UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 89th CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 111—PART 1

JANUARY 4, 1965, TO JANUARY 27, 1965
(PAGES 1 TO 1426)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1965

J
11
.R
v.111
pt 1

DEPOSITED BY THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

United States
of America

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 89th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

SENATE

Monday, January 4, 1965

The 4th of January being the day prescribed by Public Law 88–649, 88th Congress, 2d session, for the meeting of the 1st session of the 89th Congress, the Senate assembled in its Chamber at the Capitol.

CARL HAYDEN, of Arizona, President pro tempore of the Senate of the United States, called the Senate to order at 12 o'clock meridian.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., of the city of Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Father of mankind, unto whom all hearts are open, all desires known, and from whom no secrets are hid: With an unappeasable longing, our lives are drawn and driven to Thee, with a haunting, never-sated thirst for the eternal.

In the dawn of a new year on the calendar of destiny, with a world confused and dark and disturbed by portents of fear, yet lured with glorious vistas of radiant possibilities for all mankind, we turn from the shadows and shams which hedge our path, even as we seek light and truth, to this cloister of the unseen and eternal, which our fathers set up so long ago. At this high altar of the Republic's life, we pray that these servants of the public by the will of the people, lifted to high places of state, may be so strengthened by the might of dauntless dedication that, scorning all expediency, they may match these dangerous days with daring deeds. Gird them, we pray, with cheerful courage, that they may bear the weight of vast concerns, the sting of criticism, and the drudgery of unapplauded toil.

As this day, in a tapestry of words and phrases, in a time so tangled and tragic, the Chief Executive and his coadjutors sketch out the pattern of the Nation's purpose as it is seen by them may it be heard with a sympathetic realization of the vast global responsibilities, complications, and commitments with which it deals. As the panorama of the Nation's life passes before anxious eyes and minds, may the chosen legislators here highly resolve that this white-domed Capitol edifice shall be not only an arsenal of material might, but also a cathedral of religious faith where are proclaimed to all the earth the sanctions of irresistible moral force and the spiritual verities upon which our freedoms were reared, upon which they rest, and without which our boasted democracy is a bruised and broken reed.

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

CREDENTIALS—RESIGNATIONS AND APPOINTMENTS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate copies of the resignations of Senators Salinger and Humphrey and the certificates of appointment of Senators George Murphy and Walter F. Mondale to fill the respective vacancies, all of which appear to be in proper form.

Without objection, they will be printed in the Record without being read. The Chair hears no objection.

The resignations and certificates of appointment are as follows:

December 22, 1964.

Gov. Edmund G. Brown,
State Capitol,
Sacramento, Calif.

Dear Governor: I am herewith submitting my resignation as a member of the U.S. Senate effective as of the close of business Thursday, December 31, 1964.

I want to take this opportunity to again express my deep appreciation to you for the wonderful opportunity you afforded me to serve the people of the State of California in the U.S. Senate. Being a member of this distinguished body for even such a short period of time will always be something which I can recall with pride.

I am hopeful that you will appoint Senator-elect George Murphy, whom the people chose on November 3, to fill out my unexpired term and thus give the people of California the advantage of this added seniority.

Sincerely yours,

Pierre Salinger.

Executive Department,
State of California.

Certificate of Appointment

To the President of the Senate of the United States:

This is to certify that, pursuant to the power vested in me by the Constitution of the United States and the laws of the State of California, I, Edmund G. Brown, the Governor of said State, do hereby appoint George Murphy a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the unexpired term ending at noon on the 3d day of January 1965, caused by the resignation of Pierre Salinger.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, Edmund G. Brown, and our seal hereto affixed at Sacramento, Calif., this 1st day of January, in the year of our Lord 1965.

By the Governor:

Edmund G. Brown,
Governor of the State of California.
Frank M. Jordan,
Secretary of State.

U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C., *December 23, 1964.*

The Honorable Carl F. Hayden,
President pro tempore,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator: I am attaching a copy of my letter of resignation from the Senate addressed to the Honorable Karl F. Rolvaag, of Minnesota.

I am resigning on the date of December 29, in order to permit the appointment by the Governor of a Senator to succeed me on December 30.

With kind personal regards.

Sincerely,

Hubert H. Humphrey.

December 23, 1964.

The Honorable Karl F. Rolvaag,
Governor of Minnesota,
St. Paul, Minn.

Dear Governor Rolvaag: This is to inform you that I am resigning as U.S. Senator effective at the close of business on Tuesday, December 29, in order to permit the appointment of a junior Senator from Minnesota on or after December 30, 1964.

With kind personal regards.

Sincerely,

Hubert H. Humphrey,
Vice-President-elect.

State of Minnesota: Executive Department

CERTIFICATE OF APPOINTMENT OF UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM MINNESOTA

To the President of the Senate of the United States:

This is to certify that, pursuant to the power vested in me by the Constitution of the United States and the laws of the State of Minnesota, I, Karl F. Rolvaag, the Governor of said State, do hereby appoint Walter F. Mondale a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States until the vacancy therein, caused by the resignation of Hubert H. Humphrey, is filled by election as provided by law.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the great seal of the State of Minnesota to be affixed, at the capitol, in St. Paul, this 30th day of December 1964.

Karl F. Rolvaag,
Governor.
Joseph L. Donovan,
Secretary of State.

CREDENTIALS—CERTIFICATES OF ELECTION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the credentials of three Senators, namely Ross Bass, of Tennessee, Fred R. Harris, of Oklahoma, and Joseph M. Montoya, of New Mexico, elected on November 3 for unexpired terms, together with the 33 Senators elected for 6-year terms beginning on the 3d day of January 1965.

All of these certificates, the Chair is advised, except that of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. Williams] which follows a State form, are in the form suggested by the Senate.

If there be no objection, the reading of these certificates will be waived and they will be printed in full in the Congressional Record.

The credentials are as follows:

To the President of the Senate of the United States:

This is to certify that on the 3d day of November, 1964, the Honorable Ross Bass was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Tennessee, a Senator for the unexpired term ending at noon on the 3d day of January, 1967, to fill the vacancy in the representation from Tennessee in the Senate of the United States caused by the death of the Honorable Estes Kefauver.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, and our seal hereto affixed at Nashville, Tenn., this 20th day of November, in the year of our Lord 1964.

By the Governor:

Frank G. Clement,
Governor.
Joe C. Carr,
Secretary of State.

State of Oklahoma,
Office of the Governor,
Oklahoma City, November 19, 1964.

To the President of the Senate of the United States:

This is to certify that on the 3d day of November 1964, Fred R. Harris was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Oklahoma a Senator for the unexpired term ending at noon on the 3d day of January 1967, to fill the vacancy in the representation from said State in the Senate of the United States caused by the death of Robert S. Kerr.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, Henry Bellmon, and our seal hereto affixed at Oklahoma City, this 19th day of November in the year of our Lord 1964.

By the Governor:

Henry Bellmon,
Governor.
James M. Bullard,
Secretary of State.
Jack Wettengel,
Assistant Secretary of State.

State of New Mexico

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION FOR UNEXPIRED TERM

To the President of the Senate of the United States:

This is to certify that on the 3d day of November 1964, Joseph M. Montoya was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of New Mexico a Senator for the unexpired term ending at noon on the 3d day of January 1965, to fill the vacancy in the representation from said State in the Senate of the United States caused by the death of Senator Dennis Chavez.

Witness: His Excellency, Gov. Jack M. Campbell, and the State seal hereto affixed at Santa Fe, this 24th day of November in the year of our Lord 1964.

Jack M. Campbell,
Governor of New Mexico.
J. C. Compton,
Chief Justice of the Supreme Court.
Alberta Miller,
Secretary of State of New Mexico.

Certificate of Election for 6-Year Term

To the President of the Senate of the United States:

This is to certify that on the 3d day of November 1964, Quentin N. Burdick was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of North Dakota a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January, 1965.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, William L. Guy, and our seal hereto affixed at Bismarck this 1st day of December in the year of our Lord 1964.

William L. Guy,
Governor.
Ben Meier,
Secretary of State.

Commonwealth of Virginia

To the President of the Senate of the United States:

This is to certify, That on the 3d day of November 1964, Harry Flood Byrd was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Virginia a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1965.

In testimony whereof the Governor of Virginia hath hereunto signed his name and affixed the lesser seal of the Commonwealth at Richmond this 24th day of November in the year of our Lord 1964 and in the 189th year of the Commonwealth.

A. S. Harrison, Jr.,
Governor.
Martha Bell Conway,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

The State of West Virginia

To the President of the Senate of the United States:

This is to certify that on the 3d day of November 1964, Robert C. Byrd of the county of Raleigh, was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of West Virginia a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning at noon on the 3d day of January next.

Given under my hand and the great seal of the said State of West Virginia, this 18th day of December 1964.

By the Governor:

W. W. Barron,
Governor.
Joe F. Burdett,
Secretary of State.

State of Nevada

To the President of the Senate of the United States:

This is to certify, That at a general election held in the State of Nevada on Tuesday, the 3d day of November, 1964, Howard W. Cannon was duly elected by the qualified electors of the State of Nevada a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1965, having received the highest number of votes cast for said office at said election, as appears by the certificate of the duly constituted and qualified board of canvassers now on file in the office of the Secretary of State at Carson City, Nev.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the great seal of State to be affixed at Carson City, this 4th day of December in the year of our Lord 1964.

Grant Sawyer,
Governor.
John Koontz,
Secretary of State.

State of Connecticut

To the President of the Senate of the United States:

This is to certify that on the 3d day of November 1964, Thomas J. Dodd was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Connecticut a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1965.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, John Dempsey, and our seal hereto affixed at Hartford, this 25th day of November in the year of our Lord 1964.

John Dempsey
Governor.
Ella T. Grasso,
Secretary of State.

State of Arizona

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, SS.
STATE OF ARIZONA

I, Wesley Bolin, Secretary of State, do hereby certify that on the 3d day of November 1964 Paul Fannin was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Arizona, a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1965.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, Paul Fannin, and our seal hereto affixed at Phoenix, Ariz., this 8th day of December in the year of our Lord 1964.

Paul Fannin,
Governor of Arizona.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of Arizona. Done at Phoenix, the capital, this 8th day of December A.D. 1964.

Wesley Bolin,
Secretary of State.

Certificate of Election for 6-Year Term

To the President of the Senate of the United States:

This is to certify that on the 3d day of November, 1964, Hiram L. Fong was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Hawaii a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January, 1965.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, John A. Burns, and our seal hereto affixed at Iolani Palace in Honolulu, Hawaii, this 30th day of November, in the year of our Lord 1964.

By the Governor:

John A. Burns,
Governor.
William S. Richardson,
Lieutenant Governor.

State of Michigan

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION FOR 6-YEAR TERM

To the President of the Senate of the United States:

This is to certify that on the 3d day of November 1964, Philip A. Hart was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Michigan, a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1965.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, George Romney, and our seal hereto affixed at Lansing, Mich., this 10th day of December in the year of our Lord 1964.

By the Governor:

George Romney,
Governor.
James M. Hare,
Secretary of State.

To the President of the Senate of the United States:

This is to certify that on the 3d day of November 1964, Albert Gore was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Tennessee a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1965.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, and our seal hereto affixed at Nashville, Tenn., this 24th day of November in the year of our Lord 1964.

By the Governor:

FRANK G. CLEMENT,
Governor.
JOE C. CARR,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF INDIANA

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 3d day of November 1964, R. VANCE HARTKE was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Indiana a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1965.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, Matthew E. Welsh, and our seal hereto affixed at Indianapolis, Ind., this 24th day of November in the year of our Lord 1964.

By the Governor:

MATTHEW E. WELSH,
Governor.
CHARLES O. HENDRICKS,
Secretary of State.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 3d day of November A.D. 1964, SPESSARD L. HOLLAND was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Florida a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1965.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, Farris Bryant, and our seal hereto affixed at Tallahassee, this 16th day of November, in the year of our Lord 1964.

By the Governor:

FARRIS BRYANT,
Governor.
TOM ADAMS,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF NEBRASKA

CERTIFICATION OF ELECTION FOR 6-YEAR TERM

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 3d day of November 1964, ROMAN L. HRUSKA was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Nebraska a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1965.

In witness whereof, I have here unto set my hand and caused the great seal of the State of Nebraska to be affixed this 23d day of November 1964.

By the Governor:

FRANK B. MORRISON,
Governor.
FRANK MARSH,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF WASHINGTON

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 3d day of November 1964, HENRY M. JACKSON was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Washington a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1965.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the State of Washington to be affixed at Olympia this 14th day of December A.D. 1964.

By the Governor:

ALBERT D. ROSELLINI,
Governor of Washington.
KENNETH N. GILBERT,
Deputy Secretary of State.

THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION FOR 6-YEAR TERM

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 3d day of November 1964, EDWARD M. KENNEDY was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts a Senator from said Commonwealth to represent said Commonwealth in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginnnig on the 3d day of January 1965.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, Endicott Peabody, and our seal hereto affixed at Boston, this 11th day of December in the year of our Lord 1964.

By the Governor:

ENDICOTT PEABODY,
Governor.
KERWIN H. WHITE,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

STATE OF NEW YORK

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION FOR 6-YEAR TERM

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 3d day of November 1964, ROBERT F. KENNEDY was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of New York a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1965.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, Nelson A. Rockefeller, and our seal hereto affixed this 9th day of December in the year of our Lord 1964.

By the Governor:

NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER,
Governor.
JOHN P. LOMENZO,
Secretary of State.

THE STATE OF MONTANA

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 3d day of November 1964, MIKE MANSFIELD was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Montana a Senator from this State to represent the State of Montana in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1965.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, Tim Babcock, and our seal hereto affixed at Helena, this 1st day of December in the year of our Lord 1964.

By the Governor:

TIM BABCOCK,
Governor.
FRANK MURRAY,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF MINNESOTA

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION FOR 6-YEAR TERM

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 3d day of November 1964, EUGENE J. MCCARTHY was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Minnesota a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1965.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, Karl F. Rolvaag, and our seal hereto affixed at the capitol in St. Paul this 19th day of November in the year of our Lord, 1964.

KARL F. ROLVAAG,
Governor.
JOSEPH L. DONOVAN, Jr.,
Secretary of State.

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 3d day of November 1964, GALE W. MCGEE was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Wyoming a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January, 1965.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, Clifford P. Hansen, and our seal hereto affixed at 10 a.m., this 7th day of December in the year of our Lord 1964.

By the Governor:

CLIFFORD P. HANSEN,
Governor.
THYNA THOMSON,
Secretary of State.

EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT—STATE OF CALIFORNIA

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION FOR 6-YEAR TERM

To THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 3d day of November, 1964, GEORGE MURPHY was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of California a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January, 1965.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, and our seal hereto affixed at Sacramento, Calif., this 21st day of December in the year of our Lord 1964.

By the Governor:

EDMUND G. BROWN,
Governor of the State of California.
FRANK M. JORDAN,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF RHODE ISLAND

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION FOR 6-YEAR TERM

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 3d day of November 1964, JOHN O. PASTORE was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1965.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, John H. Chafee, and our seal hereto affixed at the city of Providence in the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations this 7th day of December, in the year of our Lord 1964.

By the Governor:

JOHN H. CHAFEE,
Governor.
AUGUST P. LAFRANCE,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF UTAH

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 3d day of November 1964, FRANK E. MOSS was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Utah, a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States, for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1965.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, George D. Clyde, and our seal hereto affixed at Salt Lake City, this 24th day of November, in the year of our Lord 1964.

GEORGE D. CLYDE,
Governor.
LAMONT F. TORONTO,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF MAINE

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION FOR 6-YEAR TERM

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 3d day of November 1964, EDMUND S. MUSKIE was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Maine a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United

States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1965.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, John H. Reed, and our seal hereto affixed at Augusta this 30th day of November, in the year of our Lord 1964.

By the Governor:

John H. Reed,
Governor.
Paul A. MacDonald,
Secretary of State.

State of Vermont

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION FOR 6-YEAR TERM

To the President of the Senate of the United States:

This is to certify that on the 3d day of November 1964, **Winston L. Prouty** was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Vermont a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January, in the year of our Lord 1965.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, Philip H. Hoff, and our seal hereto affixed at Montpelier, Vt., this 25th day of November, in the year of our Lord 1964.

By the Governor:

Philip H. Hoff,
Governor.
Homer B. Armstrong,
Secretary of State.

The State of Wisconsin

To the President of the Senate of the United States:

This is to certify that on the 3d day of November, 1964, **William Proxmire** was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Wisconsin a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, commencing on the 3d day of January A.D. 1965.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the great seal of the State of Wisconsin to be affixed. Done at the capitol, in the city of Madison, this 30th day of November, in the year of our Lord 1964.

By the Governor:

John W. Reynolds,
Governor.
Robert C. Zimmerman,
Secretary of State.

Commonwealth of Pennsylvania,
Governor's Office,
Harrisburg, December 22, 1964.

Hon. Carl Hayden,
President pro tempore,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Hayden: Upon certification to me by the secretary of the Commonwealth of the votes cast for the office of U.S. Senator in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, a copy of which is attached, I do herewith certify without qualification the election of the Honorable **Hugh Scott** on November 3, 1964, to be a Senator from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania for a 6-year term beginning January 3, 1965.

The three county boards of elections in whose jurisdictions the remaining challenged ballots reside have assured the secretary of the Commonwealth that the total number of such ballots is approximately 1,500. Thus, they will only serve to change the final total votes cast for each candidate without affecting the result of the election. Accordingly, when the final tabulation is completed, I will certify to you an amended return.

Meanwhile, I trust that the U.S. Senate will see fit to honor the present certification, in view of this unusual situation, and that it will seat the Honorable **Hugh Scott** along with his colleagues on January 3, 1965.

With kind personal regards and greetings of the season, I am,

Cordially yours,
William W. Scranton.

Harrisburg, *December 22, 1964.*

I, Albert E. Eberman, deputy secretary of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, having the custody of the great seal of Pennsylvania, do hereby certify, that the attached photocopy is a full, true, and correct copy of the official tabulation and computation of the votes cast in 64 counties for the office of U.S. Senator in the general election held November 3, 1964, in and for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, with the additional partial returns from three counties in which a small number of absentee votes remain challenged and unadjudicated, as prepared by the bureau of elections, department of state, in accordance with the terms of the Pennsylvania Election Code of 1937, as amended.

And I do further certify that the ballots still in dispute are insufficient in number to in anywise affect the result of the election.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the great seal of Pennsylvania to be affixed, the day and year above written.

Albert E. Eberman,
Deputy Secretary of the Commonwealth.

U.S. Senator, Nov. 3, 1964

County	Hugh Scott, Republican	Genevieve Blatt, Democrat	Morris Chertov, Mil. Wkrs.	George S. Taylor, Soc. Lab.	Scattering
Adams	10,984	8,841	19	37	4
Allegheny	366,958	349,843	1,214	1,406	312
Armstrong	16,444	15,424	24	83	6
Beaver	39,286	44,405	120	152	23
Bedford	10,142	7,016	12	24	--------
Berks	50,731	58,511	198	136	4
Blair	29,961	20,457	50	74	--------
Bradford	13,017	8,067	6	22	--------
Bucks	71,142	57,030	201	135	3
Butler	24,556	19,858	37	46	6
Cambria	39,857	41,334	92	232	4
Cameron	1,756	1,521	3	3	2
Carbon	10,405	12,081	56	25	--------
Centre	16,102	10,046	14	31	--------
Chester	55,348	33,280	59	98	41
Clarion	8,343	7,126	11	27	--------
Clearfield	15,562	14.902	40	44	2
Clinton	7,096	7,175	5	25	--------
Columbia	11,458	11,324	13	24	--------
Crawford	15,504	13,150	46	36	1
Cumberland	30,637	19,592	83	27	--------
Dauphin	52,723	35,576	304	127	3
Delaware	151,684	104.962	255	242	--------
Elk	6,812	8,114	22	17	--------
Erie	51,477	51,914	179	99	1
Fayette	25,673	34,825	120	65	--------
Forest	1,248	903	3	3	--------
Franklin	18,430	14,411	16	35	--------
Fulton	2,104	1,811	8	8	1
Greene	6,167	8,996	13	26	--------
Huntingdon	8,734	5,346	19	34	--------
Indiana	16,958	12,400	23	90	--------
Jefferson	11,496	7,757	16	32	--------
Juniata	4,050	3,145	--------	--------	--------
Lackawanna	51,973	66,887	52	54	2
Lancaster	64,873	40,444	76	76	--------
Lawrence	22,130	22,801	72	83	--------
Lebanon	20,482	12,961	32	26	--------
Lehigh	45,408	46,574	156	96	3
Luzerne	62,854	87,567	719	654	--------
Lycoming	24,049	20,953	34	48	--------
McKean	10,256	8,324	65	21	--------
Mercer	24,412	25,255	113	58	--------
Mifflin	7,764	6,889	25	11	--------
Monroe	8,500	8,237	46	13	--------
Montgomery	149,344	88,439	228	242	--------
Montour	3,157	3,127	2	6	--------
Northampton	33,561	45,591	281	84	1
Northumberland	22,452	22,319	25	52	--------
Perry	6,862	4.453	17	17	--------
Philadelphia	381,546	523,870	1,390	1,149	--------
Pike	3,312	2,067	9	7	--------
Potter	4.088	2,834	5	16	--------
Schuylkill	36,440	49,497	46	82	--------
Snyder	6,486	2,986	7	13	--------
Somerset	18,441	14,361	18	34	5
Sullivan	1,633	1,376	3	6	--------
Susquehanna	8,785	5,580	9	14	--------
Tioga	9,070	5,391	11	20	--------
Union	6,359	2,884	8	18	1
Venango	13,703	9,362	16	35	3
Warren	8,804	7,625	47	10	--------
Washington	40,520	46,876	80	173	--------
Wayne	8,043	4,077	26	15	--------
Westmoreland	70,338	78,001	292	247	40
Wyoming	5,389	2,730	6	5	--------
York	45,569	46,545	145	83	5
Total	2,429,448	2,359,026	7,317	6,881	473

Commonwealth of Pennsylvania

To the President of the Senate of the United States:

This is to certify that on the 3d day of November 1964, **Hugh Scott** was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania a Senator from said Commonwealth to represent said Commonwealth in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1965.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, William W. Scranton, and our seal hereto affixed at the city of Harrisburg, Pa., this 22d day of December in the year of our Lord 1964.

By the Governor:

William W. Scranton,
Governor.
George I. Bloom,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

State of Mississippi

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION FOR 6-YEAR TERM

To the President of the Senate of the United States:

This is to certify that on the 3d day of November 1964, **John C. Stennis** was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Mississippi a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1965.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, Paul B. Johnson, and our seal hereto affixed at Jackson, this 4th day of November in the year of our Lord 1964.

Paul B. Johnson,
Governor.
Heber Ladner,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF MISSOURI

To all who shall see these presents, greeting: Know ye, That it having been certified to me that STUART SYMINGTON was on the 3d day of November 1964, duly elected to the office of U.S. Senator within and for the State of Missouri.

Now, therefore, in the name and on behalf of the State of Missouri, I, John M. Dalton, Governor thereof, do hereby commission him U.S. Senator aforesaid, for the term of 6 years as specified by law and authorize and empower him to discharge the duties of said office according to law.

In testimony whereof, I hereunto set my hand and cause to be affixed the great seal of the State of Missouri. Done at the city of Jefferson, this 10th day of December in the year of our Lord 1964.

By the Governor:

JOHN M. DALTON,
Governor.
NAMES E. DEAMS,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF MARYLAND

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 3d day of November 1964, JOSEPH D. TYDINGS was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Maryland a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1965.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, J. Millard Tawes and our seal hereto affixed at the city of Annapolis, this 1st day of December in the year of our Lord 1964.

J. MILLARD TAWES,
Governor.
LLOYD L. SIMPKINS,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF NEW JERSEY

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 3d day of November 1964, HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR., was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of New Jersey a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1965.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, Richard J. Hughes, and our seal hereto affixed at Trenton, this 2d day of December, in the year of our Lord 1964.

By the Governor:

RICHARD J. HUGHES,
Governor.
ROBERT M. FALCEY,
Acting Secretary of State.

STATE OF DELAWARE

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

Be it known an election was held in the State of Delaware, on Tuesday, the 3d day of November, in the year of our Lord 1964, that being the Tuesday next after the first Monday in said month, in pursuance of the Constitution of the United States and the laws of the State of Delaware, in that behalf, for the election of a Senator for the people of the said State, in the Senate of the United States.

Whereas the official certificates or returns of the said election, held in the several counties of the said State, in due manner made out, signed, and executed, have been delivered to me according to the laws of the said State, by the superior court of the said counties; and having examined said returns, and enumerated and ascertained the number of votes for each and every candidate or person voted for, for such Senator, I have found JOHN J. WILLIAMS to be the person highest in vote, and, therefore, duly elected Senator of and for the said State in the Senate of the United States for the constitutional term to commence at noon on the 3d day of January in the year of our Lord 1965.

I, Elbert N. Carvel, Governor, do, therefore, according to the form of the act of the general assembly of the said State and of the act of Congress of the United States, in such case made and provided, declare the said JOHN J. WILLIAMS the person highest in vote at the election aforesaid, and, therefore, duly and legally elected Senator of and for the said State of Delaware in the Senate of the United States, for the constitutional term to commence at noon on the 3d day of January in the year of our Lord 1965.

Given under my hand and the great seal of the said State, in obedience to the said act of the general assembly and of the said act of Congress, at Dover, the 12th day of November in the year of our Lord 1964 and in the year of the Independence of the United States of America the 189th.

By the Governor:

ELBERT N. CARVEL,
Governor.
ELISHA C. DUKES,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF TEXAS

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 3d day of November 1964, RALPH W. YARBOROUGH was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Texas a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1965.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor of Texas, and our seal hereto affixed at Austin, Tex., this 20th day of November, in the year of our Lord 1964.

By the Governor:

JOHN CONNALLY,
Governor of Texas.
CRAWFORD C. MARTIN,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF OHIO

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 3d day of November 1964, STEPHEN M. YOUNG was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Ohio a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1965.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, James A. Rhodes, and our seal hereto affixed at Columbus, Ohio, this 1st day of December, in the year of our Lord 1964.

By the Governor:

JAMES A. RHODES,
Governor.
TEAL W. BROWN,
Secretary of State.

ADMINISTRATION OF OATHS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senators to be sworn in will present themselves at the desk in groups of four, as their names are called in alphabetical order.

The clerk will call the names.

The legislative clerk (Edward E. Mansur) called the names of Mr. BASS, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. BYRD of Virginia, and Mr. BYRD of West Virginia.

These Senators, escorted by Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, Mr. ROBERTSON, and Mr. RANDOLPH, respectively, advanced to the desk of the President pro tempore; the oath prescribed by law was administered to them by the President pro tempore; and they severally subscribed to the oath in the official oath book.

The legislative clerk called the names of Mr. CANNON, Mr. DODD, Mr. FANNIN, and Mr. FONG.

These Senators, escorted by Mr. BIBLE, Mr. RIBICOFF, Mr. DIRKSEN, and Mr. INOUYE, respectively, advanced to the desk of the President pro tempore; the oath prescribed by law was submitted to them by the President pro tempore; and they severally subscribed to the oath in the official oath book.

The legislative clerk called the names of Mr. GORE, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. HART, and Mr. HARTKE.

These Senators, escorted by Mr. BASS, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. MCNAMARA, and Mr. BAYH, respectively, advanced to the desk of the President pro tempore; the oath prescribed by law was administered to them by the President pro tempore; and they severally subscribed to the oath in the official oath book.

The legislative clerk called the names of Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. HRUSKA, and Mr. JACKSON.

These Senators, escorted by Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. CURTIS, and Mr. MAGNUSON, respectively, advanced to the desk of the President pro tempore; the oath prescribed by law was administered to them by the President pro tempore; and they severally subscribed to the oath in the official oath book.

The legislative clerk called the names of Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Mr. KENNEDY of New York, Mr. MANSFIELD, and Mr. MCCARTHY.

These Senators, accompanied by Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. METCALF, and Mr. BARTLETT, respectively, advanced to the desk of the President pro tempore; the oath prescribed by law was administered to them by the President pro tempore; and they severally subscribed to the oath in the official oath book.

The legislative clerk called the names of Mr. MCGEE, Mr. MONDALE, Mr. MONTOYA, and Mr. MOSS.

These Senators, accompanied by Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. ANDERSON, and Mr. BENNETT, respectively, advanced to the desk of the President pro tempore; the oath prescribed by law was administered to them by the President pro tempore; and they severally subscribed to the oath in the official oath book.

The legislative clerk called the names of Mr. MURPHY, Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. PASTORE, and Mr. PROUTY.

These Senators, accompanied by Mr. KUCHEL, Mrs. SMITH, Mr. PELL, and Mr. AIKEN, respectively, advanced to the desk of the President pro tempore; the oath prescribed by law was administered to them by the President pro tempore; and they severally subscribed to the oath in the official oath book.

The legislative clerk called the names of Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. STENNIS, and Mr. SYMINGTON.

These Senators, escorted by Mr. NELSON, Mr. CLARK, Mr. EASTLAND, and Mr. LONG of Missouri, respectively, advanced to the desk of the President pro tempore; the oath prescribed by law was administered to them by the President pro tempore; and they severally subscribed to the oath in the official oath book.

The legislative clerk called the names of Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, Mr. YARBOROUGH, and Mr. YOUNG of Ohio.

These Senators, escorted by Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. CASE, Mr. BOGGS, Mr. TOWER, and Mr. LAUSCHE, respectively, advanced to the desk of the President pro tempore; the oath prescribed by law was administered to them by the President pro tempore; and they severally subscribed to the oath in the official oath book.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 1 Leg.]

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Bartlett
Bass
Bayh
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Dominick
Douglas
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fannin
Fong
Fulbright
Gore
Gruening
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Johnston
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Miller
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Morse
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Murphy
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Robertson
Russell
Saltonstall
Scott
Simpson
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is present.

LIST OF SENATORS BY STATES

Alabama.—Lister Hill and John J. Sparkman.

Alaska.—E. L. Bartlett (Bob) and Ernest Gruening.

Arizona.—Carl Hayden and Paul J. Fannin.

Arkansas.—John L. McClellan and J. W. Fulbright.

California.—Thomas H. Kuchel and George Murphy.

Colorado.—Gordon Allott and Peter H. Dominick.

Connecticut.—Thomas J. Dodd and Abraham A. Ribicoff.

Delaware.—John J. Williams and J. Caleb Boggs.

Florida.—Spessard L. Holland and George A. Smathers.

Georgia.—Richard B. Russell and Herman E. Talmadge.

Hawaii.—Hiram L. Fong and Daniel K. Inouye.

Idaho.—Frank Church and Len B. Jordan.

Illinois.—Paul H. Douglas and Everett M. Dirksen.

Indiana.—Vance Hartke and Birch E. Bayh.

Iowa.—Bourke B. Hickenlooper and Jack Miller.

Kansas.—Frank Carlson and James B. Pearson.

Kentucky.—John Sherman Cooper and Thruston B. Morton.

Louisiana.—Allen J. Ellender and Russell B. Long.

Maine.—Margaret Chase Smith and Edmund S. Muskie.

Maryland.—Daniel B. Brewster and Joseph D. Tydings.

Massachusetts.—Leverett Saltonstall and Edward M. Kennedy.

Michigan.—Pat McNamara and Philip A. Hart.

Minnesota.—Eugene J. McCarthy and Walter F. Mondale.

Mississippi.—James O. Eastland and John Stennis.

Missouri.—Stuart Symington and Edward V. Long.

Montana.—Mike Mansfield and Lee Metcalf.

Nebraska.—Roman L. Hruska and Carl T. Curtis.

Nevada.—Alan Bible and Howard W. Cannon.

New Hampshire.—Norris Cotton and Thomas J. McIntyre.

New Jersey.—Clifford P. Case and Harrison A. Williams, Jr.

New Mexico.—Clinton P. Anderson and Joseph M. Montoya.

New York.—Jacob K. Javits and Robert F. Kennedy.

North Carolina.—Sam J. Ervin, Jr. and B. Everett Jordan.

North Dakota.—Milton R. Young and Quentin N. Burdick.

Ohio.—Frank J. Lausche and Stephen M. Young.

Oklahoma.—A. S. Mike Monroney and Fred R. Harris.

Oregon.—Wayne Morse and Maurine B. Neuberger.

Pennsylvania.—Joseph S. Clark and Hugh Scott.

Rhode Island.—John O. Pastore and Claiborne Pell.

South Carolina.—Olin D. Johnston and Strom Thurmond.

South Dakota.—Karl E. Mundt and George S. McGovern.

Tennessee.—Albert Gore and Ross Bass.

Texas.—Ralph W. Yarborough and John G. Tower.

Utah.—Wallace F. Bennett and Frank E. Moss.

Vermont.—George D. Aiken and Winston L. Prouty.

Virginia.—Harry Flood Byrd and A. Willis Robertson.

Washington.—Warren G. Magnuson and Henry M. Jackson.

West Virginia.—Jennings Randolph and Robert C. Byrd.

Wisconsin.—William Proxmire and Gaylord Nelson.

Wyoming.—Gale W. McGee and Milward L. Simpson.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. MANSFIELD submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 1) which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That a committee consisting of two Senators be appointed by the President pro tempore to join such committee as may be appointed by the House of Representatives to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that a quorum of each House is assembled and that the Congress is ready to receive any communication he may be pleased to make.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair appoints the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] as the members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

NOTIFICATION TO THE HOUSE

Mr. DIRKSEN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 2), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Secretary inform the House of Representatives that a quorum of the Senate is assembled and that the Senate is ready to proceed to business.

HOUR OF DAILY MEETING

Mr. LONG of Louisiana submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 3), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the hour of daily meeting of the Senate be 12 o'clock meridian unless otherwise ordered.

COUNT OF ELECTORAL VOTES

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 1), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the two Houses of Congress shall meet in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Wednesday, the 6th day of January 1965, at 1 o'clock post meridian, pursuant to the requirements of the Constitution and laws relating to the election of President and Vice President of the United States, and the President pro tempore of the Senate shall be their presiding officer; that two tellers shall be previously appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate on the part of the Senate and two by the Speaker on the part of the House of Representatives, to whom shall be handed, as they are opened by the President pro tempore of the Senate, all the certificates and papers purporting to be certificates of the electoral votes, which certificates and papers shall be opened, presented, and acted upon in the alphabetical order of the States, beginning with the letter A; and said tellers, having then read the same in the presence and hearing of the two Houses, shall make a list of the votes as they shall appear from the said certificates; and the votes having been ascertained and counted in the manner and according to the rules by law provided, the result of the same shall be delivered to the President pro tempore of the Senate, who shall thereupon announce the state of the vote, which announcement shall be deemed a sufficient declaration of the persons, if any, elected President and Vice President of the United States, and, together with a list of the votes, be entered on the Journals of the two Houses.

RETIREMENT OF MR. CHARLES L. WATKINS, SENATE PARLIAMENTARIAN—HIS DESIGNATION AS PARLIAMENTARIAN EMERITUS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, before sending to the desk a resolution, on behalf of the distinguished minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN] and myself, and requesting immediate consideration thereon, I announce the retirement of Mr. Charles L. Watkins, the Senate Parliamentarian.

It will be of interest to Members of the Senate and the country to know that, until his retirement, Mr. Watkins was the first and only Senate Parliamentarian. His total Government service covered approximately 59 years, with continuous Senate service of more than 50 years. Another point should be mentioned. When the United Nations Conference was held in San Francisco in 1945, with the permission and leave of the Senate, Mr. Watkins was appointed the official parliamentarian of that Conference by the late Secretary of State, Mr. Stettinius.

I wish to add a personal word. The Senate has never had a more dedicated or conscientious employee. When any individual has rendered a lifetime of capable service, whether it be in government or private business, he deserves appreciation and recognition. I know that I speak for all my colleagues in expressing our deep appreciation for his outstanding and faithful service. He has been both fair to and considerate of all of us. I wish for him many good years of good health and happiness.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a biographical sketch concerning Mr. Watkins' service.

There being no objection, the biographical sketch was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHARLES L. WATKINS

Charles L. Watkins, born at Mount Ida, Ark., August 10, 1879; graduate of the Mount Ida Normal Academy and of the law department, University of Arkansas.

Clerk in the offices of the attorney general and of the Governor of the State of Arkansas, 1899–1901.

Clerk of the commission created by the Arkansas State Legislature to provide for the erection of a building and for exhibits at the World's Fair to be held in St. Louis, Mo., in 1903 (opening later postponed to April 30, 1904), celebrating the centennial of the Louisiana Purchase in 1803; 1902–4.

On December 1, 1904, the day following the close of the fair on November 30, he was appointed stenographer in the office of U.S. Senator James P. Clarke, of Arkansas; in 1907 was named as his secretary, and in 1911 was appointed clerk of a minority committee to which Senator Clarke was assigned as chairman.

For approximately 14 months in 1913–14, during the political campaign for reelection of Senator Clarke, he served on the latter's personal payroll, but on July 16, 1914, he was appointed as a clerk in the office of the Secretary of the U.S. Senate; served in various positions in that office until June 15, 1919, when he was appointed minute and Journal clerk of the Senate.

In 1923, when one of the reading clerks, who advised the Presiding Officer of the Senate on parliamentary matters, became incapacitated, he assumed that duty also. On July 1, 1935, the office of Parliamentarian never having been created, his title was changed by the Senate to Parliamentarian and Journal Clerk. On July 1, 1937, the combined duties of his position were separated, and he was appointed as Parliamentarian.

In April 1945 he was named by Secretary of State Stettinius as the official parliamentarian at the United Nations Conference at San Francisco, having been given leave from the Senate for that purpose.

His service with the Senate has been continuous since July 16, 1914, a period of over 50 years, with a total service, however, of approximately 59 years.

Mr. MANSFIELD. In recognition of his devoted service and the unusual circumstances of the position which he held for many years, on behalf of myself and the minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], I send a resolution to the desk and request, after an interval, its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 4), as follows:

Whereas the Senate has been advised of the retirement of its Parliamentarian, Charles L. Watkins, after approximately 59 years of service as an employee of the Senate; and

Whereas the said Charles L. Watkins held the office of Parliamentarian of the Senate continuously from the date of the creation of that office until his retirement; and

Whereas the said Charles L. Wakins has discharged the difficult and important duties and responsibilities of his office with efficiency, fairness, and impartiality; and

Whereas his outstanding service and devotion to duty have earned for him the confidence, the respect, the admiration, and the affection of all those whom he has served: Therefore be it

Resolved, That, as a token of the appreciation of the Senate for his long, faithful, and outstanding service, Charles L. Watkins is hereby designated as Parliamentarian Emeritus of the U.S. Senate.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, it is doubtful whether 86 years ago, when a baby was born in the village of Mount Ida, Ark., and the word got about town, anybody thought that the baby born in the Watkins family would grow up to leave an indelible impression on the history and affairs of this Republic. The baby I refer to is Charles Lee Watkins. Twenty-five years later he came to Washington to enter the service of the U.S. Senate, and he has continued until almost this day, when, by this resolution, he is to become the first Parliamentarian Emeritus of the Senate.

When he was born, Rutherford Hayes, of Ohio, was in the White House. William Wheeler, of New York, was presiding over this body as Vice President. In this body were many distinguished Senators. There was the plumed knight from Maine, James G. Blaine. There was Hannibal Hamlin, of Maine, who formerly was Vice President under Abraham Lincoln. There was George Frisbie Hoar, of Massachusetts. There was John J. Ingalls, the great orator from Kansas. There was Zachariah Chandler, of Michigan, at one time a candidate for the Presidency. There was Roscoe Conkling, of New York, who also left an indelible stamp on this body. There were many others.

But for 30 or more years, Charles L. Watkins has served this body as its Parliamentarian, and he served under 10 Vice Presidents, 3 of whom became Presidents.

What a testimonial that is to the noble virtues of steadfastness, stability, fidelity to duty, complete impartiality, and deep conviction as he served both Democrat and Republican Parties over the years. What a testimonial also that after his retirement he still enobles those great Christian virtues, because he will continue as a Sunday school teacher at Calvary Methodist Church in the Nation's Capital.

Were he so disposed, what memoirs and what fascinating stories he could tell, but I understand he will never set on paper any memoir, on the ground that his relations with Members of the Senate were of a confidential character.

If he should ever change his mind, I could supply him with titles for books he could leave to posterity. For example, one might be entitled "Great Statesmen That I Have Overruled." Or he might write a book with some such title as "Statesmen Whose Anger Was Short-lived Over My Unpleasant Rulings."

But he leaves us a legacy in the form of Dr. Floyd Riddick, who has been at his side for 14 years. He leaves us also Murray Zweben, who now becomes Assistant Parliamentarian.

So as Charlie Watkins goes to a well-merited retirement, we say to him, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant. You have served the Senate of the United States but, more than that, you have served the people of the country in your capacity as parliamentarian to the United Nations Conference, when its charter was fabricated in San Francisco. So you also have served the people of the entire world."

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I cannot let the pending resolution be adopted without associating myself with the high tributes that have been paid to this fine and faithful employee and servant of the Senate whom I have had an opportunity to know for more than three decades.

Over that period the Senate has known many faithful servants. We have been singularly blessed by the very high quality of personnel that is attached to the Senate. I have never known a truer servant, or one more dedicated to his concept of his duties, than Charlie Watkins

I have seen this man tried by fire. I know of no power on earth and no influence in this body that could cause him to deviate from his opinion as to a proper ruling on any parliamentary question. One might think that Charlie Watkins was wrong on some point, but one could not change his position unless one could find precedents that were spelled out in the record of the Senate and bring them to his attention.

It is remarkable that a man could be so objective without respect to party affiliation.

Every Member of this body has trusted him. In his service in one of the most responsible positions in the Senate, Republican and Democrat alike have had complete faith in his desire to make proper rulings.

It so happens that I have been active on occasions in the Senate during this long period in matters involving the rules and procedures of this body. I can look down the lane of those 32 years and recall three different occasions when I made parliamentary points which resulted in the Chair being overridden and my own views sustained by the Senate.

It is remarkable to note that on not one of those occasions did the Presiding Officer take the advice of Charlie Watkins in making his rulings. The Chair made them on his own, and the Senate did not concur with the Chair when the Chair deviated from the advice that he had received from the Parliamentarian, Charlie Watkins.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is eminently correct in saying that this man could write a fascinating book on the Senate. Personally, I wish that he would do it.

He has watched the Senate for a longer period of time than has any other man in the history of the United States. He has seen the great. He has seen the mediocre. He has been the transitory. He has watched them all.

Behind his expressions of parliamentary rulings and his activities, there was the mind of a keen judge of human nature and of human beings. It would be a wonderful thing if this faithful and valued employee were to record, for the benefit of this country, some of his recollections, views, opinions, and observations.

There is nothing that I can say which would add to the eloquent statements of the majority leader and the minority leader. However, I wish to salute this good friend of mine, Charlie Watkins, and express the sincere hope and earnest prayer that he will enjoy many long and fruitful years in his well deserved retirement.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, yesterday I had occasion to attend a function to welcome new Members of Congress. Some Members of Congress had an opportunity to express their views of the new Members.

If any new Member may not have had any parliamentary experience, if he wishes to establish a reputation as a parliamentary wizard, my advice is that there is no better way to get it than to consult the Parliamentarian. That will enable him to look ahead, to see what his next situation will be.

I have seen times when a ruling by the Parliamentarian might have tended to frustrate the leadership. But no one can say that the advice of Charlie Watkins has been anything other than impartial, fair, and without regard to who was helped or hurt.

We have been extremely fortunate in the caliber of the man who has served us over that long period of years.

Mr. President, in losing a very good man, we are also gaining a very good man. In my judgment, the new Parliamentarian, Floyd M. Riddick, will live up in every respect to the kind of service that is demanded of a successor to Charlie Watkins.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks that have already been made by the distinguished majority leader and minority leader and other Senators who have preceded me.

I am happy to join them in tribute to my longtime friend Charlie Watkins, a native of the State that I have the honor to represent, and who has occupied his high position in the Senate with great credit and distinction for more than half a century.

In the course of his long years of service he demonstrated a combination of exceptional qualities that won for him the lasting respect and personal admiration and esteem of every Member of this body. He was beyond question one of the most courteous, accommodating, and patient public servants I have ever known. He was not only accommodating and considerate, but he was, in his particular field of responsibility, fully informed and knowledgeable.

The great reservoir of information that he possessed was reinforced by a thorough knowledge of long standing traditions and the multitudinous precedents that have been established by this body. He has a profound understanding of both the letter and the spirit of the rules of the Senate and this equipped him with an almost uncanny capacity to apply a correct interpretation of the Senate rules to every given situation.

He was ever faithful to his trust and dedicated to serving the Senate as well as performing the other duties which his office imposed upon him.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial lauding Mr. Watkins for his service to the Senate, and also a telegram sent to him by the President of the United States.

There being no objection, the telegram and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEMPORARY WHITE HOUSE,
JOHNSON CITY, TEX.,
December 30, 1964.

CHAS. L. WATKINS,
Office of the Secretary of the Senate:

It is hard to imagine the Senate without Charlie Watkins. Congress and the country have rarely been served by a man so devoted, so selfless, and so valuable. My best wishes for your happiness and health as you leave the Hill. I hope I may continue to have your counsel and guidance which have meant so much for so long.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Jan. 1, 1965]

A PARLIAMENTARIAN RETIRES

Charles L. Watkins is leaving the Senate at the age of 85 with rare distinction. Indeed, he is the only Parliamentarian the Senate has ever had. The facts that the Senate kept him in harness in one capacity or another for 60 years and that presiding officers of both parties have relied heavily upon his advice are sufficient evidence of the type of service he rendered.

It might be said of Mr. Watkins that he created the position which he so ably filled. Back in the days when Woodrow Wilson was President, Mr. Watkins, then Journal clerk of the Senate, began giving advice on parliamentary issues to the then Vice President, Thomas R. Marshall. Actually he has helped to keep the Senate functioning smoothly within its own rules for half a century, even though he did not receive the title of Parliamentarian until 1935.

Fortunately, he is turning over his duties to a very able understudy, Floyd M. Riddick. Even so, his genial voice, his encyclopedic knowledge of the Senate's rules and his cooperative attitude in helping people to understand the Senate and its ways will be sorely missed. Without Charlie Watkins, the Senate won't be quite the same.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, all Arkansans are proud of Charlie Watkins. I regret exceedingly his decision to resign from his post, and join with all of my colleagues in wishing him many years of joy, happiness, and good health in his retirement.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, as one who has had many long arguments with Charlie Watkins over the rules of the Senate, both in his office and on the floor of the Senate, I always found him to be extremely patient and understanding. Never would he lose his temper. Never was he hasty in his decisions. He always tried to explain his point of view fully; and that point of view was generally right.

I first came in contact with him when I wished to amend rule No. XXII in 1946. At that time, he helped me to draft a proposed change in that rule which he believed would be helpful and which was later adopted.

I join other Senators in congratulating Charlie Watkins on his work and on his service over many years; and I wish him many happy useful years ahead.

I am confident that Dr. Floyd M. Riddick, taking example from Mr. Watkins' service, will give the Senate the same type of service that Charlie Watkins did over the many years he served in the Senate.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I, too, wish to join the leaders of the Senate in expressing our deep sense of loss at the retirement of one of the great Parliamentarians of our time.

I knew Charlie Watkins very well. I respected his great knowledge of the vast lore of parliamentary detail, precedent, and procedure that his wide and long experience had given him.

He had a most difficult task, particularly in handling the great work of Senator Bob La Follette in changing the Senate rules in the Reorganization Act of 1946.

As Senators know, this act consolidated committees into approximately one-half their previous number, and set Senate guidelines and jurisdiction for the committees, something which heretofore they had not had. In the old days, the author of a bill would be able to refer its assignment to the committee on which he sat or of which he was chairman. There was a mixed jurisdiction, almost a jigsaw puzzle, as to the proper reference of legislation.

Charlie Watkins had 100 or more rules changes to decide on, which finally affected the referral of bills. He dealt with many other technicalities and facets of the La Follette-Monroney Act of 1946. He mastered them all with great grace, great ease, and great accuracy.

Often, in the years I have been privileged to serve in the Senate, I went to Charlie Watkins for parliamentary interpretations. In some committees I was fortunate enough to be presiding over some rather "hot-shot" decisions that were difficult for me to understand; but I found Charlie Watkins' advice to be always accurate, nonpartisan, and reliable.

Mr. President, the task of making changes in the Senate rules was made much more difficult than it was in the House, because the House had completed a great deal of work under the late great Parliamentarian and former chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Clarence Cannon. He spent nearly a lifetime in the compilation of the precedents of the House, and compiled a long annotated series of decisions of each Speaker from the earliest days of that body. That information was not available in the Senate. Consequently, Mr. Watkins had to do a great deal of research to find historic precedents upon which to base his opinions.

In pursuance of the Reorganization Act, which created a legislative index and summary of the Congressional Record—which we had not had before—we secured the services of a very fine young man by the name of Floyd M. Riddick to do the work on the index and digest of the Congressional Record. Mr. Watkins proceeded to train Mr. Riddick not only in conducting that operation, which improved so vastly the Congressional Record, but also trained him in the work Mr. Riddick was to do when the great Parliamentarian decided to retire.

In Mr. Riddick we have a man who has been trained for more than 12 years under Charlie Watkins. Mr. Riddick knows the great history, the great responsibility, and the great legislative lore upon the basis of which we—who have been called the greatest deliberative body in the world—must function and act.

Mr. Riddick is well aware of the great traditions of this body. He is also well aware that the Parliamentarian, like Caesar's wife, must be above suspicion on all accounts, because in the Senate many parliamentary decisions are far more important than votes. In this regard, there was never any question about Charlie Watkins whom we honor today.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I wish to join other Senators in paying tribute to our retiring Parliamentarian, Charlie Watkins.

Many Senators have referred to his ability. It was outstanding. Many Senators have referred to his knowledge of Senate rules and precedents. This knowledge has never been surpassed. Many Senators have referred to his integrity. It was unimpeachable.

All these virtues Charlie Watkins fully possessed, but I shall remember him best for his kindness to a freshman Member of the Senate, who had served previously for 14 years in the House where the rules are so very different, and where this freshman Senator was often confused as to what was going on or what would be coming up next.

No one could have been more considerate of a freshman Senator than was this veteran who has served with such distinguished men as were recently mentioned by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen].

Yet, Charlie Watkins was always available to any Member of the Senate. I developed a great fondness for him and a great admiration for his fine qualities.

It is with deep regret that I see him leave the Senate, but I hope that he will enjoy life for many years to come.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, before we get too far away from the subject, I wish to join other Senators who have paid tribute to Charlie Watkins, the retiring Parliamentarian. I can add nothing to what has been said regarding his skill, his knowledge, and his helpfulness in handling difficult parliamentary questions.

One thing that often amazed me was the intricacies that he could find in a legislative proposal that would never occur to me. I might submit a proposal that to me seemed to be simple; and yet with his skill at analysis he could soon make it plain that it was weak in one area or in another and needed a change, or that it might run into conflict with some precedent or rule.

Another quality of Charlie Watkins that I always enjoyed was his complete personal characteristics. I used to enjoy hearing him tell of some of his experiences in the Senate, some of the great debates in the Senate, and some of the characteristics of the Senators who had sat here over the years during which he had served as Parliamentarian. From time to time he would show me passages in some of the old Records that I found to be most interesting.

The remarks made by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell] were most appropriate. How great it would be if we might have the benefit of the narration of Mr. Watkins' experiences and observations during the years that he served as Parliamentarian of the U.S. Senate as well as the other bodies mentioned by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen] in which he served as parliamentarian.

Charlie Watkins has been a great public servant. We shall miss him. We are all pleased that his understudy, Dr. Riddick, will remain with us. We know we shall have highly competent parliamentary assistance from him. I trust, as I know every Senator does, that Charlie Watkins may have many years of great happiness, good health, and success during the retirement that he has so well earned.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I wish to join with those who have paid great and deserved tribute to Charlie Watkins, and I do so as one who has sat at the feet of Charlie Watkins for 20 years and has been guided by his impartiality, his fairness, his vast expertness, which has never been surpassed, his parliamentary knowledge, the integrity of his approach to all parliamentarian questions before this body, and his utter immunity in his decisions to any influence on one side or the other of a question.

I shall not burden the Senate with longer discussion of that question except to say that I heartily endorse everything that has been said about this great public servant and all the things for which he stood, and to wish him complete happiness and many years of enjoyment of the retirement which he so richly deserves.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the resolution is agreed to.

PRINTING OF REMARKS ON RETIREMENT OF CHARLES WATKINS AS PARLIAMENTARIAN AS A SENATE DOCUMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks on the retirement of Charles Watkins made today and which may be made in the next few days may be printed as a Senate document.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ORGANIZATION OF THE CONGRESS

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I want to proceed on a related item, because the next Parliamentarian will have—we hope—many changes to deal with in the structural organization of the Senate and the Congress, a reorganization of the legislative machinery of the United States which is long overdue.

Mr. President, on Wednesday I shall submit for appropriate reference a concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress of the United States. I shall ask unanimous consent on Wednesday that the resolution lie on the table until January 8, in order to permit other Senators who may wish to do so to join as cosponsors.

At this time I want to announce that the following Senators have joined in cosponsorship:

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Proxmire]; the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Hickenlooper]; the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss]; the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long]; the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Harris]; Mrs. Margaret Chase Smith, the distinguished and great lady from the State of Maine; the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Bartlett]; the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan]; another great lady of our Senate from the other side of this great Nation, the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. Neuberger]; the Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough]; the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Ribicoff]; and the Senator from Montana [Mr. Metcalf].

Mr. President, I have just received word from the chairman of the Republican policy committee, the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall], my colleague on the Appropriations Committee, that he wishes to join in cosponsoring this concurrent resolution when it is submitted.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I should be delighted to have my name added to the list of cosponsors of the concurrent resolution. I consider it a worthwhile piece of proposed legislation.

Mr. MONRONEY. I am honored that the distinguished chairman of the Democratic caucus wishes to cosponsor the concurrent resolution. I hope for immediate submission of this concurrent resolution on Wednesday. Its designation—if it comes up for consideration first—will be Senate Concurrent Resolution 2.

Mr. President, incidentally, the concurrent resolution is being submitted today in the House, which means that the Senate will be 2 days late in its submission. It is being submitted in the House by Representative **KUNKEL**, of Pennsylvania; Representative **BENNETT**, of Florida; Representative **MADDEN**, of Illinois; Representative **EDMONDSON**, of Oklahoma; Representative **HECHLER**, of West Virginia; and Representative **O'BRIEN**, of New York.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the proposed concurrent resolution be printed in the body of the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The text is as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there is hereby established a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress (hereinafter referred to as the committee) to be composed of six Members of the Senate (not more than three of whom shall be members of the majority party) to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and six Members of the House of Representatives (not more than three of whom shall be members of the majority party) to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members. No recommendation shall be made by the committee except upon a majority vote of the Members representing each House, taken separately.

SEC. 2. The committee shall make a full and complete study of the organization and operation of the Congress of the United States and shall recommend improvements in such organization and operation with a view toward strengthening the Congress, simplifying its operations, improving its relationships with other branches of the United States Government, and enabling it better to meet its responsibilities under the Constitution. This study shall include, but shall not be limited to, the organization and operation of each House of the Congress; the relationship between the two Houses; the relationships between the Congress and other branches of the Government; the employment and remuneration of officers and employees of the respective Houses and officers and employees of the committees and Members of Congress; and the structure of, and the relationships between, the various standing, special, and select committees of the Congress: *Provided*, That nothing in this concurrent resolution shall be construed to authorize the committee to make any recommendations with respect to the rules, parliamentary procedure, practices, and/or precedents of either House, or the consideration of any matter on the floor of either House: *Provided further*, That the language employed herein shall not prohibit the committee from studying and recommending the consolidations and reorganization of committees.

SEC. 3. (a) The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eighty-ninth Congress, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable.

(b) The committee is empowered to appoint and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, technicians, and clerical and stenographic assistants as it deems necessary and advisable.

(c) The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $150,000 through January 31, 1966, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers signed by the chairman.

(d) The committee shall report from time to time to the Senate and the House of Representatives the results of its study, together with its recommendations, the first report being made not later than 120 days after the effective date of this concurrent resolution. If the Senate, the House of Representatives, or both, are in recess or have adjourned, the report shall be made to the Secretary of the Senate or the Clerk of the House of Representatives, or both, as the case may be. All reports and findings of the committee shall, when received, be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate and the appropriate committees of the House.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, since completing a final draft of the resolution a few days ago, I forwarded copies of it to all Members of the Senate and to all Members of the House of Representatives. The response that already has been noted from Members of both the Senate and the House has been most gratifying. I am encouraged to believe that Congress is about to make another historic review of its modus operandi, a review and study—an expert examination—that can set the stage for a continuing healthy and reasonably happy life for the legislative branch of our Government.

This examination comes none too soon. From time to time we have dealt with minor ailments in the legislative process as their symptoms have become bothersome, but it has been 20 years since Congress submitted its overall organization and posture to such scrutiny. You will note that the resolution is almost identical to the concurrent resolution sponsored by the late Senator La Follette and myself, and passed by Congress, in 1945. The approach we made to our many difficult problems two decades ago proved so successful that we can confidently try it again.

The resolution establishes a committee to be composed of six Members of the Senate appointed by the President of the Senate and six Members of the House appointed by the Speaker. Not more than three Members from each House could be from the majority party. The committee would make a full and complete study of the organization and operation of the Congress and recommend improvements with a view toward strengthening and simplifying its operations, improving its relationships with other branches of Government, and enabling it better to meet its responsibilities under the Constitution.

The only differences from the 1945 resolution are of a technical nature, relating to expenses of the committee and limitations on staff and stenographic help.

Perhaps you read in the morning newspapers today about the Louis Harris public opinion survey recently conducted to determine the attitude of people concerning Congress. It would appear, on the basis of this dispatch, that Congress has improved its public relations during the past year. It was stated that when the 88th Congress gathered a year ago, 65 percent of the American public thought the job Congress had done up until that time was only fair, at best. As the 89th Congress convenes, Mr. Harris reported, there has been such a massive shift of attitudes that 64 percent of the public now thinks Congress has done an excellent or good job. I believe this shift in public opinion is a tribute to every Member of the 88th Congress who participated constructively in the big decisions of 1964. It speaks eloquently on behalf of the great new leadership which Congress has chosen in this decade of change and challenge. It speaks urgently also on behalf of continued efforts to improve our performance, and all Members of Congress know of improvements that could be made.

I do not intend to discuss in detail today the problem areas that militate in favor of a congressional reorganization effort again this year, but there is one provision of the resolution I want to emphasize strongly. It is the proviso which prohibits the committee from making any recommendations with respect to the rules, parliamentary procedure, practices, and/or precedents of either House, or the consideration of any matter on the floor of either House. This is the same as the proviso contained in the resolution which created the joint committee in 1945.

I realize there are many rules and precedents in both Houses which contribute to delay and inefficiency, but I am also aware that each House makes its own rules and neither can set, change, or modify the rules of the other. Any attempt to do so would be futile and would endanger the prospects for passage of other urgently needed modifications.

While the joint committee could not make recommendations on rules and procedures, it would be free to take testimony on such matters for consideration. But it would remain the prerogative and responsibility of each House to make changes in its rules, parliamentary procedures, practices, precedents, and floor procedures.

This approach enabled us in 1946 to achieve the first significant reorganization in six decades. Its strength lies in not prejudging the issues, in considering all measures which would strengthen the Congress, and in reserving to each House the right to change or not change those rules and procedures peculiar to it. Different approaches have been tried in the past 20 years, but all have failed to achieve their goal of broad reorganization.

Most of our internal problems are not dramatic. A grand-slam spectacular way to improve the functioning of democracy is not the purpose of this resolution. Reform will come through 25 or even 50 changes, each contributing its share to modernization.

Yet, around the world the nations just emerging from centuries of domination by colonial powers or from systems of local and tribal rather than national rule are looking for models of effective self-government. They will look westward toward freedom and progress. Or they will look to the East, toward totalitarian systems, sacrificing personal freedom for the sake of an enforced national unity and order and the hope of economic progress.

Of all the nations of the world, the United States, as the largest and one of the oldest of the democracies, will reflect an enlarged image, good or bad, for them to accept or reject.

But beyond setting an example, we are compelled by the pressures of our task of world leadership to refine our procedures and modernize the tools of our democracy to insure decision and action. Our system of majority rule, wisely sharing responsibility and authority among the executive, legislative, and judicial branches, must continue to work.

We do not need a strong Executive dominating a weak Legislature, or a strong Legislature imposing its will on the courts or the executive branch. We have a team of three independent and equal partners, each with its role. Their functioning under the constitutional separation of powers is vital to our continued existence, and to our leadership in a world seeking the path toward peace and human freedom. For nearly 175 years our basic freedoms have been guarded by the "people's branch" of government, the Congress. It was in these freely elected citizens from the towns and hamlets, from the big and little States, that the framers of the Constitution lodged the primary power to support and perfect our democracy. This was the branch that provided neighborhood government, at the county and State levels. The voter has his greatest influence over this branch. He can change his Representative or his Senator for any good reason, for any bad reason, or for no reason at all. In the lower House, a few hundred or a thousand votes shifting from one member to his opponent will install a new member.

The system is good, but its problems do not diminish—they grow. The functioning of the 435 House Members and the 100 Senators requires self-restraint and self-improvement. Only Congress can improve its operations. And that is why I introduce this resolution today—in hopes that this 89th Congress will take the necessary steps to improve itself so that it can perform the functions required of it in this sixth decade of the 20th century and future decades and centuries to come.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF RULE XXII

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, after consultation with the majority leader, I desire to give notice that at the first appropriate moment—possibly on Wednesday—a resolution to change rule XXII of the Senate rules will be submitted. My statement is made for the purpose of giving notice that that will be done.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. As I understand, the legal basis upon which we would be proceeding—and I hope very much to join with the Senator from New Mexico in the effort—requires that no other business be transacted by the Senate before the question is considered.

Heretofore that understanding has been had with the majority leader. We have done that previously. As the Senator who is the leader of the movement knows, that has been done in other Congresses.

I hope very much—and I make my expression to the Senator as a legal matter—that that understanding is clear of record; that is, notwithstanding the fact that the Senator is not submitting the resolution at this moment, which he would have an absolute right to do under the Constitution and the procedures of the Senate, no business will intervene, before the proposed action is taken, that will prejudice the legal basis for which we have always contended for this move.

Mr. ANDERSON. I assure the Senator from New York that his statement is correct. I have discussed the question with the present majority leader. I have previously discussed it with the minority leader. I have discussed it with the able Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. I am sure there will be no problem on that point at all. We are merely accommodating ourselves to the desires of the majority leader.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. If it would be any comfort to the Senator from New York and allay his fears, I should like to advise the Senate that I went to the RECORD of 1963, and observed that on the opening day of the 88th Congress the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] served notice that at the appropriate time, after the state of the Union message, he would submit a resolution. After the President had delivered his state of the Union message, and at the next meeting of the Senate, the Senator from New Mexico submitted a resolution. While I had some doubts as to the validity of the submission of that resolution, I was overruled by the then Vice President, the present President of the United States. I did not believe that the resolution should be introduced out of order, even though it applied to a Senate rule. But the holding of the Vice President was to the effect that the regular order of business in the morning hour provided for the introduction of new matter.

I know that the resolution will be submitted. I do not propose to quibble over the time of its submission. The question will be settled on the floor of the Senate at the appropriate time.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I agree with the Senator thoroughly. I knew that that would be his attitude, and I have no fear on that subject. Always involved is the legal question as to the validity of our position, and I felt that it was just as well to settle it now. That was the only reason for my intercession.

Mr. ANDERSON. I have no fear. I thank the Senator from Georgia for his statement.

SENATOR DIRKSEN'S BIRTHDAY

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I invite attention to the fact that today is a great day in the history of the Republican Party, in the history of the Senate, in the history of the Congress, and in the history of the country. I shall not state the age of the Senator to whom I refer. It will be up to him to state his own age if he wishes to do so. He has never been hesitant in doing so. He would still be a young man, because he was born in the same year in which I was born, though he is a little older than I am by 2 or 3 months. Some years ago there was born in Pekin, Ill., one who has come to be recognized as one of the great Americans in this country.

EVERETT DIRKSEN has devoted more than two-thirds of his mature life to public service, mostly in the Congress of the United States. During those years he has seen many issues of vital and controlling importance to our country and to the world come before this body, and he has participated in all decisions on those issues which have arisen during the time of his service.

Today is his natal day. He passes another milestone. He is not an old man. He is young in mind, and outside of an occasional sore foot or some other ailment to which hard work and sometimes exhaustion make him subject, he is young in body.

No one in the Senate—and, so far as I know, in the Congress of the United States—is a more inveterate worker in the pursuit of information on proposed legislation in relation to the programs before the Congress than is EVERETT DIRKSEN. He often works himself to the point of exhaustion in the interest of his job, and far above and beyond the ordinary call of duty in connection with his responsibilities.

He is loved by all of us, and he has served all of us impartially. The Republicans like him immensely. They have placed their confidence in him as leader of the minority in the Senate. Many of us have tried to make him the leader of the majority; but while we can make him a leader, we cannot always control the majority, or the minority, to our regret, on this side of the aisle. Be that as it may, I am sure he enjoys the confidence of the majority Members of the Senate as well as the high regard and affection of the minority Members.

So on this day, at the outset of the 89th Congress, I am sure that all Senators on this side of the aisle—and I have my affirmative opinion of the affection in which he is held on the other side of the aisle—congratulate EVERETT on passing this additional milestone and on retaining his youthful approach and his mental and physical vigor. We wish him all of the best on this anniversary of his birthday; and if he wants to tell the Senate how old he is, the Senate will know that he is just as old as I am. But I leave that to him.

Congratulations, EVERETT.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to join with the chairman of the Republican policy committee, the distinguished senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] and our other colleagues in extending felicitations and best wishes to an old, valued, and true friend, the distinguished minority leader in this body.

I have had the great privilege to serve with EVERETT DIRKSEN in both the House and the Senate. I have valued his advice, his counsel, his understanding, and his tolerance. He is, in the finest sense of the meaning of the word, an "old pro." He understands the intricacies of the Senate as an institution and he does his very best to see that it functions in as efficient a way as possible. The Republicans are extremely fortunate to have EVERETT DIRKSEN as their leader, and the country is fortunate, as well, because when we consider the type of leadership furnished by this great Senator, I believe that the future of not only the Republican Party, but the future of the country, as well, are in good hands.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I wish to join with my colleagues in congratulating the minority leader, EVERETT DIRKSEN, upon his birthday. I have looked it up in the records, so I know just how old he is, and I can tell him so today or at a later date, if he is uncertain as to his age.

He has four outstanding qualities that make him an effective leader. First, he has warm friendship with every colleague in the Senate, whether he be on the Republican side or on the Democratic side. All Senators have confidence in him. When he expresses himself, that confidence is shown.

The second quality that makes him an effective leader is his willingness to yield his own point of view in order to obtain results. That was brought out most clearly in the last year or so on the civil rights bill. Also, he was an effective advocate in the final passage of legislation concerning the nuclear test ban treaty. He has worked hard and well on legislation relating to international questions.

Third, he has the ability to express himself, so that when he reaches his decision, he states it clearly and so effectively that Senators are willing to follow him.

Finally, he has great personal courage in expressing his points of view, sometimes when they are not popular or so popular as they might be. I myself have heard him make speeches and have seen him make appearances when I knew he was in great physical discomfort.

So, Ev, I too, join with your friends in congratulating you on this birthday, which makes you an even longer experienced, more effective, and better leader than you have ever been before.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the words of Andrew Marvell come crashing down through the centuries:

> He nothing common did, or mean,
> Upon that memorable scene.

That is, has been, and will continue to be, the creed of EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN in his public career and in his private life. All of us congratulate him on his birthday. We give him our fond felicitations. We also give him our prayers for many long years of health and happiness.

We have one more prayer to utter in his behalf.

Since 1950, the U.S. Senate has passed many milestones of imposing importance to the people of the country and, indeed, of the globe. The Senate, on many of these occasions, has been guided in its path by the Republican leader whom we honor in this moment. As a matter of fact, I think I may say that, on some of those occasions, the milestones were actually constructed by the leader of the Republican Party in the Senate. There is no need to enumerate them here today, except to say that our additional prayer is that at the crossroads which the Members of this body, this year and in the future, will confront we may continue to have the guidance, and share the wisdom, of a patriot who has served his country almost all of his adult life, and who has made a valiant, noble and enduring impression upon the country and his party—the leader of the minority in this Chamber, the distinguished Senator from Illinois, EVERETT DIRKSEN.

I feel assured that the wives of all of us, as well as all Members of the Senate join in extending to him our heartfelt best wishes on his birthday and wish for him many happy returns.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, with my colleagues, I salute EVERETT DIRKSEN, on his birthday. He is an extraordinary man—a politician in the philosophical and practical sense, an orator of humor and fancy, a classicist, sometimes a poet, a pragmatist and an idealist. He has labored effectively and loyally for our party—the Republican Party—but in the long roll of history he will be known as a Senator who has moved his influence and power into decisive action for the great decisions the Congress has made—civil rights, the nuclear test ban treaty, the maintenance of the United Nations, and many others.

I have no doubt that in the years ahead Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN will make even greater contributions to our country.

ASCERTAINMENT OF ELECTORS FOR PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate two communications from the Acting Administrator of General Services Administration, transmitting pursuant to law certified copies of the final ascertainment of the electors for President and Vice President from the several States; which, with the accompanying papers, will lie on the table.

AUTHORIZATION OF SENATOR METCALF TO PERFORM DUTIES OF THE CHAIR AS ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be stated.

The resolution (S. Res. 5) was read, considered, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph 3 of rule I of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Senator from Montana (Mr. METCALF) be, and he is hereby, authorized to perform the duties of the Chair as Acting President pro tempore until otherwise ordered by the Senate.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask the distinguished majority leader what the program will be for the remainder of the day, for tomorrow, and for Wednesday, when the electoral vote will be counted in the joint session.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in response to the questions raised by the distinguished minority leader, it is our intention that the Senate stand in recess until 8:15 this evening. At the time, the Senate will reassemble and depart in a body to the Hall of the House of Representatives to hear an address on the state of the Union by the President of the United States.

It is not anticipated that the Senate will return to its Chamber after that message is concluded. But, insofar as the business for tomorrow is concerned, there will be no meeting tomorrow. This evening a motion will be entered, with the concurrence of the distinguished minority leader, to stand in recess, or adjournment, until 11:30 on Wednesday morning next, at which time the Senate once again, in a body, will repair to the Hall of the House of Representatives to participate in the counting of the electoral vote.

It is my anticipation, again with the concurence of the minority leader, that following the conclusion of that ceremony, the Senate will return to its Chamber and get down to business of some kind.

Bills will be introduced after the state of the Union message, in accordance with the traditions and customs of the Senate, but not before Wednesday.

RECESS TO 8:15 P.M.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 8:15 p.m.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess until 8:15 p.m. of the same day.

At 8:15 p.m., the Senate reassembled, when called to order by the President pro tempore.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, notified the Senate that a quorum of the House had assembled; that JOHN W. MCCORMACK, a representative from the State of Massachusetts, had been elected Speaker, and that Ralph R. Roberts, a citizen of the State of Indiana, had been elected Clerk of the House of the 89th Congress.

The message also notified the Senate that a committee of three Members had been appointed by the Speaker on the part of the House of Representatives to join with a committee on the part of the Senate to notify the President of the United States that a quorum of each House had been assembled, and that the Congress was ready to receive any communication that he may be pleased to make.

The message announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 1) to provide that the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on January 4, 1965, at 9 p.m., for the purpose of receiving such communication as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 5) continuing the joint committee to make necessary arrangements for the inauguration of the President-elect and Vice-President-elect on January 20, 1965, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 1) to provide for the counting on January 6, 1965, of the electoral votes for President and Vice President of the United States.

APPOINTMENT OF SENATORS TO COUNT ELECTORAL VOTES FOR PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. In accordance with the provisions of Senate Concurrent Resolution 1, agreed to earlier today, the Chair appoints the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] as tellers on the part of the Senate to count the electoral votes for President and Vice President of the United States on January 6, 1965.

REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the joint committee appointed by the Senate and the House of Representatives to notify the President that quorums of the two Houses have assembled and are ready to receive any communication he may desire to make have performed that duty and now report that at 9 o'clock tonight the President will deliver to Congress his message on the state of the Union.

JOINT SESSION TO RECEIVE MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 1, and that the concurrent resolution be immediately considered and agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 1, which will be stated.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 1) was read, considered, and agreed to, as follows:

> *Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)*, That the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on January 4, 1965, at 9 o'clock p.m., for the purpose of receiving such communication as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11:30 A.M. WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 6, 1965

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the joint session tonight to hear the President of the United States deliver his state of the Union message the Senate adjourn until 11:30 o'clock a.m. on Wednesday next.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NECESSARY ARRANGEMENTS FOR INAUGURATION OF PRESIDENT-ELECT AND VICE-PRESIDENT-ELECT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate, House Concurrent Resolution 5, and ask that the resolution be immediately considered and adopted.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The concurrent resolution will be read.

The legislative clerk read the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 5), as follows:

> *Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)*, That effective from January 3, 1965, the joint committee created by S. Con. Res. 71, of the Eighty-eighth Congress, to make the necessary arrangements for the inauguration of the President-elect and Vice-President-elect of the United States on the 20th day of January 1965, is hereby continued and for such purpose shall have the same power and authority as that conferred by such S. Con. Res. 71, of the Eighty-eighth Congress.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the concurrent resolution is agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

JOINT SESSION OF THE TWO HOUSES—MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is now time for the Senate to move as a body to the Hall of the House of Representatives.

Thereupon (at 8 o'clock and 42 minutes p.m.) the Senate, preceded by its Secretary (Felton M. Johnston), the Sergeant at Arms (Joseph C. Duke), and the President pro tempore, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] proceeded to the Hall of the House of Representatives, to hear the message of the President of the United States.

(The message of the President of the United States, this day delivered by him to a joint session of the two Houses of Congress, appears in the proceedings of the House of Representatives in today's RECORD.)

ADJOURNMENT

At the conclusion of the joint session of the two Houses, and in accordance with the order previously entered, at 9 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m., the Senate adjourned until Wednesday, January 6, 1965, at 11:30 o'clock a.m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 4, 1965

This being the day fixed by the 20th amendment of the Constitution for the annual meeting of the Congress of the United States, the Members-elect of the House of Representatives of the 89th Congress met in their Hall, and at 12 o'clock noon were called to order by the Clerk of the House of Representatives, Hon. Ralph R. Roberts.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., prefaced his prayer with these words of Scripture: *In the beginning God* and *Remember now thy Creator*.

Almighty God, may it be the goal of all our aspirations to begin this new Congress with Thee and to remember Thee in all our plans and purposes.

Inspire us to share in the service and struggles of our day and generation lest we merit the judgment of posterity that we have lived and labored in vain.

Show us how we may give our Republic and our democracy a new image, one that is more righteous and radiant, more meaningful and magnanimous.

We humbly acknowledge that there is still so much to do for Thee and our needy world.

Grant that our President and Vice President, our Speaker and the newly chosen Representatives of the Congress, may accept the challenge and responsibility of seeking and striving for the peace and prosperity, the health and happiness of all mankind.

Hear us as we unite in offering unto Thee our Lord's Prayer:

Our Father who art in heaven, hallowed be Thy name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread.

And forgive us our debts as we forgive our debtors. And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil: For Thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever.

Amen.

The CLERK. Representatives-elect to the 89th Congress: This is the day fixed by statute for the meeting of the 89th Congress.

As the law directs, the Clerk of the House has prepared the official roll of the Representatives-elect.

Credentials covering the 435 seats in the 89th Congress have been received and are now on file with the Clerk of the 89th Congress.

The names of those persons whose credentials show they were regularly elected in accordance with the laws of the several States and of the United States will be called; and as the roll is called, following the alphabetical order of the States, beginning with the State of Alabama, Representatives-elect will answer to their names to determine whether or not a quorum is present.

The reading clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll by States and the following Representatives-elect answered to their names:

[Roll No. 1]

ALABAMA

Edwards, Jack
Dickinson
Andrews, George W.
Andrews, Glenn
Selden
Buchanan
Martin, James D.
Jones, Robert E., Jr.

ALASKA

Rivers, Ralph J. (at large)

ARIZONA

Rhodes, John J.
Udall
Senner

ARKANSAS

Gathings
Mills
Trimble
Harris

CALIFORNIA

Clausen, Don H.
Johnson, Harold T.
Moss
Leggett
Burton, Phillip
Mailliard
Cohelan
Miller
Edwards, Don
Gubser
Younger
Talcott
Teague, Charles M.
Baldwin
McFall
Sisk
King, Cecil R.
Hagen, Harlan
Holifield
Smith, H. Allen
Hawkins
Corman
Clawson, Del
Lipscomb
Cameron
Roosevelt
Reinecke
Bell
Brown, George E., Jr.
Roybal
Wilson, Charles H.
Hosmer
Dyal
Hanna
Utt
Wilson, Bob
Van Deerlin
Tunney

COLORADO

Rogers, Byron G.
McVicker
Evans, Frank E.
Aspinall

CONNECTICUT

Daddario
St. Onge
Giaimo
Irwin
Monagan
Grabowski

DELAWARE

McDowell (at large)

FLORIDA

Sikes
Bennett
Pepper
Fascell
Herlong
Rogers, Paul G.
Haley
Matthews
Fuqua
Gibbons
Gurney
Cramer

GEORGIA

Hagan, G. Elliott
O'Neal, Maston
Callaway
Mackay, James A.
Weltner
Flynt
Davis, John W.
Tuten
Landrum
Stephens

HAWAII

(at large)

Matsunaga
Mink

IDAHO

White, Compton I., Jr.
Hansen, George V.

ILLINOIS

Dawson
O'Hara, Barratt
Murphy, William T.
Derwinski
Kluczynski
Ronan
Annunzio
Rostenkowski
Yates
Collier
Pucinski
McClory
Rumsfeld
Erlenborn
Reid, Charlotte T.
Anderson, John B.
Arends
Michel
Schisler
Findley
Gray
Springer
Shipley
Price

INDIANA

Madden
Halleck
Brademas
Adair
Roush
Roudebush
Bray
Denton
Hamilton
Harvey, Ralph
Jacobs

IOWA

Schmidhauser
Culver
Gross
Bandstra
Smith, Neal
Greigg
Hansen, John R.

KANSAS

Dole
Mize
Ellsworth
Shriver
Skubitz

KENTUCKY

Stubblefield
Natcher
Farnsley
Chelf
Carter
Watts
Perkins

LOUISIANA

Hébert
Boggs
Willis
Waggonner
Passman
Morrison
Thompson, T. A.
Long, Speedy O.

MAINE

Tupper
Hathaway

MARYLAND

Morton
Long, Clarence D.
Garmatz
Fallon
Machen
Mathias
Friedel
Sickles (at large)

MASSACHUSETTS

Conte
Boland
Philbin
Donohue
Morse
Bates
Macdonald
O'Neill, Thomas P., Jr.
McCormack
Martin, Jos. W., Jr.
Burke
Keith

MICHIGAN

Conyers
Vivian
Todd
Hutchinson
Ford, Gerald R.
Chamberlain
Mackie, John C.
Harvey, James
Griffin
Cederberg
Clevenger
O'Hara, James G.
Diggs
Nedzi
Ford, William D.
Dingell
Griffiths
Broomfield
Farnum

MINNESOTA

Quie
Nelsen
MacGregor
Karth
Fraser
Olson, Alec G.
Langen
Blatnik

MISSISSIPPI

Abernethy
Whitten
Williams
Walker, Prentiss
Colmer

MISSOURI

Karsten
Curtis
Sullivan
Randall
Bolling
Hull
Hall
Ichord
Hungate
Jones, Paul C.

MONTANA

Olsen, Arnold
Battin

NEBRASKA

Callan
Cunningham
Martin, Dave

NEVADA

Baring (at large)

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Huot
Cleveland

NEW JERSEY

Cahill
McGrath
Howard
Thompson, Frank, Jr.
Frelinghuysen
Dwyer
Widnall
Joelson
Helstoski
Rodino
Minish
Krebs
Gallagher
Daniels
Patten

NEW MEXICO

(at large)

Walker, E. S. Johnny
Morris

NEW YORK

Pike
Grover
Wolff
Wydler
Tenzer
Halpern
Addabbo
Rosenthal
Delaney
Celler
Keogh
Kelly
Multer
Rooney, John J.
Carey
Murphy, John M.
Lindsay
Powell
Farbstein
Ryan
Scheuer
Gilbert
Bingham
Fino
Ottinger
Reid, Ogden R.
Dow
Resnick
O'Brien
King, Carleton J.
McEwen
Pirnie
Robison
Hanley
Stratton
Horton
Conable
Goodell
McCarthy
Smith, Henry P. III
Dulski

NORTH CAROLINA

Bonner
Fountain
Henderson
Cooley
Scott
Kornegay
Lennon
Jonas
Broyhill, James T.
Whitener
Taylor

NORTH DAKOTA

Andrews, Mark
Redlin

OHIO

Gilligan
Clancy
Love
McCulloch
Latta
Harsha
Brown, Clarence J.
Betts
Ashley
Moeller
Stanton
Devine
Mosher
Ayres
Secrest
Bow
Ashbrook
Hays
Kirwan
Feighan
Vanik
Bolton
Minshall
Sweeney (at large)

OKLAHOMA

Belcher
Edmondson
Albert
Steed
Jarman
Johnson, Jed, Jr.

OREGON

Wyatt
Ullman
Green, Edith
Duncan, Robert B.

PENNSYLVANIA

Barrett
Nix
Byrne, James A.
Green, William J.
Rhodes, George M.
Watkins
Curtin
Dague
McDade
Flood
Whalley
Schweiker
Moorhead
Rooney, Fred B.
Kunkel
Schneebeli
Corbett
Craley
Dent
Saylor
Johnson, Albert W.
Vigorito
Clark
Morgan
Fulton, James G.

RHODE ISLAND

St Germain
Fogarty

SOUTH CAROLINA

Rivers, L. Mendel
Watson
Dorn
Ashmore
Gettys
McMillan

SOUTH DAKOTA

Reifel
Berry

TENNESSEE

Quillen
Duncan, John J.
Brock
Evins, Joe L.
Fulton, Richard
Anderson, William R.
Murray
Everett
Grider

TEXAS

Patman
Brooks
Beckworth
Roberts
Cabell
Teague, Olin E.
Dowdy
Thomas
Thompson, Clark W.
Pickle
Poage
Wright
Purcell
Young
de la Garza
White, Richard
Burleson
Rogers, Walter
Mahon
Gonzalez
Fisher
Casey
Pool (at large)

UTAH

Burton, Laurence J.
King, David S.

VERMONT

Stafford (at large)

VIRGINIA

Downing
Hardy
Satterfield
Abbitt
Tuck
Poff
Marsh
Smith, Howard W.
Jennings
Broyhill, Joel T.

WASHINGTON

Pelly
Meeds
Hansen, Julia B.
May
Foley
Hicks
Adams

WEST VIRGINIA

Moore
Staggers
Slack
Hechler
Kee

WISCONSIN

Stalbaum
Kastenmeier
Thomson, Vernon W.
Zablocki
Reuss
Race
Laird
Byrnes, John W.
Davis, Glenn R.
O'Konski

WYOMING

Roncalio (at large)

The CLERK. The rollcall discloses that 432 Representatives-elect have answered to their names.

A quorum is present.

STATEMENT REGARDING CERTAIN CREDENTIALS

The CLERK. The Clerk will state that credentials are on file showing the election of the Honorable SANTIAGO POLANCO-ABREU as Resident Commissioner from the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

ELECTION OF SPEAKER

The CLERK. The next order of business is the election of a Speaker of the House of Representatives for the 89th Congress.

Nominations are now in order.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Clerk, as chairman of the Democratic caucus, I am directed by the unanimous vote of that caucus to present for election to the office of the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the 89th Congress the name of the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, a Representative-elect from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Clerk, by authority, by direction, and by unanimous vote of the Republican conference, I nominate for Speaker of the House of Representatives the Honorable GERALD R. FORD, a Representative-elect from the State of Michigan to the 89th Congress.

The CLERK. The Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, a Representative-elect from the State of Massachusetts, and the Honorable GERALD R. FORD, Representative-elect from the State of Michigan, have been placed in nomination. Are there further nominations? [After a pause.] There being no further nominations, the Clerk will appoint the following to act as tellers: The gentleman from Texas, Mr. BURLESON, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. CORBETT, the gentlewoman from Missouri, Mrs. SULLIVAN, and the gentlewoman from Illinois, Mrs. REID.

Tellers will come forward and take their seats at the desk in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

The roll will now be called, and those responding to their name will indicate by surname the nominee of their choice.

The reading clerk will call the roll.

The tellers having taken their places, the House proceeded to vote for Speaker.

The following is the result of the vote:

[Roll No. 2]

McCORMACK

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, George W.
Annunzio
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Bandstra
Baring
Barrett
Beckworth
Bennett
Bingham
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bonner
Brademas
Brooks
Brown, Calif.
Burke
Burleson
Burton, Calif.
Byrne, Pa.
Cabell
Callan
Cameron
Carey
Casey
Celler
Chelf
Clark
Clevenger
Cohelan
Colmer
Conyers
Cooley
Corman
Craley
Culver
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Dawson
de la Garza
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Dorn
Dow
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Duncan, Oreg.
Dyal
Edmondson
Edwards, Calif.
Evans, Colo.
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farbstein
Farnsley
Farnum
Fascell
Feighan
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Foley
Ford, William D.
Fraser
Friedel
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gathings
Gettys
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gilligan
Gonzalez
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Greigg
Grider
Griffiths
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Hamilton
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Iowa
Hansen, Wash.
Hardy
Harris
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hébert
Hechler
Helstoski
Henderson
Herlong
Hicks
Holifield
Howard
Hull
Hungate
Huot
Ichord
Irwin
Jacobs
Jarman
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Okla.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Kelly
Keogh
King, Utah
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Krebs
Landrum
Leggett
Lennon
Long, La.
Long, Md.
Love
McCarthy
McDowell
McFall
McGrath
McMillan
McVicker
Macdonald
Machen
Mackay
Mackie
Madden
Mahon
Marsh
Matsunaga
Matthews
Meeds
Miller
Mills
Minish
Mink
Moeller
Monagan
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Natcher
Nedzi
Nix
O'Brien
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neal, Ga.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Poage
Pool
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Race
Randall
Redlin
Resnick
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, S.C.
Rivers, Alaska
Roberts
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Ronan
Roncalio
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Roosevelt
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roybal
Ryan
Satterfield
St Germain
St. Onge
Scheuer
Schisler
Schmidhauser
Scott
Secrest
Selden
Senner
Shipley
Sickles
Sikes
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Va.
Staggers
Stalbaum
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Sweeney
Taylor
Teague, Tex.
Tenzer
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Todd
Trimble
Tuck
Tunney
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vigorito
Vivian
Waggonner
Walker, N. Mex.
Watts
Weltner
White, Idaho
White, Tex.
Whitener
Whitten
Williams
Willis
Wilson, Charles H.
Wolff
Wright
Yates
Young
Zablocki

GERALD R. FORD

Adair
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, Glenn
Andrews, N. Dak.
Arends
Ashbrook
Ayres
Baldwin
Bates
Battin
Belcher
Bell
Berry
Betts
Bolton
Bow
Bray
Brock
Broomfield
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burton, Utah
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Callaway
Carter
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Collier
Conable
Conte
Corbett
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis
Dague
Davis, Wis.
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Dole
Duncan, Tenn.
Dwyer
Edwards, Ala.
Ellsworth
Erlenborn
Findley
Fino
Frelinghuysen
Fulton, Pa.
Goodell
Griffin
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Hall
Halleck
Halpern
Hansen, Idaho
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Horton
Hosmer
Hutchinson
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Keith
King, N.Y.
Kunkel
Laird
Langen
Latta
Lindsay
Lipscomb
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McEwen
MacGregor
Mailliard
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Mathias
May
Michel
Minshall
Mize
Moore
Morse
Morton
Mosher
Nelsen
O'Konski
Pelly
Pirnie
Poff
Quie
Quillen
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reinecke
Rhodes, Ariz.
Robison
Roudebush
Rumsfeld
Saylor
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Shriver
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Smith, N.Y.
Springer
Stafford
Stanton
Talcott
Teague, Calif.
Thomson, Wis.
Tupper
Utt
Walker, Miss.
Watkins
Whalley
Widnall
Wilson, Bob
Wyatt
Wydler
Younger

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—3

Ford, Gerald R.
McCormack
Watson

The CLERK. The tellers agree on their tallies. The total number of votes cast is 428, of which the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, received 289, and the Honorable GERALD R. FORD received 139. Three voted "present."

Therefore, the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, is the duly elected Speaker of the House of Representatives for the 89th Congress, having received a majority of the votes cast.

The Clerk appoints the following committee to escort the Speaker-elect to the chair: the gentleman from Oklahoma, Mr. ALBERT; and the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. GERALD R. FORD.

The Doorkeeper announced the Speaker-elect of the House of Representatives of the 89th Congress, who was escorted to the chair by the committee of escort.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues of the 89th Congress, in the 16 years that I have been privileged to be a Member of the House of Representatives and on the eight occasions when I have seen the Congress convene and the gavel pass from the individual who lost to the individual selected as Speaker, the gavel has gone from a Republican to a Democrat seven times. Prior to 1959, this honor of presenting the Speaker-elect has fallen on the shoulders of my good friend and outstanding legislator, former Speaker of the House, JOE MARTIN. It has also been the responsibility in the past three Congresses of my good friend and most able legislator, the Honorable CHARLES HALLECK, of Indiana. Two years ago, Mr. Speaker, he handed the gavel to you.

I can say to you, Mr. Speaker, that it is a privilege for me on this occasion to pass the gavel to you. However, I might add, in a somewhat lighter vein, that I hope this is an experience which will not be duplicated too frequently in the future; some reciprocity seems to be in order.

All of us on the Republican side, Mr. Speaker, love you as an American; we respect you as a leader of the great Democratic Party and we know of your personal dedication to the ideals and aspirations of all Americans. You and all of us in this Chamber, of course, know that we are the product of a constitutional system, a system which is based on probably the most historic document ever put together by the mind of man for the governing of people. But I think that we who actively participate in the political arena know that that document, great as it is, a document which permitted 13 poor, struggling Colonies to grow to a Nation of 50 States, to the most powerful nation in the world economically, agriculturally, militarily, and spiritually, cannot function without people who are active in politics.

Likewise it cannot function without people who are politicians. I, of course, use "politics and politicians" in the true and proper sense. We must realize that it is politics and politicians that put the blood in the veins and the breath of life into the still bones of a constitutional system. Also we know that it is our responsibility to participate in the preservation of that document whenever the necessity arises. This document can work better for all of us with the strengthing of the two-party system and we on our own side intend to work for that purpose.

May I say in conclusion that we in the minority have in the past supported you and the administration when we believed it was for the best interest of the United States. We will act accordingly in the future. We will support you when we think the ideas and the programs are right, and I am sure you will reserve to us the right and the prerogative on behalf of those we represent to oppose these programs when our conscience dictates.

So, I say to you, Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege, a pleasure, and a great honor to congratulate you and to present you to the House of Representatives.

Mr. McCORMACK. To my distinguished colleagues and valued associates, I appreciate very much the kind and generous remarks made about me by my friend, the minority leader, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD], I can assure the gentleman that the deep, philosophical thoughts that he expressed are also entertained by me in relation to this great country of ours and in relation to the protection of the rights of all Members of the House under the rules of the House.

I am deeply grateful to my Democratic colleagues who on Saturday last selected me as their party's nominee for the office of Speaker.

I am grateful to the Members of the House for today officially electing me to the important position of Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives for the 89th Congress.

Throughout the years that I have been a Member of the House it has been a pleasure for me to work with all of the Members of the House. This has special emphasis as to the friendly and understanding relationship that I have always had not only with my Democratic friends but with my Republican friends.

The Republican leadership and the members and leaders of both parties from time to time may have their differences on pending matters. But transcending any difference is the love we have for our country. Of paramount importance, also, is the friendship and the respect that we have for each other.

To be elected as a Member of the House of Representatives is a great honor, for we are Members of the greatest deliberative body in the world.

To be elected as Speaker is an added honor. But while it is an honor for one to be elected Speaker and to serve as Speaker, it represents an important and grave position of trust.

From the time I first assumed this office, I was determined to live up to the traditions of the Speakers of the past who always maintained the rights and prerogatives of the House of Representatives.

In my remarks of 2 years ago I said, in part:

> As Speaker of the House I shall always protect the dignity and the prerogatives of this great body.

I shall continue to do so.

The 88th Congress just completed was one of the great Congresses of our history, and I have every confidence that the 89th Congress will make a most notable record.

Like you, I am looking forward to serving with the new Members who sincerely and in dedication to public service have already made a profound impression on me.

We meet, my colleagues, at the beginning of the 89th Congress under circumstances of monumental crises and of unlimited opportunities. Prospects are not totally but on the whole very bright and sound. Not only does our beloved country stand in the forefront of the nations as the most powerful force for peace and justice in the world, but for me the horizon seems bright, especially behind this philosophy of decency at home and our desire for understanding abroad.

We have, as a result of the politically historic election of last November, with his clear mandate, the leadership of Lyndon B. Johnson, as President, and of HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, as Vice President. They speak to the American people and to the world from the high quality of their individual gifts, their wide experience and great moral conviction and courage, and their dedication to our Nation and to our people.

On the legislative level, as a coordinate branch of the Government, I know the Congress will cooperate with President Johnson and Vice President HUMPHREY in the best interests of our country.

All of this contributes to an atmosphere of goodwill and unity. It fosters what I would like to call cooperation in depth.

We are launched definitely and with purpose on a policy of integrity that seeks to perform the commitments that we have made and established at home that call for progressive measures to uplift and make secure the lives of the American people, and to bring equality under the law to all Americans.

Under the leadership of President Johnson we shall adhere to our basic policy of peace through strength for a powerful national defense and a firm foreign policy.

I might say, my dear friends and colleagues, that as a Member of the House for years, before I assumed the position of leadership as majority leader over 20 years ago, and as Speaker now, I have always been proud of the House of Representatives and the Congress of the United States in the strength of its Members in support of a strong national defense and a firm foreign policy in the best interests of our country. The Members feel that way because their strength here gives added strength to the leadership, or whoever might be the occupant of the White House. This House, whether the Members are elected as Republicans or Democrats, in the field of national defense and in foreign affairs, has always been a body of strength so necessary in the world today. [Applause.]

I am proud of the contributions made by the National House of Representatives throughout the years in preserving America and adding to its strength and enabling our country under the leadership of our President—at the present time President Johnson—to meet the problems that might confront us not only on the domestic level but on the international or world level.

Again expressing my profound thanks, and welcoming you, knowing that with a dedication as sincere and as determined as ours is, the 89th Congress will add another brilliant chapter in the history of our country.

I am now ready to take the oath of office and will ask the dean of the House of Representatives, Hon. EMANUEL CELLER, of New York, to administer the oath.

Mr. CELLER then administered the oath of office to Mr. McCORMACK, of Massachusetts.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBERS

The SPEAKER. According to the precedent, the Chair is now ready to swear in all Members of the House.

The Members will rise.

OBJECTION TO ADMINISTRATION OF OATH

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from New York rise?

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, on my responsibility as a Member-elect of the 89th Congress, I object to the oath being administered to the gentlemen from Mississippi, Mr. ABERNETHY, Mr. WHITTEN, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr.

Walker, and Mr. Colmer. I base this upon facts and statements which I consider to be reliable. I also make this objection on behalf of a significant number of colleagues who are now standing with me.

OBJECTION TO ADMINISTRATION OF OATH

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from New Hampshire rise?

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, on my responsibility as a Member-elect of the 89th Congress, I object to the oath being administered to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Ottinger]. I base this upon facts and statements which I consider to be reliable.

The SPEAKER. Under the precedents, the Chair will ask the gentlemen who have been challenged not to rise to take the oath with the other Members, for the present at least.

The other Members will rise and I will now administer the oath of office to them.

The Members-elect and the Resident Commissioner-elect rose and the Speaker administered the oath of office to them.

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING OATH OF OFFICE TO CERTAIN MEMBERS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 1) which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 1

Resolved, That the Speaker is hereby authorized and directed to administer the oath of office to the gentlemen from Mississippi, Mr. Thomas G. Abernethy, Mr. Jamie L. Whitten, Mr. John Bell Williams, Mr. William M. Colmer, and Mr. Prentiss Walker.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the Members-elect whose names are referred to in the resolution are here with certificates of election in due form on file with the Clerk of the House of Representatives just as all other Members of the House.

Any question involving the validity of the regularity of the election of the Members in question is one which should be dealt with under the laws governing contested elections. I therefore urge the adoption of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield for a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, will the first vote be on the resolution, or on the previous question?

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman from Oklahoma moves the previous question, the vote will be on the previous question.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, if the motion for the previous question is voted down, would it then be in order to offer a substitute or an amendment providing that the five Representatives-elect from Mississippi not be sworn at this time and that the question of their rights to be seated be referred to the Committee on House Administration?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that if the previous question is voted down, it would be in order to offer a proper amendment, which the Chair would not pass upon at this particular time, unless that situation arises.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I thank the Speaker.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield for a parliamentary inquiry.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Since the rules of the House have not been adopted, am I correct in understanding that it would require 20 percent of the Members here to stand for a yea-and-nay vote?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that under the Constitution, it would require one-fifth of the Members present to rise to order a yea-and-nay vote.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 276, nays 149, present 1, not sworn 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 3]

YEAS—276

Abbitt
Adair
Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Ill.
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, George W.
Andrews, Glenn
Andrews, N. Dak.
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Aspinall
Bandstra
Baring
Bates
Battin
Beckworth
Belcher
Bennett
Berry
Betts
Boggs
Bolton
Bonner
Bow
Bray
Brock
Brooks
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burleson
Burton, Utah
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Callan
Callaway
Cameron
Carey
Carter
Casey
Cederberg
Celler
Chamberlain
Chelf
Clancy
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Collier
Cooley
Corbett
Cramer
Culver
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis
Dague
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
de la Garza
Delaney
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Dole
Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Duncan, Tenn.
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Ellsworth
Erlenborn
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Fountain
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Garmatz
Gathings
Gettys
Gibbons
Goodell
Gray
Grider
Griffin
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Hamilton
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Wash.
Hardy
Harris
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Hays
Hébert
Hechler
Henderson
Herlong
Hicks
Hosmer
Hull
Hungate
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jarman
Jennings
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Okla.
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Kee
Keith
Kelly
Keogh
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
Kirwan
Kornegay
Laird
Landrum
Langen
Latta
Lennon
Lipscomb
Long, La.
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McEwen
McFall
McMillan
McVicker
MacGregor
Machen
Mackay
Mahon
Marsh
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Matsunaga
Matthews
May
Meeds
Michel
Mills
Minshall
Mize
Moeller
Monagan
Moore
Moorhead
Morris
Morrison
Morton
Moss
Multer
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Natcher
Nelsen
O'Konski
O'Neal, Ga.
Passman
Patman
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Pickle
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Pool
Purcell
Quie
Quillen
Randall
Redlin
Reid, Ill.
Reifel
Reinecke
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts
Robison
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney, N.Y.
Roudebush
Roush
Rumsfeld
Satterfield
St Germain
Saylor
Schneebeli
Scott
Secrest
Selden
Shriver
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Va.
Springer
Staggers
Stanton
Steed
Stephens
Stubblefield
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Trimble
Tuck
Tunney
Tuten
Ullman
Utt
Vigorito
Waggonner
Walker, N. Mex.
Watkins
Watson
Watts
Weltner
Whalley
White, Idaho
White, Tex.
Whitener
Widnall
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Wright
Wyatt
Young
Younger
Zablocki

NAYS—149

Annunzio
Ashley
Ayres
Baldwin
Barrett
Bell
Bingham
Blatnik
Boland
Bolling
Brademas
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Burke
Burton, Calif.
Byrne, Pa.
Cahill
Cleveland
Clevenger
Cohelan
Conable
Conte
Conyers
Corman
Craley
Daddario
Daniels
Dawson
Dent
Denton
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Dow
Dulski
Duncan, Oreg.
Dwyer
Dyal
Edwards, Calif.
Evans, Colo.
Farbstein
Farnsley
Farnum
Fino
Ford, William D.
Fraser
Gallagher
Giaimo
Gilbert
Gilligan
Gonzalez
Grabowski
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Greigg
Griffiths
Halpern
Hanley
Hansen, Iowa
Harvey, Mich.
Hathaway
Hawkins
Helstoski
Holifield
Horton
Howard
Huot
Irwin
Jacobs
Joelson
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
King, Utah
Kluczynski
Krebs
Kunkel
Leggett
Lindsay
Long, Md.
Love
McCarthy
McDowell
McGrath
Macdonald
Mackie
Madden
Mailliard
Mathias
Miller
Minish
Mink
Morgan
Morse
Mosher
Murphy, Ill.
Nedzi
Nix
O'Brien
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill, Mass.
Patten
Philbin
Pike
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Race
Reid, N.Y.
Resnick
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Ronan
Roncalio
Rooney, Pa.
Roosevelt
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roybal
Ryan
St. Onge
Scheuer
Schisler
Schmidhauser
Schweiker
Shipley
Sickles
Stafford
Stalbaum
Stratton
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tenzer
Thompson, N.J.
Todd
Tupper
Udall
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vivian
Wolff
Wydler
Yates

PRESENT—1

Senner

NOT SWORN—8

Abernethy
Colmer
Holland
Ottinger
Toll
Walker, Miss.
Whitten
Williams

So the previous question was ordered.

Mr. Race changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBERS

The SPEAKER. Will the Members-elect from Mississippi who have been challenged present themselves in the well of the House for the purpose of having the oath of office administered to them.

Messrs. ABERNETHY, WHITTEN, WILLIAMS, COLMER, and WALKER presented themselves at the bar of the House and the oath of office was administered to them.

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 2) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. Res. 2

Resolved, That the Speaker is hereby authorized and directed to administer the oath of office to the gentleman from New York, Mr. Richard L. Ottinger.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, again this is a resolution involving a Member whose certificate of election in due form is on file in the Office of the Clerk. I ask for the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield for a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CLEVELAND. If this resolution is adopted, will it be impossible for me to offer my own resolution pertaining to the same subject matter, either as an amendment or a substitute?

The SPEAKER. If the resolution is agreed to, it will not be in order for the gentleman to offer a substitute resolution or an amendment, particularly if the previous question is ordered.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Is it now in order, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. Not unless the gentleman from Oklahoma yields to the gentleman for that purpose.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman from Oklahoma does not yield for that purpose.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. Will there be any opportunity to discuss the merits of this case prior to a vote on the resolution offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma has control over the time. Not unless the gentleman from Oklahoma yields for that purpose.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Will the gentleman from Oklahoma yield for that purpose?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield for a question and a very brief statement. I do not yield for a speech.

Mr. CLEVELAND. May I inquire if the gentleman will yield so that I may ask for unanimous consent that certain remarks of mine pertaining to this matter be incorporated in the Record?

Mr. ALBERT. No. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Oklahoma yield to the gentleman from Mississippi for the purpose of submitting a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBER

Mr. OTTINGER appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

MAJORITY LEADER

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Democratic caucus, I have been directed to report to the House that the Democratic Members have selected as majority leader the gentleman from Oklahoma, the Honorable Carl Albert.

MINORITY LEADER

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Republican conference, I am directed by that conference to notify the House officially that the gentleman from Michigan, the Honorable Gerald R. Ford, has been selected as the minority leader of the House.

CHAIRMAN OF THE REPUBLICAN POLICY COMMITTEE

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, further as chairman of the Republican conference, I am directed by that conference to notify the House that the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. Byrnes, has been elected chairman of the Republican policy committee of the House.

ELECTION OF CLERK, SERGEANT AT ARMS, DOORKEEPER, POSTMASTER, AND CHAPLAIN

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 3) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 3

Resolved, That Ralph R. Roberts, of the State of Indiana, be, and he is hereby, chosen Clerk of the House of Representatives;

That Zeake W. Johnson, Jr., of the State of Tennessee, be, and he is hereby, chosen Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives;

That William M. Miller, of the State of Mississippi, be, and he is hereby, chosen Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives;

That H. H. Morris, of the State of Kentucky, be, and he is hereby, chosen Post-

That Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., of the master of the House of Representatives;
District of Columbia be, and he is hereby, chosen Chaplain of the House of Representatives.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Will the officers elected present themselves at the bar of the House.

The officers-elect presented themselves at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

NOTIFICATION TO SENATE OF ORGANIZATION OF HOUSE

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 4) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. Res. 4

Resolved, That a message be sent to the Senate to inform that body that a quorum of the House of Representatives has assembled; that John W. McCormack a Representative from the State of Massachusetts, has been elected Speaker; and Ralph R. Roberts, a citizen of the State of Indiana, Clerk of the House of Representatives of the Eighty-ninth Congress.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF THE ASSEMBLY OF THE CONGRESS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 5) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 5

Resolved, That a committee of three Members be appointed by the Speaker on the part of the House of Representatives to join with a committee on the part of the Senate to notify the President of the United States that a quorum of each House has been assembled, and that Congress is ready to receive any communication that he may be pleased to make.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as members of the committee to notify the President the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Albert]; the gentleman from New York [Mr. Celler]; and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ford].

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO INFORM THE PRESIDENT OF THE ELECTION OF THE SPEAKER AND THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 6) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 6

Resolved, That the Clerk be instructed to inform the President of the United States that the House of Representatives has elected John W. McCormack, a Representative from the State of Massachusetts, Speaker, and Ralph R. Roberts, a citizen of the State of Indiana, Clerk of the House of Representatives of the 89th Congress.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CLERK HIRE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. Res. 7

Resolved, That effective January 3, 1965, the provisions of H. Res. 294, Eighty-eighth Congress, are hereby continued during the Eighty-ninth Congress.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman for a question.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, what is House Resolution 294?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, this is a resolution to perfect a resolution which was passed in the 88th Congress dealing with the subject of clerk hire.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RULES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. Res. 8

Resolved, That the Rules of the House of Representatives of the Eighty-eighth Congress, together with all applicable provisions of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, be, and they are hereby adopted as the Rules of the House of Representatives of the Eighty-ninth Congress, with the following amendments therein as a part thereof, to wit:

In rule XI, strike out clause 23 and insert:

"23. The Committee on Rules shall present to the House reports concerning rules, joint rules, and order of business, within three legislative days of the time when ordered reported by the committee. If such rule or order is not considered immediately, it shall be referred to the calendar and, if not called up by the Member making the report within seven legislative days thereafter, any member of the Committee on Rules may call it up as a question of privilege and the Speaker shall recognize any member of the Committee on Rules seeking recognition for that purpose. If the Committee on Rules shall adversely report or fail to report within twenty-one calendar days after reference, any resolution pending before the committee providing for an order of business for the consideration by the House of any public bill or joint resolution favorably reported by a committee of the House, on days when it is in order to call up motions to discharge committees, it may be in order as a matter of the highest privilege for the Speaker, in his discretion, to recognize the chairman or any member of the committee which reported such bill or joint resolution who has been so authorized by said committee to call up for consideration by the House the resolution which the Committee on Rules has so adversely reported, or failed to report, and it shall be in order to move the adoption by the House of said resolution adversely reported, or not reported, notwithstanding the adverse report, or the failure to report, of the Committee on Rules. Pending the consideration of said resolution the Speaker may entertain one motion that the House adjourn; but after the result is announced he shall not entertain any other dilatory motion until the said resolution shall have been fully disposed of."

In rule XX, strike out clause 1 and insert:

"1. Any amendment of the Senate to any House bill shall be subject to the point of order that it shall first be considered in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, if, originating in the House, it would be subject to that point: *Provided, however,* That a motion to disagree with the amendments of the Senate to a House bill or resolution and request or agree to a conference with the Senate, or a motion to insist on the House amendments to a Senate bill or resolution and request or agree to a conference with the Senate, shall always be in order if the Speaker, in his discretion, recognizes for that purpose and if the motion is made by direction of the committee having jurisdiction of the subject matter of the bill or resolution."

In rule XXI, strike out clause 1 and insert:

"1. Bills and joint resolutions on their passage shall be read the first time by title and the second time in full, when, if the previous question is ordered, the Speaker shall state the question to be: 'Shall the bill be engrossed and read a third time?' and, if decided in the affirmative, it shall be read the third time by title, and the question shall then be put upon its passage."

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, this resolution, if adopted, would restore the 21-day rule which was in effect during the 81st Congress, with some modifications.

Mr. Speaker, it would enable the Speaker, after a resolution had been before the Committee on Rules for 21 days or more, to recognize the chairman or other members of the legislative committee from which the bill emanated to discharge the Committee on Rules on a day set aside for discharging committees.

The second part of the resolution would authorize the Speaker to recognize a Member in the case of sending a bill to conference, when unanimous consent could not be had to send a bill to conference, when made by direction of the committee having jurisdiction and when the Speaker agreed thereto.

The purpose of these two changes in the rules, of course, is to expedite the business of the House and to make available other methods of handling the legislative business of the House. They do not seek to change any of the rules governing the Committee on Rules or other procedures, all of which are left intact.

The last rule would simply deprive any one Member of the privilege of demanding the reading of a fully engrossed copy of a bill. This has long been considered an anachronism in the law.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. ALBERT. I first yield to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] and then I shall yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I would like to propound a few questions. The first question on this resolution is this: Are copies of this resolution available so that the Members may know on what they are voting?

Mr. ALBERT. In response to the gentleman from Virginia, I am not able to answer whether every Member has had copies of this resolution available. I do know that many Members have had copies of the resolution.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. If the gentleman will yield further, I picked up a piece of paper here on the floor the other day which makes me think it is a copy of the typewritten copy of what is proposed. I do not know. But it seems to me that in a matter of this importance we should at least have the opportunity to have a copy available before us in order to see what we are doing.

Mr. ALBERT. How many copies have been distributed to Members, I do not know.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. It was not distributed to me. I picked one up off the floor.

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman from Virginia has exercised his usual initiative in getting things.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I assume the gentleman intends to move the previous question.

Mr. ALBERT. I do, at the appropriate time.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. If the gentleman will yield further, what I want to know is whether or not there is going to be an opportunity for discussion and debate on this resolution?

Mr. ALBERT. I say to the gentleman that I have yielded to the gentleman for the purpose of making a statement at this time.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I thank the gentleman very much. I wonder if the gentleman will yield for the offering of an amendment?

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman is not in position to yield for the offering of an amendment. I may say to the gentleman from Virginia that many Members have spoken to me about the desirability of offering sundry amendments which have not been considered at all. The gentleman from Oklahoma is not in position to yield for the purpose of offering any amendments.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I suspected that would be the answer I was going to get.

There is another question I want to ask, and I think maybe the gentleman might yield. There are three distinct changes of existing rules of the House which have been in effect for a long time. The amendment to section 22 is very serious, the amendment which provides for the 21-day rule. If that is the will of the House, all right, it is the will of the House. But section 22 where you amend that I think is subject to very serious objection.

Mr. ALBERT. What does the gentleman mean by section 22? We have rule XI.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Rule XX. Under the rules perhaps this is a parliamentary inquiry. Is the opportunity for a division of the question going to be had so we can vote what we want to vote for and vote against what we do not want to vote for instead of having to swallow the whole dose at one time?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is making a parliamentary inquiry. In reply, the Chair may say this resolution is not divisible.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I take it the answer to my series of questions is that the skids have been greased. I would like an opportunity to discuss rule XX.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman for the purpose of discussing rule XX.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. If any of you have been so fortunate as to pick up one of the papers off the seats the other day after we had the caucus, you perhaps have read this resolution.

The 21-day rule I am opposed to. We had it once, we used it for one Congress, then it was abandoned as not workable.

It is rule XX that disturbs me very much. This rule will have the effect of permitting the Speaker to send a bill to conference that has in it a Senate amendment unrelated to the House bill that we sent to the Senate. In other words, we can and have in past sessions sent to the Senate small bills, some in the form of private bills. The Senate attached a tax bill of great importance and involving great expenditures. When that bill comes back to the House from the Senate with the request for a conference, under this rule you propose the House has no opportunity to consider the Senate bill or amendment. It has no opportunity to amend it and all they can do is to vote down the conference report. It just should not happen that way.

We had that matter up in the Committee on Rules. We appointed a subcommittee and they proposed an amendment to rule XX which would require a two-thirds vote to send the bill to conference which had a nongermane Senate bill attached to it. The reason the two-thirds vote was fixed is because this is a suspension of the rules. Rule XX is very positive that a Senate unrelated and ungermane amendment is subject to a point of order.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, a point of order. I cannot hear because there is so much noise and I cannot understand what the gentleman is saying.

The SPEAKER. The House will be in order. The gentleman from Virginia will proceed.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Perhaps I am not explaining it as lucidly as I should be able to do, but I am doing the best I can what with the noise going on in the Chamber and within the limitations of the present circumstances to try to get across to you the point that under the existing rules a Senate bill attached to an unrelated House bill would be subject to a point of order that it has not been submitted to the Committee of the Whole House so that we would have an opportunity to debate it and to change it. This rule that is now proposed will not remedy that situation and it is not designed to do so. In fact, it is designed to perpetuate the situation.

Now the reason for the two-thirds vote is this procedure being a suspension of the rules. We have been doing it by rules from the Committee on Rules and suspending the rules by a majority vote when we adopt the report of the Committee on Rules. We ought not put ourselves in the position where we will be forever prohibited from the consideration of these bills. Whichever side of a bill you may advocate, this will put you in the position where you will be prohibited from the consideration of these bills sent over from the Senate and adopted by the Senate but never considered by the House and some of which the House did not want to consider, and yet you are going to have to vote for or against it in the final analysis on the conference report. You are going to have to vote for or against them without ever having had the opportunity to hear any discussion in the House other than the discussion on the report of the conference committee.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COOLEY. Are these three amendments in any way related to each other and should they not be voted on separately?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Yes, they should be voted on separately.

Mr. COOLEY. You remember on one occasion we sent a honeybee bill to the Senate and they attached a sugar bill that they sent back to the House.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. COOLEY. And that was called the honeybee bill.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Yes, and you sent a cotton bill over there and they attached a wheat bill to it.

Mr. COOLEY. That is right and they brought a wheat bill back here.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. That was just last year.

Mr. COOLEY. That is right.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. As you see, there were those instances that occurred during the last session of the Congress where the Senate did do that and sent back a bill that was unrelated and which the House had no opportunity to debate or discuss and we just ought not to do this thing now. That is the reason I am appealing to you. Of course, I am opposed to the 21-day rule and always have been. But this is a matter that vitally affects the privileges of the House to have an opportunity to discus legislation that the House has to vote on.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Under the situation the gentleman describes it is perfectly conceivable that there would be at no time an opportunity to debate the conference report when it came to the floor of the House, without the good will or the discretion of the person in control.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Of course, that is true. Under the general rules of the House, nobody has an opportunity to discuss the matter unless the chairman of the committee yields him time. And that is only 1 hour, after all.

I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman first yield for a question?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. May I say to the gentleman that I was not privileged to attend the conference, or the caucus, at which this rule was discussed, and it was not until late last night that I had an opportunity to study this new rule or resolution or the effect thereof, or to read exactly the language of the resolution which the gentleman from Oklahoma has presented today.

As ranking minority member of the Rules Committee, I am, of course, vitally interested in what the rule may do. I should like to ask a question or two.

If I understand the language of the resolution, it would do more than restore the 21-day rule we had in the past, whereby if the Rules Committee did not take action on a bill within 21 days, it could automatically be brought up in the House. Apparently, this new rule goes beyond that so I should like to have the gentleman tell me if I have misinterpreted it, for I want to understand it. It goes beyond the old 21-day rule and gives authority to the Speaker greater than any which has been exercised by any Speaker for many, many years, to determine, in his own wisdom—and no one questions the present Speaker's wisdom, patriotism, or good judgment—or to decide in his own judgment—whether he wants the bill to come up at all. No one else will have any authority except the Speaker, is that correct?

Mr. ALBERT. I would say to the distinguished gentleman that this would give the Speaker authority to recognize the chairman of the committee or a member designated by a legislative committee, but would not deprive the Committee on Rules of any authority it has to bring bills out under resolutions or rules and under the procedures governing the determination of legislation.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I understand that, yet I may not have made my question clear.

Mr. ALBERT. I believe the gentleman did.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. If the Rules Committee does not act, and this new 21-day rule is applicable, it would be the Speaker, and the Speaker alone, who could decide whether the bill would be brought up, if it had been for 21 days before the Rules Committee.

Mr. ALBERT. The Speaker and the legislative committee having jurisdiction over the subject matter.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. It does not say that.

Mr. ALBERT. The House will have the final determination in all instances. The House can decide whether the resolution should be adopted or whether it should be rejected, or even whether it should be referred to a committee. The House will have complete jurisdiction over the matter.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Let me ask another question regarding another section of the rule. Is it not true the Speaker would also have the right, under the rule, to determine, in his own wisdom and in his own judgment, whether a bill shall or shall not go to conference?

Mr. ALBERT. No, because the Speaker is not the only party to the process. The legislative committee having jurisdiction over the bill would also have to act in the matter.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. It says that it shall be in order "if the Speaker, in his discretion, recognizes for that purpose."

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. And the motion is made.

Mr. ALBERT. The Speaker has discretion about recognizing a Member, but a Member under the instructions of a legislative committee, as I construe this language, must seek recognition before the Speaker could exercise that discretion.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. In other words, it does place further control in the Chair or in the Speaker?

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman is correct, and that is what is intended.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. One other question and then I am through. Will the gentleman yield for me to offer a perfecting amendment?

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman will not yield for that purpose.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The gentleman refuses to yield for the purpose of offering an amendment at this time?

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman cannot yield for that purpose.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I say to the gentleman I respect his position, but I want to make very clear what his position might be.

Mr. ALBERT. May I say to the gentleman that this resolution is being offered under instructions of the Democratic caucus. I am the agent of the caucus for that purpose. I have no authority to yield for amendment or to yield for any purpose in order to allow the bill to be divided.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. May I say to my good friend, the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma, I have the highest respect and regard for him. I know he is under instructions which he is attempting to carry out, and he always does carry out instructions to the best of his ability whether he likes them or not. I respect him for it.

Mr. ALBERT. In this case I like the instructions that I have had from the Democratic caucus.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, if the previous question is voted down, then there would be an opportunity to divide the question or to offer an amendment. Is that not correct?

The SPEAKER. If the previous question is voted down, then amendments would be in order.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I thank the Speaker.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan, the distinguished minority leader, Mr. GERALD R. FORD.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I would like to say to you that I, representing the minority in connection with these rules matter, have been under instructions from our party conference, as you have been from your caucus, to say to the House we have prepared certain amendments to the rules of the House that we would like to have considered, and that they may be offered as separate resolutions if they cannot be offered as amendments today. I think you are entitled to know this, and the House is entitled to know it, that those resolutions will be presented in due time.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman for giving me that information.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the time given by the gentleman from Oklahoma, the majority leader. I intended to say much of what was said by the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN]. The House Republican conference has met twice within the last month. On December 16 we instructed a group, a task force, to undertake a study of the proposed changes in the rules that would be needed and desirable for the protection of the minority and for the orderly prosecution of parliamentary business. This committee, under the chairmanship of Mr. BROWN, has functioned and, as a consequence, we do have some proposals that, if we have an opportunity, will be offered if the previous question is defeated. They will be constructive, and I hope and trust that we can prevail in this next vote so that the House can work its will on these and other amendments.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield for a brief question.

Mr. CURTIS. The point I would like to make to the gentleman, having worked on these proposed rule changes, is that the procedure we are following right now demonstrates the difficulty that the minority finds itself in where we are considering one of the most serious matters we are going to face; namely, the rules we are going to operate under, and we are not able to debate the question or deliberate on it. I think the gentleman from Oklahoma sees the position that the minority is in, and I think the gentleman must recognize this is unfair. I hope he will, if these resolutions are brought out, take the matter to the Democratic caucus for reconsideration of these rules for fair play.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman and now I yield to our distinguished Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, as this resolution involves changes in the rules, I feel that my views should be made known to the Members of the House. I strongly favor the resolution offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT]. I think the 21-day rule is a rule that is for the benefit of the individual Members of the House without regard to party affiliation in giving them the opportunity of passing upon legislation that has been reported out of a standing committee. Some Members may construe it as an attack on the Committee on Rules, but it is not. It is a strengthening of the rules of the House in the direction of the individual Member having an opportunity to pass upon legislation that has been reported out of a standing committee and which has been pending before the Committee on Rules for 21 days or more. We had this rule some few Congresses ago for one Congress. The reason it was not continued is simply and frankly that we did not have the votes. When it was adopted, it was not adopted as a permanent part of the rules but for one Congress. In following Congresses we did not have the votes. So it is not a question whether the advocates of the 21-day rule felt that it was not workable. I have always felt throughout the years that it would be a strengthening influence not only on the rules of the House but on each Member of the House and on the House collectively in the matter of expressing the will of the House to have the 21-day rule incorporated as a part of the rules of the House.

The other two amendments are very simple. Certainly when a bill is going to conference the regular procedure is for the Member in charge to ask unanimous consent for the bill to go to conference. In 19 cases out of 20 or even 29 cases out of 30 unanimous consent is granted. It is very seldom unanimous consent is not granted for a bill to go to conference. This proposed rule would permit the will of the House to be ascertained and the majority of the Members present and voting then could send the bill to conference.

As to the other proposed amendment there seems to be no difficulty at all on the part of Members on both sides of the aisle. I consider the 21-day rule and the three rules to be dynamic in protecting the interests of Members of the House. Of course there is no reflection here on the Committee on Rules, because the Committee on Rules does not enter into the picture. They do not enter the picture until a Member objects to the bill going to conference. So it is not an attack on the Committee on Rules at all. I think the 21-day rule clarifies the rules in favor of individual Members of the House and gives an individual Member the opportunity to express himself on the legislation and to permit a bill to be brought out which has been pending 21 days or more before the Committee on Rules for a rule and on which no action has been taken.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has made a very able defense of the Committee on Rules for which I am grateful.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I have profound respect for the Committee on Rules. May I say that as leader and as Speaker, knowing the power and the charm and the influence of the Committee on Rules, and when I meet individual members of that committee I bow to them.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. And we bow to the Speaker very humbly at times also; sometimes regretfully, but we do bow to him.

Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman a question or two in connection with what is before us? I hate to correct the Speaker, but I believe we did adopt that rule not once, but twice.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am always subject to correction.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. That was the 21-day rule, but that rule as it was adopted was different from the rule proposed.

Mr. McCORMACK. Slightly different.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Under this rule for the first time there is a provision that the Speaker may as a matter of the highest privilege and in his discretion call up a bill, or not call up a bill. It goes further than the 21-day rule that we had before. In other words, the Committee on Rules has had the power of life-and-death control over a bill—yes or no. Now you take it away from the Committee on Rules and put it in the hands of the Speaker, for whom, may I say, I have the greatest respect, love, and admiration.

Mr. McCORMACK. I can conceive of no Speaker exercising his discretion but as a matter of high trust and as a matter of complete equity and fairness to all Members involved. I believe that the discretion of the Speaker is a reasonable provision to put in there in order to have it in connection with the 21-day rule. The original rule left it entirely in the hands of the chairman of the committee. This now, if adopted, would give the Speaker some authority to confer with the chairman of the committee.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. But not the chairman of the Committee on Rules?

Mr. McCORMACK. Also, if the chairman of a committee should be recalcitrant or noncooperative then we could have the committee to direct some other member of the committee to call the bill up under the 21-day rule.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. We have the highest respect and the highest regard for the character of the Speaker of this House, but we also realize that sometimes Speakers change. I mean by that that we have had a change in the speakership and should this occur there might be someone on this side of the aisle who might abuse that privilege at the present time. There is a question as to whether or not we would want to do that by changing the rules of the House so as to permit any future Speaker—not you, because I am not worried about you, Mr. Speaker——

Mr. McCORMACK. That is very nice.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. You are too nice a fellow. But I am thinking about some dirty dog that might come along some other time and say here is a nice little wrinkle in the rule which we can use to block this legislation.

In other words, should we give that power to every Speaker in the future? We gave that power to "Uncle Joe" Cannon and Tom Reed as the gentleman recalls. We gave them too much power.

Mr. McCORMACK. This represents nothing comparable to what the gentleman is now referring. In those days the Speaker had the power to make all committee appointments. This is an entirely different situation.

I can conceive of no Speaker doing anything other than exercising his discretion for the best interests of the membership of the House of Representatives.

Frankly, I feel that that is a minor if not insignificant argument to make against this proposed change.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I salute you. You have again proven to the new membership of the House of Representatives why you have been selected as Speaker of this body. You are a very able man in the well of the House.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. I would like to propound a question, if I may:

Suppose the legislative committee passes a bill out and it goes to the Rules Committee and they have the ordinary usual hearing before the Rules Committee and the Rules Committee takes it under consideration and then denies the rule? Can you still bring that bill to the floor of the House?

Mr. McCORMACK. After 21 days.

Mr. COOLEY. If the gentleman will yield further, even though the Rules Committee has denied the rule?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is provided in the proposed change.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the resolution which has been submitted by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] will be agreed to.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 224, nays 201, answered "present" 1, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 4]

YEAS—224

Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Tenn.
Annunzio
Ashley
Aspinall
Ayres
Bandstra
Barrett
Bingham
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Brademas
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Burke
Burton, Calif.
Byrne, Pa.
Cahill
Callan
Cameron
Carey
Celler
Clark
Clevenger
Cohelan
Conyers
Corbett
Corman
Craley
Culver
Daddario
Daniels
Dawson
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Dow
Dulski
Duncan, Oreg.
Dwyer
Dyal
Edmondson
Edwards, Calif.
Evans, Colo.
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farbstein
Farnsley
Farnum
Fascell
Feighan
Fino
Flood
Fogarty
Foley
Ford, William D.
Fraser
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Gallagher
Garmatz
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gilligan
Gonzalez
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Greigg
Grider
Griffiths
Hagen, Calif.
Halpern
Hamilton
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Iowa
Hansen, Wash.
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hechler
Helstoski
Hicks
Holifield
Horton
Howard
Hungate
Huot
Irwin
Jacobs
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Okla.
Jones, Ala.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Kelly
Keogh
King, Calif.
King, Utah
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Krebs
Leggett
Lindsay
Long, Md.
Love
McCarthy
McDade
McDowell
McFall
McGrath
McVicker
Macdonald
Machen
Mackay
Mackie
Madden
Mathias
Matsunaga
Meeds
Miller
Mills
Minish
Mink
Moeller
Monagan
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Nedzi
Nix
O'Brien
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pike
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Race
Randall
Redlin
Reid, N.Y.
Resnick
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Ronan
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Roosevelt
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roybal
Ryan
St Germain
St. Onge
Scheuer
Schisler
Schmidhauser
Schweiker
Secrest
Senner
Shipley
Sickles
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Staggers
Stalbaum
Stratton
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tenzer
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Todd
Trimble
Tupper
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vigorito
Vivian
Walker, N. Mex.
Weltner
White, Idaho
Wilson, Charles H.
Wolff
Wright
Yates
Zablocki

NAYS—202

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, George W.
Andrews, Glenn
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Baldwin
Baring
Bates
Battin
Beckworth
Belcher
Bell
Bennett
Berry
Betts
Bolton
Bonner
Bow
Bray
Brock
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burleson
Burton, Utah
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Callaway
Carter
Casey
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chelf
Clancy
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Collier
Colmer
Conable
Conte
Cooley
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis
Dague
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
de la Garza
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Dole
Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Duncan, Tenn.
Edwards, Ala.
Ellsworth
Erlenborn
Everett
Findley
Fisher
Flynt
Ford, Gerald R.
Fountain
Frelinghuysen
Fuqua
Gathings
Gettys
Goodell
Griffin
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Hagan, Ga.
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Hansen, Idaho
Hardy
Harris
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Henderson
Herlong
Hosmer
Hull
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jarman
Jennings
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Mo.
Keith
King, N.Y.
Kornegay
Kunkel
Laird
Landrum
Langen
Latta
Lennon
Lipscomb
Long, La.
McClory
McCulloch
McEwen
McMillan
MacGregor
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Matthews
May
Michel
Minshall
Mize
Moore
Morse
Morton
Mosher
Murray
Natcher
Nelsen
O'Neal, Ga.
Passman
Patman
Pelly
Pickle
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Pool
Purcell
Quie
Quillen
Reid, Ill.
Reifel
Reinecke
Rhodes, Ariz.
Roberts
Robison
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Roudebush
Rumsfeld
Satterfield
Saylor
Schneebeli
Scott
Selden
Shriver
Sikes
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Va.
Springer

Stafford
Stanton
Steed
Stephens
Stubblefield
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, La.
Thomson, Wis.
Tuck
Tuten
Utt
Waggonner
Walker, Miss.
Watkins
Watson
Watts
Whalley
White, Tex.
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Williams
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Wyatt
Wydler
Young
Younger

NOT SWORN—2

Holland
Toll

NOT VOTING—6

Andrews, N. Dak.
Hébert
Rivers, S.C.
Roncalio
Thomas
Tunney

So the previous question was ordered.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Roncalio for, with Mr. Rivers of South Carolina against.

Mr. Tunney for with Mr. Hébert against.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The **SPEAKER**. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RESIGNATIONS FROM THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The **SPEAKER** laid before the House the following communications:

Nashville, Tenn.,
November 4, 1964.

Hon. John McCormack,
The Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

This is to advise that I have submitted my resignation as a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives from the Sixth Congressional District of Tennessee to the Honorable Frank Clement, Governor of Tennessee. This resignation was necessary in order to assume my duties of a Member of the U.S. Senate from Tennessee to which office I have been duly elected. Said resignation is effective at the close of business November 3, 1964.

Ross Bass.

Nashville, Tenn.,
November 4, 1964.

Hon. John W. McCormack,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

This is to advise that I have received the resignation of the Honorable Ross Bass as a Member of the House of Representatives of the Sixth Congressional District of Tennessee, effective at the close of business November 3, 1964.

Frank G. Clement,
Governor of Tennessee.

Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., November 4, 1964.

Hon. John W. McCormack,
Speaker of the House,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

My Dear Mr. Speaker: I have today submitted my resignation as U.S. Representative to the Governor, Jack M. Campbell, of New Mexico, as follows:

"I wish to submit to you my resignation as U.S. Representative in the Congress from the State of New Mexico, effective midnight, November 3, 1964.

"This is done in view of my election to the U.S. Senate and for the purpose of securing seniority privileges in the Senate which is of paramount importance to our State."

Sincerely,

Joseph M. Montoya,
U.S. Senator

House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., November 30, 1964.

Hon. John W. McCormack,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Speaker: Because of my induction into office of judge of the circuit court of Cook County on December 7, 1964, please accept my resignation as a Member of Congress for the Ninth District of Illinois as of December 6, 1964.

Respectfully yours,

Edward R. Finnegan.

SOUTH ANNA RIVER WATERSHED WORK PLAN

The **SPEAKER** laid before the House the following communication, which was read and referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

House of Representatives,
Committee on Public Works,
Washington, D.C., October 2, 1964.

Hon. John W. McCormack,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

My Dear Mr. Speaker: Pursuant to the provisions of section 2 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended, the Committee on Public Works has approved the following work plan:

State of Virginia: South Anna River Watershed; committee approval, September 30, 1964.

Sincerely yours,

Charles A. Buckley,
Chairman, Committee on Public Works.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF THE LEWIS AND CLARK TRAIL COMMISSION

The **SPEAKER**. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to the order of the House of October 3, 1964, empowering him to accept resignations and to appoint commissions, boards, and committees authorized by law or by the House, he did, on November 18, 1964, pursuant to the provisions of section 3, Public Law 88-630, appoint as members of the Lewis and Clark Trail Commission the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. Morris, of New Mexico; Mr. Rivers, of Alaska ; Mr. Berry, of South Dakota; Mr. Skubitz, of Kansas.

REFUSAL OF RUSSELL NIXON, DAGMAR WILSON, AND DONNA ALLEN TO TESTIFY BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The **SPEAKER**. The Chair desires to announce that subsequent to the sine die adjournment of the 88th Congress, the Committee on Un-American Activities reported to and filed with the Speaker statements of fact concerning the refusal of Russell Nixon, Dagmar Wilson, and Donna Allen to testify before a duly constituted subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives, and that he did, on December 11, 1964, pursuant to the mandatory provisions of Public Resolution 123, 75th Congress, certify to the U.S. attorney for the District of Columbia, the statement of facts concerning the said Russell Nixon, Dagmar Wilson, and Donna Allen.

HOUR OF MEETING OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. **SMITH** of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. Res. 9

Resolved, That until otherwise ordered, the daily hour of meeting of the House of Representatives shall be 12 o'clock meridian.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE HONORABLE ELMER J. HOLLAND

Mr. **MORGAN**. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. Res. 10

Whereas Elmer J. Holland, a Representative-elect from the State of Pennsylvania, from the Twentieth District thereof, has been unable from sickness to appear in person to be sworn as a Member of the House, and there being no contest or question as to his election: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Speaker, or deputy named by him, be, and he is hereby, authorized to administer the oath of office to said Elmer J. Holland at Bethesda, Maryland, and that the said oath, when administered as herein authorized, shall be accepted and received by the House as the oath of office of the said Elmer J. Holland.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The **SPEAKER**. Pursuant to the authority of the resolution, House Resolution 10, 89th Congress, the Chair appoints the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Moorhead] to administer the oath of office to the Honorable Elmer J. Holland.

PROVIDING FOR ADMINISTRATION OF OATH OF OFFICE TO THE HONORABLE HERMAN TOLL

Mr. **MORGAN**. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 11) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 11

Whereas Herman Toll, a Representative-elect from the State of Pennsylvania, from the Fourth District thereof, has been unable from sickness to appear in person to be sworn as a Member of the House, and there being no contest or question as to his election: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Speaker, or deputy named by him, be, and he is hereby, authorized to administer the oath of office to said Herman Toll at Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, and that the said oath, when administered as herein authorized, shall be accepted and received by the House as the oath of office of the said Herman Toll.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The **SPEAKER**. Pursuant to the authority of the resolution, House Resolution 11, 89th Congress, the Chair appoints the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Barrett] to administer the oath of office to the Honorable Herman Toll.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a concurrent resolution, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 1

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the two Houses of Congress shall meet in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Wednesday, the 6th day of January 1965, at 1 o'clock postmeridian, pursuant to the requirements of the Constitution and Laws relating to the election of President and Vice President of the United States, and the President pro tempore of the Senate shall be their presiding officer; that two tellers shall be previously appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate on the part of the Senate and two by the Speaker on the part of the House of Representatives, to whom shall be handed, as they are opened by the President pro tempore of the Senate, all the certificates and papers purporting to be certificates of the electoral votes, which certificates and papers shall be opened, presented, and acted upon in the alphabetical order of the States, beginning with the letter "A"; and said tellers, having then read the same in the presence and hearing of the two Houses, shall make a list of the votes as they shall appear from the said certificates; and the votes having been ascertained and counted in the manner and according to the rules by law provided, the result of the same shall be delivered to the President pro tempore of the Senate, who shall thereupon announce the state of the vote, which announcement shall be deemed a sufficient declaration of the persons, if any, elected President and Vice President of the United States, and together with a list of the votes, be entered on the Journals of the two Houses.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a resolution, as follows:

S. RES. 1

Resolved, That a committee consisting of two Senators be appointed by the President pro tempore to join such committee as may be appointed by the House of Representatives to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that a quorum of each House is assembled and that the Congress is ready to receive any communication he may be pleased to make.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a resolution, as follows:

S. RES. 2

Resolved, That the Secretary inform the House of Representatives that a quorum of the Senate is assembled and that the Senate is ready to proceed to business.

The message further anounced that the President pro tempore, pursuant to Senate Resolution 1, appointed Mr. MANSFIELD and Mr. DIRKSEN, on the part of the Senate, to join such committee as may be appointed by the House of Representatives to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that a quorum of each House is assembled and that the Congress is ready to receive any communication he may be pleased to make.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The SPEAKER. The Chair will recognize Members at this time to address the House for 1 minute, pending the consideration of further business and without objection, such remarks will appear in the RECORD following the legislative business of the day.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, your committee appointed on the part of the House to join a like committee on the part of the Senate to notify the President of the United States that a quorum of each House has been assembled and is ready to receive any communication that he may be pleased to make has performed that duty. The President asked us to report that he will be pleased to deliver his message at 9 o'clock tonight at a joint session of the two Houses.

JOINT SESSION OF CONGRESS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Con. Res. 1) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 1

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on January 4, 1965, at 9 o'clock p.m., for the purpose of receiving such communication as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

PROVIDING FOR A JOINT SESSION TO COUNT ELECTORAL VOTES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I call up a Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 1) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 1

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the two Houses of Congress shall meet in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Wednesday, the 6th day of January 1965, at 1 o'clock postmeridian, pursuant to the requirements of the Constitution and laws relating to the election of President and Vice President of the United States, and the President pro tempore of the Senate shall be their presiding officer; that two tellers shall be previously appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate on the part of the Senate and two by the Speaker on the part of the House of Representatives, to whom shall be handed, as they are opened by the President pro tempore of the Senate, all the certificates and papers purporting to be certificates of the electoral votes, which certificates and papers shall be opened, presented, and acted upon in the alphabetical order of the States, beginning with the letter A; and said tellers, having then read the same in the presence and hearing of the two Houses, shall make a list of the votes as they shall appear from the said certificates; and the votes having been ascertained and counted in the manner and according to the rules by law provided, the result of the same shall be delivered to the President pro tempore of the Senate, who shall thereupon announce the state of the vote, which announcement shall be deemed a sufficient declaration of the persons, if any, elected President and Vice President of the United States, and, together with a list of the votes, be entered on the Journals of the two Houses.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Senate Concurrent Resolution 1, the Chair appoints as tellers on the part of the House to count the electoral votes on January 6, 1965, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT].

PRESIDENTIAL INAUGURATION

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Con. Res. 5) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 5

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That effective from January 3, 1965, the joint committee created by S. Con. Res. 71, of the Eighty-eighth Congress, to make the necessary arrangements for the inauguration of the President-elect and Vice President-elect of the United States on the 20th day of January 1965, is hereby continued and for such purpose shall have the same power and authority as that conferred by such S. Con. Res. 71, of the Eighty-eighth Congress.

The House concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING SPEAKER TO DECLARE A RECESS TODAY AND ON WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 6, 1965

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on today and on Wednesday, January 6, 1965, it may be in order for the Speaker to declare recesses at any time subject to the call of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the majority leader tell us the occasion which will require this on January 6?

Mr. ALBERT. That is the date, if the gentleman will yield, when the electoral votes will be counted.

Mr. HALL. Then, I have no objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

INTRODUCTION AND REFERENCE OF BILLS TODAY

The SPEAKER. The Chair would like to make a statement concerning the introduction and reference of bills today.

As Members are aware, they have the privilege today of introducing bills. Heretofore on the opening day of a new Congress several thousand bills have been introduced. It will be readily apparent to all Members that it may be a physical impossibility for the Speaker to examine each bill for reference today. The Chair will do its best to refer as many bills as possible, but he would ask the indulgence of Members if he is unable to refer all the bills that may be introduced. Those bills which are not referred and will not appear in the Record as of today will be included in the next day's Record and printed with a date as of today.

The Chair feels that he should make this statement at this time so that Members of the House may understand.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR OF THE HOUSE DURING JOINT SESSION TO HEAR ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT

The SPEAKER. The Chair also desires to make an announcement. After consultation with the majority and minority leaders and with their consent and approval, the Chair announces that tonight, the time set for the joint session to hear an address by the President of the United States, only the doors immediately opposite the Speaker and those on his left and right will be open. No one will be allowed on the floor of the House who does not have the privileges of the floor of the House. The Chair suggests that ex-Members of the House seat themselves in the folding chairs so that sitting Members may find their accustomed places in the Chamber.

PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS UNDER PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. Res. 12

Whereas by the privileges of this House no evidence of a documentary character under the control and in the possession of the House of Representatives can, by the mandate of process of the ordinary courts of justice, be taken from such control or possession except by its permission: Therefore be it

Resolved, That when it appears by the order of any court in the United States or a judge thereof, or of any legal officer charged with the administration of the orders of such court or judge, that documentary evidence in the possession and under the control of the House is needful for use in any court of justice or before any judge or such legal officer, for the promotion of justice, this House will take such action thereon as will promote the ends of justice consistently with the privileges and rights of this House; be it further

Resolved, That during any recess or adjournment of the Eighty-ninth Congress, when a subpena or other order for the production or disclosure of information is by the due process of any court in the United States served upon any Member, officer, or employee of the House of Representatives, directing appearance as a witness before the said court at any time and the production of certain and sundry papers in the possession and under the control of the House of Representatives, that any such Member, officer, or employee of the House, be authorized to appear before said court at the place and time named in any such subpena or order, but no papers or documents in the possession or under the control of the House of Representatives shall be produced in response thereto; and be it further

Resolved, That when any said court determines upon the materiality and the relevancy of the papers or documents called for in the subpena or other order, then said court, through any of its officers or agents shall have full permission to attend with all proper parties to the proceedings before said court and at a place under the orders and control of the House of Representatives and take copies of the said documents or papers and the Clerk of the House is authorized to supply certified copies of such documents that the court has found to be material and relevant, except that under no circumstances shall any minutes or transcripts of executive sessions, or any evidence of witnesses in respect thereto, be disclosed or copied, nor shall the possession of said documents and papers by any Member, officer, or employee of the House be disturbed or removed from their place of file or custody under said Member, officer, or employee; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be transmitted by the Clerk of the House to any of said courts whenever such writs of subpena or other orders are issued and served as aforesaid.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SELECTION OF DEMOCRATIC WHIP

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to advise my colleagues that during the 89th Congress the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana, a great American, Hale Boggs, will serve as Democratic whip.

PROGRAM FOR THE BALANCE OF THIS WEEK

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of asking the gentleman from Oklahoma, the distinguished majority leader, the schedule for the remainder of the week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, insofar as I am able to advise the gentleman and Members of the House at this time, we shall meet tomorrow. There is no legislative business tomorrow that I know of or anticipate. Of course, we shall meet on Wednesday for the purpose of counting the electoral ballots and we shall meet on Thursday. But as to any business which might be conducted on Thursday or for the balance of the week that is undetermined at this time.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS TO APPEAR AFTER THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON THE STATE OF THE UNION THIS EVENING

The SPEAKER. If there is no objection, the requests for extension of remarks in the Record today will appear after the message on the state of the Union by the President this evening.

Is there objection?

There was no objection.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The Chair is now going to declare a recess until this evening, when the two Houses will meet in joint session to hear an address by the President of the United States.

The House will stand in recess until approximately 8:40 p.m., the bells to be rung at 8:25 p.m.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.), the House stood in recess until 8 o'clock and 40 minutes.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 8 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

House Concurrent Resolution 1. Concurrent resolution providing for a joint session of Congress to receive a communication from the President of the United States.

JOINT SESSION OF THE HOUSE AND SENATE HELD PURSUANT TO THE PROVISIONS OF HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 1 TO HEAR AN ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER of the House presided.

The Doorkeeper, Hon. William M. Miller, announced the President pro tempore and Members of the U.S. Senate who entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, the President pro tempore taking the chair at the left of the Speaker, and the Members of the Senate the seats reserved for them.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as members of the committee on the part of the House to escort the President of the United States into the Chamber the gentleman from Oklahoma, Mr. Albert; the gentleman from Louisiana, Mr. Boggs; the gentleman from New York, Mr. Celler; the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. Ford; and the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. Laird.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. On the part of the Senate the Chair appoints as members of the committee of escort the Senator from Montana, Mr. Mansfield; the Senator from Louisiana, Mr. Long; the Senator from Florida, Mr. Smathers; the Senator from Georgia, Mr. Russell; the Senator from Illinois, Mr. DIRKSEN; the Senator from Iowa, Mr. HICKENLOOPER; and the Senator from California, Mr. KUCHEL.

The Doorkeeper, Hon. William M. Miller, announced the ambassadors, ministers, and chargés d'affaires of foreign governments.

The ambassadors, ministers, and chargés d'affairs of foreign governments entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them.

The Doorkeeper, Hon. William M. Miller, announced the Associate Justices of the U.S. Supreme Court.

The Associate Justices of the U.S. Supreme Court entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

The Doorkeeper, Hon. William M. Miller, announced the Cabinet of the President of the United States.

The members of the Cabinet of the President of the United States entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

At 9 p.m., the Doorkeeper, Hon. William M. Miller, announced the President of the United States.

The President of the United States, escorted by the committee of Senators and Representatives, entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, and stood at the Clerk's desk. [Applause, the Members rising.]

The SPEAKER. Members of the Congress. I have the great and personal pleasure, the high esteem and the distinct honor of presenting to you the President of the United States. [Applause, the Members rising.]

THE STATE OF THE UNION—ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 1)

The PRESIDENT. Mr. Speaker, Mr. President, Members of Congress, my fellow Americans, on this "Hill" which was my home, I am stirred by old friendships.

Though total agreement between the Executive and the Congress is impossible, total respect is important.

I am proud to be among my colleagues of the Congress whose legacy to their trust is their loyalty to their nation.

I am not unaware of the inner emotions of the new Members of this body tonight.

Twenty-eight years ago I felt as you do now. You will soon learn that you are among men whose first love is their country, men who try each day to do as best they can what they believe is right.

We are entering the third century of the pursuit of American union.

Two hundred years ago, in 1765, nine assembled colonies first joined together to demand freedom from arbitrary power.

For the first century we struggled to hold together the first continental union of democracy in the history of man. One hundred years ago, in 1865, following a terrible test of blood and fire, the compact of union was finally sealed.

For a second century we labored to establish a unity of purpose and interest among the many groups which make up the American community.

That struggle has often brought pain and violence. It is not yet over. But we have achieved a unity of interest among our people that is unmatched in the history of freedom.

And so tonight, now, in 1965, we begin a new quest for union. We seek the unity of man with the world that he has built—with the knowledge that can save or destroy him—with the cities which can stimulate or stifle him—with the wealth and machines which can enrich or menace his spirit.

We seek to establish a harmony between man and society which will allow each of us to enlarge the meaning of his life and all of us to elevate the quality of our civilization.

This is the search we begin tonight.

STATE OF THE WORLD

But the unity we seek cannot realize its full promise in isolation. For today the state of the Union depends, in large measure, upon the state of the world.

Our concern and interest, compassion and vigilance, extend to every corner of a dwindling planet.

Yet, it is not merely our concern but the concern of all freemen. We will not, and we should not, assume that it is the task of Americans alone to settle all the conflicts of a torn and troubled world.

Let the foes of freedom take no comfort from this. For in concert with other nations, we shall help men defend their freedom.

Our first aim remains the safety and well-being of our own country.

We are prepared to live as good neighbors with all, but we cannot be indifferent to acts designed to injure our interest, or our citizens, or our establishments abroad. The community of nations requires mutual respect. We shall extend it—and we shall expect it.

In our relations with the world we shall follow the example of Andrew Jackson who said: "I intend to ask for nothing that is not clearly right and to submit to nothing that is wrong." And he promised, "the honor of my country shall never be stained by an apology from me for the statement of truth or the performance of duty." That was this Nation's policy in the 1830's and that is this Nation's policy in the 1960's. [Applause.]

Our own freedom and growth have never been the final goal of the American dream.

We were never meant to be an oasis of liberty and abundance in a worldwide desert of disappointed dreams. Our Nation was created to help strike away the chains of ignorance and misery and tyranny wherever they keep man less than God means him to be.

We are moving toward that destiny, never more rapidly than we have moved in the last 4 years.

In this period we have built a military power strong enough to meet any threat and destroy any adversary. And that superiority will continue to grow so long as this office is mine—and you sit on Capitol Hill.

In this period no new nation has become Communist, and the unity of the Communist empire has begun to crumble.

In this period we have resolved in friendship our disputes with our neighbors of the hemisphere, and joined in an alliance for progress toward economic growth and political democracy.

In this period we have taken more steps toward peace, including the test ban treaty, than at any time since the cold war began.

In this period we have relentlessly pursued our advances toward the conquest of space.

Most important of all, in this period, the United States has reemerged into the fullness of its self-confidence and purpose. No longer are we called upon to get America moving. We are moving. No longer do we doubt our strength or resolution. We are strong, and we have proven our resolve.

No longer can anyone wonder whether we are in the grip of historical decay. We know that history is ours to make. And if there is great danger, there is now also the excitement of great expectations.

AMERICA AND THE COMMUNIST NATIONS

Yet we still live in a troubled and perilous world. There is no longer a single threat. There are many. They differ in intensity and in danger. They require different attitudes and different answers.

With the Soviet Union we seek peaceful understandings that can lessen the danger to freedom.

Last fall I asked the American people to choose that course.

I will carry forward their command.

If we are to live together in peace, we must come to know each other better.

I am sure that the American people would welcome a chance to listen to the Soviet leaders on our television—as I would like the Soviet people to hear our leaders on theirs.

I hope the new Soviet leaders can visit America so they can learn about our country at first hand.

In Eastern Europe restless nations are slowly beginning to assert their identity. Your Government, assisted by leaders in American labor and business, is now exploring ways to increase peaceful trade with these countries and with the Soviet Union. I will report our conclusions to the Congress.

In Asia, communism wears a more aggressive face.

We see that in Vietnam.

Why are we there?

We are there, first, because a friendly nation has asked us for help against Communist aggression. Ten years ago our President pledged our help. Three Presidents have supported that pledge. And we will not break it now.

Second, our own security is tied to the peace of Asia. Twice in one generation we have had to fight against aggression in the Far East. To ignore aggression now would only increase the danger of a much larger war.

Our goal is peace in southeast Asia. That will come only when aggressors leave their neighbors in peace.

What is at stake is the cause of freedom. And in that cause America will never be found wanting.

THE NON-COMMUNIST WORLD

But communism is not the only source of trouble and unrest. There are older and deeper sources—in the misery of nations and in man's irrepressible ambition for liberty and a better life.

With the free republics of Latin America I have always felt—and my country has always felt—very special ties of interest and affection. It will be the purpose of my administration to strengthen these ties. Together we share and shape the destiny of the new world. And in the coming year I hope to pay a visit to Latin America. And I will steadily enlarge our commitment to the Alliance for Progress as the instrument of our war against poverty and injustice in the hemisphere.

In the Atlantic community we continue to pursue our goal of 20 years—a Europe that is growing in strength, unity, and cooperation with America. A great unfinished task is the reunification of Germany through self-determination.

This European policy is not based on any abstract design. It is based on the realities of common interests and common values, common dangers, and common expectations. These realities will continue to have their way—and especially, I think, in our expanding trade and especially in our common defense.

Free Americans have shaped the policies of the United States. And because we know these realities, those policies have been, and will be, in the interest of Europe.

Free Europeans must shape the course of Europe. And, for the same reasons, that course has been, and will be, in our interest and in the interest of freedom.

I found this truth confirmed in my talks with European leaders in the last year. I hope to repay these visits to some of our friends in Europe this year.

In Africa and Asia we are witnessing the turbulent unfolding of new nations and continents.

We welcome them to the society of nations.

We are committed to help those seeking to strengthen their own independence, and to work most closely with those governments dedicated to the welfare of all their people.

We seek not fidelity to an iron faith, but a diversity of belief as varied as man himself. We seek not to extend the power of America but the progress of humanity. We seek not to dominate others but to strengthen the freedom of all people.

I will seek new ways to use our knowledge to help deal with the explosion in world population and the growing scarcity in world resources.

Finally, we renew our commitment to the continued growth and effectiveness of the United Nations. The frustrations of the United Nations are a product of the world that we live in and not of the institution which gives them voice. It is far better to throw these differences open to the assembly of the nations than to permit them to fester in silent danger.

These are some of the goals of the American Nation in the world in which we live.

For ourselves we seek neither praise nor blame, neither gratitude nor obedience.

We seek peace.

We seek freedom.

We seek to enrich the life of man.

For that is the world in which we will flourish.

And that is the world that we mean for all men to ultimately have.

TOWARD THE GREAT SOCIETY

World affairs will continue to call upon our energy and our courage.

But today we can turn increased attention to the character of American life.

We are in the midst of the greatest upward surge of economic well-being in the history of any nation.

Our flourishing progress has been marked by price stability that is unequaled in the world. Our balance-of-payments deficit has declined and the soundness of our dollar is unquestioned. I pledge to keep it that way. And I urge business and labor to cooperate to that end.

We worked for two centuries to climb this peak of prosperity. But we are only at the beginning of the road to the Great Society. Ahead now is a summit where freedom from the wants of the body can help fulfill the needs of the spirit.

We built this Nation to serve its people.

We want to grow and build and create, but we want progress to be the servant and not the master of man.

We do not intend to live—in the midst of abundance—isolated from neighbors and nature, confined by blighted cities and bleak suburbs, stunted by a poverty of learning and an emptiness of leisure.

The great society asks not how much, but how good; not only how to create wealth but how to use it; not only how fast we are going, but where we are headed.

It proposes as the first test for a nation: the quality of its people.

This kind of society will not flower spontaneously from swelling riches and surging power.

It will not be the gift of government or the creation of Presidents.

It will require of every American, for many generations, both faith in the destination and the fortitude to make the journey.

And like freedom itself, it will always be challenge and not fulfillment.

And tonight we accept that challenge.

A NATIONAL AGENDA

I propose that we begin a program in education to insure every American child the fullest development of his mind and skills.

I propose that we begin a massive attack on crippling and killing diseases.

I propose that we launch a national effort to make the American city a better and a more stimulating place to live.

I propose that we increase the beauty of America and end the poisoning of our rivers and the air that we breathe.

I propose that we carry out a new program to develop regions of our country that are now suffering from distress and depression.

I propose that we make new efforts to control and prevent crime and delinquency.

I propose that we eliminate every remaining obstacle to the right and the opportunity to vote.

I propose that we honor and support the achievements of thought and the creations of art.

I propose that we make an all-out campaign against waste and inefficiency.

THE TASK

Our basic task is threefold—to keep our economy growing, to open for all Americans the opportunity that is now enjoyed by most Americans, and to improve the quality of life for all.

In the next 6 weeks I will submit special messages with detailed proposals for national action in each of these areas.

Tonight I would like just briefly to explain some of my major recommendations in the three main areas of national need.

I. A GROWING ECONOMY

BASIC POLICIES

First, we must keep our Nation prosperous. We seek full employment opportunity for every American citizen. I will present a budget designed to move the economy forward. More money will be left in the hands of the consumer by a substantial cut in excise taxes. We will continue along the path toward a balanced budget in a balanced economy.

I confidently predict tonight—what every economic sign now tells us—the continued flourishing of the American economy.

But we must remember that fear of a recession can contribute to the fact of a recession. The knowledge that our Government will, and can, move swiftly will strengthen the confidence of investors and business.

Congress can reinforce this confidence by insuring that its procedures permit rapid action on temporary income tax cuts. And special funds for job-creating public programs should be made available for immediate use if recession threatens.

Our continued prosperity demands continued price stability. Business, labor and the consumer all have a high stake in keeping wages and prices within the framework of the guideposts that have already served the Nation so well.

Finding new markets abroad for our goods depends on the initiative of American business. But we stand ready—with credit and other help—to assist the flow of trade which will benefit the entire Nation.

ON THE FARMS

Our economy owes much to the efficiency of our farmers. We must continue to assure them the opportunity to earn a fair reward. I have instructed the Secretary of Agriculture to lead a major effort to find new approaches to reduce the heavy cost of our farm programs and to direct more of our effort to the small farmer who needs the help the most.

INCREASED PROSPERITY

We can help insure continued prosperity through:

A regional recovery program to assist development of stricken areas left behind by our national progress;

Further efforts to provide our workers with the skills demanded by modern technology, for the laboring man is an indispensable force in the American system;

Extension of the minimum wage to more than 2 million unprotected workers;

The improvement and the modernization of the unemployment compensation system;

And, as pledged in our 1960 and 1964 Democratic platforms, I will propose to Congress changes in the Taft-Hartley Act, including section 14-B. I will do so hoping to reduce the conflicts that for several years have divided Americans in various States of our Union.

In a country that spans a continent modern transportation is vital to continued growth.

TRANSPORTATION FOR GROWTH

I will recommend heavier reliance on competition in transportation and a new policy for our merchant marine.

I will ask for funds to study high-speed rail transportation between urban centers. We will begin with test projects between Washington and Boston. On high-speed trains, passengers could travel this distance in less than 4 hours.

OPPORTUNITY FOR ALL

Second, we must open opportunity to all our people.

Most Americans enjoy a good life. But far too many are still trapped in poverty and idleness and fear.

Let a just nation throw open to them the city of promise:

To the elderly, by providing hospital care under social security and by raising benefit payments to those struggling to maintain the dignity of their later years;

To the poor and the unfortunate, through doubling the war against poverty this year;

To Negro Americans, through enforcement of the civil rights law and elimination of barriers to the right to vote;

To those in other lands that are seeking the promise of America, through an immigration law based on the work a man can do and not where he was born or how he spells his name.

TO ENRICH THE LIFE OF ALL

Our third goal is to improve the quality of American life.

THROUGH EDUCATION

We begin with learning.

Every child must have the best education that this Nation can provide.

Thomas Jefferson said that no nation can be both ignorant and free. Today no nation can be both ignorant and great.

In addition to our existing programs, I will recommend a new program for schools and students with a first-year authorization of 1 billion 500 million dollars.

It will help at every stage along the road to learning.

For the preschool years we will help needy children become aware of the excitement of learning.

For the primary and secondary school years we will aid public schools serving low income families and assist students in both public and private schools.

For the college years we will provide scholarships to high school students of the greatest promise and the greatest need and we will guarantee low interest loans to students continuing their college studies.

New laboratories and centers will help our schools lift their standards of excellence and explore new methods of teaching. These centers will provide special training for those who need and those who deserve special treatment.

THROUGH BETTER HEALTH

Greatness requires not only an educated people but a healthy people.

Our goal is to match the achievements of our medicine to the afflictions of our people.

We already carry on a large program in this country for research and health.

In addition, regional medical centers can provide the most advanced diagnosis and treatment for heart disease and cancer and stroke and other major diseases.

New support for medical and dental education will provide the trained people to apply our knowledge.

Community centers can help the mentally ill and improve health care for school-age children from poor families, including services for the mentally retarded.

THROUGH IMPROVING THE WORLD WE LIVE IN THE CITY

An educated and healthy people require surroundings in harmony with their hopes.

In our urban areas the central problem today is to protect and restore man's satisfaction in belonging to a community where he can find security and significance.

The first step is to break old patterns—to begin to think, and work and plan for the development of entire metropolitan areas. We will take this step with new programs of help for the basic community facilities and for neighborhood centers of health and recreation.

New and existing programs will be open to those cities which work together to develop unified long-range policies for metropolitan areas.

We must also make some very important changes in our housing programs if we are to pursue these same basic goals.

So a Department of Housing and Urban Development will be needed to spearhead this effort in our cities.

Every citizen has the right to feel secure in his home and on the streets of his community.

To help control crime, we will recommend programs:

To train local law enforcement officers;

To put the best techniques of modern science at their disposal;

To discover the causes of crime and better ways to prevent it.

I will soon assemble a panel of outstanding experts of this Nation to search out answers to the national problem of crime and delinquency, and I welcome the recommendations and the constructive efforts of the Congress.

THE BEAUTY OF AMERICA

For over three centuries the beauty of America has sustained our spirit and has enlarged our vision. We must act now to protect this heritage. In a fruitful new partnership with the States and cities the next decade should be a conservation milestone. We must make a massive effort to save the countryside and to establish—as a green legacy for tomorrow—more large and small parks, more seashores and open spaces than have been created during any other period in our national history.

A new and substantial effort must be made to landscape highways and provide places of relaxation and recreation wherever our roads run.

Within our cities imaginative programs are needed to landscape streets and to transform open areas into places of beauty and recreation.

We will seek legal power to prevent pollution of our air and water before it happens. We will step up our effort to control harmful wastes, giving first priority to the cleanup of our most contaminated rivers. We will increase research to learn much more about the control of pollution.

We hope to make the Potomac a model of beauty here in the Capital—and preserve unspoiled stretches of some of our waterways with a wild rivers bill.

More ideas for a beautiful America will emerge from a White House Conference on Natural Beauty which I will soon call.

ARTS AND SCIENCE

We must also recognize and encourage those who can be pathfinders for the Nation's imagination and understanding.

To help promote and honor creative achievements, I will propose a National Foundation on the Arts.

To develop knowledge which will enrich our lives and insure our progress, I will recommend programs to encourage basic science, particularly in the universities—and to bring closer the day when the oceans will supply our growing need for fresh water.

THE GOVERNMENT

For government to serve these goals it must be moderate in structure, efficient in action, and ready for any emergency.

I am busy currently reviewing the structure of the entire executive branch of this Government. I hope to reshape and to reorganize it to meet more effectively the tasks of the 20th century.

Wherever waste is found, I will eliminate it.

Last year we saved almost $3.5 billion by eliminating waste in the National Government.

And I intend to do better this year.

Very soon I will report to you on our progress and on new economies that your Government plans to make.

Even the best of government is subject to the worst of hazards.

I will propose laws to insure the necessary continuity of leadership should the President become disabled or die.

In addition, I will propose reforms in the electoral college—leaving undisturbed the vote by States—but making sure that no elector can substitute his will for that of the people.

Last year, in a sad moment, I came here and I spoke to you after 33 years of public service—practically all of them here on this Hill.

This year I speak after 1 year as President of the United States.

Many of you in this Chamber are among my oldest friends. We have shared many happy moments and many hours of work, and we have watched many Presidents together. Yet only in the White House can you finally know the full weight of this Office.

The greatest burden is not running the huge operations of government—or meeting daily troubles, large and small—or even working with the Congress.

A President's hardest task is not to do what is right, but to know what is right.

Yet the Presidency brings no special gift of prophecy or foresight. You take an oath—you step into an office—and you must then help guide a great democracy.

The answer was waiting for me in the land where I was born.

It was once barren land. The angular hills were covered with scrub cedar and a few large live oaks. Little would grow in that harsh caliche soil of my country. And each spring the Pedernales River would flood our valley.

But men came and they worked and they endured and they built.

And tonight that country is abundant—abundant with fruit, and cattle, and goats and sheep. And there are pleasant homes, and lakes, and the floods are gone.

Why did men come to that once forbidding land?

They were restless, of course, and had to be moving on. But there was more than that. There was a dream—a dream of a place where a freeman could build for himself, and raise his children to a better life—a dream of a continent to be conquered, a world to be won, a nation to be made.

Remembering this, I knew the answer.

A President does not shape a new and personal vision of America.

He collects it from the scattered hopes of the American past.

It existed when the first settlers saw the coast of a new world, and when the first pioneers moved westward.

It has guided us every step of the way.

It sustains every President. But it is also your inheritance and it belongs equally to all the people that we all serve.

It must be interpreted anew by each generation for its own needs; as I have tried, in part, to do tonight.

It shall lead us as we enter this third century of the search for "a more perfect Union."

This, then, is the state of the Union: Free, and restless, growing and full of hope.

So it was in the beginning.

So it shall always be, while God is willing, and we are strong enough to keep the faith. [Applause, Members rising.]

At 9 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m., the President, accompanied by the committee of escort, retired from the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The Doorkeeper, Hon. William M. Miller, escorted the invited guests from the Chamber in the following order:

The members of the President's Cabinet.

The Associate Justices of the Supreme Court.

The ambassadors, ministers, and chargés d'affaires of foreign governments.

JOINT SESSION DISSOLVED

The SPEAKER. The Chair declares the joint session of the two Houses now dissolved.

Accordingly, at 9 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m., the joint session of the two Houses was dissolved.

The Members of the Senate retired to their Chamber.

The SPEAKER. The House will be in order.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. DONOHUE].

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE REFERRED TO THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE ON THE STATE OF THE UNION

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the message of the President be referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

The motion was agreed to.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 2 I was unavoidably detained by an emergency long-distance telephone call. When told that the second call of the roll was about to start, due to an exceptionally crowded floor and the unusual shortness of the second call of the roll, I was unable to reach the well of the House in time to vote for the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

I desire the RECORD to show that had I been present I would have voted for the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

PROPOSED TERMINATION OF COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, many Members of the House were hoping to have an opportunity today to vote on a rules change to terminate the existence of the House Committee on Un-American Activities as a standing committee and to transfer to the House Judiciary Committee the appropriate portion of its jurisdiction.

It will not be possible to have this vote today. The parliamentary situation was such that a vote on the transfer to Judiciary would be part of the resolution embodying the all-important rules reforms. A separate vote could not be arranged.

We had hoped to have the opportunity today for meaningful debate and a clear-cut vote. We regret that this is not possible.

I have today introduced a resolution providing for the termination of the House Committee on Un-American Activities as a standing committee and transferring to the House Judiciary Committee the appropriate portion of its jurisdiction. I urge the introduction of a similar resolution by my colleagues. We trust that the Rules Committee will give prompt consideration to the resolution.

In the event the Rules Committee does not report the bill, the only opportunity in 1965 that Members of the House will have to express their dissatisfaction with the House Committee on Un-American Activities will be when its appropriation will be up for consideration. At that time there will be opportunity for debate and a vote.

And, Mr. Speaker, I respectfully ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their own remarks on this subject in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I regret that the parliamentary situation today did not permit the offering of an amendment to the rules of the House to eliminate the House Un-American Activities Committee. Throughout my service in Congress I have pointed out that this committee performs no real legislative function and how it violates basic civil liberties through consistent abuse of the committee process. An editorial in today's New York Times cogently states many of the reasons for abolishing this committee. I urge all my colleagues to read the following editorial:

[From the New York Times, Jan. 4, 1965]

THE UN-AMERICANS

There has been a tendency in some quarters to criticize the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives because it has given more time and attention to extremists of the left than to extremists of the right. This is a valid criticism, but not the basic one that can and should be made.

This basic criticism has been restated in a petition to the House, signed by a hundred or more attorneys and professors of law in leading universities. It is that the existence of a legislative committee empowered to inquire into ideas and opinions is irreconcilable with a system of free expression.

There exists in Washington a Department of Justice, equipped with the investigatory arm of the FBI, which has ample authority to institute procedure in all cases of subversive activity. There exists, within the House of Representatives itself, a Judiciary Committee competent to draft any new legislation needed in this area. These agencies provide ample protection. The Un-American Committee is unneeded, untrustworthy and basically unconstitutional. The new House could not make a better start than by getting rid of it.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend the gentleman from California who has worked diligently to obtain support for a resolution transferring the jurisdiction of the Un-American Activities Committee to the Judiciary Committee. I believe that this would be the proper jurisdiction, and that the proper procedure for obtaining this result would be through such a resolution. I was prepared to support such a resolution.

HOSPITAL INSURANCE FOR THE AGED THROUGH THE SOCIAL SECURITY SYSTEM

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous material.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to again today introduce a bill to provide a program of hospital benefits and related health benefits for the elderly through the social security system, to increase social security cash benefits by 7 percent, and make certain other needed improvements in the social security program, and to increase Federal payments toward public assistance. It is fitting that this bill is designated as H.R. 1, because its consideration and enactment are matters of the utmost urgency.

HOSPITAL INSURANCE FOR THE AGED

Social security hospital insurance for the elderly is among the proposals to which the President has accorded the highest priority. This year, more than 3 million elderly Americans will have to go to the hospital and will be called on to pay individual health bills amounting to hundreds and even thousands of dollars. Almost one-half of these older people will have no health insurance at all and the great majority will have inadequate protection against their unbudgetable health expenses. Thus, many older Americans will have to use up meager savings—savings which, once spent, can never be restored.

Some older people will be crushed by the burden of expensive illness, their dreams for an independent old age shattered. Others will have to face the prospect of becoming dependent on their children, young people with families of their own to care for; and all too many of them will have to accept public charity and a life of poverty.

Mr. Speaker, my conviction that a hospital insurance for the aged program is needed is shared by the Advisory Council on Social Security. As Members of this body know, the Social Security Advisory Council was appointed in accordance with provisions of the 1956 social security amendments and was charged with the responsibility of reviewing and making recommendations on all aspects of the social security program, including the adequacy of benefits. The council was composed of distinguished representatives of employers, employees, self-employed people, and the general public. Only a few days ago, after more than 1½ years of intensive study, the Council reported as one of its conclusions that security in old age requires the combination of a cash benefit and insurance against a substantial part of the costs of expensive illness. The Council stated further that social insurance offers the only practical way of making sure that most older people will have hospital insurance protection. I will comment further on the Council's findings at a later point in my statement.

We can no longer permit hospital costs—or the fear of hospital costs—to deprive our elderly citizens of the security and peace of mind that should be their due after a lifetime of work. Mr. Speaker, I am confident that most of my colleagues, and most Americans, share my conviction that the only practical and effective remedy to this critical and widespread problem is hospital insurance through social security. Enactment of H.R. 1, which would provide such insurance, should be our No. 1 objective in the coming months.

PROSPECTS FOR ENACTMENT

Mr. Speaker, there is no justification for postponing approval of a social security hospital benefits program. During the many years that this proposal has been before the Congress, the major issues that have blocked passage have been resolved. The mounting evidence that has been collected over this period has clearly established that older people have not been able to adequately prepare themselves to cope with their large health costs. Everyone who has come into contact with this problem knows that the situation is widespread and serious. The past several years of experimentation with private insurance and public welfare programs have also shown that these existing means of financing health care in old age cannot, by themselves, meet the problem.

Over the years, the American public has seen a great deal of controversy over social security hospital benefits for the elderly. They have been exposed to the informational campaigns carried out by proponents and opponents and they have considered the mounting support for the proposal by such nonpartisan groups of experts as the task force that was formed at the request of Senator Javits and, of course, the Advisory Council on Social Security. The American people have also considered the suggestions made during the political campaigns last year that not even the existing social security system—much less the hospital benefit plan—is acceptable and that the system should be radically changed.

The results of the November election should leave no doubt in anyone's mind over how the American voters feel about these issues. They have overwhelmingly endorsed social security and the addition of hospital insurance for the aged to the present system. The American voters have also elected to this body a membership which is clearly in favor of my proposal. We can now proceed to carry out our mandate without further delay.

SIMILARITY TO APPROVED MEASURES

With the exception of the hospital insurance provisions, the provisions of my bill are largely the same as, or similar to, those agreed to by the Committee on Ways and Means in the course of the committee's consideration of the proposed Social Security Amendments of 1964. The 7-percent benefit increase that I am proposing is somewhat larger than was agreed to by the committee, but an increase of this size is clearly needed; the last social security benefit increase was enacted in 1958 and the proposed increase is needed to bring benefits into line with current prices.

The proposed 7-percent increase, the hospital insurance program, and the other social security provisions of the bill would be financed by the contribution increases proposed in the Senate-approved bill of last year: the social security tax rate for an employee would be increased to an ultimate level of 5.2 percent—in 1971; and the amount of annual earnings subject to the tax would be raised from $4,800 to $5,600. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that the proposed Social Security Amendments of 1964 were pending in a conference committee when the 88th Congress adjourned.

The hospital insurance provisions of the bill I have introduced will be familiar to my colleagues. In all major respects, the proposed hospital benefit plan is the same as the bill I have introduced on behalf of the administration in the previous Congress and which was considered by the Committee on Ways and Means during the extensive health benefit hearings of 1963 and 1964. Similarly, the proposal is much the same as the hospital insurance provisions of the proposed Social Security Amendments of 1964 as passed by the Senate last fall.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the Record immediately following my statement material describing the provisions of H.R. 1. This will include actuarial tables showing the financial status of the social security system under my bill. At this point, however, I shall summarize the hospital insurance provisions. I shall also touch briefly on some of the ways in which these have been improved. While the proposed hospital insurance plan follows the same approach as the predecessor bill, we have continued to evaluate the plan and have been able to make further improvements in it.

HOSPITAL INSURANCE PROVISIONS

Like my previous proposals, H.R. 1 would utilize the time-tested social security mechanism to enable Americans to contribute during working years toward the cost of hospitalization and related care that they will face during their later years. The proposed hospital insurance protection would be made available to virtually all people at age 65 as an earned right. My bill would accomplish this without interfering with hospital operations or the practice of medicine in any way. The proposed program would provide the following benefits:

First. Payments would be made for up to 60 days of hospital care with the patient paying a deductible amount equal to the national average cost for 1 day of hospital care. There is no provision for a choice among alternative hospital benefit plans, as under my previous proposal, because of problems of advising elderly people about the implications of various options and the dissatisfaction that would result from "wrong" choices.

Second. To encourage the appropriate use of facilities less expensive than hospitals for convalescence, payment would be made for up to 60 days of postacute care in extended-care facilities following discharge from a hospital. My new bill would clarify the nature of the posthospital care that would be paid for under the proposed program by using the terms "posthospital extended care" and "extended care facility." In addition the bill would make it somewhat easier for these facilities to participate in the program by changing the requirement that a facility be affiliated with a hospital to one that would require only that the facility have an agreement with a hospital for the timely transfer of patients and medical information.

Third. Payment would be made for all costs above a deductible amount for outpatient hospital diagnostic services furnished within a 30-day period; the deductible amount would be equal to one-half the deductible amount for inpatient hospital benefits.

Fourth. Payment of all costs for up to 240 visits a year by visiting nurses and other health workers in the patient's own home.

In order to stimulate the supplementation of the basic plan with effective private insurance, the bill would authorize private insurance carriers to pool their resources for the purpose of making low-cost health insurance available that older people could add to their socal security hospital insurance.

The social security program of hospital insurance for the elderly that I propose would, like my previous proposals, rely on the traditional partnership between public insurance, private insurance, and public assistance that has worked so well in the area of income maintenance. First, basic protection against hospital costs and certain alternatives to hospitalization would be afforded the elderly on a paid-up basis through social security. Second, private protection would be built upon this base through employer plans and individually. Third, two States, relieved of a substantial portion of their welfare burden, would be placed in a far better financial position to provide adequate medical assistance to help the relatively small residual group whose special needs and circumstances make it impossible for them to meet their health costs.

FINANCIAL SOUNDNESS OF HOSPITAL INSURANCE PROVISIONS

The proposed hospital insurance would be financed on the same sound basis as the present social security program. The estimate of the cost of the proposed program was calculated only after intensive study of all available data, including the experience of private health insurance organizations. The cost of the proposed hospital insurance would be fully financed by contributions from workers— and matching payments from their employers. The maximum employee contribution rate would be less than one-half of one percent so that, for example, a worker earning $5,600 a year, the maximum amount subject to contributions, would pay about $25 per year toward hospital insurance; one earning $4,800 would pay about $22 a year; one earning the median amount of $3,000 would pay $13.50 a year.

Under the hospital insurance proposal, the additional contributions for hospital insurance would be automatically appropriated to a special hospital insurance trust fund, which would be kept separate and operate independently from the existing social security trust funds. All hospital insurance benefits and the administrative expenses of the proposed program would be paid only from the new hospital insurance trust fund.

IMPERATIVE NEED FOR ENACTMENT

The reasons that it is imperative to enact a program of hospital insurance for the elderly have been clearly established. Health care has become so expensive that virtually no one, not even the person who is working in a well-paying job and who is at the height of his earning power, can afford to be without insurance against large health expenses. And the elderly have an even greater need for health insurance than younger people because, on the average, their health care costs are twice as high. The incidence of expensive illness increases greatly in old age. Each year, one out of every six older people is hospitalized. Practically everyone who reaches age 65 is hospitalized at least once during his later years and most older people are hospitalized two or more times. On the average, the older person uses almost three times as much hospital care as the younger person.

It is ironic that, despite this demonstrably great need for protection against the cost of health care, the elderly have to get along without adequate health insurance coverage. Only a handful of the aged—perhaps 1 in 20—have protection against as much as 40 percent or more of their health costs. Only about one-half of the aged have any health insurance at all—even counting those with only meager $10-per-day hospital coverage policies or one of the other inadequate plans offered to the aged. Despite the much-heralded introduction over the past 5 years of Blue Cross senior citizen plans, the State-65 plans and the commercial insurance mass enrollment plans, the number of aged people without health insurance is nearly as large as it was 5 years ago.

Over the years that the social security hospital insurance proposal has been studied, it has become increasingly clear to most informed people that the existing health insurance arrangements cannot alone meet the problem of insuring the elderly. Most people cannot afford to pay for adequate health insurance when they are old, because that is the time of life when health insurance costs are highest and when the individual's financial resources are likely to be lowest. On the average, the older family group has one-half as much income as younger families of comparable size. In all but a few cases, a person will no longer have upon retirement the advantage of employer contributions toward his health insurance premiums.

On the other hand, health insurance is much more expensive for the elderly than for others, primarily because of the high health costs associated with old age. And the health insurance premiums older people must pay are pushed even higher, because the elderly are generally not eligible for group coverage. Most of the health insurance in force in the United States is purchased for groups of employees through their place of employment. This group health insurance coverage is economical, in part because the sales and premium collection costs are less and in part because some of the administrative costs are borne by the employer, who, for example, collects the premiums, generally by a deduction from wages. When administrative costs are low, almost all of the money workers pay toward their group coverage can be returned to them in the form of health benefits.

Unfortunately, the elderly, who are generally not employed and do not belong to a group for which group health insurance could be furnished, cannot ordinarily benefit from the economies of group coverage. They can generally get health insurance only on an individual basis. Individual commercial health insurance costs, on the average, about 1½ times as much as group coverage offering the same protection. Because health costs for older people are about twice and hospital costs close to three times those of younger people, an individually written health insurance policy for an aged person may cost three or four times as much as the same protection furnished under a group coverage plan for younger people. This can mean health insurance costs for an adequate policy of $500 a year or more for an aged couple.

Health costs have become the most serious remaining threat to financial security in old age. It is not surprising, then, that health care costs have become the most important single reason for the continuing need for the aged to resort to public assistance.

Over one-third of public assistance expenditures for the aged are for medical costs. As short a time as 12 years ago medical costs were only 11 percent of public assistance for the aged.

A CONTINUING PROBLEM

Unless we take the steps that the people of this country have demanded, health costs are going to remain a serious threat to the security of elderly Americans for generations to come. There is little doubt but that the cost of health care will continue to rise faster than other costs for some time to come. And, of course, the cost of health insurance must follow suit. Moreover, there is every likelihood that the elderly will continue to use an increasing volume of health services as medical science advances. And as now, the future aged will have to cope with the substantial reduction in income that comes with retirement.

PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

Welfare programs do not offer an acceptable remedy to the problem older people face in meeting the costs of expensive illness. For the problem is not one faced only by the poor, the group for whom public assistance is intended. The problem of paying large health bills in old age hits hardest at the great majority of older people—those who are neither rich nor very poor. These are the people who risk the loss of their financial independence. Giving assistance to people who are already reduced to poverty is necessary, but the prevention of dependency is certainly more in line with the aspirations of the American people.

Also, getting help through public assistance always depends on meeting a means test—and that of course involves an investigation of the individual's personal financial situation. If there is one attitude Americans have in common it is the desire to maintain individual dignity and privacy. Most people find it humiliating to undergo a scrutiny of their personal affairs and how they spend their money. In some cases, the means-test investigation takes place while the elderly person is lying helpless in a hospital bed. Even the resources of their children may be investigated.

Many of our senior citizens would rather forgo needed medical care—to the detriment of their health—than go before a public welfare agency and admit what they think amounts to social and financial failure. How can we permit this to happen to a retired person who has worked hard and been self-supporting all his life, when he finds that he has a big hospital bill. We, as a moral people, cannot consign all these people to the welfare rolls. We must adopt the much more suitable alternative of social security hospital insurance. And there are other problems with depending upon public assistance as the basic public program to meet this problem.

While a few States have fairly liberal Kerr-Mills programs of medical assistance for the aged, a few States have no Kerr-Mills program at all and most States have very stringent ones. Of the States with programs, the majority have established their programs so as to benefit only older individuals whose annual incomes fall below $1,500. Also, the State plans generally give no help to those with very modest bank accounts. Many States do not provide aid if the relatives cannot show they are too poor to help.

It is not surprising, then, that while the Kerr-Mills provisions were intended to help older people who are ordinarily self-supporting, most of the aged who have actually met the eligibility requirements were so poor that they met all the requirements for old-age assistance. In other words, essentially none but the very poor have been aided by the Kerr-Mills legislation. Even then the scope of care available is often quite limited. In some States, for example, medical care is provided under Kerr-Mills only where the applicant's life or sight is endangered, rather than whenever medically required. In a number of States payment for hospital care under MAA is very limited—to as few as 15 days.

THE SOCIAL SECURITY APPROACH

For most Americans, what is needed is not more lenient welfare programs but rather an insurance system under which all workers can, during their productive years, pay contributions toward protection against the high health costs that will beset them in later years. Social security, and only social security, would make this desirable, self-help arrangement available to practically everybody.

Unlike public assistance, social security hospital insurance would help prevent indigency by helping older people meet their health costs before they have been reduced to indigency. The hospital insurance would be financed through a system which older people have helped to support by their specific earmarked social security contributions. Thus, unlike public assistance, there would be no humiliating and degrading needs tests; the hospital benefits would be paid as an earned right—the way that preserves individual dignity and privacy.

Further, the details of the proposed hospital insurance would be spelled out by statute so that workers would know what they would get in return for their contributions. Since the funds needed to finance the proposed insurance would be provided in advance, older people would be certain of having the proposed protection when they reach age 65. There would not be the problem that public assistance administrators face of having, every so often, to cut back the medical care provided the needy because of insufficient funds.

Unlike voluntary insurance, the social security mechanism would make health benefit protection available to retired people on a group basis—a kind of coverage that is ordinarily only available to working people. Like the group insurance available to the young, there would be no waiting periods, no exclusion of preexisting conditions, no higher premiums for poorer health risks, nor other devices that now deprive those older people who need it most of hospital insurance protection. Individually purchased health insurance plans, on the average, provide less than 60 cents worth of protection in return for each dollar of premiums the individual pays, while social security hospital insurance would return 97 cents on the dollar. Social security hospital insurance would have no fixed dollar benefits that get out of date. And employer contributions, which are not generally avaliable to the aged who buy insurance, would help finance the program.

The social insurance mechanism also offers a truly conservative approach to meeting basic costs of illness in old age. The scope of the health insurance protection that would be provided would be clearly defined and limited by law, the longrun cost of the program would be actuarially calculated, and revenue sufficient to finance the program would be provided.

RECOMMENDATION OF THE ADVISORY COUNCIL ON SOCIAL SECURITY

Before concluding my statement, I would like to call attention to a few of the specific conclusions about the health insurance needs of the elderly that the Advisory Council on Social Security reached after its thorough review of all the evidence. The council concluded that monthly cash benefits are not sufficient to provide the economic security in old age that the social security program is intended to provide. In the council's opinion, monthly cash benefits can meet regularly recurring expenses such as those for food, clothing and shelter, but monthly cash benefits are not a practical way to meet the problem of high and unpredictable costs of health care, and costs that may run into the thousands of dollars for some and amount to very little for others. The Council believes that the time has come to apply the method of social insurance to this problem in order to assure the continuing effectiveness of retirement protection. The Council's report recommends the adoption of a program under which workers and their employers and the self-employed could make contributions during their working years in order to have protection against the cost of hospital care and related services in old age. Only one member dissented from this recommendation.

I am delighted that the Advisory Council has made this recommendation. Their recommendation lends additional authoritative support to the cause I have been championing for years. I should mention that the hospital insurance program proposed by the Advisory Council goes beyond the proposal in my bill by recommending that totally and permanently disabled people should have the same hospital insurance protection as the elderly. I commend to Members of this body the thoughtful and thorough report of this knowledgeable and distinguished Council.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Speaker, as I have said, the bill I have just introduced is basically the same as the hospital insurance amendment that the Senate added last year to the proposed Social Security Amendments of 1964. In approving the previous version of the bill, that body endorsed the idea that workers should have the opportunity to pay in advance, and over their working years, toward the basic hospital insurance they will need during their later years. There is no question in my mind but that most of the Members of this body share that view. We in the Congress will reach agreement on this logical extension of the retirement protection offered by social security this year, and we will be able to take great pride in having had a hand in bringing financial security and peace of mind to millions of older Americans.

As was true of previous proposals on this subject, H.R. 1 will represent less than many might wish to have included, but at the same time it represents far more than others wish to include. There has been an opportunity to add further refinements and to make changes and improve this proposal. I might point out that there certainly has been ample opportunity during the past years for all interested individuals to thoroughly consider what is involved. I see no reason why there should not be expeditious consideration and favorable action at an early date.

Mr. Speaker, I am gratified to note the number of Members who have indicated their desire to cosponsor H.R. 1 at the commencement of this Congress: EUGENE J. KEOGH, of New York; FRANK M. KARSTEN, of Missouri; AL ULLMAN, of Oregon; JAMES A. BURKE, of Massachusetts; MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS, of Michigan; GEORGE M. RHODES, of Pennsylvania; DAN ROSTENKOWSKI, of Illinois.

Congressmen from California include: CHET HOLIFIELD, GEORGE MILLER, JOHN MOSS, JAMES ROOSEVELT, B. F. SISK, JOHN MCFALL, JEFFERY COHELAN, HAROLD JOHNSON, JAMES C. CORMAN, GEORGE E. BROWN, PHILLIP BURTON, RONALD B. CAMERON, DON EDWARDS, RICHARD HANNA, AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, ROBERT L. LEGGETT, EDWARD R. ROYBAL, LIONEL VAN DEERLIN, CHARLES H. WILSON, KEN W. DYAL, and JOHN V. TUNNEY.

PETER W. RODINO, JR., of New Jersey; JOHN D. DINGELL, of Michigan; HENRY S. REUSS, of Wisconsin; SEYMOUR HALPERN, of New York; BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL, of New York; CARLTON R. SICKLES, of Maryland; LYNN E. STALBAUM, of Wisconsin; DOMINICK V. DANIELS, of New Jersey; JOSEPH P. ADDABBO, of New York; JACOB H. GILBERT, of New York.

CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, of Wisconsin; JOHN R. HANSEN, of Iowa; JOSEPH P. VIGORITO, of Pennsylvania; ROMAN C. PUCINSKI, of Illinois; CLAUDE PEPPER, of Florida; LEONARD FARBSTEIN, of New York; J. OLIVA HUOT, of New Hampshire; RAY CLEVENGER, of Michigan; SPARK M. MATSUNAGA, of Hawaii.

THOMAS C. MCGRATH, JR., of New Jersey; JOHN CONYERS, JR., of Michigan; EDWARD PATTEN, of New Jersey; WILLIAM R. ANDERSON, of Tennessee; LLOYD MEEDS, of Washington; PATSY T. MINK, of Hawaii; JAMES H. SCHEUER, of New York; LESTER L. WOLFF, of New York; ARNOLD OLSEN, of Montana; WILLIAM F. RYAN, of New York; THADDEUS J. DULSKI, of New York.

Income and outgo under H.R. 1, by calendar years

OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE TRUST FUND

Calendar year	Income	Outgo	Net income	Fund at end of year
1964	$15,840	$15,610	+$230	$18,710
1965	16,380	17,590	−1,210	17,500
1966	18,750	18,530	+220	17,720
1967	19,520	19,350	+170	17,890

DISABILITY INSURANCE TRUST FUND

Calendar year	Income	Outgo	Net income	Fund at end of year
1964	$1,200	$1,420	−$220	$2,010
1965	1,230	1,630	−400	1,610
1966	1,700	1,700		1,610
1967	1,850	1,750	+100	1,710

HOSPITALIZATION INSURANCE TRUST FUND

Calendar year	Income	Outgo	Net income	Fund at end of year
1965				
1966	$1,310	$800	+$510	$510
1967	1,980	1,780	+200	710

Actuarial balance under H.R. 1, expressed as percentages of taxable payroll

COMPUTATIONS ON PERPETUITY BASIS

Item	OASDI	Hospitalization insurance	Total
Actuarial balance of present system	−0.24		−0.24
Earnings base of $5,600	+.31		−.31
Revised contribution schedule	+.20	+0.89	+1.09
Extensions of coverage	+.03		+.03
Benefit increase of 7 percent [1]	−.60		−.60
Hospitalization and related benefits		[2] −.84	−.84
Total effect of changes	−.06	+.05	−.01
Actuarial balance under proposal	−.30	+.05	−.25

COMPUTATIONS ON 75-YEAR COST BASIS [3]

Item	OASDI	Hospitalization insurance	Total
Actuarial balance of present system	+0.01		+0.01
Earnings base of $5,600	+.31		+.31
Revised contribution schedule	+.20	+0.89	+1.09
Extensions of coverage	+.03		+.03
Benefit increase of 7 percent [1]	−.58		−.58
Hospitalization and related benefits		[2] −.84	−.84
Total effect of changes	−.04	+.05	+.01
Actuarial balance under proposal	−.03	+.05	+.02

[1] The 7-percent increase applies only on the first $400 of average monthly wage.

[2] Following is a breakdown of the 0.84 percent cost of the health benefits:

	Percent
Hospitalization benefits	0.78
Extended care benefits	.02
Outpatient diagnostic services	.01
Home nursing care	.03
Total	.84

[3] Basis recommended by Advisory Council on Social Security.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KING of California. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I congratulate my distinguished colleague for the introduction H.R. 1. I wish to tell him I am sure there are many of us who hope that at long last this measure will come to a vote in this House.

Mr. KING of California. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KING of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MILLER. I wish to join in what the gentleman from California has said with respect to this bill.

Mr. KING of California. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KING of California. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. I also desire to join with the two gentlemen who have previously spoken in congratulating the gentleman for introducing this bill.

Mr. KING of California. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KING of California. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. I wish to join heartily in what has been said by the able gentlemen, and to add that we entertain the fondest hopes that at long last this great measure will pass.

Mr. KING of California. I thank the gentleman.

HORTON RESOLUTION CALLS FOR SPECIAL CAPTIVE NATIONS COMMITTEE IN CONGRESS

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a resolution to establish a Special Committee on the Captive Nations.

I take this time to call the proposal to the attention of my worthy colleagues and urge their consideration of the manifold reasons which I believe warrant its adoption.

I also want to remind the Members of the House of the considerable sentiment which was expressed in favor of the establishment of such a special committee during the 88th Congress. By actual count, there were 45 resolutions introduced for this purpose. I am proud that mine, House Resolution 175, was among them and one of the first to be offered in the last Congress. While all of these measures were referred to the Rules Committee, no action was taken on them.

There is a common consensus in the United States today that international communism is our enemy. It poses a threat—both real and potential—to American security interests.

This consensus is no illusion. It is not a figment of anyone's imagination. Rather, it is an awareness of the vicious tyranny which has been thrust upon millions of unwilling souls in once-free nations of the world.

Throughout Eastern Europe, in Asia, in Cuba, the agents of atheistic aggression have subjugated millions of men, women, and children. They are political prisoners. The most cruel, ruthless, and inhuman bondage ever known to human history holds them in check. All the freedoms we enjoy—and too often take for granted—are denied these people of the captive nations. And, how well we know the horrible death and horrendous destruction which has followed those valiant attempts to throw off the shackles of Soviet slavery.

The plight of these peoples whose national independence and individual liberty has been wrongfully wrenched from them by Communist captors troubles me and my constituents. In thousands of cases, those whom I have the honor to represent in the U.S. Congress are sorrow stricken by these situations not alone because of an instinctive American repugnance toward tyranny but additionally because among these enslaved peoples are members of their own families and others to whom they are related by virtue of a common birthplace or national ancestry. Far better than my ability to urge a firmer U.S. policy for the ultimate liberation of the captive nations is their personal knowledge of the "iron fists" behind the Iron Curtain.

By adopting the resolution I have offered today, this great legislative body—famed historically for the architects of freedom who have served here—can express a free world commitment to a strong anti-Communist position.

Beyond this, such a resolution would reflect on our country worldwide recognition that the United States intends to take the lead in denouncing the Reds' illegal takeovers of the captive nations. This would be an important message of hope and inspiration to those now in Communist captivity.

We also need this essential congressional instrument for observing and reporting on the activities of communism. There is an informational gap at present. The American people are not getting a full and adequate picture of Communist conspiracies abroad. Therefore, I fear our fellow citizens are not so equipped as they should be to assess and to judge the real proportions of this problem.

The true nature of Soviet imperialism and colonialism is a message that should be brought home to all Americans. It should be proclaimed to the whole world, for a naked exposure of its political purpose should once and for all belie the frequent Communist charges of American imperialism.

The problem is acute; the need is obvious.

For these and many more reasons, I urge that Congress, during this new session, enact legislation establishing a Captive Nations Committee in the House of Representatives. In so doing, Congress will fulfill an important responsibility to the American people.

HORTON BILL TO REPEAL RETAIL EXCISE TAXES

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, on this opening day of the 89th Congress, I wish to announce that I have introduced today a bill to repeal the Federal retailers' excise taxes.

I believe that an examination of my actions in the last Congress makes it clear that I am a strong advocate for an immediate end of the imposition of these levies. On two occasions, I worked directly in the legislative framework for their repeal. Therefore, I now feel it is very appropriate for me to sponsor my own proposal in this regard.

The excise taxes which my bill seeks to repeal are those imposed at the retail level on jewelry, furs, toilet preparations, luggage, and handbags.

These taxes first were levied during the beginning of World War II when the Government's revenue requirements increased sharply. Other objectives of these levies were to attract investment in war bonds rather than consumer goods and to divert industrial production away from less essential items to needed weapons of war.

The legislative history is clear that these retail excise taxes were considered originally only as temporary taxes that would be allowed to expire as soon as the war was won. Yet, they were not removed at that time. In fact, they were maintained through the Korean war period and only after that were they reduced from 20 to 10 percent. Since then, every effort to abolish these taxes has met with defeat.

In the last Congress, attempts to repeal or reduce these excise levies were put off on the basis that a more thorough study should be made of them and their impact on the total economy. Now that study has been made. During this past summer, the House Ways and Means Committee held exhaustive hearings. The testimony and papers submitted on the whole range of Federal excise taxes fill six volumes.

There are, I believe, a number of compelling reasons for the repeal of the retail excise taxes. So that my colleagues may be apprised of why I have introduced a bill to that end, I should like to cite briefly what I consider to be the chief arguments calling for the end of these taxes.

First, a repel of these excise levies would provide our national economy with an added stimulus.

Last year's $11.6 billion personal and corporate income tax cut deserves much of the credit for the vigorous expansion of economic activity which occurred in 1964. Legislation repealing these excise taxes will serve to spur our economy even more.

Taking this action would bring immediate benefit to the American consumer—women, in particular—by effecting a 10-percent reduction in the price of the commodities affected.

Thus, savings in excess of $400 million would be released into the hands of consumers for expenditure or investment in other income-producing enterprises. More jobs and higher incomes and profits would be created in industries expanding to meet an increased demand for goods and services. Just as in any economic situation where more money is made available under correct circumstances, the capital released by the repeal of the taxes covered in my bill can generate further and greater prosperity for individuals and industries.

Second, I believe it is realistic to assume that a growing dynamic economy not only is worth the temporary loss in Federal revenues, but soon will compensate for it. Total collections from all retail excise taxes yielded only $475 million in fiscal year 1964. This represents but four-tenths of 1 percent of all revenues of $112.2 billion received by the Federal Government from all sources during that annual accounting period. Therefore, it would seem certain that despite this short-run loss, rising revenues from higher incomes generated by a more productive economy soon would offset the Federal income loss.

Third, the present retail excise tax structure is incongruous with our national tax philosophy. These levies are regressive, working the greatest hardship on those least able to pay, namely, those in the low-income brackets. Another argument for excise tax repeal, then, is making the Government more reliant on income taxes embracing the progressive principle of taxation.

Fourth, repeal will enable producers of these taxed items and those who retail them to compete on a more equal footing with those manufacturing and selling nontaxed articles. Not only that, but the specialty store owner or the small merchant would be freed from much of the redtape and many of the problems which continually harass them in merchandising these products. Among these problems—and, countless constituents have voiced them to me, Mr. Speaker—are trying to identify taxable merchandise, the additional bookkeeping and reports which are required in serving as the Government's tax collector and being subject to rigid accounting by agents of the Internal Revenue Service.

Fifth, and finally, taxes on such items as cosmetics, handbags, and luggage simply are not justified on the basis of being levied on luxury items. These are not luxury items. It has been pointed out before and I take the time to repeat that it smacks of the worst kind of discrimination based on sex to make a woman pay an excise tax on her pocketbook. Americans should enjoy the benefit of having these taxes repealed in order that they might purchase more of these articles and thereby enjoy their daily lives even more.

Mr. Speaker, these are the reasons I have introduced legislation to repeal the retail excise taxes. This unfair burden must be lifted from the shoulders of the purchasing public and it is within the power of this Congress to do it.

HORTON BILL WOULD ESTABLISH NATIONAL HUMANITIES FOUNDATION

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I have the pleasure to announce to my colleagues in the House that on this opening day of the 89th Congress, I have introduced a bill to establish a National Humanities Foundation.

This action, I know, is being taken in the company of many Members, and I am confident that all of us sponsoring these measures wish to acknowledge our debt of gratitude to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORHEAD] for the leadership he has provided and the inspiration he continues to put forth in behalf of this vital legislative proposal.

In a large and admittedly somewhat loose sense, this measure proposes nothing less than the restoration of man. It is not a practical proposal if it is measured in terms of putting money in our pockets and increasing the general material prosperity, although I do hasten to add that many useful benefits would accrue from the establishment of a National Humanities Foundation in terms of greater national prestige and a more meaningful use of leisure time.

Neither does my bill fit the description of a "bricks and mortar" measure to be evidenced tangibly in a grandiose new building, although it would visibly enrich the arts and culture of this Nation.

Because its concern is humanity and the deepest mysteries of human experience, its very nature is elusive and its expediency cannot be discussed in the usual urging fashion. However, the proposed National Humanities Foundation is a national imperative and its chief significance for the Congress of the United States is that it has become vital to our national interests.

I would like to quote briefly from an address by Barnaby Keeney, chairman of the Commission on the Humanities which provided the groundwork for this legislation:

> Our fulfillment as a nation depends upon the development of our minds, and our relations to one another and to our society depend upon our understanding of one another and our society. The humanities and the arts, therefore, are at the center of our lives and are of prime importance to the Nation and ourselves.

In this afflicted and often-difficult world, there is an urgent need to rediscover and explore human values. The revitalization of the humanities can be an antidote to the fading image of individuals increasingly obscured in a contemporary world of "bigness." A concerted effort to support the humanities is our best hope for reawakening man's consciousness. New vision and true freedom have as their essential ingredients creative thinking and creative works.

Described briefly, the National Humanities Foundation proposal has as its stated purpose "to develop and promote a broadly conceived policy of support for the humanities and the arts." Within the scope of the Foundation would be the humanities and the arts defined in broad and inclusive terms.

The functions of the Foundation would be first to develop and encourage the pursuit of a national policy for the promotion of scholarship, education, and research in the humanities and the arts; second, to insure that suitable means are provided for educating and developing scholars, teachers, and artists at every stage of their growth; third, to assist public and other nonprofit organizations concerned with encouraging and developing scholars, teachers, and artists, including assistance for the improvement of teaching in the humanities and arts; fourth, to award scholarships and graduate fellowships including postdoctoral fellowships in the humanities and arts; and fifth, to foster the interchange of scholarly information in the humanities and arts among the scholars and students in the United States and foreign countries.

The organization of the Foundation would consist of a board of 24 members chosen for a term of 6 years each by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, and a Director similarly chosen. Board members would be selected solely on the basis of established records of distinguished service and scholarship or creativity and also selected so as to represent a wide spectrum of views of scholars, teachers, and students in the humanities and arts in the United States. The board is authorized to create committees and divisions.

In addition to safeguarding the humanities and arts from interference and control through the creation of an independent and competent board, the Foundation's freedom also would be strengthened by the fact that its operation is proposed as similar to the Smithsonian Institution which is empowered to accept gifts, endowments, and grants from foundations, corporations, and individuals.

The National Science Foundation was created in 1950 to give impetus to the progress of science in our country. Largely through its efforts, the teaching of science has been revolutionized and our scientific resources are strong.

As we continue to clear new hurdles in science and technology and as we race toward the moon, the schism between science and the humanities deepens. The Nation has reached a stage of maturity in which the arts and humanities demand equal status with science and a redressing of the imbalance of the two cultures is required now.

We have developed our military defenses to the point where it is now possible for us to turn a greater portion of our national attention to the defense of our beliefs, our ideals. It is proper that we recognize human values as universal values with the power to unite all mankind.

I share the late William Faulkner's expressed hope and belief in the human spirit as he phrased it so eloquently when he accepted the Nobel Peace Prize in 1950:

> I believe that man will not merely endure; he will prevail. He is immortal, not because he alone among creatures has an inexhaustible voice but because he has a soul, a spirit capable of compassion and sacrifice and endurance. The poet's, the writer's duty is to write about these things. It is his privilege to help man endure by lifting his heart, by reminding him of the courage and honor and hope and pride and compassion and pity and sacrifice which have been the glory of his past.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is our duty to do no less for the humanities and the arts than to enact the legislation I propose to establish a National Humanities Foundation for I am confident that in so doing we will be accomplishing more for the future of man than any of us can now foresee.

PROTECTION OF CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS OF INDIVIDUALS COMMITTED TO FEDERAL INSTITUTIONS ON CHARGE OF MENTAL INCOMPETENCY OR INSANITY

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, today I have again introduced a bill designed to protect the constitutional rights of individuals committed to Federal institutions on a charge of mental incompetency or insanity. This bill is similar to one which I submitted in the 88th Congress and which drew a favorable recommendation from the Judicial Conference of the United States with some modifications.

Basically, the bill would amend chapter 313 of title 18, United States Code, with respect to the constitutional rights of mentally incompetent persons committed thereunder. The proposed amendments to 18 United States Code 4244, contained in the bill, would first, require that a preliminary motion for a judicial determination of the mental competency of the accused to stand trial be supported by a sworn written statement based on personal observation by a responsible adult as to the mental condition of the accused; second, require a hearing on the preliminary motion at which the accused and his attorney should be present; third, authorize a psychiatric examination or temporary commitment for such examination only upon an initial determination by the court "that there is reasonable cause to doubt the mental competency of the accused"; fourth, limit the commitment, if commitment is ordered, for a "reasonable period, not to exceed 30 days, as the court may determine"; and fifth, require a further hearing on the issue of mental competency to stand trial if the initial report of the physician "indicates a state of present mental incompetency." A new provision, to be set forth in section 4250 of title 18, would guarantee to an accused found mentally incompetent and committed pursuant to the provisions of the statute the right to a periodic reexamination, not more frequently than every 6 months, on the application of his attorney, legal guardian, spouse, parent, or nearest adult relative. The report of the examination would be forwarded to interested parties other than the accused, and would be given to the accused only if the committing court deemed it in his best interests.

Mr. Speaker, this bill was submitted by me last year only after long and deliberate consultations with many national experts in this field, most of whom agreed that some changes were necessary in the present statutes. The bill has been revised on several occasions to conform with the general consensus of those with whom I sought counsel and advice, both nationally and by members of the Greene County Bar Association of Missouri in the district I represent, and wherein is located the Federal Medical Center for Defective Delinquents.

In view of the generally favorable recommendation by a key Federal agency toward the close of the 88th Congress, I hope many colleagues will join me and that the Committee on the Judiciary will hold hearings in the near future so the House may have an opportunity to consider what I believe to be a most important piece of legislation.

THE ELECTION LAWS OF THE STATE OF MISSISSIPPI

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, ever since the Supreme Court of the United States enunciated the doctrine of "one man, one vote," our State legislatures have been busy amending State constitutions and laws to protect those of their citizens who have been unfairly represented in their legislative bodies. We, in the House of Representatives, have taken pride in the fact that our congressional districts are reapportioned every 10 years so that they may fairly represent all of the people of the United States on the basis of actual population. And I can state with a degree of pride, that the House of Representatives of the United States is probably the most representative legislative body anywhere in the world.

However, in the administration of the Mississippi election laws, since the adoption by that State of the constitution of 1890, more and more Negroes have been disenfranchised to the point where only about 5 percent of them are permitted to vote, and in some counties, it is less than 1 percent.

It has been urged that Negroes are denied the right to vote on the basis of a subjective test which requires their reading and interpreting difficult sections of the State constitution to the satisfaction of election officials who exercise their discretion one way with respect to Negro citizens and another way with respect to white citizens of voting age. Registration procedures are such that Negroes may frequently register only at the risk of life and limb. Even the most educated Negroes, who could memorize and speak authoritatively on the constitution of the State, are denied the right to register under a provision of law which grants the registrar the right to determine whether the applicant for registration is of good moral character under any definition that he may personally choose to accept. This, in my opinion, amounts to systematic disenfranchisement of American citizens.

At the same time, under a provision of the law, persons who were qualified to vote in 1954, when hardly any Negroes were on the registration rolls, are exempted from meeting further tests of qualifications for registration.

The constitution of 1890, the election laws enacted pursuant to this constitution, and the execution of these laws are in derogation of an act of Congress of February 23, 1870, which readmitted the State of Mississippi to representation in Congress. The act gave the State of Mississippi representation in Congress after such representation was taken away during the Civil War, upon condition that the constitution of Mississippi shall never be amended or changed as to deprive any citizen or class of citizens of the right to vote, granted under the Federal Constitution.

Twenty years after the enactment of 1870, under which Mississippi was permitted to resume sending Representatives to the Congress, Mississippi proceeded to violate its bargain by changing its constitution and thereafter enacting statutes which effectively discriminated against American citizens who are not white.

The Civil Rights Act of 1957, in behalf of which I had the privilege of voting, authorized the Attorney General of the United States to bring civil actions to protect the rights of citizens to vote without distinction as to race or color. Pursuant to this act, the Attorney General proceeded to institute actions against the State of Mississippi, one of which is now pending before the Supreme Court of the United States and is entitled, "United States against Mississippi, case No. 73, October term, 1964." I believe that the Supreme Court of the United States will find the election laws of the State of Mississippi and the administration of these laws to be unconstitutional under the 14th and 15th amendments to the Constitution, and in derogation thereof. Further, that they are discriminatory against the American citizens residing in the State of Mississippi, most of whom have been unjustly denied the right to vote.

Even if I should be mistaken in my prediction, there is still a grave doubt cast upon the legality of the elections under which the gentlemen from Mississippi claim their seats. The challenge to the validity of their election must finally be determined by you gentlemen.

The House of Representatives is constituted to represent all of the citizens of the United States, regardless of color. In the State of Mississippi, the gentlemen certified by the Governor to have been elected were, in fact, elected only by the white citizens with a tiny minority of the Negro citizens permitted to participate. Thus, they are not truly representative of the citizens of the State.

I do not, in any way, question the integrity or competence of those certified to be elected, and limit my criticism to the legality of the constitution and laws under which they claim seats in the House of Representatives. I join in the charge of the Attorney General reflected in his complaint in the case, "United States against Mississippi," that the elections were not lawfully conducted under the principles of our Federal Constitution, which I hold supreme. I, therefore, would urge the House of Representatives to reject the certification of the Governor of Mississippi and join in the challenge to the validity of their election.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE TAFT-HARTLEY ACT AND TO THE FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced five bills which I hope can have early hearings in the 1st session of the 89th Congress.

Two of these bills would amend the Taft-Hartley Act. The first by amending section 14(b) to prohibit State bans on union shops, and the second by amending section 302(c) to allow contributions to joint industry promotion funds.

The other three would amend various sections of the Fair Labor Standards Act. One would increase in three steps the minimum wage for those covered by the act to $2 per hour. Another would require the payment of overtime for those covered who worked in excess of 35 hours per week. This would be accomplished in two steps. And the last would extend the minimum wage and overtime provisions of the act to a significant number of Americans who now work without either of these protections.

I recognize, of course, that the administration will send to Congress its own bills dealing with certain, or perhaps all, of these subjects. However, I suggest that the bills set forth above will enhance our consideration of the administration's bills by providing Congress the opportunity to commence early consideration of their subject matter and thereby more fully assess their merit and necessity.

SIXTY-NINTH BIRTHDAY OF SENATOR EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, I call attention today to the 69th birthday of my colleague from Illinois, serving in the other body, the distinguished minority leader of the Senate, EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN.

Senator DIRKSEN has earned the respect and praise of Americans from every walk of life and of both political parties.

Time after time, Senator DIRKSEN has risen above partisan politics to espouse great national causes in the public interest.

I would like to note particularly the leadership Senator DIRKSEN displayed in behalf of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Without his support of the motion to invoke cloture, and his subsequent support of this measure, it would not be the law of the land today.

Senator DIRKSEN's advocacy of the limited nuclear test ban treaty is another instance of his objective leadership in behalf of the Nation and of the free world.

In marking his 69th birthday today, Senator DIRKSEN also is celebrating 30 years of distinguished and loyal service in the Congress, including 16 years in the House and 14 years in the Senate.

In behalf of the citizens of the 12th District of Illinois, I wish Senator Dirksen a most happy and healthy birthday. I extend to him and his faithful and beloved wife, Louella, many more years of good health and good fortune. And, to the people of this Nation, I wish many more years of devoted service from the brilliant Senate minority leader, Everett McKinley Dirksen.

LEGISLATION TO CREATE A NATIONAL HUMANITIES FOUNDATION

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to create a National Humanities Foundation to help to redress the imbalance which has developed in American education. Fifty-nine Members, of both parties, have joined with me in introducing identical bills.

The bills are substantially the same as the bill, H.R. 12406, which I introduced near the end of the 88th Congress and which in turn was based on the report of the Commission on the Humanities produced under the sponsorship of the American Council of Learned Societies, the Council of Graduate Schools in the United States and the United Chapters of Phi Beta Kappa.

Partly as a result of sputnik, this country has made a national commitment to promote education in the sciences. Out of the Department of Defense, out of NASA, out of the National Institutes of Health have poured billions of dollars for scientific research and education. Symbolic of the broadest and best of all this scientific ferment has been the National Science Foundation.

Even as we praised the magnificent work done in the sciences we began to realize that a purely materialistic outlook cannot provide an adequate basis for human life.

Yet our young people looking about them see that in national policy this country is dedicated to promoting only the sciences.

For the good of our country we must redress this imbalance. We must inspire the education of generalists who can understand and articulate the critical values that give compelling meaning and a sense of direction to human life, who are as skilled in devising a general program of peace and progress as the specialists are in creating engines of destruction.

A symbol of our national decision is needed—a symbol no less visible than the National Science Foundation.

For this purpose I propose the establishment of a National Humanities Foundation to promote progress in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes.

The bill, the "National Humanities Foundation Act of 1965," has 15 sections after the title.

Section 2 expresses the congressional findings and declaration in seven subsections. The Congress would find that there is a social, cultural, and educational imbalance in the country, and that because of this, the encouragement and support of the humanities and the arts, while primarily a matter for private and local initiative, is also an appropriate matter of concern to the Federal Government.

To carry out these findings, section 3 establishes an independent agency known as the National Humanities Foundation consisting of a Board and a Director.

Section 4 states the purpose of the Foundation in general terms to be "to develop and promote a broadly conceived policy of support for the humanities and the arts."

Section 5 defines humanities and the arts in the broadest possible terms.

Section 6 is a specific prohibition against Federal Government interference in the operation of the act.

Section 7 in five numbered subsections sets forth the functions of the Foundation.

Subsection (1) gives general policy guidance to the Foundation.

Subsection (2) provides for assistance to individual scholars, teachers, and artists at any stage of their growth.

While not so specifically limited, it is expected that programs for assistance to teachers in primary and secondary schools would be provided under this subsection and it is expected that the Foundation would consult with the Commissioner of Education, who is an ex officio member of the Board, in developing programs of this type. Similarly where programs for creative and performing artists are involved, it is expected that the Foundation will consult with the National Council on the Arts in developing programs of this type.

Subsection (3) provides for assistance to public and other nonprofit corporations to enable each institution to develop its own program for promotion of the humanities and the arts.

Subsection (4) provides for individual scholarships, fellowships, and grants and while not so specifically limited, would probably not be designed for teachers in primary and secondary education.

In carrying out the purposes of subsection (4), it is expected that the Foundation will work in consultation with private and semiprivate institutions such as the Smithsonian Institution, and the American Council of Learned Societies which are presently carrying on programs of fellowships, scholarships, and grants. The Secretary of the Smithsonian is an ex officio member of the Board.

Subsection (5) authorizes assistance for the improvement of library and museum resources. It is expected that in carrying out purposes of this subsection, the Foundation will in the case of libraries, work in consultation with the Library of Congress and in the case of museums, with the Smithsonian Institution. The Librarian of Congress and the Secretary of the Smithsonian are both ex officio members of the Board.

Subsection (b) states that one of the objectives of the Foundation should be to encourage the spread of excellence in the humanities and the arts throughout the United States and its possessions.

Subsection (c) requires the Foundation to render an annual report to the President for submission to the Congress.

Section 8 establishes a Board for the Foundation of 25 members with 20 members appointed by the President for 6-year terms by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and 5 ex officio members. Section 8 requires that the public members shall be eminent in the fields of the humanities or the arts selected solely on the basis of established records and in such a manner as to provide comprehensive representation of views of the humanities and the arts throughout the United States. The ex officio members are the director of the Foundation, the (United States) Commissioner of Education, the Librarian of Congress, the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, and the Chairman of the National Council on the Arts.

Section 9 creates the office of Director of the Foundation and provides that he shall receive the same compensation as the Librarian of Congress.

Section 10 authorizes the Board to create an executive and other committees.

Section 11 grants general legal powers to the Foundation and specifically authorizes the Foundation to receive and use donated funds.

Section 12 contains miscellaneous provisions such as the hiring of personnel, per diem for members of the Board and permits the transfer from other departments and agencies of the Government of funds available to them for development of the humanities or the arts.

Section 13 contains loyalty provisions modeled on those applicable to the National Science Foundation.

Section 14 authorizes the use of counterpart funds for programs in the humanities and the arts outside the United States.

Section 15 authorizes the appropriation of $5 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for years thereafter such sums as Congress may determine.

The Members of Congress who have introduced bills on the opening day of Congress calling for the creation of a National Humanities Foundation include Eugene J. Keogh, James G. Fulton, Melvin Price, Harold D. Donohue, Edward A. Garmatz, Abraham Multer, Wayne L. Hays, George M. Rhodes, Peter W. Rodino, Jr., John P. Saylor, Clement J. Zablocki, John C. Kunkel, Leo W. O'Brien, James A. Byrne, Ed Edmondson, Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr., Thomas L. Ashley, Henry S. Reuss, James Roosevelt, B. F. Sisk, James C. Wright, Jr., Glenn Cunningham, John H. Dent, Al Ullman, John Brademas, Jacob H. Gilbert, Ken Hechler, Ralph J. Rivers, J. Edward Roush, Robert F.

Ellsworth, Charles McC. Mathias, Jr., Arnold Olsen, George E. Brown, Jr., Ronald Brooks Cameron, James C. Cleveland, Don Edwards, Richard H. Fulton, Sam M. Gibbons, Augustus F. Hawkins, Robert L. Leggett, Joseph M. McDade, Spark M. Matsunaga, William L. St. Onge, George F. Senner, Jr., Charles H. Wilson, Walter H. Moeller, Donald J. Irwin, Tim Lee Carter, John Conyers, Jr., Ken W. Dyal, Stanley L. Greigg, Rodney M. Love, Richard D. McCarthy, Hervey G. Machen, Joseph Y. Resnick, John R. Schmidhauser, Joseph P. Vigorito, Weston E. Vivian, and Clair Callan.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be permitted to extend their remarks immediately following my remarks of today on the special order which I have previously obtained.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATION TO AMEND THE SOCIAL SECURITY LAWS

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Byrnes] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill amending the social security laws. This bill incorporates the amendments which had been virtually agreed upon by the House-Senate conferees on H.R. 11865, when the 88th Congress adjourned sine die.

In the 88th Congress, after considerable effort on the part of the Ways and Means Committee, the House passed a social security bill, H.R. 11865, which provided for an increase in cash benefits together with other provisions liberalizing coverage. In the Senate the so-called "medicare" proposal, which the Ways and Means Committee had passed over at the request of its sponsors in the House, was added to the bill. At the direction of the Johnson administration, a majority of the Senate conferees were successful in blocking the enactment of any social security legislation which did not include medicare.

I see no reason to hold up the additional benefits which will accrue to some 20 million recipients of social security from these amendments, pending the consideration of the various proposals for medical care for the aged. These recipients need the benefits now. For that reason I am introducing this bill and urge its speedy enactment.

Among the benefits provided by this bill are included the following:

First. A 7-percent increase in cash benefits, with a minimum increase of $5 for the primary insurance amount.

Second. A minimum benefit of $35 for many of those over age 72 who do not meet the work requirements of present law.

Third. Liberalization of the work test in order to avoid penalizing the aged who might seek to supplement their social security benefits with part-time jobs.

Fourth. Social security benefits for dependents who are attending school up to age 22, instead of age 18.

Fifth. Social security benefits for widows beginning at age 60, rather than at age 62.

Sixth. Liberalization of the gross income upon which farmers may elect to pay social security taxes.

Seventh. Recognition of the conscientious objection of certain long-established religious groups to the social security concept.

In addition, the bill includes certain amendments to the public assistance provisions of the social security laws. These amendments were also adopted by the Senate and had been agreed to by the conferees when Congress adjourned.

The Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee stand ready to resume consideration of any proposal providing medical care for the aged. I can assure this body that we will not adopt an obstructionist attitude to such proposals. In fact, in the 88th Congress further consideration of the King-Anderson bill by the committee was passed over, not as a result of any obstructionist tactics, but at the request of the proponents of that legislation.

On the other hand, I urge the proponents of medicare to abandon their obstructionist position with respect to other long overdue improvements to the social security laws. Let us enact those provisions with respect to which we are all in agreement without delay. This will not preclude consideration of medicare. It will give our retired much-needed additional benefits.

SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. Dwyer] may extend her remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, even as we face what must be a momentous future on this first day of the 89th Congress, our first responsibility is to remedy what many of us believe was the gravest deficiency of the 88th Congress—the failure to complete action on legislation to improve the Social Security Act.

Accordingly, I have today introduced a bill which is identical to the bill passed by the House last July 29. I would hope that the Ways and Means Committee, which has already considered and recommended this legislation, will report it favorably as soon as possible and thereby expedite the process of doing justice to the millions of Americans who are dependent, in whole or in part, on the income from social security.

This legislation, Mr. Speaker, should be a matter of the first priority for this Congress. The need for the modest 5-percent benefit increases—which would be the first since 1958—and the other important changes which the bill would make has been thoroughly established. By virtue of the wide bipartisan majority by which the bill was first approved and the endorsement of the liberalization of the social security program by both major political parties, we have made in effect a moral commitment to enact this legislation without further delay.

Additional justification for immediate passage of the legislation has just been provided by the report and recommendations of the Advisory Council on Social Security. This report establishes both that the social security program is soundly financed and that benefit increases should be provided. Indeed, the report makes a number of important recommendations for further benefit improvements, changes in the contribution rates, extension of coverage, and a possible new method of financing the proposed hospital insurance for the elderly program which deserve careful consideration by the Ways and Means Committee.

I would hope, however, that while the newer proposals are being studied, the committee and the Congress could proceed immediately to the business of enacting the bill we already have. The people who need and would benefit from this bill have lost 3 months of benefits to which they are entitled. Justice, it seems to me, requires that we delay no longer.

Four of the provisions in this social security bill, Mr. Speaker, are especially important. The 5 percent across-the-board increase in cash benefits will help to meet the increase in the cost of living since the last such adjustment was made in 1958. The liberalization of eligibility requirements will qualify for limited benefits approximately 600,000 persons age 72 or older whose covered employment under social security has been insufficient under present law. The continuation of benefits for dependent children from the present cutoff age of 18 to 22 for those who stay in school or college will provide significant encouragement for about 275,000 boys and girls to obtain better educations. Finally, the optional provision of benefits to widows at age 60 will introduce an element of flexibility which can help relieve much hardship.

Enactment of this bill will not reduce the need for consideration of further improvements in the social security system. But it will represent a major step forward in the continuing work of making social security more fair and humane and more responsive to the special needs of older people, widows, and dependent children.

I have also reintroduced, Mr. Speaker, a bill to revise the present retirement test for social security purposes, which would permit beneficiaries to earn up to $2,400 a year—or $3,600 in the case of widows with minor children—without losing social security benefits. This is a bill I have sponsored ever since 1957 and as each year passes the need for raising the present completely inadequate limit of $1,200 a year becomes more evident. I hope that with the soundness of the social security system having been demonstrated again we can move to correct this frequently painful inequity.

OTTINGER OBJECTION EXPLAINED

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, today I objected to the oath being taken by the gentleman from New York, RICHARD L. OTTINGER, who presented himself to the House as the duly elected Representative of the 25th District of New York. I did so notwithstanding the fact that Mr. OTTINGER's election had been certified by the Secretary of State of New York.

I was impelled to take this step because of facts which were disclosed after Mr. OTTINGER's election had been certified by the State of New York, facts which have engaged the concerned interest of the press both locally and nationally and which are of the highest interest to this House and to the Nation. Because of the parliamentary situation which developed, I was unable to offer a resolution or present my reasons for objecting which I set forth now.

My attention was first drawn to this matter on December 16, 1964, at which time the Republican Members of the House met in caucus in this Chamber. During this caucus, the Honorable Robert L. Barry, who has represented the 25th District of New York for 6 years, acquainted his colleagues with some of the startling facts about the financing of Mr. OTTINGER's campaign against him.

EXCESS CAMPAIGN EXPENSES THREATEN REPRESENTATIVE GOVERNMENT

I was deeply impressed by the apparent abuse of the election laws which appear to have been perpetrated against our former colleague and against the voters of the 25th District of New York. I was even more impressed by the grave implications of campaign spending excesses which, if they are not checked, threaten the foundations of representative government.

Mr. Speaker, this election is being contested in a suit brought by Mr. James R. Frankenberry, former Democratic chairman of Bronxville, N.Y., and now a vice president of the advertising agency of Cunningham & Walsh.

This matter was also presented to the House Special Committee To Investigate Campaign Expenditures in 1964 and the committee, which expired on January 3 and, I am informed, recommended in its report to the Clerk of the House that the House Administration Committee look into this case.

AT LEAST $187,000 SPENT

Information revealed in a Gannett News Service investigation of the files of the New York Election Bureau, in the secretary of state's office, disclosed that at least $187,000 was spent on the Ottinger campaign. Other press accounts have placed the figure higher than that. Of the total sum, these investigations showed that $167,000 was contributed by the Ottinger family with more than $80,000 being contributed by Mrs. William Ottinger, the candidate's mother, and more than $80,000 coming from Mrs. Patricia L. Heath, his sister.

These contributions appear to be violations of the Hatch Act, title 18, United States Code, which places a $5,000 limitation on the amount any one person may contribute either directly or indirectly to any candidate for Federal office.

Also in the same proceeding is a charge that upon information and belief Herbert L. Fischgrund and the gentleman from New York, RICHARD L. OTTINGER, did conspire to defeat the laws of New York State through manipulation of funds and that at least 34 committees which are alleged to be one and the same entity were not legally constituted committees but were rather fronts with the same officers and devoted in fact exclusively to the election of the gentleman from New York, Mr. OTTINGER.

PRESS EXPENSES CONCERN

Newspapers in Westchester County, New York City, and national news magazines have run articles ranging from utter surprise to indignation over the question of how such enormous sums could have been spent in a congressional election. For example, the White Plains Reporter-Dispatch in an editorial on December 4, 1964, said of this contest:

> The fundamental issue in this situation is that it makes a mockery of the democratic process. What layman of ordinary means may henceforth dare to profess a political ambition or hope to mount a winning campaign against an opponent who can operate without stint of expense or without regard in time and effort for the earning of a livelihood?

On December 24, the Herald Statesman of Yonkers said in an editorial:

> Certainly even the bare possibility that the personal wealth of a candidate and his family may be employed in ways to overwhelm a less affluent opponent must be disturbing to all who are concerned with the fundamental integrity of the democratic process in this country.
>
> It will, therefore, be deplorable, to say the very least, if the majority leadership of the House of Representatives fails to insist that the Frankenberry complaint be thoroughly investigated.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, we in the House would have to have a callous disregard not only for public welfare but as well for Federal laws which some in this Chamber today helped to frame were we to sit by and permit such flagrant violations of law as the facts in this case portend to go unchallenged.

OVERSPENDING HAS BARRED PAST CANDIDATES

There is precedent for not seating a winning candidate on the ground of excessive campaign expenditures. For instance, in the case of Gill against Catlin in the 62d Congress, where the contestee spent more money than the laws of the State of Missouri allowed, the contestee was not seated by the House. In that case, relatives of the contestee spent money on his behalf exceeding the amount allowed by State law. In the 70th Congress, William S. Vare, of Pennsylvania, was denied his seat principally on the basis of the excessive use of money in winning his campaign. From the Senate resolution which barred Mr. Vare, I quote:

> The expenditure of such a large sum of money * * * is harmful to the dignity and honor of the Senate and dangerous to the perpetuity of a free government.

I have been informed that the gentleman from New York [Mr. OTTINGER] has been subpenaed in connection with the contesting of the election procedures set forth in the Federal Corrupt Practices Act to present his complete campaign financial records in the Supreme Court of the State of New York in White Plains on January 19.

I include in the RECORD the following materials relating to this case:

First. An article from the January 16 issue of Newsweek magazine.

Second. An article appearing in the December 3, 1964, issue of the Yonkers Herald-Statesman.

Third. A copy of a letter from Mr. Frankenberry to Mr. OTTINGER dated December 19, 1964.

Fourth. A copy of a letter from Mr. Frankenberry to Chairman BURLESON of the House Committee on Administration and to Chairman DAVIS of the Special Committee To Investigate Campaign Expenditures in 1964.

Fifth. An editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of December 23, 1964.

Sixth. An editorial from the Herald-Statesman of December 24, 1964.

Seventh. A list of committees established for the gentleman from New York [Mr. OTTINGER] showing the contributors to them. The list was compiled from records on file with the secretary of state of New York.

Eighth. An article reporting an interview given by the gentleman from New York [Mr. OTTINGER] to Mr. Walter Pincus of the Washington Evening Star and published on December 23, 1964.

Ninth. An article from the New York Times of January 1.

Tenth. An article from the New York Herald Tribune of December 23.

Eleventh. An editorial from the White Plains Reporter Dispatch of December 24.

[From Newsweek magazine, Jan. 4, 1965]

CAMPAIGN HIGH COST OF WINNING

The whole rickety structure of political financing would not stand many such assaults. James R. Frankenberry, a New York advertising vice president and part-time politician, had looked at venerable Federal codes placing an outside limit of $5,000 on a House candidate's personal campaign outlays or a backer's contribution to any candidate or committee. Then Frankenberry, who had headed a campaign committee for defeated Republican Representative Robert Barry in suburban Westchester and Putnam counties, wondered how Barry's opponent could finance his saturation-advertising campaign within such limits.

When the opponent, 36-year-old ex-Peace Corps administrator Richard L. Ottinger, of Pleasantville, beat Barry, 117,272 to 94,589, to become the first Democratic congressman ever elected in the district, Frankenberry began to brood. Two weeks ago, he began digging into financial records in Albany, and last week he announced the pannings: Ottinger had set up at least 34 committees, to 22 of which his mother and sister were the only contributors. They gave $3,000 apiece—the maximum tax-free gift—to each of the committees, a very grand total of $132,000.

SHUDDER

Foul, cried Frankenberry, and disclosed that he was contesting Ottinger's seating in the 89th Congress. He asked the House to investigate, and won a subpena ordering Ottinger to appear in the State Supreme Court on charges of violating State as well as Federal laws on campaign financing.

Politicians shuddered at the prospect of actual enforcement of such statutes. This, said Frankenberry, was just what he had in mind. His action "was not on behalf of Bob Barry [and] I'm not at all concerned with Mr. Ottinger." It was the principle of the thing. The practice of setting up committees to skirt personal spending limits was "regrettably widespread"—the $5,000-per-committee gift limit left a vault-size loophole in ignoring the possibility of one person giving $5,000 apiece to an infinity of committees on a candidate's behalf.

In this case, he charged, Ottinger's committees were not even "legally constituted"; only 1 of the 34 was registered with the New York secretary of state as required by law. So, he charged, the mother's and sister's outlays amounted to contributions to Ottinger, totaling far more than the $5,000-per-candidate limit. The spending of these sums therefore amounted to personal expenses, far in excess of the $5,000 limit.

STRICTLY LEGAL

Ottinger himself admitted that his campaign cost close to $200,000 (Barry, who also waged an active advertising campaign, listed only $22,000), but contended that his financing, which he left up to his accountant and lawyers, "stayed strictly within the letter of the law."

"In this day and age," he observed, "campaigning is very expensive. A person who wants to run, particularly in a district held by the opposition, simply has to advertise. * * * He can finance it himself, or he can go through organizations to which he is then beholden. * * * It's damned unfortunate."

Many politicians would agree, with a resigned shrug. President Kennedy advocated but failed to get legislation that would assign free television time to candidates, and allow tax incentives for political contributions. Freshman Ottinger, who says he favors a broad-based financing of campaigns, declares he will support such measures in his coming term in Congress.

Meanwhile, of the many, many ways of obtaining and spending unobstrusively, an oldtime Tammany favorite seemed to be coming back. "The trend this year," said a cagey old Congressman, "was to cash contributions."

[From the Yonkers (N.Y.) Herald Statesman, Dec. 3, 1964]

Ottinger Spent $187,229 Plus—Barry Over $21,000

(By William Ringle)

Albany.—Some misfiled campaign committee reports turned up here today indicate that Representative-elect Richard J. Ottinger spent more than $187,229—$168,000 of it from his mother and sister—on his campaign.

Earlier campaign spending and fund-raising reports, in one of the most unusual filings with the secretary of state here in recent years, had indicated that his spending was about $155,000 with the candidate's mother and sister providing $142,000.

By contrast, Ottinger's Republican opponent, Robert Barry, apparently spent $21,000-$22,000 on the basis of reports in so far.

Today nine more reports were found from committees with high-sounding names (Examples: "Committee for Better Representation in Westchester and Putnam Counties" and "Better Government Committee for Westchester and Putnam Counties"; which had been misfiled.

Like the other reports, most of these "committees" were vehicles for Louise L. Ottinger, the candidate's mother, and Patricia L. Heath, his sister, to contribute $3,000 each in the campaign.

They indicated $24,000 more by this device than had been noted.

They also showed that Ottinger himself gave $3,000 to the Committee for Better Representation and $2,000 to the Better Government Committee.

On the spending side, they boosted to $22,000 the total paid the Doner-Harrison Advertising Co. of New York City. They also raised to $66,000 the total spent with the Health and Welfare Materials Center, 10 E. 44th Street, New York for "advertising, direct mail, and printed matter." The remainder was spent for salaries and taxes.

The only other large donor on the newly found reports, was Frits Markus, 6 Overlook Road, Scarsdale, who contributed $500. He is listed as the contact for the "Democratic Committee for Better Representation in Scarsdale."

All of the 31 committees list a Larchmont lawyer, Herbert B. Fischgruno, as assistant treasurer.

Spending on Barry's campaign was reported through two committees, Barry for Congress and Citizens for Bob Barry.

The former reported $23,491.85 received and $19,551.16 spent. The latter listed receipts and expenditures both at $1,655.

Barry's own statements apparently have not yet been filed. A law, usually winked at, limits spending by a congressional candidate or his committees to $8,000, although contributions are unlimited.

Biggest single amount for Barry was $2,000 from the National Republican Campaign Committee. Other major contributors:

Henry R. Benjamin and J. H. Pew, of Philadelphia, each $1,000; Charles T. Wilson, 120 Wall Street, New York City, $600; Lawrence O'Brien, of Charleston, S.C.; A. Riggs, Pondfield Road, Bronxville; and J. R. Frankenberry, Sr.; Republican Congressional Booster Club of Washington; Albert H. Gordon, 10 Gracie Square, New York City; Landon K. Thorne, Jr., New York City; and R. D. Wallace, $500 each; F. Dunn, 260 11th Avenue, New York, $400; J. A. Warren, $300; R. B. Crispbell, 10 The Byway, Bronxville, $250; and Henry S. Wingate, Howard T. Brinton, and Kirby Peake, 249 Pondfield Road, Bronxville, $200 each.

RAISED BY COMMITTEE

All those contributions were raised by the Barry for Congress Committee, with Theodore Kiendl, chairman, and Harry T. Rockwell, treasurer.

The spending by both committees was for the usual printing, postage, workers' expenses, meals, telephones, mileage, and supplies. Biggest single items were $2,400 spent with the Westchester Broadcasting Corp.; $2,000 with the Herald-Statesman for advertising and printing, and $2,025 with Reuben H. Donnelly for printing and mailing ads.

If a cost per vote could be set, those for Ottinger (117,272 would be more than $1 apiece, while Barry's (94,589) would be about 23 cents.

Bronxville, N.Y.,
December 19, 1964.

Richard L. Ottinger,
Pleasantville, N.Y.

Dear Sir: This will serve to notify you that I am contesting your being seated in the 89th Congress for each of these and other reasons:

1. You have violated both the spirit and the letter of the provisions of both Federal and New York State statutes by your spending more money in your campaign than the law permits.

2. You have used funds provided by you and your family shockingly in excess of these laws and in manners which the law prohibits.

The proof of these violations was uncovered in the reports received from Albany and Washington and the widespread disclosure of these reports by the Rockland-Westchester newspapers and the New York Times.

This protest is being made to you, as well as to the U.S. House of Representatives so that should you be seated temporarily, Congress may immediately proceed to make a full investigation and determination of your qualifications in accord with article I, section 5, of the Constitution of the United States.

Yours, etc.

James R. Frankenberry.

Bronxville, N.Y.,
December 23, 1964.

Re contesting the seating of R. L. Ottinger in the U.S. House of Representatives.

The Honorable Omar Burleson,
Chairman, House Administrative Committee, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Mr. Clifford Davis,
Chairman, Special Committee To Investigate Campaign Expenditures, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: Reference is made to my letter of December 19, 1964, to Richard L. Ottinger, mailed to him at his residence at 235 Bear Ridge Road, Pleasantville, N.Y., via certified mail December 19, 1964, receipt number 026326, General Post Office, New York, N.Y., and copies of said letter which have also been sent to you. This procedure to contest his election is in accord with section 201, title 2, United States Code, the Federal Corrupt Practices Act.

This is to advise you that I will proceed under sections 204, 205, 206, 207, 210, 214, 215, 217, 218, 219, and such other sections of the above named act as are appropriate and applicable to subpena Ottinger and all witnesses having knowledge of violations of Federal and New York State statutes by Ottinger and others. Further, subpenas will demand the production of all records of expenditures, checks, drafts, pledges, etc., insofar as gifts are concerned, as well as the production of such other exhibits as are necessary to determine the nature, manner, and purpose of all expenditures relating to the Ottinger campaign in accord with section 219 of the above named act.

Application for these subpenas is being made to a judge of the U.S. court who resides in the 25th Congressional District in accord with section 206 of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act.

In the meantime, while this contest is proceeding, I call upon the Congress to not seat Richard L. Ottinger.

Among the charges I am making against him are these:

1. Violation of the Hatch Act, title 18, United States Code, subsection (a) of section 608, upon information and belief that Patricia L. Heath and Mrs. William Ottinger, did contribute a sum of money in excess of

$5,000 (namely amounts in excess of $80,000 each) in violation of the above act which reads as follows:

"(a) Whoever, directly or indirectly, makes contributions in an aggregate amount in excess of $5,000 during any calendar year, or in connection with any campaign for nomination or election, to or on behalf of any candidate for an elective Federal office, including the offices of President of the United States and Presidential and Vice Presidential electors, or to or on behalf of any committee or other organization engaged in furthering, advancing, or advocating the nomination or election of any candidate for any such office or the success of any national political party, shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both."

2. Violation of New York State statutes limiting the amount for any candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives to $8,000, and upon information and belief that Herbert L. Fischgrund, RICHARD L. OTTINGER, and other persons did conspire to defeat these New York State laws through manipulation of funds and at least 34 committees which are alleged to be one and the same entity, and others, not being legally constituted committees were but "dummy fronts" to aid and abet the illegal manipulations complained of herein.

These are the charges being made at this time and the right is reserved to add to these charges, following the taking of testimony and examination of books and records and at the time of filing this testimony with Clerk of the House of Representatives, in accord with section 223 of United States Code, title 2, Federal Corrupt Practices Act.

Yours very truly,

JAMES R. FRANKENBERRY.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Herald Tribune, Dec. 23, 1964]

MR. OTTINGER'S COMMITTEES

When it comes to inventive ingenuity, the salesman translating a night on the town into business costs has nothing on the politician finagling his way around campaign expenditure laws.

Take the case of Congressman-elect RICHARD L. OTTINGER, the first Democrat ever to win in his stanchly Republican Westchester district. OTTINGER mounted an elaborate and expensive campaign to topple incumbent Republican Robert Barry. Now it appears that OTTINGER was supported by as many as 34 separate committees, for which the principal financial support came from the Ottinger family—the sole donors to 22 of those committees being OTTINGER's mother and sister, at $3,000 each per committee ($3,000 happens to be the most that can be contributed to any one entity without incurring a gift tax).

Federal law sets an outside limit of $5,000 on what a candidate for Congress can spend on his own campaign, exclusive of certain personal expenses. New York State law sets an outside limit of $8,000 on what can be spent on his behalf. The trouble is, first, that these limits are so absurdly low as to be totally unrealistic; and, second, that the laws have loopholes large enough to drive a Brink's truck through. The upshot is that candidates don't even try to conform to the spirit of the law; they simply twist their campaign organizations (and multiply their committees) to fit its flexible letter.

There may come a time, eventually, when the whole structure of campaign finances and campaign expense reporting will be put on a national basis, with realistic limits, proper incentives for small contributions and full disclosure. Then, perhaps, we'll have an enforced and enforcable law, which both permits the kind of expenditures needed and contains some safeguards against "buying" an election. Until then, we can expect more of what seems to have happened in Westchester, even if we may seldom see it practiced on so grand a scale.

[From the Yonkers (N.Y.) Herald Statesman, Dec. 24, 1964]

OTTINGER SPENDING NEEDS TESTING TO FIND IF LAW CONTAINS FLAW

Congressman-elect RICHARD L. OTTINGER, of Westchester's 25th District, has characterized as sour grapes a complaint by James R. Frankenberry, of Bronxville, that Mr. OTTINGER's estimated $200,000 in campaign expenditures, through a host of committees, violated Federal and State statutes.

But the situation shouldn't, and can't be dismissed that casually even though, as Mr. OTTINGER contends, he may have operated within the letter of applicable laws. The basic question is whether or not he violated the spirit or intent of any such laws. And that raises the further, and very pertinent question of whether or not those laws need drastic revision.

Nor is it relevant to the fundamental issue here that Mr. OTTINGER may have done only what other men of large personal means, or with vast family funds at their disposal, have done to win public office. The possibility of the use of the Ottinger technique by others serves only to emphasize the importance of establishing once and for all sound, sensible, and clearly defined public policy on such campaign spending.

The devising of such a policy will not be a simple matter, obviously. It should take into account not only the amounts and the sources of funds but the propriety of the uses to which they may be put.

Thus, rather than being a sour grapes gesture by a supporter of Congressman Robert R. Barry, who lost to Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Frankenberry's challenge of the winner's campaign finance operation may well prove an important public service.

Certainly even the bare possibility that the personal wealth of a candidate and his family may be employed in ways to overwhelm a less affluent opponent must be disturbing to all who are concerned with the fundamental integrity of the democratic process in this country.

It will, therefore, be deplorable, so say the very least, if the majority leadership of the House of Representatives fails to insist that the Frankenberry complaint be thoroughly investigated and constructively passed upon by whatever congressional committees or other Federal agencies may be charged with upholding the validity and integrity of the election process. Certainly it is to be expected that Mr. OTTINGER will cooperate fully and frankly with any such inquiry. Persistence in his sour grapes dismissal of the situation can only serve to impair his standing with many of those Westchester people who voted for him.

List of committees established for Richard L. Ottinger, showing contributors to them

New York Department of State File No.		
00700, 01503	Committee for Better Representation in Westchester, mother and sister	$6,000.00
01498	Putnam Westchester Effective Representation Committee, mother and sister	6,000.00
01468	Citizens for More Effective Movement, mother and sister	$6,000.00
01461	Northeast Yonkers Committee for Better Representation, mother and sister	6,000.00
00713, 01340	Southeast Yonkers Committee for Better Representation, mother and sister	6,000.00
00876, 01339	Southwest Yonkers Committee for Better Representation, mother and sister	6,000.00
01392	Democratic Committee for Effective Government, mother and sister	6,000.00
01393	Democratic Committee for Better Representation for Scarsdale, mother and sister	6,000.00
01389	Citizens for Better Government, mother and sister	6,000.00
01388	Committee for Improvement of Westchester Representation, mother and sister	6,000.00
01385	Effective Government in Westchester, mother and sister	6,000.00
01382	Hartsdale Committee for Better Government, mother and sister	6,000.00
013034, 01341	Scarsdale Committee for Better Government, mother and sister	6,000.00
00807	Ardsley Committee for Better Government, mother and sister	6,000.00
00716, 01422	Committee for Democratic Representation, mother and sister	6,000.00
01614	Citizens for A Democratic Congress, mother and sister	6,000.00
00772	Scarsdale Democratic Committee for Better Government, mother and sister	6,000.00
01615	Westchester Committee for Effective Government, mother and sister	6,000.00

List of committees established for Richard L. Ottinger, showing contributors to them—Continued

New York Department of State File No.		
01616	Committee for Better Government Through Better Representation, mother and sister	$6,000.00
01632	Citizens for Improving Congress, mother and sister	6,000.00
01622	Scarsdale Citizens for Better Representation, mother and sister	6,000.00
01423	Citizens for Effective Representation, mother and sister	6,000.00
01880	Putnam Westchester Better Government Committee, mother and sister	6,000.00
00442	County Committee for a Democratic Congress, mother	3,000.00
00773	Better Government Committee for Westchester and Putnam Counties, mother and sister	6,000.00
00239	R. L. Ottinger	2,000.00
00426	H. B. Fischgrund	200.00
00171, 00808	Scarsdale Residents for R. L. Ottinger Committee, mother	3,000.00
001338, 00423	Miscellaneous	900.00
01369, 00715	Westchester Committee for a Democratic Congress, sister	3,000.00
00399, 00693, 00152	Ottinger for Congress Committee, mother	3,700.00
00877, 01367, 00166, 00422	Committee for Election of Johnson and Ottinger, mother and sister	6,000.00
00806, 01621	Citizens for Ottinger, and Johnson, mother and sister	6,000.00
00170, 00694, 01825, 00429	Committee for Better Representation in Westchester and Putnam Counties, mother and sister	6,000.00
	Richard L. Ottinger	2,500.00
01422	Committee for Democratic Representatives, miscellaneous	544.00
01467	Democratic Committee for Better Government, miscellaneous	1.96
00168, 00470, 001593	Richard L. Ottinger	579.00

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Dec. 23, 1964]

FULL REPORT ON CAMPAIGN WAS HIS ERROR, OTTINGER SAYS

(By Walter Pincus)

A newly elected Member of Congress—whose seat is being contested because of allegations that his campaign funds were illegally raised—says his only error may have been filing complete reports.

Democratic Representative-elect RICHARD L. OTTINGER, whose campaign fund report filings with the New York State Secretary disclosed $200,000 was spent on his behalf, said yesterday, "The political pros said we were wrong to be honest (in the filings) and that's why we are taking a beating now."

Most House and Senate candidates, using loopholes in Federal and State campaign fund reporting laws, file statements that fail to disclose complete receipts and expenditures.

PROBE ASKED

A New York advertising executive, James L. Frankenberry, who was chairman of a citizens' group that supported OTTINGER's opponent, Republican incumbent Robert Barry, has sent a letter to two House committees asking an investigation of OTTINGER's campaign finances.

Frankenberry said yesterday in an interview that at least 22 different committees were set up in the congressional district each to receive $6,000 in contributions from OTTINGER's mother and sister. The 22 committees, Frankenberry alleged, were "loopholes" through which OTTINGER funneled family money into his campaign in excess of amounts permitted by Federal law.

The Federal Corrupt Practices Act limits contributions by individuals to political committees to $5,000, but permits one person to give that amount to any number of committees, all of whom may support the same candidate.

OTTINGER said yesterday the large number of committees set up to support him were partially to encourage small contributions and partially to serve as a convenience to his own family contributors. He added that as far as he knew, each committee complied with the law.

In describing his current situation, OTTINGER gave a vivid description of the rising costs of political campaigns and the problems created by the need to raise funds. He made no bones about the fact that his family's wealth enabled him to make the successful race for the Congress.

QUIT HIS JOB

Eight months ago, OTTINGER left a job as a regional director of the Peace Corps to devote his full time to running against Barry.

At that time he took a poll (which cost $2,500) in the heavily Republican district that includes Westchester County and found that he was unknown while Barry was supported by 70 percent who knew him.

OTTINGER laid out a strenuous campaign plan budgeted at $100,000.

Five months later, a second poll, costing $2,200, showed he had pulled even. He decided to step up the campaign effort and particularly stress the issue that Barry did not reside in his own district—a fact that had already been plugged heavily but, according to the poll, had registered with only 30 percent of the voters.

Pushing that issue on local radio stations cost additional money.

With his chances on the upgrade, OTTINGER sought additional campaign funds outside his immediate family. He raised a creditable $20,000—but nowhere near the amount he needed, so his mother and sister continued to make contributions.

OTTINGER found there were few people who wanted to give large contributions to a congressional candidate running against an incumbent. One friend gave $3,000, another $1,000, but almost all the remaining individual money came in donations less than $100.

The National Committee for an Effective Congress, which provides financial aid to liberal House and Senate candidates it endorses, said its money was going to the Democratic Study Group. That organization gave OTTINGER $500.

The regular Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee, run by Representative MICHAEL KIRWAN, also gave him $500. The Democratic National Committee contributed $2,500.

One large contribution—said to be in the $10,000 range—never came through. As OTTINGER described it, twice he was told that "a five-figure campaign contribution" was available based on how he said he would vote on the ticklish question of oil depletion. To both inquiries—once from a relative, once from a friend—OTTINGER replied he would vote against the oil industry position. In neither instance did he learn the identity of the party that was willing to make the "five figure" contribution.

FAMILY'S TOTAL

By the campaign's conclusion, OTTINGER's family had contributed $147,000 of the total amount spent on his election.

Both OTTINGER and Frankenberry, the man contesting his seat, agree on one point—campaign costs have risen too high.

OTTINGER said yesterday he would like to see the reporting laws tightened so as to require more complete disclosure on the part of all candidates.

Frankenberry, on the other hand, plans to use his effort at contesting OTTINGER's seat as the means for bringing the problem of campaign funds to the public's attention.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times]

COURT PLEA ASKS TO BAR OTTINGER—NEW REPRESENTATIVE ACCUSED OF OVERSPENDING IN RACE

WHITE PLAINS, December 31.—A court proceeding has been started here to invalidate the election of RICHARD L. OTTINGER, a Democrat and liberal, as the new Representative in the 25th Congressional District of Westchester and Putnam Counties. He is accused of excessive spending for his campaign.

James R. Frankenberry, a campaign aid of Representative Robert R. Barry, the Republican whom Mr. OTTINGER defeated in the November 3 election, said he had served a subpena on Mrs. Ottinger last night at her home in Pleasantville in the absence of Mr. OTTINGER. He said this was sufficient to be binding on the husband.

Friends of Mr. and Mrs. Ottinger said both had left the area last Tuesday and would not return until next Tuesday. Mr. OTTINGER had said they were going on a skiing holiday in Vermont and later to Washington, where he would take office as a Representative.

Only a maid was at the Ottinger home today. Telephone answering services responded to calls to Mr. OTTINGER's home and to his political office in Yonkers.

Mr. Frankenberg, a New York advertising executive contends that Mr. OTTINGER'S spending of $200,000 through 34 different committees violated the Federal Corrupt Practices Act and State election law.

He contends that the legal maximum was $8,000 to be spent by the candidate personally and $8,000 by a committee working for the candidate, making a total of $16,000. No one person can contribute more than $5,000, according to Mr. Frankenberry.

Most of the $200,000 for the campaign was given by Mr. OTTINGER's mother, Mrs. Louise L. Ottinger of 150 Central Park South, New York, and his sister, Mrs. Patricia L. Heath of Milton, Mass. Mr. OTTINGER said the different committees worked the election of many candidates in addition to himself.

On the application of Mr. Frankenberry, County Judge John H. Galloway Jr. issued the subpena. It directed Mr. OTTINGER to appear in State supreme court here on January 19 with all financial records of the committees that received contributions and spent money in his campaign.

Mr. Frankenberry said Mr. OTTINGER would be asked to make a sworn statement about the funds. This, he said would be of use to the Congressional committees he has asked to investigate the election and to disqualify Mr. OTTINGER.

OTTINGER'S SISTER: "LUMP SUM" GIFT

Representative-elect RICHARD L. OTTINGER's sister said last night that she had not contributed individually to any of the 27 committees that financed his successful Democratic campaign for Congress in Westchester County.

"I was not actively involved in my brother's campaign," said Mrs. Patricia L. Heath, "and I did offer some money to help. I contributed the money to my brother, not to any specific organization. The lump sum was given to him to do with as he saw fit."

The candidate's sister said she was not at all sure exactly how much money she had donated or why all the gifts were listed in the amount of $3,000 but she felt she could explain it.

"As I understand it," she said, "gifts are not permitted by family members in excess of $3,000. That's the sort of thing you had better ask my brother about."

Mrs. Heath, reached in Boston by telephone, said: "We did try to keep to the election law, I think that is understood." Then a few moments later, she added: "You know, campaigns cost quite a bit."

Mrs. William Ottinger, the candidate's mother, who, the records show, contributed to 27 different campaign committees, could not be reached for comment.

Yesterday a study of campaign financial records in Albany confirmed that the mother and sister of the Democratic Representative-elect were the sole or major contributors to Mr. OTTINGER's campaign.

On Monday, James R. Frankenberry charged that 34 committees were set up to finance Mr. OTTINGER's campaign, and that Mrs. Ottinger and Mrs. Heath were exclusive contributors to 22 of the groups.

A Herald Tribune examination—not yet completed—of the records showed 27 committees listed in the election campaign finances files at the department of state in Albany.

Mr. Frankenberry, who had campaigned for Republican Representative Robert L. Barry, defeated by Mr. OTTINGER in the Westchester-Putnam 25th District, has asked the House to bar the new Representative, charging violations of State and Federal election laws.

In Washington, a spokesman for the House Administrative Committee said Mr. Frankenberry's complaint had not been received. His letter was dated last Saturday, to fall within a statute of limitation on election complaints.

The House spokesman said the complaint would be investigated to see if it had merit, and a decision made on whether to pursue the matter or drop it.

There is no law to prevent a candidate from having as many separate campaign committees as he can manage. New York State law, however, limits a candidate's personal campaign expenses to $8,000, and places the same limit on all committees taking part "solely in his election." Mr. OTTINGER said Monday that provision would not apply to his case, since the committees were for all Democratic candidates, and were set up to advance the cause of better government.

In almost every case the records showed Mrs. Ottinger and Mrs. Heath contributed $3,000 each to the committees they financed.

Under Federal law, the donor of any gift over $3,000 must pay a gift tax. There is no limit on the number of $3,000 gifts that may be made in a single year without paying a gift tax, but each gift—including political contributions—must be to a separate entity. Organizations as well as individuals may receive such tax-free gifts.

Persons with large estates often distribute gifts during their lifetime to avoid heavy estate taxes after they die. The law encourages this by establishing the $3,000 exemption.

In the case of the contributions by Mrs. Ottinger and Mrs. Heath, if all the money they gave had been to a single campaign committee everything in the gift over $3,000 would have been subject to the tax.

Experts said that if the Ottingers had been trying to avail themselves of the gift-tax exemption, they would have to establish that each committee was a separate entity. If the Internal Revenue Service decides all the committees were really for a single purpose, it will order payment of the gift tax.

The Herald Tribune asked Herbert B. Fischgrund, listed as treasurer or assistant treasurer of most of the committees, if the $3,000 figure did have that significance.

He would reply only as follows:

"No comment. We will let the reports of the department of state speak for themselves."

Mr. Fischgrund is a partner in the accounting firm of Fields, Fischgrund & Aerenson, 420 Lexington Ave. He said his firm has represented the Ottinger family for some time.

[From the White Plains (N.Y.) Reporter Dispatch, Dec. 24, 1964]

THE OTTINGER CASE AS A TEST

Congressman-elect RICHARD L. OTTINGER, of Westchester's 25th District, has characterized as "sour grapes" a complaint by James R. Frankenberry, of Bronxville, that Mr. OTTINGER's estimated $200,000 in campaign expenditures, through a host of committees, violated Federal and State statutes.

But the situation shouldn't, and can't, be dismissed that casually even though, as Mr. OTTINGER contends, he may have operated within the letter of applicable laws. The basic question is whether or not he violated the spirit or intent of any such laws. And that raises the further, and very pertinent, question of whether or not those laws need drastic revision.

Nor is it relevant to the fundamental issue here that Mr. OTTINGER may only have done what other men of large personal means, or with vast family funds at their disposal, have done to win public office. The possibility of the use of the Ottinger technique by others serves only to emphasize the importance of establishing, once and for all, sound, sensible, and clearly defined public policy on such campaign spending.

The devising of such a policy will not be a simple matter, obviously. It should take into account not only the amounts and the sources of funds but the propriety of the uses to which they may be put.

Thus, rather than being a "sour grapes" gesture by a supporter of Congressman Robert R. Barry, who lost to Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. Frankenberry's challenge of the winner's campaign finance operation may well prove an important public service.

Certainly even the bare possibility that the personal wealth of a candidate and his family may be employed in ways to overwhelm a less affluent opponent must be disturbing to all who are concerned with the fundamental integrity of the democratic process in this country.

It will, therefore, be deplorable, to say the very least, if the majority leadership of the House of Representatives fails to insist that the Frankenberry complaint be thoroughly investigated and constructively passed upon by whatever congressional committees or other Federal agencies may be charged with upholding the validity and integrity of the election process. Certainly it is to be expected that Mr. OTTINGER will cooperate fully and frankly with any such inquiry. Persistence in his "sour grapes" dismissal of the situation can only serve to impair his standing with many of those Westchester people who voted for him.

LEGISLATION TO MAKE IT A FEDERAL CRIME TO ATTACK OR ASSASSINATE THE PRESIDENT, THE VICE PRESIDENT, OR ANY OTHER OFFICER NEXT IN LINE OF SUCCESSION TO THE PRESIDENT, THE PRESIDENT-ELECT, AND THE VICE-PRESIDENT-ELECT

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCHWEIKER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Speaker, a number of colleagues on both sides of the aisle join me today in introducing legislation making it a Federal crime to attack or assassinate the President, the Vice President, or other officer next in line of succession to the President, the President-elect, and the Vice-President-elect. I urge the support of the House for passage of this proposal at the earliest possible moment.

Following the tragic death of President Kennedy I was astounded to learn that assassination of the President is not a Federal crime although attacks upon a number of lesser Federal officials are covered by the United States Code. Immediately I introduced H.R. 9232 to correct this anomalous situation and several colleagues joined me in that effort during the 88th Congress.

Last fall, the Warren Commission, in its report, recommended to the Congress that it enact such legislation. The bill, which I have introduced today, follows exactly the recommendations of the Commission.

It is inconceivable to me that a crime of the magnitude of Presidential assassination, affecting as it does the security and welfare of the Nation, is not covered by Federal statutes. In 1902 similar legislation passed both Houses but failed of enactment when the other body refused to accept the conference report. During debate on that measure its sponsor, Senator George F. Hoar, pointed out that "what this bill means to punish is the crime of interruption of the Government of the United States and the destruction of its security by striking down the life of the person who is actually in the exercise of the executive power, or of such persons as have been constitutionally and lawfully provided to succeed thereto in case of a vacancy. It is important for this country that the interruption shall not take place for an hour." The gentleman's remarks are even more appropriate in 1965.

Enactment of this legislation would mean that Federal law-enforcement officials would investigate these crimes against our highest officials. At present, Federal agencies such as the FBI participate, in the words of the Warren Commission report, "only upon the sufferance of the local authorities." In addition, the Commission has pointed out that this legislation "will insure that any suspects who are arrested will be Federal prisoners, subject to Federal protection from vigilante justice and other threats."

It has been more than 13 months since I first urged the House to act upon such legislation. I renew my plea on this opening day of the 89th Congress hoping that the measures introduced today by my colleagues and me can be carefully but speedily considered.

TAX ON TELEPHONE SERVICE

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Collier] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial which appeared in a recent issue of the Chicago Sun-Times:

Tax on Telephone Service

> The Johnson administration intends to ask Congress to eliminate the excise taxes on retail sales of toilet articles, cosmetics, jewelry, furs, and leather goods. No change is contemplated in the taxes on tobacco, alcoholic beverages, gasoline, autos, and telephone bills.
>
> We cannot quarrel with the decision to keep taxes on alcoholic beverages and tobacco since, to some extent, these have a sumptuary purpose. Taxes on gasoline and autos help build Federal highways used by motorists. But there appears to be no justification for continuing the wartime tax on telephone service. If a tax on a luxury such as jewelry is to be lifted why should not a tax on a necessity such as telephone service be abolished?
>
> Hale Nelson, vice president of the Illinois Bell Telephone Co., points out that the 10-percent temporary wartime tax on telephone service has now been in effect for more than 20 years and costs the average telephone user about $22 a year.
>
> Originally the tax was imposed, along with taxes on transportation and electric power, as a wartime measure primarily to discourage use. All such taxes, except the one on telephone service and telegrams, have been repealed.
>
> The telephone tax is a tax on customers, not on the telephone companies. It is a tax on the low-income worker as well as on the firms which pass it along as a cost of doing business. The telephone industry says that repeal of the tax would mean a 10-percent reduction in phone bills and this in turn would stimulate telephone usage and bring about as much as $500 million worth of additional telephone construction. New jobs would be created. Additional tax revenues would offset in part the revenues lost from repeal.
>
> Treasury Secretary Dillon, in discussing his plan to ask elimination of taxes on jewelry, furs, et cetera, said that the administration wants to revise the excise tax structure not only as a stimulus to the economy but because many of the taxes involved have outlived their usefulness, having been enacted to discourage consumer consumption rather than to produce revenue. Telephone service certainly fits in this category but the Treasury Department probably is reluctant to give it up because it is so easy to collect.

WEST VIRGINIA LOSES OUTSTANDING CITIZEN

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Collier] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, last week saw the passing of a very prominent and dedicated public official, the Honorable Everett F. Moore, of Moundsville, W. Va. As former majority leader of the West Virginia House of Delegates, the late Mr. Moore served as chairman of the judiciary committee of the house and held a position of leadership for 20 years in serving the State of West Virginia. Among the members of his family mourning his death is our colleague, Arch A. Moore, Jr., Representative of the First District of West Virginia. I know I speak for many Members of the House of Representatives in extending condolences to his family. Mr. Speaker, I take the liberty of including in this extension notice of his obituary which appeared in the Wheeling Intelligencer on Monday, January 25.

Everett F. Moore Dies in Glen Dale

> Everett F. Moore, prominent Moundsville attorney and former majority leader of the West Virginia House of Delegates, died at 2:30 p.m. yesterday in the Reynolds Memorial Hospital.
>
> Born April 29, 1885, at Beelers Station in Marshall County, he was graduated from Moundsville High School in 1903 and from the West Virginia University Law School in 1905.
>
> The deceased entered the practice of law in Wheeling and opened his Moundsville law office in 1910.
>
> During his legislative career he served as majority leader, chairman of the house judiciary committee, and as minority leader during 20 years of service in the house of delegates.
>
> He often had served as special judge in the circuit court of Marshall County and had been a member of the bar of the Supreme Court of the United States since 1912.
>
> Surviving are two brothers, Arch A. Moore, Sr., of Moundsville, and Harry W. Moore, of Sylacauga, Ala.; two sisters, Mrs. Rose Derrow and Mrs. Harry Bryson, both of Moundsville; and a number of nieces and nephews, including Congressman Arch A. Moore, Jr., of Glen Dale.

LEGISLATION DESIGNED TO CREATE A NEW CABINET-LEVEL DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. Fogarty] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced legislation to create within our executive branch of the Federal Government a new Cabinet-level Department of Education. In my judgment, this proposal belongs at the top of the agenda in our consideration of national affairs at the outset of this new Congress.

Education today is our biggest national business, our principal domestic activity. We now recognize its importance at all levels of our government—except, indeed, at the Federal level. Expenditures for education are the biggest item in the budgets of our States and localities, representing 37 percent of all disbursements. These funds for education now total $25 billion and are decidedly on the increase.

In total funds education now ranks second to national defense as our largest public expenditure and accounts for 16 percent of the budget of our Federal, State, and local governments. Public and private expenditures for education now total $33.7 billion and represent 5.8 percent of our gross national product. Education engages the time of 3 out of 10 of all our citizens as their principal activity.

These statistics, impressive as they may be, are merely reference points to the importance of education in our national progress and survival. The foundation of our scientific and technical growth, the means of transmitting and improving our culture, education today is the mainspring of our economic and social development. It is basic to all public functions including our national defense and security. This we have known in the past, perhaps dimly. Today we are seeing education with far more clarity as a national means of meeting the thrust of communism, of adjusting to the dislocations of automation, of reacting to the persisting causes of poverty in a day of growing abundance.

A half century ago, the philosopher, Alfred North Whitehead, said:

> When one considers the education of a nation's young, the broken lives, the defeated hopes, the national failures which result from the frivolous inertia with which it is treated, it is difficult to restrain within oneself a savage rage. In the conditions of modern life the rule is absolute, the race which does not value trained intelligence is doomed. Not all your heroism, not all your social charm, not all your wit, not all your victories on land or at sea, can move back the finger of fate. Today we maintain ourselves. Tomorrow science will have moved forward yet one more step, and there will be no appeal from the judgment which will then be pronounced on the uneducated.

Now within more recent years the Federal Government has made notable strides in supporting this Nation's education. The 88th Congress set a magnificent record in its enactment of laws on education's behalf. Its accomplishments include aid to construct higher education facilities, to broaden and modernize vocational and technical education, to educate the unemployed and the technologically displaced, to build public libraries, to train teachers of the handicapped, to expand the multipurpose National Defense Education Act, as well as legislation for economic opportunity and for civil rights.

This record moved President Johnson to salute the 88th as our "Education Congress." But our work is far from done. In the 89th Congress we must continue these advances to meet fully the critical needs of education for all our citizens.

Now, perhaps, we are freed from the crippling myth that the Federal Government must not involve itself in education. Now, let us hope this folly is behind us and we can move sensibly forward as a nation to create an educational structure adequate to the job ahead. But we in Congress can only enact measures. We cannot carry them forward to fulfillment.

Today we devote almost $5 billion a year of our Federal budget to education including service, training, and research. A major share of this, approximately one-third, is expended by the Office of Education either directly or by transfer of funds from other agencies. Needless to add, a major share of the education budget still lies outside the Office of Education.

In the present structure of this Office, we are avoiding the direct identification of major educational aids as part of an essential Federal program. As a result of our shortsightedness, we have seen educational activities proliferate through the Federal structure under a variety of agencies and departments.

The Committee on Education and Labor in 1963 reported that some 42 agencies of the Federal Government were presently continuing programs within the definition of "education." Indeed education functions have become so diffuse at the Federal level that it takes a major effort such as that represented by the committee report of June 1963 simply to catalog the total effort.

Education has now outdistanced the Federal structure that was designed through the Federal Security Agency a quarter century ago to contain it, along with other semirelated functions. The plain fact of the matter is that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is today inadequate to the task of providing executive leadership to the vital function of education, while seeking to coordinate this people-to-people function along with similar functions of government.

It makes no sense to continue to talk of coordinating the function of education with those of health and welfare, when many major education components today lie outside the coordinating mechanism of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. It would be much more realistic and useful to create a new structure which recognizes the special role of education as a social function that already covers a broad spectrum of Federal interests. Thus, a Department of Education could ultimately take in a number of existing programs which have been established apart from the structure of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare because the present Department could not contain them. This has resulted in inefficiency and impaired effectiveness in the whole educational structure. Once the new Department of Education is created I would urge the President to employ his reorganization powers to locate within it other appropriate activities.

Today the responsibilities given by the Congress and the President to the Office of Education have created pressure for a much different agency in scope and function than the small and relatively unimportant statistical Office that was incorporated into the Federal Security Agency in 1939 and then brought under a similar umbrella under the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare over a decade ago. Its current budget totals $1½ billion. It expends another one-quarter billion dollars transferred from other Federal agencies of the Government. In 1966 its regular budget will approximate $2 billion, and its legislative proposals will probably be at least as large. Thus, despite the fact that the Office now accounts for less than half of the education budget of the Federal Government, it already has a budget that exceeds that of several Cabinet departments.

When we are discussing education programs which are reaching into the $8 to $10 billion range in the Federal budget, we are derelict in our duty if we fail to recognize the need to consolidate as much of this program as possible within a strong Cabinet department.

There is no longer any excuse for hiding our heads in the sands of indifference and inertia. Education is a major function of this Government and we shall serve our country well only if we properly recognize education in our Federal structure as we have recognized its function in expenditures through our Federal laws and programs enacted by the Congress.

In my personal experience with the programs of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare through my chairmanship of the Appropriations Committee as it concerns the Department, I have had a special opportunity to see how education functions over the years have been restrained and distorted by an artificial structure that lacks relevancy to the function of education today. The Office of Education is now in a department that prosecutes violators of pure food and drug laws and processes claims for social insurance while another agency of Government, namely, the National Science Foundation, is mounting a major educational program of curriculum research in the schools in science and mathematics, an undertaking which closely parallels the Office's own program for English and the social studies.

The Office of Education, moreover, shares budget ceilings with the Public Health Service and its vast array of hospital and medical services within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, while the Housing and Home Finance Agency conducts a construction program for college dormitories which closely parallels the Office's own construction program for academic facilities in the same colleges.

It is time to call a halt to these wasteful organizational conflicts and absurdities and to establish a department structure that will permit recognition of education functions for what they are. We have passed the stage where the Federal responsibility for education should either alarm or dismay the sensible objectives of the Congress or the Federal Government.

Today we have moved only part way to coordinate the various Federal education programs. To meet this growing complexity, the President late last year issued an Executive order to begin to bring about some consistency through an interagency committee chaired by the U.S. Commissioner of Education.

But this remains a partial step. A Department of Education would enable us to go the rest of the way toward bringing education programs together under an effective and unified executive administration, to bring into harmony the diffuse programs of such agencies, for example, as the National Science Foundation and the Smithsonian Institution.

My bill, as my colleagues will recognize, will retain all the protections that now exist against unwanted Federal control in education. By continuing all of the restrictions now legally in effect against Federal supervision of educational programs receiving Federal assistance, by continuing education's control in the States and localities, we can fulfill a long-needed opportunity to make our efforts count as they should.

My bill would also establish a National Advisory Committee on Education to advise the Secretary, the President, and the Congress on Federal policies and programs. This Advisory Committee would be broadly representative of the public and would include appropriate representatives of educational agencies and the academic community. Thus, the Congress, the executive branch, and the people at large will have a more effective and direct voice in the framing of national educational policies than they have today.

President Johnson has paid high acclaim to the legislative records of the 88th Congress. The mandate of his magnificent election last fall continues to place education at the forefront in the achievement of a great society. The President will rightly be known through this program as the "Education President" and his administration through the long-delayed and timely creation of a Department of Education as the "Education Administration." Surely this Nation can no longer afford the reckless indulgence of advancing education in law and demeaning it in action. It is now time for us to act to create a Department of Education for the long term advance of our society.

I urge all Members of this body to support my bill. I urge the Committee on Government Operations to initiate hearings at an early date. I think this bill should be enacted at this session of the Congress.

THE APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACT

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Appalachian Regional Development Act proposed by President Johnson.

This bill represents one of the key objectives of President Johnson's legislative program. The bill calls for the investment of Federal funds in those public facilities which Appalachia must have if it is to restore its economic vitality. With minor changes, the bill is in the same form as that which passed the Senate last year and was awaiting action by the full House itself.

I am confident that both the House and the Senate will give this measure early consideration and approval.

Following are the highlights of the bill which I think will be of interest to the Members:

First. The construction of a development highway system to provide more adequate access to the region. The bill calls for a system of 3,350 miles of development highways of which 1,000 miles are to be local access roads.

Second. A demonstration health program which will provide funds for the construction and operation of health facilities that will contribute to the economic development of the region.

Third. Land improvement and erosion control measures will be carried out under the program enabling the region to realize greater returns from the land and water which are among its principal assets.

Fourth. Timber development organizations created by local landowners will receive lands and technical assistance in order that better use may be made of the hardwood and other timber which grows over great parts of Appalachia.

Fifth. Areas harmed by past mine operations will be reclaimed, including those now suffering from serious underground mine fires and land subsidence problems. In addition a comprehensive study of strip mining will be undertaken in order to develop the guidelines for a program in this field.

Sixth. The Secretary of the Army will direct a comprehensive water resource study which will provide plans for a more complete and coordinated development of Appalachia's rivers and streams.

Seventh. Additional sums are provided to supplement the Vocational Education Act of 1963 for vocational school construction and the sewage treatment plant construction program of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act.

Eighth. A supplemental fund of $90 million is provided to enable the States and communities of Appalachia to take maximum advantage of Federal grant-in-aid programs, which they have not been able to participate in because of their difficult financial position.

Ninth. To coordinate and plan for the execution of the Appalachian development program, the bill provides for the creation of a Federal-State Commission in which both partners have an equal voice. Each State will propose the projects it desires to the Commission and no projects will be carried out in a given State without its consent.

THE HONORABLE JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I requested this time in order to pay brief tribute to my dear friend and former colleague from New Jersey, the Honorable James C. Auchincloss. Early in the 2d session of the 88th Congress, he announced that he would not be seeking reelection from the Third Congressional District of New Jersey.

I believe I speak not only my own sentiments, but also the deep feelings of all those who knew Jim Auchincloss, when I compliment him on his record. He was a most industrious, diligent and dedicated public servant through the rigors of 11 sessions of the Congress—a total of 22 years. Indeed, it is difficult to summarize his usefulness in the confines of one spoken tribute. He gave to his country valuable service as ranking Republican on the Public Works Committee and the District of Columbia Committee of the House of Representatives, also, the House Office Building Commission.

It was on the Public Works Committee that I came to know the value of Jim Auchincloss. At all times he kept his eye on those things which were for the best interests of all the people. A deep understanding of public works problems enriched his usefulness.

He always assumed a modest manner concerning his outstanding record in the Congress. He never boasted. He was always kind. He was always considerate. He always wanted to do what was best. Those on both sides of the aisle loved him and had a deep respect for his capabilities.

Efficiency is not hurry and bustle; it is not noise and excitement. It is organized planned action, with each step marked out in advance. Jim Auchincloss employed a calm, quiet and efficient manner. He always held on to those admirable characteristics. He always proceeded toward a definite goal.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to state to this body my deep personal respect for Jim Auchincloss' ability. Through the years I found his friendship to be an inspiration. His actions were always exemplary.

He always held great faith in our kind of government—he had great faith in his own political party—he had great faith in the Congress.

As Jim retires from the Congress of the United States, I wish him many years of continued success and effective service. He will be greatly missed.

A UNIQUE AND EFFICIENT OFFICE

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, one of the good things flowing from the adjournment of the last Congress was the opportunity that it afforded the Members to return to their districts and familiarize themselves with the needs and activities. No community remains at a standstill when the Congress is in session. It is a ceaseless, endless, constantly flowing ocean of human activity. Realizing this ever since I served as a member of the city council of the city of San Antonio, then in the State Senate of Texas, I have made it a point to visit every single installation having to do with those entities. As a Member of this great House of Representatives I have endeavored to visit every single Federal installation in my district, the 20th of Texas. I have almost accomplished this. One of the most efficient and remarkable offices, not only in the 20th Congressional District, but in all of the United States is the district office of the Social Security Administration, located in my home city of San Antonio, Tex.

This office is a prototype, or ideal, of what every office of this nature should be. The district director, John Palmer, is to be given full credit for having shaped this office to perform a difficult task in a complex area with brilliance and tremendous capacity.

Better than 40 percent of the interviews are conducted in Spanish because of the peculiar heritage and historical evolution of this section of our country. Dr. Palmer, an unusual man, has on his own initiative equipped himself by learning Spanish and even taking courses in various colleges and universities of Mexico. He has been evenhanded in his administration of the office; he has set the pace for fair employment opportunities to all qualified citizens in the staffing of his corps of workers.

In short, Mr. Speaker, it has been an inspiration to me to know that my district possesses such efficient and conscientious public servants working in the administration of the complex laws the Congress, in its wisdom, has enacted for the welfare and progress of us all.

THE DISASTROUS FLOOD SITUATION IN NORTHERN CALIFORNIA

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call to the attention of my colleagues here in the House of Representatives the disastrous flood situation which northern California has been experiencing since a day or two before Christmas. During the past 10 days we have suffered a tragic loss of life and property and although the floodwaters have, for the most part, subsided, we still do not know the extent of the damage. Most of the areas affected now are covered by a heavy layer of snow, 4 and 5 feet deep, with the morning weather reports forecasting even more snow.

The floods, the worst since 1955, were caused by warm rains following heavy snows. In addition to the heavy rains, the high temperatures melted the snow in the high mountains and sent torrents of water and debris raging down the mountain watersheds into the valleys below.

In portions of the Second Congressional District which I represent, hundreds of people were isolated, cut off from food and shelter by the raging rivers. It was a week or 10 days before many of them had any contact with civilization. The Red Cross and the Department of the Army, which is coordinating the relief efforts for the military, estimated it may be weeks—yes, weeks—before all of California's mercy and rescue missions can be completed, such is the destruction of the communications, roads, and bridges in the isolated areas which have suffered so greatly in the disaster.

The situation is serious, and I understand that in the four States affected, California, Washington, Oregon, and Idaho, the damage could easily top $1 billion, but I would like to ponder for a minute to consider what it could have been. In the Sacramento Valley of California, damage was a fraction of what it might have been. This is true even though the conditions were ripe for a repetition of floods which have raised havoc in the region on previous occasions.

Why did we escape the damage? Why are people enjoying the New Year who otherwise might have drowned before the old year was out? The primary answer to both of these questions is the multiple-purpose water resource development which has taken place on the Sacramento River and its tributaries, in recent years. Much of this has been due to the farsighted wisdom of the Congress of the United States. On behalf of the people of this region I would like to express the deepest appreciation for the support which the Congress has given to protecting the lives and property of these areas. Your confidence in these projects and your investment in them has reaped untold benefits. Oroville Dam, for instance, paid for itself in a short few days even though it is only partially completed. The Federal Government, I am proud to say, has made provisions for flood control operations within the reservoir.

Col. Robert Mathe, chief of the Sacramento district office of the Corps of Engineers which did such a magnificent job in directing the flood control operations in the Sacramento and San Joaquin Valleys basins these past few days, estimates that in the Sacramento River watershed alone, at least $250 million in damage had been prevented through flood control project levees, Folsom and Shasta Dams.

But some critical deficiencies were pointed up during the floods. On the American River, on the outskirts of the State's capital of Sacramento, Folsom Reservoir again saved that city from a major flood, but it was a close call. Floodwaters poured into the reservoir at such a rapid rate that if the storm had not subsided when it did, the reservoir would have filled and the waters poured over the top of the dam to flood Sacramento under several feet of water.

This points up the need for final flood control of the American River. It is my sincere hope that within this Congress, and within this year, that we shall see authorized construction of the Auburn Dam, which will end for all time the threat of floods to the city of Sacramento and its environs. I might point out that today I am reintroducing legislation to authorize this project.

On the Stanislaus River to the south, New Melones Dam has been authorized and currently is being designed by the Army Engineers. Had we had this in operation, other millions of dollars in damage could have been prevented. And the floods also brought to our attention a critical situation existing in the Yuba City-Marysville region where a repetition of the 1955 floods easily could have taken place. We were within inches of such a disaster. On the north coast there is virtually no flood protection and we certainly need it. I am pleased at the announcement that surveys which I hope will lead to development on the Mad River, where damage approximated $2 million, will be started in the immediate future. Similar action must be taken on the Klamath and other rivers of the region.

We need completion of these projects, completion of flood works on the Tuolumne, the Merced, the Fresno, and the Chowchilla Rivers. If we had had them we could have prevented several millions of dollars in damage in the past 10 days.

Thus I want to call to the attention of the Congress the critical need to prevent repetition of this type of disaster, and at the same time I want to point out some of the problems which we face today in mopping up from the current disaster.

Today I am introducing a bill which I hope will help with this massive cleanup and rehabilitation program.

A variety of proposals are contained in the bill, the most important of which, I believe, is the authorization of Federal assistance to the four States affected in rebuilding its road and bridge system. As I have said before, no one knows the true extent of this damage, but it is tremendous. Not only are there millions upon millions of dollars to be spent in rebuilding and repairing roads and bridges, but this is timber country, country which is dependent for its very existence upon roads. Without these roads no timber can be harvested and the economy of the community will collapse.

Thus the first job we must face is to rebuild the road and bridge systems of these four stricken States.

Local government is faced with an impossible task of financing the repair just to county roads and bridges—and I would point out that literally hundreds of bridges have gone down the rivers of California in the past few days. Siskiyou County, for instance, operates on a $5 million annual budget, yet when the final results are tallied, I anticipate that the flood damage to roads and bridges alone in that county may well approach $8 million.

We must help. I have proposed that matching limitations be waived and that an additional $200 million be authorized for the Bureau of Public Roads emergency fund, which now is nearly exhausted.

The legislation which I introduce today also provides:

First. Authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to compromise or release indebtedness under Farmers Home Administration programs where necessary because of losses suffered due to the floods. Indebtedness also may be refinanced if repair or replacement of buildings is required.

Second. Authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to take similar actions in connection with Rural Electrification Administration loans.

Third. Authorizing the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to take similar action on Federal housing and other similar programs under his jurisdiction.

Fourth. Authorizing the Small Business Administration to extend the loan period of its disaster relief program to 30 years instead of the present 20.

Mr. Speaker, in concluding my remarks, I would like to say just a word or two about the heroic efforts of the many, many volunteers who came to the relief of their neighbors in the disaster area. There never will be a way to thank each and every one personally, but I do want to thank them in this manner. Their devotion to their fellow man, their giving of their time, energy, and in some cases, their lives, to helping those who were afflicted, all of which was done without any thought of reward, was, I believe, the true spirit of Christmas and we should thank God that the American people still have this spirit. It was wonderful.

MISSISSIPPI CHALLENGE

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, today at the opening of the first session of the 89th Congress, on behalf of a significant number of colleagues, I objected to the oath being administered to the gentlemen from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY, Mr. WHITTEN, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. WALKER, and Mr. COLMER]. As we know, the distinguished majority leader later offered a privileged resolution—House Resolution 1—authorizing the administration of the oath to the five "Representatives-elect" from Mississippi and moved the previous question. On a rollcall vote demanded by the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] 149 of us voted against ordering the previous question. If the previous question had not been carried, I intended, as the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] explained by propounding his parliamentary inquiry, to seek recognition to offer as a substitute the following "fairness resolution":

H. RES. —

Resolved, That the question of the right of Messrs. ABERNETHY, WHITTEN, WILLIAMS, WALKER, and COLMER to be seated in the Eighty-ninth Congress as Representatives from the First, Second, Third, Fourth, and Fifth Districts of Mississippi respectively, shall be referred to the Committee on House Administration, when elected, and said committee shall have the power to send for persons and papers and examine witnesses under oath in relation to the subject matter of this resolution; and be it further

Resolved, That the said Messrs. ABERNETHY, WHITTEN, WILLIAMS, WALKER, and COLMER shall not be sworn at this time and the question of their being sworn shall be held in abeyance until the House shall finally decide the question of the right of each of said Messrs. ABERNETHY, WHITTEN, WILLIAMS, WALKER, and COLMER to be seated in the Eighty-ninth Congress; and be it further

Resolved, That the Committee on House Administration shall make its report to the House of Representatives not later than 260 days following adoption of this resolution.

The reasoning behind the "fairness resolution" is succinctly stated in the following preamble which it would have been in order to consider if the "fairness resolution" had been adopted:

Whereas article I, section 5, of the Constitution of the United States provides that "Each House shall be the Judge of the Elections, Returns and Qualifications of its own Members"; and

Whereas the 14th and 15th amendments to the Constitution forbid the denial of the right of citizens to vote on account of race or color; and

Whereas between 90 and 95 percent of all Negroes 21 years of age and resident in the State of Mississippi are not registered to vote and did not vote in the November 1964 election for Members of Congress from Mississippi due in at least substantial measure to violence, terror, discriminatory testing, economic reprisal, and similar measures; and

Whereas the Congress in the act of February 23, 1870, warned the State of Mississippi that wholesale denial of the vote to her Negro citizens would result in a loss of her representation in this body; and

Whereas relying upon the foregoing, the validity of the election of Messrs. ABERNETHY, WHITTEN, WILLIAMS, WALKER, and COLMER, respectively, for the First, Second, Third, Fourth, and Fifth Districts of Mississippi, is hereby challenged.

Mr. Speaker, under article I, section 5, of the Constitution of the United States, the House of Representatives has the solemn obligation to "be the judge of the elections, returns and qualifications of its own Members." The resolution, which I was prepared to offer, asked that the House exercise this constitutional responsibility by refusing to administer the oath to the "Representatives-elect" from Mississippi until the House finally decided the question of the right of the "Representatives-elect" from Mississippi to be seated in the 89th Congress.

This resolution is based upon the unequivocal, the indisputable, the well-known fact that the "Representatives-elect" from Mississippi were elected by an electoral process which violates the 14th and 15th amendments to the Constitution. The 15th amendment to the Constitution guarantees that the right to vote "shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color or previous condition of servitude."

The right to vote is the essence of democracy. It is the fundamental safeguard of all other rights.

The State of Mississippi has deliberately and systematically denied the right to register and vote to a substantial number of American citizens because of their race. It is no accident that there are approximately 500,000, or 67 percent of the white persons of voting age and approximately 20,000 to 25,000, or only 5 to 6 percent of the Negroes of voting age registered to vote.

According to the Congressional Quarterly, in 1961 the following were the figures for nonwhite registration in each of the five Mississippi congressional districts: First District, 1.3 percent of the nonwhites of voting age registered to vote; Second District, 6.8 percent of the nonwhites of voting age registered to vote; Third District, 9.1 percent of the nonwhites of voting age are registered to vote; Fourth District, 5.1 percent of the nonwhites of voting age registered to vote; Fifth District, 12.3 percent of the nonwhites registered to vote.

The terror, violence and murder perpetrated last summer upon those who attempted to help their fellow citizens exercise their right to vote focused national attention upon the fact that Mississippi tramples upon the U.S. Constitution by denying American citizens the right to vote.

A brief history of the efforts of the State of Mississippi to exclude Negroes from the franchise clearly shows deliberate and consistent violation of the Federal Constitution over the past 75 years.

The Mississippi constitution of 1869 afforded Negro citizens the full right to vote. The next year, in 1870, Congress enacted a statute readmitting Mississippi to representation in the Congress on the condition that Mississippi never amend or change that constitution "as to deprive any citizen or class of citizens of the United States the right to vote."

In 1890 there were in Mississippi 118,890 registered white voters and 189,884 registered Negro voters. In that year, in spite of the 1870 compact with Congress and the 14th and 15th amendment guarantees, Mississippi called a constitutional convention, the purpose of which was described by U.S. Senator George of Mississippi:

> When we meet in convention, [it] is to devise such measures, consistent with the Constitution of the United States, as will enable us to maintain a home government under the control of the white people of the State.

The record of the convention reflects, as one delegate put it, "the manifest intention of this convention to secure to the State of Mississippi white supremacy."

In order to attain that unconstitutional goal, the convention adopted section 244 of the Mississippi constitution of 1890, which, with later amendments, is still the law of Mississippi and is still being used to disenfranchise Negroes. As originally adopted, the section required that an applicant for registration read any section of the State constitution or understand it when read to him, or give a reasonable interpretation of it. In 1902 a member of the convention's franchise committee commented upon this requirement:

> These several suffrage requirements combined were deemed sufficient for the end in view, as they have so proved in even the blackest parts of the State; they have, as they were intended, reduced the Negro majorities to a negligible political quantity.

This deliberate unconstitutional purpose was successful. In 1890, 60 percent of the voters were Negro. By 1899, when 57 percent of the adult Mississippi population was Negro, less than 10 percent of the electorate was Negro. In 1903 the Clarion-Ledger of Jackson reported:

> County registrars have kept the Negroes off the books by strict enforcement of the understanding clause in the Constitution.

Strict enforcement of section 244 succeeded in disenfranchising Negroes in the first half of the century. However, by midcentury, the vast majority of Mississippi Negroes were literate. In 1954, the Mississippi Legislature adopted a resolution to amend section 244, which originally required:

> Every qualified elector shall be able to read any section of the constitution of this State, or he shall be able to understand the same when read to him, or give a reasonable interpretation thereof.

The proposed amendment tightened the law by requiring that an applicant "be able to read and write any section of the constitution of the State and give a reasonable interpretation thereof to the county registrar." It also required an applicant be able to demonstrate to the "county registrar a reasonable understanding of the duties and obligations of citizenship under a constitutional form of government," and that he execute a sworn written application for registration on a form prescribed by the State board of election commissioners.

Moreover, the resolution exempted from new requirements those already registered before January 1, 1954. This exempted about two-thirds of the white population and built in a discrimination which will last as long as the lives of those previously registered.

At the time when this resolution was up for adoption by the Mississippi electorate, the chairman of the Association of Citizens' Councils in Mississippi, in urging its passage, explained "the amendment is intended solely to limit Negro registration." The resolution passed and was inserted in the Mississippi constitution.

In 1960 further constitutional amendments designed to keep Negroes from voting were adopted. A requirement that a person be of "good moral character" was added. In anticipation of the passage by the Congress of title III of the Civil Rights Act of 1960, which required local officials to keep and make available to the Attorney General records relating to eligibility of persons for voting in Federal elections, legislation was passed authorizing the destruction of records. One State senator said, "If this bill is going to have any effect, it must be passed before the President signs the civil rights bill."

There are other Mississippi laws designed to deny Negroes the right to vote, including the "perfect form" requirement and the laws requiring publication of names and addresses of applicants for registration.

An applicant for registration must, unaided, execute a letter-perfect form. In 1962 the Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit granted a temporary injunction in a case against the registrar of Forrest County. The court found that, while white applicants were being registered without forms or with obviously defective forms and with assistance on forms, qualified Negroes were being rejected because of minor errors on forms which they filled out unaided.

In addition, the Negroes were not advised of the reasons for their rejections and arbitrarily were required to wait for 6 months before reapplying.

A more subtle attempt to prevent Negroes from voting is found in section 3212.7 of the Mississippi Code, which provides that, within 10 days after application to register is made and before consideration is given to the sufficiency of the application, the name and address of the applicant must be published in a local newspaper. The information must appear once a week for 2 weeks under a heading "Applicants for registration to vote." In most other States such a publication would not matter. In Mississippi, however, it often brings terror, intimidation, violence, and economic reprisals.

I have discussed unconstitutional laws which Mississippi has enacted and enforced successfully to deny the vote to Negroes. But laws are apparently not enough, for there is also economic reprisal, threats, intimidation and violence perpetrated not only on those Negro citizens who dare attempt to exercise their constitutional rights, but on anyone, Negro or white, who tries to assist his fellow citizens in this endeavor. The tragic events of last summer proved this fact to the Nation—indeed to the world.

The ruthless murder of three courageous young men, whose only purpose was to aid others in their effort to vote, shocked the Nation. We know that officials of Mississippi are implicated in this heinous crime.

According to the Justice Department in McComb, Miss., alone, there were from June to October 1964, 17 bombings of churches, homes, and businesses; 32 arrests; 9 beatings; and 4 church burnings as a result of voter registration and civil rights activity.

Violence and terror in Mississippi to stop Negroes from voting is not a new or isolated phenomenon. The interim report of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights issued in 1963 spells it out:

> Citizens of the United States have been shot, set upon by vicious dogs, beaten and otherwise terrorized because they sought to vote.

The complaint in an action—Council of Federated Organizations, and Others versus Rainey, and Others—pending in the Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit sets forth an appalling series of acts of terror and violence perpetrated upon Mississippi Negroes who had the courage to attempt to register, and upon those, white and Negro, who courageously aided others in attempting to exercise their constitutional right.

Last summer the Council of Federated Organizations—COFO—organized the Mississippi summer project aimed at increasing Negro registration in Mississippi. Before the program got underway, in order to alert the Nation to the flagrant denial of constitutional rights and to the overt terror and violence in Mississippi, hearings were held on June 8, 1964, in Washington before a panel of distinguished Americans. The transcript of these hearings appeared in the Congressional Record on June 15 and 16, 1964.

In these hearings statistics became people and the deprivation of constitutional rights became clear. Let me quote part of the testimony of Hartman Turnbow, who described the experience when he and 13 others tried to register to vote:

> Mr. Freedman. Did you have any difficulty getting to the registration office?
>
> Mr. Turnbow. So 14 of us got in our cars. We went to Lexington. We didn't drive our cars up in town. We stopped them outside and we walked uptown.
>
> We didn't walk in a big gang. We walked in twos about 10 or 12 feet apart, so they couldn't say we was demonstrating.
>
> So we was met by the sheriff, Mr. Andrew P. Smith. He met us at the south door of the courthouse. And he stopped us.
>
> So Samuel Block was leading us. And Samuel Block said, "March forward." And Mr. Smith put one hand on his blackjack and the other one on his pistol and said, "None of that goddammed forward stuff here."
>
> So I stepped out the line. I said, "Mr. Smith, we only come to register."
>
> He said, "Well, Turnbow, go around to the north side of the courthouse and stop under that tree and don't go in no big crowd, go in twos."
>
> So we did that, so when we got round under the tree, all 14 of us, and stopped, Mr. Smith, Mr. Andrew P. Smith, the sheriff, he came round there under the tree where we were standing and he looked at us, and he looked at us, he put one hand on his blackjack and the other on his pistol and raised his voice. He said, "All right, now, who will be first?" * * * I said, "I will be first, Mr. Smith." Well, no sooner I said I will be first than Mr. Smith calmed his voice. He said, "All right, Turnbow, go down the side, the edge of the curb and go in the courthouse in the first door on the left, and do what you got to do." I told him, "Yes, sir." I did that. I got in there. The lady—the circuit clerk wasn't in—but the lady was in there. She said, "What do you want?" I said, "I want to register to vote." She said, "Well, you have to see Mr. McLennon about that, and he is not in here." So after dinner, about 2 or 3 o'clock, I went back in and he was in. She had told him about it. He said, "What do you want?" I said, "I want to register to vote." He just handed me the form and I filled it out and signed it and handed it back to him. So then after that I noticed the next day the Lexington Herald, a little local paper they write—they had a write up in the Lexington Herald that "Hartman Turnbow was an integration leader," so I noticed that about 2 weeks or a little after that my house was firebombed and shot in all at the same time. And about 3 o'clock in the morning it took place. My wife and daughter, she is 16, they jumped out of bed screaming and hollering that the house is on fire, it had been bombed.
>
> So I woke up—I was kind of hard to wake up—I woke up and my room was full of smoke. So I didn't run out. But they done gone. I raised the window and took my foot and kicked the screen out so the smoke could get out. Then I had a little old .22 Remington sitting over in the corner. I picked it up and pushed the safety off and got it in shooting position and run out. When I run out, I met my wife and 16-year-old daughter coming back to the burning house. And as I run out, I noticed the living room was just full of flames and smoke. I noticed the back bedroom was in flames and smoke. And no sooner I got out in the open with my rifle in my hand, I saw two white men, and one of them no sooner he saw me he shot at me. He must have been shooting an automatic, because the next day we found three .45 hulls laying there where he was standing when he shot at me. So he shot at me the first time. I had my .22 already in position and I just commenced shooting at him right fast. So there was two of them. The first one run—the first white man made the first shot, while the second one run. When I started shooting right fast at him, he broke and run. But while me and this one was on the back were shooting at each other, somebody on the front was shooting all in the front of the house. We got four .45 bullets off the house there and one what hit and went another way we couldn't find. But they shot in front of the house in the house five times. So about 3 or 4 minutes, they all was gone.
>
> Then myself and wife and daughter went to pumping water and we put the fire out. And that is what I got for going to register.
>
> Chairman Taylor. Have they been all right, or have they had trouble, too?
>
> Mr. Turnbow. Well, every one—they had different kinds of trouble. Lots of them had been buying gas for their farm tractors on credit, and that was cut out. Also me. But we didn't care about that too much. But everything they could do to us, they did it. They cut the credit off and all that kind of stuff. Some said if we niggers didn't quit that mess they was going to bomb the church and all that kind of stuff.

Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that Mississippi presents the most flagrant discrimination in voting. Out of Mississippi's 82 counties, 27 have been subject to suits by the Federal Government. So far in seven separate suits concerning several parts of the State there has been a judicial determination of a "pattern or practice" of discrimination. This systematic discrimination results in Mississippi having by far the lowest Negro registration record of all States. According to the study prepared by the voter education project of the Southern Regional Council as of January 1964, only 6.6 percent of nonwhites are registered to vote in Mississippi. The closest State to Mississippi is Alabama with 18.7 percent of nonwhite registered. The next State is Virginia with 24.8 percent, South Carolina with 30.0 percent, Louisiana with 31.4 percent and so throughout the South to Tennessee which has 64.6 percent of its nonwhites registered.

The facts are well known, and we have the responsibility to act upon them. Congress has exercised this responsibility with honor in the past.

Mr. Speaker, when the infirmity of an election and of the granting by a State of a certificate was well known and cast serious and substantial doubt upon the right of a "Representative-elect" to sit in the House, the House has refused to seat him pending an investigation and final determination of the question by the House.

Here the presumptive claim of the five gentlemen from Mississippi to be sworn rested on certificates of election issued by State officials who are themselves products and protectors of the same unconstitutional electoral process. It can be fairly assumed that the question of discrimination in voter registration was not considered in issuing the certificates.

The most recent example of the House refusing to swear a Member-elect occurred in the Roush-Chambers case of 1961. The fairness resolution now before the House is derived from that case. Although Chambers held the certificate, he was not sworn. It was generally known that the certificate conflicted with a recount, which showed that our colleague, Edward Roush, the noncertified candidate, had in fact won. Congressman Roush did not receive a certificate from the Governor of Indiana until February 20, 1961, more than a month after the House adopted the fairness resolution. After months of investigation, the administration committee recommended that Edward Roush, the noncertified party, be declared the victor and sworn.

Mr. Speaker, the world knows that the 15th amendment, as well as the 14th amendment, has been violated by the Mississippi electoral process which has systematically disenfranchised 90 to 95 percent of all Negroes over 21 years of age—some 40 percent of the total population.

In the face of the most flagrant disregard of our most fundamental constitutional rights, I believed the House in good conscience should not administer the oath to the "Representatives-elect" from the State of Mississippi and that the question of their rights to be seated should be carefully considered by the House Administration Committee.

Without action by this House, the State of Mississippi will persist in frustrating the 15th amendment and continue to condone murder, arson, and other acts of violence to prevent Negro citizens from voting.

The Reverend Martin Luther King recently stated the issue with eloquence:

> The conscience of America, troubled by the twin Mississippi tragedies, the presence of violence in the absence of law, can now express itself in supporting this moral challenge to an immoral representation.

The Washington Post editorial entitled "Pretenders in Congress" said on January 1, 1965:

> There is overwhelming evidence to show that Negroes indubitably qualified to vote in Mississippi were kept from doing so by a systematic denial of their qualification by intimidation and by outright terror. The State is therefore clearly not entitled to the five members it seeks to have seated in the House of Representatives. And the election of every one of these Representatives was clearly tainted. It is high time for Mississippi to learn that the country is not altogether indifferent to its contempt for the Constitution. And it is high time for the House of Representatives to give some thought to the integrity of its own membership.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I wish to read from a message written by Mr. and Mrs. Robert Goodman after the murder of their son, Andrew, in Philadelphia, Miss.:

> In Washington 4 weeks ago, my wife and I in a sense made a pilgrimage to the Lincoln Memorial in the evening and stood in that great shrine looking down past the Washington Monument toward the soft glow of the light around the White House. Full of the awe of a great Nation that surrounded us, we turned to read, emblazoned in black letters on white marble: "It is for us the living to dedicate ourselves that these dead shall not have died in vain."

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, the occasions are rare that a Member of this House must take upon himself the high and heavy duty of rising to say that he must speak upon his honor as a Member. We have seen such an occasion today. And now all of us face together, as the U.S. House of Representatives, the high and heavy duty that some of our Members had to face as individuals earlier today. This House must speak upon its honor to the people of the United States.

We are beyond politics in the ordinary sense; we are beyond the contentions of party and program that ordinarily concern us. We must speak upon politics in the very highest sense: we must speak upon the way a free people governs itself, we must speak upon the meaning of the words and the spirit of our Constitution, we must speak upon what to an American is the most terrible of political facts—that some Americans are not freemen.

Mr. Speaker, every word of our Constitution tries to create what many of us have called the "open society." That is the society where no man is afraid to speak his mind; where every man has the opportunity to develop his talents and to use them; where the public business is open to public scrutiny; and where the whole people make the decisions about the future in which all of them will have to live. There is only one of our sister States, Mr. Speaker, that could be—that has been—damned with the title of "the closed society." In that State two-fifths of the people are excluded from any share in making political decisions. They have no voice in choosing the President of the United States, the Members of this or the other House of Congress, their own Governor and legislators, their own county commissioners and sheriffs. They have no say in the government that assesses their taxes and calls their sons into the Armed Forces, nor do they have any say in the government that controls their policemen and provides their schools and teachers. In short, their whole future is at the mercy of a government in which they have no share, no voice. That, Mr. Speaker, is the closed society. Its name is Mississippi.

And it is scarcely surprising what results. For a Negro in Mississippi where is the career open to talents? Where is the education in which he can develop his talents? Where are the courts that will protect him from violence and fraud so that a life's work of responsible effort cannot be taken away in a moment of frolic or jealousy? They do not exist; and if he protests, he is murdered by policemen and mocked by judges. That, too, Mr. Speaker, is the closed society.

It does not even end there. For it is not only Negroes who suffer by the constant efforts of the State of Mississippi to repress its Negro population. There are whites who are afraid to speak for fear of a beating or a bomb or a flood of telephone calls all night; there are white college professors who must teach elsewhere if they want to teach democracy; there are white businessmen who are forced to contribute to the Klan; there are white lawyers who dare not take a case they know is right; and that too, Mr. Speaker, is the closed society.

I said that we must today, not merely as individuals but as a House, speak upon our honor to the people of the United States. We must not only speak, we must act upon our honor. This House is honorable because from the origins of our Republic, it has been the people's forum. It is the only branch of our Federal Government whose Members have always been chosen by the people themselves, never by appointment or by succession or by electors or by State legislators. This House is honorable because it flows from the wellsprings of democracy and the open society—from the people's vote. If those wellsprings are poisoned, this House is poisoned. We dare not let men pretend to a seat in this honorable House who have been chosen by a closed vote in a closed society. If we do, we betray this House and the people of the United States and the Constitution they wrote for us.

Such men are standing before us today, pretending to seats among us. They say their constituents will have no representation if we do not seat them. But their constituents will not have representation if we do seat them. We must say to them that they cannot run a society like Soviet Russia and then claim seats in the American Congress; that they cannot win "elections" with a system based on murder and then claim the right to govern free men. We must tell these men to go back to their homes and to run in free elections where all their constituents can vote. We will be glad to seat men who win these elections; we will welcome to our midst Congressmen who have really been chosen by the people of Mississippi; but we must say to the people of all the States that until such men arrive here from Mississippi, we will not besmirch ourselves or the Constitution or the American people by seating persons who merely pretend to have been freely elected to our midst. When we say this, and not until then, we shall have spoken and acted upon our honor as the House of Representatives.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I deeply regret that the House did not adopt today the "fairness resolution" asking that the five "Members-elect" from Mississippi not be sworn in until such time as the validity of their election could be attested to by the House Committee on Administration. This procedure is clearly provided for under the rules, the circumstances demanded it, and I opposed the motion for the previous question so that this step of simple justice and equity could be taken.

It is true that the secretary of state of Mississippi has certified the "election" of these five Members.

It is equally true, however, from all the evidence gathered to date, that this election cannot be considered representative of the will of all the people of the State. How could it when 42 percent of the voting age population were systematically kept from the polls by denial of qualifications, by intimidation, and by outright terror?

The 14th amendment to the Constitution of the United States makes it abundantly clear that when the right to vote is:

> Denied to any of the male inhabitants of such State, being 21 years of age, and citizens of the United States, or in any way abridged, except for participation in rebellion, or other crime, the basis of representation shall be reduced in the proportion which the number of such male citizens shall bear to the whole number of male citizens 21 years of age in such State.

This is obviously a serious step. But so is the denial of the right to vote, which is the cornerstone of our democracy.

And as the Washington Post pointed out in an editorial on January 1:

> It seems almost self-evident that disregard of the 14th amendment in regard to Mississippi operates to dilute and, in relative terms, to diminish the representation of voters in States which do not abridge the right to vote.

Mr. Speaker, the action of the House today can only be considered as a temporary setback to the fundamental principle of this country that all men are created equal. I can only hope and urge and work for the day when such flagrant denials of basic American rights will no longer be tolerated and that expeditious action will still be taken by the House to investigate and report on the disenfranchisement of voters in the State of Mississippi.

NECESSARY LOGIC: A DEPARTMENT OF URBAN AFFAIRS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, in previous years I have sponsored legislation for the creation of a Federal Department of Urban Affairs.

Mr. Speaker, the need for this logical and prudent step has grown more acute with each passing year. Urban complexes are not depreciating in population, economic wealth, and influence. The trend is still the other way.

Again I have introduced a bill to establish a Cabinet-level Department of Urban Affairs. My hope is that the Congress, whatever the legislative recommendations of the Executive, will recognize that the problems of urban centers are truly national in scope and paramount in importance, and that this reality authorizes administrative categorization of the highest order.

We are an industrial country. The highly sophisticated economic processes of the Nation are found in urban centers. In 1900, we were primarily rural; about three of every five persons lived on farms or in sparsely populated areas. By 1920, urban inhabitants already exceeded rural populations. The trend accelerated until in 1960, 70 percent of Americans lived in the cities and surrounding suburban areas.

Perhaps more than any other society we are constantly on the move. Population shifts are very pronounced in America, and very rapid. And our population is growing. The Census Bureau estimates a total population of 214 million by 1970, and 260 million by 1980.

Indications are that the migration from rural to urban areas will continue as our total population expands. Now we have a very interesting phenomenon: Over the years dispersal of this population will occur in wider urban areas. The 70 percent of our population presently inhabiting city areas is concentrated in only 1 percent of the Nation's geographic expanse.

Jean Gottman, who wrote the book, "Megalopolis, the Urbanized Northeastern Seaboard of the United States," looks toward a new society which he terms "megalopolis." This is a densely populated strip area including large cities and their expanding commuter residents. Gottman believes these populations already form an integrated complex. Certainly they do so economically and culturally.

I tell this brief story merely to underwrite the growing and far-reaching phenomenon of urban growth and what this must mean to every American who earns a living, raises a family, and seeks a decent and healthy life. Population trends, and their consequences, should alert us to the problems which must be faced in the future.

The Federal Government is already concerned with urban issues. We have an urban mass transit bill and varied types of housing programs. The Public Health Service administers a program to combat air pollution, preeminently a city dilemma. We have assistance for road building and a Small Business Administration. In taking these various legislative steps, the fact of urbanization and its consequences may have eluded some. With some of these programs we were dealing with a different totality.

I think now, as before, that the metropolis in this country, and its outlying communities, warrants a unified approach. Cities are recognizable entities and their problems are particular to their nature.

Metropolitan communities carry out most of the industrial and commercial activities of the Nation. They are our principal centers of education and culture. Their future, as their populations grow, is of overriding importance to the future of the Nation as a whole.

And thus what is factually true must be recognized by the Government.

A Federal Department of Urban Affairs will not equip us with an utterly new bureaucratic machinery. My bill will transfer all functions of the Housing and Home Finance Agency to the Urban Affairs Department. The President is authorized to submit plans for additional transfer of agency jurisdictions should he deem this appropriate. This legislation is identical to the measure I cosponsored in the 87th Congress.

My thinking on this subject has not essentially changed. The validity of the argument in favor of this administrative relocation remains intact and is becoming more obvious. The urban resident needs representation on the highest Government level; he constitutes approximately two-thirds of our population.

Equally, as important, we can expect more intensive concentration upon metropolitan problems, and more coordinated effort to meet these problems, with full Cabinet status.

The time is ripe to translate the irreversible facts of American society into proper Government purpose. To create a Department of Urban Affairs we will not be launching a revolutionary concept. The opposite is more to the point, for in essence we are attuning the Federal Government to the real pattern of America's growth and development.

I urge that early and affirmative consideration be granted to this legislation. As early as the 83d Congress, Members have sought a coordinated and appropriate instrument to address the urban complex. The 89th Congress must act to establish a Department of Urban Affairs—at the earliest possible moment.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. ROOSEVELT, for 30 minutes, on Tuesday, January 5.

Mr. RYAN of New York, for 15 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HALPERN (at the request of Mr. HALL), for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. HALPERN (at the request of Mr. HALL), for 20 minutes, January 6, 1965.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HALL) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FINDLEY.

Mr. GROVER.

Mr. BOB WILSON.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MATSUNAGA) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GARMATZ.

Mr. HANNA.

THE LATE HONORABLE HERBERT HOOVER

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a resolution, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 16

Resolved, That the House has learned with regret and profound sorrow of the death of Herbert Clark Hoover, former President of the United States, who as an illustrious private citizen and a dedicated public official so generously contributed his labors, wisdom, and leadership to the Nation and the cause of humanity.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy of the same to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the former President, this House do now adjourn.

The resolution was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, January 5, 1965, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives, transmitting a list of reports which it is the duty of any officer or department to make to Congress, pursuant to rule III, clause 2, of the Rules of the House of Representatives (H. Doc. No. 23); to the Committee on House Administration and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting with reference to December 22, 1964, letter, a report that the appropriation to the Department of Justice for "Salaries and expenses, Federal Bureau of Investigation," for the fiscal year 1965, has been apportioned on a basis indicating a need for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to section 3679 of 31 U.S.C. 665, as amended; to the Committee on Appropriations.

3. A letter from the Governor, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the 31st annual report of the Farm Credit Administration on the work of the cooperative farm credit system for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1964, pursuant to section 3 of the Federal Farm Loan Act as amended (H. Doc. No. 18); to the Committee on Agriculture and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

4. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations, Department of State, transmitting the text of the 47th session of the International Labor Conference at Geneva, in June 1963 with its recommendations (H. Doc. No. 35); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

5. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, transmitting the report of the proceedings of the Judicial Conference of the United States, September 23–24, 1964, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 331 (H. Doc. No. 36); to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

6. A letter from the national quartermaster-adjutant, Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A., Inc., transmitting the proceedings of the national convention and the report of the proceedings of the Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A. for the year ending August 31, 1964, pursuant to Public Law 88–105, approved August 31, 1963 (H. Doc. No. 37); to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

7. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated October 1, 1964, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on an interim hurricane survey of Atlantic coast of southern New Jersey and Delaware, authorized by Public Law 71, 84th Congress approved June 15, 1955 (H. Doc. No. 38); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with three illustrations.

8. A letter from the national adjutant, Disabled American Veterans, transmitting the proceedings of the national convention for the year ending June 30, 1964, together with a report of receipts and expenditures, pursuant to Public Law 668, approved July 15, 1942 and Public Law 77–249 (H. Doc. No. 39); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

9. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report relative to the readiness of certain vehicles assigned to Strategic Army Corps units in the United States; to the Committee on Government Operations.

10. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a summary and compilation comprising three volumes of factual information on the operation and administration of Public Law 83–480; to the Committee on Agriculture.

11. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report that under title I, Public Law 480, an agreement was signed with Paraguay during September 1964, pursuant to Public Law 85–128; to the Committee on Agriculture.

12. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report that under title I, Public Law 480, an agreement was signed with the Government of the Republic of the Congo during October 1964, pursuant to Public Law 85–128; to the Committee on Agriculture.

13. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report that under title I, Public Law 480, an agreement was signed with the Government of the Republic of Vietnam during November 1964, pursuant to Public Law 85–128; to the Committee on Agriculture.

14. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, Chairman, Migratory Bird Conservation Commission, transmitting a report of the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1964, pursuant to section 3 of 45 Stat. 1222, United States Code, title 16, section 715b; to the Committee on Agriculture.

15. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a report of a violation of the Anti-Deficiency Act involving an overobligation, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; to the Committee on Appropriations.

16. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a report of a violation of the provisions of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, involving an overpayment, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; to the Committee on Appropriations.

17. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a report on a violation of subsection (h) of 31 U.S.C. 665, occurring at a VA regional office, involving an overobligation, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665(i)(2)); to the Committee on Appropriations.

18. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report that the appropriation to the Department of Agriculture for "Forest protection and utilization;" Forest Service, for the fiscal year 1965, has been reapportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

19. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report that the appropriation to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, for "Grants to States for public assistance" for the fiscal year 1965, has been apportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

20. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report that the appropriation to the Department of the Interior for "Management of lands and resources," Bureau of Land Management, for the fiscal year 1965, has been reapportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

21. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report that the appropriation to the Department of the Interior for "Management and protection," National Park Service, for the fiscal year 1965, has been reapportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

22. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report that the appropriation to the Department of the Interior for "Resources management," Bureau of Indian Affairs, for the fiscal year 1965, has been reapportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

23. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report that the appropriation to the Department of Justice for "Salaries and expenses, Federal Bureau of Investiga-

tion," for the fiscal year 1965, has been apportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

24. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report that the appropriation to the Department of Labor for "Unemployment compensation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen," for the fiscal year 1965, has been apportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

25. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report that the appropriation to the Treasury Department for "Salaries and expenses, U.S. Secret Service" for the fiscal year 1965, has been reapportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

26. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report that the appropriation to the Veterans' Administration for "Compensation and pensions" for the fiscal year 1965 has been apportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

27. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report, with reference to September 28, 1964, letter, that the appropriation for the Veterans' Administration for "Compensation and pensions" for the fiscal year 1965 has been apportioned on a basis indicating a need for supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

28. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report that the appropriation to the Veterans' Administration for "Grants to the Republic of the Philippines" for the fiscal year 1965 has been apportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

29. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report that the appropriation to the Veterans' Administration for "Readjustment benefits" for the fiscal year 1965 has been apportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

30. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report, "Real and Personal Property of the Department of Defense," as of June 30, 1964, pursuant to the National Security Act of 1947, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

31. A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a semiannual report of the Air Force military construction contracts awarded by the Department without formal advertising for the period ended June 30, 1964, pursuant to section 605, Public Law 88-390; to the Committee on Armed Services.

32. A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a report of the number of officers on duty with the executive part of the Department of the Air Force at the seat of government, as of September 30, 1964, pursuant to section 8031(c), title 10, United States Code; to the Committee on Armed Services.

33. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report of the number of officers on duty with Headquarters, Department of the Army and the Army General Staff on September 30, 1964, pursuant to section 3031(c) of title 10, United States Code; to the Committee on Armed Services.

34. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting notice of intention to donate certain surplus property to the Star-Spangled Banner Flag House Association, Inc., for the purpose of making minimum repairs to the U.S.S. frigate *Constellation*, pursuant to section 7545 of title 10, United States Code; to the Committee on Armed Services.

35. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a report of actual procurement receipts for medical stockpile of civil defense emergency supplies and equipment purposes for the quarter ending September 30, 1964, pursuant to subsection 201(h) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

36. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a notice of a proposed disposition of a quantity of hyoscine now held in national stockpile, pursuant to section 3(e) of 50 U.S.C. 98b(e); to the Committee on Armed Services.

37. A letter from the Director, Office of Emergency Planning, Executive Office of the President, transmitting the semiannual report on the strategic and critical materials stockpiling program for the period ending June 30, 1964, pursuant to section 4 of the Strategic and Critical Stock Piling Act, Public Law 79-520; to the Committee on Armed Services.

38. A letter from the Director, Office of Emergency Planning, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a semiannual report of the statistical supplement, stockpile report to the Congress for the period ending June 30, 1964, pursuant to section 4 of Public Law 79-520; to the Committee on Armed Services.

39. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting reports listing contracts negotiated under authority of sections 2304(a)(11) and 2304(a)(16) of title 10, United States Code, during the 6-month period ending June 30, 1964, pursuant to title 10, United States Code 2304(e); to the Committee on Armed Services.

40. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting a report, that in view of favorable contract awards previously entered into and uncommitted balances of authorizations, certain additional projects for the Army National Guard have become feasible and the location, nature, and estimated costs are submitted pursuant to title 10, United States Code 2233a(1); to the Committee on Armed Services.

41. A letter from the Director, Office of Civil Defense, Department of the Army, transmitting a report on property acquisitions of emergency supplies and equipment by the Office of Civil Defense for the quarter ending September 30, 1964, pursuant to subsection 201(h) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

42. A letter from the adjutant general, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, transmitting a report of the books of the quartermaster general of the Veterans of Foreign Wars for the fiscal year ended August 31, 1964, pursuant to Public Law 74-630; to the Committee on Armed Services.

43. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report covering the progress made in liquidating the assets of the former Reconstruction Finance Corporation which was transferred to the Secretary of the Treasury by Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1957, for the quarterly period ended September 30, 1964, pursuant to 67 Stat. 230, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

44. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the 69th quarterly report on export control for the 3d quarter, 1964, pursuant to the Export Control Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

45. A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting the eighth report on competition in the synthetic rubber industry, covering the industry's operation under private enterprise in the calendar year 1962; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

46. A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting a report on review of the outstanding voluntary agreements and programs as of November 9, 1964, pursuant to section 708(e) of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

47. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting a report on Department procurement from small and other business firms during July–August 1964, pursuant to section 10(d) of the Small Business Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

48. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting a report on Department procurement from small and other business firms during July–September 1964, pursuant to section 10(d) of the Small Business Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

49. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting a report on Department procurement from small and other business firms during July–October 1964, pursuant to section 10(d) of the Small Business Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

50. A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a report on the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Liquidation Fund, as of September 30, 1964, pursuant to 67 Stat. 230, 231, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

51. A letter from the Director, Office of Emergency Planning, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report on borrowing authority for the semiannual period ending June 30, 1964, pursuant to section 304(b) of the Defense Production Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

52. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Home Loan Bank Board, transmitting the annual report of the Board covering the operations of the Federal Home Loan Bank System, the Federal Savings and Loan System, and the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation for the calendar year 1963, pursuant to section 17(b) of the Federal Loan Bank Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

53. A letter from the Chairman, Export-Import Bank of Washington, transmitting the report on the activities of the Bank for the year ended June 30, 1964, pursuant to section 9 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

54. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, of the District of Columbia, transmitting a list of the institutions or organizations whose properties were specifically exempted from taxation by special acts of Congress prior to the passage of the

act of December 24, 1942, and under provisions of the act were exempted for the calendar year 1963, pursuant to subsection E of section 1 of Public Law 77–846; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

55. A letter from the Executive Secretary, Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia, transmitting the 51st Annual Report of the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia for the calendar year 1963, pursuant to section 8 of the District of Columbia Appropriations Act, approved March 4, 1913; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

56. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a report of the Advisory Committee for Training Teachers of the Deaf together with comments of the Commissioner of Education, pursuant to section 5(b) of Public Law 85–926; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

57. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting the annual report of the American National Red Cross and the combined statement of income and expenditures of the organization for the year ended June 30, 1963, pursuant to 33 Stat. 599, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

58. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the semiannual consolidated report of balances of foreign currencies acquired without payment of dollars as of June 30, 1964, pursuant to section 613 (c) of Public Law 87–195; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

59. A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting the fourth annual report on the operations of the Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange Between East and West (East-West Center) for fiscal year 1964, pursuant to section 704(c) of Public Law 86–472; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

60. A letter from the Secretary, Export-Import Bank of Washington, transmitting a report that the Bank has issued its guarantee relative to certain transactions with Poland, pursuant to title III of the Foreign Assistance and Related Agencies Appropriation Act of 1964, and to the Presidential determination of February 4, 1964; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs

61. A letter from the Secretary, Export-Import Bank of Washington, transmitting a report that the Bank has issued its guarantee relative to certain transactions with Poland, pursuant to title III of the Foreign Assistance and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1965, and to the Presidential determination of February 4, 1964; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

62. A letter from the Secretary, Export-Import Bank of Washington, transmitting a report that the Bank has issued its guarantee relative to certain transactions with Yugoslavia, pursuant to title III of the Foreign Assistance and Related Agencies Appropriation Act of 1965 and to the Presidential determination of February 4, 1964; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

63. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Export-Import Bank of Washington, transmitting a report relative to shipments to Yugoslavia for the month of November 1964, pursuant to title III of the Foreign Aid and Related Agencies Appropriation Act of 1965 and the Presidential determination of February 4, 1964; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

64. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Export-Import Bank of Washington, transmitting a report that the Bank has issued its guarantee with regard to certain transactions with Poland, pursuant to title III of the Foreign Assistance and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1965, and to the Presidential determination of February 4, 1964; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

65. A letter from the Chairman, the Advisory Committee on the Arts, Department of State, transmitting the Annual Report of the Cultural Presentations Program of the Advisory Committee on the Arts for fiscal year ended June 30, 1964, pursuant to section 107 of Public Law 87–256; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

66. A letter from the Chairman, the Board of Foreign Scholarships, Department of State, transmitting the second report of the Board of Foreign Scholarships, pursuant to section 107 of Public Law 87–256; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

67. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, transmitting the 18th semiannual report of the activities of the Commission as of June 30, 1964, pursuant to the War Claims Act of 1948, and the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

68. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a report covering personal and real property received by State surplus property agencies for distribution to public health and educational institutions and civil defense organizations, pursuant to section 203(o) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended; to the Committee on Government Operations.

69. A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting information on contracts negotiated by departments and independent agencies for experimental, developmental, or research work or for the manufacturing or furnishing of property for this purpose during the 6-month period ended June 30, 1964, pursuant to section 302 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended; to the Committee on Government Operations.

70. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Administration, Agency for International Development, Department of State, transmitting a copy of the Agency's reply to the Comptroller General's report relative to improper retention of dollar collections on loans made by Corporate Development Loan Fund; to the Committee on Government Operations.

71. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Administration, Agency for International Development, Department of State, transmitting a copy of the Agency's reply to the Comptroller General's report relative to examination of economic and technical assistance program for Turkey; to the Committee on Government Operations.

72. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting the annual report on the activities of the U.S. General Accounting Office during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1964, pursuant to section 312(a) of the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921; to the Committee on Government Operations.

73. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on weaknesses in controls over dollar refunds due Commodity Credit Corporation for adjustments in amounts financed on cotton exported under title I, Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (commonly known as Public Law 480), Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Government Operations.

74. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on unauthorized expenditures for converting a bull barn into a research laboratory at the Agricultural Research Center, Beltsville, Md., Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Government Operations.

75. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on improper payment of Colombian port charges for surplus agricultural commodities sold under title I, Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (commonly known as Public Law 480), Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Government Operations.

76. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on deficiencies in appraising southern pine sawtimber sold in the southern region (region 8), Forest Service, Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Government Operations.

77. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on deficiencies in the award and administration of timber sales contracts in the California region (region 5), Forest Service, Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Government Operations.

78. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on excessive ocean transportation costs incurred for shipments under title I, Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Government Operations.

79. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on unnecessary costs resulting from indirect procurement of transmitters from Hamilton Standard Division of United Aircraft Corp., Department of the Air Force; to the Committee on Government Operations.

80. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on overpricing of buffer amplifiers purchased from HRB-Singer, Inc., State College, Pa., by the Boeing Co., Wichita Branch, Wichita, Kans., for B–47 aircraft, Department of the Air Force; to the Committee on Government Operations.

81. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on unnecessary cost to the Government through the leasing of electronic data-processing systems by General Dynamics/Astronautics, a division of General Dynamics Corp., San Diego, Calif., Department of the Air Force; to the Committee on Government Operations.

82. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on overpricing of valves purchased from the Garrett Corp., Airesearch Manufacturing Division, Phoenix, Ariz., by General Dynamics Corp., Astronautics Division, San Diego, Calif., for the Atlas intercontinental ballistic missile, Department of the Air Force; to the Committee on Government Operations.

83. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on overstatement of target cost of AN/FPS–7 radar equipment under fixed-price incentive contracts AF 30(635)–12300 and AF 30(635)–11072 with General Electric Co., Heavy Military Electronics Department, Syracuse, N.Y., Department of the Air Force; to the Committee on Government Operations.

84. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on unnecessary costs incurred in the procurement from AC Spark Plug Division of General Motors Corp. of bombing-navigational system components manufactured by International Business Machines Corp., Department of the Air Force; to the Committee on Government Operations.

85. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on unnecessary costs incurred in negotiated procurements of batteries for aircraft ground-support equipment by Rome Air Materiel area, Rome, N.Y., Department of the Air Force; to the Committee on Government Operations.

86. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on overstated costs included in price of turbojet engine parts purchased from Solar Aircraft Co., San Diego, Calif., by General Electric Co., West Lynn, Mass., Department of the Air Force; to the Committee on Government Operations.

87. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on retention of uneconomical units in the Reserve Officers' Training Corps program, Departments of the Army and Air Force; to the Committee on Government Operations.

88. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on unnecessary costs incurred in sole-source procurement of portable radar sets, Department of the Army; to the Committee on Government Operations.

89. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on high costs of unnecessary daily compilation of statistical data by use of automatic data processing equipment, Department of the Army; to the Committee on Government Operations.

90. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on ineffective supply management causing shortages and excesses of end items and repair parts in Okinawa, Department of the Army; to the Committee on Government Operations.

91. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on unnecessary disposal of spare components procured for the Hawk air defense guided-missile system, Department of the Army; to the Committee on Government Operations.

92. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on excessive prices for power pack assemblies purchased from Sparton Corp., Jackson, Mich., by various prime contractors, Department of the Army; to the Committee on Government Operations.

93. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on unnecessary transportation costs for small arms ammunition components purchased for the military assistance program, Department of the Army; to the Committee on Government Operations.

94. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on overcharges for long-distance telephone channels leased by the 8th U.S. Army, Korea, Department of the Army; to the Committee on Government Operations.

95. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on unnecessary vacancies in available Capehart, Wherry, and other Government-owned family housing at Fort Knox, Ky., Department of the Army; to the Committee on Government Operations.

96. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on savings resulting from resale of reusable ammunition containers procured from the United Kingdom, Department of the Army; to the Committee on Government Operations.

97. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on unauthorized use of military personnel and Government property at Fort Gordon, Ga., for activities related to the Masters Golf Tournament, Department of the Army; to the Committee on Government Operations.

98. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on cost and pricing data not obtained for determining the reasonableness of prices for weapons components procured from the Aluminum Co. of America by the Bendix Corp. and ACF Industries, Inc., Atomic Energy Commission; to the Committee on Government Operations.

99. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on uneconomical practices relating to the distribution of press releases and other informational material issued by the Department of Commerce; to the Committee on Government Operations.

100. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on inadequate analysis of employment opportunities to be provided by a federally assisted project, Area Redevelopment Administration, Department of Commerce; to the Committee on Government Operations.

101. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on accelerated public works assistance approved for areas under consideration for termination of eligibility, Area Redevelopment Administration, Department of Commerce; to the Committee on Government Operations.

102. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on inadequacies in the administration of right-of-way activities of the Federal-aid highway program in the State of New Jersey, Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Commerce; to the Committee on Government Operations.

103. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on deficiencies in the award and administration of contracts for construction of Federal-aid highway projects in the State of New Jersey, Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Commerce; to the Committee on Government Operations.

104. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on unwarranted financial risks assumed under the Federal ship mortgage insurance program because of inadequate evaluation of economic soundness of proposed tanker operations, Maritime Administration, Department of Commerce; to the Committee on Government Operations.

105. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on imprudent action taken in approving loans to assist the Roustabout Co., Frackville, Pa., Area Redevelopment Administration, Department of Commerce; to the Committee on Government Operations.

106. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on employment opportunities in federally aided project generally restricted to individuals having funds to invest in business venture, Area Redevelopment Administration, Department of Commerce; to the Committee on Government Operations.

107. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on failure to require adherence to specifications for materials used in forest highway projects in certain western States under the direct Federal highway construction program, Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Commerce; to the Committee on Government Operations.

108. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on questionable validity of $32 million estimate of funds needed to complete Inter-American Highway, Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Commerce; to the Committee on Government Operations.

109. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on review of decisions reached by the Department of Agriculture on various problems affecting storage of cotton by the Commodity Credit Corporation; to the Committee on Government Operations.

110. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on use of private executive aircraft rather than commercial aircraft resulted in unwarranted charges to Government cost-reimbursable-type contracts by Lockheed Missiles & Space Co., Sunnyvale, Calif., Department of Defense; to the Committee on Government Operations.

111. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on expensive operation of mountain recreation facilities at Armed Forces Recreation Center, Kilauea Military Camp, Hawaii Volcanoes National Park, Department of Defense; to the Committee on Government Operations.

112. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on excessive costs to the Government in the sale and leaseback of an electronic data processing system by the Aerojet-General Corp., Sacramento, Calif., Department of Defense; to the Committee on Government Operations.

113. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on unnecessary cost to the Government through the leasing of electronic data processing systems by Defense Electronic Products Radio Corp. of America, Camden, N.J., Department of Defense; to the Committee on Government Operations.

114. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on unnecessary cost to the Government in the leasing of electrical accounting machines by General Dynamics/Astronautics, San Diego, Calif., and Lockheed Missiles & Space Co., Sunnyvale, Calif., Department of Defense; to the Committee on Government Operations.

115. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the uneconomical use of facilities by the Hawaii National Guard, Department of Defense; to the Committee on Government Operations.

116. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on unnecessary cost to the Government through the leasing of electronic data processing systems by General Electric Co., Missile and Space Division, Valley Forge, Pa., Department of Defense; to the Committee on Government Operations.

117. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on inventions not disclosed and confirmatory royalty-free licenses not obtained under select research and development contracts with certain divisions of Thompson Ramo Wooldrige, Inc., Department of Defense; to the Committee on Government Operations.

118. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on questionable need for stockpiling cordage fibers, Office of Emergency Planning, Executive Office of the President; to the Committee on Government Operations.

119. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on failure to construct District of Columbia Stadium in accordance with the financial plan submitted to the Congress, District of Columbia Armory Board; to the Committee on Government Operations.

120. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on proceeds from sale of land improperly retained under the control of District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency; to the Committee on Government Operations.

121. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on status of findings and recommendations included in prior report on audit of District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency; to the Committee on Government Operations.

122. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on inadequate policies and practices relating to the relocation of families from urban renewal areas, District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency, and Housing and Home Finance Agency; to the Committee on Government Operations.

123. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on unnecessary annual costs of about $1.4 million incurred because of inappropriately assigning flight data processing duties to assistant air traffic controllers, Federal

Aviation Agency; to the Committee on Government Operations.

124. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the excessive costs resulting from delayed purchase of automatic data processing equipment, Federal Aviation Agency; to the Committee on Government Operations.

125. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on inadequate planning resulting in ineffectual utilization of the automatic data processing system at National Flight Data Center, Federal Aviation Agency; to the Committee on Government Operations.

126. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on excessive costs incurred in acquiring a building site and in renting space, Federal Aviation Agency; to the Committee on Government Operations.

127. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on sale of hydroelectric power by the Department of the Interior under section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 at rates not approved by the Federal Power Commission; to the Committee on Government Operations.

128. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on overpayments to vendors by San Francisco regional office, General Services Administration; to the Committee on Government Operations.

129. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on potential savings available through purchasing rather than leasing certain office-copying machines, Federal Supply Service, General Services Administration; to the Committee on Government Operations.

130. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on unnecessary costs resulting from failure to consolidate the leasing of intercity communications lines of certain civil agencies, General Services Administration; to the Committee on Government Operations.

131. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on excessive costs incurred by leasing rather than purchasing certain telewriting equipment, Federal Supply Service, General Services Administration; to the Committee on Government Operations.

132. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on unnecessary costs to the Government for commercial long-distance telephone calls made by Federal agencies in the Dallas region between cities served by the Federal telecommunications system, General Services Administration; to the Committee on Government Operations.

133. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on reduction in costs and acceleration of training of the unemployed available through increasing the number of instructional hours per week, Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, Department of Labor and Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; to the Committee on Government Operations.

134. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on weaknesses in administration of the hospital survey and construction grant program, Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; to the Committee on Government Operations.

135. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on financial assistance provided to ineligible Cuban refugees in the Miami, Fla., area, Welfare Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; to the Committee on Government Operations.

136. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on weaknesses in administration of the student loan program under title II of National Defense Education Act of 1958, Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; to the Committee on Government Operations.

137. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on excessive allocation of costs of certain facilities to the Mill Creek Valley urban renewal project, St. Louis, Mo., Urban Renewal Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency; to the Committee on Government Operations.

138. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on overpayments for rental of automatic data processing machines caused by inaccurate recording of machine use time, Federal Housing Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency; to the Committee on Government Operations.

139. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States; transmitting a report on excessive allocation of costs of certain streets and related facilities to the North Side urban renewal project, Kansas City, Mo., Urban Renewal Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency; to the Committee on Government Operations.

140. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on proposed acquisition of unnecessary and expensive property for developing a low-rent housing project by the St. Louis Housing Authority, Public Housing Administrative, Housing and Home Finance Agency; to the Committee on Government Operations.

141. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on weaknesses in administration of the National Fish Hatchery program, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior; to the Committee on Government Operations.

142. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on revenues due the Government illegally expended for rehabilitation and improvement of concession facilities at Mount Rainier National Park, National Park Service, Department of the Interior; to the Committee on Government Operations.

143. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on unnecessary costs to the Federal Government as a result of supplanting existing employment services by federally financed services, Bureau of Employment Security, Department of Labor; to the Committee on Government Operations.

144. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on violation of statutes governing Federal employment and excess costs incurred under a contract for technical writing and related services awarded by the Goddard Space Flight Center, National Aeronautics and Space Administration; to the Committee on Government Operations.

145. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on uneconomical proposed procurement of a fire alarm system by the Goddard Space Flight Center, National Aeronautics and Space Administration; to the Committee on Government Operations.

146. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on unnecessary expense incurred by producing basically similar motion picture films, National Aeronautics and Space Administration; to the Committee on Government Operations.

147. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on unnecessary per diem payments made to military personnel assigned to temporary duty at Bath, Maine, Department of the Navy; to the Committee on Government Operations.

148. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on failure to consider available assets resulted in overstated needs for Avionics test equipment by the Aviation Supply Office, Philadelphia, Pa., Department of the Navy; to the Committee on Government Operations.

149. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on overcharges included in prices negotiated for change orders issued under fixed-price contracts awarded to Avondale Shipyards, Inc., New Orleans, La., Department of the Navy; to the Committee on Government Operations.

150. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on illegal payments of hazardous-duty submarine pay to military personnel assigned to Submarine Force Command Staffs, Department of the Navy; to the Committee on Government Operations.

151. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on overstaffing of civilian personnel at the Naval Ammunition Depot, Hawthorne, Nev., Department of the Navy; to the Committee on Government Operations.

152. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on unwarranted allowance for material price increases to Newport News Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co., Newport News, Va., for construction of the aircraft carrier U.S.S. *Enterprise,* Department of the Navy; to the Committee on Government Operations.

153. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on further comment of overpricing of the nuclear frigate U.S.S. *Bainbridge* purchased from the Bethlehem Steel Co., Quincy, Mass., Department of the Navy; to the Committee on Government Operations.

154. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on unnecessary costs incurred by not considering transportation expenses as an element of procurement cost, Panama Canal Company; to the Committee on Government Operations.

155. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on inadequate consideration of economies possible through consolidating operations and reorganizing service areas, Post Office Department, to the Committee on Government Operations.

156. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on award of procurement contracts by formal advertising procedures without obtaining effective competition, Post Office Department; to the Committee on Government Operations.

157. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on increased operating costs resulting from conversion of post office branches to independent post offices, Boston postal region, Post Office Department; to the Committee on Government Operations.

158. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on improper issuance of service-disabled veterans life insurance, Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Government Operations.

159. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on inadequate management action results in excessive payments of compensation benefits, Veterans Benefits Office, Washington, D.C., Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Government Operations.

160. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on excessive Federal contributions to veterans' life insurance trust funds because of inadequate administration of extrahazard

provisions of law, Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Government Operations.

161. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting copies of certificates of ascertainment, pursuant to section 6, title 3, United States Code; to the Committee on House Administration.

162. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior transmitting notice of the receipt of a project proposal submitted by the Brown Canal Co., of Graham County, Ariz., in conformance with and pursuant to section 10 of the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

163. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed amendment No. 4 to concession contract No. 14–10–0100–125, authorizing Clarence W. Anderson and Margarette E. Anderson to provide accommodations, facilities, and services for the public at the Boulder Beach site of Lake Mead National Recreation Area; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

164. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the proposed amendment No. 4 to concession contract No. 14–10–0100–272, authorizing the Triangle X Ranch to provide accommodations, facilities, and services for the public within Grand Teton National Park; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

165. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed concession contract under which Hill Wheatley Enterprises, Inc., will be authorized to obtain hot waters from Hot Springs National Park; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

166. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the proposed amendment No. 4 to concession contract No. 14–10–0100–89, authorizing Best's Studio, Inc., to operate a general art and photographic business for the public in Yosemite National Park; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

167. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the proposed amendment No. 3 to concession contract No. I–1p–80, authorizing Crater Lake Lodge, Inc., to continue to provide accommodations, facilities, and services for the public in Crater Lake National Park; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

168. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the proposed amendment No. 5 to concession contract No. I–1p–18251, authorizing the Quapaw Bath House Co. to continue operation of a bathhouse in Hot Springs National Park; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

169. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the proposed amendment No. 3 to concession contract No. 14–10–0100–70, authorizing Evelyn Hill, Inc., to continue to provide facilities and services for the public at the Statute of Liberty National Monument from January 1, 1965, through December 31, 1965; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

170. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the proposed amendment No. 1 to concession contract No. 14–10–0100–563, authorizing Verkamp's to continue to provide facilities and services for the public in Grand Canyon National Park; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

171. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the proposed amendment No. 2 to concession permit No. NPS–WASO–IX–62–6, authorizing Mrs. Viola H. Montgomery to provide facilities and services to the public in Muir Woods National Park; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

172. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the proposed amendment No. 2 to concession contract No. 14–10–0100–300, as previously amended and extended, authorizing the Majestic Hotel Co. to continue to obtain hot waters from Hot Springs National Park; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

173. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the proposed amendment No. 4 to concession contract No. 14–10–0100–473, as previously amended and extended, authorizing the Leo N. Levi Memorial Hospital Association to continue to obtain hot waters from Hot Springs National Park; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

174. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed concession contract authorizing Dr. Rafael Garbayo to provide medical, surgical, and hospital services in Grand Canyon National Park from October 1, 1964, through December 31, 1969; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

175. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the proposed amendment No. 5 to concession contract No. I–1p–18394, as previously amended and extended, authorizing the Ozark Bath House Co. to operate a bathhouse within Hot Springs National Park; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

176. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the proposed amendment No. 3 to concession contract No. 14–10–304–342, as previously amended and extended, authorizing Overton Resort, Inc., to continue to provide accommodations, facilities, and services for the public at Overton Beach in the Lake Mead National Recreation Area; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

177. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the proposed amendment No. 2 to concession contract No. 14–10–0100–299, as previously amended and extended, authorizing the Sisters of Mercy of St. Joseph's Hospital to continue to obtain hot waters from Hot Springs National Park; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

178. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the proposed amendment No. 2 to concession contract No. I–100np–345, as previously amended and extended, authorizing the National Baptist Convention, U.S.A., Inc., to obtain hot waters from Hot Springs National Park, from January 1, 1965, through December 31, 1965; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

179. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the proposed amendment No. 4 to concession contract No. I–100np–348, as previously amended and extended, covering the operation of the golf courses and related facilities administered by the National Capital Region, National Park Service, from January 1, 1965, through December 31, 1965; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

180. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting copies of three orders and supporting documents covering cancellations and adjustments for the fiscal year 1964 against individual Indians or tribes of Indians, pursuant to 47 Stat. 564; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

181. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting information that the Nevada Irrigation District of Grass Valley, Calif., has applied for a loan for the rehabilitation and expansion of its water distribution system, pursuant to section 10 of the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

182. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report relative to reclassification of lands for the Board of Commissioners of the Fort Shaw Irrigation District on the Sun River project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

183. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed amendment to concession contract No. 14–10–0100–373, with Cottonwood Cove Corp., for services, etc., at Searchlight Ferry site in Lake Mead National Recreation Area for year ending December 31, 1965, pursuant to 67 Stat. 271, as amended; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

184. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting information that the contract between the Secretary of Interior and the Malta Irrigation District, approved by the act of June 23, 1952, needs no further remedial legislation, pursuant to section 8(f) (53 Stat. 1187); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

185. A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, transmitting a report the proceedings have been finally concluded with respect to the claim of *The Creek Nation, Plaintiff, The Creek Nation East of the Mississippi, Intervenor* v. *The United States, Defendant,* pursuant to section 21 (60 Stat. 1055; 25 U.S.C. 70t); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

186. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the first annual report of activities of the Mobile Trade Fairs Act for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1964, pursuant to Public Law 87–839; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

187. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a report on the Department's activities to provide aviation war risk insurance as authorized by title XIII of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, pursuant to section 1309 of this act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

188. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a report on the problem of air pollution caused by motor vehicles and measures taken toward its alleviation, pursuant to section 6(b) of the Clean Air Act, Public Law 88–206; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

189. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in the Commission as of August 31, 1964, pursuant to section 5(e) of the Communications Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

190. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in the Commission as of September 30, 1964, pursuant to section 5(e) of the Communications Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

191. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in the Commission as of October 31, 1964, pursuant to section 5(e) of the Communications Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

192. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting a copy of the map, "Major Natural Gas Pipeline, as of June 30, 1964"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

193. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting a copy of "Statistics of Electric Utilities in the United States, 1962, Publicly Owned"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

194. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting a copy of "Statistics for Interstate Natural Gas Pipeline Companies, 1963"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

195. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting a copy of the Federal Power Commission's "National Power Survey" (in two volumes), pursuant to section 202 of the Federal Power Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

196. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting a report showing information on the permits and licenses for hydroelectric projects issued by the Commission during fiscal year ended June 30, 1964, financial statements thereof, and names and compensation of persons employed by the Commission during that period, pursuant to section 4(d) of the Federal Power Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

197. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a report on indemnification for property loss sustained by employees of the Coast and Geodetic Survey during the fiscal year 1964, pursuant to 33 U.S.C. 857a; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

198. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a report of claims paid for property loss to its employees for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2732(f); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

199. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copies of a report listing the tort claims approved for payment in the fiscal year 1964, pursuant to section 2673, title 28, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

200. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a report of all claims paid by the Department during the fiscal year 1964 under part 2 of section 404 of the Federal Tort Claims Act (28 U.S.C. 2673); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

201. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Administration, Department of the Interior, transmitting a report of receipts and expenditures, pursuant to section 15 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1343); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

202. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a report of tort claims paid during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 2673; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

203. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in the cases of certain aliens who have been found admissible to the United States pursuant to section 212 (a) (28) (I) (ii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

204. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in the cases of certain aliens who have been found admissible to the United States pursuant to section 212(a) (28) (I) (ii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

205. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting reports concerning visa petitions which have been approved according beneficiaries of such petitions first preference classification under the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended, pursuant to the provisions of section 204(c); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

206. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in behalf of certain aliens in which the authority contained in section 212(d) (3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act was exercised, pursuant to section 212 (d) (6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

207. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in behalf of certain aliens in which the authority contained in section 212(d) (3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act was exercised, pursuant to section 212 (d) (6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

208. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in the cases of several aliens who have been found admissible to the United States pursuant to section 212(a) (28) (I) (ii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

209. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in behalf of certain aliens in which the authority contained in section 212(d) (3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act was exercised, pursuant to section 212(d) (6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

210. A letter from the Clerk, U.S. Court of Claims, transmitting copies of the court's opinion and findings, *In re Town of Kure Beach, North Carolina* v. *The United States*, Congressional No. 2–60; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

211. A letter from the Clerk, U.S. Court of Claims, transmitting copies of the court's opinion and findings, *In re Drake America Corporation* v. *The United States*, Congressional No. 11–58; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

212. A letter from the Clerk, U.S. Court of Claims, transmitting copies of the court's opinion and findings, *In re Estates of E. L. Armiger, et al., and Marjorie H. Albrecht, et al.* v. *The United States*, Congressional No. 11–60; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

213. A letter from the Clerk, U.S. Court of Claims, transmitting copies of the court's opinion and findings, *In re Jefferson Construction Co.*, v. *The United States*, Congressional No. 1–62; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

214. A letter from the National Corporation Agent, Legion of Valor of the U.S.A., Inc., transmitting a copy of the financial statement for the period from August 1, 1963, to July 31, 1964, pursuant to Public Law 224, 84th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

215. A letter from the executive vice president, the American Society of International Law, transmitting the report of the American Society of International Law covering the period April 1, 1963, to March 31, 1964, pursuant to section 9 of 64 Stat. 869; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

216. A letter from the national adjutant, Military Order of the Purple Heart of the U.S.A., transmitting a report of the order for fiscal year ended July 31, 1964, and a copy of its constitution and bylaws, pursuant to Public Law 88–504; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

217. A letter from the treasurer, American Historical Association, transmitting a copy of the annual audit for the year ended August 31, 1964, pursuant to Public Law 88–504; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

218. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the Ninth Annual Report of the Secretary on Operations of the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries conducted under the Saltonstall-Kennedy Act, pursuant to 68 Stat. 376, as amended; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

219. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a report of the Department's activities to provide war-risk insurance and certain marine and liability insurance for the American public, and upon request for any department or agency of the United States, pursuant to section 1211 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

220. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the quarterly report for period ending September 30, 1964, of the Maritime Administration on the activities and transactions of the Administration under the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

221. A letter from the Librarian of Congress, transmitting a report for calendar year 1964 of scientific and professional positions established in the Library of Congress, pursuant to section 202, title II, Public Law 87–367; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

222. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated July 20, 1964, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of the report on, and a survey of a channel from Choctawhatchee Bay at Point Washington, Fla., to the Gulf of Mexico, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, U.S. Senate, adopted June 1, 1961, and authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved September 3, 1954; to the Committee on Public Works.

223. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated August 17, 1964, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a letter report on the Illinois River, Lemont, Romeo, and Lockport, Ill., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted July 6, 1949; to the Committee on Public Works.

224. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated August 14, 1964, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a letter report on Harvey Canal-Bayou Barataria levee, Louisiana, requested by resolutions of the Committees on Public Works, U.S. Senate and House of Representatives, adopted September 11, 1961, and May 10, 1962. No authorization by Congress is recommended as the desired improvement has been adopted for accomplishment by the Chief of Engineers under the provisions of section 205 of the Flood Control Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on Public Works.

225. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated September 3, 1964, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a letter report on Hampton River and Harbor, N.H., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted July 19, 1956. No authorization by Congress is recommended as the desired improvement has been adopted for accomplishment by the Chief of Engineers under the provisions of section 107 of the 1960 River and Harbor Act; to the Committee on Public Works.

226. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated September 3, 1964, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a letter report on Little Sodus Bay, N.Y., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted May 19, 1960; to the Committee on Public Works.

227. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated September 3, 1964, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of the reports on Green River and tributaries, North Dakota, requested by resolutions of the Committees on

Public Works, U.S. Senate and House of Representatives, adopted March 4, 1960, and June 9, 1960, respectively; to the Committee on Public Works.

228. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated September 3, 1964, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a letter report on Siuslaw River and Bar, Oreg., requested by resolutions of the Committees on Public Works, U.S. Senate and House of Representatives, adopted April 4, 1963, and July 16, 1958; to the Committee on Public Works.

229. A letter from the Secretary of the Army; transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated October 8, 1964, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a letter report on Salters Creek, Newport News, Va., authorized by the River and Harbor Act, approved July 24, 1946; to the Committee on Public Works.

230. A letter from the Secretary of the Army; transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated October 8, 1964, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a letter report on Starlings Creek, Accomack County, Va., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted May 19, 1960. No authorization by Congress is recommended as the desired improvement has been adopted for accomplishment by the Chief of Engineers under the provisions of section 107 of the 1960 River and Harbor Act; to the Committee on Public Works.

231. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated September 28, 1964, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a letter report on Horn Harbor, Mathews County, Va., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted April 9, 1957; to the Committee on Public Works.

232. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated August 14, 1964, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a letter report on Tabbs Creek, Lancaster County, Va., authorized by the River and Harbor Act, approved July 3, 1958; to the Committee on Public Works.

233. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated June 19, 1964, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a letter report on Blinkhorn Creek, Nansemond County, Va., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted August 25, 1960; to the Committee on Public Works.

234. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated October 2, 1964, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a letter report on Bennett Creek, Nansemond River, Va., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted July 20, 1946; to the Committee on Public Works.

235. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report on the use of construction of facilities funds, appropriated to NASA for 1964, to build an addition to the Central Communications Building at the Space Flight Center, Huntsville, Ala., pursuant to section 3 of 77 Stat. 141, 143; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

236. A letter from the Director of Science and Education, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a list of research grants awarded by the Department of Agriculture during fiscal year 1964, pursuant to section 3 of Public Law 85–934; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

237. A letter from the Governor, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, entitled "A bill to amend the Federal Farm Loan Act and the Farm Credit Act of 1933 to provide means for expediting the retirement of Government capital in the Federal intermediate credit banks, including an increase in the debt permitted such banks in relation to their capital and provision for the production credit associations to acquire additional capital stock therein, to provide for allocating certain earnings of such banks and associations to their users, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

238. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report that an adequate soil survey and land classification of the lands in the Farwell unit, Missouri River Basin project, Nebraska, has been completed as a part of the initial investigations required in the formulation of a plan for project development, pursuant to Public Law 83–172; to the Committee on Appropriations.

239. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Properties and Installations), transmitting a report citing the location, nature, and estimated cost of certain facilities proposed to be undertaken for the Naval and Marine Corps Reserves utilizing authorizations contained in section 701 of Public Law 88–390, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2233a(1); to the Committee on Armed Services.

240. A letter from the Director, Office of Emergency Planning, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a copy of "The National Plan for Emergency Prepardness," a guide for nonmilitary preparedness planning at all levels of government; to the Committee on Armed Services.

241. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting the annual report of the Department of Defense relative to its disposition of foreign excess personal property located in areas outside of the United States, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, for the fiscal year 1964, pursuant to section 404(d), title IV, of Public Law 81–152; to the Committee on Government Operations.

242. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on effective actions taken in approving and administering a loan to Vineland and South Jersey Cooperative Egg Auction & Poultry Association, Inc., Area Redevelopment Administration, Department of Commerce; to the Committee on Government Operations.

243. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on potential savings to the Government if bonding of Federal employees is discontinued; to the Committee on Government Operations.

244. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on unnecessary costs incurred in the procurement of selected subsystems and accessories for F–4 and other types of aircraft, Department of the Navy; to the Committee on Government Operations.

245. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on excessive Federal matching of administrative expenses for public assistance programs in the State of New York, Welfare Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; to the Committee on Government Operations.

246. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on failure to recover unpaid royalties retained by Collins Radio Co., Cedar Rapids, Iowa, Department of Defense; to the Committee on Government Operations.

247. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on inadequate management action to collect debts resulting from default of housing loans made in Florida under the loan guaranty program; Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Government Operations.

248. A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting additional copies of State certificates of ascertainment supplementing the December 23, 1964, transmission, pursuant to 3 U.S.C. 6; to the Committee on House Administration.

249. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the eighth annual report on the status of the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, pursuant to section 6 of 70 Stat. 105; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

250. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting a copy of "Steam-Electric Plant Construction Cost and Annual Production Expenses, 1962–63 Supplement"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

251. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Administration, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the annual report as to positions established pursuant to Public Law 80–313 for calendar year 1964, pursuant to section 202 of title II of Public Law 87–367; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

252. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, transmitting a report on a Civil Service Commission position in grade GS–18 which has been established "in addition to the number of positions otherwise authorized by law to be placed in such grade," pursuant to section 503(a) of title V of 84–854; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

253. A letter from the the Board of Directors, Tennessee Valley Authority, transmitting the 31st annual report covering the activities of the TVA during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964; to the Committee on Public Works.

254. A letter from the Chairman, Subversive Activities Control Board, transmitting the 14th annual report of the Subversive Activities Control Board for fiscal year ended June 30, 1964, pursuant to section 12(c) of 64 Stat. 997; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

255. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting two reports concerning claims processed by the Department of the Army during fiscal year 1964, one on claims paid under the Federal Tort Claims Act, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 2673, one on claims settled under the Military Personnel Claims Act, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2732(f); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

256. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a report of a violation of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, consisting of an overobligation, pursuant to section 3679 of 31 U.S.C. 665(i)(2), as amended; to the Committee on Appropriations.

257. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report on the number of officers above the rank of lieutenant commander, or equivalent, entitled to receive flight pay, and the average monthly flight pay authorized by law paid to such officers during the 6-month period ended December 30, 1964, pursuant to Public Law 79–301, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

258. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report of the combined statement of receipts, expenditures and balances of the U.S. Government for fiscal year ended June 30, 1964, pursuant to section 15 of 5 U.S.C. 264 and section 114 of 31 U.S.C. 66b; to the Committee on Government Operations.

259. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on excessive inventory of photographic supplies, Manned Spacecraft Center, National Aeronautics and Space Administration; to the Committee on Government Operations.

260. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed amendment to concession contract No. 14–10–0100–327, authorizing the Signal Mountain Lodge to continue to provide services to the public in Grand Teton National Park for calendar year 1965, pursuant to 67 Stat. 271, as amended; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

261. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report on the Price and San Pitch River Basins, Utah; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

262. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, entitled "A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, with respect to painting, illumination, and dismantlement of radio towers"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

263. A letter from the Clerk, U.S. Court of Claims, transmitting a report on all judgments rendered by the U.S. Court of Claims for the year ended September 30, 1964, the amounts thereof, the parties in whose favor rendered, and a brief synopsis of the nature of the claims, pursuant to section 791(c) title 28, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

264. A letter from the associate executive director, the American National Theatre and Academy, transmitting the 1964 annual report of its activities and financial statement; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

265. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report on the eight scientific and professional positions in the Department authorized by Public Law 80–313, as amended, pursuant to Public Law 87–367; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

266. A letter from the Director of Personnel, Office of the Secretary, U.S. Department of Commerce, transmitting a report of scientific and professional positions established under the authority contained in 72 Stat. 213a, pursuant to 72 Stat. 214; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

267. A letter from the Commissioner, Social Security Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a report of the Advisory Council of Social Security entitled "The Status of the Social Security Program and Recommendations for its Improvement," pursuant to section 116 of the Social Security Amendments of 1956; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

268. A letter from the Chairman, the Renegotiation Board, transmitting the ninth annual report of the Renegotiation Board for fiscal year ended June 30, 1964, pursuant to section 114 of Public Law 84–870; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

The following reports of committees on public bills and resolutions were submitted subsequent to the adjournment of the 88th Congress, 2d session:

Mr. ELLIOTT: Select Committee on Government Research. Report on Federal facilities for research and development; without amendment (Rept. No. 1931). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Select Committee on Government Research. Report on documentation and dissemination of research and development results; without amendment (Rept. No. 1932). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Select Committee on Government Research. Report on Federal student assistance in higher education; without amendment (Rept. No. 1933). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. EVINS: Select Committee on Small Business. Report on Small Business Investment Program of the Small Business Administration; without amendment (Rept. No. 1934). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. EVINS: Select Committee on Small Business. Report on organization and operation of the Small Business Administration; without amendment (Rept. No. 1935). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. EVINS: Select Committee on Small Business. Report on the impact upon small business on U.S. lumber standards; without amendment (Rept. No. 1936). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. EVINS: Select Committee on Small Business. Report on Government small business procurement practices and programs; without amendment (Rept. No. 1937). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Select Committee on Government Research. Report pertaining to impact of Federal research and development programs; without amendment (Rept. No. 1938). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Select Committee on Government Research. Report pertaining to interagency coordination in research and development; without amendment (Rept. No. 1939). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of Union.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Select Committee on Government Research. Report pertaining to Statistical Review of Research and Development; without amendment (Rept. No. 1940). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Select Committee on Government Research. Report pertaining to national goals and policies; without amendment (Rept. No. 1941). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Select Committee on Government Research. Report pertaining to contract policies and procedures for research and development; without amendment (Rept. No. 1942). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. EVINS: Select Committee on Small Business. Report on the impact upon small business of dual distribution and related vertical integration; without amendment (Rept. No. 1943). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. EVINS: Select Committee on Small Business. Final report of the Select Committee on Small Business; without amendment (Rept. No. 1944). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon: Select Committee on the Welfare and Education of Congressional Pages. Report on study of the general welfare and education of congressional pages; without amendment (Rept. No. 1945). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee: Special Committee To Investigate Campaign Expenditures. Report on article in Pageant magazine referring to certain Members of Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 1946). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. Report on investigation and study of urban renewal redevelopment programs and parking and one-way street planning; without amendment (Rept. No. 1947). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KING of California:

H.R. 1. A bill to provide a hospital insurance program for the aged under social security, to amend the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system to increase benefits, improve the actuarial status of the disability insurance trust fund, and extend coverage, to amend the Social Security Act to provide additional Federal financial participation in the Federal-State public assistance program and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 2. A bill to protect the public health and safety by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to establish special controls for depressant and stimulant drugs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 3. A bill to provide for a program of Federal assistance to States for elementary and secondary education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FALLON:

H.R. 4. A bill to provide public works and economic development programs and the planning and coordination needed to assist in the development of the Appalachian region; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SLACK:

H.R. 5. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Coal River National Recreation Demonstration Area, in the State of West Virginia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H.R. 6. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies," approved July 2, 1890; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 7. A bill to repeal the retailers' excise taxes on toilet preparations, jewelry and related items, ladies' handbags, luggage, and the like, and furs and fur-trimmed coats; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN:

H.R. 8. A bill to amend section 2(a) of the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended, to provide for the regulation of futures trading in coffee and sugar; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 9. A bill to provide certain increases in annuities payable from the civil service retirement and disability fund, to improve the financing of the civil service retirement system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 10. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit pension and profit-sharing plans to provide contributions or benefits on a nondiscriminatory basis for certain self-employed individuals without special limitations on the amount of contributions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 11. A bill to make the Federal Reserve System responsive to the best interests of the people of the United States and to improve the coordination of monetary, fiscal, and economic policy; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 12. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CAREY:

H.R. 13. A bill to authorize the Commissioner of Education to make available to students in elementary and secondary schools textbooks selected by such schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 14. A bill to authorize the establishment of Federal mutual savings banks; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 15. A bill for the establishment of a Commission on Science and Technology; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. ASPINALL (by request):

H.R. 16. A bill to amend sections 2275 and 2276 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, with respect to the selection of mineral lands by States in certain instances in lieu of lands granted to them but lost before title could pass; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HULL:

H.R. 17. A bill to authorize the erection of a memorial in the District of Columbia to Gen. John J. Pershing; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 18. A bill to amend the Copyright Act by repealing the jukebox exemption, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 19. A bill to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide further for the prevention of accidents in coal mines; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 20. A bill to amend paragraph c(5) of section 14, paragraph (a)(3) of section 656, and section 661 of the Bankruptcy Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOW:

H.R. 21. A bill to provide for the medical and hospital care of the aged through a system of voluntary health insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 22. A bill to provide for the medical and hospital care of the aged through a system of voluntary health insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 23. A bill to authorized the Secretary of the Interior to initiate a program for the conservation, development, and enhancement of the Nation's anadromous fish in cooperation with the several States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. KEITH:

H.R. 24. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to initiate a program for the conservation, development, and enhancement of the Nation's anadromous fish in cooperation with the several States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.R. 25. A bill to amend the act of July 26, 1954, to establish a National Advisory Council on Education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 26. A bill to provide Federal assistance for projects in shared-time elementary and secondary education programs in science, mathematics, reading, modern foreign languages, physical education, or vocational education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 27. A bill to provide Federal assistance for faculty exchange programs of institutions of higher education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GURNEY:

H.R. 28. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the State of Florida; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MATTHEWS:

H.R. 29. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the State of Florida; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 30. A bill to provide for participation of the United States in the inter-American cultural and trade center in Dade County, Fla., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

H.R. 31. A bill to prevent the pollution of the San Francisco Bay by any interceptor drain from the service area of any reclamation project; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California:

H.R. 32. A bill to prevent the pollution of the San Francisco Bay by any interceptor drain from the service area of any reclamation project; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LEGGETT:

H.R. 33. A bill to prevent the pollution of the San Francisco Bay by any interceptor drain from the service area of any reclamation project; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H.R. 34. A bill to prevent the pollution of the San Francisco Bay by any interceptor drain from the service area of any reclamation project; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. YOUNGER:

H.R. 35. A bill to prevent the pollution of the San Francisco Bay by any interceptor drain from the service area of any reclamation project; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN:

H.R. 36. A bill to prevent the pollution of the San Francisco Bay by any interceptor drain from the service area of any reclamation project; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. McCLORY:

H.R. 37. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

H.R. 38. A bill to provide that the National Bureau of Standards shall conduct a program of investigation, research, and survey to determine the practicability of the adoption by the United States of the metric system of weights and measures; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

H.R. 39. A bill to establish a third U.S. mint to be located in Lake or Cook County, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 40. A bill to require that each bank insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation be audited triennially, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 41. A bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act to provide for Federal Reserve support of Government bonds when market yields equal or exceed 4¼ percent; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 42. A bill to require the payment of interest on certain funds of the United States held on deposit in commercial banks, to provide for reimbursement of commercial banks for services performed for the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 43. A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act and title IV of the National Housing Act (relating to the insurance of savings and loan accounts) with respect to the maximum amount of insurance which may be provided thereunder; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 44. A bill to amend the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956, and the Federal Deposit Insurance Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 45. A bill to amend the Inter-American Development Bank Act to authorize the United States to participate in an increase in the resources of the Fund for Special Operations in the Inter-American Development Bank; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 46. A bill to amend the Clayton Act so as to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies by providing that violations of the Robinson-Patman Act shall constitute violations of the antitrust laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 47. A bill relating to certain discriminatory pricing practices affecting commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 48. A bill to amend the Clayton Act, as amended, to strengthen our competitive enterprise system by providing for competitive acts, practices, and methods of competition and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 49. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to provide for the issuance of temporary cease and desist orders to prevent certain acts and practices pending completion of Federal Trade Commission proceedings; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROUSH:

H.R. 50. A bill authorizing construction of a deep-draft harbor by the State of Indiana on the shore of Lake Michigan in the vicinity of Burns Waterway, and assumption by the Federal Government of an appropriate part of the cost of construction thereof; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 51. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H.R. 52. A bill to provide uniform policies with respect to recreation and fish and wildlife benefits and costs of Federal multiple-purpose water resource projects, and to provide the Secretary of the Interior with authority for recreation development of projects under his control; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.R. 53. A bill to provide that U.S. payments to the United Nations shall not be used for programs contrary to the policies of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 54. A bill to encourage the States to hold preferential primary elections for the nomination of candidates for the office of President, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 55. A bill to provide that dependent parents may be covered by a health benefit plan under the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 56. A bill to designate the authorized Cross-Florida Barge Canal as the John F. Kennedy Canal; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 57. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to prohibit the award of contracts by the United States to certain persons; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 58. A bill to provide for appeal from certain actions taken in connection with the granting of incentive awards and step increases for Government employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 59. A bill to modify the St. Johns River, Fla., project to provide for certain channel improvements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H.R. 60. A bill to amend the act providing books for the adult blind so as to make books also available to quadriplegics and the near blind; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 61. A bill to amend the joint resolution of June 15, 1934, to enlarge the functions of the U.S. Territorial Expansion Memorial Commission to provide for the encouragement of public appreciation of the inspiring heritage given to our country by the explorers and developers of the American West; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 62. A bill to grant officers and employees subject to the Civil Service Act of January 16, 1883, the opportunity to examine and reply to certain evaluations of their promotion qualifications, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 63. A bill to terminate the national emergency proclaimed by the President on December 16, 1950; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 64. A bill to amend the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 to provide additional choice of health benefits plans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DE LA GARZA:

H.R. 65. A bill to provide for the establishment of a veterans' hospital in south Texas; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DOWDY:

H.R. 66. A bill to authorize the Board of Parole of the District of Columbia to discharge a parolee from supervision prior to the expiration of the maximum term or terms for which he was sentenced; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 67. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Charitable Solicitation Act to require certain findings before the issuance of a solicitation permit thereunder, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H.R. 68. A bill to amend section 3 of chapter 324 of the act of June 11, 1946 (60 Stat. 238), to clarify and protect the right of the public to information; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 69. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code to provide for a National Highway Academy; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 70. A bill to provide for the conveyance of approximately 80 acres of land to the heirs of Adam Jones, Creek Indian not enrolled; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 71. A bill to amend the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act to provide for the return to the stockpile of materials withdrawn but not used for defense purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 72. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide that the penalties for homicide prescribed in such title shall apply to any person who kills the President of the United States, or the head of any executive department; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 73. A bill providing for the distribution and viewing within the United States of the film "Years of Lightning, Day of Drums" prepared by the U.S. Information Agency on the late President Kennedy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FULTON of Tennessee:

H.R. 74. A bill to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces during the induction period; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 75. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to permit for 1 year, the granting of national service life insurance to certain veterans heretofore eligible for such insurance; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 76. A bill to establish daylight saving time uniformly throughout the U.S. time zones each year, to make such time the only legal time during the period it is in effect, and to provide additional time zones for the States of Alaska and Hawaii; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 77. A bill to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and section 705(b) of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 and to amend the first proviso of section 8(a)(3) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FULTON of Tennessee:

H.R. 78. A bill to amend the Administrative Procedure Act with respect to the compensation of hearing examiners and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 79. A bill changing Memorial Day to the last Monday of May; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 80. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide that the penalties for homicide prescribed in such title shall apply to any person who kills the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, or the head of any executive department; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 81. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, to provide for the recomputation of annuities of retired employees who elected reduced annuities at the time of retirement in order to provide survivor annuities for their spouses; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 82. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil service retirement and disability fund; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 83. A bill to amend the National Housing Act to provide for the performance by the Federal Housing Administration of certain additional functions with respect to housing loans; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 84. A bill to amend section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959 and section 231 of the National Housing Act to improve and render more effective the Federal direct loan and mortgage insurance programs providing assistance to housing for the elderly; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H.R. 85. A bill to increase, in the case of children who are attending school, from 18 to 21 years, the age until which child's insurance benefits may be received under title II of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 86. A bill to repeal price support subsidies and direct the sale of Commodity Credit Corporation inventory; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LINDSAY.

H.R. 87. A bill to provide for declaratory judgment procedures in cases involving refusal of witnesses to testify or produce papers before congressional committees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 88. A bill to amend section 104 of the Revised Statutes, with respect to contempt citations in the case of witnesses before congressional committees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 89. A bill to authorize establishment of the Tocks Island National Recreation Area in the States of Pennsylvania and New Jersey, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 90. A bill to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937 to eliminate the provision which presently limits to 15 percent the portion of the total authorized annual contributions contracts which may be entered into for low-rent public housing units in any one State; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 91. A bill to amend title I of the Housing Act of 1949 to provide more equitable procedures for the relocation of persons displaced from their homes or places of business by urban renewal projects, to increase the amount of the relocation payments authorized to be made to such persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 92. A bill to create a Federal Limited Profit Mortgage Corporation to assist in the provision of housing for moderate-income families and for elderly persons; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 93. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 94. A bill to amend title 17 of the United States Code, "Copyrights," to bar actions for infringement of copyright in certain instances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 95. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1964 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 96. A bill to establish certain qualifications for election to the offices of President and Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H.R. 97. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act with respect to annuities of Panama Canal ship pilots; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 98. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, as amended, so as to provide for an additional unit of life insurance; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 99. A bill to modify the decrease in group life insurance at age 65 or after retirement; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 100. A bill to amend provisions relative to overtime in the Postal Field Service Compensation Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 101. A bill to amend provisions relative to compensatory time in the Postal Field Service Compensation Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 102. A bill to provide for the procurement of judge advocates and law specialist officers for the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Coast Guard, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 103. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to encourage competition in procurement by the armed services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 104. A bill to provide that the next cruiser commissioned in the U.S. Navy shall be named the *Brooklyn*; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 105. A bill to withhold Federal aid from National Guard organizations which practice discrimination or segregation on account of race, color, or creed; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 106. A bill to amend section 2310 of title 10 of the United States Code, relating to determinations and decisions as to procurement; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 107. A bill to establish a Federal Banking Commission to administer all Federal laws relating to the examination and supervision of banks; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 108. A bill to provide for an increase in the maximum amount of insurance coverage for bank deposits and savings and loan accounts, to protect further the safety and liquidity of insured institutions, to strengthen safeguards against conflicts of interest, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 109. A bill to amend the National Bank Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 110. A bill to require that 90 percent of the net earnings of Federal Reserve banks be paid into the Treasury, and that the financial transactions of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the Federal Reserve banks be audited by the General Accounting Office; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 111. A bill to assist in the promotion of economic stabilization by requiring the disclosure of finance charges in connection with extensions of credit; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 112. A bill to prohibit banks from performing certain nonbanking services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 113. A bill to amend section 213 of the National Housing Act to place the Federal Housing Administration cooperative housing mortgage insurance program on a mutual basis; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 114. A bill to amend the National Housing Act to fix the premium for the insurance of cooperative housing mortgages at the minimum permissible level (one-fourth of 1 percent per annum); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 115. A bill to amend the Housing Act of 1949 to provide that the full cost of opening, widening, and improving streets along the boundary of an urban renewal project shall be includible as a part of the local grant-in-aid for such project; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 116. A bill to amend section 608 of the National Housing Act to prevent the charging of excessive rents, resulting from unduly high estimates of costs, in the case of property covered by a mortgage insured under such section; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 117. A bill to prohibit banks from engaging in the business of personal property leasing; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 118. A bill to amend the Bank Holding Company Act to prohibit the approval by the Federal Reserve Board of bank holding company operations unauthorized by State law or disapproved by State authorities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 119. A bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act to provide that the terms of office of the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System shall expire upon the expiration of the term of office of the President; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 120. A bill to provide that no member of the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation shall hold any other public office or position and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 121. A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act and title IV of the National Housing Act to prohibit banks and savings and loan associations from employing inducements other than the payment of interest or dividends to obtain deposits and similar funds from the public; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 122. A bill to authorize the Comptroller of the Currency to establish reasonable maximum service charges which may be levied on dormant accounts by national banks; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 123. A bill to require an annual audit of each bank insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 124. A bill to amend section 5155 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, relating to branches of national banks; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 125. A bill to amend section 6 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to provide for the holding of public hearings in connection with the issuance of certain certificates and the making of certain findings and determinations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 126. A bill to protect the integrity and independence of national banks by strengthening the laws relating to ownership of stock in such banks; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 127. A bill to amend the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 128. A bill to establish the Federal Deposit and Savings Insurance Board to manage the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 129. A bill to amend the Home Owners Loan Act of 1933 to provide that certain proceedings shall be conducted in accordance with the Administrative Procedure Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 130. A bill to amend section 9 of the Federal Reserve Act, section 18(d) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act, section 5155 of the Revised Statutes, and section 5 of the Home Owners Loan Act of 1933; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. NATCHER:

H.R. 131. A bill to extend certain benefits to persons who served in the Armed Forces of the United States in Mexico or on its borders during the period beginning May 9, 1916, and ending April 6, 1917, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 132. A bill to provide public works and economic development programs and the planning and coordination needed to assist in the development of the Appalachian region; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. POFF:

H.R. 133. A bill to provide a tax incentive for the employment of older workers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 134. A bill to establish certain qualifications for persons appointed to the Supreme Court of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 135. A bill to provide for the loss of U.S. citizenship by persons convicted for evading military service; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 136. A bill to amend sections 1, 17a, 57j, 64a(5), 67(b), 67c, and 70c of the Bankruptcy Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 137. A bill to amend section 5 of the Administrative Procedure Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 138. A bill to establish rules of interpretation governing questions of the effect of acts of Congress on State laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 139. A bill to provide for the striking of medals to commemorate the 1,000th anniversary of the founding of Poland; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 140. A bill to provide for the greater protection of the President and the Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 141. A bill to amend chapter 57 of title 39, United States Code, so as to authorize the free use of the mails in making reports required by law of certain payments to others; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. REID of Illinois:

H.R. 142. A bill to provide for the right of persons to be represented by attorneys in matters before Federal agencies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 143. A bill to govern further development of the national cemetery system; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GROSS:

H.R. 144. A bill to provide that Federal expenditures shall not exceed Federal revenues, except in time of war or grave national emergency declared by the Congress, and to provide for systematic reduction of the public debt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 145. A bill to provide for fair representation of all areas of the United States in the House of Representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 146. A bill to provide public works and economic development programs and the planning and coordination needed to assist in the development of the Appalachian region; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SMITH of Iowa:

H.R. 147. A bill to prohibit nepotism in Government employment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN:

H.R. 148. A bill to extend and improve the laws regulating companies which own savings and loan institutions insured by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 149. A bill to amend the Meat Inspection Act to extend its coverage in certain cases; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ROUDEBUSH:

H.R. 150. A bill to amend section 1498 of title 28, United States Code, to authorize the use or manufacture, in certain cases, by or for the United States of any invention described in and covered by a patent of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 151. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, to establish the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, to provide grants for research and development, to increase grants for construction of municipal sewage treatment works, to authorize the issuance of regulations to aid in preventing, controlling, and abating pollution of interstate waters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 152. A bill to specify the number of hospital beds that the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs must maintain and operate at the veterans' hospital, East Orange, N.J.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 153. A bill to provide for the establishment under the National Science Foundation, of a National Science Academy; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN:

H.R. 154. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction for income tax purposes of certain expenses incurred by the taxpayer for the education of a dependent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 155. A bill to assist in the promotion of economic stabilization by requiring the disclosure of finance charges in connection with extensions of credit; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 156. A bill to require the inspection of certain towing vessels; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 157. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the provisions which reduce the old-age or wife's insurance benefits of a woman becoming entitled to such benefits before she attains age 65; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POOL:

H.R. 158. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to permit the recovery by the Government of amounts due the Government in the settlement of claims under such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. POFF:

H.R. 159. A bill to repeal subsection (d) of section 2388 of title 18 of the United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H.R. 160. A bill authorizing the establishment of the Wolf House National Historic Site, in the State of Arkansas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 161. A bill to promote greater equity in the administration of the pay systems of employees in the Veterans' Administration under prevailing rate schedules by providing for certain adjustments in the compensation of such employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:

H.R. 162. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Columbus Bend project, Texas; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 163. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Palmetto Bend reclamation project, Texas, a division of the Texas basins project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. UTT:

H.R. 164. A bill to rescind and revoke membership of the United States in the United Nations and the specialized agencies thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin:

H.R. 165. A bill to amend section 501 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that active military service on the Mexican border before World War I by persons who performed active service during World War I shall be included in determining eligibility of World War I veterans, their widows, and children for pension; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 166. A bill to amend section 634 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to require annual reports to the Congress concerning refund claims filed by the United States with foreign countries in connection with the foreign assistance program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 167. A bill to amend the Rederal Reserve Act in order to enable the Federal Reserve banks to extend credit to member banks and others in accordance with current economic conditions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 168. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide increases in the rates of disability compensation to reflect the increase in the cost of living from the year 1933; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H.R. 169. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide an increase of $75 per month in the rate of compensation payable to totally disabled veterans and proportionate increases in the compensation payable to other disabled veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 170. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide increases in the rates of disability compensation approximating 8 percent; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 171. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide increases in rates of disability compensation; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 172. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide increases in the rates of disability compensation to reflect the increase in the cost of living from October 1, 1962; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 173. A bill to amend chapter 11 of title 38, United States Code, to provide additional disability compensation for seriously disabled veterans as partial compensation for the reduction in their life expectancy because of their disabilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 174. A bill to amend section 314(k) of title 38, United States Code, to provide additional compensation to veterans whose lifespan has been reduced 5 or more years by serious service-connected disabilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 175. A bill to amend chapter 11 of title 38, United States Code, to provide for payment to veterans suffering from seriously disabling service-connected disabilities a lump-sum settlement as compensation for the reduction in their expected lifespan attributable to such disabilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H.R. 176. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide increases in rates of additional compensation on account of dependents payable to veterans rated as 50 percent or more disabled; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 177. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide that veterans having a service-connected disability rated at 40 percent or more shall be entitled to additional compensation for dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 178. A bill to amend section 314(k) of title 38, United States Code, to authorize payment of statutory awards for each anatomical loss or loss of use specified therein; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H.R. 179. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide for additional compensation for veterans who have suffered the loss or complete loss of use of a kidney; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 180. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide for additional compensation for veterans who have suffered the loss of a lung; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 181. A bill to amend section 312 of title 38, United States Code, to provide a presumption of service connection in the case of veterans suffering from amyotrophic lateral sclerosis developing a 10-percent degree of disability within 7 years from the date of discharge or release; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 182. A bill to amend section 312 of title 38, United States Code, by providing a 2-year presumptive period of service connection for malignant tumors (cancer) which develop within 2 years from the date of separation from active service; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H.R. 183. A bill to amend section 312 of title 38, United States Code, by providing a 2-year presumptive period of service connection for the psychoses which develop within 2 years from the date of separation from active service; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 184. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to assist veterans with a permanent and total service-connected disability due to the loss or loss of use of one upper and one lower extremity to acquire specially adapted housing; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 185. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide that heart failure suffered by certain veterans who have lost one or both lower extremities shall be considered service connected; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 186. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide that the Veterans' Administration shall provide complete medical services for any veteran totally disabled from a service-connected disability; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 187. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide an annual clothing allowance to certain veterans who, because of a service-connected disability, wear a prosthetic appliance or appliances which tends to wear out or tear their clothing; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 188. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide that certain special hand or foot controls for automobiles shall be considered to be prosthetic appliances; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 189. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to increase the income limitations applicable to parents of deceased veterans who are eligible to receive dependency and indemnity compensation; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H.R. 190. A bill to amend chapter 73 of title 38, United States Code, to make a career in the Department of Medicine and Surgery more attractive; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 191. A bill to amend section 4113 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall make necessary arrangements for sale of homes of employees of the Department of Medicine and Surgery who are transferred by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 192. A bill to amend section 5004 of title 38 of the United States Code to authorize the use of quarters on Veterans' Administration reservations by employees of the Department of Medicine and Surgery; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 193. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to permit members of the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration to be granted leave to pursue certain courses of study; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 194. A bill to amend chapter 73 of title 38 of the United States Code to authorize certain members of the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration to attend one professional meeting a year at Government expense; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 195. A bill to amend section 4113 of title 38 of the United States Code to provide that the Government shall pay certain costs involved in the move of an employee of the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration from one official station in the United States to another; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 196. A bill to amend chapter 73 of title 38, United States Code, to credit physicians and dentists in the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration with certain service for retirement purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 197. A bill to amend chapter 73 of title 38 of the United States Code to authorize the Chief Medical Director of the Veterans' Administration to enter into contracts with medical schools and clinics for scarce technical services; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 198. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to permit the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to correct certain physical defects of veterans during the course of their hospitalization in a Veterans' Administration facility; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 199. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to establish the number of hospital beds and domiciliary beds to be operated in facilities of the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H.R. 200. A bill to amend section 622, title 38, United States Code, to write into law what is already required in administrative regulation for a declaration of assets and liabilities in connection with an applicant's statement of inability to defray the expenses of necessary non-service-connected hospital or domiciliary care; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 201. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide for certain contracts between the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs and schools of medicine; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 202. A bill to limit the authority of the Veterans' Administration and the Bureau of the Budget with respect to new construction or alteration of veterans' hospitals and the closing of such hospitals; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H.R. 203. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to set aside funds for research into spinal cord injuries and diseases; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 204. A bill to amend section 101 of title 38 of the United States Code to permit the children of certain veterans to receive education or training until attaining the age of 23; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 205. A bill to amend chapter 35 of title 38 of the United States Code in order to increase the educational assistance allowances payable under the war orphans' educational assistance program; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 206. A bill to provide a realistic cost-of-living increase in rates of subsistence allowances paid to disabled veterans pursuing vocational rehabilitation training and to the sons and daughters of deceased or permanently and totally disabled veterans pursuing a program of education under the war orphans' educational assistance program; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H.R. 207. A bill to amend section 801 of title 38 of the United States Code in order to provide assistance in acquiring specially adapted housing for certain veterans afflicted with multiple sclerosis who have also suffered the loss or loss of use of a lower extremity; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 208. A bill to amend chapter 31 of title 38, United States Code, to extend to all totally disabled veterans the same liberalization of time limits for pursuing vocational rehabilitation training as was authorized for blinded veterans by Public Law 87-591, and to clarify the language of the law relating to the limiting of periods for pursuing such training; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 209. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide education and training for veterans of service after January 31, 1955, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H.R. 210. A bill to clarify the application of certain provisions of section 110 of title 38 of the United States Code; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 211. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish a Court of Veterans' Appeals and to prescribe its jurisdiction and functions; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 212. A bill to amend section 4001 of title 38, United States Code, to prescribe qualifications for members of the Board of Veterans' Appeals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H.R. 213. A bill to amend section 107 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that the benefits authorized therein shall be at a rate in pesos as is equivalent to $0.50 for each dollar authorized and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 214. A bill to repeal chapter 43 of title 38, United States Code; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H.R. 215. A bill to amend section 101(18) of title 38, United States Code, to permit the furnishing of benefits to certain individuals conditionally discharged or released from active military, naval, or air service; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 216. A bill to transfer control of Pershing Hall to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs in order that such building may be preserved as a memorial to General of the Armies of the United States John J. Pershing while being utilized in the best interests of the United States; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H.R. 217. A bill to liberalize the provisions of title 38, United States Code, relating to automobiles for disabled veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 218. A bill to amend section 721 and section 757 of title 38, United States Code, to limit review of insurance extrahazards determinations by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to 2 years from the date of original decision; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 219. A bill to amend section 725 of title 38 of the United States Code to permit veterans having a service-connected disability to obtain national service life insurance in amounts up to $20,000; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 220. A bill to amend chapter 19 of title 38 of the United States Code to permit the inclusion of provisions providing for double indemnity for accidental death in national service life insurance policies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 221. A bill to amend section 3203 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that veterans entitled to pension who are being maintained in State homes shall receive pension at the rate of $30 per month; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 222. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide that pension for non-service-connected disability or death, or for age, shall not be paid under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration to any alien who is not a resident of the United States; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H.R. 223. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to bring certain pensioners under the provisions of chapter 15 of that title (as now in effect) if it would be in their interest to do so; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 224. A bill to amend chapter 61 of title 38 of the United States Code in order to prohibit abuses in the solicitation of contributions in the name of veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H.R. 225. A bill to amend chapter 1 of title 38, United States Code, and incorporate therein specific statutory authority for the Presidential memorial certificate program; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 226. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to make the children of certain veterans having a service-connected disability rated at not less than 50 percent eligible for benefits under the war orphans educational assistance program; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 227. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to entitle the children of certain veterans who served in the Armed Forces prior to September 16, 1940, to benefit under the war orphans educational assistance program; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 228. A bill to amend section 314(k) of title 38, United States Code, to authorize payment of statutory awards for each anatomical loss or loss of use specified therein; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 229. A bill to amend section 1901(a) of title 38, United States Code, to make certain veterans of World War I eligible for the automobile assistance allowance provided for certain veterans of World War II and the Korean conflict; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 230. A bill to amend section 311 of title 38, United States Code, so as to provide a stronger presumption of soundness under certain conditions in wartime cases; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 231. A bill to amend sections 210(c) and 355 of title 38, United States Code, to rescind as of January 1, 1957, the changes made in the "Veterans' Administration Schedule for Rating Disabilities," 1945 edition, and the extensions thereto, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 232. A bill to amend section 715 of title 38, United States Code, to permit veterans with service-connected disabilities less than total who have $5 per $1,000 total disability income provisions included in their national service life insurance policies to obtain the $10 per $1,000 total disability income protection; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 233. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code so as to conform the method of computing the income of parents of certain veterans under that title; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 234. A bill to amend section 106 of title 38 of the United States Code to provide that individuals suffering the loss or loss of use of an extremity resulting from an injury incurred in line of duty during certain service shall be entitled to certain veterans' benefits; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 235. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to repeal the provisions relating to education of Korean conflict veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. **ANDERSON** of Illinois:

H.R. 236. A bill to amend section 212(e) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. **ANDREWS** of North Dakota:

H.R. 237. A bill to make certain provisions in connection with the construction of the Garrison diversion unit, Missouri River Basin project, by the Secretary of the Interior; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. **BECKWORTH**:

H.R. 238. A bill to amend chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, to liberalize the basis on which pension is payable by providing that public or private retirement payments shall not be counted as income and that the income of the spouse shall be disregarded in the determination of annual income of a veteran; to eliminate the "net worth" eligibility test; and to repeal the requirement of reduction of pension during hospitalization for veterans with dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 239. A bill to amend section 610 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that certain veterans shall be furnished hospital care without regard to administrative limitations; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 240. A bill to amend section 402 of the Veterans' Benefits Act of 1957 with respect to determinations of permanent and total disability; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 241. A bill to amend section 510 of the Veterans' Benefits Act of 1957 to authorize the granting of hospital care to veterans in need thereof; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 242. A bill to extend the apportionment requirement in the Civil Service Act of January 16, 1883, to temporary summer employment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 243. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to increase in certain cases the minimum acreage allotment for cotton; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 244. A bill to amend section 8 of title 13 of the United States Code to except certain persons from the requirement of paying fees for certain census data; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 245. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to provide minimum acreage allotments for recognized peanut farmers; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 246. A bill to establish certain requirements with respect to notice and examinations in connection with appointments to positions in the competitive civil service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 247. A bill to amend title 37 of the United States Code to provide hazardous duty pay for members of the uniformed services on duty in intimate contact with persons afflicted with epidemic hemorrhagic fever; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 248. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for the payment of child's insurance benefits to a disabled child over 18, if otherwise qualified, without regard to whether the disability began before or after the child attained such age; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 249. A bill to impose import limitations on certain meat and meat products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 250. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the provisions which presently prevent a woman from simultaneously receiving both a full old-age or disability insurance benefit and a full wife's or widow's insurance benefit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 251. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to extend from 18 to 22 the age beyond which (except in cases of disability) child's insurance benefits are not payable; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 252. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to authorize and facilitate the deduction from gross income by teachers of the expenses of education (including certain travel) undertaken by them, and to provide a uniform method of proving entitlement to such deduction; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 253. A bill to provide for the payment of certain amounts and restoration of employment benefits to certain Government officers and employees improperly deprived thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 254. A bill to permit farmers who conduct family-size farm operations and ranchers who conduct family-size ranch operations to grow without penalty grain to feed their poultry and livestock; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 255. A bill to provide for Federal assistance, on a dollar-matching basis, to State and local governments and agencies thereof for planning, constructing, operating, and maintaining water conservation and water storage projects; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 256. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the provisions which presently prevent an individual from simultaneously receiving both a full old-age or disability insurance benefit and a full widow's, widower's, or mother's insurance benefit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 257. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that the unmarried child of an insured individual, after attaining age 18, may continue to receive child's insurance benefits until he attains age 21 if he is a full-time student; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 258. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 259. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase from $1,200 to $3,600 the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 260. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that an individual under a total disability for 2 months shall be considered "disabled" for benefit and freeze purposes even though the disability is not permanent, and to permit the payment of disability insurance benefits to an individual from the beginning of his disability; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 261. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that monthly benefits based on age may be paid at age 55 rather than only at age 62 (subject to the existing actuarial reduction in the amount of such benefits in certain cases); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 262. A bill to provide for Federal assistance, on a dollar-matching basis, to State and local governments and agencies thereof and to certain individuals for planning, construction, operating, and maintaining water conservation and water storage projects; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 263. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to reduce from 62 to 55 the age at which a woman otherwise qualified may become entitled to widow's insurance benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 264. A bill to amend sections 162 and 274 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to the deductibility of certain business entertainment, etc., expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 265. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that interest on series E U.S. savings bonds shall be excluded from gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. **BENNETT**:

H.R. 266. A bill to amend sections 404 and 406 of title 37, United States Code, relating to travel and transportation allowances of certain members of the uniformed services who are retired, discharged, or released from active duty; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 267. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to establish a minimum wage rate applicable to migrant agricultural workers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 268. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that the remarriage of a widow, widower, or parent shall not prevent the payment of benefits if such remarriage is annulled; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 269. A bill to authorize that the Virgin Islands be incorporated in the State of Florida, provided the incorporation is approved by free elections in the Virgin Islands and in Florida; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 270. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to accept for administration under the act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535), as amended and supplemented, donations of encumbered lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 271. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide deductions for persons engaged in trade or business who provide new jobs for the skilled and for all persons who provide new jobs for domestics and the unskilled; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 272. A bill to provide for the establishment of a U.S. Armed Forces Medical School, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 273. A bill to amend chapter 47 (Uniform Code of Military Justice) of title 10, United States Code, by creating single-officer general and special courts-martial, providing for law officers on special courts-martial, affording accused persons an opportunity to be represented in certain special court-martial proceedings by counsel having the qualifications of defense counsel detailed for general courts-martial, providing for certain pretrial proceedings and other procedural changes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 274. A bill to facilitate the obtaining of employment by older workers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 275. A bill to provide that the United States shall reimburse the States for that portion of the construction cost of certain schools which is attributable to Negroes and Indians; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 276. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Institute to be a graduate school for advanced studies in American Government for selected individuals of outstanding ability to pursue advanced studies in American political theory, methods, and institutions in preparation for public service with the Government of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 277. A bill to amend chapter 47 (Uniform Code of Military Justice) of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Judge Advocate General to grant relief in certain court-martial cases, to extend the time within which an accused may petition for a new trial, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 278. A bill to permit the heads of Federal agencies to retrocede to the States certain jurisdiction of the United States over land within the States; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 279. A bill to amend section 1074 of title 10, United States Code, to provide more adequate facilities for medical care for retired members of the uniformed services and their dependents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 280. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to establish active duty medical and dental officer strengths in the Air Force; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 281. A bill to further amend the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended, to provide for shelter in Federal structures, to authorize payment toward the construction or modification of approved public shelter space, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 282. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, with respect to the nomination and selection of candidates for appointment to the Military, Naval, and Air Force Academies; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BRAY:

H.R. 283. A bill to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide further for the prevention of accidents in coal mines; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 284. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to reduce from 65 to 62 the age at which a taxpayer is entitled to an additional personal exemption because of his age or that of his spouse; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 285. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow the taxpayer a deduction from gross income for medical, legal, and related expenses incurred in connection with the adoption of a child; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 286. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that an individual's entitlement to child's insurance benefits shall continue, after he attains age 18, for so long as he is regularly attending high school or college; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 287. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to permit paraplegic veterans to receive military air transportation without charge; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H.R. 288. A bill to increase benefits under the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system, to provide child's insurance benefits beyond age 18 while in school, to provide widow's benefits at age 60 on a reduced basis, to provide benefits for certain individuals not otherwise eligible at age 72, to improve the actuarial status of the trust funds, to extend coverage, to improve the public assistance programs under the Social Security Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 289. A bill to amend the act of May 11, 1954 (ch. 199, sec. 1, 68 Stat. 81; 41 U.S.C. 321), to provide for full adjudication of rights of Government contractors in courts of law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 290. A bill to amend the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER (by request):

H.R. 291. A bill to amend sections 64a, 238, 378, and 483 of the Bankruptcy Act and to repeal sections 354 and 459 of the act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 292. A bill to amend the Bankruptcy Act with respect to the use of chapter XIII; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 293. A bill to amend sections 337 and 338 of the Bankruptcy Act and to add new section 339; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 294. A bill to amend section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H.R. 295. A bill creating a commission to be known as the Commission on Noxious and Obscene Matters and Materials; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 296. A bill to provide a hospital insurance program for the aged under social security, to amend the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system to increase benefits, improve the actuarial status of the disability insurance trust fund, and extend coverage, to amend the Social Security Act to provide additional Federal financial participation in the Federal-State public assistance programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DE LA GARZA:

H.R. 297. A bill to amend section 8e of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, as amended, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, and as amended by the Agricultural Act of 1961, so as to provide for the extension of the restrictions on imported commodities imposed by such section to imported carrots; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 298. A bill to amend section 312 of the Immigration and Naturalization Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 299. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act (of 1933), as amended, and as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DENT

H.R. 300. A bill to amend Public Law 874, 81st Congress, relating to assistance for schools in federally affected areas, to provide assistance in certain cases on account of children in needy families; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 301. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H.R. 302. A bill to amend the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 to authorize loans for waste disposal systems and other facilities providing community services, and for additional financial aid; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 303. A bill to amend section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act to provide for the retirement of the public debt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 304. A bill to amend title I of the Social Security Act to require that the first $50 per month of earned income be disregarded in determining an individual's need for old-age assistance thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 305. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to exclude from gross income gain realized from the condemnation of certain property by the United States or a State, or from the sale of such property to the United States or a State under threat or imminence of condemnation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H.R. 306. A bill to repeal the Federal excise taxes on jewelry, furs, toilet preparations, luggage and handbags, general telephone service, general admissions, transportation of persons by air, and safe deposit boxes, effective for periods after March 31, 1965; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GERALD R. FORD:

H.R. 307. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to provide for the greater protection of the President and the Vice President of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 308. A bill relating to withholding, for purposes of the income tax imposed by certain cities, on the compensation of Federal employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 309. A bill to authorize investigations and reports on the water resources and requirements of the Colorado River Basin, and to protect existing economies in the course of development of such resources; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 310. A bill to add a new title XI to the National Defense Education Act of 1958; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HANSEN of Idaho:

H.R. 311. A bill to increase the amount of domestic beet sugar and mainland cane sugar which may be marketed during 1965 and 1966; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 312. A bill to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H.R. 313. A bill to authorize the coordinated development of the water resources of the Pacific Southwest, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 314. A bill to permit retired personnel of the uniformed services to receive benefits under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act without relinquishing their retirement pay; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 315. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for the gradual reduction and eventual elimination of the tax on general telephone service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H.R. 316. A bill to establish the Mount Rogers National Recreation Area in the Jefferson National Forest in Virginia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 317. A bill to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide further for the prevention of accidents in coal mines; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 318. A bill to amend section 4071 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 319. A bill to provide for the establishment and administration of the Allegheny-Cumberland Parkway in the States of Virginia, Kentucky, and West Virginia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 320. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for the refund to States of certain taxes on distilled spirits and wine destroyed by fire, casualty, or act of God; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 321. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 to provide a credit against the estate tax for Federal estate taxes paid on certain prior transfers in the case of decedents dying after December 31, 1947; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 322. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to permit railroad corporations to take full advantage of tax relief measures enacted or granted by the States and their political subdivisions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 323. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an increase in the amount for which a credit may be allowed against the Federal estate tax for estate taxes paid to States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 324. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to deny deduction for rent, taxes, or interest incurred for the use or occupancy of an industrial plant financed by tax-exempt obligations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 325. A bill to repeal paragraph (6) of section 4231 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, and to amend section 4232 of such code relating to definitions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 326. A bill to adjust the tax rates on light sparkling wines in relation to those imposed on other wines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 327. A bill to amend section 501(c) (14) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt from taxation certain nonprofit corporations and associations operated to provide reserve funds for domestic building and loan associations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANDRUM:

H.R. 328. A bill to authorize the acceptance of donations of land and the construction, administration, and maintenance of an extension of the Blue Ridge Parkway in the States of North Carolina and Georgia by the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LEGGETT:

H.R. 329. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a taxpayer a deduction from gross income for tuition and other educational expenses paid by him, whether for his own education or for the education of his spouse or a dependent or any other individual; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 330. A bill to establish the Department of Urban Affairs and prescribe its functions; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 331. A bill to provide for a comprehensive study and investigation of the adequacy of the present system of compulsory military training under the Universal Military Training and Service Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 332. A bill to provide for periodic congressional review of Federal grants-in-aid to States and to local units of government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska:

H.R. 333. A bill to prevent the application or exercise of monopoly power by employers and labor organizations in employing or representing labor, to amend the Labor-Management Relations Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORHEAD:

H.R. 334. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 335. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 336. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PRICE:

H.R. 337. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H.R. 338. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H.R. 339. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HAYS:

H.R. 340. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 341. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 342. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H.R. 343. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KUNKEL:

H.R. 344. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. O'BRIEN:

H.R. 345. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 346. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purpose; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 347. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H.R. 348. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 349. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 350. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SISK:

H.R. 351. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H.R. 352. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H.R. 353. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 354. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.R. 355. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H.R. 356. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HECHLER:

H.R. 357. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H.R. 358. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ROUSH:

H.R. 359. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H.R. 360. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.R. 361. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 362. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 363. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CAMERON:

H.R. 364. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H.R. 365. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California:

H.R. 366. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FULTON of Tennessee:

H.R. 367. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HAWKINS:

H.R. 368. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LEGGETT:

H.R. 369. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. McDADE:

H.R. 370. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 371. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H.R. 372. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SENNER:

H.R. 373. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON:

H.R. 374. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. IRWIN:

H.R. 375. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 376. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GREIGG:

H.R. 377. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LOVE:

H.R. 378. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H.R. 379. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MACHEN:

H.R. 380. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RESNICK:

H.R. 381. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER:

H.R. 382. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. VIGORITO:

H.R. 383. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. VIVIAN:

H.R. 384. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MOELLER:

H.R. 385. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CARTER:

H.R. 386. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 387. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 388. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DYAL:

H.R. 389. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 390. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CALLAN:

H.R. 391. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 392. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 393. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H.R. 394. A bill to amend the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act to provide for the return to the stockpile of materials withdrawn but not used for defense purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 395. A bill to amend section 613(c)(4)(E) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 396. A bill to provide that until June 30, 1968, Congress shall be notified of certain proposed public land actions; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 397. A bill to authorize the appropriation of the receipts of the Colorado River development fund for the purpose of making allowances to the Hoover Dam powerplant for deficiencies in firm energy generation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 398. A bill to permit the discovery, location, development, and utilization of the mineral resources of certain public lands in national forests in the State of Colorado, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 399. A bill to provide adjustments in order to make uniform the estate acquired for the Vega Dam and Reservoir, Collbran project, Colorado, by authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to reconvey mineral interests in certain lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

H.R. 400. A bill to amend the Davis-Bacon Act to extend its application to contracts for the maintenance of Federal installations; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 401. A bill to define the status of retired officers of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 402. A bill to provide for the determination of the compensation of firefighting personnel in accordance with prevailing rates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 403. A bill to promote ethical standards of conduct among Members of Congress and officers and employees of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 404. A bill to authorize overtime compensation and compensatory time for substitute employees in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 405. A bill to provide that Federal savings and loan associations shall give notice in writing to shareholders of their annual meetings, and to facilitate the solicitation of proxies by shareholders of such associations; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 406. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Army pay a fair share of the cost of certain highway improvements; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 407. A bill to amend section 2732 of title 10, and section 490 of title 14, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 408. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to prohibit the broadcasting of predictions of certain elections until all polling places at which votes may be cast in such election are closed; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 409. A bill to terminate price supports in tobacco; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 410. A bill to provide that the rates of compensation of officers and employees subject to the Classification Act of 1949 shall hereafter be fixed and adjusted by wage boards on the basis of prevailing rates and practices; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H.R. 411. A bill to amend section 101 of title 38, United States Code, to extend full wartime benefits to persons who served in the Armed Forces of the United States for 90 days or more in Mexico or on its borders during the period beginning on May 9, 1916, and ending on April 6, 1917, and to extend full wartime survivor benefits to the survivors of such persons; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

H.R. 412. A bill to amend section 1613 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that in determining the period within which a veteran must complete his program of education or training, the Administrator shall disregard periods during which the veteran was unable to pursue his program by reason of disability; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H.R. 413. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to reduce from 65 to 62 the age at which a spouse's annuity becomes payable in cases where the employee is retired for disability, and to increase widows' annuities by 10 percent; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.R. 414. A bill to require certain safety devices on motor vehicles sold, shipped, or used in interstate commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. BOLTON:

H.R. 415. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 416. A bill to amend chapter 33 of title 38, United States Code, to make the educational benefits provided for therein available to all veterans whether or not they serve during a period of war or of armed hostilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 417. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase from 18 to 22, in the case of a child attending school, the age until which child's insurance benefits may be paid thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 418. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the excise tax on communications; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 419. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit a taxpayer to deduct tuition expenses paid by him for the education of himself or any of his dependents at an institution of higher learning; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 420. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the commissioning of male persons in the Regular Army in the Army Nurse Corps and the Army Medical Specialist Corps, and the Regular Air Force with a view to designation as Air Force nurses and medical specialists, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 421. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit the transportation or use in interstate or foreign commerce, with unlawful or fraudulent intent, of counterfeit, fictitious, altered, lost, stolen, wrongfully appropriated, unauthorized, revoked, or canceled credit cards; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRAY:

H.R. 422. A bill to amend section 1498 of title 28, United States Code, to authorize the use or manufacture, in certain cases, by or for the United States of any invention described in and covered by a patent of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 423. A bill for the relief of certain displaced nationals of the Netherlands; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 424. A bill to provide a deduction for income tax purposes, in the case of a disabled individual, for expenses for transportation to and from work; and to provide an additional exemption for income tax purposes for a taxpayer or spouse who is disabled; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H.R. 425. A bill to amend section 1(14)(a) of the Interstate Commerce Act to insure the adequacy of the national railroad freight car supply, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 426. A bill to protect consumers by requiring that imported meat and meat food products made in whole or in part with imported meat bear a label showing the country of origin of such imported meat; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H.R. 427. A bill to authorize appropriations for the purpose of equitably reimbursing the States for certain free and toll roads on the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 428. A bill to amend the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959, with respect to the contribution made by Government toward health benefit protection for employees and annuitants and members of their families; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 429. A bill to amend provisions relative to compensatory time and overtime for certain postal field service employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 430. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to authorize the retirement of employees after 30 years of service without reduction in annuity; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 431. A bill to amend the Classification Act of 1949 to authorize the establishment of hazardous duty pay in certain cases; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 432. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 and the Civil Service Retirement Act with regard to filing designation of beneficiary, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 433. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to authorize the retirement of employees after 30 years of service without reduction in annuity; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 434. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, to provide that accumulated sick leave be credited to retirement fund; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 435. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 436. A bill to provide for recognition of Federal employee unions and to provide procedures for the adjustment of grievances; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 437. A bill to amend provisions relative to overtime in the Postal Field Service Compensation Act to provide time and one-half for substitutes for overtime work; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 438. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to eliminate the reduction in annuity elected for a spouse when such spouse predeceases the person making the election; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 439. A bill to exempt regular and classified substitute employees in post offices of the first, second, and third classes from residence requirements governing appointment and service of postmasters at post offices to which such employees are assigned; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 440. A bill to correct certain inequities with respect to the operation of the Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 441. A bill to provide for the crediting for civil service retirement purposes of certain service rendered by civilian employees of nonappropriated fund instrumentalities of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 442. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide for mandatory retirement of employees upon attainment of 70 years of age and completion of 5 years of service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 443. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 444. A bill to repeal the cabaret tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DE LA GARZA:

H.R. 445. A bill to amend the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 to permit marketing orders applicable to carrots, citrus fruits, and onions to provide for paid advertising; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 446. A bill to authorize a 2-year program of Federal financial assistance for all elementary and secondary school children in all of the States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. DWYER:

H.R. 447. A bill to increase benefits under the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system, to provide child's insurance benefits beyond age 18 while in school, to provide widow's benefits at age 60 on a reduced basis, to provide benefits for certain individuals not otherwise eligible at age 72, to improve the actuarial status of the trust funds, to extend coverage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 448. A bill to establish the power of the individual States and the local subdivisions thereof to prevent construction of nuclear devices within their territorial limits; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. GERALD R. FORD:

H.R. 449. A bill to authorize the waiver of collection of certain erroneous payments made by the Federal Government to certain civilian and military personnel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 450. A bill to encourage the creation of original ornamental designs of useful articles by protecting the authors of such designs for a limited time against unauthorized copying; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 451. A bill for the relief of certain displaced nationals of the Netherlands; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 452. A bill to amend the public assistance provisions of the Social Security Act to permit the payment of assistance to individuals in nonpublic mental institutions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 453. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside income which a widow with minor children may earn without suffering deductions from the benefits to which she is entitled thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 454. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction from gross income for certain amounts paid for the education of the taxpayer, his spouse, or his dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 455. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to include Michigan among the States which may obtain social security coverage, under State agreement, for State and local policemen and firemen; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 456. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to make certain nonprofit organizations eligible for donations of surplus property; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.R. 457. A bill to provide for the designation of a highway from Tampa, Fla., to Miami, Fla., as a part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.R. 458. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to include the Virgin Islands as an eligible recipient of matching grants for the construction of educational television broadcasting facilities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GROSS:

H.R. 459. A bill to provide for more uniform application of section 4369 of title 39, United States Code, which pertains to filing of information relating to second-class mail publications; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 460. A bill prohibiting lithographing or engraving on envelopes sold by the Post Office Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 461. A bill to amend part I of the Interstate Commerce Act to direct the Interstate Commerce Commission to make regulations requiring that freight and other unlighted cars be so equipped that they can be readily seen at night; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 462. A bill to reduce the depletion allowance for oil and gas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 463. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to prescribe safe standards for the discharge of substances into the air by motor vehicles; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. HANSEN of Washington:

H.R. 464. A bill to provide for the construction of a new Veterans' Administration hospital at Vancouver, Wash.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 465. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to provide for the regulation of rates and practices of air carriers and foreign air carriers in foreign air transportation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HECHLER:

H.R. 466. A bill to amend the Public Works Acceleration Act to increase the authorization for appropriations under that act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.R. 467. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to require certain new packages of imported articles to be marked to indicate the country of origin, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 468. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to prevent duplication of benefits based on disability in cases where the disabled individual receives workmen's compensation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 469. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to exempt from tax musical instruments sold to students for school use; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 470. A bill to create the Freedom Commission and the Freedom Academy; to research and develop an integrated, operational science to win the nonmilitary part of the global struggle between freedom and communism; and to train Government personnel, private citizens, and foreign students in this science; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

H.R. 471. A bill to provide for a Veterans' Administration hospital in the Halifax area of Volusia County, Fla.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 472. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an income tax credit to an individual taxpayer for tuition and fees paid to an institution of higher education, and to allow a tax credit to all taxpayers for charitable contributions to institutions of higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 473. A bill to amend section 1371 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow certain testamentary trusts to qualify as shareholders in electing small business corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 474. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for the deferment of income from service contracts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 475. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that charitable contributions to museums by individuals shall be deductible for income tax purposes under the 30-percent limitation of adjusted gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 476. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to require the filing and publication of additional information by certain tax-exempt nonprofit organizations which conduct public fund drives, in order to protect the public against improper utilization of the proceeds of such drives; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 477. A bill to repeal the retailers excise tax on toilet preparations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 478. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, and certain provisions of title 28, United States Code, relating to taxation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 479. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 480. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit payment of child's insurance benefits after attainment of age 18 in the case of a child attending a college or university; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 481. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to authorize and facilitate the deduction from gross income by teachers of the expenses of education (including certain travel) undertaken by them, and to provide a uniform method of proving entitlement to such deduction; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 482. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to provide for nonrecognition of gain or loss on certain reacquisitions of real property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 483. A bill to amend section 2056 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to the effect of disclaimers on the allowance of the marital deduction for estate tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 484. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to apply to gross income from sales of items of income in respect of decedents the ordinary rules for determining the proper taxable year of inclusion in gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 485. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Auburn-Folsom South unit, American River division, Central Valley project, California, under Federal reclamation laws; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KORNEGAY:

H.R. 486. A bill to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to regulate the manufacture, compounding, processing, distribution, delivery, and possession of habit-forming barbiturate drugs, amphetamine, and other habit-forming central nervous system stimulant drugs, and other drugs that have a potential for abuse resulting in psychotoxic effects or antisocial behavior; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LEGGETT:

H.R. 487. A bill to prohibit the construction of facilities in post office buildings designed to permit the secret surveillance of employees of the Post Office Department and prohibiting the use of such facilities in post office buildings now in use; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 488. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to permit premium compensation of firefighting employees to be considered as basic salary for the purposes of such act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 489. A bill to promote fair competition among subcontractors and to prevent bid peddling on public works contracts by requiring persons submitting bids on those contracts to specify certain subcontractors who will assist in carrying them out; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 490. A bill to authorize a 3-year program of grants for construction of veterinary medical education facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 491. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for the payment of child's insurance benefits to disabled children of an insured individual even though such individual has not himself become entitled to benefits or died; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 492. A bill to amend titles XIV and XVI of the Social Security Act to provide that permanently and totally disabled individuals under age 18, as well as those over 18, shall be eligible for aid thereunder, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 493. A bill to amend chapter 37 of title 38 of the United States Code to make certain persons eligible to participate in the loan guaranty provisions of that chapter who would be so eligible if they were not in the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 494. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to expand the exemption from the tax on the transportation of persons which is accorded members of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 495. A bill to amend the act of July 4, 1955, as amended, relating to the construction of irrigation distribution systems; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LENNON:

H.R. 496. A bill to designate lock and dam 3 on the Cape Fear River, N.C., as the William O. Huske lock and dam; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 497. A bill to amend the act of July 26, 1954, to establish a National Advisory Council on Education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H.R. 498. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without any deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska:

H.R. 499. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Nebraska midstate division, Missouri River Basin project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 500. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Agate Fossil Beds National Monument in the State of Nebraska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 501. A bill to reauthorize construction by the Secretary of the Interior of the North Loup division, Nebraska, of the Missouri River Basin project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 502. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to impose a limitation upon the time for the institution of deportation proceedings, and a limitation upon the time for the loss of U.S. nationality; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 503. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 504. A bill to establish a commission to formulate plans for a memorial to recipients of the Congressional Medal of Honor; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 505. A bill to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated annually to carry out the program for the conservation and restoration of the Hawaiian nene goose, and to extend such program for an additional 5 years; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 506. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make a loan and grant to the State of Hawaii for the construction of the Kokee water project, Hawaii, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MICHEL:

H.R. 507. A bill to provide that the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall hereafter be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 508. A bill to amend the act of October 9, 1940, to provide that the 10-year statute of limitations applicable to claims against the United States shall not bar the payment of such claims where they are filed with an appropriate agency of the United States during such 10-year period; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.R. 509. A bill to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to regulate the manufacture, compounding, processing, distribution, delivery, and possession of habit-forming barbiturate drugs, amphetamine and other habit-forming central nervous system stimulant drugs, and other drugs that have a potential for abuse resulting in psychotoxic effects or antisocial behavior; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 510. A bill to amend the Federal Firearms Act: to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 511. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POFF:

H.R. 512. A bill to provide a credit against the Federal income tax for additional State and local taxes imposed for school purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 513. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall, under certain circumstances, disclose the current addresses of husbands and parents who have deserted their families; the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 514. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit donations of surplus property to volunteer firefighting organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 515. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction to a taxpayer who is a student at a college for certain expenses incurred in obtaining a higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 516. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that the child of an insured individual, after attaining age 18, may continue to receive child's insurance benefits until he attains age 21 if he is a full-time student; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POOL:

H.R. 517. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Guadalupe Mountains National Park in the State of Texas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 518. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside income which may be earned without deductions from benefits in cases where a husband and wife are both beneficiaries but all or most of such outside income is derived by only one of them; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 519. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to reduce from 72 to 68 the age at which deductions on account of an individual's outside earnings will cease to be made from benefits based on such individual's wage record; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 520. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a taxpayer increased personal exemptions for his children while they are attending school; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 521. A bill to establish and prescribe the functions of the Federal Tax Commission; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 522. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a deduction for amounts expended by firemen for meals which they are required to eat at their post of duty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 523. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a taxpayer a deduction from gross income for tuition and other expenses paid by him for his education or the education of his spouse or any of his dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 524. A bill to amend section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act to provide for the retirement of the public debt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 525. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a taxpayer a deduction from gross income for tuition and certain other educational expenses paid by him for the education of a dependent at a private nonprofit elementary or secondary school; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 526. A bill creating a commission to be known as the Commission on Noxious and Obscene Matters and Materials; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 527. A bill to provide Federal assistance to local educational agencies to assist them to meet the financial burden resulting from the entry into their school systems of children from outside the State; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. REID of Illinois:

H.R. 528. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 529. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a taxpayer a deduction from gross income for expenses paid by him for the education of any of his dependents at an institution of higher learning; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 530. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase from $600 to $800 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 531. A bill to assist the several States in establishing hospital facilities and programs of posthospital aftercare for the care, treatment, and rehabilitation of narcotic addicts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROGERS of Texas:

H.R. 532. A bill to amend section 1(14) (a) of the Interstate Commerce Act to insure the adequacy of the national railroad freight car supply, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 533. A bill to increase the personal income tax exemption of a taxpayer and the additional exemption for his spouse from $600 to $1,000, and to increase the exemption for a dependent from $600 to $1,000; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 534. A bill to require loyalty declarations from employees of Government suppliers and from labor organizations representing the employees of such suppliers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 535. A bill to provide that certain information relating to the national security shall be made available to the Speaker of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 536. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code to require that all decisions of the Supreme Court shall be participated in by the full Court, and that any vacancies or absences in the membership of the Court shall be temporarily filled by circuit judges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 537. A bill relating to the status of volunteer fire companies for purposes of liability for Federal income taxes and for certain Federal excise taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Iowa:

H.R. 538. A bill to extend Federal meat inspection and to permit cooperation with State meat inspection services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H.R. 539. A bill to amend section 312 of title 38, United States Code, by providing a 2-year presumptive period of service connection for the psychoses which develop within 2 years from the date of separation from active service; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 540. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide an 11 percent increase in rates of disability compensation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 541. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 542. A bill to authorize establishment of the Tocks Island National Recreation Area in the States of Pennsylvania and New Jersey, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin:

H.R. 543. A bill to amend section 202 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, in order to continue the veterans hospitals and Armed Forces dairy program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 544. A bill to establish a research laboratory at which programs of research and study shall be conducted to develop new and improved industrial uses for dairy products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 545. A bill to permanently extend the special milk programs for the Armed Forces and veterans hospitals; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 546. A bill to retrocede to the State of Wisconsin concurrent jurisdiction over the rights-of-way for U.S. Highway 16 and Wisconsin State Highway No. 21 within Camp McCoy, Wis., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 547. A bill to improve the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program by providing minimum benefits for certain individuals who have attained age 72 and by liberalizing the retirement test through increasing the amount of earnings permitted without full deductions from benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 548. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to impose additional duties on cattle, beef, and veal imported each year in excess of annual quotas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 549. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an exemption from the manufacturers excise tax on business machines in the case of articles purchased for the exclusive use of a church or a convention or association of churches; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 550. A bill to provide certain increases in annuities payable from the civil service retirement and disability fund, to improve the financing of the civil service retirement system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. UTT:

H.R. 551. A bill to provide for, phase out, and to extend the use of Mexican agricultural workers under title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 552. A bill to abolish the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, and repeal the Arms Control and Disarmament Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 553. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an exemption from the tax on club dues for nonprofit hunting and fishing clubs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 554. A bill to amend the act of June 29, 1940, relating to the administration of the Washington National Airport, to transfer to the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency certain additional real property of the United States to facilitate the expansion of such airport for general aviation purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H.R. 555. A bill to provide for continuity and support of study, research, and development of programs for peaceful uses in science, commerce, and other activities related to Antarctica, which shall include, but shall not be limited to, gathering, evaluating, correlating, and dispersing of information and knowledge obtained from exploration, research, and other mediums relating to weather, communications, travel, and other areas of information; also to coordinate Antarctic activities among those agencies of the U.S. Government and private institutions interested in or concerned directly with the promotion, advancement, increase, and diffusion of knowledge of the Antarctic; and to direct and administer U.S. Antarctic programs in the national interest; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 556. A bill relating to the practice of law in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 557. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Income and Franchise Tax Act of 1947 with respect to the deduction of medical expenses; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 558. A bill to provide for a dual banking system in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 559. A bill to amend section 801 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 560. A bill to provide for increased Federal Government participation in meeting costs of maintaining the Nation's Capital City and to authorize Federal loans to the District of Columbia for capital improvement programs; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 561. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of Col. David (Mickey) Marcus; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 562. A bill to prohibit banks insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation from accepting deposits in excess of certain percentages of their outstanding real estate loans; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 563. A bill to amend chapter 119 of title 28, United States Code, to provide that clergymen shall not be competent to testify with respect to certain communications; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 564. A bill to amend the Hatch Act to permit all officers and employees of the Government to exercise the full responsibility of citizenship and to take an active part in the political life of the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 565. A bill to provide a residence for pages of the Senate and of the House of Representatives, under the supervision of a Capitol Pages' Residence Board; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 566. A bill to provide for the distribution of motor-vehicle tires, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 567. A bill to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon common carriers by railroads engaged in interstate commerce by requiring such carriers to maintain tracks, bridges, roadbed, and permanent structures for the support-of-way, trackage, and traffic in safe and suitable condition, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 568. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide that an individual with 40 years' service may retire regardless of age; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 569. A bill to prohibit the shipment in interstate commerce of plastic bags unless such bags are labeled or manufactured in accordance with standards prescribed by the Secretary of Commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 570. A bill to require certificates of fitness in the sale of automobiles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 571. A bill to amend section 3402 of title 38, United States Code, to provide for the recognition by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs of the Italian American War Veterans of the United States for the prosecution of veterans' claims; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 572. A bill to amend the International Peace and Security Act of 1961 to provide for the establishment and support of a Western Hemisphere Police Force; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 573. A bill to establish a Foreign Service Officers' Training Corps; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 574. A bill to create a National Peace Agency and to prescribe its functions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 575. A bill to encourage and promote the establishment of an Inter-American Court of Justice; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 576. A bill to authorize an exhibit at the New York World's Fair in honor of the late President of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 577. A bill to amend chapter 67 of title 10, United States Code, to provide retired pay for reservists who have 10 or more years of satisfactory Federal service and who performed active duty for 5 or more years in the aggregate during World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 578. A bill to prohibit the discharge of members of the Armed Forces under conditions other than honorable except pursuant to the sentence of a court-martial; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 579. A bill to amend section 15 of the Universal Military Training and Service Act to permit certain enlistments in the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 580. A bill to establish a board (outside of the Department of Defense) to review and correct discharges and dismissals of former members of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 581. A bill to amend section 2 of the Automobile Information Disclosure Act so as to include the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands within the provisions of such act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 582. A bill to amend the Small Business Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 583. A bill to amend the Small Business Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 584. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to authorize the Small Business Administration to insure business loans made to small business concerns by private lending institutions; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 585. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to abolish the Loan Policy Board of the Small Business Administration; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 586. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to require officers and directors of any issuer of registered securities to periodically report the extent to which, and the purposes for which, their holdings of such securities are pledged, hypothecated, or loaned; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 587. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, with respect to the practice of "overlooking" passenger space reservations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 588. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 in order to provide for research to determine criteria and means for abating objectionable aircraft noise; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 589. A bill to prohibit certain tampering with speedometers on motor vehicles used in commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 590. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act with respect to certain contracts and agreements between manufacturers of motor vehicles and their franchised dealers, to permit the establishment of exclusive representation by dealers and restrict franchised dealers from reselling to certain unauthorized persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 591. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to provide that a small-business concern may not be denied assistance thereunder solely because of the type of business in which it is engaged, if such business is lawful in the community where such concern is located; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 592. A bill to provide for disaster loans to small business concerns which suffer economic injury due to federally aided highway construction programs; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 593. A bill to strengthen the competitive enterprise system by assisting qualified small-business concerns to obtain leases of commercial and industrial property, where stringent credit requirements tend to exclude such concerns, by authorizing the Small Business Administration to guarantee, directly or in cooperation with others, the payment of rentals under such leases; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 594. A bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act to require U.S. obligations to be sold at not less than par value, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 595. A bill to amend the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933 to prohibit Federal savings and loan associations from having more than three branches, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 596. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to extend coverage to certain persons engaged in civil defense; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 597. A bill to amend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 to provide for a college scholarship program; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 598. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 599. A bill to amend the Securities Act of 1933 and the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to provide that registration with State authorities shall not be required in the case of securities registered with the Securities and Exchange Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 600. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 in order to prohibit the broadcasting by means of radio or television of amateur or professional boxing matches; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 601. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to strengthen independent competitive enterprise by providing for fair competitive acts, practices, and methods of competition, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 602. A bill to amend the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 to require disclosure by investment advisers of transactions for their own account in any investments of the type with respect to which they render advisory services; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 603. A bill to provide for a nationally uniform system of automobile registration; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 604. A bill to prevent the sale of automobiles with unauthorized equipment, parts, and accessories, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 605. A bill to amend section 3 of the Securities Act of 1933 so as to remove the exemption of securities offered for sale and sold in only one State; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 606. A bill to authorize the President, under certain conditions, to control, regulate, and allocate the use and distribution of medicinal substances for the purpose of protecting and preserving the health of the American people; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 607. A bill to aid in controlling inflation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 608. A bill to require the Surgeon General to undertake a special research program with respect to cystic fibrosis; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 609. A bill to amend part I of title III of the Communications Act of 1934 to make it unlawful for broadcasters to make unauthorized deletions from certain matter submitted for broadcasting; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 610. A bill to amend title IV of the National Housing Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 611. A bill to amend section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to include within the definition of "State banks" branches of foreign banks authorized under State law to accept deposits; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 612. A bill to require banks insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation to convert inactive demand accounts into savings accounts in certain circumstances; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 613. A bill to amend section 23A of the Federal Reserve Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 614. A bill to amend section 6 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to provide for the holding of public hearings in connection with the issuance of certain certificates and the making of certain findings and determinations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 615. A bill to authorize the regulation of the solicitation of proxies in respect of securities issued by certain banks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 616. A bill to assist the several States in establishing hospital facilities and programs of posthospital aftercare for the care, treatment, and rehabilitation of narcotic addicts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 617. A bill to provide certain incentives for the repair, improvement, renovation, and restoration of residential and commercial property under the tax laws of the District of Columbia, to provide that existing housing in urban renewal areas in the District of Columbia shall be rehabilitated, restored, and preserved in all possible cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 618. A bill to amend section 5210 of the Revised Statutes to provide that lists of the shareholders of national banks shall be available for inspection by committees of Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 619. A bill to amend section 402(a) of the National Housing Act to change the name of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 620. A bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act to provide for the retirement of Federal Reserve bank stock and the substitution of interest-bearing deposits in lieu thereof; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 621. A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act and title IV of the National Housing Act to require that any stock option issued by an insured bank or savings and loan association be made available to the general public on equal terms (or, if offered only to shareholders, be made available on equal terms to all of them); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 622. A bill to provide that the Joint Committee on Defense Production shall develop a program of economic controls to stabilize the economy and safeguard the national defense in time of emergency; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 623. A bill to amend the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 624. A bill to amend section 17 of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act and to amend section 5 of the Home Owners Loan Act of 1933 to establish an International Home Loan Bank; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 625. A bill to eliminate the requirement that Federal Reserve banks maintain certain reserves in gold certificates against deposit and note liabilities, and to permit domestic banks to pay interest on time deposits of foreign governments at rates differing from those applicable to domestic depositors; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 626. A bill to provide for fuel allocations and priorities during emergencies; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 627. A bill to amend the Export Control Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 628. A bill to provide for the District of Columbia an appointed Governor and secretary, and an elected legislative assembly and nonvoting Delegate to the House of Representatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 629. A bill to provide an elected mayor, city council, school board, and nonvoting Delegate to the House of Representatives for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 630. A bill to provide for the District of Columbia an appointed Governor and secretary, and an elected legislative assembly and nonvoting Delegate to the House of Representatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 631. A bill to provide for the grading of meat and for informing the ultimate user of such grade; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 632. A bill to amend the act of July 8, 1932 (relating to dangerous weapons in the District of Columbia), to create a presumption in connection with the possession of certain dangerous weapons; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 633. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Income and Francise Tax Act of 1947 to provide an exemption for students, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 634. A bill to require proof of financial security with respect to each person who registers a motor vehicle in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 635. A bill to license and regulate private employment agencies in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 636. A bill to permit certain proceedings supplementary to judgment in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia and in the municipal court for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 637. A bill to amend the act of July 8, 1932, relating to the control or possession in the District of Columbia of dangerous weapons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 638. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 639. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act to prohibit certain advertising with respect to price, and to prohibit false advertising in the District of Columbia relating to alcoholic beverages; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 640. A bill to provide an elected mayor, city council, and nonvoting Delegate to the House of Representatives for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 641. A bill to amend section 1346 of title 28, United States Code, to permit suits against the United States arising out of contracts entered into by nonappropriated fund activities of or under departments and agencies of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 642. A bill to amend section 1498 of title 28, United States Code, to permit patent holders to bring civil actions against Government contractors who infringe their patents while carrying out Government contracts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 643. A bill to amend the Clayton Act to prohibit restraints of trade carried into effect through the use of unfair and deceptive methods of packaging or labeling certain consumer commodities distributed in commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 644. A bill to promote safe driving and eliminate the reckless and irresponsible driver from the streets and highways of the District of Columbia by providing that any person operating a motor vehicle within the District while apparently under the influence of intoxicating liquor shall be deemed to have given his consent to a chemical test of certain of his body substances to determine the alcoholic content of his blood, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 645. A bill to provide for the establishment of a municipal arts council representative of local nonprofit organizations and institutions, including educational organizations and institutions, in the District of Columbia with active programs in the arts, to set aside for such local cultural activities 1 mill out of each $1 of tax revenue of the government of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 646. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act to prohibit false advertising in the District of Columbia relating to alcoholic beverages; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 647. A bill to amend the act of March 3, 1901, to permit the appointment of new trustees in deeds of trust in the District of Columbia by agreement of the parties; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 648. A bill to amend the District of Columbia minimum wage law to provide broader coverage, improved standards of minimum wage and overtime compensation protection, and improved means of enforcement; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 649. A bill to authorize the payment to local governments of sums in lieu of taxes and special assessments with respect to certain Federal real property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. POFF:

H.R. 650. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide that men who have attained the age of 62 may retire on a full annuity thereunder upon completion of 30 years of service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 651. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to eliminate the provisions which reduce the annuities of the spouses of retired employees by the amount of certain monthly benefits payable under title II of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 652. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 653. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to permit an annuitant to receive his annuity even though he renders compensated service for the outside employer by whom he was last employed before his annuity began to accrue; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 654. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide credit against income tax for an employer who employs older persons in his trade or business; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 655. A bill to provide for adjusting conditions of competition between certain domestic industries and foreign industries with respect to the level of wages and the working conditions in the production of articles imported into the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 656. A bill to amend the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 to provide judicial review of certain determinations of the Tariff Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 657. A bill to amend title XI of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to establish liability on the part of the United States for the taking of easements in the navigable airspace of the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 658. A bill to amend section 610 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 so as to establish minimum standards for operation of civil supersonic aircraft through the navigable airspace of the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 659. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act so as to establish a special program for the construction, expansion, remodeling, and alteration of public eleemosynary hospitals; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 660. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to provide that the bombing of certain buildings will create a rebuttable presumption that a Federal criminal offense has been committed for purposes of investigation by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 661. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 662. A bill to amend section 501(b) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to require evidence of financial responsibility in connection with the registration of certain aircraft; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 663. A bill to authorize a 2-year program of Federal financial assistance for all elementary and secondary school children in all of the States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 664. A bill to amend title IX of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 to provide for establishment of a national science research data processing and information retrieval system with headquarters in Chicago, Ill.; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 665. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to make it an unfair labor practice for an employer or a labor organization to discriminate unjustifiably on account of age; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 666. A bill to amend section 8 of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 667. A bill to amend section 9(b)(3) of the National Labor Relations Act so as to eliminate the provision thereof prohibiting the certification, as bargaining representative of persons employed as guards, of a labor organization which admits to membership, or is affiliated with an organization which admits to membership, employees other than guards; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 668. A bill to amend section 307(c) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to require the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency to prescribe air traffic rules governing the use of landing areas by certain aircraft; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 669. A bill to provide for the establishment of a permanent commission on aircraft noise abatement problems; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 670. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 in order to provide for research to determine criteria and means for abating objectionable aircraft noise; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 671. A bill to amend section 601 of the Federal Aviation Act to require identification markings on the underside of the wings of certain aircraft; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 672. A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, to provide compensation for certain additional losses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 673. A bill to provide for the establishment of a U.S. Foreign Service Academy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 674. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Bureau of Senior Citizens within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; to authorize Federal grants to assist in the development and operation of studies and projects to help senior citizens; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 675. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 676. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish a Court of Veterans' Appeals and to prescribe its jurisdiction and functions; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 677. A bill to strengthen the criminal penalties for the mailing, importing, or transporting of obscene matter, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 678. A bill to provide a deduction for income tax purposes, in the case of a disabled individual, for expenses for transportation to and from work; and to provide an additional exemption for income tax purposes for a taxpayer or spouse who is physically or mentally incapable of caring for himself; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 679. A bill declaring October 12 to be a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 680. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SKUBITZ:

H.R. 681. A bill to provide for the commemoration of certain historical events in the State of Kansas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H.R. 682. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit donations of surplus property to municipalities and to volunteer firefighting organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 683. A bill to amend the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 with respect to the procedure for amending orders; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 684. A bill declaring October 12 to be a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 685. A bill to provide that the representation in the House of Representatives of each of the several States shall be reduced in proportion to the number of adult inhabitants of such State whose right to vote is denied or abridged; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 686. A bill to provide for uniform annual observances of certain national holidays on Mondays; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 687. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that employers having pension plans under which payments are correlated with social security benefits shall be subject to an additional tax in cases where increases in such benefits result in a reduction in their own contributions under such plans and are not passed on to their retired employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN:

H.R. 688. A bill to provide that tires sold or shipped in interstate commerce for use on motor vehicles shall meet certain safety standards; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 689. A bill to designate the Joanna Dam and Reservoir now under construction on the Salt River near Joanna, Mo., as the "Clarence Cannon Dam and Reservoir"; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin:

H.R. 690. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that the child of an insured individual, after attaining age 18, may continue to receive child's insurance benefits until he attains age 21 if he is a full-time student; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 691. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted without deductions from benefits, to provide minimum benefits for all individuals not otherwise entitled at age 70, and to provide an across-the-board increase in all benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 692. A bill to amend section 624(d) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to provide that all so-called end-use inspectors shall be subject to the control of the Inspector General, Foreign Assistance; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 693. A bill to extend certain benefits to persons who served in the Armed Forces of the United States in Mexico or on its borders during the period beginning May 9, 1916, and ending April 6, 1917, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 694. A bill to provide assistance to certain States bordering the Mississippi River in the construction of the Great River Road; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H.R. 695. A bill to prohibit the exclusion of dog guides for the blind from certain public carriers, transport terminals, and other places of business which operate in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WELTNER:

H.R. 696. A bill to amend the National Housing Act to facilitate sales of one- to four-family residences in locations adversely affected by airports constructed or expanded with Federal financial assistance furnished under the Federal Airport Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 697. A bill to amend section 7701 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to clarify the tax status of certain professional associations and corporations formed under State law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHITE of Texas:

H.R. 698. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Guadalupe Mountains National Park in the State of Texas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 699. A bill to amend the act of June 29, 1940, relating to the administration of the Washington National Airport, to transfer to the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency certain additional real property of the United States to facilitate the expansion of such airport for general aviation purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 700. A bill to prohibit trade with Communist nations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 701. A bill to amend the Railway Labor Act in order to provide for establishment of special adjustment boards to resolve disputes otherwise referable to the National Railroad Adjustment Board; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 702. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 so as to require additional precautionary measures aboard certain aircraft in the interest of the safety of the traveling public; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 703. A bill to provide that the provisions of the Natural Gas Act shall not apply to the sale of natural gas, as an incident of its production and gathering, by an independent producer not engaged in the interstate transmission of natural gas; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 704. A bill to amend the Railway Labor Act in order to make all awards of the National Railroad Adjustment Board final; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 705. A bill to amend title XI of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to provide that certain provisions of insurance contracts covering loss of life or personal injury of passengers being transported shall be null and void; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 706. A bill to amend the Railway Labor Act in order to provide for establishment of special adjustment boards upon the request either of representatives of employees or of carriers to resolve disputes otherwise referable to the National Railroad Adjustment Board; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WYATT:

H.R. 707. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Tualatin Federal reclamation project, Oregon, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 708. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without any deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 709. A bill relating to the rate of duty on fresh and frozen strawberries which are imported from Mexico; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H.R. 710. A bill to permit States or other duly constituted taxing authorities to subject persons to liability for payment of property taxes on property located in Federal areas within such State; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H.R. 711. A bill to establish rules of interpretation governing questions of the effect of acts of Congress on State laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 712. A bill defining the jurisdiction of the U.S. Supreme Court and all Federal courts inferior thereto, in certain instances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 713. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code to establish certain qualifications for persons appointed to the Supreme Court and to provide that persons who have held certain Federal and State offices shall be ineligible for appointment to any Federal judgeship within 5 years after leaving such offices; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 714. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to proscribe travel in interstate or foreign commerce for purposes of inciting to riot or committing other unlawful acts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

H.R. 715. A bill to amend the act of August 13, 1946, relating to Federal participation in the cost of protecting the shores of publicly owned property; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 716. A bill to amend section 107 of the River and Harbor Act of 1960 to increase the general authorization for small navigation projects; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 717. A bill authorizing the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, to expend certain appropriated funds to maintain harbors and waterways at depths required for defense purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 718. A bill to provide for the advancement of Federal funds to non-Federal entities desiring to undertake projects for flood control and related purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BOLLING:

H.R. 719. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to permit foreign-flag vessels to transport passengers between the United States and Puerto Rico to attend the Seventh Assembly of the World Convention of Churches of Christ; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BONNER:

H.R. 720. A bill to expand the authority of the Canal Zone Government to settle claims not cognizable under the Tort Claims Act; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 721. A bill to simplify the admeasurement of small vessels; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 722. A bill to amend certain provisions of existing law concerning the relationship of the Coast and Geodetic Survey to the Army and Navy so they will apply with similar effect to the Air Force; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 723. A bill to require the inspection of certain towing vessels; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 724. A bill to authorize the transfer of certain Canal Zone prisoners to the custody of the Attorney General; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 725. A bill to clarify the responsibility for marking of obstructions in navigable waters; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 726. A bill to repeal and amend certain statutes fixing or prohibiting the collection of fees for certain services under the navigation laws; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 727. A bill to provide for the administration of the Coast Guard Band; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 728. A bill to broaden the vessel exchange provisions of section 510(i) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to extend such provisions for an additional 5 years, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 729. A bill to amend section 510(a) (1) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 730. A bill to improve the aids to navigation services of the Coast Guard; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 731. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain real property of the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 732. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to require certain safety devices on household refrigerators shipped in interstate commerce," approved August 2, 1956; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 733. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the construction, protection, operation, and maintenance of a public airport in or in the vicinity of the District of Columbia"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 734. A bill to amend the joint resolution of September 15, 1960, with respect to the use of certain park roads, highways, and vehicular facilities by those carriers of passengers by motor vehicles which are certificated by the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Commission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 735. A bill to amend section 602 of title 18, United States Code, to make it a crime for certain persons, for political purposes, to divulge information relating to lists or names of persons employed by the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 736. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to provide for the greater protection of the President and the Vice President of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.R. 737. A bill to amend the Public Works Acceleration Act to increase the authorization for appropriations under that act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.R. 738. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to make certain acts against the person of the President and Vice President of the United States and certain other Federal officers designated to act as President in the event of a vacancy in that office a Federal crime; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 739. A bill to provide for the establishment of a national cemetery at Westfield, Mass.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 740. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to the northeastern water and related land resources compact; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 741. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 742. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to provide for the greater protection of the President and the Vice President of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 743. A bill to provide a hospital insurance program for the aged under social security, to amend the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system, to increase benefits, improve the actuarial status of the disability insurance trust fund, and extend coverage, to amend the Social Security Act to provide additional Federal financial participation in the Federal-State public assistance programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FARNSLEY:

H.R. 744. A bill to provide a hospital insurance program for the aged under social security, to amend the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system to increase benefits, improve the actuarial status of the disability insurance trust fund, and extend coverage, to amend the Social Security Act to provide additional Federal financial participation in the Federal-State public assistance programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRABOWSKI:

H.R. 745. A bill to provide a hospital insurance program for the aged under social security, to amend the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system, to increase benefits, improve the actuarial status of the disability insurance trust fund, and extend coverage, to amend the Social Security Act to provide additional Federal financial participation in the Federal-State public assistance programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.R. 746. A bill to provide a hospital insurance program for the aged under social security, to amend the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system, to increase benefits, improve the actuarial status of the disability insurance trust fund, and extend coverage, to amend the Social Security Act to provide additional Federal financial participation in the Federal-State public assistance programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 747. A bill to provide a hospital insurance program for the aged under social security, to amend the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system, to increase benefits, improve the actuarial status of the disability insurance trust fund, and extend coverage, to amend the Social Security Act to provide additional Federal financial participation in the Federal-State public assistance programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.R. 748. A bill to provide a hospital insurance program for the aged under social security, to amend the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system, to increase benefits, improve the actuarial status of the disability insurance trust fund, and extend coverage, to amend the Social Security Act to provide additional Federal financial participation in the Federal-State public assistance programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STALBAUM:

H.R. 749. A bill to provide a hospital insurance program for the aged under social security, to amend the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system, to increase benefits, improve the actuarial status of the disability insurance trust fund, and extend coverage, to amend the Social Security Act to provide additional Federal financial participation in the Federal-State public assistance programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FALLON:

H.R. 750. A bill to amend section 501(c) (14) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt from income taxation certain nonprofit corporations and associations organized to provide reserve funds for domestic building and loan associations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 751. A bill to provide for participation of the United States in the Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center in Dade County, Fla., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H.R. 752. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code, so as to provide for the appointment of one additional district judge for the northern district of Ohio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 753. A bill to establish the period of validity and fee for a passport; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 754. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 755. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GERALD R. FORD:

H.R. 756. A bill to direct the Interstate Commerce Commission to make regulations that certain railroad vehicles be equipped with reflectors or luminous material so that they can be readily seen at night; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H.R. 757. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to provide for the greater protection of the President and Vice President of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 758. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 759. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 760. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 761. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a credit against the individual income tax for certain amounts paid as expenses of higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 762. A bill to authorize the construction of a causeway from Jersey City, N.J., to Liberty Island; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 763. A bill making Columbus Day a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 764. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H.R. 765. A bill to amend title III of the act of March 3, 1933, commonly referred to as the "Buy American Act," to require the construction, alteration, and repair of U.S. naval vessels in shipyards in the United States; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 766. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, by inserting a new title X to authorize aid in developing, constructing, and operating privately owned nuclear-powered merchant ships; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 767. A bill to amend the act of August 6, 1947, to extend the functions of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 768. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 769. A bill to assist the several States in establishing hospital facilities and programs of posthospital aftercare for the care, treatment, and rehabilitation of narcotic addicts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 770. A bill to amend the Clayton Act to prohibit restraints of trade carried into effect through the use of unfair and deceptive methods of packaging or labeling certain consumer commodities distributed in commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 771. A bill to amend the act of September 14, 1959, with respect to sales and use taxes imposed by States on sales and other business activities in interstate commerce, and authorizing studies by congressional committees of this type of taxation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 772. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to make Federal crimes certain offenses against the person of the President or Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 773. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to make it a Federal crime to kill a letter carrier employed by the Post Office Department while in the performance of his duties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRIFFIN:

H.R. 774. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to provide for the greater protection of the President and the Vice President of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H.R. 775. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to authorize and facilitate the deduction from gross income by teachers of the expenses of education (including certain travel) undertaken by them, and to provide a uniform method of proving entitlement to such deduction; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.R. 776. A bill to designate the tomb in the Arlington Memorial Amphitheater in the Arlington National Cemetery, Va., of the three unknown servicemen of World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict as the "Tomb of the Unknown Soldiers"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 777. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the San Felipe division, Central Valley project, California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TALCOTT:

H.R. 778. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the San Felipe division, Central Valley project, California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.R. 779. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to enter into agreements with each of the States, Commonwealths, territories, and the District of Columbia to provide for a private, voluntary medical care insurance program for certain persons over the age of 65, and to authorize payments by the Secretary to States to cover part of the costs of such insurance; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 780. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 so as to require additional precautionary measures aboard certain aircraft in the interest of the safety of the traveling public; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HAGAN of Georgia:

H.R. 781. A bill to establish a Federal Commission on Alcoholism, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 782. A bill to establish certain qualification for persons appointed to the Supreme Court of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALL:

H.R. 783. A bill to amend section 1498 of title 28, United States Code, to authorize the use or manufacture, in certain cases, by or for the United States of any invention described in and covered by a patent of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 784. A bill to amend section 613(c)(4)(E) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to certain treatment processes considered as mining in the determination of percentage depletion; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 785. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to protect the constitutional rights of mentally incompetent persons committed thereunder, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 786. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to provide for the greater protection of the President and the Vice President of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 787. A bill to establish the Department of Urban Affairs and prescribe its functions; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mrs. HANSEN of Washington:

H.R. 788. A bill to provide for extension of State jurisdiction over the Quinault Indian Reservation, Wash., only with the consent of the Quinault Tribe, and to authorize the tribe to terminate any State jurisdiction heretofore extended under Public Law 280, 83d Congress; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 789. A bill to make permanent the provisions of the law authorizing certain suspension of section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, with respect to the tranportation of lumber; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.R. 790. A bill to rename a lock of the Cross-Florida Barge Canal the "R. N. Bert Dosh lock"; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 791. A bill to repeal the retailers excise taxes on jewelry, furs, toilet preparations, and luggage and handbags; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H.R. 792. A bill to amend section 7 of the act of May 21, 1920, to require the procurement of certain services from commercial suppliers when economy will result from such procurement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 793. A bill to authorize investigations and reports on the water resources and requirements of the Colorado River Basin, and to protect existing economies in the course of development of such resources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 794. A bill to clarify the relationship of interests of the United States and of the States in the use of the waters of certain streams; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 795. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to provide for the greater protection of the President and the Vice President of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HULL:

H.R. 796. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to provide for the greater protection of the President and the Vice President of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 797. A bill to establish the Whiskeytown-Shasta-Trinity National Recreation Area in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 798. A bill to provide assistance to the States of California, Oregon, Washington, and Idaho for the reconstruction of areas damaged by recent floods and high waters; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 799. A bill to revitalize the American gold mining industry; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 800. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to initiate with the several States a cooperative program for the conservation, development, and enhancement of the Nation's anadromous fish, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 801. A bill to repeal the retailers excise tax on handbags; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 802. A bill to provide a deduction for income tax purposes, in the case of a disabled individual, for expenses for transportation to and from work; and to provide an additional exemption for income tax purposes for a taxpayer or spouse who is physically or mentally incapable of caring for himself; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 803. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction for income tax purposes of certain expenses incurred by the taxpayer for the education of a dependent; to the Committtee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 804. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 805. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide a more realistic definition of the term "disability" for purposes of entitlement to disability insurance benefits and the disability freeze; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KORNEGAY:

H.R. 806. A bill to amend the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act to permit the listing on labels of certain fibers constituting less than 5 percent of a textile fiber product; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 807. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide that the Chief Medical Officer of the Federal Bureau of Prisons shall have the title of Assistant Surgeon General, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KUNKEL:

H.R. 808. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide that the spouse of an individual receiving a disability annuity may if otherwise qualified become entitled to a spouse's annuity regardless of whether such individual has attained age 65; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 809. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit donations of surplus personal property to State agencies for use by volunteer firefighting organizations; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 810. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to make a comprehensive study of certain future highway needs; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 811. A bill to amend the Railway Labor Act to specify certain procedures for use by system, group, or regional boards of adjustment, including provision for the payment by the Mediation Board of compensation to referees sitting with such boards of adjustment; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 812. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to provide for the greater protection of the President and the Vice President of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 813. A bill making Columbus Day a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEGGETT:

H.R. 814. A bill to clarify the relationship of interests of the United States and of the States in the use of the waters of certain streams; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 815. A bill to amend the act of September 26, 1950, to enlarge the service area of the Sacramento canals unit of the Central Valley project to include Yolo and Solano Counties, Calif.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 816. A bill reauthorizing the Central Valley reclamation project to include New Hogan and Black Butte projects; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 817. A bill authorizing a monetary contribution for the flood control accomplishments of the multiple-purpose developments to be constructed on the Yuba River by the Yuba County Water Agency of Marysville, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 818. A bill authorizing the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, to expend certain appropriated funds to maintain harbors and waterways at depths required for defense purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 819. A bill authorizing construction of the Lakeport Dam and Reservoir and channel improvements on Scotts Creek, Cache Creek Basin, Calif., in the interest of flood control and allied purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 820. A bill to incorporate California Cooperative Rice Research Foundation, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LENNON:

H.R. 821. A bill for the relief of the town of Kure Beach, N.C.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCLORY:

H.R. 822. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to provide for the greater protection of the President and the Vice President of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 823. A bill to provide assistance to the States of California, Oregon, Washington, and Idaho for the reconstruction of areas damaged by recent floods and high waters; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.R. 824. A bill granting the consent of Congress to a compact relating to taxation of motor fuels consumed by interstate buses and to an agreement relating to bus taxation proration and reciprocity; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 825. A bill to repeal the "cooly trade" laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.R. 826. A bill to establish a National Economic Conversion Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. MAY:

H.R. 827. A bill to amend the act of June 12, 1948 (62 Stat. 382), in order to provide for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Kennewick division extension, Yakima project, Washington, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 828. A bill to extend the period of time within which assurances of local cooperation may be furnished the Department of the Army in connection with a flood control project on the Yakima River at Ellensburg, Wash.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.R. 829. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to curb the tax-exempt financing of industrial or commercial facilities used for private profitmaking purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 830. A bill to authorize the payment to local governments of sums in lieu of taxes and special assessments with respect to certain Federal real property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 831. A bill declaring October 12 to be a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 832. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 833. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to provide for the greater protection of the President and the Vice President of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 834. A bill to require the establishment of congressional election districts composed of contiguous and compact territories, and to require that the districts so established within any one State shall contain approximately the same number of inhabitants; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 835. A bill to designate the Tuesday next after the first Monday in November in every even-numbered year as election day and to make it a legal public holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 836. A bill to provide a method for determining Presidential inability, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 837. A bill to amend title 18, Criminal Code, to declare certain papers, pamphlets, books, pictures, and writings nonmailable, to provide a penalty for mailing same, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 838. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit the use of U.S. savings stamps for trade promotion; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 839. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to promote export trade, and for other purposes," approved April 10, 1918, to provide that no export trade association shall restrict any foreign buyer from dealing, directly or through an agent of his own selection, with any producer, manufacturer, or seller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 840. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to review de novo claims for benefits and payments under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 841. A bill to amend the act of August 11, 1939, relating to domestically produced fishery products to establish a fund for the advancement of commercial fisheries; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 842. A bill to protect the position of the Government under Government-insured ship mortgages and to prevent unfair competition in the carriage of cargo preference shipments by certain vessels having Government-insured ship mortgages; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 843. A bill to amend section 4B of the Clayton Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 844. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide that clergymen who are naturalized citizens shall not lose their nationality by residence abroad, even though they are not representatives of American organizations, if they devote full time to their clerical duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 845. A bill to permit aliens registered on former quota waiting lists maintained prior to January 1, 1944, to be placed on the appropriate quota waiting lists maintained under authority of the Immigration and Nationality Act without loss of priority of their original registration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 846. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 847. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code to provide that State law shall, in certain cases, determine the number of jurors which constitute a jury and the number of jurors who must agree in order that there be a valid verdict; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 848. A bill to abolish the death penalty under all laws of the United States except the Uniform Code of Military Justice, and authorize the imposition of life imprisonment in lieu thereof; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 849. A bill to amend the Clayton Act to declare private antitrust suits to be impressed with a substantial public interest; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 850. A bill to fortify the antitrust policy of the United States against concentration of economic power and the use or abuse of that power to the detriment of the national economy by preventing manufacturers from financing the sales of their products; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 851. A bill to provide that for the purpose of disapproval by the President each provision of an appropriation bill shall be considered a separate bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 852. A bill to amend the Administrative Procedure Act so as to require every agency of the Federal Government to furnish to certain additional persons copies of certain notices or communications; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 853. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to make it unlawful to furnish transportation to certain unemployed persons and members of their family in order to cause any such person to move to another State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 854. A bill to amend section 1963 of title 28 of the United States Code to provide for the registration of that portion of divorce decrees providing for the payment of money or the transfer of property which have been entered in certain district courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 855. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code with respect to the eligibility of members of the bar of the U.S. Supreme Court to practice before all courts of appeals and district courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 856. A bill to provide for the publication before entry of decrees, judgments, and orders entered by consent upon the merits of civil antitrust proceedings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 857. A bill to prescribe a national policy with respect to the acquisition and disposition of proprietary rights in scientific and technical information obtained and inventions made through the expenditure of public funds; to establish in the executive branch of the Government a Federal Inventions Administration to administer in the public interest the proprietary rights of the United States with respect to such information and inventions; to encourage the contribution to the United States of inventions of significant value for national defense, public health, or any national scientific program; and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 858. A bill to amend the Bankruptcy Act with respect to the priority of debts owed by a bankrupt to workmen, servants, clerks, and certain salesmen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 859. A bill to amend the Bankruptcy Act with respect to the priority of debts owed by a bankrupt to workmen, servants, clerks, and certain salesmen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 860. A bill to provide an additional remedy for persons having a claim against the United States arising out of contracts relating to certain vessels; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 861. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 862. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit the use of "Federal," "National," or "United States"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 863. A bill to supplement the Sherman Act and the Federal Trade Commission Act by prohibiting automobile manufacturers from engaging in the businesses of financing and insuring automobiles purchased by consumers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 864. A bill to incorporate the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 865. A bill to provide for the establishment of a mint of the United States in the State of Illinois; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 866. A bill to provide for a more conservative capitalization of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H.R. 867. A bill to amend the act approved July 14, 1960 (74 Stat. 526), as amended, relating to the establishment of a register of names in the Department of Commerce of certain motor vehicle drivers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 868. A bill to provide for national cemeteries in the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 869. A bill to amend the act of April 19, 1950, relating to the rehabilitation of the Navajo and Hopi Tribes of Indians, to authorize certain additional highway projects; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 870. A bill to provide that the President shall include in the budget submitted to the Congress under section 201 of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, an item for not less than $2 billion to be applied toward reduction of the national debt; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 871. A bill to establish the calendar year as the fiscal year of the Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 872. A bill to amend the provisions of title 18 of the United States Code relating to offenses committed in Indian country; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 873. A bill to establish penalties for the operation of a motor vehicle between States by a person while his motor vehicle operator's license is suspended or revoked; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H.R. 874. A bill to amend the act of June 19, 1935 (49 Stat. 388), as amended, relating to the Tlingit and Haida Indians of Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 875. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land to the city of Anchorage, Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 876. A bill to establish a National Economic Conversion Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 877. A bill to establish the Department of Urban Affairs and prescribe its functions; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H.R. 878. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the full amount of any annuity received under the Civil Service Retirement Act shall be excluded from gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 879. A bill to amend subchapter S of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that a small business corporation may in certain cases retain its tax status thereunder even though one of its shareholders becomes a trust; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROGERS of Texas:

H.R. 880. A bill to close ports of the United States to certain vessels while engaged in trade with Cuba; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 881. A bill to authorize the establishment of the Alibates Flint Quarries and Texas Panhandle Pueblo Culture National Monument; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H.R. 882. A bill to reaffirm the national public policy and the purposes of Congress in enacting the Robinson-Patman Antiprice Discrimination Act entitled "An act to amend section 2 of the act entitled 'An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes,' approved October 15, 1914, as amended (U.S.C., title 15, sec. 13), and for other purposes," and to clarify the intent and meaning of the aforesaid law by providing for the mandatory nature of functional discounts under certain circumstances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Texas:

H.R. 883. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to prohibit the Federal Communications Commission from assessing fees or charges for services, publications, or instruments, unless specifically permitted by law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 884. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to prohibit the Federal Communications Commission from making certain rules relating to the length or frequency of broadcast advertisements; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 885. A bill to regulate the labeling and advertising of cigarettes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 886. A bill to protect consumers by requiring that imported meat and meat food products made in whole or in part with imported meat bear a label showing the country of origin of such imported meat; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 887. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code to require that all decisions of the Supreme Court shall be participated in by the full Court, and that any vacancies or absences in the membership of the Court shall be temporarily filled by circuit judges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 888. A bill to authorize establishment of the Tocks Island National Recreation Area in the States of Pennsylvania and New Jersey, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 889. A bill to prohibit the creation of interstate authorities having power to divert motor vehicle toll revenues to nonhighway purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 890. A bill to provide research, technical, and financial assistance with respect to the disposal of solid wastes to the several States and political subdivisions thereof; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 891. A bill to establish the Department of Urban Affairs and prescribe its functions; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. ROUDEBUSH:

H.R. 892. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the excise tax on communications; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 893. A bill to provide for the extension of the reclamation acts, as amended, to all of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 894. A bill to modernize the mining laws of the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 895. A bill to provide for a study by the Secretary of the Interior of strip-mining operations in the United States and for a report to Congress of the results of such study, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 896. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to provide for the sealing off of certain abandoned coal mines so as to prevent the pollution of waterways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SECREST:

H.R. 897. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Army to establish a national cemetery in Ohio; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 898. A bill to amend the Capper-Volstead Act, with respect to the control of unfair practices affecting associations of producers of agricultural products and members thereof; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 899. A bill to authorize waiver of indebtedness growing out of erroneous payments by the Armed Forces to military personnel or their dependents, to bar recovery of these payments if recovery action is not initiated within 6 years of payment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SISK:

H.R. 900. A bill to create four judicial districts for the State of California, to provide for the appointment of four additional district judges for the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 901. A bill to provide for an appropriation of a sum not to exceed $75,000 with which to make a survey of a proposed "Sierra Way" in the State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 902. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Auburn-Folsom south unit, American River division, Central Valley project, California, under Federal reclamation laws; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 903. A bill to add certain lands to the Kings Canyon National Park in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 904. A bill to amend section 301(a)(7) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H.R. 905. A bill to amend the act of June 22, 1936, relative to flood control, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. UTT:

H.R. 906. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to provide for the greater protection of the President and the Vice President of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.R. 907. A bill to provide for the disposition of judgment funds of the Klamath and Modos Tribes and Yahooskin Band of Snake Indians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WHITE of Idaho:

H.R. 908. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to designate the Nez Perce National Historical Park in the State of Idaho, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 909. A bill to require fresh potatoes purchased or sold in interstate commerce to be labeled according to the State in which such potatoes were grown; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WHITENER:

H.R. 910. A bill to amend section 1461 of title 18 of the United States Code with respect to the mailing of obscene matter, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 911. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide a more realistic definition of the term "disability" for purposes of entitlement to disability insurance benefits and the disability freeze; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 912. A bill to establish rules of interpretation governing questions of the effect of acts of Congress on State laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 913. A bill to amend section 3231, title 18, United States Code, to reaffirm the jurisdiction of State courts to enforce State statutes prohibiting subversive activities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 914. A bill to establish a program for the Government purchase and resale of domestically produced, newly mined processed mica and mica ore; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 915. A bill to repeal the excise tax on communications; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 916. A bill to amend the Trade Expansion Act of 1962; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 917. A bill to impose import limitations on certain meat and meat products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 918. A bill to provide that each member of the bar of the highest court of a State or of a Federal court shall be eligible to practice before all administrative agencies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 919. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code with respect to the eligibility of members of the bar of the U.S. Supreme Court to practice before all courts of appeals and district courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 920. A bill to prevent the Federal courts exercising jurisdiction in cases involving apportionment or reapportionment of the legislature of any State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.R. 921. A bill to establish the National Oceanographic Agency; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WYDLER:

H.R. 922. A bill for the establishment of a commission to study and appraise the organization and operation of the executive branch of the Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. YOUNGER:

H.R. 923. A bill to create a U.S. Academy of Foreign Service; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 924. A bill to provide that certain surplus property of the United States may be donated for park or recreational purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 925. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish a statutory policy governing the broadcasting of views on controversial issues; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 926. A bill to create a Department of Urbiculture, and to prescribe its functions; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 927. A bill to create a Department of Transportation and Communications, and to prescribe its functions; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 928. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to abolish the renewal requirement for licenses in the safety and special radio services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 929. A bill to amend section 403(b) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to permit the granting of free transportation to guides or dog guides accompanying totally blind persons; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 930. A bill to prohibit the introduction of merchandise into interstate commerce if a guarantee is made with respect to such merchandise unless the merchandise bears a complete return address; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 931. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, so as to add thereto provisions with respect to through bills of lading and liability for loss, damage, or injury to property; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 932. A bill to provide for the assessment and collection of fees to cover the cost of operation of certain regulatory agencies; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 933. A bill to require the procurement of certain services by Government agencies from commercial suppliers whenever economy will result from such procurement; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H.R. 934. A bill to amend the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended, to prohibit political contributions and lobbying by agents of foreign principals; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 935. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that full benefits (when based upon the attainment of retirement age) will be payable to men at age 60 and to women at age 60; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 936. A bill to establish the U.S. Academy of Foreign Affairs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 937. A bill granting the consent of Congress to a Great Lakes Basin compact, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 938. A bill to amend section 203(j) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 so as to provide that certain surplus property of the United States shall be offered for sale to the States; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 939. A bill to repeal the special tax imposed on amounts paid for admission, refreshment, service, and merchandise at roof-gardens, cabarets, and other similar places; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 940. A bill to increase from $600 to $800 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means

H.R. 941. A bill to provide Federal assistance for programs in the States for projects which will benefit older persons; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 942. A bill to authorize Federal financial assistance to the States to be used for constructing school facilities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 943. A bill to reaffirm the national public policy and the purpose of Congress in the laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, commonly designated "antitrust" laws, which among other things prohibit price discriminations; to aid in intelligent, fair, and effective administration and enforcement thereof; and to strengthen the Clayton Act as amended by the Robinson-Patman Act and the protection which it affords to independent business, the Congress hereby reaffirms that the purpose of the antitrust laws in prohibiting price discriminations is to conserve the opportunity of all persons to compete in trade or business; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 944. A bill to provide a residence for pages of the Senate and of the House of Representatives, under the supervision of a Capitol Pages' Residence Board; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 945. A bill to amend section 109 of title 38, United States Code, to provide benefits for members of the armed forces of nations allied with the United States in World War I or World War II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WHITENER:

H.R. 946. A bill relating to crime and criminal procedure in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 947. A bill to amend section 10 of the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended, so as to require reports of collisions in which motor vehicles are involved; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 948. A bill to amend part II of the District of Columbia Code relating to divorce, legal separation, and annulment of marriage in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 949. A bill to amend section 207, title 31, of the District of Columbia Code of 1961, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 950. A bill to amend section 103, title 31, of the District of Columbia Code of 1961, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H.R. 951. A bill to increase from $600 to $1,000 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemption for old age or blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 952. A bill to amend chapter 71 of title 38, United States Code, to permit judicial review of decisions of the Board of Veterans' Appeals in compensation and pension claims; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 953. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

H.R. 954. A bill for the relief of certain persons having summer homes in the Pinecrest Recreation Area, in the Stanislaus National Forest; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 955. A bill to provide benefits for members and survivors of members of the Philippine Scouts on the same basis as such benefits are provided for other members of the Armed Forces and their survivors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BONNER:

H.R. 956. A bill to amend the inland, Great Lakes, and western rivers rules concerning sailing vessels and vessels under 65 feet in length; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 957. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to increase from 2 to 2½ percent the retirement multiplication factor used in computing annuities of certain employees engaged in hazardous duties; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 958. A bill to increase the annuities of certain schoolteachers in the District of Columbia who retired prior to October 1, 1956; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 959. A bill to amend the Fire and Casualty Act regulating the business of fire, marine, and casualty insurance in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 960. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Leave Act of 1949 to remove certain limitations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 961. A bill to reduce the time in standby status of firefighting personnel of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 962. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, to provide annuities for surviving spouses without deduction from original annuities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 963. A bill to establish the position of U.S. customs inspector (nonsupervisory) in the Bureau of Customs, Department of the Treasury, to place such position in grade 10 of the Classification Act of 1949, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 964. A bill to provide certain increases in annuities payable from the civil service retirement and disability fund, to improve the financing of the civil service retirement system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 965. A bill to provide for the conveyance of the Accotink Dam and Reservoir area to Fairfax County, Va., as a public park and recreation area; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 966. A bill to amend section 8(b)(4) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, with respect to strikes at the sites of construction projects; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 967. A bill to amend section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act so as to protect the rights of employees and employers, in industries affecting commerce, to enter into union shop agreements; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H.R. 968. A bill to make it a criminal offense to deprive, or threaten to deprive, any person of Federal employment for refusing to contribute to a political party or candidate; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 969. A bill to authorize redetermination under the Civil Service Retirement Act of annuities of certain reemployed annuitants; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 970. A bill to require the establishment, on the basis of the 19th and subsequent decennial censuses, of congressional districts composed of contiguous and compact territory for the election of Representatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHELF:

H.R. 971. A bill to increase from $600 to $900 the income tax exemption allowed each taxpayer, each dependent, and $1,200 for a dependent child (until said dependent reaches 24 years of age) while attending any accredited business school, college, or university; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.R. 972. A bill to amend the act of June 6, 1933, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Labor to develop and maintain improved, voluntary methods of recruiting, training, transporting, and distributing agricultural workers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 973. A bill to provide for the establishment of a council to be known as the National Advisory Council on Migratory Labor; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 974. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to extend the child labor provisions thereof to certain children employed in agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 975. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act, 1938, as amended, to provide for minimum wages for certain persons employed in agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 976. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, so as to make its provisions applicable to agriculture; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. COLMER:

H.R. 977. A bill to establish rules of interpretation governing questions of the effect of acts of Congress on State laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 978. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an individual a deduction from gross income for expenses incurred by him for his education or the education of his spouse or any of his dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 979. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H.R. 980. A bill to provide for the return of obscene mail matter; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 981. A bill to repeal the excise tax on communications; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 982. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, and the Clean Air Act, as amended, to provide for improved cooperation by Federal agencies to control water and air pollution from Federal installations and facilities and to control automotive vehicle air pollution; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 983. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, to establish the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, to provide grants for research and development, to increase grants for construction of municipal sewage treatment works, to authorize the issuance of regulations to aid in preventing, controlling, and abating pollution of interstate waters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mrs. DWYER:

H.R. 984. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to limit or repeal certain retailers excise taxes and to repeal the manufacturers excise tax on musical instruments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 985. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase from $1,200 to $2,400 (or $3,600 in the case of a widow with minor children) the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H.R. 986. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FALLON:

H.R. 987. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to prohibit participation of Federal-aid funds in certain State or local taxes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 988. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to make a comprehensive study of certain future highway needs; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 989. A bill to amend the St. Lawrence Seaway Act to provide that the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation shall not engage in publicity or promotional activities such as free or paid advertising; solicitation of cargoes; publication of ocean, rail, port, or motor carrier rate or service comparisons; or other activities that are actually or potentially disruptive to the flow of waterborne trade among ports in the United States; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 990. A bill to establish within the Housing and Home Finance Agency a new program of mortgage insurance to assist in financing the construction, improvement, expansion, and rehabilitation of harbor facilities for boating and commercial craft; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 991. A bill to amend the Bankruptcy Act to increase the amount of wages entitled to priority to $2,000; to provide that pension, welfare, and other fringe benefits shall be treated as wages; and to increase the priority period from 3 months to 12 months with respect to certain wage components; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 992. A bill making Columbus Day a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 993. A bill to amend the Clayton Act to prohibit restraints of trade carried into effect through the use of unfair and deceptive methods of packaging or labeling certain consumer commodities distributed in commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 994. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to permit employees with at least 30 years of service to retire at 55 years of age with full annuities; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 995. A bill to provide coverage under the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system (subject to an election in the case of those currently serving) for all officers and employees of the United States and its instrumentalities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H.R. 996. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the benefits payable thereunder to the widows and surviving children of deceased insured workers, and to increase disability insurance benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 997. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit payment of child's insurance benefits after attainment of age 18 in the case of a child attending school; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 998. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without any deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 999. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase old-age and disability insurance benefits by $35 a month (and other monthly benefits proportionately), and to provide that full benefits (when based upon attainment of retirement age) will be payable to men at age 62 and women at age 60; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 1000. A bill to establish the Department of Education; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H.R. 1001. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1002. A bill to increase the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer, including the exemptions for a spouse and de-dependents and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness from $600 to $1,000; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1003. A bill to repeal the Federal retailers excise taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1004. A bill to establish the position of U.S. customs inspector (nonsupervisory) in the Bureau of Customs, Department of the Treasury, to place such position in grade 10 of the Classification Act of 1949, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 1005. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to permit, for 1 year, the granting of national service life insurance to certain veterans heretofore eligible for such insurance; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 1006. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide education and training, loan guaranty, wartime rates of disability compensation, pension, and other wartime service benefits to persons serving in combat zones after January 1, 1962; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H.R. 1007. A bill to amend the act of March 3, 1901, with respect to exemptions from attachment and certain other process in the case of persons not residing in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 1008. A bill to provide that the tax on admissions shall not apply to admissions to a moving picture theater; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1009. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the documentary stamp tax shall not apply with respect to any acquisition of realty through condemnation by a State or political subdivision thereof; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1010. A bill to amend the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that a fully insured individual may elect to have any employment or self-employment performed by him after attaining retirement age excluded (for both tax and benefit purposes) from coverage under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.R. 1011. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 1012. A bill to provide that tips received by an employee in the course of his employment shall be included as part of his wages for old-age, survivors, and disability insurance purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1013. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt from income tax retirement annuities and pensions paid by the United States to its employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1014. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an additional income tax exemption to certain physically handicapped individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1015. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to grant an additional income tax exemption to a taxpayer supporting a dependent who is permanently handicapped; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1016. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; and to provide that full benefits thereunder, when based upon the attainment of retirement age, will be payable to men at age 60 and to women at age 55; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1017. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase from 18 to 22, in the case of a child attending school, the age until which child's insurance benefits may be paid thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1018. A bill to amend chapter 79 of title 10, United States Code, to provide that certain boards established thereunder shall give consideration to satisfactory evidence relating to good character and exemplary conduct in civilian life after discharge or dismissal in determining whether or not to correct certain discharges and dismissals; to authorize the award of an exemplary rehabilitation certificate; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 1019. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide an allowance for work clothing for certain postal field service employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1020. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to authorize the retirement of employees after 30 years of service without reduction in annuity; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1021. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, in order to prevent the use of work measuring devices in the postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1022. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to increase the minimum wage to $2 an hour; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 1023. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide a new system of overtime compensation for postal field service employees, to eliminate compensatory time in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1024. A bill to amend section 503 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that workmen's compensation payments shall be disregarded in the computation of income for purposes of payment of pensions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 1025. A bill to increase from $600 to $900 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1026. A bill to amend title 37 of the United States Code to increase the subsistence allowance for members of the uniformed services to $75 per month; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 1027. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide that certain veterans who were prisoners of war shall be deemed to have a service-connected disability of 50 percent; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GROSS:

H.R. 1028. A bill to prohibit travel at Government expense outside of the United States by defeated or retiring Members of Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.R. 1029. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of the city of Santa Clara, in recognition of its historical significance in the Western United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1030. A bill to provide that the President shall designate one agency of the Federal Government to conduct all security investigations of civil officers and employees of the United States, and of persons who apply for employment as such officers and employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1031. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to enter into agreements with the States to provide for a private, voluntary medical care insurance program for certain persons over the age of 65, and to authorize payments by the Secretary to States to cover part of the costs of such insurance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1032. A bill to provide for the termination of programs of price support for agricultural commodities by December 31, 1970; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 1033. A bill to create the Freedom Commission for the development of the science of counteraction to the world Communist conspiracy and for the training and development of leaders in a total political war; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

H.R. 1034. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1035. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide that bagpipes and parts thereof shall be admitted free of duty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1036. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an exemption from the tax on club dues for nonprofit hunting and fishing clubs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1037. A bill to permit one-half of the budget surplus for any fiscal year to be applied against the public debt and to provide that one-half of such surplus shall be applied as tax credits against individual income taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1038. A bill to permit an individual to obtain coverage under title II of the Social Security Act on the basis of service which was not covered employment at the time it was performed, if service of that type has since become covered employment and such individual makes payment of the applicable social security taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1039. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the Secretary of the Treasury shall be bound by decisions of certain Federal courts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAGAN of Georgia:

H.R. 1040. A bill to increase from $600 to $1,200 the personal income-tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemptions for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 1041. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction for expenses incurred by a taxpayer in making repairs and improvements to his residence, and to allow the owner of rental housing to amortize at an accelerated rate the cost of rehabilitating or restoring such housing; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1042. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a depreciation deduction for the wear and tear of real property used as the taxpayer's principal residence; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARDY:

H.R. 1043. A bill to amend the National Security Act of 1947, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 1044. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the city of Norfolk, State of Virginia, certain lands in the city of Norfolk, State of Virginia, in exchange for certain other lands; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 1045. A bill to amend the Federal Voting Assistance Act of 1955; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 1046. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1047. A bill to amend section 102(a) of the Department of Agriculture Organic Act of 1944 to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out measures to eradicate ragweed; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 1048. A bill to amend section 201 of the Immigration and Nationality Act so as to provide that all quota numbers not used in any year shall be made available to immigrants in oversubscribed areas in the following year, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1049. A bill to amend section 201 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, so as to provide that the population figures for the year 1960 shall be used for the purpose of computing annual immigrant quotas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1050. A bill to grant nonquota status to any immigrant born in an independent country of the Western Hemisphere; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1051. A bill to provide that the United States shall reimburse the States and their political subdivisions for real property taxes not collected on real property owned by a foreign government and therefore exempt from taxation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 1052. A bill to authorize the appropriation of $3,063,500 as an ex gratia payment to the city of New York to assist in defraying the extraordinary and unprecedented expenses incurred during the 15th General Assembly of the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 1053. A bill to provide for the reentitlement of certain surviving widows to annuities under the Civil Service Retirement Act upon termination of their subsequent remarriages by reason of death of husband, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1054. A bill to prohibit the use of stopwatches or other measuring devices in the postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 1055. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to provide for the greater protection of the President and the Vice President of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KORNEGAY:

H.R. 1056. A bill to amend section 4233 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt from the admissions tax admissions to nonmotion-picture exhibitions, carnivals, rodeos, and circuses promoted by municipally owned facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1057. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish a Court of Veterans' Appeals and to prescribe its jurisdiction and functions; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KUNKEL:

H.R. 1058. A bill to prevent the use of stopwatches or other measuring devices in the postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 1059. A bill to repeal the 1966 multiple-price wheat program; to reinstate for the 1966 crop provisions of law applicable to wheat prior to the enactment of the 1962, 1963, 1964, and 1965 wheat programs; to allow all wheat farmers to vote in the national wheat marketing quota referendum; and to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to increase or suspend acreage allotments and marketing quotas on certain classes of wheat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 1060. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 1061. A bill to amend the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 to permit marketing orders applicable to Tokay grapes to provide for paid advertising; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 1062. A bill for the relief of certain persons having summer homes in the Pinecrest Recreation Area, in the Stanislaus National Forest; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 1063. A bill to provide for the acquisition of certain property in square 758 in the District of Columbia, as an addition to the grounds of the U.S. Supreme Court Building; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.R. 1064. A bill to authorize the acquisition, training, and maintenance of dogs to be used in law enforcement in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 1065. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Sales Tax Act to provide an exemption from the tax imposed by such act for certain operations of the majority and minority rooms of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 1066. A bill to amend section 11–1701 of the District of Columbia Code to increase the retirement salaries of certain retired judges; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MARSH:

H.R. 1067. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit donations of surplus property to volunteer firefighting organizations and volunteer rescue squads, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 1068. A bill to amend section 620 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to prohibit the furnishing of economic assistance to any country which does not grant to the United States most-favored-nation treatment with respect to the admission of our exports; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 1069. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.R. 1070. A bill to amend section 331 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 in order to continue the indemnity payment program for dairy farmers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 1071. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a 30-percent credit against the individual income tax for amounts paid for tuition, fees, or services to certain public and private institutions of higher education or for occupational training or retraining; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 1072. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 to provide for the stockpiling, storage, and distribution of agricultural commodities and products thereof for emergency purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 1073. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special commemorative postage stamp in memory of Dr. Jose Rizal, Philippine champion of liberty, and ex-President Emilio Aguinaldo, freedom fighters; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MATTHEWS:

H.R. 1074. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax for a portion of amounts paid for certain educational expenses incurred at an institution of higher learning or vocational training; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1075. A bill to extend for 2 years the definition of "peanuts" which is now in effect under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 1076. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to extend for 2 additional years the provisions permitting the lease of tobacco acreage allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 1077. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide that members of the Armed Forces shall be retired in the highest grade satisfactorily held in any armed force, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 1078. A bill to turn back to each State a portion of Federal income tax collected therein for use for educational purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1079. A bill to amend section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act to provide for the retirement of the public debt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.R. 1080. A bill to provide for the coverage of physicians by the insurance system established by title II of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 10[illegible] A bill to provide for the establishment of a program of Federal unemployment adjustment benefits, to provide for equalization grants, to extend coverage of the unemployment compensation program, to establish Federal requirements with respect to the weekly benefit amount and limit the tax credits available to employers in a State which does not meet such requirements, to establish a Federal requirement prohibiting States from denying compensation to workers undergoing training and deny tax credits to employers in a State which does not meet such requirement, to increase the wage base for the Federal unemployment tax, to increase the rate of the Federal unemployment taxes, to establish a Federal unemployment adjustment and equalization account in the Unemployment Trust Fund, to change the annual certification date under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act, to provide for a Special Advisory Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1082. A bill to amend section 218 of the Social Security Act to reopen and extend the period during which a State may elect to make retroactively certain special computations of the payments required of it pursuant to its agreement thereunder, and to extend the retroactive period to which such computations apply; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1083. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to authorize and facilitate the deduction from gross income by teachers of the expenses of education (including certain travel) undertaken by them, and to provide a uniform method of proving entitlement to such deduction; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MINSHALL:

H.R. 1084. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage aged individuals to obtain medical and hospital care under voluntary health insurance programs by allowing the cost of such programs as a tax credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1085. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit a taxpayer to deduct certain expenses paid by him in connection with his education, or the education of any of his dependents, at an institution of higher learning; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 1086. A bill to amend the Second Liberty Bond Act to provide that savings-type investors shall have priority in the allotment of certain bonds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1087. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to impose a graduated tax on the taxable income of corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1088. A bill to establish reciprocal import quotas upon the importation of confectionery and chocolate into the United States from foreign countries which impose quotas upon imports of confectionery and chocolate from the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1089. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code, act of February 10, 1939; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1090. A bill to repeal part I of subchapter G of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1091. A bill to amend paragraph 1798 (c)(2) of the Tariff Act of 1930 to eliminate the present temporary reductions in the exemption from duty enjoyed by returning residents in cases where the articles involved were obtained with foreign currencies purchased from the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1092. A bill to provide that communications relating to income tax which are mailed to a taxpayer shall not bear on the outer covering any markings which disclose information concerning such taxpayer's income or tax liability; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1093. A bill to provide for the payment of premiums on savings bonds and savings certificates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1094. A bill to provide for the establishment of a National Academy for Public Service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1095. A bill to prevent the use of stopwatches or other measuring devices in the postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1096. A bill to provide for the separation from the service of certain Government employees who have unpaid judgments against them, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1097. A bill to correct certain inequities with respect to the granting of survivor annuities under the Civil Service Retirement Act to certain students, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1098. A bill to extend the benefits of the Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act in certain cases; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1099. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to authorize retirement without reduction in annuity of employees with 20 years of service involuntarily separated from the service by reason of the abolition or relocation of their employment; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1100. A bill to amend the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, so as to authorize longevity step increases for officers and employees in grades above grade 15 of the general schedule; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1101. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to increase to 2½ percent the multiplication factor for determining annuities for certain Federal employees engaged in hazardous duties; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1102. A bill to provide that certain Government officers and employees shall be excused from duty for a sufficient period of time to vote in elections; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1103. A bill to authorize the retirement under the Civil Service Retirement Act, without reduction in annuity and regardless of age, of employees who have completed 30 years of service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1104. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to authorize the retirement of employees after 30 years of service without reduction in annuity; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1105. A bill to provide free postage for first-class letter mail matter sent by members of the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1106. A bill to authorize the transmission in the mails of lottery tickets and other matter relating to a lottery operated by a State or political subdivision thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1107. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the refund of duties paid on certain merchandise stolen while in the custody of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1108. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that, in the case of stock or stock options issued or granted in whole or in part for services rendered, the gain therefrom shall be treated as ordinary income, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1109. A bill to provide coverage under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system (subject to an election in the case of those currently serving) for all officers and employees of the United States and its instrumentalities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1110. A bill to amend the Federal Firearms Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H.R. 1111. A bill to provide for the optimum development of the Nation's natural resources through the coordinated planning of water and related land resources, through the establishment of a water resources council and river basin commissions, and by providing financial assistance to the States in order to increase State participation in such planning; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 1112. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide that any article of medical equipment or machinery imported by a State or its political subdivision for certain purposes shall be free of duty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1113. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1114. A bill to amend the Renegotiation Act of 1951 to assist small business, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1115. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that certain military service of a veteran entitled to a civil service retirement annuity may be counted for social security purposes if he irrevocably elects to exclude such service from the computation of such annuity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1116. A bill to designate judicial precedents which shall be binding in the administration and enforcement of the internal revenue laws; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1117. A bill to provide income-tax exemptions for members of the Armed Forces serving outside the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1118. A bill to amend section 103 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the interest on certain obligations shall not be tax exempt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1119. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a taxpayer a deduction from gross income for tuition and other expenses paid by him for his education or the education of his spouse or any of his dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1120. A bill to equalize income-tax revenues, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1121. A bill to provide for the waiver of income taxes on series E U.S. savings bonds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1122. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to permit the use of social security records to aid in locating runaway parents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1123. A bill to provide voluntary coverage under the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system for self-employed physicians; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1124. A bill to repeal certain miscellaneous excise taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1125. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1126. A bill to exempt from income tax, annuities and pensions paid by the United States to its employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1127. A bill to amend sections 512 and 513 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to provide direct loan funds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 1128. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide vocational rehabilitation, education and training, and loan guarantee benefits for veterans of service after January 31, 1955; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. NATCHER:

H.R. 1129. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide for the inclusion in the computation of accredited service of certain periods of service rendered States or instrumentalities of States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 1130. A bill to provide for the recognition of the Polish Legion of American Veterans by the Secretary of Defense and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PURCELL:

H.R. 1131. A bill to amend section 5 of the Area Redevelopment Act to require the Secretary of Commerce to prescribe standards based on the extent of migration out of certain areas for the purpose of designating such areas as redevelopment areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 1132. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to grant an additional income tax exemption to a taxpayer supporting a dependent or dependents who have intellectual limitations to the extent that ability to learn and to adapt to the demands of society is impaired; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H.R. 1133. A bill relating to the interest rates on loans made by the Treasury to the Department of Agriculture to carry out the programs authorized by the Rural Electrification Act of 1936; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 1134. A bill to amend section 206 of the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 1135. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and title II of the Social Security Act to provide that the Federal Government shall contribute one-third of the cost of financing the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program, with corresponding reductions in the contributions otherwise required of employees, employers, and self-employed individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H.R. 1136. A bill to provide for a program of agricultural land development in the State of Alaska; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 1137. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to include Alaska among those States which are permitted to divide their retirement systems into two parts for purposes of obtaining social security coverage under Federal-State agreement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 1138. A bill to prevent the use of stopwatches, work-measurement programs, or other performance standards operations as measuring devices in the postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1139. A bill to permit naturalization for certain employees of Free Europe Committee, Inc., or Radio Liberty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H.R. 1140. A bill to grant civil service employees retirement after 30 years' service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1141. A bill to amend section 356 of title 38, United States Code, to provide a permanent rating of 50-percent disability for veterans who have suffered from active tuberculosis for 10 or more years; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 1142. A bill to increase the personal income tax exemption of a taxpayer and the additional exemption for his spouse from $600 to $1,000, and to increase the exemption for a dependent from $600 to $1,000; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROGERS of Texas:

H.R. 1143. A bill to impose import limitations on certain meat and meat products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1144. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt from the highway use tax motor vehicles used by certain nonprofit organizations for disaster relief work; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1145. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the treatment of a dependent's income derived under State community property laws for purposes of determining the taxpayer's entitlement to a personal exemption for such dependent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROONEY of New York:

H.R. 1146. A bill to enable the mothers and widows of deceased members of the Armed Forces now interred in cemeteries outside the continental limits of the United States to make a pilgrimage to such cemeteries; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 1147. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 1148. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit payment of child's insurance benefits after attainment of age 18 in the case of a child attending school; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1149. A bill to amend the maximum hour provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide for a 35-hour workweek; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 1150. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act to provide for an increase in the minimum wage; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 1151. A bill to amend section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act so as to protect the rights of employees and employers, in industries affecting commerce, to enter into union shop agreements; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 1152. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to establish a national system of minimum retirement payments for all aged, blind, and disabled individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1153. A bill to amend section 302(c) of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, to permit employer contributions for joint industry promotion of products in certain instances or a joint committee or joint board empowered to interpret provisions of collective bargaining agreements; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 1154. A bill to provide that the Secretary of Commerce shall conduct a study to determine the practicability and desirability of the adoption by the United States of the metric system of weights and measures; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

H.R. 1155. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act to extend its protection to additional employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 1156. A bill to amend chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, in order to increase by 20 percent the income limitations imposed by that chapter on persons entitled to pensions thereunder; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 1157. A bill to convey certain oil and gas rights to the city of Los Angeles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 1158. A bill to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide further for the prevention of accidents in coal mines; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 1159. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide that, for the purpose of old-age and survivors insurance benefits, retirement age shall be 60 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1160. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a taxpayer increased personal exemptions for his children while they are attending school; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1161. A bill to provide for the medical and hospital care of the aged through a system of voluntary health insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SECREST:

H.R. 1162. A bill to permit certain employees of a State or political subdivision thereof to elect coverage under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system, as self-employed individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1163. A bill to amend the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 and the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 to reduce from 12 years to 6 years the Government service requirement for continuation of coverage under such acts after retirement; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1164. A bill to impose quota limitations on imports of foreign residual fuel oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1165. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1166. A bill to amend the Trade Expansion Act of 1962; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1167. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to prevent the disqualification for pension purposes of certain widows of Spanish-American War veterans who remarry; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 1168. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to permit a limited waiver of service-incurred disabilities in meeting health requirements for reinstatement of national service life insurance; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 1169. A bill to increase rates of death compensation payable under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 1170. A bill to amend section 312 of title 38, United States Code, to provide a presumption of service connection in the case of heart disease becoming disabling within 3 years after discharge; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SISK:

H.R. 1171. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act, 1938, as amended, to provide for minimum wages for certain persons employed in agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 1172. A bill to amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 to provide for the use of counterpart funds for international agricultural conferences; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 1173. A bill to amend section 4253 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt from the communications tax certain amounts paid to mutual or cooperative telephone companies for the repair or replacement of poles, wires, and other equipment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1174. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit the deduction of irrigation and other water district assessments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1175. A bill to provide for the renovation and modernization and an increase in the bed capacity of the Veterans' Administration hospital at Fresno, Calif.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of California:

H.R. 1176. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for the gradual reduction and eventual elimination of the tax on general telephone service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Iowa:

H.R. 1177. A bill to authorize loans for undergraduate study in public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H.R. 1178. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a 30-percent credit against the individual income tax for amounts paid as tuition or fees to certain public and private institutions of higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN:

H.R. 1179. A bill to provide reasonable safeguards for employees working with or exposed to the dangers of hazardous materials; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SCHWEIKER:

H.R. 1180. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to provide for the greater protection of the President and the Vice President of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TALCOTT:

H.R. 1181. A bill to provide benefits for members and survivors of members of the Philippine Scouts on the same basis as such benefits are provided for other members of the Armed Forces and their survivors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Forces.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 1182. A bill to provide direct aid to States and territories for educational purposes only; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1183. A bill to provide for an academy under the jurisdiction of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for the training of all U.S. astronauts; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

H.R. 1184. A bill to provide for a study and report to the Congress concerning the establishment of a National Space Museum; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

H.R. 1185. A bill to amend section 138 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 so as to provide for the reduction of the public debt by at least 10 percent of the estimated overall Federal receipts for each fiscal year; to the Committee on Rules.

H.R. 1186. A bill to authorize the Chief of Engineers to make certain repairs to roads in the Whitney Dam and Reservoir project; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 1187. A bill to provide direct aid to States and territories for educational purposes only; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 1188. A bill to provide career status as rural carriers without examination to certain qualified substitute rural carriers of record in certain cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1189. A bill relating to the distribution of the Yearbook of Agriculture; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. WATTS:

H.R. 1190. A bill to amend subsection (b) of section 512 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 by making it clear that the income, including subscription and advertising income, derived by an organization in carrying on any publication, such as a trade or professional journal, shall not be deemed to be unrelated business taxable income if the publication is substantially related to the purpose or function constituting the organization's basis for its tax exemption; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1191. A bill to amend subsection (c) of section 501 of the Internal Revenue Code by making it clear that the tax exemption of a civic league or organization exclusively for the promotion of social welfare shall not be affected because of income, including subscription and advertising income, derived from carrying on any publication, such as a journal, which is substantially related to the purpose or function constituting the organization's basis for its tax exemption; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHITE of Idaho:

H.R. 1192. A bill to establish in the Department of Agriculture an office for one additional Assistant Secretary, whose prime responsibility shall be forest resources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WYDLER:

H.R. 1193. A bill to establish a Commission on the Organization of the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. YOUNGER:

H.R. 1194. A bill relating to life insurance taken out to cover estimated liability for the Federal estate tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1195. A bill to simplify payroll administration in the House of Representatives by providing that the salaries of certain employees of the House, and the clerk hire allowance of Members, shall consist of aggregate annual amounts rather than basic annual amounts plus additional amounts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 1196. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 to provide that no documentary stamp tax shall be imposed with respect to any conveyance to which a State or political subdivision is a party; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1197. A bill to amend the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1948, to place certain restrictions on the use of the stationery allowance of Members of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 1198. A bill to advance certain officers on the retired list without affecting retirement pay; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 1199. A bill to provide for the adjustment of the basic salaries of postal field service employees on a regional basis in accordance with prevailing wage rates; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1200. A bill to provide that tips received by an employee in the course of his employment shall be included as part of his wages for old-age, survivors, and disability insurance purposes and for purposes of income tax withholding; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN:

H.R. 1235. A bill to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act so as to amend certain labeling provisions of the food, drug, and cosmetic chapters to assure adequate information for consumers, including cautionary labeling of articles where needed to prevent accidental injury; prohibit worthless ingredients in special dietary foods; require new therapeutic devices to be shown safe and efficacious before they are marketed commercially; require all antibiotics to be certified; provide adequate controls over the distribution of habit-forming barbiturates, stimulant and related drugs; require cosmetics to be shown safe before they are marketed commercially, clarify and strengthen existing inspection authority; make additional provisions of the act applicable to carriers; provide for administrative subpenas; prohibit the use of carcinogenic color additives in animal feeds; safeguard the health of children by banning sweetened or flavored aspirin from commerce; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. J. Res. 1. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to succession to the Presidency and Vice Presidency and to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.J. Res. 2. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POFF:

H.J. Res. 3. Joint resolution to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the succession to the Presidency and Vice Presidency and to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.J. Res. 4. Joint resolution designating the 6-day period beginning September 13, 1965, as "National Literacy Week," and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.J. Res. 5. Joint resolution to adopt a specific version of the Star-Spangled Banner as the national anthem of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 6. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHELF:

H.J. Res. 7. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to article III, section 1 of the Constitution of the United States, limiting the tenure of office of members of the Supreme Court to 15 years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOLE:

H.J. Res. 8. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.J. Res. 9. Joint resolution designating the fourth Sunday in September of each year as "Interfaith Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 10. Joint resolution designating the 14th day of March of each year as "Albert Einstein Memorial Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 11. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON of Tennessee:

H.J. Res. 12. Joint resolution to permit the flying of the flag of the United States for 24 hours of each day at the grave of Capt. William Driver in Nashville, Tenn.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.J. Res. 13. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.J. Res. 14. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States reserving to each State the exclusive power to apportion membership of its legislature; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARSH:

H.J. Res. 15. Joint resolution to establish an American Revolution Bicentennial Commission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.J. Res. 16. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to qualifications for election to the offices of President and Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. REID of Illinois:

H.J. Res. 17. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 18. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SECREST:

H.J. Res. 19. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN:

H.J. Res. 20. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the fourth Sunday in November in each year as "John Fitzgerald Kennedy Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H.J. Res. 21. Joint resolution to establish a temporary commission to study the veterans' program of the United States in the Philippines; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.J. Res. 22. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to the appointment of postmasters; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UTT:

H.J. Res. 23. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to abolishing personal income, estate, and gift taxes and prohibiting the U.S. Government from engaging in business in competition with its citizens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H.J. Res. 24. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 25. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide that no person may be a Member of Congress unless such person, when elected or appointed, possesses the qualifications of electors of the most numerous branch of the legislature of the State from which he is chosen, and has been an inhabitant for at least 5 years of such State; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 26. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing that the offering of prayers or any other recognition of God shall be permitted in public schools and other public places; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 27. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 28. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H.J. Res. 29. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to succession to the Presidency and Vice-Presidency and to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

H.J. Res. 30. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the popular election of President and Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 31. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H.J. Res. 32. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.J. Res. 33. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to Presidential inability; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 34. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to retirement of Federal judges at the age of 70 years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 35. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to appropriations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 36. Joint resolution to establish a Commission on Ethics in the Federal Government to interpret the application of the Code of Ethics for Government Service, to recommend modifications and improvements therein, as well as in criminal or other statutes relating to ethics, to investigate complaints of unethical conduct in Government service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.J. Res. 37. Joint resolution designating the bridge constructed over the Washington Channel of the Potomac River, in the District of Columbia, as the "Francis Case Memorial Bridge"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H.J. Res. 38. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution to enable the Congress to function effectively in time of emergency or disaster; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 39. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to appropriations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.J. Res. 40. Joint resolution to authorize the Attorney General to establish an Institute of Corrections for the training and instruction of corrections personnel selected by States and their municipal subdivisions in the field of correctional methods and techniques; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.J. Res. 41. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to succession to the Presidency and Vice-Presidency and to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLMER:

H.J. Res. 42. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin:

H.J. Res. 43. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DE LA GARZA:

H.J. Res. 44. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 45. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide that appropriations shall not exceed revenues of the United States, except in time of war or national emergency; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOLE:

H.J. Res. 46. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOWDY:

H.J. Res. 47. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FALLON:

H.J. Res. 48. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to permit the use of prayer in public schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GERALD R. FORD:

H.J. Res. 49. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FUQUA:

H.J. Res. 50. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States reserving to each State the exclusive power to apportion membership of its legislature; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 51. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.J. Res. 52. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States granting to citizens of the United States who have attained the age of 18 the right to vote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.J. Res. 53. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to provide for the appointment of a new Vice President whenever there is a vacancy in the office of Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.J. Res. 54. Joint resolution to provide for the honorary designation of St. Ann's Churchyard in the city of New York as a national historic site; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.J. Res. 55. Joint resolution declaring the first Tuesday after the first Monday of November in each even-numbered year to be a legal public holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGAN of Georgia:

H.J. Res. 56. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States permitting the offering of prayers and the reading of the Bible in public schools or other public bodies in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.J. Res. 57. Joint resolution to request the President to negotiate with the Mexican Government for the purpose of setting up a Joint United States-Mexican Commission to investigate the flow of marihuana, narcotic drugs, and dangerous drugs between the United States and Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HANSEN of Idaho:

H.J. Res. 58. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HECHLER:

H.J. Res. 59. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to grant to citizens of the United States who have attained the age of 18 the right to vote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.J. Res. 60. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 61. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States reserving to each State the exclusive power to apportion membership of its legislature; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 62. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United

States permitting the offering of prayers and the reading of the Bible in public schools in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H.J. Res. 63. Joint resolution to forestall intervention, domination, control, and colonization by international communism in the New World, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ICHORD:

H.J. Res. 64. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution relating to the apportionment of districts from which members of a State legislature or members of governing bodies of subordinate State units of government are to be elected; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.J. Res. 65. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution relating to the apportionment of districts from which members of a State legislature are to be elected; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KORNEGAY:

H.J. Res. 66. Joint resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Foreign Information and Intelligence; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KUNKEL:

H.J. Res. 67. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to succession to the Presidency and Vice Presidency and to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.J. Res. 68. Joint resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Foreign Information and Intelligence; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. McCULLOCH:

H.J. Res. 69. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAHON:

H.J. Res. 70. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARSH:

H.J. Res. 71. Joint resolution to establish a Stamp Act Congress Bicentennial Commission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATTHEWS:

H.J. Res. 72. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 73. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.J. Res. 74. Joint resolution to authorize a contribution to certain inhabitants of the Ryukyu Islands for death and injury of persons and for use of and damage to private property, arising from acts and omissions of the U.S. Armed Forces, or members thereof, after August 15, 1945, and before April 28, 1952; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.J. Res. 75. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the last Friday of April of each year as National Arbor Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.J. Res. 76. Joint resolution designating the 6th day of January of each year as Haym Salomon Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 77. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 78. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to the term of office and qualifications of Members of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 79. Joint resolution providing for the reimbursement of Members of the House of Representatives for amounts expended by them for certain travel and subsistence; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.J. Res. 80. Joint resolution requesting the President to instruct the permanent representative of the United States to the United Nations to request the Security Council without delay to convene the Arab States and the State of Israel and other interested nations in a peace conference; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PICKLE:

H.J. Res. 81. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POAGE:

H.J. Res. 82. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POFF:

H.J. Res. 83. Joint resolution to authorize transfer of a percentage of tax collections from individual and corporate income taxes to the States and territories for use for educational purposes only, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.J. Res. 84. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide that the term of office of Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States shall be 14 years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 85. Joint resolution designating the second Sunday in October of each year as National Grandmothers' Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PURCELL:

H.J. Res. 86. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H.J. Res. 87. Joint resolution expressing the determination of the United States with respect to the situation in Cuba and the Western Hemisphere; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.J. Res. 88. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 89. Joint resolution providing for a study to be conducted to determine and report to the Congress on ways and means of expanding and modernizing the Foreign Service of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.J. Res. 90. Joint resolution to provide for the erection in the city of Page, Ariz., of an appropriate marker to commemorate the achievements of former Commissioner of Reclamation John C. Page; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

H.J. Res. 91. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Texas:

H.J. Res. 92. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to authorize Congress to limit the power of course of the United States to determine that statutes of the United States or of any State are repugnant to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 93. Joint resolution providing for a study to be conducted to determine and report to the Congress on ways and means of expanding and modernizing the Foreign Service of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.J. Res. 94. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States requiring the advice and consent of the House of Representatives in the making of treaties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 95. Joint resolution to designate the lake to be formed by the waters impounded by Sanford Dam, Canadian River project, Texas, as Lake Meredith; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SISK:

H.J. Res. 96. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H.J. Res. 97. Joint resolution providing for the establishment of a National Letter Carriers Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 98. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the eligibility of certain persons to vote for any candidate for elector of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 99. Joint resolution authorizing the establishment of a National Railroad Museum in the city of Oneonta, N.Y.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.J. Res. 100. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue annually a proclamation designating the first week in March of each year as "Save Your Vision Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.J. Res. 101. Joint resolution to provide for the development of a program for controlling the production of cotton on a bale basis; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:

H.J. Res. 102. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H.J. Res. 103. Proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WATSON:

H.J. Res. 104. Joint resolution proposing a convention of the people of the United States to be known as the Freedom Convention, for the purpose of formulating a declaration of foreign policy for the United States, to be known as the U.S. Declaration of Freedom; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 105. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.J. Res. 106. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide that no person may be a Member of Congress unless such person, when elected or appointed, possesses the qualifications of electors of the most numerous branch of the legislature of the State from which he is chosen, and has been an inhabitant for at least 5 years of such State; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 107. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States permitting the offering of prayers and the reading of the Bible in public schools in the United States, and relating to the right of a State to enact legislation on the basis of its own public policy on questions of decency and morality; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 108. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H.J. Res. 109. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNGER:

H.J. Res. 110. Joint resolution designating the Luther Burbank Shasta daisy as the national flower of the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H.J. Res. 111. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H. Con. Res. 2. Concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Central Intelligence; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H. Con. Res. 3. Concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Intelligence Matters; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H. Con. Res. 4. Concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H. Con. Res. 6. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the distribution and viewing of the film prepared by the U.S. Information Agency entitled "Years of Lightning—Day of Drums"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BENNETT:

H. Con. Res. 7. Concurrent resolution to authorize the printing of additional copies of House Document No. 103 of the 86th Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H. Con. Res. 8. Concurrent resolution providing for a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H. Con. Res. 9. Concurrent resolution providing for one General Expenditure Authorization Act for each fiscal year, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H. Con. Res. 10. Concurrent resolution declaring the sense of Congress on the closing of Indian hospitals; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. Con. Res. 11. Concurrent resolution authorizing a study of the organization and operation of the Congress, and establishing a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FULTON of Tennessee:

H. Con. Res. 12. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the distribution and viewing of the film "Years of Lightning, Day of Drums," prepared by the U.S. Information Agency on the late President Kennedy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Con. Res. 13. Concurrent resolution relative to the Supreme Court decision on the reading of the Bible and offering of prayers in the public schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H. Con. Res. 14. Concurrent resolution that the President of the United States be requested to bring up the Baltic States question before the United Nations and that the United Nations conduct free elections in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, under its supervision; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H. Con. Res. 15. Concurrent resolution to establish a joint congressional committee, to make a full and complete study of the organization and operation of the Congress of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Con. Res. 16. Concurrent resolution to establish a joint congressional committee, to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the congressional page system; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GROSS:

H. Con. Res. 17. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that any variation in the traditional interpretation of the treaties between the United States and the Republic of Panama may only be made pursuant to treaty; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H. Con. Res. 18. Concurrent resolution providing for a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HECHLER:

H. Con. Res. 19. Concurrent resolution to provide for U.S. Information Agency film of the late President John F. Kennedy to be shown in the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. Con. Res. 20. Concurrent resolution establishing a Joint Committee of the Senate and House of Representatives on Organization of the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H. Con. Res. 21. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress on representation of China in the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Con. Res. 22. Concurrent resolution entitled "Objective—A Just Peace"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KING of Utah:

H. Con. Res. 23. Concurrent resolution establishing a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KUNKEL:

H. Con. Res. 24. Concurrent resolution establishing a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H. Con. Res. 25. Concurrent resolution urging the President of the United States to call attention to the denial of the rights of self-determination for the peoples of the Baltic States and to bring the force of world opinion to bear on behalf of the restoration of these rights to the Baltic peoples; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H. Con. Res. 26. Concurrent resolution to request the President of the United States to urge certain actions in behalf of Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MINISH:

H. Con. Res. 27. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the distribution and viewing of the film "Years of Lightning, Day of Drums," prepared by the U.S. Information Agency on the late President Kennedy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. Con. Res. 28. Concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Consumers; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Con. Res. 29. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the establishment of uniform traffic laws throughout the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. Con. Res. 30. Concurrent resolution relative to planning for peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Con. Res. 31. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the adoption by the United Nations of a universal declaration opposing religious intolerance and discriminatory practices; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Con. Res. 32. Concurrent resolution to favor the establishment of an international living museum of anthropology and ethnography; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PIRNIE:

H. Con. Res. 33. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the distribution and viewing of the film "Years of Lightning, Day of Drums" prepared by the U.S. Information Agency on the late President Kennedy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. POFF:

H. Con. Res. 34. Concurrent resolution relating to treaties between the United States and the Republic of Panama; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. Con. Res. 35. Concurrent resolution to provide for the establishment of a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H. Con. Res. 36. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the distribution and viewing of the film "Years of Lightning, Day of Drums" prepared by the U.S. Information Agency on the late President Kennedy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Con. Res. 37. Concurrent resolution to bring justice to Cyprus; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. REUSS:

H. Con. Res. 38. Concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H. Con. Res. 39. Concurrent resolution expressing the determination of the United States with respect to the matter of general disarmament and arms control; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Con. Res. 40. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to action by the United Nations concerning the Soviet rule over the Baltic States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. Con. Res. 41. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the incorporation of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Con. Res. 42. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the film "John F. Kennedy—Years of Lightning, Day of Drums" should be available for public viewing within the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROONEY of New York:

H. Con. Res. 43. Concurrent resolution requesting the President to initiate action leading to the adoption of a United Nations resolution calling for the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia; the return of exiles from these nations from slave-labor camps in the Soviet Union; and the conduct of free elections in these nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Con. Res. 44. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the persecution by the Soviet Union of persons because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H. Con. Res. 45. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the distribution and viewing of the film "Years of Lightning, Day of Drums" prepared by the U.S. Information Agency on the late President Kennedy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RYAN:

H. Con. Res. 46. For a study of the procedures of Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Con. Res. 47. Expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the distribution and viewing of the U.S. Information Agency film entitled "John F. Kennedy: Years of Lightning, Day of Drums"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H. Con. Res. 48. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the distribution and viewing of the film "Years of Lightning, Day of Drums" prepared by the U.S. Information Agency on the late President Kennedy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SPRINGER:

H. Con. Res. 49. Concurrent resolution proposing the establishment of a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H. Con. Res. 50. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the persecution by the Soviet Union of persons because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Con. Res. 51. Concurrent resolution to request the President of the United States to urge certain actions in behalf of Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H. Con. Res. 52. Authorizing the printing of additional copies of a Veterans' Benefits Calculator; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin:

H. Con. Res. 53. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to a program for paying the national debt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. Con. Res. 54. Concurrent resolution to grant national recognition to the Circus World Museum at Baraboo, Wis.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UDALL:

H. Con. Res. 55. Concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Ethics in the legislative branch of Government; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Con. Res. 56. Concurrent resolution relative to population growth and requesting the creation of a Presidential Commission on Population; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H. Con. Res. 57. Concurrent resolution to allow the showing in the United States of the U.S. Information Agency film "John F. Kennedy—Years of Lightning; Day of Drums"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Con. Res. 58. Concurrent resolution to provide for the creation of a Joint Committee on Consumer Interest; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H. Con. Res. 59. Concurrent resolution providing for a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BENNETT:

H. Con. Res. 60. Concurrent resolution providing for a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H. Con. Res. 61. Concurrent resolution providing for a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H. Con. Res. 62. Concurrent resolution providing for a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HECHLER:

H. Con. Res. 63. Concurrent resolution providing for a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. McCLORY:

H. Con. Res. 64. Concurrent resolution providing for a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H. Con. Res. 65. Concurrent resolution providing for a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. POAGE:

H. Con. Res. 66. Concurrent resolution providing for a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H. Con. Res. 67. Concurrent resolution providing for a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. EVINS of Tennessee:

H. Res. 13. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct studies and investigations of the problems of small business; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. Res. 14. Resolution establishing a Special Committee on the Captive Nations; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H. Res. 15. Resolution establishing a Special Committee on the Captive Nations; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BENNETT:

H. Res. 17. Resolution authorizing and directing the Committee on House Administration to rent or otherwise acquire a suitable residence, within a reasonable distance from the Capitol, to be maintained as a home for pages employed by the House, and to appoint an individual or individuals of mature years to act as supervisor of the home and to be responsible for its operation under rules and regulations made by the committee; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. Res. 18. Resolution creating in the House of Representatives a Committee on Grievances to study complaints concerning the conduct of Members of the House of Representatives and to make investigations and appropriate recommendations thereon; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Res. 19. Resolution authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary to conduct studies and investigations relating to certain matters within its jurisdiction; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 20. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H. Res. 21. Resolution creating a nonlegislative select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the aged and aging; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. Res. 22. Resolution establishing a Special Committee on the Captive Nations; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California:

H. Res. 23. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to abolish the Committee on Un-American Activities and to enlarge the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H. Res. 24. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to conduct an investigation and study of the sale of lethal firearms in interstate and foreign commerce; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 25. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to abolish the Committee on Un-American Activities and to enlarge the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. Res. 26. Resolution to provide for the unity of Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H. Res. 27. Resolution creating a Select Committee on Consumer Interests; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 28. Resolution establishing a Special Committee on the Captive Nations; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GROSS:

H. Res. 29. Resolution creating a standing Committee on Small Business in the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 30. Resolution to amend clause 6 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 31. Resolution to inquire into the financial or business interests of any present or former Member, officer, or employee of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 32. Resolution amending clause 2, subsection a, of rule XI, and clause 4 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H. Res. 33. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to efforts of the President to secure a universal condemnation of anti-Semitism; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Res. 34. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that Soviet religious persecution be condemned; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. Res. 35. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to conduct investigations and studies with respect to matters within its jurisdiction; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HORTON:

H. Res. 36. Resolution establishing a Special Committee on the Captive Nations; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KUNKEL:

H. Res. 37. Resolution declaring the Eastern Orthodox Church to be a major faith in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H. Res. 38. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to transfer the responsibilities of the Committee on Un-American Activities to the Committee on the Judiciary; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 39. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the problems of urban areas; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 40. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives on the use of the Congressional Record; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 41. Resolution authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary to conduct an investigation to determine whether a Reserve commission is incompatible with the holding of a seat in Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H. Res. 42. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct a study of the fiscal organization and procedures of the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 43. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the administration, operation, and enforcement of the Export Control Act of 1949, and related acts; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. Res. 44. Resolution to authorize the Committee on the District of Columbia to conduct an investigation and study of the organization, management, operation, and administration of departments and agencies of the government of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MINISH:

H. Res. 45. Resolution favoring an agreement among states of the Near East prohibiting the production of nuclear weapons and offensive missiles; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. Res. 46. Resolution creating a committee to investigate, make findings, and determine the representation in the House to which each State shall be qualified; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 47. Resolution to increase personal income tax exemptions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. Res. 48. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to provide that the Committee on Banking and Currency shall have jurisdiction over all consumer problems; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 49. Resolution to amend rule XXIV of the Rules of the House of Representatives to establish a method for the consideration of bills providing for home rule in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 50. Resolution condemning persecution by the Soviet Union of persons because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HAWKINS:

H. Res. 51. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to abolish the Committee on Un-American Activities and to enlarge the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. POFF:

H. Res. 52. Resolution amending clause 2(a) of rule XI and clause 4 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H. Res. 53. Resolution providing for the reading of the Declaration of Independence in the House of Representatives each year in celebration of the Fourth of July; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 54. Resolution establishing a Special Committee on the Captive Nations; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. QUIE:

H. Res. 55. Resolution to set national policies for local airline service; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mrs. REID of Illinois:

H. Res. 56. Resolution amending clause 2(a) of rule XI and clause 4 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RESNICK:

H. Res. 57. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to abolish the Committee on Un-American Activities and to enlarge the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H. Res. 58. Resolution to amend rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 59. Resolution amending clause 2 (a) of rule XI and clause 4 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 60. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of management and coordination problems in the various foreign assistance programs of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ROGERS of Texas:

H. Res. 61. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation with respect to the real property owned by the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 62. Resolution to create a select committee to investigate personnel and procedures in the Department of State of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 63. Resolution providing for an investigation and study of the production, distribution, and exhibition of objectionable motion pictures and related advertising by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, acting through a special subcommittee; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. Res. 64. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to transfer the responsibilities of the Committee on Un-American Activities to the Committee on the Judiciary; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H. Res. 65. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to abolish the Committee on Un-American Activities and to enlarge the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H. Res. 66. Resolution to establish a House Committee on the Captive Nations; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 67. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the people of all Ireland should have an opportunity to express their will for union by an election under the auspices of a United Nations Commission; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H. Res. 68. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Veterans' Affairs to conduct investigations and studies; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 69. Resolution to provide for the expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 68; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. YOUNGER:

H. Res. 70. Resolution to create a select committee on fiscal organization and procedures of the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 71. Resolution to amend the rules of the House of Representatives to create a standing committee to be known as the Committee of Inquiry which shall have no legislative jurisdiction; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 72. Resolution to provide a residence for pages; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H. Res. 73. Resolution to abolish the House Committee on Un-American Activities; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H. Res. 74. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to conduct an investigation and study of the extent to which employment in the Federal Government is denied to individuals because of age; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to calling a convention to propose an amendment to the U.S. Constitution reserving to the States exclusive jurisdiction of public school systems and the operations thereof; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Virginia, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to calling a convention to propose amendments to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Virginia, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting the U.S. Post Office Department to issue a stamp commemorating Governor Spotswood's expedition to the Valley of Virginia; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to applying the provisions of or, alternatively, to extend the coverage of the Federal antitrust laws to major league baseball; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to authorizing and providing for the construction and maintenance of a veterans' hospital in the southern part of New Jersey; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois:

H.R. 1201. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Galluzzo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1202. A bill for the relief of Jillian Vera Griffiths Hussey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1203. A bill for the relief of Branko Cule; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1204. A bill for the relief of Hassan Sayeed; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1205. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Nelly Ramirez and Sandra Ramirez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1206. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mildred C. Cadwell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

H.R. 1207. A bill for the relief of Christina Doskalopolou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1208. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Prudence Sui-Ning Chow and her daughter, Elie Tsai; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1209. A bill for the relief of Miss Nabila Abden Rahman Salim Mujahed; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1210. A bill for the relief of Le-Shiu Du and Chen Chin-Lan Tu (also known as Mr. and Mrs. R. S. Tu); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1211. A bill for the relief of Moon Fay Louie; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1212. A bill for the relief of Leonida A. Escamos, Emerita A. Escamos, and Teresita A. Escamos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1213. A bill for the relief of Alexandra Matara Narayan and Jagjiwan Narayan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1214. A bill for the relief of Miss Linda B. Aguinaldo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H.R. 1215. A bill for the relief of Murad and Ferial Kazanjian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1216. A bill for the relief of Louisa and Bernardino Pietrangelo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.R. 1217. A bill for the relief of Capt. Paul W. Oberdorfer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1218. A bill for the relief of T. W. Holt & Co. and/or Holt Import & Export Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1219. A bill for the relief of Maria Pagano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1220. A bill for the relief of Dr. Antonio Josue Castillo; to the Committee on the Judiciary

H.R. 1221. A bill for the relief of Betty H. Going; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1222. A bill for the relief of Woo Foon Leung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1223. A bill for the relief of Dr. Houshang Etessam; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 1224. A bill for the relief of Francis Janis and certain other Indians; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1225. A bill for the relief of the estate of Mary L. McNamara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. BOLTON:

H.R. 1226. A bill for the relief of Helene Bleier; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1227. A bill for the relief of Gizella Erenyi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1228. A bill for the relief of Theodora Manafis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1229. A bill for the relief of Tamas Gathy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1230. A bill for the relief of Oreste Ianiro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1231. A bill for the relief of Maria Mangano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 1232. A bill for the relief of Carlos Rogelio Flores-Vasquez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1233. A bill for the relief of Lee Chung Woo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1234. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Eugenia H. Tucker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1236. A bill for the relief of Salvador Munoz-Tostado; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1237. A bill for the relief of Norton Patrick Easton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1238. A bill for the relief of Peter Pastor Edo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1239. A bill for the relief of Martin W. Elliott; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio:

H.R. 1240. A bill for the relief of Harry C. Engle; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 1241. A bill relating to the effective date of the qualification of the profit-sharing plan of the Arlington Realty Co. as a qualified trust under section 401(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1242. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain real property to J. E. Bashor and Marie J. Bashor; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 1243. A bill for the relief of Charlotte Beulah Norrthon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1244. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the U.S. Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of Lt. Col. Harry L. Haverstick against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1245. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of Clyde Lennox; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1246. A bill for the relief of Elsie Anita Jardim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1247. A bill for the relief of Col. and Mrs. Harvey H. Hewitt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1248. A bill for the relief of Thomas H. Hughes, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1249. A bill for the relief of John A. Tarin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia (by request):

H.R. 1250. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Clorinda (Frattini) Iacangelo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1251. A bill for the relief of Anis Butros Sakhleh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1252. A bill for the relief of Horst Mueller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1253. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Suat-Lieu Soong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1254. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Yok Sun Lee and her minor son, Mark Tom; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1255. A bill for the relief of Mariam Beatrice Bedrossian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1256. A bill for the relief of Victor O. McNabb; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1257. A bill for the relief of Mir Vilayet Ali; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1258. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. M. E. Whitman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1259. A bill for the relief of Francis Paik Hwang Hahn, his wife, Theresa Hisun Ahn Hahn, and their two minor sons, John Chang Soo Hahn and Andrew In Soo Hahn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1260. A bill for the relief of Ilias Kiriakou and his wife, Maria Kiriakou, and their children, Xristin, Markos, and Emelia Kiriakou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1261. A bill for the relief of Mesrob Hovhannes Vartanian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1262. A bill for the relief of Henry Ramon Lara, M.D., and his wife, Fe DeLeon Lara, and their son, Henry Raymond Lara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1263. A bill for the relief of Hamendra C. Parikh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1264. A bill for the relief of Tsu Hsien Wong and his wife, Chin Lee Wong, and their child, Leonora Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1265. A bill for the relief of Eugenia Bilidas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1266. A bill for the relief of Yung Ja Chun; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1267. A bill for the relief of Maria Puglisi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1268. A bill for the relief of Drew V. Dean; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1269. A bill for the relief of H. Foster Hunter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1270. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lilia Lee Janse and her minor children, Margarita Janse, Lilia Gloria Janse, and Doris Janse; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1271. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rosa Lee and her sons, Tom Lee (also known as Tom Dang) and Enrique Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H.R. 1272. A bill for the relief of Zofia Jakusz-Gostomska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 1273. A bill for the relief of Kenneth Harris and Marie Harris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1274. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Michiko Miyazaki Williams; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1275. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Jadwiga (Ita) Lapides; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1276. A bill for the relief of Berta Drose; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHELF:

H.R. 1277. A bill for the relief of Jesse B. Dean; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1278. A bill for the relief of Mr. Alexandar Jacimovic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1279. A bill for the relief of Maria Pilar Abad Cambra, Encarnacion Armendariz Penagaricano, and Maria Pons Delgago; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H.R. 1280. A bill for the relief of Carlota Figueira Miquens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 1281. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Gladys O. Brown; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1282. A bill for the relief of Mario Gvardijan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1283. A bill for the relief of Michelangelo Granato; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1284. A bill for the relief of Maritsa Bitzikis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1285. A bill for the relief of Madelyn Swanwick; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DE LA GARZA:

H.R. 1286. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the former owner thereof; to the Committee on the Armed Services.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 1287. A bill for the relief of Wlodzimiesz Cielecki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. DWYER:

H.R. 1288. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Nickolitsa Alexopoulos Gerondelis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FALLON:

H.R. 1289. A bill for the relief of Sotirios John Pappathasiou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1290. A bill for the relief of Constantinos Kioumourtzoglou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H.R. 1291. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth A. Dombrowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1292. A bill for the relief of Woo Soon Kook; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GERALD R. FORD:

H.R. 1293. A bill for the relief of Dorian Whang and Bonita Whang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 1294. A bill for the relief of Abdul Rashid Khan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON of Tennessee:

H.R. 1295. A bill for the relief of Rajinder Naph Chadha; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1296. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey certain lands at the Old Hickory lock and dam, Cumberland River, Tenn., to the Tennessee Society for Crippled Children and Adults, Inc.; to the Committee on the Armed Services.

H.R. 1297. A bill for the relief of Rajinder Nath Chadha; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1298. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Huo Mei Ling Yen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H.R. 1299. A bill for the relief of Peitrina Del Frate; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H.R. 1300. A bill for the relief of Dr. Polieno A. Cespon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1301. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Conti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1302. A bill for the relief of Sesinando S. Calalang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1303. A bill for the relief of Cleopatra Trentowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 1304. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Sophia Iz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1305. A bill for the relief of Milton Thomas Sealy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1306. A bill for the relief of Loretta Negrin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1307. A bill for the relief of Eileen Millicent Henry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1308. A bill for the relief of Harold McDonald Maloney and his wife, Yvonne Angela Maloney; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 1309. A bill for the relief of Edward Berger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1310. A bill for the relief of Aldo Casole; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1311. A bill for the relief of Joseph J. McDevitt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H.R. 1312. A bill for the relief of Annunziata Zingarelli (also known as Pedone); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1313. A bill for the relief of Michael P. Klingelhoeffer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GROSS:

H.R. 1314. A bill for the relief of Foster Masahiko Gushard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.R. 1315. A bill for the relief of Dr. Chi-Chang Chao; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1316. A bill for the relief of William J. P. O'Brien; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1317. A bill to provide for the free entry of a mass spectrometer which was imported during May 1963 for the use of Stanford University, Stanford, Calif.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1318. A bill for the relief of Gum Chong Jew; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1319. A bill for the relief of Joseph Durante; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1320. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Antonia Farina Avenger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1321. A bill for the relief of Soo Bong Kim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1322. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Anna Christina Rainforth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGAN of Georgia:

H.R. 1323. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the U.S. Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of Leonidas B. Mallard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1324. A bill for the relief of Dr. Chen-Tsuau Su and Angela Su; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1325. A bill for the relief of Georgios Minakakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALL:

H.R. 1326. A bill for the relief of Marjorie Elizabeth Mullan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARDY:

H.R. 1327. A bill for the relief of Gerassimos N. Maratos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.R. 1328. A bill for the relief of Glenn D. Humes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 1329. A bill for the relief of Vito Fustaneo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1330. A bill for the relief of Genowefa Maturska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1331. A bill for the relief of Maria Angela Visca; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1332. A bill for the relief of Victoria Galante; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.R. 1333. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Willifred S. Shirley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 1334. A bill for the relief of Francesca Laiosa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1335. A bill for the relief of Serafina Salamone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H.R. 1336. A bill for the relief of Rene Hugo Heimann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1337. A bill for the relief of Sabri Sungu, his wife, Hatice Necla Sungu, and their daughter, Ayse Esen Sungu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1338. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Eugenie Ishkanian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1339. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Isabel Whittaker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1340. A bill for the relief of Maria Carmen Anihin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 1341. A bill for the relief of Gerald Berman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1342. A bill for the relief of Enester Cox; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1343. A bill for the relief of Jechiel Shulkes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1344. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lea Beatus and her children, Josef and Tauba; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1345. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hani Auspitz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1346. A bill for the relief of Rumia Rachel Nahari-Levy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1347. A bill for the relief of Cynthia L. Morrison; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1348. A bill for the relief of Clyde Cumberbatch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1349. A bill for the relief of Vincenzo Iannarelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1350. A bill for the relief of Immacolata Napoli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1351. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Alice Rousseau, nee Awed; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1352. A bill for the relief of Sema Bornstein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1353. A bill for the relief of Livia Schwartz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1354. A bill for the relief of Pamalet Maxian Garth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1355. A bill for the relief of Rodolfo, Clelia Pitta, and Giovanna Branchinella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 1356. A bill for the relief of the estate of Johanna Gristede, deceased; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1357. A bill for the relief of Althea Hadaway; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1358. A bill for the relief of Norma Delores Pitter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1359. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Esther Telushkin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1360. A bill for the relief of Lucia Benistati; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1361. A bill to authorize Rear Adm. Gordon McLintock, U.S. Maritime Service, to accept the award of the Order of Maritime Merit, Degree of Commander, and to wear and display the insignia thereof; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 1362. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Chu Chai-ho Hay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1363. A bill for the relief of Manuel Martinez Gonzalez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1364. A bill for the relief of Peter Vidoje Bjelica; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEGGETT:

H.R. 1365. A bill to provide that certain service performed by employees of the Vallejo General Hospital, Vallejo, Calif., shall be considered covered employment for social security purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1366. A bill for the relief of Josefina Mario; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1367. A bill for the relief of Luciano Vighi, Oliba Vighi, and Claudio Vighi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1368. A bill for the relief of Rudolf Kalin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1369. A bill for the relief of Slovenka Perusko; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1370. A bill for the relief of Amador Caceres, Maria Caceres, and their children, Josephine, Yolanda, Fernando, Emma, and Ricardo Caceres; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1371. A bill for the relief of Gwendolyn Dodsley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1372. A bill for the relief of Nawab Ali; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1373. A bill for the relief of Faustino M. Gayo, M.D.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1374. A bill for the relief of CWO Elden R. Comer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1375. A bill for the relief of Lynette Margaret Warrilow; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1376. A bill for the relief of Mohinder Singh Ghah; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1377. A bill for the relief of Milka Singh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1378. A bill for the relief of Ram Johl Singh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LENNON:

H.R. 1379. A bill for the relief of Pola Bodenstein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 1380. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Nathalie Iline; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1381. A bill for the relief of the estate of Rafaello Busoni; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1382. A bill for the relief of Anna Mizrahi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1383. A bill for the relief of Mrs. May Cagney; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1384. A bill for the relief of Theodore Zissu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1385. A bill for the relief of Krsto Kolega and his wife, Bozica Kolega; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H.R. 1386. A bill to provide for the free entry of one mass spectrometer for the use of Pomona College; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1387. A bill for the relief of E. Christian Des Marets, Sr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1388. A bill for the relief of Maj. Ralph D. Caldwell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCLORY:

H.R. 1389. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. Phillip L. Vetrone, U.S. Army; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 1390. A bill for the relief of Charles M. Weber; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H.R. 1391. A bill for the relief of Dirk Arnold ten Grotenhuis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1392. A bill for the relief of Annie Gabbay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1393. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maria Eduvigis Aran Heffernan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1394. A bill for the relief of Marie Katemopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1395. A bill for the relief of Irene McCafferty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1396. A bill for the relief of Masao Ebara Bennion; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1397. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Diruhi Platin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARSH (by request):

H.R. 1398. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to entertain, hear, and determine a motion for a new trial on the claim of Robert Alexander; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 1399. A bill for the relief of (Charles) Chang Kee Hong, his wife, Kerm Soon Hahm (Hong), and their minor daughters, Mi Young Hong, Sun Young Hong, and Bo Young Hong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1400. A bill for the relief of Dr. Toshi Tsurumaki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATTHEWS:

H.R. 1401. A bill for the relief of Dr. Manuel A. Sala; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1402. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jorge Rosendo Barahona; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MICHEL:

H.R. 1403. A bill for the relief of Eugene Ahrends; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1404. A bill for the relief of Dr. George H. Edler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1405. A bill for the relief of Dr. Bhagawandas P. Lathi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1406. A bill for the relief of Sydney Cecil Phillips; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.R. 1407. A bill for the relief of Leonardo Russo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1408. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Tsang Yenna and her son and daughters, Au Tim Kin, Au Yan Yan, and Au Oi Yu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1409. A bill for the relief of Louis W. Hann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1410. A bill for the relief of Nartouhi Voskeritchian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 1411. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Consiglia Di Giacomo Vozza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 1412. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Catherina Varisco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1413. A bill for the relief of Peter Czaban; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1414. A bill for the relief of Jacobo Temel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1415. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Guisippina Russo Luciforo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1416. A bill for the relief of Efrosini D. Tsarouhas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1417. A bill for the relief of Pierina Chione; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1418. A bill for the relief of Helen J. Googins; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1419. A bill for the relief of Emin S. Stephanian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1420. A bill for the relief of Franciszek Doda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1421. A bill for the relief of Antoun Nachef; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1422. A bill for the relief of Nicolaos A. Papoulias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1423. A bill for the relief of Giuseppina Vaccarezza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1424. A bill for the relief of Virgilio Vaccarezza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 1425. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Frida Fallas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1426. A bill for the relief of Michel Harari; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1427. A bill for the relief of Judith Harari-Raful; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1428. A bill for the relief of Hong Foon Hom; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1429. A bill for the relief of Ricardo R. Honrado; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1430. A bill for the relief of Isaac Ozeri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1431. A bill for the relief of Edmond Sutton and his wife, Vivianne Sutton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1432. A bill for the relief of Marco Yedid, his wife, Clara Yedid, and their daughter, Fortunata Yedid; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1433. A bill for the relief of Joseph Yeheskel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1434. A bill for the relief of Anna Maria Zagara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1435. A bill for the relief of Salomon Zami-Setton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1436. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rivka Zuraw; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1437. A bill for the relief of Salomon Vilk Datnov; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1438. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Dvora Eisenberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1439. A bill for the relief of Francesco Bongiovanni; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1440. A bill for the relief of Emanuale Balestrieri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1441. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rebecca Shavitch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1442. A bill for the relief of Joseph Salem; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1443. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Olga Bernice Bramson Gilfillan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1444. A bill for the relief of Sehimi Aktschura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1445. A bill for the relief of Charles Marowitz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.R. 1446. A bill for the relief of Jessie Hunter Todd; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H.R. 1447. A bill for the relief of Dr. Catalina Lee Huang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Michigan:

H.R. 1448. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Franciszka Andres Beregsasi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1449. A bill for the relief of Bro. Antonio Testori; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1450. A bill for the relief of Manuel Oncina, his wife, Isabel Oncina, and their children, Juan Manuel Oncina and Jose Luis Oncina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1451. A bill for the relief of Stanislaw Wicha; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1452. A bill for the relief of Sister Maria Silvia (Natalina DaDalt) and Sister Maria Angela (Rosa Colombo); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 1453. A bill for the relief of the Jefferson Construction Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1454. A bill for the relief of Eeva-Liisa Martola Gehring; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 1455. A bill for the relief of Fitz Neptune (also known as Fitz Mims); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. QUIE:

H.R. 1456. A bill for the relief of Jessie Hunter Todd; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RACE:

H.R. 1457. A bill for the relief of Christos Panagiotopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. REID of Illinois:

H.R. 1458. A bill for the relief of Jose Carrasco Hendy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. REID of Illinois (by request):

H.R. 1459. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Rome J. Moga; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H.R. 1460. A bill to authorize the disposal of surplus equipment, materials, books, and supplies under section 203(j) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to the Arizona Boys' Ranch and Epi-Hab Phoenix, Inc.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H.R. 1461. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Evdoxia Giorgiaki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1462. A bill for the relief of Fotios Gianoutsos (Frank Giannos); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1463. A bill for the relief of Panagis Razatos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1464. A bill for the relief of Alexandros Gatseopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1465. A bill for the relief of Theodora P. Andrianakos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1466. A bill for the relief of Harry N. Duff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1467. A bill for the relief of Angela Nemec; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1468. A bill for the relief of the estate of Eileen G. Foster; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1469. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth Paula Cohen-Rehfeld; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1470. A bill for the relief of Chong-jin Kim and Ilhyang Ko Kim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1471. A bill for the relief of Ann Georgette Graham; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1472. A bill for the relief of Benjamin H. Seals; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H.R. 1473. A bill for the relief of Edward V. Amason and Emerita Cecilia Amador Amason; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1474. A bill for the relief of Joao Constancio de Gouveia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SECREST:

H.R. 1475. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Helen Veselenak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of California:

H.R. 1476. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Gladys E. Walters; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H.R. 1477. A bill for the relief of Dr. Orhan Kutlu and Esin Kutlu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1478. A bill for the relief of Maria Giacona; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1479. A bill for the relief of Gerald Levine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1480. A bill for the relief of Lucia A. Flocco and daughter, Antonietta Flocco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1481. A bill for the relief of the estate of Donovan C. Moffett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN:

H.R. 1482. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marija Oterbajn (Mary Otterbine); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1483. A bill for the relief of John V. Boland Construction Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 1484. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Loneta Hackney; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.R. 1485. A bill for the relief of Primitiva Piamonte Perez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITENER:

H.R. 1486. A bill for the relief of Flor Franco Guillermo and Erlindo Franco Guillermo, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNGER:

H.R. 1487. A bill for the relief of Maj. Kenneth F. Coykendall, U.S. Army; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1488. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth Swanson Robison (Elizabeth Alice Swanson) nee Elizabeth Alice Leighton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1489. A bill for the relief of Bruna Venturi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1490. A bill for the relief of Kathryn Sanders; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1491. A bill for the relief of Capt. Oscar W. Cleal, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1492. A bill for the relief of Arthur N. Wells; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1493. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Agavni Hamamciyan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1494. A bill for the relief of Emilio and Giulio Sibilio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Disabled Officers Association, southern California chapter, Studio City, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to enacting legislation to increase the basic pay of personnel who have been retired for war-service permanent disabilities, and facilitate medical treatment to them by granting the same service now given active duty personnel; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2. Also, petition of executive vice president, Kentucky Bankers Association, Louisville, Ky., petitioning consideration of their resolutions with reference to matters of financial, economic, and educational interests requiring attention on the national level; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

3. Also, petition of William Troy Raney, M.D., and others, Carmichael, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to legislation that would reopen and reactivate the San Francisco branch mint; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

4. Also, petition of Student Council, George Washington University, Washington, D.C., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to urging the U.S. Congress to enact appropriate home rule legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

5. Also, petition of International Association of Machinists, New England Conference, Waban, Mass., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to their endorsement of the principle of the 35-hour workweek as proposed by the AFL–CIO; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

6. Also, petition of Southern Association for Counselor Education and Supervision, Richmond, Va., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to commending the Congress for its contribution to the development of appropriate guidance services for the secondary schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

7. Also, petition of director, National Association of Social Workers, Inc., Washington, D.C., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to commending the President and Congress for passing and approving legislation of great social import, and urging continued Federal leadership in eliminating the social blight which still mars our Nation; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

8. Also, petition of the secretary, Chamber of Deputies of Argentina, Buenos Aires, Argentina, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to seeking U.S. support in reinstating Argentina's sovereignty over the Malvinas Islands, the South Georgia Islands, and the South Sandwich Islands on the occasion of forthcoming United Nations action; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

9. Also, petition of Kimhae Land Development Association, Kimhae, Korea, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to claims arising out of a U.S. Air Force plane crash on February 22, 1952, involving the properties of Taecho Irrigation Association, now merged with the Kimhae association; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

10. Also, petition of president, Brookline, Brighton, Newton Zionist District, Boston, Mass., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to requesting the Government to take steps to deter the would-be aggressors from launching a war of aggression against Israel, and to assist in direct negotiations for peace between Israel and the Arab States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

11. Also, petition of commander, National Department, Polish Legion of American Veterans, U.S.A., Waukegan, Ill., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to requesting avoidance of any political promise of a war to liberate Poland from Communist domination, unless the leaders are prepared to commit the United States to a full, all-out armed conflict with Soviet imperialism and to accept the consequences of a nuclear war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

12. Also, petition of secretary-treasurer, National Association of Postmasters of the United States, Dexter, Maine, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to commending the 88th Congress for efforts in advancing a better understanding between nations, preserve world peace, establish national and international security, promote the principles of justice and decency, and for the sympathetic understanding of the needs of the postal service and the welfare of its employees; to the Committee on House Administration.

13. Also, petition of the president, Foothill College Young Democrats, Los Altos Hills, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsing a resolution proposed and endorsed by the Santa Clara County Democratic Council, in re, seating Mississippi Congressman-elect; to the Committee on House Administration.

14. Also, petition of the chairman, Democratic Party of Guam, Agana, Guam, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to respectfully requesting Congress to enact legislation for election of the Governor of Guam; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

15. Also, petition of the executive vice president, North Dakota Water Users Association, Minot, N. Dak., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the enactment of legislation supporting the development of water resources in that area; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

16. Also, petition of the president, Colusi County Historical Society, Corning, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to changing the name of the tentatively named Tehama-Colusa Canal to "William S. Green Canal"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

17. Also, petition of the executive officer, Sigma Delta Chi, Chicago, Ill., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsing proposed legislation to repeal section 315 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, in the interest of freedom of speech, press, and assembly; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

18. Also, petition of John J. Shaughnessy, Brooklyn, N.Y., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to redress of grievances; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

19. Also, petition of the president, American Public Health Association, Inc., Washington, D.C., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to expressing the appreciation of APHA for the many contributions which were made by the 88th Congress to the health and well-being of the people of the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

20. Also, petition of the deputy clerk, Board of Supervisors of Erie County, Buffalo, N.Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to requesting Congress to set aside the 22d day of November, as one of memory, remembrance, and reevaluation, and dedicated to the spirit of brotherhood and freedom throughout this great Nation and among our people; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

21. Also, petition of the acting manager, Co-Mo Electric Cooperative, Inc., Tipton, Mo., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to excluding the question of apportionment of State legislatures from the Federal courts and return to and leave these questions for determination by the States themselves; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

22. Also, petition of the secretary, New England Association of Chiefs of Police, Inc., New Britain, Conn., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to voicing faith in and continued support of Hon. J. Edgar Hoover and expressing appreciation for his years of dedicated public service, and hoping that he will continue to lead the fight against the subversive agent and the predatory criminal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

23. Also, petition of the secretary, First Baptist Church, Frank, Pa., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the Supreme Court decisions of 1961 and 1963 on prayer and Bible reading in the public schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

24. Also, petition of James J. Laughlin, Washington, D.C., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to requesting the impeachment of Milton S. Kronheim, Jr., judge of the District of Columbia court of general sessions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

25. Also, petition of the Secretaries, National Congress, Republic of Nicaragua, Managua, Nicaragua, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to expressing disapproval of the Chamorro-Bryan Treaty for the construction of an interoceanic canal in Nicaragua, which was signed in 1914; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

26. Also, petition of the president, Local 11, International Longshoremen's & Warehousemen's Union, San Jose, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to supporting efforts to abolish the House Un-American Activities Committee; to the Committee on Rules.

27. Also, petition of the chairman, Oklahoma State Legislative Council, Oklahoma City, Okla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to commending the President's Advisory Commission for its study and report on combating the problem of narcotic and drug abuse, and also commending the Bureau of Narcotics for its effective work in this connection; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

28. Also, petition of the general secretary-treasurer, Textile Workers Union of America, New York, N.Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to requesting the incoming Congress to make medicare for the elderly under social security one of the first orders of business; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

29. Also, petition of the executive secretary, Maryland Law Enforcement Officers, Baltimore, Md., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to commending the President's Commission for its study and report on methods for further combating the country's narcotic and drug abuse problem; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

30. Also, petition of the business representative, Local 107, United Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers of America, Essington, Pa., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to requesting Congress to push legislation for the medical protection of our elderly citizens; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

31. Also, petition of the president, Fraternal Order of Police, Albuquerque, N. Mex., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to commending the President's Advisory Commission for its study and report on the problems of illegal drug traffic; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

32. Also, petition of the secretary, Sheriffs' Association of New Jersey, Flemington, N.J., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to opposing the dismemberment of the Bureau of Narcotics, and the weakening of the present Federal penalties, as recommended by the President's Advisory Commission; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

33. Also, petition of secretary, National Association of Citizens Crime Commissions, Boston, Mass., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to commending the President's Advisory Commission for its study and report on methods of combating problems of narcotic and drug abuse, the Bureau of Narcotics for its effective work, and favoring uniformity of sentences; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

34. Also, petition of the secretary-treasurer, Tennessee Law Enforcement Officers' Association, Chattanooga, Tenn., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the several recommendations of the President's Advisory Commission on Narcotic and Drug Abuse; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

35. Also, petition of the secretary-treasurer, Alabama Labor Council, AFL–CIO, Birmingham, Ala., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to health care for the aged through social security; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

36. Also, petition of the president, officers of the Georgia Association of Chiefs of Police, Griffin, Ga., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the several recommendations of the President's Advisory Commission on Narcotic and Drug Abuse; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

37. Also, petition of Alfred M. Kunze, New Rochelle, N.Y., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to proposing that the social security amendments as originally passed by the House and Senate be again considered in a special session of Congress; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

38. Also, petition of Raymond L. Reynolds, Huntsville, Ala., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to requesting Congress to consider his space age tax plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

39. Also, petition of the secretary, Citizens for Retaining the House Committee on Un-American Activities, Lakewood, Ohio, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to requesting support in the group's efforts to retain the committee; to the Committee on Rules.

40. Also, petition of Canton Reynolds, Hindman, Ky., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to all school tragedy victims of the United States, and particularly an incident in Floyd County, Ky., February 28, 1958; to the Committee on House Administration.

41. Also, petition of Eighth District American Legion, Department of Texas, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to opposition to plan to consolidate the Army Reserve and National Guard; to the Committee on Armed Services.

42. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., asking Congress to provide funds for a memorial to Dr. Carlson and Miss Rine, Americans slaughtered by rebels in the Congo, to be erected near the Embassy of said Republic in Washington, D.C.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

43. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., requesting Congress to congratulate the Secretary of Defense for moving to reduce and consolidate Defense Department bases throughout the world; to the Committee on Armed Services.

44. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., requesting Congress to pass, in the 89th Congress, sundry legislation referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency during the sessions of the 88th Congress; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

45. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., requesting Congress to pass legislation renaming certain leading streets and avenues of the District of Columbia after each of the five leading terms of Americanism, viz: E Pluribus Unum, The Flag, Red, White, and Blue, The Union, and Preamble; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

46. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., asking Congress to pass the Self-Study Higher Educational Act of 1965; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

47. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., directing the attention of the Foreign Affairs Committee to an article entitled "A-Bombs for All? It Is Getting Closer," published in the December 7, 1964, issue of U.S. News & World Report; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

48. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., reforming, realining, and renaming the executive branch of the U.S. Government into nine basic Cabinet departments; to the Committee on Government Operations.

49. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., requesting passage, in the 89th Congress, of sundry legislation referred to the Ways and Means Committee during the sessions of the 88th Congress; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

50. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., requesting the passage, in the 89th Congress, of sundry legislation referred to the Veterans' Affairs Committee during sessions of the 88th Congress; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

51. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., seeking legislation to require the Director of Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, annually to index and review all the Ph.D. theses written the previous year on the subject of Congress, and require the Public Printer to publish same; to the Committee on House Administration.

52. Also, a petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., requesting Congress to pass, in the 89th Congress, sundry legislation referred to the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee during the sessions of the 88th Congress; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

53. Also, a petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., asking Congress to legislate to double the number of dentists and/or doctors of dental medicine in America, and to embark on a nationwide "denticare" program; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

54. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., requesting legislation to create the U.S. Bill of Rights Celebration Commission, during 1966, to commemorate the 175th anniversary of the adoption of the U.S. Bill of Rights; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

55. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., requesting passage, in the 89th Congress, of sundry legislation referred to the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, during the sessions of the 88th Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

56. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., asking Congress to pass a resolution declaring that the Cannon (Office) Building, has been jointly named for former Speaker "Uncle Joe" Cannon and former U.S. House Appropriations Committee chairman, Hon. Clarence Cannon, Member of Congress from Missouri; to the Committee on Public Works.

57. Also. petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., requesting Congress to change to current method of calling the roll in the U.S. House; to the Committee on Rules.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Thirty-one To Be Honored at Academy Interview Luncheon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL FINDLEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 4, 1965

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, Saturday noon, January 16, 1965, 31 outstanding young men of the 20th Congressional District, Illinois, will be honored at a luncheon at Illinois College, Jacksonville, Ill.

They are the candidates for appointment to the military academies, class to begin in June 1965. Qualifying for final consideration by passing civil service examinations, each will receive recognition at the luncheon, which is part of a daylong program of interview and evaluation. During the morning, each will be interviewed by a civilian board. Members of the boards were selected because of their deep interest in the military affairs of our country.

Serving on the interview boards will be: Gene Terry, Quincy; Russell D. Shambrook, Springfield; Ralph Knotts, Pittsfield; Ray Samples, Jacksonville; Donald W. Marshall, Macomb; Jack Huff, Quincy; Philip L. Robinson, Springfield; Harper C. Allan, Springfield; Lee Ensel, Springfield; E. C. Bone, Jacksonville; J. E. Fetter, Quincy; Frank Strieby, Quincy; Carl T. Meyer, Springfield; Patrick Noonan, Springfield.

From the young men now entering the military academies must come tomorrow's military leadership for the United States. Therefore, I am most anxious to select the best available talent. I appreciate the fine cooperation of the members of the interview boards in making possible this mode of selection. Here are the candidates:

Donald L. Goff, Springfield, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. Donald E. Goff.

Richard Johnson, Riverton, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. Troy L. Johnson.

Joseph D. McCausland, Jr., Beardstown, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. Joseph D. McCausland, Sr.

Howard E. McNier, Springfield, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. George E. McNier.

Michael J. Schussele, Springfield, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. Halbert A. Schussele.

Randall C. Moore, Roodhouse, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. Harold Moore.

Stanley L. Flynn, Colchester, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. James L. Flynn.

Steven K. Goodman, Pleasant Hill, Ill., son of Dr. and Mrs. James E. Goodman.

David Pfeiffer, Pittsfield, Ill., son of Mr. Roy F. Pfeiffer.

John F. Timko, Springfield, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. Michael J. Timko.

Dale D. Turvey, Pawnee, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. Dale C. Turvey.

David B. Wilson, Auburn, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. Edwin B. Wilson.

George J. Young, Auburn, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. Frank Young.

David Lee Hallenbeck, Macomb, Ill., son of Maj. and Mrs. Howard E. Hallenbeck.

James M. Harnly, Virden, Ill., son of Lt. Col. and Mrs. Merlin W. Harnly.

Kenneth C. Harper, Chandlerville, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. Charles B. Harper.

John R. Hinton, Quincy, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. Robert W. Hinton, Jr.

Scott D. Ingram, Fieldon, Ill., son of Col. and Mrs. James W. Ingram.

James D. Ivers, Eldred, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. James Ivers.

David H. Jennings, Pleasant Hill, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. Avery L. Jennings.

Garland R. Johnson, Jr., Springfield, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. Garland R. Johnson, Sr.

Kevin D. Johnston, Quincy, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. Dean Johnston.

Roger L. Keithley, Blandinsville, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. Gilbert L. Keithley.

Richard A. Kolaz, Springfield, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. Joseph A. Kolaz.

John L. Komnick, Athens, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. Benjamin J. Komnick.

Larry C. Louden, U.S. Air Force Academy, Colo., grandson of Mr. Ben F. Louden, La Harpe, Ill.

Ronald D. Mansfield, Carlinville, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. Delbert Mansfield.

Albert W. Scott III, Carrollton, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. Albert W. Scott II.

Carl Shulman, Pittsfield, Ill., son of Dr. and Mrs. Myer Shulman.

Charles Alan Smith, Macomb, Ill., son of Col. and Mrs. Gilbert G. Smith, Jr.

William F. Young, Jacksonville, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. William B. Young.

Tribute to an Educator: Charles Williams Armstrong

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES R. GROVER, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 4, 1965

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, recently I had an opportunity to spend a nostalgic half-hour with the former principal of the first school which I attended, Babylon Free School District No. 1, and I am pleased to recite the background of a great educator as a tribute to him:

TRIBUTE TO AN EDUCATOR: CHARLES WILLIAMS ARMSTRONG

An outstanding example of dedication to the teaching profession is personified in Charles W. Armstrong who, still living and attaining his 95th year, has continued to be interested in young people and their educational future.

Charles W. Armstrong was born in Port Byron, N.Y., to a devout business and farming family on February 15, 1870. He was one of six children, four of whom turned to education; in fact, one of his sisters became a doctor and a medical missionary to further the interests of mankind. As a boy he lived in rural New York State attending elementary and secondary schools there. Upon his graduation from high school in Port Byron, N.Y., he attended Albany State Teachers College and received a bachelor of education degree as a member of a class of 125. It might be noted here that during his high school days, Mr. Armstrong walked approximately 5 miles daily to attend classes.

Several teaching assignments followed his graduation from college, one of which was at Sag Harbor, N.Y. There he met and married Nell Merritt whose family were coopers in the whaling trade, at that time a big industry in Sag Harbor. Their first son, Francis, was born in this town. While teaching in Sag Harbor, he organized the first tennis team of Pierson High School of that town and, to this day, has remained an avid tennis fan.

In 1908 he obtained an additional degree in education at Columbia University. Then, after teaching for a time at Pierson, he joined the school system of Cobbleskill, N.Y. where his second son, Donald, was born. After teaching there for a short time, he returned to Long Island in 1913 to become the supervising principal of the Babylon high school system. He remained in Babylon in that capacity until 1932 when he retired. During his tenure many changes in the educational system at Babylon took place.

Back in those days, a principal was a jack of all trades. "Pop" as he was affectionately known ruled the school system with an iron hand. His beliefs were in the three R's. He could substitute and did substitute in any class or subject should a teacher be ailing or absent. His particular love was American history which was then, as is now, a senior high school subject. This he taught for many, many years in addition to his business duties as administrator. For a time, he also coached the Babylon High School baseball team and in the final year of its league participation, the team became county champions. This same team, after graduation from high school, continued as a unit and became a semipro team of which he was made an honorary member.

Charles Armstrong was devoted to his students, be they at the top of class or the bottom. Although he was a firm administrator and teacher, he would always lend a sympathetic ear and compassionate understanding to problems of his students and his staff alike. His home extended his working day often as frequently visitors gathered there to discuss some project or seek advice. It was not unusual of an evening to find him at home joining with his students and teachers in a songfest. During this period, Mr. Armstrong was also an active member of the Suffolk County Council of Boy Scouts of America striving with the council for about 15 years.

After many years of service, Charles W. Armstrong retired from the Babylon school system. This did not mean, however, that he retired from active participation in local and civic affairs. He became a member of the Babylon Village Board and the OPA during World War II. He was trustee and treasurer of the First Baptist Church in Babylon and a member of the Masonic lodge both in Cobbleskill and Babylon. His elder son is following in his footsteps and for many years has enjoyed the teaching profession. This son was graduated, Phi Beta Kappa, from Colgate University in 1923 with a bachelor of science degree and took his masters in languages at Columbia.

Mr. Armstrong's interest in his former students and teachers continued and he was constantly following their progress as they matured in both professional and business circles. To this day, some of his former pupils and teachers drop by to say "hello" to "Pop." His wife, now in her 88th year, is his constant companion. His later life has been brightened by the event of two grandchildren. Despite his age, Charles W. Armstrong is alert and most interested in educational developments.

Oceanography Offers Much

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 4, 1965

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill which proposes that we set up a Federal agency to help give America world leadership in a most important science—oceanography.

It is imperative for our national welfare that we move ahead in the many fields which make up the broad science of oceanography. The bill that I am introducing simply sets up a coordinating agency that would help give direction and force to the many experiments and studies already underway, and would establish goals and make assignments toward them.

The National Academy of Science Committee on Oceanography recently issued a 50-page report in which they pointed out that our Nation could, by investment of $165 million a year, reap benefits of $6 billion per year in the fields of recreation, long-range weather forecasting, ocean-bottom mining, and increased fish catches.

To derive these benefits we must exert a national effort with a unified program. Oceanography today is vital to defense. Tomorrow it may well be vital to our economy, to feeding our people and supplying our needs for raw materials, and even water supply itself.

The seas comprise three-fourths of the earth's surface, yet it has been said that we know more about the surface of the moon than about the floor of the ocean. It is time we devote attention to getting the maximum benefits from the seas around us. For example, scientists predict that within a decade the manganese nodules in the deep sea, the phosphate deposits on oceanic banks, and the placer deposits of various minerals on the inner shelves can all be profitably recovered. Mining men believe that within 10 years ocean mining may become a $50 million per year industry.

This is but a small example of the vast vistas of future benefits our Nation can expect if we plan ahead today and begin a systematic program of understanding and exploitation of oceanic resources.

Our immediate need is to harness all the research being done by private institutions, commercial interests, and Government agencies into a coordinated program. It has been done in the space program. The need is as great in the oceanographic program if we are to avoid an oceanography gap. We know the Soviets have grasped the significance of this program, and are driving ahead on many fronts, notably the military aspects of utilizing undersea knowledge.

The agency I propose would function much as the National Astronautics and Space Agency, or the Federal Aviation Agency. We are today, in oceanography, where we were perhaps 15 years ago in commercial aviation and 10 years ago in space exploration. Much work was being done, but the program did not realize its full potential until a coordinating agency was set up to unite the various elements into a meaningful program of research and development.

Oceanography offers us much for the future. It is our military frontier. It is a cornucopia of mineral wealth, a prodigious producer of food, and an unending supply of water. The taxpayers could have no better investment than establishment of a good, sound, active, progressive oceanographic program. I urge that early hearings be held, and that action be taken this session on this bill.

Fiftieth Anniversary of the Lithuanian Hall Association in Baltimore

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 4, 1965

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, Baltimore is a city which includes among its citizens almost every nationality group in existence up to World War II. Each group, while becoming Americanized and part of the everyday life of the city, retained many of the customs and cultures of its homeland.

The people of Lithuanian extraction were among the early settlers in Baltimore. As far back as 1902 they recognized the need for a central gathering place and their early activities were held in a church building which they purchased and converted to a hall the following year. Shortly thereafter an association was formed to supervise the operations and maintenance of the hall. With a large increase in the number of Lithuanians coming to the city their activities grew to such an extent that a much larger place was necessary, and in 1921 a newly constructed building was dedicated which has been used ever since. Many dramatic, musical, and social affairs have been held there, attended by many notable personages, including two former presidents of the Republic of Lithuania. After World War I and during and after World War II, a tremendous amount of relief work and charitable activities were carried on there. On November 21, 1964, the 50th anniversary of the Lithuanian Hall Association was observed at a banquet which it was my privilege to attend. On that occasion tribute was paid to the early founders, and to their foresight, which made possible this meeting place for the thousands of Lithuanians and the many activities of all kinds which have been held there.

The officers of the association are to be congratulated for continuing the fine work which was begun 50 years ago, and for arranging the commemorative banquet. Mr. John M. Stefura, chairman of the association, also served as chairman of the anniversary committee. He was ably assisted by Valys Brasauskas, Marcrit Matelis, Kazimieras Dulys, Julijus Silgalis, Albert J. Juskus, Ben Karius, P. Buda, M. Simkus, and F. Lisowski.

The Dollar and International Exchange

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 4, 1965

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, as we start a new year and a new session of Congress we again face the happy prospect of an economically favorable climate. In spite of the unhappy burdens of pockets of poverty and of high unemployment the overall level of our economic activity is expected to be increased by about 5 percent in 1965. There are those who see as the greatest threat to this bright picture the possibility of inflation. I do not agree. My own view is that the greatest threat to our domestic economic well-being is the burden we bear in the international market from the reserve status of the dollar as the exchange base for world trade. Now I grant you it may be a fine and prestigious thing that the currency of our country is thought so highly of—that it be used as the basis for an international currency system. However, Mr. Speaker, I suggest we look critically at the increasingly burdensome cost of this dubious honor.

I suggest that the very fact that our dollar is so involved in international credit and balance of payments means we are restricted in our choice of actions on interest rates, reserves, and discounts at home. Also, our domestic economy is highly exposed to critical conditions in world trade. Actions completely outside the realm of our control seriously impinge upon our domestic decisions. In a sense, we lose a portion of our sovereign will to act in our internal best interest because we are so deeply involved in external finance.

What is the alternative? you may ask. There are those of us who believe that the U.S. position relative to the International Monetary Fund should be much more aggressively and actively pointed toward the creation of some international credit machinery in the IMF, such system to be supported on at least a pro rata basis by the gold and local currencies of all the nations in the IMF. We cannot expect a sudden or dramatic release nor can we foresee sudden, revolutionary acceptance of such a change; but there should be intelligent, step-by-step moves already in action to remove from the shoulders of Britain and America the burden now carried by the pound sterling and by the dollar. The help we have already had to request in the innumerable "swap" arrangements is a "back door" method to spread this load. It is dangerous in that it relies upon the chances of cooperation in the stress of the crisis. Let us face both reality and the future and call for immediate action toward the creation of international machinery for international financial matters and safeguard our domestic decisionmaking in domestic economic policy.

Address by the Honorable Dean Rusk, Secretary of State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 4, 1965

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following address by Hon. Dean Rusk, Secretary of State:

Address by the Honorable Dean Rusk, Secretary of State, to the Chamber of Commerce of Greater Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa., November 10, 1964

I

Governor Lawrence, President Schulten, Mayor Barr, Congressman Fulton, Your Excellencies, ladies and gentlemen, members and guests of the Chamber of Commerce of Greater Pittsburgh, it is always a pleasure to visit the "New" Pittsburgh, the ever newer Pittsburgh, with all of its vitality and its progressiveness in so many fields. What you have done here in physical renovation and beautification, in controlling smoke and floods, in expanding your educational and health facilities, and your cultural activities, is justly famed. You have set an inspiring example in constructive cooperation among public authorities and enlightened private citizens.

It is a privilege to take part in this great fair and forum—and particularly to attend this session devoted to the theme: "Pittsburgh, a Supplier of Products and Know-How to the World Market." I must confess that I should have preferred to attend without making a speech. During recent weeks, in the quadrennial period ordained for debate and choice by the American people, I made a Secretary of State's normal quota of speeches. For, it seemed to me that when the foreign policies of the United States were being publicly discussed, the Secretary of State should not be the only one to remain silent. However, all of my speeches, except one, were made to nonpartisan audiences. And all, without exception, were devoted to the exposition of policies which were not, and are not, partisan, but which have been developed and supported by leaders of both major parties with experience in international affairs—policies which bear the hallmarks of such Republicans as Arthur H. Vandenberg, John Foster Dulles, and Christian Herter, as well as of such Democrats as Cordell Hull and Dean Acheson, and that extraordinary man who stood above partisan politics, George C. Marshall—the hallmarks of President Eisenhower as well as of Presidents Truman, Kennedy, and Johnson.

That bipartisan consensus on our basic foreign policies is the powerful gyroscope which holds the ship of state steady and on course even when the winds blow hard. And, I have no doubt it will continue to keep the ship steady as we pursue our course toward a more secure peace in a world of expanding freedom.

The basic foreign policies of the United States today are what they were a month ago, a year ago, a decade ago. As new situations arise, we shall try to deal with them. If new methods or greater efforts seem necessary to achieve our objectives, we shall try to find and apply them. But our goals are constant. And so are the major policies through which we worked toward those goals.

Tonight I shall discuss some of our major policies in the economic field. It goes almost without saying that a central objective of our foreign policy, as of our domestic policy, is the prosperity of the American people. We must have a strong economy, high levels of employment, a high and regular rate of growth, a high level of investment, injecting into our capital stock all that modern technology can provide—an economy capable of paving our way in the world, with a surplus to support our vital global commitments.

From the viewpoint of a Secretary of State, all these elements are indispensable to our success in the world arena. Without a strong economy we could not sustain the physical efforts necessary to preserve the security and build the strength of the free world—our vast Military Establishment, our relatively modest foreign aid programs, our oversea information program, our diplomacy. And, beyond that the ability of the American system to provide a good—and ever better—standard of living for the American people is a critical asset in the contest between freedom and tyranny.

Promotion of the economic growth of the United States is one of the oldest and most constant objectives of our foreign policy. We endeavor to enlarge foreign markets for American products and to insure access to the goods from abroad which our economy needs. In line with those fundamental economic objectives we pursue several closely related policies: the lowering of trade barriers, the strengthening of the international financial system, achievement of a balance-of-payments equilibrium, aid to the developing nations in modernizing their economic and social and political institutions.

Nowhere are the continuity of our goals and the bipartisan character of our actions more strongly demonstrated than in this field of policy—in foreign trade, foreign aid, and foreign investment. For three decades, we have used our resources and exerted our influence on the world scene to rebuild and expand the international economic order. We have sought an international environment that would encourage and expand the interchange of goods, capital, technology, and ideas among nations, and we can all take pride in the results.

I need not dwell on what has been accomplished because we see the results all around us. Trade among free world countries almost doubled in a decade, with exports and imports now more than $300 billion a year. The countries of Western Europe and Japan have long since recovered from the damage of war. As economically strong and prospering nations, they can now concert with us in the great enterprise of insuring freedom, security, and peace in the world. Capital is moving in greater volume among nations and thereby making its contribution to the more effective use of the world's resources and to higher world income. In all these respects, ties among nations have greatly expanded—to the advantage of all.

We must continue in this direction—not simply to achieve further economic benefits but to build the kind of world that will enhance our national security and well-being. These are large stakes and they highlight the role of economic affairs in foreign policy.

I would like to stress that the results we achieve will depend more heavily upon private enterprise than upon Government. The Government can set guidelines, improve the ground rules, and provide information, but, for the most part, private actions are the instruments of change and progress in the economic world.

I propose, therefore, to discuss the respective roles of Government and private enterprise in two major areas of our foreign economic relations—our relations with other industrial countries, and our relations with the developing or emerging nations of the world. As a nation we have vital interests in both groupings. And this is mirrored in the trade of the Pittsburgh area. In examining the list of your best customers overseas, I find that they are almost equally divided among the industrial and the developing nations of the world.

It is a striking fact of our contemporary world that we trade and invest more with other industrial countries than we do with developing countries. Roughly two-thirds of our foreign trade and almost as much of our direct investments abroad are concentrated in Canada, Japan, Australia, and the countries of Western Europe. It is in these countries, moreover, that our trade and investment have risen most rapidly throughout the postwar period. They are the dynamic sector of our private economic activities abroad.

This is a far cry from Marxist tenets. Indeed, these trends make a mockery of the traditional Marxist view that foreign trade is primarily a battle for markets prosecuted by colonial powers, and that foreign investment is exploitation.

Instead the figures demonstrate what is axiomatic to American business—higher incomes make for greater trade and investment. We gain more from trading with our competitors because markets are larger and more specialized and because the exchange gives us both the opportunity to concentrate somewhat more on producing and selling the things we do best. And, as investors, we are attracted to these countries because the rules governing such investments are similar to our own and because market prospects there are growing most rapidly.

Moreover, we have been able to maintain, if not to improve, our competitive position in these markets despite our higher wages. Wages in our export industries average $3.50 per hour—or much more than the average in our more highly protected industries which do not sell abroad. Essentially these figures show that the most progressive of our industries at home are also the most competitive abroad. Or, put another way, our export industries tend to be our growth industries.

That is one reason why we must continue to work with other industrial countries to free the channels of world trade. It always seems easier to avoid competition by resorting to one or another protective device. But such actions encourage retaliation, close off opportunities, raise costs, and, in the end, hurt us all. Neither we nor other industrial countries can afford to view our own markets as special economic preserves removed from world market competition.

Together with other free world countries we share the prospect of participating in a world market growing by more than $10 billion a year. But our policies must be consistent with such opportunities. We must remember that those who cannot sell to us cannot buy from us.

Government has three specific functions in this endeavor.

First, we are engaged in major negotiations with other world trading countries to reduce tariffs on a reciprocal basis. These negotiations, popularly known as the Kennedy round, have been undertaken under the authority conferred by the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. They are, of course, at the heart of our trade policy.

Second, where our products are subject to unwarranted restrictions, we negotiate bilaterally to remove such restrictions. This is a continuing and difficult process, but it is a responsibility that goes back to the beginnings of our diplomacy. We view it in that serious tradition.

Third, we have greatly expanded our program to assist U.S. businessmen in exporting abroad. This program is directed primarily to our markets in other industrial countries where the prospects are greatest, but it goes on elsewhere in the world as well. I thought some of the details would be of particular interest to your chamber.

Abroad, the Department of State has made commercial activities a responsibility of every Foreign Service officer, with the Ambassador setting the pace. Approximately 150 officers now spend all or most of their time on trade promotion work. Some 350 other staff members of the Foreign Service are closely associated with this program.

Over the past year, our missions abroad reported on almost 18,000 business opportunities relating to specific foreign companies. They also made available to American business information on approximately 4,000 foreign government tenders or planned government construction projects. We now have five trade centers operating in major foreign cities. And we have greatly expanded our participation in important trade fairs throughout the world.

A parallel effort has been made by the Department of Commerce in the United States. Through its 42 field offices, the Department of Commerce has greatly expanded its program to interest American firms in the export trade and to disseminate the business information collected by our posts abroad. There are now 1,200 members participating in regional export expansion councils in the United States. Seminars have been organized around the country to give businessmen the best available information on how to do business abroad.

These efforts—abroad and at home—clearly have had results. In the past 3 years, the number of our manufacturers engaged in exporting abroad has increased by one-third—from 12,000 to 16,000 firms.

This trade fair and forum is a demonstration of the new interest in foreign trade. It shows both the immense stake western Pennsylvania already has in world markets and your intention to enlarge them. I shall not carry coals to New Castle—I mean New Castle, Pa.—by reciting figures you already knew about western Pennsylvania's exports and your activity in establishing new foreign business units. But I must say that the statistics are impressive. And, as Secretary of State, I would add: keep up the good work.

But I would also add that much more remains to be done. We can do our best to provide American business with helpful information on market prospects and we can carry on the diplomatic negotiations necessary to open up markets. But only business can do the job itself, and this will depend on your continuing interest in these markets and on your ability to remain competitive abroad.

I turn now to some of the issues, the responsibilities, and the opportunities we confront in our economic relations with the developing countries. Here again, is a field where public and private actions must complement each other. There is not only room for both: there is an overriding need for both.

We must first remind ourselves that these countries contain three-fourths of the people in the free world; that their average per capita income is only $140 a year; that only 35 percent of them are literate. But these people are determined to achieve a better life for themselves and their children. And they are urgently pressing their leaders for economic and social progress.

We have a deep commitment to help these people realize their aspirations and make the progress they so desperately need. As President Johnson said: "These things are rooted in devotion to our democratic birthright and dedication to our spiritual values. They are * * * the only objectives possible to men that seek to retain freedom and protect moral values while pursuing progress in a world that is on the march."

We must help in the first instance, through our aid programs. These programs provide capital and technology that both supplement and stimulate the mobilization of local investment resources. Foreign aid frequently is crucial in determining whether a nation begins to move on the road to self-sustaining growth.

The cost of our foreign aid is small in relation to the contribution it makes to our national interests. It is about 3 or 4 cents out of the tax dollar, about 8 or 9 percent of the cost of our Military Establishment. And even this cost is somewhat overstated because more than 90 percent is in the form of American goods and services. Our aid programs help our agriculture, our metallurgical, chemical, and machinery and machine tool industries. You may be interested to know that Pennsylvania now is first among all the States as a source of our nonagricultural aid shipments commodity.

Nor is the United States alone in the business of extending aid. The countries which we helped to their feet through the Marshall plan have joined us to help others. So have Japan, and, on a smaller scale, other nations in the Pacific.

We must also help through our trade policies. This requires that we and other industrial countries assist in working out ways to stabilize the prices of a few key tropical products that can greatly affect the export earnings and hence the development prospects of many of these poorer nations. It also requires that all the industrial countries push forward together toward lower tariffs, the elimination of quotas, and a more open trading system. This would benefit the developing countries now and help them the more as they build their industries. In turn, our trade would also benefit. As their incomes and export earnings rise, the developing countries will be a better market for capital equipment and other advanced products from the United States and other industrial countries.

But Government actions in relation to the developing countries—even the combined actions of all the industrial countries—will not be enough unless they are accompanied by private actions. Economic development results from the growing application of capital, the will to change, and technological and managerial skills, to the productive process. Private investment and the private sector are the surest and the quickest means of bringing these factors into play.

It is this prospect that should challenge American business. There are growing signs that American firms are becoming more alert to the great differences in conditions and outlook among the newly independent countries and are adjusting to these individual situations. Nevertheless we have not been doing enough. We must learn more effective ways of investing in these countries, and how to manage these investments in ways appropriate to our times. We must experiment more with new forms of investment—with joint ventures, licensing agreements, and a variety of shared-equity arrangements. In one way or another, American private enterprise must become more extensively and more heavily engaged in the development business.

A hopeful sign is that attitudes in the developing countries are also changing—for the better. Outmoded theories and old fears are gradually being put aside. In their place is a greater recognition of what private foreign investment can accomplish and, more generally, an understanding of the dynamic role that the private sector as a whole can play in promoting economic growth.

Taken together, these changing attitudes around the world enable private foreign investment to make a much larger contribution to economic development—and in ways consistent with the interests, customs, and laws of the developing nations.

Here again I would like to outline some recent measures our Government has been taking to assist U.S. firms interested in making investments in the developing countries.

First, we have greatly expanded the investment guaranty arrangements. It is now possible for the U.S. Government to insure private investors against a variety of political risks in 61 friendly countries and areas. During this year alone, AID has written contracts under these agreements covering more than $500 million of new U.S. private investment—a record sum for the program.

Second, a great deal has been done to put more and better information at the disposal of American firms interested in making investments in the developing countries. For example, AID has recently established a Businessmen's Information Center and has brought together all available investment surveys for the ready convenience of potential U.S. investors.

Third, there is the unfinished business of the tax credit bill which President Johnson recommended and sent to Congress on March 10, 1964. This measure could greatly increase U.S. private investment in the developing countries. I have every hope it will receive the early attention it deserves in the Congress.

There is a larger issue running through these foreign economic policies that I would like particularly to bring into focus.

For too long, the critical business of economic development has been hampered by a sterile debate in the emerging nations of the world. This debate centered on the relative role of business and private enterprise. It was argued in terms of theory and ideology—not experience and performance.

In many countries, that phase seems to have run its course. There is a growing recognition that giving more scope to the private sector can be an important way of serving the public interest. There is also greater awareness that the free market is a wonderfully efficient instrument for allocating a nation's resources and organizing its human energies. There is no better teacher than success. Even some of the Communist countries are beginning to learn the lesson and to move haltingly in this direction.

The trends, therefore, point strongly toward an enlarged role for private investment and the private sector in the less developed countries. This is happening under a set of ground rules based on the proposition that public and private action need not be a substitute for each other, but must complement each other. In this environment, American private investment will have greater opportunities to participate and to help in promoting economic development. I have every confidence that you will meet the challenge.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JANUARY 5, 1965

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., prefaced his prayer with these words of Scripture:

Matthew 6: 33: *Seek ye first the kingdom of God, and His righteousness.*

Most merciful and gracious God, in whom our baffled minds and burdened hearts may find strength and sympathy, grant us daily the counsel of Thy divine wisdom and the consolation of Thy understanding love.

Give us the assurance of Thy guiding and sustaining presence for we are frequently beset by many anxieties and fears and confronted by many difficult and perplexing problems.

May our beloved country and all our leaders in the affairs of church and state bear witness to that righteousness and integrity of character which exalts a nation.

Show us how we may bring a larger measure of the blessings of democracy and freedom to all mankind and may the spirit of good will inspire us to seek one another's welfare.

In Christ's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 5. Concurrent resolution continuing the joint committee to make necessary arrangements for the inauguration of the President-elect and Vice-President-elect on January 20, 1965.

ADMINISTRATION OF OATH OF OFFICE TO REPRESENTATIVE-ELECT ELMER J. HOLLAND

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with your designation of me, pursuant to House Resolution 10, 89th Congress, adopted by the House of Representatives, to administer the oath of office to Representative-elect Elmer J. Holland, of the 20th District of Pennsylvania, I have the honor to report that on Tuesday, January 5, 1965, at Bethesda, Md., I administered the oath of office to Mr. Holland, form prescribed by section 1757 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, being the form of oath administered to Members of the House of Representatives, to which Mr. Holland subscribed.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I send to the Clerk's desk a resolution (H. Res. 75) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 75

Whereas Elmer J. Holland, a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania, from the Twentieth District thereof, has been unable from sickness to appear in person to be sworn as a Member of this House, but has sworn to and subscribed to the oath of office before the Honorable William S. Moorhead, authorized by resolution of this House to administer the oath, and the said oath of office has been presented in his behalf to the House, and there being no contest or question as to his election: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the said oath be accepted and received by the House as the oath of office of the said Elmer J. Holland as a Member of this House.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPALACHIAN REDEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I have submitted for introduction today the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, H.R. 132. There is a crisis in Appalachia which can only be met by prompt action on the enactment of legislation to initiate a program to revitalize the resources of this 11-State area which have been long neglected and bypassed by other Federal programs. Steadily declining employment in the coal and related industries, the lack of financial resources to construct roads, bridges, flood control projects, water, sewer, and other public community facilities, have created conditions which are so severe in the hardships imposed upon the inhabitants that they are unable without substantial Federal financial assistance, to undertake the types of community improvement and development projects and programs which are essential to provide a stable economy.

I want to emphasize at the outset that the funds provided in this bill are not handouts to a poor region even though the region is in desperate need. But rather, the enactment of this legislation is a profitable investment in an 11-State area of the United States with vast resources and potential and populated by 35 millions of our people.

This bill strikes at the heart of one of the chief causes of poverty in Appalachia—its isolation from the main stream of economic and social contact occasioned by the lack of major highways and extremely poor and often impassable byways. The construction of roads and highways, both developmental and access, to assure every family ready access from his home to a job, to his market, to school, and to those other centers of activity that have meaning in our modern society, command the highest priority. My only reservation concerning the highway and road construction provisions of this legislation is that the bill does not authorize a large enough investment in the construction of these roads. I emphasize the work investment because the construction of roads and highways throughout eastern Kentucky and all of Appalachia will erase its isolation and will permit natural economic forces to allow Appalachian families to enjoy the general prosperity of the Nation. In many communities in most every one of the counties that it is my privilege to serve, there are many families living on roads which are completely impassable in many months of the year.

In thousands of homes families must ford creeks on foot or on footbridges to reach their homes. The lack of ready access to public facilities such as schools, hospitals, physicians, public libraries, courthouses, markets, and similar outlets for the everyday needs of American families today is one of the major reasons for the low level of economic activity. There is little wonder that dropout rates are high when schoolbuses cannot navigate the creeks and rutted roads over which they must pass in order to reach many communities. This difficulty of communication extends not only from the family home to the marketplace, to the school, and to the county seat, but also to the larger metropolitan areas of greater commercial and industrial activity.

Appalachia, released from its isolation by the construction of modern roads and highways and other community facilities, will add greatly to the general prosperity and wealth of the Nation because it is a region containing great natural wealth. In eastern Kentucky, that portion of Appalachia which it is my privilege to represent in Congress, in addition to its coal resources and commercially significant deposits of other minerals, abounds in water resources. Four major river basins, three of which are almost totally unharnessed and untamed, now create constant flood threat, but yet could be a source of economic vitality. With the constant threat of flood, many of the available land areas suitable for commercial enterprise do not invite capital investment. The siltation and pollution of streams created by a combination of inordinate and uncontrolled rainfall combined with waste as a result of mining operations, has increased the need for a positive, constructive, and effective system of reservoirs and stream and land correction measures. In this respect, the program conducted by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers is of vital importance to the region and should be expanded and accelerated within the limits of engineering knowhow and feasibility. Those reservoirs which have been already authorized by the Congress should be built at the earliest possible date, and at the same time, additional reservoirs should be quickly put in the mill in order to provide maximum flood protection and additional controlled water supply usage in order to strengthen the already widely recognized recreational potential of the area.

I am very hopeful that the bill will spur the vast construction program of other types of public works and community facilities, water systems, sewage facilities, and public parks. Of tremendous importance would be the acceleration of the construction of vocational education buildings to implement the construction authorized by the Vocational Education Act of 1963 and assure as early as possible every young person with an educational opportunity in the Appalachian area comparable to that afforded in areas of the Nation which have not been similarly bypassed by the forces of technological revolution.

Of great importance in the bill are provisions providing for the extremely small family farm to develop pasture land. There is no question but that in the more mountainous areas of Appalachia this type of program could make no contribution to the family, but in the rolling or hill areas of Appalachia, families today are barely subsisting on small acreages. Extended financial assistance to develop pasturage so that livestock could be raised, would not add surpluses to the market, but would enable many to have balanced diets who at the present time are not consumers of such farm products. I would also hope that such provisions could provide a means whereby exploited land resources ravished by either the harvesting of timber or the extraction of minerals could be quickly changed from sources of siltation to areas which would assist in retarding the rapid runnoff of water which has created so much flood damage.

In concluding my brief remarks on a bill that will receive more lengthy praise and elaborate description, let me emphasize that this bill in no way overlaps or duplicates the programs envisioned under the Economic Opportunity Act which recently passed the Congress. The differences between these bills can be more quickly realized when it is understood that the Economic Opportunity Act deals with the education, training, health, financial, and other similar needs of individuals and families wherever the impoverished may be found throughout the country, whereas the Appalachian bill concerns itself primarily with the development of the physical resources of a large region having common topographical characteristics, the neglect of which, over a long period of time, aggravates and makes more chronic, poverty and social problems associated with poverty.

I urge the immediate passage of this legislation.

A section analysis of my bill follows:

ANALYSIS OF H.R. 132

TITLE I

Section 101 of the bill creates an Appalachian Regional Commission composed of a Federal representative appointed by the President and one member from each participating State in the 11-State Appalachian region.

Section 102 prescribes the functions of the Commission which are to develop comprehensive and coordinated plans for Appalachian regional development; to establish priorities for development projects; to conduct and sponsor research, investigations, and studies of the resources of the region; cooperate with and make recommendations to Federal, State, and local public and private programs operating in the area; to formulate and recommend appropriate interstate compacts and other forms of interstate cooperation conducive to the development of the region; encourage the formation of local development districts and private investment in industrial, commercial, and recreational projects; serve as a focal point and coordinating unit for Appalachian programs and for other purposes.

Section 103 authorizes the Commission to make recommendations to the President and to the Governors of the participating States and appropriate local officials with respect to the expenditures of governmental funds in the region in the fields of natural resources, agriculture, education and training, health and welfare, and other fields related to the purposes of the act and with respect to Federal, State, and local legislative or administrative action deemed necessary to further the purposes of the act.

Section 104 provides for continuing liaison between the Federal Government and the Commission.

Section 105 provides for the payment of the administrative expenses of the Commission by the Federal Government for the first 2 fiscal years following the date of the enactment of the act, thereafter the Federal Government to pay 50 percent and the participating States 50 percent, each State's share to be determined by the Commission. Administrative expenses are limited for the first 2 full fiscal years of the program to $2,200,000.

Section 106 authorizes the Commission to adopt, amend, and repeal bylaws and rules and regulations governing the conduct of its business and the performance of its function; appoint and fix the compensation of an Executive Director to request the head of Federal agencies to detail for temporary duty with the Commission personnel needed for carrying out its functions; arrange for the services of personnel from other governmental agencies; make arrangements for suitable retirement and employee benefit systems for its personnel; accept, use, and dispose of gifts or donations; enter into and perform contracts, leases, and cooperative agreements and other transactions necessary in carrying out its functions, and maintaining a temporary office in the District of Columbia and establishing permanent field offices.

Section 107 authorizes the Commission to gather information by conducting hearings or through arrangements with Federal, State, or local agencies and to keep accurate and complete records of its transactions and functions.

Section 108 prohibits State members or alternates, as well as officers or employees of the Commission from participating personally in any activity of the Commission affecting any concern in which he, his spouse, minor child, partner, or affiliated organization has a financial interest, and prescribes a prison term or a fine or both for violation thereof; provides exceptions to the above prohibition where the interest is disclosed in advance and the Commission determines that the financial interest is not so substantial as to be deemed likely to affect the integrity of the services to be rendered; prohibits a State member or alternate from receiving any salary or any contribution from any source other than his State and prescribes appropriate penalties for its violation; the Commission may declare void and rescind contracts or loans or grants where there has been a violation of this section.

TITLE II

Section 201 authorizes the Secretary of Commerce to assist in the construction in the Appalachian region of a development highway system not to exceed 3,850 miles in length, 1,500 miles of which may be local access roads to serve specific recreational, residential, educational, commercial, and industrial activities, in addition to the interstate system and other Federal aid highways authorized for development in the area; provides for the Commission to submit to the Secretary its recommendations with respect to the general corridors, locations, and termini of the development highways and designation of local access roads to be constructed, priorities for their construction, and other criteria for the program; provides that the Secretary shall have the authority to approve in whole or in part, the Commission's recommendations or to require modifications; prohibits the Secretary from approving any recommendations in excess of further authorizations; provides for the inclusion of each developmental highway into the Federal aid primary system upon its completion, and requires the State to maintain it thereafter; provides that the States may give special preference to the use of mineral resource material indigenous to the Appalachian region in the highway construction program and to use wherever practicable for the purposes of research and development coal and coal products in the highway construction and maintenance; provides that the Federal cost participation in the program shall be at least 70 percent of the cost but not more than 90 percent of the cost; authorizes appropriations of $1,840 million to carry out the highway program.

Section 202 provides for Federal grants for the construction of demonstration health facilities which will not exceed 90 percent of the cost of the project and authorizes $50 million for such construction grants, and provides for operating grants, including the repurchase of equipment up to 100 percent of the cost for the first 2-year period of the health facilities operations, and providing for operation grants of not exceeding 50 percent for the subsequent 3 years of operation, operating costs thereafter to be borne by the States and prescribing a $28 million limitation on operational grant funds.

Section 203 provides for a pastoral improvement and development program to promote the conservation of the Appalachian region's land and water resources to be financed by grants up to 80 percent of the cost of assisting landowners in the improvement and development of pastureland for livestock; provides for agreement between the landowner and the Secretary of Agriculture for a period up to 10 years to carry out the pastureland development on lands and calling for the utilization of the Soil Conservation Service and the State and local agricultural committees for this purpose; provides a limit of $17 million for funds for the pasture program.

Section 204 authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to provide technical assistance in the organization and operation of timber development organizations to carry out timber development programs; authorizes the Secretary to provide not more than one-half of the initial capital requirements of such timber development organizations to be carried out through loans under the applicable provisions of the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961. A limit of $5 million is authorized for this purpose.

Section 205 authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to make financial contributions to States in Appalachia to fill voids in abandoned coal mines and to plan and execute projects for extinguishing underground and outcrop mine fires, and to expand and accelerate fish and wildlife restoration projects in order to rehabilitate areas privately damaged by deleterious practices. It further provides that the Federal and State cost of such activities on lands other than federally owned lands, shall not exceed 75 percent of the total cost. The section further provides for a study of a comprehensive, long-range program for reclaiming and rehabilitating strip and surface mining areas in the United States which calls for the cooperation of the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and other appropriate Federal, State, and local departments, together with the Commission to make the survey and study. It further provides for the submission by the Secretary of the Interior to the President, his recommendations for such long-range program not later than July 1, 1967, with an interim report on July 1, 1966, to the Commission, and sets forth in detail the scope of the study and recommendations; authorizes not exceeding $50 million to be expended for the purposes of the section.

Section 206 authorizes the Secretary of the Army to prepare a comprehensive plan for the development and efficient utilization of the water and related resources of Appalachia with particular attention to the need for increasing the production of economic goods and services within the area, and authorizes the plan to include water supply for industrial and municipal uses, the development of hydroelectric power, the prevention of water pollution by drainage from mines, the development and enhancement of recreational potentials, the improvement of the rivers for navigation, the conservation and efficient utilization of the land resources (flood control), and such other measures as may be found necessary to accomplish the objectives of the Appalachian Development Act; provides for the cooperation of other Federal conservation and water resources agencies of the Federal Government; provides for submission of the plan to the Commission and to the President, who shall submit his recommendations with the plan to the Congress not later than December 31, 1968; authorizes not to exceed $10 million to carry out the section.

Section 211 authorizes the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make grants for the construction of vocational education school facilities in areas of Appalachia where such education is not now adequately available, such grants to be made in accordance with the provisions of Public Law 88–210 without regard to authorization ceilings or to allotment formulas, and shall be in addition to allotments made under the provisions of Public Law 88–210; not exceeding $50 million is authorized for the purposes of this section.

Section 212 authorizes the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make grants for the construction of sewage treatment works in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act without regard to the authorization ceilings or to allotment formulas, and shall be in addition to funds otherwise authorized under the provisions of said act for the region; not to exceed $15 million is authorized for the purposes of this section.

Section 213 amends section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954 so as to make the Appalachian Commission an eligible agency to receive comprehensive planning grants under that act. All funds for this section will come from the Housing and Home Finance Agency budget.

Section 214. In order to allow Appalachian communities to take maximum advantage of Federal grant-in-aid programs for which they are eligible but for which they cannot supply the matching funds, a special fund of $150 million for fiscal years 1965 and 1966 is authorized by this section. The Secretary of Commerce, acting on the recommendations of the Commission, shall use this fund to increase the Federal contribution to grant-in-aid programs above the fixed maximum portion authorized by the applicable law.

The Federal portion may not be increased above 90 percent of the cost. The programs referred to include those authorized by this act and other existing grant-in-aid programs which assist the construction and equipment of public facilities. The Secretary may not supplement grant-in-aid programs providing funds for operation, but only for construction and equipment acquisition programs.

Section 215 provides an authorization of an additional $500 million for the purpose of continuing the provisions of the Public Works Acceleration Act (Public Law 87–658) in the Appalachian region as defined by section 403.

Section 221 provides that no State or political subdivision thereof may receive benefits under this bill if the total expenditures of State funds, exclusive of local expenditures, for the portion of the State located in the Appalachian region falls below the average level of such expenditures for the last 2 full fiscal years preceding the date of enactment of this act. A State's expenditures for the Interstate System shall not be included. Further, if there is a substantial population decrease in the region which does not justify a continued expenditure or if the expenditure is now disproportionate to other areas of the region, a lesser requirement may be imposed by the President.

Section 222 insures that no State will be required to engage in or accept any program without its consent. The consent of a State to a program for which assistance is provided under this act will be given by that State in the same manner in which the State consents to receive assistance under the basic statute authorizing that assistance.

Section 223. To more clearly delineate the role of the Commission in the program planning process, this section provides that no programs authorized by this act shall be implemented until the Commission has submitted program plans to the President or such officer or officers as he may designate, and they have either approved or modified the plans.

Section 224. In order to clearly establish the intent of the Congress, specific criteria are set forth in this section which the Commission is to consider in making program and project recommendations. These criteria include: the relationship of the project to overall economic development; the population and area that the project or class of project serves, including the unemployment rate and per capita income of the people of the area; the financial resources available to the State and political subdivision which are undertaking the project; the importance of the project in relation to other projects seeking aid; the prospects that the project will make a long-range contribution to the economic growth of the region. There is also a specific requirement that the funds not be used to finance the cost of commercial facilities, industrial facilities, machinery or working capital, or the generation, production, transmission, or distribution of gas or electricity.

TITLE III

Section 301 sets forth a definition of those local units to which the Commission will extend assistance through the appropriate State governments. The State government will certify local development districts. Such local development districts shall be nonprofit organizations certified by their States as units having the responsibility for the economic development of counties, parts of counties, or other political subdivisions within the region.

Section 302. The Secretary of Commerce is authorized by this section to make grants either directly or through appropriate public or private organizations (including the Commission) for investigation, research, studies, and demonstration projects to further the purposes of this act. No funds can be provided for construction purposes under this section. The Secretary is also authorized to either directly or through arrangements with the Commission, make grants for the administrative expenses of local development districts, of up to 75 percent of their expenses. Such grants shall not be made to any one district for a period in excess of 3 years. Local shares may be paid in cash or in kind; $5.5 million is provided to carry out this section in fiscal 1966 and 1967.

Section 303 directs the Commission to prepare an annual report on its activities within 6 months of the close of the Federal fiscal year for presentation to the Governor of each State in the region and to the President for transmittal to the Congress.

TITLE IV

Section 401 provides an authorization of $823,200,000 in addition to the funds authorized in section 201 for the Appalachian Development Highway System, to be appropriated for the 2 fiscal years ending on June 30, 1967. The sums enumerated in each section, other than 201, add up to the $823,200,000 total contained in this section.

Section 402 provides that the construction projects assisted by this act will be covered by standard Davis-Bacon (local prevailing wage) provisions.

Section 403 designates those counties in the Appalachian region which are eligible for assistance under this act.

Section 404 is the usual clause used to protect other sections of a bill in case one section is held to be invalid.

Section 405 provides that the act will cease to be in effect on and after July 1, 1971.

PROPOSED WITHDRAWAL OF APPELLATE JURISDICTION IN APPORTIONMENT AND REAPPORTIONMENT CASES

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to withdraw from the Supreme Court of the United States appellate jurisdiction in apportionment and reapportionment cases affecting legislative assemblies in the various States, and also to deny jurisdiction to the U.S. district courts to entertain any petition or complaint seeking to apportion or reapportion the legislative assembly, or any branch thereof, of any State of the Union. This bill is identical to the bill H.R. 11926 introduced by me in the 88th Congress and which passed the House of Representatives by an overwhelming vote.

I have also introduced today an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population. The constitutional amendment which I propose is substantially the same as the one introduced in the 88th Congress by our colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCulloch].

This is a double-barreled approach to the solution of one of the most serious problems confronting the country today. The Warren Supreme Court as at present constituted is creating a revolution that will destroy our Government as we have known it and as it has existed since established by the Founding Fathers of the Republic. The ingenious tripartite Government which we have enjoyed throughout the long and glorious history of this country and on which our Union of equal sovereign States rests will be sustained or scrapped within the course of the immediate future. Unless the Warren Court is curbed and divested of some of the powers which they have unlawfully assumed and arrogated to themselves, the State and local governments will become nothing more than the hollow shells of a lost liberty.

The reapportionment decision undertakes to reduce the legislative assemblies and officials of the various States to mere pawns in the hands of these inferior Federal courts who have, as they did in Virginia, nullified and negated laws duly enacted, terminated offices established under our State constitution, peremptorily ordered the Governor of a great commonwealth when to call the assembly into special session, and, in addition, have even offered to act as both legislator and judge and have ascribed to themselves the power to instruct the people of the State when to hold elections. Such unprecedented and unwarranted conduct rightfully subjects these courts to the reproach and firm reprimand on the part of many thoughtful Americans.

The proposals I have presented will be among the most important to come before the Congress during the sessions that are now beginning. More and more, as time goes on, people are awakening to the fact that steps must be taken to preserve the Constitution of the United States and to protect it from the assaults made upon it by the Supreme Court.

These two proposals may at first blush appear to be in conflict but they are not. They are intended to be alternatives.

I am aware that some of my colleagues feel that Congress alone cannot limit the appellate jurisdiction of the Federal courts and that a constitutional amendment is needed. That is why I have introduced the proposed constitutional amendment.

I prefer the legislative approach, as I do not think a constitutional amendment is necessary. The Congress should let the Supreme Court know in no uncertain terms that we do not intend to allow them to further invade the legislative field. The Constitution of the United States explicitly provides that the Supreme Court has appellate jurisdiction "with such exceptions and under such regulations as the Congress shall make." In sum, there is ample constitutional authority for Congress to enact legislation in this area.

Since the adjournment of the 88th Congress, I have received many letters from aroused citizens all over the United States commenting favorably upon the proposed legislation. They recognize the threat to the heretofore unchallenged rights of the citizens in each State to make their own decisions as to the manner in which their legislative assemblies shall be constituted.

I am not opposed to apportionment or reapportionment. Rather do I favor action of this nature whenever it is necessary or desirable on the part of the citizens of any State, but I think the people of each State through their own representatives should exercise this power. They should not be subjected to arbitrary commands of the Supreme Court of the United States, nor should their activities and privileges be proscribed by the inferior Federal courts.

We are too prone now to cry "unconstitutional" whenever an effort is made, such as is provided in the legislation I have proposed, to free the people of the United States from the unbridled clutches of our highest court. Some people would deprive us of our liberty and our rights under the excuse of preserving our Constitution, a Constitution that was set up for our own protection and to guarantee us a life of freedom and independence.

Anyone who takes the time to read our Constitution and the cases decided on the subject will recognize the constitutional right of the Congress to legislate along the lines I have proposed. The pertinent part of section 2 of article III of the U.S. Constitution reads as follows:

> In all cases affecting Ambassadors, other public Ministers and Consuls, and those in which a State shall be a party, the Supreme Court shall have original jurisdiction. In all the other cases before mentioned, the Supreme Court shall have appellate jurisdiction, both as to law and fact, with such exceptions and under such regulations as the Congress shall make.

The Congress is given the power in article 3, section 1 of the Constitution to create "such inferior courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish." Thus the inferior Federal courts are creatures of the Congress, and their jurisdiction and powers are subject to congressional control. Although it is obviously undesirable, under the Constitution, Congress may, in its discretion, abolish every such court in the land.

I call your attention to perhaps the best known case concerning the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court—*Ex parte McCardle* (74 U.S., 7 Wallace, 506 (1869)). In that case, McCardle, a Mississippi editor, was arrested under the Reconstruction Acts and imprisoned by a military tribunal. Upon a denial of a writ of habeas corpus, appeal was taken to the Supreme Court pursuant to an act of 1867 providing for such appeals.

While the case was pending, the Congress exercised its constitutional prerogative to stake out exceptions to the Supreme Court's jurisdiction and repeal the appellate jurisdiction of the Court in habeas corpus cases under the 1867 act. The Court dismissed the appeal for want of jurisdiction. Its opinion upheld the right of Congress to withdraw jurisdiction previously exercised by the Court, as well as to cases then pending before the Court. I cite the following statement from Chief Justice Chase:

> We are not at liberty to inquire into the motives of the legislature. We can only examine into its power under the Constitution; and the power to make exceptions to the appellate jurisdiction of this Court is given by express words, 74 U.S. 514.

That decision remains the law today. Even the Warren Court has not reversed the McCardle case.

Also uniformly upheld is the power of Congress to control the jurisdiction of the lower Federal courts. The classic case in this instance was *Cary* v. *Curtis*, 3 How. 236 (1845), upholding a statute conferring final authority on the Secretary of the Treasury in tax disputes. Numerous other decisions have sustained restrictions and exceptions to Federal court jurisdiction.

I urge the House of Representatives to give prompt consideration to my proposal. If our distinctive way of life which all patriotic Americans love and cherish is to survive, an end must be made forthwith to the Federal incursions into the rights of the States and localities.

Congress has the right and the duty to stop the judicial indiscretions and abuses of the Federal judiciary. I hope and trust it will exercise the powers which clearly and exclusively belong to the Congress and thus free the people of America from the mailed fist of this judicial oligarchy.

In the Virginia Bill of Rights, that great bulwark of liberty penned by the celebrated George Mason, it is stated in substance that all power is vested in the people and consequently derived from the people, that magistrates are their trustees and servants and at all times amenable to them.

Let me in conclusion also state to my colleagues that, in that same matchless instrumentality of freedom, it is stated:

> No free government, or the blessings of liberty can be preserved to any people, but by a firm adherence to justice, moderation, temperance, frugality, and virtue, and by frequent recurrence to fundamental principles.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TUCK. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WAGGONNER. I wish to say to the gentleman from Virginia that I agree wholeheartedly with what he has had to say today with respect to the problem of apportionment and reapportionment of State legislatures. I am today joining him in introducing a similar amendment to the Constitution.

Mr. TUCK. I extend my thanks to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana.

AN INDIANA DEEPWATER PORT

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced H.R. 50, a bill to authorize Federal participation in the construction of a deepwater port on the Indiana shoreline of Lake Michigan. President Johnson in his state of the Union message spoke of a restless people. This describes the Midwest and particularly the great State of Indiana and its people. This restlessness is expressed in our desire to grow. We want to take advantage of our opportunities. We want to progress economically. We want trade and the contact which accompanies trade with the great economic centers of Europe. We want to see modern technology spawn and grow in our State. We want to provide a proper industrial climate for a restless industrial complex. Our proposed port will be a start in the realization of plans which have been a long time in the making. This is a project which will not only serve Indiana and the Midwest but it is one which will serve—and serve well—the national interest. The flow of trade between countries will be encouraged. It will make possible the finding of new markets because lower shipping costs will make us more competitive. Farming, manufacturing, and mining will be stimulated. To pass this bill will be a mark of progress.

A PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT PROVIDING FOR THE EFFECTIVE DETERMINATION OF PRESIDENTIAL INABILITY AND SUCCESSION

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution providing for the effective determination of Presidential inability and succession.

One of the many challenging issues which face the Nation today is that of Presidential inability and succession. The President, last evening, in his state of the Union message, called attention to the problems and the need for congressional action.

The United States is the leader, and sometimes the protector, of the free world. Through foreign involvements and domestic pressures, the task of leading the country is becoming increasingly more time consuming and burdensome. We have come to demand that these men devote more of their waking hours to the task of leadership.

There was a day, perhaps, in the history of the United States when Presidential inability was not so alarming and did not present the urgency that it now does. President Garfield in 1881 lay wounded 80 days; President Wilson was, in part, incapacitated for a substantial part of his second term in office.

The Constitution of the United States provides in detail the procedures for removing a President from office. But, aside from indicating that Congress shall provide for the succession to the Presidency, there is no specification as to how the disability of a President shall be determined.

Informal arrangements can be worked out as they were between Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy with their Vice Presidents. Yet, these do not have the force of law, may be subject to constitutional challenge, and fail to generate that degree of trust in the electorate in case the need arises for a Vice President to assume the office of Acting President.

For these reasons, I have proposed a constitutional amendment to remedy such lack of authority.

The proposed amendment provides that the President may, in his own behalf, issue a declaration announcing his disability. If he should fail to do so, or in the case where he is too ill to do so, then the Vice President may do so if he has the concurrence of a majority of the Cabinet.

There is a belief among many persons that, in the instance where the President fails to act, some other body than the Vice President and the Cabinet should be designated to make the choice. Some question the disinterest of the Vice President, and the trust that the people may place in nonelected members of the Cabinet. Others believe that, for political and personal reasons, the Vice President and the Cabinet, having been selected by the President, may feel reluctant to act. In place, thereof, the suggestion has been made that a commission be created which might be composed of Supreme Court Justices, elected leaders of Congress and members of the Cabinet.

I believe that the Vice President must, of necessity, be granted a primary responsibility in such matters. I also believe that members of the Cabinet, because of their intimate contact with the President, must be made to share in this responsibility and duty. I further believe that such men are dedicated to the country's welfare and will act accordingly.

In order to provide a certain amount of leeway, however, I provide in the amendment that Congress shall have the authority, if it so chooses, to designate some other body than the Cabinet to pass upon a Vice President's declaration of the President's inability.

The proposed amendment also provides that after a declaration of the President's disability, through whatever means, and the assumption of the Office of Acting President by the Vice President, the President may resume the powers and duties of his office by issuing a declaration that his disability has terminated.

If it is believed, however, that the President's disability continues, the amendment provides that the Vice President, with the concurrence of a majority of the Cabinet, or some other body designated by the Congress, shall within 2 days declare in writing that such disability continues. Thereafter, Congress has 8 additional days to determine whether the President's disability does, in fact, continue. If Congress fails to act within that period or if it does not make a determination of continuing disability by a two-thirds vote, the President shall resume his office. The burden, it will be seen, is placed upon the Vice President and the Cabinet to prove the continuance of the disability and not on the President, who has the primary claim to the office. The Congress is designated as the ultimate arbiter because it is believed that, as the elected representatives of the people, it shares the greatest trust of the people.

Turning to the other basic problem of maintaining Executive leadership, the proposed amendment provides that when a vacancy occurs in the Office of the Vice-Presidency, the President shall appoint a Vice President with the advice and consent of the Congress.

Today, far mcre than in earlier times, the Vice President is being brought into the leadership of the Nation. He is invited to and participates in Cabinet meetings. He has been designated a statutory member of the National Security Council. He is Chairman of the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity. He has been designated as the coordinator of civil rights enforcement in the executive branch of Government. He is Chairman of the National Aeronautics and Space Council. He is frequently designated as the President's representative in foreign and domestic matters. He is assigned to important troubleshooting tasks. And, perhaps most important of all, he is but one heartbeat away from becoming President. The importance of the office of Vice President means, then, that the country must always have a Vice President who is well informed and well schooled in the important issues that face the Nation.

The age we live in and the great sorrows or near sorrows that have befallen some of our Presidents in the past make it all too clear that our Nation can no longer afford the luxury of antiquated constitutional machinery which permits a vacancy in the office of Vice President or which does not provide for the contingency of Presidential disability.

A copy of the resolution follows:

H.J. RES. —

Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to succession to the Presidency and Vice-Presidency and to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission by the Congress:

ARTICLE —

"Section 1. In case of the removal of the President from office or of his death or resignation, the Vice President shall become President.

"SEC. 2. Whenever there is a vacancy in the office of the Vice President, the President shall nominate a Vice President who shall take office upon confirmation by a majority vote of both Houses of Congress.

"SEC. 3. If the President declares in writing that he is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, such powers and duties shall be discharged by the Vice President as Acting President.

"SEC. 4. If the President does not so declare, and the Vice President with the written concurrence of a majority of the heads of the executive departments or such other body as Congress may by law provide, transmits to the Congress his written declaration that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, the Vice President shall immediately assume the powers and duties of the office as Acting President.

"SEC. 5. Whenever the President transmits to the Congress his written declaration that no inability exists, he shall resume the powers and duties of his office on the second day following the transmittal of such declaration to the Congress unless, prior to his resumption of such powers and duties, the Vice President transmits to the Congress his written declaration that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, in which case the Congress shall immediately decide the issue. If the Congress determines by two-thirds vote of both Houses that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of the office, the Vice President shall continue to discharge the same as Acting President; otherwise the President shall resume the powers and duties of his office on the tenth day following the transmittal to the Congress of his declaration that no inability exists. Any declaration by the Vice President that the President is unable to resume the powers and duties of his office may be transmitted to the Congress only with the written concurrence of a majority of the heads of the executive departments or such other body as Congress may by law provide."

RELEASE OF ZINC FROM NATIONAL STOCKPILE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill to effect an emergency release of 150,000 tons of zinc from the national stockpile, with a waiver of the statutory 6 months notice, to ease the continuing critical shortage of zinc required for producing diecastings and galvanized steel needed by the automotive, appliance, builders hardware, office equipment, and other domestic industries.

Zinc supply available to industry is in crucial shortage. Domestic mining has been increased and further increases are in progress but domestic metal production—dependent on both domestic and imported ore supplies—is unable to meet demand and producers inventories have been depleted. Imports of ore and metal are restricted by quota and, in fact, the world zinc supply is short of current demand.

In 1964, after authorization by the Congress, 75,000 tons of zinc, from the national stockpile, was disposed of through the General Services Administration in an orderly manner without disrupting normal commercial relationships—a testament to the cooperative efforts of Government, industry, and zinc producers. The present disposal authorization is jointly and urgently advocated as being of paramount necessity by the industries affected. The Government's response to this appeal will serve our national interest.

Diecasting and galvanizing plants are working on a day-to-day basis and some minor cutbacks in operations have occurred. The present possibility of major shutdowns is a real and imminent threat to our national economy. The delivery of zinc die-cast parts and galvanized steel sheet to the automotive, appliance, builders hardware, and other key domestic industries is currently in danger of interruption with consequent and severe damage to the Nation.

Long-range injury to the zinc mining and producing industries is also involved since the inability of diecasters to meet existing industrial requirements is resulting in design changes away from zinc. Substitution of plastics and other materials can lead to serious consequences for our zinc industry.

The only available supply of zinc in the free world is the 1,500,000 tons in the national stockpile—all of which is in excess of the current stockpile objective of zero. The assistance of the Government to the oft beleaguered zinc industry would be clear evidence of continued and positive interest. Such a move will reassure users of diecastings and other zinc products that justifiable Government remedy is available.

The proposed release will avert layoffs of workers in the affected industries and avoid the shutting down of diecasting and galvanizing plants as well as avoiding the possibility of interruption of production in the automotive and other important industrial manufacturing segments of our economy.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I ask for favorable and prompt action on the legislation I have proposed.

THE AGE OF REVOLUTION

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, revolutions in the name of the people's right to govern themselves, and against tyranny and every form of racism, have been occurring on almost every continent and shaking this earth rather convulsively for the past several decades. New nations are being born and it is a pardonable characteristic of the young to believe, in their newfound freedom and their exuberance, that theirs is the first, the true, and the only real rebellion.

It is understandable, therefore, that in many of the emerging states of the world there is not yet an adequate or a full understanding of the American Revolution and of the series of events, including some quite recent ones, that it triggered off. Even our own citizens sometimes forget the violence that attended our origin and its causes. So it is excusable when those in other countries overlook or do not grasp the fact that the first successful anticolonial revolution in modern times was the American Revolution. And perhaps they do not even know of the milestone represented by passage of the 13th amendment to the Constitution, abolishing slavery and marking another stage and a step forward in our revolution.

The worldwide revolution for freedom began 200 years ago, in 1765, in America with the violent controversy over the Stamp Act and the Stamp Act Congress. One hundred years later, in 1865, the 13th amendment was passed. It is well at this time, while the forgetful and the ignorant make intemperate attacks and charges against the United States, to remember and commemorate the bicentenary of the first revolt against imperialism, and the centenary of the noteworthy victory over racism.

The editorial which appeared in the January 1, 1965, issue of the Washington Post eloquently expresses my own thoughts on these matters. With unanimous consent I am inserting a copy of this editorial in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the close of my remarks:

CONTINUING REVOLUTIONS

The year upon which we now enter is the centenary of a great event in one of the two revolutions that now shake the world and the bicentenary of a great climax in the other ongoing revolution.

It is the bicentenary of the revolution against colonialism which really began on this continent with the violent controversy over the Stamp Act in 1765 and proceeded from that furious tumult to the American Revolutionary War and to the 200 years of resistance to imperialism which followed it.

And it is the centenary of the passage of the 13th amendment to the Constitution of the United States in 1865, an event which marked a stage of a revolution in the status of the Negro people which still continues and which seems destined to continue until the last vestiges of political and economic inequality have been removed.

The Stamp Act Congress which met in 1765, by its declaration of rights and liberties, really set afoot the revolution on this continent, for it enunciated principles inconsistent with the continuation of colonial empire, even though many wished to forget them when Parliament repealed the Stamp Act. But the Colonies had taken a position on the rights of Parliament that they could not thenceforth abandon and the Parliament by its declaratory act had asserted in terms it could not easily abandon its right to tax. These irreconcilable views were to tear the North American Colonies out of the British Empire and the resulting American Revolution has had its imitators in struggling colonial uprisings in every quarter of the globe in every decade of the last 200 years.

The 13th amendment, of course, did not commence the struggle against slavery or end the fight against discrimination. But its passage in 1865 is still a landmark, notable because it signalized a victory over racial discrimination and servitude accomplished, not by slave insurrection and rebellion, but by civil war in which the slaves themselves did not take a principal part.

In a world that still is disturbed by these on-going and uncompleted revolutions the United States is not often remembered for the events of 100 years ago or those of 200 years ago. Its credentials as a foe of imperialism and the enemy of racism, nevertheless remain undisputed and unimpaired. The African nationalists pursue both a racial and a political goal that makes them, whether they like it or not, the followers of American precedent. Their struggle could never have taken place in this century if independence had not been won by the United States in the 18th century and slavery abolished in the United States in the 19th century. The Soviet Union and the government of Communist China have come late to these struggles but they have belatedly tried to array African and Asian anti-imperialism and antiracism against the United States.

This really is a piece of brazen effrontery for powers that themselves have not abandoned the practice of imperialistic trespass upon their neighbors and for nations that are not above offensive racial discrimination. That this effrontery has had its measure of success was shown clearly enough by the speeches of some of the African representatives at the United Nations during the debates over the Congo. What an irony of history to have this combination of malice and ignorance indict the United States in the name of the revolution it started 200 years ago and in behalf of the revolution it so far advanced 100 years ago.

The United States, in 1965, must make it clear that it is not ready to lay down the leadership of either the struggle for freedom and independence which it started in 1765 or the struggle for racial equality which it so far advanced in 1865.

ROBERT V. ROOSA, UNDER SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY FOR MONETARY AFFAIRS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, in 1961 President Kennedy appointed Robert V. Roosa to a position in the new administration requiring the highest degree of technical knowledge and skill—Under Secretary of the Treasury for Monetary Affairs. Few of us will ever forget the serious plight that the dollar had fallen into prior to Mr. Roosa's appointment, and as President Johnson recently said in a letter to him:

> When you and Secretary Dillon first took office in 1961, there was an imperative need to bolster the defenses of the dollar, which was then under severe attack by speculators and other forces.

Thanks to the abilities and good judgment of Mr. Roosa, and the painstaking work which he and others in the Kennedy and Johnson administrations have performed, those defenses have been strengthened. Further, as a Washington Post editorial stated, the restoration of confidence and the reassertion of U.S. initiative in international monetary affairs are in large part due to his efforts.

The substantial improvement in our balance of payments and the outflow of U.S. gold and dollars over the past 4 years also testifies to the successful and efficient manner in which Mr. Roosa conducted his office.

These accomplishments and achievements, among others, are yardsticks by which the public and Government officials will and should measure the performance of Robert V. Roosa, who has recently resigned from his post as Under Secretary of the Treasury. A Congressman uses other criteria as well.

As a member of the House Banking and Currency Committee, I have had occasion to work with Mr. Roosa and others in the Department of the Treasury on matters of mutual concern. And, aside from my committee assignments and work, I have had reason to call upon him for assistance and information. Mr. Roosa never regarded himself so big that he could not take the time from an intense schedule in order to answer each letter and each inquiry made by myself and on behalf of my constituents relating to matters within the purview of his duties and responsibilities. Throughout his tenure of office, he was considerate, helpful, and dedicated. That, in my opinion, is the highest tribute one can pay to a Government official.

His resignation unquestionably is a loss to us all.

With unanimous consent, I am inserting in the RECORD an article that appeared in the New York Times, January 6, 1964; an article from the Christian Science Monitor, December 2, 1964; and an editorial from the Washington Post, January 2, 1965:

[From the New York Times, Jan. 6, 1964]

ROBERT V. ROOSA

Under Secretary of the Treasury for Monetary Affairs, he is responsible for management of the country's enormous national debt and for handling such problems as curbing the outflow of gold and dollars from the United States and setting the interest rates for Treasury offerings and refundings. Normally a mild-mannered, soft-spoken man, he displayed hidden temper when confronted by Wall Street's hostility last year to the administration's proposed tax on the purchase of foreign securities. He declared financial executives whose main job has been to wear the hair shirt for those who want to do more than their resources allow were unwilling to wear the hair shirt when necessary. He was associated for 20 years with the Federal Reserve Bank of New York before appointment by President Kennedy to the Treasury. He was born on June 21, 1918, in northern Michigan.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Dec. 2, 1964]

ROOSA HAILED FOR AID TO CURRENCY

(By Philip W. McKinsey)

Robert V. Roosa, chief architect of the new era of international monetary cooperation, will become a general partner in the New York private banking firm of Brown Brothers Harriman & Co. on January 1.

Mr. Roosa has been Under Secretary of the Treasury for Monetary Affairs since January 1961. He announced the pending move Monday afternoon on the heels of a major success for the currency defenses he helped construct.

Just last week the network of central bank aid stemmed a massive speculative attack on the British pound, with the quick announcement of $3 billion in standby credits for Britain from other central banks.

CONTRIBUTION CITED

As Mr. Roosa made clear Monday, he feels his most important contribution to the economy lies in the role he played to bolster such international cooperation. "Nothing like this British operation could have been considered 4 years ago," he said.

The British themselves marked the beginning of this cooperation in 1961, with their arrangement to borrow some $900 million from European central banks. In the following years the U.S. Treasury Department and the Federal Reserve System have worked constantly to shore up monetary cooperation among major countries.

"This is the most lasting thing we've built," Mr. Roosa said Monday.

Also on Monday the White House released President Johnson's letter of November 27 accepting Mr. Roosa's resignation. The President had announced the resignation, dated November 2 on Saturday.

The President's letter to Mr. Roosa said in part: "You can justly take a good share of the credit for creating the new and very real sense of international economic and financial cooperation which has been so painstakingly developed and nurtured in recent years."

The defenses now built around major currencies—especially the dollar—contrasts sharply with the situation when Mr. Roosa joined the Kennedy administration. The United States had just lived through the worst postwar speculative attack on the dollar, which came to a head in October 1960, when the dollar deteriorated to $40 an ounce on the London gold markets from its fixed price of $35 an ounce.

The United States had lost $5.4 billion in gold in the 3 years through the end of 1960. The balance-of-payments deficit on regular transactions had clung at $4 billion a year for 2 years running.

The President took note of this in his letter released Monday. "When you and Secretary (Douglas) Dillon first took office in 1961, there was an imperative need to bolster the defenses of the dollar, which was then under severe attack by speculators and other forces."

LEADING ROLE PLAYED

Mr. Roosa was tapped by President-elect Kennedy on Christmas Eve, 1960. In the following 5 weeks he played a leading role in formulating President Kennedy's balance-of-payments policy. This policy was enunciated in a special message on February 6, 1961.

For the short term, the policy was designed to reduce the incentive for foreigners to convert their dollars into gold. For the longer term, it aimed at improving the competitive position of the U.S. economy.

The longer-term policy has been slower to get underway than the short-term, defensive moves.

ROOSA BONDS

Much of the job of neutralizing dollars abroad to prevent a run on the U.S. gold stock was carried out by Mr. Roosa. In cooperation with the Federal Reserve, he led the United States into an active role in foreign exchange markets. He negotiated for the United States in setting up the London gold pool which has damped down gold speculation. He helped nail down the $6 billion general arrangements to borrow which supplements the resources of the International Monetary Fund.

To offer foreign central banks an alternative to gold, he sold medium-term Treasury bonds denominated in foreign currencies. They were quickly dubbed Roosa bonds.

Rather surprisingly, Mr. Roosa was picked for the Under Secretary post largely to manage the $300 billion national debt. At the time, he was vice president in charge of research at the New York Federal Reserve Bank, where he was noted for his knowledge of the Government securities markets. Men in the markets knew him as the author of a guidebook on open-market operations of the Fed.

KNOWN AS THINKER

Mr. Roosa's colleagues in Washington have often expressed high regard for his unusual combination as an academic thinker and as a practical operator in the markets.

At the New York Fed he was known as both a thinker and an operating official. He taught economics at the University of Michigan, where he had taken his Ph. D. in 1942. Later he taught at Harvard and MIT. In 1946 he went to the New York Fed.

After he joins Brown Brothers Harriman, Mr. Roosa feels he will be in a position to counsel Treasury officials, should they wish to draw on his experience. He said conflict of interest would not be a consideration—partly because Brown Brothers Harriman is not a dominant factor in the markets. Also because the firm has a tradition of its people flowing back and forth to Government service.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 2, 1965]

DEFENDER OF THE DOLLAR

For 4 years Robert V. Roosa, the Under Secretary of the Treasury for Monetary Affairs who is returning to private life, has demonstrated that brilliance, perseverance, and diplomatic tact can triumph over the most formidable difficulties in the arena of international finance. When Dr. Roosa came to Washington in January of 1961, the dollar was under severe pressure in the exchange markets and foreign confidences in the ability of this Government to manage its external economic affairs was low. The restoration of confidence and the reassertion of U.S. initiative in international monetary affairs are in large part due to his efforts.

There were times in which voices—including that of this newspaper—were raised in criticism of Dr. Roosa's statements and policies. But none of them detract from his very solid accomplishments. He initiated the move to obtain international credit by selling Treasury obligations denominated in foreign currencies, and it is a tribute to his skill in inspiring confidence that the central banks of Europe now hold nearly $1 billion of "Roosa bonds." He is the architect of the network of currency swaps and standby credits without which the international monetary mechanism would have collapsed.

In addition to building bastions of international cooperation, Robert Roosa in the deliberations of the group of 10 and at the Tokyo meeting of the International Monetary Fund made a powerful case for reforming the monetary system along liberal lines. And in analyzing domestic economic policies he raised strong doubts about the efficacy of monetary restraint in the solution of balance-of-payments problems.

It is hardly likely that Roosa's rare combination of talents can be duplicated. But in nominating Frederick L. Deming of the Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis to replace him, President Johnson has chosen a professionally trained economist who will command respect in negotiations with the officials of foreign governments.

AFRICA—A REEVALUATION

The **SPEAKER**. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. **ROOSEVELT**. Mr. Speaker, the events in Africa in the last few weeks have shocked the American people.

We are appalled by brutal barbarism, by cynical and sinister conspiracy, by the conduct of member states of the United Nations which flaunt their violations of the U.N. Charter. We are dismayed by the suspicions and smears of nations which we have, in good faith, befriended and aided.

We must reexamine the premises upon which our policies are based.

Mr. Speaker, these events force us to raise once again an issue which has been debated on this floor. Is it sensible and is it right to aid nations which misuse our aid in mischief against us, against our friends and against our allies?

The spectacle in Africa is clear to those who see the facts—free from self-deception.

The architects of Africa's anarchy are two demagogs—Abdel Gamal Nasser of Egypt and Ben Bella of Algeria. They make no secret of it. They are arming insurrection and revolt against the legitimate Government of the Congo. They are engaged in aggression. They are no longer entitled to aid from us because their conduct collides with the best interests of the free world. They are entitled to the thanks of Moscow and Peiping because they will profit by their tactics, which are designed to weaken, undermine, and liquidate every American and British and pro-Western position of strength in the Near East and Africa. They have exposed their own subversive role, and President Nasser of Egypt, who holds us in contempt, has gone so far as to disparage our aid, to discredit our policy, to belittle the good faith and generosity of the American people.

Mr. Nasser's last insulting tirade against American aid suggests that he knows that our patience is not inexhaustible, and that American aid must surely come to an end. Of course, the State Department can prove Nasser wrong, but only if it insists on turning the cheek of the American people and our friends and allies. But I would like to believe and hope that the State Department, so indulgent and so tolerant for so many months and years of frustration, must now finally conclude that American aid to Egypt and Algeria should be terminated as quickly as is practical.

I believe that this is the view of the Members of the House. I would like to recall the facts and the legislative history. Under the Public Law 480 food-for-peace program we now permit Egypt to purchase about $140 million annually in surplus foods. The Egyptians pay us in soft currency. We lend most of that money back. But for a long time there has been a strong suspicion that Egypt's President Nasser has applied our aid, not to the advancement of peace, but to aggression. The State Department has had plenty of time to determine the validity of this suspicion.

Public Law 480 aid to Egypt is due to terminate unless we renew it on July 1, 1965. But I believe that African stability, world peace, and our own national interest argue for earlier cutoff date, unless strict control can now be enforced, contrary to the remaining evidence.

In October of 1963 the House adopted an amendment to the foreign aid authorization which was recommended by the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. It provided that the United States would give no assistance to any country that the President found to be preparing for war or engaged in aggression against the United States or any recipient of American aid. The Senate Committee on Foreign Relations failed to act on the House amendment, but it was offered on the Senate floor by Senators GRUENING and JAVITS. It was adopted by the Senate in November. The purpose was clear. Although Egypt was not mentioned, the intent was to cut off aid to Egypt without impinging on the authority of the executive branch by an explicit legislative fiat. The intent was written into the legislative record. It showed that Congress was opposed to aiding Egypt for a number of reasons:

First, our surplus food grants enabled Nasser to transfer Egyptian manpower from Egyptian wheat fields to Yemeni battlefields.

Second, our food shipments enabled Egypt to trade her cotton for Soviet arms instead of food.

Third, the Egyptian military establishment compelled other Near Eastern countries to divert resources from important agricultural and industrial development to defensive military establishments. The arms race has become a dead weight on their economies—a death sentence for their people.

Congress found in the autumn of 1963 that U.S. aid was underwriting the expansionism of a totalitarian police state, the personal aggrandizement of its dictator, Abdel Gamel Nasser. The administration has made no new development loans to Egypt during the last 18 months, but it did continue the massive food shipments, even though Nasser persisted in his threats against Israel and failed to keep his promises to withdraw from Yemen.

And so, last fall, the former Representative of Ohio, Oliver Bolton, offered an amendment which would have ended Nasser's food purchases in this country. Despite serious reservations, I opposed Mr. Bolton's amendment. All of us were impressed by his arguments. We were again reminded that our surplus food shipments enabled Nasser to trade two-thirds of Egypt's cotton for Soviet arms, which he was providing to Cyprus, which he was amassing as a threat against Israel, and the Arab States which refused to accept his Arab socialism and his pro-Soviet line. Supporters of the Bolton amendment noted that there was precedent for congressional designation of countries no longer to receive our aid.

The State Department appealed to us not to approve the Bolton amendment because our diplomats feared that it would deprive them of leverage in Egypt. I have the greatest confidence in, and respect for, President Johnson and his advisers. Accordingly, I tempered my natural desire to support the Bolton amendment and I proposed an alternative. My substitute amendment called upon the President to bar aid to any country unless he could certify that it was not an aggressor against any nations with which we have diplomatic relations and was not using our funds for purposes inimical to our foreign policies.

In the debate that ensued I heard no voice in this House support President Nasser. There was a wide consensus that he was an aggressor, that he was aiding the Communists and endangering the free world. The debate revolved around the question of whether Congress or the President should cut off aid to Egypt. My amendment, retaining discretionary authority in the executive branch, was carried by a bare four votes. Since then there has been mounting evidence confirming the appraisal of Congress.

I have written to the President and to Secretary of State Dean Rusk, urging immediate termination of aid to Egypt because of Nasser's aggressive policies against Jordan, Saudi Arabia, Yemen, and Israel, because of his agitation against American bases in Libya, because of his arms shipments to the rebels in the Congo, who massacred hundreds of missionaries and other civilians, because of an unprovoked attack on a private American plane—all these activities have militated against American policies and world peace.

The State Department has indicated that it is carefully reviewing our aid policy for Egypt. It has been announced that the administration is deferring action on Nasser's request for an additional allotment of $35 million in meats, poultry, and corn—over and above the normal surplus food shipments which have been going to Egypt for the last several years.

But I have seen no decisive action to challenge Nasser's irresponsible behavior. In August, Nasser followed the Communist line in condemning our peace-preserving action in the Gulf of Tonkin. In October, during the conference of the allegedly nonalined states in Cairo, a highhanded Nasser placed Moise Tshombe, the leader of the legally constituted Government of the Congo, under house arrest and held him incommunicado, in an unprecedented action completely contemptuous of international law. That brazen violation of diplomatic rights was sure to encourage further assaults on the rights of other peoples and other nations.

Thus, it was inevitable that African students in Cairo were incited, in November, to burn down the John F. Kennedy Library there. Nasser's Gestapo-like police force failed to stop the mob, and Nasser's indolent fire department failed to quench the flames which consumed a rich library of more than 25,000 books. Egypt has been a conduit for Soviet subversion and Soviet weapons. It has been sending the arms which our aid allows him to buy from Russia directly to the Congolese rebels who propose to establish a radical dictatorship after overthrowing the legally constituted Tshombe regime.

Nasser does not conceal this subversive, illegal operation, but boasts about it. On December 23, Nasser said:

> We do not conceal but openly say that we have sent arms to the Congo, and we shall send more arms to the Congo.

In the same speech, he misled the Egyptian people about the significance of American aid and told us to jump into the seas.

On December 19, Nasser's air force shot down a plane owned by the John Mecom Oil Co., of Texas, although there was no provocation. Our State Department protested, but Egypt scorned our protest.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that our aid to Egypt is illegal under the Gruening-Javits and the Roosevelt amendments adopted by Congress in 1963 and 1964.

The executive branch has seen fit to continue Public Law 480 aid to Nasser, presumably because it assumes that our aid would give us some leverage, but what does leverage mean if it is never used and if it is clear to the recipients of our aid that we attach no conditions and never intend to cut off our aid no matter what the provocation. Under such circumstances, our aid provides no leverage. On the contrary—it is totally ineffective and it is dangerously counterproductive, because as long as we give aid to an anti-American government like Egypt's we forfeit the respect of other governments and we diminish their desire to side with us against international Communist subversion. If a nation can extort money and assistance from both the United States and Russia by following the Communist line, it will not sacrifice Soviet and Chinese aid by alining with us. Our policy of unconditional aid to Nasser has been instructive to other nations. They have learned that Nasserism pays.

Mr. Speaker, I maintain my confidence that President Johnson surely is aware of the need to end this suicidal and stultifying stratagem. Democracies appeased dictators in false hope and faint fears in the 1930's.

I hope that the President will act decisively. I believe that Congress is determined to do so. There is no question but that either the Executive or Congress should terminate Public Law 480 shipments to Nasser at the earliest possible time, but we who believe in the responsibility of the Executive hope he will not force the Congress to act.

THE CONGRESS SHOULD LEARN ABOUT THE MLF

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the Congress came out of last November's election to find strong forces at work toward concluding forthwith an agreement with certain of our allies for a multilateral nuclear force.

Many Members were concerned because the matter of an MLF had never been debated in the Congress, and because of large doubts concerning the wisdom of the proposal. For example, on December 3, 1964, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS] and myself, returning from a 3-week study trip to Germany, France, Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Yugoslavia, issued the following joint statement:

STATEMENT BY REPRESENTATIVES JOHN BRADEMAS, OF INDIANA, AND HENRY S. REUSS, OF WISCONSIN, CONCERNING THE MLF

1. Prior to the adoption of major U.S. foreign policy concerning the U.N., the formation of NATO, Formosa, the Middle East, and Vietnam, the State Department consulted fully with the House and Senate and obtained a sense of Congress resolution. Although the MLF also involves a fundamental policy decision, the State Department has not consulted Congress adequately. Before pressing the MLF or any similar proposal further, we believe it should do so.

2. We believe that the State Department's current MLF proposal (25 surface vessels, 200 missiles, mixed crews) raises several grave doubts, requiring, at the least, full debate. For example:

A. We recognize that our allies ought to participate in the planning, strategy, and consultation concerning nuclear weapons much more than at present. Unfortunately, the MLF proposal does very little in this direction. Moreover, because of its emphasis on the bottom or operating level instead of the top or command level, the MLF creates ambiguities and apprehensions about whose finger may be on the trigger.

B. We certainly agree with the professed goal of MLF to prevent the proliferation of national nuclear forces. Unfortunately, the French already have the bomb and will not halt their nuclear development program because of MLF. Nor are we persuaded that the MLF will be effective as to Germany; indeed, a future German campaign for a national nuclear force could well be based upon the argument that Germany's massive financial and manpower participation in an MLF had, after all, produced no German control over A-weapons.

C. The liberalization of Eastern Europe is one of the major objectives of President Johnson's program of "building bridges" to these nations. The possibility that the MLF will retard liberalizing tendencies there has not been sufficiently taken into account.

D. German reunification is likewise a goal of U.S. policy. We do not believe the State Department has sufficiently considered the possible adverse effects of the MLF upon reunification.

E. Although the three major West German political parties have formally endorsed the MLF, our private conversations with top leaders of these parties persuade us that warm support for the proposal is not widespread. Moreover, we are not satisfied that, on an issue of such profound importance to the future of German democracy, there has been adequate discussion and debate of the MLF at all levels of German life.

F. American insistence on the MLF as the proper road to allied nuclear sharing is to confuse means with ends—a mistake we made, to our detriment, when we called in 1953 for an "agonizing reappraisal" of the NATO alliance if our particular version of joint European defense was not adopted. By pressing the MLF as the only solution to the nuclear problem over the strong objections of our allies, we create divisions in the alliance rather than build unity.

3. Accordingly, we believe the State Department should forget its current MLF proposal. The failure of MLF does not mean, however, that the Western alliance requires no reinvigoration. Let the industrialized democracies turn their joint attention to full employment in each country, to increasing world trade, to a more stable international monetary system, and to a concerted effort to help the less developed world. An immediate upgrading of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development—with a commission to propose, a parliamentary assembly to debate, and a highest level council to act—is a concept that could win widespread immediate support.

At the same time, the members of the Western military alliance should proceed in an orderly manner to discuss means of solving the nuclear defense problem. We believe it neither necessary nor desirable that this profound issue be discussed in a crisis atmosphere. We would hope that the Europeans, rather than being simply negative, would make an effort to develop constructive proposals.

Mr. Speaker, fortunately, the President has now defused the entire MLF discussion. In a reported directive to the executive branch toward the end of 1964, he ordered that aggressive U.S. propagandizing in favor of the MLF cease; that no proposal for an allied nuclear force be considered unless it bore the joint approval of at least the United Kingdom and West Germany; and that France should at the least be fully consulted before any proposal be accepted.

The months ahead give Congress an opportunity to consider the pros and cons of the MLF. In order that Members might have a background document in which to sink their teeth, I requested the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress some months ago to prepare an analysis of the MLF. An excellent report has now been prepared by Elizabeth Stabler, Analyst in Western European Affairs, Foreign Affairs Division, Legislative Reference Service,

Library of Congress, dated December 7, 1964. I commend it to all Members:

THE MLF: BACKGROUND AND ANALYSIS OF PROS AND CONS

I. BACKGROUND TO THE PROPOSAL

The American proposal for a NATO multilateral nuclear force represents an attempt to deal with a number of alliance problems that have assumed increasing importance in recent years. Although the MLF in its present form has been the subject of official discussions within the alliance only since early 1963, consideration of the possibility of some form of joint control over alliance nuclear weapons systems dates back at least to 1959. Neither the age and gravity of the problems confronting the alliance, nor the long series of studies and proposals lying behind the MLF necessarily point to the desirability of adopting the MLF or of doing so without further reflection. A brief review of the problems the MLF is designed to meet, and of the origins of the proposal, can show, however, that the MLF is neither a panacea nor a hastily improvised gimmick, and that it would be a mistake to endorse it or to dismiss it as such.

A. Alliance problems

1. The U.S. Commitment to the Defense of Europe

Despite explicit U.S. assurances and the presence of American troops on the European Continent, the long-term reliability of the U.S. commitment to the defense of Western Europe by all necessary means has always been questioned by some Europeans. European doubts grew as it became evident, following the launching of sputnik, that the continental United States was vulnerable to direct Soviet nuclear strikes.

European fears that the United States would be reluctant to expose its own cities, especially by a nuclear response to a Soviet attack limited to Western Europe, were reinforced by the fact that the great bulk of the tactical and strategic nuclear weapons at the disposal of the alliance—British forces theoretically excepted—remained under the control of American authorities. Although some of the European allies of the United States began to acquire the delivery vehicles for tactical nuclear weapons in the late 1950's, American custody of warheads for these weapons was assured by a dual-key system regulating access to the warheads. As European confidence in the U.S. commitment waned, European disquiet over the increasing number of Soviet MRBM's targeted on Western Europe grew. Meanwhile, some Americans who were also concerned with the credibility of the defense posture of the West, were increasingly disturbed by NATO's commitment to a strategy dependent on a rapid resort to nuclear weapons in the event of any Soviet thrust to the West. Efforts to modify this strategy opened a new area where differences between European and American viewpoints could flourish.

2. Emerging Differences Over Strategy

Although in the late 1950's General Norstad, in his position as SACEUR, urged the strengthening of NATO's conventional forces to the point where they could contain a limited Soviet thrust and enforce a "pause" before nuclear weapons were introduced, full U.S. pressure for an improvement of NATO's conventional capabilities came only with the advent of the Kennedy administration. One corollary of the doctrine of flexible response with its emphasis on options and graduated levels of retaliation was the necessity and possibility of increasing conventional forces in Europe to the point where they would be capable of considerably more than a short holding action. Europeans saw in the U.S. search for a choice between all-out nuclear war and capitulation a confirmation of their previous doubts; they thought that an emphasis on conventional defense would dangerously weaken the efficacy of nuclear deterrence; they were reluctant to contemplate the possibility of a full-scale conventional war being waged on the European Continent. Other corollaries of the doctrine of flexible response were that highly centralized and reliable command and control arrangements were necessary and that separate European nuclear efforts were costly in terms of other requirements sacrificed, redundant, and quite possibly dangerous. These points were made in what many Europeans considered a peremptory manner in Secretary of Defense McNamara's Ann Arbor speech of the summer of 1962. They touched two areas of European sensitivity: Centralization could only mean centralization in American hands. The French, and only to a lesser extent, the British, saw their nuclear efforts condemned.

3. The Development of Europe National Nuclear Forces

The British nuclear weapons effort began in the late 1940's; the first British atomic bomb was exploded in 1952. The French nuclear weapons effort began in 1955 and 1956, thus predating De Gaulle's return to power by more than 2 years. The first French test of a nuclear device was carried out in 1960, the first test of a bomb, in 1962. The British effort benefited by wartime cooperation with the Americans, and, in its later stages, by American assistance. The French program has proceeded without American assistance, although there have been on-again, off-again negotiations for the sale of a land-based prototype submarine nuclear reactor, and the completed sale of 12 KC-135 tanker planes to extend the range of the Mirage IV bomber. The British and French programs represent a response to the problem of relying upon an American guarantee for the defense of vital interests. More important, they reflect a quest for prestige, for political leverage vis-a-vis the United States, and for an entry card to the councils of the great. Although British Bomber Command has been coordinated with SAC for targeting purposes, American reservations about the British program began to increase when the decision to end conscription was announced in the Defense White Paper of 1957. American hostility to the French program has been more open and reflects, more than a concern for the cost to conventional efforts, fear that pressures for emulation of the French—especially in Germany—will increase.

4. The Movement Toward European Unity and European Prosperity

In defending the French nuclear effort, De Gaulle and his followers refer to both French and European interests. The French and the Europeans must prepare for the day when American and European vital interests diverge and when the American nuclear umbrella and American forces may be withdrawn. Europeans should develop political and military cooperation on the lines of the Franco-German Treaty of 1963; they should collectively resist American tutelage in NATO; they should resist the dependence entailed by integrated defense efforts in NATO. The Gaullist vision has been clear insofar as it has implied unity in separateness from the United States; it has been unclear in the crucial realm of defense. Probably realistically, close political and military integration are rejected as real possibilities in the immediate future. Are Europeans to replace American tutelage with French tutelage; are there to be a number of European nuclear efforts, loosely coordinated?

The American vision of European unity has been different. Americans have imagined a prosperous and ever more closely integrated Europe assuming a greater share of the defense burdens in the alliance. Projecting the early achievements of the European communities to the realms of politics and military policy, some Americans as well as Europeans have envisioned a European built and managed nuclear deterrent force. Two assumptions have usually underlain this projection: It has been assumed that sooner or later the United Kingdom would join the communities of the six. Americans, especially, have assumed that European and American ties would remain close and that the interests of the two continents would not significantly diverge.

Supporters of both visions have suffered serious setbacks in recent years, and it is possible that some illusions about the readiness of Europeans to shrug off the American mantle as well as some about necessarily harmonious relations between the United States and a united Europe have been dissipated. But competition between the two visions continues, with probably a large majority of Europeans caught in the middle, chafing at the more overt signs of dependence on the United States, unwilling to accept the consequences of Gaullist logic and tactics, and finding it increasingly difficult to chart in-between courses of action. This state of mind helps to explain a notable lack of enthusiasm for projects such as the MLF and, at the same time, an inability to come up with acceptable alternatives.

B. The search for ways to share the control of nuclear weapons

1. Years 1950–62

Some of the problems outlined above had already assumed serious proportions by 1959. American and European officials debated the desirability of aiding the French nuclear effort which seemed likely to encourage other states—especially Germany—to follow the French example. Europeans pressed for a greater share in the control of nuclear weapons deployed in Europe. Studies carried out at SHAPE in the 18 months following the December 1957 NATO Council meetings reached the conclusion that there was a need for MRBM's stationed in Europe beyond the Thors and Jupiters to be placed in England, Italy, and Turkey.

In August 1959, General Norstad, in his capacity as SACEUR, suggested exploration of the idea of transferring control of some nuclear weapons to NATO, making NATO a "fourth nuclear power."[1] General Norstad repeated his proposal in somewhat different forms in March and November 1960. In the fall of 1960, Norstad secured the support of both NATO Secretary General Paul-Henri Spaak and the German Government for his ideas. The Pentagon and various Members of Congress, however, remained opposed to proposals that might entail relinquishing American control over American nuclear warheads.

By the spring of 1960, the U.S. Government was actively studying the idea of a NATO nuclear deterrent. In April 1960, Secretary of Defense Thomas S. Gates, Jr., proposed at a NATO Defense Ministers meeting the deployment of Polaris missiles when they became available on barges and flatcars in Europe, and some modification of control arrangements over nuclear warheads stockpiled in Europe to increase the powers of SACEUR. In the fall of 1960, it became known that a private study undertaken for the Department of State by Robert R. Bowie, director of the Harvard Center of International Affairs and former head of the policy planning staff, had recommended that the United States make available to the alliance a fleet of Polaris-missile submarines manned with international crews and under the control of NATO and at the same time seek to obtain a substantial strengthening of the conventional forces of the alliance.

---

[1] See Robert E. Osgood, "NATO: The Entangling Alliance," Chicago, 1962, ch. 8, for details of this and other contemporary proposals.

At NATO Council meetings in December of 1960, Secretary of State Herter announced that the United States would be willing to assign five Polaris submarines to NATO before 1963, if the allies would agree to buy from the United States 100 additional medium-range missiles to be placed on surface ships and barges before 1964 and, in addition, could agree on a system of multilateral control for both submarine and surface ship weapons. At the same time, Herter emphasized the need to increase the conventional forces of the alliance and, pointing to the deficit in the U.S. balance of payments, suggested that future studies might show the desirability of the redeployment of some U.S. forces in Europe, but certainly not of a complete withdrawal.

In a speech at Ottawa in May 1961, President Kennedy repeated Herter's offer with one or two more qualifications:

"To make clear our own intentions and commitments to the defense of Western Europe, the United States will commit to the NATO command five—and subsequently still more—Polaris atomic-missile submarines, which are defensive weapons, subject to any agreed NATO guidelines on their control and use, and responsive to the needs of all members but still credible in an emergency. Beyond this, we look to the possibility of eventually establishing a NATO seaborne force, which would be truly multilateral in ownership and control, if this should be desired and found feasible by our allies, once NATO's nonnuclear goals have been achieved."

Despite evidence that the European allies were far from disposed to meet the conventional force goals given highest priority by the United States, and that they had not proceeded very far in considering possible control arrangements for an allied nuclear force, the multilateral force idea picked up momentum in the fall of 1962. During the summer, Europeans had been discouraged by the negative emphasis of McNamara's Ann Arbor speech and by the announced departure of General Norstad as SACEUR, who was considered by many to be sympathetic to European points of view. Overlooking important qualifications, they were newly encouraged by a September speech in Copenhagen by White House Special Assistant McGeorge Bundy in which he suggested that the United States was willing to contemplate a European nuclear force owned and managed by Europeans, providing it was fully coordinated with superior U.S. forces. A State Department-Defense Department mission headed by Gerard C. Smith, former Assistant Secretary for Policy Planning, and Rear Adm. John M. Lee was sent to Europe later in the fall to sound out European governments on the concept of a multilateral force.

Finally, in a communique following the December meetings in Nassau, Prime Minister Macmillan and President Kennedy endorsed both the idea of a multilateral force and the idea of a multinational NATO force composed of elements from U.S. Strategic Forces, British Bomber Command, and tactical nuclear forces in Europe, nationally armed and manned and under ultimate national control. Great Britain apparently agreed to assign the Polaris submarines she planned to build, and for which she would buy U.S. missiles, to both forces subject to withdrawal when "supreme national interests are at stake," and the United States agreed to assign equal forces to the multilateral nuclear force.

2. The MLF After Nassau

During the course of 1963 and 1964, the MLF made the transition from one idea among others intended to provoke Allied discussion and countersuggestions to a proposal supported and promoted by U.S. Government officials with a gradual but discernible increase in fervor. Undoubtedly, the events of January 1963 helped to pave the way for this transition. On January 14, De Gaulle, in effect, vetoed Britist entry into the Common Market and confirmed his refusal of the U.S. offer to sell France Polaris missiles under the same conditions they would be sold to Great Britain. On January 22, the Franco-German Treaty of Cooperation was signed, covering the realms of military and political cooperation as well as cultural exchange.

On January 24, Ambassador Livingston Merchant was appointed to head a new U.S. mission to Europe to undertake detailed discussions of the MLF. The mission was unfortunately preceded by considerable public confusion as to whether the United States intended to propose submarines or surface vessels for the fleet. Some Europeans reacted sharply with cries of "second best" when it became evident that the latter were intended.

The European response to the mission was lukewarm at best. The West European press was all but uniformly hostile to the proposal, seeing in the MLF an expensive and militarily useless device to preserve the status quo, with the most unfavorable editorial comment coming from West Germany.[2] Indicative of a U.S. dilemma, however, was the fact that some European critics, especially in Scandinavia, lamented any move toward diluting U.S. control over the nuclear forces of the West, while other critics found that the MLF did not go far enough in sharing control.

Some interest was apparently expressed in the proposal by West German, Italian, Greek, and Turkish officials. The French and Scandinavian Governments expressed no interest. The British, Dutch, and Belgian Governments remained reserved, the British, especially, preferring to place emphasis on the multinational approach also envisioned at Nassau, and expressing alarm at the prospect of costs in addition to those entailed by the Polaris program. By the summer of 1963, it was evident that the "problem of nonnuclear powers," chiefly a euphemism for Germany, was uppermost in the administration's mind, and it seemed probable that German interest in the proposal, no matter how qualified, was crucial in the decision to push ahead with the proposal. This decision was registered in a June 24 communique issued following meetings between President Kennedy and Chancellor Adenauer:

"The multilateral organization is considered a good instrument for serving all members of the alliance in combining their defense efforts. They reaffirmed their agreement to use their best efforts to bring such a force into being. They also agreed that discussions about the principal questions involved in the establishment of such a force should be pursued with other interested governments."

In October 1963, an MLF working group was established in Paris to undertake detailed discussions of the proposal. The group was formed of delegations from West Germany, Italy, Belgium, Turkey, and Greece, in addition to that from the United States headed by Ambassador Finletter. The Netherlands and the United Kingdom decided to join the group after some hesitation. In the spring of 1964, while the discussions of the group continued, the United States made available a guided missile destroyer to explore the problems of mixed manning, for which all the working group nations except Belgium provided contingents.

II. THE PROPOSAL

.. *Outline of the proposal*[3]

The MLF would consist initially of 25 surface ships resembling merchant vessels armed with 200 Polaris A-3 missiles with a range of up to 3,000 miles, 8 missiles to a ship. The combination of IRBM missiles and surface ships would constitute a new weapons system. The possibility of adding other weapons systems to the MLF, if feasible, is not excluded by the United States.

The ships would be identified by a flag as belonging to the MLF. They would frequent Atlantic and Mediterranean sealanes, using the ports and waters of participating members.

The ships would be manned by crews including representatives of at least three nationalities with no nation providing more than 40 percent of the personnel on each ship or for the force as a whole. Each participating nation's contribution of personnel would probably correspond roughly to its financial contribution to the cost of the fleet. It is not yet clear whether the expected levels of the German and American financial contributions would mean that there would be American and German crewmembers on all ships. The crews would receive prolonged and intensive training, and a knowledge of English would be required.

The control arrangements for the MLF would be elaborate. The fleet would have its own commander and would be assigned to the operational control of SACEUR. In addition, there would be a civilian director-general and an MLF governing board on which representatives of nations having made a certain financial contribution—perhaps as much as 10 percent of the costs—would sit. The arming and firing of the missiles would be controlled by electronic permissive action links, which could be released only by headquarters outside the ship. Presumably, the chain of command would stretch from at least the major participating governments to the MLF governing board to SACEUR to the fleet commander to the individual ships where there might be some verification of orders received by several officers after the PALs had been released by higher authorities. There would be no custody arrangements giving a special status to U.S. officers.

The United States would retain a veto over any decision to release the missiles for use. Voting procedures for other members of the governing board might require unanimous agreement, or agreement on the basis of a weighted majority, or a simple majority with votes being assigned on the principle of one vote for each member or in proportion to financial contribution.

The MLF would be targeted by SACEUR and would be integrated with NATO strategy. The use of MLF weapons would be coordinated with U.S. strategic plans.

The total cost of the MLF during the first 5 years including past research and development costs, the construction of the ships and missiles and electronic equipment, and the training of crews, is estimated at between $2.3 and $3 billion. The annual operating cost of the fleet thereafter is estimated at

---

[2] See USIA Research and Reference Service Report, "Western European Press Cold to U.S. Proposal for a Multilateral NATO Nuclear Force," Apr. 5, 1963, 14 pp.

[3] See Gerard C. Smith, "The Nuclear Defense of NATO," Department of State Bulletin, May 18, 1964, pp. 783–790; Robert E. Osgood, "The Case for the MLF: A Critical Evaluation," 57 pp., Washington Center of Foreign Policy Research, 1964; and "The Multilateral Force: Questions and Answers," Nov. 10, 1964, a mimeographed document prepared by the office of the assistant to the Secretary of State for NATO multilateral force negotiations for the most reliable details of the MLF proposal. The following outline relies on these sources.

$150 million. Of the total costs, the United States would probably assume from 33⅓ to 35 percent; West Germany, from 33⅓ to 35 percent; the United Kingdom and Italy, about 25 percent; and Belgium and Holland about 5 percent. The missiles and much of the electronic equipment would be procured in the United States, which would amount to about —— percent of the total cost or about ——. The ships would probably be built in participating European countries, which would amount to about —— percent of the total cost or about ——. (It was hoped that these figures would become available. All that could be obtained was a rough estimate that weapons and weapons systems would account for about two-thirds of the total cost, and that ships and bases would account for about one-third of the total cost.)

Any agreement to establish the MLF would be submitted to Congress for approval, probably in the form of a treaty. After the agreement is approved by all participating nations, it is estimated that the first ship would become operational in about 3 years, and that thereafter, one additional ship would become available every month. Thus the fleet as presently contemplated, would become operational in a little more than 5 years following an agreement.

B. Points needing clarification

1. Voting System Among European Members of the Governing Board

This sensitive point is obviously still under discussion. But it is worth noting that the British are adamantly opposed to any system that might deny them a veto, and that the Germans have been reported as worried at the prospect that one or several other European allies could veto the use of the force. There is also the problem of how useful a sharing device the MLF could be if any members have made a small financial contribution or merely a manpower contribution are denied a vote on the governing board.

2. The U.S. Veto

There has been much speculation over the possibility and the desirability of the removal of the U.S. veto over use at some future date and whether this would entail a U.S. withdrawal from the MLF and even a redeployment of vulnerable U.S. forces in Europe. Some U.S. spokesmen have referred to the possibility of eventual European control of the fleet "as Europe marches toward unity";[4] Other administration spokesmen have emphasized the point that the day when Great Britain and France will decide to merge completely their forces with a European MLF and when the Europeans will have central political and military institutions is yet far away. They also indicate that any "European option clause" in an MLF charter would be phrased in only the most general terms requiring reexamination of the charter if conditions should significantly change. The United Kingdom remains vigorously opposed to any prospect of the removal of a U.S. veto; some prominent German officials and some Italians have believed that this should remain a real possibility.[5]

3. The Order To Release and the Order To Fire

It is possible that the question as to which electronic devices, if any, might be controlled by the MLF governing board and/or the Director General, and which by SACEUR, and the question as to how communications are to be assured between participating governments and members of the governing board, cannot be publicly clarified or even publicly discussed with much more illumination than that accompanying the debate of the past summer over the control of battlefield nuclear weapons. According to some observers, Europeans will assign the highest importance to such questions; according to others, it would not much matter even if the President of the United States were designated as executive agent as long as Europeans participated in establishing strict guidelines for the use of the MLF as well as for other forces upon which the alliance relies. The questions are worth asking, however, if only in the hope of casting some light on just how possible it might be to exercise political control in a crisis situation, and of establishing just how much credibility the MLF might have as a force distinct from superior American forces.

4. Weapons Custody, "Weapons Know-How," and the Atomic Energy Act of 1954

Unless special custody arrangements to insure U.S. control over access to the MLF missiles to which warheads will be already mated are made, which are not at present contemplated, it seems certain that the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 as amended in 1958 will require further amendment. Section 92 of that act reads as follows:

"It shall be unlawful, except as provided in section 91, for any person to transfer or receive in interstate or foreign commerce, manufacture, produce, transfer, acquire, possess, import, or export any atomic weapon."

Section 91c provides for the transfer of nonnuclear parts of atomic weapons, certain nuclear materials and utilization facilities only to nations having made "substantial progress in the development of atomic weapons," and for the transfer of other nonnuclear parts of atomic weapons—i.e., delivery vehicles—to other nations for defense purposes, providing such a transfer does not contribute significantly to the development of an atomic weapons program in those nations.

According to section 121 of the same act, it seems possible that amendment of the act could be accomplished by Senate approval of the treaty establishing the MLF:

"Any provision of this Act or any action of the Commission to the extent and during the time that it conflicts with the provisions of any international arrangement made after the date of enactment of this Act shall be deemed to be of no force or effect."

Just how much more access to weapons fabrication know-how participating MLF nations might gain beyond what they already possess on the basis of bilateral agreements for the exchange of data under section 91c and 144b of the Atomic Energy Act is difficult to determine. Details on data that has been transmitted pursuant to these agreements remain classified. But with the exception of nations already having made substantial progress in their atomic weapons programs—to all intents and purposes, Great Britain—this data is not supposed to contribute to an effort to design or fabricate these weapons. Although it is certain that precautions will be taken to safeguard crucial design data for missiles, warheads, and electronic systems, it would seem worth inquiring just what information will have to be made available that has not already been communicated under existing agreements and whether this information could contribute to any national atomic weapons program.

5. Relations Between MLF Participants and Nonparticipants

Some observers are disturbed by the prospect that the MLF will constitute a new special grouping of nations within the North Atlantic Alliance, and emphasize the point that since all members of the alliance are vulnerable to the consequences of the acts of one or a few, all ought to have as much voice as possible in establishing guidelines for the use of alliance forces. The United States emphasizes the point that any alliance member who wishes to do so may "buy in". Some countries such as those in Scandinavia might not feel free, however, to avail themselves of this option. Some kind of clarification of relations between present alliance institutions and MLF institutions would seem desirable.

6. A German-American MLF?

There has been some talk of West Germany and the United States proceeding to set up the MLF with minimal or no participation by other allies if circumstances should so require. This possibility—even if only used as a means to place pressure on reluctant allies—seems sufficiently undesirable to warrant a firm and clear denial. Even if the problem of Germany is the most compelling reason for establishing the MLF, the broad purposes of the project seem certain to be vitiated if Germany and the United States should be the sole or completely dominant participants.

C. Current status of the proposal; the need for flexibility

It is possible between now and the time when the MLF might be incorporated in an agreement that some of the details set out above might change, and that some of the points that remain vague might be clarified. The discussions of the Paris working group and its various subcommittees are continuing and a report is expected sometime around the end of the year. It should be noted, however, that these discussions are understood not to entail any commitment to participate, and that the results are subject to review by the governments concerned. Despite official U.S. optimism about the possibility of an agreement in the first months of the new year, there is every indication that proposals the British Labour Government may make in which they set conditions to their participation in the MLF may entail difficult negotiations. It is more than possible that the Germans might object to some reported features of these proposals: they might object to nationally manned British Polaris submarines constituting the principal British contribution to the MLF; they might see in the subjection to multilateral control of various dual-key weapons systems in Europe—e.g., the Pershing missiles—a diminution rather than an increase in their share of control over nuclear weapons, and, most important, a reduction of the possibility that they might actually be used. Given recent vigorous French opposition to the project, it is also apparent that the Germans are having some second thoughts about proceeding rapidly to the conclusion of an agreement.

Since the first highly reserved reception accorded to Ambassador Merchant in the spring of 1963, there has been some evolution in European thinking about the MLF. This evolution probably reflects greater knowledge of the details of the proposal and the arguments in favor of it as well as a somewhat resentful awareness of the extent to which the United States is committed to the proposal. The MLF has gained some prominent supporters—notably, the London Economist, Jean Monnet's action committee (with some abstentions), Theo Sommer of the Hamburg Die Zeit, and Klaus Mehnert, a German specialist in international affairs. These balance to some extent the still numerous severe critics—both informed and uninformed—who remain.

---

[4] See a speech at Brussels on Nov. 8, 1963, by then Vice President Johnson, Department of State Bulletin, Dec. 2, 1963, and a speech by J. Robert Schaetzel, "The Nuclear Problem and Atlantic Interdependence," Atlantic Community Quarterly, winter 1963–64.

[5] For opposing U.S. academic viewpoints consult Robert R. Bowie, "Tensions within the Alliance," Foreign Affairs, October 1963, (the United States should be prepared to relinquish its veto); and Malcolm W. Hoag, "Nuclear Strategic Options and European Force Participation," The Rand Corp., July 1963 (strong case against relinquishment of the U.S. veto and U.S. withdrawal from the force).

The press is less hostile, but remains unenthusiastic while unwilling to recommend outright rejection. Recurrent themes are fear of Germany, the fact that the vast bulk of U.S. weapons remain unaffected by the MLF, criticism of pressure for rapid agreement on the MLF, the necessity of tying the United States firmly to Europe (a German point of view), the possibility of endangering East-West relations, and the characterization of the MLF as the least of several evils.[6]

In view of these attitudes, continuing reports of serious reservations in generally sympathetic European circles, and the current unsettled state of affairs in Europe, it might be wise if the United States did not insist too strongly that its European allies either "fish or cut bait" in the near future. Great Britain may very well not possess much leverage to back up its proposals but the advantages of strong British participation in the MLF even at the cost of altering the original outlines of the proposal and making some gestures toward a greater European voice in establishing guidelines for the use of U.S. forces would seem to outweigh the disadvantages—from the U.S. point of view—of not proceeding full steam ahead. If the Germans are having second thoughts, the desirability of breaking the vicious circle of German acquiescence to please the Americans and an American commitment to the MLF to please the Germans, would seem to outweigh the dangers of any immediate Franco-German nuclear effort that might give the Germans unrestricted access to a nuclear trigger. Unfortunately, the degree of U.S. commitment to the MLF will make it difficult to show flexibility without seeming to back down before Gaullist threats. But the need for flexibility would seem to outweigh even this possibility of the loss of diplomatic face.

III. THE POLITICAL RATIONALE FOR THE MLF

Both defenders and detractors of the MLF assign more weight to the political rationale for the project than to its military rationale. Some of the military problems of the alliance have political origins; others have political consequences. Without the expectation of important political dividends, it is dubious whether the MLF would have been so persistently promoted. Without being able to cast serious doubt on these expectations, the case against the MLF would be considerably weakened.

A. A continuing and strengthened alliance?

Both supporters of the MLF and some opponents look to the need for alliance ties and cooperation between Europe and America in NATO for an indefinite future. Those who favor the MLF see the project as confirming and furthering the interdependence of the United States and Europe and as symbolizing the compelling need for integrated rather than merely coordinated and overlapping defense efforts if mutual security is to be assured. They argue that a jointly manned, owned, and controlled nuclear force will pull members of the alliance together and that an imaginative initiative is needed now to counteract divisive forces in the alliance.[7] Some acknowledge that important changes may take place in relations between Europe and the United States in the future, but contend that the alliance cannot afford to mark time until the direction of these changes can be discerned, and that the structure of the MLF can be adapted to take account of changes, assuming, of course, that change does not mean a substantial loosening of ties between the United States and Europe. Others acknowledge that differences between European and American perceptions of vital interests will probably persist, but believe that an area of mutual security interests will remain within which fruitful cooperation can be pursued. The MLF is seen as promoting that cooperation, especially insofar as it may contribute to European stability by deflecting a German search for nuclear independence.[8]

Some critics of the MLF, while accepting the above goals as worthy ones, believe that the MLF will be counterproductive in their pursuit. They see the MLF as essentially divisive because it would tend to foreclose the possibility of nuclear collaboration between France and Great Britain, would throw up a wall between participants and nonparticipants, and would isolate and embitter France while making West Germany a special partner of the United States.[9] Among these critics are some who believe that the United States will have to find some way of giving a greater say to its allies in the formulation of strategic plans and in the management of the nuclear forces of the West. They see the MLF as an insignificant step in this direction which, by frustrating our allies, will further undermine the cohesion of the alliance.

There are other critics of the proposal, who call into question assumptions that NATO, and even the alliance, will continue for years to come. The more cautious of these observers believe that Europe is going through a period of adjustment, and that during a time of changes in the Soviet bloc and East-West relations, it would be folly to initiate projects such as the MLF that hark to alliance structures, assumptions, and relations of the 1950's. For these observers, a multilateral fleet that will only become completely operative at the end of 5 years risks being a costly anachronism and an irritant to alliance relations during a period when adjustments and new thinking will be required on both sides of the Altantic.

Basic to an evaluation of these varying points of view on the alliance and the MLF will be the considerations presented in the following sections on the U.S. commitment, nuclear sharing, European unity, the German problem, and arms control and East-West relations. It is possible that the MLF, if not burdened with too many objectives, especially in areas where basic military and political goals are in controversy in the alliance, could serve as a useful experiment without prejudicing future alliance relations or increasing alliance tensions. It is also possible that if numerous Europeans, for opposing reasons and representing a variety of viewpoints on the future of the alliance, remain unenthusiastic about the MLF, the project might well prove to be distracting insofar as it obscures basic issues, as well as divisive.

B. Confirming the U.S. commitment to the defense of Europe?

It is probable that a large majority of Europeans—especially in the Netherlands, Great Britain, Scandinavia, and Germany—and of Americans continues to believe that the military and political engagement of the United States in Europe for the middle-run future is essential and desirable. Supporters of the MLF see the project as a confirmation of ties between the United States and Europe and as a counter to fears of a U.S. withdrawal. Europeans, through participation in a joint nuclear endeavor with the United States, would be able to see more clearly that the U.S. pledge to defend Europe by all necessary means, including nuclear weapons, is reliable.

It may be countered, however, that participation in the MLF might have the opposite effect; it might confirm European doubts about the reliability of the U.S. pledge for all situations that might arise in Europe because the force would remain integrated with U.S. strategy and subject to a U.S. veto. One view among others at issue here borders on heresy. This view is that it might be desirable for Europeans and Americans to recognize the facts of vulnerability in the nuclear age, and to accept the possibility that Americans might not prove willing to equate the citizens of Detroit with the citizens of Berlin in all possible contingencies, even if American troops abroad were engaged with an enemy. According to this view, it would be better to seek ways now to build a separate and credible deterrent force in Europe with the least possible disruption of relations among European states than to perpetuate what might be a dangerous myth.

This view has been severely criticized. It is argued that the Soviet Union shows every evidence that it will continue to be deterred by the possibility, as distinguished from the certainty, of U.S. nuclear retaliation in the event of any Soviet move to the West. It is also argued that the goals of nonproliferation and eventual arms control in Europe are too important to be sacrificed on the alter of the higher logic of the nuclear age. It should be noted that these arguments are also cited against the MLF.

There is evidence that some Europeans—especially Germans—support the MLF because they see in the project a way to tie the United States still more firmly to Europe. There is also evidence that some Europeans fear that a European rejection of the MLF might embitter the United States and thus lead to a loosening of ties. It is to be suspected that with or without the MLF some European doubts about the American commitment will persist and will continue to be the source of some alliance tensions.

C. A step toward nuclear sharing?

At the heart of the quest for a say in how the nuclear forces of the West might be used and the quest for national deterrent forces lies an understandable even if atavistic disinclination to entrust the fate of a nation to the decisive judgment of the leaders of another nation.

American officials believe that through the MLF an important step can be taken toward meeting this problem. They argue that the MLF will give Europeans an opportunity to participate in the ownership, management, and control of a significant strategic force. At the same time, other U.S. goals will be furthered: incentives to follow the British and French examples will be curbed; the military requirement that the MLF be integrated with alliance strategic plans and coordinated with U.S. forces will be met. They strongly believe that the European participants will accept the compelling political and military reasons for retention of a U.S. veto over use for the foreseeable future: Europeans will recognize that both Americans and Europeans disagree as to the desirability of removing that veto, that the force would be difficult to present as a step toward nonproliferation without a U.S. veto, and that the need for coordinating the force with superior U.S. forces requires a U.S. say in its use.

Some supporters of the MLF believe that the veto problem has been exaggerated.

---

[6] See USIA Research and Reference Report, "The Current Status of West European Press Opinion Toward MLF," Sept. 1, 1964, 6 pp.

[7] See, for example, Theo Sommer, "For an Atlantic Future," Foreign Affairs, October 1964.

[8] See, for example, Osgood, "The Case for the MLF," op. cit., pp. 52–53.

[9] See Henry Kissinger, "NATO's Nuclear Dilemma," the Reporter, Mar. 28, 1963, pp. 32–33.

They argue that once the Europeans have bought a share in a strategic force, and are faced with the real responsibility of making plans for a force in which they have a tangible stake, they will find both that there are real dilemmas that they had not anticipated in the management of nuclear forces and that there are compelling reasons behind recent adaptations in U.S. strategic doctrine. In the words of one official:

"We believe that there is a great tendency to overrely on nuclear weapons, and to overestimate their deterrent (sic). I am sure you have seen certain statements made by Europeans which would suggest that adequate defense capability could be found in total reliance on strategic nuclear weapons, or that ground forces have become obsolete and that a limited amount of tactical nuclear capability could be a substitute for any kind of conventional force.

"It is our conviction that a deliberate and careful exchange of information based on our own experience on what the real potentialities of nuclear war may be—that this kind of exchange is going to lead (to) a more rational appreciation of the risks of nuclear war and what would ensue from nuclear exchanges, and, therefore, lead to more realistic policies and attitudes on the part of our allies." [10]

Thus it is argued that the MLF will serve an educational function and will help to promote agreement on strategy. At the same time, it will be founded on the principle that responsibility flows from ownership—in this case, joint ownership. Given the present lopsided distribution of burdens in the alliance and strains on the U.S. balance of payments, this principle may also be stated as representation or participation in the making of decisions upon the payment of taxes.

These arguments are open to question on several counts. Some observers maintain that different historical experiences, different geographic realities and, most important, different vital interests lie behind disagreements over strategy between Europeans and Americans. They suspect that there very well may be no "alliance strategy" that satisfies both sets of interests. Crudely stated, it is in the interest of Europeans to make it clear that any Soviet move against Western Europe would lead to immediate strategic nuclear strikes on the Soviet Union; it is in the interest of the United States to defer this response in the case of a Soviet conventional assault on Western Europe, even if not at the cost of allowing Western Europe to be overrun.[11] According to this view, Europeans are already well advanced in their nuclear education; they can appreciate the nuances of the doctrine of flexible response and at the same time logically be led to the conclusion that instant nuclear retaliation should be threatened in Europe while more caution should be displayed in other tension areas of the world.

The strategy problems of the alliance cannot be explored in detail here. It should be noted, however, that a persuasive case may be made for the contention that the MLF and other forms of nuclear-sharing that leave the main outlines of American strategic doctrine unaltered, are unlikely to reduce significantly tensions arising from differences over strategy between Europeans and Americans or to give Europeans strong incentives to assume a greater share of alliance burdens. It may be objected that prominent defense experts in the British Labour Party and the German Social Democratic Party as well as some French critics of the French nuclear program are strongly sympathetic to some American strategic ideas and especially, to the need to strengthen conventional forces in Europe. This is an important point. From these and other sources, however, come expressions of more interest either in increased influence over the 95 percent of the nuclear forces remaining outside the MLF or in the establishment of a separate European nuclear deterrent force than in the MLF as now conceived.

D. Furthering European unity?

Many supporters of the MLF argue convincingly that the countries of Western Europe simply are not and will not be ready in the near future to build and manage a European deterrent force. They believe that the MLF is a reasonable step toward nuclear-sharing that should be taken now; they believe that the MLF could very well point up the distinct advantages of cooperative alliance defense efforts that leave the primary responsibility for providing and managing the nuclear forces of the West with the United States. If, however, the Europeans should decide that a European nuclear force is feasible and desirable, the MLF need not block their way and might itself be adapted to meet this demand. Some supporters of the MLF go one step further and argue, less convincingly, that the MLF could actually promote efforts to build an integrated political and military community in Europe through the provision of experience in intimate political cooperation and in the joint ownership and control and mixed manning of an important weapons system.

Even if the MLF should provide a basis for reaching the most favorable conclusions about the feasibility and desirability of military integration, it seems dubious that the political consequences of establishing the force could significantly further the cause of European unity. Some observers of the European integration movement believe that military unity is much more apt to follow political unity than to precede it. They suspect that De Gaulle is perfectly correct in assuming that political unity can only come about through a loosening of ties with the United States and the definition of distinct European interests, and point out that neither of these developments is anticipated in the MLF. They suggest that it would be worth while to reeaxamine some assumptions that a truly united Europe would be in the interest of the United States, if only to remove some ambiguities in the arguments of supporters of the MLF.[12]

Other observers fear that the MLF might prove sufficiently disruptive on the continent to compromise some vital U.S. interests, whether European unity were furthered or not. They argue that the MLF could deepen differences between France and her European Allies, that it could underline the isolation of France and embitter many Frenchmen who, while disagreeing with some features of De Gaulle's policies, share his opposition to the MLF. It could increase the already significant tensions in relations between France and Germany, without whose cooperation no European political entity can come into being, and in whose harmonious relations the United States has a vital interest.

With an eye to a hypothetical future, it is contended that there is all the difference in the world between France seeking to merge its nuclear forces with a grouping in which Germany is dominant and Germany seeking entrance to a grouping built about Franco-British nuclear cooperation.[13]

The fact that Franco-British collaboration in the nuclear realm will remain only the remotest of possibilities for the foreseeable future does not vitiate the case made above. It does cast serious doubt on the feasibility of one alternative to the MLF: U.S. aid to the British and French nuclear efforts on the condition that there be increasing cooperation between the two countries in this realm. It also points to a U.S. dilemma in seeking to devise ways to reshape cooperation in NATO that please all of its allies and at the same time promote a number of other U.S. policy objectives. There is as much if not more disarray among Europeans as there is disagreement between the United States and some prominent Europeans on the question of how best to proceed. While British Labour Party leaders and Scandinavians sharply criticize the idea of a European force, French Socialists, and Belgians, Italians, and Germans of various persuasions support this idea and at the same time disagree as to just how strong an American connection should be maintained.

Proponents of the MLF argue that everyone can't be pleased and that the proposal represents a reasonable compromise given the existence of various and partially conflicting views on alliance problems and how they might be resolved. They further argue that in the absence of any coherent European point of view and of conclusive evidence that De Gaulle can be said to speak for Europeans there is every reason for Americans to promote a project that conforms to their view of what form alliance relations should take. Opponents of the MLF contend that a project that risks pleasing no one for very long and incurring the acute displeasure of some will only prepare the way for future disputes after some vital bargaining positions have been sacrificed. It is possible that in weighing these two points of view, the difference between a German dissatisfied, if indeed he is dissatisfied, and a German satisfied, if indeed he can be satisfied, could be crucial.

E. A German problem?

Behind almost every general argument for the MLF lies a sober estimate that the alliance faces or will very soon face a German problem, and a qualified hope or a conviction that the MLF can provide a means to meet this problem. The problem assumes these dimensions: West German fears, discontents, and natural aspirations have led to pressures for a greater share in the control of alliance nuclear forces, and could lead to significant pressures for the acquisition of an independent deterrent force. The second set of pressures, especially if they led to a German or joint Franco-German nuclear effort, would prove highly disruptive within the alliance and could introduce a dangerous element of instability into East-West relations. The MLF, it is argued, can relieve the first set of pressures and, thereby, greatly reduce the chances that the second set of pressures could emerge and assume serious proportions.

Many critics of the MLF and a few supporters contend that if a German problem exists, it has been greatly exaggerated. They suggest that too great a solicitude for German needs now will guarantee the emergence of the problem later in all its feared dimensions. Other observers believe that if the sources of German uneasiness were completely understood, it would be seen that the

---

[10] J. Robert Schaetzel in hearings before the Subcommittee on Agreements for Cooperation of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. 88th Cong., 2d sess., July 30 and Aug. 18, 1964, p. 42. This statement was made in reference to a recently concluded agreement between the parties to the North Atlantic Treaty for cooperation regarding atomic energy information (under sec. 144b of the Atomic Energy Act). The same hopes have been expressed in connection with the MLF. (See also, Hoag, op. cit., pp. 18 ff.)

[11] For a detailed and lucid exposition of these different interests see Hedley Bull, "Strategy and the Atlantic Alliance: A Critique of United States Doctrine, 42 pages, Center for International Studies, Princeton University, 1964.

[12] See Osgood, "The Case for the MLF," op. cit., pp. 27–31, and John Newhouse, "The MLF: An Appraisal." Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, September 1964, pp. 13–17.

[13] See Kissinger, op. cit.

MLF as presently conceived will be relatively ineffective in acting upon these sources. They believe that the risks that would accompany consequent disillusionment in the United States and in Germany should be fully weighed before the project is pursued. Some opponents of the project contend that the German problem is largely a result of an unhealthy tug-of-war between the United States and France for German loyalties and that the MLF can only insure that this contest will endure and assume dangerous proportions. Other opponents of the project flatly insist that German pressures for increased access to nuclear weapons, no matter what form they take or how legitimate, should and can be resisted now and later.

In attempting to pick a way among these contending points of view at least four subjects must be explored: West German treaty obligations with respect to nuclear weapons; West German fears and suspicions; West German desires with respect to nuclear weapons; West German reactions to the MLF.

1. West German Treaty Obligations

The Federal Republic of Germany, through a unilateral declaration made by Chancellor Adenauer in the fall of 1954, has undertaken not to manufacture in its territory any atomic, biological, and chemical weapons. This declaration, made on October 3, 1954, was incorporated in the final act of the London Conference of September and October 1954, and was made a part of the protocols amending the Brussels Treaty of 1948, signed at Paris on October 23, 1954, by the seven prospective members of the Western European Union. West Germany was at the same time invited to become a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and, following the ratification of the London and Paris agreements, acceded to membership in 1955. West Germany has not renounced the right to possess nuclear weapons or to seek complete or partial control over their use. National leaders have from time to time affirmed that they have no intention of seeking to withdraw or modify the 1954 pledge. Competent observers believe, however, that if a way were to be sought to nullify that pledge, a good case might be founded on the contention that neither Great Britain nor France have in the development of their national nuclear forces observed the reporting and inspection requirements of the WEU arms control agreements of 1954.

The Federal Republic of Germany is also a signatory of the test ban agreement of the summer of 1963. If a clandestine nuclear effort were attempted by this technologically advanced country, however, testing might not be essential to the development of a crude but transportable nuclear device. If open participation in the French nuclear effort were contemplated, it could possibly be construed as a violation of the test ban agreement, despite the fact that France is not a signatory of that agreement.

At the Yalta and Potsdam Conferences of 1945, the United States, the Soviet Union, and the United Kingdom agreed that one of the purposes of the occupation of Germany should be the complete disarmament and demilitarization of Germany and the elimination or control of all German industry that could be used for military production. Although the occupation regimes in both West Germany and East Germany have been officially terminated, no peace treaty has yet been concluded with either country. The parties to the Yalta and Potsdam accords continue to insist on their validity for various purposes. In fact, the provisions on disarmament and demilitarization have been observed only in the breach, with both East and West citing compelling reasons for the rearmament of East and West Germany.

2. West German Fears and Suspicions

Under the leadership of Chancellors Adenauer and Erhard, West Germany has been committed to the pursuit of international respectability and the status of an equal ally in the Western alliance system to the extent permitted by her special political position. West Germany has also been committed to full participation in the movement toward Western European integration and to reconciliation with France, although with significant differences in approach characterizing the styles of Adenauer and Erhard. Both the Social Democrats and the Free Democrats have in the past challenged the compatibility of these commitments with the pursuit of German reunification. The Social Democrats have all but reversed their stand in recent years; the Free Democrats have been restrained in their public expression of doubts.

Occupying the most exposed position in Western Europe, West Germans have been especially fearful of invasion and especially conscious of their dependence on the United States to deter any Soviet attack. They have attached the highest value to close ties with the United States, to the presence of between five and six American divisions in West Germany, to the deterrent effect of the threat of nuclear retaliation in case of any Soviet incursion, and to the adoption of a forward strategy under which an attempt would be made to defend all areas of West Germany. They have reacted sharply to rumors of American troop reductions, and have tended to see in exercises such as Operation Big Lift of the fall of 1963 signs of impending withdrawal.

Leading officials and journalists have speculated on the significance of increasing U.S. vulnerability to direct Soviet nuclear strikes. Some have seen in the elaboration of the U.S. doctrine of flexible response and in U.S. emphasis on the necessity for an improvement in conventional capabilities in Europe a direct threat to German security. While believing nuclear deterrence to be compromised, they have doubted the feasibility of a conventional defense and have seen in the attempt to defer the use of tactical nuclear weapons an increase in the likelihood that they would be used on West German soil and in the possibility of successful Soviet grabs of territory.

These fears have been accompanied by suspicions that the German aim of reunification was being placed on a back shelf while a search for ways to reduce East-West tensions was pursued. There has been resistance to the idea that West Germany should participate in this search without the prospect of concessions from the Soviet Union that further specific German interests. There has been resistance to the idea that West Germany should be subjected to special measures of arms control to which neither Germany's allies nor the Soviet Union were subjected. West Germany hesitated before signing the test ban treaty. The Erhard-Shroeder "policy of movement" in relation to the countries of Eastern Europe has drawn severe criticism from the right wing of the present Chancellor's own party.

With the achievement of prosperity and stability and with a steadily increasing contribution to alliance defense forces, German leverage has grown. This leverage has been used to press for place and influence in Western political and military councils at all levels in order to obtain at least a hearing for German views.

3. West German Desires With Respect to Nuclear Weapons

With the exception of some ambiguous statements by Former Defense Minister Franz-Josef Strauss and occasional speculation by defense experts in the press, there is scant evidence lying in the public domain of any West German desire to manufacture atomic weapons or otherwise acquire control over a strategic nuclear force. A lack of evidence, however, may reflect as much a good reading of political realities at this time on the part of German leaders as an absence of appetite. A good case may be made for the proposition that such a desire already exists among the followers of Strauss in the Bavarian wing of the CDU and in limited military circles and that it might spread.

It would be unreasonable to expect West German military and political officials to remain impervious to the reasoning that has led the British and the French to undertake independent nuclear efforts. Given the fears and suspicions described above, the widespread belief that a nuclear defense of the Central European front is essential, and concern for the declining credibility of an American nuclear response to conventional aggression in Europe, it seems unlikely that some Germans would fail to see advantages in nuclear forces controlled by Europeans, and possibly, by Germans alone.

The campaign for the equipment of German forces with tactical nuclear weapons, expressions of interest in the idea of a NATO nuclear deterrent force, and recent suggestions that there is a need for land-based MRBM's to counteract Soviet MRBM's targeted on Western Europe, are also instructive. A major theme of the campaign for tactical nuclear weapons, which began in the fall of 1956, was equality in equipment for defense forces performing the same tasks. The campaign was successful. In 1958 the Germans, along with other European Allies, began to receive American delivery vehicles for tactical nuclear weapons. The warheads for these weapons, secured by a dual-key system, remained under the control of American authorities. It is to be suspected that uneasiness over these control arrangements helped to move Defense Minister Strauss to make a proposal that the Supreme Allied Commander in Europe be empowered to order the use of alliance nuclear weapons to defend any member's territory at the request of that government.[14] Presumably, similar control arrangements have been in mind, when Strauss, actively backed by Adenauer, has supported or made other proposals for a NATO deterrent force, a closely integrated Atlantic Union, or a European force.

Other concerns are evident in the recent remarks of a West German military spokesman who stressed the need for medium-range missiles for the Bundeswehr. Germany is in an especially vulnerable position. Soviet forces threatening Germany should be matched by Western forces in Germany. "Without a missile adequate in number as well as in range, the German Air Force will be unable in the long run to fulfill the task assigned to it by NATO."

The West German Government's quest for equality in obtaining the most modern equipment for West German forces and insistence on a nuclear strategy for the defense of German territory have not gone uncontested in Germany. During 1957 and 1958 the Social Democratic Party and a large group of West German scientists vigorously opposed—unsuccessfully—Government plans to equip German forces with tactical nuclear weapons. Any open move on the part of the Government to acquire an independent deterrent force would undoubtedly provoke the same groups to conduct another campaign of opposition, which would be certain to attract much more widespread support than the 1957–58 effort. There is no absolute guarantee, however, that such a campaign would be successful. Leading defense experts of the SPD continue to criticize the Government's overreliance on nuclear weapons and omissions in building up conventional forces, and to oppose the stationing of strategic weapons in Germany. SPD spokesmen have also, however, pointed to a need for increased European participation in the development of alliance strategy and increased European influence over the making of U.S. decisions.

---

[14] See Leonard Beaton and John Maddox, "The Spread of Nuclear Weapons" (New York, 1962). Cr. 6, "Germany," p. 15.

4. West German Reactions to the MLF

The government of Chancellor Erhard has given its full support to the proposal for a NATO MLF. It has stressed the importance of ties between West Germany and the United States and German dependence on the superior forces of the United States for the defense of Germany, and has seen in the MLF a means to strengthen those ties. Adenauer's government also endorsed the MLF, but recently the former Chancellor has veered toward the opposition position taken by Franz-Josef Strauss and his followers, and has asserted that the MLF should be given a more "European" character. The Adenauer and Strauss factions at present constitute a minority in the Christian Democratic Union. There is evidence, however, that fears for the future of ties with France if the MLF is established extend beyond this minority. There is also evidence that some impressions or hopes may persist in official circles that the American veto over the use of the force will be withdrawn at some future time. The present Defense Minister, Kai-Uwe Hassel, expressed in early 1963 his belief that such a development would be desirable.

SPD leaders have been reluctant to endorse or openly to oppose the project, although some party groups offered opposing resolutions at a recent party congress. At least one leading West German scientist has suggested that increased German access to strategic nuclear weapons would arouse legitimate fears in both East and West. This particular statement of risks might not gain widespread support, but there is more general concern as to just how German participation in the MLF might affect chances for German reunification. Both support for the MLF and opposition to it have been expressed in the press. A general lack of enthusiasm persists for a project that is seen as neither militarily useful nor necessary and as a price to be paid for continued American support.

A majority of Germans probably see no alternative to reliance on American might for the protection of their country. At the same time they are reluctant to be placed in a position where they have to choose clearly between France and the United States. If vehement French opposition to the MLF continues while other European Allies remain reserved or hostile, even official German support for the MLF may dwindle.

5. Possible Conclusions

Informed observers disagree and will continue to disagree as to whether a German problem as here defined exists and how serious that problem may be if it does exist. Responsible officials of the Department of State believe that while there is little public expression of sentiment in favor of a German national nuclear weapons program, such pressures will inevitably arise if German aspirations for a share in the management and control of the alliance's strategic deterrent remain unsatisfied. There is evidence that Germans have been subject to fears and suspicions that could lead them to conclude that a national nuclear effort should be undertaken, and that this uneasiness extends beyond the small group of German "Gaullists," although how far remains uncertain. In controversy is the extent to which uneasiness can be said to have led to specific aspirations for a share here and now in the control of a strategic weapons system.

Informed observers also disagree as to whether the MLF is an appropriate response to the German problem, assuming that it exists. A compelling case has been made for the proposition that the MLF, by giving Germans an assured role in the management and control of a significant deterrent force in close partnership with the United States, could reduce fears and suspicions if not eliminate them, and could direct into safe channels a German quest for status and influence.[15] According to this view, the MLF is in harmony with the basic aims of postwar West German foreign policy: close association with the most powerful nation in the West in order to secure protection and bargaining power vis-a-vis the Soviet Union; close military, political, and economic cooperation with other European nations as a means to heal the wounds of the past and to regain status without arousing new fears. The MLF would promote continuing stability in relations with the United States and with European nations while helping to counteract distracting French pressures and prophesies.

Comparable but more drastic assumptions to the existence of a German problem dominate one case against the MLF. It has been suggested that German uneasiness may be traced to some military officials and to individuals influenced by military thinking. This group, it is contended, is inclined to overemphasize the advantages of a strong military stance in the pursuit of such political goals as German reunification. It is feared that these Germans may anticipate that the MLF will fall largely under German control, or that they may already be seeking other ways to acquire independent nuclear forces. According to this view, the United States has helped to foster the influence of this group by pressing for a maximum German contribution to alliance forces and by inviting or acceding to German requests for modern weapons—both conventional and nuclear. The United States, therefore, has helped to create the very pressures it is seeking to combat today. The MLF, it is argued, by whetting appetites without satisfying them, can only insure that these pressures will continue and spread and will be accompanied by speculation as to what West Germany might gain if she were in a position to bargain independently with the Soviet Union. The project should be abandoned because it will further compromise the development of a peaceful, democratic West German nation and will jeopardize the longrun interests of the United States.

This view runs counter to some basic assumptions of postwar U.S. foreign policy and may be challenged as distorted and unduly pessimistic. It nevertheless is shared by a not inconsiderable number of Britons, Western Europeans, and Americans.

Some observers believe that both supporters and opponents of the MLF may have exaggerated the severity of a German problem and that both may expect too much to follow from the establishment of the MLF. These observers acknowledge the existence of German uneasiness. They doubt that it will be significantly reduced by participation in a force closely integrated with U.S. forces, submitted to U.S. strategic conceptions and subject to a U.S. veto. Nevertheless, they do not reject the possibility that the MLF could be a useful alliance experiment, especially if it continues to command official German support and gains more supporters in other West European capitals. They think it unreasonable to conclude that if an agreement on the MLF were not reached the pressures feared by American officials would immediately materialize, or that if these pressures did gather despite an agreement to proceed with the MLF, they could not be resisted. In both cases, however, other ways to reassure responsible Germans about American intentions and to increase German weight in alliance councils would probably have to be sought.

Would Germans be seriously tempted by the possibility of Franco-German nuclear collaboration? De Gaulle is probably not yet prepared to offer the Germans favorable terms for participation in the French nuclear effort. Even if he were, many Germans are convinced that such a joint effort would add nothing to their security, and suspect that it might actually diminish their security, especially if it led to any qualification of the American commitment and to increased Soviet hostility. If Franco-German collaboration were considered as a route—clandestine or open—to an independent German deterrent, the same objections would hold with even more force.

Both supporters and some opponents of the project believe that it would be extremely difficult and perhaps impossible for any national group to seize control of MLF weapons, and they doubt that the Germans, by participating in the force, would gain any more technical advantages than they already possess. They also believe, however, that certain misunderstandings could arise from overvigorous U.S. support of the project, especially insofar as it is motivated by fear of close cooperation between France and Germany.

Germans might gain the impression that U.S. opposition to a German nuclear effort is not a fixed and unalterable policy position. They might suspect that if they could point to continuing and increasing pressures for a national force, U.S. policy could be made to yield gradually while American protection continued undiminished. The threat of a new rapprochement with France could be used to gain more influence over U.S. foreign policy.

If U.S. opposition to a German nuclear effort is indeed firm and unconditional, it would seem desirable that this position be made crystal clear. One step in this direction might be to deemphasize the MLF as a means to meet actual or anticipated German pressures for a national nuclear force, especially since its efficacy in this respect is open to question. There is a significant difference between conveying the impression that fear of irresistible pressures looms large in the American rationale for the MLF, and the impression that the project represents a limited response to limited and reasonable German desires. A certain amount of American leverage vis-a-vis Germany could well be at stake.

F. A threat to arms control negotiations and improved East-West relations?

Supporters of the MLF believe that there is no basic incompatibility between American support for a nondissemination agreement at the 18 Nation Disarmament Conference at Geneva and American promotion of the MLF. They see the MLF as a measure to combat nuclear proliferation and to promote multilateral arms control arrangements. The MLF need not lead to any increase beyond already planned increases in the nuclear forces maintained by the Western alliance because it can substitute for programed American forces. The British and French forces might at some future time be merged with the MLF, and thereby become subject to multilateral control. An American veto over use would be maintained for the foreseeable future. It would not be relinquished if this meant increasing the number of separate nuclear forces in Europe. The MLF could not add to the number of nationally controlled nuclear forces; it might even lead to a reduction in the number of these forces.

---

[15] See Osgood, "The Case for the MLF * * *," op. cit., pp. 32–44.

It is further argued that the MLF constitutes a safe response to the legitimate aspirations of a moderate West German Government and that it takes account of the special political position of Germany. The MLF, it is contended, would serve the interests of the Soviet Union and Eastern European countries as well as the interests of the West in that it would deflect any German pressures for nationally controlled nuclear forces. It is hoped that through detailed Western explanations of the project the Soviet Union may at least be convinced that the MLF is not intended to be provocative, that the control arrangements for the force will be safer than existing systems for the control of tactical nuclear weapons, and that there is no Western intention of giving West Germany national control over the force.

Continued Soviet hostility to the project may be expected, however. It has been suggested that this hostility will reflect (1) a calculation that the MLF can be exploited as a divisive issue in the West; (2) traditional opposition to any measure that promises to further the cohesion of the Western alliance and to provide an effective counter to the Soviet forces arrayed against Western Europe; and (3) a persistent and genuine fear of Germany. Pointing to these mixed motives and to other Soviet objectives in relations with the United States and Western Europe, some observers conclude that it is unlikely that an agreement to establish the MLF would provoke drastic Soviet measures of retaliation or reverse the trend toward a relaxation in tensions between the Soviet Union and the West.[16]

Some supporters of the MLF acknowledge that a Geneva nondissemination agreement might prove more difficult and perhaps impossible to achieve if the MLF is established. They believe, however, that the advantages to be gained from a project that will further Western cohesion and directly combat, in Europe at least, incentives to acquire national nuclear forces, outweigh the advantages to be gained from a nondissemination agreement.

They point to the probability that the nuclear "haves" are already under substantial restraints not to assist the nuclear "have nots." They argue that the MLF would not be incompatible with other arms control objectives, such as an agreement limiting land-based nuclear weapons in a central European zone and a freeze on delivery vehicles for strategic weapons.[17]

Among opponents of the MLF who have discussed the project in detail, probably a minority have stressed the Western goals of arms control, stable relations with the Soviet Union, and encouragement of centrifugal tendencies in the Soviet bloc in arguing against the desirability of the project. This minority, however, has used to good advantage the arguments of the majority of outright opponents or critics of the project. They have pointed to the possibility that the MLF may not promote alliance cohesion, that it may not be an appropriate response to the German problem insofar as it exists, and that it may further complicate relations among Western European nations. They have added these risks to the risks of jeopardizing other Western goals and concluded that the project should not be pursued.

These critics argue that supporters and opponents alike admit that there is no pressing military need for the MLF. They suggest that the nuclear arsenal of the United States is more than adequate to meet the threat of Soviet IRBM's, and that the number of tactical nuclear weapons deployed in Europe is more than adequate to deal with lesser threats. Efforts should be concentrated on improving conventional forces in Europe and on seeking ways to thin out or more effectively control the nuclear weapons on the European Continent. The nuclear weapons race will only be accelerated by the establishment of the MLF, which may very well be described as under effective control and as a substitute for programed weapons or obsolescent weapons, but which nevertheless will appear as a menacing new strategic weapons system. Indeed, there is a basic contradiction between emphasizing control and nonproliferation to the Soviet Union and the credibility of a significant strategic deterrent to Europeans.

The same problem arises in the Geneva disarmament negotiations. The MLF may well be reconciled with the letter of a nondissemination agreement; but it stands in contradiction to the spirit of such an agreement, especially insofar as it may increase appetites for nationally controlled forces and not appease them. If the United States is willing to join with nonnuclear European powers to set up a strategic nuclear force, would it be willing to contemplate the same arrangements with the Indians, the Japanese, the Nationalist Chinese?

Even if a nondissemination agreement is not assigned the highest priority, an antagonized Soviet Union may refuse to continue general discussions that might lead to other arms control arrangements. Soviet and Eastern European fears of Germany should not be underemphasized, it is contended. The new Soviet leaders could well see in the MLF a sign that the West is not interested in further measures to reduce tensions; they could well wonder, by looking at the trend of Western policy in the rearmament of Germany, if the West will hold firm in resisting possible German pressures for a national nuclear force; they could well fear the emergence of a European force of which Germany might be the dominant member.

It is further suggested that the MLF, by augmenting East European fears of a nuclear-armed Germany, will force East European leaders to draw closer to the Soviet Union. The Soviet bloc will find new reasons for unity at a time when there is a hopeful trend toward the lowering of barriers between Eastern and Western Europe and toward improved relations between West Germany and various East European countries.[18]

These asumptions are questioned by those observers who believe that the Soviet Union has an overriding interest in seeking areas of accommodation with the West in order to be free to deal with pressing economic problems at home and deteriorating bloc relations. This interest would preclude any major revision of Soviet policy in reaction to the establishment of the MLF. Eastern European countries, it is argued, will continue to find it in their interest to assert more independence vis-a-vis the Soviet Union and to increase their contacts with the West. They will at least not seek to undo what has already been done.

Despite disagreement as to whether the MLF can further a broad range of Western interests and as to how the Soviet bloc will react to an agreement to proceed with the project, many observers would join with those supporters and opponents of the project who have urged that further steps be taken to reassure the Soviet Union about Western intentions with respect to Germany. One Soviet expert has suggested a pledge by the United States to oppose any West German attempt to transform participation in the MLF into an independent nuclear effort, and a pledge to the U.N. by nonnuclear MLF participants that they would not seek independent nuclear forces.[19]

IV. THE MILITARY RATIONALE FOR THE MLF

A. The MRBM requirement

The military rationale for the MLF centers about a NATO requirement for MRBM's, stationed on or near the European Continent, to counter between 700 and 800 Soviet missiles targeted on Western Europe. The Thor and Jupiter missiles stationed in Great Britain, Italy, and Turkey have been removed because they were obsolete. European-based American and British planes with the range to cover these missiles and other Soviet targets are obsolescent. Existing and planned tactical aircraft and missiles with nuclear delivery capabilities and ranges reaching into the western part of the Soviet Union are needed for other missions. Two Supreme Allied Commanders in Europe—General Norstad and General Lemnitzer—have urged that the MRBM requirement be met; they have been seconded by various European military officials.

In recent years, U.S. officials have become increasingly opposed to the idea of placing MRBM's on the European Continent, whether in fixed, hardened sites or on mobile carriers. The missiles would be difficult to hide or to move about without detection on the densely populated European Continent. They would present easy and possibly tempting targets to the Soviet Union; they would be a source of disquiet and controversy among West European populations. Existing and programed U.S. strategic weapons systems, both land based and sea based, are more than sufficient, they believe, to cover the Soviet targets in question. They recognize, however, that some Europeans have questioned whether they could rely on weapons systems under the exclusive control of the United States and located largely in the United States.

The MLF, its supporters argue, provides a way to meet the MRBM requirement, and at the same time, to avoid the disadvantages of land-based missiles in Western Europe. Europeans would be reassured because they would have a voice in the management and control of this force; they would be reassured because the MLF would be targeted exclusively on Soviet weapons systems threatening Europe; they would be reassured because MLF ships would to a large extent use European ports and sail in European waters.[20]

---

[16] See, for example, Zbigniew Brzezinski, "Moscow and the MLF: Hostility and Ambivalence." Foreign Affairs, October 1964, pp. 126–134.

[17] See, for example, Osgood, "The Case for the MLF," op. cit., pp. 49–52.

[18] The arguments set out above have been drawn in part from Newhouse, op. cit.; Wayland Young, "The Insoluble Issue," the Listener, July 30, 1964, pp. 147–148, 169; and John Silard, "Should the United States Continue To Promote the MLF?" study paper for the Council for a Livable World, April 1964.

[19] See Brzezinski, op. cit., p. 134.

[20] See Smith, op. cit., for a more extensive presentation of the advantages of the MLF in meeting the MRBM requirement. The views of Secretary of Defense McNamara are also relevant: "As to the multilateral force, this country has stated that it does not believe there is an urgent military requirement for such a force. This is because the forces that I have outlined to you in table 2 we consider to be adequate to deter and protect the United States and our NATO Allies in relation to the Soviet forces [deleted] for the period under review. * * * We do see a possibility, however, of developing such a force, and that is the position we are taking with them. [Deleted.] If they are willing to contribute financially to it we are willing to contribute financially to it under those circumstances." Military Procurement Authorizations Fiscal Year 1963: Hearings before the Committee on Armed Services and the Subcommittee on Department of Defense of the Committee on Appropriations. U.S. Senate, 88th Cong., 2d sess., Feb. 3–7, 17–21, 1964, p. 72.

Thus the MLF would meet European requirements and help to reduce European fears. Would it be an unnecessary and costly duplication of existing and planned strategic forces? "No" is the answer, because the MLF could substitute for programed U.S. forces, and Europeans would defray a large part of the costs.

The military rationale for the MLF has been criticized from several conflicting points of view. Some observers flatly contest the existence of an MRBM requirement. They do not believe that effective deterrence of a Soviet attack on Europe depends on matching Soviet capabilities at every level with equivalent capabilities in Western Europe. They believe that a Soviet assault on Western Europe with strategic nuclear weapons is the most unlikely of eventualities, but that if it did occur, the United States would immediately engage its own strategic weapons. They believe that small, probing conventional attacks are much more likely, and that NATO must be prepared to meet these actions with conventional and tactical nuclear capabilities. The Soviet Union, they argue, is well aware of the awesome number of tactical nuclear weapons deployed in Europe—both short range and long range (up to 400 miles). The possibility that these weapons would be used to repulse a conventional attack serves as an effective deterrent to Soviet thrusts.

Other critics acknowledge that an MRBM requirement may exist, but believe that it is best met by present arrangements. The only effective deterrent to an attack with strategic weapons, they contend, is the threat of a rapid response. A rapid response can be mounted only when there is one decision to be made by one person. Europeans can participate in establishing the guidelines for a decision by the U.S. President; the decision must be his if a credible threat is to be achieved. The United States has deployed three Polaris submarines to the Mediterranean. There are, therefore, a minimum of 48 MRBM's that have been assigned to NATO and are already in the European area.

Some observers have expressed the suspicion that the MRBM requirement is largely a German requirement, promoted by the German military establishment.[21] They doubt that other Europeans see any great need for MRBM's either now or in the future. Admittedly, Great Britain and France have embarked on expensive programs to acquire strategic nuclear weapons. But these programs represent a search for nationally controlled weapons, not a search for MRBM's subject to a U.S. veto on use. The only virtue Germans and Italians could possibly see in the MLF, it is contended, is the possibility that the force might come under exclusive European control. Even if there were no American veto, they might well wonder whether a force subject to several European vetoes could be effective.

Finally, a few critics reject the MLF in favor of land-based missiles in Europe. They believe that these missiles would be less vulnerable and more accurate than missiles on surface ships. They see no reason why control arrangements similar to those being planned for the MLF could not be applied to land-based missiles. They assign less weight than do supporters of the MLF to the political disadvantages of land-based missiles.

B. An integrated alliance effort

U.S. officials are firmly convinced that effective deterrence and effective defense in the nuclear age can be achieved only on the basis of cooperation efforts that extend far beyond the mere coordination of national forces. Interdependence is a necessary assumption; military independence is a possibly dangerous illusion. Common plans, a common strategy, a common command structure, and a rational allocation of tasks to the degree possible are necessary. The United States provides the great bulk of the nuclear forces and a large part of the conventional forces on which the alliance depends. The say of the United States in the use of these forces will be necessarily large; it does not exclude a European say. The idea that a European nuclear force or national nuclear forces could be used effectively apart from the superior forces of the United States is dangerous and divisive.

U.S. supporters of the MLF and a few European supporters believe that the project can further these views and promote agreement on alliance plans and strategy. American supporters, especially, probably hope that close collaboration in all phases of planning for a force that will be closely integrated with U.S. forces will bring greater understanding and acceptance of U.S. strategic doctrine. There may also be some hope that some Europeans will cease to look longingly to the eventual establishment of a European force.

Sceptics suggest that some Europeans have learned to live with nuclear dependence, and that some have not. They suspect that the former would be happy to gain greater access to the sources of U.S. decisions; especially if they could be sure of having influence on decisions affecting the use of all alliance forces, before and during crises. They doubt that the MLF promises either greater access or increased influence. They suspect that the latter cannot be converted by participation in integrated efforts under American auspices, whether small scale or large scale.

C. Other alliance requirements

Many critics of the MLF believe that improvements in the conventional capabilities of the alliance should be given the highest priority. They see the MLF as a costly and unnecessary diversion from this task. It has been estimated that major European participants would spend between 1 and 4 percent of their annual defense budgets during the first 5 years of construction of the force and other European participants, less than 1 percent. These critics believe that these expenditures represent significant and controversial sums in several European countries.

Supporters of the project deny that the requirement of improved conventional capabilities will take second place if an agreement on the MLF is reached. They believe that if the needs of nonnuclear European powers for increased access to the management and control of strategic weapons are satisfied, there may well be a greater inclination to meet the conventional requirements of the alliance.

Some observers believe that a decision to proceed with the MLF could well provide Europeans with a convenient excuse for a lack of interest in improved conventional efforts. They doubt, however, that abandonment of the project would lead to any greater disposition to increase defense budgets and to look to gaps in conventional defense than hitherto shown. For most Europeans, the threat of an invasion from the East has receded. Despite some questioning of the credibility of the American commitment, reliance on the efficacy of nuclear deterrence is preferred to contemplation of the possibility of conventional war on the European Continent.

D. A credible deterrent and an effective striking force?

Three novel features of the MLF have led opponents to doubt that the force could be a credible deterrent and an effective striking force, and have led supporters to cite extensive studies to show that novelty is no bar to feasibility and efficacy. These features are mixed-manning, surface vessels as opposed to submarines, and multilateral control.[22]

1. Mixed Manning

Most supporters agree that the manning of a highly complex weapons system with crews whose members would be representatives of their different national governments has no precedent. They see no obstacles, however, that cannot be overcome by careful selection and long, and intensive training. The experiment being carried out on the guided missile destroyer, the U.S.S. *Claude V. Ricketts*, they believe, has shown the feasibility of mixed-manning. Small problems of food and different national pay scales may be easily surmounted.

Critics of the MLF see no reason why the combination of multinational crews and an advanced weapons system cannot be proved workable for certain purposes. What they question is the idea that the combination can be workable given the crucial importance mixed-manning assumes in MLF control arrangements. They fail to see how a harmonious and unified crew—essential to rapid and effective action—can be built on the principle that each national group serves as a check on another to assure that no nation or national group can gain control of one or more ships or impede or otherwise interfere with the execution of orders.

2. Surface Ships Versus Submarines

Surface ships were chosen for the MLF because they would require less time to build and could be built in European shipyards. They would be less costly, would be less complicated to operate than Polaris submarines, and would require relatively simple logistic support. The number of ships and missiles presently being discussed reflects an estimate as to a possible minimum number necessary given a certain amount of vulnerability and a possible maximum number necessary to counter effectively Soviet MRBM's. After extensive studies, American and European military and political officials concerned with the project have apparently reached the conclusion that a surface fleet, if properly deployed, could have a high degree of survivability.[23]

Doubts persist, however, as to the efficacy of a surface system that will be easier to track than submarines, and to which the Soviet Union might not hesitate to assign the number of trawlers required for adequate surveillance. It will be difficult to counteract an impression extending well beyond the European press that the political requirement of mixed manning has led to the choice of a second-best weapons system that cannot meet the military requirement defined.

3. Multilateral Control

Doubts have also been expressed as to whether a force with multiple vetoes on use could serve as a credible deterrent. One expert observer has reached the conclusion that the force would neither significantly increase the credibility of a nuclear response to Soviet aggression nor significantly decrease the credibility of a nuclear response. This conclusion depends on the assumptions that the Soviet Union will continue to be deterred primarily by superior American forces and that the MLF control group would not make a decision on use independently of an American decision to use or not to use the great bulk of alliance nuclear weapons remaining under American control.[24]

---

[21] See, for example, Leonard Beaton, in the Economist, Aug. 29, 1964, p. 806. It has been reported that during recent consultations between German and American defense officials the United States promised to sell improved Pershing missiles with a range of 700 miles to Germany when they became available. Since these missiles could reach strategic targets in the western Soviet Union, it is to be wondered whether the German MRBM requirement, insofar as it exists, has not already been met. See the New York Times, Nov. 22, 1964, p. 1.

[22] See Osgood, "The Case for the MLF," op. cit. for an extensive discussion of these features.

[23] See, for example, Thomas W. Connolly, "The Ballistic Missile Surface Force," U.S. Naval Institute Proceedings, June 1964, pp. 41–47.

It is possible then that the issue of the credibility of a force under multilateral control may prove in practice to be largely irrelevant. From an American point of view, this would be a major advantage of the MLF. From a European point of view, it might be concluded that the MLF will do little more than confirm the status quo.

V. ALTERNATIVES

Alternative approaches to alliance problems that the MLF is designed to meet have been suggested by many observers. Discussion of some proposals is long standing; discussion of others, more recent. Preferences vary according to how alliance problems are diagnosed. One observer may emphasize the problem of control over the use of nuclear weapons; another may believe that the real problem is one of reaching agreed alliance policies at the highest political level; still another may stress the need for greater European participation in the development of military plans and strategy. All do not necessarily conclude that the MLF should be rejected outright in favor of some other proposal; some believe that the MLF, in combination with various other steps toward nuclear sharing or more political and military consultation, might prove productive.

A. Abandon the MLF and seek no substitutes for the time being

A few critics believe that the MLF should be abandoned, as gracefully as possible, and that no alternative scheme should be sought for the time being. They suggest that any substitute for the MLF that also attempts to reconcile a number of conflicting points of view will be encumbered with the same political liabilities and will be of equally dubious military value. Europeans disagree as to what they would like the United States to offer. Americans undoubtedly disagree as to what they are prepared to offer. This does not mean that the alliance has come to an end, or that the United States should prepare to withdraw from Europe. It does mean that both Americans and Europeans need some time to consider what divides them and what unites them, free from distracting proposals that represent essentially mechanical approaches to political problems of moment. There are many ties between the United States and Europe—political, military, and economic. They will not be compromised by a failure to agree right now on what new institutional form they might take.

This view assumes, of course, that there is time; that there is a sufficient number of Europeans who oppose one or another of De Gaulle's policy aims to relieve the United States of an unrewarding, inappropriate, and even counterproductive task; that if this proposition is incorrect, the sooner the United States finds out, the better; that West Germany is not yet ready or free to jump into the arms of France or the Soviet Union; and that the course of wisdom is to be attentive to but not overly solicitous about West German needs. This view also assumes that the United States and West Germany are not so committed to the MLF that a face-saving substitute must be found if the project is abandoned.

B. Change U.S. policies on nuclear sharing; change U.S. strategic doctrine

In one of the more extreme versions of this alternative, it is suggested that the United States assist any of its allies who so wish in acquiring national nuclear deterrent forces. Alliance cohesion requires mutual trust and equality in weapons systems. There might be preauthorization for the use of nuclear weapons by front-line forces in certain contingencies; the authority of SACEUR to make decisions on use also ought to be increased. MRBM's should be stationed on the European Continent: NATO should maintain forces clearly superior to those of the East.[25]

Other observers are more cautious but nevertheless think that it might be desirable to modify U.S. policies on the sharing of nuclear weapons technology and on the transfer of parts of atomic weapons to include at least France. They would, of course, set certain conditions to assistance—agreement on strategy, perhaps, or agreement to the coordination of forces with U.S. forces and to a cooperative effort with Great Britain.[26] Some of these observers believe that the United States could, thereby, actively promote the establishment of a separate but coordinated European force. They assume, of course, that West Germany would be willing to accept a position of inferiority vis-a-vis Great Britain and France, and that Europeans themselves agree on the desirability of a European force.

Still other observers believe that U.S. strategic doctrine contains some dangerous ambiguities about the use of tactical nuclear weapons in case of a conventional Soviet assault on Western Europe. They believe that under certain conditions, the deferred use of tactical nuclear weapons could work to the disadvantage of the United States and its allies. They suggest that removal of these ambiguities could meet the interests of both Europeans and Americans.

C. More political and military consultation

Both opponents and supporters of the MLF have joined in urging greater political and military consultation among alliance members. Those who believe that there is a crisis of political confidence in NATO suggest that more frequent and high-level consultation on all the world problems that face the members of NATO would be desirable. Some suggest a kind of contingency planning on the model of the four-power Berlin group. Others suggest a four- or five-power directorate, possibly joined by representatives of other NATO nations and the Secretary-General of NATO, to coordinate and reach agreement on broad alliance policies. These observers are inclined to believe that the NATO allies of the United States are especially distrustful of U.S. policies vis-a-vis the Soviet Union and in the Far East, southeast Asia, and Africa. Implicit in their suggestions for more consultation and some kind of NATO directorate is the idea that the United States would be disposed to follow alliance guidelines, if indeed general agreement on what they should be could be reached.[27]

These and other observers also believe that more military consultation among alliance members would be desirable. They suggest that the European allies of the United States are less interested in being associated with the firing of nuclear weapons and targeting than with the formulation of strategic plans. They believe that Europeans would prefer effective influence over the whole of American potentialities to a complete influence over one insignificant part of these potentialities. Thus one critic describes the MLF as his second choice and says that his first choice is "for the European partners to have a well-organized influence on the drawing up of strategic plans and the preparation of military decisions in this field."[28]

Suggestions vary for the implementation of these ideas. Some observers have proposed moving the NATO military committee and standing group from Washington to Paris. Others have proposed going beyond recent steps to broaden European participation in the standing group. Common to several proposals is the idea that the U.S. President should act as a trustee for alliance members. Common plans and guidelines, especially for the use of nuclear weapons, should be drawn up by a council of NATO allies. The U.S. President should act on the basis of these plans.

Some American officials point out that the United States, since the NATO meetings at Athens in 1962 and Ottawa in 1963, has substantially increased the flow of information to its allies, and has undertaken detailed explanations of U.S. strategic plans and the estimates on which they are based. They believe that there is a limit to the amount of joint planning that can take place short of joint ownership of the weapons systems involved. Some observers suggest that consultation and joint planning is already highly organized in NATO and wonder what more can be accomplished short of European representation and weight in the U.S. Department of Defense.[29]

D. Apply the MLF approach to existing or planned weapons systems

Behind proposals for the mixed-manning and/or joint ownership and control of existing and planned weapons systems lies the idea that this approach would be less costly—politically and financially—than the MLF as presently proposed. These weapons systems are of proved military efficacy; their subjection to some kind of multilateral control could be accomplished in a relatively short period of time.

One proposal is that a squadron (50) of Minuteman missiles located in the United States and subsequently a wing (150) of these missiles be jointly manned and placed under multilateral control. The missiles would cost considerably less than the surface ship system proposed for the MLF; European participants would share costs with the United States; the control system would be similar to that proposed for the MLF with a U.S. veto over use.[30]

It has also been proposed that various European-based tactical nuclear weapons systems—planes and missiles—either be gathered together in a new multinational command or be placed under multilateral control and mix-manned to the extent possible. The coming British plane TSR-2 and the U.S. plane TFX as well as an alliance V/STOL have also been suggested for these arrangements. Common to several versions of this proposal is the idea that U.S. custodial units for American nuclear warheads in NATO stockpiles should be replaced by mixed-manned custodial units. Suggested control arrangements vary. Some observers favor the idea of a NATO nuclear executive composed of permanent and rotating members in which decisions would be taken by weighted majority votes.[31]

---

[24] See Osgood, "The Case for the MLF," op. cit., pp. 18–19.

[25] See, for example, Stefan Possony, "The Ethos of Interdependence," Modern Age, fall 1963, pp. 355–369.

[26] See, for example, Kissinger, op. cit.

[27] For variations on these themes see Bowie, op. cit.; Sommer, op. cit.; Alastair Buchan, "The Multilateral Force: A Study in Alliance Politics," International Affairs (London), October 1964, pp. 619–637; Henry Kissinger, "Coalition Diplomacy in a Nuclear Age," Foreign Affairs, July 1964, pp. 525–545.

[28] Fritz Erler, "Partners in Strategy," Atlantic Community Quarterly, summer 1963, p. 299. Erler would probably be Foreign Minister in any Social Democratic Government in West Germany.

[29] For a more moderate statement of this view, see Gen. James E. Moore (retired), "NATO Today: An Analysis of Its Nuclear and Conventional Power." Army, August 1964, pp. 27–33.

[30] See "Report of the Committee on Defense Questions and Armaments," WEU Assembly, Mr. Duynstee (Netherlands), Rapporteur. Oct. 30, 1963. Atlantic Community Quarterly, winter 1963–64, pp. 643–656; Osgood, "The Case for the MLF," op. cit. p. 48; and Newhouse, op. cit. for different versions of this proposal.

General Norstad has also suggested that a NATO executive committee on which the United States, the United Kingdom, France, and the Secretary General or two representatives of smaller countries would sit be considered as a control body for alliance nuclear weapons. The present nuclear powers of the alliance would commit the weapons needed to implement alliance strategy to a NATO stockpile, with physical custody remaining with the donor country. A majority vote on use would govern in the committee. A dissenting member could not withhold weapons committed to the stockpile, but could withhold other forces.[32]

CONCLUSION

By comparison with some of the alternatives outlined above, many observers would find the MLF to be a very modest, and relatively safe step toward nuclear sharing. Given the elaborate control arrangements planned for the force, they believe it very unlikely that any one participating nation could gain control of the force or of some of its ships without the voluntary withdrawal of other participants. The missiles of the force would not seem to be any more vulnerable to accidental or unauthorized firing than existing weapons systems. In fact, some observers believe that they would be more tamperproof than the tactical nuclear weapons stationed in Europe. It also seems unlikely that any participating nation would gain significantly more access to weapons "know-how" than it already has, although this point remains controversial. The force would be integrated with superior U.S. forces. There would be a U.S. veto over use for the foreseeable future.

However modest and safe a step the MLF might appear to be, other observers wonder whether the United States should undertake any kind of nuclear sharing that involves a modification of previous policies concerning the transfer of U.S.-produced weapons and warheads. They think that either European pressures for a greater share in the management of the nuclear forces of the West should be firmly resisted, or that other ways to meet these pressures should be found.

Still other dissenters have found the size of the undertaking to be incongruous with the minimal amount of real sharing involved. They are not surprised that some Europeans view the force as an expensive and militarily ineffective confirmation of the status quo. A new weapons system of 200 strategic missiles and 25 ships which is estimated to cost something under $3 billion and which would become fully operational only in 5 years' time is a major project both by American and European standards. Though the MLF would represent something less than 5 percent of the total nuclear forces of the West, the striking power of the force, when measured against existing and planned British and French forces, looms large.

Most observers would agree that the MLF meets no military requirement that cannot be met more efficiently by existing and planned American forces. An attempt has been made to meet European pressures without compromising the American objectives of nonproliferation and safe and effective command and control arrangements for nuclear weapons. A decision to proceed with the project would presumably reflect an expectation that American political aims within the alliance would be thereby furthered, and a judgment that political risks would be manageable.

Supporters of the MLF see in the size of the undertaking one of its virtues. They believe that nonnuclear European powers will gain an appreciation of strategy problems only if they are associated with the management of a significant deterrent force and with all phases of planning for the use of that force. They further believe that shared responsibilities will seem real and can be justified only if Europeans have made a substantial financial contribution to a joint enterprise. Europeans have pressed for a greater role in the management of the strategic forces of the alliance. They can accede to this role through participation in a force closely integrated with U.S. forces.

The fact that the United States will also make a substantial financial contribution to the force and that Americans will be closely associated with Europeans in the management of the force is seen as another virtue of the proposal. American participation in a project designed primarily to meet European needs will dramatize the firmness of the American commitment to the defense of Europe. It will underline American determination to remain engaged on the Continent as long as that engagement is believed necessary and desirable by a majority of Europeans. West Germans, it is believed, will be especially responsive to these advantages of the MLF. Other Europeans who fear the emergence of a dominant German military power on the Continent might welcome any proposal that promises to tie that power to superior U.S. power.

West Germany occupies the most exposed position in Western Europe and makes a major contribution to the conventional forces of the alliance. West Germans, it is argued, cannot be expected to remain indifferent to the arguments that have been used to justify the British and French nuclear efforts. They should be given a role in relation to strategic weapons that is at once safe and satisfying. The MLF, its supporters believe, can provide that role. A moderate West German Government will be less open to pressures to undertake an independent nuclear effort or to participate in a joint effort with France.

For supporters of the MLF, the need to maintain close ties between West Germany and the United States, and perhaps to contain any future West German inclination to embark on independent diplomatic adventures with the Soviet Union or with France outweighs the risk of alienating France. At present, there is little likelihood that French and American views of the alliance can be reconciled. France, they believe, is unlikely to withdraw completely from the alliance if the MLF is pursued.

Opponents of the MLF believe that the project promises only nominal political returns and that it entails substantial political risks. They fear that the divisive effects of the project may prove lasting and the unifying effects illusory. They doubt that a project that could come close to establishing a German-American alliance is desirable from either a German or an American point of view. They believe that nonparticipants will be divided from participants; they believe that France could be isolated in the alliance over an issue that is far from vital. The MLF, its opponents further contend, might very well increase tensions in central Europe and harden the division between East and West Germany. Efforts to improve relations between the Soviet Union and the West might be seriously impeded. Ties between France and West Germany might remain strained over a long period of time.

Thus it is dubious whether the project can further external German interests and, at the same time, it is to be wondered whether it might not strain the fabric of West German society. The MLF is an overreaction to German uneasiness, it is argued. Only a small minority of West Germans has expressed interest in access to strategic weapons. That minority will not be satisfied for long with participation in an effort over which there is an American veto. It will only be encouraged to press for greater concessions. Other means should be sought to meet the more reasonable needs of the majority of West Germans. The United States has a vital interest in promoting a stable West German society and in encouraging good relations between West Germany and her neighbors to the east and to the west. The MLF, its opponents believe, cannot further this interest.

It is also argued that the United States stands to gain little by insistently promoting a project that has not captured the enthusiasm of any European government, with the possible exception of the West German Government. A project that is regarded as too ambitious by some, as an insignificant step toward sharing by others, as dangerous by some, and as militarily ineffective and unnecessary by still others, cannot serve to rally alliance members. The MLF is a military response to political problems, opponents contend; it may well be irrelevant in addition to being costly and risky.

In coming months the proposal to establish a NATO MLF may change substantially. The British Labour Government will probably seek to persuade the United States and West German Governments that a broader nuclear grouping including some nationally manned weapons systems of Great Britain and of the United States would be desirable. Other wavering European governments may gain an opportunity to make proposals of their own. It is unlikely, however, that the United States will abandon readily what it considers to be the heart of the MLF proposal—a small number of mixed-manned surface vessels. It is even more unlikely that the United States will abandon its assumption that West Germany must be given some role in relation to strategic weapons that extends beyond consultation. The arguments set out above in summary form center to a large extent about the role of West Germany in the alliance. Even with a significantly altered proposal, it seems probable that the focus of pro and con arguments will continue to be West Germany.

Mr. Speaker, another instructive paper prepared by the Legislative Reference Service is the December 16, 1964, report on "Current German Opinion on MLF as Reflected in the Press" by Cedric W. Tarr, Jr., analyst in national defense:

The German Government under Chancellors Konrad Adenauer and Ludwig Erhard has consistently sought NATO interdependence and close American ties to the alliance. Bonn has also been anxious to become a respectable and more influential partner in the alliance carrying weight more commensurate with Germany's sizable contribution. Official support for the American MLF proposal is based on the hope that it will contribute to these goals. A review of recent German press comment reveals continuing uncertainty as to whether MLF membership would actually contribute to security, solidarity, and status. All Germans are concerned about the effect MLF would have on the issue of reunification. The Bonn government has continued its official loyalty to the American plan but it has not attracted widespread public support.

---

[31] For different versions of this proposal, see WEU committee report, op. cit.; Osgood, "The Case for the MLF," op. cit.; Frederick W. Mulley, "NATO's Nuclear Problems: Control or Consultation," Orbis, spring 1964, pp. 21–35; and Air Marshal Sir John Slessor, "Multilateral or Multinational: An Alternative to the MLF," Atlantic Community Quarterly, summer 1964, pp. 285–291.

[33] General Lauris Norstad, "The Longer Second Look," Atlantic Community Quarterly, March 1963, pp. 45–52.

The essentially political character of MLF is freely acknowledged by German officials. Defense Minister Kai-Uwe von Hassel says that the MLF would have a substantial military capacity but would satisfy only a part of the military requirement to counter the many Soviet MRBM's targeted on Europe.

"Its major importance, however, would be its political aspect. It would provide an additional political link between the European and American partners to the alliance. Its close interlacing with the nuclear potential of the United States would result in strengthening the deterrent on the one hand, and establishing strong ties between Europe and America on the other. This is its definite advantage as compared to other concepts which envisage a European nuclear force. In my opinion, the establishment of a European nuclear force of this kind would be more likely to slacken than to strengthen the ties between Europe and the United States. It has become apparent, with greater clarity than a few years ago, that Western Europe cannot assume a truly European responsibility for the use of nuclear weapons before it has become a political entity; in other words, it can assume this responsibility only after unification, i.e., after the careful and gradual integration of national sovereignty in a political community. Today there is no alternative to the American proposal of a multilateral force which would take into account the present possibilities of nuclear partnership while leaving the door open to political development into a partnership on a more comprehensive basis." [1]

Two themes heard with increasing frequency on all sides are (1) that Germany must not be forced to make a choice between France and the United States, and (2) that the MLF must not take the form of an exclusive German-American undertaking. Lt. Gen. von Baudissin, commander of the NATO Defense College in Paris told an American official, in an informal conversation, that he does not want to see a bilateral MLF, and that British membership would be desirable, since it would reassure others.[2]

Following Defense Minister von Hassel's trip to Washington in November, Die Welt, the influential independent paper of Hamburg, questioned whether this might further complicate relations with France. In response to the uneasiness aroused by his trip, and the lengthy communique, Von Hassel insisted that the joint statement with McNamara was not intended as a demonstration of opposition to De Gaulle.

The desire to avoid a showdown with France accounts for the favorable reaction to the timing if not the substance of Prime Minister Harold Wilson's proposals of mid-November. In an editorial entitled "Breathing Space," the independent daily, General-Anzeiger (Bonn) said that Germany had been too prominent in its endorsement of the MLF. A predominantly German role would be disruptive and Germany now has the opportunity to dissociate itself from a bilateral MLF.

Die Welt welcomed the pause but said the Government should make it clear to Britain that it will not compromise its right to nuclear partnership.

A number of other press comments expressed belief but also suspicion of the designs of the Labor government. They reminded their readers that the Labor Party had endorsed the Rapacki plan for the denuclearized zone in central Europe and that Labor had been adamant against a German finger on any nuclear trigger. Angrier remarks from the press were heard following Wilson's more negative statements during the House of Commons debate on defense policy later in November. Some voiced the suspicion that Britain's only interest in MLF membership may be to counter German influence.

Sebastian Haffner, writing in Der Stern, the weekly illustrated, November 8, 1964 (Hamburg), stated that Germany wants to join the atomic club while Britain wants to prevent this, and both hope to use the MLF for their opposing aims. Haffner is one of the most outspoken critics of the MLF, which he opposes on the ground that the most promising means of German reunification is through Russo-German rapproachement, and that the MLF will be an obstacle to this.

Within Germany the Socialists, like the British Laborites have favored nuclear self-denial. Although Fritz Erler, deputy chairman of the Social Democratic Party (SPD) has neither rejected nor endorsed the MLF a number of district units of the party have passed resolutions calling for renunciation of any West German share in the nuclear deterrent.[3] The party has shown greater interest in increasing conventional strength to improve military flexibility and reduce the dependence upon nuclear weapons for defense of the NATO area. Its recent parliamentary opposition has centered around the defense budget rather than the MLF.

The SPD has also swung around to the view that close ties across the Atlantic are essential and should be increased. Erler believes the issue of fingers on the trigger is not critical since the nuclear forces of the West would certainly be unleashed in the event of a Soviet nuclear attack. For lesser forms of attack "the conventional forces would give the alliance as a whole some time to think." [4]

For the decision to initiate nuclear weapons against a conventional attack Erler is willing to leave this to the U.S. President. He believes that defense of the West is indivisible and that the whole nuclear deterrent, including the major portion maintained by the United States, should be under collective control.

"The American idea of organizing a multilateral force as an atomic force within the alliance is in my opinion, only the second choice. The first choice would be for the European partners to have a well-organized influence on the drawing up of strategic plans and the preparation of military decisions in this field. I prefer a somewhat less precise but nevertheless effective influence on the whole of American potentialities to a complete influence on one insignificant part of these potentialities. I very much fear that the financial effort required of the Europeans to create this device for themselves will result in a decrease of European efforts in the nonnuclear field, where they are far more important to the alliance as a whole. Nevertheless, this idea should not be abandoned until a better solution is found. It is, after all, still better than the method I consider to be third choice: a number of national nuclear forces." [5]

But to qualify for this added influence Erler stated that the European side must include Great Britain, must contribute to a common effort in research and development, and must "have common institutions capable of exercising effective political control." [6] Erler foresees two partners of similar size, Europe and the United States with a harmony of interests and a worldwide coordination of policy.

The Erhard government does not dismiss the problem of control and early stated a preference for a weighted voting system, rather than a veto.[7] This would give the larger contributors a greater say in the force. Bonn also preferred a land based system, but has not pressed the point since the American MMRBM program was canceled in August 1964.

The "Gaullists" of Germany, whose major spokesmen are Franz-Josef Strauss and Karl Theodor zu Guttenberg, also foresee a twin pillar alliance, but they do not assume such a close identity of interests.

Indeed their motive in building solidarity in Europe is to permit more independence from the United States. Gaullist Germans see the possibility of German objectives being bypassed by the United States in its efforts to reduce tensions with Russia. They see the MLF as militarily irrelevant and, politically, a device used by the United States to counter French policy and to insure a continuation of the status quo, meaning a continuation of American predominance.

The German Gaullists feel that any MLF treaty should have a "Europeanization clause" which would end the U.S. veto as soon as a European political command is achieved. This would assure France that the MLF is not merely a device to maintain the status quo.[8] Konrad Adenauer has also endorsed the idea of a specific Europeanization clause.

Guttenberg stated that to create a NATO within NATO or a NATO over NATO, as the MLF project has become, would be a divisive factor in the alliance. He argues that German prestige is not engaged in MLF and that Germany should not feel committed to it in its present form.

"It was not the Germans who sought an instrument to come 'closer to the atomic button' but rather the Americans who apparently wished by this means to satisfy an assumed wish of this type. Therefore it must be said with all clarity that there exists among the political groups in Germany which are to be taken seriously none which seeks a change in the present organization of the atomic defense of the West along the lines, say, of an old, national, great power concept. Such categories do not exist for the Federal Republic. We are concerned solely with securing and protecting our safety." [9]

Writing in Der Stern, Strauss summarizes his CSU party's position on the European deterrent: (1) As many European nations as possible should participate. (2) the United States should promise to turn over the MLF after formation of a European control organ. (3) the United States should put its tactical nuclear weapons under the same European command.

German Gaullists, and indeed many Europeans, are anxious to exploit the deterrent effect of nuclear weapons and are less interested in the problems of defense. They regard the U.S. emphasis on conventional forces and on flexibility as detracting from the deterrent effect of tactical nuclear weapons. The MLF would not change the American monopoly and American control of these weapons, and it is feared that they might be withheld in case of attack.

---

[1] Kai-Uwe von Hassel, "Detente Through Firmness," Foreign Affairs, January 1964, p. 189.

[2] Unclassified mission report, dated Nov. 6, 1964.

[3] New York Times, Nov. 24, 1964.

[4] Fritz Erler, "Partners in Strategy," Atlantic Community Quarterly, summer 1964, p. 297.

[5] Ibid., p. 299.

[6] Ibid., p. 300.

[7] Washington Post, May 29, 1963.

[8] Karl Theodor zu Guttenberg, "MLF—Integrating Factor or Troublesome Project," Bayern Kurier, Nov. 21, 1964.

[9] Ibid.

Adelbert Weinstein, a respected commentator of the moderate right commented on MLF in an editorial in the Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung, October 15, 1964. He appreciates the U.S. reasoning behind the MLF, and compares it with that of the early fifties in support of German rearmament. He indicates that the Europeans have not rejected the concept of two separate centers of deterrence. He describes MLF as "part of a military organization which will give us the appearance of participating in the political and military utilization of the atom whereas it actually serves to keep the Germans away from its destructive force.

"It is true that our integrated Armed Forces qualified us for military alliances but in comparison with our military and financial contribution, our influence upon the overall defense of the West is unsatisfactory. The multilateral fleet is to bring us a similar future. This time, however, it is not our military force that is sought after and to be harnessed. This time, the greatest nuclear power in the world is seeking, on a preventive basis, to neutralize in the Federal Republic a political force, namely, the atom.

"In any case, the multilateral nuclear force is more of a problem concerning the nuclear giants than a means of strengthening Atlantic defense. We Germans are merely an object of policy in this respect. To use a very pointed formulation: German diplomacy must limit itself to finding out with the Americans how far we can go with our opposition and to keeping the resulting financial burden as low as possible. We should soberly realize how small our scope of action in the field of military policy is as soon as nuclear weapons and the political utilization of the atom are involved. This has nothing to do with resignation. As far as security in the nuclear age is concerned, however, the burden of our past and the unfavorable geographic location of the Federal Republic make modesty a virtue."

The cover story on MLF (no author) in Der Spiegel of November 4, 1964, gives a comprehensive survey of the status of the proposal, its objectives and problems. The article states that the Bonn government and the CDU–CSU politicians believe it may be worthwhile to spend so much money for membership to come closer to German atomic importance (Atomgeltung). They openly hope the U.S. Atomic Energy Act will be amended some time in the future, assuming the American people gain confidence in the force.

In the November 18 issue of Der Spiegel 15 letters on MLF were published, all critical. Criticism characteristic of the left and right was represented. One said MLF was an American "tranquilizing pill" to German politicians, and that Germany will have to pay without gaining any greater power of decision. Another letter said the same thing would happen in a deal with De Gaulle. Another said existing NATO weapons should be included. Another writer believes MLF would stimulate the arms race and make the division of Germany permanent. Several letters questioned the military value of MLF because of the vulnerability of surface ships and the problem of mixed manning.

An article by Carl Friedrich von Weizsäcker, the famous, politically independent physicist, in Die Zeit, November 20, 1964, attempted to give a balanced analysis of the MLF from the German standpoint.

Weizsäcker lists three questions that should be considered in relation to MLF: (1) Does the MLF contribute to European unity? (2) Does the MLF contribute to the American-European alliance? (3) Does the MLF contribute to the security of the Federal Republic and to the solution of the German problem?

On the question of European unity Weizsäcker believes that if it is already declining, MLF will not make any difference. If MLF strengthens European unity it could do so only indirectly as a consequence of strengthening the European-American alliance.

On this second point Weizsäcker is dubious. Unless it gains more adherents than it now has the MLF would hardly contribute to transatlantic unity. A critical question is whether or not the United States would be willing to give up its veto. If it did so, transatlantic unity would suffer, for the United States might eventually withdraw from Europe. If the United States does not give up the veto, European unity will suffer, for then the MLF would be merely symbolic. The United States would still have its own vast power under independent control while Europe would be able to employ the MLF only with American consent. Weizsäcker leaves open the question as to whether this purely symbolic sharing would be valuable.

He goes on to say that the Germans must learn to realize the sensitivities of their neighbors, even if it is inconceivable that Germany would use nuclear weapons on them or anyone else. Next to Britain and France, Germany is the only European nation that gives the impression of wanting nuclear arms.

Weizsäcker says the question for Germany is whether or not the goal of reunification will be furthered by MLF membership, and whether it would be possible to trade MLF for some progress in reunification. He also asks whether Germany's prospects would be endangered by leaving the impression of being a dangerous nation.

Mr. Speaker, still another helpful Legislative Reference Service report is that of December 14, 1964, on "Treaty Obligations Relating to the Possession of Nuclear Weapons by West Germany," by Elizabeth Stabler, analyst in Western European affairs:

1. The Federal Republic of Germany (West Germany) has not entered any treaty or agreement by which it renounces the possession of nuclear weapons, or is forbidden to possess these weapons.

2. The Federal Republic of Germany, through a declaration made by Chancellor Adenauer in the fall of 1954, has undertaken not to manufacture in its territory any atomic weapons, chemical weapons, or biological weapons, the so-called ABC weapons.

This declaration, made on October 3, 1954, was incorporated in the final act of the London conference of September and October 1954, and was made a part of the protocols amending the Brussels Treaty of 1948, signed at Paris on October 23, 1954. The declaration may be found in annex I to protocol III on the control of armaments. The other six parties to the protocols take note of the declaration in article I of protocol III, and in annex II to the same protocol, atomic, chemical, and biological weapons are defined. Thus West Germany should be regarded as being under treaty obligation not to manufacture the ABC weapons in her territory. In contrast to the further obligation not to manufacture certain other weapons, which arises from the same declaration, the obligation relating to ABC weapons is not made subject to amendment by the Brussels Council of Ministers upon a request from SACEUR.

Through the London and Paris agreements of the fall of 1954, West Germany and Italy joined the Brussels Treaty Powers (the United Kingdom, France, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxembourg) to form a Western European Union. The Western European Powers agreed to regulate the levels of their land and air forces on the mainland of Europe and to establish an agency for the control of armaments. The same agreements incorporated a decision on the part of the United States, the United Kingdom, and France to terminate the ocupation regime in West Germany, and a further decision to invite West Germany to accede to the North Atlantic Treaty.

3. In the late summer of 1963, the Federal Republic of Germany signed the Moscow test ban treaty in which the United States, the Soviet Union and the United Kingdom agreed "not to carry out any place under its jurisdiction or control: (a) in the atmosphere; beyond its limits, including outer space; or underwater, including territorial waters or high seas." The parties to the treaty further undertook "to refrain from causing, encouraging, or in any way participating in, the carrying out of any nuclear weapon test explosion, or any other nuclear explosion, anywhere which would take place in any of the environments described, or have the effect referred to, in paragraph 1 of this article."

Presumably, such tests or explosions would be essential to the development of any nuclear weapons capability by West Germany.

4. In January of 1963, West Germany and France signed a treaty of cooperation in which they undertook to cooperate in the formulation of military strategy and tactics and to pursue joint weapons developments programs. There have been rumors, never reliably confirmed, that France has invited the West German Government to contribute financial and technical assistance to the French nuclear weapons effort. Such cooperation, if pursued on French territory, would not necessarily be in contravention of the Paris Protocols of 1954. It might, however, contravene the obligations West Germany has assumed by signing the test-ban treaty, especially in view of the fact that France intends to conduct further tests of nuclear devices in the atmosphere. Whether an invitation has been issued or not, there is no indication that the present West German Government would be disposed to undertake such a cooperative effort.

5. At the Yalta and Potsdam Conferences of 1945, the United States, the Soviet Union, and the United Kingdom agreed that one of the purposes of the occupation of Germany should be the complete disarmament and demilitarization of Germany and the elimination or control of all German industry that could be used for military production. Although the occupation regimes in both West Germany and East Germany have been officially terminated, no peace treaty has yet been concluded with either country. The parties to the Yalta and Potsdam accords continue to insist on their validity for various purposes.

In fact, the provisions on disarmament and demilitarization have been observed only in the breach. As early as 1950, the Soviet Union had set up a 50,000 man police force in East Germany which increasingly resembled an army. In 1955, folowing the London and Paris agreements of 1954, West German rearmament began.

6. It should be noted that the West German armed forces are equipped or are being equipped with a variety of delivery vehicles—rocket-launchers, missiles, and planes—designed to carry tactical nuclear warheads, and, by and large, acquired from the United States. Training in the use of these weapons has been carried out in the United States. Custody over the nuclear warheads and a veto over their release and use remains with U.S. authorities. Under the proposal to establish a multilateral NATO nuclear force, which is currently being discussed by eight members of NATO, West Germany would share in the ownership of the force and in control over its use, and would provide contingents for the mixed-manned missile bearing surface ships. Thus far, it has not been officially suggested that West Germany should possess, that is, own and control alone, any tactical or strategic nuclear weapons system

including both delivery vehicles and warheads. The limitations in respect to possession, however, that is, acquisition of nuclear weapons systems without restrictions from another country, are not to be found in any treaty obligations assumed by West Germany. They lie rather in compelling political considerations, the force of which is felt in both the Soviet bloc and the West, and in domestic legal restrictions in possible donor countries. Thus the U.S. Atomic Energy Act of 1954 as amended may be interpreted as requiring U.S. custody over U.S. nuclear warheads and as forbidding the communication of information for the design of warheads to countries not having already developed an atomic weapons capability.

7. It should be further noted that West Germany participates in the work of Euratom and the European Space Research Organization for the peaceful exploitation of atomic energy and exploration of space. The Euratom Treaty of 1957 contains provisions to insure that the programs pursued under the auspices of Euratom in the participating countries will remain devoted to peaceful purposes.

8. In summary, West Germany is bound by treaty only not to manufacture atomic weapons. West Germany is not bound by treaty not to possess atomic weapons. It is the opinion of most experts that the West Germans have the theoretical basis to develop a nuclear weapons capability of their own, if the limitations of the Paris protocols should ever be removed, or if they should should decide to circumvent these limitations as well as those of the test-ban treaty.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to Mr. Reuss, for 30 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Albert) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Beckworth.
Mr. Tenzer.
Mr. Powell in four instances.
Mr. Donohue.
Mr. St. Onge.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 11 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, January 6, 1965, at 12 o'clock noon.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H.R. 1495. A bill to provide a hospital insurance program for the aged under social security, to amend the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system to increase benefits, improve the actuarial status of the disability insurance trust fund, and extend coverage, to amend the Social Security Act to provide additional Federal financial participation in the Federal-State public assistance programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1496. A bill to authorize the sale, without regard to the 6-month waiting period prescribed, of zinc proposed to be disposed of pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 1497. A bill to amend section 22 of the Interstate Commerce Act so as to assure that rates, fares, and charges established under that section for the U.S. Government are free from undue prejudice and preference; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BANDSTRA:

H.R. 1498. A bill to prohibit nepotism in Government employment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H.R. 1499. A bill to provide for the establishment of a commission on problems of small towns and rural counties; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 1500. A bill to provide that the former owners of land acquired by the United States shall, in certain cases, have the right to acquire the mineral rights in such land when it is sold by the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 1501. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 and the Social Security Act to eliminate those provisions which restrict the right of a spouse or survivor to receive full benefits simultaneously under both acts; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 1502. A bill to provide that when a family's home is being acquired by the United States, in determining the price to be paid for such home the agency acquiring such home may take into account the same considerations as would be taken into account by such family in determining whether or not to sell their home voluntarily; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1503. A bill to provide for post cards of a distinctive color for nonbusiness messages with a postage rate of 1 cent; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1504. A bill to amend chapter 33 of title 38, United States Code, to make the educational benefits provided for therein available to all veterans whether or not they serve during a period of war or of armed hostilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 1505. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 1506. A bill to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I and their widows and children at the same rates as apply in the case of veterans of the Spanish-American War, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 1507. A bill to amend section 312 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that disabilities of certain veterans held as prisoners of war for two or more years by the Japanese during World War II shall be considered to be service connected; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 1508. A bill to eliminate the requirement that outpatient dental treatment and related appliances for service-connected disabilities be furnished on a one-time completion basis; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 1509. A bill to amend section 610 of title 38, United States Code, to provide hospital care for peacetime veterans on the same basis as such care is provided for wartime veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 1510. A bill to amend title 39 of the United States Code to establish a 35-hour workweek for postal field service employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 1511. A bill to amend chapter 35 of title 38, United States Code, to provide educational assistance to the children of veterans who are permanently and totally disabled from wartime service-connected disability; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 1512. A bill to eliminate the requirement that veterans have served for 90 days or more to qualify for certain benefits under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 1513. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit the payment of disability insurance benefits, to an individual otherwise qualified therefor, from the beginning of such individual's disability; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1514. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that an individual may qualify for disability insurance benefits and the disability freeze with only four quarters of coverage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1515. A bill to increase from $600 to $1,000 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1516. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide benefits thereunder for certain individuals who have paid social security taxes as employers but have not themselves become entitled to such benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1517. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a woman who is permanently and totally disabled may become entitled to widow's insurance benefits without regard to her age (and without losing her entitlement (if any) to disability insurance benefits); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1518. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a taxpayer a deduction from gross income for tuition and other expenses paid by him for his education or the education of his spouse or any of his dependents at a college or university; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1519. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that income derived by an individual from a trade or business carried on by a partnership shall not constitute "earnings" for purposes of deductions on account of work unless he renders personal services in such trade or business; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1520. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a woman who is otherwise qualified may become entitled to wife's insurance benefits or widow's insurance benefits without regard to her age if she is permanently and totally disabled; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1521. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide coverage under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system for self-employed tree farmers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1522. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide monthly insurance benefits for the unmarried dependent sister of an individual who dies leaving no other survivors eligible for benefits under such title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1523. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the amount of the deduction allowed a woman or widower for the expenses of providing for the care of certain dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1524. A bill to amend title I of the Social Security Act to provide increased Federal matching of State old-age assistance expenditures thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.R. 1525. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code in order to promote high morale in the uniformed services by providing a program of medical care for certain former members of the uniformed services and their dependents; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 1526. A bill to require an annual report to Congress comparing the salary rates of the uniformed services and those of private industry; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BRAY:

H.R. 1527. A bill to strengthen State governments, to provide financial assistance to States for educational purposes by returning a portion of the Federal taxes collected therein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 1528. A bill to amend the Water Resources Research Act of 1964 in order to eliminate a provision making certain assistance under such act conditional upon approval thereof by committees of the Congress; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 1529. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the 150th anniversary of the admission of the State of Indiana to the United States to be celebrated in 1966; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DAGUE:

H.R. 1530. A bill to amend the Wool Products Labeling Act of 1939 to authorize the Federal Trade Commission to exclude from the provision of that act wool products with respect to which the disclosure of wool fiber content is not necessary for the protection of the consumer; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 1531. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to provide for the greater protection of the President and the Vice President of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1532. A bill to amend the Trade Expansion Act of 1962; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1533. A bill relating to the status of volunteer fire companies for purposes of liability for Federal income taxes and for certain Federal excise taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 1534. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 1535. A bill to amend the Classification Act of 1949 to authorize the establishment of hazardous duty pay in certain cases; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1536. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act in order to correct an inequity in the application of such act with respect to the U.S. Botanic Garden, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. EVERETT:

H.R. 1537. A bill providing for construction of a highway, and appurtenances thereto, traversing the Mississippi Valley; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 1538. A bill to amend section 4107 of title 38, United States Code, to provide for payment of an additional allowance to certain physicians assigned to duty at Veterans' Administration facilities where it is difficult to recruit or retain physicians; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H.R. 1539. A bill to amend the Federal Firearms Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

H.R. 1540. A bill to prohibit the discharge of members of the Armed Forces under conditions other than honorable except pursuant to the sentence of a court-martial; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 1541. A bill to amend chapter 79 of title 10, United States Code, to provide that certain boards established thereunder shall give consideration to satisfactory evidence relating to good character and exemplary conduct in civilian life after discharge or dismissal in determining whether or not to correct certain discharges and dismissals; to authorize the award of an exemplary rehabilitation certificate; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 1542. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 1543. A bill to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 1544. A bill to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide further for the prevention of accidents in coal mines; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 1545. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act to extend its protection to additional employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 1546. A bill to reduce the maximum workweek under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to 32 hours, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 1547. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 1548. A bill to amend section 9(b)(3) of the National Labor Relations Act so as to eliminate the provision thereof prohibiting the certification, as bargaining representative of persons employed as guards, of a labor organization which admits to membership, or is affiliated with an organization which admits to membership, employees other than guards; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 1549. A bill to provide that primary elections and runoff primary elections for nomination of candidates for the Senate and House of Representatives shall be held on the same day throughout the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 1550. A bill to provide that railroad employees may retire on a full annuity at age 60 or after serving 30 years; to provide that such annuity for any month shall be not less than one-half of the individual's average monthly compensation for the 5 years of highest earnings; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 1551. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to make it a Federal crime to kill the President or Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1552. A bill to prevent the use of stopwatches or other measuring devices in the postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1553. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 1554. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide vocational rehabilitation, education and training, and loan guarantee benefits for veterans of service after January 31, 1955, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 1555. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a taxpayer a deduction from gross income for tuition and other expenses paid by him for his education or the education of his spouse or any of his dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1556. A bill to increase from $600 to $1,000 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemption for old age or blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1557. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a taxpayer a deduction from gross income for tuition and other expenses paid by him for his education or the education of his spouse or any of his dependents at a college or university; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1558. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase benefits, to increase the earnings includible in computing benefits, to eliminate age requirements for spouse's benefits, to reduce retirement age (with full benefits for both men and women) to 60, to provide child's benefits beyond age 18 while in school, to increase the outside earnings permitted without deductions from benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LAIRD:

H.R. 1559. A bill to provide for a national self-help dairy stabilization program and to provide for an adequate balanced and orderly flow of milk and dairy products in interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 1560. A bill to provide for the issuance of a postage stamp in commemoration of the birth of Jesus Christ; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1561. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a 30-percent credit against the individual income tax for amounts paid as tuition or fees to certain public and private institutions of higher education and high schools; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1562. A bill to provide financial assistance to the States by returning to the States a portion of the Federal income taxes collected therein; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1563. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted without deductions from benefits, to provide minimum benefits for all individuals not otherwise entitled at age 70, and to provide an across-the-board increase in all benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1564. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that the child of an insured individual, after attaining age 18, may continue to receive child's insurance benefits until he attains age 21 if he is a full-time student; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.R. 1565. A bill to specify the number of hospital beds that the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs must maintain and operate at the Veterans' Hospital, East Orange, N.J.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 1566. A bill to provide that tips received by an employee in the course of his employment shall be included as part of his wages for old-age, survivors, and disability insurance purposes and for purposes of income tax withholding; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1567. A bill to require that Congress be given notification prior to the closing of any defense installation; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 1568. A bill to protect the right to vote in Federal elections free from arbitrary discrimination by literacy tests or other means; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 1569. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to provide for the greater protection of the President and the Vice President of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1570. A bill to provide a hospital insurance program for the aged under social security, to amend the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system to increase benefits, improve the actuarial status of the disability insurance trust fund, and extend coverage, to amend the Social Security Act to provide additional Federal financial participation in the Federal-State public assistance programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 1571. A bill to amend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 to provide Federal assistance for projects for the acquisition of equipment to be used for shared-time secondary educational programs in science, mathematics, and modern foreign language, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 1572. A bill to amend the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, to strengthen independent competition by providing for competitive enterprise in the retail sales of meat, meat food products, livestock products, and other food items; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 1573. A bill to strengthen the competitive enterprise system by assisting qualified small business concerns to obtain leases of commercial and industrial property, where stringent credit requirements tend to exclude such concerns, by authorizing the Small Business Administration to guarantee, directly or in cooperation with others, the payment of rentals under such leases; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 1574. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to provide for the issuance of temporary cease and desist orders to prevent certain acts and practices pending completion of Federal Trade Commission proceedings; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 1575. A bill for the establishment of a Commission on Revision of the Antitrust Laws of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1576. A bill to amend the Clayton Act to prohibit restraints of trade carried into effect through the use of unfair and deceptive methods of packaging or labeling certain consumer commodities distributed in commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1577. A bill to amend the Clayton Act by making section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act a part of the Clayton Act, in order to provide for governmental and private civil proceedings for violations of section of the Robinson-Patman Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1578. A bill to require certain companies engaged in dual distribution to disclose separate annual operating data on each of their establishments which compete with independent customers of such companies in the sale and industrial use of their products; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1579. A bill to amend section 4071 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHRIVER:

H.R. 1580. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a taxpayer a deduction from gross income for tuition and other expenses paid by him for his education or the education of his spouse or any of his dependents at an institution of higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 1581. A bill to establish a uniform system of time standards and measurement for the United States and to require the observance of such time standards for all purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TALCOTT:

H.R. 1582. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property to the State of California; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H.R. 1583. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide an increase in compensation for veterans having certain service-connected disabilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TUCK:

H.R. 1584. A bill defining the jurisdiction of the U.S. Supreme Court and all Federal courts inferior thereto, in certain instances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WAGGONNER:

H.R. 1585. A bill to permit States and other duly constituted taxing authorities to levy and collect property taxes on certain property located within Federal areas; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 1586. A bill defining the jurisdiction of the U.S. Supreme Court and all Federal courts inferior thereto, in certain instances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H.R. 1587. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, with respect to the hours of operation of certain broadcasting stations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 1588. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp to commemorate the 20th anniversary of the death of Ernie Pyle; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1589. A bill to provide for determination through judicial proceedings of claims for compensation on account of disability or death resulting from disease or injury incurred or aggravated in line of duty while serving in the active military or naval service, including those who served during peacetime, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 1590. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1591. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a taxpayer a deduction from gross income for tuition and other educational expenses paid by him, whether for his own education or for the education of his spouse or a dependent or any other individual; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1592. A bill to amend title IV of the Social Security Act to permit Federal grants for aid to dependent children to be made thereunder even though the parents or other relatives with whom such children are living are required to perform services in a work relief program as a condition of such aid; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1593. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt certain farm vehicles from the highway use tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 1594. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FINDLEY:

H.R. 1595. A bill to adjust wheat and feed grain production, to establish a cropland retirement program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H.J. Res. 112. Joint resolution designating the rose as the national flower of the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BRAY:

H.J. Res. 113. Joint resolution to establish the World War I Commemorative Commission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAGUE:

H.J. Res. 114. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 115. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

H.J. Res. 116. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 117. Joint resolution to provide for three civilian Commissioners for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.J. Res. 118. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States on Presidential power and succession; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCULLOCH:

H.J. Res. 119. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to succession to the Presidency and Vice Presidency and to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.J. Res. 120. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States permitting nonsectarian prayer in public schools or other public places if participation therein is not compulsory; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TUCK:

H.J. Res. 121. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.J. Res. 122. Joint resolution authorizing the awarding of a gold medal to Danny Kaye; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MINISH:

H. Con. Res. 68. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the United Nations conduct free elections in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia under its supervision and punish all Soviet Communists who are guilty of crimes against the peoples of the Baltic States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. Con. Res. 69. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President should instruct the U.S. mission to the United Nations to bring the Baltic States question before that body with a view to obtaining the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia; the return of exiles from these nations from slave-labor camps in the Soviet Union; and the conduct of free elections in these nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. Res. 76. Resolution creating a Select Committee on Consumer Interests; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 77. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to conduct studies and investigations and make inquiries relating to housing; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H. Res. 78. Resolution creating a standing Committee on Small Business in the

House of Representatives, with authority to report germane amendments to the Small Business Act and the Small Business Investment Act of 1958; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 79. Resolution to amend clause 4 of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives relating to the Committee on Banking and Currency; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXI, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AYRES:

H.R. 1596. A bill for the relief of Vasiliki Manolis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.R. 1597. A bill for the relief of Antonia Romano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1598. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Anna Benes-Szoverffy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYS:

H.R. 1599. A bill for the relief of Sister Rosalba (Maria Putrino) and Sister Ernestine (Giuseppe Vitello); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

H.R. 1600. A bill for the relief of Lt. Liu Ching Chiu, his spouse, and minor child; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1601. A bill for the relief of Kevork Agopoglu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1602. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Zorka Boskov; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1603. A bill for the relief of George Sakellariou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1604. A bill for the relief of Dung How Yee and Kai Suey Yee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1605. A bill for the relief of Miss Esther Robbins; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1606. A bill for the relief of Maria Giuriani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1607. A bill for the relief of Felippo and Giuseppa Raccuglia and minor children, Antonino and Tommaso Raccuglia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1608. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ourania Thomareis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1609. A bill for the relief of Mrs. An Fu Wang Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LAIRD:

H.R. 1610. A bill for the relief of Tadao Nagashima; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MacGREGOR:

H.R. 1611. A bill for the relief of Laura G. Carbonell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts:

H.R. 1612. A bill for the relief of Jose Clemente Pedro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1613. A bill for the relief of Jacinto Aguiar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1614. A bill for the relief of Messias Vicente de Arruda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1615. A bill for the relief of Mr. Eng Shang Lee (Mah) and Mrs. Lee So Har (Mah); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1616. A bill for the relief of Carlos Pavao Alves; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1617. A bill for the relief of Dimas Pereira Tavares; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1618. A bill for the relief of Jose Tavares de Sousa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1619. A bill for the relief of Marianna V. Aguiar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1620. A bill for the relief of Emilio S. Binavince; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1621. A bill for the relief of Maria da Conceicao Macedo da Estrella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1622. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Stamatina Sideris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN:

H.R. 1623. A bill for the relief of Fausto Zarrelli and Immacolata Zarrelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1624. A bill for the relief of Sister Elvira Nacchia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1625. A bill for the relief of Gaetano Messina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1626. A bill for the relief of Antonio Fogliano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1627. A bill for the relief of Esterina Ricupero; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H.R. 1628. A bill for the relief of Dr. Catalina Lee Huang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 1629. A bill for the relief of Rocco di Rienzo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1630. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Paolini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 1631. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Efronia Tossounian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1632. A bill for the relief of Ita Gordon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1633. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Anna Diana Tsezana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1634. A bill for the relief of Eladio Montferrer-Gil and Inocencia Juan Esteller de Montferrer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1635. A bill for the relief of Miss Erna Albu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1636. A bill for the relief of Fakhr Motardjem Aalam; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1637. A bill for the relief of Ofelia Gamba; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1638. A bill for the relief of Uichi Kayahara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1639. A bill for the relief of Dr. Philip Green; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1640. A bill for the relief of Istvan Kelemen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1641. A bill for the relief of Henry and Roxane Mansoor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1642. A bill for the relief of Maurice Schriqui; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H.R. 1643. A bill for the relief of Constantine George Xidaris and his wife, Ismini Xidaris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1644. A bill for the relief of 1st Lt. Robert B. Gann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Independence Day of Cameroon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 5, 1965

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on January 1, the Federal Republic of Cameroon celebrated the fifth anniversary of her independence. Since the 89th Congress had not yet convened, I am taking this opportunity, belatedly, to extend warm felicitations on this occasion to His Excellency Ahmadou Ahidjo, the President of Cameroon; and to His Excellency Jacques Kuoh Moukouri, the Cameroon Ambassador to the United States.

Cameroonian Independence Day falls on January 1, for on that day 5 years ago most of the 4 million Cameroonians proclaimed their independence and established the Cameroon Republic. But the birth of the Federal Republic of Cameroon and the complete independence for all Cameroonians did not take place until the union of Southern Cameroon with the Cameroon Republic on October 1, 1961. Since the earlier date, that is, since January 1, 1960, however, Cameroonians have been masters of their fate in their fertile, sunny land, and enjoying the blessings of freedom.

From the time of its birth the Federal Republic of Cameroon has had its problems and difficulties, but happily we can say that at least some of these have been solved and others are being dealt with in a peaceful and orderly manner among contending groups. Some of these seemingly difficult problems were solved because Cameroonians were fortunate in having intelligent, educated, and dedicated leaders. In the difficult and delicate task of bringing about the union of British Southern Cameroons with the Cameroon Republic the part played by Ahmadou Ahidjo, the patient and skillful President of the Federal Republic, proved of supreme importance. Nor was his role in establishing a federal government based on democratic principles is less praiseworthy. The draft Constitution of the country, providing for a strong president and a National Federal Assembly was probably his brain child, though he did not give the appearance that his views on such important matters should prevail. However, his sound and practical advice was taken, and fortunately proved both workable and wise.

As the result of such a well-suited constitution, and also because of their willingness to seek counsels among their experienced and matured leaders, the Federated Republic of Cameroon has become one of the most stable of the new African countries. Its economic recovery has been steady and quite rapid. The Government has constantly pursued a policy of assisting the development of agriculture. The production of cocoa, Cameroon's chief cash-earning crop, has been increased while the expansion of coffee plantations has been encouraged.

On the international political scene Cameroon's status is high. It holds a central position in the French-speaking Union of African and Malagasy States, and with the formation of the Organization of African Unity, Cameroon has become a stanch supporter of continentwide cooperation. Cameroon's relations with the United States have been on the best of terms. We have extended bilateral assistance, as well as multilateral aid through the United Nations and the European Economic Community. In all this the sole aim of this great Republic has been to help in the growth and strengthening of the Federated Republic of Cameroon as a steadying force in the turbulent African Continent.

On the fifth anniversary of their independence day I wish Cameroonians peace and prosperity.

Representative Philip J. Philbin Nominates Speaker John W. McCormack

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 5, 1965

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday, January 2, 1965, in the House Democratic caucus held here, it was the privilege of the Members on this side to hear the distinguished gentleman from the Third Massachusetts Congressional District [Mr. Philbin] deliver one of the most eloquent addresses and tributes ever uttered on such occasion when he nominated for the continuing speakership of this House, our beloved and revered colleague from Massachusetts, the Honorable John W. McCormack. Of course, the nomination was unanimously approved and yesterday we wisely and formally reelected Speaker McCormack.

All of us agree with and share in the sentiments so ably expressed by the gentleman from Massachusetts, Congressman Philbin, as he summarized the tremendous public service record of our great Speaker and reviewed the remarkable talents of his brilliant mind and courageous heart, which have endeared him to all who have ever served with him and which assure that the name of Speaker McCormack will be forever an inspiring byword in the legislative history of this Nation.

A great many Members, on both sides of the aisle here asked me to intercede with my very dear and esteemed friend and colleague from the Third Massachusetts District for the purpose of having his eloquent address included in the permanent Record. He graciously consented to permit me to introduce it into the Record and Congressman Philbin's nomination speech follows:

CONGRESSMAN PHILIP J. PHILBIN'S SPEECH NOMINATING SPEAKER MCCORMACK

Mr. Chairman and members of the caucus, the great man, whom I have the honor, privilege, and pleasure of nominating today surely needs no encomium. The gleaming record of brilliant, outstanding service and achievement, which he has made in a lifetime of devoted, distinguished contributions to the well-being and advancement of the Nation and the world, is too well known and too widely acknowledged to require either comment or elucidation.

This man is indeed cast in an heroic mold, blessed by the Creator with great abilities and talents, tested in the crucible of long experience, deeply dedicated to mankind, to justice and the rule of law, rich in all those attributes of humaneness and sympathetic understanding that make for lofty service to the people.

The greatness, the goodness, the lovable qualities, the zeal for great accomplishment, the work and achievements of this man are manifest to all Members of the House, to the Nation, to the world.

A man of humble beginnings and humble spirit, and profound religious faith, this illustrious son of Massachusetts is hailed on every side and every quarter of this country and the world. His impressive dignity, impartiality, fairness, sagacity, loyalty, and the outstanding distinction with which he has conducted the affairs of this House are widely recognized and appreciated.

He will go down in history as one of our greatest Speakers. His keen insight into every facet of the work of Congress and the Government, his superb knowledge of the great public questions with which the Congress is required to deal, his tact, his diplomacy, his skill, his invariable cooperation, his innate humaneness, his high aspirations, his progressive political philosophy, and his strong, vibrant, inspiring leadership have left a permanent imprint upon this body and upon the course of history.

The notable success which he has achieved in leading the House in these critical times has won for him the greatest respect, highest admiration, widest acclaim and deepest gratitude.

How fortunate we are in these uneasy days to have such a richly experienced, warmhearted, forward-looking and effective leader at the helm, guiding the affairs of this great, deliberative body with wisdom and sound judgments toward the cherished goals, which the American people and this Nation have set, to bring our ship of state through uncertainties and challenges of the hour into the calmer waters of peace, human betterment, and progress for our land and for the nations and peoples of the earth.

This dear colleague truly touches our hearts. He inspires our confidence.

And together with his gracious, charming wife, an inspiration and partner in his life and career, he holds our deepest affection.

For my esteemed colleagues of the Massachusetts delegation, and for myself, I am very proud and greatly pleased and honored to place in nomination in the Democratic caucus for Speaker of the House, the name of a very great American, a courageous leader, our beloved, distinguished Speaker and friend, the Honorable John W. McCormack.

Independence Day of the Sudan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 5, 1965

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on January 1, the Republic of the Sudan celebrated the ninth anniversary of her independence. Since the 89th Congress had not yet convened, I am taking this opportunity, belatedly, to extend warm felicitations to His Excellency Sir al-Khatim al-Khalifa, the Prime Minister; and to Togeldin Mohamed Eltahir, the Chargé ad Interim of the Sudanese Ambassador to the United States.

In 1956 the Sudanese people proclaimed their independence, became masters of their own fate, and constituted a new sovereign state. Since then these some 10 million vigorous Sudanese have proved themselves worthy of the freedom they acquired, and today they are struggling hard to hold an enviable place for themselves in the family of free and independent nations.

Sudan, with its nearly 1 million square miles of territory, is one of the important and commercially strategic places in the whole African Continent. It is the natural bridge between the Middle East and Africa. Situated to the south of the United Arab Republic and separated from the Arabian Peninsula by the Red Sea, the northern part of the country is peopled by seminomadic negroid tribes. This part of the country is joined to the south by the lifegiving Nile, whose waters cultivate Sudan's most staple crop, cotton. Financially and economically Sudan has done well since its independence; actually startling gains have been made in the economic sphere, mostly because of the increase in the production of cotton. The country's irrigation system has been improved. A good indication of the soundness of the economy is indicated by the fact that the country has been able to meet its important needs through export earnings and regularly return a surplus to the national budget with which to finance a large portion of its development plans. The 10-year development plan which went into effect in 1961 envisions an annual growth rate of more than 5 percent.

On the political front the Sudanese have done well to keep clear of the troubles involving many other developing nations in Africa. Relatively speaking their Government has been fairly stable, and their leaders have been on the alert to maintain a degree of stability.

On the ninth anniversary of their independence day one can only hope that this involvement will not endanger Sudanese independence, and that they will continue to work for their salvation in peace and prosperity.

President Johnson's State of the Union Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 5, 1965

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's state of the Union address last night was a very constructive and forward-looking program as befits our Nation in the tasks facing it in the years ahead. It is a blueprint for action to maintain America strong and secure, to promote peace in the world and economic prosperity at home.

I believe that the 89th Congress will enact most, if not all, of the President's program outlined in his state of the Union address. His observation that the state of the Union is "free and restless, growing and full of hope" is so very true of present-day America and should serve as a source of inspiration and encouragement to our people.

The President's address marks the beginning of what we all hope will prove to be a highly successful program in the interests of our Nation and the world. I was deeply impressed with his presentation. He has again shown that he is a most capable leader and a man who has a profound understanding of the Nation's problems. His confident mood, his determination, and his leadership ability should prove most reassuring to the American people in these crucial times.

Independence Day of Burma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 5, 1965

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, Burma celebrated the 17th anniversary of her independence, and I wish to take this opportunity to extend warm felicitations to His Excellency Gen. Ne Win and the Burmese Ambassador to the United States, His Excellency On Sein.

The Union of Burma came into existence on January 4, 1948, and from that day on the Burmese have enjoyed their own sovereign and independent state. Thus they have been in the community of free and sovereign states for 16 years, and during that relatively short time they have given a creditable account of themselves on many fronts. In the difficult art of government their leaders have been very careful and cautious, and they have jealously guarded, until very recently, the republican form of government set up by a liberal constitution. That constitution provided for a president, a cabinet and a parliament. For more than a decade the constitution served the purpose of the state well. Since 1958, however, there have been disturbances which have upset the uneasy balance maintained by rival factions. From that year on one person has dominated the politics of the country. On October 29 of that year Gen. Ne Win took over the government. In the subsequent elections he lost out, but then he managed to come to the top again, and since 1962 he has governed Burma through his own revolutionary council under his personal chairmanship.

Gen. Ne Win's aim of establishing a socialist state is being realized by the nationalization of numerous industrial establishments, banking, rice trade, mining, and some manufacturing industries. Agricultural yields of rice, millet and cotton have been on the increase. Exports of milled rice and raw rubber, as well as raw cotton have also increased, thus easing financial strains on Burma's supply of hard currency. With its strategic geographic postion, and with its 22 million population, Burma is destined to play an important role in the affairs of southeast Asia. On the 17th anniversary of their independence day we wish them peace and prosperity in this important role.

Here Is Opportunity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 5, 1965

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial written by Hon. Ellie Hopkins, which appeared January 1, 1965, in the 30th east Texas industrial progress edition of the Longview Daily News, Longview, Tex., along with a reproduction of a letter written to Publisher Carl Estes by President Johnson. The editorial is most timely and the letter written by President Johnson is one which is fully deserved by Publisher Carl Estes:

HERE IS OPPORTUNITY

Industrialists, investors, and businessmen looking for opportunity in 1965 are invited to research the 538 pages of this industrial progress edition. It is an illustrated record of progress that depicts the great potential of the Nation's most inviting new industrial region, the ideally located and weather-conditioned Sabine-Cypress inland empire.

A careful check through the sections of this newspaper will reveal the picture of a well-watered and resources-rich region in which more than a hundred cities and towns are working individually and cooperatively to expand their public facilities, improve their advantages for happy living, and display their readiness for new industrial and commercial development.

The emergence of the Sabine-Cypress region as a new industral center of national note has come about in two distinct but related stages—both of which have been widely publicized through this annual industrial edition, itself a unique venture in journalism.

The first stage of major development started several years ago in the upper watershed of the Sabine, accompanying and following the building of Lake Cherokee at Longview, Lake Tawakoni at Iron Bridge, and several other reservoirs; and the beautiful Lake O' The Pines and earlier reservoirs on the Cypress watershed north of Longview.

The second stage of development has just begun with construction about completed on the large Sam Rayburn Reservoir on the Angelina River and now underway on the gigantic Toledo Bend Reservoir and hydroelectric project on the middle Sabine River southeast of Longview in southern east Texas and southwest Louisiana.

Just as the northern part of east Texas already has experienced an infusion of new industry and continues to record expansion and growth due to earlier major water conservation projects and community improvement programs, so is southern east Texas and southwest Louisiana now assured of a new era of industrial and commercial expansion with nearing completion of large water conservation projects and community improvement programs.

Longview, centrally located and the chief industrial and commercial city in this vast Sabine-Cypress inland empire, has made truly remarkable progress from an early start. Today, Longview's several large industrial districts are graced by plants of some of the best known blue chip industries in the world, many of which have major expansions underway.

Indicative of this city's industrial and commercial progress in 1964 is the fact that in the first 10 months Longview was first in Texas in rate of increase in total construction permits with a gain of 385 percent over the like 1963 period; first in Texas in rate of increase in nonresidential permits with a gain of 1,216 percent; and third among Texas cities in dollar volume of nonresidential permits, being exceeded only by Houston and Dallas.

Industrial and commercial progress in east Texas by no means has been confined to Longview. It is most encouraging to note what is happening all over east Texas. The list of new industries carried elsewhere in this edition includes plants in such perimeter cities as Texarkana, Paris, Greenville, Corsicana, Lufkin, Keltys, Center, and Marshall—with new plants or expansion projects in dozens of east Texas communities from the Red River to the Gulf of Mexico.

The rapidly developing east Texas region centering around Longview is one of the principal reasons why Texas ranks right at the top among the States in industrial growth as measured by numbers of new plants. Industry is learning that here we have an unusual concentration of the major factors of first importance to manufacturing and marketing.

Probably nowhere else in America today is found such a concentration of industrial advantages and materials—central location with reference to population, especially as projected in upcoming growth patterns; all major methods of transportation, so important in rapid and economical distribution; plenty of trained and adaptable manpower, noted for giving a day's work for a day's pay; ample electric power now and for the future at favorable rates; unlimited fuel supplies of oil, natural gas, and liquid petroleum products; the greatest available and unpledged supply of fresh water left in America; rich commercial deposits of iron ore, salt, sulfur, and other minerals; small cities and attractive communities were citizen pride and purpose assure the best in educational, cultural, religious, and recreational facilities of good living.

Industry looking for opportunity here will find ready help from banks and chambers of commerce throughout east Texas, industrial departments of utility firms and railroads, industrial districts in Longview and several other cities, or from such well organized groups as the Northeast Texas Industrial Development Council, Greater Cypress River Industrial Commission, Sabine River Authorities of Texas and Louisiana and local development councils in the Toledo Bend Reservoir and Sam Rayburn areas.

Major development projects now under way or projected for this east Texas region—such as Interstate 20 and Interstate 30, Toledo Bend, new dam on Caddo Lake, new reservoirs on the upper Sulphur River and other streams, airport improvements, and community industrial projects—now assure the present and future industrialization and progress of the Sabine-Cypress empire. Here is opportunity, ready and waiting. We invite all who may be interested to come and see for themselves.

ELLIE HOPKINS,
Editor in Chief.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, December 24, 1964.
Mr. CARL L. ESTES,
Publisher, The Longview News & Journal, Longview, Tex.

DEAR CARL: I am delighted to join your many friends as they pay tribute to you on your 30th anniversary as owner-publisher of Longview News & Journal and to extend to you my warmest greetings and good wishes on this happy occasion.

Under your responsible guidance the Longview News Co. has provided the people of your area with most effective and reliable news reporting and interpretation. You have brought honor and distinction to American journalism and your fine record of achievement stands as an inspiring example to your staff as well as to all the members of our Nation's press.

I wish you abundant happiness and continued success in the years ahead, as you endeavor to sustain the high traditions of your past.

Sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

George Washington Carver: A Tribute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 5, 1965

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, Tuesday, January 5, was George Washington Carver Day, a day which commemorated the passing 22 years ago of one of America's greatest scientists, most unusual teachers, and most unselfish contributors to the welfare of our people. It is with pride in an eminent fellow American and with gratefulness for his inspiring example that I rise to pay him tribute.

By the time of his death George Washington Carver, the son of Negro slaves, had gained international renown for his work in the field of agricultural research. He was unexcelled as an agricultural chemist, and he, probably more than any other single human being, had enabled the South to lift itself from despair and poverty by overcoming the destructive tyranny of a one-crop policy.

Born in Missouri about 1864, he was kidnaped as a baby and redeemed by a master in exchange for a $300 racehorse. By the age of 10 his master, recognizing the boy's intelligence, permitted him to leave in search of schooling and the youth set out penniless to acquire an education.

He worked his way through grade school in four nearby towns, through high school in Minneapolis, Kans., and for 3 years attended Simpson College in Iowa. Then, at the age of 32, in 1896, his years of struggle and patience won him a master of science degree from Iowa State College at Ames.

It is to the great credit of these schools that they did not make race or color the basis for entrance, for in extending education to young Carver they helped to mold one of America's most remarkable figures.

Dr. Carver was a modest man. I suggest that he would want us to use his life as an example of what this world might be like if there were equality of education for all citizens.

He became more than a good agricultural chemist. He became a superlative botanist, a teacher of great stature, an extraordinary inventor, a profound scientist, an unexcelled pioneer in the application of chemistry to industry, and an unselfish, devoted humanitarian. When he said these words, he genuinely and humbly felt them:

> There is goodness in everything * * *. I am only a trailblazer for those who come after me.

This trail that Dr. Carver was to blaze led him first to become director of the department of agricultural research for the Tuskegee Institute at the request of Booker T. Washington. It was here in a poorly equipped laboratory that he began the astonishing series of creative experiments that brought him fame.

Recognizing the soil-exhausting effects of cotton, Dr. Carver began preaching crop rotation to the depressed Alabama farmers. In his soft, shy manner, he urged them to alternate with soil-enriching crops such as peanuts and sweetpotatoes. As the South slowly heeded his advice, he worked endlessly in search of new uses for the products that were soon to become surplus foodstuffs.

In his laboratory he developed some 300 synethic products from peanuts, including milk, butter, cheese, coffee, flour, breakfast food, ink, dyes, soap, wood stains, and insulating board. His efforts lifted the peanut industry from a lowly state to a multimillion dollar yearly business.

From the sweetpotato he developed 118 products, such as tapioca, starch, vinegar, molasses, library paste, and rubber. He used pecan nuts, soybeans, cotton, cowpeas, and wild plums to produce valuable new products. He made synthetic marble from wood shavings; dye pigments from Alabama clays; mats and carpets from okra fiber; and fertilizers from the muck of swamps.

His output was phenomenal and he might easily have become a millionaire. But Dr. Carver steadfastly refused to exploit his discoveries, gifts he felt to be from God. His discoveries became the world's property, and to him, as to all great teachers, the reward lay in the thrill of expanding man's horizon. He put it very simply:

> Whatever helps the southern farmer helps the entire South. And what helps the South helps everybody.

Dr. Carver's was a natural humility. He considered his abundant talents to be a sacred trust. The harshness of his early life did not embitter him nor did the honors of his later life make him arrogant or proud.

In 1953, his birthplace in Missouri became a national monument. A bronze bust immortalizes the man who, born a slave, became a scientist, a pioneer, and a benefactor of his country. It is proper that we remember him, and we do so in gratitude.

Independence Day of Western Samoa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 5, 1965

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on January 1, Western Samoa celebrated the third anniversary of her independence. The House was not in session on this date, so we are taking this opportunity, belatedly, to extend warm felicitations to congratulate the Head of State Chief Malietoa Tanumafili II, Prime Minister Fiame Mata'afa Faumina, and the people of Western Samoa.

West Samoans were the first of the Polynesian islanders in the South Pacific to attain their freedom and establish their own sovereign state. This was done only 3 years ago, but these dauntless islanders had to struggle long before they could attain their cherished goal.

Western Samoa, comprising the two large islands of Savai'i and Opolu with a galaxy of other small islands, have a combined area about 1,200 square miles and their population totals no more than 150,000. These islands were seized by Germany in 1900, and the islanders endured Germany's stern protectorate for some 18 years. At the end of the First World War Western Samoa was assigned to New Zealand under a League of Nations mandate, and at the end of the last war New Zealand's administration was confirmed by a United Nations trusteeship agreement. In May 1961 a plebiscite was held under the supervision of the United Nations which resulted, by an overwhelming majority, for independence as from January 1, 1962. In October 1961, the General Assembly terminated the trusteeship agreement by a resolution, and since January 1, 1962, Western Samoa has become an independent sovereign state.

The Government of Western Samoa is essentially republican in form, with some qualifications. The constitution provides for a head of state in whom is vested all executive power. He appoints the Prime Minister, and in consultation with him, also appoints eight other ministers who form the Cabinet. There is a legislative assembly of 47 members, elected for 3-year terms. In April of 1963 when the incumbent head of state died, he was succeeded by Malietoa Tanumafili as head of state for life. Future heads of state will be elected by the legislative assembly for 5-year terms.

West Samoans have had considerable tutelage in government and had developed a certain amount of sense of public service. Partly because of this, and partly due to the benevolent attitude of its former mandatory power, the Government of New Zealand, Western Samoa possesses a stable and effective government. Today the government of that Commonwealth country is providing about $250,000 annually toward educational development in the islands, and has been equally generous in providing

$125,000 annually toward strengthening the administrative machinery of the government there. Western Samoans are working hard to make themselves worthy of such aid, as they are striving for effective membership in the world community. On the third anniversary of their independence day we wish them full success in all their endeavors.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1965

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, offered the following prayer:

Acts of the Apostles 21:14: *The will of the Lord be done.*

O Thou God of all greatness and goodness we are again uniting our souls in the fellowship of prayer, seeking together those needed blessings which none can ever find or enjoy alone.

We pray that our minds and hearts may be brought under the discipline and domination of Thy divine spirit to gain the secret of the Master's faith and fortitude.

Thou hast committed unto us a vast amount of self-will which we cannot measure or know how to rightly use, but help us to understand that our wills are ours to make them Thine.

Hear us in His name who exclaimed in those final hours of greatest triumph, "Not My will but Thine be done." Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, informed the House that the President pro tempore, pursuant to Senate Concurrent Resolution 1, agreed to on January 4, had appointed Mr. Jordan of North Carolina and Mr. Curtis as tellers on the part of the Senate to count the electoral vote for President and Vice President of the United States on January 6, 1965.

NATIONAL ECONOMIC CONVERSION AND DIVERSIFICATION COMMISSION

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, as the new Congress opens, we must face the pressing problem of converting a defense-oriented economy to peacetime purposes. This issue was focused sharply by the Secretary of Defense's announcement of the closing of certain military installations, including the Brooklyn Navy Yard. The Government was totally unprepared with plans for converting these facilities.

The economic displacement and dislocation caused by the closing of these installations is not the end but the beginning of the problem.

Under President Johnson, the defense budget was cut $1 billion last year, and further reductions are expected. Former Deputy Secretary of Defense Gilpatric has suggested that the defense budget can be reduced by 25 percent by 1970.

As the nature of defense needs change and as we seek disarmament under effective international control, there must be advance planning and a forward-looking program for conversion of activities and resources from defense to constructive peacetime goals.

Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill, which will also be introduced in the other body by Senator George McGovern, to create a National Economic Conversion and Diversification Commission to study these problems and report to the President and the Congress. I sponsored similar legislation in the 88th Congress.

The Commission would include the Secretaries of Commerce, Defense, Labor, Treasury, and Health, Education, and Welfare, as well as the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the Director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, and the Administrators of the General Services Administration and the Small Business Administration.

The Commission would institute studies to help to determine appropriate policies and programs to be carried out by the departments and agencies of the Federal Government in order to facilitate economic conversion and diversification. It would also encourage industries to explore methods of better meeting public needs in such areas as school construction, health facilities, transportation, and pollution abatement.

A National Conference on Industrial Conversion and Growth would be convened and consultations would be carried on with the State Governors to encourage appropriate studies and conferences at the State, local, and regional level, in support of a coordinated effort to improve the Nation's economic conversion and diversification capability.

Mr. Speaker, I hope hearings will be held on this measure as soon as possible.

THE ROAD TO THE WHITE HOUSE

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, preceding the national presidential campaigns and ending 1 week after the election on November 4, 1964, the public affairs department of WNBC–TV programed a series of 20 half-hour shows called "The Road to the White House." It was designed as part of WNBC–TV's continuing series, "Education Exchange."

The purpose of "The Road to the White House" was to impart a better understanding of present-day political campaigns and campaigners through a deft analysis of significant elections from America's past and to follow through with the elections of 1964 with an analysis of the outcome.

The programs of national interest were conducted by members of Columbia University's excellent history and government facilities. Host for the series was William Wood, dean of the Columbia School of Journalism.

Elements as you will see from the enclosed scripts showed graphically how our presidential election system has been evolved, brought back some bizarre political figures and little known historical incidents. But perhaps the uniqueness of the series lay in its classic probing of the whys and wherefores of the choices the voters have made in the 175 years since the adoption of the Constitution. The nuances of issues, the effect of personality, the development of the political campaign, the selection and election of Vice Presidents, the effects of an elected Congress on the presidential election—all of these factors were discussed.

Appropriately, the series closed with a clear-eyed view of the campaign and the Johnson victory of 1964.

I would also like to point out that as a part of the "Education Exchange" series, "The Road to the White House" has been shown in its entirety on NBC-owned stations in Los Angeles and Chicago, is currently being viewed in Washington and is scheduled to start in Philadelphia on January 19, 1965. On January 3 the series will start again in New York, Sundays at 2 p.m. until June 17 at which date it will switch time periods and remain at 10:30 a.m.

This 20-program series represents a one-of-its-kind effort to focus attention on campaigns and politics which remain virtually unwritten in American history.

I am including the format of "Road to the White House" and compliment the authors and this program on their contribution to a greater political understanding on the part of the American people.

Road to the White House

1. GEORGE WASHINGTON

How the shape of the U.S. Constitution was influenced by the confidence of its framers that George Washington would be chosen as our first Chief Executive. The triumphal journey to New York and the first inaugural.

2. THOMAS JEFFERSON

His election marked the first time the American electorate voted in a two-party election. There was a tie vote, and the country almost had Aaron Burr for President.

3. JOHN QUINCY ADAMS

In a wide-open race, Adams, perhaps the best qualified President ever elected, edged out Andrew Jackson. He had fewer popular votes and fewer electoral votes than his opponent. The matter was settled in the House of Representatives, and Jackson's backers accuse Adams of indulging in a "corrupt bargain."

4. ANDREW JACKSON

Jackson fights for a second term in 1832 against Henry Clay's National Republic and attempts to dethrone "King Andrew."

5. CHOICE OF A CABINET

How a vital part of our executive branch began, how it grew, and the part it has played through our history and today.

6. WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON

A military hero with few qualifications for the office wins over incumbent Martin Van Buren. Historically significant chiefly for Harrison's early death which made John Tyler our first "accidental" President.

7. CHOICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT

The history of the No. 2 office in the land. Showing how often nonentities have served despite the eight times since 1840 that Vice Presidents have succeeded to the Presidency by death. Something about the presidential succession system.

8. ABRAHAM LINCOLN

The dramatic election of 1860 against the background of a divided nation, and the voters decision which made secession and war inevitable.

9. RUTHERFORD B. HAYES

He won the election with less votes than his opponent—Tilden. Behind the scenes skullduggery marked the final choice of Hayes, but it may have been a good thing for the country it came out the way it did.

10. WILLIAM M'KINLEY

A nation seeking to forget its cares rejected William Jennings Bryan for a conservative, McKinley, who campaigned on his front porch. On his death, the country got Teddy Roosevelt, quite a different man in the White House.

11. WOODROW WILSON

The college professor, thought safely conservative, double-crosses the bosses, runs as a liberal, and makes the White House when Taft and T.R. split the Republican vote.

12. PRIME MINISTERS AND PRESIDENTS

Lindsay Rogers explains the principal differences between ours and Britain's parliamentary democracy, method of elections, method of choosing the Chief Executive.

13. WARREN HARDING

Again the voters go for a ticket they feel will bring an era of quiet and noninterference in affairs by the Government. Harding is not the perpetrator but the victim of a scandal-ridden administration.

14. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT, 1932

The depression moves the electorate sharply away from the incumbent administration, and F.D.R. wins big and meets the challenge at a grave moment in U.S. history.

15. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT, 1940

The battle for a third term. How and why F.D.R. won it, and the aftermath—war.

16. THE DEFEATED CANDIDATES

Why did they lose? What if they had won? What happened to them afterwards? A particular phenomenon of the American presidential system.

17. HARRY S. TRUMAN

Who balked the pollsters and surprised the country by winning in 1948. He knew the voters better than his opponents and better than some of his friends. The story of his second term.

18. THE PRESIDENT AND CONGRESS

Complementary and conflicting factors in the relationship between presidential and congressional elections. Effects on the voter. Effects the voter can bring by splitting his ticket.

19. JOHN F. KENNEDY

The closest election battle in our history. The Kennedy style and method for victory. The "youth movement" in Washington.

20. THE ELECTION OF 1964

The outcome and analysis of the presidential campaign culminating on November 3, 1964.

END AID TO UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a resolution today calling on the administration to suspend aid to the United Arab Republic in view of that Government's anti-United States policy in the Congo and elsewhere in the Near East.

Amendments were added to the Foreign Aid Authorization Act of 1963 and to the bill extending Public Law 480 in 1964 forbidding the distribution of aid and surplus foods to countries which are preparing for aggression against the United States or against other governments which receive assistance from us.

At the time of passage of the foregoing legislation there was left with the President the discretion in the determination of the aggressor. The legislative record shows very clearly that both in 1963 and 1964 Congress was convinced that Egypt is an aggressor. Congress has twice signified to the executive branch that it favors discontinuation of aid because of Egypt's aggressive posture and activity.

Now in recent weeks there has been new evidence that Egypt is an open foe of American policy. It boasts of its aggressive policy in the Congo, where it is supporting elements which are in revolt against the legal government of that unhappy country. In view of these developments and in view of President Nasser's derisive attacks on American aid, self-respect requires the President to make the kind of determination envisaged by Congress. The President should conclude that Egypt is an aggressor and no longer entitled to our assistance. Because I believe that this is the consensus in Congress, I have introduced a resolution to that effect.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARBSTEIN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN] for introducing this legislation.

Throughout my service in the Congress I have urged a strong stand concerning aid to Nasser. Time and again on the floor of the House and in communications to the Secretary of State and the President, I have pointed out that Nasser is preparing for aggression against the democracy of Israel and that our foreign aid program allows him to allocate his resources for the dangerous arms race in which he is engaged. Although there never has been any doubt that Nasser is not a friend of the United States, recently he made his position crystal clear. Nasser accused the U.S. Ambassador of using economic pressure and told the Egyptian people that anyone disagreeing with his anti-U.S. attitude "can drink from the sea."

Mr. Speaker, yesterday I wrote to the Secretary of State once again urging that we end foreign aid to Egypt. I pointed out to the Secretary that Nasser is in violation of the Foreign Assistance Act which provides that aid should be terminated to any nation which "is engaging in or preparing for aggressive military efforts directed against any country receiving assistance under this act or any other act." He is also in violation of Public Law 480 as we amended it on the floor of the House last year.

The aggressor nation clauses must be implemented. As one who has fought against continuing aid to Nasser, I feel we must adopt this policy.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. I thank the gentleman.

TO FIX THE DATES FOR TRANSMITTING THE BUDGET AND THE ECONOMIC REPORT DURING THE MONTH OF JANUARY 1965

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Joint Resolution 123 to fix the dates for transmitting the budget and the economic report during the month of January 1965.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the majority leader whether this has been done before and to ask the gentleman the purpose of this resolution.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. It is my understanding that this was done during one of the administrations of President Eisenhower.

It represents only a delay of a maximum of 10 days. Of course, the inauguration comes just after the 15th, and it is my understanding that this would be a great convenience for all concerned, if it could be done.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. RES. 123

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress asembled, That (a) notwithstanding the provisions of section 201 of the Act of June 10, 1922, as amended (31 U.S.C. 11), the President shall transmit to the Congress not later than January 25, 1965, the budget for the fiscal year 1966, and (b) notwithstanding the provisions of section 3 of the Act of February 20, 1946, as amended (15 U.S.C. 1022), the President shall transmit to the Congress not later than January 28, 1965, the Economic Report.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

IMPROVEMENT OF OUR SOCIAL SECURITY SYSTEM

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, the President, in his state of the Union message on Monday, urged improvement of our social security system. I agree with him wholeheartedly. We must humanize and further liberalize our social security system so that our aging American workers can look forward to security, dignity, and self-respect in later years.

Today, I have reintroduced my bill to provide full benefits under social security to men at age 60 and to women at age 55.

I feel strongly that it would be a wise move to make social security benefits available to men at 60 and women at 55. Not only is such a move warranted by considerations of allowing our senior citizens to commence their leisure years at an earlier date, but it is suggested by technological evolution.

If we lower the retirement age, we will create new job opportunities for younger workers, decrease the hardships of unemployment for older workers and modernize our system and its vital protection in a very important way. It is becoming clear that technological evolution is reducing the number of hours a day that the average worker must work so that the total work force may meet society's needs. Why should not the number of years be decreased as well, so that our workers may retire at an earlier age, to reap the fruits of their past labors? I strongly urge the Congress to make this possible.

THE LATE HONORABLE GEORGE ARTHUR PADDOCK

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker on Tuesday, December 29, 1964, I received a telephone call from my close friend and valued constituent, George Paddock, Jr., informing me of the passing, in Evanston, Ill., of a dedicated servant of his country and his party, former Congressman George Arthur Paddock, who served in this body as Representative from the then 10th District of Illinois in the 77th Congress. George Paddock gave more than 25 years of his life actively to the Republican cause and to the cause of good government at all levels.

I extend to his family our warm sympathy and deep understanding at this difficult time. It is a privilege for me to know the Paddock family, and it is heartening to note that the tradition of George Paddock, Sr., lives on in his son, George Paddock, Jr.

I know that many Members who served with Mr. Paddock join me in expressing gratitude for his service to our country and deepest sympathy to his family.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to participate in this tribute to the late George A. Paddock who served as a Member of the 77th Congress representing the old 10th District of Illinois which included Lake County, the county where I reside and which is now part of the new 12th District of Illinois.

George Paddock was a citizen of the type which we need in increasing numbers in the political and public life of the Nation.

George Paddock's private and business life was marked with outstanding success. He was respected for the intelligent management of his business affairs, for his studious attitudes on all subjects with which he dealt and his faithful attention to the interests of his clients, customers, and constituents as a lawyer, investment banker, and public servant.

I knew George Paddock particularly during his years of service in the 77th Congress; and I might add that the citizens of Lake County were proud of his devoted and capable representation of our interests at that time.

It is entirely appropriate that we pause at this hour in the House of Representatives to pay respect to one who formerly served in this Chamber; particularly one who possessed such high qualities of citizenship and such fine attributes of statesmanship as did George A. Paddock.

On behalf of the citizens of Lake County, as well as on my own behalf, I extend sympathy and condolences to the members of his family.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay my respects to a great American and a former Member of this great body, the late George Arthur Paddock.

Representative Paddock loved the House of Representatives and he served it faithfully and protected its traditions. He heard when his country called, and knew how to respond.

George Paddock will live long in the memory and affection of not only those who had the privilege of serving with him in the House of Representatives, but also in the affection of those who benefit from the great works he did in the Halls of Congress.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable George Arthur Paddock served with honor and distinction as the Representative of the 10th Congressional District of Illinois in the 77th Congress. I was grieved to learn of his passing and join with my colleagues in tribute to his memory and deep sympathy to his family.

Mr. Paddock was born in Winnetka, Ill., March 24, 1885, was graduated from Chicago Manual Training School in 1902 and later from the University of Virginia. He was admitted to the bar in 1907 and commenced practice in Chicago.

In 1916 he attended the Plattsburg Training Camp and in 1917 the Officers Training Camp at Fort Sheridan, serving during World War I as captain and later as major of the 342d Infantry, 86th Division.

A lawyer and investment banker, he was a prominent leader in the Republican Party, a delegate to the Republican State Convention in 1936, and treasurer of the Cook County Republican Central Committee in 1938–42. He was elected as a Republican to the 77th Congress. He was a man of high principle and was held in warm esteem by his friends and associates and by the community and the broad circles of his interests.

Mr. Speaker, it has been 22 years this month since Congressman Paddock completed his service in this Chamber, but he is still remembered with affection and appreciation.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may have 2 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the late George Arthur Paddock.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

CONGRESSIONAL REORGANIZATION

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced a concurrent resolution providing for the establishment of a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress. Now is the time for such a proposal, for the degree of success we here in the Congress achieve in keeping abreast of the changing world will influence in large measure the very character of this changing world. Our ability to adjust to a highly industrialized and very complicated society will affect considerably our ability to communicate our way of life to others throughout the world. And, in a very practical sense, our efforts to modernize our own procedures will determine to a great extent the kind of performance we will be showing in years to come right here in the Congress.

This resolution, in addition to establishing a joint committee of 12 members—6 from the House and 6 from the Senate—provides working tools for the committee and gives it the funds necessary to carry out its work.

The joint committee proposal is a reasoned and moderate approach to the much-discussed question of congressional reorganization. I believe it to be an intelligent approach. Others are studying this question in depth; particularly noteworthy is the study launched by Prof. Ralph Huitt, of the University of Wisconsin for the American Political Science Association. The Congress cannot afford the luxury of overlooking current interest in the question. We must proceed. And we must proceed in a fashion in keeping with the great traditions of the Congress.

I hasten to point out that the resolution I am introducing today does not authorize the joint committee to make recommendations regarding the rules, parliamentary procedure, practices, and/or precedents of either House. The intent of the resolution is to provide the means for thoroughly examining all aspects of reorganization. Any permanent changes, of course, would be subject to full consideration and a favorable vote from Members of the Congress.

I am pleased to join with Senator Mike Monroney and other distinguished Members of the House and the other body and of both political parties in this joint effort to achieve progress in making our legislative machinery more efficient.

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE U.S. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 13)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith the Annual Report of the U.S. Civil Service Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1964.

Lyndon B. Johnson.

The White House, *January 6, 1965.*

THIRD ANNUAL REPORT ON OPERATIONS OF THE PEACE CORPS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of section 11 of the Peace Corps Act, as amended, I transmit herewith the third annual report on operations under the act covering the fiscal year ended June 30, 1964.

Lyndon B. Johnson.

The White House, *January 6, 1965.*

FIFTH ANNUAL REPORT ON WEATHER MODIFICATION FOR FISCAL YEAR 1963—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 43)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith for the consideration of the Congress the Fifth Annual Report on Weather Modification (for fiscal year 1963) as submitted by the Director of the National Science Foundation.

Lyndon B. Johnson.

The White House, *January 6, 1965.*

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The House will stand in recess until 12 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired at 12 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m., the House was called to order by the Speaker.

COUNTING THE ELECTORAL VOTES; JOINT SESSION OF THE HOUSE AND SENATE HELD PURSUANT TO THE PROVISIONS OF SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 1

At 12 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m., the Doorkeeper, Mr. William M. Miller, announced the President pro tempore and the Senate of the United States.

The Senate entered the Hall, headed by the President pro tempore and the Secretary of the Senate, the Members and officers of the House rising to receive them.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore took his seat as the Presiding Officer of the joint convention of the two Houses, the Speaker of the House occupying the chair on his left.

The joint session was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the Congress, the Senate and the House of Representatives, pursuant to the requirements of the Constitution and laws of the United States, have met in joint session for the purpose of opening the certificates and ascertaining and counting the votes of the electors of the several States for President and Vice President.

Under well-established precedent, unless a motion shall be made in any case, the reading of the formal portions of the certificates will be dispensed with. After ascertainment has been made that the certificates are authentic and correct in form, the tellers will count and make a list of the votes cast by the electors of the several States.

The tellers on the part of the two Houses will take their place at the Clerk's desk.

The tellers, Mr. Curtis and Mr. Jordan of North Carolina on the part of the Senate, and Mr. Burleson and Mr. Corbett on the part of the House, took their places at the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair hands to the tellers the certificates of the electors for President and Vice President of the State of Alabama, and they will count and make a list of the votes cast by that State.

Senator JORDAN of North Carolina (one of the tellers). Mr. President, the certificate of the electoral vote of the State of Alabama seems to be regular in form and authentic and it appears therefore that Barry Goldwater, of the State of Arizona, received 10 votes for President and William E. Miller, of the State of New York, received 10 votes for Vice President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no objection, the Chair will omit in further procedure the formal statement just made and will open in alphabetical order and pass to the tellers the certificates showing the votes of the electors of each State. The tellers will read, count, and announce the result in each State as was done in the State of Alabama.

Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The tellers then proceeded to read, count, and announce, as was done in the case of Alabama, the electoral votes of the several States in alphabetical order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Gentlemen of the Congress, the certificates of all of the States have now been opened and read, and the tellers will make the final ascertainment of the result and deliver the same to the Vice President.

The tellers delivered to the President pro tempore the following statement of the results:

The undersigned, B. Everett Jordan and Carl T. Curtis, tellers on the part of the Senate, Omar Burleson and Robert J. Corbett, tellers on the part of the House of Representatives, report the following as the result of the ascertainment and counting of the electoral vote for President and Vice President of the United States for the term beginning on the 20th day of January 1965.

States	Electoral votes of each State	For President		For Vice President	
		Lyndon B. Johnson, of Texas	Barry M. Goldwater, of Arizona	Hubert H. Humphrey, of Minnesota	William E. Miller, of New York
Alabama	10		10		10
Alaska	3	3		3	
Arizona	5		5		5
Arkansas	6	6		6	
California	40	40		40	
Colorado	6	6		6	
Connecticut	8	8		8	
Delaware	3	3		3	
District of Columbia	3	3		3	
Florida	14	14		14	
Georgia	12		12		12
Hawaii	4	4		4	
Idaho	4	4		4	
Illinois	26	26		26	
Indiana	13	13		13	
Iowa	9	9		9	
Kansas	7	7		7	
Kentucky	9	9		9	
Louisiana	10		10		10
Maine	4	4		4	
Maryland	10	10		10	
Massachusetts	14	14		14	
Michigan	21	21		21	
Minnesota	10	10		10	
Mississippi	7		7		7
Missouri	12	12		12	
Montana	4	4		4	
Nebraska	5	5		5	
Nevada	3	3		3	
New Hampshire	4	4		4	
New Jersey	17	17		17	
New Mexico	4	4		4	
New York	43	43		43	
North Carolina	13	13		13	
North Dakota	4	4		4	
Ohio	26	26		26	
Oklahoma	8	8		8	
Oregon	6	6		6	
Pennsylvania	29	29		29	
Rhode Island	4	4		4	
South Carolina	8		8		8
South Dakota	4	4		4	
Tennessee	11	11		11	
Texas	25	25		25	
Utah	4	4		4	
Vermont	3	3		3	
Virginia	12	12		12	
Washington	9	9		9	
West Virginia	7	7		7	
Wisconsin	12	12		12	
Wyoming	3	3		3	
Total	538	486	52	486	52

CARL T. CURTIS,
EVERETT B. JORDAN,
Tellers on the Part of the Senate.
OMAR BURLESON,
ROBERT J. CORBETT,
Tellers on the Part of the House of Representatives.

The state of the vote for President of the United States, as delivered to the President of the Senate, is as follows:

The whole number of the electors appointed to vote for President of the United States is 538, of which a majority is 270.

Lyndon B. Johnson of the State of Texas, has received for President of the United States 486 votes;

Barry M. Goldwater, of the State of Arizona, has received 52 votes.

The state of the vote for Vice President of the United States, as delivered to the President of the Senate, is as follows:

The whole number of the electors appointed to vote for Vice President of the United States is 538, of which a majority is 270.

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, of the State of Minnesota, has received for Vice President of the United States 486 votes;

William E. Miller, of the State of New York, has received 52 votes.

This announcement of the state of the vote by the President of the Senate shall be deemed a sufficient declaration of the persons elected President and Vice President of the United States, each for the term beginning on the twentieth day of January, nineteen hundred and sixty-five, and shall be entered, together with a list of the votes, on the Journals of the Senate and House of Representatives.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Members of the Congress, the purpose for which the joint session of the two Houses of Congress has been called, pursuant to Senate Concurrent Resolution 1, 89th Congress, having been accomplished, the Chair declares the joint session dissolved.

(Thereupon, at 1 o'clock and 46 minutes p.m., the joint session of the two Houses of Congress was dissolved.)

The House was called to order by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to Senate Concurrent Resolution 1, the Chair directs that the electoral vote be spread at large upon the Journal.

HORTON BILL TO REPEAL ADMISSIONS TAX

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce to my colleagues in the House that I have introduced today a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the tax on admissions.

The action proposed by my measure, I believe, is long overdue. There are a number of benefits to the citizens of our country that can flow from admissions tax repeal, and I would like to cite a few of them in support of the legislation I am sponsoring in this regard.

I also wish to point out the particular pertinence the enactment of this bill would have to the constituents in the district which it is my honor to represent in Congress. The people of the Rochester, N.Y., area enjoy nationwide notice for their patronage of theatrical presentations in the fields of music, drama, motion pictures, et cetera. Thus, removing the currently imposed 10-percent levy on admission charges in excess of $1 certainly would serve to further this wholesome interest.

Directly tied to the question of the admission tax is the financial health of many segments of this Nation's entertainment and amusement industry. And, of course, we recognize that a number of allied business enterprises employing many more millions also are affected by the ability of the industry they serve to survive and maintain its viability in the American economy.

There is no doubt that removal of the admissions tax will improve the survival quotient for American amusements. I am told by the operators of many theaters and sports stadiums that the tax often represents the difference between profit and loss, which ultimately becomes the difference between business life and death.

Just a few weeks ago, New York State Attorney General Louis J. Lefkowitz impressed upon me that elimination of the admissions tax would allow theatrical producers to readjust their ticket price scale to a flexible level which would make for a more attractive price level for all types of theatergoers. Mr. Lefkowitz points out that the overall cost of tickets has risen to meet the rising costs of production in recent years, so that tax removal would help both the proprietors and the patrons.

There are many proposals to bring Federal encouragement to the arts and other aspects of America that so enrich our culture. I believe my colleagues know my endorsement of these measures.

Now, I believe it is wholly consistent with my past actions and attitudes—and really a logical extension—that I urge this Congress to demonstrate and display a sense of national patronage for the arts by passing into law the bill I have offered to repeal the Federal tax on admissions.

HORTON SPORTS ANTITRUST BILL

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation similar to legislation I introduced last year to provide a limited or qualified exemption from the antitrust laws for the professional team sports of football, basketball, and hockey and to include baseball under the antitrust laws and grant baseball these same qualified exemptions. I am doing this because of the anomaly which now exists between baseball and the other professional sports—baseball is exempt from the antitrust laws and the other professional sports are covered.

Baseball has been exempt from the antitrust laws since 1922 when the Supreme Court said in *Federal Baseball Club of Baltimore* v. *National League,* 259 U.S. 200 that baseball was not "trade or commerce" within the meaning of the Sherman Act. This decision was reaffirmed by the Court as recently as 1953 in *Toolson* v. *New York Yankees, Inc.,* 346 U.S. 356. However, in *Radovich* v. *National Football League,* 352 U.S. 445 in 1957, 3 years later the Court denied such antitrust exemption to professional football and said:

> If this ruling is unrealistic, inconsistent, or illogical, it is sufficient to answer, aside from the distinctions between the businesses that were we considering the question of baseball for the first time upon a clean slate we would have no doubts. But Federal Baseball held the business of baseball outside the scope of the act. No other business claiming the coverage of those cases has such an adjudication. We, therefore, conclude that the orderly way to eliminate error or discrimation if any there be, is by legislation and not by Court decision. Congressional processes are more accommodative offering the whole industry hearings and an opportunity to assist in the formulation of new legislation. The resulting product is therefore more likely to protect the industry and public alike.

The Court said substantially the same thing in the Toolson case in 1953 so twice the Supreme Court has exhorted the Congress to act. Congress has responded in rather a desultory manner with both the House and Senate making moves to correct the situation, but the incongruity still exists, not particularly because of great opposition to the measures, but because the bills have been sidetracked for a multitude of other reasons without prejudice.

The bill I am introducing today does not provide a blanket exemption but only an exemption in those areas which are so essential to the continued growth and prosperity of professional team sports. These are: First an exemption for agreements and rules concerning the equalization of competitive playing strengths; second, such agreements and rules as deal with the employment, selection, or eligibility of players or the reservation, selection, or assignment of player contracts; third, agreements and rules for the right to operate within specific geographic areas; and, fourth, agreements and rules for the preservation of public confidence in the honesty in sports contests.

These exemptions are for the purpose of assuring competition and for no other purpose. Professional team sports are unique in that if there is not a degree of equality in the teams spectator interest is lost. The club owners know this and for this reason support proposals such as those to equalize player strength. They have learned that where one team continually dominates a league, that league will not be in operation long. Thus, they must be permitted to agree among themselves on those things required to equalize player strength such as the employment, selection, or eligibility of players or the reservation, selection, or assignment of player contracts. In addition, owners must be assured that they have an unreserved right to operate within specified geographic areas. If such areas are not held inviolate, cutthroat competition could eventuate which would be detrimental to the players, the owners, and especially the fans. Finally, presidents or commissioners of leagues must be given broad authority to take those actions necessary to preserve public confidence in the honesty of the sports contests. We have seen examples of the need for this type of authority in the past few years.

The need for this type of legislation is self-evident. Thus, I urge this Congress to take quick and favorable action so that this discrimination among professional sports be done away with and professional sports be given those exemptions so necessary for their continued existence.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I also would like to include for the information of my colleagues the fact that on August 4, 1964, the Senate Committee on the Judiciary reported to the Senate S. 2391—88th Congress—similar to the bill I have submitted today.

In favorably recommending passage of this measure, the committee held that it is necessary to maintain and expand certain identified activities pertaining to the sports aspects of the business involved. It went on to emphasize that the public interest would be served best by keeping essentially business aspects of the sports within the antitrust laws and the essentially sports activities outside the laws.

As an additional reference to the history of this legislation, it should be noted that the bill I am introducing today was H.R. 10912 in the 88th Congress and was introduced by me on April 15, 1964.

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT PROVIDING FOR PRESIDENTIAL INABILITY AND SUCCESSION

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SHRIVER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, today I have joined in introducing a resolution which proposes a constitutional amendment providing for the effective determination of Presidential inability and succession.

In recent years our Nation has had the tragic experience brought home to all its people emphasizing the need for such legislation.

My respected colleague from Ohio [Mr. MCCULLOCH], who is ranking Republican on the Committee on the Judiciary, yesterday eloquently pointed out the necessity for early action. I am privileged to join the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCCULLOCH] in introducing a similar resolution.

Many organizations, including the American Bar Association, have given deliberate thought and consideration to this important constitutional problem. The time has come for the Congress to act to insure continuity in Government by providing for the contingency of a Presidential disability, and the filling of the office of the Vice President whenever a vacancy should occur.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert the following editorial from the Wichita, Kans., Eagle, dated January 4, 1965, which emphasizes the public interest in this problem and the importance of congressional consideration and action:

[From the Wichita (Kans.) Eagle, Jan. 4, 1965]

CHANCE FOR A SUCCESSION LAW

Congress, which has been dragging its feet on the matter of establishing some new laws for Presidential succession, may look more favorably on action in the next session.

With a President whose vigor is undisputed—despite a serious heart attack 10 years ago—and a robust Vice President, Congress could go about the task of establishing succession without the embarrassment it showed in addressing the problem during the the time Mr. Johnson was filling in for an assassinated President and there was no Vice President.

So say some of the Washington observers, at any rate. And they point, also, to the situation during the Eisenhower administration when the President's sometimes precarious health would have made such legislation seem cruelly pointed.

To be sure, the Senate passed a succession bill in the last session, but it expired later in the House Judiciary Committee. Because it would necessitate a constitutional amendment, such legislation would need approval by two-thirds of both Houses and three-fourths of the States.

Any reasonable bill should have little trouble getting such approval under present circumstances. The need has been apparent for at least a century. It is to be hoped that during the early days of the session, which traditionally are not very busy, Congress will give its earnest consideration to this important matter.

TAX LAW REVISIONS TO HELP AMERICA REACH ITS EMPLOYMENT POTENTIAL

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, in the last Congress I introduced several bills which would treat various aspects of the problems of employment and unemployment. H.R. 1908 provided a tax deduction for the expenses involved in upgrading skills, while H.R. 2076 provided that per diem allowances for expenses incurred by an employee away from home on company business would not be treated as taxable income on the outmoded theory that a man's residence is where his job is. Today I am reintroducing these two measures and will include my previous remarks—Congressional Record, volume 109, part 1, page 526—concerning these bills at the end of this statement.

There is a collateral problem to the ones above which affects disabled workers. They often incur additional routine expenses which are necessary so that they can hold their jobs, for which I feel they should be permitted a tax deduction. I introduced a bill in January to meet some of these problems, later revising it in October. Today I am reintroducing the October version, and the remarks that I made at that time—Congressional Record, volume 110, part 1, page 23408—will follow at the end of today's statement.

One final related problem is that of education of our youth so that they can produce in this increasingly technological society. Today, more money is being spent on education and educational purposes than at any time in our history. But the problem of education is an increasing rather than a decreasing one. Our position in international affairs, as well as the technological advancements of our time require that we allow the education of our children to flourish rather than be impeded through the Government's methods of taxing its people. During the last Congress, I introduced two bills, one which was the refinement of the other, which would amend the Internal Revenue Code so as to allow a tax credit for educational expenses and one for individual contributions to institutions of higher learning—See Congressional Record, volume 109, part 15, page 20652.

Some progress was made in the last Congress in the Revenue Act of 1964 by a more liberal recognition of costs incurred in the changing of residence as a result of changing employment—see section 213 of the 1964 Revenue Act. This still requires further liberalization to keep pace with modern times and enlightened employment practices.

There are other matters regarding revision of the tax laws which relate to the matters I have discussed today, and I intend to introduce further legislation as the session proceeds.

The following are the statements that I prepared for the Record in the past Congress which relate to the matters I have discussed here:

Tax Deductions To Ease Problems of Training and Worker Mobility

Mr. Curtis. Mr. Speaker, the Manpower Retraining and Development Act, passed in the last Congress, gave recognition to the importance of developing our manpower resources. By helping meet the critical shortage of skilled labor, and there are jobs by the millions that are going begging for the need of a skilled worker to fill them, this act will help America face the challenges which progress poses and help this country meet its potential. Under the theory of this act, which seeks to give new skills to those who are unemployable because their skills are no longer in demand, we look to the future of the country and its labor needs. And this act turned away from the approach to unemployment of putting an unemployable worker on the dole in the hope that what skill he has will come once again into demand.

This was an important step which was taken to help tailor the American labor force to the economic future of our country. There is more that can be done, however, and I have today introduced four bills which are designed to operate in this area and better develop our labor resource.

TAX DEDUCTION FOR EDUCATIONAL EXPENSE

The first of these would operate in conjunction with the Manpower Retraining Act. The act, in the long run, is intended to eliminate from the ranks of the unemployed those who are unable to gain employment because of lack of skill and, at the same time, to help meet the needs for highly skilled workers which our dynamic economic progress create. But this is not a direct step—taking an unemployed ditchdigger whose job has been ended by a ditchdigging machine and transforming him into a skilled technician on the latest data processing and computing machines. Many of the low-skilled unemployed cannot be trained up to the high skill level jobs. Rather than a one-step process it is a many-phased upgrading of skills generally. The Manpower Retraining Act operates only on the first level, giving the unemployed a new skill with which they can reenter the labor market.

The proposal which I am offering would help in the upgrading of skills throughout the labor force. It would provide for the deduction of amounts spent for education or training to obtain a new or better job as business expenses. At present such expenditures are deductible only if necessary to maintain existing skills or to keep a present job or job level. Under my proposal, there would be a tax incentive for those farther up the line in the labor force, farther up than those for whose benefit the Manpower Retraining Act was passed, to increase their skill levels, to seek better jobs through further education and training.

It is essential that we promote this upgrading throughout our labor force. The technological progress of our economy will call for an ever-increasing level of worker competence. No longer can we be content to train sons in the jobs their fathers and grandfathers had done. The change of our economy will not allow this, for the skill and job of the father may well be obsolete when the son comes into the labor market. We must have every American working to his capacity if we are to have the country meet its potential. This involves a process of continual progress in the level of our labor force. This bill works toward this goal.

WORKER MOBILITY

A second very important requirement for our labor force if it is to meet the challenge of America's future is mobility. Just as economic progress will demand ever higher skill levels for our workers it will also require that our workers be geographically mobile to take advantage of new opportunities and to meet newly appearing needs. At present our tax laws discourage this mobility and I have offered legislation to help correct this.

The discouragement to worker mobility in our tax law revolves around the outdated concept of home. In earlier days, in days of less dramatic technological change, a worker's home was, as the tax law defines it, the principal place of his employment. Today, however, this is not the case. Technological progress, as I have noted, calls for mobility and, since most workers today own their homes, to call home the place of a worker's employment ignores the fact that he may for some extended period maintain his family at his place of residence and be employed elsewhere.

Two specific cases illustrate the operation of our tax laws to discourage worker mobility. The first deals with defense industry workers, in this instance machinists working for McDonnell Aircraft Corp., who must spend extended periods away from their homes in the process of developing modern weapons. The highly complex military hardware of today often demands long periods of testing, testing which, in the case of McDonnell products, takes place far away from the company's home office and the homes and families of the workers who must participate in these tests. Some provision is made for this type of situation in the tax laws; if there is a temporary period of employment away from home, per diem paid during this time may be considered spent for business purposes. But, the rule as to a temporary period is very narrow and if this period is indefinite, the worker's home in the tax sense follows his job.

The second situation is exemplified by the problem facing the Chrysler Corp.'s employployees who transferred from a plant in Indiana to the company's new plant in St. Louis County, Mo. Their tax home went with the plant to St. Louis, but many of the workers left their families in Indiana for some period, waiting to sell their homes there and find suitable places to live in Missouri.

In both of these cases the tax laws discourage the worker from being mobile, from taking the job which will involve a period of work away from home or from taking a job away from one's present home. This is the direct opposite of what we need. We need to encourage mobility of our workers as well as we need to encourage the upgrading of their skills. Both of these will contribute materially to the achievement of our economic goals. Allowing business expense deductions for education and training and revising the tax rules as to the definition of home, making it, for a homeowning worker, the place where he owns his home and maintains his family would be significant steps toward this overall goal of helping America meet its potential.

Aid to Disabled Workers

Mr. Curtis. Mr. Speaker, on January 17, 1963, I introduced a measure in this House which would allow a deduction from income tax for transportation expenses to and from their place of employment. When I introduced that bill, Congressional Record, volume 109, part 1, page 527, I made the following remarks which are still pertinent to the measure which I am introducing today:

"The second proposal would allow a deduction to disabled workers for the costs of transportation to and from work. The disabled worker has special problems in the area of transportation in many cases and, while normally such expenses are not allowed as deductions, permitting it for these workers would encourage them to offer their skills to the Nation's economy. This proposal works hand-in-hand with efforts to rehabilitate disabled workers, to bring them back into a useful and productive life. I think that this is one of the most meaningful of human activities, the rehabilitation of the individual to permit him, as nearly as possible, to live a normal life and this bill would be one small step in helping reach this goal."

Since that time, the Labor Department has had an opportunity to report on the bill which I had introduced. In that report, which took a position in opposition to my bill, there was expressed the concern that the bill would provide coverage for some disabled workers while not others, and there were other exceptions that would not be covered by the bill. At my request, the Solicitor of Labor made some very beneficial suggestions that would clarify the matter raised by my bills. Under unanimous consent I place his letter to me into the RECORD at this point:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR,
Washington, August 25, 1964.

Hon. THOMAS B. CURTIS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CURTIS: The Secretary has asked that I reply to your letter concerning our report on H.R. 1999, which would allow an income tax deduction to certain disabled individuals for transportation expenses to and from work.

We are sympathetic with the bill's objective, but are concerned that it would give a small group of disabled workers special tax privileges which are denied to others equally handicapped. The tax deduction, if as a policy matter it were approved, should apply to any person whose physical impairment makes it unduly difficult to use public transportation in getting to work. To accomplish this, we suggest that the bill be written in general language, rather than listing one or more of the particular disabilities which would prevent a person from using public transportation.

While it deals with a more severe type of disability than is involved in H.R. 1999, section 213 of the Internal Revenue Code (26 U.S.C. 213) provides an approach to this problem which may be helpful. Section 213 provides an increased deduction of medical expenses for an individual who is over 65 and is disabled. It defines "disabled individual" in a general manner; that is, the term includes every person whose disability prevents him from working, and there is no reference to specific disabilities of any kind. Following this approach, the definition of disabled individual in H.R. 1999 could be amended to include all persons whose physical impairment makes it impossible to use public transportation in getting to work.

Thank you for your interest in writing us concerning this matter.

Yours sincerely,
CHARLES DONAHUE,
Solicitor of Labor.

This matter is of great importance, and it is for that reason that I am introducing a bill today which would incorporate the suggestions of the Labor Department.

TAX CREDIT FOR EDUCATIONAL EXPENSES AND CHARITABLE CONTRIBUTIONS TO INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER LEARNING

Mr. Speaker, the real pinch in the cost of education is at the parent level because parents bear both the basic cost as parents and the supplemental cost as taxpayers. To ease this cost burden somewhat and to aid and encourage education at the postsecondary school level, I introduced a bill, H.R. 3393, earlier this year, which is similar to the measures I have introduced in prior Congresses. As I mentioned in my remarks at the time I introduced H.R. 3393, appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 109, part 2, page 1849, I chose the mechanism of a sliding scale credit against tax as a means whereby the desirable goal of aiding education would be attained without encountering the major objections to other forms of aid to education.

Today I am introducing a bill which is a refinement of my previous bill. One refinement in the legislation that I am proposing is that a person is entitled to use this credit against tax only when the student is a candidate for a degree, or is taking courses required for the attainment of educational, professional, or vocational objectives. Another refinement offered in this bill is one which allows the taxpayer to take a credit against tax as well as a deduction, if he is entitled to the deduction as a trade or business expense. I feel that with these two added provisions, plus the revision of the technical language, the objectives of my first bill can be more readily attained.

A second section of the bill that I am introducing gives a credit against tax for contributions made to nonprofit institutions of higher learning by either individuals or corporations. There is an upper limit, $100 for an individual and $10,000 for a corporation, to the amount of this credit in any one year. The taxpayer, under this section, is permitted to take a deduction for charitable contributions, as well as the credit provided.

I feel that by adding this section to the bill, a stimulus is provided for increasing contributions to our colleges and universities, which are characteristically in extreme financial straits and having great difficulty in expanding facilities, increasing faculty salaries, and sponsoring more research. This provision, I believe, will alleviate to a considerable extent the plight of those colleges and universities which do not have large endowment funds, or other similar means by which the costs of education are absorbed.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS AND TEXT OF TUITION CREDIT BILL

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

Section 39—Tuition and fees paid to institutions of higher education

(a) Taxpayer is allowed to take as credit against his final tax the amount of tuition and fees paid by him during the taxable year to one or more colleges or institutions, of higher education for himself or for any other individual for whom he can claim an exemption.

(b)(1) Credit for tuition and fees shall be allowed on the following schedule: (a) 100 percent of the first $100; (b) 30 percent of the next $400; (c) 20 percent of the next $1,000.

For example, a parent pays $1,350 in tuition and fees to a college on behalf of his son. Thus the parent would be entitled to a credit of $390 as follows:

(a) 100 percent of first $100	$100
(b) 30 percent of next $400	120
(c) 20 percent of next $850	170
Total	390

The maximum credit allowance under this provision would be $420.

(b)(2) Where more than one taxpayer pays the tuition and fees the credit allowance shall be prorated among the taxpayers. For example, a parent pays $500 and his son pays $1,000 in tuition and fees to a college. The credit allowance would be $420, of which the parent would be entitled to one-third or $140, and the son would be entitled to two-thirds or $280. NOTE.—The application of this subsection would be very limited inasmuch as each taxpayer must be able to claim an exemption for the individual for whom tuition and fees are paid. In the case cited above, the parent could continue to claim his son as an exemption even though the son is himself a taxpayer provided that the parent contributes more than one-half of his son's support while the son is a student.

(c)(1) Defines "tuition" and "fees" as those required for enrollment or attendance or required for courses of instruction at an institution of higher education. It excludes amounts paid for meals, lodgings and other personal, living, or family expenses. If the tuition and fees include an amount for meals, lodging, etc., not separately stated, the portion of the amount attributable to meals, lodging, etc., shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury.

(c)(2) Defines "institution of higher education" as one which: (1) normally maintains a regular faculty and curriculum; (2) normally has a regularly organized student body in attendance where the educational activities are carried on (thereby excluding correspondence schools); (3) offer education at a level above 12th grade; and, (4) gifts made to it constitute charitable contributions within the meaning of the code.

(d)(1) If an individual receives a scholarship or fellowship grant (which are not included in gross income) or receives an education and training allowance under the Korean GI bill or War Orphans' Educational Assistance Act, the amount of such grant or allowance is deducted from the amount paid for tuition and fees in determining the credit allowance. Thus, if the amount paid for tuition and fees is $1,500 and the individual receives a grant or allowance of $800, then the credit allowance is based on $700, and not $1,500.

(d)(2) In the case of an individual who is a candidate for a college degree, credit allowance will be given only for tuition and fees paid for courses for which credit is allowed for a college degree. In the case of an individual not a candidate for a degree, credit allowance will be given for tuition and fees paid for courses required for the attainment of an educational, professional, or vocational objective. For example, a Foreign Service officer, transferred to a new post, may take a limited course of instruction in the language, culture, and history of the country to which he has been assigned, or a lawyer may wish to enroll in several graduate law courses to upgrade and enlarge his legal skills. Under both examples, it is intended that credit for tuition and fees paid would be allowed. On the other hand, a certified public accountant who enrolls in a course in Shakespeare merely for his own enlightenment and entertainment would not be entitled to a credit for tuition and fees paid, since the course in Shakespeare would not be part of an educational, professional, or vocational objective.

(d)(3) Provides that the credit allowance cannot exceed the amount of tax owed by the taxpayer. If the credit allowance is $420 and the amount the taxpayer owes is $400, then the credit allowance is reduced to $400. Simply a technical amendment to prevent a claim by the taxpayer that the Government owes him $20 or the amount in excess of his tax.

(e) If a taxpayer is entitled to a deduction under section 162 (relating to trade or business expenses) for tuition and fees paid, he may continue to claim the deduction and the credit allowance as well. However, the deduction and the credit together cannot exceed the amount actually paid for tuition and fees. For example, a taxpayer in the 30-percent bracket pays $150 in tuition and fees. He reduces his tax by $45 (30 percent of $150) by way of the deduction and is entitled to $115 as a credit. Since the total amount of the credit and the deduction is $160, the credit is thereby reduced to $105.

(f) Secretary of the Treasury is given authority to prescribe regulations to carry out this provision.

Section 40—Contributions to institutions of higher education

(a) Provides a credit against his final tax for an individual for the amount of his contributions to one or more institutions of higher education during the taxable year.

(b) The credit cannot exceed $100 in the case of an individual or $10,000 in the case of a corporation.

(c) Such credit will apply only if the contribution to or for the use of an institution of higher education is deductible as a charitable contribution. Where the contribution is made not to a college or university but to an agency, foundation or institution, such contribution may be only used by the agency for the same purposes that a college or university may use its funds.

(d) Definition of "institution of higher education" same as section 39(c)(2).

(e) Same as section 39(d)(3).

(f) Permits taxpayer to continue to take a deduction for charitable contributions as well as the credit provided by this section. In no event shall the deduction and the credit together exceed the actual amount of the contribution. Similar to the example set forth in section 39(e)(2).

(g) Secretary of the Treasury authorized to issue regulations to carry out provisions of this bill.

(h) Technical amendment—renumbering of code sections.

Section 2: Provisions shall apply to taxable years ending after the enactment of this act. If this bill becomes law in September 1963, a taxpayer may take advantage of the credits provided herein in filing his income tax return for the taxable year 1963.

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a tax credit for certain tuition and fees paid by individuals to institutions of higher education and to allow a tax credit for certain contributions made by individuals or corporations to institutions of higher education.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) subpart A of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to credits allowable) is amended by renumbering section 39 as 41, and by inserting after section 38 the following new sections:

"Sec. 39. Tuition and Fees Paid to Institutions of Higher Education.

"(a) General Rule.—There shall be allowed to an individual, as a credit against the tax imposed by this chapter for the taxable year, an amount (determined under subsection (b)) of the tuition and fees paid by him during the taxable year to one or more institutions of higher education in providing an education above the twelfth grade for himself or for any other individual with respect to whom he is entitled for such year to an exemption under section 151.

"(b) Limitations.—

"(1) Amount per individual.—The credit under subsection (a) for tuition and fees paid in providing an education above the twelfth grade for any individual during the taxable year shall be an amount equal to the sum of—

"(A) 100 percent of so much of such tuition and fees as does not exceed $100,

"(B) 30 percent of so much of such tuition and fees as exceeds $100 but does not exceed $500, and

"(C) 20 percent of so much of such tuition and fees as exceeds $500 but does not exceed $1,500.

"(2) Proration of credit where more than one taxpayer pays tuition or fees.—If tuition or fees for any individual are paid to one or more institutions of higher education by more than one taxpayer during the taxable year, the credit allowable to each such taxpayer under subsection (a) shall be the same portion of the credit determined under paragraph (1) which the amount of the tuition and fees for such individual paid by the taxpayer during the taxable year is of the total amount of tuition and fees for such individual paid by all taxpayers during the taxable year.

"(c) Definitions.—For purposes of this section—

"(1) Tuition and fees.—The term 'tuition and fees' means only—

"(A) tuition and fees required for the enrollment or attendance of a student at a level above the twelfth grade at an institution of higher education, and

"(B) fees required for courses of instruction above the twelfth grade at an institution of higher education.

Such terms does not include any amount paid, directly or indirectly, for meals, lodging, or similar personal, living, or family expense. In the event an amount paid for tuition or fees includes an amount for meals, lodging, or similar expenses which is not separately stated, the portion of such amount which is attributable to meals, lodging, or similar expenses shall be determined under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate.

"(2) Institution of higher education.—The term 'institution of higher education' means only a duly accredited educational institution—

"(A) which normally maintains a regular faculty and curriculum and normally has a regularly organized body of students in attendance at the place where its educational activities are carried on,

"(B) which regularly offers education at a level above the twelfth grade, and

"(C) contributions to or for the use of which constitute charitable contributions within the meaning of section 170(c).

"(d) Special Rules.—

"(1) Adjustment for certain scholarships and veterans' benefits.—The amounts otherwise taken into account under subsection (a) as tuition and fees paid for any individual during any period shall be reduced (before the application of subsection (b)) by any amounts received by such individual during such period as—

"(A) a scholarship or fellowship grant (within meaning of section 117(a)(1)) which under section 117 is not includible in gross income, and

"(B) education and training allowance under chapter 33 of title 38 of the United States Code or educational assistance allowance under chapter 35 of such title.

"(2) Noncredit and recreational, etc., courses.—Amounts paid as tuition or fees for any individual shall be taken into account under subsection (a)—

"(A) in the case of an individual who is a candidate for a baccalaureate or higher degree, only to the extent such tuition or fees are attributable to courses of instruction for which credit is allowed toward a baccalaureate or higher degree, and

"(B) in the case of an individual who is not a candidate for a baccalaureate or higher degree, only to the extent such tuition or fees are attributable to courses of instruction necessary to fulfill requirements for the attainment of a predetermined and identified educational, professional, or vocational objective.

"(3) Application with other credits.—The credit allowed by subsection (a) to the taxpayer shall not exceed the amount of the tax imposed on the taxpayer for the taxable year by this chapter, reduced by the sum of the credits allowable under this subpart (other than under this section and section 31).

"(e) Correlation With Section 162.—

"(1) In general.—Deduction shall not be denied under section 162 (relating to trade or business expenses), for tuition and fees otherwise allowable as a deduction under such section, by reason of the fact that such tuition and fees are taken into account in determining the credit allowable under subsection (a).

"(2) Reduction of credit.—If the amount allowable (but for this paragraph) for any taxable year as a credit under subsection (a) for tuition and fees paid by the taxpayer in providing an education above the twelfth grade for himself, when added to the amount by which the tax imposed by this chapter for such taxable year is less by reason of the allowance of a deduction under section 162 for such tuition and fees, exceeds the amount of such tuition and fees, then the amount allowable as a credit under subsection (a) shall be reduced by an amount equal to such excess.

"(f) Regulations.—The Secretary or his delegate shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.

"Sec. 40. Contributions to Institutions of Higher Education

"(a) General Rule.—There shall be allowed as a credit against the tax imposed by this chapter for the taxable year an amount (subject to the limitations of subsection (b)) equal to the amount of contributions by the taxpayer, payment of which is made within the taxable year, to or for the use of one or more institutions of higher education.

"(b) Limitations.—

"(1) Individuals, etc.—In the case of a taxpayer other than a corporation, the credit under subsection (a) for any taxable year shall not exceed $100.

"(2) Corporations.—In the case of a corporation, the credit under subsection (a) for any taxable year shall not exceed $10,000.

"(c) Contributions to Which Applicable.—Subsection (a) shall apply to a contribution to or for the use of an institution of higher education only if—

"(1) such contribution is a charitable contribution within the meaning of section 170(c), and

"(2) if such contribution is made for the use of an institution of higher education but is not paid to such institution and is not made available to it by the recipient only for the same purposes for which such institution of higher education may expend its funds.

"(d) Institution of Higher Education Defined.—For purposes of this section, the term 'institution of higher education' has the meaning assigned to it by section 39 (c)(2).

"(e) Application with Other Credits.—The credit allowed by subsection (a) to the taxpayer shall not exceed the amount of the tax imposed on the taxpayer for the taxable year by this chapter, reduced by the sum of the credits allowable under this subpart (other than under this section and section 31).

"(f) Correlation with Section 170.—

"(1) In general.—Deduction shall not be denied under section 170 (relating to charitable, etc., contributions and gifts), for contributions to institutions of higher education otherwise allowable as a deduction under such section, by reason of the fact that such contributions are taken into account in determining the credit allowable under subsection (a).

"(2) Reduction of credit.—If the amount allowable (but for this paragraph) for any taxable year as a credit under subsection (a) for contributions to institutions of higher education, when added to the amount by which the tax imposed by this chapter for such taxable year is less by reason of the allowance of a deduction under section 170 for such contributions, exceeds the amount of such contributions, then the amount allowable as a credit under subsection (a) shall be reduced by an amount equal to such excess.

"(g) Regulations.—The Secretary or his delegate shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section."

"(h) The table of sections for such subpart A is amended by striking out the last item and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 39. Tuition and fees paid to institutions of higher education.

"Sec. 40. Contributions to institutions of higher education.

"Sec. 41. Overpayments of tax."

Sec. 2. The amendments made by this Act shall apply to taxable years ending after the date of the enactment of this Act.

DEDICATION OF THE SAM RAYBURN STATUE

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, today it was my privilege to be present for the impressive ceremony to dedicate the statue of Sam Rayburn which stands in the main stair hall of the new congressional office building which bears his name.

The speech of dedication by Mrs. Lyndon Baines Johnson was a fine tribute to an outstanding American statesman and former Speaker of the House. The First Lady succeeded in capturing in words the feelings which were in the hearts of all on this inspiring occasion. Your own remarks, Mr. Speaker, bespoke the dignity and power of the office in which both Sam Rayburn and you have distinguished yourselves.

The statue of "Mr. Sam" which was unveiled today is also deserving of high praise. Its sculptor, Mr. Felix W. de Weldon, is recognized as one of the Nation's finest creators of public monuments. He has given us a statue which portrays Sam Rayburn as the man of vigor and purpose which we all remember him to be.

It is fitting that his statue should stand as the focal point of a building which he worked and planned for, and which now bears his name. His presence will be a constant reminder to us and future generations that true greatness can be achieved through service in Congress.

HAVE YOU HAD YOUR RICE TODAY?

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, more than a decade has passed since the attention of the American people was directed intensely to events occurring in Korea. The concern at that time was inevitable because young men were fighting and dying there in an effort to check Communist aggression and preserve freedom for the people of that country.

Today, we have turned our attention to other, new world trouble spots, and have neglected to give the deserved consideration to the job that is being done to rebuild Korea out of the ashes of a devastating war.

Recently I received a copy of a new book which gives a picture of postwar Korea and the efforts being made there to repair the fabric of that nation's society. It is "Have You Had Your Rice Today?" by the Reverend Jerome E. Breunig, S.J., formerly connected with Marquette University in Milwaukee, Wis.

Father Breunig makes no pretense at presenting an exhaustive treatise on South Korea. Rather, he conveys to his readers impressions and thoughts on a land which he grew to love and appreciate. In doing so, he enriches our own concepts of South Korea and its people.

I commend this book to the attention of my colleagues and, under permission granted, I include in the RECORD reviews which it has received in newspapers and periodicals:

[From Ave Maria magazine]

Have You Had Your Rice Today?

A bowl of rice may not be your cup of tea, but what the author presents in these compact pages is more than the title suggests. Essentially, it is a flavorful account of the founding of Sogang College in Korea.

What began as an assignment for the author to "go to Korea and teach" ended up in a less-formal commitment to tell the "Sogang Story to America."

Father Breunig does a commendable job. He takes the reader into the everyday life of the Korean home, village and marketplace giving eyewitness accounts of the struggle the Koreans carry on with the Communists. He also describes, firsthand, the experiences of the Jesuit Fathers and laymen in establishing a modern college in an awakening country.

It is not inaccurate to say that the author has a chapter for nearly every reader. He describes the sociological, economic, educational, and cultural aspects of Korea and even includes accounts of humorous episodes involving faculty, students, and friends of Sogang.

There is also included very accurate descriptions of the political events which led up to the student revolts in the spring of 1960. Though the author does not attempt to provide a total account of the entire situation, he does provide descriptions of firsthand and eyewitness reports of events preceding the revolution.

Truly, you will enjoy the style with which Father Breunig describes the real, everyday conditions of Korean life and his almost poetic description of the natural beauty of the land and the people.

[From the Fond du Lac (Wis.) Commonwealth Reporter]

Priest-Author Meets Kin of Soldier Slain in Korea

THERESA, August 3.—Mr. and Mrs. Eric Seiler, of Theresa, are in possession of a book, "Have You Had Your Rice Today?" presented them by the author, the Reverend Jerome Breunig, S.J., a native of Fond du Lac, and which contains mention of their son, Pvt. David A. Seiler, 24, who was killed in a Korean Communist ambush a year ago this month.

It was through the Commonwealth Reporter that the priest met the parents.

Father Breunig, professor of English and Jesuit counselor in the college of engineering at Marquette University, was granted a leave of absence in 1963 to teach at Sogang Jesuit college in Seoul, Korea. His book, written in Korea, grew out of his reports as a foreign correspondent.

Father Breunig noted in his book that the Korean situation "came close to home as far as I was concerned, for one of the American soldiers killed lived only a short distance from my home in Wisconsin."

The priest quoted an article in a national magazine listing a letter Private Seiler had written home and the publication's account of the ambush.

On July 18, the Commonwealth Reporter carried a story on the area page about the construction of a chapel at the ambush site, dedicated to the memory of Private Seiler and his companion, Pvt. Charles Dessart, Jr., of Drexel Hills, Pa., both slain by four North Korean guerrillas.

Father Breunig was visiting a relative in Fond du Lac and read the newspaper. He immediately telephoned the Seilers and went to visit them, presenting a copy of his book to them. The mention of their son appears on pages 166 and 167 of the publication.

Father Breunig autographed the book: "In memory of David."

[From the Omaha True Voice, Aug. 28, 1964]

Jesuit Tells Moving Story of Korean Mission Project

"Have You Had Your Rice Today?" Jerome Breunig, S.J., Loyola University Press, Chicago; 184 pages.

The author of this modest little volume is an enthusiastic lover of Korea and Koreans, and almost every page reflects his affection for his brother Jesuit missioners, their eager young students and the cheerful, hard-working poor of the "Land of the Morning Calm."

The result is a sketchbook which presents the Jesuit mission of establishing a Catholic university in the Korean capital in warm and moving human terms. It is an interesting person-to-person, down-to-earth kind of "I Was There" account told with constant good humor.

As such, it far outshines many slicker, more professional travelogs. Father Breunig is not a victim of Time magazine style; he writes as if he were a good friend telling you all that happened to him and all he observed during his year as a volunteer teacher at the brand new Sogang University in Seoul.

It is especially noteworthy that the author doesn't ignore the grinding poverty of Korea nor the debilitating hardships his fellow Jesuits experienced in getting their assigned project under way. He gives the whole picture. It's just that he doesn't let the black areas dim his enthusiasm or dissolve his hope for the complete Christianizing of this oriental land.

"Have You Had Your Rice Today?"—a literal translation of a colloquial Korean greeting—is entertaining as well as informative. Father Breunig's accounts of traveling on impossible mountain roads and of walking his feet off while trying to keep up with students on a little holiday mountain climb are highly amusing. At the same time, they give the reader an insight into the ruggedness of the country and its people.

[From the Korean Times, July 15, 1964]

Jesuit Father Greets Korea

"Have You Had Your Rice Today?" by Jerome Bruenig, S.J., Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1964, 184 pages, $3.50.

(By Chang Wang-rok)

Father Breunig's successful book, "Have You Had Your Rice Today?" reminds me of a Korean expression, the literal translation of which is, "He is a lightning," meaning, "He is a fellow who does an unusual thing in a brief time." Based on only a few brief months' stay in Korea in 1963, the author has written an unusually good book about Korea which reflects his ability as a reporter as well as his God-fearing spirit.

This book, comprising 26 chapters and 25 pictures, is beautifully printed and hardbound. Each chapter is as interesting as a short story in its own right and all the pictures are worth prizes. As he, a Jesuit Father, was a visiting professor at Sogang Jesuit College, he had many things to say about the newly founded West River (Sogang) College where he taught English literature, besides telling us his observations and impressions of Korea in general, but mainly of her culture. A layman is apt to pay little attention to how a Jesuit college was started in Korea or how Catholicism has developed in Korea, for those subjects would seem to lack universal interest. However, the author wrote in such a fascinating way that even what might otherwise be uninteresting chapters of the book are thoroughly enjoyable. When he writes about Korean Catholicism, he does not merely survey it or give statistics about it, but makes it vivid by creating plenty of imagery. For instance, in describing the Catholic martyrs, he gives us episodes or dramatizes certain scenes so that the reader gets an impression that the Catholic martyrs were real people, not in the least like the martyrs portrayed by Richard Kim in his "The Martyred." In describing a retreat the author led, he not only states how it was conducted but shows the response of the attendants by presenting a composition written by one of the attendants. He also often compares and contrasts a Korean scene with that of the Western counterpart, which adds to the readers' interest. "Scenes along the Han eastward from Seoul can match those on the upper Mississippi, the Hudson, and the Rhine," etc.

In the chapters describing the embryo stage of Sogang College, the author makes you feel as if you had participated in the founding of West River College and makes you share the founding father's high hopes for the college. In obtaining the charter of the new college, the Jesuit Fathers had to face the hesitancy of the education ministry. Tracing back that situation, the author comments objectively, and his criticism is by no means out of date even today: "It seems as if everyone and his brother were starting a college—for the primary purpose of making money. Getting the tuition fee in exchange for a degree was the essential concern. Attendance in class, curriculums, teachers and teaching methods, and learning were incidental." The author presents an interesting interview between Bishop Thomas Quinlan and President Syngman Rhee. It was after a persistent effort and passage of time that the charter was finally granted shortly before the student revolution in 1960. The author thinks it was granted just at the right time, because had the charter been granted by President Rhee's successor, it might certainly have seemed to be a mark of religious favoritism, for Premier Chang was Catholic.

In the chapter called The Breathtaking Language Father Breunig seems to admit the inevitability of the use of Chinese characters along with hankul on the ground that Chinese characters serve to eliminate the ambiguity that hankul often has. As for the difficulty of learning Korean for an American, he says, "To learn Korean you must attune your ears to elusive nuances of sound, rearrange your mouth, redirect your tongue, reshape your lips, and readjust your breath expulsion." Elsewhere he confesses, "Even with the help of a regular tutor I have learned pitifully little Korean and this cost blood, sweat, tears, and humiliations." These remarks are particularly interesting, because to Korean learners of English their experience is similar. The author says he was fascinated by a 3-year-old Korean girl whose little lips calmly wrapped themselves around the "tzch" and "kkhh" sounds. There are many other things which are fascinating or shocking to him which we Koreans do not find particularly fascinating or shocking. Examples of such are ample throughout the book. For example, the Korean people's comfortable manner of eating with chopsticks and without shoes while sitting on the floor, the high school students wearing uniforms, boy students with visored caps which remind him of streetcar conductors in America, blacksmith shops making shoes for oxen, houses with sides made out of flattened beer cans, villages of straw-roofed houses, a farmer plowing with an ox, a woman with a babe on her back leading an ox for her husband's plow, A-frame carriers, and industrious housewives beating clothes in the water and later hanging them almost anywhere to dry. Along 1 clear stream I saw more than 50 women doing their laundry.

He thinks Korean young men good-looking and young women quietly lovely. He praises Korean women's dress as graceful and beautiful. How keen his observation is when he says, "Though they like Western dress in warmer weather, they revert to Korean to dress up."

No less keen observation is seen when he speculates that the highly developed oriental bureaucracy existing in Korean public and national life is the result of Confucian stress on family relationships. We are led to think that more emphasis should be placed on the abstract and impersonal "common good" of all the people of the state, if we are to catch up with the advanced Western democracy.

He gives his unbiased explanations of the Mansei Uprising of 1919, the Communist betrayal and war, the student revolution of 1960, and the military revolution of 1961. Nor does he exclude vivid portrayals of the Korean political leaders since the liberation. This book closes with a description of the first graduation of Sogang Jesuit College early this year. The ceremony included General Douglas MacArthur's resounding congratulatory message to the first graduates, which he sent shortly before he faded away.

The reader is sure to find every page of this book interesting although he may object to the writer's viewpoints in a few cases. His severe criticism on the birth control and planned parenthood program, for example, would not seem very realistic, although it may represent his Catholic stand. Time and again he illustrates overpopulation of Korea and the poverty-stricken life of the Korean masses who can hardly afford to eat three meals of rice a day so that they have to ask one another in greetings, "Have you had your rice today?" Moreover, it is apparent that the committee on socioeconomic life in Asia which he advocates will not be able to tackle this vital problem of the population explosion. As he said in one place, God helps those who help themselves. However, it may be right for a foreigner, apart from religious conviction, not to encourage birth control in another nation, "a great people in a troubled, difficult land" whose culture he considers unique and superior and for whom he feels "an ever-increasing respect, admiration, and sympathy."

As a whole "Have You Had Your Rice Today?" by Father Breunig may be regarded as one of the best books about Korea, panoramic, revealing, and expressing hope, and as a book to be recommended to Koreans and foreigners alike, especially to Korean university and college students, let alone West River College students.

[From the Marquette University Tribune, July 2, 1964]

Review by Sister Peter Damian, S.D.S.

"Have You Had Your Rice Today?" by Father Jerome Breunig, S.J. Loyola University Press, 1964, $3.50.

Walk up to a fellow American sometime and greet him warmly with "Have you had your coffee today?" He will probably chafe at the implication that his morale needs lifting. In Korea, "Have you had your rice today?" is a common and friendly greeting. This as well as other differences in culture are deeply and intimately explored by Father Jerome Breunig, S.J., English professor and Jesuit counselor in the College of Engineering at Marquette University, in his new book. The book is a series of foreign correspondence reports that Father Breunig wrote in 1963 while teaching English at Sogang (West River) Jesuit College in Seoul, Korea.

From the beginning, the report becomes an intriguing story of people, of their language and customs. But this book is not a travelog; nor it is mere human interest. The author combines local color and humorous anecdotes (such as the tale of the scholastic who went to the store to buy toothpaste (chee-yak) and returned with rat poison (jwee-yak) with an enlightening history of Sogang college, the "miracle on the Han."

From its beginning 10 years ago to its first graduation of 60 students February 8, 1964, the story of Sogang is an inspiring one for those interested in "how the Jesuits do it." Episodes of cosmic importance such as the student revolution or the fall of Syngman Rhee's government are taken in stride in the narrative just as they must have been in the daily lives of the Jesuit community in Seoul.

From the warm descriptions of the "beautiful and happy" children, the open-hearted hospitality of the people, and meaningful or amusing landmarks, such as the "Bendix" river, named by Americans because of the all-day laundering done along its banks, Father Breunig's love for Korea brushes off easily onto the willing reader.

To illustrate another difference between the American and Korean, the author chose an example from a typical dinner party. While the American would say, "Well, we have some delicious T-bones for dinner," the Korean host would rather demure: "We simply do not have a thing to serve. The cooking is poor and I hope you will pardon all the inconvenience and discomfort. But do eat heartily for your own sake." For your own sake—do read "Have You Had Your Rice Today?" It will turn out to be T-bone.

AMENDMENT OF THE RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACT

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Ashley] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing three bills to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, to remove several inequities in the current law which I have long felt needed correction.

The first of these measures provides that a widow or widower, as the case may be, who has lost entitlement by remarrying, may again become entitled to a railroad annuity if her second husband dies within 1 year after remarriage. The bill also restores the entitlement of widowers, parents, and surviving dependent beneficiaries under these same circumstances.

Under the present provisions of the Railroad Retirement Act, a widow who remarries, becomes ineligible for any monthly payments she may have received as the result of her first husband's death. Furthermore, if her second husband dies before they have been married 1 year, she is unable to collect any widow's benefits based on his income.

This bill, Mr. Speaker, would permit her to again collect the widow's insurance benefits she was receiving before her second marriage. In other words, it would restore the benefits she was receiving before her second marriage. In other words, it would restore the benefits she was receiving on the basis of her first husband's employment record. This legislation is of the utmost importance to a few unfortunate women who have twice become a widow and find themselves deprived of benefits to which they should be entitled.

Mr. Speaker, the 85th Congress amended our social security law to reinstate the entitlement of widows and surviving dependents under these same circumstances and I sincerely hope that the same humanitarian spirit will prevail so that equity may be restored under our railroad retirement program.

The second bill which I have introduced is also designed to correct another inequity in the retirement status of spouses of retired railroad employees.

Under the present law the wife of a retired railroad worker cannot receive her full annuity if in addition she is entitled to social security benefits either in her own right or on the basis of her husband's employment credits. Her railroad annuity is either reduced by the amount to which she is entitled under social security or she receives only one of such annuities, whichever is the largest.

My bill proposes to repeal this discriminatory and unjust restriction against dual benefits as it now applies to spouses of retired railroad employees.

It is to be noted, Mr. Speaker, that this proposal has been the subject of hearings before the committee dealing with railroad retirement legislation for a number of years. This legislation has been consistently opposed by the Railroad Retirement Board, primarily because of the actuarial deficits facing the railroad retirement account, currently estimated at 0.41 percent of payroll, or approximately $20 million a year. Estimates furnished the committee last year as to the cost of this proposal indicate that it would cost approximately $13 million a year or 0.30 percent of taxable payroll annually. However, the committee was informed that an actuarial deficit in the railroad retirement fund of 0.50 percent or less is well within the limits of actuarial tolerance. The committee felt that despite the increase in deficit, the equities involved in this legislation are sufficiently compelling to justify the small added costs to the railroad retirement system.

I earnestly trust, Mr. Speaker, that the 89th Congress will rectify this serious inequity in our present laws.

A third amendment which I am proposing will remove another severe inequity of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act that penalizes those workers who suffer a continuous period of illness from June to July, the end of one fiscal year and the beginning of another, or more specifically under the Railroad Retirement Act, the ending of one registration year and the beginning of another.

Under present law, if a worker becomes ill, benefits are payable for each day of sickness in excess of 7 during the first registration period within a benefit year in which he will have had 7 or more days of sickness, and for each day of sickness in excess of 4 during any subsequent registration period in the same benefit year. However, if a worker is unfortunate enough to have one period of illness extending from June through July, he is penalized the first 7 days in accordance with the law but must, in effect, forfeit another 7 days because his illness is extending into a new benefit year. Clearly this is unfair and the reason for introduction of this legislation.

CHILDREN'S EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1965

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. Fogarty] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to be known as the Children's Educational Assistance Act of 1965 which would authorize the Commissioner of Education to make textbooks available to students in all elementary and secondary schools. I have long felt the need of providing to all students the equality of educational opportunities since in my opinion the Federal Government should recognize its continuing responsibility to assist in the achievement of educational excellence and the elimination of inequalities and disadvantages for every American child.

The selection of these books would be made by school authorities of both public and nonpublic schools. The texts and other teaching materials would be limited to subject matter such as science, mathematics, history, civics, geography, modern foreign language, remedial reading, and English. The authorized funds would be distributed on a system of priorities which would assist those students most in need, those who are handicapped or otherwise disadvantaged. The textbooks would remain Government property on loan to the student.

Under the provisions of this bill the Commissioner of Education would provide basic criteria as is necessary to give priority in the use of funds appropriated to achieve the objectives of this act. Funds would be allotted among the States so that the allotment to each State would be an amount which bears the same ratio to the amount appropriated as the number of students enrolled in grades 1 to 12 of elementary and secondary schools bears to the total number of students enrolled in such school and grades in all of the States.

In the fulfillment of the responsibility of the Federal Government by the enactment of this legislation, there will be no distinction or discrimination among the children of this Nation in the distribution of educational benefits in order that every child may be enabled to acquire knowledge to the full extent of his or her capacity.

MEDICAL CARE FOR THE AGED

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Minshall] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, there is a real and recognized need for a program of medical care for citizens of 65 and over. Unfortunately, there also is a widely prevalent misconception that King-Anderson legislation will solve their health care problems.

Those of us who have studied this measure are aware that in most cases King-Anderson would provide less than 25 percent of the cost of medical care. It does not provide, for example, for physician fees, medicines, dental care. It is simply a $90 deductible hospitalization program with certain nursing home and outpatient services included. It would entail endless red tape which could jeopardize patient choice of hospital and attending physician, and it would present a grave danger of Federal interference in the administration of health facilities and the practice of medicine.

Such a program would place a new and heavy burden on both the wage-earner who pays social security taxes and on the social security structure itself.

Because I am so well aware that action is needed now to meet the needs of the aged, I introduced H.R. 1084 on the opening day of this session to provide a tax credit on insurance premiums where incomes do not exceed $4,000 annually. For those not covered by a policy and whose yearly income tax is less than $150, my measure would provide medical care insurance premium certificates to be redeemed in cash to the insurance carrier by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. No one would be excluded because he was not covered by social security or railroad retirement during his working days. Employers would be entitled to tax credits when providing insurance programs for their employees.

My bill would eliminate the exclusionary factors of King-Anderson as well as expanding benefits to include doctor bills, drugs and medicines, under private insurance programs. There would be no drain on the social security system nor increases in social security taxes to finance the new program.

I hope that thoughtful consideration will be given to this approach when hearings are held by the Ways and Means Committee and that the House will be given an opportunity to vote on it on the floor.

COLLEGE DIPLOMA IS ESSENTIAL PASSPORT TO PERSONAL SUCCESS

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Minshall] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, as automation replaces skilled hands in industry, as the business world becomes increasingly computerized and complex, as demands for specialized professional services grow, as even farming becomes a highly technicalized science, a college diploma is an essential passport to personal success in America.

Last June more than 2 million young people were graduated from high school in the United States. Only two out of five of them enrolled in college in September. Of the three not going on to a higher education, some experts say two were deterred because of lack of finances.

In a society which finds it necessary to create a Job Corps, a Youth Corps, and a Domestic Peace Corps to combat poverty and delinquency springing from educational neglect, it is strange that Congress has ignored a simple and effective method of assisting all college students.

Legislation to provide tax exemption for college tuition has been introduced in the last several Congresses, but has never been reported by the Ways and Means Committee. Yet I have heard more spontaneous public expression favoring this type of educational assistance than I have ever found for Federal grants, scholarships, or loans, with the restrictions and qualifications they involve.

Accordingly on the opening day of this Congress, January 4, I introduced H.R. 1085, which not only provides that tuition fees paid by a student or his family would be deductible for income tax purposes, but also the cost of textbooks, laboratory fees, and other items essential to scholastic work. I am convinced that enactment of this bill would in many cases spell the difference between a high school diploma and a college degree for countless promising young people.

I am most hopeful that H.R. 1085 will receive congressional consideration and approval.

BILL PROVIDING ADDITIONAL JUDICIAL SERVICES FOR STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. BOB WILSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to provide additional judicial services for the State of California. Specifically, the bill would amend the United States Code to create four more judicial districts for the State and four additional judgeships.

This legislation, in somewhat different form, has been proposed on a number of past occasions, and the need now is more acute than ever. I am most hopeful that this year will bring success to what is basically and by its nature bipartisan legislation and which I understand now has the unanimous support of the California delegation.

Our State has had the good fortune to prove increasingly attractive to the citizens of this country, with the result that our population increase has been phenomenal. It follows that the need for Federal judicial services likewise has increased. I would particularly call attention to the situation in the southern part of the State, an area with whose needs I am particularly familiar. San Diego alone has seen an increase of population of more than 134,000 persons since the 1960 census. Moreover, the area encompasses the 25th custom collection district which is the largest narcotic and border egress and ingress district in the United States. In addition, there are the international port of San Diego and the military and defense establishments which generate increasing litigation.

For these reasons, my bill would set up a southern district in the State, comprised of San Diego and Imperial Counties, and provide for a U.S. court to be held in San Diego.

The additional southern judicial district would eliminate the expense, delays, inconvenience, and administrative redtape now occasioned by the fact that the district offices are in Los Angeles, more than 100 miles away. The San Diego County Bar Association has estimated that the savings to the Federal Government alone would more than compensate for the estimated $46,750 annual cost of implementing this legislation.

Turning to the predicament of the State as a whole, I would point out that California, the second State in population, now has only two judicial districts, one less than in Georgia, Alabama, Tennessee, Illinois, North Carolina, Oklahoma, and Pennsylvania.

In plain fact, California has outgrown her present judicial garments. Justice is delayed, respect for law is not enhanced, the business of the Federal Government is slowed and made more costly, and the maintenance of the orderly processes of law is rendered more difficult by this embarrassment.

The remedy is at hand. It is simple. It is effective. And it involves no notable cost, but rather a saving. Finally, it is badly needed.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1801

A bill to create four judicial districts for the State of California, to provide for the appointment of four additional district judges for the State of California, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 84 of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 84. California

"California is divided into four judicial districts to be known as the Northern, Eastern, Central, and Southern Districts of California.

"NORTHERN DISTRICT

"(a) The Northern District comprises three divisions.

"(1) The Northern Division comprises the counties of Del Norte, Humboldt, Lake, Marin, Mendocino, Napa, San Francisco, San Mateo, and Sonoma.

"Court for the Northern Division shall be held at San Francisco and Eureka.

"(2) The Eastern Division comprises the counties of Alameda, and Contra Costa.

"Court for the Eastern Division shall be held at Oakland.

"(3) The Southern Division comprises the counties of Monterey, San Benito, Santa Clara, and Santa Cruz.

"Court for the Southern Division shall be held at San Jose.

"EASTERN DISTRICT

"(b) The Eastern District comprises three divisions.

"(1) The Northern Division comprises the counties of Lassen, Modoc, Plumas, Shasta, Siskiyou, Tehama, and Trinity.

"Court for the Northern Division shall be held at Redding.

"(2) The Central Division comprises the counties of Alpine, Amador, Butte, Calaveras, Colusa, El Dorado, Glenn, Inyo, Mono, Nevada, Placer, Sacramento, San Joaquin, Sierra, Solano, Stanislaus, Sutter, Tuolumne, all of Yosemite National Park, Yolo, and Yuba.

"Court for the Central Division shall be held at Sacramento.

"(3) The Southern Division comprises the counties of Fresno, Kern, Kings, Madera except Yosemite National Park, Mariposa except Yosemite National Park, Merced, and Tulare.

"Court for the Southern Division shall be held at Fresno.

"CENTRAL DISTRICT

"(c) The Central District comprises the counties of Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino, San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara, and Ventura.

"Court for the Central District shall be held at Los Angeles.

"SOUTHERN DISTRICT

"(d) The Southern District comprises the counties of Imperial and San Diego.

"Court for the Southern District shall be held at San Diego."

SEC. 2. (a) The two district judges for the Northern District of California holding office on the day before the effective date of this section and whose official station is Sacramento shall, on and after such effective date, be the district judges for the Eastern District of California whose official station shall be Sacramento. All other district judges for the Northern District of California holding office on the day before the effective date of this section shall, on and after such effective date, be the district judges for the Northern District of California.

(b) The district judge for the Southern District of California, residing in the Northern Division thereof and holding office on the day before the effective date of this section, shall, on and after such effective date, be the district judge for the Eastern District of California whose official station shall be Fresno. The two district judges for the Southern District of California holding office on the day before the effective date of this section and whose official station is San Diego shall, on and after such effective date, be the district judges for the Southern District of California, as established by subsection (d) of the first section of this Act. All other district judges for the Southern District of California holding office on the day before the effective date of this section shall, on and after such effective date, be the district judges for the Central District of California.

SEC. 3. The President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, two additional district judges for the Northern District of California, and two additional district judges for the Central District of California.

SEC. 4. Not less than one judge of the Northern District of California shall have his station at San Jose, and not less than one judge in that district shall have his station at Oakland.

SEC. 5. In order that the table contained in section 133 of title 28, United States Code, will reflect the changes made by this Act in the number of judicial districts and district judgeships for the State of California, such table is amended to read as follows:

"Districts	Judges
* * * *	*
California:	
Northern	9
Eastern	3
Central	12
Southern	2
* * * *	*".

SEC. 6. The first section and section 2 of this Act shall take effect on the sixtieth day after the date of enactment of this Act. The other provisions of this Act shall take effect on such date of enactment.

REPORT TO THE POLISH

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, to commence each new year the President of the Polish Government in Exile, the truly legitimate government of the Polish people, reports to the Polish nation.

In view of the tremendous interest which Americans and all freedom-loving people have in the just aspirations of the people of Poland and the other captives of communism to reestablish free, democratic governments in their lands, I am placing in the RECORD at this point the 1965 New Year's speech by the President of the Polish Government in Exile, August Zaleski:

NEW YEAR'S SPEECH BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF POLAND, LONDON, JANUARY 3, 1965

His Excellency August Zaleski, President of the Republic of Poland, addresed members of the Polish Government in Exile, the Council of the Republic of Poland, and representatives of Polish organizations and of the Polish Community in Great Britain on January 3, 1965, as follows:

"Looking back at the past 12 months, as we do every year, we cannot but be struck by the changes which occurred in the governments of many countries with a democratic or a Communist system in force. However, some of these changes are so relatively recent that it cannot be determined which transformations, if any, they will produce on the international forum. There are many matters which may lead to serious complications.

For, these complications exist not only in East-West relations but also within both the rival blocs. It must be plainly stated that this complex situation is undoubtedly an outcome of enormous blunders committed during the Second World War. A plan for dividing authority over the world between two great blocks of countries was drawn up during the Teheran Conference: America was the strongest power in one of these and Russia in the other. The plan acquired concrete forms at Yalta and Potsdam, with absolute disregard shown for the rights of feebler nations to sovereign state existence. America concluded the arrangement in the conviction that to hand over a number of European countries with an aggregate population of over 100 million souls to Russia would satiate the imperialism of that country. America undoubtedly believed at the time that her primacy in the Western bloc would for the most part apply to her wartime allies, prepared to share this authority voluntarily. But Russia, with her usual imperialistic ambitions, desired to exploit the situation for the purpose of further expansion.

In time, that happened which had to happen. Russia's real policy was soon revealed. The transformation of the Russian zone of occupation in Germany into a separate Communist republic and the evident aim of incorporating Berlin within it opened the eyes of the Western Powers. The cold war ensued, and lasts to this day. Its essential nature stems in reality from the fact that Russia is still trying to extend her influence wherever possible: in Asia, Africa, and in South America. The United States, conscious that present-day nuclear armaments make warfare overdangerous, is exerting every effort to prevent the cold war becoming a real one. Under such conditions, the upper hand in diplomatic negotiations is usually gained by the more insolent side. And, in this respect, Russia is unequaled.

It is only when we also take into consideration the ever greater clash of views within the two blocs that we acquire a better idea of the soaring difficulties implicit in the world situation.

Within the Communist bloc, Sino-Russian disputes are more and more evident. For, China rejects the primacy of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and, in addition, has advanced extensive claims to territories held by Russia. Other Communist countries, such as Rumania and Yugoslavia, are profiting by this conflict in an attempt to emancipate themselves from Russian tutelage as far as possible.

Unfortunately, a similar situation has arisen in the West. The continental countries of Europe realize their weakness in relation to Russia; they are unable to defend themselves against Russia without American help as matters now stand. This brings about a specific feeling of uncertainty which need evoke no surprise. They all know, though nothing is said on this point for several reasons, that among 100 million Europeans handed over to Russia in order to gain her good will, there were not only neutral nations but also those most loyal allies of the Western Powers, Poland and Czechoslovakia. Each of the Western European Powers is troubled by the insistent thought that such a transaction may be repeated. In these conditions, the free part of Europe cannot but aim at assuring itself against such an eventuality. This gives rise to two natural aspirations. Europe must unite if her voice is to carry weight in world affairs. Furthermore, possession of own nuclear armament, dependent on nobody else, is essential for defense against possible Russian attacks. After all, when Great Britain and France tried without American permission to settle the Suez Canal dispute by force, the U.S. 6th Fleet demonstrated off Suez with the implied threat of recourse to arms.

At present, France has taken the lead in efforts to achieve both these aims. We know neither will be attained within the near future, but it is gratifying that a great, though not a decisive step toward European unity was recently made when agreement was reached on agrarian policy, that most difficult of economic issues.

The cause of a united Europe has great significance for Poland. Poland's national culture is fully part of West European civilization, and liberation from Russian imposed hegemony will never cease to be one of our goals. Thus, I am convinced that the Polish nation will be prepared to join united Europe on an equal footing with the other European nations.

But we must also consider the fact that the Polish nation cannot erase from memory the terrible barbarity of Germany's behavior toward Poland during the last war. Nevertheless, the immutable fact that we are neighbors of Germany remains. It can be supposed that Germany as an integral part of a united Europe will be less dangerous for us than if she were to conduct a foreign policy of her own unagreed with the other members of such a united Europe—with France, Italy, and the Benelux lands and perhaps ultimately also some other countries. The most purposeful means of allaying the fears of Polish public opinion in this connection would be for Germany to recognize the Oder-Neisse frontier as soon as possible.

In any case, Poland's accession to a united Europe would be an incomparably better settlement of the Polish issue than that proposed by the stooge regime imposed upon her by Russia. This regime's plan proposes the neutralization of present-day West Germany, a step which would in effect perpetuate Poland's status as a satellite of Russia's.

A neutral zone between Communist Russia and Western Europe would be purposeful only if no united Europe arose or if such a Europe proved too weak to extend its organization beyond the Iron Curtain. In such case, this zone would have to consist of all the European countries which lost their independence after the last war. Such a solution has been proposed by the Polish Government (in exile) on more than one occasion.

If a united Europe arises, the hope can be entertained that the first steps would be taken within it to bring about that state of affairs which the Pope called for in his Christmas message and that universal peace and the brotherhood of all people may in due course prevail in such a united Europe.

Mr. Speaker, the United States must reestablish a foreign policy based on victory rather than slow defeat in the cold war. The stirring words of legitimate voices of the captive peoples such as this message of the President of the Polish Government-in-exile serve as an inspiration to us to continue the long, hard, but necessarily successful struggle against the false ideology of communism.

AN AMERICAN RESPONSE TO SOVIET ANTI-SEMITISM

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I have had occasion in previous years to speak on the odious and discriminatory treatment of the Jewish community in the Soviet Union.

I do so again today, in the opening stage of a new Congress, because I fervently believe that religious persecution is an outrage to humanity, and that its continued perpetration, particularly directed at Jews in the Soviet Union, constitutes a crushing obstacle to the world of peace, order, and justice we seek.

Although there are obvious limitations to what Americans can effectively do to alleviate the plight of the Jewish minority in Russia, the House must express itself firmly in this regard so that there may be no political or moral ambiguity. I have introduced two pertinent resolutions on the subject and I hope that my colleagues will join in registering support.

One of them condemns the Soviet Union for its antireligious war, and specifically calls upon that Government to cease its anti-Jewish persecution. The other expresses House support for the efforts to secure, in treaty form through the United Nations, a universal condemnation and prohibition of anti-Semitism. The objective here is to establish anti-Semitism as an international offense.

There are many people in the world today who will immediately cling to the illusory argument that national sovereignty prohibits any such action. They will contend that each and every country is an isolated, self-propelling region of the earth completely independent from external considerations. They will say, in effect: You have no right to interfere.

I must insist that there are interests which transcend national boundaries and render them meaningless. If we are to draw any conclusive lessons from the tough struggles of this century, it is that we are an interdependent world, and that isolation and narrow self-interest lead to war and suffering.

In my view, the military realities of current existence may prevent modern war for a good while to come. But these will not justify our policy in history. They are artifical and shifting. In the final analysis, a livable peace can only be attained by concentrating both strength and perception upon a continuing search for world law.

In the 20th century world law has also come to mean human rights. World War II ushered in a new arena, uplifting the individual in some respects, making him susceptible to the precepts of accepted norms of conduct.

What this country does to enhance the rights of the individual can live in history.

The eradication of all forms of racial and religious discrimination belongs in this category. The catastrophic and tragic policies of national socialism are remembered. Since then the means have become less crude. But it is the means themselves, and the character that breeds such offense, which must be reprimanded and effectively policed.

I will not repeat here the many aspects of Soviet anti-Semitism. It involves a premeditated effort to stamp out Jewish culture and religion.

There is a consistent effort to keep Jews in the Soviet Union out of observable government positions. Anti-Jewish publications, of the most crass nature, are officially favored. Restrictive measures have been taken against synagogues and Jewish schools. The release of Yiddish books is practically prohibited. All cultural activity, such as the theater productions, has been halted. Many Jews are refused entrance to institutions of higher learning. And with the implementation of the law relative to so-called economic crimes, approximately 55 percent of those sentenced to death since 1961 have been Jews, which account for 1.9 percent of the entire Russian population.

In connection with the latter item, the International Commission of Jurists, in a staff study presented in the summer 1964 Journal, brought forth some authoritative commentary. In the court proceedings on economic crimes, the Commission wrote that "a disproportionate emphasis is placed on the nefarious activities of Jewish defendants"—Journal of the International Commission of Jurists, summer, 1964, volume V, No. 1: "Economic Crimes in the Soviet Union," staff study, Geneva, Switzerland.

In the so-called Frunze affair, the study notes that "the prominence given to the Jewish defendants clearly indicates an attempt to lay the main guilt at their door."

Although the report concludes that there is no "organized discrimination," it does say:

The number of Jews receiving death sentences and severe terms of imprisonment is greatly disproportionate to their number as a minority group.

In the autumn of 1963, the Soviet Government undertook a multifaceted campaign against all religions. For those interested I would recommend the recent article of Mr. Harry Willetts in the November-December edition of Problems of Communism.

Quite naturally, anti-Judaism forms a part of this campaign. But it is at once inseparate and apart from the campaign.

Religion, as such, is not only inimical to dialectical materialism, but in practical terms repugnant to the all-inclusive nature of the dictatorial state. Religion will interject a second loyalty which is instinctively abhorrent to the Communist regime. Communism requires that we render all and everything unto Caesar.

But the attack upon Judaism and Jewish life has different implications. It is a heritage which has Western connections. It is a more independently identifiable community. As such, the Jewish citizens have always been considered a political threat, more important and menacing than other minority groups. Many Russian Jews, moreover, have personal relatives living in the West.

For these reasons the Soviet policy of discrimination against Jews, as distinct from other groups, has been more deliberate and harsh. The insipid anti-Semitic sentiments among much of the Russian population are famed. It is a deliberate policy, but also a secretive one; the techniques are shrewd and sophisticated, and the object is always, if possible, to avoid an outright show of official attitudes which can unfavorably affect world opinion.

Last year a constructive move was made in the other body to amend the Foreign Assistance Act. The amendment condemned the Soviet policy of anti-Semitism. Unfortunately, and in spite of the energy of the junior Senator from Connecticut, the amendment was deleted prior to final congressional passage.

Right now it is important that we again strive for some positive steps. As I mentioned earlier, there are realities with which we must deal. We cannot officially, in any real sense, compel a foreign government to make certain domestic adjustments. But we can express our honest feelings; we should expect our own Government to undertake diplomatic representations with the Soviet Union in keeping with our belief in human dignity; we can energetically work for the attainment of an international treaty, including an effective clause on anti-Semitism; we can, by expressing ourselves forthrightly, muster a world opinion to which, as we are aware, communism listens.

Recently, I corresponded with the Department of State seeking a clarification of official American opinion. Specifically I asked whether fresh diplomatic initiatives could not be taken to seek an alleviation of the discrimination against Jews in Russia. Although I believe the Department has a sincere interest and concern in this area, I cannot agree with the officials that diplomatic action is undesirable. It is their feeling that representation of this nature would be contrary to the welfare of Russian Jewry; I disagree. For the RECORD, I include the Department's letter to me, dated November 6, 1964, following the conclusion of my remarks.

I sincerely hope that my colleagues in the House will join in pressing for the enactment of my two resolutions. They are not radical. They do not aim to drastically tie the hands of the executive branch in foreign policy. They simply express American condemnation of the Soviet anti-Semitic trends, and they set this House on record in full support of a world convention, effectively enforced, prohibiting religious and racial discrimination.

I do not believe that mere speechmaking on the part of Government personnel can possibly be an effective instrument in this case. It has proved its ineffectuality already.

This effort toward a reversal of Russian anti-Semitism forms part of American world objectives. I see no reason why we should be timid. I seek action, concrete and clear, and I believe we should make a contribution toward the elimination of prejudice and persecution wherever it exists.

The above-mentioned letter follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., November 6, 1964.

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HALPERN: On behalf of the Secretary I wish to thank you for the letter which you addressed to him on October 28, 1964, suggesting that the Department review the record relating to Soviet Jewry with a view to considering what representations might be made to the Soviet authorities to bring about a reversal in their anti-Semitic practices.

Restrictions on the religious and cultural life of the Jewish community in the Soviet Union are a matter of deep and continuing concern to the Department and to high officials of our Government. Acting upon the instructions of the Secretary after his meeting on April 7, 1964, with representatives of a Washington Conference on Soviet Jewry, the Department reviewed the available information about the situation of the Jews in the Soviet Union. The enclosed statement prepared during the course of this review and now brought up to date gives the Department's assessment of the situation of Soviet Jews.

Although as expressed in the statement it is the belief of the Department that formal official protests would not be in the best interests of the Jewish people in the Soviet Union, responsible officials in our Government continue to search for practical means of helping the Soviet Jews, as well as other religious groups which suffer similar persecution in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. A reference to the record of the past year gives evidence of these efforts:

On October 27, 1963, Under Secretary of State Averell Harriman denounced Soviet anti-Semitism in a speech before the American Jewish Congress in New York City.

On December 6, 1963, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State Richard N. Gardner also denounced Soviet anti-Semitism before the same audience and urged a strengthening of U.N. human rights procedures to focus international attention on problems of this kind.

On February 28, 1964, Mrs. Marietta Tree, U.S. representative to the U.N. Commission on Human Rights, introduced a specific amendment on anti-Semitism to the Draft Convention on Racial Discrimination then under debate and drew attention to anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union.

On April 7, 1964, the Department of State issued the following statement after a meeting between the Secretary of State and representatives of a Washington Conference on Soviet Jewry:

"At the meeting this morning, Secretary Rusk took the occasion to reaffirm the concern expressed by Mrs. Marietta Tree, U.S. representative on the United Nations Human Rights Commission, that anti-Semitism is used by some members of the United Nations to turn groups against each other and to deprive Jewish minorities of the religious and cultural heritage which makes this group unique. He confirmed the proposal made by Mrs. Tree that U.N. members pledge themselves to eradicate anti-Semitism in accordance with their obligations under the United Nations Charter."

On April 30, 1964, Secretary of State Rusk in a speech before the American Jewish Committee stated:

"I would add my assurance that American leaders at the highest levels are aware of the problems of Soviet Jewry and that Soviet leaders are aware of our concern. We shall continue to make known our interest in the welfare of religious communities within the Soviet Union and elsewhere, because we consider human rights indivisible."

On October 28, 1964, the President sent a telegram to the New York Conference on Soviet Jewry in which he called attention to the position of the Jewish community in the Soviet Union and stated that all responsible officials of the U.S. Government continue to search for practical methods of alleviating the position of Soviet Jews. He expressed the belief that the official actions available to the United States must be reinforced by the pressure of an aroused world public opinion; and the hope that citizens and organizations of all faiths will join in an overwhelming expression of moral concern for the Jews of the Soviet Union, believing that the moral judgment of millions of people throughout the world cannot be ignored by any government.

I wish to assure you that the Department considers the situation of Soviet Jewry to be a subject of active concern meriting a continued high priority of attention. Consequently, the Department will be alert to consider every appropriate initiative which might bring relief to this and other oppressed minorities in the Soviet Union.

Please do not hesitate to let me know if the Department can be of further assistance.

Sincerely yours,

Robert E. Lee,
Acting Assistant Secretary
for Congressional Relations.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to Mr. Conte, for 15 minutes, tomorrow; and to revise and extend his remarks.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Hall) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Martin of Nebraska in two instances.

Mr. McClory.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 49 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, January 7, 1965, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

269. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting an audit of the financial statements of the Federal National Mortgage Association, Housing and Home Finance Agency, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1964, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 841 (H. Doc. No. 40); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

270. A letter from the Postmaster General, Chairman, Board of Trustees, Postal Savings System, transmitting a report on the operations of the Postal Savings System for fiscal year ended June 30, 1964, pursuant to section 1 of the act approved June 25, 1910 (H. Doc. No. 41); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and ordered to be printed.

271. A letter from the Acting General Counsel, Department of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to prescribe the basic pay and allowances of an officer who is serving as Supreme Allied Commander, Europe"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

272. A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, entitled "A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit members of the Armed Forces to be assigned or detailed to the Weather Bureau or the Office of the Federal Coordinator for Meteorological Services and Supporting Research, Department of Commerce"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

273. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting required report on the Department of the Army aviation personnel above the grade of major pursuant to 37 U.S.C. 301(g); to the Committee on Armed Services.

274. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "A bill to amend titles 10 and 37, United States Code, to provide for confinement and treatment of offenders against the Uniform Code of Military Justice"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

275. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the unsupported costs included in price of nuclear submarine valves purchased from Crane Co., Chicago, Ill., by Westinghouse Electric Corp., Pittsburgh, Pa., under cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contracts, Department of the Navy; to the Committee on Government Operations.

276. A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a report on administration of functions of the General Services Administration for fiscal year ended June 30, 1964; to the Committee on Government Operations.

277. A letter from the Acting General Counsel Department of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the act of February 28, 1958, relating to the withdrawal, reservation, or restriction of public lands, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

278. A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for the restriction of certain areas in the Outer Continental Shelf (known as the Eastern Test Range) for defense purposes, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

279. A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for the restriction of a certain area in the Outer Continental Shelf for defense purposes, and for other purposes (Matagorda Water Range)"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

280. A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for the restriction of certain areas in the Outer Continental Shelf for defense purposes, and for other purposes (Gulf Test Range, Gulf of Mexico)"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

281. A letter from the Acting Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 407(e) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to clarify the authority of the Civil Aeronautics Board to examine the books and records of persons controlled by, or under common control with, an air carrier, or of service organizations controlled by groups of air carriers, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

282. A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend titles 10 and 14, United States Code, and the Military Personnel and Civilian Employees' Claims Act of 1964, with respect to the settlement of claims against the United States by members of the uniformed services and civilian officers and employees of the United States for damage to, or loss of, personal property incident to their service, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

283. A letter from the Governor, Canal Zone Government, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, entitled "A bill to authorize the issuance of certificates of citizenship in the Canal Zone"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

284. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting a report on the allocation or placement of positions in grades 16, 17, and 18 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, pursuant to section 503(a) of Public Law 84–854; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

285. A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the act entitled, 'An act to provide better facilities for the enforcement of the customs and

immigration laws'," to extend construction authority for facilities at Guam and the Virgin Islands of the United States (76 Stat. 87; 19 U.S.C. 68); to the Committee on Public Works.

286. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a report of the activities of the Veterans' Administration for fiscal year ended June 30, 1964, pursuant to 38 U.S.C. 214 (H. Doc. No. 8); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H.R. 1645. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to eliminate the provisions which reduce the annuities of the spouses of retired employees by the amount of certain monthly benefits payable under title II of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 1646. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide that the entitlement of a widow, widower, or parent to a survivor annuity may in certain cases be retained or regained after his or her remarriage; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H.R. 1647. A bill to provide for the payment of certain amounts and restoration of employment benefits to certain Government officers and employees improperly deprived thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1648. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide for the adjustment of inequities and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1649. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, to provide for the recomputation of annuities of certain retired employees who elected reduced annuities at the time of retirement in order to provide survivor annuities for their spouses, and for the recomputation of survivor annuities for the surviving spouses of certain former employees who died in service or after retirement; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 1650. A bill to provide for the construction of recreation facilities in the Belle Fourche Reservoir area, South Dakota; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BOW:

H.R. 1651. A bill to strengthen State governments, to provide financial assistance to States for educational purposes by returning a portion of the Federal taxes collected therein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 1652. A bill to amend chapter 57 of title 39, United States Code, so as to authorize the free use of the mails in making reports required by law of certain payments to others; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1653. A bill to provide additional funds for education in the several States without Federal direction, control, or interference; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1654. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a taxpayer a deduction from gross income for tuition and certain other expenses at institutions of higher learning; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1655. A bill to amend the Trade Expansion Act of 1962; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 1656. A bill to establish a National Economic Conversion and Diversification Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BURKE:

H.R. 1657. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide for the manufacture, use, and disposition of beer concentrate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 1658. A bill to authorize the sale, without regard to the 6-month waiting period prescribed, of lead proposed to be disposed of pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CAHILL:

H.R. 1659. A bill to permit the burial in national cemeteries of mothers and fathers of deceased servicemen or veterans who died leaving no spouse or minor child entitled to be buried in a national cemetery; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 1660. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Army shall acquire additional land for the Beverly National Cemetery, N.J.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 1661. A bill to provide for the construction of a new Veterans' Administration hospital in southern New Jersey; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 1662. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that an individual may deduct amounts paid for his higher education, or for the higher education of any of his dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAREY:

H.R. 1663. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 1664. A bill to amend the Clayton Act to prohibit restraints of trade carried into effect through the use of unfair and deceptive methods of packaging or labeling certain consumer commodities distributed in commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1665. A bill to amend title 28, entitled "Judiciary and Judicial Procedure," of the United States Code to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment in special jurisdictional cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H.R. 1666. A bill to provide for the medical and hospital care of the aged through a system of voluntary health insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H.R. 1667. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Nebraska midstate division, Missouri River Basin project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CURTIN:

H.R. 1668. A bill to create a U.S. Academy of Foreign Service; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 1669. A bill to provide for the establishment of national cemeteries in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 1670. A bill to amend the act of August 21, 1935, to provide for a determination of whether certain sites, buildings, or other objects are of national historical significance, and to prohibit the use of Federal funds for highway purposes which damage or destroy national historical sites, buildings, or other objects; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 1671. A bill to prohibit the introduction into interstate commerce of any shipping container manufactured in the United States from imported steel unless the container is marked so as to indicate the country of origin of the steel; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 1672. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an additional income tax exemption for each dependent who is a full-time undergraduate student at a college or university; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1673. A bill to provide for the medical and hospital care of the aged through a system of voluntary health insurance and tax credits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1674. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1675. A bill to provide that Flag Day shall be a legal public holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1676. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to provide for the greater protection of the President and the Vice President of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1677. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H.R. 1678. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the costs of education or training shall be deductible as trade or business expenses when incurred in order to obtain a new or better job, as well as when incurred in order to maintain existing skills, status, salary, or employment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1679. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit a taxpayer to deduct (as trade or business expenses) the expenses of travel, meals, and lodging while employed away from his regular place of abode; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1680. A bill to allow a deduction for income tax purposes, in the case of a disabled individual, of expenses for transportation to and from work; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1681. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a tax credit for certain tuition and fees paid by individuals to institutions of higher education and to allow a tax credit for certain contributions made by individuals or corporations to institutions of higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DADDARIO:

H.R. 1682. A bill relating to the power of the States to impose use tax assessments with respect to sales in interstate commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1683. A bill to amend the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 with respect to property rights in inventions; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

H.R. 1684. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DAGUE:

H.R. 1685. A bill to provide an exemption from participation in the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program for individuals who are opposed to participation in such program on grounds of conscience or religious belief; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H.R. 1686. A bill to amend the Soldiers and Sailors Civil Relief Act of 1940 to permit civil actions against members of the Armed Forces for support of their spouses and children; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 1687. A bill to authorize the acceptance of donations of land and the construction, administration, and maintenance of an extension of the Blue Ridge Parkway in the States of North Carolina and Georgia by the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 1688. A bill to amend section 7701 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to clarify the tax status of certain professional associations and corporations formed under State law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DE LA GARZA:

H.R. 1689. A bill to give the consent of Congress to the construction of certain international bridges; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 1690. A bill to provide for the recognition of the Polish Legion of American Veterans by the Secretary of Defense and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DOWDY:

H.R. 1691. A bill to amend the Career Compensation Act of 1949 to provide the maximum retired pay for certain retired enlisted men for the period from June 1, 1942, through June 30, 1946; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 1692. A bill to establish a National Economic Conversion and Diversification Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 1693. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that full benefits thereunder, when based upon the attainment of retirement age, will be payable to men at age 60 and to women at age 55; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FINO (by request):

H.R. 1694. A bill to amend chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that the award of pension to any person which has been in effect for 10 or more years shall not thereafter be revoked on the basis that the individual did not have the length of service required to qualify therefor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 1695. A bill to authorize the Commissioner of Education to make available to students in all elementary and secondary schools textbooks selected by such schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.R. 1696. A bill to prohibit the manufacture, sale, or use in commerce of any motor vehicle which discharges substances into the air in amounts found by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to be dangerous to public health; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.R. 1697. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code in order to promote high morale in the uniformed services by providing a program of medical care for certain former members of the uniformed services and their dependents; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 1698. A bill to amend the National Arts and Cultural Development Act of 1964 to authorize the National Council on the Arts to accept gifts; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HARSHA:

H.R. 1699. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of podiatry in the District of Columbia," approved May 23, 1918, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 1700. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for commitments to, maintenance in, and discharge from, the District Training School, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1925, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

H.R. 1701. A bill to amend section 8(b)(4) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 1702. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the tax on admissions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HULL:

H.R. 1703. A bill to extend rural mail delivery service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1704. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow income tax deductions for certain payments to assist in providing higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1705. A bill to provide that Federal expenditures shall not exceed Federal revenues, except in time of war, national disaster, emergency, or economic depression, and to provide for the retirement of the public debt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1706. A bill to amend section 162 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to clarify the deductibility of premiums paid for flood insurance or indemnity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1707. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted during a calendar year from $1,200 to $1,800 without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H.R. 1708. A bill to provide public works and economic development programs and the planning and coordination needed to assist in the development of the Appalachian region; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 1709. A bill to authorize the distribution of the film "Years of Lightning, Day of Drums" by the U.S. Information Agency; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 1710. A bill to establish a National Economic Conversion and diversification Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KEE:

H.R. 1711. A bill to provide public works and economic development programs and the planning and coordination needed to assist in the development of the Appalachian region; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mrs. MAY:

H.R. 1712. A bill to provide for the payment of debt service construction charges, and increased operation and maintenance charges when irrigable lands are taken for nonagricultural uses under Federal programs; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MORGAN:

H.R. 1713. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide that, for the purpose of old-age and survivors insurance benefits, retirement age shall be 60 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1714. A bill to impose quota limitations on imports of foreign residual fuel oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1715. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1716. A bill to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide further for the prevention of accidents in coal mines; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. QUIE:

H.R. 1717. A bill to amend section 331 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 in order to continue the indemnity payment program for farmers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. REDLIN:

H.R. 1718. A bill to make certain provisions in connection with the construction of the Garrison diversion unit, Missouri River Basin project, by the Secretary of the Interior; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 1719. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the manufacturers excise tax on household-type hot water heaters; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1720. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to make certain acts against the person of the President and Vice President of the United States, the President-elect and Vice-President-elect of the United States and certain other Federal officers a Federal crime; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 1721. A bill to establish a National Economic Conversion and Diversification Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROUDEBUSH:

H.R. 1722. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide career status by appointment of certain qualified substitute rural carriers of record to fill vacancies on rural routes on the basis of noncompetitive examinations; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1723. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp to commemorate the 20th anniversary of the death of Ernie Pyle; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1724. A bill to authorize the construction of the Big Pine Reservoir in the State of Indiana for flood control, recreation, and related purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 1725. A bill to prescribe the size of flags furnished by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to drape the caskets of deceased veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 1726. A bill to amend section 501 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that active military service on the Mexican border before World War I by persons who performed active service during World War I shall be included in determining eligibility of World War I veterans, their widows, and children for pension; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 1727. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an additional income tax exemption for each dependent who is a full-time undergraduate student at a college or university; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 1728. A bill to establish a National Economic Conversion and Diversification Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SICKLES:

H.R. 1729. A bill to amend section 331 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 1730. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Assateague Island National Seashore in the States of Maryland and Virginia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 1731. A bill to establish a National Economic Conversion and Diversification Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 1732. A bill to extend the act of September 26, 1961, relating to allotment and assignment of pay, to cover the Government Printing Office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1733. A bill to provide public works and economic development programs and the planning and coordination needed to assist in the development of the Appalachian region; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SCHWEIKER:

H.R. 1734. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for the establishment of a program of cash awards for suggestions or inventions made by members of the Armed Forces which contribute to the efficiency, economy, or other improvement of Government operations; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 1735. A bill to provide an exemption from participation in the Federal old-age and survivors insurance program for an individual member of a recognized religious sect who is conscientiously opposed to acceptance of benefits because of his adherence to the established tenets or teachings of such sect; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SWEENEY:

H.R. 1736. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H.R. 1737. A bill to authorize the acceptance of donations of land and the construction, administration, and maintenance of an extension of the Blue Ridge Parkway in the States of North Carolina and Georgia by the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.R. 1738. A bill to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, to make more specific the purpose for which loans may be made under sections 2 and 4 of such act, and to modify the provisions relating to interest rates on loans made under such act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 1739. A bill to authorize investigations and reports on the water resources and requirements of the Colorado River Basin, and to protect existing economies in the course of development of such resources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 1740. A bill to authorize the coordinated development of the water resources of the Pacific Southwest, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 1741. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H.R. 1742. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide education and training for veterans of service after January 31, 1955, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 1743. A bill to amend section 410(a) of title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of dependency and indemnity compensation to certain survivors of deceased veterans who were rated 100 percent disabled by reason of service-connected disabilities for 20 or more years; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 1744. A bill to amend section 312(3) of title 38, United States Code, to include the reinfection type of pulmonary tuberculosis in the provision relative to presumptive service connection for active tuberculosis disease; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 1745. A bill to amend section 523(b), chapter 15, of title 38, United States Code, to enable certain permanently and totally disabled veterans to receive the full rate of disability compensation found payable for their wartime service-connected disabilities, and also a proportionate amount of disability pension under a specified formula; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 1746. A bill to define the term "child" for lump-sum payment purposes under the Civil Service Retirement Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WATTS:

H.R. 1747. A bill to provide public works and economic development programs and the planning and coordination needed to assist in the development of the Appalachian region; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H.R. 1748. A bill to amend section 215 of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1749. A bill to amend the act of December 22, 1928, relating to the issuance of patents for lands held under color of title, to liberalize the requirements for the conveyance of the mineral estate, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H.R. 1750. A bill to provide certain increases in annuities payable from the civil service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H.R. 1751. A bill to provide for the establishment of a veterans' hospital in south Texas; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNGER:

H.R. 1752. A bill to adjust wheat and feed grain production, to establish a cropland retirement program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ABBITT:

H.R. 1753. A bill to amend section 331 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 in order to continue the indemnity payment program for dairy farmers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ANNUNZIO:

H.R. 1754. A bill making Columbus Day a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H.R. 1755. A bill to amend the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act with respect to the payment of sickness benefits in cases involving sickness which extends continuously from one benefit year into the next; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CLANCY:

H.R. 1756. A bill to repeal the Federal excise taxes on jewelry, furs, toilet preparations, luggage and handbags, general telephone service, general admissions, transportation of persons by air, and safe deposit boxes, effective for periods after March 31, 1965; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H.R. 1757. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an income tax deduction for certain expenses of attending colleges and universities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1759. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that any unmarried person who maintains his or her own home shall be entitled to be taxed at the rate provided for the head of a household; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1758. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide that polished sheets and plates of iron or steel shall be subject to the same duty as unpolished sheets and plates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1760. A bill to establish a Commission on the Organization of the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

H.R. 1761. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

H.R. 1762. A bill to amend section 312 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that poliomyelitis developing a 10-percent degree of disability within 1 year from the date of discharge of any veteran shall be held and considered to be service connected; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 1763. A bill to amend section 1825 of title 28 of the United States Code to authorize the payment of witness' fees in habeas corpus cases and in proceedings to vacate sentence under section 2255 of title 28 for persons who are authorized to proceed in forma pauperis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1764. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1765. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to make the robbery of a cooperative bank which is a member of the Federal home loan bank a crime; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1766. A bill to provide for the greater protection of the President and the Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 1767. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to reduce the percentage depletion rate for oil and gas wells from 27½ to 12½ percent in three stages; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1768. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase from $600 to $700 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1769. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase old-age and disability insurance benefits by $35 a month (and other monthly benefits proportionately), and to provide that full benefits (when based upon attainment of retirement age) will be payable to men at age 62 and women at age 60; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1770. A bill to prevent the use of stopwatches or other measuring devices in the postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1771. A bill to establish a 5-day week for postmasters; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HAGEN of California:

H.R. 1772. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that the child of an insured individual may receive child's insurance benefits even though he has attained age 18 if he is under 21 and is a full-time student attending a college or university; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALEY:

H.R. 1773. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a form of averaging for recovery of amounts received as damages for injury to crops through pollution of air, water, or soil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1774. A bill to provide for the designation of a highway from Tampa, Fla., to Miami, Fla., as a part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 1775. A bill to amend the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, to provide for the retirement of the public debt by setting aside the first 5 percent of the budget receipts of the United States for each fiscal year for the sole purpose of retirement of obligations counted as part of the public debt; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 1776. A bill to provide for national cemeteries in the county of De Soto, State of Florida; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 1777. A bill to help maintain the financial solvency of the Federal Government by reducing nonessential expenditures through reduction in personnel in various agencies of the Federal Government by attrition, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HARSHA:

H.R. 1778. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to create a Board for the Condemnation of Insanitary Buildings in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved May 1, 1906, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HECHLER:

H.R. 1779. A bill to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide further for the prevention of accidents in coal mines; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 1780. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to provide for the greater protection of the President and the Vice President of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HENDERSON:

H.R. 1781. A bill to amend section 113(a) of title 28, United States Code, to provide that Federal District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina shall be held at Clinton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1782. A bill to amend the Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act with respect to Government contributions for expenses incurred in the administration of such act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1783. A bill to grant for purposes of the Civil Service Retirement Act for service performed by Federal employees under a cooperative agreement between the Federal Government and the State of North Carolina with respect to the administration of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 in such State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1784. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Cape Lookout National Seashore in the State of North Carolina, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 1785. A bill to limit the applicability of the antitrust laws so as to exempt certain aspects of designated professional team sports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HULL:

H.R. 1786. A bill authorizing construction of a bridge across the Missouri River in the vicinity of St. Joseph, Mo.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 1787. A bill to provide for the acquisition of certain property in square 758 in the District of Columbia, as an addition to the grounds of the U.S. Supreme Court Building; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KEE:

H.R. 1788. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to reduce from 62 to 50 the age at which widows' benefits become payable thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1789. A bill to designate the authorized Justice Reservoir on the Guyandot River, W. Va., as the R. D. Bailey Reservoir; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 1790. A bill to provide for the establishment and administration of the Allegheny Parkway in the States of West Virginia and Kentucky and Maryland, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KING of Utah:

H.R. 1791. A bill to confirm in the State of Utah title to lands lying below the meander line of the Great Salt Lake in such State; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 1792. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the tax on transportation of persons by air shall not apply to uninterrupted international combined air and sea transportation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1793. A bill to prohibit transportation in interstate or foreign commerce of articles to or from the United States aboard certain foreign vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MARTIN of Alabama:

H.R. 1794. A bill defining the jurisdiction of the U.S. Supreme Court and all Federal courts inferior thereto, in certain instances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MAY:

H.R. 1795. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Touchet division, Walla Walla project, Oregon-Washington, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 1796. A bill to amend section 1346 of title 28, United States Code, to permit suits against the United States arising out of contracts entered into by nonappropriated fund activities of or under departments and agencies of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 1797. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide for the manufacture, use, and disposition of beer concentrate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 1798. A bill to waive the repayment of advances made to finance the planning of public works if construction of the project planned is initiated as a result of a grant-in-aid made from an allocation made by the President under the Public Works Acceleration Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 1799. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 1800. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide for the defense of suits alleging malpractice or negligence in furnishing medical care and treatment against physicians, dentists, and nurses in the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.R. 1801. A bill to create four judicial districts for the State of California, to provide for the appointment of four additional district judges for the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WYDLER:

H.R. 1802. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a deduction from gross income for certain nonreimbursable expenses incurred by volunteer firemen; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1803. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1804. A bill to provide for the greater protection of the President and the Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 1805. A bill to amend section 5899 of title 10, United States Code, to provide permanent authority under which Naval Reserve officers in the grade of captain shall be eligible for consideration for promotion when their running mates are eligible for consideration for promotion; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 1806. A bill to prohibit misuse or exportation of the flag of the United States in certain instances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1807. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to conduct research and development of precision equipment and systems for utilizing radio signals from space satellites to improve navigation of nonmilitary vessels at sea; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 1808. A bill authorizing the admission of two citizens and subjects of the Republic of Korea to the U.S. Military Academy, the U.S. Naval Academy, and the Air Force Academy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 1809. A bill to provide a hospital insurance program for the aged under social security, to amend the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system to increase benefits, improve the actuarial status of the disability insurance trust fund, and extend coverage, to amend the Social Security Act to provide additional Federal financial participation in the Federal-State public assistance programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 1810. A bill to provide a hospital insurance program for the aged under social security, to amend the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system to increase benefits, improve the actuarial status of the disability insurance trust fund, and extend coverage, to amend the Social Security Act to provide additional Federal financial participation in the Federal-State public assistance programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 1811. A bill to provide a hospital insurance program for the aged under social security, to amend the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system to increase benefits, improve the actuarial status of the disability insurance trust fund, and extend coverage, to amend the Social Security Act to provide additional Federal financial participation in the Federal-State public assistance programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 1812. A bill to provide a hospital insurance program for the aged under social security, to amend the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system to increase benefits, improve the actuarial status of the disability insurance trust fund, and extend coverage, to amend the Social Security Act to provide additional Federal financial participation in the Federal-State public assistance programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

H.R. 1813. A bill to provide a hospital insurance program for the aged under social security, to amend the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system to increase benefits, improve the actuarial status of the disability insurance trust fund, and extend coverage, to amend the Social Security Act to provide additional Federal financial participation in the Federal-State public assistance programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KREBS:

H.R. 1814. A bill to provide a hospital insurance program for the aged under social security, to amend the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system to increase benefits, improve the actuarial status of the disability insurance trust fund, and extend coverage, to amend the Social Security Act to provide additional Federal financial participation in the Federal-State public assistance programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 1815. A bill to provide a hospital insurance program for the aged under social security, to amend the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system to increase benefits, improve the actuarial status of the disability insurance trust fund, and extend coverage, to amend the Social Security Act to provide additional Federal financial participation in the Federal-State public assistance programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H.R. 1816. A bill to provide a hospital insurance program for the aged under social security, to amend the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system to increase benefits, improve the actuarial status of the disability insurance trust fund, and extend coverage, to amend the Social Security Act to provide additional Federal financial participation in the Federal-State public assistance programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TENZER:

H.R. 1817. A bill to provide a hospital insurance program for the aged under social security, to amend the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system to increase benefits, improve the actuarial status of the disability insurance trust fund, and extend coverage, to amend the Social Security Act to provide additional Federal financial participation in the Federal-State public assistance programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VIVIAN:

H.R. 1818. A bill to provide a hospital insurance program for the aged under social security, to amend the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system to increase benefits, improve the actuarial status of the disability insurance trust fund, and extend coverage, to amend the Social Security Act to provide additional Federal financial participation in the Federal-State public assistance programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 1851. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that certain income derived from manufacturing plants established on Indian reservations shall not be subject to tax, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 1966. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to provide for a middecade census of population, unemployment, and housing in years 1966 and 1975 and every 10 years thereafter; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.J. Res. 124. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOW:

H.J. Res. 125. Joint resolution making the 17th day of September in each year a legal holiday to be known as Constitution Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 126. Joint resolution providing for the revision of the Status of Forces Agreement and certain other treaties and international agreements, or the withdrawal of the United States from such treaties and agreements, so that foreign countries will not have criminal jurisdiction over American Armed Forces personnel stationed within their boundaries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CAHILL:

H.J. Res. 127. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to limit the power of the States and their political subdivisions to tax the salaries and wages of persons who are not domiciliaries or residents thereof; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIN:

H.J. Res. 128. Joint resolution designating the American marigold (Tagetes erecta) as the national floral emblem of the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.J. Res. 129. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to establish a commission to determine the inability of a President to discharge the powers and duties of the office of President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 130. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DE LA GARZA:

H.J. Res. 131. Joint resolution to determine the desirability of establishing a historic site near Brownsville, Tex., in commemoration of the Mexican War; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H.J. Res. 132. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.J. Res. 133. Joint resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the Government of Egypt be denied aid under the terms of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.J. Res. 134. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to the States of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, and the District of Columbia to negotiate and enter into a compact to establish a multistate authority to construct and operate a passenger rail transportation system within the area of such States and the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALEY:

H.J. Res. 135. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for a 4-year term for Members of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 136. Joint resolution expressing a declaration of war against the 98 Communist Parties constituting the international Communist conspiracy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HUTCHINSON:

H.J. Res. 137. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution relating to apportionment of State legislatures; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KORNEGAY:

H.J. Res. 138. Joint resolution to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct research into the quality and health factors of tobacco and other ingredients and materials used in the manufacture of tobacco products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.J. Res. 139. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 140. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to provide for the selection of a new Vice President whenever there is a vacancy in the Office of Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska:

H.J. Res. 141. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America providing for a 4-year term for Members of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.J. Res. 142. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the 13th day of September as Commodore John Barry Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHRIVER:

H.J. Res. 143. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to succession to the Presidency and Vice-Presidency and to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.J. Res. 144. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to the States of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, and the District of Columbia to negotiate and enter into a compact to establish a multistate authority to construct and operate a passenger rail transportation system within the area of such States and the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H.J. Res. 145. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to the States of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, and the District of Columbia to negotiate and enter into a compact to establish a multistate authority to construct and operate a passenger rail transportation system within the area of such States and the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.J. Res. 146. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.J. Res. 147. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to the States of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, and the District of Columbia to negotiate and enter into a compact to establish a multistate authority to construct and operate a passenger rail transportation system within the area of such States and the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H.J. Res. 148. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNGER:

H.J. Res. 149. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H. Con. Res. 70. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the distribution and viewing of the U.S. Information Agency film on the late President Kennedy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BOW:

H. Con. Res. 71. Concurrent resolution relative to captive nations days; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H. Con. Res. 72. Concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Congressional Reorganization; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. Con. Res. 73. Concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DADDARIO:

H. Con. Res. 74. Concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Committee on the Intelligence Community; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H. Con. Res. 75. Concurrent resolution to request the President of the United States to urge certain actions in behalf of Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H. Con. Res. 76. Concurrent resolution to request the President to initiate discussion of the Baltic States question before the United Nations with a view to gaining the independence of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia from the Soviet Union; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H. Con. Res. 77. Concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MacGREGOR:

H. Con. Res. 78. Concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RANDALL:

H. Con. Res. 79. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the film, "John F. Kennedy—Years of Lightning, Day of Drums," should be released for domestic public showing; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. UDALL:

H. Con. Res. 80. Concurrent resolution for a study of the procedures of Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Con. Res. 81. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that arrangements be made for viewing within the United States of a film entitled "John F. Kennedy—Years of Lightning, Day of Drums," prepared by the U.S. Information Agency; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H. Res. 80. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to make investigations into any matter within its jurisdiction, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H. Res. 81. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to abolish the Committee on Un-American Activities and to enlarge the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H. Res. 82. Resolution establishing a Special Committee on the Captive Nations; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H. Res. 83. Resolution, that Robert Lloyd be held in contempt of Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORGAN:

H. Res. 84. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Foreign Affairs to conduct a full and complete investigation of matters relating to the laws, regulations, directives, and policies including personnel pertaining to the Department of State and such other departments and agencies engaged primarily in the implementation of U.S. foreign policy and the oversea operations, personnel, and facilities of departments and agencies of the United States which participate in the development and execution of such policy; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 1819. A bill for the relief of Francesca Cusumano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1820. A bill for the relief of Winsome Elaine Gordon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1821. A bill for the relief of Louis Adler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1822. A bill for the relief of Won Loy Jung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1823. A bill for the relief of Sime Guzabat; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1824. A bill for the relief of Cosimo Barbetta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1825. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Voglioso and wife, Giulia Giovanna Gisotti Voglioso; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1826. A bill for the relief of Virginia Peters; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1827. A bill for the relief of Rosario Minacappelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1828. A bill for the relief of Anastasia Zafiropoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1829. A bill for the relief of John (Ionnis) Psomas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1830. A bill for the relief of Evelyn Adora Flowers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1831. A bill for the relief of Enrico Cortina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1832. A bill for the relief of Umberto Callari; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1833. A bill for the relief of Margherita Di Matteo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATES:

H.R. 1834. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Faride Afif; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1835. A bill for the relief of Dr. Melecio H. Flores; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1836. A bill for the relief of Constantinus Agganis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1837. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Khatoun Hazarchachian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1838. A bill for the relief of Mr. Ng Ying Lung and Mrs. Ng Lau Kwen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1839. A bill for the relief of Sister Vittorina, Sister Colomba, Sister Orsanna, and Sister Filomena; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1840. A bill to provide for the presentation of a medal to the family of the late Patrick Rose, in recognition of his valor in saving the lives of fellow fishermen; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 1841. A bill for the relief of Ioannis Vasiliou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H.R. 1842. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rose D'Arienzo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1843. A bill for the relief of Irma Ceruti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1844. A bill for the relief of Dr. Alfredo C. Kaguyutan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1845. A bill for the relief of Dr. Kiyoshi Kimura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1846. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Uberti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1847. A bill for the relief of Marie Yvette Beaudoin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1848. A bill for the relief of Domenico Dell 'Aera; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1849. A bill for the relief of Michele Granaudo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1850. A bill for the relief of Louis Discenza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1852. A bill for the relief of Megerditch Birajiclian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1853. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Delina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1854. A bill for the relief of Momcilo and Sokolka Radosavljevic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1855. A bill for the relief of John C. Garand; to the Committee on the Judicary.

By Mr. BOW:

H.R. 1856. A bill for the relief of Liliana Vrchkovska Pandoff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 1857. A bill for the relief of Anna Formicola Nacca; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURKE:

H.R. 1858. A bill for the relief of Thomas J. Condon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1859. A bill for the relief of Dina Cohen (nee Levin); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1860. A bill for the relief of Silverio Conte; his wife, Lucia Conte; their son, Aniello Conte; and their daughter, Silvanna Conte; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1861. A bill for the relief of Naja Nessrallah; his wife, Samira Nessrallah; and their minor sons, Kozaya Nessrallah and Mansur Nessrallah; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1862. A bill for the relief of Michael and Concetta Terriaca; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1863. A bill for the relief of Antoine Nasrallah; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1864. A bill for the relief of Rebecca K. C. Wang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1865. A bill for the relief of Fotios Nicolpoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1866. A bill for the relief of Marie Dimou (known as Demos); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1867. A bill for the relief of Daniel Walter Miles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1868. A bill for the relief of Maria Laura Rego Torres; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAHILL:

H.R. 1869. A bill for the relief of Noreen Mavis Philomena Kingham; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1870. A bill for the relief of Edward G. Morhauser; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1871. A bill for the relief of Anna Del Baglivo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHELF:

H.R. 1872. A bill for the relief of Bo Han Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLANCY:

H.R. 1873. A bill for the relief of Elisabeth Werner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1874. A bill for the relief of Nunsia (Nancy) Francesca Badali; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1875. A bill for the relief of Marie Sahely; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1876. A bill for the relief of Konstantina D. Ioannou (Johnson); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1877. A bill for the relief of Adamantia Kakogianni; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 1878. A bill for the relief of Peter George Klinklavs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1879. A bill for the relief of Konstantinos and Magdalini Likouresis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1880. A bill for the relief of Constantine Sotos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1881. A bill for the relief of Pavlos Agos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1882. A bill for the relief of Justi Bevc; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1883. A bill for the relief of Gregorios Karalis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1884. A bill for the relief of Julia and Triantafylos Economopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1885. A bill for the relief of Anastassia Dimiza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1886. A bill for the relief of Konstantinos Papagiannis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1887. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Inga; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONABLE:

H.R. 1888. A bill for the relief of Sister Enrica (Pasqualina Filippo) and Sister Antonia (Ida Conforto); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1889. A bill for the relief of Albert Marks; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 1890. A bill for the relief of Michael P. Buckley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H.R. 1891. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the U.S. Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Frank E. Lipp; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1892. A bill for the relief of M. Sgt. Richard G. Smith, U.S. Air Force, retired; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1893. A bill for the relief of Panagiotis Kamboukos (Kazantzas); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1894. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Liliana A. Barsoum; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1895. A bill for the relief of Gaetano Fuccio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIN:

H.R. 1896. A bill for the relief of Mario Budinich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1897. A bill for the relief of Hadi Ozer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1898. A bill for the relief of Nasralla Aziz Barbar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1899. A bill for the relief of Alextine Karoline Voogel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H.R. 1900. A bill to provide for the conveyance of the interest held by the United States in certain real property situated in the State of Georgia; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H.R. 1901. A bill for the relief of Sara Khalil Mohamed, Osmand Mohamed, her husband, and Hassan Mohamed, her son; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 1902. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Sylvia Ross; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOLE:

H.R. 1903. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Sadie Y. Simmons; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H.R. 1904. A bill for the relief of Athanasios Panagopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1905. A bill for the relief of International Mortgage & Investment Corp. and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1906. A bill for the relief of Yanina Opielowska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1907. A bill to promote public knowledge of progress and achievement in astronautics and related sciences through the designation of a special day in honor of Dr. Robert Hutchings Goddard, the father of modern rockets, missiles, and astronauts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1908. A bill for the relief of Chester (Abramczyk) Hill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H.R. 1909. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marjory Erricsson Geltch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 1910. A bill for the relief of Margaret Miklos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1911. A bill for the relief of Reuven and Ella Glancz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1912. A bill for the relief of Dr. Pura Vargas and Dr. Andres Vargas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1913. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Milazzo, Felicia Milazzo, and Emanuela Milazzo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 1914. A bill for the relief of Luigi Silvestri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1915. A bill for the relief of Maggiorina Civetta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1916. A bill for the relief of Dr. Olga J. Agbayani Asar and Dr. Sadat Ali Asar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1917. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Altobello; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1918. A bill for the relief of Eligio Ciardiello; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1919. A bill for the relief of Yvonne May Hall; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1920. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Nettie Anabel James; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1921. A bill for the relief of Onafino Spadafino and Maria Bozzi Spadafino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1922. A bill for the relief of Abraham and Nitza Gil; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGEN of California:

H.R. 1923. A bill for the relief of Antonio Garcia Jorge; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1924. A bill for the relief of Jose Borges Mendes Godinho; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1925. A bill for the relief of Gus Consani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1926. A bill for the relief of Julio Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 1927. A bill for the relief of Visitacion Enriquez Maypa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1928. A bill for the relief of William F. Bening; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARSHA:

H.R. 1929. A bill for the relief of Mary Edna Younie; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 1930. A bill for the relief of Joseph Monaco and his wife, Josephine Monaco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUTCHINSON:

H.R. 1931. A bill for the relief of Alexander Porzse; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1932. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maria de Jesus Umali; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 1933. A bill for the relief of Sister Rosaria Carlino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1934. A bill for the relief of Cyriac J. Thengumthiel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1935. A bill for the relief of Alejandro Debeljkovic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1936. A bill for the relief of Sister Ornella Longo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1937. A bill for the relief of Letizia Geta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1938. A bill for the relief of Sister Corrada Amorosa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 1939. A bill for the relief of Donald B. Bonner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1940. A bill for the relief of Dr. Celedonia V. Koh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1941. A bill for the relief of Dan and Sarah Gwily; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1942. A bill for the relief of Hilda Eaves; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1943. A bill for the relief of Serafino Tomassetti and his wife Luisa Maria Tomassetti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1944. A bill for the relief of Rose Minutillo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1945. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Raisla Stein and her two minor children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1946. A bill for the relief of David Dagan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1947. A bill for the relief of Lenford A. Rowe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1948. A bill for the relief of Lileith Murtina Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1949. A bill for the relief of Celes W. White; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1950. A bill for the relief of Elfladis Veronica Nelson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1951. A bill for the relief of Cecil E. and Linnette Dunkley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1952. A bill for the relief of Dr. George Varughese; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1953. A bill for the relief of George Gabourel and four of his children, Marie Elizabeth, Dorothy Ann, Alice Louise, and Kathleen Florence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1954. A bill for the relief of the children of Margaret Wint; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1955. A bill for the relief of Frida and Jacobo Goldstein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1956. A bill for the relief of Gilbert Fitzgerald Thomas and his wife, Norma Ina Beatrice Thomas (nee Kendall); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 1957. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Klari Kertesz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1958. A bill for the relief of Nguyen Thai Son; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1959. A bill for the relief of Dr. Maximo Deysine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1960. A bill for the relief of Shahrbanou B. Estakhry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1961. A bill for the relief of Paul Leopold Hofmann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1962. A bill for the relief of Wissa Ernest Zaki Wissa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland:

H.R. 1963. A bill for the relief of Rafael and Olimpia Aybar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1964. A bill for the relief of K. S. Krishnaswami; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1965. A bill for the relief of Dr. Lolita Lerma; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1967. A bill for the relief of Dr. John James Russell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1968. A bill for the relief of Mary B. Baylis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1969. A bill for the relief of John J. Tavormina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1970. A bill for the relief of Sui Tsai Zee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H.R. 1971. A bill for the relief of Juraj Mikan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts:

H.R. 1972. A bill for the relief of Rosaria Nogueira; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1973. A bill for the relief of Manuel Cabral do Rego; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1974. A bill for the relief of Jose Luis da Silva; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1975. A bill for the relief of Antonio Coelho Morgado; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1976. A bill for the relief of Isaura Maria Carreiro da Silva and Luiz Leonardo da Silva; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1977. A bill for the relief of Henrique Botelho de Medeiros; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1978. A bill for the relief of Manuel da Mota Fragata; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 1979. A bill for the relief of Shigeo Tokoro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1980. A bill for the relief of Dai Hwan Pang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1981. A bill for the relief of Satya P. Sood; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1982. A bill for the relief of Dr. Pureza Flor Monzon Gaerlan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MAY:

H.R. 1983. A bill for the relief of Lawrence Ben Huie; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 1984. A bill for the relief of Dr. Felipe and Flora Tolentino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 1985. A bill for the relief of Miss Zaida Zapata deDios; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 1986. A bill for the relief of Yerzy Clemens Gzella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PIRNIE:

H.R. 1987. A bill for the relief of Nabhane M. Nickley (Nabhane M. Karam); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 1988. A bill for the relief of Dr. Narciso C. Bauzon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1989. A bill for the relief of Krystyna Glowacka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1990. A bill for the relief of Dr. Ibrahim Faruk Sarac, his wife, Fatma Nukhet Sarac, and their two daughters, Ayes Hulya Sarac and Fatma Nil Sarac; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1991. A bill for the relief of Dr. Marcelo A. Manubay and his wife, Eugenia B. Manubay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 1992. A bill for the relief of Emma Hairapetian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHWEIKER:

H.R. 1993. A bill for the relief of Francesca Bacino Boccella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1994. A bill for the relief of Ottillia Sophie Murphy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SICKLES:

H.R. 1995. A bill for the relief of Sister Fara (Giuseppina Perrone); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1996. A bill for the relief of Demetrios Stratigeas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1997. A bill for the relief of Luciano Di Salvo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1998. A bill for the relief of Dr. Silvino B. Muneses; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1999. A bill for the relief of Chan Yoon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2000. A bill for the relief of Anna Oleksiejuk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TALCOTT:

H.R. 2001. A bill for the relief of Julio Sorio and family; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2002. A bill for the relief of Nadezda Markovic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2003. A bill for the relief of Gholamali Homayoun; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.R. 2004. A bill for the relief of Cho Seung Man and Kim Chul Hee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2005. A bill for the relief of Miss Gloria Seborg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2006. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Laurette Mae Dunn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2007. A bill for the relief of Stella Braha Levy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2008. A bill for the relief of Mr. Liem Gien Tjwan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2009. A bill for the relief of Adolfo Lopez Mendez, doctor of medicine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2010. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Liem Gien Tjwan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2011. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hamaka Nakamura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2012. A bill for the relief of Dr. Ignace D. Liu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2013. A bill for the relief of certain individuals employed by the Department of the Navy at the Pacific Missile Range, Point Mugu, Calif.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H.R. 2014. A bill for the relief of Swiff-Train Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNGER:

H.R. 2015. A bill for the relief of Robert H. Clark, Arthur E. Field, Edward M. Leonard, Bradford A. Turcott, and Fred J. Tuck; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2016. A bill for the relief of Arline and Maurice Loader; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H.R. 2017. A bill for the relief of Lourdes C. Villareal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII:

58. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the supreme secretary, Knights of Columbus, New Haven, Conn., requesting local and national governmental leaders to call upon every moral fiber which they possess to preserve the heritage and tradition of our American way of life; to the Committee on House Administration.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 6, 1965

The Senate met at 11:30 a.m., and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, in the toils and troubles of time Thou hast set eternity in our hearts. Scorning the cheap cant of secular panaceas and partisan shibboleths, give us to see that we cannot house our spirits even in ornate barns—that really to live we must ever be building more stately habitations for our own souls and for Thy children under all skies.

As we come in a high hour of human destiny, solemnized by the tangled tragedy in which all human life is caught, empower Thy servants in this forum of governance to rise above all that is base and small, and to work together in glad and eager harmony for the honor, safety, and welfare of our Nation, and of all the peoples of this stricken earth, who will unite in mutual good will determined to open the gates of a new life for all mankind.

We ask it in that Name which is above every name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, January 4, 1965, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, notified the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of section 3, Public Law 88–630, the Speaker, on November 18, 1964, appointed Mr. MORRIS of New Mexico, Mr. RIVERS of Alaska, Mr. BERRY of South Dakota, and Mr. SKUBITZ of Kansas as members of the Lewis and Clark Trail Commission on the part of the House.

The message communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Herbert Clark Hoover, former President of the United States, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

ORDER FOR INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND SUBMISSION OF RESOLUTIONS WITHOUT PREJUDICE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order to introduce bills and submit resolutions that would be referred to the appropriate standing committees of the Senate without prejudicing the rights of any Senator as regards the parliamentary situation affecting any proposed amendment to the Senate rules, and that that procedure be continued today so long as any Senator desires to be recognized, and that statements during that period be limited to 3 minutes.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. As I understand, that is the procedure which was adopted in 1963. At that time there was no difficulty with the procedure in connection with the proposed amendment of the rules.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Do I correctly understand that Senators will have only 3 minutes in which to make remarks in connection with the introduction of bills?

Mr. MANSFIELD. During the morning hour.

Mr. McCLELLAN. May Senators make statements thereafter?

Mr. MANSFIELD. When the Senate returns from the joint meeting, the morning hour will have been concluded and discussions at greater length can then be undertaken.

Mr. McCLELLAN. If remarks on the introduction of a bill or the submission of a resolution are made during the morning hour and the speech in connection with such introduction or submission is concluded after the morning hour, will it be in order that the entire speech be inserted in the RECORD at the point at which the morning hour proceedings appear?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, has there been a ruling on my request?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair has ruled. There being no objection, the request has been agreed to.

REPORT ON OPERATIONS OF PEACE CORPS ACT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 42)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of section 11 of the Peace Corps Act, as amended, I transmit herewith the third annual report on operations under the act covering the fiscal year ended June 30, 1964.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 6, 1965.*

ANNUAL REPORT OF CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 13)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting the Annual Report of the U.S. Civil Service Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1964, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith the Annual Report of the U.S. Civil Service Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1964.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 6, 1965.*

ANNUAL REPORT OF WEATHER MODIFICATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 43)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Commerce:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith for the consideration of the Congress the Fifth Annual Report on Weather Modification (for fiscal year 1963) as submitted by the Director of the National Science Foundation.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 6, 1965.*

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON CONSTRUCTION AT GEORGE C. MARSHALL SPACE FLIGHT CENTER, HUNTSVILLE, ALA.

A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on construction at the George C. Marshall Space Flight Center, Huntsville, Ala.; to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

REPORT OF NATIONAL FOREST RESERVATION COMMISSION (S. DOC. NO. 3)

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, President, National Forest Reservation Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

REPORT ON SUMMARY OF ORGANIZATION AND PROCEDURES FOR THE OPERATION AND ADMINISTRATION OF THE AGRICULTURAL TRADE DEVELOPMENT AND ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1954

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the summary of organization and procedures for the operation and administration of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, dated December 1963 (in three parts) (with accompanying documents); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORTS ON AGREEMENTS UNDER TITLE I OF AGRICULTURAL TRADE DEVELOPMENT AND ASSISTANCE ACT

A letter from the Acting Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on title I agreements under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act, signed during September 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Two letters from the Associate Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, report on title I agreements under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act, signed during the months of October and November 1964, respectively (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT OF FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Governor, Farm Credit Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Administration on the work of the cooperative Farm Credit System, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL FARM LOAN ACT AND FARM CREDIT ACT OF 1933

A letter from the Governor, Farm Credit Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Federal Farm Loan Act and the Farm Credit Act of 1933 to provide means for expediting the retirement of Government capital in the Federal intermediate credit banks, including an increase in the debt permitted such banks in relation to their capital and provision for the production credit associations to acquire additional capital stock therein, to provide for allocating certain earnings of such banks and associations to their users, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORTS ON OVEROBLIGATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS

A letter from the Secretary of State, reporting, pursuant to law, the overobligation of an appropriation in that Department (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations.

Two letters from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, Veterans' Administration, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, the overobligation of an appropriation in that Administration; to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT ON JUDGMENTS RENDERED BY U.S. COURT OF CLAIMS (S. DOC. NO. 2)

A letter from the Clerk, U.S. Court of Claims, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on all judgments rendered by that court, for the year ended September 30, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS ON REAPPORTIONMENT OF APPROPRIATIONS

Ten letters from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, dated September 28 (2), September 29, September 30 (2), October 5, October 31, November 27, November 28, and December 12, 1964, respectively, reporting, pursuant to law, that sundry appropriations in the various departments were reapportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for supplemental estimates of appropriations; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, dated December 22, 1964, reporting, pursuant to law, that the appropriation to the Department of Justice for "Salaries and expenses, Federal Bureau of Investigation," for the fiscal year 1964, had been apportioned on a basis indicating a need for a supplemental estimate of appropriation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Reports on Approval of Loans by Rural Electrification Administration

A letter from the Administrator, Rural Electrification Administration, Department of Agriculture, reporting, pursuant to law, on the approval of a loan to the Dairyland Power Cooperative, of LaCrosse, Wis., for the financing of certain generation and transmission facilities (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations.

A letter from the Administrator, Rural Electrification Administration, Department of Agriculture, reporting, pursuant to law, on the approval of a loan to the Corn Belt Power Cooperative, of Humboldt, Iowa, for the financing of certain transmission facilities (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations.

A letter from the Administrator, Rural Electrification Administration, Department of Agriculture, reporting, pursuant to law, on the approval of a loan to the East Kentucky Rural Electric Cooperation Corporation of Winchester, Ky., for the financing of certain generation and transmission facilities (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations.

Reports of Export-Import Bank of Washington on Guarantees of Certain Transactions

Three letters from the Secretary, Export-Import Bank of Washington, Washington, D.C., dated November 16, November 19, and December 9, 1964, respectively, reporting, pursuant to law, on the issuance by that bank of guarantees with respect to certain transactions; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Export-Import Bank of Washington, Washington, D.C., dated December 15, 1964, reporting, pursuant to law, on the issuance by that bank of guarantees with respect to certain transactions; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Report on Shipments Insured by Export-Import Bank of Washington

A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Export-Import Bank of Washington, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, that shipments to Yugoslavia, insured under the short-term export credit insurance program, totaled $3,502, for the month of November 1964; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Reports on Officers on Duty With Headquarters, Department of the Army and Army General Staff

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports on number of officers on duty with Headquarters, Department of the Army and the Army General Staff, as of September 30, 1964 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report on Military Construction Contracts Awarded Without Formal Advertising

A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on military construction contracts awarded by the Air Force without formal advertising, for the 6-month period ended June 30, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report on Officers Assigned to Permanent Duty at the Seat of Government

A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, reporting, pursuant to law, that as of the end of the first quarter of fiscal year 1965, September 30, 1964, there was an aggregate of 2,183 officers assigned or detailed to permanent duty in the executive part of the Department of the Air Force at the seat of Government; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report on Proposed Donation of Certain Surplus Property to Star-Spangled Banner Flag House Association, Inc.

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, reporting, pursuant to law, on the proposed donation of certain surplus property to Star-Spangled Banner Flag House Association, Inc.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Donation of Certain Surplus Property to Star-Spangled Banner Flag House Association, Inc.

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, relating to an executive communication transmitted to the Senate in November 1964, pertaining to the donation of certain surplus property to the Star-Spangled Banner Flag House Association, Inc. (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report on Procurement Receipts for Medical Stockpile of Civil Defense Emergency Supplies and Equipment

A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, reporting, pursuant to law, on actual procurement receipts for medical stockpile of civil defense emergency supplies and equipment purposes, for the quarterly period ended September 30, 1964; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report on Military Procurement Actions for Experimental, Developmental, or Research Work

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on military procurement actions for experimental, developmental, or research work in the interest of national defense or industrial mobilization, for the period January-June 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report on Real and Personal Property, Department of Defense

A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on real and personal property of that Department, as of June 30, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report on Military Construction, Army National Guard

A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Properties and Installations), reporting, pursuant to law, on the military construction of certain Army National Guard Armories (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report on Military Construction, Naval and Marine Corps Reserves

A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Properties and Installations), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on military construction, Naval and Marine Corps Reserves, dated December 17, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report on Critical Materials Stockpiling Program

A letter from the Director, Office of Emergency Planning, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the critical materials stockpiling program, for the period January 1 to June 30, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Statistical Supplement, Stockpile Report

A letter from the Director, Office of Emergency Planning, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a statistical supplement, stockpile report, for the 6-month period ended June 30, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report on Notice of Proposed Disposition of Certain Hyoscine

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a notice to be published in the Federal Register on the proposed disposition of approximately 2,100 ounces of hyoscine now held in the national stockpile (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report on Property Acquisitions of Emergency Supplies and Equipment

A letter from the Director of Civil Defense, reporting, pursuant to law, on property acquisitions of emergency supplies and equipment, for the quarterly period ended September 30, 1964; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report on Reconstruction Finance Corporation Liquidation Fund

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Liquidation Fund, for the quarter ended September 30, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Report on Export Control

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on export control, for the third quarter of 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Reports on Department of Defense Procurement From Small and Other Business Firms

A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on Department of Defense procurement from small and other business firms, for the period July–September 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on Department of Defense procurement from small and other business firms, for the period July-October 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Installations and Logistics, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on Department of Defense procurement from small and other business firms, for the period July-August 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Report on Review of Outstanding Voluntary Agreements and Programs

A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the continuing review of the outstanding voluntary agreements and programs under the provisions of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, as of November 9, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Report on Certain Liquidation Activities of Reconstruction Finance Corporation

A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the progress of the liquidation activities of the national defense, war and reconversion activities of Reconstruction Finance Corporation, for the quarter ended September 30, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Report of Federal Home Loan Bank Board

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Home Loan Bank Board, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Board, for the calendar year 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Report of Export-Import Bank of Washington

A letter from the President, Export-Import Bank of Washington, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Bank, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Report on Borrowing Authority

A letter from the Director, Executive Office of the President, Office of Emergency Planning, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on borrowing authority, for the period ended June 30, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

National Plan for Emergency Preparedness

A letter from the Director, Executive Office of the President, Office of Emergency Planning, Washington, D.C., transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a copy of "The National Plan for Emergency Preparedness" (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Report on Mobile Trade Fair Activities

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on mobile trade fair activities, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

Report on U.S. Travel Service

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the U.S. Travel Service, for the 6-month period ended June 30, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

Report on Provision of War Risk Insurance and Certain Marine and Liability Insurance for the American Public

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting pursuant to law, a report on the provision of war risk insurance and certain marine and liability insurance for the American public, as of September 30, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

Report on Aviation War Risk Insurance

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on aviation war risk insurance, as of September 30, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

Report on Transactions Under Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on activities and transactions under the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, for the quarter ended September 30, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

Report on Operations of Bureau of Commercial Fisheries

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of operations of the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

Report of Migratory Bird Conservation Commission

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, Chairman, Migratory Bird Conservation Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

Publication Entitled "Steam-Electric Plant Construction Cost and Annual Production Expenses, 1962–63 Supplement"

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a copy of a publication entitled "Steam-Electric Plant Construction Cost and Annual Production Expenses, 1962–63 supplement" (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on Commerce.

Report on National Power Survey

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on National Power Survey—1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

Report on Permits and Licenses for Hydroelectric Projects

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on permits and licenses for hydroelectric projects issued by that Commission during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

Publications of Federal Power Commission

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a copy of the map "Major Natural Gas Pipelines, as of June 30, 1964" (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on Commerce.

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a copy of "Statistics of Electric Utilities in the United States, 1962, Publicly Owned" (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on Commerce.

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a copy of "Statistics for Interstate Natural Gas Pipeline Companies, 1963" (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on Commerce.

Reports on Real Property Exempted From Taxation in District of Columbia

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports on real property exempted from taxation in the District of Columbia, during the calendar year 1963 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Report on Certain Properties Exempt From Taxation in the District of Columbia

A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on certain properties exempt from taxation in the District of Columbia, during fiscal year 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Report of Public Utilities Commission, District of Columbia

A letter from the Executive Secretary, Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, for the calendar year 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Combined Statement of Receipts, Expenditures, and Balances of the U.S. Government

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a combined statement of receipts, expenditures, and balances of the U.S. Government, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

Report on Balances of Foreign Currencies Acquired Without Payment of Dollars

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of balances of foreign currencies acquired without payment of dollars, as of June 30, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Report of Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange Between East and West

A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange Between East and West, for the fiscal year 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Report on U.S. Exchange Program

A letter from the Chairman, the Board of Foreign Scholarships, Department of State, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the U.S. exchange program, dated September 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Report of the Advisory Committee on the Arts

A letter from the Chairman, the Advisory Committee on the Arts, Department of State, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Committee, for the year July 1, 1963, to June 30, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Report of Foreign Claims Settlement Commission

A letter from the Chairman, Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, for the 6-month period ended June 30, 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Interpretation of the Chamorro-Bryan Treaty

A letter from the Legislative Reference Service (Senate Library) transmitting a translation of the conclusions of a commission to report to the National Congress of Nicaragua on the Chamorro-Bryan Treaty, relating to the construction of a canal in Nicaragua (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Analytical Translation of Official Documents of the American Interparliamentary Union

A letter from the Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C., transmitting, for the information of the Senate, the following analytical translation of official documents of the American Interparliamentary Union, which with the accompanying documents, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

1. Bulletin No. 1 of the American Interparliamentary Union, which contains (1) statute of the American Interparliamentary Group, approved during the Second Plenary Session on February 5, 1964, at the Pan American Union in Washington, (2) the Interparliamentary Declaration of Washington (of the Third I-P Conference); (3) a resolution on the creation of an American Parliament; and (4) a list of the Executive Committee of this group.

2. The agenda of the Latin American Parliament, which will meet in Lima in December 1964.

3. An informational bulletin on the December 1964 meeting of the Latin American Parliament, in Lima, Peru.

4. The legal basis of the coming Latin American meeting in Peru.

Report on Foreign Excess Personal Property of Department of Defense

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on foreign excess personal property of that Department, as of June 30, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Real and Personal Property Received by State Surplus Property Agencies for Distribution to Public Health and Educational Institutions

A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on real and personal property received by State surplus property agencies for distribution to public health and educational institutions, for the quarterly period ended September 30, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Contracts Negotiated for Experimental, Developmental, or Research Work

A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on contracts negotiated for experimental, developmental, or research work, for the 6-month period ended June 30, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Research Grants Awarded by Department of Agriculture

A letter from the Director of Science and Education, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on research grants awarded by that Department, during fiscal year 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Examination of Economic and Technical Assistance Program for Turkey

A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Administration, Agency for International Development, Department of State, Washington, D.C., transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a copy of that Agency's reply to the Comptroller General of the United States relating to a report (B-133026) on examination of economic and technical assistance program for Turkey (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Improper Retention of Dollar Collections on Loans Made by Corporate Development Loan Fund

A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Administration, Agency for International Development, Department of State, Washington, D.C., transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a copy of that Agency's reply to the Comptroller General of the United States relating to a report (B-133220) on improper retention of dollar collections on loans made by Corporate Development Loan Fund (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Additional Interest Costs to the United States Because of Premature Releases of Funds to Social Progress Trust Fund

A letter from the Acting Director, Agency for International Development, Department of State, Washington, D.C., transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a copy of that Agency's reply to the Comptroller General of the United States relating to a report (B-146937) on additional interest costs to the United States because of premature releases of funds to the social progress trust fund administered by the Inter-American Development Bank (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Reports of Comptroller General

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report on the activities of the General Accounting Office, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on unnecessary cost to the Government through the leasing of electronic data processing systems by General Dynamics/Astronautics, a division of General Dynamics Corp., San Diego, Calif., Department of the Air Force, dated September 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on unnecessary costs incurred in the procurement from A-C Spark Plug Division of General Motors Corp. of bombing-navigational system components manufactured by International Business Machines Corp., Department of the Air Force, dated September 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on inadequate policies and practices relating to the relocation of families from urban renewal areas, District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency, and Housing and Home Finance Agency, dated September 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on excessive allocation of costs of certain streets and related facilities to the northside urban renewal project, Kansas City, Mo., Urban Renewal Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency, dated September 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on use of private executive aircraft rather than commercial aircraft resulted in unwarranted charges to Government cost-reimbursable-type contracts by Lockheed Missiles & Space Co., Sunnyvale, Calif., Department of Defense, dated October 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on excessive costs resulting from delayed purchase of automatic data processing equipment, Federal Aviation Agency, dated October 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on unnecessary expense incurred by producing basically similar motion picture films, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, dated October 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on unnecessary cost to the Government through the leasing of electronic data processing systems by General Electric Co., Missile and Space Division, Valley Forge, Pa., Department of Defense, dated October 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on unnecessary costs incurred by not considering transportation expenses as an element of procurement cost, Panama Canal Company, dated October 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on excessive ocean transportation costs incurred for shipments under title I, Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, Department of Agriculture, dated October 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on inadequate planning resulting in ineffectual utilization of the automatic data processing system at National Flight Data Center, Federal Aviation Agency, dated October 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on retention of uneconomical units in the Reserve Officers' Training Corps program, Departments of the Army and Air Force, dated October 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on weaknesses in administration of the hospital survey and construction grant program, Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, dated October 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on uneconomical proposed procurement of a fire alarm system by the Goddard Space Flight Center, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, dated October 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on unwarranted allowance for material price increases to Newport News Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co., Newport News, Va., for construction of the aircraft carrier U.S.S. *Enterprise*, Department of the Navy, dated October 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on revenues due the Government illegally expended for rehabilitation and improvement of concession facilities at Mount Rainier National Park, National Park Service, Department of the Interior, dated October 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on excessive costs incurred by leasing rather than purchasing certain telewriting equipment, Federal Supply Service, General Services Administration, dated October 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on inadequacies in the administration of right-of-way activities of the Federal-aid highway program in the State of New Jersey, Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Commerce, dated October 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on unnecessary costs resulting from failure to consolidate the leasing of intercity communications lines of certain civil agencies, General Services Administration, dated October 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on excessive Federal contributions to veterans' life insurance trust funds because of inadequate administration of extra-hazard provisions of law, Veterans' Administration, dated October 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on employment opportunities in federally aided projects generally restricted to individuals having funds to invest in business venture, Area Redevelopment Administration, Department of Commerce, dated October 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on questionable need for stockpiling cordage fibers, Office of Emergency Planning, Executive Office of the President, dated October 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on unnecessary costs incurred in sole-source procurement of portable radar sets, Department of the Army, dated October 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on deficiencies in the award and administration of timber sales contracts in the California region (region 5), Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, dated October 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on cost and pricing data not obtained for determining the reasonableness of prices for weapons components procured from the Aluminum Company of America by the Bendix Corp. and ACF Industries, Inc., Atomic Energy Commission, dated October 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on excessive costs to the Government in the sale and leaseback of an electronic data processing system by the Aerojet-General Corp., Sacramento, Calif., Department of Defense, dated October 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on uneconomical practices relating to the distribution of press releases and other informational material issued by the Department of Commerce, dated October 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on improper issuance of service-disabled veterans life insurance, Veterans' Administration, dated October 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on proceeds from sale of land improperly retained under the control of District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency, dated October 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on overcharges included in prices negotiated for change orders issued under fixed-price contracts awarded to Avondale Shipyards, Inc., New Orleans, La., Department of the Navy, dated October 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on overpricing of valves purchased from the Garrett Corp., Air Research Manufacturing Division, Phoenix, Ariz., by General Dynamics Corp., Astronautics Division, San Diego, Calif., for the Atlas intercontinental ballistic missile, Department of the Air Force, dated October 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on weaknesses in administration of the national fish hatchery program, Bureau of Sports Fisheries and Wildlife, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, dated October 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on potential savings available through purchasing rather than leasing certain office copying machines, Federal Supply Service, General Services Administration, dated October 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on violation of statutes governing Federal employment and excess costs incurred under a contract for technical writing and related services awarded by the Goddard Space Flight Center, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, dated October 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on unnecessary per diem payments made to military personnel assigned to temporary duty at Bath, Maine, Department of the Navy, dated October 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on accelerated public works assistance approved for areas under consideration for termination of eligibility, Area Redevelopment Administration, Department of Commerce, dated October 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on unnecessary disposal of spare components procured for the Hawk air defense guided-missile system, Department of the Army, dated October 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the unnecessary cost to the Government through the leasing of electronic data processing systems by Defense Electronic Products, Radio Corporation of America, Camden, N.J., Department of Defense, dated November 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on loss of interest on U.S. owned foreign currencies in the Republic of China (Taiwan), Treasury Department, Department of State, and Agency for International Development, dated November 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on overstated cost estimates included in target prices negotiated for B-52G airplanes produced by the Boeing Co., Wichita Branch, Wichita, Kans., Department of the Air Force, dated November 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the status of findings and recommendations included in prior report on audit of District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency, dated November 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on unnecessary vacancies in available Capehart, Wherry, and other Government-owned family housing at Fort Knox, Ky., Department of the Army, dated November 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the failure to construct District of Columbia Stadium in accordance with the financial plan submitted to the Congress, District of Columbia Armory Board, dated November 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the unnecessary costs resulting from indirect procurement of transmitters from Hamilton Standard Division of United Aircraft Corporation, Department of the Air Force, dated November 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on overpayments to vendors by San Francisco Regional Office, General Services Administration, dated November 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the uneconomical use of facilities by the Hawaii National Guard, Department of Defense, dated November 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the improper payment of Colombian port charges for surplus agricultural commodities sold under title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (commonly known as Public Law 480), Department of Agriculture, dated November 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the unnecessary transportation costs for small arms ammunition components purchased for the military assistance program, Department of the Army, dated

November 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on excessive costs incurred in acquiring a building site and in renting space, Federal Aviation Agency, dated November 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on deficiencies in the award and administration of contracts for construction of Federal-aid highway projects in the State of New Jersey, Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Commerce, dated November 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the unnecessary costs to the Federal Government as a result of supplanting existing employment services by federally financed services, Bureau of Employment Security, Department of Labor, dated November 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the weaknesses in administration of the student loan program under title II of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, dated November 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law a report on the unnecessary costs to the Government for commercial long-distance telephone calls made by Federal agencies in the Dallas region, between cities served by the Federal Telecommunications System, General Services Administration, dated November 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on deficiencies in appraising southern pine sawtimber sold in the southern region (region 8), Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, dated November 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the failure to require adherence to specifications for materials used in forest highway projects in certain Western States under the direct Federal highway construction program, Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Commerce, dated November 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on overpayments for rental of automatic data processing machines caused by inaccurate recording of machine use time, Federal Housing Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency, dated November 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on unwarranted financial risks assumed under the Federal ship mortgage insurance program, because of inadequate evaluation of economic soundness of proposed tanker operations, Maritime Administration, Department of Commerce, dated November 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on imprudent action taken in approving loans to assist the Roustabout Co., of Frackville, Pa., Area Redevelopment Administration, Department of Commerce, dated November 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on excessive prices for power-pack assemblies purchased from Sparton Corp., Jackson, Mich., by various prime contractors, Department of the Army, dated November 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on inventions not disclosed and confirmatory royalty-free licenses not obtained under selected research and development contracts with Lockheed Missiles & Space Co., Division of Lockheed Aircraft Corp., Sunnyvale, Calif., Department of Defense, dated November 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on overstatement of target cost of AN/FPS-7 radar equipment under fixed-price incentive contracts AF 30(635)-12300 and AF 30(635)-11072, with General Electric Co., Heavy Military Electronics Department, Syracuse, N.Y., Department of the Air Force, dated November 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on unnecessary cost to the Government in the leasing of electrical accounting machines by General Dynamics/Astronautics, San Diego, Calif., and Lockheed Missiles & Space Co., Sunnyvale, Calif., Department of Defense, dated November 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on expensive operation of mountain recreation facilities at Armed Forces Recreation Center, Kilauea Military Camp, Hawaii Volcanoes National Park, Department of Defense, dated November 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on weaknesses in controls over dollar refunds due Commodity Credit Corporation for adjustments in amounts financed on cotton exported under title I, Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (commonly known as Public Law 480), Department of Agriculture, dated November 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the sale of hydroelectric power by the Department of the Interior, under section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944, at rates not approved by the Federal Power Commission, dated November 1964 with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on reduction in costs and acceleration of training of the unemployed available through increasing the number of instructional hours per week, Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, Departments of Labor and of Health, Education, and Welfare, dated November 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the award of procurement contracts by formal advertising procedures without obtaining effective competition, Post Office Department, dated November 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on inventions not disclosed and conformatory royalty-free licenses not obtained under selected research and development contracts with certain divisions of Thompson Ramo Wooldridge, Inc., Department of Defense, dated November 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of decisions reached by the Department of Agriculture on various problems affecting storage of cotton by the Commodity Credit Corporation, dated November 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on increased operating costs resulting from conversion of post office branches to independent post offices, Boston postal region, Post Office Department, dated December 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on financial assistance provided to ineligible Cuban refugees in the Miami, Fla., area, Welfare Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, dated December 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on questionable validity of $32 million estimate of funds needed to complete Inter-American Highway, Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Commerce, dated December 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on inadequate analysis of employment opportunities to be provided by a federally assisted project, Area Redevelopment Administration, Department of Commerce, dated December 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on unnecessary procurement of AN/APN-99A radar system components resulting from failures of Warner Robins Air Materiel Area to make excess spare components available for installation on new aircraft, Department of the Air Force, dated December 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on unnecessary costs incurred in negotiated procurements of batteries for aircraft ground support equipment by Rome Air Materiel Area, Rome, N.Y., Department of the Air Force, dated December 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on overstaffing of civilian personnel at the Naval Ammunition Depot, Hawthorne, Nev., Department of the Navy, dated December 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on inadequate consideration of economies possible through consolidating operations and reorganizing service areas, Post Office Department, dated December 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on further comment on overpricing of the nuclear frigate U.S.S. *Bainbridge* purchase from the Bethlehem Steel Co., Quincy, Mass., Department of the Navy, dated December 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on unauthorized use of military personnel and Government property at Fort Gordon, Ga., for activities related to the Masters' Golf Tournament, Department of the Army, dated December 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on overstated costs included in price of turbojet engine parts purchased from Solar Aircraft Co., San Diego, Calif., by General Electric Co., West Lynn, Mass., Department of the Air Force, dated December 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on overcharges for long-distance telephone channels leased by the 8th U.S. Army, Korea, Department of the Army, dated December 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on unauthorized expenditures for converting a bull barn into a research laboratory at the Agricultural Research Center, Beltsville, Md., Department of Agriculture, dated December 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on illegal payments of hazardous duty submarine pay to military personnel assigned to submarine force command staffs, Department of the Navy, dated December 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on ineffective supply management causing shortages and excesses of end items and repair parts in Okinawa, Department of the Army, dated December 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on proposed acquisition of unnecessary and expensive property for developing a low-rent housing project by the St. Louis Housing Authority, Public Housing Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency, dated December 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on failure to consider available assets resulting in overstated needs for avionics test equipment by the Aviation Supply Office, Philadelphia, Department of the Navy, dated December 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on high costs of unnecessary daily compilation of statistical data by use of automatic data processing equipment, Department of the Army, dated December 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on inadequate management action results in excessive payments of compensation benefits, Veterans Benefits Office, Washington, D.C., Veterans' Administration, dated December 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on unnecessary annual costs of about $1.4 million incurred because of inappropriately assigning flight data processing duties to Assistant Air Traffic Controllers, Federal Aviation Agency, dated December 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on overpricing of buffer amplifiers purchased from HRB-Singer, Inc., State College, Pa., by the Boeing Co., Wichita Branch, Wichita, Kans., for B-47 aircraft, Department of the Air Force, dated December 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on failure to recover unpaid royalties retained by Collins Radio Co., Cedar Rapids, Iowa, Department of Defense, dated December 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on inadequate management action to collect debts resulting from default of housing loans made in Florida under the loan guaranty program, Veterans' Administration, dated December 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on unnecessary costs incurred in the procurement of selected subsystems and accessories for F-4 and other types of aircraft, Department of the Navy, dated December 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on excessive Federal matching of administrative expenses for public assistance programs in the State of New York, Welfare Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, dated December 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on potential savings to the Government if bonding of Federal employees is discontinued, dated December 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on ineffective actions taken in approving and administering a loan to Vineland and South Jersey Cooperative Egg Auction and Poultry Association, Inc., Area Redevelopment Administration, Department of Commerce, dated December 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report of Secretary of the Senate

A letter from the Secretary of the Senate, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report of receipts and expenditures, for the period July 1, 1963, to June 30, 1964 (with an accompanying report); ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Report on Application for Loan Under Small Reclamation Projects Act

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, on the receipt of an application from the Brown Canal Co. of Graham County, Ariz., for a Small Reclamation Projects Act loan; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Reports on Project Proposals, Under Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, on the receipt of a project proposal from the Brown Canal Co. of Graham County, Ariz., under the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, on the receipt of a project proposal from the Nevada Irrigation District of Grass Valley, Calif., under the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Proposed Concession Contracts

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a proposed concession contract under which Hill Wheatley Enterprises, Inc., will be authorized to obtain hot waters from Hot Springs National Park (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a proposed concession contract to authorize Dr. Rafael Garbayo to provide medical, surgical, and hospital services in Grand Canyon National Park (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Proposed Amendments to Certain Concession Contracts

Sixteen letters from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, dated October 12, 26, 27, 30 (4), November 2, 3, 16, 23, December 1, 4, 7 (2), and 23, 1964, respectively, transmitting, pursuant to law, proposed amendments to certain concession contracts (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Report on Cancellation of Charges Against Certain Tribes of Indians

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders relating to the cancellation of charges against certain tribes of Indians (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Certification of Adequate Soil Survey and Land Classification, Farwell Unit, Missouri River Basin Project, Nebraska

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, that an adequate soil survey and land classification has been made of the lands in the Farwell unit, Missouri River Basin project, Nebraska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Report on Reclassification of Lands Within Fort Shaw Irrigation District, Sun River Project

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, that a reclassification had been made of the lands within Fort Shaw Irrigation District, Sun River project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Report on Colorado River Storage Project and Participating Projects

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Report on Administration of Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act

A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Administration, Department of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, on the receipts and expenditures in connection with the administration of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act, for the fiscal year 1964; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Report on Reclassification of Lands Within Malta Irrigation District

A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law on the reclassification of lands within the Malta Irrigation District of the Milk River project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Report on Final Settlement of Certain Indian Claims

A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on the final settlement of the claim of the Creek Nation, plaintiff, the Creek Nation East of the Mississippi, intervenor, v. the United States, defendant, docket No. 21 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Report on Tort Claims Paid by Department of the Treasury

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by the Department of the Treasury during fiscal year 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Reports on Tort Claims Paid and Claims Settled Under Military Personnel Claims Act

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by the Department of the Army, for fiscal year 1964, and a report on claims settled under the Military Personnel Claims Act, for fiscal year 1964 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Report on Tort Claims Paid by Department of Commerce

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by that Department, during fiscal year 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Report on Property Loss Sustained by Employees of the Coast and Geodetic Survey

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, reporting, pursuant to law, on claims paid for property loss sustained by employees of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, for the year 1964; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Report on Competition in the Synthetic Rubber Industry

A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on competition in the synthetic rubber industry for the calendar year 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Report on Tort Claims Paid by Veterans' Administration

A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by that Administration, during the fiscal year 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Report of the Subversive Activities Control Board

A letter from the Chairman, Subversive Activities Control Board, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, the 14th annual report of that Board, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Financial Statement of the Legion of Valor of the United States of America, Inc.

A letter from the national corporation agent, Legion of Valor of the United States of America, Inc., transmitting, pursuant to law, the financial statement of that legion covering the period August 1, 1963, to July 31, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Audit Report of American Society of International Law

A letter from the executive vice president of the American Society of International Law, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual audit report of that society covering the period April 1, 1963, to March 31, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Reports on Findings in Case of Rochester Iron and Metal Company Against the United States

A letter from the clerk, U.S. Court of Claims, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of that court's opinion and findings in the case of the *Rochester Iron and Metal Company* v. *The United States*, Cong. 1–59 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Report of Proceedings of Judicial Conference of the United States

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the proceedings of the Judicial Conference of the United States, held at Washington, D.C., September 23–24, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Admission Into the United States of Certain Defector Aliens

Two letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting admission into the United States of certain defector aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Temporary Admission Into the United States of Certain Aliens

Four letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting temporary admission into the United States of certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Report on Petitions To Accord First Preference Status to Certain Aliens

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on approved petitions to accord first preference status to certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Report of Advisory Committee for Training Teachers of the Deaf

A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Advisory Committee for Training Teachers of the Deaf, under Public Law 87–276 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Convention and Recommendations of International Labor Conference

A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations, transmitting, for the consideration of the Senate, copies of the convention and recommendations adopted by the International Labor Conference at Geneva, in June 1963 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Report on Scientific and Professional Positions

A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Administration, Department of Agriculture, reporting, pursuant to law, that during the year 1964 there were no new positions established for scientific and professional positions in that Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Report on Certain Scientific or Professional Positions in Department of the Interior

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, additional information relative to eight scientific or professional positions in that Department as reported to the Senate in a letter dated January 7, 1964; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Report on Positions in Grades GS–18, GS–17, and GS–16 Existing in Calendar Year 1964

A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on positions in grades GS–18, GS–17, and GS–16, existing in calendar year 1964 (covering positions in addition to the number of positions otherwise authorized by law to be placed in such grades) (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Report on the Problem of Air Pollution

A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the problem of air pollution caused by motor vehicles and measures taken toward its alleviation, dated December 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Public Works.

Report of Tennessee Valley Authority

A letter from the Chairman and Directors, Tennessee Valley Authority, Knoxville, Tenn., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Authority, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Public Works.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 3

"Concurrent resolution to petition the Congress of the United States to call a convention to propose an amendment to the U.S. Constitution reserving to the States exclusive jurisdiction of public school systems and providing that all rights, privileges, and immunities of citizens relating to public school education shall be determined solely by State courts

"Whereas there is an urgent necessity for clarification and settlement by law questions relating to the powers and rights reserved to the people and the several States under article X of the amendments of the U.S. Constitution as such powers and rights relate to the operation, management, and control of public schools in the several States: Therefore be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana (the House of Representatives thereof concurring)*, That the Congress of the United States is hereby petitioned, under authority of article V of the U.S. Constitution, to call a convention, as therein provided, to propose an amendment to article X of the amendments to the U.S. Constitution by adding a proviso thereto as follows:

"'Among the rights reserved to the States shall be the right to sole and exclusive jurisdiction of public school systems in the separate States, and all rights, privileges, and immunities of citizens of the separate States, as they relate to public school education, shall be determined solely by State courts. This Constitution shall not be construed in a manner to empower the President of the United States, the Congress, or the Federal judiciary to disparage or nullify this inherent right in the States,' and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this concurrent resolution shall be forwarded to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate of the U.S. Congress, to the presiding officers of the separate houses of the legislatures of the several States, to the Governors of the several States, and to the Members of the Louisiana delegation in Congress.

C. C. Aycock,
"*Lieutenant Governor and President of the Senate.*
"Vail M. Delony,
"*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*"

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Virginia; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

"Senate Joint Resolution 5

"Joint resolution requesting the U.S. Post Office Department to issue a stamp commemorating Governor Spotswood's expedition to the Valley of Virginia

"Whereas Alexander Spotswood, who was Colonial Governor of Virginia, and his Knights of the Golden Horseshoe made their famous expedition into the area now known as the Shenandoah Valley in 1716 and crossed the Blue Ridge Mountains at Swift Run Gap September 5, 1716; and

"Whereas Governor Spotswood's exploration of the valley area led to its settlement a few years later and also contributed to the development and settlement of the American frontier; and

"Whereas Governor Spotswood's exploration and the interest shown by members of his expedition focused attention on the vast untapped areas of the new world; and

"Whereas the year 1966 will mark the 250th anniversary of Governor Spotswood's famous expedition into the valley: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of Virginia (the House of Delegates concurring)*, That the General Assembly of Virginia requests that the U.S. Post Office Department issue a 5-cent Alexander Spotswood commemorative postage stamp on September 5, 1966; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the clerk of the senate is instructed to send copies of this resolution to the Postmaster General of the United States, the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of the Congress from this State.

"Agreed to by the senate December 2, 1964.

"Ben D. Lacy,
"*Clerk of the Senate.*

"Agreed to by the house of delegates December 3, 1964.

"George R. Rich,
"*Clerk of the House of Delegates.*"

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Joint Resolution 126A

"Joint resolution memorializing Congress to apply the provisions of or, alternatively, to extend the coverage of the Federal antitrust laws to major league baseball

"Whereas major league baseball today is a big business which should be subject to the Federal antitrust laws; and

"Whereas major league baseball officials have taken certain actions, including the arbitrary relocation of major league teams, which could be construed to constitute a violation of those laws; and

"Whereas such actions are likely to be continued in the future in the absence of any effective legislative or judicial prohibition; and

"Whereas such actions are detrimental to professional baseball as a whole, as well as to the loyal followers of baseball and the individual communities which support major league teams; and

"Whereas the stanch followers of the Milwaukee Braves baseball team in the city of Milwaukee and the State of Wisconsin, who have actively supported the team during its 11 years in Milwaukee, will be adversely affected by the pending relocation of the team; and

"Whereas legislative regulation is badly needed in the field of professional baseball to prevent current as well as future abuses arising from violations of the Federal antitrust laws: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring)*, That the Wisconsin Legislature memorializes the Congress of the United States to enforce the provisions of the antitrust laws in regard to major league baseball or, alternatively, to extend the coverage of the Federal antitrust laws to major league baseball; and, be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be submitted to the Secretary of the U.S. Senate, the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives, the House of Representatives Committee on Judiciary, to each Member of the Wisconsin delegation to Congress, to the members of the County Board of Milwaukee County and to the members of the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee.

"Jack B. Olson,
"*President of the Senate.*
"Lawrence R. Larsen,
"*Chief Clerk of the Senate.*
"Robert Haase,
"*Speaker of the Assembly.*
"Kenneth E. Priebe,
"*Chief Clerk of the Assembly.*"

A resolution adopted by the fifth biennial convention of the Alabama Labor Council, AFL–CIO, favoring the enactment of the so-called Douglas truth in lending bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A resolution adopted by the 1964 annual convention of Sigma Delta Chi, professional journalistic society, at Kansas City, Mo., favoring the enactment of legislation to repeal section 315 of the Communications Act of 1934; to the Committee on Commerce.

A resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Colusi County Historical Society, of Corning, Calif., relating to the designation of the Tehama-Colusa Canal as the Will S. Green Canal; to the Committee on Commerce.

A resolution adopted by the convention of the Alabama Labor Council, AFL–CIO, favoring the enactment of legislation to provide medical care for the aged through the social security program; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the North Dakota Peace Officers Association, at Bismarck, N. Dak., relating to the report of the President's Commission on Narcotic and Drug Abuse; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the Tennessee Law Enforcement Officers' Association, relating to the report of the President's Advisory Commission on Narcotic and Drug Abuse; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the Erie County (N.Y.) Association of Chiefs of Police, at Amherst, N.Y., relating to the report of the President's Advisory Commission on Narcotic and Drug Abuse; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the Maryland Law Enforcement Officers, Inc., Baltimore, Md., relating to the report of the President's Advisory Commission on Narcotic and Drug Abuse; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the Sheriffs' Association of New Jersey, relating to the report of the President's Advisory Commission on Narcotic and Drug Abuse; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the National Association of Citizens Crime Commissions, of Boston, Mass., relating to the report of the President's Advisory Commission on Narcotic and Drug Abuse; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the officers of the Georgia Association of Chiefs of Police, at Athens, Ga., relating to the report of the President's Advisory Commission on Narcotic and Drug Abuse; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the executive committee of the Oklahoma State Legislative Council, relating to the report of the President's Advisory Commission on Narcotic and Drug Abuse; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the Democratic Party of Guam, favoring the enactment of legislation to provide for the election of the Governor of Guam; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The petition of Edgar M. Powers, of Flat Rock, N.C., relating to the printing in the Congressional Record a petition for a redress of grievances which he transmitted to the Senate in September 1964; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The petition of Reginald B. Naugle, a citizen of the State of Pennsylvania, relating to the legality of the election of November 3, 1964; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the fifth biennial convention of the Alabama Labor Council, AFL–CIO, relating to reapportionment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The petition of John Boldt, of Kingston, N.Y., praying for a redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the fifth biennial convention of the Alabama Labor Council, AFL–CIO, relating to poverty; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The petition of Mildred Lemon, of Seattle, Wash., relating to the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, which authorizes the States to enact right-to-work laws prohibiting compulsory unionism; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the Southern Association for Counselor Education and Supervision, at Asheville, N.C., on October 14, 1964, commending the Congress for the enactment of the National Defense Education Act, and recommending careful review of budgetary provisions to insure full implementation of the act; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the fifth biennial convention of the Alabama Labor Council, AFL–CIO, favoring the continuation and expansion of the Public Works Acceleration Act; to the Committee on Public Works.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the Consulting Engineers Council, Washington, D.C., signed by Donald A. Buzzell, executive director, relating to the use of consultant engineering first in the administration of the highway program; to th Committee on Public Works.

EXPRESSION OF THANKS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from Allan Hoover, of New York, N.Y., expressing thanks to the Senate for the flowers sent at the death of the late President Herbert Hoover, and also for the joint resolution commemorating his 90th birthday, together with the flags, which was ordered to lie on the table.

CONTINUATION OF CERTAIN STUDIES BY COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 2)

Mr. JOHNSTON, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 13) authorizing the continuation of certain studies and the initiation of others by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and submitted a report (No. 2) thereon; which resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

S. Res. 13

Resolved, That the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate to examine, investigate, and conduct such studies as may be deemed necessary with respect to any and all aspects of—

(1) the postal service, with particular emphasis upon (a) the feasibility of greater use of modernized equipment and the development of more efficient processing techniques, (b) continuation of a study of parcel post as required by law with a view to insuring a reasonable cost-revenue balance and at the same time maintaining rates within an area commensurate with the basic purpose of the parcel-delivery system, (c) postal rates generally, and

(2) the civil service system, investigations and studies including (a) the merit system, (b) the civil service retirement system and the continually increasing unfunded liability of the retirement fund, along with a study of means by which the system can be improved, (c) the Federal health benefits program, taking into account the rising costs of hospitalization and other medical care, (d) Federal pay, including the practical effects of the Federal Employees Salary Act of 1964, (e) and the Federal employees life insurance program.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1965, to January 31, 1966, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,100 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1966.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $100,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

ADDITIONAL ASSISTANT FOR COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 3)

Mr. JOHNSTON, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 14) authorizing the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to employ one additional assistant, and submitted a report thereon, which resolution, under the rule, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

S. Res. 14

Resolved, That, until otherwise provided by law, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service is authorized to employ one additional clerical assistant to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman in accordance with the provisions of Public Law 4, Eightieth Congress, approved February 19, 1947, as amended.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself, Mr. Gore, Mr. Javits, Mr. McNamara, Mr. Bartlett, Mr. Bayh, Mr. Bible, Mr. Brewster, Mr. Burdick, Mr. Case, Mr. Clark, Mr. Church, Mr. Dodd, Mr. Douglas, Mr. Gruening, Mr. Hartke, Mr. Inouye, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Kennedy of Massachusetts, Mr. Kuchel, Mr. Long of Missouri, Mr. Mansfield, Mr. McCarthy, Mr. McGee, Mr. McGovern, Mr. McIntyre, Mr. Metcalf, Mr. Mondale, Mr. Montoya, Mr. Morse, Mr. Moss, Mr. Muskie, Mrs. Neuberger, Mr. Pastore, Mr. Pell, Mr. Proxmire, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Ribicoff, Mr. Tydings, Mr. Williams of New Jersey, Mr. Yarborough, and Mr. Young of Ohio):

S. 1. A bill to provide a hospital insurance program for the aged under social security, to amend the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system to increase benefits, improve the actuarial status of the disability insurance trust fund, and extend coverage, to amend the Social Security Act to provide additional Federal financial participation in the Federal-State public assistance programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Anderson when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McCLELLAN (for himself, Mr. Bayh, Mr. Bible, Mr. Boggs, Mr. Brewster, Mr. Burdick, Mr. Carlson, Mr. Cooper, Mr. Curtis, Mr. Dirksen, Mr. Ervin, Mr. Fannin, Mr. Fong, Mr. Gruening, Mr. Hickenlooper, Mr. Inouye, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Javits, Mr. Lausche, Mr. McGee, Mr. Miller, Mr. Monroney, Mr. Montoya, Mr. Moss, Mr. Mundt, Mr. Muskie, Mr. Pearson, Mr. Pell, Mr. Proxmire, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Ribicoff, Mr. Stennis, Mr. Williams of New Jersey, Mr. Yarborough, and Mr. Young of Ohio):

S. 2. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. McClellan when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. RANDOLPH (for himself, Mr. Burdick, Mr. Cooper, Mr. Anderson, Mr. Bartlett, Mr. Bass, Mr. Bayh, Mr. Brewster, Mr. Byrd of West Virginia, Mr. Clark, Mr. Dodd, Mr. Douglas, Mr. Gruening, Mr. Hart, Mr. Hartke, Mr. Inouye, Mr. Johnston, Mr. Kennedy of Massachusetts, Mr. McCarthy, Mr. McGovern, Mr. McNamara, Mr. Magnuson, Mr. Metcalf, Mr. Morse, Mr. Morton, Mr. Moss, Mr. Nelson, Mrs. Neuberger, Mr. Pell, Mr. Ribicoff, Mr. Scott, Mr. Tydings, Mr. Williams of New Jersey, and Mr. Young of Ohio):

S. 3. A bill to provide public works and economic development programs and the planning and coordination needed to assist in the development of the Appalachian region; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. Randolph when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MUSKIE (for himself, Mr. Bartlett, Mr. Bayh, Mr. Boggs, Mr. Brewster, Mr. Clark, Mr. Douglas, Mr. Fong, Mr. Gruening, Mr. Hart, Mr. Inouye, Mr. Kennedy of Massachusetts, Mr. Long of Missouri, Mr. Magnuson, Mr. McCarthy, Mr. McGee, Mr. Metcalf, Mr. Miller, Mr. Moss, Mr. Nelson, Mrs. Neuberger, Mr. Pearson, Mr. Pell, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Ribicoff, Mr. Williams of New Jersey, and Mr. Young of Ohio):

S. 4. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, to establish the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, to provide grants for research and development, to increase grants for construction of municipal sewage treatment works, to authorize the establishment of standards of water quality to aid in preventing, controlling, and abating pollution of interstate waters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. Muskie when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HARTKE:

S. 5. A bill to provide assistance for students in higher education by establishing programs for student grants, loan insurance, and work-study; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Hartke when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BYRD of West Virginia (for himself, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Cooper, Mr. Brewster, Mr. Morton, and Mr. Tydings):

S. 6. A bill to provide for the establishment and administration of the Allegheny Parkway in the States of West Virginia and Kentucky and Maryland, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BYRD of West Virginia (for himself and Mr. Randolph):

S. 7. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks National Recreation Area, in the State of West Virginia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. McNAMARA:

S. 8. A bill to provide for a program of Federal assistance for the construction of public elementary and secondary schools; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. McNamara when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. YARBOROUGH (for himself, Mr. Hill, Mr. Morse, Mrs. Smith, Mrs. Neuberger, Mr. Byrd of West Virginia, Mr. Gruening, Mr. Hartke, Mr. Eastland, Mr. Long of Missouri, Mr. Burdick, Mr. Bible, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Williams of New Jersey, Mr. Douglas, Mr. Bartlett, Mr. Inouye, Mr. McGee, Mr. McGovern, Mr. Fulbright, Mr. Cannon, Mr. Pastore, Mr. Fong, Mr. Clark, Mr. Dodd, Mr. Young of Ohio, Mr. Bayh, Mr. Sparkman, Mr. Johnston, Mr. Metcalf, and Mr. Nelson):

S. 9. A bill to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces during the induction period; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Yarborough when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McCLELLAN (for himself, Mr. Byrd of Virginia, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Eastland, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Curtis, Mr. Stennis, and Mr. Tower):

S. 10. A bill to amend the antitrust laws to prohibit certain activities of labor organizations in restraint of trade, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCLELLAN (for himself, Mr. Holland, Mr. Ervin, Mr. Mundt, Mr. Eastland, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Stennis, Mr. Curtis, and Mr. Thurmond):

S. 11. A bill to prohibit strikes by employees employed in certain strategic defense facilities; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. RIBICOFF (for himself, Mr. Dominick, Mr. Allott, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Boggs, Mr. Brewster, Mr. Cannon, Mr. Case, Mr. Dodd, Mr. Eastland, Mr. Ervin, Mr. Fannin, Mr. Fong, Mr. Gruening, Mr. Harris, Mr. Hart, Mr. Hickenlooper, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Jordan of Idaho, Mr. Long of Missouri, Mr. Magnuson, Mr. McGovern, Mr. Miller, Mr. Montoya, Mr. Morton, Mr. Mundt, Mr. Pastore, Mr. Prouty, Mr. Proxmire, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Scott, Mr. Simpson, Mr. Symington, Mr. Thurmond, and Mr. Tower):

S. 12. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to individuals for certain expenses incurred in providing higher education; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Ribicoff when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. YOUNG of Ohio (for himself and Mr. Lausche):

S. 13. A bill to provide for the appointment of additional district judges for the northern and southern districts of Ohio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DODD (for himself, Mr. Bayh, Mr. Fong, Mr. Lausche, Mr. McGovern, Mr. Morse, and Mr. Thurmond):

S. 14. A bill to amend the Federal Firearms Act; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Dodd when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SCOTT:

S. 15. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase to $2,400 the annual amount individuals are permitted to earn without suffering deduction from the monthly insurance benefits payable to them under such title; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 16. A bill for the relief of Eugeninsz Lupinski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. SMITH (for herself and Mr. Muskie):

S. 17. A bill to repeal certain acts relating to containers for fruits and vegetables, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

S. 18. A bill to amend the act of August 31, 1916, so as to provide a standard for a dry 1½-quart container; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 19. A bill to amend the District of Columbia minimum wage law to provide broader coverage, improved standards of minimum wage and overtime compensation protection, and improved means of enforcement; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(See the remarks of Mr. Morse when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BREWSTER (for himself, Mr. Douglas, Mr. Gruening, Mr. McCarthy, Mr. McGee, Mr. McGovern, Mr. Metcalf, Mr. Montoya, Mr. Moss, Mr. Scott, and Mr. Tydings):

S. 20. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Assateague Island National Seashore in the States of Maryland and Virginia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Brewster when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself, Mr. Hart, Mr. Eastland, Mr. Kuchel, Mr. Metcalf, and Mr. Moss):

S. 21. A bill to provide for the optimum development of the Nation's natural resources through the coordinated planning of water and related land resources, through the establishment of a water resources council and river basin commissions, and by providing financial assistance to the States in order to increase State participation in such planning; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Anderson when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself, Mr. McGovern, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Kuchel, Mr. Metcalf, Mr. Hart, Mr. Gruening, Mr. Burdick, Mr. McGee, Mr. Morse, Mr. Carlson, Mr. Mansfield, Mr. Yarborough, Mr. Long of Missouri, Mr. Bayh, Mr. Bartlett, and Mr. Moss):

S. 22. A bill to promote a more adequate national program of water research; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Anderson when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Bible, Mr. Cannon, Mr. Kuchel, Mr. McGee, and Mr. McGovern):

S. 23. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a program in five areas of the United States to increase usable precipitation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 24. A bill to expand, extend, and accelerate the saline water conversion program conducted by the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MOSS:

S. 25. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Great Salt Lake National Monument, in the State of Utah, and for other purposes;

S. 26. A bill authorizing the establishment of the Golden Spike National Monument in the State of Utah; and

S. 27. A bill to provide an adequate basis for the administration of Lake Powell and adjacent lands in Arizona and Utah as the Glen Canyon National Recreation Area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Moss when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. SYMINGTON:

S. 28. A bill to insure the availability of certain critical materials during a war or national emergency by providing for a reserve of such materials, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. Symington when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. FULBRIGHT (for himself and Mr. McClellan):

S. 29. A bill authorizing modification of the Greers Ferry Dam and Reservoir, White River Basin, Ark., in the interest of recreational development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. Fulbright when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McGOVERN (for himself, Mr. Bayh, Mr. Brewster, Mr. Clark, Mr. Gruening, Mr. Hartke, Mr. Long of Missouri, Mr. Montoya, Mr. Morse, Mr. McIntyre, Mr. Nelson, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Williams of New Jersey, Mr. Young of Ohio, Mr. Tydings, and Mr. Ribicoff):

S. 30. A bill to establish a National Economic Conversion and Diversification Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. McGovern when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BIBLE:

S. 31. A bill for the relief of Jafar Shoja; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIBLE (for himself and Mr. Cannon):

S. 32. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the southern Nevada water project, Nevada, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 33. A bill to prohibit the fixing of traffic tickets in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(See the remarks of Mr. Morse when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BURDICK (for himself, Mr. Young of North Dakota, Mr. McGovern and Mr. Mundt):

S. 34. A bill to make certain provisions in connection with the construction of the Garrison diversion unit, Missouri River Basin project, by the Secretary of the Interior; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

S. 35. A bill to provide for the inclusion of years of service as judge of the District Court for the Territory of Alaska in the computation of Federal judicial service of the Honorable Walter H. Hodge; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLARK (for himself, Mr. Case, Mr. Javits, Mr. Kennedy of New York, Mr. Scott, and Mr. Williams of New Jersey):

S. 36. A bill to authorize establishment of the Tocks Island National Recreation Area in the States of Pennsylvania and New Jersey, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FONG:

S. 37. A bill to provide a method for regulating and fixing wage rates for employees of the Army, Navy, and Air Force in Hawaii; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 38. A bill to repeal the interest equalization tax; and

S. 39. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to provide for a 7 per centum increase in the monthly insurance benefits payable thereunder; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 40. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act so as to permit retirement of employees with 30 years of service on full annuities without regard to age; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. YOUNG of Ohio:

S. 41. A bill for the relief of Susana Juh-Mei Chen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOGGS:

S. 42. A bill for the relief of George Tilson Weed; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRD of Virginia:

S. 43. A bill for the relief of Cato Brothers, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYDEN:

S. 44. A bill for the relief of Jao Fernandes Nunes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORTON:

S. 45. A bill for the relief of Maj. Raymond G. Clark, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONTOYA:

S. 46. A bill to amend the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 to authorize loans for waste disposal systems and other facilities providing community services, and for additional financial aid; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota:

S. 47. A bill to amend the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951 so as to extend to employees of State agricultural stabilization and conservation service committees credit for annual and sick leave purposes for service performed as employees of county agricultural stabilization and conservation service committees; and

S. 48. A bill to provide for allowance of credit under the Civil Service Retirement Act for service as a member of a county committee established under section 8(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GRUENING (for himself, Mr. Muskie, and Mr. Pastore):

S. 49. A bill to conserve the offshore fishery resources of the United States and its territories, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Gruening when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota:

S. 50. A bill to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended, so as to permit Federal cost sharing for certain uses of water stored in reservoir structures constructed or modified under such act; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 51. A bill for the relief of Dr. Ilhan Baki Taskin; and

S. 52. A bill for the relief of Wang Chi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 53. A bill to provide for retroactive payment of annuities payable under the Civil Service Retirement Act to the survivors of Members of Congress who died between February 29, 1948, and March 5, 1954; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota (for himself and Mr. Burdick):

S. 54. A bill to provide for the establishment of a mint of the United States at Bismarck, N. Dak.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 55. A bill to increase the authorization for the appropriation of funds to complete the International Peace Garden, N. Dak.; and

S. 56. A bill to authorize Federal assistance for the construction by public school districts of classroom facilities needed for the education of Indian children who reside outside the boundaries of the district; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FONG:

S. 57. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide that the Ryukyu Islands shall be treated as a separate quota area; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AIKEN (for himself and Mr. Prouty):

S. 58. A bill for the relief of Vermont Maple Orchards, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIBICOFF:

S. 59. A bill for the relief of Mrs. David S. Fedson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHURCH (for himself and Mr. Jordan of Idaho):

S. 60. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to designate the Nez Perce National Historical Park in the State of Idaho, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BOGGS:

S. 61. A bill for the relief of Dr. J. O. Small, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER:

S. 62. A bill for the relief of George John Sarris and Marie George Sarris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GORE:

S. 63. A bill to provide for the temporary free entry of certain electrodes imported for use in producing aluminum; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 64. A bill for the relief of Basilios Captain; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McNAMARA:

S. 65. A bill to provide for payment for hospital and related health services for persons 65 years of age and older, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. McNamara when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MOSS:

S. 66. A bill for the relief of Robert T. Barnes;

S. 67. A bill for the relief of Earl H. Smith and his wife, Dorothy Smith;

S. 68. A bill for the relief of Mehdi Heravi; and

S. 69. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Genevieve Olsen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGEE:

S. 70. A bill to provide for the establishment of a national cemetery in the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 71. A bill to amend the act of September 22, 1961, providing for the Peace Corps; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

S. 72. A bill for the relief of Hanover irrigation district of Worland, Wyo.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 73. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Pandelis Salvaris; and

S. 74. A bill for the relief of Juan Miguel Apezteguia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYDEN (for himself and Mr. Fannin):

S. 75. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Lower Colorado River Basin project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Hayden when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McGEE:

S. 76. A bill for the relief of Anna Maria Heiland;

S. 77. A bill for the relief of Pejo Topolic;

S. 78. A bill for the relief of Lia Novelli;

S. 79. A bill for the relief of Leonard F. Rizzuto;

S. 80. A bill for the relief of Jadwiga Zuzanna Kobielusz; and

S. 81. A bill for the relief of Constantina (Mihas) Michia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGEE (for himself and Mr. Simpson):

S. 82. A bill for the relief of Royce C. Plume, a member of the Arapahoe Tribe of Indians;

S. 83. A bill to authorize the establishment of the Fossil Butte National Monument; and

S. 84. A bill to provide for reimbursement to the State of Wyoming for improvements made on certain lands in Sweetwater County, Wyo., if and when such lands revert to the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McGEE:

S. 85. A bill to amend section 35 of the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 with respect to the disposition of the proceeds of sales, bonuses, royalties, and rentals under such act; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 86. A bill to amend section 407 of the Packers and Stockyards Act of 1921, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 87. A bill to determine the claims of certain prisoners of war permanently disabled, and to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims in the event of disagreement as to such claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 88. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended, to require the labeling of certain imported meats, poultry, and fish; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 89. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to equalize additional annuities in return for contributions of annuitants during service in excess of the amount necessary to provide the maximum annuity under such act at the time of their retirement; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SIMPSON:

S. 90. A bill to amend section 35 of the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 with respect to the disposition of the proceeds of sales, bonuses, royalties, and rentals under such act; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Simpson when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McGEE:

S. 91. A bill to provide premium compensation for work performed on Saturday or Sunday by employees in the postal field service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McGEE (for himself and Mr. Moss):

S. 92. A bill to establish the Flaming Gorge National Recreation Area in the States of Utah and Wyoming, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 93. A bill to amend section 2 of the act of August 22, 1949 (63 Stat. 623; 20 U.S.C. 53a), to authorize appropriations to the Smithsonian Institution for the purchase of reprints from technical journals or other periodicals and the payment of page charges for the publication of research papers and reports in such journals; and

S. 94. A bill to amend Public Law 722 of the 79th Congress, and Public Law 85-935, relating to the National Air Museum of the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

S. 95. A bill to provide that lands within the exterior boundaries of a national forest acquired under section 8 of the act of June 28, 1934, as amended (43 U.S.C. 315g), may be added to the national forest, and for other purposes; and

S. 96. A bill to amend the Indian Long-Term Leasing Act; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 97. A bill for the relief of Lt. Raymond E. Berube, Jr., to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself, Mr. Gruening, Mr. Randolph, Mr. McCarthy, Mr. Bible, and Mr. Hart):

S. 98. A bill to promote the preservation, for the public use and benefit, of certain portions of the shoreline areas of the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BURDICK:

S. 99. A bill to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act so as not to exclude from the benefits provided by such act areas which includes structure of twelve thousand five hundred or less acre-feet of floodwater detention capacity; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. RIBICOFF:

S. 100. A bill to establish a Department of Education; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. Ribicoff when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BURDICK:

S. 101. A bill to provide for a connecting road between three units of the Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park, N. Dak., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 102. A bill to provide an additional place for holding court in the district of North Dakota; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURDICK (for himself, Mr. Mansfield, and Mr. Metcalf):

S. 103. A bill to authorize establishment of the Fort Union Trading Post National Historic site, N. Dak., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BARTLETT (for himself and Mr. Gruening):

S. 104. A bill to provide for the rehabilitation of the Eklutna project, Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FONG:

S. 105. A bill authorizing certain improvements in the State of Hawaii for navigation purposes; and

S. 106. A bill authorizing certain improvements in the State of Hawaii for navigation purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. METCALF (for himself and Mr. Mansfield):

S. 107. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture to classify as "wilderness" the national forest lands known as the Lincoln Back Country, in Montana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BOGGS (for himself, Mr. Carlson, Mr. Case, Mr. Williams of Delaware, Mr. Byrd of West Virginia, Mr. Ribicoff, Mr. Young of North Dakota, Mr. Metcalf, Mr. McCarthy, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Saltonstall, Mr. McGee, Mr. Williams of New Jersey, Mr. Montoya, Mr. Prouty, Mr. Tower, Mr. Javits, Mr. Cooper, Mr. Douglas, Mr. Smathers, Mr. Nelson, Mr. Pell, Mr. Dirksen, Mr. Pastore, Mr. Kennedy of Massachusetts, Mr. Inouye, Mr. Scott, Mr. Brewster, Mr. Allott, Mr. Dominick, Mr. Dodd, Mr. Clark, Mr. Muskie, Mr. Kennedy of New York, Mr. Tydings, and Mr. Fong):

S. 108. A bill making Columbus Day a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AIKEN (for himself, Mr. Lausche, Mr. McCarthy, and Mr. Young of North Dakota):

S. 109. A bill to amend the act authorizing association of producers of agricultural products, approved February 18, 1922; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. GRUENING (for himself and Mr. Randolph):

S. 110. A bill to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated to carry out the provision of the Public Works Acceleration Act; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. Gruening when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. GRUENING (for himself, Mr. McGee, Mr. Montoya, Mr. Tydings, Mr. Metcalf, Mr. Pastore, Mr. Fong, Mr. Miller, Mr. Williams of New Jersey, Mr. Anderson, Mr. Bass, Mr. Burdick, Mr. Douglas, Mr. Hart, Mr. Ribicoff, Mr. Yarborough, Mr. Young of Ohio, Mr. Moss, Mr. Muskie, Mrs. Neuberger, Mr. Inouye, and Mr. Randolph):

S. 111. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress, research and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Gruening when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. INOUYE:

S. 112. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make real estate mortgage loans on leased lands in Hawaii; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 113. A bill to authorize an investigation relating to the restoration and preservation of certain cultural and historical artifacts of the Ryukyuan people; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 114. A bill to amend the Home Owners Loan Act of 1933, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 115. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to permit the duty-free entry of certain articles grown, manufactured, or produced in the Ryukyu Islands;

S. 116. A bill to amend title 3 of the Sugar Act of 1948 to provide for the establishment of fair and reasonable minimum wage rates for workers employed on sugar farms, and for other purposes; and

S. 117. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to allow gas tax refunds due for gasoline used by aerial applicators serving farmers to be refunded to the aerial appplicators providing such service to farmers; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 118. A bill to provide that the Secretary of State shall investigate and report to the Congress as to the feasibility of establishing a Pacific International House on Sand Island, Hawaii; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

S. 119. A bill to provide that the unincorporated territory of Guam shall be represented in Congress by a Territorial Deputy to the House of Representatives; and

S. 120. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make a loan and grant to the State of Hawaii for the construction of the Kokee water project, Hawaii, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 121. A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948 and the Trading With the Enemy Act to provide for the submission of certain claims and the reinstatement of certain claims;

S. 122. A bill to provide cost-of-living allowances to judicial employees stationed outside the continental United States or in Alaska and Hawaii;

S. 123. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lucy Anthony;

S. 124. A bill for the relief of Gervacio V. Aranca;

S. 125. A bill for the relief of Armando S. Arguilles;

S. 126. A bill for the relief of Eusebio R. Balmilero and Rosa R. Balmilero;

S. 127. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Julia B. Briones;

S. 128. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Manuela Cabasag;

S. 129. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Angela Alcon Calamaan;

S. 130. A bill for the relief of Felicidad Caletena;

S. 131. A bill for the relief of Carl H. Carson;

S. 132. A bill for the relief of Anita P. Daoang;

S. 133. A bill for the relief of Faustino G. Dumaplin, Jr.;

S. 134. A bill for the relief of Lloyd K. Hirota;

S. 135. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth Kam Oi Hu;

S. 136. A bill for the relief of Angel Lagmay;

S. 137. A bill for the relief of Rosauro L. Lindogan;

S. 138. A bill for the relief of Pauline D. McLaughlin;

S. 139. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Kiku Matsuhashi;

S. 140. A bill for the relief of Mesepa (Naesepa) and Tuileau, both of Aloau Village, American Samoa;

S. 141. A bill for the relief of Fred R. Methered;

S. 142. A bill for the relief of Gus Nihoa;

S. 143. A bill for the relief of the estate of Yoshito Ota;

S. 144. A bill for the relief of Masayoshi Onaka;

S. 145. A bill for the relief of Rosario Pascual;

S. 146. A bill for the relief of Delma S. Pozas;

S. 147. A bill for the relief of Antonio G. Ancheta;

S. 148. A bill for the relief of John Puli, Mrs. Salote Puli, Sharon Puli, Anna Puli, and Benjamin Puli;

S. 149. A bill for the relief of Benjamin A. Ramelb;

S. 150. A bill for the relief of Teresa Isidro Raneses;

S. 151. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Kiki Sakurai;

S. 152. A bill for the relief of Eishin Tamanaha;

S. 153. A bill for the relief of Matsusuke Tengan;

S. 154. A bill for the relief of Luisa G. Valdez;

S. 155. A bill for the relief of Miss Min Min Wong;

S. 156. A bill for the relief of William Wong;

S. 157. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ryo H. Yokoyama;

S. 158. A bill for the relief of Priscilla Legarda Koh;

S. 159. A bill for the relief of Manzo Kawashima;

S. 160. A bill for the relief of George K. Aikala, Lu Ella Marie Aikala, Vernis J. K. Fish, Verson S. Fish, Vivian A. Ahmad, and Velma Solomon;

S. 161. A bill for the relief of Chiyo Shitanishi;

S. 162. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide that any territory over which the United States has jurisdiction under a treaty shall be regarded as a separate quota area; and

S. 163. A bill to adjust the retirement benefits of certain retired district judges for the district of Hawaii; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 164. A bill to amend section 601 of title 38, United States Code, to restore to certain veterans in Alaska or Hawaii the right to receive hospital care;

S. 165. A bill to amend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 to make certain benefits under that act available to teachers in nonpublic elementary and secondary schools; and

S. 166. A bill to provide a method of regulating and fixing wage rates for ungraded employees in the State of Hawaii; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 167. A bill to amend section 131 of title 23 of the United States Code relating to industrial and commercial plans;

S. 168. A bill authorizing the project for harbor improvements at Honolulu Harbor and Barber's Point Harbor, Oahu, Hawaii; and

S. 169. A bill to require bidders for public works construction contracts to disclose the identity of proposed joint contractors and subcontractors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. INOUYE (for himself and Mr. Fong):

S. 170. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow the standard deduction in the case of certain departing aliens, and for other purposes;

S. 171. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide credit against income tax for an employer who employs older persons in his trade or business; and

S. 172. A bill relating to the income tax treatment of cost-of-living allowances received by certain caretakers and clerks employed by the National Guard outside the continental United States, and Hawaii; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 173. A bill to provide that in determining the amount of retired pay, retirement pay, or retainer pay payable to any enlisted man, all service shall be counted which would have been counted for the same purposes if he were a commissioned officer; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 174. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, in order to provide a price-support program for coffee produced in the State of Hawaii; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 175. A bill to provide for the establishment of a mint of the United States in the State of Illinois; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PROUTY:

S. 176. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Public Assistance Act of 1962 so as to provide for the furnishing of medical assistance for the aged to eligible residents of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. TALMADGE:

S. 177. A bill to amend section 7701 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to clarify the tax status of certain professional associations and corporations formed under State law; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 178. A bill for the relief of Miss Caterina Gadoni; to the Committee on Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS (for himself and Mr. Hruska):

S. 179. A bill to amend section 1(14)(a) of the Interstate Commerce Act to insure the adequacy of the national railroad freight car supply, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. SIMPSON:

S. 180. A bill to prohibit the use of appropriated funds by officials or agencies of the Government for the purpose of influencing the vote in any referendum or election held pursuant to an act of Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MUNDT:

S. 181. A bill to provide for the increased use of agricultural products for industrial purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 182. A bill for the relief of Martha Huber Vavra;

S. 183. A bill for the relief of Raymond Ku; and

S. 184. A bill for the relief of Miss Fructuosa Gonzales; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 185. A bill to extend rural mail delivery service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 186. A bill to provide for the free entry of one digital polarimeter for the use of Smith College; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 187. A bill for the relief of Franca D'Orazio Allocca;

S. 188. A bill for the relief of Sister Maria Araujo;

S. 189. A bill for the relief of Michelina Lanni;

S. 190. A bill for the relief of Carnetta Germain Thomas Hunte;

S. 191. A bill for the relief of Jordan V. Peyev; and

S. 192. A bill for the relief of Maria Liberty Burnett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NELSON:

S. 193. A bill for the relief of Speros L. Saites;

S. 194. A bill for the relief of Emanuel E. Bloch;

S. 195: A bill for the relief of Sunnyside Seed Farms;

S. 196. A bill for the relief of Georges Fraise;

S. 197. A bill for the relief of Trifun Suljic; and

S. 198. A bill for the relief of Irene Andreadou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TALMADGE:

S. 199. A bill to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. BYRD of West Virginia:

S. 200. A bill for the relief of Francesco Mira and his wife, Maria Mira; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PROXMIRE (for himself, Mr. Bayh, Mr. Clark, and Mr. Douglas):

S. 201. A bill to provide for an investigation and study of means of making the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence Seaway available for navigation during the entire year; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 202. A bill to amend section 8e of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, so as to extend to imported tangerines the restrictions imposed by such section on certain other imported commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 203. A bill to provide for the conveyance under certain conditions of the phosphate rights in certain lands in the State of Florida; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 204. A bill to confer jurisdiction on U.S. district courts to hear and render judgment on certain claims;

S. 205. A bill for the relief of Dr. Miguel Martinez y Corpas;

S. 206. A bill for the relief of Gerys Dessalernos (also known as Gerassimos Dessalernos);

S. 207. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jose S. Lastra; and

S. 208. A bill for the relief of Branko (Bronco) Balic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 209. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act so as to provide that nothing therein shall invalidate the provisions of State laws prohibiting strikes in public utilities; and

S. 210. A bill to amend the Railway Labor Act with respect to the settlement of labor disputes involving common carriers by air; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 211. A bill to designate one of the locks in the Cross Florida Barge Canal as the Bert Dosh Lock; and

S. 212. A bill to designate a navigation lock and flood control structure of the central and southern Florida flood control project in the State of Florida as the W. P. Franklin lock and control structure; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HOLLAND (for himself and Mr. Smathers):

S. 213. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the State of Florida; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 214. A bill to amend section 5 of the Area Redevelopment Act to provide that certain areas within the United States having a large number of Cuban refugees shall be designated as redevelopment areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 215. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a form of averaging for recovery of amounts received as damages for injury to crops through pollution of air, water, or soil; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 216. A bill to provide for participation of the United States in the Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center in Dade County, Fla., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

S. 217. A bill to provide that the highway running from Tampa, Fla., through Bradenton, Fla., Punta Gorda, Fla., Fort Myers, Fla., Naples, Fla., and Miami, Fla., to Homestead, Fla., shall be a part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; and

S. 218. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act as amended, in respect of the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 219. A bill to provide for the control of noxious plants on land under the control or jurisdiction of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 220. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide coach bodies shall not be subject to the manufacturers' excise tax on motor vehicles;

S. 221. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit an otherwise qualified disabled widow to receive widow's insurance benefits thereunder even though she has not attained retirement age;

S. 222. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an additional income tax exemption of $1,000 for a taxpayer, spouse, or dependent who is a student at an institution of higher learning; and

S. 223. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit a taxpayer to deduct expenses paid during the taxable year for repair, maintenance, alterations, and additions to his residence; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 224. A bill to provide for the commemoration of certain historical events in the State of Kansas, and for other purposes;

S. 225. A bill directing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands in the State of Kansas to the State of Kansas Forestry, Fish, and Game Commission; and

S. 226. A bill to establish Huron Cemetery, Kansas City, Kans., as a national monument; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CARLSON (for himself and Mr. Pearson):

S. 227. A bill for the relief of Rosa Maria Colavolpe Massie; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 228. A bill for the relief of Miss Luisa Fernandez Perez;

S. 229. A bill for the relief of the Campbell Oil Co.;

S. 230. A bill for the relief of John C. Cadwell; and

S. 231. A bill for the relief of James W. Adams; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 232. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act so as to provide for recomputation of annuities where persons otherwise eligible to receive survivor annuities predecease the annuitants;

S. 233. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act so as to eliminate the provisions requiring termination of annuities of surviving widows or widowers upon remarriage;

S. 234. A bill to amend the Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act with respect to the contribution made by the Government toward health benefits protection for retired Federal employees and members of their families;

S. 235. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp commemorating the 100th anniversary of the birthday of Dr. Luther Halsey Gulick; and

S. 236. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide for the adjustment of inequities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CARLSON (for himself and Mr. Pearson):

S. 237. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code to provide an additional 150 miles of highway in the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HARTKE:

S. 238. A bill for the relief of Antonio Catazariti;

S. 239. A bill for the relief of Julius Byula Ferenczy and his wife, Shara Ferenczy;

S. 240. A bill for the relief of Dr. Presentacion Medina Foronda;

S. 241. A bill for the relief of Anna Gerodimos;

S. 242. A bill for the relief of Dr. Bong Oh Kim;

S. 243. A bill for the relief of Kalliope Kostides;

S. 244. A bill for the relief of Charles Chung Chi Lee and Julia Lee;

S. 245. A bill for the relief of Athanasia Nikolopoulos and Soterios Kikolopoulos;

S. 246. A bill for the relief of Olga Milanovitch;

S. 247. A bill for the relief of Susan Targett Sexton;

S. 248. A bill for the relief of Violet Shina; and

S. 249. A bill for the relief of Eleni Euthimos Svolos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. NEUBERGER:

S. 250. A bill to establish the Oregon Dunes National Seashore in the State of Oregon, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mrs. Neuberger when she introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina (for himself and Mr. Ervin):

S. 251. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Cape Lookout National Seashore in the State of North Carolina, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PROXMIRE:

S. 252. A bill to provide for appointment by the Postmaster General of postmasters at first-, second-, and third-class post offices; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. METCALF (for himself, Mr. Mansfield and Mr. Burdick):

S. 253. A bill to authorize assumption by the various States of civil or criminal jurisdiction over cases arising on Indian reservations with the consent of the tribe involved; to permit gradual transfer of such jurisdiction to the States; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. NEUBERGER (for herself and Mr. Morse):

S. 254. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Tualatin Federal reclamation project, Oregon, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mrs. Neuberger when she introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McNAMARA:

S. 255. A bill to provide for the reduction over a 3-year period of the excise tax on passenger automobiles; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. McNAMARA (for himself and Mr. Morse):

S. 256. A bill to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and section 705(b) of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 and to amend the first proviso of section 8(a)(3) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 257. A bill to modify the reduction in group life insurance of retired employees who have attained age 65; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CANNON:

S. 258. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an additional exemption of $600 to a taxpayer for each dependent son or daughter under the age of 23 who is a full-time student above the secondary level at an educational institution; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 259. A bill with respect to the proof of value necessary in the case of certain mining claims located prior to July 23, 1955; and

S. 260. A bill to amend the act relating to the multiple use of the surface of the same tracts of the public lands in order to provide that certain varieties of sand and gravel shall be considered as valuable mineral deposits under the mining laws of the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Cannon when he introduced the last two above-mentioned bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CANNON:

S. 261. A bill to provide additional time to certain homestead entrymen in the State of Arizona to establish actual permanent residence; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 262. A bill for the relief of Milagros Aragon Neri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Cannon when he introduced the first above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

S. 263. A bill for the relief of Honorata A. Vda de Narra; and

S. 264. A bill for the relief of Marko Markovic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSS:

S. 265. A bill to confirm in the State of Utah title to lands lying below the meander line of the Great Salt Lake in such State; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 266. A bill for the relief of Wong Chuck Ying; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 267. A bill to provide that the cost of certain investigations by the Bureau of Reclamation shall be nonreimbursable; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 268. A bill to provide an elected mayor, city council, and nonvoting Delegate to the House of Representatives for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(See the remarks of Mr. Morse when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JOHNSTON:

S. 269. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an additional personal exemption for a taxpayer or a spouse who is disabled; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 270. A bill for the relief of Anna B. Dreyspring; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 271 A bill to amend the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959, with respect to the contribution made by the Government toward health benefit protection for employees and annuitants and members of their families;

S. 272. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, as amended; and

S. 273. A bill to improve the financing of the civil service retirement system, and to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide for retirement on full annuity at age 55 after 30 years of service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 274. A bill to provide for adjustments in the lands or interests therein acquired for the Hartwell Dam project, South Carolina and Georgia, by the reconveyance of certain lands or interests therein to the former owners thereof;

S. 275. A bill to provide for adjustments in the lands or interests therein acquired for the Clarks Hill Dam and Reservoir project, South Carolina, by the reconveyance of certain lands or interests therein to the former owners thereof; and

S. 276. A bill to provide a residence for congressional and Supreme Court pages; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. Johnston when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. SYMINGTON:

S. 277. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to permit foreign-flag vessels to transport passengers between the United States and Puerto Rico to attend the seventh assembly of the World Convention of Churches of Christ; to the Committee on Commerce.

S. 278. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 so as to provide for reductions in aid to countries in which property of the United States is damaged or destroyed by mob action; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

S. 279. A bill for the relief of Frank E. Christenson and Patricia Christenson;

S. 280. A bill for the relief of Jack L. Curtis; and

S. 281. A bill for the relief of Kenneth Shek Mah; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANSFIELD (for himself and Mr. Metcalf):

S. 282. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds for the construction, reconstruction, and improvement of the Alaska Highway; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MANSFIELD (for himself, Mr. Metcalf, Mr. Burdick, and Mr. McGee):

S. 283. A bill to amend section 8 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. NELSON:

S. 284. A bill for the relief of Ilias Stilianidis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 285. A bill to amend the Employment Act of 1946 to establish policies with respect to productive capital investments of the Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

S. 286. A bill to require Members of Congress, certain other officers, and employees of the United States, and certain officials of political parties to file statements disclosing the amount and sources of their incomes, the value of their assets, and their dealings in securities and commodities; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the remarks of Mr. Morse when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. MORSE (for himself, Mr. Randolph, and Mr. Yarborough):

S. 287. A bill to provide fellowships for graduate study leading to a master's degree for elementary and secondary school teachers; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Morse when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MORSE (for himself and Mr. Randolph):

S. 288. A bill to amend Public Law 874, 81st Congress, in order to provide assistance to local educational agencies in the education of children of needy families and children residing in areas of substantial unemployment with unemployed parents; and

S. 289. A bill to amend Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, to provide financial assistance in the construction and operation of public elementary and secondary schools in areas affected by a major disaster; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Morse when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MORSE (for himself and Mr. Cooper):

S. 290. A bill to protect the integrity of the court and jury functions in criminal cases; and

S. 291. A bill to effectuate the provision of the sixth amendment of the U.S. Constitution requiring that defendants in criminal cases be given the right to a speedy trial; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Morse when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 292. A bill to regulate private employment agencies in the District of Columbia; and

S. 293. A bill to authorize the establishment of a public community college and a public college of arts and sciences in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(See the remarks of Mr. Morse when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KUCHEL (for himself and Mr. Murphy):

S. 294. A bill to authorize the coordinated development of the water resources of the Pacific Southwest, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Kuchel when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

S. 295. A bill to establish the Guadalupe Mountains National Park in Texas; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Yarborough when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BAYH (for himself, Mr. Anderson, Mr. Bartlett, Mr. Bible, Mr. Boggs, Mr. Brewster, Mr. Burdick, Mr. Byrd of Virginia, Mr. Carlson, Mr. Case, Mr. Church, Mr. Clark, Mr. Cooper, Mr. Curtis, Mr. Dirksen, Mr. Dodd, Mr. Dominick, Mr. Douglas, Mr. Eastland, Mr. Ervin, Mr. Fannin, Mr. Fong, Mr. Gruening, Mr. Hart, Mr. Hartke, Mr. Hickenlooper, Mr. Inouye, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Javits, Mr. Johnston, Mr. Jordan of North Carolina, Mr. Jordan of Idaho, Mr. Kuchel, Mr. Long of Missouri, Mr. Magnuson Mr. Mansfield, Mr. McCarthy, Mr. McClellan, Mr. McGee, Mr. McGovern, Mr. McIntyre, Mr. Metcalf, Mr. Monroney, Mr. Morse, Mr. Morton, Mr. Moss, Mr. Mundt, Mr. Murphy, Mr. Muskie, Mr. Nelson, Mrs. Neuberger, Mr. Pastore, Mr. Pell, Mr. Prouty, Mr. Proxmire, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Ribicoff, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Saltonstall, Mr. Scott, Mr. Simpson, Mr. Smathers, Mr. Sparkman, Mr. Stennis, Mr. Symington, Mr. Tydings, Mr. Yarborough, Mr. Young of North Dakota, and Mr. Young of Ohio):

S.J. Res. 1. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to succession to the Presidency and Vice Presidency and to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Bayh when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DIRKSEN (for himself, Mr. Aiken, Mr. Allott, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Boggs, Mr. Carlson, Mr. Cooper, Mr. Cotton, Mr. Curtis, Mr. Dominick, Mr. Fannin, Mr. Fong, Mr. Hickenlooper, Mr. Hruska, Mr. Jordan of Idaho, Mr. Kuchel, Mr. Miller, Mr. Morton, Mr. Mundt, Mr. Murphy, Mr. Pearson, Mr. Prouty, Mr. Saltonstall, Mr. Scott, Mr. Simpson, Mrs. Smith, Mr. Thurmond, Mr. Tower, Mr. Williams of Delaware, Mr. Young of North Dakota, Mr. Symington, and Mr. Holland):

S.J. Res. 2. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to preserve to the people of each State power to determine the composition of its legislature and the apportionment of the membership thereof in accordance with law and the provisions of the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Dirksen when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

S.J. Res. 3. Joint resolution extending the date for transmission of the budget and the economic report; considered and passed, without amendment.

(See the remarks of Mr. Mansfield when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mrs. SMITH (for herself and Mr. Aiken):

S.J. Res. 4. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for nomination of candidates for President and Vice President, and for election of such candidates by popular vote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGOVERN:

S.J. Res. 5. Joint resolution to designate the bridge crossing the Washington Channel of the Potomac River on Interstate Route 95, near the intersection of the extension of 13th and G Streets SW., as the "Francis Case Memorial Bridge"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HRUSKA:

S.J. Res. 6. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Hruska when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself and Mr. Saltonstall):

S.J. Res. 7. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELL:

S.J. Res. 8. Joint resolution to authorize the distribution in the United States of the film prepared by the U.S. Information Agency entitled "Years of Lightning, Day of Drums," depicting events in the administration of the late President John F. Kennedy; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. McGEE:

S.J. Res. 9. Joint resolution to cancel any unpaid reimbursable construction costs of the Wind River Indian irrigation project, Wyoming, chargeable against certain non-Indian lands; and

S.J. Res. 10. Joint resolution to determine the susceptibility of minerals to electrometallurgical processes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S.J. Res. 11. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MUNDT (for himself, Mr. Thurmond, Mr. McClellan, Mr. Hruska, Mr. Morton, Mr. Fong, Mr. Boggs, Mr. Stennis, and Mr. Prouty):

S.J. Res. 12. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of the President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FONG:

S.J. Res. 13. Joint resolution to authorize a contribution to certain inhabitants of the Ryukyu Islands for death and injury of persons, and for use of and damage to private property, arising from acts and omissions of the U.S. Armed Forces, or members thereof, after August 15, 1945, and before April 28, 1952; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. HOLLAND (for himself, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Carlson, and Mr. Bennett):

S.J. Res. 14. Joint resolution to authorize the Architect of the Capitol to construct a memorial to James Madison, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. MILLER:

S.J. Res. 15. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to vacancies in the Vice Presidency; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Miller when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS

PROPOSED REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1965

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I am honored today to make a speech on the Reorganization Act which I hope will become the Reorganization Act of 1965. I am especially honored that my distinguished, fine, and brilliant young junior Senator from the State of Oklahoma [Mr. Harris] is presiding for the first time over the Senate, as I introduce legislation, which I think will in the passage of time become one of the most important acts of the present Congress. The junior Senator from the State of Oklahoma [Mr. Harris] is the first of this year's Senate class to act as Presiding

Officer and, other than the President pro tempore and the Acting President pro tempore, is the first Senator to occupy the chair this session.

Oklahoma is very proud of the record of the present occupant of the chair, the junior Senator from Oklahoma. Mr. Harris not only adds to our backlog of Phi Beta Kappa representatives from the State of Oklahoma in the Senate, but he also is a member of the Order of Coif, which is, of course, comparable to the Phi Beta Kappa, in the law school. It is an honor to have him preside at the time when I make my first speech this session. I know that the junior Senator from Oklahoma will be of great assistance in resolving the many difficulties and troublesome issues which will be before this Congress.

Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress of the United States. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution lie on the table until January 8 in order to permit other Members who may wish to do so to join as cosponsors.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed at this point in the Record.

The **PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the resolution will lie on the table as requested by the senior Senator from Oklahoma.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 2) to establish a Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, submitted by Mr. Monroney (for himself and other Senators), was received, and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there is hereby established a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress (hereinafter referred to as the committee) to be composed of six Members of the Senate (not more than three of whom shall be members of the majority party) to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and six Members of the House of Representatives (not more than three of whom shall be members of the majority party) to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members. No recommendation shall be made by the committee except upon a majority vote of the Members representing each House, taken separately.

Sec. 2. The committee shall make a full and complete study of the organization and operation of the Congress of the United States and shall recommend improvements in such organization and operation with a view toward strengthening the Congress, simplifying its operations, improving its relationships with other branches of the United States Government, and enabling it better to meet its responsibilities under the Constitution. This study shall include, but shall not be limited to, the organization and operation of each House of the Congress; the relationship between the two Houses; the relationships between the Congress and other branches of the Government; the employment and remuneration of officers and employees of the respective Houses and officers and employees of the committees and Members of Congress; and the structure of, and the relationships between, the various standing, special, and select committees of the Congress: *Provided*, That nothing in this concurrent resolution shall be construed to authorize the committee to make any recommendations with respect to the rules, parliamentary procedure, practices, and/or precedents of either House, or the consideration of any matter on the floor of either House: *Provided further*, That the language employed herein shall not prohibit the committee from studying and recommending the consolidations and reorganization of committees.

Sec. 3. (a) The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eighty-ninth Congress, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable.

(b) The committee is empowered to appoint and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, technicians, and clerical and stenographic assistants as it deems necessary and advisable.

(c) The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $150,000 through January 31, 1966, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers signed by the chairman.

(d) The committee shall report from time to time to the Senate and the House of Representatives the results of its study, together with its recommendations, the first report being made not later than 120 days after the effective date of this concurrent resolution. If the Senate, the House of Representatives, or both, are in recess or have adjourned, the report shall be made to the Secretary of the Senate or the Clerk of the House of Representatives, or both, as the case may be. All reports and findings of the committee shall, when received, be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate and the appropriate committees of the House.

Mr. **MONRONEY**. Mr. President, I am very happy to announce that 47 Members of the Senate have indicated a desire to be listed as cosponsors. I am deeply grateful for this support. These Senators are: Senator Proxmire, Senator Hickenlooper, Senator Moss, Senator Edward Long of Missouri, Senator Harris, Senator Smith, Senator Bartlett, Senator McClellan, Senator Neuberger, Senator Yarborough, Senator Ribicoff, Senator Metcalf, Senator Saltonstall, Senator Smathers, Senator Stephen Young of Ohio, Senator Morse, Senator McIntyre, Senator Pearson, Senator Bennett, Senator Gruening, Senator Boggs, Senator Morton, Senator Muskie, Senator Dominick, Senator Miller, Senator McGovern, Senator Randolph, Senator Bible, Senator Nelson, Senator Thurmond, Senator Mundt, Senator Hartke, Senator McGee, Senator Bayh, Senator Burdick, Senator Williams of New Jersey, Senator Tydings, Senator Church, Senator Hart, Senator Kuchel, Senator Hruska, Senator Fong, Senator Scott, Senator Brewster, Senator Curtis, Senator Allott, and Senator Pell.

Mr. President, I hope other Senators who wish to sponsor this resolution creating the bipartisan commission will add their names to it by January 8.

I wish to make a parliamentary inquiry of the Chair.

The **PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. **MONRONEY**. The resolution would carry with it the designation of Senate Concurrent Resolution 2. Could it continue to have that designation, if it should lie on the table for additional cosponsorship until January 8?

The **PRESIDENT** pro tempore. That can be done.

Mr. **MONRONEY**. I thank the Chair.

In respect to the letter I wrote to each Member of the Senate, enclosing a copy of the resolution, 47 Senators have indicated a desire to be cosponsors. I am greatly heartened by the support for this resolution.

The resolution provides for a committee composed of six Members of the Senate appointed by the President of the Senate and six Members of the House appointed by the Speaker. Not more than three Members from each House could be of the majority party. The committee would be directed to make a full and complete study of the organization and operation of the Congress and to submit recommendations designed to strengthen and streamline congressional procedures and operations with a view toward improving the relationship of Congress with the other branches of our tripartite National Government. Constitutional responsibilities of the Congress will thus be maintained in an improved manner.

As I have previously stated, this resolution is almost identical to the concurrent resolution sponsored by the late Senator La Follette and myself which was passed by the Congress in 1945. The differences are of a technical nature and relate to expenses of the committee and limitations on staff and stenographic help. The joint committee established in 1945 made recommendations which were the basis for the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946—which was the first major reorganization of Congress in 60 years. Now that 20 years have passed, the Congress is again in need of major reorganization.

Congress has always been, and I hope Congress always will be, an institution capable of adapting to new conditions and new needs. The work of Congress changes as the world changes. To a major degree, the responsibilities of the Members of the Congress have become far more complex as our society and our economic system have increased in complexity. In this era of fantastic technological and engineering advancement Congress must deal with myriad problems and matters as diverse as the elements that go into the makeup of our civilization and social order.

Without hesitation we now must delve into the difficulties associated with the great adventures of our time, discussing lunar landings and fly-bys past Mars and supersonic airplanes that will span the Atlantic in 2½ hours. We must appropriate billions upon billions for missiles with intercontinental ranges and for hundreds of other terribly important defense and security items. Yet Congress maintains, and must always maintain, the beautiful and orderly traditions, precedents and procedures that are the heritage of the legislative branch from the great days of Webster and Calhoun and other illustrious leaders of the past.

This proposed study of various means of renovating and updating our congressional operating techniques need not do violence or damage of the slightest kind to either the traditions or the more efficient aspects of the Congress. We revere the traditions such as the snuffboxes there in the front of the Chamber. These nice but uncomfortable chairs, these old-fashioned but charming mahogany desks, the blotting sand and the archaic inkwells—these are great traditions and they do not detract to the slightest degree from the diligent pursuit of our duties.

However, there are other aspects of the Congress not so charming and not so visible as its furnishings and decor. Some of these traditions now interfere with our work to a degree that they should be examined at length.

Certainly the American people expect the Congress to improve its performance. Many citizens are convinced that there are better ways to handle, or perhaps even to balance, the $100 billion budget through modern accounting and computer techniques.

Many citizens wonder why the Congress, with so much on its agenda, continues to hold a Tuesday to Thursday schedule most weeks. Thousands upon thousands of Capitol visitors have been puzzled when they visit the galleries expecting to hear a debate on a tax bill that has been publicized widely throughout the land, but instead find one or two lonely Members on the floor of this Chamber discussing something entirely different—say, perhaps, an amendment to the fishing laws for the District of Columbia. We who serve in Congress have always found ourselves to be consistent targets for jokesters and cartoonists. The lampoonings and caricatures, however, are beginning to wear thin. There is a strident and persistent demand for improved congressional practices.

I need not remind any of my colleagues that the problems of 1965 are far different from the problems of 1955 or 1945 or 1925 or 1905. There was a time when Congress would ordinarily meet for only 3 or 4 months each year. It would take up a few bills, some about tariffs, some about rivers and harbors, maybe passing legislation to build a few new post offices, and then adjourn for 9 months.

Our workload in this era defies simple description. The Congress must be responsible for policies affecting virtually every facet of human affairs. This is a big country and it is growing. Its problems have grown larger as it has expanded to become the leader of the free world. We cannot expect our problems to grow any easier or our solutions to be less difficult to arrive at. Congress must be prepared for the responsibilities ahead. As the Nation grows in strength and security, so must Congress prove stronger and more efficient as a bulwark of our national system.

I hardly need remind you also that the 100 Senators with staff assistants and the 435 Members of the House of Representatives and their assistants total fewer than the number required to run the Bureau of Indian Affairs. The cost of operating the entire Congress, $89 million—Members' and staff assistants' salaries and other associated expenses, exclusive of building costs—totals less than the cost of the Federal Fish and Wildlife Service, $110 million.

Yet, Congress is expected to hold up its share of the responsibility in our tripartite system of government. It must hold hearings and allocate the funds for all 2,300 departments, agencies, offices, and bureaus of government, containing nearly two and a half million employees. It must by law raise the necessary taxes to meet these costs, plus the tens of billions needed for global defense and the exploration of space. It must be as expert as possible on whether our Gemini or Apollo capsules can compare with their Russian counterparts.

It must provide for trade policies that will build up our exports, yet guard against tariffs so low that they destroy domestic markets. It must maintain a balance of payments favorable to the United States, but at the same time permit huge expenditures, both public and private, in dozens of foreign countries.

Proposals dealing with the taxes, trade, transportation, and health of our 190 million Americans account for a large proportion of bills. But on top of this duty is the enormous problem of passing on appropriations bills to allocate funds for all the Government agencies and installations. With the budget now ranging toward $100 billion, this job alone is enough to consume nearly half the time of the Congress, if we are to justify every item and ask all the questions that might reveal any waste or extravagance.

Only through specialization can Members of Congress qualify as experts in any single field of governmental activity. Yet every Member of Congress, regardless of whether he has undertaken a specialty or not, has to assume responsibility in connection with the entire gamut of Federal problems, domestic and international. This across-the-board responsibility sometimes gives the executive branch an advantage, for most of our people in the various executive departments work only in limited and specialized fields. Their programs and plans take form usually after long intra-agency conferences and considerations. By contrast, the work of the Congress, from the beginning of hearings on a bill until its final passage, is done in a goldfish bowl under the glare of worldwide news media coverage. When a department or agency miscues, it often can make quiet corrections behind the scenes. But when Congress makes a boo-boo, it is on the 6 o'clock news and the front pages everywhere.

When Senator Robert M. La Follette and I started to work on the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, we thought that the capacity of the Congress then had been stretched to the limit. Coming out of World War II, we had little idea that the workload, which then seemed enormous, would continue to grow with each new year.

Twenty years ago, about the time the first Reorganization Act was being launched, the Congress received 6,539 bills. This was in the 1st session of the 78th Congress.

Ten years later, in 1953, the 1st session of the 83d Congress received 10,695 bills, and, in 1959, in the 1st session of the 86th, it received a total of 13,847 bills in both Houses. In the 1st session of the 88th a total of 14,168 bills were introduced.

I am reciting these figures as proof that Congress needs to remodel its legislative machinery, with proper procedures for committee action and floor debate, to do a better job on the mammoth problems that are thrust upon it for settlement each year. These are the problems that require days and sometimes weeks of study to be sure that the jokers and mistakes are discovered and eliminated before a new law is passed.

There are many ways in which Congress could improve its machinery—some involving major changes, others of a minor nature. The proposed joint committee could take testimony on these suggested changes and make recommendations to the Congress. The areas of major importance, in my opinion, which require immediate attention are:

First. Congressional procedure for dealing with the Federal budget.

Second. Committee operation.

Third. Earlier adjournment or specified recess periods.

Fourth. Reducing the individual Member's caseload.

In addition to these major changes, there are many minor changes which could be made to strengthen Congress and simplify its operation. Among them are:

First. Hiring an architect for the Capitol who is really a distinguished architect in his own right—someone with great talent and imagination.

Second. Hiring a construction manager to oversee all construction work on Capitol Hill or calling upon the services of the Corps of Engineers or the GSA's building department.

Third. Hiring a business manager who would be responsible for the operations of all Capitol buildings and would keep them as clean as the capitol buildings in many of the smaller nations as a result of diligent housekeeping work.

Fourth. Putting the Capitol guides under civil service—and with retirement for their accumulated service.

This, perhaps, is the only capitol in the world where the people—who pay the expenses of running the government—are charged a 25-cent fee for the privilege of viewing the operation of the people's branch of the Government, which is the Congress.

All of these things—both major and minor—should be considered by a joint committee of the Congress.

The greatest problem the Congress has is dealing annually with a Federal budget of $100 billion. Congress does not have the proper tools to do the job.

Today, the Appropriations Committees and their staffs wrestle with a task that is impossible with our present machinery. We are literally attempting to run a business 10 times as large as A.T. & T., the Santa Fe Railroad, and General

Motors combined, with machinery as obsolete as a quill pen, a slanting bookkeeper's desk and an old-fashioned high stool.

There are ways in which automatic data processing could be brought in to serve as an invaluable aid in assembling, comparing, and consolidating Government expenditure figures, bringing them in line with good management practices. I am not an auditor, but I am sure we would find the talent to give such modernization and automation a good try. Hundreds of thousands of accounts must be examined. The magnitude of the task by the old method of oral testimony is beyond the capacity of the human mind to absorb the hundreds of thousands of words that are taken down in shorthand and transcribed at all these various hearings.

The primary function of the Congress is still the exercise of power of the purse. I repeat, the powers of the purse rest only in the Congress.

If we use this power well, we can and will be able to control the size of Government, its activities, and the number of people who find their way on or off the payroll. This is the major responsibility given to the Congress by the Constitution. We dare not fail in this assignment.

In addition to seeking ways to improve accounting machinery through automation, many good, bad, and mediocre suggestions have been made along many lines. They should be studied carefully. Only such a study can separate the good suggestions from the bad.

First. Establish a joint committee on the budget, composed of both House and Senate Members and a joint staff of experts. They could advise and assist the regular Appropriations Committees in fixing the funding levels of Government agencies.

Second. Prepare a legislative budget. This was provided in the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, but it was never carried out. It would empower the Congress to set a ceiling for its total appropriations at the outset of each session in order to fit the separate bills into the overall plan and into a balanced budget.

Third. Consolidate our present 13 separate appropriations bills into a single annual consolidated general appropriation act, carrying funds for all Government departments.

This was tried once in the fifties and was abandoned, I believe, after one session.

Fourth. Divide appropriation bill responsibility between House and Senate. Each House would originate half the bills, thus avoiding delay in passage until late in the session each year. This perhaps would be another controversial suggestion, but it is offered only as another suggestion that may be available for study.

Fifth. Establish in the Bureau of the Budget a special personnel section, whose principal duty would be to screen minutely—I repeat, screen minutely—requests for additional Federal employees. They should also plan for better utilization of existing Government workers.

Sixth. Provide for a separate session each year to consider only the appropriation bills.

Seventh. Extend appropriation bills to cover 2-year periods so that Congress could concentrate on legislation in one session and appropriations in the next, with provisions for emergencies.

Eighth. Require all legislative bills to authorize new expenditures to be accompanied by a report specifying the annual cost of such program.

Ninth. Amend House rules to restrict back-door spending.

Tenth. Limit the use of supplemental and deficiency appropriation bills to emergency needs.

Eleventh. Require a yea-and-nay vote on all appropriation bills.

I again emphasize that these are only a few of the many proposals that may be suggested and considered carefully at the hearings.

Certainly the passage of appropriation bills before the beginning of the fiscal year on July 1 would encourage better management of Government departments. With the public closely aware of the congressional duty to control the expenditures of Government, the failure properly to exercise this most important function has brought heavy criticism upon the Congress.

At fault, primarily, are the systems used to control expenditures. The staff members for the appropriations committees of both Houses are of highest caliber and experience. But no matter how skilled or experienced any staff member is—or any Congressman or Senator for that matter—he is unable to get on top of and know every item in an appropriation bill totaling $50 billions of dollars, or in the case of other than defense appropriations, ranging downward from that figure to amounts ranging from $5 to $10 billion.

An improvement in systems, with data processing and other accounting aids, plus the addition of auditors to simplify the budget and to reveal clearly the expenditures provided by the bills, is long overdue. A few dollars spent for added staff and added organization of the budget requests into clearly understandable accounts would pay off 100 times its cost.

Under such a system, if it can be worked out, we can quickly identify the peaks and valleys of costs, and place individual responsibility for high costs on the administrators of such departments. Today we have no comparative analysis whatsoever. The administrative spenders and the administrative savers all look alike in today's appropriation system.

The level of appropriations and the care with which funds are granted influence the quality of government as much as any regulatory laws that are passed. Reform in this field would bring great credit upon the Congress.

Another area where great improvement could be made is in committee operations. The committees are the heart and key to any improvement in congressional machinery. As the committee work is improved, the speed and efficiency of handling legislation will be greatly accelerated. The holdup of our legislative program last session in the Senate, and I suspect in the House, was often caused by logjams in the committees. Until the bills are reported to the House or Senate by the standing committees, they cannot be considered on the floor.

The key point in the passage of all legislation is at the committee level. Ninety-five percent of the bills approved by committees are passed by the House or Senate, and the committee versions generally remain 95 percent unchanged. No bill is likely to pass unless it has committee approval. Therefore, the quality of committee work and the expedition of its business are of primary importance to the legislative process.

This importance is recognized in the great variety of proposals for improving committee procedures. Two proposals were adopted by the Senate in the last Congress—one to permit committees to sit during the morning hour and the other establishing a rule of germaneness. Both are helpful in speeding up the handling of bills.

Other proposals among many for improving the committee system that may be studied include:

First. The selection of committee chairmen by secret ballot rather than by the rules of seniority. A few hazards of the present system are evident. Those Senators who can continue to be reelected move inexorably toward the chairmanship, where they can prevent or at least delay consideration of major legislation referred to their committees, regardless of the overwhelming national interest. Yet most of the substitutes, including the proposed selection by secret ballot, have their own hazards, and can split the committee members into splinters of special interest. Perhaps some plan or compromise that would retain the rule of seniority but limit the chairman's term, perhaps by years. At the end of his term the chairmanship could be passed along to the next senior member. I have seen the suggestion that the chairmanship should be limited by age—65 or 70. Certainly care should be taken so only future chairmen would be affected by such suggestions.

Second. Permit a majority of a committee to convene meetings, consider matters within their jurisdiction, and end debate by moving the previous question; in other words, bring the matter to a vote. This is another way of limiting the power of the chairman.

Third. Changing the method of assigning Members to committees. The majority members of the Ways and Means Committee perform this task in the House and seem to meet with little criticism. In the Senate, however, the party steering committees make the decisions, and our system is under heavy attack.

These first three proposals shouuld be studied and thoughtfully considered, although their attainment would be difficult since they are so loaded with political controversy.

Turning to the more attainable, we should perhaps consider:

First. Realining some of the committee jurisdictions to achieve a better balanced workload.

Second. Limiting as near as possible House Members to one major committee, and Senate Members to two major committees.

Third. Providing more time for committee hearings early in the session.

The convening of certain committees, say on December 1, to hold hearings and be ready to report proposed legislation when the Senate and the House are organized on January 3 or 4 would certainly start us off to work when we are bright-eyed and full of vim and vigor, instead of getting underway on the legislative program about March 1 or 15.

Fourth. Providing more staff specialists for committees dealing with technical matters—military, space, medical research.

Fifth. Establishing more careful rules for the conduct of committee investigations.

In a representative form of government, it is extremely important that elected representatives have firsthand knowledge of the views and desires of their constituencies. Under our tripartite system the Congress is the only truly representative branch of government. Its Members are the only officials whom the people can get close to. Members of Congress must be able to spend a considerable amount of time in their districts and States.

Because of increased workload and national crises it has been impossible for Members of Congress to spend much time outside Washington in the past two or three Congresses. But a lot of the blame must fall on the Congress itself and not on the workload or national crises.

Congress could save at least 2 months time if it would get busy at the start of the session when the Members are full of fire and bright-eyed. As Senators well know, we often spin our wheels from the beginning of Congress until about March 1, waiting for committees to have hearings and report bills.

Perhaps committees could be recalled, with travel provided, to meet from about December 1 to December 20. That way we would have bills ready for the Senate and House calendars for floor action immediately after the President's state of the Union address. Under our present system, usually the Lincoln Day recess forestalls any floor action until about March 1.

We could save a lot of time if we abandoned the 3-day, Tuesday-to-Thursday workweek and went on a 5-day, Monday-to-Friday workweek. We could break this up by scheduling one long weekend a month.

We have to abandon the practice of avoiding rollcalls and delaying action on bills because too many Members are out of town during the week giving speeches. We must make the committee chairman responsible for the bills reported out of his committee and require that he be on hand whenever the leadership deems it advisable to call up his bills.

We must permit our committees to sit while the Senate is in session. One Member should not be able to block all committees from meeting. Because of a misinterpretation of the act of 1946 this situation prevails today. We need to clarify this rule so that our committees can operate efficiently and with greater dispatch.

This proposed study of congressional operations must examine the nonlegislative workload of the Members. I believe it has grown tenfold during my years in the House and Senate. In 1939, one secretary could easily handle the task of correspondence and the departmental problems of constituents. Today most Congressmen have 6 or more secretaries and Senators average between 10 and 20.

While legislators should concentrate on their lawmaking duties, I would estimate that most senatorial staffs devote 75 percent of their time and energy to the errands, problems, and inquiries from constituents or from their States' public agencies. These include veterans' problems, public works programs, farm crop quota adjustments, and a thousand and one other problems that seem to get lost or pigeonholed in Washington, and for which help is asked of Members of Congress.

We have given ourselves an ever-increasing number of assistants, but the workload grows faster than the staff. The administrative assistant, recommended in the Reorganization Act of 1946, has helped materially; but he and other staff aids have been unable to take over the complete staff workload. Much of it still rests upon the Congressman or the Senator.

In an effort to make sure that the primary legislative task is performed effectively and not buried by this other service to the State, 66 Senators have already appointed legislative assistants, many equal in authority and salary to the administrative assistant. Yet, unlike the position of administrative assistant, legislative assistants as such are not authorized by statute or Senate rule, and no extra salary funds are available for the position. It is time to recognize this need for specialized service in the legislative area.

Many other suggestions have been made to lighten the congressional workload. These are worthy of the joint committee's study. Among them are suggestions to:

First. Provide for elective officials and home rule for the District of Columbia.

Second. Remove the authority of Congressmen and Senators to appoint postmasters and candidates for the military academies.

Third. Turn over for executive determination the settlement of certain immigration and claims bills.

Fourth. Provide advisory committees of scientists to assist Congress on a part-time basis.

Fifth. Create a high-level commission for the continuous study of differences between the two Houses, and the adjustment of them when they occur.

Sixth. Provide for Senate and House leadership conferences to work out a schedule of hearings, markup, and floor action on important administrations bills as well as others.

Let me emphasize at this point an outstanding provision of this resolution. This is the proviso which would prohibit the committee from making any recommendation with respect to the rules, parliamentary procedure, practices and/or precedents of either House or the consideration of any matter on the floor of either House. This same proviso was included in the resolution that created the joint committee of 1945. Each House must be responsible for its own rules, and neither desires to be involved in any way in determining the rules of the other. But this joint committee would be free to hear testimony on matters relating to rules and procedure without invading the prerogatives and responsibilities of the separate Houses insofar as rules, parliamentary procedures, practices, precedents, and floor procedures are concerned.

I hope that those Members who have not yet had a chance to study this very brief resolution will do so in time to meet the January 8 deadline for cosponsorship. This is a practical and realistic approach to our congressional organizational needs of 1965, just as it was in 1945. Many other approaches have been tried and have been found wanting during the past 20 years. Many, many hours of hard work will be required in order to gain the objectives sought by this resolution, but they are objectives worthy of the effort. Let us proceed now to make 1965 a banner year for the legislative branch, exceeding the very worthy achievements of 1964 and other past years.

Let us not lose sight of the fact that the progress of all mankind toward a brighter world hinges to a major degree on how well we in the Congress perform our assigned duties as servants of a free and well-motivated people. The reforms that will become self-evident in the course of a congressional reorganization study can contribute materially to the further growth and development of our democratic institutions that light the way for all men.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield. I appreciate the cosponsorship of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I commend the Senator from Oklahoma on his presentation of this concurrent resolution. It is not only a source of pride for me to be a cosponsor of the resolution on the basis of its substantive value, but also a great privilege to be a cosponsor under the leadership of the senior Senator from Oklahoma.

I have said, out of his presence, on many platforms of America that I think the LaFollette-Monroney Act, with the reforms that it brought about, is probably the greatest piece of procedural legislation that has been enacted by Congress in my time. I am sure that the legislative results of the concurrent resolution that the Senator from Oklahoma has just submitted will far surpass in effectiveness the pace-setting program known as the LaFollette-Monroney Act. All America should be indebted to the Senator from Oklahoma for submitting the concurrent resolution.

Mr. MONRONEY. I am deeply appreciative of the remarks of the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon, who has always been one of our most thoughtful students and advisers on legislation, and who, like the senior Senator from Oklahoma, has insisted on maintaining in our system of government the constitutional place that the Founding Fathers established for the legislative branch. The Constitution provides that the membership of Congress may be changed only by a vote of the people. Even a few thousand or a few hundred votes can change the representation of the Members of the House. We have seen Senate races in many States turn on as low as 200 or 300 votes. It is the right of the people to change the membership of their Congress for any good reason, for any bad reason, or for no reason at all. This is democracy at its best. Democracy, under the congressional or parliamentary system, has survived longer in history than any other form of government. Its development has been indigenous to this country. It has been copied somewhat from parliaments but has been changed to some degree. We look upon it as a kind of compromise. Although it has been changed through the years, we can properly claim to have the longest established system of government in continuous operation.

I thank the Senator from Oregon for his compliment.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, it has been almost 20 years since the Congress has acted upon a concurrent resolution authorizing a full study of congressional organization by a joint committee. The recommendations of the joint committee convened in 1945 led to the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 which has by and large proved to be successful.

I believe that it is once again time that Congress authorize a joint committee to take a long and objective look into the matter of congressional organization, free of any predetermined bias toward any particular matter. I am sure that there will be many suggestions made to such a joint committee by Members of Congress themselves as we all have some ideas of our own in this area. I am sure that we would all welcome such a study, but each of us must reserve our rights concerning any recommendations which might be made. The joint committee is empowered to recommend, but it will then be up to Congress as a whole to implement these recommendations. At that time, each individual Member of Congress will be able to determine for himself the feasibility and desirability of implementing any particular recommendation. With this caveat, it is a pleasure for me to cosponsor the resolution offered by the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

AMENDMENT OF LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT RELATIVE TO ADJOURNMENT OF CONGRESS

Mrs. SMITH submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 3); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That section 132 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 132. (a) Effective with the first session of the Eighty-ninth Congress, in each even-numbered year in which the two Houses have not adjourned sine die by August 15, they shall stand adjourned on that date, or on the next preceding day of session, until 12 o'clock meridian on November 15 in that year, or the following Monday if November 15 falls on Saturday or Sunday; and in each odd-numbered year in which the two Houses have not adjourned sine die by August 1, they shall stand adjourned on that date, or on the next preceding day of session, until 12 o'clock meridian on November 1 in that year, or the following Monday if November 1 falls on Saturday or Sunday.

"(b) The consent of the respective Houses is hereby given to an adjournment of the other for the period specified in subsection (a)."

DISTRIBUTION OF FILM ENTITLED "JOHN F. KENNEDY—YEARS OF LIGHTNING, DAY OF DRUMS"

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, several weeks ago I was privileged to attend, along with other Members of Congress and public and governmental officials, a special premiere showing of a new memorial film on the administration of the late President John F. Kennedy.

The movie, entitled "John F. Kennedy: Years of Lightning, Day of Drums," was produced by the U.S. Information Agency for distribution overseas. The documentary has recently been released by USIA for distribution in more than 30 languages to some 114 foreign countries all over the world. From the outset, worldwide reaction to this brilliant film has been most favorable.

Under existing law the U.S. Information Agency does not have the authority to exhibit its films in the United States. All of its appropriations, including those which paid for the memorial film's preparation, are intended strictly for use overseas. These prohibitions are designed in part to prevent the party in power from glorifying itself at Government expense. Because of them, the film cannot be shown in this country without a special congressional authorization.

There is, however, no partisanship in the Kennedy film. It is a drama that grows out of the life of the American people. I am, therefore, introducing for myself and Senators BARTLETT, BAYH, BREWSTER, BURDICK, BYRD of West Virginia, CANNON, CHURCH, COOPER, DOUGLAS, ERVIN, GRUENING, HARRIS, HOLLAND, LONG of Missouri, McCARTHY, McGEE, McINTYRE, METCALF, MONDALE, MONTOYA, MORSE, MOSS, MUSKIE, NELSON, PASTORE, PROUTY, RANDOLPH, RIBICOFF, SALTONSTALL, SMATHERS, TYDINGS, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, and YARBOROUGH, a concurrent resolution which will make it possible for every American to see this stirring and thought-provoking new film. A clear expression of congressional intent from both Houses of the Congress will secure domestic release of the film.

The resolution which I am introducing exempts the movie from the existing ban on domestic use of USIA products. It expresses the sense of the Congress that the U.S. Information Agency should arrange to make the memorial film available for viewing within the United States. Distribution would be through both educational and commercial media. I am hopeful that educational and nonprofit organizations, as well as commercial movie theaters, will arrange showings of the film. The broad wording of the resolution is intended to cover such possibilities as television release for the film and recordings which might be made from the film's sound track.

The resolution further expresses the sense of the Congress that any proceeds collected by the media showing the film should be contributed to the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, Washington, D.C. This is not a mandatory requirement, but I can think of no more appropriate way to aid the Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts than to have the media and organizations which show this exceptional memorial film donate any proceeds received to the Center. In this way, we will be further enriching the culture of generations to come.

"Years of Lightning, Day of Drums," a full-length, hour-and-a-half film, is a personal and historical review of our late President and his 2 years and 10 months in the White House. It met with the unanimous praise of the distinguished film critics who attended the premiere showing. Bosley Crowther, noted drama critic of the New York Times, described it as "a superior documentary that articulately and artfully combines a comprehension of the basic aims of the murdered President and an eloquent elegy for him."

Richard Coe, drama critic for the Washington Post, said:

> This masterfully imaginative hour-and-a-half length documentary is the first full-length feature and by all odds the finest film I've seen by the U.S. Information Agency * * * USIA's major contribution * * * is its foresight to end our year of mourning with the affirmation that those who say yes to life are its heroes. The naysayers drift away with the wind.

I personally found the color superb, the narration of Gregory Peck rich and forceful, and the musical score by Bruce Herschenson excellent.

President Kennedy's life is a continuing inspiration to Americans all across our land. It would be unfortunate if our citizens were to be denied the opportunity of viewing this dramatic story of his brief years in the White House. It is a message of inspiration directed to all peoples of the world, perhaps especially to the American people. It is a part of the history of our Nation which every American citizen is entitled to share.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of my resolution be printed at this point in the Record and that it lie on the table for 5 legislative days for the benefit of any additional Senators who may wish to join in cosponsoring the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the concurrent resolution will be printed in the Record, and lie on the table, as requested by the Senator from South Dakota.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 4) was received and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 4

Whereas the life of John Fitzgerald Kennedy is a continuing inspiration to American citizens all across our land; and

Whereas the film "John F. Kennedy—Years of Lightning, Day of Drums" is a part of the history of our Nation which every American citizen is entitled to share: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) The people of the United States should not be denied an opportunity to view the film prepared by the United States Information Agency entitled "John F. Kennedy—Years of Lightning, Day of Drums";

(2) The United States Information Agency should make appropriate arrangements to make such film available for distribution through educational and commercial media for viewing within the United States; and

(3) Any proceeds collected by such media should be contributed to the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, Washington, District of Columbia.

RESOLUTIONS

AMENDMENT OF RULE XXII OF STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

Mr. ANDERSON (for himself and Mr. MORTON) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 6), which, under the rule, was ordered to lie over 1 day, as follows:

S. RES. 6

Resolved, That rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended to read as follows:

"1. When a question is pending, no motion shall be received but—

"To adjourn.

"To adjourn to a day certain, or that when the Senate adjourn it shall be to a day certain.

"To take a recess.

"To proceed to the consideration of executive business.

"To lay on the table.

"To postpone indefinitely.

"To postpone to a day certain.

"To commit.

"To amend.

Which several motions shall have precedence as they stand arranged; and the motions relating to adjournment, to take a recess, to proceed to the consideration of executive business, to lay on the table, shall be decided without debate.

"2. Notwithstanding the provisions of rule III or rule VI or any other rule of the Senate, at any time a motion signed by sixteen Senators, to bring to a close the debate upon any measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, is presented to the Senate, the Presiding Officer shall at once state the motion to the Senate, and one hour after the Senate meets on the following calendar day but one, he shall lay the motion before the Senate and direct that the Secretary call the roll, and upon the ascertainment that a quorum is present, the Presiding Officer shall, without debate, submit to the Senate by a yea-and-nay vote the question:

"'Is it the sense of the Senate that the debate shall be brought to a close?'

"And if that question shall be decided in the affirmative by three-fifth of the Senators present and voting, then said measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, shall be the unfinished business to the exclusion of all other business until disposed of.

"Thereafter no Senator shall be entitled to speak in all more than one hour on the measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, the amendments thereto, and motions affecting the same, and it shall be the duty of the Presiding Officer to keep the time of each Senator who speaks. Except by unanimous consent, no amendment shall be in order after the vote to bring the debate to a close, unless the same has been presented and read prior to that time. No dilatory motion, or dilatory amendment, or amendment not germane shall be in order. Points of order, including questions of relevancy, and appeals from the decision of the Presiding Officer, shall be decided without debate.

"3. The provisions of the last paragraph of rule VIII (prohibiting debate on motions made before 2 o'clock) shall not apply to any motion to proceed to the consideration of any motion, resolution, or proposal to change any of the Standing Rules of the Senate."

AMENDMENT OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR CERTAIN SUBCOMMITTEES

Mr. DIRKSEN (for himself and Mr. MANSFIELD) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 7); which, under the rule, was ordered to lie over for 1 day:

S. RES. 7

Resolved, That S. Res. 262, Eighty-eighth Congress, agreed to February 10, 1964 (authorizing an investigation of antitrust and monopoly laws of the United States), is hereby amended on page 3, line 8, by striking out "$512,000.00" and inserting in lieu thereof "$540,500.00".

SEC. 2. S. Res. 266, Eighty-eighth Congress, agreed to February 10, 1964, to study matters pertaining to immigration and naturalization, is hereby amended on page 2, line 15, by striking out "$135,000.00" and inserting in lieu thereof "$145,000.00".

SEC. 3. S. Res. 274, Eighty-eighth Congress, agreed to February 10, 1964 (authorizing an investigation of juvenile delinquency), is hereby amended on page 3, line 2, by striking out "$188,000.00" and inserting in lieu thereof "$211,000.00".

AMENDMENT OF RULE RELATING TO CLOTURE

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS), the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] and in accordance with article I, section 5 of the Constitution of the United States and the advisory rulings of the Chair that were rendered at the opening of the 85th, 86th, and 87th Congresses, I send to the desk a resolution. I ask that it not be read, but that it be printed.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 8) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. RES. 8

Resolved, That rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by adding a new section 3 as follows:

"3. If at any time, notwithstanding the provisions of rule III or rule VI or any other rule of the Senate, a motion, signed by sixteen Senators, to bring to a close the debate upon any measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, is presented to the Senate pursuant to this section, the Presiding Officer shall at once state the motion to the Senate, and one hour after the Senate meets on the fifteenth calendar day thereafter (exclusive of Sundays, legal holidays, and nonsession days) he shall lay the motion before the Senate and direct that the Secretary call the roll, and, upon the ascertainment that a quorum is present, the Presiding Officer shall, without further debate, submit to the Senate by a yea and nay vote the question:

"'Is it the sense of the Senate that the debate shall be brought to a close?'

"And if that question shall be decided in the affirmative by a majority vote of the Senators duly chosen and sworn, then said measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, shall be the unfinished business to the exclusion of all other business until disposed of.

"Thereafter, debate upon the measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, the amendments thereto, and motions with respect thereto, shall be limited in all to not more than 100 hours, of which 50 hours will be controlled by the majority leader, and 50 hours will be controlled by the minority leader. The majority and minority leaders will divide equally the time allocated among those Senators favoring and those Senators opposing the measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, the amendments thereto, and the motions affecting the same; provided, however, that any Senator so requesting shall be allocated a minimum total of one hour. It shall be the duty of the Presiding Officer to keep the time. The above provisions for time in this paragraph are minimum guarantees and the motion to bring the debate to a close may specify additional time for debate. Except by unanimous consent, no amendment shall be in order after the vote to bring the debate to a close, unless the same has been presented and read prior to that time. No dilatory motion, or dilatory amendment, or amendment not germane shall be in order. Points of order including questions of relevancy, and appeals from the decision of the Presiding Officer, shall be decided without debate.

"*Resolved, further*, That section 3 of the Standing Rules of the Senate be redesignated as section 4."

Mr. DOUGLAS. The resolution would amend rule XXII of the rules of the Senate, by providing for cloture under certain conditions by a majority vote.

I ask for the immediate consideration of the resolution.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I object.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President——

Mr. DOUGLAS. Inasmuch as objection has been entered, I send to the desk notice of motion to amend certain rules of the Senate. I do not ask that it be read, but I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD at the appropriate place.

There being no objection, the notice of motion to amend certain rules of the Senate was ordered printed.

NOTICE OF MOTION TO AMEND CERTAIN SENATE RULES

In accordance with the provisions of rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that I shall hereafter move to amend rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate in the following particulars, namely:

Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by adding a new section 3 as follows:

"3. If at any time, notwithstanding the provisions of rule III or rule VI or any other rule of the Senate, a motion, signed by sixteen Senators, to bring to a close the debate upon any measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, is presented to the Senate pursuant to this section, the Presiding Officer shall at once state the motion to the Senate, and one hour after the Senate meets on the fifteenth calendar day thereafter (exclusive of Sundays, legal holidays, and nonsession days) he shall lay the motion before the Senate and direct that the Secretary call the roll, and, upon the ascertainment that a quorum is present, the Presiding Officer shall, without further debate, submit to the Senate by a yea and nay vote the question:

" 'Is it the sense of the Senate that the debate shall be brought to a close?'

"And if that question shall be decided in the affirmative by a majority vote of the Senators duly chosen and sworn, then said measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, shall be the unfinished business to the exclusion of all other business until disposed of.

"Thereafter, debate upon the measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate or the unfinished business, the amendments thereto, and motions with respect thereto, shall be limited in all to not more than 100 hours, of which 50 hours will be controlled by the majority leader, and 50 hours will be controlled by the minority leader. The majority and minority leaders will divide equally the time allocated among those Senators favoring and those Senators opposing the measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, the amendments thereto, and the motions affecting the same: *Provided, however,* That any Senator so requesting shall be allocated a minimum total of one hour. It shall be the duty of the Presiding Officer to keep the time. The above provisions for time in this paragraph are minimum guarantees and the motion to bring the debate to a close may specify additional time for debate. Except by unanimous consent, no amendment shall be in order after the vote to bring the debate to a close, unless the same has been presented and read prior to that time. No dilatory motion, or dilatory amendment, or amendment not germane shall be in order. Points of order including questions of relevancy, and appeals from the decision of the Presiding Officer, shall be decided without debate.

"SEC. 3. Redesignate section 3 of the Standing Rules of the Senate as section 4."

The purpose of the proposed amendment is:

To provide for bringing debate to a close by a majority of the Senators duly chosen and sworn after full and fair discussion.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] for his submission of his proposed change in rule XXII, which provides for a three-fifths vote on cloture.

In no sense are we rivals in this matter. I congratulate the Senator on his action. I hope that if the majority-rule provision is not adopted by the Senate that the three-fifths provision will be adopted.

ORDER FOR THE PRINTING OF OFFICIAL COPIES OF BOOKLET "HOW OUR LAWS ARE MADE"

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I offer a resolution, which I send to the desk, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 9), as follows:

S. RES. 9

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Senate fourteen thousand additional copies of House Document numbered 103 of the Eighty-eighth Congress, first session, entitled "How Our Laws Are Made", compiled by Charles J. Zinn, S.J.D., Law Revision Counsel, House Committee on the Judiciary.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the request of the Senator from Montana.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 9) was considered and agreed to.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY TO MAKE CERTAIN INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. ROBERTSON (for himself and Mr. BENNETT) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 10); which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Resolved, That the Committee on Banking and Currency, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—

(1) banking and currency generally;

(2) financial aid to commerce and industry;

(3) deposit insurance;

(4) the Federal Reserve System, including monetary and credit policies;

(5) economic stabilization, production, and mobilization;

(6) valuation and revaluation of the dollar;

(7) prices of commodities, rents, and services;

(8) securities and exchange regulation;

(9) credit problems of small business; and

(10) international finance through agencies within the legislative jurisdiction of the committee.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee from February 1, 1965, to January 31, 1966, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,100 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $106,000.00, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. McNAMARA submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 11); which was referred to the Committee on Public Works:

Resolved, That the Committee on Public Works, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to flood control, navigation, rivers and harbors, roads and highways, water pollution, air pollution, public buildings, and all features of water resource development and economic growth.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1965, to January 31, 1966, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ, upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,600 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1966.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $110,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

EXTENSION OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

Mr. SMATHERS submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 12); which, by unanimous consent, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the Special Committee on Aging established by S. Res. 33, Eighty-seventh Congress, agreed to on February 13, 1961, as amended and supplemented, is hereby extended through January 31, 1966.

SEC. 2. It shall be the duty of such committee to make a full and complete study and investigation of any and all matters pertaining to problems of older people, including but not limited to, problems of maintaining health, of assuring adequate income, of finding employment, of engaging in productive and rewarding activity, of securing proper housing, and, when necessary, of obtaining care or assistance. No proposed legislation shall be referred to such committee, and such committee shall not have power to report by bill or otherwise have legislative jurisdiction.

SEC. 3. The said committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable.

SEC. 4. A majority of the members of the committee or any subcommittee thereof shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business, except that a lesser number, to be fixed by the committee, shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of taking sworn testimony.

SEC. 5. For purposes of this resolution, the committee is authorized (1) to employ on a temporary basis from February 1, 1965, through January 31, 1966, such technical, clerical, or other assistants, experts, and consultants as it deems advisable: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,100 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (2) with the prior consent of the executive department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to employ on a reimbursable basis such executive branch personnel as it deems advisable.

SEC. 6. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $213,000 from February 1, 1965, through January 31, 1966, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

SEC. 7. The committee shall report the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as it may deem advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1966. The committee shall cease to exist at the close of business on January 31, 1966.

INVESTIGATION BY COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY OF MATTERS RELATING TO PUBLIC AND PRIVATE HOUSING

Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. BENNETT, and Mr. TOWER) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 15); which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Resolved, That the Committee on Banking and Currency, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to public and private housing.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1965, to January 31, 1966, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,100 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1966.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $133,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

HOSPITAL CARE FOR THE AGED

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, for myself, Mr. GORE, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. McNAMARA, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BAYH, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. CASE, Mr. CLARK, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. DODD, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. McCARTHY, Mr. McGEE, Mr. McGOVERN, Mr. McINTYRE, Mr. METCALF, Mr. MONDALE, Mr. MONTOYA, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MOSS, Mr. MUSKIE, Mrs. NEUBERGER, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. PELL, Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. RIBICOFF, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. YARBOROUGH, and Mr. YOUNG of Ohio I send to the desk, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide a hospital insurance program for the aged under social security, to increase social security cash benefits and to make other needed improvements in the social security program. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be permitted to lie on the desk for 3 days so that Senators who wish to do so may join as cosponsors.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred and, without objection, the bill will lie at the table for 3 days, as requested by the Senator from New Mexico.

The bill (S. 1) to provide a hospital insurance program for the aged under social security, to amend the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system to increase benefits, improve the actuarial status of the disability insurance trust fund, and extend coverage, to amend the Social Security Act to provide additional Federal financial participation in the Federal-State public assistance programs, and for other purposes; introduced by Mr. ANDERSON (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I feel certain that historians will mark this year as the turning point in our long struggle to solve the major part of what has become one of the most urgent issues of public policy—the problem of financing the costs of hospital care for the aged, costs which now represent the major remaining cause of personal financial disaster among our aged citizens. It is, therefore, entirely appropriate that my bill is designed S. 1, for as one of the major pieces of unfinished business of the previous Congress, social security hospital insurance has moved to the forefront of public policy debate, and has unquestionably become a major legislative item on the agenda of this Congress.

As Senators will immediately recognize, the bill I have introduced is substantially the same bill which the Senate passed last September 2, by a vote of 49 to 44. I am again proposing the social insurance approach because the need of the aged for adequate insurance protection against the costs of expensive illness has not diminished; if anything, the need grows greater and more urgent with each passing day. As the proportion of the aged in the population continues to rise, the problem increases in dimension and the plight of our aged citizens becomes increasingly a humiliation for our society.

Every month that we delay in providing the needed protection means that more and more elderly persons will be forced to look to public welfare programs for help in getting the health care they need. Such programs necessarily do little to relieve indigency because they help older people meet their health care costs only after they have used up most of the financial resources they may have, and sometimes only after their children have demonstrated that they cannot help further. The tragedy is not just that the older person must sacrifice his pride and prove he can no longer pay his own way. The real tragedy is the hopelessness of his situation, for once an aged person has exhausted his resources to the point where he can qualify for assistance, it is practically impossible for him to replenish them and again become self-reliant.

Nostalgic statements about the virtues of individual responsibility for all of one's needs, about the rewards and joys of old age are no substitutes for concrete facts and reasoned programs. For those aged Americans who must face the harsh reality that they may well be reduced to a state of destitution as a result of a prolonged illness—which experience demonstrates that most aged people can expect to occur—benign assurances of those who urge greater thrift or sole reliance on public assistance and those who tell us private insurance alone can do the job, have a hollow ring.

The problem which confronts our senior citizens requires little further documentation—this problem has probably attracted more public attention and intensive study than any other current domestic issue. Since 1946, the average cost for 1 day of hospital care has risen from $9 to nearly $40. This situation is compounded by the fact that the aged hospital patient, on the average, spends three times as long in the hospital as a younger person. To make things worse, 55 percent of these aged have annual incomes of less than $1,000.

In their working years, when sickness is less frequent, workers can generally meet costs of current care for themselves and their families—directly or through insurance—out of their current employment income. The aged, however, generally cannot do this because the higher costs associated with old age occur at the very time income is greatly reduced because of retirement.

Private health insurance, which has made large health costs manageable for people in the working groups, has not proved to be an effective means of protecting older people against financial ruin. Despite great efforts and much ingenuity on the part of the voluntary insurance organizations, today only a relatively few older people—perhaps 1 in 20—have insurance covering as much as 40 percent of their average health costs. Almost half of the elderly have no health insurance at all—not even inadequate coverage. The number of older people without any health insurance protection at all is nearly as large as it was 5 years ago.

Most of the aged who now have some form of health insurance are those who are still working, those in good health, and those in the higher income group. Thus, it is extremely unlikely that many of the elderly people who are not now insured will ever have meaningful health insurance protection through private sources.

While the much higher hospital costs of older people as compared with younger people is the major reason why hospital insurance rates are higher for the aged, the cost of such insurance is further increased for most older people because of the high cost of selling and administering insurance on an individual basis. The result is that an individually written policy for the aged may cost four times as much as comparable protection furnished under a group coverage plan to younger people.

The conclusion appears inescapable. The only solution is to provide a system under which people can contribute from earnings during their working years to help pay for hospital care and related services that will be needed later on when the risk is higher and income curtailed. The only way such a system can be set up to guarantee that practically everyone will have hospital insurance protection in old age is by applying the social insurance method. This is the system that has proved its effectiveness over 3 decades of the social security retirement program.

Mr. President, this week the Advisory Council on Social Security, a distinguished group of business, labor and professional leaders, including a former member of President Eisenhower's Cabinet and a former high official in that Republican administration, recommended a Government program of hospital and hospital-related-care insurance.

I am in complete agreement with the Advisory Council on Social Security that social insurance should not cover all the costs of illness during old age. The American approach to income security has traditionally involved a cooperative partnership of private effort and governmental measures. Old-age, survivors, and disability insurance, for example, is supplemented by employer and trade union plans, by private insurance, and by individual savings and investments, and all contribute to the common goal of personal and economic independence throughout the later years. Backing up this combination of measures for individual self-support are the Federal-State public assistance programs which aid those who have needs which are still unmet.

I believe that this same pluralistic approach can be used effectively in meeting the costs of major illness in old age. With social insurance meeting, on the average, at least half the costs associated with the most expensive illnesses—that is, meeting the costs of hospitalization—the older person will be in a much better position than he is today to meet, on his own and through private insurance, the costs of physician services, drugs, and other medical supplies and services. Also, with social insurance providing basic protection, it should be practicable to improve the Federal-State public assistance programs so as to meet more fully the health costs incurred by older people whose needs are not fully met in other ways, the Advisory Council on Social Security declared.

ELEMENTS OF THE PLAN

The hospital insurance plan embodied in my bill places primary emphasis on the coverage of hospital care. The reason for this emphasis is clear in the Advisory Council's report:

> The cost of hospitalization affects practically all older people. Of every 10 persons who reach age 65, 9 will be hospitalized at least once during their remaining years and most will be hospitalized two or more times. In the case of aged couples, the chances are about even that the husband and wife will each be hospitalized two or more times.
>
> Not only is hospitalization a virtually universal occurrence among older people but there is a high correlation between hospitalization and large total medical expenses. Older people who are hospitalized in a given year are the ones who have the big expenses. While medical care costs for all aged couples averaged about $442 in 1962, the medical expenses of aged couples with one or both members hospitalized averaged $1,220; for nonmarried elderly people, average medical expenses for the year were $270, whereas for those who were hospitalized, the average was $1,038. Both the averages and the differentials would be even higher now.

While the greater part of the benefit cost of the program would be for hospital benefits, the proposal also provides coverage for three additional types of services: First, extended care following hospital care in an institution which is equipped to provide high quality convalescent services and which has an arrangement with a hospital for a timely transfer of patients and needed medical information; second, home health care services which are furnished by qualified nurses and other specialized medical personnel under a plan established by a physician covering the use of such services; and third, hospital outpatient diagnostic services covering the full use of the hospital's facilities and personnel but not covering the diagnostic services of the patient's private physician.

A major consideration that guided the selection of services to be covered by the plan was that the program should support the principle that, in each case, health services should be tailored to the health needs of the patient. Provision for the aforementioned four types of benefits—hospital care, extended care outside the hospital, organized home nursing care, and hospital outpatient diagnostic services—would make available to the older person the kinds of services appropriate for his individual situation. The benefit structure would thus offer a continuum of institutional and home nursing services and would permit the progressive care of individuals who require extended care of a somewhat lesser degree of intensity than that provided for hospital inpatients.

Particularly for the aged, the next step in the care of a person who had been hospitalized for a serious illness may be a period of medically supervised treatment in an extended-care facility rather than the intensive care furnished to hospital inpatients. The coverage of important alternatives to hospitalization would remove some of the undesirable financial considerations from the decision, shared in by the doctor, patient, patient's family and institution, on whether inpatient hospital care or another form of care would be best for the patient. The benefits provided in the bill would give financial support to the provision of institutional and noninstitutional services at the most appropriate level of intensity for patients who require care of extended duration. Covering each of the stages of required care is conducive to careful planning of the long-range treatment of those suffering serious illnesses.

Mr. President, the hospital insurance program provided for in my bill is the culmination of years of serious study.

A great many people, including those who have had objections to one or another element of the original proposal, have made a constructive contribution to public understanding of the issues and the formulation of my bill. I have had the benefit of extensive research and study by many experts, within and without the Government. Independent groups of responsible and knowledgeable representatives of all segments of our community, like the National Committee on Health Costs of the Aged, sponsored by my colleague, Senator JAVITS, and directed by Dr. Arthur Flemming, a former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, have contributed greatly to the fund of knowledge from which I have drawn heavily in preparing my proposal.

Moreover, as everyone knows, my proposal has been subjected to thorough scrutiny by public and private experts in insurance, medical economics, and medical care, by committees in both the House and Senate in public hearings and executive sessions, on the floor of the Senate and in conference committee. It has been so shaped and molded in this process that it is fair to say that my bill is the product of an extended, and I believe fruitful, joint effort of scientific research, professional study, and public discussion. It is medically, socially, and financially sound. The list of sponsors and supporters shows it is bipartisan.

Mr. President, even though my proposal has now gained such widespread support that I believe its enactment this session is virtually assured, I must say that we have never ceased trying to perfect the proposal. Throughout the years of study and deliberation we have sought to preserve an open mind on all elements of the proposal, and we have welcomed constructive comments and criticisms from any source whatever. I believe that our hopes for a sound and just solution are more likely to be realized because we have taken nothing for granted, left no stone unturned in our search for a sound and meaningful solution to the problem. The few changes which have been made in the present bill are a result of recommendations which emerged from the deliberations of the Advisory Council on Social Security and the advice of professional people whose sole interest is to improve the proposal.

The bill, as I have indicated, provides coverage for services furnished in extended care facilities. I agree with the Advisory Council on Social Security that it is necessary to assure the coverage of facilities which are designed primarily to render convalescent services. Services of this kind are essential in the overall treatment of many illnesses, including terminal illnesses, following their acute stage and prior to the time when a person can be transferred to his home or to a custodial institution. The bill also provides, as recommended by the Advisory Council, for coverage of hospital care for up to 60 days without a beneficiary option. A change has also been made in the utilization review provision to make it clear that reviews conducted by a group established by a local medical society would be acceptable as an alternative to hospital staff review.

In addition, the bill incorporates the proposal to authorize the creation of associations of private insurers to encourage the development of policies covering costs—primarily physician's fees—not met under the Government program. I have always tried to assure ample room for private complementary insurance and to provide encouragement for private insurers to assume that role. This suggestion is therefore a welcome and beneficial addition to the bill.

Mr. President, I ask for unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD immediately following my statement material describing the provisions of S. 1. This will include actuarial tables showing the financial status of the social security system under my bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, our social insurance system has shown a remarkable facility for improvement. It has effectively met the successive challenges involved in the monumental task of providing Americans with protection against some of the major threats to their financial security—loss of income due to old age, death, or disability. Our social insurance system is a true product of the American temper—flexible, humane, responsive to the changing needs of our people and fiscally sound. Despite the anxieties that were expressed in the early days of social security and as improvements were proposed, the program has performed well every task assigned to it. When the disability program was initiated we took another step toward preserving individual independence and security in the face of the severest catastrophes in life. As one physician has said:

> The fear of insecurity in old age today has supplanted the fear of death in 1900.

We in this Congress must take the remaining major step to relieve insecurity in old age without imposing Federal control over the practice of medicine. Providing a social security hospital insurance program for the aged is the only way that we can effectively combine the special contributions of different elements of the community, public and private, to meet this goal.

Mr. President, in addition to hospital insurance for the aged, S. 1 provides for a 7-percent increase in monthly case benefits for some 20 million social security beneficiaries. Had the conference committee reached agreement last October on hospital insurance, these beneficiaries would have received increased benefits beginning January 1, 1965. My bill provides that on passage monthly benefits would be retroactive to that date. In this way, those of us who would not accept a social security bill in conference that did not include hospital insurance and thus barred an increase in cash benefits will be keeping faith with America's aged. They will not have been financially hurt by the deadlocked conference.

EXHIBIT 1

SUMMARY OF MAJOR PROVISIONS OF HOSPITAL INSURANCE, SOCIAL SECURITY, AND PUBLIC ASSISTANCE AMENDMENTS OF 1965

A. HOSPITAL INSURANCE FOR THE AGED

1. Eligibles:

(a) Persons age 65 and over who are eligible for social security or railroad retirement benefits (numbering about 16⅔ million).

(b) Other persons who are age 65 and over (about 2 million) or who will reach age 65 within the next few years, but with the cost for them being paid from general revenues.

2. Benefits (payable July 1, 1966, except for extended care):

(a) Hospital inpatient services for 60 days in a benefit period, with a "deductible" of the national average cost of 1 day of care to be paid by the patient.

(b) Posthospital extended care (in a facility having an arrangement with a hospital for timely transfer of patients and medical information about patients) for 60 days in a benefit period. The services would be covered only in the case of transfer from a hospital. (Effective January 1, 1967.)

(c) Home health services (such as a visiting nurse) up to 240 visits a year.

(d) Outpatient hospital diagnostic services (such as X-ray and laboratory services) with a deductible for services in any one month, equal to one-half of the deductible for inpatient hospital services, to be paid by the patient.

3. Financing:

(a) A completely separate hospital insurance trust fund established in the Treasury. This trust fund would be separate from the old-age and survivors insurance trust fund and the disability insurance trust fund. An earmarked allocation from the social security contributions would be made to the separate hospital insurance fund.

(b) Allocations to the fund: Amounts equal to the following percentages of earnings would be allocated to this separate fund:

[In percent]

Year	Employer	Employee	Total, employer and employee	Self-employment
1966	0.30	0.30	0.60	0.45
1967–68	.38	.38	.76	.57
1969 and after	.45	.45	.90	.675

The allocation for 1966 would enable a fund to be built up before benefits became payable. It is estimated that the fund would be about $600 million as of July 1, 1966.

(c) Actuarial status of the fund: The allocation of contributions provided in the bill have been determined by the Chief Actuary of the Social Security Administration to be sufficient to cover all the costs of the benefits (and administration) for persons entitled to social security benefits. The actuarial estimates are based on the assumptions recommended by the Advisory Council on Social Security that hospital costs will continue to rise faster than earnings for the next 10 years.

(d) Illustrative costs: The amount allocated during 1967–68 and during 1969 and later years for hospital insurance—0.38 of 1 percent and 0.45 of 1 percent, respectively, on the employee—amounts to the following for employees earning the annual amounts shown:

Annual earnings	Hospital insurance cost (1967–68)			Hospital insurance cost (1969 and after)		
	Weekly	Monthly	Annually	Weekly	Monthly	Annually
$4,000	$0.29	$1.27	$15.20	$0.35	$1.50	$18.00
$4,800	.35	1.52	18.24	.42	1.80	21.60
$5,000	.37	1.58	19.00	.43	1.88	22.50
$5,600	.41	1.77	21.28	.48	2.10	25.20

4. Administration: By the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare through the social security program. Hospitals could elect to be represented by a private organization (such as Blue Cross) to negotiate their contracts. The Secretary could also delegate to such organization the functions of receiving payments from the social security program.

Payments would be made to hospitals and other providers of services on a cost basis. The cost of hospital services would be based on semiprivate accommodations (two,three, or four-bed rooms).

5. Complementary private insurance: The bill includes the Javits amendment (modified somewhat) to authorize creation of an association of private insurance carriers to sell, on a nonprofit basis, approved policies covering health costs not covered under the social security plan. Participating carriers would be exempt from antitrust laws.

B. SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS

1. A 7-percent benefit increase to the 20 million social security beneficiaries equal to about $1.3 billion a year; the same increase over present law would be given to those who became beneficiaries in the future. The minimum primary benefit would thereby be increased from $40 per month at present to $42.80; the maximum from $127 to $135.90. The average primary benefit, which is currently about $77.50, would be increased to about $83.

2. Benefit increases would be paid retroactively to January 1, 1965. If the law is enacted in June 1965, this would result in retroactive payments of about $750 million in the fall of 1965.

3. The maximum annual earnings on which taxes and benefits are computed would be increased from $4,800 to $5,600 a year, effective January 1, 1966. The maximum primary benefit would thereby be further increased to $149.90 and maximum benefit for a family would be increased from $254 at present to $312.

4. The social security contribution schedule (combined for social security and

hospital benefits) would be changed to be as follows:

[In percent]

Year	Employer	Employee	Self-employed
1966–67	4.25	4.25	6.4
1968–70	5.0	5.0	7.5
1971 and after	5.2	5.2	7.8

5. Self-employed physicians and tips are covered.

C. WELFARE AMENDMENTS

The public assistance titles of the Social Security Act would be amended as follows:

1. The Federal share under all State public assistance programs is increased a little more than $2.50 a month for the needy aged, blind, and disabled and about $1.25 for needy children effective January 1, 1966. Cost: from general revenues, for the last 6 months of the fiscal year 1966, about $75 million.

2. Federal funds to the States would be authorized for aid for the needy aged in mental or tuberculosis institutions. Cost: about $38 million from general revenues for the last 6 months of fiscal year 1966.

3. Earned income to the needy aged which is disregarded is increased slightly. Cost: about one-half million dollars for fiscal year 1966 from general revenues.

4. Amendment to Kerr-Mills program relating to the Federal share being paid for both cash and medical services to needy aged in the first and last month of care in a medical institution. Cost: $1 million in fiscal year 1966 from general revenues.

Employee and employer contributions

Average annual earnings	Under present law	Under King-Anderson bill		
		OASDI	Hospital insurance	Total
1966:				
$2,000	$82.50	$79.00	$6.00	$85.00
$3,000	123.75	118.50	9.00	127.50
$4,000	165.00	158.00	12.00	170.00
$4,800	198.00	189.60	14.40	204.00
$5,600 plus	198.00	221.20	16.80	238.00
1967:				
$2,000	82.50	77.40	7.60	85.00
$3,000	123.75	116.10	11.40	127.50
$4,000	165.00	154.80	15.20	170.00
$4,800	198.00	185.76	18.24	204.00
$5,600 plus	198.00	216.72	21.28	238.00
1968:				
$2,000	92.50	92.40	7.60	100.00
$3,000	138.75	138.60	11.40	150.00
$4,000	185.00	184.80	15.20	200.00
$4,800	222.00	221.76	18.24	240.00
$5,600 plus	222.00	258.72	21.28	280.00
1969–70:				
$2,000	92.50	91.00	9.00	100.00
$3,000	138.75	136.50	13.50	150.00
$4,000	185.00	182.00	18.00	200.00
$4,800	222.00	218.40	21.60	240.00
$5,600 plus	222.00	254.80	25.20	280.00
1971 and after:				
$2,000	92.50	95.00	9.00	104.00
$3,000	138.75	142.50	13.50	156.00
$4,000	185.00	190.00	18.00	208.00
$4,800	222.00	228.00	21.60	249.60
$5,600 plus	222.00	266.00	25.20	291.20

Income and outgo under H.R. 1, by calendar years

OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE TRUST FUND

Calendar year	Income	Outgo	Net income	Fund at end of year
1964	$15,840	$15,610	+$230	$18,710
1965	16,380	17,590	−1,210	17,500
1966	18,750	18,530	+220	17,720
1967	19,520	19,350	+170	17,890

Income and outgo under H.R. 1, by calendar years—Continued

DISABILITY INSURANCE TRUST FUND

Calendar year	Income	Outgo	Net income	Fund at end of year
1964	$1,200	$1,420	−$220	$2,010
1965	1,230	1,630	−400	1,610
1966	1,700	1,700	----------	1,610
1967	1,850	1,750	+100	1,710
HOSPITAL INSURANCE TRUST FUND				
1965	----------	----------	----------	----------
1966	$1,310	$800	+$510	$510
1967	1,980	1,780	+200	710

Actuarial balance under H.R. 1, expressed as percentages of taxable payroll

COMPUTATIONS ON PERPETUITY BASIS

Item	OASDI	Hospital insurance	Total
Actuarial balance of present system	−0.24	-------	−0.24
Earnings base of $5,600	+.31	-------	+.31
Revised contribution schedule	+.20	+0.89	+1.09
Extensions of coverage	+.03	-------	+.03
Benefit increase of 7 percent [1]	−.60	-------	−.60
Hospitalization and related benefits	--------	[2] −.84	−.84
Total effect of changes	−.06	+.05	−.01
Actuarial balance under proposal	−.30	+.05	−.25
COMPUTATIONS ON 75-YEAR COST BASIS [3]			
Actuarial balance of present System	+0.01	-------	+0.01
Earnings base of $5,600	+.31	-------	+.31
Revised contribution schedule	+.20	+0.89	+1.09
Extensions of coverage	+.03	-------	+.03
Benefit increase of 7 percent [1]	−.58	-------	−.58
Hospitalization and related benefits	--------	[2] −.84	−.84
Total effect of changes	−.04	+.05	+.01
Actuarial balance under proposal	−.03	+.05	+.02

[1] The 7-percent increase applies only on the first $400 of average monthly wage.

[2] Following is a breakdown of the 0.84-percent cost of the health benefits:

	Percent
Hospitalization benefits	0.78
Extended care benefits	.02
Outpatient diagnostic services	.01
Home nursing care	.03
Total	.84

[3] Basis recommended by Advisory Council on Social Security.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I am pleased to join with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and others in cosponsoring this bill, S. 1 providing hospital and nursing home care for older citizens. It very rightly has priority in the legislative work of the 89th Congress because it presents a reasonable and practical solution to the health problems and worries of senior Americans.

This bill offers a workable combination of social security protection, private insurance help, and Federal Government backing. It is based on the sound concept of insurance programs—that an individual pays a relatively small amount regularly—no more than 5.2 percent of his earnings for all social security coverage including the added medical benefits—throughout his working life. His employer pays the same amount. Then when he retires, he has what amounts to a paid-up insurance policy to cover the hospital expenses that may arise later in life when his income will be smaller but his health expenses will probably be greater. This pay-as-you-go insurance program is a typical example of the practical approach to national problems which has characterized American growth from earliest pioneer days. It offers people a chance to be self-sufficient without denying them the opportunity to select their own doctors, their own hospitals, and their own private insurance to supplement the basic social security payments if they wish.

This approach was enthusiastically endorsed by the Advisory Council on Social Security in its recent report. With only one dissenting voice, the committee concluded that the monthly cash payments now provided by social security are not enough to provide real protection against high and unpredictable costs of health care. They recommended an insurance program, under social security, to help Americans pay their health bills by paying their premiums during the years when they are best able to do so.

The fact is that expensive illnesses are much more likely and frequent in old age. Every year, one out of six persons over 65 is hospitalized. Nearly everyone who reaches age 65 is hospitalized at least once during his later years and most are hospitalized two or more times. On the average, an older person requires almost three times as much hospital care as a younger one.

Yet, over the last decade, costs of medical care have risen 36 percent and hospitalization expenses have risen 65 percent. The median income of aged couples in 1962 was only $2,875. Many people, especially in rural areas, must get along on a fraction of that amount. For them, a major illness or even a fall or similar accident can wipe out the savings of a lifetime because they are no longer able to go to work and use their earning power to replenish savings.

Today there are over 18 million persons age 65 or older in the United States. These senior citizens deserve and are entitled to the best health care in their later years that our Nation can give them. These citizens are able and willing to pay for such care—not in sudden catastrophic medical bills, during their later years but in regular annual insurance payments, through their working years, under the social security system.

That is the approach that this bill offers. It has been carefully studied, revised, and improved over the last few years. Now, I believe it is a sound plan to help people help themselves, to reduce dependence on welfare and means tests, and to provide better health care for our senior citizens. I am very glad to cosponsor S. 1.

THE PRIVATE SECTOR OF MEDICARE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I assure Senators that I shall take only a moment. I appreciate the presence in the

Chamber of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Anderson], because today he introduced the administration's bill for medical care for the aged, in which I feel it an honor to have joined with my colleagues the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Case], and the Senator from California [Mr. Kuchel].

Mr. President, as introduced, the bill contains the private sector amendment which has been identified with my name. I believe that that fact has not been adequately noted in respect to the introduction of the bill today. I believe that it should be very carefully noted because it is a critically important part of the bill. The reason is the following:

First, the bill originally, as the King-Anderson bill, provided a limited amount of health care—with nothing more—in the form of hospitalization, and concerned many people who might otherwise have supported it on the ground that the process of political "bidding up" might cause a far greater intrusion, in their view, into the health field by the Government than would be justified either by the social security taxes which were being paid or by the preservation of the integrity of the doctor-patient relationship.

The private sector amendment would provide a built-in guarantee that at every stage an effort would be made to do that. The private enterprise system can compete in carrying the additional responsibility, and it seems to me that that is one of the surest guarantees and assurances to those who might have some doubts on the question as to whether the tendency will be to limit the Federal Government's role very strongly to the hospitalization provision.

Second, the provision would follow the concept of self-help, because 80 percent of the aged, based upon their incomes, could pay a reasonable premium for health care coverage—and these are the important words—when it is added to the hospitalization feature under social security, which is the most expensive element of the whole program.

Then, at a modest cost, a possibility would be opened. A great committee which I inspired, which was headed by Arthur Flemming, former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, spent a year studying the subject and reported a cost in the area of $2 per person per month, which would come within the competence of 80 percent of the aged, leaving the other 20 percent to the possibility of the Kerr-Mills bill, if need be.

In that way, in the bill introduced by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Anderson] and many other Senators there would be presented a complete program for health care for the aged with a magnificent role for the private sector.

Here is the important point, and upon this note I wish to conclude: In my judgment, the proposal offers one of the most challenging opportunities ever extended to the insurance companies of the United States. The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Anderson] is himself in the insurance business and is fully cognizant of it. Something must be done about the problem of medical care for the aged. If we are to keep Government within reasonable limits, and if we are to keep the social security tax within reasonable limits, only a relatively modest amount can be done by Government. That amount is estimated at about 30 percent of the total cost of health care for the aged.

The overwhelming bulk of it must be done by the private enterprise system. I say to all Senators, especially to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Anderson], that at the time when we consider the measure—and I have no doubt that this is the most auspicious time we have ever had for its consideration—I shall do everything I can, and I hope other Senators will feel exactly the same way—to bring about a situation in which, when the measure is passed, we shall have before us at one and the same time a proposal from the great insurers of the United States to pick up the private sector option and really make the bill operative, so as to provide not only limited health care and hospitalization, but total health care, that the overwhelming bulk of the older people, especially people over 65 years of age, can pay for.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I say to the Senator from New York that the panel which he inspired, organized, and had established was a helpful group.

Many of us had tried to find a solution to this problem by seeking a way to encourage insurance companies to participate in the medical care program. It was very difficult; but the panel which the able Senator from New York assembled, including Marion B. Folsom, Arthur Larsen, and Arthur Flemming—many of them of a different political belief from my own—have devised a wonderful program, made great contributions, and reached conclusions with which, although I may not finally agree with them, were the result of a search for a good solution.

Many times I have commended privately, and also in public, the able senior Senator from New York for bringing together this group of men, to make certain that their contributions were ready. Since they were ready, we tried to draft a bill this year, and we hope that when the bill is finally passed, it will contain the very fine provisions that the Javits panel has worked out.

Mr. JAVITS. I am grateful to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a part of my remarks a statement issued by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Case], the Senator from California [Mr. Kuchel], and myself on yesterday with reference to our cosponsorship.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Joint Statement by Senators Case, Javits, and Kuchel To Cosponsor Medicare Bill

We are proposing to cosponsor the administration's bill for medical care for the aged because we believe it is in substance the plan which passed the Senate in the last session. It contains a major role for the private sector in affording not only limited hospital care under social security financing, but providing the opportunity for total health care for all aging citizens. We consider this plan to be creative and constructive. Such a major role in medical care for the aging on the part of the private sector was the basis of the Republican initiative taken in the introduction of our public-private medical care for the aging bill in the last Congress.

The private sector provision of the current bill allows private insurance carriers and health service groups to cover medical and surgical costs on a nonprofit basis over and above the limited hospital insurance of the King-Anderson bill, and on a basis of cost low enough to be available to the overwhelming majority of our aging citizens. This private sector provision also acts as a built-in governor against unlimited Federal expansion in the medical care for the aging field.

The four points which we have long felt should be included in an acceptable medical care plan for the aging are incorporated in the bill which we will cosponsor. They are: (1) inclusion of the estimated 2½ million Americans over 65 not covered by the social security system; (2) provision for participation by the private insurance industry to make up total health care; (3) provision for use of approved private organizations and State bodies in the administration of the program; and (4) establishment of a separate health insurance trust fund into which all Federal health care funds shall be deposited.

We consider the chances for passage of this bill to be auspicious in this session. We consider the effort to be bipartisan, as it was the private sector provision which provided that Republican support in 1964 and provided the margin required to pass the Anderson-Gore-Javits amendment in the Senate.

We believe this is the time to provide an effective program for medical care for the aging fully consistent with the encouragement of private enterprise, the satisfaction of the national need and the protection against excesses. We believe also that the fundamental structure which this bill provides is the sound basis upon which private sector interest in medical care for the aging can be enlisted in the total effort.

Other Republican Senators are also giving consideration to cosponsoring this measure.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the distinguished Senator from New York for his thoughtful approach to this subject. It does much to provide a good bill and affords an opportunity to the medical profession to have a privately operated program that can function in harmony with the proposal which will be made in the Gore amendment to modify the King-Anderson bill.

CREATION OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, once again I submit, for appropriate reference, on behalf of myself and 34 other Members of the U.S. Senate, a bill to create a Joint Committee on the Budget. This proposed legislation is well known to many Members of this body, since between 1952 and 1964, the Senate has approved similar or identical measures, overwhelmingly, on six occasions.

Mr. President, this proposed legislation is designed to remedy serious deficiencies in our appropriation procedures and in the expenditure of public funds. It constitutes, in my judgment, a positive approach toward the elimination of extravagance, waste, and needless or excessive appropriations.

The purpose of this bill is to provide the Congress with the machinery necessary to enable it to meet its constitutional responsibilities with respect to the appropriation of funds required for the conduct of the Federal Government. It seeks to accomplish this objective by establishing a Joint Committee on the Budget, composed of members of the Senate and House Committees on Appropriations, which would assist the Congress is exercising adequate control over the expenditure of public funds by the executive branch of the Government. This proposed Joint Committee on the Budget would be staffed with nonpartisan fiscal experts and technicians who would be engaged in making continuing studies of programs and expenditures proposed by the executive branch, 12 months of the year. The establishment of this joint committee would provide the Congress with the same type and caliber of detailed, technical information, in the appropriation field, as the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation provides for the revenue committees of the Congress, and as the Bureau of the Budget provides for the executive branch.

One of the most serious problems confronting our Nation today is the maintenance of national solvency in the face of ever-growing demands on the Federal Government for programs and services, coupled with the necessity of meeting the national defense requirements of the cold war and the atomic and space age. Our national expenditures budget has grown from $67.5 billion in fiscal year 1954 to an estimated $98.4 billion in fiscal year 1964, and an estimated $97.9 billion for fiscal year 1965. Present indications are that they will be in the neighborhood of $100 billion in fiscal year 1966. Thus, we are rapidly moving toward an annual expenditures budget in excess of $100 billion, and toward annual expenditures in all categories that will exceed $150 billion, bearing in mind that approximately $25 billion in annual spending does not appear in the appropriation budget. Finally, our national debt, as of June 30, 1964, has reached an alltime high of $311.7 billion, and is expected to reach approximately $317 billion by June 30, 1965.

Mr. President, this matter is of the gravest concern to the Congress, since, from the formation of our Government down to the present time, it has been clearly understood that the Constitution vested in the Congress—and the Congress alone—the exclusive right to appropriate money for the various branches of the Federal Government, and to designate the purposes for which the money shall be used.

Although we are now operating in an era of annual expenditures budgets in the neighborhood of $100 billion, the procedures used by the Congress in carrying out these vital responsibilities are practically no different than those used 25 or 50 years ago. In other words, the methods and procedures which we now use in the appropriation processes are simply inadequate to meet present-day needs and requirements.

In January 1950, after having served 1 year as a member of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, I became convinced that under procedures then in use, which were no different than those presently followed, the Appropriations Committees of both Houses were laboring under a tremendous disadvantage in their efforts to pass upon budget requests for Federal expenditures. The fundamental problem which I found to exist at that time—and it still exists today—is due to the fact that the Congress, which is most generous in equipping the executive branch agencies with personnel to handle its affairs, has simply failed to provide itself with adequate machinery to carry out one of its most vital functions and responsibilities—the appropriation of funds for the conduct of the Government.

Instead of equipping itself with an adequate number of experts and technicians to examine every detail of the appropriation requests submitted by executive branch agencies and departments, the Congress has been content to limp along without the staff assistance and fiscal data and information it requires. Thus, aside from the overburdened housekeeping staffs of the Senate and House Appropriations Committees, which cannot possibly make the kind of analysis of budget requests which is necessary in the time available, members of the Appropriations Committees are forced to rely upon the testimony of representatives of the executive branch who formulate the programs and present them in a light most favorable to their purposes. Furthermore, they usually tell us only as little or as much as they desire to disclose.

Accordingly, on January 19, 1950, I introduced a bill, S. 2898, which was similar, in many respects, to the pending bill. The committee studied the bill and revised it, but took no further action on it during the 81st Congress. Thereafter, the committee reported favorably, and the Senate passed, in the 82d, 83d, 84th, 85th, 87th, and 88th Congresses, virtually identical bills proposing the creation of a Joint Committee on the Budget. On each occasion, following Senate passage, the measure was permitted to die in the House of Representatives.

In each Congress, these bills were cosponsored by a substantial majority of the Members of the Senate. In the 85th Congress, 71 Members of a total of 96 cosponsored the measure; in the 87th Congress, there were 67 cosponsors; and in the 88th Congress, the bill had the largest number of sponsors it has ever had—77 Senators.

As majority leader in the Senate, President Johnson gave his active support to this proposed legislation, which passed the Senate unanimously in each of these Congresses. In his state of the Union message to the Congress on January 4, 1965, the President set out as a part of his national agenda, a proposal to "make an allout campaign against waste and inefficiency." The President stated that he would submit special messages with detailed proposals for national action with this objective in mind. I know of no better way for the Congress to support the President's program for promoting economy and efficiency in Government than by the passage of this bill. It conforms specifically with his stated objective that "we will continue along the path toward a balanced budget in a balanced economy."

This bill is also in accord with the President's statement that wherever waste is found in Government, it will be eliminated. This legislation, if enacted into law, will aid the President in attaining this objective.

President Kennedy joined as a cosponsor of this proposed legislation, as a U.S. Senator, in the 85th Congress. President Eisenhower, on December 2, 1959, released a memorandum prepared by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget setting forth proposals directed toward effecting improvements in budgeting, which included the proposal to create a Joint Committee on the Budget stating that its "objective is in line with the viewpoint expressed in the budget message," as a budget reform requiring congressional initiative and action. The proposal to create a Joint Committee on the Budget was also approved by Mr. Frederick Lawton, Director of the Bureau of the Budget in the Truman administration.

It appears perfectly clear that the conditions which prompted the introduction of this measure, in 1950, and its initial passage by the U.S. Senate, in 1952, have in no way diminished. On the contrary, they have increased with the rising cost of Government and the swelling of the national debt. We have only to compare our national expenditures budget of $39.5 billion in fiscal year 1950, and $65.3 billion in fiscal year 1952, with the fiscal year 1965 estimate of $97.9 billion, to get the full impact of the current picture. If that is not sufficient, compare, if you will, our national debt of $257.3 billion in 1950, and $259.1 billion in 1952, with the $312 billion which constituted our national debt as of June 30, 1964—an increase since June 30, 1952, of in excess of $53 billion in the national debt alone.

An additional important factor to be considered in connectoion with this bill is the breakdown in our appropriations procedure which occurred during the 87th Congress, and which is a matter of the greatest concern to all of us. It is my firm conviction that if this bill had been enacted into law earlier, and the proposed joint committee had been in operation, this breakdown would not have occurred. I say this because I believe that the establishment of a Joint Committee on the Budget will be conducive to a better cooperation and a spirit of working in harmony between the two Appropriations Committees of the Congress. If we can have members of these committees working together, each receiving the same information, each using the same tools, and each relying on the technical advice and information furnished by a joint staff, they will be able to obtain more complete information and to evaluate more intelligently the budget requests made by the various agencies of Government. This, in turn, should go a long way toward removing the frictions and disagreements which have cropped up between the two bodies, from time to time, in connection with the appropriation process.

Mr. President, although the Senate has been endeavoring, for more than 14 years, to effect the necessary improvements in the fiscal operations of the legislative process, the House of Representatives has so far failed to act favorably on this proposal. I am convinced that a majority of the Members of that body are as much interested in correcting serious deficiencies in the appropriation procedures of the Congress as are Members of the Senate. This is evidenced by the fact that to my knowledge 26 Members of the House had introduced identical or similar bills when the staff of the Committee on Government Operations made a count of such bills early in the first session of the 88th Congress.

Mr. President, in closing, may I say that it is my sincere and fervent hope that this or a similar measure will be enacted into law at this session of the Congress. The American taxpayer has a very real and vital stake in this legislation. We should not fail him.

Mr. President, among the sponsors of the bill which I am introducing today are included all members of the Committee on Government Operations, which has reported this measure to the Senate in preceding Congresses. In view of the interest numerous other Senators have manifested in this proposed legislation, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be held at the desk for 10 days, so that other Members of the Senate who may desire to do so may include their names as cosponsors.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be held at the desk as requested; and will be appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2) to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States, introduced by Mr. McCLELLAN (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

PUBLIC WORKS AND OTHER ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide public works and other economic development programs for the rehabilitation of the economy of the Appalachian region. I ask unanimous consent that the measure be held at the desk until the close of business on next Thursday, January 14, that other Senators may have the opportunity to join in sponsorship.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3) to provide public works and economic development programs and the planning and coordination needed to assist in the development of the Appalachian region introduced by Mr. RANDOLPH (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, Members will recall that the Senate, on September 25, 1964, passed the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1964 by a vote of 45 to 13. Unfortunately, during the closing days of the 88th Congress, the other body was unable to bring the legislation to a vote.

Since the adjournment of the 88th Congress President Johnson has repeatedly expressed his desire for early action on the Appalachian program by the 89th Congress, and has ranked this bill among the highest priority measures of his legislative program.

I am gratified that our esteemed majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD] concurred in this judgment on a "Meet the Press" telecast last Sunday evening, and expressed the conviction that this would be the first major legislation passed by the Senate in the 89th Congress.

Mr. President, during the adjournment I had occasion to visit a number of communities in the Appalachian region, in other States as well as the State of West Virginia. I found a deep-seated and continuing interest in this legislation which has already stimulated much thought and planning at the local and State levels. The people of Appalachia are anxious for the enactment of this program so that their region also may begin to move toward the Great Society which the President eloquently depicted in his state of the Union message.

Mr. President, in this connection, I invite attention to the fact that there are 35 Senators whose names are on the bill which I have presented to the Senate. I wish to make special reference to the cosponsorship of the eminent Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], who was most active in the development of this measure in the 88th Congress. I do this in a sense because sponsors of the measure come from all sections of the country and from both parties.

The measure is substantially the same bill passed by this body last year by a majority of more than three to one. I, therefore, endorse the view expressed by the majority leader that the bill should not require extensive hearings. It is my hope that the Committee on Public Works will conduct brief but adequate hearings, then complete committee action on the measure, and report it to the Senate before the end of January.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill lie at the desk for 5 days so that others who wish to do so may have an opportunity to join as cosponsors.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will lie at the desk, as requested by the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I am glad to join my good friend, the distinguished senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], in introducing the proposed Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965—S. 3—which is similar to the bill we worked to develop in the last Congress, and which the Senate passed by a vote of 45 to 13 before adjournment.

The programs proposed in this bill represent the work of the Appalachian Governors, the work which we in the Senate began over 6 years ago, and the great interest which both President Kennedy and President Johnson have given to this region.

I have spoken often on this subject, for I know well the conditions in eastern Kentucky and throughout Appalachia. For some 175 years, my family has lived in this great region. The people are of pioneer stock and through many generations have been ever faithful to the needs of their country. The spirit of its people is high despite the unhappy and continuing problem of unemployment. But the development program proposed in this bill is required if our communities are to build the facilities to encourage industry to use the great resources that exist in the region. Increased flood protection, new highways and airports, more health and education facilities, and increased efforts at land improvement are vital.

This bill, S. 3, which we introduced today, authorizes the same expenditure of $1,077 million over a period of 5 years, stated in the bill which I was pleased to comanage with Senator RANDOLPH in the Senate last year. We are, though, proposing to increase the total authorized road system mileage from 2,850 to 3,350 miles across the region, including 1,000 miles of access roads instead of the figure of 500 miles in the bill last year. The $840 million for highway construction, providing up to 70 percent as the Federal share, is a basic program in this legislation, for roads will open isolated areas in Kentucky and in other Appalachian States to industry, to tourism, and to a fuller life for the people of the area.

In addition to the increase in authorized road mileage, this bill would place greater responsibilities and authority on the States, and I am sure that this will be welcomed by the States. This emphasis on the approval of programs at the local and State level, along with the incentives for private investment, will do much both to close the economic gap between this section and other regions of the United States, and to raise the standards of living.

The Appalachian development program is the result of much study. It is directed to a great and evident need. If the Congress approves this program providing support for transportation and flood protection, as well as for education and community development, then the 15 million people living in the hills and valleys in the Appalachian regions of 11 States—including eastern Kentucky—can work to achieve the same levels of abundance that are found in most of America.

I am grateful to my friend from West Virginia for his work and for his kind words. I will join him in the Public Works Committee to secure the earliest possible hearings and to bring this bill before the Senate. I hope others will again join with us in support of this bill. It will benefit Appalachian States, but it will also benefit the Nation.

THE WATER QUALITY ACT OF 1965

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill (S.

4) amending the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended.

This legislation is, with two exceptions, identical to that which passed the Senate on October 16, 1963, and in which 21 Members of this body joined me as cosponsors. I would add that the legislation was approved by the Senate by a vote of 69 yeas and 11 nays, and of the 20 Members not voting, 15 announced themselves as favoring its passage. The House Public Works Committee reported an amended version during the closing days of the 88th Congress. However, no further action was taken by the other body.

The bill which I am introducing is cosponsored by 25 of my colleagues, including all members of our Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution. It is a bipartisan measure directed toward improving the quality of our water resources and making more effective our programs for the control and abatement of water pollution.

This proposal is consistent with and supports the objectives outlined by President Johnson in his state of the Union message, in which he called for an expanded conservation program as part of our effort to achieve the Great Society:

> For over 3 centuries the beauty of America has sustained our spirit and has enlarged our vision. We must act now to protect this heritage. In a fruitful new partnership with the States and cities the next decade should be a conservation milestone.
>
> We will seek legal power to prevent pollution of our air and water before it happens. We will step up our effort to control harmful wastes, giving just priority to the cleanup of our most contaminated rivers. We will increase research to learn much more about the control of pollution.

These objectives and approaches are reflected in S. 4.

As I mentioned previously, this legislation is, with two exceptions, identical to S. 649, as approved by this body October 16, 1963. The sections deleted were those relating to the control and abatement of pollution from Federal installations and the problem of nondegradable detergents.

The Federal installations section was eliminated from this bill because similar problems with respect to Federal installations are present in the field of air pollution, as well as water pollution. In addition, there were other matters relating to Federal activities in both fields which require separate and more complete consideration. Because of these factors it was decided to cover these matters in separate legislation which will be introduced within a week.

The detergents section was deleted because the members of the coal and detergent industry have reported changes in their schedules for supplying the market with detergents which will degrade more readily than those presently on the market. In view of this change in schedule, it is considered advisable to conduct additional hearings on the detergent problem to determine the type or need of corrective legislation.

S. 4 includes the following proposals which were contained in S. 649 as it passed the Senate in October 1963:

First. To establish an additional position of Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to help the Secretary to administer the Federal Water Pollution Control Act.

Second. To create a Federal Water Pollution Control Administration to administer sections 3, comprehensive programs; 4, interstate cooperation and uniform laws; 10, enforcement measures; and 11, to control pollution from Federal installations.

Third. To authorize appropriations for fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for 3 succeeding fiscal years in the amount of $20 million annually for grants for research and development to demonstrate a new or improved method of controlling discharge of sewage from combined sewers.

Fourth. To increase grants to individual sewage treatment projects from $600,000 to $1 million and to allow multimunicipal combinations to be allowed grant increases from $2,400,000 to $4 million.

There is also a provision which allows for an increase of 10 percent in construction grants for treatment plants where comprehensive metropolitan planning has been carried out and where the treatment plants are part of such comprehensive plans.

Fifth. To provide procedures for the establishment of standards of quality applicable to interstate waters.

Sixth. To authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to initiate abatement where he finds that substantial economic injury results from the inability to market shellfish or shellfish products in interstate commerce because of pollution of interstate or navigable waters and action of Federal, State, or local authorities.

Seventh. To provide for audits where Federal funds are utilized and the normal requirements for technical amendments.

The need for the acceleration of sewage treatment plant construction and for the correction of the problem of combined sewers is no less urgent than when I introduced S. 649 in January of 1963, or when it passed the Senate in October of that year. As a matter of fact, the delay in enactment of legislation has created a greater backlog of needs in correcting the Nation's water pollution problems.

Today our older cities are faced with the necessity of separating their combined storm and sanitary sewers or devising means whereby the discharge of runoff from city streets are gradually fed through treatment plants to prevent overloading of treatment systems and the discharge of untreated sewage into public waterways. The correction of the problem of combined sewers requires huge expenditures on the part of the communities. In order to encourage and assist these hard-pressed cities it is essential that Federal encouragement be provided. The $20 million authorization could not correct the problem, but would furnish an incentive to attack it.

The importance of establishing water quality standards in our interstate water system is gaining more recognition and support. While this would be a new provision in Federal legislation, it is by no means a new or novel approach to aiding in the improvement of water quality and in the proper management of our water resources. We all recognize that the availability of water of good quality is a necessity for our economic and industrial growth. It is essential to the achievement of the Great Society.

The development and application of water quality standards would enable us to establish objectives and guidelines on the use of our waters and to prevent the misuse and abuse of this vital resource.

Water quality standards would provide techniques which could, in many instances, help us to avoid the necessity for enforcement action. Under present law and procedures nothing is done until pollution has reached the point where it endangers the health or welfare of many people. Then abatement action is taken and efforts are made to correct a situation which could have been prevented if standards of water quality had been established; municipalities and industries could develop realistic plans for new plants or expanded facilities, without uncertainties about waste disposal limitations which may be imposed.

In my own State, as in others, our previously abundant shellfish-producing waters have been immeasureably harmed through disposal of deleterious wastes. The economic losses to shellfishermen have been catastropic. S. 4 could provide them with effective protection for the first time.

For the program of sewage treatment facilities to be of greater benefit to our larger communities the limitation on individual and multimunicipal grants needs to be raised. The present ceilings are unrealistic when applied to the considerably greater expenditures which a larger city must bear in installing necessary treatment works. In application, the grants approximate as little or less than 10 percent of the costs involved, and thus they fail to achieve what is at once a primary and necessary objective of the grant program—the incentive to develop local projects for the control and abatement of water pollution.

S. 4 would authorize the establishment of an additional Assistant Secretary to help in the responsibility of the Department to oversee this important sphere of activities. There would also be authorized a Federal Water Pollution Control Administration to carry out certain functions of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, thus accomplishing two purposes.

First, the new administration would elevate the status of our water pollution control and abatement programs to a more appropriate and effective level in the Department. Second, it would free the Public Health Service to concentrate in its primary concern with health in the water pollution field as it is in other areas.

I ask unanimous consent that the complete text of the bill, and a section-by-section analysis of the bill, be printed in the RECORD at this point:

The **PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and section-by-section analyses will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 4) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, to establish the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, to provide grants for research and development, to increase grants for construction of municipal sewage treatment works, to authorize the establishment of standards of water quality to aid in preventing, controlling, and abating pollution of interstate waters, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Muskie (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a)(1) section 1 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 466) is amended by inserting after the words "section 1." a new subsection (a) as follows:

"(a) The purpose of this Act is to enhance the quality and value of our water resources and to establish a national policy for the prevention, control, and abatement of water pollution."

(2) Such section is further amended by redesignating subsections (a) and (b) thereof as (b) and (c) respectively.

(3) Subsection (b) of such section (as redesignating by paragraph (2) of this subsection) is amended by striking out the last sentence thereof and inserting in lieu of such sentence the following: "The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (hereinafter in this Act called 'Secretary') shall administer this Act and, with the assistance of an Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare designated by him, shall supervise and direct the head of the Water Pollution Control Administration created by section 2 and the administration of all other functions of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare related to water pollution. Such Assistant Secretary shall perform such additional functions as the Secretary may prescribe."

(b) Section 2 of Reorganization Plan Numbered 1 of 1953, as made affective April 1, 1953, by Public Law 83-13, is amended by striking out "two" and inserting in lieu thereof "three"; and paragraph (17) of subsection (d) of section 303 of the Federal Executive Salary Act of 1964 is amended by striking out "(2)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(3)".

Sec. 2. Such Act is further amended by redesignating sections 2 through 4 and references thereto, as sections 3 through 5, respectively, sections 5 through 14, as sections 7 through 16 respectively, by inserting after section 1 the following new section:

"FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ADMINISTRATION

"Sec. 2. Effective ninety days after the date of enactment of this section there is created within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare a Federal Water Pollution Control Administration (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the 'Administration'). The head of the Administration shall be appointed, and his compensation fixed, by the Secretary, and shall, through the Administration, administer sections 3, 4, 10, and 11 of this Act and such other provisions of this Act as the Secretary may prescribe. The head of the Administration may, in addition to regular staff of the Administration, which shall be initially provided from personnel of the Department, obtain, from within the Department or otherwise as authorized by law, such professional, technical, and clerical assistance as may be necessary to discharge the Administration's functions and may for that purpose use funds available for carrying out such functions."

Sec. 3. Such Act is further amended by inserting after the section redesignated as section 5 a new section as follows:

"GRANTS FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

"Sec. 6. The Secretary is authorized to make grants to any State, municipality, or intermunicipal or interstate agency for the purpose of assisting in the development of any project which will demonstrate a new or improved method of controlling the discharge into any waters of untreated or inadequately treated sewage or other waste from sewers which carry storm water or both storm water and sewage or other wastes, and for the purpose of reports, plans, and specifications in connection therewith.

"Federal grants under this section shall be subject to the following limitations: (1) No grant shall be made for any project pursuant to this section unless such project shall have been approved by an appropriate State water pollution control agency or agencies and by the Secretary; (2) no grant shall be made for any project in an amount exceeding 50 per centum of the estimated reasonable cost thereof as determined by the Secretary; (3) no grant shall be made for any project under this section unless the Secretary determines that such project will serve as a useful demonstration of a new or improved method of controlling the discharge into any water of untreated or inadequately treated sewage or other waste from sewers which carry storm water or both storm water and sewage or other wastes.

"There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for each of the next three succeeding fiscal years, the sum of $20,000,000 per fiscal year for the purpose of making grants under this section. Sums so appropriated shall remain available until expended. No grant shall be made for any project in an amount exceeding 5 per centum of the total amount authorized by this section in any one fiscal year."

Sec. 4. (a) Clause (2) of subsection (b) of the section of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act herein redesignated as section 8 is amended by striking out "$600,000," and inserting in lieu thereof "$1,000,000,".

(b) The second proviso in clause (2) of subsection (b) of such redesignated section 8 is amended by striking out "$2,400,000," and inserting in lieu thereof "$4,000,000,".

(c) Subsection (f) of such redesignated section 8 is redesignated as subsection (g) thereof and is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "The Secretary of Labor shall have, with respect to the labor standards specified in this subsection, the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176; 64 Stat. 1267; 5 U.S.C. 133z 15) and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (48 Stat. 948; 40 U.S.C. 276(c))."

(d) Such redesignated section 8 is further amended by inserting therein, immediately after subsection (e) thereof, the following new subsection:

"(f) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this section, the Secretary may increase the amount of a grant made under this section by 10 per centum for any project which has been certified to him by an official State, metropolitan, or regional planning agency empowered under State or local laws or interstate compact to perform metropolitan or regional planning for a metropolitan area within which the assistance is to be used, or other agency or instrumentality designated for such purposes by the Governor (or Governors in the case of interstate planning) as being in conformity with the comprehensive plan developed or in process of development for such metropolitan area. For the purposes of this subsection, the term 'metropolitan area' means either (1) a standard metropolitan statistical area as defined by the Bureau of the Budget, except as may be determined by the President or by the Bureau of the Budget as not being appropriate for the purposes hereof, or (2) any urban area, including those surrounding areas that form an economic and socially related region, taking into consideration such factors as present and future population trends and patterns of urban growth, location of transportation facilities and systems, and distribution of industrial, commercial, residential, governmental, institutional, and other activities, which in the opinion of the President or the Bureau of the Budget lends itself as being appropriate for the purposes hereof."

Sec. 5. (a) Redesignated section 10 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act is amended by redesignating subsections (c) through (i) as subsections (d) through (j).

(b) Such redesignated section 10 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act is further amended by inserting after subsection (b) the following:

"(c)(1) In order to carry out the purposes of this Act, the Secretary may, after reasonable notice and public hearing and in consultation with the Secretary of the Interior and with other Federal agencies, with State and interstate water pollution control agencies, and with municipalities and industries involved, prepare regulations setting forth standards of water quality to be applicable to interstate waters or portions thereof.

"(2) The Secretary shall also call such a public hearing on his own motion or when petitioned to do so by the Governor of any State subject to or affected by the water quality standards set pursuant to this subsection for the purpose of considering a revision in such standards.

"(3) Such standards of quality shall be such as to protect the public health and welfare and serve the purposes of this Act. In establishing standards designed to enhance the quality of such waters, the Secretary shall take into consideration their use and value for public water supplies, propagation of fish and wildlife, recreational purposes, and agricultural, industrial, and other legitimate uses.

"(4) The Secretary shall promulgate the standards pursuant to this subsection with respect to any waters only if, within a reasonable time after being requested by the Secretary to do so, the appropriate States and interstate agencies have not developed standards found by the Secretary to be consistent with paragraph (3) of this subsection and applicable to such interstate waters or portions thereof.

"(5) The discharge of matter into such interstate waters, which reduces the quality of such waters below the water quality standards promulgated by the Secretary pursuant to paragraph (4) of this subsection or established by the appropriate State or interstate agencies consistent with paragraph (3) of this subsection (whether the matter causing or contributing to such reduction is discharged directly into such waters or reaches such waters after discharge into tributaries of such waters), is subject to abatement in accordance with the provisions of this section.

"(6) Nothing in this subsection shall (a) prevent the application of this section to any case to which subsection (a) of this section would otherwise be applicable, or (b) extend Federal jurisdiction over water not otherwise authorized by this Act."

(c) Paragraph (1) of redesignated subsection (d) of the section of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act herein redesignated as section 10 is amended by striking out the final period after the third sentence of such subsection and inserting the following in lieu thereof: "; or he finds that substantial economic injury results from the inability to market shellfish or shellfish products in interstate commerce because of pollution referred to in subsection (a) and action of Federal, State, or local authorities."

(d) Redesignated subsection (h) of the section of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act herein redesignated as section 10 is amended by inserting after the word "practicability" in the second sentence thereof, the words "of complying with such standards as may be applicable."

Sec. 6. The section of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act hereinbefore redesignated as section 12 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(d) Each recipient of assistance under this Act shall keep such records as the Secretary shall prescribe, including records which fully disclose the amount and disposition by such recipient of the proceeds of such assistance, the total cost of the project or undertaking in connection with which such assistance is given or used, and the amount of that portion of the cost of the project or undertaking supplied by other sources, and such other records as will facilitate an effective audit.

"(e) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Comptroller General of the United States, or any of their duly authorized representatives, shall have access for the purpose of audit and examination to any books, documents, papers, and records of the recipients that are pertinent to the grants received under this Act."

Sec. 7 (a) Section 7(f)(6) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as that section is redesignated by this Act, is amended by striking out "section 6(b)(4)" as contained therein and inserting in lieu thereof "section 8(b)(4)."

(b) Section 8 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as that section is redesignated by this Act, is amended by striking out "section 5" as contained therein and inserting in lieu thereof "section 7".

(c) Section 10(b) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as that section is redesignated by this Act, is amended by striking out "subsection (g)" as contained therein and inserting in lieu thereof "subsection (h)".

(d) Section 10(i) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as that section is redesignated by this Act, is amended by striking out "subsection (e)" as contained therein and inserting in lieu thereof "subsection (f)".

(e) Section 11(a) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as that section is redesignated by this Act, is amended by striking out "section 8(c)(3)" as contained therein and inserting in lieu thereof "section 10(d)(3)" and by striking out "section 8(e)" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 10(f)".

Sec. 8. This Act may be cited as the "Water Quality Act of 1965".

The section-by-section analyses, presented by Mr. Muskie are as follows:

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSES OF AMENDMENTS PROPOSED TO FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT, AS AMENDED

Section 1. National water pollution control policy: Adds new subsection (a) to section 1 of act stating the act's purpose to enhance the quality and value of our water resources and to establish a national policy for the preservation, control, and abatement of water pollution.

Section 1 of the act would be further amended by redesignating subsections (a) and (b) and (c) and amending subsection (b) to provide for an additional Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to assist the Secretary in administering the act by supervising and directing the head of the Water Pollution Control Administration created by section 2 of the bill and administering all other functions of the Department related to water pollution. Other duties could be assigned as desired by the Secretary.

Section 2. Federal Water Pollution Control Administration: Redesignates sections and includes new section 2 in act creating the Federal Water Control Administration within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to administer redesignated sections 3 (comprehensive programs), 4 (interstate cooperation and uniform laws), 10 (enforcement measures), and 11 (to control pollution from Federal installations) of act. Responsibility for other provisions of the act could be assigned as the Secretary may prescribe.

Section 3. Grants for research and development: New section 6 provides authority for grants to any State, municipality, or intermunicipal or interstate agency for the purpose of assisting in the development of any project which will demonstrate a new or improved method of controlling the discharge into any waters of untreated or inadequately treated sewage or other waste from combined sewers.

Grants would require approval of appropriate State authorities and projects must demonstrate new or improved methods of controlling discharges from combined sewers. Also grants would be limited to 50 percent of the estimated reasonable cost.

There would be authorized for appropriation $20 million annually for 4 fiscal years starting with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965. Grants to any project would be limited to 5 percent of total appropriations.

Section 4. Grants for construction: Redesignated section 8 is amended by increasing the dollar ceiling limitation on any grant for a single waste treatment plant construction project from $600,000 to $1 million. This section is also amended by increasing the dollar ceiling limitation on a grant for a project which will serve more than one municipality from $2,400,000 to $4 million.

Subsection (f) is redesignated as subsection (g) and additionally makes applicable the Secretary of Labor's labor standards enforcement authority to the present provisions making prevailing wage provisions of Davis-Bacon Act applicable to workers employed on grant-assisted projects.

New subsection (f) authorizes the Secretary to increase the amount of a grant by 10 percent for a project in a standard metropolitan area which is certified by an official State, metropolitan, or regional planning agency as being in conformity with a comprehensive plan for the metropolitan area.

Section 5. Enforcement measures against pollution of interstate or navigable waters: Redesignates subsections of redesignated section 10, (c) through (i) as subsections (d) through (j) and inserts new subsection (c) authorizing the Secretary, after notice and public hearing and in consultation with the Secretary of the Interior and other Federal agencies, State, and interstate water pollution control agencies, and municipalities and industries involved, to prepare regulations setting forth standards of water quality to be applicable to interstate waters or portions thereof.

Directs the Secretary to also call a public hearing on his own motion or at a Governor's request to consider a revision in such standards. The standards of quality are to be such as to protect the public health and welfare and serve the purposes of the act. In establishing standards for enhancing water quality, the Secretary is to take into consideration their use and value for all legitimate water uses.

Directs the Secretary to promulgate the standards only if, following his request, State, and interstate agencies have not developed satisfactory standards.

Makes the discharge of matter, which reduces quality of interstate waters below the promulgated standards, subject to abatement under existing enforcement procedures.

Provides that this subsection does not prevent the application of enforcement measures to applicable cases and does not extend Federal jurisdiction over water not otherwise authorized by the act.

Paragraph (1) of redesignated subsection (d) of redesignated section 10 directs the Secretary to call an enforcement conference whenever he finds that substantial economic injury results from the inability to market shellfish or shellfish products in interstate commerce because of pollution of interstate or navigable waters and action of Federal, State, and local health authorities.

Redesignated subsection (b) of redesignated section 10 provides that in addition to requiring that the court, in enforcement cases, give not only due consideration of the practicability and the physical and economic feasibility of securing abatement of any pollution proved but consider also the practicability of complying with such standards as may be applicable.

Section 6. Administration: Adds new subsection (d) to provide that recipients of assistance under the act shall keep such records as prescribed by the Secretary for audit purposes.

Section 7. Provides for technical amendments.

COLLEGE STUDENT ASSISTANCE

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the greatest natural resource of this Nation today is no longer its mineral reserves, its oilfields, or its traditional riches whose past exploitation have built our economy. Rather, today's greatest natural resource is the potential of a well-educated, competent populace fitted to lead the Nation into the space-age era with all its material and human complexities.

This realization, with the new demands it makes upon us for assuring the sound educational development of all our youth without regard to their economic status, or that of their families, has been growing. The magnitude of the need, and the vast potential reward to the Nation in providing training for all qualified youth to the limit of their abilities, has become even more apparent than it was last February when I first introduced the Hartke college student assistance bill, then S. 2490.

That bill received hearings last year before the Education Subcommittee and was favorably reported, with amendments, as S. 3140, which remained on the calendar at adjournment. Today I am offering a new version of the Higher Education Student Assistance Act. Since one portion of my earlier bill was absorbed in the amendments to the National Defense Education Act last year, S. 5 is comprised of three rather than four portions: First, a program of student grants doubled in size over the previous proposal; second, a work-study program identical to the proposal of last year, which on a small scale is now a part of the antipoverty program; and third, a most substantially increased student loan insurance venture, containing a number of changes from the 1964 bill.

All three portions of this comprehensive student assistance act would run for an authorized 4-year period. The undergraduate student grants would aid 100,000 students in the first year, with an additional 100,000 in each of the following 3 years at a cost of $75 million per year, with a peak of $300 million in the fourth year of the program. These student grants are intended to aid a student who has exhausted other possibilities—such as National Defense Education Act loans, parental assistance, or work-study grants. They are not intended to be scholarships in the usual sense that only the top-ranking academically qualified would receive them. They are intended, rather, to be the necessary lift to put over the final financial barriers students accepted by the institution as capable of keeping up with the academic requirements, presumably including B and C as well as A students. Further, administration of the grants would be under the control of the institution rather than through the State commission structure outlined in the 1964 bill.

As I have already mentioned, the work-study provisions remain the same as in S. 2490. The cost would be $250 million per year, which would aid 330,000 students annually.

Fully as important as these two portions, and in some ways the most vital as well as the least costly, is the guaranteed student loan provision toward which I have directed not only S. 2490 but other bills in the past.

Members of the Senate, I am sure, are familiar with the basic idea—a Federal insurance guarantee for loans arranged directly by the student with a lending institution. S. 5 calls for the insurance of loans up to a total of $700 million in fiscal 1966, with an increase of $100 million annually to a peak of $1 billion in the fourth year. These figures, of course, are for gross amounts of insured loans, not by any means of cost to the Government, which will be quite minimal as to operation and reserves.

Other changes include, rather than insurance of 90 percent of the loan and interest, insurance of 100 percent of the loan but no insurance of the interest; eliminating involvement of the colleges except for certifying eligibility of the student as in good standing; extension of the borrowing privilege to all students who are carrying at least half of a full-time academic load; inclusion of vocational type institutions as well as academic; and an interest grant of 2 percent from the time the loan is made until the end of repayment.

We must give vigorous aid to all qualified to benefit by education and training for the new age that is upon us. To do so effectively, we need the kind of program provided by my bill. It provides help directly to the student, the very person we are seeking to benefit, rather than aiding him through his parents at second hand. It gives access to resources needed at whatever level is necessary—grants to maintain the hard-pressed student who has exhausted the resources of loans, work opportunities, and meager family backing or none at all; extension of the work-study principle to the benefit of both students and their institutions; and above all, the opportunity for low-cost loans, made from private sources, for which the student himself becomes responsible.

Such a package approach has secured the enthusiastic support and endorsement of the entire spectrum of educational experts, as last year's hearings showed. These include the National Education Association, the American Council on Education, the American Personnel and Guidance Association, the Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges, and many more.

There is also a strong support from Members of this body. I am pleased to announce that the following Members have requested to be included at this time as cosponsors of the bill: Senators MUSKIE, MCGEE, RANDOLPH, GRUENING, CLARK, MCINTYRE, BURDICK, YARBOROUGH, INOUYE, CANNON, KENNEDY of Massachusetts, CHURCH, MCGOVERN, PELL, and BAYH.

Mr. President, in order that others may consider the bill and join in its sponsorship, I ask that the complete text of S. 5 may appear in the RECORD at the close of my remarks, and that the bill lie on the table until the close of business on January 15.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the table as requested by the Senator from Indiana, and be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 5) to provide assistance for students in higher education by establishing programs for student grants, loan insurance, and work-study introduced by Mr. HARTKE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Higher Education Student Assistance Act of 1965".

TITLE I—UNDERGRADUATE STUDENT GRANTS

Appropriations authorized

SEC. 101. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated $75,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for each of the three succeeding fiscal years for grants to persons who have not previously received grants under this title and who are selected for such grants by the institution of higher education in which they are enrolled or have been accepted for enrollment. In addition, there are authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for each of the six succeeding fiscal years such sums as are necessary for making grants to individuals who have received grants under this title for previous years.

Amount and duration of student grants

SEC. 102. Any person who is determined by the institution of higher education in which he is enrolled or has been accepted for enrollment, in accordance with the provisions of the institution's plan approved under section 104, to need financial assistance to begin or continue his education as an undergraduate at such institution may be given a student grant under this title. Such a grant shall be based on the student's financial need for assistance during the academic year, but shall not exceed $1,000 for such year or its equivalent.

Allotments to States and institutions

SEC. 103. (a) From the sums appropriated pursuant to the first sentence of section 101 for any fiscal year, the Commissioner shall set aside an allotment for each State which bears the same ratio to the amount so appropriated as the number of full-time undergraduate students enrolled in institutions of higher education in such State bears to the total number of such students enrolled in institutions of higher education in all of the States. The number of such students enrolled in institutions of higher education for purposes of this section shall be determined by the Commissioner for the most recent year for which satisfactory data are available to him.

(b) Sums appropriated pursuant to the second sentence of section 101 for any fiscal year, shall be allotted among the States in such manner as the Commissioner determines as to be necessary to carry out the purposes for which such amounts are appropriated.

(c) From each State's allotment under subsection (a) there shall be allotted to each institution of higher education in the State an amount which bears the same ratio to the State's allotment as the number of full-time undergraduate students enrolled in such institution bears to the number of such students enrolled in all institutions of higher education in the State. Sums allotted to institutions of higher education which do not have plans approved under section 104 shall be reallotted among the other institutions of higher education in the State pro rata on the basis of their original allotments under this subsection. Subject to the provisions of the next sentence, the Commissioner shall pay from each State's allotment for each fiscal year to each institution which has a plan approved under section 104 the amount requested by the institution. Where the total requested by all institutions in a State is less than the State's allotment, the Commissioner may reallot the remaining amount from time to time, on such date or dates as he may fix, among institutions which requested more than the amount allotted to them. Such reallotment shall be made in proportion to the original allotment, but with such adjustments as may be necessary to insure that no payment will be made in excess of the amount requested by the institution. Any amounts remaining after the Commissioner has carried out such reallotment may be reallotted within other States in the discretion of the Commissioner.

Plans for participating institutions

SEC. 105. (a) Any institution of higher education desiring to participate in the student grant program under this title may do so by submitting to the Commissioner a plan for such institution for carrying out the purposes of this title which the Commissioner approves under this section. No divinity school or seminary or similar institution shall be eligible to submit a plan under this title. The Commissioner shall approve any such plan which—

(1) provides that funds received pursuant to this title will be used only for making student grants in accordance with the plan;

(2) provides for the selection of undergraduate students to receive grants, for determination of the amounts of such grants, and for determining the extent of financial need, in accordance with standards, procedures, and criteria which provide reasonable assurance—

(A) that the individuals selected to receive grants under this title will have the ability to pursue sucessfully, at the institution of higher education, the course of study he has selected, determined in accordance with the institution's regularly employed measures of aptitude and ability, and that the amount of each such grant for each year will be based solely on his need for financial assistance to continue his education at an institution of higher education, and

(B) that such individuals are exceptionally needy and but for the receipt of a student grant pursuant to this title would not pursue a course of study at an institution of higher education;

(3) provides for such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be neces-

sary to assure proper disbursement of and accounting for Federal funds paid to the institution under this title;

(4) provides that such a grant shall be paid in such installments as provided in the institution's plan, and that no payments shall be made for any period when the student is not maintaining satisfactory progress in the course of study which he is pursuing, according to the regularly prescribed standards and practices of the institution which he is attending, or is not devoting essentially full time to educational work, except that failure to be in attendance for a short period of time where there is good cause in the judgment of the institution for nonattendance shall not disqualify a student from receiving further payments, or failure to be in attendance at an institution during vacation periods, periods of military service, or during other extended periods of time during which there is good cause in the judgment of the institution for nonattendance (during which periods he is receiving no payments) shall not terminate the grant; and

(5) provides for the making of such reports, in such form and containing such information, as may be reasonably necessary to enable the Commissioner to perform his functions under this title.

(b) The Commissioner shall not finally disapprove any plan submitted under this title, or any modification thereof, without first affording the institution of higher education submitting the plan reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing.

(c) In the case of any plan which has been approved by the Commissioner, if the Commissioner finds—

(1) that the plan has been so changed that it no longer complies with the provisions of subsection (a), or

(2) that in the admistration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with such provisions,

the Commissioner shall notify such institution that the institution will not be regarded as eligible to participate in the program under this title until he is satisfied that there is no longer any such failure to comply.

Cost of education allowances

Sec. 106. In order partially to compensate institutions of higher education for expenses in excess of student tuition and other fees, incurred by such institutions in providing education to persons awarded student grants and receiving payments with respect thereto under this title, the Commissioner shall, in accordance with regulations, pay each institution which such a person attends during the major portion of each academic year for which such person receives student grant payments, the amount of $350. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to make such payments.

Payments

Sec. 107. The Commissioner may arrange for the payment of the amounts due recipients of student grants and institutions under this title in accordance with section 405.

TITLE II—LOAN ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

Scope and duration of loan assistance program

Sec. 201. (a) For the purpose of facilitating loans to students in eligible institutions, eligible lenders may be insured by the Commissioner, on behalf of the United States, against losses on loans made by them to such students, on or after July 1, 1965, if made upon the conditions and within the limits specified in this title. The total principal amount of new loans to students covered by insurance under this title in any fiscal year ending before July 1, 1969, shall not exceed $700,000,000 in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, $800,000,000 in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, $900,000,000 in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and $1,000,000,000 in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969. Thereafter, insurance pursuant to this Act may be granted only for loans made (or for loan installments paid pursuant to lines of credit as defined in section 203) to enable students, who have obtained prior loans insured under this title, to continue or complete their educational program; but no insurance may be granted or any such loan made or installment paid after June 30, 1972.

(b) The Commissioner may, if he finds it necessary to do so in order to assure an equitable distribution of the benefits of this title, assign, within the maximum amounts specified in subsection (a), insurance quotas applicable to eligible lenders, or to States or areas, and may from time to time reassign unused portions of such quotas. For purposes of this title, the term "eligible lender" means an eligible institution, or a financial or credit institution (including an insurance company) which is subject to examination and supervision by an agency of the United States or of any State.

Authorization of Commissioner to make certain interest payments

Sec. 202. (a) The Commissioner shall pay such part of the interest on any loan insured under this title as equals 2 per centum on the amount borrowed. The remainder of such interest up to the maximum prescribed by the Commissioner shall be paid by the student borrower in accordance with section 205. Payments by the Commissioner pursuant to this section shall be made out of funds appropriated for the purpose of this section. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 205 with respect to the payment of interest, the Commissioner may enter into such special arrangements with lenders with respect to interest payments to be made by him as he deems necessary for the proper administration of this Act.

(b) The Commissioner shall prescribe and define from time to time the maximum rate of interest for loans insured under the provisions of this Act. In doing so he shall give consideration to the going commercial rate for loans with similar security.

(c) There are authorized to be appropriated such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.

Limitations on individual loans and on insurance

Sec. 203. (a) No loan or loans by one or more eligible lenders in excess of $2,000 in the aggregate to any student in any academic year or its equivalent shall be covered by insurance under this title, and the aggregate insured unpaid principal amount of all loans made to any student shall not exceed $10,000 at any time. The annual insurable limit per student shall not be deemed to be exceeded by a line of credit under which actual payments by the lender to the borrower will not be made in any year in excess of such annual limit. As used in this section and hereinafter in this title, the term "line of credit" means an arrangement or agreement between the lender and the borrower whereby a loan is paid out by the lender to the borrower in annual installments, or whereby the lender agrees to make, in addition to the initial loan, additional loans in subsequent years.

(b) The insurance liability on any loan insured under this title shall be 100 per centum of the unpaid balance of the principal due on such loan, but shall not include any part of the interest on such loan.

Sources of funds

Sec. 204. Loans made by eligible lenders in accordance with this title shall be insurable whether made from funds fully owned by the lender or from funds held by the lender in a trust or similar capacity and available for such loans.

Eligibility of student borrowers and terms of student loans

Sec. 205. A loan by an eligible lender shall be insurable under the provisions of this title only if—

(a) made to a student who has been accepted for enrollment at an eligible institution or, in the case of a student already attending such an institution, is in good standing, and in either case will be carrying at least one-half of the normal full-time academic workload, as determined by the institution,

(b) such student is in need of the loan to pursue a course of study at such institution, as determined by the lender, and

(c) evidenced by a note or other written agreement which (1) is made without security and without endorsement, except that if the borrower is a minor and such note or other written agreement executed by him would not, under the applicable law, create a binding obligation, endorsement may be required, (2) provides for repayment of the principal amount of such loan in installments over a 10-year period (or such other period as may be authorized by regulation of the Commissioner) beginning (except in the event of default in payment of the cost of insurance premiums, or other default by the borrower) not earlier than 1 year following the date on which the student completes or ceases to pursue the study program in which he was enrolled or had been accepted for enrollment, (3) provides for interest on the unpaid balance of such loan at a yearly rate, not exceeding the applicable maximum rate as prescribed and defined by the Commissioner by or pursuant to regulation, which shall be payable, by the Commissioner and the borrower as provided in section 202, in installments over the period of the loan, (4) entitles the student borrower to accelerate repayment of the whole or any part of such loan, and (5) contains such other terms and conditions, consistent with the provisions of this title and with the regulations issued by the Commissioner pursuant to this title, as may be agreed upon by the parties to such loan, including, if agreed upon, a provision requiring the borrower to pay to the lender, in addition to principal and interest, amounts equal to the insurance premiums payable by the lender to the Commissioner with respect to such loan.

Certificates of insurance—Effective date of insurance—Premiums

Sec. 206. (a)(1) If, upon application by an eligible lender, made upon such form, containing such information, and supported by such evidence as the Commissioner may require, and otherwise in conformity with this section, the Commissioner finds that the applicant has made a loan to an eligible student which is insurable under the provisions of this title, he may, upon tender by the applicant to the first year's insurance premium payable pursuant to subsection (c), issue to such applicant a certificate of insurance covering such loan and setting forth the amount and terms of such insurance.

(2) Insurance evidenced by a certificate of insurance pursuant to subsection (a)(1) shall become effective upon the date of issuance of such certificate, except that the Commissioner is authorized, in accordance with regulations, to issue commitments with respect to proposed loans, or with respect to lines (or proposed lines) of credit (as defined in section 203), submitted by eligible lenders, and in that event, upon compliance with subsection (a)(1) by the lender, the certificate of insurance may be issued effective as of the date when any loan, or any payment by the lender pursuant to a line of credit, to be covered by such insurance, was made. Such insurance shall cease to be effective upon thirty days' default by the lender in

the payment of any installment of the premiums payable pursuant to subsection (c).

(3) An application submitted pursuant to subsection (a) (1) shall contain (A) an agreement by the applicant to pay, in accordance with regulations, the premiums fixed by the Commissioner pursuant to subsection (c), and (B) an agreement by the applicant that if the loan is covered by insurance the applicant will submit such supplementary reports and statements during the effective period of the loan agreement, upon such forms, at such times, and containing such information as the Commissioner may prescribe by or pursuant to regulation.

(b) (1) In lieu of requiring a separate insurance application and issuing a separate certificate of insurance for each student loan made by an eligible lender as provided in subsection (a), the Commissioner may issue to any eligible lender applying therefor a certificate of comprehensive insurance coverage which shall, without further action by the Commissioner, insure all insurable loans made by such lender, on or after the date of such certificate and before a specified cutoff date, within the limits of an aggregate maximum amount stated in the certificate. Such regulations may provide for conditioning such insurance, with respect to any loan, upon compliance by the lender with such requirements (to be stated or incorporated by reference in the certificate) as in the Commissioner's judgment will best achieve the purpose of this subsection while protecting the financial interest of the United States and promoting the objectives of this title, including (but not limited to) provisions as to the reporting of such loans and information relevant thereto to the Commissioner and as to the payment of initial and other premiums and the effect of default therein, and including provision for confirmation by the Commissioner from time to time (through endorsement of the certificate) of the coverage of specific new loans by such certificate, which confirmation shall be incontestable by the Commissioner in the absence of fraud or misrepresentation of fact or patent error.

(2) If the holder of a certificate of comprehensive insurance issued under this subsection grants to a student a line of credit (as defined in section 203) extending beyond the cutoff date specified in such certificate, loans or payments thereon made by such holder after such date pursuant to such line of credit shall not be deemed to be included in the coverage of such certificate except as may be specifically provided therein; but, subject to the limitations of section 201, the Commissioner may, in accordance with regulations, make commitments to insure such future loans or payments, and such commitments may be honored either as provided in subsection (a) or by inclusion of such insurance in comprehensive coverage under this subsection (b) for the period or periods in which such future loans or payments are made.

(c) The Commissioner shall, pursuant to regulations, charge for insurance on each loan under this title a premium in an amount not to exceed one-fourth of 1 per centum per year of the unpaid balance of principal and accrued interest of such loan, payable in advance, at such time and in such manner as may be prescribed by the Commissioner. Such regulations may provide that such premium shall not be payable, or if paid shall be refundable, with respect to any period after default in the payment of principal or interest, or after the borrower has died or becomes totally and permanently disabled, if (1) notice of such default or other event has been duly given, and (2) request for payment of the loss insured against has been made or the Commissioner has made such payment on his own motion pursuant to section 207(a).

(d) The rights of an eligible lender arising under insurance evidenced by a certificate of insurance issued to it under this section may be assigned as security by such lender only to another eligible lender, and subject to regulation by the Commissioner.

(e) The consolidation of the obligations of two or more insured loans obtained by a student borrower in any fiscal year into a single obligation evidenced by a single instrument of indebtedness shall not affect the insurance by the United States. If the loans thus consolidated are covered by separate certificates of insurance issued under subsection (a), the Commissioner may upon surrender of the original certificates issue a new certificate of insurance in accordance with such subsection upon such consolidated obligation; if they are covered by a single comprehensive certificate issued under subsection (b), the Commissioner may amend that certificate accordingly.

Procedure on default, death, or disability of student

SEC. 207. (a) Upon default by the student borrower on any loan covered by insurance pursuant to this title, or upon the death of the student borrower or a finding by the insurance beneficiary that the borrower has become totally and permanently disabled (as determined in accordance with regulations established by the Commissioner) before the loan has been repaid in full, and prior to the commencement of suit or other enforcement proceeding upon any security for such loan, the insurance beneficiary shall promptly notify the Commissioner, and the Commissioner shall if requested (at that time or after further collection efforts) by such beneficiary, or may on his own motion, if the insurance is still in effect, pay to the beneficiary, within the limits of liability specified in section 203(b), the amount of the loss sustained by the insured upon such loan as soon as such amount has been determined. The "amount of the loss" on any loan shall, for the purposes of this subsection, be deemed to be an amount equal to the unpaid balance of the loan, not including interest, on the date of payment by the United States on its insurance obligation, except that where the Commissioner has decided to make payment on his own motion the amount of the loss as so determined shall be deemed tentative and shall be increased by the excess, if any, over such tentative amount of any net recovery made by the Commissioner on such loan after deduction of the cost of such recovery (including reasonable administrative cost).

(b) Upon payment by the Commissioner of the insured portion of the loss, or tentative amount of loss, pursuant to subsection (a), the United States shall be subrogated to the rights of the holder of the obligation upon the insured loan with respect to amounts of principal.

(c) Nothing in this section or in this title shall be construed to preclude any forbearance for the benefit of the student borrower which may be agreed upon by the parties to the insured loan and approved by the Commissioner, or to preclude forbearance by the Commissioner in the enforcement of the insured obligation after payment on such insurance, or to require collection of the amount of any loan by the insurance beneficiary or by the Commissioner from the estate of a deceased borrower or from a borrower found by the insurance beneficiary to have become permanently and totally disabled.

(d) Nothing in this section or in this title shall be construed to excuse the holder of a loan from exercising, in the making and collection of loans under the provisions of this title, the same care and diligence which would reasonably be used in making and collecting loans not insured. If the Commissioner, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to an eligible lender, finds that it has substantially failed to exercise such care and diligence, or to make the reports and statements required under section 206(a) (3), or to pay the required insurance premiums, he shall disqualify such lender for further insurance on loans granted pursuant to this title until he is satisfied that such failure has ceased and finds that there is reasonable assurance that the lender will in the future exercise necessary care and diligence or comply with such requirements, as the case may be.

(e) As used in this section, the term "insurance beneficiary" means the insured or its authorized assignee, if the certificate of insurance is held by such assignee.

Revolving insurance fund

SEC. 208. (a) There is hereby established a Student Loan Insurance Fund (hereafter in this section called the "Fund") which shall be available without fiscal year limitation to the Commissioner for carrying out the provisions of this title, and the Commissioner is hereby authorized to transfer to the Fund from time to time from the appropriations provided under subsection (b) of this section such sums as he deems necessary to provide capital for the Fund. All amounts received by the Commissioner as premium charges for insurance and as receipts, earnings, or proceeds derived from any claim or other assets acquired by the Commissioner in connection with his operations under this title, and any other moneys, property, or assets derived by the Commissioner from his operations in connection with this section, shall be deposited in the Fund. All expenses under this title other than payments under section 202 shall be paid from the Fund, including (within the limits authorized from year to year in appropriation Acts to be paid for such purpose from the Fund) all administrative expenses which the Commissioner determines are reasonably attributable to his operations under this title. Moneys in the Fund not needed for current operations under this section may be invested in bonds or other obligations guaranteed as to principal and interest by the United States. If at any time the Commissioner determines that capital surplus and reserves of the Fund exceed the present and any reasonably prospective future requirements of the Fund, such excess may be deposited in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

(b) (1) For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this title, there are authorized to be appropriated for transfer to the Fund, pursuant to subsection (a) of this section—

(A) the sum of $1,000,000; and

(B) such further sums, if any, as may become necessary for the adequacy of the Fund. Any sums appropriated under this subsection shall remain available until expended.

(2) Interest shall accrue to the Treasury on outstanding capital resulting from transfers to the Fund from appropriations under paragraph (1) of this subsection. The rate of such interest with respect to each such transfer shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average market yield, during the month preceding such transfer, on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States having maturities comparable to those of loans insured under this title. From time to time and at least at the close of each fiscal year, the Commissioner shall pay to the Treasury, as miscellaneous receipts, all accrued interest.

(3) If at any time the moneys in the Fund (including any appropriation available for transfer to the Fund pursuant to this section) are insufficient to make payments in connection with the default of any loan insured under this title, the Commissioner is authorized to issue to the Secretary of the

Treasury notes or other obligations in such forms and denominations, bearing such maturities, and subject to such terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. Such notes or other obligations shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average market yield on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States of comparable maturities during the month preceding the issuance of such notes or other obligations. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to purchase any notes and other obligations issued hereunder and for such purpose he is authorized to use as a public debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under such Act, as amended, are extended to include any purchases of such notes and obligations. The Secretary of the Treasury may at any time sell any of the notes or other obligations acquired by him under this paragraph. All redemptions, purchases, and sales by the Secretary of the Treasury of such notes or other obligations shall be treated as public debt transactions of the United States. Sums borrowed under this paragraph shall be deposited in the Fund and redemption of such notes and obligations shall be made by the Commissioner from such Fund.

Legal powers and responsibilities

SEC. 209. (a) In the performance of, and with respect to, the functions, powers, and duties vested in him by this title, the Commissioner may—

(1) prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this title;

(2) sue and be sued in any court of record of a State having general jurisdiction or in any district court of the United States, and such district courts shall have jurisdiction of civil actions arising under this title without regard to the amount in controversy, and any action instituted under this subsection by or against the Commissioner shall survive notwithstanding any change in occupying the office of Commissioner or any vacancy in such office; but no attachment, injunction, garnishment, or other similar process, mesne or final, shall be issued against the Commissioner or property under his control, and nothing herein shall be construed to except litigation arising out of activities under this title from the application of sections 507(b) and 2679 of title 28 of the United States Code and of section 367 of the Revised Statutes (5 U.S.C. 316);

(3) include in any contract for insurance such terms, conditions, and covenants relating to repayment of principal and payment of interest, relating to his obligations and rights and to those of eligible lenders, and borrowers in case of default, and relating to other matters as the Commissioner determines to be necessary to assure that the purposes of this title will be achieved; and any term, condition, and covenant made pursuant to this clause or any other provision of this title may be modified by the Commissioner if he determines such modification is necessary to protect the financial interest of the United States;

(4) subject to the specific limitations in this title, consent to the modification, with respect to rate of interest, time of payment of any installment of principal and interest or any portion thereof, or any other provision, of any note or other instrument evidencing a loan which has been insured under this title;

(5) enforce, pay, or compromise, any claim on, or arising because of, any such insurance; and

(6) enforce, pay, compromise, waive, or release any right, title, claim, lien, or demand, however acquired including any equity or any right of redemption.

(b) The Commissioner shall, with respect to the financial operations arising by reason of this title—

(1) prepare annually and submit a budget program as provided for wholly owned Government corporations by the Government Corporation Control Act;

(2) maintain an integral set of accounts, which shall be audited annually by the General Accounting Office in accordance with principles and procedures applicable to commercial corporate transactions, as provided by section 105 of the Government Corporation Control Act with respect to insurance under this title, except that the transactions of the Commissioner, including the settlement of insurance claims, and transactions related thereto and vouchers approved by the Commissioner in connection with such transactions, shall be final and conclusive upon all accounting and other officers of the Government.

TITLE III—WORK-STUDY PROGRAMS FOR STUDENTS IN INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Appropriations authorized

SEC. 301. For the purpose of enabling the Commissioner to stimulate and promote work-study programs for students who are in need of the earnings from employment to pursue courses of study at institutions of higher education, and to assist such institutions to develop and expand courses of study requiring periods of full-time on-the-job training, there are authorized to be appropriated $250,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and each of the next three fiscal years. Sums appropriated under this section for any fiscal year shall be available, in accordance with the provisions of this title and with agreements between the Commissioner and institutions of higher education, for payment by the Commissioner of the compensation of students employed under work-study programs covered by such agreements for such fiscal year.

Apportionment of funds

SEC. 302. For the purpose of determining the maximum amount that may be paid by the Commissioner under this title as compensation to students at each participating institution of higher education, the Commissioner shall apportion the amount appropriated pursuant to section 301 for any fiscal year as follows:

(a) The Commissioner shall allot to each State an amount which bears the same ratio to the amount so appropriated as the number of persons enrolled on a full-time basis in institutions of higher education in such State bears to the total number of persons enrolled on a full-time basis in institutions of higher education in all of the States. The number of persons enrolled on a full-time basis in institutions of higher education for the purposes of this section shall be determined by the Commissioner for the most recent year for which satisfactory data are available to him.

(b) In order to allocate the amount so allocated to any State among institutions of higher education in such State with which he has agreements under this title and which meet the requirements established in his regulations under this title, the Commissioner shall from time to time set dates by which such institutions must file application for such allocations. In the event that the total requested in such applications from such institutions in a State exceeds the amount of the allotment of such State available for such purpose, the allocation from such allotment to each such institution shall bear the same ratio to the amount requested in its application as the amount of such allotment available for such purpose bears to the total requested in all such applications. In the event the total requested in such applications from such institutions in a State is less than the amount of the allotment of such State available for such purpose, the Commissioner may reallot the remaining amount from time to time, on such date or dates as the Commissioner may fix, to other States in proportion to the original allotments to such States under subsection (a) for such year, and may allocate such reallotted amounts among participating institutions in such other States.

Conditions of agreements

SEC. 303. An agreement with any institution of higher education under this title shall—

(1) provide for the operation by the institution of a work-study program for the employment of its students by such institution, or by a public agency or institution pursuant to a contract or other arrangement with such institution, in work of an educational character or having a substantial educational or public service content;

(2) provide that employment under such work-study program shall be furnished only to a student who (A) is in need of the earnings from employment to pursue a course of study at such institution or to undertake a period of full-time on-the-job training required by his course of study at such institution, (B) is capable, in the opinion of the institution, of maintaining good standing in such course of study while employed under the program covered by the agreement, and (C) has been accepted for enrollment as a full-time student at the institution, or in the case of a student already enrolled in and attending the institution, is in good standing and in full-time attendance at such institution;

(3) provide that no student shall be employed under such work-study program for more than fifteen hours in any week in which classes in which he is enrolled are in session;

(4) provide that, in each fiscal year during which the agreement remains in effect, the institution shall expend (from sources other than payments by the Commissioner under this title) for the employment of its students (whether or not in employment eligible for assistance under this title) an amount that is not less than its average annual expenditure for such employment during the three fiscal years preceding the fiscal year in which the agreement is entered into;

(5) provide for payment by the Commissioner, within the limits of the applicable allocation with respect to such institution under section 302(b), of the Commissioner's share of the compensation of each student employed in the work-study program in accordance with the agreement, which share shall be 100 per centum of such compensation for employment prior to July 1, 1967, and 75 per centum of such compensation for employment on that date and thereafter; and, subject to section 304, provide that the institution undertakes to act, if so requested by the Commissioner, as his agent for the payment of the Commissioner's share of the student's compensation;

(6) provide that the Commissioner's share of the compensation of any student employed in the work-study program in accordance with the agreement shall not exceed for any calendar year or its equivalent, as determined under regulations of the Commissioner, (A) in the case of a student who is participating in a course of study at such institution, or who is participating in a program of full-time on-the-job training required by his course of study, during essentially all of such calendar year or its equivalent, $2,500 if he is a graduate or professional student or $1,250 if he is any other type of student, or (B) in the case of a student who is so participating during substantially less than such calendar year or its equivalent, as determined under regulations of the Commissioner, $2,000 if he is a graduate or professional student or $1,000 if he is any other type of student;

(7) provide for the making of such reports, in such form and containing such information, as the Commissioner may reasonably require to carry out his functions under this title, and for the keeping of such records and for affording such access thereto as the Commissioner may find necessary to assure the correctness and verifications of such reports;

(8) include such other provisions as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this title and as are agreed to by the Commissioner and the institution; and

(9) include provisions designed to make work financed under the program covered by the agreement, or equivalent work offered by the institution, reasonably available (to the extent of available funds) to all eligible students in the institution in need thereof.

Payments to students

SEC. 304. (a) The Commissioner's share of a student's compensation for work performed in employment covered by an agreement under this title may be paid directly by him to the student; or it may be paid through the institution making such agreement as paying agent for the Commissioner. If the institution is utilized as paying agent, the Commissioner's share may be paid to the institution in advance or by way of reimbursement, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Commissioner, and the Commissioner may authorize the institution to combine the Commissioner's share and the remainder, if any, of the student's compensation in a single payment to the student.

(b) Regardless of the method of payment under this section, students employed in a work-study program covered by an agreement under this title shall not by reason of such employment be deemed employees of the United States, or their service Federal service, for any purpose.

(c) Nothing in this title shall be construed as restricting the source (other than this title) from which the institution may pay its share of the compensation of a student employed in accordance with an agreement under this title.

(d) Financial transactions of the Commissioner pursuant to this title, and vouchers approved by him in connection with such financial transactions, shall be final and conclusive upon all officers of the Government; except that all such transactions shall be subject to audit by the General Accounting Office at such times and in such manner as the Comptroller General may by regulation prescribe.

TITLE IV—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Federal control of education prohibited

SEC. 401. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the curriculum, program of instruction, administration, or personnel of any educational institution or school system.

Definitions

SEC. 402. As used in this act—

(a) The term "Commissioner" means the Commissioner of Education.

(b) The term "State" includes, in addition to the several States, the District of Columbia, the Canal Zone, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa.

(c) The term "secondary school" means a school which provides secondary education, as determined under State law or, if such school is not in any State, as determined by the Commissioner except that it does not include any education provided beyond grade 12.

(d) The term "institution of higher education" means an educational institution in any State which—

(1) admits as regular students only individuals having a certificate of graduation from a secondary school, or the recognized equivalent of such a certificate;

(2) is legally authorized within such State to provide a program of education beyond secondary schools;

(3) provides an educational program for which it awards a bachelor's degree, or provides not less than a two-year program which is acceptable for full credit toward such a degree, or offers a two-year program in engineering, mathematics, or the physical or biological sciences which is designed to prepare the student to work as a technician and at a semiprofessional level in engineering, scientific, or other technological fields which require the understanding and application of basic engineering, scientific, or mathematical principles or knowledge;

(4) is a public or other nonprofit institution; and

(5) is accredited by a nationally recognized accrediting agency or association listed by the Commissioner pursuant to this paragraph or, if not so accredited, is an institution whose credits are accepted, on transfer, by not less than three institutions which are so accredited for credit on the same basis as if transferred from an institution so accredited: *Provided, however,* That in the case of an institution offering a two-year program in engineering, mathematics, or the physical or biological sciences which is designed to prepare the student to work as a technician and at a semiprofessional level in engineering, scientific, or technological fields which require the understanding and application of basic engineering, scientific, or mathematical principles or knowledge, if the Commissioner determines there is no nationally recognized accrediting agency or association qualified to accredit such institutions, he shall appoint an advisory committee, composed of persons specially qualified to evaluate training provided by such institutions, which shall prescribe the standards of content, scope, and quality which must be met in order to qualify such institutions to participate under this Act and shall also determine whether particular institutions meet such standards.

(e) The term "eligible institution" means (1) an institution of higher education or (2) a business or trade school, or technical institution, or other technical or vocational schools, in any State which (A) admits as regular students only persons who have completed or left secondary school, (B) is legally authorized within such State to provide a program of postsecondary vocational or technical education, (C) provides a program of postsecondary vocational or technical education designed to fit individuals for useful employment in recognized occupations, and (D) is accredited by a nationally recognized accrediting agency or association listed by the Commissioner pursuant to this clause, except that if the Commissioner determines there is no nationally recognized accrediting agency or association qualified to accredit schools of a particular category, he shall appoint an advisory committee, composed of persons specially qualified to evaluate training provided by schools of that category, which shall prescribe the standards of content, scope, and quality which must be met by such schools in order for loans to students attending such schools to be insurable under this title and shall also determine whether particular schools meet such standards; and for the purpose of this clause the Commissioner shall publish a list of nationally recognized accrediting agencies or associations which he determines to be reliable authority as to the quality of education or training offered.

(f) The term "nonprofit", as applied to a school or institution means a school or institution owned and operated by one or more nonprofit corporations or associations no part of the net earnings of which inures, or may lawfully inure, to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual.

(g) The term "public" as applied to any school or institution includes a school or institution of any agency of the United States, except that no such school or institution shall be eligible to receive any grant, loan, or other payment under this Act.

Delegation of authority

SEC. 403. The Commissioner is authorized to delegate any of his functions under this Act, except the promulgation of regulations, to any officer or employee of the Office of Education.

Administration

SEC. 404. In administering this Act, the Commissioner is authorized to utilize the services and facilities of any agency of the Federal Government and of any other public or nonprofit agency or institution, in accordance with agreements between the Secretary and the head thereof, and to pay therefor, in advance or by way of reimbursement as may be provided in the agreement.

Method of payment

SEC. 405. Payments under this Act to any individual or to any State or Federal agency, institution of higher education, or any other organization, pursuant to a grant, loan, or contract, may be made in installments, and in advance or by way of reimbursement.

BILL TO PROVIDE FEDERAL ASSISTANCE FOR CONSTRUCTION OF CLASSROOMS IN ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide $500 million a year in Federal assistance—for the next 2 years—for construction of classrooms in public elementary and secondary schools.

This is similar to legislation I have proposed many times in the past, and I am hopeful that the year 1965 will see Congress enact, for the first time, a comprehensive program of Federal assistance to the public elementary and secondary schools of this country.

The 88th Congress, as we all know, made a remarkable record of achievement in the field of education. So much so, in fact, that it has rightly earned the nickname "the Education Congress."

There was the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963; the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act; the Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Health Centers Construction Act of 1963; the Vocational Education Act of 1963; including extension of the federally impacted areas program and an expanded and extended National Defense Education Act program.

We also approved the Library Services and Construction Act, and revised and broadened the Manpower Development and Training Act program. The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is an education-oriented program to train both young people and adults. Then there is the Nurse Training Act of 1964.

It would be hard to find any Congress in history that had done as much for education.

But we have one major piece of unfinished business that must receive top-priority attention and that is our elementary and secondary schools.

Through many years of neglect, we have inherited a chronic shortage of qualified teachers and suitable classrooms that is really a national scandal.

The bill I propose would make only a modest start on this enormous problem.

The Federal funds would be allocated to the States on the basis of an allocation formula which measures the relative income per schoolchild of the several States.

The range of the formula would be limited to a ratio of 2 to 1—wherein the least wealthy States would receive approximately $16 per school age child, while those with the highest per capita incomes would receive approximately $7 per school age child.

Each State, in order to qualify for its full allotment, would have to maintain a school expenditure effort equal to both its past effort and the average national increase.

Using an estimated figure of $35,000 as the average national cost of classroom construction, this bill, in 2 years, would provide the funds for construction of some 38,000 classrooms.

At some later time, I intend to discuss this legislation in more detail. But for now, I shall content myself with the observation that the need for congressional action in this area, has increased each of the 10 years I have been in the Senate.

It is greater now than it has ever been. And we must begin now to meet this urgent national need.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 8) to provide for a program of Federal assistance for the construction of public elementary and secondary schools, introduced by Mr. McNamara, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

COLD WAR VETERANS' READJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1965

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I introduce again, for appropriate reference, the cold war GI bill, to make educational assistance and home loan guarantees available to the 5 million veterans of the cold war similar to that made available to the veterans of World War II and Korea.

The provisions of this bill are almost identical with those of similar cold war GI bills which I have introduced during the last three Congresses. In the 86th Congress, the cold war GI bill (S. 1138) passed the Senate by a vote of 57 to 31, but was not acted upon by the House Veterans' Affairs Committee. The bill of the 87th Congress (S. 349), as well as the cold war GI bill of the 88th Congress (S. 5), was favorably reported by the Labor and Public Welfare Committee. The latter bill was left on the Senate Calendar for almost a year and a half, and the Senate was unable to bring it to a vote.

The proposed legislation has always enjoyed broad public support, and its popularity today is greater than it has ever been before. Even though this bill has been pending for some time in the Nation's Congress, the people of this country refuse to allow their hopes to lapse. Instead of remaining dormant while they wait for this body to consider this needed legislation, our citizens have maintained a consistent tide of support for the cold war GI bill.

Each year a large number of our vigorous American youth enter military service to give from 2 to 4, or more, years of their lives to the defense of their country. They do so, and this country needs them to do so, because foreign powers continue to threaten the security of this Nation and of the free world. This military requirement will continue until the last vestige of danger to this Nation has been removed from the frontiers of freedom. So long as there is a violent Vietnam, a Berlin crisis, or an island threat from Cuba, our American youth will be required to serve their Nation.

The bill I have introduced provides an opportunity to demonstrate that we, as a nation, do recognize the extreme unique personal sacrifices exacted from our cold war veterans by their military service. Before a misconception develops, let me point out now, Mr. President, that this bill is not conceived as a reward or as an inducement for our young men to serve their country. For those who would reduce the purpose of this bill to these concepts, I can only retort that I conceive the level of patriotism in our country to be of a higher quality. I do not believe that we need reduce our defense effort to gimmicks or rewards to induce our young men to defend our country. Service to one's country should be, and presently is, based on a moral obligation to defend the principles by which we live.

For this reason, Mr. President, I do not wish this bill to be confused with the thoughts of those who would hold this educational opportunity out as a reward to those who undergo specially hazardous duty for their country. I mention this because I do not believe that there is any room in our American philosophy for the thoughts of those who demand that our youth earn educational opportunities by risking their lives. We often speak of the United States as the Nation of opportunity, a place where anyone is offered an opportunity in life to aspire to his highest ambitions. There is no place in our heritage for the idea that educational opportunity must be earned by placing one's life at stake.

In apposition to this manner of thinking, the basis of the philosophy behind this bill is that everyone in this country should have the opportunity of pursuit of happiness without being penalized unfairly. This is the idea that in the name of justice, one will not be discriminated against unfairly in seeking fulfillment of life. Yet, this is just what is happening at the present time.

We find that only 44 percent of our draft-eligible young men ever serve their country in uniform. While these men are sacrificing 2 to 4 years of their lives just at the crucial age of peak development, the 56 percent of their counterparts are utilizing this time to further their careers and develop their futures. An even more unfortunate fact is that it is just these admirable young men who are serving their country who are the least able to afford the time which is sacrificed from their future development. These are the men who are least able to afford an education, who are least prepared for a civilian occupation, and who have to struggle the hardest to survive the competition for the future. Hence, the injustice is magnified, as we take the very men who must struggle the hardest to get ahead in life and set them 2 to 4 years behind in their competitive position, just because they are the 44 percent who do the admirable thing in serving their country.

The real problem occurs when our cold war veterans return to civilian life. After being removed for 2 to 4 years from the mainstream of competition, they return to civilian life just as they left—unskilled, uneducated, and largely unemployable. Last year unemployment compensation for veterans increased $2 million—to over $96 million—money which could have reaped benefits if used for the training of these veterans. Here is the place where the cold war veteran needs help. He does not need a reward—what he needs is a chance. Whatever his military experience, hazardous or not, there is a need for readjustment assistance to help the cold war veteran get his ship of success back into the mainstream of opportunity.

It is not for the veteran alone that this assistance is needed, for our Nation can ill afford to lose the talents and ability of over 5 million cold war veterans by 1970. Our Nation needs them, and they need the interest of our Nation in their future. This is the purpose of this bill: to do everything we can to rectify the injustice dealt these veterans, and to afford opportunity to every American indiscriminately.

The cold war GI bill provides these young people with 1½ days of educational assistance for each day of service, not to exceed 36 months of schooling. This aid would be in the form of a monthly cash allowance to the veteran, who selects his own school and pays his tuition and maintenance expense from the allowance. A single veteran would receive $110 monthly. A married veteran with two children would receive a maximum of $165 a month. The bill also provides home and farm loan assistance of a type which calls for a loan fee that will be set aside to pay for any losses under the program. Only those persons who perform 180 days or more of military service, and who are discharged honorably, would be eligible for these benefits.

This is not a bonus or a pension plan; it is a readjustment plan to train a veteran to become self-sufficient and thus avoid the necessity of a bonus or a pension. It is a way to give these young veterans an opportunity to return to civilian life, get a job, and to realize their educational objectives at the most formative time in their lives.

By far the most farsighted veterans' program in our history was the original World War II GI bill of 1944 which accomplished just these objectives. Through this bill and the later Korean conflict GI bill, almost 11 million veterans received training which elevated them into productive employment and additional income. Their increase in taxes paid on this additional earning power was more than sufficient to pay back the Government the cost of the programs, and Uncle Sam is now accruing a profit to the tune of over a billion dollars a year. The cold war GI bill will also be self-liquidating.

Aside from the monetary advantages of this investment, the GI bills have injected thousands of trained scientists, doctors, engineers, teachers, and other professional personnel into our economy. Through these bills, veterans were able to escape the problems of readjustment now plaguing cold war veterans, and this is just what this bill will provide for the cold war veteran.

But the cold war GI bill does more than redress inequities and provide opportunities. In addition, it will help build an educational fortress which, in the long run, will be of more value in defending our freedom than all the armaments in existence. The contributions which can be made by these educationally readjusted veterans is incalculable, especially in light of our still desperate need for more teachers, more engineers, and more scientists. Last year, this body, earned the distinction of being labeled the "Education Congress" because of its efforts to raise the standard of education. Let us not view this as a landmark to be seen in passing, but let us convert it into a stepping stone leading to a complete educational system which provides an opportunity for every citizen to develop his abilities to his utmost potential.

Mr. President, the documentation of need for and values accruing from this bill could go on ad infinitum. However, the most important basis for this bill is the need to provide our young veterans with an opportunity to readjust to civilian life so that military service will not have the effect of creating a lifetime burden for the 44 percent of our eligible men who defend their country.

This is not a halfway proposal to reward only those who see hazardous duty, or some other select group of servicemen—for educational opportunity cannot be used to salve our conscience for sending men to war. Rather this is the recognition that there is a segment of our population that suffers from lack of opportunity, and that is the entire cold war veteran population. Their need is not based on the type of military duty they performed, but on the lack of opportunity to readjust back to civilian life after having been removed for 2 to 4 years.

The proposed legislation would also enjoy broad public support. Its popularity today is greater than it has ever been before.

Mr. President, on this subject I have received a great volume of mail from people all over the country and from servicemen overseas. During this fall, while on speaking tours, more people came to me and expressed an interest in that bill than in any other bill that has been before the Congress in the past year. I include in that statement the civil rights bill and the tax bill. The people of our country recognize that the bill is a measure of the utmost and pressing importance.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be allowed to remain at the desk for 1 week for additional cosponsors and that an explanation of the bill be printed at this point in the Record as part of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the explanation of the bill will be printed in the Record and the bill will remain at the desk as requested by the Senator from Texas.

The bill (S. 9) to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces during the induction period, introduced by Mr. Yarborough (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The explanation is as follows:

Digest Explanation of the Cold War GI Bill, Entitled the "Cold War Veterans Readjustment Assistance Act of 1965"

This bill provides readjustment assistance for cold war veterans; i.e., persons who perform active duty in the Armed Forces during the "induction period." As defined by the bill, the "induction period" extends from January 31, 1955 (the termination of Korean conflict readjustment aid) and ends on the date of termination of the compulsory draft law. The present draft law termination date is July 1, 1965. Applicable throughout the bill is a requirement of discharge under conditions other than dishonorable. Readjustment assistance authorized by the cold war bill is similar to that previously afforded to veterans of the Korean conflict.

Educational and vocational training assistance: Eligibility is conditioned upon more than 180 days of active duty or discharge for service-connected disability. Period of education or training (not to exceed 36 months) is calculated by multiplying 1½ times each day of active duty. During educational period veteran receives monthly allowance, as follows: For full-time college training the monthly allowance would be—no dependents, $110; one dependent, $135; more than one dependent, $160. Veteran must begin education or training within 3 years after discharge or enactment of bill, whichever is later; and must complete education within 8 years after discharge or enactment of bill, as case may be. No allowance shall be paid for any period prior to September 1, 1965. Persons enrolled in courses of education on September 1, 1965, would be entitled to allowance from that date, although they could not receive payment until after bill's enactment. All education and training end not more than 10 years after the end of the induction period, except that certain career enlistees have a later termination date determined by the date of their final discharge.

Guaranty and direct loan assistance: Eligibility for guaranty and direct loans is conditioned upon more than 180 days of active duty, or discharge for service-connected disability. Widow of veteran who died of service-connected disability also eligible. Loans are for purpose of purchasing (a) homes, including farm homes, and (b) farm lands, livestock, etc., to be used by veteran in farming operations. Banks or other lenders make loans with Government guaranteeing 60 percent, up to $7,500, on residential real estate, and 50 percent, up to $4,000, on nonresidential real estate. Loans are subject to guaranty fee not to exceed one-half of 1 percent of loan amount, to be used to cover losses on loans. Direct loans not exceeding $13,500 may be made to veterans in certain small towns and rural areas when private capital is not available for guaranty loans. Interest rates and maturities of loans controlled by laws applicable to World War II and Korean veterans, now and in the future. (Under Public Law 86–73, maximum interest rate is 5¼ percent per annum.) Termination date of guaranty and direct loan program is 10 years after end of induction period, except for loans on which VA commitments have been issued before such date.

TAX CREDIT FOR EXPENSES OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to individuals for certain expenses incurred in providing higher education.

This bill is identical to the proposal I offered last year as an amendment to the 1964 tax cut bill. The amendment was narrowly defeated by a 45-to-48 vote. It provides an income tax credit on the first $1,500 of tuition, fees, books, and supplies to anyone who pays these expenses for a student at an institution of higher education. It is cosponsored by Senators Dominick, Allott, Bennett, Boggs, Brewster, Cannon, Case, Dodd, Eastland, Ervin, Fannin, Fong, Gruening, Harris, Hart, Hickenlooper, Jackson, Jordan of Idaho, Long of Missouri, Magnuson, McGovern, Miller, Montoya, Morton, Mundt, Pastore, Prouty, Proxmire, Randolph, Scott, Simpson, Thurmond, and Tower.

The concept of tax relief to ease the burden of the high costs of higher education has been advanced many times in the past. In the past decade over 400 bills have been introduced in this and the other body. In the last Congress alone, 19 bills of this nature were introduced in the Senate and over 100 in the House.

I first proposed tax relief for college expenses 2 years ago in a speech on this floor.

This year we must squarely face the issue of providing tax relief to ease the heavy burden of college costs. It has been discussed for a decade. Now we must decide if, as a nation, we are to treat education costs as we do the interest on a home mortgage, or flood damage, or health expenses.

This proposal is for the average family in America. Their income is made up almost entirely of salary. They work hard to earn that salary, and it is all taxable.

If they pay a $1,000 medical bill, they get some tax relief. If a tornado or a flood causes them $1,000 of damage, they get some tax relief. But when they pay $1,000 a year for 4 years to send their sons and daughters to college, they bear that burden without adequate help from our tax laws.

I believe the time has come to recognize that these average Americans are entitled to a break. When they pay large sums to provide their children or themselves with a college education, they are spending money in the national interest, and it is entirely appropriate for the Nation to ease their burden through the tax laws.

Our tax laws recognize also the importance of investment. Both in 1962 and again last year tax laws were enacted making substantial provision for tax relief when investment was made in new plant and equipment. Investment in our future as a nation—in the education of college students—is just as entitled to a tax credit as investment in a new plant and equipment.

So however we approach it—relief from the burden of a heavy, extraordinary expense or inducement to invest—tax credit for higher education costs is a must.

The bill introduced today was jointly developed last year by the original cosponsors who included Senators BREWSTER, BYRD of West Virginia, CANNON, DODD, DOMINICK, GRUENING, HUMPHREY, Keating, LONG of Missouri, MOSS, PROUTY, RANDOLPH, and SCOTT. It was designed to provide the necessary tax relief to those who need it most. The principal features of the proposal are as follows:

First. The bill provides an income tax credit on $1,500 of tuition, fees, books, and supplies for a student at an institution of higher education. The credit is subtracted from the amount of taxes which are due, at the bottom of the income tax form, after all deductions and exemptions have been taken into account and after the appropriate tax rate has been applied. Thus, each dollar of tax credit is a dollar actually saved by the taxpayer.

Second. The credit is computed as follows: 75 percent of the first $200 of expenses, 25 percent of the next $300, and 10 percent of the next $1,000. For example, expenses of $300 would result in a credit of $175, while expenses of $1,500 would result in a credit of $325.

The sliding scale formula has been adopted to equalize the benefit of the credit with respect to students at private and public colleges. Tuition charges average a much smaller amount at public colleges than at private colleges. On the other hand, the nontuition expenses such as room and board are a much larger percentage of the total college costs at a public college than they are at a private college. The credit does not apply to room and board expenses. Therefore, the fairest way to equalize the benefit between public and private college students is to provide a larger percentage of credit on the first few hundred dollars of tuition expenses.

While the dollar amount of relief would be higher at private colleges, the percentage of relief would be actually greater at State and land-grant institutions. For instance, the median charge for tuition and fees in all public institutions of higher education for 1962–63 was $170. Books and supplies cost an additional $90. A taxpayer sending his son or daughter to such a college would be entitled to a tax credit of $165 or almost 100 percent of the total tuition cost. He would be entitled to a credit of $253 if the student attended a private institution of median cost—or roughly only 40 percent of the total tuition cost at such an institution.

Third. The credit is available to anyone who pays for the tuition expenses—parents, students, or any other person who pays for a student's higher education.

Fourth. There is a limitation on the credit so that it gives less dollar benefit to upper middle income groups and no benefit to high income groups. The credit is reduced by 1 percent of the amount by which the taxpayer's adjusted gross income exceeds $25,000. In other words, for every $5,000 of adjusted gross income above $25,000, the credit is reduced by $50. As a result, the taxpayer earning $40,000 gets less benefit than the taxpayer at the $10,000 or $20,000 level, and the taxpayer at the $57,500 level gets no benefit at all.

The primary purpose of this bill is to ease the heavy financial burden of college costs and thus to help reach the goal of enabling every deserving young man and woman in this country to obtain a college education. It is primarily a tax measure but it aids education too. The financial burdens of high college costs are just as entitled to be eased through tax relief as medical expenses and casualty losses. These college costs hit middle income and lower middle income families with an impact that hurts. The man earning $8,000, $10,000 or $15,000 faces a heavy burden in paying $2,000, $1,000 or even $500 for college costs. And this man is generally not eligible for scholarship or loan funds to aid his son or daughter. For example, under the National Defense Education Act loan program, 71 percent of the families receiving loan funds have incomes below $6,000.

But this bill is not offered as a substitute for any other form of aid to higher education. We need funds for buildings, for scholarships, for loans, for teacher training institutes, for graduate fellowships, and for research. All will help higher education, and I support these programs. But the need for these programs do not in any way lessen the need to ease financial burden of high college costs.

This proposal was criticized last year on a number of counts, often by critics who did not know what it provided. Let us deal with those objections one by one now so that future discussion and debate can be based on fact, not fancy.

First. It is claimed the bill helps the wealthy. The fact is, the $5,000 man gets more benefit than the $30,000 man, and the $60,000 man gets no benefit at all.

Sixty-two percent of the dollar benefit goes to families with incomes between $3,000 and $10,000 who happen to comprise 62 percent of our population; 91 percent of the benefit goes to families below $20,000 of income. This is not a millionaire's bill for one simple reason: the millionaire gets no benefit whatsoever. I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at the end of my remarks a chart showing the dollar benefit distribution under this bill.

Second. It is claimed the bill discriminates against the poor. The fact is the credit operates exactly like all other tax relief provisions of the Internal Revenue Code: It is available only to those who pay a tax. The medical deduction is not used by nontaxpayers, yet who would oppose it on that ground? And who would argue that it discriminates against the very poor? All credits and deductions provide no relief to those who pay no tax. Why then should this one credit be attacked for such a reason? Those in the very low income groups who pay no taxes need a sound program of student aid including scholarships. I am for such a program. It is needed in addition to tax relief for middle-income families. These are not alternatives. They are both necessities.

Third. It is claimed the bill favors the high-tuition colleges; most of which are private colleges. The fact is the bill favors the low-tuition colleges, most of which are public colleges. For instance, the credit on a $200 expense is $150. That is 75 percent. The credit on a $1,000 expense is $275. That is only 27 percent. Even where a college charges no tuition, the expense of fees, books, and supplies invariably totals $200 or more.

Those who claim this proposal favors high-tuition colleges are looking just at the dollar amounts of the credit. It is true that the credit on $1,000 of tuition is more dollars than the credit on $200 of tuition. But that cannot possibly be the test of discrimination or else every credit and deduction in the Internal Revenue Code would be similarly attacked. The investment credit gives far more dollar benefit to the man who buys a $100,000 machine than to the man who buys a $10,000 machine, but who would call that discrimination?

While most credits in the Internal Revenue Code work on a flat percentage basis the credit provided for in this bill has been weighted in favor of the low tuition colleges. This is done by using the sliding scale formula, whereby the greatest percentage of credit is computed on the lowest amount of tuition.

The only sensible way to measure the fairness of a tax relief measure is to see what share of the burden is eased. This credit saves 75 percent of the $200 burden and only 27 percent of the $1,000 burden. So the man with a $200 expense has $50 left to pay, and the man with a $1,000 expense has $730 left to pay. How that result can be said to work against the $200 man is more than I can understand.

This argument about the low tuition colleges has been put forth most vigorously on behalf of the land-grant colleges and the State universities. I strongly suspect that many presidents of these colleges who attacked the bill last year did not realize that it actually favors the low tuition colleges. Even then, I am sure that the parents and students at these colleges and universities favor this bill. And I am sure that many other critics of the proposal have no idea what the costs really are of attending these colleges.

I have prepared a table showing what the dollar benefit of the credit would be on tuition, fees, books, and supplies at most of the State universities and land-grant colleges of America. The tuition and fee figures were supplied by the Office of Education. To these has been added the Office's $90 estimate for books and supplies. I ask unanimous consent to insert this table in the Record at the end of my remarks.

Fourth. It is claimed the tax credit will produce tuition increases. The fact is that tuitions go up whether tax relief is granted or not. Colleges set their charges by the expenses they face, not by what the traffic will bear. But if there are colleges that raise their tuition whenever they find that parents have some extra money, then they will do so whether or not this bill is enacted. For these colleges will know that parents already have extra money because of the rate reductions in last year's tax bill. Finally, the bill provides only a 10-percent credit on expenses over $500, so every added $100 of tuition over $500 results in only a $10 saving to the parent—scarcely an incentive to the college.

Mr. President, in submitting this bill, I want to emphasize that I will once again push for its early consideration and enactment. Tax legislation is sure to be considered this year. Tax credits for the expense of higher education will also be voted on—one way or another. I ask unanimous consent that the bill remain at the desk an additional 5 days in order that others who wish to join as cosponsors might do so.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the Record at this point.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and tables will be printed in the Record and will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Connecticut.

The bill (S. 12) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to individuals for certain expenses incurred in providing higher education, introduced by Mr. Ribicoff, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 12

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) subpart A of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to credits allowable) is amended by renumbering section 39 as 40, and by inserting after section 38 the following new section:

"SEC. 39. EXPENSES OF HIGHER EDUCATION.

"(a) General Rule.—There shall be allowed to an individual, as a credit against the tax imposed by this chapter for the taxable year, an amount, determined under subsection (b), of the expenses of higher education paid by him during the taxable year to one or more institutions of higher education in providing an education above the twelfth grade for himself or for any other individual.

"(b) Limitations.—

"(1) Amount per Individual.—The credit under subsection (a) for expenses of higher education of any individual paid during the taxable year shall be an amount equal to the sum of—

"(A) 75 percent of so much of such expenses as does not exceed $200,

"(B) 25 percent of so much of such expenses as exceeds $200 but does not exceed $500, and

"(C) 10 percent of so much of such expenses as exceeds $500 but does not exceed $1,500.

"(2) Proration of credit where more than one taxpayer pays expenses.—If expenses of higher education of an individual are paid by more than one taxpayer during the taxable year, the credit allowable to each such taxpayer under subsection (a) shall be the same portion of the credit determined under paragraph (1) which the amount of expenses of higher education of such individual paid by the taxpayer during the taxable year is of the total amount of expenses of higher education of such individual paid by all taxpayers during the taxable year.

"(3) Reduction of credit.—The credit under subsection (a) for expenses of higher education of any individual paid during the taxable year, as determined under paragraphs (1) and (2) of this subsection shall be reduced by an amount equal to 1 percent of the amount by which the adjusted gross income of the taxpayer for the taxable year exceeds $25,000.

"(c) Definitions.—For purposes of this section—

"(1) Expenses of higher education.—The term 'expenses of higher education' means—

"(A) tuition and fees required for the enrollment or attendance of a student at a level above the twelfth grade at an institution of higher education, and

"(B) fees, books, supplies, and equipment required for courses of instruction above the twelfth grade at an institution of higher education.

Such term does not include any amount paid, directly or indirectly, for meals, lodging, or similar personal, living, or family expenses. In the event an amount paid for tuition or fees includes an amount for meals, lodging, or similar expenses which is not separately stated, the portion of such amount which is attributable to meals, lodging, or similar expenses shall be determined under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate.

"(2) Institution of higher education.—The term 'institution of higher education' means an educational institution (as defined in section 151(e)(4))—

"(A) which regularly offers education at a level above the twelfth grade, and

"(B) contributions to or for the use of which constitute charitable contributions within the meaning of section 170(c).

"(d) Special Rules.—

"(1) Adjustment for certain scholarships and veterans' benefits.—The amounts otherwise taken into account under subsection (a) as expenses of higher education of any individual during any period shall be reduced (before the application of subsection (b)) by any amounts received by such individual during such period as—

"(A) a scholarship or fellowship grant (within the meaning of section 117(a)(1)) which under section 117 is not includible in gross income, and

"(B) education and training allowance under chapter 33 of title 38 of the United States Code or educational assistance allowance under chapter 35 of such title.

"(2) Noncredit and recreational, etc., courses.—Amounts paid for expenses of higher education of any individual shall be taken into account under subsection (a)—

"(A) in the case of an individual who is a candidate for a baccalaureate or higher degree, only to the extent such expenses are attributable to courses of instruction for which credit is allowed toward a baccalaureate or higher degree, and

"(B) in the case of an individual who is not a candidate for a baccalaureate or higher degree, only to the extent such expenses are attributable to courses of instruction necessary to fulfill requirements for the attainment of a predetermined and identified educational, professional, or vocational objective.

"(3) Application with other credits.—The credit allowed by subsection (a) to the taxpayer shall not exceed the amount of the tax imposed on the taxpayer for the taxable year by this chapter, reduced by the sum of the credits allowable under this subpart (other than under this section and section 31).

"(e) Disallowance of Expenses as Deduction.—No deduction shall be allowed under section 162 (relating to trade or business expenses) for any expense of higher education which (after the application of subsection (b)) is taken into account in determining the amount of any credit allowed under subsection (a). The preceding sentence shall not apply to the expenses of higher education of any taxpayer who, under regulation prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, elects not to apply the provisions of this section with respect to such expenses for the taxable year.

"(f) Regulations.—The Secretary or his delegate shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section."

(b) The table of sections for such subpart A is amended by striking out the last item and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 39. Expenses of higher education.

"Sec. 40. Overpayments of tax."

Sec. 2. The amendments made by this Act shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1964.

Dollar benefit under Ribicoff bill providing tax credit on 1st $1,500 of tuition, fees, books, and supplies at an institution of higher education

	Adjusted gross income up to—							
	$25,000	$30,000	$35,000	$40,000	$45,000	$50,000	$55,000	$60,000
Tuition per student:								
$100	$75	$25	0	0	0	0	0	0
$200	150	100	$50	0	0	0	0	0
$300	175	125	75	$25	0	0	0	0
$400	200	150	100	50	0	0	0	0
$500	225	175	125	75	$25	0	0	0
$600	235	185	135	85	35	0	0	0
$700	245	195	145	95	45	0	0	0
$800	255	205	155	105	55	$5	0	0
$900	265	215	165	115	65	15	0	0
$1,000	275	225	175	125	75	25	0	0
$1,100	285	235	185	135	85	35	0	0
$1,200	295	245	195	145	95	45	0	0
$1,300	305	255	205	155	105	55	$5	0
$1,400	315	265	215	165	115	65	15	0
$1,500	325	275	225	175	125	75	25	0

Dollar benefit of Ribicoff tax credit bill on tuition, fees, and books at State universities and land-grant colleges

	Resident		Nonresident	
	Tuition, fees, and books	Dollar benefit of tax credit	Tuition, fees, and books	Dollar benefit of tax credit
Alabama A. & M. College	$274	$169	$394	$199
Auburn University	315	179	615	237
University of Alabama	350	188	700	245
University of Alaska	328	182	628	238
Arizona State University	320	180	920	267
University of Arizona	297	174	897	265
Arkansas A. & M	270	168	470	218
University of Arkansas	290	173	560	231
University of California	263–314	166–179	863–914	261–274
Colorado State University	330	183	750	266
University of Colorado	370	193	994	250
University of Connecticut	250	163	650	240
Delaware State College	245	161	495	224
Florida A. & M	270	168	620	237
University of Florida	316	179	666	242
Florida State University	316	179	666	242
Fort Valley State College	315	179	615	237
Georgia Institute of Technology	399	200	789	254
University of Georgia	350	188	695	245
University of Hawaii	338	185	338	185
University of Idaho	254	164	564	231
Southern Illinois University	275	169	425	206
University of Illinois	360	190	710	246
Indiana University	390	198	795	255
Purdue University	390	198	940	269
Iowa State	387	197	690	244
University of Iowa	380	195	710	246
Kansas State University	334	184	664	241
University of Kansas	314	179	664	241
Kentucky State College	264	166	414	204
University of Kentucky	310	178	610	236
Louisiana State University	260	165	560	231
University of Maine	490	223	890	264
University of Maryland	396	199	746	250
Maryland State College	271	168	421	205
Massachusetts Institute of Technology	1,790	325	1,790	325
University of Massachusetts	514	226	914	266
Michigan State University	414	204	960	271
University of Michigan	370	193	990	274
Rutgers (New Jersey)	596	235	696	245
New Mexico State University	340	185	590	234
University of New Mexico	390	198	660	241
Cornell University	1,790	325	1,790	325
State University of New York	515–865	227–226	515–1,085	227–284
North Carolina Agricultural and Technical	410	203	660	241
University of North Carolina	375	194	800	255
North Carolina State College	409	202	834	258
North Dakota State University	390	198	660	241
University of North Dakota	390	198	660	241
Kent State (Ohio)	486	222	816	257
Miami University (Ohio)	490	223	890	264
Ohio State University	465	216	960	271
Wayne State University	402	201	840	259
University of Minnesota	405	201	870	262
Alcorn A. & M. (Mississippi)	276	169	476	219
Mississippi State University	361	190	761	251
University of Mississippi	371	193	770	252
Lincoln University (Missouri)	223	156	323	181
University of Missouri	305	176	605	236
Montana State College	420	205	758	251
Montana State University	400	200	738	249
University of Nebraska	354	189	594	234
University of Nevada	351	188	951	270
University of New Hampshire	492	223	1,037	279
Ohio University	540	229	940	269
Langston University (Oklahoma)	274	169	537	229
Oklahoma State University	314	179	666	242
University of Oklahoma	300	175	630	238
Oregon State University	465	216	1,035	279
University of Oregon	420	205	990	274
Pennsylvania State University	615	237	1,140	279
University of Puerto Rico	247	162	1,057	281
University of Rhode Island	415	204	915	267
Clemson College (South Carolina)	546	230	796	255
South Carolina State College	380	195	610	236
South Dakota State College	388	197	526	228
State University of South Dakota	378	195	546	230
University of Tennessee	315	179	615	237
Prairie View A. & M. (Texas)	239	160	539	229
Texas A. & M. University	257	164	557	231
Texas Technical College	242	163	542	229
University of Texas	234	159	534	228
Utah State University	309	177	474	219
University of Utah	390	198	585	234
University of Vermont	581	233	1,365	312
Virginia Polytechnic Institute	420	205	750	250
Virginia State College	430	208	600	235
University of Virginia	467	217	967	273
University of Washington	390	198	690	244
Washington State University	390	198	690	244
West Virginia University	320	180	850	260
University of Wisconsin	390	198	1,090	284
University of Wyoming	386	197	686	244

INTRODUCTION OF BILL TO AMEND THE FEDERAL FIREARMS ACT

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senators BAYH, FONG, MORSE, THURMOND, LAUSCHE, and MCGOVERN, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Federal Firearms Act.

I ask unanimous consent that this bill be left at the desk for 5 days so that other Senators who wish to do so will have an opportunity to join as cosponsors. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be reprinted in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

This bill, S. 14, if enacted into law, would curtail the shipment in interstate commerce and delivery by common carrier of mail-order firearms to juveniles under the age of 18 years and to persons with felony convictions.

It would accomplish this by providing that the potential purchaser of a mail-order gun enclose a notarized affidavit with his purchase order to establish his bona fide age, name, address, felony convictions, and whether he has complied with local State firearms laws.

The affidavit must contain the name and address of the principal local law-enforcement authority in his community. The seller is then required to forward, by registered letter, a copy of the affidavit and a description of the gun to the law-enforcement officer named in the affidavit with return receipt requested.

Mr. President, I believe this bill would bring a reasonable measure of regulation to the vast interstate commerce in firearms now being conducted via the mail-order, common carrier route.

S. 14 is identical to S. 1975, which died in the last Congress without a vote ever being taken on it.

I feel strongly about this legislation, as I know many of my colleagues do. But our concern over the mail-order gun problem and our efforts to do something about it were not enough to get my or any other bill through the Senate during the 88th Congress.

In short, I think the gun interests prevailed in this matter last year. My proposal was killed, as has been every other serious attempt to amend the Federal firearms laws since their enactment.

I want to make it clear now that my amendment was shouted down by an unreasonably and unjustly opposed small, vocal, and well-organized hard-core minority.

This din of opposition began on August 2, 1963, when the bill was first introduced by myself along with Senators ERVIN, BAYH, Kefauver, and FONG. And this opposition was a novel situation considering that the amendment had the prior approval of those concerned with the problem, including the Treasury Department which enforces the law, the National Rifle Association, which represents the Nation's sportsmen, the manufacturers of firearms, the importers of firearms, and others involved in the sale of weapons.

This legislation was neither hastily conceived nor hastily introduced, nor poorly thought out as the public has been led to believe. For almost 3 calendar years, during which time the bill was drawn, those who would be most affected by its adoption were consulted on each provision, at each step on the way, as it were. The result was almost unanimous approval of the amendment when it was introduced on August 2, 1963, almost 4 months prior to the assassination of President Kennedy with a mail-order gun and the subsequent murder of Officer Tippit with a mail-order gun.

The gun interests knew the history of this legislation; but, following President Kennedy's assassination, the gun lobby exploited a cry of "hysteria." There was much flag waving, highly emotional appeals about disarming the law-abiding citizen, constant misinterpretation of the Supreme Court's decisions in this area, and repeated attempts to confuse the issue in the minds of the public. These devices were used in speeches, national and local advertising, public appearances by prominent persons, weasel-worded statements before congressional committees, and personal contacts.

Altogether the Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency has intensively investigated this problem for more than 4 years.

During the extensive hearings we held prior to the introduction of the original bill, we documented, conclusively, I believe, the existence of a mail-order firearms problem in the United States and the need for remedial legislation.

I would like to cite only a few of the many startling facts that we uncovered.

We found that mail-order firearms were being consigned to juveniles and criminals in the city of Pittsburgh in contravention of the Uniform Firearms Act provisions of the laws of the State of Pennsylvania.

We found that hardened felons had ordered and received mail-order firearms in Los Angeles which were subsequently used in the commission of armed robberies.

We found that the Sullivan law of the State of New York was being circumvented by the shipment into that State of mail order firearms consigned to felons.

We found that 25 percent of the mail order firearms which were shipped into the District of Columbia were consigned to persons with criminal records.

We found that virtually no effective control over the interstate traffic in firearms exists today.

And we found that responsible Federal, State, and local officials recommend and strongly support Federal legislation which would place the necessary controls over this traffic in firearms.

It was evident to me and a majority of this subcommittee that remedial legislation was not only prudent, but vital if the flow of firearms interstate were to be curtailed.

To insure that legislation would be developed which would not unduly restrict the rights of the law-abiding citizen to own and possess firearms, I sought and received the counsel of the domestic firearms industry and the sporting fraternity.

A series of conferences were held in the Senate Office Building attended by representatives of the firearms industry, gun clubs, the appropriate Federal executive agencies, and the subcommittee staff, to draft a bill which in the opinion of those concerned would effect positive results but which would not infringe the liberties of responsible citizens.

This, I believe, was accomplished and the bill was introduced.

S. 1975 was referred to the Senate Commerce Committee. However, no action was scheduled until the tragic assassination of President Kennedy with a mail order rifle in Dallas.

An outraged citizenry was stunned by the ease with which the assassin purchased and received his firearm. My mail overwhelmingly reflected this.

With public attention thus focused on the problem, public hearings were scheduled by the Commerce Committee and were held in December of 1963, and January and March of 1964.

I testified to the need for Federal legislation before the Commerce Committee on December 13, and appeared again in March 1964 to clarify misconceptions and distortions which were published concerning the provisions of my bill.

On August 11, 1964, the bill died when the Senate Commerce Committee adjourned without voting on it.

Mr. President, I continue to believe in this bill. Independent polls have shown that more than 70 percent of the American public favors more control over mail order firearms and the great majority of the editorials and articles that have been written on the mail order gun problem support my proposal.

And I mean to see to it that this time S. 14 does not fall victim of the same forces that brought about the demise of the bill in the last Congress.

The FBI uniform crime statistics, released in July 1964 for the year 1963, are perhaps the best attestation to the seriousness of the continuing and growing misuse of firearms in this country.

There were 8,500 willful killings during 1963. Firearms were used in 56 percent of all murders.

The FBI report concludes:

> The easy accessibility of firearms and the lethal nature of the gun are clearly apparent in these murder figures. When assaults by type of weapon are examined, a gun proves to be seven times more deadly than all other weapons combined.

The most recent FBI figures indicates that for the first 9 months of 1964, there was a 10 percent increase in murders committed in this country compared to the same period in 1963.

When we consider the fact that mail order sales account for one-half of the total guns sold; that criminals in cities with tight gun laws avail themselves of mail order guns; and that juvenile delinquents are prime users of mail order guns, we can appreciate the important effects these sales have on these FBI statistics.

The subcommittee's continuing investigation reveals there is still a serious mail order firearm problem throughout the Nation. For example, we found that over a recent 3-year period, just two Los Angeles firms sent 4,069 firearms to consignees in Chicago. Subcommittee investigators with the help of the Chicago police found that 25 percent of these consignees had criminal records in that city.

A person must have a permit to purchase a gun in Chicago, yet 95 percent of these people did not have permits. And that is the point of this bill in a nutshell.

It would guarantee that a person did not buy a gun through the mails in contravention of local laws. Without this bill, the police of Chicago and other cities across the land are virtually powerless to stop the flow of guns across State and city borders.

There is no doubt that the mail order firearm problem will not be resolved until the Federal Government enacts the necessary remedial legislation.

I hope that this bill will receive prompt consideration in the Senate Commerce Committee and on the floor of the Senate. Each day of added delay is costing human lives.

The **PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record, and held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from Connecticut.

The bill (S. 14) to amend the Federal Firearms Act, introduced by Mr. Dodd (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first section of the Federal Firearms Act (52 Stat. 1250) is amended to read as follows:

"That as used in this Act—

"(1) The term 'person' includes an individual, partnership, association, or corporation.

"(2) The term 'interstate or foreign commerce' means commerce between any State or possession (not including the Canal Zone), or the District of Columbia, and any place outside thereof; or between points within the same State or possession (not including the Canal Zone), or the District of Columbia, but through any place outside thereof; or within any possession or the District of Columbia. The term 'State' shall be held to include the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and the District of Columbia.

"(3) The term 'firearm' means any weapon, by whatsoever name known, which will, or is designed to, or which may be readily converted to, expel a projectile or projectiles by the action of an explosive, the frame or receiver of any such weapon, or any firearm muffler or firearm silencer.

"(4) The term 'manufacturer' means any person engaged in the manufacture or importation of firearms for purposes of sale or distribution; and the term 'licensed manufacturer' means any such person licensed under the provisions of this Act.

"(5) The term 'dealer' means (a) any person engaged in the business of selling firearms at wholesale or retail; (b) any person engaged in the business of repairing such firearms or of manufacturing or fitting special barrels, stocks, or trigger mechanisms to firearms, or (c) any person who is a pawnbroker. The term 'licensed dealer' means any dealer who is licensed under the provisions of this Act.

"(6) The term 'fugitive from justice' means any person who has fled from any State, the District of Columbia, or possession of the United States, (a) to avoid prosecution for a crime punishable by imprisonment for a term exceeding one year; or (b) to avoid giving testimony in any criminal proceeding.

"(7) The term 'pawnbroker' means any person whose business or occupation includes the taking or receiving, by way of pledge or pawn, of any firearm as security for the repayment of money loaned thereon.

"(8) The term 'Secretary' or 'Secretary of the Treasury' means the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate.

"(9) The term 'indictment' includes an indictment or an information in any court of the United States, the several States, possessions, or the District of Columbia under which a crime punishable by imprisonment for a term exceeding one year may be prosecuted.

"(10) The term 'crime punishable by imprisonment for a term exceeding one year' shall not include any Federal or State offenses pertaining to antitrust violations, unfair trade practices, restraints of trade, or other similar offenses relating to the regulation of business practices as the Secretary may by regulation designate."

Sec. 2. (a) Subsections (a), (b), (d), (e), (g), and (h) of section 2 of the Federal Firearms Act are amended by striking out the words "or ammunition" wherever they appear.

(b) Subsection (d) of section 2 of said Act is amended by striking out the word "Territories".

(c) Subsection (f) of section 2 of said Act is amended to read as follows:

"(f) It shall be unlawful for any person who is under indictment or who has been convicted by any court of a crime punishable by imprisonment for a term exceeding one year, or who is a fugitive from justice, to receive any firearm which has been shipped or transported in interstate or foreign commerce."

(d) Subsection (i) of section 2 of said Act is amended by striking out the words, "and the possession of any such firearm shall be presumptive evidence that such firearm was transported, shipped, or received, as the case may be, by the possessor in violation of this Act."

(e) Section 2 of said Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(j) It shall be unlawful for any manufacturer or dealer knowingly to deliver, or cause to be delivered, to any common or contract carrier for transportation or shipment in interstate or foreign commerce, to persons other than licensed dealers or manufacturers, any package or other container in which there is any firearm without written notice to the carrier that a firearm is being transported or shipped.

"(k) It shall be unlawful for any common or contract carrier to deliver, or cause to be delivered, in interstate or foreign commerce any firearm to any person with knowledge or with reasonable cause to believe that such person is under eighteen years of age.

"(l) It shall be unlawful for any manufacturer or dealer to ship, or cause to be shipped, any firearm in interstate or foreign commerce to any person (other than to a licensed manufacturer or to a licensed dealer, or to a person exhibiting a State license as prescribed in subsection (c) of this section, or for exportation to a foreign country) unless the person to whom such firearm is to be shipped has submitted to such manufacturer or dealer a sworn statement, in duplicate, in such form and manner as the Secretary shall by regulations prescribe, attested to by a notary public, to the effect that (1) such person is eighteen years or more of age, (2) he is not a person prohibited by this Act from receiving a firearm in interstate or foreign commerce, (3) there are no provisions of law, regulations, or ordinances applicable to the locality to which the firearm will be shipped which would be violated by such person's receipt or possession of the firearm, and (4) that (Title ------ ------, Name ------, and Official Address ------) (blanks to be filled in with the title, true name, and address) are the true name and address of the principal law enforcement officer of the locality to which the firearm will be shipped. It shall be unlawful unless such manufacturer or dealer has, prior to the shipment of such firearm, forwarded by United States registered mail (return receipt requested) to the local law enforcement officer named in the sworn statement, the description (including (1) manufacturer thereof, (2) the caliber or gauge, (3) the model and type of firearm but not including serial number identification) of the firearm to be shipped, and one copy of the sworn statement, and has received a return receipt evidencing delivery of the registered letter or such registered letter has been returned to the manufacturer or dealer due to the refusal of the named law enforcement officer to accept such letter as evidenced in accordance with U.S. Post Office Department regulations. It shall be unlawful for any person to cause to be transmitted by United States mail, or to cause to be transmitted in interstate commerce, such a sworn statement which contains any false statement as to any material fact for the purpose of obtaining a firearm from a licensed manufacturer or a licensed dealer.

"This subsection shall not apply in the case of any firearm shipped to a licensed manufacturer or dealer for authorized service and which is being returned to the sender by the manufacturer or dealer and the records of the manufacturer or dealer shall properly show such information."

Sec. 3. Section 3 of the Federal Firearms Act is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 3. (a) Any manufacturer or dealer desiring a license to transport, ship, or receive firearms in interstate or foreign commerce shall file an application for such license with the Secretary, in such form and containing such information as the Secretary shall by regulation prescribe. Each such applicant shall be required to pay a fee for obtaining such license as follows:

"(1) If a manufacturer of firearms, a fee of $50 per annum;

"(2) If a dealer (other than a pawnbroker) in firearms, a fee of $10 per annum; or

"(3) If a pawnbroker, a fee of $50 per annum.

"(b) Upon filing by a qualified applicant of a proper application and the payment of the prescribed fee, the Secretary shall issue to such applicant the license applied for, which shall, subject to the provisions of this Act, entitle the licensee to transport, ship, and receive firearms in interstate or foreign commerce during the period stated in the license. Except that, no license shall be issued pursuant to this Act (1) to any applicant who is under twenty-one years of age; or (2) to any applicant, if the applicant (including, in the case of a corporation, partnership, or association, any individual possessing directly or indirectly, the power to direct or cause the direction of the management and policies of the corporation, partnership, or association) is prohibited by the provisions of this Act from transporting, shipping, or receiving firearms in interstate or foreign commerce.

"(c) The provisions of section 2 (d), (e), and (f) of this Act shall not apply in the case of a licensed manufacturer or licensed dealer who is under indictment for a crime punishable by imprisonment for a term exceeding one year, provided that such manufacturer or dealer gives notice to the Secretary by registered or certified mail of his indictment within thirty days of the date of the indictment. A licensed manufacturer or licensed dealer who has given notice of his indictment to the Secretary, as provided in this subsection, may continue operations pursuant to his existing license during the term of such indictment, and until any conviction pursuant to the indictment becomes final, whereupon he shall be fully subject to all provisions of this Act and operations pursuant to such license shall be discontinued.

"(d) Each licensed manufacturer and licensed dealer shall maintain such permanent records of production, importation, shipment, and other disposal of firearms as the Secretary may by regulation prescribe."

SEC. 4. Section 4 of the Federal Firearms Act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 4. (a) The provisions of this Act shall not apply with respect to the transportation, shipment, receipt, or importation of any firearms sold or shipped to, or issued for the use of (1) the United States or any department, independent establishment, or agency thereof; (2) any State, or possession, or the District of Columbia, or any department, independent establishment, agency, or any political subdivision thereof; (3) any duly commissioned officer or agent of the United States, a State, or possession or the District of Columbia, or any political subdivision thereof; (4) to any bank, public carrier, express, or armored-truck company organized and operating in good faith for the transportation of money and valuables, which is granted an exemption by the Secretary; (5) to any research laboratory designated as such by the Secretary; or (6) to the transportation, shipment, or receipt of antique or unserviceable firearms (other than a 'firearm' as defined in section 5848(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954) possessed and held as a curio or museum piece.

"(b) Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to prevent shipments of firearms to institutions, organizations, or persons to whom firearms may be lawfully delivered by the Secretary of Defense or his delegate, nor to prevent the receipt or transportation of such firearms by their lawful possessors while they are engaged in military training or in competitions."

SEC. 5. (a) Subsection (b) of section 5 of the Federal Firearms Act is amended by striking out the words "or ammunition."

(b) Subsection (b) of section 5 of said Act is further amended by striking out the words "title 26" where they first appear and inserting in lieu thereof the words "the Internal Revenue Code of 1954", and by striking out the words "section 2733 of title 26" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "section 5848 of said Code."

SEC. 6. The amendments made by this Act shall become effective on the first day of the second month beginning after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 7. The Federal Firearms Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 10. Nothing in this Act shall be construed as modifying or affecting the requirements of section 414 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, with respect to the manufacture, exportation, and importation of arms, ammunition, and implements of war."

INCREASE TO $2,400 OUTSIDE EARNINGS UNDER SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I am introducing legislation today that would increase the amount of money social security beneficiaries can earn before suffering deductions.

Under the present law persons receiving benefits do not suffer deductions for the first $1,200 which they earn. But they then lose $1 for every $2 earned up to $1,700 and $1 for every dollar earned thereafter.

I have long felt this system of deductions to be both unfair and inadequate. It robs many of our citizens of the initiative to better their own circumstances, as well as working a hardship on those who must because of illness or other reasons augment their social security benefits. That is why I am introducing legislation to strengthen our social security system by helping those who have paid money into it and who are now dependent upon it.

My bill would amend the Social Security Act to increase to $2,400 the annual amount individuals are permitted to earn without suffering deductions from their social security benefits.

This legislation conforms with a pledge I made to the people of Pennsylvania last fall, and I am urging its early consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 15) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase to $2,400 the annual amount individuals are permitted to earn without suffering deduction from the monthly insurance benefits payable to them under such title, introduced by Mr. SCOTT, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

ASSATEAGUE ISLAND NATIONAL SEASHORE

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I introduce for myself, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. METCALF, Mr. MONTOYA, Mr. MOSS, Mr. SCOTT, and Mr. TYDINGS a bill to provide for the establishment of the Assateague Island National Seashore in the States of Maryland and Virginia. This is to be a joint Federal-State venture.

The purpose of this bill is to provide for the development of Assateague Island and certain adjacent waters and small marsh islands for public outdoor recreation. It would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire lands, waters, and other property, and to administer these for the general purposes of public outdoor recreation and conservation. The natural features of the island would be retained for the benefit of the public.

Assateague Island is a low, narrow, undeveloped barrier reef approximately 32 miles in length, lying parallel to the coasts of Maryland and Virginia, separated from the mainland of these States by Sinepuxent and Chincoteague Bays.

But Assateague Island is more than this—it is the largest remaining undeveloped seashore between Cape Cod and Cape Hatteras. It is one of the very few remaining such areas in this country. Within a 250 mile radius of Assateague is to be found one-fifth of the population of the United States—about 33½ million people. Almost one-fourth of this number live within a 3-hour drive of the island.

Thus, Assateague Island represents one of our last opportunities to acquire a sizable seashore for public benefit.

Mr. President, these are the simple geographic facts which motivate my introduction of this legislation. There are, however, additional factors which have influenced my decision on this matter, and which deserve to be made a part of the public record at this time.

For almost three decades, the outstanding recreational values of Assateague Island have been recognized. A 1935 survey of the National Park Service included Assateague as one of the 12 areas along the Atlantic coast to be preserved for public use and enjoyment. In 1943, the Virginia portion of the island was acquired by the Federal Government, and established as the Chincoteague National Wildlife Refuge.

In 1955, the National Park Service made a restudy of the Atlantic coast, but made no recommendations with respect to Assateague Island because, at that time, the 14 miles of the island immediately north of the Virginia line were being extensively subdivided by private developers, and it appeared that the opportunity to preserve the natural and untapped recreational resources of the island for the public had been lost.

In 1961, the Maryland General Assembly authorized the State roads commission to construct a bridge connecting Assateague Island with the mainland of Worcester County. The State subsequently acquired 640 acres with 2 miles of ocean frontage for development as a State park, and declared its intention to acquire the remaining 7 miles of the island to the north for similar development.

Tidal storms of 1962–63 focused increased attention on Assateague Island, and pointed up the urgent need for beach-front stabilization and other protective work if the barrier reef was to be preserved in any form for development purposes.

In June of 1962, Maryland Governor Tawes and Interior Secretary Udall agreed to a joint study for purposes of determining the most feasible future utilization of the superb recreational opportunities offered by Assateague Island.

The following spring, the newly created Bureau of Outdoor Recreation published its report recommending the acquisition of Assateague Island for public recreational use. At the same time, contracts were let and construction began on the bridge. The cost of the bridge was to be borne jointly by Worcester County and the State of Maryland.

Since the filing of the report by the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, intensive study of the proposals embodied in this report, and endorsed by the Secretary of the Interior, has been carried on by the appropriate agencies of the State government. In addition to these studies, public hearings have been held to permit all interested parties to be heard. Innumerable meetings have taken place between representatives of private property owners on Assateague Island, officials of Worcester County, State officials, and representatives of the Department of the Interior. These meetings have included several inspection tours of the island itself.

In 1963, the Maryland Department of Forests and Parks, under the able leadership of its chairman, Mr. S. L. Hammerman, recommended public development of the island. Similar recommendations have been made by the Maryland Economic Development Commission and the Maryland State Department of Planning. Yesterday, the Maryland Board of Public Works, the State's highest authority in this field, unanimously approved the concept of public development of Assateague Island.

That the various State boards, agencies, and officials have concurred in their approval of a plan for Assateague Island which embodies public development jointly by the State and the Federal Governments is a tribute to their foresight in these matters.

The studies which I have made of the reports issued by the Department of the Interior, the agencies of the State of Maryland, and the Worcester County Commissioners, including the pertinent engineering analysis, have convinced me that the future of this island demands exclusive public development.

Wise conservation and development of our natural resources today will return vast dividends tomorrow. Each failure to act now is an opportunity lost forever. The task of preserving our natural resources becomes more acute each day. To conserve and preserve what is left, and to reclaim some of what has been lost, is an obligation which we owe to ourselves and to future generations. We must continually bear in mind that we are only trustees of a rich and bounteous heritage found in the natural resources of our land.

The rapid rate of our population expansion makes it imperative that we act now to preserve for the residents of our cities, our suburbs, and our towns the recreation areas which will enrich the lives of their inhabitants.

Many of the challenges in the development of adequate recreational facilities are best met at the State and local level. Maryland officials are to be congratulated for their continuing efforts in this regard—efforts which, in the case of Assateague Island, have already brought about the acquisition of parts of that island for State park purposes, and the letter of contracts for bridge construction.

Only through further public development can we hope to preserve what is a precious possession not only of Worcester County but of the Nation. Only through public development will the necessary Federal funds and techniques be available for beach stabilization and protection. Only through public development can we hope to provide the large metropolitan area between Philadelphia and Washington with an unparalleled recreational opportunity. Only through public development can Maryland take advantage of the unrivaled publicity and promotional facilities of the Department of the Interior—facilities which have increased the number of visitors to the Hatteras National Seashore, with no nearby metropolitan area, by 500 percent in a period of 10 years; facilities which can be expected to bring 3 million visitors a year to the Assateague National Seashore by 1975. Only through public development can we expect to provide for the greatest economic benefit to Worcester County and to Maryland from this, one of its most valuable assets.

A national seashore at Assateague will serve as a magnet for visitors which will increase each year. In view of the plans of the Department of the Interior for only minimum facilities on the island itself, the areas adjacent to the island will acquire an enormous potential for private development and growth. With this in mind, it is not too early for the citizens and officials of Worcester County, with the assistance of the State, to begin the preparation of a master plan for the development of facilities along the bay side of the county to service the island.

Mr. President, convinced of the importance of conserving for all time and for all people the unique natural features of Assateague Island, and for the many other reasons cited above, I lay before the Senate today a proposal which would place the entire 32 miles of the island in public ownership, and would make possible the comprehensive planning and development of this magnificent beach through joint State and Federal action.

Under this proposal, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to acquire land, water, and other property within the boundaries of the seashore by donation, purchase, or exchange, or in such other manner as he shall find to be in the public interest, except that any property or interest owned by the States of Maryland or Virginia shall be acquired only with the concurrence of these States.

Mr. President, I want to take this opportunity to assure all Assateague Island property owners that every effort will be made to bring about negotiated settlements of land transfers, and that every property owner will be justly compensated.

Owners of improved property acquired by the Secretary may reserve a right of use and occupancy of the improved property for noncommercial purposes for a term of 25 years.

The Secretary is authorized and directed to compensate the State of Maryland in the amount of two-thirds of the cost of the bridge and its approaches, presently uncompleted, between Sandy Point and Assateague, and to pay a reasonable share of the cost of operation and maintenance of this bridge and its approaches. The State has agreed to reimburse Worcester County for the full share of its investment in the bridge construction and I have been advised by the Governor that the funds for this reimbursement will be included as part of the program he will present to the Maryland General Assembly later this month.

Since my introduction of the original legislation in September 1963, conferences with other members of the Maryland delegation, with representatives of Worcester County, and with the Department of the Interior have resulted in an amendment to the original bill. This amendment, which is included in the new bill as section 7, provides for selection of 600 acres of suitably elevated land for the construction by private interests of suitable overnight and other public accommodations for visitors to the seashore. These facilities will be subject to taxation by the State and by Worcester County. These facilities, those which are certain to be constructed on the adjacent mainland near the bridge terminus, and the anticipated influx of visitors from across the Nation, will surely mean an unprecedented increase in economic activity and tax revenues for Worcester County.

The State of Maryland shall continue to own the area presently designated as a State park, and shall have the right to acquire from the Department of the Interior any additional area of the island northward from the State park as the State may from time to time determine to be needed for State park purposes.

The Secretary of the Interior will administer the Assateague Island National Seashore for general purposes of public outdoor recreation, including conservation of natural features contributing to public enjoyment. The seashore will furnish unlimited opportunities for hunting, fishing, swimming, and boating, and the park will be open to the public at all times.

Mr. President, I introduced this bill in the 1st session of the 88th Congress. In spite of a crowded committee calendar, and the marathon debates which characterized the 88th, I received the utmost cooperation from my colleague, Senator BIBLE. As chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Public Lands, the distinguished Senator from Nevada has performed a magnificent service to future generations of Americans through his careful protection of the great natural beauty of our country.

Through the cooperation of the chairman, the Assateague Island National Seashore proposal received a preliminary hearing on August 11, 1964. At that time, an early resumption of hearings was promised. Recent events have made immediate committee action essential if this great national resource is to be preserved for public enjoyment.

Private commercial developers have been pressing the State very hard for construction permits. The State, which is firmly behind Federal acquisition, has refused to grant the permits based on its ownership of State park land and the failure of developers to provide adequate sanitation plans. In an initial court test, the failure to grant permits has been reversed, and the State has appealed to Maryland's supreme judicial body. Permits will not be granted pending the outcome of this appeal.

The Maryland Court of Appeals is expected to rule early in 1965, perhaps as early as February or March. If the opinion of the lower court is sustained, there is little likelihood that private development can be forestalled. The millions of people living in Baltimore, Washington, Wilmington, and Philadelphia, and those additional millions who will visit the seashore annually, will have been deprived of an unprecedented recreational opportunity.

I hope the Congress can act in time.

Mr. President, I ask that this bill be allowed to lie on the table until the close of business on January 13 so as to give other Senators an opportunity to join as cosponsors.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 20) to provide for the establishment of the Assateague Island National Seashore in the States of Maryland and Virginia, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. BREWSTER (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION RELATING TO WATER RESOURCES

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I am today introducing four bills in regard to water resources for myself and a number of cosponsors which constitute a rather broad research and planning program in that field. Three of the bills might be described as unfinished business from the 88th Congress, for they were before us last year. Two of the three have been passed by the Senate.

The four bills are the river basin planning bill; a measure to enact title II of the Water Resources Research Act as it was adopted in the last Congress by the Senate but modified in conference; a measure to speed our program of weather modification research, experimentation and testing; and an amendment to the Saline Water Act.

I request that all these bills lie on the desk the remainder of this week to permit Senators who wish to join as cosponsors to do so.

The river basin planning bill, Mr. President, is S. 1111 of the 88th Congress as it was reported favorably to the House of Representatives by the House Interior Committee. It was slightly modified from the Senate version by the House committee to insure the orderly functioning of the river basin planning commissions. The amendments are acceptable. I understand the House committee chairman expects to take the measure up soon and hopes to report it to the House again at an early date. Inasmuch as it has once been approved by the Senate, I hope it will also be handled here without delay.

The planning bill accomplishes three things. It provides for a Federal Water Council composed of the Secretaries of Interior, Army, Agriculture, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission. This Council has been functioning on an ad hoc basis for 4 years. The bill also authorizes the establishment of Federal-State river basin planning commissions where and when half the States involved and the Council agree that a commission is desirable. Finally, it authorizes the appropriation of $5 million annually for 10 years to assist State governments in planning for both intrastate and interstate waters.

The planning bill has the vigorous support of the Interstate Conference on Water Problems of the Council of State Governments, and many other groups.

The second bill I have introduced, to amend the Water Resources Research Act, restores the language of title II as we passed it in 1963 in this body.

Title II originally authorized the appropriation of $5 million increasing $1 million each year for 5 years to $10 million annually, for the Secretary of the Interior to use to make matching agreements, contracts, grants, or other arrangements with any colleges, universities, private institutes, foundations, or firms or individuals with competence to undertake needed research on water problems.

The House of Representatives eliminated title II entirely from the bill. It agreed in conference to restore an authorization of $1 million each year for 10 years, subject to a preappropriation submission to Congress of research projects proposed to be undertaken with the funds. The President has objected to the proviso. Response to the act has indicated that the sums originally authorized can be fruitfully invested in research in this important area. Many of us feel that we should adopt the program as it was originally proposed.

Resolutions calling for amendment of the bill as I am now proposing have been passed by the Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges, by the Interstate Conference on Water Problems of the Council of State Governments, by a group of colleges and universities in the New England area which conferred on water problems at Cornell University in New York in September, and by a group of foundations and research institutes, including Stanford Research Institute of California and the Illinois Institute of Technology—formerly the Armour Foundation—which met in December at the Brookings Institution here.

The response to the Water Resources Research Act has been very great. The bill as enacted authorized a basic grant to one college or university in each State to help finance a water resources research institute or center, plus matching funds for specific research projects. I am advised that 43 States have already filed applications for their basic grants and that the other 7 have advised the Office of Water Research that they will do so shortly.

The bill was patterned very closely after the Hatch Act of 1887 which established the Agriculture Experiment Stations. That act provided basic grants to each State, then matching funds. In the first year of the Hatch Act, nine States qualified. It was 6 years before all had qualified. We may very well have all 50 of our States qualified for water research work in the first year of operation under S. 2 of the 88th Congress.

In addition to the title I response, I am told that more than 30 research projects have been submitted for assistance under title II. This has been done in spite of the administration's reluctance to implement the title II program until it has been amended.

This response to the act, Mr. President, is proof of nationwide concern with water problems, of a recognition of their importance by our institutions of higher education, and of their willingness to assign some of their most competent personnel to research in the field and to the training of more hydroscientists, who are urgently needed.

The Senate can take a good deal of pride in this Senate-originated measure, and in other water legislation recently enacted and in the process of enactment. These bills stem from the work of the Senate Select Committee on Water Resources, which was proposed by Senator MIKE MANSFIELD in 1959, and chaired by the late Senator Robert S. Kerr, of Oklahoma. The select committee did an outstanding job, giving this body, and the Nation, a much needed understanding of the critical nature of our water problems, and the broad outlines of steps necessary for their solution.

The third bill which I am submitting is intended to speed up work on weather modification, and to provide for increased experimentation and field testing of weather modification procedures.

The Senate select committee, in making the Nation's first assessment or inventory of supply and requirements for water by regions, found that five major river basins in the Southwest and the upper Missouri basin would be making full use of all water available to them by 1980. By the year 2000, three additional areas, including the western Great Lakes region, will be at the end of their supply.

The problem of these areas is an additional quantity of water for all uses, to support economic growth.

Throughout the East, and especially in the great industrial area from New England south to Norfolk and then stretching in a band west to Sioux Falls, S. Dak., and Kansas City, quantity is not so great a problem as quality. There is a growing stringency for unpolluted, usable water supplies. A great deal of storage is going to have to be built in the East to store municipal water and to augment minimum flows for waste dilution.

Increased precipitation, either as rainfall or snowfall, will prove as helpful to the East in meeting dilution flow requirements within the next few years as to the arid Western States. Acceleration of weather modification studies, as proposed in the bill I am offering, is consequently of national interest. I hope it will not be regarded as a sectional matter.

We have two situations in the West which make weather modification experimentation there appropriate, in addition to our urgent need for water. There are large, sparsely settled or unsettled areas where experiments can be run with minimum danger of damage. We also have some fully developed river systems where reservoirs can catch and store all runoff waters regardless of when and where the precipitation occurs within the basins.

It is no longer necessary to make water fall on a specific farm or ranch at a specific time to give value to weather modification. With basinwide reservoir systems, clouds can be "milked" anytime they occur and the water stored. It is now obvious that within a generation or two we are going to have full development and control of most of the major river systems in the Nation. What we can develop now in the weather modification field will be of value throughout the Nation, and even the world, in a very few years.

Under the circumstances, the relatively small authorization proposed in this accelerated weather modification proposal is both timely and modest.

The last of the four measures I am offering is an amendment to the Saline Water Act.

For centuries men have tried to find a cheap way to make fresh water from the ocean. Shortage of pure water in arid areas, and periodic droughts have resulted in as serious disasters to the human race as has too much water in other instances.

With our increasing population, the seasons of drought, and the pollution of many of our water sources becoming a more serious problem as the years passed, President Truman in 1949 recognized that we had been doing too little to develop ways and means of desalting sea and brackish water. He recommended to the Congress that legislation be passed to provide a program of research and demonstration of practical means for producing from sea or other saline waters, water suitable for beneficial consumptive use. The President had in mind a broad program, and visualized such a program as the only means by which early results could be obtained.

On the basis of President Truman's recommendation a bill was introduced in the House by Representative Clinton D. McKinnon, Democrat, of San Diego, Calif., and one by the late Senator O'Mahoney of Wyoming early in the 81st Congress. Hearings were conducted and a great deal of work was done on this legislation but the legislation died at the end of the 81st Congress.

Similar legislation was reintroduced in the 82d Congress by Senator O'Mahoney and the late Senator Engle, then Congressman from California. I conducted hearings in the Senate beginning March 15, 1951. The legislation was supported by the Department of the Interior. The Senate bill 5 was reported to the Senate and the Engle bill was passed by the House. When the House bill came to the Senate the language of S. 5 was substituted and the House bill approved and became Public Law 448 on July 3, 1952.

The President had recommended $25 million for the program; however, the Congress chose to proceed more cautiously and approved only $2 million for a 6-year program; $175,000 of this was authorized for the fiscal year 1953.

Although this legislation was not what we hoped for, it was a beginning and in 1955 the Congress increased the authorization to $10 million and extended the program from 6 to 14 years.

Three years elapsed during which it became obvious that private industry had perfected techniques and equipment for converting saline and brackish water which gave promise of meeting, at an early date, the goals of the saline water program.

The Department of the Interior, now under a different management, seemed reluctant to move promptly to demonstrate processes that it had not generated from its own research, and there was no evidence of an energetic demonstration program being carried out by the Department of Interior.

Therefore, in 1958, after nearly a year of preparation, I introduced Senate Joint Resolution 135, "To provide for a full-scale demonstration plant for production from sea or other saline waters, of water suitable for agricultural, industrial, municipal, and other beneficial consumptive uses." This resolution authorized $10 million for the construction of a full-scale plant. I stated at the introduction of this bill that we hoped to do in the saline water program what we had done in the atomic energy program, and that is to demonstrate in an actual production test knowledge and equipment which had resulted to date from research, both public and private, into techniques of desalting water.

The task of getting this legislation finally approved was long and arduous. There was opposition from the Department of Interior. Those connected with the program wanted to hold the program to the former type of research program and limit the size of plants to the degree that they would not be able to demonstrate on a large scale. After hearings and considerable work, the opposition of the Department of Interior to the demonstration idea was overcome. After being amended to provide for five demonstration plants, the bill was finally signed on September 2, 1958 and became Public Law 85–883.

This legislation did not end the research program but in effect it divided the overall saline water program into two parts: First, a research and development program, authorized by the act of July 3, 1952, and broadened by Public Law 84–111 in 1955; and second a demonstration plant program designed to produce the concrete results designed from the beginning.

Interest in the saline water program continued to spread throughout the United States and several foreign nations. In the 87th Congress, I sponsored a bill to provide for additional research and development in the saline water field. This included economic studies, studies of methods and uses of byproducts, development of plant processes and designs and annual reports with recommendations for location and operation of new demonstration plants. The law, as finally passed provided $75 million for this program during the years 1962 through 1967. This was sponsored in the House by Congressman Aspinall. The Senate proposed $100 million for this program and the House $50 million and the final act was a compromise between the House and Senate.

Some fine progress has been made with this program, but now we are ready to go on to bigger plants. The President has expressed a keen interest and strong support for this program and I understand that there will be some budget increase for the work. The Department of Interior has signed contracts for studies of conceptual designs for combination water desalting and power generating plants which would turn out 50 million gallons of fresh water per day. Even though we have made some fine progress there remain a great many problems and especially when we begin to move to plants that will produce 50 to 100 million gallons of fresh water per day. We are not sure what we will run into in these large plants in connection with such problems as heat exchanges, cost of pumping, pressures, and heavy scaling. These are mostly engineering problems but they must be solved and it will take additional money and time to build larger plants and work on these problems. I do not believe that we have any time to lose because the water shortages exist today.

The bill that I am introducing today will amend the Saline Water Act of September 22, 1961, in order to permit the acceleration of the saline water conversion program.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bills will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from New Mexico.

The bills were received, read twice by their titles, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself, Mr. Hart, Mr. Eastland, Mr. Kuchel, Mr. Metcalf, and Mr. Moss):

S. 21. A bill to provide for the optimum development of the Nation's natural resources through the coordinated planning of water and related land resources, through the establishment of a water resources council and river basin commissions, and by providing financial assistance to the States in order to increase State participation in such planning; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself, Mr. McGovern, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Kuchel, Mr. Metcalf, Mr. Hart, Mr. Gruening, Mr. Burdick, Mr. McGee, Mr. Morse, Mr. Carlson, Mr. Mansfield, Mr. Yarborough, Mr. Long of Missouri, Mr. Bayh, Mr. Bartlett, and Mr. Moss):

S. 22. A bill to promote a more adequate national program of water research; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Bible, Mr. Cannon, Mr. Kuchel, Mr. McGee, and Mr. McGovern):

S. 23. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a program in five areas of the United States to increase usable precipitation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 24. A bill to expand, extend, and accelerate the saline water conversion program conducted by the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

GREAT SALT LAKE NATIONAL MONUMENT

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I am today introducing a bill to set aside part of Antelope Island—the largest island in Great Salt Lake—as a national monument. The National Park Service is wholly in accord with this proposal, and has already given a favorable report to an identical bill I introduced in the 88th Congress (S. 25).

Great Salt Lake is unique among American bodies of water. It possesses singular scientific and recreational attractions. Yet neither can be fully appreciated or enjoyed because they are not accessible.

Ever since our celebrated lakeshore resort, Saltair, was closed some years ago, facilities for bathing in the lake have been very limited. And nothing has been done to preserve and make accessible to all the tremendous geological story the lake has to tell, or to give to outdoor lovers the satisfaction that comes from viewing the vast panorama of the lake's windswept beaches and surrounding mountains from one of the islands.

A national monument on Antelope would restore and develop these striking values of Great Salt Lake. I propose that the monument embrace only the western side of the island, where the waters are deepest, and that the eastern side of the island, where an operating ranch is now located, be excluded, for the present at least. This would establish a national monument about 14 miles long and 4 miles wide, enclosing approximately 16,300 acres of land and 4,500 acres of water.

Within these boundaries would be enough of the rugged mountain range which runs down the center of the island to provide for an entertaining and educational display of the geologic history of the Great Basin area from the present time back to the ice age. The monument would also embrace enough of the shoreline to allow for the establishment of suitable facilities for public bathing in the briney water which is unlike any this side of the Dead Sea, and for the construction of ramps so that boats could be launched into the dense blue water nearly one-third salt in content.

While Great Salt Lake is remarkable in itself, it is the key to a much broader geological study, as I have indicated. Schoolchildren are taught throughout our land that the lake is the remnant of vastly larger ancient lakes that were formed in the Great Basin during the ice age of the Pleistocene epoch, beginning roughly 1 million years ago and ending only about 10,000 years ago.

At different levels above the present surface of Great Salt Lake, the shorelines of the larger ancestral lakes occupying the area are easily recognized. These lake levels extend up across the beaches of Antelope Island and on up its rugged mountain range. Each lake level bears a different name—Bonneville, Provo, Stansberry, and Gilbert. The ancient lake which eroded the highest level has been named in honor of Capt. B. L. E. Bonneville who explored much of the area between 1832 and 1836. At its maximum size, Lake Bonneville occupied much of western Utah, and extended more than 300 miles from the extreme southern part of Idaho nearly as far as the Arizona boundary. The waters lapped against the Wasatch Mountains on the east and spread 180 miles to the west into Nevada. Its total area was approximately 20,000 square miles—more than twice the area of Massachusetts.

Geologists estimate that Lake Stansberry, corresponding to the shoreline 300 feet above the present lake, existed some 23,000 years, while Lake Gilbert existed a short time and shrunk to a level only about 400 feet above the present lake. This whole story is etched on Antelope Island.

For those who want scenery with their geology, the ravines between the peaks are filled with gray-green sage, service berries, and willows, and, in season, with starchroot, sunflowers, and wild roses. Mountain climbing and hiking are a challenge with a spectacular view in every direction. To the west is the burnt umber of the Oquirrh Mountains—to the east the smoky brown of the Wasatch Range, with towering snow-covered peaks of the Wasatch Front, a great geologic fault of ancient days.

The fascination of Great Salt Lake is well described in a magnificent book on it written by Dale L. Morgan. I quote him:

> Visitors have called its waters bright emerald, grayish green, and leaden gray; they have called them sapphire and turquoise and cobalt—and they have all been right. Its colors vary with the time of day, the state of the weather, the season of the year, the vantage point from which it is seen. It can lie immobile in its mountain setting like a vast, green light-filled mirror or, lashed by a sudden storm, rise wrathful in its bed to assault boats and its shoreline with smashing 4-foot waves. The wind is its only master.

Thousands of Americans have seen the lake from the windows of a pullman car, as they crossed the Lucin Cutoff. This, Mr. Morgan holds, is to miss the real lure of the lake. He sums it up this way:

> The feel of the sun and the salt on your skin, the wide sweep of the open sapphire sky, the strangely scented wind raucous with the screaming of the gulls, the intermingled beauty and striped ugliness of the lake and the shore * * * in all these things is something of the experience of great Salt Lake.

During the three centuries of written history, the lake has been a magnet for all types of men. Spaniards, mountain explorers, and other adventurers sought it out. For years this strange body of water beckoned the intrepid and the fearless. Many expeditions charted and studied it. Later the Mormons found it and in the Great Salt Lake Valley their promised land.

During the years of the westward migrations, the lake and the blazing salt deserts to the west of it formed a barrier to the march to California, lengthening the trail by many miles. Those who tried to cross the salt desert directly lost their wagons, their animals, and sometimes their lives, and wrote tragic chapters in pioneer history.

Years later—in your time and mine—these salt flats came into their own as an internationally famous track for the great auto racing meets beginning in the thirties. Speed records were broken then by Utah's own Ab Jenkins, and England's Sir Malcolm Campbell. Again this past fall the salt flats were the scene of new recordbreaking speed tests, with Art Arfons driving a car at an average speed of 536.71 miles an hour to break all previous world land speed records.

I began almost as soon as I came to the Senate 6 years ago to seek ways to develop the potential of Great Salt Lake. In both the 86th and 87th Congresses I introduced bills to establish a Great Salt Lake National Park, which would have included all of both Antelope and Fremont Islands, and a substantial portion of the lake itself. Hearings were held on this bill in Utah, and the support for it was overwhelming. I also requested that the National Park Service make an official survey of the area encompassed by the bill. Highly skilled people with years of experience in evaluating and developing park projects found the area of great interest. The National Park Service report made three special points:

First. Great Salt Lake illustrates outstandingly significant scientific values worthy of preservation and interpretation either by the Federal or State governments.

Second. No existing area in the national park system duplicates the values of Great Salt Lake.

Third. The north end of Antelope Island was the most impressive site for development.

When this report came out, I decided that a bill establishing a national monument on Antelope Island would make the most of the lake's potential, and eliminate any objection which might arise from trying to incorporate sections of the lake precluded from recreation use because of industrial and municipal pollution. I introduced the first monument bill last session.

Construction of an improved access highway across the lake would bring Antelope Island within less than a 30-minute drive from Salt Lake City. My bill provides that the Secretary of the Interior may construct a causeway or causeways to the island. Because of the shallow water to the east and south, shoreline area roads could be built easily.

My bill would also permit the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate and maintain boating and bathing facilities on the Antelope Island beaches. It likewise contains a section protecting all present rights of the State of Utah, its political subdivisions, and persons, to water flowing into the lake, to minerals there—including oil and gas—and to chemicals outside the monument boundaries. No effort will be made to control the lake level, and no requirements so to do may be laid on the National Park Service. The monument will not limit or impair private recreation facilities, nor mining of salt or other minerals elsewhere in the lake.

This Great Salt Lake Monument bill already has the support of the vast majority of the citizens of my State of Utah, and I am hopeful it will receive the support of the remainder of the country. It would preserve an area unduplicated in any of our other national parks or monuments for the wonderment and enjoyment of generations to come.

Mr. President, I send to the desk a bill to provide for the establishment of the Great Salt Lake National Monument, in the State of Utah, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 25) to provide for the establishment of the Great Salt Lake National Monument, in the State of Utah, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Moss, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

GOLDEN SPIKE NATIONAL MONUMENT

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I send to the desk, for appropriate reference, a bill to create a Golden Spike National Monument at Promontory, 30 miles west of Brigham City in Box Elder County, Utah.

It was at Promontory, as every schoolboy knows, that the first transcontinental railroad was completed on May 10, 1869. President Leland Stanford of the Central Pacific and Vice President Durant of the Union Pacific drove a golden spike to climax the road building race—1,800 hand-built miles of track in 6½ years.

The event fulfilled the dream of Columbus for a shorter route to the Orient, insured possession of the entire West for the United States and began a new era of development for the Nation.

The spot where this historic event took place is now commemorated as the Golden Spike National Historical Site. A small monument has been erected by the National Park Service, and each year the driving of the spike is reenacted by the Golden Spike Association of Box Elder County.

I have long felt that the importance of this event in the history and economic development of our Nation deserved greater recognition than the small monument now erected there. I have been trying to obtain either an expanded historical site, or a national monument, which would include some of the old historic roadbed, and a railroad museum.

Last March a significant step was taken toward this goal when the Southern Pacific Railroad deeded to the Federal Government some 730 acres including 15 miles of the old roadbed. The Department of Justice, however, has now raised some questions concerning the title to this land, and without a clear title the Federal Government cannot spend funds for the development of an expanded Golden Spike area.

I feel that this whole problem should come before the Congress, and I am introducing the bill for this purpose. The National Park Service is anxious to move ahead with development of the Golden Spike area. I have conferred many times with National Park Director George Hartzog about it.

The driving of the golden spike at Promontory, Utah, was more than just an event. It symbolized the linking of a continent, and the opening up of the West. It is not now properly commemorated, and I seek to remedy this at the earliest possible time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 26) authorizing the establishment of the Golden Spike National Monument in the State of Utah, introduced by Mr. Moss was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

GLEN CANYON RECREATION AREA

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I am today introducing a bill to create a Glen Canyon Recreation Area. Authority to create this area was contained in the Colorado River storage project—Public Law 84-485—but I have found that this authority does not provide an adequate basis for administering the Glen Canyon Recreation Area, and I seek to establish the area by enactment of a new law which spells out in detail its purposes and how they shall be realized.

I think it important that this be done. Glen Canyon Recreation Area has been called "America's Newest Playground." It is without doubt one of the most overpoweringly beautiful sections of the country. For countless centuries it has been remote and lonely. A few lucky people saw parts of it by horseback; others glimpsed far horizons and meager parts of it in adventuresome boat trips down the Colorado River. But, now the waters of the Colorado have backed up behind Glen Canyon Dam to form Lake Powell, and miles and miles of this magnificent towering, red rock country have become accessible to all by modern motor launch. Whole canyons, never before entered are now easily entered and explored. The accessibility and beauty of Glen Canyon have been multiplied a thousandfold.

It is quite appropriate, I think, that the waters confined by Glen Canyon have been named for the first man to run the Colorado River—John Wesley Powell. For the waters themselves are as venturesome as was this early intrepid explorer. They have gone places water has never gone before, and quite literally a new world is opening up. It is a world of steep walls and rolling slick rock, of cliff faces and sheer drops, of narrow canyons in deep shadows and immense amphitheaters in bright sunlight, of buttes and minarettes, and spires and ridges of wide expanses of flickering water and the splash of ephemeral waterfalls. The colors of the rocks are as magnificent as they are unpredictable—striped in graduated tones of brown, gray, black and white, of red, purple, and pink, softened by weathering and by the vivid green of ferns, monkey flowers, moss, or lichens. The glow of the rocks and their fantastic shapes, contrasted with the deep blue of the waters of Lake Powell make the Glen Canyon recreation area a paradise for the outdoors lover, and a photographer's dream. For the latter it can be the most exciting experience of his life.

In addition to broadening the legislative authority for dealing with this remarkable area, my bill will do two other things:

First. It would provide by law for a review of the area to determine those portions necessary to preserve and provide public access to the shores of the lake, and provide public recreation within the present boundaries of the area established administratively by the Interior Department. The area now encompasses some 1,430,000 acres in both Arizona and Utah. Studies are underway to adjust these boundaries. More than likely the area can be reduced. Presently it appears to be too large. I anticipate that by the time my bill is called up for hearings we will have the recommendations of the Department of the Interior for boundaries, and that the congressional committees can make the final determination as to where those boundaries should be located.

Second. The bill would make present mineral leasing laws apply to the entire recreation withdrawal, subject only to a general regulation by the Secretary to protect scenic and recreation values.

Mineral leasing policies in this area have had a rather checkered history. In an order dated September 10, 1953, the Bureau of Reclamation, with the concurrence of the Bureau of Land Management, withdrew about 1¾ million acres for reclamation purposes in the Glen Canyon area. This closed them completely to mineral entry. At that time, however, there was considerable interest in connection with the search for uranium ore, and since construction of the Glen Canyon Dam would not be started for some years, the lands were reopened in 1954 to mineral location, entry, and patent, subject to the stipulation that each locator would remove all improvements without cost to the United States if and when it was determined that the lands would be needed for reclamation purposes.

The mineral order was revoked in 1957, on all of the lands in Arizona and about 160,000 acres in Utah, since most of them would be inundated as soon as the dam was completed. In July of 1963, the Bureau of Reclamation asked that the mineral reopening order be revoked in its entirety, which means that the adjacent lands as well as the inundated lands would be included. The Department embarked on a program of collecting facts on which the Secretary can base a decision. Multiple use in the area is now under study, I understand, along with boundary adjustments.

I am, of course, concerned that an order which would close the Glen Canyon Recreation Area to mineral location and mineral leasing would even be suggested. One of the reasons I want to establish the Glen Canyon Recreation Area by law is to clarify and emphasize the principle of multiple use within a recreation area. Few of our Western States can afford to have such large areas locked up for recreation use only—we must assure that we will be getting the most we can from multiple use of our national recreation area for the benefit of our entire economy. Subject to general regulation by the Secretary to protect scenic and recreational values, multiple use should, in general, be our watchword.

In this respect, my bill provides that grazing should be continued, and that hunting and fishing should be permitted and continue under applicable laws of the respective States. There should be exceptions only in zones and areas where hunting or fishing would jeopardize public safety or enjoyment, fish and wildlife management, or administration of the recreation area. The bill provides that fishing and hunting limitations shall be put into effect by the Secretary of the Interior only after consultation with the Arizona Game and Fish Department or the Utah Department of Fish and Game.

The bill I am introducing today is patterned after the measure introduced last session by my distinguished colleague from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE] to establish the Lake Mead Recreation Area above Davis and Hoover Dams on the Colorado. There are several differences, however. There is a slight change in my bill relating to the acquisition authority, because there is no question about establishing the area—it is already subject to reclamation withdrawal. There is also some adjustment in language made necessary because the Department of the Interior now recognizes recreation as one of the primary objects in multiple-purpose projects, while when Lake Mead was established, reclamation was a primary objective but recreation had not been given this new recognition. There is now underway in the Department of the Interior a pilot study of outdoor recreation values on the public domain land in Utah, and I anticipate that the results of this study, also, will be available when my bill is given committee consideration.

There are also a few other minor variations between this bill and the bill to establish the Lake Mead Recreation Area made necessary because of changed conditions, but, in general, the bills follow the same pattern.

The 88th Congress is to be commended for passing legislation to establish Canyonlands National Park in southern Utah. Already a superintendent has been appointed for Canyonlands—Mr. Bates Wilson—and several Park Service crews are at work. We are already at work to open up this spectacular area.

The Glen Canyon Recreation Area abuts on Canyonlands. It is within the magnificent golden circle concept of national parks, monuments, and recreation areas in the Four Corners area where Colorado, Arizona, New Mexico, and Utah come together. I am hopeful that the Congress will continue to develop this superb recreation complex, and that we can give specific legislative authority to the establishment of the Glen Canyon Recreation Area.

Mr. President, I send to the desk, for appropriate reference, my bill to provide an adequate basis for the administration of Lake Powell and adjacent lands in Arizona and Utah as the Glen Canyon National Recreation Area, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 27) to provide an adequate basis for the administration of Lake Powell and adjacent lands in Arizona and Utah as the Glen Canyon National Recreation Area, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Moss, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

MATERIALS RESERVE AND STOCKPILE ACT OF 1965

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to insure the availability of strategic and critical materials during a war, or national emergency, by providing for a stockpile of such materials, and for other purposes. This legislation, to be known as the Materials Reserve and Stockpile Act of 1965, would repeal and replace the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, as amended, of 1946.

This bill has its origins in the inquiry into the strategic and critical materials stockpiles of the United States conducted by the Stockpile Subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee during previous sessions of the Congress. During the last session of Congress, this legislation was thoroughly studied and unanimously agreed upon, first by the National Stockpile Subcommittee and then by the full Armed Services Committee. All appropriate departments of the executive branch of the Government unanimously favored it and urged its early passage. All who have studied the current stockpile situation can only become convinced that new legislation is long overdue.

Under this bill all strategic and critical materials now kept in three stockpiles—the national stockpile, the supplemental stockpile, and Defense Production Act inventory—will be consolidated into two; namely: First, the national stockpile in which would be held those strategic and critical materials needed to meet established stockpile objectives; and second, the materials reserve inventory in which would be held all materials excess to stockpile objectives.

Uniform management and disposal procedures with more precise statutory guidelines are stipulated for the operation of these stockpiles. The bill also provides for disclosures to Congress and the public of all pertinent information on the management of the stockpiles which would not help a possible enemy; permits disposal of surplus material without requiring congressional action on each and every disposal, yet retains for Congress the power to disapprove of any proposed disposals; and makes all contracts for furnishing materials to the stockpiles subject to the Renegotiation Act of 1951, as amended.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 28) to insure the availability of certain critical materials during a war or national emergency by providing for a reserve of such materials, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. SYMINGTON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

MODIFICATION OF THE GREERS FERRY DAM AND RESERVOIR, WHITE RIVER BASIN, ARK.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I introduce, for myself and my colleague from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], a bill to modify the Greers Ferry Dam and Reservoir project in Arkansas to include the construction of a water garden as a feature of the recreational facilities adjacent to the dam.

Greers Ferry Reservoir was dedicated in the fall of 1962 by our late President, John F. Kennedy, who at the time expressed interest in this unique project to capitalize on the attractive setting in which the dam is located. The concept of a water garden at Greers Ferry had its origin in the department of architecture of the University of Arkansas where it was assigned as a student project. The work done by the architecture students and members of the faculty was the basis for more detailed plans which have been prepared under Presidential directive by the Little Rock district office of the Corps of Engineers.

This bill was introduced in the last session of the Congress, but due to the substantial workload of the Senate and the fact that executive comments on it were not received in time it was not reported by the Public Works Committee. During the recess, I received a letter about the project from the Acting Director of the Bureau of the Budget who said, in part:

> We believe the garden would be an interesting and worthwhile experiment.

The Greers Ferry area is one of the most beautiful in the country. The rugged terrain and the trees, rocks, shrubs, and flowers which cover it provide a perfect setting for the water garden development which would capitalize on the natural beauty of the area and be a prime attraction for visitors to the north central section of Arkansas. I might point out that most recreational facilities at such reservoirs are designed for fishermen and campers, and little is done to develop them for the enjoyment of others. The project is admittedly a unique innovation in America, although water gardens are well known in other parts of the world. The Trivoli Gardens of Italy and the Peterhof Gardens in Russia are world famous and attract countless visitors each year. It is proper, I think, that we in this country begin to recognize the potential beauty of many of our public structures as has long been the practice elsewhere in the world. This administration has been committed by President Johnson to a major effort to conserve and exploit the natural beauty of America and to lay stress on the artistic products of our society. I believe this project supports this commitment.

Greers Ferry Reservoir is centrally located and readily accessible to large population centers such as Memphis, St. Louis, Kansas City, Tulsa, and Little Rock.

The cost of the project is estimated at $325,000. This figure, while impressive in the abstract, is small when compared to the benefits to be derived from the project. Approximately $1,500,000 will be spent at Greers Ferry on the recreational facilities now provided as a matter of course at Federal reservoirs. These include campsites, ramps for boat launching, and access roads. Little is provided for those who are not fishermen, boat operators, or campers. This beautiful development could be enjoyed by every visitor to the damsite.

Mr. President, I wish it were possible for me to insert the preliminary sketches of the water garden in the RECORD. They will, of course, be available to the Public Works Committee in its consideration of the bill, and I believe the members of the committee will be highly impressed with the proposal.

An abundant supply of water is available from the reservoir, which is approximately 2,000 feet from the site tentatively selected for the water garden. The preliminary sketches of the project show a walkway from the observation platform adjacent to the dam descending to the lower level of the river along which the garden would be constructed. A series of walkways and fountains at various levels would capitalize on the natural terrain. Lighting would be installed to give the fountain a dramatic quality at night.

Mr. President, we believe this project is a worthy experiment in the realization of the esthetic potential of our great Federal public works projects. It is in keeping with this administration's emphasis on artistic achievement and quality. I hope it will receive prompt attention from the Public Works Committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 29) authorizing modification of the Greers Ferry Dam and Reservoir, White River Basin, Ark., in the interest of recreational development, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. FULBRIGHT (for himself and Mr. MCCLELLAN), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

NATIONAL ECONOMIC CONVERSION AND DIVERSIFICATION COMMISSION

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, for myself and Senators BAYH, BREWSTER, CLARK, GRUENING, HARTKE, LONG of Missouri, MONTOYA, MORSE, MCINTYRE, NELSON, RANDOLPH, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, YOUNG of Ohio, TYDINGS, and RIBICOFF, a bill to establish a National Economic Conversion and Diversification Commission. The purpose of the Commission, as outlined in this legislation, is to assist the Nation's industries and communities in meeting defense cutbacks or shifts with a minimum of economic dislocation and a maximum productive use of all our national resources.

In October 1963, I first introduced a bill along these lines, to promote a greater awareness of the increasingly important issue of defense adjustments throughout our economy and to encourage planning in the industries which are most affected by shifts or reductions in defense procurement.

Since that time, the Congress approved for the current fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, a military budget nearly $1½ billion less than the previous year. For fiscal year 1966, a further reduction is planned.

Furthermore, on December 12, 1963, the Secretary of Defense announced the closing of 26 military activities throughout the United States and the elimination of 16,300 jobs in the Military Establishment. Then again on November 19, 1964, the Secretary of Defense announced the closing of 95 additional military installations at home and overseas, with a personnel reduction of 63,401 employees.

These cutbacks are not the beginning of unilateral disarmament, nor are there any real grounds for expecting that the vast resources which have made our defenses second to none throughout the world can easily or immediately be transferred to other public and national needs. But these cutbacks are an indication that defense spending, which since 1950 has represented about 50 percent of the Federal budget and 10 percent of the Nation's gross national product, has probably ceased to grow and may well decline for the rest of this decade. These cutbacks are an indication that defense installations which have contributed jobs and money to the economies of some areas over long periods—in fact, as long as a century and a half in the case of some of the naval shipyards—will be adjusted to changing defense needs.

The overall result of the shifts and cutbacks should be a stronger America—a defense establishment more alert to the changing demands of a troubled world, defense equipment more suited to current needs and a national economy freed from the burden of supporting uneconomic and unnecessary activities. Millions—perhaps even billions—of dollars may ultimately be released for productive public purposes, such as new schools, better health facilities, finer recreation opportunities, better transportation, cleaner air and water, and the like.

But the immediate impact of contract cancellations and closing of facilities is very difficult for the employees and the communities directly affected. The long-term benefits may be hard to visualize. More aid to education is no immediate help to a shipyard worker with 18 years seniority and know-how in the construction of warships. A better urban mass transit system will not provide immediate new jobs for atomic technicians who are no longer needed in production of radioactive materials for stockpiling. The prospect of a cut in excise taxes does not help the community that has gone deeply into debt to provide schools, sewers, roads, and similar facilities for people who will be transferred out of the area.

The problems that these people, these firms, and these communities face are very real ones. The answers can be found only through careful planning, through coordination of local opportunities with Federal programs, of local resources with public needs, and through recognition that the conversion or diversification of military activities into useful civilian programs deserves high priority on the national agenda at this time.

> The National Economic Conversion and Diversification Commission, to be established in this bill, would be a top level national forum with direct responsibility for this problem to work with business, labor, local government officials, and Federal agencies to ease the transition from military to civilian work wherever the shift can be made.

The Commission, as outlined in this bill, differs slightly from the original proposal. Its 12 members would include the Secretary of Commerce as Chairman, the Secretaries of Defense, Labor, the Treasury, Health, Education, and Welfare, the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, the Administrators of the National Aeronautics and Space Agency, the General Services Administration, the Small Business Administration, and the Directors of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, and the Office of Economic Opportunity.

The duties of the Commission will be varied and flexible enough to encourage large electronics firms to find new products and markets, to assist small rural communities in finding new jobs when military facilities are closed down, and to help individual unions and employees orient themselves toward new employment prospects. It will institute studies on the impact of conversion over the whole economy, using some of the capabilities including systems management techniques developed in defense programs, to develop new approaches to civilian problems and the allocation of resources in civilian programs.

It will submit reports on such studies to the President and Congress, together with proposals for executive or legislative action. It will encourage industries to explore new methods of meeting public needs, such as improved schools, health facilities, transportation, and pollution abatement.

The Commission is also charged with responsibility for calling a National Conference on Industrial Conversion and Growth to encourage national planning efforts to meet the problems of defense adjustments. Similar conferences have been held in recent years on the problems of trade expansion, narcotics addiction, youth and physical fitness, and problems of the aging. It would be appropriate and useful to invite interested persons and groups from all over the country to consider the best approach in meeting defense shifts and making the most of opportunities for advancement in other directions with some of the resources released through a more efficient defense program.

The Commission is also charged with fostering the development of whatever regulations or procedures may be most useful in encouraging industry to seek direct answers to contract cutbacks. Among possible methods to encourage industry attention to the conversion problems are guidelines written into defense contracts, additional funds for future planning and diversification, tax incentives or bonuses and other Federal aids. These should be evaluated carefully by the Commission, in cooperation with the contracting agencies of the Federal Government and private industry. The bill is based on the assumption that public programs of all kinds should draw upon the talents and experience of our defense and nondefense industries within a competitive, free enterprise system.

The Commission is directed to work closely with local government authorities to help communities facing a particularly heavy adverse impact from the reduction of defense business. Regional planning—to assess and put to best use all the human and industrial resources of an area—is important to attract new jobs and, if feasible, to utilize facilities that may be excess to defense needs. Furthermore, areas which are heavily dependent on defense dollars, even though they may not be slated for immediate cutbacks, should be considering alternative sources of revenue to reduce their dependence on uncertain military spending.

In my own State the recent announcement that the Black Hills Ordnance Depot will be closed within 2 years has caused great anxiety to the people of the Edgemont, S. Dak., area. I am pleased that the citizens of this community are now working hard to attract alternative economic activities to their community.

The principal change in this bill as compared with the legislation which I introduced in 1963, is the elimination of the mandatory language requiring defense contractors to establish industrial conversion committees. Although I believe that such committees should be formed and can be useful, there are a number of different ways in which procurement regulations might be modified to encourage their formation. I believe it would be most helpful for the Commission to explore all of these possibilities in order to work out with the agencies and industry the most useful and acceptable procedures.

There is also additional emphasis on regional planning as an overall approach to shifting patterns of defense spending.

Regional planning can awaken communities to the needs for upgraded services in such fields as education, transportation, and health facilities. Although a direct transfer of manpower and equipment from building bombers to building roads may not be possible, a regional perspective on the problem could be very fruitful both in moving toward new jobs and in moving toward greater fulfillment of the needs of the citizens in any area.

The overall purpose of this bill then is to help industries and communities make the transition from fulfillment of defense needs to better fulfillment of the many pressing human needs of our society. A combined and cooperative effort by the Federal Government, the States and localities, and the industries involved will hasten the day when we can beat our swords into plowshares and turn our industrial talents even more directly to improving the quality of our society.

With such a design, we will begin to relieve the concern which many feel, lest conversion from war production be the occasion of unreasonable hardship for Americans. In turn, the development of competence for conversion will make possible more realistic appraisals of defense spending, for then decisions on the termination of contracts or the closing of installations to meet legitimate efficiency and security requirements need not be blunted by concern for economic dislocation. This is bound to improve both the short- and long-term design and administration of our security policies. It will also add new force to disarmament discussions by removing fear of the economic consequences.

These proposed steps can help give our people a solid basis for confidence in their own and our Nation's future. With other related efforts, they can demonstrate that the best path to American prosperity and economic growth lies not in a constantly expanding arms race but in carefully gaged steps toward peace.

Mr. President, I want to clarify my purpose in introducing legislation at this time.

This is not a newly recognized issue, arising out of the apparent thaw in East-West relationships. The problem was recognized in the report on the "Economic and Social Consequences of Disarmament" made by the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency in March of 1962.

It was recognized by our very able colleague the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] in 1962, when he proposed a Senate Select Committee on the Economic Impact of National Defense to study procurement policies and take into consideration the effect that termination or modification of procurement contracts would have on the economy.

It was recognized by the New York Times financial and business editors in 1963 when they made a survey of conversion planning by our 25 major corporations which handle 50.8 percent of all defense work. They reported on August 16, 1963, that very little planning for conversion has been done by industry and that "many defense contractors simply refuse to consider a sizable cutback in arms production as any kind of a possibility in the foreseeable future."

It was recognized by the Senate Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower under the able leadership of Senator CLARK of Pennsylvania which held extensive hearings in 1964. The subcommittee estimated that, just to keep pace with population growth over the next two decades, public and private programs costing from $500 to $700 million will be needed in urban areas. Rural problems of conservation, water development, and recreational development on public lands would require an additional $12 billion a year for 10 years. All these efforts could profit from the reduction in defense spending, but only if a serious effort is made to plan for the switchover in resources and to make the most of funds no longer necessary for defense.

It was recognized by President Johnson in December 1963 when he established an interagency committee chaired by Gardner Ackley, of the Council of Economic Advisers. This Committee on the Economic Impact of Defense and Disarmament can undertake studies in the field, but it lacks the legislative mandate, the staff, and the direction to undertake the broad effort of education, coordination, and encouragement that is needed to give top national priority to the problems and opportunities of economic conversion and diversification.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this bill remain at the desk until the close of business January 15 for additional cosponsors, and that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD following my remarks so that any other Senators who wish to join in support of this measure may have the opportunity to do so.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD and will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from South Dakota.

The bill (S. 30) to establish a National Economic Conversion and Diversification Commission, and for other purposes introduced by Mr. MCGOVERN (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Government Operations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "National Economic Conversion and Diversification Act."

DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

SEC. 2. The Congress finds and declares that in the last decade the cold war has required the United States to make a heavy military and economic commitment for defense; that it is the policy of the United States to maintain a fully adequate national defense and to regulate expenditures for such defense in accordance with changing requirements of American security; that economic ability to adjust to changing security needs is in the interest of the general welfare of the United States; that careful preparation is necessary if such adjustments are to be achieved with a minimum of economic dislocation and individual hardship; that the problem-solving capabilities of American industry should be utilized to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of public programs in non-defense areas; and that the economic conversion and diversification required by changing defense needs presents a great challenge and opportunity to the American people.

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 3. (a) There is hereby established, in the Executive Office of the President, the National Economic Conversion and Diversification Commission (hereafter referred to as the "Commission"), which shall be composed of:

(1) The Secretary of Commerce, who shall be chairman of the Commission;

(2) The Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers;

(3) The Secretary of Defense;

(4) The Secretary of Labor;

(5) The Secretary of the Treasury;

(6) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare;

(7) The Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission;

(8) The Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration;

(9) The Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity;

(10) The Director of the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency;

(11) The Administrator of the General Services Administration;

(12) The Administrator of the Small Business Administration.

(b) The Secretary of Commerce shall preside over meetings of the Commission; except that in his unavoidable absence he may designate a member of the Commission to preside in his place.

(c) The Commission shall have a staff to be headed by an executive secretary who shall be appointed by the President, his compensation to be at the rate provided for Grade 18 of the general schedule of the Classification Act of 1949 as amended.

DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 4. It shall be the duty of the Commission to—

(a) institute studies that will help to determine appropriate policies and programs to be carried out by the departments and agencies of the Federal Government in order to facilitate economic conversion and diversification, including studies of possible schedules of public and private investment patterns that could result from various degrees of economic conversion and the anticipated income and employment effects of such patterns, and studies of how the advanced scientific, technical, systems management and related capabilities of American industry might be employed in established nondefense public programs, the reports of such studies to be submitted to the President and to the Congress whenever appropriate, but at least annually, with the first report to be submitted within one year after the enactment of this Act;

(b) encourage industries to explore methods of better meeting public needs in such areas as school construction, health facilities, transportation, and pollution abatement;

(c) convene a National Conference on Industrial Conversion and Growth, within one year after the enactment of this Act, to consider the problems arising from shifts or reductions in defense outlays including the termination of defense contracts or the closing of defense facilities, and to encourage appropriate planning and programing by State or local governments and by all sectors of the economy to facilitate the Nation's economic conversion and diversification capability;

(d) consult with the Governors of the States to encourage appropriate studies and conferences at the State, local, and regional level, in support of a coordinated effort to improve the Nation's economic conversion and diversification capability;

(e) develop programs, in cooperation with the appropriate departments and agencies of the Federal Government, that will bring their established authorities and programs to bear on the problem of planning for economic diversification in communities, States, and regions heavily impacted by defense expenditures; and

(f) make such recommendations to the President and to the Congress as will further the purposes of this Act.

SEC. 5. The Commission, in cooperation with contracting agencies of the Federal Government, shall foster the development of regulations, procedures, and recommendations to encourage recipients of defense contracts, subcontracts, or grants to plan for conversion and diversification to civilian work in the event of curtailment or termination of such contracts or grants.

SEC. 6. The Commission, in cooperation with States and local government authorities, shall encourage areas heavily dependent on defense contracts, subcontracts, grants, or Federal installations, to form regional conversion and diversification committees to plan for alternative employment opportunities in the event of curtailment or termination of such facilities.

POWERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 7. (a) The Commission shall have the power to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable in accordance with the provisions of the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended. The Commission may also procure, without regard to the civil service laws and the classification laws, temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as authorized for the departments by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 810; 5 U.S.C. 55a).

(b) The Commission is authorized to secure directly from any executive department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment or instrumentality, information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics for the purpose of this Act, and each such department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment or instrumentality, is authorized and directed to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the Commission upon request made by the Chairman.

(c) The Secretary of Commerce, as Chairman of the Commission, is authorized to make contracts or grants for studies relevant to the purposes of the Commission.

SEC. 6. Such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act are hereby authorized to be appropriated.

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, it is most gratifying to be able to join with my distinguished colleague from South Dakota today in introducing again a bill which recognizes one of the most serious economic problems that face our people. In my opinion, this bill to establish a National Economic Conversion and Diversification Commission is one of the most important measures to be presented to the 89th Congress. The Senator from South Dakota is to be commended for his determination and vision.

Mr. President, the realities of today's world point out clearly the necessity for legislation of the kind proposed here.

With the continuing change in defense needs brought about by the advancement of science and technology, with the concentrated efforts to reduce unnecessary defense spending, and with the hope for additional steps toward responsible arms control and disarmament, it only seems commonsense for the Federal Government to participate in the planning of actions that will meet the economic effects of changes in defense spending.

In a free economy like ours, the major responsibility for such planning rests with the industries involved and the communities in which defense industry is concentrated. However, the Federal Government cannot disassociate itself from the consequences of substantial changes in defense outlays. It will require the cooperative efforts of industry, State, and local governments, and the Federal Government if such changes are to be met with a minimum of economic dislocation and individual hardship.

As indicated above, two types of planning are needed. First, there is the planning necessary to meet individual plant or military facility closing due to shifts in defense needs. The other is the broader planning required to prepare our Nation for widescale reductions in defense expenditures if responsible arms control agreements can be reached. The first type, however, demands our immediate attention as evidenced by the recent announcement of the closing of numerous military installations.

Many private firms which do substantial business with the Defense Department have taken tremendous strides in preparation for adjustments when Government contracts are no longer forthcoming. However, many firms have done little or nothing to prepare for changes. In some instances, this lack of action is due to lethargy but often it is due to lack of capability either financial or other.

The Federal Government has taken some steps to help individuals and firms affected by changes in defense spending, but they have not been sufficient to meet the need. State governments and local governments have also acted to assist in seeking adjustments. But, unfortunately, most of these efforts have been after the fact and thus somewhat haphazard. The economic health of our Nation and the welfare of the individuals affected demand a change in this situation. We must have thorough advance planning for future changes.

The Federal Government cannot prescribe by law how and what adjustments are to be made when plants or facilities are reduced or closed. However, it can help provide answers to many questions and provide leadership, impetus, and assistance to industry and community planning for conversion and diversification.

The Arms Control and Disarmament Agency has made and is making efforts in the field of the economic impact of arms control and disarmament. A number of scholars have also undertaken studies with regard to the economic impact of changes in defense spending.

But there remains much to be learned—many questions to be answered. We need more knowledge as to the total economic effect of specific changes or reductions in defense spending. We need more knowledge as to the effect of increased Government spending in other sectors to offset defense cuts. We need more knowledge as to the effect of a tax cut to offset defense cuts. We need more study of other fiscal and monetary steps that could be taken. We need careful study of ways to divert or increase research and development efforts in the civilian sector. We need to look at the problems of firms which lack the capital to plan for adjustment. We need to look at the problems of firms so defense oriented they do not have a capability for civilian production.

A National Conversion and Diversification Commission could contribute substantially to filling these needs.

Shifts from defense production to civilian production offer a tremendous challenge and opportunity. Our task is to work for the best utilization of the manpower and resources released from defense production in meeting the economic and social needs of our Nation.

Mr. President, it is my hope that the Congress will take immediate action on this bill so that we can move forward with a far greater degree of confidence that we are prepared to meet the human and economic problems which are a consequence of our ever-changing defense picture. Such action would add significantly to the overall security of our Nation.

SOUTHERN NEVADA WATER PROJECT

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my distinguished colleague, Senator CANNON, I introduce, for proper reference, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the southern Nevada water project, Nevada, and for other purposes.

Mr. President, this project is vitally needed, to relieve a critical water supply situation in the area, to protect and conserve the dwindling ground water resources in Clark County, Nev., and to provide the firm additional supply of municipal and industrial water as required to serve a rapidly increasing population, as well as to provide for the optimum development of the natural resources of the southern Nevada area.

This section of Nevada has experienced a rapid increase in population since the early 1940's; and for most of the past decade this growth has been, and continues to be, phenomenal. A favorable climate, availability of large areas of undeveloped land, a strategic location in relation to the Lake Mead National Recreation Area, the Nevada atomic test site, plus activities of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, have all contributed to this development. The rapid growth of the area is best exemplified by the fact that the population has increased from an approximate 50,000 people in 1950 to 141,400 people in 1960. A projection of future growth indicates that over 300,000 people will be in need of water in this area by 1970; and that by the year 2000, over one-half million will call it home.

So great is the local interest in this project that the State of Nevada, at the last session of its legislature, designated the Colorado River Commission of Nevada as the State agency to contract with the United States for the repayment of project costs, and to operate and maintain the project when construction is completed. It has the active support of the Nevada congressional delegation; the State of Nevada, through its Governor, the Honorable Grant Sawyer; the department of conservation and natural resources; the Eldorado Valley Advisory Board; the Clark County Commissioners; the Southern Nevada Industrial Foundation; and all the municipalities and city groups located therein.

Previous activity on this proposal had been delayed, pending the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of Arizona against California, to which Nevada was a party. This decision, among other things, allocated to the State of Nevada 300,000 acre-feet of the waters of the Colorado River. It is these waters that will be utilized through the distribution system provided for in this bill.

The major problems faced by the project area are those associated with the availability of water and the need to bolster the economic base as the foundation for continued economic health and future growth. An increased water supply must be made available for the expanding population, or industrial growth will not be able to continue, and the heavy investment of the Federal Government in the Nellis Air Force Base, the atomic energy test site, and the NASA project will be seriously hampered.

At present, the principal source of water in this area is the underground artesian basin, supplemented by a small amount of water pumped from Lake Mead. Withdrawals from the ground water basin have for several years exceeded the safe yield, with a resulting critical depletion of the underground waters. The Nellis Air Force Base, which relies entirely on water from wells drilled in the basin, is faced with an especially critical situation. The water supply for fire protection is inadequate during the summer months; and a constant patrol has been necessary in order to enforce water conservation measures.

The magnitude of the problem to service the entire area has been recognized by the State and local interests, and all are agreed that the proper solution requires the development of a single comprehensive master plan to supply additional water to meet the needs of the entire area. This project is the answer to that need.

In addition, I point out that the entire cost of the project will be repaid to the Government, together with interest over a 50-year period, normally used for this type of development.

The attention of the Senate should be also called to the fact that this project is a part of the southwest Pacific water plan, recently proposed by Secretary Udall as a solution to the overall problem facing the fastest growing section of the United States.

This project, like the central Arizona project, in Arizona, and the Dixie project, in Utah, authorized by the last Congress, need not await action on the complete plan. Although they are integral portions of the Secretary's proposal, they can be authorized and constructed individually, without in any way interfering with the complete plan slated for long-term action.

Because of the demonstrated need for the authorization without delay of the southern Nevada water project, I urge the committee to proceed immediately again to consider the matter favorably and the Senate thereafter to take affirmative action to authorize this project.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 32) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the southern Nevada water project, Nevada, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. BIBLE (for himself and Mr. CANNON), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I am pleased to be associated with my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Nevada, in the introduction of the southern Nevada water supply project bill.

Last year this bill received favorable action by the Interior Committee; but, unfortunately, there was insufficient time in which Congress could act.

The need for such legislation to make adequate provision for domestic and industrial water supply in southern Nevada is well known to anyone even passingly concerned with the great issues that confront the development of the Southwest.

This area is blessed with ideal climatic conditions and great tracts of undeveloped land which await only the application of water to reach its full potential.

Southern Nevada has undergone growth which has been so phenomenal as to catapult the entire State into a position of preeminence in increased population, which within the century will reach half a million. Congress has this opportunity to decide whether that growth will be orderly and welcome and a boon to the Southwest, or an insoluble problem and a curse.

Every responsible State and local organization in Nevada supports this plan to provide additional water to meet the growing needs of Las Vegas, North Las Vegas, Henderson, Boulder City, Nellis Air Force Base, and the El Dorado Valley.

The consideration of this bill could not be more timely, for it comes at a point in our development when the underground artesian basin can no longer meet the existing requirements of the area. Indeed, the area has overdrawn on its underground supply.

Mr. President, in my view this project can stand alone, independent and financially feasible. Its cost is fully repayable over the normal 50-year period generally assigned to such projects. Yet the southern Navada water supply project will make a contribution to the overall, long-term water needs of the entire Pacific area.

I share fully the support expressed for this bill by my colleague, Senator BIBLE; and I believe that no single piece of legislation is more vital to the survival and development, as well as the prosperity, of our State.

TOCKS ISLAND NATIONAL RECREATION AREA

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, on behalf of Senators CASE, JAVITS, KENNEDY of New York, SCOTT, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, and myself, I send to the desk for appropriate reference a bill to authorize the establishment of the Tocks Island national recreation area in the States of Pennsylvania and New Jersey, and for other purposes.

This legislation would authorize the establishment of a national recreational area 70,000 acres in extent along the Delaware River between the Delaware Water Gap and Port Jervis, N.Y. The area would be established by the Federal Government under the supervision of the Secretary of the Interior and would supplement the Tocks Island Dam and Reservoir authorized to impound the waters of the Delaware River in the area I have just described.

This proposed recreational area would serve more Americans than any other recreational facility ever created by the Federal Government. Located only 95 miles from downtown Philadelphia by express turnpike and only 75 miles from downtown Manhattan, the proposed national recreation area will be within a 2-hour drive of more than 25 million Americans—a sixth of the Nation's population.

In his state of the Union message President Johnson has called for a new conservation program designed for an increasingly urban America. The Tocks Island national recreation area fills the bill exactly. It will utilize rapidly dwindling outdoor areas to provide recreation for millions of people before the land is lost forever to urban sprawl and honky-tonk development.

In August 1963, a few months before he was killed, our late President Kennedy pointed with pride to the new national seashores established under his administration and continued:

> I hope their ranks will soon include the Tocks Island national recreation area on the Delaware River. We need recreation areas where the people live and this can be closer to the largest amount of people in the country.
>
> Tocks Island will bring vitally important recreational opportunities to the heart of the Atlantic megalopolis—that giant urban strip reaching from Boston to Washington—which we desperately need if our huge metropolitan areas are to continue to be livable.

Mr. President, it was my privilege to be with President Kennedy when he made that historic address at Milford, Pa. in the Tocks Island area. At that time he dedicated the gift by the Pinchot family.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for not more than 2 additional minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator may proceed.

Mr. CLARK. The late President dedicated and accepted on behalf of the Federal Government the Gifford Pinchot estate and had it named as a Federal monument in honor of the late great Governor of Pennsylvania.

The national recreation area would be developed by the National Park Service around the mammoth Tocks Island Reservoir, already authorized and funded by Congress, providing a 32-mile-long manmade lake. The area is bordered on the west by Pennsylvania's Poconos on the east by New Jersey's Kittatiny Mountains, and on the extreme north by the foothills of New York's Catskills.

The area to be included in the proposed park includes many scenic gorges and waterfalls as well as large acreages of mountain forest. But the pressures of commercial development are already making inroads on the area, and the land grows more expensive with each passing day. There is a special urgency for Congress to approve establishment of the area this year before the cost skyrockets beyond our reach.

All forms of recreational development compatible with the out of doors and escape from the motorized and crowded cities would be proposed for inclusion in the development plans and that the facility would give a great boost to the vacation economy of the Poconos and the surrounding region.

It will be readily accessible to the 25 million people who live in the great megalopolis that stretches from Boston to Washington.

Interstate 80—the Keystone shortway—will link it with New York City, northern New Jersey, and Pennsylvania's anthracite cities; Interstate 84 will provide access from New England and the Catskill region as well as northern Pennsylvania; the northeastern extension of the Pennsylvania Turnpike will provide easy access to the area from Philadelphia, Allentown, Easton, and Bethlehem; and Interstate 78 will place the facility within easy reach of such Pennsylvania cities as Reading, Lancaster, York, and Harrisburg.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 36) to authorize establishment of the Tocks Island National Recreation Area in the States of Pennsylvania and New Jersey, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. CLARK (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRINTING OF REPORT ENTITLED "A BUILDING FOR A MUSEUM OF HISTORY AND TECHNOLOGY FOR THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION"

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, pursuant to the requirements of section 4 of Public Law 106, 84th Congress (69 Stat. 189), I submit to the Senate, from the Joint Congressional Committee on Construction of a Building for a Museum of History and Technology for the Smithsonian Institution, a report entitled, "A Building for a Museum of History and Technology for the Smithsonian Institution," and request unanimous consent to have it printed as a Senate document.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DISCRIMINATORY OCEAN FREIGHT RATES AND THE BALANCE OF PAYMENTS (S. REPT. NO. 1)

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, as chairman of the Joint Economic Committee, I submit a report entitled "Discriminatory Ocean Freight Rates and the Balance of Payments." I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed as a Senate report.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF RECEIPT OF NOMINATIONS BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I desire to announce that today the Senate received the nominations of Ben H. Brown, Jr., of South Carolina, to be Ambassador to Liberia; William A. Crawford, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador to Rumania; Ralph A. Dungan, of Pennsylvania, to be Ambassador to Chile; William H. Sullivan, of Rhode Island, to be Ambassador to Laos.

In accordance with the committee rule, these pending nominations may not be considered prior to the expiration of 6 days of their receipt in the Senate.

PROPOSAL TO PROHIBIT THE FIXING OF TRAFFIC TICKETS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill prohibiting the fixing of traffic tickets in the District of Columbia. All Senators will be interested to know that since last April, when in the Senate I severely criticized the gross practice of fixing traffic tickets in the District of Columbia by the police, the number of such fixed tickets has been drastically curtailed.

At the time I brought this matter to the attention of the Senate, it was argued that the adjustment of such tickets was in all likelihood justified by the facts of each situation.

The Metropolitan Police Department had furnished me with statistics showing the number of traffic tickets issued and the number of such tickets adjusted or fixed. At the time, I questioned whether the statistics showed the whole picture. I am glad that I questioned them.

I now learn that the statistics provided me, and contained in the annual report of the police department, included arrests only.

In regard to parking tickets, the word "arrest" means that it takes place only when the violator posts collateral or is booked at the police station.

It is interesting to note that many traffic tickets were never reported to the Central Violations Bureau, and thus did not appear in the statistics which the police department furnished me.

Last year, during a 1-month period, nearly 11,000 traffic tickets were transmitted by the Central Violations Bureau. I have had a study made of these tickets, and am informed that there were more than 400 traffic tickets which were not forwarded to the Central Violations Bureau at all to be included in the statistics.

Of these 400 traffic tickets, 261 were fixed or voided by the police, and 139 were missing.

I am also advised that a list of traffic tickets fixed or adjusted for moving violations was not compiled at all.

Since I made several speeches on the subject in the Senate last year, the District Commissioners have changed the ground rules for fixing or adjusting tickets. Their rules still leave room for abuse. However, the publicity attached to the practice of fixing tickets has reduced the number sharply.

According to information I have in my possession, the number of fixed or adjusted traffic tickets actually forwarded to the Central Violations Bureau shows that fewer than 200 parking tickets were adjusted in July of last year, as compared to more than 2,700 actually recorded during that month in the previous year.

As I pointed out a few minutes ago, these figures include those reported, and not necessarily the total number of tickets adjusted. It was argued that the number of tickets fixed in previous years was probably justified. If it was justified then, why is not the same number justified now?

The fact is, we almost stopped the racket of traffic-ticket fixing in the District of Columbia.

Though the recent action taken by the District Commissioners has tended to reduce the irregularities occurring in the adjustment of traffic tickets, it has not closed all the loopholes which exist. My bill would do so.

It is widely known that certain Members of Congress were not pleased with the original order of the District Commissioners, which would have taken traffic-ticket fixing completely out of the hands of the District of Columbia Police.

The Board of Commissioners, in an attempt to placate certain Members of Congress, modified their position so that police officials may file tickets during certain days and hours. In my judgment, this practice cannot be justified and leads to police abuse in the District of Columbia in regard to ticket fixing.

The bill I am introducing today would settle once and for all the problem of ticket fixing in the District of Columbia. I hope the bill will receive the enthusiastic support of the District of Columbia Commissioners, both Houses of Congress, and the public, so that this ticket-fixing racket in the District of Columbia can be stopped.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and printed in the RECORD.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two memorandums from the District of Columbia Government, one of November 18, 1964, entitled "Traffic violation notices—Commissioners, District of Columbia"; and the other one, dated December 29, 1964, entitled "Traffic violation notices—to Commissioners, District of Columbia."

There being no objection, the memorandums were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT,

November 18, 1964.

MEMORANDUM ORDER NO. 43, SERIES 1964

Subject: Traffic Violation Notices—Commissioners, District of Columbia.

To the Force:

The following order of the Commissioners, District of Columbia, relative to the subject matter, is published for your information and guidance: November 10, 1964, C.O. 64–1618.

Ordered:

1. Except as hereinafter provided, after copies of a traffic violation notice (hereinafter ticket) are received in the Central Violations Bureau of the District of Columbia court of general sessions (hereinafter court), neither "cancellation" nor "adjustment" of such tickets, whether for moving or nonmoving violations, may be made except by the Corporation Counsel or by Assistant Corporation Counsel designated by him and assigned to the Law Enforcement Division of the Office of the Corporation Counsel (hereinafter Law Enforcement Division).

2. Prior to the time that the copies of a ticket are received in the central violations bureau of the court, officials of the Metropolitan Police Department designated by the Chief of Police (hereinafter police) may cancel tickets for nonmoving violations found by them to have been erroneously issued (i.e., for parking at a broken or improperly working parking meter, for parking in a restricted area where the sign advising the public of the restriction is not in its proper place, or for other factual circumstances in which the motorist's reason for parking is not the basis for the cancellation).

3. Either before or after the copies of a ticket for nonmoving violation have been received in the Central Violations Bureau, adjustments of such tickets (as distinguished from cancellation for factual reasons as provided in par. 2 hereof) may be made only by the Corporation Counsel or his assistants designated by him in the Law Enforcement Division. As used herein, "adjustment" includes any decision not to prosecute based on the principles governing the entry of a nolle prosequi.

4. Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph 1 hereof, tickets for nonmoving violations issued after 12 o'clock noon on Saturday, or on Sunday or a legal holiday, which the police certify were issued to a motor vehicle operator whom they find will not be available to appear on the next work day of the Law Enforcement Division, may be tentatively adjusted by the police, provided the police shall stamp on the ticket "subject to review by the Corporation Counsel" and shall send the ticket, accompanied by written reasons for such tentative adjustment, to the Assistant in Charge of the Law Enforcement Division. If the Corporation Counsel disapproves the action of the police, he shall notify the Commanding Officer of the issuing precinct to direct the offender to post collateral, and the case shall proceed in routine fashion.

5. The police shall not be under any obligation to forward to the Corporation Counsel a voided ticket; e.g., a ticket which has never been issued by being placed on an offending vehicle or delivered to an offending vehicle operator.

6. All police officers shall be instructed to be particularly cautious in the issuance of tickets to vehicles obviously being operated by tourists; i.e., vehicles from nonmetropolitan area jurisdictions, having therein suitcases, clothing, etc. However, it is expected that tickets will be issued to a vehicle of a nonresident, even if a tourist, in any case in which a violation occurs in a plainly marked area or for a violation which should have been quite obvious to the vehicle operator.

7. In the case of all requests for ticket adjustments, the person seeking the same shall submit reasons therefor in writing.

By order of the Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia.

F. E. ROPSHAW,
Secretary to the Board.
HOWARD V. COVELL,
Acting Chief of Police.

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT,

December 29, 1964.

MEMORANDUM ORDER NO. 43–A, SERIES 1964

Subject: Traffic violation notices—Commissioners, District of Columbia.

To the Force:

To implement the provisions of Commissioners' order No. 64–1618, dated November 10, 1964, as published in memorandum order No. 43, series 1964, the following procedures are hereby established:

1. Police officials may not cancel or otherwise adjust traffic violation notices, whether moving or nonmoving violations, after copies of the violation notices are received in the Central Violations Bureau of the District of Columbia court of general sessions.

2. Prior to the time copies of traffic violation notices are received in the Central Violations Bureau, officials of the Metropolitan Police Department designated by the Chief of Police may cancel nonmoving violation notices found by them to have been erroneously issued. Such action may only be taken for factual reasons based upon a written request for adjustment made by the recipient of the citation.

3. Traffic violation notices for nonmoving offenses issued after 12 noon on Saturday or on Sunday or a legal holiday, may be tentatively adjusted by the police when it is determined the recipient of the violation notice will not be able to appear in the Office of the Assistant Corporation Counsel, District of Columbia court of general sessions, on the next workday. In such cases the recipient of the violation notice shall be required to execute PD form No. 11 stating his reason for seeking the adjustment. The police official shall record on the violation notice "subject to review by the Corporation Counsel" and shall forward the written statement of the offender and the traffic violation notice to the Assistant Corporation Counsel on PD form No. 237. The recipient of the violation notice shall be informed that the final decision rests with the Assistant Corporation Counsel and if the decision is not to adjust the citation, it will be returned to the recipient with instructions to deposit collateral in the case.

4. Police officials shall maintain a detailed record of all traffic violation notices voided or canceled under the provisions of this order. This record shall reflect a detailed accounting for each traffic violation notice so processed. PD form No. 90 shall be forwarded to headquarters on Monday of each week and shall reflect all actions taken during the preceding week: Provided, however, it shall not be required that voided tickets, i.e., those which are spoiled, mutilated, or erroneously prepared and have not been issued by being placed on an offending vehicle or delivered to an offending vehicle operator, be reported on PD form No. 90. PD form No. 90 shall contain complete information with a detailed explanation of all tickets canceled under the provisions of section 2 of this order.

Police officials authorized to act on traffic violation notices under the provisions of this order shall be construed to mean commanding officers of any unit, supervisory officials of the rank of captain or above, and lieutenants who may be serving in the capacity of acting captains during the absence of unit commanders. It shall not include sergeants who may be temporarily serving as acting lieutenants. Nothing herein shall be construed to prohibit unit commanders from delegating subordinate officials to interview recipients of traffic violation notices on other than the day tour of duty and making recommendations to the unit commander.

Commanding officers shall take appropriate steps to require extreme care in the preparation, issuance, and processing of all traffic violation notices. This shall include instructing officers in the proper preparation of traffic violation notices, care in the issuance of violation notices so as to avoid unnecessary voiding or cancelling of tickets, and the absolute necessity for all tickets being legible. Steps shall also be taken to insure that all traffic violation notices are properly accounted for and that they are reviewed by an official for accuracy and legibility at the time they are turned in by the issuing officer. Erasures, alterations, or strikeovers shall not be permitted.

These procedures become effective immediately.

By direction of the Chief of Police.

Howard V. Covell,
Deputy Chief of Police,
Executive Officer.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, let me say to the District of Columbia Commissioners that I do not intend to let them off the hook. I intend to continue to disclose to the public what I consider to be a source of corruption in law enforcement in the District of Columbia involving ticket fixing.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Oregon has expired.

Mr. MORSE. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an article entitled "A Fix Is a Fix by Any Name," written by George Lardner, Jr., and published in the Washington Post on December 22, 1964.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Dec. 22, 1964]

A Fix Is a Fix by Any Name

(By George Lardner, Jr.)

New excuses for old abuses have been sanctioned by the District Commissioners.

With straight faces painted by the House District Committee, they solemnly announced that parking tickets could no longer be "adjusted" by police.

Henceforth they can only be "canceled." A fix is a fix.

Commissioners Charles M. Duke and John B. Duncan called for the new version. It requires simply a little more speed and perhaps a little more imagination.

All police officials have to do is catch the tickets before they go over to the Central Violations Bureau of General Sessions Court.

That leaves men of influence, their relatives, friends, and constituents only 12 to 36 hours—on the average—to catch police.

Walter F. Bramhall, clerk of General Sessions Court, says that copies of traffic tickets issued by police are supposed to be turned over to the Violations Bureau the morning after they're issued.

Most of them come in on time, Bramhall says, although some have come in 5 to 6 days late in the past.

Under the new rules of the game, police brass can squelch parking tickets until then for reasons such as "faulty meter," "sign prohibiting parking torn down," or any other "factual circumstances" except the motorist's personal reason for parking illegally.

Up to now, the excuses written on fixed tickets have been timeworn, homespun stuff such as "official business for a Congressman," "unaware of violation," and "stranger in town."

Much of this, of course, has been nonsense. There is little reason to expect that the new catchwords dreamed up will be any different.

So far there are no signs that the new game has caught on yet. But that doesn't mean it can't—or won't—be played.

Lack of imagination should be no real bar to giving it a whirl either. Under the old ticket-fixing rules, police were still supposed to write down the reason for the "adjustment," but many tickets were fixed without any reason at all noted. There's nothing in the new regulations to stop this.

Even the "stranger in town" tune may survive. The Commissioners ordered all police officers "to be particularly cautious in the issuance of tickets to vehicles obviously being operated by tourists." Drivers with out-of-town plates need only keep a suitcase in the back seat at all times.

From start to finish, the Commissioners have been dancing on a congressional string in this year's ticket-fixing episode.

Their unanimous vote in June to ban the practice was no declaration of independence to begin with.

Senator Wayne Morse, Democrat, of Oregon, who had launched an investigation of the Police Department, charged that thousands of tickets had been fixed. Commissioner Walter N. Tobriner, who oversees the Department, said Morse was quite right.

The ban followed. The House District Committee cried foul.

The Congressmen liked the old practice of letting police precinct captains, their deputies and other higher-ups in the Department fix tickets.

Many police officials said they were glad to get the monkey off their backs, but the Congressmen weren't.

The Commissioners backed down to mull things over. It took them 5 months. The new version was a hollow attempt to save face by mixing the rules up a bit.

Tobriner voted against it, but Commissioner Duncan doesn't like to rock the congressional boat, and Commissioner Duke sorely wants to get a 1-cent increase in the gas tax out of the House District Committee.

What Congress wants, Congress gets. Now its Senator Morse's turn again.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 33) to prohibit the fixing of traffic tickets in the District of Columbia, introduced by Mr. Morse, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That no officer or employee of the District of Columbia shall administratively adjust or cancel any summons or other process issued by an officer or member of the District of Columbia Metropolitan Police force in connection with a violation of any law or regulation of the District of Columbia relating to motor vehicles or the control of traffic. All records in connection with any such summons or other process so issued shall be preserved for a period of five years. Any officer or employee of the District of Columbia violating the provisions of this Act shall be imprisoned for not more than ninety days or fined not more than $300, or both.

GARRISON DIVERSION, MISSOURI RIVER BASIN PROJECT

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, I introduce a bill, for appropriate reference, cosponsored by three of my colleagues, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Young], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGovern] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. Mundt], in connection with the construction of the Garrison Diversion, Missouri River Basin project by the Secretary of the Interior.

This proposed legislation would provide for the diversion of the Missouri River water in the States of North and South Dakota for irrigation purposes, for industrial and municipal use, and for lake restoration; also for recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement.

This is essentially the same bill which was passed by the Senate in the previous Congress by a unanimous vote.

I hope that the bill will receive speedy approval in the 89th Congress.

I ask unanimous consent to have the text of the bill printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received, appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 34) to make certain provisions in connection with the construction of the Garrison diversion unit, Missouri River Basin project, by the Secretary of the Interior, introduced by Mr. Burdick (for himself and other Senators) was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the general plan for the Missouri-Souris unit of the Missouri River Basin project, heretofore authorized in section 9 of the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 887), as modified by the report of the Secretary of the Interior contained in House Document Numbered 325, Eighty-sixth Congress, second session, is confirmed and approved under the designation "Garrison diversion unit," and the construction of a development providing for the irrigation of two hundred and fifty thousand acres, municipal and industrial water, fish, and wildlife conservation and development, recreation, flood control, and other project purposes shall be prosecuted by the Department of the Interior substantially in accordance with the plans set out in the Bureau of Reclamation report dated November 1962 (revised May 1963) supplemental report to said House Document Numbered 325.

Sec. 2. The Secretary is authorized in connection with the Garrison diversion unit to construct, operate, and maintain or otherwise provide for basic public outdoor recreation facilities, to acquire or otherwise to include within the unit area such adjacent lands or interests therein as are necessary for present or future public recreation use, to allocate water and reservoir capacity to recreation, and to provide for the public use and enjoyment of unit lands, facilities, and water areas in a manner coordinated with other unit purposes. The Secretary is authorized to enter into agreements with Federal agencies or State or local public bodies for the operation, maintenance, and additional development of unit lands or facilities, or to dispose of unit lands or facilities to Federal agencies or State or local public bodies by lease, transfer, conveyance, or exchange, upon such terms and conditions as will best promote the development and operation of such lands or facilities in the public interest for recreation purposes. The Secretary shall notify the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of any such proposed disposition to a State or local public body by transfer, conveyance, or exchange, or by lease for twenty-five years or more, and no such transfer, conveyance, or exchange shall be effectuated and no such lease shall be executed prior to sixty calendar days (which sixty days, however, shall not include days on which either the Senate or the House of Representatives is not in session because of an adjournment of more than three days to a day certain or an adjournment sine die) from the date of such notification. In connection with the foregoing undertakings and developments for the enhancement of fish and wildlife resources on the Garrison diversion unit: (1) Federal costs incurred specifically for land

and basic facilities shall be nonreimbursable; (2) joint costs allocated to recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement, other than those hereafter specified, shall in the aggregate be nonreimbursable to the extent they do not exceed the sum of $13,000,000 plus 4 per centum of the cost of joint-use land and facilities of the unit in excess of $100,000,000; (3) joint costs allocated to fish and wildlife enhancement which are attributable to migratory waterfowl production habitat benefits shall be nonreimbursable; and (4) other Federal costs, including separable joint costs, allocated to recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement shall in the aggregate be nonreimbursable up to a limit of $2,500,000. Provision shall be made for the reimbursement, for the contribution by non-Federal interests, or for the reallocation of costs allocated to recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement in excess of the foregoing limit under one or a combination of the following methods as may be determined appropriate by the Secretary: (1) provision by non-Federal interests of land or interests therein or facilities required for the unit; (2) payment or repayment, with interest at a rate comparable to that provided in section 4(a) of this Act, pursuant to agreement with one or more non-Federal public bodies; (3) reallocation to other project functions in the same proportion as joint costs are allocated among such functions. Costs of means and measures to prevent loss of and damage to fish and wildlife shall be treated as unit costs and allocated to the other unit purposes. For the purpose of this Act, "joint-use land and facilities" shall mean land and facilities serving two or more unit purposes, one of which is recreation or fish and wildlife enhancement. Nothing herein shall limit the authority of the Secretary granted by existing provisions of law relating to recreation, development of water resource projects, or disposition of public lands for recreational purposes.

Sec. 3. The Garrison diversion unit shall be integrated physically and financially with the other Federal works constructed or authorized to be constructed under the comprehensive plan approved by section 9 of the Act of December 22, 1944, as amended and supplemented. The Secretary shall give consideration to returning to the Missouri River to the fullest extent practicable such of the return flows as are not required for beneficial purposes.

Sec. 4 (a) The interest rate used for computing interest during construction and interest on the unpaid balance of the capital costs allocated to interest-bearing features of the Garrison diversion unit as authorized in this Act shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury as of the beginning of the fiscal year in which construction is initiated, on the basis of the computed average interest rate payable by the Treasury upon its outstanding marketable public obligations, which are neither due or callable for redemption for fifteen years from date of issue.

(b) From and after July 1, 1965, the interest rate on the unamortized balance of the investment allocated to commercial power in facilities constructed or under construction on June 30, 1965, by the Department of the Army in the Missouri River Basin, the commercial power from which is marketed by the Department of the Interior, and in the transmission and marketing facilities associated therewith, shall be 2½ per centum per annum.

Sec. 5. For a period of ten years from the date of enactment of this Act, no water from the project authorized by this Act shall be delivered to any water user for the production on newly irrigated lands of any basic agricultural commodity, as defined in the Agricultural Act of 1949, or any amendment thereof, if the total supply of such commodity for the marketing year in which the bulk of the crop would normally be marketed is in excess of the normal supply as defined in section 301(b)(10) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, unless the Secretary of Agriculture calls for an increase in production of such commodity in the interest of national security.

Sec. 6. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for construction of the Garrison diversion unit as authorized in this Act, the sum of $207,000,000, plus or minus such amounts, if any, as may be justified by reason of ordinary fluctuations in construction costs as indicated by engineering cost indexes applicable to the types of construction involved herein. There are also authorized to be appropriated such additional sums as may be required for operation and maintenance of the unit.

EXTENSION OF OUR FISHING AREA TO 12 MILES

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I am introducing today on behalf of myself and Senators PASTORE and MUSKIE, a bill designed to conserve the offshore fishery resources of the United States to authorize the extension of the territorial waters of our Nation and its territories to 12 miles. The bill is identical to S. 1816, which I introduced in the 88th Congress. I ask unanimous consent that this proposed legislation be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks and that the bill lie on the table for 10 days.

We must face up to the grim reality that our once great fishing industry is in trouble. The 88th Congress wisely took a long-overdue first step to help U.S. fishermen when it approved a bill introduced by my good friend and colleague from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], which makes it possible to fine or imprison violators of our coastal waters who come inside our 3-mile limit. But the need persists to extend our territorial waters and give our fishermen a wider area in which to fish unmolested by foreign competition.

Today, 49 nations have extended their territorial waters to 12 miles or more and at the same time foreign vessels are fishinf off our shores in ever-increasing numbers.

In 1963 these sea farmers from other nations harvested fish off New England, off the Middle Atlantic States, in the Gulf of Mexico, in the Bering Sea, and in the North Pacific off Alaska.

Last year was the first time in our Nation's history that more than half of our fish supply—56 percent—of fishery products was imported. The percentage of fishery products imported in this country has doubled since 1950.

According to the Department of the Interior, nearly 300 Soviet vessels operated off New England in 1963; the total is one-third more than in 1962. Even as this occurred, even as foreign fishermen took more fish in our waters, our catch off the coasts of foreign countries declined. The Bureau of Commercial Fisheries tells me that in 1954 our fishermen took 574 million pounds of fish on the high seas off Canada and Central and South American countries compared with only 429 million pounds in 1963. This is a decline of 145 million pounds in one decade.

Let us look at the fish import statistics.

In 1963, we imported a total of 6.5 billion pounds of fishery products. The previous high in 1962 was 1.5 billion pounds less—or 5 billion pounds.

Our imports of groundfish and ocean perch fillets, including blocks and slabs, went up to 232 million pounds from 221 million pounds in 1962.

Our imports of scallops went up to 13.3 million pounds from 11.6 million pounds in 1962.

Our imports of shrimp climbed to 151.5 million pounds from the previous 1962 high of 141.2 million pounds.

We ate more oysters. Our imports in 1963 totaled 8.3 million pounds of oysters, up from the previous 1962 high of 7.8 million pounds.

We imported more fish meal and scrap. The 1963 total of fish meal and scrap was 382,400 tons as opposed to the previous high in 1962 of 252,300 tons.

What did our fishermen do? Their catches of flounders, tuna, clams, blue crabs, king crabs, dungeness crabs and Oregon shrimp established new records. But our catches of Pacific halibut, Maine herring, Alaska herring, jack and Pacific mackerel, menhaden, salmon, Pacific sardines, tuna, and oysters did not increase. The oyster production in fact dropped to a new low.

How did Alaska participate in the national fishing picture?

First. Halibut landings in Ketchikan and Petersburg dropped and depressed the national catch;

Second. The herring catch, smallest since 1917, was about 31 million pounds or 8 percent less than in 1962;

Third. The salmon catch of red, chum, and pink salmon decreased by 60 million pounds;

Fourth. The dungeness crab catch totaled a record 11.8 million pounds or some 3 million pounds more than in the previous year;

Fifth. The Alaska king crab take of 77 million pounds was recordbreaking, exceeding by 24 million pounds the 1962 figure;

Sixth. The shrimp catch of plus-14 million pounds was 2.5 million pounds less than in 1962.

The lowered salmon catch in turn depressed the Alaska salmon pack by 708,000 cases.

Thus, in but two instances—the taking of king and dungeness crabs—has the Alaska fisherman been able to increase his catch. His halibut, herring, and shrimp catches dropped. Worse—the statistics of the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries show that fishing in all parts of the Nation could be a great deal better.

I ask unanimous consent that at this point in my remarks there be printed a table showing the world fish catch of the 10 leading nations for the years 1960, 1961, and 1962. The United States holds to fifth place but the four leading nations catch increasingly larger amounts and statistics as to the actual take of mainland China simply do not exist.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

World fish catch

Country	1960		1961		1962	
	Pounds (billion)	Percent	Pounds (billion)	Percent	Pounds (billion)	Percent
Japan	13.7	16.4	14.79	16.3	15.13	15.3
Peru	7.8	9.4	11.56	12.7	15.06	15.3
China (mainland)	11.1	13.3	11.07	[1] 12.2	11.07	[1] 11.2
Russia	6.7	8.1	7.16	7.9	7.98	8.1
United States	6.2	7.5	6.48	7.1	6.47	6.6
Norway	3.5	4.2	3.33	3.7	2.95	3.0
Canada	2.047	2.5	2.25	2.5	2.46	2.5
Spain	2.1	2.5	2.24	2.5	2.22	2.3
India	2.6	3.1	2.12	2.3	2.15	2.2
United Kingdom	2.037	2.4	1.98	2.2	2.08	2.1

[1] Based on 1959 data.

Source: Information supplied by the Department of the Interior, Mar. 4, 1964.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, upon first introducing this proposed legislation on June 28, 1963, I described the 3-mile limit as an albatross around the neck of U.S. fishermen. The albatross is still there and its victims—the fishermen—are weaker. It it disheartening to be told by the Department of the Interior that our fishing catch of both edible and nonedible items declined in 1963.

The catch of 4,750 million pounds in 1963 was 11 percent less than the record 5,534 million pounds taken in 1962. Fishermen also suffered a financial loss for they received $378 million for that catch or 5 percent less than the record $396 million received in 1962.

While we keep our wornout 3-mile limit, other nations catch our fish, thereby forcing U.S. consumers to buy part of the foreign catch to supplement our short supply. It makes no sense.

We keep our 3-mile limit which is an obsolete provision dating from days when 3 miles was the approximate distance a cannonball from a shore battery could hit a hostile vessel. In other words, the 3-mile limit was a development of a national defense measure which had nothing whatever to do with fishing.

Is it not silly and defensively unsound of us to keep that limitation and expose our shores to perhaps unfriendly eyes at this moment in world history when 49 nations have tossed aside the outdated concept

The following countries, as of December 1, 1964, according to information supplied by the Library of Congress, Legislative Reference Service, claim territorial limits or zones for special purposes, including fishing, which extend to at least 12 miles from the coasts: Albania, Algeria, Brazil, Bulgaria, Byelorussian S.S.R,. Cambodia, Canada, Ceylon, Chile, Communist China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Republic of Korea, Libya, Malagasy Republic, Morocco, Norway, Panama, Peru, Rumania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, South Africa, Sudan, Syria, Tanzania, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian S.S.R., U.S.S.R., United Arab Republic, United Kingdom, Uruguay, Venezuela, Vietnam (South).

It is expected that the following nations will shortly ratify the European Fishery Convention of 1964 which claims a 3-mile territorial sea plus 3 miles exclusive fishing zone plus 6 additional miles which is restricted to nations party to the convention: Denmark, France, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, The Netherlands, Portugal, Spain, Sweden.

So the total may climb to 58 countries claiming jurisdiction over at least 12 miles of territorial sea for fishing purposes.

On earlier occasions, both in this Chamber and elsewhere, I have discussed the need to extend our territorial waters for fishing purposes to 12 miles.

I ask unanimous consent that the remarks I made before the 16th annual session of the Gulf and Caribbean Fisheries Institute held in Miami, Fla., November 11, 1963, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR FISHERIES NEED GREATER AND FIRMER SUPPORT AND A 12-MILE LIMIT

(Speech by Senator GRUENING given at Miami, Fla., November 11, 1963)

Friends and members meeting at the 16th annual session of the Gulf and Caribbean Fisheries Institute, a little over 4 months ago, I introduced a bill in the Senate which sought to extend our fishing limits from the present and traditional 3 nautical miles from our coasts to 12 miles, and at the same time avoid some of the conflicting views and interests among our diverse American fishing groups.

The reason for this precaution was that we are not—and when I say "we" I mean our fishermen and those concerned with our fishermen—are not entirely united on the desirability of extending these limits an additional 9 miles, although I am convinced that a substantial majority of them are.

So, the bill provided that whenever the Governor of any State or territory alleged, by petition to the President, that the fishing by nationals of other nations in some or all of the coastal waters lying within the 12 miles of the shores of such State or territory was of such intensity or magnitude, or of a character to endanger the fishery resource within that area, the President should appoint a factfinding board which would investigate the allegations of the Governor and report within 90 days; that if the report sustained the contention of the Governor, as it probably would, the President could prohibit by decree the fishing of these nationals in the waters of that State up to 12 miles or he could provide other regulations which would limit the extent of their fishing, the type of their gear, and establish other restrictions that seemed necessary.

One purpose of introducing this legislation was to call attention to the need of action regarding the obsolete 3-mile limit.

In my remarks to the Senate I referred to that 3-mile limit as an "albatross hung around every fisherman's neck." For I am saying to you very frankly that I am in favor of the 12-mile limit for the entire United States. I think it is overdue. The 3-mile limit is an outmoded conception dating from the days of the cannon that shot round iron balls whose effective range was estimated to be approximately 3 miles. In other words, the 3-mile limit was a development of a national defense measure which had nothing whatever to do with fishing. For long the 3-mile limit was common to all nations with seacoasts.

While there has been a lot of discussion concerning these limits for years and the pros and cons of changing them, there has been no concerted action. International conferences to change these limits have never developed a sufficient agreement to make possible multilateral action or universal action. So what actually has happened recently is that individual nations have taken it upon themselves to extend these limits to whatever seemed to them to be best for their nationals, and varyingly to hope and assume that each could make its prescription prevail on others. But Uncle Sam, being generally good natured and perhaps in his maturity a little timid, has hesitated to take such action partly because of concern for international relations, but also because there were differences of opinion in our own fishing family.

These differences of opinion have become less and less valid because they were largely based on the desire of some of our fishermen to fish as close to the 3-mile limits of other nations as possible and did not wish to stimulate those nations into retaliatory measures if the United States proclaimed a 12-mile limit for itself. That situation has been rapidly disappearing as other nations have acted or claimed extensions of their fishing areas, and I suspect that before long we shall move closer to unanimity among American fishermen in supporting a 12-mile limit for our fisheries.

Let it be understood that this is for fisheries only and that is what our discussion is about, because there are some military or naval aspects, and extension of the limit to 12 miles for purposes other than fishing clash with some conceptions of our Defense Establishment.

Actually, the United States has in the past been a retarding agent in promoting change.

When the Hague Codification Conference met in 1930 under the auspices of the League of Nations, the United States favored continuation of the 3-mile limit which was then supported by the United Kingdom and by its former colonies or associates in the British Empire—Canada, India, Ireland, and South Africa, as well as by the Netherlands, Greece, Denmark, and China. Favoring 4 miles were Norway, Sweden, Finland, and Iceland. Six miles was sought by Italy, Yugoslavia, Rumania, Brazil, and Colombia. Portugal reached for 12 miles. No agreement was reached at this Conference.

Another conference, after long preparation in which 86 nations were represented, met in 1958, known as the Geneva Conference of the Law of the Sea. At that gathering 21 countries, including the United States and the United Kingdom, claimed 3 miles. In that category were also Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, China, Cuba, Denmark, the Dominican Republic, France, Japan, Jordan, Liberia, Malaya, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Pakistan, Poland, South Africa, and Tunisia. Again Norway and Sweden, Finland, and Iceland favored 4 miles. Cambodia claimed 5 miles.

Twelve countries claimed 6 miles—Ceylon, Colombia, Greece, India, Iran, Israel, Portugal, Spain, Thailand, Uruguay, and Yugoslavia. Mexico claimed 9 miles and Albania 10. By this time, 11 countries were claiming 12 miles—Bulgaria, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Guatemala, Indonesia, Libya, Rumania, Saudi Arabia, the Soviet Union, the United Arab Republic, and Venezuela. Chile, Costa Rica, Salvador, and Peru put in a claim for 200 miles, while Argentina, Korea, Nicaragua, and Panama sought to claim their continental shelves. At this Conference, Soviet Russia and the Arab bloc insisted on 12 miles, while the United States and the United Kingdom led the fight for the status quo—namely, 3 miles. Late in the Conference the U.S. delegation offered a compromise. It proposed a 6-mile limit with an additional 6-mile contiguous zone in which the coastal nation would have exclusive fishing rights, subject only to "historic rights" for countries whose nationals had fished in the area for the 5 previous years. This compromise failed to receive the two-thirds vote required for adoption as a Conference recommendation.

Two years later, in 1960, there was another conference—the Second Geneva Conference on the Law of the Sea. This time the Conference began with the proposal that failed in the closing hours of the 1958 Conference, with the added qualification that after an initial 10 years the right of the states to fish within 12 miles would end unless bilateral treaties could meanwhile be negotiated. In this Conference the proposal fell short of one vote of the necessary two-thirds. With 82 nations voting and 5 abstentions, the proposal received 54 votes to 28 against. A shift of 1 vote would have made it 55 for to 27 against, the needed two-thirds majority. But let us remember that even after such a favorable vote there would be no compulsion for nations to carry out the findings of the Conference. A subsequent treaty with each nation, or a multilateral treaty of ratification, would have been needed and there was no guarantee or certainty that this would follow and that such treaties could be successfully negotiated.

This brief summary of recent history on the extent of territorial waters will give an idea of the difficulty of arriving at international agreement. The United States has been making efforts to secure such agreement. This is a praiseworthy objective—if attainable.

The United States has, in recent years, been suffering from what might be termed a power inferiority complex. Because we are powerful, we hesitate to assert that power. We demur at asserting it because of a well-intentioned and idealistic desire to show the world that we believe in negotiation, arbitration and decisions arrived at by mutual consent, if possible, of vexatious international problems. That is a fine ideal and a high purpose, which I applaud and which someday may prevail in the world. There is an old saying to the effect it is well to have a giant's strength but it is tyrannous to avail oneself of it. Well, neither is it desirable to have Lilliputians truss up and hamstring the giant through unwillingness on his part to use his giant's strength to protect his nationals' interest. For indeed events are outrunning the worthy high purposes but languid action of some aspects of our national policy. While the United States is striving for international agreements, other nations are going it alone.

On June 4 last, Canadian Prime Minister Lester Pearson, addressing the Canadian Parliament, declared that the time had come to "take firm and national action to protect Canada's fishing industry." Commenting on the growing number of foreign fishing operations which threatened to deplete his nation's offshore fishery resources, Canada's chief executive declared:

"The Canadian Government has decided to establish a 12-mile exclusive fisheries zone along the whole of Canada's coastline as of mid-May 1964, and to implement the straight baseline system at the same time as the basis from which Canada's territorial sea and exclusive fisheries zone shall be measured."

I can only applaud Canada's action as a vigorous move to protect its nationals' fishing interests.

Other nations, too, are moving—and moving unilaterally. Ecuador—little Ecuador—a country with no great political stability and seeking our financial aid under Uncle Sam's generous foreign assistance program and receiving it—to date to the extent of $152 million—seized two American fishing vessels and arrested their crews, although they were fishing more than 12 miles from shore, since Ecuador claimed exclusive fishing jurisdiction up to 200 miles. The crews were brought into the harbor and kept imprisoned on their vessels for 3 weeks, a plain, unmitigated outrage. Then the two ships were fined $12,086 and $14,186 respectively.

We may well contrast the absence of vigorous action by our State Department in this case with its action in Alaska, where it insisted that the crews of the Japanese vessels arrested by Governor Egan, when they were caught fishing within 3 miles of Alaska's coast, be released without trial, although in their case they could only have been fined for failure to have fishing licenses and for violation of the conservation practices prevailing in our waters.

There have been other cases in Ecuador and similar to these of harassment of American fishing boats off the shores of other Latin American countries, and it is high time that we had a clear-cut understanding as to what they may and may not do, and not be subject to the arbitrary, brutal, and ruthless maltreatment to which these American fishermen have been subjected. Submission to such maltreatment does not instill respect either for the country guilty thereof or for the United States which accepts it passively.

As you know, I was asked to present a written copy of this address, which required my writing it a week in advance; and when I wrote it, I said, at this point: "I expect that this issue will come up in the current debate on foreign aid and that legislation will be proposed to obviate such occurrences in the future."

Well, it has come up. It took place on the floor of the Senate on Wednesday and Thursday, November 6 and 7. At that time, an amendment to the foreign aid bill, sponsored by the two California Senators—Senator Thomas Kuchel, Republican, and Senator Clair Engle, Democrat—provided as follows:

"No assistance shall be furnished under this act to any country which (1) has extended or hereafter extends its jurisdiction for fishing purposes over any area of the high seas beyond that recognized by the United States, and (2) hereafter imposes any penalty or sanction against any U.S. fishing vessel on account of its fishing activities in such area. The provisions of this subsection shall not be applicable in any case in which the extension of jurisdiction is made pursuant to international agreement in which the United States is a party."

The amendement was vigorously supported both by my colleague, Senator Bartlett, and by me. It was opposed by the leadership on both sides of the aisle, but it passed by a vote of 57 to 29.

An unusual parliamentary situation developed. It is customary, immediately after a vote has been taken, for the leader on the winning side to move for reconsideration of the bill and then have another Senator, similarly on the winning side, to move that the move for reconsideration be laid on the table. The purpose of this is to make the decision final and not to permit reconsideration at a future date.

Before the move for reconsideration could be offered by Senator Kuchel in behalf of the Kuchel-Engle amendment, Senator Long of Louisiana obtained the floor and spoke very emphatically against the amendment. He succeeded in swinging a few votes but not sufficient to prevent the motion for reconsideration to be laid on the table.

The amendment, of course, will still have to be approved in conference, since it is not in the House version of the bill, and I think you can be reasonably sure that strong efforts will be made by the opponents to secure its deletion in conference.

But there is more than that to prompt the United States to act. Foreign fishing vessels in increasing numbers are also appearing off our shores, in waters traditionally fished by American vessels. They have been off the Atlantic coast from Maine to Florida and off our gulf coasts.

Soviet Russia is going after the fisheries all over the world with effectiveness, determination, and ruthlessness that threatens our fisheries and the livelihood of our fishermen. The Japanese likewise have become more and more aggressive. In 1956 the United States ranked second only to Japan as a fishing nation. By 1961, 5 years later, the United States had dropped to fifth place among nations in the size of its catch. We are now behind not only Japan, but behind Soviet Russia, Red China, and Peru. That is not a position of which we should be proud. Nor is it a trend that we can or should continue to tolerate.

While the world's annual fish catch has doubled in the last 15 years, the U.S. share of that increase has been negligible. But what has increased is our fisheries importation, which has, since 1940, grown approximately 400 percent. A determined national policy, geared to the national interest, could rectify that condition.

To be sure our dilemma is a complex one and I shall shortly touch on some of its problems and proposed remedies. But among the remedies which will be decidedly beneficial is the extension of our fishing preserves at least to the 12-mile limit with appropriate baselines between headlands.

The bill, S. 1816, of which I spoke earlier, cosponsored by Senator Ed Muskie, of Maine—thus evidencing support from our easternmost and westernmost States—has not been acted upon. The reason for the delay is, in part, the desire of the State Department to complete negotiations with some of the nations which are already asserting, or preparing to assert, exclusive control of coastal waters beyond the 3-mile limit. Among these is Canada, whose announced purpose to extend its limits to 12 miles next May would—unless we reach an agreement—deprive some of our American fishermen of long-frequented fishing grounds.

Central and South American nations have made similar departures, and while our Government has "reserved all its rights," as the diplomatic phrase goes, it remains to be seen just what those reservations of our rights mean. In any event, I am convinced that we cannot wait much longer before taking action ourselves.

The urgency for action is brought home to us particularly in Alaska by not merely the invasion of our waters by Japanese and Russian fishing fleets, but their actual penetration inside the 3-mile limit and the taking of fish inside it. One may suspect that the Russians are there also for purposes of observation.

In the summer of 1962, Gov. William Egan, of Alaska, apprised of Japanese fishing vessels moving into the waters of Shelikof

Strait, a body of water lying between Kodiak Island and the mainland, long fished exclusively by Americans, wrote a vigorous protest to the State Department requesting effective action to prevent the Japanese incursion. Hearing nothing, he followed this up with a telegram. Still getting no response, he telephoned and got the Acting Secretary of State on the line. This was, the Acting Secretary said, the first he had heard of the difficulty. The best Governor Egan could exact from him was the promise to send an observer. Governor Egan was caustic over the phone. But, more important, defying precedent, he decided to act. He sent the Alaska National Guard to board two Japanese vessels clearly within these waters, arrested the captains and crews, and ordered them brought to court.

This forthright action was displeasing to the State Department, and produced an editorial in the Washington Post, the Capital's only morning daily, highly critical of Governor Egan. It pointed out that he had improperly taken upon himself a Federal function and chided him for not knowing the limits of a State Governor's authority.

However, his action received the virtually unanimous and enthusiastic support of the people of Alaska. In fact, there are many who believe this brought about his reelection in 1962. The pioneer spirit, still characteristic of "the last frontier" takes many forms. Governor Egan's pioneering received the hearty approval of Alaska's congressional delegation.

At the request of the State Department, the offending Japanese fishermen were released. Actually, there was at the time no penalty for the violation of our 3-mile limit. But the captain and crew could have been fined for not having an Alaska fishing license and for violation of conservation regulations related to the type of their ship's gear, for their nets were fine meshed and take everything, old and young, large and small.

Since that time, I am happy to report, legislation has been introduced in Congress to provide fines up to $10,000 and imprisonment up to 1 year for the violation of our coastal waters; that is, penetration by foreign vessels within the 3-mile limit. It, S. 1988, has passed the Senate, in large part due to the efforts of Senator Warren Magnuson, chairman of the Commerce Committee, and of my Alaska colleague, Bob Bartlett, and is awaiting action in the House, where I am confident it will also be approved. If the United States extends its fishing limits to 12 miles, these penalties will apply without need of any amendatory legislation.

The need for both the penalties and the extension is further demonstrated by actions of the Russian fishing fleet. Soviet vessels have repeatedly, under cover of morning fog, penetrated inside our 3-mile limit. Russian whaling vessels have taken whales well within it, and have been observed doing it. When detected by plane, they have often not moved, and only with the approach of our Coast Guard vessels have they moved out. Hitherto they have had nothing to fear. The Coast Guard vessel merely escorts them outside of the 3-mile limit. Actually, if S. 1988 becomes law, we shall need faster vessels because as of now they are not fast enough to catch the Russian ships. I have repeatedly requested the administration to station faster vessels—a destroyer or two—in Alaskan waters to overtake and apprehend such violators. Up to now, we are limited to escorting them outside our waters and then making a protest to the Russian Foreign Office.

So far, I have not secured compliance with these requests for destroyers or faster ships. I shall continue to make them. I have pointed out the uselessness of diplomatic protests made after such violations. Enactment of S. 1988, to impose fines up to $10,000 or a year's imprisonment, or both, will have a deterrent effect provided also we can catch the culprits. Otherwise, the Russian practice of fish-and-run will continue. I wonder, parenthetically, what would happen to American fishing vessels if they should similarly venture into Siberian waters. My guess is that our fishing vessels would never be heard from again.

Indeed, there is real danger that unless the Federal Government acts decisively, the State of Alaska may again feel impelled to act, as it did in the case of the Japanese fishing vessels in the summer of 1962.

Telegraphing the State Department on August 2, last, Governor Egan called attention to the presence of four Russian whalers within the 3-mile limit, giving their exact location. One whaler, he reported, had a freshly killed whale on a harpoon line, another whaler was preparing to fire. They were spotted by an experienced aircraft pilot and his passengers. Although the noise of the plane caused the whales to sound, the whalers made no effort to leave the area. This was but the latest of a number of confirmed observations of Russians fishing actively.

After urging the strongest possible representations to Russia and greatly augmented patrols, Governor Egan added that the State of Alaska had no desire again to take unilateral action and was aware of the delicate international situation but "cannot stand idly by in face of repeated violations of its territorial waters."

But there are still other problems with the Russians which will not be solved by the 12-mile limit and baselines alone and the penalties for their violations.

In Alaska we have, in recent years, developed an entirely new and desirable fishery product—the king crab. This is a large animal—its mature specimen measuring from 3 to 5 feet in diameter. The meat in each of its six claws is a meal. This new industry has been developed over the last decade largely through the enterprise and initiative of two Alaskans, brothers, Lowell and Howard Wakefield. Alaska king crab has become a nationally known delicacy and is increasingly marketed. It is caught by traps or pots which are lowered to the sea bottom from the crab fishing vessels and hauled to the surface and placed aboard.

For two succesive seasons Russian trawlers cruising outside the 3-mile limit have torn up these traps. Governor Egan met with the victims at Kodiak last month and their testimony was to the effect that the Russians were deliberately dragging through the crab fishermen's gear, each of whose pots were clearly marked by a buoy. The Russians went back and forth through this area. One fisherman lost three pots on one day, five on the next, and two subsequently. As these cost about $200 apiece, he felt he could no longer set out his crab pots. Others gave similar testimony. Our crab fishermen, in effect, have been driven off their fishing grounds and deprived of their livelihood.

Another fisherman, coming alongside a Russian trawler, observed large quantities of king crab on its decks. There were many female and immature crabs and none of these were thrown off, as our conservation practices require.

In a letter to the President last month, Governor Egan reported these facts to the President. He had counseled the fishermen fully to document and report their gear losses and encounters with the Russians and to avoid any incidents which would prejudice their cause. He was evidently apprehensive that some of them, inflamed by the deliberate and insolent invasion of their grounds and destruction of their property, might be tempted to take the law into their own hands. (Violence against Japanese seal poachers flared over half a century ago, when Alaskans did take the law into their hands.)

"I believe the evidence conclusive," Governor Egan wrote the President, "that the Russians are driving American fishermen from their traditional fishing grounds and ignoring the fundamental requirements of king crab conservation."

So even the 12-mile limit and the establishment of base lines will not be enough. The United States should reserve its continental shelf—subject only to such bilateral treaties as serve the interests of both our fishermen and of the Nation with which we treat. But even that will not be enough unless our Government takes a firm stand in behalf of our fishermen's rights and is prepared to back it up.

We have the largest defense budget in our history. We claim, and have, the most powerful military machine in the world—Army, Navy, and Air Force. We justify it and Congress votes it cheerfully in order to stop the advance of Communist imperialism all over the world. A large part of our defense effort, in dollars, material and manpower, is spent far from our shores, in distant parts of the world. Is it not inconsistent and inexplicable that we do not put out the same effort at home; that we do not stop the economic aggression on our very coasts?

It is high time we did so.

Such action, however imperative, will not solve all our fishery problems, for we must also meet the competition of other nations' subsidized fishing vessels and efficient floating factories. The Congress is moving in this direction with legislation to authorize the Government to pay a subsidy of 55 percent of the cost of new fishing vessels. This is proper and realistic, since our fishery interests are obligated to build in American shipyards. When we have modern ships and equipment, we will be able to compete on the high seas, though that will not solve the problem of foreign vessels disregarding conservation practices and taking immature fish.

Other legislation is giving us increased funds for research.

I sponsored a bill in the 87th Congress which would have turned over one-third of the proceeds from the Kennedy-Saltonstall Act to the States to be used by the State fishery authorities for whatever purpose they deem best. The funds were allocated to the States on the basis of fishery landings. The bill ran into some objections and did not pass.

In a modified form, sponsored by my Alaska colleague, Bob Bartlett, along with 30 other Senators, of whom I was one, it has been introduced in this Congress and has already passed the Senate. It is S. 627, and I am confident it stands an excellent chance of passage in the House.

In addition to that, we now have an amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act which includes fish products and fish protein concentrate as part of the food for peace program. Senator Bartlett of Alaska was one of the prime movers in securing this desirable amendment. When we overcome the stubborn resistance of the Administrator of the Food and Drug Administration, who objects to the domestic sale of fish protein concentrate on esthetic grounds, we will also increase our domestic market substantially for fishery products.

Indeed, it is high time that we began to give consideration to those who produce food from the sea comparable to that we give those who produce food from the land.

We are spending billions of dollars annually to help the farmer with price supports and storage of surpluses—but we have done next to nothing for the fisherman. We have never subsidized our fishermen for the fish they do not catch. We have no sea bank comparable to the soil bank. To quote President Kennedy's clarion call: "Let us begin." Well, we are just barely beginning in ship construction and research. We must do much more to regain our lost position.

But we can, and I believe we must, protect our coastal waters and their fisheries. Although there are some differences between the views and interests of our own fishermen, I am convinced that the preponderant national interest will be served, as I have said, by extending our fishing waters to at least 12 miles and by including the Continental Shelf for crustacea and shellfish, and by being determined to enforce our rights within these areas. A vacillating, a weak-kneed, a soft policy will lead only to continuing and further encroachment. The United States has abundantly shown its generosity, its empathy, and its willingness to help other nations. Our foreign aid program has for years included projects to assist, to rehabilitate, to support the fisheries of a score of foreign nations.

It's high time we stood up for our own.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, it is time we stood up for our own.

We have given in grants the sum of $14,693,024 since 1955 to build up the fisheries of other nations.

That total includes $5,351,000 to help the fishermen of Korea; $1,355,670 to assist the fishermen of Pakistan, and $907,198 to assist the fishermen of Indonesia.

I ask unanimous consent that a chart appearing in the Yearbook of Fishery Statistics, 1962, volume 15, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United States, showing the world catch of fish, by countries, be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the chart was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

World catch of fish, crustaceans, mollusks, etc., by countries, 1962

[Live weight basis]

Country	Billion pounds	Percent
Japan	15.13	15.3
Peru	15.06	15.3
China (mainland)	[1] 11.07	11.2
U.S.S.R	7.98	8.1
United States	[2] 6.56	6.7
Norway	2.95	3.0
Canada	2.46	2.5
Spain	2.22	2.3
India	2.15	2.2
United Kingdom	2.08	2.1
Indonesia	2.08	2.1
Iceland	1.84	1.9
Denmark	1.73	1.8
France	1.62	1.6
South Africa	1.44	1.5
Chile	1.41	1.4
Germany, Western	1.39	1.4
Portugal	1.14	1.2
Philippines	1.11	1.1
Korea, South	.99	1.0
South West Africa	.90	.9
Burma	.79	.8
Thailand	.75	.8
Pakistan	.73	.7
China (Taiwan)	.72	.7
Netherlands	.71	.7
Sweden	.64	.6
Brazil	[3] .62	.6
Angola	.59	.6
Vietnam, South	.56	.6
Mexico	.48	.5
Italy	.48	.5
Federation of Malaya	.44	.4
Poland	.40	.4
Morocco	.36	.4
Cambodia	.32	.3
Other	6.69	6.8
Total	98.59	100.0

[1] 1959 data.
[2] Revised.
[3] 1961 data.

Source: "Yearbook of Fishery Statistics, 1962," vol. XV, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, our fishing industry can be a principal weapon in our war against poverty. We can, if permitted, harvest our bountiful sea crops and make available to the hungry men, women, and children of our land the protein needed to grow strong and to keep strong.

Poverty can be cured here and in other lands. As a forward-looking society, verging on undreamed of greatness, we can end malnutrition if we utilize the untapped resources of our oceans.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record, and held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from Alaska.

The bill (S. 49) to conserve the offshore fishery resources of the United States and its territories, and for other purposes introduced by Mr. Gruening (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Whereas for some years the Congress of the United States has viewed with great concern the inadequacy of present arrangements for the protection, conservation, and rehabilitation of the fishery resources contiguous to the coasts of the United States of America and, in view of the potentially disturbing effect of this situation, has carefully studied the possibility of improving the jurisdictional basis for conservation and rehabilitation measures in this field; and

Whereas such fishery resources have a special importance to coastal communities as a source of livelihood and to the Nation as an important food and industrial resource; and

Whereas the progressive development of new methods and techniques contributes to intensified fishing over wide sea areas and, in certain cases, seriously threatens fisheries with depletion; and

Whereas there is urgent need to protect coastal fishery resources from destructive exploitation, having due regard to conditions peculiar to each region and situation and to the special rights and equities of the coastal States: Now, therefore,

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That whenever the Governor of any State or territory alleges by a petition to the President of the United States that fishing by nationals of other nations in some or all of the coastal waters lying within twelve miles off the shores of such State or territory is of such intensity or magnitude that the fishery resources in such waters are in danger of depletion, the President shall appoint a Fact Finding Board (hereinafter called the "Board") consisting of three persons, one of whom shall be a resident of such State or territory.

Sec. 2. The Board shall, within ninety days, investigate the allegations made by the Governor and report its findings of fact and recommendations for action to the President.

Sec. 3. The President, on the basis of such report and recommendations and such other information as may be brought to his attention, may by Presidential proclamation, if he finds that the allegations are sustained by the facts—

(a) prohibit fishing in some or all of the coastal waters up to twelve miles off the coast of such State by any person not a national of the United States of America; or

(b) establish conservation zones in the coastal waters lying up to twelve miles off the coast of such State or territory, limit the amount and type of fishing which may be conducted in such conservation zones, and set forth when and by whom fishing may be conducted in such conservation zones.

Sec. 4. Members of the Board shall be appointed without regard to the civil service and classification laws and shall receive compensation at the rate of $75 per day when engaged in carrying out their duties and shall, in addition, receive reimbursement for actual expenses incurred in the performance of such duties.

NEZ PERCE NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague [Mr. Jordan], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to designate the Nez Perce National Historical Park, in the State of Idaho.

With only minor changes, this is identical with the bill—S. 2326—which I introduced during the 1st session of the 88th Congress, and upon which hearings were conducted both here and in Idaho late last year, at my request.

Mr. President, this measure is designed to preserve and interpret a series of invaluable historic sites in the Nez Perce Indian country of north-central Idaho—an area deeply interwoven in the fabric of our Nation's westward exploration and settlement. Dispatched by President Jefferson to find a Northwest Passage to the Pacific, the Lewis and Clark Expedition in 1805 here met and mastered its greatest crisis, an accomplishment that gave us a major claim to the Oregon country. Here, too, was one of the first Christian missions established among the Northwest Indian tribes; the first printing press utilized in the Northwest; the gold discovery, in 1860, which populated the region; the first battles of the dramatic Nez Perce Indian War of 1877; and numerous other events which blazed the trail of our westward march.

Uniquely, these events transpired in a compact area of magnificently beautiful mountain country—an area with an average north-south distance of about 60 miles, and an east-west distance of approximately 110 miles, which is nearly the full width of northern Idaho. The new Lewis and Clark Highway follows the route of the explorers, from east to west, and crosses the Nez Perce Reservation, thus providing easy access for the thousands who will come to be reminded of a colorful and most important chapter of our national past.

The Secretary of Interior would be authorized to designate as the park a series of scattered sites throughout the area, thus requiring only the cooperation of other agencies, and the possible acquisition of a small amount of property in nonpublic ownership. The bill restricts such acquisition to not more than 1,500 acres of land and interests in land.

Mr. President, this proposal has impressive backing. It has been cleared by the Bureau of the Budget, and recommended by both the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Interior. Federal agencies were unanimously in favor at hearings held here by the Senate Subcommittee on Public Lands. Those conducted at Lewiston, by the chairman and distinguished senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. Bible], last October, brought forth overwhelming approval through direct and submitted testimony by more than 100 persons, including Gov. Robert E. Smylie. Printed hearings of this field inspection trip will soon be available, and I am hopeful that the bill will be high on the priority list of the Senate Interior Committee for this session.

Action is urgent. The opening of the new Lewis and Clark Highway has accelerated roadside commercial and residential development along the route, endangering the integrity and availability of potential sites.

A similar measure has been introduced in the House by the Honorable Compton I. White, Jr., of Idaho.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed at this point in the Record.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 60) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to designate the Nez Perce National Historical Park in the State of Idaho, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Church (for himself and Mr. Jordan of Idaho), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That it is the purpose of this Act to facilitate protection and provide interpretation of sites in the Nez Perce country of Idaho that have exceptional value in commemorating the history of the Nation.

Sec. 2. To implement this purpose the Secretary of the Interior may designate as the Nez Perce National Historical Park various component sites in Federal and non-Federal ownership relating to the early Nez Perce culture, the Lewis and Clark Expedition through the area, the fur trade, missionaries, gold mining and logging, the Nez Perce War of 1877, and such other sites as he finds will depict the role of the Nez Perce country in the westward expansion of the Nation.

Sec. 3. The Secretary of the Interior may acquire by donation or with donated funds such lands, or interests therein, and other property which in his judgment will further the purpose of this Act and he may purchase with appropriated funds land, or interests therein, required for the administration of the Nez Perce National Historical Park: *Provided,* That he may purchase no more than one thousand five hundred acres in fee, and no more than five thousand one hundred acres in scenic easements. The Nez Perce Tribe's governing body, if it so desires, with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, is authorized to sell, donate, or exchange tribal-owned lands held in trust needed to further the purpose of this Act.

Sec. 4. (a) Indian trust lands and sites in Federal ownership under the administrative jurisdiction of other Government agencies, not to exceed one thousand and five hundred acres overall, may be designated by the Secretary of the Interior for inclusion in the Nez Perce National Historical Park with the concurrence of the beneficial owner or agency having administrative responsibility therefor, but such designation shall effect no transfer of administrative control unless the administering agency consents thereto. The Secretary of the Interior may cooperate with the administering agency in research into and interpretation of the significance of the site and in providing desirable interpretive services and facilities and other facilities required for public access to and use and enjoyment of the site, and in conservation of the scenic and other resources thereof.

(b) The Secretary of the Interior may enter into cooperative agreements with the owners of property which under the provisions of this Act may be designated for inclusion in Nez Perce National Historical Park as sites in non-Federal ownership, and he may assist in the preservation, renewal, and interpretation of the properties, provided the cooperative agreements shall contain, but not be limited to, provisions that: (1) the Secretary has right of access at all reasonable times to all public portions of the property for the purpose of conducting visitors through the property and interpreting it to the public, and (2) no changes or alterations shall be made in the properties, including buildings and grounds, without the written consent of the Secretary.

Sec. 5. When the Secretary of the Interior determines that he has acquired title to, or interest in, sufficient properties or determines that he has entered into appropriate cooperative agreements with owners of non-Federal properties, or any combination thereof including the designation of sites already in Federal ownership, he shall by publication in the Federal Register establish the Nez Perce National Historical Park and thereafter administer the Federal property under his administrative jurisdiction in accordance with the Act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535; 16 U.S.C. 1 et seq.), as amended and supplemented.

Sec. 6. (a) In order to carry out the purposes of this Act the Secretary of the Interior may contract and make cooperative agreements with the State of Idaho, its political subdivisions or agencies, corporations, associations, the Nez Perce Tribe or individuals, to protect, preserve, maintain, or operate any site, object, or property included within the Nez Perce National Historical Park, regardless as to whether title thereto is in the United States: *Provided,* That no contract or cooperative agreement shall be made or entered into which will obligate the general fund of the Treasury unless or until Congress has appropriated money for such purpose.

(b) To facilitate the interpretation of the Nez Perce country the Secretary is authorized to erect and maintain tablets or markers in accordance with the provisions contained in the Act approved August 21, 1935, entitled "An Act to provide for the preservation of historic American sites, buildings, objects, and antiquities of national significance, and for other purposes" (49 Stat. 666).

Sec. 7. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this Act.

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, it is a real pleasure for me to cosponsor the bill to authorize the designation of the Nez Perce National Historical Park in the State of Idaho. I not only have an interest in this as a Senator from Idaho, but I have lived most of my life in the Nez Perce country and I fully appreciate its national historical significance.

The purpose of the bill is to preserve, commemorate, and interpret the history and culture of the Nez Perce Indian country of this area in northern Idaho. This reaches from the Wallowa Mountains of northeast Oregon, some 200 miles across the State of Idaho to the crest of the Bitteroot Mountains in Montana. It encompasses a string of historic sites such as the ancestral homes of the proud Nez Perce Indian Tribe, campsites used by Lewis and Clark when they opened up the northwest empire in 1805, markers where battles were fought between Indians and Federal troops, the Spaulding area which includes the remains of the Henry Spaulding Mission of 1836, the St. Joseph's Mission and one of the first Indian Presbyterian churches at East Kamiah, the Craig donation land claim, the famous log drive sites on the Clearwater River, markers of those fur traders who first began to acquaint the Indians with our civilization, the town of Pierce where gold was first discovered in Idaho and the Weis Rock filter, a significant archeological site. These will be preserved and properly marked so these places where history was made will be available for the education and enjoyment of future generations.

Mr. President, this will be a unique park in many ways. All these sites will be linked together so that one administrative area will serve for all of them. Only the actual sites, where they are now in private ownership, will be acquired. There may be scenic and protective easements secured which will not adversely affect the local tax base or the productive capacity of the local communities. The actual sites may not exceed 1,500 acres and the scenic easements not exceed 5,100 acres under the terms of the bill. With about two-thirds of the State of Idaho now in Federal ownership this factor is of importance to us.

Under this program the historical and archeological sites will be preserved and made available for thousands of people interested in the Nez Perce Country each year, and yet the minimum of land will be purchased and scenic easements will protect these sites so they will not be unduly affected by the construction of buildings and structures not in keeping with the historical background.

A hearing on a bill for this same purpose which was introduced in the last session of Congress was held at Lewiston, Idaho, last October. Support for this legislation and the creation of such a historical park was widespread and enthusiastic.

This bill has the full support of Idaho's congressional delegation and we urge approval by the Congress for this unique national historical park.

PROGRAM OF HOSPITAL INSURANCE FOR THE ELDERLY

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I again introduce for appropriate reference a bill to establish a program of hospital insurance for the elderly, to be administered by the Social Security Administration.

The financing of adequate hospital and related care for older Americans is a persistent and pervasive national problem with which I have long been concerned.

Since 1959, I have sponsored bills to provide an equitable and meaningful program of hospital insurance that would help our senior citizens retain their independence and dignity.

At no time since this issue first came before the Congress many years ago have chances of favorable action been so bright. As a result of the 1964 elections, a clear majority of both Houses of the Congress support this program.

President Johnson, in his state of the Union message, reemphasized his desire for early action. An overwhelming majority of the American people favor the program, and I truly believe that we will at last see it become law later this year.

The need for this program has been so clearly documented that there is no point in my repeating the obvious statistics.

The bill I submit today represents my personal efforts at development of a meaningful medicare program.

It differs in some respects from the King-Anderson bill, which has the support of the administration.

But the goal of both bills is the same, namely to establish a universal program of hospital insurance for older Americans on a national basis.

Accordingly, I intend to work with Senator ANDERSON and other supporters of this program to get the best possible medicare bill through the Congress.

At a later date, I shall discuss the details of my bill at greater length. In many ways, it coincides with the recommendations of the Advisory Council on Social Security, which reported last week to the President.

Under my bill, a separate hospital insurance trust fund, financed by a separate payroll tax, would be established. The tax would amount to eight-tenths of 1 percent on salaries and wages up to $9,000 a year, with employer and employee each contributing four-tenths of 1 percent. Self-employed persons would pay six-tenths of 1 percent, up to the same maximum.

My bill would amend the Social Security Act, and the separate payroll tax would be collected on earnings as defined by social security, under existing procedures.

The bill would provide coverage to all persons 65 and over who are eligible for social security or railroad retirement benefits. All retired persons who are not covered by social security or railroad retirement, except for retired Federal employees who have their own programs, would receive the same benefits over the next 5 years, with the cost financed out of general revenues.

Benefits would be similar to bills I have introduced in the past and would include:

First. Forty-five days of hospital care per benefit period, without any deductible provision to be paid by the patient. The bill would provide as high as 90 days of hospitalization per calendar year.

Second. Ninety days' care in skilled nursing home per benefit period, following hospitalization, or up to 180 days per calendar year.

Third. Up to 120 home health service visits following hospital or skilled nursing home care in a supervised home health program, or in the outpatient department of a hospital, including radiation therapy and laboratory examinations.

Fourth. Payment for diagnostic outpatient services as recommended by a physician, without prior hospitalization or nursing home confinement, for such items as laboratory tests and X-rays, with the patient paying the first $10 of such charges in each 30-day period.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 65) to provide for payment for hospital and related health services for persons 65 years of age and older, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. McNAMARA, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

LOWER COLORADO RIVER BASIN PROJECT

During the delivery of Mr. MORSE's speech,

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it is my great pleasure and privilege to yield now to the distinguished junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. FANNIN]. In yielding to him, I welcome him to service in the Senate. This will be the first statement that the junior Senator from Arizona has made on the floor of the Senate. I want him to know how happy I am to have him with us.

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, I offer my sincere thanks to the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon. I am honored by his yielding to me.

My esteemed colleague from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] has today introduced a bill to authorize the construction and operation of the Lower Colorado River Basin project. I am pleased to be a cosponsor of the bill.

Arizona is in dire need of immediate construction of the central Arizona unit contained in this bill. Her existing and ever-growing economy are fast exhausting her water resources in many areas of the State. Her very future is threatened by any delay.

The bill is more than a State project, as the benefits it provides will extend far beyond Arizona's borders. It is a program designed to initiate a regional plan to provide much needed water to the Pacific Southwest, with the cost repayable to the Federal Government under reclamation law.

Within the provisions of this project is included a program to assist alleviating the disastrous consequences of the floods now devastating California areas.

I hope the bill will receive the favorable consideration of Congress. I ask unanimous consent that my remarks on this subject appear in the RECORD immediately following the remarks of the senior Senator from Arizona.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF MINERAL LEASING ACT

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President. I introduce for appropriate reference a bill which is of tremendous importance to the State of Wyoming and the other public land States. The purpose of my bill is to increase to 90 percent the amount of mineral royalties returned to the States from their respective mineral lands which are controlled by the Federal Government.

Unlike the great majority of the States of the Union, 70 percent of Wyoming's mineral interests has been reserved to the U.S. Government. Consequently, Wyoming, as is the case with the other Western States, is deprived of realizing the wealth of its natural resources.

Congress wisely provided that the State of Alaska would receive 90 percent of the royalties from all federally owned mineral lands within Alaska. This principle needs to be extended to the other Western States which experience unique and different problems as does the State of Alaska.

The Eastern States retained title to all their public lands and thus receive direct royalties from the same type of lands which our public land States gave to the Federal Government. My proposal is not a new one, but it is a just one and needs to be acted upon if we are to give equal treatment to all the States.

I do not mean to suggest that the Federal Government is getting rich off our mineral royalties. It only gets 10 percent of the royalties, as would be the case if my bill, which calls for a 90-percent return to the respective States, were adopted. Presently, 37½ percent goes to the States and 52½ percent goes to the reclamation fund. There seems to be little reason for this latter distribution since the reclamation expenditures have no relationship to the contributions made by the respective States or are they even capable of paying for a fraction of the costs of reclamation. Our reclamation program is now completely different than it was when this was originally set up. Now all our reclamation projects are self-liquidating, and the fund is not essential to our successful reclamation program.

It would be much simpler, more logical, and certainly more just to return this royalty money directly to the States of origin. The alternative to this is to force the States to come to Washington for financial assistance. Every effort must be made to enact legislation which will permit the States to do for themselves what they can do.

I am hopeful that this legislation will receive favorable consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 90) to amend section 35 of the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 with respect to the disposition of the proceeds of sales, bonuses, royalties, and rentals under such act, introduced by Mr. SIMPSON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

THE FOURTH STEP—PROPOSED DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, nearly 100 years ago, this Nation—then smaller, more rural in character, but not less forward looking or lacking in imaginative vision—established an independent Office of Education.

Nearly 100 years ago, the Congress of the United States, agreeing with Thomas Jefferson and other founders of this Republic that ignorance is the enemy of freedom, and knowing that the well-being of our children is synonymous with the security and integrity of our society, took the first step toward putting the resources of the Federal Government at the disposal of our children.

True, the Department, created by an act signed into law on March 2, 1867, by another President Johnson—President Andrew Johnson—was without Cabinet rank. And it was headed by a Commissioner, but so was the Department of Agriculture which was then 5 years old. The Commissioner was paid $4,000 a year, and his office, at home under the Interior Department umbrella, was at first known as a "Bureau." His staff was composed of three clerks, paid $2,000, $1,800, and $1,600 a year.

"It will throw a flood of light upon the dark places of the land. It will form a public sentiment which will arouse to increased activity the friends of education everywhere, and ignorance will fly before it," said Representative Ignatius Donnelly of Minnesota, of the new office. So while the conception on which it was based was far from limited, the new Office itself was small.

But after all, so was our Nation. In 1870, the number of our elementary and secondary school students was 7.8 million; in 1963 it was 51.4 million, and while we as a nation spent $63.4 million on public elementary and secondary schooling in 1870, we spent $17.1 billion in the last school year.

As our Nation grew, we moved twice to raise the status of the Federal Government's commitment to education: After 72 years, the Office of Education became part of the Federal Security Agency. And in April 1953, the Office was transferred to the new Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. At this point—if Senators will go back with me into rather ancient history—the Department was of rather modest size, and a single Cabinet officer might reasonably be expected to conduct its diverse affairs with some success. Still, the responsibilities of the Office of Education were limited. Basically, it remained an agency of pamphleteering, of statistical accumulation, and of technical advisement.

What I propose today, Mr. President, is that we take a fourth step to provide our children with fair and equitable educational opportunity—a step commensurate with the maturity of our society, the vision of its leadership, and the role expected of America by the free world and indeed by our own national conscience. What I propose is the creation of a Department of Education headed by a Secretary of Cabinet rank. The new Department will bring together the scattered educational activities of the Federal Government and will coordinate its work. It will assure that education, a matter of paramount concern to our people, has a spokesman at the very summit of Government.

I propose today a bill which would restore education to full departmental status on the 100th anniversary of the founding of the first Department of Education within the executive branch—March 2, 1867. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. RIBICOFF. My bill is not a complicated one. It specifically prohibits Federal control of education. But it does establish a focal point within the Federal Government for education. It would create a Cabinet-level Department, headed by a Secretary of Education, and the staff and programs of the present Office of Education would form the nucleus of the new Department.

In addition, the President would be given the responsibility of transferring to the new Department such education-related functions of other Government agencies as he believes are necessary to promote efficiency in Government and carry out the policy of the legislation. He would be directed to complete the transfers by March 2, 1967. To assist the President, the existing Federal Interagency Committee on Education, established by Executive order on October 16, 1964, would be given statutory authority not only to continue to aid in the coordination of Federal programs in education, but to recommend the appropriate transfers of authority to the President by July 1, 1965.

Within the new Department, the bill would create the positions of Secretary, Under Secretary, three Assistant Secretaries and a chief counsel—all appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The bill would also create the position of Special Assistant Secretary for Educational Research and Development, to be responsible for long-range planning, forecasting trends and problems in education, and assessing the results of existing Federal programs. He would be appointed by the Secretary from the civil service, with the approval of the President.

The purpose of this reorganization conforms with our traditions and aspirations as a democratic people. By strengthening the role of the Federal Government in its dealings with educational problems, we will give all our people a greater part in determining the ultimate form of the Great Society. A new Department of Education will give new dignity and import to the Federal—or general—concern with education. It will give greater visibility to the good work which the Federal Government is already performing in this field. It will help to focus public attention on educational problems—Federal, State, and local—North, South, East and West. And it will attract superior public servants to the cause of education, which is the cause of the future.

And in taking problems concerning our teachers' activities and our children's opportunities out of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, we will help that Department achieve greater unity.

Under my bill, the Secretary of Education would be required to submit to the Congress a report dealing not only with the activities of his Department during the year, but with the facts and figures we must have if we are to legislate effectively. These would include objective data on enrollments, expenditures by States and communities, numbers of teachers, specific needs of critical areas in education and similar objective data.

The clear and firm commitment of our Nation to promote the cause of education was spelled out as long ago as the Northwest Ordinance of 1787, which pledged that "the means of education shall forever be encouraged." In legislative act after act we have strengthened that commitment. We recognized long ago that the strength of education in our society presents a clear and essential Federal responsibility—it is long since time to give education in the executive branch a position equal to that responsibility.

Where is education in the executive branch today? It might be more appropriate to ask where it is not. From the green lawns of Bethesda's National Institutes of Health to Foggy Bottom—from the space age world of NASA to the heavily bureaued Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—42 separate Federal departments, agencies, and bureaus are involved in Federal education programs, and each of them makes educational policy—often indifferent or ignorant of the broad national objectives in the field of education. I do not say this in condemnation of any one of these departments. Each of them has a narrow responsibility which it seeks to discharge. None of them is concerned with the whole problem of education. Yet many of these peripheral approaches involve the expenditures of large sums of money—so large that they may unbalance and distort the whole picture.

The Department of Education I propose today would deal with the broad aspects of Federal education policy. It would seek answers to questions of urgent national concern—questions either long ignored or dealt with in haphazard fashion. What, for example, should be the role of Federal research support in higher education? Are we taking our most talented faculty away from their students and confining them to the laboratory? Are we building an elite within our universities—an elite of those who have received Federal research grants? Are we creating an elite of universities themselves?

What is the role of the small college—the junior college, the technical institute, the vocational school, the centers of excellence—not only separately, but considered together as a total national resource?

What are we doing to assure that our future leaders have the opportunity to gain the experience, knowledge, and training they will need? What of the average child? The child, who, like Winston Churchill or John Fitzgerald Kennedy, is a late bloomer, but who has the capacity to become a titan of his times? Our vocational programs are vastly improved and expanded—to be sure, but are they equal to the awesome challenge of automation? Are we adequately preparing our students for 21st century demands and skills? Are our exceptional children—both the gifted and the slow—receiving the attention due their given gifts? Have we emphasized the sciences and mathematics in our schools so greatly that we are losing touch with our magnificent cultural inheritance?

Today, we are spending $5 billion a year in Federal funds for education. But less than a third of that amount, or $1.6 billion is channeled through the nominal agency for education—the Office of Education. Even within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, there is an additional $800 million spent for education—through the Public Health Service, the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration, and the Welfare Administration.

The school lunch programs, State agricultural experiment stations and research and development programs of the Department of Agriculture add another half billion dollars a year to the Government's educational budget.

The National Science Foundation is directly and primarily concerned with education. It will channel $400 million into our schools and universities this year.

The Housing and Home Finance Agency's one-third of a billion dollars for college housing loans, the Labor Department's $362 million for vocational and technical training programs, the Veteran's Administration's $77 million for war orphans and veterans education programs are but a few more examples.

The Department of Defense, NASA, and the Atomic Energy Commission together contribute another $443 million to education—primarily in the area of research and science.

Let me conclude this list by naming the agencies and amounts that make up the remainder of the Federal education budget. The Department of Interior, $123 million; the State Department, $60 million; the District of Columbia government, $12.5 million; the Canal Zone, $12.4 million; the Department of Commerce, $7 million; the Treasury, $6.1 million; the Justice Department, $3 million; and the Job Corps of the Office of Economic Opportunity, $190 million.

It is no wonder that the Office of Education, as now constituted, cannot begin to answer urgent questions of national education policy. It is but a part—and a small part—of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare which I was once privileged to head.

When the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare was established in 1953, there were 35,408 employees. By 1960, the number had grown to more than 61,000. Today more than 83,000 men and women are needed to carry out the Department's programs.

The total HEW annual appropriations have soared from under $2 billion in 1953 to nearly $7 billion in fiscal 1965. The Office of Education spends $1.6 billion of that amount—a budget that has grown five times since 1953 and doubled in the past 2 years alone. Since the advent of the Kennedy-Johnson administrations, education in America has made tremendous strides. We have passed more education bills in the past few years than in the entire previous history of the Office of Education. We have had two outstanding Commissioners of Education in Sterling McMurrin and Francis Keppel and it is a tribute to their imaginative talents—and those of their colleagues—that we have made as much progress as we have.

Now our great President has called for a new assault on ignorance and its evils, assigning a star role to education in the Great Society. He asked this week in his sweeping state of the Union message for an additional $1.5 billion for education. It only makes sense that we develop an administrative structure that can deal efficiently and effectively with programs of this magnitude and that can properly supervise and coordinate them.

We cannot expect to achieve success with an outmoded and antiquated administrative system. We cannot run 20th-century programs with 19th-century organizations.

I am not the first to propose a Department of Education. Educators and former Commissioners of Education have repeatedly urged that the Office of Education be elevated in strength and stature in the Federal Government. Since 1908, 53 bills have been introduced in Congress to accomplish this result.

The Education Policies Commission of the National Education Association and the American Association of School Administrators in its study of "Educational Responsibilities of the Federal Government" recommended this past year:

> We believe that education deserves * * * status and that the most thorough and most durable way to assure it would be to establish a Department of Education with a Secretary who would sit in the Cabinet.

In November 1964, the Council of Chief State School Officers resolved:

> The council recommends that there be created in the Federal Government a Department of Education, headed by a Secretary of Cabinet rank, for carrying out the Federal responsibility in education.

In 1963, the American Council on Education's program to develop higher education as a national resource recommended:

> That there should be an appropriate revision of Federal organization and administration to strengthen the U.S. Office of Education, and to bring the U.S. Commissioner of Education into a closer relationship with the President.

Former Commissioner Earl J. McGrath proposed in October 1962 that the Commissioner of Education become an independent officer with Cabinet rank. Similar views were earlier expressed by past Commissioners Sterling M. McMurrin and Lee M. Thurston.

The President's Committee for the White House Conference on Education in April 1956 called for "a far stronger U.S. Office of Education." The Hoover Commission in 1947 declared that "the Office of Education has been kept so weak that it has neither the governmental status nor the facilities to be an effective force in developing or coordinating a Federal program of education."

President Truman's Commission on Higher Education in 1946 advised that "the status of education in the Federal Government must be raised before the Government will be able to play its important part in the speedy improvement in education."

As far back as 1929, the National Advisory Committee on Education reported to President Hoover that "the Committee recommends establishment of a Department of Education with a Secretary in the President's Cabinet."

Mr. President, we have talked long enough. The consensus is overwhelming. The time has come to end the uncertain status of education in our Government. The time has come to end unnecessary duplication, waste, and administrative chaos. The time has come to create a Department of Education. For 100 years the forces of education in the United States have grown stronger and more effective. It is time to give them a leader—a leader who would speak for our children and their needs in the highest councils of Government.

Mr. President, the Hartford Courant this week editorialized about the two education measures which I have introduced today. Because of the constructive and interesting way in which the Courant presented its views in its editorial of January 4, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MR. RIBICOFF'S BILLS ON EDUCATION

Senator RIBICOFF is renewing his effort to get some income tax relief for those who are paying for a college education. His last attempt was foiled, largely by the Treasury Department, which foresaw a loss of many million dollars if the Ribicoff plan were adopted. Now Mr. RIBICOFF is planning a companion measure that would set up a Department of Education as a Cabinet post, divorcing it from the melange that now goes under the name of Health, Education, and Welfare.

It is a commentary on our national thinking that while defense, commerce, and labor are accorded Cabinet status, we take the three most important activities that affect the lives of our citizens and lump them together in an administrative jumble. As Secretary of this Department Mr. RIBICOFF has had a firsthand view of the matter, and knows that one of the factors that militate against a strong Office of Education is the fact that it is buried in HEW.

The two proposed bills are correlated. Mr. RIBICOFF thinks Federal contributions to education, present and future, have risen to a point where a separate department should be set up to correlate the existing and new programs. The Federal Government is now spending $4.9 billion a year in a wide series of educational programs and there is little doubt that under the Johnson administration this program will be accentuated greatly, particularly the student loans. There is an increasing protest in Congress over the manner in which private loans are now being made by small loan companies to college students at high interest rates.

The Ribicoff plan for college tax credits would charge off part of income up to $325 yearly spent for the college education of a child. Individuals working their way through college would also be granted this modest relief.

Three factors may militate against the Ribicoff bills. There are some who are afraid of a strong Federal Education Department, although there has been no evidence as yet of a Federal desire to dominate. Then there is a national ambivalence toward higher education. We pay lipservice to it, and yet there are many, including Congressmen, who are mildly resentful of it, and object to anything making it easier for those who seek a higher education. Finally there will be the objections of Treasury officials who don't like any diminution in tax income.

Despite these factors there is a good chance that Mr. RIBICOFF will be more successful than he was last time. Change is in the wind.

EXHIBIT 1

S. 100

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there is hereby established an executive department which shall be known as the Department of Education (hereinafter referred to as the "Department"). There shall be at the head of the Department a Secretary of Education (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary"), who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who shall receive compensation at the rate prescribed for level I of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule established by the Federal Executive Salary Act of 1964. The Department shall be administered under the supervision and direction of the Secretary.

FUNCTION AND PURPOSE

SEC. 2. The function and purpose of the Department shall be to promote the cause and advancement of education throughout the Nation. To that end the Secretary shall, among his responsibilities, (1) advise the President with respect to the progress of education; (2) develop and recommend to the President appropriate policies and programs to foster the orderly growth and development of the Nation's educational facilities and resources; (3) exercise leadership at the direction of the President in coordinating Federal activities affecting education; (4) conduct continuing comprehensive surveys, collect data, and make available findings, on the progress of education; (5) provide information and such other assistance as may be authorized by the Congress to aid in the maintenance of efficient school systems; and (6) encourage comprehensive planning by the State and local governments with a view to coordinating Federal, State, and community educational activities at the local level.

UNDER SECRETARY AND OTHER OFFICERS

SEC. 3. There shall be in the Department an Under Secretary, four Assistant Secretaries, and a General Counsel, each of whom shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall perform such functions and duties as the Secretary may prescribe. The Under Secretary shall receive compensation at the rate prescribed for level III of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule established by the Federal Executive Salary Act of 1964, and the Assistant Secretaries and General Counsel shall receive compensation at the rate prescribed for level IV of such schedule. The Under Secretary (or during the absence or disability of the Under Secretary, or in the event of a vacancy in the office of Under Secretary, an Assistant Secretary determined according to such order as the Secretary shall prescribe) shall act as Secretary during the absence or disability of the Secretary or in the event of a vacancy in the office of Secretary.

PROVISIONS OF LAW APPLICABLE TO THE DEPARTMENT

SEC. 4. Except to the extent inconsistent with this Act, all provisions of law applicable to the executive departments generally shall apply to the Department.

SEAL

SEC. 5. The Secretary shall cause a seal of office to be made for the Department, of such design as the President shall approve, and judicial notice shall be taken thereof.

DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY

SEC. 6. The Secretary may, without being relieved of his responsibility therefor, and unless prohibited by some specific provision of law, perform any function vested in him through or with the aid of such officials or organizational entities of the Department as he may designate.

TRANSFERS TO DEPARTMENT

SEC. 7. (a) The United States Office of Education, together with all of its functions, personnel, property, records, obligations, commitments, and unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations and other funds (available or to be made available), is hereby transferred to the Department, and all functions of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare being administered through such Office, and all functions of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare with respect to such Office, are transferred to the Secretary.

(b) All laws dealing with the relationship between Gallaudet College, Howard University, Freedmen's Hospital, and American Printing House for the Blind, respectively, and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare or the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare are hereby amended to substitute "Secretary of Education" for "Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare," and to substitute "Department of Education" for "Department of Health, Education, and Welfare."

(c) Section 394 (3) of the Act to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish a program of Federal matching grants for the construction of television broadcasting facilities to be used for educational purposes (Public Law 87–447) is hereby amended to substitute "Secretary of Education" for "Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare".

(d) Title II, part B, sections 231 and 232, and title III, sections 301, 302, 303, 306, and 309 of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 (Public Law 87–415) are hereby amended by transferring from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to the Secretary of Education all duties and responsibilities contained therein.

(e) The President shall transfer to the Department from other departments, agencies and instrumentalities of the Federal Government such additional functions relating to education as he determines necessary or appropriate to promote efficiency in Government and to carry out the purposes of this Act. Such transfers shall be completed by March 2, 1967.

TRANSFER MATTERS

SEC. 8. All laws relating to any agency or function transferred under this Act shall, insofar as such laws are not inapplicable, remain in full force and effect. Any transfer of personnel pursuant to this Act shall be without change in classification or compensation, except that this requirement shall not operate to prevent the adjustment of classification or compensation to conform to the duties to which such transferred personnel may be assigned. All orders, rules, regulations, permits, or other privileges made, issued, or granted by any agency or in connection with any functions transferred by this Act, and in effect at the time of the transfer, shall continue in effect to the same extent as if such transfer had not occurred, until modified, superseded, or repealed. No suit, action, or other proceeding lawfully commenced by or against any agency or any officer of the United States acting in his official capacity shall abate by reason of any transfer made pursuant to this Act, but the court, on motion or supplemental petition filed at any time within twelve months after such transfer takes effect, showing a necessity for a survival of such suit, action, or other proceeding to obtain a settlement of the questions involved, may allow the same to be maintained by or against the appropriate agency or officer of the United States.

ANNUAL REPORT

SEC. 9. The Secretary shall, as soon as practicable after the end of each calendar year, make a report to the President for the submission to the Congress on the activities of the Department during the preceding calendar year. Such report shall also contain objective data on enrollments, expenditures, numbers of teachers, numbers of professionals who lack full qualifications, needs for classroom and other construction, special needs of critical areas such as urban areas, and similar data.

PROHIBITION AGAINST FEDERAL CONTROL OF EDUCATION

SEC. 10. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the curriculum, program of instruction, administration, or personnel of any educational institution or school system.

CONFORMING AMENDMENTS

SEC. 11. (a) Section 19 (d) (1) of the Act of June 25, 1958, is hereby amended by striking out the phrase "Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare" at the end thereof and inserting the following: "Secretary of Health and Welfare, Secretary of Education".

(b) Section 158 of the Revised Statutes (5 U.S.C. 1) is amended by adding at the end thereof: "Eleventh. The Department of Education." and by amending the phrase "Health, Education, and Welfare" to read "Health and Welfare".

(c) Any reference to the Office of Education or the Commissioner of Education, in any other law, rule, regulation, certificate, directive, instruction, license, or other official paper in force on the effective date of this Act shall be deemed to refer and apply to the Department or the Secretary, as may be appropriate.

(d) Any reference to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare or the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in any other law, rule, regulation, certificate, directive, instruction, license, or other official paper in force on the effective date of this Act shall be deemed to refer and apply to the Department of Health and Welfare and the Secretary of Health and Welfare, respectively.

FEDERAL INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

SEC. 12. (a) There is hereby established a "Federal Interagency Committee on Education" (hereafter referred to as the "Committee").

(b) The Committee shall study and recommend such actions as may be necessary to assure effective coordination of Federal programs affecting education including: (1) development of Federal programs in accordance with the educational goals and policies of the Nation; (2) consistent administration of policies and practices among Federal agencies in the conduct of similar programs; (3) full and effective communication among Federal agencies to avoid unnecessary duplication of activities; (4) adequate procedures for the availability of information on educational matters requested by the Secretary; and (5) full and effective cooperation with the Secretary on such studies and analyses as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

(c) The Committee shall, not later than July 1, 1966, advise the President with respect to his responsibilities under subsection (e) of section 7 of this Act.

(d) The Committee shall be composed of the Secretary, who shall be the Chairman, and one appropriate representative of each of the following: the Department of State, the Department of Defense, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Labor, the Department of Health and Welfare, the National Science Foundation, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

(e) The chairman may invite Federal agencies in addition to those which are represented on the Committee under the provisions of subsection (d) of this section to designate representatives to participate in meetings of the Committee on matters of substantial interest to such agencies which are to be considered by the Committee.

(f) The Director of the Bureau of the Budget, the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, and the Director of the Office of Science and Technology may each designate a member of his staff to attend meetings of the Committee as an observer.

(g) Each Federal agency which is represented on the Committee under the provisions of subsection (d), of this section, shall furnish necessary assistance to the Committee in accordance with section 214 of the Act of May 3, 1945, 59 Stat. 134 (31 U.S.C. 691).

EXPENDITURES AUTHORIZED

Sec. 13. The Secretary is authorized to make such expenditures (including expenditures for personal services and rent at the seat of government and elsewhere, for lawbooks, books of reference and periodicals, and for printing and binding) as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act, and as may be provided for by the Congress from time to time.

APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

Sec. 14. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to enable the Department to carry out the provisions of this Act and to perform any other duties which may be imposed upon it by law.

EFFECTIVE DATE

Sec. 15. The provisions of this Act shall be effective on its date of enactment, except that section 7 shall be effective after ninety days following such date.

The **PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 100) to establish a Department of Education, introduced by Mr. Ribicoff, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

EARTHQUAKE REPAIR OF EKLUTNA, ALASKA

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and my colleague, the junior Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening] I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill providing for the rehabilitation of the Eklutna hydroelectric project near Anchorage, Alaska.

Shortly before the Congress adjourned last year, a similar bill was introduced by me in the hope that in the interim the Interior Department and any other agencies which might be concerned would have an opportunity to study the matter and be prepared to render early reports in this Congress because of the importance of the measure to Alaska.

The act of July 31, 1950, as amended by the act of August 13, 1953, authorized the construction of the Eklutna project, the only such facility in existence in Alaska. It is vitally important to the fast-increasing Anchorage area. Although the expanding needs through the years for power have been partially met by other means, the benefits of Eklutna are required and used by the city of Anchorage, the Matanuska Electric Association and the Chugach Electric Association.

The law authorizing the project at a cost not to exceed $33 million provided that the capital investment allocable to each unit of the Eklutna project would be amortized over a period of not to exceed 50 years from the time such unit was first put into service. The first 15,000-kilowatt unit went on the line in January of 1955 and the second 15,000-kilowatt unit was in place in March of that same year.

Actually, the project construction costs were considerably less than $33 million, reaching $30,521,183. The gross revenue through November 1964, was $14,148,903 and the net revenue through the 1963 fiscal year was $3,534,668.

Project studies have indicated that the project investment would be paid off in 41 years, or by 1996, at the current rate.

There had been real hope that the success of the project would lead to favorable consideration for a rate reduction, extending the repayment period from 41 to 47 years, well within the 50-year amortization period established by Congress in the 1950 act.

However, the March 27, 1964, Alaska earthquake cast doubts on these prospects. Inspections following the spring thaw last year disclosed considerable earthquake damage to Eklutna. The thaw created an open area below the outlet structure; the earth below the dam subsided. Permanent repair estimates are placed at about $3.1 million, or $1,390,000 for the dam and spillway and $1,700,000 for a new tunnel and inlet structure, the total cost to be budgeted over a 3-year period. In October the House and Senate Appropriations Committees approved $600,000 from existing Bureau of Reclamation funds for emergency transmission and intake structure repairs.

The temporary and permanent repairs will thus reach something in the neighborhood of $3.7 million. Under the terms of the original authorization law, these funds are reimbursable from project revenue unless otherwise provided by law. The bill I introduce today would, in effect, provide that the costs of repairing the earthquake-damaged Federal facility will be nonreimbursable and would, therefore, not be charged against Eklutna's revenues. The bill provides a means for bringing into reality the rate reductions anticipated for the Eklutna project prior to the devastating Good Friday earthquake.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed at this point in the Record.

The **PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 104) to provide for the rehabilitation of the Eklutna project, Alaska, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Bartlett (for himself and Mr. Gruening), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That rehabilitation of the Eklutna project, Alaska, from damage caused by the earthquake of March 27, 1964, shall include measures determined by the Secretary of the Interior to be justified for protection of the project from possible future earthquake damage, and sums expended by the Secretary in effecting such rehabilitation shall be nonreimbursable and nonreturnable, and not subject to the provisions of the second sentence of section 1 of the Act of July 31, 1950 (64 Stat. 382), as amended.

DESIGNATION OF COLUMBUS DAY AS A LEGAL HOLIDAY

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to make Columbus Day a legal public holiday in the same manner as the eight other Federal holidays we now celebrate.

The intent of this bill is to perpetuate the memory of Christopher Columbus by making the date of his discovery of the New World, October 12, a legal public holiday.

It must be emphasized that this is not a new idea for most of the country—38 States now celebrate Columbus Day as a legal State holiday. Seven other States mark the day by gubernatorial proclamation, while five States and the District of Columbus have no provision for celebrating the day.

The effect of passage of this bill, which will carry the same number, S. 108, as it did when I introduced it in the last Congress, would be to make Columbus Day a permanent Federal holiday. This would immediately affect the District of Columbia and the Federal Government. But it would not establish October 12 as an immediate nationwide holiday, since legal holidays binding on States are established by action of State legislatures. Generally the permanent Federal holidays have also been designated as State holidays by the State legislatures, thereby making such days "national holidays" in the general meaning of the term.

The story of Columbus' epic struggle to set out on his voyage of exploration and the voyage itself is too well known to require repeating here. It is the story of a man who would not be daunted in his dream of exploration. His victory was a vindication of his study and perseverance. It was also a victory for all of us who now share in the fruits of his great discovery and his courageous example can well be followed as we personally and as a nation work to make the best of our destinies.

I was strongly influenced in my decision to introduce this legislation by my good friend from Delaware, Joseph A. L. Errigo, and the Sons of Italy organization in Delaware.

My warmest appreciation is extended to my colleague, the senior Senator from Delaware, for his cosponsorship of this bill, as well as to the 34 other Senators who are also cosponsors. In the 88th Congress the bill passed the Senate but was not acted upon in the House. It is my hope that the Senate will again approve it and that the House will speedily take it up.

The **PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 108) designating Columbus Day as a legal holiday, introduced by Mr. BOGGS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF ACT AUTHORIZING ASSOCIATION OF PRODUCERS OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I send to the desk for introduction a bill which is cosponsored by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], and myself. This is a bill which I introduced late in the session last year.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the same explanation of the bill which was inserted last year.

Certain Members of the Senate have expressed a desire to have an opportunity to look this bill over with a view to perhaps becoming cosponsors. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have the bill lie over for 2 days, and I ask unanimous consent that the bill be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The **PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the table, as requested, and the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 109) to amend the act authorizing association of producers of agricultural products, approved February 18, 1922, introduced by Mr. AIKEN (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The statement presented by Mr. AIKEN is as follows:

AMENDMENT OF ACT RELATING TO ASSOCIATION OF PRODUCERS OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS

WHY THE NEED FOR LEGISLATION?

With the concentration of the marketing and distribution of agricultural products in the hands of fewer buyers, and the resulting dangers of monopolistic practices from such concentration, it has become apparent that it is not only in the best interest of farmers but also in the best interest of our entire national economy that the marketing power of farmers and ranchers be strengthened. The wider use of contract marketing also has created a greater need for strengthening the bargaining position of farmers. Many farmers and agricultural leaders are of the opinion that in the future most agricultural commodities will be produced under contract. Marketing contracts are now being used for many commodities.

The success of these marketing and bargaining associations depends to a great degree on the number of producers who join these associations and the volume of product they produce. Failure to sign a sufficient membership and tonnage results in the associations being unsuccessful in their attempt to obtain recognition from processors and handlers.

Some processors have made it well known that they are opposed to marketing and bargaining associations as they adversely affect the balance of buying power that processors now enjoy. They much prefer to deal with a grower on an individual basis rather than deal with a group of growers who have voluntarily joined together to market their crop.

Processor actions intended to discourage, and interfere with, association membership during the past few years have aroused growers to request Federal legislation to prevent discriminatory practices. Present Federal antitrust legislation does not effectively deal with certain unfair trade practices which are being carried on by some food processors.

Growers believe that they should not have to operate in an economic climate where they fear processor reprisal because they are members of an association which has as its purpose the strengthening of the market power of its farmer members.

WHAT ARE SOME OF THESE UNFAIR TRADE PRACTICES?

First. Threats have been made by representatives of some processing companies that growers will not be offered contracts if they sign association membership agreements. This may eliminate the market outlet for many growers.

Second. Cases have been reported where growers who have joined a marketing association one year have not been offered contracts by processors the following year.

Third. Some processors have encouraged growers to resign from bargaining associations by providing resignation forms and advice on how to terminate their marketing contracts with the association.

Fourth. In some cases leaders of associations have been singled out as examples. They have been offered limited contracts—or no contracts at all—even though they had been reliable, high-quality producers for a company for many years. Cases have also been reported where association leaders have received undesirable unloading schedules or have been denied use of company containers in which to harvest and deliver crops.

Fifth. Some processors have employed other discriminatory tactics to prevent associations from reaching their legitimate objectives. As an example, a processor refused to buy from association members located near his processing plant and contracted with new growers at considerable distance from his plant, even though the raw product cost was higher due to hauling charges and quality factors.

Sixth. Some processors have carried on planned and organized campaigns designed to make certain that a marketing association was not successfully organized in their area.

WHAT DOES THE LEGISLATION DO?

The proposed legislation would amend chapter 12 of title 7 of the United States Code by providing for a new section 3, which establishes unlawful practices affecting associations of producers of agricultural products and members thereof.

The effect of the proposed language is to provide a new section 3 to the Capper-Volstead Act, which is the basic legislation that authorizes the establishment of associations of producers of agricultural products and members thereof.

The new section 3 would make it unlawful for any processor, handler, distributor, dealer, or agent thereof, or for any person, doing business in interstate or foreign commerce, who purchases or contracts to purchase agricultural commodities from producers, knowingly to do any of the following:

First, interfere with, restrain, coerce, or boycott any agricultural producer in the exercise of his rights to join and belong to an association of producers of agricultural products;

Second, discriminate against any agricultural producer with respect to price, quantity, quality, or other terms of purchase of raw agricultural commodities by reason of his membership in, or contract with, such association;

Third, coerce or intimidate any association member or other person to breach, cancel, or otherwise terminate a membership agreement or marketing contract with association;

Fourth, pay or loan money, or give any other thing of value, to a producer as an inducement or reward for refusing to or ceasing to belong to such association; or

Fifth, make false reports about the finances, management or activities of such associations, or interfere in any way with the efforts of such associations in carrying out the legitimate objects thereof.

WHAT ARE THE PENALTIES FOR VIOLATION?

Section 4 would provide for a criminal penalty and damages in case any person violates section 3. Any person who was found to be in violation and convicted would be punished by a fine not to exceed $1,000 or imprisonment not to exceed 1 year, or both, in the discretion of the court.

Any person who felt that he was injured in his business or property by reason of violation of section 3 could sue in his own district court and could recover triple damages he might have sustained and the cost of the suit including a reasonable attorney's fee.

The proper State courts would not be deprived of jurisdiction of any action that might be taken in them for damages.

WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF THE SECTION DEALING WITH AFFILIATION OF ASSOCIATIONS?

Section 5 recognizes the right of an association of producers to be affiliated with other agricultural associations or organizations in carrying out its objectives. There is nothing in the law at present which prohibits such an affiliation. However, section 5 would further clarify this matter.

SUMMARY

Because of the increasing importance of marketing and bargaining associations in agriculture, growers feel very strongly that they should have the right to organize voluntary associations of this type without fear of reprisal or the conducting of unfair trade practices on the part of processors or other handlers. They believe there is an urgent need to have legislation which will spell out the law so that appropriate action can be taken in the future to prevent such unfair trade practices. Failure to meet the situation will mean that in the future this type of voluntary marketing association will be severely handicapped in its ability to adequately serve the needs of farmers as it attempts to improve their marketing power.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2849) to amend the act authorizing association of producers of agricultural products, approved February 18, 1922, introduced by Mr. AIKEN (for himself and Mr. LAUSCHE), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AN IMMEDIATE ACCELERATED PUBLIC WORKS PROGRAM WOULD ACHIEVE MANY OBJECTIVES OF THE PRESIDENT'S PROGRAM

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, one of the basic goals enunciated by the President in his admirable and forceful state of the Union message Monday night was stated by him as follows:

We seek full employment opportunity for every American.

I commend the President for the establishment of full employment as the No. 1 goal of the Nation. That is as it should be. Nothing can be more distressing than the plight of a breadwinner seeking employment and being unable to find it. Such an individual is not interested in high levels of gross national product or in total numbers of employed. He is interested in securing employment so that he can provide for his family adequately and decently.

In the past I have spoken out repeatedly of the need for immediate action to relieve the distress in the many—far too many—pockets of serious and chronic unemployment in the United States. I know whereof I speak, for my own State of Alaska has for years now suffered in this manner. And suffered sorely. It still suffers, and ways must be found to alleviate the immediate need while fighting the war against poverty on a more permanent and lasting scale.

I was pleased to note the President's words that "special funds for job-creating public programs should be made available for immediate use if recession threatens." But here I hope that the word "recession" will not be given too narrow a construction. The chronically idle, in a pocket of severe unemployment in an otherwise prosperous State, are not threatened by a recession. The recession is already upon them. They are not concerned with statewide or nationwide averages or in industry-wide statistics. All they know is that they are unemployed and cannot find—and have for some time been unable to find—employment, however diligently they may seek it.

A persistent unemployment rate of over 5 percent is not a healthy sign, however glowing the other economic statistics may be. Those other statistics are scant comfort to those comprising the more than 5 percent unemployed.

What is needed is an immediate revival of the accelerated public works program which has exhausted all its funds, even though there are at least $700 million worth of sound public works projects ready to go.

Testifying before the Senate Committee on Public Works last March, Mr. Andrew J. Biemiller, on behalf of the AFL–CIO, stated:

> The overriding economic challenge to the United States today is jobs—jobs for the unemployed, jobs for those who are displaced daily by the advance of automation, jobs for the flood of newcomers entering the labor force. This is beyond dispute.
>
> Equally beyond dispute is that fact that public works programs have proved to be a most effective weapon for creating jobs—good jobs on needed public facilities of permanent worth.
>
> Therefore it would be a tragedy to allow the accelerated public works program to die. It is the conviction of the AFL–CIO that this job-creating program—which also provides vitally needed public facilities of lasting worth—should be both extended and strengthened.
>
> We are advised that there are on file already, here in Washington, some $800 million in such projects which were submitted after all the authorized Federal funds, under the 1962 act, had been committed. This is despite the fact that, as early as January 1963, Federal officials discouraged the submission of further requests because it was apparent that the number on hand exceeded the funds available.
>
> It is unquestionable, then, that a vast number of equally worthy and equally needed projects remain which have never been submitted. There is no doubt that there is work to be done; all that is lacking is the wherewithal to do it.
>
> We know that this committee, which worked so hard on behalf of the original public works acceleration program 2 years ago, is fully aware of the need. We urge your prompt approval of an extension of the existing program, backed by a Federal appropriation of $2 billion.

With these remarks, I agree.

During the 88th Congress, I introduced an amendment to the Accelerated Public Works Act to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated. A bill (S. 1856) to authorize an additional appropriation of $1.5 billion—slightly smaller than the one I proposed—was reported favorably by the Senate Committee on Public Works, but was not acted on by the Senate as a whole.

To meet a serious, immediate need, I am introducing on behalf of myself and the able senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] who has labored so diligently to combat unemployment, a bill to increase the amount authorized under the accelerated public works program by $1.5 billion. I ask unanimous consent that this bill lie at the table for 10 days and that its text, as well as the full testimony of Mr. Biemiller and the committee report on S. 1856, be printed in full at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the table as requested by the Senator from Alaska, and will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 110) to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated to carry out the provisions of the Public Works Acceleration Act, introduced by Mr. GRUENING (for himself and Mr. RANDOLPH), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 3(d) of the Public Works Acceleration Act (Public Law 87–658; 76 Stat. 542) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(d) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $2,400,000,000 to be allocated by the President in accordance with subsection (b) of this section, except that not less than $800,000,000 shall be allocated for public works projects in areas designated by the Secretary of Commerce as redevelopment areas under subsection (b) of section 5 of the Area Redevelopment Act."

Appropriations made pursuant to this authorization after the date of enactment of this sentence shall remain available until expended.

The testimony of Mr. Biemiller and the committee report on S. 1856 are as follows:

STATEMENT OF ANDREW J. BIEMILLER, DIRECTOR, DEPARTMENT OF LEGISLATION, AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR AND CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS, BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES, MARCH 11, 1964

Mr. Chairman, my name is Andrew J. Biemiller. I am director of the department of legislation of the AFL–CIO and I am appearing here today on behalf of that organization.

We are here to support the continuation of the Public Works Acceleration Act, and to endorse the purposes of S. 1856, introduced by Senator MCNAMARA.

But our appearance is not only merely a pro forma expression of approbation for a generally desirable piece of legislation. We are here because in our view this program is an essential element in the broad and varied campaign that must be undertaken to insure the security of the Nation, at home and abroad.

The overriding economic challenge to the United States today is jobs—jobs for the unemployed, jobs for those who are displaced daily by the advance of automation, jobs for the flood of newcomers entering the labor force. This is beyond dispute.

Equally beyond dispute is that fact that public works programs have proved to be a most effective weapon for creating jobs—good jobs on needed public facilities of permanent worth.

Yet the accelerated public works program is now expiring. Unless the Congress moves quickly, the 200,000 jobs it is currently providing will vanish. This must not happen.

When this committee conducted hearings on the Public Works Acceleration Act almost 2 years ago, the AFL–CIO testified to its great importance as a means of providing jobs and creating public improvement of long-term worth. Experience has verified that testimony. The benefits of the program are unquestionable. But the need is as great today as when the program was initially proposed.

The tax cut hopefully will prevent, this year, an economic downturn and the sharp rise in unemployment it would bring. However, as the AFL–CIO executive council recently pointed out, "There is no sound basis for anticipating anything more than a small reduction of joblessness in 1964. By next year, the economic stimulus of the tax cut will be wearing out—with the possibility of a renewed upward movement of unemployment."

Let us frankly face the facts about unemployment in the United States.

1. Unemployment has been in a rising trend for 10 years—up from 1.9 million, or 2.9 percent of the labor force, in 1953 to 4.3 million, or 5.7 percent of the labor force, in 1963.

2. There were fewer full-time jobs in private, profitmaking business last year than there were 10 years ago.

3. Unemployment actually increased more than 150,000 in 1963—a year of general prosperity for most Americans—despite a $30 billion rise in total national production.

4. America's job needs are accelerating. While productivity continues to increase at a rapid pace, with the spread of automation, the growth of the labor force is also speeding up—from an average of 900,000 a year in the last decade to an expected 1.4 million a year during the remainder of the 1960's.

The growth of unemployment over the last 10 years, and its persistence even during years of so-called boom, is statistically demonstrated by the table attached to this testimony. This problem is far more serious than most Americans realize. The waste of manpower, the loss of personal income and dignity, the sharpening of labor-management and race relations conflicts, the tremendous social costs are greater than the Nation can safely endure for long. And without decisive action on many fronts, these costs will mount.

In 1963, a record production year, an average of 4.2 million Americans were unemployed and 2.3 million additional workers were compelled to work part-time because full-time jobs were not available. Moreover, an estimated 1.5 to 2 million people had given up seeking work; people who want to work, people who would return to the labor force if jobs became available again.

In order to achieve and sustain reasonably full employment in the United States more than 4 million new job opportunities must be created each year through the remainder of the 1960's, or more than 80,000 jobs every week.

It would be a dangerous illusion to believe that the tax cut, or any other single measure, could alone achieve this goal. Nor will any amount of wishful thinking achieve it. What the Nation needs is action, not just one action but many.

Therefore it would be a tragedy to allow the accelerated public works program to die. It is the conviction of the AFL–CIO that this job-creating program—which also provides vitally needed public facilities of lasting worth—should be both extended and strengthened.

Since President Kennedy signed the Public Works Acceleration Act in September 1962, thousands of workers in areas of substantial unemployment have gone back to work building public facilities of long-term value. Additional thousands have been at work providing material and equipment for those construction projects. At a time like the present, when the private sector of the economy is failing to utilize the Nation's full manpower and production resources, this is an unsurpassed way to put people to work and, at the same time, permanently enrich the Nation.

Let me summarize the record:

All of the $880 million in Federal funds made available by the Congress under this act have now been committed. As a matter of fact, by January 1963—more than a year ago and after the program had been in effect for less than 4 months—the backlog of project requests already exceeded the $900 million originally authorized for this program by the Congress.

The $280 million ultimately appropriated is helping to finance about half of the cost of nearly 8,000 projects in more than 3,000 communities where unemployment is most severe. These projects are not only putting people to work; they are also helping to create the basis for future economic growth and well-being.

These 8,000 job-creating projects are public investments of enduring value. They include about 1,200 badly needed water supply improvement and expansion projects, about 650 waste treatment works, about 600 sewer projects and over 300 new public buildings such as fire and police stations, courthouses, and libraries. In addition, they include over 500 long-needed health and recreation projects, 1,150 street and road improvements, and 1,650 conservation and natural resource undertakings.

These projects, on completion, will not only have generated 220,000 more years of work in onsite employment and in the production of materials and supplies. In addition, many of the facilities made possible by the program—like airports, libraries, water purification plants, and hospitals—will establish permanent jobs.

When State and local matching funds are added to the $880 million Federal outlay, the total adds up to almost $1¾ billion in important public improvements. Had it not been for the Public Works Acceleration Act, these improvements would not be under construction; the manpower and industrial resources they are using would otherwise have remained idle.

Within the next month or two the peak job impact of these projects will be reached. Thereafter, the number of jobs will quickly dwindle as the projects are completed. This I repeat, would be a tragedy.

A tremendous backlog of essential public works still exists in areas of substantial unemployment. If the act is extended, these job-creating projects will move forward, providing employment for thousands of workers. If the act is not extended, most of this backlog of projects will remain on the shelf.

We are advised that there are on file already, here in Washington, some $300 million in such projects which were submitted after all the authorized Federal funds, under the 1962 act, had been committed. This is despite the fact that as early as January 1963, Federal officials discouraged the submission of further requests because it was apparent that the number on hand exceeded the funds available.

It is unquestionable, then, that a vast number of equally worthy and equally needed projects remain which have never been submitted. There is no doubt that there is work to be done; all that is lacking is the wherewithal to do it.

As the recent report of the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives pointed out in urging continuation of the accelerated public works program:

"It would be unrealistic to expect these huge backlogs to be eliminated in the immediate future, but it would be even more unrealistic to ignore the urgency of accelerating our efforts to meet these needs. The accelerated public works program is directing the economic potential of our idle resources toward that goal."

The value of the Public Works Acceleration Act to the jobless, to the communities that are obtaining lasting improvements, and to the Nation as a whole has been clearly demonstrated. At its recent constitutional convention, the AFL–CIO unanimously voiced its support for the extension of that act and for an additional authorization of $2 billion in order to increase its job-creating impact. Our proposed authorization is $500 million higher than the amount proposed by S. 1858.

A Federal effort of this magnitude, plus the supplemental State and local matching funds, would stimulate almost $4 billion in construction projects, at the right time and in the right places. Moreover, according to U.S. Department of Labor studies, this $4 billion outlay would directly create about 400,000 badly needed jobs in onsite construction and in the production and distribution of building materials and equipment. What is more, as these funds are spent by working people and businesses, another 200,000 to 400,000 jobs would be created indirectly. These are jobs that America badly needs.

In a sense, Mr. Chairman, what we are talking about is one avenue toward the implementation, at long last, of the Employment Act of 1946.

The tax cut, just signed into law, is one such avenue. But it is only one of the many that are required. The Public Works Acceleration Act of 1962 was another; it must not now be closed.

We in the AFL–CIO are deeply convinced that the principles of the Employment Act of 1946—committing the Federal Government to use its resources to reach and sustain maximum production, employment, and purchasing power in the United States—are more important today than they were when the law was passed.

They can no longer be honored more in the breach than in the observance. The unprecedented growth in the American work force, the mounting impact of automation, confront us with an employment problem which few envisioned a decade and a half ago.

We must solve these problems, for even more compelling reasons than could then be seen. The economic strength of this country is no longer a matter of concern to Americans alone; it will determine the future of freedom on earth.

We know that this committee, which worked so hard on behalf of the original public works acceleration program 2 years ago, is fully aware of the need. We urge your prompt approval of an extension of the existing program, backed by a Federal appropriation of $2 billion.

This is not a time for half measures, or even three-quarter measures; the need is immediate and growing, and it can be met only by imaginative, decisive action.

Years	The unemployed		Long-term unemployed			
			Jobless 15 weeks or more		Jobless 27 weeks or more	
	Number of jobless	Percent of labor force	Number	Percent of total unemployment	Number	Percent of total unemployment
1953	1.9	2.9	211,000	11.3	72,000	4.2
1954	3.6	5.6	812,000	22.7	317.000	8.9
1955	2.9	4.4	703,000	24.2	336,000	11.6
1956	2.8	4.2	533,000	18.9	232,000	8.2
1957	2.0	4.3	580,000	19.1	239,000	8.1
1958	4.7	6.8	1,482,000	31.0	667,000	14.2
1959	3.8	3.5	1,040,000	27.3	571,000	15.0
1960	3.9	5.6	956,000	24.3	454,000	11.5
1961	4.8	6.7	1,532,000	31.9	504,000	16.7
1962	4.0	5.0	1,119,000	27.9	585,000	14.6
1963	4.2	5.7	1,068,000	26.1	553,000	13.3

Source: U.S. Department of Labor.

Accelerated Public Works Program

(Report together with individual views)

The Committee on Public Works, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1856), to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated to carry out the provisions of the Public Works Acceleration Act, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with amendment and recommend that the bill as amended do pass.

The amendment is indicated in the bill as reported and is shown by italic.

SUMMARY OF THE BILL AND AMENDMENT

S. 1856 would amend section 3(d) of the Public Works Acceleration Act to provide authorization of $2,400 million inclusive of the original authorization of $900 million, the increase of $1,500 million to be available until expended. The new authorization contains the same formula of distribution as the original, providing one-third of the funds for areas designated under subsection 5(b) of Public Law 87–658.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY OF PUBLIC LAW 87–658

The present accelerated public works program was generated from President Kennedy's desire to have standby authority to combat a recession before it might become fully developed. Among the arsenal of economic weapons devised for such a purpose, he requested authority from the Congress to commit $2 billion in Federal funds for public works projects whenever unemployment reached a critical level as defined in the draft bill the President submitted to the Congress.

On February 19, 1962, President Kennedy in a letter to the Congress requested standby authority to commit $2 billion in Federal funds to stimulate the economy whenever seasonally adjusted unemployment rates had risen 3 out of 4 or 4 out of 6 consecutive months by a total of at least 1 percentage point during that period, and whenever the President determined that use of the standby authority was necessary to realize the goals of the Full Employment Act of 1946.

Under the proposal, the President could, after determining that the requisite conditions existed, declare a 12-month "capital improvement acceleration period" during which he could commit, without further congressional approval, $750 million in direct Federal expenditures previously authorized, $750 million for grants-in-aid to State and local governments, $250 million in loans to the States and localities, and $250 million additional among the three categories.

The proposal called for automatic termination of the President's authority at the end of 12 months unless extended by Congress or previously terminated by the President. After a waiting period of 6 months, he could declare another 12-month capital improvement acceleration period, commit another $2 billion, and repeat the cycle without further limitation.

The $750 million for grants-in-aid was to be used either to accelerate work on existing Federal-State grant projects, or initiate Federal grants for projects not otherwise eligible under existing statute.

Transmitted with the President's message was a draft bill—the Standby Capital Improvements Act of 1962—which was introduced in the House (H.R. 10318) on February 21, 1962, and in the Senate (S. 2965) on March 8, 1962.

On March 26, in letters to the House and Senate Public Works Committees, the President stated that the economy had not recovered as well as had been expected during the first months of 1962, and requested the Congress to amend H.R. 10318 to permit immediate commitment of $600 million for capital improvement programs in areas designated for redevelopment under the Area Redevelopment Act of 1961, and areas which had an unemployment rate of over 6 percent for a year or longer.

The Senate Public Works Committee conducted hearings on April 12–13, 1962, and on April 25, 1962, reported, with amendments, the administration bill (S. 2965, S. Rept. 1358) containing a $2 billion standby authority and a $600 million immediate acceleration program.

On May 28, 1962, the Senate passed an amended version of S. 2965, authorizing the President to spend $750 million for immediate acceleration of public works projects in areas of heavy unemployment, and also authorizing appropriation after June 30, 1963, of $750 million for a standby public works program.

The Senate measure provided that the standby authority could be triggered only when the adjusted unemployment rate had risen 1 percentage point over a 3- to 9-month period.

The House Public Works Committee conducted hearings from March 26 to April 6, 1962, on the administration bill (H.R. 10318) to authorize a $2 billion standby program and a $600 million immediate acceleration program, and a bill (H.R. 10113) to authorize a $2 billion standby program and an Office of Public Works Coordination and Acceleration. On June 2, 1962, the House Public Works Committee reported, with amendments, H.R. 10113, authorizing appropriations of $900 million for immediate acceleration of public works through both direct Federal projects and grants-in-aid to State and local governments. It also provided for an Office of Public Works Coordination and Acceleration, but no authority for a standby program.

The House passed H.R. 10113 on August 29, 1962, by a voice vote, authorizing appropriation of $900 million for immediate acceleration of public works and deleting the provision for a special Office of Coordination and Acceleration. The House then vacated passage of H.R. 10113, amended S. 2965 to conform to the House-passed version, and substituted S. 2965 for H.R. 10113.

On September 10, 1962, the Senate agreed to the House amendments by a 45 to 22 rollcall vote and the bill was signed into law by President Kennedy on September 14, 1962.

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC LAW 87–658 AND IMPLEMENTING REGULATIONS

The Public Works Acceleration Act includes specific provisions for designation of the areas eligible for accelerated public works projects, the requirements for State and local governments to participate, and the rules of equity to be followed by the Federal Government in approving the projects. Eligible areas, as defined in the statute, exist in each of the 50 States, in Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa.

The principal features of Public Law 87–658 are:

First, all designated redevelopment areas under sections 5(a) and 5(b) of the Area Redevelopment Act are eligible for accelerated public works assistance. (Sec. 5(a) areas are urban areas of high unemployment; sec. 5(b) areas are rural and semirural areas of high unemployment, underemployment and low income designated by the Secretary of Commerce, and all Indian reservations.) Also eligible are those areas designated by the Secretary of Labor as having had substantial unemployment for at least 9 of the preceding 12 months, substantial unemployment being defined as above 6 percent.

Second, Federal public works projects in eligible areas which have been authorized by the Congress can be initiated or accelerated.

Third, public works projects of State and local governments for which Federal financial assistance is authorized in other legislation can be initiated and accelerated. For such projects, grants up to 50 percent of the total cost are authorized, and up to 75 percent if the State or local government lacks the financial capacity to assume the full additional financial obligation.

Department of Commerce regulations have established firm and objective criteria for relating grants of above 50 percent to local financial capacity. Areas eligible for 58-percent grants are those with median family incomes between $1,700 and $1,800 per year or twice the national unemployment rate for 3 of the last 4 years.

Areas with median family annual incomes of $1,600 to $1,700 or twice the national unemployment rate for all of the last 4 years qualify for 66-percent grants.

Areas with median family incomes under $1,600 per year or three times the national unemployment rate for all of the last 4 years are eligible for 75-percent grants. All of the 54 Indian reservations fall within this category.

The fourth main provision of the act declares that no State may receive more than 10 percent of the funds allocated, and no less than $300 million of the $900 million originally authorized must be allocated for the nonurban small labor market areas, low-income areas, and Indian reservations designated under section 5(b) of the Area Redevelopment Act. The new authorization of $1,500 million recommended by the committee retains this formula of distribution, allocating an additional $500 million to areas designated under section 5(b).

Fifth, adequate consideration must be given to relative needs of eligible areas, and criteria are established which the selected projects must meet. These criteria assure that projects—

(a) Can be initiated or accelerated within a reasonably short period of time, this period having been interpreted as within 120 days after the obligation of funds;

(b) Will meet an essential public need;

(c) Will have a substantial portion (51 percent) completed within 12 months after initiation;

(d) Will contribute significantly to the reduction of local unemployment;

(e) Are not inconsistent with locally approved comprehensive plans for the areas affected, where such plans exist.

It may be noted at this point that during the committee hearings testimony was submitted in criticism of the presumed failure of Federal administrative officials to fulfill two of the above five conditions. Evidence was received which would indicate that in certain instances, despite Department of Commerce requirements designed to assure the maximum employment of local labor, contractors have imported labor from outside the local labor market. Indications are that this may be due to the lack of requisite skills within the local labor market. However, the committee would urge administering officials to exert every effort to assure the employment of local labor, and to give particular priority to those qualified persons who have undergone the longest periods of unemployment.

The second criticism of administering of accelerated public works which was brought to the attention of the committee during its hearings was raised by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce in its attack upon recreation projects on the presumption that such projects fail to satisfy the condition of "essential public need." Representatives of the chamber declined to offer a systematic evaluation on any specific project on this ground, and their testimony was not supported by any of the local chambers of commerce or Government officials queried by the committee.

HEARINGS

The Special Subcommittee for Accelerated Public Works conducted hearings on S. 1121 and S. 1856 on December 10, 11, 12, and 13, 1963, and March 11, 12, and 13, 1964. During the 7 days of hearings the special subcommittee received testimony from more than 60 witnesses, including Members of the Senate and House of Representatives, elected officials from the great metropolitan areas, as well as from smaller cities and rural and semirural communities throughout the Nation, from labor, farm, and management organizations, and from scholars and economists.

The evidence adduced was overwhelmingly in support of the accelerated public works program as it has been administered and was in favor of an extension of the program under a new authorization.

The following tables and charts set forth the distribution of the $880 million thus far appropriated and demonstrate the categories of projects for which the funds have been obligated.

Table I presents the allocation of funds among the departments and agencies, which material is also presented on a percentage basis (as of December 1, 1963) in chart I.

Chart II presents the distribution of funds among categories of projects (as of December 1, 1963); and table II presents the allocation of funds to the individual States (as of April 1, 1964).

Chart III offers a comparative representation of total allocations, the value of projects approved, and the value of funds put in place.

It should be noted with reference to the following charts that an amount in excess of $12,800,000 has been allocated but will not be used on specific projects. Due to the appropriation period deadline and the failure of certain communities to fulfill their commitments, some funds were allocated which were not used and which were "returned" too late to be reallocated. These funds amounted to a lapse of $8,900,000 from the first appropriation of $450 million and as of March 31, 1964, $3,900,000 from the second appropriation. And it is expected that there will be additional funds lapsing from the second appropriation. It is for this reason that the committee has recommended amending the bill to provide that the funds be available until expended.

TABLES AND CHARTS

TABLE I.—*Accelerated public works program—Allocation of funds*

Agency	*Amount (thousands)*
A. Direct Federal projects:	
Agriculture	$59,690
Interior	50,979
Commerce	15,570
Defense (Engineers)	10,450
General Services Administration	3,000
Post Office	2,950
Justice	1,800
Tennessee Valley Authority	800
Treasury (Coast Guard)	800
Veterans' Administration	350
Total, direct Federal projects	146,389
B. Grants-in-aid projects:	
Housing and Home Finance Agency	475,635
Health, Education, and Welfare	229,845
Interior	13,021
Agriculture	3,110
Commerce	2,845
Total, grant-in-aid projects	724,456
C. Administrative costs:	
Housing and Home Finance Agency	5,600
Commerce	1,325
Health, Education, and Welfare	1,195
Interior	485
Agriculture	400
Labor	150
Total, administrative costs	9,155
D. Grand total:	
Direct Federal projects (16.6 percent)	146,389
Grant-in-aid projects (82.4 percent)	724,456
Administrative costs (1.0 percent)	9,155
Total (100 percent)	880,000

(Chart I and II omitted from printing.)

TABLE II.—*Number, estimated accelerated public works cost, and man-months of on-site employment, by States, accelerated public works projects approved through Apr. 1, 1964*

State	Number of projects	Estimated cost (thousands)		Estimated on-site man-months[1]
		Accelerated public works	Total	
Alabama	193	$27,135	$59,910	33,556
Alaska	66	7,684	12,691	7,191
Arizona	83	9,417	10,559	12,295
Arkansas	291	17,491	35,286	22,820
California	264	31.939	59.066	32.820
Colorado	57	3,575	5,242	3.413
Connecticut	55	7.392	16.229	7,978
Delaware	18	1,131	3,083	2,047
Florida	108	15,313	31,848	17,088
Georgia	203	17,005	34,665	19,849
Hawaii	9	2,733	6,097	3,366
Idaho	106	6,404	8,293	6,466
Illinois	226	21,675	40,339	23,515
Indiana	121	12,499	26,576	14.605
Iowa	3	551	855	628
Kansas	12	953	1,928	835
Kentucky	339	45,060	102,720	60,169
Louisiana	177	32,096	73,739	39,297
Maine	55	4,614	12,719	7,582
Maryland	39	3,531	8,355	4,834
Massachusetts	103	21,240	49,403	23,746
Michigan	714	67,538	146,254	85,613
Minnesota	290	14,998	25.306	22,949
Mississippi	168	13,873	29,317	18,760
Missouri	214	11,881	23,907	16,447
Montana	101	7,369	9,023	9,097
Nebraska	28	1,729	2,739	1,817
Nevada	13	1,020	1.140	1.070
New Hampshire	23	2.116	5,668	2,794
New Jersey	121	42,410	102,579	46,320
New Mexico	229	14,363	19,516	17,306
New York	209	36,295	77,763	40,316
North Carolina	228	20,749	43,098	27,155
North Dakota	22	1,335	1,608	1,868
Ohio	173	27,510	66,718	35,389
Oklahoma	222	18,515	33,597	21,720
Oregon	114	12,917	19,744	12,372
Pennsylvania	512	81,759	169,563	87,409
Rhode Island	43	12,438	38,222	18,525
South Carolina	162	11,108	28,125	18,678
South Dakota	25	2,111	2,432	2,691
Tennessee	161	21,451	48,080	28,730
Texas	184	24,437	49,958	28,774
Utah	108	7,218	10,847	8,598
Vermont	13	1,399	3,578	1,765
Virginia	61	5,491	10,258	7,181
Washington	190	15,425	26,067	16,130
West Virginia	301	43,020	78,053	43,051
Wisconsin	207	9,171	20,779	14,543
Wyoming	43	2,415	3,553	3,121
American Samoa				
Guam	2	134	160	166
Puerto Rico	345	29,525	43,335	25,793
Virgin Islands	8	724	1,008	875
Total	7,762	851,882	1,741,598	1,011,123

[1] Estimated months of employment for the HHFA-CFA projects were computed by ARA on the basis of the latest data available from BLS studies of construction costs for various types of public works projects.

(Chart III omitted from printing.)

GENERAL STATEMENT

The committee has addressed the two main arguments advanced against the authorization of new funds for accelerated public works, the first of these being predicated on the assumption that the stimulus of the income tax reduction will reduce unemployment sufficiently without an additional investment in public works projects. A corollary to this argument is the presumption that the Congress—by voting for the tax reduction—pledged itself against enacting other legislation to stimulate the economy.

In this regard, the committee would draw attention to President Kennedy's plea when recommending the original program as a further Federal effort "* * * to provide useful work for the unemployed and underemployed, and to help these and other hard-pressed communities, through improvement of their public facilities, to become better places to live and work."

Thus, it is evident to the committee that neither in its conception nor in its design has the accelerated public works program been justified solely as a countercyclical economic measure. It has been designed and administered to provide additional employment and improved community facilities in those areas of greatest economic and social need. Despite the progress achieved to date, the conditions of excessive unemployment and community need still prevail in some 1,300 areas comprising one-third of the Nation.

Acknowledging the full economic stimulus of the tax reduction that its proponents claim, this will be a necessary though not a sufficient condition for fulfillment of the needs of the 1,300 designated areas of greatest distress.

Speaking with reference to the multiplicative effect of the tax cut, Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, chairman of the Joint Economic Committee, informed the Special Subcommittee on Accelerated Public Works that the $10 billion tax cut could create an additional stimulus of $35 billion and employ "something over 2 million people." However, stated Senator DOUGLAS, "* * * this is a general demand and the accelerated public works is a rifleshot increase in demand in the areas where it is most needed."

Referring to production and employment trends during the past 15 years, Dr. Leon Keyserling, former Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers under President Truman, pointed out to the special subcommittee that: "The true level of unemployment or the full-time unemployment as officially recorded, has increased about 50 percent over 5 years, or 100 percent over 10 years, [and] we face the alarming prospect of another 50-percent increase over 5 years, or doubling over 10 years, under the impact of policies now in being, and under active consideration."

Other witnesses, taking an even more pessimistic view of the employment effect of the tax cut, referred to the prospect of additional technological unemployment growing from the plant modernization which will be stimulated by the tax cut.

In summary, it is the view of the committee that neither the tax cut nor other domestic programs now in being or submitted to the Congress are a substitute for filling the precise needs toward which the accelerated public works program is oriented.

The second major criticism against the accelerated public works program has been leveled against the inaccuracy of the early estimates of on-site employment. Overestimates of on-site employment were acknowledged by administrative officials as a result of their failure to anticipate the degree of prefabricated work involved in some construction projects. However, the committee was also informed of a corresponding increase of off-site employment over the early estimates, and in summation, Dr. Johannes U. Hoeber, Acting Deputy Administrator for Public Works Acceleration, declared that: "As far as we know at this time, our estimate that the entire $880 million program, when completed, will generate 220,000 man-years of on-site and off-site employment should come very close to what the program will actually produce."

The committee has also taken note of the fact that these estimates do not include the permanent employment created directly by the new facilities and the indirect employment created in industries which are dependent upon some of the facilities constructed.

In the former category, for example, are the thousands of permanent hospital jobs created by the construction of new hospital and clinical facilities. As of March 1964, 256 hospital and nursing home projects had been assisted under the accelerated public works program with a total Federal expenditure of $102 million and a total expenditure from all sources of $253 million. According to the American Hospital Association, it requires approximately $25,000 investment for each new hospital bed, and hospitals require an average of 2.8 employees for each bed served. Thus, the $253 million in hospital and nursing home projects represents approximately 10,000 new hospital beds and 28,000 new permanent jobs, many of which are of a highly skilled and technical nature. At approximately $9,000 capital investment for each new job, this compares favorably with the general increase of $15,000 to $20,000 in the gross national product which is required for each new job.

For many of the individual communities, however, the most significant achievement of the accelerated public works program is in the construction of vital water and sewage facilities on which local industries depend. These facilities may mean the difference between whether a local industry leaves the community or remains and expands; thus, in many instances noted before the committee, specific accelerated public works projects have been the critical factors in providing for a viable local economy. Table III below presents several such examples.

TABLE III

Project No.	Location	Type	Grant	Employment effect
APW-Ga-17G	Sandersville, Ga	Water	61,000	2 new industries employing 74 persons result from these 2 projects.
APW-Ga-22G	do	Sewer	84,000	
APW-Ga-34G	Blairsville, Ga	Water and sewer	61,200	400 new jobs result from new shoe plant and pepper plant.
APW-Ga-38G	Sylvania, Ga	Water	30,000	230 new jobs in new industrial area.
APW-Miss-5G	De Kalb, Miss	do	375,500	75 jobs in lumber industry saved.
APW-SC-1G	Blaney, S.C	Water and sewer	175,000	250 new jobs.
APW-Tenn-10GL	Camden, Tenn	Water	248,700	Water to industrial park made possible 200 new jobs with Genesee Shoe Co.
APW-Tenn-19G	Big Creek Utility District, Tenn	do	640,000	400 new jobs.
APW-Tenn-28G	Springfield, Tenn	do	173,500	400 new jobs in 3 industries result from water to industrial park.
APW-Ky-70GL	Quicksand Water District, Jackson, Ky	do	117,000	Water needed for University of Kentucky Wood Utilization Center to develop new uses for wood and long-term employment and for eastern Kentucky resource development project.
APW-Wash-6G	Skagit County	Dam	418,000	Made possible retention of 3 canneries otherwise forced to leave by poor water quality.

With reference to both categories of permanent employment mentioned above, it is evident that considerable benefits accrue from the accelerated public works program which are not revealed in the statistics of onsite employment created. Due to rather stringent limitations established by the Congress for administrative costs of the program, the Area Redevelopment Administration has not been able to conduct impact studies to measure the extent of such benefits on a nationwide basis. Such studies would, however, be essential for an accurate assessment of the effect of the accelerated public works program on the national economy.

BACKLOG OF UNFILLED NEEDS

As noted earlier in this report, the Public Works Acceleration Act was signed by President Kennedy on September 14, 1962. Yet, within less than 4 months the applications for assistance to State and local projects surpassed the $900 million authorization. In January 1963, it was announced that applications received after January 24, 1963, would not be processed except for those from high distress areas which qualified for grants in excess of 50 percent, applications from areas which had received nothing under the first appropriation or were newly designated, applications which had been filed earlier but with insufficient data, and applications for projects that balanced the program better than applications filed earlier.

Despite this official discouragement, as well as unofficial discouragement from many congressional offices, communities have continued to apply for accelerated public works assistance, with a present backlog, after obligation of all appropriated funds, in excess of $700 million. Table IV presents a State-by-State summary of pending projects which would be eligible for assistance under a new authorization.

TABLE IV.—*Estimated accelerated public works cost of pending projects as of May 20, 1964*

State	Accelerated public works cost (thousands)
Alabama	$12,620
Alaska	5,417
Arizona	4,011
Arkansas	9,117
California	22,987
Colorado	3,484
Connecticut	3,228
Delaware	1,138
Florida	17,758
Georgia	7,654
Hawaii	49
Idaho	$246
Illinois	19,819
Indiana	4,954
Iowa	469
Kansas	3,775
Kentucky	29,884
Louisiana	22,023
Maine	960
Maryland	2,457
Massachusetts	27,748
Michigan	33,874
Minnesota	19,401
Mississippi	4,626
Missouri	7,386
Montana	6,429
Nebraska	2,517
Nevada	0
New Hampshire	2,315
New Jersey	36,903
New Mexico	7,024
New York	40,770
North Carolina	7,212
North Dakota	666
Ohio	20,884
Oklahoma	9,556
Oregon	5,342
Pennsylvania	96,561
Rhode Island	4,380
South Carolina	3,140
South Dakota	3,193
Tennessee	19,888
Texas	22,270
Utah	6,007
Vermont	1,450
Virginia	2,787
Washington	5,044
West Virginia	18,775
Wisconsin	6,764
Wyoming	1,053
American Samoa	
Guam	
Puerto Rico	27,975
Virgin Islands	100
Total	624,090
Pending projects for which specific data are not available	93,193
Total pending	717,283

It should be emphasized, however, that the preceding table does not accurately reflect the effective demand for Federal assistance on State and local projects. In view of the fact that applications were received prior to the announcement of January 1963, at an average volume of $200 million per month, dropped to $35 million a month and then rose to $113 million when the second appropriation of $400 million was made, it is safe to infer that the present level of demand would increase markedly with the authorization of new funds.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The committee noted one particular problem in the administration of the accelerated public works program which is more appropriately the subject of administrative action than legislative. The practice of importing labor from outside the local labor market has occurred, to the committee's knowledge, in the States of Kentucky, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia, and there have doubtless been other instances not brought to the committee's attention. The committee acknowledges the high quality of administrative effort and the dedication of officials in charge of the accelerated public works program; yet we urge administration officials to exert every effort, by administrative procedure and by promulgation of new regulations, if necessary, to assure the maximum employment of local labor, with particular priority being given to the long-term unemployed and those who have exhausted their unemployment compensation benefits.

COMMITTEE VIEWS

It is the opinion of the committee that extension of the accelerated public works program by authorizing an additional $1.5 billion will benefit the national economy and provide more adequate public facilities in hundreds of communities. In order to achieve full utilization of the funds appropriated the committee also recommends that the funds be available until expended. It therefore recommends enactment of the bill as amended.

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

In compliance with subsection (4) of rule XXIX of the Standing Rules of the Senate, changes in existing law made by the bill as reported are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets, new matter is printed in italic, existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

PUBLIC WORKS ACCELERATION ACT

(76 STAT. 542)

SEC. 3. * * *

(d) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed [$900,000,000] *$2,400,000,000* to be allocated by the President in accordance with subsection (b) of this section, except that not less than [$300,000,000] *$800,000,000* shall be allocated for public works projects in areas designated by the Secretary of Commerce as redevelopment areas under subsection (b) of section 5 of the Area Redevelopment Act. *Appropriations* *made pursuant to this authorization after the date of enactment of this sentence shall remain available until expended.*

Individual Views of Senator Cooper

The Public Works Acceleration Act established a good and helpful program, which has provided employment and assisted many worthwhile local development projects in the last 2 years. It has helped depressed communities, many of them rural, build the water and sewer systems which are necessary for the health of tneir people, and a condition for the establishment of almost any type of industry.

Following enactment of the tax cut, however, and at a time when additional expenditures will increase the deficit, we have the responsibility to limit spending authorizations to what is essential. For this reason, and because I want to see the accelerated public works program continued as long as it is needed to provide employment, I offered an amendment in the Special Senate Subcommittee for Accelerated Public Works, and also in the full Committee on Public Works, to reduce from $1.5 billion to $900 million the additional authorization proposed by S. 1856. I will again offer my amendment when S. 1856 comes before the Senate.

The amount I propose—$900 million—is the same as the amount originally authorized by the Public Works Acceleration Act, which proved acceptable to the Appropriations Committees and the Congress which must provide funds for this program. I do not wish to see the program lost because of requests for $600 million more than the original authorization, or for more than can efficiently be used. I believe extension of the accelerated public works program we have had for the last 2 years is the reasonable course for the Congress to adopt at this time.

I hope the expansion of private industry will soon be able to take up the slack in unemployment—which is one of the chief purposes of the tax cut. But until it does, we must continue measures to help those who are out of work through no fault of their own.

I approve the recommendation of the committee, which I urged, that in administering the program strong efforts be made to provide maximum employment in the communities and areas for which projects are approved, and that priorities be established for those who have been longest out of work and have exhausted their unemployment compensation benefits.

With the adoption of my amendment, I can strongly support S. 1856 and extension of the accelerated public works program which is now providing jobs and useful public works in Appalachia, throughout Kentucky, and in hundreds of other areas throughout the country where unemployment is high and development projects can help build a better future.

John Sherman Cooper.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, at this point, I wish to stress two points.

In his state of the Union message on Monday, President Johnson stressed the need for:

> New programs of help for basic community facilities and neighborhood centers of health and recreation;
>
> A new and substantial effort must be made to landscape highways and provide places of relaxation and recreation wherever our roads run.
>
> Within our cities imaginative programs are needed to landscape streets and transform open areas into places of beauty and recreation.

These are only a few of the many public needs stressed by the President in the satisfying of which an accelerated public works program can play an important part.

But, the question will be asked, where will the money come from? The President himself has reported that in the past year alone $3½ billion in wasted Government expenditures have been eliminated. And, he went on, "I intend to do better this year."

I am asking, Mr. President, that less than one-half of this savings be expended on needed public works which may give needed, immediate employment to at least some of our unemployed.

Is this too much to ask?

PROPOSED NATIONAL HUMANITIES FOUNDATION

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, we seek to walk on the moon and to see with our own eyes what our cameras have reported.

We have sent a space vehicle toward Mars and our scientists advise us that its course is steady even as they have accomplished miracles and as wizards of space have corrected its course by remote control systems located on Earth.

We have sent our astronauts into orbit and thankfully and proudly welcomed them back to Earth.

As we are mastering space, so have our scientists developed the greatest weaponry systems known to man. Our nuclear deterrent and our nuclear capability are unsurpassed. We have much for which to be proud and we honor our scientists who have made these advances possible.

We have worked hard since the days of the Puritans in New England, of Capt. John Smith in Virginia, and of the Dutch in New York. Spanning a continent and keeping the peace of the world has been an around-the-clock job. And the work is not finished.

Because man is a human being, I suggest that this work will be with us always.

In the sciences, our progress has been aided greatly in recent years by a vast program of aids by the Federal Government to basic and applied science. This is as it should be and I can only applaud the use of any of the funds which have been intelligently spent in scientific endeavors.

But in directing our efforts to aid the sciences, we have created an imbalance in the advances in the humanities and the arts. I therefore urge that we initiate a humanities program of corresponding scope which will enable us to understand one another better. As President Johnson said in his state of the Union message Monday:

> We must also recognize and encourage those who can be pathfinders for the Nation's imagination and understanding.

To achieve that goal, I introduce on behalf of myself and Senators Anderson, Bass, Bayh, Burdick, Clark, Dodd, Douglas, Fong, Gore, Hart, Hartke, Inouye, McGee, McGovern, Metcalf, Miller, Montoya, Morse, Moss, Muskie, Nelson, Neuberger, Pastore, Randolph, Ribicoff, Tydings, Williams of New Jersey, Yarborough, and Young of Ohio, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the establishment of a National Humanities Foundation. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be held at the desk for 10 days for cosponsors and that the full text of the bill appear in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks as exhibit 1.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Alaska.

The bill (S. 111) to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress, research, and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Gruening (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, humanities encompass the branches of learning concerned with human thought and relations, as distinguished from the sciences, according to Webster's New World Dictionary of the American Language.

The Commission on the Humanities, created by three respected bodies in American letters—the American Council of Learned Societies, the Council of Graduate Schools in the United States, and the United Chapters of Phi Beta Kappa—tells us in its report that the humanities are "the study of that which is most human—their subject is every man." Admittedly one cannot speak of history or culture apart from the humanities.

The Commission report states:

> If the interdependence of science and the humanities were more generally understood, men would be more likely to become masters of their technology and not its unthinking servants * * *. Humanist scholars have therefore a special responsibility in that the past is their natural domain. They have the privilege and obligation of interpreting the past to each new generation of men who necessarily must live in one small corner for one little stretch of time. * * * Through the humanities we may seek intellectual humility, sensitivity to beauty, and emotional discipline. By them we may come to know the excitement of ideas, the power of imagination, and the unsuspected energies of the creative spirit.

I am concerned, as is the Commission, with the state of the humanities today. We in the United States are not materialists, although it is difficult to explain $50 billion for defense and the fact that 10.6 million students in the United States do not have access to a central library of any kind.

The Archaeological Institute of America in its report to the Commission writes:

> Our greatest single need is for high school teachers who can teach the classical language * * *. Unless Greek and Latin are maintained in the secondary schools, our discipline is threatened at its roots.

Webster defines archeology as "the scientific study of the life and culture of ancient peoples, as by excavation of ancient cities, relics, artifacts, and so forth." Archeology is the key to the humanities, yet its very existence is in jeopardy. The Archaeological Institute of America suggests that the introduction of Latin in the elementary schools would go a long way toward improving the situation. And, as do other groups which comprise the humanities, the institute urges the establishment of fellowships and scholarships adequate to pay transportation and maintenance costs abroad.

Our archeologists are not State supported as are archeologists of so many nations, nor do they want to be, but they do want a realistic appraisal of the existing situation and they would like to solve the problems. I was disturbed by the institute's observation:

> The archeologist of advanced civilizations is at a disadvantage in comparison with his colleagues in paleolithic and neolithic archeology, since the latter have a ready source of support in the National Science Foundation. The NSF, for example, has lately made two grants totaling $110,000 for the study of neolithic remains in Mesopotamia and Macedonia.

I have no wish to interject myself into the middle of a discussion involving the merits of stone age culture as opposed to that of Biblical times for both are important to the humanities. The point is that we want to know as much as possible about all mankind so that we may better walk into the future. Grants should be available for such study when the project is found meritorious and is approved.

Now, who or what is best qualified to aid our ailing humanities?

The purpose of the Commission on Humanities, headed by Chairman Barnaby C. Keeney, president of Brown University, was: "to consider the state of the humanities in America and to report its findings and recommendations to the sponsoring organizations."

The Commission report of more than 200 pages released April 30, 1964, made two major findings:

First. That expansion and improvement of activities in the humanities are in the national interest and consequently deserve financial support by the Federal Government.

Second. That Federal funds for this purpose should be administered by a new independent agency to be known as the National Humanities Foundation.

These were no sudden decisions. The Commission members know their findings could evoke debate. But these individuals—eminent scholars in their respective fields—know from experience the state of the humanities. I ask unanimous consent that a full list of the members of the Commission, and their positions be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE COMMISSION ON THE HUMANITIES

Barnaby C. Keeney, chairman, president, Brown University.

Herman B. Wells, vice chairman, chancellor, Indiana University.

Kingman Brewster, Jr., president, Yale University.

Carl Bridenbaugh, professor of history, Brown University.

Paul H. Buck, director, Harvard University Library.

Edgar M. Carlson, president, Gustavus Adolphus College.

Arthur H. Dean, senior partner, Sullivan and Cromwell.

William K. Frankena, professor of philosophy, University of Michigan.

Pendleton Herring, president, Social Science Research Council.

Rev. Theodore M. Hesburgh, C.S.C., president, University of Notre Dame.

Harold Howe, II, superintendent of schools, Scarsdale, New York.

Devereux C. Josephs, former chairman, New York Life Insurance Co.

Clark Kerr, president, University of California.

Robert M. Lumiansky, professor of English, Duke University.

Whitney J. Oates, professor of classics, Princeton University.

Henri M. Peyre, professor of French, Yale University.

Mina Rees, dean of graduate of studies, the City University of New York.

Andrew C. Ritchie, director, Yale University Art Gallery.

Glenn T. Seaborg, Chairman, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission.

Thomas J. Watson, Jr., chairman, International Business Machines Corp.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I have read the report of the Commission on the Humanities and I hope it will be widely circulated, for its findings and conclusions affect each of us. Serious defects in the teaching of the humanities are reported, including overworked teachers, inadequate staffing of existing facilities, outmoded textbooks or none at all, lack of coordination between students and faculty at the elementary, secondary and college level, major defects in our classical libraries in nearly every area, and language instruction geared more toward the 17th century than to the 20th century.

My bill to establish the National Humanities Foundation specifies that the Foundation would be established in the executive branch of the Government as an independent agency.

The National Humanities Foundation would have as its purpose the development and promotion of a broadly conceived policy of support for the humanities and the arts, but the Foundation would not attempt to direct, control, or otherwise influence the scholarship, teaching, research, or artistic endeavors which it would support.

The bill defines humanities and the arts as including, but not being limited to, the study of languages, literature, history, and philosophy; the history, criticism, and theory of art and music; the history of religion, science, and law; the creative and performing arts, including the theater and the dance; and those aspects of the social sciences that have humanistic content and employ humanistic methods. Because humanities encompass the branches of learning concerned with human thought and relations, I am confident that the list I have proposed will be expanded.

Under the proposed language of my bill, the National Humanities Board will consist of 24 members to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The bill specifies that Board members should be eminent in the fields of the humanities or the arts and the membership shall be so distributed as to provide national representation. Names of prospective members of the Board may be submitted to the President for consideration by any national organization on the humanities and the arts.

Members of the National Humanities Board are to serve for terms of 6 years although persons taking office immediately after enactment of the humanities bill shall have specified terms so as to insure that at the end of each 2-year period the terms of one-third of the Board membership shall expire. A member serving 12 consecutive years will not be eligible for reappointment for a 2-year period.

The creation of a National Humanities Foundation and the National Humanities Board is relatively simple. The need for the Foundation exists. Men and women qualified to serve on the Board live in every sector of this Nation, from Alaska in the North to Puerto Rico in the South and from Hawaii in the West to the great States of the Atlantic seaboard in the East.

The National Humanities Foundation will need an able Director. I have suggested that the Director be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. As chief executive officer of the Foundation the Director will serve as an ex officio voting member of the National Humanities Board. The Director will receive compensation at the same rate as provided for the Librarian of Congress and shall serve for a term of 6 years unless sooner removed by the President.

Matters not related to policy will be handled by an executive committee appointed by the National Humanities Board from its members, if the Board wishes. Membership on such a committee would be limited to 2 years with no member serving on the committee for more than 6 consecutive years. Again national representation would be required.

Section 10 of my bill describes the functions of the National Humanities Foundation. I consider this section of the bill of prime importance for through it the Congress authorizes and directs the Foundation to develop and to implement a national policy in the humanities and arts, including the interchange of scholarly information with foreign countries and the establishment of a program of grants and loans to educate or further educate scholars and teachers.

In section 12 of my bill, I have suggested how these scholarships and fellowships are to be awarded to citizens of the United States and its possessions. The amount of the awards are to be determined by the Board.

Subsequent language in the bill outlines the proposed general authority of the National Humanities Foundation including the making of rules and regulations, the encouraging of the development of the new curricular materials, the acquisition of real and/or personal property, the use of donated funds, the publishing of scholarly information on the humanities and arts, and the acceptance of the services of volunteers.

The funding of the Foundation shall be determined by the Congress.

I have in my remarks made numerous references to the report of the Commission on the Humanities. At this point in my remarks I would like to have printed in the Record the names of the 24 learned societies reporting to the Commission, for from these reports prepared by 176 scholars, the reader will have a finer understanding of the needs of the ailing humanities.

There being no objection, the list of names was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Reports to the Commission on the Humanities From 24 Learned Societies

American Society for Aesthetics.
American Studies Association.
American Anthropological Association.
Archaeological Institute of America.
Society of Architectural Historians.
Association for Asian Studies.
Society of Biblical Literature.
American Dialect Society.
American Folklore Society.
Association of American Geographers.
American Historical Association.
History of Science Society.
Modern Language Association of America.
Association of American Law Schools.
Linguistic Society of America.
Metaphysical Society of America.
American Musicological Society.
American Numismatic Society.
American Oriental Society.
American Philological Association.
American Philosophical Association.
American Political Science Association.
Renaissance Society of America.
American Sociological Association.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the needs of the humanities would fill many records. The American Historical Association in its report warns:

> Today, more than ever, those concerns which nourish personality, and are at the heart of individual freedom, are being neglected in our free society. These studies which refine the values and feed the very soul of a culture are increasingly starved of support. Nor is this merely a matter of popular ignorance or congressional indifference. By national science scholarships for undergraduates, by graduate fellowships and research grants in the defense sciences, the ablest young men and women—the potential humanists of the future—are being lured away. Without really intending it, we are on the road toward becoming a dehumanized society.

We can stop this senseless march.

As the American Political Science Association bluntly states in its report:

> Studies which probe into the medieval roots of constitutional government may seem at first glance to have little practical relevance, but it is through such studies that light can be shed on the meaning of constitutional government itself. An understanding of the past is essential to an understanding of the present and may be useful in charting our course in the future. One obstacle to effective teaching and research in the field of medieval political theory is the lack of translations of medieval political texts and the fact that many of the original texts are available only in European libraries * * *. The study of the past is an important means of discovering our own identities and that of the civilization of which we are a part * * *. Research in political philosophy is the least well-known field of research in political science, but the questions to which it seeks answers are of ultimate concern.

Typifying the urgency for the National Humanities Foundation is the report to the Commission presented by the Renaissance Society of America. Rather than excerpt it, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the report be printed at the conclusion of my remarks as exhibit 2.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, President Johnson in his September 28, 1963, address at Brown University, whose president, Barnaby C. Keeney, served as Chairman of the Commission on the Humanities, spoke favorably of a National Foundation for the Humanities. I ask unanimous consent that the full text of his speech be printed at the conclusion of my remarks as exhibit 3.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 3.)

Exhibit 1

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "National Humanities Foundation Act of 1965."

Sec. 2. The Congress hereby finds and declares—

(1) that the encouragement and support of the humanities and the arts, while primarily a matter for private and local initiative, is also an appropriate matter of concern to the Federal Government;

(2) that a high civilization must not limit its efforts to science and technology alone but must give full value and support to the other great branches of man's scholarly, literary, and artistic activity;

(3) that democracy demands wisdom and vision in its citizens and that it must therefore foster and support a form of education designed to make men masters of their technology and not its unthinking servants;

(4) that, during our early history, the Nation was largely engaged in mastering its physical environment while, more recently, advancing technology, defense, and space needs have put a claim on energies that might have gone into humane and artistic endeavors, with the result that our social, moral, and esthetic development has lagged behind our material advance;

(5) that it is in the national interest that the resulting social, cultural, and educational imbalance be redressed;

(6) that the world leadership which has come to the United States cannot rest solely upon superior power, wealth, and technology, but must be solidly founded upon worldwide respect and admiration for the Nation's high qualities as a leader in the realm of ideas and of the spirit;

(7) that, in order to implement these findings, it is desirable to establish a National Humanities Foundation.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A NATIONAL HUMANITIES FOUNDATION

Sec. 3. There is hereby established in the executive branch of the Government an independent agency to be known as the National Humanities Foundation (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the "Foundation"). The Foundation shall consist of a National Humanities Board (hereinafter referred to as the "Board") and a Director.

PURPOSE OF THE FOUNDATION

Sec. 4. The purpose of the Foundation shall be to develop and promote a broadly conceived policy of support for the humanities and the arts, but it shall not attempt, directly or indirectly, to direct, control, or otherwise influence the scholarship, teaching, research, or artistic endeavors which it supports.

DEFINITION

Sec. 5. The term "humanities and the arts", as used in this Act, includes, but is not limited to, the study of languages, linguistics, literature, history, philosophy and political theory; the history, criticism, and theory of art and music; the history of politics, religion, science, and law; the creative and performing arts, including theater and dance; and those aspects of the social sciences that have humanistic content and employ humanistic methods.

NATIONAL HUMANITIES BOARD

Sec. 6. (a) The Board shall consist of twenty-four members to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and of the Director ex officio, and shall, except as otherwise provided in this Act, exercise the authority granted to the Foundation by this Act. The persons nominated for appointment as members (1) shall be eminent in the fields of the humanities or the arts; (2) shall be selected solely on the basis of established records of distinguished service and scholarship or creativity; and (3) shall be so selected as to provide comprehensive representation of the views of scholars and teachers in the humanities and the arts in all areas of the United States. The President is requested, in the making of nominations of persons for appointment as members of the Board, to give due consideration to any recommendations for nomination which may be submitted to him by the American Association of Land Grant Colleges and Universities, the Association of American Colleges, the Association of American Universities the Association of Graduate Schools in Association of American Universities, the American Council of Learned Societies, the United Chapters of Phi Beta Kappa, or by any other national organization on the humanities and the arts.

(b) The term of office of each member of the Board shall be six years, except that (1) any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term; and (2) the terms of office of the members first taking office after the enactment of this Act shall expire, as designated by the President at the time of appointment, eight at the end of two years, eight at the end of four years, and eight at the end of six years, after the enactment of this Act. Any member of the Board who has been a member of the Board for twelve consecutive years shall thereafter be ineligible for appointment during the two-year period following the expiration of the twelfth year.

(c) The President shall call the first meeting of the Board, at which the first order of business shall be the election of a Chairman and a Vice Chairman.

(d) The Board shall meet annually on the first Monday in May unless, prior to April 15 in any year, the Chairman has set the annual meeting for a day in May, other than the first Monday, and at such other times as the Chairman may determine, but he shall also call a meeting whenever one-third of the members of the Board so request in writing. A majority of the members of the Board shall constitute a quorum. Each member shall be given written notice, mailed to his last known address of record not less than fifteen days prior to any meeting, of the call of such meeting.

(e) An election of the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Board shall take place at the first meeting of the Board following the enactment of this Act. Thereafter such elections shall take place at the second annual meeting occurring after each such election. The Vice Chairman shall perform the duties of the Chairman in his absence. In case a vacancy occurs in the chairmanship or vice chairmanship, the Board shall elect a member to fill such vacancy.

DIRECTOR OF THE FOUNDATION

SEC. 7. (a) There shall be a Director of the Foundation who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Board may make recommendations to the President with respect to the appointment of the Director, and the Director shall not be appointed until the Board has had an opportunity to make such recommendations. The Director shall serve as an ex officio member of the Board. In addition, he shall be the chief executive officer of the Foundation. The Director shall receive compensation at the same rate as provided for the Librarian of Congress and shall serve for a term of six years unless sooner removed by the President.

(b) In addition to the powers and duties specifically vested in him by this Act, the Director shall, in accordance with the policies established by the Board, exercise the powers granted by sections 11 and 12 of this Act, together with such powers and duties as may be delegated to him by the Board; but no final action shall be taken by the Director in the exercise of any power granted by section 10(a)(5) or 12(a) of the Act unless in each instance the Board has reviewed and approved the action proposed to be taken, or such action is taken pursuant to the terms of a delegation of authority from the Board or the Executive Committee to the Director.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

SEC. 8. (a) The Board is authorized to appoint from among its members an Executive Committee and to assign to the Executive Committee such of the powers and functions granted to the Board by this Act as it deems appropriate; except that the Board may not assign to the Executive Committee the function of establishing policies.

(b) If an Executive Committee is established by the Board—

(1) Such Committee shall consist of the Director, as an ex officio member, and not less than five nor more than nine other members elected by the Board from among their number.

(2) The term of office of each member of such Committee shall be two years, except that (A) any member elected to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was elected shall be elected for the remainder of such term; and (B) the term of office of four of the members first elected after the date of enactment of this Act shall be one year.

(3) Any person who has been a member of such Committee for six consecutive years shall thereafter be ineligible for election during the two-year period following the expiration of such sixth year.

(4) The membership of such Committee shall, so far as practicable, be representative of diverse interests and shall be so chosen as to provide representation, as far as practicable, for all areas of the Nation.

(5) Such Committee shall render an annual report to the Board, and such other reports as it may deem necessary, summarizing its activities and making such recommendations as it may deem appropriate. Minority views and recommendations, if any, of members of the Executive Committee shall be included in such reports.

(c) The Board is authorized to appoint from among its members or otherwise such committees as it deems appropriate, and to assign to committees so appointed such survey and advisory functions as the Board deems appropriate for the purposes of this Act.

DIVISIONS WITHIN THE FOUNDATION

SEC. 9. The Board may establish within the Foundation such divisions and divisioned advisory committees as it may, from time to time, deem necessary in order to carry out the powers and duties of the Foundation as set forth in this Act.

FUNCTIONS OF THE FOUNDATION

SEC. 10. (a) The Foundation is authorized and directed—

1. to develop and encourage the pursuit of a national policy for the promotion of scholarship, education, research and creative work and performance in the humanities and the arts;

2. to provide suitable means (including grants, loans and other forms of assistance) for educating and developing, at any stage of their growth, artists and scholars and teachers in the humanities and the arts;

3. to assist (by grants, loans, and other forms of assistance) public and other nonprofit organizations, as defined in section 501(c) of the Internal Revenue Code, engaged in encouraging and developing artists and scholars and teachers in the humanities and the arts;

4. to initiate and promote by contracts or other arrangements, including grants, loans, and other forms of assistance, programs for the improvement of teaching and research in the humanities and the arts;

5. to award, as provided in Section 12 of this Act, scholarships and graduate fellowships, including postdoctoral fellowships, and grants for research and for creative work and performance in the humanities and the arts;

6. to foster the interchange of scholarly information in humanities and the arts among scholars, teachers and students in the United States and foreign countries;

7. to encourage and assist the improvement of library and museum resources and services for research and for teaching at all levels in the humanities and the arts.

(b) In exercising the authority and discharging the functions referred to in subsection (a) of this section, it shall be one of the objectives of the Foundation to strengthen education and research in the humanities and the arts throughout the United States and its possessions, and to avoid undue concentration of such education and research.

REPORTS

SEC. 11. The Foundation shall render an annual report to the President for submission on or before the fifteenth day of January of each year to the Congress, summarizing the activities of the Foundation and making such recommendations as it may deem appropriate. Such report shall include minority views and recommendations, if any, of members of the Board.

SCHOLARSHIPS AND FELLOWSHIPS

SEC. 12. (a) The Foundation is authorized to award, within the limits of funds made available specifically for such purpose pursuant to Section 15 or of funds donated or transferred to the Foundation pursuant to Sections 13 and 14, scholarships and graduate fellowships, including postdoctoral fellowships, for study or research in the humanities and the arts at public or nonprofit American or nonprofit foreign institutions of higher education, selected by the recipient of such aid, for stated periods of time. Persons shall be selected for such scholarships and fellowships from among citizens of the United States, and such selections shall be made solely on the basis of ability; but in any case in which two or more applicants for scholarships or fellowships, as the case may be, are deemed by the Foundation to be possessed of substantially equal ability, and there are not sufficient scholarships or fellowships, as the case may be, available to grant one to each of such applicants, the available scholarship or scholarships or fellowship or fellowships shall be awarded to the applicant in such manner as will tend to result in the wide distribution of scholarships and fellowships among the States, possessions of the United States, and the District of Columbia. Nothing contained in the Act shall prohibit the Foundation from refusing or revoking a scholarship or fellowship award, in whole or in part, in the case of any applicant or recipient, if the Board is of the opinion that such award is not in the best interests of the United States.

(b) The amount of the stipend and dependency allowance for scholarships and fellowships awarded under section 11(a) of this Act shall be determined by the Board and shall be reviewed and, if necessary, adjusted annually on the basis of stipends for comparable awards and allowances granted by other agencies of the Federal Government.

GENERAL AUTHORITY OF THE FOUNDATION

SEC. 13. The Foundation shall have the authority, within the limits of available appropriations or donated funds, to do all things necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act, including, but without being limited thereto, the authority—

(a) to prescribe such rules and regulations as it deems necessary governing the manner of its operations and its organization and personnel;

(b) to make such expenditures as may be necessary for administering the provisions of this Act;

(c) to enter into contracts or other arrangements or modifications thereof with accredited public or other nonprofit institutions of higher education for the establishment and conduct of summer or academic-year institutes, or both, for the training of teachers and scholars of the humanities and the arts;

(d) to support improved teaching at all levels of education by encouraging experiments in presentation and organization, including disciplinary and interdisciplinary studies and the development of new curricular materials;

(e) to make, advance, progress, and other payments which relate to the establishment and conduct of such institutes and such experiments without regard to the provisions of section 3648 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 529);

(f) to acquire by purchase, lease, loan, gift, or condemnation, and to hold and dispose of by grant, sale, lease, or loan, real and personal property of all kinds necessary for, or resulting from, the exercise of authority granted by this Act;

(g) to receive and use funds donated by others, if such funds are donated without restriction other than that they be used in furtherance of one or more of the general purposes of the Foundation;

(h) to publish or arrange for the publication of scholarly information in the humanities and arts without regard to the provisions of section 11 of the Act of March 1, 1919 (40 Stat. 1270; 44 U.S.C. 111);

(i) to accept and utilize the services of voluntary and uncompensated personnel and to provide transportation and subsistence as authorized by section 5 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b–2), for persons serving without compensation; and

(j) to prescribe, with the approval of the Comptroller General of the United States, the extent to which vouchers for funds expended under contracts for institutes in the humanities and the arts, as provided in subsection (c) of this section, shall be subject to itemization or substantiation prior to payment, without regard to the limitation of other laws relating to the expenditure of public funds and accounting therefor.

MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 14. (a) The Director shall, in accordance with such policies as the Board shall from time to time prescribe, appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act. Such appointments shall be made and such compensation shall be fixed in accordance with the provisions of the civil service laws and regulations and the Classification Act of 1949; except that the Director may, in accordance with such policies as the Board shall from time to time prescribe, employ such technical and professional personnel and fix their compensation, without regard to such laws, as he may deem necessary for the discharge of the responsibilities of the Foundation under this Act. The Deputy Director hereinafter provided for, and the members of any divisional committees, shall be appointed without regard to the civil service laws or regulations. Neither the Director nor the Deputy Director shall engage in any other business, vocation, or employment than that of serving as such Director or Deputy Director, as the case may be; nor shall the Director or Deputy Director, except with the approval of the Board hold any office in, or act in any capacity for, any organization, agency, or institution with which the Foundation makes any contract or other arrangement under this Act.

(b) The Director may appoint, with the approval of the Board, a Deputy Director who shall perform such functions as the Director, with the approval of the Board, may prescribe and shall be the Acting Director during the absence or disability of the Director or in the event of a vacancy in the Office of the Director.

(c) The members of the Board and the members of the divisional committees shall receive compensation at the rate of $75 for each day engaged in the business of the Foundation and shall be allowed travel expenses as authorized by section 5 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b–2).

(d) Persons holding other offices in the executive branch of the Federal Government may serve as members of divisional committees, but they shall not receive remuneration for their services as such members during any period for which they receive compensation for their services in such other offices.

(e) Funds available to any department or agency of the Federal Government for the development of the humanities or the arts, or the provisions of facilities therefor, shall be available for transfer, with the approval of the head of the department or agency involved, in whole or in part, to the Foundation for such use as is consistent with the purposes for which such funds were provided, and funds so transferred shall be expendable by the Foundation for the purposes for which the transfer was made, and, until such time as an appropriation is made available directly to the Foundation, for general administrative expenses of the Foundation without regard to limitations otherwise applicable to such funds.

UTILIZATION OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES

SEC. 15. Section 104 of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (7 U.S.C 1704) is amended by inserting immediately after paragraph (s) the following new paragraph:

"(t) for financing under the direction of the National Humanities Foundation, in such amounts as may be specified from time to time in appropriation acts, programs outside the United States designed to foster the interchange of information in the humanities and the acts between the United States and other countries, including but not limited to the financing of archeological expeditions through grants, loans, or other forms of assistance;".

ASSURANCE AGAINST FEDERAL INTERFERENCE

SEC. 16. In the administration of this Act, no department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States shall exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the policy determination, personnel, curriculum, or the administration or operation of any school or other non-Federal agency, institution, organization or association.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 17. To enable the Foundation to carry out its powers and duties, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Foundation such sums as the Congress may determine.

EXHIBIT 2

THE RENAISSANCE SOCIETY OF AMERICA

Committee:[1] Prof. Josephine Waters Bennett, Hunter College, chairman; W. G. Constable, Museum of Fine Arts, Boston; Prof. Paul O. Kristeller, Columbia University; Prof. George B. Parks, Queens College; Prof. Gustave Reese, New York University.

I

Since this society is interdisciplinary, some areas of your inquiry, concerned with teaching and teaching techniques, can be answered only in the most general terms. We do not aim at establishing a new teaching field, but at broadening and deepening the learning of our members who are engaged in teaching in one of the many already established disciplines of the field of the humanities. Our undertaking is the intensive study of a single period in history from every angle. We therefore promote interdepartmental exchanges of ideas and techniques—through our publications, through regional meetings and the meetings of our national council, in which Canadian scholarship is also represented, and through the international organizations in which we have representation.

We now support two publications: a quarterly of "Renaissance News" and an annual volume of "Studies in the Renaissance." Both are mailed to all members. The Casa Italiana of Columbia University gives us office space without charge. After 10 years of effort we now have barely enough in the publication fund to publish one volume in what we hope will be a series of edited texts of significant Renaissance works. These are mostly in Latin, but works in other languages are not excluded. Each volume will be provided with either a translation or a full summary in English.

The society, in its first year (1954), published on 29 rolls of microfilm M. E. Cosenza's "Biographical and Bibliographical Dictionary of the Italian Humanists and of the World of Classical Scholarship in Italy 1300–1800." This lifetime's accumulation of notes was reproduced at the expense of a private patron and advertised and distributed by the society at cost. It sold well enough to interest a commercial publisher, who took it over and published it in book form. The society has also acted as banker for successive gifts toward the collection and publication of the letters of Lorenzo de' Medici, sponsored by the Istituto Nazionale di Studi sul Rinascimento of Florence and the Warburg Institute. Our endorsement has helped to make possible the publication of P. O. Kristeller's "Iter Italicum," a finding list of uncataloged or incompletely cataloged manuscripts in European and American libraries—a massive work now being printed in four volumes. This is a piece of primary research upon which all future editors of Renaissance works will build, yet it had to go to the Warburg Institute to find a sponsor, and to the Bollingen Foundation for a substantial subsidy. The society makes what use it can of the prestige of a membership of over 2,000 scholars, many of them at the top of their professions (plus about 600 library members), but it lacks funds for the promotion of large cooperative projects of basic research (bibliographies, edited texts, etc.) badly needed in our field.

The society has organized an International Federation of Renaissance Societies and Institutes, with member organizations in Holland, Italy, France, Switzerland, West Germany, and Colombia. This federation, organized with six members in 1958, has now grown to over twice that number. We have, therefore, the organizational machinery for the promotion of Renaissance scholarship on a regional, national, and international scale; but without funds very little can be accomplished. Out of dues and small gifts from members we can scarcely pay for minimal secretarial services. The director serves on a voluntary basis, and the members of the executive board pay their own expenses to attend meetings, as do also the representatives of regional conferences and of various disciplines who make up our governing body.

The understanding of human activities and institutions which have created our civilization is certainly necessary to the understanding and preservation of that civilization. Democracy rests on a base of mutual understanding, and trust arising from that understanding. This trust is the result of common experience over a considerable period of time. The humanities, as they embrace all fields of human history, require continuing research if civilization is to be preserved and enriched. Just as in science, each major advance calls for reconsideration of our generalizations. For example, the relatively new development of economic history has affected art history. Discoveries in archeology throw new light on classical and Biblical texts. Unitive study of the Middle Ages has been underway since the 19th century and has produced many important discoveries, but study of the Renaissance is still in its infancy. Much of the material for such study is unpublished, and so largely unavailable. And yet the Renaissance has had a decisive influence on the modern world. Extensive and coordinated work is needed. The Renaissance Society now has the machinery for planning and promoting such work, but with such small means very little can be accomplished.

II

We feel very strongly that Federal support for the humanities is needed, and that the establishment of a national humanities foundation would be the most practical means of giving a permanent organization to this support. The main reasons are:

(a) Such support exists for the sciences, and its absence for the humanities creates an imbalance at the universities and in other connections, as has been noticed by many recent critics, including university presidents. The imbalance even affects the recruiting of talented young people into the humanities.

(b) There is foreign precedent for such a move. The main research organizations in several European countries (France, West Germany, Spain, and others) include, as a matter of course, the historical disciplines along with the natural sciences. On the other hand, in such English-speaking countries as Britain and Canada, where loss of the root meaning of scio in science has created a separation of the humanities from science, separate organizations in support of the humanities have been created recently.

(c) This country possesses few institutions, comparable to the academies of science in Europe, that are taking care of scholarly projects. The American Philosophical Society is the only one that functions in the same way, and its operations are not large enough for present needs. The American Academy of Arts and Sciences is primarily concerned with the sciences but also contributes to a limited extent to research in the humanities. Other academies are either of a local character (Connecticut, Michigan) or limited in subject matter (Mediaeval Academy of America).

---

[1] The report drafted by the committee was discussed and revised by the entire executive board of the Renaissance Society. The members, in addition to those listed above, are: Curt F. Bühler (The Pierpont Morgan Library), Elizabeth Story Donno (Columbia University), Charles Garside, Jr. (Yale University), Felix Gilbert (Institute for Advanced Study), Rensselaer W. Lee (Princeton University), William Nelson (Columbia University), John H. Randall (Columbia University), Helen E. Sandison (Vassar College), and M. A. Shaaber (University of Pennsylvania).

(d) Private foundations have done a good deal for humanistic scholarship, but do not provide sufficiently extended support for long-range planning.

(e) The American Council of Learned Societies would be ideally equipped to serve the function we advocate, if it had adequate funds for support of the humanities on a national scale. However, at present it is unable to support certain very necessary activities, such as publication, because the foundations upon which it is dependent refuse to make grants for this purpose.

However, if and when a national humanities foundation is established, it is obvious that the ACLS and its constituent societies should have a decisive managerial role in it. What is needed is an organization comparable to the French Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, or the German Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (in their humanistic sections), where all legitimate branches of humanistic scholarship would find their proper share of support. The merits of every program and project would be judged by the organizations, and by committees of experts, in the appropriate fields.

The humanities should have either a separate foundation or, if a foundation including the social sciences and the creative and performing arts is created, a distinct division within that foundation to make sure that the humanistic disciplines receive their proper share of support.

III

Among the many areas and levels of training where support for our branch of the humanities is needed are the following:

1. Teaching: We welcome all efforts to improve the equipment of students in languages (including English) and in history and geography. The Modern Language Association's foreign-language project has helped to improve instruction in foreign languages in the schools. The concept of area studies has done much to encourage college foreign-language study, except for the languages of Western Europe, with which we are most concerned. We should like to see intensive courses, especially in Latin and Italian, available in colleges and graduate schools.

Books for course study of Renaissance subjects are scarce or not available. Although publication of paperback editions has filled some gaps, a great many remain. There are several translations of Machiavelli's "The Prince" in print, but few of most other Italian Renaissance books, no translation of Tasso's critical writings, no copies at all in most libraries of dozens of other significant English and Continental works. The result is that courses are distorted to fit available materials and students and teachers are hampered and frustrated.

Just as the National Science Foundation has done much to improve the teaching of the sciences at all levels, so a humanities foundation could strengthen teaching in our field. Increasing emphasis on subject matter courses should help to lessen the gap in the preparation of teachers between high schools and colleges.

2. Research and publication: Research in the humanities, while it aims at increasing the sum of human knowledge, also makes available to students the materials needed to increase their knowledge. It provides self-education for the teacher-researcher and, at the same time, materials for the education of future scholars, so that, instead of taking the researcher out of teaching (as much scientific research does), it improves his competence as a teacher and enlarges the size of his audience. Through his publications, he may even continue to teach long after he is dead.

We probably should not quarrel with the fact that scholars are not paid for doing research in the humanities as they are in the sciences. We are paid for teaching and librarianship (the library is the humanist's laboratory), and some of us write or compile textbooks for profit. Research, however, is done in recreation time or on leave, although graduate schools consider it part of the service which a professor renders to his university. Leave with half pay is now usual every seventh year, but the scholar cannot afford to take a sabbatical year unless he also has a fellowship, and the best of these (most range from $3,500 to $7,000) do not fully replace the half pay sacrificed, nor do they provide adequately for necessary travel. We need not dwell upon the grant to a science colleague of $30,000 plus costly equipment, as compared with a maximum of $2,000 for an ACLS grant-in-aid.

Scholarly articles can usually find a publisher (through the self-help of learned society journals). Book publication, however, is difficult, unless the work is of a general nature and can command an audience large enough to pay for the cost of production. For this reason many scholars, discouraged by the prospect of never finding a publisher, report their findings piecemeal in short papers, and never undertake the larger (and more significant) synthesis which it would require a book to develop.

3. Cooperative scholarship: What is most difficult now is the carrying on of cooperative scholarly projects in the humanities. Here we are entirely dependent upon the interests of private patrons and private foundations. The result is adequate provision for editing the works of Thomas More, but no American funds for an edition of the enormously more influential and significant works of Erasmus. (With the encouragement of the society that work has now been undertaken by the Dutch Academy of Sciences.) While lack of financial support hampers and stifles individual research, it positively strangles cooperative scholarship. The managing committee of such a project pays its own carfare to necessary meetings, and types its own letters; the contributors type their own copy; the editors canvass the foundations for subsidy (the Milton Variorum is said to have tried 400 in vain), and many gain a cautious interest from a university press; but even if a publisher is found, he discreetly ignores hints about the cost of typing the final copy. Operation shoestring is the proper name for cooperative scholarship in Renaissance studies. A member of this board is concerned with three such enterprises, all sponsored by a committee or a section of a professional society. Two sponsors semipromise publication, one even semipromised the typing of final copy; but the editors and contributors type their own letters and pay their own carfare, as usual—except for one who luckily has a lead into the National Science Foundation, and gets typing and plane fare at will. He should be editor-in-chief, of course.

However, what is really unfortunate is that the contributors have only their spare, or leisure, time to give to research. Result: the American Bibliography of French Literature is still unfinished after 25 years, whereas the Cambridge Bibliography of English Literature, which had a paid editor and which paid contributors, came out in 10 years and produced a supplement 16 years later.

The Renaissance Society needs funds for promotion of cooperative research. We have in hand a catalog of Latin authors of the Renaissance. Housed in shoe boxes in a private office, it is being worked on in leisure time by a distinguished scholar whose time is valuable because his mind is valuable—yet he does his own typing and much work a filing clerk could do. We have just published as a sample for correction in various great libraries, and for evaluation, the letter A. When the rest of the alphabet will be done, even in this preliminary form, depends on what help can be secured. Another project for which funds are needed is the publication of Lorenzo de' Medici's letters. The preliminary checklist is in process of publication, but the editing is still to be done. Italy will do the publication. The society has about $5,000 given to it specifically for this project. It will take several scholars several years to do the editing, and this sum is perhaps enough to compensate one competent scholar for 3 months' work. The letters are of much interest not only for economic history, but also for literary and art history, the history of communication and travel, of the transmission of ideas, etc. A dictionary of Renaissance Latin is urgently needed as a tool, but to produce one would require cooperative organization, and therefore funds.

4. Libraries: Renaissance scholars, especially in the English field, are fortunate in having such special libraries as Folger, Huntington, and Newberry, and such great libraries as Harvard and those of the New York area to use, but these libraries will be wholly inadequate for the teachers now being trained to meet the needs of the exploding college population. The New York Public Library is now being destroyed because it lacks funds for the care, repair, and duplication of its books. University libraries generally need funds for the purchase and housing of the multiple copies of important books which they should provide, so that it will not be necessary to present a class of 50 or even a 100 with a reading list of books of which the library has only one copy. America possesses no really great library of Renaissance books in foreign languages. For those the scholar must go abroad. I Tatti, the Harvard center in Florence, is hospitable, but lacks funds for fellowships.

We need one or more American centers, or institutes, where Renaissance scholars can work together and help each other. This need is especially urgent in our field because it is cross-disciplinary. A similar center abroad would be most useful, and would do much to increase national prestige abroad.

5. The society: The Renaissance Society of America needs funds for publication and for the subsidy of publication because: (a) the existence of such funds would enormously encourage scholars to produce suitable books; (b) research in the humanities is a broadening and self-educating process which makes the scholar more valuable as a teacher; (c) publication is the means by which the scholar educates his colleagues, his students—and other people's students.

The society needs also, and urgently, funds for meetings; executive sessions; planning conferences; and learned conferences for exchange of ideas, information, and techniques among leaders of the various disciplines.

IV

The Renaissance was the great age of the spread of education. It emphasized history, ethics, literature, and scholarship. America desperately needs a reemphasis on these subjects today. Interest in the Renaissance has already been exploited by popular publications. The beauty of its pictures and architecture and music has a perennial popular appeal. What is needed is a better understanding of the forces and especially the ideas which produced this great flowering of human creativity, which produced also sweeping reforms in religion and the reunion of Christians with classical ethics.

EXHIBIT 3

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT TO 200TH ANNIVERSARY CONVOCATION OF BROWN UNIVERSITY, MEEHAN AUDITORIUM, PROVIDENCE, R.I.

President Keeney, my old and valued friend, Senator PASTORE and Senator PELL, Congressman FOGARTY, Congressman ST GERMAIN, Governor Chafee, Governor Gallagher, distinguished scholars, my fellow Americans.

This is a proud day for this university, and for the citizens of this great State. In these times, the greatness of States is measured not by their size, but by the worth of their schools. By that measure, no State stands larger than the home State of Brown University.

For 200 years Brown has honored that charter of 1764 by forming the rising generation into a succession of men duly qualified for discharging the offices of life with both usefulness and reputation.

From this campus have come many of the most useful figures of our national life—great educators like Horace Mann; great leaders of business like John D. Rockefeller, Jr. and Tom Watson, Jr.; great public servants like Tom Corcoran, four Secretaries of State, and many distinguished U.S. Senators.

I speak with personal appreciation today on this subject. In the Senate, I had no more trusted counselors or cherished friends than Theodore Francis Green and JOHN E. PASTORE. And your brilliant young Senator CLAIBORNE PELL is taking his place as a leader and statesman. Today I am proud to have in my administration two men who served as deans at Brown—Dr. Robert W. Morse and Dr. Donald Hornig.

For all that has gone before, Brown's service to the Nation has never been greater than it is today. On behalf of the Nation, I am proud to salute you—and all who have made Brown University one of the really great universities in the world.

In other times we might have come to this convocation looking back upon the past—but not today. I know that the face of New England—the face of America—is turned toward the future, and it is of the future that I have come to New England to speak today. I want to consider with you today the future of an old and fruitful American partnership—the partnership of campus and country. That partnership was formed in 1787 when our forefathers gave us the command that: "The means of education shall forever be encouraged."

From that Northwest Ordinance to the Land Grant College Act, from the Smith-Hughes Act to the enactments of this present Education Congress, America has kept faith with that command. In all history, no other nation has trusted education, invested in it, or relied upon it as a means to national progress so much as we.

A former great president of the Republic of Texas, Lamar, once said that the educated mind is the guardian genius of democracy. It is the only dictator that freemen recognize, and the only ruler that freemen desire.

Yes, our partnership has paid us priceless returns. From a backward position American scholarship has flourished. Today, wherever our country leads, that leadership traces to the contribution of the campus. Our partnership is challenged now by new dimensions. From 1776 until the present time, our universities have grown. From 9 in the beginning to more than 2,000 today. From the present until 1980, our existing institutions must double in capacity, and 1,000 more must grow with average enrollments of 2,500 each. But before the total of American scholars has doubled, the sum of human knowledge shall have doubled or more.

These are challenges that we should welcome, and that we should go out to meet, for the increase in scholarship is not a burden, but a blessing. The growth of knowledge is not a curse, but a cure for the ills of this age. Our concepts must change in both education and in politics. But our confidence and our courage must grow.

At the desk where I sit in Washington, I have learned one great truth: The answer for all of our national problems, the answer for all the problems of the world, comes down, when you really analyze it, to one single word—education. Thus, I take a hopeful view, and I call upon you of this campus to join with us who are entrusted with the affairs of a country to help us chart a hopeful course.

President Keeney said last week that knowledge is developing so rapidly that we can take no comfort in the belief that what appears to be the whole truth today will be the whole truth tomorrow. I believe that our partnership must be committed, deeply committed, to seeking the truth, for actually it is truth alone that will finally keep us free. Knowledge is not something which threatens to overwhelm us. Knowledge promises to be our salvation, and we must seek after it, and we must nurture its growth, and we must spread it, spread it among all of our people so each one of them have some of it.

Over the years, leadership of our university system has come from a relatively few great institutions, public and private. Well, I believe we must regard our existing centers of excellence as natural resources to set standards, to supply teachers, to furnish researchers for the new centers of excellence that we develop. This is a first responsibility. A great nation and a great civilization feeds on the depth of its scholarship as well as the breadth of its educational opportunities.

In the sciences, in the arts, in our understanding of human behavior, all of our tools must be sharpened. Our public policy must encourage further the spread of research and scholarship throughout our system of higher learning. In our graduate schools, your Federal Government—your Federal Government—awards 12,000 fellowships and 35,000 trainees in science and engineering. We spend $850 million—$850 million—almost $1 billion—on the support of research in our universities alone.

The partnership of government, your government—not in any way-off-yonder, but something that belongs to you—the partnership of your government and the universities is closest in the advanced education of postgraduate students. Twenty-nine percent of engineering students, 37 percent of the students in physical science, 46 percent of those in life sciences, and 10 percent of those in humanities are aided. And there simply just must be no neglect of humanities. The values of our free and compassionate society are as vital to our national success as the skills of our technical and scientific age. And I look with the greatest of favor upon the proposal by your own able President Keeney's commission for a national foundation for the humanities.

We must also make certain that there is no neglect or no compromise of the American devotion to democracy of educational opportunity, because universal, free, public education is the very foundation upon which our entire society rests today. So our goals must be to open the doors to education beyond the high school to all young Americans, regardless of station or the station of their families. You and I have an opportunity that is not unlike that of the men and women who first formed these New England States. We have the opportunity to plant the seed corn of a new American greatness and to harvest its yield in every section of this great land.

On the response of our partnership depends the vigor and the quality of our American way of life for many generations yet to come. As a party to that partnership, let me urge you of this campus to admit no compromise in charting our course to excellence. Concern yourselves not with what seems feasible, not with what seems attainable, not with what seems politic, but concern yourselves with only what you know is right. Your duty is the vision. The duty of the world that I represent is the reality.

There is one thing more that I would like to emphasize: 323 years ago Roger Williams founded Providence. He brought into American life a bright flame, which must never be allowed to grow dim. And he said, "I humbly conceive that it is the express and the absolute duty of the civil powers to proclaim an absolute freedom of conscience in all the world." Our partnership is not as some would have it, a conspiracy against liberty. That partnership exists to reinforce the freedom of higher learning, and it must never be otherwise. And so long as I hold any public trust, or any private responsibility, I shall devote my every effort to defending against all enemies the freedom of conscience, the freedom of belief, and the spirit of free inquiry on which our American system stands.

The statue atop the statehouse of Rhode Island is dedicated to the independent man. Man cannot be independent if he or his society are imprisoned in dogma, or bound by bias, or borne down by hate, or fear, or suspicion, or discrimination. At this moment I believe that we have a great opportunity in this country to move forward. As President Keeney has put it, "move forward toward making our society what it really should be." If we turn away from knowledge and truth, we will not succeed. If we believe the worst and suspect the best, we alone will suffer. If we deny our progress, if we are against all of it, if we tear down our accomplishments, we will fill the world with sorrow, and we will blemish our own name with shame. But if we are courageous, farsighted and farseeing, if we have no fear of the truth, if we seek only after light, then we and our children and our children's children shall know the greatness of this wonderful, beautiful land we call America.

I pray that when historians write the story of this time, of our lives, that it may be recorded that this President tried, tried to lead his Nation, tried to lead his Nation with justice and with compassion, and with courage; and there was faith, and there was firmness in his heart. May it further be written that the people of the United States cast out their doubts, took great pride on their achievements, and bravely made of this land and this world a brighter, happier place for all mankind. This is our choice. This is our decision. Let us all be greatly determined that this society shall survive and this society shall succeed. And what it should be will be for all time to come.

As I will return tonight to my large room and my lonely desk in the White House, to cope with the decisions that have come to that desk through the day from all countries of the world, and when I review the problems of our men in uniform and those on strike, when I see the farmer and the laborer seeking justice and believing that his Government will do what is right, my mind will wander back here to the little State of Rhode Island, far away from what was once the largest State in the Nation where I was born, and I will remember back 10 months ago when a terrible tragedy befell the people of this Nation and I was called upon, as best I could, with all of my limitations, to attempt to carry on. And I will think of the Presidents, Mr. Hoover in New York, Mr. Truman in Independence, Mr. Eisenhower in Gettysburg, all of whom sent me their good wishes and their prayers, who told me that they were at the service of this Nation in this crisis. And I will remember how the butcher and the baker and the candlestick maker, the little children on the sidewalks, the folks sitting in the old folks' home as I drove by—how they all gave me their hopes and their prayers that somehow we might be able to carry on.

But there is nothing I will be more thankful for than the contribution of the people of this State, because in my moment of trial, Congressman St Germain and Congressman Fogarty, Senators Pell and John Pastore, all walking in the tradition of that great democratic leader Theodore Francis Green, they marched up by my side and said, "You have our talents, our energy, and our prayers." And however long I may be permitted to continue in my work, I shall always feel deeply in the debt of this great university for the inspiration it has given me through the years, for the honor it has paid me by giving me a degree, and for the little State of Rhode Island, for the quality of the manhood it has produced.

Thank you.

MEDICAL ASSISTANCE FOR THE AGED IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill which seeks to permit the District of Columbia to participate in the medical care for the aged program which was established by law in the fall of 1960.

As of today, a total of 43 jurisdictions, including 40 States have a medical care for the aged program which participates in the Federal funds appropriated for the purpose.

Two years ago I introduced the substance of this present bill. At that time, the District of Columbia had no program, and none was proposed in the legislative program of the District Commissioners.

Now, the District is conducting a program. But, that program is permitted only under legislative language in an appropriations act, which is precarious and temporary legislation to say the least.

We all know the aversion with which Congress regards such legislation, and we have been put on notice that no such legislation will continue under future appropriations bills.

It is imperative, then, for the life of medical care for the aged in the District of Columbia, that we enact this bill as soon as it is possible to do so. Without this legislation, medical assistance for the aged in the District will most probably have to cease operations after July 1st of this year. And, if that happens, the Federal contribution—for fiscal 1964, it was $903,841—will no longer be available for the aged in the District.

Mr. President, the Senate passed this bill on August 14, 1964. There was insufficient time for the House to act on it prior to adjournment last session.

In addition to legislative authority for conducting the medical care for the aged program, the bill includes amendments which were requested by the District Commissioners after I had introduced the bill last Congress. These amendments were acceptable to me, and the District Committee included them in the bill on my motion. They are, therefore, part of the bill which I introduce today.

In other words, the bill as I am introducing it is in identical form with the bill, S. 763, as it passed the Senate last year.

These several amendments, briefly, are:

First. A removal of residence requirements for medical assistance for the aged recipients in the District of Columbia. I understand this to be mandatory for participation in Kerr-Mills.

Second. Permission for the District to take advantage of title XVI of the Social Security Act, which allows a combined plan for the various categories of public assistance and medical assistance.

Third. Permission for 3 months' retroactive participation in the program to permit full coverage for individuals in emergency situations, where an illness occurs prior to approval of an application for coverage of the elderly.

Mr. President, I fully expect the bill to have administration support. The Commissioners endorsed its provisions last year. I recommend it to them, and I urge its early adoption by my fellow committee members, and its early consideration on the floor of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 176) to amend the District of Columbia Public Assistance Act of 1962 so as to provide for the furnishing of medical assistance for the aged to eligible residents of the District of Columbia, introduced by Mr. Prouty, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

RELIEF OF BOXCAR SHORTAGE

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I am today introducing for myself and my colleague from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska] a bill designed to help end the annual boxcar shortage which plagues Nebraska and other Midwestern States and becomes particularly acute during the period when grain shipments normally occur.

I wish to express to the distinguished senior Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson], chairman of the Committee on Commerce, my thanks for his help in dealing with the boxcar shortage. His leadership has been of great value, and all western boxcar users are grateful to him. I shall be happy to join Chairman Magnuson as a cosponsor of his bill when it is offered.

Mr. President, the bill I am introducing is similar to those I have cosponsored for the past 6 years, and hits at the heart of one of the fundamental reasons Nebraska and all the Midwest experience a boxcar crisis each year. This is the matter of clearing the way for higher car rentals or "per diem" charges paid by railroads for using cars owned by other railroads. I do not contend, of course, that inadequate car rental rates are entirely to blame for the shortages. But they represent a major factor contributing to these shortages.

The bill I am introducing is very simple. It is very brief. The bill would amend section 1(14) (a) of the Interstate Commerce Act by adding at the end of that section a new sentence to read as follows:

> In fixing the compensation to be paid for the use of freight cars, the Commission shall give consideration to the level of freight car ownership and to other factors affecting the adequacy of the national freight car supply and shall, on the basis of such consideration, determine whether compensation should be computed on the basis of elements of ownership expense involved in owning and maintaining freight cars, including a fair return on value (which return shall be fixed at such level as in the Commission's judgment will encourage the acquisition and maintenance of an adequate freight car fleet), or should be computed on the basis of elements reflecting the value of use of freight cars, or upon such other basis or combination of bases as in the Commission's judgment will provide just and reasonable compensation to freight car owners, contribute to sound car service practices, and encourage the acquisition and maintenance of a car supply adequate to meet the needs of commerce and the national defense.

As reported by the Senate Commerce Committee last year, a new section 2 was added, reading as follows:

> The amendment made by this Act shall be effective only during the two-year period following the effective date of the first orders issued by the Interstate Commerce Commission under the authority of such amendment with respect to compensation to be paid for the use of freight cars.

This new section 2, somewhat restrictive in nature, is made a part of the bill I am introducing today.

Mr. President, the legislative proposal I have sent to the desk is identical with S. 1063, introduced in the 88th Congress by the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson], chairman of the Senate Committee on Commerce, and reported by that committee to the Senate on July 16, 1964. I was listed as a cosponsor of that bill which did not come before the full Senate for consideration.

Through the years, I have been in constant communication with people engaged in the grain industry in Nebraska, and all are in agreement that, while not the entire cause of the perennial boxcar shortage, inadequate per diem charges are one of the fundamental causes. Western railroads concede that the Nation's boxcar fleet is diminishing; but they are trying to do something about it. Western railroads are engaged in a huge construction program, building cars to help overcome the shortage.

Meanwhile, these same western railroads are being shortchanged by railroads in other sections which continue to rent rather than build cars. In a word, those railroads in other sections find it cheaper to rent than build cars. Understandably, they have opposed legislation of the kind I am introducing today.

I am reliably informed that during 1964 10 western railroads arranged financing to construct 2,360 box cars costing $41,140,273. This is part of those railroads' overall 1964 construction program to provide 6,021 freight cars of all types, at a total cost of $99,590,822. Plain boxcars, of course, are the workhorse of the Nation's freight car fleet, and are vital to the movement of Midwest grains to market.

Some rather misleading information has been circulated, Mr. President, tending to minimize the critical boxcar shortage. For example, last fall it was announced that there was a decline of only 2,409 serviceable freight cars from October 1, 1963, to October 1, 1964. But during that same period, the number of serviceable boxcars declined 11,872. Since the boxcar numbers are included in the overall totals, it means that other types of cars were on the increase while the all-important boxcar fleet continued downward at a rapid rate.

Advancing the comparison of boxcar figures by 1 month—from November 1, 1963, to November 1, 1964—the decline is even more alarming. During that 1-year period, boxcar numbers dipped from 575,098 to 560,321, a decrease of 14,777.

Another misleading report is found in figures showing that 16,473 boxcars were included in freight car orders during the 12 months ending October 31, 1964, which report neglected to mention that during those same 12 months 38,464 boxcars were retired from services, for a net loss of 21,991.

Mr. President, the boxcar fleet is at its lowest level in this century. This presents a very serious problem for a vital segment of our agricultural economy, and indeed our entire national economy.

The low rental policy of the past not only has created recurring freight car shortages; it has created as well major inequities between car owners and car users. An official of one western railroad operating in my State was quoted a few months ago as saying that when his railroad builds a new $12,000 or $15,000 car, they could expect to use it on their own line only about 1 day out 10. Ninety percent of the time it will be used on other lines which rent rather than own such equipment. Older freight cars are "at home" on the owning railroad's lines about 4 days out of 10.

This same railroad official went on to say:

> We not only get an inadequate rental when our freight cars are offline, but when our colleagues are gracious enough to return some of our equipment, we get the old and they retain the new.

The bill I have introduced, as well as proposals I have cosponsored for the past 6 years, would help to remedy this condition. I want to make it clear that it is not my intention to sponsor legislation entirely for the relief of western railroads from these inequities; this is a byproduct, so to speak. It is my primary intention to seek legislation which would benefit the grain industry of the Midwest through providing sufficient boxcars to ship their products when they are ready for shipment and to avoid losses occasioned by the inadequacy of this equipment.

As mentioned earlier, I have been in constant communication with people engaged in the grain industry in Nebraska and elsewhere in the farm belt. Only recently I wrote to a large number of these people advising them of my intention, with my colleague, Senator HRUSKA, to reintroduce this legislation. I solicited their comments and suggestions. I was not surprised, Mr. President, to receive unanimous endorsement of this legislation. Many of them expressed the opinion that the 1964 boxcar shortage was the most acute within their memory.

I would like to quote briefly from just a few of the letters I received.

A grain dealer in western Nebraska wrote to "urge that you spare no effort in securing its passage." He said the boxcar shortage—

> historically represents a real problem for us practically every year particularly during the harvest season and the period immediately following.
>
> We are having the worst boxcar shortage in the history of Nebraska—

Wrote the manager of an elevator and feed company in eastern Nebraska—

> I have been in the grain business for 35 years and I have never seen it so bad.

From another eastern Nebraska firm:

> We offer our wholehearted support and wish to state the following in behalf of this bill. The boxcar shortage in the State of Nebraska has been, and still is, the worst in the history of the State. Our company, among others, has suffered untold hardships due to the inadequate boxcar supply and any continuation will create unrepairable damage that cannot be overcome by the grain and grain products industry for the future.
>
> The boxcar situation has been more acute during the past 2 months than any time since I came here 6½ years ago—

Said an official of a south-central Nebraska company.

> We certainly are in favor of this bill and hope that you will be successful in getting some action on it since it without doubt will be helpful in returning cars to the ownership lines.

The manager of a cooperative firm in western Nebraska said:

> We have been resorting to a few hopper cars and trucks to move our own grain, however we must say that the movement of cars is almost at a standstill due to the lack of cars.

Another grain company official in eastern Nebraska advised that:

> We are heartily in favor of this legislation and will in any way we can vigorously support. The annual car shortage, which is the worst this year that we have ever experienced in 40 years, is a very serious economic handicap to the entire State.

This, Mr. President, is just a sampling of the many, many letters I have received on this subject. I commend this legislation to my colleagues and hope for their support in this effort to help resolve a perennial problem.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 179) to amend section 1 (14) (a) of the Interstate Commerce Act to insure the adequacy of the national railroad freight car supply, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. CURTIS (for himself and Mr. HRUSKA), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

PROHIBITION OF USE OF CERTAIN APPROPRIATED FUNDS IN CERTAIN ELECTIONS

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, by the Constitution of the United States, Congress is given the responsibility and authority to appropriate the moneys in the Federal Treasury. Again and again the Congress has required that the money appropriated be used only for the purposes for which it has been appropriated. Title 31 of the United States Code, section 628, states that "sums appropriated for the various branches of expenditure in the public service shall be applied solely to the objects for which they are respectively made, and for no others."

In addition to this general restriction, Congress has specifically and repeatedly stated that the appropriated moneys should not be used for unauthorized publicity and lobbying activities. Public Law 87–844, section 701, states that "No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes not authorized by the Congress." Public Law 87–741, section 301, again expresses the intention of Congress:

> No part of any appropriation contained in this act, or funds available for expenditure by any corporation or agency included in this act, shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes designed to support or defeat legislation pending before the Congress.

The 88th Congress made this provision permanent when Public Law 88–257, section 509, was enacted. It states, "No part of any appropriation contained in this or any other act" shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes designed to support or defeat legislation pending before Congress.

Congress has felt so strongly about the unauthorized use of appropriated money that in addition to the statute restricting the use of appropriated funds we have a criminal statute which carries a penalty for any Government employee who is convicted of using appropriated funds to influence Members of Congress.

Title 18, section 1913, of the United States Code reads:

> No part of the money appropriated by any enactment of Congress shall, in the absence of express authorization by Congress, be used directly or indirectly to pay for any personal service, advertisement, telegram, telephone, letter, printed or written matter, or other device, intended or designed to influence in any manner a Member of Congress, to favor or oppose, by vote or otherwise, any legislation or appropriation by Congress, whether before or after the introduction of any bill or resolution proposing such legislation or appropriation; but this shall not prevent officers or employees of the United States or of its departments or agencies from communicating to Members of Congress on the request of any Member or to Congress, through the proper official channels, requests for legislation or appropriations which they deem necessary for the efficient conduct of the public business.
>
> Whoever, being an officer or employee of the United States or of any department or agency thereof, violates or attempts to violate this section, shall be fined not more than $500 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both; and after notice and hearing by the superior officer vested with the power

of removing him, shall be removed from office or employment.

The meaning is clear. Government employees can communicate with Members of Congress about legislation and appropriations they want only when requested to do so by that Member of Congress with whom they communicate. This is as it should be. In addition, the government employees and agencies can present their needs and problems to the Congress as a whole by the "proper official channels."

It is not the purpose of this statute to limit the use of appropriated funds in the exercise of the basic responsibilities of the executive branch to inform and consult with the Congress on legislative considerations, draft bills, and urge in messages, speeches, reports, committee testimony, and by direct contact, the passage or defeat of various measures. House Report 3138, 81st Congress, 2d session, page 51.

However, 18 U.S.C. 1913 does have a real purpose by imposing limitations on what an administration can do with taxpayers' moneys to further its position. It is this—the misuse of appropriated funds by the administration to enhance its own image and its own program at the expense of all else—that concerns me.

These statutes, the restrictive statute and the criminal statute, have been set forth to protect the taxpayers' money, and yet, in too many instances the administration has used appropriated moneys, taxpayers' dollars, to improperly influence Members of Congress.

On July 25, 1963, during the 88th Congress, I introduced S. 1939, which is the same bill I am now introducing, and cited several examples which clearly demonstrated the improper use by the administration of appropriated funds. That speech can be found in the Congressional Record, volume 109, part 10, page 13383.

Mr. President, the unauthorized use of appropriated funds is a serious violation of the trust that the people of America have placed in their Government. We have a criminal statute which makes it a crime to use appropriated moneys to influence Members of Congress, but we do not have a statute which makes it a crime to use appropriated moneys to improperly influence the general public.

Unfortunately, it is easy for administration officials and employees, in their eagerness to push for their programs, to use taxpayers' moneys to advance their cause without due regard to the opposition or the public's money. During this coming session, I am sure that there will be several instances which will tempt the zealous administration supporters to take their ideas to the public. This is well and good, but it should not be done with the taxpayers' money. Additional safeguards must be enacted if we are to protect the American people from those in Government who seek to convince, by whatever means possible, that their way is the one and only way. There is no room in Government for such employees and officials.

If we are to protect the liberty of our people and retain freedom of choice, as well as freedom of speech, we must restrain those in Government who improperly use Federal funds to influence and prejudice the American public.

Mr. President, I now introduce for appropriate reference a bill patterned after 18 U.S.C. 1913 which will make it a crime to use appropriated funds directly or indirectly to influence the vote of any person in any referendum or election held pursuant to an act of Congress or to influence public opinion in favor of or against any matter or issue to be voted upon by the Congress or either House thereof.

It should be stressed that this much needed bill would not prohibit any Government employee or official from furnishing to any person upon request a factual explanation of the matter to be voted upon by the Congress or by the people in a referendum.

It is sad to think that our form of government would need such a criminal statute, but the need does exist. Not only is there the need for such a law, but there is also the need for strong enforcement of this law. I ask Congress to pass this legislation which will protect the public funds and the people of America from lobbying pressures by Government employees.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 180) to prohibit the use of appropriated funds by officials or agencies of the Government for the purpose of influencing the vote in any referendum or election held pursuant to an act of Congress, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Simpson, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PROPOSED STUDY OF POSSIBILITY OF OPENING GREAT LAKES TO YEAR-ROUND SHIPPING TRAFFIC

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, today, I am introducing, for appropriate reference, on behalf of myself and Senators Bayh, Clark, and Douglas, proposed legislation authorizing a study of the possibility of opening the Great Lakes to year-round shipping traffic. At the present time, severe weather necessitates the shutdown of lake traffic over the winter months. This has an adverse economic impact on the United States as a whole and particularly on the Great Lakes region.

It is estimated that a Federal study of the feasibility of keeping the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence Seaway open on a permanent basis would cost only $50,000. It would take 2 years from the time funds were appropriated, and would be conducted by the Corps of Engineers.

There is considerable information available on deicing harbors and waterways. The study proposed by my bill would include a review of such information including previous reports by the Department of the Army, any available information from any other departments of the Government, and methods in use by private concerns and foreign governments.

My measure provides for the submission of a final report together with recommendations for such legislation and administrative actions as are deemed advisable.

Mr. President, the potential profits from such a study to our national economy and defense posture are great indeed. The cost of the study is low. I hope that the Senate will take speedy action on this measure as it did in 1963.

I ask unanimous consent that my bill be placed on the table for 10 days so that other interested Senators may add their names as cosponsors.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested.

The bill (S. 201) to provide for an investigation and study of means of making the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence Seaway available for navigation during the entire year, introduced by Mr. Proxmire (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL POWER ACT

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I send forward a bill to amend the Federal Power Act, and ask that a statement explaining its contents be printed immediately after its introduction. This bill is being cosponsored by my colleague, the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the explanation will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 218) to amend the Federal Power Act, as amended, in respect of the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission, introduced by Mr. Holland (for himself and Mr. Smathers), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The explanation presented by Mr. Holland is as follows:

Statement

In July of last year, hearings were held before the Senate Committee on Commerce on two bills to amend the Federal Power Act in respect of the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission. These bills were S. 2028 introduced by the then Senator Humphrey for himself and six others and S. 3038 introduced on behalf of Senator Smathers and myself.

Although no action on these bills was taken by the Senate in the closing days of the last Congress, the Commerce Committee, in its Report No. 1363 dated August 10, 1964, made clear that it intended to consider in this Congress appropriate amendments to the Federal Power Act in respect of Federal Power Commission jurisdiction.

The committee's report stated: "During the course of the committee hearings, other issues were raised, including the question of FPC jurisdiction over public utilities selling electric power at wholesale primarily for consumption in the States in which they operate.

"The committee considers that this issue, in addition to the issue of Commission jurisdiction over cooperatives, merits extensive hearing and consideration during the next session of Congress."

The purpose of this legislation introduced by me today is to clarify the Federal Power Act by further defining the limits of the Federal Power Commission's jurisdiction with respect to operations of cooperatives and companies engaged in what are essentially local activities which are primarily of local concern and which ought to be subject to State and local, rather than Federal, regulation.

This bill would reaffirm the original intent of the Congress in enacting the Federal Power Act; that the act was to supplement and not supplant State and local regulation.

The bill would, in general, exempt from Federal Power Commission jurisdiction any company, including any nonprofit corporation engaged in rural electrification, having all of its generating and transmission facilities within a single State and having no direct connections with the facilities of any public utility deriving the major portion of its electric revenues from sales in another State. The Federal Power Commission would continue to have jurisdiction over companies having generating or transmission facilities in more than one State as well as over the single-State companies which are directly connected with public utilities having their major operations in another State. The bill would also provide an exemption for what are essentially local sales to governmental bodies, cooperatives and exempt single-State companies.

Specifically, the bill amends section 201(f) of the Federal Power Act by adding two sentences.

The first sentence exempts from Federal Power Commission jurisdiction any company, including any nonprofit corporation, or membership or cooperative corporation or association, engaged in rural electrification, where (a) all of the generating and transmission facilities of such company are wholly within one State; and (b) none of the facilities of such company is directly connected with the facilities of any public utility otherwise than by an authorized or approved emergency connection or by a connection within the same State with the facilities of a public utility deriving the major portion of its electric revenues from sales at retail or for resale at retail within such State.

The second sentence of the bill exempts transactions involving the sale or, within the State in which delivery takes place, the transmission of electric energy to any entity exempted by subsection 201(f), as amended by this bill, or to any nonprofit corporation, or membership or cooperative corporation or association, engaged in rural electrification, where a substantial portion of the seller's electric revenues from sales within such State is derived from the sale of electric energy at retail.

OREGON DUNES NATIONAL SEASHORE

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, legislation to create the Oregon Dunes National Seashore has been before each session of the Congress since March 25, 1959, when the first bill on this subject was introduced by Senator Richard L. Neuberger and cosponsored by the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse].

On November 27, 1963, the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs favorably reported S. 1137 to the Senate Calendar. I am introducing today the Oregon Dunes National Seashore bill in the form in which it was approved by the Senate Interior Committee over a year ago, with the exception that I have incorporated into it amendments proposed on January 22, 1964, by the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Anderson].

The bill which I introduce is the product of many conferences, discussions, studies, and hearings by congressional committees and by the numerous Federal, State, county, and local officials, as well as individual citizens in the State of Oregon. During the period of nearly 6 years when the first bill was introduced there has been ample opportunity for the expression of all viewpoints regarding this new unit of the national park system. As a spokesman for Oregon Gov. Mark O. Hatfield said at hearings of the Senate Public Lands Subcommittee at Eugene, Oreg.: "It is now time for action on the Oregon dunes." I am hopeful that the Senate Interior Committee can again complete favorable action on the legislation in the very near future.

Mr. President, I ask consent to include with my remarks some excerpts from the favorable Senate Interior Committee report on S. 1137, the bill which was before the Senate in the 88th Congress.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the excerpts will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 250) to establish the Oregon Dunes National Seashore in the State of Oregon, and for other purposes, introduced by Mrs. Neuberger, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The excerpts presented by Mrs. Neuberger are as follows:

Excerpts From Senate Report No. 674

BACKGROUND

The proposed Oregon Dunes National Seashore contains what an eminent biologist and ecologist and recognized authority on dunes has described as the most beautiful and impressive coastal dunes in North America, if not the world. He is Dr. William S. Cooper, of Boulder, Colo., who reports that the transverse ridge pattern of the northern dunes in the area, while common in deserts, is uncommon in coastal areas.

In a comprehensive study of all of the Nation's shorelines, the National Park Service has found the proposed seashore 1 of the 10 most important, relatively unspoiled natural seashore areas in the 48 contiguous States.

It is an area of unusual scenes and beauty. The vast dunes of moving sand adjoining the Pacific Ocean beach, which varies from 40 to 125 yards in width with the tides. They are interlaced with fresh water lakes. Inland from the moving dunes are ancient, forested, stable dunes ranging 450 feet above sea level, interspersed with other lakes popular for boating, fishing, swimming, and water sports.

The Oregon Dunes National Seashore, as proposed in the amended bill, stretches approximately 31 miles along the Pacific coast from the Siuslaw River south to Tenmile Creek, which is 10 miles north of Coos Bay. It contains 30,000 acres of land and water lying chiefly between U.S. Highway 101 and the ocean, but jutting east across the highway to reach, and include in the seashore area, stretches of inland shores on lakes Tahkenitch, Siltcoos, and Woahink, which would provide seashore visitors access and opportunity to enjoy water sports. The ocean itself is too cold even in summer for all but the hardiest swimmers and skiers. It is, however, one of the world's most renowned salmon fishing areas.

U.S. Highway No. 101, skirting its east side or passing through the seashore, extends from Canada to Mexico. It is the main Pacific coastal artery and connects with numerous east-west roads.

The Interior Department has accurately reported, as committee members who have inspected the area can attest, that no area on the Pacific coast can present such an association of spectacular dunes, seashore, fresh water lakes, and forests, plus the tidal bays and harbors formed by the Siuslaw and Umpqua Rivers which reach the ocean through the seashore area.

A few miles north of the proposed seashore is a second great tourist attraction, not now proposed for Federal acquisition, the famed Oregon Sea Lion Caves.

The area fully meets the criteria of outstanding scenic beauty and unusual character qualifying it to become a national seashore. The Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings, and Monuments has recommended it for such status.

The committee is in full agreement on the desirability of a national seashore in the area.

IMPLEMENTING THE OUTDOOR RECREATION RESOURCES REVIEW COMMISSION REPORT

The establishment of such a seashore would be a further step by the Federal Government to meet the growing needs of the Nation for outdoor recreational opportunities and a further step toward implementation of the report of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, which recommended: "Immediate action * * * by Federal, State, and local governments to reserve or acquire additional water, beach, and shoreline areas, particularly near centers of population."

This recommendation was backed by these findings:

"About 90 percent of all Americans participated in some form of outdoor recreation in the summer of 1960. In total, they participated in one activity or another on 4.4 billion separate occasions. It is anticipated that by 1976 the total will be 6.9 billion, and by the year 2000 it will be 12.4 billion, a threefold increase by the turn of the century.

"Most people seeking outdoor recreation want water—to sit by, to swim and to fish in, to ski across, and to run their boats over. Swimming is now one of the most popular outdoor activities and likely to be the most popular of all by the turn of the century. Boating and fishing are among the top 10 activities. Camping, picnicking, and hiking, also high on the list, are most attractive near water sites."

CONDEMNATION

Seashore and recreation area bills adopted in the 87th and 88th Congresses have included provisions to give special consideration to property owners and to minimize numbers of houses and businesses taken. Exemption from condemnation in areas not necessary for public use developments has been granted where use of the property is consistent with recreation area objectives. Residence owners have been given options of 25 years continued tenure, life tenure for the owner and spouse, or until the youngest surviving child reaches age 21.

The majority of the committee agrees that Congress should not go beyond such extended tenure provisions in delaying full acquisition of properties in the main body of a seashore or other recreation area. Some private inholdings interfere with needed public use facilities—a highway, campground, visitor center, water access, or other essential development. The ultimate authority to condemn is necessary to assure proper development of the new recreation areas and safeguard against unreasonable acquisition costs. The committee feels, as courts have held, that the acquisition of some of our vanishing shorelines and other recreational areas, is a public purpose justifying use of condemnation where necessary.

The extended tenure provisions, revision of boundaries to minimize private properties affected, and other provisions have been adopted to minimize the necessity and onerous effects of condemnation. But it is the majority's firm belief that the power of condemnation is essential, and that it would not be equitable to property owners in other areas of acquisition, nor a wise precedent, to delete condemnation entirely from S. 1137. It has consequently been retained along with the extended tenure provisions in previous, comparable legislation. A summary of such provisions appears as an appendix to this report. A study of the constitutional power of State, local, and Federal governments to condemn land for outdoor recreation and related open space purposes will be found in the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission Study Report No. 16 entitled "Land Acquisition for Outdoor Recreation—Analysis of Selected Legal Problems."

OWNERSHIP OF LANDS INVOLVED

Most of the land involved in the proposed Oregon Dunes National Seashore is in public ownership. About 6,000 acres is water area. The character of land ownership, by acreage, is:

	Acres
National Forest Service	13,399
Bureau of Land Management	1,773
State, including parks	3,493
County and local government	1,194
Private	4,242
Total land	24,101

COSTS

The committee has amended S. 1137 to include a section 12 authorizing appropriations for acquisitions under the act not to exceed $1,500,000.

The estimated cost of acquiring all private lands within the new boundaries, exclusive of scenic easements authorized in the new section 4(d), was $1,392,000. These costs may be reduced by retentions of tenure to residences, and the committee feels that the authorization is adequate at this time.

The estimated development costs of the seashore area, which includes roads, campgrounds, picnic facilities, beach development, boat ramps, headquarters, visitor centers, sanitary facilities, etc., is $6,274,000. Annual operating and maintenance costs are estimated in the fifth year at $310,000. The National Park Service has continuing authorization of development, maintenance, and operating funds so authority for their appropriation is not necessary in S. 1137.

PROPOSAL TO END SENATE CONFIRMATION OF POSTMASTERS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I introduce a bill, for appropriate reference, to end Senate confirmation of postmasters. In this era of equal employment opportunities it is indeed strange that first-, second-, and third-class postmasters are appointed not solely on the basis of merit but rather on the strength of political pull, only partly modified by civil-service provisions.

Such a change has been recommended in every major study in the executive government since President Taft's administration in 1911.

Let me outline briefly a few of the reasons for eliminating this system of discriminatory appointments.

First, it weakens the Post Office Department by eliminating for consideration many qualified applicants who do not have political affiliations. The Hatch Act prohibits political activity on the part of Post Office employees. This means that a career civil servant in the Post Office Department cannot participate in the type of political activity which often is a prerequisite to appointment to a postmastership. Yet these career civil servants have the experience and the acquired skills to do an excellent job in this position.

Second, it has a severe impact on the morale of career postal personnel. They know that, no matter how good they are, a postmaster vacancy will in all likelihood be filled on the basis of political considerations rather than merit.

Third, for every successful appointee, there are from 2 to 10 unhappy or even infuriated rejectees who resent their Senator's action. Consequently, party harmony can be strained rather than strengthened by the awarding of a postmastership for faithful party service.

Fourth, the many hundreds of letters received by Senate offices recommending postmaster candidates as well as a Senator's role in processing and recommending consume valuable staff time in this period of unprecedented legislative and administrative burdens. This time-consuming job ties up committee staffs as well as Senators.

Fifth, the concept of equal opportunity as a basic part of our democratic ideals makes any reliance on political qualifications rather than job ability repugnant to the basic principles upon which this country was founded.

My bill, then, would provide that the Postmaster General, rather than the President, shall appoint postmasters at post offices for the first, second, and third classes in the competitive civil service without term. No Senate confirmation would be required and the law would read as follows:

> In making such appointments, no political test or qualification shall be permitted or given consideration, but such appointments shall be made solely on the basis of merit and efficiency.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that my bill be permitted to lie on the desk 1 week for cosponsors.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested.

The bill (S. 252) to provide for appointment by the Postmaster General of postmasters at first, second, and third class post offices, introduced by Mr. PROXMIRE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

CONTROL AND DEVELOPMENT OF OREGON WATER RESOURCES

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, rampaging rivers and streams in Oregon caused tragic loss of life and costly property damage throughout my State during Christmas week. Devastation from this natural disaster will run into the hundreds of millions of dollars. Despite havoc in every county of Oregon, the people of my State have responded to the disaster with characteristic energy and initiative, with compassion for the needy and homeless. Oregonians proved equal to their pioneer heritage.

There will be need for emergency disaster relief funds to repair damaged roads, bridges, water supply and sanitation installations. There will be need for financial aid to business, farmers, and individuals. I have pledged my best efforts to restoration of all facilities so that Oregon's economy can be brought back to normal at the earliest possible date.

The great flood of 1964 has focused attention on the valuable contribution of water resource development projects throughout the Columbia and Willamette River Basins. Without these dams and reservoirs, the destruction would reached much higher figures. The Corps of Engineers has estimated that the Willamette Basin project cut 4.5 feet from the crest of the flood at Portland. Without the dams, it is possible that Portland would have lost five of its six bridges. Damage at upstream points also was reduced by existence of flood control dams.

However, the flood has shown that the construction completed is not enough. We must go forward with a program aimed at maximum comprehensive development of Oregon's water resources. Our ultimate goal must be to harness and control our State's rivers and streams so that the threat of future floods is curbed. The Corps of Engineers and Bureau of Reclamation will need to restudy the reports to determine feasible locations for new projects.

As the beginning of an expanded Oregon water resource development and control program, I am introducing a bill for the construction of the Tualatin reclamation project. This measure is being cosponsored by my senior colleague [Mr. MORSE]. This project is essential to the battle against flood threats in Oregon. It provides additional benefits for irrigation, water quality, conservation of fish and wildlife, and other purposes. The project has the approval of local and State officials and the development plans have been sent to Congress with a favorable report from the Secretary of the Interior.

The Tualatin project plan of development provides for a 61,000 acre-foot reservoir behind the proposed Scoggin Dam to store excess wintertime flows of the river and release the water as needed for municipal and industrial supplies, irrigation, the maintenance of fish life in the river, flood control, and water quality control.

Included in the plan are some 70 miles of main canals and necessary pumping plants, laterals, drains, and appurtenant facilities to irrigate 17,000 acres of productive lands. Project facilities would provide for the foreseeable water needs of three cities in the project area and for other nonagricultural uses. Specific facilities would also be provided at Scoggin Reservoir for recreation and fish enhancement, and modifications at an existing downstream industrial diversion dam will assure the passage of anadromous fish.

Washington County cities of Hillsboro, Forest Grove, and Beaverton, Tigard water district, as well as the Lake Oswego Corp., will require about 14,000 acre-feet of water annually from the project.

Construction cost of the Tualatin project is estimated at $19,235,300 of which $14,431,500 is reimbursable. Tentative allocations of the project cost to functions are as follows: Irrigation, $13,089,000; municipal and industrial water supply, $1,342,500; water-quality control, $1,720,700; fish and wildlife, $1,977,200; recreation, $795,100; flood control, $30,800; highway transportation, $280,000.

Mr. President, this project has been strongly endorsed by the Oregon State Water Resources Board, as well as the local units of government concerned.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 254) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Tualatin Federal reclamation project, Oregon, and for other purposes, introduced by Mrs. NEUBERGER (for herself and Mr. MORSE), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REDUCTION OF EXCISE TAX ON AUTOMOBILES

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to reduce the excise tax on automobiles from 10 to 5 percent over a 3-year period. Under the provisions of this measure, the tax will drop to 7 percent on July 1, 1965, to 6 percent in the following year, and reach 5 percent in 1967.

Of the major wartime excise taxes, only that on passenger cars has remained unchanged since the Korean conflict. Taxes on refrigerators, jewelry, cameras, sporting goods, electric, gas, and oil appliances have been reduced; also taxes on general admissions and local phone services.

In the transportation field, the 10-percent levy on bus and rail fares was lifted. The tax on freight and oil pipeline transportation also was repealed; and the 15-percent tax on airlines was reduced to 5 percent.

All competing forms of transportation have enjoyed significant tax relief. Only the tax on automobiles remains at its peak wartime level.

My efforts to reduce the excise tax on cars go back to 1958. In March of that year, the automobile manufacturers endorsed reduction or repeal of these excise taxes. At the same time, I was assured that the savings would be passed along to the retail customers.

On June 18, 1958, I introduced amendments to the excise tax extension bill. These amendments sought to repeal the 10-percent Federal excise tax levied on automobiles sold after March 1, 1958. They also would have reduced the rate imposed on trucks and buses by one-half—to 5 percent—also retroactive to March 1, 1958. They were defeated.

On September 5, 1959, I tried again to reduce the Federal excise tax on auto passenger cars. I introduced an amendment to the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1959 which would have amended section 4061(a)(2) to the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 by providing for automatic reductions in the 10-percent rate applied on passenger automobiles to 7 percent on July 1, 1960; 6 percent on July 1, 1961; and 5 percent on July 1, 1962. Unfortunately, the amendment was defeated by a vote of 7-to-78.

Each year since 1954 Congress has failed to reduce the 10-percent tax on automobiles—the only major Korean war excise tax not to be cut. The consumer was shelling out as much as $400 more in taxes for his new car, while excise taxes on "essential" items such as golf clubs, cameras, cosmetics and appliances for the home had been reduced.

In September, of 1962, the Congress had another opportunity to vote on major tax legislation. As far as the rank-and-file taxpayer was concerned, the tax grabbag offered by the Congress was an empty bag. It did not lower his tax rate—or increase his deductions—or raise personal exemptions from $600 to a more realistic figure.

Nor did it reduce unfair consumer taxes such as the one I am trying to reduce today—the Korean-inspired 10-percent excise tax on the purchase of a new passenger car. I voted against it.

Now in 1965—is the time to correct the tax abuses of other years. Obviously, the administration is of a mind to do this. President Johnson has given support to the recommendation that excise taxes now levied on many items be reduced or repealed.

Treasury Secretary Dillon testified before the Democratic platform committee last summer that excise tax cuts should precede additional income tax reductions. And President Johnson made a campaign pledge to reduce these taxes in 1965.

In addition, the President, in three statements, advocated this action.

Accordingly, I introduce my bill with the hope that the Senate will at last act favorably upon it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 255) to provide for the reduction over a 3-year period of the excise tax on passenger automobiles, introduced by Mr. McNAMARA, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

ADDITIONAL INCOME TAX EXEMPTION FOR CERTAIN STUDENTS

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an additional exemption to a taxpayer for each son or daughter under the age of 23 years who is a full-time student above the secondary level at an educational institution.

This bill is intended to make possible the achievement of some of the goals about which many spoke during the past Congress. Other Senators have introduced similar bills and I am hopeful that all of them can be given active consideration during the 89th Congress.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 258) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an additional exemption of $600 to a taxpayer for each dependent son or daughter under the age of 23 who is a full-time student above the secondary level at an educational institution, introduced by Mr. CANNON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION RELATING TO SAND AND GRAVEL

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, in 1955 Congress enacted Public Law 167 which provided:

> Common varieties of sand, stone, gravel, pumice, pumicite, or cinders shall not be deemed a valuable mineral deposit within the meaning of the mining laws of the United States so as to give effective validity to any mining claim hereafter located under such mining laws.

The principal purpose for this legislation was apparently to remove the possibility of unauthorized and fraudulent locations by speculators who had no interest in developing mining operations, but were only interested in acquiring title to surface land.

I believe sincerely that this is a sound purpose. My concern today, however, is not with the intent of Public Law 167, but with the interpretation given it by the Department of the Interior since its enactment.

The decisions rendered since 1955 have been equally as restricting on bona fide sand and gravel operations as on the fraudulent operators. Regulations have been drawn which have greatly impaired and, in fact, threatened to totally cripple the construction and building industry in Nevada and other Western States.

Section 7 of the 1955 act provides that there be no limit or restrictions on existing rights under valid mining claims. In spite of this, however, the Department of the Interior has consistently ruled that those claims validly located prior to 1955 must meet a marketability test at a date not later than the time of the act. This flatly violates the historical idea that an operator was entitled to locate and protect his reserves even though he did not in fact remove and market them prior to the time he sought patent.

An arbitrary date is set by the Department ruling at which time any operator, no matter how well intentioned, must be able to prove that he could have economically mined the materials located.

In an area expanding at such an accelerated rate as is Nevada, the effect of the Department's ruling is a serious threat. In my State, for example, 86.9 percent of the total area is controlled by the Federal Government. All Western States have a significant, though lesser, amount of land in public domain. It is imperative, therefore, that, to meet the demands of growth, we have access to the materials held in these lands.

I am not proposing that carte blanche permission be given any operator to remove minerals. I am proposing that more reasonable interpretations be given to existing law and that certain clarifications be made in order that valid mining operations can be conducted.

The first bill which I send to the desk, therefore, would simply provide that a valuable mineral deposit within the meaning of the mining laws can be proven by establishing that such deposit was marketable at the time application for patent was made. This bill would only apply to claims located prior to July 23, 1955, the date of enactment of Public Law 167.

The second bill deals with the interpretation of the term "common varieties" as applied in the 1955 act. The Department in this case has held that all sand and gravel was of a common variety and therefore not locatable under the Minerals Act.

In my judgment, such interpretation is not realistic and does not take into consideration the type of materials which are needed by the construction industry. The adoption of this position again seems to ignore the intent of Congress at the time it passed Public Law 167, for had the purpose been elimination of all varieties, the language would have been so worded. Congress, in fact, added the word "common," however, to indicate that only common varieties were excluded leaving all special varieties of building materials subject to the mining laws.

I therefore send to the desk a second bill which would clarify the intent of Congress in this connection.

May I point out that in terms of mine units produced, the sand and gravel industry is the largest member of the mining family. In 1963, according to the U.S. Bureau of Mines, the industry produced 831 million tons valued at $838 million.

The executive director of the American Society of Planning Officials, Mr. Dennis O'Harrow, has pointed out that if the present sand and gravel production should remain static, there would have to be produced 25 billion tons in the next 30 years. With the anticipated increase in population, however, he estimates that it will be necessary to produce 42 billion tons during that time period. By 1993, annual production would have to be approximately 2,100 million tons.

I believe these figures will dispel any erroneous notions that although gravel is commonly found and not regarded as valuable, it is a vital natural resource and an important, essential element to our economy. It is an unrenewable resource that needs to be used with prudence but needs to be available to the honest operators who seek to keep pace with the demands of our growing population.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills will be received and appropriately referred.

The bills, introduced by Mr. CANNON, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, as follows:

S. 259. A bill with respect to the proof of value necessary in the case of certain mining claims located prior to July 23, 1955; and

S. 260. A bill to amend the act relating to the multiple use of the surface of the same tracts of the public lands in order to provide that certain varieties of sand and gravel shall be considered as valuable mineral deposits under the mining laws of the United States.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR CERTAIN HOMESTEAD ENTRYMEN TO ESTABLISH ACTUAL PERMANENT RESIDENCE

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill for the relief of certain homestead entrymen, residents of Mesquite, Nev., who have filed applications on land in the so-called Arizona strip, just 12 miles from Mesquite.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 261) to provide additional time to certain homestead entrymen in the State of Arizona to establish actual permanent residence, introduced by Mr. CANNON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

MILAGROS ARAGON NERI

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill for the relief of Milagros Aragon Neri, which passed the Senate during the last Congress and which I am hopeful will be passed by this body again and by the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received, and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 262) for the relief of Milagros Aragon Neri, introduced by Mr. CANNON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ELECTED MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL AND NONVOTING DELEGATE IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I introduce a bill to provide for an elected mayor and city council and a nonvoting delegate to the House of Representatives for the District of Columbia.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be appropriately referred and printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 268) to provide an elected mayor, city council, and nonvoting Delegate to the House of Representatives for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MORSE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subject to the retention by Congress of the ultimate legislative authority over the Nation's Capital which is granted by the Constitution, it is the intent of Congress to restore to the inhabitants of the District of Columbia the powers of local self-government which are a basic privilege of all American citizens; to reaffirm through such action the confidence of the American people in the strengthened validity of principles of local self-government by the elective process; to promote among the inhabitants of the District the sense of responsibility for the development and well-being of their community which will result from the enjoyment of such powers of self-government; to provide for the more effective participation in the development of the District and in the solution of its local problems by those persons who are most closely concerned; and to relieve the National Legislature of the burden of legislating upon purely local District matters. It is the further intention of Congress to exercise its retained ultimate legislative authority over the District only insofar as such action shall be necessary or desirable in the interest of the Nation. Finally, it is recognized that the restoration of the powers of local self-government to the inhabitants of the District by this Act will in no way change the need, which arises from the unique character of the District as the Nation's Capital, for the payment by the Federal Government of a share of the expenses of the District government; and it is intended that an equitable share thereof shall be paid annually.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Title I—Definitions

Sec. 101. Definitions.

Title II—Status of the District

Sec. 201.201. Status of the District.

Title III—The District Council

Part 1—Creation of the District Council

Sec. 301. Creation and membership.
Sec. 302. Qualifications for holding office.
Sec. 303. Compensation.
Sec. 304. Procedure for changes.

Part 2—Principal Functions of the District Council

Sec. 321. Functions heretofore exercised by the Board of Commissioners.
Sec. 322. Functions relating to zoning and other agencies.
Sec. 323. Certain delegated functions.
Sec. 324. Powers of and limitations upon District Council.

Part 3—Organization and Procedure of the District Council

Sec. 331. The Chairman.
Sec. 332. Secretary of the District Council; records and documents.
Sec. 333. Meetings.
Sec. 334. Committees.
Sec. 335. Acts and resolutions.
Sec. 336. Passage of acts.
Sec. 337. Procedure for Zoning Acts.
Sec. 338. Investigations by District Council.

Titles IV—Mayor

Sec. 401. Election, qualifications, and salary.
Sec. 402. Powers and duties.

Title V—The District budget

Sec. 501. Fiscal year.
Sec. 502. Budgetary details fixed by District Council.
Sec. 503. Adoption of budget.
Sec. 504. Budget establishes appropriations.
Sec. 505. Supplemental appropriations.

Title VI—Borrowing

Part I—Borrowing for Capital Improvements

Sec. 601. Borrowing power; debt limitations.
Sec. 602. Contents of borrowing legislation; referendum on bond issue.
Sec. 603. Publication of borrowing legislation.
Sec. 604. Short period of limitation.
Sec. 605. Acts for issuance of bonds.
Sec. 606. Public sale.

Part 2—Short Term Borrowing

Sec. 621. Borrowing to meet supplemental appropriations.
Sec. 622. Borrowing in anticipation of revenues.
Sec. 623. Notes redeemable prior to maturity.
Sec. 624. Sale of notes.

Part 3—Payment of Bonds and Notes

Sec. 631. Payment of bonds and notes.

Part 4—Tax Exemption—Legal Investment

Sec. 641. Tax exemption.
Sec. 642. Legal investment.

Title VII—Financial affairs of the District

Part 1—Financial Administration

Sec. 701. Surety bonds.
Sec. 702. Financial duties of the Mayor.
Sec. 703. Control of appropriations.
Sec. 704. Accounting supervision and control.
Sec. 705. When contracts and expenditures prohibited.
Sec. 706. General fund.
Sec. 707. Contracts extending beyond one year.

Part 2—Annual Post Audit by General Accounting Office

Sec. 721. Independent annual post audit.
Sec. 722. Amendment of Budget and Accounting Act.

Part 3—Adjustment of Federal and District Expenses

Sec. 731. Adjustment of Federal and District expenses.

Title VIII—Elections in the District

Sec. 801. Board of elections.
Sec. 802. What elections shall be held.
Sec. 803. Elective offices; terms of office.
Sec. 804. Vacancies.
Sec. 805. What candidates are elected.
Sec. 805a. Recall.
Sec. 806. Qualified electors.
Sec. 807. Registration.
Sec. 808. Qualified candidates.
Sec. 809. Nominations.
Sec. 810. Nonpartisan elections.
Sec. 811. Method of voting.
Sec. 812. Recounts and contests.
Sec. 813. Interference with registration or voting.
Sec. 814. Violations.

Title IX—Miscellaneous

Sec. 901. Agreements with United States.
Sec. 902. Personal interest in contracts or transactions.
Sec. 903. Compensation from more than one source.
Sec. 904. Assistance of United States Civil Service Commission in development of District merit system.

Title X—Succession in Government

Sec. 1001. Transfer of personnel, property, and funds.
Sec. 1002. Existing statutes, regulations, and so forth.
Sec. 1003. Pending actions and proceedings.
Sec. 1004. Vacancies resulting from abolition of Board of Commissioners.

Title XI—Separability of provisions

Sec. 1101. Separability of provisions.

Title XII—Temporary provisions

Sec. 1201. Powers of the President during transition period.
Sec. 1202. Reimbursable appropriation for the District.

Title XIII—Effective dates

Sec. 1301. Effective dates.

Title XIV—Submission of charter for referendum

Sec. 1401. Charter referendum.
Sec. 1402. Board of Elections.
Sec. 1403. Registration.
Sec. 1404. Charter referendum ballot; notice of voting.
Sec. 1405. Method of voting.
Sec. 1406. Acceptance or nonacceptance of charter.

Title XV—Delegate

Sec. 1501. District Delegate.

Title XVI—Referendum

Sec. 1601. Power of referendum.
Sec. 1602. Effect of certification of referendum petition.
Sec. 1603. Submission to electors.
Sec. 1604. Availability of list of qualified electors.
Sec. 1605. Results of referendum.

Title XVII—Initiative

Sec. 1701. Initiative.

Title XVIII—Title of Act

Sec. 1801. Title of Act.

TITLE I—DEFINITIONS

Definitions

SEC. 101. For the purposes of this Act—

(1) The term "District" means the District of Columbia.

(2) The terms "District Council" or "Council" means the Council of the District of Columbia provided for by title III.

(3) The term "Chairman" means the Chairman of the District Council provided for by title III.

(4) The term "Mayor" means the Mayor provided for by title IV.

(5) The term "qualified elector" means a qualified elector of the District as specified in section 806, except as otherwise specifically provided.

(6) The term "Act" includes any legislation adopted by the District Council, except where the term "Act" is used to refer to this Act or other Acts of Congress herein specified.

(7) The term "District Primary Act" means the Act of August 12, 1955 (69 Stat. 699).

(8) The term "person" includes an individual, partnership, association, joint-stock company, trust, or corporation.

(9) The term "capital project", or "project", means (a) any physical public betterment or improvement and any preliminary studies and surveys relative thereto; (b) the acquisition of property of a permanent nature; or (c) the purchase of equipment for any public betterment or improvement when first erected or acquired.

(10) The term "pending", when applied to any capital project, means authorized but not yet completed.

(11) The term "Board of Elections" means the Board of Elections created by section 3 of the District Primary Act.

(12) The term "election", unless the context otherwise indicates, means an election held pursuant to the provisions of this Act.

(13) The term "domicile" means that place where a person has his true, fixed, and permanent home and to which, when he is absent, he has the intention of returning.

(14) The term "municipal office" means an office of any governmental unit subordinate to a State government.

(15) The terms "publish" and "publication", unless otherwise specifically provided herein, mean publication in a newspaper of general circulation published in the District.

(16) The term "Municipal Courts of the District of Columbia" means the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions, the District of Columbia Court of Appeals, the District of Columbia Tax Court, the juvenile court of the District of Columbia, and such other municipal courts as the District Council may hereafter establish by act.

TITLE II—STATUS OF THE DISTRICT

Status of the District

SEC. 201. (a) All the territory constituting the permanent seat of the Government of the United States shall continue to be designated as the District of Columbia. The District of Columbia is hereby declared to be a body politic and corporate in perpetuity for governmental purposes and as such may sue and be sued, contract and be contracted with, and have a corporate seal. Such body politic and corporate is the successor of the District of Columbia created by section 2 of the Revised Statutes relating to the District of Columbia and continued by the first section of the Act of June 11, 1878 (D.C. Code, sec. 1–102). So far as is consistent with the provisions of this Act, all powers, rights, privileges, immunities, duties, obligations, assets, and liabilities of the District of Columbia created by such section 2 are hereby transferred to, vested in, and imposed upon the body politic and corporate created by this section.

(b) Section 1 of the Act of February 21, 1871 (16 Stat. 419), and section 1 of the Act of June 11, 1878 (20 Stat. 102), are hereby repealed.

(c) Nothing contained in this section shall affect the boundary line between the District of Columbia and the Commonwealth of Virginia as the same was established or may be subsequently established under the provisions of title I of the Act of October 31, 1945 (59 Stat. 552).

TITLE III—THE DISTRICT COUNCIL

Part I—Creation of the District Council

Creation and membership

SEC. 301. There is hereby created a Council of the District of Columbia consisting of nine members elected as provided in title VIII.

QUALIFICATIONS FOR HOLDING OFFICE

SEC. 302. No person shall hold the office of member of the District Council unless he (1) is a qualified elector, (2) is domiciled in the District and resides in the ward from which he is nominated, has, during the three years next preceding his nomination resided and been domiciled in the District and has for one year preceding his nomination, resided and been domiciled in the ward from which he is nominated, (3) holds no other elective public office, and (4) holds no appointive office for which compensation is provided out of District funds. A member of the Council shall forfeit his office upon failure to maintain the qualifications required by this section.

Compensation

SEC. 303. Each member of the District Council, except the Chairman, shall receive compensation at a rate of $6,500 per annum, payable in periodic installments. The Chairman shall receive compensation at a rate of $8,500 per annum, payable in periodic installments. All members shall receive such additional allowances for expenses as may be approved by the District Council to be paid out of funds duly appropriated therefor.

Changes in Membership and Compensation of District Council Members

SEC. 304. The number of members constituting the District Council, the qualifications for holding office, and the compensation of such members may be changed by Act passed by the District Council; except that no such Act shall take effect until after it has been assented to by a majority of the qualified electors of the District voting at an election on the proposition set forth in any such Act.

Part 2—Principal functions of the District Council

Functions Heretofore Exercised by the Board of Commissioners

SEC. 321. (a) Except as otherwise provided in this Act, all functions granted to or imposed upon the Board of Commissioners of the District are hereby transferred to the District Council except those powers hereinafter specifically conferred on the Mayor.

(b) The Board of Commissioners of the District is hereby abolished, and all provisions of law providing for the Board of Commissioners of the District, and the offices of Commissioner, Engineer Commissioner, and Assistants to the Engineer Commissioner of the District, are hereby repealed.

(c) The Board of Education provided for in section 2 of the Act entitled "An Act to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia", approved June 20, 1906 (34 Stat. 316), is hereby abolished and its functions are hereby transferred to the District Council for exercise in such manner and by such person or persons as the Council may direct.

Functions Relating to Zoning and Other Agencies

SEC. 322. (a) The Zoning Commission created by the first section of the Act of March 1, 1920, creating a Zoning Commission for the District of Columbia, as amended (D.C. Code, sec. 5–412), is hereby abolished, and its functions are transferred to the District Council.

(b) The Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia; the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency; the Armory Board; and the National Capital Housing Authority are hereby abolished and their functions transferred to the District Council for exercise in such manner and by such person or persons as the Council may direct.

Certain Delegated Functions

SEC. 323. No function of the Board of Commissioners of the District which such Board has delegated to an officer or agency of the District shall be considered as a function transferred to the Council by section 321. Each such function is hereby transferred to the officer or agency to whom or to which it was delegated, until the Mayor or Council, or both, pursuant to the powers herein granted, shall revoke, modify, or transfer such delegation.

Powers of and Limitations Upon District Council

SEC. 324. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b) and subject to the reserved powers of the Congress as provided in section 324(d), there shall be vested (1) in the District Council, and (2) in the qualified electors of the District of Columbia as provided in section 1701 of this Act, complete legislative power over the District with respect to all rightful subjects of legislation not inconsistent with the Constitution or with the laws of the United States which are applicable but not confined to the District: *Provided,* That such subjects are within the scope of the power of Congress in its capacity as the legislature for the District of Columbia as distinguished from its capacity as the National Legislature. Except as otherwise provided in sections 321 and 322, nothing in this section shall be construed as vesting in the District government any greater authority over the Commission on Mental Health, the National Zoological Park, the Washington Aqueduct, the National Guard of the District of Columbia, or any Federal agency, than the authority which was vested in the Board of Commissioners prior to the date of the enactment of this Act. The District Council shall, by majority vote of those present, confirm or reject nominees proposed by the Mayor, and shall have power, by vote of two-thirds of its members, to override any veto by the Mayor.

(b) The qualified electors of the District of Columbia or the District Council may not pass any act contrary to the provisions of this Act or—

(1) impose any tax on property of the United States;

(2) grant any exclusive privilege, immunity, or franchise;

(3) authorize any lottery or the sale of lottery tickets or authorize any form of gambling;

(4) authorize the use of public money in support of any sectarian, denominational, or private school except as now or hereafter authorized by Congress;

(5) lend the public credit for support of any private undertaking;

(6) authorize the issuance of bonds except in compliance with the provisions of title VI; or

(7) pass any act inconsistent with or contrary to the Act of June 6, 1924 (43 Stat. 463), as amended by the Act of April 30, 1926 (44 Stat. 374), the Act of July 19, 1952 (66 Stat. 781); and the Act of May 29, 1930 (46 Stat. 482), and the people or the Council shall not pass any act inconsistent with or contrary to any provision of any Act of Congress as it specifically pertains to any duty, authority, and responsibility, of the National Capital Planning Commission; except insofar as the above-cited or other referred to Acts refer to the Engineer Commissioner or the Board of Commisioners, the former of which terms, after the enactment of this Act, shall mean the Mayor or some District Government official deemed by the Mayor to be best qualified, and designated by him to sit in lieu of the Mayor as a member of the National Capital Planning Commission and the National Capital Regional Planning Council, and the latter term shall mean the District Council.

(c) An act, except as otherwise provided in this Act, shall become effective thirty days after its passage or at such later time as the Council may designate: *Provided,* That an act may become effective at any time after its passage if the Council by vote of two-thirds of its members shall state in such act that an emergency exists requiring such earlier effective date. Every act or resolution shall include a preamble, or be accompanied by a report, setting forth concisely the purposes of its adoption. Every act or resolution shall be published, within seven days after its passage, as the District Council may direct.

(d) The Congress of the United States reserves the right, at any time, to exercise its constitutional authority as legislature for the District of Columbia, by enacting legislation for the District on any subject, whether within or without the scope of legislative power granted to the qualified electors of the District of Columbia and the District Council by this Act, including without limitation legislation to amend or repeal any law in force in the District of Columbia prior to or after the enactment of this Act and any act or resolution passed by the Council or any act passed by the qualified electors of the District of Columbia.

(e) Upon the effective date of this title, jurisdiction over the Municipal Courts of the District of Columbia shall vest with the District Council in all matters pertaining to the organization and composition of such Courts, and to the appointment or selection, qualification, tenure, and compensation of the judges thereof. Nothing in this Act shall be construed to change the tenure of any judge occupying the position of a judge of one of the Municipal Courts of the District of Columbia on the date of the enactment of this Act, except that his compensation may be increased.

(f) On or after the effective date of this title, any person appointed or elected to serve as judge of one of the Municipal Courts of the District of Columbia shall not (1) be appointed or elected to serve for a term of less than ten years, or (2) receive as compensation for such service an amount less than the amount payable to an associate judge of the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions on the date of enactment of this Act.

(g) Nothing in subsection (e) of this section shall be construed to curtail the jurisdiction of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia or any other United States court other than the Municipal Courts of the District of Columbia.

Part 3—Organization and Procedure of the District Council

The Chairman

SEC. 331. The District Council shall elect from among its members a Chairman who shall be the presiding officer of the District Council and a Vice Chairman, who shall preside in the absence of the Chairman. When the Mayor is absent or unable to act, or when the office is vacant, the Chairman shall act in his stead. The term of the Chairman shall be for two years.

Secretary of the District Council; Records and Documents

SEC. 332. (a) The District Council shall appoint a secretary as its chief administrative officer and such assistants and clerical personnel as may be necessary. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the compensation and other terms of employment of such secretary, assistants, and clerical personnel shall be prescribed by the District Council.

(b) The secretary shall (1) keep a record of the proceedings of the District Council, (2) keep a record showing the text of all acts and resolutions introduced, and the ayes and noes of each vote, (3) authenticate by his signature and record in full in a continuing record kept for that purpose all acts passed by the District Council, and (4) perform such other duties as the District Council may from time to time prescribe.

Meetings

SEC. 333. (a) The first meeting of the District Council after this part takes effect shall be called by the member who receives the highest vote in the election provided in title VIII. Such member shall preside until a Chairman is elected. The first meeting of the District Council in each odd-numbered year commencing with the first odd-numbered year next following such election shall be called by the Secretary of the District Council for a date not later than January 7 of such year.

(b) The District Council shall provide for the time and place of its regular meetings. The District Council shall hold at least one regular meeting in each calendar week except that during July and August it shall hold at least two regular meetings in each month. Special meetings may be called, upon the giving of adequate notice, by the Mayor, the Chairman, or any three members of the Council.

(c) Meetings of the District Council shall be open to the public and shall be held at reasonable hours and at such places as to accommodate a reasonable number of spectators. The records of the Council provided for in section 332(b) shall be open to public inspection and available for copying during all regular office hours of the Council Secretary. Any citizen shall have the right to petition and be heard by the Council at any of its meetings, within reasonable limits as set by the Council Chairman, the Council concurring.

Committees

SEC. 334. The Council Chairman, with the advice and consent of the Council, shall appoint such standing and special committees as may be expedient for the conduct of the

Council's business. All committee meetings shall be open to the public except when ordered closed by the committee chairman, with the approval of a majority of the members of the committee.

Acts and Resolutions

SEC. 335. (a) The Council, to discharge the powers and duties imposed herein, shall enact acts and adopt resolutions, upon a vote of a majority of the members of the Council, unless otherwise provided herein. Acts shall be used for all legislative purposes. Resolutions shall be used to express simple determinations, decisions, or directions of the District Council of a special or temporary character.

(b)(1) The enacting clause of all acts passed by the District Council shall be, "Be it enacted by the Council of the District of Columbia:".

(2) The resolving clause of all resolutions passed by the District Council shall be "The Council of the District of Columbia hereby resolves,".

(c) A special election may be called by resolution of the District Council to present for referendum vote of the people any proposition upon which the District Council desires to take such action.

Passage of Acts

SEC. 336. The District Council shall not pass any act before the thirteenth day following the day on which it is introduced. Subject to the other limitations of this Act, this requirement may be waived by the unanimous vote of the members present.

Procedure for Zoning Acts

SEC. 337. (a) Before any zoning act for the District is passed by the District Council—

(1) the District Council shall deposit the act in its introduced form, with the National Capital Planning Commission. Such Commission shall within thirty days after the date of such deposit, report to the District Council whether the proposed act is in conformity with the comprehensive plan for the District of Columbia. The District Council may not pass the act unless it has received such report or the Commission has failed to report within the thirty-day period above specified; and

(2) the District Council (or an appropriate committee thereof) shall hold a public hearing on the act. At least thirty days' notice of the hearing shall be published as the Council may direct. Such notice shall include the time and place of the hearing and a summary of all changes in existing law which would be made by adoption of the act. The District Council (or committee thereof holding the hearing) shall give such additional notice as it finds expedient and practicable. At the hearing interested persons shall be given reasonable opportunity to be heard. The hearing may be adjourned from time to time. The time and place of the adjourned meeting shall be publicly announced before adjournment is had.

(b) The District Council shall deposit with the National Capital Planning Commission each zoning act passed by it. If in the opinion of the Commission such act as passed would adversely affect the interests of the Federal Government, the Commission shall within thirty days after the date of such deposit certify to the District Council its disapproval of such act. If such certification of disapproval is not made within such thirty-day period, the zoning act shall take effect as law on the day following the expiration of such period. If the Commission makes such certification of disapproval within the thirty-day period above specified, the zoning act shall take effect as law only if, within thirty days after the day on which such certification is received, the act be readopted by the affirmative vote of at least two-thirds of the members of the District Council; in which case the zoning act shall take effect as law on the day following the day on which it is readopted, or at such later date as the Council may designate.

Investigations by District Council

SEC. 338. (a) The District Council, or any committee or person authorized by it, shall have power to investigate any matter relating to the affairs of the District; and for that purpose may require the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and other evidence. For such purpose any member of the District Council (if the District Council is conducting the inquiry) or any member of the committee, or the person conducting the inquiry, may issue subpenas and may administer oaths.

(b) In case of contumacy by, or refusal to obey a subpena issued to, any person, the District Council, committee, or person conducting the investigation shall have power to refer the matter to any judge of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, who may by order require such person to appear and to give or produce testimony or books, papers, or other evidence, bearing upon the matter under investigation; and any failure to obey such order may be punished by such court as a contempt thereof as in the case of failure to obey a subpena issued, or to testify, in a case pending before such court.

TITLE IV—MAYOR

Election, Qualifications, and Salary

SEC. 401. (a) There is hereby created the office of Mayor of the District of Columbia. The Mayor shall be elected as provided in title VIII.

(b) No person shall hold the office of Mayor unless he (1) is a qualified elector, (2) is domiciled and resides in the District and has during the three years next preceding his nomination been resident in and domiciled in the District, (3) holds no other elective public office, and (4) holds no appointive office for which compensation is provided out of District funds. The Mayor shall forfeit his office upon failure to maintain the qualifications required by this section.

(c) The Mayor shall receive an annual salary of $15,000, and an allowance for official expenses, which he shall certify in reasonable detail to the District Council, of not more than $2,500 annually. Such salary shall be payable in periodic installments.

(d) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the method of election, the qualifications for office, the compensation and the allowance for official expenses pertaining to the office of Mayor may be changed by act passed by the District Council; except that no such act shall take effect until after it has been assented to by a majority of the qualified electors of the District voting at an election of the proposition set forth in any such act.

Powers and Duties

SEC. 402. The Mayor shall be the chief executive officer of the District government. He shall be responsible for the proper administration of the affairs of the District coming under his jurisdiction or control, and to that end shall have the following powers and functions:

(1) He shall designate the officer or officers of the executive department of the District who shall, during periods of disability or absence from the District of the Mayor, the Chairman, and the Vice Chairman of the District Council, execute and perform all the powers and duties of the Mayor.

(2) He shall act as the official spokesman for the District and as the head of the District for ceremonial purposes.

(3) He shall administer all laws relating to the appointment, promotion, discipline, separation, and other conditions of employment of personnel in the office of the Mayor, personnel in executive departments of the District, and members of boards, commissions, and other agencies, who, under laws in effect on the effective date of this section, are subject to appointment and removal by the Commissioners. All actions affecting such personnel and such members shall, until such time as legislation is enacted by the District Council superseding such laws and establishing a permanent civil service system or systems, based on merit, pursuant to section 402(4), continue to be subject to the provisions of Acts of Congress relating to the appointment, promotion, discipline, separation, and other conditions of employment applicable to officers and employees of the District government; to section 1001(d) of this Act, and, where applicable, to the provisions of the joint agreement between the Commissioners and the Civil Service Commission authorized by Executive Order Numbered 5491 of November 18, 1930, relating to the appointment of District personnel. He shall appoint or assign personnel to positions formerly occupied, ex officio, by one or more members of the Board of Commissioners and shall have power to remove such personnel from such positions. The officers and employees of each agency with respect to which legislative power is delegated by this Act and which, immediately prior to the effective date of this section, was not subject to the administrative control of the Board of Commissioners of the District, shall continue to be appointed and removed in accordance with applicable laws until such time as such laws may be superseded by legislation passed by the Council establishing a permanent civil service system or systems, based on merit, pursuant to section 402(4): *Provided*, That all appointments of department heads and members of boards and commissions, all appointments and assignments to positions formerly occupied, ex officio, by one or more members of the Board of Commissioners of the District, and appointments made pursuant to section 804 of this Act, shall be by and with the consent of the Council.

(4) He shall administer the personnel functions of the District covering employees of all District departments, boards, commissions, offices, and agencies, except as otherwise provided by this Act. Personnel legislation enacted by Congress prior to or after the effective date of this section, including, without limitation, legislation relating to appointments, promotions, discipline, separations, pay, unemployment compensation, disability and death benefits, leave, retirement, insurance, and veteran's preference, applicable to employees of the District government, as set forth in section 1002(c), shall continue in effect until such time as the Council shall, pursuant to this section, provide similar or comparable coverage under a District civil service system or systems, based on merit. The District civil service system or systems shall be established by legislation of the Council and shall provide coverage similar or comparable to, or shall provide for continued participation in, all or part of the Federal civil service system. The District civil service system or systems shall take effect not earlier than one year or later than five years after the effective date of this section.

(5) He shall, through the heads of administrative boards, offices, and agencies, supervise and direct the activities of such boards, offices, and agencies.

(6) He shall, at the end of each fiscal year, prepare reports for such year of (a) the finances of the District, and (b) the administrative activities of the executive office of the Mayor and the executive departments of the District. He shall submit such reports to the Council within ninety days after the close of the fiscal year.

(7) He shall keep the District Council advised of the financial condition and future needs of the District and make such

recommendations to the Council as may seem to him desirable.

(8) He may submit drafts of acts to the District Council.

(9) He shall perform such other duties as the District Council, consistent with the provisions of this Act, may direct.

(10) He may delegate any of his functions (other than the function of approving contracts between the District and the Federal Government under section 901) to any officer, employee, or agency of the executive office of the Mayor, or to any director of an executive department who may, with the approval of the Mayor, and if the Council has given assent, make a further delegation of all or a part of such functions to subordinates under his jurisdiction.

(11) The Mayor or the District Council may propose to the executive or legislative branch of the United States Government, legislation or other action dealing with any subject not falling within the authority of the District government, as defined in this Act.

(12) As custodian, he shall use and authenticate the corporate seal of the District in accordance with the rules of the Council.

(13) He shall have the right, under rules to be adopted by the District Council, to be heard by the Council or any of its committees.

(14) If empowered by the District Council, he is authorized and directed to promulgate, adopt and enforce such rules and regulations, not inconsistent with any Act of the Congress or any act of the Council, as are necessary to carry out his functions and duties.

(15) He shall within ten days after the adoption of any act by the District Council approve or disapprove such act. If he disapproves such act, he shall state in writing his reasons therefor. Upon such disapproval, such act shall not become law unless pursuant to section 324(a) it shall within thirty days of such disapproval be readopted by a vote of two-thirds of the members of the District Council, whereupon it shall become law in accordance with the provisions of this Act. If the Mayor fails to approve or disapprove such act within ten days after its adoption, such act shall become law as provided in this Act.

TITLE V—THE DISTRICT BUDGET

Fiscal Year

SEC. 501. The fiscal year of the District of Columbia shall begin on the 1st day of July and shall end on the 30th day of June of the succeeding calendar year. Such fiscal year shall also constitute the budget and accounting year.

Budgetary Details Fixed by District Council

SEC. 502. (a) The Mayor shall prepare and submit, not later than April 1, to the District Council, in such form as the Council shall approve, the annual budget estimates of the District and the budget message.

(b) The Mayor shall, in consultation with the District Council, take whatever action may be necessary to achieve, insofar as is possible, (1) consistency in accounting and budget classifications, (2) synchronization between accounting and budget classifications and organizational structure, and (3) support of the budget justification by information on performance and program costs as shown by the accounts.

Adoption of Budget

SEC. 503. The District Council shall by act adopt a budget for each fiscal year not later than May 15, except that the District Council may, by resolution, extend the period for its adoption. The effective date of the budget shall be July 1 of the same calendar year.

Budget Establishes Appropriations

SEC. 504. The adoption of the budget by the District Council shall, from the effective date thereof, operate to appropriate and to make available for expenditure, for the purposes therein named, the several amounts stated therein as proposed expenditures, subject to the provisions of section 702.

Supplemental Appropriations

SEC. 505. The District Council may at any time adopt an act by vote of a majority of its members rescinding previously appropriated funds which are then available for expenditure, or appropriating funds in addition to those theretofore appropriated to the extent unappropriated funds are available; and for such purpose unappropriated funds may include those borrowed in accordance with the provisions of section 621.

TITLE VI—BORROWING

Part 1—Borrowing for capital improvements

Borrowing Power; Debt Limitations

SEC. 601. The District may incur indebtedness by issuing its bonds in either coupon or registered form to fund or refund indebtedness of the District at any time outstanding and to pay the cost of constructing or acquiring any capital projects requiring an expenditure greater than the amount of taxes or other revenues allowed for such capital projects by the annual budget: *Provided*, That no bonds or other evidences of indebtedness, other than bonds to fund or refund outstanding indebtedness, shall be issued in an amount which, together with indebtedness of the District to the Treasury of the United States pursuant to existing law, shall cause the aggregate of indebtedness of the District to exceed 12 per centum of the average assessed value of the taxable real and tangible personal property of the District subject to taxation by the District as of the first day of July of the ten most recent fiscal years for which such assessed values are available, nor shall such bonds or other evidences of indebtedness issued for purposes other than the construction or acquisition of capital projects connected with highway, water and sanitary sewage works purposes or other revenue-producing capital projects which are determined by the District Council to be self-liquidating exceed 6 per centum of such average assessed value. Bonds or other evidences of indebtedness may be issued by the District pursuant to an act of the District Council from time to time in amounts in the aggregate at any time outstanding not exceeding 2 per centum of said assessed value, exclusive of indebtedness owing to the United States on the effective date of this title. All other bonds or evidences of indebtedness, other than bonds to fund or refund outstanding indebtedness, shall be issued only with the assent of a majority of the qualified electors of said District voting at an election on the proposition of issuing such bonds. In determining the amount of indebtedness within all of the aforesaid limitations at any time outstanding there shall be deducted from the aggregate of such indebtedness the amount of the then current tax levy for the payment of the principal of the outstanding bonded indebtedness of the District and any other moneys set aside into any sinking fund and irrevocably dedicated to the payment of such bonded indebtedness. The District Council shall make provision for the payment of any bonds issued pursuant to this title, in the manner provided in section 631 hereof.

Contents of Borrowing Legislation; Referendum on Bond Issue

SEC. 602. (a) An act authorizing the issuance of bonds may be enacted by a majority of the District Council members at any meeting of the Council subsequent to the meeting at which such act was introduced, and shall contain at least the following provisions:

(1) A brief description of each purpose for which indebtedness is proposed to be incurred;

(2) The maximum amount of the principal of the indebtedness which may be incurred for each such purpose;

(3) The maximum rate of interest to be paid on such indebtedness; and

(4) In the event the District Council is required by this part, or it is determined by the Council in its discretion, to submit the question of issuing such bonds to a vote of the qualified electors of the District, the date on which such election will be held, the manner of holding such election, the manner of voting for or against the incurring of such indebtedness and the form of ballot to be used at such election. The ballot shall be in such form as to permit the electors to vote separately for or against the incurring of indebtedness for each of the purposes for which indebtedness is proposed to be incurred.

(b) The District Council shall cause the proposition of issuing such bonds to be submitted by the Board of Elections to the qualified electors at the first general election to be held in the District not less than forty days after the date of enactment of the act authorizing such bonds, or upon a vote of at least two-thirds of the members of the District Council, the Council may call a special election for the purpose of voting upon the issuance of said bonds, such election to be held by the Board of Elections at any date set by the Council not less than forty days after the enactment of such act.

(c) The Board of Elections is authorized and directed to prescribe the manner of registration and the polling places and to name the judges and clerks of election and to make such other rules and regulations for the conduct of such elections as are not specifically provided by the District Council as may be necessary or appropriate to carry out the provisions of this section, including provisions for the publication of a notice of such election stating briefly the proposition or propositions to be voted on and the designated polling places in the various precincts and wards in the District, which said notice shall be published at least once a week for four consecutive calendar weeks on any day of the week, the first publication thereof to be not less than thirty nor more than forty days prior to the date fixed by the District Council for the election. The Board of Elections shall canvass the votes cast at such election and certify the results thereof to the District Council in the manner prescribed for the canvass and certification of the results of general elections. The certification of the result of the election shall be published once by the Board of Elections within three days following the date of the election.

Publication of Borrowing Legislation

SEC. 603. The Mayor shall publish any act authorizing the issuance of bonds at least once within five days after the enactment thereof, together with a notice of the enactment thereof in substantially the following form:

"Notice

"The following Act authorizing the issuance of bonds published herewith has become effective, and the time within which a suit, action, or proceeding questioning the validity of such bonds can be commenced as provided in the District of Columbia Charter Act will expire twenty days from the date of the first publication of this notice or in the event the proposition of issuing the proposed bonds is to be submitted to the qualified electors, twenty days after the date of publication of the promulgation of the results of the election ordered by said act to be held.

——— ———,
"MAYOR".

Short Period of Limitation

SEC. 604. Upon the expiration of twenty days from and after the date of publication of the notice of the enactment of an act authorizing the issuance of bonds without the submission of the proposition for the issuance thereof to the qualified electors, or upon the expiration of twenty days from the date of publication of the promulgation of the results of an election upon the proposition of issuing bonds, as the case may be, all as provided in section 603—

(1) Any recitals or statements of fact contained in such act or in the preambles or the titles thereof or in the results of the election of any proceedings in connection with the calling, holding, or conducting of election upon the issuance of such bonds shall be deemed to be true for the purpose of determining the validity of the bonds thereby authorized, and the District and all others interested shall thereafter be estopped from denying same;

(2) Such act and all proceedings in connection with the authorization of the issuance of such bonds shall be conclusively presumed to have been duly and regularly taken, passed, and done by the District and the Board of Elections in full compliance with the provisions of this Act and of all laws applicable thereto;

(3) The validity of such act and said proceedings shall not thereafter be questioned by either a party plaintiff or a party defendant, and no court shall have jurisdiction in any suit, action, or proceeding questioning the validity of same, except in a suit, action, or proceeding commenced prior to the expiration of such twenty days.

Acts for Issuance of Bonds

Sec. 605. After the expiration of the twenty-day limitation period provided for in section 604 of this part, the District Council may by act establish an issue of bonds as authorized pursuant to the provisions of sections 601 to 604, inclusive, thereof. An issue of bonds is hereby defined to be all or any part of an aggregate principal amount of bonds authorized pursuant to said sections, but no indebtedness shall be deemed to have been incurred within the meaning of this Act until the bonds shall have been sold, delivered, and paid for, and then only to the extent of the principal amount of bonds so sold and delivered. The bonds of any authorized issue may be issued all at one time, or from time to time in series and in such amounts as the District Council shall deem advisable. The act authorizing the issuance of any series of bonds shall fix the date of the bonds of such series, and the bonds of each such series shall be payable in annual installments beginning not more than three years after the date of the bonds and ending not more than thirty years from such date. The amount of said series to be payable in each year to be so fixed that when the annual interest is added to the principal amount payable in each year the total amount payable in each year in which part of the principal is payable shall be substantially equal. It shall be an immaterial variance if the difference between the largest and smallest amounts of principal and interest payable annually during the term of the bonds does not exceed 3 per centum of the total authorized amount of such series. Such act shall also prescribe the form of the bonds to be issued thereunder, and of the interest coupons appertaining thereto, and the manner in which said bonds and coupons shall be executed. The bonds and coupons may be executed by the facsimile signatures of the officer or officers designated by the act authorizing the bonds, to sign the bonds, with the exception that at least one signature shall be manual. Such bonds may be issued in coupon form in the denomination of $1,000, registerable as to principal only or as to both principal and interest, and if registered as to both principal and interest may be issuable in denominations of multiples of $1,000. Such bonds and the interest thereon may be payable at such place or places within or without the District as the District Council may determine.

Public Sale

Sec. 606. (a) All bonds issued under this part shall be sold at public sale upon sealed proposals at such price or prices as shall be approved by the District Council after publication of a notice of such sale at least once not less than ten days prior to the date fixed for sale in a daily newspaper carrying municipal bond notices and devoted primarily to financial news or to the subject of State and municipal bonds published in the city of New York, New York, and in a newspaper of general circulation published in the District. Such notice shall state among other things that no proposal shall be considered unless there is deposited with the District as a downpayment a certified check or cashier's check for an amount equal to at least 2 per centum of the par amount of bonds bid for, and the District Council shall reserve the right to reject any and all bids.

(b) The Treasurer of the United States, and any administrative officer or agency of the United States Government may purchase bonds issued under this part with funds under the control of such officer or agency to the same extent as the Treasurer, officer, or agency is permitted by law to invest such moneys in obligations of the United States Government, and such sale may be negotiated without the necessity of complying with the provisions of this section, relative to a public sale of the bonds.

Part 2—Short-term borrowing

Borrowing To Meet Supplemental Appropriations

Sec. 621. In the absence of unappropriated available revenues to meet supplemental appropriations made pursuant to section 505, the District Council may by act authorize the issuance of negotiable notes, in a total amount not to exceed 5 per centum of the total appropriations for the current fiscal year, each of which shall be designated "supplemental" and may be renewed from time to time, but all such notes and renewals thereof shall be paid not later than the close of the fiscal year following that in which such act becomes effective.

Borrowing in Anticipation of Revenues

Sec. 622. For any fiscal year, in anticipation of the collection or receipt of revenues of that fiscal year, the District Council may by act authorize the borrowing of money by the execution of negotiable notes of the District, not to exceed in the aggregate at any time outstanding 20 per centum of the total anticipated revenue, each of which shall be designated "Revenue Note for the Fiscal Year 19 ". Such notes may be renewed from time to time, but all such notes, together with the renewals, shall mature and be paid not later than the end of the fiscal year for which the original notes have been issued.

Notes Redeemable Prior to Maturity

Sec. 623. No notes issued pursuant to this part shall be made payable on demand, but any note may be made subject to redemption prior to maturity on such notice and at such time as may be stated in the note.

Sale of Notes

Sec. 624. All notes issued pursuant to this part may be sold at not less than par and accrued interest at private sale without previous advertising.

Part 3—Payment of bonds and notes

Sec. 631. (a) The act of the District Council authorizing the issuance of bonds pursuant to this title, shall, where necessary, provide for the levy annually of a special tax without limitation as to rate or amount upon all the taxable real and personal tangible property within the District in amounts which, together with other revenues of the District available and applicable for said purposes, will be sufficient to pay the principal of and interest on said bonds and the premium, if any, upon the redemption thereof, as the same respectively become due and payable, which tax shall be levied and collected at the same time and in the same manner as other District taxes are levied and collected, and when collected shall be set aside for the purpose of paying such principal, interest, and premium.

(b) The full faith and credit of the District shall be and is hereby pledged for the payment of the principal of and the interest on all bonds and notes of the District hereafter issued pursuant to this title whether or not such pledge be stated in the bonds or notes or in the act authorizing the issuance thereof.

Part 4—Tax Exemption—Legal Investment

Tax Exemption

Sec. 641. Bonds and notes issued by the District Council pursuant to this title and the interest thereon shall be exempt from all Federal and District taxation except estate, inheritance, and gift taxes.

Legal Investment

Sec. 642. Notwithstanding any restriction on the investment of funds by fiduciaries contained in any other law, all domestic insurance companies, domestic insurance associations, executors, administrators, guardians, trustees and other fiduciaries within the District of Columbia may legally invest any sinking funds, moneys, trust funds, or other funds belonging to them or under or within their control in any bonds issued pursuant to this title, it being the purpose of this section to authorize the investment in such bonds or notes of all sinking, insurance, retirement, compensation, pension and trust funds. National banking associations are authorized to deal in, underwrite, purchase and sell, for their own accounts or for the accounts of customers, bonds and notes issued by the District Council to the same extent as national banking associations are authorized by paragraph seven of section 5136 of the Revised Statutes (title 12, U.S.C., sec. 24), to deal in, underwrite, purchase and sell obligations of the United States, States, or political subdivisions thereof. All Federal building and loan associations and Federal savings and loan associations; and banks, trust companies, building and loan associations, and savings and loan associations, domiciled in the District of Columbia, may purchase, sell, underwrite, and deal in, for their own account or for the account of others, all bonds or notes issued pursuant to this title: *Provided*, That nothing contained in this section shall be construed as relieving any person, firm, association or corporation from any duty of exercising due and reasonable care in selecting securities for purchase or investment.

TITLE VII—FINANCIAL AFFAIRS OF THE DISTRICT

Part 1—Financial administration

Surety Bonds

Sec. 701. Each officer and employee of the District required to do so by the District Council shall provide a bond with such surety and in such amount as the District Council may require. The premiums for all such bonds shall be paid out of appropriations for the District.

Financial Duties of the Mayor

Sec. 702. The Mayor, through his duly designated subordinates, shall have charge of the administration of the financial affairs of the District and to that end he shall—

(1) prepare and submit in the form and manner prescribed by the District Council under section 502 the annual budget estimates and budget message;

(2) supervise and be responsible for all financial transactions to insure adequate control of revenues and resources and to insure that appropriations are not exceeded;

(3) maintain systems of accounting and internal control designed to provide—

(A) full disclosure of the financial results of the District government's activities,

(B) adequate financial information needed by the District government for management purposes,

(C) effective control over and accountability for all funds, property, and other assets: *Provided*, That as soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Mayor shall cause the accounts of the District to be maintained on a basis that will facilitate the preparation of cost-based budgets;

(4) submit to the District Council a monthly financial statement, by appropriation and department, and in any further detail the District Council may specify;

(5) prepare, as of the end of each fiscal year, a complete financial statement and report;

(6) supervise and be responsible for the assessment of all property subject to assessment within the corporate limits of the District for taxation, make all special assessments for the District government, prepare tax maps, and give such notice of taxes and special assessments as may be required by law;

(7) supervise and be responsible for the assessment and collection of all taxes, special assessments, license fees, and other revenues of the District for the collection of which the District is responsible and receive all money receivable by the District from the Federal Government, or from any court, or from any agency of the District;

(8) have custody of all public funds belonging to or under the control of the District, or any agency of the District government, and deposit all funds coming into his hands, in such depositories as may be designated and under such terms and conditions as may be prescribed by act of the District Council;

(9) have custody of all investments and invested funds of the District government, or in possession of such government in a fiduciary capacity and have the safekeeping of all bonds and notes of the District and the receipt and delivery of District bonds and notes for transfer, registration, or exchange.

Control of Appropriations

SEC. 703. The District Council may provide (1) the transfer during the budget year of any appropriation balance then available for one item of appropriation to another item of appropriation, and (2) the allocation to new items of funds appropriated for contingent expenditure.

Accounting Supervision and Control

SEC. 704. The Mayor, through his duly authorized subordinates, shall—

(1) prescribe the forms of receipts, vouchers, bills, and claims to be used by all the agencies of the District government;

(2) examine and approve all contracts, orders, and other documents by which the District government incurs financial obligations, having previously ascertained that moneys have been appropriated and allotted and will be available when the obligations shall become due and payable;

(3) audit and approve before payment all bills, invoices, payrolls, and other evidences of claims, demands, or charges against the District government and with the advice of the legal officials of the District determine the regularity, legality, and correctness of such claims, demands, or charges; and

(4) perform internal audits of central accounting and department and agency records of the District government, including the examination of any accounts or records of financial transactions, giving due consideration to the effectiveness of accounting systems, internal control, and related administrative practices of the respective agencies.

When Contracts and Expenditures Prohibited

SEC. 705. No officer or agency of the District shall, during any budget year, expend or contract to expend any money or incur any liability, or enter into any contract which by its terms involves the expenditure of money, for any purpose, in excess of the amounts appropriated for any item of expenditure. Any contract, verbal or written, made in violation of this Act shall be null and void. Any officer or employee of the District who shall violate this section, upon conviction thereof, may be summarily removed from office. Nothing in this section, however, shall prevent the making of contracts or of expenditures for capital improvements to be financed in whole or in part by the issuance of bonds, nor the making of contracts of lease or for services for a period exceeding the budget year in which such contract is made, when such contract is permitted by law.

General Fund

SEC. 706. The general fund of the District shall be composed of the revenues of the District other than the revenues applied by law to special funds. All moneys received by any agency, officer, or employee of the District in its or his official capacity shall belong to the District government and shall be paid promptly to the Mayor, or his duly authorized subordinates, for deposit in the appropriate funds.

Contracts Extending Beyond One Year

SEC. 707. No contract involving expenditure out of the appropriations for more than one year shall be made for a period of more than five years; nor shall any such contract be valid unless made or approved by act of the District Council.

Part 2—Audit by General Accounting Office

Independent Audit

SEC. 721. (a) The financial transactions shall be audited by the General Accounting Office in accordance with such principles and procedures and under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Comptroller General of the United States. In the determination of the auditing procedures to be followed and the extent of the examination of vouchers and other documents, the Comptroller General shall give due regard to generally accepted principles of auditing, including consideration of the effectiveness of the accounting organizations and systems, internal audit and control, and related administrative practices. The audit shall be conducted at the place or places where the accounts are normally kept. The representatives of the General Accounting Office shall have access to all books, accounts, financial records, reports, files, and all other papers, things, or property belonging to or in use by the District and necessary to facilitate the audit, and they shall be afforded full facilities for verifying transactions with the balances or securities held by depositories, fiscal agents, and custodians.

(b)(1) The Comptroller General shall submit such audit reports as he may deem necessary to the Congress, the Mayor, and the Council. The reports shall set forth the scope of the audits and shall include such comments and information as may be deemed necessary to keep the Mayor and the Council informed of the operations to which the reports relate, together with such recommendations with respect thereto as the Comptroller General may deem advisable. The reports shall show specifically every program, expenditure, and other financial transactions or undertaking which, in the opinion of the Comptroller General, has been carried on or made without authority of law.

(2) After the Mayor and his duly authorized subordinates have had an opportunity to be heard, the Council shall make such report, together with such other material as it deems pertinent thereto, available for public inspection.

(3) The Mayor, within ninety days after the report has been made to him and the Council, shall state in writing to the Council what has been done to comply with the recommendations made by the Comptroller General in the report.

Amendment of Budget and Accounting Act

SEC. 722. Section 2 of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (U.S.C., title 31, sec. 2), is hereby amended by striking out "and the municipal government of the District of Columbia".

Part 3—Adjustment of Federal and District expenses

Adjustment of Federal and District Expenses

SEC. 731. Subject to section 901 and other provisions of law, the Mayor, with the advice and consent of the District Council, and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, are authorized and empowered to enter into an agreement or agreements concerning the manner and method by which amounts owed by the District to the United States, or by the United States to the District, shall be ascertained and paid.

TITLE VIII—ELECTIONS IN THE DISTRICT

Board of Elections

SEC. 801. (a) The members of the Board of Elections in office on the date of enactment of this Act shall continue in office for the remainder of the terms for which they were appointed. Their successors shall be appointed without regard to political affiliations, by the Mayor, by and with the advice and consent of the District Council. The term of each such successor (except in the case of an appointment to fill an unexpired term) shall be three years from the expiration of the term of his predecessor. Any person appointed to fill a vacancy shall be appointed only for the unexpired term of his predecessor. When a member's term of office expires, he may continue to serve until his successor is appointed and has qualified. Section 3 of the District Primary Act is hereby modified to the extent that it is inconsistent herewith.

(b) In addition to its other duties, the Board of Elections shall also, for the purposes of this Act—

(1) maintain a permanent registry;

(2) conduct registrations and elections;

(3) in addition to determining appeals with respect to matters referred to in sections 807 and 811, determine appeals with respect to any other matters which (under regulations prescribed by it under subsection (c)) may be appealed to it;

(4) print, distribute, and count ballots, or provide and operate suitable voting machines;

(5) divide the District into three wards as nearly equal as possible in population and of geographic proportions as nearly regular as possible, and establish voting precincts therein;

(6) operate polling places;

(7) certify nominees and the results of elections; and

(8) perform such other functions as are imposed upon it by this Act.

(c) The Board of Elections may prescribe such regulations not inconsistent with the provisions of this title, as may be necessary or appropriate for the purposes of this title, including regulations providing for appeals to it on questions arising in connection with nominations, registrations, and elections (in addition to matters referred to it in sections 807 and 811) and for determination by it of appeals.

(d) The officers and agencies of the District government shall furnish to the Board of Elections, upon request of such Board, such space and facilities in public buildings in the District to be used as registration or polling places, and such records, information, services, personnel, offices, and equipment, and such other assistance and facilities, as may be necessary to enable such Board properly to perform its functions.

(e) In the performance of its duties, the Board of Elections shall not be subject to the authority of any nonjudicial officer of the District.

(f) The Board of Elections, and persons authorized by it, may administer oaths to persons executing affidavits pursuant to sections 801 and 807. It may provide for the administering of such other oaths as it considers appropriate to require in the performance of its functions.

(g) The Board of Elections is authorized to employ such permanent and temporary personnel as may be necessary. The appointment, compensation, and other terms of employment may be set by the Board of Elections without regard to the provisions of section 402 of this Act.

(h) Each member of the Board of Elections shall be paid at the rate of $1,500 per annum in periodic installments.

What Elections Shall Be Held

SEC. 802. (a) The Board of Elections shall conduct a general election—

(1) in any even-numbered calendar year commencing with 1966; and

(2) in any odd-numbered calendar year commencing with 1967, if an act authorizing the issuance of bonds required by section 602 to be submitted for a referendum at an election is enacted at least forty days prior to the date for conducting the election in such year.

(b) Such general elections shall be held on the fourth Tuesday before the Tuesday in November prescribed hereafter for runoff elections.

(c) Any runoff elections required to be held pursuant to section 805 shall be held on the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November.

Elective Offices; Terms of Office

SEC. 803. (a) The offices of the District to be filled by election shall be the elective offices on the District Council, the Mayor and the District Delegate.

(b) The term of an elective office on the District Council shall be two years beginning on January 1 of the odd-numbered year following such election.

(c) The term of office of the Mayor shall be four years, beginning on January 1 of the odd-numbered year next following his election.

(d) The term of office of the District Delegate shall be two years beginning at noon on January 3 of the odd-numbered year following such election.

Vacancies

SEC. 804. (a) Vacancies in the office of Mayor or in the District Council shall be filled at the next general election held pursuant to section 802 for which it is possible for candidates to be nominated following the occurrence of the vacancy. A person elected to fill a vacancy shall take office as soon as practicable following the certification of his election by the Board of Elections and shall hold office for the duration of the unexpired term to which he was elected but not beyond the end of such term.

(b) If the office of Delegate becomes vacant at a time when the unexpired term of such office is six months or more, a special election and, if necessary, a runoff election shall be held, at such time and in such manner (comparable to that prescribed for general elections) as the Board of Elections shall prescribe.

(c) Until a vacancy in the office of Mayor or in the District Council can be filled in the manner prescribed in subsection (a) hereof, a vacancy in the office of Mayor shall be filled by appointment by the District Council; and a vacancy in the District Council shall be filled by appointment by the Mayor. No person shall be qualified for appointment to any office under this subsection unless, if nominated, he would have been a qualified candidate for such office at the last election conducted prior to or on the date the vacancy occurred. A person appointed to fill a vacancy under this subsection shall hold office until the time provided for an elected successor to take office, but not beyond the end of the term during which the vacancy occurred.

What Candidates Are Elected

SEC. 805. At any general election, a candidate for Delegate or a candidate for Mayor who receives a majority of the votes validly cast for such office shall be elected. At any general election, each of the three candidates in each ward for positions on the District Council receiving the highest number of valid votes, shall be elected if he receives more than one-sixth of the total number of votes validly cast for all candidates in his ward for the position for which he is a candidate. In case any office is unfilled because of failure of any candidate to receive in any general election the necessary proportion of votes validly cast, there shall be a runoff election to fill such office. In such runoff election the candidates shall be the persons who were the unsuccessful candidates for the unfilled offices in the general election, and who received the highest number of valid votes in that election, to the number of twice the offices to be filled. The candidate or candidates receiving the highest number of votes validly cast in the runoff election shall be elected. In any election in which there are two or more similiar positions to be filled in any ward, a vote for any candidate for such a position in that ward will be valid only if the ballot records votes for as many candidates for such positions in that ward as there are positions to be filled.

Recall

SEC. 805a. (a) Any elective officer of the District of Columbia shall be subject to recall by the qualified electors of the District. Any petition filed demanding the recall by the qualified electors of the District of any such elective officer shall be signed by not less than 25 per centum of the number of qualified electors of the District voting at the last preceding general election. Such petition shall set forth the reasons for the demand and shall be filed with the Secretary of the District Council. If any such officer with respect to whom such a petition is filed shall offer his resignation, it shall be accepted and take effect on the day it is offered, and the vacancy shall be filled as provided by law for filling a vacancy in that office arising from any other cause. If he shall not resign five days after the petition is filed, a special election shall be called by the Council to be held within twenty days thereafter to determine whether the qualified electors of the District will recall such officer.

(b) There shall be printed on the ballot at such election, in not more than two hundred words, the reason or reasons for demanding the recall of any such officer, and, in not more than two hundred words, the officer's justification or answer to such demands. Any officer with respect to whom a petition demanding his recall has been filed shall continue to perform the duties of his office until the result of such special election is officially declared by the Board of Elections. No petition demanding the recall of any officer filed pursuant to this section shall be circulated against any officer of the District until he has held his office six months.

(c) If a majority of the qualified electors voting on any petition filed pursuant to this section vote to recall any officer, his recall shall be effective on the day on which the Board of Elections certifies the results of the special election, and the vacancy created thereby shall be filled immediately in a manner provided by law for filling a vacancy in that office arising from any other cause.

(d) The Board of Elections shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary or appropriate (1) with respect to the form, filing, examination, amendment, and certification of a petition for recall filed pursuant to this section, and (2) with respect to the conduct of any special election held pursuant to this section.

Qualified Electors

SEC. 806. No person shall vote in an election unless he meets the qualifications of an elector specified in this section and has registered pursuant to section 807 of this Act or section 7 of the District Primary Act. A qualified elector of the District shall be any person (1) who has maintained a domicile or place of abode in the District continuously during the one-year period ending on the day of the election, (2) who is a citizen of the United States, (3) who is on the day of the election at least twenty-one years old, (4) who has never been convicted of a felony in the United States, or, if he has been so convicted, has been pardoned, (5) who is not mentally incompetent, as adjudged by a court of competent jurisdiction, and (6) who certifies that he has not, within one year immediately preceding the election, voted in any election at which candidates for any municipal offices (other than in the District of Columbia) were on the ballot.

Registration

SEC. 807. (a) No person shall be registered unless—

(1) he shall be able to qualify otherwise as an elector on the day of the next election; and

(2) he executes, in the presence of an employee of the Board of Elections authorized to take oaths for such purposes a registration affidavit on a form prescribed by the Board of Elections showing that he will meet on the day of the election all the requirements of section 806 of this Act.

(b) If a person is not permitted to register, such person, or any qualified candidate, may appeal to the Board of Elections, but not later than three days after the registry is closed for the next election. The Board shall decide within seven days after the appeal is perfected whether the challenged elector is entitled to register. If the appeal is denied the appellant may, within three days after such denial, appeal to the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions. The court shall decide the issue not later than eighteen days before the day of the election. The decision of such court shall be final and not appealable. If the appeal is upheld by either the Board or the court, the challenged elector shall be allowed to register immediately. If the appeal is pending on election day, the challenged elector may cast a ballot marked "challenged", as provided in section 811.

(c) For the purposes of this Act, the Board of Elections shall keep open, during normal hours of business, Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays excepted, a central registry office and shall conduct registration at such other times and places as the Board of Elections shall deem appropriate. The Board of Elections may suspend the registration of voters, or the acceptance of changes in registrations for such period, not exceeding thirty days, next preceding any election as it may deem necessary and appropriate.

Qualified Candidates

SEC. 808. The candidates at an election in the District shall be the persons, registered under section 807 of this Act or under section 7 of the District Primary Act, who have been nominated as provided in section 809 of this Act: *Provided*, That no member of the Board of Elections may be such a candidate.

Nominations

SEC. 809. (a) Nomination of a candidate shall take place when the Board of Elections receives a petition in accordance with rules, not inconsistent with this Act, prescribed by the Board which is either—

(1) a declaration of candidacy accompanied by a filing fee equal to 5 per centum of the annual compensation for which nomination is sought; and said fee to be refunded—

(A) if the candidate withdraws his candidacy in writing received by the Board not more than three days after the last day on which nominations may be made; or

(B) if the candidate polls 10 per centum or more of the total vote cast for that office; or

(2) A nominating petition signed by the number of registered voters specified below, without payment of a filing fee: *Provided*—

(A) that any petition for a candidate for the office of District Delegate or Mayor be signed by six hundred qualified electors registered in the District, and

(B) that any petition for a candidate for the District Council be signed by three hundred qualified electors registered in the ward from which he is nominated for such office.

(b) No person may be a candidate for more than one office in any election. If a person is nominated for more than one office, he shall, within three days after the last day on which nominations may be made (as prescribed by the Board of Elections), notify the Board of Elections as to which such office he shall seek.

(c) The Board of Elections is authorized to accept any nominating petition as bona fide with respect to the qualifications of the signatories thereto: *Provided*, That the originals or facsimile copies thereof shall have been posted in a suitable public place for at least ten days: *And provided further*, That no challenge as to the qualifications of the signatories shall have been received in writing by the Board of Elections within ten days of first posting of such petition.

(d) The Board of Elections may, at its discretion, declare elected, without an actual count of the votes cast, any unopposed candidate.

Nonpartisan Elections

SEC. 810. (a) Ballots and voting machines shall show no party affiliations, emblem, or slogan.

(b) Section 16 of the Act entitled "An Act to prevent pernicious political activities", approved August 2, 1939 (53 Stat. 1147), is amended by inserting immediately after "exists in" the following: "the District of Columbia or".

Method of Voting

SEC. 811. (a) Voting in all elections shall be secret. Voting may be by paper ballot or voting machine.

(b) The ballot shall show the wards from which each candidate (other than for District Delegate and Mayor) has been nominated. Each voter shall be entitled to vote for three candidates for the District Council from the ward in which such voter resides; for one candidate for Mayor and for one candidate for District Delegate. No person shall be a candidate from more than one ward.

(c) The ballot of a person who is registered as a resident of the District shall be valid only if cast in the voting precinct where the residence shown on his registration is located.

(d) Absentee balloting shall be permitted under regulations adopted by the Board of Elections.

(e) At least ten days prior to the date of any referendum or other election, any group of citizens or individual candidates interested in the outcome of the election may petition the Board of Elections for credentials authorizing watchers at any and all polling places during the voting hours and until the count has been completed. The Board of Elections shall formulate rules and regulations, not inconsistent with provisions of this title, to prescribe the form of watchers' credentials, to govern their conduct, and to limit the number of watchers so that the conduct of the election will not be unreasonably obstructed.

(f) If the official in charge of the polling place, after hearing both parties to any challenge or acting on his own with respect to a prospective voter, reasonably believes the prospective voter is unqualified to vote, he shall allow the voter to cast a paper ballot marked "challenged". Ballots so cast shall be segregated, and no such ballot shall be counted until the challenge has been removed as provided in subsection (g).

(g) If a person has been permitted to vote only by challenged ballot, such person, or any qualified candidate, may appeal to the Board of Elections within three days after election day. The Board shall decide within seven days after the appeal is perfected whether the voter was qualified to vote. If the Board decides that the voter was qualified to vote, the word "challenged" shall be stricken from the voter's ballot and the ballot shall be treated as if it had not been challenged.

(h) If a voter is physically unable to mark his ballot or to operate the voting machine, the official in charge of the voting place may enter the voting booth with him and vote as directed. Upon the request of any such voter, a second election official may enter the voting booth to assist in the voting. The officials shall tell no one what votes were cast. The official in charge of the voting place shall make a return of all such voters, giving their names and disabilities.

(i) In any election held pursuant to this Act, any voter entitled to vote for any office shall not vote more than once for that office.

(j) Copies of the regulations of the Board of Elections with respect to voting shall be made available to prospective voters at each polling place.

(k) Before being allowed to vote the voter shall sign a certificate, on a form to be prescribed by the Board of Elections, that he has duly registered under the election laws of the District and that, to his best knowledge and belief, he has not since such registration done any act which might disqualify him as an elector.

Recounts and Contests

SEC. 812. (a) The provisions of section 11 of the District Primary Act with respect to recounts and contests shall be applicable to any election or referendum held under this Act, except that in the case of any initiative, referendum, or recall election any qualified voter who has voted in any such election may petition the Board of Elections for a recount of the votes cast in one or more precincts under the same conditions required of a candidate for office under section 11(a) of the District Primary Act.

(b) If the court voids all or part of an election under this section, and if it determines that the number and importance of the matters involved outweigh the cost and practical disadvantages of holding another election, it may order a special election for the purpose of voting on the matters with respect to which the election was declared void.

(c) Special elections shall be conducted in a manner comparable to that prescribed for regular elections and at times and in the manner prescribed by the Board of Elections by regulation. A person elected at such an election shall take office on the day following the date on which the Board of Elections certifies the results of the election.

(d) Vacancies resulting from voiding all or part of an election shall be filled as prescribed in section 804.

Interference With Registration or Voting

SEC. 813. (a) No one shall interfere with the registration of voting of another person, except as it may be reasonably necessary in the performance of a duty imposed by law. No person performing such a duty shall interfere with the registration or voting of another person because of his race, color, sex, or religious belief, or his want of property or income.

(b) No registered voter shall be required to perform a military duty on election day which would prevent him from voting, except in time of war or public danger or unless he is away from the District in military service. No registered voter may be arrested while voting or going to vote except for a breach of the peace then committed or for treason or felony.

Violations

SEC. 814. Whoever willfully violates any provision of this title, or of any regulation prescribed and published by the Board of Elections under authority of this title, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be fined not more than $500 or imprisoned for not more than six months, or both.

TITLE IX—MISCELLANEOUS

Agreements With United States

SEC. 901. (a) For the purpose of preventing duplication of effort or of otherwise promoting efficiency and economy, any Federal officer or agency may furnish services to the District government and any District officer or agency may furnish services to the Federal Government. Except where the terms and conditions governing the furnishing of such services are prescribed by other provisions of law, such services shall be furnished pursuant to a contract (1) negotiated by the Federal and District authorities concerned, and (2) approved by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget and by the Mayor, by and with the advice and consent of the District Council. Each such contract shall provide that the cost of furnishing such services shall be borne in the manner provided in subsection (c) by the Government to which such services are furnished at rates or charges based on the actual cost of furnishing such services.

(b) For the purpose of carrying out any contract negotiated and approved pursuant to subsection (a), any District officer or agency may in the contract delegate any of his or its functions to any Federal officer or agency, and any Federal officer or agency may in the contract delegate any of his or its functions to any District officer or agency. Any function so delegated may be exercised in accordance with the terms of the delegation.

(c) The costs to each Federal officer and agency in furnishing services to the District pursuant to any such contract shall be paid, in accordance with the terms of the contract, out of appropriations made by the District Council to the District officers and agencies to which such services are furnished. The costs to each District officer and agency in furnishing services to the Federal Government pursuant to any such contract shall be paid, in accordance with the terms of the contract, out of appropriations made by the Congress to the Federal officers and agencies to which such services are furnished.

Personal Interest in Contracts or Transactions

SEC. 902. No member of the District Council and no other officer or employee of the District with power of discretion in the making of any contract to which the District is a party or in the sale to the District or to a contractor supplying the District of any land or rights or interests in any land, material, supplies, or services shall have a financial interest, direct or indirect, in such contract or sale. Any willful violation of this section shall constitute malfeasance in office, and any officer or employee of the District found guilty thereof shall thereby forfeit his office or position. Any violation of this section with the knowledge express or implied of the person contracting with the District shall render the contract voidable by the Mayor or the District Council.

Compensation From More Than One Source

SEC. 903. (a) Except as provided in this Act, no person shall be ineligible to serve or to receive compensation as a member of the District Council, or the Board of Elections because he occupies another office or position or because he receives compensation (including retirement compensation) from another source.

(b) The right to another office or position or to compensation from another source otherwise secured to such a person under the laws of the United States shall not be abridged by the fact of his service or receipt of compensation as a member of the District Council or such Board, if such service does not interfere with the discharge of his duties in such other office or position.

(c) For the purpose of sections 281, 283, 284, 434, and 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code and section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U.S.C. 99), no person shall, by reason of membership on the District Council, or the Board of Elections or by reason of his serving in any position in or under the government of the District of Columbia, be considered to be an officer or employee of the United States.

Assistance of United States Civil Service Commission in Development of District Merit System

SEC. 904. The United States Civil Service Commission is hereby authorized to advise and assist the Mayor and the District Council in the further development of the merit system required by section 402(3) and the said Commission is authorized to enter into agreements with the District of Columbia government to make available its registers of eligibles as a recruiting source to fill District positions as needed. The costs of any specific services furnished by the Civil Service Commission may be compensated for under the provisions of section 901 of this Act.

TITLE X—SUCCESSION IN GOVERNMENT

Transfer of Personnel, Property, and Funds

SEC. 1001. (a) In each case of the transfer, by any provision of this Act, of functions to the Council or to any agency or officer, there are hereby transferred (as of the time of such transfer of functions) to the Council or to such agency or to the agency of which such officer is the head, for use in the administration of the functions of the Council or such agency or officer, the personnel (except the members of boards or commissions abolished by this Act), property, records, and unexpended balances of appropriations and other funds, which relate primarily to the functions so transferred.

(b) If any question arises in connection with the carrying out of subsection (a), such question shall be decided—

(1) in the case of functions transferred from a Federal officer or agency, by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget; and

(2) in the case of other functions (A) by the District Council, or in such manner as the District Council shall provide, if such functions are transferred to the District Council, and (B) by the Mayor if such functions are transferred to any other officer or agency.

(c) Any of the personnel transferred to the Council or any agency by this section which the Council or the head of such agency shall find to be in excess of the personnel necessary for the administration of its or his functions shall, in accordance with law, be retransferred to other positions in the District or Federal Government or be separated from the service.

(d) No officer or employee shall, by reason of his transfer by this Act, be deprived of a civil-service status held by him prior to such transfer.

Existing Statutes, Regulations, and So Forth

SEC. 1002. (a) Any statute, regulation, or other action in respect of (and any regulation or other action issued, made, taken, or granted by) any officer or agency from which any function is transferred by this Act, shall, except to the extent modified or made inapplicable by or under authority of law, continue in effect as if such transfer had not been made; but after such transfer references in such statute, regulation, or other action to an officer or agency from which a transfer is made by this Act shall be held and considered to refer to the officer or agency to which transfer is made.

(b) As used in subsection (a), the term "other action" includes any rule, order, contract, policy, determination, directive, grant, authorization, permit, requirement, or designation.

(c) Unless otherwise specifically provided, nothing contained in this Act shall be construed as affecting the applicability to the District of Columbia government of personnel legislation relating to the District government until such time as the District Council may otherwise elect to provide similar and comparable coverage as provided in section 402(4).

Pending Actions and Proceedings

SEC. 1003. (a) No suit, action, or other judicial proceeding lawfully commenced by or against any officer or agency in his or its official capacity or in relation to the exercise of his or its official functions, shall abate by reason of the taking effect of any provision of this Act, but the court, unless it determines that the survival of such suit, action, or other proceeding is not necessary for purposes of settlement of the questions involved, shall allow the same to be maintained, with such substitutions as to parties as are appropriate.

(b) No administrative action or proceeding lawfully commenced shall abate solely by reason of the taking effect of any provision of this Act, but such action or proceeding shall be continued with such substitutions as to parties and officers or agencies as are appropriate.

Vacancies Resulting From Abolition of Board of Commissioners

SEC. 1004. Until July 1, 1967, no vacancy occurring in any District agency by reason of section 321, abolishing the Board of Commissioners, shall affect the power of the remaining members of such agency to exercise its functions, but such agency may take action only if a majority of the members holding office vote in favor of it.

TITLE XI—SEPARABILITY OF PROVISIONS

Separability of Provisions

SEC. 1101. If any provision of this Act or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of the Act and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

TITLE XII—TEMPORARY PROVISIONS

Powers of the President During Transition Period

SEC. 1201. The President of the United States is hereby authorized and requested to take such action during the period following the date of the enactment of this Act and ending on the date of the first meeting of the District Council, by Executive order or otherwise, with respect to the administration of the functions of the District of Columbia government, as he deems necessary to enable the Board of Elections properly to perform their functions under this Act.

Reimbursable Appropriations for the District

SEC. 1202. (a) The sum of $500,000 is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the District of Columbia, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for use (1) in paying the expenses of the Board of Elections (including compensation of the members thereof), and (2) in otherwise carrying into effect the provisions of this Act.

(b) The full amount of expenditures out of the appropriations made under this authorization shall be reimbursed to the United States, without interest, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, from the general fund of the District of Columbia.

TITLE XIII—EFFECTIVE DATES

Effective Dates

SEC. 1301. (a) As used in this title and title XIV the term "charter" means titles I to XI, both inclusive, and titles XV, XVI, and XVII.

(b) The charter shall take effect only if accepted pursuant to title XIV. If the charter is so accepted, it shall take effect on the day following the date on which it is accepted (as determined pursuant to section 1406) except that—

(1) part 2 of title III, title V, and title VII shall take effect on the day upon which the council members first elected take office, and

(2) section 402 shall take effect on the day upon which the Mayor first elected takes office.

(c) Titles XII, XIII, and XIV shall take effect on the day following the date on which this Act is enacted.

TITLE XIV—SUBMISSION OF CHARTER FOR REFERENDUM

Charter Referendum

SEC. 1401. (a) On a date to be fixed by the Board of Elections, not more than nine months after the enactment of this Act, a referendum (in this title referred to as the "charter referendum") shall be conducted to determine whether the registered qualified electors of the District of Columbia accept the charter.

(b) As used in this title, a "qualified elector" means a person who meets the requirements of section 806 on the day of the charter referendum.

Board of Elections

SEC. 1402. (a) In addition to its other duties, the Board of Elections established under the District Primary Act shall conduct the charter referendum and certify the results thereof as provided in this title.

(b) Notwithstanding the fact that such section does not otherwise take effect unless the charter is accepted under this title, the applicable provisions of section 801 of this Act shall govern the Board of Elections in the performance of its duties.

Registration

SEC. 1403. (a) The Board of Elections shall conduct within the District of Columbia a registration of the qualified electors commencing as soon as practicable after the enactment of this Act and ending not more than thirty days nor less than fifteen days prior to the date set for the charter referendum as provided in section 1401 of this title.

(b) Prior to the commencement of such registration, the Board of Elections shall publish, in daily newspapers of general circulation published in the District of Columbia, a list of the registration places and the dates and hours of registration.

(c) The applicable provisions of section 807, notwithstanding the fact that such section does not otherwise take effect unless the charter is accepted, shall govern the registration of voters for this charter referendum.

Charter Referendum Ballot; Notice of Voting

Sec. 1404. (a) The charter referendum ballot shall contain the following, with the blank space appropriately filled:

"The District of Columbia Charter Act, enacted __________, proposes to establish a new charter for the District of Columbia, but provides that the charter shall take effect only if it is accepted by the registered qualified electors of the District in this referendum.

"By marking a cross (X) in one of the squares provided below, show whether you are for or against the charter.

☐ For the charter

☐ Against the charter"

(b) Voting may be by paper ballot or by voting machine. The Board of Elections may make such changes in the second paragraph of the charter referendum ballot as it determines to be necessary to permit the use of voting machines if such machines are used.

(c) Not less than three days before the date of charter referendum, the Board of Elections shall mail to each person registered (1) a sample of the charter referendum ballot, and (2) information showing the polling place of such person and the date and hours of voting.

(d) Not less than one day before the charter referendum, the Board of Elections shall publish, in newspapers of general circulation published in the District of Columbia, a list of the polling places and the date and hours of voting.

Method of Voting

Sec. 1405. Notwithstanding the fact such sections do not otherwise take effect unless the charter is accepted under this title, the applicable provisions of sections 811, 812, 813, and 814 of this Act shall govern the method of voting, recounts and contests, interference with registration or voting, and violations connected with this charter referendum.

Acceptance or Nonacceptance of Charter

Sec. 1406. (a) If a majority of the registered qualified electors voting in the charter referendum vote for the charter, the charter shall be considered accepted as of the time the Board of Elections certifies the result of the charter referendum to the President of the United States, as provided in subsection (b).

(b) The Board of Elections shall, within a reasonable time, but in no event more than thirty days after the date of the charter referendum, certify the result of the charter referendum to the President of the United States and to the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives.

TITLE XV—DELEGATE

District Delegate

Sec. 1501. (a) Until a constitutional amendment or subsequent congressional action otherwise provide, the people of the District shall be represented in the House of Representatives of the United States by a Delegate, to be known as the "Delegate from the District of Columbia", who shall be elected as provided in this Act. The Delegate shall have a seat in the House of Representatives, with the right of debate, but not of voting. The Delegate shall be a member of the House Committee on the District of Columbia and shall possess in such committee the same powers and privileges as in the House of Representatives, and may make any motion except to reconsider. His term of office shall be for two years.

(b) No person shall hold the office of District Delegate unless he (1) is a qualified elector, (2) is at least twenty-five years old, (3) holds no other public office, and (4) is domiciled and resides in the District and during the three years next preceding his nomination (a) has been resident in and domiciled in the District and (b) has not voted in any election (other than in the District) for any candidate for public office. He shall forfeit his office upon failure to maintain the qualifications required by this subsection.

(c)(1) Subsection (a) of section 601 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out "from the Territories".

(2) Clause (b) of section 1 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended (70 Stat. 743), is hereby amended by striking out "from a Territory".

(3) The second paragraph under the heading "House of Representatives" in the Act of July 16, 1914 (U.S.C., title 2, sec. 37), is hereby amended by striking out "from Territories".

(4) Paragraph (1) of section 302 of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, 1925, as amended (U.S.C., title 2, sec. 241), is hereby amended by inserting after "United States" the following: "and the District of Columbia".

(5) Section 591 of title 18, United States Code, is hereby amended by inserting "and the District of Columbia" before the period at the end thereof. Section 594 of such title is hereby amended by inserting after "Territories and possessions" the following: "or the District of Columbia". The first paragraph of section 595 of such title is hereby amended by inserting after "from any Territory or possession" the following: "or the District of Columbia".

TITLE XVI—REFERENDUM

Power of Referendum

Sec. 1601. (a) The qualified electors (as defined in section 806) shall have power, pursuant to the procedure provided by this title, to approve or reject in a referendum any act of the District Council, or part or parts thereof, which has become law, whether or not such act is yet operative. This power shall not extend, however, to acts authorizing the issuance of bonds, which shall be subject to the referendum provisions contained in section 602, or to acts continuing existing taxes or making appropriations which in the aggregate are not in excess of those for the preceding fiscal year. Within forty-five days after an act subject to this title has been enacted, a petition signed by qualified electors equal in number to at least 10 per centum of the number who voted at the last preceding general election may be filed with the Secretary of the District Council requesting that any such act or any part or parts thereof, be submitted to a vote of the qualified electors.

(b) The Board of Elections shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary or appropriate with respect to the form, filing, examination, amendment, and certification of petitions for referenda and with respect to the conduct of any referendum held under this title.

Effect of Certification of Referendum Petition

Sec. 1602. (a) When a referendum petition has been certified as sufficient, the act, or the one or more items, sections or parts thereof, specified in the petition shall not become operative, or further action shall be suspended if it shall have become operative, until and unless approved by the electors, as provided in this title. The filing of a referendum petition against one or more parts of an act shall not alter the operative effect of the remainder of such act.

(b) If, within thirty days after the filing of a referendum petition, the Secretary has not specified the particulars in which a petition is defective, the petition shall be deemed sufficient for the purposes of this title.

Submission to Electors

Sec. 1603. An act with respect to which a petition for a referendum has been filed and certified as sufficient shall be submitted to the qualified electors at a referendum to be held in connection with the first general election which occurs not less than thirty days nor more than one year from the date on which the Secretary files his certificate of the sufficiency of the petition. The District Council shall, if no general election is to be held within such period, provide for a special election for the purpose of conducting the referendum.

Availability of List of Qualified Electors

Sec. 1604. If any organization or group requests it for the purpose of circulating descriptive matter relating to the act to be voted on at a referendum, the Board of Elections shall either permit such organization or group to copy the names and addresses of the qualified electors or furnish it with a list thereof, at a charge to be determined by the Board of Elections, not exceeding the actual cost of reproducing such list.

Results of Referendum

Sec. 1605. An act which is submitted to a referendum which is not approved by a majority of the qualified electors voting thereon shall thereupon be deemed repealed. If a majority of the qualified electors voting thereon approved the act, it shall become operative on the day following the day on which the Board of Elections certifies the results of the referendum. If conflicting acts are approved by the electors at the same referendum, the one receiving the greatest number of affirmative votes shall prevail to the extent of such conflict. As used in this section, the word "act" shall mean the complete act, or any part or parts thereof, specified in the petition for referendum.

TITLE XVII—INITIATIVE

Sec. 1701. (a) Subject to the provisions of section 324 of this Act, the qualified electors of the District shall have the power, independent of the Mayor and Council, to propose and enact legislation relating to the District with respect to all rightful subjects of legislation not inconsistent with the Constitution or with the laws of the United States which are applicable but not confined to the District.

(b) In exercising the power of initiative conferred upon the qualified electors by subsection (a) of this section, not more than 10 per centum of the number of qualified electors voting in the last preceding general election shall be required to propose any measure by an initiative petition. Every such petition shall include the full text of the measure so proposed and shall be filed with the Secretary of the District Council to be submitted to a vote of the qualified electors. Any such petition which has been filed with the Secretary, and certified by him as sufficient, shall be submitted to the qualified electors of the District at the first general election which occurs not less than thirty days nor more than one year from the date on which the Secretary files his certificate of sufficiency. The Council shall, if no general election is to be held within such period, provide for a special election for the purpose of considering the petition. Any measure so proposed by the petition shall, if approved by a majority of the qualified electors voting thereon in such election, take effect and become law on the day following the day on which the Board of Elections certifies the results of such election or on the date provided for by such measure. If conflicting measures proposed are approved by the electors at the same election, the measure receiving the greatest number of affirmative votes shall prevail to the extent of such conflict.

(c) If, within thirty days after the filing of a petition, the Secretary has not specified the particulars in which a petition is defective, the petition shall be deemed certified as sufficient for purposes of this section.

(d) The style of all measures proposed by initiative petition shall be as follows: "Be it enacted by the People of the District of Columbia".

(e) The Board of Elections shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary or appropriate (1) with respect to the form, filing, examination, amendment, and certification of initiative petitions, and (2) with respect to the conduct of any election during which any such petition is considered.

(f) If any organization or group request it for the purpose of circulating descriptive matter relating to the measures proposed to be voted on, the Board of Elections shall either permit such organization or group to copy the names and addresses of the qualified electors or furnish it with a list thereof, at a charge to be determined by the Board of Elections, not exceeding the actual cost of reproducing such list.

TITLE XVIII—TITLE OF ACT

SEC. 1801. This Act, divided into titles and sections according to table of contents, and including the declaration of congressional policy which is a part of such Act, may be cited as the "District of Columbia Charter Act".

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, this bill is an old legislative friend in the Senate. This is the latest revision of the so-called Neely-Morse home rule bill.

When the late great and beloved Senator from West Virginia, Matt Neely, was in this body, and I had the opportunity of sitting at his feet and to become a student of District of Columbia problems, I had the privilege of being joined with him on several occasions as the author of the Neely-Morse home rule bill.

After the Senator from West Virginia had died, at the next session of Congress I introduced the Neely-Morse bill. It has borne my name ever since. On the floor of the Senate again, as I have in the past, I wish to extend my thanks and express my sense of deep gratitude to the late Senator Matt Neely for the leadership that he extended to the several hundred thousand residents in the District of Columbia, as he battled during his service in the Senate for first-class citizenship for these several hundred thousand American citizens in the District of Columbia, which we in Congress unfortunately have kept as second-class citizens for these many years.

It is a shameful thing, Mr. President, and it is a shame that ought to be erased from the ledger of the District of Columbia by Congress this year.

We have passed the Neely-Morse home rule bill, or the Morse home rule bill, as it is known now, in the Senate several times, only to have it killed and embalming fluid injected into it by the House District of Columbia Committee.

We Americans participate in a great deal of hypocrisy. We do not like to face the fact that we are sometimes shocking hypocrites, and that as a people we are hypocrites when it comes to the matter of providing freedom to all of our people. We do not like it.

Here in the District of Columbia we deny the right of self-government in municipal affairs to several hundred thousand fellow Americans. If anyone thinks that that fact is not known around the world, let him come with me to international conferences.

I tell the Senate again today, as I have in the past, that the denial of freedom and rights of freedom bearing upon first-class citizenship in the District of Columbia, the Capital of this Republic, is better known in the capitals of backward countries of the world than in the State capitals of the 50 States of the United States.

As we discuss matters with people in international conferences anywhere in the world, we do not carry on our discussion very long before they raise the question, "Why does not your Congress give to the citizens of the Capital of your Nation the right to govern themselves?"

We can no longer hide behind the facade that under the Constitution Congress has certain prerogatives in the District of Columbia and is the ultimate source of government of the District of Columbia.

That is true of every State legislature in the 50 States in respect to the capital city of each State.

The final and ultimate residue of power rests in the State legislature. The Morse bill on home rule makes no attempt to deny the ultimate power of Congress. It does seek to give to the people of the District of Columbia the right to govern themselves.

Could it still be true, even after the passage of the civil rights bill, that the fact that the population of the District of Columbia is somewhere between 54 and 56 percent Negro is the main reason for the denial of freedom to the people of the District of Columbia?

Let Congress soon answer that question for itself, for if it continues to deny home rule to the people of the District of Columbia, it will continue to be charged around the world as a Congress that denies freedom to the people of the District of Columbia because a majority of its residents are colored.

Therefore, Mr. President, the senior Senator from Oregon will again press for action in this session of Congress for the adoption of the home rule bill.

I am not wedded to my bill. I shall give consideration to any fair and reasonable amendment to it. I shall support any reasonable proposal including the administration's bill, if and when it will send one to Congress, that seeks to give to the people of the District of Columbia the right to elect—and these are minimum rights—a mayor, the right to elect a city council, the right to elect a school board, the right to govern themselves under a municipal law system, as the citizens of any State, in this instance, have a similar right. That is the issue. All the alibiing and rationalizing and excusing for not doing it cannot be justified.

I discuss this subject more outside of Washington than I do in Washington—which perhaps may come as a surprise to Senators who listen to me speak so often on this subject. If Senators believe that I talk a great deal about it in the Senate, I talk a great deal more about it across the length and breadth of America.

Today I repeat that only when the people at the precinct level in the States of America make clear to their politicians under this Capitol Dome in Washington, D.C., that they wish full, first-class citizenship delivered to the people of the District of Columbia, are we going to get passage of a home rule bill.

I say to State party organizations of both parties that here is a job to get busy on if they really wish to strengthen democratic processes.

They will remove the shameful blot on the existing record of this country by seeing to it that a home rule bill is passed this year which is a home rule bill in fact and not in name.

HEALTH BENEFITS

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I send to the desk for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959, with respect to the contribution made by the Government toward health benefit protection for employees and annuitants and members of their families.

Existing law provides that the Government pay a specific dollar amount of the cost of the premium, but in no case more than 50 percent. The result is that the Government contribution equals 50 percent of the low option of the least expensive of the governmentwide plans. However, 86 percent of Federal employees having health insurance have chosen high-option plans, costing approximately $23.75 a month. Of this amount, the Government contributes $6.76 a month.

This bill would increase the Government contribution to approximately $10.80 a month, but in no case more than one-half the cost. The Government would then be contributing approximately 40 percent of the cost of the high option.

The **PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 271) to amend the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959, with respect to the contribution made by the Government toward health benefit protection for employees and annuitants and members of their families, introduced by Mr. JOHNSTON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

LIFE INSURANCE

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I send to the desk for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, as amended.

This proposal would have the following effects:

First. It would increase maximum life insurance coverage from $20,000 to $27,500.

Second. It would allow certain reemployed annuitants to have life insurance coverage.

Third. It would clarify existing law as to the designation of beneficiaries.

Fourth. It would increase the Government contribution from one-third to one-half of the cost of the program.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 272) to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, as amended, introduced by Mr. Johnston, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

RETIREMENT

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I send to the desk for appropriate reference a bill to improve the financing of the civil service retirement system and to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide for retirement on full annuity at age 55 after 30 years of service.

This bill is urgently needed. The unfunded liability of the retirement fund is now in excess of $34 billion. This deficiency, which threatens the stability of the entire retirement system, stems from inadequate Government contributions over the years since the fund was established; retirement liberalizations; credit for past service; and salary increases boosting retirement benefits.

The unfunded liability is increasing by $1.1 billion per year. By 1972, unless legislative steps are taken, outgo will exceed income and the deficit will have to be made up out of principal. By 1990, the fund will be exhausted, requiring outright appropriations of $2 or $3 billion a year.

This bill would establish a permanent supplemental contribution on the part of the Government of one-half of 1 percent of the payroll of each agency, increasing one-half of 1 percent each year until a supplemental contribution of 3½ percent is reached over a period of 7 years. The total Government contribution would then be 10 percent. The regular 6½-percent employee contribution would continue.

Further, this bill provides that the Department of Defense will reimburse the retirement fund for the cost of crediting military service for civil service retirement purposes. Under existing law, the cost of crediting military service toward civilian retirement is a drain on the fund. This provision would add to the fund revenues approximately $62 million the first year, an amount increasing by $5 million a year, and leveling off at approximately $230 million a year after the turn of the century.

The provision permitting retirement on full annuity at age 55 after 30 years of service is a liberalization of the retirement system which will benefit both the Federal service and the individual employee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 273) to improve the financing of the civil service retirement system, and to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide for retirement on full annuity at age 55 after 30 years of service, introduced by Mr. Johnston, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION RELATING TO INTERESTS IN CERTAIN LANDS

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference two bills to authorize the Secretary of the Army to reconvey to former owners, lands, or interest in lands, not deemed necessary and acquired by the Federal Government for the Hartwell and Clarks Hill Dam projects.

This legislation will enable landowners in South Carolina and Georgia, whose acreage was condemned for the Federal projects, to buy their land back from the Government after the Secretary of the Army has announced that certain acreage is no longer necessary in order to accomplish the projects.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills will be received and appropriately referred.

The bills, introduced by Mr. Johnston, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Public Works, as follows:

S. 274. A bill to provide for adjustments in the lands or interests therein acquired for the Hartwell Dam project, South Carolina and Georgia, by the reconveyance of certain lands or interests therein to the former owners thereof; and

S. 275. A bill to provide for adjustments in the lands or interests therein acquired for the Clarks Hill Dam and Reservoir project, South Carolina, by the reconveyance of certain lands or interests therein to the former owners thereof.

RESIDENCE FOR CAPITOL PAGES

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference a bill to provide a residence for congressional and Supreme Court pages. Since I have been a Member of the Senate many instances have come to my attention which make it very necessary to have such a home for these young men.

I feel very keenly that it is our duty and moral obligation to establish a residence board which would properly supervise these pages.

I sincerely hope that Congress will see fit to take some action this year on this legislature.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 276) to provide a residence for congressional and Supreme Court pages, introduced by Mr. Johnston, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the people of this country are outraged by the apparently approved wanton destruction of American embassies and libraries at the hands of mobs and rioters in foreign nations so generously assisted by the United States.

These assaults have done violence to the American sense of decency and justice. The failure of the constituted authorities of those countries to take precautionary measures to protect American property transgresses international rules of conduct among nations.

I, therefore, offer for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to eliminate our aid to such countries for the 12 months following the occurrence in which property was damaged or destroyed by mob action if police or other local authorities of the host nation have failed to take reasonable measures of protection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 278) to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 so as to provide for reductions in aid to countries in which property of the United States is damaged or destroyed by mob action introduced by Mr. Symington, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

RECONSTRUCTION AND IMPROVEMENT OF THE ALASKA HIGHWAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the Acting President pro tempore, the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. Metcalf], and myself, I send to the desk a bill which would authorize the United States to cooperate with Canada in the reconstruction and improvement of the Alaska Highway. The legislation is identical with the bill we sponsored in the 88th Congress.

Both Senator Metcalf and I have felt for some time that the Federal Government should take the lead in encouraging our neighbors to the north to look favorably on the reconstruction of this important highway. The Alaska Highway provides a very valuable link between the Northwest and our sister State of Alaska. To date there is no adequate surface transportation between Alaska and the rest of the United States. I recognize that the major portion of the highway is on Canadian soil; but when the highway is completed, the United States will be a major beneficiary.

In the past, legislative proposals similar to the text of this bill have not been acted upon, largely because of a lack of interest in Canada and its Provinces. I am now pleased to report that the situation is changing. In fact, the Canadian Government has ordered studies to provide up-to-date cost estimates for the entire project, the sections which need blacktopping, reconstruction, or completely new construction. To date, there is no really accurate estimate of these costs.

Legislators and civic groups on both sides of the border are actively promoting the project. This is the time for the United States to express its support and interest. This can best be done by authorizing our Federal Government to participate in a 50-50 cooperative project.

This proposal is of sufficient interest to the Northwest, Alaska, and the entire country to be included on the agenda of the next meeting between President Lyndon Johnson and Prime Minister Lester Pearson.

This legislative proposal was before the appropriate departments and agencies during the 88th Congress, and I hope they will now be able to expedite early and favorable reports on this bill.

I send this bill to the desk, and request its reference to the appropriate committee.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am particularly interested in the first bill the distinguished Senator from Montana has mentioned—the one to ask the cooperation of Canada in connection with the reconstruction and improvement of the Alaskan highway. In order to show that this problem is one of general interest to the United States, not merely of interest to the States along our border with Canada and to Alaska, I should like very much to join as one of the cointroducers of that measure, if I may be permitted by the Senator from Montana to do so.

Mr. MANSFIELD. We would be most happy to have that done; and I ask unanimous consent that it be done.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 282) to authorize the appropriation of funds for the construction, reconstruction, and improvement of the Alaska highway, introduced by Mr. Mansfield (for himself and Mr. Metcalf), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I enthusiastically join the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. Mansfield], and the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. Metcalf] in their proposed legislation to pave the Alaskan highway.

The proposed legislation is highly desirable. It emphasizes that Alaska is a part of the Union and deserves the same assistance as the other 49 States.

I hope that I may be able to be a cosponsor and do everything that I can to assist in the bill's speedy enactment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF EMPLOYMENT ACT OF 1946 TO ESTABLISH POLICIES WITH RESPECT TO PRODUCTIVE CAPITAL INVESTMENTS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Employment Act of 1946 to establish policies with respect to productive capital investments of the Government.

This is the same capital budget bill that I have introduced for some years in the Senate. We are making progress. Last year there was a considerable amount of interest in and support for this bill. I am always somewhat at a loss to understand why there need be such a lag between legislation against which there is no successful answer and final passage of legislation. I have not heard, in the years I have introduced the bill, one single argument of merit in opposition to the setting up of a capital budget.

The only way we can tell the American people factually what the fiscal status of the Government is is to establish a capital budget. It happens to be the accounting system of any business of size in our Republic.

I sincerely hope this bill will be passed not only by the Senate but by the House as well.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the Record as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 285) to amend the Employment Act of 1946 to establish policies with respect to productive capital investments of the Government, introduced by Mr. Morse, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Government Operations, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 285

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Employment Act Amendments of 1961."

DECLARATION OF POLICY

Sec. 2. Section 2 of the Employment Act of 1946 is amended by inserting "(a)" after the section number and by adding thereto the following subsection:

"(b) To assistant in achieving these objectives it is the further policy of the Federal Government (1) to distinguish between its operating expenditures and capital investments, (2) to exclude certain productive capital investments from the public debt, and (3) to retire the public debt."

FUNCTIONS OF COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS

Sec. 3. Section 4(c) of such Act (relating to the duties and functions of the Council of Economic Advisers) is amended by changing the designation of paragraph (5) to (6) and inserting after paragraph (4) a new paragraph (5) to read as follows:

"(5) to evaluate each year the Federal budgetary situation as related to the prospective gross national product and other economic indicators and needs, and to recommend, for inclusion in the Economic Report, a minimum and maximum program of proposed capital investments, including, on a segregated basis, productive capital investments for the next fiscal year, and a six-year projection of such proposed investments;".

CAPITAL BUDGET

Sec. 4. (a) Such Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"Sec. 6. (a) In transmitting to Congress the estimates called for in section 201 of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, as amended, the President shall also—

"(1) to the extent and in such detail as he shall designate by Executive order (and so far as practicable consistent with the practices of the Internal Revenue Service) distinguish between operating expenditures and capital investments of the Government, and further set forth the productive capital investments, including mortgage loans, which have a useful economic life of more than ten years and which are revenue producing or self-liquidating in nature;

"(2) advise the Congress as to the progress made in identifying and computing capital investments and more particularly such productive capital investments; and in computing the public debt exclude therefrom an amount equal to such productive capital investments;

"(3) advise the Congress as to a minimum and maximum program of proposed capital investments, including, on a segregated basis, productive capital investments for the next fiscal year, and a six-year projection of such proposed investments; and

"(4) advise the Congress as to the amount of the public debt as computed in accordance with this section and of the effect of the proposed budgetary program upon the retirement of the public debt.

"(b) The amount of obligations issued to finance productive capital investments shall not be considered a part of the public debt for the purpose of limitations on the public debt contained in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended."

(b) The amendment made by this section shall be effective with respect to each budget transmitted to the Congress pursuant to section 201 of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, as amended, after the date of enactment of this Act.

APPLICATION OF GOVERNMENT CORPORATION CONTROL ACT

Sec. 5. The provisions of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, with respect to budgets, reporting, auditing, and accounting, shall apply to the functions exercised by any officer or agency of the Government proposing the investment of Federal bond proceeds in productive capital, to the same extent as applicable to wholly owned Government corporations.

FILING OF FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS OF CONGRESS AND CERTAIN OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I send to the desk another bill, which I have introduced in various forms, but without great modifications, from year to year since 1946. I received a vote on it last year. I had to use it as a rider to another bill, a legislative practice which I am not enthusiastic about, but at least I got a vote on it. I received 25 votes for it. I have been around here long enough to realize that when one starts getting 25 votes on the floor of the Senate, the opponents had better take note.

This is a bill to require Members of Congress, certain employees of the United States, and certain officials to file statements setting forth the value of their assets and their dealings in other securities and commodities.

This is the old bewhiskered Morse public disclosure bill. Since I first offered this proposal in 1946, I have been a successful evangelist, because I have made some converts in the Senate. So enthusiastic are they for the purposes of this bill that they are introducing their own bills in various forms. It delights me. I have no pride of authorship. When a bill embodies the principle I am for, I do not care whose name it carries. But in order to encourage them again to introduce their bills or join in the cosponsorship of this bill, I am introducing it today, and ask that it lie on the desk for 1 week, and that it be printed at this point in the Record.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, will lie on the desk as requested.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I want to say, on the merits of the bill, that one argument that is made by some of my political colleagues is that the bill interferes with their right of privacy. They do not have any right of privacy. Once they offer themselves for public office, so far as any rights of theirs are concerned, the public has the right to full knowledge of their financial transactions.

If they do not wish to disclose the sources and amounts of their income, for the voter to pass his or her value judgment on them, they do not have to run for office. No one is imposing the office on them. They seek it.

In a democracy, as I have been heard to say so many times in support of the bill, there is no substitute for full public disclosure of the public's business. It is the business of the public to know the sources and amounts of income of the representatives who sit in the Senate and in the House of Representatives and cast votes on legislation.

Some of my colleagues in the Senate know the great concern that I developed before I introduced this bill in the first place, when it became a matter of public knowledge that a member of a Senate committee was making use of certain confidential information he had in regard to securities, growing out of his position in the Senate.

I said then on the floor of the Senate that the public is entitled to know the financial dealings of Members of Congress, and, for that matter, of all the other public officials who are covered by the bill.

I ask that the bill be printed at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 286) to require Members of Congress, certain other officers and employees of the United States, and certain officials of political parties to file statements disclosing the amount and sources of their incomes, the value of their assets, and their dealings in securities and commodities, introduced by Mr. Morse, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 286

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That each Member of the Senate and House of Representatives (including each Delegate and Resident Commissioner); each officer and employee of the United States who (1) receives a salary at a rate of $10,000 or more per annum or (2) holds a position of grade GS–15 or above, and each officer in the Armed Forces of the rank of colonel, or its equivalent, and above; and each member, chairman, or other officer of the national committee of a political party shall file annually with the Comptroller General a report containing a full and complete statement of—

(1) the amount and resources of all income and gifts (of $100 or more in money or value, or in the case of multiple gifts from one person, aggregating $100 or more in money or value) received by him or any person on his behalf during the preceding calendar year;

(2) the value of each asset held by or entrusted to him or by or to him and any other person and the amount of each liability owed by him, or by him together with any other person as of the close of the preceding year; and

(3) the amount and source of all contributions during the preceding calendar year to any person who received anything of value on his behalf or subject to his direction or control or who, with his acquiescence, makes payments for any liability or expense incurred by him.

Sec. 2. Each person required by the first section to file reports shall, in addition, file semiannually with the Comptroller General a report containing a full and complete statement of all dealings in securities or commodities by him, or by any person acting on his behalf or pursuant to his direction, during the preceding six-month period.

Sec. 3. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b), the reports required by the first section of this Act shall be filed not later than March 31 of each year; and the reports required by section 2 shall be filed not later than July 31 of each year for the six-month period ending June 30 of such year, and not later than January 31 of each year for the six-month period ending December 31 of the preceding year.

(b) In the case of any person required to file reports under this Act whose service terminates prior to the date prescribed by subsection (a) as the date for filing any report, such report shall be filed on the last day of such person's service, or on such later date, not more than three months after the termination of such service, as the Comptroller General may prescribe.

Sec. 4. The reports required by this Act shall be in such form and detail as the Comptroller General may prescribe. The Comptroller General may provide for the grouping of items of income, sources of income, assets, liabilities, and dealings in securities or commodities, when separate itemization is not feasible or not necessary for an accurate disclosure of a person's income, net worth, or dealings in securities, and commodities.

Sec. 5. Any person who willfully fails to file a report required by this Act or who willfully and knowingly files a false report shall be fined $2,000 or imprisoned for not more than five years, or both.

Sec. 6. (a) As used in this Act—

(1) The term "income" means gross income as defined in section 22(a) of the Internal Revenue Code.

(2) The term "security" means security as defined in section 2 of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended (U.S.C., title 15, sec. 77b).

(3) The term "commodity" means commodity as defined in section 2 of the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended (U.S.C., title 7, sec. 2).

(4) The term "dealings in securities or commodities" means any acquisition, holding, withholding, use, transfer, disposition, or other transaction involving any security or commodity.

(5) The term "person" includes an individual, partnership, trust, estate, association, corporation, or society.

(b) For the purposes of any report required by this Act, a person shall be considered to be a Member of the Senate or House of Representatives, an officer or employee of the United States and of the armed services as described in the first section of this Act, or a member, chairman, or other officer of the national committee of a political party, if he served (with or without compensation) in any such position during the period to be covered by such report, notwithstanding that his service may have terminated prior to December 31 of such calendar year.

Sec. 7. The Comptroller General shall have authority to issue, reissue, and amend rules and regulations governing the publication of reports, or any part of them. He shall prescribe fees to cover the cost of reproduction. In formulating such rules and regulations, he shall seek to maximize the availability of reports for purposes of informing the public and agencies and officials of the Federal and local governments, and to minimize use of such records for private purposes.

FELLOWSHIPS FOR GRADUATE STUDY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough] and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph], I introduce, for appropriate reference, the fellowship bill. I ask unanimous consent that it may lie at the desk until the close of business January 12, 1965, to permit as many other Senators as may wish to do so to join with us in cosponsoring the bill. I also ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the Record at the close of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, it will remain at the desk as requested by the Senator from Oregon, and will be printed as requested.

The bill (S. 287) to provide fellowships for graduate study leading to a master's degree for elementary and secondary school teachers, introduced by Mr. Morse (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Fellowships for Teachers Act of 1965".

FELLOWSHIPS AUTHORIZED

Sec. 2. (a) The Commissioner of Education (hereinafter referred to as the "Commissioner") is authorized to award under the provisions of this Act not to exceed twenty five thousand fellowships for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, thirty thousand fellowships for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and thirty five thousand fellowships for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968. Fellowships, awarded under the provisions of this Act shall be for graduate study leading to a master's or equivalent degree in the field of education for the purpose of teaching in elementary or secondary schools. Such fellowships may also be awarded in fields ancillary to elementary and secondary education such as library science, school social work, guidance and counseling, educational media, special education for handicapped children, and other fields having the purpose of assisting or improving elementary or secondary education, or both. Such fellowships shall be awarded for such periods as the Commissioner may determine but not to exceed two academic years.

(b) In addition to the number of fellowships authorized to be awarded by subsection (a) of this section, the Commissioner is authorized to award fellowships equal to the number previously awarded during any fiscal year under this Act but vacated prior to the end of the period for which they were awarded; except that each fellowship awarded under this subsection shall be for such period of study, not in excess of the remainder of the period for which the fellowship which it replaces was awarded, as the Commissioner may determine.

FELLOWSHIPS FOR RECENT GRADUATES

SEC. 3. One-half the number of fellowships under the provisions of this Act for any fiscal year shall be awarded by the Commissioner to persons recommended to the Commissioner for such fellowships by institutions of higher education. An institution of higher education may for the purposes of this section recommend any individual who has received a bachelor's degree with high standing from such institution, except that such recommendation shall be made not later than six months after the awarding of such degree.

FELLOWSHIPS FOR EXPERIENCED TEACHERS

SEC. 4. The remaining half of the number of fellowships awarded under the provisions of this Act for any fiscal year shall be awarded by the Commissioner to persons with at least eight academic years of experience teaching in an elementary or secondary school, who are recommended to the Commissioner for such fellowships by local educational agencies. A local educational agency may for the purposes of this section recommend any such person who is teaching in such agency's elementary or secondary schools upon condition that such agency agree to rehire such individual upon his completing the course of study under such fellowship.

FELLOWSHIPS IN ANCILLARY FIELDS

SEC. 5. Not less than 20 per centum of the fellowships awarded under sections 3 and 4 shall be awarded to persons for graduate work in fields ancillary to elementary and secondary education, as defined in section 2.

DISTRIBUTION OF FELLOWSHIPS

SEC. 6. In awarding fellowships under the provisions of this Act the Commissioner shall endeavor to provide an equitable distribution of such fellowships throughout the Nation, except that to the extent he deems proper in the national interest, the Commissioner shall give preference in such awards to persons already serving, or who intend to serve, in elementary or secondary schools in low-income rural or metropolitan areas.

STIPENDS

SEC. 7. (a) Each person awarded a fellowship under the provisions of section 3 shall receive a stipend of $2,000 for the first academic year of study and $2,200 for the second such year. Each person awarded a fellowship under the provisions of section 3 shall receive a stipend of $4,800 for each academic year of study. In both cases an additional amount of $400 for each such academic year of study shall be paid to each such person on account of each of his dependents.

(b) In addition to the amount paid to persons pursuant to subsection (a) there shall be paid to the institution of higher education at which each such person is pursuing his course of study, $2,500 per academic year in the case of a person receiving a fellowship pursuant to section 3 and $5,000 per academic year in the case of a person receiving a fellowship pursuant to section 4. Amounts paid pursuant to this subsection shall be less any amount charged any such person for tuition.

(c) The Commissioner shall reimburse any person awarded a fellowship pursuant to this Act for actual and necessary traveling expenses of such person and his dependents from his ordinary place of residence to the institution of higher education where he will pursue his studies under such fellowship, and to return to such residence.

LIMITATION

SEC. 8. No fellowship shall be awarded under this Act for study at a school or department of divinity. For the purposes of this section, the term "school or department of divinity" means an institution or department or branch of an institution, whose program is specifically for the education of students to prepare them to become ministers of religion or to enter upon some other religious vocation or to prepare them to teach theological subjects.

FELLOWSHIP CONDITIONS

SEC. 9. A person awarded a fellowship under the provisions of this Act shall continue to receive the payments provided in section 7(a) only during such periods as the Commissioner finds that he is maintaining satisfactory proficiency in, and devoting essentially full time to, study or research in the field in which such fellowship was awarded, in an institution of higher education, and is not engaging in gainful employment other than part-time employment by such institution in teaching, research, or similar activities, approved by the Commissioner.

APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 10. There are authorized to be appropriated such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

FEDERAL CONTROL NOT AUTHORIZED

SEC. 11. No department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States shall, under authority of this Act, exercise any direction, supervision, or control over, or impose any requirements or conditions with respect to, the personnel, curriculum, methods of instruction, or administration of any educational institution.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 12. As used in this Act—

(1) The term "State" means a State, Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, the Canal Zone, Guam, American Samoa, or the Virgin Islands.

(2) The term "institution of higher education" means an educational institution in any State which (1) admits as regular students only persons having a certificate of graduation from a school providing secondary education, or the recognized equivalent of such a certificate, (2) is legally authorized within such State to provide a program of education beyond secondary education, (3) provides an educational program for which it awards a bachelor's degree, (4) is a public or other nonprofit institution, and (5) is accredited by a nationally recognized accrediting agency or association or, if not so accredited, is an institution whose credits are accepted, on transfer, by not less than three institutions which are so accredited, for credit on the same basis as if transferred from an institution so accredited.

(3) The term "local educational agency" means a board of education or other legally constituted local school authority having administrative control and direction of public elementary or secondary schools in a city, county, township, school district, or political subdivision in a State, or any other private nonprofit institution or agency having administrative control and direction of an elementary or secondary school.

EDUCATION LEGISLATION—UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the new year period is one in which we traditionally cast up our accounts to see where we stand. At the outset of a new Congress especially, it is important to learn how far along we are in meeting the goals we had previously set, so that we may chart anew the course we should follow. This I propose to do briefly for educational legislation of the 88th Congress as a preface to the introduction of bills on educational assistance on which I hope to schedule early hearings.

The omnibus education bill of the last Congress, S. 580, contained 24 separate programs covering the full spectrum of our educational system from the first grade through postdoctoral research. Twenty of the 24 proposals were substantially enacted. In the case of some of the proposals notably in the field of vocational education and in the broadening of the scope and content of the National Defense Education Act, the Congress exceeded the expectations of the administration. Roughly 80 percent of the Kennedy program became law.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at the conclusion of my remarks, an article prepared by the Office of Education entitled "Milestones in Education," which documents in detail the point I make.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, while this record is one in which we can take some measure of quiet satisfaction, candor compels me to say that there were areas, and among them the most important, in which we did not measure up to our responsibility to the American people, to those who are engaged in teaching our children, and especially to the young men and women who are engaged in learning at every level.

We did not provide the full measure of Federal aid to education to supplement State and local effort, needed for a prosperous and healthy America in the last third of this century.

There are three main areas where Federal financial supplementation can usefully be given to our public educational system. These are first, grants for physical facilities construction and equipment purchase; second, money to bear part of the cost of the operation and maintenance of our school systems; and third, financial incentives to bring into the teaching profession young men and women of high potential achievement, and to help those already engaged in teaching to improve, through training, their professional skills, techniques, and abilities.

As chairman of the Education Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I shall welcome the recommendations of the administration which will accompany the President's message on education, and I pledge to the Senate that early and careful consideration will be given to each program proposed, so that the Senate can vote upon each of them in the lifetime of this Congress. It is my hope that the legislation proposed by the administration will cover the unfinished business of the 88th Congress, in such areas as, first, student loan guarantees, which although reported from committee, did not pass the Congress; and second, the general university extension proposal which, although it had previously passed the Senate, remained unenacted at the close of the 88th Congress.

I am confident that proposals to improve the educational quality of our public school system by providing Federal grants to bring aid where it is needed most, in our rural and urban poverty areas, will be included.

I am, however, today reintroducing a measure upon which the Education Subcommittee held hearings last July, S. 2528, which is directed to this goal through the addition of more categories of children upon which to base impacted area payments, so that full information can be developed during the hearings this session as to the most practicable method which should be followed in achieving the desired objective.

I am also reintroducing S. 2725, of the 88th Congress, which concerns the provision of financial aid to school districts adversely affected by major disasters. The Christmas week toll of property damage in our Western States has convinced me that such legislation deserves careful and, I hope, favorable consideration.

The third measure I shall introduce today should be of major interest to all who are concerned with the problem of recruitment and training of our teachers in all of our schools. It is a fellowship bill for both, prospective teachers regardless of the field of their undergraduate training, and, for those who are already teaching but who are recommended by their school systems for further graduate work.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an outline of the bill, a memorandum of the consonance of the proposed bill with the November 1, 1964, White House Policy Paper on Education, and the policy paper itself, be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the outline, memorandum and paper were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Outline of Teachers Fellowship Bill

Testimony taken in connection with the omnibus education bill, S. 580 of the 88th Congress, and S. 2826, the improvement of education quality, of the 87th Congress, indicates that there may be merit in establishing a new federally supported program of teacher training at the graduate level.

Such legislation might either (a) be drafted as a new section to title IV of the National Defense Education Act or (b) be introduced as a clean bill conferring additional responsibility upon the Commissioner of Education. Since the National Defense Education Act has so recently been extensively amended, the latter procedure is recommended.

Briefly, under the proposed bill the Commissioner of Education would be empowered to establish for fiscal year 1966, 25,000, for fiscal year 1967, 30,000, and for fiscal year 1968, 35,000 1- and 2-year fellowships to be held at institutions of higher education offering the master's degree in the field of education or similar first professional degrees in closely related fields, such as library science, school social work, guidance and counseling, and the education of the handicapped child.

Fifty percent of the fellowships could be held by young men and women who have received a bachelor's degree with high standing regardless of the field of undergraduate preparation who are recommended by their undergraduate institution for such a master's program. These fellowships should be parallel to the National Defense Education Act, title IV fellowships; e.g., carrying a stipend of $2,000 per annum for the first year which would rise to $2,200 in the second year.

Such fellowships, as in the title IV National Defense Education Act program, would be accompanied by a $2,500 grant to the institution in which the graduate work is taken, to enable the institution to improve its graduate curriculum offerings to such graduate students. The award language, however, should contain the standard clause of the present National Defense Education Act, which states in effect, that any tuition or fees charged to the fellow would be offset by a corresponding reduction in the flat grant made to the institution.

Fifty percent of the fellowships authorized would be reserved for teachers with 8 or more years experience as teachers in elementary or secondary schools. These awards would be made by the Commissioner on the basis of recommendations received by him from local school authorities proposing candidates from their systems. Such fellowships should be funded in view of the maturity and financial commitments of the candidates at not less than $4,800 per annum plus $400 for each dependent and should be awarded only to those recommended teachers who are placed on leave of absence with return rights to the system from which they were selected.

These fellowships, since they may involve expansion of existing graduate programs which are designated primarily for students without field teaching experience, should be accompanied by a flat grant to the institution of $5,000 per fellow to encourage program improvement. It is anticipated that most of the experienced teachers since they are presumably certificated, would wish training in subject matter areas of concentrations such as are to be found in many master of arts in teaching degree programs, notably at Harvard and Duke among others.

Language should be included to pay for the travel expenses of the selected candidate and his dependents from the home community of the school system from which he was selected to the institution which has accepted him for training and for his return upon completion of training. Language should also be included permitting the Commissioner to reaward lapsed fellowships in both categories.

In awarding both types of fellowships the Commissioner should seek for an equitable geographic selection and distribution of the fellowships but should accord special consideration to those teachers or prospective teachers who are serving or who intend to serve in areas of rural poverty or in the low income areas of metropolitan school systems.

Twenty percent of the fellowships in each category should be reserved for individuals seeking the first professional degree in the ancillary educational fields, including but not restricted to, library services, school social work, guidance and counseling, and special education for the physically, mentally, and emotionally handicapped child.

Consonance of Fellowship Proposal With White House Policy Paper on Education

On November 1, 1964, the White House released a policy paper on education which is reproduced as attachment A. The proposed bill would seek to meet the five purposes outlined in that statement. The policy paper states: "First, we must broaden and improve the quality of our school base. We will need a minimum of nearly 400,000 new classrooms in our public schools during the next 5 years to eliminate overcrowding and replace those teachers who retire or resign—and we need to increase incentives so that our best people will be attracted to the teaching profession. But most of all we must provide a good education for every boy and girl—no matter where he lives."

The draft bill will provide a recruitment incentive to the above average undergraduate (regardless of his field of academic preparation) to enter the teaching field through the provision of a prestige financing of his professional training. Currently, less than one-fourth of our Nation's teachers hold the master's degree or higher degree. Enactment of this program would provide the financing of 45,000 new teachers within the 3-year period of the bill or 80,000 new teachers within 5 years if a further 2-year extension were to be granted, while simultaneously providing refresher professional training to an additional 45,000 to 80,000 experienced teachers. The impact of such a program upon the quality of education in the American school system should become apparent shortly after the inception of the program and its cumulative effect after a decade of use would be of massive proportions.

The second point in the policy statement indicates the importance of concentrating of teaching resources in urban slums and poor rural areas. The bill meets this criterion through the special consideration accorded in it to those who teach or intend to teach in just such areas.

The third goal outlined in the President's statement is the expansion and enrichment of our colleges. Through the cost of education allowances which accompany the fellowships, the financial resources available to the graduate education centers to improve their offerings would be enhanced in the first 3 years of the program by more than $300 million. Since there are some 800 to 900 institutions of higher education which offer graduate programs in education and thus presumably could qualify, sums in excess of $300,000 each for the improvement of graduate training programs are made available.

The fourth point recognized by the President is that education is a lifelong process. The draft bill is consonant with this objective in that it provides at a critical point in a teacher's career an opportunity for significant retraining which would be of continuing professional value for the balance of the individual's professional career.

The fifth yardstick in the presidential program is the strengthening of State and community education systems respecting our tradition that control of our schools remain at the local level. The program set forth in the draft bill measures up fully to this standard. The changes and improvements in both the graduate centers and the local school systems which would follow upon the operation of the program would be guaranteed by those most closely concerned. The Federal Government's role is in making such changes as the collegiate and local systems wish to have occur, financially possible. No direction as to course content would be given, but the dynamics of the marketplace in training should lead most condidates to try to enter the schools they perceive as best suited to provide the training they wish to take.

Essentially, the draft proposal recognizes the advances which have been made in pilot and demonstration programs carried on at institutions such as Harvard University and Duke University and generalizes upon the success of those programs. The proposal is complementary to the existing fellowship proposals but it does not overlap nor supplant them, since the objective of the instant fellowship program is the attainment for ever increasing numbers of teachers of a working not a research degree.

Commissioner Keppel, when a dean at Harvard, recognized the importance of strengthening the recruitment procedures of elementary and secondary education through improved standards of selection of candidates for teaching positions. If enacted, the proposed bill should provide material inducements to those individuals who desire to teach, but for whom the financial barrier of advanced training in the past has acted as a deterrent.

Comments have been made by nationally recognized educators such as Dr. Conant, attacking the present systems of teacher certification through claims that such procedures act as barriers to the undergraduate whose bachelor's degree is in the field of liberal arts. The selection procedures for the able undergraduate student envisaged by the draft bill should go far to bringing into the teaching mainstream a significant number of young men and women whose undergraduate preparation has been broad and whose professional preparation through this program will be thorough.

One aspect of the proposal deserves particular attention and that is the effect upon the graduate institution of a student body mixture such as is here proposed. The mature teacher in the graduate learning situation should be able to bring to his classmates and to the instructing faculty, insights based upon experience which could prove invaluable in modifying and reforming the graduate training curriculum.

As important, however, as this contribution is, it is overweighted by the greater contribution that the mature master's candidate who has taught will be able to make to his colleagues in the form of a personification of those value systems which are held by teachers who in the regular practice of their profession, are regarded by their supervisors and their colleagues as being of superior ability. Conversely, the mature teacher should find the intellectual challenge posed by the bachelor candidates highly stimulating.

It is anticipated that the response from local school systems in supplying the names of candidates for such fellowships would be on a large scale.

Since the safeguards contained in the legislation insist upon return rights to the originating systems for the selected teacher, it is to the interest of the recommending school system to furnish the names only of those teachers whom they would willingly and enthusiastically receive back upon completion of the training program.

The career teacher recognition aspect of the bill should have the effect in the local community of bringing to the attention of the public the value of the educational work being accomplished in the local school system and the regard of the Federal Government for improvement of education.

Attachment A

The White House Policy Paper on Education, November 1, 1964

I believe that every child has the right to as much education as he has the ability to receive. I believe that this right does not end in the lower schools, but goes on through technical and higher education—if the child wants it and can use it.

I want this not only for his sake, but also for our Nation's sake. America badly needs educated men and women. And America needs not just more education, but better education.

Nothing matters more to the future of our country. Not our military preparedness—for armed power is worthless if we lack the brain power to build a world of peace. Not our productive economy—for we cannot sustain growth without trained manpower. Not our democratic system of government—for freedom is fragile if citizens are ignorant.

Thomas Jefferson once said, "If we expect a nation to be ignorant and free, we expect what never was and never will be." Our Nation's school systems were founded on that proposition.

Today, 41 million students are enrolled in our public schools. Four million more will enter by the end of this decade. But that is not enough. One student out of every three now in the fifth grade will drop out before finishing high school—if we let him. Almost a million young people will quit school each year—if we let them. And over 100,000 of our smartest high school graduates each year will not go to college—if we do nothing.

This cannot continue. It costs too much: we cannot afford it. The whole Nation suffers when your youth is neglected.

Twenty percent of our 18- to 24-year-olds with an eighth grade education are unemployed—four times the national average—while jobs in America are hunting for trained men and women. Jobs filled by high school graduates rose by 40 percent in the last 10 years. Jobs for those with less schooling decreased by nearly 10 percent.

In the next 10 years, 30 million boys and girls are going to enter our job force. Unless we act now, 2½ million of them will not see the inside of a high school; 8 million will not finish high school; and too many of our schools and colleges will be jammed like city buses at rush hour. Our youth will suffer a handicap that no amount of time—no amount of money—can remove.

We must act. I pledge now to put education at the head of our work agenda. First, we must broaden and improve the quality of our school base. We will need a minimum of nearly 400,000 new classrooms in our public schools during the next 5 years to eliminate overcrowding and replace unsatisfactory facilities. We will need over 800,000 new public school teachers in the next 5 years to keep up with expanding enrollments and to replace those teachers who retire or resign—and we need to increase incentives so that our best people will be attracted to the teaching profession. But most of all we must provide a good education for every boy and girl—no matter where he lives.

Second, we must concentrate our teaching resources in the urban slums and the poor rural areas. Our war on poverty can be won only if those who are poverty's prisoners can break the chains of ignorance. This means that we must give our best a chance to do their best.

Third, we must expand and enrich our colleges. Our college enrollment is due to double within this decade. It will reach almost 9 million by 1975, and will probably expand to four or six times its present size before this century ends.

Fourth, we must recognize that education is a lifelong process. In today's world, we cannot neglect the adult's need for schooling to keep up with technology.

Fifth, we must strengthen our State and community education systems. We do not intend to forsake our tradition that schools and colleges should be controlled at the local level.

This is neither new nor radical. The late Senator Taft declared, "Education is primarily a State function—but in the field of education, as in the fields of health, relief, and medical care, the Federal Government has a secondary obligation to see that there is a basic floor under those essential services for all adults and children in the United States."

Every President from Franklin Delano Roosevelt to John Fitzgerald Kennedy worked to build that floor. I plan to get on with the task.—Lyndon B. Johnson.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I send to the desk for myself and Senator Randolph, for appropriate reference, the first bill to which I have referred relating to the additional categories of children to be counted in the computation of impacted area payments, and I ask that it be held until the close of business January 8, to permit such additional Senators as may wish to cosponsor it.

I ask further that it be printed at the close of my remarks on the education bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, it will remain at the desk as requested by the Senator from Oregon, and will be printed as requested.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in view of the interest that other western Senators may have in the proposal to assist disaster-stricken school districts, I send the bill to the desk on behalf of myself and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph] and ask unanimous consent that it may lie at the desk until the close of business January 12, so that as many other Senators as may wish to cosponsor the measure may have an opportunity to do so. I ask unanimous consent that the bill also be printed in the Record at the close of my speech.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, it will remain at the desk as requested by the Senator from Oregon, and will be printed as requested.

(See exhibit 3.)

Exhibit 1

Milestones in Education: What the 88th Congress Did for American Schools and Colleges

(Prepared by the Office of Information of the Office of Education)

FOREWORD

Federal legislation enacted in 1963 and 1964 to strengthen education will benefit Americans and contribute to the progress of the Nation for generations.

Colleges and universities can now expand to help meet the critical educational needs of increasing numbers of students seeking higher education. New and needed facilities can be built—especially junior colleges and technical schools. Thousands of bright young people who otherwise might have had to forgo a college education can now obtain the financial assistance they need to continue their studies. Specific aids are provided to increase the Nation's supply of doctors, dentists, and nurses. New quality and versatility in keeping with modern needs is being introduced into vocational education. Libraries and library services will be improved in both urban and rural areas. There will be more and better-trained teachers.

This is greater progress in education than in any comparable period in our history. But the needs are also greater today than ever before. There must be no slackening in the Nation's total educational effort until every American has the opportunity to acquire all the education he wants and needs for the demands of an increasingly complex world. A full commitment to that goal is a full commitment to the future progress and strength of America.

Athony J. Celebrezze,
Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

HEALTH PROFESSIONS EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1963 (PUBLIC LAW 88–129)

In the hearings which preceded passage of the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act of 1963, it was pointed out that while we have the scientific knowledge to save about half of the 450,000 Americans who develop cancer every year, we actually are saving only one-third. Lack of public understanding and cooperation is a contributing factor. But the prime factor is lack of enough physicians to conduct the regular examinations on which early diagnosis of cancer depends.

In virtually all the health fields, population growth is outracing our output of professionally trained practitioners. In 1950 there was 1 physician per 1,300 people; in 1960, 1 per 1,700; the outlook for 1975 is 1 per 2,000. In pharmacy and optometry the number of graduates in the past 10 years has actually declined.

A two-pronged attack

The legislation Congress enacted to try to right this situation makes a two-pronged attack on the problem—funds to expand teaching facilities and loans to help deserving youngsters meet the high cost of education for the health professions.

The Health Professions Educational Assistance Act of 1963 authorizes a 3-year program of grants to help construct new teaching facilities and improve existing facilities for the training of additional physicians, dentists, pharmacists, nurses, optometrists, podiatrists, and professional public health workers. The size of the Federal share of construction costs varies according to the gains in trained personnel which the facility will make possible: in the case of schools of public health (there are only 12 in the Nation), the Federal share can range up to 75 percent.

Both public and nonprofit private institutions are eligible for construction grants, but they must (except in the case of new institutions) be fully accredited by recognized accrediting bodies. The act places responsibility for determining eligibility in the hands of the Commissioner of Education and the responsibility for administering the grants in the hands of the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service. A National Advisory Council on Education for the Health Professions has been created to assist the Surgeon General. The Commissioner of Education is a member ex officio.

Student loans in four fields

The act's loan provisions are designed to assist students who have the capacity and ambition to be physicians, dentists, osteopaths, and optometrists[1] but who would not otherwise be able to afford training. The act authorizes the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to work out arrangements for the establishment of loan funds with schools in those four fields of acute shortage. The schools, which may be either public or private nonprofit institutions, administer the loans themselves according to criteria set up in the act. Loans can be made only to full-time students who are pursuing courses leading to degrees in medicine, dentistry, osteopathy, and optometry, and who are not receiving National Defense Education Act funds. Loans are limited to $2,000 per student per academic year and are repayable over a 10-year period beginning 3 years after the student finishes his full-time study.

The act authorized the following funds:

	Fiscal 1964	1965	1966
New teaching facilities: medicine, pharmacy, optometry, podiatry, nursing, public health	$15,000,000	$45,000,000	$55,000,000
New teaching facilities: dentistry	5,000,000	15,000,000	15,000,000
Replacement, rehabilitation, existing facilities	5,000,000	15,000,000	15,000,000
Student loans	5,100,000	10,200,000	15,400,000

Congress subsequently appropriated $110,782,000 for these purposes for fiscal 1965, including a $25,582,000 supplemental appropriation to cover authorizations not funded in 1964.

MENTAL RETARDATION FACILITIES AND COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH CONSTRUCTION ACT OF 1693—TITLE III, EDUCATION PROVISIONS (PUBLIC LAW 88–164)

Handicaps—blindness, mental retardation, and others—make traditional schooling inaccessible to some 5,000,000 American children.

Yet only one-fourth of the Nation's handicapped children are enrolled today in schools of any kind, largely because teachers with the specialized training to educate them are in short supply. At least 200,000 such teachers are needed, but there are only an estimated 60,000.

Title III of Public Law 88–164, dealing with education, is a pioneering attempt on the part of the Federal Government to remove what the Commissioner of Education, in his Congressional testimony, called the greatest obstacles to the advance of special education: "the extreme shortage of qualified personnel and lack of scientifically tested knowledge."

Teacher will be trained

Title III authorizes grants to help public and other nonprofit colleges and universities train a corps of teachers of the handicapped—and as part of that endeavor, to educate supervisors, speech correctionists, researchers, and college instructors. State education agencies are eligible for grants to help train people to teach the handicapped. Enlarging the pool of trained manpower is to be accomplished both through grants-in-aid to the sponsors of the training programs and through fellowships and traineeships to encourage people to enter the field. Grants to State education agencies are to be apportioned on the basis of population.

The act's enormous scope is suggested in the broad definition it gives to the term "handicapped children." Included are blind, partially-seeing, deaf, hard-of-hearing, speech-impaired, crippled, seriously emotionally disturbed, and metally retarded youngsters, and those who suffer other forms of health impairment.

Stimulates research and demonstration

In addition to its grants for training purposes, the act seeks to stimulate needed research and demonstration projects through grants to institutions and research organizations. It stipulates that the research be aimed at knowledge which is directly applicable to the education of the handicapped. Demonstrations are expected to translate research results and observations into practice—in the form, for instance, of new classroom methods and materials.

The act also extends previous legislation supporting education of the mentally retarded and deaf through teacher-training scholarships and grants to educational institutions (Public Laws 85–926 and 87–276).

Administration of title III is vested in the Division of Handicapped Children and Youth of the Office of Education. The act calls for the creation of technical advisory committees in the various fields of handicapping to advise the Commissioner of Education on policy.

The following allocations were authorized to carry out the objectives of title III:

	For teacher training	For research and demonstrations
Fiscal 1964	$11,500,000	$2,000,000
Fiscal 1965	14,500,000	2,000,000
Fiscal 1966	19,500,000	2,000,000

Appropriations of $16,500,000 were subsequently voted for fiscal 1965.

Two additional titles of the Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act attack other important aspects of the burden inflicted by handicapping. In summary, titles I and II authorize the following:

Title I, part A: Project grants to public or other nonprofit institutions for research on human development—to find the causes of mental retardation and ways to prevent and mitigate it. These grants are administered by the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, National Institutes of Health, Public Health Service. Part B: Grants for the construction of university-affiliated clinical facilities for the mentally retarded—to provide patient services, to demonstrate diagnosis, treatment, and care, and to demonstrate in the education of specialists attending the retarded. These grants are administered by the Division of Hospital and Medical Facilities, Bureau of State Services, Public Health Service. Part C: Grants to States for construction, expansion, remodeling, etc., of public and other nonprofit facilities for the mentally retarded; administration is the same as for part B.

Title II: Grants for the establishment and construction of public and other nonprofit community mental health centers offering a wide range of services. These grants are administered by the National Institute of Mental Health, National Institutes of Health, Public Health Service.

HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES ACT OF 1963 (PUBLIC LAW 88–204)

The Higher Education Facilities Act of 1964 will provide buildings to house classrooms, libraries, and laboratories to expand enrollment capacity.

The act authorized a $1.2 billion investment by the Federal Government in the academic facilities needed by public and other nonprofit colleges and universities. By making special provisions for their growth, it takes note of the unique role of public community colleges and technical institutes in the national scheme of post-high-school education. And it takes measures to spur the development of graduate schools and their better geographic distribution across the Nation.

In short, what the Congress has done is to supply higher education with grants and loans that will ease the struggle to accommodate the growing swarm of students and meet the accelerating demand for educated minds. The act reflects a view of trained intelligence as an indispensible national resource.

The primary goal of the bill was to expand enrollment capacity. The reasons for enacting it were compelling. By 1970, the number of college students is expected to be double the number in 1960, or 7 million. To keep pace, colleges will need to spend $1 billion more a year until 1970 than they now are able to spend. As the Commissioner of Education put it in his testimony before a Senate committee: "States and municipalities cannot provide the additional funds—nor can contributions from private sources." The enrollment crisis foreseen for higher education was already at the doorstep.

Needed for economic growth

Other aspects of the problem are just as troubling. Trained manpower needs call for the creation of additional graduate schools of top quality and for adjustment of a situation which finds the graduate schools of a handful of States producing 55 percent of the doctorates. At a lower level of education, there is need to train another 600,000 highly skilled technicians by 1970.

Under title I of the act a 5-year program of grants is authorized to construct and improve academic facilities in undergraduate colleges and universities, both public and private nonprofit.

---

[1] Optometrists were added to the provisions of this act by Public Law 88–665, enacted on Oct. 16, 1964.

Of these funds, 22 percent is earmarked for public community colleges and public technical institutes which meet requirements specified by the act. These latter institutions are eligible to have the Federal Government pay 40 percent of their improvements for the stated purposes, while other institutions qualifying under title I are entitled to Federal shares of up to 33⅓ percent.

Specific uses are spelled out in the legislation for the grants made to public and private nonprofit universities and 4-year colleges and 2-year private nonprofit colleges out of the remaining 78 percent of title I funds. The funds are designated for the construction of teaching or research facilities in the natural or physical sciences, mathematics, modern foreign languages, or engineering, or for libraries. A State commission "broadly representative of the public and of institutions of higher education" determines relative priorities of eligible projects and submits a priority list to the Commissioner of Education. High school enrollment, college and university enrollment, and per capita income all figure in the determination of State allotments.

To benefit graduate education

The 5-year program of grants under title II will expand and improve academic facilities at present graduate schools and centers and establish top-flight new ones. The Commissioner will make these grants directly to the institutions but may not allocate more than 12½ percent of any year's appropriation to institutions in one State. The Federal share of construction costs is limited to 33⅓ percent.

In reviewing projects, the Commissioner is to consider the advice of a committee on graduate education which he chairs and which is to include, among others, representatives of the Office of Science and Technology and the National Science Foundation, and leaders from the humanities, education, and other graduate fields.

Title III differs from the others primarily in one respect: it authorizes loans instead of grants for academic facilities. The Commissioner again deals directly with the institutions, which in this case range from 2-year schools to graduate schools, both public and private nonprofit. Not less than one-fourth of the development cost must be paid out of non-Federal funds.

All three titles exclude the following kinds of facilities: those to which the public will be charged admission, those designed for athletics or recreation (though not those designed for teaching physical education), those to be used for sectarian instruction or worship, those to be used primarily by a department or school of divinity, and those to be used for a school of the health professions, which are covered under Public Law 88–129.

The act makes the following authorizations:

	Fiscal 1964	1965	1966	1967–68
Construction grants for undergraduate facilities	$230,000,000	$230,000,000	$230,000,000	To be authorized.
Construction grants for graduate facilities	25,000,000	60,000,000	60,000,000	Do.
Construction loans for undergraduate and graduate facilities	120,000,000	120,000,000	120,000,000	Do.

For fiscal 1965 Congress appropriated $463,150,000 for these purposes, including carryover funds from fiscal 1964 not previously appropriated.

Allotments to States under title I of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, fiscal year 1965

State	Total	For public community colleges and public technical institutes [1]	For undergraduate institutions other than public community colleges and public technical institutes [2]
U.S. and outlying parts	$230,000,000	$50,600,000	$179,400,000
50 States and District of Columbia	227,755,334	49,951,705	177,803,629
Alabama	3,792,266	1,161,234	2,631,032
Alaska	173,044	34,640	138,404
Arizona	2,075,312	441,438	1,633,874
Arkansas	2,305,346	675,760	1,629,586
California	23,647,473	3,770,269	19,877,204
Colorado	2,590,141	488,984	2,101,157
Connecticut	2,924,141	520,836	2,403,305
Delaware	501,141	83,580	417,561
Florida	5,713,768	1,371,448	4,342,320
Georgia	4,510,292	1,241,148	3,269,144
Hawaii	887,495	238,400	649,095
Idaho	981,732	273,453	708,279
Illinois	11,461,804	2,099,039	9,362,765
Indiana	6,026,900	1,329,064	4,697,836
Iowa	3,843,504	948,388	2,895,116
Kansas	3,141,136	755,571	2,385,565
Kentucky	3,513,562	910,444	2,603,118
Louisiana	4,121,306	1,112,553	3,008,753
Maine	1,180,112	327,504	852,608
Maryland	3,651,720	761,870	2,889,850
Massachusetts	7,004,607	1,202,327	5,802,280
Michigan	10,213,516	2,262,998	7,950,518
Minnesota	5,019,166	1,194,015	3,825,151
Mississippi	2,732,233	745,866	1,986,367
Missouri	5,193,192	1,187,717	4,005,475
Montana	946,361	232,825	713,536
Nebraska	1,946,320	457,648	1,388,672
Nevada	322,612	53,792	268,820
New Hampshire	$802,018	$176,297	$625,721
New Jersey	6,063,579	1,330,510	4,733,069
New Mexico	1,269,005	306,493	962,512
New York	19,303,194	3,293,519	16,009,675
North Carolina	5,983,904	1,631,375	4,352,529
North Dakota	1,000,654	273,453	727,201
Ohio	11,552,972	2,543,162	9,009,810
Oklahoma	3,451,567	820,205	2,631,362
Oregon	2,731,544	582,166	2,149,378
Pennsylvania	13,406,602	3,146,597	10,260,005
Rhode Island	1,078,197	218,112	860,085
South Carolina	2,829,174	859,181	1,969,993
South Dakota	982,449	262,767	719,682
Tennessee	4,455,372	1,216,007	3,239,365
Texas	11,792,046	2,717,703	9,074,343
Utah	1,824,266	355,845	1,468,421
Vermont	616,351	138,043	478,308
Virginia	4,404,365	1,116,941	3,287,424
Washington	4,193,154	877,508	3,315,646
West Virginia	2,319,653	642,876	1,676,777
Wisconsin	5,518,080	1,369,176	4,148,904
Wyoming	443,970	101,338	342,632
District of Columbia	1,313,016	89,620	1,223,396
American Samoa	14,565	3,665	10,900
Canal Zone			
Guam	69,264	19,049	50,215
Puerto Rico	2,137,444	616,857	1,520,587
Virgin Islands	23,393	8,724	14,669

---

[1] Distributed according to the State products of (1) 1962–63 high school graduates and (2) allotment ratios with limits of 0.3333 and 0.6667.

[2] Half is distributed according to fall 1963 enrollment in grades 9 to 12, and half is distributed according to fall 1963 enrollment in institutions of higher education. Data on enrollments in institutions of higher education were partially estimated.

Allotment of funds for administrative expenses of State commissions for title I of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, fiscal year 1965

Alabama	$43,000
Alaska	30,000
Arizona	30,000
Arkansas	30,000
California	120,000
Colorado	34,000
Connecticut	42,000
Delaware	30,000
Florida	71,000
Georgia	59,000
Hawaii	30,000
Idaho	30,000
Illinois	120,000
Indiana	71,000
Iowa	57,000
Kansas	47,000
Kentucky	47,000
Louisiana	45,000
Maine	30,000
Maryland	54,000
Massachusetts	112,000
Michigan	120,000
Minnesota	64,000
Mississippi	44,000
Missouri	76,000
Montana	30,000
Nebraska	30,000
Nevada	30,000
New Hampshire	30,000
New Jersey	71,000
New Mexico	30,000
New York	120,000
North Carolina	77,000
North Dakota	30,000
Ohio	120,000
Oklahoma	45,000
Oregon	38,000
Pennsylvania	120,000
Rhode Island	30,000
South Carolina	37,000
South Dakota	30,000
Tennessee	59,000
Texas	120,000
Utah	30,000
Vermont	30,000
Virginia	58,000
Washington	51,000
West Virginia	30,000
Wisconsin	76,000
Wyoming	30,000
District of Columbia	30,000
American Samoa	10,000
Guam	10,000
Puerto Rico	30,000
Virgin Islands	10,000
Subtotal	2,878,000
Reserve	122,000
Grand total	3,000,000

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ACT OF 1963 (PUBLIC LAW 88–210, PT. A)

A changing economy and the shrinking market for unskilled labor have given new urgency to the need to provide vocational education for people of all ages. When Congress passed the Vocational Education Act of 1963, it was responding not only to present needs but also to future portents. By 1970, 58 million people who are working today will need training to keep pace with new methods, new materials, and new opportunity. As for the young, many of the 26 million who will have entered the labor market by 1970 will find that their high school studies, however worthwhile, have not supplied the special skills required for employment. The nature of work changes fast.

The Vocational Education Act of 1963, which consolidates previous legislation in this field, assures the improvement of existing programs and the development of new ones to support the part-time employment that will enable many young people to continue their vocational training on a full-time basis. Under the legislation, people in all communities can be given ready access to training or retraining which is keyed to job opportunities—present and future—and is suited to individual needs, interests, and ability. The act is directed both to youth and to adult workers: to high school students, unemployed high school dropouts, high school graduates who need additional training, adult employees who can profit from upgrading in learning or skills, and jobless or underemployed adults who need specialized training to become fully employable.

Research for improving quality

The legislation was written, moreover, with an eye to improving the quality of vocational education. The emphasis on quality is such, in fact, that the Commissioner of Education is authorized to channel 10 percent of funds authorized by the act into grants for research, experimentation in the curriculum, the development of instructional materials, teacher training, and other projects of a related nature.

The act will substantially expand the Nation's facilities for offering vocational instruction. It will help to fund classroom construction at area vocational technical schools and certain other schools offering comprehensive vocational courses and will provide initial equipment for them. One totally new feature of the bill is the authority to establish pilot residential vocational schools serving large urban areas, where youth between the ages of 15 and 21—youth who are unemployed and out of school—will live and learn a useful occupation. (This feature will be implemented upon appropriation of the necessary funds. They were not included in the fiscal year 1965 appropriation for the Office of Education.)

The following are some of the specific highlights of the act:

1. It continues grants to the States authorized under the 1917 Smith-Hughes Act (Public Law 347) and the 1946 George-Barden Act (Public Law 79-586). It makes permanent the practical nurse training program (Title II, George-Barden Act) and the area technical education programs (Title VIII of the National Defense Education Act).

2. It allows the transfer of funds under these acts from one category of training to another, and for new purposes specified in the new act to help meet actual manpower needs and job opportunities.

3. It provides for special training for persons with academic, socioeconomic, or other handicaps which prevent them from succeeding in the regular vocational education program.

4. It stipulates that there must be periodic evaluation of State and local programs by officials of the States so that offerings keep pace with known and anticipated labor needs.

5. It instructs public employment offices to supply occupational information to schools for use in the vocational guidance and counseling of students. By the same token, it calls for information about students' occupational qualifications to be supplied to public employment offices. The aim is to relate vocational programs more directly to the realities of the labor market.

6. Under the bill, construction and equipment funds may be used for the vocational education quarters of high schools and colleges meeting certain conditions of instruction, as well as for area vocational centers.

7. Special funds may be used to support locally administered work-study programs authorized as a 4-year experiment; the programs, to be operated by schools and other institutions, would provide part-time employment for students of ages 15 to 21.

8. Grants for the operation of residential vocational schools are made available on a 4-year experimental basis (upon appropriation of funds) to State boards for vocational education, to colleges and universities, or, with State board approval, to local public education institutions.

9. If an existing State board does not meet certain criteria in its makeup, a State advisory council must be named to serve in a consultative capacity to the board in carrying out the State plan. The criteria call for junior colleges, technical institutes, and other institutions offering vocational training to be represented on the board, along with persons familiar with the vocational education needs of labor and management in the State.

The 1963 act authorizes the following appropriations:

Fiscal year 1964	$60,000,000
Fiscal year 1965	118,500,000
Fiscal year 1966	177,500,000
Fiscal year 1967 and each fiscal year thereafter	225,000,000
For work-study programs (4 years):	
Fiscal year 1965	30,000,000
Fiscal year 1966	50,000,000
Fiscal year 1967	35,000,000
Fiscal year 1968	35,000,000

As the result of 1964 appropriations under the Vocational Education Act of 1963 and under earlier legislation, the following Federal funds are available for vocational education in fiscal 1965: $15 million through National Defense Education Act title VIII appropriations; $7,161,455 through Smith-Hughes Vocational Education Act of 1917; $158,296,000 through George-Barden Act of 1946 and the Vocational Education Act of 1963.

Allotment of Federal funds to States and possessions for vocational education authorized by the Vocational Education Act of 1963 (Public Law 88-210), fiscal year 1965 [1]

Alabama	$2,444,832
Alaska	128,189
Arizona	978,265
Arkansas	1,348,007
California	7,651,248
Colorado	1,068,905
Connecticut	1,123,756
Delaware	204,805
Florida	3,347,839
Georgia	3,044,016
Hawaii	472,634
Idaho	502,829
Illinois	4,251,204
Indiana	2,589,590
Iowa	1,620,842
Kansas	1,306,482
Kentucky	2,245,932
Louisiana	2,395,272
Maine	659,252
Maryland	1,645,385
Massachusetts	2,348,897
Michigan	4,277,948
Minnesota	1,977,118
Mississippi	1,716,098
Missouri	2,311,645
Montana	436,321
Nebraska	826,226
Nevada	163,524
New Hampshire	366,271
New Jersey	2,716,801
New Mexico	712,867
New York	7,434,613
North Carolina	3,638,471
North Dakota	443,707
Ohio	5,269,589
Oklahoma	1,714,985
Oregon	1,013,770
Pennsylvania	6,078,813
Rhode Island	499,902
South Carolina	1,961,818
South Dakota	472,478
Tennessee	2,650,260
Texas	6,786,269
Utah	656,822
Vermont	$250,755
Virginia	3,079,742
Washington	1,671,148
West Virginia	1,281,164
Wisconsin	2,237,815
Wyoming	190,786
American Samoa	16,090
District of Columbia	323,488
Guam	49,147
Puerto Rico	2,021,876
Virgin Islands	23,492
Total	106,650,000

[1] Based upon an authorization of $118.5 million appropriated, 10 percent reserved for grants by the Commissioner of Education.

Allotment of Federal funds to States and possessions for work-study programs authorized by the Vocational Education Act of 1963 (sec. 13, Public Law 88-210), fiscal year 1965 [1]

Alabama	$99,072
Alaska	16,542
Arizona	46,988
Arkansas	59,820
California	396,986
Colorado	55,039
Connecticut	67,620
Delaware	20,568
Florida	129,769
Georgia	119,453
Hawaii	31,136
Idaho	28,368
Illinois	226,642
Indiana	117,189
Iowa	73,659
Kansas	61,330
Kentucky	91,524
Louisiana	96,053
Maine	34,155
Maryland	87,498
Massachusetts	124,989
Michigan	193,932
Minnesota	89,511
Mississippi	74,414
Missouri	106,117
Montana	26,858
Nebraska	42,710
Nevada	17,800
New Hampshire	24,342
New Jersey	148,641
New Mexico	35,916
New York	380,128
North Carolina	141,847
North Dakota	26,355
Ohio	232,429
Oklahoma	71,143
Oregon	52,523
Pennsylvania	263,126
Rhode Island	30,633
South Carolina	83,472
South Dakota	27,362
Tennessee	104,356
Texas	260,358
Utah	34,910
Vermont	19,310
Virginia	121,466
Washington	83,724
West Virginia	57,556
Wisconsin	101,337
Wyoming	17,800
American Samoa	10,634
District of Columbia	24,342
Guam	11,684
Puerto Rico	88,001
Virgin Islands	10,863
Total	5,000,000

[1] No more than 1 percent of such allotment or $10,000 (whichever is the greater) may be expended for the development of the State plan provisions for work-study programs or for the administration of such programs.

Allotments to States and territories, George-Barden and supplemental acts, fiscal year 1965 [1]

State or territory (1)	Grand total (2)	Title I						Title II—Practical nurse training (9)	Title III [2]—Technical education (10)
		Total (3)	Agriculture (4)	Distributive occupations (5)	Home economics (6)	Trades and industry (7)	Fishery trades and industry (8)		
Grand total, including supplemental acts	$49,795,823	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
Grand total	49,490,823	$29,490,823	$10,309,997	$2,602,298	$8,182,825	$8,215,703	$180,000	$5,000,000	$15,000,000
Alabama	1,138,512	679,535	283,349	44,954	213,135	136,819	1,278	114,744	344,233
Alaska	253,204	151,128	40,000	15,000	40,000	40,000	16,128	25,519	76,557
Arizona	277,575	165,674	40,000	17,919	47,907	59,848	----	27,975	83,926
Arkansas	796,383	475,331	233,263	24,581	147,526	69,493	468	80,263	240,789
California	2,555,956	1,525,553	235,107	216,285	309,808	734,905	29,448	257,601	772,802
Colorado	432,580	258,191	89,720	24,136	66,636	77,699	----	43,597	130,792
Connecticut	460,436	274,817	40,000	34,887	79,425	119,947	558	46,405	139,214
Delaware	233,571	139,410	40,000	15,000	40,000	40,000	4,410	23,540	70,621
Florida	953,556	569,141	74,147	68,138	186,426	231,520	8,910	96,104	288,311
Georgia	1,285,476	767,252	286,460	54,261	254,730	168,921	2,880	129,556	388,668
Hawaii	228,355	136,296	40,000	15,000	40,000	40,000	1,296	23,015	69,044
Idaho	333,375	198,979	93,392	15,000	50,587	40,000	----	33,599	100,797
Illinois	2,129,233	1,270,858	395,878	138,727	280,445	454,728	1,080	214,594	643,781
Indiana	1,438,156	858,381	341,459	64,161	253,208	199,553	----	144,944	434,831
Iowa	1,327,191	792,150	465,787	37,947	187,127	100,101	1,188	133,760	401,281
Kansas	782,395	466,982	225,430	29,980	122,803	88,769	----	78,853	236,560
Kentucky	1,322,853	789,561	385,312	41,808	243,468	118,973	----	133,323	399,969
Louisiana	901,502	538,073	163,978	44,820	172,878	144,463	11,934	90,857	272,572
Maine	299,300	178,641	40,000	15,000	68,224	44,005	11,412	30,165	90,494
Maryland	657,931	392,694	77,479	42,669	122,368	142,870	7,308	66,309	198,928
Massachusetts	826,609	493,372	40,000	70,850	122,251	244,251	16,020	83,309	249,928
Michigan	1,797,787	1,073,031	310,134	107,655	301,140	352,680	1,422	181,189	543,567
Minnesota	1,311,008	782,491	413,253	46,978	186,588	135,024	648	132,129	396,388
Mississippi	1,155,193	689,491	381,807	29,973	196,130	78,125	3,456	116,425	349,277
Missouri	1,388,763	828,900	380,371	59,445	208,545	180,539	----	139,966	419,897
Montana	298,006	177,869	74,273	15,000	48,596	40,000	----	30,034	90,103
Nebraska	640,853	382,501	217,166	19,421	93,240	52,674	----	64,588	193,764
Nevada	226,183	135,000	40,000	15,000	40,000	40,000	----	22,796	68,387
New Hampshire	226,183	135,000	40,000	15,000	40,000	40,000	----	22,796	68,387
New Jersey	869,516	518,981	40,000	83,485	100,051	287,381	8,064	87,634	262,901
New Mexico	243,818	145,526	40,980	15,000	46,895	42,651	----	24,573	73,719
New York	2,690,653	1,605,949	228,411	230,941	354,071	786,244	6,282	271,176	813,528
North Carolina	2,032,856	1,213,335	568,575	62,697	397,977	179,046	5,040	204,880	614,641
North Dakota	432,210	257,970	143,764	15,000	59,206	40,000	----	43,560	130,680
Ohio	2,198,609	1,312,266	365,400	133,570	373,268	438,894	1,134	221,586	664,757
Oklahoma	733,509	437,804	182,132	32,040	124,772	98,860	----	73,926	221,779
Oregon	501,661	299,422	97,276	24,339	96,605	77,890	3,312	50,560	151,679
Pennsylvania	2,339,171	1,396,163	250,585	155,766	464,891	523,751	1,170	235,752	707,256
Rhode Island	230,931	137,834	40,000	15,000	40,000	40,872	1,962	23,274	69,823
South Carolina	972,703	580,570	246,985	32,787	202,470	97,050	1,278	98,033	294,100
South Dakota	434,600	259,396	144,671	15,000	59,725	40,000	----	43,801	131,403
Tennessee	1,425,296	850,705	412,688	49,087	245,971	142,383	576	143,648	430,943
Texas	2,342,819	1,398,340	488,465	131,826	345,666	424,481	7,902	236,120	708,359
Utah	226,979	135,475	40,000	15,000	40,000	40,475	----	22,876	68,628
Vermont	226,183	135,000	40,000	15,000	40,000	40,000	----	22,796	68,387
Virginia	1,289,118	769,426	279,355	54,589	254,608	170,542	10,332	129,923	389,769
Washington	711,763	424,824	114,817	39,263	131,487	128,511	10,746	71,735	215,204
West Virginia	602,883	359,838	85,062	25,601	166,073	83,102	----	60,761	182,284
Wisconsin	1,363,794	813,997	389,561	54,380	206,572	162,332	1,152	137,449	412,348
Wyoming	226,183	135,000	40,000	15,000	40,000	40,000	----	22,796	68,387
District of Columbia	226,183	135,000	40,000	15,000	40,000	40,000	----	22,796	68,387
Guam	54,035	----	----	----	----	----	----	13,509	40,526
Puerto Rico	1,410,208	841,700	543,505	32,332	189,326	75,331	1,206	142,127	426,381
Virgin Islands	27,017	----	----	----	----	----	----	6,754	20,263
Total, supplemental acts	305,000	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
Guam	80,000	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
Puerto Rico	105,000	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
Virgin Islands	40,000	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
American Samoa	80,000	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----

[1] Based upon U.S. Census of Population, 1960.

[2] National Defense Education Act, title VIII.

Allotments to States, Smith-Hughes funds, fiscal year 1965 [1]

State (1)	Total (2)	Agriculture (3)	Trades and industry and home economics (4)	Teacher training (5)
Total	$7,161,455	$3,016,355	$3,041,787	$1,103,313
Alabama	143,330	81,863	43,172	18,295
Alaska	30,000	10,000	10,000	10,000
Arizona	51,789	18,401	23,388	10,000
Arkansas	85,107	56,663	18,440	10,004
California	534,067	118,994	327,051	88,022
Colorado	66,744	25,594	31,150	10,000
Connecticut	92,547	30,506	47,843	14,198
Delaware	30,000	10,000	10,000	10,000
Florida	187,558	71,604	88,223	27,731
Georgia	172,456	97,839	52,534	22,083
Hawaii	31,661	10,000	11,661	10,000
Idaho	39,430	19,430	10,000	10,000
Illinois	360,319	107,716	196,145	56,458
Indiana	193,488	97,255	70,121	26,112
Iowa	122,556	71,873	35,240	15,443
Kansas	91,385	47,167	32,017	12,201
Kentucky	143,135	93,514	32,606	17,015
Louisiana	134,293	66,401	49,651	18,241
Maine	48,182	26,204	11,978	10,000
Maryland	118,672	47,000	54,307	17,365
Massachusetts	179,461	46,955	103,672	28,834
Michigan	297,765	115,665	138,287	43,813
Minnesota	141,929	71,666	51,144	19,119
Mississippi	107,308	75,332	19,778	12,198
Missouri	$173,605	$80,100	$69,312	$24,193
Montana	38,665	18,665	10,000	10,000
Nebraska	64,271	35,813	18,458	10,000
Nevada	30,000	10,000	10,000	10,000
New Hampshire	34,050	14,050	10,000	10,000
New Jersey	201,903	38,429	192,498	33,976
New Mexico	43,107	18,012	15,095	10,000
New York	575,316	135,995	345,334	93,987
North Carolina	221,793	152,859	43,418	25,516
North Dakota	42,740	22,740	10,000	10,000
Ohio	369,365	143,369	171,636	54,360
Oklahoma	96,258	47,924	35,295	13,039
Oregon	73,613	37,105	26,508	10,000
Pennsylvania	437,176	178,560	195,223	63,393
Rhode Island	37,901	10,000	17,901	10,000
South Carolina	114,757	77,766	23,647	13,344
South Dakota	42,940	22,940	10,000	10,000
Tennessee	159,386	94,475	44,934	19,977
Texas	359,602	132,767	173,185	53,650
Utah	38,478	12,402	16,076	10,000
Vermont	33,318	13,318	10,000	10,000
Virginia	173,136	97,792	53,128	22,216
Washington	113,306	50,503	46,824	15,979
West Virginia	91,340	63,787	17,134	10,419
Wisconsin	162,247	79,342	60,773	22,132
Wyoming	30,000	10,000	10,000	10,000

[1] Based upon U.S. Census of Population: 1960.

National Defense Education Act, Amendments of 1963 and 1964 (Public Law 88–210, Pt. B) (Public Law 88–665)

Virtually every school and college in the United States has felt the impact of the National Defense Education Act. National Defense Education Act was passed in 1958, and has since been extended through fiscal year 1968.

In the 6 years since National Defense Education Act's enactment, the Federal Government has disbursed nearly $1 billion in program funds. The money went into the training of teachers in modern teaching methods using up-to-date subject matter. Money was translated into new equipment for science, mathematics, and language classrooms; for upgrading technical education—especially in those skill areas directly related to national defense industries—and technical equipment; and for loans and fellowships for able and needy students. The 1958 act was sweepingly original, and subsequent revisions and extensions have represented even further progress.

National Defense Education Act is a historic piece of education legislation because it represents a new emphasis in congressional approach to American education. The act reinforces "local education agencies" as the real source of teaching. An "agency" may be an elementary school, a high school, a college, junior college, or university. It may be a State-supported school for the handicapped. It may be a private nonprofit institution duly chartered for education by State authority. Thus, this law is neither an elementary nor secondary school act nor a higher education act: it is an act for the entire American education system.

Loans to college students

The original authors of National Defense Education Act—Congressmen and educators, lay leaders and professionals—believed that young men and women are the Nation's greatest natural resource and that this Act should work for them. Their wishes have materialized. The provisions for loans to college students (title II) have been the most frequently used of all. More than 600,000 undergraduates in more than 1,500 colleges and universities have taken advantage of the loan provisions. They have borrowed an average of $490 each, for a grand total of $453 million over 6 years.

The Federal Government deposited about 90 percent of this money in student loan funds established on the 1,500-plus campuses. The participating institutions made up the remaining 10 percent, a National Defense Education Act requirement that still stands.

National Defense Education Act student loans may be partially forgiven if the student goes on to be an elementary or secondary school teacher or instructor in an institution of higher education. To date, 45,000 young men and women have done this.

National Defense Education Act became law in that hectic period of 1957–59 when the Soviet Union launched Sputnik I, the first manmade earth satellite in history, and the United States raced to match the feat. Suddenly the Nation realized that it was short of well-trained scientists, of translators and foreign language scholars, of mathematicians, and of specialists in a variety of critical subjects. The gap had to be closed, and the Congress set about to close it with National Defense Education Act.

Original categories are broadened

Title III of the original 1958 version of National Defense Education Act authorized the Federal Government to provide grants on a 50–50 matching basis to the States for the strengthening of instruction in science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages in elementary and secondary schools. In the course of writing the 1963 and 1964 amendments, Congress added English, reading, history, geography, and civics to the original subjects and broadened the eligible categories of audiovisual supplies and equipment that could be purchased with National Defense Education Act help.

Before the act was passed in 1958, only 33 subject-matter specialists were employed as supervisors in State departments of education, hardly enough to give local schools the help they needed to upgrade instruction. Today, as a result of this legislation, the States employ 227 subject-matter specialists who are busy year-round working with local school curriculum planners.

The Federal Government has disbursed about $237.6 million to the States under title III during the act's 6-year existence, as grants to States (on the 50–50 matching basis) or as loans to private elementary and secondary schools. About three-fourths of the money has gone into strengthening science. As the 1964 amendments begin to take effect, a new balance will doubtless be struck between the sciences and the other basic subjects.

Still, the Congress reasoned, there are bound to be imbalances of other kinds. If National Defense Education Act, through its undergraduate loan program, is encouraging young people to pursue excellence in critical subject areas, is it reasonable to leave the top students who want to become college teachers hanging in midair for lack of funds? The answer was built into title IV, the graduate fellowship program administered by the U.S. Commissioner of Education with the advice and counsel of a committee of experts.

More graduate fellowships available

Since 1958, the Commissioner has expended $101 million under title IV. Only 1,500 graduate fellowships were authorized in the 1958 version of the act, but the 1964 amendments increased the number to 3,000 fellowships authorized for fiscal year 1965; to 6,000 for 1966; and 7,500 each for fiscal years 1967 and 1968.

Half of the $101 million already spent under title IV went to the individual students as annual stipends (from $2,000 to $2,400) and allowances ($400 for each dependent). The other half went to the institutions at which they pursued their studies. The Commissioner of Education awards each such institution $2,500 per year for every title IV fellow (less the amount charged for annual tuition). This is in recognition of the additional costs of instructional staff, library books, equipment, and space (laboratory, study, office) the institution must bear if it wishes to accommodate a graduate student.

Gifted students identified and counseled

Early identification of talented young people is one of the major goals of the National Defense Education Act. The tools of identification are guidance, counseling, and testing, which are supported under title V. So far in the 6-year history of title V, disbursements have reached a total of $80 million. Within that time, the number of full-time public school guidance counselors has risen 150 percent: from 12,000 in 1958 to 30,000 in 1964. With money available under part A of title V, more than 109 million scholastic aptitude and achievement tests have been given, in both public and private secondary schools.

When the act was passed in 1958, the pressing concern was to salvage the talented students who were then moving through secondary school but failing to go on to higher education. That initial emergency having been faced, the provisions of title V have been extended downward to meet the needs of elementary education, and upward to help students in public junior colleges and technical institutes.

Under part B of title V, guidance counselors or persons planning to become counselors in elementary, secondary, or higher education may attend training institutes set up by colleges and universities with Federal help. By the end of fiscal 1965, the Federal Government will have spent nearly $37 million for 480 counselor-training institutes. Forty percent of this total will have covered the colleges' operating costs; the remaining 60 percent will have been paid out to 15,700 enrollees as stipends and living allowances.

New thrust for language study

In 1958, jet flight suddenly became a reality. Every nation was at once the neighbor of every other nation on earth, yet the languages spoken by more than three-fourths of the world's people were barely noticed in American colleges and universities. The emphasis was on the "big four"—English, Spanish, French, and German—although these were the native tongue of only 22 percent of mankind. Nearly a third of the world's population spoke such languages as Chinese, Hindi, Russian, Japanese, Indonesian, Portuguese, Arabic, and Bengali. If the United States were to get along with its new neighbors, if it was to negotiate with them in the realms of trade, arms control, cultural exchanges, and so on, it desperately needed thousands of linguists.

Under title VI of the National Defense Education Act, about $11 million of Federal funds have so far gone to establish 55 language and area centers on the campuses of 34 colleges and universities. These centers offer instruction in some 90 previously neglected languages, each of which is spoken by millions of people. These centers teach more than the languages, however; they carry on studies of problems—political, social, economic—peculiar to the area in which each language is spoken.

An additional $16 million has gone into fellowships for approximately 2,600 students. In 1964, the first postdoctoral fellowships were awarded to 13 teachers from liberal arts colleges to help them become prepared to administer or teach new undergraduate programs of nonwestern studies.

Nearly as much money—$14 million—has been spent by the Federal Government over the past 6 years for 271 language research projects. These projects help America's schools and colleges determine which of the neglected foreign languages need special attention; what some of the successful teaching methods seem to be in this field; and how such teaching tools as foreign-language textbooks, dictionaries, and recordings may be better produced.

Teacher training is expanded

Title VI has produced a profound change in the conduct of language training in elementary and secondary schools through another of its provisions, one under which teacher-training institutes are set up by colleges and universities. More than 17,400 teachers will have attended 386 institutes by the end of the 1964–65 academic year. Two new institutes added in the summer of 1964 indicate the kind of fresh thinking the National Defense Education Act activity inspires. These were institutes for persons engaged in teaching English as a second language.

The language institute program has produced so much interest and activity that the

88th Congress in 1964 separated it from title VI and incorporated it into a new and separate title XI which will not only continue to support foreign language institutes but will establish institutes for school librarians, for educational media specialists, for teachers of history, geography, English, and reading, and for those teachers who work with disadvantaged youth. A total of $32.75 million for all title XI teacher-training institutes has been authorized by the Congress for each fiscal year from 1965 to 1968.

Communications technology is tested, exploited

The development of new technology for education received its most important thrust forward with the enactment of the National Defense Education Act title VII, which is concerned with new educational media, among them television, radio, motion pictures, tape recordings, teaching machines, and other devices.

Under title VII, more than $24 million had been obligated through September 1964 for research into communications media. This is a two-part program: First, the research projects are approved and carried out (262 of them since the start of the program in 122 institutions and education agencies), second, research findings are disseminated throughout the educational system (1,974 contracts to 105 institutions, agencies and individuals). American industry, informed of research results, has been able to provide schools and colleges with better equipment at moderate prices.

Aid to technical and vocational education

Title VIII of National Defense Education Act, dealing with technical education, has been of primary significance not only for education but for the American economy as a whole. Title VIII was written to help meet the space-age demand for highly skilled technicians in such fields as electronics, drafting and design, instrumentation, and industrial chemistry.

Approximately 42,000 new technicians have completed training under the Area Vocational School Program authorized under title VIII. The Federal contribution has been $62 million, largely for salaries, instructional supplies, and equipment. In the 1963–64 academic year, about 210,000 youths and adults were enrolled in area vocational programs. About 90,000 of these were in preparatory programs of 2 or 3 years; the rest were adult workers in refresher or retraining courses.

States and individual communities participating in this broad-scale technical program have actually overmatched by two to one the amount of money contributed by the Federal Government.

Spreading scientific knowledge

The problem that motivated National Defense Education Act title IX is a technical one: Scientists are piling up knowledge at such breakneck speed that the conventional means for storing and disseminating it have bogged down. Title IX set up a Science Information Service in the National Science Foundation, together with an Advisory Council for it composed of leaders in the fundamental science and librarianship. The objective: a speedier, more efficient flow of information through indexing, abstracting, and translating of relevant materials and through the development of new technology for making research data accessible. The title is administered by the National Science Foundation.

State statistical services improved

In the course of writing National Defense Education Act and in listening to testimony, the 85th Congress became convinced that major improvements had to be made in the methods of collecting, processing, and disseminating educational statistics. Under title X, the U.S. Office of Education was authorized to make grants to State education agencies so that they might improve and expand their statistical services. Thus far the Office of Education has disbursed $7,768,000 under title X. With the help of this program, 37 States have installed new electronic data processing systems.

The 1964 amendments extended National Defense Education Act through June 30, 1968. Congress authorized the following funds:

	Fiscal 1965	Fiscal 1966	Fiscal 1967	Fiscal 1968
Title II	$163,300,000	$179,300,000	$190,000,000	$195,000,000
Title III	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000
Title IV	34,367,000	60,747,000	95,657,000	123,937,000
Title V–A	24,000,000	24,500,000	30,000,000	30,000,000
Title V–B	7,250,000	7,250,000	7,250,000	7,250,000
Title VI	13,000,000	14,000,000	16,000,000	18,000,000
Title VII	5,000,000	7,500,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
Title VIII	15,000,000	15,000,000	15,000,000	15,000,000
Title IX	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
Title X	2,750,000	2,750,000	2,750,000	2,750,000
Title XI	32,750,000	32,750,000	23,750,000	32,750,000

[1] Program funded by National Science Foundation.

Aggregate authorizations for the National Defense Education Act will increase during this period from $382,417,000 for fiscal 1965 to $514,688,000 for fiscal 1968. To carry out the provisions of the act during the first of these years, Congress has appropriated $348,603,000.

When the National Defense Education Act was passed in 1958, the Senate majority leader was Lyndon B. Johnson, of Texas. "There must be an awakening," Senator Johnson said, "not only in Congress, but throughout the country, and first things come first." In 1964, President Lyndon Johnson, speaking to a group of educators at the White House, noted that "the first work of these times and the first work of our society is education." He went on to say, "We must rest our faith and hopes for America on education—not for some, but education for all."

If there are any words anywhere which characterize the purpose and achievement of the National Defense Education Act, then these words of President Johnson can stand.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education—Estimated distribution of legislative authorizations, National Defense Education Act of 1958, title II, sec. 202(a), as amended by amendments of 1964

State	Fiscal year 1965	Fiscal year 1966	Fiscal year 1967	Fiscal year 1968
United States and outlying parts	$163,300,000	$179.300,000	$190,000.000	$195,000,000
50 States and the District of Columbia	162,176,927	178,066,889	188,693.302	193,658,914
Alabama	2,245.349	2,465,346	2,612.470	2.681.219
Alaska	65,807	72,255	76.567	78,581
Arizona	1,660.469	1.823,161	1,931,961	1,982,802
Arkansas	1,453,648	1.596.075	1,691,323	1,735,832
California	16,936,492	18.595,915	19,705.653	20.224.225
Colorado	2.270,206	2,492,639	2,641,391	2,710.901
Connecticut	2,071.351	2,274.300	2,410,023	2.473.444
Delaware	318.837	350.076	370,968	380,730
Florida	3,709.141	4,072.560	4,315,596	4.429,164
Georgia	2,704,085	2,969.029	3,146,211	3,229.006
Hawaii	568.096	623.757	660,981	678,375
Idaho	641,498	704.351	746,385	766,026
Illinois	8,082,566	8.874,490	9,404.088	9,651,564
Indiana	4,678.718	5,137,135	5,443,701	5,586,956
Iowa	3.103,388	3.407,456	3.610,801	3,705.822
Kansas	2,659.417	2,919.985	3,094,240	3,175.667
Kentucky	2,307,863	2,533,985	2,685,205	2,755,868
Louisiana	2,969,172	3,260,089	3,454,640	3,545,551
Maine	672,622	738.525	782,598	803,192
Maryland	2,298,143	2,523.313	2,673.896	2,744,262
Massachusetts	6,283,631	6,899,296	7,311,022	7,503,418
Michigan	7,057,009	7,748,449	8,210,849	8,426,924
Minnesota	3,954,895	4,342,392	4,601,531	4,722,624
Mississippi	1,931,505	2,120,752	2,247,311	2,306,451
Missouri	4,036,476	4,431,967	4,696,451	4,820,042
Montana	744,378	817,311	866,085	888,877
Nebraska	$1,546,967	$1,698,538	$1,799,901	$1,847,226
Nevada	176,388	193,670	205,228	210,629
New Hampshire	660,512	725,229	768,508	788,736
New Jersey	3,140,674	3,448,394	3,654,182	3,750,345
New Mexico	832,864	914,467	969,039	994,540
New York	13,144,547	14,432,439	15,293,716	15,696,183
North Carolina	4,104.514	4,506,671	4,775,613	4,901,287
North Dakota	786,815	863,906	915,461	939,552
Ohio	7,977,456	8,759,081	9,281,792	9,526,050
Oklahoma	2,636,526	2,894,850	3,067,605	3,148,331
Oregon	2,221,926	2,439,629	2,585,217	2,653,249
Pennsylvania	8,563,875	9,402,957	9,964,093	10,226,306
Rhode Island	861,757	946,192	1,002,657	1,029,043
South Carolina	1,640,605	1,801,350	1,908,849	1,959,082
South Dakota	758,931	833,290	883,018	906,255
Tennessee	3,205,418	3,519,483	3,729,513	3,827,658
Texas	8,943,740	9,820,040	10,406,065	10,679,909
Utah	1,844,824	2,025,579	2,146,458	2,202,944
Vermont	563,741	618,975	655,914	673,175
Virginia	2,706,635	2,971,829	3,149,177	3,232,050
Washington	3,265,223	3,585,147	3,799,097	3,899,073
West Virginia	1,424,223	1,563,767	1,657,088	1,700,695
Wisconsin	3,981,929	4,372,076	4,632,986	4,754,906
Wyoming	339,392	372,645	394,883	405,275
District of Columbia	1,422,683	1,562,076	1,655,295	1,698,856
American Samoa	----------	----------	----------	----------
Canal Zone	23,157	25,426	26,944	27,653
Guam	16,890	18,545	19,651	20,169
Puerto Rico	1,081,698	1,187,682	1,258,558	1,291,678
Virgin Islands	1,328	1,458	1,545	1,586

NOTE.—Distribution of all amounts estimated on the basis of full-time degree credit enrollment (excluding U.S. service schools), fall 1963.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education—Estimated distribution of legislative authorizations, National Defense Education Act of 1958, title III, as amended by amendments of 1964, for each of fiscal years 1965, 1966, 1967, and 1968

State	Acquisition of equipment for science, mathematics, modern foreign languages, and other critical subjects		State administration and supervision
	Grants for public schools	Loans for nonpublic schools	
United States and outlying parts	$79,200,000	$10,800,000	$10,000,000
50 States and the District of Columbia	77,769,460	10,672,056	9,837,327
Alabama	2,089,073	53,059	188,955
Alaska	95,345	3,727	50,000
Arizona	825,045	56,075	82,976
Arkansas	1,096,763	21,472	99,201
California	4,692,986	693,843	849,066
Colorado	866,393	76,660	100,434
Connecticut	707,227	194,312	127,955
Delaware	133,952	33,894	50,000
Florida	2,256,586	154,385	264,126
Georgia	2,513,700	46,138	227,362
Hawaii	274,115	53,946	50,000
Idaho	430,778	15,971	50,000
Illinois	2,836,888	929,856	494,570
Indiana	2,028,256	227,141	245,847
Iowa	1,361,199	171,598	144,386
Kansas	1,025,334	91,211	113,784
Kentucky	1,852,916	155,272	167,595
Louisiana	2,141,299	250,387	193,679
Maine	494,084	62,641	50,525
Maryland	1,306,554	242,402	170,060
Massachusetts	1,528,454	461,379	247,901
Michigan	3,281,426	594,469	436,240
Minnesota	1,730,299	297,944	186,490
Mississippi	1,482,787	33,716	134,117
Missouri	1,684,094	294,573	210,521
Montana	353,453	36,733	50,000
Nebraska	$687,541	$100,261	$73,734
Nevada	96,991	7,098	50,000
New Hampshire	271,085	61,931	50,000
New Jersey	1,681,223	525,262	304,177
New Mexico	667,596	48,090	60,383
New York	4,443,154	1,486,173	803,881
North Carolina	2,915,620	34,426	263,716
North Dakota	397,376	36,378	50,000
Ohio	3,755,845	674,145	524,761
Oklahoma	1,266.671	37.798	124,464
Oregon	799.514	62,109	94,888
Pennsylvania	4,186,466	1,082,466	557,418
Rhode Island	297,661	93,518	50,000
South Carolina	1,621,303	28,038	146,646
South Dakota	441,994	41,347	50,000
Tennessee	2,159,466	55,011	195,322
Texas	5,374,317	266,180	550,229
Utah	616,541	10,825	57,713
Vermont	203,123	31,232	50,000
Virginia	2,262,271	98,487	224,487
Washington	1,235,333	102,213	157,326
West Virginia	1,105,846	30,699	100,023
Wisconsin	1,852,429	454,281	212,369
Wyoming	165,221	6,921	50,000
District of Columbia	175,957	44,363	50,000
American Samoa	50,000	2,307	10,000
Canal Zone	50,000	1,242	10,000
Guam	50,000	8,695	10,000
Puerto Rico	1,230,540	110,199	122,673
Virgin Islands	50,000	5,501	10,000

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education—Estimated distribution of legislative authorizations, National Defense Education Act of 1958, title V, pt. A, sec. 501, as amended by amendments of 1964

State	Fiscal year 1965	Fiscal year 1966	Fiscal year 1967	Fiscal year 1968
United States and outlying parts	$24,000,000	$24,500,000	$30,000,000	$30,000,000
50 States and the District of Columbia	23,616,000	24,108,000	29,520,000	29,520,000
Alabama	465,334	475,091	582,223	582,223
Alaska	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Arizona	204,342	208,627	255,672	255,672
Arkansas	244,301	249,423	305,667	305,667
California	2,090,971	2,134,810	2,616,209	2,616,209
Colorado	247,335	252,521	309,464	309,464
Connecticut	315,112	321,719	394,267	394,267
Delaware	59,684	60,936	74,676	74,676
Florida	650,456	664,094	813,847	813,847
Georgia	559,919	571,658	700,567	700,567
Hawaii	93,067	95,018	116,445	116,445
Idaho	99,136	101,215	124,039	124,039
Illinois	1,217,962	1,243,498	1,523,907	1,523,907
Indiana	605,440	618,134	757,523	757,523
Iowa	355,576	363,031	444,895	444,895
Kansas	280,212	286,087	350,600	350,600
Kentucky	412,731	421,385	516,407	516,407
Louisiana	476,968	486,968	596,779	596,779
Maine	124,426	127,035	155,681	155,681
Maryland	418,801	427,582	524,001	524,001
Massachusetts	610,498	623,298	763,852	763,852
Michigan	1,074,315	1,096,840	1,344,177	1,344,177
Minnesota	459,265	468,894	574,629	574,629
Mississippi	330,286	337,211	413,252	413,252
Missouri	518,443	529,313	648,673	648,673
Montana	95,090	97,084	118,976	118,976
Nebraska	181,582	185,389	227,194	227,194
Nevada	$50,000	$50,000	$52,527	$52,527
New Hampshire	76,376	77,977	95,561	95,561
New Jersey	749,087	764,793	937,253	937,253
New Mexico	148,705	151,822	186,058	186,058
New York	1,979,695	2,021,201	2,476,982	2,476,982
North Carolina	649,445	663,061	812,581	812,581
North Dakota	88,515	90,371	110,749	110,749
Ohio	1,292,314	1,319,410	1,616,936	1,616,936
Oklahoma	306,514	312,940	383,508	383,508
Oregon	233,679	238,578	292,377	292,377
Pennsylvania	1,372,736	1,401,518	1,717,559	1,717,559
Rhode Island	101,665	103,797	127,203	127,203
South Carolina	361,140	368,712	451,856	451,856
South Dakota	98,631	100,699	123,406	123,406
Tennessee	481,014	491,009	601,842	601,842
Texas	1,355,033	1,383,444	1,695,409	1,695,409
Utah	142,129	145,109	177,831	177,831
Vermont	50,074	51,124	62,652	62,652
Virginia	552,837	564,428	691,707	691,707
Washington	387,441	395,565	484,764	484,764
West Virginia	246,324	251,488	308,199	308,199
Wisconsin	522,995	533,961	654,369	654,369
Wyoming	50,000	50,000	56,957	56,957
District of Columbia	78,399	80,042	98,092	98,092
Outlying parts	384,000	392,000	480,000	480,000
American Samoa	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
Canal Zone	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
Guam	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
Puerto Rico	304,000	312,000	400,000	400,000
Virgin Islands	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000

NOTE.—Distribution of all amounts estimated on the basis of school-age (5 to 17) population as of July 1, 1962, for the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico, and as of Apr. 1, 1960, for the other outlying parts.

SCHOOL ASSISTANCE TO FEDERALLY AFFECTED AREAS, AMENDMENTS OF 1963 AND 1964 (PUBLIC LAW 88–210, PT. C) (PUBLIC LAW 88–665)

In many communities, especially those near military bases, the influx of new families generated by the growth of Federal operations has severely strained school facilities. Moreover, some school districts have borne an additional burden in that property acquired by the Federal Government has passed into tax-free status and been lost to the community as a source of revenue.

For these reasons, Congress, since 1950, has compensated local school districts for the expense of educating federally connected children. In some cases the Federal Government has constructed schools on Federal property to accommodate these children. In all, appropriations between 1950 and 1964 totaled $3.2 billions.

Legislation passed in 1963 and 1964 extend through fiscal 1965 and 1966, respectively, the temporary provisions of Public Laws 815 and 874, which were originally enacted in 1950.

Public Law 815 grants school districts the funds to construct the minimum school facilities they need to house the overflow occasioned by federally connected children. Public Law 874 grants operating funds to school districts to relieve the day-to-day expenses stemming from the same cause. The 1964 amendment, which embodies the latest extension of these laws, makes the District of Columbia eligible for such help for the first time.

The funds are made available to local educational agencies which provide free public schooling to substantial numbers of children in the following categories: those whose parents work or live (or both) on Federal property in the vicinity; and those whose attendance in a school district is due to Federal contract activities.

To carry out Public Laws 815 and 874, the Congress has appropriated $390,400,000 for fiscal 1965.

MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT, AMENDMENTS OF 1963 (PUBLIC LAW 88–214)

The prosperity shared today by millions of Americans has a paradoxical, dark underside, the phenomenon of growing permanent unemployment. Poverty has become the way of life and hopelessness the outlook for millions of Americans concentrated primarily in mining, industrial, and farm communities.

The ranks of these hard-core jobless are being swelled not only by automation, shifts in market demands, and other economic and technological changes which are beyond any one man's power to control. They are also being fed afresh each year by the undereducated young and especially by high school dropouts. Dropouts will account for almost a third of the 26 million young workers expected to enter the labor force during the 1960's.

The disadvantage all these people share is lack of sufficient education. Many in the older group have never learned to write or do simple arithmetic. They are, therefore, the poorest candidates for the training programs of private industry.

Programs are extended and more accessible

Congress addressed itself to this problem by passing the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 and amending it the following year.

Under the original act (Public Law 87–415), responsibilities are shared by the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. The former surveys employment opportunities in the States, selects people needing training, pays them training allowances, and helps place them in jobs. The latter, through the Office of Education's Division of Vocational and Technical Education, organizes the training.

Reflecting new information and experience, the 1963 amendments improve the program in several ways. They increase the original authorization and extend the life of several provisions, and they postpone State contributions until 1966 (at the same time lowering them temporarily). The most important changes, however, have the effect of making the program's benefits more accessible, particularly to the out-of-school young.

The amended act calls for special programs to test, counsel, select, and refer youths 16 and older for occupational training. The age of eligibility for allowances to accompany the training has now been lowered from 19 to 17, and trainees are permitted to work as much as 20 hours a week without endangering their allowances. Many of the disadvantaged young could not take advantage of training without some funds for necessities like transportation and clothing.

To be eligible for allowances, 17-year-olds must either be high school graduates or, if they have not completed high school, must have been out of a school a year and be considered beyond the reach of traditional schooling. The reason is to encourage dropouts to return to school.

Under the amendments, training for these young people may be provided by public agencies or in certain instances by private agencies designated by the State vocational education agencies.

Adult workers aided

In the stipulations of the act which affect older workers, the amount of work experience required for eligibility to receive allowances has been lowered from 3 years to 2, and the ceiling on the weekly allowance has been raised to $10 above the average State unemployment compensation payment. An unemployed member of a family or household may substitute for the unemployed head of the family as long as only one member of the family is receiving a training allowance at any one time.

For older workers an important new feature is the opportunity to learn skills in language and arithmetic. They may receive 20 weeks of additional allowances for training programs that include this kind of teaching.

Some hard-core unemployed are the victims of such changes in the economic climate as the departure of a factory from their home community. The act experiments with a new way to help them—with loans and grants to enable them to relocate where there are jobs.

The 1963 amendments authorize the following Federal support:

	Fiscal 1965	Fiscal 1966
For training and skills development.	$407,000,000 (increased from $161,000,000).	[1] $281, 000, 000
For information, evaluation, and research programs.	$3,000,000	3, 000, 000

[1] State matching (1/3 of cost) begins this year.

Funds to organize the training programs are transferred to the Office of Education each year from appropriations made to the Department of Labor.

LIBRARY SERVICES AND CONSTRUCTION ACT OF 1964 (PUBLIC LAW 88–629)

President Johnson has called libraries "the best training ground for enlightenment that rational man has ever conceived." That statement underscores the impact of the Library Services and Construction Act of 1964 on the intellectual, scientific, social, economic, and spiritual aspects of American life.

By passing the act, Congress sought to arrest the progressive deterioration of the Nation's libraries and to give hundreds of communities (in which more than 18 million Americans live) the first public libraries they have ever had.

Rural and urban communities benefit

The act amends the Library Services Act of 1956, passed originally to help States develop library services for rural readers. It does two main things: (1) It provides, for the first time, for Federal assistance in the construction of libraries as well as in library services, and (2) it extends Federal assistance, in both construction and services, to urban as well as rural areas. More than 100 million readers of all ages and interests are expected to benefit.

Under title I, dealing with services, the States may apply grant funds to salaries, books and other materials, equipment, and various operating expenses. Under title II, devoted to construction, States may apply for funds to build new public libraries and to expand and remodel old ones. The act allots funds to the States in proportion to their population, and each State matches the Federal share in proportion to its per capita income. The maximum Federal contribution is set at 66 percent; the minimum, 33 percent. The act requires that each State's plan for developing its network of library services be submitted to the Commissioner of Education by its library administrative agency.

The 1964 amendments authorized the following Federal funds:

For services: fiscal year 1964, $25 million; fiscal years 1965 and 1966, sums to be determined by Congress.

For construction: fiscal year 1964, $20 million; fiscal years 1965 and 1966, sums to be determined by Congress.

Grants for public libraries, fiscal year 1965

States and outlying parts	1964 allotment	1965 allotment library services	1965 allotment library construction	1965 total allotment
Total	$7, 500, 000	$25, 000, 000	$30, 000, 000	$55, 000, 000
Alabama	184, 438	454, 452	543, 258	997, 710
Alaska	53, 748	124, 540	112, 073	236, 613
Arizona	72, 466	241, 289	264, 660	505, 949
Arkansas	139, 976	293, 816	333, 312	627, 128
California	249, 951	1, 805, 367	2, 308, 865	4, 114, 232
Colorado	85, 158	290, 309	328, 728	619, 037
Connecticut	93, 825	375, 081	439, 523	814, 604
Delaware	55, 032	148, 424	143, 289	291, 713
Florida	166, 338	637, 260	782, 183	1, 419, 443
Georgia	212, 626	527, 841	639, 175	1, 167, 016
Hawaii	54, 572	168, 658	169, 743	238, 392
Idaho	74, 282	172, 392	174, 615	347, 007
Illinois	230, 053	1, 193, 838	1, 509, 614	2, 703, 452
Indiana	211, 595	605, 896	741, 191	1, 347, 087
Iowa	166, 813	399, 202	471, 048	870, 250
Kansas	123, 222	336, 386	388, 950	725, 336
Kentucky	204, 994	429, 650	510, 842	940, 492
Louisiana	157, 157	453, 397	541, 880	995, 277
Maine	86, 234	205, 168	217, 452	422, 620
Maryland	122, 927	436, 435	519, 710	956, 145
Massachusetts	122, 847	658, 637	810, 122	1, 468, 759
Michigan	244, 077	948, 841	1, 189, 411	2, 138, 252
Minnesota	166, 448	470, 415	564, 122	1, 034, 537
Mississippi	172, 914	336, 335	388, 883	725, 218
Missouri	181, 328	568, 713	692, 595	1, 261, 308
Montana	72, 932	173, 214	175, 689	348, 903
Nebraska	103, 187	253, 134	280, 141	533, 275
Nevada	$48, 282	$130, 954	$120, 455	$251, 409
New Hampshire	64, 790	165, 853	166, 068	331, 921
New Jersey	107, 803	758, 265	940, 333	1, 698, 598
New Mexico	71, 780	203, 189	214, 865	418, 054
New York	279, 948	1, 920, 933	2, 459, 907	4, 380, 840
North Carolina	309, 703	594, 357	726, 111	1, 320, 468
North Dakota	80, 123	168, 622	169, 687	338, 309
Ohio	292, 958	1, 153, 175	1, 456, 469	2, 609, 644
Oklahoma	124, 556	352, 626	410, 175	762, 801
Oregon	105, 468	291, 908	330, 818	622, 726
Pennsylvania	355, 049	1, 328, 187	1, 685, 205	3, 013, 392
Rhode Island	51, 417	193, 257	201, 884	395, 141
South Carolina	177, 210	358, 519	417, 877	776, 396
South Dakota	80, 475	173, 838	176, 504	350, 342
Tennessee	206, 690	487, 040	585, 851	1, 072, 891
Texas	274, 252	1, 139, 425	1, 438, 499	2, 577, 924
Utah	61, 883	196, 636	206, 300	402, 936
Vermont	63, 498	142, 303	135, 289	277, 592
Virginia	212, 544	530, 427	642, 555	1, 172, 982
Washington	129, 106	409, 583	484, 616	894, 199
West Virginia	152, 545	301, 862	343, 827	645, 689
Wisconsin	179, 990	528, 780	640, 403	1, 169, 183
Wyoming	53, 955	135, 813	126, 807	262, 620
District of Columbia	----------	182, 892	188, 337	371, 229
American Samoa	11, 963	27, 176	22, 843	50, 019
Guam	15, 190	32, 274	29, 508	61, 782
Puerto Rico	168, 303	354, 933	413, 190	768, 123
Virgin Islands	11, 379	28, 483	24, 552	53, 035

The amendments also increased the basic allotments for public library services to each State from $40,000 to $100,000 and to Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands from $10,000 to $25,000. The District of Columbia also is brought within coverage of the act as applied to States.

Appropriations totaling $55 million were made for library services and construction during fiscal 1965.

CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964: TITLES IV AND VI (PUBLIC LAW 88-352)

Congress included in the Civil Rights Act of 1964 two titles (IV and VI) that bear directly on the schools. These titles give the Commissioner of Education and the Attorney General new powers—within specified limitations—to take significant new steps on behalf of equal educational opportunity.

Title IV requires the Commissioner to conduct a survey for the President and the Congress on the lack of availability of equal opportunity in education because of race, color, religion, or national origin. The Commissioner is to make his report within 2 years, and it is to cover public education at all levels in all sections of the Nation.

The same title authorizes the Commissioner to respond to requests of local officials for technical assistance in the form of materials and advice to help achieve desegregation and prepare teaching staffs and communities for the transition.

Broad technical assistance is possible

Congress recognizes in title IV that, as more Negro children are taken into the regular school system, many communities will face educational problems they had never confronted before. Many of the children will come from neglected schools and from backgrounds which have isolated them from the rest of society. Title IV gives the Commissioner the means to help communities deal not only with the desegregation process itself but with the educational challenge issuing from it. He can arrange with colleges, universities, and school districts for special training institutes for teachers and administrators. He is authorized to grant school districts additional funds to hire specialists in the education of disadvantaged children. On request of a school district, the Office of Education can send consultants—either from the Office staff or from a university or neighboring school district—to help plan and execute improvements in the educational program for children involved in desegregation.

Under title IV the Attorney General also is endowed with new authority which bears directly on education. He has the power for the first time to initiate civil suits against school boards which deny a child equal protection under the law, and against authorities of public colleges which deny any person's enrollment for reasons of race, religion, color, or national origin. Strict boundaries are drawn, however, on the Attorney General's powers. Among the most important are these: The complaint of discrimination must originate with those affected; the Attorney General must deem the complaint justified; and the individual or parents involved must be deemed unable to initiate or maintain legal proceedings themselves for such reasons as expense or jeopardy to their personal welfare.

In title VI of the Civil Rights Act, Congress outlawed discrimination in federally assisted programs. Title VI imposes the responsibility on each agency of the Government to insure that such discrimination is ended—by voluntary compliance if possible but if necessary by discontinuing Federal assistance. The legislation stipulates a 30-day waiting period before funds can be withheld, provides an opportunity for a hearing, and sets forth provisions for judicial review.

Appropriations of $8 million were made for fiscal 1965 to enable the Office of Education to carry out its responsibilities under the Civil Rights Act.

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY, AND YOUTH OFFENSES CONTROL ACT, AMENDMENTS OF 1964 (PUBLIC LAW 87-274)

There is convincing documentation that there is no single cause of juvenile delinquency but rather that it springs from a combination of forces—some social and economic, some personal. Among them are lack of education, joblessness, slum housing, racial discrimination and an array of other problems that transcend individual responsibility and the resources of most communities to deal with them. They are disorders of the society as a whole; and they make juvenile delinquency and youth crime a national as well as local concern.

Delinquency began receiving particularly intensive national attention in 1961 with appointment of the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime, composed of the Attorney General and the Secretaries of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare. Further concern was focused on delinquency with passage of the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961. Through this act and 1964 amendments to it, Congress has paved the way for new approaches to combat juvenile delinquency on many fronts.

The act gives the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, in consultation with the other two members of the President's Committee, the authority to make grants to Government agencies and to private nonprofit groups and institutions for three purposes.

Pilot projects are supported

The first is to generate demonstrations of experimental programs to counteract delinquency and hopefully to make lasting changes in the social patterns that give rise to it. These demonstrations may range from new techniques for training workers involved in youth problems to practices for encouraging cooperation among social workers, teachers, the police, the courts, and others concerned with the fate of young people. Many of the designs for these demonstrations have originated with schools of education and social work and represent the results of years of research.

The second purpose of the grants program directly involves education. Funds are made available to spur the training of manpower which a concerted attack on delinquency demands. One result is the establishment of 14 training centers at as many universities to prepare youth workers in a wide variety of fields. Curriculum development is continuing at universities and at agencies in the fields of health, welfare, correction, law enforcement, and the like. In addition, short-term workshops are being offered by sponsors ranging from schools of education to local courts.

The legislation also addresses itself to the shortage of trained professional and volunteer help by authorizing traineeships in connection with the training centers and workshops. These traineeships are designed to transmit new knowledge and techniques to social workers, teachers, probation officers, policemen, and guidance counselors.

More information is needed

The third purpose of the grants program is to permit the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make studies of problems, trends, and projects related to youth crime and delinquency, and to encourage the free flow of information among all those in the Nation working toward prevention and control.

The 1964 amendments (Public Law 87-274) extend the original act through fiscal 1966 and supplement it with three new provisions. One of these will result in a special study of the impact on delinquency of compulsory school attendance and child labor laws. The others broaden the scope of the demonstration projects to include "techniques for the establishment of high ethical and community standards" and to establish in the District of Columbia a special demonstration of ways in which a community can mobilize to curb delinquency.

The amendments authorize the following funds:

For fiscal 1965: $10 million, plus a special $5 million grant (available over a period of several years until expended) for the District of Columbia project.

For fiscal 1966: Sum to be determined by subsequent legislation.

Congress made a fiscal 1965 appropriation of $10 million for demonstrations, training programs, and technical assistance and $1,500,000 for the 1965 cost of the District of Columbia project.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT OF 1964, EDUCATION PROVISIONS (PUBLIC LAW 88-452)

The education theme is woven securely into the pattern for social change laid out by the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. The act was passed to mobilize the Nation for the rescue of 30 million Americans from the brutalizing conditions which are spawned by poverty and perpetuated by joblessness, illness, dilapidated housing, and despair—but most of all by ignorance and illiteracy. The act recognizes education as an essential means of relieving the harassments which typically have paralyzed the poor, often for generations.

The legislation calls, for example, for a Job Corps which will enroll the unemployed youth of impoverished families and give them another chance for education and vocational training while they accumulate work experience in fields like conservation, where manpower is in short supply. Such schooling is believed likely to take with these young people because it will occur in a wholesome setting—in conservation camps and residential training centers now being established in rural and urban areas of the Nation.

Schools have important role

In this plan to salvage youth of 16 to 21 and make them more employable, public schools and private vocational and technical institutes have an important role to play. The new Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) in the Executive Office of the President has been authorized to provide support for the contributions these institutions can make to the instruction of Job Corps members.

Some 140,000 young men and women are expected to enroll during the Corps' first 2 years of operation. The plan includes paying for the maintenance and living expenses of these young people and compensating them, albeit nominally, for each month of satisfactory work when they have completed their 6 months to 2 years of service.

The focus of another section of the bill is on teenagers who are headed toward dropping out of school and those who have already left but might be induced to return. The cooperation of guidance counselors and teachers will be needed to identify such youngsters. Envisioned for them is a half-time job and half-time school arrangement, with State and local governments and institutions of a public character (such as hospitals and settlement houses) putting the teenagers to work at useful tasks with the aid of Federal funds. Hopefully, the arrangement will sufficiently change the outlook of young people headed for trouble to encourage them to continue their schooling. Their work will at the same time benefit their communities and give them experience as a nurse's aid, laboratory assistant, or landscape gardener—to name a few of the possibilities. The Department of Labor will administer this work-training program.

Since illiteracy tends almost inevitability to perpetuate a life of poverty, the new legislation contains a provision authorizing adult basic literacy programs for people of 18 or over. Grants to the States to help establish programs to teach reading, writing, and other basic skills are being administered by the Office of Education. Each State is entitled to a basic allotment of $50,000, and a formula based on the number of adults with less than a sixth grade education is provided in the act for the distribution of additional sums. The Federal share during the first 2 years may range up to 90 percent of costs, but in the third year may not exceed 50 percent.

Complements area redevelopment

This activity complements that conducted by the Office of Education under the Area Redevelopment Act of 1961. This act provides occupational training for underemployed and unemployed persons in areas designated by the Secretary of Commerce as suffering persistent or chronic unemployment. Funds for training projects are provided by the Department of Labor, $3,335,000 in the 1965 fiscal year. In fiscal 1964 a total of 11,603 persons received training in 38 States.

Another program in the antipoverty bill will help many students of low-income families achieve their aspirations for a college education. Here, funds administered by the Office of Education go directly to the colleges and universities to enable them to offer such students useful part-time work. The work may be on campus or may originate in the community through arrangements made by the college. When the latter is the case, however, the job must serve some public interest—recreation, social service, or the like—and must be work that would not otherwise be accomplished. Under this work-study plan, some of the estimated 150,000 students who will benefit initially are likely to be working part time in activities which will spring from other sections of the new legislation—such as tutoring in the community action programs.

These community action programs often have been characterized as the heart of the new act. Their spirit is one of democratic self-help, their intent to marshal all the resources and motivation which communities can tap within themselves to strike at the causes of poverty.

The community draws its own plan

Each community is to be the architect of its own total design for attacking poverty at its sources, but it is required that designs be founded on the maximum feasible participation of people within the area. Communities submitting plans which meet with OEO approval become eligible for Federal support ranging up to 90 percent of the cost. Technical help will be given to local communities during both the planning and action phases by the OEO field staff and, where appropriate, by the staffs of other Federal agencies as well—for example, the Small Business Administration, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Housing and Home Finance Agency. State agencies in education and other fields will receive Federal support to enable them to serve as further sources of technical aid to communities. Local nonprofit agencies and institutions, as well as agencies of local government, may take the initiative in designing community action programs and still be eligible for Federal help.

No blueprints for these programs appear in the legislation, since they must evolve from each community's self-analysis. In general, however, they are expected to include projects geared to the problems of the poor in numerous fields—among them, employment, job training and counseling, health, vocational rehabilitation, and of course education. Hopefully, the entire education potential of communities will be engaged to mesh with the larger plan. For, while the legislation prohibits Federal support for general education purposes (thus no schools can be built, for example, or teachers' salaries supplemented), the enabling phrase "special remedial and other noncurricular educational assistance" which appears in the law was designed to stimulate a variety of education projects to offset the effects of poverty.

Support the extra effort

The phrase qualifies for Federal support many educational activities which are carried on before, after, in addition to, or alongside the regular school program (i.e., the program a school district had in operation when it applied for the support). These activities might include:

Preschool activities to help cancel out educational disabilities that take root early in life and predispose children to school failure.

The lighted schoolhouse serving the community's needs by night as well as during the day and offering remedial reading and arithmetic after school, specialized night classes for parents, or a place for the children of the poor to study.

Backup services to teachers to give them a better chance for succeeding in slum schools —for example, Federal funds to cover the salary of a specialist in speech and hearing.

Projects to bring art and music within reach of the deprived child and expand his view of the world.

Since its interests run parallel to such undertakings, the Office of Education's Task Force on the Education of Disadvantaged Youth is making available to the OEO the results of its own research projects and the insights which have flowed from them. But how imaginatively the Nation carried out the educational mandate which is implicit in the community action section of the new law will depend in great part on the ability of the Nation's schoolpeople to come up with creative ideas.

Education will receive support in another section of the act as well—for instance, through the programs to aid migrant workers and to train the parents of dependent children. The programs in which education plays a prime part are authorized to receive the following funds:

Fiscal 1965:

Youth programs (Job Corps, work - training, work-study)	$412, 500, 000
Urban and rural community action programs	315, 000, 000
Adult basic education programs	25, 000, 000

Sums for fiscal 1966 and 1967 will be determined by subsequent authorizations.

The total authorization for the Economic Opportunity Act, including the above educational activities as well as others, is $947,500,000 for fiscal year 1965. Sums appropriated amount to $800 million.

Work-study program fund distribution by States

Alabama	$1, 716, 951
Alaska	53, 775
Arizona	611, 507
Arkansas	1, 055, 469
California	5, 809, 750
Colorado	737, 359
Connecticut	748, 034
Delaware	143, 963
Florida	1, 873, 202
Georgia	1, 926, 678
Hawaii	247, 874
Idaho	272, 011
Illinois	3, 169, 810
Indiana	1, 682, 425
Iowa	1, 203, 831
Kansas	933, 763
Kentucky	1, 464, 578
Louisiana	1, 732, 678
Maine	342, 086
Maryland	1, 025, 401
Massachusetts	1, 870, 943
Michigan	2, 733, 109
Minnesota	1, 465, 634
Mississippi	1, 475, 646
Missouri	1, 728, 984
Montana	283, 175
Nebraska	616, 509
Nevada	80, 431
New Hampshire	212, 367
New Jersey	1, 553, 989
New Mexico	415, 312
New York	5, 085, 160
North Carolina	2, 536, 967
North Dakota	336, 631
Ohio	3, 149, 790
Oklahoma	1, 118, 484
Oregon	714, 246
Pennsylvania	3, 705, 820
Rhode Island	296, 218
South Carolina	1, 360, 279
South Dakota	355, 295
Tennessee	1, 858, 717
Texas	4, 317, 727
Utah	479, 008
Vermont	184, 663
Virginia	1, 636, 483
Washington	1, 088, 613
West Virginia	878, 882
Wisconsin	1, 493, 608
Wyoming	125, 246
District of Columbia	356, 919
Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, Virgin Islands	1, 434, 000
Total	70, 266, 000

COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS—FUND DISTRIBUTION BY STATES

Estimated distribution of $228,900,000,[1] with ⅓ on the basis of public assistance recipients; ⅓ on the basis of unemployment; and ⅓ on the basis of the number of children under 18 in families with income of less than $1,000

	Total estimated State amounts	Estimated State amounts on basis of—		
		Public assistance recipients [2]	Unemployment [3]	Children under 18 in families with income less than $1,000 [4]
United States and outlying parts	$228, 900, 000	$76, 300, 000	$76, 300, 000	$76, 300, 000
50 States and District of Columbia	223, 180, 000	74, 393, 333	74, 393, 334	74, 393, 333
Alabama	6, 820, 544	2, 115, 677	1, 141, 377	3, 563, 490
Alaska	279, 626	69, 349	122, 290	87, 987
Arizona	1, 802, 985	633, 862	487, 221	681, 902
Arkansas	3, 485, 062	978, 643	636, 687	1, 869, 732
California	20, 026, 577	8, 245, 714	7, 997, 405	3, 783, 458
Colorado	2, 097, 816	1, 006, 315	607, 570	483, 931
Connecticut	2, 314, 517	863, 251	1, 077, 320	373, 946
Delaware	424, 014	164, 564	149, 466	109. 984
Florida	6. 045, 590	1, 886, 651	2, 135, 229	2, 023, 710
Georgia	6, 198, 027	1, 841, 865	1, 232, 610	3, 123, 552
Hawaii	586, 487	179, 519	230, 993	175, 975
Idaho	672, 868	193, 434	281, 462	197, 972
Illinois	10, 473, 529	4, 159, 357	3, 806, 532	2, 507, 640
Indiana	3, 413, 240	716, 517	1, 486, 896	1, 209, 827
Iow	2, 666, 764	854, 547	580, 394	1, 231, 823
Kansas	1, 896, 069	695, 881	584, 276	615, 912
Kentucky	5, 380, 845	1, 487, 929	1, 077, 320	2, 815, 596
Louisiana	6, 393, 796	2, 562. 965	1, 279, 197	2, 551, 634
Maine	1, 118, 624	452, 851	401, 811	263, 962
Maryland	2, 893, 312	997, 582	1, 059, 850	835, 880
Massachusetts	5. 316, 684	1, 921, 115	2, 581, 686	813, 883
Michigan	7, 924, 188	2, 897. 569	3, 002, 909	2, 023, 710
Minnesota	3, 950. 395	1, 258, 844	1. 525. 718	1, 165. 833
Mississippi	6. 330. 546	1, 738, 946	720. 155	3, 871, 445
Missouri	5, 846, 371	2, 379, 736	1, 684, 890	1, 781, 745
Montana	694, 720	219, 821	232, 934	241, 965
Nebraska	1, 174, 455	295, 833	372, 695	505, 927
Nevada	284, 114	80, 948	159, 172	43, 994
New Hampshire	467, 301	147, 676	209, 641	109, 984
New Jersey	6, 000, 110	1, 626, 891	3, 317, 370	1, 055, 849
New Mexico	1, 346, 786	451, 998	300, 873	593, 915
New York	18, 559, 853	6, 874, 697	8, 385, 629	3, 299, 527
North Carolina	8, 152, 018	1, 892, 451	1, 508, 248	4, 751, 319
North Dakota	734, 861	175, 211	207, 700	351, 950
Ohio	9, 753, 590	3, 798, 502	3, 645, 419	2, 309, 669
Oklahoma	3, 623, 579	1, 679, 351	844, 386	1, 099, 842
Oregon	1, 568, 612	507, 510	687, 156	373, 946
Pennsylvania	13, 843, 764	4, 692, 989	6, 489, 157	2, 661, 618
Rhode Island	1, 130, 101	395, 092	493, 044	241, 965
South Carolina	4, 662, 941	705, 360	790, 035	3, 167, 546
South Dakota	896, 035	199, 234	168, 877	527, 924
Tennessee	6, 079, 477	1, 469, 029	1, 486, 896	3, 123, 552
Texas	12, 219, 350	3, 242, 300	3, 499, 835	5, 477, 215
Utah	917, 502	381, 776	337, 754	197, 972
Vermont	414, 439	116, 167	188, 288	109, 984
Virginia	4, 382, 525	719, 942	956, 971	2, 705, 612
Washington	3, 325, 239	1, 466, 360	1, 286, 961	571, 918
West Virginia	4, 163, 690	1, 543, 353	1, 102, 555	1, 517, 782
Wisconsin	3, 162, 960	1, 070, 532	1, 234, 551	857, 877
Wyoming	326, 477	89, 024	149, 466	87, 987
District of Columbia	937, 025	248, 603	446, 457	241, 965
Outlying parts [5]	5, 720, 000	1, 906, 667	1, 906, 666	1, 906, 667

---

[1] $315,000,000 minus $20,000,000 for research and training (sec. 207), minus $9,000,000 for technical assistance and training (secs. 206 and 209), minus 2 percent of the balance ($5,720,000) for distribution to the territories, and minus $57,100,000 reserved for distribution by Director, Office of Economic Opportunity (sec. 203).

[2] Public assistance recipients, January 1964.

[3] Total unemployment, average 1963 (preliminary 11-month average). Data for Tennessee are for 1962.

[4] Estimate based on the assumption that there are an average of 5 children in families with 4 or more children as shown in PC-1-D series, 1960 census.

[5] Includes American Samoa, Canal Zone, Guam, Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY—ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM

Estimated distribution by States of $24,460,000 for the adult basic education program

State	Population [1]	Distribution
Alabama	369, 538	$766, 796
Alaska	12, 123	50, 000
Arizona	93, 587	194, 194
Arkansas	202, 170	419, 505
California	687, 376	1, 426, 315
Colorado	59, 262	122, 969
Connecticut	136, 029	282, 262
Delaware	21, 229	50, 000
Florida	357, 352	741, 510
Georgia	476, 075	987, 862
Hawaii	51, 426	106, 710
Idaho	17, 745	50, 000
Illinois	517, 183	1, 073, 162
Indiana	178, 192	369, 751
Iowa	70, 074	145, 405
Kansas	61, 058	126, 696
Kentucky	308, 090	639, 291
Louisiana	443, 389	920, 038
Maine	35, 010	72, 646
Maryland	196, 031	406, 767
Massachusetts	247, 132	512, 802
Michigan	339, 026	703, 484
Minnesota	98, 952	205, 327
Mississippi	278, 065	576, 989
Missouri	244, 266	506, 855
Montana	21, 563	50, 000
Nebraska	41, 022	85, 121
Nevada	8, 012	50, 000
New Hampshire	20, 160	50, 000
New Jersey	363, 811	754, 913
New Mexico	71, 915	149, 225
New York	1, 081, 984	2, 245, 131
North Carolina	530, 639	1, 101, 083
North Dakota	26, 136	54, 233
Ohio	421, 276	874, 153
Oklahoma	145, 550	302, 018
Oregon	47, 761	99, 105
Pennsylvania	630, 417	1, 308, 124
Rhode Island	48, 727	101, 109
South Carolina	318, 568	661, 033
South Dakota	21, 947	50, 000
Tennessee	384, 621	798, 094

Estimated distribution by States of $24,460,000 for the adult basic education program—Continued

State	Population [1]	Distribution
Texas	914, 439	$1, 897, 473
Utah	17, 551	50, 000
Vermont	11, 886	50, 000
Virginia	392, 678	814, 812
Washington	78, 304	162, 482
West Virginia	151, 204	313, 750
Wisconsin	168, 461	349, 559
Wyoming	9, 361	50, 000
District of Columbia	44, 359	92, 046
Outlying parts (Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, Virgin Islands)	----------	489, 200

[1] Estimated population 18 and over with less than 6 grades of school completed.

NATIONAL ARTS AND CULTURAL DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1964 (PUBLIC LAW 88–579)

Historically, encouragement for the arts has depended in the United States on private philanthropy, civic endeavor, and commercial sponsorship. It has not been seen as a national concern.

The National Arts and Cultural Development Act of 1964, however, opens the way for a significant departure from this pattern. It establishes a National Council on the Arts in the Executive Office of the President, with a membership composed of practicing artists, cultural leaders, authorities in the various arts, and, ex officio, the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution. The act invests this group with a number of responsibilities—among them to recommend means of increasing the Nation's cultural resources, to foster artistic endeavors both nationally and internationally, and to build a greater appreciation of the arts.

These undertakings will reinforce the efforts of schools to give students experience with artistic achievement. They will also complement Office of Education programs to foster research and teaching in the arts and humanities.

To enable the Council to carry out its work, the act authorizes appropriations of $150,000. Congress appropriated $50,000 for the Council's use in fiscal 1965.

NURSE TRAINING ACT OF 1964 (PUBLIC LAW 88–581)

Like schools in the other health professions, schools of nursing have been struggling with overstrained facilities, underpowered teaching staffs, and overburdened budgets. Moreover, the scarcity of student aid funds discourages many young women from entering a profession so short of personnel that 1 in 20 professional nursing posts in hospitals goes unfilled. Enrollment is rising; but the gains are offset by two recent developments. One is the tendency to delegate greater responsibility for medical procedures to nurses, thereby reducing the number of patients each nurse can care for. The second is the growth of the Nation's older-aged population, a trend that has enormously increased the need for long-term care. As a result of all these developments, the shortage of nursing talent has become critical.

Critical shortage of nurses predicted

The 1962 report of the Public Health Service's Consultant Group on Nursing pointed out that the Nation would require 300,000 new nurses by 1970 but that under existing circumstances it stood no chance of reaching that goal. Congress answered with the Nurse Training Act of 1964.

The new act authorizes construction grants to boost the enrollment capacity of colleges, universities, junior colleges, and hospitals.

It allows Federal contribtuions of as much as two-thirds of the cost of new buildings and half the cost of improving existing facilities. Schools are prohibited, however, from using these funds for living quarters, offsite improvements, facilities for patient care, or buildings used for sectarian instruction or religious worship.

Federal support also is authorized for a wide range of teaching improvement projects, among them efforts to develop the curriculum, experiment with new teaching methods, upgrade faculties, and improve supervision in clinical practice. Proposed projects will be judged according to their potential adaptability to the needs of nursing schools in general and their ability to contribute to a better geographic distribution of first-class nursing education across the country.

The act singles out for special support the accredited diploma schools operated by hospitals, many of which have been curtailing their programs or closing their doors because of spiraling costs. A grant formula for these schools is related to the increased enrollment they can expect as the result of the student loan funds authorized in another section of the act.

The bill launches a major student loan program to attract new recruits to nursing. Further, it enlarges the existing program of graduate traineeships in order to propagate the supervisory, administrative, and teaching talents, and clinical specialties.

All three major types of nursing schools (those of colleges and universities, those of junior colleges, and those of hospitals) are eligible to participate in the student loan program as long as they are public or nonprofit and meet accreditation requirements. The loans are earmarked for students who qualify both by need and academic standing. They are limited to $1,000 per student per year and may not run concurrently with a National Defense Education Act loan; and they are accompanied by a "forgiveness" clause allowing as much as 50 percent of the loan to be canceled over the years in return for full-time service as a nurse in a public or nonprofit setting.

A program for leadership

The traineeships are intended to qualify graduate nurses for leadership roles. They may be used either for full-time university study (maximum, 24 months) or for short-term training organized by health agencies and other nonprofit sponsors. The funds go to the institutions, which select trainees according to their own policies but in keeping with criteria spelled out in the act. For example, in the awarding of university traineeships, need as well as ability must be a factor. In the case of short-term awards, the trainee must be employed in (or committed to) a clinical specialty or an administrative, supervisory, or teaching post from which the individual's employer agrees to a temporary release.

Various divisions of the Public Health Service are responsible for administering the Nurse Training Act. To assist in policy matters, the legislation sets up a National Advisory Council on Nurse Training with the Surgeon General as Chairman and the Commissioner of Education (ex officio) among the 17 members.

The following funds were authorized for the Nurse Training Act:

	Fiscal 1965	1966	1967	1968	1969
Construction grants	(1)	$15,000,000	$25,000,000	$25,000,000	$25,000 000
Teaching improvement grants	$2,000,000	3,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
Reimbursement, diploma schools	4,000,000	7,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
Student loans	3,100,000	8,900,000	16,800,000	25,300,000	30,900,000
Traineeships	8,000,000	9,000,000	10,000,000	11,000,000	12,000,000

[1] Program to begin in fiscal 1966.

NOTE.—To carry out the provisions of the Nurse Training Act in fiscal 1965 Congress appropriated $17,000,000.

SOURCES OF INFORMATION

Inquiries about the legislation discussed in this booklet should be directed to the Federal agencies indicated below. Where the source given is the Office of Education, please complete the address by adding: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C., 20202.

Health Professions Educational Assistance Act: Bureau of State Services (Community Health), Public Health Service, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C., 20201.

Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act: Education provisions: Division of Handicapped Children and Youth, Office of Education.

Higher Education Facilities Act: Bureau of Higher Education Facilities, Office of Education.

Vocational Education Act: Division of Vocational and Technical Education, Office of Education.

National Defense Education Act

Title II, student loans: Student Financial Aid Branch, Division of College and University Assistance, Office of Education.

Title III, instruction in critical subjects: Instructional Resources Branch, Division of State Grants, Office of Education.

Title IV, graduate fellowships: Graduate Fellowship Branch, Division of College and University Assistance, Office of Education.

Title V–A, guidance, counseling, and testing services: Guidance and Counseling Program Branch, Division of State Grants, Office of Education.

Title V–B, guidance and counseling training institutes: Counseling and Guidance Institutes Branch, Division of College and University Assistance, Office of Education.

Title VI, language development: Language Development Branch, Division of College and University Assistance, Office of Education.

Title VII, communications media: Media Research and Dissemination Program, Division of Educational Research, Office of Education.

Title VIII, technical education: Division of Vocational and Technical Education, Office of Education.

Title IX, science information: National Science Foundation, Washington, D.C., 20550.

Title X, State statistical services: Field Programs Branch, Division of Education Statistics, Office of Education.

Title XI, training institutes, critical subjects: Division of College and University Assistance, Office of Education.

School assistance to federally affected areas: Division of School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas, Office of Education.

Manpower Development and Training Act: Training provisions: Manpower Development and Training Program, Division of Vocational and Technical Education, Office of Education. All other provisions: Manpower Administration, Department of Labor, Washington, D.C., 20210.

Library Services and Construction Act: Division of Library Services, Office of Education.

Civil Rights Act of 1964: Education assistance programs: Office of the Commissioner, Office of Education.

Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act: Office of Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime, Welfare Administration, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C., 20201.

Economic Opportunity Act (education provisions)

Job Corps: Office of Economic Opportunity, Executive Office of the President, Washington, D.C., 20506.

Work-training programs: Neighborhood Youth Corps, U.S. Department of Labor, Washington, D.C., 20210.

College work-study programs: Student Financial Aid Branch, Division of College and University Assistance, Office of Education.

Adult basic education program: Adult Education Branch, Division of Library Services, Office of Education.

Community action program: Office of Economic Opportunity, Executive Office of the President, Washington, D.C., 20506.

National Arts and Cultural Development Act: National Council on the Arts, Executive Office of the President, Washington, D.C., 20506.

Nurse Training Act: Bureau of State Services (Community Health), Public Health Service, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C., 20201.

CHRONOLOGY OF LEGISLATION

Public Law No. 88–129: Health Professions Educational Asisstance Act of 1963, date signed by President, September 24, 1963.

Public Law No. 88–164: Education Provisions (title III), Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act of 1963, date signed by President, October 31, 1963.

Public Law No. 88–204: Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, date signed by President, December 16, 1963.

Public Law No. 88–210, part A: Vocational Education Act of 1963, date signed by President, December 18, 1963.

Public Law No. 88–210, part B: National Defense Education Act, Amendments of 1963,[2] date signed by President, December 18, 1963.

Public Law No. 88–210, part C: School Assistance to Federally Affected Areas Amendments of 1963,[2] date signed by President, December 18, 1963.

Public Law No. 88–214: Manpower Development and Training Act Amendments of 1963, date signed by President, December 19, 1963.

Public Law No. 88–269: Library Services and Construction Act of 1964, date signed by President, February 11, 1964.

Public Law No. 88–352: Civil Rights Act of 1964: titles IV and VI, date signed by President, July 2, 1964.

Public Law No. 88–368: Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Contract Act, Amendments of 1964, date signed by President, July 9, 1964.

Public Law No. 88–452: Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, date signed by President, August 20, 1964.

Public Law No. 88–579: National Arts and Cultural Development Act of 1964, date signed by President, September 3, 1964.

Public Law No. 88–581: Nurse Training Act of 1964, date signed by President, September 4, 1964.

Public Law No. 88–665: National Defense Education Act, Amendments of 1964; and School Assistance to Federally Affected Areas Amendments of 1964,[2] date signed by President, October 16, 1964.

---

[2] The National Defense Education Act and federally affected areas laws were amended twice by the 88th Congress.

Office of Education—fiscal 1965 appropriations

Higher education facilities construction (Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, Public Law 88-204)	[1] $463,150,000
Morrill Land-Grant College Act (Aug. 30, 1890, as amended)	2,550,000
Further endowment of colleges of agriculture and the mechanical arts (Bankhead-Jones Act, Public Law 74-184, as amended)	11,950,000
Assistance for school construction in federally affected areas (Public Law 81-815, as amended)	58,400,000
Payments to school districts (maintenance and operations) (Public Law 81-874 as amended)	332,000,000

Office of Education—fiscal 1965 appropriations—Continued

National Defense Education Act (Public Law 85-864, as amended, including 1963 and 1964 amendments)	[1] $348,603,000
Smith-Hughes Vocational Education Act (Public Law 64-347, as amended)	7,161,455
Expansion and improvement of vocational education (Public Law 79-586, as amended, and including Public Law 88-210)	158,296,000
Assistance for public library services and construction (Public Law 84-597, as amended, including Public Law 88-269)	55,000,000
Educational improvement for the handicapped (Public Law 85-926, as amended, and including Public Law 88-164)	16,500,000

Office of Education—fiscal 1965 appropriations—Continued

Cooperative Research Act (Public Law 83-531)	$15,840,000
Educational research—special foreign currency program (Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act, Public Law 83-480, as amended)	500,000
Foreign language training and area studies (Fulbright-Hays Act, Public Law 87-256)	1,500,000
Civil rights educational activities (Public Law 88-352)	8,000,000
Salaries and expenses	[2] 19,699,000
Total	1,499,149,455

[1] Includes loans as well as grants.

[2] Total administrative expense of Office of Education and authorized programs.

Legislative progress, National Education Improvement Act of 1963 (H.R. 3000, S. 580)

(Following is a description of the progress of the 24 parts of the omnibus education bill sent to the Congress by President Kennedy on Jan. 29, 1963. Public law numbers are indicated.)

24 parts	Committee or 1-House action	Extended without amendment	Substantially or totally enacted
1. Student loans (title II, National Defense Education Act)			
2. Student loan insurance			Public Law 88-210, 665.
3. College work-study program (title I-C of Economic Opportunity Act)			
4. Graduate fellowships (title IV, National Defense Education Act)			Public Law 88-452.
5. Higher education facilities, loans for			Public Law 88-210, 665.
6. Public community college academic facilities			Public Law 88-204.
7. College-level technical education			Public Law 88-204.
8. College and university libraries			Public Law 88-204.
9. Graduate schools			Public Law 88-204.
10. Modern foreign language training and research (title VI-A, National Defense Education Act)			Public Law 88-204.
11. Institutes for advanced study for teachers (includes title V-B of National Defense Education Act and new title XI)			Public Law 88-210, 665.
12. Teacher preparation programs			Public Law 88-210, 665.
13. Specialized training for teachers and related educational personnel			
14. Educational research and demonstration:			
A. Cooperative research			
B. National Defense Education Act title VII, extension of			Public Law 88-665.
15. State statistical services (title X, National Defense Education Act)			Public Law 88-210, 665.
16. Public elementary and secondary education		Public Law 88-210, 665.	
17. Science, mathematics, and modern foreign language instruction (title III, National Defense Education Act)			
18. Guidance, counseling, and testing (title V-A, National Defense Education Act)			Public Law 88-210, 665.
19. Federally affected areas (Public Laws 815, 874)			Public Law 88-210, 665.
20. Vocational education		Public Law 88-210, 665.	
21. Education of handicapped children			Public Law 88-210.
22. General university extension education			Public Law 88-164.
23. Adult basic education (title II-B of Economic Opportunity Act)			Public Law 88-452.
24. Public community libraries			Public Law 88-269.

EXHIBIT 2

S. —

A bill to amend Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress, in order to provide assistance to local educational agencies in the education of children of needy families and children residing in areas of substantial unemployment with unemployed parents.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 1 of the Act entitled "An Act to provide financial assistance for local educational agencies in areas affected by Federal activity, and for other purposes", approved September 30, 1950 (20 U.S.C. 236), is amended (1) by inserting "(a)" after "SECTION 1." and (2) by inserting at the end of such section a new subsection as follows:

"(b) It is further declared that in recognition of the continuing policy and responsibility of the Federal Government to promote full employment throughout the Nation and to encourage education necessary to such employment, it is also the purpose of this Act to provide assistance to local educational agencies in the education of children of needy families and children residing in areas of substantial unemployment with unemployed parents."

SEC. 2. Such Act is further amended by inserting after section 4 a new section as follows:

"CHILDREN OF NEEDY FAMILIES AND CHILDREN RESIDING IN AREAS OF SUBSTANTIAL UNEMPLOYMENT WITH UNEMPLOYED PARENTS

"Authorization

"SEC. 4A. (a) For the purpose of computing the amount to which a local educational agency is entitled under this section for any fiscal year, the Commissioner shall determine the number of children who were in average daily attendance at the schools of such agency, and for whom such agency provided free public education, during such fiscal year, and who, while in attendance at such schools—

"(1) were dependent children for the purposes of title IV of the Social Security Act, or

"(2) resided in an area, which during a major portion of such year was designated by the Secretary of Labor as an area of substantial unemployment, with one or more parents neither of whom was regularly employed and at least one of whom was drawing State unemployment compensation.

For the purposes of this section a child may not be counted under both clauses 1 and 2 of this subsection for the same period.

"DETERMINATION OF AMOUNT

"(b) The amount to which a local educational agency is entitled under this section for any fiscal year shall be an amount equal to (1) 25 per centum of the local contribution rate (determined under section 3(d)) multiplied by (2) the number of children determined under subsection (a).

"MINIMUM REQUIREMENT

"(c) No local educational agency shall be entitled to receive any payment for a fiscal year with respect to a number of children determined under subsection (a) unless the number of children who were in average daily attendance during such year and to whom such subsection applies—

"(1) is ten or more; and

"(2) amounts to 3 per centum or more of the total number of children who were in average daily attendance during such year and for whom such agency provided free public education.

Notwithstanding the preceding provisions of this subsection, the Commissioner may waive the 3 per centum condition of entitlement whenever, in his judgment, exceptional circumstances exist which would make the application of such condition inequitable and would defeat the purposes of this section.

"DETERMINATION OF NUMBER OF CHILDREN

"(d) The determination whether a local educational agency has met the percentage requirement for eligibility under this section for any fiscal year shall be made on the basis of estimates by the Commissioner prior to the close of such year, except that an underestimate made by the Commissioner pursuant to this subsection shall not operate to deprive an agency of its entitlement to any payments under this section to which it would be entitled had the estimate been accurate."

SEC. 3. Sections 3(f) and 4(d) of such Act are each amended (1) by inserting after "such agency is otherwise entitled under this section for such year" the following: "and the two succeeding fiscal years", and (2) by striking out "current expenditures for such year" and inserting in lieu thereof "current expenditures for such years".

SEC. 4. Section 5 of such Act is amended (1) in subsection (a) by striking out "or 4" and inserting in lieu thereof "4, or 4A", and (2) in subsection (c) by striking out "and 4(a)" and inserting in lieu thereof "4(a), and 4A".

SEC. 5. Section 9 of such Act is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following:

"(11) The term 'State unemployment compensation' means unemployment compensation paid to an individual under State law or title XV of the Social Security Act."

SEC. 6. The amendments made by this Act shall be effective for fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1965.

EXHIBIT 3

A bill to amend Public Laws 815 and 874, Eighty-first Congress, to provide financial assistance in the construction and operation of public elementary and secondary schools in areas affected by a major disaster.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act of September 23, 1950, as amended (20 U.S.C. 631–645), is amended by inserting, immediately after section 15 of that Act, the following new section:

"SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION ASSISTANCE IN MAJOR DISASTER AREAS

"SEC. 16. (a) If the Commissioner determines with respect to any local educational agency that—

"(1)(A) such agency is located in whole or in part within an area which has suffered a major disaster as a result of any flood, drought, fire, hurricane, earthquake, storm, or other catastrophe which, in the determination of the President pursuant to section 2(a) of the Act of September 30, 1950 (42 U.S.C. 1855a(a)), is or threatens to be of sufficient severity and magnitude to warrant disaster assistance by the Federal Government, and

"(B) the Governor of the State in which such agency is located has certified the need for disaster assistance under this section, and has given assurance of expenditure of a reasonable amount of the funds of the government of such State, or of any political subdivision thereof, for the same or similar purposes with respect to such catastrophe;

"(2) public elementary or secondary school facilities of such agency have been destroyed or seriously damaged as a result of this major disaster;

"(3) such agency is making a reasonable tax effort and is exercising due diligence in availing itself of State and other financial assistance available for the replacement or restoration of such school facilities; and

"(4) such agency does not have sufficient funds available to it from State, local, and other Federal sources (including funds available under other provisions of this Act), and from the proceeds of insurance on such school facilities to provide the minimum school facilities needed for the restoration or replacement of the school facilities so destroyed or seriously damaged,

he may provide the additional assistance necessary to enable such agency to provide such facilities, upon such terms and in such amounts (subject to the provisions of this section) as the Commissioner may consider to be in the public interest; but such additional assistance, plus the amount which the Commissioner determines to be available from State, local, and other Federal sources (including funds available under other provisions of this Act), and from the proceeds of insurance, may not exceed the cost of construction incident to the restoration or replacement of the school facilities destroyed or damaged as a result of the disaster.

"(b) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section. Pending such appropriation, the Commissioner may expend from any funds heretofore or hereafter appropriated for expenditure in accordance with other sections of this Act such sums as may be necessary for immediately providing assistance under this section, such appropriations to be reimbursed from the appropriations authorized by this subsection when made.

"(c) No payment may be made to any local educational agency under subsection (a) except upon application therefor which is submitted through the appropriate State educational agency and filed with the Commissioner in accordance with regulations prescribed by him, and which meets the requirements of section 6(b)(1). In determining the order in which such applications shall be approved, the Commissioner shall consider the relative educational and financial needs of the local educational agencies which have submitted approvable applications. No payment may be made under subsection (a) unless the Commissioner finds, after consultation with the State and local educational agencies, that the project or projects with respect to which it is made are not inconsistent with overall State plans for the construction of school facilities. All determinations made by the Commissioner under this section shall be made only after consultation with the appropriate State educational agency and the local educational agency.

"(d) Amounts paid by the Commissioner to local educational agencies under subsection (a) may be paid in advance or by way of reimbursement and in such installments as the Commissioner may determine. Any funds paid to a local educational agency and not expended or otherwise used for the purposes for which paid shall be repaid to the Treasury of the United States.

"(e) None of the provisions of sections 1 to 10, both inclusive, other than section 6(b)(1), shall apply with respect to this section."

SEC. 2. The Act of September 30, 1950, as amended (20 U.S.C. 236–244), is amended by inserting, immediately after section 9 of that Act, the following new section:

"ASSISTANCE FOR CURRENT SCHOOL EXPENDITURES IN MAJOR DISASTER AREAS

"SEC. 10. (a) If the Commissioner determines with respect to any local educational agency that—

"(1)(A) such agency is located in whole or in part within an area which has suffered a major disaster as a result of any flood, drought, fire, hurricane, earthquake, storm, or other catastrophe which, in the determination of the President pursuant to section 2(a) of the Act of September 30, 1950 (42 U.S.C. 1855(a)), is or threatens to be of sufficient severity and magnitude to warrant disaster assistance by the Federal Government, and

"(B) the Governor of the State in which such agency is located has certified the need for disaster assistance under this section, and has given assurance of expenditure of a reasonable amount of the funds of the government of such State, or of any political subdivision thereof, for the same or similar purposes with respect to such catastrophe; and

"(2) such agency is making a reasonable tax effort and is exercising due diligence in availing itself of State and other financial assistance, but as a result of such major disaster it is unable to secure sufficient funds to meet the cost of providing free public education for the children attending the schools of such agency,

he may provide to such agency the additional assistance necessary to provide free public education to the children attending the schools of such agency, upon such terms and in such amounts (subject to the provisions of this section) as the Commissioner may consider to be in the public interest. Such additional assistance may be provided for a period not greater than a five fiscal year period beginning with the fiscal year in which the President has determined that such area suffered a major disaster. The amount so provided for any fiscal year shall not exceed the amount which the Commissioner determines to be necessary to enable such agency, with the State, local, and other Federal funds available to it for such purpose, to provide a level of education equivalent to that maintained in the schools of such agency during the last full fiscal year prior to the occurrence of such major disaster. The amount, if any, so provided for the second, third, and fourth fiscal years following the fiscal year in which the President determined that such area has suffered a major disaster shall not exceed 75 per centum, 50 per centum, and 25 per centum, respectively, of the amount so provided for the first fiscal year following such determination.

"(b) In addition to and apart from the funds provided under subsection (a), the Commissioner is authorized to provide to such agency an amount which he determines to be necessary to replace instructional and maintenance supplies, equipment, and materials (including textbooks) destroyed or seriously damaged as a result of such major disaster, and to lease or otherwise provide (other than by acquisition of land or erection of facilities) school and cafeteria facilities needed to replace temporarily such facilities which have been made unavailable as a result of the major disaster.

"(c) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section. Pending such appropriation, the Commissioner may expend from any funds heretofore or hereafter appropriated for expenditure in accordance with other sections of this Act, such sums as may be necessary for immediately providing assistance under this section, such appropriations to be reimbursed from the appropriations authorized by this subsection when made.

"(d) No payment may be made to any local educational agency under this section except upon application therefor which is submitted through the appropriate State educational agency and is filed with the Commissioner in accordance with regulations prescribed by him. In determining the order in which such applications shall be approved, the Commissioner shall consider the relative educational and financial needs of the local educational agencies which have submitted approvable applications.

"(e) Amounts paid by the Commissioner to local educational agencies under this section may be paid in advance or by way of reimbursement and in such installments as the Commissioner may determine. Any funds paid to a local educational agency and not expended or otherwise used for the purposes for which paid shall be repaid to the Treasury of the United States."

PROCEDURES IN FEDERAL CRIMINAL CASES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in June of 1963, I introduced two bills dealing with procedures in Federal criminal cases. One of them, S. 1801, sought to spell out the "speedy trial" which is guaranteed by the sixth amendment to the Constitution.

The second was S. 1802. It sought to spell out some of the attributes of the "fair trial" also promised by the sixth amendment. There could have been no more dramatic display of the need for this legislation than the running television commentary on the weekend of November 22, 1963, when police authorities of Dallas, Tex., passed on to the Nation's television audience the evidence against Lee Harvey Oswald before the man ever saw a lawyer and before he was formally charged with any crime. The result was a second murder, a lynching, that was as shameful to the American system of government as was the murder of the President.

I appreciate that my bill would have no application to State or local authorities. It would, however, restrict the pretrial release of information to the press by either defense or prosecution in Federal cases. The establishment of some rules on this subject at the Federal level would contribute greatly to improvement at the State and local level.

Recently, the Judicial Conference has reported favorably on the principle of S. 1802. It suggested certain changes in the enforcement of the restriction which I have incorporated in a new bill. Its report reflects a growing concern about the release of evidence before it is ever heard by a judge or jury, making it difficult to find jurymen who have not formed some opinion of a case.

But it has another bad effect that is less appreciated. It conditions the public to expect a certain verdict that may not be forthcoming when the case is heard in full. Then there are outcries that justice is too lenient and that criminals are being set loose in the streets.

Restrictions on pretrial publicity applied to prosecution and defense are in the best interest both of accused persons and of public confidence in our judicial system.

I send both bills to the desk, in behalf of myself and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], and ask that they lie on the table for 1 week to give any Senators who may wish to cosponsor them an opportunity to do so.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point sections of the report of the Judicial Conference on S. 1802 and on S. 1801.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills will be received, appropriately referred and held at the desk, and, without objection, sections of the report of the Judicial Conference on S. 1802 and S. 1801 will be printed in the RECORD.

The bills, introduced by Mr. MORSE (for himself and Mr. COOPER), were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

S. 290. A bill to protect the integrity of the court and jury functions in criminal cases; and

S. 291. A bill to effectuate the provision of the sixth amendment of the U.S. Constitution requiring that defendants in criminal cases be given the right to a speedy trial.

The sections of the report presented by Mr. MORSE are as follows:

PUBLICATION OF INFORMATION IN CRIMINAL CASES

S. 1802, 88th Congress, would make it unlawful for an employee of the United States, or any defendant or his attorney or the agent of either, to publish information not already properly filed with the court, which might affect the outcome of any pending criminal litigation, except evidence that has already been admitted at the trial. The proposed legislation would make such publication a contempt of court, punishable summarily by the court on motion of any party to the litigation by a fine of not less than $500 for each such publication. It was the view of the committee that certain provisions in the bill (1) authorizing punishment summarily for misbehavior not committed in the presence of the court, (2) limiting the usual authority of the court by providing that the prosecution proceed only on motion of a party and (3) limiting the discretionary authority of the court to impose a penalty appropriate to the particular facts and circumstances by "a fine of not less than $500 for each publication", were objectionable. The committee therefore proposed that the bill be amended to read as follows:

"It shall constitute a contempt of court for any employee of the United States, or for any defendant or his attorney or the agent of either, to furnish or make available for publication information not already properly filed with the court which might affect the outcome of any pending criminal litigation, except evidence that has already been admitted at the trial. Such contempt shall be punished by a fine of not more than $1,000."

Upon recommendation of the committee, the conference approved the amended bill.

RIGHT OF TRIAL

S. 1801, 88th Congress, is a bill to effectuate a provision of the sixth amendment of the U.S. Constitution requiring that a defendant in a criminal case be given the right to a speedy trial. The proposals contained in the bill were considered by the conference and referred to the Committee for further study and report at a later session.

REGULATION OF PRIVATE EMPLOYMENT AGENCIES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to regulate private employment agencies in the District of Columbia. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be appropriately referred, and be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 292) to regulate private employment agencies in the District of Columbia, introduced by Mr. MORSE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 292

A bill to regulate private employment agencies in the District of Columbia.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, as used in this Act, the term—

(1) "Person" means an individual, firm, partnership, joint stock company, association, corporation, incorporated society, statutory or common-law trust, estate, executor, administrator, receiver, trustee, conservator, liquidator, committee, officer, employee, principal, or agent;

(2) "Fee" means anything of value, including any monetary or other valuable consideration, paid or contracted to be paid, directly or indirectly, for any service or act performed by an employment agency;

(3) "Employment" means any service performed for remuneration or with the expectation of remuneration, whether in the form of salary, wages, or other consideration, and regardless of whether such service be performed under any contract for hire, written or oral, express or implied;

(4) "Employment agency" means any person other than an organization operated by or under the exclusive control of a bona fide educational, religious, or charitable institution who, for a fee, (A) procures or offers or attempts to procure employees for persons seeking the service of employees or employment for persons seeking employment; or (B) in seeking to perform any of the foregoing, gives information by any means as to where employees, workers, or employment may be obtained; and

(5) "Commissioners" means the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

SEC. 2. (a) Except as otherwise provided in subsection (c) of section 10 of this Act, no employment agency shall do business in the District of Columbia unless it holds a valid license issued by the Commissioners under this Act.

(b) A license may be issued or renewed under this Act only upon the determination of the Commissioners that—

(1) the premises in which the business will be conducted are suitable for use as an employment agency;

(2) the applicant for such license is of good moral character, trustworthy, and intends to operate a bona fide employment agency; and

(3) the applicant for such license intends to make his services available to any person without discrimination as to race, creed, color, or national origin.

(c) Such license shall contain the name of the licensee, the name under which the business is to be conducted, and the specific place of business of the employment agency so licensed. Such license shall be valid only as to the person and place named therein. Any license issued under this Act shall contain an effective date and shall be valid for one year following such date, unless suspended or revoked. An application for the renewal of such license shall be made at such time and in such manner as the Commissioners may by regulations prescribe. Pending administrative action by the Commissioners on such an application, such license may be continued in effect for a period not to exceed sixty days beyond its expiration date.

(d) The Commissioners shall fix the fee for such license at such amount as, in their judgment, will be commensurate with the cost of the District of Columbia of inspecting supervising, and regulating the licensed activity.

Sec. 3. (a) Each applicant for a license as an employment agency shall file with the Commissioners a bond in such form as may be prescribed and approved by the Commissioners, in the penal sum of $5,000 running to the District of Columbia, with corporate surety authorized by the Secretary of the Treasury pursuant to title 6, United States Code, and by the Department of Insurance of the Government of the District of Columbia, to do business in the District of Columbia. In lieu of such bond, an applicant for a license as an employment agency may deposit with the Commissioners other security in a form and amount acceptable to them, but not exceeding the value of $7,500.

(b) Such bond shall be conditioned that—

(1) the licensee shall comply with the provisions of this Act, including applicable rules, regulations, or orders issued pursuant thereto, and shall pay any loss or damage occasioned to any person by reason of such failure to comply; and

(2) the suspension, revocation, surrender, or expiration of a license to operate an employment agency shall not affect the coverage of such bond as to a claim arising out of acts which occurred prior to the date of such suspension, revocation, surrender, or expiration.

(c) The Commissioners may at any time notify the licensee to file a new or supplementary bond, in a form and amount to conform with the provisions of this section, whenever they shall deem the surety of such bond to be unsatisfactory, or the amount of such bond to have become insufficient to satisfy all claims accrued or contingent against the licensee. In the event the bond is secured by cash, the cash shall not be released for a period of one year following the date of suspension, revocation, surrender, or expiration of the license.

(d) Any person aggrieved by the violation of any law or regulation applicable to the licensee's conduct of the licensed activity shall have, in addition to his right of action against such licensee, a right to bring suit against the surety on a bond required by this section, either alone or jointly with the principal thereon, and to recover in an amount not exceeding the penalty of such bond any damages sustained by reason of any act, transaction, or conduct of the licensee, or of any officer, agent, employee, or other person acting on behalf of said licensee, which is in violation of law or regulation in force in the District relating to the licensed activity. The provisions of the second, third, and the fifth subparagraphs of paragraph (b) of the first section of the Act entitled "An Act to grant additional powers to the Commissioners, and for other purposes", approved December 20, 1944 (58 Stat. 820; sec. 1-244(b), D.C. Code, 1961 edition), shall be applicable to each bond required by this section as if it were the bond required by the first subparagraph of such paragraph (b) of the first section of said Act approved December 20, 1944: *Provided,* That nothing in this subsection shall be construed to impose upon the surety on any such bond a greater liability than the total amount thereof or the amount remaining unextinguished after any prior recovery or recoveries.

Sec. 4. (a) No employment agency licensed under this Act shall—

(1) charge or receive a fee greater than that stated in the schedule established by the Commissioners pursuant to section 6(a) of this Act;

(2) engage or attempt to engage in the splitting or sharing of fees with any employer, any agent or other employee of an employer, or any other person to whom employment service has been furnished, or any other person not authorized to charge a fee under this Act;

(3) make, give, or cause to be made or given to any applicant for employees or employment any false promise, misrepresentation, or inaccurate or misleading statement or information if such agency had knowledge or should have had knowledge of such falsity, misrepresentation, or inaccurate or misleading statement or information;

(4) procure or attempt to procure the discharge of any person from his employment;

(5) knowingly induce or attempt to induce an employee to quit his employment for the purpose of obtaining other employment through such agency; except that nothing in this paragraph shall be construed as prohibiting any employment agency from assisting any employee in obtaining other employment if such agency has been so requested in writing by such employee;

(6) require applicants for employees or employment to subscribe to any publication or incidental service or contribute to the cost of advertising;

(7) refer any person to employment deleterious to health or morals if the agency had knowledge or should have had knowledge of such conditions;

(8) refer any employee, worker, or applicant for employment to a place where a strike or lockout exists without furnishing such employee, worker, or applicant with a written statement as to the existence of such strike or lockout, if the agency had knowledge or should have had knowledge of such facts or conditions, a copy of which statement signed by the employee, worker, or applicant shall be kept on file for one year after the date thereof;

(9) make any referral to an employment or occupation prohibited by law;

(10) refer any applicant for employment except upon order therefor and except upon furnishing such applicant with such statement in respect to the employment as the Commissioners may by rule or regulation prescribe;

(11) operate directly or indirectly in conjunction with the employment agency any lodging house, restaurant, small loan company, or any place where intoxicating liquors or beverages are sold or dispensed;

(12) except with the written consent of the Commissioners, conduct an employment agency business in a room or rooms used for eating, sleeping, or other living purposes;

(13) make or cause to be made or use any name, sign, or advertising device bearing a name which may be similar to or reasonably be confused with the name of a Government agency;

(14) receive or require any person to execute any paper or document relating to the liability of any applicant for employment except on such forms as shall have been approved by the Commissioners and every such paper or document made or executed contrary to the provisions of this Act shall be void and unenforcible both in law and in equity;

(15) use any contract form or other forms except as the Commissioners may by rule or regulation prescribe.

(b) Nothing contained in subsection (a) shall be construed as prohibiting the Commissioners, by regulation, from defining and prohibiting an activity or practice not set forth in such subsection.

Sec. 5. The Commissioners are authorized to establish such rules and regulations; minimum professional requirements for employees and officers of employment agencies in the District of Columbia; prescribe such forms of applications, reports, contracts, entries, and other papers; issue such instructions; delegate such functions; and perform such other acts as they may determine necessary in the administration or enforcement of the provisions of this Act.

Sec. 6. (a) The Commissioners shall establish a schedule of maximum fees which may be charged by employment agencies in the District of Columbia. Each employment agency shall issue a receipt acknowledging payment of any such fee received by it.

(b) Where any applicant for employees or employment who has paid a fee to any employment agency fails to secure or refuses to accept employees or employment, as the case may be, such fee shall be returned by the agency within three days after a written demand by the applicant. If, due to no fault of such applicant or because the employee or the employment is other than as represented by the employment agency, employment is discontinued within thirty days, all fees paid pursuant to subsection (a) of this section by such applicant in excess of the applicable maximum for the period worked shall be returned within three days, excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays, after a written demand by the applicant.

Sec. 7. Each employment agency shall (1) keep and maintain such accurate and comprehensive records of all information, reports, and transactions relating directly or indirectly to the business of such agency as the Commissioners may by regulation require; (2) post or display conspicuously at each place it conducts business the license required under section 2 of this Act, together with such other information as the Commissioners may by regulation require; (3) file a schedule of fees in duplicate with the Commissioners, who shall determine that the fees set in the schedule are not in excess of those established by the Commissioners pursuant to section 6(a) of this Act; and (4) post or display conspicuously a copy of such schedule of fees approved by the Commissioners at each place it conducts business.

Sec. 8. It shall be the duty of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to administer and enforce the provisions of this Act. In carrying out such duty the Commissioners shall be authorized—

(1) to make all necessary inspections and do all other things necessary to the proper effectuation and enforcement of this Act;

(2) to enter and inspect any premises where an employment agency carries on its business;

(3) to have access to, and the right to copy, information pertinent to the administration and enforcement of this Act from all records, documents, or other papers relating to the business of such agency;

(4) to hold hearings without being bound by the technical rules of evidence and prescribed rules of procedure therein;

(5) to take an assignment of any claim arising under this Act against any employment agency.

Sec. 9. (a) The Commissioners may, after reasonable notice and opportunity to be heard, refuse to issue a license to, or renew the license of, any applicant under this Act, if they determine that such applicant has failed to comply with any provision of this Act or any rule, regulation, or order issued pursuant thereto.

(b) The Commissioners may, after reasonable notice and opportunity to be heard, revoke or suspend for any period any license issued or renewal under this Act, if they determine that the holder of that license has failed to comply with any provision of this Act or any rule, regulation, or order issued pursuant thereto.

(c) Any person aggrieved by any final order of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia denying, refusing to renew, revoking, or suspending a license of a private employment agency under subsection (a) or (b) may obtain a review of such order as provided under subsections (e) and (f) of section 7 of the Act of April 1, 1942 (56 Stat. 195).

(d) Paragraph 5 of subsection (e) of section 7 of the Act of April 1, 1942 (56 Stat. 195), is amended to read as follows:

"(5) Any final order of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia denying, refusing to renew, revoking, or suspending a license of a private employment agency under the provisions of section 9 of the District of Columbia Private Employment Agency Act;".

Sec. 10. (a) Except as otherwise provided in subsection (b) of this section, paragraphs 42 through 42i, inclusive, of section 7 of the Act entitled "An Act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June thirtieth, nineteen hundred and three, and for other purposes", approved July 1, 1902 (32 Stat. 628), as amended, and any provisions of the Act entitled "An Act to regulate the keeping of employment agencies in the District of Columbia where fees are charged for procuring emploment or situations", approved June 19, 1906 (34 Stat. 304), which are in effect on the effective date of this Act are hereby repealed.

(b) The repeal of such paragraphs and provisions shall not affect any warrant, prosecution, action, suit, proceeding, or liability of any kind or nature, civil or criminal, brought or existing on the day immediately preceding the date of such repeal. Any such warrant, prosecution, action, suit, proceeding, or liability shall be heard and determined in accordance with such paragraphs and provisions in the same manner and to the same extent as if they had not been repealed.

(c) Any individual who, on the effective date of this Act, holds a valid license issued under such paragraph 42 shall be permited to continue to do business as authorized by that license for a period of not to exceed thirty days following the effective date of this Act; except that the holder of that license shall otherwise comply with the provisions of this Act. Any person holding such a license on such effective date shall receive a pro rata refund of the annual fee paid for such license based on the unexpired portion of such license remaining upon the expiration of such thirty-day period.

Sec. 11. Any person failing to comply with any provision of this Act or with any rule, regulation, or order issued thereunder, or interfering with, impeding, or obstructing in any manner the Commissioners in the performance of their official duties under this Act, shall be guilty of a violation of this Act and upon conviction thereof shall be subject to a fine of not more than $2,000 or imprisonment for not more than one year, or both. All prosecutions for violations of this Act, or regulations made pursuant thereto, shall be conducted in the name of the District of Columbia by the Corporation Counsel or any of his assistants. As used in this Act the term "Corporation Counsel" means the attorney for the District, by whatever title such attorney may be known, designated by the Commissioners to perform the functions prescribed for the Corporation Counsel in this Act.

Sec. 12. (a) There is hereby established an Employment Agency Advisory Board, which shall consist of three members appointed by the Commissioners as follows:

(1) one member to be appointed from the District of Columbia Department of Licenses and Inspections to represent the public;

(2) one member who shall be a person who owns and operates an employment agency in the District of Columbia to represent employment agencies in the District of Columbia;

(3) one member who shall be a personnel executive to represent employers in the District of Columbia.

(b) Members of the Board shall be appointed for terms of one year and may, in the discretion of the Commissioners, be reappointed for additional terms. The Commissioners shall designate one member to be Chairman. Any vacancy on the Board shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(c) Members of the Board shall serve without compensation as such. The Commissioners are authorized to pay reasonable expenses necessarily incurred by the Board in carrying out its responsibilities under this Act on vouchers signed by the Chairman.

(d) It shall be the duty of the Board, if requested by the Commissioners, to advise and make recommendations to the Commissioners with respect to all matters (including applications for licenses or complaints) relating to employment agencies in the District of Columbia.

Sec. 13. Nothing in this Act shall be construed so as to affect the authority vested in the Commissioners by Reorganization Plan Numbered 5 of 1952 (66 Stat. 824). The performance of any function vested by this Act in the Commissioners or in any office or agency under the jurisdiction and control of the Commissioners may be delegated by them in accordance with section 3 of such plan.

Sec. 14. This Act may be cited as the "District of Columbia Private Employment Agency Act".

Sec. 15. This Act shall take effect on the sixtieth day following the date of its enactment.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A PUBLIC COMMUNITY COLLEGE AND A PUBLIC COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the establishment of a public community college and a public college of arts and sciences in the District of Columbia.

I shall discuss this bill later this afternoon under the general subject matter of education, before I finish my remarks today.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed at this point in the Record, and lie on the desk for 1 week for additional cosponsors.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record and lie on the desk, as requested.

The bill (S. 293) to authorize the establishment of a public community college and a public college of arts and sciences in the District of Columbia, introduced by Mr. Morse, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 293

A bill to authorize the establishment of a public community college and a public college of arts and sciences in the District of Columbia

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "District of Columbia Public Higher Education Act".

Sec. 2. As used in this Act—

(a) The term "public college of arts and sciences" means an institution of higher education established pursuant to this Act and which is organized and administered principally to provide a four-year program in the liberal arts and sciences acceptable for a bachelor's degree, including, but not limited to, courses in teacher education, and such additional program of study as may be acceptable for a master's degree, and courses on an individual, noncredit basis to those desiring to further their education without seeking a degree.

(b) The term "public community college" means an institution of higher education established pursuant to this Act and which is organized and administered principally to provide a two-year program which is acceptable for full credit toward a bachelor's degree or for a degree of associate in arts, which program shall include, but shall not be limited to courses in business education, secretarial training, and business administration, and courses in engineering, mathematics, and the physical and biological sciences which are designed to prepare a student to work as a technician and at a semiprofessional level in engineering, scientific, and other technological fields requiring the understanding and application of basic engineering, scientific, or mathematical principles or knowledge, and which college also provides courses on an individual, noncredit basis for persons desiring to further their education without seeking a degree.

(c) The terms "Board of Higher Education" and "Board" mean the Board of Higher Education established by section 3 of this Act.

(d) The term "Board of Education" means the Board of Education of the District of Columbia established by the Act of June 20, 1906 (34 Stat. 316), as amended (D.C. Code, sec. 31–101 et seq.).

Sec. 3. (a) The control of the public college of arts and sciences and of the public community college is hereby vested in a Board of Higher Education, which shall consist of nine members of whom not less than five shall have been residents of the District of Columbia for a period of not less than five years immediately prior to their appointments. The members of the Board (including all members appointed to fill vacancies on such Board) shall be appointed by the judges of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia from a panel of nominees submitted to such judges pursuant to subsection (b) of this section. Such members shall be appointed for terms of six years; except that the terms of office of the members first taking office shall expire, as designated by the said judges at the time of appointment, three at the end of two years, three at the end of four years, and three at the end of six years. Any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of that term. Members of the Board shall serve without compensation, and may be removed in the same manner as that provided for members of the Board of Education under section 2 of the Act of June 20, 1906 (34 Stat. 316), as amended (D.C. Code, sec. 31–101).

(b) There is hereby established a committee to be known as the Board of Higher Education Nominating Committee, which shall consist of seven members of whom not less than four shall have been residents of the District of Columbia for a period of not less than five years immediately prior to their appointments. The members of the Committee shall be appointed by the judges of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia for terms of six years; except that the terms of office of three of the members first taking office shall expire, as designated by the said judges at the time of appointment, at the end of three years. Members of the Committee shall serve without compensation, and shall be subject to removal in the same manner as that provided for members of the Board of Education. The Committee shall elect a Chairman and a Vice

Chairman from among its members. It shall be the duty of the Committee, as soon as practicable following the enactment of this Act, to submit to the said judges a panel of not less than twenty-seven nominees for consideration as initial appointees to the Board and to thereafter submit to the judges, in connection with any vacancy on the Board, a panel of not less than three nominees for consideration by such judges in filling that vacancy.

(c) The Commissioners of the District of Columbia and the Board of Education may furnish to the Board of Higher Education, upon request of such Board, such space and facilities in public buildings of the government of the District of Columbia, records, information, services, personnel, offices, and equipment as the Commissioners and the Board of Education determine are available to enable the Board of Higher Education properly to perform its functions.

SEC. 4. (a) The Board of Higher Education shall, at such time as may be mutually agreed upon by the Board and the Board of Education, merge the District of Columbia Teachers' College (established pursuant to the Act of February 25, 1929 (45 Stat. 1276; D.C. Code, sec. 31–118)) into the public college of arts and sciences. At the time of such merger, all personnel, property, records, and unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, and other funds available to, or to be made available to, such Teachers' College shall be transferred to, and shall be under the control of, the Board of Higher Education.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the laboratory schools in the District of Columbia shall remain under the control and management of, and the employees assigned to such schools shall remain subject to the supervision of, the Board of Education.

SEC. 5. (a) The Board of Higher Education is hereby vested with the following powers:

(1) To prepare plans for the establishment of a public college of arts and sciences (including the selection of a site), and, subject to the provisions of subsection (b) of this section, to establish, organize, and administer such college;

(2) To prepare plans for the establishment of a public community college (including the selection of a site), and, subject to the provisions of subsection (b) of this section, to establish, organize, and administer such college;

(3) To fix, from time to time, tuition and fees to be paid by residents and nonresidents attending any such college, which tuition and fees shall be deposited to the credit of the general revenues of the District of Columbia. Tuition and fees charged nonresidents shall be fixed in such amounts as will, to the extent feasible, approximate the cost to the District of Columbia of the services for which such charges are imposed;

(4) To appoint, for a term of four years, a president for the public college of arts and sciences and a president for the public community college;

(5) To appoint, promote, demote, transfer, suspend, or dismiss such administrative, educational, or noneducational employees of any college established pursuant to this Act as the president thereof may recommend in writing;

(6) To accredit junior colleges operating in the District of Columbia;

(7) To award appropriate degrees and certificates of completion of courses of study in the colleges established pursuant to this Act; and

(8) To make such rules and regulations as the Board deems necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

(b) No action shall be taken with respect to the actual establishment of any college authorized under this Act prior to the expiration of ninety calendar days (which ninety days shall not include days on which either the Senate or the House of Representatives is not in session because of an adjournment of more than three calendar days to a day certain) after the plans for such college have been submitted to the Congress.

(c) The Board of Higher Education shall annually on the first day of October transmit to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia an estimate in detail of the amount of money required for the colleges established pursuant to this Act for the ensuing year, and the Commissioners shall transmit the same in their annual estimate of appropriations for the District of Columbia, with such recommendations as they may deem proper.

SEC. 6. All obligations and disbursements for the purposes of this Act shall be incurred, made, and accounted for in the same manner as other obligations and disbursements for the District of Columbia.

SEC. 7. (a) Subchapter 1 of chapter 18 of the Act of March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1280), as amended (D.C. Code, sec. 29–401—29–419), is amended (1) by striking out "Board of Education" wherever it appears in such subchapter and by inserting in lieu thereof "Board of Higher Education", and (2) by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 586g. As used in this subchapter, the term 'Board of Higher Education' means the Board of Higher Education established pursuant to the District of Columbia Public Higher Education Act."

(b) Nothing contained in the amendment made by this section shall be construed as affecting the validity of any license issued by the Board of Education prior to the date of the enactment of this Act.

PACIFIC SOUTHWEST PROJECT ACT OF 1965—WATER FOR PACIFIC SOUTHWEST

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, on a number of occasions, my colleagues have heard me speak about the gloomy future facing a large segment of our people if an abundance of water is not assured for agriculture, industry, domestic uses, and other essential purposes. This threat of water shortages is real, is imminent, and is alarming in the Pacific Southwest.

The growth rate of States in a considerable section of this Nation—which has been and continues to be phenomenal—will be retarded and literally endangered because the Colorado River—the last waterhole of the Southwest—does not appear able to bring to the States of the region a supply they and their mushrooming populations will require.

Southern California especially has grown to greatness because it was able—through ingenuity and perseverance—to tap this source.

With the keenest regret, for about three decades, I have seen my State of California and neighboring Arizona at loggerheads over allocation and use of this precious, irreplaceable resource. I was, and so were great numbers of people, grieved a number of years ago when tensions even reached the point where the militia was called out to enforce claims on this waterhole.

The 89th Congress can go into the history books as saviors of Western America if it constructively tackles this problem. We can provide by law for a vast undertaking—surely in the context of the Great Society—for importing water into the lower basin which would guarantee the future of California, Arizona, and Nevada. Such a project would do more: it can be an enormous benefit to our sister States to the north, by easing the burden their own futures must bear.

Furthermore, this Nation has a solemn compact with its good neighbor, Mexico, to deliver to her Colorado River waters which may be used to advance the welfare of her people. The performance by the United States of this treaty obligation is a duty shared by the upper and lower basins alike. By importing needed quantities to the lower basin, this Congress can lessen the strain on the whole Colorado system and reassure the ability of the United States to discharge its responsibilities.

I am confident that the beneficial results of such an enactment will be many and historic. Not the least will be the expanded opportunity for the upper basin States to fill their own reservoirs which comprise the upper Colorado storage project, along with a firm foundation on which the lower basin States can plan their expanding future. Thus, both groups of signatories to the Colorado River compact will be able, with competence, to anticipate the mounting demands of growing populations, agriculture, and industry, thereby caring for their economic health in long years ahead.

On behalf of myself and my colleague from California [Mr. MURPHY] I introduce a bill, the Pacific Southwest Project Act of 1965.

In the 88th Congress, I introduced S. 2760. Counterparts were introduced by 10 Members of the California delegation in the House, of both parties.

The present bill deals with the same subject, the water resources of the Colorado River, but it offers a new and broader approach prompted by the events of the last few months.

The bill is not partisan. It is written in the light of the proposals made in Secretary Udall's Pacific Southwest project plan, which was a courageous and constructive step; the hearings on that plan, which developed some critical weaknesses; the hearings and report of a joint committee of the California State Senate and Assembly, just released; correspondence, and conferences with scores of California executives and experts; and in the light of my own experiences in the Colorado River controversy over the past dozen years.

The text of this measure, like its predecessor, has been drafted in consultation with Northcutt Ely, counsel for the six California agencies that have water rights in the Colorado. These are the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, the City of Los Angeles, San Diego County Water Authority, Imperial Irrigation District, Coachella Valley County Water District, and Palo Verde Irrigation District. Their six-agency committee has approved the principles stated in this bill. I wish to emphasize here a fact that is too often overlooked. These six agencies, not the State of California, own the water rights in the Colorado River upon which 12 million Californians depend.

I. OBJECTIVES

The measure recognizes that both the upper basin and the lower basin of the Colorado River have a common interest in accomplishing three major objectives. The existing supply is inadequate to meet all three. These objectives are:

1. PROTECTION OF EXISTING PROJECTS

First, existing projects must not be destroyed to find water for new ones. The existing economy of the Pacific Southwest must be safeguarded, and assured the water that is required for its inevitable growth.

2. FILLING OF RESERVOIRS

Second, the upper basin reservoirs must be filled, and Lake Mead must be refilled. I understand that it would require 43 million acre-feet to do this. I am told that there is no likelihood that the upper basin reservoirs can ever be filled or that Lake Mead, now nearly two-thirds empty, can ever be refilled if the Central Arizona project is constructed without simultaneously constructing works to import water into the Colorado. I am told that all the reservoirs on the Colorado, in both upper and lower basins, now contain a margin of safety or cushion of only 1.9 million acre-feet above the minimum quantities that must be in those reservoirs if the powerplants are to continue to operate. The margin of safety against shutdown of the powerplants was reduced 600,000 acre-feet in 2 recent months.

3. WATER FOR CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT

Third, water must be found for the central Arizona project, if this can be done without wrecking existing economies in the lower basin or drying up the upper basin reservoirs that the Secretary is having such difficulty in filling.

II. INVESTIGATIONS OF WATER REQUIREMENTS AND SUPPLY

My bill directs the Secretary to carry out an investigation and to make a report to Congress within 18 months on the deficiencies that will have to be supplied, together with his recommendation of projects that ought to be constructed to furnish added water to remedy these shortages. The investigation is not restricted to any one type of supply or to any one watershed or to any one State. The surplus waters of any rivers, anywhere, which could feasibly be utilized, along with the possibilities of desalinization, and any other solutions, if any there be, would all be examined under the terms of my bill.

CRITERIA

The Secretary is directed to conform to certain criteria or guidelines. These, in addition to meeting the three objectives that I have identified, would include four important safeguards. These are:

1. "LAW OF THE RIVER" TO BE RESPECTED

The works that the Secretary proposes must be built and operated in compliance with the compacts, statutes, treaty, court decisions, and so forth, that constitute the "law of the river."

2. STATES OF ORIGIN MUST BE PROTECTED

The "States of origin" must be protected. My bill requires the Secretary to include in his plans "adequate and equitable protection of the interests of States from which water may be imported into the Colorado River system, to the end that the quantities of water remaining available for use in those States shall be adequate for ultimate requirements therein, at prices to the users which are not adversely affected by the exportation of water from those States to the Colorado River system."

3. COOPERATION WITH ALL AFFECTED STATES IN PLANNING

The Secretary is directed to cooperate with all of the States affected, in making his investigations and reports. His reports must go to the States concerned for comment before being submitted to Congress.

4. RESTRICTIONS ON CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT

The Secretary, in finding water for the central Arizona project, shall not destroy existing projects. The bill tells him that if he is unable to supply the 7.5 million acre-feet apportioned by the decree in Arizona versus California, the water rights of the central Arizona project shall bear the shortage, because its rights are junior to those of the existing projects in Arizona, Nevada, and California. But California's existing uses would be protected only to the extent of the basic 4.4 million acre-feet apportioned to California by the decree, not to the extent of the full 5.1 million acre-feet now used in California.

NEW PROVISION TERMINATES PROTECTION OF EXISTING PROJECTS WHEN IMPORTED WATER ACTUALLY ARRIVES

I am adding a new provision, which was not in the legislation introduced in the 88th Congress. The new provision is important. My bill says that the priority protection which it gives to existing projects as against the new central Arizona project shall cease "whenever the President shall proclaim that works have been completed and are in operation, capable in his judgment of continuously delivering water in aggregate annual quantities of not less than 2,500,000 acre-feet into the main stream of the Colorado River below Lee Ferry, from sources outside the natural drainage area of the Colorado River System; and that such sources are adequate, in the President's judgment, to permanently supply such quantities without adverse effect upon the satisfaction of the foreseeable water requirements of any State from which such water is imported into the Colorado River System."

In the 88th Congress, the representatives of the government and the people of Arizona offered to recognize the principles that California's existing uses must be protected to the extent of 4.4 million acre-feet, but only for 25 years. It was represented to us that importation works surely would be built within 25 years. If this is so, then the right way to express the principle is to make the protection ironclad until the imported water actually arrives. The 25-year restriction is totally unacceptable to California water users.

I said at the time that it would be similar to a man purchasing a policy of life insurance with the provision that the policy would lapse if the man should pass away. I think that is true, because the only reason to indicate a guarantee effective in any fashion is to tie that guarantee to the construction of public works by which into the lower basin would come sufficient quantities of supplemental water to supply not one but the two great States of the Pacific Southwest—Arizona and California—and Nevada as well, and simultaneously ease the burden of the Colorado River with respect to those States so ably represented by our colleagues in the Upper Colorado River Basin. If imported water is delayed, there is no justice in drying up California's existing metropolitan aqueduct so that Arizona's new aqueduct can run full.

THE MEXICAN TREATY BURDEN

Quantities other than 2.5 million acre-feet can be suggested as the proper measure for the Presidential finding which the bill requires. But the importation of about 2.5 million acre-feet annually would offset the Mexican Treaty burden, which guarantees 1.5 million acre-feet annually to Mexico at the boundary, and would offset evaporation and regulatory losses, some of them involved in the storage and transportation of water for Mexico, to the extent of another million acre-feet. It appears to me reasonable, therefore, to use the 2.5 million acre-feet figure as fair and just for all affected States.

The Secretary is to advise Congress what part of the cost of importing water to offset the Mexican Treaty burden should be made nonreimbursable.

IMPORTATIONS INTO THE MAIN STREAM

I stipulate that the importation must be made into the main stream in the lower basin. This eliminates one of the objectionable features of the original Udall plan, which would have delivered northern California water into points in southern California. I want to make it plain that the importation is to benefit everyone on the Colorado: It would improve the quality of water for all lower basin users as well as Mexico, a country which now rightfully complains of the salt being pumped into the river from under an Arizona project. It would relieve both upper and lower basins of the Mexican treaty burden, and enable the upper basin to store water that it must now deliver to Mexico. Finally, it would provide Arizona and California enough water so that they could support each other's projects, including the central Arizona project, instead of quarreling over shortages.

All I ask is that existing projects, on both sides of the river, in both our States—Arizona and California—shall not be hurt for the benefit of any new Colorado River project in either State while we are waiting for the imported water to arrive. Delivery of water into the mainstream, as my bill provides, assures that Metropolitan Aqueduct and the All American Canal will serve the constructive functions for which they were designed at a cost of $500 million—indeed, more—which the taxpayers of my State have bonded themselves to pay.

III. CONDITIONAL AUTHORIZATION FOR CONSTRUCTION OF IMPORTATION WORK

In the hearings last spring on the Udall plan, I pointed out that one of its major flaws was that it failed to authorize importation works to bring into the Colorado the water that the Secretary said was needed to meet deficiencies, while at the same time firmly authorizing the central Arizona project, which would increase the overdraft on the main stream. I asked whether it was possible to write in a conditional authorization, such as appears in the 1939 Reclamation Project Act, so that the importation project would be presently authorized subject to the later filing of a finding of feasibility by the Secretary. There was general approval of this thought.

Another major defect of the Udall plan was that it was admittedly too small. The importation project on which it proposed a feasibility study—not an authorization—would have added only 1.2 million acre-feet to the supply, all from northern California, whereas the Secretary's figures showed the necessity of importing at least twice that much as the first stage, and more later on.

My present bill attempts to meet these two objections to the Udall plan.

I propose that Congress authorize, now, the construction of works to import 2.5 million acre-feet annually into the Colorado River, but subject to the submission to Congress of a finding of engineering and economic feasibility approved by the President. As I have stated, there is existing statutory authority for this procedure, found in section 9(a) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939. My bill modifies the existing law on this point in three respects. First, we require that the Secretary's findings, to be operative, be approved by the President. Second, a portion of the cost, related to water shortages occasioned by the Mexican Treaty burden, is to be written off. Third, the portion to be repaid is to be recovered in 75 years, not 40 to 50, as the 1939 law provides. The reason is that we are dealing here with a multi-billion-dollar undertaking for the preservation of the economy on which tens of millions of people are dependent, or soon will be. As the Supreme Court said about a much smaller stream on which some improvements were in controversy, a hundred years is but a short time in the life of a nation. Note that the President is to act twice: first, in approving the finding of feasibility which will authorize construction of works to import 2.5 million acre-feet; again, in proclaiming that works are successfully completed which will accomplish this result. Not until then do we release the priority protection of existing projects on both sides of the river.

To the extent that importation of water is necessary to enable the Secretary to supply, under his Boulder Canyon contracts, the 7.5 million acre-feet of consumptive use apportioned by the Supreme Court decree, the bill provides that the imported water be furnished by the Secretary at the same costs and on the same terms as water originating in the Colorado River system.

To the extent that importations enable the Secretary to supply more than 7.5 million acre-feet of consumptive use, the bill provides that the excess be made available as under the Supreme Court decree. The decree gives half of the excess to California, half to Arizona and Nevada. One of the preliminary drafts of the Udall plan proposed that someday a second 1.2 million acre-feet would be added to the river, but it gave all of this excess to Arizona. California water users objected to it, feeling that if the water supply of the Colorado were increased by Federal expenditures, Arizona should not properly claim more than if the supply were increased by rainfall. But imported water constituting part of the "excess" would have to be paid for at cost.

IV. AUTHORIZATION OF BRIDGE AND MARBLE CANYON DAMS

The bill unconditionally authorizes the construction of Bridge Canyon and Marble Canyon Dams, with their powerplants and transmission lines, describing them just as Secretary Udall did in his proposal. These dams and powerplants will be "cash registers" to finance the project.

But because people who are sincerely dedicated to preservation of scenic and recreation values were greatly concerned about these dams, I have tried to allay their apprehension by adding a number of provisions for the protection of those values. The bill, for example, directs that the level of the reservoir behind Bridge Canyon Dam be maintained so that it will not fluctuate in elevation more than 10 feet, so far as this can be done practically. Exactly the same rule now applies, by contract, to the lake created by Parker Dam. The purpose is to preserve the Bridge Canyon Lake as a spectacularly beautiful means of access to scenery that rivals the Norwegian fiords. These desert fiords can be reached in no other way. They will thus be opened up to enjoyment by millions of visitors, just as previously inaccessible wonders have been opened up by the construction of Glen Canyon Dam. As Bridge Canyon Dam is altogether a power producer designed to be operated at a constant high head, this restriction on fluctuations, I am told by engineers, is quite workable.

The bill authorizes construction of bypass roads, or other devices, to make it possible for small boats, pulled on trailers behind passenger cars, to be transported around the great dams. Finally, it prohibits diversion of water at either Marble or Bridge Canyon Dams.

V. AUTHORIZATION OF CONSTRUCTION OF THE CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT

The bill authorizes the immediate construction of the central Arizona aqueduct, as described by the Secretary's reports. But, until the President proclaims that importation works have been completed, capable of continuously delivering at least 2.5 million acre-feet annually into the main stream below Lee Ferry, diversions for the central Arizona project must be limited, in the event of shortage. They will be limited to the extent necessary to assure a supply of 4.4 million acre-feet for the partial satisfaction of California's existing uses, which are 5.1 million, and to assure a supply for the Arizona and Nevada projects that are now dependent on the river, or that Congress has authorized. But this importation must be from sources that the President certifies are adequate permanently to supply that quantity without adversely affecting the satisfaction of the foreseeable water requirements of the States of origin. This differs from S. 2760, my previous bill, which made the protection of California's 4.4 million acre-feet permanent. The new bill ends that protection when imported water arrives at the river in an amount of 2.5 million acre-feet annually. And the imported water is to be made available at the same cost to the user as Colorado River water, up to the portions of the basic 7.5 million acre-feet apportioned to each State by the Supreme Court decree.

VI. CONSERVATION WORKS

This bill, like the Udall plan, authorizes certain conservation works—such as channelization, and so forth—and canal lining. But it provides that if any canal lining is done, it shall be covered by a contract between the Secretary and the water users who are served by that canal. I want to make it clear that we do not intend that the Secretary, by lining one water user's canal, can take the water that is saved away from that user—who may urgently need all the water he can get—and turn it over to someone else.

VII. RECREATION AND PROTECTION OF WILDLIFE

As to recreation, in addition to the special provisions about Bridge Canyon Dam that I have mentioned, we provide that all allocations of costs to recreation shall be nonreimbursable. We also provide that the fees that people pay for the use of these facilities shall be earmarked for their operation and maintenance, or for further investments for similar purposes.

As to fish and wildlife, we authorize the Secretary to spend the money that the Udall plan proposed. But we limit the quantity of water that may be consumed for this purpose—for example, in growing rice for birds, or in maintaining swamp areas—to the quantities of water that the Supreme Court decreed for this specific purpose. This was about 60,000 acre-feet, whereas the Udall plan proposed to consume about 340,000 for wildlife conservation. The bill tells the Secretary to submit to Congress, for further consideration, any such projects that he has in mind that would use more water than the Supreme Court decreed.

VIII. FINANCING

A basin account, to be known as the Pacific Southwest development fund, would be created. Advances would be made to this fund from the General Treasury, for construction. Such a fund was created by the statutes which authorized the Boulder Canyon project and the upper Colorado River storage project. Into this fund would be paid revenues from Bridge and Marble Canyon powerplants, and from Hoover, Davis, and Parker powerplants after those projects have paid for themselves under existing laws, plus revenues to be received from the storage and delivery of water for irrigation, and municipal and industrial purposes. From this income, the fund would repay the Treasury's advances under the general scheme of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939, that is, without interest on capital allocated to irrigation, but with interest on capital allocated to power and industrial and municipal water supplies. Such income would also repay a portion of the cost of importation works. The bill would permit subsidies from this fund not only to the central Arizona project, but also to the Dixie project, Utah, and the southern Nevada and Moapa projects, to the extent that the Secretary may recommend and the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs of the two Houses may approve.

IX. PACIFIC SOUTHWEST REGIONAL WATER COMMISSION

The bill would create a Federal-State commission with long-range planning functions. On it would be represented each State affected—the seven States of the Colorado River Basin plus every State from which water is imported into the Colorado—and each major Federal department or agency concerned.

X. GENERAL PROVISIONS

The bill groups together a number of general provisions applicable to all operations under the act. Of these, the most significant is one borrowed from the Colorado River Storage Project Act, amended to meet deficiencies that have been discovered in it. This directs all Federal agencies to comply with the "law of the river"—the applicable compacts, statutes, treaty, court decisions, et cetera, and, in the internal distribution of water within each State, to comply with that State's laws, including intrastate priorities. In the event of noncompliance, any affected State may bring suit against the offending agency or official in the U.S. Supreme Court or in the District Court for the District of Columbia, and grants the consent of Congress to the joinder of the United States in such a suit, as defendant or otherwise. This is because, without the consent of Congress, the United States may not be sued.

CONCLUSION

I reiterate what I said during the hearings on the Udall plan last spring, when I introduced S. 2760, the present bill's predecessor. In that bill, I offered what no California Senator or Congressman had ever offered before: to join in sponsoring the authorization of the central Arizona project. I made the offer on two conditions: First, that that project be part of a regional project, which would help solve the water problems of the whole Southwest, not merely Arizona. Second, that existing projects in all three States be protected against the shortages which construction of the central Arizona project would bring about. The protection asked for California was limited to 4.4 million acre-feet, the quantity that California was apportioned from the first 7.5 million. That offer was rejected.

Arizona first denied that there would be a water shortage at all. If that is so, she cannot possibly be hurt if she recognizes that existing projects in California, Arizona, and Nevada are entitled to the protection of the 100-year-old rule of water law in the West, that existing projects shall not be destroyed to create new projects. But Arizona did reject this protection to California and Nevada, while her legislature passed two acts assuring this very protection to existing Arizona projects as against this same proposed central Arizona project, by name.

We stood firm. Next, Arizona offered to recognize the principle of the protection of California's existing uses up to 4.4 million acre-feet, but only for 25 years. I rejected this position. California's water users, likewise, have rejected it.

I again hold out the hand of friendship to Arizona. I am willing now, as the bill I have just introduced demonstrates, and as my bill, S. 2760 in the 88th Congress demonstrated, not only to acquiesce in the construction of the central Arizona project, but also to join in sponsoring a bill authorizing its construction, on two reasonable conditions. The first is that the central Arizona project be part of a broader plan, simultaneously authorized, for the relief of the water shortages in the whole Colorado River Basin, not just Arizona. The second is, that if construction of the central Arizona project is to begin before imported water actually arrives in sufficient quantity to assure both States the survival of their economies that are now dependent upon the Colorado River, the central Arizona project bear the risk of the shortages that its construction would bring about. If Arizona will agree to these conditions, let us join hands in a single bill that will not only authorize construction of the central Arizona project, but which will also meet two other needs, which are just as urgent as Arizona's: the survival of the lower basin projects which already exist, and the filling of the upper basin reservoirs. The future life of the whole Colorado River Basin is at stake.

Mr. President, I repeat, this Congress can go down in history as the savior of the Pacific Southwest region of the United States. There is a rapidly burgeoning economy and a rising population in Arizona. The amazing progress in population and in wealth in my State of California continues. Their economies are intertwined. Their people are friendly neighbors. They need—as I am sure my friends in Arizona will agree—to think and plan together so that Congress can successfully enact legislation which will help both States, and which will also help Nevada and the Upper Colorado River States without doing damage to any other State.

Therefore, in good faith, I introduce the proposed legislation, for appropriate reference to the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

I know that the dean of the Senate, whom I am honored to call a friend, will give consideration to the sort of proposed legislation which I now send to the desk today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 294) to authorize the coordinated development of the water resources of the Pacific Southwest, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. KUCHEL (for himself and Mr. MURPHY), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF BILL TO ESTABLISH THE GUADALUPE MOUNTAINS NATIONAL PARK IN TEXAS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to establish the Guadalupe Mountains National Park in Texas.

Over 70,000 acres of the highest, ruggedest mountains in Texas would be set aside for the enjoyment of future generations under this proposal.

Last year the Interior Department in recommending approval of this proposal stated that this area:

> Contains a combination of scenic and scientific attributes that qualify it as an outstanding addition to the National Park System. It contains the most diversified and beautiful scenery in Texas, some of the most beautiful landscape in the entire southwestern part of the United States, and its Permian marine limestone mountains contain the most extensive and significant fossil reefs in the world.

Lying 100 miles east of El Paso, Tex., and 30 miles southwest of Carlsbad Caverns, N. Mex., the Guadalupe Mountains are visible above the arid lands of west Texas for scores of miles as one approaches them. The mountain range culminates in the massive bluff of El Capitan and the height of Guadalupe Peak. The sudden rise in elevation of nearly a mile brings one from a near-desert to mountain forests and shaded canyon streams. The Guadalupe Mountains abound in wildlife, including mule deer, antelope, bear, mountain lion, elk, and wild turkey. It includes areas of grassland, shrubs as well as forests of pine, maple, fir, oak, and pecan, and is watered by springs and wells.

This area has been surveyed many times by the Interior Department, culminating in its recommendation for national park status by the Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings, and Monuments in its November 1963 meeting. The proposal is also widely hailed by conservation groups and civic associations in the area.

This bill provides for the acquisition of some 70,000 acres of land of the heart of the Guadalupe Mountains, to be added to 5,600 adjacent acres presently owned by the United States. Most of the land to be acquired is part of the Guadalupe Mountain ranch owned by J. C. Hunter, Jr. This individual has wisely operated this ranch so as to preserve the environment and wildlife values, in hopes that someday the beautiful area could belong to the public. He is to be saluted for preserving these mountains in virtually their native condition, worthy of national park status.

I first introduced a bill to create this national park in 1963, the year after the enactment of my bill creating the Padre Island national seashore recreation area. There is a tremendous contrast between the sun-drenched beach at Padre Island and the rocky bluffs of the Guadalupe Mountains, illustrating the great variety and contrast of our continent, and that part of it found within the State of Texas. For future generations we must make sure that some of each natural component of our environment is preserved for enjoyment and study. The Guadalupe Mountains compose a unique area that should be made a national park.

The bill I introduce today is almost identical with that recommended by the Interior Department to the 88th Congress, with minor changes in boundaries to reflect the best thought of myself and others as to the most desirable area to be included. I do not think there will be any controversy over these changes and there may be still other minor boundary adjustments that will appear desirable during consideration of the bill. This bill also contains a provision similar to one enacted in the Padre Island national seashore recreation bill of the 87th Congress, requiring consent of the State of Texas and local governmental bodies to acquisition of land interests owned by them. The State of Texas does own the mineral interest in a considerable portion of this area, but I anticipate no problem in insuring conservation and protection of the natural beauties of the area while avoiding any financial loss to the State of Texas as a mineral owner.

This week our President in a great address to the Nation, called on us to act to protect the beauty of our heritage. He said:

> We must make a massive effort to save the countryside and to establish—as a green legacy for tomorrow—more large and small parks, more seashores and open spaces than have been created during any other period in our national history.

Mr. President, I introduce this bill for the Guadalupe Mountains National Park as a step toward this noble goal.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the matters referred to will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 295) to establish the Guadalupe Mountains National Park in Texas introduced by Mr. YARBOROUGH, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the attached articles describing the beauty of the Guadalupe Mountains and the public support for the establishment of a national park on this site be inserted as an appendix to my comments at this point in the RECORD.

The matters presented by Mr. YARBOROUGH are as follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE TEXAS STATE HISTORICAL SURVEY COMMITTEE SUPPORTING GUADALUPE MOUNTAIN AREA AS A NATIONAL PARK AND DECLARING IT A HISTORIC SITE WORTHY OF PRESERVATION

Whereas it is the statutory purpose of the Texas State Historical Survey Committee to conduct studies and surveys of the various aspects of historical heritage and to stimulate the development of historical resources in every locality of Texas; and

Whereas members of the Texas State Historical Survey Committee have personally visited and inspected the Texas Guadalupe Mountain area and found these mountains and canyons to be of historical significance to the region, State and Nation; and

Whereas historians may delve into the recorded history in the mountains—only touched by the elements—and find fossils, pictographs in caves, Indian pottery and the ruins of a stagecoach stand by El Capitan Mountain, landmark to travelers and campsite for Indians and cavalry; and

Whereas Pinery Station is the only Butterfield Stage station located on a major U.S. highway, its foundations are intact and the original plans are available, therefore affording excellent opportunities for authentic renovation; and

Whereas this area is now being surveyed and studied by the National Park Service with the idea in mind of acquiring a portion that would include the above and other historic sites and trails; and

Whereas firmly believing we should preserve the reminders of the past to find strength for the future: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Texas State Historical Survey Committee in its quarterly meeting in Austin, Tex., on October 11, 1963, does urge this area be designated a national park and that the mountains remain in their untouched state, affording Americans the opportunity to see the historical beauty of their country: And be it further

Resolved, That under the powers conferred upon us by law that we do declare this a historic site worthy of preservation.

TEXAS' TALLEST TALE—THE GUADALUPES

(By Robert Schick)

Soon after I arrived from Missouri to take up residence in Texas, a Lone Star State native welcomed me with this short and sweet analysis of my adopted State.

"You'll like it, son," he said. "Texas just about has it all, except for three things—ugly women, short men, and tall mountains."

After living in many parts of the State for two decades, I found that he was wrong about the women—I've seen three or four downright homely ones. As for the men, I'm not sure for I measured them more by attitude than by altitude. But regarding the lack of tall mountains, all I could do was to face the West and ask pardon for my friend's ignorance from the guardian spirits of the tall Guadalupe Mountains.

It is strange but true that many Texans have little conception of the mountain grandeur of their State. People who are the greatest boosters of the rugged attractions of Colorado or New Mexico, delightfully find the Big Bend a scenic shocker. The Guadalupe Mountains, the State's highest, are even more surprising. When you speak to some people of the sublimity of the Guadalupes—now being proposed as the site of Texas' second national park—they think you're pulling their leg. Go further and tell them that the mighty frontpiece of this range—El Capitan—is one of the world's great individual mountains and they are likely to wonder about your sanity.

But El Capitan qualifies. True, the peak is only 8,200 feet above sea level and isn't even Texas' highest. (The crown goes to Guadalupe Peak, a less imposing relative that sits on El Cap's shoulders.) Look up the elevations of the world's other illustrious peaks and you'll find most of them are much higher—on paper. But old Capitan isn't a "paper" mountain. It has everything a king-peak should have—an overpowering presence, domination of its surroundings and an unforgettable profile.

I'll certainly never forget the first time I saw it. The car I was riding in was crawling cautiously up Guadalupe Pass, bucking a rousing sandstorm. The sky had lost that luminous, white-gold purity typical of those parts and had taken on a delinquent color of rusty dishwater mixed with dusty asphalt. We were lost in a one-dimensional, almost ceiling-zero world. It had been this way since Van Horn. The Guadalupes, ordinarily visible from 75 miles away, had been wiped from the horizon by the giant curtain of the storm. But half way up the pass, I suddenly saw a monster form looming through the swirling, murky tableau of sand. It was El Capitan: immense, overwhelming, seeming to rise to the top of a nonexisting sky. I knew that it wasn't the tallest mountain in the world, but at that moment, for me at least, it had to be.

Capitan's dimensions speak for themselves. It rises a vertical mile above the nearby salt flats. Its knobby summit, resembling a giant clinched fist threatening the world, is 3,000 feet above its base and the last 2,000 feet is sheer cliff. It's easy to see why it has always been the most famous landmark in the Southwest.

The Mescalero Apaches must have held it in religious awe. It certainly was used for their "smoke talk." The first white men to see El Cap probably were Spaniards from Onate's expedition in the late 16th century. Their approach must have been first detected from this high place and the warning smoke seen by half the Mescalero Nation. From Onate's time onward, no white men could enter this land without being picked up by the "Apache radar" on El Capitan.

Called Signal Peak on the early maps, the mountain was to be a beacon to westering Americans for over a century. It guided 49'ers in ox wagons, travelers on the Butterfield stages, U.S. cavalry, Texas Rangers, buffalo hunters, early cattlemen, rustlers and renegades. When man got wings, he found he still had to take Capitan into account. Pilots know it well and respect it. They should, for they know that planes have been dashed to pieces against the limestone monster. Far up there somewhere still remains a memento of tragedy, the crumpled wreckage of a B–29 that didn't make it over "the Hump of Texas" during World War II. In 1958 Noel Kincaid, foreman of the Guadalupe Mountain Ranch, accomplished a folklore-inspiring feat of hauling a monument to the top of El Cap by mule power. The memorial, now in place, honors the airmen who died on the mountain.

El Capitan today is a familiar sight to thousands of east-west motorists who pass almost under its loom on the four-lane highway (U.S. 62–180) over Guadalupe Pass. But the Guadalupe range that lies behind the goliath is one of Texas' least known wilderness areas and one of its most beautiful.

The National Park Service recently acquired 6,000 acres of the McKittrick Canyon section near the New Mexico line. The Texas Guadalupes have been privately owned but its current proprietors, Wallace Pratt, of Houston, and J. C. Hunter, of Abilene, have used this ownership as a public trust. It was Pratt who donated the acreage now operated by the Park Service as an extension of Carlsbad National Park. Hunter is the owner of one of the Southwest's most fabulous holdings, Guadalupe Mountain Ranch, a 71,000-acre spread that covers the greater part of these mountains including El Capitan. It's a working ranch but it is well known that Hunter's abiding interest in the Guadalupes is its preservation as one of the continent's most remarkable geologic and wildlife sanctuaries.

Right now Mr. Hunter would like to see his work of half a lifetime capped by the establishment of a separate national park over the whole of the Texas Guadalupes. His dream may be realized for at this time there is a bill before Congress, introduced by Texas Representative JOE POOL, calling for just this. If the bill is passed and the park becomes a reality, national park rangers will only continue a job of preservation and conservation begun and successfully carried out by this dedicated Texan.

With a hospitality known throughout the West, Hunter and his famous foreman, Noel Kincaid, have been welcoming lovers of the Guadalupes to his ranch for years. The carelessly irreverents who come uninvited with rifles and matches to endanger this wild empire are a different matter. In the days of the Old West, ranchers kept their cowhands on constant vigil to prevent rustling and fence cutting. On Guadalupe Ranch, riders are just as alert to spot those who despoil the land itself and its wild creatures.

In the ranch section of McKittrick Canyon you won't find a head of cattle grazing although it has the finest grass and the best water in the Guadalupes. Instead you will see elk. Mr. Hunter introduced and has protected Texas' only elk herd which now includes over 200 of these lordly animals. You certainly will see deer—white tail, Sonora and mule deer. And you are liable to startle wild turkeys into raucous flight. In the swift, cold stream that splashes down the canyon floor for 5 miles before disappearing underground, are found Texas' only Rainbow trout.

McKittrick Canyon could be called Texas' hidden Yosemite. It has Yosemite's wild grandeur, softened like Yosemite's, by luxuriant growths of trees and grass. Like Yosemite it has its mighty, upthrusted monolith of stone. In McKittrick it is Lover's Leap, a 2,000-foot high, sheer bluff of solid limestone, a thing of almost terrifying beauty.

McKittrick's beauty is the creation of water, which indeed is the transforming genie in all arid lands. Water laid bare its vast limestone outcroppings which are among the world's greatest. Water carved the canyon itself and water nourishes its profoundly varied vegetation.

It is this variety and profusion of growing things that delight and amaze the visitor who has known only the majestic but barren face the Guadalupes turn to the world. Here on the slopes of McKittrick, ponderosa pine stand like regiments of green church spires keeping watch on throngs of trees native to almost every clime. You'll see the ponderosa's neighbors from the upper Rockie—Douglas-fir, western yellow pine, Rocky Mountain juniper and that tree that showers autumn gold, the aspen. A glamordoll of a tree is here. It's the madrone whose peeling bark, revealing layers of different colors, turns its trunk into a jeweled column. If it is a hot day, put your cheek against the madrone's bark and feel its welcome coolness. And, if you look hard, you can find a real exotic in McKittrick's woods—the mahogany tree.

Trees from the Yankee forests are part of the show, big tooth maple from the North Woods and the East's familiar sugar maple, walnut, cherry, chinquapin, and species of oak. These northern hardwoods set the canyon afire with color in the fall.

Water lured these migrant trees, but McKittrick isn't all a watered paradise. Where moisture is scarce and the sun hot, the native southwestern vegetation is boss. On the drier, south-facing slopes you are reminded that the desert is never far away. Like the Apaches watched the intruding white men, the sotol, the agave, the mesquite and the cacti wait to reclaim the land from the "stranger" trees. Not to be outdone, these dry slopes boast one marvel—the great faxon yucca, a magnificent and rare plant.

If a national park does materialize in this area, the close proximity of world-famous Carlsbad's subterranean wonders and the high altitude beauties of the Guadalupes would offer tourists a travel experience unmatched, in its own way, on this continent. The real clincher for the mushrooming of tourism in the Trans-Pecos country, however, could be the linking, in the public mind, of this twin park with Big Bend National Park, only some 200 miles to the southeast.

In the entire West, there are only three or four other regions that can equal the Trans-Pecos in potential tourist lure. They are the regions already blessed with two or more national parks so located that visitors can see more and enjoy more on less money.

Just how long it will be before the Guadalupes become a national domain is hard to tell, but it is time now to make its giant signpost, El Capitan, the unofficial "State mountain" of Texas.

Its image could be a visual symbol of the State as Mount Rainier is of Washington State, Mount Hood is of Oregon and, skipping overseas, old Vesuvius is of Italy. By the way, compared to the Neapolitan Mountain, El Cap is not only taller but has better manners—it doesn't chain smoke and it has never blown its top.

[From the Fort Worth Star-Telegram, July 7, 1963]

A NEW PARK FOR FAR WEST TEXAS

An increase of nearly a fourth in visits to the Big Bend National Park suggests the growing attraction of the rugged beauty of far west Texas for vacationing Americans.

In the first half of this year the huge park counted 53,390 visitors, compared with 42,995 in the first half of 1962. Most significant of the park's spell perhaps is a 91-percent increase in campers. The park's climate permits it to remain open and operating throughout the year.

The interest shown in the Big Bend by vacationers is a strong argument in favor of Federal acquisition of additional available acreage in the Guadalupe Mountains of Texas northward from the Big Bend and just under the New Mexico State line for creation of a new national park.

Six thousand acres in this region already belong to the National Park Service. Extensive adjoining ranch lands belonging to J. C. Hunter, Jr., of Abilene—72,000 acres containing some of the most spectacular scenery in Texas—have been visited by members of a Park Service field survey party whose findings will be analyzed by specialists in the Service.

There is a strong hope for a favorable decision. The high, forested region the park would include contains Guadalupe Peak, which rises to 8,751 feet to form the highest point in the State, and the jagged eminence called El Capitan.

The situation of the area permits easy accessibility for visitors at the closely neighboring Carlsbad Caverns National Park in New Mexico, and good highway facilities connect both to the more distant Big Bend area.

Establishment of a national park in the Guadalupe Mountains thus would complete a group of three great national parks in the same areas, all linked and each distinct in its characteristics.

It would be a loss to future generations if the present opportunity, which may be unique, to acquire such an addition to the Nation's recreation lands were allowed to pass. The population is increasing rapidly, and already the existing recreational areas are being crowded. It is important, in any case, that such scenic regions as the Guadalupes be preserved against the ruination of haphazard development, and preservation can best be accomplished by the National Park Service.

RESOLUTION OF THE WEST TEXAS CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Whereas the Guadalupe Mountain area in Culberson and Hudspeth Counties, Tex. is now under study as a suitable and desirable park site; and

Whereas a subcommittee of the Tourist Development Committee of the West Texas Chamber of Commerce personally visited and inspected the area on July 12–14, 1963; and

Whereas this subcommittee made its report and presented a resolution, covering all the virtues and attributes of the area now under study, which was adopted unanimously in a called meeting of the Tourist Development Committee held in Big Spring, Tex., on August 13, 1963: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the directors of the West Texas Chamber of Commerce, in regular meeting, September 26, 1963, do support the studies looking toward the designation of the said Guadalupe area as a park site; and order copies of this resolution forwarded to the Texas congressional delegation, the Secretary of the Interior, members of the National Park Advisory Committee, the Director of the National Park Service, the Governor of the State of Texas and the Texas Parks and Wildlife Commission.

E. H. DANNER,
President.
FRED H. HUSBANDS,
Executive Vice President.

SIERRA BLANCA, TEX.,
July 10, 1963.

SENATOR RALPH YARBOROUGH,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR YARBOROUGH: The following is a copy of the resolution adopted by the commissioner's court of Hudspeth County at their regular session July 8, 1963.

Upon a motion duly made by Commissioner J. D. Lee, seconded by Commissioner W. F. Hargrove, Jr., and carried unanimously, it is ordered by the court that the following resolution be adopted.

Whereas it is the opinion of the commissioner's court of Hudspeth County, Tex., that places of natural beauty should be maintained for the emjoyment of present and future generations; and

Whereas the national parks now in existence are few and many are only seasonably accessible for the enjoyment of the traveling public; and

Whereas the establishment and maintenance of a national park in the Guadalupe Mountains, in and around McKittrick Canyon, would be of great value to the entire country as well as surrounding areas and would afford year-round recreation in a setting of high rugged mountain peaks, running mountain water, and beautiful trees, and shrubs: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, The commissioner's court of Hudspeth County, Tex., assembled in regular session this 8th day of July, A.D. 1963, unanimously endorse the creation of a national park by the National Park Service of the U.S. Government in North Culberson County in the Guadalupe Mountains in the McKittrick Canyon area.

Yours very truly,

Tom H. Neeley.

Whereas the Guadalupe Mountain area in Culberson and Hudspeth Counties, Tex., is now under study by the National Parks Service for a possible designation as a suitable and desirable national park site; and

Whereas said area is most fitting and suitable for a park site because of its outstanding natural beauty and historical significance; and the Southwest being abundant in maple, wild cherry, ash, walnut, madrone, etc.; in the upper elevations are El Capitan, landmark of the early settlers in their movement to the West, and Guadalupe Peak, the highest point in Texas, 8,751 feet, and where are found heavy stands of ponderosa, limber and pinon pine together with Douglas-fir and aspen; this being the only location in Texas that has rainbow trout and Rocky Mountain elk; plus a dense population of mule deer, wild merriam turkey, mountain sheep, black bear, mountain lions and a normal population of small game; and

Whereas this is one of the few areas remaining in its natural, virgin state in Texas, much of the area never having been utilized for livestock and/or commercial purposes and which has the characteristics that meet the criteria for park use as set forth by the National Park Service; and

Whereas the National Park Service now owns approximately 6,000 acres in the Guadalupe Mountains, adjacent to and including the entrance to the beautiful and spectacular McKittrick Canyon, a result of the generous gift of Mr. Wallace Pratt, celebrated Texas geologist, now being preserved by the Park Service but being of insufficient size to develop into a park; and

Whereas this location is only 35 miles from Carlsbad Caverns National Park and could be operated in conjunction therewith thus effecting a considerable saving; and

Whereas this would add to the existing attractions in the Pecos Valley and the Trans-Pecos areas and would complement our Balmorhea State Park and swimming pool, Fort Davis with its old military installations, scenic drive, and McDonald Observatory; and

Whereas the projected population of Pecos and Reeves Counties will demand more recreational areas to serve our own needs and with the completion of the new highway from Orla in Reeves County to the New Mexico line, we have a direct road to the Guadalupes that will serve not only Pecos and Reeves Counties but will enable Pecos to get its share of the tourists to and from the park; and

Whreas this development would help in the campaign to sell the tourist "on spending an extra day in the Pecos area" as well as the State tourist program of offering more to see and do in Texas: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the directors of the Pecos Chamber of Commerce, in regular meeting, September 10, 1963, do support the designation of the said Guadalupe area as a national park site; and order that copies of this resolution be sent to the Texas congressional delegation, the Secretary of Interior, members of the National Park Advisory Committee, the Director of the National Park Service, the Governor and our State senator and representative.

Archie Scott,
President, Pecos Chamber of Commerce.

Resolution Supporting Guadalupe National Park Legislation, March 23, 1964

On this day, on motion of Commissioner Mays, seconded by Commissioner Sanchez, it is ordered by the court that the following resolution be adopted by the commissioners' court of El Paso County, Tex.:

Whereas the commissioners' court of El Paso County, Tex., on the 29th day of July 1963, went on record as actively and vigorously endorsing and supporting the Guadalupe Mountain Ranch area as a national park; and

Whereas U.S. Senator Ralph W. Yarborough introduced in the Senate bill 2296, and Congressman at Large Joe Pool introduced in the House of Representatives bill H.R. 9312 asking Congress to establish said park; and

Whereas El Paso County commissioners' court continues to believe that the site is fitting and suitable for a national park: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, on this 23d day of March, 1964, That the El Paso County commissioners' court supports the proposed legislation and urges the Congress of the United States to pass this legislation in order that this area may be preserved for the enjoyment of present and future generations of Americans.

[From the Abilene (Tex.) Reporter-News, May 19, 1964]

Guadalupe Area Unspoiled by Man

(By Henry Wolff, Jr.)

Guadalupe Mountain Ranch.—Spanish conquistadores riding north from Mexico in the 1500's must have experienced many of the same inquisitive thoughts of modern day travelers as they approach the Guadalupe mountain range.

Traveling by the scenic range, one cannot help but wonder how El Capitan, the point of the wedge; Guadalupe Peak, the highest point in Texas; and numerous other peaks and interesting canyons would appear on closer inspection.

Today, the average tourist most often does not get a chance to inspect these impressive displays at close range. However, if a proposal of Congressman at Large Joe Pool becomes reality, many future tourists through this area of Texas will get an opportunity to share its beauty and outdoor recreation possibilities.

OVER 8,000 FEET

Rugged El Capitan rises to 8,200 feet above sea level. It has an impressive sheer face and is visible for over 50 miles. Guadalupe Peak, directly north of El Capitan, is 8,751 feet high. Near Guadalupe Peak is Pine Top Mountain, 8,362 feet.

Guadalupe Mountain and part of nearby McKittrick Canyon are on acreage of the 71,790-acre Guadalupe Mountain Ranch owner by J. C. Hunter, Jr., of Abilene. A portion of the Canyon was owned by Wallace Pratt, a noted geologist, who gave approximately 6,000 acres to the National Park Service in March of 1961. The Park Service has explained that because the area is relatively small, it would not be feasible to do more than give protection at this time.

At the time Pratt made his gift to the Nation, he commented, "If the public is to enjoy anything like a full measure of the grandeur and scenic beauty of McKittrick Caynon and the surrounding Guadalupe Mountain, the limits of the new national park must be extended to include these privately owned lands."

At the present time the area is unspoiled by man. Population is scarce and those who live on the land take a great pride in its beauty. When hiking up McKittrick Canyon, Hunter will often stop to pick up a gum wrapper or other litter that some careless visitor has left behind. He is careful to leave behind only that which will return to the earth easily.

It is currently a good hike over rock and through stream to view much of the beauty of the canyon. It has a stream which lazily travels some 4 miles through the cut in the mountains before vanishing underground. Trout swim in the cool, clear water. On each side of the stream, mountains often rise to nearly 6,000 feet. The canyon itself is a rich museum of living plant life, ranging from cacti and other desert vegetation to ponderosa and other pine, more often seen outside the State.

To get a highland view of Guadalupe Peak and El Capitan, one can ride a horse or mule up the rocky, twisting, and narrow trail that leads to the top of Pine Top Mountain, nearly 3,000 feet above Frijole, the ranch headquarters. The view is one not to be forgotten for those few who get an opportunity to venture this far into the mountain range. The State's only herd of wild elk roams this area. Though the elk and trout were not around when Mescalero Apaches inhabited the region, the rest has not changed. The beauty which they knew has been slightly marred only by man's fences and roads.

WANDER TO LEGENDS

With a strong mountain breeze rustling the pines, man can today stand on Pine Top viewing the two more noted peaks before him and quickly find himself leaving thoughts of today behind while letting his mind wander into legend and lore.

While Gen. Lew Wallace was Governor of New Mexico, he says he found a document in Santa Fe describing how a converted Indian conducted a party of Spaniards to a rich gold deposit on the eastern spurs of the Guadalupe Mountains. It is said that Geronimo, leader of the Apaches, used to say that the richest gold mines in the world lay hidden in the Guadalupes. In the 1880's, Ben Sublett, a prospector from Odessa, used to venture into a cave somewhere on the mountain and return with nuggets.

Today, the mountains might not offer man what some of the legends say they did in years gone by, but they can still offer him a chance to get away from crowded civilization for a closer look at nature. They are located in what is already an area with considerable tourist interest. New Mexico's White City, located within a few miles of Carlsbad Caverns and 20 miles from Carlsbad, is only some 25 miles. El Paso with its gateway to Mexico is less than a 2-hour drive.

Though pleased to look at her beauty today, tourists with that desire to enjoy the outdoors must travel through on their way to other spots of interest feeling somewhat deprived of having a more intimate contact with the majestic mountain range.

[From the Fort Worth (Tex.) Star-Telegram, July 3, 1963]

Guadalupes Shelter Wild, Colorful Terrain

(By Don Williams)

The grandly forbidding Guadalupe Mountains of far west Texas enfold a sweep of woodland, canyon, and stream whose presence is unrevealed to those who take U.S. Highway 180 between Carlsbad, N. Mex., and El Paso.

Most Texans, in fact, probably have little idea of the scope and variety of the high country behind the steep, barren wall of the range.

And if a survey should be made, it probably would show that 9 out of 10 Texans think El Capitan—the rocky and almost sheer peak at the south end of the ridge—is the highest mountain in the State.

It isn't. It is only the most spectacular and most photographed.

The highest one is Guadalupe (pronounced waddle-oopy by ranchers in the area, but gwaddle-oopy is acceptable) Peak, elevation 8,751 feet above sea level.

An Abilene oil operator, J. C. Hunter, Jr., owns both mountains as well as the rest of the ridge that includes the highest and the second, third, and fourth highest mountains in the State.

His, too, are the Ponderosa pine and Douglas-fir forests of the high bowl country behind the ridge, and the maple-lined stream that idles down McKittrick Canyon.

The stream is full of 8- to 16-inch rainbow trout, and until it is proved otherwise they may be considered the only trout outside of captivity in the State.

The presence of this unique and colorful hidden terrain might be of only academic interest to the public, except for one thing: Hunter has reason to think the National Park Service is interested in developing the land as a public vacation ground.

Field representatives of the Service spent 5 days on the Hunter ranch last month, riding and camping in the summit ranges and picking their way through the rocks of the canyon.

They told Hunter they were favorably impressed with the site as a possible national park.

The findings of their field survey, which was authorized by Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall, will be analyzed by specialists in the Department. Udall will receive their recommendation and if it is favorable the proposal could go before Congress for authorizing legislation and an appropriation.

Hunter, whose father acquired the 72,000-acre ranch over a period of years beginning in the early 1920's, hopes all the departmental wheels turn in the direction of making his ranch public land.

He has the ranch up for sale, anyway, and he would like to have its new owner preserve it for the enjoyment of millions.

NORTHEAST LIMIT NEAR FAMED CAVERNS

"It would hurt me to have loved those mountains this many years and then see them ruined by some commercial development," he said.

The Hunter Ranch starts at the New Mexico line southwest of Carlsbad and stretches south and west. Its northeastern limit is 20 miles or less from the edge of Carlsbad Caverns National Park.

Visitors to one park would find it convenient to spend the night in the area and then go through the other, if the Park Service should buy the Guadalupe Mountain area, Hunter said. As it is visitors to the caverns are inclined to get back in their cars and leave for distant parts—and nearly all parts are distant from the Carlsbad-Gaudalupe territory.

Hunter showed representatives of newspapers and wire services over his ranch last weekend.

One tour went by horseback and muleback up a narrow trail from the Hunter ranch headquarters near Highway 180 to the rocky summit of Pine Top Mountain, elevation 8,362 feet. Westward across a canyon from Pine Top stands Guadalupe Peak, which slopes hundreds of feet downward to the top of El Capitan, elevation 8,078. The riders also went through The Bowl, timbered country that lies between 7,500 and 8,000 feet. The rim is marked by Bush Mountain, 8,676 feet, Shumard Peak, 8,626 feet, and Bartlett Peak, 8,513 feet.

The second tour was by foot, about 4 miles up McKittrick Canyon from Hunter's lodge at the 5,300-foot level to the narrows at 6,800 feet.

The rock walls of the canyon rise precipitously in places, with about 1,700 vertical feet in sight from canyon floor to limestone crest.

The stream trickles from pool to pool, but the deep spots are patterned by the forms of nice-sized trout, lying like linear shadows in the clear water. The party saw one rainbow with an agreed-upon length of 16 inches. It flashed to the surface and grabbed a piece of bread someone threw in. No one had any fishing tackle. Hunter discourages fishing on the principle that the stream is not big enough to support much depletion.

Hunter's father, the late J. C. Hunter, an oil man who for a time was county judge of Culberson County, had the trout put in the creek in the 1930's. It was restocked after a flood in the early 1940's. Since then, the fish have multiplied without any human augmentation.

ELK, TURKEYS CALL RANCH HOME

Hunter, who is 48, drives out to the ranch from Abilene on special occasions or when he has guests. He runs about 100 Brangus cattle and 3,000 Angora goats on the ranch. His foreman, Noel Kincaid, keeps the stock out of the canyon and the bowl so that the timber and undergrowth will not be harmed. At least partly for this reason, the creek always had water in it but rarely floods. There also are several springs on the ranch.

A kind of an island in zoological and botanical terms, the ranch has 250 or 300 elk (offspring of a small herd introduced years ago), numerous wild turkeys and mule deer, a few bears and occasionally a transient mountain lion.

It has maples that turn brilliant red and orange in late October and early November, and, in the high country, a few quaking aspens and small spruces and true firs that usually grow at Alpine elevations.

Those on the trip up the canyon Sunday saw bright red dragon flies and an emerald green June bug. Canyon wrens fifed a tune that tumbled like a waterfall, and at night an owl sang and a whippoorwill called.

Temperatures ranged from about 60 in the early morning to the lower 90's at midafternoon on the canyon floor. It is cooler in the higher places. May and June are the dry months. From July through September there are frequent afternoon showers.

PARK RANGER LIVES IN $70,000 HOME

Six thousand acres of the Guadalupe Mountain country already belongs to the Park Service. It was given to the Government in 1961 by Wallace Pratt, a noted geologist who spends some of his time on the land but lives most of the year in Tucson.

A park ranger, Pete Sanchez, who is unmarried, lives alone in the $70,000 Pratt home near the mouth of the canyon. The service is already making plans for initial development of the Pratt grant, which adjoins the Hunter property.

Congressman at large Joe Pool introduced a bill earlier this year to have a survey made of the mountain country with a national park in mind. This bill is now in committee. But Secretary Udall's authorization of a survey seems to have made it of no consequence whether or not the Pool bill is adopted, since the proposal is already being carried out.

If the Hunter and Pratt properties should be made a national park, it would be the second one for Texas. Big Bend National Park is about 230 miles southeast of the Guadalupe Range.

A ridge drive, along the summits of the range from northeast to southwest, might be one of the attractions of the proposed new park. It would provide a big view downward and outward for those who like to do their roughing from a car.

Aside from that and a few trails and other minimal conveniences, Hunter hopes that the Guadalupe National Park, if it materializes, retains a lot of untracked wildness. That's the way he has known and preserved it.

Resolution Adopted by the Board of Directors of the El Paso County Historical Society Favoring Establishment of Guadalupe Mountains National Park

Whereas the preservation of sites where significant historical events and movements have occurred and which possess a colorful and rich historical heritage are of particular importance to a regional historical society; and

Whereas the area designated in a bill now before the U.S. Senate as "Guadalupe National Park" is stamped with an historical heritage which represents the great cultures, ideas, and movements which have molded the traditions of the American southwest; and

Whereas the Guadalupe Peak-McKittrick Canyon area is rich with the lore of the Southwestern Indian tribes; was the site of important campaigns against the Comanches and Apaches; was a welcome landmark and beacon arising above the desert plains for travelers along the southern routes; was visited by travelers, traders, and immigrants who passed it on several important southwestern travel routes, including the famous Butterfield Express Line; abounds with stories of lost mines and buried treasures; and was the witness of the most significant and colorful chapter of Southwestern history; the great westward migration; and

Whereas it is the belief of the El Paso Historical Society that the rich historical heritage of this area can best be protected and preserved, and the natural beauty of the area best displayed and made available to the public by the U.S. National Park Service; Now therefore, be it

Resolved, That the El Paso Historical Society unanimously endorse the bill now before the U.S. Senate to create "Guadalupe National Park" and recommend and encourage its prompt enactment into law.

Resolution Adopted by Directors of Odessa Chamber of Commerce Endorsing Designation of Guadalupe Mountains Area as National Park

Whereas the Guadalulpe Mountains area in Culberson and Hudspeth Counties, Tex., is now under study by the National Park Service for a possible designation as a suitable and desirable national park site; and

Whereas said area is most fitting and suitable for a park site because of its outstanding natural beauty and historical significance; and

Whereas in the area is McKittrick Canyon with plantlife unique in the Southwest being abundant in maple, wild cherry, ash, walnut, madroñe, etc.; in the upper elevations are El Capitan, landmark of the early settlers in their movement to the West, and Guadalupe Peak, the highest point in Texas, 8,751 feet, and where are found heavy stands of pondersoa, limber and piñon pine together with Douglas-fir and aspen; this being the only location in Texas that has rainbow trout and Rocky Mountain elk; plus a dense population of mule deer, wild merriam turkey, mountain sheep, black bear, mountain lions and a normal population of small game; and

Whereas this is one of the few areas remaining in its natural, virgin state in Texas, much of the area never having been utilized for livestock and/or commercial purposes and which has the characteristics that meet the criteria for park use as set forth by the National Park Service; and

Whereas the National Park Service now owns approximately 6,000 acres in the Guadalupe Mountains, adjacent to and including the entrance to the beautiful and spectacular McKittrick Canyon, a result of the generous gift of Mr. Wallace Pratt, celebrated Texas geologist, now being preserved by the Park Service but being of insufficient size to develop into a park; and

Whereas this location is only 35 miles from Carlsbad Caverns National Park and could be operated in conjunction therewith thus effecting a considerable saving; and

Whereas this would add to the existing attractions in the Permian Basin and Trans-Pecos Areas and would compliment our own Meteor Crater, Odessa College Museum and Rim Rock City; and

Whereas the projected population of Odessa alone will demand more recreational areas to serve our own needs and with the completion of the new highway from Orla in Loving County to the New Mexico line, we have a direct road to the Guadalupes that will serve not only Odessa but will enable Odessa to get its share of tourists to and from the park; and

Whereas this development would help in the campaign to sell the tourist "on spending an extra day in the Permian Basin," as well as the State tourist program of offering more to see and do in Texas: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the directors of the Odessa Chamber of Commerce, in regular meeting, August 27, 1963, do support the designation of the said Guadalupe area as a national park site; and order that copies of this resolution be sent to the Texas congressional delegation, the Secretary of Interior, members of the National Park Advisory Committee, the Director of the National Park Service, the Governor and our State Senator and Representative.

JACK LOGAN,
President,
Odessa Chamber of Commerce.

Attest:

R. W. HEDGES,
Executive Vice President,
Odessa Chamber of Commerce.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY DIRECTORS OF MONAHANS CHAMBER OF COMMERCE SUPPORTING DESIGNATION OF GUADALUPE MOUNTAINS AREA AS A NATIONAL PARK SITE

Whereas the Guadalupe Mountains area in Culberson and Hudspeth Counties, Tex., has now been approved by the National Park Service for a possible designation as a suitable and desirable national park site; and

Whereas said area is most fitting and suitable for a park site because of its outstanding natural beauty and historical significance; and

Whereas in this area is McKittrick Canyon with abundant plantlife unique in the Southwest, being maple, wild cherry, ash, walnut, madroñe, etc.; in the upper elevations are El Capitan, landmark of the early settlers in their movement to the West, and the Guadalupe Peak, the highest point in Texas, 8,751 feet, and where are found heavy stands of ponderosa, limber, and piñon pine together with Douglas-fir and aspen; this being the only location in Texas that has rainbow trout and Rocky Mountain elk; plus a dense population of mule deer, wild Merriam turkey, mountain sheep, black bear, mountain lions, and a normal population of small game; and

Whereas this is one of the few areas remaining in its natural, virgin state in Texas, much of the area never having been utilized for livestock and/or commercial purposes and which has the characteristics that meet the criteria for park use as set forth by the National Park Service; and

Whereas the National Park Service now owns approximately 6,000 acres in the Guadalupe Mountains; adjacent to and including the entrance to the beautiful and spectacular McKittrick Canyon, a result of the generous gift of Mr. Wallace Pratt, celebrated Texas geologist, now being preserved by the Park Service but being of insufficient size to develop into a park; and

Whereas this location is only 35 miles from Carlsbad Caverns National Park and could be operated in conjunction therewith thus effecting a considerable saving; and

Whereas this would add to the existing attractions in the Permian Basin and Trans-Pecos areas and would compliment our own Monahans Sandhills State Park and Museum; and

Whereas the projected population of the Permian Basin will demand more recreational areas to serve our own needs and with the completion of the new highway from Orla in Loving County to the New Mexico State line, we have a direct road to the Guadalupes, that will enable Monahans to get its share of tourists to and from the park; and

Whereas this development would help in the campaign to sell the tourist "on spending an extra day in the Permian Basin," as well as the State tourist program of offering more to see and do in Texas: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the directors of the Monahans Chamber of Commerce, in regular meeting, April 9, 1964, do support the designation of the said Guadalupe area as a national park site; and order that copies of this resolution be sent to the Texas congressional delegation, the Secretary of Interior, members of the National Park Advisory Committee, the Director of the National Park Service, the Governor and our State legislators.

H. J. ASHER,
President,
Monahans Chamber of Commerce.

Attest:

R. T. WILSON,
Manager,
Monahans Chamber of Commerce.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY MIDLAND CHAMBER OF COMMERCE URGING ESTABLISHMENT OF GUADALUPE MOUNTAINS NATIONAL PARK

Whereas Senate bill 2296 to establish the Guadalupe Mountains National Park has been introduced in the Congress of the United States; and

Whereas the Midland Chamber of Commerce in regular meeting of August 21, 1963, did pass its resolution supporting the designation of the Guadalupe Mountain area in Culberson and Hudspeth Counties, Tex., as the site of a national park; and

Whereas since that time, distinguished Americans have visited the proposed site and have agreed with the Midland Chamber of Commerce that the area contains outstanding scenic and scientific value which ought to be preserved; and

Whereas the best interests of the United States will be served by the favorable consideration and passage of the legislation introduced: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the directors of the Midland Chamber of Commerce, in regular meeting this 15th day of April 1964, do hereby urge the Senate to pass the legislation introduced to establish the Guadalupe Mountains National Park; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution receive the widest possible publicity and that copies hereof be addressed to the Secretary of Interior and the Governor of this State; be it further

Resolved, That John Younger, immediate past president of the Midland (Tex.) Chamber of Commerce be, and hereby is, authorized and delegated to urge the passage of S. 2296 in hearings before the Senators on the 21st and 22d of April 1964.

WALTER C. BEARDSLEY,
President.

STEP BACK INTO TIME IN EL CAPITAN'S SHADOW

(By Robert H. Johnson, Jr.)

PINE SPRINGS, TEX.—The Guadalupe Mountains turn a forbidding face on travelers hurrying past in the desert glare. But it is only a front—shielding a green highland wilderness of canyon and forest. Elk, deer, and turkey wander there, and trout dart in a cold, clear stream.

The National Park Service now owns a small part of this area. It is looking into the possibilities of acquiring another 60,000 acres so that the interior beauty of the Guadalupes can be seen by everybody.

The new park would take in Texas' most famous natural landmark, El Capitan, and the State's highest point, Guadalupe Peak.

The Guadalupes are a wedge-shaped range stretching from southern New Mexico to a point in west Texas about 100 miles east of El Paso and 40 miles southwest of Carlsbad, N. Mex.

El Capitan is the southernmost point of the range. Its sheer limestone walls rise awesomely from the foothills to a height of 8,078 feet. Behind it several peaks tower higher, and Guadalupe Peak reaches 8,751 feet.

This high country now is part of Guadalupe Mountain Ranch, 71,790 acres of desert and mountain owned by J. C. Hunter, Jr., of Abilene, an independent oilman whose father bought the ranch in 1924.

Over the years, the Hunter family has protected the wilderness as a game and vegetation preserve.

Wallace Pratt, a geologist often called the father of Humble Oil's geology department, has a ranch near the Hunters. In March 1961, he gave about 6,000 acres of it to the National Park Service.

The Park Service has a ranger stationed to protect this relatively small area from harm. The public is not admitted now.

The additional 60,000 acres would come from the Hunter ranch. Pratt's former land adjoins Hunter's in McKittrick Canyon.

From the Hunter family lodge, the canyon cuts into the east side of the Guadalupes.

A rough foot trail disappears among limestone boulders. Maple, oak, wild cherry, ash, walnut, ponderosa pine, and alligator juniper trees—so called because of their rough bark—grow on either side of McKittrick Creek and along the canyon walls. Madroñes spread smooth, salmon-colored limbs ending in clusters of deep green leaves. Sotol and mescal grow among the trees.

Cliffs rise straight up, as much as 2,000 feet above the canyon floor.

It is a rough hike up the canyon.

The limestone walls and boulders, the towering trees, and the sentinel-like mescal—or century plant—all create an impression of rugged, enduring grandeur.

Yet, there is fragile beauty, too. Swifts dart above you. Canyon wrens whistle their descending scale, and mockingbirds echo them.

Where cloudbursts and winds have hollowed wide overhangs in the walls over centuries, constant seepage deposits delicate buds of white limestone on moss, and maidenhair fern fringes the crevices. Yellow columbine and blue lupine grow in the sunny places along the stream.

Emerald-green June bugs buzz in the trees. And Chinese-red dragonflies flirt with death over the pools where rainbow trout—the only ones in Texas—glide between sunlight and shadow.

To get to the big timber country high in the mountains, it's best to go horseback. Noel Kincaid, foreman of the Hunter ranch, leads the way up Bear Canyon from his headquarters just off U.S. 180.

Bear Canyon is on the southern face of the range. It rises in a rocky surface dotted with scrub spruce, mescal, sotol, and madroñes.

The trail switches nearly 3,000 feet up a 70° slope, where your horse needs a goat's feet in the shale.

At the crest, a rolling green forest spreads over the ridges and an area called the Bowl. Ponderosa pine, Douglas-fir, and oak tower together. This is the land of the elk—like the trout the only ones in Texas—and wild turkey.

A little farther up is the rocky summit of Pine Top Mountain, 8,362 feet high. From there you can see the hazy blue line of the Davis Mountains, nearly 100 miles to the southeast. You can look down on the majesty of El Capitan. Guadalupe Peak's summit seems at eye level. And you can pick up rocks that show clearly in fossil remains how eons ago tiny sea animals died and gradually built up this limestone mass that once was part of the Capitan Reef of the Permian Sea.

Mescalero Apaches lived in the Guadalupes when the Spaniards came to this country.

Both Apache and Spaniard handed down legends of gold in the Guadalupes.

Passengers on the Butterfield stage speculated about treasure as they watched El Capitan sit before them mile after dusty mile.

And in the 1800's, an old prospector called Ben Sublett may have found it. He used to go into the mountains and take big nuggets back to Odessa. The secret died with Sublett in 1892. And the only sign of him left in the mountains is his initials, "WCS," carved into an alligator juniper, now scoured nearly smooth by wind and sand.

Nobody since Sublett has found the lost gold. But there may be another treasure of the Guadalupes for Americans today—camping, riding, and hiking in these hidden wilds.

PRESIDENTIAL DISABILITY OR VACANCY IN OFFICE OF VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution to deal with the vexing problem of Presidential disability and with vacancies which have existed some 16 times in the office of Vice President. I do not wish to take the time of the Senate now to read the imposing list of cosponsors who have joined me in offering this measure; however, I ask unanimous consent that their names, their States, and the text of the joint resolution be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the names, States, and text of the joint resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S.J. RES. 1

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission by the Congress:

"ARTICLE

"SECTION 1. In case of the removal of the President from office or of his death or resignation, the Vice President shall become President.

"SEC. 2. Whenever there is a vacancy in the office of the Vice President, the President shall nominate a Vice President who shall take office upon confirmation by a majority vote of both Houses of Congress.

"SEC. 3. If the President declares in writing that he is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, such powers and duties shall be discharged by the Vice President as Acting President.

"SEC. 4. If the President does not so declare, and the Vice President with the written concurrence of a majority of the heads of the executive departments of such other body as Congress may by law provide, transmits to the Congress his written declaration that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, the Vice President shall immediately assume the powers and duties of the office as Acting President.

"SEC. 5. Whenever the President transmits to the Congress his written declaration that no inability exists, he shall resume the powers and duties of his office unless the Vice President, with the written concurrence of a majority of the heads of the executive departments or such other body as Congress may by law provide, transmits within two days to the Congress his written declaration that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office. Thereupon Congress will immediately decide the issue. If the Congress determines by two-thirds vote of both Houses that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of the office, the Vice President shall continue to discharge the same as Acting President; otherwise the President shall resume the powers and duties of his office.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I invite specific attention to the fact that the joint resolution bears the names of 68 cosponsors in addition to my own name. This makes a sponsorship of 69 Senators, the number necessary to pass this important piece of legislation. I believe this demonstrates a recognition on the part of a large number of Members of this body of the importance of this problem. The President, in his outstanding state of the Union message, pointed out his recognition of this problem, as well.

I hope it will be possible for this body to reach a speedy acceptance of this measure, which was once passed by the Senate by a voice vote and later by a vote of 65 to 0 in the closing days of the last session.

I close by referring to the remarks made by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], who recognized this problem when he introduced, a moment ago, a resolution dealing with the problem of vice-presidential vacancy. He said it was his opinion that the reason this measure would not receive consideration in the House was that disability had been included.

I hope the House will join the Senate in recognizing the seriousness of this problem. President Eisenhower was disabled three times, President Garfield for 80 days, and President Wilson for 16 months. Congress needs to deal both with the problem of disability and vice-presidential vacancy.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to succession to the Presidency and Vice-Presidency and to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, introduced by Mr. BAYH (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REAPPORTIONMENT

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I have always believed that the people are the fountainhead of governmental power under our form of government. Therefore, I send to the desk a proposed constitutional amendment to clearly set out the right of the people to choose whether or not they wish to have one house of the legislature of their State apportioned on the basis of factors other than population. This is the same legislative system we have in the Federal Government. The amendment would make the use of such a system optional for the States. In the case of a unicameral legislature, the standard of apportionment would be a reasonable one which could be reviewed by the courts.

In order that other Senators who wish to join me in sponsoring this amendment may have an opportunity to do so, I ask that the resolution lie on the table for 3 days.

I also request, Mr. President, that the the text of the proposed amendment be printed in full in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will lie on the desk and be printed in the RECORD, as requested by the Senator from Illinois.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 2) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to preserve to the people of each State power to determine the composition of its legislature and the apportionment of the membership thereof in accordance with law and the provisions of the Constitution of the United States, introduced by Mr. DIRKSEN (for himself and other Senators), is as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

ARTICLE I

SECTION 1. The right and power to determine the composition of the legislature of a State and the apportionment of the membership thereof shall remain in the people of that State. Nothing in this Constitution shall prohibit the people from apportioning one house of a bicameral legislature upon the basis of factors other than population, or from giving reasonable weight to factors other than population in apportioning a unicameral legislature, if, in either case, such apportionment has been submitted to a vote of the people in accordance with law and with the provisions of this Constitution and has been approved by a majority of those voting on that issue.

SEC. 2. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States within seven years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress.

EXTENSION OF DATE FOR TRANSMISSION OF THE BUDGET AND THE ECONOMIC REPORT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I send to the desk a Senate joint resolution, and request its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be stated .

The resolution (S.J. Res. 3) was read, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) notwithstanding the provisions of section 201 of the Act of June 10, 1922, as amended (31 U.S.C. 11), the President shall transmit to the Congress not later than January 25, 1965, the budget for the fiscal year 1966; and (b) notwithstanding the provisions of section 3 of the Act of February 20, 1946, as amended (15

U.S.C. 1022), the President shall transmit to the Congress not later than January 28, 1965, the Economic Report.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution? The Chair hears none. Without objection, the joint resolution is considered and agreed to.

FRANCIS CASE MEMORIAL BRIDGE

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, the Senate last year passed Senate Joint Resolution 110 which I sponsored naming the Washington Channel Bridge on Interstate Route 95 the "Francis Case Memorial Bridge." The resolution had been favorably reported by the District Committee. Unfortunately the measure was not acted on by the other body last year.

I am sending to the desk the resolution as it was approved by the committee and passed by the Senate in the hope that it can be acted upon early in the present session.

The late Senator Francis Case of South Dakota was an indefatigable supporter of the Interstate Highway System and for the District of Columbia, making this structure, linking the District and the interstate route, an especially appropriate memorial to him.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 5) to designate the bridge crossing the Washington Channel of the Potomac River on Interstate Route 95, near the intersection of the extension of 13th and G Streets SW., as the "Francis Case Memorial Bridge" introduced by Mr. McGovern, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PRESIDENTIAL INABILITY—THE NEED FOR A DIRECT AND SIMPLE SOLUTION

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, it is generally agreed that a constitutional amendment is required to clarify the question of Presidential inability. This was a subject of comment in the President's state of the Union message on Monday last.

The relatively permanent nature of an amendment to the Constitution requires the closest examination of all proposed amendments with an eye toward the attributes of the original Constitution. The language must provide Congress with the power to legislate mechanisms for the transfer of Presidential powers and must reflect the sound principles upon which the Constitution was built.

The thorough hearings and discussion conducted by the Constitutional Amendments Subcommittee under the leadership of Senator Bayh resulted in a proposed solution. That solution was passed in the 11th hour of the 88th Congress by the Senate. It was not considered by the House of Representatives. The study of this problem by that subcommittee has been helpful in developing thoughtful approaches.

However, the committee proposal is one with which I do not find myself in full agreement. The proposal does not contain two aspects which are fundamental and necessary. The first is to avoid "locking into" the Constitution a detailed and complex method of deciding the presence and termination of inability of the President. The second is to honor the spirit and the word of the doctrine of separation of powers.

In regard to the advisability of setting forth a detailed and complex procedure in the Constitution by amendment, it is helpful to note the comments of the Deputy Attorney General Katzenbach, now Acting Attorney General, in the hearings held last year, when he stated:

> The wisdom of loading the Constitution down by writing detailed procedural and substantive provisions into it has been questioned by many scholars and statesmen. The framers of the Constitution saw the wisdom of using broad and expanding concepts and principles that could be adjusted to keep pace with current needs. The chances are that supplemental legislation would be required in any event. In addition, crucial and urgent new situations may arise in the changing future—where it may be of importance that Congress, with the President's approval, should be able to act promptly without being required to resort to still another amendment to the Constitution.
>
> Since it is difficult to foresee all of the possible circumstances which the Presidential inability problem could arise, we are opposed to any constitutional amendment which attempts to solve all these questions by a series of complex procedures (1964 hearings, p. 203).

An objection which has been raised against a simple constitutional amendment requiring subsequent legislation is that it will give Congress a "blank check" on writing implementing legislation. The second aspect of this problem is important on this point. The principle of separation of powers should be included in the amendment. If this is done Congress will not have a "blank check" but firm limitations will be placed upon the mechanism devised for the determination of inability. For this reason, it is my firm belief that any constitutional amendment adopted should leave the determination of disability to the executive branch of our Government.

A look at history will dispel any doubts as to the importance of separation of powers. It is helpful to review the case involving the impeachment of a President. Historical accounts of the impeachment trial of President Andrew Johnson illustrate the clear dangers presented when Congress is called upon to consider where to place the mantle of the Presidential powers. We should not provide additional commingling of powers in the case of inability.

There are sound reasons for applying the principle of separation of powers in this situation. First, the determination of the presence of inability is a factual matter. No policy is involved. The issue is simply the presence or absence of inability on the part of an individual. Congress has no expertise in such a determination, by experience, by proximity, nor by temperament. In fact, it is not inconceivable that fact could be clouded with considerations of a political nature should Congress be brought into the question of the President's inability. None of us would have our doctor prescribe treatment for an illness on the basis of political factors. We must take care to assure that the President of the United States is not subjected to such a determination.

Second, this is a decision which cannot be subject to long delays. In an age of advanced weapons and an accelerated pace in national and international affairs, we cannot afford the luxury of weeks or days of delay for a final determination to be reached.

Third, the parties having firsthand access to the facts regarding inability are found within the executive branch and not in Congress nor the Supreme Court.

In the case of a constitutional amendment we do not have the protection of the veto power of the President to assure that the procedure prescribed by the Congress does not transgress his prerogatives, as would be the case with implementing legislation subsequent to an open-ended amendment.

Even if this protection were present, the crucial point in the separation of powers concept is the time that the Presidential power hangs in balance. Any amendment must meet this delayed reaction test.

For these reasons, I am sending to the desk a constitutional amendment to resolve this lingering "blind spot" in our Constitution and ask that its text be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks; and that the resolution lay on the desk till Monday next to permit of addition of cosponsors to same before printing.

It is my hope that this amendment will provide the relatively direct and simple solution which will allow speedy consideration by both the Senate and the House of Representatives and will, in its simplicity, be quickly ratified by the required number of State legislatures.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will lie at the desk, as requested by the Senator from Nebraska.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 6) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office introduced by Mr. Hruska, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, in connection with this proposal I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record two newspaper articles; one written by C. P. Trussell, of the New York Times, and another which was printed in the Washington Post of Wednesday, January 6, 1965.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Jan. 6, 1965]

PRESIDENTIAL DISABILITY BILL REVIVED ON HILL

Leaders in both Houses plan early hearings and expect congressional approval this year of a constitutional amendment to cope with the never-settled issue of presidential disability.

They will use as a starting point the Bayh amendment which was passed by the Senate 65 to 0 last year and reportedly is supported by President Johnson.

This is two-part amendment, containing a formula for determining when a Vice President should act for a disabled President and providing for appointment of a Vice President in case that office becomes vacant.

The President told Congress in his state of Union message that he would submit proposals on disability. He did not spell them out. But Senator **Birch E. Bayh**, Democrat, of Indiana, who had discussed the question with the President, promptly announced that he would reintroduce his amendment today. He has already collected 33 Senate cosponsors.

Representative **Emanuel Celler**, Democrat, of New York, chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, has introduced a resolution identical to **Bayh**'s and said it had top priority on the committee's agenda.

The amendment provides that, if the Vice Presidency becomes vacant, either because of the death of the President or Vice President, the President shall nominate a Vice President subject to confirmation by a majority vote of both Houses of Congress.

The disability problem arises from the vagueness of the Constitution. It says that in case of presidential disability the President's "powers and duties * * * shall devolve on the Vice President." But it does not tell how to decide whether a President is disabled, nor does it make clear whether a recovered President could reclaim his job.

The amendment provides that, if the President is disabled and so states in writing, the Vice President shall become Acting President. If the President does not so declare, perhaps because he is unconscious, the Vice President may act as President with concurrence of the majority of the Cabinet.

The President would take back the reins of his office with a written statement to Congress that he has recovered. In case of a disagreement between the President and the Vice President backed by the Cabinet as to his ability to function, Congress would decide the question.

The amendment provides that Congress act "immediately" and that the President would resume the powers and duties of his office unless two-thirds of both Houses decided he was unable to act.

Representative **William M. McCulloch**, Republican, of Ohio, senior Republican on the House Judiciary Committee, introduced a resolution generally similar to **Bayh**'s, but requiring that Congress act within 10 days on an argument over disability. **Bayh** said a deadline had been considered by his subcommittee and had been rejected on grounds that Congress could be depended upon to act quickly, but that there was no way to force it to do so.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 5, 1965]

Bayh To Present Succession Plan: Bill on Replacing an Ailing President Due Today

(By C. P. Trussell)

Washington, January 5.—A plan for the replacement of an ailing President appeared certain today of early Senate and House consideration. The plan, which also calls for keeping the Vice-Presidency filled, is expected to have President Johnson's active support. He urged such action in his state of the Union message last night.

The plan would be presented as a constitutional amendment, which requires a two-thirds majority approval by Congress and ratification by three-fourths of the States.

A similar bill was approved by a 65 to 0 vote of the Senate last September. It was sent to the House but Congress adjourned before hearings could be started.

Senator **Birch Bayh**, Democrat, of Indiana, the original sponsor of the Senate resolution, will reintroduce it tomorrow and was expected to be joined by a score or more cosponsors.

NO SNAGS EXPECTED

Such programs previously had run into considerable opposition in the House but this time leaders expect no trouble getting the measure to the floor. The Senate is expected to repeat its performance of last autumn.

Senator **Bayh** plans only 1 day of hearings on his bill, since transcripts of last year's hearings are available. He said he believed there was new support throughout the country for the proposed amendment.

Representative **Emanuel Celler**, the Brooklyn Democrat who heads the House Judiciary Committee, introduced a companion measure yesterday as House Joint Resolution 1.

A similar measure was introduced by Representative **William M. McCulloch**, of Ohio, the ranking Republican on Mr. **Celler**'s committee.

"This legislation," Mr. **Celler** said, "will be the first order of business of our committee. Hearings will start as soon as the committee is organized for the new Congress."

The Senate's action last September was the first it had taken to correct a succession system that has left the country without a Vice President 16 times for a total of 37 years.

The proposed constitutional amendment makes these proposals:

If a President were removed from office by death or resignation, the Vice President, as under the present constitutional formula, would become President.

Whenever there was a Vice Presidential vacancy, the President would nominate a Vice President to take office upon confirmation by a majority vote of both Houses of Congress.

If the President declared in writing that he was unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, these would be discharged by the Vice President as Acting President.

If the President did not so declare, and the Vice President, with the written concurrence of a majority of the heads of the executive departments (the Cabinet) or such other body as Congress might provide by law, transmitted to Congress his written declaration of Presidential inability, the Vice President would immediately become Acting President.

Whenever the President transmitted a written declaration to Congress that an inability no longer existed, he could reassume his powers and duties unless the Vice President, with the written concurrence of a majority of the heads of the departments, declared to Congress within 2 days that the President was in fact disabled.

In the last-mentioned instance, Congress would immediately decide the issue. If Congress determined by a two-thirds vote of both Houses that the President was not able to resume his duties, the Vice President would continue as Acting President. Otherwise the President would resume the powers and duties of his office.

The sponsors expressed hope that the legislation could clear Congress without material amendment.

PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT RELATING TO ELECTORAL COLLEGE

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. **Saltonstall**], I introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution pertaining to a proposed constitutional amendment relating to the electoral college. The joint resolution is the same as others which have been introduced in Congress on several occasions. Similar joint resolutions were sponsored in this body, first by former Senator Lodge, of Massachusetts, and later by Senator Kefauver, of Tennessee. I have joined in sponsoring them every time. One such joint resolution passed this body by an overwhelming majority.

I strongly believe that something needs to be done regarding the electoral college. It was quite interesting to observe that in his state of the Union message the President included a statement that something would be done to change the electoral college system.

I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be appropriately referred, but that first it may lie on the table for a week, to permit Senators who may wish to do so to become cosponsors.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 7) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President, introduced by Mr. **Sparkman** (for himself and Mr. **Saltonstall**), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

DISTRIBUTION OF FILM ENTITLED "YEARS OF LIGHTNING, DAY OF DRUMS"

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, before we turn our attention to the challenges which lie ahead for this new Congress and the new era of the Great Society, I would like to call attention to one small but important step we should take to keep faith with the past.

I refer to the splendid film which has been made by the U.S. Information Agency entitled "Years of Lightning, Day of Drums," which depicts events in the administration of our late beloved President John F. Kennedy.

The USIA is properly prohibited from producing films for domestic consumption, but to my mind there never was a clearer case for exception to this rule than is presented by this film.

"Years of Lightning, Day of Drums" is a masterpiece of documentary photography. It tells the moving story of the New Frontier with accuracy and good taste. It recaptures the stark tragedy of the assassination without being maudlin, for the theme of this film is that one "day of drums" could not obliterate the splendid achievements of the Kennedy years, and that John F. Kennedy does indeed live on in the accomplishments of his administration and in the spirit which he imparted so richly to American public life.

It seems to me that this remarkable film should be seen by as many Americans as possible—particularly by young Americans in our schools—because it is an inspirational challenge for the kind of active citizenship which John Kennedy personified. I believe that Congress should therefore take special steps to permit domestic distribution of this film.

The joint resolution which I introduce today would simply express the sense of Congress that the U.S. Information Agency should make appropriate arrangements to make this film available for distribution through educational and commercial media for viewing within the United States. While it will be necessary to distribute the film on a commercial basis to cover the costs involved, it seems to me that the net proceeds should be applied in some way to perpetuate the memory of the late President. My joint resolution, therefore, directs that the net proceeds revert to the Treasury for the express benefit of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts. I can think of no more fitting way in which to assist the construction of this lasting memorial to President Kennedy.

I might add that there was one precedent for making such an exception to the usual policy prohibiting domestic distribution of such films, and that involved another excellent USIA film depicting the visit of Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy to India in 1962. Unfortunately, the intent of Congress was not clearly expressed on that film because the House failed to act on a Senate concurrent resolution, with considerable confusion resulting. I hope that Congress will lose no time in expressing its will clearly with regard to this new film on President Kennedy.

Mr. President, I send my joint resolution to the desk and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 8) to authorize the distribution in the United States of the film prepared by the U.S. Information Agency entitled "Years of Lightning, Day of Drums," depicting events in the administration of the late President John F. Kennedy, introduced by Mr. PELL, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S.J. RES. 8

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That it is the sense of the Congress that the people of the United States should not be denied an opportunity to view the film prepared by the United States Information Agency entitled "Years of Lightning, Day of Drums", depicting events in the administration of the late President John F. Kennedy. Accordingly, it is the sense of the Congress that the United States Information Agency should make appropriate arrangements to make the film described above available for distribution through educational and commercial media for viewing within the United States.

SEC. 2. The net proceeds resulting from any such distribution shall be covered into the Treasury for the benefit of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts and made available, in addition to appropriations authorized in the John F. Kennedy Center Act, to the trustees of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts for use in carrying out the purposes of such Act.

ELECTORAL COLLEGE REFORM

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, interest in our electoral college reform has reached an alltime high; in part, I suspect, because of the recent Supreme Court decisions on the one citizen-one vote concept. In part also, it is because the State of Delaware has recently given notice that it will file a Federal suit on behalf of the State of Delaware to break up the "winner take all" block system of electoral college voting.

In part, certainly it is because the President of the United States in his state of the Union address called attention to the inequities and evils in the present electoral college system, and placed himself on record as being in favor of some type of reform.

It is appropriate, therefore, that on this day, when the electoral college votes are to be counted, we should reintroduce the proposed constitutional amendment which has been before the Senate for some time—namely, Senate Joint Resolution 12, which I now send to the desk for appropriate reference and for the usual number of cosponsors and coauthors.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the joint resolution will lie on the desk, as requested.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 12) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of the President and Vice President, introduced by Mr. MUNDT (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, it seems to me that now is the time to act on this important question.

Senate Joint Resolution 12 provides the formula for correcting the situation, on which the present President of the United States, Lyndon Johnson, when a Senator from Texas, voted in this chamber.

So it would seem that the signs augur well for the passage of electoral college reform in the early future.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I am pleased to have the opportunity again to cosponsor with the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] and others, a proposed constitutional amendment to effect certain changes in the method of electing the President and Vice President. For the past several Congresses I have joined in this effort to reform the electoral college because, in my opinion, there is no political issue of greater significance to our Nation.

As all Members of the Senate know, the present system of electing the Nation's two highest officers is governed by article II, section 1, and the 12th amendment to the Constitution, which provide simply that the President and Vice President shall be chosen by electors appointed by each State in the manner directed by its legislature. Each State has the same number of electors as it is entitled to representatives in the Congress, and the candidates receiving a plurality of the popular vote receive the State's entire electoral vote.

A major popular objection to this system is that it is possible to elect a minority President. On 11 occasions since the adoption of the Constitution, a President has been elected without a majority of the popular vote although he received more popular votes than any other candidate. On three occasions, the candidate elected President had fewer popular votes than his leading opponent. In 1888, for example, Grover Cleveland received a plurality of about 100,000 votes over Benjamin Harrison, but Harrison received 233 electoral votes and Cleveland received only 168. There will always be the possibility under the present system that this result will occur, and in a great democratic society the majority vote shall always be reflected in the election of the people's choice.

I believe, however, that the greatest danger of our present system is in the ever-increasing concentration of population in a few States and the disproportionate influence these areas exert in our national elections.

At the present time, the 11 largest States, plus any one other State, have a sufficient number of electoral votes to control the election. These 11 States are New York, California, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Ohio, Texas, Michigan, New Jersey, Florida, Missouri, and Indiana. Within these States, one or two large cities control the entire electoral vote. In a very real sense, these relatively few urban areas determine who will be the President and Vice President of the United States. It can hardly be questioned that this political power is disproportionate to the population of these few cities.

This situation has developed because of the growth of our two-party system and the movement of our population to large urban areas. While I do not suggest that we change our political party organization, or that residents of our major cities be denied proper representation, I do believe that the electoral vote should more accurately reflect the total national popular vote. Brief mention has already been made of the so-called minority Presidents that have been elected under the present electoral system. Even when the candidate receives a majority of both the popular and electoral votes, the disparity is often great. In 1936, for example, President Roosevelt received 60 percent of the popular vote and 98 percent of the electoral vote. General Eisenhower received 83 percent of the electoral vote in 1952, but only 55 percent of the popular vote. In 1960, the late President Kennedy's popular vote exceeded that of Vice President Nixon by only two-tenths of 1 percent of the total vote, but he received 300 electoral votes to 223 for Mr. Nixon. In the State of Illinois, Mr. Kennedy received less than 10,000 votes more than Nixon out of almost 5 million votes, and yet he received all of the State's 27 electoral votes.

This disparity between the popular and electoral votes exists in these cases largely because a simple plurality in these large States controls the entire electoral vote. Because of this development in our electoral process, many proposals have been submitted to Congress through the years to reform the electoral college system.

These proposals have taken three basic forms which are generally described as first, the direct popular election plan; second, the proportional election plan; and third, the direct election plan. I favor the direct plan which is basically incorporated in the resolution just introduced by the Senator from South Dakota. Basically, this plan retains the electoral vote system. Each State would choose two electors on a statewide basis, corresponding to their representation in the Senate, and would also choose an elector from each of several single-elector districts corresponding to the number of representatives to which that State is entitled in the House of Representatives. Under this system, a State's entire electoral vote would not go to the candidate receiving a plurality of the total popular vote, but would be divided according to the vote in each district. Had this system been in effect in Illinois in the 1960 election, for example, Mr. Kennedy would have received 15 electoral votes and Mr. Nixon would have received 12.

It can be readily seen that this division would have more accurately reflected voter sentiment in that State, instead of Mr. Kennedy receiving all 27 electoral votes.

All Senators are generally familiar with this proposal, Mr. President, and I therefore shall not discuss it in detail at this time. I believe that its merits are easily recognized; its adoption would result in a great improvement over the present electoral system. In my opinion, it is absolutely necessary that the Congress consider this proposal and submit it to the States for ratification if we are to continue to be a great representative democracy. Unless some change is made, the smaller, less populous States will have no significant voice in the election of the President and Vice President. The time for passage of this or a similar proposal is now, and to that end I urge prompt action by the Senate.

Mr. President, soon after I came to the Senate in 1947 a resolution similar to the one now submitted passed this body by a vote of more than two-thirds. I do not believe that it was ever considered on the floor of the House of Representatives, but that vote then demonstrated a need and a realization of that need. The measure has several times previously been considered by the Senate. I believe that the facts are now sufficient, and that the realization of the need is great; they will be so recognized, and the measure will be passed by this body.

PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT RELATING TO FUTURE VACANCIES IN THE OFFICE OF VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I send to the desk a joint resolution proposing a constitutional amendment relating to future vacancies in the office of Vice President.

Simply stated, it provides that in the event of a vacancy in this office, the the President shall nominate a Vice President of the same party affiliation as that of the President.

The nominee would take office only upon confirmation by a majority vote of both Houses of Congress sitting in joint session.

Senators will note that my proposal addresses itself to the heart of the question relative to filling the office of Vice President. It does not contain superfluous language or concern itself with side issues, which would only bog down the Congress in endless controversy while the immediate problem is left unresolved.

Our concern at the moment should be to set up the machinery to fill the Vice-Presidency in the event of death or resignation of the President. In one word—"continuity."

Any other issues, such as the disability of the President, can be left for later decision and action. Such a question as this can be resolved, at least temporarily, by arrangement between the President and the Vice President.

Mr. President, as I understand it, the reason why the bill passed by the Senate in the preceding session was not acted upon by the House was the great difficulty in resolving this particular issue.

It must be underscored again that the issue of immediacy is filling the post of Vice President.

In addition, my proposal would meet head on the problem of future controversy, should the Congress be controlled by a party not the same as that of the President.

If this language is not included, I can envision a problem such as Mr. Truman would have had in the late 1940's when he assumed the Presidency.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this joint resolution be appropriately referred, printed in the Record, and lie over for additional cosponsors through Friday, January 15, 1965.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred, will be printed in the Record and lie over for additional cosponsors through Friday, January 15.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 15) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to vacancies in the Vice-Presidency, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), that the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution only if ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission by the Congress:

"ARTICLE —

"Section 1. In the case of the removal of the President from office or of his death or resignation, the Vice President shall become President.

"Sec. 2. Whenever there is a vacancy in the office of Vice President, the President shall nominate a Vice President who shall be a member of the same political party as the President, who shall take office upon confirmation by a majority vote of both Houses of Congress sitting in joint session."

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "Wilson Hopes Congress Acts Soon on Succession," written by Richard Wilson and published in the Des Moines Register of December 17, 1964, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Wilson Hopes Congress Acts Soon on Succession

(By Richard Wilson)

Washington, D.C.—Now that the electoral college has acted and Lyndon Johnson and Hubert Humphrey are formally elected President and Vice President, respectively, the new Congress should lose no time enacting legislation on the succession to the Vice Presidency.

Ordinarily the opening weeks and even months of Congress are unproductive and Congress has little excuse not to adopt this essential legislation by April 15.

The action of the electoral college on December 14 filled one vacuum but left another. If President Johnson should die prior to January 20, Humphrey would not be entitled to succeed to the Presidency. The man in line is the Speaker of the House, John McCormack, of Massachusetts, 72. Humphrey would not be entitled to the Presidency until January 20.

BAYH'S BILL

If he then succeeded McCormack, there would be no Vice President and a Speaker of the House would once again be second in line. This condition would continue, exempting mortality, for 4 years.

This illustrates how unsatisfactory are the present laws of succession. The country is constantly faced by the possibility that a man will succeed to the Presidency who was not specifically chosen for this role, who might have no qualification for the office whatsoever, but who might serve for several years.

In practical effect there is no problem. A presidential candidate chooses his running mate and thus his possible successor. It follows logically that a President should choose a new Vice President if the incumbent Vice President dies. This is provided by a bill introduced by Senator Bayh, of Indiana which passed the Senate at the last session.

The trouble with the Bayh bill is that it involves other questions which could well be left for later decision after Congress has provided that a President may fill the vacant office of Vice President. What is needed now is action on this one simple question. The Bayh bill provides that the President shall nominate a new Vice President for the duration of an unexpired term and that he shall then be elected by a majority of both Houses of Congress.

If the President's nominee were to be rejected then he shall submit additional names until Congress has approved. Bayh offers his proposal in the form of a constitutional amendment. It is doubtful if the approval of Congress should be called for at all.

Take, for example, the case of President Truman. He was without a Vice President for nearly 4 years and during that time both Houses of Congress were controlled for 2 years by the Republican Party. If the Bayh proposal had been in effect Truman would have been forced to get approval of his Vice-Presidential choice from a Republican Congress, which might or might not have given approval.

A DISABLED PRESIDENT

Other debatable matters are included in the Bayh proposal. One of them is that a majority of the Cabinet could declare the President disabled thus enabling the Vice President to assume the powers and duties of the Presidency. Such arrangements are better left to written understandings between the Vice President and President.

President Eisenhower had such an understanding with Vice President Nixon. A similar arrangement was made between President Kennedy and Vice President Johnson, and Johnson has announced he will make such an agreement with Humphrey when Humphrey becomes Vice President.

Congress need only address itself to the simplest problem, that of filling the Vice-Presidency if this office falls vacant.

ALL-INCLUSIVE SETTLEMENTS

All-inclusive settlements of the various problems entering into the many possible different forms of succession are likely to be found unduly restrictive in the future.

What is needed is the settlement of one single part of the problem which arises now in direct form. This can be done by giving the President the right he already has in practical politics, the right to choose his possible successor for a limited term. If this can be done without a constitutional amendment so much the better.

If the legislation is not adopted this will be the typical situation in the future if a President dies in office: The Vice President will succeeed to the Presidency, there will be no Vice President and the next in line for the Presidency will be a Member of Congress, elected by a fraction of the voters in one State, who may or may not be a member of the President's political party. He will be a man of mature years and of high seniority in Congress; otherwise he would not be Speaker of the House.

ADDITIONAL JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

The following additional joint resolution was introduced, which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

By Mr. PELL:

S.J. Res. 16. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to the States of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, and the District of Columbia to negotiate and enter into a compact to establish a multistate authority to construct and operate a passenger rail transportation system within the area of such States and the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. PELL when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

HIGH-SPEED RAIL PASSENGER SERVICE IN THE NORTHEASTERN PART OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I wish at this time to reintroduce my original, basic joint resolution to provide high-speed rail passenger service in the northeastern part of the United States.

This Senate joint resolution, which I first introduced in the 87th Congress on June 1, 1962, and reintroduced in the 88th Congress, has prompted a remarkable volume of public debate and deliberation in spite of the fact that it has never been considered in committee. I am proud indeed to reintroduce it today, particularly in view of the fact that President Johnson found enough merit in my idea to incorporate it into his program for the Great Society as set forth by him in his state of the Union message.

This is a very simple bill. It would simply authorize the eight Seaboard States between Boston and Washington plus the District of Columbia to enter into a compact and form a public authority to operate rail passenger service. It would do nothing more than permit a group of States to combine to form a new agency for financing public transportation. It would not commit the Federal Government to any program of direct subsidy, although I have suggested that it be desirable for the Federal Government to guarantee a portion of the bonded debt of the authority.

This simple joint resolution is, thus, only a suggested innovation for financing railroad rehabilitation. Although the language of the bill makes no attempt to spell out just what form this rehabilitation would take, the immense possibilities of what could result, I believe, have caught the fancy of the traveling public everywhere.

I have suggested from the beginning that the very minimum improvement should be the acquisition of new equipment which would permit frequent service at 100 miles per hour speeds between the great urban centers of our northeastern megalopolis. The existing railroad companies, caught in the spiral of their own decline in passenger service, are unwilling or unable to make such an investment. I believe it is in the public interest for Government to take limited steps to stimulate such activity.

My reasoning has been that because of the unique geographic, economic, and demographic features of our area, the railroads inevitably will play an essential role in moving people. We have in our northeast megalopolis over 20 percent of the Nation's population and nearly 30 percent of the Nation's manufacturing operations crowded on only 1.4 percent of the Nation's land area. There is no other comparable area in our country where there are so many people competing for space and for channels of transportation.

By 1980, we are told, intercity travel in this megalopolis is expected to increase by about 170 percent, and we are already beginning to see limitations to the existing modes of transportation.

Our highway system in some areas is overbuilt, monopolizing an excessive portion of our valuable and costly urban area, often without adequate planning for its overall economic and social impact. We may soon approach the condition of Los Angeles where, for example, at least 50 percent—and possibly as much as 68 percent—of surface space in downtown Los Angeles is devoted to vehicle movement and storage.

And the Commerce Department reports that up to $1 million in runway expansion will be required to accommodate normal increases in air service in the megalopolitan corridor by 1980, even if no new alternatives are presented.

Finally, the railroad passenger service has steadily declined in every conceivable way as passengers are being increasingly tossed about on the deteriorating railroad facilities. In fact, I refer to the night train along our seaboard as the "waker," not the "sleeper."

It is against this background that I originally conceived my proposal for high-speed rail passenger service in the Northeast States.

It seems to me that the railroads, with their valuable, restricted rights of way, have a huge, unrealized potential for efficient, dependable, and safe transportation. A single set of rails can do the job of up to 18 lanes of highway. And rail service is relatively immune from the twin plagues of airborne and highway travel—weather and traffic jams. We had a striking demonstration of this fact last Christmas eve when dense fog up and down the eastern seaboard forced thousands of travelers to depend on the railroads.

But the railroads, in order to fulfill their destiny, must attempt to be competitive. I am convinced that in the intermediate length hauls of the megalopolis they can be. With proper innovation the trip from Washington to New York by rail could be made in about 2 hours, and the trip from Washington to Boston could be made in 4.

If such competitive service were to be made available, I believe the railroads would come back into their own as passenger carriers, and their service thus would be preserved intact and viable to meet the even more complex needs of the future. For this reason, I believe that Government should act now to preserve and develop what private industry is unable to save.

I am very glad indeed that the administration of President Johnson has found merit in my general thesis and now is moving ahead with plans for long-range research and development as well as immediate demonstration projects.

The executive branch took an early interest in my proposal in October 1962 when President Kennedy first asked for an evaluation of the plan. This led to feasibility studies by the Department of Commerce during 1963 and 1964 which terminated last August with the conclusion that "the promise of efficient, low cost, fast rail service along the Northeastern Corridor is sufficient to warrant proceeding with detailed investigation and evaluation, including research, design, testing, and demonstration."

In October, President Johnson directed the Secretary of Commerce to initiate a program of high-speed rail demonstration projects and to plan an extensive program of research and development to stimulate new technology in high-speed ground transportation.

It was this two-part program to which the President referred when he pledged in his state of the Union message last Monday:

> I will ask for funds to study high-speed rail transportation between urban centers. We will begin with test projects between Boston and Washington. On high-speed

trains, passengers could travel this distance in less than 4 hours.

As the author of the concept which stimulated all of this activity, I can only say that I am immensely gratified and pleased. I hope that Congress will act favorably and quickly on the implementing legislation and appropriation requests which the administration is expected to submit shortly.

I might add that while I fully support this forward-looking development program, I am greatly aware that much needs to be done here and now for the pressing problems confronting our railroads, particularly in New England. I hope to have more to say on this matter later this week.

Finally, I would point out that the compact bill which I introduce today is one of several possible approaches which may be taken when the administration's program enters the developmental stage. It is by no means the only one and others may be put forward for consideration in time. The original compact bill, nonetheless, is a reasonable and practical approach which I wish to keep before Congress unless and until a better concept presents itself.

Mr. President, I send a joint resolution to the desk, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

I am happy to note that identical or similar bills are being introduced in the House today by Congressmen Giaimo and St. Onge, of Connecticut, St Germain, of Rhode Island, Sickles, of Maryland, and Widnall, of New Jersey.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, will be printed in the Record.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 16) granting the consent of Congress to the States of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, and the District of Columbia to negotiate and enter into a compact to establish a multistate authority to construct and operate a passenger rail transportation system within the area of such States and the District of Columbia, introduced by Mr. Pell, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Whereas the eastern seaboard area containing the eight States of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, and the District of Columbia, is rapidly becoming a megalopolis, and now has a population of over thirty-seven million, and contains almost 30 per centum of the Nation's manufacturing and 21 per centum of the Nation's retailing establishments, as well as the Nation's Capital;

Whereas this area is now serviced by a multitrack system of railroads which for the most part have sufficient rights-of-way to provide adequate passenger transportation throughout the area, but the railroads involved have not been able to provide such passenger service on a paying basis and must rely on profits from freight transportation to keep their entire systems operating;

Whereas it therefore appears that a Government authority must be organized to provide such passenger service which is essential to the welfare of the Nation as well as the area involved, and that the existing railroads would continue to provide necessary freight transportation; and

Whereas it appears that a multistate authority formed by the States involved would be the best type of governmental authority to carry out this passenger rail transportation function: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the consent of Congress is hereby given to the States of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, and to the District of Columbia to negotiate and enter into a compact for the purpose of establishing a multistate authority to construct and operate a passenger rail transportation system within the area of such States and the District of Columbia.

Sec. 2. Such consent is given upon the following conditions:

(1) a representative of the United States, who shall be appointed by the President of the United States, shall participate in such negotiations and shall make a report to Congress of the proceedings and of any compact entered into; and

(2) such compact shall not be binding or obligatory upon any of the States involved or upon the District of Columbia unless and until it has been ratified by the legislature of each of such States and approved by the Congress of the United States.

Sec. 3. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this joint resolution is hereby expressly reserved.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, this is not the first time I have commended the Senator from Rhode Island for the introduction of his measure on a rapid transit railroad service in this part of the country. I think it would set a pattern that would spread elsewhere in the country. I was delighted the other night when the President recommended the principle of the Senator's proposal in his state of the Union address. I hope the Senator from Rhode Island will be successful not only in getting hearings on his measure but in passage this year. To that end he can count on any assistance I can give him.

Mr. PELL. I thank the Senator from Oregon very much.

RESOLUTION TO EQUALIZE PAY OF THREE SUBCOMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, under the pay act which was enacted last year, there were three subcommittees of the Senate Judiciary Committee which, because there were no funds available, would not have their pay equalized at the end of January.

My understanding is that a resolution to correct that situation would have to be acted upon almost immediately, or at least before the 10th day of the month in order to make pay equalization possible for the month of January.

Therefore, Mr. President, on behalf of the majority leader and myself I submit a resolution to accomplish that equalization and ask for its immediate consideration.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

By Mrs. SMITH:

Responses by recipients of Hadassah Myrtle Wreath Awards, at New York City on December 3, 1964.

RETIREMENT OF MR. CHARLES L. WATKINS—HIS DESIGNATION AS PARLIAMENTARIAN EMERITUS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I was not in the Chamber on Monday when the majority leader, my colleague from Arkansas, and several other Senators joined in paying tribute to Charlie Watkins on his retirement.

I wish to join in what was said then and to add my thanks to Charlie for the wise counsel and long service which he has given to the Senate. All of us in the Senate have to take second place to him both in seniority and in knowledge of the Senate rules and procedures. His long tenure as Parliamentarian has given him a tremendous fund of experience and knowledge about the Senate, its rules, its traditions, and its Members. He has been relied upon by Vice Presidents, majority leaders, and freshmen Senators alike. He has never failed to give calm and unerring counsel.

It is a source of special pride to me that Charlie Watkins is a native of my State, having come to Washington over 60 years ago as secretary to Senator James P. Clarke, of Arkansas, whose statue, I might add, is contained in the lower hall of the Capitol.

The Senate will miss Charlie Watkins, and I hope he will drop by occasionally to be sure that things are in good order. I know that all Members of the Senate join in wishing him good luck and Godspeed in the years ahead.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two articles about the retirement of Charles Watkins, which appeared in the Washington Evening Star and the Arkansas Gazette, be printed in the body of the Record.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Arkansas Gazette]

SENATE PARLIAMENTARIAN, FIRST, ONLY ONE, RETIRING—HE'S NATIVE OF ARKANSAS

Washington.—Charles L. Watkins, 85, the only official Parliamentarian in Senate history, will retire today after 59 years of continuous service in one Senate job or another.

Watkins, a native of Mount Ida, Ark., has been Senate Parliamentarian continuously since 1937, when the job was created as a separate post. For 2 years before that, he was both Parliamentarian and Journal clerk.

Watkins, still trim and spry, was closing up his office and looking forward to retirement when he paused to reminisce with reporters. He has no special plans, he said.

"I plan to do as much of nothing as I can and take it easy," he said, "and get a good rest."

Senate Secretary Felton M. Johnston, in announcing Watkins' retirement, named Dr. Floyd M. Riddick, Assistant Parliamentarian since 1952 and an established authority on congressional procedure, as Parliamentarian to succeed Watkins.

Murray Zweben, an assistant in Watkins' office for the last 2 years, was named Assistant Parliamentarian.

Watkins figured in virtually every important Senate ruling and controversy for more than 50 years.

The scholarly, mild-mannered Watkins laughed off any suggestion he might write a book or compile his memoirs. In effect, he said, he couldn't afford to. Too many people have trusted him with too many secrets.

Watkins grew up at Mount Ida and took shorthand there. After 3 months, he went to Little Rock and got a job on the staff of Attorney General Jeff Davis, who later served three terms as Governor of Arkansas. He worked as a secretary under Davis and studied law on the side.

He came to Washington on December 1, 1905, to join the staff of Senator James P. Clarke, of Arkansas. Watkins went to work in the office of the Secretary of the Senate in 1914.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star]

PARLIAMENTARIAN RETIRES—60 YEARS WITH SENATE

(By Cecil Holland)

A Senate tradition has come to an end and a repository of Senate secrets has been closed voluntarily with the retirement of Charles L. Watkins after 60 years of service in the Senate.

The Parliamentarian of the Senate for more than a quarter of a century ended his long service yesterday as quietly as he had made his rulings during many controversial Senate debates.

A notice of his retirement and a brief biography of his Senate service dating back to 1904 was sent to the Senate Press Gallery.

Watkins drove to his home at 4201 Massachusetts Avenue NW., with no fanfare after his final official day at the Capitol.

He left with the best wishes for his successor, his assistant for the last several years, Floyd M. Riddick, and for the Assistant Parliamentarian who once served as Watkins' secretary, Murray Zweben.

As Parliamentarian, the 85-year-old retiring Senate official sat directly in front of the Vice President or whoever was presiding officer in the Senate. In this position he overheard many discussions and many Senate secrets.

But for Watkins there will be no memoirs, no history, and no published recollections.

He said he plans to do no writing and has kept no notes and does not intend to comment on "what I have heard."

Any such comments, he said, were "confidential."

The slender wispy and soft-spoken Parliamentarian was a great favorite of the Senators, newspapermen, and all others who knew him.

In some of the major Senate battles over the years, Watkins occupied his seat in front of the presiding officer for as long as 12 hours at a time. He has been connected with the Senate debates for more than 40 years.

He served as Parliamentarian under 10 Vice Presidents and 3 of them became President. These were Calvin Coolidge, Harry S. Truman, and Lyndon B. Johnson.

The retiring official's greatest stresses came during filibusters and with a wry comment he remarked: "I've been through a lot of them."

His greatest strains came through Senate consideration of such measures as the Fair Employment Practices Act, antilynching proposals and civil rights legislation. He believes the parliamentary situation is clearer now on such issues since "the pattern is pretty well outlined."

Watkins was born in Mount Ida, Ark., on August 10, 1879. He was graduated from the Mount Ida Normal Academy and the University of Arkansas' law department.

His connection with the Senate began on December 1, 1904, when he was appointed as a stenographer in the office of Senator James P. Clarke, of Arkansas. After various service in other offices he was appointed Journal clerk of the Senate in 1919.

In 1923, when the office of Parliamentarian was still not created, he was given in addition to his regular duties the position of unofficial adviser to the Vice President.

On July 1, 1935, his title was changed by the Senate to Parliamentarian and Journal clerk. Two years later these duties were divided and he was assigned to the responsibilities which he has filled since that time.

In 1945, on leave given by the Senate, he served as Parliamentarian of the United Nations Conference at San Francisco.

His successor as Senate Parliamentarian has been an assistant in the office since 1952. Riddick, who lives in Manassas, Va., is a native of North Carolina and a recognized expert on Senate procedures.

Zweben, a George Washington University Law School graduate, has been Second Assistant Parliamentarian of the Senate since January 1963. He practiced law after serving as secretary to the Parliamentarian from 1956 to 1959.

CHARLES L. WATKINS: DISTINGUISHED PUBLIC SERVANT

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, we begin this week a new and challenging chapter in the legislative history of the United States—the 89th Congress is convened and already embroiled in the complex business of forging the laws of our Nation. But, as we gather again in this Chamber to begin this demanding task we note with regret that a familiar face is missing.

Charles L. Watkins has richly earned the pleasures and relaxations of retirement after nearly threescore years of service to the U.S. Senate. As Parliamentarian in this body, his has been a difficult and often thankless duty—to provide procedural advice to insure the orderly conduct of business in a forum which is the scene of almost daily controversy. To say that he has done his job well is to deal in monumental understatement.

Since coming to the Senate as a spokesman for the people of West Virginia in 1958, I have had many opportunities to observe Charlie Watkins at work. In the midst of heated debate, with feeling and partisanship much in evidence, Mr. Watkins was ever the impartial and unperturbable adviser of the Chair. His unfailing accuracy and extensive knowledge of precedent were alternately a source of amazement and inspiration to me. And, it is also likely that he has successfully endured more exposure to the spoken word than any other living American, for the Senate is not a place of stony silence.

We are saddened that our friend and coworker, Charlie Watkins, is no longer at our side as we again take up the burdens of government. However, we rejoice that he can now devote himself to leisure pursuits. We are grateful to Charles L. Watkins for his years of steadfast service; grateful that he leaves us with a capable replacement, Dr. Floyd Riddick; but perhaps most grateful for the indelible imprint that he has made on the character and continuity of action in the U.S. Senate. In this, his has been an invaluable service to the people of our Nation.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on Monday of this week, I was unavoidably called off the Senate floor when a number of the Members of the Senate paid fitting tribute to our esteemed retiring Parliamentarian, Mr. Charles L. Watkins. I want to take this opportunity to join in these tributes and tell of my high admiration and respect for Mr. Watkins and for the service he has performed for the U.S. Senate. Mr. Watkins has labored long and diligently in his position as Parliamentarian. In fact, Mr. Watkins is the creator of the position of Senate Parliamentarian, serving as the first and, until his retirement, as the only Parliamentarian of the Senate. His Government service spans some 59 years in all, with continuous Senate service of more than 50 years. He has advised many Vice Presidents and other presiding officers while they were presiding over the Senate, and has always been a fair and impartial arbiter of the rules. His personal life has been no less impeccable than his public life. Mr. Watkins has been honored for rendering 35 years of continuous service as secretary of his Sunday school.

Fortunately for us, Mr. Watkins leaves behind an invaluable compilation of Senate procedures and a staff of able assistants to continue in the tradition set by Mr. Watkins. In his position as Parliamentarian emeritus, he will be available for consultations and advice when the Senate is in need of his clear and cogent thinking on any parliamentary problem. The Senate will not be the same in the years ahead without Mr. Watkins, but I wish for him many years of good health and happiness.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I would like to add to the sentiments expressed by other Senators my personal admiration and appreciation for the service Mr. Charles L. Watkins has rendered the Senate for over half a century. We shall miss his wise and unfailingly fair counsel and feel a sense of loss at his retirement. Mr. Watkins leaves us an able successor, Dr. Floyd Riddick, to continue in the tradition of conscientious fairness.

I wish for Mr. Watkins good health, long life, and much happiness in the future.

NOTICE OF MOTION TO AMEND RULE XXII

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, pursuant to article I, section 5, of the Constitution, which declares that "Each House may determine the rules of its proceedings," and to the advisory opinions of Vice President Nixon that rules which restrict the power of a majority of the Senate of a new Congress to change its rules are not binding on the Senate at the opening of a new Congress, I send to the desk, on behalf of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] and myself, a resolution to amend rule XXII, and request its present consideration.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I must regretfully object.

The **PRESIDENT** pro tempore. Objection is heard; and the resolution will go over, under rule XIV.

Mr. ANDERSON. Then, Mr. President, I send to the desk a notice of a motion to amend rule XXII, as follows:

NOTICE OF MOTION TO AMEND CERTAIN SENATE RULE

In accordance with the provisions of rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, and without prejudice to the constitutional right of a majority of the Senate of the 89th Congress to accept, reject, or modify any such rule, I hereby give notice in writing that I shall hereafter move to amend rule XXII of the Standing Rules in the following particulars, namely:

That rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended to read as follows:

"1. When a question is pending, no motion shall be received but—

"To adjourn.

"To adjourn to a day certain, or that when the Senate adjourn it shall be to a day certain.

"To take a recess.

"To proceed to the consideration of executive business.

"To lay on the table.

"To postpone indefinitely.

"To postpone to a day certain.

"To commit.

"To amend.

Which several motions shall have precedence as they stand arranged; and the motions relating to adjournment, to take a recess, to proceed to the consideration of executive business, to lay on the table, shall be decided without debate.

"2. Notwithstanding the provisions of rule III or rule VI or any other rule of the Senate, at any time a motion signed by sixteen Senators, to bring to a close the debate upon any measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business is presented to the Senate, the Presiding Officer shall at once state the motion to the Senate, and one hour after the Senate meets on the following calendar day but one, he shall lay the motion before the Senate and direct that the Secretary call the roll, and upon the ascertainment that a quorum is present, the Presiding Officer shall, without debate, submit to the Senate by a yea-and-nay vote the question:

" 'Is it the sense of the Senate that the debate shall be brought to a close?'

"And if that question shall be decided in the affirmative by three-fifths of the Senators present and voting, then said measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, shall be the unfinished business to the exclusion of all other business until disposed of.

"Thereafter no Senator shall be entitled to speak in all more than one hour on the measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, the amendments thereto, and motions affecting the same, and it shall be the duty of the Presiding Officer to keep the time of each Senator who speaks. Except by unanimous consent, no amendment shall be in order after the vote to bring the debate to a close, unless the same has been presented and read prior to that time. No dilatory motion, or dilatory amendment, or amendment not germane shall be in order. Points of order, including questions of relevancy, and appeals from the decision of the Presiding Officer, shall be decided without debate.

"3. The provisions of the last paragraph of rule VIII (prohibiting debate on motions made before 2 o'clock) shall not apply to any motion to proceed to the consideration of any motion, resolution, or proposal to change any of the Standing Rules of the Senate."

The purpose of the proposed amendment is: To provide for bringing debate to a close under certain circumstances by vote of three-fifths of the Senators present and voting.

TRIBUTE TO FRANK P. BRIGGS

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, one of the Nation's outstanding public servants, a former member of this body, Hon. Frank P. Briggs, of Macon, Mo., currently Assistant Secretary of the Interior, has decided to retire from Government.

No one would deny that this outstanding Missourian, former chairman of the Missouri Conservation Commission, and a former Missouri State senator, who completed the term of President Harry S. Truman, has full right, after such a long and distinguished career, to retire from public service. His retirement, however, is a loss to the people of both our State and Nation.

Frank Briggs has worked tirelessly for the wildlife conservation program of this country. His vision as expressed in his efforts have been a practical interpretation of President Johnson's hope to establish "a green legacy for tomorrow."

Those of us who know this able public servant not only respect his ability and capacity, but are very grateful to him for his true and loyal friendship. Frank Briggs leaves the mark of friendship on every path he travels.

I ask unanimous consent that an editorial in the Kansas City Times of December 26, "Frank Briggs Will Return to the Outdoors," be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Kansas City (Mo.) Times, Dec. 26, 1964]

FRANK BRIGGS WILL RETURN TO THE OUTDOORS

On March 1, Frank P. Briggs will step down as the Nation's No. 1 outdoor man. For the last 4 years he has served as Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Fish and Wildlife. During his tenure, Briggs has placed special emphasis on the problems of migratory waterfowl and the so-called endangered species of birds and game, such as the whooping crane and the buffalo. His record has been good.

Briggs accepted the assignment from President Kennedy after a long career in Government, which included many years as an able and hard-working member of the Missouri Conservation Commission. Earlier he had served in the State senate and had filled out the final 2 years of the senatorial term of Harry S. Truman.

The retiring Assistant Secretary has had a lifelong fascination with the duck blinds and quail country of north Missouri. Briggs has missed this rolling countryside. In Washington, he has given up countless hours of personal hunting to help guarantee that there will be plenty of birds left for others in future years. An integral part of the program has been his work with Canada to set aside sufficient "wet lands" for nesting and breeding. During his 4 years, the Interior Department has more than tripled the acquisition of land for wildlife conservation in the United States.

Frank P. Briggs has forged a long and enviable career of public service to Missouri and the Nation. Next March he plans to return to his home in Macon, Mo., and, we presume, to many more contented hours in the great outdoors.

TRIBUTE TO DR. FRANK LUTHER MOTT, DEAN EMERITUS, UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI SCHOOL OF JOURNALISM

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, this last fall Missouri lost an able educator and fine gentleman and American, one of its foremost scholars in the fields of history and journalism, in the death of Dr. Frank Luther Mott, dean emeritus of the University of Missouri School of Journalism.

Dr. Mott, a native of Iowa, was respected and honored not only in Missouri and nationally, but also throughout the world for his contributions to freedom of the press and his scholarly work on the history of American journalism.

I ask unanimous consent that an editorial appearing in the Kansas City Star on October 24, 1964, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Kansas City (Mo.) Star, Oct. 24, 1964]

DR. FRANK LUTHER MOTT

Warmth marked whatever Frank Luther Mott wrote about or did. He had great relish for life and splendid insight into what makes people tick. Dr. Mott had long been recognized as the dean of American historians of journalism. One of his many authoritative books in this field, "American Journalism: A History" has been standard for a generation.

Dr. Mott earned national fame in education and journalism long before becoming dean of journalism at the University of Missouri in 1942. The native Iowan developed a love for the variety of Missouri that was reflected in his most recent book, "Missouri Reader," an anthology of writings linked to the Show-Me State.

Dean Mott himself was a distinguished literary craftsman as well as a prolific producer of nonfiction. He could and did write first-rate fiction. One of his short stories, "The Man With the Good Face," has been translated into several languages. Cheerful and with a bow tie as a trademark, he could also be entertaining in the classroom.

Nationally, Dr. Mott's greatest recognition came from his "History of the American Magazine." Two volumes of that work brought him the Pulitzer Prize for history in 1939. Illness that preceded his death yesterday at the age of 78 prevented completion of the fifth volume.

After becoming dean emeritus in 1951, Dr. Mott continued his lifelong habit of hard work. His wife, who died last month, was his faithful research assistant. In a volume of biographical essays Dr. Mott observed: "I led one life in classroom and office, one in libraries and at my typewriter, and a third as a family man and a social being of sorts."

Frank Luther Mott touched many lives as a teacher, dean, and author. He was the ideal preceptor for young journalism students as well as a brilliant chronicler of America's newspaper and magazine heritage.

TRIBUTE TO BYRON SPENCER

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, in the death this last fall of Byron Spencer, Kansas City lost one of its dedicated service leaders and one of its most able public servants. As a former member of the Kansas City Council and a recent president of the Kansas City Chamber of Commerce, Mr. Spencer contributed much both in his profession and in his public service to the advancement of his city and his State.

I ask unanimous consent that an editorial appearing in the Kansas City Times on October 29, 1964, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Kansas City (Mo.) Times, Oct. 29, 1964]

BYRON SPENCER

Byron Spencer's career covered many years and a broad range of interests. Few adopted Kansas Citians—he practiced law in his native St. Joseph until his middle twenties—have shown more dedication to advancing what was good for this city.

Mr. Spencer served on the city council in the early 1930's and as president of the chamber of commerce just last year. In all that span of time he was concerned with building a better Kansas City. Sometimes his focus was on better streets and highways; at others, on adequate taxes to operate the city, and at still other times he worked to get and keep a major league baseball team here.

In more than 40 years of law practice, Byron Spencer, who died Monday, became as respected for his business judgment as his legal opinions among the various companies he served. Outside office hours, he found civic activity a source of satisfaction rather than an obligation. It was a message he sought to pass along to younger men. He had an abiding interest in the future of the generation behind him, the young lawyers in his firm, his Phi Delta Theta brothers at MU. Their future accomplishments may well serve as a reminder of the civic philosophy of Byron Spencer.

FLOODS IN NORTHERN CALIFORNIA

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, when Nature occasionally goes on a rampage, tremendous forces often are loosed which, far beyond the ability of man to control, inflict grievous damage and—regrettably on occasions—heavy toll of human suffering on wide areas of the Nation.

The devastation caused by hurricanes, tornadoes, earthquakes, floods, blizzards, and other tragic occurrences has been experienced from time to time in virtually every section. Most recently, as all in this body appreciate, my native State of California and neighboring States of the Northwest have been afflicted. Property damage runs into the hundreds of millions. Sorrowfully, more than two-score lives were lost, some of them in gallant but futile rescue and relief efforts.

The widespread consequences of the unprecedented floods which poured down western streams will demand tremendous labors in rehabilitation and rebuilding. It undoubtedly will be necessary for Congress to enact special measures under which needed funds can be provided and steps taken for rebuilding highways and bridges, replacing and repairing basic facilities rendering essential service such as water and sewage plants and systems, extending financial aid to businesses, industries, and individuals, and otherwise aiding in restoring lost enterprises and possessions.

I shall be cooperating with my colleagues from adjoining States when it becomes clear what measures are advisable. I trust that the Congress, traditionally sympathetic in such tragic situations, will act expeditiously on whatever proposals or requests are put forward.

While man frequently is impotent to control these furious forces of nature, human ingenuity and perseverance have enabled our people to take some protective measures against certain vicious threats. Conspicuous in this field are the water projects which the Federal Government has joined with States and other non-Federal entities in constructing. Both multipurpose developments and single-purpose flood control works in which tremendous sums have been invested during the past several decades once more demonstrated during the recent Christmas season misfortune the soundness of such efforts and the wisdom of the heavy outlays.

Incalculable benefits were derived from the dams, levees, debris basins, channelization, and other undertakings accomplished, often on a cooperative basis with other agencies, by the Army's Corps of Engineers and the Interior Department's Bureau of Reclamation.

In harnessing rivers for water conservation, power production, and flood prevention, we made it possible in many instances to retard the runoff of the recent torrential downpours. While human suffering and property damage was lamentably great in many locations, people and property in other sections were spared a recurrence of past tragedies by public works projects such as Shasta and Folsom Dams in California, channel clearance and bank protection on the Sacramento, Yuba, Feather, and lesser rivers. The greatest devastation appears to have been inflicted in basins such as the Klamath, the Eel, and tributaries where to date few such measures have been undertaken.

These facts point up the need for continuing with determination and vigor these worthwhile programs of natural resource conservation and flood protection. We must pursue aggressively the policy of cooperative effort in this direction and, to the limits of our financial and physical ability, speed the building of other desirable projects.

Several impressive instances of the benefits which can be attributed to works of the sort I have in mind have been enumerated in a recent review by the Department of the Interior. A statement based on preliminary estimates shows that Bureau of Reclamation reservoirs are credited with having averted more than $100 million of threatened damage in my State of California and adjoining States in the Christmas storms. Let me note that ironically this is the second time in a decade that sections of California have had the usually happy holiday season turned into a period of suffering and tragedy by the fury of nature.

To illustrate the importance of action and the value of efforts taken in the past, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as part of my remarks a press release from the Interior Department on this matter and an excellent editorial from the Sacramento Bee entitled "Dams, Even Uncompleted, Pay Large Dividends."

There being no objection, the press release and editorial were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

RECLAMATION RESERVOIRS IN FAR WEST AVERT TREMENDOUS FLOOD LOSSES

Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall said today that surging floodwaters trapped and controlled by Bureau of Reclamation reservoirs in the Far West prevented damage of nearly $100 million in California and Nevada and at least $13.5 million in other States in the Pacific Northwest, during last week's devastating floods.

"These estimates are only preliminary and by no means complete," Secretary Udall said. "They take no account of many river basins such as the Trinity in California and the Rogue in Oregon, where no dollar estimates of savings have come in yet, but where we know reclamation dams played a vital role in reducing downstream flooding. And I want to say, too, that dollar signs are pretty inadequate as a means of judging the value of flood prevention. You can't begin to sum up the worth of human lives saved or the misery and suffering averted in terms of cold dollars."

Commissioner of Reclamation Floyd E. Dominy pointed out that the most devastating damage and loss of life and property occurred where there are few, if any, river regulating dams—such as the Eel River Valley in northern California and the Klamath Basin in southwestern Oregon.

"In several watersheds Reclamation dams were able to hold the streams completely in check and prevent any damage at all," Commissioner Dominy said, "and in others, the operation of Reclamation structures was able to hold damages to a very minimum."

A dramatic example of the flood controlling function of a multipurpose dam was afforded on the morning of December 23, by Folsom Dam on the American River above Sacramento. For 2 days Folsom had been reducing flows of the American River through the city by nearly half, thus preventing the flood from topping the main Sacramento levees. Then a non-Federal upstream dam still under construction gave way and sent 30,000 acre-feet of water roaring into the American River and Folsom Lake. Folsom Lake caught the flood and held it. This additional surge would have sent 278,000 cubic feet per second of American River water rampaging through Sacramento in the absence of Folsom Dam. That day saw the highest flow ever recorded in the American River, and marked the third time in 10 years that Folsom Dam has saved Sacramento from a major flood.

Folsom Dam is credited with saving $45 million in damages in the Sacramento area during the crisis.

An additional $40 million in damages in the Sacramento River Valley is estimated to have been saved by the floodwaters stored in Reclamation's Shasta Dam on the upper Sacramento River, where 700,000 acre-feet of flood runoff were caught and held during the 4 days of maximum flow.

"If it hadn't been for Shasta Dam," Commissioner Dominy said, "the Sacramento River from Redding on down would have spilled over its banks like the Eel River to the north. I'm only sorry we aren't a few years ahead in our planning on the Eel. That river needs control badly, both for the local benefits that control would accomplish, and because all that surplus water could be diverted and bring tremendous benefits to the arid Pacific Southwest where excess water is a dream instead of a nightmare."

Other Reclamation dams in California that played important roles in preventing or reducing floods are Trinity, Monticello (Lake Berryessa), East Park, and Stony Gorge. No dollar estimates of savings are yet available for the watersheds below those structures, though the damages prevented are known to be substantial.

On the east slope of the Sierra, Reclamation's Boca and Prosser Creek dams on the Truckee River are estimated to have saved between $5 and $10 million in damages to the Reno area. Just before noon on December 23, the Truckee reached a peak flow of 12,000 cubic feet per second, topping the banks in downtown Reno, but doing relatively little damage. At the same time, Boca and Prosser Creek reservoirs were holding back an additional 14,000 cubic feet per second in flood flows, much of which would otherwise have wound up in Reno's streets, homes, and business establishments.

In Idaho, Reclamation's most impressive flood control structures were Anderson Ranch and Arrowrock Dams in the Boise River Basin. These two reservoirs, operating in conjunction with the Corps of Engineers' Lucky Peak Reservoir just above the city of Boise, stored all the peak inflow of 34,000 cubic feet per second except for a rock-bottom minimum of barely 150 cubic feet per second—the minimum required to support the fish population in the river. There was no downstream flooding at all, and an estimated $11 million in damages was thereby saved.

Another million dollars and more in estimated damages were saved in Idaho by three Reclamation dams on the Payette River above Emmett: Black Canyon, Cascade, and Deadwood. These three structures held back 14,000 cubic feet per second during the flood. Damages occurring along the lower Payette River were the result of side inflows entering the stream below the control structures.

Other Reclamation dams making substantial contributions to flood reduction in Oregon were: McKay Dam (Umatilla River), Owyhee Dam (Owyhee River), Emigrant Dam (Rogue River), Bully Creek Dam, and Prineville and Ochoco Dams (Crooked River). Without these latter two structures, the local irrigation manager estimated that downtown Prineville would have been under 4 feet of water.

The flood crests have passed in all damaged areas and no further losses are expected. In the main, Reclamation structures withstood the flood force and sustained very little damage. A section of Corning Canal in the Sacramento River Valley was washed out, due to inflow from an uncontrolled tributary. Several irrigation distribution systems have been flooded out and ruptured, but the extent of damages will not be known until flood waters recede further. At the dams which played such important roles in flood curtailment, Reclamation crews will experience considerable problems in clearing away debris.

Otherwise, Reclamation's multiple-purpose water conservation structures appear to have weathered the storm in fine shape.

Dams, Even Uncompleted, Pay Large Dividends

Northern California has just experienced a historic storm. It was the type which just over a half century ago would have turned the Sacramento Valley into one vast lake.

But thanks to the huge reservoirs which store sufficient water to take the top off the natural crests, overflow and damage have been kept to a minimum.

Even Oroville Dam, only partially completed, undoubtedly saved Yuba City from a repetition of the tragic Christmas flood of 1955 by holding back enough of the runoff to mean the difference between the river remaining within its levees or topping them.

The major flooding which occurred was on rivers which have not been controlled by dams or levees. The property loss and personal sorrow which occurred should be the spur to provide protection also on those streams—the Eel, Russian, Van Duzen, and Smith Rivers.

And no one should deceive himself regarding the security on some of the streams which do have dams. In a few instances the margin of safety was too narrow for comfort. This includes the American.

The 1964 storm as well as that of 1955 should convince Congress that the protection on the American will not be enough until Auburn Dam is constructed. The next torrential rains may not stop just in the nick of time.

Not only did the big dams save large farm areas and possibly populous urban districts from inundation but they are storing water for irrigation next summer and for the generation of electric power.

It takes occurrences such as the one just passed to prove these dams pay for themselves over and over again and to show how narrowminded, how unconcerned with the public welfare were those who opposed them.

J. EUGENE HARLEY—HOW THE CHARTER OF THE UNITED NATIONS WAS CREATED

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, J. Eugene Harley was an outstanding professor of international relations of the University of Southern California during most of his adult life. I had the honor to be one of his students in law as a student at USC. Professor Harley passed away last November.

He prepared an excellent paper on how the Charter of the United Nations was created. I ask unanimous consent that the text of his paper be incorporated at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

How the Charter of the United Nations Was Created

(Prepared at the suggestion of the United Nations Association of Los Angeles by J. Eugene Harley, emeritus professor of political science, University of Southern California; member of the Commission To Study the Organization of Peace, research affiliate of the American Association for the United Nations)

PREFACE

Carl Q. Christol (professor of international law and chairman, Department of Political Science, University of Southern California; chair of international law, Naval War College, 1962–63; president of the United Nations Association of Los Angeles, 1961–62):

"The United Nations Association of Los Angeles is obliged to provide factual information about the United Nations to the members of our community. We are very fortunate in having as a member a distinguished authority on international organization who attended the San Francisco Conference and who has studied and written about the United Nations from 1945 to the present. It is with pleasure that I am able to introduce this recent analysis by Dr. J. Eugene Harley, and to express my appreciation to him for his superior scholarship. I am particularly hopeful that our members will insure a very wide distribution of this study. Please ask the office of the United Nations Association of Los Angeles for additional copies."

TEXT

"A Stradivarius violin is nothing more than an assemblage of wood and catgut. It takes a musician to get harmony out of it. But if the player is at fault, there is no sense in blaming it on the instrument—still less in smashing it to pieces."

Sir Alexander Cadogan (United Kingdom's representative on the U.N. Security Council) in pleading for patience, understanding, and support for the United Nations. (Quoted from 5 U.N. Bulletin, Aug. 15, 1948, p. 667.)

In 1962, as in past years, there will be a recognition of the day (June 26, 1945), when the Charter of the United Nations was signed. And October 24, 1962, will be observed as United Nations Day to mark the date when the charter went into effect on October 24, 1945.

Twice in the lifetime and memory of millions of the generation now living there has occurred a remarkable tidal wave of practical idealism and efforts for world peace. After World War I this great surge of public opinion was led by President Woodrow Wilson and resulted in the Covenant for the League of Nations.

Once more, during and after World War II, the suffering and devastation caused by the war kindled again the desire for an effective organization for world peace and this led to the writing of the Charter of the United Nations at San Francisco.

In this critical year when under notable difficulties the United Nations is striving for an orderly and peaceful world it is well to recapture the more important elements in the story of the United Nations Charter. It is timely and reassuring to take note of the historical trends toward international cooperation and the remarkable extent of the contributions of many individuals, statesmen, and nations, to the creation of the charter of the United Nations. These highlights in the forging of the charter serve to emphasize the range and extent of the positive efforts for world peace by the 104 nations already members of the United Nations.

In the broader historical sense it may be said that some of the basic ideas in the charter were found in the writings and plans of outstanding men of past centuries such as Mo Ti (ancient China), Osoka (India), Kant (Germany), William Penn (England, United States), Simon Bolivar (Latin America), and Henry Root (United States) to the formation of the Permanent Court of Arbitration at The Hague and the Permanent Court of International Justice (especially through the Root-Phillimore plan) were of major significance.

On the basis of the writings by outstanding and imaginative thinkers came the demands for official action. Thus there were the Bureau of American Republics (1889) which became the Pan American Union, the two Hague Peace Conferences of 1899 and 1907 with the remarkable Convention on Peaceful Settlement of International Disputes and Permanent Court of Arbitration, the League of Nations (1919–20), and the Kellogg-Briand Pact for the Renunciation of War (1928).

The League of Nations: A special word must be spoken to emphasize the fact that the United Nations rests heavily upon the cornerstone that was the League of Nations. Notable contributors to the creation of the League of Nations were President Woodrow Wilson, Gen. Jan C. Smuts (South Africa), Lord Robert Cecil (Great Britain), former President William Howard Taft, and men from many nations. As evidence of their appreciation of the work of President Wilson in the creation of the League of Nations, the city of Geneva, Switzerland, had carved in capital letters on a white stone near the Secretariat of the League the following words, the original being in French:

"To the memory of Woodrow Wilson, President of the United States, founder of the League of Nations."

A careful comparison of the League of Nations Covenant with the Charter of the United Nations reveals with striking clarity the extent to which the United Nations drew upon the League of Nations. This is illustrated by the General Assemblies, the small councils composed of large powers with permanent seats plus a group of other members elected by the assemblies, the secretariats, the "world" courts, sanctions, recognition of regional arrangements, mandates system as basis for trusteeship system, control and reduction of armament, methods for peaceful settlement of international disputes, and other points that could be mentioned.

MAKING THE CHARTER

Like the Constitution of the United States and the covenant of the League of Nations the charter of the United Nations evolved from many plans, conferences, and preceding drafts. The charter is truly a "composite" document which rests upon the work of many individuals, nations, and official international agreements.

The fact that the Charter of the United Nations is the product of many minds, especially those of experts in the United States, is emphasized by the following quotation:

"Probably no other major governmental policy has ever been the product of so many minds as the American proposals for an international organization. Numerous private organizations devoted themselves during the war years to studying the problems of the postwar period, some of them in a most technical fashion, others in more general terms."

Besides the League of Nations Covenant, the Kellogg-Briand Pact, and regional organizations like the Pan American Union, other notable documents pointing to peaceful cooperation were the Inter-Allied Declaration of St. James Palace (June 12, 1941) in which 14 allied governments agreed to cooperate against the menace of aggression and to work for social and economic security in peace and war, the Atlantic Charter (1941), the joint declaration by the United Nations (January 1, 1942), the Fulbright and Connally resolutions (1943) which stated in effect that the United States was willing to join a world peace organization according to the constitutional processes of the Nation. The Fulbright resolution was unanimously adopted by the House of Representatives Committee on Foreign Affairs, June 15, 1943, and on September 21, 1943, it was adopted by the House of Representatives by a vote of 360 to 29.[1] The Connally resolution was approved by the Senate on November 5, 1943, the vote being 85 for and 5 against.[2]

In late October 1943, Secretary of State Cordell Hull—taking his first trip by airplane—met in Moscow with representatives of the United Kingdom, the U.S.S.R., and Nationalist China to talk about common problems, especially a general organization for peace. On October 30, 1943, the representatives of these four governments agreed on the text of the Moscow Declaration which recognized the "necessity of establishing at the earliest practicable date a general international organization, based on the principle of sovereign equality of all peace-loving states, and open to the membership of all such states, large and small." [3]

Dumbarton Oaks proposals: Early in 1944 a small group of well-known experts in the field of international organization met as a citizens committee created by President Roosevelt to work with Under Secretary of State Sumner Welles and his associates in preparing the first American working draft of a charter for the United Nations.[4] This Committee included Isaiah Bowman, former president of Johns Hopkins University, James T. Shotwell, professor of history at Columbia University and chairman of the Commission To Study the Organization of Peace, Hamilton Fish Armstrong, editor of the Foreign Affairs quarterly, Benjamin V. Cohen, former counsel for the Department of State, and Clark M. Eichelberger, then director of the League of Nations Association (now the American Association for the United Nations). As noted later some of these men were participants in the Dumbarton Oaks conversations and their thinking was helpful in the formation of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals. (Dr. Shotwell and Mr. Eichelberger were later consultants at the San Francisco Conference.)

The Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, was aided by the views of the men listed above and in addition had the viewpoints of such experts as Norman Davis, James C. Dunn, Stanley Hornbeck, Harley A. Notter, Green H. Hackworth, and Leo S. Pasvolsky. By the early months of 1944 these experts had prepared for the Department of State a working draft of a forthcoming charter. Secretary Hull also obtained the views of Charles Evans Hughes, ex-Governor Nathan L. Miller, of New York, John W. Davis, and leaders in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. At this juncture the Government of the United States in May 1944 invited the United Kingdom and the U.S.S.R. to send representatives to Dumbarton Oaks—a private estate in the Georgetown area of Washington, D.C.—for informal talks looking to the outlines for the projected Charter of the United Nations.

The Dumbarton Oaks "conversations" began on August 21, 1944. In the first phase of the discussions the United States, the United Kingdom, and the Soviet Union were represented. In the second phase representatives from Nationalist China met with representatives from the United States and the United Kingdom but the Soviet Union was not represented during this period.

For the Dumbarton Oaks conversations Nationalist China sent 4 representatives, the United Kingdom sent 15, the Soviet Union sent 9, and the United States was represented by the following: Edward R. Stettinius, Isaiah Bowman, Benjamin V. Cohen, James Clement Dunn, Lt. Gen. Stanley D. Embick, Maj. Gen. Muir S. Fairchild, Henry P. Fletcher, Joseph C. Grew, Green H. Hackworth, Adm. Arthur J. Hepburn, Stanley K. Hornbeck, Breckinridge Long, Leo Pasvolsky, Maj. Gen. George V. Strong, Rear Adm. Harold C. Train, Vice Adm. Russell Willson, and Edwin C. Wilson.[5]

The four Governments agreed on the text of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals for a General International Organization, October 7, 1944, and this document was used as a basis for discussion at the San Francisco Conference.[6]

UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE ON INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION

San Francisco, April 25–June 26, 1945

During the period between the completion of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals and the beginning of the San Francisco Conference there were two important conferences which had some bearing on the United Nations Charter. These were the Yalta Conference, February 4–11, 1945, and the Mexico City Conference, February 21–March 8, 1945. At Yalta agreements were reached by President Franklin D. Roosevelt (United States), Winston S. Churchill (Great Britain), and Marshal J. V. Stalin (U.S.S.R.). With respect to the forthcoming international organization for peace it was agreed that the United Nations Conference on International Organization would meet in San Francisco on April 25, 1945. At Dumbarton Oaks there was an unresolved deadlock on the procedure for voting in the Security Council. This deadlock was broken at Yalta by an agreement to the effect that the permanent members of the Security Council would have a "veto" as to "substantive" but not on "procedural" matters.

Since the Latin American nations were not represented at Dumbarton Oaks the Inter-American Conference on Problems of War and Peace had as one of its main purposes that of affording to the people of Latin America an opportunity to express their views as to the proposed Charter for the United Nations.

The delegates to the Mexico City Conference favored the principle of universality for the world peace organization. They wished to increase the powers of the General Assembly and to extend the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice. In line with previous views held by many Latin American nations the delegates stressed the importance of an agency to promote intellectual cooperation among nations and the need to allow for the peaceful settlement of international disputes on a regional basis in harmony with the general principles of the world peace organization. A special point was made of the matter of giving proper representation to Latin American nations on the Security Council. It was recommended that Argentina should be allowed to resume active collaboration with the other nations of Latin America and in pursuance of this gesture Argentina was seated as a member of the United Nations Conference on International Organization at San Francisco.[7]

On April 25, 1945, the United Nations Conference on International Organization opened with Secretary of State Stettinius as temporary chairman. With some 3,000 persons in the War Memorial Opera House including delegates from 46 nations—later increased to 50 nations—President Truman addressed the Conference from Washington, D.C., by way of transcontinental telephone.

Members of the delegation of the United States: Before his death and as announced from Yalta, February 13, 1945, President Roosevelt selected the following delegates to represent the United States at the San Francisco Conference: [8] Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., Secretary of State, chairman (Democrat); Cordell Hull, former Secretary of State, senior adviser (Democrat); Tom Connally, chairman of Senate Foreign Relations Committee (Democrat); Arthur H. Vandenberg, ranking Republican member of Senate Foreign Relations Committee; Sol Bloom, member of House Committee on Foreign Affairs (Democrat); Charles A. Eaton, member of House Committee on Foreign Affairs (Republican); Comdr. Harold E. Stassen, U.S.N.R. (Republican); Virginia C. Gildersleeve, dean of Barnard College.

It is thus seen that the delegation represented Democrats and Republicans and no doubt President Roosevelt chose this bipartisan group so as to avoid partisan difficulties such as those experienced by President Wilson when the Covenant of the League of

---

[1] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sept. 21, 1943, p. 7225.

[2] Ibid., Nov. 5, 1943, p. 9222.

[3] See U.S. Department of State Bulletin, Nov. 6, 1943, pp. 308–309.

[4] See U.S. Department of State, Postwar Foreign Policy Preparation, 1939–45. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1950. See also Clark M. Eichelberger, UN—The First Fifteen Years (New York, Harper & Bros. 1960), p. vii.

[5] See Yearbook of the United Nations, 1946–47, annex 1, p. 43.

[6] For full text of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals see ibid., pp. 4–9.

[7] See Bulletin of the Pan American Union, May 1945, p. 263.

[8] See Department of State Bulletin, vol. 12, Feb. 13, 1945, p. 217.

Nations came before the Senate for ratification. Dean Gildersleeve's appointment was a well-merited recognition of the role played by women in efforts for world peace.

In order to achieve a wide reflection of public opinion some 42 private organizations in the United States were allowed to send consultants to the San Francisco Conference. Thus a cross section of opinion was sought. These consultant groups—of national significance—represented various interests such as business, labor, agriculture, education, religion, and men's and women's service organizations. (For a complete list of these organizations see appendix.)

Besides the delegates themselves there were several hundred specialists and advisers who served the delegations to which they were attached. For example, John Foster Dulles was a principal adviser to the delegation of the United States. Following the usual practice in regard to international conferences the host country provided the persons who made up the secretariat which consisted of 1,058 technical and clerical workers, not including Army and Navy personnel and volunteers.

The San Francisco Conference was an ad hoc conference and the secretariat of this conference is not to be confused with the Secretariat of the United Nations. The role of Alger Hiss as secretary general of this conference is not to be confused with that of the Secretary General of the United Nations—a position held to date by Trygve Lie (Norway), Dag Hammarskjold (Sweden), and U Thant (Burma). The role of Mr. Hiss was limited to the mechanical and administrative duties of the conference and was not related to the creative work of writing the charter which was done by four main commissions and 12 technical committees as explained below.

It was decided that the presidency of the plenary (general) sessions should rotate amongst the four sponsoring nations including the United States, the United Kingdom, the Soviet Union, and Nationalist China. France was not a sponsoring nation.

There were four general committees. The Steering Committee, composed of the chairman of all delegations, with Mr. Stettinius as presiding officer, dealt with the more important problems of policy and procedure. The Executive Committee of 14 made recommendations to the Steering Committee. The Coordination Committee of 14 members assisted the Executive Committee and supervised the final drafting of the charter. The Credentials Committee verified the credentials of the various representatives.[9]

THE ACTUAL WORK OF WRITING THE CHARTER

Actually, the work of writing the charter was that of four major Commissions. Each of these Commissions had the assistance of a number of technical committees. Commission I on "general provisions" included committees on preamble, purposes, and principles, membership, Secretariat. The president was Henri Rolin (Belgium). The rapporteur was Vicente G. Sinco (Philippines) and the executive officer was Malcolm Davis (United States).

Commission II on the "General Assembly" was presided over by Field Marshal Jan C. Smuts (Union of South Africa) with Octavio Mendez Pereira (Panama) serving as rapporteur. The executive officer was Huntington Gilchrist (United States). This commission had committees on structure and procedure, political and security functions, economic and social cooperation, and the trusteeship system.

Commission III on "The Security Council" had committees on structure and procedure, peaceful settlement, enforcement arrangements, and regional arrangements. Its president was Wilhelm M. Morgenstierne (Norway) with Celso R. Velázquez (Paraguay) as rapporteur. Grayson Kirk (United States), now president of Columbia University, was the executive officer.

Commission IV on "judicial organization" had a committee on the International Court of Justice and a second committee on legal problems. Its president was Caracciolo Parra-Pérez (Venezuela) with Ato Emmanuel Abraham (Ethiopia) as rapporteur. Norman J. Padelford (United States) served as executive officer.

There were 10 plenary sessions at the San Francisco Conference. In his opening address, April 25, 1945, President Truman—by way of telephone from Washington, D.C.—told the delegates that "if we do not want to die together in war, we must learn to live together in peace." He called upon "Almighty God to guide us in building a permanent monument to those who gave their lives that this moment might come."

Many well-known diplomats and statesmen addressed their fellow delegates at plenary sessions. A careful screening of the texts of speeches reveals an abundance of noble as well as practical sentiments. Many tributes to President Roosevelt were heard. Among the delegates whose words were heard with interest and respect were Anthony Eden (Great Britain), General Smuts (Union of South Africa), General Romulo (Philippines), Masaryk (Czechoslovakia), Spaak (Belgium), Paul-Boncour (France), Stettinius, Vandenberg, and Connally (U.S.A.), Belt (Cuba), Evatt (Australia), Kleffens (Netherlands), Malik (Lebanon), Molotov (U.S.S.R.), and Soong (Nationalist China).

Speakers from small countries, by reason of their sincere appeals to the better side of motivations in life and their captivating words, revealed that many big ideas come from statesmen from little nations. Thus, great applause was heard when Brig. Gen. Carlos P. Romulo, Chairman of the Philippine Delegation, said in part, April 28, 1945:

(Excerpts from General Romulo's speech)

"Let us make this floor the last battlefield.

"We are here to determine whether the human race is going to exist or whether it is to be wiped out in another world holocaust. Those among us who have watched the death agony of great cities, those among us who come from the foxholes of battlefronts, have no illusions as to what another war will do to all men. This may be our last opportunity to achieve peace. We are here to fight for our lives."[10]

Senator Vandenberg spoke of the United Nations as a "town meeting of the world." He made a very noteworthy contribution to the Charter by insisting that justice should be emphasized as a major goal in addition to the goals of peace and security. This emphasis upon justice is quite in line with the decision to make the International Court of Justice an integral part of the United Nations peace machinery, thus dignifying the Court and the role of internationl law as factors in preventing war and preserving peace in the world. With reference to justice, Senator Vandenberg said: "As a result of the San Francisco Conference, Dumbarton Oaks has been given a new soul. As originally drawn, it avoided any reference to justice—without which there can be no stable peace. San Francisco's Charter fills that void. The Charter names justice as the prime criterion of peace."[11]

Besides the decision to stress the importance of international law and justice by making the International Court of Justice an integral part of the United Nations organization the delegates at San Francisco, largely because of the pleas of the Australian Delegation, especially Dr. Evatt, voted to raise the level of the economic and social committee to that of a major organ of the United Nations, viz, the Economic and Social Council. The Trusteeship Council took the place of the old mandates system of the League of Nations. In general, the powers of the General Assembly were increased as compared with those listed in the Dumbarton Oaks proposals. Thus, the way was paved for the subsequent actions by the General Assembly in regard to difficult problems of peace, especially when the Security Council was stalled by inaction caused by deadlocks and vetoes.

Limitations of space do not permit an extensive review of the Charter which consists of 110 articles. The Statute of the International Court of Justice contains 70 articles. A third basic document agreed to at the San Francisco Conference was the Text of Interim Arrangements providing for a Preparatory Commission to plan for the first meetings of the organs of the United Nations.

The special agencies: It is appropriate to draw special attention to the remarkable galaxy of "specialized agencies" which are related to the United Nations through action by the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council as provided by articles 57 and 63 of the Charter. The titles of these special organizations give an indication of how such "functional" efforts are working to remove the causes of war and to promote international cooperation. By means of special agreements these specialized agencies are related to the United Nations. The list of such agencies follows:

1. International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA); 2. International Labor Organization (ILO); 3. Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO); 4. United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO); 5. World Health Organization (WHO); 6. International Bank for Reconstruction and Development; 7. International Monetary Fund; 8. International Development Association; 9. International Finance Corporation; 10. International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO); 11. Universal Postal Union (UPU); 12. International Telecommunication Union (ITU); 13. World Meteorological Organization (WMO); 14. Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization (IMCO).

Thus the delegates had completed their task of creating the Charter of the United Nations. President Truman came in person to the last plenary session, June 26, 1945, and addressed the Conference. This was the day when the charter was signed on behalf of the participating nations. The delegates returned to their homes with hope and faith that the new organization might realize its high ideals of world peace, world security, and world justice. Meantime, there remained the problem of ratification of the charter and the finding of the permanent home for the United Nations. Anticipating the ratification of the charter the Preparatory Commission worked on plans for the first meetings of the organs of the new peace organization.

THE UNITED NATIONS CHARTER APPROVED: AN HISTORIC OCCASION

The Charter of the United Nations was unanimously approved on the evening of June 25 with Lord Halifax (United Kingdom) serving as President. Because of its historic significance the following statement by Lord Halifax is reproduced verbatim:

"Now, ladies and gentlemen of the Conference, we come to the final action of this, the penultimate session. The rapporteurs of the four commissions and of the steering committee have reported on the work of those bodies in the formulation of the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations, including the statute of the International Court and the agreement on interim arrangements, providing for the establishment of the Preparatory Commission. These texts have, I think, been distributed to the delegates and it is now my duty, my honor, and my privilege in the chair to call for a vote on the approval of the Charter of the United Nations, including the statute of the International Court, and also of the agreement on interim arrangements. I feel, ladies and gentlemen, that in view of the world importance of this vote we are collectively about to give, it would be appropriate to depart from the usual method of signifying our feeling by holding up one hand. If you are in agreement with me, I will ask the leaders of delegations to rise in their places in order to record their vote on an issue that I think is likely to be as important as any of us in our lifetime are ever likely to vote upon.

---

[9] See United Nations Yearbook, 1946-47, p. 13.

[10] See Verbatim Minutes of the Fourth Plenary Session of the United Nations Conference on International Organization. Doc. 24 (English), p. 8. Apr. 29, 1945.

[11] See his speech to the Senate, June 29, 1945. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 29, 1945.

"If I have your pleasure, may I invite the leaders of delegations who are in favor of the approval of the charter and the statute and the agreement on interim arrangements to rise in their places and be good enough to remain standing while they are counted. [Here the vote was taken.]

"Thank you. Are there any against?

"The charter and the other documents are unanimously approved.

"[At this point the delegates and the entire audience rose and cheered.]

"I think, ladies and gentlemen, we may all feel that we have taken part, as we may hope in one of the great moments of history." [12]

[It was announced that the actual signing of the charter would occur the next day, June 26, 1945.]

The Preparatory Commission: In pursuance of the Text of Interim Arrangements which was adopted along with the charter a "Preparatory Commission" was established for the purpose of planning for the first meetings of the General Assembly and for organizing the United Nations. Each member of the United Nations had one representative on this Commission which began its working sessions on August 16, 1945. Gladwyn Jebb—later Sir Gladwyn Jebb—of the United Kindgom was elected Executive Secretary of this Commission.[13]

Based upon the careful planning of the Preparatory Commission the first meetings of the General Assembly were held in London, January 10–February 14, 1956. Prime Minister Attlee of the host country addressed the delegates at the first plenary session of the General Assembly, January 10, 1946. He told the delegates that:

"We realize that as perhaps never before a choice is offered to mankind. Twice in my lifetime a war has brought untold sorrow to mankind. Should there be a third world war, the long upward progress toward civilization may be halted for generations, and the work of myriads of men and women through the centuries be brought to nought.[14]

The General Assembly proceeded with its special tasks of electing the nonpermanent members of the Security Council, the members of the Economic and Social Council, and to discharge its function in regard to the election of judges of the International Court of Justice—a function which was shared with the Security Council. These, and many other duties, were carried out during the first session. (The second part of the first session met at Flushing Meadow Park, New York, on October 23, 1946.)

THE CHARTER RATIFIED AND PUT INTO EFFECT

Affirmative action by the Senate of the United States: The action taken by the Senate of the United States on the charter is reflected through hearings by the Foreign Relations Committee resulting in a report favoring ratification and extensive debates in which nearly every Senator participated in recognition of the great importance of the question. Then came the final vote advising ratification. One remarkable feature of the hearings was the submission by Chairman Tom Connally of an "exhibit A" which in four pages of fine print listed the various organizations (and some individuals) for and against the ratification of the charter. This array of oral and written statements, telegrams, and other communications showed an overwhelming majority in favor of ratification.[15]

The final vote on ratification came on July 28, 1945. The count of votes showed 89 Senators voting "yea," 2 Senators (Langer, Shipstead) voting "nay," and 5 Senators not voting. Of those not voting Senator Johnson (California) announced that his vote was "nay" and it was paired with "yea" votes by Senators Reed (Kansas) and Thomas (Idaho). Senator Bailey (North Carolina) was ill and announced that if his vote for ratification had been necessary it would be "yea." Likewise Senator Glass (Virginia) was absent on account of illness and he stated that if he were able to be present his vote would be "yea." [16]

The Charter of the United Nations came into effect on October 24, 1945, when it had been ratified by the five permanent members of the Security Council and a majority of the other signatory states. October 24 of each year has been observed as "United Nations Day."

The members of the United Nations decided—upon the invitation of the United States—to locate the permanent headquarters in New York City. Temporary meetings of the organization were held at Lake Success and Hunter College in New York. John D. Rockefeller, Jr., already noted for his philanthropy, gave to the United Nations for its New York headquarters a tract of land—about 17 acres—worth $8,500,000. The Government of the United States loaned the United Nations a sum of money for the purpose of building the 39-story structure which now houses this world peace organization. This loan of $65 million is interest-free and it is being regularly repaid in annual installments ranging from $1 to $2½ million, the last installment to be paid July 1, 1982.

Thus was born the United Nations. The charter sets forth the three great objectives of world peace, world security, and world justice. It is strikingly in line with the "common denominator" points found in plans for peace and order as stated by many of the great minds of the past: (1) an organization of nations (peoples) into a continuous forum for discussion and peaceful settlement of international disputes; (2) a world court to decide legal (justiciable) disputes; and (3) sanctions (methods of enforcement).

In the debates and addresses at the San Francisco Conference and in the Senate of the United States there were three points emphasized time and again: (1) Another world war will mean the end of civilization as we know it; (2) this time—after World War II—we must build a worthy "living monument" to the war dead by creating a workable world organization dedicated to international peace and order; and (3) this time we must put "teeth" (sanctions, enforcement power) in the peace organization.

Another way of stating the great purpose of the charter is that its framers were trying to substitute reason and rationality (through courts and conferences) for brute force—now topped by thermonuclear weapons—in the settlement of international disputes.

Does the United Nations Charter meet the requirements as set forth above? Time alone will provide the answer. Meantime, the faith, prayers, and earnest efforts of millions of people throughout the world—as never before in history—are dedicated to the support of the United Nations as the best insurance toward a brighter world, a world governed by law and justice and serving the interests of humanity.

SELECTED REFERENCES

The first "Yearbook of the United Nations, 1946–47," gives a good account of the making of the charter and the early months of the United Nations.

The basic reference covering the work of the United Nations Conference on International Organization is the fifteen volume series photo-lithographed by Edwards Brothers, Ann Arbor, Michigan, from the original documents and published by the United Nations Information Organization (38 Russell Square, London and 610 Fifth Avenue, New York). Published in cooperation with the Library of Congress.

Many of the basic documents relating to the formative period of the United Nations are found in "A Decade of American Foreign Policy, Basic Documents, 1941–49." Prepared at the request of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations by the Staff of the Committee and the Department of State. 1381 pages. 81st Congress, 1st Session, Document No. 123.

U.S. Department of State, "Postwar Foreign Policy Preparation, 1939–45." Publication 3580, General Foreign Policy Series 15. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1950. (This is the most comprehensive account of the work of scores of experts who served the State Department and some of the committees in planning for postwar foreign policy, especially the outlines for a world peace organization.)

Ruth B. Russell, assisted by Jeannette E. Muther, "A History of the United Nations Charter." Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution, 1958, 1140 pages. (This volume is very useful in providing a detailed story of the role played by the United States from 1940 to 1945 with reference to planning for the United Nations Charter.)

Authoritative articles on the work of the four main Commissions which took the leading role in writing the charter at San Francisco were written by the Executive Officers of these Commissions and printed in "International Conciliation," September 1945.

An extensive coverage of the debates at San Francisco and in the Senate of the United Nations is given in J. Eugene Harley, "Documentary Textbook on the United Nations; Humanity's March Towards Peace." second ed., revised and enlarged, 1950, 1,470 pages.

Clark M. Eichelberger, "U.N.—The First Fifteen Years," New York: Harper & Bros., 1960. (This volume by the Executive Director of the American Association for the United Nations gives a readable, accurate, and up-to-date account of the more important developments in the work of the

---

[12] See verbatim minutes of the ninth plenary session of the United Nations Conference on International Organization, June 27, 1945. Doc. 1210 (English) p. 20.

[13] For a list of representatives on the Preparatory Commission see the United Nations Yearbook, 1946–47, p. 49.

[14] See the official records of the first part of the first session of the General Assembly, plenary meetings. Verbatim record. Jan. 10–Feb. 14, 1946. Central Hall, Westminster, London.

See also the report of the U.S. delegation to the first part of the first session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, Washington: Government Printing Office, 1946, 54 pages.

[15] For text of "exhibit A" see hearings before the Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate, on the Charter of the United Nations, Government Printing Office, 1945, pp. 712–714.

[16] See the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 28, 1945.

U.N. from its beginning to 1960. Paper cover edition, 50 cents.

Two of the indispensable sources of information about the United Nations are the periodical United Nations Review and the volume entitled "Everyman's United Nations," sixth edition, 1959, published by the Office of Public Information of the U.N.

APPENDIX

List of national organizations which sent consultants to the San Francisco Conference.

The Secretary of State announced on April 10, 1945, that the following organizations had been invited to send representatives to serve as consultants to the American delegation at the United Nations Conference on International Organization:

American section of the International Chamber of Commerce.

Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

National Association of Manufacturers.

National Foreign Trade Council.

American Bar Association.

National Lawyers Guild.

American Federation of Labor.

Congress of Industrial Organization.

Railway Labor Executives Association.

American Legion.

American Veterans Committee.

Disabled American Veterans of the World War.

Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

American Farm Bureau Federation.

Farmers Union.

National Council of Farmer Cooperatives.

National Grange.

American Association of University Women.

General Federation of Women's Clubs.

National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc.

National League of Women Voters.

Women's Action Committee for Victory and Lasting Peace.

American Jewish Conference.

American Jewish Committee.

Catholic Association for International Peace.

Church Peace Union.

Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America.

National Catholic Welfare Conference.

American Association for the United Nations (Commission To Study the Organization of Peace).

Americans United for World Organization, Inc.

Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

Council on Foreign Relations.

Foreign Policy Association.

National Peace Conference.

Kiwanis International.

Lions International.

National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

National Exchange Club.

Rotary International.

American Council on Education.

National Congress of Parents and Teachers.

National Education Association.

"An effort has been made * * * to select organizations which, taken as a whole, constitute a fair cross section of citizen groups." (List taken from 12 U.S. Department of State Bulletin, April 15, 1945, pp. 671–672.)

IS THERE A REPUBLICAN FUTURE?

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, an able member of my staff, my legislative assistant, Mr. Stephen Horn, prepared an address, which he delivered on November 20, 1964, at Princeton, N.J., before the Woodrow Wilson Association of the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs. The address dealt with the rather vital subject "Is There a Republican Future?"

He answered the question in the affirmative.

I believe his comments deserve study by my colleagues on this side of the aisle, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that the entire text of the address be incorporated in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IS THERE A REPUBLICAN FUTURE?

(Address by Stephen Horn, legislative assistant to Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL, before the Woodrow Wilson Association of the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs, November 20, 1964, Princeton, N.J.)

I

The year 1964 has been an interesting year for Republicans and for the Nation. If we were Chinese—and there has been some allusion to Mao's tactics and even policies being advocated in the campaign recently concluded—if we were Chinese, we might call it the year of the political paradox. Perhaps that will be what historians call it, but probably many of us who followed the compaign and hoped for enlightenment by either candidate will also remember it as the year of the bore. As a Republican, I hope we can look on it as the last of its kind to confront our party.

There were many paradoxes, but 10 come readily to mind:

(1) the conservative candidate won even though he was not nominated by what some have called the presumedly conservative political party. The radical candidate was repudiated.

(2) there has been more active infighting in the 2 weeks following the national election and pious statements on the need for leadership by certain Republican politicians than there were in the crucial 2 months prior to the San Francisco Republican Convention, especially by some from whom we waited in vain to hear during the California Republican primary.

Said Mr. Nixon: "anyone who sits on the sidelines in a struggle cannot assume a role of national leadership in the party."

A few days later, although correctly interpreting the election as "a rejection of reaction, a rejection of racism, a rejection of extremism," Mr. Nixon went on to inform all Republicans who might be interested that in his judgment Senators Case, Javits, and Kuchel, Governor Rockefeller, and his former running mate Ambassador Lodge were too "ultraliberal" to aid in rebuilding the Republican Party. He failed to mention that these were the men who almost alone had borne the burdens in the fight to save the Republican Party from reaction, racism, and extremism.

But then some were heard from who were also visible prior to San Francisco. Said Congressman DERWINSKI (one of Mr. Goldwater's stanchest supporters): "The party can't go to the liberals. How could they possibly ask for conservative support after the example they set? If people like JOHN LINDSAY and George Romney are supposed to be the white hopes, the Republican Party may as well disband."

Said Denison Kitchel, the Goldwater campaign director: "We may have to wait 4 years, but we're going to get this Government back where it belongs."

(3) The pamphleteers who painted with a broad and usually inaccurate brush decades of recent history failed to discern the very obvious fact of November 3: there are no 10 million "conservatives" who have not voted in the past for want of a "choice, not an echo."

Said Phyllis Schlafly, those conservatives did come out and vote but they were overcome by another factor. "The Democrats got a large number of people out who never voted before. They got them out on the social security issue and on the issue of war and peace." She thinks these issues were big lies and notes, perceptively, I think, that "If the choice turns out to be between war and peace, people will go for peace." She concluded that: "I think it's pretty wonderful that 26 million Americans support Barry Goldwater and his principles."

Former Senator Knowland noted that this was a higher vote than any presidential candidate had received from George Washington through the election of Harry Truman in 1948—a rationalization which no doubt will be of interest to historical statisticians.

The fallacy here is that the 26 million included a lot who do not agree with Mr. Goldwater's policies but supported him because of party loyalty. But more important, it should be remembered that 42 million votes is a lot more.

As the San Francisco Chronicle correctly editorialized: "Before crowing over 26 million votes, Senator Goldwater and his apologists might well consult the results of the 1960 presidential election. Then, with the total vote virtually identical to this year's, the Republican candidate, unburdened by Goldwater's kind of conservatism, polled more than 34 million votes. It is fair to suggest that Goldwaterism cost the Republican Party more than 8 million votes."

As with "right to work" in 1958, if "Goldwaterism" aroused any voters, who had been sleeping on election days and not been going to the polls, they probably voted Democratic. As one California Republican Congressman noted: "You made the choice, now listen to that echo."

One awaits the word from that glossy pontificator, National Review, which noted prior to the election: "This Tuesday conservatives throughout America will have the opportunity which they have not had for a generation, to state their allegiance in a meaningful way. When they are through, their critics may indeed feel that they have emerged not from a taffy pull, but from a wrestling match. Already they are traumatized by the nature of the beast they have had to confront. They are not likely to emerge from the ring unchanged."

(4) But the great paradox of the election was the overthrowing of an assumption that when the political ax falls on either party it usually falls primarily on those from the marginal districts and not on those from the so-called "safe" districts. Thus, so the rule goes, if there are survivors they are those with seniority, who, over time, become frequently more inflexible regardless of their party since they have no constant demand to accommodate themselves to a "mainstream" which results from competitive two-party American politics.

It is unusual for Republican Congressional candidates to run ahead of the national ticket; witness the 1952 and 1956 Eisenhower and the 1960 Nixon elections. In this election it was commonplace for not only the Republican winners but also the Republican losers to run ahead of the national ticket. Truly, with a handful of notable exceptions such as Keating in New York and Schwengel in Iowa, it was the moderate incumbent who survived.

Thus, John Lindsay, an articulate progressive, in a 2-to-1 Democratic district in New York secured 71 percent of the 3-party vote (yes, Virginia, there are Conservatives, all 5 percent of them). In the 1960 Presidential election, Lindsay received 56.1 percent of the vote. This year he even ran ahead of President Johnson.

Across the Nation, in California, in a 60-percent Democratic district, John Baldwin, an outstanding Republican Congressman, despite being the victim of a particularly dirty campaign, won by the largest margin of his career; almost 65 percent. In 1960, he had received 57.9 percent of the vote.

But to show I'm not reasoning by exception, let's look at this another way.

Twenty-three incumbent Congressmen signed up to help Goldwater defeat Rockefeller in California. All ran for reelection. Seven of the twenty-three were defeated. Only three of the seven were in marginal districts (less than 55 percent of the vote in 1962). These individuals had actively opposed the last Republican administration substantially more on rollcall votes (15.5 percent) more than the average Republican Congressman.

Sixty-two incumbent Congressmen signed the Goldwater endorsement ad which appeared in the New York Times on July 7, 1964. Of the 62, 5 did not run for reelection. Three of those five seats are now held by Democrats. Of the 57 who did run, 20 or over one-third were defeated. A few others who won will probably think twice next time before committing themselves: Ralph Harvey, of Indiana, with 50.4 percent; Joel T. Broyhill, of Virginia, with 50.3 percent; and Carleton J. King, of New York, with 50.03 percent.

On the other hand, the Committee to Support Moderate Republicans, chaired by Charles P. Taft, endorsed 32 incumbent House Members. Only four were defeated.

(5) The master craftsmen of nominating convention politics proved to be perhaps the most unskilled practitioners of general election politics in our modern history. They failed to understand that one wins in America by putting together a majority which includes often diverse groups and individuals of varying beliefs and feelings. With self-righteous zeal they rejected moderate support.

"Accommodation" is proudly not in the rightwing lexicon—for they truly would rather be right than President. They see the world in blacks and whites. They see American politics in apparently a similar light sometimes with the emphasis seemingly only on the whites. One has difficulty determining whether in their perspective it is worse to be a "me-tooer" or a Communist for to the true believer they are one and the same.

(6) The Republican Party of equal opportunity after almost a century has finally broken into the one-party Democratic South of largely unequal opportunity at the congressional level only on the wrong and most transitory grounds while once Republican States, such as Vermont and Iowa, were largely inundated by the Democrats on a much sounder basis.

Thus, the Southern States (except for Mississippi) which had still voted 4 years ago for the Democratic candidate who had telephoned Mrs. Martin Luther King, in 1964 split among a southerner who had largely opposed civil rights legislation until he became President and a southwesterner who while avoiding mention of it would leave racial relations basically to jurisdiction of the States.

It is estimated that the 6 million Negroes who voted this year—and whose forebears until the thirties were wedded to the party of Lincoln—gave at least 90 percent of their votes to President Johnson. Certainly Negro support of President Johnson was decisive in his carrying Florida, North Carolina, and Tennessee. Their effect was also felt in other contests, as in the reelection of Congressman Charles L. Weltner, the Atlanta Democrat who voted for the final passage of the 1964 Civil Rights Act. No doubt Negro feelings toward the top of the ticket had an adverse effect on the failure to elect such a distinguished Republican, and supporter of civil rights, as Robert A. Taft, Jr., candidate for the Senate in Ohio.

When it was progressive Republican leadership in the Senate and House of Representatives who vigorously pressed a constantly stalling Kennedy administration for two and a half years to introduce civil rights legislation and Republican Members of the Senate and House who provided a greater proportion of their party's vote, than did the Democrats, for this long overdue and needed legislation, such a loss is particularly tragic. Given the attitudes of and representations made by the national ticket, such a loss is completely understandable. They could do no other.

(7) Supposedly Republican suburbia went for the Democratic candidate. President Johnson ran as much as 20 percent better than President Kennedy did in the suburbs.

Congressional Quarterly estimates that 50 congressional seats are predominantly suburban in character. Before November 3, 31 were Republican and 19 were Democratic. After November 3, 26 were Republican and 24 were Democratic. President Johnson, of course, carried the suburbs in all areas but the South and even there he carried the suburbs in Arkansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, and Virginia.

(8) The temporary Republican candidate gave hope to those who seek to eliminate the income tax by advocating a cut in Government spending while berating the present administration for not spending more on the Air Force and our national defense. The paradoxes to be developed in terms of the Republican candidate's stands on the issues compared to the actual voting record of Republicans in Congress are endless. Suffice it to say that on the 25 issues endorsed in the Republican platform of 1960 which came before the Senate for a vote, Mr. Goldwater opposed the platform on all 25 occasions and Senator Kuchel, the assistant Republican leader, supported the platform on all 25 occasions. A majority of Republican Senators supported the platform on 23 of the 25 occasions.

(9) "Farley's law," in eclipse since 1948 and which appeared amended by the Republican primaries—as voters apparently changed their minds while entering the voting booths from New Hampshire through California—gained a new lease on life as little change in public opinion occurred between the conventions and the election.

(10) Finally, from the architects of disunity we have heard much of the merits of party unity—provided, of course, that it is on their terms alone.

Thus, Republican candidates who wisely saw the debacle in the making and sought to steer clear of the national ticket and thus with varying degrees of success attempt to avoid self-inflicted political suicide are now labeled "so-called" Republicans. Scott in Pennsylvania, Romney in Michigan, and to a lesser degree, Fong in Hawaii and Murphy in California, were successful practitioners of this oldest example of preventive political medicine. I imagine the less successful practitioners such as Keating, in New York, Beall in Maryland, Taft in Ohio, and Percy in Illinois must view with awe and wonderment Senator Goldwater's morning-after statement. "I think if some Governors and Senators and some Congressmen had more actively supported the ticket they would have been better off."

Forgotten by the architects of defeat is that their most ardent supporters harassed the Republican Party in such States as New York where the so-called conservative party plies its trade.

Forgotten by the architects of defeat is that in Virginia where a gallant Republican, Richard A. May, waged the first campaign against Harry F. Byrd in 18 years the "Virginia Republicans for Byrd" was headed by Admiral Lewis L. Strauss and the other ardent Goldwater leaders. No public endorsement was given Mr. May by the national ticket.

This week, Mr. Goldwater, as the temporary sage of Montego Bay, described Governor Rockefeller, Governor Romney, Senator Scott, and Senator Kuchel as "so-called Republicans."

This is certainly no new position based on any incident in the last campaign since on page 113 of the book, "Barry Goldwater," by Rob Wood and Dean Smith, Mr. Goldwater is quoted as saying over 4 years ago that Senator Jacob K. Javits of New York and Thomas H. Kuchel of California "were hypocrites and don't belong in the Republican Party."

So much—perhaps too much—for some of the paradoxes; now what is the problem?

II

The problem is that the Goldwater clique has completely misunderstood American politics. They have sought to structure an ideological program—largely a negative program—onto a political party which, like its counterpart, has succeeded by being pragmatic and positive—or realistic—since the Founding Fathers idea of a unity of the able and select broke down into factions and then evolved into viable, competitive political parties. The history—and perhaps the success of American politics—has been marked with flexibility of means within certain broad goals. Each party has sought to attract to itself a majority of the people in order to be entrusted with the right to govern. Each party wanted to win—desire for power, putting ideals into action, call it what you will, the men who guided our parties preferred to be "in" rather than "out." They had no desire to become a perennial minority debating society by digging in their feet and resisting the changes wrought by their more fortunate opponents. Republican dominance after the Civil War was broken by Cleveland just as Democratic dominance after the great depression was ended by Eisenhower.

While new vistas of natural resource development were opened up with the Reclamation Act of Theodore Roosevelt, it was under a Democratic administration that the dream of a progressive Republican Senator, George Norris, for a Tennessee Valley Authority reached fruition.

While social security was enacted under Franklin Roosevelt, its first great expansion came, in 1954, under the Republican administration of Dwight D. Eisenhower when benefits were given the biggest increase in history and 10 million more workers were covered. And so it goes.

Each party has, on the whole, tried to practice the essence of politics—accommodation of conflicting interests in order to serve a higher interest—the national interest. When accommodation failed in the Nation, the result was the Civil War just as when accommodation failed within the Republican Party, the result was the debacle of November 3d. Now is the time for humane reconstruction, with appropriate education, so that such an event can never again occur.

For our parties have not evolved merely to gain boodle, since, in this era of the civil service and the general feeling that ambassadors should at least know the language of the country to which they are assigned, there is little boodle to pass out.

The evolution of two competitive political parties has resulted in vigor in the pursuit of a freely arrived consensus and thus the preservation of liberty, in the long run, in our land. Where competition has not existed, such as in the South, the progress of all the people has long been delayed. Highhandedness in the alleged pursuit of the public duty should always be a vice whether it takes the form of removing Americans of Japanese ancestry from the west coast, attempting to draft railroad workers during a labor dispute, or merely having Federal agents knock on the door of newsmen in the early hours of the morning following a rise in steel prices. A Republican mayor of Tacoma, Wash., Harry Cain, later a U.S. Senator, was the only public official to speak out against the unconstitutional removal of our fellow Americans, of Japanese origin, from the Pacific coast, just as a Republican Senator, Robert A. Taft, alone blocked the House-approved proposal of President Truman to draft striking railway workers.

The most valuable attribute of a moderate is his greatest burden: He is a moderate. Yet he would have it no other way. He does not believe that he has discovered infinite truth and has arrived at infinite wisdom. He seeks rather to prevent infinite error.

Thus in seeking to counteract the extremists and negativists in his midst, he confronts the dilemma of how to carry out what must be accomplished if he is to survive, and his party is to survive, without adopting the very tactics and attitudes of those whose actions he most deplores. One does not have to look too far in either Mr. Welch's "Politician" or "Blue Book" to realize that Mr. Welch in his zeal to eliminate the Communist Party, the extremists of the left, has consciously patterned his extremists of the right after them in organization, in propaganda, and often in the end result of the basic policies he advocates which would weaken America; get out of the United Nations, eliminate the income tax, and withdraw from NATO. He disapproves of representative democracy. He, by his actions, would foment distrust of the responsible leadership of both great political parties. Extremists have always profited, hopefully, only temporarily in the long stretch of history, by this dilemma. Thus Kerensky, who fervently believed in democratic values, on reflection as to whether he would have incarcerated or executed Lenin if he had it to do over again, could give no other answer but that he would let him go free.

While no political party will ever be able, in a free society to eliminate an extremist cancer from its midst, it can take the initiative and educate the remaining party members so that the extremists are politically isolated by an aroused membership—a membership that cares—and thus frustrated in their efforts to control the party apparatus. This political preventive medicine must be the first order of business for the Republican Party if it is to provide the vigorous two-party competition which it has a responsibility to provide in our land.

The extremist to be successful depends on apathy. If he thinks about his position in a rational way, he knows that his zealousness is the secret of his success. He has a mission, a clearcut goal, and unlimited heathen to convert to his "true" beliefs.

My own State of California seemingly has more than its share of extremists. Whether they be bearded or clean shaven, "I'd rather be Red than dead" or "I'd rather be dead than Red," we have them. This is not a recent phenomena. Long ago Frank Lloyd Wright wryly observed that when they turned the United States on end everything loose fell into southern California. As a Californian, I, of course, deny that we have more than any other State—they are just more visible in the sunshine.

Both political parties in my State have them. It is just that the extremists are currently at work primarily on the Republican Party. Thus, as Republicans, we are confronted with the same problem which confronted the Democratic Party in the decade of the 1940's when the Communists attempted, with varying degrees of success, to infiltrate their local units. The Americans for Democratic Action arose as a response to this infiltration with a desire by its founders to create a "liberal," but non-Communist political organization. Labor unions in the 1930's and 1940's early and successfully led the fight against extremist subversion from the left.

In my judgment, part of the reason for this new extremism of the right results from not merely the nature of our mobile and burgeoning society where social and economic instability exists, but also from the nature of communication within that society.

What is the source of information most of our fellow citizens have for what is going on in the world about them? Newspapers, television, radio, books, friends: all play a part. Yet, how many read books and how many have really informed friends who can deal with the complexities of the Congo one day, South Vietnam the next, Panama the next, Cyprus the next or maybe all of them at once? Thus, our information, if any, comes primarily from the mass media: the daily or hourly written and spoken word.

But, what is news? News is conflict. News is not that men are good, it is when men are bad. News is not that our Nation has kept a government from going Communist, that we are shoring up the economies of many free world countries such as India and Brazil so that they can put their own house in order and offer hope and opportunity to their people. News is that the West, the free world, whatever you would call it, is losing, is giving way. An embassy is stoned here, a flag is hauled down there, an American is held for ransom in one part of the world for what is happening in another part of the world. Somebody is on the march, it is so easy to infer. It isn't us—so it must be the international Communist conspiracy.

The broad outline comes in the 1 minute hourly newscast; perhaps there will be an "in depth" report of 3 minutes on the evening television show. Who fills the vacuum? Who interprets and tries to put sense in the news? Why, Mr. Welch and "American Opinion," Mr. Smoot and his "Report," Mr. Manion and his "Forum," the Courtneys and their "Independent American," and Gerald L. K. Smith and his "Cross and the Flag"—to name but a few. If you prefer a longer version you can turn to Phyllis Schlafly and her "A Choice, Not an Echo" or John Stormer and his "None Dare Call It Treason."

Whatever you turn to, you will find it provocative and readable. There will be more villains than appear in a month of watching "The Lone Ranger"—besides the international Communist conspiracy which is often relegated in importance to the internal Communist conspiracy, you will find kingmakers and "Me-Too Republicans," the eastern establishment and the sensation-seeking columnists and you won't find a very careful line drawn between any of these groups. If room is left over, the ax might also fall on the Texan or just "That Man" be he Franklin Roosevelt, Harry Truman, Dwight D. Eisenhower, John F. Kennedy, or Hubert Humphrey. If a line is drawn, it usually attempts to link all of these people directly with the Council on Foreign Relations and, of course, in the extremists' weird world, that leads to Nelson Rockefeller.

The result is an "infected" core group which then spreads the dogma to those around them and thus fills the "information gap."

That people who are well educated, in the formal sense, can follow the tenets of the John Birch Society whose self-appointed leader openly believes that the last Republican President was "a dedicated, conscious agent of the Communist conspiracy" and that only "treason" can describe Dwight D. Eisenhower's actions is something that is beyond belief. It is beyond belief until you confront them in the precincts and see the gleam in their eyes, the fear in their faces, and often, sadly, the hate in their hearts. Then it becomes very real.

It is unbelievable to me that such people can follow such absurd statements as that of Mr. Welch who said on October 24, 1963: "I described John Foster Dulles as a Communist. I say he was a Communist. I'm willing to state so here that in my opinion he was always a Communist from the days that he was working for Edward Mandel House in 1919 as one of House's bright young men."

But they do believe such absurdities. They also believe those of the "tongue in cheek" variety. One such appeared in the July-August 1963 issue of "American Opinion," the official publication of the John Birch Society. This is the "explanation" by which they sought to explain why General de Gaulle, Mao, Khrushchev, Castro, and two African rulers were grouped around a red star on their cover: "You see, a Communist must, axiomatically, carry a card, or be a friend of Senator KUCHEL's, or some other giveaway like that. Why, we challenge you "extremists" everywhere to produce a single photocopy of the party card of even one of these noble gentlemen. There, you see. All you can offer is circumstantial evidence. Perhaps these men are just dupes, or opportunists, or fools. True, they may be a little socialistic; but so is President Kennedy. The real danger to this country is from people like, er, like us. * * *"

What a wonderful way to play the game of conspiracy? Soon, someone might ask, if I were a Communist and wanted to undermine the United States by casting doubt on the responsible leaders of the United States, would not I form a group and name it the John Birch Society? It is a dangerous game.

Perhaps it would be well for some to recall the words of J. Edgar Hoover, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, who has frequently and correctly warned against self-appointed vigilantism: "Unfortunately, there are those who make the very mistake the Communists are so careful to avoid. These individuals concentrate on the negative rather than on the positive. They are merely against communism without being for any positive measures to eliminate the social, political, and economic frictions which the Communists are so adroit at exploiting.

"Those persons would do well to recall a recent lesson from history. Both Hitler and Mussolini were against communism. However, it was by what they stood for, not against, that history has judged them."

The fact remains that, rightly or wrongly, for good reasons or bad, some Americans are frustrated by the society in which they find themselves and the events which take place in the world about them. Sometimes their concern is valid. Other times it is not. But it does no good to try to preserve freedom in our land and abroad if in the process we turn ourselves into the totalitarian mentality we deplore.

III

What is the solution?

Most of us who have devoted our lives to politics at the national and State levels or who have studied it in an institution such as Princeton sometimes forget that we too often talk only to people like ourselves and that the average voter does not have the opportunity to acquire the same level of political information which we have. Sometimes he does not care, but even if he does care, he is occupied with a different type of work and other responsibilities which may prevent him from developing his interest to the extent he would like to.

Thus, the question for those who want to recreate a forward-looking and vigorous Republican Party is what do we do to raise the level of political information, understanding, and sophistication and thus fill the vacuum into which the pamphleteers of the right have poured their conspiracy theories of history, their hates and their all-too-simple solutions?

The answer is twofold. The Republican Party must be positive on the issues which confront our Nation at home and abroad and it must develop the organizations and means to communicate these beliefs and to secure the active involvement of Republicans who have often not cared until it was too late. I believe issues and organization are interchangeable. We have heard too much in recent years about something being wrong with the sales technique. When the product is off base, all the sales technique in the world will not result in long-run victory.

But let us first consider organization and communication.

There is an urgent need for a continuing party conference to provide an outlet for the views of the rank and file and a free flow of communication and ideas between the Republican electorate and the Republican elected. The so-called Percy committee of 1959–60 and the Critical Issues Council headed by Dr. Milton S. Eisenhower in 1963–64 are steps in this direction. This can be done through some existing Republican organizations or through the establishment of new ones.

Certainly, regardless of the ultimate success in reorienting some of the established party organizations there is a crucial need in Washington for an organization which will combine the efforts, functions, and spirit of such groups as the Committee to Support Moderate Republicans, the Ripon Society, the National Negro Republican Assembly, and similar organizations which have worked untiringly in the struggle to save the soul of the Republican Party.

We have said in reference to our own State that the rebuilding of the Republican Party must begin in the living rooms and the classrooms of California. Concerned Americans—Republicans, Democrats, and Independents alike—should gather together to read and to discuss the books and statements by Senators CASE, JAVITS, and KUCHEL, Governor Rockefeller, Arthur Larson, and yes, Senator Goldwater, as well as others, both politicians and nonpoliticians. Then let each ask himself what the problems are that confront him as a citizen and then what is the appropriate solution which might resolve these problems. High school and junior college teachers should be invited to party-sponsored seminars on these international, national, and local issues, not to indoctrinate them but to inform them and to show we are interested in them.

A well-written newsletter which sets National and State problems in perspective with the emphasis on education rather than emotion should be distributed to those who have indicated an interest in responsible Republicanism. In California, for example, we have the names of at least 200,000 individuals who, in our telephone survey during the 1964 Republican primary, indicated that they supported Governor Rockefeller. These names include some in each of the almost 33,000 precincts in our State. Such an effort could be the basis for an organization which would return the Republican Party to the path of victory. This pattern could be duplicated in other States.

More effort has to be made to bring leading Republicans at the National and State levels into local communities and into the high school and junior college government and history classes of those communities. By 1966, 2.8 million young Americans, the initial wave of the "postwar babies," will reach the voting age of 21 for the first time. Next year, in fact, almost 1 million more young Americans will reach age 18 than have this year. The average yearly increase in America's teenage labor force in the 1960's will be almost six times the average yearly increase in the 1950's. These young people offer a great challenge and opportunity to the Republican Party if only we can put our house in order to take advantage of it. They are not wedded to the emotions of the past. They can be enlisted in a reasoned future.

In the more practical "nuts and bolts" sense (hopefully we will sidetrack the former and tighten the latter), responsible Republicans have a series of immediate organizational tasks ahead of them. Where moderate leadership exists in the Senate and House of Representatives it must be preserved and expanded, if possible, in the party caucuses which will meet on both sides of the Capitol prior to the opening of the 89th Congress.

At the national level, later in January, when the Republican National Committee meets in Washington, it is essential, from the standpoint of the future of our party, that the present leadership be removed and a forward-looking chairman and staff selected who are in the Republican tradition. The national committee's legitimacy and influence on the 1968 convention makes this imperative.

Serious consideration should also be given to the conduct and staffing of the senatorial campaign committee and the House congressional campaign committee. If these three units are to be merely hollow vacuums which sin by silence when extremists roam the land then neither the Republican Party nor our country will be well served.

If I were a Republican officeholder who had come here at the beginning of the Eisenhower administration in 1953, I would be less than happy to know that in the Senate we have gone from 48 out of 96 down to 32 out of 100 and in the House from a slim majority of 221 to a quarter century low of 140. I would think that it was time for a change. Indeed, to paraphrase the words of Brecht in his play "Galileo": instead of divine patience, I would think it was time to invoke divine anger.

All too often, until it has been too late, Republican officeholders—with the exception of Kuchel, a Rockefeller, a Case, a Cooper, a Javits, a Keating, a Scott, and a Milton Young of North Dakota—have let a handful of vociferous extremists who inundate them with vehement pen force them to sin by silence in the name of party unity. Some of those who should have known better will not be in the 89th Congress. Hopefully, others who by narrow margins or large margins were returned, will now know better.

Besides setting a new tone for the Republican Party, placement of these three party committees in the proper hands can go far toward assuring that in the congressional elections of 1966, more Republicans in the grand tradition of the party will have the opportunity to offer themselves for the House and Senate seats then being contested. Of the Democrats elected to the House of Representatives on November 3, 60 were elected with less than 55 percent of the popular vote. In such marginal districts, in the off year elections of 1966 without the benefit of Presidential coattails they are particularly vulnerable. With proper work at the national and local level, these 60 seats provide a great opportunity to strengthen the position of forward-looking Republicans in the House.

If effective organization in our country does exist, it exists at the State level and thus the tasks ahead of us in the 50 State parties are equally challenging. In California, for example, there are several Republican statewide volunteer groups: The Republican Women, the Republican Assembly, the United Republicans of California, the Young Republicans, and the California College Republicans. There are still others such as the Republican Alliance and Republican Associates which have strong chapters centered in various metropolitan areas. Other groups are in the process of being launched.

In recent years, first the Young Republicans and then the Republican Assembly were taken over by the rightwing with the active aid of paid organizers of the John Birch Society. In 1963, when we held off these negativists from taking over the Republican Assembly, they went out and organized the United Republicans of California (UROC). All three groups endorse candidates for statewide office. A fourth group, the Republican Women, does not endorse candidates. A fifth, the California College Republicans, was organized as a responsible alternative to the extremist take-over of the Young Republicans.

Thus, the first task is to regain, if possible, control of several of these statewide organizations. For example, if we are to try and take back the Republican Assembly, we must get responsible Republicans into the various local units by December 31 in order that the increased membership will be recognized at the annual convention in March. We are now engaged in that task. If successful, it will mean that one of the three major endorsing groups will at last be able to provide responsible guidance to the Republican voter at the time of the primary election. If we are unsuccessful—and this is possible with the continuance of almost two dozen full-time Goldwater headquarters around the State, the opportunity to create "paper" chapters, and the fact that our opponents will still have control of the "rule" book, then we will have to consider the advisability of creating a new statewide organization.

One could, at length, discuss many additional organizational approaches which must be undertaken if we are to attract intellectuals, new citizens, new voters, Negroes, Mexican-Americans, building trades workers, senior citizens, and so on, but a framework in responsible hands must first be provided. If Republicans ever again deserve to merit the faith of the people, we must enthusiastically welcome to our ranks men and women, young and old, of all faiths, of all races, from all walks of life.

Control of the various State Republican parties in the urban North and West is, of course, essential if the Republican convention of 1968 is not to repeat the tragedy of 1964. Despite the dour prognostications of election eve, the outlook is bright. The guidance and direction our State party organizations so sorely need can only come from the Governor's office. The Governor can daily work with Republican leaders and by personal effort attract new people to the ranks of the faithful. In 1964, Republican Governors of progressive mold were elected or continued in office in Maine, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, New York, Pennsylvania, Michigan, Wisconsin, Kansas, Colorado, Idaho, Washington, and Oregon. In the elections of the next 3 years great opportunities exist to continue Republican domination in most of these States and to win the Governor's chair in California, Kentucky, Minnesota, and New Jersey. Depending on the personality of the candidate and the issues raised, Republicans in these industrial States will have the chance to re-register those who are now Democrats or independents and to work toward a majority registration.

No one now knows who the Democratic candidate for 1968 will be. Should it be the present incumbent, I suspect that the supposedly overwhelming "mandate" he received on November 3 would readily evaporate with a responsible Republican candidate, 4 years of work, and 4 years in which the President eventually will have to say "no" to either Walter Reuther or Henry Ford or both.

But the question still remains, Do Republicans have anything to offer? Do we deserve to win? To deserve to win, Republicans must cope with the problems that confront most Americans and fashion appropriate solutions for them. In doing this, Republicans need not be as ebullient as HUBERT HUMPHREY whom the Wall Street Journal once described as having solutions for which there are no problems.

Serious problems do confront our Nation in the jungle warfare of South Vietnam, in the deteriorating NATO Alliance, in the financing of the United Nations, and in dealing politically and economically with Communist China. There are millions of fellow human beings who suffer from ill health and malnutrition. As difficult as these problems are, while generally continuing the bipartisan commitment begun under a Democratic President, Harry Truman, and a Republican Congress, and continued under a Republican President, Dwight Eisenhower, and a Democratic Congress, is it too much to expect to put some of the finest minds in the country who are Republicans to work on these problems? Perhaps, as in science, a "breakthrough" is in order by leapfrogging ahead of the inertia of ideas and practice which often builds up in the governmental mechanism.

In international affairs the Republican Party has never been like the proverbial ostrich with its head in the sand despite the outcries one hears from a few negativists in our party, who would repudiate the United Nations, repudiate mutual security and repudiate our various defensive alliances such as NATO. This small handful are the unwilling handmaidens of international totalitarianism. It was a great Republican, James G. Blaine, who as Secretary of State conceived of the Pan-American Union. It was a great Republican, William McKinley, who stated clearly that America had a responsibility to educate backward peoples and to help bring them into the 20th century. It was a great Republican, Theodore Roosevelt, who used the office of the Presidency to promote peace between warring nations such as Russia and Japan. It was great Republicans such as Wendell Willkie, Henry L. Stimson, and Herbert Hoover who clearly stated America's responsibilities in combating dictatorship whether of the left or of the right. It was a great Republican, Christian Herter, as chairman of a special committee in the Republican-controlled 80th Congress, who recommended, along with another great Republican, Arthur Vandenberg, that the Marshall plan to aid wartorn Europe be enacted.

Republicans have an outstanding record of support in the U.S. Senate for a vigorous bipartisan foreign policy. Indeed, on several occasions in the last 4 years, it has been the Republicans under EVERETT M. DIRKSEN who have provided the main support in this area for the Kennedy and Johnson administrations. Republicans stood by President Kennedy's commitment to stand firm in Berlin when his Senate majority leader was urging an "open city." Republicans supported foreign aid when various northern Democrats sought to slash it just as the program was finally becoming effective.

The record is clear. All four Senate Republican leaders—DIRKSEN, of Illinois (the minority leader), KUCHEL, of California (the assistant minority leader), HICKENLOOPER, of Iowa (the chairman of the Republican policy committee), and SALTONSTALL, of Massachusetts (the chairman of the Republican conference)—have supported all of the following bipartisan foreign policy initiatives: The United Nations loan, the establishment of the Arms Control Agency, the ratification of the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, the authorization of educational and cultural exchanges, the continuation of mutual security and the ratification of both the Antarctic Treaty and Economic Cooperation Agreement which were submitted at the close of the Eisenhower administration.

A majority of Republican Senators supported these policies on each of these occasions, often by overwhelming majorities such as 2 to 1 for the U.N. loan, 4 to 1 for the Arms Control Agency, over 3 to 1 for the test ban, 7 to 1 for the Antarctic Treaty, over 14 to 1 for educational and cultural exchanges, almost 3 to 1 for mutual security, and over 3 to 1 for the European Economic Cooperation Agreement.

The 1960 Republican platform specifically endorsed each of these policies. Oh yes, I regret to note that the standard bearer of our party in the recent election opposed each of these policies when they came before the Senate on rollcall votes.

Abraham Lincoln, the first Republican President, in a speech in Springfield 6 years prior to his election in 1860, provided Republicans with a sound criterion as we seek to judge what programs are appropriate and inappropriate for government to undertake when he stated: "The legitimate object of government is to do for a community of people whatever they need to have done, but cannot do at all, or so well do for themselves, in their separate and individual capacities. In all that the people can individually do as well for themselves, government ought not to interfere."

Progressive Republicans in Congress have kept faith with that principle. They have sought to attain human progress in our land always mindful of maintaining the appropriate relationship between the Federal Government and the States and the public and private sectors which would permit both, in a complementary way, to best serve the people's needs.

Progressive Republicans have also approached problems of domestic policy with a concern for the administrative and fiscal soundness of these programs. We are for human progress and fiscal responsibility, not merely for anything which is labeled "human progress," as are all too many northern Democrats. Progressive Republicans continue to recall Lincoln's words which he expressed in a letter to H. L. Pierce in 1859: "Republicans are for both the man and the dollar, but in case of conflict, the man before the dollar." A great Republican Governor of California, Hiram Johnson, expressed this another way when he said, "We are going to forget for a moment how to make men richer, and we are going to think how to make men better." That is our mission as we concern ourselves with people, not merely the pocketbook, with the many, not merely the few.

Let us remember that government is our government. Government—whether it is Federal, State, or local—is not an enemy or alien institution thrust upon the body politic. It is a necessary instrument through which the American people can resolve the unsolved problems which confront them in their daily lives and which confront us, as a nation, abroad. Yet, some in our society and in my party would have you believe that encroaching government is the major issue of our time. It need not be. When government becomes irresponsible and is no longer of the people, by the people, and for the people, then let us resolve to change those whom we have entrusted with the responsibility of governing, be they Democrats or Republicans.

The paucity of the argument was correctly noted in the Wall Street Journal in an editorial on November 13, 1964: "So far conservatives have not inspired greater support chiefly, we think, because they deal too much in abstractions and too little in specifics. They act on the premise that Jeffersonian warnings of encroaching government are such universal truths they will be recognized as overriding if they are repeated often enough."

Let us always remember too that it is a better life for each individual with which we are concerned. Government exists to serve people, not to be their master. In the long run, the Republican Party if it is to have a valid reason for existence must work for the public policies which will result in a better America, not only materially, but nonmaterially as well.

The Republican Party now is at the threshold and has an historic opportunity to come to grips with "specifics" in terms of programs which will truly develop this better America we seek. Such initiatives have been undertaken at the State and local levels as Republican Governors and mayors have grappled with the problem of urban blight, education, parks and recreation, and mass transportation. Such initiatives have also been undertaken by various Republican Members of the Senate and the House as they have sought to deal realistically, in the Republican tradition, with resolving problems that are meaningful to their fellow countrymen.

For example, the castastrophic rise in the cost of institutional health care daily plagues millions of our elderly Americans. In 1962, several Republican Senators under the leadership of Senator JACOB K. JAVITS set to work to do something about this plight which confronts many of our 18 million senior citizens. These Republicans did not approve of the administration's King-Anderson bill as it was introduced, yet, they saw a problem which demanded solution. The administration legislation only covered those over 65 who had been under social security. Two and a half million of our senior citizens were not eligible for social security, not through any fault of their own but because the law simply did not cover the occupations in which they were engaged. Thus, these Republican Senators drafted a proposal which would provide that all who were over 65 at the time of the passage of the legislation would receive the benefits with the difference to be made up from the general revenue. After a transition period, those who sought the benefits would have to have some social security credits.

These Republicans believed in the principle of contributory social insurance. They believed that the fiscally responsible way to finance the health care program was by having those who would eventually be eligible for the benefits in their retirement years put away the necessary funds, on an actuarially sound basis, during their working years.

But these Republicans also believed that the health care problems of our senior citizens would not be alleviated by merely providing for payment of some limited institutional care under social security, as the administration advocated. What was needed was encouragement for the private health insurance sector to complement the public program. At Senator JAVIT's suggestion a private, independent committee, chaired by Arthur S. Flemming, former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare during the Eisenhower administration, was selected to study health care for the aged. After a year's study, the committee reported. As a result, six Senate Republicans perfected their original ideas and proposed a nationwide pooling of interested private health care insurance companies and providers of services, with exemption from the antitrust laws and Federal and State taxation on premium income, in order to meet the remaining health care needs of our senior citizens on a voluntary basis.

Earlier in 1962, these Republicans also advocated the establishment of a separate trust fund for the public hospitalization program so that there would be no danger of affecting the actuarial soundness of the regular social security retirement program; the use of private health care organizations to perform administrative services under the program; the utilization of State agencies to determine eligibility and provide consultative services; the possibility for the States to supplement the program; and the automatic accreditation of hospitals approved by the private professional group known as the joint commission on accreditation of hospitals.

These were constructive suggestions. After weeks of bargaining with the administration, our proposals were accepted and it was, in reality, a Republican-oriented bill that the Senate voted on in 1962 and finally passed in 1964. Still more remains to be done in reorienting this legislation to provide preventive care, the maintenance of nutrition and adequate shelter, and an emphasis on immunization and the early diagnosis of disease prior to hospital admission.

Similar Republican initiative has occurred in the field of Federal aid to education where Senator JOHN SHERMAN COOPER has improved upon the legislation originally authored by Senator Robert A. Taft. The Taft bill passed the Senate in 1949, but failed in the House of Representatives. No bill was to pass the Senate again until 1961 only to meet the same fate in the House.

The Cooper proposal would have provided a minimum base grant of $20 per cubic school child and then an equalization grant for those States, some 18 in all, where the level of precollege education is drastically in arrears compared with the rest of the Nation. This is the same approach that exists within many States, where the counties with a highly developed industrial base contribute funds, on an equalization basis, to the schools in those counties which are not as fortunate in having such an industrial base for taxing purposes.

In our 20th century technological society, education means jobs. Our Nation needs the most highly developed skills which can be developed. Improper education and continued illiteracy means that an individual will lack the opportunities which he otherwise might have had. With the increasing mobility of our people, what happens in Mississippi does affect us in California or you here in New Jersey. A lack of job opportunities can only mean an increased burden upon the local property taxpayer in additional welfare costs because one of our fellow citizens cannot carry his own load. More important, however, a fellow human being and our Nation have been the losers.

But still more must be done as we seek constructive alternatives and original initiatives. There is an urgent need for more thought to be given to the encouragement of science and creativity in our land. Both industry and skilled workers should be given an incentive to fashion with their brains, their hands, their money, and their faith in a better future for our people. Despite recent tax legislation, more incentive should be given to those who wish to provide new plant and equipment on one hand and those who are willing to take a risk and employ more individuals to do what needs to be done as we seek to expand our markets at home and abroad and as we seek to spread the benefits of American science, technology, production, and marketing throughout the world.

Let Republicans share President Eisenhower's concern, expressed so eloquently in his farewell address to the Nation when he warned of the dangers of a military-industrial complex, by assuring that the work of the scholar in our society is encouraged and that a higher proportion of Federal funds for basic research is given to the universities of this Nation as "seed" money where faculty committees, rather than officials far removed in Washington, can best determine how these funds are invested.

As we seek to build a better America educationally and scientifically for ourselves, we should recall that Republicans, individually and together, have an unprecedented opportunity in the history of mankind to serve our fellow man. In Africa, let Americans commit themselves to staffing the universities and educational institutions of those evolving nations and thus spread the values of a representative democracy and a free, competitive society. Republicans must never forget that in the worldwide struggle in which we are engaged against the forces of totalitarianism, whether it be Communist or Fascist, our country has an obligation to lead and to propagate and spread the fundamental values of a free society, not only in its economic and governmental aspects, but, more importantly, in its nonmaterial aspects as well. Thus, as we concern ourselves with material progress, let us always remember that esthetic improvement, whether in government architecture or support for the arts, is not, in the long run, incompatible with it.

While, as Republicans, we do not wish to dominate State and local government let us, through tax incentives and other financial and nonfinancial (such as planning) assistance, encourage them to deal effectively with the problems of urban blight, mass transportation, recreation, and air and water pollution which have plagued so many of our metropolitan areas.

Let Republicans work, as Senator CLIFFORD CASE has done, for the establishment of ethical standards to guide the conduct of public officials in the executive and legislative branches of our Government. Let us include officers of the judicial branch as well and let us also deal at long last in a realistic way with the vexing problems of financing and supervising the receipts and expenditures made in Federal elections.

Let Republicans take a new look at the relationship between existing Federal law and our private economy, its management, and its workers. Let us strive to bring our antitrust laws into relation with modern economic reality. Let us provide the incentive for management not merely to retool its existing plants, but rather to encourage investment in the development of new research and the products which derive from it. Let us revise our tax laws so that oppressive excise taxes for the consumer are removed as we seek also to provide additional incentive for those who have risked their brains and their wealth to add to our economic growth.

Let Republicans continue to urge the reinstitution of the collective bargaining policies established by the late Secretary of Labor, James P. Mitchell, when he asked both management and labor to remember that there is a third chair at the bargaining table: the public. He saw the role of the Federal Government not as intervening willy nilly in all labor disputes, dictating a settlement or pulling either party's chestnuts out of the fire by permitting a back-door route to the White House, but rather as providing a climate for bargaining and thus encouraging labor and management to learn to live with each other the year round, not merely as a contract deadline grew near.

Let Republicans work for full parity and a fair return to our farm population by devising policies which will encourage the retraining and readjustment to life in urban America of the million and a half farmers who are barely managing to subsist on the farm.

Let Republicans also concern themselves with the plight of the migrant farmworker by striving not to encourage his nomadism from one part of our Nation to another as certain Democratic proposals would do, but to repeal the exemption in the law which prohibits a national agricultural minimum wage and thus apply at long last a national standard so that the farmworker can, with the industrial worker, receive a basic minimum for the difficult work he performs.

Let Republicans keep faith with the heritage of Theodore Roosevelt in reclaiming arid lands and while conserving our natural resources for the use of generations yet unborn, put to beneficial use on an integrated and cooperative basis an appropriate amount of our water and power resources to meet the agricultural, industrial, and urban needs of our society.

Let Republicans renew the historic commitment of the Republican Party to the quest for equal opportunity in our own land so that no one will join our party under the mistaken, misguided, or misinformed notion that we shall tolerate racial, ethnic, or religious bigotry. The Republican Party came into being as an instrument to make all men free and to enable them to fulfill their aspirations in a land of equal opportunity. Republicans in the Congress have been primarily responsible for the successful passage of civil rights legislation during the Eisenhower and Johnson administrations. In 1957, when President Eisenhower submitted the first comprehensive civil rights legislation to be approved in 80 years, it was 25 Republicans in the U.S. Senate who fought to retain the heart of that legislation—the so-called title III authority for the Attorney General to intervene and obtain a preventive injunction to get the disputes off of the streets and into the courts. Regrettably, only 13 Democrats voted with us on that occasion.

Similarly in 1964, after 2½ years of urging the Kennedy administration to submit needed legislation, it was Senate Republicans who sought to strengthen the House-passed civil rights bill. Senator Keating's proposal to assure the right to vote in State and local elections is still necessary as we witness the harassing practices engaged in by local officialdom in the South. Not only must we strengthen the provisions relating to job opportunity, but we must also deal effectively with the right of a person to purchase the home of his choice or live in the apartment of his choice without being the victim of discrimination.

Much work remains to be done at all levels of our society and in all of our States. For the question of human and civil rights is not merely one of law, but it is also one of morality and conscience—an endeavor in which all Americans, regardless of party, can fruitfully participate.

In this regard let us recall that it is the Republican Party which was conceived to serve the national interest, not a sectional interest or two sectional interests. Thus, in the South let Republicans resolve to appeal to the rising urban middle class of both races as well as to the long impoverished Negro farm dweller who has been denied a fair opportunity because of the county courthouse control exerted by the Democratic Party. We can do no less if we are to keep faith with the Republican heritage.

Finally, let Republicans recall that the two-party system in our land was not ordained for America in either the Holy Scriptures or the Constitution. If it is to be retained, it will be retained only because it has worked to meet the needs of our people and that it has meant good government and responsible government as two vigorous, competitive parties offer programs and ideas in their attempt to achieve a majority consensus. We must seek a broadbased party striving always to serve the national interest and not the special interest of any group or any section.

While American political parties are not organized on an ideological basis, and should not be, this does not mean that fundamental principles may not provide the basis for much of what we seek to do. The whole basis for the Republican Party has been a moral one: freedom of the individual and his equality of opportunity. That is perhaps our problem, yet most of us would have it no other way. Republicans came into being in response to a moral crisis. At times we have seemed self-righteous about it. Regrettably, at times, some Republicans have all too easily forgotten what the crisis was and what our response was.

Thus, in order to deserve to win the faith of the American people, let Republicans determine to set a new course in our land. As we do, it is perhaps appropriate to take heart from the words uttered by a Democratic President, Woodrow Wilson, after whom this school was named, when he said during his fight to see that America assumed her responsibilities in the world: "I would rather fail in a cause that someday will triumph than to win in a cause that I know someday will fail."

ADDRESS BY SENATOR ELLENDER AT THE CONVENTION OF THE AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, on December 8, 1964, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], delivered a most able address at the annual convention of the American Farm Bureau Federation, assembled at Philadelphia, Pa.

The address contains so much valuable information on the agricultural program of our Nation that I think it should be included in the RECORD and made available to the public generally, so that all may learn more about the agricultural program.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that the address be incorporated in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY THE HONORABLE ALLEN J. ELLENDER, U.S. SENATOR, AT THE 46TH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION, PHILADELPHIA, PA., DECEMBER 8, 1964

Ladies and gentlemen, it is indeed a pleasure and an honor to be with you today. The American Farm Bureau Federation, as the largest organization of its kind in the country, has a distinct and unique responsibility, not only to its members, but to the country as a whole. And I believe that through the years you have fulfilled that responsibility, with your programs of education and your participation in the development of policies on all important issues facing our Nation.

I have great respect for the American Farm Bureau and for your president, Mr. Shuman, a man whose ideals and principles are beyond reproach. Now let me hasten to add that I am not always in complete agreement with your policies. As a matter of fact—and Mr. Shuman will attest to this—I have vigorously opposed some of your recommendations. However, despite any differences of opinion, I nevertheless have the highest regard for your organization and for your president.

Actually our aims are not greatly different. I desire a prosperous agriculture—and you want a prosperous agriculture. I want our farm programs to provide the greatest of flexibility and freedom. You also wish flexibility and freedom to make decisions as you see them. I want a minimum of governmental interference—and you do too. In addition, I want all programs to reflect fiscal responsibility, and I am sure you are in agreement with me in that position.

We differ, it appears to me, primarily as to the manner of achieving our objectives, but I feel confident that even here we should be able to reach common ground.

And I would suggest that you give close attention during the days ahead to the farm programs now in effect, and that will be proposed in the near future. If you do, you will find that a radical change has occurred, and is occurring, in the fundamental philosophy underlying agricultural policies since the beginning of farm price support programs.

Agricultural legislation in this country has a long history. It actually began in 1839 when Congress appropriated the munificent sum of $1,000 to enable the Patent Office to distribute seeds, conduct investigations, and collect statistics. In 1862 Congress created the Department of Agriculture, and provided for the establishment of our State land-grant colleges of agriculture.

In 1887 the Hatch Experiment Station Act, providing Federal-State experiment stations to be operated as part of the agricultural colleges, became law. In 1914 Congress enacted the Smith-Lever Extension Act, which provided for a nationwide county agent system.

The Federal land banks were established by Congress in 1916, and in 1922, the Capper-Volstead Act, exempting cooperatives from the restrictions of the antitrust laws, became effective. In 1923 the Agricultural Credit Act, and 10 years later the Farm Credit Act, brought into existence the Federal intermediate credit banks, the production credit associations, and the 13 banks for cooperatives.

Briefly, this is the history of agricultural legislation prior to 1933. The philosophy underlying those laws is quite evident. It was felt that if farmers and their families were provided with additional opportunities, with access to science, research, credit, and the means of utilizing technological advances, they would be in a position to compete successfully with other segments of the American economy. In other words, Congress sought to provide farmers with the tools to help themselves.

Unfortunately, a protracted period of low prices for agricultural commodities during the 1920's and early thirties led farm leaders to petition Congress for more direct assistance.

I am sure some of you remember those years, when wheat prices were less than a dollar per bushel, with a low of about 32 cents in December of 1932; when prices received by farmers for both the 1932 and 1933 crops of corn averaged only 29 cents per bushel; when, in 1931, prices received for cotton averaged less than 6 cents per pound; and when hogs and beef cattle sold for less than 4 cents per pound. Prices of other commodities were equally low.

It was generally agreed at that time, based upon the experiences of the Federal Farm Board, that farm prices could not be improved unless some means could be devised to reduce production. To achieve that end, Congress, in 1933, authorized the first direct price-support operation, attempting to control production on a voluntary basis through incentive payments. A tax on the commodities to be benefited was imposed to meet the cost of the program, but the Supreme Court declared the law unconstitutional in 1936.

Nevertheless, farm price supports, essentially as we know them today, were on their way to become a permanent part of the price structure of agricultural commodities.

As a result of the adverse Supreme Court decision on the 1933 act, Congress passed the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, which I fostered. This law provided for mandatory price-support loans for corn, wheat, and cotton at from 52 to 75 percent of parity and, when necessary, marketing quotas and acreage allotments on tobacco, corn, wheat, cotton, and rice. Permissive price supports for other agricultural commodities were also authorized. Later, peanuts were added to the basics.

Through the years this act has been repeatedly amended. Beginning with flexible price supports, we moved to inflexibility, and back again to the original concept.

The basic philosophy of the 1933, and later the 1938 acts was to improve and stabilize farm prices and promote orderly marketing achieved through a system of price supports on the one hand, and production controls on the other. Improvement of farm income was also fundamental, but this was to come about through supports and controls—not by Government guarantees of income through direct payments. This philosophy was maintained until the cotton and wheat laws of 1964 were enacted.

Today, only the tobacco, rice, and peanut programs remain essentially the same. The present cotton, wheat, and feed grain programs are, in my opinion, vastly different from the original concept contained in the act of 1938. These changes have occurred for a number of reasons. One of the main reasons, I think, is that the requirements and characteristics of the different commodities were recognized as being incompatible with a single type program covering all commodities.

In 1958 Congress enacted a program dealing with feed grains, cotton and rice. While there were differences among feed grain producers as to the merits of this program, there were few objectors among the producers of cotton and rice.

I was not too happy with the feed grain program, because of the inflexibility in the price support determination. As you recall, price supports had to be set at 90 percent of the 3-year average, or 65 percent of parity, whichever was higher. In the absence of controls, and with production exceeding requirements, this formula left little room for the free play of market prices in guiding decisions of individual farmers.

As to the cotton provisions, Congress envisioned an expanding consumption brought about through a more competitive price, the idea being to increase acreage and lower price supports.

As most of you know, the Secretary of Agriculture was given considerable flexibility in determining both price support levels and acreage allotments. Supports could be set at between 65 and 90 percent of parity, and allotments established at any level above the minimum of 16 million acres, depending upon supply and demand. With lower price supports and more production, farmers' income would not have been materially reduced, and more cotton would have been available at a lower price. I am firmly convinced that had this law been allowed to operate as intended, cotton would not be faced with the problems it has today.

The cotton law that was enacted this year, with the support of virtually the entire cotton industry, introduced direct payments as a major feature for the first time. I opposed this bill very vigorously, because I feared the adverse effect of a direct payment program on the welfare and future, not only of cotton, but of all our major agricultural commodities.

I will not go into details of the program. Suffice it to say that this new law affecting cotton sets up three choices of allotments for producers, with as many different price levels.

In addition, there are two separate direct payments. The smaller is made to producers, and the larger—designed to make cotton available to domestic mills at world prices—is made to the trade. The law specifically states that this large payment will not be made to producers.

To put it plainly, the reason why this second payment is not made to producers is that the designers of the act feared public reaction and possible congressional limitation on the total amount of payments made to any one producer. I might add that the mills were also against being named recipients of payments for the same reason. I need only point out to you what happened as a result of the procedures put into effect to expedite the changeover from the old to the new cotton program. Through these procedures payments were made to the mills on the cotton used between April 11 and

August 1, the date the new law became fully effective. During this period total payments of $86.1 million were made by the Government directly to the mills. In short order the list of the mills and the amounts of the payments received were publicized, and the echoes of the howls that went up from the mills can still be heard. The fact of the matter is that neither the millowners nor the producers want direct payments which can be totaled and brought to light for public scrutiny.

It is my view that the producers who advocated this new cotton law were very shortsighted. They were sold on the idea that the cotton industry was doomed unless domestic mills were permitted to buy cotton at the same price as that paid by foreign mills. It is true that mill consumption of cotton was trending downward, but it is likewise true that mill consumption of manmade fibers was increasing. For example, during the 1950–53 period an average of 9.4 million bales of cotton was consumed by mills. In 1960–63, however, this had dropped to 8.6 million bales.

While the amount of cotton used by mills was declining, that of manmade fibers was increasing. In 1952, the proportion of cotton used was 69.9 percent and of manmade fibers 22.9 percent. In 1963, cotton had declined to 60.2 percent, and manmade fibers had increased to 33.6 percent. I might mention that the use of wool fibers also declined from 7.2 to 6.2 percent during this period.

This same condition existed in foreign countries whose mills were buying cotton at free and competitive world prices. I will cite only one example, but there are many others. In Italy the proportion of cotton used dropped from 62 percent in 1952 to 44.4 percent in 1963, while that of manmade fibers increased from 19.1 percent to 38.3 percent.

There were a number of ways to meet this challenge, but such a drastic price reduction for cotton was not the proper way. It was not in the best longrun interest of farmers. Nor was it in the best longrun interest of the trade, because necessary adjustments within the industry under these conditions would be difficult, if not impossible, to achieve.

At the time the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was holding hearings, the proponents claimed not only that cotton would become competitive again, but that the Government would save money on this new program, and in addition, consumers would save millions of dollars a year through reduced prices for manufactured textiles.

The cost estimates, as prepared by the Department of Agriculture, indicated that total major expenditures for the new cotton program would amount to $448 million for the 1964 crop, as compared to $566 million under the old program, with price suports at 32½ cents per pound, and to $451 million under the old program, with price supports at 30 cents per pound.

Of course, this lower cost was predicated on a reduction in production in 1964 below requirements. However, the advocates of the plan were incorrect in their estimates as to production, as well as costs. On November 9, the Department estimated cotton production at 15.4 million bales. This is about 600,000 bales greater than estimated disappearance, and the program will cost in excess of $800 million when all costs are taken into consideration.

In only one instance were the planners correct. They estimated that with a direct payment of 6.5 cents per pound, domestic mills would increase their utilization of cotton by about 1 million bales. Department estimates now show that increased activity by the mills this year will result in a domestic consumption of about 9.7 million bales of cotton, about 1.1 more than last year.

However, the increased consumption came at the tremendous cost to the Federal Government of about $312 million. My own estimates indicate a cost nearer $350 million. In other words, it will cost the Federal Government from $300 to $350 for every additional bale of cotton that will be used above last year. This is especially startling when you consider the fact that an average bale of cotton this year is valued at about $117.50. Actually, it might have been cheaper to give the mills the additional cotton.

Now, how about savings to consumers? Well, there really is no way to make a determination at this time, but we do have data which is published by the Department on cloth prices, cotton prices, and mill margins.

These figures show that the average price of 20 types of cloth constructions in October of 1964 was ony nine one-hundredths of 1 percent below the price of 61.34 cents per pound in October of 1963. This is in spite of the fact that cotton prices to the mills, including landing costs and brokerage, are 8.31 cents per pound less than the 35.11 cents paid by mills in October of 1963.

And mill margins—which is the spread between the cost of a pound of cotton and its cloth equivalent—have increased 8.22 cents over the 26.23 cents in October 1963. I grant that there are differences of opinion as to the value of these figures in showing the true picture. But they have been published by the Department for many years and there have been no complaints heretofore. To be completely fair, I want to point out that the BLS wholesale index on yarns has dropped from 98.6 in March of this year to 92.7 in October, and the index on gray fabrics from 104 to 101.6 during the same period. From what I hear, mill profits are up considerably. Now, I have nothing against the mills, and I want them to have the most profitable operation possible, but not at the expense of the Federal Government.

The most important and far-reaching point of the new legislation is the fact that direct payments are being used for the first time to make cotton competitive at world prices.

This has a two-pronged effect. First, any material increase in price to the mills after 2 years of this low price will certainly cause an extremely adverse immediate, as well as long-run, effect on the consumption of cotton by mills. Furthermore, but more importantly, cotton farmers have admitted that they cannot profitably produce at world prices. So, the question is, where do we go from here?

In this connection, the USDA Advisory Committee on Cotton has recently met to study the current supply and demand picture for cotton, the 1965 program for cotton, and the long-range legislative needs for cotton. I might add that I have not had an opportunity to review their recommendations. But my guess is that they will probably be in line with the recently released recommendation of the National Agricultural Advisory Commission which was appointed by the President to review present and future agricultural policy. Essentially, the Commission's recommendation for cotton was to extend the present program.

Now, I do not mean to be overly critical of the President's Agricultural Advisory Commission. As a matter of fact, I sympathize with its members, considering the base from which they had to start. But it does seem to me they could have done a better job. There are a number of possible alternatives, any of which, in my opinion, appears more desirable than an extension of the monstrosity now on the books.

I apologize for having dwelt on cotton in such detail, because I know that not all of you here are cotton producers. Why did I do this? To make a point. And the point is that any legislation, ill conceived, scarcely studied, but ramrodded through Congress, is bound to cause disaster for one or more segments of the industry.

We already have examples of the adverse effects of this legislation. The Federal Government is out to the tune of about $800 million. The handlers of cotton are dissatisfied. The New Orleans Cotton Exchange has had to close its doors. The New York Cotton Exchange is struggling along in the hope that through some magic it may survive. The trade, the merchants, the marketing system as a whole are divided on the merits of this law, and last, but certainly not least, farmers are left with 23-cent cotton.

I would ask that in your deliberations on cotton, you face this issue squarely and come up with recommendations that will stand the test of meeting cotton's present problems. Come up with alternatives, if you wish, but come up with something realistic and acceptable.

Now I would like to talk about feed grains.

This program, also, expires with the 1965 crop and will have to be considered by Congress next year. If no action is taken, feed grains will come under the permanent law which provides for price supports at from 50 to 90 percent of parity, but in no event at a level which would result in the Government's acquiring additional stocks of grain.

Most of you recall, I am sure, that the feed grain diversion program was originally enacted in 1961, later reenacted and extended through 1965. This program was supposed to be of a temporary nature, pending enactment of a mandatory acreage allotment program for corn and other feed grains. Since the mandatory program failed to pass, Congress has extended again and again a program originally enacted for only 1 year, in the hope that a realistic program could be devised.

I must say that I favor mandatory controls for feed grains, if they are to be price supported. I believe our experience of the late 1950's shows conclusively that in the absence of controls and even with lower support prices, production of feed grains will increase. The record shows that in 1954, with the support price for corn at $1.62, production amounted to 2.7 billion bushels, and Government stocks amounted to 858 million bushels. Over the years the support price was being lowered, but both production and Government stocks were increasing. In 1960, with the support price for corn at $1.06 per bushel, production had increased by over a billion bushels from 1954, and Government stocks likewise had increased by over a billion bushels.

The feed grain diversion program was presented to Congress as an emergency measure that would reduce stocks, be less costly, and improve farm income. At the time we were faced with surplus stocks of 84.7 million tons.

In 1961, the first year of operation, a total of slightly over 25 million acres of feed grains were diverted from production, at a total cost of about $824 million. Production was lower in 1961 than in the year before by about 15 million tons. In 1962 production was reduced below 1960 by about 12.7 million tons, at a cost of about $872 million, and about 28 million acres were diverted. In 1963 production exceeded 1960 by about 300,000 tons and the cost was about $900 million, with 25 million acres out of production.

This year production, with slightly over 34 million acres diverted, is estimated at about 18½ million tons below 1960, but the cost will increase to about $1.2 billion. Altogether, this program will have cost the taxpayers about $3.8 billion during the last 4 years, for acreage diversion and price support payments. This cost does not include price support losses and related costs of about $1.4 billion. To summarize, we have reduced stocks from 84.7 million tons in 1960 to an estimated 58 million tons by the end of this marketing year, a difference of less than 27 million tons, at a total cost of $5.2 billion.

Production and stocks have been reduced because of the program, but the cost has exceeded by far even the wildest estimates that might have been made. In my opinion this program, while popular with farmers, is far too costly to be extended again without change. Since our carryover of corn and other feed grains has been considerably reduced, it might be well for us to permit the permanent legislation to become effective.

No doubt there will be considerable pressure for an extension of the present feed grain diversion program. As a matter of fact, last month the USDA Advisory Committee recommended a 5-year extension of both the feed grain and wheat programs, apparently with no major changes. I presume the new program would embrace more fully the principle of direct payments. At any rate this seems to be the trend in the thinking of many agricultural leaders.

On the other hand, the President's Advisory Commission, about which I spoke earlier in connection with cotton, has recommended an extension of the present feed grain program with some adjustments.

First, the Commission recommends a long-range land retirement program designed to take marginal or submarginal land, now in crops, out of production. This program envisions about 40 million acres over a 5-year period. During the first 5 years when the program is being built up to 40 million acres out of production, costs are estimated at about $550 million per year. If no new land were added in the second 5 years, annual costs would average about $300 million.

The Commission cautions, however, that a long-range land retirement program in itself is not capable of making the proper adjustment in crop production.

The Commission estimates that under present conditions about 70 million acres would be required to prevent overproduction on the remaining land. Land retirement is likely to be slow moving because it appeals to only a small fraction of farmers at any one time. The program is not directed at particular crops that may be in surplus. And to increase the scale of the program by a large amount would sharply increase the per-acre cost and might severely depress local communities in areas where the retired land was concentrated.

This recommendation would really be separate from the feed grain program, but apparently is an integral part insofar as costs are concerned.

Second, the Commission recommends that wheat be included in the feed-grain program. A wheatgrower's acreage allotment under the 55-million-acre national allotment would be his base acreage for the feed grain program. A nonparticipant in the wheat certificate program could divert wheat acreage under the feed grain program and receive payments alined with those for feed grains based on wheat at feed grain prices.

Third, the Commission indicates that the feed grain program might be broadened to include soybeans.

The cost of the feed grain program? Well, they estimate that with corn prices at $1.10 and yields at 64 bushels, 18 million acres would have to be diverted at a cost of about $600 million annually. If yields were at 67 bushels, 25 million acres would have to be diverted at a cost of about $850 million annually. But while the long-range land retirement was being built up, annual costs might well be about $1.3 billion, somewhat higher than the current program.

It is interesting to note that the Commission's report to the President stresses farm income, both individual and total. This differs from early farm price support legislation, in that price stability and orderly marketing were the major goals of policy. Of course, farm income was also fundamental, but that came about through the use of supports and controls, and not through the use of Government funds as a supplement to income.

Besides the cotton and feed grains, the voluntary wheat certificate program expires with the 1965 crop. This program, widely misunderstood at the beginning, is now receiving considerable support among the rank and file farmers.

The acreage diversion program which has been in effect since 1962, coupled with the high level of exports, has been responsible for a substantial reduction in the carryover of wheat. From a high of approximately 1.3 billion bushels, the carryover of wheat at the end of this marketing year is now estimated at about 900 million bushels. Wheat is therefore in a more desirable position stockwise than in 1961.

I know that the official position of the American Farm Bureau Federation opposes both the voluntary and mandatory wheat certificate programs and that is your privilege. Notwithstanding your opposition, however, I feel quite certain that a similar program will be extended beyond 1965.

In a recent report from the Department of Agriculture, I noticed that almost 781,000 farms signed up to participate in the 1965 wheat program. That signup, of course, was limited only to winter wheat areas. In spring wheat areas, the signup will begin February 8. There are advantages to the program, and the large number of farmers electing to participate is evidence of this.

Furthermore, based upon the figures I have, program costs will be reduced materially. Payments for diversion are expected this year to be approximately $34 million, which is negligible compared to the feed grain program, and certificate costs will balance out with receipts from millers and exporters.

Naturally, in a new program such as this, some shortcomings, as well as inequities, arise, but I feel that these can be readily ironed out. I believe this program, with some modifications, could be made to work.

The wool program must also be considered by Congress next year. Since 1954 there has been a direct payment plan in effect for this commodity. Ostensibly, the purpose of the act was to achieve a 300-million pound domestic production of raw wool. The reasons for payments were twofold. First, a free market for domestic wool would make it competitive with foreign wool, and second, the payment would be an incentive to increase production. The act has not achieved its objective. Production in 1964 amounted to about 224 million pounds and the estimate for 1965 is 215 million pounds, notwithstanding the fact that payments since 1954 totaled $450 million, as of June 30.

To the best of my knowledge there is little unrest in the industry, except among the mills. They are suffering from the competition of imported woolen textiles just as the cotton mills claimed to have been suffering from competition of imported cotton textiles. The big difference, however, is that cotton textile mills were operating at an 8½-cent disadvantage as compared to foreign mills, while the woolen mill industry in this country can obtain its raw product at a competitive price, because wool is not price supported in the United States. It moves in the market free and at whatever price the market will pay, based purely on the supply and demand situation.

I don't know what the outcome in wool will be. I can only surmise that here too Congress will have trouble. In the end, I suppose there will be an extension of the present program, perhaps with some changes.

In addition to the foregoing crop programs, the President's National Agricultural Advisory Commission has recommended changes in the tobacco, peanut and dairy programs.

As to tobacco, the Commission recommends poundage rather than acreage allotments; in peanuts it recommends a self-help plan, or assessments on farmers to cover the cost of diverting surplus peanuts to crushing for oil or meal; and in dairying it recommends a class I allocation plan in market order areas similar to that passed by the Senate last year. It also recommended that Public Law 480 be amended to authorize sales of all agricultural commodities under its provisions, rather than limiting sales to surplus commodities.

These are the recommendations of the Advisory Committee, not yet espoused by the President. I believe that the administration's position on all of these programs will more nearly approximate the recommendations of the task force headed by Under Secretary Charles Murphy, who is now working on a report to the President.

There seems little doubt that the administration will propose new legislation for most, if not all, of these commodities. By new legislation, I do not mean drastic changes from present programs, but rather some modifications in existing legislation.

Since all our major agricultural commodities will be considered in 1965, there is no doubt that a broad review of agricultural policy and programs will be made by congressional committees.

In anticipation of this, as chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I have asked for recommendations from all of the land-grant colleges, as well as the major farm organizations and others, on agricultural policies for the years ahead. I am hopeful that positive, forward-looking programs will result.

I must confess that although I have given this subject intensive thought and study in recent years, I am not sure just what ought to be done. It would seem desirable to attempt to work out a program which would give full flexibility to producers, provide some price and income protection, reduce costs to the Government, and yet move away from governmental control or interference.

However, the direction in which legislation appears headed is that of direct payments to farmers in order to supplement their incomes. I have opposed this method ever since its inception, because I believe that it is unsound and not in keeping with good government. I believe that farm income, just as the income of a jobholder, ought to come from the marketplace. I know that farmers would not only be happier but would also be in a more independent position if their income were from the marketplace.

But there are the problems of price competition, overproduction, and reduced incomes on the one hand, and the unwillingness of many farmers to submit to controlled production and its attendant woes on the other. Unfortunately, we cannot have both high price supports and uncontrolled production, without excessive cost to the Government.

I agree wholeheartedly that Government interference must be kept to a minimum. On the other hand, if the Government is called upon to support the price of any agricultural commodity, then the Government should be protected from excessive costs.

Doubtless past programs have been extremely costly for many agricultural commodities, particularly those pertaining to wheat, feed grains, cotton, and dairying.

As of June 30 of this year, the Commodity Credit Corporation reported that the price support program costs for feed grains, since 1933, totaled about $6.1 billion, for wheat about $4.8 billion, for dairying about $3.9 billion, and for cotton $2.1 billion. This includes losses and payments, International Wheat Agreement costs, and the special milk programs. It does not include administrative, interest, and other such costs of the CCC which amount to $8.1 billion.

When all commodities and programs are considered, the total cost, since 1933, amounts to $41.8 billion, comprised of $20.3 billion program costs for all commodities, $8.1 billion for administration interest, and other costs, and $13.4 billion for Public Law 480.

There is no implication here that all Public Law 480 costs should be charged against farm programs. Quite the contrary. This program more and more is becoming an outright foreign aid program, bearing less and less resemblance to the original Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act enacted in 1954. On the other hand, there is little doubt but that price support losses, export payments, direct payments, and other such costs, which altogether amount to $20.3 billion, are a legitimate charge against the farm program.

It is startling to learn that costs of farm programs from 1933 to June 30, 1953, totaled only $2.9 billion, whereas the cost since 1953 amounts to $17.4 billion.

I hope that I am not misunderstood here. True, program costs are substantial, but they are not as high as some misinformed individuals might have you believe. For example, in a certain column published on November 25, I found this statement, and I quote, "We are paying $7 or $8 billion to farmers to shield some of them from the marketplace." An informed person would know that the $7 to $8 billion amount is even higher than the total budget of the Department of Agriculture. Further, all informed persons know that the Department budget contains a host of consumer benefit expenditures.

While I feel that even the exact costs of the program have been excessive, there is little doubt but that farm programs have been helpful, not only to agriculture, but to consumers, and the national economy as well.

How have farm programs helped American agriculture?

First, farm programs have been effective in improving and maintaining farm prices and income.

Second, through price stability farmers have been better able not only to plan land and capital acquisition, but also to secure additional credit requirements. Banks and other lending institutions give considerable weight to an allotment and to guaranteed price supports in the lending of their funds. Although I am not personally aware of any studies which fully substantiate this fact, I feel quite certain from my years of experience on the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry that many of our outstanding agricultural leaders would agree wholeheartedly with me.

And third, much of the science and technology now available to producers is the result of work by the Federal Government and our land grant colleges. Further, our county agents have been largely instrumental in disseminating the discoveries among farmers. Our agriculture could never have attained its high level of efficiency were these services not available.

In these, and in a host of other ways, our farm programs have been helpful.

Now, how have our farm programs helped consumers?

Our abundant farm production indicates that nowhere else on earth do consumers have available such a varied and nutritious diet at such a small fraction of their income.

In the United States about 18½ percent of the wage earner's net pay is being spent for food. Britishers spend about 30 percent and Russians about 50 percent.

For an hour's pay our industrial worker can buy a good balanced meal for four persons. In Germany and England it takes 2 hours to buy the same meal, in Austria 4 hours in France 4½ hours, and in Italy more than 5 hours.

Furthermore, through our grading and inspection programs, American consumers are guaranteed the best and the most wholesome of food. But more importantly, because of our abundance, American consumers are not faced, ever, with the spectre of food shortages.

How have our farm programs helped the national economy?

Well, first, agriculture is the Nation's largest industry. The number of workers in agriculture exceeds the combined employment in transportation, public utilities, steel, and the automobile industries.

The assets of agriculture amount to $216 billion, equal to nearly two-thirds of the market value of all corporate stocks on the New York Stock Exchange.

Farmers have invested about $18 billion in cars, trucks, tractors, and other farm machinery. In 1963, they spent over $4 billion on operation and repairs on machinery, equipment, and other farm items.

In 1961, and I am sure it is higher now, farmers used enough steel products to make almost 5 million compact cars, enough rubber to put tires on more than 6 million cars, and enough electricity to power the six New England States. They used the equivalent of 15 million gallons of crude oil, and they spent over $1.5 billion for fertilizer and lime.

Further, it is important to remember that many thousands of small communities throughout the land depend almost entirely upon agriculture for their livelihood. This was forcefully demonstrated in instance after instance when communities virtually disappeared as a result of land being placed in the soil bank. The equipment distributors, those engaged in repair, the chemical and fertilizer handlers, and the retail and wholesale merchandise no longer had a customer.

Surely a segment of our economy as large and important as agriculture must remain strong if the rest of the economy is to prosper.

One last observation. All of our efforts would have been for naught had not American farmers the ability to apply and utilize the technology and information available to them. This is a success story in its own right, and in my opinion it is indicative of the high level of intelligence, practicability, and ingenuity of today's successful farmers.

I express the hope that your great organization will join hands with the Members of Congress and others in providing agriculture with a sound and realistic program that will benefit all mankind.

SENATOR NELSON'S WISCONSIN TRAILBLAZING ON CONSERVATION NOW PAYING OFF FOR NATION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Nation was aroused by President Johnson's eloquent plea in his state of the Union speech Monday night for a more beautiful America.

Knowing President Johnson as we all do, this pledge to beautify America, will soon be translated into specific proposals to be considered by Congress.

The assault on America's natural beauty has already ripped deep, ugly scars in our countryside. Much of our limited fresh water is already polluted. Even the air we breathe has been poisoned by indiscriminate, unnecessary waste pollution.

Thanks to the trailblazing success of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON], when he was Governor of Wisconsin, the Nation has a proven blueprint on how the Nation can preserve its scenic beauty practically, economically, and without invading the rights and freedom of American property owners.

The Gaylord Nelson conservation program in Wisconsin is a $50 million 10-year plan. It is based on a sparkling new park system and an ingenious use of easements. It has won enthusiastic, bipartisan approval throughout Wisconsin.

Recently, U.S. News & World Report, in a characteristically clear and convincing analysis of the President's proposal for a more beautiful America, paid tribute to Wisconsin and to the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON]. In 1961, I recall that when the then Gov. GAYLORD NELSON succeeded in winning passage of this legislation, I predicted that this Wisconsin idea would become a model for America. U.S. News & World Report concisely describes the Wisconsin program and its relevance to our national problem.

I ask unanimous consent to have this brief article printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WISCONSIN'S BEAUTY PLAN—AN IDEA THAT WILL SPREAD

Several features of the emerging plans to give the United States a face-lifting got their first big tryout in Wisconsin.

The Wisconsin approach is of interest to landowners, including golf clubs and other organizations, who own natural beauty spots they would like to preserve if they could stand the costs.

Starting in 1961, Wisconsin adopted a 10-year program to clean up and expand its parks, scenic highways, forests, lakes, and other natural resources.

A novel feature was the purchase of scenic easements and public easements—agreements with landowners that enable public agencies to preserve beauty spots and make them accessible to limited public use.

In return, the landowner gets a payment in cash; or the landowner may get certain tax reductions through lowered assessments, for example.

Senator GAYLORD NELSON, Democrat, of Wisconsin, who as Governor of the State pushed the 1961 plan into being, says the idea of easements may be the biggest contribution to preserving America's beauty in many decades.

"Most people have an instinct to preserve beauty," Senator NELSON says. "They want to help, but many also want to hold on to their property and pass it on to their children. The easement idea gives them a chance to do something for their country and maybe solve some of their own problems as well."

The easements device grew out of Rockefeller Foundation studies. The State of New York in 1960 passed a law authorizing scenic easements. Wisconsin was the first State to apply the principle on a large scale, however.

THE WHEREWITHAL

To finance its beauty plan, the Wisconsin Legislature voted a 1-cent-a-pack tax on cigarettes. This is expected to provide $50 million in the program's first 10 years.

The money is to be divided generally along these lines:

For scenic rights along 3,000 miles of State highways: $2 million.

For public easements on farms and other tracts useful for parks, fish and game developments: $6.5 million.

For 25 new lakes: $1.5 million.

For nine new State parks, plus open spaces near cities, State forests and wildlife and fish areas: $24 million.

For park improvements: $14 million.

By November 1964, the Wisconsin Conservation Commission had bought 87,000 acres of land at an average of about $100 an acre. It had taken easements on 9,000 acres at a cost of about $23 an acre.

The easements cost the taxpayers about one-fourth as much as the purchased land, and the acreage involved remained in a taxpaying status. This is a key point in many localities, which resent State and Federal agencies' gobbling up land resources.

The Wisconsin State Highway Commission, meanwhile, has bought 262 easements along the Great River Road beside the Mississippi River at a cost of $116,000. Easements also are being purchased on other roads.

CLEANING UP TRASH

Wisconsin has adopted some strict laws against people who litter roads, parks and streams with trash.

Senator NELSON thinks roadside incinerators or mammoth trash bins, perhaps at filling stations, are the only answer. Built-in trash containers in cars also would help, in his opinion.

A sizable Federal program to finance scenic easements is another necessary step, Senator NELSON believes. Last September he urged the Government to put up $10 million a year from general appropriations to be matched by the States for purchase of scenic easements along Federal highways.

IN THE CITIES

Senator NELSON also urged that up to a billion dollars a year be made available for cities and States to use in cleaning up their parks, employing jobless youths.

More than 450 mayors and other officials endorsed that idea. There are other signs that voters around the country feel it's time to push a clean-up-and-preserve-America campaign, in line with President Johnson's theme.

Three years ago the voters of New York States voted a $100 million bond issue for a program to buy land for parks and open spaces.

In December, Nassau County, on the fringe of New York City, employed a scenic easement for the first time.

One large estate owner gave the county an easement for a nature-study area. This qualifies as a contribution under the income tax laws, and a tax-assessment reduction is involved.

Minnesota last year became the first State to apply for scenic-easement funds under the interstate-highway program.

It all adds up to a ferment of State and local activity aimed at hanging on to what is left of America's beauty.

"If President Johnson does nothing more than give us a symbol of national leadership and interest in this effort, it will be a help," said one State conservation official.

ARTHUR KROCK, GENTLEMAN OF THE OLD SCHOOL

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, while the Senate was in adjournment, Arthur Krock observed his 78th birthday. It is a little late to wish him a happy birthday. But it is never too late to pay tribute to this distinguished journalist. I know of no newspaperman who better fits the description, "A gentleman and a scholar."

Insight and integrity, candor and clarity, these are the qualities that mark an Arthur Krock column; plus, of course, a total lack of pretentiousness. Arthur Krock has been writing for the New York Times for many years. In all those years he has never failed to deliver the brand of journalism that we have grown to expect of him.

I invite the attention of Senators to a very fine birthday tribute paid to Mr. Krock by Walter Trohan, of the Chicago Tribune, and ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Trohan's article printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT FROM WASHINGTON

ARTHUR KROCK, GENTLEMAN OF THE OLD SCHOOL

(By Walter Trohan, chief of Chicago Tribune's Washington bureau)

WASHINGTON, November 15.—In the restless ecstasy of digging into the past, keeping pace with the present, and prying into the future that constitutes the work of conducting a news column, there is seldom time to yield to a sentimental gesture, no matter how deserving it may be. It is, therefore, all the greater a pleasure to salute a valued and distinguished colleague on the occasion of his 78th birthday tomorrow.

He is Arthur Krock, a gentleman of the old school and a newspaperman in the finest traditions of what had long been considered a profession, but which has been made a trade union in the last three decades. If it is a profession, he has lent it his integrity, and if it is a trade, he has raised it by honored service.

Krock began his career as a reporter in Louisville in 1907, became a Washington correspondent in 1910, and returned to Louisville to become an editor for a number of years. In 1923 he became assistant to the president of the now defunct New York World and in 1927 he joined the New York Times, becoming its Washington correspondent in 1932 and serving until 1953. He has continued his column since he relinquished direction of that newspaper's Washington bureau.

His reflections are a way of life

For many of its readers and for those of other papers his reflections and observations have become a way of life. For newspapermen in Washington and around the country his writings have been shafts of enlightenment on complex problems of the day and flashes of verbal lightning to be envied and emulated.

There was a piece he wrote so long ago that he must have forgotten it about a village festival on the deep and dark Saguenay River in Quebec that Robert Louis Stevenson would have envied. There was a tale of the American visit of Lyndon Baines Johnson's camel driver, in the manner of the Arabian nights, that Mark Twain would have relished.

This is by way of saying that the gentleman can write, perhaps in the measured balance of the 19th or early 20th century, rather than in the flippancy and intimacy that characterize so much of the efforts of toilers in the vineyard today. For this he deserved praise, no doubt, but the monument he has erected for himself will, like that of Horace or Shakespeare, outlast brass.

His greater contribution is honor. In his long years of service as a newspaperman, Krock has shared thousands upon thousands of confidences and broken none. He has been asked for advice and given it honestly and freely. He has been generous in lending his name to help writers, young and old. He has not profited from his confidences, advice, or help in memoirs which would be a great contribution to the history of our times.

Earns Pulitzer Prize many times

Twice he was awarded the Pulitzer Prize, although he earned it many times. Yet, this was not his greatest contribution to the newspaper business. It was the inspiration and example he set for others that must not be forgotten.

Krock was not one to don a powder blue shirt for television cameras on press conference days. He was not one to identify himself with assumed modesty. He had no more love for the press conference and its posturing than he did for the news handout and its administration line.

Krock sought out the newsmakers and the news on his own. He can turn out a news story as clear, factual, and polished as any news gem, which he did on the death of Franklin Delano Roosevelt. And he can lead you to the heart of any foreign or domestic problem to give it perspective and meaning.

It is a happy birthday for us, Arthur, because we are better for your being with us.

THE COLD WAR GI BILL IS MORE DESIRABLE THAN EVER

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, President Johnson's two praiseworthy purposes to aid education as well as to increase employment, as disclosed in his state of the Union message, will be materially advanced by the enactment, in the 89th Congress, of Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH's GI bill for the selective service draftees. This is similar to, though less extensive than, the bills enacted first in behalf of the World War II veterans, and second in behalf of Korean war veterans. The experience with these two important and desirable acts clearly showed that their benefits far exceeded their costs.

Now, there is an additional reason for this legislation which did not exist in previous Congresses. Entitled to such assistance are not only the cold war draftees but also the participants in our undeclared war in South Vietnam. Already our American dead there exceed 350, and the number of injured—to date undisclosed—is far larger.

Senator YARBOROUGH's bill had 39 cosponsors in the 88th Congress, of whom I was proud to be one. I shall, of course, cosponsor it again. I understand it will be Senate bill 9.

An excellent article by the distinguished and dynamic senior Senator from Texas appears in the current issue of Harper's magazine.

I ask unanimous consent that the article, entitled: "A Fair Deal for the Cold War Soldier," by Senator RALPH W. YARBOROUGH, which so cogently sets forth the desirability of the pending legislation, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A FAIR DEAL FOR THE COLD WAR SOLDIER

(By Senator RALPH W. YARBOROUGH)

(A proposal to extend the old GI bill of rights to the new crop of veterans—not as a giveaway, but as a sound national investment—by the newly reelected Senator from Texas, who has sponsored laws for conservation, education, and the Peace Corps.)

Not long ago I talked with a young ex-serviceman who is working as a truck driver to support his family while he attends night school.

"At the rate I'm going, I'll be 40 when I graduate," he said. "I suppose that isn't really 'old' but my value—and the degree's—will certainly have decreased by then—if I manage to stick it out. And I'm not sure I can."

This man is one of 3 million forgotten American veterans. By 1973 there will be 5 million in the same position. All of them had the bad luck to serve in the Armed Forces after the benefits of the World War II GI bill of rights and the Korean bill had run out.

To give these young veterans a fair shake, I have proposed a cold war veterans readjustment bill. In the 88th Congress, this bill was cosponsored by 39 Senators, and we had hoped it would be enacted into law last June—on the 20th anniversary of the Omaha Beach landing. (In the same month and year, 1944, the original GI bill was passed.) When Congress adjourned in October, the bill was still pending on the Senate Calendar. It had been there for over a year. For the bill to pass in the 89th Congress, when it is reintroduced, it will be necessary for a great many Americans to demand it—in the name of both justice and good sense.

This is no bonus or giveaway program, for the GI bills have proved among the best investments our Government ever made. The record speaks for itself.

Almost 8 million veterans received training under the World War II bill and thus acquired a median of 12.2 years of school compared to 9.6 years for nonveterans of their age. These veterans have been earning from $2,000 to $3,000 more a year than the less educated nonveterans. Assuming—as we properly may—that at least half of this added income is due to better education and training, then the GI bill should be credited with giving the Government an extra $1 billion a year in taxes. By 1970, in fact, the men we educated will have fully repaid the cost of the bill by their additional taxes, and it can be regarded from there on as one of the Government's few profit-making ventures.

The GI's also proved admirable loan risks. Defaults amount to only 0.02 percent of the more than $56 billion loaned or guaranteed on veterans' homes and businesses, and this small loss has been more than offset by the Government's $118 million profit in interest payments.

Some 3 million additional veterans received schooling under the Korean GI bill, making a total of about 11 million Americans whose educational level has been raised under these 2 laws. In the process we have added to our supply of sorely needed professional people some 625,000 engineers, 375,000 teachers, 165,000 natural and physical scientists, and 220,000 workers in medicine and related fields. Not surprisingly, many more in the veteran group educated under the GI bill hold professional and managerial jobs, and unemployment is far less of a problem to them than to equivalent nonveterans.

The Nation, in effect, created a new source from which to draw its leaders. At this writing, such leaders include 2 Cabinet officers—Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall and Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman—7 Governors, at least 47 Congressmen, and 9 Senators. Indeed, about a thousand of the men listed in the 1960–61 "Who's Who in America" owe their educations to the GI bills. If the pattern holds, 12 to 15 percent of the book's total listings in the 1980's will be veterans who benefited from the program. And as World War II and Korean servicemen mature they are likely to assume still more important positions of leadership.

In contrast, our cold war veterans are often lucky to get any jobs at all, and it is the Government itself which seems to block their path. It keeps them out of the labor market for 2½ years, on the average, and then sets them loose in the civilian economy to catch up as best they can with the thousands of young men—56 percent of those eligible for the draft—who were never in uniform.

Since the Korean GI bill lapsed on January 31, 1955, more than 2½ million men have been discharged from active duty only to find themselves untrained, unemployable, and unable to compete for scarce jobs. Increasing automation promises to make their plight still worse. In 1963 alone, more than 210,000 veterans received unemployment compensation in excess of $96 million—that is, $2 million over the figure for 1962. We can expect to reverse the trend only by investing in their education.

The bill we have proposed aims to train today's veterans so that they can stay off the unemployment rolls. Specifically, it offers men who served in the military for more than 180 days between January 31, 1955, and July 1, 1967, 1.5 days of educational assistance for each day of active service—with a limit of 36 months of schooling. Its estimated $289 million annual cost will be entirely self-liquidating since well-trained veterans will pay higher tax bills.

Despite the fact that the initial cost of the bill would account for only three-fifths of 1 percent of all military expenses, the Bureau of the Budget and the Department of Defense oppose the measure. Current inservice courses, so their argument runs, offer the same benefits and may encourage young men to enter the Armed Forces, while postservice educational programs are more likely to lure them to leave. The Defense Department has not, however, come up with evidence that GI bills lower reenlistment rates.

Fighting for the bill are, among others, the AFL–CIO, the American Federation of Teachers, the National Education Association, the National Farmers Union, and more than half a dozen veterans' organizations. What they want is not a rash and extravagant experiment; it is a program which has proven its value for our Nation in general and for the men who defend the United States in particular. I think they ought to get it.

TRIBUTE TO FRANK E. TAYLOR, JR.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, members of the Virginia delegation in Congress are going to miss an old and faithful friend from the Press Galleries of the House and Senate this year.

I refer to Frank E. Taylor, Jr., of the Associated Press, who began a well-earned retirement on January 1. Mr. Taylor had a long and honorable newspaper career, but we will remember him best for the nearly 20 years he has served as Virginia regional correspondent for the Associated Press here at the seat of Government.

During a part of his service in Washington he also reported news of interest to West Virginia, Maryland, Kentucky and Indiana.

Mr. Taylor was born December 8, 1899, near Pendleton, S.C., and worked on the Birmingham Age-Herald and the Columbia, S.C., Record before joining the Associated Press at Richmond, Va., in 1928. He was transferred to Washington in 1945. He was married in 1937, and the Taylors have two children. The family home is in McLean, Va.

Frank is one of the most modest, unassuming men I have ever known, but I do not want him to leave without letting him know the high regard in which he has been held by those of us with whom his work brought him into frequent contact. I wish Frank and Mrs. Taylor many years of health and happiness.

BRIDGES EAST AND WEST

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, recently, on December 8, 1964, while Congress was in recess, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] delivered a speech entitled "Bridges East and West" at Southern Methodist University in Dallas, Tex. I have never read a more impressive statement outlining the goals, methods, and policies our Government should have in mind in our dealings with the Communist world.

Senator FULBRIGHT spoke convincingly of the failure of military conflict in the past, and of the dangers which general war now poses:

> We have reached a point in history in which no rational man can conceive of war as a useful instrument of national policy * * *. I believe that we must pursue a policy of building bridges of accommodation with the Communist world, not because this approach is inherently more desirable than one of total victory for American interests, but because there is no acceptable alternative in the nuclear age. The usefulness and desirability of a clear and quick victory over all our adversaries can be debated, but such a debate must be academic because the option of complete victory does not exist. The choice before us in our relations with the Communist world is not between victory and defeat but between mutual accommodation and mutual annihilation.

The Senator from Arkansas carefully explained the assumptions upon which he would build his policy toward the Communist bloc:

> The key assumption of a policy of building bridges to the Communist world is that the Communist countries are susceptible to external influence and to internal change. I think the assumption is eminently sound. If the determination of the Communists to destroy us is indeed as permanent, monolithic and unalterable as some of our people seem to believe, then they have achieved a constancy of will that no movement or nation or individual has ever before achieved.
>
> It is nonsense to suppose that the character and objectives of communism are unalterable. Change and the susceptibility of change are practically a law of human life, and however much the Communists may imagine that they have altered or conquered human nature, it is a demonstrable fact that they have not. Even the dreariest of Chinese or Soviet fanatics is a human being as well as a Communist * * *. Great changes have in fact taken place and are continuing to take place in the Communist countries.
>
> Far from the monolith of Stalin's time, the Communist bloc—if it can still be called a bloc—presents the world with a panoply of change proceeding at widely varying rates.
>
> A highly diversified situation calls for highly diversified policies. This, I think, must be the key consideration in the Western effort to build bridges to the Communist world.

Senator FULBRIGHT has many worthwhile ideas to offer, but the most important service his speech renders is placing the problems of our time in better focus. As he noted near the conclusion of his speech:

> What is called for is a sense of historical perspective in meeting the crises and tensions of the moment—a perspective from which we will perceive that the doctrines and the causes that arouse men to violence are transitory, that more often than not they fade into irrelevance with the erosion of time and circumstances.

In order that every Member of Congress may read this remarkable address, I ask unanimous consent that the text be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRIDGES EAST AND WEST

(Statement by Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT, chairman, Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, Southern Methodist University, Dallas, Tex., All-University Convocation)

I am honored to be with you today at this great university in one of the Nation's great cities. Like so much of our country, Dallas is a growing and changing community and the growth that is taking place here is healthy and sound and constructive.

As a citizen of a neighboring State, I am proud of the development of Southern Methodist University as one of the Nation's leading institutions of learning and of the development of Dallas as one of the Nation's handsomest and most prosperous communities. As a member of the Democratic Party, I am filled with admiration for the excellent judgment shown by the citizens of Dallas in last month's election. And as an American, I am proud of the efforts that have been made here in Dallas in the last year—efforts that, in Mayor Jonsson's words, are building a community "balanced in human and spiritual values as well as economically."

It cannot truthfully be said that war is never profitable, but it can be said that its costs have almost always exceeded its rewards and that in our own time a general war would result in such mass destruction that, as President Kennedy once put it, the survivors would envy the dead. We have reached a point in history in which no rational man can conceive of war as a useful instrument of national policy. Unfortunately, however, men are not always rational and the fact that war is insanity does not mean that it is impossible or even unlikely.

It follows, I think, that one of the guiding principles of our foreign policy must be the accommodation of conflicting interests in the world by means other than military conflict. We should be under no illusions about the fact that accommodations without conflict mean a peace without victory, or at least without the kind of total victory for American ideals and values that was discussed so much in the recent election campaign. Great nations do not as a general rule surrender their interests and ideologies to other great nations without being compelled to do so. If it is agreed that neither the West nor the Communist nations are able to coerce the other into submission, then it should be clear to both sides that the condition of their survival is the acceptance by each of certain conditions and arrangements in the world that it will find distasteful. The challenge of statesmanship is to devise compromises that respect the vital interests of both sides while requiring concessions that, however distasteful, are at least tolerable.

I believe that we must pursue a policy of building bridges of accommodation with the Communist world, not because this approach is inherently more desirable than one of total victory for American interests but because there is no acceptable alternative in the nuclear age. The usefulness and desirability of a clear and quick victory over all our adversaries can be debated, but such a debate must be academic because the option of complete victory does not exist. The choice before us in our relations with the Communist world is not between victory and defeat but between mutual accommodation and mutual annihilation. If there was ever a time in our history when it was open to us to seek a universal victory for American ideals and institutions—and it may well be questioned that there was—it is clear beyond doubt that that time has passed and that for as far into the future as we can see we shall be living in a world of diverse and often conflicting interests and ideologies.

I do not think there is reason for despair in this state of things. Compromises often turn out to be very much more tolerable than they seem when they are being made and victories even more often turn out to be bitter disappointments. There are two reasons, I think, why the fruits of triumph so often turn to ashes in the victor's hand.

The first is the inescapable limitations of human nature. Man is by far the most generously endowed of God's creatures, but for reasons known best to Himself, the Almighty endowed us liberally with technical and scientific skills but only modestly with the qualities of wisdom and farsightedness. A total victory is really too great a responsibility for any man or any nation. Men are simply not equipped to decide each other's fate, and when they try to do so, the chances are very great that, however good their intentions, the result will be something between tragedy and futility.

Democracy itself is built on this view of human nature. Democratic procedures are based on the assumption that no man has access to absolute truth and that no man, therefore, must be allowed to impose his will upon all others. The genius of democracy is that, unlike other political philosophies, it acknowledges the limits of human wisdom and understanding.

Viewed from the perspective of man's moral and intellectual shortcomings, the shattered hopes and lost victories of the recent past seem somewhat less surprising. A great deal of intellectual energy has been expended in an effort to understand how and why the victory of 1918 was followed in only 20 years by another global conflict and how and why the total victory of 1945 turned almost at once into the cold war that still engages us. These baleful events might well have been avoided, or at least alleviated, by different policies and different decisions at critical moments, but perhaps the basic cause of our disappointments lies in the very totality of the victories we won. Signaling as they did an opportunity to reshape the character of international relations, the victories of 1918 and 1945 were lost largely, I think, because they created opportunities that could only have been realized by the application of far greater wisdom and far greater vision than any of us possesses.

The second reason why great military triumphs so often fail to realize their promise lies in the character of conflict itself. War is not merely a method of resolving disputes that preceded it; it is not, as Clausewitz thought, a mere extension of politics. International conflicts, especially sustained international conflicts, have an evil dynamism of their own. The original causes of modern warfare are soon lost in a maelstrom of passion and destruction; new ambitions are aroused and new forces are released that change the character of the conflict and largely determine its outcome and aftermath.

Peace settlements in this age of national and ideological conflict are made by angry and agitated men. Nations are profoundly altered by conflict, and whatever their motives for entering a war, they are likely to come out of it embittered, vindictive and physically and morally exhausted, with far more extensive and far less realistic ambitions than those which drove them into war. Reason and wisdom are fragile human qualities, easily consumed in the passions of national conflict. One of the tragedies of modern warfare—perhaps the greatest tragedy—is that it puts men most completely at the mercy of their emotions at precisely the moment when they are most desperately in need of their reason.

On November 29, 1917, the Daily Telegraph of London published a letter by Lord Lansdowne about the damage to be wrought by the war then in progress. His prophecy, which was scornfully rejected at the time but tragically vindicated in the outcome, is even more compelling for our own time. "We are going to win the war," he wrote, "but its prolongation will spell the ruin of the civilized world, and an infinite addition to the load of human suffering which already weighs upon it. Security will be invaluable to a world which has the vitality to profit by it, but what will be the value of the blessings of peace to nations so exhausted that they can scarcely stretch out a hand with which to grasp them?" [1]

We Americans are more susceptible to excessive idealism than to vindictiveness. We have a tendency to turn conflicts for the defense of our interests into crusades for the regeneration of mankind. In 1917, we went to war to defend our maritime rights and ended by conducting a crusade to make the world safe for democracy. In the Second World War, we remained neutral while most of Europe and much of the Far East were overrun and entered the war only when our own territory was attacked, but then we prosecuted the war to the unconditional surrender of our enemies.

In both World Wars we dreamed great dreams about a new era of world peace under world law. In both instances we were disappointed, largely, I believe, because our hopes soared beyond the limits of our capacity. In both instances, the price of unattainable aims was the loss of lesser prizes that were well within our grasp. I believe that America and the free world would be safer and happier today if we had not tried to outrun history in 1919 and again in 1945 and had tempered our idealism by combining it with more modest and traditional objectives. "The wicked are wicked, no doubt," wrote Thackery, "and they go astray and they fall, and they come by their deserts; but who can tell the mischief which the very virtuous do?" [2]

Every society has its shortcomings of style and character. Ours, I think, is the mischief of too great virtue, of idealism insufficiently tempered by the sobering wisdom of experience. It is this crusading tendency, so noble in intent, so potentially destructive in its consequences, that we must guard against in our relations with the Communist world.

The point that I wish to stress is that in this nuclear age we must learn to live in an imperfect world. We must scale our ideals to the limits of external reality and to the limits of our own capacity. We must recognize, in the words of the old maxim, that "the best is the enemy of the good." We must acknowledge, however, regretfully, that it is not open to us to remove the threat of communism from the world, but that it is open to us to build bridges to the Communist world and in so doing to influence the course which it follows in a direction compatible with our own safety and with the peace of the world.

The building of bridges is a modest and limited enterprise. In no sense is it to be taken as a harbinger of general reconciliation between the free world and the Communist world. Such a reconciliation is unlikely to occur in our lifetimes, not because we would not like it but because the differences are too great to be eliminated by any process more rapid than the evolution of history.

---

[1] Lord Newton, "Lord Lansdowne: A Biography" (London: Macmillan, 1929), p. 467.

[2] William Thackery, "The Newcomers," ch. 20.

The building of bridges means nothing more than the opening of normal contacts and communications across a chasm of misunderstanding. It is most unlikely to result in the early resolution of such fundamental issues as the division of Germany, the nuclear arms race, and Chinese Communist aggression in the Far East. And, it should be emphasized, a program of limited accommodations with the Communist world can be only one part of the grand strategy of American national security. The other bases of our national security are the maintenance of the world's most powerful nuclear deterrent force and the maintenance and sustenance of a vigorous Atlantic Alliance. These, I think, are the three bedrocks of our security: none would be an adequate policy by itself and each contributes to the effectiveness of the other.

There is all but unanimous agreement among the American people on the need for military strength and the value of the Atlantic Alliance. It is on the third element of our national security policy—the need for building bridges to the East—that we often find ourselves divided. It is important to emphasize, therefore, that the purpose and effect of limited accommodations with Communist countries are exactly the same as those of our nuclear deterrent and of the Alliance: to reduce the Communist appetite for expansion and thereby to increase our own national security.

The key assumption of a policy of building bridges to the Communist world is that the Communist countries are susceptible to external influence and to internal change. I think the assumption is eminently sound. If the determination of the Communists to destroy us is indeed as permanent, monolithic and unalterable as some of our own people seem to believe, then they have achieved a constancy of will that no movement or nation or individual has ever before achieved.

It is nonsense to suppose that the character and objectives of communism are unalterable. Change and the susceptibility to change are practically a law of human life, and however much the Communists may imagine that they have altered or conquered human nature, it is a demonstrable fact that they have not. Even the dreariest of Chinese or Soviet fanatics is a human being as well as a Communist, subject to one degree or another—however little he may like it—to the same weaknesses, the same hopes and the same temptations that characterize all human life. In a way which the leaders of the Communist world would probably be the last to understand, they themselves as well as their peoples are connected with us by unalterable bonds of a common human nature. This common humanity can be a powerful and constructive instrument for change in the hands of those who understand it.

Great changes have in fact taken place and are continuing to take place in the Communist countries. On the whole there has been a tendency toward more liberal—or less dictatorial—domestic policies and more conservative—or less aggressive—foreign policies. Our policy should take close account of the nature and extent of these changes and of the diverse character of the world's Communist regimes. They range from China at one extreme, which hangs back in fanaticism and an aggressive foreign policy, to Yugoslavia at the other extreme, which has ceased to be a member of the bloc and pursues policies which are often friendly and seldom harmful to the West.

The Soviet Union stands approximately midway between the Chinese and Yugoslav extremes. During the period of Khrushchev's rule the apparatus of police terror was dismantled and after the great Cuban crisis of 1962 the regime adopted a policy of limited accommodations with the West. The new regime of Brezhnev and Kosygin has somewhat tempered the competition in insults with China but otherwise seems to be maintaining the Khrushchev policy of "goulash" communism at home and generally prudent policies abroad.

The area of most rapid, although widely varying, change in the Communist world is Eastern Europe. Even aside from Yugoslavia, which is far in the vanguard and cannot be considered a member of the bloc, the winds of change are being felt in most of the states which we have considered satellites of the Soviet Union. Poland has enjoyed a considerable measure of independence in its internal affairs since Gomulka's successful defiance of Khrushchev in 1956. Hungary has progressed considerably since the brutal suppression of its revolution in 1956 and the Kadar regime has won a measure of public acceptance by raising living standards and tolerating limited popular liberties. Except for the release of some political prisoners, Rumania remains a Stalinist dictatorship in its internal life but has openly defied the Soviet Union in pursuing an independent foreign economic policy. Czechoslovakia, which until recently was one of the most compliant satellites, is now beginning to stir in its internal life. Only East Germany and Bulgaria remain Stalinist dictatorships almost wholly under Soviet domination, while backward Albania has broken with the Soviet Union and become a Chinese Communist satellite.

Far from the monolith of Stalin's time, the Communist bloc—if it can still be called a bloc—presents the world with a panoply of change proceeding at widely varying rates. This situation presents the West with interesting and important opportunities to influence events in the Communist world in a direction favorable to Western security and interests. As the Communist states become less like each other, they become more like the rest of the world, subject to traditional aims and ambitions, to traditional pressures of nationalism, and—most important for our purposes—to traditional forms of external influence.

A highly diversified situation calls for highly diversified policies. This, I think, must be the key consideration in the Western effort to build bridges to the Communist world. Our purpose is not simply to advance some vague purpose of greater international understanding but to influence the pace and character of change in the Communist world in such a way as to discourage aggressive and expansionist policies toward the free world. To do this, we must differentiate carefully between one Communist country and another, rewarding those which show a greater inclination to confine the practice of their ideology within their own frontiers and to enter into friendly relations with the West and withholding our rewards and, when necessary, applying sanctions against those which continue to pursue expansionist policies.

There can be no such thing, under current world conditions, as a single American policy toward communism or toward the Communist bloc. An appropriate policy toward Yugoslavia must be different in certain respects from our policies toward Poland or Hungary, substantially different from our policy toward the Soviet Union, and radically different from our policy toward Communist China.

Yugoslavia is a Socialist state which permits its people considerable liberty, engages in experimental and pragmatic internal economic practices, and pursues a neutralist foreign policy which is free of Soviet control and not unfriendly to the West. Yugoslavia also exerts considerable influence on the Soviet bloc states of eastern Europe, who admire Yugoslavia's progress and envy her independence.

These are compelling reasons for a friendly American policy toward Yugoslavia. Except for a few outstanding issues, our relations are in fact cordial and constructive. I visited Yugoslavia a few weeks ago to attend the signing of an educational exchange agreement and I am confident that the exchange of students and scholars will make for an even better understanding between the two countries.

From the point of view of our own national security, there are two important objectives to be served by a policy of friendly cooperation with Yugoslavia. The first is to strengthen Yugoslavia itself, with its sizable territory, developing economy, and substantial army, in the pursuit of its independent national policies. The second reason for good relations with Yugoslavia is its unique position as a bridge between East and West. When we engage in cordial political relations with the Yugoslavs and accord them most-favored-nation treatment in trade, we are demonstrating to the other Communist states of Eastern Europe in the most persuasive possible way that there are attractive rewards to be gained by the adoption of friendly policies toward the West.

Poland and Hungary represent a lower gradation in the evolution of Communist states. Poland, like Yugoslavia, receives most-favored-nation treatment in trade with the United States and is permitted to buy surplus food products under Public Law 480. Poland, however, has regressed somewhat in the last few years toward more passive acceptance of Soviet leadership and, for this reason, I would think that no new American initiatives are in order for the time being. As to Hungary, I think it is time for the United States to take cognizance of the Kadar regime's progress and internal liberalization by reestablishing the full diplomatic relations that were suspended at the time of the revolution and perhaps as well by opening discussions for educational and cultural exchange.

Rumania has refused to subordinate its economy to an overall plan for the bloc and the United States, quite wisely, has encouraged this defiance by concluding a trade agreement with Rumania. As to the other countries of the bloc, they have not yet progressed to a degree that would warrant new American policies in trade or in other fields, and, indeed, just as independence is encouraged by rewarding those who practice it, it must also be encouraged by withholding concessions from those who do not.

Twelve years ago the Eisenhower administration came to power proclaiming a policy of liberation for Eastern Europe. That policy was a failure. When the workers of East Berlin rose in 1953 and again when the Hungarian people rebelled against their Communist rulers in 1956, the United States could not provide assistance beyond words of sympathy and concern. Despite the brave words of Secretary of State Dulles, the iron curtain was not rolled back in the 1950's except for the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Austria, which was not accomplished by forcible liberation but by years of painstaking negotiations that finally produced the Austrian state treaty.

The liberation policy of the 1950's failed because it purported, in its ill-defined way, to roll back the iron curtain by forcible means of one sort or another. It therefore came up against the realities of the nuclear age. When Eisenhower and Dulles were put to the test of using force to realize their declared objective, they recognized, quite wisely, that no policy can be sustained when its likely result will be the nuclear incineration of the world.

The changes that have taken place in Eastern Europe in the last few years have opened a new and far more realistic possibility for its gradual liberation. That possibility lies in the policies which we are now pursuing and which can be built upon and expanded in the years ahead. Just as the Soviets have sometimes profited by infiltrating and dividing free nations, we now have an opportunity to influence events in the countries of Eastern Europe in a way that will promote their liberty and our security. The skillful use of trade and diplomacy and educational and cultural exchange can do far more to bring about the liberation of Eastern Europe than all the brave and hollow words that used to be uttered about rolling back the iron curtain.

It is not possible in a few words to outline a long-term policy for the Soviet Union. Broadly speaking, our Government has recognized—and I hope will continue to recognize—that the Soviet Union of Brezhnev and Kosygin is a markedly different country from the Russia of Stalin, posing the West with markedly different challenges and opportunities from those of 12 and even 5 years ago.

It is not to be expected that we will soon find it possible to build bridges to the Soviet Union comparable to those which can be built, say, to Yugoslavia or Poland or Hungary. The Soviet Union is second only to the United States in power and wealth, and it is the only nation in the world that poses a major military threat to the United States. Its policies are more moderate and more reasonable than they were a decade ago, and that is to be welcomed and encouraged. Unlike the nations of Eastern Europe, however, the Soviet Union has the power and the will to expand its influence whenever the opportunity arises. Accordingly, our policy toward the Soviet Union must be based somewhat less on measures of influence and accommodation and somewhat more on the other two major components of American security policy, the nuclear deterrent and the vitality of the Western Alliance.

The fact that the opportunities for building bridges are smaller in the case of the Soviet Union than they are in the case of Eastern Europe does not mean that they are unimportant. On the contrary, significant progress has been achieved and significant opportunities remain for limited accommodations between the Soviet Union and the West. The partial nuclear test ban treaty, the agreement not to put nuclear weapons in orbit around the earth, the sale of American surplus wheat for gold, and the cultural exchange program have all contributed to an improvement in relations and to a substantial reduction in the danger of war.

I do not think that we will soon solve the problems of Berlin and of a divided Germany, and I am absolutely certain we will not soon achieve the "general and complete disarmament" that both sides are so fond of talking about. I do think, however, that useful opportunities will continue to arise in such fields as commerce and cultural relations, starting with a treaty for the establishment of consular relations that will be put before the Senate early in 1965. I believe that we should pursue these opportunities patiently and persistently because, modest as they are, their cumulative effect is the gradual lessening of the danger of war, which is not a modest achievement but a very significant one.

It is not really useful to argue over a hard policy versus a soft policy in our relations with the Soviet Union. Implicit in the eternal and fatuous debate between hawks and doves is the assumption that our policy must be based solely on military power or solely on compromise and conciliation. This is nonsense. A wise and farsighted policy is one which is tough in response to provocation, as in the case of the Cuban missile crisis, conciliatory in response to demonstrations of cooperative intent, as in the case of the test ban treaty, and unerring in its dedication to the peace and security of the free world.

The instruments of policy should not be confused with the goals of policy. The nuclear deterrent, the Western Alliance and measures of East-West accommodation are not ends in themselves but instruments of policy. The task of statesmen is not to choose one or another for all purposes and for all time but to decide in each instance which instrument of policy or what combination of policies is most likely to contribute to the security of the United States and of the free world.

The aims of our policy toward the Soviet Union are necessarily limited. They are limited because we are neither strong enough nor wise enough to eliminate all evil from the world and to bring about universal peace and justice. The issue between the Soviet Union and the West is not communism versus capitalism, but the universal and unlimited aims of Soviet policy. In the words of the French journalist and scholar Raymond Aron: "Should the Soviets ever recognize that their regime is only one of a number of possible ways of organizing industrial societies, the majority of democrats—while continuing to regard certain practices of the Soviet regime as deplorable, inefficient or inhuman—would no longer feel obliged to maintain an attitude of active hostility to the Soviet Union."[3]

China, with its ideological fanaticism, expansionist ambitions, and relentless hostility to the United States, poses a challenge of a different nature for American policy. It is to be hoped that in time, perhaps in 10 or 20 years, the Chinese Communist leaders, like the Russians before them, will become somewhat less fanatic and somewhat more realistic in their view of the world. When they do—if they do—it will be wise and desirable to try to build bridges between China and the West. In the meantime we can make it clear that they can have peaceful and even cordial relations with the West whenever they abandon their policies of aggression and subversion.

Until they do, however, our policy must be one of containing Chinese power just as we contained the power of Stalinist Russia. To put it another way, until China shows a far more cooperative disposition toward the free world, we shall have to base our policy on diplomatic, military and economic measures against Chinese Communist expansion, while withholding proposals for accommodation. Specifically, I think there is nothing to be gained at present either by according diplomatic recognition to Communist China or by acquiescing in its admission to the United Nations.

Wisely or not, we have withheld recognition and opposed the Chinese Communist admission to the United Nations for 15 years as expressions of our disapproval of their regime and its policies. Having withheld recognition as a mark of our disapproval, we cannot now accord it without having it taken as an expression of approval and acceptance. Since we do not and cannot approve of the present policies of the Chinese Communist regime, I do not think we should take a step which would convey the impression of approval, even though it should not have that effect. As to Chinese Communist membership in the United Nations, I think we must expect it sooner or later, but if it occurs before Communist China alters its present policies, I would expect the American vote to be cast in opposition.

There is little to be pleased with in the current situation in the Far East and little to be optimistic about in the prospects of an aggressive Communist China arming itself with nuclear weapons. But, as George Kennan wrote recently, "we must not make the mistake of taking any of this as absolute and unchangeable. These, too, are only men. They once had mothers and childhood and affections. They are, today, what circumstances have made of them. It is circumstances which will determine what they, or their successors, will be in 10 or 20 years' time * * *. Neither these men in Peiping nor the regime over which they preside are immune to the laws of change that govern all human society, if only because no single generation, anywhere, ever sees things exactly the same as the generation that went 10 years before it."[4]

These, I believe, are some of the ways in which bridges can be built between East and West. The purpose of these bridges is to open channels of communication across the chasm of misunderstanding that divides the human community and to break through some of the prevailing myths of international relations, of which the most dangerous is the belief that different political philosophies cannot survive together in the same world, that sooner or later one must prevail over all others.

Just as the medieval Christians could not bear the existence of heretical sects and alien religions, the extreme ideologues of our time have persuaded themselves that life is intolerable unless it is governed everywhere by uniform standards and values. This view is held as a kind of revealed truth, certainly not as an inference from history, which, far from suggesting that there is anything "natural" about uniformity in political ideas, leads us to the conclusion that if there is any "law" of historical development, it is a law of infinite variety, especially in men's ideas about their own nature and their relations with other men.

The crusading spirit is not a characteristic of mature societies but of unstable and politically primitive societies. The mature nation, like the mature man, is sure of its values in a way that welcomes but does not require imitation by others. The mature nation, like the mature man, is more interested in solving problems than in proving theories, more interested in helping people to be happy than in forcing them to be virtuous, and at least as interested in hearing the ideas of others—and perhaps learning and benefiting from them—as in preaching and spreading its own ideas.

I do not know whether the ideological and national animosities of our own time will erode away in the decades and centuries ahead. I do believe, however, that the lessons of the past offer grounds for hope that they will, if only we will let them. What is called for is a sense of historical perspective in meeting the crises and tensions of the moment—a perspective from which we will perceive that the doctrines and the causes that arouse men to violence are transitory, that more often than not they fade into irrelevance with the erosion of time and circumstances. Only from such a perspective can we hope to build bridges that will stand—bridges that will bring a divided world together in a reawakened awareness of its common humanity, in a reawakened understanding that the common hopes, common interests and common dangers that unite men are far more important than the ideologies that divide them.

---

[3] Raymond Aron, "Coexistence: The End of Ideology," Partisan Review, spring 1958, p. 230.

[4] George F. Kennan, "A Fresh Look at Our China Policy," New York Times magazine, Nov. 22, 1964, p. 142.

THE OAHE IRRIGATION PROJECT

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, farmers in Brown and Spink Counties of South Dakota yesterday voted on establishment of irrigation districts in their counties under the Oahe irrigation project planned for my State. The vote was 5 to 1 in favor of proceeding with the project—an overwhelming approval on the part of those who will be directly affected.

The vote was 222 to 48 in favor of a district in Brown County and 330 to 79 in favor in Spink County.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to include in the Record a short statement I have just made for news services in my State on the results.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement by Senator McGovern

The 5 to 1 vote in favor of the Brown and Spink County districts Oahe subconservancy district project is good news for all South Dakota. It is an endorsement of the most important economic project in the State's future. The directors of the district, and the voters, have my heartiest congratulations on the results.

I am especially pleased with the size of the majority. It will considerably improve our case for authorization of the Oahe project when it comes up in Congress. There can now be no question of overwhelming local approval. I am sure that as the benefits of the project become available, even those now hesitant about endorsing it will agree to its wisdom.

MEETING THE AUTOMATION CHALLENGE

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, an article in the January 12 issue of Look magazine outlines why there is much hope that the country will successfully cope with the problems brought by automation.

The author, Look Senior Editor T. George Harris, describes how individuals and companies are reacting to automation.

"A mighty tide of human resources is rolling out to buck the challenge of automation," he says.

The article also serves to underline the need for the greatest possible understanding of automation if individuals are to make the best possible adjustment to its impact.

Although some companies and workers are dealing with automation effectively, there is still a lack of proposals to meet the problems it causes, the article points out.

In addition, misunderstanding about automation tends to produce a nail-biting reaction by some people which can cause obsession with unreal problems at the same time that real problems are at hand.

In order to achieve the broadest possible understanding of automation, and to encourage new approaches to meeting the impact of automation, I introduced a bill during the last Congress providing for a White House Conference on Automation.

This tested method of gathering information about a general problem, and generating understanding about it at the same time, is well suited to the automation problem, in my opinion. I plan to introduce, in the current session, a similar bill calling for a White House Conference on Automation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Look article entitled "Automation—We Can Handle It," be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Automation: We Can Handle It

Automation booted Romie G. Seals out of his job last year, but it couldn't knock him down. In his final week on the line at Lockheed's Van Nuys, Calif., plant, this 35-year-old metalworker took a smoke break to talk about men, machines, jobs. He knew the facts and what to do about them.

"You're competent today, and you're obsolete tomorrow," he said. "Our economy is changing. Automation's coming in. It would be stupid to try and stop it. We're living in a fast world. We've advanced 30 years' worth in 5 years."

So how can a man beat a machine, any more than the horse could beat the car? "It comes down," Seals answered, "to your ability to take in new information." He nodded at a technical manual. "I'm studying the hell out of titanium now."

He had become, he knew, an unknown part of a well-known statistic—one of another 38,000 men and women who every week lose their jobs because of automation. But he was also the living solution to that statistic. He was a man-sized sample of the guts and brains that carry most of the robot-bumped thousands on to better work. They, and their children, are racing the robots, and they are winning.

Seals felt pride. Just as an old-fashioned spike driver on the railroad had confidence in his muscles, this man had confidence in his brains. Born in St. Louis, a Negro, he had taken in enough information over the years to move up through aerospace metals to junior engineer, at $3.27 an hour plus fringes. His talent had never failed him. Then automation caught up with him by one of its convulsive twists inside the flexible structures of the economy. Computer-guided missiles, hundreds of them stored in silos and submarines, had automated the weapons of war and led to cuts in defense contracts. A big, efficient missile plant 500 miles away ran short of work and gobbled up the Van Nuys production of missile-tracking consoles. Seals, with gifted 11-year-old daughter Lynda in school, did not care to move.

So he studied instead, job hunted, made out fine 3 weeks later as an analytical chemist at a metal-plating shop. And 4 months after that, using his fresh titanium know-how, he was back with Lockheed in another plant at higher pay.

Today, Seals pushes his study further out ahead of his current job. It's a natural thing to do. In the aerospace industry, each big company runs an educational department that is really a private college hidden inside the factory. Seals is taking Lockheed's cryogenics course to find out what metals do at low temperatures out in space. Off the job, drawing the standard tuition subsidy from his company, he invests his private time toward a metallurgy bachelor of science at UCLA.

"You either stay on the merry-go-round, or you fall off," he says. "You have to look upon education as a permanent profession."

Most articles and books on automation tell only about the helpless victims, and imply that we are all on the way to futility in 38,000-a-week batches. This fearful notion oozes around us. In months of research on automation application and theory, spliced into 10 years of reporting here and abroad, I have often shared the dread of landslide unemployment. Yet it is a rank superstition that any competent economist can disprove.

You can't really shake it, though, until you go into many U.S. plants and offices to watch able men and women take on ever-new work as if they had done it all their lives. Only when you know that most of them are winning, and how, do you see the real reason why something can and must be done for those not yet equipped to win. Otherwise, they and their children will be left behind in a permanent submachine caste.

A worker like Romie Seals may seem an exception to any rule, even for a futuristic industry. Hogwash. Look around you. The work force is not amass of inert, uneducated wage slaves clumping in and out of iron factory gates to earn last week's groceries. The full-time U.S. worker belongs to a force such as history has not seen before. He has an average family income of $7,458, has savings stashed away in his owned home, and can rely upon unemployment compensation to help bridge him over to another job. Car-mobile and competent, he belongs to an army of talent that strengthens itself on each struggle.

Do you know the American worker's education level? Among the 71 million men and women who work for pay—counting coal miners and sharecroppers, too—the average formal education is that of a college freshman. One day, we'll be a nation of salaried sophomores. Compared to my generation, who went to work at war's end, the new job applicant has 40 percent more, and better, schooling. A mighty tide of human resources is rolling out to buck the challenge of automation.

The function of education is specific, and it is essential to the fast changes of an automated economy. The studied capacity to take in new information provides that newly essential skill—skill at changing skills. "We've got to hire men who can move," says one shop-trained personnel expert, "from one specialty to another."

The strains of constant change test the older workers more than the young. A veteran machinist at Lockheed had to hunt longer than most for new work. "It's worse than being a cherry picker," he said. To understand the plight of these men, we need to know the basic workings of automation.

LITTLE BLACK BOXES START IT ALL

What is it? As a tool for more efficient production, it is but the latest item in the inventory of technological improvements since the hoe. The term automation was coined in the fifties to describe new factory equipment fitted with electronic controls. In their little black boxes, the controls feed back information from electronic sensors that, like a machinist's fingers and eyes, check the work and make it right. Next, bigger black boxes were built to supervise the little ones. Some of the biggest boxes, even full-sized digital computers, now slave on line night and day to run continuous-production plants that spew out chemicals, synthetic textiles, oil products and metals. These fully automated factories don't even leave many buttons for a man's thumb to push.

Going further, Chrysler, American Airlines and other firms operate networks of black boxes that pick up information input from many distant places. Swapping facts with each other, checking infallible memory banks, the robot nets can help men run vast production and distribution systems at high efficiency, low labor cost. The electrons cut into paperwork that, ever rising, would otherwise choke the phone company, big banks and other giant organizations. The robot nets handle your airline reservations and grab your checks by their squatty little numbers.

In short, automation produces more for less. One result: A transcontinental phone call that once cost $16.50 now costs $1. A refrigerator that cost the average worker 178 hours of pay in 1949 now costs him only 76.

Some of our 20,000 computers do a variety of nonproduction chores to speed up economic and technical advance. The research lab computer organizes information, points to new theories and products. Business computers keep track of consumer goods inventories well enough to reduce the erratic surges and cuts that once made postwar recessions so drastic. Government computers spot overall economic trends in "real time" (jargon for "fast enough to act upon"), so that public and private decisions can keep production high and steady.

If you add all such activities to your broad definition of automation, you end up talking about most of the causes behind the technological revolution now shaking sizable sections of U.S. industry. You might as well take them in a bundle. These causes combine to bring constant changes in many kinds of jobs. Nor is the shuffle apt to stop. We are in the era of radical change.

General Electric Co., wired in with new technology, trains executives to expect the incredible in everyday business. They are not disappointed. One of their products is a monster robot that walks like a man. In a routine training film, "The Winds of Change," GE compares the forces at work in our society with a Florida hurricane.

Some thinkers panic. They fear that electronic "brains" will outsmart men. Relax. From recent brain research, we know that any computer's "synthetic intelligence" is crude stuff beside the poetic waves now dancing in your skull.

The real problems arise from changes so ordinary we hardly notice. For instance, take the rise of the working woman. That girl, by sheer weight of numbers, has become the most important new labor factor of the automation era. Why? Prepared foods and squads of electronic domestics—at-home technology—have freed our wives from centuries of menial duty. Leaving stove and broom, the girls have been flinging themselves upon the general labor market in such numbers as to take over three out of every five new jobs.

They are job jumping from kitchen to office. Though most become perpetual privates in the white-collar ranks, their work makes the electronic era possible. Without our 25 million skirted nine-to-fivers, we would now suffer from an acute labor shortage, not unemployment. With them, about half of the U.S. families benefit from a second cake-winner and have more to invest in the home's main product—the educated child.

It is such ordinary, taken-for-granted actions, repeated in the lives of millions, that add up to the radical changes in our way of work and life.

Companies, unions, and workers have built new labor relations devices to stablize themselves in a shifting world. Labor expert A. H. Raskin points out the labor contract trend inspired by automation: Management is moving toward an effective promise to insure many a worker a lifetime job. But it may not be the same job for life. Companies provide the worker with job security in return for the right to change ancient work rules, and management ends up with a profit incentive to develop the employee's potential for job jumping.

How? The answer is hidden in a secret affair between business and education. Oldline companies, from Southern Pacific Railroad to Procter & Gamble, use a heady variety of programs, from Harvard School of Business scholarships to training films, to home employee talent. The habit spreads. Campbell Soup runs an in-plant high school. President W. B. Murphy even promotes his soups by operating a management school, free of charge and free of plugs, for supermarket clerks.

The total business involvement in learning, ever greater but little noted, is hard to estimate. One reason: Hardnosed executives don't know how to explain serious investment in the economy's most important resource, the able worker. But every year, about 8 percent of all major company employees go into formal job training.

Sign of the times: At many a factory gate, you see men come early to work with lunchbox in one hand, textbook in the other.

Most have figured out the double meaning of automation. On an existing job, it cuts the number of workers and often lowers the skills required. It's easy to punch a button, but many workers have to move on. Shock waves of change set off by big new tools force dozens of job jumps and a general upping of the demand for noggin skills.

This trend has a built-in accelerator. The closer you get to the technology of the future, the more clearly you see how it demands more, not less, from men. For this reason, the aerospace industry, daily dependent on new know-how, previews the shape of things to come in other industries. At North American Aviation, the firm that will put a scientist on the moon, President J. L. Atwood heads an institution of higher learning. One plant looks like a corporate campus laid out around a modern cloister. Well, shades of Oxford, that's what it is. Inside the missile shops, 102,000 employees last year took 1,154,000 hours of study, and in 2 recent years, 3,000 blue-collar students rose to white-collar ranks.

There's more. Like a sensible corporation in any industry, North American pays tuition costs for employee study in the many colleges of California's educated economy. Last year, 9,500 of its working scholars completed 14,000 courses, won 171 bachelor's degrees, 91 master's and 13 Ph. D.'s. Old-style vocational courses give way to something more practical—general education.

As automation snowballs, so does education. The more you have, the more you get. You build it up in a working career. Columbia University's Jacob Mincer measured the Nation's annual investment in further education of men and women on the job. He found the outlay on the college-bred worker about as high as the national expenditure each year on the next crop still sprouting on the campus. His research indicated that, in spite of Government and business subsidies, the workers themselves shoulder the main cost of study, largely through deferment of the pay they would otherwise earn on study time.

They get it back later, with dividends. University of Chicago economists have started the systematic study of "human capital," which they define as the health, knowledge and mobility of workers. Our haphazard investment in ourselves, it turns out, now returns a better profit than Wall Street's calculated investment in production machines—and does more to aid the economy's growth.

The present stage of technology puts a premium on the improvement of human resources. That's why the distribution of knowledge has become American capitalism's only basic industry. Public and private, it now accounts for 33 percent of the gross national product.

Ralph Helstein, poetry-quoting union chief, fears automation, but sees its promise. "In the thirties, we thought it would be enough to change material conditions," he says. "Now, we know we were wrong. The work of the next generation is to find out what it means to be a human being."

UNREAL FEAR, REAL NEED

Harvard labor economist John Dunlop, expert on industry's jerry-built teaching system, believes, that it must expand fast to meet the needs. In testimony before Senator JOSEPH CLARK's Subcommittee on the Manpower Revolution, Dunlop urged practical moves to inspire "vastly greater dedication by private groups and individuals."

But when I asked for specific proposals, he had surprisingly few to offer. Searching for some, IBM has put up $5 million for study of what automation does to people. Research may overcome the intellectual community's fear of machines. "We're scaring ourselves to death," said economist Clark Kerr after he read one nail-biting forecast. "If we become obsessed with the unreal problems, we can't respond to the real ones."

The real problems come in three shapes, all forbidding. But not one of the three comes without a proven answer that can, with enough effort, be made to fit. Let's list them, then take each in turn:

1. The problem of full employment. The economy has to be healthy to grow jobs faster than machines can cut them down. Right now, it also has to produce an annual bonus of job opportunities to make room for the first litter of postwar babies. They are coming of age to go to college or hunt work in half again the previous numbers. "We will see if the economy can reproduce jobs," says population expert Phil Hauser, "as fast as people reproduced people after the war."

2. The problem of structural unemployment. As automation strikes some workers, but opens up jobs for others, we have able-bodied men without work—and work to be done that they don't know how to do. The basic answer lies in job-jumping education, and in reasonable protection for the worker who can't jump. Unions, business, Government, and independent institutions can put out a stronger hand to help struggling individuals.

3. The special problem of the hard core, and the school dropouts forever recruited into it. Long-term unemployment is coming down, but young people are still being added to the hard core. High schools have sharply raised standards to train their graduates for the new world of work. However, many slum kids, lacking the family resources of the middle-class work force, don't have what it now takes. Result: In our recent years of prosperity, teenage unemployment has hung high near 15 percent—30 for Negro youth—though it has lately turned down. So far, only local communities have found answers big enough—locally—to clean up the Nation's worst scandal.

The three problems are stated above in the standard terms used by both businessmen and Government officials. These two groups of leaders, reaching a rare concensus, now share a resolve to expand economic opportunity and to help would-be workers take advantage of it. Labor Secretary Willard Wirtz talks of the determination he finds among businessmen and in community organizations. "If we can identify the nature of the poverty situation," he says, "we've got a lot of allies."

The agreement on principle began to shape up in 1963 when the late President Kennedy confronted the automation crisis. Labor leaders and some Labor Department officials believed that industry's efficient new machines had changed all the economic rules. Business expansion, they argued, would only bring on more automation, speed up the job-kill. Kennedy rejected this dogma. In proposing the tax cut, he bet that more automation would expand the private economy fast enough to create more jobs than would be killed.

He was right. The tax cut, passed after his death, shifted the U.S. system into high. In the past year, it created 1.4 million more jobs than it lost. The gross unemployment rate, which had hit 6.7 percent in 1961, backed down toward 5 percent. In boom areas, business now recruits and trains workers once marked "unemployable."

More tax cuts will follow. To make room for more people, the economy of the sixties has to grow jobs half again as fast (17.2-percent rise) as it did in the recession-racked fifties (12.9 percent).

As the country got moving again last year, it left behind the rumble of talk about landslide unemployment. It was always a rumble without a cause. If all the new technology coming into use were about to make people obsolete, this danger would show on a simple economic indicator. The labor-productivity index compares our total output with the hours of human labor that produce it. That index has long been rising, about 2.6 percent a year, because of our ever-better tools and skills. In the recent automation surge, the index has risen about 3.5 percent a year, not enough to justify anybody's fear that the machines are taking over. We can continue to absorb the annual increase by consuming more, working less.

THE SINS OF THE PAST

So the tax cut proved that Government has the fiscal and monetary tools to keep total employment high in the automation era. But the second big problem, structural unemployment, needs to be worked on in a thousand ways—and has been.

The most painful blows have hit specific groups of workers in traditional industries: coal, steel, meatpacking and docking. Years ago, in these citadels of early industrialism, the muckrakers found men and women exploited in degrading indignity. Unions sprang up to fight for better pay and conditions. But the work hardly changed enough to exercise a man's better talents, or to equip him for moves into new fields.

Today, automation helps wipe out the man-ruining jobs of old, but it also strikes a blow at men left helpless in them. The social evils of the past deepen the troubles of the present. Only 111,000 now go down into the soft-coal pits. Machines go. But no decent society can ignore the aging exminers left beside Appalachia's idle tipples.

The big unions have been in the middle of battles to protect their members. On their bargaining table, automation has been the only serious issue for years, and it drove them to slugfest strikes in steel, rails, newspapers. In the quiet periods between strikes, however, unions and companies have upheld the U.S. tradition of trying anything that works. Examples:

The west coast's longshoremen swapped the featherbeds on the dock for "a bite out of the machine": a well-financed guarantee that they will retire in dignity on automation profits. Kaiser steelworkers won protection from automation layoff and downgrading, plus instant slices out of future economies. Meatpacking unions at Armour & Co., about to walk out over automation plant closings, settled for a fund to develop techniques for aiding layoffs into new work.

The Armour fund's social workers learned from failure the urgent need for new approaches. In an Oklahoma City shutdown, they could do little for laid-off butchers, many of them Negroes with no other skill. But by the time a Fort Worth abattoir closed, the researchers had come up with ways to retrain and place almost any worker who had the confidence to try something new. Fund researchers now can cultivate an all-important "sense of mobility" in the low-skill employee if they can get to him before the shock of layoff knocks him flat.

Bernard Haldane, reemployment expert for several companies and New Jersey's State employment service, uses depth interviews to dig out forgotten talents, turn them into new careers. The new economy demands reinvestment in people.

Hundreds of managements, pushed by unions or fearing low morale, have perfected an ever-wider range of protections: supplemental unemployment compensation (in one-third of all labor contracts), attrition-only reductions, work spreading, early retirement, paid-for moves, subsidized education. Alert personnel men shifted their departments into reverse gear: Instead of hiring, they placed their layoffs in job-growth industries.

Arthur W. Brown of Standard Oil (New Jersey) summed up the new goal for automation-hit industries. "The challenge employers face," he said, "is to develop * * * a program which will provide the work force with a stairway to other work, instead of a back door to retirement."

Isolated company and union actions may sound like pathetic gestures, too feeble to matter. That is only because it is hard to add up the sum of many different accomplishments. University of California's Robert Aaron Gordon tried. By a close check on unemployment records in all industries, he proved that experienced blue-collar workers withstood the 1959–62 unemployment surge better than previously believed. Though hurt, they actually closed part of the job-security gap between themselves and the white collars. What the figures mean: The private management-labor policies have created a huge, flexible program that protects millions from sudden damage, and helps others into new work or the first stages of retirement.

Pittsburgh steelworker William H. Kerfoot, 58, was one of the first to try out his industry's new long-vacation scheme—13 weeks every 5 years. Look Senior Editor David Maxey spent a restful week with "Murphy" Kerfoot to see how he liked leisure. Mainly, Maxey and Murphy whiled away the days at the Dravosburg volunteer fire department, which doubles as a refreshment and pinochle department. "I'll tell you the truth," Murphy soon said, "I'm ready to go back to work now. You work 40 years, you sort of get in the habit.

"The best advice I could give anybody going into the mill is: Don't, unless you've got a good education," he said. "With automation, there'll be good jobs for technicians, but that's about it."

Why? The total number of factory blue-collar jobs, with lower demands for education, has not declined, no matter what you hear. Amid structural shifts, this total has fluctuated around 12 million for 15 years. However, by failing to grow with the population, the blue-collar regiment has taken a relative decline, until it now includes only 19 percent of all workers. The high school dropout's difficulty: He's part of a bigger nation, but able to work only in trades that have not grown.

Automation has built an ironic twist into the cliche about the factory worker's son who goes to college. That dream has become a necessity. Those who used to be bosses and boss-helpers—the technicians, managers, and clerks—are now the working majority. Since 1956, more than half the employed have been wearing white collars. If you can't fit into one, you can't go where the action is.

IRREGULARS VERSUS ROBOTS

The plight of the young inspired the Federal poverty program. Basically a package of education projects, it will train a few hundred thousand people stuck in the hard core. But the program's best effect, already visible, will be to provoke private and independent groups to action.

Everywhere you go now, the work is getting underway, often by expansion of earlier efforts. Labor unions, long suspicious of the formal education kick, have begun to try it. The United Auto Workers teach design molding to ex-mechanics. Out in southern California, a machinists union local even cultivates highbrow aspirations in union-hall classes. Textbook title: "Oedipus—Myth and Complex." Those same machinists run courses on tape-controlled tools. Their electronics branch put education on the bargaining table. Its members demand a new kind of 40-hour week: 32 hours of work, 8 hours of company-taught courses. The 32–8 demand would sound silly if many members were not already spending hours in such courses.

Unlikely volunteers, even the League of Women Voters, are on the prowl for solutions to employment problems. Behold, the Junior League dips its manicured nails into this grimy chore. In Indianapolis, the debutantes seek out money-short Negro mothers, uniform them, coach them, find them jobs as maids. Partly because the pretty girls are at it, the business leaders of the city are organizing a total attack upon poverty. With unemployment down to 2.3 percent there, these men believe they can do something for most of the 5,000 souls left in the local hard core.

The civil-rights movement has turned decisively from marching to teaching. The Urban League, now four times its 1961 size, has aided more Negroes into good jobs than all Federal training programs put together. CORE, the courageous sit-in force, has turned to the tougher task of improving the skill and confidence of job applicants. Alongside CORE comes none other than the National Association of Manufacturers with its own $5 million war on poverty. NAM expects, among other stratagems, to make industry less finicky about formal education requirements.

The whole ragtaggle machinery of U.S. institutions—government, independent, private—now throws its weight against what looked not long ago like a job too big to try. As fast as a new group discovers that automation unemployment is not a form of incurable cancer, things begin to happen.

Will the robots defeat this army of irregulars? The doomsday school says yes, definitely. Robert Theobald, author of "The Challenge of Abundance," has transformed automation fear into a political movement of ad hoc intellectuals. He warns that the robots will soon crank out a terrible overabundance of consumer goods and wipe out wage-paying jobs. If so, capitalism is kaput.

The one salvation, in Theobald's bold theory, is to break the old-fashioned connection between work and income. How? By automatic Government "wages" to nonworkers. A crusader with a flashing eye and fervent voice, Theobald does not believe, as I do, that his scheme would freeze the human problem where it is—instead of developing each man's talent by its economic use.

The theory of overabundance cannot be tested in a real, still-hungry world. For a working model, you have to go to science-fiction writers. In Frederik Pohl's "The Case Against Tomorrow," millions of reproducing robots distribute a surfeit of all the food and luxuries yet dreamed of. To keep demand up, the lowest human classes, guaranteed the highest income, are forced to consume piles of steak, sports goods, martinis. Work is related to income, but inversely. Pohl's land of ultimate abundance is an upside-down utopia where scarcity runs scarce and cornucopia turns into carcinoma.

The story's clarity spotlights the flaw in the overabundance theory. Material resources, even robots, are by nature finite; man's wants, given a little practice, are infinite. This nation, if it never does anything else, has proved that everyman's animal hunger for food, clothing and shelter is but the down payment on the civilized appetite.

We don't yet know many of the new goods automation will offer. Right now, we have an almost unlimited appetite for better education. Computers and video tapes can relieve teachers of rote work, let them search out each pupils' gifts. The whole education business, organized like an old-fashioned factory, will have to transform itself to meet the specific new needs of young and old.

We don't even know what automation's deeper dangers will be. At the dawn of this new age, we are like the average American in the early 1900's. He had heard about Ford's auto and the Wright boys' flying gadget. He could grasp a mechanical feat like the horseless carriage on a racetrack. If he happened to be a blacksmith, he could worry about his horseshoe trade. But he was blind to the dimensions of horror, and hope, about to drive and fly upon him. He never dreamed of bombers over London, the three-car family, or tourist jets to Florence. If he could not imagine a smogbound Los Angeles freeway at rush hour, he never suspected that his family would take off from the old hometown in mobile, one-generation units.

We can now see, looking backward, that the car and the airplane did more than replace the horse and the train. Yet both of these inventions had limited use. They were transportation. By comparison, the electronic-control device is already a family of instruments—from automated plants to research computers—and capable of broader, deeper imprint upon the family of man. The steam engine, which set off the first industrial revolution, is far less revolutionary than the computer, which has launched the second.

Such a powerful, all-purpose tool properly compels concern. "If America does not handle the second industrial revolution any better than England handled the first, then the West—and the world—will suffer for years to come," says Sir Leon Bagrit, an Englishman among the elite designers of advanced control systems.

History haunts him. He recalls how 18th-century businessmen in his country, eager for steampower profits, sent 10-year-old children into the coalpits and sweatshops. Their descendants still suffer the scars of that cruelty, which generated a reaction called Marxism. Sir Leon fears that modern business will, in ruthless use of its brave new tools, bring on forced idleness for millions and a whole new variety of inhumanities.

Beyond this tangible danger, which we can handle if we will, lies a prospect so startling that it shocks, and lifts, the soul. The system that we are shaping, and that is shaping us, does more than pile up an abundance of goods. We seem to be driving ourselves, at electron speed, toward a society in which robots are the slaves and man works at the difficult arts of civilization. If so, America may at last build what it promised itself 178 years ago: a nation in which each sovereign citizen pursues to the limit his human potential.

MORRIS E. JACOBS—KNIGHT OF ST. GREGORY

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the highest Catholic award ever given to a person of the Jewish faith, the Papal Honor of Knight of St. Gregory, has been conferred on one of Omaha's outstanding civic leaders and philanthropists, Mr. Morris E. Jacobs.

The career of Mr. Jacobs, who rose from a newsboy on the streets of Omaha to the presidency of a nationwide advertising firm, would be remarkable from any standpoint.

To him, the word "interfaith" is more than a term; it is a way of life. He is associated chairman of the American Jewish Fund-Raising Campaign and a member of the National Executive Committee of the American Jewish Committee. He is a trustee of the American Fund for Israel Institutions.

And at the same time, Mr. President, he is a member of the board of regents of Creighton University in Omaha and has served as general chairman of that Catholic institution's multimillion-dollar fundraising campaign. He is also a member of the Board of Lay Trustees of St. Joseph's College in Indiana.

He has long been one of the most ardent supporters of Boys Town and it was he who suggested the name for this world-famous institution which has been known as Father Flanagan's Home for Boys. He played a leading role in raising funds for a Catholic school adjacent to the Capehart Housing at Offutt Air Force Base, headquarters of the Strategic Air Command.

Mr. Jacobs has served in virtually every important civic activity in Omaha, bringing to the task boundless energy, great creativity and unquenchable enthusiasm. He is an active member of the board of Clarkson Hospital in Omaha, supported by the Episcopal Church, and he serves as an officer of the Young Men's Christian Association.

In 1952, Mr. Jacobs was the leader in the statewide campaign for an amendment to Nebraska's constitution to establish a State board of education and was elected as one of the first members of the board.

At the national level, he serves on the board of governors of the United Services Organization, Inc.—the USO—and he is a director for the Board of Fundamental Education and a member of the National Committee for the Support of Public Schools. He was general chairman of the 50th anniversary celebration for the Missouri School of Journalism.

I am pleased, Mr. President, to call to the attention of the Senate, this account of one man's dedication to the cause of helping others, a dedication that leaps the barriers of race and religion and serves as an inspiration to all of us.

INAUGURATION OF GOV. ROBERTO SÁNCHEZ OF PUERTO RICO—TRIBUTE TO OUTGOING GOV. LUIS MUÑOZ MARÍN

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I had the honor to attend the inauguration of the new Governor of Puerto Rico last Saturday. He is a distinguished man who, I am sure, will make a great leader of that Commonwealth.

The outgoing Governor, Luis Muñoz Marín, who was Governor for 16 years—in fact, ever since Puerto Rico became a Commonwealth—is one of the great men of this era. His leadership has contributed to stable, independent, progressive government; a leadership I may add, which is rare throughout the world. There is a scarcity of such talent and character as those embodied by Governor Marín.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point of my remarks an editorial entitled "It's Just Beginning To Sink In," published in the San Juan Star of Sunday, January 3, 1965.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IT'S JUST BEGINNING TO SINK IN

Luis Muñoz Marín is no longer the Governor of Puerto Rico. It will take some getting used to for those of us who were privileged to observe from a relatively intimate vantage point the public life of this unusual man. When he walked out of La Fortaleza one day last week in his shirtsleeves, without previous announcement that his official duties as Governor were ended, he left behind a legacy of human betterment of incalculable worth in the aggregate of its influence here and elsewhere. This was a rare man indeed who was stepping down from the highest office that his people could grant, after 24 years of leadership that transformed an island beggared by adversity and weighed down by self-pity and hopelessness into a society of hope and vigor and confidence and attainment. It was this uncommon man who voluntarily stepped down, relinquishing the power and authority of his high office to a younger man when he felt he had taught his people how an elected Governor should act, and now wished to set an example of how a former Governor should act. The lessons in democracy which he taught by his example as Governor were many and fundamental to the democratic way of life. We found on many occasions that he deserved criticism, in our opinion, and on others that he earned public praise. We were often wrong, but he never quibbled or used his position to strike back, to belittle, or to denounce. It was the nature of the man and a tribute to his position as he saw it to let the nature of fact and fiction strike its own balance which, he knew, it would in time. To a group at La Fortaleza one night he explained it this way, when asked why this writer criticized his administration so often. "He does criticize me more often than any other newspaperman in Puerto Rico, and sometimes he's mistaken. But he also praises me more often than any other newspaperman in Puerto Rico, and he doesn't know how often he's mistaken." For us that quote always epitomized the mature statesman who understood the responsibility of public office in a democracy and the role of the press in a free society to serve as the link between the people and those they entrust with the management of their business.

When the only elected Governor in 16 years leaves office it is natural that his name and the governorship become synonymous to many people. Every citizen of 30 was only 14 when Muñoz Marín became Governor for the first time, and, obviously, those who are younger today have even less reason to associate the word "governor" with any other name than "Muñoz." It would not surprise us if many youngsters for awhile will think of Gov. Roberto Sánchez as "the new Muñoz." That he cannot be and we know he is realistic enough not to pretend to be another Muñoz, for one century rarely produces two of that kind. Governor Sánchez will, we feel confident, make his own mark with his own personal traits and capacities, and be his own man. None should expect him to be anything else, certainly not a Muñoz Marín. The characteristics of a Muñoz Marín are as extraordinary as they are unlimited in their scope to fit the need of the moment. We recall his pacing the living room of his Mayflower Hotel suite the night before he was to testify before the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee in Washington on the bill to authorize the people of Puerto Rico to draft and adopt their own constitution, and to later accept or reject a congressional act which established the relationship between Puerto Rico and the United States which we call commonwealth. We asked him questions which we believed the committee would ask. One was, "what are you going to call this new political concept?" He replied, a "commonwealth." And added, "Estado Libre Asociado in Spanish." But why not "Associated Free State" in English, we asked, "because it translates into that?" "They (the committee) may not understand that," he said. "They may see a connotation of something like the Irish Free State." And, with finality, he said: "They will understand 'commonwealth.'" And so they did the next morning, with nods of approval from the Senators at the hearing table, and understanding. So we are a commonwealth. Since then, we asked ourselves many times what might have happened had this statesman not thought out every angle in detail.

We have watched this man walk into the office of the President of the United States several times and come out with far-reaching changes in national policy toward Puerto Rico which, at the moment, seemed less than transcendental but with time became part of the ever-changing relationship that has evolved into the present and still developing scheme of association. At times a White House visit would appear to be nothing more than a casual paying of respects, until one day, shortly after, there would come an Executive order from the White House to all departments of the Federal Government and then it would dawn on us that Muñoz had been there and that what he had talked to us about earlier as a possibility some day had come to pass. It was the same with Members of Congress, chairmen of committees, and individual Senators. Muñoz would "drop in" to say hello, nothing more. But a seed would be planted, a thought expressed, a little enlightenment provided, and we knew that we could anticipate the falling into place of the pieces that would make up the whole, a bill already drafted which would be introduced later when the atmosphere was likely to be receptive and "understanding" relatively widespread where it counted most.

We have seen Muñoz as the genial host to Congressmen visiting La Fortaleza or at Trujillo Alto for a "social evening," not 1 minute of which would be wasted. And then we would ride back to the hotel with the Congressmen, often Republicans, who would start pumping us on "what we can do for Puerto Rico," and suggesting something that had sneaked into their consciousness from somewhere which, to them, at times seemed to be brilliant ideas that just naturally came to mind. But we knew from whence they sprang for, we too, the press, found ourselves putting down words we thought original until it occurred to us that once more the master persuader had planted conviction where doubt had dwelt before.

Puerto Rico will never have another Muñoz Marín, nor will it know fully what he has meant to every living man, woman, and child of this island, or to those still unborn. None can know such a thing for it is beyond the available methods of assessing a man's contributions to his fellowmen. For him, we know his rewards surround him on every side, in every lighted home that was once a hovel, in every child whose belly is no longer bloated from hunger, in every smiling face of healthier children, and in the surge of hope that permeates a once deadened atmosphere. We wish him Godspeed in retirement and many years of fruitful happiness in the manner of his choosing and a heartfelt thank you, Don Luis.

William J. Dorvillier,
Editor-Publisher.

ORDER FOR JOINT SESSION TODAY WITH THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES TO COUNT ELECTORAL VOTES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate take a recess at 12:45 p.m. today, subject to the call of the Chair, and proceed as a body to the Chamber of the House of Representatives, in accordance with the provisions of Senate Concurrent Resolution 1.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

JOINT SESSIONS OF THE TWO HOUSES—RECESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Pursuant to the previous order, the Senate will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Pursuant to the previous order, at 12 o'clock and 45 minutes, the Senate stood in recess, subject to the call of the Chair, for the purpose of attending a joint session for the count of electoral votes.

RESUMPTION OF LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The joint session of the two Houses having been dissolved, the Senate returned to its Chamber at 1 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m., and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore.

RESULTS OF COUNTING OF ELECTORAL VOTE

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Curtis] and myself, as tellers on the part of the Senate, and Representatives Burleson and Corbett, as tellers on the part of the House of Representatives, I report the results of the ascertainment and counting of the electoral votes for President and Vice President of the United States for the term beginning January 20, 1965, and ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The undersigned, B. Everett Jordan and Carl T. Curtis, tellers on the part of the Senate, Omar Burleson and Robert J. Corbett, tellers on the part of the House of Representatives, report the following as the result of the ascertainment and counting of the electoral vote for President and Vice President of the United States for the term beginning on the 20th day of January 1965.

States	Electoral votes of each State	For President		For Vice President	
		Lyndon B. Johnson, of Texas	Barry M. Goldwater, of Arizona	Hubert H. Humphrey, of Minnesota	William E. Miller, of New York
Alabama	10		10		10
Alaska	3	3		3	
Arizona	5		5		5
Arkansas	6	6		6	
California	40	40		40	
Colorado	6	6		6	
Connecticut	8	8		8	
Delaware	3	3		3	
District of Columbia	3	3		3	
Florida	14	14		14	
Georgia	12		12		12
Hawaii	4	4		4	
Idaho	4	4		4	
Illinois	26	26		26	
Indiana	13	13		13	
Iowa	9	9		9	
Kansas	7	7		7	
Kentucky	9	9		9	
Louisiana	10		10		10
Maine	4	4		4	
Maryland	10	10		10	
Massachusetts	14	14		14	
Michigan	21	21		21	
Minnesota	10	10		10	
Mississippi	7		7		7
Missouri	12	12		12	
Montana	4	4		4	
Nebraska	5	5		5	
Nevada	3	3		3	
New Hampshire	4	4		4	
New Jersey	17	17		17	
New Mexico	4	4		4	
New York	43	43		43	
North Carolina	13	13		13	
North Dakota	4	4		4	
Ohio	26	26		26	
Oklahoma	8	8		8	
Oregon	6	6		6	
Pennsylvania	29	29		29	
Rhode Island	4	4		4	
South Carolina	8		8		8
South Dakota	4	4		4	
Tennessee	11	11		11	
Texas	25	25		25	
Utah	4	4		4	
Vermont	3	3		3	
Virginia	12	12		12	
Washington	9	9		9	
West Virginia	7	7		7	
Wisconsin	12	12		12	
Wyoming	3	3		3	
Total	538	486	52	486	52

B. Everett Jordan,
Carl Curtis,
Tellers on the Part of the Senate.

Omar Burleson,
Robert J. Corbett,
Tellers on the Part of the House of Representatives.

The state of the vote for President of the United States, as delivered to the President of the Senate, is as follows:

The whole number of the electors appointed to vote for President of the United States is 538, of which a majority is 270.

Lyndon B. Johnson, of the State of Texas, has received for President of the United States 486 votes;

Barry M. Goldwater, of the State of Arizona, has received 52 votes.

The state of the vote for Vice President of the United States, as delivered to the President of the Senate, is as follows:

The whole number of the electors appointed to vote for Vice President of the United States is 538, of which a majority is 270.

Hubert H. Humphrey, of the State of Minnesota, has received for Vice President of the United States 486 votes;

William E. Miller, of the State of New York, has received 52 votes.

This announcement of the state of the vote by the President of the Senate shall be deemed a sufficient declaration of the persons elected President and Vice President of the United States, each for the term beginning on the 20th day of January, 1965, and shall be entered, together with a list of the votes, on the Journals of the Senate and House of Representatives.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 12 O'CLOCK NOON TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business this afternoon, it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, during the morning hour tomorrow, on the convening of the Senate, during which time bills may be introduced, resolutions submitted, and other routine business transacted, statements be limited to 3 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REAPPORTIONMENT

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, on December 28 a comprehensive article written by the well-known, able, and accurate reporter, Mr. John D. Pomfret, was published in the New York Times. The article was an analysis of the action of the various States dealing with the question of reapportionment.

Mr. Pomfret very properly summarized this analysis by saying that the States were accepting the Court's decision on apportionment, that the populous areas of the Nation, and particularly the suburbs, were gaining in the legislatures. He summarized this by stating:

> Perhaps the most noteworthy fact about what has happened since the Court's decision of June 15 is the sheer volume of activity. It indicates that most States are prone to accept eventual compliance as inevitable despite efforts currently being made to upset the decision by a constitutional amendment.

This summary is particularly important in view of the proposed constitutional amendment that was introduced in the Senate this morning by my junior colleague, the distinguished minority leader Senator EVERETT M. DIRKSEN.

I believe this analysis, covering all 50 States of the Union, or, rather, covering the developments over the country, should be studied by the Members of this body, and by the general public. I ask unanimous consent that the article appearing in the New York Times of Monday, December 28, 1964, by John D. Pomfret, entitled "States Accepting Court's Decision on Apportioning," be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATES ACCEPTING COURT'S DECISION ON APPORTIONING—POPULOUS AREAS OF NATION, PARTICULARLY THE SUBURBS, GAIN IN LEGISLATURES—RURAL POWER DECLINING—PLANS FOR REDRAWING LINES OFTEN STIR DISPUTE—EFFECT ON PARTIES UNCERTAIN

(By John D. Pomfret)

WASHINGTON, Dec. 26.—It has been a scant 6 months since the U.S. Supreme Court, in a 6-to-3 decision, laid down its historic rule that both houses of State legislatures must be apportioned on the basis of population.

But the one-man, one-vote ruling, as it has come to be called, has already had a broad impact across the country. Its ultimate consequences on State politics and policies are yet to be fully measured.

Perhaps the most noteworthy fact about what has happened since the Court's decision of June 15 is the sheer volume of activity. It indicates that most States are prone to accept eventual compliance as inevitable despite efforts currently being made to upset the decision by a constitutional amendment.

TENNESSEE CASE FIRST

Some of the activity occurred after the Supreme Court's first historic decision in the reapportionment area, on March 26, 1962. In a Tennessee case known as *Baker* v. *Carr*, the Court ruled that the Federal courts were free to examine the constitutionality of State legislative districts. Previously the Court had taken the view that it would not enter the political thicket of districting.

The Court did not give any hint in *Baker* v. *Carr* of what standards should be used to determine whether State legislative districts were constitutional.

More particularly, it did not rule on the constitutionality of the so-called Federal system under which many States apportioned one house on the basis of population and the other on geographic standards, just as, in Congress, the House of Representatives is apportioned by population and the Senate is apportioned on the basis of two Senators for each State.

Cases to clear up the question were quick to develop, however. And in its decision of last June 15, written by Chief Justice Earl Warren, the Court found inequities in districts in six States—Alabama, New York, Colorado, Maryland, Virginia, and Delaware. The Federal system in the States was swept aside by the decree that in both houses of State legislatures the districts must be substantially equal in population.

THE SITUATION TODAY

A survey by New York Times correspondents discloses this current situation:

In four States reasonable compliance has been achieved by the legislatures without litigation, or is expected to be achieved soon.

In six, reasonable compliance has been achieved by the legislatures in the face of a suit or a court order.

In one, action has been taken with respect to one house and a suit is pending with respect to the other.

In three, State or Federal courts have carried out the reapportionment.

In two, action has been taken by the legislatures but is being challenged in court as inequitable.

In two, there has been no action and no suits, but action is in the making.

In 18, legislatures are meeting or soon will meet under court orders to reapportion.

In four, there has been no action, but suits have been filed to force reapportionment.

In two, court action is being threatened to force reapportionment.

In eight, court action has either been inconclusive or no suits have been filed, and there appears to be a disposition to resist action. Six of these States are in the South.

THE CONVENTION PLAN

The plan to upset the Supreme Court's ruling involves an effort to invoke for the first time a constitutional clause that directs Congress to call a constitutional convention upon petition by two-thirds of the State legislatures.

To date, 16 of the required 34 State legislatures have petitioned Congress for a constitutional convention the purpose of which would be to adopt an amendment allowing one house of a State legislature to be apportioned on a basis other than population.

Advocates of the one-man, one-vote doctrine consider it extremely unlikely that petitions from 18 additional legislatures can be obtained. But they are fearful that a blitz is being planned by advocates of the so-called Federal system.

The blitz would be staged in the opening days of 1965 sessions of many legislatures and would be designed to win approval of the petition before new legislators, many of them Democrats carried in by the Johnson landslide, acquired the parliamentary acumen to block it.

Time, however, appears to be on the side of those who favor the one-man, one-vote rule. Despite widespread opposition to the Supreme Court's ruling, its supporters believe that many legislatures that have acted, or have firm plans to act, would be reluctant to undo what they have accomplished after so much study and haggling.

THE BIG ISSUE

Indeed, reports from Times correspondents indicate that the big issue now is most often how reapportionment shall be accomplished, not whether it will be. The arguments are over the location of boundary lines, not over whether the number of people inside them should be nearly equal. And the air is full of partisan political cries of gerrymandering.

In some States, planned or accomplished reapportionment has worked to the advantage of the Republicans. Any precise assessment of the political effects in party terms is made well-nigh impossible by the dimensions of the Johnson landslide, which brought Democrats victory in many districts that in more normal elections would almost surely go to Republicans.

One thing is axiomatic, however, and was noted by almost all the correspondents. This is that reapportionment is giving the more populous areas a bigger voice in State legislatures. Often, however, the chief beneficiaries are not the central cities but the fast-growing suburbs.

Since these are frequently Republican in complexion, reapportionment in many instances appears to be a matter of taking away rural Republican votes in the legislature and adding suburban Republican votes.

THE FUTURE

But even where this is the net result, the shift away from rural domination, which has characterized most State legislatures for years, to a bigger voice for the cities or their suburbs, may significantly shape State policies into the indefinite future.

Although there has not yet been enough legislative experience to warrant firm conclusions, it appears reasonable to expect that the overall effect will be to direct vastly more attention to the problems of urban areas and, in the South, to foster a more moderate, less intransigent outlook on racial issues.

There follows a summary of the apportionment situation in each State. "Electoral percentage" figures indicate the smallest percentage of the population that mathematically could now elect a majority of the members in each house. Experts regard this as the best test of the representative quality of legislatures.

A low percentage indicates that the inhabitants of sparsely populated rural areas could elect a majority in that house.

A high percentage does not necessarily reflect big-city domination. Rural and small-town representatives can retain control by systems of alliances, domination of key committees and of committee-appointing machinery, and parliamentary skill.

New England

Connecticut

The main issue here is the house, which is apportioned by townships rather than population.

Political and legislative leaders of both parties have agreed on the mechanics for calling a State constitutional convention September 13, 1965, to be followed by a popular referendum on whatever reapportionment plan emerged from the convention.

Meanwhile, leaders are continuing discussions on a temporary plan that would be in effect until the permanent plan was adopted. A three-judge Federal district court has given the legislators until January 30 to act on the temporary plan. If they fail to do so, the court will impose its own plan now being drafted by a special master, Morris Davis, director of the Yale University Computer Center.

Any reapportionment based on population is bound to help the Democrats. Electoral percentages: senate 32, house 12.

Maine

The legislature has not waited for litigation, even though the State's districts were among the country's more representative on the basis of population. The electoral percentages were 47 in the senate and 40 in the house before the voters approved a constitutional amendment in 1963 to make the house more representative.

On the basis of the amendment, the legislature reapportioned the house. Although this left the electoral percentage at 40, both political parties agree that the reapportionment of the house was fair and that no changes are required in the senate.

Massachusetts

The house reapportioned in 1963 in the face of a suit. The realinement was the first since 1945. It cost Boston four seats in the house. The senate was last reapportioned in 1960.

Both houses are expected to be reapportioned next year, and every 5 years from now on. There are no suits pending, but if next year's action costs Boston some more seats some kind of battle is anticipated. The electoral percentages are 45 in the house and senate.

New Hampshire

The voters November 3 ordered reapportionment of both the house and the senate. The 24-member senate, heretofore apportioned on the basis of direct taxes paid, will be alined on the basis of population for the first time.

The house districts ostensibly were already based on population, but twice as many voters were required for additional seats than for the first. This favored small towns over cities.

Under the voters' action, reapportionment of both branches is mandatory in the coming legislative session. The Democrats are expected to be the gainers. Present electoral percentages are 45 in the senate, 44 in the house.

Rhode Island

On November 3 the voters elected delegates to a State constitutional convention that convened December 8. Modernization of the State's 122-year-old constitution is expected to include some action on reapportionment. This will be subject to ratification by the voters.

Litigation has focused on the house, where 47 percent of the population can elect a majority. Thus far there has been no challenge to senate districts, fixed in the State constitution, although the percentage for control is only 18.

The State supreme court ruled on July 24, 1962, that the house should be reapportioned. The legislature did so, but the measure was vetoed in 1963 by Gov. John H. Chafee, Republican, on the ground that it violated the State constitution's prescription of at least one house seat for each city and town. The measure had combined the 11 smallest towns into 4 representative districts.

In 1964 the legislature passed substantially the same bill, but some changes tacked on by the senate meant that it had to go back to the house for concurrence. The bill died with adjournment of the legislature after the Governor had said he would veto it again.

The Federal district court was asked to halt the 1964 elections, but refused on the ground that the Supreme Court had told lower courts not to interfere with election machinery already in motion. The court also noted the then pending referendum in which the voters subsequently voted to have a constitutional convention.

Vermont

Last July 10 the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit ordered reapportionment of both houses of the legislature by April 1, 1965. The legislature will convene January 6 for its regular biennial session, but is limited under the court order to action on reapportionment.

Gov. Philip H. Hoff, Democrat, wants the court order amended to allow action on appropriations so that State services can be operated past June 30, when current appropriations expire. Meantime, he and others have appealed the court order to the U.S. Supreme Court.

The State now has a 246-member house with 1 member for each city and town. This system has stood unchanged since 1793. The electoral percentage in the house is 12. The State's 30 senators are elected on a rough population basis from the 14 counties. The electoral percentage is 47.

A reapportionment commission is expected to recommend a shift in the senate from a county to a district basis and to submit three or four proposals for meeting the one-man, one-vote standard in the house. There may be resistance to action in the house, where there is considerable sentiment for an amendment to the U.S. Constitution permitting one unit of a legislature to be alined on a basis other than population.

Middle Atlantic

Delaware

The legislature's reapportionment of both houses in 1964 is being challenged by the Republicans in Federal court on the ground that the Democratic majority gerrymandered the State.

Their plea that the court forbid the November 3 election was denied, but the court said that if a detailed study showed that the one-man, one-vote standard had not been complied with, a new election would be held later.

The Democrats say that the districts are equal in population within 15 percent, but the Republicans contend the disparity runs as high as 46 percent.

The Republicans have cited as proof Democratic gains in the legislature. The old house was composed of 24 Democrats and 11 Republicans; the new, 30 Democrats and 5 Republicans. The old senate had 10 Democrats and 7 Republicans; the new, 13 and 4. The Democrats attributed these gains to the Johnson landslide.

The electoral percentages have been estimated at 52 for the senate and 45 for the house, although these figures have been strongly disputed.

New Jersey

The State supreme court ruled November 25 that apportionment of both houses of the legislature was unconstitutional.

It directed that a temporary plan for compliance with the one-man, one-vote ruling be adopted by statute to cover the 1965 elections to the legislature and that a constitutional change be effected before the 1967 balloting.

The senate, anticipating the court's action, on November 16 adopted a weighted voting system under which each member was given votes in proportion to the population of his county.

The State supreme court declared this invalid December 15 on the ground that the weighted voting system could not be adopted as it was, by a simple change in the senate's rules. The court did not rule on the constitutionality of the system, but it expressed strong doubts on this score.

A bipartisan 12-man commission was created by the legislature November 30 to submit plans for revising the State's congressional and legislative districts to the legislature by February 1. The electoral percentages are now 19 in the senate, 51 in the house.

New York

The Republican-controlled "lame duck" legislature, which will yield to Democratic majorities in both houses on January 1, passed an intricate series of reapportionment bills 2 days before Christmas.

A Federal court order requires the State to reapportion by April 1, 1965.

The Republicans drew up four bills and passed each succeeding one as an amendment. Each is more favorable to the Republicans than the one before. Thus the court can strip away one or more layers of law until it finds one acceptable.

Democratic leaders in the legislature, dissatisfied with all four bills, plan to put through their own reapportionment plan when they gain control next month. This undoubtedly will be vetoed by Governor Rockefeller, however, leaving it up to the courts to decide on the ultimate plan.

The Supreme Court, in its historic decision of June 15, specifically declared: "Neither house of the New York Legislature is apportioned sufficiently on a population basis to be constitutionally sustainable."

In the senate, for instance, 38 percent of the voters can elect a majority under present districting. The electoral percentages under the new law—the fourth bill passed—are 49 for the assembly and 50.9 for the senate.

Pennsylvania

The State supreme court has given the 1965 legislature, which convenes January 5, until September 1 to reapportion both the house and the senate. In its order of last September 29, the court said that should the legislature fail to enact "a constitutionally valid plan" by then, the court itself would "take such action as may be appropriate in the light of the then existing situation."

Since the house is controlled by the Democrats and the senate by the Republicans, many observers expect that it will be difficult and perhaps impossible to reach a bipartisan reapportionment agreement.

A now invalid reapportionment action by the legislature last January 9 did, to some extent, correct disparities, but it was taken within the framework of the State constitution, which says that every county is entitled to a representative and that no county may have more than 8 of the 50 senators. The present electoral percentages are 43 in the senate and house.

Border

Kentucky

After Republicans filed suit in Federal Court to force redistricting, but before a final decision, the legislature passed the first reapportionment act in 20 years. It raised the electoral percentages from 42 to 45 in the senate and from 34 to 47 in the house. No suit has been filed against the new act.

Maryland

The legislative council, a between-sessions study arm of the legislature, has recommended a plan to reapportion both houses.

The plan would give the Baltimore area, which has about 76 percent of the State's population, 75 percent of the seats in the house and 60 percent in the senate. The area now has 55 percent of the house seats and 34 percent of the senate's.

Reapportionment watchdogs have failed to get the Maryland Court of Appeals to take definitive action on the U.S. Supreme Court's order to revise the legislature. But the court said that a lower court should "take affirmative action" if the legislature failed to enact a constitutionally valid apportionment plan before the 1966 primaries.

Figures compiled by the Maryland Fair Representation Committee show that about 35 percent of the population can now elect a majority of the house, 14.2 percent a majority of the senate.

Missouri

The legislature will meet January 6 for the first time since the Supreme Court handed down its one-man, one-vote decision. It is expected to take up the problem of malapportionment, which is particulary acute in the house.

Under a formula designed to favor rural areas, the house electoral percentage is 20. The senate, apportioned on a population basis, has an electoral percentage of 48. A suit in Federal district court to force reapportionment of both houses has been heard and a decision is being awaited.

The State's Governor-elect, Warren E. Hearnes, Democrat, has said he favors creation of a 10-member bipartisan commission to submit to the legislature a redistricting plan for the house, but opposes changing the senate unless the court orders it changed.

Oklahoma

The State's first completely reapportioned legislature in its history will convene January 5, with rural domination broken. The new electoral percentages are 49 in the senate and house. Before reapportionment, the percentages were 25 and 29, respectively.

The realinement was accomplished under a decree of a three-judge Federal district court, which had declared the May primary elections void and vacated all legislative offices effective November 18.

A new legislature was elected November 3 using the court's reapportionment plan. A new appeal from the court's order is pending before the U.S. Supreme Court.

West Virginia

Under pressure of a State supreme court order, the legislature passed an apportionment act in 1963. The act raised the electoral percentages from 40 to 45 in the house and 41 to 44 in the senate. The main effect was to increase urban strength in the legislature.

Although the Democrats made gains in the legislative elections November 3, the indications were that this was more because of the Johnson landslide than reapportionment. There is no current pressure for further realinements. The legislative districts will probably remain as they are until after the 1970 census.

South

Alabama

A joint study committee of the legislature is to supply reapportionment recommendations in the forthcoming legislative session. A three-judge Federal court is retaining jurisdiction in the situation until it can see what the legislature does.

The elections November 3 were held under a court apportionment decree that made a temporary apportionment out of features of discarded legislation. The net effect was to raise the electoral percentages from 26 to 43 in the house and from 25 to 28 in the senate.

Arkansas

A reapportionment suit is pending in Federal district court but has not yet been heard. The legislature will convene in January for the first time since the Supreme Court's decision.

There are no plans for action and Gov. Orval E. Faubus, Democrat, has said he thinks the legislature ought to wait for further action by the courts. The electoral percentages are 14 in the senate, 33 in the house.

Florida

The U.S. Supreme Court has declared invalid some slight apportionment changes made by the legislature on February 1, 1963.

The incoming Governor, Haydon Burns, Democrat, has said he wants to wait until after the regular legislative session next April and May before taking up the problem. He hopes the Federal courts will go along.

The electoral percentages are 15 in the senate, 30 in the house.

Georgia

Immediately after *Baker* v. *Carr*, a Federal court ordered that at least one house of the legislature be reapportioned. The legislature revised the senate districts to make them almost exactly equal in population.

On June 30, the Federal court ordered the legislature to reapportion the house before 1966. This must be done during a 45-day session opening January 11, with special elections later in the year, or the legislature will be unable to transact business legally thereafter.

A legislative study committee has held hearings. The principal dispute centers on how large the new house should be. The electoral percentages are 49 in the senate, 22 in the house.

Louisiana

The legislature reapportioned the house at a special session in 1963, but made no significant change in the urban-rural balance. The realinement of the senate is being studied by a joint legislative committee.

There is a possibility that reapportionment of the senate will be taken up in the May legislative session, but the general feeling is that nothing will be done until the next regular session in 1966.

A suit to force reapportionment is pending in Federal court, but the plaintiff is not pushing it at the moment. The electoral percentages are 33 in both houses.

Mississippi

After a State court invalidated the apportionment that had existed for 70 years, the legislature in 1963 put the house on a population basis and the Senate on a combination of population and area. Electoral percentages were raised from 35 to 37 in the senate, and 29 to 41 in the house.

No action has been taken by the legislature since the one-man, one-vote decision. No suits are pending.

North Carolina

The problem here is the house, last reapportioned in 1961. Under the State constitution, each of the State's 100 counties has a seat and 20 more are allotted on the basis of population. The electoral percentage in the house is 26. No suits to force revision are pending, however.

The senate was reapportioned in a special session in 1963. The electoral percentage was raised from 37 to 47.

South Carolina

The legislature has taken no action. When it gets around to it, the process is expected to be difficult, especially in the senate, where each county is allotted a seat. The senate is dominated by rural elements.

The electoral percentages are 23 in the senate and 46 in the house, which is apportioned on a population basis. Gov. Donald S. Russell, Democrat, may urge an official study of the situation by the legislature when it convenes January 12. An ad hoc committee named by the Governor last spring has met once and asked the State attorney general to study the situation, but there has been no report.

No suits have been filed.

Tennessee

The legislature is under a Federal court order to reapportion both houses along one-man, one-vote lines by June 1 or have the court do the job. The legislature convenes January 4.

The court acted within the framework of the original *Baker* v. *Carr* case. The legislature has already been reapportioned twice since the Supreme Court ruled in that case. The electoral percentages have been raised from 29 to 40 in the house and 27 to 45 in the senate. Reapportionment is working to the advantage of the Republicans.

Texas

A three-judge Federal court in Houston ruled 2 weeks ago that the Texas Legislature must revise boundaries of its house and senate districts by August 2.

The court retained jurisdiction of a suit filed by a group of liberal and moderate Democrats. This means the court can put its own redistricting plans into effect if the legislature fails to act or if it adopts a plan unsatisfactory to the court. The court said it would insist upon redistricting, either by the legislature or by the court itself, before the 1966 elections.

The electoral percentages are 30 in the senate, and 39 in the house.

Virginia

The legislature earlier this month, at a special session, effected reapportionment ordered by a Federal court.

At the same time, it adopted resolutions asking Congress to call a convention to amend the Constitution so as to permit one house of a State legislature to be apportioned on factors other than population and to deny Federal courts jurisdiction in State apportionment cases.

The reapportionment action raised the number of urban seats in the 100-member house by 8 and in the 40-member senate by 3. But rural and conservative forces will still control the all-important legislative committees and the machinery through which the committees are named.

The old electoral percentages were 41 in both houses and presumably this month's action increased them.

Middle West

Illinois

Failure to redistrict the house last year brought into play a State constitutional provision requiring that under those circumstances the house be elected at large. This was done November 3, with the election of 118 Democrats and 59 Republicans.

Another attempt will be made in 1965 to reapportion the house on a population basis as required by the State constitution. The constitution allocates 18 senate seats to Chicago, 6 to suburban Cook County and 34 to the rest of the State.

The electoral percentage in the senate is 29 and an attempt may be made to redistrict it, too, in the legislative session beginning in January. But it is questionable whether the Republican senate majority and Gov. Otto Kerner, a Democrat, will be able to agree on senate boundaries.

Indiana

Suits are pending in Federal and State courts to force compliance with the one-man, one-vote mandate. Faced with the possibility of Federal court action, the legislature reapportioned in 1963. Gov. Matthew E. Welsh, Democrat, vetoed the act, but the State supreme court ruled that the veto was too late.

The 1963 act raised the electoral percentages from 35 to 42 in the senate and 38 to 48 in the house.

Both houses of the new legislature, which convenes January 7, are dominated by Democrats. It is expected to reapportion itself again on the one-man, one-vote standard of the U.S. Supreme Court and the State constitution, which provides for redistricting every 10 years on the basis of the latest census.

Iowa

After the voters in 1963 rejected a proposal that would have put the senate on a population basis, but would also have lowered the electoral percentage in the house from 27.4 to 27 by giving each county one seat, a Federal court ordered the legislature to reapportion.

At a special session last February, a temporary plan was passed, raising the electoral percentages from 36 to 39 in the senate and to 44 in the house. The State AFL–CIO has brought a suit asking a Federal court to review both the temporary plan and a proposed permanent plan that would put the electoral percentages at 37 in the senate and 45 in the house.

Kansas

Under pressure from the State courts, the legislature reapportioned the senate before the one-man, one-vote Supreme Court decision. The action raised the electoral percentage from 27 to almost exactly 50.

The house was not changed, however. The State's constitution provides for 1 seat for each of 105 counties, with 20 more seats apportioned on a population basis. The electoral percentage in the house is 19.

The legislature is expected to take up reapportionment again after it convenes in January. State and Federal court suits seeking the reapportionment of the senate on a population standard have been filed. A decision from the State supreme court is expected early in 1965, in time for the legislature to comply with whatever ruling it makes.

Michigan

After a bipartisan commission failed to agree on reapportionment, the State supreme court adopted a Republican-sponsored plan as most nearly consonant with the mandate of the State constitution that the house districts be based on population and the senate districts be based 80 percent on population and 20 percent on area.

After the U.S. Supreme Court's one-man, one-vote ruling in June, however, the State court threw out its earlier decision and adopted a Democratic-sponsored plan apportioning both houses on the basis of population alone. In the November 3 election, partly as a result of this reapportionment, the Democrats took control of both houses of the legislature for the first time since 1934.

A Republican-oriented group is asking the State supreme court to review its adoption of the Democratic-sponsored reapportionment plan, charging that the plan is "partisan gerrymandering." Gov. George Romney, Republican, has called the plan "vicious gerrymandering" and has pledged a fight against it.

Under the old alinement the electoral percentages were 29 in the senate, 44 in the house. Now it takes slightly more than 50 percent of the voters to elect a majority in each.

Minnesota

A Federal court this month declared unconstitutional a reapportionment law of 1959 and ordered the 1965 legislature to reapportion itself on the basis of the 1960 census. The present electoral percentages are 39 in the senate, 35 in the house.

Nebraska

A Federal court in July ordered the 1965 legislature to reapportion on a one-man, one-vote basis. The Nation's only one-house legislature redistricted the State in 1963, under an amendment to the State constitution adopted in 1962 providing that 20 to 30 percent consideration be given to area.

Although this raised the electoral percentage from 37 to 44, the Federal court held that this was not sufficient.

North Dakota

When the legislature convenes January 3, it will be operating under a Federal court order directing that it reapportion itself within a reasonable time or have the court do the job. Action in 1963 raised the electoral percentage in the house from 35 to 42, but left the senate percentage at 32.

Ohio

The Republicans, with their margin next year sharply cut in the house and reduced to a tie in the senate, acted this month to put to a referendum May 4 a constitutional amendment setting up a new system of apportionment for the house.

The legislature was operating under a Federal court mandate to act within a reasonable time.

The proposed amendment calls for house districts with "substantially" equal populations and puts the job of drawing the lines in the hands of an expanded State apportionment board composed of State officials and legislators. The board would apportion after each Federal census.

The present electoral percentage in the house is 29. In the senate, which is not involved in the proposed amendment, the percentage is 45.

South Dakota

No action has been taken, and the prospects for any in the 1965 legislature are considered negligible. The electoral percentages are 41 in the senate, 39 in the house.

Wisconsin

The State supreme court reapportioned both houses of the legislature May 14. The court took the case at the request of Gov. John W. Reynolds, Democrat, after he had vetoed Republican-sponsored reapportionment bills passed by the State legislature, then controlled by Republicans.

The electoral percentages before the court acted were 43 in the Senate, 40 in the House. Now they are 48 and 45, respectively.

Mountain

Arizona

No action yet, but the 1965 legislature is under a Federal court edict to reapportion or have the court do it. A legislative council and a Governor's committee are studying the problem. The electoral percentages are 13 in the senate, 46 in the house.

Colorado

The U.S. Supreme Court's decision last June struck down a so-called Federal plan adopted by referendum in November of 1962. This plan reapportioned the house on a population basis, but allowed geographical representation in the senate.

Last summer the legislature enacted a new plan, putting representation in both houses substantially on the basis of population—the electoral percentages are theoretically 50 plus in both houses—and dividing larger counties, which had elected legislators at large, into districts.

The State constitution says that counties shall not be divided into districts. The Federal court ruled that the new plan complied with the State constitution, but the State supreme court ruled on July 17 that it did not. The State court deferred the effect of its decision to give the 1965 legislature a chance to act on this feature of the plan.

Idaho

The legislature is under a Federal court order to reapportion within 30 days after the end of its regular session, which starts January 4. Reapportionment of the house, under pressure of a State court suit, raised the electoral percentage in 1963 from 33 to 44. The senate figure remained at 17.

Montana

With electoral percentages of 37 in the house and 16 in the senate, the legislature has not yet taken action. Nor have any suits been filed. Reapportionment, however, is to be a major item of business when the legislature convenes January 4.

A Governor's commission is expected to make recommendations on which it is hoped the legislature can agree, thus avoiding a long battle.

Nevada

Two suits are on file in Federal courts and a hearing on one will go ahead June 23 if the legislature, which convenes January 18, does not act by April 15. Electoral percentages are 36 in the senate, 8 in the house.

New Mexico

A State court has ruled invalid a weighted voting system adopted by the legislature for the house in November of 1963. The 1965 legislature may act, although there appears to be considerable sentiment favoring delay to see whether the Federal Constitution cannot be amended to allow States to apportion one house on other than a population basis.

Utah

The Legislative Reapportionment Act of 1963 has been held invalid by a Federal court, but a legislative council subcommittee on reapportionment was unable to agree on a new plan. The council thereupon ordered that bills embodying a number of plans be prepared for submission to the 1965 legislature.

Among the difficulties are provisions in the State constitution that the senate have no more than 30 members, with a representative from each of 29 counties, and that the house have no more than 90 members. The Federal court said that State constitutional provisions in conflict with the one-man, one-vote ruling of the U.S. Supreme Court were invalid.

The 1963 act raised the electoral percentages from 21 to 25 in the senate and from 34 to 38 in the house.

Wyoming

A Federal court November 24 struck down the 1963 reapportionment of the senate and warned that it would reapportion the body unless the legislature acted before the 1966 elections.

The 1963 act reduced the electoral percentage in the senate from 28 to 24 while raising that of the house from 36 to 47. A special session of the legislature, called while the suit was pending, was unable to reach agreement last July.

Pacific

Alaska

Gov. William A. Egan, Democrat, will reapportion soon on the basis of recommendations from the State reapportionment advisory board, which favors dividing the State into 20 districts, each electing one senator and two house members.

A threatened suit was not filed because the Governor called the advisory board into session. Electoral percentages: house 47, senate 42.

California

The main focus of controversy is the senate, which is based more on area considerations than population. A Federal court suit in Los Angeles, which city would stand to gain heavily from reapportionment on a population basis, seeks an order directing realinement of the senate on a population basis.

The problem is expected to be the first order of business when the legislature meets January 4. Electoral percentages: house 45, senate 11.

Hawaii

A special 30-day session of the legislature last summer tried and failed to come up with a reapportionment plan for both houses. The main problem is the senate, which is apportioned on a geographical basis.

Now a suit is pending in Federal court. The electoral percentages are 38 in the house, 18 in the senate.

Oregon

Voters in 1952 passed a constitutional amendment reapportioning both houses on a population basis. No suits are pending. The electoral percentages are 48 in both houses.

Washington

A Federal court has directed the 1965 legislature to reapportion and to take up nothing but routine housekeeping chores until it does.

The Governor-elect, Daniel J. Evans, Republican, organized a committee to study the problem in November, but the Democrats refused to cooperate, contending that reapportionment was a legislative problem.

The court acted after the 1963 legislature wrangled at length but did nothing. Electoral percentages are 38 in the house, 36 in the senate.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, there is one correction which I think should be made. That is the statement of Mr. Pomfret that 16 of the required 34 State legislatures have petitioned Congress for a constitutional convention, the purpose of which would be the adopting of an amendment to allow one house of a State legislature to be apportioned on a basis other than population.

Mr. Pomfret is a very able reporter. But, as I see the situation, this statement is in error. The petition which the 34 State legislatures have addressed is primarily based on the original decision of the Supreme Court in the case of Baker against Carr, the so-called Tennessee case. That decision declared that one house should be apportioned roughly on the basis of population. It was not addressed to the consequences of the Alabama decision and other decisions which stated that both houses should be apportioned on the basis of population. Therefore, I submit that the petition of these various State legislatures is not addressed to the constitutional amendment now before this body, as introduced by my colleague [Mr. Dirksen], nor is it before the House as introduced by Representative McCulloch. Furthermore, I believe the history of these amendments is that the language in the petitions must be identical. I believe this is not the case in the so-called Ripper amendments advanced by the State legislatures in the period when they did not quite know what was happening or what the contents of these petitions actually were.

In any event, once we have organized the Senate, and once the Committee on the Judiciary has been appointed, I think we should have very thorough hearings on the Dirksen amendment, and it should be thoroughly debated.

There is no intention on the part of those of us who believe that a legislature should be apportioned according to population, to filibuster any constitutional amendment. But we do believe that it deserves at least a thorough consideration, as did the proposal of President Roosevelt in 1937, dealing with the composition of the Supreme Court. It deserves very careful consideration before we blast at the fundamental principles of the American Government.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, as we all know, the Committee on Rules and Administration has been conducting an investigation for approximately 15 months. I do not think that the Committee on Rules and Administration was ever set up as a permanent investigating committee, although, sometimes it seems that it might have been.

In the first place, we did not have a sufficient staff to do the type of work we were engaged in. We were able to select some very fine personnel who have done an exceedingly fine job. Those people have other things to do. Some of them want to go back to their homes. They have stayed much longer than they intended to stay.

The hearings which we have conducted so far comprise over 2,000 pages of testimony. There have been 77 sessions. I believe the committee has done a magnificent job.

We have no intention of quitting this investigation until we have completed the task in which we are engaged. I do not know just how long that will take us. We intend to finish it. We intend to do a thorough job and bring out all the facts necessary to complete this investigation.

Last year the Senate voted on and adopted a resolution to establish a select committee, a permanent committee to investigate all things pertaining to the Senate, employees, and so forth. That committee ought to be activated as soon as practicable. At the conclusion of our work, and when we make our report, it is our intention to turn over to that committee all records and information that we have gathered. We shall cooperate with the new committee in any way possible. That is what we have done from the very first day that we started this investigation. We have turned over or made available to the Federal Bureau of Investigation, to the Department of Justice, and the Internal Revenue Service, all the information gathered day by day. Some people have been in our office today looking over our files.

We have assisted them and cooperated with them in every way possible. We intend to do that with any agency of the Government which might want information from our committee files.

In the early part of this session the select committee authorized by Congress ought to be activated at as early a date as possible and ought to have any additional information that might come before the Senate.

I want it thoroughly understood that the Committee on Rules and Administration is not a permanent investigating committee.

A CONFUSION OF TONGUES—ADDRESS BY CHARLES E. WHITTAKER, FORMER JUSTICE, U.S. SUPREME COURT

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on October 23, 1964, Associate Justice Charles E. Whittaker, who is retired from the Supreme Court of the United States, delivered the principal address at the southern regional meeting of the American Bar Association. The address is entitled "A Confusion of Tongues." It is a splendid analysis of the manner in which our Nation has departed from a government of laws and self-government by the people through the process of usurpation in the form of judicial interpretation and construction. It is the type of address which should bring Americans up sharp and particularly those of us who have official responsibilities for the preservation of our constitutional system. I ask unanimous consent that this address be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A Confusion of Tongues

(Address by Charles E. Whittaker, Associate Justice, Supreme Court of the United States (retired), before southern regional meeting of the American Bar Association, Atlanta, Ga., Oct. 23, 1964)

I have consented to speak to you, briefly, about the U.S. Constitution, its origin, evolution, and present status.

You will, of course, recall from history that State governments—those of the Thirteen Colonies, which later became States—existed for a good many years before the necessities of their conditions, including particularly their physical and economic vulnerability, virtually compelled them to join in the formation of an overriding sovereign union, which they named the United States of America.

Originally, all of the power to govern was deemed to be vested in the people themselves, and they exercised those powers through their respective State governments which they created and alone controlled. Being historically aware of, and having themselves actually suffered from, the deeds of despots committed in their exercise of general governmental powers over the populace, the colonists so highly prized the virtues of their newly and painfully acquired local self-governments that they were resolutely determined to retain them.

But, although their valiant joint and united efforts in waging their Revolution against the English crown had recently resulted in victory, they were each left individually weak, isolated and, singularly, vulnerable to attack. In those circumstances, their domestic tranquillity and general welfare imperatively required that they confederate, in some measure, for their common defense, for the preservation of their newly won liberties, and for the promotion of their economy by regulating imports, exports, and commerce with foreign nations, with the Indian tribes, and among the States themselves.

They concluded that those purposes could be accomplished only by the formation and creation of a national sovereign, specifically invested with those powers, to rest as a capstone over, but not otherwise to diminish or disturb, the people's existing local State governments or their full and free control of them. And so to those ends, that is to say, in the founders' words, "to insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and [to] secure the blessings of liberty," the people, acting through the Original Thirteen States, created the National Government and conferred upon it—some of them most reluctantly, because of their keen awareness and fears of the historical tendencies of national sovereigns to invade and usurp the functions of subordinate local self-governments—the quite specific, yet very limited, powers which they found necessary for those purposes. And to assure, as best they could with words—then, as now, the only means of expressing and communicating thoughts and ideas—against the exercise, or attempted exercise, by the National Government of any powers not so delegated to it, the people, in explicit emphasis of those limitations upon national power, expressly provided, in the 10th amendment, that "the powers not delegated to the United States by this Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

In this way two layers of separate and independent sovereignty were created; namely, first, the respective States, in whom were reposed and reserved all general powers of government; and, second, the overriding National Government of the Union, possessing only specific but limited powers. Hence, there were thus created, and have since existed, dual but independent sovereignties, operating simultaneously in the same physical area. This philosophy of government has become known as our duality or our federalism. Naturally, the founders, in their wisdom and experience, knew that with two separate but independent sovereignties operating in the same physical area at the same time, there would likely be occasions of conflict of authority which would have to be resolved, and for their peaceful and lawful resolution they provided, in article VI, clause 2, that: "This Constitution and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof * * * shall be the supreme law of the land." This meant, and still means, of course, that if, when both sovereignties are acting within their supposed authorized scope, conflicts of authority occur, State laws must give way to the national ones as the supreme law of the land.

Recognizing that changing conditions that would be met in the development and growth of the country might require, for its better government, amendments of the Constitution, Congress expressly provided, in article V, that the Constitution might be amended in respects approved and proposed by the two-thirds vote of both Houses of Congress, or by conventions, and submitted to and ratified by three-fourths of the States.

Mindful of the means and processes by which encroaching erosions and usurpations had been practiced throughout history by overriding sovereigns upon subordinate or local self-governments—and of the vulnerability of local governments to those means and processes—such men as Washington, Jefferson, Madison, and Penn solemnly alerted the people to be watchful against those means and processes, and warned that they tend to be destructive of liberties. In his Farewell Address, Washington said:

"The basis of our political system is the right of the people to make and to alter their constitutions of government. But the Constitution, till changed by an explicit and authentic act of the whole people, is sacredly obligatory upon us all. * * * If in the opinion of the people the constitutional powers be thought in any particular wrong, let (the Constitution) be corrected by amendment in the way the Constitution designates. But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this in one instance may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed."

To our great glory and benefit—and I should add, to the envy of the world—our system of government has worked well. So well indeed, that under it, we have made the greatest civil, social, and economic progress of any nation the world has seen. Yet, in recent years, we have seemed to be under unusually great stress, and often distress, and, in very recent times, to be suffering a rash of organized disobedience and disorder.

It may be well to remember that our Government is only about 175 years old and is, therefore, quite new as time is measured in history. It is still referred to around the world as the great American experiment.

It can hardly be denied that, for some years, our system of government has been challenged—until recently, quite covertly—by the advancement, and in some cases the adoption, of political and social philosophies that are foreign to its concepts and which have, in important particulars, succeeded in changing its complexion.

Doubtless you, just as I, were taught as toddlers around parental knees, and ever since, that our Constitution was an inspired document, whose concepts were next to Holy Writ, and, until amended by the people in the manner it prescribes, imposes upon us a sacred obligation of complete and honest obedience to its terms.

With all this in our background it surely is not amiss to note, as R. G. LeTourneau reminded us in March of 1963, that the average age of the world's great governments has been 200 years; that those governments progressed through this sequence: (1) from bondage to spiritual faith, (2) from spiritual faith to great courage, (3) from courage to liberty, (4) from liberty to abundance, (5) from abundance to complacency, (6) from complacency to apathy, (7) from apathy to dependence, and (8) from dependence back again to bondage. He also reminded us that Gibbon, in his "Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire," isolated five basic reasons why that great civilization died out. These were (a) "the undermining of the dignity and sancity of the home—the basis of all human society, (b) higher and higher taxes to fund the spending of public money for free bread and circuses for the people, (c) the mad craze for pleasure, (d) the building of great armaments for the defeat of an external enemy when the real enemy was within—the decay of individual morality and responsibility, and (e) the decay of religion; faith fading into mere form, losing touch with life and its power to guide the people"—which, some thoughtful persons believed, resulted, at least partially, from what they saw as the departure by some of its ministers of its creeds and pulpits for the highly divisive forum of the political platform.

Whether we are experiencing or threatened with parallels are matters upon which your analyses and conclusions will be as good as mine, and those matters I leave to you. But whether we have kept faith with the Constitution, and have heeded the warnings of George Washington and others of our Founding Fathers to be vigilant in protecting our fundamental law against the pressures of erosion and usurpation, are matters I will speak upon briefly.

I believe we ought to be able to agree that words—though not ends in themselves—are our only tools and means of communicating thoughts and ideas. Hence, plain and unambiguous words surely should be taken and adhered to in their commonly accepted sense, for otherwise the result must necessarily be the loss of all means of communicating with certainty; and all documents, however carefully prepared, would result in mere scraps of paper. This, carried to an illustrative extreme, would even make it dangerous for a borrower or a lender to sign or accept a simple promissory note.

Despite this simple grammatical fact, and notwithstanding plain words of the Constitution (when, indeed, they are plain, clear and unambiguous—as, unfortunately, is not always the case) and the warnings of Washington and others, it cannot be, and indeed is not, any longer denied that there has been, particularly in the last three decades, a different kind of fidelity—if fidelity it has been—to the meaning of the plain words in the Constitution by some than by others of us.

Throughout the period just mentioned, it was thought, charged and protested by many, who may be identified as "strict constructionists," that our Constitution was being gradually, but steadily and continuously expanded and changed by the definitional and interpretative processes in both the legislative and judicial departments of the National Government in usurpation of the right of the people only to amend the Constitution and then only in the manner specified in its 5th article, and in derogation of the 10th amendment which provides that "the powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

Until rather recently, those who supported what they called a policy of liberal construction vigorously denied that the Constitution was being changed or, in effect, amended in those ways; but since recently the cumulative effect of those definitional and interpretative actions has become so evident, in composite, as to be clear beyond rational dispute, it is now rather freely conceded, even by the liberal constructionists, that a number of very substantial and far-reaching changes in the meaning of the Constitution have evolved from those processes. And so today hardly anyone, familiar with the subject, denies that the meaning of our Constitution has actually been changed, and in effect amended, in substantial particulars by the definitional and interpretative processes and is no longer a document of the meanings adopted by our forefathers, as from time to time amended by the people in the manner it provides.

But, while making these admissions of the obvious, the liberal constructionists are not apologetic. Instead they seek to defend and to justify. They argue that such changes of the Constitution were both necessary and good for our Nation—in other words, that the ends attained have justified the means employed. They say that the Constitution was framed and adopted when our society was new and its economy was simple—the horse and buggy days—and that, if it was adequately to serve the needs of a growing economy, it could not be held in a straitjacket but had to be kept abreast of the times, and that this could timely and efficiently be done only by treating the instrument as a living document of sufficient elasticity to permit its constructional expansion to cover the ever-changing needs, as they have viewed them, of a rapidly expanding population, an ever more complex economy. They, of course, make no mention of the obvious fact that these changes were not brought into existence by amendments of the Constitution by the people in the manner it designated.

I have been asked, many times, how these changes in the Constitution were brought about. Just how were they brought about? The answer is not a mystery. In retrospect, it is quite clear that they were in large part, at least, brought about by a legislative definitional process, aided and supported by a judicial process of interpretation—not strictly of the provisions of the Constitution, but rather of legislative definitions of constitutional concepts.

And I believe that—without reference to any recent Federal legislative or judicial actions, definitions or interpretations, which, because they might be thought to be involved in current political debates, I naturally wish to avoid—a simple concrete example from the relatively distant past will suffice to demonstrate how that process has operated to change in meaning, and, in effect, to amend, the Constitution.

By article I, section 8, clause 3, of the Constitution, commonly known as the commerce clause, the States and the people granted power to the Congress "to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes."

For no less than a century and a quarter, the phrase "commerce * * * among the several States," as used in the Constitution, was uniformly believed by the people and held by the courts to embrace only that which had actually been introduced into the stream, and was in the flow, of commerce between the States. Thus, in seeming accord with the accepted meaning of its plain words, the phrase "commerce * * * among the States, was expressly and repeatedly held not to embrace those multitudinous local activities that are involved in producing the products of the field or factory—that production and manufacture were not commerce even though the products, or some of them, might eventually move, or indeed, might earlier have moved, in commerce among the States, and were, therefore, not activities subject to the regulatory power of Congress.

But in the latter portion of that period, the legislative department advanced, and the judicial department sustained (without any loud public protest—and most constitutional lawyers still think correctly), the concept that whatever really and substantially burdens or affects commerce among the States falls within the powers "to regulate commerce among the States" and hence is within the power of Congress to regulate under the commerce clause; however the principle that local production and manufacture is not commerce was repeatedly reannounced and stoutly maintained.

During the teens, some Federal officials and liberal constructionists, evidently chafing under the strict constitutional limitations upon Federal powers over State and local activities and seeking an expeditious way to vest in the Central Government an effective control over those activities, advanced not a constitutional amendment but the interpretative concept that the constitutional phrase empowering Congress "to regulate commerce * * * among the several States" ought to be held to include the power to control whatever is involved in the production of goods in the fields and factories.

The fallacies and dangers of that emerging philosophy of construction were promptly demonstrated by many startled persons, including President Wilson who protested in these ringing terms:

"May it—Congress—also regulate the conditions under which the merchandise is produced which is presently to become the subject matter of interstate commerce? May it regulate the conditions of labor in field and factory?

"Clearly not, I should say; and I should think that any thoughtful lawyer who felt himself at liberty to be frank would agree with me. For that would be to destroy all lines of division between the field of State legislation and the field of Federal legislation.

"If the Federal power does not end with the regulation of the actual movement of trade, it ends nowhere, and the line between State and Federal jurisdiction is obliterated."

Despite the clear and overpowering logic of that protest, and the many similar ones, that emerging new philosophy of construction was not thereby ended but rather was only temporarily driven underground.

That philosophy was again openly renewed under stress of the great depression of the 1930's. The Chief Executive, in the evident belief that Federal power to control the conditions of production in the fields and factories was necessary to revive the Nation's depressed economy, sought not an accommodating constitutional amendment, but instead prevailed upon Congress to enact the Wagner Act which, by resting upon Congress commerce powers, sought to control conditions of labor used in producing goods in fields and factories on the ground that such labor so affected commerce as to be a part of it.

In that act, the term "commerce" was conventionally defined, but the reach of the act was attempted legislatively to be extended to activities "affecting commerce," which phrase, in turn, was there expansively defined to include those activities which "tended to lead to a labor dispute," and which, Congress said, might in some way burden or obstruct the free flow of commerce among the States.

The constitutionality of that act was assailed in the Supreme Court in the Jones and Laughlin case in the 1936 term. Under the depressed conditions of the times and pressures of the then current "court-packing" attempts, the Supreme Court held the act to be constitutional. It turned its decision not on any interpretation of the words of the Constitution by which Congress had been empowered "to regulate commerce * * * among the States," but rather upon the congressionally created concept of "affecting commerce," and upon Congress expansive definition of that phrase in the terms stated. It held, in essence, that those recurring local activities which bear a close relationship to interstate commerce may, in some way, affect commerce—which it felt the activities involved in that case did, as nearly any imaginable transaction or occurrence would—and, in consequence, it upheld the act as within the reach of congressional power.

The opinion was written by the most able and universally honored Chief Justice Hughes; and although it represented a demonstrably precipitous change from the views he had numerous times, and only recently before, expressed on the subject, he was rather widely applauded at the time for that decision upon the ground that it may have saved the Court from further Executive attack and attempts to pack it—sometimes referred to as the "stitch in time that saved nine."

However that may be, it can hardly be denied that the decision did not turn upon an interpretation of the words of the Constitution empowering Congress "to regulate commerce * * * among the States," nor upon any other words in the Constitution itself. Rather the decision turned upon an interpretation of Congress expansive phrase "affecting commerce" and of its definition of that phrase.

It is also clear, and worthy of minute notice, that the Court's crucial phrase—"a close relationship" to interstate commerce—embraced a relative conception of uncertain degree, requiring ad hoc determinations in each case, which necessarily must be as variable as the notions of men, including judges, as to whether a particular activity does or does not bear a sufficiently close relationship to interstate commerce to meet that announced vague conception; and thus, in practical effect—at least in borderline cases—the vital and momentous question of Federal power over local activities was left to a vague rule of men rather than to a definite rule of law.

Even if the last stated conclusion can be doubted, there can be no room to doubt that the opinion in the Jones and Laughlin case was a sharp break with what had been regarded as fundamental in the past, and it opened the gates to such a vast expansion of Federal power over local activities as left the States, just as Woodrow Wilson warned it would, without any line between State and Federal jurisdiction. And, in the light of the supremacy clause of the Federal Constitution, the Federal Government was thus given, in practical effect, power to control all local activities which, in its view, bear a close relationship to interstate commerce, and it seems that nearly every transaction, however local in itself, may be said to do so.

If the latter statement seems extreme, let it be remembered that this doctrine has been applied to sustain a Federal statute imposing criminal penalties upon a farmer for growing wheat on his own farm to be fed on the same farm to his own livestock. It would be a little difficult to imagine an activity more local than that.

These are the ways and means by which the meaning of the Constitution has been changed—specifically, these are the ways and means by which the repository of general governmental powers was changed from the people and their respective States to the Federal Government.

Whether these and like changes in the Constitution were, as the liberal constructionists claim, both necessary and good for the Nation may well be very seriously doubted, but even if, in any view, it can honestly be said that those changes were necessary and good for the Nation, it is obvious that they were not made by the people—they were not made by any amendment of the Constitution by the people themselves, or in the amending manner specified in the fifth article of the Constitution. Rather, it appears that they were made by what George Washington called usurpation which, he said, "is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed."

Although our forefathers had learned from experience and had warned us, we have had painfully to learn for ourselves, that true liberty cannot be preserved alone by words or declarations, but, rather, as the late and lamented judge, Learned Hand, in the reflective wisdom of experience and full maturity, some years ago reminded us: "Liberty lies in the hearts of men and women; when it dies there, no constitution, no law, no court can save it; no constitution, no law, no court can do much to help it."

Surely love for our Constitution and for the liberties its plan and words attempt to secure to us is not dead in the hearts of a large majority of the American people. Though it may seem to be dormant in the hearts of some of us, it is in our blood and, by patriotic arousal and determined effort, it can be revived.

Surely we must make that effort with resolution, and with faith in the fact that kites rise highest against the wind. What a shame it would be to fail, but how much more the shame to fail even earnestly to try.

The strength, or weakness, of America lies not in its farms and forests, its factories and fortresses, nor in the glorious achievements of its past generations, but it lies in the patriotic character, strength, determination, and faith of its present people who now control, and must be responsible for, its destiny.

I close in the eloquent words of a great American patriot, the late Gen. Douglas MacArthur:

"Let us hope that this Nation will continue to be a rallying point to build courage when courage seems to fail, to restore faith when there seems to be little cause for faith, to create hope when hope becomes forlorn. May we sustain our two mighty symbols—the cross and the flag. The one based on those immortal teachings which provide the spiritual strength to preserve the cause of right and justice; the other based on an indomitable will that human freedom shall not perish from the earth."

THE WAR IN SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, during the previous session of Congress a great and wonderful colleague of mine, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], and I discussed on the floor of the Senate time and time again the United States outlawry in South Vietnam.

Time and time again we pointed out that the United States was acting in South Vietnam completely outside the framework of international law. We pointed out that the State Department had been unable to submit a single tenet of international law to justify unilateral American military action in South Vietnam.

Up until the moment I now speak, the State Department has yet to produce a single tenet of international law to justify our unjustifiable and illegal course of action in South Vietnam.

Since the previous session of Congress, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] and I have not remained silent on this subject. I am not so sure that we were not the only two Democrats who in the recent campaign discussed the subject matter openly and frequently in the campaign. I was given speaking assignments in 14 States during that campaign and was very proud to be of service to my great President and Vice President. But many times in those meetings the issue of South Vietnam was raised, and I did not duck the issue, although it was perfectly obvious that during that campaign little was said by the candidates on either ticket about the subject matter of South Vietnam.

The only time the President of the United States discussed it was in the speech he delivered in the East, where he discussed it briefly. I shall shortly introduce his remarks in the RECORD. But, Mr. President, I intend to continue to discuss it, because in my judgment it is the major, No. 1 issue which confronts this country at this hour.

(At this point Mr. KENNEDY of New York took the chair as Presiding Officer.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, unless there is a successful solution to the crisis in South Vietnam, I am satisfied that the unilateral military action of the United States in South Vietnam will be the primary cause of leading Asia into a massive war. We would be whistling in the graveyard, or engaging in empty-headed, wishful thinking, if we thought that a massive war in Asia would stop there. I am satisfied that it would lead to a nuclear war, out of which there would come no victor. This I have stated many times.

This administration continues to argue that we shall lose prestige if we change our course of action in Asia.

I point out to the President of the United States that we have no prestige left in Asia because of our shocking course of action in South Vietnam.

What do prestige and face have to do with the United States doing what is right? Nothing. If our course of action in South Vietnam is wrong—and I am satisfied that it is completely wrong—the sooner we right it by taking the right course, the better for the future of this country.

Are we not going to learn from history? There were those in France who argued for years that France could not and should not get out of Indochina because she would lose face. After 240,000 casualties, the French people gave the French Government its answer, and it made very clear to that French Government that it had better change its course of action in Indochina. As all Senators know, it did.

There was worked out the Geneva accord of 1954, which the United States did not sign, and which John Foster Dulles persuaded the first American puppet in South Vietnam—President Diem—not to sign.

They divided Indochina into four parts; namely, Laos, North Vietnam, Cambodia, and South Vietnam.

Today, France is hailed around the world for her international statesmanship in following the course of action she took.

There were those in France who said that France would lose face and prestige if she changed her course of action in Algeria. In that instance, the leaders of the French Government came to recognize before it was too late that France was wrong in Algeria. De Gaulle, to his everlasting credit, righted France's wrong course and proceeded to change the French course of action in Algeria.

Since when has the United States reached such a hypocritical position that it is going to run away from the right and continue doing wrong?

The face savers are dead wrong in their arguments about American policies in South Vietnam, on the ground that we cannot change our course of action because we would lose face.

The sad and ugly reality, Mr. President, is that the face savers in South Vietnam are in fact warmongers. They are the ones who wish to rationalize and alibi the unjustifiable killing of more and more American boys.

Mr. President, I am for substituting each and every one of them for drafted boys in South Vietnam who fight in the jungles of Vietnam for a cause that is unwarranted because it is outside the framework of international law. It is one thing for us to sit in the comfort and security of the Chambers of the Senate and the House of Representatives and wave that flag into tatters. That action is nothing but paying disrespect to that flag while American boys are being killed in the jungles of South Vietnam. The duty of our Government is to get back within the framework of international law, to seek an honorable and negotiated settlement of that war over there, preserve the peace, and stop threatening the danger of leading us into a massive war in all of Asia.

As I said to the Secretary of State yesterday, and I repeat today, a continuation of the State Department policy in South Vietnam is certain to lead to a massive war in Asia; and that massive war in Asia will be a nuclear war. Neither the United States nor any other country would be a victor in such a war.

Mr. President, I plead and pray that the leadership of my Government will no longer seek to alibi and rationalize an illegal course of American action in South Vietnam. I plead and pray that the leaders of my Government will seek to apply the existing framework of international law and its procedures to the war in South Vietnam.

As I said to the Secretary of State yesterday, when a question was raised as to what I would have the United Nations do, my answer is, "Take jurisdiction."

What a question to ask the senior Senator from Oregon. What would I have the United Nations do? Take jurisdiction under the provisions of the charter to which the signature of the United States is attached.

The sad fact is that the United States has run out on the United Nations. The sad fact is that the United States, more than any other nation in the world—and, sad to say but true, more than Russia—is undermining the United Nations by its course of action in South Vietnam.

As I pointed out in my Syracuse University lecture, which I shall shortly ask to have printed in the RECORD, article after article of the United Nations Charter calls for the submission to the United Nations for jurisdiction of allegations concerning violation of international treaties. It calls for some other things, and offers two alternatives. But I stress this point first, because I wish to warn the present administration that if it follows its present course of action in South Vietnam, in my judgment, it will go out of office the most discredited administration in all the history of this Republic, because across this land, at the grassroots of America, increasing tens of thousands of American people are asking the question, "Why unilateral U.S. military action in South Vietnam?"

At long last there is hope now that we shall have a debate in the Senate on South Vietnam. All of last year the senior Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] and the senior Senator from Oregon did their best to get a debate in the Senate on South Vietnam, and we were met with silence on the floor of the Senate, but pats on the back in the cloakroom.

Mr. President, the American people are entitled to a debate on the floor of the Senate. The American people are also entitled to the lifting of the rules of secrecy by the State Department and the Pentagon in regard to the war in South Vietnam, for American boys are dying. The parents of those boys—the boys fighting over there—and every citizen in this country are entitled to have the truth about what is going on in Asia; and I charge on the floor of the Senate today that the administration is not giving the American people the truth about what is going on in Asia. Read some of the remarkable accounts and responses of the Pentagon and the State Department. Newspaper correspondents report allegations concerning violations of the borders of North Vietnam, violations of international law in Tonkin Bay, and violations of international law in Laos. What is the response of the State Department and the Pentagon to these reports?

"No comment."

I trust that our Nation is not yet a police state. But those are police state tactics, Mr. President. As I said a few moments ago, in discussing a bill I introduced in the Senate, in a democracy there is no substitute for a full public disclosure of the public's business. The war in South Vietnam does not belong to the President of the United States. It does not belong to Dean Rusk, the Secretary of State. It does not belong to McNamara in the Pentagon, or to Adlai Stevenson in the United Nations, or to Maxwell Taylor in South Vietnam. It happens to be the problem of the American people. They are entitled to have the facts and all the facts in regard to it.

Mr. President, as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I state to the American people today one of my great concerns. I have not been here for 20 years without gaining a pretty good intuition as to what is going on. But I am satisfied that we have Government officials who are more interested in concealment than in telling the American people the facts. I am satisfied that plans are underway for an escalation of activities in Asia that are bound to lead to a major war in Asia. While I might disagree with our Secretary of State on many things, I have a great admiration and respect for him. As I told him yesterday, it saddens me to find myself so completely against him on such a subject as South Vietnam. On most issues of foreign policy I find myself in complete agreement with him. I am satisfied that our great Secretary of State is concerned about where the South Vietnam war may lead. But the time has come for the American people to give the present administration its direction, for foreign policy does not belong to this administration. The old bromide that we hear repeated so often in the Senate and elsewhere in our country that foreign policy belongs to the President of the United States is, of course, complete nonsense, for the President is only an administrator of the people's foreign policy.

The American people will have to give direction to this administration in respect to the war in South Vietnam. I say to them today that I am satisfied that although they are a small minority, there is a group of officials in our country, in and out of uniform, who apparently think that we must prepare the way for a bombing of nuclear installations in Red China.

How anyone could possibly think that such a course of action on the part of the United States could produce peace is beyond my imagination. The danger of provoking a major war in Asia on the part of the United States is so great that, in my judgment, the American people should demand, without further delay, that this question be taken to the conference table.

I say again that the senior Senator from Oregon has never favored our simply pulling out of Vietnam. The senior Senator from Oregon has taken the position that if the only course open to us is to remain on a unilateral basis, we cannot justify staying there under international law. What I have urged, in speech after speech and article after article, is that we should make use of existing international agencies for the settlement of this dispute, if possible, by way of negotiated settlement, short of war. So I have urged, time and time again, and repeat this afternoon, that we ought to try to use SEATO; but the fact is that a majority of the SEATO nations want no part of it.

A foreign minister of Pakistan said some months ago, in Washington, that Pakistan had no intention of coming to the assistance of the United States in South Vietnam. I have called the roll of the SEATO nations in speech after speech, and I call it again this afternoon, with the question on my lips: Where are you in South Vietnam? Australia, New Zealand, Pakistan, Thailand, the Philippines, France, and Great Britain are not there. It is quickly said that some of them are there in token; but it is a pretty small token. The Australians have probably some 60 or 70 advisory troops there. There is some delivery of materiel, mostly out of Australia—and at a good dollar profit—in a few cargo planes belonging to Australia. But there is no active participation by Australia in the war in South Vietnam.

If any countries have a large stake in South Vietnam, if our claims are true, they are Australia and her sister state, New Zealand. In the lecture that I shall introduce into the RECORD shortly, I quote the Australian press—a conservative press. The Australian press is greatly concerned about U.S. plans for escalating the war in South Vietnam. The Australian press is saying some of the very things I am saying as to the danger of a massive war in Asia leading to nuclear war. The "domino" theory cannot be sold to Australia; they will not buy it. It cannot be sold to New Zealand. It is interesting to observe that there is no great concern so far as Thailand and the Philippines are concerned. We do not find their troops dying in South Vietnam. Aside from the Vietnamese, the only ones who are dying are American boys. We cannot justify that.

Let me say something about the question of SEATO. We do not hear the lack of SEATO action discussed very much. Although the SEATO nations have pledged themselves under the protocol agreement in the SEATO treaty to consider South Vietnam an area of vital concern and interest, they have also a procedural rule of unanimity. It is not possible to get any action by SEATO on a majority vote basis. The only way to get any help from SEATO is to have an individual SEATO nation, on the basis of its own sovereignty, but not as a member of the SEATO treaty, come into South Vietnam voluntarily. I should like us to try to change that. I should like us to try to see if we could have SEATO—and I have said this for many months—undertake a peace-keeping action and try to bring about a cease-fire, setting up a SEATO control for a period, until stability and order can be restored in South Vietnam.

I am afraid it is true, as has been pointed out to me by so many persons, that we cannot get sufficient support in depth from SEATO nations to accomplish that purpose. We may get some token support from a few, but that will be all. I shall have something to say about token support momentarily.

I turn now to the possibility of reconvening the 14-nation conference. The fact that that was first proposed by President De Gaulle, of France, is no reason for not approving of it, but, rather, is a reason for giving him credit for seeking to work out a peaceful solution to the war in South Vietnam.

The White House and the State Department ought to be urging the reconvening of the 14-nation conference, to the end of seeing what can be worked out, if anything, to bring about a cease-fire in South Vietnam and an administration of that country by a joint commission, with a view to stopping the killing in South Vietnam.

It may be said that if that course of action is followed, Communist nations will be participating in any such joint commission. Of course they will. We Americans cannot wish Communist nations out of existence. They are an ugly reality on the face of the earth. But we shall not defeat communism by following the course of action that we are following in South Vietnam. To the contrary, in my judgment, we are making more Communists around the world by the unilateral action of the United States in South Vietnam than we have any reasonable hope of defeating in South Vietnam. The use of the jungle law of military force by the United States will make more Communists around the world, not reduce their number.

It may be said that if Communists are placed in any representative positions, the danger always is that they will produce conflict; that they will try to take over; and that the action eventually will end in chaos. Here again, we shall never know until we try. I believe the time has come for us to try, at least, to be law abiding and to keep our commitments under the United Nations Charter.

But it is said that the United States is in South Vietnam because the Geneva accords of 1954 are being violated. They certainly are. They are being violated by Red China; by North Vietnam; by the Pathet Laos; probably, on some occasions, by Cambodia; but also by the United States and South Vietnam. The record is undeniable. We cannot justify refusing to go to the United Nations on the basis of the argument that we are in South Vietnam only to enforce the Geneva accords of 1954. The United States did not even sign them. We convinced our puppet, Mr. Diem, that he should not sign them. Neither the United States nor South Vietnam ever signed the Geneva accords. But my argument would be the same if we had. The fact that the Geneva accords are being violated by Red China, North Vietnam, and other nations does not justify the United States taking the law into its own hands, so to speak, and setting itself up as the policeman of the world to enforce the Geneva accords of 1954.

That is the responsibility under the international law, of the United Nations, or of a regional organization that is qualified to function under the authorization of the United Nations. No, Mr. President, we cannot justify our illegalities in South Vietnam, our unjustifiable killing of American boys, or our participation in the killing of thousands of Vietnamese on both sides in that great war on that great hypocritical pretense that we are there only because others are violating the Geneva accords of 1954. The time has come for us to seek peaceful procedures to stop violations by all parties, including ourselves.

Mr. President, the American action in southeast Asia has been the action characteristic of a provocateur. We have provoked incident after incident in South Vietnam. There is no question that the borders of North Vietnam have been violated with our knowledge. There is no question that we are supplying materiel for those violations. We cannot even get a categorical denial from this administration that our own so-called military advisers have participated in some of those transgressions.

Mr. President, as I said last year, we were a provocateur in the Tonkin Bay. We knew in advance of the bombing of the North Vietnam islands that was going to take place by the South Vietnam ships that we furnished, that we armed, by the personnel that we trained. We kept our own destroyers in the proximity of the bombing, in constant radio communication with our headquarters in Saigon. We stated that we had a right to do what we did. We had a right to be where we were. I have never denied that. We were on the high seas. And we had a right to defend our ships from attack. But, after we defended those ships, we had no right to commit an act of aggression against the mainland of North Vietnam.

That was an act of war on the part of the United States. As I said in the Senate at the time, and repeat today, what we should have done at that time, once our ships were defended, was to take the charge of the violation of international law by North Vietnam to the United Nations immediately, and lay our charges before the United Nations. We should have found out if that body has become nothing but a chatterbox, or is a great fortress, enforcing the peace of the world.

I want to find out whether the United Nations has become naught but a great debating society, or is an organized body of nations pledged to enforce the peace.

Mr. President, we have not taken our case to the United Nations. What are we afraid of? I think the American people are entitled to have an answer to that question. The only way to get an answer will be to have this administration, under this great President, lay the South Vietnam crisis before the United Nations and find out how much multilateral support we can get. As I say in the Syracuse lecture, I have asked for nothing more than what Franklin Delano Roosevelt asked for 20 years ago at Teheran when he proposed at the Teheran Conference that all of Indochina be placed under an international trusteeship. He was blocked by Winston Churchill. As I point out in the lecture, Franklin Delano Roosevelt knew that the British would not favor it because of the British colonial policy in southeast Asia. France has already learned. The Dutch have learned. The British are learning, and the Americans ought to learn that white-man colonialism in Asia is as dead as a dodo. We are not going to save it by killing American boys.

What the United States has to face up to is the reality that Asians are going to control Asia.

One further word about the fallacious Dulles theory about the dominoes, that all of Asia will go down if one of the countries goes down. What nonsense that is. Tell it to Burma. Tell it to Cambodia. Tell it to Australia. Tell it to New Zealand.

Even the Prime Minister of India in the press today came out against American military action in South Vietnam.

The best way for the United States to lose its sphere of influence in Asia is to stay in South Vietnam on a unilateral basis.

I shall support our staying in, and have always tried to make it clear that I shall support our staying in on a multilateral peacekeeping basis, but not on a warmaking basis. In the Senate, I shall enthusiastically support funds for military assistance to a peacekeeping corps, to supply our fair share of men for a peacekeeping corps, acting under the jurisdiction of any one of the three agencies that I have mentioned, SEATO, a reconvened 14-nation conference, or the United Nations.

But if the ultimate choice is given us of staying there on a unilateral basis, with no jurisdiction being exercised under existing international law procedures by any one of these three groups I have mentioned, or getting out, then I am for getting out. But not until then. I do not think we will ever have to get out, because I think we will be surprised by the enthusiastic response that a relieved world will give to the kind of international statesmanship I am calling upon my Government to exercise in respect to South Vietnam. I think it will be hailed around the world.

Of course, we shall have great difficulties with that kind of operation, but we are going to have even more difficulty with warmaking policies we are following that bring us to the brink of war.

Note, I am not talking about token support. I am talking about good faith, full support, on an international law basis, with the membership, preferably, of the United Nations, in which a peacekeeping corps, with whatever numbers and at whatever financial cost may be necessary will carry out the principle which Franklin Roosevelt proposed 20 years ago for this area. That was for an international jurisdiction—call it trusteeship or whatever one wants to call it, but international jurisdiction—based on a cease-fire order, that would bring about stability and freedom in South Vietnam.

That statement causes me to comment that all this talk about freedom has no bearing upon reality in South Vietnam, for there is no freedom in South Vietnam, and there has never been any freedom in South Vietnam since the United States took over. There has been no freedom in South Vietnam since the first American puppet, Diem, became the first dictator of South Vietnam, followed by General Minh, followed by Khanh, and now followed by complete chaos. Freedom? South Vietnam is ruled by military tyrants acting under military dictatorships carrying out American orders.

No; we are not going to help the cause of reality, or the cause of stability, or of freedom, in South Vietnam that way. The Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense have said that North Vietnam and Red China and others should leave South Vietnam alone. If we would go over there, we would find in countries in that area that the sentiment is for the United States to let South Vietnam alone. The truth is that the war there is a civil war. It is not a war between two nations. It is a war civil in nature. It is true that North Vietnam is receiving assistance, but it is true also that South Vietnam is getting aid from the United States, in the amount of over $1.5 million a day now; and since the war began in 1946, $6 billion of the taxpayers' money have been poured into South Vietnam, not covering the cost of keeping American forces there. Much of that, I want to say, and I say it sadly, has resulted in great waste and has produced great corruption in South Vietnam.

Mr. President, we are not going to end this civil war by any of the courses of action being recommended by the White House, the State Department, and the Pentagon Building. We cannot win this war by the policies we are following. We can win military victories. We can bomb and kill by the thousands. We can destroy the cities of Red China and Vietnam. We can destroy the nuclear installations of Red China. But we will lose the war, for, do not forget, we are dealing with a people and a philosophy of a people to whom time does not matter. And after we win all these military victories, what are we going to do with South Vietnam and North Vietnam and

Laos and Red China and the rest of the nations that will be involved, assuming for the moment that we might get into a nuclear war? We would have to police them for decades. We have neither the manpower nor the resources to rebuild that part of Asia after that type of war. We will inherit as a legacy for generations of Americans yet to come the undying hatred of the yellow man. He will hate us for hundreds of years. It will be an unending war. Let us think not in terms of the present time, but let us think in terms of the next 100 years. We have the responsibility in our time to lay out courses of action that will not produce the type of holocaust that will bring about for millions of American boys and girls the hatred of many people of the world that will be incurred if we continue to pursue our course of action in South Vietnam.

TOKEN ASSISTANCE

I said I would make a brief comment on token assistance. I am very disturbed about some of the activity on the part of the State Department, through the American embassies in Latin America, urging the heads of Latin American countries and high officials in those States to at least send something to South Vietnam—an ambulance or a medical corps or some contingency of assistance—so that it can be said by American officialdom that "We have the following nations in." The American people are not going to be fooled by that kind of hypocrisy, either. The American people are not going to be fooled by token assistance. I happen to know that there is already resentment on the part of some of those people—I speak as chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs—with this approach. We are told it is going to be used by Communists and non-Communists as pointing up that, because we provide so much foreign aid to Latin America, we are using it as a means of pressure to obtain token support in Latin America for our policy in Asia.

It should be repudiated. The State Department should desist from any such course of action.

Let us find out where the Latin Americans stand in the United Nations. Let us find out where the Latin American countries stand with respect to the proposal for the reconvening of a 14-nation conference on the war in South Vietnam. Let us find out where the Latin Americans stand on SEATO as offering a jurisdictional basis. Let them pledge their support, if pledge their support they will, to an international organization; but not to the United States, which is conducting this unjustified unilateral military action in South Vietnam.

Such a course of action, of seeking to get token support from nations into whose coffers we are pouring millions of dollars in military and economic aid is a great mistake, and it ought to be stopped immediately.

From time to time I shall discuss the unjustifiable course of action of my country in South Vietnam. Let me say, as I have said before, if a declaration of war is recommended by the President, and the Congress of the United States passes that declaration of war, the senior Senator from Oregon will take the position that we must unite behind the declaration and do what we can to bring that war to a speedy and successful end. But until there is a declaration of war, our position in South Vietnam cannot be reconciled by the Constitution of the United States. Under article I, section 8, of the Constitution, only Congress can declare war, and no President has the right to make war on such a sustained basis as he is making it in South Vietnam in the absence of a declaration of war. Let the record show that if I were asked to vote for a declaration of war tonight in connection with South Vietnam, I would vote against it, because in my judgment the facts do not warrant our declaring war. If the facts remain that way, if, as, and when a declaration of war is proposed, I shall vote against it.

But, if the facts change, so as to justify a declaration of war under our Constitution, the senior Senator from Oregon will vote for it.

However, we should not be talking about war at all. We should be talking about how best to bring about peace in southeast Asia.

I intend to continue here, and across the country, to offer the proposal that I have offered for more than a year, of submitting this war in South Vietnam, as far as the U.S. participation in it is concerned, to one of three agencies that I have outlined again in this speech. We must do more than prate about substituting the rule of law for the jungle law of military force; we must practice it; we must stop being hypocrites about it. We must live our ideal of peaceful pursuit in connection with disputes that threaten the peace of the world.

I close this subject matter, before I turn to my next one, by asking unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point a lecture I delivered at Syracuse University on December 14, 1964, entitled "Is Our Policy in Vietnam Leading the United States Into War?"

There being no objection, the lecture was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IS OUR POLICY IN VIETNAM LEADING THE UNITED STATES INTO WAR?

(Remarks of Senator WAYNE MORSE before Syracuse University, Syracuse, N.Y., December 14, 1964)

A few weeks ago, people laughed when presidential candidate Barry Goldwater talked blithely of "interdicting" the routes from North Vietnam into South Vietnam, especially by use of chemicals and radiation to defoliate the trees that conceal the jungle trails.

But today there is every evidence that the American Ambassador has returned to Saigon from Washington with something very similar to the Goldwater prescription for the civil war in South Vietnam.

A traditional signpost that points to this conclusion is the increased emphasis in the White House communique on the Taylor talks, in the statements by the Vietnamese Ambassador in Washington, and from official sources in Saigon, upon infiltration of men and supplies from North Vietnam through Laos into South Vietnam.

This new emphasis is in total contrast to the previous official testimony on this point presented to the Foreign Relations Committee. In fact, no new evidence has been offered to change the assessment that the great bulk of the Vietcong rebels were local residents, that close to 90 percent of their weapons were captured from Government sources, and that their civil war against the Government would continue whether or not it received aid or leadership from North Vietnam.

But the 100 percent expansion of the South Vietnamese Air Force and the drumbeating in both Washington and Saigon about alleged infiltration from North Vietnam, suggest to these experienced ears that air attacks by U.S. jets flown by United States and Vietnamese pilots will soon commence in Laos, as they may already have begun in the demilitarized zone of North Vietnam.

What this will accomplish, no one has explained. But it has long been obvious that just as Chiang Kai-shek could never return to the Chinese mainland except on the crest of a full-scale American invasion, neither can the patchwork Government of South Vietnam survive much longer except with full-scale U.S. military intervention that escalation of the war will bring about.

ORIGINS OF PRESENT POLICY

One of the most astonishing elements in the discussions of this policy is the number of Washington officials who will tell you that getting into South Vietnam was a hideous mistake, but once involved we have no choice but to continue. One wonders how much blood they are willing to spill to pursue a policy they recognize was fallacious from the beginning.

But I would like to go back to the end of World War II and examine the history of American relations with southeast Asia to see just how our policy led us to the present perilous situation.

Twenty years ago almost to the very month, the subject of postwar American policy in southeast Asia came in for study in the high levels of Government. A State Department memorandum to President Roosevelt suggested that positive announcements should be made of American policy toward the former colonial areas of southeast Asia being liberated from Japanese occupation. It suggested that specific dates for their self-government be set as objectives of American policy.

We know from Cordell Hull's memoirs that President Roosevelt heartily endorsed that policy. He believed that French dominion over Indochina should not be restored. At the Cairo and Teheran Conferences he urged that it be placed under an international trusteeship as a final step toward independence.

Cordell Hull records that only Prime Minister Churchill disagreed, and he quotes Roosevelt as saying: "The only reason (the British) seem to oppose it is that they fear the effect it would have on their possessions and those of the Dutch. They have never liked the idea of a trusteeship because it is, in some instances, aimed at future independence.

"Each case must, of course, stand on its own feet, but the case of Indochina is perfectly clear. France has milked it for 100 years. The people of Indochina are entitled to something better than that."

Today we are paying the price for our failure to carry out that policy. Within 10 years of the end of the war, the British, the Dutch, and the French largely recognized, after years of war and the expenditure of billions of dollars, that colonialism is a thing of the past. It is the United States that has failed to recognize what Mr. Roosevelt knew to be true: The era of white rule in Asia is finished, whether it takes the form of economic exploitation through direct rule or the form of manipulating governments to protect what we regard to be our interest—the postwar American form of colonialism.

Roosevelt's policy died with him. Our primary interest became one of bowing to French wishes in all international matters to guarantee her support and participation in NATO, and we began financing the French effort to recapture Indochina. We put over $1¼ billion into that futile struggle. And when the French finally gave up, we took it over ourselves.

WANTED: A WESTERN FOOTHOLD

All in all, it has cost American taxpayers $5½ billion, exclusive of the cost of our own forces, to try to keep a Western foothold in southeast Asia. Some writers are working hard to convince the American people that all we are doing is maintaining a historic American policy. Journalistic spokesmen for the Defense Department are vehement in declaiming that to lose our foothold in Vietnam is to lose all we fought for in the Pacific in World War II.

Nothing is further from the truth. Never in our history have we had any kind of foothold on the mainland of Asia. Before World War II, the most we ever had was the Philippines, which we voluntarily relinquished in 1935 and formally freed in 1945. Since 1945, we have maintained base rights in the Philippines, as in Japan; and we have kept a base in Okinawa, won by conquest. Our present "foothold" in South Korea is a legacy of World War II, not its objective.

What these Defense Department spokesmen really have in mind are not the strictly American footholds and bases in that part of the world but the whole network of French, Dutch, and British possessions that in World War II were freely used by Americans in the prosecution of the war against Japan. The possibility that these staging areas should no longer be available for use at our pleasure vis-a-vis China is for many of them so unthinkable that they believe it is worth a war to retain at least one of them.

When France finally gave up the struggle in Indochina, the United States refused to sign the Geneva Accord of 1954, which ended the war. And we prevailed upon a new government we had chosen to back in South Vietnam not to sign it either. We began to send military aid early in 1955, and we, along with South and North Vietnam, were found by the International Control Commission to be in violation of the treaty.

The sad truth is that the threats of leading American officials to make war on China and the present war crisis, are the logical end of the dismal road in Indochina that John Foster Dulles set us upon in 1954. After failing in his efforts to keep the French fighting on in Indochina, despite American aid to their war effort and the promise of direct U.S. military action, Dulles refused to put the signature of the United States on the Geneva agreement of 1954 which marked the end of French rule there. South Vietnam also declined to sign. The most the United States said about the 1954 agreement was that we would recognize it as international law and regard violations with grave concern and as seriously threatening international peace and security.

Among the provisions of the 1954 accords was article 16: "With effect from the date of entry into force of the present agreement, the introduction into Vietnam of any troop reinforcements and additional military personnel is prohibited."

An exception was made for rotation of personnel, meaning French, already there.

Article 17 provided: "(a) With effect from the date of entry into force of the present agreement, the introduction into Vietnam of any reinforcements in the form of all types of arms, munitions, and other war materials, such as combat aircraft, naval craft, pieces of ordnance, jet engines, and jet weapons and armored vehicles is prohibited."

Again, an exception was made for replacement on the basis of piece for piece of the same type and with similar characteristics.

Article 18: "With effect from the date of entry into force of the present agreement, the establishment of new military bases is prohibited through Vietnam territory."

For 10 years we have claimed that North Vietnam was violating the accord by sending in help to the rebels against the South Vietnamese Government. But our solution was not to go to the parties who signed the agreement and who were responsible for its enforcement. Nor did we go to the United Nations, the sole international body with jurisdiction over threats to the peace.

Instead we multiplied our own violations by joining in the fighting. Each time we increase the number of American boys sent to that country to "advise" the local troops we violate the Geneva agreement of 1954. Every jet plane, every helicopter, every naval vessel we furnish South Vietnam or man with American servicemen is a violation, and so is every military base and airstrip we have constructed there.

Yet we hypocritically proclaim to ourselves and the world that we are there only to enforce the Geneva agreement.

Part of the 1954 agreement established an International Control Commission of Poland, India, and Canada to investigate complaints of violations. As early as its report covering 1956, this Commission found both North and South Vietnam had violated the accords of 1954, the latter in conjunction with the U.S. military aid activities.

The independent Commission, consisting of Poland, India, and Canada, found as early as 1956, that both North Vietnam and South Vietnam were in violation of the accords, and that the United States was in violation with them, because of the military aid that we supplied in direct violation of the articles of the accord which I have previously read.

Immediately upon the signing of the 1954 agreement, the United States began to support the new government of South Vietnam in a big way. In the letter President Eisenhower wrote President Diem, a letter still serving as the basis for our policy in 1964, aid was pledged to Diem, and in turn, "the Government of the United States expects that this aid will be met by performance on the part of the Government of Vietnam in undertaking needed reforms."

NO FREEDOM OR DEMOCRACY IN SOUTH VIETNAM

In 1964, President Johnson refers to that letter as the basis for our aid, but the part about reforms has long since been forgotten.

In the decade following 1954, the United States for all practical purposes made a protectorate out of South Vietnam. Its new government immediately became financially dependent upon us; as rebellion against it grew, our level of aid was stepped up. By 1961, we had to send 15,000 American troops as "advisers" to the local military forces. Today, the figure is 22,000.

When the Diem government diverted itself from fighting rebels to fighting Buddhists, a coup by military proteges of the United States overthrew it. Within a few weeks, another coup replaced the Minh junta with what American advisers considered a more efficient military junta under General Khanh. In turn, the Khanh government has been succeeded by a series of coalitions, the current one being headed by Tran Van Huong.

At no time have the people of this unfortunate country had a government of their own choosing. In fact, the Khanh junta justified its coup with the excuse that some Minh officers were pro-French, and might seek some way of neutralizing the country. Just how these various creations of the U.S. Government differ from the old Bao Dai government which served as the French puppet, I have never been able to see. Yet American leaders talk piously of defending freedom in South Vietnam.

We say that one of our objectives is the enforcement of the 1954 agreement. But it has never been explained why we have any business enforcing by force of arms an agreement to which neither we nor our client country is a signatory.

Nor is it explained why enforcement can only take the form of massive violations by ourselves of articles 16, 17, and 18 of that agreement.

In the case of Laos, we did sign the Geneva accord of 1962, which sought to neutralize that country. Hence, we claim that the violations we have committed ourselves were undertaken only after North Vietnam violated the accord first. Our violations have taken the form of sending armed planes flown by American pilots over Laos.

The 1962 agreement permits military equipment to be brought into the country at the request of the Laotian Government, but it forbids "the introduction of foreign regular and irregular troops, foreign paramilitary formations, and foreign military personnel into Laos."

Any American planes raiding Laos, whether flown by Americans or South Vietnamese, will be in violation of the 1962 Laotian accord.

Now we are faced with the collapse of the government we have been supporting. It is becoming obvious that it was not a case of our aiding an established government; but of having created and maintained in office a whole series of governments that have had little or no support among the people.

We have been making covert war in southeast Asia for some time, instead of seeking to keep the peace. It was inevitable and inexorable that we would have to engage in overt acts of war as we are now doing.

There never was a time when it was possible for us to impose a government upon the people of South Vietnam without constant fighting to keep it in power. Nor was it possible to "bring the boys home by 1965," or by any other date. Never could the war be fought and won in South Vietnam alone, because the Khanh junta—and any of its successors and predecessors—could not survive without the massive and direct American military backing that is possible only if the war is expanded.

OUR INTERESTS NOT THEIRS

The United States is, of course, a full partner in the Government of South Vietnam. I am satisfied that since 1954 we have been a provocateur of military conflict in southeast Asia and marched away from our obligations to international law.

In recent months, evidence has mounted that both the Pentagon and the State Department were preparing to escalate the war into Laos and North Vietnam. American forces in nearby bases in the Philippines and Okinawa have been poised for air attacks on Laos and North Vietnam. The 7th Fleet has moved into the South China Sea and the Gulf of Tonkin, while the entry of ground forces through Thailand into Laos has been prepared.

Last August, vessels we had furnished to South Vietnam were used to shell two islands in the Tonkin Gulf belonging to North Vietnam. Meanwhile, American naval vessels patrolled a few miles seaward in international waters.

Those vessels were pursued by northern PT boats. Anticipating an attack, our destroyers began the exchange of fire while they were still some 3 miles away. After the second such incident, a well-planned retaliatory air raid was carried out against the ports harboring the PT boats.

This raid was not self-defense on our part; it was supposed to be a "lesson" to North Vietnam. It was supposed to give her a taste of what would happen to her if she did not cease and desist from what we regard as her interference in the affairs of South Vietnam. Today, one can only conclude that the lesson was lost.

It is evident that our military policymakers believe that our losses in South Vietnam must be covered by fighting elsewhere. Not able to win the battle against the local rebels, they believe American interests must be served by fighting where the power of American weapons superiority can be brought into play.

Shortly before the election, James Reston wrote in the New York Times: "While the political situation in Saigon is said officially to be deteriorating, the administration insists that there is no danger of collapse there in the foreseeable future, and Ambassador Maxwell Taylor has stated this week that the Communist military assault on South Vietnam is further from success now than ever before. If this is true, it is difficult to understand why some prominent officials, a few weeks before a national election, should be talking so openly about expanding the war, and not only advocating but almost lobbying for such a course of action.

"It is even possible now to hear officials of this Government talking casually about how easy it would be to 'provoke an incident' in the Gulf of Tonkin that would justify an attack on North Vietnam and thus, according to this thesis, enable the United States to bring strong military pressure on the Communists there to let up on their pressure on South Vietnam."

As Mr. Reston points out, our policy always has been described as helping a people remain free from Communist domination. We have stated over and over again that the war had to be fought and won in South Vietnam because the rebels were people of South Vietnam and the great bulk of their weapons were taken from Government forces or brought by defectors from Government armies.

The fact that it is really American interests and not the interests of South Vietnam about which we are concerned is coming to the surface. Now, we hear that American prestige cannot take the blow of a retreat from South Vietnam; and if the war cannot be won there, then we must display our strength somewhere else. Our objective is no longer to help another people, but to maintain an American military presence on the mainland of Asia.

The discrepancy between our announced interests and our real interests is the source of much of our difficulty with American public opinion about southeast Asia. As long as the fiction could be maintained that we were helping a people remain "free," support for almost any U.S. involvement could be expected. But the disintegration of the political fabric of South Vietnam has exposed this discrepancy.

The signs from official Washington indicate a recognition among even the most ardent advocates of this U.S. policy in Vietnam that it has been a failure. Of the alternatives now being discussed, the one espoused so long by General Taylor and Secretary McNamara for increased U.S. aid is rarely heard.

That is because the preponderance of American money and military equipment is already so heavy that additional increments could not affect the situation. South Vietnam—at least the third or so of it still under Government control—has for many months been completely saturated with U.S. money, U.S. military equipment, and U.S. advisers, both political and military.

Still the tide runs against us. Still the political condition of the country deteriorates, and still the Vietcong raid with greater success and audacity.

So General Khanh openly calls for attacks on North Vietnam by the United States. And his frank recognition of the failure of past U.S. policy is being echoed by more and more of the American community of policymakers who devised it in the first place.

The theory they are now advancing is that the leadership for the Vietcong movement comes from North Vietnam and if we inflict heavy damage upon the industry and transportation network of that country, it will cease and desist from whatever succor it is giving the Vietcong.

All this assumes, of course, that the body and the muscle of the Vietcong resistance would be rendered helpless without the vague and unknown amount of direction it receives from the north. It further assumes that only the United States will decide to escalate the conflict and that North Vietnam and China will not respond by increasing their level of participation.

These assumptions are so unsound as to render the theory even less likely to succeed than the present policy. They are sheer guesswork, and they are the product more of embarrassment and frustration than of careful thought about the long-range interests of the United States.

IGNORING THE U.N. CHARTER

If we expand the war into Laos, North Vietnam, or China, in the name of protecting our investment in South Vietnam, it will be an outright American aggrandizement of the kind we have not embarked upon since the Mexican War. We will not only be inviting disaster but will be flouting every principle of international policy we have espoused since World War II.

Not the least of these is our signature on the U.N. Charter and our support of its activities. If our signature means anything, it requires us to observe article 2, section 4: "All members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations."

Other charter provisions are specific as to the duty of nations when they find themselves involved in a dispute. Article 33 states:

"Section 1. The parties to any dispute, the continuance of which is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security, shall, first of all, seek a solution by negotiation, inquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial settlement, resort to regional agencies or arrangements, or other peaceful means of their own choice."

Notice that the controlling verb is "shall." This is not an option but a directive. So far, it has been ignored by the United States.

It is commonly said both in and out of government that the U.N. is a waste of time and that the Communists understand nothing but force. However, the line continues; maybe at some future date we will find it to our interest to go to the U.N. This supposedly sophisticated argument ignores several points.

First, it may not be left to us to decide whether and when the issue should go to that body. Article 35 provides that "any member of the United Nations may bring any dispute, or any situation of the nature referred to in article 34 (threats to international peace), to the attention of the Security Council or of the General Assembly." This means that if we wait for another country to invoke article 35, we can be sure it will not be under conditions most favorable to us.

Second, the assumption by administration spokesmen that someday, sometime, somehow, and under some other circumstances we will seek U.N. action is an admission that the issue is really one of U.N. jurisdiction. What they are saying is that to adhere to the charter now would not serve American interests: the time to negotiate is when we dominate the battlefield.

This amounts to saying that any treaty obligation that does not serve our national interest is just a scrap of paper. These officials take the view that we may one day resurrect the charter from the wastebasket but not until we think it serves our interests.

If this is to be our policy, then we are helping to destroy the United Nations and all the advances in the rule of law in world affairs that it represents. This will undermine our moral position and seriously compromise our capacity for calling others to account for breaches of the peace. This is already the case in connection with Mr. Sukarno's aggressions against Malaysia.

Third, the "fight now, negotiate later" line is based on the wholly illusory assumption that Red China and North Vietnam will do what we refuse to do—negotiate when they are losing. Can we really expect that when China is in the same situation in which she was in Korea, she will negotiate instead of pouring her hordes into the fray? I know no reason to justify either this wishful thinking or the head-in-the-sand attitude that if we kill enough and bomb enough, North Vietnam and Red China will yield.

UNITED STATES ISOLATED IN ASIA

There is yet another element to this problem that has largely been ignored. That is the isolation we would create for ourselves in Asia.

There is no evidence that any other nation would join us in expansion of the war into Laos or North Vietnam. Although a spokesman for Thailand recently proposed that military forces from other Far Eastern nations join the United States in the fighting, not even Thailand has actually sent any. There are no British, New Zealand, French, Filipino or Pakistani forces in Vietnam, either, yet all are members of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization, under whose terms we claim we are acting in South Vietnam.

Prime Minister Wilson has rejected a request by President Johnson that Britain send troops to join ours. But so did the President reject Wilson's request that the United States help fry Britain's fish in Malaysia. Apparently each country will act unilaterally in those places with a moratorium on criticism of any illegalities or threats to world peace that may result.

Of SEATO members, only Australia has sent a token force. It now amounts to perhaps 60 to 70 men, with a few air transport planes and crews promised for the future.

That is the measure of how our SEATO allies feel about fighting in Vietnam.

The SEATO organization, in the first meeting of its foreign ministers in 1955, adopted what amounts to a bylaw requiring that all action taken by the treaty organization shall be by unanimous agreement. Flat opposition by France and Pakistan has foreclosed any formal military action in Vietnam by SEATO.

Indeed, the largest newspaper in Pakistan, Jang, recently editorialized: "As long as the United States is allowed to remain in the area she will continue to involve countries of the area in war. This is because the United States is out to encircle and destroy the People's Republic of China."

Even Australia is expressing alarm about the possible escalation of the war. The Daily Mirror, of Sydney, a relatively conservative Australian paper, said on November 26:

"DON'T BOMB HANOI

"There are ominous signs that renewed efforts are about to be made in Washington to stampede the Johnson administration into agreeing to bomb North Vietnam.

"This would be the last throw in an effort to end the civil war that has racked South Vietnam for so long.

"Any such reckless action could well prove to be disastrous. At the best it is not likely to achieve its objective. At its worst it could start a Korea-type war, with Chinese intervention, which might spread nobody knows where.

"The American Ambassador to South Vietnam, General Maxwell Taylor, left Saigon yesterday to confer with President Johnson and Defense Department officials.

"Before leaving he gave an indication of his thinking when he said that Communist forces 'outside South Vietnam' had played a major role in supporting the Communist Vietcong insurgents.

"The reference was clear. Support for the rebels, in his view, comes from North Vietnam. It is logical to assume that he is thinking about attacking Hanoi, the capital, and other strategic targets across the border. For some time a steady flow of propaganda from the 'bomb Hanoi' school in Washington has been trying to prepare the American people for such action.

"Yet there is very little evidence that support for the Vietcong is coming from the north. They are strongest in the southern tip of South Vietnam, farthest from North Vietnam, and they are armed largely with American weapons captured from the Government forces.

"They are, in fact, a strongly organized Communist movement capitalizing on popular dissatisfaction with the rottenness of successive administrations in Saigon. It is a serious fallacy to think that bombing North Vietnam would end their activities.

"Two of the most influential British newspapers, the Guardian and the Times, condemn the proposal to extend the war. The Guardian says that even if the present propaganda campaign is merely designed to put the United States in a better bargaining position, it still does not seem a good idea.

"The Times says that the dangers 'scarcely need pointing out.' One of the risks, it says, is of Chinese intervention, and it adds: 'One of the fallacies of the past 5 years in South Vietnam has been that the guerrillas in the south were a creation of the north and not a genuine revolt against misgovernment.'

"The French, who have bitter cause to know more about the situation in Indochina than anybody else, also oppose bombing North Vietnam."

"After 16 years of ruinous civil war surely commonsense would dictate to Washington that a political, not a military, solution is the answer."

Although India is the one country of Asia most threatened by China, even India has no desire to see a war break out, because in conditions of war between the United States and anyone in Asia, nuclear weapons would be used sooner or later. Moreover, like Australia, India knows that in war, nations lose control of events. Nations are controlled by wars, and not the other way around.

Official opinion in India has been expressed for a 14-nation conference on Vietnam. That is the most sympathetic view of our position among any of the leading nations of Asia.

How much further do we want to dig ourselves into this pit, started by the Eisenhower administration and deepened by the Kennedy administration?

FUTURE OF UNITED STATES IN ASIA UP TO PRESIDENT JOHNSON

That question is going to have to be answered by President Johnson alone. It is too bad that all these chickens have all come home to roost on his doorstep; but there they are.

The resolution passed last August by Congress gave the President a blank check to use force in Asia. As a legal statement it means little; but it was sought and given as a political backstop. On two other occasions, similar resolutions authorizing a President to use armed force in given areas led right straight to war. One was with Mexico in 1846 and a second was with Spain in 1898. Those resolutions, like the current one, were supposed to prevent war by warning an adversary of our intentions. But both had to be followed by declarations of war.

President Johnson has said little in public on this matter except for what he said in a New Hampshire campaign speech last September 28, 1964. In responding to the Goldwater prescription, he said:

"So just for the moment I have not thought that we were ready for American boys to do the fighting for Asian boys. What I have been trying to do, with the situation that I found, was to get the boys in Vietnam to do their own fighting with our advice and with our equipment. That is the course we are following. So we are not going north and drop bombs at this stage of the game, and we are not going south and run out and leave it for the Communists to take over. We have lost 190 American lives, and to each one of those 190 families this is a major war. We lost that many in Texas on the 4th of July in wrecks. But I often wake up in the night and think about how many I could lose if I made a misstep. When we retaliated in the Tonkin Gulf, we dropped bombs on their nests where they had their PT boats housed, and we dropped them within 35 miles of the Chinese border. I don't know what you would think if they started dropping them 35 miles from your border, but I think that that is something you have to take into consideration.

"So we are not going north and we are not going south; we are going to continue to try to get them to save their own freedom with their own men, with our leadership and our officer direction, and such equipment as we can furnish them. We think that losing 190 lives in the period that we have been out there is bad, but it is not like 190,000 that we might lose the first month if we escalated that war. So we are trying somehow to evolve a way, as we have in some other places, where the North Vietnamese and the Chinese Communists finally, after getting worn down, conclude that they will leave their neighbors alone, and if they do we will come home tomorrow."

The question now is whether President Johnson can bring himself to do the only thing that can be done in Asia to escape an expanded war: to bring other interested parties into a multilateral political agreement for southeast Asia.

This could take the form of a United Nations jurisdiction along the lines proposed so wisely by President Roosevelt; or it could take the form of seeking a SEATO action that would police South Vietnam while a political solution is developed; or it could take the form of a new 14-nation conference among the same nations that arranged the 1954 Geneva accord.

The further we go in expanding the war—the more agreements we violate and the more people we kill in the name of peace—the more military opposition we harden against us in North Vietnam and China—the more we alienate ourselves from the now-Communist nations in that part of the world—the more impossible any peaceful solution becomes.

In the last 10 years we have learned that we are not masters of events in Vietnam, despite our billions of dollars and our thousands of troops on the scene. It has not been shown that any stepped-up investment of blood or money will make us masters.

It still is not too late for President Johnson to lead the American people out of this morass. Whether he leads us out or further in, will be the first great test of his administration.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as I said earlier in this speech, since Congress adjourned last fall, from time to time, I have discussed the war in South Vietnam. In order to keep the record straight—I understand there are those who have been heard to say that I have been surprisingly silent on the subject matter during the adjournment—I ask unanimous consent that the following press releases on the subject matter be inserted in the RECORD at this point:

The press releases of November 23, 1964, November 27, 1964, December 22, 1964, December 23, 1964, December 24, 1964, December 30, 1964, and January 5, 1965.

There being no objection, the press releases were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOVEMBER 23, 1964.—Senator WAYNE MORSE, a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, said in a press statement today that "widespread circulation is being given in today's press to a State Department and Pentagon Building trial balloon on South Vietnam.

"The dope story is that Ambassador Taylor is on his way back to the United States from South Vietnam to recommend an expansion of the South Vietnam war into North Vietnam and Laos by United States bombing a limited number of selected targets and bases in North Vietnam and Laos.

"I hope there is no basis in fact for these stories of proposed warmaking. On the other hand, if they prove to be accurate, then in my judgment, Ambassador Taylor should be summarily fired and all others in the State Department and Pentagon Building who may be associated with him in any such recommendation of international outlawry on the part of the United States.

"It was on General Taylor's recommendation of 1961 that 21,000 U.S. military personnel, much of the 7th Fleet, and extensive air forces are now floundering in Vietnam.

"The new adventures he is alleged to be proposing would only shove this country even deeper into an Asian quicksand.

"The United States is not legally at war with North Vietnam or any other country in Asia although it is true that we are engaged in unilateral military action in South Vietnam in violation of our international treaty obligations under the United Nations Charter. In the absence of a declaration of war, the State Department and the Pentagon Building cannot justify under international law the continuation of our acts of aggression against the borders of North Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos.

"Contrary to repeated newspaper misrepresentations of my position of the past year in opposition to United States military action in South Vietnam, I have not advocated only that the United States stop making war in South Vietnam; but rather I have advocated that the United States insist that the United Nations or SEATO or a reconvening of the 14-nation Geneva Conference assume jurisdiction over the threat to world peace in southeast Asia.

"I have advocated that the United States contribute its share of assistance to the establishment of such a United Nations program which would amount, in effect, to the setting up of a United Nations trusteeship over war-stricken South Vietnam until peace can be restored. This, in essence, is the same program as President Franklin Roosevelt recommended for all of Indochina 20 years ago.

"If the State Department and the Pentagon Building continue with advocating expansion of the South Vietnam civil war into a war against North Vietnam and Laos and possibly Red China by American military forces, the American people will rightly hold this administration to accounting. Every day produces increased evidence that the American people are becoming fed up with the continuation of unjustified slaughter of American boys in southeast Asia.

"The unilateral military action of the United States in Asia should be stopped, and our Government should insist that the procedures of international law applied through the United Nations Charter should be used in meeting the threat to world peace in Asia which is growing more dangerous by the day."

November 27, 1964.—Senator Wayne Morse, Democrat, of Oregon, issued the following statement today on the southeast Asia crisis:

"Ambassador Maxwell Taylor is back in the United States appearing on television, radio and in press conferences where he is spreading his propaganda and alibis in support of increased United States military action in southeast Asia.

"Taylor should be kept in the United States permanently. His Deputy Ambassador, Alexis Johnson, should be recalled along with him. These two Ambassadors have not only been complete failures as far as bringing about greater internal stability in South Vietnam but they have been in league with war expansionists in the South Vietnamese military establishment, headed by America's No. 1 puppet, General Khanh.

"Taylor's last appearance before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee convinced me that he is a key leader among United States military and State Department warmongers who are seeking to extend the war in Asia in the absence of a declaration of war.

"Any proposal to use American men or equipment to commit acts of bombing, selective or general, in North Vietnam, Laos or elsewhere in Asia in the absence of a declaration of war by Congress, constitutes acts of aggression on the part of the United States. Such military action by the United States would make our country the most serious threat to the peace of the world.

"The slaughter of American boys in South Vietnam and the continued killing of both South Vietnamese and North Vietnamese, as the result of illegal and unjustifiable aggressive unilateral military action by the United States in southeast Asia, constitutes the writing of a bloody and shameful page in United States history. Our Government, to date, has made no attempt to take the southeast Asia war to the conference tables of the United Nations or to the negotiations of a reconvened Geneva Conference.

"Instead our Government is permitting the Pentagon Building and the State Department to conduct an undeclared war in Asia to the consternation of millions of people throughout the world, including people in the United States.

"A civil war prevails in South Vietnam. It cannot be settled by unilateral United States intervention. The Pentagon Building and the State Department are playing into the hands of our despicable Communist enemies, and they are frightening our friends among the free nations of the world who want no part of United States outlawry in Asia.

"The time has come for the American people to make clear to the Johnson administration that the slaughter of American boys in southeast Asia must stop immediately.

"The time has come for member nations of the United Nations to impose all the sanctions of international law available through the procedures of the United Nations Charter to stop the United States, South Vietnam, North Vietnam, Laos, Red China and Russia from a further endangering of the peace of the world by expanding the civil war in South Vietnam to a major war in Asia."

December 22, 1964.—"Our bankrupt policy in Vietnam has reached the point where we cannot even put together a government," Senator Morse said today.

"General Khanh and his fellow military progeny of the American aid program have no capacity to govern, nor even to carry out the military end of the civil war. Apparently they do not intend to let anyone else govern, either.

"This chaos in South Vietnam is the fruit of 10 years of American mistakes. It is the result of installing one clique of corrupt tinhorn generals after another to carry out American interests, with no thought whatsoever for the interests or well-being of the 14 million people of South Vietnam.

"These generals and their civilian counterparts have been living off American aid for 10 years. They have made corruption a way of life. They have done nothing to unite their country or to reform their society so as to remove the appeal of the Vietcong, and they never will so long as American boys are there to die for the status quo. These men are accomplished only in maladministration.

"To place the lives of American soldiers at the mercy of these flunkies is to throw away those lives. The administration must stop concealing from the American people the futility of what we are being asked to do in Vietnam, and the futility of the American deaths there.

"It is obvious that there is no will among its people to fight the rebels. There is no incentive for 14 million people in South Vietnam to put down some 35,000 rebels. The only incentive is with those who have waxed fat off American aid, but for them the status quo is the most profitable situation. We must stop protecting these corruptionists with American lives.

"There must be a complete change in our policy and a complete change in the personnel responsible for it. The administration must face the fact that the Taylor-McNamara policy is a failure. It must stop the further slaughter of American boys and start finding the political solutions that should have been devised 10 years ago. Those whose advise brought the country to this debacle must be replaced with men willing to do what should have been done long ago, and that is to place Vietnam under international auspices."

Senator Wayne Morse, a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, today made the following statement about South Vietnam:

"President Johnson must lay the Vietnam problem before the United Nations. The loss of one more American life in defense of the hopeless chaos in South Vietnam would be inexcusable.

"The military and civilian factions in Saigon are indulging in their struggle for power with the understanding that American military power will always protect them from their excesses and from whatever follies they may commit. The masses of the South Vietnamese people, however, are demonstrating no interest in defending their country for the benefit of these factions and profiteers.

"Sending American boys to their death for these greedy and incompetent cliques should no longer be sanctioned by the American people.

"President Johnson cannot justify further pursuit of the costly and dangerous Taylor-McNamara policy in that country."

December 24, 1964.—Senator Morse said today that Secretary Rusk's press conference remarks about South Vietnam "were further evidence that Rusk's department has failed to work out a sound American policy in South Vietnam.

"His feeble platitudes did not hide the fact that American soldiers are being sacrificed for a small group of men in South Vietnam who live off American aid. Americans are not dying for anyone's freedom in Vietnam; they are dying only to save a few 'faces' in Saigon and Washington.

"It is the Pentagon that has fashioned the present disastrous policy in Vietnam. It is a policy that promises perpetual war at best, and a bigger and expanded war at worst.

"Mr. Rusk must know that only Vietnamese will ever unify Vietnam. Americans will only divide it so long as any faction there depends upon U.S. aid for its existence. There will never be any American-sponsored 'unity' in South Vietnam. What we need from Mr. Rusk is not more tranquilizing but an American policy in Asia that will be based on realities."

December 30, 1964.—Speaking again today of our problems in South Vietnam, Senator Wayne Morse said:

"Contrary to oft-published reports, it is not my position that the United States should merely 'get out' of South Vietnam.

"We should get out in the sense that we should stop making war there for U.S. interests, and stop making an American puppet out of South Vietnam.

"That unfortunate country should be put under international auspices through the United Nations, a new 14-nation conference, or even through SEATO. In any of these procedures, there will be an important role to be played by the United States.

"It is the continued use of South Vietnam as a battleground for American interests and prestige that must stop because it can only end in disaster for the United States."

January 5, 1965.—Senator Wayne Morse, Democrat, of Oregon, issued the following statement today on President Johnson's state of the Union message:

"The rhetoric of the foreign policy part of the President's speech does not camouflage successfully the illegality under our treaty obligations of American unilateral military action in South Vietnam.

"We are not defending freedom in South Vietnam, because there has never been a free government in South Vietnam. That unfortunate country has always been ruled by a dictatorship acting as American puppets.

"The American people will not be deceived much longer by the administration's propaganda about alleged freedom in South Vietnam. Only an aroused American public opinion can now stop the unjustifiable killing of American boys in South Vietnam."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have before me a few comments from American newspapers bearing on the subject, which I should like to make a part of my speech.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that there be inserted at this point in the Record an editorial from the Providence Journal of December 24, 1964, entitled "U.S. Withdrawal From South Vietnam."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

U.S. Withdrawal From South Vietnam

The crisis in Saigon has grown to the point where American policy must be backed by firm decisions; no longer can we drift along in the hope that time will cure the Vietnamese situation. Withdrawal will be a serious blow to our prestige in Asia, but harsh facts dictate the need for tough-minded policy decisions now.

This country cannot and must not attempt to go it alone in southeast Asia or in any other region or country where our presence and our help are not wanted by local governments. We are in South Vietnam to help the Vietnamese win the war, not to replace them or to win the war for them.

Implicit in the congressional resolution authorizing American aid, including the use of armed forces, to maintain the peace and security of southeast Asia, is the understanding that nations seeking our help will establish, maintain, and observe reasonable standards of partnership.

Today in Saigon, power rests on the gun barrels of dissident young generals. Any civilian government they allow to exist will be a facade, and the thrust of attacks on

Ambassador Maxwell D. Taylor makes it plain that the generals propose to rewrite the terms of partnership to their own benefit.

America cannot afford to let the generals milk us of arms and cash, turn the country into a military dictatorship, and run the war for their private prestige and personal profit. If the terms of partnership are changed unilaterally, there will be no partnership. We were asked to help—but in a common cause.

Withdrawal from Vietnam need not mean withdrawal from southeast Asia or the frustration of the congressional resolution on maintenance of peace in that area. We can still help those governments willing to fight for themselves and cooperate honorably in joint restraint of internal and external attack.

We can offer Malaysia a more active participation (with Great Britain) in the defense of that nation against Indonesian assault. We can affirm our support of Thailand, although the Thai, almost wholly surrounded by Communist or Communist-leaning countries, may elect to survive by attempting some sort of coexistence.

But most of all, we can do no less than restate our historic ties with the Philippines and Australia, our two best friends in the Pacific, each with a stable government dedicated to the principles of the free world and whose people are demonstrably ready to fight to preserve their freedoms.

Withdrawal from Vietnam, in short, need not mean the disappearance of our presence or our strength from southeast Asia. A reinforced 7th Fleet alone gives us continuing, meaningful power that even Red China will hesitate to provoke and certainly is not prepared to attack.

If we leave Saigon, we shall leave in honor, not because we broke promises to South Vietnam but because the Vietnamese refused to keep the terms of agreement under which we went there. An agreement to help is just that, not a promise of an unending free ride for a clique of power-hungry generals.

Withdrawal will not be easy, but it's time that we faced up to the prospect of leaving instead of simply appealing for a unity that grows more unlikely every day. If we do leave, we must take, however, this one solid fact with us: In the future, we must help only those nations genuinely dedicated to self-help. All else is dangerous delusion.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there next follow in the RECORD a very brilliant analysis, by Richard Starnes, entitled "Shameful Mess," published in the Washington Daily News of January 4, 1965.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHAMEFUL MESS

(By Richard Starnes)

The pretense of legality cloaking American intervention in southeast Asia grows more threadbare with every passing hour.

U.S. aircraft are preparing to launch strikes against parts of the miscalled Ho Chi Minh Trail that cross Laos, in clear violation of the Geneva accord of 1962, which we signed.

The 1962 pact, which undertook to neutralize Laos, prohibits "introduction of foreign regular and irregular troops, foreign paramilitary formations, and foreign military personnel into Laos."

Our excuse for this calculated violation of a solemn covenant is that North Vietnam violated it first. Even if this is true, it reveals a corrosive cynicism on the part of the one nation on earth that has always preached the rule of law in international affairs.

Leaving for the moment the moral and legal character of our resolve to enlarge the war, we find that the more practical aspects of the decisions are no more durable. The theory (which even our most ardent war hawks cannot really believe) is that bombing the Ho Chi Minh Trail will somehow persuade North Vietnam and Communist China to withdraw support from the Vietcong insurgency that is winning South Vietnam.

There are three tragically dangerous fallacies involved here—fallacies that could cost a great many young American lives.

Fallacy 1: That any amount of bombing (short of laying a massive radioactive carpet across the waist of the peninsula) would be effective. Korea proved that no amount of conventional bombing could diminish the enemy's ability to supply his troops. There is, moreover, not one shred of credible evidence that the bulk of munitions used by the Vietcong originate in the north. At the outset, the Vietcong used crude homemade weapons, but the bulk of their arms now are captured or otherwise acquired from the woefully inept defenders of South Vietnam.

Fallacy 2: On no evidence at all, the proponents of escalation insist that this demonstration of Western armed power would create an atmosphere in which negotiations for peace could be undertaken from a position of strength. This reasoning simply won't float, for it assumes that North Vietnam and Red China would be willing to do what we ourselves are so unwilling to do—that is, negotiate from a position of weakness.

Underlying all else is fallacy three: That the insurgency in South Vietnam is primarily an external war of aggression. Again, there is no real evidence of this. The war is nurtured and encouraged by North Vietnam, to be sure, but there is no assurance that Hanoi could stop the war even if it so willed.

In Korea we hypnotized ourselves into believing that Communist China would not enter the war. We are now in the process of repeating this catastrophic piece of self-deception. On past performance, Red China is calculated to respond in kind if the United States falls into the trap of stepping up the war in southeast Asia. It is a mistake to assume that this would simply result in another Korea. It would result in something infinitely worse, for we are now dealing with a Communist China that has the bomb.

Thus the smallest increment in the war contains the frightful seeds of nuclear holocaust.

There are, sadly, times when such terrible risks must be taken. The Cuban missile crisis was one such time, for it threatened the very existence of the American nation.

No such threat exists in South Vietnam. The fact that the Vietcong are Communists does not make the war any less a civil war. Talk that we are fighting to keep a foothold on the Asian mainland makes no more sense than the Soviet gibberish that it was installing defensive missiles in Cuba. It is equally indefensible.

American interests in the Western Pacific can be handsomely garrisoned from Okinawa, the Philippines and South Korea. There is no more military rationale for risking war over South Vietnam than there is moral or legal justification.

President Johnson needs to remind himself of Clemenceau's dictum that war is too important a concern to be left in the hands of generals, and he needs to find the courage and statecraft to extricate us from the shameful mess we are in in southeast Asia.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the RECORD at this point a column entitled "Bipartisan Mistakes in Vietnam," written by Drew Pearson and published in the Washington Post, Friday, December 4, 1964.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WASHINGTON MERRY-GO-ROUND—BIPARTISAN MISTAKES IN VIETNAM

(By Drew Pearson)

When you read over the file on Vietnam and French Indochina, you get no tingle of American pride.

For after 18 years of Western civilian and military aid—8 under the French and 10 under the United States and after $7 billion of American money plus the services of thousands of Western advisers, South Vietnam is worse off than at the end of World War II.

Furthermore, if a vote were held in South Vietnam today, the majority of its people would probably vote to have the United States, with all its aid, all its advisers, and all its troops, go home.

These are the facts, unpleasant as they may be.

The mistakes are bipartisan. Both the Republican and the Democratic administrations made them. Both sides made grandiose promises, both waved the flag of unfulfilled achievement.

John Foster Dulles on October 6, 1953, stated that a stronger French position in Indochina was his "brighest achievement for the year."

But 1 year later, France had tossed in the sponge. It was out of Indochina altogether. Seven years later, April 20, 1961, John F. Kennedy told the American people: "We dare not fail to see the insidious nature of the new and deeper struggle. We dare not fail to grasp the new concepts, the new tools, the new sense of urgency that we will need to combat it in Cuba or South Vietnam."

And 10 years later, January 1964, President Johnson was making the same promises: "We shall maintain in Vietnam American personnel and materiel needed to assist you in achieving victory."

RECORD OF THE COST

One month later, Secretary of Defense McNamara made the most sensible statement of the entire 18-year period of flag waving. "I don't believe," he said, after returning from Vietnam, "that we as a nation should assume the primary responsibility for the war in Vietnam. It is a war that can only be won by the Vietnamese themselves."

Meanwhile the American people have been getting only fragmentary information regarding the burden, the bungling in Vietnam. The record shows, for instance, that in 1953 the United States paid $300 million for training Vietnamese troops under the French. And General de Gaulle, believe it or not, protested.

It shows that between 1950 and 1952, the United States footed one-third of the French war bill in Indochina, sending 228 warplanes, 235 naval vessels, 775 combat vehicles, and 1,300 trucks. In 1953, furthermore, the United States spent $100 million building airstrips for the French. One year later, the French got out.

Added together we spent about as much on the French in Indochina as we spent to rebuild metropolitan France under the Marshall plan.

There was one cautioning voice at the time, that of Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, of Montana, later to become Senate majority leader. "We should end all but humanitarian aid to South Vietnam," he said in 1955. He later claimed, after a Senate investigation, that President Eisenhower had censored and kept secret a report on the evaluation of U.S. aid.

Aid continued at around $200 to $300 million a year under Mr. Eisenhower, then was stepped up under Mr. Kennedy. As a

Senator, J.F.K. had been one of John Foster Dulles' faithful supporters.

On October 26, 1961, he exchanged letters with President Diem regarding military assistance, following up the exchange on November 9, with 200 Air Force instructors, plus heavy amounts of Air Force equipment.

EVENTS IN 1962

By February 8, 1962, a total of 5,000 U.S. military men was in South Vietnam, actively engaged in battle. On June 25, 1962, the International Control Commission charged South Vietnam with violating the 1954 Geneva agreement by accepting U.S. military men and making a factual military alliance with the United States.

Meanwhile Presidents Kennedy and Diem had exchanged further correspondence charging the Communists of North Vietnam with unceasing violation of the Geneva treaty.

Since the assassination of President Diem there has been no political stability whatsoever. Premiers and military dictators have come and gone, some picked by the United States, none able to remain in power more than 5 minutes without the United States.

All of this is why silent sentiment has increased among the men who have to do the fighting to turn over the entire Vietnam problem to the United Nations.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the Record an editorial published in the Washington Post of December 22, 1964, entitled "Empty Sack?" It refers to an analysis of the situation in South Vietnam by the editorial writer of the Washington Post.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Empty Sack?

Unless a stable, continuing government can be established in South Vietnam, the U.S. Government, whatever its preferences and wishes, may be compelled to withdraw its aid and support. The sixth uprising in 14 months almost eliminates the assumption that there is a South Vietnam Government competent to extend a request for aid and capable of utilizing whatever aid is extended.

The rebelling generals have made it quite clear that some of the young leadership of the armed forces is interested first in promotion and pay, thereafter in personal and family prerogatives, then in the distribution of American aid and only then, if there are any intellectual or emotional resources left over, in fighting the Vietcong.

The United States has frequently expressed and has continuously demonstrated its willingness to help defend the freedom and independence of small countries who do not have the economic or military resources to defend themselves against Chinese Communist aggression. That willingness persists, but it cannot be effective in a country which is not willing or able to use its resources in its own behalf. The indispensable ingredient of an endurable situation in South Vietnam is a stable civilian government backed by a military force appropriately subordinate to civilian authority. No amount of American aid can make up for the lack of this ingredient. Unless it is present, no foreign power can save Vietnam. Efforts to do so will constitute an attempt to prop up an empty sack.

It does not much matter what we would like to do in South Vietnam. What we would like to do is governed by what we can do and what we cannot do. And it is becoming increasingly clear that, without an effective government, backed by a loyal military and some kind of a national consensus in support of independence, we cannot do anything for South Vietnam.

When we decide that the hope of putting together these elements of success can no longer be entertained, the United States must have the courage to confess the unattainability of its ends and courageously abandon them. The economic aid and military power of the United States are going to be needed by countries that have the restraint, national discipline, and military purpose to use them effectively. They must not be wasted in a futile attempt to save those who do not wish to be saved.

If the warring factions in South Vietnam extinguish the last spark of hope and confidence, we will need to make it clear that they and not we have made the decision to give up the fight. This country will depart with a heavy heart; for the subjection of the unfortunate people of South Vietnam seems inevitable. Our national honor and interest alike compelled us to help ourselves; but neither honor nor interest requires us to continue that help a moment beyond the instant when it is clear that all help will be unavailing. We are very close to that decision.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the Record an editorial entitled, "Time for Decision," published in the Oregonian, of my State, for Tuesday, December 22, 1964.

I hope that my inserting the editorial from the Oregonian will not cause the editorial writer of that newspaper too great a shock. I believe I have demonstrated over the years that whenever I find that in my opinion the Oregonian is right about something, which is seldom, I always give due credit for such writing.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the Record at this point this editorial, which is critical of our policy in South Vietnam.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Time for Decision

The latest military coup in South Vietnam, the sixth change in governmental power in 14 months, comes near the end of the wet season and in a period of increasing Communist military attacks. Obviously, the role of the 22,000 U.S. military men assigned to help the South Vietnamese defend their country from the Vietcong is made more difficult.

None of these military and civilian upheavals at the top levels of government, including the ouster and murder of President Ngo Dinh Diem and his ruthless brother, Ngo Dinh Nhu, has touched the main problem. That problem is the inability of the government to compete with the Vietcong agitators in winning the support of the Vietnamese farmers and villagers outside Saigon.

The "young generals" who arrested 9 remaining members of the civilian High National Council and about 20 other generals and politicians left the new premier, Tran Van Huong, Chief of State Phan Khac Suu and Lt. Gen. Nguyen Khanh, chief of the armed forces, in their offices. But it is apparent these will take orders, for the time being, at least, from the "Young Turks." A new civilian government is promised. But this, too, is window dressing.

Some politicians under Buddhist attack were among those arrested. But so were some Buddhist leaders. The Buddhists called off weekend demonstrations while appraising the new situation. But nothing in the change in military authority promises satisfaction to the Buddhist politicians. Indeed, nothing is likely to satisfy them except all-out Buddhist authority, possibly accompanied by a blood bath of Catholics.

The proclaimed goal of the "young generals" is to mediate religious and political differences, to achieve national unity and to "annihilate the Communists." The junta has power. Its leader is Brig. Gen. Nguyen Chanh Thi, commander of the 1st Army Corps, and it includes Air Force Commander Brig. Gen. Nguyen Cao Ky, Marine Corps Commander Brig. Gen. Le Nguyen Khang and 4th Army Corps Commander Brig. Gen. Nguyen Van Thieu. But these are only unfamiliar names to the Vietnamese people who help or join the Vietcong, either because they want to or are afraid not to. They have no popular following among people so drained by years of war that they want peace above all and care nothing about the ideological beliefs of their rulers.

It is absurd for the U.S. diplomats to hint that aid will be cut off from the South Vietnamese Government because some generals have usurped the power earlier usurped by other generals. The Johnson administration cannot any longer postpone a decision. If it has no plan which has a hope of defeating the Vietcong, and only intends to hang on, it must continue to aid whatever batch of generals or politicians is on top at the moment. The alternatives are to strengthen American forces and do more of the fighting for the South Vietnamese, or to get out. It is President Johnson's move.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Congressional Record an editorial published in the St. Louis Post Dispatch of December 27, 1964, entitled "What Kind of Regime?" It is a very keen analysis of the corrupt regime that prevails in South Vietnam.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

What Kind of Regime?

A news dispatch from the Far East the other day raised the question of whether the United States is justified in insisting on a civilian government in South Vietnam in view of the fact that Asians generally are not politically mature enough to fulfill all the demands of democracy.

It was pointed out that parliamentary democracy works in India, Japan, the Philippines, Malaysia, and Ceylon, all of which, excepting Japan, had long experience with Western teaching. Japan developed independently. But of the others, mainland China, North Korea and North Vietnam are Communist controlled, and there are military regimes in South Korea, Thailand, Burma, and Pakistan. Formosa, Indonesia, Laos, and Cambodia have outward democratic forms, but are authoritarian.

It is certainly true that self-rule is an advanced concept, outside the frame of reference of many Asians. Democracy is expensive, and it connotes an informed and politically alert population. But the fact that it is difficult of attainment is no reason why it should not be urged universally by the United States. The United States may often have to settle for less, but it should not be in the business of advocating less.

The United States is right in demanding a civilian regime in Saigon as a condition of support. The reason is that the civilian government, which was cut to pieces a week ago by a group of young military officers, was reasonably representative of the population and was struggling to solidify itself. The United States must be interested in the welfare of the people of a country, rather than their rulers. We have too often made the mistake of supporting dictatorships, military and otherwise.

The excuse is made that Saigon is engaged in a guerrilla war, and needs military direction. But military interests were adequately represented in the duly constituted government of Premier Tran Van Huong. The overall policy direction of the civil war, as well as the negotiations for the eventual peace, should be in the hands of civilians.

There is also a practical reason why the United States should not support the military clique that seems to be dominant in Saigon at the moment. Its leadership is likely to be transitory, and there is no evidence that the military can do better than the civilians. The dictatorial Diem regime was overthrown 2 years ago by the military. The soldiers failed to establish a viable government. There have been six upheavals in the last 14 months. One of the regimes that went under was headed by Lt. Gen. Nguyen Khanh, who was highly regarded by the United States: He is still chief of the armed forces, but he failed to attract popular support as Premier.

So those who advocate a military regime for Saigon ask for what has already proved a failure, and more than once. And they ask the United States to desert principles for expediency. We cannot and should not dictate the form of another country's government, but we can and should encourage governments that are responsive to the will of the people.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the Congressional Record an article from the New York Journal-American of December 29, 1964, entitled "We've Had It."

It covers not only the views of the editor on the South Vietnam subject, but also his views on our shameful policies in giving further support to Nasser in Egypt, as well as the views of the editor in regard to the assessment crisis in the United Nations.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

We've Had It

Because we've been a nation of even temper, controlled strength and persistent peaceful purpose, we've endured for years a vicious kicking around. Our patience and generosity have misled certain high-handed and low-minded adversaries into the blunder of regarding us a namby-pamby, wishy-washy, faltering paper tiger.

There are indications in Washington at long, long last we're near the turning point.

It's time to get tough. Being tough doesn't mean being rough. It means that enough is enough. We're fed up. We've had it.

Frustrated by our insistence on a civilian government if our cooperation is to continue, General Khanh who yearns to be South Vietnam's military overlord with his army in full charge, suggests the Yankee pack up and go home. Leaving Vietnam may not be a bad idea. But not to go home, which would be to abandon southeast Asia.

We are not there to take care of South Vietnam but to stop communism.

We can move over a bit to friendly stable Thailand and its fine American-trained Air Force, fine airfields and deep-rooted concern over possible Communist aggression. Thailand is a nation of proud independence. Thailand would be a convenient replacement for our South Vietnam futility. We could even continue providing Saigon with some arms, fuel and economic aid and let Khanh and his stripe squirm in their barrel of worms.

We have squandered millions on aid to Egypt and Algeria.

These ingrates lead the malicious chorus of vituperation over our part in rescuing hundreds of beleaguered people from the murderous savagery of the Congolese rebels.

Our Embassy library in Cairo is burned. President Nasser rejects our protest against the wanton killing of two civilians in an unarmed commercial American plane. He brags of sending arms to the Congo rebels, and when we object in the U.N. he accuses us of "interfering" with Egypt's foreign and domestic policies.

OK—let us cease interfering completely.

A few years ago we saved this crummy dictator's neck by interfering—on his side—when our good and old friends, Great Britain and France, decided to take over the Suez Canal.

We badly ruffled our allies' feelings, but did we get any credit or thanks from or make a friend of Nasser? No, indeed.

As a matter of fact were it not for the stubbornness of John Foster Dulles, we would have sunk heaven knows how many of the American taxpayers' dollars into the Aswan Dam. Dulles in effect said "not for or by a dam site."

So let's leave Nasser alone, as he demands. We can, and should cut off economic aid to him.

Let Nasser turn to the Congolese rebels for his food supply.

And the same goes for Algeria and other nations whose dictators play the same game.

Russia owes the United Nations $52.6 millions toward the cost of the Congo and Middle East peacekeeping operations.

She has owed it more than 2 years.

Moscow has refused to pay. A compromise, face-saving for Russia, has been proposed, involving a special fund to which Russia could contribute. We are willing to go along with the arrangement, which Russia continues to spurn.

Article 19 of the U.N. Charter says a member more than 2 years delinquent in payments is to be deprived of its Assembly vote. We didn't write the book. But we subscribed to it. Russia subscribed to it.

It's time to cut out the dillydallying and go by the book. No rubles, no representation. In plain English, put up or shut up.

And if the U.N. Assembly does not stand by this, then, of course, should we continue to pay our share?

The Hearst newspapers long have advocated a harder line in our foreign policy. It's time to take an unyielding stand toward our adversaries and our make-believe friends. Its the American way to be enduring, to suffer even continuing frustrations in our hope of eventual restoration of reason over madness. But the limit has been reached.

Its time now to be tough. Its time for a new broom to sweep clean. Let that be our resolution for the new year.

THE FLOOD DISASTERS IN THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the great calamity which has struck the west coast.

Tomorrow, the Members of the Oregon congressional delegation in both Houses will introduce in each House the first of what may probably be a series of bills seeking to use the services of the Federal Government and the appropriations of the Federal Government to alleviate, to the extent that it is possible under the law, the great human suffering and heavy losses that the people of the west coast have suffered in the recent past.

The hour is late, and I shall be discussing this subject matter at other times in the Senate as we take up necessary legislation. But there are a few points I wish to make hurriedly.

First, let me express my thanks and my commendation to the Governor of the State of Oregon—Mark O. Hatfield—for the diligence and dedicated public service he has rendered to the people of my State during these days of travail in Oregon.

Under existing law, as Senators know, the first responsibility when a disaster strikes a State rests upon the shoulders of the Governor, to determine the extent of the disaster and to determine whether it is of such proportions that it meets the criteria necessary to declare an area a disaster area, and then to issue a proclamation to that effect and notify the Federal Government.

Immediately upon the breaking of this terrible and horrible tragedy upon the people of not only my State but also parts of the States of Washington, California, and Idaho, the Governor of Oregon reached me by telephone and described the situation and stated that he would remain in frequent contact with me in my position as head of the Oregon delegation, and would keep me advised and the other Members of the delegation—through me—advised, as to the tragedy and its extent.

He did that. I, of course, in turn, on behalf of myself and members of the Oregon delegation, pledged to the Governor that we would do everything we could to be of maximum assistance to him and to the people of my State.

The Governor declared the State a disaster area under the requirement of the law, and transmitted the proclamation to Washington. We assisted in having it processed in less than 2 hours, because the Federal officials had already been aware of the situation in Oregon and had sent Federal officials into the State and knew whereof the Governor spoke.

The declaration was approved at the administrative level and then rushed by plane to Johnson City for the consideration of the President of the United States. It was only a matter of formality, for the President had already fully informed himself in regard to the crisis and had signed the Federal order immediately. Since that signing, the area has been a disaster area, including also parts of Washington, California, and Idaho.

This afternoon, I have not recited the extent of the losses, the damage and the suffering, except to say that this tragedy has been unequaled in the history of my State. Oregon has had nothing like it in all its history. That is because of a combination of natural circumstances—often described as resulting in "acts of God" which produced this terrible flood—that we had a long, hard freeze, which is not common in our State. Many Senators know that the Willamette Valley, where the greatest loss occurred—although it spread, too, into many other parts of the State—is an area that seldom gets snow in the winter. The ground is seldom frozen. The pastures are used the year around. We have heavy rains, but the freeze that occurred—and it was a hard freeze—made the ground so hard that the water could not be absorbed into the ground and it just flowed off. It was followed by a very heavy snow in the mountains.

Then, more bad luck was added by what we call a Chinook rain or thaw immediately following. A Chinook rain or thaw—an old Indian term—is a very sudden rise in temperature bringing warm rain which melts the snow at a rapid rate and develops flood.

The waters of part of the Willamette Valley at times were 12 feet above flood crest. Later, I shall discuss the great benefits that the people of our State enjoyed in these days of tragedy as the result of existing public works developments in the form of dams built by the Army Engineers, and dams and reclamation projects built by the Bureau of Reclamation.

My hometown of Eugene was very fortunate. Some loss occurred there, of course. But compared with other parts of my State, the loss in Eugene was de minimus. That was because the dams which had been built in that area of the Willamette River were sufficient to hold back the water so that the Willamette River did not overflow its banks to the degree it overflowed them farther down.

The capital city of my State, Salem, and the surrounding area, suffered great losses. The last report I had was that 27 major bridges had been washed out. For days, every major highway in the State was closed. Road damage rose to unbelievable proportions. A good many of our lumber mills—the main source of employment in my State—are located on or near river banks and a good many of those mills were washed out. Access roads to commercial timber stands were also destroyed.

I shall insert in the RECORD and discuss in the days to come the evidence which is being supplied me daily, as to what this flood has done to the economic life of my State from the standpoint of employment alone, due to the damage that the lumber industry has suffered.

Thus, I could go on and point out the great damage to houses—houses washed away, houses ruined, livestock losses which were tremendous; but the country knows and the Senate knows whereof I speak.

The Oregon delegation, along with the Washington, California, and Idaho delegations, are all deeply concerned over the great losses which were sustained from this terrible tragedy.

Tonight, we are all greatly concerned because the reports that we have been receiving during the day indicate another flood stage is developing. There is great concern that there may be an additional major tragedy, although the last report I had from Salem gave some hope that the waters might start receding in a matter of hours.

I know that the committees of the Congress are going to be anxious and willing to be of assistance; yet, as the senior Senator from my State and speaking in behalf of my junior colleague and also in behalf of my colleagues on the House side, both Democrats and Republicans, I can say tonight that speed and time are of the essence in this matter. The matter of emergency assistance which is being obtained under the emergency program is going forward at a rapid rate. I have not the slightest criticism about the highest of praise for the response of the Federal Government.

One could not have received more sympathetic and helpful cooperation from the President of the United States than the Oregon delegation has received in regard to this Pacific coast disaster. But the Congress has an obligation—and I know it will assume it—of proceeding with dispatch in passing whatever implementing legislation is necessary to make available Federal assistance to the people of my State and the other States involved. In a good many instances we shall have to make low-interest rate loans available to help rehabilitate the economy, to get men back to work, and to try to restore the economic damage that the State has suffered, and we will have to appropriate these funds promptly.

As I indicated heretofore, the December flood in the State of Oregon was one of the most devastating floods in its recorded history. The damage inflicted upon private and public property totaled hundreds of millions of dollars, and many lives were lost in the floodwaters. There were more than 20 lives lost in my State. The total loss of life in the whole area may reach 40.

Mr. President, Federal and State officials responded promptly with help in the flood-ravaged areas, and they are to be commended for the remarkably fine job they did under difficult and trying circumstances.

I repeat that I do not see how anyone could have done more in carrying out the duties of his office than the Governor of our State did. He and I agreed that I could be of the greatest assistance if I stayed on the Washington, D.C., end of the telephone line. I sent to Oregon my administrative assistant, Mr. Berg, and made available to the Government my executive assistant in Oregon, Mr. Charles Brooks.

I also made available to the Governor a very close associate of mine in public life in Oregon, Mr. Ed Spencer, the postmaster of the post office at Salem and the former State chairman of the Democratic Party. Governor Hatfield, Travis Cross, an assistant to the Governor, Warne Nunn, also an assistant, and the Governor's other associates extended every possible cooperation to my assistants as they worked together in connection with the governmental problems that were involved in the tragedy.

Much remains to be done before we can say that we have done everything humanly possible to help those who were the hardest hit by the flood. My colleague [Mrs. NEUBERGER] and I and the entire Oregon delegation in the House of Representatives are working intensively to ascertain the extent of additional funds required by Federal agencies to continue their programs to reduce the impact of the flood on Oregon's citizens and the public facilities of the State.

Today we issued a press release explaining the nature of our work in that respect. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the release be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> Members of the Oregon delegation in the Congress are surveying the entire range of Federal assistance programs available to the flood-stricken areas of Oregon to determine the amount of additional funds Government agencies will require to meet the staggering needs.
>
> In a joint statement today, Senators WAYNE MORSE and MAURINE NEUBERGER, Representatives EDITH GREEN, AL ULLMAN and ROBERT DUNCAN reported that conferences are being scheduled with the Bureau of the Budget and the President's Office of Emergency Planning.
>
> Detailed and expanded contacts are being made with all Federal agencies that could be of any assistance in extending aid to flood areas, including the Department of Interior, Department of Agriculture, Army Corps of Engineers, Small Business Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency, and others whose programs could be used to reduce the impact of the floods and storms on the lives and businesses of Oregon citizens.
>
> Delegation members are also working with the Federal agencies to determine what additional congressional authorization might be needed to speed and make more effective such agency programs in the flood-swept areas of the State. The members pledged that everything is being done and will be done to get all the Federal assistance possible for Oregon's flood areas.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the severity of the damage in Oregon warrants immediate study, not only by Federal agencies, but also by the Congress. Therefore, I cannot urge too strongly that an appropriate committee of the Senate send committee and staff members to the west coast to study the needs and make recommendations to the Congress concerning funds and additional legislative authorizations that will be required for reducing to some extent, the impact of this disaster in Oregon and a number of other Western States.

Mr. President, the entire Oregon congressional delegation is working on legislation designed to help our State in connection with this great disaster. When this legislation is introduced, it is our earnest hope that it will have prompt action in committee and in the Senate. The needs are great, and we are sure the Congress will respond.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate adjourn, under the order previously entered, until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 12 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Thursday, January 7, 1965, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 6, 1965:

THE JUDICIARY

Manuel L. Real, of California, to be U.S. attorney for the southern district of California for the term of 4 years. He was appointed during the recess of the Senate.

Department of Interior

John A. Carver, Jr., of Idaho, to be Under Secretary of the Interior, to which position he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Department of Commerce

John T. Connor, of New Jersey, to be Secretary of Commerce.

Federal Trade Commission

Mary Gardiner Jones, of New York, to be a Federal Trade Commissioner for the unexpired term of 7 years from September 26, 1959, to which office she was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Department of Internal Revenue

Sheldon S. Cohen, of Maryland, to be Commissioner of Internal Revenue, vice Mortimer M. Caplin, resigned.

Treasury Department

Mitchell Rogovin, of Virginia, to be an Assistant General Counsel in the Department of the Treasury (Chief Counsel for the Internal Revenue Service), vice Sheldon S. Cohen.

Frederick Lewis Deming, of Minnesota, to be Under Secretary of the Treasury for Monetary Affairs, vice Robert V. Roosa, resigned.

Veterans' Administration

W. J. Driver, of Virginia, to be Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Council of Economic Advisers

Arthur M. Okun, of Connecticut, to be a member of the Council of Economic Advisers, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress

The following-named persons to be members of the National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress, to which office they were appointed during the last recess of the Senate:

Benjamin Aaron, of California.
Joseph A. Beirne, of Maryland.
Daniel Bell, of New York.
Howard R. Bowen, of Iowa.
Patrick E. Haggerty, of Texas.
Albert J. Hayes, of Maryland.
Anna Rosenberg Hoffman, of New York.
Edwin H. Land, of Massachusetts.
Walter P. Reuther, of Michigan.
Robert H. Ryan, of Pennsylvania.
John I. Snyder, Jr., of New York.
Robert M. Solow, of Massachusetts.
Philip Sporn, of New York.
Whitney M. Young, Jr., of New York.

Diplomatic and Foreign Service

The following-named persons, who were appointed during the last recess of the Senate, to the offices indicated:

Ben H. Brown, Jr., of South Carolina, a Foreign Service officer of class one, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Liberia.

William A. Crawford, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of class one, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Rumania.

The following-named persons, who were appointed during the last recess of the Senate, to the offices indicated:

Ralph A. Dungan, of Pennsylvania, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Chile.

William H. Sullivan, of Rhode Island, a Foreign Service officer of class one, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Laos.

The following-named persons, who were appointed during the last recess of the Senate, to the offices indicated:

Now Foreign Service officers of class two and secretaries in the diplomatic service, to be also consuls general of the United States of America:

Antonio Certosimo, of Arizona.
Philip H. Chadbourn, Jr., of California.
William B. Connett, Jr., of New Jersey.
Livingston D. Watrous, of Massachusetts.

Now Foreign Service officers of class three and secretaries in the diplomatic service, to be also consuls general of the United States of America:

Frank C. Carlucci, of Pennsylvania.
Charles Gilbert, of Florida.
John L. Hagan, of the District of Columbia.

For appointment as Foreign Service officers of class three, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

John P. Condon, of Oklahoma.
Herbert G. Ihrig, Jr., of Washington.

For appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 7, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Lee S. Bigelow, of Texas.
Henry Clay Black II, of Illinois.
Edmund T. DeJarnette, Jr., of Virginia.
Denis Lamb, of New York.
George H. Lane, of Illinois.
Michael J. Mercurio, of Ohio.
Ned E. Morris, of Tennessee.
Geoffrey Ogden, of California.
Alan D. Romberg, of New York.
Charles B. Salmon, Jr., of New York.
David S. Wilson, of California.

For appointment as Foreign service officers of class 8, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Edward James Alexander, of Colorado.
George T. Basil, of New York.
David E. Brown, of Pennsylvania.
Miss Patricia L. Guyer, of California.
Richard J. Harrington, of California.
John J. Hurley, Jr., of Massachusetts.
Frank P. Kelly, of New Jersey.
John H. Kelly, of Virginia.
Thomas J. O'Flaherty, of New York.
Roger E. Sack, of New York.
Miss Eleanor Wallace Savage, of California.
Robert D. Simon, of New York.
Miss Elizabeth R. Thurston, of Indiana.
William D. Wade, of Massachusetts.

Foreign Service Reserve officers to be consuls of the United States of America:

Fentress Gardner, of Virginia.
Anthony J. Gentile, of Ohio.
Daniel M. Kennedy, of Massachusetts.
S. Richard Rand, of Florida.
Edward L. Robinson, of Illinois.
Robert A. Rockweiler, of Wisconsin.

Foreign Service Reserve officers to be vice consuls of the United States of America:

Jerry J. Allinson, of New York.
Walter C. d'Andrade, of Massachusetts.
Vernon J. Goertz, Jr., of Virginia.
Michael A. Kristula, of California.
Edward H. Schulick, of New Jersey.

Foreign Service Reserve officers to be secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

William H. Brubeck, of Virginia .
Philip Cherry, of Pennsylvania.
Edwin P. Earnest, of Maryland.
John C. Erskine, of Maryland.
Fred C. Fischer, of Virginia.
John F. Gilhooly, of Connecticut.
John G. Gloster, of Maryland.
John Heilman, of Pennsylvania.
William C. Ide, of Virginia.
Kenneth L. Mayall, of Washington.
Adger E. Player, of Colorado.
Charles L. Stermer, of Illinois.
Donald H. Winters, of Ohio.

Foreign Service staff officers to be consuls of the United States of America:

Miss Mary Willis McKenzie, of Virginia.
Miss Eleanor R. Paulson, of Washington.
Victor D. Russillo, of Rhode Island.
Miss Ruth E. Wagner, of the District of Columbia.

Defense Department

Paul R. Ignatius, of Massachusetts, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, 26A (major general Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force, to be placed on the retired list in the grade of general, effective February 1, 1965, under the provisions of section 8962, title 10 of the United States Code.

Gen. John P. McConnell, 611A (major general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force, for appointment as Chief of Staff, U.S. Air Force, for a period of 2 years beginning February 1, 1965, under the provisions of section 8034, title 10 of the United States Code.

In the Air Force

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Air Force, under the appropriate provisions of chapter 835, title 10, United States Code, as amended. All officers are subject to physical examination required by law.

Line of the Air Force

Captain to major

Aaron, Doyce L., 43736A.
Aaronson, Allan E., 53023A.
Abel, Charles R., 50692A.
Abernathy, Robert L., 44035A.
Abraham, James G., 49469A.
Ackfeld, Virgil F., 44487A.
Adams, Glenn D., 44458A.
Adams, Robert E., 49347A.
Adams, Vincent O., Jr., 26720A.
Addor, Henry S., 44207A.
Adelson, Stanley M., 49500A.
Agosta, Howard A., 43926A.
Agosta, Joseph J., 50716A.
Ailes, Richard H., 44400A.
Ainslie, Wilbur R., 44070A.
Akins, George D., Jr., 27787A.
Albrecht, Walter H., 20463A.
Aldrin, Edwin E., Jr., 22091A.
Alexander, Sigmund, 51140A.
Alexander, William T., 24477A.
Alfano, Mario A., 50506A.
Allard, Joseph A., 25894A.
Allen, Gordon J., 25598A.
Allen, John E., 22092A.
Allen, Marion S., 44371A.
Allen, William E., 28373A.
Allison, Clifford, Jr., 50551A.
Allison, Jack G., 24565A.
Allison, John M., 43810A.
Allison, John V., 28301A.
Allison, William B., 44502A.
Allred, John P., 24583A.
Allred, Laurence L., 50546A.
Alongi, Frederick F., 53075A.
Amado, Frank B., Jr., 50561A.
Ames, Henry P., Jr., 24249A.
Andersen, Robert N., 53054A.
Andersen, Roger E., 43856A.
Anderson, Charles D., 22445A.
Anderson, Edwin P., Jr., 43878A.
Anderson, Jesse J., 25564A.
Anderson, Loren A., 22094A.
Anderson, Paul R., 53001A.
Anderson, Robert L., 25921A.
Andres, Donald L., 44227A.
Andrews, William, 49534A.
Andrichak, John J., 28299A.
Anthony, Thomas P., 51233A.
Appleby, Phillip E., 24842A.
Apter, Ethel E., 44471W.
Archuleta, Harry M., 25577A.
Areen, Frank M., 28417A.
Arey, David, 44314A.
Armbruster, Owen R., 43769A.

Armstrong, Dwight F., 43883A.
Arrowood, William J., 44150A.
Artz, Robert B., 22918A.
Ash, John R., 52977A.
Askew, Arthur N., 44228A.
Astrella, Ralph J., 24609A.
Atkins, James G., 52950A.
Atkisson, Robert M., 44274A.
Atwood, Robert L., 77558A.
Aubry, George, Jr., 49470A.
Augsburger, Willi E., 26919A.
Augustine, Charles A., 43819A.
Austin, John W., 44453A.
Avinger, Isaac E., 64849A.
Avlakeotes, Atha, 52960A.
Ayala, John S., 52979A.
Babbitt, Louie A., 52955A.
Babcock, Earl L., 22536A.
Bacon, Walter J., II, 22096A.
Baer, Allan R., 49447A.
Bagby, Joseph L., 43790A.
Bailey, Burt S., 23048A.
Baird, Weldon R., 22098A.
Baird, Willet J., Jr., 22099A.
Baker, Albert R., 25906A.
Baker, Coleman L., 44085A.
Baker, Henry F., 44426A.
Baker, John W., 22930A.
Baker, Joseph H., Jr., 64818A.
Baker, Kenneth G., 25933A.
Baker, Robert L., 43917A.
Baldwin, Robert C., 28408A.
Ballard, John G., Jr., 22101A.
Baltz, Dickey L., 22100A.
Baltzell, Leonard E., 25582A.
Banfield, Thomas V., 43005A.
Banks, William O., 22102A.
Baptiste, Joseph C., 49425A.
Barber, Bruce H., 44007A.
Bardnell, Edward E., 44447A.
Barker, Kendall S., 44322A.
Barker, Stewart G., 52841A.
Barnes, Daniel S., 22103A.
Barnes, Jack L., 23125A.
Barnes, John F., 43697A.
Barnes, Oswald E., 44049A.
Barnes, Rodman W., 50454A.
Barnes, Warren S., 21773A.
Barnes, William C., 27009A.
Barr, Robert H., 44333A.
Barrett, Joseph M., 42808A.
Barrett, Ralph W., 44517A.
Barrett, William R., 50768A.
Barry, William D., 43784A.
Bartholoma, John H., 44302A.
Bartolich, Eugene, 23111A.
Barwin, Richard O., 23126A.
Bass, Thomas C., 50529A.
Baulch, Henry L., 22106A.
Baumgardner, Budd E., 44270A.
Bayly, Arthur M., 44104A.
Bazley, Robert W., 27018A.
Beardslee, Thomas J., 50754A.
Beasley, Ewell M., 49382A.
Beatie, Billingsley, 27003A.
Beatty, Bernard L., 44078A.
Bebout, Charles W., 53005A.
Beckwith, Bicknel K., 51168A.
Beebe, Wallace E., 44174A.
Beery, Rhoderick J., 44355A.
Beitsch, Donald E., 43928A.
Belew, Ruby C., 43989W.
Belinski, Edward J., 21721A.
Bender, Jack N., 49433A.
Bendorf, Harry H., 43975A.
Benefield, Bruce S., 43733A.
Benham, Joseph S., 53003A.
Benjovsky, Victor C., 22109A.
Benn, Bohden, 49434A.
Bennett, Donald W., 26412A.
Bennett, Frank E., 22435A.
Bennett, John H., 23139A.
Bennett, William B., 44141A.
Bennington, J. T., 26547A.
Bennink, William H., 50761A.
Benson, John J., 49489A.
Bento, William L., 51217A.
Bepko, Stephen J., 44015A.
Beranek, Orville J., 44101A.
Berdoy, Ronald A., 44497A.
Berg, Wallace S., 50507A.
Berga, John O., 22110A.
Bergeron, Paul E., 28412A.
Berher, Joseph J., 42837A.
Berndt, Harley E., 64837A.
Bernich, Kirby A., 43939A.
Berrie, William M., 49417A.
Berry, Eugene, 44518A.
Berry, Schuyle P., Jr., 22893A.
Bialas, Howard S., 28256A
Bielefeldt, Vilas L., 51148A.
Bienert, Albert R., 52934A.
Bierman, Casper S., 49457A.
Biggers, Edgar W., Jr., 51232A.
Biggs, Walter J., Jr., 43879A.
Billingslea, Clem D., 22113A.
Binderim, Robert C., 43742A.
Binkin, Martin, 53058A.
Birch, Paul R., 22114A.
Bird, John F., 44411A.
Bischofs, Hans, 51237A.
Bishop, Arthur F., 25914A.
Bishop, Norman C., 51134A.
Bissette, John H., 42401A.
Bittinger, Dale A., 26725A.
Bjorklund, Robert H., 42305A.
Black, Harold H., 20504A.
Blackbird, David P., 27779A.
Blackburn, Robert M., 52935A.
Blackmon, Leon A., 26920A.
Blaisdell, Morton C., 26946A.
Blakemore, Malcolm, 51229A.
Blan, Kennith W., 28391A.
Blanchard, Robert G., 22925A.
Blanchard, Robert L., 44399A.
Blankenship, Bill F., 50508A.
Blankinship, Albert B., 50721A.
Blincow, Dean R., 49357A.
Blinkinsop, Paul H., 44154A.
Block, Gerald A., 44093A.
Block, Robert L., 27751A.
Blodgett, Donald D., 49520A.
Bloom, William M., 49383A.
Bloomfield, George A., Jr., 25896A.
Blume, George D., 26557A.
Boatright, William J., 51151A.
Bobbitt, William M., 44428W.
Bogle, Chester V., Jr., 26545A.
Bohe, Edward E., 43699A.
Bohinc, Samuel H., 43833A.
Bolado, Victor H., 50711A.
Boldi, George, 44209A.
Boles, Thomas W., 50755A.
Bollinger, Russell W., 41750A.
Bollman, William J., 52949A.
Bonczek, Roman J., Jr., 43817A.
Bond, Jack D., 26583A.
Bonnell, John H., 27783A.
Bonner, William F., 52958A.
Bonsac, Francis L., Jr., 44215A.
Bonsac, John W., 43834A.
Bookout, Bertram E., Jr., 44417A.
Booth, Harry J., 66001A.
Bores, James J., 64628A.
Borgeson, Marvin A., 50683A.
Borkowski, Edmond J., 50577A.
Borowski, Eugene C., 50623A.
Boswell, Samuel E., 53039A.
Bosworth, Alvin L., 43901A.
Bott, James F., 23603A.
Bounds, Robert S., 50585A.
Bowden, Jackson H., 22115A.
Bowe, Thomas M., 64761A.
Bowen, Clifford R., 50655A.
Bowen, Donald J., 26986A.
Bowlin, Robert A., 44124A.
Bowman, Howard L., 50612A.
Bowman, Lloyd D., Jr., 44519A.
Box, George B., 28255A.
Boyd, John R., 43985A.
Boyd, Robert F., 43666A.
Boyer, Wallace R., 26960A.
Boyle, James M., 24861A.
Brackett, Wentworth, 49378A.
Bradford, John A., 49458A.
Bradley, Andrew J., 44155A.
Brady, John D., 49550A.
Braly, Harold C., 27738A.
Brame, Horace L., 22116A.
Branch, Robert L., 64699A.
Brandom, Thomas M., Jr., 24482A.
Brandt, John S., 44498A.
Brandy, Donald H., 53057A.
Brantley, Arnim L., 22117A.
Breazeale, Paul C., 51178A.
Breden, Ralph E., 44152A.
Breeding, Kenneth W., 50757A.
Breithaupt, Charles E., 44401A.
Brennan, Eugene A., 43815A.
Brennan, James C., Jr., 51250A.
Brennen, Harold J., 44425A.
Bretzke, Lou E., 22120A.
Brewer, Andrew C., 49379A.
Brewer, Donald A., 22121A.
Bridges, Garland D., Jr., 51220A.
Bridgford, Lloyd R., 64767A.
Briggs, James E., 27027A.
Briggs, Morris F., 44001A.
Briley, James R., 24239A.
Brinson, James K., 64772A.
Brockmeyer, William D., 26990A.
Brode, Ross B., 42971A.
Brooks, Barnet E., Jr., 49471A.
Broome, Lees, 43778A.
Broussard, James H., 21826A.
Brown, Allan L., 21905A.
Brown, Chester L., 44476A.
Brown, Donald D., 25590A.
Brown, Jack N., 50490A.
Brown, James L., 27554A.
Brown, James R., 22124A.
Brown, James S., 52938A.
Brown, Jasper C., 44481A.
Brown, John D., 50722A.
Brown, Julius W., Jr., 25585A.
Brown, Larry F., 24859A.
Brown, Norma E., 26589W.
Brown, Ogden, Jr., 26562A.
Brown, Robert E., 44275A.
Brown, William E., Jr., 51159A.
Brown, William E., Jr., 23193A.
Brown, William R., 20890A.
Brown, William S., Jr., 51207A.
Brownfield, Harold H., 44077A.
Browning, Howard J., 22473A.
Browning, John W., 44455A.
Brumbeloe, James T., 26961A.
Bruton, Albert T., 49545A.
Bryan, William A., Jr., 44381A.
Bryant, Edward H., Jr., 43914A.
Bryant, William P., 44520A.
Bryniarski, Al F., Jr., 43935A.
Bucher, Tilman K., 43937A.
Buckio, Frank L., Jr., 49319A.
Budd, Roger, Jr., 43634A.
Budner, John R., 44503A.
Buehler, James W., 49369A.
Buettgenbach, Max A., 50597A.
Buffington, Le C., Jr., 22126A.
Buhler, Theodore W., 50709A.
Bull, Herbert R., 43912A.
Bunker, Herbert, Jr., 26858A.
Burch, Donald J., 50720A.
Burch, John R., 44278A.
Burgess, George M., 22417A.
Burgy, William P., 52783A.
Burkardt, Edward A., 24097A.
Burke, Robert F., 51175A.
Burkett, Howard R., 43691A.
Burkhart, Robert E., 23020A.
Burkley, Edward L., 43318A.
Burks, Tillman C., Jr., 64722A.
Burnett, James R., 43933A.
Burns, John W., 64779A.
Burns, Robert L., 50659A.
Burnsed, Edward A., 49389A.
Burrell, Francis A., 44398A.
Burri, Raymond A., 50440A.
Burtt, Stuart E., 26719A.
Burwell, William D., 44536A.
Buschman, Glen W., 49415A.
Bush, David A., 44136A.
Bush, Harry L., 50605A.
Bush, James O., 49517A.
Bush, William H., 26575A.
Bushey, Warren E., 43981A.
Buss, Robert H., 43868A.
Bussell, Henry C., 50730A.
Butler, Paul A., 26405A.
Butts, Duncan R., 28406A.
Butz, William J., 44306A.
Byer, Harry J., 44382A.
Bynum, Paul H., 26973A.

Byrne, John J., 51248A.
Cabaniss, Robert J., 43866A.
Cadwell, Harry B., 28365A.
Cady, Robert P., 22883A.
Cagle, James D., 44139A.
Cahoon, Jack, Jr., 27753A.
Caldwell, Alonza L., 28383A.
Callahan, Drury, 44482A.
Callander, Bertha K., 50514W.
Callen, Lonnie E., 53047A.
Cameron, Raymond C., 44315A.
Cameron, Robert L., 44116A.
Cameron, Thomas B., Jr., 44239A.
Campbell, Charles R., 23039A.
Campbell, Don L., 28418A.
Campbell, Robert T., 44543A.
Campbell, Will C., Jr., 44540A.
Campbell, William H., 49337A.
Cannon, Lawrence F., 53036A.
Canon, Gustave A., 50541A.
Cantrell, George K., 43783A.
Cantrell, John B., 51161A.
Capers, William T., III, 22866A.
Caple, John W., 44117A.
Capstraw, Robert J., 50599A.
Caraher, Richard R., 50670A.
Carcich, Marvin J., 28409A.
Cardwell, Max D., 49435A.
Cardwell, Thoma J. M., 50724A.
Carell, William A., 50446A.
Carey, John B., 44243A.
Carlson, Howard F., 50465A.
Carman, Kenneth R., 51176A.
Carnahan, Kenneth R., 44201A.
Carnathan, Herbert G., 51238A.
Carr, William E., 22470A.
Carter, Robert D., 22525A.
Carus, Glenn A., 44483A.
Caruso, Charles P., 21822A.
Casaus, Jesse, 44433A.
Casey, James M., 44003A.
Cass, Robert L., 44393A.
Cassinotti, Jo M., Jr., 44521A.
Castellina Valentine, 44164A.
Casterlin, Har B., Jr., 44254A.
Castleman, Stanley A., 26551A.
Catlin, Frank S., 43799A.
Catlin, John E., Jr., 22510A.
Caudle, Ralph E., 27713A.
Caudle, Ted W., 43987A.
Caulfield, Patrick H., 25901A.
Cerny, Joseph P., 27784A.
Chabbott, George H., 27767A.
Chag, Steve S., 44023A.
Chambers, Cant P., Jr., 44317A.
Chamness, Benjamin H., Jr., 43965A.
Chaney, Hubert E., 44144A.
Chaney, Lester E., 43416A.
Chapman, D. L., 64870A.
Chapman, Henry A., 26588A.
Chapman, John H., 50691A.
Chapman, Ray E., 44279A.
Charette, Franklin M., 25601A.
Chatfield, Ric C., Jr., 43209A.
Chatfield, William E., 27732A.
Chatham, Roy J., 49493A.
Chellman, Chester E., Jr., 27001A.
Chesney, Michael T., 64812A.
Chester, Louie B., 52931A.
Chestnut, Johnny C., 64741A.
Chevrier, John A., 51246A.
Chick, Robert L., Jr., 43916A.
Childers, William L., 26935A.
Christner, Wallace G., 22132A.
Christofferson, D. D., 43882A.
Church, Harold N., 44169A.
Church, Joe L., 22524A.
Churchill, Richard M., 43994A.
Cima, Anthony P., Jr., 49341A.
Cisco, Guy C., Jr., 21747A.
Clance, James R., 50509A.
Clanton, Charles C., Jr., 43902A.
Clapsaddle, Charles H., 64728A.
Clark, Donald L., 53020A.
Clark, Edward P., 22134A.
Clark, Ray E., 64712A.
Cleary, Edward G., Jr., 53076A.
Cleland, Paul S., Jr., 44364A.
Clelland, Donald M., 50746A.
Clem, William J., 44115A.
Clement, Harold R., 43734A.
Clement, Jack D., 26948A.
Click, Allen R., 50592A.
Cline, Theodore, Jr., 44405A.
Clontz, Charles B., 51165A.
Clouse, Leland F., 43417A.
Coady, John S., Jr., 26991A.
Coats, J. C., 43980A.
Cobb, William J., 52995A.
Coblenz, Jack G., 50693A.
Cochran, Samuel W., 49342A.
Cochrane, Albert C., Jr., 53029A.
Codding, Ray E., 28343A.
Coen, Charles J., 64709A.
Coffee, Kenneth H., 22889A.
Cogburn, John B., 49363A.
Coggin, Billy B., 53063A.
Cole, Arthur S., 25563A.
Cole, Donald C., 22136A.
Cole, Donald K., 22137A.
Cole, Raymond E., 51204A.
Cole, Richard R., 43955A.
Coley, Ray H., 52943A.
Collins, Earl J., 23051A.
Collins, Harry R., 25342A.
Collins, Kriebel N., 50545A.
Colson, James E., 44369A.
Combs, Chalmer J., 52991A.
Comerford, John R., Jr., 44097A.
Compton, Laurence B., 50472A.
Cone, Lafayette W., 43692A.
Cone, Ralph A., 44016A.
Conine, William B., 25900A.
Conley, Kenneth H., 50496A.
Conlin, Thomas P., 22139A.
Connolly, John M., Jr., 50487A.
Connor, Gerald B., 22140A.
Connor, Vernon L., 22541A.
Connors, Donald F., 43970A.
Conrad, David M., 25919A.
Conti, Julius R., Jr., 22141A.
Convey, John P., Jr., 26544A.
Cook, Charles W., 44445A.
Cook, Daniel E., 26540A.
Cook, David L., 51215A.
Cook, James A., 44233A.
Cooke, Gerald E., 25560A.
Cooney, Lloyd I., 24531A.
Cooper, James P., 53068A.
Cooper, Leland J., 64867A.
Copas, Charles B., 50510A.
Cope, Robert C., 49459A.
Corbitt, Gilland W., 28361A.
Corcoran, Daniel G., 50613A.
Corea, Dominick J., 50742A.
Corey, Michael L., 44036A.
Corkery, Eugene F., 44180A.
Cornetti, Robert A., 28386A.
Correll, Paul P., 50588A.
Corrigan, Patrick J., 22146A.
Corrigan, Robert C., 24821A.
Cotton, James P., 49404A.
Counce, James M., 43770A.
Courtney, Clifford E., 23599A.
Couture, Ernest P., 50745A.
Coville, Alan, 27000A.
Cowan, Arista H., III, 28401A.
Cowan, Gordon E., 50598A.
Cowart, George B., Jr., 49407A.
Cowne, Robert W., 27028A.
Cox, Billy F., 43893A.
Cox, Myron K., 269065A.
Coyner, Donald F., 49333A.
Craig, Edward P., Jr., 44156A.
Craigie, John H., 21147A.
Cramer, Dayton C., 50441A.
Crandall, Clifford S., 44118A.
Crandall, Robert V., 51141A.
Crane, George R., 50584A.
Crank, Dale F., 49343A.
Crawford, Arch M., Jr., 44098A.
Crawford, Lawrence V., 44465A.
Crawford, Robert R., 49400A.
Creekman, David B., 28381A.
Creswell, Boyce L., 51182A.
Crews, Alvan M., 22149A.
Croan, John W., 22150A.
Crocker, John C., 26980A.
Cromar, Jack J., 44360A.
Crooke, Jack O., 43791A.
Cross, Carl S., 41721A.
Cross, Robert R., 44437A.
Crouch, Solon R., 50728A.
Crow, Frederick A., Jr., 26569A.
Crowell, Schuyler T., 44034A.
Cruise, Joe N., 53070A.
Crum, Suzanne, 27785W.
Crume, William R., 44372A.
Crump, Enoch, 50756A.
Cullen, George E., Jr., 43722A.
Culp, Robert C., 50781A.
Cunneely, Eugene P., 28400A.
Cunningham, Joe C., 25859A.
Cunningham, John W., 22153A.
Cunningham, Orpha R., 44149A.
Custer, Gerald B., 25578A.
Cuthbertson, William H., 22154A.
Cuthill, Fred J., 64795A.
Cyr, Louis P., 44193A.
Czarnomski, Edward F., 49501A.
Dague, Jesse R., 43802A.
Dahl, Gerald R., 25565A.
Dahlberg, Carl A., Jr., 53012A.
Daigle, Edward A., 28405A.
Daily, Ralston B., 43898A.
Dale, William C., Jr., 49481A.
Daley, Robert F., 44370A.
Danforth, Gordon E., 22156A.
Danielson, Walter R., Jr., 22481A.
Danner, Bruce L., 25927A.
Darby, Charles M., 49385A.
Darby, John C., Jr., 44010A.
Darby, Robert J., 44300A.
Darlington, Arthur E., 50571A.
Darrow, Jack L., 44205A.
Datson, Burton T., 43967A.
Daube, Daniel C., 52987A
Davenport, David E., 27033A.
Davenport, Sterling E., 49498A.
David, Donald A., 44352A.
Davidson, Carl M., 51251A.
Davidson, Robert N., Jr., 64729A.
Davies, Benjamin W., Jr., 50537A.
Davis, Cecil, 24513A.
Davis, Charles T., 44053A.
Davis, Charlie B., Jr., 25580A.
Davis, John E., 50606A.
Davis, Paul M., 44365A.
Davis, Philip C., Jr., 22436A.
Davis, Thurman C., Jr., 44157A.
Day, Devon, 44073A.
Day, George E., 49555A.
Deans, David H., 50447A.
Dearmond, Robert C., 43952A.
Debelles, Ignazio R., 51216A.
Deem, Paul S., 49418A.
Dees, Robert W., 44466A.
Dejong, Robert V., 43749A.
Delancey, Harry W., 52946A.
Delcambre, Pierre L., 43951A.
Dellaripa, James M., 26591A.
Deloney, Thurmon L., 53028A.
Delvecchio, Henry J., 53032A.
Dempsey, William F., 44328A.
Denardo, Jack D., 44392A.
Dennard, Mack W., 44061A.
Denton, Tommy C. L., 49374A.
Desilets, John C. M., 22157A.
Dessauer, Christopher F., 44299A.
Deuschle, Francis J., 50590A.
Dewar, William N., Jr., 49531A.
Dibaggio, Anthony J., 64806A.
Dickens, Samuel T., 22158A.
Dickey, Guy E., 44002A.
Dickson, Gerald E., Jr., 22159A.
Diehl, Arthur F., Jr., 50533A.
Diener, William E., 44522A.
Dietrich, Burnell R., 43995A.
Diggs, William D., 49332A.
Dimalante, Thomas J., 64567A.
Dimmery, Hubert M., 43737A.
Dingman, Richard G., 22160A.
Dingus, Hubert R., 43941A.
Dingwell, Cyril H., 22447A.
Dinkins, William M., 437774A.
Dippold, Dennis R., 49508A.
Dirienz, John A., Jr., 49513A.
Dishon, Donald C., 26537A.
Divall, Robert H., 23915A.
Dix, Louis E., 52984A.
Dixon, Paul V., 55899A.
Dobbs, Maurice T., 27755A.
Dobek, Henry W., 49334A.

Dodge, Donald S., 50771A.
Dodge, Ward K., 43924A.
Dollard, Oakley J., 64784A.
Donaldson, Henry S., Jr., 43715A.
Donnelly, Joseph W., 44542A.
Donohue, William J., 24173A.
Doolittle, Harry B., 50558A.
Dorroh, William E., 64841A.
Doss, Thornton T., 27007A.
Dougherty, Charles B., 44203A.
Dougherty, William E., 49348A.
Doughty, Herbert H., 42181A.
Downer, Leo H., 43793A.
Dozier, Wayne M., 22161A.
Drake, Ernest E., 49529A.
Driessnack, Hans H., 21831A.
Druen, Walter D., Jr., 44484A.
Duc, Albert C., 43804A.
Ducharme, Robert R., 49386A.
Duer, Walter G., 44067A.
Dugan, Earl M., 64714A.
Dugger, Frank H., 49532A.
Duke, Charles B., Jr., 22163A.
Dukett, Harold W., 43250A.
Dula, Billy F., 43363A.
Dulaney, Dan E., 44423A.
Dulin, Billy J., 44478A.
Dunagan, Bobby J., 50614A.
Duncan, John H., Jr., 50493A.
Duncan, Kenneth W., 44092A.
Dunn, Creighton R., 26567A.
Duquette, Norman E., 50624A.
Durham, Leonard E., 44216A.
Duval, James D., Jr., 26953A.
Duval, Lawrence H., Jr., 50615A.
Dybvad, William R., 43925A.
Dye, Gerald J., 50500A.
Eberanz, Howard V., 44464A.
Eckles, Robert B., 51163A.
Eckrich, George W., Jr., 43992A.
Edgar, Gordon C., 44202A.
Egierd, Henry A., 50725A.
Eichbaum, Charles F., 43978A.
Eicher, Jacob M., 44499A.
Eidenire, John L., 53010A.
Ellanson, Robert C., 44255A.
Elliott, Robert C., 50697A.
Elliott, Stewart E., 50511A.
Ellis, Billy J., 22167A.
Ellis, John M., 64735A.
Elton, Calvin W., Jr., 44460A.
Emmert, Merle W., 23017A.
Emmons, Melvin B., 43863A.
Endsley, Leland C., 44062A.
Engelbrecht, Louis E., 43809A.
England, John K., Jr., 44461A.
Engle, Alan B., 44244A.
Engle, James C., 50640A.
English, Lysle R., 43379A.
English, Webster C., Jr., 26563A.
Enright, Joseph K., 24790A.
Enslen, Allen T., 24845A.
Entsminger, William L., 43803A.
Epperson, Lee M., 43806A.
Eppley, Lawren L., Jr., 22168A.
Erdman, Donald L., 64723A.
Erikson, Lester A., 45181A.
Erwin, Henry E., Jr., 50740A.
Esping, James E., 44541A.
Espy, Billy J., 43845A.
Etheridge, Travis R., 50625A.
Eubank, Richard A., 25916A.
Evans, Albert J., 43693A.
Evans, Clyde G., 26951A.
Evans, Douglas C., Sr., 50550A.
Evans, Harold M., 51177A.
Evans, Norman D., 43857A.
Evans, Quintin H., 50581A.
Evans, William L., Jr., 26415A.
Eveland, William A., 28392A.
Everett, Ronald H., 43762A.
Every, John E., 49375A.
Fabian, Gregory W., 64840A.
Fagan, James F., 21748A.
Fagan, William E., 50706A.
Fairburn, Edward H., Jr., 64708A.
Falvey, Joseph L., 49326A.
Farfel, Clifford A., 52940A.
Farley, Robert H., 50779A.
Farmer, Darrell, 44505A.
Farquhar, Arnold S., 53060A.
Farquhar, Hoyt Q., 44176A.
Farrell, Norman J., 51181A.
Farris, Harold D., 25589A.
Fass, Franklin R., 27765A.
Fatiuk, Michael, Jr., 24143A.
Faulds, Rodney D., 25599A.
Faulkner, Leroy, 50595A.
Faurot, William L., 49492A.
Fauteux, Charles A., 64733A.
Fay, James R., 28377A.
Fay, John V., Jr., 44273A.
Federle, Gordon I., 26521A.
Feero, Urban A., Jr. 24820A.
Fehlings, Donald M., 22908A.
Feiden, Richard S., 43822A.
Felker, Walter J., Jr., 44267A.
Fenell, Klas K., 44050A.
Fenn, James R., 51197A.
Ferguson, William C., 44473A.
Ferlmann, Herbert C., 43940A.
Fernandez, Edward J., 49360A.
Ferrara, Vincent L., 43707A.
Ferree, David F., 22170A.
Ferriell, Kendrick E., 44173A.
Fiebelkorn, John A., 22901A.
Fiedor, Rudolph E., 43890A.
Field, Burton M., 43894A.
Field, William H., 26523A.
Fierro, Lawrence R., 50553A.
Fillingim, Rob L., Jr., 64868A.
Fincher, Julian A., 50647A.
Finley, Charles J., 44066A.
Finney, Raymond M., 26550A.
Firebaugh, James R., Jr., 43962A.
Fischl, Frank R., Jr., 22171A.
Fisher, Victor G., 26906A.
Fisk, Delbert L., Jr., 50727A.
Fitch, William L., 64758A.
Flaherty, Warren F., 43990A.
Flanagan, Stephen M., 22877A.
Flanders, Fred J., 44506A.
Fleischman, Ralph E., 44037A.
Fletcher, Marshal H., 44260A.
Florio, Philip, Jr., 25594A.
Fluitt, Marvin L., 50776A.
Foldy, Mark S., 51198A.
Ford, Clarence W., 64811A.
Ford, Harry E., Jr., 49320A.
Ford, Jack, 53000A.
Ford, John, 64641A.
Forrey, William R., 43703A.
Forsythe, Fred W., Jr., 49494A.
Fortuna, Angelo L., 49426A.
Fosdick, James C., Jr., 49473A.
Foster, Hugh B., 26908A.
Foster, Robert E., 26994A.
Foster, Robert M., 43959A.
Fox, Arthur E., 23605A.
Fox, Galen C., 26414A.
Fox, George A., 50763A.
Fox, Roger P., 43835A.
Frailey, Richard L., 43929A.
Frame, Hubert V., 44470A.
Frank, Jack C., 51254A.
Franklin, Robert J., 43867A.
Franklin, Willard E., 44329A.
Franzen, Marvin H., 22897A.
Frasca, William H., 22174A.
Fraser, Edward C., Jr., 53033A.
Frazier, Edward H., 44188A.
Frazier, Frank D., 22487A.
Frazier, Robert B., 49510A.
Frederick, Walter H., Jr., 64693A.
Fredericks, Leslie L., 64803A.
Fremont, John C., 22448A.
Friday, Grady L., Jr., 53061A.
Friedman, Arnold, 26404A.
Frigeri, Peter G., 64827A.
Frink, John P., 28397A.
Frisch, Robert J., 50583A.
Froehlich, Emil, Jr., 43468A.
Fruge, Romain C., Jr., 44269A.
Fryauf, Donald F., 22522A.
Fulcher, Donald W., 44454A.
Fullerton, John R., 43903A.
Fulton, Thomas L., Jr., 43687A.
Fyock, Charles B., 49511A.
Gallaway, Stanley D., 51213A.
Gallenberger, Dar A., 28413A.
Gallion, John W., 44373A.
Gallogly, Inman G., 44208A.
Gamache, Albert C., Jr., 44432A.
Gamble, Thomas O., Jr., 44256A.
Gammon, Clay, 53044A.
Gant, George T., 64768A.
Gantt, Richard B., III, 44507A.
Garcia, Miguel A., 43777A.
Gardner, Arthur J., 28245A.
Gardner, Gayle B., 44366A.
Gardner, James L., Jr., 43743A.
Gardner, Laurence F., 26931A.
Gardner, Paul E., 49353A.
Garner, Joseph S., 28344A.
Garofalos, Nick, 64836A.
Garrett, Bill J., 50668A.
Garrett, Kenneth E., 44338A.
Garrison, Charles E., 24846A.
Garrison, Robert M., 50651A.
Garvey, Joseph P., 49371A.
Garvey, Thomas J., 44218A.
Gatz, Edward C., 50576A.
Gaudion, John J., 50732A.
Gavin, Frederick J., Jr., 28410A.
Gavin, Thomas J., 64810A.
Gaynor, Lee R., 50491A.
Gehrke, Edward F., 44079A.
Geier, Frederick P., 49366A.
Geiger, Richard F., 27745A.
Geisinger, Walter F., 49401A.
Gemmill, William B., 44325A.
Gentzel, Charles R., 53066A.
George, Harry E., Jr., 23043A.
George, James L., 52948A.
George, Konrad, 25930A.
Georgen, Larry R., 53026A.
Gerdau, Richard V., 24598A.
Germundson, Carl N., 49410A.
Gex, Louis J., 44109A.
Gibson, Doyle G., 44266A.
Gibson, William H., 23606A.
Giesen, Herman M., 22179A.
Giesler, Bryan E., 50548A.
Gilbert, Daniel F., 44280A.
Gilbert, Thomas M., Jr., 43877A.
Gilbreath, George C., 43764A.
Gillmour, Louis B., Jr., 49330A.
Gimble, Billie, 49444A.
Gindrat, Norman R., Jr., 44303A.
Giordano, Bruno A., 22181A.
Giovannini, Max, 64842A.
Gipson, Carl R., 50538A.
Gipson, John B., 50710A.
Gleason, Leonard E., 53078A.
Gleason, William J., 50528A.
Glenn, Donald T., 50679A.
Glenn, Ervin L., 43765A.
Glenn, Joshua, 64718A.
Glenn, Leo, Jr., 22182A.
Glenn, Richard H., 64869A.
Glenn, Sam D., 23240A.
Glenn, Sidney A., 44103A.
Glover, Allison G., 23030A.
Goelz, Raymond F., 43821A.
Gore, James E., 27029A.
Gores, Vernon D., 22936A.
Gori, Floyd E., 51152A.
Gorman, Thomas W., 43947A.
Gottsleben, Alvin A., 43676A.
Gould, Norman D., 49521A.
Gould, Richard V., 44135A.
Gould, Robert P., 22187A.
Gozur, Alexander, 53008A.
Graber, Fred L., 44436A.
Grady, James H., 22188A.
Graeb, Kenneth, 43753A.
Graham, Bruce E., 22449A.
Graham, Eugene M., 49539A.
Graham, James E., 50680A.
Graham, Neal F., 44323A.
Graham, Russell A., 43726A.
Graves, Harry W., 64751A.
Graves, William H., Jr., 49528A.
Gray, David L., 23142A.
Gray, Edmund W., 44406A.
Gray, Paul L., 25897A.
Green, Billy J., 44327A.
Green, Lewis U., Jr., 64736A.
Greene, Vernon F., 50699A.
Greener, William I., Jr., 50579A.
Gregory, Jack W., 43946A.
Gregory, Kenneth L., 53041A.
Gregory, Robert F., 44190A.

Gribble, William A., 50566A.
Griese, Herman R., 50456A.
Griesmer, Donald R., 22190A.
Griffin, Hays F., 50542A.
Griffin, Joseph M., 26975A.
Griffith, Maurice L., 52927A.
Griffith, William C., 50438A.
Grimsley, George C., 26577A.
Grinham, Ernest E., 51218A.
Grissom, Virgil I., 22450A.
Gronewald, Harry L., 64793A.
Gross, Albert B., 44451A.
Gross, Stanley C., 44326A.
Grosse, Guy W., 42318A.
Grosz, Milton J., 44241A.
Grover, Arnold L., 28358A.
Groves, Richard T., Sr., 51136A.
Grubaugh, Kenneth W., 21906A.
Grube, George R., 43920A.
Gryska, Frank C., 43993A.
Guider, Edward J., 50658A.
Guidice, Daniel E., 26420A.
Guidroz, Richard P., 22191A.
Guild, Samuel M., Jr., 22192A.
Gunnell, Alan K., 51138A.
Gutweiler, William D., 64740A.
Guymon, Edward W., 49507A.
Gwinn, Thomas W., Jr., 43982A.
Gyulavics, Joseph J., 22437A.
Haas, Harold H., 50701A.
Hackenberger, Harold B., 49505A.
Hackett, Richard S., 44416A.
Hagan, William J., 27014A.
Hagen, Howard A., 49397A.
Haggard, Robert R., 49328A.
Haggren, Richard A., 22194A.
Hagood, Donald M., 44029A.
Hagopian, Jack, 64754A.
Hain, Harlon A., 32754A.
Haines, Frank W., 53011A.
Hair, Thomas L., Jr., 24145A.
Haislip, Thomas W., 51143A.
Halbert, Billy G., 25581A.
Hall, Charles J., 44219A.
Hall, Clarence M., 42580A.
Hall, Harold H., Jr., 52929A.
Hall, Hollis O., 25913A.
Hall, Howard D., 27734A.
Hall, John W., 23089A.
Hall, Randolph L., 49364A.
Hall, Raymond W., 64805A.
Hall, William E., 64721A.
Hallett, Edward D., 22928A.
Hallgren, John F., 24570A.
Hallin, Carl G., 44391A.
Halstead, Frank C., 22196A.
Hambleton, John A., 49318A.
Hamborsky, Rudolph J., 64588A.
Hamilton, Harold T., 26909A.
Hamilton, Laverne A., 52937A.
Hamilton, Richard K., Jr., 49491A.
Hamilton, Richard G., 24149A.
Hamilton, Thomas M., 28387A.
Hamley, Earle S., 26997A.
Hammann, Robert M., 50600A.
Hammond, Henry L., 50684A.
Hammons, Jim E., 50677A.
Hampton, Frederick J., 22197A.
Hanaway, John F., 22198A.
Hancock, Humphrey J., 51227A.
Haner, Byron E., 43685A.
Haney, Donald A., 26928A.
Hanners, Charles S., 25929A.
Hanning, Royal M., 50468A.
Hansen, Edward L., 26580A.
Hansen, Lester T., 28414A.
Hanson, George B., 44229A.
Hanson, Paul G., Jr., 51164A.
Hanson, Wilbur T., 49554A.
Hanto, Donald C., 26970A.
Haralson, Donald H., 51242A.
Harbaugh, Albert K., 49518A.
Harding, Francis W., III, 26724A.
Harding, Lynn B., 44281A.
Harding, Robert C., 22199A.
Hargrove, James T., 75785A.
Harmes, Richard W., 60092A.
Harmon, Orrin C., Sr., 28366A.
Harmon, Robert L., 43761A.
Harness, Arminta J., 25909W.
Harper, Henry A., 49412A.
Harrell, Louis J., 52968A.
Harrington, Roger D., 26921A.
Harris, Chester D., 43696A.
Harris, Dana H., Jr., 44021A.
Harris, Edward R., 50775A.
Harris, James M., 49538A.
Harris, Ralph M., 44178A.
Harris, William E., Jr., 22912A.
Harrison, Frank B., 25935A.
Harrison, Michael H., Jr., 43918A.
Hart, Gilbert A., 50543A.
Hart, Harold B., 25924A.
Hartley, Howard K., 43852A.
Hartley, Millard C., Jr., 50748A.
Hartline, James H., 50452A.
Hatcliff, Robert E., 52967A.
Hatfield, Charles F., 49395A.
Hatzenbuehler E., Jr., 50475A.
Haug, Richard E., 64755A.
Hay, David J., 50607A.
Hay, Jack R., 504485A.
Hayford, Robert L., 25942A.
Hays, James A., 51191A.
Hays, Theodore C., 44321A.
Head, James W., 50484A.
Headlee, Harold E., 22202A.
Hearon, Ernest F., Jr., 44014A.
Hearon, Wallis T., 43744A
Heasman, James W., 50672A.
Hebert, Paul E., 44409A.
Heck, Floyd M., 44301A.
Hedge, Thomas L., 44099A.
Hedges, Donald J., 43853A.
Hegberg, Willard W., 23601A.
Hegland, Eugene E., 64833A.
Hegland, Martin J., 44282A.
Heider, Eugene J., 49312A.
Heinzig, Floyd E., 64830A.
Held, Robert E., 43718A.
Helton, Daymond E., 22907A.
Hemm, Wayne H., 51192A.
Hemmer, Donald J., 26530A.
Hemphill, Will T., Jr., 49549A.
Henderson, James D., 44309A.
Henderson, William R., 43688A.
Hendren, Arthur E., 49381A.
Hendricks, Donald G., 27556A.
Hendricks, Gerald K., 22206A.
Henkell, Victor C., 44222A.
Hennessy, John E., 44374A.
Henney, Frederick A., 22207A.
Henning, Donald A., 44013A.
Hennrikus, George F., Jr., 28369A.
Henry, Frederick P., 27757A.
Henson, Lenore, 44431W.
Herman, Donald W., 44367A.
Herrick, Louis E., 51167A.
Herrin, Lexie E., 26934A.
Herron, Eldon L., 28371A.
Herron, Elmer E., 44349A.
Hessman, Fred W., Jr., 44383A.
Hester, Joyce B., Jr., 44113A.
Hevern, Howard S., Jr., 44477A.
Heyser, Richard S., 26536A.
Hickle, Buster A., 50737A.
Hickman, Thomas J., 43796A.
Hicks, Ben F., 44424A.
Hicks, James L., Jr., 44276A.
Hicks, Stephen B., 26400A.
Hiebert, Frederick C., 43785A.
Hiers, John D., 43844A.
Hildebrand, Don R. H., 25934W.
Hill, Arthur S., 44231A.
Hill, Burritt E., 64706A.
Hill, John J., 50777A.
Hill, Kenneth D., 28402A.
Hill, Watt G., Jr., 44456A.
Hillard, Stephen D., 50469A.
Hilliard, Joseph C., 49506A.
Hilliard, Roy E., 28388A.
Hillock, Joseph P., Jr., 22210A.
Hines, John S., 27030A.
Hines, Robert C., 64610A.
Hinman, Joseph C., Jr., 28350A.
Hinz, Richard H., 27748A.
Hite, Kennith F., 22211A.
Hobbie, Eugene G., 64780A.
Hochreich, Leigh A., 44214A.
Hodek, Henry W., 52771A.
Hodges, Vernon W., 27752A.
Hodges, Willis M., 44396A.
Hodgkins, Robert L., 44183A.
Hoffman, Francis J., Jr., 50726A.
Hoffman, Robert D., 26917A.
Hoffman, Wylie W., 51142A.
Hogan, Eugene S., 44057A.
Hogan, Jack F., 50654A.
Hoggard, Clarence H., 50626A.
Hoke, Charles S., 21828A.
Holcombe, William P., 52942A.
Holland, Anthony E., 22425A.
Holland, John M., 44515A.
Hollandsworth, Vi R., 28422A.
Hollenbaugh, David I., 44005A.
Hollinden, Albert B., 27729A.
Hollingshead, Fra J., 50457A.
Holloman, Charles R., 49446A.
Holston, Walter E., 49372A.
Holt, Harold J., 44175A.
Holt, Jack H., 43717A.
Holtgrewe, George F., Jr., 44435A.
Hook, Robert D., 28389A.
Hooks, Arnold S., Jr., 50773A.
Hooper, Vincent C., 44212A.
Hooten, Donald H., 24545A.
Hoover, Thomas R., 44304A.
Hope, Raymond L., Jr., 28398A.
Hornbake, William S., 43679A.
Horne, Elmer A., 44310A.
Horton, Howard C., 50650A.
Horton, James J., 43812A.
Horton, Lemuel D., 22418A.
Horton, William R., 49541A.
Horvath, Joseph D., 51162A.
Horvath, Joseph L., 27761A.
Hosack, Ted A., 49480A.
Hoskins, Thomas R., 43831A.
Hostetter, Henry G., 24504A.
Hotard, Josep L., III, 44020A.
Houghton, Rodney E., 43915A.
Houlahan, Robert F., 51160A.
Houser, Carlton E., 51199A.
Houston, Ben H., 51154A.
Houy, Robert H., 51226A.
Howard, David F., 26967A.
Howard, David R., 23032A.
Howard, William H., 64738A.
Howell, Harold, 48872A.
Howells, Orville J., 44613A.
Hoyt, Richard L., 43672A.
Hudack, David M., 43922A.
Hudson, Robert D., 49449A.
Huebinger, Vincent, 50474A.
Huff, David W., 22214A.
Huff, Wilbur C., 49509A.
Huffman, Edward C., 50696A.
Huffman, James P., Jr., 43899A.
Hughes, Allen M., 43686A.
Hughes, Edward J., 49544A.
Hughes, James B., 26727A.
Hugo, Vane, Jr., 51223A.
Hull, John R., Jr., 51244A.
Hull, Robert L., 64750A.
Hummel, Donald J., 49356A.
Hummel, Gerald W., 43945A.
Hummel, Hubert H., 49335A.
Humphrey, Eugene C., 25939A.
Humphrey, Thomas R., 26929A.
Humphries, John A., Jr., 44008A.
Hunt, Eldon W., 44058A.
Hunt, James C., Jr., 22216A.
Hunter, Harold A., 44052A.
Hurd, Calvin W., 22218A.
Huston, Evan E., 22515A.
Huston, John M., 49329A.
Hutchinson, William K., 43836A.
Hutchison, Curtis R., 23129A.
Hutchison, Eric W., 50495A.
Hutton, Glenn K., 44064A.
Hyde, William H., 44343A.
Immler, Thomas A., 49392A.
Ingeman, James W., Jr., 69714A.
Ingmire, Gardner C., 44199A.
Ingraham, Ronald L., 26925A.
Ingram, Benjamin F., Jr., 23201A.
Iosue, Andrew P., 44048A.
Irvine, William E., 44042A.
Irvine, William G., 26559A.
Irwin, James B., 22220A.
Jackson, Linwood S., 44213A.
Jackson, Oliver N., 49408A.
Jackson, Philip R., 26538A.

Jackson, Thomas L., 22221A.
Jacobs, Delmar G., 22932A.
Jacobs, Robert F., 43874A.
Jacobs, Robert L., 22222A.
Jacobs, Saul A., 22223A.
Jacobson, Martin P., 44217A.
Jacobson, Robert H., 49483A.
Jaffers, Harry, 44345A.
Jakoboski, Joseph S., 49551A.
James, David R., 22225A.
James, Terrence C., 28352A.
Janczewski, George H., 44545A.
Jarrell, Vernon H., 27721A.
Jeans, Harley E., 22227A.
Jeffrey, Charles R., 43837A.
Jenkins, Joyful J., 43906A.
Jenks, Robert G., 44488A.
Jennings, Bruce D., Jr., 50734A.
Jensen, George W., 27726A.
Jensen, Marvin E., 44125A.
Jessen, Dean L., 51243A.
Jewell, Samuel G., 43999A.
Joachim, Frank M., 27022A.
Joel, Nathan L., 22886A.
Joganich, Rudolph, 50512A.
Johns, Thomas H., 22511A.
Johnson, Albert W., 22226A.
Johnson, Edwin W., 51173A.
Johnson, Elven A., Jr., 43735A.
Johnson, George W., Jr., 26943A.
Johnson, George E., 49450A.
Johnson, Glendon T., 51245A.
Johnson, Grant W., Jr., 21772A.
Johnson, Harlan W., 22426A.
Johnson, Herbert H., 52983A.
Johnson, Holden C., 52972A.
Johnson, James O., 44485A.
Johnson, Jay J., 28403A.
Johnson, John H., 28357A.
Johnson, Keith B., 26554A.
Johnson, Larry R., 44404A.
Johnson, Leroy K., 51255A.
Johnson, Loyd M., 22229A.
Johnson, Maurice E., 43644A.
Johnson, Norris A., 43720A.
Johnson, Richard E., 50549A.
Johnson, Richard E., 43954A.
Johnson, Roy T., 27771A.
Johnson, Samuel R., 25936A.
Johnson, Stanley M., 44335A.
Johnson, Veskel E., 44358A.
Johnson, William T., Jr., 22423A.
Johnson, William J., 50774A.
Johnson, Worth R., 49324A.
Johnston, Paul J., 50750A.
Johnston, Richard A., 22483A.
Johnston, Robert A., Jr., 44172A.
Johnston, Robert M., 43719A.
Johnston, Sidney F., Jr., 25903A.
Johnston, Verle L., 22230A.
Jolley, Hughlon W., 49527A.
Jondahl, Robert L., 43887A.
Jones, Alvan C., Jr., 43690A.
Jones, Charles A., 64598A.
Jones, Donovan L., 49460A.
Jones, George H., 43847A.
Jones, Hilton A., Jr., 64813A.
Jones, Hubert K., Jr., 50712A.
Jones, James L., 26520A.
Jones, Oscar E., 43731A.
Jones, Richard E., 50637A.
Jones, Wilmer E., 49352A.
Joppa, Jacob A., Jr., 25457A.
Joppa, Richard M., 22914A.
Jordan, James D., Jr., 49373A.
Jordan, Joe B., 52947A.
Jordan, Marvin E., 49451A.
Joyce, John P., 43943A.
Jubber, George F., 24471A.
Jungers, Raymond A., 43757A.
Kadous, Calvin J., 50667A.
Kaehlert, Donald A., 26976A.
Kalapach, Fabian F., 44181A.
Kalb, John F., Jr., 50481A.
Kalberer, William A., 27715A.
Kaldahl, Bernard A., 64801A.
Kale, Gerald A., 27737A.
Kalinowski, Francis J., 49346A.
Kalisch, Robert B., 22231A.
Kane, James L., 44407A.
Kane, Stuart E., Jr., 44347A.
Kantar, Nick, 60085A.
Karalis, Evangeli H., 22884A.
Karas, Norman, 28257A.
Karki, Govind S., 50642A.
Karl, George M., Jr., 52992A.
Karstetter, Wayne H., 43885A.
Kasler, James H., 24551A.
Kauttu, Paul A., 25941A.
Kaven, Wilbur V., 44439A.
Kawamoto, Francis H., 43827A.
Kay, Donald J., 22232A.
Kayea, Raymond F., Jr., 53040A.
Keables, Robert F., 50513A.
Keel, Murray E., 44283A.
Keenan, John J., Jr., 43820A.
Keenan, Thomas A., 44257A.
Keeney, William O., Jr., 52961A.
Kelgard, Philip E., 22927A.
Kelleher, Timothy F., 64790A.
Keller, Frank O., 26950A.
Keller, Thomas D., 44084A.
Keller, Walter R., 27023A.
Kelley, George E., Jr., 52975A.
Kelley, Robert B., 44403A.
Kelly, Lloyd J., 64864A.
Kelly, Russell F., 50778A.
Kempe, Harry E., 49547A.
Kendrick, Jack I., 22233A.
Keney, Russell S., 51155A.
Kenney, Thomas E., 44546A.
Kerl, Robert C., 64832A.
Kern, Albert E., II, 50758A.
Kertesz, George J., 44122A.
Kerwin, John J., 44430A.
Ketchum, James C., 64838A.
Kiah, Clifford B., 50459A.
Kidd, Cara W., Jr., 64753A.
Kidder, David B., 44179A.
Kienholz, Donald D., 43289A.
Killelea, Charles J., 50602A.
Kilpatrick, Ri H., Jr., 49336A.
King, Charles H., Jr., 44408A.
King, John A., 49482A.
King, Leroy J., 50641A.
King, Robert P., 22453A.
King, Ronald R., 50502A.
Kinghorn, William H., 44226A.
Kingsbury, Dal C., Jr., 50675A.
Kingston, Raymond F., 44126A.
Kinkade, Lester D. F., 49403A.
Kinney, John J. R., 43976A.
Kinnier, Ferdinand M., 44509A.
Kirby, Kermit A., 22234A.
Kirk, Alfred H., 64757A.
Kirkham, Don T., 44351A.
Kirkland, Floyd W., 50634A.
Kirlin, William F., 44236A.
Kirstein, Leroy M., 51153A.
Kissling, Lamar R., 52953A.
Kittrell, Donald N., 43705A.
Klatt, Gustav B., 26570A.
Kleck, Peter G., 64720A.
Klena, Martin D., 43824A.
Klodzinski, Edwin L., 49338A.
Kloeppel, Frederick A., 64787A.
Kminek, John M., 25925A.
Knapp, Herman L., 26963A.
Knapp, Leslie E., 44138A.
Knight, Albion, 49419A.
Knight, Dean A., 44450A.
Knopf, Robert P., 43977A.
Knothe, William C., 25923A.
Knowles, John S., Jr., 21836A.
Knox, Edward M., Jr., 43973A.
Koenig, Ramon L., 50627A.
Koeninger, Charles E., 25583A.
Kokoszka, Florian T., 24828A.
Konaszewski, Richard F., 50649A.
Koons, Burt S., 24486A.
Korbett, Arthur, 52933A.
Kormos, William J., 44065A.
Kosmerl, Edward J., 51146A.
Kosnick, John E., 44060A.
Kottas, William M., 22446A.
Kramer, Louis R., Jr., 49537A.
Kranske, Eugene J., 50639A.
Kraus, Robert C., 43212A.
Kresl, John M., 50547A.
Krikorian, Garo, 51221A.
Kronbetter, Alvin H., 43020A.
Kruggel, Ewald G., 43864A.
Krumpe, Robert H., 23016A.
Kubesch, Sidney J., 44384A.
Kuchera, Thomas J., 22534A.
Kuhlmann, Kenneth L., 44245A.
Kundrat, Joseph, 64822A.
Kuntz, David T., 28399A.
Lach, Joseph C., Jr., 44510A.
Lachner, Gerald O., 44240A.
Lacy, Thomas E., 28382A.
LaFrancis, Cyril R., 50486A.
Lair, Norman L., 50439A.
Laird, Fred L., Jr., 44284A.
Lamb, Norman C., 26910A.
Lambert, Robert E., 24146A.
Lambrecht, Donald W., 26578A.
Lands, Billie F., 43991A.
Lang, George W., 44045A.
Langer, Warren, 64766A.
Langhorne, Donald L., 50766A.
Langhorne, John P., 49380A.
Langlois, Russell G., 64809A.
Laplante, Clifford C., 44285A.
Larger, Bernard A., 44090A.
Larkin, Charles J., 43891A.
Larock, Michael K., 44206A.
Larsen, Larry J., 22239A.
Larson, Donald J., 51225A.
Larue, James E., Jr., 23191A.
Lassetter, Jimmy S., 27777A.
Lathrop, Richard C., 43748A.
Laughrun, Noble B., 43908A.
Lavish, Alexander, 43919A.
Lavoie, George P., 50694A.
Lawler, Rita A., 44420W.
Lawrence, Norton J., 44076A.
Lawrence, Wendell B., 50759A.
Lawson, Richard L., 25940A.
Lawton, William H., Jr., 22242A.
Layer, Eugene E., 43714A.
Layman, Loren J., 50466A.
Leach, George T., Jr., 51157A.
Leaf, Howard W., 44242A.
Leahy, Cornelius M., 44418A.
Leavell, Adelbert D., Jr., 44395A.
Lebsack, Alvin J., 44028A.
Lee, Dwight A., 43678A.
Lee, John M., 43301A.
Lee, Robert H., 44082A.
Leeper, Neil M., 43960A.
Leggate, George H., 49533A.
Lehr, Donald E., 44006A.
Leibrock, James T., 51193A.
Leman, Anthony, 50574A.
Leming, Richard L., 44107A.
Lemke, Herbert M., 44140A.
Lemoine, William P., Jr., 50666A.
Lemon, Lewis C., 43907A.
Lenahan, Harry F., Jr., 51158A.
Lerner, Robert, 22245A.
Lessard, William D., 43704A.
Lessig, Raymond H., 22246A.
Levy, Eugene D., 26723A.
Lewis, David, Jr., 49429A.
Lewis, Gladstone S., Jr., 23018A.
Lewis, Leroy C., 44330A.
Lewis, William E., 50646A.
Lewis, William H., 50674A.
Lightner, Gerald W., 44331A.
Lilygren, Richard C., 50450A.
Lindo, Jesse P., Jr., 50608A.
Lindsay, John T., 23050A.
Lingel, Edward W., 50733A.
Lingenfelter, Glen, 26930A.
Lingle, Harvey C., 44448A.
Linnon, Robert D., 44449A.
Little, Forest L., 64804A.
Lloyd, Robert J., 25918A.
Locke, Jesse C., Jr., 51184A.
Lockyer, Jesse L., 51137A.
Loemker, Fred H., 43781A.
Loest, John E., 49322A.
Logie, Loren C., 53056A.
Logsdon, Harold E., 22935A.
Loken, Virgil D., 44489A.
Long, Elon, 44232A.
Long, Harry C., 50604A.
Long, Herbert N., 50560A.
Long, James D., 44012A.
Long, Patrick G., 26981A.
Long, Robert C., 43713A.

Loosmore, Thomas R., 50448A.
Lopes, Richard F., 52974A.
Loree, Ellis R., 51203A.
Lorenz, Bernard C., 21750A.
Lorenzen, Robert C., 50729A.
Lorey, Willis E., 24539A.
Loscalzo, Joseph A., 43709A.
Lottich, Edward W., 44538A.
Lounsbery, William R., 51239A.
Love, Curtis C., 22469A.
Love, James S., 28407A.
Low, James F., 23194A.
Lowe, Charles M., 51156A.
Lowe, Richard W., 43998A.
Lucas, Clyde J., 50516A.
Luckingham, Rudolph M., Jr., 43854A.
Ludwig, John H., 50476A.
Lund, Neils H., 54862A.
Lunsford, Hollis, 44088A.
Lynch, Andrew C., 52986A.
Lysaght, Charles A., 43798A.
Mabus, Earl F., 49384A.
MacAlpine, James G., Jr., 26982A.
MacCallum, John M., Jr., 50765A.
MacDonald, Robert, 51149A.
MacDonald, Robert W., 44108A.
MacGlothlin, Tho M., 44031A.
Mack, William M., 50461A.
Mackey, Wilfred G., 64859A.
Maclaren, Will G., Jr., 21823A.
Madril, Ernest, 50458A.
Main, Eugene L., 23027A.
Maines, Leland E., Jr., 44440A.
Major, Alford M., Jr., 50565A.
Majoros, Theodore E., 28346A.
Mallard, Herbert L., 44210A.
Malone, Edwin F., 52988A.
Malone, William C., 44286A.
Malot, Richard C., 27010A.
Malsbury, Robert E., 64792A.
Manning, William F., 49398A.
Markel, Richard K., 26555A.
Marks, Donald M., 43700A.
Marks, John B., Jr., 44525A.
Marks, Paul D., 27026A.
Marlow, Louis G., 22253A.
Marrs, Maurice A., Jr., 43871A.
Marshall, Frank R., Jr., 50736A.
Marshall, James H., 22533A.
Martin, Emlen L., Jr., 64703A.
Martin, Lyal A., 43786A.
Martin, Paul B., 22257A.
Martin, Ralph D., 43776A.
Martin, Richard E., 44429A.
Martin, William H., 21818A.
Martineau, Horace W., 27015A.
Martini, Joseph A., 50564A.
Marzluf, Earl R., 44261A.
Mason, Dwight E., 43746A.
Mason, Harold W., 51171A.
Massey, Guy R., 43892A.
Massey, Rawlinson M., 50498A.
Mateer, Alan, 28426A.
Mathews, Charles L., 43789A.
Mathews, James W., 43858A.
Matson, Keith W., 22258A.
Matula, Walter E., 44059A.
Maultsby, Charles W., 51185A.
Maxwell, Allen D., 28425A.
Maxwell, James R., 50738A.
May, Clarence T., 69713A.
May, Hugh E., 24399A.
May, William A., Jr., 51234A.
Mayfield, William O., 50661A.
Mazak, Edward P., Jr., 22875A.
Mazza, James D., 32419A.
McAlpine, James L., 44158A.
McArdle, Frank H., 43936A.
McBride, Donald B., 50443A.
McCaffrey, Margar I., 44434W.
McCain, Otis E., 51249A.
McCallum, William, III, 44100A.
McCarthy, George F., 43670A.
McCartie, Floyd E., 50743A.
McCauley, Clifton H., 44182A.
McClain, Keith E., 50587A.
McCollester, Robert E., 51219A.
McConnell, John P., 22530A.
McConnell, Thomas G., 27742A.
McConnell, William F., 44200A.
McCord, Beverly B., 43921A.
McCormick, James E., 22261A.
McCormick, Mark H., Jr., 32755A.
McCormick, Robert J., 44127A.
McCracken, Naomi, M., 44234W.
McCreary, Richard D., 27016A.
McDaniel, Gerald, 43787A.
McDonald, David R., 21771A.
McDonald, James R., 27735A.
McDonald, Lewis E., 50656A.
McDonald, Richard Q., 43745A.
McDonald, Robert F., 22262A.
McDougal, Douglas C., 50479A.
McElhaney, John H., 51144A.
McElroy, Jane, 27736W.
McFarland, Walter J., 28364A.
McFolin, Olin E., 44287A.
McGee, Patrick L., 23090A.
McGregor, Mark A., 44165A.
McGuire, Dale A., 49452A.
McGuire, Danny W., 43763A.
McHargue, Robert S., 49317A.
McIlvain, Kenneth J., Jr., 44526A.
McIntosh, Robert H., 22267A.
McIntyre, Robert K., 52925A.
McKague, James F., 64734A.
McKanna, William R., 51145A.
McKee, Roy L., 49512A.
McKeethen, Lloyd B., 49350A.
McKenzie, Carl W., 50531A.
McKenzie, Eugene A., 50689A.
McKenzie, Wallace J., 26534A.
McKinley, Richard J., 64739A.
McKinney, Robert E., 44235A.
McKusick, Charles E., 43677A.
McLaughlin, Jean W., 43646A.
McLoud, Harold J., Jr., 27005A.
McLucas, Bob, 50753A.
McManamon, Arnold G., 74884A.
McMillan, James A., 27740A.
McMillan, Lonnie C., 23610A.
McMullen, Thomas H., 22268A.
McMullian All E., Jr., 26993A.
McNamara, Donald J., 28384A.
McNamee, Albert R., 64820A.
McNeil, Sidney L., 51252A.
McQuillen, John R., 25591A.
McRae, Joseph W., 43728A.
Medcalf, John R., 52990A.
Meharg, William B., 44163A.
Meinhold, Robert L., 22271A.
Mellin, James A., 50688A.
Mendenhall, Joseph H., 23028A.
Merrill, Frank J., 44114A.
Merrow, Elmer W., 49530A.
Mesropian, Leon M., 52815A.
Messinger, Mary W., 44421W.
Messmore, Jack W., 24472A.
Methfessel, Herman J., 44256A.
Metscher, William, 44288A.
Meyer, Delvin H., 50473A.
Meyer, Warren W., 64724A.
Mickelson, Gordon B., 44247A.
Mickelson, John M., 64554A.
Miknuk, Harry J., 43830A.
Miller, Burr V., Jr., 64854A.
Miller, George R., 24483A.
Miller, Harold R., 51166A.
Miller, Howard E., 53009A.
Miller, John, 23097A.
Miller, John H., 50731A.
Miller, John M., 42763A.
Miller, Milton E., 44102A.
Miller, Nelson L., 44080A.
Miller, Paul R., 22273A.
Miller, Ray E., 27730A.
Miller, Richard O., 27006A.
Miller, Walter H., 27776A.
Milliman, Dain W., Jr., 22274A.
Milling, Robert W., 28370A.
Mills, Royce L., 53014A.
Milstead, Robert E., 24613A.
Mingus, John H., Jr., 64629A.
Minor, Roy N., 25892A.
Miraglia, Michael B., 43983A.
Misgen, Darrell J., 26940A.
Mitchell, Harry A., Jr., 52969A.
Mitchell, Hershal, 28415A.
Mitchell, Robert J., 24614A.
Mixon, Exley C., Jr., 25928A.
Mohr, William E., II, 64765A.
Moise, Benjamin J., 49331A.
Molzer, Victor J., 44469A.
Monaghan, Thomas J., 44196A.
Money, James E., 49321A.
Montague, George H., 53019A.
Montague, Ronald B., 26962A.
Montgomery, Wi T., Jr., 44457A.
Montgomery, William H., 50631A.
Moody, Eugene E., 27021A.
Moore, Billy J., 25920A.
Moore, Donald W., 51202A.
Moore, Emory R., 49432A.
Moore, Harold W., 52952A.
Moore, James R., 43226A.
Moore, Warren C., 43801A.
Moore, William E., 44032A.
Moore, William L., Jr., 43194A.
Morgan, Bernard S., Jr., 22276A.
Morgan, Glenn F., Jr., 44348A.
Morgan, James F., 28240A.
Morgan, Thomas P., 44313A.
Morgan, Wallace M., 44147A.
Moritz, Franklin P., 43938A.
Morrell, Bruce E., 24473A.
Morris, Eldon W., 50535A.
Morris, Emerson E., 50517A.
Morris. Jack, 43988A.
Morrow, Joseph W., Jr., 32418A.
Morrow, William F., Jr., 43767A.
Morton, George J., 26722A.
Morton, James L., 26969A.
Moshier, Howard W., 43695A.
Mott, Elbert L., 44132A.
Mottsmith, Tipton P., 22277A.
Mounts, Thomas T., 51186A.
Muhlbach, George W., 43683A.
Mularz, Joseph J., 22278A.
Mullaney, David M., 22279A.
Mullenix, Ronald R., 43758A.
Mullinix, Mark F., 64816A.
Mullins, Jimmy W., 22526A.
Munsey, Virgil W., 49462A.
Murdock, Robert G., 26582A.
Murdy, Robert L., 50494A.
Murnin, John J., 44133A.
Murphy, Cecil R., 20775A.
Murphy, Frank, Jr., 44086A.
Murphy, James B., 22280A.
Murphy, Miles G., 50707A.
Murphy, Patrick J., 27750A.
Murray, Daniel C., 22281A.
Murray, John V., 50594A.
Musgjerd, Clair H., 49345A.
Myers, Donald L., 44094A.
Myers, Fred B., 50747A.
Myers, Paul R., 04340A.
Myers, Ralph H., 23132A.
Nadeau, Louis J., 44009A.
Narciso, Joseph J., 44192A.
Nash, James S., 51236A.
Navarro, Herbert, 43716A.
Nealon, Francis R., 43900A.
Neimeyer, Allen C., 28300A.
Nelson, Robert C., 44120A.
Nelson, William B., 22285A.
Nelson, William E., 44146A.
Nelson, William L., 53034A.
Nesbitt, Walter H., Jr., 49540A.
Nesmith, E. Archie, Jr., 44516A.
Newhall, Robert A., 50635A.
Newton, Brewer N., 52772A.
Nicholl, Robert L., 49436A.
Nichols, William L., 22475A.
Nichols, William L., 53062A.
Niggle, Harry T., 52963A.
Noe, Richard D., 26972A.
Noll, Harry E., 64769A.
Nolli, John, 43497A.
Norrbohm, Joseph W., 44258A.
Norris, Karl D., 44153A.
Northey, Clare E., Jr., 43668A.
Northrup, Edgar A., Jr., 43859A.
Norton, Alfred D., 22289A.
Norton, James B., 49365A.
Norton, Neal E., 43814A.
Norton, Nile B., 49351A.
Norton, Phillip A., 50628A.
Nowogrowski, Edward E., 51187A.
Nugent, Charles W., 49406A.
Nunn, Rodolph L., Jr., 43805A.
Nunnery, William E., 50460A.
Nurge, Henry C., Jr., 43934A.

Nutt, Waymond C., 22484A.
Nyquist, Charles W., 22290A.
Nystrom, Robert K., 44363A.
O'Brien, Charles C., 22291A.
Ochota, Joseph P., 64752A.
O'Connell, Charles J., 44468A.
O'Connell, Donald R., 26586A.
O'Connor, William L., 44225A.
Odom, James R., Jr., 22440A.
Ogden, Wallace H., 49543A.
O'Grady, Barry, 51194A.
Ohlheiser, Richard G., 64782A.
Okuly, Robert L., 50698A.
O'Leary, James L., 64645A.
Oliver, John K.,. 43788A.
Olmsted, Joan, 53069A.
Olsen, William P., 23133A.
Olson, James L., 64839A.
Olson, Robert E., 22292A.
Olson, Rollie G., 49453A.
O'Malley, Gene J., 25937A.
O'Malley, John F., 20305A.
Omo, Wayne H., 50764A.
Orabona, John J., 64785A.
Origer, Leo J., 44128A.
Orr, Loren E., 64860A.
Ortolivo, Basil A., 22293A.
Orwoll, Paul D., 50636A.
Osborn, John R., 22294A.
Osborne, George S., 64843A.
Ostman, Harold A., 53027A.
Ottaway, Donald W., 64856A.
Outlaw, Albertus B., 28260A.
Overton, Norris W., 28385A.
Owens, Joy L., 43855A.
Pack, Moody J., 44237A.
Pagano, Frank G., Jr., 44362A.
Pahl, Philip M., 22295A.
Palmer, Donald P., 26529A.
Palmquist, Robert D., 53079A.
Panas, George W., 49548A.
Panuska, Richard G., 44555A.
Parber, Jack L., 50554A.
Pardee, William J., 22297A.
Parenti, Edward J., 44262A.
Paris, Harold K., 51253A.
Parker, Robert H., 53050A.
Parks, Robert L., 26956A.
Parks, Roland W., 23197A.
Parlett, Henry W., 22489A.
Paroby, Michael J., 27011A.
Parsons, Russell K., 44110A.
Partridge, Norman E., 53006A.
Pascoe, Donald L., 43865A.
Pasley, John V., 44324A.
Passauer, James L., 44415A.
Pate, Joe H., 64737A.
Pate, William B., 26584A.
Paterson, Cameron D., 44177A.
Patrick, Alexander, 28368A.
Patrone, Ferdinand L., 64796A.
Patten, Andrew L., 43759A.
Patterson, Gerald L., 64800A.
Patton, Dewey, Jr., 28348A.
Patton, Norman P., 44087A.
Patton, William E., Jr., 43754A.
Paul, Charles A., 44248A.
Paul, Leroy S., 50518A.
Paul, Norman L., 27778A.
Paulnock, Eugene N., 49387A.
Paxton, Donald E., 43986A.
Paydo, John, Jr., 50568A.
Payne, Sam, 52932A.
Peake, Erwin C., 22299A.
Peck, Joe P., 48871A.
Peck, Warren G., 44337A.
Peckham, Howard L., Jr., 22300A.
Peden, Alpha E., Jr., 64850A.
Pemberton, Gene T., 26552A.
Penney, Francis W., 22919A.
Percival, Wilson, 64717A.
Perez, Mario, 64828A.
Perham, Guy D., 21776A.
Perry, Howard I., 44041A.
Perry, William F., 50685A.
Peterson, Donald C., 22491A.
Peterson, Keith E., 44043A.
Peterson, Nile G., 55846A.
Peterson, Richard J., 44474A.
Peterson, Roger K., 49454A.
Petska, Jerry J., 44223A.
Petta, Joseph, 64763A.
Pettway, Frank H., 26966A.
Pfeifer, Harold E., 22929A.
Pfeiffer, Leon K., 44030A.
Phillips, Joseph J., 50567A.
Phillips, Martin T., 49496A.
Phillips, Paul C., 43963A.
Phillips, Victor F., Jr., 23611A.
Phillips, Wilbur O., 44527A.
Phipps, Claude P., 49463A.
Phipps, John L., 43944A.
Piazza, John A., 49340A.
Pickett, George K., 22521A.
Pierce, Fred P., 44289A.
Pierce, Robert E., 28353A.
Pierson, Howard J., 50702A.
Pietschner, Paul W., 51211A.
Pijanowski, Robert R., 50593A.
Pilcher, Delbert L., 50772A.
Pilecki, Edward J., 43724A.
Pinckney, Thomas C., Jr., 22924A.
Pineau, Norman T., Jr., 43336A.
Pinkerton, David W., 26936A.
Pinney, George F., 50715A.
Piper, Marian L., 44290W.
Pitchford, Kenneth L., 49556A.
Pitt, Paul R., 51200A.
Pittman, Ralph S., 44186A.
Plack, Richard P., 43904A.
Pletcher, John S., 64747A.
Plonowski, Francis S., 22885A.
Plunk, William G., 64865A.
Polasek, Bill E., Jr., 50769A.
Pollack, Raymond, 64764A.
Poor, Arthur R., 20894A.
Porritt, Orval R., 43888A.
Porter, Charles F., 50519A.
Porter, Elliott W., 26944A.
Porter, Eugene R., 26937A.
Porter, Scott S., 44051A.
Porter, Thurman, Jr., 43813A.
Post, Foster A., 25597A.
Potochnik, Roy, 50586A.
Potter, Thomas D., 27763A.
Potter, William D., 43689A.
Powell, James V., 23134A.
Powell, John C., 22305A.
Powell, John R., 44105A.
Powers, Paul R., 49368A.
Powers, William E., 23023A.
Pratt, Carl E., Jr., 26585A.
Price, Clifford D., 43680A.
Price, Emmerson D., 49484A.
Price, Jack L., 22307A.
Price, Thomas D., 51180A.
Price, William D., 49464A.
Price, William S., Jr., 43997A.
Prince, Alan M., 52936A.
Prince, Darrell P., 64834A.
Pritchard, Eve E., Jr., 26407A.
Pritchard, Robert B., 49553A.
Proctor, Robert E., 51147A.
Provance, William J., 27768A.
Purdy, Channing L., 26401A.
Purdy, Ira J., 51256A.
Putt, Mitchell A., 27012A.
Quandt, Theodore W., 50617A.
Quann, John L., 26926A.
Quigley, Thomas K., 43832A.
Quinn, Joseph S., 64281A.
Quinn, William M., 22311A.
Quinn, William P., 53024A.
Raeburn, Alexander N., 43100A.
Raful, Robert, 43782A.
Rainey, Harold W., 44191A.
Ralston, Billy L., 43740A.
Ramey, Jack L., 22313A.
Ramos, Rafael E., 53004A.
Randall, Robert P., 28380A.
Randolph, James G., 44528A.
Ratcliffe, James C., 43710A.
Rau, Edward J., 49437A.
Raunikar, Eugene, 21816A.
Raymond, Richard L., 52998A.
Reagan, Robert L., 25932A.
Reagan, Thomas J., 28396A.
Reddoch, John H., 25912A.
Reddy, Robert J., 64855A.
Reed, Irving B., 22316A.
Reeder, Damon B., 44263A.
Reedy, Jack C., 44123A.
Rees, Ervin F., 50632A.
Reeve, Gerald S., 22317A.
Reeves, Donald E., 64719A.
Reeves, James D., 27775A.
Rehberg, Dwight F., 26566A.
Rehwaldt, Robert J., 22318A.
Reid, George R., 44490A.
Reid, Jack W., 28376A.
Reid, Robert L., 26568A.
Reilly, Lavern G., 26398A.
Reis, Andrew J., Jr., 49502A.
Reitan, Harold T., 44291A.
Remaklus, Donald R., 52928A.
Reneau, Leland D., 49465A.
Renelt, Walter A., 50618A.
Renken, Randall R., 44512A.
Renner, Sylves G., Jr., 50520A.
Renner, Sylvester G., Jr., 50520A.
Renz, Robert E., 24514A.
Reschke, William G., Jr., 28375A.
Reynold, Robert P., 49359A.
Reynolds, Herbert H., 25595A.
Reynolds, Plea G., Jr., 44397A.
Reynolds, Robert A., 64848A.
Rhemann, John F., 50719A.
Rice, Russell H., 50714A.
Richards, John W., 50665A.
Richardson, Edgar L., 43698A.
Richardson, Floyd W., 49546A.
Richardson, Kenneth M., 50619A.
Richardson, Russe G., 64825A.
Richardson, Wi L., Jr., 22321A.
Richman, Samuel R., 55091A.
Rick, George H., 44385A.
Rickey, Roger M., 50544A.
Rider, John, 49466A.
Riepling Robert O., 44491A.
Rilling, Robert G., 25895A.
Rinearson, Richard E., 44142A.
Rines, David D., 51188A.
Ripp, Mason L., 24151A.
Risdon, Willis P., 44462A.
Ritchie, John, 22323A.
Rivers, John S., 49467A.
Rivers, William J., Jr., 26579A.
Rizzo, Harry F., 27004A.
Roach, James M., 49487A.
Roan, Norman C., Jr., 43905A.
Robar, Leland J., 49438A.
Robb, Donald S., 50563A.
Roberts, Robert M., 22326A.
Robertson, George B., Jr., 44375A.
Robertson, Robert E., 43860A.
Robertson, William E., 50652A.
Robinette, Roy C., Jr., 44442A.
Robinson, Charles G., 26539A.
Robinson, John S., 52989A.
Robinson, Leonard G., 44106A.
Robinson, Richard E., 49524A.
Robinson, Samuel M., 22898A.
Robinson, Walter A., 50663A.
Robison, Donald, 44500A.
Robison, Richard R., 50752A.
Rode, David, 49488A.
Rodriguez, Francis W., 53042A.
Rogers, Billy F., 23613A.
Rogers, John A., 44221A.
Rogers, John R., 26989A.
Rogers, Lynn, 44319A.
Rogers, William A., 50536A.
Rogge, Gene F., 26968A.
Rohlfs, Max E., 43972A.
Rohlinger, Donald J., 43671A.
Roloff, Donald H., 22329A.
Romine, Lester M., 44376A.
Roper, Clarence R., 50442A.
Rosalia, Joseph A., 43880A.
Rose, Ernest G., 22331A.
Rose, James E., Jr., 25917A.
Rosker, Benjamin H., 28175A.
Ross, Glenn D., 49411A.
Ross, Irving F., 49495A.
Ross, Leroy E., Jr., 43875A.
Rosser, William E., II, 52956A.
Rossler, Arthur A., 49424A.
Rothwell, Lyman W., 51231A.
Routhier, Paul J., 44204A.
Rowell, Claude R., 28419A.
Rowland, Donald M., 50705A.
Rowley, Armand G., 51135A.
Roy, Robert W., 22332A.

Rozar, James P., 50505A.
Rozner, Maurice, 25853A.
Rozsa, Allen C., 24606A.
Rudd, Walter L., 69712A.
Rule, John H., 21827A.
Rumph, Herbert L., 43843A.
Runyan, Albert E., 49475A.
Ruppert, Warren G., 43913A.
Rush, Charles M., 49535A.
Rushing, Henry C., 44119A.
Russell, Daniel W., 50676A.,
Russell, Francis M., 44167A.
Russell, Harry C., Sr., 42677A.
Russell, John P., 43968A.
Russell, Thurman C., 64821A.
Rutherford, Leslie G., 51195A.
Rutter, Robert S., 64871A.
Ruvolo, Sam J., 64783A.
Ryan, B. W., 22508A.
Ryan, Wallace C., 43848A.
Ryan, William A., 43808A.
Ryan, William J., 22333A.
Rynning, James L., 49445A.
Saffell, Robert C., 44249A.
Safford, Robert R., 52888A.
Sakanich, Donald, 52996A.
Salem, George L., 44047A.
Salemi, Paul J., 51210A.
Salvi, Albert M., 64824A.
Samotis, John A., 22335A.
Sampson, James B., 25899A.
Sandberg, Theodore H., Jr., 44025A.
Sandel, Robert A., 53043A.
Sanders, Claude R., 52981A.
Sanders, Elisha P., 26977A.
Sanders, James B., 50717A.
Sandini, Edward J., 64573A.
Sandlin, David W., 42850A.
Sands, Carl A., 43795A.
Saunders, Menno R., 50690A.
Savage, Bernard M., 44022A.
Savage, George R., 50609A.
Savage, Joseph E., 44292A.
Savidge, David, 43861A.
Savoy, Harry J., 50480A.
Savoye, Richard O., 26984A.
Sawyer, Mary A., 25596W.
Schafer, Gerald G., 44044A.
Scharff, James H., 22910A.
Schatzman, George W., Jr., 50521A.
Scheerer, Ernest A., 50562A.
Schenaker, Jack H., 64797A.
Schiffer, John T., 23092A.
Schiltz, Juanita D., 27019W.
Schimberg, Richard J., 25600A.
Schimsk, Herbert F., 43996A.
Schindler, Charles A., 50552A.
Schlatter, David M., Jr., 22337A.
Schlatter, James D., 53051A.
Schlotterback, Da L., 64799A.
Schmid, Ernest A., 44095A.
Schmidt, Glenn E., 44452A.
Schmitt, Russell E., 44334A.
Schmuck, Frank J., 43984A.
Schock, Grover J. D., 43839A.
Schooley, Jean M., 43708A.
Schra, Carl J., 52982A.
Schultz, Jean L., 43712W.
Schultz, Paul G., 23091A.
Schultz, Robert G., 44293A.
Schulz, Donald A., 64808A.
Schumacher, Elmer J., 52966A.
Schutawie, Ted J., 64823A.
Schwab, Paul F., 52957A.
Schwanke, Otto F., Jr., 50657A.
Schweisfurth, Walter, 64743A.
Schwob, Clair A., 49390A.
Scott, Alden A., 22939A.
Scott, Bobby L., 52978A.
Scott, Ralph, 43664A.
Scott, Ralph D., 44038A.
Scott, Richard E., 43755A.
Scovell, Rolf S., 21756A.
Scruggs, Seth W., 22339A.
Seal, William R., 49442A.
Seaman, Ernest G., 44151A.
Seawards, Earlan L., 64748A.
Sedivec, Edward G., Jr., 50555A.
Sedlak, John E., 52964A.
Seegren, Norman W., 49515A.
Seehafer, Don, 27727A.
Seibel, Conrad H., 44168A.
Seiders, Reed E., 44026A.
Seiler, Charles E., Jr., 50449A.
Self, Jimmy K., 50578A.
Self, Robert L., 52980A.
Selfridge, Harold R., 64730A.
Sellers, Robert L., 50503A.
Seltzer, Lloyd M., 44339A.
Selvaggi, Rossi L., 44294A.
Senger, Pius F., 44295A.
Sentir, Harris, 50462A.
Severson, Eldon B., 28360A.
Shackelford, Coll G., 44296A.
Shackelford, Edward E., 64744A.
Shaff, Maurice A., Jr., 27780A.
Shaffer, Glenn B., 23113A.
Shannon, Hugh R., 44529A.
Shannon, James J., Jr., 50534A.
Shannon, Robert S., 44068A.
Sharp, Richard C., 52994A.
Shattuck, Eugene J., Jr., 26553A.
Shattuck, James W., 44268A.
Shaw, Robert B., 22538A.
Sheekley, John R., 26978A.
Sheen, Jack W., 64711A.
Sheldon, Donald J., 49354A.
Sheldon, Roscoe T., 64585A.
Shepard, Jack E., 44264A.
Shepard, Marcella M., 44530W.
Shepherd, Philip R., 43823A.
Sheridan, Philip, 22340A.
Sherman, Thomas W., Jr., 22344A.
Sherry, Donald T., 43956A.
Sherwood, Richard L., 43942A.
Shipley, George R., 28331A.
Shivers, Edward D. III, 43923A.
Shockley, Charles, 43870A.
Shockley, Harold J., 49399A.
Shoemaker, Robert C., 24777A.
Shoop, Marion H., 44170A.
Short, Robert F., 27756A.
Shoults, Hugh W., 22496A.
Showen, Donald R., 43816A.
Shrider, Robert E., Jr., 50669A.
Shultz, Harold D., 22347A.
Shuping, James A., 44074A.
Sifers, Samuel I., Jr., 25907A.
Silagy, Joseph J., 43849A.
Simanonok, Joseph E., 51212A.
Simmons, Clyde M., 49490A.
Simmons, Jimmie L., 44305A.
Simon, Kalman D., 27722A.
Simon, Robert E., 44341A.
Simon, Robert V., 43957A.
Simons, John C., 49316A.
Simpson, George M., 26411A.
Simpson, Travis L., 64773A.
Sims, Eaton K., 23614A.
Singer, Stewart M., 22348A.
Sisson, Frank E., II, 22349A.
Sittig, Beverly E., 64861W.
Skidmore, John G., 22350A.
Skiles, Thomas N., 42982A.
Skillman, Tom M., 22441A.
Skousen, Alma W., 44368A.
Slaughter, Norman E., Jr., 2590A.
Sleep, Otis A., 22442A.
Slepicka, Francis W., 44531A.
Slezak, Donald A., 26988A.
Sloan, Glenn R., 50596A.
Smalley, Wyman J., 49514A.
Smith, Allen, 44532A.
Smith, Arthur F., 43669A.
Smith, Cecil R., Jr., 53030A.
Smith, Charles O., 26413A.
Smith, Claris A., Jr., 50467A.
Smith Click D., Jr., 26949A.
Smith, Conrad H., 44272A.
Smith, Cooper R., Jr., 44533A.
Smith, Donald M., 44486A.
Smith, Eugene A., 50559A.
Smith, Floyd E., 49428A.
Smith, Guy L., 51247A.
Smith, Harold A., 44096A.
Smith, James A., Jr., 64863A.
Smith, John A., 49476A.
Smith, John S., 64756A.
Smith, Louis J., 52930A.
Smith, Norman L., 26964A.
Smith, Paul A., Jr., 22351A.
Smith, Ray H., Jr., 49427A.
Smith, Raymond C., 43766A.
Smith, Richard N., 44459A.
Smith, Richard P., 44346A.
Smith, Robert C., 43979A.
Smith, Robert R., 53035A.
Smith, Robert W., 50735A.
Smith, Ronald W., 50682A.
Smith, Scott G., 27770A.
Smith, Vernon W., 49536A.
Smith, Von L., 26573A.
Smith, Wayne E., 53031A.
Smith, William F., 26581A.
Smith, William L., 44463A.
Smith, William M., Jr., 22352A.
Smithson, Claude J., Jr., 23615A.
Smurro, William E., 22900A.
Snider, Henry G., 26933A.
Soapes, Thomas D., 28421A.
Sobelman, Phillip, 52973A.
Solis, Roland X., 42998A.
Sommer, William R., 22903A.
Soper, William R., 43725A.
Sorenson, Nile A., 50492A.
Sorrelle, John W., Jr., 26549A.
Southworth, St George, Jr., 23042A.
Sparks, David K., 52976A.
Sparks, James C., Jr., 53048A.
Sparks, Lawrence R., 44000A.
Spaulding, Melbur C., 50741A.
Spears, Kent C., Jr., 50671.
Spelis, Edward A., 53002A.
Spelts, David E., 52993A.
Speroni, Joseph M., 49441A.
Spieldenner, Frank E., 28424A.
Sprague, Carleton K., 22353A.
Springer, Leonida K., 20469A.
Sproul, John L., 44342A.
Squires, John C., 49413A.
Staab, John M., 22509A.
Stables, Thomas B., 49414A.
Staggs, Glenn E., 53053A.
Stahlhut, Dale S., 43751A.
Stanley, Jess F., 50522A.
Stanley, Lawrence W., 49355A.
Stanton, James D., 44271A.
Stanton, Richard R., 21833A.
Stapher, Elmer F., 51214A.
Starbuck, Floyd C., Jr., 51235A.
Starkel, Richard L., 28363A.
Starkey, Gerald E., 23049A.
Starrett, John P., 22354A.
Stauffer, Glenn F., 26995A.
Stavast, John E., 52944A.
Stein, James W., 28379A.
Steelman, Donald L., 44040A.
Steger, Jack M., 50504A.
Steger, James G., 23031A.
Steig, Ted, 50463A.
Steiner, Robert W., 50523A.
Steingasser, Joseph N., 27020A.
Stembridge, Edward E., 26546A.
Stephens, Dallas K., 22455A.
Stephens, John H., 44004A.
Stephens, Perry L., 22356A.
Stephenson, James R., 44194A.
Stevens, Henry L., Jr., 26985A.
Stevens, John T., Jr., 43869A.
Stevens, Richard H., 50488A.
Stevens, Walter C., Jr., 22358A.
Stevenson, Sharman R., 44033A.
Stewart, Donald W., Jr., 50703A.
Stewart, Ervin C., 44018A.
Stewart, Ervin O., Jr., 43825A.
Stewart, Gerald W., 24826A.
Stickney, Frank A., 26959A.
Stiegel, Raymond B., 44387A.
Stiles, David L., 50662A.
Stiles, Ralph W., 44259A.
Stillman, Albert E., 44250A.
Stillwagon, Edwin A., 24850A.
Stimson, James S., 26913A.
Stith, Alan H., 53055A.
St. John, Ernest A., 53021A.
Stobaugh, Warren K., 50499A.
Stockdell, Victor B., 26556A.
Stockman, David T., 22359A.
Stokum, Russell L., 52954A.
Storm, Mary L., 44297W.
Story, Warren H., 64845A.
Stoss, Fred B., Jr., 44220A.
Stout, Norman N., 53072A.

Stringer, William L., 24837A.
Stull, Ned R., 27766A.
Stumpf, Charles J., 27013A.
Sullivan, William H., 64826A.
Sulser, Mayo B., 49311A.
Summerour, Joseph E., Jr., 44198A.
Summers, Robert L., 44055A.
Sumner, Darvel L., 44072A.
Sundberg, Donald L., 44388A.
Sutch, Victor D., 43800A.
Sverha, Michael J., 50620A.
Swan, Robert B., Jr., 52997A.
Swearingen, Paul, 51139A.
Sweeney, Daniel J., 53017A.
Sweeney, Mack D., Jr., 50687A.
Sweesy, James W., 50478A.
Swol, Thomas C., 28237A.
Tackett, Edward J., 43756A.
Taft, Gordon G., 44389A.
Talbert, William H., 43966A.
Tarrant, Donald H., 64776A.
Tarrant, Robert E., 50744A.
Tarver, William R., 26590A.
Tatsch, Clarence C., 43771A.
Taylor, Clyde T., 50582A.
Taylor, Everette, 22361A.
Taylor, Harold L., Jr., 64742A.
Taylor, Ira T., 49431A.
Taylor, Jack M., 64727A.
Taylor, Jack W., 51222A.
Taylor, Richard N., 22876A.
Taylor, Robert H., 44277A.
Taylor, Stillman V., 44412A.
Taylor, Victor D., 50762A.
Tedder, Therion D., 44307A.
Teegarden, Clifford J., 50451A.
Terry, Homer T., 44318A.
Therkelsen, Edward R., 44121A.
Thogersen, Alton J., 25905A.
Tholen, Lloyd A., 53016A.
Thomas, Arnold W., Jr., 53067A.
Thomas, Earle G., III, 44265A.
Thomas, Frederick H., 49377A.
Thomas James R., 64710A.
Thomas, Ralph W., 22502A.
Thomas, Will R., Jr., 50470A.
Thomas, William E., Jr., 43826A.
Thomason, Jackson L., 53018A.
Thomason, John F., 44311A.
Thompson, Charles E., 64858A.
Thompson, Edwin E., 26726A.
Thompson, Glen E., 64846A.
Thompson, James B., 53052A.
Thompson, Johnny M., 52999A.
Thompson, Walter W., 23617A.
Thompson, Herman O., 43772A.
Thorne, Anthony S., 22363A.
Threlkeld, William R., 64788A.
Thresher, Russell W., Jr., 64802A.
Tibbetts, Fred M., Jr., 53025A.
Timm, William M., 24832A.
Timmons, Robert A., Jr., 64831A.
Tingle, Leslie G., 50713A.
Tinius, John O., 22519A.
Titus, Thomas L., 28355A.
Tocci, Vincent R., 52951A.
Toedt, Dell C., 27773A.
Tone, Myron L., 27032A.
Toomey, Robert L., 26558A.
Towne, Earle F., Jr., 44361A.
Towner, Melvin, 44187A.
Tracy, Fred L., 26587A.
Trapani, Renato V., 64786A.
Travis, John T., 53013A.
Tribble, George S., 53046A.
Trimble, Garland E., 49362A.
Trimble, Robert P., 44377A.
Trobaugh, John C., 44251A.
Trost, Frederick J., Jr., 22364A.
Trost, Jack D., 43850A.
Troublefield, J. E. J., 49421A.
Trowbridge, Charles E., 44054A.
Truehart, James L., 24509A.
Truesdell, Willard M., 22365A.
Truitt, William F., 50591A.
Tucker, Roy C., Jr., 52965A.
Tullos, Lamar G., 52959A.
Tunis, William C., 49409A.
Turner, Eldon K., 44184A.
Turner, William P., 44131A.
Twining, Richard G., 27714A.
Tynan, George P., 23096A.
Tyndall, Robert H., 43807A.
Tyre, Ronald, 64853A.
Uehara, Kiyoshi J., 64775A.
Uken, Helmuth L., 44539A.
Ulrich, Myron D., 50610A.
Umstead, Stanley M., Jr., 22366A.
Unger, Richard, 44195A.
Uphouse, Earl W., 51240A.
Vaitekunas, Anthony M., 64819A.
Valdez, Bobby G., 44479A.
Valentino, Rudolph A., 44081A.
Vandenberg Ho S., Jr., 22367A.
Vandendries, John E., 64716A.
Vandenheuvel, Robert J., 44071A.
Vandusen, John N., 21821A.
Vangilder, William S., 44143A.
Vangorder, Francis C., 23145A.
Vanlew, William R., 43840A.
Vannatta, Robert A., 26560A.
Vanwagner, Ross, Jr., 43727A.
Vaughn, Billy M., 53007A.
Vechik, Donald, 26998A.
Venable, William P., Jr., 22529A.
Verner, Edward W., 22368A.
Veurink, William J., 22369A.
Vick, Robert I., 64796A.
Vickers, Grover W., 64777A.
Vickrey, Carol D., 43873A.
Vogt, Tom W., 53022A.
Vogt, Wayne D., 50524A.
Vonphul, Stephen, 64866A.
Vosburgh, Leland E., 44492A.
Wachter, Robert J., 64807A.
Waechter, Luther H., 51201A.
Waespy, Charles M., 22370A.
Waggoner, Cecil E., 49523A.
Waitt, Lawrence L., 43723A.
Wallace, Charles W., 22500A.
Wallace, Neil W., 24530A.
Wallace, Preston A., 27760A.
Wallis, Wesley R., 51205A.
Walls, James L., 50611A.
Walsh, Kenneth L., 64713A.
Walter, Alonzo, J., Jr., 19896A.
Walters, George S., 24849A.
Walters, James J., 49396A.
Walters, Marvin L., 23116A.
Walters, Wilme C., Jr., 27017A.
Walton, Charles E., 49504A.
Ward, Albert H., Jr., 22457A.
Ward, Clifford L., 22374A.
Ward, John D., 43706A.
Ward, Kermit D., 53064A.
Ward, Robert W., 22531A.
Warix, Clay W., Jr., 43841A.
Warner, Eugene R., 22504A.
Warner, Max O., 43760A.
Warren, Calvin C., 50525A.
Warren, Walter H., 52962A.
Warren, William J., 22444A.
Warrington, James, 50570A.
Washington, Edward P., 49420A.
Wassil, Michael G., 50678A.
Wassom, Chester R., 50718A.
Wasson, Glenn E., 21904A.
Waterbury, David E., 24833A.
Waters, Charles E., 43797A.
Waters, William G., 44075A.
Watkins, Elmer R., 44378A.
Watkins, James L., 49422A.
Watson, Charles F., Jr., 23110A.
Watson, Ervin R., 50708A.
Watson, Harold B., 50621A.
Watson, Jerry F., 50695A.
Watson, Raymond S., 49314A.
Watts, Jack K., 26522A.
Waugh, Charles A., 49503A.
Weaver, Harvey C., 50630A.
Weaver, Russell E., Jr., 50556A.
Webb, Charles L., 44544A.
Webb, Herbert G., 24525A.
Webb, James A., Jr., 24822A.
Webb, James L., 44390A.
Webb, Robert C., 44353A.
Webb, Sidney A., 64852A.
Webster, Everett H., 26979A.
Webster, James V., 51196A.
Wedding, George W., 43881A.
Wedekind, Donald H., 44171A.
Weehler, Eldon R., 50501A.
Wehe, John H., 44160A.
Weil, Joseph R., 44475A.
Weiss, George L., 50445A.
Weiss, Kenneth E., 64857A.
Weitzel, Hulbert F., Jr., 52941A.
Welch, Dudley G., 49394A.
Welch, John W., 23146A.
Welch, Robert E., 27764A.
Weller, Burton L., 22881A.
Wells, Douglas D., 49468A.
Wells, George W., 49552A.
Wells, Lee C., 44472A.
Wells, Robert A., 49325A.
Wells, Walter W., 52945A.
Welsch, Jack H., 50455A.
Welsh, Mark A., Jr., 25568A.
Weltz, Charles O., 50749A.
Wendt, Robert V., 51189A.
Weniger, Andrew L., 44350A.
Werner, Paul J., 53074A.
Wertz, Andrew W., 44159A.
Wesse, Wilbert D., 44185A.
West, Glenn H., 50437A.
West, Keith W., 26957A.
Wetherell, Ernest J., 44438A.
Wethington, Jerry D., 22480A.
Whalen, Donald B., 44402A.
Whatley, George R., 64362A.
Whatley, Wayne N., 43750A.
Whealen, Daniel M., 43846A.
Wheeler, George E., 43930A.
Whelan, Paul A., 52971A.
Whelan, Richard J., 43721A.
Whetzel, Robert D., 64770A.
Whicher, William C., 26974A.
Whisnant, Jackson R., 50539A.
Whitaker, J. L., 43911A.
White, B. D., 22499A.
White, Benjamin L., 50664A.
White, James E., 22379A.
White, Kenneth J., 50767A.
White, Roy L., 43730A.
White, Simon S., Jr., 22482A.
Whitehead, Robert J., 49439A.
Whitener, Carr C., 22380A.
Whitten, Solomon D., Jr., 44252A.
Whittingham, Dona W., 50589A.
Whittington, Oddi E., 51174A.
Whitworth, Lorne D., 49391A.
Wicker, Eugene C., 22871A.
Wicks, Marvin A., 49477A.
Wickwire, Robert J., 49455A.
Wiekhorst, Mark C., 43872A.
Wilcox, David W., 51150A.
Wiles, Howard O., Jr., 22381A.
Wilkins, George I., 43889A.
Wilkins, Robert G., 64771A.
Wilkinson, Paul K., 26938A.
Willahan, Leon L., 43682A.
Willard Garry A., Jr., 26958A.
Willett, Homer N., 49323A.
Willey, Kenneth W., 44069A.
Williams, Carol M., 49370W.
Williams, Clarence R., 44039A.
Williams, Gene F., 27555A.
Williams, Jack B., Jr., 50526A.
Williams, James R., 50497A.
Williams, Jessie B., 51190A.
Williams, John T., 44757A.
Williams, Joseph B., 44129A.
Williams, Mittie R., 44534W.
Williams, Reuben E., 24835A.
Williams, Richard E., 44298A.
Williams, Robert, 43732A.
Williams, Robert H., 49478A.
Williams, Robert P., 49327A.
William, Shepherd C., Jr., 49456A.
Williams, Walter A., 24844A.
Williamson, Donald S., 24505A.
Williford, James F., 43702A.
Willis, Stephen N., 28351A.
Willis, Vincent C., 44513A.
Willoughby, Michael E., 64815A.
Wills, Harley N., 43932A.
Willsie, Donovan L., 44493A.
Wilson, Clayton A., III, 27031A.
Wilson, Ernest F., 44238A.
Wilson, Robert D., 44480A.
Wilson, Thomas C., 50482A.
Wilson, Troy M., 49367A.
Wilson, William E., Jr., 50527A.

Wilson, William B., 22384A.
Wilson, William M., 43681A.
Winberg, Harry L., 43862A.
Windland, Sara J., 64847W.
Wingard, Sigurd J., Jr., 51209A.
Wingate, Clark L., 27720A.
Winkler, Ralph E., 43261A.
Winters, Warren J., 50444A.
Wirta, Victor H., Jr., 50660A.
Wise, Harvey E., 20778A.
Wise, Joseph H., Jr., 50770A.
Wissman, William O., 43729A.
Witt, Harry M., 44145A.
Wittry, John P., 44446A.
Wolf, Robert K., 22921A.
Wolfe, John L., 28411A.
Wolfe, Leon K., Jr., 50645A.
Wolff, Earle R., 49388A.
Woliver, Robert M., 50644A.
Wood, Harry L., 43747A.
Wood, Kenneth C., 51206A.
Wood, Richard D., Sr., 44056A.
Wood, Richard J., 24615A.
Wood, William F., Jr., 49405A.
Woodall, John B., 44089A.
Woodell, John N., Jr., 64851A.
Woodhouse, Edward J., 22878A.
Woods, David A., Jr., 24540A.
Woods, Richard M., 43884A.
Woods, Robert F., 50622A.
Woods, Sumner R., 64749A.
Worley, Luther D., 44356A.
Worth, Francis H., 43974A.
Woske, Donald G., 49479A.
Wratten, Joseph B., Jr., 26728A.
Wright, Howard E., 22933A.
Wright, John C., 44501A.
Wright, Vernon L., 49485A.
Wright, William N., 44253A.
Wurschmidt, Leo C., 44312A.
Wurthmann, Henry S., Jr., 23136A.
Wylie, Sherrel W., Jr., 43773A.
Wymer, James R., 49361A.
Wyrick, Glenn R., 50751A.
Yanecek, Earl E., 23144A.
Yeager, Marvin A., 44494A.
Yennie, Eugene V., 44410A.
Yoast, Charles, 50633A.
Yockey, Raymond, 44535A.
Yocum, John W., 44495A.
Young, Albert L., 44379A.
Young, George J., Jr., 50530A.
Yuhas, Louis D., 50760A.
Zaroban, Richard H., 24475A.
Zedaker, Willis D., 44380A.
Zehnder, Herbert R., 44189A.
Zemple, Charles J., 50704A.
Zettel, Frank C., 49430A.
Zielinski, Lester W., 44511A.
Zimmerman, Harry C., 44537A.
Zinsmeister, P. C., Jr., 43971A.
Zook, Donald B., 44496A.
Zunic, Nicholas F., Jr., 50700A.
Zunker, Gordon K., 43842A.
Zurawski, Donald D., 22387A.
Zwiacher, John W., 27759A.

MEDICAL CORPS

Captain to major

Allen, S. Thomas, 29495A.
Anderson, Daniel H., 59938A.
Benson, Jack O., 29491A.
Benz, James A., 78102A.
Butler, Thorne J., 29320A.
Callaghan, Patrick E., 76226A.
Camp, Thomas F., Jr., 29497A.
Carlson, Kenneth P., 29632A.
Cary, George R., Jr., 29290A.
Christensen, Don L., 29322A.
Cleland, William O., 78496A.
Conrad, Fred G., 28141A.
Cooper, Alan B., 69728A.
Culton, Yancey G., Jr., 29874A.
Daley, John G., 29435A.
Daly, James W., 78104A.
Dann, Theodore A., 78105A.
Dart, Leroy H., Jr., 76594A.
Davidson, W. Harley, 29432A.
Eagleton, John E., 29323A.
Ednie, Thomas F., 32324A.
Ezell, Roy C., 59547A.
Fitzgerald, Robert T., 76528A.
Flanagan, Paul, 59942A.
Froede, Richard C., 29318A.
Fry, Harold H., Jr., 59699A.
Funk, John W., 56548A.
Graveline, Duane E., 29875A.
Gretz, Herbert F., Jr., 70876A.
Hanson, Paull R., 61143A.
Heine, Earle R., 64207A.
Higgins, Lloyd M., 29441A.
Hockenberry, James H., 29317A
Hoffman, Paul E., 76364A.
Howell, William D., 78109A.
Jenkins, John T., 59703A.
Lagergren, William R., 76233A.
Leary, Frank J., 49679A.
Leigh, John E., 29500A.
Longenhagen, John B., 29642A.
Lovett, Vernor F., 29314A.
Manning, William K., I., 29325A.
Matejka, Robert E., 59702A.
McLain, Clarence R., Jr., 76510A.
Meng, Gunter R., 29285A.
Miller, Monte B., 76575A.
Miller, Robert T., 29326A.
Mills, Edward H., 29288A.
Mitchell, William J., 29327A.
Moore, Patrick J., 29310A.
Muller, Herber A., Jr., 29328A.
Neurnberger, Louis G., 29459A.
O'Brien, David D., 59704A.
Ockner, Stephen A., 28138A.
Parker, Gerald W., 59701A.
Patterson, Lewis T., 29455A.
Penry, James K., 29501A.
Peterson, Carl G., Jr., 28140A.
Pories, Walter J., 32582A.
Priebe, Cedric J., Jr., 29442A.
Richardson, Howard D., 29461A.
Rickenbach, Ho F., Jr., 29329A.
Riley, Claude C., Jr., 76242A.
Rollins Lawrence T., 29502A.
Roman, James A., 29286A.
Rueve, William W., 29641A.
Russell, Robert J., 29449A.
Ryder, Robert G., 76243A.
Santacroce, Thomas A., 59940A.
Scibetta, Richard C., 78114A.
Scott, John R., 29330A.
Sharp, Page, Jr., 61142A.
Shoener, John A., 28147A.
Simes, David L., 76244A.
Snodgrass, W. T., 29639A.
Snoga, Jimmy R., 59700A.
Story, William C., 29490A.
Straub, John J., 59936A.
Sullivan, John B., 29452A.
Thomas, Frank W., Jr., 29504A.
Titus, Charles O., 29508A.
Turns, James E., 66018A.
Weston, Eugene L., 28150A.
Wilson, Charles L., 59941A.
Woodmansee, Terrence R., 28152A.
Woolley, Galen S., 29505A.
Yamauchi, Hiroshi, 29506A.
Zick, Herbert R., 59937A.

DENTAL CORPS

Captain to major

Baum, Leroy M., Jr., 76253A.
Brolling, Robert A., 59718A.
Bulman, Robert E., 56161A.
Carr, Bernard M., 31962A.
Ciampa, John B., Jr., 63479A.
Colaizzi, Frank A., 51360A.
Cole, Theodore C., 29893A.
Curtis, William J., 51575A.
DeJmek, Homer W., 59955A.
Dooley, Benjamin E., 32585A.
Drake, Robert B., 55217A.
Fitch, Melvin G., 70371A.
Frady, Ralph H., Jr., 56160A.
Gilliam, Robert H., 51356A.
Green, Hampton, Jr., 76578A.
Gutweniger, Charles A., 51359A.
Harless, Charles F., Jr., 32580A.
Harrison, Billy M., 31961A.
Henry, Richard A., Jr., 31963A.
Hope, Harley F., Jr., 51358A.
Hungerford, Richard W., 29817A.
Jacoby, James K., 51355A.
Jans, Jack F., 62820A.
Johnson, Robert P., 32363A.
Junghans, John A., 59602A.
Kleinman, Preston R., 76514A.
Lazanas, Theodore P., 76438A.
Marshall, Jerome B., Jr., 62922A.
McCarthy, Paul H., 59717A.
Meffert, Roland M., 69744A.
Meister, Frank, Jr., 64228A.
Meyerhoeffer, War A., 77292A.
Morrow, Robert M., 29658A.
Parish, Gene D., 59603A.
Patterson, Joe M., 49706A.
Pelc, Henry T., 55820A.
Rank, Dale F., 56162A.
Reiner, Peter R., 56551A.
Rogers, Edward W., 56387A.
Rogers, James H., 51574A.
Sarka, Robert J., 51357A.
Schmidt, William H., 59883A.
Smith, James R., 29818A.
Takacs, William J., 51361A.
Wall, Joseph W., Jr., 32362A.
Weiss, Lane E., 75309A.
Wilkinson, Edward G., 55216A.

VETERINARY CORPS

Captain to major

Clarke, Neville P., 54936A.
Godden, William R., 51562A.
Jones, William L., Jr., 56481A.
Whitehair, Leo A., 51124A.

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Captain to major

Ables, William A., Jr., 25675A.
Allen, George F., 26718A.
Baber, Winston D., 25678A.
Bates, Jack H., 49028A.
Bauman, Bernard F., 55339A.
Beale, Charles C., 51114A.
Bell, Herbert E., 22542A.
Bitter, Harold L., 49024A.
Blair, Marshal N., 55338A.
Braden, Robert W., 25339A.
Britt, Clyde L., 49031A.
Busch, Emery B., Jr., 24253A.
Butcher, Bruce A., 25704A.
Cardarelli, Alexander J., 24254A.
Chambers, Binning P., 49025A.
Cortner, Robert H., 25347A.
Dibona, Joseph, 23229A.
Diedrich, Fred J., Jr., 24246A.
Diehl, Harold, Jr., 55337A.
Etter, Hal G., 24247A.
Farmer, Jack N., 25741A.
Freud, Sheldon L., 24245A.
Gabel, Richard J., 25345A.
Galbraith, John R., 49027A.
Gibble, Thomas B., 24252A.
Gray, Pat B., 25676A.
Green, John R., 49019A.
Grimes, Ivan B., 49018A.
Guerin, Michael D., Jr., 27535A.
Hartman, John L., Jr., 27536A.
Hirsch, Jerome A., 25350A.
Huttenhauer, Glen A., 55333A.
Isbell, Frank H., 26751A.
Jenkins, Thomas H., Jr., 49032A.
Johnson, James E., 55343A.
Jones, Bruce, 24240A.
Keeffe, Loren J., 27537A.
Kopp, Warren W., 49035A.
Lapresto, Jasper, Jr., 49034A.
Long, Ralph S., Jr., 24248A.
Loper, Lester R., 24251A.
McAllen, Daniel L., Jr., 25679A.
McIntyre, Walter V., 24243A.
Moyer, James E., 25683A.
Murphy, James D., 25674A.
Nolan, Francis X., 51115A.
Nugent, Edward S., 55335A.
Overfelt, Clifford D., Jr., 25340A.
Parker, Gene H., 24255A.
Peters, Kenneth W., 51112A.
Pitts, Donald G., 24250A.
Pons, James T., 49023A.
Reischmann, William C., 49017A.
Richardson, Tom W., Jr., 24242A.
Ross, William C., Jr., 55334A.
Simmons, Bennie F., 55341A.

Skafidas, Gregory J., 25740A.
Smith, Francis J., 29334A.
Summers, Donald E., 49033A.
Teems, Ray M., 32476A.
Thimm, Frederick F., 55340A.
Thornell, Emmett A., 51113A.
Todd, Garry W., Jr., 55342A.
Trager, Leonard W., Jr., 25677A.
Tribble, William D., 25341A.
Truelove, James W., 25739A.
Watson, Robert A., 25680A.
Watterson, Lewis A., 49021A.
Williams, Williams L., 24244A.

NURSE CORPS

Captain to major

Banfield, Teresa, 59609W.
Bates, Maudie L., 28013W.
Beard, Sarah E., 35384W.
Betzold, Margery E., 28015W.
Burkhardt, Ann L., 32441W.
Carlson, Mary S., 25764W.
Chaplin, Genevieve, 51591W.
Chavez, Carmen V., 32443W.
Clarke, Mary M., 56560W.
Cole, Mary L., 59732W.
Collavo, Laverne M., 24259W.
DeJesuscruz, Maria, 28014W.
Farrell, Eileen, 51373W.
Fleming, Edith E., 51372W.
Fueller, Jean M., 59962W.
Golden, Norma J., 25766W.
Grim, Patricia A., 27550W.
Grubbs, Garnett P., 54952W.
Higdon, Wanda J., 51375W.
Hope, Louis V., 32594W.
Householder, Marjorie L., 49721W.
Howard, Lillian T., 62924W.
Hurley, Betty J., 26660W.
Ingram, Helene A., 32592W.
James, Phyllis M., 25354W.
Kellam, Agnes L., 28012W.
Longbottom, Vera M., 59610W.
Maguire, Mary P., 32445W.
Marshall, Louise A., 26658W.
Martinjak, Marti J., 54950W.
Maslanka, Helen A., 32446W.
McFall, Eleanor L., 49719W.
Momrow, Esther M., 24258W.
Myles, Ruth M., 49718W.
Powell, Elma J., 32444W.
Rolwing, Miriam D., 27546W.
Sanderson, Charlotte E., 54953W.
Scanlon, Mary M., 49722W.
Simpson, Iva L., 32442W.
Stewart, Bonnie L., 55822W.
Stone, Ethel, 61212W.
Stout, Ellen M., 51593W.
Thomas, Frances E., 32593W.
Thornburgh, Erlene, 64245W.
Tyler, Eva C., 26661W.
Veitch, Janet, 26666W.
Wallace, Mary E., 26663W.
Weaver, Phyllis J., 29764W.
Welborn, Ella E., 26664W.
Wells, Sarah P., 56561W.
Whitlock, Ona F., 56559W.
Wikoff, Lois J., 29346W.
Wood, Edith, 26657W.
Zirkle, Robbie J., 26662W.

MEDICAL SPECIALIST CORPS

Captain to major

Coursey,, Junie M., 27553W.
Schmid, Mary H., 64279W.
Vanscoy, Joan L., 54968W.

CHAPLAIN

Captain to major

Backman, Lee W., 48652A.
Chapman, Billy G., 55176A.
Coggins, Joseph H., 48656A.
Collins, John R., 48659A.
Connelly, George R., 28158A.
Cooper, Calvin C., 48653A.
Copeland, Isaa M., Jr., 48660A.
Dier, Blanche J., Jr., 48655A.
Ellison, Ervin D., III, 32434A.
Gardiner, Homer E., 56415A.
Hofstad, Dean C., 48658A.
Klaric, George M., 48651A.
Krieger, Wilfred L., 64312A.
Ledbetter, Curtis E., 55175A.
Lyznicki, Edmund F., 49665A.
Margitich, Michael, 48661A.
Moran, Thomas J., 48657A.
Powell, Samuel G., 50962A.
Riggs, Carl B., 64313A.
Squires, Donald M., 48654A.
Wilkens, Charles H., 32435A.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Air Force, under the appropriate provisions of chapter 835, title 10, United States Code, as amended. All officers are subject to physical examination required by law.

LINE OF THE AIR FORCE

Second lieutenant to first lieutenant

Ache, Leroy P., 70975A.
Acheson, Densel K., 77312A.
Adams, George B., Jr., 77582A.
Adams, Joseph D., III, 69613A.
Adams, Wendell M., 63720A.
Ahl, Arthur W., 72196A.
Aiken, Gerald G., 76745A.
Albrecht, Charles F., Jr., 69684A.
Alcini, Gerald L., 76746A.
Aldridge, Robert P., Jr., 77313A.
Alexander, Robert M., 63721A.
Allen, Glenn D., Jr., 77583A.
Allport, Charles W., 63722A.
Alston, Harold R., 76747A.
Altman, Herbert, 63723A.
Andersen, Jack T., 76748A.
Andersen, Niels B., 77314A.
Andersen, William C., 70424A.
Anderson, Jack L., 63724A.
Anderson, Richard C., 76749A.
Anderson, Robert F., 63725A.
Andres, John C., 69639A.
Annis, James R., 63726A.
April, Paul K., 78304A.
Armstrong, John J., 63727A.
Arnold, John D., 76750A.
Arnold, William E., 76751A.
Asakura, Takazum, Jr., 77777A.
Ashe, Braxton W., 76752A.
Asher, Laurence F., 77315A.
Atchison, Richard M., 76753A.
Attix, Harold B., Jr., 76754A.
Atwood, Daryl G., 76755A.
Auth, Edward G., Jr., 77584A.
Ayers, Richard G., 77316A.
Baber, Gary P., 76756A.
Babin, Logan H., Jr., 63728A.
Babler, Myron J., 70553A.
Backman, Vernon E., 63729A.
Bailor, Ronald O., 77585A.
Baily, Joseph J., III, 76757A.
Baj, Chester T., Jr., 63730A.
Baker, Guy F., 76758A.
Baker, Marion K., 76759A.
Baker, Roy T., 76760A.
Baker, Samuel J., 63731A.
Baker, Willard L., Jr., 77778A.
Banks, Frederick M., 63732A.
Barazzone, Samuel W., 76761A.
Barber, Hugh W., Jr., 77317A.
Barker, William V. H., 77318A.
Barkhurst, Paul D., 77779A.
Barr, Michael J., 69839A.
Barr, Michael L., 63733A.
Barranco, Stephen S., 77319A.
Barsanti, Ronald F., 77587A.
Barthelemy, Richard P., 77588A.
Bartley, Robert W., 63734A.
Barton, Roland S., Jr., 76762A.
Barwell, Robert R., 76763A.
Bates, Roy O., Jr., 76764A.
Bates, Thomas M., 70660A.
Bates, William E., 69683A.
Baucom, Donald R., 63735A.
Baughman, Gary L., 63736A.
Bauhahn, Paul E., 76765A.
Baxter, Robert H., 63737A.
Bayer, Roger T., 76766A.
Bayless, William E., 77320A.
Bazet, Randolph A., Jr., 76767A.
Beasley, Earle C., 76768A.
Beaudry, Richard G., 77780A.
Beck, Bradley T., 63738A.
Beers, L. N., 76769A.
Beldy, Andrew J., 77321A.
Bell, Jerald R., 77322A.
Bellas, Robert, 70554A.
Belter, Melvin J., 77323A.
Bender, James F., 78305A.
Bender, Walter W., 78499A.
Bennett, Charles O., Jr., 63739A.
Bennett, Dennis R., 63740A.
Benton, Stanley H., Jr., 63741A.
Benzel, Gerald D., 77589A.
Bergmann, Harold W., 77781A.
Bergstrom, Harry F., 77782A.
Berkovich, James, III, 76770A.
Berringer, Lynn T., 77324A.
Berry, John S., 77783A.
Bessett, George R., 76771A.
Betz, Ernest J., 77590A.
Bezanson, Richard H., 63743A.
Bicknell, Ernest P., III, 76772A.
Biegalski, Conrad S., 63744A.
Biel, Fredrick W., 69687A.
Bifolchi, George J., 63745A.
Bigelow, David L., 76773A.
Bigelow, Joseph P., 70968A.
Billington, Gordon F., 63746A.
Bird, Horace C., Jr., 77591A.
Birkhead, Robert F., 77592A.
Bishop, Halford R., 76774A.
Bjorklund, Donald C., 76775A.
Blackner, Craig S., 76776A.
Blair, Thomas W., Jr., 77325A.
Blaisdell, Michael P., 63747A.
Blue, David R., 76777A.
Bobko, Peter B., 63748A.
Bockelman, David C., 63749A.
Bodenheimer, Clyde E., 76778A.
Boette, August E., 74396A.
Bogart, Bruce C., 77593A.
Bogart, Paul C., Jr., 76779A.
Bogemann, Lawrence L., 76780A.
Bohan, James A., 77326A.
Bolster, Carl H, 63750A.
Bolt, James F., 70574A.
Bond, Jack C., 76781A.
Bond, John E., 79086A.
Booker, William E., Jr., 76782A.
Boortz, Eugene H., 76783A.
Borden, Benton L., 78306A.
Borts, Robert A., 77327A.
Bosser, Robert L., 63751A.
Bostick, Neil D., 78307A.
Bouchoux, Gerald E., 77328A.
Boursaw, Jon E., 76784A.
Bow, Rudolph N., Jr., 63752A.
Bowen, Robert H., Jr., 77329A.
Bowers, Hilton C., 63753A.
Bowles, Howard F., Jr., 76785A.
Bowling, Gene D., 76786A.
Bowman, Gary H., 76787A.
Boyd, Charles H., 76788A.
Boyke, William E., 76789A.
Bradstreet, Frank P., 63754A.
Brame, Charles E., 76790A.
Branch, Kirby P., 77784A.
Brandt, David A., 76791A.
Bredenkamp, Barton C., 76792A.
Breen, Walter M., 77330A.
Brenizer, Robert F., 77331A.
Bridge, Jason K., 79157A.
Briggs, Dean M., 77332A.
Brinkley, Vernon C., 76793A.
Brinkman, James M., III, 63755A.
Brinson, James E., 76794A.
Brock, Billy J., 76795A.
Brothers, John N., 63756A.
Brown, Alwyn K., Jr., 77333A.
Brown, Christopher H., 63757A.
Brown, Dennis E., 77594A.
Brown, Donald R., 77334A.
Brown, Jerry E., 77595A.
Brown, Richard C., 76796A.
Brown, Robert B., 77335A.
Brown, Sidney K., Jr., 76797A.
Browning, William A., 63758A.
Bruce, Donald W., 77596A.
Brucher, John M., 63759A.
Bryant, Clarence J., 77597A.

Bryant, William L., 79087A.
Buchanan, Glenn M., 70575A.
Bucksbee, John D., 76798A.
Bullard, Barry W., 76799A.
Bullard, Donald R., 77785A.
Bundy, Wayne P., 77336A.
Burch, Thomas E., 63760A.
Burchett, Dewey E., Jr., 78308A.
Burchfield, Joseph P., 79207A.
Burdin, Thomas W., 76800A.
Burgess, Thomas E., 77598A.
Burns, Robert G., 77337A.
Burns, Ronald A., 76801A.
Butchko, Michael J., Jr., 63761A.
Butler, Charles M., 63762A.
Butler, Leonard A., 63763A.
Butler, Ronald L., 76802A.
Butler, William K., 70413A.
Buzard, Clifford S., 77338A.
Byrd, Ronald D., 76803A.
Byrne, Richard O., 78420A.
Byrne, Stewart R., 76804A.
Calder, David M., 77599A.
Caldwell, Laps R., Jr., 63765A.
Callaway, Patrick W., 77600A.
Camerlo, Ronald J., 77786A.
Campbell, Burton W., 70564A.
Campbell, Harvey C., 78309A.
Campbell, Jimmie R., 77601A.
Campbell, Joe L., 74441A.
Cannon, William P., 63766A.
Capps, Ted C., 76805A.
Caputo, Vito M., 63767A.
Caravaglio, Francis J., 70565A.
Carder, James R., Jr., 76806A.
Carleton, Will A. Jr., 76807A.
Carlin, David M., 77339A.
Carn, Robert M., Jr., 63768A.
Carpenter, Kenneth M., 77602A.
Carroll, Howard K., 63769A.
Carroll, John L., 63770A.
Carter, William P., 63771A.
Carver, James I., II, 76808A.
Carver, Linwood J., 63772A.
Case, Carl T., 77603A.
Casey, Walter H., 77340A.
Casjens, David W., 77604A.
Cason, Carl W., 77787A.
Castillo, Richard, 76809A.
Cavell, James E., 69800A.
Chaklos, Thomas E., 63773A.
Challis, Ford F., 70952A.
Champion, Joel T., 70555A.
Chapman, John W., 69600A.
Chapman, Peter H., II, 69846A.
Charlow, Joseph F., Jr., 70550A.
Chastain, Calvin H., 75490A.
Chavanne, William G., 63774A.
Chavez, Antonio I., Jr., 77341A.
Cheeld, Charles M., III, 78310A.
Chellman, Edward M., 77342A.
Childress, Guy P., Jr., 77788A.
Choulet, Robert A., 77789A.
Ciesko, Robert, 77605A.
Claflin, Richard A., 76810A.
Clanton, Norman G., 76811A.
Clanton, Paul L., 63776A.
Clardy, Charles W., 63777A.
Clark, David W., 70549A.
Clark, Kirk B., 63778A.
Clark, Leonard L., 77343A.
Cliatt, Edwin R., 77790A.
Click, John E., 76812A.
Coady, Robert F., 76813A.
Coate, Larry C., 76814A.
Cobb, Lawrence D., II, 77344A.
Coble, William C., Jr., 77606A.
Cochran, Donald R., 76339A.
Coe, Peter S., 71107A.
Cole, Charles M., Jr., 76815A.
Cole, Ralston P., 63779A.
Coles, Louis E., 77345A.
Collette, William R., 77792A.
Compton, Phil V., 77346A.
Congleton, Charles W.. 77791A.
Congleton, Roger V., 77793A.
Conlan, James T., 76816A.
Conlan, Ralph E., 63780A.
Connerat, Edwin B., Jr., 63781A.
Connolly, James M., 70958A.
Connolly, Robert J., 63782A.
Conrad, Joseph P., 77347A.
Constant, Dennis L., 76817A.
Cook, James T., 78311A.
Cook, Loyal S., 76818A.
Cooke, George E., 77348A.
Cooke, Harry D., III, 63783A.
Cooksey, Mellwood, Jr., 76819A.
Cooper, Frank B., 77349A.
Copeland, Jerry, 70417A.
Corballs, Fred F., Jr., 63784A.
Corey, Cletus A., 74493A.
Cornetet, Gerald F., 63785A.
Corr, James F., 63786A.
Costa, John J., 78125A.
Costa, Nicholas P., Jr., 77607A.
Cottrell, William A., 76820A.
Couch, Robert P., 78421A.
Coughlin, Donald T., 63787A.
Cougill, Robert P., 76821A.
Couvillion, Charles E., 78126A.
Cox, Claude D., 76822A.
Cox, Homer M., Jr., 77350A.
Craddock, Joe P., 77351A.
Crane, Robert D., Jr., 76823A.
Cranmer, Roger L., 77352A.
Crawford, Charles L., 77608A.
Crawford, Robert L., 63788A.
Crawford, Roger A., 69611A.
Crawshaw, Wharton R., 69843A.
Cronin, Philip F., Jr., 70651A.
Cross, Francis M., Jr., 63937A.
Crossley, Robert W.,77794A.
Crossman, Charles K., 76824A.
Crowley, Jackson O., 78127A.
Croy, Otto E., Jr., 77795A.
Cruickshank, John P., 77609A.
Culhane, Peter K., 76825A.
Culver, John N., 77353A.
Cuneo, William J., Jr., 77796A.
Cunningham, Robert G., 76826A.
Curtis, Richard E., 76827A.
Curtis, Richard R., 77797A.
Cushman, Clifton E., 77354A.
Cuthbert, Bradley G., 63790A.
Cutney, John M., 78128A.
Czech, Felix, 77355A.
Dalton, Ronnie D., 70658A.
Danber, Edward B., 63791A.
Daniel, Gerald A., 63792A.
Daniel, Marsha E., Jr., 70959A.
Daniel, Robert J., 76828A.
Danigole, Simon A., 77610A.
Dannenberg, William J., 76829A.
Danner, James E., 78312A.
Dardeau, Arthur T., 77356A.
Daughterty, Jerry W., 63793A.
Davey, Jack N., 78129A.
Davey, Robert F., 63794A.
Davidson, James A., Jr., 63795A.
Davie, Thomas E., Jr., 78313A.
Davis, Allan S., 76830A.
Davis, Charles W., 77611A.
Davis, David P., 77357A.
Davis, James L., 77798A.
Davis, Joseph T., Jr., 76831A.
Davis, Kenneth D., 76832A.
Davis, Lowell K., 76833A.
Day, Carroll N., 77612A.
Dean, John G., 70653A.
Dean, Robert L., 77613A.
Deberry, Robert D., 63796A.
Debolt, Donald C., 76834A.
Decker, Carl G., 77799A.
Decosmo, Ronald L., 70963A.
Dehne, Denis E., 63797A.
Deichelmann, Samuel M., 69686A.
Delestine, Gary R., 76835A.
Delphin, Barry R., 63798A.
Demarco, Robert V., 63799A.
Demaret, Richard J., 76836A.
Dempsey, David D., 78314A.
Dentremont, James A., 63800A.
Derks, Eugene L., 77614A.
Devaney, James E., 77615A.
Diaiso, Robert J., 63801A.
Diamond, Verl K., 77358A.
Dichtl, Rudolph J., 78315A.
Dick, Charles R., 77359A.
Dierlam, Mark J., 78130A.
Dieterly, Duncan L., 77800A.
Dietrich, Frederick L., 63802A.
Dillon, Dan V., 77360A.
Dinning, Otis O., Jr., 63803A.
Dinsmore, John C., 63804A.
Dix, Alfred C., 77616A.
Dobson, George E., 77361A.
Dockum, Robert R., 76837A.
Donaca, Richard R., 70654A.
Dondero, Richard W., 76838A.
Donnellan, James L., 76839A.
Donovan, Daniel J., II, 63805A.
Doonan, William W., Jr., 76840A.
Dorman, Ralph T., 77617A.
Dorsey, James E., Jr., 76841A.
Doten, Eric S., 76842A.
Doty, Mickey D., 69840A.
Downs, Clelland R., 79197A.
Draper, Charles T., 77618A.
Drinnon, Donald T., 69833A.
Dryden, Joseph W., Jr., 63806A.
Duckworth, Kenneth J., 63742A.
Duell, John V., 72638A.
Duell, Thomas L., 76843A.
Duemmel, John W., 77362A.
Duigon, Theodore M., Jr., 70955A.
Dulaney, Elliott D., 76844A.
Duncan, John K., 77619A.
Dunlap, Richard O., 78316A.
Dunn, Daniel R., 63807A.
Dunning, Thomas B., 69791A.
Durham, Harold R., Jr., 77363A.
Durrett, John C., 69610A.
Duvall, Ronald W., 63808A.
Dvorak, James E., 77620A.
Dyer, Dana D., 76845A.
Dykes, Frederick T., 63809A.
Easter, John R., 63810A.
Eastman, John W., 77801A.
Eaton, James D., Jr., 63811A.
Echelberger, Arthur D., 77802A.
Eckel, George M., III, 63812A.
Eckert, Jon S., 77364A.
Edwards, Lloyd A., 77365A.
Edwards, Rufus L., 79089A.
Egleston, William F., 76846A.
Eichorst, Douglas W., 76847A.
Eilers, Dennis L., 76848A.
Eisinger, Jerry B., 76849A.
Elam, John G., 76850A.
Elder, Norman D., 77621A.
Ellenburg, Kay R., 77366A.
Eller, Richard A., 76851A.
Ellis, Noel G., Jr., 76852A.
Ellis, Stephen H., 63814A.
Ellsworth, John R., 63815A.
Elsam, Eric S., 76853A.
Emberlin, Richard L., 69864A.
Engels, Geoffrey P., 63816A.
Engle, Ira, Jr., 70556A.
Englehart, William D., 77803A.
Epley, Thomas F., 63817A.
Erbes, James L., 76854A.
Erickson, Vern E., 76855A.
Eriksson, Ronald J., 77804A.
Erkkinen, Albert T., 77805A.
Ernest, Ronald G., 76856A.
Ernspiger, Richard K., 77622A.
Esses, David J., 78317A.
Eubanks, Johnny D., 77368A.
Evanczyk, Elroy E., 77623A.
Evans, Travis L., 78318A.
Evon, William J., 77806A.
Ewing, John H., 76857A.
Faber, Brian R., 76858A.
Fabian, Ralph R., 77369A.
Faessler, Lawrence J., 70964A.
Fahey, William C., 75363A.
Fairburn, David R., 77370A.
Fairchild, Edward A., 76859A.
Fairweather, James D., 77371A.
Fallon, Clifford B., 63819A.
Faloon, Robert L., 76860A.
Farnham, John W., 77372A.
Farrington, Arthur D., 63820A.
Fassero, Joseph M., 70420A.
Fellows, Gary W., 76861A.
Fellows, Richard W., Jr., 63821A.
Felts, Robert L., 63822A.
Fer, John, 63823A.
Ferris, Dean L., 63824A.
Festerman, Gary T., 77373A.

Ficinus, Robert F., 76862A.
Fiedler, Frederick A., 63825A.
Field, Henry W., 76863A.
Fields, Barry N., 77374A.
Fields, David A., 63826A.
Fields, Walter C., Jr., 77375A.
Figgins, Jerry M., 76864A.
Finelli, Ralph J., 63827A.
Fischer, Alton F., 77897A.
Fisher, John C., 76865A.
Fisher, Kenneth S., 63828A.
Fitzgerald, James D., 77625A.
Flanagan, John F., Jr., 63829A.
Fleig, Norman G., 76866A.
Fleming, Kenneth H., 63830A.
Fleming, Michael C., 78319A.
Fletcher, William D., 70581A.
Floodas, James G., 76867A.
Foltz, Warren L., 76868A.
Forbrich, Carl A., Jr., 76869A.
Ford, James N., 76870A.
Ford, Ralph C., 63831A.
Ford, William R., 78320A.
Forrest, Gary F., II, 63832A.
Forster, George J., 77376A.
Fort, Darrell L., 74598A.
Fournier, Robert E., 76871A.
Fowler, Charles W., 76872A.
Fowler, Robert T., 77626A.
Fowler, Vernon F., 76873A.
Fox, Allan L., 76874A.
Fox, Darrell L., Jr., 63833A.
Fox, Gordon W., 69609A.
Francis, David P., 63834A.
Franco, Charles S., 63835A.
Franklin, Charles E., 70546A.
Freudenberger, Jo W., 79100A.
Frisk, Charles A., 76875A.
Fritz, Nicholas H., Jr., 63836A.
Fritzel, Roger N., 63837A.
Fulaytar, Donald J., 77377A.
Fullen, Floyd R., 76876A.
Fuller, Jerry A., 76877A.
Fuller, Philip S. B., 63838A.
Fulton, Allan C., 63839A.
Fulton, David H., 76878A.
Funk, Evan C., 63840A.
Funk, Ronald R., 78131A.
Funston, David L., 67879A.
Gabel, Beau E., 63841A.
Gadd, Richard B., 77378A.
Gage, Donald H., 77627A.
Gallagher, James P., 63842A.
Gallagher, John A., 77628A.
Gallington, Roger W., 77379A.
Galloway, Terrence L., 63843A.
Gambill, Jack H., 77808A.
Garcia, Denis, 76880A.
Garland, Robert A., 77380A.
Garner, Hugh T., Jr., 77381A.
Garrett, David J., Jr., 76881A.
Garrett, Jack D., 63844A.
Garrison, Harry E., 77382A.
Garvin, William L., 76882A.
Gasparro, George G., 77629A.
Gates, George O., 77383A.
Gaylor, Wayne T., 76884A.
Geiger, John A., Jr., 63846A.
Gerber, Harry D., 77384A.
Gerber, William G., 76885A.
Gerken, Frederick E., Jr., 63847A.
Gertsch, William D., 63848A.
Gesell, William H., III, 76886A.
Gibson, Michael K., 63849A.
Giedlin, Robert W., 74624A.
Giere, Bernard D., 76887A.
Giger, John M., 77809A.
Gilbert, James F., 76888A.
Gilchrist, John R., Jr., 77385A.
Gilg, John F., 76889A.
Gillson, Arthur W., 63850A.
Gillum, Charles R., 76890A.
Gilmartin, Richard T., Jr., 63851A.
Gilmore, Richard M., 76891A.
Gilstad, Dennis W., 63852A.
Gipson, Walter M., 70542A.
Gish, Donald L., 70940A.
Gittleman, Arnold J., 77630A.
Gleason, Edwin M., 77631A.
Gleason, Michael V., 74630A.
Gleichman, Edward A., 63853A.
Glud, Robert G., 76892A.
Gober, Donald W., 69858A.
Godowski, John L., 76893A.
Golden, Norman G., 77632A.
Goldman, Paul T., Jr., 77386A.
Goldman, Robert J., 70960A.
Goldsmith, May L., Jr., 63854A.
Gonzales, Jose R., 77387A.
Gooch, Lawrence L., 63855A.
Goodenough, Russell E., 63856A.
Goodhue, Bruce S., 76894A.
Goold, Phillip L., 76895A.
Gordon, Charles E., II, 71099A.
Gordon, William S., III, 76896A.
Gorman, Richard V., 76897A.
Gortler, Gordon D.,77634A.
Graham, Carl G., 76898A.
Graham, Elmer A., 76899A.
Graham, Robert P., 77388A.
Gransewicz, Robert C., 70560A.
Grapes, Darrell W., 77389A.
Gray, David L., 77390A.
Gray, Willie W., Jr., 63857A.
Graziadei, John D., Jr., 77635A.
Green, Robert D., 63858A.
Greene, Albert R., Jr., 76900A.
Greene, John V., 76901A.
Greenfield, Joseph F., 76902A.
Gregory, Duane B., 77391A.
Griffey, Terrence H., 63859A.
Griffin, Charles F., 63860A.
Griffin, Chester W., Jr., 63861A.
Griffith, Alexander J., 76903A.
Grigg, Ralph W., Jr., 76904A.
Grohn, Dan A., 76905A.
Gros, Percy J., Jr., 77810A.
Groves, Robert E., 76906A.
Grundeland, Haral I., 77636A.
Guenther, Michael A., 63862A.
Guidry, Roland D., 77811A.
Guilmartin, Joseph F., Jr., 63863A.
Gunn, Earnest L., 77392A.
Gunn, Kenneth C., 76907A.
Gunst, Robert P., 77393A.
Gura, John T., 76908A.
Gustafson, Jarl S., 76909A.
Gutierrez, Siro, Jr., 77394A.
Haag, George A., 76910A.
Haars, Neil W., 76911A.
Haberstich, Charles H., 69859A.
Haggett, Charles D., 73890A.
Hala, Norbert A., 76912A.
Hale, Charles E., Jr., 63864A.
Hall, Graham, 63865A.
Hall, Henry V., 77395A.
Hall, Jack G., 76913A.
Hall, Joel T., 76914A.
Hall, Lanny W., 63866A.
Hall, William E., III, 76915A.
Hall, William H., 76916A.
Hallager, Donald J., 63867A.
Haller, Charles J., 76917A.
Halprin, Edwin A., Jr., 77396A.
Halstead, Wood J., Jr., 77637A.
Hamiga, John V., 76918A.
Hamlin, Philip D., 76919A.
Hamrick, Gary R., 63868A.
Hanby, James W., 63869A.
Hand, Douglas K., 77813A.
Handy, Burrell R., III, 77638A.
Handy, James H., 70972A.
Haney, Robert L., 77397A.
Hankins, Jimmy G., 76920A.
Hanley, Pierce J., 63870A.
Hanlin, Thomas G., II, 77398A.
Hard, Donald G., 63871A.
Harden, James A., 76921A.
Haring, David R., 77399A.
Harker, Joseph D., 76922A.
Harlan, David L., 63872A.
Harmon, George E., 70541A.
Harmon, Larry R., 63873A.
Harrell, Herbert L., Jr., 76924A.
Harris, John D., 77184A.
Harris, Max H., 77400A.
Harris, Michael W., 76926A.
Harris, Robert E., 77639A.
Harris, William R., 76927A.
Harrison, Foster W., 76928A.
Harrison, George B., 63874A.
Harrison, Robert L., 76929A.
Hart, Joseph T., 76930A.
Harter, Carl E., 77815A.
Harvey, William T., 63875A.
Harwell, Blake B., 77401A.
Harwick, Alexander H. C., 63876A.
Hathcock, Allan C., 77640A.
Haugen, William J., 63877A.
Hauschildt, John C., 63878A.
Hauser, Jack C., 63879A.
Hawkins, Frederick O., 63880A.
Hawkins, Thane D., 63881A.
Haynie, Charles W., Jr., 78321A.
Heacock, Phillip K., 77402A.
Heacox, Donald J., 63882A.
Heard, Stephen R., 70561A.
Heatherly, James C., 77403A.
Hebert, Lawrence R., 76931A.
Heckman, Ralph P., 63883A.
Hedges, Robert L., 79090A.
Heim, Donald C., 77641A.
Heininger, Marvin W., 76932A.
Heiskell, Lucius L., 63884A.
Hendryx, Frederic L., 63885A.
Henning, Hal P., 76933A.
Henninger, Frederick W., 76934A.
Henshaw, Robert A., 63886A.
Hepburn, Phili R., Jr., 63887A.
Herbst, Ralph E., 76935A.
Hernett, Charles X., 77816A.
Herring, Kenneth D., 63888A.
Herrington, Horace S., 76936A.
Herter, Walter C., 63889A.
Hertzog, Randolph B. E., 63890A.
Herzog, Gerald W., 76937A.
Hickman, Donald W., 76938A.
Hickman, John A., 63891A.
Hickman, Peter K., 76939A.
Hickman, Roger A., 70547A.
Hieronymus, Robert E., 70566A.
High, John T., III, 63892A.
Highfill, Jack D., 77643A.
Hilbert, Ronald H., 71156A.
Hill, Gayle W., 69842A.
Hilliard, George, III, 77404A.
Hilton, Russell B., 76940A.
Hilvers, Robert J., 77405A.
Hines, Edward E., 77406A.
Hines, Joseph V., 63893A.
Hinkle, Rodney L., 77817A.
Hipp, Edward F., 77818A.
Hird, William G., 76942A.
Hobbs, Fleming C., Jr., 78323A.
Hodges, Joe W., 76943A.
Hodgkinson, Richard L., 63894A.
Hoffert, Richard L., 63895A.
Hohl, Winton C., 77407A.
Holbrow, Wilmer F., Jr., 63896A.
Holcomb, Robert G., 63897A.
Holden, Albert F., 76944A.
Holihan, Larry C., 77408A.
Holley, Carroll J., 76945A.
Holt, David E., 63898A.
Holtz, Ronald E., 77819A.
Holway, Walter D., 78422A.
Honeycutt Rember L., 76946A.
Hooker, Larry L., 69602A.
Hoover, Richard D., 76947A.
Hopkins, Edward A., 79101A.
Hopkins, Robert S., 63899A.
Hopkins, Roger E., 63900A.
Hornaday, Ralph J., Jr., 63901A.
Horton, Frank B., III, 63902A.
Horton, Kenneth 76948A.
Hoskins, Donald R., 76949A.
Hosler, Robert L., 70965A.
Houck, Freddie R., 76950A.
Houston, John L., 69598A.
Hoven Gary H., 77409A.
Howell, William P., 63903A.
Howes, George F., 79091A.
Hrisak, Robert G., 78324A.
Huard, Joseph E., 79102A.
Hubbard, David B., 69790A.
Huber John L., 76951A.
Huchberger, Bertran, 63904A.
Hudack, Larry J., 76952A.
Hudak, Seth J. 63905A.
Hudgins, Richard E., 77645A.
Huff, Dennis E., 63906A.
Huffman, Ronald P., 76953A.
Hughes, Thaddeus E., 63907A.

Hughes, William F., Jr., 77410A.
Hull, Raymond P., 77411A.
Hunt, David F., 76954A.
Hunt, Leo B., 76955A.
Hunt, Raymond D., 76956A.
Hunter, Raymond F., 76957A.
Hunter, Sammie R., 76958A.
Huntsman, Robert J., 63908A.
Hurley, Richard S. 77820A.
Huston, Lawrence E., 77412A.
Hutchinson, Donald L., 63909A.
Hutchinson, Robert L., 77413A.
Ikelman, Robert H., 76959A.
Ivins, Peter, 78325A.
Jackson, Edgar A. 63911A.
Jackson, Gary R., 70977A.
Jackson, John T., III, 63912A
Jackson, Peter A., 77646A.
Jackson, Rodger N., 76960A.
Jacobson, Loren A., 77414A.
Jaeckle, John T. 76961A.
Jamba, John W., 63913A.
Janicke, Jerome T., 63914A.
Janka, Paul J., 77822A.
Janni, Joseph F., 70416A.
Jarrell, Thomas H., 77415A.
Jeffreys, James V., 78326A.
Jenkins, John P., 63915A.
Jenkins, Paul W., 77647A.
Jennings, Thomas T., 77416A.
Jensen, Harold O., 77417A.
Jensen, Larry O., 63916A.
Jensen, Niels D., 63917A.
Johnson, Allan P., 79211A.
Johnson, Charles B., 77821A.
Johnson, Charles R., 79092A.
Johnson, Curtis M., 77419A.
Johnson, Dale R., 77420A.
Johnson, David C. Z., 76962A.
Johnson, Douglas A., 76963A.
Johnson, Joe E., II, 70583A.
Johnson, Johnny R., 76964A.
Johnson, Laurence J., Jr., 77823A.
Johnson, Laurie R., 76965A.
Johnson, Leo, 63918A.
Johnson, Leonard E., 74761A.
Johnson, Richard A., 76966A.
Johnson, Richard K., 63919A.
Johnson, Richard R., 63920A.
Johnson, Ronald N., 76967A.
Johnson, Russell C., 76968A.
Johnson, William B., Jr., 77421A.
Johnson, William N., 76969A.
Johnston, Bernard W., 63921A.
Johnston, Charles H., Jr., 63922A.
Jones, Billy S., 76970A.
Jones, Lionel T., Jr., 79103A.
Jones, Max K., 76971A.
Jones, Needham B., 77422A.
Jones, Nicholas, 77648A.
Jones, Phillip T., 78423A.
Jones, Ray E., 77649A.
Jones, Robert V., 76972A.
Jordan, Malcolm E., 76973A.
Josey, James W., 77650A.
Judge, Paul J., 76974A.
Jue, Kam B., 77651A.
Justice, Donald H., 77652A.
Kagan, Stanly S., 76975A.
Kahla, Jeffery D., 78132A.
Karwoski, Robert, 78327A.
Kasperbauer, James C., 76976A.
Kauer, Donald F., 63923A.
Kawamoto, David K., 76977A.
Keaney, Thomas A., 63925A.
Keck, Harold G., Jr., 63926A.
Keech, Marvin E., 76978A.
Keighery, Robert P., 63927A.
Keller, James G., 76979A.
Kelly, Bruce W., Jr., 76980A.
Kelly, Dennis F., 79104A.
Kelly, James M., 77824A.
Kennard, Larry E., 76981A.
Kennedy, Gerald L., 77424A.
Kennedy, Thomas M., Jr., 63928A.
Kennedy, Thomas J., 77425A.
Kepner, Dennis A., 63929A.
Keppen, Keith H., 63930A.
Kerner, George M., 76982A.
Kerr, John G., 76983A.
Kiehle, James H., 63931A.
Kielpinski, Thomas J., 70695A.
Kiffer, John F., 77653A.
Kimble, James L., 77654A.
Kimick, Ray W., 77655A.
Kincaid, James W., Jr., 77656A.
Kindurys, Victor A., 76984A.
King, George S., Jr., 76985A.
King, William L., 76986A.
Kingery, Thomas L., 78133A.
Kinser, Edward L., 77825A.
Kirby, George F., 78424A.
Kirk, David J., 76987A.
Kiser, Billy J., 76988A.
Kitchen, Joseph L., 78425A.
Kitchen, Robert W., 76989A.
Kittle, Joseph S., 76990A.
Klass, Richard L., 63933A.
Klimen, Witold P., 76991A.
Klinger, Chandis L., 77657A.
Klos, Alan R., 63934A.
Knipp, William N., 63935A.
Knowles, Homer W., 76992A.
Koch, Theodore H., Jr., 77426A.
Komoriya, George M., 78134A.
Koob, Stephen J., 78426A.
Kooser, Robert K., 76993A.
Kormanik, James R., 76994A.
Koski, Kenneth G., 76995A.
Krajewski, Donald E., 76996A.
Kraus, Ronald J., 77658A.
Krebs, Richard G., 63936A.
Krehbiel, Kenneth D., 70694A.
Kreutz, James M., 69841A.
Kritzler, Robert P., 77660A.
Kropf, Arnold N., 77427A.
Krupka, Joseph P., 77428A.
Kruse, Richard K., Jr., 77826A.
Kubley, Roy R., 77661A.
Kuhlenschmidt, Ke N., 77662A.
Kuhns, Dale H., 63939A.
Kun, Louis A., 69856A.
Kurshan, David, 63940A.
Laabs, Donald E., 77827A.
Labriola, James M., 63941A.
Lacey, Howard T., 77429A.
Lacheman, Ernest R., Jr., 76997A.
Lamaida, Terry A., 77663A.
Lamb, William C., 76998A.
Lambert, Edgar P., 77430A.
Lammers, Kenton E., 63942A.
Lancaster, Lann T. G., 63943A.
Lance, Henry R., 77431A.
Landers, Paul E., Jr., 63944A.
Landry, James J., 78328A.
Lane, Howard L., 77432A.
Langer, Hart A., 77433A.
Lannon, Robert G., 63945A.
Larabee, Harry W., 63946A.
Larkins, James T., 76999A.
Larson, Charles A., 63947A.
Larson, George W., Jr., 63948A.
Lasley, Thomas T., 77664A.
Laughlin, Charles E., 63949A.
Lausten, Lawrence R., 69836A.
Lavalle, Arthur J. C., 78427A.
Laverty, Theodore D., 77665A.
Lavin, James K., 77434A.
Lawrence, Dana B., 77666A.
Lawrence, Harl E., Jr., 73478A.
Lazzaro, Joseph A., 77000A.
Leach, Thomas J., Jr., 63950A.
Leatham, Anthony L., 63951A.
Lee, David R., 63952A.
Lee, Raymond H., 77828A.
Lehmiller, David J., 63953A.
Leib, David B., 77001A.
Leich, Frederick H., 77002A.
Lenahan, Roderick, 77435A.
Lenox, Hamilton T., 63954A.
Lester, Owen A., Jr., 77829A.
Lester, Peter M., 70576A.
Lewis, John W., 69857A.
Lewis, Russell L., 77003A.
Lewis, Thomas E., Jr., 77004A.
Lickteig, Norbert E., 77667A.
Liepins, Andris I., 77668A.
Lightner, George W., 77005A.
Lightsey, Robert H., 63957A.
Lillie, Marvin A., 77006A.
Lindbo, Don A., 77669A.
Linden, Ronald C., 77007A.
Linderholm, James L., 77670A.
Lindgren, John O., Jr., 63958A.
Linn, Joseph E., Jr., 77008A.
Lison, Robert H., 77830A.
Liss, Walter E., 77831A.
Litteer, Albert H., 77832A.
Lloyd, Robert M., 69848A.
Loberg, David E., 70973A.
Locke, George D., Jr., 69612A.
Lockhart, Thomas G., 71009A.
Lockwood, Franklin J., 77436A.
Lodin, Dale J., 78329A.
Logar, Andrew, 70539A.
Logeman, John D., Jr., 78135A.
Loney, Charles D., 77009A.
Lopresto, Raymond J., 72252A.
Lorenzini, Dino A., 63959A.
Loupot, David N., 77437A.
Lovretich, Robert J., 77010A.
Lowe, Chester A., Jr., 78429A.
Lowell, Richard D., 77011A.
Lucia, William A., 69603A.
Luckenbach, Peter R. H., 71102A.
Ludwin, Raymond J., 77012A.
Luebbermann, John N., 63960A.
Lukes, Mark R., 77671A.
Lumpkin, Donald E., 69849A.
Lundvall, Donald A., 77672A.
Lutes, Kenneth O., 63961A.
Lutes, Paul M., 77438A.
Luther, Karl E., 69691A.
Lyddane, George H., 63962A.
Lynch, William J., Jr., 77013A.
Lynn, Lawrence A., Jr., 63963A.
Lyon, David C., 63964A.
Lyon, Larry B., 77014A.
Lyons, Michael F., 73364A.
MacCraw, Robert B., 77439A.
MacDonald, Vincent, J., 74846A.
MacGlashan, Donald H., 77673A.
Mack, James E., 63965A.
MacLennan, Jerome C., 63966A.
MacNevin, Charles H., 63967A.
Madden, Philip L., 74849A.
Mages, James G., 63968A.
Magoulas, Jerry M., 70425A.
Mahach, Thomas G., 78331A.
Mahnken, Robert J., 77015A.
Mahon, Thomas M., 70584A.
Mahoney, Francis J., III, 77016A.
Major, Michael G., 63970A.
Makowsky, Joseph, Jr., 77017A.
Maloney, Earl F., III, 63971A.
Maloney, James M., 77018A.
Mandeville, James J., 77440A.
Mangold, Richard T., 63972A.
Manini, Gary W., 77019A.
Mannion, William H., 63973A.
Marano, Franklin A., 77674A.
Maraska, Donald G., 77020A.
Marck, Ronald V., 77021A.
Marienthal, George, 63974A.
Markham, David A., 77022A.
Markham, Gordon E., 79095A.
Markle, Gene L., 77023A.
Marks, Vincent C., 77441A.
Marlar, Joseph F., 77675A.
Marshall, Larry G., 77676A.
Marshall, Lyman W., 63975A.
Martin, Harreld P., 63976A.
Martin, Jerry D., 78213A.
Martin, John L., 77677A.
Martin, Peter E., 77024A.
Martin, Ronald G., 77025A.
Martinelli, Edward A., 63977A.
Masella, James V., Jr., 63978A.
Mason, Jerry N., 77833A.
Matteis, Richard M., 77026A.
Mauldin, Stephen L., Jr., 70567A.
May, Gerald M., 77027A.
May, Thomas C., 79156A.
McAtee, Thomas P., 63979A.
McCallum, James N., 77028A.
McCarthy, Joseph V., 78430A.
McClintock, Ra M., Jr., 63980A.
McClure, Wallace B., 77678A.
McColl, Hugh F., 77679A.
McConnell, Daniel L., 77680A.
McCravy, Dewey H., Jr., 77442A.
McCready, Floyd D., Jr., 77029A.
McCreary, Galen W., 78136A.

McCurdy, Clark B., 77834A.
McCurdy, Ronald E., Jr., 79160A.
McCusker, Robert J., 71086A.
McDaniel, Bobby L., 77030A.
McDaniel, Johnny F., 79161A.
McDearman, Nancy J., 70957A.
McDonald, Clinton R., 77682A.
McDonald, Fred L., 77683A.
McDonough, Robert L., 63981A.
McDowell, Ross G., 77031A.
McElhannon, Virgil B., 77443A.
McGlothlin Ronald E., 77032A.
McGrath, William J., 77033A.
McGregor, Glynn A., 77835A.
McHargue, Robert M., 69850A.
McHollan, James A., 77034A.
McHugh, Eugene D., 63982A.
McIver, Alexander, Jr., 77684A.
McKee, Edmond M., 77685A.
McKee, Frank T., 77836A.
McKinney, William F., 69792A.
McLester, Jud C., III, 77035A.
McMillan, Curt L., Jr., 69693A.
McMillen, Donald L., 77036A.
McMurray, Louis E., 77686A.
McNabb, Francis V., Jr., 70568A.
McNamara, Roger T., 63983A.
McNaughton, Robert J., 63984A.
McNeil, Earnest E., Jr., 77687A.
McRae, David S., 78137A.
Meade, Charles H., 77037A.
Meadows, James O., Jr., 77038A.
Merceda, John R., 63985A.
Melin, Carl D., 77688A.
Mengel, John E., 77689A.
Menghini, Raymond L., 79105A.
Menning, John E., 77690A.
Merkel, Philip A., 63986A.
Mettler, Stephen C., 63987A.
Metzger, Kenneth E., 77039A.
Meyer, Fredrick C., 77837A.
Meyer, Walter D., 70418A.
Meyers, Roger T., 63988A.
Meyr, Herbert C., Jr., 77444A.
Michael, Robert M., 77691A.
Mickel, Richard S., 63989A.
Miga, Michael J., 63990A.
Miko. John F., 63991A.
Miles, Gary A., 78431A.
Miller, Arthur R., 63992A.
Miller, Carl W., 70582A.
Miller, Donald G., 78432A.
Miller, Gary T., 77040A.
Miller, Herbert W., 77041A.
Miller, Kenneth J., 77042A.
Miller, Michael G., 79106A.
Miller, Warren R., Jr., 79108A.
Miller, William S., Jr., 77692A.
Milligan, Kenneth B., 77043A.
Mitchell, Jerome F., 77044A.
Mitchell, Lyle D., 77045A.
Mitchell, Theodore L., 77046A.
Modolo, Jerome M., 77693A.
Mogan, William W., 63993A.
Molvar, Jan T., 63994A.
Moneyhun, Bobby J., 70569A.
Monroe, David R., 77694A.
Montgomery, Alan P., 70580A.
Montgomery, Joe L., 77047A.
Moore, Charles L., 63995A.
Moore, Frank E., 77048A.
Moore, Thomas K., 63996A.
Moore, Warren A., 77049A.
Moran, Robert T., 77050A.
Morgan, James P., 77051A.
Moriarty, Jerald T., 77052A.
Mormino, Lawrence D., 77838A.
Morphew, Robin T., 77445A.
Morrell, David N., 77053A.
Morrell, Robert G., 63997A.
Morris, Dan R., 77054A.
Morrison, Wayne E., 70562A.
Morrow, John P., 77695A.
Morse, Howard L., II, 69694A.
Morton, Harold E., Jr., 77055A.
Morton, John T., 77446A.
Moser, Corwin A., Jr., 78333A.
Mosher, Alan L., 63998A.
Muehring, Gene H., 77056A.
Mullaney, Gerald A., 77057A.
Mullen, James B., Jr., 69692A.
Mullen, Ronald E., 77696A.
Mullooly, William E., 77697A.
Munro, Kenneth J., Jr., 77058A.
Munson, William E., 77447A.
Murphy, Edward V., 77448A.
Murphy, Jack L., 77839A.
Murphy, Paul F., 63999A.
Murray, William L., 77059A.
Myers, Jerry L., 77060A.
Naftanel, John C., 77449A.
Najman, Mirko, 77840A.
Nakagawa, Wayne A., 77450A.
Namaksy, Adolph J., Jr., 77451A.
Nash, Philip B., 77061A.
Nations, William O., 77062A.
Needham, Kenneth E., 64000A.
Neel, Charles B., 62706A.
Neel, Wayne J., 77841A.
Neff, James F., Jr., 79162A.
Neff, Ted A., 64001A.
Nelson, David L., 77063A.
Nelson, Ronald J., 71043A.
Nemecek, Glen E., 77064A.
Nettleton, John G., 78334A.
Netzinger, Don L., 64002A.
Nevin, Charles E., 79212A.
New, Gary D., 77452A.
Newhall, Frederick C., 77065A.
Newman, Edwin C., 64003A.
Newman, Kenneth R., 77698A.
Nicewarner, Charles E., 77699A.
Nichols, Charles L., 77066A.
Nichols, Howard F., Jr., 64004A.
Nichols, James B., 77453A.
Nichols, James L., 64005A.
Nichols, Laymon H., 77700A.
Nichols, Neil C., 77067A.
Nielsen, Jerry L., 78335A.
Nielson, Steve W., 64006A.
Niemann, William J., 77842A.
Nitsche, George R., 72716A.
Nixon, James A., 77068A.
Noble, James D., Jr., 77454A.
Nolen, Michael E., 77069A.
Nophsker, Howard G., 77070A.
Norris, Thomas E., 77071A.
Norwood, William B., 77072A.
Nottingham, Wesley D., 77701A.
Novotny, Frank J., Jr., 78138A.
Nuccio, Antonino J., 78139A.
Oalmann, Ralph E., 70412A.
Oberg, Robert R., 77073A.
O'Berry, Carl G., 77074A.
O'Connell, Donald L., 77702A.
O'Connor, Edward A., Jr., 77843A.
Ogershok, Richard W., 74960A.
Ohl, Joseph A., 77075A.
Ohlemeier, Dennis L., 77844A.
Ohman, Nils B., 64008A.
Ohmsieder, William H., 77703A.
Olesek, Fredrick W., 77076A.
Olgeaty, Edward C., 77845A.
Oliver, John D., 77077A.
Olson, Daryl F., 64009A.
Olson, David G., 64010A.
Olson, Gerald D., 77704A.
Olson, Robert E., 69599A.
O'Neal, Donald O., 77078A.
Orbeck, Einar A., 77079A.
Ordes, Diane E., 77705W.
O'Reilly, Patrick J., 78336A.
Ormonde, Neil J., 70577A.
O'Rourke, William R., Jr., 64011A.
Osborn, James F., 69699A.
Osborne, Carl R., 77080A.
O'Toole, Robert M., 77455A.
Otway, Leo R., 77081A.
Overby, Walter C., 77456A.
Owings, Will L., Jr., 77706A.
Ozawa, Galen M., 70953A.
Ozment, Herbert P., 69643A.
Pabich, Edward J., 64012A.
Pacina, Gene C., 64013A.
Paddon, Harry G., III, 64014A.
Page, Embert G., 64015A.
Paige, John K., 70954A.
Paquet, Robert D., 64016A.
Paris, Jack F., 77082A.
Parish, Richard V., 71045A.
Parker, David A., 77083A.
Parker, Richard C., 64017A.
Parker, Robert H., 64018A.
Parkhurst, Robert H., 77846A.
Parrett, Rufus N., 77084A.
Pastor, Ronald C., 77085A.
Patrick, James R., Jr., 77086A.
Patrick, Rayford P., 77087A.
Patrie, Stanley A., Jr., 64019A.
Patterson, Robert E., 71161A.
Patterson, William B., 64020A.
Payne, Bobby J., 77088A.
Payne, Edwin C., 69851A.
Payne, Glenn D., 79094A.
Payne, James H., Jr., 79096A.
Pearce, Frederick H., Jr., 77089A.
Pearson, Benjamin J., II, 69607A.
Peck, Frank E., 77707A.
Peck, Gaillard R., Jr., 64021A.
Pederson, David J., 64022A.
Pederson, Donald F., 64023A.
Pemberton, Daniel H., 64024A.
Penasack, John P., 77090A.
Penczer, Rudolf E., 64025A.
Pendray, John J., 70415A.
Perlmutter, Jay M., 77091A.
Perlotto, Richard E., 64026A.
Perry, David C., 77708A.
Perry, Glenn G., Jr., 77847A.
Petersen, Roland N., 77092A.
Peterson, Nelda M., 77848W.
Peterson, Peter F., 77093A.
Petrie, Frank L., Jr., 77849A.
Pewthers, Morris G., 77094A.
Pfeifle, Ward A., 77095A.
Pfrang, Kenneth M. C., 69641A.
Phillips, James C., 70538A.
Phillips, Lawrence G., 77096A.
Phillips, Otis D., III, 77850A.
Phillips, Will E., Jr., 71108A.
Piepenburg, Dwayne D., 64027A.
Pinckney, Scott S., 77709A.
Pirtle, Paul E., 64028A.
Pittman, Howard W., 69700A.
Pittman, Robert, 77097A.
Platts, Richard P., 77710A.
Plunkett, Richard A., 77711A.
Poates, John T., 77098A.
Poley, Paul W., 77712A.
Polick, Melvin E., 77457A.
Pool, Nicholas E., 77458A.
Poole, Jerry A., 77713A.
Pope, William B., 77714A.
Porter, David W., 78433A.
Porter, Jimmie, 77459A.
Porter, William J., 77460A.
Post, Delbert A., 69845A.
Poth, John E., 77099A.
Powell, Arthur A., 77100A.
Powell, Douglas W., 64029A.
Powell, John P., 77461A.
Powell, Richard C., 64030A.
Powell, Vernon C., 77101A.
Power, Charles F., 70969A.
Preiss, Terry D., 78337A.
Preston, Harry T., 77715A.
Previty, Anthony P., 77102A.
Pribus, Glenn F., 70570A.
Price, Charles S., 64031A.
Priebel, Elmer A., 77103A.
Prima, Paavo, 77104A.
Pritchett, Kenneth G., 75020A.
Przygogki, Julius V., 69597A.
Pulicella, George J., 79107A.
Pylate, Patrick W., 77716A.
Pyle, Charles R., 69681A.
Quann, Byron G., 71049A.
Quantock, Russell A., 77105A.
Quick, David H., 79163A.
Quinton, Michael E., 64032A.
Rackiewicz, Daniel C., 78338A.
Radloff, James L., 69865A.
Ramella, Eugene, 64033A.
Ramm, Edmund C., 77106A.
Ramsey, Richard A., 64034A.

Randazzo, Richard J., 64035A.
Rank, Lawrence M., 64036A.
Ranson, William J., 77462A.
Rapalee, Ernest W., Jr., 77107A.
Rausch, John T., 64037A.
Raven, John B., 77108A.
Raymer, Thomas E., 77717A.
Readnour, James L., 77463A.
Reagan, William C., 77109A.
Rebstock, James E., 77110A.
Record, James F., 77111A.
Rector, Edwin, 64038A.
Redding, Michael J., Jr., 77464A.
Reeves, Raymond J., Jr., 64039A.
Reid, Albert R., 78434A.
Reid, Charles L., 77112A.
Reid, Daniel F., 77113A.
Reid, James M., Jr., 78339A.
Reining, Rodney J., 77852A.
Rekart, Jerome A., 77465A.
Remington, Bobby R., 77114A.
Rentenbach, Thomas M., II, 64040A.
Repak, Harry J., 77115A.
Reschak, Robert J., 78340A.
Reynolds, Phillip L., 77116A.
Rhame, James L., Jr., 77117A.
Rhoades, Roger S., 64041A.
Rhoades, Thomas S., 64042A.
Rhodes, Harold W., 64043A.
Rice, Lawrence C., 77718A.
Richards, Fred F., Jr., 77719A.
Richards, Lon D., 70657A.
Richardson, Colin, 64044A.
Richardson, David A., 69852A.
Richardson, Evere B., 77118A.
Richardson, Tommy L., 77119A.
Ridgway, Robert S., 77120A.
Riedel, Jay E., 77121A.
Rigg, Richard L., 69688A.
Riggs, Robert E., 78140A.
Riley, James T., 73405A.
Rinehart, Herbert M., Jr., 77122A.
Rist, David J., 77466A.
Robbins, Eugene L., 64045A.
Robbins, Warren G., 64046A.
Roberson, Paul L., 70548A.
Roberts, Cyrus S., IV, 64047A.
Roberts, David E., 77123A.
Roberts, James E., 77124A.
Roberts, James E., 64048A.
Roberts, Richard A., 77125A.
Robinson, Paul K., Jr., 64049A.
Robinson, Peter D., 64050A.
Robinson VI A. A., Jr., 77126A.
Robnett, Dean E., 77467A.
Rocky, Robert E., 77127A.
Roderick, Norman F., 64051A.
Rodgers, William M., 77468A.
Roe, David H., 64052A.
Roeder, George L., 77128A.
Rogers, Dana B., 70571A.
Rogers, John H., Jr., 64053A.
Rohrer, Ralph H., Jr., 77469A.
Rokke, Ervin J., 64054A.
Rosenbach, William E., 77129A.
Rosencrans, He C., Jr., 77130A.
Ross, Bruce E., 77720A.
Ross, James A., Jr., 77470A.
Rossiter, William W., 77132A.
Rossley, Paul R., 77471A.
Roth, Louis L., 77133A.
Rothell, Ross D., Jr., 77134A.
Rothrock, Kent G., 77135A.
Rounds, Gordon M., 78141A.
Rowell, Arlington L., 77721A.
Ruana, Rudolph M., 77722A.
Rubstein, Peter A., 79164A.
Ruffcorn, Carroll L., 75061A.
Ruggles, Bertrand F., 78341A.
Runnels, Joseph D., 64055A.
Ruschmeier, Peter F., 78142A.
Rushforth, Ch P., III, 77136A.
Ryan, Edward J., Jr., 70970A.
Ryan, William A., 70559A.
Ryer, Richard T., 64056A.
Saber, James A., 78435A.
Sadovsky, Edward M., 77853A.
Sailer, Allen J., 77854A.
Sample, Robert J., 77723A.
Sanders, Jack N., Jr., 77472A.
Sanders, Richard D., 77137A.
Sanders, Richard F., 64058A.
Sanders, William D., 77138A.
Sanford, Frederick E., 77139A.
Sanford, Glenn F., 77474A.
Sanford, Jack R., 75066A.
Sanford Lonn T., III, 77855A.
Santore, Robert B., 77140A.
Sather, Harold D., 77141A.
Sawyer, Leon E., 77475A.
Sawyer, William E., 77142A.
Scauzillo, Robert J., 64059A.
Schachman, Alan, 77143A.
Schaefer, Edgar N., 75070A.
Schaefer, Gary O., 77476A.
Schaefer, Robert C., 77144A.
Schaller, Robert C., 64060A.
Schamberger, Rand., L., 64061A.
Schang, Joseph F., 77724A.
Schatz, Harold R., 77477A.
Schaumberg, Robert S., 64062A.
Scheu, Robert A., 77145A.
Schieber, Michael T., 64063A.
Schlue, Joseph W., 77478A.
Schmidt, Frederick E., 77725A.
Schmitz, Charles L., 77479A.
Scholes, William O., 77146A.
Scholz, Alfred F., 77726A.
Schoof, Richard J., 64064A.
Schott, Delyle J., 77174A.
Schrade, Bobby D., 79213A.
Schredl, Michael G., 64065A.
Schulz, Raymond E., 77148A.
Schulze, Carl J., 77856A.
Schuneman, Stephen T., 77149A.
Schwalm, Arthur E., 77727A.
Schwam, Stephen R., 64066A.
Scible, Robert H., III, 73411A.
Scifers, Leonard V., 64067A.
Scott, Lynn P., 77480A.
Scott, William T., 77728A.
Searl, Clinton W., 64068A.
Seasholtz, Gary L., 64069A.
Seastrom, Dale E., 69685A.
Seidt, Richard J., 77729A.
Sell, Richard H., 64070A.
Sellers, David A., 64071A.
Sessoms, William R., Jr., 78143A.
Shade, Eugene W., 69860A.
Shamberger, Douglas E., 70974A.
Shane, Larry L., 77150A.
Sharp, Gary L., 64072A.
Sharp, Paul D., 70423A.
Sharpe, Walter R., Jr., 71056A.
Shea, Robert, 77152A.
Shefl, Frank O., 70563A.
Shelton, Harold A., 77481A.
Shenk, Howard F., 71057A.
Shepherd, Robert L., Jr., 77482A.
Sheppard, Richard R., 77730A.
Shepperd, Donald W., 64073A.
Shera, Thomas L., 77153A.
Sherman, Frederick G., 77731A.
Sherman, Jay D., 64074A.
Shields, David L., 77154A.
Shine, Anthony C., 77155A.
Shivers, Walter W., 77857A.
Shockley, Jackson C., 77156A.
Shonts, John M., 77157A.
Short, Charles D., 77158A.
Shotz, Donald S., 77732A.
Shuler, Henry K., 77733A.
Siders, Marvyn J., 77160A.
Siegel, Charles J., 77161A.
Sigman, Allen, 64075A.
Sikorski, Paul M., 77162A.
Simpson, Laird E., 77164A.
Sims, John N., 77165A.
Sinclair, George M., 78436A.
Singleton, Jerry A., 64076A.
Skanchy, Thomas C., 69835A.
Skeels, Ronald D., 77858A.
Slater, Richard G., 77166A.
Slessler, Larry W., 69853A.
Slowikowski, Will F., 64078A.
Smart, Wayne G., 77167A.
Smeby, Alan J., 77168A.
Smedley, David R., 77169A.
Smedley, Gerald F., 78343A.
Smith, Arthur D., 77170A.
Smith, David W., 78144A.
Smith, Francis K., 64079A.
Smith, Gary R., 77734A.
Smith, Jerry L., 64080A.
Smith, John C., 77171A.
Smith, John E., 64081A.
Smith, John L., 77735A.
Smith, Morris D., 64082A.
Smith, Reeves P., Jr., 69690A.
Smith, Richard P., 77172A.
Smith, Roger T., 64083A.
Smith, Rowland F., Jr., 78437A.
Smith, William C., 77173A.
Smith, William H., II, 77174A.
Smithe, Lee B., Jr., 77736A.
Smull, Richard N., 64084A.
Snyder, Warren D., 64085A.
Solum, James L., 77175A.
Sommer, Arthur B., 77859A.
Sowa, Joseph P., 77483A.
Spaan, James T., 77737A.
Spargur, Robert E., 70572A.
Spence, Maynard R., 77738A.
Spencer, Bennie F., 77176A.
Spencer, Gary K., 77177A.
Spencer, John C., 77178A.
Spicer, Edward L., 64086A.
Spodnick, Joseph S., 77484A.
Spory, Ralph M., Jr., 64087A.
Stachelczyk, Victor S., 70557A.
Staden, Arthur L., 77179A.
Stafford, Roy W., Jr., 64088A.
Staggs, Kenneth E., 69854A.
Staib, Robert L., 64089A.
Stanbery, Charles E., 78438A.
Stanton, Edward J., 64090A.
Staples, Jon R., 64091A.
Starbuck, Ronald J., 77860A.
Starkey, James F., Jr., 77861A.
Starnes, Thomas E., Jr., 78345A.
Steck, Charles G., 78346A.
Steckler, Richard H., 77485A.
Stefferud, Curtis M., 77862A.
Steinig, Norman B., Jr., 77180A.
Stenback, Paul R., 77863A.
Stenson, Stephen S., 78145A.
Stephens, George E., 71480A.
Stetson, John A., 77739A.
Stevenson, Samuel J., 77864A.
Stewart, James R., 69861A.
Stewart, Leslie W., Jr., 77181A.
Stewart, Roger I., 77486A.
Stice, William H., 77182A.
Stock, Harold S., 77183A.
Stock, Ronald P., 64093A.
Stolp, James T., 77487A.
Stouder, Kyle, 77184A.
Strehle, William H., Jr., 70976A.
Stremlau, Leon E., 77185A.
Strickland, Bryan D., 69844A.
Strong, Lowell B., 77865A.
Strong, Ronald D., 78439A.
Studer, William A., 77186A.
Stuecklen, Klaus H., 71109A.
Stump, Kenneth H., 77740A.
Suits, Norman L., 77187A.
Sumner, William A., Jr., 78146A.
Sunderman, Charles K., 77741A.
Sung, William K., 79165A.
Surles, Becky F., 77188W.
Susi, Ronald A., 77189A.
Svitenko, Leonard, 64094A.
Svitenko, Lewis C., 64095A.
Swanson, Harold J., Jr., 78440A.
Swanson, John W., Jr., 77742A.
Swartz, Carl, III, 64096A.
Swartz, William J., 64097A.
Sweazy, Stewart B., 77866A.
Swiler, William G., 77190A.
Swonson, John C., Jr., 64098A
Symes, Albert R., 64099A.
Symons, John R., 77191A.
Tall, Raymond R., 77867A.
Tash, Allen R., 64100A.
Tateishi, William N., 77192A.
Taylor, Charles S., Jr., 69831A.
Taylor, John H., 77193A.

Taylor, Lee, 64101A.
Taylor, Robert L., 64102A.
Taylor, Ronnie G., 64103A.
Taylor, Thomas L., 79109A.
Teague, Harold K., Jr., 77194A.
Teasdale, Irvin C., 76595A.
Tellier, Jean G., 75580A.
Terry, Sidney C., 77195A.
Teuten, Thomas J., 64104A.
Thackray, Robert G., 77743A.
Thatcher, Paul D., 64105A.
Theobald, Robert E., Jr., 77196A.
Thomas, James G., 77197A.
Thomas, James H., 69689A.
Thomas, Richard W., 77199A.
Thomes, James T., 64106A.
Thompson, Gary W., 77744A.
Thompson, George M., Jr., 64107A.
Thompson, Robert T., Jr., 70971A.
Thompson, Ronald, 69855A.
Thomson, David W., 77868A.
Thuma, Thomas C., 77869A.
Thursby, William R., Jr., 64108A.
Tice, Charles D., 64109A.
Tidrick, Ralph L., 77488A.
Tietge, Michael R., 64110A.
Tilford, Philip B., 77745A.
Tilghman, Dorothy J., 77200W.
Tilton, Frederick E., 64111A.
Tilton, William T., 78347A.
Timmerman, Joe A., 77201A.
Tinsman, John L., Jr., 77202A.
Tocado, Douglas M., 64112A.
Todd, Jerry C., 77870A.
Todd, Rodney L., 77203A.
Tokar, Paul, 77204A.
Toler, John R., 77871A.
Tomb, Robert, 77872A.
Tomlin, Troy N., 64114A.
Tonda, Harold K., 69638A.
Torbenson, Robert V., 79110A.
Torkelson, Roger A., 77205A.
Torline, Norbert K., 77746A.
Toth, Harrold A., Jr., 70579A.
Travis, George S., Jr., 77747A.
Tribo, Ronald J., 77206A.
Trimmer, Ray A., 64115A.
Triquart, William A., 77207A.
Tubbs, Ronald C., 64116A.
Tumey, Lincoln E., 77489A.
Tupper, Nathan G., 64117A.
Turner, Charles L., 64118A.
Turner, Louis W., 77490A.
Turner, William M., 70967A.
Tweddle, Donald L., 70552A.
Tyson, Ralph M., 70961A.
Underdal, Stanley J., 69863A.
Urban, Frank R., 64119A.
Uribe, Henry T., 77208A.
Usher, Harry A., II, 70540A.
Vanbrunt, Donald L., 77209A.
Vanbrunt, Peter R., 77749A.
Vanderbilt, William D., 77750A.
Vanderhyde, Kenne D., 77210A.
Vandeventer, J. H., Jr., 70419A.
Vansant, Bradley, 64120A.
Vansickle, Lawrence J., 69601A.
Vaughan, David K., 64121A.
Vecchio, Raymond R., 77211A.
Ventura, Joe E., 69866A.
Verneski, John C., 64122A.
Vesely, Charles J., 69605A.
Viau, David L., 75209A.
Viccellio, Henry, Jr., 64123A.
Vicknair, Rene M., Jr., 70962A.
Viele, Brian N., 77491A.
Vilensons, John J., 77873A.
Vining, Robert L., 77751A.
Vinup, Glen W., 77752A.
Vipond, George H., 77874A.
Virden, Robert N., 69862A.
Visel, David P., 77492A.
Vitito, Thomas E., 77493A.
Vogtli, Joseph H., Jr., 77212A.
Vojir, Joseph L., 71061A.
Voland, Paul M., 77213A.
Voorhis, Byron E., 77753A.
Wagener, Wayne F., 77875A.
Wagley, Ardith N., 77754A.
Wagner, Albert M., 77214A.
Wagner, Gervase J., 77215A.
Wagner, Robert Z., 77216A.
Wajda, Walter L., 77494A.
Walder, Glen W., 77217A.
Waldron, Lynn K., 77755A.
Waldron, Thomas R., 69640A.
Walker, Edgar S., 77218A.
Walker, Robert W., 69834A.
Wall, Robert L., 77876A.
Walla, Gerald J., 77756A.
Waller, Robert W., 77757A.
Wallgren, Garner G., 77219A.
Wallin, Robert G., 69793A.
Walter, Larry R., 77877A.
Walters, Arthur E., 77220A.
Walther, Glen P., 77221A.
Walton, James M., 69637A.
Walton, Richard C., 77758A.
Walton, Willis R., 77495A.
Wantiez, Harold N., 77496A.
Ward, Lucius M., 77222A.
Ward, Willis N., 77223A.
Warner, Edward L., III, 64124A.
Watkins, Franklin W., 77759A.
Watson, Donald D., 64125A.
Weatherhead, Herbert J., 64126A.
Webb, Keith W., 77760A.
Webb, William J., 77497A.
Weber, Richard L., 78441A.
Wedemeyer, Austin C., 64127A.
Weight, Robert H., 64128A.
Wellington, Le E., Jr., 77498A.
Wells, Frank F., Jr., 77499A.
Wells, John H., 78442A.
Wells, Robert F., 64129A.
Wells, Sidney R., 77761A.
Wells, Walter E., 77762A.
Wells, William A., 69837A.
Welsh, Warren P., 78348A.
Wendt, Douglas M., 77224A.
Wessinger, Lon H., Jr., 78147A.
Westbrook, Albert E., 78443A.
Westenhaver, Herbert J., 77763A.
Westerman, Robert R., 64130A.
Westhorp, David C., 64131A.
Wetherington, Phi R., 75237A.
Weyland, Drew C., 77878A.
Whaley, Edward K., 77225A.
Whaley, John M., 77500A.
Wheeler, Edd D., 64132A.
Wheeler, Joseph C., 77764A.
Wheeler, Richard C., 64133A.
Whelton, Matthew B., Jr., 64134A.
Whichard, Will K., Jr., 77227A.
Whidbee, Clifton L., 70652A.
Whisonant, Clinton T., 77228A.
Whitcomb, Francis G., 70558A.
Whitcomb, Harold C., 77765A.
White, George W., 77229A.
White, Gurney D., 77230A.
Whitehead, Lauris E., 72949A.
Whiting, Evans K., 64135A.
Whitman, David S., 64136A.
Whitted, James M., 64137A.
Whitteker, Richard L., 77766A.
Whittier, Henry R., Jr., 77232A.
Wick, Daniel W., 64138A.
Wickham, Kenneth J., 77233A.
Wicklein, Walter A., III, 64139A.
Wicks, Fredrick C., 64140A.
Wilks, Linus R., 77234A.
Willard, John D., Jr., 78444A.
Williams, Fred A., Jr., 69832A.
Williams, Jerry C., 77767A.
Williams, Jimmy L., 78148A.
Williams, Merle R., Jr., 64141A.
Williams, Michael R., 64142A.
Williams, Perry E., 77235A.
Williams, Richard A., 64143A.
Williams, Richard L., 77236A.
Williams, Robert M., 77237A.
Williams, Robert W., 77238A.
Wilson, Frank S., 77239A.
Wilson, Fred A., Jr., 77240A.
Wilson, Glen D., 64144A.
Wilson, Gordon S., 64145A.
Wilson, J. Leon, 70956A.
Wilson, James A., 77768A.
Wilson, John L., 77241A.
Wilson, Lyle E., 64146A.
Wilson, Murle A., 64147A.
Wilson, William R., 77242A.
Wimpee, Victor R., 77243A.
Winkler, Anthony J., 77769A.
Winstead, Robert L., 78349A.
Winston, Charles C., III, 77244A.
Wise, Phillip R., 77245A.
Wiser, Joe B., 77770A.
Witt, Jay H., 64148A.
Wittekind, Robert L., 69838A.
Woempner, Stanley W., 78445A.
Wojcik, Joseph J., 64149A.
Wolf, Richard G., 77771A.
Wolfe, Bruce R., 77247A.
Wolff, Allan E., 75260A.
Wood, Daryl P., 64150A.
Wood, Douglass G., 77248A.
Wood, Jerry D., 77249A.
Wood, Thomas W., 77250A.
Wood, Vern M., 64151A.
Wood, Wayne L., 77879A.
Woodcock, Larry A., 77251A.
Woodman, Donald K., 64152A.
Woods, William J., 77501A.
Woodson, Raymond E., 77252A.
Woodworth, Clifton E., 64153A.
Woolley, Robert B., 77253A.
Wright, Jack E., 77254A.
Wright, Larry J., 77772A.
Wright, Leonard L., 64154A.
Wyatt, Ralph E., 77502A.
Wyatt, Richard H., 77503A.
Wylie, Allan R., 64155A.
Wyman, James P., 77255A.
Wyman, Robert D., 75889A.
Yannarella, Anthony M., 64156A.
Yeagle, Paul H., 77880A.
Yoder, Frederick D., 77256A.
Yohe, Wayne I., 77773A.
Young, Duke A., 78350A.
Young, Ernest L., III, 77257A.
Young, Gerard T., 64157A.
Young, James W., 77881A.
Young, Larry N., 77774A.
Young, Richard E., 71018A.
Zaleski, Joseph R., 64158A.
Zalewski, Zigmund W., 78351A.
Zamolyi, Laslo L., Jr., 77258A.
Zeltman, Francis E., Jr., 77775A.
Ziegwied, George O., 77259A.
Zine, Richard E., 77882A.
Zumbro, Paul E., 64159A.
Zylstra, Corliss E., 77776A.

MEDICAL SPECIALIST CORPS

Second lieutenant to first lieutenant

Moorhouse, Marianna, 76617W.

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Second lieutenant to first lieutenant

Aldrich, Terrance C., 78072A.
Cochran, Roger W., 76453A.
Dexter, John E., 70938A.
Dyer, Richard F., 76273A.
Egan, Donald J., 63813A.
Graham, Roger B., 76274A.
Gregg, Bruce P., Jr., 69596A.
Iott, Robert O., 76275A.
Jaroszewski, Leo F., 78267A.
Kazmar, William J., 63924A.
Lentz, Gary D., 63955A.
Mills, Robert L., 76276A.
Polk, Joseph E., 78495A.
Reilly, Neil B., 76534A.
Sanders, Lawrence T., 64057A.
Savoy, Joyce A., 76278W.
Scarbrough, Jessie F., 78073A.
Smith, George D., 76456A.
Stover, William L., 76279A.

NURSE CORPS

Second lieutenant to first lieutenant

Allen, Nancy L., 76328W.
Bobko, Stephen E., 76408A.
Holtz, Jerry G., 75778A.
Payton, Ruth G., 76409W.
Wilder, William M., 76329A.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

A Bill To Designate Agate Springs Fossil Quarries as a National Monument

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DAVE MARTIN

OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 6, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, on the opening day of this 1st session of the 89th Congress, I introduced a bill (H.R. 500) to preserve and designate the Agate Springs fossil quarries—located in Sioux County, Nebr.—as a national monument in the National Park Service System.

In brief, the Agate Springs fossil beds are unique. The general sandhills area in which these fossil beds lie are of exceptional geological interest, scenic beauty, and solitude. Scientists feel that comparable fossil deposits have yet to be found that equal those at Agate Springs. This area may well contain the world's largest deposit of prehistoric animal remains, as estimates indicate that only about 25 percent of the beds have been explored after some 60 years of digging by scientists.

It was a fortunate accident of history that these fossil beds were first discovered by a man who had the imagination and understanding to see the tremendous importance of preserving them and investigating their scientific importance—Capt. James H. Cook, Indian scout, frontiersman, and later a well-known author. He soon acquired the property on which this discovery was made and brought it to the attention of leading paleontologists. His son, the late Dr. Harold J. Cook, not only maintained this family tradition but was himself a noted paleontologist and authority on fossils.

Since 1891, these deposits have been the object of repeated scientific explorations by a dozen leading institutions: Carnegie Institute, the American Museum of Natural History, the Chicago Natural History Museum, the Smithsonian Institution, the Colorado Museum of Natural History, Amherst College, the Universities of Nebraska, Chicago, Kansas, Michigan, Princeton, Yale, and many others. In other words, since their discovery, the quarries have been carefully preserved and safeguarded so as to be of maximum value from a scientific standpoint. Now, following Dr. Cook's death, it is proposed that the Nation take over the duty of preserving these deposits, making them available for the instruction of the public and for further scientific study.

The site of these fossil beds could conceivably attract some 50,000 visitors per year if the proposed project is carried out. The project would include almost 3,000 acres of land, construction of a visitor's center, an Indian artifacts museum, and development of a museum at the fossil quarries. Three stories could be told at the site: First, paleontology of the area dating back some 21 million years; second, pioneer ranching; and third, the Indian experiences of Capt. James Cook—Government Indian Scout, cattleman, author, and amateur bone collector, who purchased Agate Springs in 1887.

The National Park Service feels that these fossil beds should be preserved for research and future generations. The area could be developed into a prime tourist attraction in addition to neighboring Scottsbluff National Monument, Chimney Rock, the Black Hills, and so forth.

As presently proposed, the cost of the project is estimated to be $1,750,000, including the acquisition of the land, construction of a visitors' center, an Indian artifacts museum, development of a museum at the quarries, and the paving of roads to the fossil sites.

I believe that this is a worthwhile project, as it is our duty to protect these fossil deposits for additional research and posterity. This is the major purpose of my bill.

Abbott Laboratories Awarded 200,000th Design Patent for Sucaryl Dispenser

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 6, 1965

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, it is with real pride that I report to you and to the Members of the House, the distinct honor which has come to Abbott Laboratories, of North Chicago, Ill., one of our great pharmaceutical manufacturers, and to two of its brilliant inventors, Howard Richards and Jack Williams, of Waukegan, Ill.

Abbott Laboratories and these two inventors received the 200,000th design patent from the Commissioner of Patents, Edward J. Brenner, at ceremonies held in Commissioner Brenner's office on Tuesday, January 5, 1965.

The patented article consists of a dispensing container for Sucaryl, a low-calorie sweetening tablet, one of the many useful products of Abbott Laboratories.

In addition to the prestige and honor which accompanies the awarding of this milestone design patent to Abbott Laboratories, the occasion was particularly significant because it falls in the year when the Patent Office is celebrating the 175th anniversary of the patent system.

Mr. Speaker, I am arranging to send one of these dispensing containers to each of my colleagues in the Congress, containing, of course, a supply of Sucaryl tablets.

This example of the ingenuity and skill of Abbott Laboratories and two of its inventors, Howard Richards and Jack Williams, identifies in some measure the great private enterprise system which has developed in this Nation and which contributes so much to the good things of life for citizens of this Nation and to mankind around the world.

Let me also take this occasion to compliment Commissioner Brenner and the Patent Office on the occasion of this 175th anniversary and to extend to George R. Cain, chairman of the board and president of Abbott Laboratories; Robert L. Niblack, manager of the company's patent and trademark department, as well as to the distinguished inventors, Howard Richards and Jack Williams and the other officers and employees of Abbott Laboratories, the Nation's congratulations on this award of the 200,000th design patent for the dispensing container for Sucaryl.

Responses by Hadassah Myrtle Wreath Awards Recipients

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH

OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, January 6, 1965

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, on December 3, 1964, Myrtle Wreath Awards were made by Hadassah at its annual brunch in New York City. Because I feel that the remarks of the very fortunate awardees would be of interest to the Members of Congress, I ask unanimous consent that they be placed in the Record.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Hadassah Myrtle Wreath Awards Brunch, Responses by Award Recipients—Dr. Solomon Grayzel, Miss Dorothy Height, Dr. Margaret Mead, Mr. Richard Rodgers, Dr. Howard A. Rusk, Senator Margaret Chase Smith—Hotel Astor, New York, December 3, 1964

Dr. Solomon Grayzel. Madam Chairman and ladies of Hadassah, I have no intention of deprecating your choice of me to represent literature. [Laughter.] On the contrary, I heartily approve of your choice and am grateful for it. I am especially pleased that you did so knowing that my chief occupation for a quarter of a century has been to revive, restore Jewish literary activity and encourage the reading of Jewish books.

I'm glad to assume that through me you have just expressed your approval of the work being done by the Jewish Publication Society of America. [Applause.]

In all candor, however, it seems to me desirable for your protection and for mine to make clear the sense in which I understand the term literature so that no man of letters will argue that I am here under false pretenses.

It seems to me that literature has served two purposes. It has served as a mirror of life. The writer of today holds up this mirror to his contemporaries and asks them to recognize themselves. The image may be ugly, revolting, even terrifying. This is no fault of the author, that is, of the one who holds up the mirror. Even if he has exaggerated for effect, the fault is not his but that of the mass whose character he chooses to reflect.

There is also literature of another kind. It serves not as a mirror but as a guide in a quest. It assumes that as obnoxious as human nature may be, it is redeemable if not perfected. This side of literature too may be accused of exaggerating since it posits a willingness on the part of the people to improve. This also is forgiveable since not to make that assumption is to admit defeat from the start. This is literature in the tradition of the Bible and of all that has been written in the course of the centuries in the hope of building a utopia.

This latter is currently not the popular type of literature. It has been abused by becoming identified too closely with religiosity just as mirror literature is being blurred by being identified too closely with ephemeral entertainment.

In the one, or the latter, the hero used to be the conqueror and he is now nothing more than the schelemiel. [Laughter.] In the other, the hero used to be the incredible saint and he is now he who no matter how vainly seeks the meaning of life.

This questing literature is the kind with which I have identified myself. In doing me honor, make no mistake about it, you are honoring the type of literature which believes in God and in human dignity, which sympathizes with human failings, which frankly hopes that man, weak, benighted, blundering man can and should look for ways to better days.

For encouraging me in my work and in my dreams, you have earned my profound thanks. [Applause.]

Dorothy Height. Thank you, Hadassah, from the depths of my heart. In accepting your distinguished Myrtle Wreath Award, I am deeply honored. I accept this high honor with full realization that in fact, no one individual can achieve human rights alone, nor can human rights become a reality except as individuals take responsibility. I am my brothers keeper, long has been Hadassah's answer to a key life question. And this award reminds one that each of us must be ready to answer.

My acceptance of this award is but a symbol of appreciation of all that has made this moment possible: the early teachings in home, and school and church where the biblical concept of man as a child of God and the political guarantees of the Constitution of the United States were deeply embedded; the opportunities to work to translate problems of brotherhood into experiences of fellowship through the YWCA with its clear commitment to full equality; the creative hours with many groups and individuals especially concerned with the status of women; the challenge of great personalities like Mary McLeod Bethune who founded the NCNW because she could not rest in the face of the unharnessed womanpower and the thousands of women who now work continuously to fulfill her dream; the thousands who have given leadership in the Negro revolution in search of full civil and human rights, those who have gone to jail singing and those who challenge their elders lest they too quickly rest on their laurels; the little people around the world whose rising expectations make clear that freedom is indivisible.

Women in minority groups in the United States have a very special contribution to make to the Great Society. As women and as members of minority groups we know through a life of double jeopardy that its realization depends upon what happens in human relations in every community.

Eleanor Roosevelt said it quite clearly: "Where, after all, do universal human rights begin? In small places, close to home—so close and so small that they cannot be seen on any map of the world. Yet they are the world of the individual person: The neighborhood he lives in; the school or college he attends; the factory, farm, or office where he works. Such are the places where every man, woman, and child seeks equal justice, equal opportunity, equal dignity without discrimination. Unless these rights have meaning there, they have little meaning anywhere. Without concerted citizen action to uphold them close to home, we shall look in vain for progress in the larger world."—March 27, 1958.

Hadassah's recognition of the significance of human rights must send us forth this day with new dedication to the unfinished tasks of our democracy. For you this is no new struggle. What is new is that with the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the conditions for making equality a working principle in every part of our land have been given a clear base of legal support. It is up to us now to live the values of a free society from this foundation of law.

Today's women of valor, in the tradition of Henrietta Szold, deep in a family life enriched by the concept of peoplehood, can identify the struggle of the Negro woman whose family roots were destroyed even as they left the shores of Africa. It is disturbing when the civil rights movement calls for special effort to help the long deprived catch up, to hear people of good will join the detractors and say the call is for special treatment. Hadassah has demonstrated at home and especially in Israel that a policy of special effort and special treatment is essential to achieve true equality of opportunity.

Hadassah's award is a constant reminder that women must give direct support to the movement for civil and human rights. "We need allies," the nonviolent civil rights movement is saying in many ways. We need others to take initiative to help achieve quality education in integrated classrooms for all. We need jobs and the training for jobs. We need role models to lend vision and to bring inspiration to youth who have lost their way. There are those who ask—"will there be more civil rights demonstrations, will we have peace in our town?"

As you know, in the Hebrew the word for peace itself is "wholeness." Who better than Hadassah can make clear that until the whole community has equality of opportunity and equality of responsibility there can be no real peace for any part of it.

So then, the task of teaching and healing must go on so long as a Michael Schwerner, the young civil rights worker in Mississippi, can become the target for death because of what was called his Jewishness makes him different.

The task of opening communications must go on so long as there are millions with a sense of powerlessness in the black ghetto and there are those with a feeling of separation and of having no problem in the lily-white suburbs. The task of communication and of building bridges without which there can be no reconciliation must continue until in every section of our country people of different backgrounds live together, in respect and harmony.

Dr. Margaret Mead. Hadassah: I am 5 feet 2, so I have to climb up again.

I think all of us who are here today and honored by your awards think of perhaps one of the most important aspects of the award, the chance to talk to this group, a chance to meet face to face this large group of women from so many regions representing such a large membership, whom one knows are responsible and compassionate people.

There are all kinds of audiences in the world, but an audience where you are so certain of whom you're speaking to is something very valuable to those of us who are given an opportunity to speak.

But perhaps in line with this quotation from Mrs. Roosevelt as Dorothy Height read, I thought also of a lot of little things as well as big ones in attempting to prepare what I would say.

I remember when I was an undergraduate at Barnard how my roommate and I used to buy one large piece of white cardboard and cut it in half. She made the poster for the Jewish student society and I made the poster for the Sunday night club. And I put in my first lessons on how to be a well behaved goy. [Laughter.] I've had a lot more lessons through the years and I don't claim any proficiency, just an attempt to learn.

And I thought also of the visit I made to Israel in 1956 which started out with people paying quite a little attention to me and taking—starting early in the morning and going on late at night to be sure I didn't miss anything, especially anything of all the things that Hadassah was doing there. At the same time, each person told me not to let other people overwork me. [Laughter.] Which is characteristic of the Israeli position where everyone is so enthusiastic that even a visitor can hardly appreciate all that's going on.

This is the—the way I went to Israel—I left Israel an almost total eclipse because my young daughter had decided to stay there which everybody felt was much more interesting. So the last 3 or 4 days were devoted to my daughter and the fact that she had fallen in love with Israel and decided to stay and learn Hebrew and finish high school in Hebrew.

And I think it was very appropriate that they were more interested in what she had to say than in what I had to say or what she was going to say later once she had learned Hebrew, because Israel does so much belong to the future and so much to the very young people that we have an opportunity to send there.

Now, each one of us has thought in many ways of what we would like to say today and what we would like to say to this group of people where we're certain that anything one says that matters will have an echo not only in your hearts but in your actions.

And what I would like to say is a little about the contribution that movements like Hadassah make to the building of a world in which nationhood replaces nationalism, because one of the necessary parts of nationhood is that one does not love one's country less because one loves other countries also. [Applause.]

Hadassah has demonstrated over and over again that being compassionate, responsible American citizens is compatible with also loving and caring for children of the world and the particular children in particular other countries dear to them. And I think that what you've done, what you're doing and what you will do is going to be a tremendous contribution to the world of the future in which people will not only have a country of their birth, a country of their citizenship, but many other countries, countries of their minds, countries of their hearts, countries of their hopes, and in which we will realize that each nation grows in stature because it is able to care about other nations also. [Applause.]

Dr. Howard Rusk. Thank you very much, Mrs. Salpeter.

Members of Hadassah, I think the reason that you gave me this award is the fact that subconsciously you recognize my long and secret love affairs for Hadassah. [Laughter.]

I first got to know about Hadassah when Dr. Yassky and his staff spent a month with me at Bellevue in the late summer of 1951. I visited Israel for the first time 3 weeks after

Dr. Yassky and his nurses and workers were ambushed and killed on their way up Mount Scopus. I spoke the second night I was there to a group of nurses that graduated from your nursing school. There were 17 of them. The graduation exercises were held on the patio of an old French convent. Every graduate was a [inaudible]. Everyone carried one flower, a dark red rose. Everyone was going to take a vacation before they went to work. The vacation was the rest of the afternoon. Every girl went to work in the hospitals and the health services the next morning.

Because of groups like this and dedicated people and opportunity that you made possible, the planes that were coming in from Yemen, DC-3's, normally made to seat 36 were bringing in a hundred, a hundred and twenty individuals from Yemen, and it wasn't uncommon to open the door and find a half a dozen children dead and hospitals were set up on the airstrip manned by girls like this. Water was carried for a quarter of a mile in certain instances.

I remember going into one and seeing two transfusions and five intravenous infusions going at the same time with young children and one nurse looking after 200 patients alone with no help except those that she had [inaudible].

I came back and reported the things that I had seen to you. Now I have had the privilege in these years of continuing romance to see the development of your magnificent hospital. You have trained a number of physicians. You have participated in the new research programs in Israel, made possible by our Congress and about 5 years ago, our International Health Act in which Senator Smith was one of our staunch supporters which made counterpart funds available in the currencies of the countries that was frozen and we'd agreed not to take out for research purposes.

There are now projects going in nine different countries, but by far the largest and the best are the nine projects that are now going on in Israel. [Applause.]

It is a wonderful opportunity to study the problems of disease as far as ethnic origin is concerned, the essence, the course, the problems.

I revisited Israel 7 years after my first visit and again saw what has been described to you, this magnificent transformation. I saw Israel already sharing her doctrine with the new countries in Africa and I saw doctors from other countries now coming to learn.

So it's been an evolution not only in development but sharing. It has some little idea about the part that you have played.

In many of these projects, you've not only been the yeast in the loaf but you have furnished the loaf itself. I think all of us in medicine owe you a great debt of gratitude, but I think I speak for my colleagues when I say thank you.

I am grateful for his honor. I will put it by one of my most treasured ones, the Henrietta Szold Award, but I don't need them to remember you because I remember the people and the country that you have helped off their knees and I know what you do in this country to make it the kind of a place that we all want to live in.

I'd like to close with six lines written by a man who had a stroke in his forties, who lived to his late seventies, who did his greatest scientific work after he was paralyzed and he left this philosophy as his heritage in addition to the knowledge he left. I think it's your philosophy, too:

"Not to destroy but to construct; I hold the unconquerable belief that science and peace will triumph over ignorance and war.

"That nations will come together not to destroy but to construct; and that the future belongs to those who accomplish the most for humanity."

And the author was Louis Pasteur. [Applause.]

May I wish for you in the future the joy of accomplishment that you have here today. Thanks to your strong heart and great spirit. Thank you very much. [Applause.]

Mrs. Richard Rodgers. Thank you very much, Mrs. Salpeter. Honored guests, ladies, my husband is so sorry he cannot be here today to accept this great honor. But he has something we all know about, a bad back. He hurt himself yesterday morning and it's very painful when he moves and that's why I'm here. Perhaps you'll accept me as a poor substitute and forgive us both. [Applause.]

Well, Mrs. Salpeter suggested that I tell you a little bit—very little I assure you—about my experience in Israel. I went to Palestine in 1928 on a trip with my parents and I didn't go back again until about a year and a half ago when Dick and I went and you just cannot imagine—or perhaps this audience particularly can imagine—the change that took place in those years.

It was transformed from a desert, really just a sandy, arid desert where nothing green grew and it looked to me a year and a half ago very much like the land of milk and honey. It was green once again and I know that that's due in a large part to the efforts of Hadassah. I saw all those trees that were planted throughout the length of Israel. We were fortunate enough to be there on Independence Day and the parade was held a year ago in Haifa and that was perhaps the most beautiful setting in which to see it because you had the Mediterranean Sea and Mount Carmel in back of you and it was a marvelously sunny day and it was a thrilling, thrilling experience.

Our 12-day visit was all too short. We were so excited about this wonderful country and what is being accomplished and I know the tremendously important part that Hadassah has played in what has happened in Israel in the last 16 years—is it, since it was established? Yes, 17 now.

Well, I will now read the few words that Dick expected to say to you today.

As a practitioner in the musical theater, it is an important part of my job to deal with stories and I am convinced that the most inspirational stories are those that depict courage and imagination and energy, stories that relate the triumph of the human spirit over all kinds of obstacles in the face of adversity.

The history of Hadassah is that kind of story. But it's even more exciting and heartwarming because it is based on fact rather than fiction.

When the late Henrietta Szold founded your organization in 1912 in the old Temple Emanuel here in New York, it consisted of 12 members. Today there are more than 300,000 members located in all 50 States and Puerto Rico. Hadassah's initial project consisted of two lone nurses sent by you to struggle against the squalor, the disease and the malnutrition that beset the children of Palestine 50 years ago.

Having recently seen for myself the Hadassah Hebrew University Medical Center on the outskirts of Jerusalem with its magnificent hospital, its clinics and its medical, dental, and nursing schools, I am convinced that this accomplishment is among the most outstanding in the whole noble history of philanthropy. But you haven't stopped there. Through the World Youth Aliyah movement, you have helped to resettle over 100,000 children in Israel and there you have trained and rehabilitated them.

You have been the largest single contributor to the Jewish National Fund which has converted thousands of square miles of arid wasteland into productive fields. Through your efforts, hundreds of medical research projects are contributing to the world's store of medical knowledge and these activities constitute only a few of Hadassah's major accomplishments during the past half century.

Furthermore, you have achieved this proud record with dignity, with efficiency, and with a selfless dedication that has won the admiration of every one to whom compassion is more than just a word.

The American women of Hadassah, past and present, have faithfully practiced the credo of the ancient Jewish physician Maimonides. "In the sufferer, let me see only the human being."

In the face of Hadassah's magnificent history, I am deeply moved that you have been gracious enough to include me in this most distinguished group of Myrtle Wreath recipients. I accept your award with pride, with gratitude, and with the recognition that it symbolizes all that is best in American and Jewish traditions.

Thank you from the bottom of my heart. [Applause.]

Senator Margaret Chase Smith. I deeply appreciate the great honor you have accorded me with your Myrtle Wreath Award. In all humility I do hope that I am worthy of it.

For I have the greatest respect and admiration for Hadassah in its wonderful record of service to humanity. I mean specificaly your efforts to help safeguard the democratic—spelled with a small "d"—way of life here in the United States; your countrywide medical and public health system in Israel; and your work toward peace and security throughout the world.

You have answered with a most impressive "Yes" that very crucial question of "Am I my brother's keeper?" and at a time when too many Americans are giving a timid and almost silent "No."

Because I feel so very strongly on this matter I do want to repeat observations and cite cases as I have before done both in informal and private discussions and in formal and public statements.

Each of us has the responsibility to meet our obligations to ourselves and society and the reason for that responsibility is set forth in the statement many of you will recall—that "The only thing necessary to insure the triumph of evil is for enough good men to do nothing."

Let me recall your memory to some specific examples. The court trial of one of the American prisoners in Korea—the trial and conviction of an American who threw two other American prisoners out of a hut in snow because they were two miserable, human specimens suffering from diarrhea. There were 40 Americans in that hut. The two were thrown out of the hut to freeze to death.

The man who threw them out was put on trial. But of even greater concern should be the fact that 37 other men in that hut didn't lift a finger to do anything about it.

This is a forceful and frightening example of the saying that "The only thing necessary to insure the triumph of evil is for enough good men to do nothing."

Within the past year we have read in our newspapers of a 28-year-old woman stabbed to death while 38 of her neighbors admitted hearing her cries for help, but—did nothing. Yes, "Evil triumphs when good men do nothing."

An 18-year-old girl, in broad daylight, was assaulted, beaten, stripped. When she broke away from her 38-year-old assailant and pleaded for help, some 40 onlookers were attracted by her cries, but they—did nothing. Yes, "Evil triumphs when good men do nothing."

On a beach in our country, 12 adults stood passively by ignoring the pleas of a man who was trying without success to rescue a drowning boy. There is a frightening development of a behavior pattern on the part of too many of our citizens who, when asked about their doing nothing in the face of crime or unpleasantness, give the shocking answer of "I didn't want to become involved"—who callously refused to be their brother's keeper.

The sophistry of "not getting involved" and refusing to be "my brother's keeper" is pervasive. We see it even in semantics. In recent years, there has been a growing awe and admiration for pragmatists whose philosophy is that the end justifies the means. There has been too much glorification of the angle players, the corner cutters, the sharpshooters and the "goofoffs."

Many years ago, the word "square" was one of the most honored and respected words in our vocabulary. A square deal was an honest deal. A square meal a good and full meal. It was the squareshooter rather than the sharpshooter who was admired. When you were financially square, you had paid all your debts.

What is a "square" today? He's the fellow who never learned to get away with it—the one who volunteers when he doesn't have to—who tries to do better than others—who has to be reminded to go home because he's so lost in his work—whose heart beats faster and who gets choked up when the band plays the Star-Spangled Banner and the flag unfurls.

Yes, he's the fellow who says, "I am my brother's keeper" and means it.

We used to respect character as real power instead of admiring pragmatism—to recognize that mind without heart, intelligence without ethics, cleverness without goodness—all have dangerous flaws.

A man of character was a person universally acclaimed and respected for integrity, honor, responsibility, and determination—who was willing to be "his brother's keeper."

Now the word "character" has been prostituted for when someone is referred to as being a character, he is considered a square, an eccentric, an odd-ball—as being abnormal.

Yes, one of America's greatest needs today is for more people who are square and who have character and who are willing to be their brother's keeper—who dedicate themselves to the welfare of humanity as does your Hadassah.

I say, "Thank God for you"—and God bless all of you.

Term of Office for Members of the U.S. House of Representatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVE MARTIN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 6, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to make the term of office 4 years instead of 2 for Members of the U.S. House of Representatives.

Under my resolution, one-half of the Members of the U.S. House of Representatives would be elected every 2 years for a 4-year term.

This resolution would offer several advantages over the present 2-year terms:

First. Members would be able to devote more time and energy to their committee work and legislative duties and less time working toward reelection.

Second. The resolution would provide greater continuity in the membership of the House since only one-half of the total membership would be up for reelection every 2 years.

Third. In view of the fact that the average Member now represents slightly over 400,000 people, in contrast to the First Congress where the average Member represented approximately 45,000 people, this tremendous increase in the workload justifies a 4-year term instead of the original 2-year term.

Fourth. Many able young men with family responsibilities are hesitant to run for election to the House of Representatives because of the 2-year term and the constant job of campaigning. By making this a 4-year term, more young men would be attracted to seeking election to the U.S. House of Representatives.

Fifth. Costs of campaigning have increased tremendously within the last few years and many qualified people decide against running because of the combination of a 2-year term and the excessive cost of a campaign.

Sixth. The physical burden of a campaign every 2 years is most exhausting and is no doubt a contributing factor to the number of deaths of Members from each Congress.

I have discussed the merits of this proposal with many people in my district, both Republicans and Democrats, and have their unanimous approval of a 4-year term for Members of the House of Representatives. I hope early favorable consideration is given to this resolution.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JANUARY 7, 1965

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

God of pity and of love, we thank Thee for this fenced-in enclosure where quietness reigns and over whose portal is written, "In the beginning God."

We pray that as we go forth from this chapel of prayer to meet the day's demands that no festering resentment, no camouflaged self-interest, no small loyalties, no ingrained prejudice may choke and clog the channels of unadulterated public service.

Commissioned to stand upon the ramparts of democracy in this land the people rule, facing the dire needs of this changing world with its hosts of Thy undeveloped human family, but eager for a better life they have glimpsed, undergird, we pray, those called in such a day to serve the Nation, to keep steady and bright the one global purpose of this land of our hope and prayer, the passion to preserve and to extend the areas of human betterment under the concepts and institutions of liberty through law.

And as we give our best to bequeath that heritage in this world of ferment may we never forget that this way of life under Thee has taken a thousand years of blood and tears to bring to its consummation.

May those who serve here be worthy representatives of the American dream for all men.

In the Redeemer's name we ask it. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, January 6, 1965, was dispensed with.

MODIFICATION OF ORDER

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, yesterday, as shown on page 235 of the RECORD, under "Limitation of Debate During Morning Hour Tomorrow," I made the following statement:

> LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR TOMORROW
>
> Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, during the morning hour tomorrow, on the convening of the Senate, during which time bills may be introduced, resolutions submitted, and other routine business transacted, statements be limited to 3 minutes.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] has asked me if I meant when I made that statement what I had said at the opening of the Senate yesterday, which is as follows:

> Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order to introduce bills and submit resolutions that would be referred to the appropriate standing committees of the Senate without prejudicing the rights of any Senator as regards the parliamentary situation affecting any proposed amendment to the Senate rules, and that that procedure be continued today so long as any Senator desires to be recognized, and that statements during that period be limited to 3 minutes.

That is what I had in mind when I made the statement I first read. I merely wish to clarify the RECORD.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The order prevails today, then, and not merely yesterday.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is what I had intended to state but did not state.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the majority leader.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to a modification of the RECORD accordingly? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Morning business is in order.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President——

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry: I thought I caught the eye of the Chair first. Am I not correct? I respectfully inquire of the Chair if the rule for morning business does not provide, first, for the presentation of petitions and memorials; following that, reports of standing and select committees; following that, the introduction of bills and joint resolutions; and following that, concurrent and other resolutions. The only reason why I raise the question is to determine how much time might be occupied in the morning hour, assuming that Senators have bills that they wish to introduce today, because that procedure would take precedence.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate is now operating under a unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But would not the rule take precedence?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The unanimous-consent agreement supersedes the procedure which the Senator from Illinois read.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I was not aware that the unanimous-consent request superseded the order of business as called for under rule VII.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is the case.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

THE NATION'S HEALTH—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 44)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

To the Congress of the United States:

In 1787, Thomas Jefferson wrote that, "Without health there is no happiness. An attention to health, then, should take the place of every other object."

That priority has remained fixed in both the private and public values of our society through generations of Americans since.

Our rewards have been immeasurably bountiful. "An attention to health"—of the individual, the family, the community, and the Nation—has contributed to the vitality and efficiency of our system as well as to the happiness and prosperity of our people.

Today, at this point in our history, we are privileged to contemplate new horizons of national advance and achievement in many sectors. But it is imperative that we give first attention to our opportunities—and our obligations—for advancing the Nation's health. For the health of our people is, inescapably, the foundation for fulfillment of all our aspirations.

In these years of the 1960's, we live as beneficiaries of this century's great—and continuing—revolution of medical knowledge and capabilities. Smallpox, malaria, yellow fever, and typhus are conquered in this country. Infant deaths have been reduced by half every two decades. Poliomyelitis, which took 3,154 lives so recently as 1952, cost only 5 lives in 1964. Over the brief span of the past two decades, death rates have been reduced for influenza by 88 percent, tuberculosis by 87 percent, rheumatic fever by 90 percent.

A baby born in America today has a life expectancy half again as long as those born in the year the 20th century began.

The successes of the century are many.

The pace of medical progress is rapid.

The potential for the future is unlimited.

But we must not allow the modern miracles of medicine to mesmerize us. The work most needed to advance the Nation's health will not be done for us by miracles. We must undertake that work ourselves through practical, prudent, and patient programs—to put more firmly in place the foundation for the healthiest, happiest and most hopeful society in the history of man.

Our first concern must be to assure that the advance of medical knowledge leaves none behind. We can—and we must—strive now to assure the availability of and accessibility to the best health care for all Americans, regardless of age or geography or economic status.

With this as our goal, we must strengthen our Nation's health facilities and services, assure the adequacy and quality of our health manpower, continue to assist our States and communities in meeting their health responsibilities, and respond alertly to the new hazards of our new and complex environment.

We must, certainly, continue and intensify our health research and research facilities. Despite all that has been done, we cannot be complacent before the facts that—

Forty-eight million people now living will become victims of cancer;

Nearly 15 million people suffer from heart disease and this, together with strokes, accounts for more than half the deaths in the United States each year;

Twelve million people suffer arthritis and rheumatic disease and 10 million are burdened with neurological disorders;

Five and one-half million Americans are afflicted by mental retardation and the number increases by 126,000 new cases each year.

In our struggle against disease, great advances have been made, but the battle is far from won. While that battle will not end in our lifetime—or any time to come—we have the high privilege and high promise of making longer strides forward now than any other generation of Americans.

The measures I am outlining today will carry us forward in the oldest tradition of our society—to give "an attention to health" for all our people. Our advances, thus far, have been most dramatic in the field of health knowledge. We are challenged now to give attention to advances in the field of health care—and this is the emphasis of the recommendations I am placing before you at this time.

I. REMOVING BARRIERS TO HEALTH CARE

In this century, medical scientists have done much to improve human health and prolong human life. Yet as these advances come, vital, segments of our populace are being left behind—behind barriers of age, economics, geography, or community resources. Today the political community is challenged to help all our people surmount these needless barriers to the enjoyment of the promise and reality of better health.

A. HOSPITAL INSURANCE FOR THE AGED

Thirty years ago, the American people made a basic decision that the later years of life should not be years of despondency and drift. The result was enactment of our social security program, a program now fixed as a valued part of our national life. Since World War II, there has been increasing awareness of the fact that the full value of social security would not be realized unless provision were made to deal with the problem of costs of illnesses among our older citizens.

I believe this year is the year when, with the sure knowledge of public support, the Congress should enact a hospital insurance program for the aged.

The facts of the need are well and widely known:

Four out of five persons 65 or older have a disability or chronic disease.

People over 65 go to the hospital more frequently and stay twice as long as younger people.

Health costs for them are twice as high as for the young.

Where health insurance is available it is usually associated with an employer-employee plan. However, since most of our older people are not employed they are usually not eligible under these plans.

Almost half of the elderly have no health insurance at all.

The average retired couple cannot afford the cost of adequate health protection under private health insurance.

I ask that our social security system—proved and tested by three decades of successful operation—be extended to finance the cost of basic health services. In this way, the specter of catastrophic hospital bills can be lifted from the lives of our older citizens. I again strongly urge the Congress to enact a hospital insurance program for the aged. Such a program should—

Be financed under social security by regular, modest contributions during working years;

Provide protection against the costs of hospital and posthospital extended care, home nursing services, and outpatient diagnostic services;

Provide similar protection to those who are not now covered by social security, with the costs being paid from the administrative budget;

Clearly indicate that the plan in no way interferes with the patient's complete freedom to select his doctor or hospital.

Like our existing social security cash retirement benefits, this hospital insurance plan will be a basic protection plan. It should cover the heaviest cost elements in serious illnesses. In addition, we should encourage private insurance to provide supplementary protection.

I consider this measure to be of utmost urgency. Compassion and reason dictate that this logical extension of our proven social security system will supply the prudent, feasible, and dignified way to free the aged from the fear of financial hardship in the event of illness.

Also, I urge all States to provide adequate medical assistance under the existing Kerr-Mills program for the aged who cannot afford to meet the noninsured costs.

B. BETTER HEALTH SERVICES FOR CHILDREN AND YOUTH

America's tradition of compassion for the aged is matched by our traditional devotion to our most priceless resources of all—our young. Today, far more than many realize, there are great and growing needs among our children for better health services.

Acute illness strikes children under 15 nearly twice as frequently as it does adults.

One in five children under age 17 is afflicted with a chronic ailment.

Three out of every 100 children suffer some form of paralysis or orthopedic impairment.

At least 2 million children are mentally retarded, with a higher concentration of them from poor families.

Four million children are emotionally disturbed.

At age 15, the average child has more than 10 decayed teeth.

If the health of our Nation is to be substantially improved in the years to come, we must improve the care of the health of our 75 million preschool and school-age children and youth.

There is much to do if we are to make available the medical and dental services our rising generation needs. Nowhere are the needs greater than for the 15 million children of families who live in poverty.

Children in families with incomes of less than $2,000 are able to visit a doctor only half as frequently as those in families with incomes of more than $7,000.

Public assistance payments for medical services to the 3 million needy children receiving dependent children's benefits throughout the Nation average only $2.80 a month, and in some States such medical benefits are not provided at all.

Poor families increasingly are forced to turn to overcrowded hospital emergency rooms and to overburdened city clinics as their only resource to meet their routine health needs.

Military entrance examinations reveal the consequences. Half of those rejected cannot pass the medical tests. Three-fourths of them would benefit from treatment, and earlier treatment would greatly increase recovery and decrease lifelong disability.

The States and localities bear the major responsibility for providing modern medical care to our children and youth. But the Federal Government can help. I recommend legislation to—

Increase the authorizations for maternal and child health and crippled children's services, earmarking funds for project grants to provide health screening and diagnosis for children of preschool and school age, as well as treatment and followup care services for disabled children and youth. This should include funds to help defray the operational costs of university-affiliated mental retardation clinical centers. Provisions should also be made for the training of personnel who will operate medical facilities for children;

Broaden the public assistance program to permit specific Federal participation in paying costs of medical and dental care for children in medically needy families, similar to the Kerr-Mills program for the aged; and

Extend the grant programs for (a) family health services and clinics for domestic agricultural migratory workers and their children and (b) community vaccination assistance.

C. IMPROVED COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES

Mental illness afflicts 1 out of 10 Americans, fills nearly one-half of all the hospital beds in the Nation, and costs $3 billion annually. Fortunately, we are entering a new era in the prevention, treatment, and care of mental illness. Mere custodial care of patients in large, isolated asylums is clearly no longer appropriate. Most patients can be cared for and cured in their own communities.

An important beginning toward community preparation has been made through the legislation enacted by the 88th Congress authorizing aid for constructing community mental health centers. But facilities alone cannot assure services.

It has been estimated that at least 10,000 more psychiatrists are needed.

Few communities have the funds to support adequate programs, particularly during the first years.

Communities with the greatest needs hesitate to build centers without being able to identify the source of operating funds.

Most of the people in need are children, the aged, or patients with low incomes.

I therefore recommend legislation to authorize a 5-year program of grants for the initial costs of personnel to man community mental health centers which offer comprehensive services.

D. A NEW LIFE FOR THE DISABLED

Today, we are rehabilitating about 120,000 disabled persons each year. I recommend a stepped-up program to overcome this costly waste of human resources. My 1966 budget will propose increased funds to rehabilitate an additional 25,000.

Our goal should be at least 200,000 a year. I recommend legislation to authorize—

Project grants to help States expand their services;

Special Federal matching so that rehabilitative services can be provided to a greater number of the mentally retarded and other seriously disabled individuals; and

Construction and modernization of workshops and rehabilitation centers.

II. STRENGTHENING THE NATION'S HEALTH FACILITIES AND SERVICES

In our urbanized society today, the availability of health care depends uniquely upon the availability and accessibility of modern facilities, located in convenient and efficient places, and on well organized and adequately supported services. The lack of such facilities and services is, of itself, a barrier to good health care.

A. MULTIPURPOSE REGIONAL MEDICAL COMPLEXES

In this century, we have made more advance than in all other centuries toward overcoming diseases which have taken the heaviest toll of human life. Today we are challenged to meet and master the three killers which alone account for 7 out of 10 deaths in the United States each year—heart disease, cancer, and stroke. The Commission on Heart Disease, Cancer, and Stroke has pointed the way for us toward that goal.

The newest and most effective diagnostic methods and the most recent and most promising methods of treatment often require equipment or skills of great scarcity and expense such as open heart surgery, advanced and very high voltage radiation therapy, and advanced disease detection methods.

It is not necessary for each hospital or clinic to have such facilities, equipment, or services, but it is essential that every patient requiring such specialized and expensive procedures and services have access to them. Multipurpose medical complexes can meet these needs. They would—

Speed the application of research knowledge to patient care, so as to turn otherwise hollow laboratory triumphs into health victories;

Save thousands of lives now needlessly taken annually by the three great killers—heart disease, cancer, and stroke—and by other major diseases.

A plan to improve our attack upon these major causes of death and disability should become a part of the fabric of our regional and community health services. The services provided under this plan will help the practicing physician keep in touch with the latest medical knowledge and by making available to him the latest techniques, specialized knowledge, and the most efficient methods.

To meet these objectives, such complexes should—

Be regional in scope;

Provide services for a variety of diseases—heart disease, cancer, stroke, and other major illnesses;

Be affiliated with medical schools, teaching hospitals, and medical centers;

Be supported by diagnostic services in community hospitals;

Provide diagnosis and treatment of patients, together with research and teaching in a coordinated system; and

Permit clinical trial of advanced techniques and drugs.

Medical complexes—consisting of regional organizations of medical schools, teaching hospitals, and treatment centers tied into community diagnostic and treatment facilities—represent a new kind of organization for providing coordinated teaching, research, and patient care. When we consider that the economic cost of heart disease alone amounts to 540,000 lost man-years annually—worth some $2.5 billion—the urgency and value of effective action is unmistakable.

Action on this new approach, stemming from recommendations of the Commission on Heart Disease, Cancer, and Stroke, will provide significant improvements in many fields of medicine.

I recommend legislation to authorize a 5-year program of project grants to develop multipurpose regional medical complexes for an all-out attack on heart disease, cancer, stroke, and other major diseases.

B. IMPROVED SERVICES FOR THE MENTALLY RETARDED

Mental retardation in any individual is a lifelong problem of the most serious nature for the family and for the community. But we know today that the problem need not and must not lead to tragic hopelessness. Much is being done to provide a decent, dignified place in society for these unfortunate individuals.

The 88th Congress provided a substantial foundation for building an effective national program for the prevention of mental retardation and care of the mentally retarded. Under this authority, grants are authorized—

For construction of mental retardation research centers, community mental retardation centers, and university affiliated mental retardation centers; and

For planning by all the States of comprehensive action to combat mental retardation at the State and community levels.

The 1966 budget includes $282 million—a $40 million increase—for these programs and other mental retardation services, including preventive activities and the training of teachers of the retarded. I urge that this full amount be appropriated.

Extensive resources and programs need to be developed in the States and communities to prevent mental retardation and to care for the mentally retarded. The existing authority for planning grants will end on June 30, 1965. The developmental needs and effective utilization of the construction grants require followup action.

I recommend the enactment of mental retardation program development grants for 2 additional years to help the States continue this essential work.

C. MODERNIZATION OF HEALTH FACILITIES

Great progress has been made throughout the Nation in the provision of new general hospitals under the Hill-Burton program. But relatively little assistance has been available for modernization of the older hospitals, found particularly in our large cities. Without aid, deterioration threatens and rapid scientific and technical change is passing by these essential links to health care for millions of our people.

The 1966 budget will include funds for a greatly increased hospital modernization effort as well as for expansion in the number and quality of nursing homes. I urge the Congress to approve the full amount requested for each of these purposes.

D. AID FOR GROUP PRACTICE FACILITIES

New approaches are needed to stretch the supply of medical specialists and to provide a wider range of medical services in the communities. The growth of voluntary, comprehensive group practice programs has demonstrated the feasibility of grouping health services for the mutual benefit of physicians and patients by—

Integrating the burgeoning medical specialities into an efficient and economical system of patient care; and

Reducing the incidence of hospitalization which may now occur because there are few alternative centers for specialized care.

The initial capital requirements for group practice are substantial, and funds are not now sufficiently available to stimulate the expansion and establishment of group practice. To facilitate and encourage this desirable trend, I recommend legislation to authorize a program of direct loans and loan guarantees to assist voluntary associations in the construction and equipping of facilities for comprehensive group practice.

III. MANPOWER FOR THE HEALTH SERVICES

The advance of our Nation's health in this century has, in the final measure, been possible because of the unique quality and fortunate quantity of men and women serving in our health professions. Americans respect and are grateful for our doctors, dentists, nurses, and others who serve our Nation's health. But it is clear that the future requires our support now to increase the quantity and assure the continuing high quality of such vital personnel.

In all sectors of health care, the need for trained personnel continues to outstrip the supply.

At present, the United States has 290,000 physicians. In a decade, we shall need 346,000.

Today we are keeping pace with our needs largely because of the influx of numbers of foreign-trained doctors. Last year 1,600 came into the United States, the equivalent of the output from 16 medical schools and 21 percent of our medical school graduates.

Population growth has badly outpaced the increase in dentists and the shortage of dentists is now acute.

To begin to meet the Nation's health needs, the number of new physicians graduated each year must increase at least 50 percent by 1975, and the output of new dentists by 100 percent.

The Health Professions Educational Assistance Act of 1963, authorizing grants to schools for construction of medical and other health education schools and loans to students, will help meet this problem. The magnitude of the need is demonstrated by the response:

Ninety applications have been received from medical and dental schools, requesting $247 million in Federal aid for construction;

Only $100 million is available in 1965; and the full authorization for 1966, which I will shortly request in the budget I am submitting, will provide $75 million more.

In the light of these needs, I urge the Congress to appropriate the full amount authorized and requested for the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act program.

While we must build new medical and dental schools, we must also retain and sustain the ones we have. To be neglectful of such schools would be wasteful folly.

We must face the fact that high operating costs and shortages of operating funds are jeopardizing our health professions educational system. Tuition and fees paid by medical and dental students meet less than half the institutional costs of their education. Several underfinanced medical and dental schools are threatened with failure to meet educational standards. New schools are slow to start, even when construction funds are available due to lack of operating funds.

I therefore recommend legislation to authorize—

Formula grants to help cover basic operating costs of our health profession schools in order that they may significantly expand both their capacity and the quality of their educational programs; and

Project grants to enable health profession schools to experiment and demonstrate new and improved educational methods.

Traditionally, our medical profession has attracted outstanding young talent and we must be certain that this tradition is not compromised. We must draw the best available talent into the medical profession. Half of last June's medical school graduates came from families with incomes of over $10,000 a year. The high costs of medical school must not deny access to the medical profession for able youths from low- and middle-income families.

I therefore recommend legislation to authorize scholarships for medical and dental students who would otherwise not be able to enter or complete such training.

LOOKING TO THE FUTURE

We must also look to the future in planning to meet the health manpower requirements of the Nation.

Unmet health needs are already large. American families are demanding and expecting more and better health services. In the past decades the proportion of our gross national product devoted to health has increased by more than 50 percent. The trend is still upward. If we are to meet our future needs and raise the health of the Nation, we must—

Improve utilization of available professional health personnel;

Expand the use and training of technicians and ancillary health workers through special schools and under the Vocational Education Act and Manpower Development and Training Act programs;

Expand and improve training programs for professional and for supporting health personnel;

Plan ahead to meet requirements for which the leadtime is often 10 years or more.

With these objectives in mind, I have asked the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to develop a long-range health manpower program for the Nation and to recommend to me the steps which should be taken to put it into effect.

IV. HEALTH RESEARCH AND RESEARCH FACILITIES

Two decades ago this Nation decided that its Government should be a strong supporter of the health research to advance the well-being of its people. This year that support amounts to more than two-thirds of the total national expenditure of $1.5 billion for health research.

Continued growth of this research is necessary and the 1966 budget includes—

A 10-percent growth in expenditures for health research and for the related training;

Funds to begin an automated system for processing the exploding volume of information on drugs and other chemicals related to health.

Health research, no less than patient care, requires adequate facilities. Over the past 8 years the Health Research Facilities Act has been highly successful in helping provide research facilities to universities and other nonprofit institutions. Federal grants of $320 million to 990 construction projects have generated over $500 million in matching institutional dollars.

This authority expires on June 30, 1966, and I recommend that it be extended for 5 years with an increased authorization and with a larger Federal share for specialized research facilities of a national or regional character.

V. HEALTH GRANTS AND PROTECTION MEASURES

Our complex modern society is creating health hazards never before encountered. The pollution of our environment is assuming such important proportion I shall shortly send to the Congress a special message dealing with this challenge.

But the protection of the public health also requires action on other fronts.

A. HEALTH GRANTS TO COMMUNITIES AND STATES

In safeguarding and advancing the Nation's health, States and communities have long had special responsibilities. General and special purpose health grants have proved an effective means of strengthening the Federal Government's partnership with them in improving the public health.

I have directed the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to study these programs thoroughly and to recommend to me necessary legislation to increase their usefulness.

Authorizations for many of these programs expire at the close of fiscal year 1966. So that a thorough review may be made, I recommend that the Congress extend the authorizations through June 30, 1967.

B. CONSUMERS HEALTH PROTECTION

Modernization of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act is imperative if our health protection program is to keep pace with the technological and industrial advances of recent years.

The health of all Americans depends on the reliability and safety of the products of the—

Food industry, which alone generates nearly $100 billion in retail sales each year;

Drug industry, with sales reaching $6 billion; and

Cosmetic industry which markets $2.5 billion of products. All must be operated under the highest standards of purity and safety.

Yet, despite recent improvements in food and drug legislation, serious gaps in our ability to protect the consumer still exist. The law should be strengthened to provide adequate authority in the regulation of nonprescription drugs, medical devices, cosmetics, and food.

Narcotics are not alone among the hazardous, habit-forming drugs subject to improper use. Barbiturates, amphetamines, and other drugs have harmful effects when improperly used. Widespread traffic resulting from inadequate controls over the manufacture, distribution, and sale of these drugs is creating a growing problem which must be met. We must also counter the threat from counterfeit drugs.

I recommend legislation to bring the production and distribution of barbiturates, amphetamines, and other psychotoxic drugs under more effective control.

For the fuller protection of our families, I recommend legislation to require—

Adequate labeling of hazardous substances.

Safety regulation of cosmetics and therapeutic devices by premarketing examination by the Food and Drug Administration.

Authority to seize counterfeit drugs at their source.

CONCLUSION

I believe we have come to a rare moment of opportunity and challenge in the evolution of our society. In the message I have presented to you, and in other messages I shall be sending, my purpose is to outline the attainable horizons of a greater society which a confident and prudent people can begin to build for the future.

Whatever we aspire to do together, our success in those enterprises, and our enjoyment of the fruits that result, will rest finally upon the health of our people. We cannot, and we will not, overcome all the barriers, or surmount all the obstacles, in one effort, no matter how intensive. But in all the sectors I have mentioned we are already behind our capability and our potential. Further delay will only compound our problems and deny our people the health and happiness that could be theirs.

The 88th Congress wrote a proud and significant record of accomplishment in the field of health legislation. I have every confidence that this Congress will write an even finer record that will be remembered with honor by generations of Americans to come.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 7, 1965*.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H.J. Res. 123) to fix the dates for transmitting the Budget and the Economic Report during the month of January 1965, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON OVEROBLIGATION OF AN APPROPRIATION

A letter from the Administrator of Veterans Affairs, Veterans' Administration, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on the overobligation of an appropriation in that Administration; to the Committee on Appropriations.

AMENDMENTS OF TITLES 10 AND 37, UNITED STATES CODE, RELATING TO TREATMENT OF OFFENDERS AGAINST THE UNIFORM CODE OF MILITARY JUSTICE

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend titles 10 and 37, United States Code, to provide for confinement and treatment of offenders against the Uniform Code of Military Justice (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AUTHORIZATION FOR CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES TO ACCEPT AND WEAR DECORATIONS OF CERTAIN FOREIGN NATIONS

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize certain members of the Armed Forces to accept and wear decorations of certain foreign nations (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, TO PERMIT MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES TO ACCEPT CERTAIN GRANTS

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit members of the Armed Forces to accept fellowships, scholarships, or grants offered by a foreign government (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON OFFICER ARMY AVIATORS ENTITLED TO FLIGHT PAY

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on officer Army aviators entitled to flight pay, for the 6-month period ended December 31, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, RELATING TO ASSIGNMENT OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES TO WEATHER BUREAU

A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit members of the Armed Forces to be assigned or detailed to the Weather Bureau or the Office of the Federal Coordinator for Meteorological Services and Supporting Research, Department of Commerce (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Amendment of Title 10, United States Code, Relating to Exemptions for Certain Contracts With Foreign Contractors

A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 10, United States Code, to exempt certain contracts with foreign contractors from the requirement for an examination-of-records clause (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report on U.S. Coast Guard Flight Pay

A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, reporting, pursuant to law, on flight pay in the U.S. Coast Guard, for the 6-month period ended December 31, 1964; to the Committee on Commerce.

Amendment of Section 407(e) of Federal Aviation Act of 1958, Relating to Authority of Civil Aeronautics Board To Examine Certain Books and Records

A letter from the Acting Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 407(e) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to clarify the authority of the Civil Aeronautics Board to examine the books and records of persons controlled by, or under common control with, an air carrier, or of service organizations controlled by groups of air carriers, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

Amendment of Communications Act of 1934, Relating to Painting, Illumination, and Dismantlement of Radio Towers

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, with respect to painting, illumination, and dismantlement of radio towers (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

Report on Land Acquisitions, National Capital Planning Commission

A letter from the Chairman, National Capital Planning Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on land acquisitions by that Commission, during the fiscal year 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Report of the Renegotiation Board

A letter from the Chairman, the Renegotiation Board, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Board, for the fiscal year 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

Reports of Comptroller General

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on procurement of defective fuel servicing semitrailers and school buses, Department of the Army, dated December 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on additional costs resulting from the failure to procure parts used in overhauling special air mission aircraft engines directly from the overhauling subcontractor, Curtiss-Wright Corp., Department of the Air Force, dated December 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on excessive costs incurred in constructing low-rent public housing projects in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Santurce (Puerto Rico) Regional Office, Public Housing Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency, dated December 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Audit Report on Gorgas Memorial Institute of Tropical and Preventive Medicine, Inc.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Gorgas Memorial Institute of Tropical and Preventive Medicine, Inc., fiscal year 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report of General Services Administration

A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Administration, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Readiness of Combat and Combat-Support Vehicles Assigned to Strategic Army Corps Units in the United States

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a confidential report on readiness of combat and combat-support vehicles assigned to Strategic Army Corps units in the United States (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Excessive Inventory of Photographic Supplies, Manned Spacecraft Center, National Aeronautics and Space Administration

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on excessive inventory of photographic supplies, Manned Spacecraft Center, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, dated January 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Price and San Pitch River Basins, Utah

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Price and San Pitch River basins, Utah, dated December 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Proposed Amendment to Concession Contract, Grand Teton National Park

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a proposed amendment to the concession contract authorizing the Signal Mountain Lodge to continue to provide overnight accommodations, facilities, and services in Grand Teton National Park (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Restriction of Certain Areas in the Outer Continental Shelf for Defense Purposes

A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the restriction of certain areas in the outer Continental Shelf (known as the Eastern Test Range) for defense purposes, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Restriction of Certain Areas for Defense Purposes (Gulf Test Range, Gulf of Mexico)

A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the restriction of certain areas in the outer Continental Shelf for defense purposes, and for other purposes (Gulf Test Range, Gulf of Mexico) (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Restriction of a Certain Area for Defense Purposes (Matagorda Water Range)

A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the restriction of a certain area in the outer Continental Shelf for defense purposes, and for other purposes (Matagorda Water Range) (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Report on Settlement of Claims of Certain Indians

A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on the final settlement of the claims of certain Indians (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Amendment of Titles 10 and 14, United States Code, Relating to Settlement of Certain Claims Against the United States

A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend titles 10 and 14, United States Code, and the Military Personnel and Civilian Employees' Claims Act of 1964, with respect to the settlement of claims against the United States by members of the uniformed services and civilian officers and employees of the United States for damage to, or loss of, personal property incident to their service, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Issuance of Certificates of Citizenship in the Canal Zone

A letter from the Governor, Canal Zone Government, Balboa Heights, Canal Zone, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the issuance of certificates of citizenship in the Canal Zone (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution adopted by the Okinawa Cities, Towns, and Villages Association, of Naha, Okinawa, favoring the early return of administrative authority of the United States over Okinawa; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Southern Association for Counselor Education and Supervision, Richmond, Va., commending the Congress for the enactment of the National Defense Education Act, and requesting a careful review of budgetary provisions to insure full implementation of the act; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The memorial of Reginald B. Naugle, of Conyngham, Pa., remonstrating against the recent counting of the electoral votes, and raising his objections thereto; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred, as follows:

By Mr. MANSFIELD (for himself, Mr. Metcalf, Mr. Hayden, Mr. Ribicoff, and Mr. Morse):

S. 296. A bill to authorize the temporary release of 100,000 short tons of copper from the national stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. Mansfield when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota:

S. 297. A bill to amend the act of July 1, 1948 (62 Stat. 1215), providing for the furnishing of Government headstones and markers; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota (for himself and Mr. Burdick):

S. 298. A bill for the relief of Dr. Fang Luke Chiu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIMPSON:

S. 299. A bill to establish qualifications for persons appointed to the Supreme Court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Simpson when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SCOTT:

S. 300. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to allow a deduction for certain amounts paid by a taxpayer for tuition and fees in providing a higher education for himself, his spouse, and his dependents; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Scott when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 301. A bill to promote public knowledge of progress and achievement in astronautics and related sciences through the designation of a special day in honor of Dr. Robert Hutchings Goddard, the father of modern rockets, missiles, and astronautics; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Saltonstall when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CURTIS (for himself and Mr. Hruska):

S. 302. A bill to reauthorize construction by the Secretary of the Interior of the North Loup division, Nebraska, of the Missouri River Basin project; and

S. 303. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Nebraska midstate division, Missouri River Basin project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 304. A bill for the relief of W. J. B. Daniel; and

S. 305. A bill for the relief of Charles B. Franklin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MUSKIE (for himself, Mr. Bartlett, Mr. Bayh, Mr. Bible, Mr. Brewster, Mr. Clark, Mr. Douglas, Mr. Gruening, Mr. Hartke, Mr. Inouye, Mr. Kennedy of Massachusetts, Mr. Kuchel, Mr. Long of Missouri, Mr. McGee, Mr. Mansfield, Mr. Metcalf, Mr. Moss, Mr. Nelson, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Ribicoff, and Mr. Williams of New Jersey):

S. 306. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to require standards for controlling the emission of pollutants from gasoline powered or diesel powered vehicles, to establish a Federal Air Pollution Control Laboratory, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. Muskie when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HART:

S. 307. A bill granting the consent of Congress to a compact relating to taxation of motor fuels consumed by interstate buses and to an agreement relating to bus taxation proration and reciprocity; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 308. A bill to permit the establishment and operation of certain branch offices by the Michigan National Bank, Lansing, Mich.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MUNDT (for himself, Mr. Scott, Mr. Prouty, Mr. Sparkman, Mr. Bible, Mr. Young of North Dakota, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Cooper, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Smathers, Mr. Allott, Mr. Carlson, Mr. Case, Mr. Holland, Mr. Simpson, Mr. Thurmond, and Mr. Tower):

S. 309. A bill creating a commission to be known as the Commission on Noxious and Obscene Matters and Materials; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. Mundt when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself, Mr. Cooper, Mr. Long of Missouri, Mr. Metcalf, Mr. Pell, and Mr. Randolph):

S. 310. A bill to amend the National Arts and Cultural Development Act of 1964 to authorize the National Council on the Arts to accept and receive bequests, gifts, and donations for use in carrying out the purposes of such act, and to establish the National Arts Foundation; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Javits when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

Mr. FONG:

S. 311. A bill to repeal the retailers excise taxes on jewelry, furs, toilet preparations, and luggage and handbags; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. JOHNSTON:

S. 312. A bill to provide for further research relating to new and improved uses for farm and forest products and for development of new crops, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. DIRKSEN (for himself and Mr. Simpson):

S. 313. A bill relating to the appointment of the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Dirksen when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

S. 314. A bill to provide for the settlement of claims resulting from an explosion at a U.S. ordnance plant in Bowie County, Tex., on July 8, 1963; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELL (for himself, Mr. Brewster, Mr. Clark, Mr. Cooper, Mr. Javits, Mr. Kennedy of Massachusetts, Mr. Long of Missouri, Mr. Metcalf, Mr. Pastore, Mr. Randolph, and Mr. Ribicoff):

S. 315. A bill to establish a National Arts Foundation; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. PELL (for himself, Mr. Brewster, Mr. Kennedy of Massachusetts, Mr. Long of Missouri, Mr. Metcalf, Mr. Pastore, and Mr. Randolph):

S. 316. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Pell when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BURDICK:

S. 317. A bill for the relief of the Swanston Equipment Co.;

S. 318. A bill for the relief of Jane Jast Delorme;

S. 319. A bill for the relief of Cathyrn A. Glesener;

S. 320. A bill for the relief of Denis Ryan;

S. 321. A bill for the relief of Leo M. Mondry; and

S. 322. A bill for the relief of Choy-Sim Mah; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURDICK (for himself and Mr. Young of North Dakota):

S. 323. A bill for the relief of Gertrude Margitta McCannell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BREWSTER (for himself, Mr. Proxmire, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Tydings, and Mr. Young of North Dakota):

S. 324. A bill to amend section 331 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 in order to continue the indemnity payment program for dairy farmers; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Brewster when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. RIBICOFF:

S. 325. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, to authorize the Interstate Commerce Commission to assist common carriers of passengers by railroad in preserving and improving essential passenger train services and facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Ribicoff when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

S. 326. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, to provide that accumulated sick leave be credited to the retirement fund or that the individual be reimbursed; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. Yarborough when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MORSE (for himself and Mrs. Neuberger):

S. 327. A bill to provide assistance to the States of Oregon, Washington, California, and Idaho for the reconstruction of areas damaged by recent floods and high waters; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. Morse when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION—STOP AIDING AGGRESSORS

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, everyone knows that the United States is a nation of peace. We seek in every way not only to prevent aggressions wherever they may be found, but to bring our own and world efforts to bear on the solution of problems of international discord.

Yet, Mr. President, we are in a sense aiding and abetting with our foreign aid programs nations which are actively engaged in aggressive actions upon others. I refer particularly to Mr. Sukarno's regime in Indonesia and its acts against Malaysia, and to the war conducted by Mr. Nasser against the country of Yemen. It is my belief that the Congress should take a strong position advising against the continuation of any such aid to those countries, or to others which may become involved in aggressive actions.

Further, we have continued our programs of assistance to countries which have permitted acts of vandalism and destruction against property of the United States within their borders. The least we can do to prevent the repetition of such actions is to similarly withdraw support in such instances.

Therefore, Mr. President, I send to the desk a concurrent resolution making clear that this is the sense of the Congress and request that the text of the resolution may appear at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 5), submitted by Mr. HARTKE, was received and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

> *Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That it is the sense of the Congress (a) that no assistance should be provided under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, or any other Act—
>
> (1) to any foreign country which is engaged or hereafter engages in carrying out, or providing assistance to others engaged in carrying out, armed aggression against any other country; or
>
> (2) to any foreign country which permits, or fails to take adequate measures to prevent, the destruction by mob action of United States property within such country;
>
> and (b) that in any case in which assistance is terminated by reason of any activity referred to in this concurrent resolution, such assistance should not be resumed until the President determines that such activity has ceased and receives assurances satisfactory to him that it will not be renewed.

RESOLUTIONS

AMENDMENT OF RULE XXII RELATIVE TO CLOTURE

Mr. MORSE submitted a resolution (S. Res. 16) to amend rule XXII relative to cloture, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the remarks of Mr. MORSE when he submitted the above resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. SPARKMAN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 17) to provide additional funds for the Select Committee on Small Business, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

> *Resolved*, That section 4 of S. Res. 284, Eighty-eighth Congress, second session, authorizing an examination, investigation and study of the problems of American small and independent business, agreed to February 10, 1964, is amended by striking out "$125,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$132,000".

RELEASE OF COPPER FROM NATIONAL STOCKPILE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in recent months there have been several very disturbing trends in the copper industry. There is now a short supply of copper and the reserve is dwindling. These trends have brought about manipulation in the international market, a situation which can contribute only instability of price, production, and employment. I am receiving more reports about the shortage of copper for the domestic market and the significant layoffs that are underway or contemplated.

The copper economy is very important in this country and the Federal Government has a responsibility to see that the situation is stabilized. As one who worked in the copper mines of Montana for nearly 10 years, I have firsthand knowledge of what occurs when there is instability of price, production, and employment. The copper producers of this country have held the line of the price structure extremely well. Copper has been selling between 30 cents and 34 cents over the past several years. On the other hand substantial quantities of refined scrap copper have been sold at premium prices as high as 65 cents per pound. In the London market, which incidentally plays a part out of all proportion to its real significance in the field, it has been selling at approximately the same price.

Today, on behalf of my colleague from Montana, Senator METCALF, Senator HAYDEN, Senator RIBICOFF, and me, I have sent to the desk a bill which we believe can be instrumental in providing some stability in the current situation. Simply, the problem is that we do not have an adequate supply of copper. We do have copper in the national stockpile which could be made available to the domestic users on a loan basis. This will take congressional action. In brief, Senator METCALF's and my bill proposes that the Office of Emergency Planning be given the authority to loan from the national stockpile 100,000 short tons of copper to the primary producers to cover a period no longer than 1 year. Also in the event of an emergency these loans could be recalled within a 30- to 60-day period. The Director of OEP would be given the responsibility for setting the necessary rules and regulations. Of prime concern to us is to see that when such loans are authorized that they are made on an equitable basis to all copper users.

The copper situation is quite serious. It appears that relief cannot be given administratively so it is my hope that the Congress will act expeditiously in granting the necessary authority. If the price of copper gets out of hand, it can affect other segments of the economy, bring about the use of substitutes for copper and, in my opinion, badly damage the economy of the country.

I believe that in this instance the Federal Government has the responsibility to promote stability and assist both the producers and users of copper. Favorable action on this proposal would stabilize the economy and it would tide us over the period necessary to allow the industry to increase production of copper to make up the lag which now exists. This would also do away with the speculation and trading at exorbitant prices which has made the situation so difficult.

Senator METCALF, Senator HAYDEN, Senator RIBICOFF, and I are aware of the great interest in this matter and the desire of a number of our colleagues to cosponsor this legislation. We, therefore, ask unanimous consent to have this bill lay on the desk for additional sponsors for an additional 3 legislative days.

Mr. President, in conclusion, I ask unanimous consent to have the text of this legislation printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, will lie at the desk as requested by the Senator from Montana, and will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 296) to authorize the temporary release of 100,000 short tons of copper from the national stockpile, introduced by Mr. MANSFIELD (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That in order to avoid serious economic dislocation and instability in the domestic market for copper, the Administrator of General Services is authorized, notwithstanding any limitation or requirement in the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act with respect to the disposition of materials acquired thereunder, or in any other provision of law, to release not to exceed one hundred thousand short tons of copper now held in the national stockpile. The disposition herein authorized shall be made to domestic producers of copper under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning. One of the terms and conditions applicable to such disposition shall be that any producer receiving such copper shall agree to restore to the national stockpile an amount and grade of copper at least equivalent to that received (1) not later than one year after the receipt thereof, or (2), in the event of an emergency, as determined by the President, not later than sixty days after notice thereof.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield to my colleague from Montana.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, the proposal to loan 100,000 tons of copper to domestic producers will prevent repetition of the 1955-56 boom and bust cycle in our basic domestic mining industry.

Price stabilization, resulting from this legislation, will protect copper's place in our economy and also will be in the interest of the consumer. Without this legislation, the price of copper may be expected to continue to rise—to the point where competitive materials will move in and capture a part of the market which will never return to copper. This price increase also will be passed on to the consumer.

The copper, loaned under this legislation, will be returned to the stockpile by domestic producers as a result of a gradual increase in production, which will be maintained, to the benefit of producers, the union labor they employ, and the mining centers which serve them. In addition, it is our feeling that those who borrow this copper should be charged a reasonable interest rate, which could, perhaps, take the form of the return of 2 or 3 percent more copper to the stockpile than they borrowed, or in the direction of Director of OEP, a dollar amount. But the actual copper returned to the stockpile must equal the amount borrowed.

Mr. President, this legislation is in the public interest.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, the Majority Leader, Senator MANSFIELD, has acted decisively to achieve a solution to the serious copper supply problem facing our Nation.

I am proud to join the Senator from Montana in sponsoring a measure which, as he has put it, can be instrumental in providing some stability in the current situation. And I assure him that I will continue to work with him, as I have in the past, toward this end.

The current copper situation has resulted in serious consequences for Connecticut's copper and brass fabricating industry. Connecticut leads the Nation in the manufacture of such products. The Connecticut brass and copper industry strongly supports this bill.

The shortage threatens production cutbacks with attendant unemployment. I strongly support Senator MANSFIELD's copper loan proposal and am pleased to join him in its sponsorship. I assure him that I will do everything I can to help speed the enactment of this measure.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article from the Waterbury American of December 15, 1964, and my letter of December 14, 1964, to the President of the United States on this subject.

There being no objection, the article and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITY BRASS FIRMS BACK PROPOSED BILL

Waterbury's "big three" brass companies have endorsed plans of U.S. Senate leaders to seek legislation which would release 100,000 tons of copper from the national stockpile of strategic materials.

U.S. Senator ABRAHAM RIBICOFF disclosed he and Senate Democratic Leader MIKE MANSFIELD, of Montana, will introduce the legislation, which is sought by brass and copper companies as a means of stabilizing the price of copper and making more available for production.

The United Press International reported Senator RIBICOFF sent a letter today to President Johnson, informing him that the proposed bill would call for the loan of copper to producers for 1 year to prevent "sharp production cutbacks resulting in defaults on industrial defense contracts and high unemployment."

Senator RIBICOFF said the Government's loan of the copper would allow the industry to operate a greater volume, and thus would help manufacturers and employees and would protect the national interest in case of emergency.

Spokesmen for Waterbury's major brass companies have joined those in other parts of the country in endorsing the plan.

Glenn P. Bakken, president of Chase Brass & Copper Co., contacted at Chase headquarters in Cleveland said a release of national stockpile copper "would end the speculation which has created abnormal stock market conditions and a situation in which you can't establish true demand."

The Associated Press said Sunday that news of MANSFIELD's proposal last week sent prices tumbling on the copper futures market in New York. The London Metal Exchange quotation was lower at opening Saturday, but held at 64⅝ cents through the session, the AP reported.

Bakken said the extreme changeability and speculative nature of the situation makes it impossible to estimate the ultimate effect on Chase in Waterbury as to possible production cutbacks and possible resultant layoffs.

He said current prices, if they were to prevail, speak for themselves with No. 1 copper scrap at 41 cents and more a pound and dealers' copper at more than 60 cents a pound.

SUPPLIES RATIONED

The U.S. producer price has continued to hold at a normal 34 cents with supplies being rationed to regular customers. The hope for 1965 is sufficiently increased production to make enough copper available at this price to meet the demand. The hope is also to bring this about soon enough to keep the producers' price variation within the 31 to 34 cent range which has been successfully maintained for the last 42 months.

Bakken said that Chase in Waterbury is living on its inventories as are other users of the metal. These inventories have been sufficiently depleted at Chase to create a semicritical situation here, Bakken said.

Scovil spokesmen declined to discuss the matter in as much detail as the Chase president, but made no secret of the fact that they, too, are feeling effects of the situation in the copper market. They issued the following statement on the Mansfield-Ribicoff proposal:

We support this proposal. Jobs and working schedules have been disrupted by copper shortages and profit margins have been reduced by higher copper prices. The proposal to lend stockpile copper to producers should help to improve this situation."

Anaconda American Brass Co. officials also said increased availability of copper would do much to remedy abnormal copper market conditions, although they were less specific in endorsing the Mansfield-Ribicoff proposal for creating this increase.

"There is no question," said AABC spokesmen, "that if more copper were made available, wherever it might come from, we could bring supply more into balance with demand." AABC echoed Bakken's emphasis on reducing the high price of copper scrap on which fabricators depend for between 30 and 40 percent of their metal.

The various company spokesmen indicated that as yet, no serious cutbacks in production have been caused here by the shortage.

DECEMBER 14, 1964.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The current copper shortage is of grave concern to the State of Connecticut. Our copper and brass industry, which employs thousands of workers and is a vital cog in the economy of the State, is plagued by high copper prices resulting from the present shortage.

Representing the State that is the Nation's leading producer of brass mill products, I want to join with Senator MANSFIELD, whose State is a major copper producer, in urging you to give careful consideration to the proposal to lend copper producers up to 100,000 tons of copper from Federal stockpiles for 1 year. I will join Senator MANSFIELD in sponsoring the necessary legislation to ease the copper shortage.

Unless action is taken permitting the copper and brass industry to operate at greater volume, we will be faced with sharp production cutbacks resulting in defaults on industry defense contracts and high unemployment. It is imperative that this be avoided.

This proposal would relieve the situation and at the same time protect the national interest in case of emergency. I urge your favorable consideration of it.

My best wishes.

Sincerely,

ABRAHAM RIBICOFF.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my name may be added as a cosponsor of the bill related to copper introduced by the Senators from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD and Mr. METCALF]. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], and other Senators spoke in support of it, and I respectfully request that my name be placed on the bill as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, recent months have seen the demand for copper rise beyond the available supply. This has had the usual results in the marketing place—the quoted price of electrolytic copper has increased from 31 to 34 cents per pound, and because there is not enough copper available at any price an "outside—gray" market has developed. This market has often been close to 70 cents a pound, double the ostensible market price.

Nevertheless, today the United States has more than 250,000 short tons of copper excess to stockpile objectives in its strategic and critical materials stockpiles. This is true even after the recent sale of 30,000 tons to the U.S. Mint and the imminent agreed upon sale of 20,000 tons to commercial users. That, of course, comes out of the DPA stockpile.

This 250,000 tons excess copper in the stockpile cost the American taxpayer some $133 million.

Although our industry badly needs this excess copper, and the Government does not need it for defense, the Government cannot sell the copper without the express consent of the Congress. As a matter of fact, under the present setup, even with congressional consent to a request from the executive branch, the Government could not sell the copper for 6 months unless and until the Congress passes a special bill authorizing its sale at some earlier date. Then, of course, the President must take his time to sign it.

Because of this ludicrous situation, our majority leader, who comes from a great copper mining State, and is attuned to the needs of the copper industry, suggests the loan of 100,000 tons of copper from the Government to industry.

I agree with the majority leader that some of the Government's excess copper should be released to meet the demands of industry.

It makes no economic sense to retain excess copper in the stockpile, paid for by the taxpayer, when industry needs and wants 100,000 tons of copper that, because of current economic conditions, could be sold at substantial gain to the Government; and, of course, such a sale would return a great many million dollars to the Treasury.

This is not the first time copper has been in short supply in the United States.

For example, as was referred to by the distinguished Senator from Montana, from 1954 to 1956 there was a shortage and private industry encountered difficulties in obtaining sufficient copper for its needs.

At that time the Government adopted a policy of permitting suppliers of copper to divert deliveries from the stockpile to private industry. These copper suppliers thereupon sold copper designated for delivery to the stockpile to industrial consumers at market prices much higher than the contract price to the Government, and obviously thereby made a great deal more profit on their sale of copper.

Since the delivery price of copper delivered to the stockpile was at times tied to production cost, or the price in the marketplace, the Government at times paid more for the copper delivered at a later date.

Under a law which would authorize copper loans from the stockpile we might again have such a situation develop against the best interests of the Government.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Missouri has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator may have 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SYMINGTON. A sale of any required stockpile copper, therefore, instead of a loan, would be much better for the Government. At the same time it would give industry the copper industry states is now needed.

Therefore, I would hope the able and distinguished majority leader would give consideration, if it meets with the approval of the Armed Services Committee, that we sell any copper, instead of going to a loan, which operated so drastically against the taxpayer in the 1950's.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I have listened with great interest to the speech which has just been made by the distinguished Senator from Missouri, who is chairman of the Strategic Stockpile Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee. It is my belief that his proposed legislation will be referred to that committee and very likely hearings will be held under the chairmanship of the Senator from Missouri, who has just made the statement.

Frankly, I am encouraged by the tone of the Senator's remarks, not because he advocates the possibility of the sale of copper from the national stockpile, but because of the interest which he has shown in the fact that there is a shortage, but it is tied in with the possibility of unemployment, instability in production, and unsureness in price. On the basis of those remarks, I think the outlook is very encouraging in view of what has been done and what will be done in the next 2 or 3 months to bring about a meeting of supply and demand on a worldwide basis so far as copper production is concerned.

I am delighted that the Senator has made his suggestion, and I know that when this matter is referred to his committee, he will go into it in all its aspects and make absolutely certain that the Government is protected all the way through.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I will read three paragraphs from a letter sent me by a constituent who is one of the leading copper fabricators in the United States. He wrote recently:

> Once in a while you must come upon something that really riles you. Well, I just have and it reeks of a very unbusinesslike handling of Government funds. I don't know how it got started, but something certainly should immediately be done to correct it. It has to do with the $5 billion worth of metals the Government is holding in its stockpile over and above what is required for the strategic defense stockpile.
>
> The Whitaker Cable Corp. is concerned primarily with copper which has been in serious short supply. We naturally have tried to find out why there has been such a shortage and then, of course, how to get enough of the material to keep our doors open. We have paid as high as 61½ cents a pound for some of our copper during this period which is a 27½ cents per pound premium over the producer's price of 34 cents, but the producers haven't enough to go around. In making our search for copper we discovered the Government stockpile situation.
>
> An article regarding a proposal by Senator MANSFIELD appeared in the Wall Street Journal on December 12, 1964 (a copy is attached), which tells of the copper shortage, the premium prices being paid, the total amount of copper in the stockpile (1.1 million tons) and his proposal of loaning 100,000 tons to industry from the stockpile.

I thank the majority leader, and assure him the Stockpile Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee will do its best to expedite legislation on the basis of a sale of copper, instead of a loan.

Let us at this time give consideration to the fact that we now again have a bill introduced, S. 28, which was approved unanimously by the subcommittee and the full Armed Services Committee last year but which could not, because of the pressure at the end of the last session, be taken up. It is a bill which would correct this situation because it would be possible to move this copper into industry without going through all this rigmarole, unless one of the two branches of Congress objected.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am delighted to yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. It seems to me that perhaps the proposed legislation has a great deal of merit. I heard with a great deal of interest what the Senator from Missouri has said. I am wondering at this time if the bill should not include some of the other commodities which are being held in the stockpile, and which, under certain conditions, could be released without further legislation.

I am thinking particularly of sisal. A year or two ago there was a real shortage of this commodity, but the stockpile continued to grow. It could not be sold without special legislation. It would have helped the country a great deal if the Government could have sold it. Of course, it could have been replaced later, if it were necessary to do so.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the able and distinguished Senator from North Dakota, an authority on the agricultural products that are in the national stockpile today.

For his possible interest, the surpluses of minerals and metals today equal the total agricultural stockpile held by the U.S. Government.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 30 seconds.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator may proceed.

Mr. SYMINGTON. May I say to the Senator from North Dakota that S. 28 does exactly what he proposes; that is, it places the entire situation on what could be called a proper businesslike basis.

QUALIFICATIONS OF PERSONS APPOINTED TO THE SUPREME COURT

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which would establish qualifications for persons appointed to the Supreme Court of the United States.

Our Constitution sets out certain qualifications for those who serve in the executive and legislative branches of Government. Unfortunately, however, the Constitution does not require that the Justices of the Supreme Court meet any standard.

Because of the importance of our Supreme Court, I believe its Justices should be held in the highest regard by our legal profession when appointed. We need men of proven experience to sit on the High Bench. The necessary judicial maturity is attained only after long years of painstaking study, research, and analysis. The proper experience for a U.S. Supreme Court Justice should be gained under conditions where his aberrations and his deviations from the law will be brought forcefully home in reversals by higher courts. He should not be placed in a position where his errors will be perpetuated on the books for years to come.

Under existing law, there are no requirements or qualifications for an appointment to the U.S. Supreme Court. It is not even necessary that the person be a trained lawyer. I think this is a mistake—there is no substitute for legal and judicial experience in our high courts.

Except for Justice Black's police court experience, the total prior judicial experience of the nine Justices now sitting is 14 years, consisting of 8 years for Justice Brennan, 5 years for Justice Stewart, and 1 year for Justice Harlan. It is disturbing to me that of the nine judges only three have had prior judicial experience that would help in the maturing and tempering of their minds for the tasks which they must face as members of the highest Court in this great free Nation.

There have been 98 judges appointed to the Court since 1790 and, except for recent years, the great majority appointed had judicial experience that helped to prepare them for the High Bench. In fact, from 1790 to 1900, 58 judges were appointed, and only 19 of them had no prior judicial experience. In the years from 1900 to 1932, 20 judges were appointed with the majority—11 of them having previous judicial experience. But in recent years, from 1932 until the present time, those appointed without prior judicial experience have outnumbered those with such experience 12 to 8. This is not a healthy trend.

I believe the best way to insure that the highest Court in the land is composed of well qualified men is to require that a person appointed to the Supreme Court have, at the time of his appointment, at least 5 years of judicial service. As used in the bill which I have introduced, "judicial service means service as a judge of a court of appeals or district court of the United States, or a justice or judge of the highest court of a State."

I am hopeful that the appropriate Senate committee will give this bill immediate attention.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 299) to establish qualifications for persons appointed to the Supreme Court, introduced by Mr. Simpson, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

THE $1,000 TAX DEDUCTION FOR HIGHER EDUCATION COSTS

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the skyrocketing cost of higher education constitutes one of the most urgent challenges facing this session of the Congress. To help to meet this challenge I am introducing legislation today which will give a $1,000 tax deduction to parents for each child they are putting through college and to students who are working to finance their own higher education.

Higher education is no longer a luxury but a necessity. If we are to continue to move forward to build a more prosperous and progressive society in this age of social and technological change, we will need an evergrowing number of skilled and college-trained people.

My bill is a direct form of aid to education requiring no new bureaucratic machinery. It would not only assist those of our citizens faced with the financial burdens of college tuition and fees, but would furnish a tax incentive to many parents to enroll or to keep their children in college.

This legislation conforms with a pledge I made to the people of Pennsylvania last fall, and I am urging its early consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 300) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to allow a deduction for certain amounts paid by a taxpayer for tuition and fees in providing a higher education for himself, his spouse, and his dependents, introduced by Mr. Scott, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

SPECIAL DAY TO HONOR DR. ROBERT HUTCHINGS GODDARD

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I am introducing today for appropriate reference a bill designed to set aside March 16 of every year in honor of Dr. Robert Hutchings Goddard and the invaluable contributions he made to our modern age of space science. It was on this date in 1926, at Auburn, Mass., that Dr. Goddard became the first man ever to test and launch successfully a liquid-fuel rocket. This and later experimental tests conducted by Dr. Goddard, coupled with intensive research and study, were instrumental in ushering the United States and the world into the space age.

Dr. Goddard was born in Worcester, Mass., on October 5, 1882, and was educated there at Worcester Polytechnic Institute and Clark University. His continuing efforts to fulfill his childhood dream of spaceships in the sky led him to the formulation in 1912 of a mathematical theory of rocket propulsion which formed the technical basis for today's dramatic accomplishments in the fields of missilery and space exploration. He, more than any other single individual, deserves the title "the father of modern-day rocketry."

Although Dr. Goddard died in 1945, appropriate recognition has been given to the important contributions he made to the space age only in the past few years. In 1959 Congress voted to award posthumously a gold medal to Dr. Goddard for his achievements in rocket and space science. It was presented to his widow, who still lives in Worcester, at the dedication of the Space Flight Center in Greenbelt, Md., in his name.

In view of Dr. Robert Goddard's untiring efforts to advance man's knowledge of a heretofore unexplored field and his many significant achievements in astronautics and related sciences, I think it is altogether fitting that we designate March 16 of every year "Goddard Day" as a continuing tribute to the memory of a man who gave so much to his country. I am hopeful indeed that Congress may take favorable action on this proposal during this session.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 301) to promote public knowledge of progress and achievement in astronautics and related sciences through the designation of a special day in honor of Dr. Robert Hutchings Goddard, the father of modern rockets, missiles, and astronautics, introduced by Mr. Saltonstall, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENTS TO THE CLEAN AIR ACT OF 1963

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill amending the Clean Air Act—Public Law 88–206. I am joined in this bill by 19 of my colleagues.

The Clean Air Act of 1963, which was signed into law by President Johnson on December 17, 1963, and became Public Law 206 of the 88th Congress, created a mechanism for stimulating the national effort to abate and control air pollution. Its provisions were broad and they ranged into fields which the Federal air pollution effort had not previously entered—abatement authority, financial aid for control programs, expanded research into sources and control of pollutants such as those resulting from the combustion of fossil fuels in plants and factories and emissions from automotive vehicles, and a system of permits to effect control of pollutants from Federal installations.

Nevertheless, enactment of the Clean Air Act was not in itself the end, but rather a fresh beginning. There remain several important aspects of the national air pollution problem which require additional attention on the part of Congress, the executive branch, the cities and States, industrial and other sources of community air pollution, and the American people.

President Johnson has proposed that we end "the poisoning of—the air we breathe." He has called on us to "prevent the pollution of our air—before it happens." This bill would help meet his objectives.

Following adoption of the Clean Air Act, the Special Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution turned to a more detailed inquiry into the complexities of the national air pollution problem, devoting its attention chiefly to vehicular pollution, industrial pollution, municipal waste disposal pollution, local and regional air pollution needs and controls, and the effect of Federal installations and defense efforts on the creation of air pollution problems.

Extensive hearings were held throughout the country, with several days of technical hearings here in Washington. As a result of these hearings, the subcommittee compiled a report which incorporates the findings and recommendations for specific actions required to supplement the provisions of the Clean Air Act. The subcommittee report, entitled "Steps Toward Clean Air," contains a concise analysis and evaluation of the basis for the proposed amendments to the Clean Air Act, which I am introducing at this time.

We cannot avoid—for much longer—some action which would reduce the pollutants from the millions of automotive vehicles clogging our streets. The State of California is to be commended for its action in taking aggressive leadership in not only the control of automotive emissions but also in controlling other air pollutants. However, the problem of auto exhaust pollution is not confined to California. It would be unwise to predicate the future installation of automotive devices and standards solely on the needs of that single State.

The need for effective national action on the control of automotive emissions has been endorsed by the recent report of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to the Congress.

Devices have been installed for several years on automobiles to control emissions from crankcases. Also, equipment has been perfected to control to a large extent the harmful emissions through the auto tailpipe. Recently the automobile industry has announced that it will be able soon to produce automobiles for distribution in California capable of meeting that State's requirements for exhaust pollution control. I can see no reason why the entire Nation cannot be the beneficiary of these technological advances.

There is, in my judgment, a strong justification for legislation which would insure that the entire Nation will benefit from the technological advances which have been made and which will become available to California.

This legislation would call for early control of emissions from new automobiles which are known to be harmful and for which methods of control have been devised. The language relative to automotive emissions contained in the proposed legislation is necessarily broad to permit latitude for determining extent to which it is feasible and practicable to provide hardware and means available to correct the problem of emissions from older vehicles. The language provides for the establishment of additional standards when it is determined that such are appropriate.

The effect and means of controlling emissions from diesel-powered vehicles has not had the attention or study necessary to set a basis for exact standards, but I do feel that there is need for study and the development of criteria for allowable emissions from these sources. In this area there is a great need for accelerated research and development. My proposal would not only accelerate the much needed study of diesel emissions, but would call for an intensive program of research and development in all areas relating to the problems of air pollution.

Our increasing populations, urbanization, consumption of energy, production of waste, and industrial development has created tremendous quantities of solid wastes—garbage and refuse. Current methods used for the disposal of such refuse commonly constitute a significant source of air pollution in most of our urban communities. Based on an urban population of 130 million people, 520 million pounds of refuse in our urban areas must be disposed of every day of the year. Open dumps have been extensively used for refuse disposal because they are low in cost. Land fill methods of disposal have been used; however, large quantities of land are required for this method. In other instances refuse is disposed of through incineration which is sometimes inefficient and costly. It is my belief that the provision in the bill being introduced is essential to aid in the proper disposal of solid waste and will provide the necessary stimulation to the correction of this problem, as has the construction grant program for sewage treatment works aided that program.

The Clean Air Act recognized the problem of sulfurous air pollution, especially that produced by the burning of sulfur-bearing fuels by calling for the initiation and conducting of a program of research directed toward the development of improved, low-cost techniques for extracting sulfur from fuels. However, it is believed that since sulfurous emissions are a major factor in community air pollution problems, there should be greater emphasis placed on the resolution of this problem. The progress that has been made thus far is impressive, but limited. If real progress is to be made and if the isolated achievements are to be expanded to the benefit of all regions of the country, there will have to be a coordinated and greatly augmented research and development effort.

In order to stimulate the efforts greatly in resolving the sulfurous air pollution problem, I am proposing that a congressional mandate be forthcoming to create a basis for a fully coordinated and accelerated research and development program. Also, I propose that periodic reports be submitted to the Congress so that an evaluation can be made of progress and the possible need for corrective legislation.

I ask unanimous consent that the complete text of the bill, and a section-by-section analysis of the bill, be printed in the Record at this point.

The **PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and section-by-section analysis will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 306) to amend the Clean Air Act to require standards for controlling the emission of pollutants from gasoline powered or diesel powered vehicles, to establish a Federal Air Pollution Control Laboratory, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Muskie (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 306

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 3 of the Clean Air Act (which relates to research, investigations and training) is amended—

(1) by striking out the word "and" at the end of paragraph (3) of subsection (a) thereof;

(2) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (4) of subsection (a) thereof and inserting in lieu thereof "; and";

(3) by adding after paragraph (4) of subsection (2) thereof the following new paragraph (5):

"(5) conduct and accelerate research programs relating to the means of controlling hydrocarbon emissions resulting from the evaporation of gasoline in carburetors and fuel tanks, and the means of controlling emissions of oxides of nitrogen and aldehydes from gasoline powered or diesel powered vehicles. To carry out such research the Secretary shall consult with the technical committee established under section 6 of this Act and for research concerning diesel powered vehicles, he may add to such committee such representatives from the diesel powered vehicle industry as he deems appropriate."; and

(4) by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(d) The Secretary shall establish a Federal Air Pollution Control Laboratory within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and shall staff and equip such laboratory as necessary to conduct such phases of the national research and development program for the prevention and control of air pollution as he deems appropriate.

"(e) The Secretary shall appoint a technical committee whose membership shall consist of representatives from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Bureau of Mines of the Department of the Interior, the Federal Power Commission, and the coal, petroleum, and electric power industries, for the purpose of encouraging the development of improved low-cost techniques designed to reduce emissions of oxides of sulfur produced by the combustion of sulfur-containing fuels. The committee shall meet from time to time at the call of the Secretary to evaluate progress in the development of such techniques and to recommend additional research programs for the development of such techniques. One year after enactment of this section and semiannually thereafter, the Secretary shall report to the Congress on the progress of the development of such techniques and his recommendations, if any, for additional legislation."

Sec. 2. (a) Section 4 of the Clean Air Act (which relates to grants for support of air pollution control programs) is amended by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d) and by inserting immediately after subsection (b) the following subsection (c):

"(c) The Secretary is authorized to make grants to municipalities in an amount up to two-thirds of the cost of the construction of facilities which are designed to eliminate air pollution resulting from the disposal of solid wastes. No grant shall be made under this subsection to any municipality that has not enacted an ordinance or other regulation prohibiting open burning of solid wastes and containing enforcement procedures insuring that disposal facilities will have a beneficial effect on reducing air pollution. No grant shall be made for any facility under this subsection until the applicant has made provision satisfactory to the Secretary to assure the proper and efficient operation and maintenance of the facility after completion of the construction thereof."

(b) Subsection (d), as so redesignated, is amended to read as follows:

"(d) Not more than 12½ per centum of the grant funds available under subsection (a) of this section shall be expended in any one State, and no grant shall be made for any project, authorized under subsection (c) of this section, in an amount exceeding 5 per centum of the total authorized in any one fiscal year."

Sec. 3. Section 6 of the Clean Air Act (which relates to automotive vehicle and fuel pollution) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(c) (1) the Secretary shall prescribe and publish in the Federal Register, standards for the allowable emissions of pollutants from gasoline powered vehicles, and the effective date for such standards.

"(2) In prescribing standards for gasoline powered vehicles under this subsection the Secretary shall require (i) that within six months after enactment of this subsection all new gasoline powered vehicles be equipped with blowby systems with emissions from crankcases limited to 0.15 per centum of supplied fuel under cyclic operating conditions and (ii) that after November 1, 1966, the allowable exhaust emissions from new gasoline powered vehicles shall be not more than two hundred and seventy-five parts per million of hydrocarbons measured by a nondispersive infrared spectrometer calibrated with hexane and not more than 1.5 per centum by volume of carbon monoxide measured by a nondispersive infrared spectrometer under metropolitan area cyclic type operating conditions with results normalized to fifteen divided by per centum carbon dioxide plus per centum carbon monoxide plus six times per centum hydrocarbons.

"(3) The Secretary shall establish criteria for allowable emissions from diesel powered vehicles manufactured and introduced into interestate commerce or imported into the United States. Upon the establishment of such criteria the Secretary shall make his recommendations for additional legislation, if necessary, to regulate the discharge of pollutants from diesel powered vehicles.

"(4) The manufacture for distribution in commerce of any gasoline powered vehicle or the importation into the United States of any gasoline powered vehicle, after the effective date of any standards prescribed by the Secretary in accordance with this subsection, which does not meet such standards, is unlawful.

"Whoever violates the provisions of this subsection or the regulations prescribed pursuant to this subsection shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than six months, or both.

"(d) The Secretary and the Secretary of the Treausry shall jointly promulgate rules and regulations that prohibit the importation of any gasoline powered vehicles which fail to meet the standards prescribed in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (c) of this section.

"(e) It is the policy of the United States to insure the proper inspection and maintenance of the devices and other means required to control the emission of air pollutants from gasoline powered vehicles within the standards prescribed by the Secretary under this section. The Secretary is authorized to enter into agreements with, and to make grants to, appropriate State agencies designated by the Governors (including such supplemental agreements as may be necessary) to carry out the policy of this section. For the purpose of this subsection an interstate air pollution control agency may qualify if one State having jurisdiction of such agency enters an agreement authorized by this subsection. The sums appropriated to carry out this subsection shall be allotted by the Secretary to States entering into agreements in the proportion that the number of gasoline powered vehicles registered in such year in each such State bears to the total such number in all such States for such year.

"(f) All action taken under this section for the adoption of standards and the promulgation of rules and regulations shall be taken in conformity with the provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act."

Sec. 4. Section 9 of the Clean Air Act (which relates to definitions) is amended by redesignating subsection (g) as subsection (h) and by inserting after subsection (f) the following subsection (g):

"(g) The term 'commerce' means (1) commerce between any place in a State, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, or a territory or possession of the United States or any place outside thereof, and (2) commerce wholly within the District of Columbia or any such territory or possession."

Sec. 5. (a) Section 13 of the Clean Air Act (which relates to appropriations) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(c) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to carry out subsection 4(c) of this Act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for each of the next two succeeding fiscal years the sum of $100,000,000 per fiscal year for the purpose of making grants under this subsection. Sums so appropriated shall remain available until expended.

"(d) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated $25,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966 for the establishment of inspection programs under subsection 6 (e) of this Act."

(b) Subsection (b) of section 13 is amended by inserting immediately after the word "Act" the following: ", exclusive of subsection (c) of section 4 and subsection (e) of section 6,".

The section-by-section analysis presented by Mr. Muskie is as follows:

Section-by-Section Analyses of Amendments Proposed to Clean Air Act

Section 1. Research, investigations, training and other activities: Section 3(a) of the Clean Air Act would be amended to provide for the conduct and acceleration of research programs relating to the means of controlling hydrocarbon emissions resulting from the evaporation of gasoline and carburetors and fuel tanks, and the means of controlling emissions of oxides of nitrogen and aldehydes from gasoline powered or diesel powered vehicles. The Secretary shall consult with the technical committee established under section 6 of the Clean Air Act for research concerning diesel powered vehicles, and he may add to this committee representatives from the diesel powered vehicle industry.

Section 3 would be further amended to provide that the Secretary shall establish a Federal Air Pollution Control Laboratory. Also, staff and equip the laboratory as needed to conduct research and development program for the prevention and control of air pollution.

This amendment also provides that the Secretary shall appoint a technical committee made up of representatives from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Bureau of Mines of the Department of the Interior, the Federal Power Commission, and the coal, petroleum, and electric power industries, to encourage the development of improved low-cost techniques designed to reduce emissions of oxides of sulfur produced by the combustion of sulfur-containing fuels. The committee would meet from time to time to evaluate progress in the development of techniques and to recommend additional research programs needed. One year after enactment of this provision and semiannually thereafter, the Secretary shall report to the Congress on the progress of the development of such techniques and his recommendations, if any, for additional legislation.

Section 2. Grants for support of air pollution control programs: Section 4 of the Clean Air Act would be amended to authorize grants to municipalities in an amount up to two-thirds of the cost of the construction of facilities which are designed to eliminate air pollution resulting from the disposal of solid wastes. No grant would be made to any municipality that has not enacted an ordinance or other regulation prohibiting open burning of solid wastes and containing enforcement procedures insuring that disposal facilities will have a beneficial effect on reducing air pollution. No grant would be made for any facility until the applicant has made provision satisfactory to the Secretary to assure the proper and efficient operation and maintenance of the facility after completion of construction. It is further provided that no grant would be made for any project in excess of 5 percent of the total authorized in any one fiscal year.

Section 5 provides authorizations for fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for the next 2 fiscal years in the amount of $100 million per fiscal year for the purposes of making grants of solid waste disposal facilities.

Section 3. Automotive vehicle and fuel pollution: Section 6 of the Clean Air Act would be amended to authorize the Secretary to prescribe and publish standards for the allowable emissions of pollutants from gasoline powered vehicles.

In prescribing standards for gasoline powered vehicles the Secretary shall require (i) that within 6 months after enactment of this provision all new gasoline powered vehicles be equipped with blowby systems with emissions from crankcases limited to 0.15 percent of supplied fuel under cyclic operating conditions and (ii) that after November 1, 1966, the allowable exhaust emissions from new gasoline powered vehicles shall be not more than 275 parts per million of hydrocarbons and not more than 1.5 percent by volume of carbon monoxide measured by a nondispersive spectrometer under metropolitan area cyclic type operating conditions with results normalized to 15 divided by percent carbon dioxide plus percent carbon monoxide plus 6 times percent hydrocarbons.

The manufacture for distribution in commerce of any gasoline powered vehicle or the importation into the United States of any gasoline powered vehicle, after the effective date of any standards prescribed by the Secretary which does not meet such standards, is unlawful. Violators of standards or regulations prescribed shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than 6 months, or both.

The Secretary and the Secretary of the Treasury shall jointly promulgate rules and regulations that prohibit the importation of any gasoline powered vehicles which fail to meet the standards prescribed.

The Secretary shall establish criteria for allowable emissions from diesel powered vehicles manufactured and introduced into interstate commerce or imported into the United States. Upon the establishment of such criteria the Secretary shall make his recommendations for additional legislation, if necessary, to regulate the discharge of pollutants from diesel powered vehicles.

It is stated that the policy of the United States is to insure the proper inspection and maintenance of the devices and other means required to control the emission of air pollutants from gasoline powered vehicles within the standards prescribed by the Secretary. The Secretary is authorized to enter into agreements with, and to make grants to, appropriate State agencies designated by the Governors (including such supplemental agreements as may be necessary) to carry out inspection programs. An interstate air pollution control agency may qualify if one State having jurisdiction of such agency enters an agreement. The sums appropriated to carry out the inspection program shall be allotted by the Secretary to States entering into agreements in the proportion that the number of gasoline powered vehicles registered in such year in each State bears to the total such number in all such States for such year. Section 5 provides that $25 million would be authorized for fiscal year ending June 1966 for the establishment of inspection programs.

It is also provided that all action taken for the adoption of standards and the promulgation of rules and regulations shall be taken in conformity with the provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act.

Section 4. Definitions: It is provided that section 9 of the Clean Air Act would include a definition of the term "commerce" to mean (1) commerce between any place in a State, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, or a territory or possession of the United States or any place outside thereof, and (2) commerce wholly within the District of Columbia or any such territory or possession.

Section 5. Appropriations: Section 13 of the Clean Air Act would be amended to provide appropriations of $100 million for 3 fiscal years for grants for solid waste disposal works and $25 million to establish automotive inspection programs. A further amendment would insure that funds now authorized by the Clean Air Act would not be available for the two programs enumerated above but only for those programs authorized by the act.

COMMISSION ON OBNOXIOUS AND OBSCENE MATTERS AND MATERIALS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the following cosponsors, Mr. Scott, Mr. Prouty, Mr. Sparkman, Mr. Bible, Mr. Young of North Dakota, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Cooper, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Smathers, Mr. Allott, Mr. Carlson, Mr. Case, Mr. Holland, Mr. Simpson, Mr. Thurmond, and Mr. Tower, I send to the desk for appropriate reference the bill which was before the Senate last year, to create a commission to be known as the Commission on Obnoxious and Obscene Matters and Materials.

This bill has twice passed the Senate, but has failed to receive action in the House.

This year, we have every reason to believe that there is a tremendous upsurge of national interest in stamping out what has been called a billion-dollar smut racket in this country.

I am hopeful that the Senate will act early in this session to approve this legislation for the third time, and that this time it will also be approved by the House.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may lie on the desk until close of business Wednesday, January 13, 1965, in case other Senators wish to cosponsor this proposed legislation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk as requested.

The bill (S. 309) creating a commission to be known as the Commission on Obnoxious and Obscene Matters and Materials, introduced by Mr. Mundt (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

U.S. NATIONAL ARTS FOUNDATION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I send to the desk, for appropriate reference, a bill on behalf of myself, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long], the Senator from Montana [Mr. Metcalf], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pell], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph], establishing a U.S. National Arts Foundation and authorizing the National Council on the Arts, created last year, to accept donations of funds and other property by the public.

This bill is the second half of the bill which last year was passed by the Senate, only one-half of which—namely, an advisory council—was passed by the House. This bill for a U.S. National Arts Foundation represents the other part of the program.

It follows the call of President Johnson in his state of the Union message for a National Foundation on the Arts. I have the honor to state to the Senate that I have joined in cosponsoring the parallel bill of the Senator from Rhode Island as he has joined in cosponsoring mine, and I hope that this will be a fruitful partnership which will result in adoption of this long overdue measure.

The President's announcement in the state of the Union message that he would support a National Foundation on the Arts was gratifying. It was a natural and extremely welcome second phase to the passage last year of the bill, which I cosponsored, to establish a National Council on the Arts and constituted recognition that the Federal Government has a vital interest in the development of our national cultural resources. But it is clear that we need a definite national program for Federal help, consistent with our tradition and that a council such as the one established last year must be supported by resources and authority.

I have long maintained that Government support of a more concrete nature is absolutely necessary if we are to realize the full educational, recreational, and prestige values that we as a nation can derive from the arts. More than 15 years ago I introduced a resolution in the House of Representatives calling for the establishment of a national opera and ballet as well as an American national theater.

The legislation which I am sponsoring today clearly defines the role of the Federal Government so that nothing will endanger or interfere with the traditional freedom of the artist. Guarantees against Federal control or political intrusion into the arts are contained in the bill, administration of the program being based on the same principles as the Smithsonian Institution, which is famous for its nonpolitical character.

The proposed U.S. National Arts Foundation would provide matching grants and subventions to nonprofit groups to encourage them to perform or exhibit in cities and towns which could not otherwise receive and support them. It is sobering to realize that hundreds of thousands of Americans are being educated without any opportunity to see professional theater or a professional ballet troupe or to attend a live performance of a symphony or of an opera on a professional standard of quality.

The National Arts Foundation would require in its first year an appropriation of $5 million, and afterward, $10 million annually in succeeding years, half of which would be available for matching grants to the States. Of course, this is a modest sum for the very large nationwide purposes for which it is intended, but the fund would serve essentially as seed money to help stimulate substantial contributions from private foundations and other benefactors interested in the advancement of the arts.

This relatively small Federal appropriation will stimulate the expenditure of as much as $50 to $80 million a year in nongovernmental support for the arts. The experience of the New York State Council on the Arts, for example, shows that the amount of private artistic activity resulting from public-supported programs is on the order of $8 of private funds to $1 of public funds over a 3-year period.

Also, the bill I am introducing today is needed to give the National Council on the Arts authority to receive and expend funds. Presently it has an authorization of only $150,000, which is barely enough to meet its administrative expenses.

Working closely with the National Council on the Arts the U.S. National Arts Foundation, while not the giant step that such countries as Great Britain, Canada, and other free nations have taken, nevertheless, will go a long way toward fulfillment of the cultural and artistic needs of our country. It would help stimulate a revival of all the arts in entire regions through the efforts of nonprofit groups, municipalities, and State governments able to provide cultural services because of the subventions available from the Foundation to cover the difference between production costs and box-office admissions.

Within the framework of free enterprise and with adequate safeguards against any possibility of Federal control, the Arts Council and the Arts Foundation together would help make it possible for many more people in many more places to see and hear and participate in the best of American culture.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may lie on the desk for a week for other sponsors and that the text of the bill may be printed in the Record together with my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record and will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from New York.

The bill (S. 310) to amend the National Arts and Cultural Development Act of 1964 to authorize the National Council on the Arts to accept and receive bequests, gifts, and donations for use in carrying out the purposes of such act, and to establish the National Arts Foundation introduced by Mr. Javits (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 310

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "National Arts Foundation Act of 1965".

Sec. 2. The National Arts and Cultural Development Act of 1964 is hereby amended as follows:

(a) Amend paragraph (5) of section 2 by inserting, after "National Council on the Arts", the following: "and a National Arts Foundation".

(b) Insert, after section 3, the following title heading:

"TITLE I—NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE ARTS"

(c) Redesignate sections "4.", "5.", "6.", "7.", "8.", "9.", "10.", and "11.", as sections "101.", "102.", "103.", "104.", "105.", "106.", "107.", and "108.", respectively.

(d) Amend section 107, as redesignated pursuant to subsection (c) of this section, by striking out "Act" and inserting in lieu thereof "title".

(e) Amend section 108, as redesignated pursuant to subsection (c) of this section, as follows:

(1) In subsection (a) strike out "Act" and insert in lieu thereof "title".

(2) In subsection (b) strike out "Act" the first time it appears and insert in lieu thereof "title".

(f) At the end of title I, as designated by subsection (b) of this section, add the following new section:

"Bequests, gifts, donations

"SEC. 109. The Council is authorized to accept and receive from public or private sources, by devise, bequest, gift, donation, or otherwise, money and securities and real, personal, or mixed property; to hold the same absolutely or in trust; to invest, reinvest, manage, and dispose of the same; and to apply such money, securities, or property, the proceeds thereof, or the income derived therefrom, to such expenditures and disbursements as the Council shall determine to be necessary or appropriate for the performance of its functions. For the purposes of the United States income, estate, and gift tax laws, any gift, donation, devise, or bequest accepted by the Council under this section shall be deemed to be a gift, donation, devise, or bequest to or for the use of the United States."

(g) After title I, as designated by subsection (b) of this section, add the following new title:

"TITLE II—NATIONAL ARTS FOUNDATION

"Establishment of Foundation

"SEC. 201. There is hereby established in the executive branch of the Government an independent agency to be known as the National Arts Foundation (hereinafter referred to as the 'Foundation').

"Trustees of Foundation

"SEC. 202. (a) The Foundation shall be subject to the general supervision and policy direction of a Board of Trustees which shall consist of twenty-one members to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Such members shall be selected (1) from among private citizens of the United States who are widely recognized for their broad knowledge of or experience in, or for their profound interest in, the arts; (2) so as to include practicing artists, civic cultural leaders, members of the museum profession, and others who are professionaly engaged in the arts; and (3) so as collectively to provide an appropriate distribution of membership among the major art fields listed in section 210(a) of this title. The President is requested in the making of such appointments to give consideration to such recommendations as may from time to time be submitted to him by leading national organizations in these fields and the National Council on the Arts.

"(b) The term of office of each trustee of the Foundation shall be six years; except that the terms of the trustees first taking office after the enactment of this title shall expire, as designated by the President at the time of appointment, seven at the end of two years after the date of enactment of this title, seven at the end of four years after such date, and seven at the end of six years after such date. If a vacancy occurs in the term of office of a trustee, such vacancy shall be filled only for the unexpired portion of such term. Any person who has been a trustee of the Foundation for twelve or more consecutive years shall be ineligible for appointment during the two-year period following the termination of his duties as such a trustee.

"(c) Any vacancy in the Foundation shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

"(d) A majority of the trustees of the Foundation shall constitute a quorum.

"(e) The President shall call the first meeting of the trustees of the Foundation, at which the first order of business shall be the election of a Chairman and a Vice Chairman, who shall serve until two years after the date of enactment of this title. Thereafter each Chairman and Vice Chairman shall be elected for a term of four years in duration and each such election shall take place at the annual meeting occurring at the end of each such term. The Vice Chairman shall perform the duties of the Chairman in his absence. In case a vacancy occurs in the chairmanship or vice chairmanship, the Foundation shall elect an individual from among the trustees to fill such vacancy for the remainder of such term.

"(f) The trustees of the Foundation shall meet at the call of the Chairman, but not less than four times each year. The Chairman shall also call a meeting whenever one-third of the trustees so request in writing. Each trustee shall be given notice, by registered mail mailed to his last known address of record not less than fifteen days prior to any meeting, of the call of such meeting.

"Director of Foundation

"SEC. 203. (a) The Director of the Foundation shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. In the appointment of the Director the President is requested to give due consideration to any recommendations submitted to him by the Board of Trustees. The Director shall serve as an ex officio trustee of the Foundation. In addition, he shall be the chief executive officer of the Foundation. The Director shall receive compensation at the rate prescribed for level III of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule established by the Federal Executive Salary Act of 1964, and shall serve for a term of six years unless previously removed by the President.

"(b) The Director may appoint, with the approval of the Board of Trustees, a Deputy Director, who shall perform such functions as the Director, with the approval of the trustees, may prescribe, and shall be Acting Director during the absence or disability of the Director. In the event of a vacancy in the office of the Director, the Deputy Director shall serve as Acting Director until the President shall fill such vacancy. The Deputy Director shall receive compensation at the rate prescribed for level V of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule established by the Federal Executive Salary Act of 1964.

"(c) The Director shall have general authority to carry out and execute the programs of the Foundation on a full-time, continuous basis, to recommend programs to the Foundation, and to discharge such other functions as the Foundation may delegate to him consistent with this title.

"(d) The Director and the Deputy Director shall be reimbursed for travel and subsistence expenses incurred by them while away from their homes or regular places of business in accordance with the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended, and the Standardized Government Travel Regulations.

"(e) The Director and the Deputy Director shall be appointed without regard to the civil service laws and regulations.

"(f) The Director and the Deputy Director shall not engage in any other business, vocation, or employment than that of serving as Director or Deputy Director, or hold any office in, or act in any capacity for, any organization, agency, or institution with which the Foundation makes any contract or other arrangement under this title.

"Grants to groups and States

"Sec. 204. (a)(1) The Foundation is authorized to establish and conduct a program of grants-in-aid in a manner consistent with sections 2 and 3 of the National Arts and Cultural Development Act of 1964, from the funds appropriated to the Foundation or otherwise obtained pursuant to section 206 (a) (3) or (4) of this title, to nonprofit professional groups (and nonprofit groups meeting professional standards or standards of authenticity) engaged in or concerned with the arts, for the purpose of enabling such groups to provide (A) productions which have substantial artistic and cultural significance, giving emphasis to American creativity, (B) productions irrespective of origin which are of significant merit and which, without such assistance, would otherwise be unavailable to our citizens in many areas of the country, (C) projects that will encourage and assist artists who are citizens or who have evidenced their intention to become citizens of the United States, (D) projects that will encourage and develop the appreciation and enjoyment of the arts by our citizens, and (E) other relevant projects including surveys, research, and planning in the arts. No portion of any moneys granted under this subsection shall be applied to the purchase, erection, preservation, or repair of any building or buildings, or for the purchase or rental of any lands.

"(2) No payment may be made to any group under this section except upon application therefor which is submitted to the Foundation in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Foundation.

"(3) The amount of any grants allotted to any group pursuant to this subsection shall not exceed 50 per centum of the total cost of such project or production, except that not more than 20 per centum of the funds appropriated to the Foundation for the purposes of this section for any fiscal year may be available for allotment by the Foundation in such fiscal year without regard to such limitation in the case of any group which submits evidence to the Foundation that it has attempted unsuccessfully to secure an amount of funds equal to the grant applied for by such group, together with a statement of the proportion which any funds it has secured represent of the funds applied for by such group.

"(4) Any group shall be eligible for financial assistance pursuant to this section only if (A) no part of its net earnings inures to the benefit of any private stockholder, or stockholders, or individual or individuals, and (B) donations to such group are allowable as a charitable contribution under the standards of subsection (c) of section 170 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

"(5) Except as otherwise provided in the second sentence of subsection (b)(3) of this section, the total amount appropriated to the Foundation for grants-in-aid to groups for any fiscal year shall be equal to the total amounts appropriated to the Foundation for grants-in-aid to States for such fiscal year.

"(b)(1) The Foundation is authorized to establish and conduct a program of grants-in-aid, in a manner consistent with the declaration of policy set forth in the National Arts and Cultural Development Act of 1964, from the funds appropriated to the Foundation or otherwise obtained pursuant to section 206(a) (3) or (4) of this title, to assist the several States in supporting existing projects and productions which are making a significant public contribution in one or more of the arts, and in developing projects and productions in the arts in such a manner as will furnish adequate programs, facilities, and services in the arts to all the people and communities in each of the several States. No portion of any moneys granted under this subsection shall be applied to the purchase, erection, preservation, or repair of any building or buildings, or for the purchase or rental of any lands.

"(2) In order to receive such assistance in any fiscal year, a State shall submit an application for such grants prior to the first day of such fiscal year and accompany such application with a plan which the Foundation finds—

"(A) designates a State agency (hereinafter in this title referred to as the 'State agency') as the sole agency for the administration of the State plan;

"(B) provides that funds paid to the State under this title will be expended solely on projects and productions approved by the State agency which carry out one or more of the objectives of this title; and

"(C) provides that the State agency will make such reports, in such form and containing such information, as the Foundation may from time to time require.

"(3) Each State which has a plan approved by the Foundation in effect on the first day of the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1965, or any succeeding fiscal year, shall be entitled to a maximum allotment in any such fiscal year of an amount equal to half the total amount appropriated to the Foundation for the purposes of this section for such fiscal year divided by the total number of States. In the event that any sum is remaining out of the maximum allotment available for grants to each State in any fiscal year after all allotments are made to States with approved plans in effect on the first day of such fiscal year, the Foundation, in its discretion, may grant the aggregate of such remaining sums or any portion thereof to any group eligible for financial assistance under subsection (a) of this section or State agency for projects and productions which the Foundation finds will encourage the arts in areas where such assistance will be of value. In making grants to any group pursuant to this subsection, the Foundation shall require matching funds in accordance with the provisions of subsection (a) (3) of this section.

"(4) The amount of any grants allotted to any State or State agency pursuant to this subsection for any project or production shall not exceed 50 per centum of the total cost of such project or production.

"(c) Whenever the Foundation, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to any group or State agency, finds that—

"(1) any such group is not complying substantially with the provisions of this title;

"(2) any such agency is not complying substantially with the terms and conditions of its State plan approved under this title; or

"(3) any funds granted to such group or agency under this title have been diverted from the purposes for which they were allotted or paid

the Foundation shall immediately notify the Secretary of the Treasury and the group or State agency concerned that no further grants will be made under this title with respect to such group or State agency until there is no longer any default of failure to comply or the diversion has been corrected, or, if compliance or correction is impossible, until the group or State repays or arranges the repayment of the Federal funds which have been improperly diverted or expended.

"Advisory committees, councils, or panels

"Sec. 205. The Foundation may appoint persons other than trustees of the Foundation to committees, councils, or panels concerned with particular regions of the country or with particular aspects of the arts, or both, to advise and consult with the Foundation with respect to the duties of the Foundation and the projects and productions for which financial assistance is sought by groups and States. Such appointments shall be made without regard to the civil service laws and regulations.

"Administrative powers and duties of the Foundation

"Sec. 206. (a) The Foundation is authorized to—

"(1) prescribe such rules and adopt such bylaws as it deems necessary to govern the manner of its operation and its organization and personnel, and to implement any of the provisions of this title;

"(2) make expenditures, and enter into contracts or other arrangements, as may be necessary for administering the provisions of this title, without regard to the provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (4 U.S.C. 5);

"(3) acquire by loan or gift, and to hold and dispose of by sale, lease, or loan, real and personal property of all kinds necessary for, or resulting from, the exercise of authority granted by this title;

"(4) receive and use funds or marked gifts or property donated by others, if such funds are donated without restriction other than that they be used in furtherance of one or more of the general purposes of the Foundation;

"(5) accept and utilize the services of voluntary and uncompensated personnel;

"(6) pay fees for and enter into contracts with persons for the performance of services required by the Foundation;

"(7) pay to persons rendering services to the Foundation on an uncompensated basis or on a fee or contract basis, as provided in paragraphs (5) and (6) of this subsection, travel and subsistence expenses while away from their homes or regular places of business in accordance with the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended, and the Standardized Government Travel Regulations; and

"(8) maintain an office in the District of Columbia.

"(b) The Foundation is authorized to procure assistance, as specified herein, from any department, agency, and instrumentality of the executive branch of the Government, or any independent agency of the United States, with the consent of the head thereof, and each such department, agency, or instrumentality is authorized to render such assistance to the Foundation by the donation or loan of employee services and by the donation or loan of supplies, office or building space, or other property, either on a reimbursable or nonreimbursable basis, upon request made by the Director or Deputy Director of the Foundation.

"(c) The Foundation shall not itself produce or present any project or production.

"(d) Not later than ninety days after the end of each fiscal year, the Foundation shall submit to the President and the Congress an annual report summarizing the activities of the Foundation and making such recommendations as it may deem appropriate.

"Staff of the Foundation

"Sec. 207. The Director shall, in accordance with such policies as the Foundation shall from time to time prescribe, appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title. Such appointments shall be made and such compensation shall be fixed in accordance with the provisions of the civil service laws and regulations and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, except that the Director may, in accordance with such policies as the Foundation shall from time to time prescribe, employ such technical and professional personnel or personnel with experience in or relating to any of the arts, and fix their compensation without regard to such laws, as he may deem necessary for the discharge of the responsibilities of the Foundation under this title.

"Compensation of the trustees of the Foundation and the members of its councils, committees, and panels

"Sec. 208. The trustees of the Foundation, and the members of the councils, committees, and panels shall receive compensation at a rate to be fixed by the President in the case of the trustees, and by the Foundation in the case of the members, but not to exceed $75 for each day in which they are actually engaged in the business of the Foundation pursuant to authorization of the Foundation, and shall be allowed travel and subsistence expenses while away from their homes or regular places of business in accordance with the Travel Subsistence Act of 1949, as amended, and the Standardized Government Travel Regulations.

"Appropriations

"Sec. 209. (a) For the purpose of making grants authorized in section 204 of this title, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, such sum, not exceeding $5,000,000, and for each fiscal year thereafter such sum, not exceeding $10,000,000 annually, as the Congress may determine. The moneys appropriated to the Foundation shall remain available for expenditure for two years following the expiration of the fiscal year for which appropriated.

"(b) Moneys received by the Foundation under section 206(a) (3) and (4) of this title, shall not be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts, but shall be kept in a special account, maintained by the Treasury Department, or kept by the Foundation in commercial banking institutions, or invested in securities eligible for trust funds in the District of Columbia, and shall be available to the Foundation for the purposes of this title.

"(c) The Director shall determine any payments to be made under this title and certify to the Secretary of the Treasury the amounts thereof. Upon receipt of such certification, the Secretary of the Treasury shall, prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office, pay in accordance with such certification. Sums allotted to any group or State for any fiscal year under this title and not transferred during that fiscal year shall remain available to such group or State for the same purposes for the next fiscal year in addition to the sums allotted for such next fiscal year.

"(d) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to administer the provisions of this title.

"Definitions

"Sec. 210. As used in this title—

"(a) The term 'the arts' means (1) the major art fields including music (instrumental and vocal), drama, dance, folk art, literature, architecture and allied fields, painting, sculpture, photography, graphic and craft arts, industrial design, costume and fashion design, motion pictures, television, and radio; and (2) the arts related to the presentation, performance, execution, and exhibition of such major art fields.

"(b) The term 'production' means plays (with or without music), ballet, dance and choral performances, concerts, recitals, operas, exhibitions, readings, motion pictures, television, and radio, and any other activities involving the execution or rendition of the arts and meeting such standards as the Foundation may establish.

"(c) The term 'project' means programs organized by groups, States, and State agencies to carry out the purposes of this title, including programs to foster American artistic creativity, to train artists, to commission works of art, and to develop and enhance knowledge and understanding of the arts.

"(d) The term 'group' includes any society, institution, organization, association museum, or establishments, whether or not incorporated."

APPOINTMENT OF A DIRECTOR AND AN ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR OF FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, in both the 87th and 88th Congresses I offered legislation providing for the appointment of a Director and Associate Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, would make these appointments for a term of 15 years and neither appointee would be eligible for reappointment to the same office. The provisions of these legislative proposals would have become effective only after the present incumbent ceases to serve.

The record of the Federal Bureau of Investigation under the outstanding leadership of J. Edgar Hoover is truly one of the great records of accomplishment in modern government. This country is fortunate indeed to have had the services of this devoted and patriotic American. Under his leadership the term "protecting democracy" has come to mean more than mere words.

Consider for a moment a few of the activities of this agency over the past year. Fines, savings, and recoveries in FBI cases were $142,822,244 in fiscal year 1960; in fiscal year 1964 they were $210,771,402. Convictions in cases investigated by the FBI reached 12,921 in fiscal year 1964, an amazing 96.5 percent of all persons brought to trial. Even more striking is the fact that 91 percent of these offenders entered pleas of guilty.

During fiscal year 1964 the FBI handled 3,340 civil rights cases, a substantial increase over the preceding year. Each of these cases was handled by experienced agents, who had been specially trained in this field. Because the jurisdiction of the FBI in this field is limited, it is only where there is an indication of violation of a Federal statute that the FBI can enter the case. They are not authorized to provide protection for the victims in such cases.

But even more important, Mr. President, has been the protection of the internal security of the United States by the FBI. Even though there has been a step-up in Communist programs on all domestic fronts, in fiscal year 1964 the FBI has met the challenge, and met it well, I might add. But, protecting democracy is their primary responsibility and I am reassured by the capable hands in which this grave problem has been entrusted. We are deeply indebted to J. Edgar Hoover.

All this and more has been accomplished, Mr. President, with a staff of 6,140 special agents and 8,211 clerks, stenographers, and technical assistants. The cost of operation of this agency is such that it could well be studied by other agencies of Government. For every dollar appropriated to run this agency, $1.43 was recovered in fines, savings, and recoveries, a total of $210,771,402 in fiscal year 1964, an increase of $24 million over fiscal year 1963.

Yet, Mr. President, we in the Senate have no voice in the selection of the next Director of this vital agency. Although the Director supervises a staff larger than that of the Department of Labor we are not afforded an opportunity to pass upon the appointment of a Director of the FBI. We are called upon to give our advice and consent to the appointment of members of the Atomic Energy Commission, lower court judges, to members of miniscule agencies and commissions; why even postmasters must receive Senate confirmation. Yet we have no voice in these appointments to one of the most important agencies of Government.

For myself and in behalf of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON], I send to the desk, Mr. President, proposed legislation which will require the advice and consent of the Senate in the appointment of the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation after the present incumbent ceases to serve, and ask that it be printed in full at the conclusion of my remarks. I request that it be referred to the appropriate committee.

In addition, Mr. President, I ask that the short introduction to the FBI annual report for fiscal year 1964 be printed at the end of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and introduction to the report will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 313) relating to the appointment of the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, introduced by Mr. DIRKSEN (for himself and Mr. SIMPSON), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 313

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, effective as of the day following the date on which the present incumbent in the office of Director ceases to serve as such, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall receive compensation at the rate prescribed for Level II of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule.

The introduction to the report presented by Mr. DIRKSEN is as follows:

INTRODUCTION

The accomplishments of the FBI reached new highs in many categories in the fiscal year 1964. At the same time, investigative demands on the agency increased tremendously. Meeting the dual threats of subversion and lawlessness required the full, dedicated effort of the more than 14,300 FBI employees.

A variety of important violations in the criminal field were handled by the FBI during the fiscal year. At the order of the President, a full inquiry was made into the tragic assassination of President Kennedy. Numerous civil rights cases received intensive investigation. A record number of violations of the Federal bank robbery statute occurred, and other crimes increased substantially.

In coping with the increased numbers of Federal lawbreakers, the FBI conducted investigations which led to 12,921 convictions during the year, an increase of 105 over the previous fiscal period. This figure represented 96.5 percent of all persons brought to trial. Fines, savings and recoveries rose to $210,771,402, a new high. Included in this figure is the value of 19,856 stolen motor vehicles which were recovered in cases investigated by the FBI. This total sum amounted to a return of $1.43 for every dollar appropriated for the Bureau. The number of fugitives located by the FBI increased to 12,810, including 16 whose names had appeared on the "Ten Most Wanted" list.

The tightly knit ranks of organized crime continued to be targets of highly effective penetration by the FBI. Investigation in this field is concerned with the gathering of intelligence data and collection of evidence for prosecution. During the 1964 fiscal year, 56 members of the organized mobs were convicted under interstate gambling and racketeering laws. FBI informants furnished valuable information regarding the organized underworld, and made tremendous contributions in other areas of the Bureau's responsibilities. Information furnished by informants which was of interest to other agencies was promptly disseminated. More than 187,000 items of criminal information received from informants and other sources were relayed by the FBI to appropriate authorities in the fiscal year.

In the domestic intelligence field, the FBI continued to effectively counter the operations of various subversive elements. During the year, two Soviet nationals and two alleged Soviet illegal agents were arrested by the FBI on espionage charges. The Soviet nationals were released to return to Russia in exchange for an American citizen held in that country.

FBI investigations of nationalist organizations in Puerto Rico did much to forestall violence by these groups. In March 1964 the Bureau furnished information to the Puerto Rican police regarding a nationalist group which had committed a series of burglaries to obtain funds for the purchase of arms and supplies. Based on this information, the police arrested most of the members of this group and at year's end they were in prison or awaiting trial.

The FBI kept appropriate Government agencies constantly informed regarding the activities of the Communist Party, USA, which stepped up its programs on all domestic fronts during the year. A close check was also maintained on the activities of numerous Communist front groups.

In keeping with its emphasis on raising the professional level of law enforcement, the FBI participated in 4,163 police training schools during the fiscal year. These schools were attended by 117,275 officers. Two classes of officers were also graduated from the FBI National Academy, bringing the total number of graduates to 4,546.

During the year, thousands of agencies availed themselves of the cost-free services of the FBI Laboratory and Identification Divisions. New records were set by the Laboratory with 200,119 specimens submitted and 257,060 examinations conducted. A record total of 20,270 fugitives were identified by the FBI Identification Division through fingerprint searches and, at year's end, that Division had 171,775 fingerprint cards in its files.

An alltime high of 578,903 persons toured FBI Headquarters during the 1964 fiscal year.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION DEALING WITH THE ARTS AND HUMANITIES

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and a number of distinguished Members of this body, I introduce, for appropriate reference, two bills pertaining to the arts and the humanities and to the cultural growth and progress of our Nation.

The first bill, entitled "the National Arts Foundation Act of 1965," is cosponsored by Senators BREWSTER, CLARK, COOPER, JAVITS, KENNEDY of Massachusetts, LONG of Missouri, METCALF, PASTORE, RANDOLPH, and RIBICOFF.

The second more comprehensive bill, entitled "the National Humanities Foundation Act of 1965," is cosponsored by Senators BREWSTER, KENNEDY of Massachusetts, LONG of Missouri, METCALF, PASTORE, and RANDOLPH.

Both these bills are directed toward enhancing those areas of the mind and the creative spirit which bear so significantly not only on the welfare of our Nation today, but on its future goals.

I am indeed happy that President Johnson, in his most excellent state of the Union message, said he would propose a national foundation "to help promote and honor" creative achievements.

A Great Society, if it is truly to flourish, must be deeply concerned with the inspirational attributes of its life; and nowhere are these attributes better expressed than in the field of artistic and cultural progress.

We strive to better ourselves, to strengthen our minds, to shape new attitudes and understandings. What we do in a cultural sense, what we project into the realms of imagination and of ideas, what we are able to assimilate and give to others—all these are intrinsic to the meaningful contribution our society can produce and to the heritage it can transmit to future generations.

Last year the Congress passed the National Arts and Cultural Development Act of 1964, establishing for the first time in our history a National Council on the Arts. Concepts for this legislation had been before the Congress for some 87 years.

As chairman of the Senate Special Subcommittee on the Arts during the 87th and 88th Congress and as floor manager of S. 2379—providing both for the Council in title I, and for a National Arts Foundation in title II—I was most pleased that this body gave its approval to that legislation on December 20, 1963. It was introduced by our Vice-President-elect, HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, who then so ably served in this Chamber as Senator and as majority whip, and who gave us here the immense benefits of his keenly creative mind and spirit.

The cosponsors of S. 2379 included Senators CLARK, COOPER, JAVITS, KENNEDY of Massachusetts, LONG of Missouri, METCALF, RANDOLPH, and RIBICOFF. I am glad to have their esteemed support as cosponsors today. And I am especially pleased to have as cosponsor of both bills the senior Senator from Rhode Island, JOHN O. PASTORE.

Senator CLARK's concept of providing appropriate assistance in the arts to the several States, as introduced during the 87th Congress, was fundamental to the legislation we considered last year and to the legislation I am now proposing. He has always played a leading role in this field.

It was a source of disappointment that the House of Representatives did not endorse the full contents of our Senate-passed bill during the 88th Congress. However, it was felt that by providing for a National Council on the Arts, we had taken a very important step in the right direction. The Council gives recognition to the vital role of the artist in our contemporary life, and it furnishes our country and our Government with a means for continuing on our journey toward greater cultural progress. Had it not been for the excellent leadership of Congressman FRANK THOMPSON, JR., from New Jersey, and the support of such leaders as Congressman JOHN E. FOGARTY from my home State of Rhode Island, the bill to establish the Council could not have succeeded. I am delighted to understand that Congressman FOGARTY is introducing companion bills to mine in the House of Representatives today.

The first bill I am introducing here would implement the work of the Council. It would place under the jurisdiction of the Council a program similar to title II of S. 2379, that part of the bill which the House did not see fit to endorse last year. This program of grants in aid, on a matching basis and formula, to the several States and to qualified nonprofit groups concerned with cultural endeavors, received the wholehearted support of artists in all the major fields throughout the United States.

We held extensive Senate hearings. Illustrious representatives of the arts from all sections of our country testified enthusiastically for the program we envisioned, and for the beneficial effect it would have, even with modest appropriation, on the increasing financial crisis threatening cultural undertakings, especially in areas removed from metropolitan centers. The assistance proposed is very different from direct subsidy. It can be described as seed money for the arts, to stimulate and to encourage private support and action by State agencies.

The bill in its final form was the result of our very best thinking and combined efforts. It had bipartisan support; and I would like at this point to express once again my esteem for the valuable and valiant support rendered by Senator JAVITS, who has long championed the cause of the arts, first as a Congressman and then as a Senator. Indeed, the New York Council on the Arts has been a pioneer in demonstrating the effectiveness of the very type of assistance we proposed.

It would seem proper, therefore, that this program to encourage and develop artistic achievement should be included in our current legislation, and that the Council now established in law, should be responsible for the program's implementation as its administering body. This is the substance of the first bill.

The second is more comprehensive. It would establish a National Humanities Foundation within a broad definition which would include the arts as defined in title II of S. 2379 and the companion House bill, H.R. 9587, in the 88th Congress, and as now implicit in Public Law 88–579, which established the National Council on the Arts.

The second bill would provide for an appropriate separation of responsibilities in those areas defined as applicable to the humanities and those areas defined as the arts. It would provide for an equitable distribution of funding under those two broad areas.

The term "humanities," as used in this act, would include the study of language, literature, history, and philosophy; archeology; the history, criticism, and theory of the arts; the history of law, religion, and science; and those aspects of the social sciences which have humanistic content and employ humanistic methods.

This bill stresses that insofar as possible the Foundation would work through existing Federal programs in the humanities and the arts. These would include the Office of Education and the Smithsonian Institution. These two bodies would be represented on the Foundation Board, by the Commissioner of Education and the Secretary of the Smithsonian. The Chairman of the National Council on the Arts and the Librarian of Congress would also be members of the Foundation Board.

The Board would consist of 20 additional members and a Director appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The members would be eminent in the fields of humanities and the arts and selected on the basis of established records of distinguished service and scholarship or creativity, so as to provide a comprehensive representation and the views of professional practitioners in the humanities and arts throughout the United States. The Board would have the opportunity of making recommendations to the President with respect to the appointment of the Director, who would receive compensation at the same rate as provided for the Director of the National Science Foundation.

This bill is similar in its general concepts to one introduced in this Chamber by Senator ERNEST GRUENING, from Alaska, and by Congressman WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD, from Pennsylvania and others in the House of Representatives; and I would like to extend to them my admiration for the initiative they have taken. I have made some additions, chiefly to enlarge the area of responsibility for the National Council on the Arts.

In this connection, too, let me express my high regard for Dr. Barnaby Keeney, president of Brown University, who as chairman of the Commission on the Humanities recommended the establishment of a National Humanities Foundation under Federal auspices.

The commission is composed of the American Council of Learned Societies, the Council of Graduate Schools in the United States, and the United Chapters of Phi Beta Kappa.

In broad philosophic terms, and as in the commission's admirable report published in 1964, the humanities involve those cultural areas "which widen the understanding of man in relation to his environment as well as to other men."

The bill furnished specifics for this principle. Its thrust is toward education, including the highest levels of educational enterprise, and toward the best possible creative performance and intelligent appreciation in the fields it covers.

In part the bill states that "the world leadership which has come to the United States cannot rest solely upon superior power, wealth and technology, but must be solidly founded upon worldwide respect and admiration for the Nation's high qualities as a leader in the realm of ideas and of the spirit."

It also states that "during our early history, the Nation was largely engaged in mastering its physical environment while, more recently, advancing technology, defense, and space needs have put a claim on energies that might have gone into humane and artistic endeavors, with the result that our social, moral, and esthetic development has lagged behind our material advance" and "that it is in the national interest that the resulting social, cultural and educational imbalance be redressed."

These are among the important reasons motivating my introduction of the second, more comprehensive bill; but I do not look upon these two legislative proposals as conflicting. Rather, I believe they would allow a choice—of either advancing our cultural endeavors through progressive stages and building more gradually on what we have begun; or of taking, ideally, one inclusive stride forward.

In both bills provision is made so that the body involved can receive and utilize private funding to carry out the purposes of the legislation. This factor is relevant to the establishing of these bodies as independent agencies. It is believed that their status in this respect would have greatest appeal to the cultural leadership of our country, and to those whom this legislation will assist.

Both bills provide assurances against Federal interference in the humanities and the arts. Both recognize that while the support and encouragement of our cultural endeavors is primarily a matter of private and local initiative, it is also an appropriate matter of concern to the Federal Government.

As a mature nation, as free men and women in a democratic society, as Members of this great deliberative body, we have the ability to choose the avenues we will follow wisely. I would like to see us advance to the utmost of these abilities.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of these two bills be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks. I also ask unanimous consent that these bills remain at the desk for an additional 2 weeks if other Senators desire to become cosponsors.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bills will be printed in the Record, and held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from Rhode Island.

The bills, introduced by Mr. Pell (for himself and other Senators), were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, as follows:

> By Mr. PELL (for himself, Mr. Brewster, Mr. Clark, Mr. Cooper, Mr. Javits, Mr. Kennedy of Massachusetts, Mr. Long of Missouri, Mr. Metcalf, Mr. Pastore, Mr. Randolph, and Mr. Ribicoff):

S. 315. A bill to establish a National Arts Foundation.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

Sec. 1. This Act may be cited as the "National Arts Foundation Act of 1965".

DECLARATION OF POLICY

Sec. 2. The Congress finds that a widespread and growing portion of the American public is deprived of the opportunity to view and enjoy the visual arts, such as painting and sculpture, and the performing arts, such as theatrical performances, musical concerts, opera, dance, ballet and choral recitals; that the increasing leisure time and life expectancy of all our people provides increased opportunity to enjoy the benefits of the arts; that the encouragement of these arts will help to satisfy the intellectual and spiritual demands of men's minds; that the Nation's general welfare will be promoted by providing recognition of the status of these arts as a cherished and valued part of the Nation's cultural resources and by encouraging such activity; and that it is desirable to establish a National Arts Foundation to provide such recognition and encouragement.

ASSURANCE AGAINST FEDERAL INTERFERENCE IN THE ARTS

Sec. 3. In the administration of this Act no department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States shall exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the policy or program determination of any group, State, or State agency involved in the arts.

ESTABLISHMENT OF FOUNDATION

Sec. 4. There is hereby established in the executive branch of the Government an independent agency to be known as the National Arts Foundation (hereinafter referred to as the "Foundation").

NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE ARTS

Sec. 5. For the purpose of carrying out the objectives of this Act, the National Council on the Arts (hereinafter referred to as the "Council"), established by the National Arts and Cultural Development Act of 1964, is authorized and directed to administer the Foundation, discharge the functions and duties provided by this Act for the Foundation, and execute the programs of the Foundation. The Council shall meet not less than two times each year in its capacity of administering the Foundation. Except as otherwise provided in this Act, the provisions of the National Arts and Cultural Development Act of 1964 shall be applicable, insofar as necessary to carry out the objectives of this Act, with respect to the membership of the Council, procedural matters of the Council, the appointment and procuring of staff by the Council, and the compensation of members and staff of the Council.

GRANTS TO GROUPS AND STATES

Sec. 6. (a) (1) The Foundation is authorized to establish and conduct a program of grants-in-aid from the funds appropriated to the Foundation or otherwise obtained pursuant to section 8(a) (3) or (4) of this Act, to nonprofit professional groups (and nonprofit groups meeting professional standards or standards of authenticity) engaged in or concerned with the arts, for the purpose of enabling such groups to provide (A) productions which have substantial artistic and cultural significance, giving emphasis to American creativity, (B) productions irrespective of origin which are of significant merit and which, without such assistance, would otherwise be unavailable to our citizens in many areas of the country, (C) projects that will encourage and assist artists who are citizens or who have evidenced their intention to become citizens of the United States, (D) projects that will encourage and develop the appreciation and enjoyment of the arts by our citizens, and (E) other relevant projects including surveys, research, and planning in the arts. No portion of any moneys granted under this subsection shall be applied to the purchase, erection, preservation, or repair of any building or buildings, or for the purchase or rental of any lands.

(2) No payment may be made to any group under this section except upon application therefor which is submitted to the Foundation in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Foundation.

(3) The amount of any grants allotted to any group pursuant to this subsection shall not exceed 50 per centum of the total cost of such project or production, except that not more than 20 per centum of the funds appropriated to the Foundation for the purposes of this section for any fiscal year may be available for allotment by the Foundation in such fiscal year without regard to such limitation in the case of any group which submits evidence to the Foundation that it has attempted unsuccessfully to secure an amount of funds equal to the grant appplied for by such group, together with a statement of the proportion which any funds it has secured represent of the funds applied for by such group.

(4) Any group shall be eligible for financial assistance pursuant to this section only if (A) no part of its net earnings inures to the benefit of any private stockholder, or stockholders, or individual or individuals, and (B) donations to such group are allowable as a charitable contribution under the standards of subsection (c) of section 170 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

(5) Except as otherwise provided in the second sentence of subsection (b)(3) of this section, the total amount appropriated to the Foundation for grants-in-aid to groups for any fiscal year shall be equal to the total amounts appropriated to the Foundation for grants-in-aid to States for such fiscal year.

(b)(1) The Foundation is authorized to establish and conduct a program of grants-in-aid from the funds appropriated to the Foundation or otherwise obtained pursuant to section 8(a) (3) or (4) of this Act, to assist the several States in supporting existing projects and productions which are making a significant public contribution in one or more of the arts, and in developing projects and productions in the arts in such a manner as will furnish adequate programs, facilities, and services in the arts to all the people and communities in each of the several States. No portion of any moneys granted under this subsection shall be applied to the purchase, erection, preservation, or repair of any building or buildings, or for the purchase or rental of any lands.

(2) In order to receive such assistance in any fiscal year, a State shall submit an application for such grants prior to the first day of such fiscal year and accompany such application with a plan which the Foundation finds—

(A) designates a State agency (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the "State agency") as the sole agency for the administration of the State plan;

(B) provides that funds paid to the State under this Act will be expended solely on projects and productions approved by the State agency which carry out one or more of the objectives of this Act; and

(C) provides that the State agency will make such reports, in such form and containing such information, as the Foundation may from time to time require.

(3) Each State which has a plan approved by the Foundation in effect on the first day of the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1965, or any succeeding fiscal year, shall be entitled to a maximum allotment in any such fiscal year of an amount equal to half the total amount appropriated to the Foundation for the purposes of this section for such fiscal

year divided by the total number of States. In the event that any sum is remaining out of the maximum allotment available for grants to each State in any fiscal year after all allotments are made to States with approved plans in effect on the first day of such fiscal year, the Foundation, in its discretion, may grant the aggregate of such remaining sums or any portion thereof to any group eligible for financial assistance under subsection (a) of this section or State agency for projects and productions which the Foundation finds will encourage the arts in areas where such assistance will be of value. In making grants to any group pursuant to this subsection, the Foundation shall require matching funds in accordance with the provisions of subsection (a)(3) of this section.

(4) The amount of any grants allotted to any State or State agency pursuant to this subsection for any project or production shall not exceed 50 per centum of the total cost of such project or production.

(c) Whenever the Foundation, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to any group or State agency, finds that—

(1) any such group is not complying substantially with the provisions of this Act;

(2) any such agency is not complying substantially with the terms and conditions of its State plan approved under this Act; or

(3) any funds granted to such group or agency under this Act have been diverted from the purposes for which they were allotted or paid

the Foundation shall immediately notify the Secretary of the Treasury and the group or State agency concerned that no further grants will be made under this Act with respect to such group or State agency until there is no longer any default or failure to comply or the diversion has been corrected, or, if compliance or correction is impossible, until the group or State repays or arranges the repayment of the Federal funds which have been improperly diverted or expended.

ADVISORY COMMITTEES OR PANELS

SEC. 7. The Foundation may appoint persons other than members of the Council to committees or panels concerned with particular regions of the country or with particular aspects of the arts, or both, to advise and consult with the Foundation with respect to the duties of the Foundation and the projects and productions for which financial assistance is sought by groups and States. Such appointments shall be made without regard to the civil service laws and regulations. The members of the committees and panels, while engaged in the business of the Foundation pursuant to authorization of the Foundation, shall receive compensation at a rate to be fixed by the Foundation, but not exceeding $75 per diem and shall be paid travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

ADMINISTRATIVE POWERS AND DUTIES OF THE FOUNDATION

SEC. 8. (a) The Foundation is authorized to—

(1) prescribe such rules and adopt such bylaws as it deems necessary to govern the manner of its operation and its organization and personnel, and to implement any of the provisions of the Act;

(2) make expenditures, and enter into contracts or other arrangements, as may be necessary for administering the provisions of this Act, without regard to the provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (4 U.S.C. 5);

(3) acquire by loan or gift, and to hold and dispose of by sale, lease, or loan, real and personal property of all kinds necessary for, or resulting from, the exercise of authority granted by this Act;

(4) receive and use funds or marked gifts or property donated, devised, or bequeathed by others, if such funds are donated, devised, or bequeathed without restriction other than that they be used in furtherance of one or more of the general purposes of the Foundation;

(5) accept and utilize the services of voluntary and uncompensated personnel;

(6) pay fees for and enter into contracts with persons for the performance of services required by the Foundation;

(7) pay to persons rendering services to the Foundation on an uncompensated basis or on a fee or contract basis, as provided in paragraphs (5) and (6) of this subsection, travel and subsistence expenses while away from their homes or regular places of business in accordance with the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended, and the Standardized Government Travel Regulations; and

(8) maintain an office in the District of Columbia.

(b) The Foundation shall not itself produce or present any project or production.

(c) Not later than ninety days after the end of each fiscal year, the Foundation shall submit to the President and the Congress an annual report summarizing the activities of the Foundation and making such recommendations as it may deem appropriate.

APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 9. (a) For the purpose of making grants authorized in section 6 of this Act, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, such sum, not exceeding $5,000,000, and for each fiscal year thereafter such sum, not exceeding $10,000,000 annually, as the Congress may determine. The moneys appropriated to the Foundation shall remain available for expenditure for two years following the expiration of the fiscal year for which appropriated.

(b) Moneys received by the Foundation under section 8(a) (3) and (4) of this Act, shall not be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts, but shall be kept in a special account, maintained by the Treasury Department, or kept by the Foundation in commercial banking institutions, or invested in securities eligible for trust funds in the District of Columbia, and shall be available to the Foundation for the purposes of this Act.

(c) The Chairman of the Council shall determine any payments to be made under this Act and certify to the Secretary of the Treasury the amounts thereof. Upon receipt of such certification, the Secretary of the Treasury shall, prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office, pay in accordance with such certification. Sums allotted to any group or State for any fiscal year under this Act and not transferred during that fiscal year shall remain available to such group or State for the same purposes for the next fiscal year in addition to the sums allotted for such next fiscal year.

(d) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to administer the provisions of this Act, but in no event shall the amount appropriated in any fiscal year exceed a total of $75,000.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 10. As used in this Act—

(a) The term "the arts" means (1) the major art fields, including music (instrumental and vocal), drama, dance, folk art, literature, architecture and allied fields, painting, sculpture, photography, graphic and craft arts, industrial design, costume and fashion design, motion pictures, television, radio, and tape and sound recording; and (2) the arts related to the presentation, performance, execution, and exhibition of such major art fields.

(b) The term "production" means plays (with or without music), ballet, dance and choral performances, concerts, recitals, operas, exhibitions, readings, motion pictures, radio, television, and tape and sound recording, and any other activities involving the execution or rendition of the arts and meeting such standards as the Foundation may establish.

(c) The term "project" means programs organized by groups, States, and State agencies to carry out the purposes of this Act, including programs to foster American artistic creativity, to train artists, to commission works of art, and to develop and enhance knowledge and understanding of the arts.

(d) The term "group" includes any society, institution, organization, association, museum, or establishments, whether or not incorporated.

By Mr. PELL (for himself, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. METCALF, Mr. PASTORE, and Mr. RANDOLPH):

S. 316. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "National Humanities Foundation Act of 1965".

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby finds and declares—

(1) that the encouragement and support of the humanities and the arts, while primarily a matter for private and local initiative, is also an appropriate matter of concern to the Federal Government;

(2) that a leading civilization must not limit its efforts to science and technology alone but must give full value and support to the other great branches of man's scholarly and cultural activity;

(3) that democracy demands wisdom and vision in its citizens and that it must therefore foster and support a form of education designed to make men masters of their technology and not its unthinking servants;

(4) that, during our early history, the Nation was largely engaged in mastering its physical environment while, more recently, advancing technology, defense, and space needs have put a claim on energies that might have gone into humane and artistic endeavors, with the result that our social, moral, and esthetic development has lagged behind our material advance;

(5) that it is the national interest that the resulting social, cultural, and educational imbalance be redressed;

(6) that the world leadership which has come to the United States cannot rest solely upon superior power, wealth, and technology, but must be solidly founded upon worldwide respect and admiration for the Nation's high qualities as a leader in the realm of ideas and of the spirit;

(7) that, in order to implement these findings, it is desirable to establish a National Humanities Foundation.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A NATIONAL HUMANITIES FOUNDATION

SEC. 3. There is hereby established in the executive branch of the Government an independent agency to be known as the National Humanities Foundation (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the "Foundation"). The Foundation shall consist of a National Humanities Board (hereinafter referred to as the "Board") and a Director.

PURPOSE OF THE FOUNDATION

SEC. 4. The purpose of the National Humanities Foundation shall be to develop and promote a broadly conceived policy of support for the humanities and the arts, but it shall not attempt to supervise control, or otherwise direct the scholarship, teaching, research, or artistic endeavors which it supports.

DEFINITION

SEC. 5. As used in this Act—

(a) The term "humanities and the arts" includes all those cultural areas which widen the understanding of man in relation to his environment as well as to other men, and encompasses all areas and fields referred to in subsections (b) and (c) of this section.

(b) The term "humanities" includes, but is not limited to, the study of language, literature, history and philosophy; archeology; the history, criticism and theory of the arts; the history of law, religion and science; and those aspects of the social sciences which have humanistic content and employ humanistic methods.

(c) The term "the arts" includes all art areas and fields covered by the National Arts and Cultural Development Act of 1964, such as (1) music (instrumental and vocal), drama, dance, folk art, creative writing, architecture and allied fields, painting, sculpture, photography, graphic and craft arts, industrial design, costume and fashion design, motion pictures, television, radio, tape and sound recording; and (2) the arts related to the presentation, performance, execution and exhibition of such major art forms.

(d) The term "production" means plays (with or without music), ballet, dance and choral performances, concerts, recitals, operas, exhibitions, readings, motion pictures, television, radio, and tape and sound recordings; and any other activities involving the execution or rendition of the arts and meeting such standards as the Foundation may establish.

(e) The term "project" means programs organized by groups, States, and State agencies to carry out the purposes of this Act, including programs to foster American artistic creativity, to train artists, to commission works of art, and to develop and enhance knowledge and understanding of the arts.

(f) The term "group" includes any society, institution, organization, association, museum, or establishments, whether or not incorporated.

ASSURANCE AGAINST FEDERAL INTERFERENCE

SEC. 6. In the administration of this Act, no department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States shall exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the policy determination, personnel, curriculum, or the administration or operation of any school or other non-Federal agency, institution, organization, or association.

FUNCTIONS OF THE FOUNDATION

SEC. 7. (a) The Foundation is authorized and directed—

(1) to develop and encourage the pursuit of a national policy for the promotion of scholarship, education, research, and creative work and performance in the humanities and the arts;

(2) to insure that suitable means (including grants, loans, and other forms of assistance) are provided for educating and developing scholars and teachers in the humanities and the arts, and artists, at any stage of their growth;

(3) to assist by institutional grants, loans, and other means of assistance public and other nonprofit organizations, as defined in section 501(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, concerned with encouraging and developing scholars and teachers in the humanities and the arts, and artists, in order to enable each institution to develop its own program of research and instruction in the humanities and the arts; and to initiate and promote by contract or other arrangements, including grants, loans, and other forms of assistance, programs for the improvement of teaching in the humanities and arts;

(4) to award scholarships and graduate fellowships, including postdoctoral fellowships, and grants for research and for creative work and performance in the humanities and the arts;

(5) to foster the improvement of library and museum resources and services for research and for teaching at all levels in the humanities and the arts, and to foster the interchange of information in the humanities and the arts in the United States and with other countries; and

(6) insofar as practicable, to carry out the purposes of this Act in a manner consistent with, and in support of, the activities of the National Council on the Arts established by the National Arts and Cultural Development Act of 1964.

(b) In exercising the authority and discharging the functions referred to in subsection (a) of this section, it shall be one of the objectives of the Foundation to strengthen education, research, creative work, and performance in the humanities and the arts throughout the United States and its possessions, and to operate, insofar as practicable, in cooperation with existing Federal programs, including those conducted by the Smithsonian Institution and the United States Office of Education.

(c)(1) The Foundation is authorized to establish and conduct a program of grants-in-aid to nonprofit professional groups (and nonprofit groups meeting professional standards or standards of authenticity) engaged in or concerned with the arts, for the purpose of enabling such groups to provide (A) productions which have substantial artistic and cultural significance, giving emphasis to American creativity, (B) productions irrespective of origin which are of significant merit and which, without such assistance, would otherwise be unavailable to our citizens in many areas of the country, (C) projects that will encourage and assist artists who are citizens or who have evidenced their intention to become citizens of the United States, (D) projects that will encourage and develop the appreciation and enjoyment of the arts by our citizens, and (E) other relevant projects including surveys, research, and planning in the arts.

(2) No payment may be made to any group under this section except upon application therefor which is submitted to the Foundation in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Foundation.

(3) The amount of any grants allotted to any group pursuant to this subsection shall not exceed 50 per centum of the total cost of such project or production, except that not more than 20 per centum of the funds allotted by the Foundation for the purposes of subsections (c) and (d) of this section for any fiscal year may be available for allotment by the Foundation in such fiscal year without regard to such limitation in the case of any group which submits evidence to the Foundation that it has attempted unsuccessfully to secure an amount of funds equal to the grant applied for by such group, together with a statement of the proportion which any funds it has secured represent of the funds applied for by such group.

(4) Any group shall be eligible for financial assistance pursuant to this section only if (A) no part of its net earnings inures to the benefit of any private stockholder, or stockholders, or individual or individuals, and (B) donations to such group are allowable as a charitable contribution under the standards of subsection (c) of section 170 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

(5) Except as otherwise provided in the second sentence of subsection (d)(3) of this section, the total amount allotted by the Foundation for grants-in-aid to groups for any fiscal year shall be equal to the total amounts allotted by the Foundation for grants-in-aid to States for such fiscal year.

(d)(1) The Foundation is authorized to establish and conduct a program of grants-in-aid to assist the several States in supporting existing projects and productions which are making a significant public contribution in one or more of the arts, and in developing projects and productions in the arts in such a manner as will furnish adequate programs, facilities, and services in the arts to all the people and communities in each of the several States.

(2) In order to receive such assistance in any fiscal year, a State shall submit an application for such grants prior to the first day of such fiscal year and accompany such application with a plan which the Foundation finds—

(A) designates a State agency (hereinafter in this subsection referred to as the "State agency") as the sole agency for the administration of the State plan;

(B) provides that funds paid to the State under this subsection will be expended solely on projects and productions approved by the State agency which carry out one or more of the objectives of this title; and

(C) provides that the State agency will make such reports, in such form and containing such information, as the Foundation may from time to time require.

(3) Each State which has a plan approved by the Foundation in effect on the first day of the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1965, or any succeeding fiscal year, shall be entitled to a maximum allotment in any such fiscal year of an amount equal to half the total amount allotted by the Foundation for the purposes of subsections (c) and (d) of this section for such fiscal year divided by the total number of States. In the event that any sum is remaining out of the maximum allotment available for grants to each State in any fiscal year after all allotments are made to States with approved plans in effect on the first day of such fiscal year, the Foundation, in its discretion, may grant the aggregate of such remaining sums or any portion thereof to any group eligible for financial assistance under subsection (c) of this section or State agency for projects and productions which the Foundation finds will encourage the arts in areas where such assistance will be of value. In making grants to any group pursuant to this subsection, the Foundation shall require matching funds in accordance with the provisions of subsection (c)(3) of this section.

(4) The amount of any grants allotted to any State or State agency pursuant to this subsection for any project or production shall not exceed 50 per centum of the total cost of such project or production.

(e) Whenever the Foundation, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to any group or State agency, finds that—

(1) any such group is not complying substantially with the provisions of this section;

(2) any such agency is not complying substantially with the terms and conditions of its State plan approved under this section; or

(3) any funds granted to such group or agency under this section have been diverted from the purposes for which they were allotted or paid

the Foundation shall immediately notify the Secretary of the Treasury and the group or State agency concerned that no further grants will be made under this section with respect to such group or State agency until there is no longer any default or failure to comply or the diversion has been corrected, or, if compliance or correction is impossible, until the group or State repays or arranges the repayment of the Federal funds which have been improperly diverted or expended.

(f) The Foundation shall render an annual report to the President for submission on or before the 15th day of January of each year to the Congress, summarizing the activities of the Foundation and making such recommendations as it may deem appropriate. Such report shall include minority views and recommendations, if any, of members of the Board.

(g) No portion of any moneys granted, loaned, or otherwise provided as assistance under this section shall be applied to the purchase, erection, preservation, or repair of any buildings, or for the purchase or rental of any land.

NATIONAL HUMANITIES BOARD

SEC. 8. (a) The Board shall consist of (1) twenty members to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate; and (2) the Director of the Foundation, the United States Commissioner of Education, the Librarian of Congress, the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, and the Chairman of the National Council on the Arts, each of whom shall be voting members of the Board ex officio. The Board shall, except as otherwise provided in this Act, exercise the authority granted to the Foundation by this Act. The persons nominated by the President for appointment as members (A) shall be eminent in the fields of the humanities or the arts; (B) shall be selected solely on the basis of established records of distinguished service and scholarship or creativity; and (C) shall be so selected as to provide a comprehensive representation of the views of professional practioners in the humanities and the arts throughout the United States.

(b) The term of office of each appointed member of the Board shall be six years, except that (1) any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term; and (2) the terms of office of the members first taking office after the enactment of this Act shall expire, as designated by the President at the time of appointment, six at the end of two years, six at the end of four years, and eight at the end of six years, after the enactment of this Act. Any appointed member of the Board who has been a member of the Board for twelve consecutive years shall thereafter be ineligible for appointment during the two-year period following the expiration of his term of office.

(c) The President shall call the first meeting of the Board, at which the first order of business shall be the election of a chairman and a vice chairman, who shall serve until two years after the date of enactment of this Act. Thereafter each chairman and vice chairman shall be elected for a term of two years in duration and each such election shall take place at a regular annual meeting occurring at the end of each such term. The vice chairman shall perform the duties of the chairman in his absence. In case a vacancy occurs in the chairmanship or vice chairmanship, the Board shall elect a member to fill the vacancy.

(d) The Board shall meet at the call of the chairman, but not less than four times each year. The chairman shall also call a meeting whenever one-third of the members of the Board so request in writing. A majority of the voting members of the Board shall constitute a quorum. Each member shall be given notice, by registered mail or by certified mail mailed to his last known address of record not less than fifteen days prior to any meeting, of the call of such meeting.

DIRECTOR OF THE FOUNDATION

SEC. 9. (a) There shall be a director of foundation who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Board may make recommendations to the President with respect to the appointment of the director, and the director shall not be appointed until the board has had an opportunity to make such recommendations. The director shall serve as a voting ex officio member of the Board. In addition, he shall be the chief executive officer of the foundation. The director shall receive compensation at the same rate as provided for the director of the National Science Foundation and shall serve for a term of six years unless sooner removed by the President.

(b) In addition to the powers and duties specifically vested in him by this Act, the Director shall, in accordance with the policies established by the Board, exercise the powers granted by section 12 of this Act, together with such powers and duties as may be delegated to him by the Board; but no final action shall be taken by the Director in the exercise of any power granted by section 12(3) of this Act unless in each instance the Board has reviewed and approved the action proposed to be taken, or such action is taken pursuant to the terms of a delegation of authority from the Board or the Executive Committee to the Director.

POWER TO CREATE COMMITTEES

SEC. 10. (a) The Board shall appoint from among its members an Executive Committee and assign to the Executive Committee such of the powers and functions granted to the Board by this Act as it deems appropriate; except that the Board may not assign to the Executive Committee the function of establishing policies.

(b)(1) The Executive Committee shall consist of the Director, as a nonvoting ex officio member, and not less than five nor more than nine other members elected by the Board from among their membership.

(2) The term of office of each voting member of the Executive Committee shall be two years, except that (A) any member elected to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was elected shall be elected for the remainder of such term; and (B) the term of office of four of the members first elected after the date of enactment of this Act shall be one year.

(3) Any person who has been a member of the Executive Committee for six consecutive years shall thereafter be ineligible for election during the two-year period following the expiration of his term of office.

(4) The membership of the Executive Committee shall, so far as practicable, be representative of diverse interests and shall be chosen so as to provide professional representation, so far as practicable, for all areas of the Nation.

(5) The Executive Committee shall render an annual report to the Board, and such other reports as it may deem necesary, summarizing its activities and making such recommendations as it may deem appropriate. Minority views and recommendations, if any, of members of the Executive Committee shall be included in such reports.

(c) The Board is authorized to appoint from among its members or otherwise such advisory panels as it deems necessary, and to assign to the panels so appointed such survey and advisory functions as the Board deems appropriate for the purposes of this Act.

DIVISIONS WITHIN THE FOUNDATION

SEC. 11. (a) There shall be within the Foundation such divisions as the Board may, from time to time, deem necessary in order to carry out the powers and duties of the Foundation as set forth in this Act. Among the divisions established pursuant to this section there shall be included divisions concerned with those aspects of the humanities and the arts which pertain to the development of educational excellence as related to the purposes of this Act and which pertain to creative, interpretive and professional performance as related to the purposes of this Act.

(b) (1) There shall be a committee for each division of the Foundation.

(2) Each divisional committee shall be appointed by the Board and shall consist of not less than five persons who need not be members of the Board.

(3) The terms of members of each divisional committee shall be two years. Each divisional committee shall annually elect its own chairman from among its own members and shall prescribe its own rules of procedure subject to such restrictions as may be prescribed by the Board.

(4) Each divisional committee shall make recommendations to, and advise and consult with, the Board and the Director with respect to matters relating to the program of its division.

GENERAL AUTHORITY OF THE FOUNDATION

SEC. 12. The Foundation shall have the authority, within the limits of available appropriations, to do all things necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act, including, but without being limited thereto, the authority—

(1) to prescribe such rules and regulations as it deems necessary governing the manner of its operations and its organization and personnel;

(2) to make such expenditures as may be necessary for administering the provisions of this Act, in accord with the principle that there shall be an equal distribution of funding between (A) the humanities and (B) the arts;

(3) to enter into contracts or other arrangements or modifications thereof with accredited public or other nonprofit institutions of higher education for the establishment and conduct of summer or academic-year institutes, or both, for the training of teachers of the humanities and the arts;

(4) to support improved teaching at all levels of education by encouraging experiments in presentation and organization, including interdisciplinary studies and the development of new curricular materials;

(5) to make advance, progress, and other payments which relate to the establishment and conduct of such institutes and such experiments without regard to the provisions of section 3648 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 529);

(6) to acquire funds by gift, and to use such funds to carry out the purposes of this Act, and to hold and dispose of by sale, lease, or loan, real and personal property of all kinds necessary for, or resulting from, the exercise of authority granted by this Act;

(7) to receive funds donated, bequeathed or devised by others, if such funds are donated, bequeathed or devised without restriction other than that they be used in furtherance of one or more of the general purposes of the Foundation; and to use such funds to carry out the purposes of this Act;

(8) to publish or arrange for the publication of scholarly information in the humanities and arts without regard to the provisions of section 87 of the Act of January 12, 1895 (28 Stat. 622), and section 11 of the Act of March 1, 1919 (40 Stat. 1270; 44 U.S.C. 111);

(9) to accept and utilize the services of voluntary and uncompensated personnel and to provide transportation and subsistence as authorized by section 5 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b–2), for persons serving without compensation; and

(10) to prescribe, with the approval of the Comptroller General of the United States, the extent to which vouchers for funds expended under contracts for institutes in the humanities and the arts, as provided in subsection (3) of this section, shall be subject to itemization or substantiation prior to payment, without regard to the limitation of other laws relating to the expenditure of public funds and accounting therefor.

MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 13. (a) The Director shall, in accordance with such policies as the Board shall from time to time prescribe, appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act. Such appointments shall be made and such compensation shall be fixed in accordance with the provisions of the civil service laws and regulations and the Classification Act of 1949; except that the Director may, in accordance with such policies as the Board shall from time to time prescribe, employ such technical and professional personnel and fix their compensation, without regard to such laws, as he may deem necessary for the discharge of the responsibilities of the Foundation under this Act. The Deputy Director hereinafter provided for, and the members of the divisional committees, shall be appointed without regard to the civil service laws or regulations. Neither the Director nor the Deputy Director shall engage in any other business, vocation, or employment than that of serving as such Director or Deputy Director, as the case may be; nor shall the Director or Deputy Director, except with the approval of the Board, hold any office in, or act in any capacity for, any organization, agency, or institution with which the Foundation makes any contract or other arrangement under this Act.

(b) The Director may appoint, with the approval of the Board a Deputy Director who shall perform such functions as the Director, with the approval of the Board, may prescribe and shall be the Acting Director during the absence or disability of the Director or in the event of a vacancy in the Office of the Director. The Deputy Director shall receive compensation at the same rate as provided for the Deputy Director of the National Science Foundation.

(c) The members of the Board and the members of the divisional committees shall receive compensation at the rate of $75 for each day engaged in the business of the Foundation and shall be allowed travel expenses as authorized by section 5 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b–2).

(d) Persons holding other offices in the executive branch of the Federal Government may serve as members of the divisional committees, but they shall not receive remuneration for their services as such members during any period for which they receive compensation for their services in such other offices.

(e) Funds available to any department or agency of the United States for the development of the humanities or the arts, or the provisions of facilities therefor, shall be available for transfer, with the approval of the head of the department or agency involved, in whole or in part, to the Foundation for such use as is consistent with the purposes for which such funds were provided, and funds so transferred shall be expendable by the Foundation for the purposes for which the transfer was made, and, until such time as an appropriation is made available directly to the Foundation, for general administrative expenses of the Foundation without regard to limitations otherwise applicable to such funds.

(f) All artists employed by persons, organizations or institutions to present public performances which are wholly or in part federally assisted under this Act shall be paid, without subsequent reduction or rebate on any account, not less than the minimum wages as determined by the Secretary of Labor to be the prevailing minimum wages for persons professionally employed in similar activities in the Nation. Furthermore, no part of such artistic performances shall take place nor will any preparations for such performances be engaged in under conditions which are unsanitary or hazardous or dangerous to the health and safety of employees engaged in such activities. Compliance with the safety and sanitary laws of the State in which the performance or part thereof is to take place shall be prima facie evidence of compliance. The Secretary of Labor shall have, with respect to establishing such conditions, the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan No. 14 of 1950 (64 Stat. 1267; 5 U.S.C. 133z–15). Notwithstanding the first sentence of this section relating to minimum wages, this section shall not apply with respect to minimum wages when the beneficiary of Federal assistance under this Act is a bona fide educational institution and the audiences for public performances organized under the auspices of such an institution are comprised solely of faculty members or others employed by the institution and students enrolled in a regular course of study at the institution.

UTILIZATION OF FOREIGN CURRENCY

SEC. 14. Section 104 of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1704) is amended by inserting immediately after paragraph(s) the following new paragraph:

"(u) For financing under the direction of the National Humanities Foundation, in such amounts as may be specified from time to time in appropriation acts, programs outside the United States designed to foster the interchange of information in the humanities and the arts between the United States and other countries, including but not limited to the financing of archaeological expeditions through grants, loans, or other forms of assistance;".

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 15. To enable the Foundation to carry out its powers and duties, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Foundation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, the sum of $10,000,000; for fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, the sum of $20,000,000; and for each succeeding fiscal year such sums as the Congress may determine.

TO AMEND SECTION 331 OF THE ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT OF 1964

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I send to the desk for introduction at this time for myself, Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. TYDINGS, and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, a bill to amend section 331 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 in order to continue the indemnity payments to farmers whose milk has been contaminated by the use of Government-approved pesticides.

The legislation which I introduced last year, and which was enacted, has enabled dairy farmers to apply for $500,000 to cover their losses thus far. To date, Maryland dairy farmers have applied for relief payments totaling $100,000.

The authorization for such payments will expire on January 31 this year. I propose to extend this authorization to June 30, 1967.

There is an even greater need for this law this year than there was during the past year. The full effects of the use of certain pesticides, which were approved by the Federal Government when they were used, are only beginning to be felt by dairy farmers not only in Maryland, but in other States across the Nation.

An appropriation of $8.8 million has already been made to carry out the original indemnity program. These funds will remain available until June 30, 1965, to carry out the provisions of the program should it be extended as I propose.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 324) to amend section 331 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 in order to continue the indemnity payment program for dairy farmers, introduced by Mr. BREWSTER (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

NEW HAVEN RAILROAD CRISIS

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, for more than 8 years the State of Connecticut—under my administration as Governor and under my able successor, Gov. John Dempsey—has strained and labored to save the New Haven and its indispensable commuter service.

We forgave the New Haven its taxes. We established a Connecticut Transportation Authority, with authority to operate or contract to operate the essential New Haven Service. We authorized the appropriation from revenues and bonds of $3 million in State funds to assure the life of the New Haven. Since 1961, we have extended annually $500,000 in direct State aid for grade crossing and bridge maintenance. These programs of tax relief and direct State assistance were both begun in my administration as Governor. Last year we entered into a contract to pay $450,000 for Connecticut's share of the first year's payment of the cost necessary to allow the New Haven to rehabilitate 50 of its ancient commuter cars and acquire 80 new cars from the Port of New York Authority.

At every turn, as the New Haven's difficulties grew, the State of Connecticut stood ready to help and did its share. But Connecticut is not the only State involved.

It is obvious that the New Haven's commuter service is not a one-State proposition. It is as essential to the economic health of New York's Westchester County and the State of New York as it is to Connecticut. The Connecticut residents who commute to New York add to New York's economy as well as Connecticut's.

Let us be realists. In addition to Connecticut, New York and other States served by the New Haven have a responsibility to help save commuter service. There is a part for all the States to play.

Mr. President, I support the regional approach to the New Haven's problems. I support Senator PELL's proposal for a four-State public agency to operate commuter service. I believe there is no question that—in the long run—a public authority must be given the responsibility to assure continued commuter operations. But what of the short run? What about next month? The public authority proposed is an essential step, but it will take years to complete.

Mr. President, I am concerned about the immediate future. I am concerned about commuter service not only in 1967, but in March 1965.

I am introducing a bill, for appropriate reference, to establish an emergency fund to preserve needed passenger and commuter railroad service throughout the Nation, especially in congested urban areas like the New York-Connecticut area. This is not a proposal for 1970, it is a proposal for now. This is not a proposal to solve all the problems of the Nation's passenger car service, but it is a measure that is vitally needed now to meet emergency situations as they arise in urban areas. Unless we provide this type of aid some areas may lose vitally needed commuter service.

Mine is a simple bill to provide immediate relief to hard-pressed passenger service lines. First, under a formula provided in the bill, funds will be made available for the continued operation of passenger service. Such Federal assistance would not exceed whatever financial aid is available from the States, including tax forgiveness.

Second, Federal assistance will be available to aid the railroads in the acquisition and modernization of passenger equipment to assure efficient, clean, safe service. This provision will assure the continued operation of a vital public service which is so necessary in this modern age.

The bill authorizes $100 million for the program. It is essential that legislation of this kind is enacted without delay. I shall do all in my power to see that this is accomplished.

As an immediate first step, I have asked the Housing and Home Finance Agency to accept and give serious consideration to an application from the Connecticut Transportation Authority to develop and implement a program to demonstrate the applicability of the Mass Transportation Act to a crisis of this kind, and in that way help pave the way for a permanent solution to the problem.

I have been assured by Mr. Perrie Phillips, Governor Dempsey's representative, that the Connecticut Transportation Authority will submit an application of this kind.

The **PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 325) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, to authorize the Interstate Commerce Commission to assist common carriers of passengers by railroad in preserving and improving essential passenger train services and facilities, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. RIBICOFF, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

A BILL TO ALLOW FEDERAL EMPLOYEES CREDIT FOR UNUSED SICK LEAVE

Mr. **YARBOROUGH**. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to give Federal employees an incentive for accumulating unused sick leave. This is the same bill as S. 1661, which I introduced in the 88th Congress.

At present, Federal employees are allowed 13 days a year of sick leave, which they may accumulate indefinitely against the day when some catastrophic illness may overtake them. Thus, many employees who enjoy good health arrive at the time when they are to retire or leave the Government service with a large amount of accumulated sick leave.

A survey by the Civil Service Commission has shown that employees in their final year of Government service use three times as much sick leave as other Federal employees. I doubt that this indicates a possible misuse of this leave by employees, but shows a defect in the system which allows the accumulation of large quantities of sick leave without recompense or recognition for the employee. All but a few Federal employees who retire or leave service do so with accumulated sick leave to their credit. I doubt that abuses are widespread, but we must recognize that any day of sick leave taken when not justified is a loss to the Government of that employee's pay for that day. Why should we not save money by taking positive steps to encourage employees not to use sick leave in marginal cases of need?

The bill I introduce today would provide this incentive by allowing Federal employees to credit unused sick leave in their retirement annuity computations, or alternatively to be paid at half pay for the unused leave. These formulas, I think, are indications of the route we should follow in working out an equitable equivalent for unused sick leave. It may be that some other fraction or equivalent may prove to be more desirable after close study.

I think the merit of this approach is self-evident. Many who are in a position to observe the workings of our Federal employee laws and regulations say that the enactment of this bill would save money for the Government, since it is usually necessary to replace those absent on sick leave. The experienced man being more efficient than a substitute, further costs necessary in the use of temporary employees could be avoided. There would be a reduction in the use of sick leave.

This proposal in no way derogates or downgrades sick leave for those who need it. Substantial parity is still preserved for those not fortunate enough to enjoy perfect health through other Government policies such as the Federal employees health insurance program.

This bill is a needed step toward efficient and equitable management of our Government's employees. I hope it will be possible to study the subject thoroughly, perfect the proposal, and enact it in this Congress.

The **PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 326) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, to provide that accumulated sick leave be credited to the retirement fund or that the individual be reimbursed, introduced by Mr. YARBOROUGH, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

THE NEW YORK-NEW ENGLAND RAILROAD CRISIS

Mr. **PELL**. Mr. President, I am leaving at the desk, for additional cosponsors, a bill designed to resolve the deepening crisis in railroad service in the New York-New England area.

On a number of occasions in the past, I have addressed the Senate on my general interest in the development of high-speed intercity passenger service in our crowded Northeastern States. Earlier this week, I reintroduced my original bill to permit an eight State public authority to operate such service, and I remain vitally interested in this concept, especially now that President Johnson has incorporated it into his design for the Great Society.

The bill is not directly or immediately related to the high-speed project—except that some of its approach and thinking stems from my work on the high-speed intercity concept. I might also say that there may not be anything left to modernize in the New York-New England area unless we act swiftly to preserve rail facilities there for future development. Indeed, the rail situation in southern New England and Metropolitan New York is so bad that we will welcome the preservation of service at any speed—gladly deferring for the moment visions of high-speed operations while we concentrate on sheer survival measures.

Our problem is concentrated in the operations of the New York, New Haven, and Hartford Railroad, which serves Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, and New York and provides essential commutation services into New York City for thousands of residents of New York State and Connecticut. The railroad has been bankrupt since July 1961, and its reorganization has been frustrated by a chronic and overwhelming financial crisis. It operated at a deficit of $12,264,275 in 1963, and the trustees in their report to the U.S. District Court in New Haven last March reported that—

> The New Haven's operating revenues continued to decline in 1963, posing a critical challenge to the road's survival and practically nullifying the effects of drastic measures taken to cut operating expenses.

The crux of the New Haven's problem clearly is the fact that so much of its business is in high-cost passenger service. Of a net railway operating deficit of $10,090,136 in 1963, $8,587,416 was attributed to passenger service. Only last week on December 31, the trustees indicated that they may have to petition for discontinuance of their passenger operations unless public assistance is forthcoming soon.

Clearly, discontinuance is an unacceptable alternative both from the point of view of the metropolitan commuter States as well as my own State, which is served by no other railroad.

Conversely, it is clear that continuation of the passenger service under some sort of public management, separate from the overall operation of the railroad, would remove the largest share of the deficit from the books and facilitate ultimate reorganization of the line. The threat of ultimate liquidation and termination of all service—both freight and passenger—thus would be removed and our whole region would benefit from the assurance of continued operations.

My own considerable involvement in the problems of rail development over the past 3 years has convinced me that the elements of a solution are at hand if only they could be properly organized.

The bill is, in fact, a detailed variation of the bills I have introduced in three successive Congresses to provide a framework for financing high-speed rail passenger service. In these previous bills, I have suggested the use of the interstate compact-public authority mechanism to promote modernization and long-range development; now I propose the same mechanism to preserve essential service in danger of extinction, and, in the final analysis, to save a railroad.

This bill would authorize the States of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, and New York to form a public authority for the operation of rail passenger service in their territory. Unlike my other compact bill, this measure contains the actual text of the proposed compact and spells out the structure and organization of the authority. While it may seem to be a somewhat unusual departure to suggest the terms of an interstate agreement in such detail in a congressional bill, I believe in this instance it is necessary to establish clear philosophical guidelines and to spell out the terms on which the interests of different levels of government might be reconciled.

This bill suggests quite explicitly, for example, a formula by which the four States and the Federal Government could guarantee the financial solvency of the authority's operations. It would divide the burden by assigning to the Federal Government responsibility for guaranteeing the capital of the authority while assigning to the States responsibility for guaranteeing the operating costs. The States, for their part, would be bound to underwrite the annual operating deficits of the authority in proportion to the number of passenger miles traveled in each State per year. If, in time, the authority should make money, it would be directed to reimburse the States in the same ratio. Similarly, the authority would be free of State taxation until such time as its revenues exceed operating expenses.

The Federal Government, for its share, would be bound to guarantee the bonded indebtedness of the authority up to $500 million. This, I believe, would be a proper and necessary degree of involvement for the Federal Government. It would stop short of Federal subsidy. And the Federal Government, which already has extended loans or covered guarantees totaling $35 million on behalf of the New Haven, would be protected from further default by the States guarantee of the operating budget. The Federal guarantee, moreover, would be of immense help to the authority in raising capital on liberal terms with which to make badly needed replacement of passenger equipment. It would be most difficult to obtain such a guarantee from the States, because three of the four States involved have constitutional restrictions against pledging their credit.

The bill leaves unspecified, and thus to the discretion of the authority, the question of whether the authority would purchase all of the New Haven's existing passenger service property or whether it would operate wholly or partially on a rental basis.

I wish to emphasize that I do not present this bill as a perfect remedy. The financial formula which I suggest, for example, certainly could be adjusted to accommodate State interests. It might even be amended to vest the authority with its own taxing power, if the States so desire. But I believe the bill suggests a framework for cooperative action, with a proper division of responsibility, and I hope, therefore, it can be a useful basis for immediate negotiation by all concerned.

Finally, I recognize that the compact procedure is cumbersome at best and that even with the most urgent action by Congress and the States, it would be several months before my proposal could be brought to reality. I recognize that interim, stopgap measures probably may have to be taken, and am ready to support any reasonable steps to meet an emergency.

However, I would emphasize that immediate, stopgap assistance is meaningless without a concerted effort to resolve the New Haven's problems on a permanent basis. It is in this spirit that I offer my bill today and express the hope that it may receive early consideration. Mr. President, I send the bill to the desk for appropriate reference.

I ask that this bill remain for cosponsors.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REVISED LIST OF COSPONSORS OF S. 111, TO ESTABLISH A NATIONAL HUMANITIES FOUNDATION

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, we all have the highest admiration for the splendid work performed by the Official Reporters of Debates and the Government Printing Office in reporting so accurately the happenings on the floor of the Senate.

However, in the press of affairs yesterday, a number of cosponsors of my bill, S. 111, to establish a National Humanities Foundation, were omitted.

Those cosponsoring the bill should have been listed as follows:

Senators Anderson, Bass, Bayh, Burdick, Clark, Dodd, Douglas, Fong, Gore, Hart, Hartke, Inouye, McGee, McGovern, Metcalf, Miller, Montoya, Morse, Moss, Muskie, Nelson, Neuberger, Pastore, Randolph, Ribicoff, Tydings, Williams of New Jersey, Yarborough, and Young of Ohio.

Also a number of addresses made by Members of the Senate were omitted. I have been assured that they will appear in today's Record.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF JOHN A. CARVER, JR., TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I would like to announce that the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has scheduled a hearing on the nomination of John A. Carver, Jr., to be Under Secretary of the Interior. The hearing will be held on January 12, beginning at 10 a.m. in our committee hearing room 3110 in the New Senate Office Building.

This notice is given so that any Member of the Senate or the public at large will have an opportunity to present any statement or make their views known to the committee at the time of our hearing. Mr. Carver will be present to testify at our meeting.

For the information of the Senate I ask unanimous consent to include a biographical sketch of Mr. Carver at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the biographical sketch was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Biographical Sketch of John A. Carver, Jr., Assistant Secretary for Public Land Management, Department of the Interior

John A. Carver, Jr., of Boise, Idaho, Assistant Secretary of the Interior since January 30, 1961, in that capacity has supervised the activities of the Bureau of Land Management, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the National Park Service, the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, the Office of Territories, and the Alaska Railroad.

He was administrative assistant to Senator Frank Church, of Idaho, from January 1957 until appointed Assistant Secretary. In 1947–48 he served as assistant attorney general of Idaho, and from 1948 to 1957 he was in private law practice in Boise. He also has had considerable experience as a career Federal civil service personnel executive from 1940 to 1947, with the National Roster of Scientific and Specialized Personnel and the Civilian Personnel Division, Office of the Secretary of War, where he directed field activities successively in Ogden, Utah, Baltimore, Md., and New York City.

Mr. Carver was born in Preston, Idaho, April 24, 1918. He has an A.B. degree from Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah (1939) and an LL.B. degree from Georgetown University, Washington, D.C. (1947).

Inducted into the military in May 1943, he was later commissioned in the U.S. Air Force, and served as a civilian personnel officer of the U.S. Strategic Bombing Survey in England and Japan.

Mr. Carver is a member of the bar in Idaho and the District of Columbia; is a member of the American Bar and Federal Bar Associations. He is a member of the National Advisory Committee, Center for Advanced Study in Organization Science, University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee.

Mr. Carver married Ruth O'Connor of Seattle, Wash., in June 1942. They have three children: John A., III, 19, student at the University of Wisconsin; Craig Roger, 16; and Candace Elaine, 13. The family lives at 6605 16th Street North, Arlington, Va.

CORRECTION OF TIME FOR HOLDING BILL (S. 109) AT THE DESK

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, yesterday I introduced a bill to be numbered S. 109 and asked that it be held over for a couple of days. I now ask that the bill be sent to the Printing Office for printing today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NAZI WAR CRIMINALS AND THE GERMAN STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senate to a situation in Germany which is a matter of concern to many persons.

The German Bundestag is considering whether to extend the statute of limitations, as it affects Nazi war criminals charged with genocide or murder, but so far not apprehended, for either an indeterminate period or for a period of 20 years from May 8, 1965, when according to German law it would expire. The Bundestag has now asked for a report from the German Government as to what it has done either to institute prosecutions or to start investigations approved by a judge, which under German law toll the statute of limitations; that is, put a stop to its operation and make the 20-year period start running again. This type of procedure for tolling a statute of limitations on a criminal prosecution is unknown to us in Anglo-American law, but it is the case under the German code.

Many organizations and individuals in the United States and in the world are deeply offended by the idea that any Nazi criminal who may ultimately be discovered could come out of hiding and go scot free although he is a murderer, and, in effect, thumb his nose at the whole world, because the statute of limitations has run against a prosecution of him.

What I have said is not a theory. It is believed that the East German Government has within its possession names and dossiers of many such criminals, and would like nothing better than to show to the whole world how ridiculous is this form of justice, under which criminals would go unpunished because there was not the foresight to extend the statute of limitations.

I call that point to the attention of the Senate because I believe we are all interested. Although it is the internal problem of a foreign government, it is also a world problem, as shown by the Nuremburg trials and by the pendency of the Genocide Convention.

Mr. President, the German Government has done a great deal in terms of these prosecutions. Certainly, since 1954 it has initiated many investigations which will toll the statute of limitations. I make no complaints against the German Government in that respect whatsoever.

I point out only that the world should be alert to what is at stake, and as Germany pays great attention to what the world thinks on this subject, I hope that there will be a world expression of feeling which will induce the German Bundestag, as it well can do legally, to see that the statute of limitations does not operate to free any Nazi criminal from prosecution, even if his name is not known and he has not yet been discovered. Not one of these criminals should have the mental comfort of knowing that he cannot be prosecuted because the statute of limitations has run against his crime.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from an extraordinary article by the German Ambassador to the United States written in Aufbau, a German-language newspaper in New York, explaining the situation, together with a letter from the State Department.

There being no objection, the excerpts and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROSECUTION OF NAZI MASS MURDER MUST NOT AND WILL NOT END NEXT MAY

During the past weeks, we have received a great number of petitions, letters, and telegrams from well-meaning and truly concerned persons and groups, particularly from Jewish circles and organizations in the United States. It pained us to see that most of them, but also many newspaper articles on this subject, were based on assumptions about the effects of this statute which are not in keeping with the facts, but profoundly mistaken. There seems to be a widespread impression that in Germany after May 8, 1965, all Nazi criminals not legally adjudicated by that time would go scot-free; that hundreds or even thousands (one publication spoke of 10,000) of Nazi criminals who had tortured and murdered human beings could promenade freely in Germany's streets and jeer at all legal authorities: "You can't do a thing against us, our deeds are subject to the statute of limitations." All one can say with regard to this notion is that it is false.

Regrettably, we have also often been confronted with another, no less erroneous notion, namely: that the German courts did practically nothing to clean up the German house "except for a few show trials designed to throw dust in the eyes of the world"—as someone said to me in a recent conversation. This notion, too, is false.

As I know from my own activity in the denazification process, German courts during the early postwar years were not able—or only to a very limited degree—to try Nazi criminals, because the Allies reserved these cases almost entirely for themselves. Only with the establishment of the Federal Republic and the conclusion of the Bonn Conventions of 1954 was German judicature able to take on fully the prosecution of Nazi criminals. This was particularly difficult in the beginning as the most important documents were still in Allied hands, and because it was especially difficult, during those first turbulent years, to reach surviving witnesses who were essential for such trials.

Still, German judicature pronounced the high number of 5,445 legal verdicts between May 8, 1945, and January 1964 with 12 death sentences among them (that could not however be carried out because the 1949 Constitution abolished the death penalty). I therefore believe that the charge that German judicature did nothing to clean up the German scene, can really not be maintained.

THOUSANDS INVESTIGATED BY LUDWIGSBURG OFFICE

Did these convictions in East and West, by Allied military tribunals and German courts, bring all or nearly all Nazi criminals to justice? This question may well be answered negatively, even though everyone must admit that a great deal of justice was done in this fashion. In the course of a trial in Ulm in 1958, it emerged that many of the crimes committed in the concentration camps and by the "Special Groups" had not yet been prosecuted or adjudicated.

The German judiciary therefore established a center in the town of Ludwigsburg, exclusively charged with examining and uncovering crimes committed in concentration camps and so-called special actions outside the Federal Republic. With German thoroughness, this center during the past 6 years reconstructed, on paper, all those places of horror where human beings were tortured and killed, and also the organizations set up to commit such mass murder; and it attempted to find the names of all those involved in these crimes, so that subsequently the regular courts could prosecute.

So far, the Ludwigsburg center has pieced together no fewer than 540 such complexes (of which, incidentally, the Auschwitz trial now taking place in Frankfurt is one). All these complexes encompass one or more participants who are known by name, and a criminal dossier was prepared in the case of every one of them. Involved in these 540 complexes, are certainly several thousand suspects with whom the German courts will have to deal in the years to come.

LIMITATIONS PROVISION IN GERMAN CRIMINAL CODE

With this I return to the frequently so thoroughly misunderstood effects of the statute of limitations. German law provides—this is generally not known—that every statutory limitation can be interrupted by a simple action on the part of a judge: the statutory period then begins anew. What does that mean in practice? If the Ludwigsburg center forwards the dossier of a suspect to a regular court, and the judge merely makes a notation in the papers, such as: "The investigation is to be continued. Mueller, District Judge"; the statutory limit is automatically set aside and the case runs for another 20 years. Therefore the statutory limitation is interrupted as regards those under suspicion by the Ludwigsburg center, regardless of whether it is known they are still alive, where they live, or whether they live somewhere under an assumed name, and the statute of limitations will not apply to them as of next May, but only 20 years after its interruption. Thus, this large number of persons will be excluded from the statute, so that justice can proceed unhampered in their cases.

GERMANY CALLS UPON WORLD FOR EVIDENCE

Finally, the German Federal Republic went to extra lengths on November 20, 1964, when it launched an appeal to the entire world asking everyone—individuals, organizations, or governments—to make available to the Ludwigsburg center (Zentralstelle der Landesjustizverwaltung zur Aufklaerung nationalsozialistischer Gewalttaten, Ludwigsburg, Schorndorfer Strasse 28) any documents, photostats, microfilms, or other information containing names of Nazi criminals so far not known to legal authorities of the Federal Republic. There are still 4 months to go before the statute takes effect, unless the statute is previously stayed by juridical action. This is further guarantee that no one will escape justice.

CAN A FEW STILL ESCAPE JUSTICE?

In spite of all this, the theoretical possibility still remains, that one or the other of the culprits, if he was never named in any context nor pointed out by an accusing witness, might, under the shelter of the statute, dare to show himself again. Theoretically, I say; for in practice such a case is very improbable after all the lists of names of the concentration camp guards and the special groups have been combed, and so many convictions obtained.

But it must be admitted that, theoretically, the possibility remains and therefore—in my personal opinion—this possibility should also be blocked. It is not impossible, for example, that the authorities in the Soviet-occupied zone of Germany have some such cases in their files, in order to bring them out only after May 8, 1965. They most certainly would not do that to help justice triumph, but to capitalize on it politically to the detriment of the Federal Republic. Should the zonal authorities fail—now, after the appeal by the Federal Republic—to release such information, they would thereby protect Nazi criminals.

GERMANS CONTINUE STUDY ON EXTENSION OF LIMIT

What can be done to prevent abuse of the statute in the few theoretically possible cases—if there should be such cases at all? It is surely understandable that people in Germany are reluctant to change the constitution because of these few possible cases, a change which in the opinion of some jurists would be necessary in order to extend the time limits of the statute. Other jurists, however, are of the opinion that no constitutional change would be required, but merely a normal legislative act. In any event, the debate over the closing of this last small gap is not yet ended. A few days ago the German Parliament charged the Federal Government with the task of presenting a full report before March 1, 1965, on the extent to which National-Socialist crimes of violence have been solved, prosecuted, and punished. Parliament will then draw its conclusions from that report and take measures to close the last gap through which a Nazi criminal might slip. For as I said in the beginning, it is the firm intention of Germany's political leadership to prevent this and to assure that particularly in cases of National-Socialist acts of violence justice will take its course unhampered.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, December 21, 1964.

Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR JAVITS: I refer to your letter to the Secretary dated December 9, 1964, concerning the prospects for continued prosecution of Nazi war criminals in the Federal Republic of Germany.

As I am sure you have noted in the press, the West German Bundestag, on December 9, passed a joint resolution by an overwhelming vote calling for further action on the matter. The resolution calls on the Federal Republic Government to report to the Bundestag on March 1, 1965, whether in all identifiable cases the statute has been interrupted by appropriate judicial action and further to report whether the government is prepared, if necessary, to discuss with the Bundestag the question of extending the statute. A pertinent clipping from the Washington Post of December 10 is enclosed.

The German Federal Government is acutely aware of the deep moral debt of Germany to its past, and it has made a conscientious effort to find, try, and convict Nazi criminals. Even though the statute of limitations is now scheduled to run its course in 1965, prosecution of Nazi criminals will not cease. Many cases which are now being prepared for trial will be heard over the next 4 or 5 years. The Federal Government has also initiated extensive investigations of all other known Nazi war criminals. By doing so, it has automatically invoked a 20-year extension of the time in which these criminals may be tried. In addition, it has issued a public worldwide plea for any other information which may be available so that any criminals not now known can also be included in this 20-year extension. As of possible interest, I am enclosing a copy of a recent study prepared by the American Embassy at Bonn on the problem of the war crimes trials and the statute of limitations.

Since sovereignty was returned to the German Government in May 1955, we have on a number of occasions made known to the Federal Republic our strong belief that these trials should be pursued. Now the German Bundestag has formally initiated the process of reconsideration of the statute of limitations problem. In these circumstances it seems unnecessary and undesirable to interfere with the German Government's effort to work its own way through to a solution satisfactory in both legal and policy terms.

If the Department of State can be of any further service to you, please do not hesitate to let us know.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT E. LEE,
Acting Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO RULE XXII

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution and ask for its appropriate reference. It is the resolution that I have submitted in years gone by, and seeks to establish a modification of rule XXII that will provide for a majority vote for the ending of debate after the cloture period of time has passed.

I call particular attention to the following paragraph, which illustrates the major difference between my bill and that of others:

> Thereafter no Senator shall be entitled to speak in all more than 1 hour on the measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, the amendments thereto, and motions affecting the same; except that any Senator may yield to any other Senator all or any part or the aggregate period of time which he is entitled to speak; and the Senator to whom he so yields may speak for the time so yielded in addition to any period of time which he is entitled to speak in his own right. It shall be the duty of the Presiding Officer to keep the time of each Senator who speaks. No dilatory motion, dilatory amendment, amendment not germane, or motion to table any germane amendment offered to the said measure, motion, matter, or business shall be in order. Points of order, including questions of relevancy, and appeals from the decision of the Presiding Officer, shall be decided without debate.

Mr. President, in my judgment, the measure could theoretically provide for 10 days of debate after the filing of a cloture motion on a 10-hour day basis. That is adequate time for debate on any issue after cloture. It would protect the minority, but it would also permit the people of the country the right to have the majority in the Congress speak and legislatively act for them.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. As I listened to the Senator, I gathered that if 10 Senators were willing to yield their hour to the Senator from Oregon or the Senator from Illinois, that Senator would then have 10 hours in which to discuss the subject.

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Of course, that would defeat the very purpose and spirit of the cloture rule.

Mr. MORSE. Not at all. The purpose is to fix a time certain at which to vote. That is all we need to do in order to break a filibuster in the Senate. The Senator knows that as well as I do. After 100 hours maximum of debate the Senate would vote under the provisions of my resolution. Debates would not last more than 20 to 30 hours on the average because once it is known that a vote will take place for a certainty at a time certain little is to be gained by continuing a filibuster for the full 100 hours that would be possible under my resolution. At the same time my resolution prevents denying to the minority adequate time for debate in order to present their case on its merits.

That is the important thing that my resolution provides.

Mr. DIRKSEN. There would be an interim in which a Senator would have to listen to 10 or 12 hours of debate.

Mr. MORSE. He could go to lunch or go to sleep or work in his office if he were not interested in the debate. That happens every day in the Senate.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That would be all right. One would wonder what freedom is left in this country to go down and sit at the festive board; but I do not know that that would be a good way to discharge legislative duties.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Illinois and a good many other Senators are off the floor of the Senate most of the time anyway when what we would call prolonged debate is occurring in the Senate. I have not seen my delightful, wonderful friend from Illinois on the floor of the Senate many hours during filibusters. There is no reason why he should be. I have not been here, either.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am willing to bet $100 out of my pocket right now, and lay the money on the clerk's desk, that the Senator from Illinois has to lunch oftener from his desk in order to keep up with the workload than does any other Senator.

Mr. MORSE. I am not arguing with the Senator from Illinois as to where he eats lunch; I merely say he is away for lunch or attending to Senate business off the floor of the Senate much of the time when a filibuster is going on in the Senate and so am I and most other Senators. There is nothing wrong about that.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes. He is there because there is a workload that has to be disposed of. He tries to dispose of it not only here but there. But the bet still stands.

Mr. MORSE. I shall be glad to have lunch, at the Senator's invitation, in his office any day. Nothing would be more pleasant.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I make the point of order that the rules do not provide for wagering at the desk. [Laughter.]

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 16) to amend rule XXII relative to cloture, submitted by Mr. MORSE, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

> *Resolved,* That subsection 2 of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, relating to cloture, is hereby amended to read as follows:
>
> "Notwithstanding the provisions of rule III or VI or any other rule of the Senate, if at any time at which any measure, motion, or other matter, or the unfinished business, has been pending before the Senate for not less than seven calendar days, a motion, signed by sixteen Senators, to bring to a close the debate upon that measure, motion, matter, or business, is presented to the Senate, the Presiding Officer shall at once state the motion to the Senate, and one hour after the Senate meets on the following calendar day but one, he shall lay the motion before the Senate and direct that the Secretary call the roll, and, upon the ascertainment that a quorum is present, the Presiding Officer shall,

without debate, submit to the Senate by a yea-and-nay vote the question:

"'Is it the sense of the Senate that the debate shall be brought to a close?'

"And if that question shall be decided in the affirmative by a majority of those voting, then said measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, shall be the unfinished business to the exclusion of all other business until disposed of.

"Thereafter no Senator shall be entitled to speak in all more than one hour on the measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, the amendments thereto, and motions affecting the same; except that any Senator may yield to any other Senator all or any part or the aggregate period of time which he is entitled to speak; and the Senator to whom he so yields may speak for the time so yielded in addition to any period of time which he is entitled to speak in his own right. It shall be the duty of the Presiding Officer to keep the time of each Senator who speaks. No dilatory motion, dilatory amendment, amendment not germane, or motion to table any germane amendment offered to the said measure, motion, matter, or business shall be in order. Points of order, including questions of relevancy, and appeals from the decision of the Presiding Officer, shall be decided without debate."

SEC. 2. Subsection 3 of such rule is hereby repealed.

NEED FOR REFORM IN AMERICAN SYSTEM OF ELECTIONS

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, the Milwaukee Journal is known throughout the journalism world for its outstanding editorial page. To my knowledge, no newspaper of comparable size invests more talent, time, and space in original, thoughtful editorials on public affairs.

The Milwaukee Journal recently has done a particularly outstanding series of nine editorials on the need for reform in our American system of elections.

The editorials develop in detail the theme that America is trying to operate in the jet age with an election system born in the days of the horse and buggy.

They review our rather ridiculous system of presidential primaries, no two alike and none of them designed to serve the national interest; they discuss our national nominating conventions, which the Journal says are marked by "noise, gaudy display, boring speeches, extreme partisanship, frequent squabbling, and sometimes * * * deep bitterness." They discuss the conclusions of leaders in both parties that our election campaigns are simply too long. They document the obsolescence and the danger to democracy in our ancient electoral college system.

The Journal's analysis and its recommendations deserve the most thoughtful consideration by the Congress and by the American people. I ask unanimous consent that this series of editorials on election reform be reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Milwaukee (Wis.) Journal, Dec. 13, 1964]

HORSE AND BUGGY IN JET AGE—ELECTION REFORM VITAL—1

In a jet age, the United States operates with a presidential election system born in the days of the horse and buggy and snail-paced communications.

The campaign which the country has just endured proved anew that the process is too long, too costly, too exhausting for the candidates and, after the first few weeks, a terrible bore for the citizenry.

We endure presidential primary elections for almost 4 months, from early March. We are subjected to midsummer conventions which are too long, far too noisy and undignified, treat mainly with matters of little moment and almost make television viewers wish for the return of the most outdated soap opera.

Then, for 12 to 15 weeks or more, candidates literally drip from the skies—racing around the country in jet planes, landing repeatedly, invading our homes via television and radio for hour after hour. Attempts to deal with issues become so agonizingly repetitive that they sound like broken records. In desperation some candidates fall back on name calling, shrill charges, and appeals to prejudice.

And, once the election issue is over, the ancient machinery creaks on. The President isn't really elected until the electoral college meets in December. Once he is named by the electors, he doesn't take office for more than a month later—and when he is to replace an incumbent, a lameduck President and a new Congress must sit around Washington for almost 3 weeks waiting for him to arrive.

The jet plane and television, new tools of politics, have made the contrast between our modern times and our ancient methods all the more glaring and ridiculous. After each recent election there has been widespread agreement that something must be done about it all.

Unfortunately, the next election is always 4 years away, and after a month or so of rest and the celebration of holidays, most people forget the electoral horrors until it is too late to change in time for the next election. Change takes time. It requires changes in State and Federal law—even a constitutional amendment under some circumstances and proposals.

There is nothing sacred or immutable about our present election processes. Most were adopted to meet conditions which no longer exist. They can be modernized in ways that do no harm to the democratic process but bring real improvements.

It has been suggested by several experts that a high-level study commission be named to study and propose needed changes. Whatever is done must be started soon, or the next election and the same mad race will be upon us.

[From the Milwaukee (Wis.) Journal, Dec. 14, 1964]

THE UNHELPFUL PRIMARIES: ELECTION REFORM VITAL—2

The Nation's time of trial in selecting a President starts long before the election year. For reasons of tradition and tactics, candidates may refrain from announcing at least until the early months of election year. But long jousting, testing, polling and attempting to get public exposure precedes open campaigning.

In the case of the late President Kennedy the effort to win the 1960 nomination was launched at the 1956 Democratic Convention at which he sought the vice-presidential nomination. Followers of Senator Goldwater began work to make him the Republican candidate in 1964 even as the 1960 nominating convention ended. Right now, Republican hopefuls are assessing the 1968 possibilities.

The early struggle is behind the scenes, among professionals and party leaders. Candidates move into the open prior to State presidential primaries in the spring of election year. Increasingly, candidates seem to feel that participation in some presidential primaries is necessary. Kennedy effectively sewed up his party's nomination by winning primaries. Goldwater—save for his surprise win in the California primary—lost the primaries but won nomination. He won because his supporters took the more traditional road of fighting to control State party conventions and capture posts of local and State leadership. They were in position to name convention delegates. When leaders are preconvinced about a candidate's chances they don't need primaries to convince them.

Primaries are exhausting, expensive and seldom serve to crystallize issues. In 1964, primaries were held in 15 of the 50 States and the District of Columbia. Candidates ignored many of them. No two were alike or operated under the same rules.

Wisconsin will long remember the snowy, cold weeks of 1960 in which John Kennedy and HUBERT HUMPHREY crisscrossed the State doing little more than drinking coffee and shaking hands.

New Hampshire's primary this year was notable for the many hands shaken by Governor Rockefeller of New York and Goldwater and for the quantities of bean soup politicians gulped down. They campaigned for cold, dreary weeks. And when it was over, Henry Cabot Lodge, half a world away in South Vietnam, won every delegate. The weary losers went on to test other States and ended up pretty much in a draw.

In Wisconsin a favorite son slate left the Republican delegation out in the cold with no national leader to support and it barely got aboard the Goldwater bandwagon at the nominating convention.

Oregon has a primary with built-in drawbacks. The secretary of state may place on the ballot the name of anyone who he belives is a presidential possibility. A man so named must file an affidavit denying his candidacy to have his name removed. Thus, he is forced to commit himself in many cases long before he may wish to—either by leaving his name on the ballot or taking it off.

In sum, the primaries, which got started in Wisconsin, have served little purpose most of the time. Some experts have proposed a national advisory primary—one held in every State on the same day to get an expression of the preference of the voters. This would have the advantage of getting primaries out of the way all at once. But it would probably result in an arduous nationwide campaign rivaling the final election campaign. It might tend to bring selection of candidates on the basis of personality rather than experience or ability. The leadership consensus that is so important—and largely so successful—in choosing the best men to lead the parties would be relegated to a secondary role.

Primaries have always fascinated students of politics. But as operated now they add to the physical and financial burdens of candidates and help spread election year politics over an unconscionably long period. We might better do without them.

[From the Milwaukee (Wis.) Journal, Dec. 15, 1964]

CONVENTIONS ARE TOO LONG: ELECTION REFORM VITAL—3

Our major political parties formally select presidential and vice-presidential candidates at national conventions—political gatherings which H. L. Mencken found to be "as fascinating as a revival or a hanging."

These affairs are the culmination of months of planning, political infighting, and party turmoil. It is a climax marked by noise, gaudy display, boring speeches, extreme partisanship, frequent squabbling, and sometimes, as in the case of 1964 Republican convention, deep bitterness.

Yet conventions have had moments of historic importance and supreme excitement.

They are often at once preposterous and thrilling, and there is agreement every 4 years that something ought to be done about them.

It is generally agreed that conventions are too long and too costly. The television costs at conventions have risen to such heights that even that free spending industry complains. The cost to candidates is heavy as they put on parties, hold open houses, pay for "spontaneous" demonstrations, and woo delegates in various and often expensive ways. The cost to delegates grows as well and for some is a serious matter. All of this, plus increasing complaints of lack of dignity in choosing a President who leads the free world, brings the convention system under criticism.

Yet the convention has a purpose. Our two-party system needs mechanisms to hold it together and keep it working. The national convention is one important mechanism. It may be unwieldy, subject to manipulation and pressure, and a creature of compromise—but it is in an effective decisionmaker. It brings together party stalwarts—and careful surveys have shown that delegates as a whole stand high in their communities in leadership positions.

The convention has four main jobs. It picks the candidates. It adopts the platform of party principles upon which the candidates presumably but not necessarily will run. It endorses a continuing body to govern the party for the next 4 years. And it serves as a pep meeting and rally. It is in this last function that it brings the most criticism.

Obviously the major task of nominating candidates is not an overly time-consuming matter at modern conventions. Since the incredible Democratic convention in 1924 which took 103 ballots to nominate, neither of our parties has required more than 6 ballots. This is merely an evening's work.

The platform can be handled quickly, too, if the parties want to do it quickly. Much of the work is done before the convention convenes and more could be. The draft could be all wrapped up before the opening gavel. Conventions seldom make major changes in proposed platforms—indeed, delegates are sometimes so little interested that they don't even read them. In 1956 the Republicans printed their platform in the firm conviction that it would be quickly adopted, as it was, and no delegate read it or had it read to him before voting.

Thus the real business of conventions could be consummated quickly. Why isn't it? Some reasons will be discussed tomorrow.

[From the Milwaukee (Wis.) Journal, Dec. 16, 1964]

Two Days for Convention: Election Reform Vital—4

The major reason our national political conventions are too long is money. Cities bid big sums to get conventions. Their businessmen have to raise the funds. They, in turn, insist that delegates stay around long enough to spend enough to make the city's expenditure worthwhile for the businessmen.

Hotels demand 4- or 5-day stays—payable in advance in most cases. Restaurants and nightclubs and stores and other establishments want assurance that they will get their shares of what delegates spend.

Thus conventioners have a lot of time on their hands and fill it in various noisy, sometimes colorful, often boring ways. There are pretty prancing girls in bright dresses and campaign buttons, baby elephants and donkeys, bands, parades, endless demonstrations (sometimes by paid outsiders), Hollywood entertainment, amateur and professional orations, a combination of circus and stage show.

Not all of this is new. The parades and banner waving have been around since Andrew Jackson first ran for President in 1828, and were made permanent features in the first national conventions in 1832. One reason for the variety of gimmicks and attention getters is that when a successful candidate has tried something new, every candidate ever after is afraid not to do the same thing.

Conventions have changed, however, since the advent of television.

Time was when speakers could talk for several hours, 20 or more persons could be honored by letting them make seconding speeches, the party elders could be paraded and given opportunity to be heard. But now convention planners have to consider whether speakers are photogenic. They worry lest speeches be too long or tiresome and sour television viewers across the Nation. So, in spite of general belief, speeches have been getting shorter and fewer. The elders are kept in the background. Hollywood stars get on camera. The aim is to keep things moving and colorful.

The aim is seldom realized. Television, committed to full coverage, has increasingly turned its lens from the platform and convention business to the floor, where excitement and controversy may be found or stirred up. Sometimes this gives viewers a false impression of what is important. The television cameras often spend much of their time showing television commentators. As there is a limit to intelligent and interesting comment, the whole thing often is a deadly melange.

Conventions need to be shortened. Two days would do the job. That might be expensive for the parties, for few cities would put up much money to lure a short convention. Yet by cooperating in holding conventions in the same city and using the same facilities and sharing costs for special requirements, the two parties—as they have done on occasion—could cut expenses. The television networks, by cooperating in such an undertaking, could do the same thing.

In 2 days the delegates could do their nominating, adopt their platform, elect their continuing officers and hold a colorful rally to stir up party enthusiasm. Things could move fast and efficiently and yet allow plenty of time for cheering and parading. Television viewers would not suffer offended dignity or utter boredom.

[From the Milwaukee (Wis.) Journal, Dec. 17, 1964]

Long Campaigns Ridiculous: Election Reform Vital—5

As the recent presidential campaign drew to a close the candidates were in general agreement that they had been at it too long and were all tired out.

Senator Goldwater said that it would be a good idea to "change this crazy system in this country whereby we have to campaign for months and months." Senator HUMPHREY said that "what we really find ourselves doing with these long, extended campaigns of 2 and 3 months is replaying old material * * *. I think that a candidate tends to become more than a little tired."

All of this was particularly true in 1964. Only President Johnson really waited until the traditional Labor Day opening for his campaign—but even he seemed to feel a late compulsion to go jetting over the Nation shaking hands, buying Milwaukee sausage, dangerously exposing himself to crushing mobs and at times diminishing the dignity of the presidency.

The time was when candidates had no way of reaching the voters except by whistle stopping and speaking from rear platforms of trains. They could give the same speech over and over and have a new audience every time. They could use the time between stops profitably in resting and conferring with local and regional political leaders who made short hops with them.

Now the candidates travel through the skies at 10 miles and more a minute. They gave the same speeches over many times, inevitably. And the hordes of newsmen accompanying them reported them over and over. The tendency naturally was to pick up any slight deviation, any name calling, any sensational bit to spice up an otherwise repetitive and old story. The Nation was saturated and bogged down in a constant rerun of the same old stuff. The jetplane and television made the whole business almost ridiculous.

Not everyone agrees that the campaign should be shortened. The compaign managers have some doubts. Denison Kitchel, Goldwater's campaign manager, says that it takes a minimum of 60 days for a candidate's issues to "crystallize." John M. Bailey, Democratic national chairman, says that the shorter the campaign "the greater the advantages of the party in power." An incumbent gets constant exposure automatically, Bailey says, and a challenger needs time to be seen and heard. Some think that a short campaign would help the party with the most money. Others say limiting a campaign would violate our tradition of unlimited political debate. And there are those who believe that this country is so big, in spite of jetplanes and television, that long campaigns are needed to cover it.

However, it seems increasingly obvious that in this modern day candidates can reach so many people so fast that campaigns could be shortened drastically to the benefit of everyone. It would save the candidates energy and the parties money—and campaign costs have zoomed up 25 percent over 1960 and 60 percent over 1956. It would give Congress more time to do the work that each year seems to require longer sessions.

[From the Milwaukee (Wis.) Journal, Dec. 18, 1964]

Brief Campaign, Earlier Vote: Election Reform Vital—6

There are many ways to shorten presidential campaigns. Representative MONAGAN, Democrat, of Connecticut, has repeatedly introduced bills to limit the period between nomination and election to 60 days. Senator DODD, Democrat, of Connecticut, once proposed a 4-week period. Vice-President-elect HUMPHREY would hold conventions in early September and hold off campaigns until mid-September.

There is nothing sacred about the law which sets presidential elections on the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November. Congress set that date in 1845, taking four things into consideration—weather, religion, the harvest, and business.

Early November was after the harvest and before bad weather set in. Congress did not want the election on Monday because many farmers in those days had to start out a day early to reach the polls and some would refuse to begin a trip on Sunday because of religious scruples. Congress did not want the election held on the first of the month, for that was the day when small town merchants traditionally billed their customers. So the logic of that time made it the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November. Today these factors do not apply. We could set any day.

It would be simple to require that conventions be held within 45 or 60 days of the election and to set the election in, say, mid-October. That would rule out July conventions. It would cut down campaigning time. Candidates would have to make good use of their opportunities and give less time to posing in Indian headdresses, kissing babies, and milking cows.

Other nations hold much shorter campaigns than we do. Britain often limits its campaigns to 3 weeks, and has had shorter ones. Canada had a very important national election in 1963 and the campaign lasted only 30 days.

[From the Milwaukee (Wis.) Journal, Dec. 19, 1964]

Electoral College Obsolete: Election Reform Vital—7

Our President is not really elected when we go to the polls on the first Tuesday after the first Monday of November in a presidential election year. We vote instead for electors. Not until they meet in the electoral college on the first Monday after the second Wednesday in December is a president elected. And the election is not confirmed until after Congress convenes. It will be announced this time on January 6. Because our electors are normally pledged to a specific candidiate, we know who is to be president—but nothing except honor binds electors to vote a certain way. They can vote as they please.

Under the electoral system each State is granted a vote for each U.S. Senator and Representative and the District of Columbia is arbitrarily given three votes. The candidate winning the most popular votes in a State or the district is given all the electoral votes—even though he may win by as little as a single popular vote. This violates the concept of equal voting.

In any serious consideration of change in our electoral processes the electoral college is a candidate for overhaul.

Originally the college served a good purpose. The voters chose electors known to them in a time when they might have little idea of the qualifications of the candidates for President. The electors were normally men acquainted with national figures and competent to choose among them. The system tended to keep the selection in the hands of the more stable members of a society—a matter of concern to leaders in the formative years of the Republic.

But as the Nation matured and communication improved, the electoral college system less and less served a need. Political parties formed and offered leaders, and voters tended to fix their loyalty to one of these. A select committee of the Senate said in 1826 that "instead of being chosen for their noble qualities set forth in the Federalist, candidates for electors are now most usually selected for their devotion to a party, their popular manners, and a supposed talent for electioneering, which the framers of the Constitution would have been ashamed to possess."

Numerous proposals have been made for changing the electoral system. One would choose electors by congressional districts instead of States. The Senate voted in 1950 for a plan to give candidates the same proportion of a State's electoral votes as the proportion of the popular vote he received there.

Logic, however, argues for abolishing the electoral college completely and using the popular vote as the measure for choosing the President. The one-man, one-vote tent would be served. A half-dozen larger States would cease getting the concentrated attention of candidates. Small States would cease having a larger voice than their populations justify.

[From the Milwaukee (Wis.) Journal, Dec. 21, 1964]

An Earlier Inauguration: Election Reform Vital—8

If presidential campaigns were shortened and elections held earlier another part of the system would need changing—the date on which the new President takes office. The problem of the interregnum, or period between election and White House occupancy, has long plagued the country.

When a President needed days in which to be informed of his election and get to Washington to be sworn in, a long interregnum was necessary. The Constitution provided that the President take office on March 4 and that new congressional terms start the same day. In 1933 it was amended to start congressional terms January 3 and the presidential term on January 20. This eliminated "lameduck" congressional sessions.

There is need for some interregnum. A newly elected President needs time to find men to staff his administration. He needs briefing by the outgoing administration. Moving and settling other affairs take time. Beginning with the Eisenhower takeover from Truman in 1953 the transition has been smoothed by cooperation and exchange of views and information.

If we elected a President in mid-October it would not be necessary to wait until January 20 for him to take office. James MacGregor Burns of Williams College suggests that inauguration could take place about December 1. Then there would no longer be a lameduck President and a new Congress sitting together in Washington for 17 days. It would give the new President a few weeks in office before Congress convened. It would end the need for a State of the Nation message by an outgoing President—a message now largely ignored anyway. It would give new appointees a breathing spell in which to get the feel of office, and a quicker start on their proposals for congressional action.

A shorter campaign plus a shorter interregnum would be a service to our allies as well as ourselves. This is the world's most powerful nation and the leader of the free world. Our policies are vital to many nations. When we conduct our presidential election contest every 4 years many world chancelleries almost literally shut down. They do not care to act while the American mind is occupied by the election and they are not too sure who will be making our policy. The interregnum between election and inauguration is also a time of waiting for them, especially if a new party is to take over.

Moving inaugural day ahead would cap any major overhaul of our presidential election system. It would complete a modernization long needed. An additional bonus would be that the inaugural would take place when the Nation was in a holiday mood. Also, Washington weather is more conducive to ceremony around December 1.

[From the Milwaukee (Wis.) Journal, Dec. 22, 1964]

The Five Biggest Changes: Election Reform Vital—9

Nobody today would prefer to be treated by George Washington's dentist. Yet we persist in using a presidental election system that is a relic of his day, necessarily designed without foresight of our electronic, space, and jet age, in which it is terribly inefficient. The case for modernizing it, and against procrastinating still longer, is clear.

Here is the summation of this series of editorials on its failures and their correction:

1. Abolish State presidential primaries where held. They are rarely constructive, impossible to organize into a workable and meaningful device, merely add months of campaigning and confusion.

2. Abbreviate national conventions and hold them later. They now drag on tediously and expensively for commercial purposes. Two days apiece would suffice for the actual business. Holding them in the same place in quick succession would save time, energy, money and avoid boredom.

3. Shorten campaigns. Present length exhausts candidates and funds and issues and voters, degrades campaign conduct. Forty-five or sixty days between nomination and election is plenty with modern means of communication and travel. This would involve decreeing a maximum gap between conventions and election day. It could also involve moving election day up to, say, mid-October.

4. Abolish the electoral college. Development of political parties and nominating conventions made it obsolete long since. It wipes votes by the millions out of the national reckoning—the minority in each State—leaving it always possible for the nationwide majority to be thwarted. The national popular vote should spell election.

5. Install the President-elect with some promptness. A lame duck President now stays on until January 20, in the third week of a new Congress, which is needless and unsettling. Along with campaigning, it virtually suspends American world leadership for a whole year in every 4 and 8. Inaugurating a new President around December 1 after a mid-October election would smooth and speed a change of administration.

The time for reform is now. The changes will take time. If we are tempted just to relax for a while after a wearying election year, the next election year will loom as another excuse to wait. We have just 2 years, 3 at most, if we are to have a modern intelligent presidential election system ready for 1968.

STRENGTHEN THE COAL INDUSTRY BY LIMITING RESIDUAL OIL IMPORTS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, Mr. W. A. Boyle, president of the United Mine Workers of America, has given serious thought to the problem of unemployment in West Virginia.

In a guest editorial for the Huntington (W. Va.) Advertiser on December 28, 1964, Mr. Boyle stated that some 55,000 jobs have been lost in the West Virginia coal industry due to the importation of residual fuel oil into the United States.

He added that this does not include the ancillary services, the storeowners, the service people, and all the rest.

I believe that the editorial states a highly convincing argument against the importation of residual oil. I commend it to Senators for study, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in its entirety in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Curbing Fuel Oil Imports Would Speed Economic Revival of Appalachia: A Guest Editorial by W. A. Boyle, President, United Mine Workers of America

For many years the United Mine Workers of America has fought against the excessive importation of residual fuel oil. We have done so for one very simple reason.

The importation of residual fuel oil is a threat to the jobs and income of American coal miners. It is so because it deprives the coal industry of markets and precludes it from the normal growth that it should rightfully have.

The marketing pattern of coal must be understood before the damage that is done by residual oil imports can be realized. The impact that residual has and will have upon the social and economic life of Appalachia must also be understood if its detrimental and injurious effect upon the Nation as a whole is to be truly appreciated.

Coal must compete in the most intensely competitive market in the world, the energy market of the United States. In order to survive, coal must match, on the bases of quality and price, fuel oil, natural gas, water power, and now the atom. The fact that coal is sold largely on the basis of price per million B.t.u. and not because of any inherent advantages, further intensifies the problem of the coal industry in seeking survival.

The market convulsions that coal has undergone are well known and need no further elaboration. Fortunately, the industry was able to reorder itself in time to meet the challenge posed by the market and to gain some confidence for the future. Unfortunately, however, the transformation which coal underwent made it vulnerable to price competition and to unscrupulous and unfair tactics by competitors.

Perhaps the most notorious example of such tactics is in the area of residual oil importation.

Residual oil is essentially a waste product. It is what is left over after the refining process. It is transportable only with difficulty and can be burned only in special equipment expressly suited for the job.

For many years coal faced the problem of competition from residual fuel oil produced in domestic refineries. It was successful in meeting such competition largely because of its production efficiency and also because the domestic refiners produced as little residual oil as possible, due to residual's extremely low price.

This is not to say that domestic residual oil was not a good competitor for coal. It was and is. However, competition was carried on largely within the framework of the domestic energy industry, an industry which seeks to maximize return from each unit of energy produced.

Foreign residual fuel oil in the United States comes mainly from Venezuela and the Netherland East Indies. It is also a byproduct of the refining process and is essentially a waste material.

There is, however, one important difference. In the nations producing foreign residual oil, conservation and resource utilization is not quite so important. They are willing to produce many more barrels of residual oil than the U.S. refineries. In fact, in many cases, the production of residual oil in foreign nations reaches 60 percent of the total refinery run.

Thus, huge quantities of a useless product are produced, unless some area can be found in which it can be sold. Since it will go to waste and pose a disposal problem unless sold, price is no object. It is in fact a dump product, since it can move only if the price is lower than other energy fuels.

The only area in the world that can absorb this much residual oil is the east coast of the United States. We have seen for several years a concerted attack upon the fuel market of the east coast by the producers of foreign residual fuel oil.

The result of this methodical assault has been to create a shambles of the energy market in the United States. It has disrupted the traditional patterns of marketing and caused the gravest harm possible to the coal industry, as well as to the domestic oil industry in the United States. This damage is particularly harmful to the coal industry in Appalachia, since it is most directly involved in supplying the east coast. However, the ripple effects of residual oil competition reach far beyond the area directly involved and touch almost every aspect of coal mining.

From a strict industrial point of view the most immediate impact of residual fuel oil imports has been to shut off coal from the growth of the east coast energy market. This is immediately apparent in the following statistics.

Between 1957 and 1963 the consumption of coal in the east coast declined from 157,064,000 tons to 153,325,000 tons. At the same time the importation of residual fuel oil in the same region increased from 30,613,000 tons of coal equivalent to 49,166,000 tons of coal equivalent, or 60.6 per cent. In other words, the importation of residual oil increased extremely rapidly at a time when the consumption of coal was declining by 2.4 per cent.

Look at this picture in another way. The total demand for energy in the east coast, exclusive of energy sources not competitive with coal, increased from 350,106,000 tons in 1957 to 407,660,000 tons in 1963.

From this it is evident that coal did not share in the energy growth of the area. It is also evident that imported residual fuel oil gained to a much greater degree than the other energy fuels.

There is a question of national policy involved here that must soon be resolved. We as a nation must determine whether or not our own industry is going to meet our national needs. We must decide to whom we shall look for the satisfaction of the needs of the Nation for energy. In so doing we shall have to determine to what extent we shall protect our own industry from the ravages of foreign competition and the unfair tactics of foreign competitors.

In this case the time is past due for such a decision. For, to continue long upon our present course will doom the coal industry to death by submerging it in an ever expanding sea of foreign residual fuel oil. Our present policies will suffocate the coal industry and render it unable to meet the needs of the Nation, especially in the event of a crisis of a national or international nature.

But this is not the gravest danger of residual fuel oil importation.

There are men today who are out of work because of the excessive importation of residual fuel oil. There are men currently working who will be thrown out of jobs if the quotas on residual oil are increased any further. There are families in Appalachia and elsewhere who know the total despair of poverty because of residual oil importation.

This is also waste of a natural resource. For, if we as a nation choose to write off the coal industry, if we are content to allow the importation of foreign residual oil to continue on its present level and even to expand—then we must be ready to face the hard and cold reality of unemployment in the coal areas.

It is the announced policy of the Johnson administration to alleviate the poverty of Appalachia. To this end the President has introduced legislation in Congress. He has formed study groups and turned out reports.

But all of the activity that has been carried on thus far will amount to little if residual oil continues to erode coal markets. Any contemplated action will be futile unless something is done to restore some sort of sane balance between the coal and residual oil industries in the energy market.

If the President is content to allow the importation of residual fuel oil to increase, if he is willing to further depress the coal industry of Appalachia, while at the same time promising programs to help that region—then he is either economically naive, or guilty of a cruel hoax.

Coal underlies the economic superstructure of Appalachia. Coal dollars permit the region to function and grow, if growth is possible. Coal is the basic natural resource of the region and must form the foundation for regional growth.

This is amply illustrated in the survey on the impact of coal production recently completed by the United Mine Workers of America, the National Coal Association and the National Coal Policy Conference. This survey pointed to the $271,547,420 going into the economy of West Virginia each year because of the production of coal. It pointed to the employment that it brought about because of the coal industry and its associated industries. It showed how the trickle of coal dollars permeates the entire economic sructure of Appalachia, giving it strength and vitality and the substance that it needs to grow.

Residual fuel oil threatens all of that. Residual oil importation strikes at the income and the jobs and the future of coal miners and their families.

We estimated that the job loss due to current quota levels approximates 55,000 jobs. This does not include the ancillary services, the storeowners, the service people, and all the rest. Nor does it account for the desperation that comes to a coal mining community when a layoff occurs or a mine is shut down.

Even this figure, staggering as it is, does not tell the whole story of the damage done by residual oil imports.

Each time the U.S. Government allows more residual oil to come into the Nation it in effect discounts the importance of the coal industry. The price competition becomes more severe and the legitimate profit margins of the industry become depressed.

In this environment the industry pattern tends to degenerate. Investment in the industry is driven away and mines closed because they can no longer meet the competitive threat.

We have seen many mines close in the Appalachian region in the years since the increase in residual oil imports has taken place. Many of these mines would not have closed if imported residual oil was not present. For, under a fairer marketing arrangement the mine that has become marginal would not be so and would be able to operate.

Instead, under the constant pressure of residual competition, a ruthless, vicious, brutal competition, the industry no longer can sustain itself.

It might be said that we do not have a stake in what happens to the industry in this regard. But we feel differently.

A mine can close and investment be lost. But investment can often be transferred elsewhere. In fact, one of the peculiar phenomena of our modern industrial age is the flight of capital from coal to other industries. Many of the leading coal companies have taken part in this flight. At least one of the major coal companies is involved in the importation of residual fuel oil.

But what happens to the men when the money goes? What happens to the wives and children when the mines close and the breadwinner is out of work?

The answer is easy to find. It shows up in the face of Appalachia, in the poverty and the want. For a coal miner who is out of work is usually tied to an area. He cannot easily move or transfer his skills to another job. His investment is his own ability, his courage and his experience. It is a valuable investment, a priceless commodity. But it cannot with ease be changed to other pursuits.

So it is that the real loser is the coal miner, the people of the area involved. So it is that when a mine closes people are the expendable commodity.

This human wastage is the real tragedy of residual oil. It is a tragedy that is repeated often in the Appalachian region each year as the quantity of imported residual oil goes up and as the pressure on coal increases apace.

The present quota, which continues to rise beyond reason and good judgment, adds to the loss of job opportunities and a waste of human resources and makes added burden on our Government to feed those who suffer forced unemployment.

There can be no doubt that a reasonable policy on the importation of residual oil would help to induce investment in the coal industry of Appalachia. Indeed, the coal operators of the area and the railroads serving it have made a dramatic proposal to President Johnson on this very subject.

They propose to invest $1.5 billion in the Appalachian region. However, this proposal is contingent upon the adoption of a reasonable oil import policy.

This is dramatic proof of the harm that has come to coal areas because of the importation of residual fuel oil. For here we see American industry willing and able to make an investment in a depressed area. Here is a great part of the answer to the problems besetting the Appalachian area, problems which must finally come to the question of jobs.

But the one contingency, the one drawback that prevents this boon to the area is the fear of residual fuel oil importation.

We need no further evidence. Usually, if a company or group of companies offered to spend $1.5 billion in the Appalachian region, a great cry of relief would go up from all of the populace. If the Federal Government succeeds in passing its Appalachian program and spends millions of dollars of Federal money in this area, we shall count ourselves lucky. Yet, we have a concrete proposal from leading businessmen in the area to spend $1.5 billion of their own money in our region. We have the promise of jobs and income security. We have a proposal that will use a natural resource of the region and which will employ the labor force at a job for which they are uniquely suited.

All that we ask is protection from the flood of a cheap foreign product which threatens to engulf us. We ask: is this not a reasonable request?

As we have said, in essence we do not ask for favored treatment. We do not ask for subsidy or for market guarantee.

We are a proud people, we coal miners. We are used to looking out for our own and taking care of the problems that arise in our own way. We have made a contribution to the Nation, a contribution that cannot be measured solely in terms of dollars and cents. We believe in our system of government and in the free enterprise economy. We feel that our record in the past substantiates this belief.

However, we do believe that we can request help and protection. We do feel that we can ask, yes, demand the right to compete on a fair basis for the energy market of our Nation.

It is beyond our comprehension to see the energy market of the east coast, a market where we traditionally were strong, being given to a foreign fuel, to a waste fuel, while coal miners go hungry and in want. It is a tragedy to see the abandoned tipples and the squalid homes in Appalachia, when we know that our soil holds millions and millions of tons of the finest fuel in the world.

So it is that we seek fairness and equity. The time is long overdue that such should be granted to us. The Nation must decide once and for all whether or not it will protect its own industry against the inroads of foreign products. The Nation and the Government must determine if the Appalachian program is a sham or whether or not the promises for the Great Society do in fact hold hope to those who now live without hope.

Our struggle will continue until we can once again see the coalfields as centers of prosperity and the future bright for coal miners and their families.

THE BUDGET BUREAU AND FARM POLICY

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I have written the Secretary of Agriculture today requesting that he reconsider a decision to close the research station at Newell, S. Dak., which has been working on water and livestock problems. I also expressed to the Secretary my concern about the present course of agricultural policy decisions in the executive branch.

As my letter reflects, I am concerned that the Director of the Bureau of the Budget appears to be enunciating farm policy rather than the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. Kermit Gordon, Director of the Bureau of the Budget, is the author of an article in the current issue of the Saturday Review of Literature, a splendid magazine, but hardly one of our leading farm journals, in which he states that 2.5 million of our 3.5 million farmers "do not now and cannot in the future be expected to operate successful commercial farms." He contends they should be moved off the land. Might one conclude that this is the Budget Bureau's formula for filling up the new Job Corps? Or is it a formula for converting rural poverty into urban poverty?

Mr. Gordon throws in some conclusions on reclamation policy as a bonus for his readers, although that is the policy field of Secretary of the Interior Udall and the President, rather than the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. Gordon's contention that there are 1 million successful farmers making more than average national income and absorbing most of the benefits from the farm programs is misleading.

If the Budget Director had subdivided the 1 million farms with sales of over $10,000 he would have found fewer than 200,000 farms selling over 40 percent of the products marketed.

Preliminary estimates of the Economic Research Service indicate that 140,000 farms with sales of $40,000 or over marketed 37 percent of all farm products in 1964. This small group of farmers do, indeed, have incomes above average, and some way might very well be considered for limiting Government expenditures to individuals.

There are about 1,400,000 farms with sales of $5,000 to $39,999, however, which market about 55 percent of all farm products. The families on these farms are receiving a fair return for their labor, if their capital investment is overlooked, or a fair return on their investment, if the value of their labor is overlooked. But their returns for both labor and capital is far less than the returns for comparable labor and capital in most other industries.

Farm programs should be made more effective for farm families with receipts of less than $5,000. Over 90 percent of the farm families which produce most of our food and fiber, at present price levels, are underpaid for their efforts.

We might well develop modifications in current price supports which reduce the benefits going to the upper 10 percent of the farm families which produce our food and fiber, and are well off. But to average the incomes of that upper 10 percent with the next highest 30 percent and conclude that the whole 40 percent is overpaid, and all other farmers are hopeless cases, reveals a sad lack of understanding of the farm problem.

Just how misleading Mr. Gordon's figures are is further highlighted in additional facts which he emphasizes. He talks about the million farmers who sell $10,000 or more in products. Then he refers to their $9,500 average income.

Now, I am sure that there is no Senator who believes the cost of producing $10,000 worth of farm commodities is $500, and that 95 percent of the return is net income. Neither do I believe that Mr. Gordon would contend that, but the manner in which he has used his agricultural statistics definitely leaves that impression, and thereby illustrates how misleading they are.

Let me say, that I do not think Mr. Gordon intended to mislead his readers. He is an able economist and a fine public official, but he obviously is not equipped to set farm policy or even to interpret the farm problem.

Persons with some practical experience in the various fields of government, who have seen the practical effect of Federal policies, should be the policymakers, and not those charged with budget responsibility.

The Budget Director should also inform himself about the nature of commodities produced on irrigated lands, and the shift from crops in surplus toward higher protein and specialty products resulting from irrigation, before he announces any further conclusions on reclamation. Irrigation can be most helpful in moving farm production away from surplus crops to those commodities that are needed.

I ask unanimous consent to put in the RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks the text of Mr. Gordon's disturbing article in the Saturday Review of Literature.

I also ask unanimous consent to include a copy of the letter I have sent Secretary Freeman in regard to the closure of the agricultural research center at Newell, S. Dak., and a copy of a letter from Mr. F. Lyn Gladstone, editor of the Valley Irrigator, published at Newell, which indicates the impact of the Newell closure on the community, and on the Belle Fouche irrigation project located there.

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Saturday Review of Literature, Jan. 9, 1965]

THE CHALLENGE OF PROSPERITY: HOW MUCH SHOULD GOVERNMENT DO?

(By Kermit Gordon)

In a community where I once lived, there was a civic association dedicated to the economical conduct of the local government. Since I shared this interest, I undertook to look into the policies of the association in order to decide whether or not I should join.

I never did become a member, for I discovered that the association had a view of the meaning of economy that I could not accept. The association had a simple, one-plank program—opposition to any proposals for new programs that cost money. I found no evidence that the group had any interest in looking critically at the usefulness of ongoing programs, or weighing the prospective benefits of new proposals against the realized benefits of old programs, or searching for ways to cut the costs of governmental activities without reducing their benefits. Just a single objective—oppose anything new.

I remember thinking at the time how great a distortion of the meaning of economy this view conveyed. But I later discovered that

Edmund Burke fretted about the same question two centuries ago. "Economy," said Burke, "is a distributive virtue, and consists not in saving but in selection. * * * Parsimony requires no providence, no sagacity, no powers of combination, no comparison, no judgment."

My friends in the civic association were practicing parsimony under the guise of economy. If there is a common conservative error in the way the citizen looks at public budgeting, this is probably it. For parsimony is not only distinguishable from economy—it is often the enemy of economy. To accept the status quo of government programs while opposing innovation is to run the risk of spending money on objects of lesser urgency while denying recognition to more compelling needs. And this, of course, is the very opposite of economy. It is waste.

The path of parsimony often leads to a narrow preoccupation with a single measure of the soundness of government finance—the total size of the public budget. If the budget does not increase over the previous year, it is thought on that ground alone to be a good budget. But this is clearly an imperfect test. A budget unchanged in total size from the year before may constitute simply a timid extension of established programs, however questionable some of them may be, or it may reflect a searching effort to expand here and contract there in order to increase the benefits flowing from a given amount of expenditure.

This is what President Johnson had in mind when he said in his budget message last January:

"An austere budget need not be and should not be a standstill budget. When budgetary restrain leads the Government to turn its back on new needs and new problems, economy becomes but another word for stagnation. But when vigorous pruning of old programs and procedures releases the funds to meet new challenges and opportunities, economy becomes the companion of progress."

If the confusion of parsimony with economy is the error that often entraps conservatives in their thinking about public budgets, there is a closely symmetrical error that often appears on the liberal side. This is the confusion of profligacy with progress—the disposition to look with favor on an increase in total public spending just because it is an increase. This preference for rising expenditures rests on two convictions—the conviction that rising expenditures are needed to stimulate the economy and promote economic growth, and the conviction that the public sector of the economy is too small relative to the private sector.

But as to the first of these, it is clear that a need for fiscal stimulus is not in itself sufficient to justify higher public expenditure, for any stimulus that can be provided through increased expenditures can also be provided through reduced tax rates.

As to the second of these, the proponents of public-sector expansion soon make clear that they are talking not about expansion of our programs for defense, space, veterans, agriculture, or interest on the public debt—which together constitute more than 80 percent of the administrative budget—but rather about our programs in health, education, welfare, housing and urban renewal, mass transportation, air and water pollution, area development, and related fields.

Certainly, then, however convincing the argument for increased spending in this limited sector, it is hardly a logical basis for favoring increased total spending on principle. The case for an increase in total spending must rest on judgments concerning all major programs in the budget, not merely on judgments concerning one sector.

Parsimony and profligacy are false guides to policy for exactly the same reason: both deny the necessity for choice. Neither, in Burke's words, requires providence, sagacity, combination, comparison, or judgment. Neither faces up to the budgetary challenge of the 1960's.

The necessity for choice—for a reexamination of the premises of existing programs, for a weighing of alternatives—is always an imperative of responsible budgetmaking. But we live in a time when this imperative has taken on a special urgency.

New claims on the Federal budget, many of them bearing credentials of the highest merit, press in on every side. We need more education and better education, from the primary grades through the graduate and professional schools. We should expand our job training and retraining programs both for the unskilled and for those whose skills are obsolete. We must intensify the war on poverty. We need improved outdoor recreation facilities, efficient urban mass transportation, and better mental health facilities. We need to bring the benefits of medical research discoveries to more people more quickly. We should step up our attack on air and water pollution.

These and other demands—new, compelling, and costly—make it doubly necessary that we look carefully at the programs that have already found a place in the Federal budget. They are not suspect simply because they are there; but neither does their long tenure exempt them from periodic scrutiny to determine whether their shape and size are appropriate.

The problems of adapting public programs to social change are difficult even in the most favorable circumstances. But when social change proceeds as rapidly as it has in recent years, the difficulties are compounded. Let me try to illustrate the problems of adaptation by drawing on two cases of unusual difficulty—farm policy and water resources policy. These are simply illustrative; others could readily be cited.

We are currently spending between $3.5 and $4 billion for farm commodity programs. The rationale for these farm income supports has changed drastically over the years. In the 1930's, farm income supports were basically a relief measure designed to prevent the literal collapse of the farm economy. During the Second World War, and to a lesser extent during the Korean war, income supports were a stimulus for needed production increases. Since then, supports have been used primarily to counteract the price- and income-depressing effects of the increase in farm productivity.

The revolution of the past several decades in farm technology has been accompanied by a revolution in the social and economic structure of the farming industry. In 1963 there were 3,500,000 farms. The 1 million farms with cash receipts of over $10,000 accounted for only 27 percent of the number of farms but for almost 80 percent of the sales of farm products. These 1 million farmers could produce all of the Nation's farm needs, including our large commercial exports. Taking into account earnings from off-farm work, the 1963 average income of these 1 million relatively successful farmers was over $9,500, up 13 percent from 4 years ago. These 1 million farmers earn average rates of return on their capital investments and labor almost equal to the corresponding averages in the nonfarm economy.

Our farm income supports basically operate through the price-support technique—although in recent years some direct income payments have crept into the system. This implies that the distribution of the direct and indirect assistance provided by the Federal Government is roughly the same as the distribution of cash receipts. On this basis, about 80 percent of our assistance goes to the 1 million farmers whose average income exceeds $9,500. The other 20 percent of assistance is spread thinly among the remaining 2,500,000 farmers.

These figures highlight the dramatic impact of changing farm technology on Government farm programs. The farms that produce most of the Nation's food and fiber no longer fall into the lowest one-third of the Nation's income distribution. Most are successful business firms. Their continued success is of course not independent of Government commodity programs, whose elimination would cause a sharp fall in the income of all farmers. But these programs are no longer a means of distributing income to the neediest groups in our population; they are not welfare programs. From a welfare standpoint, the chief claimants to assistance are the 2,500,000 farmers who do not now and cannot in the future be expected to operate successful commercial farms. Yet their needs cannot be met through farm commodity programs. Rather, they require assistance in the painful transition to nonfarm jobs, to which most of them or their children will certainly have to move.

This is an area in which our current programs and attitudes are, at least in part, based upon conditions that no longer exist. In the interest of both the farmer and the Nation at large, we need to reexamine the hidden premises of our current policies and shape them anew, in closer correspondence to the facts of today's world.

Federal expenditures on water resources and related activities, for example, currently amount to about $1.5 billion per year and are rising at some 3 to 4 percent annually. These projects serve five major purposes; irrigation, flood control, navigation, hydroelectric power, and recreation—and in many cases one project serves two or more of these purposes.

These outlays constitue national investment in productive facilities. They have played a major role in our national growth, and many regions of the country owe much of their current prosperity to past national investment in water resources. Here, too, however, our current policies and practices are partly based upon objectives and concepts that have been overrun by events. This does not mean, necessarily, that we are spending too much in this area, but we may well be spending too much on some aspects of water resource development and too little on others. Let me illustrate with a few examples.

The Nation's reclamation program dates from the Reclamation Act of 1902. Since then, the total value of projects authorized has been $9.8 billion. Of this amount, about $5 billion has been spent; annual expenditures are now running at about $325 million.

Reclamation investment is principally irrigation investment. Of the $9.8 billion authorized for the program to date, some $5.7 billion has been or will be allocated to irrigation. Under the reclamation program the prices charged for irrigation water are heavily subsidized. The $5.7 billion cost bears no interest, and of this $5.7 billion only $3 billion will be repaid by irrigation water users. For projects that Congress is likely to be considering next year, the typical investment costs for irrigation will range between $500 and $1,500 an acre, most of which will not be recovered in the price of irrigated water.

Reclamation law was designed primarily to help develop the West by irrigating arid lands. The program was initiated at a time when the Nation sought to encourage family farm settlement on public lands in the West. Over one-fourth of the irrigated lands in the West was developed under this program, and about 5 percent of total U.S. agricultural production takes place on reclamation irrigated land.

Two major and closely related kinds of economic change have occurred during recent decades to raise the problem of how best to adapt the reclamation program to new needs. The first, and most obvious, is the problem of surplus agricultural production. Our farm commodity programs, through acreage controls, marketing quotas, and diversion payments, seek to limit agricultural production. But subsidized irrigation tends to increase production. In most cases, but not all, the crops irrigated are not the same crops as those subject to production limitations. But through the complex chain of market and producer substitution, increased production of one crop tends to aggravate the surplus situation of other crops.

These facts do not imply that irrigation investment is per se undesirable. Though we are limiting total agricultural production, there is still room for a shift, within the total, from less efficient to more efficient areas of production. Nevertheless, it is clear that irrigation policy must be based upon an integrated approach that looks at the most desirable locational pattern of agricultural production.

A second major set of economic changes arises out of the growing need for water for municipal and industrial uses. The urbanization and industrialization of America—in the new West as well as in the older eastern seaboard and Middle West—has dramatically increased the demand for urban water.

In many parts of the Nation—particularly the Southwest—water has become an increasingly scarce resource. Now, if there is any one principle of economics that economists of every persuasion would accept, it is that the price system is an exceptionally useful mechanism both for conserving a scarce resource and for allocating it to uses with the greatest value. But we rely too little on this mechanism in considering the water problems of the Nation. Additional agricultural surpluses have little value. Yet irrigation water for agricultural purposes is priced far below cost. Added water for municipal and industrial uses makes a major contribution to the burgeoning urban economies of the West.

But projects designed to add to municipal and industrial water often receive less attention and unlike those for irrigation water, are priced to recover full costs. The city of Los Angeles currently pays $20 per acre-foot for water from Boulder Dam and will soon be paying $63 an acre-foot for water brought down from northern California. Many southern California irrigators pay $2.25 per acre-foot for water from Boulder Dam, and for new Federal irrigation water will be paying perhaps $10 per acre-foot.

The need is clear, I believe, to think through the implications of a rapidly changing economy for the composition and structure of our water resources program. The solutions will not be easy. We cannot and should not ignore the plight of the commercial farmer whose livelihood depends upon irrigated water and whose water table is falling year by year. We have an obligation to those agricultural communities whose heavy investment in the land was based upon continued availability of water supplies. Nevertheless, having said this, I believe we must take steps gradually to adapt this program, designed to meet the problems of agricultural settlement, to the needs of the rapidly growing urban communities of our Nation.

The pursuit of the goals of the Great Society requires that we give equal attention to the need for innovation and the need for reform. The Great Society must be an efficient society. The responsibility of the Federal Government to heed the new needs of an evolving society is no greater than our responsibility to assure that the old programs are using the right number of dollars.

The task of modernizing the Federal budget will not be accomplished in 1 year or 4. It is a continuing struggle, for the barriers are formidable and the pitfalls many. But it is an effort that should command the support and assistance of all who choose economy over both parsimony and profligacy.

JANUARY 7, 1965.

Hon. ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Secretary, Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: This is to urge you to reconsider your decision to close the Newell, S. Dak., agricultural research station and to continue its work in the fields of soil and water management, and of beef feeding and management.

The research being done at Newell is in areas where problems are acute and work is needed. Congress has just established a new, multimillion-dollar research program in water problems in compliance with a 1961 select committee report declaring that the study of efficient management and conservation of water is of the greatest urgency. As you know, the report listed the Upper Missouri Basin as one of five basins in the Nation which will reach the limit of its available water supplies before 1980.

If the Newell Station is not making an adequate contribution to the enormous water research job which confronts us, then it should be reorganized and redirected, but not terminated.

As you know, the current distress of the cattle industry makes efficient feeding and management of beef cattle, the second area of work at Newell, of top urgency.

I am extremely disturbed by this closure as symptomatic of a decision at some level in the executive branch to reduce agricultural budgets regardless of the urgency of the need for the programs involved. I am disturbed that the Director of the Bureau of the Budget has attacked the farm programs in the current issue of the Saturday Review of Literature, a splendid journal, but hardly the voice of agriculture. I am disturbed that the Council of Economic Advisers no longer has a member who has an orientation in agricultural economics.

As the spokesman for farmers in the cabinet, Mr. Secretary, you are rather obviously in a difficult situation. I hope you will reopen the decision on the Newell Research Station, and related decisions, and give those of us who have an agricultural constituency an opportunity both to be heard on the matter of such closures and to uphold your hand in resistance to blind budget cutting.

It is not going to benefit either farmers or consumers of the Nation to follow penny wise and pound foolish policy in urgent areas of research and conservation.

I am enclosing a letter from F. Lyn Gladstone, editor of the Valley Irrigator of Newell, S. Dak., which indicates the disastrous impact which closing the Newell Station will have on an irrigation project, a community and citizens already staggering under the closure of a sugar plant.

Sincerely,

GEORGE MCGOVERN.

(Enclosure.)

NEWELL, S. DAK.,
January 4, 1965.

Hon. GEORGE MCGOVERN,
Senator from South Dakota, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MCGOVERN: This is to request your valued assistance in the retention of the U.S. Newell Irrigation and Dry Land Field Station, which has contributed so much to the economy of the Belle Fourche Irrigation District, northwestern South Dakota, northeastern Wyoming, and the entire region for more than 50 years.

The Executive order announced the past Thursday, to close this station by April 1, could not have come at a more inopportune time for the irrigation farmers on the project who must now turn from sugarbeets, due to the closing of the Belle Fourche factory, to some other crops. Never have they been in greater need of research from such a station.

It is also inopportune in that much of the research now in progress there—that relating to watershed technology and hydrology, that dealing with beef cattle feeding and management, that of agricultural economics barely underway, and other studies—could furnish priceless data for the irrigation district and adjacent rangeland areas. And much of this can only be concluded in the field here.

The Newell station has also and still offers the greatest possible research field for the some 19 million acres of soil of common characteristics extending into four States, and of which it is the hub.

It would also be a shame if, at this time, South Dakota would lose the only such Federal facility it has, and which is at the same time of great economic value to the four bordering States, portions of which are included in this area of the Pierre shales.

Initial press releases relative to the order directing the closing of this station indicate that it is part of a larger move to concentrate such research near larger cities or academic institutions. However, we feel that the Newell station has had a unique advantage in being located close to a town which is so completely dependent upon agriculture and so typical of the thousands of small towns over the Nation which are such an integral part of American agriculture.

Such factor, probably more than any other, affords personnel of such stations a keener understanding of the basic needs of agriculture and of what should be the basic purposes and goals of agricultural research. Nowhere else can agricultural research be more accurately evaluated; nowhere else can it be conducted under a more exacting or so typically agricultural environment.

Closing of the station will, of course, have a tremendous adverse economic effect on the Newell community. Following the decision of Utah-Idaho Sugar Co. to close its Belle Fourche factory, this decision which will have a much greater effect leaves us with little optimism with which to begin the new year.

It came as a surprise to me Thursday, also, to hear a high school senior discuss the order to close the Newell station and concentrate such work at larger centers. "These people," she said, "can't afford to move to a larger place; they're too poor too live in larger cities * * * and this, when they want to eliminate poverty * * * how stupid can they get?"

How, we wondered, could we answer her. She was right; it does cost more to move to and live in larger communities; there's more traveling to work, more to do, more to spend money for. Then, too, here the person earning but $3,000 a year or less can attend the same clubs and parties, can sit at the same games, shows, or other activities beside the person with the highest salary in town * * * and most people leave their homes unlocked, and children and ladies walk home from the show or extension club meeting alone at night.

But what if the closing of the Newell station is affected? Shouldn't the entire remaining debt of the Belle Fourche Irrigation District, whose farmers the station was primarily established to help, be written off? Is there any possibility of it being reopened as a rural job corps training center under the Department of Agriculture? Even under its present operation, there have been few boys growing up in the Newell community over the past 50 years who have not, at some time or another, received some valuable training there in part-time summer employment.

There are many other incidental benefits which accrue to the community, the county, the region, this and others, from operation and research at the U.S. Newell Field Station so it is important that it be continued.

In behalf of the five-State area, therefore, as well as the people in this immediate territory, I sincerely request that you bend every effort immediately to retaining this most valuable installation for the benefit of the entire country.

Respectfully yours,
F. LYN GLADSTONE,
Editor, the Valley Irrigator.

AID TO INDONESIA

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, last year the Senate voted to halt aid to Indonesia. I introduced such a proposal. I did so knowing that although foreign aid is a valuable program in many ways, there is no valid reason for throwing good money after bad. I do not believe in continuing to ask the American people for their tax dollars to support a man—Mr. Sukarno—whom I described last year as being arrogant, insulting, incompetent and unstable.

Now Mr. Sukarno has led his nation out of the United Nations. Indonesia is the first country ever to withdraw from the United Nations. Admittedly, the United Nations has certain weaknesses. But it is, nonetheless, a forum in which the family of nations can try to mediate disputes; it is an organization upon which countless numbers of the world's forlorn and hungry depend for hope and sustenance; it is an organization which has helped to keep the peace in several of the world's most dangerous trouble spots.

Mr. Sukarno has demonstrated by his past actions and by his unreasoning action of today that he does not want to participate in the family of nations. My heart goes out to the people of Indonesia who are being led into darkness by Mr. Sukarno. My heart goes out to the hungry and the ill in Indonesia who have been helped by the American people.

Yet the U.S. Government has a responsibility to the sovereign people of America and to the people of other nations who continue searching for world peace in good faith. Part of that responsibility is to do everything in its power to rebuke Mr. Sukarno in the hope that the people of Indonesia would rectify this situation.

Toward this end, I ask my colleagues to join with me in urging the President of the United States to use his authority as granted by the Congress to immediately halt all American assistance to Indonesia. I further ask my colleagues to join me in urging the President to bring about a cessation of American and Allied trade with Indonesia.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 2 Leg.]

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Bartlett
Bass
Bayh
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Clark
Cooper
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Dominick
Douglas
Eastland
Ellender
Fannin
Fong
Fulbright
Gore
Gruening
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McNamara
Metcalf
Miller
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Morse
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Murphy
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Ribicoff
Robertson
Russell
Saltonstall
Scott
Simpson
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MCINTYRE], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] are necessarily absent.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is present.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF CLOTURE RULE OF THE SENATE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Senate Resolution 6 comes over from the previous day. It will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 6) to amend the cloture rule of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I move——

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President——

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I move that the resolution be sent to the Committee on Rules and Administration. I ask to be heard on the motion.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I wonder if my colleague would permit me, before he speaks, to offer my substitute, so that it may be a part of the proceedings as well.

Mr. DIRKSEN. No; I would rather not. I would rather have the first vote come on this motion, if possible, although my colleague will be at liberty to make his offer later.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I wanted to provide that whatever action was taken with respect to the Anderson proposal would also apply to the Kuchel-Douglas proposal.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I prefer to take one at a time, if my distinguished colleague does not mind, because the Anderson resolution is the one that is now before the Senate which provides for three-fifths. As I understand, the resolution of the Senator from Illinois provides for a majority vote.

Mr. JAVITS. Will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I do not desire in any way to rush my leader, but I do believe that if he will think it over, he will find that the proposal of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] is correct, for this reason. If the Senator's motion should be such that it should not have been made, the Senator from Illinois can come along later and the whole procedure would have to be repeated.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am fully aware of that; but the Senator from Illinois intends to discuss that question separately.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes; but I do not wish to have it ruled out before I can——

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Illinois will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Do I correctly understand that there is only one resolution now before the Senate?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Illinois is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I wonder if the Senator from Illinois—and I shall not stress the point—would not permit me to very briefly present my proposal as a substitute so that both matters would be before the Senate? The Senator can then make his motion, and the Senate can work its will.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I should like to oblige the Senator, but I prefer to deal with the question that is pending before the Senate; namely, the Anderson resolution to modify rule XXII to provide that instead of two-thirds, three-fifths of the Senators present and voting can bring about cloture under the cloture rule.

Mr. President, rule XXII has been a standing rule of the Senate, so far as I know, for a period of 48 years. It was adopted by the Senate in 1917, when a bill relating to the arming of certain ships was then the business before the Senate. It was at that time that the Senate adopted that rule, and I believe that Senators who were Members of this body at that time certainly knew what they were about. Certainly, they were not lacking in perception and in a sense of responsibility.

Early this morning, I went back to find out who, among others, was serving in the Senate in the 65th Congress in 1917.

The list included John Bankhead and Oscar Underwood, of Alabama. Certainly they were capable and knowledgeable Senators.

There was Henry Fountain Ashurst, of national repute. There was that distinguished former leader of the Senate, Joe Robinson, of Arkansas. There was Senator Hiram Johnson, of California. From Georgia they had Hoke Smith and Senator Thomas Hardwick. From Idaho, Senator William Borah was in the Senate. From my own State of Illinois, that very renowned Senator, James Hamilton Lewis. That most perspicacious Senator from Indiana, Jim Watson. From Iowa, Senator Albert Cummins and also Senator William Kenyon. From Minnesota, one whom I knew as a student, Senator Knute Nelson; and one who became Secretary of State, Hon. Frank Kellogg.

From Mississippi one of the great Senators of all time, John Sharp Williams, as well as Senator James Vardaman. From Montana Senator Tom Walsh was serving in this body; and from Missouri there was Hon. James Reed. From North Carolina Lee Overman. From Ohio Senator Atlee Pomerene; from Utah Senator Reed Smoot; and from Virginia, Senator Claude Swanson, who became Secretary of the Navy; and also Senator Miles Poindexter of Washington. From Wisconsin there were both Senators Robert La Follette and Irvine Lenroot.

That was a very distinguished and redoubtable galaxy of Senators. What an incredible thing it would be to believe that they did not know what they were about in the 65th Congress when the so-called rule XXII was adopted.

I am glad that it was, and I so earnestly hope that this body will not modify it any further.

Three times in a period of 37 years the Senate has voted cloture, to prove beyond all doubt that when the time, the action, and the merit are appropriate, it is possible to obtain cloture in this body. We obtained it on the communications satellite bill. To be sure, I got on my knees in a few places and did some beseeching. We got it on the civil rights bill—the first time in the history of the Senate that cloture was voted on a civil rights measure.

I remind Senators that that bill, H.R. 7152, the civil rights bill of 1964, passed the House on the 10th of February and went to the Senate Calendar on the 9th of March, at which time it was called up for consideration. By a vote of 67 to 17, the Senate voted to consider the bill. So, with that kind of one-sided vote, there was no question that, first, the interest was present, and that at some point the Senate would work its will upon a civil rights proposal.

The debate continued until the 30th of March. The cloture motion was filed on the 8th day of June. I remind Senators of the vote. The galleries were filled. It was a rather tense moment, and when the clerk had finished intoning the roll and the score was totted, the result was 71 to 29. There were four more votes than necessary in order to impose cloture upon the deliberations of the Senate and get down to the business of passing a civil rights bill. Both parties were instrumental in the adoption of the cloture vote. On my side of the aisle, 27 Senators voted for cloture, and only 6 Republicans opposed it.

On the Democratic side of the aisle, there were 44 for cloture and only 23 against; and I reaffirm that there were four more than necessary in order to achieve cloture.

Mr. President, it can be done if a case is made. Whether it takes a little longer time or a shorter time is always a question of circumstance and depends upon the nature of the business before the Senate for discussion, and whether or not an early cloture is merited.

The astonishing thing about what is happening here today—and I presume certain fulminations will result—is that Senators who heretofore have solicited participation in the filibuster and wanted no cloture are the very ones who wish to tighten up the cloture rule now. Is there any doubt about it? I shall mention no names, but I know that when the communications satellite bill was before the Senate, more than 100 amendments were read, in order to delay a vote upon that bill. It had the approval of four Senate committees. It had the approval of the Attorney General. It had the approval of the Secretary of State. It had the approval of the President of the United States. Yet Senators who want to tighten up now on this rule were the very ones who conducted the filibuster. They conducted the filibuster that resulted from the apportionment proposal which I submitted.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No; I do not yield.

I know that my proposal had weaknesses. We were dealing with the fact that we were within the shadow of adjournment, and we had no choice except to deal with the issue on a stop-gap basis. I know that. But it was a most important issue. So the opponents of the proposal resorted to the filibuster.

There were other occasions, to which I shall not address myself. But somehow it seems to involve the old question of whose ox is being gored.

Rule XXII has been a standing rule for a period of 47 years. I, for one, do not propose to see it modified if, by any feeble effort on my part, such modification can be stopped. It is rather strange that there has been a 180 degree turn in the minds of some Senators who are first on one side and then on the other, depending upon where their particular interest lies.

As I go back and review what happened in connection with the rights bill, I must assert and reassert that notwithstanding the heated controversy that shot through title I, title III, title VII, and other titles among the 11 titles of that bill, we consummated cloture, and we consummated final action, to the everlasting credit of the Senate. But that action stands as a monument to the fact that regardless of rule XXII, if there is a case, the case can be made.

Frankly, I am no Johnny-come-lately to all this. Notwithstanding the fact that I got on my knees to some Senators and said, "Please give us a vote on cloture on the satellite bill" and "Please give us a vote on cloture on the civil rights bill"; and notwithstanding my abiding interest in civil rights legislation, I still do not want to see rule XXII tampered with and weakened, because it is, after all, a weapon for the minority.

Senators on this side of the aisle number only 32. That is less than one-third of the membership of the Senate. I do not propose to forfeit any weapon or shield of the minority, because another day will come, I am sure.

I have not heard what the President of the United States wishes to do about this question. I have seen language in the platforms with respect to rule XXII. I do not think it had any place in a political platform, because the Senate is the sole judge and artificer and author of its own rules. I doubt very much whether such language has a place in a political platform. Yet, somehow it got into a platform. But I have never yet heard an expression directly from the President of the United States on this subject. I knew what his disposition was on the subject when he graced the first seat on the other side of the aisle. Many times we discussed the subject in his office. I knew how deeply he felt.

Far be it from me to put into the President's mouth any articulated thought or expression as to where he stands on the question today. I knew where he stood when he was a Member of this body. He was subject to its rules. He operated with great circumspection under the rules of the Senate. It would be interesting indeed to know precisely what was in his mind.

There will come another day when it will not all be milk and honey, when it will not all be apple pie, when it will not all be beer and skittles. It will not all be peace and harmony. It will not all be prosperity. As we have seen, economic forces have their impact upon this country, as they did in 1837, as they did in 1857, as they did in 1873, as they did in 1893, when we had Black Friday; and as they did in 1907 and 1908. There may come other times. And when those times come and the people refuse to face up to burning reality because of the abuses that have existed with respect to the solvency and security of this country, then what?

That is when the sumptuary legislation will be coaxed out of the corner. That is the day when all manner of things will be placed upon the desk for the consideration of the Senate.

Some proposals will be incredible. I remember that in my days in the House of Representatives there was a time when a single Representative whom I shall not name, on a single day introduced bills totaling $100 billion.

I have lived through the depression. I know what it was. I knew what its impact was. My mother knew what it was when she was raising a brood of children, including the man who addresses the Senate today. Who shall say—because of the demands made upon Government, which have become more and more expansive—that these same sumptuary proposals will not be before us?

If there is a disparity in the Senate such as exists today, what chance have we, who do not approve such proposals, to try to obtain full and fair consideration and bring them to the attention of the country?

In the civil rights debate, the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] made what I thought was a good observation. He said this was the first time that he and his associates really had an opportunity to bring their story to the country and to obtain what they thought was fair treatment from the press. I think the press did quite well. There were tons and tons of copy. I was glad that this was so, because it was enlightening to the country. It gave everyone an opportunity to be thinking about it.

It accounted for the delegations that came from every State, including my own. I do not know how many people I met in the reception room or in my office. Some agreed with me. Some disagreed.

I remember a time when I was picketed at O'Hare Airport in Chicago. I remember when the Federal Building in Chicago was picketed because my office was there. They were marching around that building with their placards. I remember when I was picketed by thousands of people at the Congress Hotel in Chicago when I addressed a Republican women's convention. It did not bother me. It was a part of the American scene. They were orderly. And they had a right to do it.

On the other side, it evoked a great response from many people who said I was on the right track and that I should stay there. I did.

The country was gradually alerted to what was involved in the issue. At long last, through patient labor in my office and in the majority leader's office, at which meetings he and I participated, we developed what we thought was a workable bill. I am delighted to say that as I read of its enforcement in the court decisions and the general attitude of the country, I thought it redounded to the everlasting credit of the Congress of the United States.

So we obtained cloture. We can get it again if it ever becomes necessary and the issue is presented and the minds of Senators to whom it is presented decide that that is the course to pursue.

By way of ending this little discussion, I only say that I am sure we shall see the time when there may be other sumptuary measures. When that happens, where are the weapons? Where is the shield and buckler? Where and how can we make the fight, until the people, who are the fountainhead of all power of our Government, and whose servants we are, have an opportunity to judge and have the knowledge and facts laid before them?

What is the real virtue of rule XXII? First, it gives the minority—and by that I mean a minority viewpoint, whether it is on this side or on that side, or whether it is a minority consisting of Senators who share a certain conviction—an opportunity to get the story to the country.

Second, that rule should not be changed because it is essentially a minority weapon. I have been in the minority so long in the past 32 years in the House and Senate that I have become accustomed to it, but I would not be accustomed to not having it as a weapon, for then I would be as weak as a feeble reed in the wind.

The third reason is that it delays hasty action. How absorbed and possessed we become with our own brain children that we drop into the hopper. How eager we become to have them inscribed in ink even before the vapor of that ink evaporates into the air.

Edward Gibbon, one of the great historians of all time, who wrote of the decline and fall of the Roman Empire, said, "Progress is measured not only by what goes on the statute books, but what goes off." To that I might add also "by what is kept from going on the statute books."

If at a heated meeting sometime someone who does not agree with me should rise and ask, "In a capsule, what have you contributed? What bills have you introduced? What have you gotten enacted?" I think I would have to say, "My forte in life as a legislator is not what I got enacted but what I kept from getting enacted because I thought it was not in the interest of the people of this Republic."

The fifth reason is that this is a national issue. It was put in the platforms. Let us be consistent. Let us send it to the Committee on Rules and Administration. That is my motion. Let there be no strings on it, no direction to report back in 30 days or 60 days. Let the committee set up a subcommittee. Let its members go to Chicago and hold hearings. Let them go to the State of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON]. Let them go to Los Angeles. Let them go to South Carolina. Let them go to Kansas. Let them go to Delaware. Let them hear what the people have to say. Perhaps they will have nothing to say, but I venture the guess that a good many people would show up and contend for the preservation of this rule because not only is it the way the minority defends itself, but it provides a method of presenting a contrary viewpoint, so that the people can digest the issue, and the issue can better be resolved.

Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate any longer on this subject. I recur to the speech that Abraham Lincoln made in Springfield, Ill., long ago, when he was a young man. He was either in the legislature or had a short time before left the legislature, where he served a short term. I believe he was addressing a group of young men in Springfield, although I shall have to check my rather feeble memory, to make sure that the citation is correct. However, I am pretty sure that he addressed the Young Men's Lyceum in Springfield, and there used this phrase, which I reconstruct as nearly as I can. He said: "If destruction shall be our lot, it will not come from without, but it will be suicide."

He sketched graphically the impossibility of conquering hordes ever taking a drink out of the Ohio River.

He then said: "If destruction shall be our lot, it will not be by conquest, but by suicide."

I shall make no contribution to the denigration of this Republic and its freedoms and the freedom of the minority in a great parliamentary forum like this, but wish to let it assert itself and to make its cause, and to send it to the country; then cheerfully to abide by the result.

I hope, therefore, that these resolutions can be sent to the Committee on Rules and Administration—the Anderson proposal for a vote by three-fifths of the Senators present and voting, and the Douglas proposal to impose cloture by majority vote. When that day comes, I shall be unhappy, indeed.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. My understanding is that the pending motion applies only to the Anderson proposal, and not to the Douglas proposal, because only the Anderson proposal is before the Senate. I have just conferred with the Parliamentarian, and he advises me that that is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator from Illinois is quite aware of that fact. He knows full well that the Douglas proposal will be submitted.

Mr. CLARK. But at the present time——

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator is correct. It applies only to——

Mr. CLARK. The present motion applies only to the Anderson proposal.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I beseech the Senate not to take a downward step, in the wrong direction. If we do so, we shall lament the day when we weakened that rule, as we look into the future and reasonably anticipate that there will come a day when arbitrary, sumptuary, extreme, and emergent measures will probably be trotted out. Then we will wish that we had left that rule intact.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on referring the resolution (S. Res. 6) to the Rules Committee.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I desire to speak briefly on this subject.

It has been suggested that this is not a new proposal made with respect to a new subject. The Senator from Illinois, for whom I have both personal and strong affection, has stated that he is not a "Johnny-come-lately" to the Senate. Neither am I.

This issue has been brought before the Senate many times before. Time after time the suggestion has been made that it be referred to the Rules Committee, from which we can expect a very fine flowering of judgment in a very short time.

I remind the able Senator that when he refers to the time in the House when a Representative introduced a number of bills totaling $100 billion, I was a member of the Appropriations Committee in the House, as was he.

In 1943, when the budget was presented in a single bill, it ran to $109 billion. If these measures are handled legislatively by a legislative committee, no great damage is done.

There have been many arguments about cloture. In 1953, the able Senator from Ohio, Mr. Taft, was the majority leader. There was a discussion on the tidelands oil. A group of us felt that the tidelands oil bill was a bad bill as drawn, and we tried by prolonged debate to make sure that something was done with respect to the Continental Shelf.

After many long days of debate, we reached the point where we could do something about it, but not until the able Senator from Ohio had risen and stated, "There is a filibuster going on and the Senator from New Mexico is the leader and organizer of it."

Therefore, when the Senator from Illinois says that there are Senators who have been on both sides of this question, he could just as well have named me directly, because I have been.

However, we have made some promises time after time that need to be looked at again.

In 1957, a very fine gentleman, now no longer a Member of the Senate, but still an active and prominent American, Mr. William Knowland, was minority leader of the Senate, and he made a speech which is in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 107, part 1, at page 623. I wish to quote from that speech to show how much significance there was to the suggestion being made in 1961.

In this speech, Mr. Knowland said this:

> I believe the correct procedure would be to have the bill introduced next Monday, when Senators will be able to introduce bills, to urge early committee hearings, to have it reported to the Senate, and to debate it fairly and fully, as it should be debated, affecting as it does many citizens in all parts of our country.

He was, of course, referring to something other than this discussion on the rules change.

Mr. Knowland continued:

> We shall have a committee to which to refer such a bill next Monday, if the Senate has any rules under which to proceed. We shall have a Committee on Foreign Relations to which to refer the President's message which will be delivered tomorrow, if the Senate has rules tomorrow. But whether the Senate has rules or not apparently will depend to no small extent upon whether this body in its judgment lays on the table the motion of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].
>
> On Monday next, when it will be possible to introduce proposed legislation in the Senate, I shall introduce, and I shall ask all my colleagues on this side of the aisle, and I hope, many of them on the other side of the aisle, to join with me, a proposal to amend rule 22 of the Senate.

A great deal of stress was placed upon that point, and a great deal of support was engendered for his cause. A resolution was introduced by the able Senator from California, Mr. Knowland, at that time, just as a resolution had been introduced previously by Senator Jenner of Indiana, as chairman of the Rules Committee. But, the important thing is to ask ourselves is, What happened?

The answer is simple—nothing.

In 1961, I tried to point out that if that path were followed, again, we would end up exactly where we ended up before, with no real opportunity to vote on a change in rule XXII.

We have been going over this ground for a long time. In 1961, the able majority leader of the Senate made a very eloquent speech on the subject. I believe it is worth repeating, because he was seriously trying to make possible, I am sure, the adoption of an amendment which would have provided for a three-fifths vote. The able Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] said—

> And I must act, too, without regard for party but as a Senator in a fashion which I believe will best gird the dignity and preserve the vitality of the Senate as an institution, as a citadel of this Government. I am persuaded that, insofar as these considerations are involved in rule XXII, a change of the kind sought in the proposal of the distinguishd Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is desirable. The distinguished minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN] is, I am informed, in accord with me in the view that the requirement of three-fifths of the Senators present and voting should be sufficient to preserve the concept of full debate in the Senate while discouraging its abuse.
>
> But both the minority and the majority leaders believe that this matter ought first to go to the Rules and Administration Committee. We are confronted with possible rulings by the Presiding Officer of far-reaching consequence. These have never been given adequate hearing and consideration by the Committee on Rules and Administration. As probable chairman of that committee, I wish to assure the Senate that this proposition will receive such consideration and that I shall leave no stone unturned to see to it that a measure of the kind proposed by the Senator from New Mexico is reported to the Senate at a later date. And, further, the minority leader joins with me in assuring the Senate that we shall do everything in our power to bring such a measure to a vote in this body.

I ask any Senator who has been here since 1961 if such a vote ever took place. I point out that the failure to vote was not the fault of the able majority leader, because he sincerely believed in a possible three-fifths vote instead of a two-thirds vote. But promise after promise is made, and somehow year after year the proposal is sent to the same burying ground, where it remains buried and never emerges. All I would like to do is to make certain that it emerges.

I do not question the judgment of many people that it would be desirable to set the measure aside for a while until the Senate organizes. Therefore I shall present a motion.

I move to amend the Dirksen motion to read as follows:

> That the resolution be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, which shall make its report on said resolution and any other proposed amendments of rule XXII of the Senate on January 25, 1965, and all rights in existence at the opening of the Congress shall be deemed preserved.

I point out merely that the motion suggests that there be a date certain on which the report will be made. We have no particular pride of opinion about what date is provided. The Senate can make it January 15, 18, 20, 25, or, as far as I am concerned, the 30th.

All we say is that the Committee on Rules and Administration should report, but not as happened in 1957, when the measure was sent to the Committee on Rules and Administration to be buried, and not as happened in 1961, when it was again sent to the Committee on Rules and Administration to be buried. Let us send it to the Committee on Rules and Administration so that it might be brought back to the Senate and voted upon by the Senate. I think that is the essential and important point. We could remain here a long time engaged in discussions and receiving assurances from many Senators that the measure would be brought back to the Senate for a decision.

Senator Jenner, who has been away from this body for some time, and who, I am glad to report, is in good health and happy, made a proposal as sincerely as any man could.

I spoke many times with Senator Jenner after he ceased to be chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration as to what happened. I knew he had tried hard, but he was unsuccessful in having a measure reported to the Senate to have it voted upon. That is the whole question: Can we have a vote on this question, or can we not? Many people are worrying about votes for people in all parts of the country. What about votes for Members of the Senate? How long have we been trying to get a vote in the Senate on the clear-cut question: Shall rule XXII be amended?

Therefore, in the hope that the proposal may be sent to committee, and time provided for Senators to consider everything they wish to consider, and time to permit it to come back to the Senate floor, I now move to amend the Dirksen motion to refer to read as follows:

> That the resolution be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration which shall make its report on said resolution and on any other proposed amendments to rule XXII to the Senate on January 25, 1965, and all rights in existence at the opening of Congress shall be deemed preserved.

I send the amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

> That the resolution be referred to the committee on Rules and Administration which shall make its report on said resolution and any other proposed amendments to rule XXII to the Senate on January 25, 1965, and all rights in existence at the opening of Congress shall be deemed preserved.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I support the Anderson amendment to the Dirksen motion. As the Senator from New Mexico has said, this is old and long-traveled ground, for year after year, at the opening of Congress, the Senator from New Mexico has made his valiant effort to have the Senate come to a vote on an amendment to rule XXII. On a number of occasions, the tactic—and it is a perfectly legitimate tactic—employed by the minority leader, of having the proposal referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, has been followed, and on several occasions the measure has been approved by the Senate.

In the old days, the Committee on Rules and Administration had a majority favorable to amendment of rule XXII. But that day, unhappily, has, I fear, now passed. The subcommittee of the Committee on Rules and Administration, on which I serve, consists of the able and beloved President pro tempore; the distinguished junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON]; and the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER]. As a member of the full committee, I believe that it would be highly unlikely that that subcommittee would submit a favorable report on the Anderson proposed amendment.

Who knows what Senators will do in circumstances which cannot be accurately known until a vote comes? But I should think it most unlikely that the full membership of the Committee on Rules and Administration would report favorably on the Anderson amendment. So the question may arise: Why do we who support the Anderson amendment and those who support the even more drastic motion to amend rule XXII consent to send this proposal to the Committee on Rules and Administration? It is because a case can be made for following the normal committee procedure to give the committee an opportunity to consider the amendment and to submit a report. But let us fix a day certain when that report must be made, favorable, unfavorable, or the result reported back on the amendment.

In that way, we shall be sure, as the Anderson motion provides, that all rights existing at the opening of Congress will be preserved. The Senate will have, for its benefit, a report from the Committee on Rules and Administration. We can then move to take up the resolution as reported back and proceed to test the constitutional theories on which the Senator from New Mexico and his colleagues rely. We can reach a vote under the Constitution.

I know that it will be said, and said with some justice, that the Committee on Rules and Administration is too busy to make a report back on this matter by the 25th of January. It will be said that this is a grave and serious matter which will require long hearings and much careful consideration. The Committee on Rules and Administration is terribly busy at this time of the year. We have the money resolution. We have the inauguration. And, let it not be forgotten, we still have Bobby Baker. So, they will ask how the Committee on Rules and Administration can give adequate attention to this serious matter if it is so rushed. To which my reply will be clear. This is the sixth time—I believe I am correct, and if not, the Senator from New Mexico can correct me over a period of 12 years, or the fifth time, perhaps, that the Senator from New Mexico has made this motion.

The question has been debated extensively. Learned briefs have been placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Two Vice Presidents have ruled on the underlying constitutional question involved. There is not a member of the Committee on Rules and Administration who does not now know how he shall vote on the Anderson motion. At one meeting of that committee, with minds well made up, we could report this bill back before January 25.

Let us take the normal course. Let us accept the suggestion of the distinguished minority leader. Let us refer this proposal to the Committee on Rules and Administration in accordance with orderly procedure. But, let us bring it back before the Senate becomes involved in strenuous legislative business, before committees begin to bring out their reports, and before the program of the President can be brought before this body.

Let it not be said that this delay of perhaps 20 days, or 3 weeks, will interrupt the business of the Senate. We can continue with whatever is before us while the Committee on Rules and Administration is debating this matter. We can organize the committees. The committees can go to work on the bills which have been referred. Senators can speak on any business they desire to. The normal procedure can continue without interruption. We will get back to this matter on the 25th of January, in ample time to come to a sound and sensible decision, after reasonable debate, without interfering in any way with the program of the President, or any other legislation which might come before the Senate at that time.

I hope very much that the Anderson substitute motion will be approved by the Senate.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I should like to have the clerk report those instructions again. There is some language contained in it that I do not regard as being appropriate under the rules in a situation of this kind.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

> The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] moves to amend the Dirksen motion to refer as follows: That the resolution be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration which shall make its report on said resolution and on any other proposed amendments to rule XXII to the Senate on January 25, 1965, and all rights in existence at the opening of Congress shall be deemed preserved.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, that instruction relates not only to the pending business, but also to any other rule change that might be brought forward.

I submit that is not appropriate under the rules. Likewise, I should like to have some understanding as to what is meant by that last clause. It would seem to indicate that under some conditions, Senators might be denied their constitutional rights. I should like to know what conditions could arise that would cause the Senators to lose their constitutional rights in this body.

Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the Chair and the Parliamentarian, because I think it is a valid point of order. On page 543 of the book on Senate procedure there is set forth the first part of paragraph 1 of rule XXII, and that rule reads as follows:

> When a question is pending, no motion shall be received but—

I repeat:

> No motion shall be received but—

I will not read all of them, but I will go down to the one that is pending:

> to commit.

The precedents are clear that a motion to commit with instructions can be offered as a motion to commit, but I submit those instructions cannot apply to anything except a measure before the Senate. It is being undertaken in this motion to instruct the committee with respect to resolutions that have not yet been offered, because the instruction is to report back all resolutions that may deal with this subject matter. I submit that the rules do not permit that.

We are dealing here only with the resolution offered by the Senator from New Mexico. A Senator has no right to offer any amendment but a motion to instruct on this measure; he cannot instruct the committee with respect to other legislation and other proposals that may not have been introduced as of now.

Paragraph 1 of rule XXII is very clear and limited. It reads:

> To commit.

The sentence reads:

> When a question is pending, no motion shall be received but to commit.

What? Something that has not been introduced yet? Commit some other legislation that is not before the Senate? It cannot possibly mean there is a right to instruct the committee, in committing this measure, with respect to other measures that are not pending and may not have even been introduced.

When we get to the description or the definition of this paragraph, it reads:

> When motions are made for reference of a subject to a select committee, or to a standing committee, the question of reference to a standing committee shall be put first; and a motion simply to refer shall not be open to amendment, except to add instructions.

It is now proposed to instruct the committee, with respect to any resolution in this area dealing with these rules—even though they may not have been introduced as of now—to report back by January 25. I insist that that part of the instruction is not authorized under paragraph 1 of the rule XXII.

There are precedents which hold that an amendment to a motion to recommit with instructions providing that certain amendments offered from the floor should be subject to a point of order is in violation of the rules of the Senate and therefore not in order.

There are clear precedents set out on page 544 of the book on Senate procedure. Another precedent reads:

> An amendment to a motion to recommit with instructions, which provides that amendments from the floor to a general appropriations bill increasing the total above a certain amount should be subject to a point of order, was in effect a change of Senate rules without customary procedure.

The part of the motion which deals with all other resolutions in this area simply is not in order in this resolution.

I respectfully submit that that part of the motion to instruct is subject to a point of order.

Further, I should like to know what is meant by the latter part of the instruction, which states that any constitutional rights of any Member of the Senate in this area shall not be affected by the motion.

I wonder how the Chair construes that part.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I request the opportunity to be heard before the Chair rules.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have not yielded the floor. I am waiting for a more opportune time to be heard. These remarks were addressed to the Chair.

Mr. CLARK. Does the Senator agree that I may be heard on this point?

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course; that is a matter for the Chair, and I have no control over it.

I have made a parliamentary inquiry as to how the Chair construes the last clause of the motion to commit, with respect to preserving constitutional rights.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It appears to be an instruction to the committee.

Mr. RUSSELL. The committee is to do something; is that correct?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Yes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Does the Chair hold that the committee can be instructed, in a motion applying to this resolution, with respect to other resolutions?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It states that all the rights in existence at the opening of Congress shall be deemed preserved. That is something that the Senate could do.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is no instruction to the committee. It provides that the rights shall be preserved by the Senate.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield before he proceeds further?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. CLARK. I should like to suggest to my able friend from Georgia that the phrases to which he takes exception are subject, I think, to a very clear interpretation.

The phrase with respect to any other proposed amendments to rule XXII of the Senate obviously refers only to the amendments to rule XXII of the Senate which are now before the Senate. This means (a) the Anderson resolution and (b) the Douglas resolution. In my judgment, it could not possibly be construed to cover resolutions which have not yet been submitted.

I ask my able friend from New Mexico whether he would be willing to make it abundantly clear by indicating that he has in mind the Anderson resolution and the Douglas resolution.

Mr. RUSSELL. There is nothing to prevent the committee from going into the Douglas resolution and considering it. The committee can write an entirely new rule. It need not follow either the Anderson or the Douglas proposal. It can bring in an entirely different proposal. The Chair has so ruled.

Mr. ANDERSON. Has the Chair so ruled?

Mr. RUSSELL. In response to an inquiry by the Senator from Illinois, yes; that he could not bring his resolution into this procedure because we were dealing only with the Anderson proposal.

It is now proposed by the Senator from New Mexico to include the Douglas resolution and instruct the committee with respect to it even though it is not pending before the Senate.

Mr. ANDERSON. Did the Chair so rule?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is entirely out of order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The first part of this resolution deals with instructions to the committee. The last part is simply an understanding among Senators.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is the very thing that this precedent which I have read says is not in order.

Mr. ANDERSON. Would the Senator from Georgia kindly quote that precedent once more?

Mr. RUSSELL. The precedent states that that part of it is not in order.

Mr. ANDERSON. Would the Senator quote that again?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to do so:

> An amendment to a motion to recommit with instructions providing that a certain amendment offered from the floor is subject to a point of order is in violation of the rules of the Senate and therefore not in order.

That would certainly apply; the motion would give the committee instructions with respect to the proposal which is not pending here and which the Chair within the past hour and a half has held could not be brought into this procedure except by unanimous consent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The first part of the resolution were instructions to the committee and the last part is instructions to the Senators and not in order.

Mr. ANDERSON. I did not hear the ruling of the Chair. Did the Chair so rule?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It was my impression that this was an addition to the instructions brought here. "All rights essential to the opening of Congress shall be preserved." Does the Senator from New Mexico object to that language?

Mr. ANDERSON. Do I object to that language?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator object to that language?

Mr. ANDERSON. This is the understanding we have had right along. I certainly do not wish to have that language in it, and then it would become necessary to have the battle going on or prevent committees from meeeting. If that is what people wish, they should state so frankly. Personally, I do not. I wish the business of the Senate to go on with rights being preserved.

Mr. RUSSELL. The instructions to report on this bill by January 25 are in order, and the precedents on that are very clear, and we must pass on that order. Then we have the other portion of this so-called instruction, dealing with instructions to the Senate and not to the committee. I submit that they are not justified under the rules of the Senate and that they are not in order. The Senator is undertaking to instruct the Rules Committee with respect to the Douglas resolution, when the Senator from Illinois was denied the right even to offer his resolution as an amendment. He could not bring it into this procedure at all. Yet the Senator from New Mexico, by these instructions, would instruct the committee with respect to the Douglas proposal, when it is not pending here. I submit that it would be just as much in order to instruct the Rules Committee to report an appropriation bill as it would be to instruct it to report the Douglas resolution.

Mr. ANDERSON. I should like to have the Senator from Georgia point to those instructions which he was reading a moment ago, from page 244, was it?

Mr. RUSSELL. Page 544, the first sentence in the fourth paragraph on that page.

Mr. ANDERSON. An amendment to a motion to recommit.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. ANDERSON. It states an amendment to a motion to recommit.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course it is. The Senator is amending a motion to commit a bill.

Mr. ANDERSON. To commit, not recommit.

Mr. RUSSELL. There is no difference in that, to recommit or commit.

Mr. ANDERSON. Play or replay are the same words?

Mr. RUSSELL. It is exactly the same effect as if it were a motion to recommit.

Mr. ANDERSON. The language is very plain.

Mr. RUSSELL. If it had been reported by the committee, the language would have had to say, "I move to recommit." If it had not been reported by committee, the language would be, "I move to commit." There is no difference whatever in the effect. This language as proposed here is not in order.

Mr. ANDERSON. I invite the attention of the Chair to the fact that on page 543 there are two simple words, "to commit." That is all that is involved here. Whether to commit with instructions is another story. If they wish to confine it to something that might have to be spelled out by Senators wishing to spell it out to commit a question which is pending and no motion received but to commit, it does not say anything about what the instructions should be, or anything else.

Mr. RUSSELL. There is no difference between a motion to commit and a motion to recommit.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The precedents are the same for practical purposes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, is there any difference between the words scrupulous and unscrupulous?

Mr. ANDERSON. I only point out to the Presiding Officer that the language which the Senator from Georgia has used has to be tested to substantially get around to where it applies to this case. An amendment to a motion to recommit with instructions providing that certain amendments offered from the floor shall be subject to a point of order, there is nothing about that in here. It is truly voluntary.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course not, but the Senator's resolution is more violative of the rules than this one because it reaches out to bring another resolution into the picture which is not even pending. The precedents I have cited refer to amendments that are pending. The Senator seeks to reach out and cover the Douglas resolution when it is not even pending.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator from Georgia suspend for a moment? The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, and the morning hour having expired, the resolution under consideration now goes to the calendar under the uniform rules of the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Since Senate Resolution 6 has been placed on the calendar, am I not correct in assuming that a motion to take up from the calendar Senate Resolution 6 is necessary to continue the discussion?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 6.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, that motion is debatable. Is that correct?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

ORDER FOR RECESS UNTIL NOON TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today that it stand in recess until 12 o'clock tomorrow noon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 3) extending the date for transmission of the budget and Economic Report.

DISASTER RELIEF IN OREGON

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to send to the desk a bill in behalf not only of myself and my colleague in the Senate, but the entire Oregon delegation in the Congress dealing with the flood disaster in Oregon. I ask that the bill be appropriately referred, and that I be granted permission to file later this afternoon a statement on the bill.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, reserving the right to object to the request of the Senator from Oregon, will the Senator amend his request so as to make it clear that if unanimous consent is granted, the right under the Constitution to amend the rules of the Senate at the opening of each Congress shall not be prejudiced by the granting of the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. MORSE. I am willing to accept any qualification that must be accepted in order to get the disaster bill to which I have referred before the Senate. It would be beyond my belief or comprehension that the Senate would prevent the introduction of such a bill. The agencies downtown, as well as the Governor of my State and the State government, are calling for immediate action on the disaster bill, and they are certainly entitled to have such action.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I understand that the Senator is agreeable to my qualification of his unanimous-consent request.

Mr. MORSE. I have no objection to any qualification so long as my bill can be introduced and appropriately referred.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. Does the text of the bill which my friend from Oregon is now introducing affect any of the problems which the Senator's neighboring State—my own—will have or does have?

Mr. MORSE. Not at all. I have already joined the Senator from California in his earlier statement calling for action on the entire Pacific coast.

Mr. KUCHEL. Indeed the Senator has.

Mr. MORSE. But I also have an obligation in respect to my own State and its Governor to introduce the bill that seeks to bring consideration and relief to the highways, bridges, and the lumber mills that have been washed out, because we are suffering devastating tragedy, as is the State of the Senator from California. All I am asking is that the bill be introduced. In no way will it impair the Senator's bill. In fact, I am standing shoulder-to-shoulder with him and the Senators from Washington.

Mr. KUCHEL. The bill should be introduced. Once again it points out what my able friend from Oregon has been saying. There should be no delay in the introduction of that proposed legislation.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that the bill has been received and appropriately referred?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. INOUYE in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement of the Senator from Oregon will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 327) to provide assistance to the States of Oregon, Washington, California, and Idaho for the reconstruction of areas damaged by recent floods and high waters, introduced by Mr. MORSE (for himself and Mrs. NEUBERGER), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. MORSE. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 327) is as follows:

S. 327

A bill to provide assistance to the States of Oregon, Washington, California, and Idaho for the reconstruction of areas damaged by recent floods and high waters

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Congress hereby recognizes that the States of Oregon, Washington, California, and Idaho have experienced extensive property loss and damage as the result of floods and high waters during December 1964 and January 1965, and declares the need for special measures designed to aid and accelerate these States in their efforts to provide for the reconstruction of devastated areas.

SEC. 2. (a) Notwithstanding section 120(f) of title 23 of the United States Code, the Federal share payable from the emergency fund authorized by section 125 of such title on account of any repair or reconstruction of highways on the Federal-aid highway system of Oregon, Washington, California, and Idaho, which were damaged or destroyed by the floods and high waters during December of 1964, and January of 1965 shall be 100 percent of the cost of such repair or reconstruction.

(b) The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized with funds and authorizations available to him for the construction and maintenance of forest development roads and trails, to undertake either directly or in cooperation with timber purchasers to restore or reconstruct to such extent as he deems appropriate any roads and trails which were in the process of construction by purchasers of national forest timber and which were destroyed or severely damaged by the floods of December 1964 and January 1965.

(c) There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section, in addition to the amounts authorized by section 125 of title 23, United States Code, not to exceed $200,000,000 for the period ending July 1, 1966.

(d) That subsection 120(f) of title 23, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the words, "park roads and trails," the following: "highways, roads and trails on public lands, roads and trails on wildlife refuge system lands,": *Provided further,* That subsection 125(c) of title 23, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the words, "park roads and trails,", the following: "highways, roads and trails on public lands, roads and trails on wildlife refuge system lands,".

SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to compromise or release such portion of a borrower's indebtedness under programs administered by the Farmers Home Administration in Oregon, Washington, California, and Idaho as he finds necessary because of loss resulting from the floods and high waters during December 1964, and January 1965, and he may refinance outstanding indebtedness of applicants in such States for loans under section 502 of the Housing Act of 1949 for the repair, reconstruction, or replacement of dwellings or farm buildings lost, destroyed, or damaged by such causes and securing such outstanding indebtedness. Such loans may also be provided for the purchase of building sites, when the original sites cannot be utilized.

(b) The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to compromise or release such portion of a borrower's indebtedness under programs administered by the Rural Electrification Administration in Oregon, Washington, California, and Idaho as he finds necessary because of loss, destruction, or damage of property resulting from floods and high water during December 1964 and January 1965.

SEC. 4. The Housing and Home Finance Administrator is authorized to compromise or release such portion of any note or other obligation held by him with respect to property in Oregon, Washington, California, or Idaho pursuant to title II of the Housing Amendments of 1955, or included within the revolving fund for liquidating programs established by the Independent Offices Appropriation Act of 1955, as he finds necessary because of loss, destruction, or damage to facilities securing such obligations by the floods and high water during December 1964 and January 1965.

SEC. 5. Loans made pursuant to paragraph (1) of section 7(b) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(b)) for the purpose of replacing, reconstructing, or repairing dwellings in Oregon, Washington, California, and Idaho, damaged or destroyed by the floods and high water of December 1964 and January 1965 may have a maturity of up to thirty years, except that section 7(c) of such Act shall not apply to such loans.

SEC. 6. This Act shall not be in effect after June 30, 1966, except with respect to payment of expenditures for obligations and commitments entered into under this Act before such date.

The statement subsequently presented by Mr. Morse is as follows:

Disaster Relief Legislation for Oregon, Washington, California, and Idaho

On behalf of myself and my colleague, Senator Neuberger, I have introduced a bill to provide assistance to the States of Oregon, Washington, California, and Idaho for the reconstruction of areas damaged by the disastrous floods and high waters of late December 1964.

Yesterday, I informed my colleagues in the Senate concerning the extent of the devastation wrought by the December flood in the State of Oregon and I stated that today Senator Neuberger and I would introduce in the Senate a bill to provide assistance for the individuals and the States that have experienced appalling degrees of losses and suffering due to the flood.

The bill that is offered today by the two Oregon Senators seeks to provide assistance in several respects. First, on the reconstruction of highways on the Federal aid systems of Oregon, Washington, California, and Idaho, the Federal contribution would constitute 100 percent of the cost of such repair and construction if this bill were to be enacted.

This is a distinct improvement over the present law dealing with the Federal contribution in such cases. For example, today we were advised that the Bureau of Public Roads has allotted $476,000 for work on the adequate restoration of the John Day River Bridge located on Interstate Highway 80N in Oregon. This allocation represents only 63 percent of the estimated cost of bridge restoration and the State of Oregon must assume the balance of the cost on this almost new interstate highway bridge. In other words, the State of Oregon, which is now burdened with tremendous obligations and losses due to the December floods, must pay a greater share of the restoration than it paid for the original construction of the bridge. This simply does not make good sense in light of the tragic burdens being borne by the State of Oregon at this time.

Our bill would also authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to undertake, either directly or in contracts with timber purchasers, the restoration or reconstruction of forest access roads in the national forest commercial timber areas. The situation in Oregon is particularly acute because scores of forest access roads were washed out, thereby making it impossible to proceed with the completion of timber sale contracts. Unless immediate action can be taken to restore these roads, the economies of many areas of the four affected States will be severely damaged due to the closure of logging operations, sawmills and plywood manufacturing firms. The assistance provided by our bill would speed up this access road reconstruction work to a substantial degree and would be of immeasurable help to many small communities that depend almost entirely on the lumber industry.

The bill we have introduced today would extend the present 100 percent Federal contribution to the cost of repair or reconstruction of highways and trails on the wilderness refuge system lands.

On loans programs administered by the Farmers Home Administration in the four affected States, the Secretary of Agriculture would be authorized to compromise or release the portion of a borrower's indebtedness that reflects the loss resulting from the December and January floods. It would also make assistance available on the refinancing of outstanding indebtedness to cover the cost of repair, reconstruction or replacement of dwellings or farm buildings lost or damaged in the floods.

Comparable relief with respect to indebtedness under the Rural Electrification Administration program would be provided. Obligations held by the Housing and Home Finance Administrator in any of the four States could, in like manner, be compromised or released to the extent found necessary.

The measure we have offered today would authorize a maturity of up to 30 years on Small Business Administration loans designed to cover the cost of replacing, reconstructing or repairing flood-damaged or destroyed dwellings.

Unfortunately, the funds now on hand in the Small Business Administration are not adequate to cope with the demands for Small Business Administration disaster loans in Oregon, Washington, California, and Idaho. We feel that it is imperative that emergency appropriations be made to provide the Small Business Administration with ample funds to carry on its disaster loan programs in the four flood-damaged States. We are now obtaining information concerning the amount required to do the job and as soon as that information is available, we will introduce a bill to achieve this objective.

Bills comparable to our bill have been introduced in the House of Representatives today by Representatives Green and Ullman, of Oregon. Congressman Duncan of Oregon, is working closely with his Oregon colleagues in the House side on these measures and it gives me a great deal of pleasure to indicate to my colleagues that the Oregon delegation in the Congress is working as a unit in an effort to provide every possible assistance that may be available through Congress or governmental sources to flood-stricken individuals and areas of our State.

Mr. RUSSELL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. The bill has been introduced, has it not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator has a constitutional right, if he can get unanimous consent, to introduce a bill, and that action cannot possibly affect any other procedures in the Senate.

Mr. MORSE. That is my view, but I was not going to argue the procedural point so long as I could introduce my bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. Has the Senator from Pennsylvania preserved the Constitution by unanimous consent? I congratulate the Senator for his concern about the Constitution.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names.

[No. 3 Leg.]

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Bartlett
Bass
Bayh
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Clark
Cooper
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Dominick
Douglas
Eastland
Ellender
Fannin
Fong
Fulbright
Gore
Gruening
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McNamara
Metcalf
Miller
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Morse
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Murphy
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Ribicoff
Robertson
Russell
Saltonstall
Scott
Simpson
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Inouye in the chair). A quorum is present.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF CLOTURE RULE OF THE SENATE

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois will state it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have heard it rumored that the Presiding Officer who was occupying the chair shortly before the hour of 2 o'clock arrived declared in an inaudible voice that the last clause in the Anderson motion was not in order; namely:

> And all rights in existence at the opening of Congress shall be deemed preserved.

I should like to address a parliamentary inquiry to the Chair.

Mr. President, I should like to address a parliamentary inquiry through the Chair to the Official Reporter as to whether such a ruling was made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Parliamentarian has informed the present Presiding Officer that that is so.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, if I may speak to this point, this is a very significant and, in my opinion, a very unfair ruling, for this reason. The Anderson proposal was that his resolution would be reported back from the Committee on Rules and Administration on January 25, or nearly 3 weeks from this day.

If the Senate appoints committees during this time, it can be maintained with a great deal of strength that we have accepted the previous rules in toto, including rule XXII and that therefore a motion to change rule XXII is not in order.

This is a very extraordinary ruling. I think no one, except those at the desk, heard the ruling made. It places those who are supporting the Anderson motion at a very grave parliamentary disadvantage.

We would have appealed from the ruling of the Chair if we had known what the ruling was. But, since it was made just prior to 2 o'clock and no one heard it, except those at the desk, it was impossible for us to do so.

I do not know what the procedure is. I have served in the Senate now for 16 years. This is one of the most unfair proceedings that I have witnessed. I do not believe that the Senate should uphold it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, if it is in order, I move now that the Anderson motion has gone to the calendar, and has been called up again, that it be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion to take up the Anderson motion has not been agreed upon. The resolution of the Senator from Illinois would automatically come up.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I raised two matters, one parliamentary, and one of a substantive nature. If the Anderson motion is taken up and debated, while it is in the process of debate—if committees are organized and if the Senate is organized—can it be maintained in the absence of the wording, that we have tacitly accepted all of the rules of the Senate, including rule XXII?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Parliamentarian advises me that the Senator will not lose any of his constitutional rights, and furthermore if amendments must be made to rules, they can be made at any time.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, if the Senate organizes, by the appointment of committees and the transaction of other business, while the Anderson proposal to change rule XXII is pending, either on the floor or in committee, can it be maintained successfully that the Anderson proposal is out of order?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, before the Chair rules, I think I am entitled to be heard on this.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, my colleague would not listen to me, but I am very glad to listen to him.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I want to know, as a matter of right, whether I am entitled to be heard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Parliamentarian advises me that the Chair may entertain a discussion from any Senator on a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I simply suggest to the Chair that actually there is no point of order pending at the moment, and my distinguished colleague from Illinois is asking for the opinion that would be given if a point of order were to be lodged. A point of order has not been lodged. And, I do not believe, since it is not specifically before the Senate, that there ought to be an opinion rendered by the Chair.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, may I be heard on that?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I had thought that there was a procedure which would be followed. Then, I discovered to my consternation that the previous Presiding Officer had made a ruling—not heard by any Member of the Senate, so far as I know—just prior to 2 o'clock when he left the chair. He had made a ruling that the phrase "all rights in existence at the opening of Congress shall be preserved" was not in order. That is confirmed by the present occupant of the chair, after consultation with the Parliamentarian, and I assume, the clerks.

I want to point out the practical effect of this is that if this ruling stands, it seems to me that the way is open for a point of order at any time that successful attempts to organize the Senate constitute in effect an acceptance of all the existing rules of the Senate, including rule XXII, which is the very rule that the Senator from New Mexico and others of us wish to have modified.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, is a question of privilege in order at this time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I raise that question now. I respectfully request that the Record be brought from the reporters on a point of order to see exactly what the ruling was.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The notes have not been transcribed yet.

RECESS SUBJECT TO CALL OF THE CHAIR

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I suggest that the Chair declare a recess until the notes have been transcribed and the transcript can be produced.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator so move?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I so move, subject to the call of the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(At 2 o'clock and 28 minutes p.m. the Senate took a recess subject to the call of the Chair.)

The Senate reconvened at 3:19 p.m., when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. Inouye) in the chair.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is the intention of the leadership to move to recess shortly; but before that is done, it is my understanding that the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas] has a few remarks to make at this time.

CLARIFICATION OF THE RECORD

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Before the Chair recognizes the junior Senator from Illinois, does the senior Senator from Illinois still request that the transcript be read?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I would like to be privileged to make an explanatory statement and ask that the parliamentary reporter who was in the room at the time be privileged to reply to my questioning, and that the Journal clerk be privileged to reply.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I did not quite hear the statement.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I requested that I be privileged to make an initial statement, and then, that the parliamentary reporter be privileged to reply to my questions, and that the Journal clerk be privileged to reply.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have no objection. I was about to raise the point that we should make sure to get the statement from the Journal clerk and make sure it is on the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Senator from Georgia is recognized.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I do not know what the Senator from Illinois has in mind. But I would not wish to be precluded, if we are going to enter into this unusual hearing here in the Senate, from asking questions or making a statement in my own right, if I deem it desirable. I do not recall any time in my experience when there has been any such open session. I have no objection to it. But, I do not think the privilege should be confined to one Senator by unanimous consent. If it is so confined, I shall object.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I thoroughly agree with the senior Senator from Illinois. If I understood the majority leader correctly, he intended to wait until Senator Douglas made some remarks, and then recess. That would leave us up in the air. Based on what he says, there are many of us who might have something to say or something to ask on that issue. The majority leader could move to recess at any time. He could move to recess right now. That is the right of the majority leader.

If the questioning is to be opened on what did or did not occur with respect to this ruling, I respectfully submit in all fairness that we ought to finish that questioning and then recess when Senators have had a chance to express themselves on that one issue.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in view of what has developed, and the length of time that it might take, I think it would be in the best interest of all concerned if we were to consider the possibility of recessing at this time of the afternoon and taking this matter up at 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the difficulty with that is that in the meantime the Congressional Record will have been printed. It is very important that it be printed correctly. I promise to be very brief. But I want to be thorough on the matter. It is a parliamentary issue on which possibly the whole fate of the Anderson proposal is at stake.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, this is a most unusual situation. I do not know that questioning official reporters and others in open sessions of the Senate is such a good precedent to set.

I suggest that the Senator from Illinois make whatever statement he desires, and raise any questions, and that those questions be answered in writing and presented to the Senate tomorrow.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is very good.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I would object to that. We do not know what the answers would be. We might have other questions that we would wish to ask, in the nature of cross-examination. This kind of inquiry is usually conducted by the full committee of the Senate on motion. But, if we are to depart from that practice—and I have no objection to spending 2 or 3 days on it, if necessary—certainly every other Senator ought to have the same right that the Senator from Illinois would enjoy.

If there is to be an open hearing here, any Member of the Senate should have the right to make a statement and ask questions. Unless that privilege is allowed, I feel constrained to object.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, there is no provision in the rules for such procedure.

RECESS TO TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I feel that this matter is getting a little out of hand. I sympathize fully with the distinguished Senator from Illinois. But, in view of the events as they have transpired, at this time I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Montana.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, may I be heard on this question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is not debatable.

The question is on the motion of the Senator from Montana to recess to 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Friday, January 8, 1965, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 7, 1965:

U.S. District Judge

Edwin Langley, of Oklahoma, to be U.S. district judge for the eastern district of Oklahoma, vice Eugene Rice, retired.

In the Army

The following-named officer under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in grade as follows:

Maj. Gen. Berton Everett Spivy, Jr., O19479, U.S. Army, in the grade of lieutenant general.

The following-named officer to be placed on the retired list in grade indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3962:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. Walter King Wilson, Jr., O17512, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. William Frederick Cassidy, O18354, U.S. Army, for appointment as Chief of Engineers, U.S. Army, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3036.

The following-named officer under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in grade as follows:

Maj. Gen. William Frederick Cassidy, O18354, U.S. Army, in the grade of lieutenant general.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JANUARY 7, 1965

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Hebrews 13: 6: *The Lord is my helper, and I will not fear.*

Almighty and ever-blessed God, Thou hast entrusted our Speaker and the Members of the House of Representatives with a high and sacred vocation.

Grant that these moments of prayer may be times of insight and inspiration enabling them to come to the sacrament of public service, richly endowed with clear judgment and wise decision.

We humbly acknowledge that we were never meant or expected to discharge our tasks and responsibilities unaided and alone, for Thou hast placed at our disposal the inexhaustible resources of Thy grace.

May we never yield to those devastating moods of cynicism and defeatism which tempt us to feel that our faith in Thee and our effort to build a nobler civilization are futile.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which concurrence of the House is requested:

S.J. Res. 3. Joint resolution extending the date for transmission of the budget and the economic report.

ADMINISTRATION OF OATH OF OFFICE TO REPRESENTATIVE-ELECT HERMAN TOLL

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with your designation of me, pursuant to House Resolution 11, 89th Congress, adopted by the House of Representatives, to administer the oath of office to Representative-elect Herman Toll, of the Fourth District of Pennsylvania, I have the honor to report that on Monday, January 4, 1965, at Philadelphia, Pa., I administered the oath of office to Mr. Toll, form prescribed by section 1757 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, being the form of oath administered to Members of the House of Representatives, to which Mr. Toll subscribed.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I send to the Clerk's desk a resolution (H. Res. 85) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas Herman Toll, a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania, from the Fourth District thereof, has been unable from sickness to appear in person to be sworn as a Member of this House, but has sworn to and subscribed to the oath of office before the Honorable William A. Barrett, authorized by resolution of this House to administer the oath, and the said oath of office has been presented in his behalf to the House, and there being no contest or question as to his election: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the said oath be accepted and received by the House as the oath of office of the said Herman Toll as a Member of this House.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 86 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 86

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the standing Committee of the House of Representatives on Ways and Means: Wilbur D. Mills (chairman), of Arkansas; Cecil R. King, of California; Hale Boggs, of Louisiana; Eugene J. Keogh, of New York; Frank M. Karsten, of Missouri; A. S. Herlong, Jr., of Florida; John C. Watts, of Kentucky; Al Ullman, of Oregon; James A. Burke, of Massachusetts; Clark W. Thompson, of Texas; Martha W. Griffiths, of Michigan; W. Pat Jennings, of Virginia; George M. Rhodes, of Pennsylvania; Dan Rostenkowski, of Illinois; Phil M. Landrum, of Georgia; Charles A. Vanik, of Ohio; Richard H. Fulton, of Tennessee.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADVANCING THE NATION'S HEALTH—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 44)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

In 1787, Thomas Jefferson wrote that, "Without health there is no happiness. An attention to health, then, should take the place of every other object."

That priority has remained fixed in both the private and public values of our society through generations of Americans since.

Our rewards have been immeasurably bountiful. "An attention to health"—of the individual, the family, the community, and the Nation—has contributed to the vitality and efficiency of our system as well as to the happiness and prosperity of our people.

Today, at this point in our history, we are privileged to contemplate new horizons of national advance and achievement in many sectors. But it is imperative that we give first attention to our opportunities—and our obligations—for advancing the Nation's health. For the health of our people is, inescapably, the foundation for fulfillment of all our aspirations.

In these years of the 1960's, we live as beneficiaries of this century's great—and continuing—revolution of medical knowledge and capabilities. Smallpox, malaria, yellow fever, and typhus are conquered in this country. Infant deaths have been reduced by half every two decades. Poliomyelitis, which took 3,154 lives so recently as 1952, cost only 5 lives in 1964. Over the brief span of the past two decades, death rates have been reduced for influenza by 88 percent, tuberculosis by 87 percent, rheumatic fever by 90 percent.

A baby born in America today has a life expectancy half again as long as those born in the year the 20th century began.

The successes of the century are many.

The pace of medical progress is rapid.

The potential for the future is unlimited.

But we must not allow the modern miracles of medicine to mesmerize us. The work most needed to advance the Nation's health will not be done for us by miracles. We must undertake that work ourselves through practical, prudent, and patient programs—to put more firmly in place the foundation for the healthiest, happiest, and most hopeful society in the history of man.

Our first concern must be to assure that the advance of medical knowledge leaves none behind. We can—and we must—strive now to assure the availability of and accessibility to the best health care for all Americans, regardless of age or geography or economic status.

With this as our goal, we must strengthen our Nation's health facilities and services, assure the adequacy and quality of our health manpower, continue to assist our States and communities in meeting their health responsibilities, and respond alertly to the new hazards of our new and complex environment.

We must, certainly, continue and intensify our health research and research facilities. Despite all that has been done, we cannot be complacent before the facts that:

Forty-eight million people now living will become victims of cancer.

Nearly 15 million people suffer from heart disease and this, together with strokes, accounts for more than half the deaths in the United States each year.

Twelve million people suffer arthritis and rheumatic disease and 10 million are burdened with neurological disorders.

Five and one-half million Americans are afflicted by mental retardation and the number increases by 126,000 new cases each year.

In our struggle against disease, great advances have been made, but the battle is far from won. While that battle will not end in our lifetime—or any time to come—we have the high privilege and high promise of making longer strides forward now than any other generation of Americans.

The measures I am outlining today will carry us forward in the oldest tradition of our society—to give "an attention to health" for all our people. Our advances, thus far, have been most dramatic in the field of health knowledge. We are challenged now to give attention to advances in the field of health care—and this is the emphasis of the recommendations I am placing before you at this time.

I. REMOVING BARRIERS TO HEALTH CARE

In this century, medical scientists have done much to improve human health and prolong human life. Yet, as these advances come, vital segments of our populace are being left behind—behind barriers of age, economics, geography, or community resources. Today the political community is challenged to help all our people surmount these needless barriers to the enjoyment of the promise and reality of better health.

A. HOSPITAL INSURANCE FOR THE AGED

Thirty years ago, the American people made a basic decision that the later years of life should not be years of despondency and drift. The result was enactment of our social security program, a program now fixed as a valued part of our national life. Since World War II, there has been increasing awareness of the fact that the full value of social security would not be realized unless provision were made to deal with the problem of costs of illnesses among our older citizens.

I believe this year is the year when, with the sure knowledge of public support, the Congress should enact a hospital insurance program for the aged.

The facts of the need are well and widely known:

Four out of five persons 65 or older have a disability or chronic disease.

People over 65 go to the hospital more frequently and stay twice as long as younger people.

Health costs for them are twice as high as for the young.

Where health insurance is available it is usually associated with an employer-employee plan. However, since most of our older people are not employed they are usually not eligible under these plans.

Almost half of the elderly have no health insurance at all.

The average retired couple cannot afford the cost of adequate health protection under private health insurance.

I ask that our social security system—proved and tested by three decades of successful operation—be extended to finance the cost of basic health services. In this way, the specter of catastrophic hospital bills can be lifted from the lives of our older citizens. I again strongly urge the Congress to enact a hospital insurance program for the aged.

Such a program should:

Be financed under social security by regular, modest contributions during working years;

Provide protection against the costs of hospital and posthospital extended care, home nursing services, and outpatient diagnostic services;

Provide similar protection to those who are not now covered by social security, with the costs being paid from the administrative budget;

Clearly indicate that the plan in no way interferes with the patient's complete freedom to select his doctor or hospital.

Like our existing social security cash retirement benefits, this hospital insurance plan will be a basic protection plan. It should cover the heaviest cost elements in serious illnesses. In addition, we should encourage private insurance to provide supplementary protection.

I consider this measure to be of utmost urgency. Compassion and reason dictate that this logical extension of our proven social security system will supply the prudent, feasible, and dignified way to free the aged from the fear of financial hardship in the event of illness.

Also, I urge all States to provide adequate medical assistance under the existing Kerr-Mills program for the aged who cannot afford to meet the noninsured costs.

B. BETTER HEALTH SERVICES FOR CHILDREN AND YOUTH

America's tradition of compassion for the aged is matched by our traditional devotion to our most priceless resource of all—our young. Today, far more than many realize, there are great and growing needs among our children for better health services.

Acute illness strikes children under 15 nearly twice as frequently as it does adults.

One in five children under age 17 is afflicted with a chronic ailment.

Three out of every 100 children suffer some form of paralysis or orthopedic impairment.

At least 2 million children are mentally retarded, with a higher concentration of them from poor families.

Four million children are emotionally disturbed.

At age 15, the average child has more than 10 decayed teeth.

If the health of our Nation is to be substantially improved in the years to come, we must improve the care of the health of our 75 million preschool and school-age children and youth.

There is much to do if we are to make available the medical and dental services our rising generation needs. Nowhere are the needs greater than for the 15 million children of families who live in poverty.

Children in families with incomes of less than $2,000 are able to visit a doctor only half as frequently as those in families with incomes of more than $7,000.

Public assistance payments for medical services to the 3 million needy children receiving dependent children's benefits throughout the Nation average only $2.80 a month, and in some States such medical benefits are not provided at all.

Poor families increasingly are forced to turn to overcrowded hospital emergency rooms and to overburdened city clinics as their only resource to meet their routine health needs.

Military entrance examinations reveal the consequences. Half of those rejected cannot pass the medical tests. Three-fourths of them would benefit from treatment, and earlier treatment would greatly increase recovery and decrease lifelong disability.

The States and localities bear the major responsibility for providing modern medical care to our children and youth. But the Federal Government can help. I recommend legislation to:

Increase the authorizations for maternal and child health and crippled children's services, earmarking funds for project grants to provide health screening and diagnosis for children of preschool and school age, as well as treatment and followup care services for disabled children and youth. This should include funds to help defray the operational costs of university-affiliated mental retardation clinical centers. Provisions should also be made for the training of personnel who will operate medical facilities for children.

Broaden the public assistance program to permit specific Federal participation in paying costs of medical and dental care for children in medically needy families, similar to the Kerr-Mills program for the aged.

Extend the grant programs for (a) family health services and clinics for domestic agricultural migratory workers and their children and (b) community vaccination assistance.

C. IMPROVED COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES

Mental illness afflicts 1 out of 10 Americans, fills nearly one-half of all the hospital beds in the Nation, and costs $3 billion annually. Fortunately, we are entering a new era in the prevention, treatment, and care of mental illness. Mere custodial care of patients in large, isolated asylums is clearly no longer appropriate. Most patients can be cared for and cured in their own communities.

An important beginning toward community preparation has been made through the legislation enacted by the 88th Congress authorizing aid for constructing community mental health centers. But facilities alone cannot assure services.

It has been estimated that at least 10,000 more psychiatrists are needed.

Few communities have the funds to support adequate programs, particularly during the first years.

Communities with the greatest needs hesitate to build centers without being able to identify the source of operating funds.

Most of the people in need are children, the aged, or patients with low incomes.

I therefore recommend legislation to authorize a 5-year program of grants for the initial costs of personnel to man community mental health centers which offer comprehensive services.

D. A NEW LIFE FOR THE DISABLED

Today, we are rehabilitating about 120,000 disabled persons each year. I recommend a stepped-up program to overcome this costly waste of human resources. My 1966 budget will propose increased funds to rehabilitate an additional 25,000.

Our goal should be at least 200,000 a year. I recommend legislation to authorize:

Project grants to help States expand their services.

Special Federal matching so that rehabilitative services can be provided to a greater number of the mentally retarded and other seriously disabled individuals.

Construction and modernization of workshops and rehabilitation centers.

II. STRENGTHENING THE NATION'S HEALTH FACILITIES AND SERVICES

In our urbanized society today, the availability of health care depends uniquely upon the availability and accessibility of modern facilities, located in convenient and efficient places, and on well-organized and adequately supported services. The lack of such facilities and services is, of itself, a barrier to good health care.

A. MULTIPURPOSE REGIONAL MEDICAL COMPLEXES

In this century, we have made more advance than in all other centuries toward overcoming diseases which have taken the heaviest toll of human life. Today we are challenged to meet and master the three killers which alone account for 7 out of 10 deaths in the United States each year—heart disease, cancer, and stroke. The Commission on Heart Disease, Cancer, and Stroke has pointed the way for us toward that goal.

The newest and most effective diagnostic methods and the most recent and most promising methods of treatment often require equipment or skills of great scarcity and expense such as open heart surgery, advanced and very high voltage radiation therapy, and advanced disease detection methods.

It is not necessary for each hospital or clinic to have such facilities, equipment, or services, but it is essential that every patient requiring such specialized and expensive procedures and services have access to them. Multipurpose medical complexes can meet these needs. They would—

Speed the application of research knowledge to patient care, so as to turn otherwise hollow laboratory triumphs into health victories; and

Save thousands of lives now needlessly taken annually by the three great killers—heart disease, cancer, and stroke—and by other major diseases.

A plan to improve our attack upon these major causes of death and disability should become a part of the fabric of our regional and community health services. The services provided under this plan will help the practicing physician keep in touch with the latest medical knowledge and by making available to him the latest techniques, specialized knowledge, and the most efficient methods.

To meet these objectives, such complexes should—

Be regional in scope;

Provide services for a variety of diseases—heart disease, cancer, stroke, and other major illnesses;

Be affiliated with medical schools, teaching hospitals, and medical centers;

Be supported by diagnostic services in community hospitals;

Provide diagnosis and treatment of patients, together with research and teaching in a coordinated system;

Permit clinical trial of advanced techniques and drugs.

Medical complexes—consisting of regional organizations of medical schools, teaching hospitals, and treatment centers tied into community diagnostic and treatment facilities—represent a new kind of organization for providing coordinated teaching, research and patient care. When we consider that the economic cost of heart disease alone amounts to 540,000 lost man-years annually—worth some $2.5 billion—the urgency and value of effective action is unmistakable.

Action on this new approach, stemming from recommendations of the Commission on Heart Disease, Cancer, and Stroke, will provide significant improvements in many fields of medicine.

I recommend legislation to authorize a 5-year program of project grants to develop multipurpose regional medical complexes for an all-out attack on heart disease, cancer, stroke, and other major diseases.

B. IMPROVED SERVICES FOR THE MENTALLY RETARDED

Mental retardation in any individual is a lifelong problem of the most serious nature for the family and for the community. But we know today that the problem need not and must not lead to tragic hopelessness. Much is being done to provide a decent, dignified place in society for these unfortunate individuals.

The 88th Congress provided a substantial foundation for building an effective national program for the prevention of mental retardation and care of the mentally retarded. Under this authority, grants are authorized—

For construction of mental retardation research centers, community mental retardation centers, and university affiliated mental retardation centers; and

For planning by all the States of comprehensive action to combat mental retardation at the State and community levels.

The 1966 budget includes $282 million—a $40 million increase—for these programs and other mental retardation services, including preventive activities and the training of teachers of the retarded. I urge that this full amount be appropriated.

Extensive resources and programs need to be developed in the States and communities to prevent mental retardation and to care for the mentally retarded. The existing authority for planning grants will end on June 30, 1965. The developmental needs and effective utilization of the construction grants require followup action.

I recommend the enactment of mental retardation program development grants for 2 additional years to help the States continue this essential work.

C. MODERNIZATION OF HEALTH FACILITIES

Great progress have been made throughout the Nation in the provision of new general hospitals under the Hill-Burton program. But relatively little assistance has been available for modernization of the older hospitals, found particularly in our large cities. Without aid, deterioration threatens and rapid scientific and technical change is passing by these essential links to health care for millions of our people.

The 1966 budget will include funds for a greatly increased hospital modernization effort as well as for expansion in the number and quality of nursing homes. I urge the Congress to approve the full amount requested for each of these purposes.

D. AID FOR GROUP PRACTICE FACILITIES

New approaches are needed to stretch the supply of medical specialists and to provide a wider range of medical services in the communities. The growth of voluntary, comprehensive group practice programs has demonstrated the feasibility of grouping health services for the mutual benefit of physicians and patients by—

Integrating the burgeoning medical specialties into an efficient and economical system of patient care; and

Reducing the incidence of hospitalization which may now occur because there are few alternative centers for specialized care.

The initial capital requirements for group practice are substantial, and funds are not now sufficiently available to stimulate the expansion and establishment of group practice. To facilitate and encourage this desirable trend, I recommend legislation to authorize a program of direct loans and loan guarantees to assist voluntary associations in the construction and equipping of facilities for comprehensive group practice.

III. MANPOWER FOR THE HEALTH SERVICES

The advance of our Nation's health in this century has, in the final measure, been possible because of the unique quality and fortunate quantity of men and women serving in our health professions. Americans respect and are grateful for our doctors, dentists, nurses, and others who serve our Nation's health. But it is clear that the future requires our support now to increase the quantity and assure the continuing high quality of such vital personnel.

In all sectors of health care, the need for trained personnel continues to outstrip the supply.

At present, the United States has 290,000 physicians. In a decade, we shall need 346,000.

Today we are keeping pace with our needs largely because of the influx of numbers of foreign-trained doctors. Last year 1,600 came into the United States, the equivalent of the output from 16 medical schools and 21 percent of our medical school graduates.

Population growth has badly outpaced the increase in dentists and the shortage of dentists is now acute.

To begin to meet the Nation's health needs, the number of new physicians graduated each year must increase at least 50 percent by 1975, and the output of new dentists by 100 percent.

The Health Professions Educational Assistance Act of 1963, authorizing grants to schools for construction of medical and other health education schools and loans to students, will help meet this problem. The magnitude of the need is demonstrated by the response:

Ninety applications have been received from medical and dental schools, requesting $247 million in Federal aid for construction.

Only $100 million is available in 1965; and the full authorization for 1966, which I will shortly request in the budget I am submitting, will provide $75 million more.

In the light of these needs, I urge the Congress to appropriate the full amount authorized and requested for the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act program.

While we must build new medical and dental schools, we must also retain and sustain the ones we have. To be neglectful of such schools would be wasteful folly.

We must face the fact that high operating costs and shortages of operating funds are jeopardizing our health professions educational system. Tuition and fees paid by medical and dental students meet less than half the institutional costs of their education. Several underfinanced medical and dental schools are threatened with failure to meet educational standards. New schools are slow to start, even when construction funds are available due to lack of operating funds.

I therefore recommend legislation to authorize—

Formula grants to help cover basic operating costs of our health profession schools in order that they may significantly expand both their capacity and the quality of their educational programs; and

Project grants to enable health profession schools to experiment and demonstrate new and improved educational methods.

Traditionally, our medical profession has attracted outstanding young talent and we must be certain that this tradition is not compromised. We must draw the best available talent into the medical profession. Half of last June's medical school graduates came from families with incomes of over $10,000 a year. The high costs of medical school must not deny access to the medical profession for able youths from low- and middle-income families.

I therefore recommend legislation to authorize scholarships for medical and dental students who would otherwise not be able to enter or complete such training.

LOOKING TO THE FUTURE

We must also look to the future in planning to meet the health manpower requirements of the Nation.

Unmet health needs are already large. American families are demanding and expecting more and better health services. In the past decades the proportion of our gross national product devoted to health has increased by more than 50 percent. The trend is still upward. If we are to meet our future needs and raise the health of the Nation, we must—

Improve utilization of available professional health personnel;

Expand the use and training of technicians and ancillary health workers through special schools and under the Vocational Education Act and Manpower Development and Training Act programs;

Expand and improve training programs for professional and for supporting health personnel; and

Plan ahead to meet requirements for which the leadtime is often 10 years or more.

With these objectives in mind, I have asked the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to develop a long-range health manpower program for the Nation and to recommend to me the steps which should be taken to put it into effect.

IV. HEALTH RESEARCH AND RESEARCH FACILITIES

Two decades ago this Nation decided that its Government should be a strong supporter of the health research to advance the well-being of its people. This year that support amounts to more than two-thirds of the total national expenditure of $1.5 billion for health research.

Continued growth of this research is necessary and the 1966 budget includes:

A 10-percent growth in expenditures for health research and for the related training; and

Funds to begin an automated system for processing the exploding volume of information on drugs and other chemicals related to health.

Health research, no less than patient care, requires adequate facilities. Over the past 8 years the Health Research Facilities Act has been highly successful in helping provide research facilities to universities and other nonprofit institutions. Federal grants of $320 million to 990 construction projects have generated over $500 million in matching institutional dollars.

This authority expires on June 30, 1966, and I recommend that it be extended for 5 years with an increased authorization and with a larger Federal share for specialized research facilities of a national or regional character.

V. HEALTH GRANTS AND PROTECTION MEASURES

Our complex modern society is creating health hazards never before encountered. The pollution of our environment is assuming such important proportion I shall shortly send to the Congress a special message dealing with this challenge.

But the protection of the public health also requires action on other fronts.

A. HEALTH GRANTS TO COMMUNITIES AND STATES

In safeguarding and advancing the Nation's health, States and communities have long had special responsibilities. General and special purpose health grants have proved an effective means of strengthening the Federal Government's partnership with them in improving the public health.

I have directed the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to study these programs thoroughly and to recommend to me necessary legislation to increase their usefulness.

Authorizations for many of these programs expire at the close of fiscal year 1966. So that a thorough review may be made, I recommend that the Congress extend the authorizations through June 30, 1967.

B. CONSUMERS HEALTH PROTECTION

Modernization of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act is imperative if our health protection program is to keep pace with the technological and industrial advances of recent years.

The health of all Americans depends on the reliability and safety of the products of the—

Food industry which alone generates nearly $100 billion in retail sales each year:

Drug industry with sales reaching $6 billion; and

Cosmetic industry which markets $2.5 billion of products.

All must be operated under the highest standards of purity and safety.

Yet, despite recent improvements in food and drug legislation, serious gaps in our ability to protect the consumer still exist. The law should be strengthened to provide adequate authority in the regulation of nonprescription drugs, medical devices, cosmetics, and food.

Narcotics are not alone among the hazardous, habit-forming drugs subject to improper use. Barbiturates, amphetamines, and other drugs have harmful effects when improperly used. Widespread traffic resulting from inadequate controls over the manufacture, distribution, and sale of these drugs is creating a growing problem which must be met. We must also counter the threat from counterfeit drugs.

I recommend legislation to bring the production and distribution of barbiturates, amphetamines, and other psychotoxic drugs under more effective control.

For the fuller protection of our families, I recommend legislation to require—

Adequate labeling of hazardous substances;

Safety regulation of cosmetics and therapeutic devices by premarketing examination by the Food and Drug Administration; and

Authority to seize counterfeit drugs at their source.

CONCLUSION

I believe we have come to a rare moment of opportunity and challenge in the evolution of our society. In the message I have presented to you—and in other messages I shall be sending—my purpose is to outline the attainable horizons of a greater society which a confident and prudent people can begin to build for the future.

Whatever we aspire to do together, our success in those enterprises—and our enjoyment of the fruits that result—will rest finally upon the health of our people. We cannot and we will not overcome all the barriers—or surmount all the obstacles—in one effort, no matter how intensive. But in all the sectors I have mentioned we are already behind our capability and our potential. Further delay will only compound our problems and deny our people the health and happiness that could be theirs.

The 88th Congress wrote a proud and significant record of accomplishment in the field of health legislation. I have every confidence that this Congress will write an even finer record that will be remembered with honor by generations of Americans to come.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 7, 1965.*

RESIGNATION OF MINORITY EMPLOYEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

DECEMBER 29, 1964.

Hon. JOHN MCCORMACK,
The Speaker of the House,
The Capitol, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby resign my position as minority employee of the House of Representatives, effective at the close of business January 3, 1965.

Very truly yours,
DONALD H. ACKERMAN, Jr.

EXTENDING THE DATE FOR TRANSMISSION OF THE BUDGET AND THE ECONOMIC REPORT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I call up the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 3) extending the date for transmission of the budget and the Economic Report and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the majority leader what is the purpose of this resolution, in light of the fact that the House took action on a similar resolution yesterday.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished minority leader yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Both the Senate and the House have passed identical resolutions. Either one or the other body, in order to implement it, must pass the resolution of the other body.

I talked to the majority leader of the Senate. He requested that we go ahead and pass their resolution, inasmuch as it is identical to the one we passed previously.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS. Just for a question. What is the date for the President's Economic Report?

Mr. ALBERT. As I understand it, notwithstanding the provisions of section 201 of the act of June 10, 1922, as amended, the President shall transmit to the Congress not later than January 25, 1965, the budget, and notwithstanding the provisions of section 3 of the act of February 20, 1946, as amended, the President shall transmit to the Congress not later than January 28, 1965, the Economic Report.

Mr. CURTIS. I would say to the gentleman that this has been done before, and certainly it is appropriate.

Mr. ALBERT. It has been done.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

S.J. RES. 3

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) notwithstanding the provisions of section 201 of the Act of June 10, 1922, as amended (31 U.S.C. 11), the President shall transmit to the Congress not later than January 25, 1965, the Budget for the Fiscal Year 1966; and (b) notwithstanding the provisions of section 3 of the Act of February 20, 1946, as amended (15 U.S.C. 1022), the President shall transmit to the Congress not later than January 28, 1965, the Economic Report.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT RESEARCH

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Resolution 87.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 87

Resolved, That, during the period beginning January 3, 1965, and ending February 28, 1965, inclusive, there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House of Representatives on vouchers approved by the Committee on House Administration such sums as may be necessary to pay the compensation and other expenses of assimilating data, compiling a summary report which shall be printed as part II of House Report Numbered 1941 of the Eighty-eighth Congress, and otherwise closing the work of the Select Committee on Government Research established under authority of House Resolution 504, as amended, of the Eighty-eighth Congress. Such work shall be completed by the following persons under the direction of the Committee on House Administration, and they shall receive compensation at the basic rate set forth following their name: Robert L. Hopper, staff director, $8,835; Stephen P. Strickland, chief clerk, $6,600; Edward T. Fogo, staff assistant, $6,600; Harry L. Selden, editor, $6,600; Russell Saville, staff assistant, $4,020; Rowena G. Lovette, administrative assistant, $3,780; Catherine S. Cash, secretary, $2,940.

The Committee on House Administration is authorized to employ a substitute for any such person not available to serve.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as I understand it, this resolution is the one that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOLLING] discussed with me, as the ranking member of the Select Committee on Government Research, which died with the 88th Congress at noon on January 4. What this resolution really does, if adopted, is to permit the Committee on House Administration to spend some, $16,000 or $18,000 I believe to conclude the work of mailing out the final reports of the select committee, itself, to the various universities and colleges of the country, and to the research organizations that are very much interested in it, during January and February, only. Also, I understand that the select committee, which ceased to exist at high noon on January 4, has turned back to the contingent funds of the House, under the jurisdiction of the Committee on House Administration, some $250,000, from which these particular funds would be taken to maintain this small staff in order to wrap up, or to conclude, the work of the select committee and to send out the final reports. Is that correct?

Mr. BOLLING. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. And actually, as the gentleman from Texas, the chairman of the Committee on House Administration, will agree, this will permit the saving of a great deal of money and will not require the reconstitution of the select committee, while going through all of the processes that have to be gone through, otherwise, to conclude its work. Instead, the Committee on House Administration would simply pay these people out of the contingent funds which would be turned back to them and wind up the affairs of the select committee.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLLING. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BURLESON. As I understand it—and I believe I did not get all of the gentleman's statement—this committee ceases its functions or, as a matter of fact, had ceased to exist when the new Congress convened. To be perfectly frank, under the circumstances I do not wish to assume any greater responsibility in this matter than is necessary for orderly disposition of the matter. At the same time the gentleman from Missouri conferred with me about it, and I am not objecting or at least not protesting the arrangement because I know of nothing better. So I would agree with both the gentlemen, as I know of no other alternative.

On the other hand I should want the Members to know that so far as a report being finally produced is concerned, no one would have the responsibility of signing the report, it being produced by the staff. I assume the staff is efficient, able, and conscientious in what they do. At the same time I should like to say as chairman of the committee that the committee would not be in a position to approve the report because we would not know anything about its background.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLLING. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I understand the final or summary report, as it is now in printed form, has already been approved by our committee, but the distribution has not yet been accomplished. The group that is there, while we still have the equipment and the special facilities, with the small amount of manpower necessary, will conclude the distribution of this report which has already been approved by the Elliott committee and by Chairman Elliott himself, and by me as ranking member, and by other members of the committee.

This matter was cleared, as I understand, with the Speaker, with the minority leader, and with others in the House, and is a very well designed method of saving a lot of time and a lot of money.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, as I understand the resolution calls for a summary report which would be the final report. I have seen the earlier reports at various stages, but I have reference to the summary or final report which it would seem under ordinary procedure someone who is a member would have to approve.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. That has been approved, as I understand. There were 10 different reports put out by the Select Committee on Government Research at various periods during the life of the committee. This summary report, or final report, was prepared and approved by the select committee while it was still in existence. The printing was done. But now there is the actual physical job of distributing these reports to the people who have written in and requested them. This includes many research organizations, Government organizations, and a great many colleges, universities, and libraries throughout the country.

Mr. BURLESON. I did not understand that the summary report had been approved.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. That is my understanding.

Mr. BURLESON. It would seem to me that it would be most reasonable that this matter could be done in 30 days instead of the 60 days as provided here.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. This was done because the select committee staff does have a great deal of correspondence and requests for reports.

Mr. BURLESON. I just wanted the RECORD to show that we have assumed as much responsibility in this matter as we can.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 40, United States Code, sections 175 and 176, the Chair appoints the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL], as members of the House Office Building Commission to serve with himself.

CONNECTING ROAD FOR UNITS OF THEODORE ROOSEVELT NATIONAL MEMORIAL PARK

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. REDLIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. REDLIN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to authorize construction of a road connecting the three units of Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park in western North Dakota.

In my State lies one of the great beauty spots of the Nation—the Badlands. It is not surprising that Theodore Roosevelt, 17 years before he became President, chose this area to rebuild his health by leading a vigorous outdoor life on his famous Elkhorn Ranch.

Forming the backdrop for the Roosevelt ranch are many vivid colors, produced by the majestic erosion of the North Dakota Badlands. There is grandeur in the boulders, in the gnarled cedars and tough sage. Several times I have taken my family on nature trails on this rugged and distinctive terrain.

In 1947, Congress recognized the magnificence of this natural setting, as well as the historical importance of the Roosevelt Elkhorn Ranch by establishing the Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park, comprised of three separate units. The Elkhorn Ranch is the middle unit—and there is a unit to the south and one to the north. Large stretches of rugged terrain separate the three units—no road connects them.

The bill I have introduced today would remedy this situation by authorizing the National Park Service to construct a connecting road.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this legislation is a necessary followup to the action of Congress 18 years ago in establishing Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park. I regard it as a reasonable proposition that the park should be made more accessible, so that more Americans may enjoy the natural wonders of the Badlands and appreciate the historical values of the Roosevelt Elkhorn Ranch.

Construction of the road likewise would improve communication between the three park units and promote proper development and maintenance.

Mr. Speaker, President Johnson in his state of the Union message this week placed the Nation's problems and needs in broad perspective. I believe the Theodore Roosevelt Park road fits perfectly into his vision of the future. Of particular relevance were these words of the President in his state of the Union message:

> For over three centuries the beauty of America has sustained our spirit and has enlarged our vision. We must act now to protect this heritage. In a fruitful new partnership with the States and cities the next decade should be a conservation milestone. We must make a massive effort to save the countryside and to establish—as a green legacy for tomorrow—more large and small parks, more seashores and open spaces than have been created during any other period in our national history.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD at this point the text of my bill:

H.R. 2113

A bill to provide for a connecting road between three units of the Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park, North Dakota, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in order to enhance public enjoyment of the three units of the Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to accept the donation of, or to procure by such other means as may be in the public interest, lands and interests in lands in the State of North Dakota for the development of a connecting road that traverses generally the area of the Little Missouri River and connects the three existing units of the memorial park. Such connecting road shall include necessary connections, bridges, and other structures and utilities, together with related sites for recreational and interpretive facilities.

SEC. 2. Lands acquired for such connecting road, not including lands for related recreational and interpretive purposes, shall consist of the fee title to a right-of-way of not more than an average of twenty-five acres per mile and of scenic easements on lands adjoining the right-of-way to preserve the present use and appearance of such lands, said easements not to exceed an average of one hundred acres per mile. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, Federal property required for such connecting road or its directly related facilities may, with the concurrence of the agency having custody thereof, be transferred to the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior, without consideration, for use by him in carrying out the purpose of this Act. All property acquired or transferred pursuant to this Act shall become a part of the Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park and be administered in accordance with such special rules and regulations as the Secretary may promulgate to further the purposes of this Act: *Provided*, That the Secretary shall permit the use of the connecting road by farm or other vehicles, including trucks, serving adjacent landowners; and in regard to fencing, the Secretary shall be guided by the range laws of North Dakota, local requirements, and the desires of adjoining landowners.

SEC. 3. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

VISIT OF FEDERAL INSTALLATIONS IN SAN ANTONIO, TEX.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, since the adjournment of the last Congress, I have made it a point to visit many of the Federal installations located in my home district of San Antonio, the 20th Congressional District of Texas. Recently I had the honor and pleasure of touring the Army Map Service field office located at Fort Sam Houston in San Antonio. This remarkable and efficient office is under the competent leadership and command of Maj. Jack E. Himes.

It is at this installation that maps of all parts of the world are prepared. It is this office too which has the primary supply responsibility for maps of the entire Western Hemisphere. It is in San Antonio also that one of the most modern photogrammetric divisions is located, utilizing in its work the latest advances in photogrammetry and drafting. It is this division which pioneered the production of plastic relief maps in quantity that have enabled man to see his earth in accurate Three Dimension.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that San Antonio is an ideal location for this field office of the Army Map Service because of the availability of experienced and competent technicians; thus, enabling this field office to continue its highly specialized work in this worthy contribution of scientific knowledge to our Nation and to the entire world.

ARTS AND HUMANITIES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I speak at this time to introduce two bills concerned with the arts and humanities.

Indeed, since I last spoke on this subject, the sense of concern about this area of our national life has widened and deepened. The highly significant National Arts and Cultural Development Act of 1964 is now law. Very recently we heard a stirring affirmation in President Johnson's state of the Union message, when he proposed a national foundation of the arts "to help promote and honor creative achievements."

What do these developments mean? I suggest that they signify nothing less than an arrival at a new stage of maturity in our national life, with all that this implies in courage of commitment and the assumption of responsibilities.

I do not mean to say that this momentum is entirely due to natural inevitability. On the contrary, it is in large part due to the dedication, the leadership, and the plain hard work of a great many men.

Many of you know that I have long regarded the National Council on the Arts, the first title of the bill which I introduced in the 88th Congress, as part of a unity which is yet to be completed. There remains the matter of practical implementation.

The Council's function is advisory. It will define goals, establish standards, and provide informed guidance. The first of these bills, the National Arts Foundation Act of 1965, is designed to directly implement the work of the National Council on the Arts. The Council would be "authorized and directed to administer the Foundation, discharge the functions and duties provided by this act, and execute the programs of the Foundation." It would then carry out a program of grants-in-aid, on a matching basis, to the States and to qualified groups concerned with cultural endeavors. The second bill, the National Humanities Foundation Act, also would complement the National Council on the Arts, but in a broader and more inclusive fashion. It includes a program for the arts similar to the bill described above. In addition, it provides support and recognition for the humanities.

This bill conforms with the principles and recommendations of the report of the Commission on the Humanities issued last year. The Chairman of the Commission was Barnaby C. Keeney, president of Rhode Island's Brown University. It was made up of the American Council of Learned Societies, the Council of Graduate Schools in the United States, and the United Chapters of Phi Beta Kappa.

Their closely reasoned and thoughtful report says in part:

> Traditionally our Government has entered areas where there were overt difficulties or where an opportunity had opened for exceptional achievement. The humanities fit both categories, for the potential achievements are enormous while the troubles stemming from inadequate support are comparably great. The problems are of nationwide scope and interest. Upon the humanities depend the national ethic and morality, the national esthetic and beauty or the lack of it, the national use of our environment and our material accomplishments—each of these areas directly affects each of us as individuals.
>
> The stakes are so high and the issues of such magnitude that the humanities must have substantial help both from the Federal Government and from other sources. It is for these reasons that the Commission recommends the establishment of a National Humanities Foundation to parallel the National Science Foundation, which is so successfully carrying out the public responsibilities entrusted to it.

The second bill is more consistent with actual needs. Recent information tells us of an increasing interest in the arts and humanities on a State and local level. This is reflected in the establishment of planning councils in the arts by more than half of the 50 States, and the development of programs of service to local communities. These State and local organizations, however, encounter problems in implementing their plans. The endorsement given to this proposed legislation indicates their desire for Federal assistance. The National Council on the Arts and a Humanities Foundation could provide much needed leadership and support at the national level.

I call particular attention to the following features of this bill:

First. The purposes of the National Council on the Arts are furthered and carried into action.

Second. It provides assurances against Federal interference in scholarship, teaching, research, and artistic endeavors.

Third. Funds are allotted on a State basis, State agencies are encouraged, and the determination of program is left in their hands.

Fourth. Means are provided for educating and developing scholars and teachers in the arts and humanities.

Fifth. Matching-fund grants, loans, and other means of assistance are extended to public and other nonprofit organizations, including those resources so necessary to the arts—libraries and museums.

Sixth. Cooperation with existing Federal programs, including those of the U.S. Office of Education and the Smithsonian Institution, is assured.

I am particularly pleased that this bill emphasizes cooperation with existing Federal programs, including those of the Smithsonian Institution and the U.S. Office of Education. The Smithsonian Institution is developing an inventive and unique national museum education program. The U.S. Office of Education program in the arts and humanities is providing modest financial support for research and related needs in these fields. Cooperative efforts between these agencies and a new Humanities Foundation would complement and strengthen a national effort in these important areas, and to individuals for research and for creative work and performance.

The intellectual and creative future of our Nation is linked to recognition and support for the arts and humanities. The passage of either of the two bills will provide effective results far out of proportion to the dollars involved.

THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Willis] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to address the House on the subject of certain communications I have recently received which have been addressed not only to me but to the Speaker and to all Members of this body.

The day before yesterday I had a visitor in my office, Mr. Tom Hoag, of Anaheim, Calif. He presented to me petitions in support of the House Committee on Un-American Activities which had been signed by over 30,000 Americans from 44 States.

On November 17 of last year, Mr. Hoag wrote a letter to certain people in different parts of the country, bringing to their attention the fact that a campaign was on to bring about the abolition of the committee. He asked them to draft their own petitions in support of the committee, obtain signatures for them, and mail the petitions to him no later than December 28.

In a little over a month, he received the 30,000 signatures I have referred to. Mr. Hoag had no national organization behind him. No funds were collected or expended in obtaining these signatures. The whole operation was a voluntary, grassroots expression of the feeling of American citizens.

In addition, within the last week I have received seven separate communications from a group of citizens in Ohio who, on their own initiative, have banded together as the Citizens for Retaining the House Committee on Un-American Activities. In each communication, there were petitions, addressed to all Members of the House, signed by varying numbers of people from cities and towns in Ohio, totaling over 1,300 signatures.

Until I received these communications I was unaware of the existence of this organization in Ohio, the cochairmen of which are a Protestant clergyman and a Roman Catholic monsignor. This, again, was an expression of the grassroots feeling of the American people.

I have also received within the past week or two many letters and telegrams from individual citizens in various parts of the country who have heard that a move was under foot to eliminate the committee and have written to urge me to do all that I possibly can to see that the committee is retained and that it receive an appropriation adequate to carry on its activities. These letters are unsolicited. They are spontaneous expressions of the feelings, the concern and beliefs of American citizens. They are not the results of any organized campaign. I might add that the committee receives numerous communications of this type each time an attempt is made to abolish it or to cut or eliminate its appropriations.

Needless to say, I and all members of the Committee on Un-American Activities are most grateful for the petitions, letters, and telegrams which have been received. I wish to take this opportunity to express our appreciation to all those who have thus indicated their support of the committee—and also, of course, to bring the fact of their communications to the attention of the House, because that is what many have asked me to do.

I believe these communications are most revealing and significant for us who are here to represent the people of the United States. They indicate the stand we will take on this issue, as representatives of the people, if we are to truly represent them—the stand which, I am pleased to say, this House has consistently taken for 26 years.

A BILL EXTENDING THE PROTECTION OF FEDERAL MEAT INSPECTION AND PERMITTING COOPERATION WITH STATE MEAT INSPECTION SERVICES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Smith] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, in 1961, I first introduced a bill extending the protection of Federal meat inspection and permitting cooperation with State meat inspection services. Late in the last Congress, the administration endorsed this bill. I am very hopeful that hearings can be held fairly early in this Congress and that the bill will pass. An important part of this bill is the provision which permits cooperation with the State meat inspection services which provide for minimum standards of inspection. It would permit contracts with these State groups and the use of the Federal seal so that consumers would know when they are protected. This would encourage more States to take care of part of the gap now existing and would in no way conflict with the State passing a State inspection law to provide protection in those plants which are not now covered by Federal inspection.

This bill and the talk of it has stirred up considerable interest and has resulted in several of the State legislatures becoming interested in the subject matter. At least one State has passed the kind of a State act that would protect consumers from diseased meat, permit State inspectors being deputized, and the processors for whom they work being permitted to use a Federal inspection stamp.

It is a sad commentary but I am afraid it is true that many people will live with a danger without protection unless suffering and misery has affected them or their friends.

Some outbreaks of trichinosis and examples of diseased meat being sold to unsuspecting customers who assumed they were buying meat that would be safe to eat, has in the interim caused temporary increase in concern; and some additional States, including Iowa, are now talking of a State act to cover some of the problems in their particular part of our great country.

Since only a half dozen States have adequate State inspection laws to protect their citizens against meat being sold to them from cancer-eyed cows, diseased pigs, and parts of the carcass they would not eat if they knew what was in the baloney they buy, enough uninspected meat from large and medium-sized slaughter houses is sold to provide the purchases of approximately 30 million people.

Although 80 percent of the meat is properly inspected, many consumers as a practical matter are unable to tell whether they are getting inspected or uninspected meat and too many assume that it is all adequately inspected.

The bill I have introduced this year is identical to the bill I introduced last year and was endorsed by the administration.

In addition to many other consumer groups who have shown interest in this matter, the United Packinghouse Workers Association has made a report to their membership and because others who are interested might like to see a copy of that report, I am having it reprinted in the Record. It is as follows:

UPWA Urges Smith Bill Support To Stop the Use of Unsafe Meats

The United Packinghouse, Food and Allied Workers of America, AFL–CIO, supports legislation now pending in the Congress which would require meat processors to meet Federal standards of sanitation and public safety.

We join with the Council of Public Health and Regulatory Veterinary Medicine of the American Veterinary Medical Association in its endorsement of H.R. 1015, introduced by Representative Neal Smith, of Iowa.

Under this legislation the Federal Government would be empowered to designate State agencies (where they meet Federal requirement of competence and efficiency) to cooperate in meat industry inspection under standards regarded as essential by the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

OUR OBSERVATIONS

The Nation's packinghouse workers know from personal observation that the rigorous and continuous inspection of meats as they are processed into sausage, frozen dinners, lunch meat, or other meat products is just as important to the public health as is inspection for disease at the time the animal is slaughtered.

When the Meat Inspection Division of the U.S. Department of Agriculture reports that in 1 year it condemned over 22 million pounds of meat as tainted, rancid, moldy, odorous, unclean, or contaminated, our members can assure the American public that such condemnation is thoroughly in the public interest.

By their own observations in the course of their work the members of our union know how unwholesome meat products can become if not preserved and produced under the highest standards.

We also know how tempting it is to a management to allow dirty products to proceed through the processing channels rather than to incur the financial loss of its destruction.

GRAVE DANGER EXISTS

The members of this union have good reason to warn the American public that it faces a grave danger in the rapidly expanding volume of meat slaughtered and processed which escapes adequate inspection under present Federal and State legislation.

Inspection by State or municipal authorities in the nonfederally inspected area of the meat industry varies in effectiveness from State to State and from one community to another. Some States provide no inspection whatever. Others confine inspection to the slaughtering operation while ignoring later decomposition of the product. Some States fail to finance their inspection service sufficiently to assure that it can perform its duty.

PUBLIC SAFETY IS PARAMOUNT

We point out to those who would permit the States to be lax in their supervision of meats prepared for local consumption on the traditional grounds of States rights, that the American public is engaged in interstate travel.

A traveling citizen of any State in the Union is surely entitled to the assurance that when he pulls up at a roadside restaurant the hamburgers which he orders for his family are not made from a tubercular cow, nor was the meat ground up by a local processor using equipment contaminated because of improper cleaning.

Moreover, such a traveler ought to be assured by public authority that his hamburger is not loaded with adulterants and toxin-masking chemicals which make it impossible for him to detect spoiled meat by the ordinary tests of taste and smell.

We do not doubt that the public, once made aware that the assumption that the Nation's meat supply is fully guarded by the highly respected Federal meat inspection service is unfounded, will insist that Congress move promptly to fill this gap in the essential protection of the health interests of the people.

We presume that the Congress, which so recently adopted legislation to the effect that livestock must be slaughtered in a humane fashion, will move with expedition to assure the sanitary preparation of healthful meat products for all the American people.

MONTANA AXES BUDGET; WON'T CHECK PRODUCT

HELENA, MONT.—The Montana Legislature refused to expand its State meat inspection to include supervision of processing and labeling in State-inspected slaughtering plants.

The appropriation for ante and post mortem inspection was increased to $129,500 for the next 2 fiscal years.

The livestock sanitary board was refused its requested $75,000 for the biennium to support product inspection.

MICHIGAN BILL DIES IN COMMITTEE

LANSING, MICH.—A bill providing for mandatory meat inspection in Michigan was allowed to die in committee by the State legislature although endorsed by the Michigan State Meat Packers Association.

Michigan law does not even require the licensing of slaughtering plants within the State.

APPROVAL STAMP IN MINNESOTA

ST. PAUL.—Under a recently passed law a "Minnesota Approved" label may be placed on meat products from establishments which have been licensed by the State for inspection purposes.

Hearings are to be held in June on proposed regulations.

FINDS WIDE VARIATIONS IN STATE INSPECTION LAWS

WASHINGTON.—An examination of State meat inspection laws made by the Agriculture Department reports:

Examination of live animals for obvious disease, 17 States.

Examination of all carcasses and viscera, 18 States.

Reinspection of meat for possible deterioration, six States.

Mark of inspection on products, 27 States.

Examination of meat during processing, 16 States.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, JANUARY 11, 1965

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of asking the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT], the distinguished majority leader, what the legislative schedule is for next week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. In response to the minority leader's question, there is no legislative business coming from committees, and so far as I know at this time there will not be any legislative business next week. There may be reports from committees on committees. I am advised that we will have some messages next week from the White House.

Mr. Speaker, if there is any legislative business—and I know of none now—I shall make it a point to try to advise the Members just as soon as information of such business comes to my attention.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

ASSISTANCE IN FLOOD CONTROL

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Oregon?

There was no objection?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, today in cooperation with other members of the Oregon delegation I have introduced legislation to authorize a greater measure of Federal assistance of flood-damaged sections of Oregon.

The legislation covers interstate highways and bridges, forest roads, farm property, Small Business Administration activities, and rural electrification.

Mr. Speaker, the terrible Christmas-week flooding devastated sections of Oregon. One community received 24 inches of rain within 5 days. It wiped out homes, businesses, utility, and transportation facilities. Preliminary damage estimates run in the neighborhood of $315 million—that is, nearly one-third of a billion dollars. SBA estimates that there has been $120.5 million damage just to private property in Oregon. Families suffered untold hardships.

SBA estimates that nearly 1,500 homes suffered major or total damage; 11,410 families suffered property losses and 537 family businesses incurred losses. One-third of the lumber-processing plants may have been closed down, albeit temporarily.

The replacement, renovation, and repair tasks confronting the stricken people of Oregon are staggering.

President Johnson immediately expressed his concern when the floods began to roll. Top Federal Government officials have toured the stricken areas. Emergency disaster offices have been established in half a dozen Oregon communities.

The concern of the President and the executive departments is gratefully acknowledged. Emergency measures, including disaster relief of the American Red Cross, was most helpful. We are now, however, at the stage of a permanent reconstruction of public and private facilities.

The Congress responded magnificently when called upon to assist Alaska and its people when the Good Friday earthquake erupted last year. I am confident that the Congress, House and Senate alike, will respond in similar fashion to this legislation.

FLOOD DISASTER IN THE STATE OF OREGON

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, my State of Oregon has just suffered the worst natural disaster in its history. Similar damage has been suffered in Idaho, Washington, and northern California from the heaviest and most widespread flood of record. Due to continuing bad weather conditions, it will be many weeks and perhaps months before we know the full extent of the damage.

I would like at this time to join my colleagues from those areas in extending praise and thanks for the efforts of local, State, and Federal officials, and private citizens who have done such a tremendous job in preventing a greater loss of life and more widespread destruction of property in the disaster area. We particularly appreciate the quick response of President Johnson in declaring the area eligible for emergency Federal assistance.

While all agencies of Government have been working hard to alleviate the problems resulting from the disaster, it is readily apparent, Mr. Speaker, that existing authority is not sufficient to permit the type and extent of aid necessary to restore the productive capacity of the region and to prevent total financial disaster for many of the victims.

I have been working very closely with the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON], the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN], the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DUNCAN], Senators MORSE and NEUBERGER, and many others in an attempt to evaluate the various Federal programs that are involved and in an effort to work out a legislative solution to the problem.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill to resolve some of the limitations that prevent an adequate program of rehabilitation in this four-State area.

The bill, similar to others being introduced in the Senate and the House of Representatives, will expand Federal authority to reconstruct or repair highways and facilities within the Federal aid highway system. It authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to compromise or release indebtedness under Farmers Home Administration programs where necessary because of losses of property encumbered by existing loans. It authorizes refinancing where replacement or repair of buildings is required. The Secretary will be able to take similar actions with respect to Rural Electrification Administration loans, and the Housing and Home Finance Administrator with respect to similar programs under his jurisdiction. The Small Business Administration will be authorized to extend the loan period of its disaster relief program to 30 years, instead of the present 20 years. The bill would extend authority for 100 percent road and trail rehabilitation to roads on the public lands and wildlife refuge system lands administered by the Department of Interior. National forests, park lands, and Indian reservation lands are already eligible under existing laws. These urgent needs must be met by authorizing additional funds for the Bureau of Public Roads emergency program, now nearly exhausted.

Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt that Congress will act expeditiously to alleviate the burden of this great disaster.

FLOOD DISASTER IN THE STATE OF OREGON AND OTHER WESTERN STATES

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, the staggering damage to Oregon, California, Washington, and Idaho homes, farms, ranches, timber, businesses, highways, bridges, and other public works left in the wake of storms and floods is well known to you, although the extent of that damage cannot yet be determined accurately.

And that damage may still mount as storms continue to plague the Northwest.

Although the true extent of need is not yet known, I join with my able colleagues, the gentlewoman from Oregon, Representative GREEN, and the gentleman from Oregon, Representative ULLMAN, in recognizing the insistent and legitimate demand for effective and prompt Federal assistance in the flood stricken area.

I support the efforts of the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] and the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ULLMAN] as represented by the bills they are introducing today in the House. I further support similar legislation introduced by my friend and neighbor, the gentleman from California, Congressman JOHNSON, whose district continues to suffer the ravages of the flood.

My present opinion is that there may be additional legislative authorizations necessary if the U.S. Government is to meet its fullest responsibilities to help the ravaged areas of the Pacific Northwest. Should my additional research confirm my present view, I shall offer further legislation in addition to supporting that the gentlewoman from Oregon, Representative GREEN, and the gentleman from Oregon, Representative ULLMAN, are introducing today.

I am sure that all of us in this body share with the Members from the Northwest their concern for the plight of families and businesses as a result of the disaster that struck at the height of the Christmas season and has not yet subsided fully.

All of us, too, should be proud of the manner in which citizens whose States were so ruthlessly hit rallied to reduce the loss of life and property threatened by high winds and swollen rivers turned suddenly into rampaging torrents of water.

The much maligned civil defense units sprang into action to perform yeoman service at considerable personal risk and sacrifice, as did State and local officials and employees challenged so harshly by the full force of nature run wild. I am proud of them, as I know you are.

I know the people of the Pacific Northwest can and must depend on the Congress and the Federal agencies to fulfill their responsibilities to the fullest with compassion, understanding, and generosity.

LEGISLATION DESIGNED TO PUNISH THOSE GUILTY OF KILLING THE PRESIDENT OR GUILTY OF ASSAULT UPON THE PRESIDENT

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I have just introduced legislation to punish the killing of the President of the United States.

The bill would also prevent the attempted killing or assaulting of the President. It would likewise provide punishment for the killing, attempted killing, or assaulting of the Vice President, former Presidents, President-elect, Vice President-elect, Justices of the Supreme Court, members of the Cabinet, and Members of Congress.

A killing or attempted killing of the President or other named official could bring the death penalty to a guilty party. In the case of assault, the imposed punishment would be greater if a dangerous weapon is used.

The assassination of President Kennedy clearly demonstrated the need for Federal legislation which would permit Federal law enforcement officers to immediately participate in the investigation.

The interest of national security dictates that the American public know whether attempts upon the life of the President or other high officials is a single act of a deranged mind or a part of an organized plot to disrupt the workings of government.

If this proposed legislation had been law when President Kennedy was assassinated there may well have been a greater opportunity to obtain all of the facts and to protect the life of a material witness.

The proposed legislation would not nullify State law. I emphasize that this bill will preserve a State's right to investigate and prosecute persons charged with such acts.

A copy of the bill follows:

H.R. 2063

A bill to punish the killing, attempted killing, or assaulting of the President of the United States and other high officials

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) chapter 51 of title 18 of the United States Code is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 1116. THE KILLING OF THE PRESIDENT AND CERTAIN HIGH OFFICIALS

"Whoever kills a President, President-elect or former President of the United States, a Vice President or Vice-President-elect of the United States, any Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, any member of the Cabinet of the President of the United

States, or any Member of the Senate or of the House of Representatives of the United States, shall be punished as provided under sections 1111 and 1112 of this title."

(b) The analysis at the head of chapter 51 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"1116. The killing of the President and certain high officials."

SEC. 2. (a) Chapter 7 of title 18 of the United States Code is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sections:

"§ 115. ASSAULTING, WITH INTENT TO KILL, THE PRESIDENT AND CERTAIN HIGH OFFICIALS

"Whoever assaults, with intent to kill, any person designated in section 1116 of this title shall be imprisoned for not more than fifteen years.

"§ 116. ASSAULTING, WITH INTENT TO CAUSE BODILY INJURY, TO THE PRESIDENT AND CERTAIN HIGH OFFICIALS

"Whoever, without justifiable or excusable cause, assaults or offers violence, with intent to cause bodily injury, to any person designated in section 1116 of this title shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than three years, or both.

"Whoever, in the commission of any such acts, uses a deadly or dangerous weapon, shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than ten years, or both."

(b) The analysis at the head of chapter 7 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"115. Assaulting, with intent to kill, the President and certain high officials.

"116. Assaulting, with intent to cause bodily injury, to the President and certain high officials."

SEC. 3. Nothing contained in any section of this Act shall be construed as indicating an intent on the part of Congress to occupy the field in which such sections operate, to the exclusion of any State laws on the same subject matter, nor shall any provision of this Act be construed as invalidating a provision of State law which would be valid in the absence of such Act, except to the extent that there is a direct and positive conflict between such provisions so that the two cannot be reconciled or consistently stand together.

REPORTED INCIDENTS OF POLITICAL FUND SOLICITING IN AGENCIES OF THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and to include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, on numerous occasions during the 88th Congress I brought to the attention of my colleagues reported incidents of political fund soliciting in agencies of the Government and point to the fact that such activities are in violation of the Hatch Act and the Corrupt Practices Act which should be investigated thoroughly and action taken accordingly. Toward the end of the last session of the Congress I reported that the Civil Service Commission was instituting an investigation of such activities in the Rural Electrification Administration. Since this investigation was launched at my request, I received a report from the Commission upon the conclusion of their inquiry.

On October 8, 1964, I received the following letter from Mr. John J. McCarthy, Assistant General Counsel of the Civil Service Commission:

U.S. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., October 8, 1964.

Hon. ANCHER NELSEN,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. NELSEN: This is in response to your letter of September 22, 1964, concerning the investigation of alleged Hatch Act violations in the Rural Electrification Administration and your telephone calls of September 28 and October 1. As I told you on the phone, I was somewhat handicapped in my endeavor to obtain the information you wanted because of the hospitalization of Mr. Meloy, who was personally supervising the conduct of the investigation.

As you know, we conducted an investigation of the alleged Hatch Act violations in the Rural Electrification Administration. There are four individuals involved. One is in the competitive service and subject to our jurisdiction; the other three are in excepted positions and subject to the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture. In an effort to coordinate action we have notified the Secretary of Agriculture of our investigation. We have not been advised as to what they plan to do.

In addition, we have furnished the Department of Justice with a copy of our investigation. That Department has jurisdiction to determine whether to prosecute for violation of the criminal laws. It has been our practice in this kind of a situation to defer administrative action until the criminal aspects of the case have been fully explored.

I am not in a position at this time to express an opinion as to a violation of the Hatch Act by the employee who is subject to our jurisdiction. Under the procedure we follow such a decision is made initially only after a letter of charges has been served and the employee's answer has been considered.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN J. MCCARTHY,
Assistant General Counsel.

It is interesting to note that the Commission reports four individuals being involved, one of whom was in the classified service subject to the jurisdiction of the Commission and the other three of whom were in excepted positions subject to the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture. Although the Commission investigation findings were reported to the Department of Justice some months ago, I have not yet had a report of any action having been taken by the Justice Department.

The President in his state of the Union message pointed out the need of thorough law enforcement, the need of checking juvenile delinquency, and I am sure that we would all agree with his statement.

Many times we have heard statements coming from the Justice Department, calling upon the business community to observe proper business practices in keeping with the laws of the land.

We all recognize the merits of a civil service system which protects our Federal employees and prevents political machines from using Federal employees in a manner found to be disastrous to the efficiency and quality of performance of our Federal employees and opens the door to a return to the spoils system.

If we are to expect our youth to observe our laws, if we hope to receive the cooperation of the business community in proper regard to existing laws, certainly Government officials should be the examples showing proper regard to strict adherence to Federal laws passed by the Congress of the United States.

Such blatant political activities on the part of appointed officials of the Federal service are a violation of every precept of the merit system and it is my intention to press for responsible action in bringing this matter to a conclusion. I cannot overemphasize the need for stern administrative action to avoid such corruption in the civil service system of our Federal Government.

I call on Members of this Congress, Republicans and Democrats, to help me search out instances where violations have occurred; and it is my hope that we can restore our civil service system to its proper level.

EXTENSION OF CREDIT BY FEDERAL RESERVE BANKS

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, on January 4, 1965, I introduced legislation which would provide the Federal Reserve Banks with the authority to extend credit to member banks and others on any satisfactory security. This bill, H.R. 167, would greatly increase the ability of the Federal Reserve banks to perform one of their principal responsibilities. Appropriate credit assistance to member banks is essential if the banking community is to meet the legitimate credit needs of a growing economy.

The bill would eliminate the penalty rates which Federal Reserve banks must now levy on member bank borrowings secured by collateral other than Government securities or so-called "eligible paper." The present definition of "eligible paper" as short-term, self-liquidating paper bears little relationship to the type of loans which commercial banks now extend. Since 1935, the Reserve banks have had permanent authority to make advances on any security satisfactory to the Reserve banks, but at a penalty rate of interest, one-half of 1 percent above the regular discount rate. My bill would remove both this penalty rate and the necessity for cumbersome administrative procedures for deciding between eligible and ineligible paper.

We have heard a good deal of late about "reforming" the Federal Reserve system. In August of 1963 the Federal Reserve recommended the reform contained in my bill, but in the past 16 months no consideration has been given by the Banking and Currency Committee to this worthwhile suggestion. Since World War II, bank holdings of Government securities have declined, and should an economic upswing trigger further reductions in holdings, banks will be hard-pressed to seek other kinds of collateral if they need Federal Reserve credit for increased consumer credit demands. I would hope that this reform, which would assist the Federal Reserve System and the banking community in their continued performance in the public interest, would receive the attention it deserves from Congress.

I include, as part of my remarks, a section-by-section analysis of H.R. 167:

In general, the first section of this bill would confer upon the Federal Reserve banks broad authority to make advances on any satisfactory security and the remaining sections of the bill are largely of a conforming nature.

Section 1: A new section 13A would be inserted in the Federal Reserve Act. It would authorize any Federal Reserve bank to make advances to any of its member banks on the note of the member bank secured to the satisfaction of the Reserve bank, subject to such limitations, restrictions, and regulations as the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System may prescribe. In making such advances, the Reserve bank would be required to give due regard to the "maintenance of sound credit conditions and the accommodation of commerce, industry, and agriculture" and to keep itself informed as to the character and amount of the loans and investments of its member banks, with a view to determining whether undue or inappropriate use is being made of bank credit for speculative purposes or for purposes inconsistent with the maintenance of sound credit conditions. These requirements are substantially the same as those now prescribed by the eighth paragraph of section 4 of the Federal Reserve Act.

In addition to advances to member banks, the Reserve banks would be authorized to make advances to individuals, partnerships, and corporations on the security of obligations of the United States, an authority similar to that now contained in the last paragraph of section 13 of the Federal Reserve Act, although the new authority, like that with respect to advances to member banks, would not specify any maturity limitation. As under present law, the authority to make advances to corporations would cover advances to nonmember banks.

Section 2: Because they would be superseded or rendered obsolete by the authority conferred by the new section 13A, the provisions of the Federal Reserve Act hereafter described would be repealed.

Section 10(a) of the act (12 U.S.C. 347a), enacted in 1932, authorizes advances to groups of five or more member banks. This authority has never been utilized and would be unnecessary in the light of the new authority.

Section 10(b) (12 U.S.C. 347b), containing authority for advances to member banks on any satisfactory security but at a one-half-of-1-percent penalty interest rate, would likewise be rendered unnecessary by the new legislation.

Section 11(b) of the act (12 U.S.C. 248 (b)), authorizing the Board of Governors to permit or require a Federal Reserve bank to rediscount the discounted paper of other Reserve banks, has not been used since 1933 and is of no practical importance today.

The 2d, 3d, 4th, 5th, 6th, 8th, 10th, and 13th paragraphs of section 13 of the act (12 U.S.C. 343, 344, 345, 346, 347, 361, and 347c, respectively) contain the basic provisions of present law regarding discounts and advances by the Federal Reserve banks. These provisions limit eligible paper to paper "issued or drawn for agricultural, industrial, or commercial purposes, or the proceeds of which have been used, or are to be used, for such purposes"; provide emergency authority (never used) for the discounting of eligible paper for individuals, partnerships, and corporations; authorize the discounting of sight drafts in certain limited circumstances; authorize the discounting of bankers' acceptances and "dollar exchange" acceptances of the kinds described in paragraphs 7 and 12 of section 13; limit the amount of paper of one obligor that may be discounted for a member bank; authorize advances (as distinguished from discounts) to member banks secured by Government obligations or eligible paper; provide for the regulation of discounts by the Board; authorize advances to individuals, partnerships, and corporations on the security of Government obligations; authorize the discounting of agricultural paper, paper held by Federal intermediate credit banks, and paper of cooperative marketing associations; and provide that certain types of real estate loans by national banks shall be regarded as commercial paper for discount purposes. All of these provisions would either be superseded or covered by the new section 13A added by section 1 of the present bill.

Section 3: The eighth paragraph of section 4 of the act (12 U.S.C. 301) presently requires each Federal Reserve bank to consider the maintenance of sound credit conditions and the accommodation of commerce, industry, and agriculture in extending credit to member banks, and to keep itself informed regarding undue uses of bank credit for speculative purposes; and the Board of Governors is authorized to suspend any member bank from access to Federal Reserve credit for any such undue use of bank credit. These provisions would be retained in substance in the new section 13A. Accordingly, the similar provisions of section 4 would be repealed, so that the eighth paragraph of that section would provide only—as it does now—that the board of directors of each Federal Reserve bank shall administer its affairs "fairly and impartially and without discrimination in favor of or against any member bank or banks."

Section 4: The 13th paragraph of section 9 of the act (12 U.S.C. 330) would be amended to repeal the proviso limiting the amount of paper of one obligor that may be discounted for any member bank. This limitation, like the similar limitation in section 9 of the act, appears unnecessary in view of the fact that most State laws limit the amount of loans that may be made to one borrower by State banks, in terms similar to those applicable to national banks under section 5200 of the Revised Statutes.

Section 5: The last sentence of section 11(c) of the act (12 U.S.C. 248(c)), regarding the addition to the discount rate of any tax paid by the Reserve banks on deficiencies in their reserves against Federal Reserve notes, would be modified to refer to the interest rate charged on advances under the new section 13A.

Section 6: The language of the last sentence of section 11(m) of the act (12 U.S.C. 248(m)), regarding suspension of rediscount privileges for certain increases in loans secured by stock or bond collateral, would be conformed to refer to suspension of use of the credit facilities of the Federal Reserve banks.

Section 7: The provision of section 12 of the act (12 U.S.C. 262), authorizing the Federal Advisory Council to make recommendations in regard to discount rates and rediscount business, would be changed to refer to advances under the new section 13A and interest rates on such advances.

Section 8: The first paragraph of section 14 of the act (12 U.S.C. 353) would be amended to eliminate a reference to paper eligible for rediscount and, at the same time, to omit a reference to regulation of Federal Reserve bank open market operations by the Board of Governors, a function that has been subject to regulation since 1935 by the Federal Open Market Committee.

Section 9: A conforming change would be made in section 14(c) of the act (12 U.S.C. 356) to eliminate a reference to paper arising out of commercial transactions, as hereinbefore defined.

Section 10: Section 14(d) of the act (12 U.S.C. 357), relating to the fixing of discount rates, would be amended to refer to interest rates under the new section 13A. At the same time, this provision would be broadened to authorize the fixing of different rates, not only for different classes of paper, but also according to such other basis or bases as may be deemed necessary to accomplish the purposes of this provision. The amended provision would also include separate authority as to rates on advances to individuals, partnerships, and corporations under subsection (c) of the new section 13A.

Section 11: The provision of section 16 of the act (12 U.S.C. 412) authorizing the use of paper acquired under section 13 as security for Federal Reserve notes would be modified to refer to notes of member banks or others acquired under the provisions of [the new] section 13A of this act.

Section 12: The provision of section 19 of the act (12 U.S.C. 463), prohibiting member banks from acting as agents for nonmember banks in obtaining Federal Reserve discounts, without the Board's permission, would be conformed to refer to advances instead of discounts.

Section 13: A provision of section 23A of the act, relating to security for loans to affiliates of member banks, would be conformed to eliminate a reference to drafts eligible for rediscount.

Section 14: A provision of the act of July 21, 1932 (12 U.S.C. 1148), authorizing agricultural credit corporations to rediscount elibible paper with the Federal Reserve banks, would be repealed.

THE NATIONAL ARTS FOUNDATION

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, when the Congress passed last year an act to provide for a National Council on the Arts, it left, as unfinished business, a proposal for a National Arts Foundation. Today, the original sponsor of that proposal, the senior Senator from New York, Senator JACOB K. JAVITS, has reintroduced his legislative suggestion. I am happy to join my distinguished Republican colleague and the other bipartisan proponents of the National Arts Foundation, a project whose merit was recognized by the President on January 4 in his state of the Union message.

In introducing this bill, I am not unmindful of the delicate task that this Foundation will face in encouraging the arts in the United States. The arts are fields of expression whose freedom deserves the greatest protection free men can provide. As Kingman Brewster, the president of Yale University, said in his annual report:

> The search for truth in the areas of taste, ideology and belief can never safely be made dependent upon a Federal chosen instrument of financial support.

This bill provides, however, that in the case of both grants to the several States and to private groups, section 3 of the National Arts and Cultural Development Act of 1964 shall apply. That section, prohibiting Federal interference in the arts, reads as follows:

> SEC. 3. In the administration of this Act no department, agency, officer or employee of the United States shall exercise any direction, supervision, or control, over the policy or program determination of any group, State or State agency involved in the arts.

In addition, I have made two small but important changes in my own bill to eliminate the need for the Foundation to make value judgments on the ideas or contents of an artistic work in setting priorities for grant assistance. Required would be a finding that proposed productions be of an artistic and cultural nature, rather than a judgment of what is of a substantial artistic and cultural significance, in grants to groups. Similarly, the Foundation would not be asked to judge significant merit but only that a particular production had artistic or cultural merit.

I believe these changes are of particular importance since part of the idea of this bill is to encourage creativity and new talent development in such fields as art, the dance, literature, motion pictures, radio and television, music, and drama. The Foundation should not be required, or have the authority, to read through the actual contents of each production and make a subjective judgment prior to performance or publication, and its reception by the public and the artist's peers. That type of authority would obviously permit the possibility of subtle pressures upon the artist to conform to prevailing social and political views.

The bill itself would provide grants to nonprofit professional groups or their equivalent in terms of professional standards. This is a guarantee of performance quality. Grants to States would be made for existing projects or productions whose past contributions could be used to judge future quality of performance. The bill's definition of the arts is itself a safeguard against mediocrity. There is no justification for leaving any avenues open for possible Federal influence on the content of the artistic production itself.

As envisioned by this bill, the Foundation would consist of 21 members, appointed by the President, from private citizens involved in the arts, cultural and art experts, and the artists themselves, representative of the major fields of artistic endeavor. The Foundation would have a Director and staff, would not produce or present any productions itself, and would make matching grants of up to 50 percent of costs to States and private groups. Funds could not be used for the purchase, repair, construction, or rental of buildings or land.

It is my hope that this bill will provide a stimulus for the discussion of the status of the arts in our national life, and the equally important debate over the proper role that the Federal Government should play in encouraging the increased development of the arts and their appreciation by the public.

PARKING SPACE FOR PUBLIC USE IN THE VICINITY OF THE NATION'S CAPITOL

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I think it is disgraceful that there is so little parking space for the public near the Capitol.

Here we are on the eve of the inauguration ceremonies. In attendance, we are told, it will be the biggest ever. Yet even on an ordinary weekday persons desiring to visit their Congressman or the Capitol Building or Houses of Congress to see them in action, find it difficult or impossible to find parking space within walking distance. Yet just east of the Cannon House Office Building is a whole empty block with no buildings on it, acquired a few years ago by the Government at a cost of $5.8 million. Why not—temporarily at least—open this area for public parking?

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that immediate steps can be taken to alleviate the public parking shortage on the Hill. The Members of Congress are taking care of their own needs; why not give the public some consideration?

FUEL IMPORT QUOTAS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, on many occasions I have felt it necessary to address this House on behalf of the people of New England who for over 5 years have fought for the removal of residual fuel oil import quotas. As I stand here today, there is no doubt whatsoever in my mind but that the relief which we so justly deserve from this economic millstone would have been forthcoming long ago if it had not been for the strenuous opposition of the spokesmen for the coal industry. To you gentlemen from coal-producing States, particularly those along the Appalachian chain, I address myself today, and all I ask is that you once again examine the facts in this long and continuing controversy, and on the basis of these facts reach your own unbiased conclusions as to whether or not the system of residual fuel import quotas should be continued. I think you will find that this program which has placed substantial burdens on New England consumers has never offered one iota of relief to your unemployed coal miners nor would its termination have any significant effect on the vigorous, healthy, flourishing coal industry of your States which faces the future, according to all of the best estimates, with the outlook bright for a tremendous expansion in coal production because of almost doubled market demand in the next decade.

I ask you to do this, bearing in mind that this Congress has been asked to approve legislation which will commit millions of dollars in the coming year to a massive effort to eliminate poverty, insofar as it is humanly possible to do so, in distressed communities of Appalachia where coal mining has been and will continue to be the dominant industry.

The elected representatives of New England will be asked to support this program with their votes. If approved, the 10 million residents of the 6 New England States will be required to support it with their tax dollars.

I think you will find New Englanders, particularly, inclined to be sympathetic with those suffering from economic hardships. They know firsthand what it is like for an entire area to lose its livelihood and why it is so necessary for an all-out effort to improve the lot of their fellow human beings beset by hunger and want.

But while they will be asked and expected to support this gigantic program of Federal relief for Appalachia, I find it inconceivable that they should be forced to face continuing hardships in their own efforts to remain fully competitive in United States and world markets by being deprived of their free choice of fuel because of needless Government import quotas or residual fuel oil, the one fuel they find the best and most convenient for their factories, institutions, and utilities.

They feel, and rightly so, that these restrictions contribute nothing to improving economic conditions along the Appalachian chain and for that reason, they resent the powerful opposition of coal industry spokesmen to their efforts to terminate this program.

If you gentlemen from the Appalachian area will examine the facts, as I ask, you will find that imported residual fuel oil because of its very nature is competitive with coal only under steam boilers of electric utility plants and even in this market, competition is limited to a very narrow coastline area along the eastern seaboard.

Your examination will further show that even in this area of very limited competition coal has been doing very well. If you check Federal Power Commission statistics you will find that in the last decade coal sales to eastern seaboard electric utilities have almost doubled to over 80 million tons in 1963.

Oil sales in the same period increased by only 2.5 million tons coal equivalent. I ask you in all sincerity if you really believe that this is sufficient justification to deny New England consumers their free choice of fuels.

Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, in the past, discussions of this problem have been clouded by false emotional issues. Now, however, it seems appropriate to us in New England to look at the facts objectively and take positive, immediate steps to eliminate this program and move on to constructive contributions which truly will bring relief to those areas in need.

RULES OF THE HOUSE

The **SPEAKER**. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, in my remarks I shall separate two items of business. The first item I want to talk about here is in respect to a resolution I have just introduced to change the Rules of the House of Representatives. This resolution will be one of a series that will be presented in the ensuing weeks in the areas where the Republicans feel that the rules of the House need changing for the benefit not only of the minority—although that is the main thrust of it—but in order to permit the majority to have a good, loyal opposition available against which to direct their programs. There must be meaningful debate to hammer out some of these issues.

I take this time to point out the inadequacy of the rules of the House which prevailed when we discussed or failed to discuss the merits of the House rules at the time they were adopted when the Congress met on the first day.

Under those rules there was no opportunity for anyone who disagreed with any change to have time in which to debate the issue. There was no opportunity for anyone to offer affirmative amendments, of course, because under the 1-hour rule as prevails, any time the person who has been recognized by the Speaker can move the previous question and immediately that shuts off debate. It does not permit amendments, and the previous question is ordered. There is only one way in which the House could have proceeded to open up the matter for debate at all, and that was to defeat the ordering of the previous question.

And even if the previous question had been voted down we still would have proceeded under the basic 1-hour rule which again leaves control of the time entirely in the hands of the person who has been recognized.

We know that some issues as they are formed in the Congress come to a head in conference reports. Conference reports are handled in the House under the 1-hour rule where it is completely in the discretion of the person handling the conference report to move the previous question, without yielding equal time to the other side.

Indeed, so unbalanced are these rules that minority views are not permitted in the written report, the conference report, which is required and which must accompany the recommendations of the conference. So there is no way of formulating minority views in this kind of way and in such a way as to inform the membership on both sides of the aisle what the issues are that are involved and what the differences of opinion are. There is no way of formalizing these views and this is another area where we need correction.

But essentially the one subject for which I am introducing this resolution has to do with the 21-day rule which was the amendment adopted changing the rules of previous Congresses and going back in essence to the rule that was adopted in one Congress—the 81st Congress—the 21-day rule.

Note that the floor was taken and held by only those who said that this was a great change. Well, I submit if it was such a great and beneficial change, why could it not have stood on its own merits under honest debate? There were people on both sides of the aisle who disagreed with this new rule. Maybe it would have been the will of the majority that the change should be made. But if this Congress, this House, is to be a deliberative body, we must deliberate. I remember engaging in colloquy on two or three occasions in the last Congress with the gentleman from Oklahoma, the majority leader, for whom I have indeed great respect and affection. But the colloquy was along this line, if I recollect it correctly, that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] said that the majority should have an opportunity to work its will, and I said that I agree with the gentleman but only after there had been deliberation and debate.

If you are simply going to say that under the rules the majority can work its will at any time as it decides through a Democratic or Republican caucus or however, outside the House Chamber, then you have indeed destroyed this body as a deliberative body. We must have rules which provide that those who disagree among the majority—yes, and there is going to be disagreement—those who might disagree in the majority with the majority of the majority as well as those who might disagree in the minority—that they have an opportunity to express their reasons. Sometimes those in the minority might come forward with logic that pertains to an issue that should prevail, and if the majority heard it they might well wish to go along those lines.

Now I do want to discuss a little bit the 21-day rule and some of the things I would have said had I been given an opportunity to debate this before we took the vote. Incidentally, one other thing about the manner in which we adopted the 21-day rule—notice that the gentleman from Virginia, our distinguished colleague and beloved colleague, the chairman of the Committee on Rules, pointed out that the rules as changed in the Democratic caucus had not even been made available in written form to the membership of the House at the time of the debate. So we could not even have the benefit of having in front of us the language that was being used to change these rules. I submit to the sense of fairness on the part of the majority that this falls far short of good rules of fair play. We must have these documents or the language of a particular proposal. The label itself might be good. I mean most labels are good and most changes in legislation proposed sound good. But our job is to look beneath the labels to see whether indeed the detailed language does carry out these objectives. Many is the time that we with all good intentions and thinking that we are attaining certain objectives, find out that we have written it in such a way that we actually have not attained those objectives and actually have thwarted them and gone backward.

In fact, this is the business of a legislative body: To go over the details of language, first to be sure that the language as written will attain the objectives sought by those who propose the language and, second, to permit those who are opposed to the objectives to take their positions, which sometimes comes into the issue.

The 21-day rule which was adopted by the Congress was not the 21-day rule that prevailed in the 81st Congress. The resolution which I have introduced today would put into effect the 21-day rule which prevailed in the 81st Congress.

Why would I propose such a thing, particularly since I was one who was opposed to the 21-day rule and tried to prevent its enactment in the 82d Congress? That was done with success, though this is not to say that I had any great bearing on it, being a freshman Congressman at that time.

I did want to make the record clear so far as my own views are concerned. I do not favor the theory of a 21-day rule, but if there is to be a 21-day rule I certainly believe that the rule as it prevailed in the 81st Congress would be a great deal more fair and would be more designed to carry out the intentions which those who have advanced it profess to have than the alterations which occur under the 21-day rule which was adopted.

The theory behind the 21-day rule was to provide a system under which the majority of the House could work its will, and under which the Rules Committee, consisting of a small group, and a minority of the House itself would not be permitted to keep legislation off the floor of the House.

First, let me say that this never has been the power of a Rules Committee. It is not their power with or without a 21-day rule.

When the power of Speaker Cannon was broken back in 1910 or thereabouts, he was a member of the Rules Committee, as Speaker, and there were only three members of the Rules Committee. The committee was then enlarged, I believe to nine at that time, and the Speaker was removed from it. Those who brought about that reform were greatly concerned lest the Rules Committee itself take over in a dictatorial fashion, just as the Speaker has done previously. So they created the Calendar Wednesday Rule. Calendar Wednesday is available and always has been available since. It is a practical remedy, if it is sought to be used, if the Rules Committee or any Rules Committee seeks to prevent legislation which has been voted out of a legislative committee from being brought on the floor of the House, and neither the Speaker nor the Rules Committee under Calendar Wednesday can prevent such from coming about.

So, really, the 21-day rule is unnecessary and extraneous.

But this 21-day rule is not quite so extraneous. Perhaps this is its design, but the design is not to have the majority work its will, I submit, but rather to give to the Speaker power to say whether he wants matters on the floor of the House. It is not whether a committee wants it, but whether the Speaker wants it. This could well go backward, to the days of "Czar" Cannon. It could lead in that direction. It is clearly designed to put more power in the hands of the Speaker, and in no sense is it designed to have the majority exercise its will.

Let me go further to say that a similar situation existed at a time, a few Congresses ago, when there was talk of enlarging the Rules Committee from 12 to 15, the object being, again, to permit a majority of the House to exercise its will.

I pointed out at that time that this was specious and that under Calendar Wednesday the Committee on Rules could not block the measures from coming to the floor of the House, but I, as one Republican, tried to persuade many other colleagues, with some success, that if the majority wanted to enlarge the Committee on Rules to 15 in number, then let them do so. This was to try to pin down the proposition of the speciousness of the argument that the Committee on Rules could actually block legislation from coming to the floor of the House. Indeed, the proof of the pudding here was in the eating, because the majority leadership had the same difficulty under a 15 man Rule Committee that existed under previous Congresses in getting some of this legislation on the floor of the House. The real reason why it did not move, I submit, is because the legislation itself was contrary to the view of the majority. It just saved embarrassment to Members not to have matters come on the floor of the House and saved embarrassment to the leadership not to have matters coming on the floor of the House which could be defeated. However, at that time I pointed out I was afraid that there was a more sinister purpose behind enlarging the Committee on Rules and that that purpose was the real motive. I look back into the 1930's during the first days or months of the Roosevelt administration where the Committee on Rules was accustomed to bringing on the floor of the House closed rules with a gag rule and where the majority, let alone the minority, had no opportunity to amend the measures before them. They had to take them and vote them up or down. What I feared with the enlargement of the Committee on Rules was that far from permitting the majority to work its will, it was going to be done and used to thwart the majority from working its will through the use of a closed rule.

Gentlemen, the recent history of the Congress reveals that this is exactly what has been done whenever possible with this enlargement of the Committee on Rules. I warn now that I suspect this is the purpose in mind of this kind of control, namely, increasingly we are going to have more gag rules.

Now, this affects the majority side. When you differ with some aspects of a bill, although the main thrust of the bill you agree with and you could vote for it if certain parts of it were amended, still under the closed rule or gag rule you will have no opportunity to offer such perfecting amendments. I speak as a member of the Committee on Ways and Means where my committee in my judgment is one of the main violators of this principle of fair play and good legislative procedure. The Committee on Ways and Means—and it is true on my side, also, when we have been in control—has been one which consistently goes before the Committee on Rules to ask for closed rules. You will find that when a matter comes before the House from the Committee on Ways and Means almost invariably there is a closed rule and the 5-minute rule for debate and amendment does not prevail. After general debate is held—and that is under the control of the membership of the committee reporting the bill, so how does anyone else get their oar in or get permission to contribute their sentiments and views on this issue under debate—after general debate is held and is over, the matter is then up for voting up or down.

I hope as we move along in this session and as other proposed rule changes of this nature are presented for the consideration of the House and after reference to the Committee on Rules, we may receive some help from those in the majority who understand the need for fair play if the Congress is to be a deliberative body and indeed if the minority are to play their proper role in Government, being the loyal opposition, so as to provide intelligent debate and a different point of view from that which the majority presents.

HEALTH CARE FOR THE AGED

Now, Mr. Speaker, if I may go to another matter entirely different. The President just delivered his address on advancing the Nation's health to this Congress. One of the main thrusts in this message, of course, relates to material which is before my Committee on Ways and Means, in particular in relation to the issue which is called medicare and has various names. It was the Forand bill one time and then it became the King-Anderson bill No. 1 and the King-Anderson bill No. 2, No. 3, and No. 4. There have been about seven or eight versions of the King-Anderson bill, but essentially this is the proposal to put a certain amount of hospital insurance for people over 65 on a compulsory basis into the social security system, paid for through the payroll tax.

The President in his message does not spell out in real detail just what kind of a bill this is going to be, other than it is going to have two factors, which I will discuss. Maybe it will not have the complete compulsory feature, it does not say it must be fully compulsory. One of the suggested modifications is that older people must have health insurance but they can be given the opportunity either to take it out in the private sector or in the governmental sector. As I read this message it would be within the scope of the generalities mentioned.

But the main thrust of this is that we should use the payroll tax as a base for financing this program.

The President uses some language that is quite questionable. He says that it is "to be financed under social security by regular modest contributions during working years." The term "modest contributions" is one of the points at issue and presents one of the basic problems—can we get the payroll tax beyond 10 percent of payroll without endangering the social security system itself, which is based on a payroll tax; and this is true whether you create a separate trust fund or not.

The payroll tax is the most regressive tax we have in our bundle of Federal taxes. It has no deductions for number of dependents in the family. It is at the same rate; it is not graduated. It is only on the lowest portion of people's wages and salaries. All wages and salaries above this ceiling are exempt. There is no tax on income derived from capital gains or royalties or dividends or anything else. It is, indeed, the most regressive tax we have.

The question was raised by Mr. RIBICOFF when he was Secretary of HEW, Can you get this payroll tax beyond 10 percent without creating serious damage in other economic areas?

One of the big problems today is unemployment as a result of automation, the displacement of manpower with machines. The payroll tax is a tax on manpower. There is no similar tax on machinery. So the higher this tax becomes, the more burdensome it becomes on this one aspect of our basic economics of employment of manpower as opposed to machines.

The second problem involved in the economic discussion is how high a payroll tax can become before it gets to the point of diminishing returns. It is in essence a consumer's tax. The employer has to pass on to the consumer the payroll tax in the price of the goods and services that he is selling to the public. Otherwise he goes broke, of course. And one of our big problems today is being priced out of the market as the result of foreign competition. When we increase our costs and therefore the price of our products and services beyond our productivity increases we make ourselves noncompetitive. This is not an issue between good guys and bad guys, those who want to help the older people and those who do not. This is a very serious problem. How do we do it? The administration has no discussion of these basic problems in this message.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the administration has now adopted what has largely been a Republican proposal, hammered home in past debates, in its medicare program the proposition that the older people who are not on social security would not be left out.

In the Forand bill the people not on social security, those over 65—and that represents a sizable group of older people because they were born too soon, in effect—were not covered.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that as a result of the Republican effort in pointing out this deficiency in the Forand bill that future proposals began to include the problem of those over 65 not on social security.

Our next thrust was that we should not use a payroll tax to pay for the benefits of the people over 65 which they would receive because they will have paid nothing into the fund. Apparently this recommendation of the President does provide similar protection to those who are not now covered by social security, with the costs being paid from the administrative budget—not from further burdening the payroll tax. So, there is a movement forward.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me go to another major problem. In going to the program of health care or hospital insurance through social security or the payroll tax system, one of the great advancements of social security insurance over the old-age assistance program was that we moved to a completely cash benefit program. We paid the people in cash; that it, we did not provide any benefits-in-kind or in services. When the Government provides services instead of cash, the Government has to get into the bureaucratic aspect of providing the services.

Mr. Speaker, one of the great things about social security insurance is its simplicity in that it pays cash. However, note that this proposal represents a step backward, saying to the older people, "We will pay you cash for everything in your budget, save this one area of medical cost. Here we are going to provide some services."

Mr. Speaker, some of us have said that if the older people need more money—and perhaps they do—we would do better to increase their cash benefits rather than to radically change the system of pure cash payments. This retrogressive step proposed by the administration would represent a hybrid, to include some services and the rest cash.

But, Mr. Speaker, the other implications of the Federal Government getting into this business of providing service of course, leads the doctors and others to point out that this would lead—not that it is but would lead—to socialized medicine.

Here, Mr. Speaker, is the test. All the King-Anderson bills provide that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare shall enter into contracts with hospitals in regard to the charges that they will make, and which of these services will be covered under it. Of course, we have to do this because it is taxpayers' money we are dealing with. But in the process, what situation do we create? If a hospital board disagrees with the great administration in Washington in regard to the prices they are charging for any service, what will be the situation? What it amounts to, frankly, is national price control in this area.

Mr. Speaker, I say to my friends who are labor leaders in the Nation that if you think you have to have price controls in this area why do you think we will not have to have wage controls at the same time? Indeed, we do. In this field of hospital care I feel that our wages and salaries are about as low as in any area of endeavor in our society and that they need to be increased more than any sector of our economy about which I can think. However, these points I am making lead to some of the problems involved.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. While the gentleman is pointing out this problem of services versus cash benefits, I believe it is important to recognize the fact that under the old-age and survivors' insurance system the cash benefits that are paid are related to the wage base on which the individual has paid taxes during his working lifetime.

Mr. CURTIS. That is correct.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Therefore, the benefits which one receives have some relationship at least to the base upon which he is paying taxes.

Under this proposal if we make a complete departure from that practice, while people may be paying different dollar amounts in taxes into this fund during the period of their working lifetime, the benefit does not vary under a service benefit, as we have arranged that it does vary by having a cash benefit on a variable base, depending upon the wage base on which a person has paid a tax.

This is really a new departure in terms of the basic philosophy of the old-age and survivors' insurance system.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin who, as the ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, has been a great student of this area for many years. Before he came to the Congress, in his own State of Wisconsin he was a student of these problems.

Let me point out another matter in the President's message where he said:

> Where health insurance is available it is usually associated with an employer-employee plan.

The President is a little bit out of date. This was true perhaps 2 or 3 years ago, but since the innovation of the Connecticut 1965 plan, which is being emulated by State after State, this is no longer true. In the past 2 or 3 years a number of national health insurance companies—the Continental Casualty, and the Mutual of Omaha, to name two—have been offering open end golden-age health insurance policies with no medical examination for people over 65. That is where the President unfortunately is out of date. That is also true of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. At the time they are discussing health matters they seem unaware of what amazing progress has been made in our society each day, each month and each year, particularly in the field of health care for the aged.

Another statement of the President's was:

> Almost half of the elderly have no health insurance at all.

That is out of context to this extent. If the President had added that 10 years ago over three-fourths of the elderly had no health insurance, we would begin to get the true picture. In the past decade or 15 years I know of no field in our entire society that has advanced as rapidly as has the field of health insurance. In fact in no part of this field has advancement been as fast as in health insurance for the elderly, in quantity and in quality.

To conclude my remarks, because there is a great deal more that could be discussed on this matter, may I say that it is time to point out that the President's generalities show that he is far short in understanding what is really going on in our society in the field of health care. After all, the ingenuity of the free system and the initiative of our people working as free men and women is beyond conception, and it behooves the Government before it moves into any area to make a careful review of what really is going on in our society so that Government can be of assistance to what is going on in the private sector and in a supplementary way. Government is the servant of the people not a copartner and certainly not their master.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I would like to compliment the gentleman from Missouri on his very masterful analysis of this health message, much of which we can agree with as far as social aspiration is concerned. I think he has keenly analyzed the economics thereof. I am glad he mentioned the service and cash benefits.

I would like to ask him if he does not think this is predicated on a project as far as additional health care attention is concerned, inasmuch as we have the same ratio of physicians to patients that we have had since 1949, and if he does not think the question of need or near need has been left out?

I compliment him again, and those who have joined with him today on their prompt and masterful analysis of this matter.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the gentleman and I do agree with his observations.

THOMAS E. MILLSOP, CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD AND CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER OF NATIONAL STEEL CORP.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was objection.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, January 5, I was privileged to be present at the retirement dinner of Mr. Thomas E. Millsop, chairman of the board and chief executive officer of National Steel Corp., a truly great American, in Weirton, W. Va. More than 250 of his close friends, including former Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. George Humphrey, were present. It was indeed a thrilling climax to a career in steel by one of its greatest fighters, Tom Millsop.

In speaking briefly to those who were present on this occasion, I felt it imperative to say that Tom Millsop, the son of Scotch parents was the personification of the rugged individualism that has contributed greatly to the success of this

Nation of ours. This individualism that I speak of, Mr. Millsop put to work in the fabric of a great corporation, but more than that he took the time to apply it to the affairs of his city, Weirton, W. Va., as its mayor, to his State of West Virginia, as president of the board of governors of West Virginia University, and in his private life.

Many honors have been bestowed upon Mr. Millsop over the years, but none was greater in my opinion than that which is summed up in the phrase "Thanks, Tom Millsop, for being the kind of guy that you are."

Under unanimous consent, I include with these remarks the newspaper account of this affair honoring "T.E.M." which appeared in the Weirton Daily Times on January 6, 1965, and written by its distinguished editor, Mr. Earle V. Wittepenn:

Millsop Is Honored

Solemnity and sincerity marked the spirit of the occasion as more than 250 of his friends met Tuesday to honor Thomas E. Millsop at a retirement banquet at the Williams Country Club. The tributes were in keeping with the character for the man for whom they were given.

Mr. Millsop, in the twilight of a brilliant 38-year career in the steel industry, accepted the accolades with the humble traits which earned him the respect and admiration of everyone from the man in the street to the man in the White House.

And the tributes were there.

From politicians to preacher and from lawyer to laymen. There were also the educators, the man in the mill and business, civic, and industrial leaders. They came from all levels of life. Theirs was a singleness of purpose—to honor a king among kings.

It was summed up in a brief, simple inscription on a plaque presented to him by Paul H. Carnahan, his successor as chief executive officer at National Steel. It read: "With grateful appreciation to Thomas E. Millsop. Life's greatest adventure is doing one's level best—and life's greatest reward is the cherished friendship formed along the way. Presented by friends of 'T.E.M.' January 5, 1965."

Mr. Carnahan's presentation was preceded by his tribute in behalf of the National directors to the man whose "guiding genius propelled National Steel to unprecedented heights in the past 11 years."

Mr. Carnahan reviewed briefly the accomplishments of National in its 11 years of leadership by Mr. Millsop. The statistics tell an almost unbelievable story. During the years of the Millsop reign, the corporation recorded sales of $7½ billion with earnings at $525 million. Shareholders received $275 million in dividends and an additional $868 million were plowed back into the corporation. The corporation in the past 11 years has employed 27,000 people with salaries for the period amounting to $2,332,000.

Mr. Carnahan read excerpts from letters which he had received attesting to the skill, genius, and perseverance of Mr. Millsop and cited particularly a comment by George Humphrey who had written earlier this year, "I want to put on the record my tremendous esteem and affection for an appreciation of you for enormous contribution to the success of the company as chief executive officer. The stockholders, the officers, and the employees of the company can never adequately repay you for your devotion and wise administration of the affairs of the company to the exclusion of everything else, even your health."

Mr. Millsop was given a standing ovation. His friends, by their warm applause, visibly demonstrated their affection for a friend.

Mr. Millsop reflected on the vast changes he has seen in the immediate valley since he first came to Weirton. He cited the changes in the sociological, business, political, and economic structure.

He said: "I take no credit for what has happened in Weirton. When I came to Weirton in 1928, the Weirton Steel employment costs were $16 million. Employment costs for the same company in 1964 amounted to $127 million. Taxes paid by Weirton Steel in 1928 amounted to $1,200,000. Last year's taxes amounted to an amazing $86 million."

Mr. Millsop defended the importance of big business and free enterprise and said: "We need more big business if we expect to survive in the world's economic race."

The industrial genius who catapulted from millworker to corporation president in a 38-year span spoke on the influence of his mother and his role in life. He said she had admonished him at an early age that he must go through life and conduct himself in such a way that there will be two blades of grass where there was only one before you had passed.

Mr. Millsop said that he used her great wisdom as the guiding light throughout his career.

George Humphrey who preceded Mr. Millsop as chairman of National Steel regarded his longtime friend as an individual with "definite firmness and devotion." Mr. Humphrey presented Mr. Millsop with cufflinks and the testimonial plaque.

John A. Jones, director of public relations of Weirton Steel Co., presided for the program. He introduced each of the dignitaries on the program and a number of National Steel executives. These included: Gen. and Mrs. Winton R. Close; Dr. G. O. Brown; Congressman Arch A. Moore; Senator Jennings Randolph; George Humphrey; Paul Carnahan; Bishop Joseph H. Hodges; Congressman Wayne Hays; Charles Tournay; Albert J. Berdis; Robert F. Roelofs; E. O. Burgham; and Mr. Millsop's wife, Frances.

Congressman Moore said: "He has walked in the way of kings and his message and lessons have been felt by each of us. This retirement party is simply a beginning of another chapter in a momentous life."

Congressman Hays commended Mr. Millsop for his great efforts in industry and lauded his service as a public servant, pointing specifically to Mr. Millsop's two terms as mayor of Weirton. Senator Randolph said: "Mr. Millsop is a great man, and I join with you in this salute to him. He has lived a life of conviction, of capacity, and a full measure of compassion. He lives for those who love him and know him true."

When the banquet was concluded, Mr. and Mrs. Millsop received warm wishes from each of the more than 250 who attended the tribute. The guests basked in the knowledge that Mr. Millsop has vowed that "I plan to live and die in Weirton"—the community he loves.

ADJOURNMENT OF THE 2D SESSION OF THE 87TH CONGRESS

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, it is quite fitting, in light of the protracted 1st session of the 88th Congress which lasted until Christmas Eve, and the length of the 2d session of the 87th Congress which scarcely sputtered to a halt before election day that the Congress turn its attention on the day it convenes to the question of when it shall adjourn. For this reason, I have today reintroduced a bill which I offered in the last Congress in the hope that by raising the point now, rather than next autumn, we can spare ourselves the unhappy experience of these lengthy sessions.

My bill is quite simple; it merely calls upon the Congress to abide by the decision which was made in the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946: that is, to adjourn by July 31. This decision was based upon sound reasoning, I believe. It recognized that if the Congress would put its mind to its work it could finish its business by that date. If, instead of wasting the first 3 months of the legislative year in sessions whose most important and most time-consuming business was the opening prayer, this time could be put to use, we could shorten the time the Congress must meet and do the same amount of business.

It also recognized that the Congressman, to do an adequate job of representing his constituency, must be a part of the community he represents and it was designed to give him a chance to keep his roots firmly settled among the people of his district. I have been taken to task from time to time when I say that the job of the Congressman should be a part-time job. This is not to say that a Congressman should not give the best he has to the job; far from it, it means that to do the job here he must keep himself current with the thoughts and feelings of those he represents. He cannot represent his district when he lives in and feels himself a part of the Washington area. He must keep his interests and his contacts in his home area alive. He must be a part-time Congressman and devote the rest of his time to maintaining the liaison between his constituency and himself.

Certainly the majority of the Congress itself has no desire to spend ever more weeks and months in session every year.

As I noted, the July 31 date is fixed by law as the date upon which the Congress is to adjourn. Yet it does not do so, for the law provides also, and with good reason, that the Congress may stay in session beyond that date in years when there is a war or national emergency. And we are, according to the record, living in a period of national emergency, so proclaimed by President Truman on December 16, 1950, to meet the Korean crisis. I contend the crisis which brought about this proclamation of a national emergency has ended insofar as it bears upon the adjournment date of Congress and my bill so states.

Certainly, should other grave national emergencies arise, requiring the Congress to meet beyond the July deadline, provision can then be made for continued meeting by the proclamation of an emergency or by vote of the Congress, another procedure authorized in the Reorganization Act for lengthening the congressional session. But I believe we should recognize that, for purposes of holding the Congress in session past a reasonable date, the Korean war is over.

It may seem early in the session to worry about adjournment, but if we do not think about it now and if we do not put our shoulders to the wheel from the very beginning, we shall once again be forced to stay in session long past the Reorganization Act's appointed adjournment date.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois, for 60 minutes, on February 15, 1965, to speak on the anniversary of the sinking of the battleship *Maine*.

Mr. CURTIS, for 30 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GILBERT.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. HALL) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BOB WILSON.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GETTYS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, January 11, 1965, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

287. A letter from the President, Gorgas Memorial Institute of Tropical and Preventive Medicine, Inc., transmitting a copy of the 36th Annual Report for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 1964, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 278a (H. Doc. No. 10); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

288. A letter from the Acting General Counsel, Department of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for participation by members of the Armed Forces in international sports activities"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

289. A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to exempt certain contracts with foreign contractors from the requirement for an examination-of-records clause"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

290. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit members of the Armed Forces to accept fellowships, scholarships, or grants offered by a foreign government"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

291. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize certain members of the Armed Forces to accept and wear decorations of certain foreign nations"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

292. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 1006 of title 37, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary concerned, under certain conditions, to make payment of pay and allowances to members of an armed force under his jurisdiction before the end of the pay period for which such payment is due"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

293. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 1485 of title 10, United States Code, relating to the transportation of remains of deceased dependents of members of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

294. A letter from the Chairman, National Capital Planning Commission, transmitting a report showing lands acquired by the Commission during the fiscal year 1964, pursuant to section 13 of Public Law, 592, approved July 19, 1952; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

295. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize disbursing officers of the Armed Forces to advance funds to members of an armed force of a friendly foreign nation, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Government Operations.

296. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Gorgas Memorial Institute of Tropical and Preventive Medicine, Inc., for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1964, pursuant to authority contained in the act of May 7, 1928 (22 U.S.C. 278a); to the Committee on Government Operations.

297. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on procurement of defective fuel servicing semitrailers and schoolbuses, Department of the Army; to the Committee on Government Operations.

298. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on excessive costs incurred in constructing low-rent public housing projects in the commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Santurce, P.R. regional office, Public Housing Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency; to the Committee on Government Operations.

299. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on additional costs resulting from the failure to procure parts used in overhauling special air mission aircraft engines directly from the overhauling subcontractor, Curtiss-Wright Corp., Department of the Air Force; to the Committee on Government Operations.

300. A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, transmitting a report that proceedings have been finally concluded with respect to certain claims, pursuant to provisions of section 21 of the Indian Claims Commission Act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1055; 25 U.S.C. 70t); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

301. A letter from the national adjutant paymaster, Marine Corps League, transmitting copies of reports of the national officers and committee chairmen presented at the 41st National Convention and a financial statement; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

302. A letter from the Librarian of Congress, transmitting a report on positions in the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress within the purview of subsection (c) of section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, allocated to grades 16, 17, and 18 of the general schedule, pursuant to title V, section 503(a) of Public Law 84–854; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

303. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "to amend section 2104 of title 38, United States Code, to extend the time for filing certain claims for mustering-out payments"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota:

H.R. 2018. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the amount of club dues or membership fees exempt from the tax, on such dues and fees, from $10 per year to $25 per year; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H.R. 2019. A bill to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the northern district of Ohio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 2020. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the southern Nevada water project, Nevada, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H.R. 2021. A bill to amend the Federal Firearms Act in order to provide more effective control over firearms shipped in interstate or foreign commerce; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.R. 2022. A bill to amend section 511 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, to equalize the retired pay of certain officers of the uniformed services retired prior to June 1, 1958, under the same law and with same service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H.R. 2023. A bill to repeal the interest rate limitations on obligations of the United States issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAREY:

H.R. 2024. A bill to authorize a 2-year program of Federal financial assistance for all elementary and secondary school children in all of the States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H.R. 2025. A bill to establish a National Economic Conversion and Diversification Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H.R. 2026. A bill to amend section 132 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for the adjournment of the Congress not later than the last day in the month of July except in time of war or national emergency hereafter proclaimed by the President; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 2027. A bill to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2028. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to extend to employees retired on account of disability prior to October 1, 1956, the minimum annuity base established for those retired after that date; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2029. A bill to extend to nonprofit retirement organizations certain third-class mailing privileges; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2030. A bill making the 12th day of October in each year a legal holiday to be known as Columbus Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2031. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, Crimes and Criminal Procedure, act of June 25, 1948 (ch. 645, 62 Stat. 683); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2032. A bill to provide for the covering of unclaimed postal savings deposits into the Treasury of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2033. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide annuities for surviving spouses without deduction from original annuities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2034. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to equalize additional annuities in return for contributions of annuitants during service in excess of the amount necessary to provide the maximum annuity under such act at the time of their retirement; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2035. A bill to provide for cost-of-living adjustments in star route contract prices; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2036. A bill to amend section 411 of title 38, United States Code, to provide additional dependency and indemnity compensation payments to widows with one or more children; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2037. A bill to provide for the suspension of U.S. foreign aid to any country with respect to which diplomatic relations with the United States have been terminated or suspended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 2038. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act in order to permit supervisors to be considered as employees under the provisions of such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2039. A bill to amend section 610 of title 38, United States Code, to authorize the furnishing of hospital care at Veterans' Administration facilities for Gold Star Mothers; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California:

H.R. 2040. A bill to establish a National Economic Conversion and Diversification Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H.R. 2041. A bill to provide public works and economic development programs and the planning and coordination needed to assist in the development of the Appalachian region; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 2042. A bill to establish a National Arts Foundation; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2043. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GILLIGAN:

H.R. 2044. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 2045. A bill to amend titles X and XVI of the Social Security Act to improve the programs of aid to the blind so that they will more effectively encourage and assist blind individuals to achieve rehabilitation and restoration to a normal, full, and fruitful life; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2046. A bill to amend the Area Redevelopment Act to clarify the areas which may be designated as redevelopment areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 2047. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to exempt from tax musical instruments sold to students for school use; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRABOWSKI:

H.R. 2048. A bill to establish a National Economic Conversion and Diversification Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.R. 2049. A bill to provide assistance to the States of California, Oregon, Washington, and Idaho for the reconstruction of areas damaged by recent floods and high waters; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HUTCHINSON:

H.R. 2050. A bill to provide for the medical and hospital care of the aged through a system of voluntary health insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JONES of Alabama:

H.R. 2051. A bill to permit coverage under the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 and the Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of employees of the Tennessee Valley Authority retired or retiring under the Civil Service Retirement Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KARSTEN:

H.R. 2052. A bill to extend the benefits of the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 to certain retired employees reemployed under conditions not terminating title to annuity; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 2053. A bill to limit jurisdiction of Federal courts in reapportionment cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2054. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a taxpayer a deduction from gross income for tuition and certain transportation expenses paid by him in connection with the education of himself, his spouse, or any of his dependents at an institution of higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2055. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an exemption from the tax on club dues for nonprofit hunting and fishing clubs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LAIRD:

H.R. 2056. A bill to provide for payments in lieu of taxes on lands in national forests; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 2057. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to require that a judge of a U.S. district court shall be a resident of the district for which he is appointed at least 3 years immediately prior to the time of his appointment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHALLEY:

H.R. 2058. A bill to establish certain qualifications for persons appointed to the Supreme Court of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LAIRD:

H.R. 2059. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to protect the public from unsanitary milk and milk products shipped in interstate commerce, without unduly burdening such commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 2060. A bill to repeal the retailers excise taxes on jewelry, furs, toilet preparations, and luggage and handbags; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland:

H.R. 2061. A bill to indemnify farmers for certain hay losses; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 2062. A bill to establish a Bureau of Older Workers in the Department of Labor; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. McCULLOCH:

H.R. 2063. A bill to punish the killing, attempted killing, or assaulting of the President of the United States and other high officials; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H.R. 2064. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, to establish the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, to provide grants for research and development, to increase grants for construction of municipal sewage treatment works, to authorize the establishment of standards of water quality to aid in preventing, controlling, and abating pollution of interstate waters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 2065. A bill to amend title 3 of the Sugar Act of 1948 to provide for the establishment of fair and reasonable minimum wage rates for workers employed on sugar farms, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 2066. A bill to amend the act of August 28, 1950, enabling the Secretary of Agriculture to furnish, upon a reimbursable basis, certain inspection services involving overtime work; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 2067. A bill to amend chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, to liberalize the basis on which pension is payable by providing that public or private retirement payments (including social security benefits) shall not be counted as income and that the income of the spouse shall be disregarded in the determination of annual income of a veteran; to eliminate the "net worth" eligibility test; and to repeal the requirement of reduction of pension during hospitalization for veterans with dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2068. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to encourage travel to the United States on the part of nationals of Japan by requiring the Secretary of State to waive visa requirements with respect to such nationals coming to the United States as nonimmigrant visitors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2069. A bill to provide a hospital insurance program for the aged under social security, to amend the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system to increase benefits, improve the actuarial status of the disability insurance trust fund, and extend coverage, to amend the Social Security Act to provide additional Federal financial participation in the Federal-State public assistance programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2070. A bill to amend section 152 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the term "dependent," for purposes of the personal exemption, shall include residents of the Republic of the Philippines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORTON:

H.R. 2071. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Assateague Island National Seashore in the States of Maryland and Virginia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 2072. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act so as to require Federal Power Commission authority for the construction, extension, or operation of certain facilities for the transmission of electric energy in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2073. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Auburn-Folsom South unit, American River division, Central Valley project, California, under Federal reclamation laws; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 2074. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H.R. 2075. A bill providing for the distribution and viewing within the United States of the film "Years of Lightning, Day of Drums" prepared by the U.S. Information Agency on the late President Kennedy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H.R. 2076. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with States and other public agencies in planning for changes in the use of agricultural land in rapidly expanding urban areas and in other nonagricultural use areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 2077. A bill to provide for the issuance of a series of special postage stamps to be known as the "Signers for Freedom Stamps," honoring the signers of the Declaration of Independence; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2078. A bill to amend section 201 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, so as to provide that all quota numbers not used in any year shall be made available to immigrants in oversubscribed areas in the following year, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2079. A bill to amend section 401(d) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to provide for the issuance of certain certificates of public convenience and necessity; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2080. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to authorize and facilitate the deduction from gross income by teachers of the expenses of education (including certain travel) undertaken by them, and to provide a uniform method of proving entitlement to such deduction; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2081. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, to provide that button blanks, regardless of state of finish, shall be subject to the same duty as buttons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PRICE:

H.R. 2082. A bill to provide certain increases in annuities payable from the civil service retirement and disability fund, to improve the financing of the civil service retirement system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RANDALL:

H.R. 2083. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an exemption from the tax on club dues in the case of private shooting and fishing preserves; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 2084. A bill to eliminate the requirement that the Federal Reserve banks maintain certain reserves in gold certificates against deposit and note liabilities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 2085. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase from $600 to $800 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TENZER:

H.R. 2086. A bill to amend section 302 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to provide for the establishment of an Aircraft Noise and Pollution Control Service within the Federal Aviation Agency and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TOLL:

H.R. 2087. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2088. A bill to establish a Department of Education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. TUPPER:

H.R. 2089. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 2090. A bill to provide needed facilities and services not otherwise available for the accommodation of visitors in the areas administered by the National Park Service, by authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to guarantee loans which are part of concessioner investments in such facilities and services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 2091. A bill relating to the establishment of concession policies in the areas administered by National Park Service and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.R. 2092. A bill to strengthen the criminal penalties for the mailing, importing, or transporting of obscene matter, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHALLEY:

H.R. 2093. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to provide for the greater protection of the President and the Vice President of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2094. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2095. A bill to require the Secretary of Commerce either to give the State of Pennsylvania alternative mileage on the Interstate System or to pay the Federal share of the Pennsylvania Turnpike; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 2096. A bill to amend the Trade Expansion Act of 1962; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 2097. A bill to amend the National Arts and Cultural Development Act of 1964 to authorize the National Council on the Arts to accept and receive bequests, gifts, and donations for use in carrying out the purposes of such act, and to establish the National Arts Foundation; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H.R. 2098. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a credit against income tax for a taxpayer with one or more children in college; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DULSKI (by request):

H.R. 2099. A bill to provide for the recognition of the Masonic War Veterans of the State of New York, Inc., by the Secretary of Defense and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. JONES of Alabama:

H.R. 2100. A bill to amend the act of March 3, 1899, to authorize the United States to recover by civil actions the cost of removing certain obstructions from the navigable waters of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland:

H.R. 2100. A bill to amend the act of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act to prohibit the sales of alcoholic beverages to persons under 21 years of age; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 2102. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Assateague Island National Seashore in the States of Maryland and Virginia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 2103. A bill to establish a National Economic Conversion and Diversification Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2104. A bill to transfer certain administrative responsibility for the operation of Washington National Airport and Dulles International Airport from the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency to a Washington Airports Board, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2105. A bill to require that new motor vehicles transported in interstate commerce be equipped with a device to control or prevent the discharge of air pollutants; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2106. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to make certain acts against the person of the President or Vice President of the United States and certain other Federal officers a Federal crime; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2107. A bill to amend the act of June 16, 1948, to authorize the construction of an additional bridge across the Chesapeake Bay in the State of Maryland, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 2108. A bill to remove drift from Baltimore Harbor; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 2109. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the manufacturers excise tax on lacrosse balls and sticks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2110. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a taxpayer a deduction from gross income for tuition and other expenses paid by him for his education or the education of his spouse or any of his dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H.R. 2111. A bill to provide for the reimbursement of the town of Lancaster, Mass., for the loss of taxes on certain property in such town acquired by the United States for use for military purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 2112. A bill to promote public knowledge of progress and achievement in astronautics and related sciences through the designation of a special day in honor of Dr. Robert Hutchings Goddard, the father of modern rockets, missiles, and astronautics; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REDLIN:

H.R. 2113. A bill to provide for a connecting road between three units of the Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park, N. Dak., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SCHNEEBELI:

H.R. 2114. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit for amounts paid for tuition or fees to institutions of higher education or for occupational training or retraining, to allow a credit for taxes paid for public education, and to exempt from income tax certain scholarships, fellowships, and student assistantships; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.R. 2115. A bill to provide assistance to the States of California, Oregon, Washington, and Idaho for the reconstruction of areas damaged by recent floods and high waters; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CABELL:

H.J. Res. 150. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN:

H.J. Res. 151. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to preserve to the people of each State power to determine the composition of its legislature and the apportionment of the membership thereof in accordance with law and the provisions of the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONABLE:

H.J. Res. 152. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H.J. Res. 153. Joint resolution to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct research into the quality and health factors of tobacco and other ingredients and materials used in the manufacture of tobacco products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.J. Res. 154. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States on Presidential power and succession; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.J. Res. 155. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to preserve to the people of each State power to determine the composition of its legislature and the apportionment of the membership thereof in accordance with law and the provisions of the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 156. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.J. Res. 157. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to the term of office of Members of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.J. Res. 158. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to succession to the Presidency and Vice-Presidency and to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H.J. Res. 159. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the 7th day of August of each year as Purple Heart Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SICKLES:

H.J. Res. 160. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to the States of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, and the District of Columbia to negotiate and enter into a compact to establish a multi-State authority to construct and operate a passenger rail transportation system within the area of such States and the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UTT:

H.J. Res. 161. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to preserve to the people of each State power to determine the composition of its legislature and the apportionment of the membership thereof in accordance with law and the provisions of the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHALLEY:

H.J. Res. 162. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States pertaining to the offering of prayers in public schools and other public places in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUTCHINSON:

H. Con. Res. 82. Concurrent resolution to request the President of the United States to urge certain actions in behalf of Lithuania, Estonia, Latvia, and other Communist-controlled countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. Con. Res. 83. Concurrent resolution to print the proceedings in connection with the acceptance of the statue of the late Speaker of the House of Representatives, Sam Rayburn of Texas; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H. Con. Res. 84. Concurrent resolution providing for a Joint Committee on the organization of the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. Con. Res. 85. Concurrent resolution relating to restoration of freedom to captive nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Res. 88. Resolution to provide funds for the Committee on the Judiciary; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. Res. 89. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Agriculture to conduct studies and investigations; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H. Res. 90. Resolution establishing a Special Committee on the Captive Nations; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LAIRD:

H. Res. 91. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct a study of the fiscal organization and procedures of the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. Res. 92. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the studies, investigations, and inquiries authorized by House Resolution 77; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. Res. 93. Resolution to establish a House Committee on the Captive Nations; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. Res. 94. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Education and Labor to conduct certain studies and investigations coming within its committee; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H. Res. 95. Resolution to amend the rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the Virgin Islands of the United States, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, relating to an act designating the Wayne N. Aspinall High School, St. Thomas, V.I., and designating the Bourne Field housing project as the "Michael J. Kirwan homes," which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 2116. A bill for the relief of Tommaso Marsiglia (Massiglia); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2117. A bill for the relief of Antonia Marsiglia (Massiglia); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2118. A bill for the relief of Ray Roy Brown and wife, Daisy Brown; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 2119. A bill for the relief of Miss Meeri Sinikka Nieminen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.R. 2120. A bill for the relief of Darko Rebic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2121. A bill for the relief of Radonjica Dragovic and Vera Dragovic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 2122. A bill for the relief of Gentilia Trotta Mazzeo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2123. A bill for the relief of Miss Katarzyna Szydziak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2124. A bill for the relief of Ramon Angeles, Jr., M.D.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2125. A bill for the relief of Miss Antonia M. Mallamaci; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2126. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe LaVersa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2127. A bill for the relief of Jan Wodecki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2128. A bill for the relief of Socrates Garivaltis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2129. A bill for the relief of Maria Rossi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2130. A bill for the relief of Dr. Kiyoshi Kimura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2131. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Sushil K. Mukherjee and son; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2132. A bill for the relief of Dr. Young K. Kim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2133. A bill for the relief of Kim Kwang Mo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2134. A bill for the relief of Milan Knor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2135. A bill for the relief of Krystyna Horoszko Powell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 2136. A bill for the relief of T. Sgt. Steve E. Billirakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.R. 2137. A bill to permit the vessel *Janice Vee* to be documented for use in the fisheries and coastwise trade; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 2138. A bill for the relief of Capt. Kenneth R. Speer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2139. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mauricia Reyes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2140. A bill for the relief of Homero Sada; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2141. A bill for the relief of Maj. Robert A. Munford; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2142. A bill for the relief of Louis A. Oswald; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2143. A bill for the relief of Ely Sabidales; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2144. A bill for the relief of Capt. Norris L. Green; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.R. 2145. A bill for the relief of Panagiotis Paulus (also known as Panagiotis Mantas); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2146. A bill for the relief of Demetrios Konstaninos Georgaras (also known as James K. Geogaras); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JONES of Alabama:

H.R. 2147. A bill for the relief of certain employees of the Department of the Army at the Redstone Arsenal, Ala.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KARSTEN:

H.R. 2148. A bill for the relief of Andrzej Filimowicz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER:

H.R. 2149. A bill for the relief of Dr. Sei Byung Yoon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2150. A bill for the relief of Dr. Hiroshi Yamazaki; his wife, Toshiko Yamazaki; and his mother, Tomo Yamazaki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEITH:

H.R. 2151. A bill for the relief of Debora N. Machado (Brum); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 2152. A bill for the relief of Mario T. Moncado; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2153. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Dominga Sampayan Ragudo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 2154. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maria Rossi Pacifico; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2155. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Gertrude Reskin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H.R. 2156. A bill for the relief of Georgios P. Sotos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H.R. 2157. A bill for the relief of Seppo R. Saikkonen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2158. A bill for the relief of Allen Pope, his heirs or personal representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2159. A bill for the relief of Biagio DeSantis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PHILBIN (by request):

H.R. 2160. A bill for the relief of Gray Television & Research, Inc., of Boston, Mass.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 2161. A bill for the relief of Miss Mary Chresanthakes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2162. A bill for the relief of Krystyna Kwiatkowska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 2163. A bill for the relief of Dr. Eulalia Sayas DiBattiste; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 2164. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Gungor Hikmet Demirezer Spillar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 2165. A bill for the relief of Matilde F. Pasimio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHNEEBELI:

H.R. 2166. A bill for the relief of Staiman Bros.-Simon Wrecking Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.R. 2167. A bill for the relief of Pedro Velasquez Espinoza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

59. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Miss Sue Reithner and others, La Canada, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to a proposed amendment to the Fair Labor Standards Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

60. Also, petition of James V. Morelli and others, Brooklyn, N.Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to asking Congress to discontinue all forms of aid, military or economic, to the Communist enslaved nations of the world, and to maintain opposition to any new aid plan for those nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

61. Also, petition of David R. Blossom and others, Brooklyn, N.Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to asking Congress to support the "fairness resolution" of the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party; to the Committee on House Administration.

62. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to requesting Congress to pass a resolution congratulating President Lyndon B. Johnson for his great state of the Union address; to the Committee on House Administration.

63. Also, petition of Dick Gratzke and others, Brookfield, Wis., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to urging Congress to act to abolish the House Committee on Un-American Activities; to the Committee on Rules.

64. Also, petition of J. F. Fall and others, Milwaukee, Wis., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to opposing the addition of three new members to the House Ways and Means Committee, and supporting the Kerr-Mills bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

A Bill To Prevent the Mailing, Importing, or Transportation of Obscene Matter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 7, 1965

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to prevent the mailing, importing, or transporting of obscene matter by strengthening the penalties presently provided in the United States Code.

The bill is in response to frequent complaints received by me from parents, educators, ministers and others against the steadily increasing use of the mails and other forms of transportation by filth peddlers. I am sure many of my colleagues are receiving similar complaints.

A particularly infuriating aspect of this situation is that much of this obscene material is unsought by those who receive it. Their names are obtained by a variety of tricks, and unfortunately, many of them are young children.

Unhappily, even when convicted, these smut peddlers often are only lightly penalized. In instances where the penalties are more severe, the effect has been demonstrably to discourage the peddling of smut.

As a constituent has written me, If we are to maintain a strong nation, we must start with strong moral principals, especially in the upbringing of our children. For these reasons I am hopeful of success for the bill, the text of which follows:

H.R. —

A bill to strengthen the criminal penalties for the mailing, importing, or transporting of obscene matter, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the eighth paragraph of section 1461 of title 18 of the United States Code (relating to the mailing of obscene matter) is amended to read as follows:

"Whoever knowingly uses the mails for the mailing, carriage in the mails, or delivery of any obscene, lewd, lascivious, indecent, filthy, or vile article, matter, thing, device, or substance, or knowingly causes to be delivered by mail according to the direction thereon, or at the place at which it is directed to be delivered by the person to whom it is addressed, or knowingly takes any such thing from the mails for the purpose of circulating or disposing thereof, or of aiding in the circulation or the disposition thereof, shall be fined not less than $1,000 nor more than $5,000 and imprisoned not less than one year nor more than five years for the first such offense, and shall be fined not less than $3,000 nor more than $20,000 and imprisoned not less than three years nor more than ten years for each such offense thereafter.

"Whoever knowingly uses the mails for the mailing, carriage in the mails, or delivery of anything (other than anything within the purview of the immediately preceding paragraph) declared by this section to be nonmailable, or knowingly causes to be delivered by mail according to the direction thereon, or at the place at which it is directed to be delivered by the person to whom it is addressed, or knowingly takes any such thing from the mails for the purpose of circulating or disposing thereof, or of aiding in the circulation or disposition thereof, shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both, for the first such offense, and shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than ten years, or both, for each such offense thereafter."

SEC. 2. The next to the last and the last paragraphs of section 1462 of title 18 of the United States Code (relating to the importation or transportation of obscene matter) are amended to read as follows:

"Whoever knowingly takes from such express company cr other common carrier any matter, article, or thing within the purview of paragraph (a) or (b) of this section shall be fined not less than $1,000 nor more than $5,000 and imprisoned not less than one year nor more than five years for the first such offense, and shall be fined not less than $3,000 nor more than $20,000 and imprisoned not less than three years nor more than ten years for each such offense thereafter.

"Whoever knowingly takes from such express company or other common carrier any matter or thing within the purview of paragraph (c) of this section, the depositing of which for carriage is herein made unlawful, shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both."

Sec. 3. The second paragraph of section 1463 of title 18 of the United States Code (relating to the mailing of obscene or indecent matter on envelopes, wrappers, or cards) is amended to read as follows:

"Whoever knowingly deposits for mailing or delivery anything declared by this section to be nonmailable matter, or knowingly takes the same from the mails for the purpose of circulating or disposing of, or aiding in the circulation or disposition of, the same, shall be fined not less than $1,000 nor more than $5,000 and imprisoned not less than one year nor more than five years for the first such offense, and shall be fined not less than $3,000 nor more than $20,000 and imprisoned not less than three years nor more than ten years for each such offense thereafter."

Sec. 4. The first paragraph of section 1465 of title 18 of the United States Code (relating to the transportation of obscene matter for sale or distribution) is amended by striking out "shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than five years or both" and inserting in lieu thereof "shall be fined not less than $1,000 nor more than $5,000 and imprisoned not less than one year nor more than five years for the first such offense, and shall be fined not less than $3,000 nor more than $20,000 and imprisoned not less than three years nor more than ten years for each such offense thereafter".

Increase the Minimum Wage to $2 an Hour

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB H. GILBERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 7, 1965

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill, H.R. 1022, to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to increase the minimum wage to $2 an hour. This increase in the minimum wage is vitally necessary if we are to establish the Great Society envisioned by President Johnson, and if we are to win the fight against poverty in our country. The workingman, the bulwark of our economy and our Nation's strength, must have an adequate living wage in order to meet ever-increasing living costs, high taxes, and skyrocketing medical costs. His children must be given the security and assistance which increased wages will provide; nourishing food, good medical and dental care, and educational advantages, are all essential to the well-being and progress of our children.

An enduring myth in our country is that the poor are generally unemployed, and by innuendo, shiftless and lazy. We have many employed workers with incomes of $3,000 and less who are underemployed or working for substandard wages. Our minimum wage laws were enacted to enable workers to live at least at a minimum standard of decency.

The average workingman cannot meet all these obligations on his present income, and children often suffer neglect which is unavoidable under present wage conditions. The laboring man is entitled to all possible help so that he can maintain a decent standard of living, a home he can be proud of, and have the satisfaction that his family can enjoy at least the minimum comforts and advantages of life.

Mr. Speaker, the Fair Labor Standards Act was originally a product of the depression in the thirties. Congress declared it to be the policy of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 "to correct and as rapidly as practicable to eliminate labor conditions detrimental to the maintenance of the minimum standard of living necessary for health, efficiency and general well-being of workers." Mass poverty at that time was greatly reduced by Federal minimum wage and hour protection. Today, mass poverty stemming from substandard wages is one of our society's greatest problems, affecting every racial and ethnic group. In my own State of New York, it is clear that Negro and Spanish-speaking persons constitute an increasingly large segment of the lowest income groups. It is a fact, and a tragic one, that more than 1 million workers in New York State receive wages of less than $1.50 an hour.

As our President has pointed out, now in the 1960's we have one-fifth of our American families with incomes too small to meet their basic needs. To be truly meaningful, this new war on poverty also must include an attack on low wages and long hours. Our effort to combat poverty would certainly be advanced by the minimum wage increase proposed in my bill. It would be an important step in breaking the present-day cycle of poverty which plagues millions of our citizens. It is to our advantage to pursue every reasonable means in fighting the battle against the evils of poverty.

The passage of the Fair Labor Standards Act 25 years ago has proved an important stabilizing factor in maintaining the purchasing power of workers. Today, the act needs further amendment, as provided in my bill, to maintain this safeguard by narrowing the gap between the average wages and the minimum wage. We must adjust the minimum wage upward to reflect current conditions.

The civil rights movement has adopted the $2 an hour Federal minimum wage as one of its major goals. Without adequate income to patronize stores, theaters, and hotels, the public accommodations law cannot be meaningful. The $2 an hour Federal minimum proposed in my bill is only a minimum standard, in view of the $3 an hour which Labor Department studies show as necessary for a family of four to attain an adequate and decent standard of living.

Those who oppose such a minimum wage increase will argue that industries covered by the minimum wage will find it difficult or impossible to adjust to wage increases. Surveys of the U.S. Department of Labor and various State agencies have shown this has not been the case after previous minimum increases.

The increase to $2 an hour I propose is reasonable and practicable. I am hopeful that the House Education and Labor Committee will take action on my bill early in this new Congress.

SENATE

FRIDAY, JANUARY 8, 1965

(Legislative day of Thursday, January 7, 1965)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou holy and merciful God, the strength of our weakness, the Good Shepherd of our waywardness: In the light of Thy presence, we pour contempt on all our contemptible pride, as in Thy effulgence we stand revealed as having followed our own wills and desires, even as we have prayed, "Thy kingdom come." Grant us honesty in dealing with our besetting sins; and, as we confess them, strengthen our resolution in overcoming them.

As those into whose unworthy hands have been placed the crying needs of bewildered humanity, may the sympathies of our hearts, the words of our lips, and the decisions of our deliberations be acceptable in Thy sight, O Lord, our strength and our Redeemer. Amen.

ORDER FOR MORNING HOUR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a morning hour, and that statements therein be limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FIXING OF DATES OF TRANSMISSION OF THE BUDGET AND THE ECONOMIC REPORT DURING MONTH OF JANUARY 1965

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a joint resolution coming over from the House of Representatives, which the clerk will state by title.

The Legislative Clerk. House Joint Resolution 123, to fix the dates for transmitting the budget and the economic report during the month of January 1965.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that House Joint Resolution 123 be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON PUERTO RICAN HURRICANE RELIEF LOANS

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, reporting, pursuant to law, on Puerto Rican hurricane relief loans, as of December 31, 1964; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Authorization for Disbursing Officers of the Armed Forces To Advance Certain Funds

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize disbursing officers of the Armed Forces to advance funds to members of an armed force of a friendly foreign nation, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Amendment of Section 1006, Title 37, United States Code, Relating to Advancement of Certain Pay and Allowances

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 1006 of title 37, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary concerned, under certain conditions, to make payment of pay and allowances to members of an armed force under his jurisdiction before the end of the pay period for which such payment is due (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Amendment of Section 2104, Title 38, United States Code, To Extend the Time for Filing Certain Claims for Mustering-Out Payments

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 2104 of title 38, United States Code, to extend the time for filing certain claims for mustering-out payments (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Amendment of Section 1485, Title 10, United States Code, Relating to Transportation of Remains of Deceased Dependents of Members of the Armed Forces

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 1485 of title 10, United States Code, relating to the transportation of remains of deceased dependents of members of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Amendment of Title 10, United States Code, To Provide for Participation by Members of the Armed Forces in International Sports Activities

A letter from the Acting General Counsel of the Department of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for participation by members of the Armed Forces in international sports activities (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Amendment of Title 37, United States Code, To Prescribe the Basic Pay and Allowances of a Certain Officer

A letter from the Acting General Counsel of the Department of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 37, United States Code, to prescribe the basic pay and allowances of an officer who is serving as Supreme Allied Commander, Europe (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Authorization of the Appropriation for the District of Columbia of Expenses in Case of Emergency

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the appropriation for the District of Columbia of expenses in case of emergency (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Transfer of Certain Functions of the Secretary of the Treasury

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to transfer certain functions of the Secretary of the Treasury, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Finance.

Report of Administrator of Veterans' Affairs

A letter from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, Washington, D.C., transmitting pursuant to law, his report, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

Reports of Comptroller General

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on examination of financial statements, fiscal year 1964, Federal National Mortgage Association, Housing and Home Finance Agency, dated January 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on unsupported costs included in price of nuclear submarine valves purchased from Crane Co., Chicago, Ill., by Westinghouse Electric Corp., Pittsburgh, Pa., under cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contracts, Department of the Navy, dated December 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on unnecessary costs to the Government due to excessive rentals for electronic data processing equipment at Lockheed Missiles & Space Co., Sunnyvale, Calif., Department of Defense, dated December 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Amendment of Act Relating to the Withdrawal, Reservation, or Restriction of Public Lands

A letter from the Acting General Counsel of the Department of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of February 28, 1958, relating to the withdrawal, reservation, or restriction of public lands, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Laws Enacted by Legislature of the Virgin Islands of the United States

A letter from the Executive Secretary, the Legislature of the Virgin Islands of the United States, Charlotte Amalie, St. Thomas, V.I., transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of laws enacted by that legislature (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Lt. Col. Porter F. Sheldon

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Lt. Col. Porter F. Sheldon, U.S. Air Force (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Lt. Col. John E. McRoberts and T. Sgt. Harold C. Fisher, Jr.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Lt. Col. John E. McRoberts and T. Sgt. Harold C. Fisher, Jr., U.S. Air Force (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Capt. Richard A. Ingram and Capt. Arthur R. Sprott, Jr.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Capt. Richard A. Ingram and Capt. Arthur R. Sprott, Jr., U.S. Air Force (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Report on Placement of Positions in Grades GS-16, GS-17, and GS-18

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on the placement of positions in grades GS-16, GS-17, and GS-18 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949 for calendar year 1964; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Report on Positions in Grades GS-16, GS-17, and GS-18

A letter from the Chairman, Railroad Retirement Board, Chicago, Ill., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on positions in grades GS-16, GS-17, and GS-18, for the year 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PETITION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the petition of C. R. Mead, of Westport, Conn., supplementing his claim for a redress of grievances, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. TOWER:

S. 328. A bill to amend section 620(j) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 in order to prohibit the furnishing of any further U.S. assistance to Indonesia, including the training of Indonesian military and police personnel at U.S. Government facilities; and

S. 329. A bill to amend section 620(j) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 in order to prohibit the furnishing of any further U.S. assistance to the United Arab Republic, including the training of United Arab Republic military personnel and police personnel at U.S. Government facilities; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. Tower when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BENNETT:

S. 330. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Golden Spike National Monument in the State of Utah; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TALMADGE:

S. 331. A bill for the relief of Warren F. Coleman, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS (for himself and Mr. Hruska):

S. 332. A bill to amend the Unemployment Tax Act so as to exempt from coverage thereunder service performed in the employ of certain tax exempt agricultural or horticultural organizations; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. DODD:

S. 333. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Loukia Spathakis;

S. 334. A bill for the relief of Maria Coega; and

S. 335. A bill for the relief of Marie Rose Abdul Massih Denha; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT:

S. 336. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain mineral rights to Joseph C. Sandberg and Anna Marie Sandberg; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 337. A bill for the relief of F. F. Hintze; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRUENING (for himself, Mr. Bartlett, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Church, Mr. Jordan of Idaho, Mr. Long of Missouri, Mr. McGovern, Mr. Metcalf, Mr. Montoya, Mr. Moss, Mr. Mundt, and Mr. Simpson):

S. 338. A bill to amend section 615 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the tax treatment of exploration expenditures in the case of mining; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Gruening when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HRUSKA (for himself, Mr. Curtis, Mr. Simpson, Mr. Allott, Mr. Dominick, Mr. McGee, and Mr. Mundt):

S. 339. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Agate Fossil Beds National Monument in the State of Nebraska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Hruska when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ERVIN:

S. 340. A bill for the relief of Man-Pan Hui;

S. 341. A bill for the relief of San Kong Chen;

S. 342. A bill for the relief of Jack William Mark;

S. 343. A bill for the relief of Paride Marchesan;

S. 344. A bill for the relief of Han Chang Wong; and

S. 345. A bill for the relief of Dr. Edward Everard Low, his wife, Daisy, and their children, Helen Dawn and Michael Jonathan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIRKSEN (for himself and Mr. Douglas):

S. 346. A bill for the incorporation of the Merchant Marine War Veterans Association; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 347. A bill to authorize certain modifications of the project for Calumet Harbor and River, Ill. and Ind.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PELL (for himself, Mr. Dodd, Mr. Kennedy of Massachusetts, Mr. Kennedy of New York, Mr. Pastore, and Mr. Ribicoff):

S. 348. A bill to encourage the preservation and development of a modern and efficient passenger rail transportation service in the northeastern seaboard area by granting the consent and approval of Congress to the States of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, and New York to negotiate and enter into a compact to create their own Northeast Rail Authority, and by guaranteeing certain loans and other credit to such Authority; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Pell when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PROUTY:

S. 349. A bill to increase benefits under the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system;

S. 350. A bill to improve the old-age, survivors and disability insurance program by providing minimum benefits for certain individuals who have attained age seventy; and

S. 351. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase to $2,400 the annual amount individuals are permitted to earn without suffering deductions from the monthly insurance benefits payable to them under such title; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Prouty when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 352. A bill for the relief of Mimosa Thereseta Goderich; and

S. 353. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Theresa Gomez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

S. 354. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Palmetto Bend reclamation project, Texas, and for other purposes; and

S. 355. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Columbus Bend Federal reclamation project, Texas; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JACKSON:

S. 356. A bill for the relief of Miloye M. Sokitch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CANNON:

S. 357. A bill for the relief of the Moapa Valley Water Co. of Logandale, Nev.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Cannon when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 358. A bill for the relief of Vladimir Gasparovic and Dragica Rendulic Gasparovic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARTKE:

S. 359. A bill for the relief of Maj. Preston E. Phillips; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON (for himself, Mr. Douglas, Mr. Hartke, Mr. Bayh, Mr. Anderson, Mr. Burdick, and Mr. Moss):

S. 360. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Jackson when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HARTKE:

S. 361. A bill for the relief of Anastasios Athanasopoulos and his wife, Ourania Athanasopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NELSON (for himself, Mr. Bible, and Mr. McClellan):

S. 362. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code (relating to highways) in order to authorize appropriations to assist the States in the purchase of lands and easements for scenic purposes along Federal-aid highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. Nelson when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BENNETT:

S. 363. A bill to provide for an appropriation of a sum not to exceed $200,000 with which to make a survey of a proposed Golden Circle national scenic parkway complex connecting the national parks, monuments, and recreation areas in the southern part of Utah with the national parks, monuments and recreation areas situated in northern Arizona, northwestern New Mexico, and southwestern Colorado; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Bennett when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S.J. Res. 17. Joint resolution providing that the 17th day of September in each year shall be known as Constitution Day, and for other purposes; and

S.J. Res. 18. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the fourth week in April of each year as "Youth Temperance Education Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIRKSEN (by request):

S.J. Res. 19. Joint resolution designating the American marigold (Tagetes erecta) as the national floral emblem of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Dirksen when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

AUTHORIZING THE USE OF THE GOOD OFFICES OF THE UNITED NATIONS ON BEHALF OF THE ENSLAVED BALTIC STATES

Mr. DIRKSEN submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 6); which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Whereas the Communist regime of the Soviet Union did not come to power in the Middle Eastern European countries by legal or democratic processes, but has flouted even the solemn assurances and agreements entered into at the Yalta Conference of February 1945; and

Whereas the Soviet Union has denied self-determination by free election in those countries, resorting not only to heavily manned occupational forces, but also to genocidal activities in the cases of the Baltic States Republics; and

Whereas the sovereignty and independence of the former free governments of the Baltic States were duly recognized and continue to be given diplomatic recognition by the United States, as confirmed by House Resolution 346 of the Eighty-third Congress, agreed to July 27, 1953; and

Whereas the suppression of human freedoms and the denial of free trade and communications with other sovereign countries present a threat to peace, intolerable either to the United States, other free nations, or the international law agencies; and

Whereas the governments and peoples of the Baltic States have always been in close relation with the United States and constantly continue to prove their belief in democracy through the work and blood of their peoples: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the President is hereby requested to take such action as may be necessary to bring before the United Nations for its consideration the question of the forceful incorporation of the Baltic States Republics into the Soviet Union, and a resolution declaring that—

(a) the Soviet Union shall withdraw all Soviet troops, agents, colonists, and controls from the Baltic States;

(b) the Soviet Union shall return all citizens of the Baltic States to their homelands from places of exile in Siberia, and dispersion in prisons and slave labor camps throughout the Soviet Union; and

(c) the United Nations should conduct free elections in the Baltic States under the direct supervision of the United Nations and sit in judgment on the Communist counterparts of the Nazi war criminals convicted at the Nuremberg trials.

RESOLUTIONS

DEMOCRATIC ASSIGNMENTS FOR THE STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE FOR THE 89TH CONGRESS

Mr. MANSFIELD submitted a resolution (S. Res. 18) to amend rule XXV, changing the number of members on various committees, which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. Mansfield, which appears under a separate heading.)

DESIGNATION OF MAJORITY MEMBERS OF STANDING AND SELECT COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE AND OF CERTAIN JOINT COMMITTEES

Mr. MANSFIELD submitted a resolution (S. Res. 19) designating majority members of standing and select committees of the Senate and of certain joint committees, which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. Mansfield, which appears under a separate heading.)

TO CREATE A STANDING COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS FOR THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Mr. DIRKSEN (for himself, Mr. Allott, Mr. Boggs, Mr. Carlson, Mr. Case, Mr. Cotton, Mr. Fong, Mr. Hickenlooper, Mr. Javits, Mr. Kuchel, Mr. Magnuson, Mr. Miller, Mr. Mundt, Mr. Pearson, Mr. Prouty, Mr. Scott, Mr. Simpson, Mrs. Smith, Mr. Young of North Dakota, Mr. Pastore, and Mr. Randolph) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 20); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate (relating to standing committees) is amended by—

(1) striking out subparagraphs 10 through 13 in paragraph (h) of section (1);

(2) striking out subparagraphs 16 through 19 in paragraph (l), section (1); and

(3) inserting in section (1) after paragraph (p) the following new paragraph:

"(q) Committee on Veterans' Affairs, to consist of nine Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:

"1. Veterans' measures, generally.

"2. Pensions of all the wars of the United States, general and special.

"3. Life insurance issued by the Government on account of service in the Armed Forces.

"4. Compensation of veterans.

"5. Vocational rehabilitation and education of veterans.

"6. Veterans' hospitals, medical care, and treatment of veterans.

"7. Soldiers' and sailors' civil relief.

"8. Readjustment of servicemen to civil life."

Sec. 2. Section 4 of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by striking out "and Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences" and inserting in lieu thereof "Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences; and Committee on Veterans' Affairs".

Sec. 3. Section 6(a) of rule XVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate (relating to the designation of ex officio members of the Committee on Appropriations), is amended by adding at the end of the tabulation contained therein the following new item:

"Committee on Veterans' Affairs—For the Veterans' Administration"

Sec. 4. The Committee on Veterans' Affairs shall as promptly as feasible after its appointment and organization confer with the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare for the purpose of determining what disposition should be made of proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters theretofore referred to the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare during the Eighty-eighth Congress which are within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

PROVIDING FOR THE AWARDING OF SERVICE PINS OR EMBLEMS TO MEMBERS, OFFICERS, AND EMPLOYEES OF THE SENATE

Mr. DIRKSEN (for himself and Mr. Mansfield) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 21); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. Dirksen, which appears under a separate heading.)

TERMINATION OF AID TO INDONESIA AND UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I send to the desk two bills amending the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 so as to terminate U.S. aid to Indonesia and to the United Arab Republic, and also to end the training by U.S. forces of military and police personnel of those nations.

This Senate will remember that it voted 62 to 28 last August to cut off such assistance to Indonesia. I offered the amendment upon which the Senate so overwhelmingly stated its opinion then, and in view of the subsequent actions of Indonesian dictator Sukarno, I can only lament the fact that the will of the Senate was not upheld in the conference committee.

Because the conference committee dropped the Senate amendment, this Nation continued to provide aid to Indonesia and to provide training for Indonesian police and military personnel.

It is my sad duty to report to the Senate that the Department of State advised me only 2 weeks ago that it plans this year to provide to Indonesia such items as vehicles containing two-way radios. This folly must be ended, as the Senate so wisely stated 6 months ago.

During those 6 months, Indonesia has renounced membership in the United Nations, increased attacks upon our ally, Malaysia, and continued its contemptuous "go to hell" attitude toward the United States.

On the other side of the world, Mr. President, the same "go to hell" attitude has been evidenced by President Nasser of the United Arab Republic. Among other things, the United Arab Republic has condemned U.S. aid policies, ridiculed the U.S. relief mission to the Congo, openly assisted Congolese rebels in defiance of international law, shot down a U.S. civilian airplane, and burned the John F. Kennedy Library in Cairo.

We have been very patient with President Nasser. We have given him a lot of rope. And he has hung himself in his own words.

I quote Nasser:

> We have sent arms to the Congolese, and we will still send them arms.
>
> Aggression has taken place in the Congo. American and Belgian troops landed. We condemn this aggression.
>
> I want to say that we are getting wheat from the Americans. We get wheat, meat, and leftovers * * * yesterday the American Ambassador to talk about supplies from America * * * he does not like our currency. I would like him to know that whoever does not like our currency can go and drink up the sea.

I commend the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. Talmadge] for his remarks.

Mr. President, I urge the Members of the Senate to read again the arguments presented on this floor last August 13. Those facts remain valid and need not be repeated now. And I ask that the text of my two bills be printed at this point in the Record.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, they will be printed in the Record.

The bills, introduced by Mr. Tower, were received, read twice by their titles, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 328. A bill to amend section 620(j) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 in order to prohibit the furnishing of any further United States assistance to Indonesia including the training of Indonesian military and police personnel at United States Government facilities.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 620(j) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(j) In light of the actions of Indonesia in renouncing United Nations membership and in aligning itself with North Vietnam, a nation which has aggressively attacked United States naval vessels, and in light of the actions of Indonesia in threatening the peace and security of the nation of Malaysia—

"(j) No further United States assistance shall be furnished to Indonesia under this Act or any other provision of law; and

"(2) All Indonesian military and police personnel now receiving training at United States military schools, bases, or on any other United States Government facilities, shall be notified of the immediate termination of such training, and no other training of Indonesian nationals shall be initiated."

S. 329. A bill to amend section 620(j) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 in order to prohibit the furnishing of any further United States assistance to the United Arab Republic, including the training of United Arab Republic military personnel and police personnel at United States Government facilities.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 620(j) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(j) In light of the actions of the United Arab Republic in condemning the United States relief mission in the Congo and in openly assisting Congolese rebels in conflict with the principles of international law; in view of intemperate United Arab Republic attacks upon United States aid policies; and in light of the burning and looting of the John F. Kennedy Library in Cairo—

"(1) No further United States assistance shall be furnished to the United Arab Republic under this Act or any other provision of law; and "(2) All United Arab Republic military and police personnel now receiving training at United States military schools or bases or at any other United States Government facilities, shall be notified of the immediate termination of such training, and no other training of United Arab Republic nationals shall be initiated."

Mr. BENNETT subsequently said: Mr. President, I have been asked by the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower] to ask in his behalf unanimous consent that the two bills he introduced during the morning hour today may also lie on the table until Wednesday of next week.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

A BILL TO AID THE MINING INDUSTRY BY LIBERALIZING DEDUCTIONS FOR EXPLORATION EXPENSES

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the last session of the Congress enacted the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, a program now underway to combat poverty and increase the prosperity of the United States. The enactment of this legislation emphasizes the importance of revitalizing every sector of the economy as a means of promoting the welfare of our whole society.

Beyond the provisions of the Economic Opportunity Act are other ways we can attack poverty by rooting out its causes, particularly by removing the hopelessness of prolonged unemployment suffered by those dependent on a depressed industry. Many of our citizens who find themselves in this plight are miners. The mining industry is one in which there is, in many respects, a depression and resulting unemployment.

While we have allowed parts of our mining industry to fall into an economic decline, we have neglected action which might have been taken by the Federal Government to prevent this. The mining industry has been almost uniquely neglected by Federal programs of subsidy, technical assistance and generosity of Federal expenditures so lavishly displayed for other segments of our economy, such as agriculture, transportation, and manufacturing. While loans and grants from the Federal Government are freely available to myriad business enterprises, very little is available to assist mining operators needing Federal help.

Miners are, pretty generally, self-reliant people, and the mining industry does not look to Uncle Sam for unjustified handouts. However, this is an industry that, for the sake of those dependent on it for a livelihood, we should feel obligated to maintain in a healthy economic status.

The mining industry itself has repeatedly called attention to a particular restriction on its effectiveness, which I believe can be and should be removed. That is the present Internal Revenue law limiting deductions of mining industries for exploration expenses to a total of $400,000, with an annual limitation of $100,000.

This arbitrary restriction on deductions that may be taken for exploration expenses, essential to development of a mining property, presents an obvious and unjustified inhibition of investment in mining enterprises. This, in turn, limits employment opportunities, limits income of those employed, and inevitably results in failures in development of properties that could, instead of remaining worthless, make a contribution to a prosperous economy.

The bill I now introduce, for myself and Senators Bartlett, Bennett, Church, Jordan of Idaho, Long of Missouri, McGovern, Metcalf, Montoya, Moss, Mundt, and Simpson would allow full deduction of exploration expenditures by mining industries as they are paid or incurred without regard to the $400,000 total, $100,000 annual limitation now in the Internal Revenue law. To meet objections raised by the Treasury Department to total eliminitation of existing deduction limitations, grounded on the theory exploration expenses represent capital investment, the bill contains recapture provisions. Thus, the taxpayer would, when a mine reaches the producing stage, be required to comply with provisions resulting in payment of taxes representing the difference between those which would have been levied if the expenses had been capitalized and amounts actually paid under the new provisions; and, in the case of disposition of mining properties, adjustment of tax on any realized gain to prevent conversion of ordinary income into capital gain.

At the time a mine reaches the producing stage, the taxpayer would be given alternatives of (a) including in gross income for the taxable year in which production is reached an amount equal to that previously deducted as exploration expense; or (b) foregoing deductions for depletion until the amount of depletion allowable otherwise equals the amount of the exploration expenditures deducted.

Upon sale or disposition of a mining property on which exploration expenditure deductions have been taken under provisions of this bill any gain to the extent of deductions allowed will be taxed as ordinary income and not as capital gain.

It is the belief of the mining industry the enactment of this legislation will stimulate exploration; hence development; hence prosperity of the Nation. Insofar as it represents an innovation in tax procedure, it is not one which would deprive the Federal Government of revenues needed and otherwise collectible. In fact, it is my belief this treatment of the mining industry would generate income and, in the long run, stimulate the economy so that we might look forward to an increase in tax revenues as a result of its enactment.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill I now introduce be printed in full at the conclusion of these remarks, that the bill be appropriately referred, and lie on the table until January 15.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the table as requested by the Senator, and will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 338) to amend section 615 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the tax treatment of exploration expenditures in the case of mining, introduced by Mr. Gruening (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 338

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 615 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to mine exploration expenditures) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(e) Expenditures in Excess of Limitation.—

"(1) Election of taxpayer.—If expenditures described in subsection (a) which are paid or incurred during the taxable year are not deductible in the manner provided by subsection (a) or (b) solely because they exceed—

"(A) the limitation of $100,000 set forth in subsection (a), or

"(B) the limitation of $400,000 set forth in subsection (c),

at the election of the taxpayer such excess expenditures shall be allowed as a deduction for such taxable year despite such limitations.

"(2) Recapture on reaching producing stage.—If a mine reaches the producing stage after the taxpayer has made an election provided by paragraph (1), then—

"(A) If the taxpayer so elects with respect to such mine, he shall include in gross income for the taxable year in which the mine reaches the producing stage an amount equal to the adjusted exploration expenditures with respect to the mine, and the amount so included in income shall be treated for purposes of this subtitle as an expenditure which (i) is paid or incurred on the date on which the mine reaches the producing stage, and (ii) is properly chargeable to capital account.

"(B) If the taxpayer does not elect the application of subparagraph (A) with respect to such mine, then the deduction for depletion under section 611 with respect to the property shall be disallowed until the amount of depletion which would be allowable but for this subparagraph equals the amount of the adjusted exploration expenditures with respect to such mine.

"(3) Recapture in case of bonus or royalty.—If the taxpayer has made an election provided by paragraph (1) and receives or accrues a bonus or royalty with respect to a property, then the deduction for depletion under section 611 with respect to the bonus or royalty shall be disallowed until the amount of depletion which would be allowable but for this paragraph equals the amount of the adjusted exploration expenditures with respect to the property to which the bonus or royalty relates.

"(4) Basis of property.—The basis of any property shall not be reduced by the amount of any depletion which would be allowable but for the application of this subsection.

"(5) Elections.—

"(A) Method.—Any election under this subsection shall be made in such manner as the Secretary or his delegate may by regulations prescribe.

"(B) Time and scope.—

"(i) The election provided by paragraph (1) for any taxable year may be made or changed at any time before the expiration of the period prescribed for making a claim for credit or refund of the tax imposed by this chapter for the taxable year. Such an election for a taxable year shall apply to all expenditures described in subsection (a) paid or incurred by the taxpayer during the taxable year.

"(ii) The election provided by paragraph (2)(A) may be made or changed not later than the time prescribed by law for filing the return (including extensions thereof) for the taxable year during which the mine reaches the producing stage.

"(6) Definitions.—For purposes of this subsection and subsection (f)—

"(A) The term 'mine' includes a well (other than an oil or gas well) or other natural deposit.

"(B) The term 'property' has the meaning determined under sections 614 (a), (c), and (e).

"(C) The term 'adjusted exploration expenditures' means, with respect to any property or mine—

"(i) the amount of the expenditures allowed as deductions under paragraph (1) which are properly chargeable to such property or mine, reduced by

"(ii) the amount (if any) by which the allowances for percentage depletion under section 613 were reduced on account of the deduction of such expenditures,

properly adjusted for any amounts included in gross income under this subsection and for any amounts of gain to which subsection (f) applied.

"(f) Gain From Dispositions of Certain Mining Property.—

"(1) General rule.—Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, if mining property is disposed of during a taxable year ending after December 31, 1964, the lower of—

"(A) the adjusted exploration expenditures with respect to such property, or

"(B) the excess of—

"(i) the amount realized (in the case of a sale, exchange, or involuntary conversion), or the fair market value (in the case of any other disposition), over

"(ii) the adjusted basis of such property, shall be treated as gain from the sale or exchange of property which is neither a capital asset nor property described in section 1231. Such gain shall be recognized notwithstanding any other provision of this subtitle.

"(2) Disposition of portion of property.—For purposes of paragraph (1)—

"(A) In the case of the disposition of a portion of a mining property (other than an undivided interest), the entire amount of the adjusted exploration expenditures with respect to such property shall be treated as attributable to such portion to the extent of the amount of the gain to which paragraph (1) applies.

"(B) In the case of the disposition of an undivided interest in a mining property (or a portion thereof) a proportionate part of the adjusted exploration expenditures with respect to such property shall be treated as attributable to such undivided interest to the extent of the amount of the gain to which paragraph (1) applies.

This paragraph shall not apply to any expenditure to the extent the taxpayer establishes to the satisfaction of the Secretary or his delegate that such expenditure relates neither to the portion (or interest therein) disposed of nor to any mine, in the property held by the taxpayer before the disposition, which has reached the producing stage.

"(3) Exceptions and limitations.—Section 1245(b) (relating to exceptions and limitations with respect to gain from disposition of certain depreciable property) shall apply in respect of this subsection in the same manner and with the same effect as if references in section 1245(b) to section 1245 or any provision thereof were references to this subsection or the corresponding provisions of this subsection and as if references to section 1245 property were references to mining property.

"(4) Adjustments to basis.—The Secretary or his delegate shall prescribe such regulations as he may deem necessary to provide for adjustments to the basis of property to reflect gain recognized under paragraph (1).

"(5) Definitions, etc.—For purposes of this subsection—

"(A) Mining property.—The term 'mining property' means any property (within the meaning determined under section 614 (a), (c), and (e)) with respect to which any expenditures allowed as a deduction under subsection (e)(1) are properly chargeable.

"(B) Disposal of coal or domestic iron ore with a retained economic interest.—A transaction which constitutes a disposal under section 631(c) shall be treated as a disposition.

"(6) Application of Subsection.—This subsection shall apply notwithstanding any other provision of this subtitle."

Sec. 2. (a) The following provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 are each amended by striking out "section 1245(a)" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 615 (f)(1), 1245(a),":

(1) Section 170(e) (relating to charitable contributions).

(2) Subsections (b)(1)(B)(ii) and (d)(1)(B) of section 301 (relating to amount distributed).

(3) Paragraph (3) of section 312(c) (relating to adjustments of earnings and profits).

(4) Paragraph (12) of section 341(e) (relating to collapsible corporations).

(5) Subparagraphs (A) and (B) of section 453(d)(4) (relating to distribution of installment obligations in certain corporate liquidations).

(b) The last sentence of section 751(c) of such Code (relating to definition of "unrealized receivables" for purposes of subchapter K) is amended—

(1) by striking out "section 1245 property (as defined in section 1245(a)(3))" and inserting in lieu thereof "mining property (as defined in section 615(f)(5)(A)), section 1245 property (as defined in section 1245(a)(3)),", and

(2) by striking out "section 1245(a)" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 615(f)(1), 1245(a),".

Sec. 3. The amendments made by this Act shall apply to taxable years ending after December 31, 1964, but only in respect of expenditures paid or incurred after such date.

AGATE FOSSIL BEDS NATIONAL MONUMENT

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague [Mr. Curtis], the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Simpson], the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee], the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. Allott], the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. Mundt], and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the establishment of the Agate Fossil Beds National Monument at Agate, Nebr.

The purpose of the bill is to preserve a scientific treasure which is quite literally priceless, since, if it were ever lost, it could not be replaced by the expenditure of any sum of money. Within a narrow area of western Nebraska, in Sioux County, there is a group of deposits of fossilized mammal bones of almost unbelievable richness.

By a miracle of historical coincidence, they were first discovered by a man who had the vision and understanding to see that they must be preserved and developed for future generations. Their discoverer was Capt. James H. Cook, Indian scout, frontiersman, and author of the fascinating story of the old frontier, "50 Years on the Old Frontier."

Captain Cook took upon himself the duty of custodianship over these irreplaceable deposits, and made them available to leading museums, universities, and other scientific institutions. His son, Dr. Harold Cook, who died recently, continued this tradition and was also himself a noted paleontologist who made significant contributions to knowledge in this field.

With the death of Dr. Cook, a danger exists that these fossil deposits may be destroyed unless action is taken promptly. The bill now being introduced will permit the National Park Service to acquire title to the deposits and provide for their development and display, as well as making them available for appropriate scientific development and analysis.

Last year the bill, S. 1481, was reported unanimously by the Senate committee, with minor amendments of a clerical nature, and was passed by the Senate without objection. Unfortunately, this action was taken too late in the year to permit House action. The bill now being introduced is identical to S. 1481 as reported by the Senate committee. In view of the full committee hearing last year and the action by both the Senate committee and the full Senate, it is my hope that the bill may receive early consideration and favorable action by both Houses.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received, and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 339) to provide for the establishment of the Agate Fossil Beds National Monument in the State of Nebraska, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Hruska (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ALLEVIATION OF CRISIS CONFRONTING RAILROADS IN NEW ENGLAND

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill designed to resolve the deepening crisis confronting our railroads in New England. It suggests a framework for cooperation between the States of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, and New York in conjunction with the Federal Government. The bill was discussed at a meeting of the Senators from the four States yesterday and explanatory remarks are printed in today's Record. I am happy to announce that the following Senators have agreed to cosponsor: the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore], the Senators from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd and Mr. Ribicoff], the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Edward Kennedy], and the junior Senator from New York [Mr. Robert Kennedy].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 348) to encourage the preservation and development of a modern and efficient passenger rail transportation service in the northeastern seaboard area by granting the consent and approval of Congress to the States of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, and New York to negotiate and enter into a compact to create their own Northeast Rail Authority, and by guaranteeing certain loans and other credit to such authority, introduced by Mr. Pell (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am gratified that Senator Pell's bill takes basically the same position as Congressman Reid and I did in the proposal we advanced the day before yesterday, calling for a four-State agency to operate and assist in financing the New Haven Railroad. Senator Pell has introduced implementing legislation and invited my cosponsorship. I feel this bill in the main is a good one but have decided to withhold cosponsorship of it at this time because of questions I have concerning the imposition of an open-end, long-term financial obligation upon the State of New York and the three other participating New England States which is contained in article VII of the bill. I strongly support the concept of a four-State agency as one solution to the crisis situation on the New Haven, and Congressman Reid and I intend to introduce parallel legislation to that of Senator Pell and the other cosponsors of his bill focusing on this important concept but with financial provisions more likely to get State approval and adequate to do the job. We are working on such legislation at this time and will introduce it shortly. I shall continue to work to improve the legislation introduced today.

SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS INCREASE ACT OF 1965

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a bill relating to the Social Security Act and ask that it be printed and appropriately referred.

In the closing minutes of the 88th Congress, the hopes of many older Americans were frustrated by the conferees' failure to come forward with needed revisions in the Social Security Act. Today I introduce three measures to alleviate the hardships placed on our fellow citizens.

The bill I now send to the desk would raise the minimum monthly benefit from $40 to $70 with scaled increases upward to $300, the maximum family benefit. I ask unanimous consent that there be included in the Record at this point a chart showing the breakdown of these increases.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the request of the Senator from Vermont is granted.

The bill (S. 349) to increase benefits under the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system, introduced by Mr. Prouty, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Social Security Benefits Increase Act of 1965."

Sec. 2(a). Section 215(a) of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out the table and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"TABLE FOR DETERMINING PRIMARY INSURANCE AMOUNT AND MAXIMUM FAMILY BENEFITS

"I		II		III		IV	V
(Primary insurance benefit under 1939 Act, as modified)		(Primary insurance amount under 1958 Act, as modified)		(Average monthly wage)		(Primary insurance amount)	(Maximum family benefits)
If an individual's primary insurance benefit (as determined under subsec. (d)) is—		Or his primary insurance amount (as determined under subsec. (c)) is—		Or his average monthly wage (as determined under subsec. (b)) is—		The amount referred to in the preceding paragraphs of this subsection shall be—	And the maximum amount of benefits payable (as provided in sec. 203 (a)) on the basis of his wages and self-employment income shall be—
At least—	But not more than—	At least—	But not more than—	At least—	But not more than—		
------	$19.24	$40	$49	---	$83	$70.00	$105.00
$19.25	24.20	50	59	$84	101	77.00	115.50
24.21	29.25	60	69	102	132	84.00	126.00
29.26	35.00	70	79	133	178	91.00	142.40
35.01	41.76	80	89	179	225	98.00	180.00
41.77	-----	90	99	226	272	106.00	217.60
		100	109	273	319	116.00	254.00
		110	119	320	365	126.00	266.00
		120	127	366	412	134.00	284.80
				413	450	144.00	300.00"

(b) Section 215(c) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"Primary Insurance Amount Under 1958 Act as Modified

"(c)(1) For the purposes of column II of the table appearing in subsection (a) of this section, an individual's primary insurance amount shall be computed as provided in, and subject to the limitations specified in, (A) this section as in effect prior to the enactment of the Social Security Benefits Increase Act of 1965, and (B) the applicable provisions of the Social Security Amendments Act of 1960.

"(2) The provisions of this subsection shall be applicable only in the case of an individual—

"(A) who became entitled to benefits under section 202(a) or section 223 prior to the second month following the month in which the Social Security Benefits Increase Act of 1965 is enacted or who died prior to such second month, and

"(B) to whom neither paragraph (4) nor paragraph (5) of subsection (b) is applicable."

(c)(1) Paragraph (2) of section 203(a) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(2) when two or more persons were entitled (without the application of section 202(j)(1) and section 223(b)) to monthly benefits under sections 202 and 223 for the first month following the month in which the Social Security Benefits Increase Act of 1965 is enacted on the basis of the wages and self-employment income of such insured individual, such total of benefits shall not be reduced to less than the larger of—

"(A) the amount determined under this subsection without regard to this paragraph, or

"(B) the sum of the amounts derived by multiplying the benefit amount (determined under this title as in effect prior to the enactment of the Social Security Benefits Increase Act of 1965) of each such person for the month specified therein by 105 percent and raising each such increased amount, if it is not a multiple of $0.10, to the next higher multiple of $0.10."

(2) Paragraph (3) of such section 203(a) is repealed.

(d) The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to monthly benefits under title II of the Social Security Act for months after the first month following the month in which this Act is enacted and with respect to lump-sum death payments under such title in the case of deaths occurring after such first month.

(e) If an individual was entitled to a disability insurance benefit under section 223 of the Social Security Act for the first month following the month in which this Act is enacted and became entitled to old-age insurance benefits under section 202(a) of such Act, or died, in the month following such first month, then, for purposes of section 215(a)(4) of the Social Security Act, as amended by this Act, the amount in column IV of the table appearing in such section 215(a) for such individual shall be the amount in such column on the line on which in column II appears his primary insurance amount (as determined under section 215(c) of such Act) instead of the amount in column IV equal to his disability insurance benefit.

Sec. 3. In addition to amounts appropriated under other provisions of law to the Federal Old Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated to such fund, from time to time, such amounts as may be necessary to equal, with respect to each individual who becomes entitled to a benefit under title II of the Social Security Act by reason of the amendments made by this Act, payments to such individuals to the extent that they exceed additional contributions to such trust fund provided for by this Act.

Sec. 4. Notwithstanding any other provision of the Act no increase in any social security benefit provided for by this Act shall be counted in determining the annual income of an individual receiving benefits under chapter 15 of the Veterans Pension Act of 1959 or under the first sentence of section 9(b) of such Veterans Act.

The statement presented by Mr. Prouty is as follows:

Statement by Senator Prouty

Under the Prouty amendment the minimum primary insurance amount is $70. The lowest maximum family benefit is $105. The following benefit changes are made:

Those now receiving between—

	Prouty plan
$40 to $49	$70
$50 to $59	77
$60 to $69	84
$70 to $79	91
$80 to $89	98
$90 to $99	106
$100 to $109	116
$110 to $119	126
$120 to $127	134

Those with an average monthly wage between $413 and $450 per month will receive $144, and the maximum family benefit for that group will be $300.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, the average older couple in America has considerably less than half the annual income of an average young couple. Not only do many of our senior citizens lack sufficient financing to live modestly and comfortably, they lack what is necessary to eke out a mere subsistence.

The social security system was created with a view toward providing a basic floor of protection against want. But, today, the system is geared to an unreasonably low level of subsistence, $40 per month. My daily mail reflects the inadequacy of this current floor.

In the past few days the Advisory Council on Social Security, cognizant of the gap between current benefits and current needs, has called for an extensive increase in monthly benefits. It is my feeling that my plan will meet that urgent call.

AMENDMENT OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a second bill to amend the Social Security Act. I ask that it be printed in the Record and appropriately referred.

There exists a situation under our present social security laws which defies logical explanation. When the social security program was created it was hoped that within the span of a few years most of our older Americans would benefit from its protective arm. Although the program has expanded over the years, there remains an unfortunately large number of older Americans who are not eligible for assistance. They are the people who, for one reason or another, have not obtained sufficient quarters of covered employment or who have worked in jobs outside the scope of the contribution program. As they reach retirement age, they are not eligible for the benefits extended to their neighbors.

If we are to meet the long term objectives of the social security system and provide a basic floor of protection against want for every older American, we must bring within the aid and comfort of the act those now unnecessarily excluded. My proposal would "blanket in" all those age 70 or over who are not now eligible for social security payments.

Mr. President, it is not too late for these people. They have done much during their lives to make America a better place to live. We ought not to permit further suffering because of our earlier oversight.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 350) to improve the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program by providing minimum benefits for certain individuals who have attained age 70, introduced by Mr. Prouty, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Social Security Amendments of 1965".

MINIMUM BENEFITS FOR CERTAIN INDIVIDUALS WHO HAVE ATTAINED AGE SEVENTY

Entitlement

Sec. 2. (a)(1) Section 202 of the Social Security Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"Benefit payments to persons not otherwise entitled under this section

"(v)(1) Every individual who—

"(A) has attained age seventy,

"(B) is not and would not, upon filing application therefor, be entitled to any monthly benefits under any other subsection of this section for the month in which he attains such age or, if later, the month in which he files application under this subsection,

"(C) is a resident of the United States,

"(D)(i) is a citizen of the United States, and has resided in the United States continuously for not less than eighteen months before the month in which he files application for benefits under this subsection, or (ii) has resided in the United States continuously for the ten-year period preceding the month in which he files application for benefits under this subsection, and

"(E) has filed application for benefits under this subsection,

shall be entitled to a benefit under this subsection for each month, beginning with the first month in which he becomes so entitled to such benefits and ending with the month preceding the month in which he dies. Such individual's benefit for each month shall be equal to the first figure in column IV of the table in section 215(a).

"(2)(A) If—

"(i) any individual is entitled to a benefit for any month under this subsection, and

"(ii) it is determined that a periodic benefit or benefits are payable for such month to such individual under a pension or retirement system established by any agency of the United States or of a State or political subdivision thereof (or any instrumentality of the United States or a State or a political subdivision or subdivisions thereof which is wholly owned thereby),

then the benefit referred to in clause (i) shall be reduced (but not below zero) by an amount equal to such periodic benefit or benefits for such month.

"(B) If any periodic benefit referred to in subparagraph (A)(ii) is determined to be payable on other than a monthly basis (excluding a benefit payable in a lump sum unless it is a commutation of, or a substitute for, periodic payments), the reduction of such individual's benefit under this paragraph shall be made at such time or times and in such amounts as the Secretary finds approximates, as nearly as practicable, the reduction prescribed in subparagraph (A).

"(C) In order to assure that the purposes of this subsection will be carried out, the Secretary may, as a condition to certification for payment of any monthly benefit to an individual under this subsection (if it appears to the Secretary that such individual may be eligible for a periodic benefit which would give rise to a reduction under this paragraph), require adequate assurance of reimbursement of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund in case periodic benefits, with respect to which such a reduction should be made, become payable to such individual and such reduction is not made.

"(D) Any agency of the United States which is authorized by any law of the United States to pay periodic benefits, or has a system of periodic benefits, shall (at the request of the Secretary) certify to him with respect to any individual such information as the Secretary deems necessary to carry out his functions under this paragraph. For purposes of this subparagraph, the term 'agency of the United States' includes any instrumentality of the United States which is wholly owned by the United States.

"(3) Benefits shall not be paid under this subsection—

"(A) to an alien for any month during any part of which he was outside the United States;

"(B) to any individual for any month during all of which he was an inmate of a public institution; or

"(C) to any individual who is a member or employee of an organization required to register under an order of the Subversive Activities Control Board as a Communist-action organization, a Communist-front organization (or a Communist-infiltrated organization under the Internal Security Act of 1950, as amended."

(2) The following provisions of section 202 of such Act are each amended by striking out "or (h)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(h), or (v)":

(A) subsection (d)(6)(A),

(B) subsection (e)(4)(A),

(C) subsection (f)(4)(A),

(D) subsection (g)(4)(A), and

(E) the first sentence of subsection (j)(1).

(3) Section 202(h)(5)(A) of such Act is amended by striking out "or (g)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(g), or (v)".

(4) Section 202(k)(2)(B) of such Act is amended by striking out "preceding".

Reimbursement of trust fund

(b)(1) With respect to every individual who becomes entitled to a benefit under title II of the Social Security Act by reason of the amendments made by subsection (a), the Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer to the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund, from the general fund of the Treasury, an amount equal to the sum of—

(A) The total amount of employee and employer taxes that would have been paid under the provisions of sections 3101 and 3111 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (or the corresponding provisions of prior law) if such individual had been paid wages (as defined in section 209 of the Social Security Act) equal to the first figure in column III of the table in section 215(a) in each month of the period beginning with January 1951 (or January of the year after the year in which he attained age 31, if that is later) and ending with December of the year in which he attained age 69 (or, if later, December 1962); and

(B) Interest, compounded at 3 percent per annum, on the total amount determined under subparagraph (A), for each year in the period referred to in such subparagraph.

(2) The transfer of funds from the general fund of the Treasury to the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund with respect to any individual pursuant to paragraph (1) shall be made not later than the end of the calendar quarter following the calendar quarter in which such individual becomes entitled to benefits under title II of the Social Security Act by reason of the amendments made by subsection (a).

Effective date

(c) The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply only in the case of monthly benefits under title II of the Social Security Act for months beginning on or after the thirtieth day after the date of the enactment of this Act based on applications filed in or after March 1965.

AMENDMENT OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a third bill to amend the Social Security Act. I ask that it be printed in the Record, and appropriately referred.

Current law tolerates an anomaly of objectives. While seeking to provide a cushion of financial support for the elderly who are unable to work past the retirement years, the system penalizes those older Americans who continue their earnest labors by causing them to lose a portion or all of their social security benefits if they earn above $1,200 a year.

My third bill would permit persons eligible for social security to earn up to $2,400 before they would suffer a diminishment in social security benefits. It is my strong feeling that the $1,200 limitation of the present law is totally out of line with the realities of what it costs to live from day to day. It is my hope that this gross inequity will be removed.

These, Mr. President are the most pressing revisions needed in the social security system. There are, of course, many others and from time to time I hope to bring to the attention of the Senate other vital revisions. I hope we shall see swift action on these and other related social security matters.

I hope I will soon be able to turn to the people of Vermont and say: "It is late, but we have brought to you a more meaningful social security system."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 351) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase to $2,400 the annual amount individuals are permitted to earn without suffering deductions from the monthly insurance benefits payable to them under such title, introduced by Mr. Prouty, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a)(1) paragraphs (1), (3), and (4)(B) of subsection (f) of section 203 of the Social Security Act are each amended by striking out "$100" wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "$200".

(2) The first sentence of paragraph (3) of such subsection (f) is amended by striking out ", except that of the first $500 of such excess (or all of such excess if it is less than $500), an amount equal to one-half thereof shall not be included".

(b) Paragraph (1)(A) of subsection (h) of section 203 of such Act is amended by striking out "$100" and inserting in lieu thereof "$200".

Sec. 2. The amendments made by the first section of this Act shall be effective, in the case of any individual, with respect to taxable years of such individual ending after 1964.

MOAPA VALLEY WATER CO.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, on behalf of myself and the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. Bible], a private bill for the relief of the Moapa Valley Water Co. of Logandale, Nev.

The purpose of our proposal would be to forgive accrued interest through December 31, 1965, on funds obtained by the company from the Farmers Home Administration which was used in the construction of a sanitary culinary water system.

This system brought to this small farm area its only source of potable water from 60 miles distant. The line was necessary, since the only natural water available to the region was the supply which flowed in open canals for distances of 25 miles. The supply has been condemned by State and county health officials as unfit for human consumption.

It was against this background that Farmers Home Administration, after careful studies, approved a culinary water system of thin-walled plastic pipe in 1958. Financing was obtained in part from Farmers Home Administration.

It developed, however, that the pipe approved for the system lacked sufficient strength and became a source of continual problems for the users.

In 1960, a flash flood washed away a sizable section of the pipe, requiring complete replacement with a stronger, more durable line.

The additional financial commitments have placed and continue to impose a heavy financial burden on this small farm community which finds it impossible to provide revenues which will permit the company to make payments on either the principle or interest.

Mr. President, in our view, the FHA had a responsibility for approval of the inadequate original pipe and it is our belief that the community should not have to bear the burden of interest repayment while shouldering the expense of replacing the faulty system.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 357) for the relief of the Moapa Valley Water Co. of Logandale, Nev., introduced by Mr. Cannon (for himself and Mr. Bible), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

INDIANA DUNES NATIONAL LAKESHORE

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senators Douglas, Hartke, Bayh, Anderson, Burdick, and Moss, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the establishment of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore and for other purposes.

This proposal has had extensive hearings before my Interior and Insular Affairs Committee during the past several years.

As S. 2249 of the 88th Congress, the bill was favorably reported by the Interior Committee and was passed by the Senate on September 19, 1964. Unfortunately, insufficient time was available last year for action on the part of the House of Representatives.

The purpose of the bill is to preserve for educational, inspirational, and recreational use of the public certain portions of the Indiana dunes and other areas of scenic, scientific, and historical interest and recreational value on the shores of Lake Michigan in the State of Indiana.

Inasmuch as S. 2249 was sponsored by 26 Senators in the last Congress, I request that the present bill lie on the desk for 5 days in order that other interested Senators may join as cosponsors.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Washington.

The bill (S. 360) to provide for the establishment of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Jackson (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I wish to join as a cosponsor in supporting the proposed creation of a national lakeshore park in the Indiana dunes area. This bill, as my colleagues know, is identical to the one which the Senate passed last September.

The proposed park would serve a large area and would conserve the natural beauty and resources of the Indiana dunes for the enjoyment of future generations. Many experts have long pointed out the great value of this land for recreational purposes. In addition, it is most important to preserve the natural botanical, geological, and scientific features of this region.

Let me emphasize that the bill takes into careful consideration the potential industrial development which is already taking shape in this section of my State. Omitted from the park is a number of acres which will be devoted to a new deepwater port and harbor facility. It is my intention to introduce a bill next week which will help facilitate the construction of this proposed port.

This administration has already made a fine record in the field of conservation. I hope that the Members of the Senate will agree with me and the other sponsors of this measure that its enactment would contribute greatly to the welfare of the Nation as a whole as well as benefit the people of the Midwest.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, it is with good hope for its enactment this year that I join with the Senators from Indiana [Mr. Hartke and Mr. Bayh] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Anderson] as a sponsor of the bill to create the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore, which the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs [Mr. Jackson] has introduced today.

This bill is identical with the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore bill which the Senate passed on September 30, 1964, only 3½ months ago. I want to express my appreciation to the distinguished Senators whom I have named, and to the more than a score of our colleagues who were cosponsors of this legislation in the last Congress.

As Senators know, this proposal is a carefully worked out compromise, put forward by the Kennedy administration and endorsed by the Johnson administration, on which there is widespread agreement. There can be no better evidence of this agreement than the list of principal sponsors and the fact that the Senate passed the bill last fall after 7 years of effort to preserve this irreplaceable gift which nature has placed in the heart of a closely populated area of 8½ million people.

Of those years of struggle to save the dunes I will say only this. I regret the unnecessary loss of several thousands acres of beautiful dunes to industrial and residential use, but I have reluctantly agreed to the administration compromise as the best hope for preserving the thousands of acres which still remain.

When the parliamentary situation permits, I shall discuss the details of this proposal at length. Briefly, the bill authorizes the creation of an Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore of approximately 11,300 acres. This acreage figure includes the 2,182 acres of the Indiana Dunes State Park, but the expectation is and always has been the cooperative management of the two areas and the State park would become a part of the national lakeshore only with the consent of the State of Indiana.

The lakeshore would provide approximately 10.8 miles of unmatched shoreline and swimming beaches along the warmest shore of Lake Michigan.

Every effort has been made to accommodate the wishes of local residents and to provide liberal transition rights for property owners.

Owners of improved property which is within the lakeshore boundaries, defined as a detached, one-family dwelling construction of which was begun before October 21, 1963, may retain their home in ownership and use, together with land on which it is located, or they may lease it, sell it, or will it to their heirs. They may also sell it to the Government under a lease agreement for a period up to 25 years. The condition on this simply is that zoning ordinances to protect the residential and recreational nature of the area be followed. This will be a protection both to the homeowners and the lakeshore.

Mr. President, in view of the Senate's approval of this identical bill in the closing days of the last session, it is my hope that the Public Lands Subcommittee and the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs will again report the lakeshore bill within a few weeks. It is essential that this be done so that there will be adequate time for consideration in the House.

Like millions of others, I return again and again to the beautiful wilds of the Indiana dunes for refreshment and restoration. I did so again last fall, and I want to report to my colleagues that the beauty and recreational values of the dunes still remain.

I inspected thoroughly the interior sections of the lakeshore and was greatly impressed by the natural values these sections will provide. I walked again, as I have for 40 years, along the beaches which I regard as unequaled anywhere for family bathing. There can be no doubt, Mr. President, of the urgency or necessity to act now to save this treasure. President Kennedy called for the creation of an Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore in his conservation message. The Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission has made it unmistakeably clear that our urgent need is for parks where the people are and the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore is the classic example of such an opportunity.

President Johnson has called anew for a "massive effort to save the countryside and establish more large and small parks, more seashores and open spaces than have been created during any period in our history." I urge the Senate to make this effort, and as a part of it, to again pass the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore.

I wish to thank the Senators from Indiana and other States, and to thank the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] for the fine cooperative part which they have played in connection with this matter.

INDIANA DUNES NATIONAL LAKESHORE SHOULD BE ESTABLISHED AS SOON AS POSSIBLE

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, in connection with the remarks of the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] concerning the Indiana dunes, and the proposed legislation passed by the Senate in the closing days of the last Congress, I would say that of all the many seashore and lakeshore parks which have been created in the last two Congresses—the 87th and the 88th Congresses—which have written a superb record of conservation and recreational development in this field, none strikes me as more important, more needed, and more overdue than the Indiana dunes.

It is overdue because during the years when the senior Senator from Illinois, with unflagging devotion, was pressing for this proposed legislation, industry moved in and very unwisely and shortsightedly destroyed a very large part of this irreplaceable natural heritage, so that what is left today is by no means what it might have been had the proposed legislation been enacted 4 years ago or even earlier. The discovery of the great and unique value and superlative beauty of Indiana dunes and its priceless ecology was made a half century ago, and that was the time when action should have been taken. Stephen Tyng Mather, that great advocate of national park establishment proposed that this area be set aside as such in 1916. But the American people were regrettably not as conservation-minded at that time as they have now become, and unfortunately, the lag of time coupled with the unenlightened activities of industrial developers, has proved very destructive; much of the dunes has been destroyed. So it is important not merely because of the great natural beauty of what remains and its great variety, but also because it lies close to the second largest concentration of population in the United States, that the Indiana dunes be speedily saved and preserved for all time.

The American people are going to need this and other such areas. We shall need far more of them. And I am hopeful that in this coming session the Senate will speedily reenact the proposed legislation related to the Indiana dunes, send it over to the House, and secure appropriate action there. I am happily informed that some of the resistance which existed in the House has diminished. The proposed legislation now has the unqualified support of the two distinguished Senators from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE and Mr. BAYH], and I, as a member of the Subcommittee on Public Lands of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, certainly will do everything I can to speed the enactment of this very worthwhile proposed legislation to which the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] has consecrated so many years and so much dedicated, hard work. It will be a monument to him and he deserves all the credit in the world for it. He has had to overcome many obstacles, both on the scene in Indiana and in the Congress. But at last I think we are going to achieve this desirable result of getting the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GRUENING. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Alaska not merely for the generous statement which he has made, but also for his untiring advocacy of the proposal. He knows whereof he speaks. Some years ago, as a member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the Senator from Alaska made a trip to the Indiana dunes and spent 2 days in the area. He went swimming—which is his characteristic recreation—in Lake Michigan. He traversed the area on foot and by plane, and he was convinced; and having been convinced, his support with his characteristic energy has been invaluable.

The Senator is much too kind in what he has said about me. Many local groups deserve credit.

I wish no credit. I only hope that the dunes bill can be passed and that a national park can be established there.

Mr. GRUENING. The Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS] and I, as members of the Senate Public Lands Subcommittee, visited there 4 years ago and were greatly impressed with the area. I am glad to see that the resistance which existed at the time has greatly diminished. I am confident that the bill will be enacted in the 89th Congress.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS] for his interest in this matter, for his attention to it, and for the characteristically unselfish way in which he has supported it.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the dunes national lakeshore bill introduced today is a brilliant example of what comes of diligence, patience, and dedication to the wants and needs of people today and for years to come.

"Save the dunes" has long been a cry of conservationists and others who sought to preserve for posterity the beauty and peace of Indiana's Lake Michigan shoreland. The plant and animal life of this sandy stretch is unmatched. The delightful dune formations are magnificent. The sandy beaches match any in this country.

The cry of "save the dunes" was taken up by columnists, newspapers, nature lovers, fishermen, campers, and plain citizens who rightfully feel that America is in danger of losing her precious natural resources. Millions of midwesterners longed to keep these dunes for recreation.

And yet, thousands of Hoosiers knew that the short shoreline of Lake Michigan in Indiana had incredible possibilities for producing industrial jobs. Thousands of Hoosiers, four legislatures, and two Governors were dedicated, too, to the building of a public port in this narrow shoreland—one which would give our State an outlet on the St. Lawrence Seaway.

The beginnings of industrial development have been seen for half a century from South Chicago past Gary. Today heavy industry—steel and oil, chiefly—crowd the shore from Chicago into Porter County, Ind., east of Gary.

It is with a great measure of pride, therefore, that I recall that it was I who first suggested that industry and recreation, port, and park, could live side by side in this section of our State.

In the 86th Congress I began the fight for what I believed was the just and proper solution. I suggested that a natural boundary between heavy industry and recreational dune land existed near the proposed site of the Burns Waterway Harbor.

Neither side agreed. The conservationists asked for a park and no port. The business-labor-industrial community was just as emphatically for a port and no park.

And so the controversy raged.

The distinguished senior Senator from Illinois led the group dedicated to "save the dunes." The other dedicated conservationists who have worked with him were equally insistent on preserving those precious dunes. Many of these were and are my good friends. Those who sought the port and fought the park also included many of my good friends and colleagues.

Emotions were aroused on both sides. But it continued to seem to me that reason dictated the desirability of both park and port, and that they were far from mutually exclusive.

In the course of the intervening years, the port drew closer to a construction schedule, a new steel mill began operating without pollution of air or water, and another was under construction. Then, in 1963, the late President Kennedy proposed that Congress find a way to proceed with both park and port in the best possible manner, as I had long advocated.

Consequently we worked out a bill which provided for the park but which did not foreclose the port possibilities. Today the park bill that achieved Interior Committee and Senate approval at the end of the last Congress, is again being introduced. Next week we shall introduce the bill authorizing construction of the port.

Steelmakers, steel labor, businessmen, conservationists and Senators from different States once more feel warmly able to work together.

The Nation, as well as Indiana, is the real winner.

Jobs for the future, steel for a new and better America will come from Indiana's thin Lake Michigan shoreland.

But man does not live by bread alone. And a dunes national lakeshore will be "a thing of beauty and a joy forever" for the benefit of all our country.

Two dreams are going to be fulfilled. Indiana is going to have a national park on its lakeshore. And it is also going to have a seaport.

I am extremely proud that I had a part in making this possible. I look forward to the day when both these bills have been prodded through the Congress with the help of all our colleagues.

THE HIGHWAY SCENIC EASEMENT BILL OF 1965

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, on behalf of Senators Bible, McClellan, and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill, the Highway Scenic Easement Act of 1964, designed to implement President Johnson's goal of beautifying America's highways.

The bill would amend section 319 of the Highway Code—title 23, United States Code—to authorize $10 million annually in 50-50 Federal matching funds to the States for the purchase of scenic easements and roadside rest areas. The money would be appropriated from general revenue.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the Record at the end of my remarks. I also ask unanimous consent that the bill lie on the table until January 22 for cosponsors.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the table and be printed in the Record, as requested.

The bill (S. 362) to amend title 23 of the United States Code (relating to highways) in order to authorize appropriations to assist the States in the purchase of lands and easements for scenic purposes along Federal-aid highways, introduced by Mr. Nelson (for himself, Mr. Bible, and Mr. McClellan), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the Record.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, President Johnson is to be commended for his commitment in the state of the Union message to the preservation of that scenic heritage that has nurtured the American spirit for 3 centuries.

Conservationists and citizens across the Nation were delighted especially by the new attention given in the message to the fight to protect and develop our roadside scenic heritage.

I ask unanimous consent that an article detailing both the President's interest and the Wisconsin experience in roadside beauty protection from the January 11 issue of U.S. News & World Report. be printed in the Record at the end of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, it seems to me, after a good deal of study, that the most practical way to fulfill the President's commitment is to provide funds and encouragement to States so that they may begin to move vigorously in this area.

In buying a scenic easement the State, in effect, buys the scenic beauty of a piece of property—say a strip of trees beside the road—while leaving title to the land in the hands of its owners, and the land on the tax rolls. The owner sells forever the right to build homes, billboards, junkyards, to develop commercially or change the physical appearance of his property. If he were a farmer the selling of an easement would in no way interfere with his routine.

After introducing an identical bill in the closing days of the 88th Congress last September, I circulated copies of it to State Governors and to leading conservationists.

All the information I requested is not as yet in, but my bill already has the support of some 12 State Governors. I ask unanimous consent that their letters to me be printed in the Record at the close of my remarks. I plan to speak further on this matter when all the facts about scenic highway designation, protection, and tourist value are available.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 3.)

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, this much is clear: Tourism is already very big business indeed. Estimates by the Wisconsin State Department of Resource Development for outdoor recreation expenditures run between $750 million and $1 billion annually.

Florida reports receipts of over $2 billion a year. California reports well over $1 billion.

Scenic highways and places of historical interest, the "capital" for the tourist business, are getting increasing formal attention. We are coming to understand that the beauty along our State roads must be viewed as a precious asset to be husbanded and developed.

A year-long Federal study of the scenic highway situation is now underway by the Recreation Advisory Council. The Council is made up of the Secretaries of Interior, Agriculture, Commerce, Defense, Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Housing and Home Finance Administration Administrator.

Progress is finally accelerating along the Great River Road, a scenic highway first conceived before the Second World War, that runs from the delta of the Mississippi, up the storied river valley and around Lake-of-the-Woods in Canada.

California, in 1963, set aside by statute 4,900 miles of her State roads as scenic highway.

And, under the public relations, promotion and organizational patronage of the American Petroleum Institute, six well-publicized scenic routes have been laid out across the country from the Old West Trail in the Western Mountain

States to New England's Heritage Trail on the east coast.

The very success of these ventures can be their undoing unless we act soon. The increased traffic will bring expanded commercial development. Increased commerce, of course, is a main purpose for these roads. But uncontrolled strip development, glaring neon jungles by night and shabby shake-and-burger joints by day can very quickly turn a lovely stretch of road into one you would just as soon avoid.

The Great River Road, winding along the Mississippi from the gulf to Lake-of-the-Woods in Canada, is a prototype of what can be done. The idea, ratified by Congress in 1951, was for a scenic route made by connecting and marking existing roadways, but with the scenic values preserved through the purchase of scenic easements.

Wisconsin is very proud of its roll in the development of the Great River Road. It began to acquire scenic easements along the route soon after 1950. In the legislation passed while I was Governor, Wisconsin established a $50 million, 10-year conservation and recreation land acquisition program. Of this $2 million were allotted for scenic easements with those along the Great River Road given top priority.

Easements have been purchased along 124 of the 255 miles of the scenic route in Wisconsin at a cost of a little over $152,000.

Wisconsin enjoys a long tradition of progressive State legislation. Our conservation program, financed by a penny-a-pack increase in cigarette taxes is unique in the Nation. Nowhere else along the Great River Road route has easement acquisition moved very far past the planning stages.

In a May hearing before the Senate Public Works Subcommittee I made a plea for the passage of a bill, S. 1672, that would provide $4 million in Federal funds for easements along the Great River Road.

However, the legislation did not receive administration support. Rex M. Whitton, Federal Highway Administrator, pointed out, in his testimony, that there is already in Federal law provision for scenic easement purchase

This can be found in section 319 of the Highway Code. It has been on the books since 1940, but has never actually been used. In the past year New York and Minnesota have had applications for section 319 funds approved by the Bureau of Public Roads but the projects have not yet been carried out.

Section 319 provides that a State may use up to 3 percent of its Federal highway aids for the purchase of scenic easements, waysides, and rest areas.

Harvey O. Grasse, chairman of the Wisconsin State Highway Commission, explained at the hearing why the section has not been used:

> Wisconsin, together with the other States, is so hard pressed for construction funds that it cannot afford to ues the 3 percent for any other purposes. The 3 percent is not additional Federal aid; it is merely a permitted use of regular apportionments for roadbuilding. Every bit of our Federal-aid funds must be carefully husbanded and, even so, our available funds are far short of meeting our current construction needs.

It has been suggested that States be compelled to use the 3 percent of their Federal highway aids for the protection of our roadsides.

It seems to me, however, that it would be wiser to provide additional money from outside the highway fund for this purpose.

As Mr. Grasse indicates, State highway officials are so short of vitally needed construction money that an attempt to compel the use of 3 percent of the Federal aid funds for road beautification purposes would raise a good deal of legitimate opposition and serve only to hamper the excellent program now just beginning.

As I introduce this bill I want to make it clear that I do not think of it as the final answer to the problem.

We all await the results of the Federal study and the administration's proposals in this area.

Most of the Governors who have written say that their States are woefully short on highway funds of all kinds. If we are to move fast enough in this area it may be necessary to consider outright Federal grants for scenic easement acquisition.

Another area of possible legislation is in the field of planning grants to States to aid in the developing detailed scenic highway plans.

Over the past year my office has been in close contact with the responsible Federal experts in this area. We shall continue to be.

In closing let me again express my appreciation and admiration to President Johnson for the fine leadership he is providing in this as in so many other areas.

EXHIBIT 1

S. 362

A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code (relating to highways) in order to authorize appropriations to assist the States in the purchase of lands and easements for scenic purposes along Federal-aid highways

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 319 of title 23 of the United States Code is amended by inserting "(a)" at the beginning of such section, and by inserting at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(b) In addition to the amounts authorized in subsection (a), there is authorized to be appropriated, to provide assistance to the States for purchases described in the second sentence of such subsection, not to exceed $10,000,000 for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1964, and for each fiscal year thereafter. The amount appropriated for any fiscal year for the purposes of this subsection shall be apportioned among the States, one-third in the manner provided in section 104(b)(1), one-third in the manner provided in section 104(b)(2), and one-third in the manner provided in section 104(b)(3). A State's apportionment pursuant to this subsection for any fiscal year shall be available during such year and the succeeding fiscal year for paying not more than 50 per centum of the costs of any such purchases. Amounts authorized in subsection (a) of this section may not be used to pay a State's share of the cost of any purchases for which assistance is provided under this subsection."

EXHIBIT 2

L.B.J.'S PLAN TO BEAUTIFY AMERICA: GETTING UNDERWAY WITH STRONG WHITE HOUSE BACKING: A DRIVE TO ERADICATE UGLINESS AND RESTORE THE NATURAL BEAUTY OF THE AMERICAN COUNTRYSIDE. FIRST STEP: CENSUS OF JUNK HEAPS THAT OUGHT TO GO. BUT MUCH MORE THAN THAT WILL BE INVOLVED EVENTUALLY

President and Mrs. Johnson, during last year's election campaign, would mention casually in speeches that auto graveyards they saw were eyesores.

Each time, it brought ringing applause.

So the President observed: "If it's beautifying they want, it's beautifying they'll get."

Now, there is to be a program to do just that—make America more beautiful. A task force has been at work. Congress will get some ideas.

That raises a question: What exactly can be done to beautify a countryside littered with beer cans and marred by junk heaps?

The answer: A good many things, but most of them cost money.

A census now is being taken of the country's junk piles, automobile graveyards, billboard jungles, blighted commercial areas, rendering plants, and other eyesores along the highways.

Being studied, too, is a little-known section of the Federal Highway Act that could be used, if State authorities requested it, to apply what amounts to zoning restrictions for the protection of roadside beauty spots.

Then, there's to be an effort to induce more States to take advantage of the bonus offered for barring billboards on major highways. So far, only 20 of the 50 States are in this program.

A 3.5-MILLION-MILE VIEW

In the United States there is 1 mile of highway, public road, or street for every square mile of countryside. This adds up to 3.5 million miles of thoroughfare. Driving for pleasure is described as the No. 1 U.S. recreation, far surpassing sports. The view that driver and passengers get from the highway is the view of America as far as most people, including visitors, are concerned.

President Johnson's idea is to use every resource at his command to make that view just as attractive as possible. In this, he has the support and encouragement of the First Lady, who is said to have "ideas just pouring out of her" for beautification of the United States.

Highways will not get all the attention. Many other ideas are in the works as well.

Federal aid is to be made available for the development of "green belts" around cities, and for the revitalization and maintenance of city parks.

Rivers and streams are to be cleaned up and protected from the dumping of ugly and foul-smelling wastes.

A Federal program to conserve what is left of the country's natural shoreline is to be pushed.

New outdoor recreation areas in public parks, forests, seashore areas and along waterways are to be built over the next 10 years. Congress last year approved the spending of $2 billion for this purpose.

MORE-BEAUTIFUL ROADS

High priority is to be given to the problem of making highways more attractive.

For many years, Federal and State highway builders have been landscaping the rights-of-way along new highways. This is especially true of the new interstate roads. Out of the total cost of $41 billion, three-quarters of a billion is to be devoted to landscaping.

Now, new attention is to be given to intrastate roads and lesser highways built with Federal aid. The Government will chip in with advice and encouragement and, in special cases, with money.

Says Federal Highway Administrator Rex M. Whitton:

"Thousands of miles of existing roads * * * cry out for scenic improvement. Why shouldn't they be? In getting from here to there, by highway, we have to keep our eyes open. Let's give them feast instead of famine.

"When an otherwise beautiful stretch of highway is spoiled by unsightly scars, let's do the necessary surgery. Screen out the automobile graveyard with shrubs and trees. Plant vines and bushes on the barren slopes. Round the sharp angles in cuts and fills * * * Open up vistas where you can, and provide parking overlooks. Take easements on attractive roadside scenic spots, to insure their preservation."

One weapon to be used in this drive is a provision in the Federal Highway Act that allows the Federal Government to put up 100 percent of the money requested by a State to acquire additional rights-of-way along a highway. This land can be used to preserve a scenic view or historical monument, to wipe out a junkyard, or keep forever a stand of trees that masks a drab or ugly background.

Another project being pushed calls for building more roads that give the public a chance to see the beautiful sights of America. The National Park Service has proposed 84 additions to its system, and access roads to some of these sites now are being planned.

As Mr. Johnson sees it, the Government will provide financial aid where it is needed, but most incentive and direction are to come from the States.

One Federal highway official describes the U.S. role this way:

The basic approach is to stress preservation of natural beauty in highway location and design. No highway looks right in the wrong place. Merely planting shrubs and flowers by the roadside will not overcome the disruptive effect of a badly designed bridge, or curve, or separation device.

The States should be encouraged to approach these problems from their own regional level, this official believes, so that the entire highway system does not become monotonous, but rather exploits regional and natural adornments. The good highway is an unobtrusive one, blending into the landscape. Gingerbread beauty is not desirable; it never lasts, soon becomes slumlike.

One instance cited by this highway official as a neglected opportunity to create beauty is an overpass with a view of a bridge near Kansas City.

With the proper kind of arch, he said, the bridge could have become the frame for a striking view of the Kansas City skyline. But a conventional, nonarch type of bridge was built. The result: a missed opportunity to break the monotony of a major interstate highway.

To help bring beauty to America's highways, cooperation from State and local authorities is to be sought. One thought advanced is that if laws against dumping trash on highways were strictly enforced, major progress would be made toward the President's goal.

Other areas where law enforcement may bring improvements are being investigated by the Bureau of Public Roads. These include efforts to discover how much of a problem roadside junkyards pose, and how many States have specific laws to deal with this problem. When the dimensions of these eyesores have been collected and analyzed, the Bureau is expected to recommend to Congress some way of eliminating them.

Some highway engineers say the cure does not lie in planting bushes around the eyesores, especially in areas where foliage disappears in wintertime. They also point out that junkyards are growing higher and higher. One, in the South, has autos piled eight cars high.

In such cases, the plan to use Federal funds to help States gain scenic easements on major highways is expected to be helpful. The provision was enacted after a top Federal highway official had this experience: One day he saw a beautiful new road which was flanked by a stand of lovely trees. Several years later, when he drove over the same road, he found that the trees were gone, and that the area was a wasteland.

That's the kind of thing President and Mrs. Johnson are determined to block in the future. It's part of the President's dream to make America beautiful.

Wisconsin's "Beauty" Plan—An Idea That Will Spread?

Several features of the emerging plans to give the United States a facelifting got their first big tryout in Wisconsin.

The Wisconsin approach is of interest to landowners, including golf clubs and other organizations, who own natural beauty spots they would like to preserve if they could stand the costs.

Starting in 1961, Wisconsin adopted a 10-year program to clean up and expand its parks, scenic highways, forests, lakes, and other natural resources.

A noval feature was the purchase of scenic easements and public easements—agreements with landowners that enable public agencies to preserve beauty spots and make them accessible to limited public use.

In return, the landowner gets a payment in cash; or the landowner may get certain tax reductions through lowered assessments, for example.

Senator Gaylord Nelson, Democrat, of Wisconsin, who as Governor of the State pushed the 1961 plan into being, says the idea of easements may be the biggest contribution to preserving America's beauty in many decades.

"Most people have an instinct to preserve beauty," Senator Nelson says. "They want to help, but many also want to hold on to their property and pass it on to their children. The easement idea gives them a chance to do something for their country and maybe solve some of their own problems as well."

The easements device grew out of Rockefeller Foundation studies. The State of New York in 1960 passed a law authorizing scenic easements. Wisconsin was the first State to apply the princple on a large scale, however.

THE WHEREWITHAL

To finance its beauty plan, the Wisconsin Legislature voted a 1-cent-a-pack tax on cigarettes. This is expected to provide $50 million in the program's first 10 years.

The money is to be divided generally along these lines:

For scenic rights along 3,000 miles of State highways, $2 million.

For public easements on farms and other tracts useful for parks, fish and game developments, $6.5 million.

For 25 new lakes, $1.5 million.

For nine new State parks, plus open spaces near cities, State forests and wildlife and fish areas, $24 million.

For park improvements: $14 millions.

By November 1964, the Wisconsin Conservation Commission had bought 87,000 acres of land at an average of about $100 an acre. It had taken easements on 9,000 acres at a cost of about $23 an acre.

The easements cost the taxpayers about one-fourth as much as the purchased land, and the acreage involved remained in a taxpaying status. This is a key point in many localities, which resent State and Federal agencies' gobbling up land resources.

The Wisconsin State Highway Commission, meanwhile, has bought 262 easements along the Great River Road beside the Mississippi River at a cost of $116,000. Easements also are being purchased on other roads.

CLEANING UP TRASH

Wisconsin has adopted some strict laws against people who litter roads, parks, and streams with trash.

Senator Nelson thinks roadside incinerators or mammoth trash bins, perhaps at filling stations, are the only answer. Built-in trash containers in cars also would help, in his opinion.

A sizable Federal program to finance scenic easements is another necessary step, Senator Nelson believes. Last September he urged the Government to put up $10 million a year from general appropriations to be matched by the States for purchase of scenic easements along Federal highways.

IN THE CITIES

Senator Nelson also urged that up to a billion dollars a year be made available for cities and States to use in cleaning up their parks, employing jobless youths.

More than 450 mayors and other officials endorsed that idea. There are other signs that voters around the country feel it's time to push a "clean up and preserve America" campaign, in line with President Johnson's theme.

Three years ago the voters of New York State voted a $100 million bond issue for a program to buy land for parks and open spaces.

In December, Nassau County, on the fringe of New York City, employed a scenic easement for the first time.

One large-estate owner gave the county an easement for a nature-study area. This qualifies as a contribution under the income tax laws, and a tax-assessment reduction is involved.

Minnesota last year became the first State to apply for scenic-easement funds under the interstate-highway program.

It all adds up to a ferment of State and local activity aimed at hanging on to what is left of America's beauty.

"If President Johnson does nothing more than give us a symbol of national leadership and interest in this effort, it will be a help," said one State conservation official.

Exhibit 3

State of Alaska,
Juneau, December 22, 1964.

Hon. Gaylord Nelson,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Nelson: I am both pleased and interested in the proposed legislation to protect the scenic value of our roadsides, as outlined in your letter of November 27, 1964. The superlative scenic and recreation potential of Alaska is a matter of considerable pride and value to us. Any measures for protection of this heritage are of interest and will receive our full support.

The following information is in response to your questions:

1. While Alaska has, in fact, the most scenic routes in existence, at the present time none of the system has been specifically designated as "scenic." In this regard, however, the Alaska Department of Highways has a study underway as a part of the national program established by the Recreation Advisory Council pursuant to Executive Order No. 11017. I might add that only a negligible portion of the Alaska highway system would not qualify high on the list of scenic roads.

2. Alaska has a statute prohibiting roadside outdoor advertising, and in this way has prevented the billboard blight from becoming established. The scenic road study now underway will consider the need for scenic easements and other protective measures.

3. Analysis of the economic value of motor tourism to the State has not developed quantitatively to an exact science at this stage of our growth. A study during the summer

of 1964 covering only the out-of-State tourists indicated an annual economic impact of approximately $20 million, which is expected to appreciably increase when the Canadian portion of the Alaska Highway is paved.

4. In the event that the 50–50 Federal matching grants for scenic easements and roadside developments are allocated on the same basis as the Federal-aid highway funds, Alaska would participate to the maximum possible extent.

I hope the above information will be of benefit to you. If we can be of any further assistance to you in this effort, please do not hesitate to advise.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM A. EGAN,
Governor.

PHOENIX, ARIZ.,
December 10, 1964.

The Honorable GAYLORD NELSON,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: In response to your letter of recent date I would like to quote to you the answer I received to your inquiry from the Arizona State Highway Department:

1. In Arizona there are only 30 miles officially designated as a scenic drive. This section is known as the Pinal Pioneer Parkway; it lies between Florence and Oracle Junction on U.S. Route 80/89. This is a completely billboard-free area of attractive desert growth and is controlled by the Arizona Highway Department through acquisition of several hundred feet of right-of-way on both sides of the road.

There are countless other areas in this State which would lend themselves of this type of treatment if funds were available. At the request of the Department of Commerce we are in the process of studying cost estimates for accomplishing this very objective. As a matter of fact, all the States are expected to supply these data by January 25, 1965.

At the present time, it appears as though Arizona will be reporting on at least 2,000 miles which would qualify as "scenic roadways." The estimates will include the costs of completely new routes as well as differential costs for bringing existing routes to a "scenic" standard. This would be achieved through the use of wider rights-of-way for parkway-type development and the addition of picnic areas, overlooks, campsites, trails, and so forth.

2. This question is answered by the foregoing statement.

3. The estimated value of tourism to Arizona is $375 million annually, according to a recent Valley National Bank statistical release.

4. In order to match a 50–50 Federal-aid program, the State's share of the financing would have to come from existing revenues or a new source of funds. Presently, we are having financial difficulty maintaining our A–B–C systems at a satisfactory level. While we feel very amenable toward a scenic program, a new source of revenue, or a matching ratio similar to the interstate apportionments would be most welcome. At any rate, we would definitely participate in a 50–50 program to the best of our practical ability."

I am looking forward to meeting you and working with you.

My best regards.

Sincerely,

PAUL FANNIN,
Governor.

STATE OF ARKANSAS,
Little Rock, December 18, 1964.

Senator GAYLORD NELSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR NELSON: This acknowledges your communication received sometime ago about the measure which you are sponsoring to create scenic drives as a part of the highway system in the Nation, and appropriate Federal money on a 50–50 matching basis to the States for the purchase of scenic easements and roadside development.

I would be very happy to see such a measure approved, and I will indicate to the members of my congressional delegation my approval and support of such a measure. We have a number of highways in the State of Arkansas that could become very fine scenic drives.

Most sincerely,

ORVAL E. FAUBUS,
Governor.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
Sacramento, December 17, 1964.

The Honorable GAYLORD NELSON,
U.S. Senator, Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR GAYLORD: It is a pleasure to have your letter of November 27, 1964, on the subject of legislation for preservation of scenic values along highways. I am happy indeed to tell you of our activities in California.

Early in my first term as Governor, action was taken on a statewide plan for scenic highways. First, I asked for a preliminary investigation of feasibility. The legislature then authorized preparation of a plan for a scenic road system within the framework of the State highway system. The final plan was presented to the legislature on March 15, 1963. It resulted in passage of senate bill 1467, in 1963, which adopted a master plan for State scenic highways, and authorized appointment of an advisory committee. It also provided for establishment of standards for planning and design of scenic highways, and for preservation of scenic corridors traversed by these highways.

Your specific questions are answered in the order given:

1. There are approximately 5,000 miles in the master plan of State scenic highways.

2. Standards for scenic highway planning and design have been adopted. Standards for preservation of scenery beyond the highway right-of-way, in the scenic corridors, are under study.

3. The estimated value of total tourism in California was $1,007 million for 1963. With over 6 million visitors, the value per visitor is $167. The estimate, which includes travel by highway, air, and other, is from the State economic development agency and was assembled from reliable sources.

4. Under present California law, only cities and counties generally may acquire scenic easements; however, a limited provision for acquisitions, by specific State agencies, of scenic easements along a portion of Interstate 4 in the San Joaquin Valley is in Senate bill 581, passed in 1963.

For your information I am enclosing the following:

1. Preliminary plan for scenic highways in California—March 15, 1962.
2. Plan for scenic highways in California—March 15, 1963.
3. Senate bill 1467 (1963) relating to State scenic highways and adopting a master plan therefor.
4. Map: Master plan for State scenic highways.
5. Senate bill 1468 (1963) relating to county scenic highways.
6. Senate bill 581 (1963) relating to the Westside Freeway and the California Aqueduct.

I can assure you that there is deep appreciation in California for your efforts to preserve the natural scenic areas along the highways of our Nation.

Sincerely,

EDMUND G. BROWN,
Governor.

STATE OF FLORIDA,
Tallahassee, December 16, 1964.

Hon. GAYLORD NELSON,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am pleased to acknowledge your letter of November 27 which has reference to legislation for the protection of the scenic value of our roadsides. I am delighted to see that there is an interest in the scenic beauty of our highways and roadsides on the national level.

Our State road department has recently undertaken a survey to determine the feasibility of creating a network of scenic roads throughout our State. At the present time we have over 500 miles of scenic highways designated as such. These include: the Overseas Highway, from the mainland to Key West; the Tamiami Trail, across the Everglades; the Sunshine Skyway, across Tampa Bay; and the Buccaneer Trail, which runs adjacent to the Atlantic Ocean in northeast Florida.

As to the steps that are being taken to preserve the beauty of these roads, the road department is constantly seeking ways to preserve and enhance the existing beauty of these highways.

As to the economic value of motor tourism in our State, during the year 1963 we enjoyed having 11,782,756 tourists who entered our State via passenger car. It is estimated that each of these tourists spent an average of $177.53, for a grand total in excess of $2 billion by tourists who entered the State by automobile.

I am sure that if Federal matching programs were enacted that our State would certainly give serious consideration to sharing the benefits from this program.

Sincerely,

FARRIS BRYANT,
Governor.

ATLANTA, GA.,
December 17, 1964.

Hon. GAYLORD NELSON,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR NELSON: Reference is made to your letter of November 27, 1964, and the questions contained therein concerning scenic highways in the State of Georgia. Before answering the questions you have posed to me, I would like to take this opportunity to thank you, both for myself and the people of Georgia, for your interest and efforts toward the preservation of one of our greatest natural resources—scenery. We in Georgia are aware of the scenic values within our State from the beautiful mountains of northern Georgia to the marshes along our coast and are most interested in joining our efforts with yours toward the development of a system of roads that will present these scenic vistas to the traveling public.

To date, Georgia has not designated or signed any road within the State as a "scenic highway." At the present time, the State is conducting a scenic roads and parkway study in cooperation with the U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Public Roads, at the request of the Recreation Advisory Council. The local, State, and Federal agencies actively engaged in this study are the State highway department, State department of industry and trade, State parks department, State game and fish commission, State forest commission, State department of geology and mines, Georgia Historical Commission, U.S. Forest Service, U.S. Wildlife Service, and various area planning and development commissions that have been organized within the State. The study involves the designation as proposed scenic routes of certain roads and highways with a minimum length of 5 miles in urban areas and 25 miles in rural areas with 90 percent of the length of each route having scenic value. While the study will not result in the immediate designation of a scenic highway system for the State, it is to be used in determining the need for such a system at the Federal level and the possible future designation of a system or a program of scenic road improvements.

Since Georgia has not marked any roads as "scenic" drives, your second question as to the method used to preserve the scenic beauty of these roads cannot be answered. Research into this problem as a part of the scenic roads study revealed that present State laws could be used to preserve this beauty although the need for additional legislation may be revealed in the final analysis of the study. The acts establishing the power of eminent domain for the purposes of highways and State parks, and the zoning powers, including zoning for open spaces, contained in the enabling legislation under which area planning and development commissions are organized, offer promises for exercising the necessary control.

Estimates by the tourist division of the Georgia Department of Industry and Trade reveal that vacation and recreation parties traveling by private automobile spent $324.2 million in Georgia in 1963. These estimates were based on actual roadside interviews of vacation and recreation travelers.

It is most difficult to estimate at this time the extent to which the State of Georgia would participate n a "scenic" roads program on a 50 percent Federal-50 percent State financing basis since an estimate has not been completed on the total magnitude of the proposed program. Georgia would most certainly participate in such a program to the limits of its financial ability.

As an additional indication of our interest in roadside beauty, the State is in the process of conducting an inventory of unsightly junkyards and wrecker yards that are visible from our primary and interstate highways to determine the magnitude of these "eyesores" to the traveling public.

If I can be of further service to you, please feel free to call on me.

With kindest regards, I am,

Cordially,

CARL E. SANDERS,
Governor.

STATE OF MAINE,
Augusta, December 17, 1964.

Hon. GAYLORD NELSON,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR NELSON: In reply to your letter of November 27, 1964, the subject of scenic easements and roadside development is one which is very pertinent insofar as the State of Maine is concerned. We do have in our State some wonderful scenery and a great part of our economic well-being in the State of Maine depends, of course, upon visitors coming to our beautiful State.

I do understand that there is underway at the present time a study of proposed scenic highways in all of the States, this study being carried on by the U.S. Department of Commerce through the Federal Bureau of Public Roads. The State highway commission has been requested to file a report in the form of recommendations for sections of highways to be included in such a system of scenic highways, this report to be filed with the Bureau of Public Roads. It is my understanding that the Department of Commerce will make a report to the White House where I believe there is a high level committee consisting of several Cabinet members interested in this subject. I expect that you are aware of this study and proposed report to the White House.

In regard to the specific questions contained in your letter, this is to advise that the State of Maine does not have any scenic drives or highways so designated by legislative action. If the Federal Government programs do not develop such designations the State will, of course, give every consideration to legislative action to this effect.

The State highway commission has, on occasions, provided for scenic turnouts and I can assure you that the commission does give consideration to the matter of landscaping and roadside development within the right-of-way limits on the highways which are constructed. Maine was fortunate in that we did receive a national award in 1961 for the most scenic section of interstate highway constructed that year. Since that time our highway commission has constructed other sections of interstate highway which I think compare rather favorably with the section which received the award.

There is much that must be done to preserve the beauty of our roads due to the fact that activity involving clearing and probably landscaping outside the established right-of-way will be necessary.

Our department of economic development estimates that the economic value of motor tourism in our State amounts to $300 million per year. This, of course, is a very substantial part of our economy.

If a program of 50-50 Federal matching grants were available to the States for the purpose of scenic easements and roadside development, I am sure the State of Maine would be interested. Moneys for our highway program are not plentiful but with the development of scenic easements and roadside landscaping being such a vital need I am sure our legislature would be willing to participate in such a program.

Your interest in these matters is very much appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN H. REED,
Governor.

THE STATE OF NEVADA,
Carson City, December 10, 1964.

Hon. GAYLORD NELSON,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR GAYLORD: I received your letter of November 27, 1964, and its contents were of considerable interest to me.

In Nevada we enjoy with a great amount of freedom and ease, many scenic and heritage roadways and areas not yet touched by human development. We all realize that enterprise, development, and progressive expansion must and will take place, but feel that it can and must be done compatibility with the preservation of our scenic wonderlands.

I referred the questions contained in your letter to our State highway department and they furnished me with the following answers:

1. How many miles of scenic drive or highways have been marked out in your State?

Nevada does not officially have any designation for scenic roadways. Unofficially there are scenic routes depicted on maps and designated by appropriate signs indicating such in the Reno, Lake Tahoe, Carson City, and Virginia City area. This scenic route covers some 74 miles. In the Las Vegas area the Charleston Mountains and park serves as the scenic attraction and is so designated. It covers some 25 miles.

2. What steps, if any, have been taken to preserve the beauty of these roads?

(a) Local governmental action has precluded erection of billboards and local zoning dictates what type development may take place. This occurs only on a portion of the routes indicated above.

(b) On portion of routes, wide right-of-way widths and control of access are a deterrent to action that would destroy scenic esthetics.

3. Have you an estimate of the economic value of motor tourism to your State?

A comprehensive tourist study conducted by the Nevada Highway Department in 1958 showed that of total money expended in Nevada by out-of-State residents, 76 percent was derived from the road user (car and bus). The expenditures of tourists totaled $439,654,000 during 1958 and $335,522,000 came from road users. We updated the 1958 tourist report with additional coverage in 1962. Our 1962 tourist expenditures approximated $594 million, and of this, $450 million was expended by those using road and highway facilities. Recent tabulations have indicated that Nevada ranks in the top 10 States of the United States relative to tourist industry.

4. If a program of 50-50 Federal matching grants such as I propose were adopted, to what extent would your State take part?

Nevada is extended to the limit in making our State-derived funds meet the matching requirements of the present Federal apportionments, and to carry on those operations where Federal funds will not participate. However, I feel the State highway department would certainly attempt to obtain funds for the 50-50 matching ratio proposed above. To make a dollar estimate at this time is rather difficult but would say that $100,000 may be in the range we would be able to provide.

It is evident from the above comments that to date the State of Nevada does not have an official scenic road program in being, nor is there any legislation or State control in effect with respect to designated scenic highways.

A recent questionnaire pertaining to scenic highway designations has been made by the Bureau of Public Roads and a meeting of all State agencies with respect to preparation of answers to the questionnaire has been scheduled for the middle of December. As a result of the above scheduled meeting and further discussion with the Bureau of Public Roads, it may well be the start of a scenic route highway development program in this State.

I trust the above provides you with the desired information and I shall watch with interest the progress made in this direction.

Sincerely,

GRANT SAWYER,
Governor.

STATE OF NEW JERSEY,
TRENTON, *December 24, 1964.*

Hon. GAYLORD NELSON,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: New Jersey, as an outstanding resort center, is naturally interested in preserving the scenic value of its roadsides to encourage the many hundreds of thousands of motorists who visit us each year to see as much of the Garden State as possible. In spite of the desire of my administration, it has not been possible to move this program along as extensively as I earnestly wish to have it.

At present, four routes in the State of New Jersey have been marked as scenic highways:

1. The Garden State Parkway—156 miles from the New York border to Cape May.

2. The Rockefeller Memorial Highway—40 miles in the Monmouth County shore area, of which 16 miles have been extensively landscaped.

3. The Palisades Interstate Parkway—11 miles along the Hudson River.

4. The Blue Star Memorial Highway—60 miles across the central and western portion of the State.

The Garden State Parkway, largely under the control of the New Jersey Highway Authority, and the Palisades Interstate Parkway are limited access roads developed and maintained as parkways. It is interesting to note that the parkway is considered one of the most beautiful toll roads in the Nation, although it is not outstandingly scenic in terms of the topography it traverses.

The Rockefeller Memorial Highway has been protected to some degree by purchasing an especially wide right-of-way, although portions of this are still to be acquired. In the meantime, the northern portion has been shortened and has deteriorated through marginal development.

The Blue Star Memorial Highway (Route U.S. 22 and Interstate Route 78) has been protected to some degree by the purchase of additional right-of-way and certain sections have been improved by landscaping with the cooperation of the Garden Clubs of New Jersey.

To date, we have experienced great difficulty in protecting the scenic beauty of our land service roads which, as far as Federal aid is concerned, are all on the primary and urban system eligible for only 50–50 grants. It is extremely doubtful that we could restrict driveway entrances along these roads in frequency to the point where decent landscaping would be possible, regardless of the width of the right-of-way. Our best opportunity to achieve a really worthwhile goal is through the construction of freeways.

The New Jersey State Highway Department, under agreement with the U.S. Secretary of Commerce, is regulating outdoor advertising along the Interstate System. The basic purpose is to preserve the beauty of the areas through which these new highways will pass, and there is no doubt that there will be stretches of considerable beauty in the central and northwestern portions of our State.

Unfortunately, we do not presently have an estimate of the economic value of motor tourism as such in New Jersey. However, it may interest you to know that our traffic volumes are roughly five times the national average, and that our State revenue from gasoline taxes now approximates $130 million a year.

If the funds to be made available under the measure you propose were to be distributed among the various States according to the existing 50–50 formulas, a rough estimate indicates New Jersey would receive only approximately $200,000 and as ours is an extremely urban State, we could not acquire much in the way of additional right-of-way or easements for this amount. However, such money as might be available could be used for the construction of overlook areas and rest areas.

We certainly appreciate your interest in this problem and feel that any effort to promote the attractiveness of highway travel throughout the Nation and to preserve our scenic heritage cannot help but improve the overall economy.

My congratulations to you Senator for your forthright approach to this national need.

Sincerely yours,

RICHARD J. HUGHES,
Governor.

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA,
Raleigh, December 8, 1964.

The Honorable GAYLORD NELSON,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR NELSON: I wish to acknowledge your letter of November 27 which requested our cooperation in the development of legislation to protect the scenic value of our roadsides.

In response to the questions raised in your letter, I wish to advise that in North Carolina the State government has not officially designated any routes as "scenic" or "heritage" motor trails. Our general statutes give the highway commission power to name highways and give the county boards of commissioners authority to designate names for roads, streets, or highways outside the corporate limits within their respective counties.

However, we do have in North Carolina the Blue Ridge Parkway which is being constructed by the Federal Government on rights-of-way acquired by the State. This is North Carolina's prime example of a scenic highway. This parkway is approximately 263 miles in length and all but 17 miles are either open to traffic or nearing completion. Also, the U.S. Forest Service maintains approximately 60 miles of "scenic ways" within the national forest lands here in North Carolina.

North Carolina has several memorial or geographically named highways throughout the State which have been officially recognized by the State highway commission. Several of these routes such as "The Ocean Highway," "The Jefferson Davis Highway," and "The Dixieland Trail" continue through several States as well as North Carolina. Enclosed for your information is a brochure on the Dixieland Trail. Other highways located within the State have also been named. These include "The Smoky Park Highway," "The Tomahawk Trail," and "The Virginia Dare Trail." As of this date few or no positive steps, such as the acquisition of scenic easements, have been taken to preserve the beauty and character of these roads. Unfortunately, North Carolina finds itself in the position of so many of the other States in that there is always a much greater demand for highway construction than available funds.

At this time the staff of our State highway commission is cooperating with the Bureau of Public Roads of the U.S. Department of Commerce on a study aimed at deriving and developing a recommendation for a national program of scenic roads and parkways, involving improved recreational driving opportunities. In this study each State will select and nominate specific routes, highways, or segments of routes or highways or travel corridors, conforming to the specifications set forth by the Bureau of Public Roads. It is anticipated that our recommendations for this program will be submitted to the Bureau of Public Roads sometime during the latter part of January 1965.

I am enclosing for your information a report entitled "An Economic Analysis of North Carolina's $968 Million Travel Serving Industry." This report details the substantial economic value of motor tourism to North Carolina.

If a program of 50–50 Federal matching grants such as set forth in your proposed legislation were available, I feel certain that North Carolina would participate to the fullest extent possible in this program.

We sincerely appreciate your interest in preserving the natural beauty of our highways and surrounding lands.

With best wishes always.

Sincerely,

TERRY SANFORD.

STATE OF OREGON,
Salem, December 29, 1964.

The Honorable GAYLORD NELSON,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR NELSON: In answer to your letter of November 27, which I read with genuine interest, I take pleasure in answering your questions regarding scenic areas. I favor adequate development of our scenic areas not only because of their attraction to tourists but also because we must preserve scenic and historic spots as part of our heritage.

Your questions and my answers follow:

1. How many miles of "scenic" drive or highway have been marked out in your State?

The State highway department is in the process of conducting, and acting as a coordinator in, a statewide study of scenic roads and parkways. This came about through a specific request from the Federal Bureau of Public Roads and will involve investigation and analysis of at least 5,000 miles of roadways and proposed roadways. The study was started in November of this year and is to be completed by about the middle of January 1965.

2. What steps, if any, have been taken to preserve the beauty of these roads?

To date, 1,119.27 miles of Oregon's highways have been designated scenic areas by the Oregon Scenic Area Board in compliance with the Scenic Areas Act of 1961. This act deals with signs and billboards and effects removal of such signs within a 7-year period in the designated areas. These areas, with few exceptions, will be on the proposed scenic routes of the abovementioned study.

3. Have you an estimate of the economic value of motor tourism to your State?

Tourism is of great economic value to our State and ranks third among Oregon industries. Survey figures show that approximately 54 percent of the money spent by travelers came from out-of-State visitors and 46 percent from Oregon residents. The total tourist income for 1964 was estimated at $452 million, with $244 million spent by out-of-State visitors and $208 million by residents. The greatest expenditure was made by out-of-State visitors traveling in cars. This total was approximately $179,200,000.

4. If a program of 50–50 Federal matching grants such as I propose were adopted, to what extent would your State take part?

Oregon would, I am confident, cooperate fully in fact and in spirit with the precepts of a bill such as yours.

For your information, I am enclosing a copy of "Oregon Scenic Area Commission Report" for 1961–63. I hope my answers to your questions are sufficient for your purpose.

Sincerely,

MARK O. HATFIELD,
Governor.

STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA,
Charleston, December 11, 1964.

Senator GAYLORD NELSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR NELSON: Regarding your letter of November 27 having to do with our program of scenic road protection and development, we must confess that we consider nearly all our highways among the most scenic in the Nation.

However, to be more specific, we now have under consideration the Allegheny Parkway, running 360 miles in West Virginia from around Harpers Ferry to southern West Virginia; and the Highland Scenic Highway, running from Gormania to Mill Point, a total of about 160 miles, both anticipated in State and Federal cooperative programs.

When completed, these two highways will come under the same Federal protection that the Blue Ridge Parkway now enjoys.

Our own State highways are now adorned by more than 100 newly developed roadside parks, which handle litter, sanitary facilities, and provide picnic needs for hundreds of families. These and thousands of litter cans provided by the State road commission are policed regularly.

Two antilitter laws became effective in the past few years dealing with fines for littering highways or stream banks, and these are proving effective tools for beautifying our highways.

Motor tourism values will not be known definitely until West Virginia University completes a comprehensive travel study now being wrapped up and finalized for publication. However, our estimate runs around $250 million per year, but last year alone the 2,400 primary service stations, not including the 2,000 nonprimary ones, reported a gross income of $124 million, which indicates the value of travel here.

Concerning how far West Virginia will go to take part in future matching fund programs to keep our highways beautiful, I can only report that the State recognizes tourism and travel as major phases of our growing economy and predicts they will grow faster than other phases as planned developments become operational.

Scenery is a major asset to our travel program and of primary interest in advertising. We will do what we must to protect this natural heritage. To this extent we will cooperate with any agency or community which assists us in keeping our State beautiful.

Sincerely,

William Wallace Barron,
Governor.

GOLDEN CIRCLE AND SOUTHERN UTAH NATIONAL SCENIC PARKWAY COMPLEX

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I send to the desk a bill to authorize a survey of a proposed road complex in what has been called the Golden Circle in the four States of Utah, Arizona, Colorado, and New Mexico. Included in the Golden Circle survey under my bill is the proposed Southern Utah Parkway for which I have crusaded for many years.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill lie on the desk until Tuesday of next week in order to give other Senators the opportunity to join in sponsoring my bill, and that a statement I have prepared be included at this point in the Record as if read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested, and the statement will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 363) to provide for an appropriation of a sum not to exceed $200,000 with which to make a survey of a proposed Golden Circle national scenic parkway complex connecting the national parks, monuments, and recreation areas in the southern part of Utah with the national parks, monuments, and recreation areas situated in northern Arizona, northwestern New Mexico, and southwestern Colorado, introduced by Mr. Bennett, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The statement presented by Mr. Bennett is as follows:

Golden Circle and Southern Utah Scenic Parkway

Mr. Bennett. I send to the desk, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to make a survey to determine the best and most feasible route or routes for the establishment of a so-called Golden Circle National Scenic Parkway complex. Such a parkway would link together the national parks, monuments, and recreation areas of southern Utah, northern Arizona, northwestern New Mexico, and southwestern Colorado.

THE GOLDEN CIRCLE—SCENIC AND RECREATIONAL WONDERLAND

Centered around the Four Corners area of Arizona, New Mexico, Colorado, and Utah are more than 40 outstanding scenic and recreational attractions which form a great golden circle as the area has been aptly described. These attractions include both national and State parks and monuments and other areas of scenic, archeologic, geologic, historic, and recreational value. It is an area unduplicated in the world, and has recently received added value in the designation of Canyonlands National Park and in the formation of Lake Powell and the Glen Canyon National Recreation Area.

SCENIC PARKWAY COMPLEX NEEDED

Most of the points of interest would be only a few hours apart if there were adequate access and connecting roads. Yet, at the present time the people of America are being denied, except at great inconvenience and hardship, the opportunity to see some of the most spectacular and majestic country in the world. Some of these points of interest have no roads at all or are accessible only by jeep trail. Those that do have good roads usually are not linked in any pattern to provide contiguous travel from one to another. The construction of a national scenic parkway in the Golden Circle area would cross and open up this area to countless thousands of people who are now denied this great esthetic experience. In fact, the parkway would be a national park in itself while at the same time connecting important units of the national park system.

SURVEY REQUIRED

In the 87th Congress, I introduced a bill to authorize the construction of a national parkway through southern Utah. The Department of the Interior submitted a negative report on the bill, however, on the grounds that no survey had been made by the Department. Significantly, the Department indicated that it wished to make such a survey as soon as personnel and funds are available. I then introduced a bill to give the Department the necessary funds and personnel. In testifying on this bill in testimony before the Appropriations Committee, Conrad L. Wirth, then Director of the National Park Service, stated that the Park Service could economically use the full amount of $80,000 which the bill provided, but added that he felt such a study should include not only southern Utah but the general Colorado River region in adjoining States where outstanding scenic parkway possibilities exist. I heartily concur in the broader concept, which the bill I am introducing today proposes. My bill authorizes $200,000 for the broader survey.

A survey of the area will show that there are several possible routes which hold great promise for location of a national scenic parkway. They are not only scenic but are feasible from an economic and engineering standpoint. In southern Utah, for example, the Bureau of Public Roads has surveyed four possible routes; and other locations have been suggested by other groups. No doubt routes in other States to complete the road complex are equally available.

NEEDED—PARKWAYS IN THE WEST

As my colleagues know, all of our existing national parkways are east of the Mississippi River, principally in the South. It is my strong conviction that this discriminatory policy should cease so that the Golden Circle area can receive a portion of the $16 million appropriated annually by Congress for construction of national parkways. The parkway which I propose would traverse one of the most magnificent areas in the United States. Since the area is almost entirely owned by the Federal Government, the right-of-way will cost very little.

Moreover, Utah is expected by Secretary Udall to give up hundreds of thousands of acres for new parks and recreation areas. But development lags far behind the Department of Interior's desire for great acreage tracts. In fairness we should and must have roads.

UTAH STUDY

The Utah State Department of Highways has recently completed an exhaustive study of road needs in the Golden Circle area. Mr. C. Taylor Burton, Utah highway director, points out that National Park Service developments on Lake Powell, for example, have brought into sharp focus the need for access roads. The National Park Service anticipates 1 million visitors annually if good access roads are provided. In anticipation of the influx of visitors, the Park Service is spending millions of dollars in the development of some six permanent recreation sites in the Glen Canyon National Recreation Area. Yet, only one area, Wahweap, is accessible today over a hard-surfaced, all-weather road. No passable road exists to Bullfrog Basin, now being developed by the Park Service some 41 miles from Utah State Route 95. Castle Butte development can be reached first by jeep, then by foot by the hardy few. Hall's Crossing is 52 miles from route 95 over a rough dirt road, and Hole-in-the-Rock is 50 miles, over primitive road, from the nearest connecting highway. The Utah State Department of Highways recommends the improvement of Utah State Route 95, the backbone through the area, which is now a dirt road, and the construction and improvement of access roads leading into the recreational sites on Lake Powell. I know the National Park Service and the Bureau of Public Roads, in carrying out the survey proposed in my bill, will wish to consider the valuable information developed by the Utah State Department of Highways and to work with the highway departments and other interested agencies in Arizona, Colorado, and New Mexico, as well.

I am inviting my colleagues from each of these States to join me in sponsoring this legislation because of its great importance to the region.

DESIGNATION OF THE AMERICAN MARIGOLD AS THE NATIONAL FLORAL EMBLEM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, a resolution to designate the American marigold, whose botanic name is *Tagetes erecta*, as the national floral emblem of the United States.

In connection with the last whereas clause in the resolution, I recite that the marigold represents the character of the United States more appropriately as an emblem than does any other flower and that it is an American native and native of nowhere else in the world; grown in abundance in the home gardens of every State in the Union, including the flower gardens, such as they are, of the minority leader, and yet not the floral emblem of any State in the Union; that it is grown easily and quickly from seed; already acknowledged as a symbol of religious faith; a flower, in its very appearance, representing not just beauty, but a rugged humility of character; and, like the American eagle and the American flag, an exclusively American emblem unclaimed by any foreign nation.

In connection with that proposal, as I think of these golden marigolds, a couplet comes to mind:

> Ten thousand saw I at a glance,
> Tossing their heads in spritely dance.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Do I correctly understand that this is the third or fourth effort which the distinguished Senator from Illinois has made to get action on having the marigold made the national flower?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am a persistent person.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct. To what extent has the Senator tried to get the committee to which this bill will be referred to take action?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I ran into some obstacles. I discovered that the carnation, the rose, the corn tassel, and other flowers are competitors. I have had difficulty persuading enough people to the virtues of my cause.

Mr. ELLENDER. I ask that question because, as the Senator knows, every time a bill is introduced in the Congress it costs the taxpayers a minimum of $24. That is for a two-page bill. For a four-page bill, the cost is a minimum of $47; for an eight-page bill, the printing cost is $94. It seems to me that something should be done to get action on these various bills instead of just introducing them at every session this way.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I agree with the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. Why not make an effort to have these bills acted upon and have something done about them. I well remember, in 1944, when I was selected——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Illinois has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator from Illinois may proceed for 3 additional minutes.

Mr. ELLENDER. When I was selected as chairman of the Claims Committee that dealt with bills against the Government, we had a stack of approximately a thousand bills that were introduced at the beginning of every session. What I sought to do then was to have action taken on all those bills by having hearings on them and by having reports of some kind written that more or less satisfied the introducers of these bills. It would therefore seem to me that we could save a great deal of time if efforts were made by those who propose these bills to have action taken by the committee, one way or the other, and not just have them introduced at every session of the Congress.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I must remind my dear fellow friend from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], that this bill will go to the Judiciary Committee.

This committee has been dealing for a long time with highly noncontroversial matters such as civil rights. We have not been able to obtain an opportunity, so far, to discuss the merits of our humble, little, sprightly marigold. Perhaps this year, in the 89th Congress, it will be different. Our distinguished chairman, the amiable, genial and competent chairman, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], I am sure will give me a hearing and I believe that he will do so quickly.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Judiciary Committee has so many subcommittees and so many people working for it that it would seem to me the Senator from Illinois should be able to get an early hearing and have disposition made of his bill and other bills of similar character. The Congress should not be faced each year with having four to five bills on the same subject introduced without any action being taken on them.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I hope my recollection is correct, but I am sure that in terms of volume and number of bills, the Senate Judiciary Committee handles as many bills as all the other standing committees of the Senate put together.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator from Illinois is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct. And when the Claims Committee was in effect, before the reorganization of 1946, that little, measly committee handled about 55 percent of the bills which came to the floor of the Senate.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But the committee now handles all of those subjects.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand what the committee does. I merely wish to point out that the transfer was made from that small committee to the Committee on the Judiciary. As I stated, my recollection is that the Claims Committee voted out as much as 55 percent of all the bills acted upon by the Senate.

I myself, as chairman, sat down and disposed of many of the bills. I parceled out the others to the committee members and encouraged them to do likewise. We did not require any huge staff to do our jobs for us, get underfoot, and bloat the public payroll.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Committee on the Judiciary is a busy committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. Prior to 1946, these matters were all handled at a very small cost to the Government. Now I am informed that the printing cost of all these private bills amounted to approximately $100,000 last year alone. Why, last year the Judiciary Committee received an authorization of $1,961,451 to handle matters just such as this.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes. Think of all the private immigration, deportation, naturalization, court matters, and other subjects considered by that committee.

But, Mr. President, I must hurry along.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 19) designating the American marigold (*Tagetes erecta*) as the national floral emblem of the United States, introduced by Mr. DIRKSEN, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMBERSHIP RATIO OF STANDING COMMITTEES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration. I do so with the stipulation that it will not prejudice the right of any Senator so far as the pending business is concerned.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

(S. RES. 18)

Resolved, That rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate be amended as follows:

In paragraph (a) (dealing with the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences) of subsection 1 of rule XXV, strike out the word "fifteen" and insert in lieu thereof "sixteen."

In paragraph (b) (dealing with the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry) of subsection 1 of rule XXV, strike out the word "seventeen" and insert in lieu thereof "fifteen."

In paragraph (e) (dealing with the Committee on Banking and Currency) of subsection 1 of rule XXV, strike out the word "fifteen" and insert in lieu thereof "fourteen."

In paragraph (f) (dealing with the Committee of Commerce) of subsection 1 of rule XXV, strike out the word "seventeen" and insert in lieu thereof "eighteen."

In paragraph (i) (dealing with the Committee on Foreign Relations) of subsection 1 of rule XXV, strike out the word "seventeen" and insert in lieu thereof "nineteen."

In paragraph (j) (dealing with the Committee on Government Operations) of subsection 1 of rule XXV, strike out the word "fifteen" and insert in lieu thereof "fourteen."

In paragraph (k) (dealing with the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs) of subsection 1 of rule XXV, strike out the word "seventeen" and insert in lieu thereof "sixteen."

In paragraph (l) (dealing with the Committee on the Judiciary) of subsection 1 of rule XXV, strike out the word "fifteen" and insert in lieu thereof "sixteen."

In paragraph (m) (dealing with the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare) of subsection 1 of rule XX, strike out the word "fifteen" and insert in lieu thereof "sixteen."

In paragraph (n) (dealing with the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service) of subsection 1 of rule XXV, strike out the word "nine" and insert in lieu thereof "twelve."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 18) was agreed to.

AWARD OF SERVICE PINS OR EMBLEMS TO EMPLOYEES IN LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, in the executive branch of the Federal Government it has long been the custom, and they have the authority, to award service pins or emblems to employees in the executive branch.

We have never done so in the legislative branch, and I believe it is high time that we recognize the service of not only Senators but the officers and employees of the Senate as well.

Therefore, on behalf of myself and the distinguished majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD], I submit a resolution to that effect, and ask that it be appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 21) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

S. RES. 21

Resolved, That the Committee on Rules and Administration is hereby authorized to provide for the awarding of service pins or emblems to Members, officers, and employees of the Senate, and to promulgate regulations governing the awarding of such pins or emblems. Such pins or emblems shall be of a type appropriate to be attached to the lapel of the wearer, shall be of such appropriate material and design, and shall contain such characters, symbols, or other matter, as the committee shall select.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Senate, under direction of the committee and in accordance with regulations promulgated by the committee, shall procure such pins or emblems and award them to Members, officers, and employees of the Senate who are entitled thereto.

Sec. 3. The expenses incurred in procuring such pins or emblems shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate on vouchers signed by the chairman of the committee.

IMPROVEMENT OF ALASKA HIGHWAY — ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the distinguished Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] be added as a cosponsor of S. 282, which was introduced by me and my colleague from Montana [Mr. METCALF], to improve the Alaska highway.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Montana whether I am also a cosponsor of the bill introduced by him and his colleague from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I believe the Senator made that request yesterday. I assumed all along that he was a cosponsor of it.

Mr. GRUENING. If I am not, I should like to be included as a cosponsor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I make the same request. In order to make certain that the distinguished Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] is a cosponsor, I ask that his name be included also.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT ON PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE] be added as a cosponsor to Senate Joint Resolution 1.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I point out that the inclusion of the name of the distinguished Senator from Minnesota brings to 70 the number of cosponsors in this body who have recognized the great need that exists for dealing with the problem of vacancies which have existed on 16 occasions in the office of Vice President, and the equally vexing and severe problem of Presidential disability.

I call this to the attention of my colleagues. I thank the Chair for recognizing me.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there any further morning business?

SENATOR DOMINICK SUPPORTS TAX CREDIT LEGISLATION

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, my good friend and colleague the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] had intended today to deliver a speech on behalf of proposed legislation which both he and I consider of the utmost importance. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] and I are sponsors of the bill (S. 12) introduced by our colleague the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], to provide tax credits to those persons burdened with the increasingly onerous financial responsibilities of higher education.

Unfortunately, the Senator from Colorado must be absent from the Senate Chamber today, and it is with pleasure that I ask unanimous censent to have printed the text of his speech in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR DOMINICK

I have joined Senator RIBICOFF and a number of our colleagues with great pleasure in sponsoring bill S. 12, designed to provide tax credits to those persons burdened with the financial responsibilities of higher education. I have worked for this type of legislation for over 10 years as a private citizen, as a member of the State legislature in Colorado, as a Member of the House of Representatives, and during the 88th Congress as a Member of this body. It is my strong belief that here is an area in which the Federal Government can act to provide an incentive to private citizens of a positive nature, rather than an encumbrance of red tape or regulations.

Last year 19 Senators, including myself, introduced similar legislation to provide tax relief for the costs of higher education. Over 100 Members of the House of Representatives also sponsored legislation of this nature. This provides ample evidence of the broad base of congressional support such proposals enjoy. A proposal identical to that introduced by Senator RIBICOFF today gained greater support in the last Congress than any previously introduced bill of this nature and was ultimately defeated by a 48 to 45 vote, only after extreme pressure was brought to bear against it by the executive branch. I am hopeful that many of the objections raised at that time by the administration will not be raised this year, and we may gather sufficient bipartisan support to insure its passage.

The heart of this bill is that it provides an opportunity for citizens to use their pretax earnings for higher education and receive a credit for a predetermined percentage of those costs up to $1,500. The maximum allowable credit to be applied against an individual's final income tax is $325 for each individual student being financed. This credit is computed in such a manner as to provide maximum benefits toward the first few hundred dollars of educational expenses, including tuition fees, books, and supplies. Of the first $200 in expenses, the allowable credit is 75 percent or $150. Of the next $300 the allowable credit is 25 percent, and of the next $1,000 the allowable credit is 10 percent. Thus, expenses of $300 would result in a credit of $175, while expenses of $1,500 would result in a credit of $325.

In view of the seriousness and importance of this bill, I would like to make several points about it perfectly clear.

First. It does not, and indeed no tax proposal can, provide relief to those low income families who pay no income tax. These families and their children can continue to take advantage of scholarship, loan, and grant programs specifically designed for them. Most colleges and universities also give these students from low income families first priority on student employment programs.

Second. It does benefit the low income families who do pay tax, and the middle income families. It has already been pointed out that families with incomes between $3,000 and $10,000 comprise 62 percent of our population, and thus the greatest benefit will be within this income group. Let us remember, too, that the tax credit inures to any taxpayer who pays for the expenses of higher education. Thus, the single person who must pay tax while working himself through college will benefit as well as employed married couples where one spouse works while the other attends school.

Third. It is not a rich man's bill, and anyone who so contends simply does not understand the sliding scale provisions of the bill. Over 90 percent of the tax benefit will go to families with incomes of less than $20,000 per year, and persons with incomes of $60,000 or above will receive no benefit whatsoever from this bill.

Fourth. The tax credit approach avoids many serious problems involved with Federal aid to education. The religious controversy and its constitutional difficulties is completely avoided. The formula employed for computing benefits concentrates on the first $500 of costs and thereby equalizes the relative benefits between those who pay tuitions at public and private colleges.

Fifth. No additional Federal bureaucracy is required since we utilize the existing machinery of IRS. No Federal control is encountered.

We have every indication that the costs of obtaining a higher education will continue to increase just as they have over the years. In all probability, the passage of this bill will not curb these costs. Its passage will, however, give much needed tax relief to those families and individuals whose financial burden is particularly great. It will also have the effect of feeding back much needed revenues into the private sector of our economy.

Some have speculated that the passage of this bill will directly cause public and private educational institutions to raise their tuition and fee schedules. This is pure speculation. I think history has shown us that these costs have been rising steadily anyway. It seems to me that it is equally logical to assume that the people who will realize tax savings from this bill might be inclined to plow these savings back into public and private educational institutions. These savings would also give the States a greater source of tax revenue to tap in order to sustain their own educational systems. Finally, it would allow the recipients of these tax benefits to contribute toward the education of more of their children beyond high school and may well form the incentive for some to pay part of the expenses for children of neighbors or friends.

This bill will give tax benefits to those low- and middle-income families who desperately need it. It will not solve all of our educational problems, but it will be a significant step toward helping those who do need the assistance in bearing the costs of higher education. It will fill in part of the gap which we now have in our efforts to assist all Americans to have the opportunity for receiving higher education. We have given grants and loans to the universities and graduate schools for buildings and equipment, we have made progress toward helping teachers, we have advocated special programs to stimulate interest in secondary education. We must now recognize the problem of those who struggle to give their children the chance to improve and better their lot through higher education.

Mr. SIMPSON. As is the case with all the Senator's speeches, his remarks on S. 12 are articulate and cogent. They spell out graphically the reasons why the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] has supported this type of legislation for the past decade.

AMERICAN SUPPORT OF DICTATORS STICKS IN THE THROAT

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, it is inconceivable to think that such bad days have fallen upon the foreign relations of the United States that we would have to endure the threats, insults, and curses of dictators.

It is more shocking that we would even consider the continuance of our foreign-aid programs in nations that not only do not profess to be our friends, but which by word and deed make no secret about being our enemies.

Regardless of how eloquently anyone may attempt to justify it, I cannot swallow the idea of sending American dollars and American food into dictatorships which take our assistance with one hand and slap us with the others. It sticks in my throat.

I submit, Mr. President, that it is a shame and a disgrace to the American people. This is the strongest, the most free, the richest, the greatest Nation on the face of the earth. The United States has never assumed the role of a lackey, and it ill befits our position of world leadership to go hat in hand to anyone.

The recent outrages perpetrated against the United States and our friends and allies by Nasser's Egypt demand the immediate end to our aid program in that country.

Nasser ever increases his alinement with the Soviet Union and Red China, and repeatedly acts against the best interests of the free world. He boasted of joining the Chinese Communists in sending arms to support the bloody and bestial war against the legally constituted government in the Congo. He has taken our aid and turned it into Russian arms to further Egyptian aggression against Yemen and Israel. He stood by while the John F. Kennedy Library was burned and destroyed in Cairo last November. His air force in December shot down without provocation a private plane owned by a Texas oil company. And then, to add insult to injury, Nasser told the United States to take our aid and go drink from the sea, or in effect, to go jump in the lake.

In the past 12 years, Nasser's Egypt has received approximately $1 billion in aid from the United States, and food is still being shipped to Nasser at the rate of about $150 million a year.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague [Mr. TALMADGE] may be allowed 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, there should be no more. The President has authority under amendments to the 1963 and 1964 Foreign Assistance Act to immediately terminate all U.S. assistance to Egypt. This authority should be exercised without further ado.

Earlier last year, Sukarno, of Indonesia, told the United States to take our foreign aid and go to hell. Despite this insult, despite Sukarno's continued aggression against our ally Malaysia, and notwithstanding his support of the warmongering policies of Red China in Asia, Indonesia and its leftwing government is being aided and abetted by U.S. dollars. Nearly $900 million has been pumped into Indonesia, and according to the Agency for International Development, we spent more than $10 million upon Sukarno in fiscal year 1964, and scheduled the same amount for fiscal 1965.

Algeria, under the totalitarian hand of Ben Bella, has followed the lead of Nasser and walked hand in hand with the Communists. He too is guilty of supporting the inhuman massacres in the Congo. Since Ben Bella took over just over 2 years ago, he has received more than $144 million in U.S. foreign aid.

Mr. President, these nations, individually and collectively, are openly hostile to the United States. They scorn and thwart our foreign policy at every turn. They line up with the Soviet Union and Red China and promote the advance of communism. They wantonly destroy our property and tell us to go to blazes.

I say it is time that we stopped helping our enemies.

WORLD PEACE THROUGH LAW

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, last December I wrote for the American Bar Association Journal an article entitled "Lawbooks U.S.A.: Messenger of World Peace Through Law." I ask unanimous consent that the text of the article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LAWBOOKS U.S.A.: MESSENGER OF WORLD PEACE THROUGH LAW

(By Hon. THOMAS H. KUCHEL, U.S. Senator from California)

"Every one of us has in truth an underlying philosophy of life, even those of us to whom the names and the notions of philosophy are unknown or anathema. There is in each of us a stream of tendency, whether you choose to call it philosophy or not, which gives coherence and direction to thought and action."[1] These words of Benjamin Nathan Cardozo are logically followed by his own philosophy of law: "The final cause of law is the welfare of society."

It is the welfare of society that Lawbooks U.S.A. seeks to serve. This unique and significant program, for which I am pleased and honored to serve as a trustee, should be of vital interest to members of the American Bar Association, as it is to me both as a Senator and as a lawyer. In both capacities one is conscious of the limits of the legislative process in the global struggle to persuade men's minds and of the positive role that a project like Lawbooks U.S.A. might play in bridging these limits.

LEGISLATIVE POWER OVER PEOPLE OF OTHER COUNTRIES

To state that there are limits, practical as well as constitutional, to the power of a legislative body in the enactment of sound law is axiomatic to lawyers. This statement is readily believable when viewed in the context of domestic laws whereby a legislature seeks to place on the statute books the ideas men think, the causes they espouse and the views they embrace. This basic statement applies, however, with special force to efforts by legislative bodies to enact laws relating to inhabitants of other countries.

"Justiciable is a lawyer's word * * * used to describe disputes of a kind that can be resolved justly and peacefully through adjudication by impartial tribunals on the basis of commonly accepted legal principles. * * *

"Questions of justiciability are fundamental in any legal system. In international law, they are not only fundamental but conspicuous and insistent."[2]

I have, of course, a strong belief in the power and authority of Congress to enact laws enhancing our position as the leader of the free world. After listening to hundreds of witnesses reading thousands of pages of testimony on the role American foreign policy must take, I am convinced beyond doubt that Congress, the legislative voice of our Federal Republic, in cooperation with the executive branch, carries a significant share of the burden in devising and implementing a positive program to meet the difficult problems confronting our ideologically divided world today.

In acting on the Foreign Assistance Appropriation Act, both in committee and in the Senate, I enthusiastically supported this necessary effort to aid our allies—knowing fully that any foreign assistance program, by its very nature, has built-in limitations. We can appropriate funds to build educational facilities, but we should not attempt to imprison men's minds by dictating the course of study. We can appropriate dollars to feed the undernourished and cloth the naked, but we cannot insure the freedom and dignity of the individual. We can appropriate funds to mend men's bodies, but we cannot hope to bend men's minds merely by appropriating money. America has learned, sometimes through bitter experience, that dollars alone cannot persuade the minds of other men.

The most important and by far the most difficult aspect of our international relations is a great intangible—the delicate, human art of persuasion. It is only by word of mouth, by cultivated personal contact abroad and by an intelligent articulation of our way of life in person and through printed material that we shall be able to persuade others that our viewpoint is right and that our actions, as well as our goals, are in harmony with theirs.

"Freedom has given the United States the elasticity to endure strain. Freedom keeps open the path of novel and creative solutions and enables change to come by choice. * * * Now as always in our history, books are among our greatest instruments of freedom. They are almost the only means for making generally available ideas or manners of expression that can initially command only a small audience."[3]

Recognizing the shortcomings of a purely monetary assistance program, Congress has taken certain steps to bridge the people-to-people gap. The U.S. Information Agency, for example, was established to speak to the world for America. USIA endeavors to associate the American people in their daily lives, their progress and their yearnings with the legitimate aspirations of all peoples everywhere. The Peace Corps program brings volunteer Americans into the underdeveloped areas of the world to offer aid and assistance with problems confronting humanity in its struggle for survival. In both these instances, Congress has recognized the difficult task of speaking in many languages to many peoples of vastly differing cultures and styles. Thus, Congress can and does appropriate money in an effort to carry the message of America—its people, its culture, its philosophy and especially its spirit of liberty—to the peoples of the world.

---

[1] Cardozo, "The Nature of the Judicial Process," 2 (1921).

[2] Berman, "Talks on American Law," 208 (1961).

[3] Newman, "The Freedom Reader," 1119 (1963).

Learned Hand, after admitting that he could not define liberty, said: "The spirit of liberty is the spirit which is not too sure that it is right; the spirit of liberty is the spirit which seeks to understand the minds of other men and women; the spirit of liberty is the spirit which weighs their interests alongside its own without bias * * *."[4]

Recognizing what Congress wants to do and what it cannot always do, various segments of the organized bar have united to form Lawbooks U.S.A., a unique and significant program, a joint project of the American Bar Association's World Peace Through Law Committee, the Federal Bar Association and the U.S. Information Agency. It is based on the desire and need to communicate with lawyers of the world on a lawyer-to-lawyer basis by sending paperback books concerning the basic nature of our legal system to selected lawyers, jurists, teachers, and law students in the newborn nations.

KNOWLEDGE AND INTEREST IN AMERICAN LAW

It is a needed program. In my travels throughout the world, I have come to the realization that there is a considerable amount of preconditioning that people of other countries have developed to the American image and to the American way of life, especially to our system of administering justice. Their impression is based more frequently on motion picture and television westerns and gangster shows than on the serious writings of our great jurists.

As a member of the legal profession, I was dismayed to discover that many lawyers in foreign nations do not have a basic conception of the elementary principles of American justice. If only the lawyers and statesmen in foreign nations understood the American heritage of trial by jury and presumption of innocence, the civil rights issues confronting our Nation would be placed in a proper perspective, instead of assuming a distorted image of frontier justice consisting of lynchings and bombings. If they understood the concept of governmental checks and balances and constitutional order, the smooth transition following a dreadful Presidential assassination would have been more readily anticipated and comprehended. If they knew the rudiments of administrative law principles, they would realize that a ruling of an administrative tribunal may be appealed in most cases to a court of law.

The widespread ignorance abroad of the mechanics of the American legal system should be and is of great concern to the organized bar at a time when the Communists are exporting books in dozens of different languages to some 68 non-Communist nations. This resolute Soviet effort graphically demonstrates the great need today of offering American literature to the ideologically enslaved peoples who are subject to one concept of government and therefore are not even aware of the virtues of the democratic way of living. They need to be told that "what powers men delegate to their governments depend upon what they think of themselves and of their needs. * * * If the citizenry thinks well of its own intelligence and wisdom * * * it will struggle for access to facts and to ideas."[5]

On the other hand, I have witnessed a great interest in American jurisprudence by many lawmakers in the emerging nations. Many of these nations are former British colonies, and the local leaders, educated in English schools, are familiar with a common law system. In these new nations, also, lawyers and law students constitute probably the greatest single source of political and intellectual leadership. A great proportion of the educated population has studied law, and these lawyers serve as the statesmen, politicians, civil servants, and administrators of the developing countries.

"The legal profession in all countries knows that there are only two real choices of government open to a people. It may be governed by law or it may be governed by the will of one or of a group of men. Law, as the expression of the ultimate will and wisdom of a people, has so far proven the safest guardian of liberty yet devised."[6]

These emerging nations are in a good position to "understand the legal system of the United States" because it is easy for them to "recall the situation in which the Colonies found themselves after the successful conclusion of the Revolutionary War." They would do well to read and remember Carroll Moreland's advice that "* * * the legal system of this country is the most important instrument in the maintenance of the American way of life. We have seen personal liberties and freedom diminish and disappear elsewhere in the world in proportion to the decline in the independence of the courts."[7]

LAWBOOKS U.S.A.—ACCEPTANCE OF A CHALLENGE

In answer to the need and the desire of the leaders of the emerging nations, eight paperback books were selected by lawyers, law students, and law teachers in this country from titles offered by a number of publishers. The books selected were "The Spirit of Liberty," by Learned Hand; "The Nature of the Judicial Process," by Benjamin Cardozo; "Talks on American Law," by Harold Berman; "The Brandeis Reader," by Erwin Pollack; "Equal Justice Under Law," by Carroll Moreland; "The Freedom Reader," by Edwin Newman; "An American Constitutional Law Reader," by Robert McKay; and "The American Jurisprudence Reader," by Thomas Cowan. These books will be combined into packets to be sent abroad under the Lawbooks U.S.A. program.

Technical treatises were omitted from the selection to conform to the intent to select books dealing with the philosophy and spirit of our legal system. Occasionally, too, substitute titles may have to be sent in a packet if the supply of any book is temporarily exhausted. As the program progresses, translations into more and more languages will be undertaken, since the publishers of these books have agreed to relinquish copyright and translation rights.

The words of Justice Brandeis, "a moral teacher, who follows Socrates in the belief that virtue is the pursuit of enlightened purpose," who also believed that problems "are never solved" and that civilization "is a sequence of new tasks,"[8] will be carried into many lands in the packets sent by American lawyers.

For each $8 contributed to Lawbooks U.S.A. by American lawyers, a packet of basic paperbacks is sent to lawyers in foreign countries. Final selection of the recipients of these books is made by the USIA, but lists of prospective recipients may be furnished by the American and Federal Bar Associations and attorneys serving with the Peace Corps. The individual American donor may leave the choice entirely with the USIA, or he may indicate a particular country within which he wishes his packet distributed. The donor's name is enclosed with the packet, and the recipient is encouraged to correspond directly with the American donor.

The Lawbooks U.S.A. program is being spearheaded by a team of younger lawyers selected on a national basis. The future leaders recognize the potential impact of a lawyer-to-lawyer program in fostering world peace and understanding; they are to be commended for their efforts and foresight. Scott Hodes, of Chicago, now serving on the Pentagon staff of the Army Judge Advocate General and currently chairman of the Federal Bar Younger Lawyers, has been selected as the first national chairman of Lawbooks. Named as national vice chairmen are Robert S. Mucklestone, of Seattle, chairman of the American Bar Association Junior Bar Conference, and Richard N. Flint, of Minneapolis. Edwin G. Krasnow, of Washington, D.C., formerly president of the Capitol Hill Bar, has been chosen treasurer.

As I stated in a speech in the Senate, "It is apparent that the legal profession of our country understands that lawyers in these new nations must know and have the very feel of the American concept of law if peace through law is to be achieved." It is hoped that these popular selections by noted American legal scholars will form the basis for a greater understanding of our legal system in today's divided world. The thrust of the Lawbooks program was eloquently stated by Edward R. Murrow, former head of the USIA, who said: "This is a small price to pay for helping to keep the human spirit unshackled and the desire for freedom alive."

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR MURPHY

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, Senator GEORGE MURPHY, of California, is a man of considerable dignity, intellect, and erudition. He brings to the Senate a rich background of experience that well commends him for his new position here.

I was delighted to see in the Washington Post of January 7 a fine, perceptive article about our new colleague written by Mr. John Chamberlain. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I have known and respected our new colleague, GEORGE MURPHY, for many years, and was particularly impressed with the recent tribute to him by columnist John Chamberlain. I am delighted to join in the request that the column be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

EDUCATION OF A SENATOR

(By John Chamberlain)

In practically every reference to GEORGE MURPHY, the new Senator from California, he is ticketed as the "song and dance man." There is always a tinge of patronizing in such a description. Yet show business is part of politics, as Ronald Reagan, a theatrical friend of GEORGE MURPHY's demonstrated when he made the most potent conservative speech of the entire 1964 campaign.

People forget that Tom Dewey was a singer, that the elder Bob La Follette yearned to be a Shakespearean actor, and that the success of the late President Kennedy's campaigns was at least partially due to the advice of his father, old Joe Kennedy who had learned a trick or two about the arts of showmanship in his career as a Hollywood impresario.

But if GEORGE MURPHY need not apologize for being a showman, he has a right to resent any implication that he is just an ex-hoofer and no more. Actually, he has had more types of experience than most aspirants to important political careers.

His father was Mike Murphy, a famous college and Olympic track coach. GEORGE himself had 3 years of Yale, leaving for economic reasons, and his first job was in Wall

---

[4] Hand, "The Spirit of Liberty," 190 (1960).

[5] Cowan, "The American Jurisprudence Reader," 59 (1956).

[6] McKay, "An American Constitutional Reader," 46 (1958).

[7] Moreland, "Equal Justice Under Law," 11 (1957).

[8] Pollack, "The Brandeis Reader," 77 (1956).

Street as a runner in the days of the great madness of the late twenties. He got into show business because he married a dancer who quickly perceived his natural aptitude as a dancing partner who could carry an act sufficiently well to keep the family afloat during the perilous years of the great depression.

What really makes GEORGE MURPHY an exciting prospect in politics is his experience as a labor leader. He found himself president of the Screen Actors Guild at a time when the Communists, in collaboration with some fellow-traveling liberals, were making a big pitch to infiltrate the key positions of power in Hollywood.

There have been many complaints about the blacklisting of Communist screenwriters, but what is forgotten is the period in which the Communists and their sympathizers tried with all sorts of dirty maneuvers to force patriotic authors such as the humorous playwright Morrie Ryskind into a limbo of fashionable contempt.

GEORGE MURPHY was too tough, too wise, and too patriotic on his own part to let the leftists succeed in their attempted takeover of the Screen Actors Guild. He remembers ruefully his period as a labor leader. "Those Hollywood liberals," he has said, "if you didn't fit their viewpoint, they tried to destroy you."

There's nothing like an experience with hidden Communists and their not-so-hidden dupes in a labor organization to prepare a man for understanding of the worldwide political scene. One can read all the books about Marxism, the Bolshevik Revolution, and the cold war and still be unprepared to detect the tunnelings of the enemies of the capitalists and democratic West.

But if you have ever been in a union with Communists, you really know. This columnist was cured of his innocence about the tricks of the Communists and their liberal stooges in the late 1930's and the early 1940's when he was a member of the Newspaper Guild at Time, Inc.

After a long struggle the anti-Communists won their particular fight to take over the leadership of the Time Guild chapter. Those of us who witnessed the fight from close up—and the group included the late Whittaker Chambers, who always knew when the Communists were likely to pull a parliamentary trick—would never be fooled for long in later contacts with the fellow-traveling left.

GEORGE MURPHY has had lots of experience in California Republican politics ever since he left the Democratic Party to support Wendell Willkie. In 1953 he was State chairman for his party, a difficult job which he performed with some brilliance at a time when the various factions of Senator Knowland, Governor Knight, and Vice President Nixon were trying to cut each other's throats.

But the thing that has really prepared GEORGE MURPHY for the Senate is his labor leader experience with the sort of leftist that always strikes from ambush.

Senator GEORGE MURPHY will not be fooled as he watches the Communists maneuver on the world stage.

CLARIFICATION OF THE RECORD

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I would like to make a short statement about events which occurred yesterday, the main substance of which is to be found on pages 403–404 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Thursday, January 7.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] had moved to amend the Dirksen motion to commit the Anderson resolution to the Committee on Rules and Administration. His amendment proposed first that the committee report back to the Senate on January 25 and second that "all rights in existence at the opening of Congress shall be deemed preserved."

The able and distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] raised a parliamentary question about several matters in connection with the Anderson amendment and especially with respect to the last clause. At 2 o'clock, all these issues under the rules were placed on the calendar.

Shortly thereafter, upon inquiry by a member of my staff to the Parliamentarian, I heard that the Chair had ruled on the objection of the Senator from Georgia. I was surprised at this because I had not heard the ruling and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], all of whom were here and listening carefully to the procedures, informed me that they had heard no ruling—that the clause was "not in order."

I then raised this issue on the floor and my distinguished junior colleage, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] requested on a point of order that the RECORD be brought from the reporters to see exactly what the ruling was. Shortly thereafter, he asked that the Chair "declare a recess until the notes had been transcribed and the transcript can be produced."

I was able to determine that, along with the Senator from New Mexico, the Senator from Pennsylvania, the Senator from Michigan, and myself, the Official Reporter, Mr. Romagna, had not heard the ruling made.

I was also able to establish in fact, however, that the Journal clerk had heard such a ruling, the Parliamentarian had heard such a ruling, and the distinguished, esteemed, and beloved senior Senator from Arizona, the President pro tempore of the Senate, states that he made such a ruling. The ruling also appears in the Journal for today. It is my understanding that the Journal has precedent over either the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD or the transcript of that RECORD as taken down by the Official Reporter.

As clearly as I can state them, these are the facts. I think it is true that those of us on the floor most vitally concerned, as well as the Official Reporter of the debates who was taking down the debate at the time, did not hear the ruling. As a result of not hearing the ruling, it was not possible for us to take any action at that time to preserve any rights which we might have had then, but which we might well lose subsequently.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the Senator from Illinois may be extended.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I hope, therefore, when we reach the Anderson amendment to the Dirksen motion to commit it that in view of these circumstances, Members of the Senate will not feel that this ruling is binding or that it will be used against us. I hope very much, if it is necessary—and it may well not be necessary to raise this issue again, that in view of circumstances it will be considered de novo.

The point I wished to make yesterday, and the point I wish to make again today is that those of us who were most interested in this matter did not in fact hear the ruling of the Chair and, hence, were unable to take action which we might otherwise have taken, and that is substantiated also by the fact that the Official Reporter's notes showed that he also did not hear the ruling.

I do not doubt the accuracy of the statement of our esteemed and beloved President pro tempore, the Parliamentarian, or the Journal clerk. I merely wish to say that those of us on this side of the dias did not hear it. I hope we can now move on to consider the motion to take up this matter, and that, if at some later time it is necessary to raise this issue, the Senate and our colleagues, in view of these circumstances, will consider that our point of view should not be prejudiced because of a ruling which we did not hear and about which we are unable to assert the rights we might have had at the time.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, of course this matter is not before the Senate directly at this time, but it is involved because if the motion made by the Senator from New Mexico to proceed to the consideration of the resolution is agreed to, it will present the Senate with the motion of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], which is on the calendar with that resolution at the present time; and likewise with the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico.

We cannot settle that issue now, but, in my judgment, the ruling of the Chair that this resolution is not in order is binding, unless it is set aside by unanimous consent.

I regret very much that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] did not hear the statement of the Presiding Officer. I heard it, and my hearing facilities are not as keen as they were in days gone by, and I have heard other Senators who were on the floor say they heard it. We cannot settle this issue now.

This is a day when everyone is trying to avoid the doctrine of estoppel. The purpose of the amendment was to avoid estoppel by having acquiesced in the rules as written. Of course, they are binding on the Senate.

While I want to be fair and will be perfectly willing at some subsequent date to contest this matter de novo, there is no doubt that the ruling of the Chair is the ruling of the Senate as of this hour. Of course, no appeal was entered and no dissent was expressed. The Senator from New Mexico, of course, was strongly supporting that part of his motion when it was settled by the Presiding Officer. But until it is made the unfinished business, it cannot be settled. It is likely to be several hours before it is made the unfinished business. We shall have time to investigate the question and go back to the precedents recorded in the Manual. That I shall do before we reach the question of the consideration of the resolution.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. When the time comes for the termination of the morning hour, and the Chair submits the question, what will be the pending business?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion to take up the resolution.

Mr. DIRKSEN. And with that the so-called Dirksen motion?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That does not come up before the Senate agrees to take it up.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct; when it is agreed to. But, if the Chair feels free to do so, I should like very much for the RECORD to show now whether or not the Anderson proposal to amend the Dirksen motion to set a time limit of January 25 will be a part of it, or whether, under the ruling of the Chair, it is out of order and therefore is not a part of the motion.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair did not rule out the first part of it. The last part of it, to which the Senator from Georgia objected, the Chair ruled out yesterday.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The first part stands?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Namely, the amendment proposed that it be reported back by the 25th of January?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I think it may be well, so that there may be some semblance of order, that I call the attention of the Chair to what is contained on page 403 of yesterday's RECORD, where the Senator from Georgia said:

> Does the Chair hold that the committee can be instructed, in a motion applying to this resolution, with respect to other resolutions?

The President pro tempore said:

> It states that all the rights in existence at the opening of Congress shall be deemed preserved. That is something that the Senate could do.

At a subsequent time—and I do not wish to go into the details now, but I shall as we go along—the resolution which I had prepared had additional language in it. The Parliamentarian said, "This language is objectionable."

We took out some of the language, but left in the last sentence.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], along with a representative from my office, went to the Parliamentarian, and showed him the language, and he said, "That is all right. That is agreeable."

Therefore I was watching as carefully as any person could to hear whether the Chair made a ruling.

On page 403 of yesterday's RECORD, halfway down in the first column, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] said:

> There is nothing to prevent the committee from going into the Douglas resolution and considering it. The committee can write an entirely new rule. It need not follow either the Anderson or the Douglas proposal. It can bring in an entirely different proposal. The Chair has so ruled.

I had not heard the ruling.

I therefore said:

> Has the Chair so ruled?

I did not address the question to the Senator from Georgia, but to the Chair.

The answer was given by the Senator from Georgia:

> That is entirely out of order.

Then the President pro tempore said:

> The first part of this resolution deals with instructions to the committee. The last part is simply an understanding among Senators.

I asked the question:

> Did the Chair so rule?

At the top of the next column the President pro tempore said:

> The first part of the resolution were instructions to the committee and the last part is instructions to the Senators and not in order.

I only want to say that I did not hear the President pro tempore say "and not in order." Neither did the reporter, who was between the Presiding Officer and me.

This depends on the recollection of the Journal clerk. If our reporters are not able to hear what the Chair says, there has been a great breakdown in our reporting system.

In order to make sure—because the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] said no appeal was taken—I immediately said I did not hear the ruling of the Chair. I said:

> I did not hear the ruling of the Chair. Did the Chair so rule?

I ask Senators to find any ruling by the Chair subsequent to that.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I do not believe it can be assumed that our reporting system has been impaired or broken down. It would not be unusual that the Journal clerk could catch the ruling and not the reporter, because of all the confusion in the Senate at the time, with people walking back and forth, and staff members walking around. The Journal clerk sits very close to the Presiding Officer. It would be strange, indeed, if he did not catch the ruling; whereas, if the reporter were seated in the front row of the Chamber, he might not hear it.

Mr. ANDERSON. But he was sitting in the front row, between the President pro tempore and me.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Journal clerk was sitting there also. The confusion was not up there. It was down here.

Mr. ANDERSON. Does the Senator from Illinois contend that rulings should be made so that Members of the Senate should not hear what was said?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, indeed, I do not so contend.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is what we are talking about. That is all we are talking about.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield to me?

Mr. ANDERSON. I am yielding the floor.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask for recognition.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President——

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from New Mexico has used a statement of the Chair that is entirely consistent with the ruling in an effort to undermine the ruling. The language he reads states, "that the rights in existence at the opening of Congress shall be deemed preserved." That is something that the Senate, not the committee, could do. It does not belong in any instruction to the committee. That is completely consistent with the ruling of the Chair when he said "and the last part is instructions to the Senators and not in order."

There is not the slightest confusion anywhere about the ruling of the Chair. It is completely consistent. In the first instance, he says that it is something the Senate could do. When he made his final ruling he said that these are instructions to the Senators and not in order as instructions to the committee.

In the last analysis, the Senate could do that if it wished to do so. It could do it by majority vote on the floor of the Senate. But a committee, which is a creature of the Senate, cannot do it, except by rules of the Senate.

Mr. ANDERSON. Is there any obligation on the part of anyone to answer the questions which I propound? I stated that I did not hear the ruling of the Chair. "Did the Chair so rule?" Does not the Senator believe that question should have been answered?

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senator from New Mexico will read the entire column, he will find that after considerable discussion dealing with another part of the ruling—because I was complaining about the proposed instructions to deal with other resolutions, as well as the language that undertook to instruct the committee on the question of rights of Senators—he will see that he finally asked me to cite the precedent. When I pointed out the exact place in the book of precedents where the precedent in question was located, which absolutely demolished the contention of the Senator from New Mexico, I assumed that he was content with the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President——

Mr. RUSSELL. And did not pursue the matter any further.

There is nothing inconsistent here. The Chair said that it was something the Senate could do. When he finally ruled, he said that the last part of the instructions was to Senators and not to the committee, and was, therefore, not in order.

Mr. ANDERSON. My question remains: Does not the Senator believe that when a Senator asks the question whether the Chair has ruled, he is entitled to an answer?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. And the Chair did answer. He made the answer in colloquy.

Mr. ANDERSON. I beg the Senator's pardon, but the Chair did not answer it, as the Senator from Georgia will see if he will read the language.

Mr. RUSSELL. He did. He was engaging in colloquy with——

Mr. ANDERSON. He did not answer the question. We were trying to find out whether a ruling had been made.

Mr. RUSSELL. A ruling had been made, and the Senator from New Mexico did not pursue the matter with any great diligence and launched off into something else.

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not believe that is a fair statement of the situation. The Presiding Officer asked if I objected to the language. The Presiding Officer asked me that question. Would I ignore the Presiding Officer?

Mr. RUSSELL. And then, after I had again described to the Senator the page number from which I was reading, we had a discussion as to whether a motion to recommit had the same effect as a motion to commit. The ruling of the President pro tempore was that the precedents are the same for all practical purposes as between a motion to recommit and a motion to commit, which settled the question as to whether the instructions had to be in the same form on a motion to commit.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Anderson] has been contending that that was not the case. He did not appeal from the ruling of the Chair, just as he did not appeal from the other one. We shall have to settle the question at another time, but there is no question in my mind that the ruling is binding.

I should like also to point out that since time immemorial it has been recognized that the Journal clerk, who does not have the responsibility for reporting and transcribing every word that is spoken on the floor of the Senate, but transcribes only those statements that are material to an understanding of what the Senate did, has a much better opportunity to prepare his record. That would be true even if he were not more closely seated to the Presiding Officer than the reporter, who is on the floor in the midst of all the chaos and confusion.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, may I have 2 additional minutes?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not know about the experience of other Senators, but I have had a number of experiences when I could hardly recognize in the Record what I had said on the floor of the Senate when there had been a heated colloquy, and there was a great deal of confusion. This morning I noticed in the Record that the Senator from New York is reported as having said, "I agree with the Senator from Illinois," when he specifically stated, "I agree with the Senator from Georgia."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Which Senator from Illinois?

Mr. RUSSELL. The senior Senator. I do not know whether the Senator from New York has seen the Record this morning and observed his reference to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. JAVITS. I did not read it.

Mr. RUSSELL. I heard it stated otherwise on the floor.

Mr. President, I wish to make a parliamentary inquiry before I take my seat.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. RUSSELL. In case there is any variance between the record of the Journal clerk and the record of the Official Reporter of Debates, which takes precedence?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. A good many attachés, apparently with nothing to do come in here and loiter around in the hallway. They talk to themselves and prevent Senators from hearing other Senators. I want the Sergeant at Arms to clear the space alongside me, or I shall clear it myself and forcibly. I am sorry to interrupt the Senator.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator from Georgia repeat his parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I submitted a parliamentary inquiry as to which record takes priority, the recording of the Journal clerk in the Journal or what is transcribed by an Official Reporter in the Record of debates in Congress?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Journal is mentioned in the Constitution, and all the precedents support the Journal as the proper record.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Chair.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I desire to make a brief statement about the matter which the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Anderson], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell] have been discussing. I have been assisted in my recollection by a memorandum prepared for me, at my request, by Mr. Howard Bray, an assistant to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Anderson].

On January 7, 1965, shortly before the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Anderson] proposed his instruction to amend the Dirksen motion to send Senate Resolution 6 to the Committee on Rules and Administration, Mr. Bray showed the language to Dr. Riddick, the Parliamentarian. Dr. Riddick suggested that portions of the motion were not in order, but he did state that the final version, which is now in controversy—"and all rights in existence at the opening of Congress shall be deemed preserved"—was innocuous. Mr. Bray then deleted that phrase from the proposed motion.

He came back to Senator Anderson's desk, where I was sitting, and suggested that this version should be retained. I then went with him to Dr. Riddick's desk.

Dr. Riddick told me he saw no objection to that phrase being included in the instruction. Subsequently he changed his mind and advised the Presiding Officer that this particular version was not in order.

I asked Dr. Riddick on what basis he had changed his mind. He said it had been on the basis of the discussion which he had heard on the floor of the Senate. At that point there was considerable confusion in the Chamber. I did not hear any ruling made by our beloved President pro tempore on this point. The Official Reporter heard no such ruling.

I went with Senator Douglas to the room of the Official Reporters of Debates, where we learned that the reporter had not heard any such ruling but was proposing to put the ruling in anyway on the basis of what he had been told by the Journal clerk.

We objected to that, and the reporter agreed that he should not put into the official Congressional Record any statement he did not have in his notes.

Thereafter, that ruling was changed.

I make this statement merely to clarify the Record and point out that, in my opinion, this ruling is of absolutely no effect, and that I do not intend to be bound by it.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. CLARK. My time has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Pennsylvania may have an additional minute.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Pennsylvania is aware, is he not, that while the Parliamentarian is invaluable to the Senate, in the last analysis the ruling of the Chair is the ruling of the Presiding Officer without regard to what the Parliamentarian may think about that ruling?

Mr. CLARK. The Senator's legal position is unassailable. As a practical matter, those of us who spend much time in the Chair over the years are well aware of the fact that it is a rash Presiding Officer who ignores the advice he gets from the Parliamentarian.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I, too, wish to address myself—I did not have the opportunity to do so yesterday—to the controversy with respect to what is to happen concerning a rules change.

A number of things have been discussed, and they are critically important. The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Anderson] may, when the time comes—and it will come when the motion of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen] is again before the Senate, which will not occur until the Anderson resolution is the pending business—modify, in any way he chooses, his proposed instructions to the committee, so long as the yeas and nays have not been ordered—and they have not been. He may then include anything he pleases.

As I understand the rules of the Senate, the Chair would then be required to entertain another point of order, if the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell] should choose to make one, and an appeal may then be taken from the ruling of the Chair.

What the Chair did yesterday was to establish a precedent which could be invoked upon that argument. If the Senate does not like that precedent, it can, as it has so many times in the past, overrule it.

Therefore, in my judgment, we are discussing a matter of great importance in terms of whether Senators hear the ruling or not, so that they can appeal. But I see no permanent jeopardy or loss of rights with respect to what has been done so far.

The other question has, again, not been approached substantively, and we might as well call a spade a spade, because in the final analysis the Senate will decide whether the Anderson resolution will go to committee or will remain here. No Senator wishes to take advantage of another. In preceding years, 1957, 1959, 1961, and 1963, there was either a gentleman's understanding or unanimous consent that whatever rights existed would not be lost in the course of the transaction of business between the time when the resolution to change rule XXII was before the Senate in any form—even on a motion to take up as it is now—and the time that it was actually acted on.

Mr. President, there is really a substantive right involved. The substantive right in brief is this, Can debate be ended upon this resolution by invoking a constitutional right that the Senate may change its own rules free of the inhibition of the cloture provisions in rule XXII, or must rule XXII be complied with? This is the substantive question. However the Senate may decide, it is inconceivable to me that any Senator would wish to deprive a Member of the right to make this argument because of waiver or estoppel, or because of the pettifogging argument that business had interfered, and that, therefore, whatever constitutional rights might have accrued at the opening of the session had now been lost.

I submit that, in all decency and honor, in accordance with the precedents which we ourselves have established at the beginning of a number of Congresses, either by unanimous consent or at the appropriate time on an appropriate ruling of the Chair, it should be made clear that this matter having been raised at the appropriate time, whatever the business of the Senate might be in the intervening time—whether consideration of a committee, or otherwise—no Senator will lose the fundamental right to claim whatever he might claim at the time he made the motion. That is all that the argument is about.

I respectfully submit that it does not do the Senate any good, in the eyes of the country, which finds it very hard to understand what we are talking about if we engage in this kind of debate when it seems to me the issue is so very clear.

I respectfully submit that I doubt very much that any Senator proposes seriously to deny to the mover his right to proceed, whatever might have been the validity of his argument at the time he made the motion, whatever else might have intervened for the convenience of the Senate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I might proceed for 1 additional minute.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. In short, both on the law and on the facts, I cannot conceive of a situation in which we would deny the moving Senator and his associates, of whom I am one, the right to make a constitutional argument in accordance with the normal practice and at the convenience of the Senate. It may properly be made without that right having been lost because of estoppel or waiver because of intervening business.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A NATIONAL SEASHORE ON ASSATEAGUE ISLAND

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, on Wednesday, I introduced legislation to provide for the establishment of a national seashore on Assateague Island. In the remarks which I made at that time, I stressed the need for immediate congressional action if this great national resource is to be preserved for public enjoyment. I pointed out that, if the ruling expected from the Maryland court of appeals should require the granting of construction permits, there is little likelihood that private construction could be forestalled.

Through the cooperation of the chairman of the Public Lands Subcommittee, the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], this seashore proposal received a preliminary hearing during the 2d session of the 88th Congress. An immediate resumption of these hearings is essential.

Mr. President, since the adjournment of the last Congress, and in recent days, there have been a number of editorials from leading newspapers which have stressed the need for speed in the matter of Assateague. I ask unanimous consent that editorials on this subject from the Baltimore Sun of September 26 and January 8, and from the Evening Sun of December 1 and 22 and January 7, be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Baltimore Sun, Sept. 26, 1964]

BRIDGE TO ASSATEAGUE

The opening of the bridge to Assateague Island should be an unclouded occasion for public rejoicing. As Governor Tawes said in his dedicatory remarks, the bridge adds 22 miles to Maryland's accessible ocean front, hitherto limited to the 8-mile stretch from Ocean City to the Delaware line. Those 22 additional miles are one long, unspoiled stretch of glistening sand beach, a natural asset to be hailed by all Marylanders.

The opening of the bridge, though, is far from being an unclouded event in Maryland life. It opens the way not only for public recreation but for the thousands of lot owners who purchased the middle portion of Assateague in the early 1950s. The bridge, in fact, brings to a head the question dangling for a decade: Is Assateague to be preserved for public recreation? Or is this last extensive stretch of unspoiled seashore along the middle Atlantic coast to be developed privately for private use?

The question on paper has been answered. The Tawes administration and the U.S. Department of the Interior have agreed that a small portion of the island should be a State park and the rest should be a national seashore. But despite the wide public support given that solution, and the actual fulfillment of the State portion of the agreement, the answer is only on paper. Congress has not acted on the national seashore proposal. With the bridge now making Assateague accessible not only to the public but also to private developers, any congressional delay will mean that Assateague land costs will soar. Maryland's congressional delegation will have to make the full Congress see that, if the solution to Assateague is to be realized while the island is still in its unspoiled state.

[From the Baltimore Evening Sun, Dec. 1, 1964]

HOLDING THE LINE

Once again a State agency is trying to hold the line against further private development of Assateague Island. Earlier, Maryland health authorities declined to issue permits for septic tanks on Worcester county's offshore island because, they said, the soil was unfit for the kind of facilities proposed. Now the State forests and park commission is refusing to let the county build a road through the State's parkland at the northern end of Assateague. The effect of both rulings is to stall private plans for the island and allow time for a hoped-for congressional decision to establish it as a national seashore area.

S. Lawrence Hammerman, chairman of the forest and park commission, states frankly the reason why his group is blocking construction of a road. "We are at that stage * * * where careless direction could scar the land," he says, "and where uncontrolled development could have disastrous effects, to the discredit of the State of Maryland." Congress, Mr. Hammerman says, might be reluctant to help purchase for public use an island already dotted with new private cottages and tourist facilities. And it would be disastrous, he feels, if the fight to preserve the island is finally lost.

There are many reasons, and obvious ones, for saving Assateague—the last remaining stretch of unspoiled seashore between North Carolina and Massachusetts. Worcester countians, who regard Assateague as a potential tax source, have not recognized the public's interest in the island and aren't likely to do so. Maryland, therefore, can expect more such disputes until Congress approves plans for the island and condemnation proceedings have been completed. County officials are pledged to fight right down to the Halls of Congress.

State agencies shouldn't be expected to hold off the private developers indefinitely. This year a bill to preserve Assateague died in Congress; next year there is to be a new bill. It too may die unless the Governor and Maryland's Representatives in the House and Senate make known the need for swift action.

[From the Baltimore Evening Sun, Dec. 22, 1964]

EDUCATIONAL CAMPAIGN

Among impediments to the campaign to preserve Assateague Island as public parkland is the fact that the island, being both remote and undeveloped, is relatively unknown outside Maryland. If Congress is to approve the bill which will be introduced to make Assateague a national seashore area, Congressmen from across the Nation are going to have to be informed of the island's great potential as a recreational resource. Senator DANIEL BREWSTER's announcement that he has begun an educational campaign among his colleagues comes, therefore, as welcome news.

The Senator says that on the first day of the coming congressional session he and Senator-elect JOSEPH TYDINGS will introduce a bill to establish the island as a park. Senator BREWSTER disclosed also the text of a letter he has sent to Senators from neighboring States, to Senators who have been especially interested in conservation and to members of the Public Lands Subcommittee of the Senate's Interior Committee. The letter makes clear the need for quick action by Congress.

Senator BREWSTER obviously understands the urgency of the matter. He understands too that the attractiveness of the Interior Department's proposals for Assateague won't be appreciated on Capitol Hill until Congressmen are made aware of the island's assets. If a similar educational campaign can be begun in the House of Representatives, and if other Marylanders will join Senator Brewster in telling the Nation about Assateague, perhaps Congress will move with the dispatch which the situation demands.

[From the Baltimore Evening Sun, Jan. 7, 1965]

Highest Priority

"For over three centuries," the President said in his state of the Union address, "the beauty of America has sustained our spirit and enlarged our vision. We must act now to protect this heritage." To do this, he said, in the next few years the Nation must build more large and small parks, more seashores and open spaces than have been created during any period in our history.

The East, especially, has seen its legacy of natural beauty depleted. But there remains, off the Eastern Shore of Maryland, a long, windswept island still available for preservation as unspoiled parkland. President Johnson did not in his address mention Assateague Island specifically, but there were reasons to believe Assateague was among the places he had in mind. Now Stewart Udall, Secretary of the Interior, says as much. The Interior Department hopes to cooperate with Maryland in making the island a State park and national seashore area. Bills to give effect to the plan have been introduced and Mr. Udall has asked the Interior Committees of both House and Senate to give the project their highest priority.

This may well be the most encouraging statement so far in the long campaign to save Assateague. The Secretary made it clear he understands the urgency of the situation. Private developers are prepared to move quickly to secure the island for commercial exploitation: if they succeed the prospects of reclamation would suffer. "If we don't act this session," Mr. Udall said, "we will be confronted with a situation making it difficult to do the conservation work ahead."

But if the need for action is urgent, there is also good reason at last for confidence that the need will be met. Federal officials and all the members of Maryland's congressional delegation are in harmony on the subject of Assateague. United, they should be able to convince other Members of the House and Senate of the recreation opportunities the island offers. Three million Americans, as the Interior Department points out, are within a day's driving distance of Assateague's sands. "We want to grow," the President said in his address, "and build and create, but we want progress to be the servant and not the master of man." An unspoiled Assateague is waiting to serve.

[From the Baltimore Sun, Jan. 8, 1965]

Assateague's Year

In his call for a massive effort to preserve our natural beauties President Johnson specifically has mentioned the need for more seashores. Maryland with its 24 miles of uncluttered Assateague Island has just such a seashore to add to the national heritage, if action is taken before private development spoils the last extensive stretch of clear ocean frontage within easy reach of Washington, Baltimore, Wilmington, and Philadephia.

A long list of Maryland organizations favor the acquisition of Assateague Island as a national seashore.

The Tawes administration has backed the creation of a national seashore along with a small State seashore park.

The U.S. Department of the Interior heartily approves of Federal acquisition of Assateague as a national seashore, and Interior Secretary Udall has just given the proposal his department's highest priority.

The entire Maryland delegation to Congress, led by Senator BREWSTER, has agreed on a bill to have Assateague become a national seashore.

All that remains now is to obtain congressional action, as the Assateague bill becomes one among thousands in Washington and as the threat of private development on Assateague itself becomes increasingly strong. With a Presidential blessing on seashores, this should be the year for Assateague in Congress, but successful action from here on will depend on just how hard each member of the Maryland delegation pushes and on how well he musters the substantial public backing at his disposal.

DR. MILO BAIL'S VALEDICTORY AS PRESIDENT OF OMAHA UNIVERSITY

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, for 45 years, Dr. Milo Bail has been an educator.

For the past 16 years he has served with great distinction as president of the University of Omaha. At the end of this month he is laying aside the burdens of that office for a richly deserved retirement.

In what can be described as his valedictory, Dr. Bail addressed the Downtown Kiwanis Club of Omaha on December 18. In his remarks which he titled, "Education Faces the Future," this highly regarded educator dealt in a refreshing and imaginative way with the challenges and opportunities of education in America today. He said:

So often are we concerned only about the size of the school, college or university, many of which are doubling and tripling in enrollment, yet the major problem of our concern must be with the quality of the learning experience while we continue to deal with the quantity seeking learning.

Restating the same proposition, he said:

To accept less than the best is the recipe for failure.

Quality and excellence have been the hallmarks of Dr. Bail's inspiring career. He takes justifiable pride in the legacy he is leaving to the University of Omaha and to his successor. But he is most proud of that part of the legacy represented by the 12,000 young men and women who have passed across a platform to receive a diploma.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the text of Dr. Bail's remarks before the Downtown Kiwanis Club and commend them to the thoughtful attention of my colleagues.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Education Faces the Future

(Remarks by Milo Bail, president, Municipal University of Omaha)

It is an honor and a privilege to have this opportunity to appear before you this afternoon to talk about some things which I have grouped under the title "Education Faces the Future." In these days when so much is being said and written about education—both pro and con—and when so many people are mindful of the importance of education, and yet so many are unmindful, and when some of the critics of education get rich on their publications and public addresses; and when many who have dedicated their lives to education are vilified, it is indeed difficult to present something about or for education that hasn't already been said, either by someone else or by yourself—hence, I shall quote not only from others but also from myself, which I believe Shaw has said is likely one's best quotes, at least one's best liked quotes.

It is trite to say, with Devereaux Josephs, that we stand at the confluence of two great streams which threaten to engulf all of us engaged in this business of education—two streams, each of which is the result of a great explosion. The first, the population explosion which is forcing great problems upon us—particularly in certain States of the Nation as well as abroad. With the constant movement of people from the rural to the urban areas, we find that 84 percent of our Nation's population now lives in 212 metropolitan areas which produce 75 percent of our marketable products.

However, in this great belt of Midwestern States, including Nebraska, our rural population is rapidly moving to town and even some of it moving out of the State—although at the same time our agricultural productivity through advanced educational methods increases year by year.

The population of the Nation's boundary States from Washington, Oregon, California, and around the South and up the east coast is rapidly and constantly increasing. In California alone, an annual increase of 1 million a year (practically two-thirds of Nebraska) is expected above the present 18 million until by 1980 or 1985 there will be 40 million people in California.

What is needed in each State—and in Nebraska in particular—is a master plan for education at all levels based upon the facts regarding population and population trends—and gathered by the State department or the Governor or the legislature upon which the State can develop an educational system to serve the needs of its citizens.

There is another explosion; namely, that of information or knowledge.

In 1800, information was doubling each 50 years. Today, it is doubling each 8 to 10 years and if I am reliably informed, by the seventies it will double each 5 years. In the physicial sciences alone, there are 600,000 pages annually—two volumes every day of the year—more than can ever be read—not to count the hundreds and thousands of articles in the various journals and periodicals.

Paper—paper—paper—the paper for the plans of a bomber weigh more than the bomber itself.

Files—files—files—95 percent of which will never be referred to again.

But you say Du Pont's report that at some time in the near future, tape and film will replace paper. But even now the work preceding a bomb explosion requires 700 miles of tape which would require five men 5 years just to analyze.

Records—records—records—less than 5 percent meaningful—95 percent never looked at again.

Research—research—research—duplication of research—no time to read the journals to discover whether or not the experiment has already been performed and a new discovery achieved. Cheaper it is for a research department to conduct its own research even if the experiment has already been performed than to search the literature for information to prevent duplication.

The data processing machine has a significant function to serve, in gathering information to communicate although as someone has said in comparing the machine with man—the machine is fast, efficient, and stupid, while man is slow, slovenly, and brilliant. How are we to use this machine in our work with the boys and girls in our schools and colleges? To what purpose shall it be put? First, however, we should consider the real reason for the existence of the school and college in our contemporary life. How do we account for the extreme popularity of all levels of education? From kindergarten to adult? How shall we direct our educational program that it may face the future in a meaningful manner for all students, faculty, and the citizenry.

As the historians, Charles and Mary Beard, have said:

"The prime end of education (the Founding Fathers held) was to help to realize the ideal of progress, raise the general well being, bring all citizens within the range of the cooperative life, apply science to the service of mankind, prepare pupils for economic independence, instruct them in the duties of citizenship, instill in them republican principles, strengthen and enrich American nationality."

That is, the schools, colleges, and universities have been established to afford the inhabitants—the men and women, the youth and adults, of the State and Nation—the means of acquiring a thorough knowledge of the branches of learning—both liberal and applied.

In other words, human learning is the real reason for the existence of the school. The school is an institution of people, for people. The staff, the faculty, the services, the facilities, the instruction, the curriculums, the ways and means, the administration, the members of the board—in fact, all the school has and all the school uses—exists to maximize human learning. Hence, it is essential that we understand better than we do now the human learning process. We must remember that although we teach collectively, in groups of 20, 30, 50, or 100, our students learn individually, one by one. Also, they learn in spite of us, as well as because of us. We must so organize our resources that our students may gradually mature mentally to become self-directed individuals, and thus achieve proper and effective human behavior patterns.

To achieve better human learning, we need a much better inventory of human resources—a much better inventory of the raw material which we use in the human learning process. Think what we might be able to achieve in our classrooms if we had a detailed inventory of all the talents represented in the students who face the teacher. Here is a real application for the computer and the data processing machine—to provide a comprehensive yet detailed body of information about the school population which the teachers can use to guide and direct the learning activities of the boys and girls in their classrooms and laboratories. So often we are concerned only about the size of the school, college, or university, many of which are doubling and tripling in enrollment. Yet the major problem of our concern must be with quality of the learning experience while we continue to deal with the quantity seeking learning. The size of the learning situation is the size of the actual classroom or laboratory in which the dynamic teacher-scholar meets the students and effectively challenges and directs the learning activities of each individual present.

Never forget—a teacher in school or a professor in college or university is not teaching the whole enrollment of 500, 1,500, 5,000, or 15,000, but is, or should be, teaching and shaping the learning and behavior patterns of the 20, 30, 40, 50, or, under certain lecture-room conditions, a hundred or so students before him. No matter how much the machine or any other of the teaching gadgets—ETV, Tele-lecture, or visual aids—may help us, it is the reaction between the learner and the teacher that makes the difference and which produces the dividends in the classroom.

If the real reason for our educational institutions is human learning, we had better learn and soon how to secure and utilize the very best inventory of human resources possible—not only the human resources represented in our students but also the human resources represented in our faculties. Here is the real pay dirt—here is the place where we maximize human learning—here it is where the dividends are produced—here it is where we process the men and women, the inhabitants of our society, that they may attain their maximum growth and achieve their maximum potentiality for successful life and living in the days they have ahead of them.

Let us keep ever before us, two very important purposes of education: first, for the days of our youth, that of self-improvement; and second, for the days of our maturity, that of self-protection. Let us keep these two purposes ever before us and direct our energies with courage—the courage of conviction and the courage to prepare ourselves, our homes, our schools, our churches, our government, our city, State, and Nation for a future that will bring the good life, success, happiness, and peace and harmony to all peoples.

As citizens who have accepted the responsibility for shaping people to face the future, we must do so with plans designed for a new world, not merely with plans designed for past performances, not as described in Barbara Tuckman's "Guns of August," where all the leaders of Europe planned for August of 1914 with plans designed for the war of 1870, but, as reported by John Gardner, president of the Carnegie Foundation in his statement, "Education must always attempt to shape the future." And also as President Johnson said only last month to a group of educators meeting in the White House, "The success of the Nation depends upon the faith of its people in education."

My challenge to you, as interested citizens, keep your faith in education—not only for yourself but for your sons and daughters, as well as the sons and daughters of all people, both privileged and underprivileged, fortunate or less fortunate.

Further, if as educated citizens, we are to help shape the future, we will find it a most difficult task, in fact, the most difficult process that we know anything about.

It is easy to quarry stone, cut it, square it, raise it, fit it; it is easy to work with other materials—steel, copper, glass, brass—and to make new materials; because they all react to certain conditions of temperature, stress, strain, bending, twisting, the forces we put upon them. They react according to the properties which they possess. But man does not react predictably; man reacts in many ways—some men always, some men never, some men sometimes.

Through education we hope to be able to predict their behavior but as yet our efforts have not had the success that we have hoped for. Some of you may remember Finley Peter Dunne, a Will Rogers at the turn of the century, and his foil, Mr. Dooley. After Mr. Dunne discussed the necessity for reorganizing the House of Representatives, he has Mr. Dooley reply: "But Mr. Dunne, after you have reorganized the House, there will still be people in the House."

My charge to all who have accepted the responsibility for shaping people to face the future is that we must also strive to focus attention on the self-shaping of these people who are in our own houses. Not come as you are which you see on so many billboards, and on invitations to enter, whatever the establishment may be, and which some of you may have seen described in a recent Reader's Digest, but "Come better than you are. Come with your best foot forward in dress and behavior not always in a casual manner but in a dressed up manner, and especially in learning or living patterns, come better than you are." This is essential if we are to maximize human learning and human behavior as is expected of us—and as is so much needed in every aspect of contemporary living. And may I say that teachers, in the majority do come better than you are and, in many cases, come better than the parents do.

A republic such as ours depends upon the general intelligence of the many as well as the wisdom of the few. The authority and strength of government rests in the people; through their zeal for its continuance and their ability to govern themselves, the ideals of freedom take root and flourish.

Popular education is the key to the development of men and women with a purpose and a sense of direction; men and women who will direct their efforts and energies to the survival of the open road to merit.

Popular education that will provide for the discovery and development of talents and abilities wherever they may be found is the best investment we can make to insure each individual the freedom and liberty necessary for the maintenance of an open road to merit for all people.

Freedom and liberty, however, cannot be taken for granted—they must be worked for. Citizens must be correctly informed, must be as active in meeting their civic duties and responsibilities as they are in pursuing their personal rights. The most valuable right we possess is the right of suffrage, or at least so we proudly proclaim to the rest of the world; yet, in November, many of our citizens did not take the trouble to go to the polls, and for some reason or another, the more education they had, the fewer there are who go to the polls.

Purposeful citizens who have a sense of direction and who believe in maintaining our freedom will not take freedom for granted but will assume their responsibilities by studying the issues involved and then exercising their right of suffrage accordingly. They will work for the improvement of the home, the school, and the community—they will know what government services are necessary, they will know what their tax dollars buy, they will be concerned about public affairs, and they will demonstrate by word and deed that they are at work maintaining, the kind of government under which they wish to live.

Man's progress as a race has been governed by his progress as an individual. It has been individuals who have painted the great masterpieces, composed the great symphonies, designed the great cathedrals, written the great books, discovered the great scientific principles—not the group, not the committee, not the organization man, but the individual in spite of some of our togetherness ads of today.

In every age, in every society, in every area of endeavor it has been the individual, the creative thinker, the frontrunner who has made the difference.

It just may be that in facing the future we should follow Professor Redefer's suggestion, which some of you may have read in the August 8 issue of Saturday Review, which reminded me very much of my own proposal that every school, college, and university, should insist that each teacher have an hour a day in a secluded room where, with a sign on the door reading, "Do Not Disturb—Man Thinking," he would actually be thinking rather than doing. To quote from Mr. Redefer, "What is needed, it seems to me, is a vice president for serendipity, a man whose sole job is to search for valuable and unexpected ideas. The vice president for serendipity should be given the liberty of free wheeling and should be allowed to reach some decisions intuitively, without the assistance of experts, consultants, committees, or field generals.

He should be given a sizable budget, and, while he would of course be accountable for the results, he should not be held to a specific batting average. He should have a small office. It need not have wall-to-wall carpeting but be a place where the vice president for serendipity could talk with all those time-consuming teachers, professors, and board members, who have an imaginative idea that requires only small encouragement to develop. He would also serve as the person to handle new ideas in education. It takes courage these days to propose a change in the educational pattern. Helping schools, colleges, universities, teachers, and professors do better what they are already doing is not meeting the challenge of a rapidly changing age. Even giving bigger grants or more elaborate buildings is not the answer. Perhaps some of the answers will be found in the serendipitous ideas that are too often allowed to slip through the foundations' net.

And, as I have suggested, the value of the vice president for serendipity would by no means be limited to education. Indeed, if even a few dozen were placed at appropriate vantage points throughout the business and governmental communities, we might see some exciting developments in the market place of ideas.

May I also refer you to "The Wild Birds Find a Corporate Roost," by Tom Alexander, in the August issue of Fortune.

If we are to develop such individuals—people who believe in the value of the intellectual man, the creative man, the man of wisdom, the man of faith and spiritual values—we must change our current heroes from the commonplace and accept only the best that the creative artist or man-thinking has to offer. To accept less than the best is the recipe for failure.

Although it is the responsibility of all of us engaged in any aspect of teaching to see that we provide every means possible to discover, to select and motivate the front runner, the creative thinkers, those who will make the significant contributions and possibly develop solutions for the problems of the future, it is also our responsibility to provide the very best education possible for that great majority of us so often called the average followers but whom I chose to call the middle group, the doers, the supporters, the workers who carry out the ideas of the creative thinkers.

True, we must have as one of the major purposes of education, the education of the man of intellect, yet at the same time we must remember that the future of our Republic and our State depends upon the intelligence of that great middle group who carry out the instructions on the label as well as it does upon the wisdom of the few who write the instructions on the label.

Let us take a look at the other side of the coin. Some 40 years ago Josiah Royce in "The Philosophy of Loyalty" wrote, "To be an ethical individual, select a cause and serve it." Man is a gregarious individual, a joiner, one who needs to belong. As a member of an organization he develops interests, finds something greater than self, and discover a solidarity and meaning in life. To belong to a dedicated worthwhile group is good for the individual. To work for the improvement of his fellowmen—it doesn't matter much in what area or with what worthwhile group—4-H Clubs, Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, handicapped or underprivileged children, youth groups, hospitals, schools, churches—such service will improve the home, neighborhood, city, State, and Nation, and bring happiness to the participant.

The first great cause to be selected and served is work. His work, vocation, or profession should challenge the individual to put forth an all-out effort. Work for the joy of it, for the thrill of it, for the pride in a job well done. There is no easy path—the earth yields nothing save to the labor of mankind. No matter what some people—even some in high places—are saying to the contrary today, we cannot get something for nothing, whether it be in business, industry, government, the professions, or in the fields of learning.

Work is honorable, the small job as well as the large, and if we are to be honest and realistic we must respect work. We must see that each worthwhile job has a prestige value in our society. All boys and girls do not have to go to college or university. But they must be trained for work and taught that it is honorable and they must receive recognition for a job well done. The methods of doing many jobs have changed from muscles to machines, yet upon work and the service we render it, rests all attainments of the past, the present, and the future.

I don't doubt but that some of you who are present this afternoon have said, "I want my sons and daughters to secure an education so they will not have to work as hard as I have." This is indeed a vicious legacy and a heartless wish, because if there is anything wrong with this generation of parents, work didn't cause it. Do not deny your students or your own sons and daughters the thrill of accomplishment—the thrill that comes from their own effort in carrying a job through to completion, not in the same way which you or their fathers and grandfathers did, but work nevertheless.

May I recall with you Irving Stone's great volume, "The Agony and the Ecstacy," which has a philosophy which I have quoted many times. To Bartoldo, the great Florentine sculptor, there comes a lad who possesses the potential of doing the great "David," the "Pieta," and all of his other great masterpieces. At 19, Michelangelo appears before Bartoldo to learn sculpturing from this great master. And Bartoldo, after he has shown the youngster how to make the tools, and use the tools, and fashion the stone, and to produce some pieces of his own, says to this young lad, "I am not a great sculptor. But with you as my pupil I may become a great teacher." Think of that philosophy as we are thinking about facing the future and as we think of the improvement of mankind to solve the problems of life and living, "with you as my pupil, I may become a great teacher."

Think also of the other side of that coin. Suppose all boys and girls were sent by their parents to school, to college, or university, each morning to look up at the teacher to say, "I may never become a great scientist, musician, writer, engineer, teacher, lawyer, banker, doctor, but with you as my teacher I may become a great citizen." I challenge each of you this afternoon to think what a change that would make in every area of our national life today and tomorrow. That every teacher in every classroom and laboratory in every school, college, and university, would deserve to have his students look at him each day with sufficient faith that these words would come to his mind, "With you as my teacher, I may become a great citizen."

This is the challenge we need today as we face the future in our classrooms and laboratories—that educated citizens may go forth from the experiences they have with great teachers to make their maximum contribution to society, each in his own particular service area. Although the ideal may never be attained, we must strive to move along the road to maximum effectiveness in the human learning experiences which we direct. In the words of Oliver Wendell Holmes, "The great thing in this world is not so much where we are, but in what direction we are moving."

This much is certain: our Nation will grow; our Nation will change.

My hope is that we who serve in any aspect of this program we call education may have the knowledge, the skill, the courage, the desire, and the wisdom, to help direct it in the proper direction.

INAUGURATION OF DR. JAMES C. FLETCHER, PRESIDENT, UNIVERSITY OF UTAH

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, this past fall I had the privilege of attending the inaugural ceremonies of Dr. James Chipman Fletcher, eighth president of the University of Utah.

It was an impressive occasion. We were installing as president of the oldest State university west of the Missouri a world-renowned physicist who is one of today's intellectual pioneers. It seemed wholly appropriate that this man, eminent in space research and administration in the midtwentieth century, should have been chosen to head a university whose founding over 100 years ago in Salt Lake City was an intellectual and practical triumph of the midnineteenth century.

Dr. Fletcher comes from a family touched with genius. His father retired as director of physical research for Bell Telephone Laboratories to become dean of the College of Physical and Engineering Sciences at Brigham Young University in Provo, Utah. At the time he was tapped for the presidency of the University of Utah, Dr. James Fletcher was vice president of the Aerojet Corp. and chairman of the board of the Space-General Corp. He has four brothers all of whom have distinguished themselves either in science or medicine.

The establishment of the University of Deseret in 1850 by Brigham Young was in itself an act of genius. The Mormon pioneers had been in the valley less than 3 years. They were building homes and digging irrigation ditches and fighting the desert to grow food to sustain them in a desert land when President Young announced that he was establishing the university. It was this rugged determination to nourish the intellect as well as the body which set the Mormon pioneer community apart from other western communities, and which has made it a center for culture and education ever since. The descendents of these pioneers still thirst for knowledge, and it has been our proud boast that Utah has always been at or near the top of the States in the percentage of high school graduates who go on to college.

The honored position of the University of Utah in the educational world today, and the type of man who has been chosen as its new president, are reflected in the two major addresses made at the inaugural ceremonies. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD—the address entitled "Educational Evolution" made by Dr. Clark Kerr, president of the University of California, and that of Dr. Fletcher himself entitled "The Next Twenty Years."

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE EDUCATIONAL EVOLUTION

(Address at the inauguration of Dr. James Chipman Fletcher as eighth president of the University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah, November 6, 1964, by Clark Kerr, president, University of California)

Mr. Chairman; President Fletcher; Governor Clyde, ladies and gentlemen: This day belongs equally to the University of Utah and to its new president—Dr. James Chipman Fletcher. It is my very great pleasure to join in bringing both to the man and to the institution the greetings, congratulations, and best wishes of the community of scholars from our universities and colleges, our learned societies, and foundations whose representatives are gathered here today.

As a working member of the guild of university presidents, I urge my colleague to enjoy this memorable day to the utmost. For, as he will inevitably discover, the festivities will all too soon give way to frustration, the congraulations to querulous complaints, the banquets to a sandwich on the run, the hearty handshakes to hard labor. Today may well be the only occasion, in what I trust will be a long and distinguished tenure, when President Fletcher may enjoy to the full all of the prerequisties and be troubled by none of the requisites of his high office.

A year or so ago in some lectures I had occasion to comment on the role of the American university president—or rather on the many roles he must play at the same time. He is expected to be a friend of the students; a colleague of the faculty; a good fellow with the alumni; a sound administrator with the regents; a good speaker with the public; an astute bargainer with the foundations and Federal agencies; a politician with the State legislature; a friend of industry, labor, and agriculture; a persuasive diplomat with donors; a champion of liberal education; a vigorous supporter of the professions; a skilled spokesman with the press; a creative scholar in his own right; a public servant at the State and national levels; a devotee of classical music and football equally—also of art and basketball; a decent human being; a good family man; an active member of a church. Above all, he must enjoy traveling in airplanes, eating his meals in public, and delivering speeches on all sorts of official and semiofficial occasions.

After listening to this catalog, President Fletcher may well be wondering why he has chosen to accept such an assignment—to leave the comparatively orderly and peaceful realms of science and space research administration for the turbulent life of a university president. I know, however, that he is not unacquainted with many of the problems he will encounter. A strong tradition of university service as well as devotion to science runs in his family; his father and one of his brothers have held high academic and administrative offices at Brigham Young University. Further, his own extensive experience in directing scientific research and development enterprises and in serving as a consultant on scientific problems to the highest levels of government, give him unusual qualifications for assuming the leadership of a university in our increasingly scientific and technological age. His fellow university presidents will be greatly interested in learning of his plans for the future of the University of Utah, and in watching their development.

The inauguration of a university president is an event of particular significance to the scholarly world whose delegates are assembled here today. The ceremony provides a welcome occasion for us to share publicly our deep convictions of the worth of intellect, the satisfaction of guiding young minds into the realms of scholarship, the ancient but always new excitement of the pursuit of truth, the values of the university as the institution in our society designed for and dedicated to the furtherance of human knowledge.

But the community of scholars cannot claim exclusive interest in today's observances. The occasion is scarcely less meaningful to the entire society. Our universities today are not cloisters removed from the world's problems—much as university presidents sometimes wish they were. Our universities stand now at the very crossroads of society—preserving and interpreting the past, serving the present, discovering and even helping to shape the future.

If ever we allow ourselves to take our institutions of higher learning for granted, if ever we permit their essential freedom and independence to be compromised, if ever we fail to give them the financial support they need, then we shall be harming not only these institutions but ourselves and society as a whole.

For we depend upon our universities to produce the highly trained men and women essential to the daily activities of a complex industrial society, the broadly educated citizens imperative to the preservation and vigor of a democracy in today's world. We look to our universities for the ideas and insights which are the lifeblood of our material strength, our political and social well-being, our intellectual growth.

A modern university has a surprisingly great impact upon its immediate community—gone are the barriers that once separated town and gown. The campus has become a center of cultural life. Its lecture and concert halls, its exhibits in the arts and sciences, the presence of students and faculty from many other parts of the world, representing a wide spectrum of subject fields and interests and points of view—all these serve to diversify and to enrich community life and make a university city a desirable and even exciting place in which to live.

And universities increasingly become important locational factors for industry. The immediate accessibility of knowledge and its tools, in the form of laboratories, libraries, and men with ideas, gives universities a drawing power far greater than low taxes or cheap labor. In California, new industrial laboratories were located next to two new university campuses before the first building was begun on either of the campuses.

Government as well as industry depends upon the university for ideas, insights, expert advice. Local governments hope for solutions to the host of problems that come with the accelerating shift to urban life. State governments ask for aid with problems of agriculture, public administration, conservation, and many other regional matters. The Federal Government, through one agency or another, calls upon the university for answers to questions ranging from public health to foreign aid to national defense to exploration of space.

A State university has one additional and vital obligation in a democratic society. It is the institution primarily responsible for providing true equality of opportunity in the educational field to young people of whatever economic means. It helps to guarantee that the leadership of a free nation shall be the stronger for being based upon true merit and accomplishment.

Today, more than ever before, education is inextricably involved in the quality of a nation. But this I scarcely need tell the people of Utah. Your reverence for education, exemplified by the inscription "The glory of God is Intelligence" which appears on so many public buildings in the State, is proverbial. Your belief in the value of education is demonstrated, moreover, by many impressive facts. Utah leads all the States of the Union in the median number of school years completed by persons 25 years or older. The figure for Utah is 12.2, and I am happy to note that California runs a close second, with 12.1—this compared with a national median of 10.6. Utah, tied with New Mexico, leads the Nation in the percent of total personal income devoted to public higher education. Utah and New Mexico also head the list in their expenditures for public elementary and secondary education as a percent of total personal income. The establishment of this university, the oldest such institution west of the Missouri River, took place in 1850, very soon after the first settlers came to Utah and at a time when such an effort represented substantial sacrifices. Obviously, the people of Utah, and their leaders, know better than most Americans that education is a sound and essential investment. They not only know it, they have acted on it consistently over the years, and with telling effect.

If education today serves all of society, what may be said of education tomorrow? I should like to suggest that education's future role will be even more influential, and for a reason which is both intriguing and just a little disquieting. Throughout history, education has been the preserve of one class or another or the servant of one institution or another. Now, for the first time, it is beginning to loom as an independent force in the world—at first in a few nations, perhaps eventually in all. This increasingly vast machine of education which man has fashioned to serve his own purposes is taking on an autonomous life, demonstrating the capacity to perpetuate itself and to change the surrounding society in the process—even beyond the conscious will of that society. The faithful servant may become a forceful master.

This educational evolution which is now beginning will undoubtedly have sweeping effects, many unforeseeable from our perspective. But we can attempt to predict a few of them.

Education may actually determine how nations evolve. In a monolithic and authoritarian society education produces more and more intellectuals to serve the needs of modernization. These intellectuals are likely to exert a growing and insistent pressure for more freedom and diversity, until ultimately the monolithic system cracks and some form of pluralistic society emerges. There is some evidence that this pressure is being exerted now in Eastern Europe and even in Russia.

Education and research may guarantee the renewal of societies. Institutions of higher education today are creating or discovering new knowledge at a phenomenal rate. This new knowledge, because of its quantity and vitality, spurs the progress of a society and throws off encrustation and stagnation. In fact, our main problem today is to adjust rapidly enough to the process of renewal.

Education will produce new class structures in society. Merit will increasingly be the portal of advancement. Generally speaking, the higher a person's skill, the greater will be his prestige in society. This hierarchy will bring about some interesting effects. The upper levels of society, the better educated, are likely to be more adaptable to change and thus more progressive. The less well educated, the lower strata, will tend to be more rigid and conservative.

Education is becoming big business, and it is acquiring political power. In time it may even come to rival the military-industrial complex of which former President Eisenhower has spoken. The education complex will take its place in the power structure.

Education will bring about a new life for modern man. With a more highly educated labor force, jobs will have to be made more interesting—more varied and more responsible. Ways can be found to do this, even in the large organizations of today and tomorrow. Leisure pursuits will be more diverse, consumers' tastes and demands more varied, cultural life stimulated and enriched. In turn, education will come to be regarded less as an investment to make men serve society better, and more as a means to serve the individual in society.

Only time will tell whether today's prophecies are accurate. And I realize that education as one of the masters of man's fate may seem farfetched to some today; but I believe it will be commonplace to all tomorrow.

This increasingly crucial role for education, and particularly higher education, places the inauguration of a new university president in a most significant light. For the president is the leader of this important institution; and its health and vigor, its progress and the value of its contributions to society depend in large measure on how he exercises his leadership. Knowing this, the board of regents chose carefully and well when it chose the new president of the oldest university in the West. I congratulate them on their choice.

To you, Mr. President, on this day of your inauguration, we extend greetings and confident good wishes. The omens all appear eminently favorable: your own impressive achievements and experience; the present quality of this university, which can serve under your leadership as a springboard to even greater heights of excellence; the firm dedication of the people of Utah to the values of education.

We wish you success for your own satisfaction in a great service greatly performed; and, more, for the future welfare of the University of Utah; and, beyond all this, for the sake of a free society whose strength and progress depend so vitally upon this university and the other great institutions of learning throughout our Nation.

INAUGURATION OF JAMES C. FLETCHER
"THE NEXT 20 YEARS"

(Inaugural address by Dr. James C. Fletcher, November 6, 1964, Kingsbury Hall)

Customarily a new president at his inaugural discusses the plans and programs he wishes to undertake during his administration, but today I shall depart from that custom. I should like to speculate in a general way on the changes that are likely to occur at this institution over the next 20 years, although I know well enough that it is rash to do so.

First, however, I think we need to reflect on the spectacular changes which have occurred during the past 20 years, the period which coincides approximately with the tenure of my predecessor, Dr. A. Ray Olpin. As a new president, he was immediately faced with the problem created by the tremendous influx of veterans returning from the war, men who were anxious not only to obtain the kind of training necessary for adaptation to civilian life but also to seek in the liberal and humane areas of learning insights into the nature of man and society which would help them assimilate and come to terms with the universal tragedy of war. Dr. Olpin very capably capitalized on the increased enrollment to enlarge and enrich his faculty, but more specifically he created a graduate school and persuaded that amiable genius, Henry Eyring, to leave Princeton University and come here to preside over it. Over the years the graduate school has produced an ever-increasing number of highly qualified and well-educated men, who, in turn, have become prominent in the life of the State and the Nation. The influx of outstanding faculty has resulted in the professional growth of many individuals who have achieved nationwide recognition in the field of educational administration. Among these are O. Meredith Wilson, president of the University of Minnesota; James Roscoe Miller, president of Northwestern University; G. Homer Durham, president of Arizona State University; John T. Wahlquist, president of San Jose State College; Don A. Orton, president of Lesley College; James L. Jarrett, former president of Western Washington State College; Elmo R. Morgan, business vice president of the University of California; Sterling M. McMurrin, former U.S. Commissioner of Education, and many others.

It is said to contemplate the quality of some of the men who were developed here and who eventually left us. Yet it is unrealistic to assume that one can retain indefinitely all our men of genius, whether in science, administration, the fine arts, or humanities, for they are a notably restless group, and in this day at least, their abilities are always more than matched by their opportunities. But I think we have retained our fair share of them, and we are grateful for that.

During this period of growth at the University of Utah, there was also a growing nationwide awareness of the importance of higher education, and, after sputnik, there grew up a swift and intimate interdependence between the national need for scientific research on the one hand and the Nation's universities on the other. Dr. George B. Kistiakowsky's committee reported recently:

"The condition of mutual dependence between the Federal Government and institutions of higher learning and research is one of the most profound and significant developments of our time. It is abundantly clear that the fate of this Nation is now inextricably interwoven with the vigor and vitality of these institutions. In turn, the fate of these institutions is dependent upon the wisdom and enlightenment with which Federal funds are made available in support of their activities."

The University of Utah has done its share in contributing to the defense and welfare of the Nation, and in turn, as Dr. Kistiakowsky states, it has been profoundly affected in turn. Without the national program, the graduate school, particularly in science and medicine, could never have achieved its present stature, for approximately one third of the university's total annual income comes from the Federal Government. But this massive involvement of the Federal Government has also brought tremendous complications to the life of the university, with consequent difficulties for the administration.

In the last 20 years, then, the University of Utah has moved from a modest liberal arts college with two professional schools to one of the Nation's fine universities. This remarkable change is a tribute to all of the faculty, to the people of the State who financed the change, and especially to our president emeritus.

When we turn to the next 20 years and ask what the future holds, it is tempting simply to extrapolate the progress of the past into the future and say that we will continue on about the same line. Before we move to such a conclusion, however, it is important that we ask some basic questions:

Why is education important?

What should the University of Utah attempt to accomplish?

What can a university do for the State and for the Nation? I shall attempt to give some kind of answer to such questions.

Arnold Toynbee once said "It is up to our generation to keep the world going for the next 2,000 million years." I believe that he is right and that basically this is the function of education, specifically of higher education.

If we look back at mankind before the dawn of civilization, we cannot help asking what unique thing about him led to his differentiation from other species, what enabled him to gain superiority over other animals, to develop a highly sophisticated civilization, and even to gain some degree of control over his environment. Commonly it is said that the unique thing about man is a highy developed brain. But this answer has at least two deficiencies. One is that man coexisted with many other animals, not as an inferior being, perhaps, but certainly not as a superior being either. He existed in this manner for thousands of years before emerging as part of a developed civilization. A second difficulty in attributing man's superiority only to his brain lies in the fact that, according to modern evidence, there are several animals with a brain apparently as large and sophisticated as man's; in particular, the dolphins appear to have such a brain.

Some thinkers, especially engineers, have thought that the principal difference between man and dolphin is not the brain, but rather the prehensile hand of the human, "which allows him to develop artifacts and later tools and still later machines which can greatly amplify his own efforts." I personally believe that this aptitude did contribute to man's superiority; but I feel that there are even more important reasons for man's ultimate ascendance, one of which is his highly developed form of communication, the most sophisticated form known to us. In addition, man undergoes a very long period of childhood, which, until recently at least, was spent primarily with the parents. Thus the parents were able to pass on to the offspring their own experience and some of the experience of the race itself.

Perhaps it was the accumulation of this experience that led to the first signs of civilization after many thousands of years of prehistoric man. The real beginnings of civilization were marked by specialization among the classes of men—the priests or teachers, the kings, and the slaves. The slaves produced enough excess capital to provide for the other two classes, a fine arrangement provided you were not a slave; and the teachers were able to accumulate knowledge and pass it on to their own class. Later a form of writing developed, which was initially nothing more than a form of recordkeeping, particularly for mundane business transactions. But writing in turn developed a much broader class of learning, which produced the civilization of ancient Greece. In that civilization the epics of Homer and the tragedies of Sophocles testified that man had at last found a voice suited to express the subtlest nuances of his mind and spirit, to explore the mysteries of our existence, and to sing of our pain and our hope.

Two thousand years later came the printing press, the next great advance in human communications, and the press enabled the experience of others to be transmitted almost immediately to vast numbers of people. Learning then began to spread and flower, and it continues to do so. Perhaps the most significant recent innovation in man's communication with man occurred in this country, when the idea of public education was developed and amplified. In theory at least this education enabled nearly everyone to have access to the total accumulated experience of the generations which preceded him. Even more recently the idea of a public higher education has been developed, and today our colleges and universities carry the principal burden of transmitting higher forms of experience and knowledge to the next generation.

President Johnson, addressing the presidents of State universities at a recent White House conference, said:

"You have educated more than 50 percent of all living American Nobel Prize winners, and whether you are proud of it or not, you have trained 60 percent of our Senators and 44 percent of our Congressmen and 29 of our 50 Governors. You have educated the heads of A.T. & T. and General Motors. One of them spends $15 billion a year, the president of General Motors told me the other day, and the other one spends $10 billion a year as head of A.T. & T. You have also educated the heads of General Electric, Prudential Life, United States Steel, Gulf Oil, RCA, CBS, American Airlines, and five of the seven original Mercury astronauts. Your graduates discovered streptomycin and the blue-baby operation."

I think it is obvious that our current form of civilization, at least in this country, can be equated directly with education and more specifically with public education. And I think what Toynbee meant when he said that it was up to us to keep the world going for the next 2,000 million years is that we must do so in this generation by insuring that every qualified individual receives the maximum education we can afford.

The idea that public education in this country is our greatest strength has been put in even stronger terms by Mr. Walter Carey, president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, who said, "If the United States doesn't face up to a crisis in education brought on by its expanding technology, it cannot long remain the strongest, most prosperous, and advanced nation on earth."

Facing this crisis is a serious challenge to our entire generation, but more specifically to the president of any State university. A part of a president's responsibility in meeting this challenge is to attempt to establish goals and set a tone that will enable the interests and views of the faculty and community to coalesce. In order to do this, we must be clear about the responsibilities a university administration faces.

First and foremost of these is our responsibility to our students. About that there can be no question. And although I am aware of the oversimplification, I think that our basic responsibility is to prepare the student for a self-reliant life. Perhaps the most important aspect of this self-reliance is that he acquire the training that will give him a decent livelihood. At the same time we cannot neglect the broader issues, such as his ability to learn to live with other people and to feel some responsibility for preserving our human values for future generations. If he is to understand human values we must direct his thoughts away from a total concern with himself and his immediate environment to other times, other peoples, and other places in order that he may see more objectively than would otherwise be possible the failures and achievements in society and in human conduct. The role of the teacher in the university must be to create humane and enlightened men and women who are capable of carrying the burdens of democracy, who can find fulfillment in their own lives, and who can assist other people in the dangerous but meaningful struggle of humanity as it seeks to fulfill its great potential.

The administration of the university also has a responsibility to the Nation as a whole. We must do our share in strengthening the Nation in its military, economic, and especially in its civic life. This is very clearly a matter of national interest, and if the States do not assume the burdens of higher education, the Nation will very likely take unilateral measures to protect its vital interests. A Nation's security today depends on its posture at the frontier of knowledge, just as surely as nations once relied for security on troops at the border. Unilateral measures would undoubtedly tend to move the control of education away from the local community, and that, I think we would all agree, would be undesirable.

Finally, the university administration has a direct responsibility to the community which supports it. We have an obligation to give direct and significant assistance to the cultural and economic life of the State. We can do this partly by sustaining an institution and providing courses of study that bear a reasonable relationship to our community and partly by creating new knowledge through study and research which can be transmitted to the community in terms that it can understand and use, whether it be economic data, new technology, or some new art forms. If the university administration cannot carry out this part of its responsibility, it is not reasonable to expect that the community will continue to support the university in its attempt to meet its responsibility to the individual student and to the Nation.

Now that we have delineated the responsibilities, I think it is easy to agree on the goals which relate to these responsibilities—goals which are, I believe, compatible with the desires of the faculty and the community.

1. While continuing to participate fully in the research programs of the Nation, the university must also provide more direct help to the State of Utah. The university must not only provide information and assistance to the State when asked but must also try to set forth clearly to the various State officials the nature of the assistance that is available.

2. The university must provide the youth of the State and other potentially outstanding students with an education equivalent to the best in the Nation. This education should be superior in all aspects and should give the graduating student both the training and the reputation he will need in order to enter any field of endeavor.

3. The university must attain sufficient national stature to persuade the Federal Government to give it responsibility for major new programs, contracts, and other special undertakings. These new programs will enhance its reputation, contribute to its growth, and discharge its duties to the Nation.

It is a simple matter to say that these goals represent mutual goals of citizens, students, and faculty, but it is more difficult to determine whether they are actually attainable given the environment in which the university finds itself and the time in which we live. This environment can first be characterized by a continued rapid growth in population but also because of an increasing need for advanced education in our society. As Prof. L. B. Mayhew, of Stanford University, has said:

"Education will eventually be considered as enterprise replacing work as a means by which people will assign meaning to their lives. Education is coming to be an industry which requires many people to produce and many people to consume. In this regard, education will take the place of war, the production of automobiles, or the settling of the frontier, which, in the past, have kept people busy."

Along with the continued growth of enrollment at the university, there will be a continuation of the current trend toward increased Federal support, particularly in research and development, but possibly also in other areas which involve the Nation's defense a little less directly. This continued growth has its dangers as well as its advantages as we seek to carry out our goals.

On the good side, it is likely that the Federal Government will attempt to broaden the base of its support not only for science but also for higher education in general. In the recent past there has been a deliberate attempt on the part of the National Institutes of Health to encourage research at institutions other than those on the east coast, in the Middle West, or in California. The reason for this attempt is that there has been a concentration of Federal dollars in the univerities of highest excellence. Such a concentration was natural; results were wanted, and results were most likely to be obtained in institutions of proven capability. However, this policy had the effect of making the rich richer and the poor poorer, and the base on which nationally supported research could be done was dangerously narrowed. Now the National Science Foundation has joined the National Institutes of Health in a policy which will attempt to establish new centers of scientific excellence throughout the country. This policy may reduce the value received from the research dollar initially, but in the long run it will make for a much stronger national effort. Utah and other smaller States certainly should benefit from this new policy.

Another discernible trend in our present university environment applies specifically to the University of Utah. Utah has strong cultural traditions supportive of education. The State usually leads the entire Nation in percentage of personal income spent on education. Further, Utah has already achieved national recognition, in scientific disciplines at least, in that it now produces more outstanding scientists per capita than any State in the Nation, according to the listings in American Men of Science. Furthermore, even though our graduate school is less than 20 years old, we rank 33d among the universities of the Nation in production of Ph. D.'s in the field of science and 18th among State universities. A third important consideration is that Utah's birthrate is the highest in the Nation, therefore, its percentage of college-age students per capita is also highest in the Nation.

Thus I think it is apparent that growth of the University of Utah may exceed, in relative terms, that of other comparable institutions. A period of growth offers opportunity for adding strength to the faculty, upgrading the quality of instruction, and securing new buildings and other resources. As we add to our faculty, it is well to remember that, at present, the salary differential between a man of national reputation and one with a more modest reputation may be no greater than 20 percent. Therefore it is possible, without undue economic strain, to bring superior faculty members into a growing institution, provided, of course, that we can create an academic climate here at the university which highly qualified faculty members will find compatible.

The environmental factors I have been talking about so far all seem favorable ones, but we cannot ignore some other factors that may offer difficulties. In the first place, there will likely be increasing pressures of various kinds from all of the groups which look to the university. Undoubtedly the Federal Government will continue to emphasize research, sometimes at the expense of teaching and all other areas of academic endeavor. The science faculty will tend to side with the Federal Government, and they may continue the present trend of being more concerned with Washington than with their own university. This is a source of constantly increasing danger; and many recent reports, such as those by Killian and Kistiakowsky, recognizing this danger, place the entire responsibility for maintaining control and academic balance on the university administration itself. I strongly feel, however, that the Federal Government must now also begin to exercise restraint and to assist the university administrations in maintaining reasonable relationships and harmony among the sciences and the other disciplines.

There will likely be increasing pressures from the students of the State for an institution with a curriculum oriented more and more in the direction of vocational education and an increasing desire to omit the liberal and humane studies. There will be pressures from the State to educate everyone, regardless of academic qualifications, and such pressures could severely limit the chances of creating a climate of academic excellence. Obviously, the administration must counter all of these pressures or modify them in an attempt to strike a balance, a precarious balance to be sure, for it will shift continually with the changing times.

In addition to the problem of adverse environmental factors there is also the problem and the danger that rapid expansion of an institution may lead to mediocrity in the quality of instruction and staff. The university must continually seek and discover techniques of improving itself during such a period.

A third and perhaps most important problem at the University of Utah is the fact that we are part of a developing community. There is great demand from all sides for the resources of the State, and those resources will never be abundant. This condition requires that we be scrupulous in our handling and cautious in our expenditure of State funds; the State must receive, and it must feel that it receives, adequate compensation for funds expended. During the years that I have been involved in the expenditure of public funds, I have been continually impressed by a statement attributed to Thomas Paine:

"Public money ought to be touched with the most scrupulous conscientiousness of honor. It is not the product of riches only, but of the hard earnings of labor and poverty. It is drawn even from the bitterness of want and misery. Not a beggar passes or perishes in the streets whose mite is not in that mass."

It is interesting to speculate on what would happen if every university in the country established goals similar to the ones I have outlined. Obviously not all of them could succeed completely, not all could be best in the Nation. Even so, it might be the greatest and most significant program that we could undertake; certainly nothing could do more to enhance the national welfare.

In closing, I would like to make a plea to those groups which do exert pressure on the State university: to the Federal Government to exercise self-restraint and control in dealing with the faculties of our institutions; to the State to decide on a realistic financial program and a wise assignment of roles for higher education, and, after calculating costs, to make a plan and implement it; to the faculty members not to subordinate the interests of their students to their own individual programs of research, important as the latter may be. We must continually respond to our responsibilities to the State which supports us, to the institution whose character is ultimately shaped and determined by our efforts, and to the students who are the most important part of the University, but not the whole, to exercise their privileges and freedom responsibly, for it is they who validate ultimately the worth of the university.

If we can reach out toward the goals I have described, the faculty will benefit as individuals, the Nation will become stronger, the State's economic and cultural life will be enriched, and, most important, our young men and women will be successfully prepared to live in the world of tomorrow and to prepare successive generations for the next 2,000 million years.

SENATOR SCOTT URGES U.S. AID BE HALTED TO UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC, OTHER ANTI-AMERICAN GOVERNMENTS

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, in his state of the Union message to Congress last Monday, President Johnson said:

> We are prepared to live as good neighbors with all, but we cannot be indifferent to acts designed to injure our interest, or our citizens, or our establishments abroad. The community of nations requires mutual respect. We shall extend it—and we shall expect it.

I applaud that statement and now look forward to its implementation by the executive branch of our Government. Within recent weeks we have witnessed an outbreak of anti-American activity in the United Arab Republic, in Algeria, and in other nations.

American installations have been destroyed in these countries, and there has been flagrant disrespect for the American Government and the American people. More serious, these governments have given aggressive assistance to rebel forces opposing the legally constituted government in the Congo. These governments have fought against U.S. interests and they have characterized our policies as aggression.

The U.S. Government has for too long condoned the irresponsibility of these governments and has assisted them despite their hostile words and hostile posture. But it is one thing to condone; it is quite another to assist. In my judgment the time has come to suspend further assistance to governments which misuse our aid programs in order to weaken the United States. I hope that the President will now serve notice on other governments which receive our assistance that we cannot continue to furnish aid to those governments whose policies attempt to humiliate and undermine American policy, prestige, and power.

We seek peace everywhere, and the major test in the distribution of our assistance must be that such aid furthers and strengthens the cause of peace.

SEGREGATION IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, when the U.S. Supreme Court, for the first time in 86 years, found authority in the 14th amendment in 1954 to legislate on the subject of segregation in public schools, it started one of the most disturbing trends in government in our national history.

Last year, numerous other Senators and I were frustrated in our efforts to put even a temporary curb upon the outrageous invasion of States rights by the Supreme Court in the State redistricting cases. This week, I therefore joined with the distinguished minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN] in proposing a constitutional amendment which would prohibit the Supreme Court from usurping the proper legislative functions of the States, at least with respect to the districting of their Senatorial districts.

On yesterday, the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] introduced a bill to require a minimum of 5 years of judicial experience for elevation to the U.S. Supreme Court.

In 1956, when President Eisenhower sent to the Senate for confirmation the name of a distinguished Baltimore lawyer, Simon E. Sobeloff, who had had no previous judicial experience, I stated, in voting against Mr. Sobeloff, that never again would I vote for any member of any appellate court who had had no previous judicial training and experience. Needless to say, therefore, I intend to support the Simpson bill.

In presenting his bill, Senator SIMPSON said that if a trial judge has erratic tendencies which would include the substitution of his own political and social philosophy for the Constitution, statutes made pursuant thereto, and established precedents, Members of the Senate in exercising their constitutional right to consent to the confirmation of a Supreme Court Judge should have before them the record of such a judge as discussed by appellate courts. I attempted to develop that same theme in speaking against the confirmation of Mr. Sobeloff, pointing out that he had expressed the personal philosophy that it was the proper function of an appellate court to usurp policymaking functions which properly belonged to the Congress, and I said his confirmation would be the first opportunity of the Senate to go on record against that policy. The Senate did not go on record against that policy and now nearly a decade later when the Supreme Court has exercised that unconstitutional right, time after time, we are seeking the help of a constitutional amendment on just one issue. That, in all likelihood, will likewise be defeated by the so-called liberals who approve of the exercise of legislative power by the courts when it is in keeping with their personal views on the subject.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the statement I made on July 16, 1956, on the subject.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESERVATION OF CONSTITUTIONAL PRINCIPLES

(Speech of Hon. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, of Virginia, in the Senate of the United States, Monday, July 16, 1956)

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I do not know Mr. Simon E. Sobeloff personally and, therefore, the objections I have to his confirmation as a judge of the U.S. Circuit Court for the Fourth Circuit are necessarily on other than personal grounds. However, I am compelled to oppose him for three reasons which involve questions of principle which I cannot ignore.

In the first place, I am opposed to Mr. Sobeloff being made a judge of the Federal circuit which includes the States of Virginia and North and South Carolina because I feel his appointment is an affront to these States and that his selection represents an effort to woo certain political pressure groups in other parts of the Nation by an action which is offensive to a majority of the people in the region he will serve.

In the second place, I am opposed to the confirmation of this nomination because lack of understanding on the one hand and lack of confidence on the other between Mr. Sobeloff and the people within his jurisdiction would make his service as a circuit judge unsatisfactory and ineffective.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I will yield for this interruption, but after that I prefer to complete my statement, and then I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Is it not true that 6 of the 10 Senators representing States in the district signed a petition?

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is absolutely true. They signed a petition setting forth that the nominee was obnoxious to the people of their States and therefore obnoxious to them.

In the third place, I am opposed to confirmation because to approve this nomination would be to give implied consent to a theory of government which I consider contrary to a fundamental principle of our Republic. I am referring to the theory, which I feel already has gained too much headway, that a proper function of the Federal courts is to serve as policymaking bodies, which means constricting the powers of the legislative branch of the Government and nullifying the rights reserved by our Constitution to the States and to the people.

I shall stress particularly the third of my objections, not only because I personally consider it more important, but because it has broader significance for the people of our whole Nation. To do an injury to the people of one State or of several States may not directly harm the people of the other States, although the fact that such a thing is done should serve as warning that it might be done again with different victims. But, when damage is done to the foundations of our constitutional Government, there is immediate peril which should be recognized by all, because, as Daniel Webster said:

"Other misfortunes may be borne, or their effects overcome. If disastrous war should sweep our commerce from the ocean, another generation may renew it; if it exhaust our treasury, future industry may replenish it; if it desolate and lay waste our fields, still, under a new cultivation, they will grow green again, and ripen to future harvests. It were but a trifle even if the walls of yonder Capitol were to crumble, if its lofty pillars should fall, and its gorgeous decorations be all covered by the dust of the valley. All these might be rebuilt. But who shall reconstruct the fabric of demolished government? Who shall rear again the well-proportioned columns of constitutional liberty? Who shall frame together the skillful architecture which unites national sovereignty with State rights, individual security, and public prosperity? No, if these columns fall, they will be raised not again. Like the Coliseum and the Parthenon, they will be destined to a mournful, a melancholy immortality. Bitterer tears, however, will flow over them, than were ever shed over the monuments of Roman or Grecian art; for they will be remnants of a more glorious edifice than Greece or Rome ever saw, the edifice of constitutional American liberty."

I have said that my objections to Mr. Sobeloff as a Federal circuit judge serving my own State are not personal but, in a broad sense, the objections of the people of Virginia—and I believe also the people of the Carolinas—to him are similar to those which have been made to other nominees for office which have been rejected in the past on the ground that they were "personally obnoxious" to Members of this body.

Those of you who have served here when such cases were considered do no need to be told that classing a nominee as "personally obnoxious" does not mean that the objector would refuse to shake hands with him or to greet him politely, or even that the objector denies that the nominee has ability and possibly many admirable qualities. What it does mean is that the objector would find it obnoxious to have that particular individual in the particular spot in which it is proposed to place him. And that feeling has been generally respected and supported by the Senate.

By way of illustration, I might mention the case of Judge Floyd H. Roberts, of Virginia, who was nominated as judge of the western Federal district of Virginia and rejected by the Senate in 1939 by a vote of 72 to 9 after my predecessor, Carter Glass, had made known his objections to the confirmation.

In that action the Senate did not merely humor the whim of a distinguished Member of this body. It recognized that an action had been taken by the head of the executive branch of the Government obviously to lower the prestige of Members of the Senate who opposed the President's theories, and that the purpose was to discourage such independence in the future.

Former Senator Thomas, of Utah, made this clear when he told the Senate following the rejection of the nomination of Judge Roberts that the question had been decided, "not on the basis of senatorial courtesy, whatever that is, but on the basis of a constitutional right and a constitutional duty."

The distinguished Senator from Utah said:

"A Senator of the United States has as much right to expect respect for his position as a representative of a sovereign State as has the President to expect respect for his."

I hasten to say that I do not mean to imply that the nomination of Mr. Sobeloff is entirely comparable with that of Judge Roberts. In the present instance the court involved serves more than one State, and there is no evidence that in picking the nominee the President intended to embarrass or to put pressure on the Senators from those States. My contention is simply that in taking this action the President was badly advised by his Attorney General, who in addition to being his legal adviser is the chief architect of his party's plan to win this year's election, and who has been under pressure from the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. My hope is that if we can make a record here, showing why Mr. Sobeloff should not have been chosen, and if the Senate in acting on the nomination will show the respect which has been accorded in the past for the sentiment of States which a Presidential appointee will serve, the President will recognize his error and will send to us the name of someone better suited to this particular position.

Because of my high personal regard for the President of the United States, as an individual, as well as because of the position he holds, I cannot believe he will persist in forcing upon my State a presiding judge whom the people believe, whether rightly or wrongly, will be given the punitive assignment of whipping them into line with his own views on social problems.

The Supreme Court has said that we must change some major aspects of our southern way of life. Many of us in the South feel not only that such changes, suddenly made, would be harmful even to those the decisions were designed to benefit, but we also are convinced that the Court erred constitutionally in making those decisions, which overturned all previous decisions of the Court along the same lines. We believe in our right, as free Americans, to use every legal means at our disposal to combat those decisions in the hope that eventually the Court and the people of the Nation will see the justice of our cause. While we are doing this we want the privilege of presenting our arguments to district and to circuit court judges who are not irrevocably committed to a hostile viewpoint.

We have felt the influence of pressure groups, well heeled financially, who have threatened political reprisals unless the southern "rebels" are brought quickly into line, by use of force if necessary. And many who are aware of this cannot see the selection of Mr. Sobeloff for this particular post at this particular time as anything except a political gesture on the eve of a national political campaign.

My record in bipartisan support of the President on issues where we have agreed in principles is well known. It has at times been a subject for criticism by some citizens of my State. I feel, therefore, that I can speak as a friend and not as a political opportunist in pointing out the unfavorable interpretation which has been placed upon this appointment and in urging the President to reconsider his choice in the light of the reaction from those people who are most deeply concerned.

Now, as to my second point of objection: Why is Mr. Sobeloff, an honorable man and a competent lawyer, personally objectionable to the people of my State as a judge of the fourth judicial circuit?

One of the Virginia witnesses who appeared against him at the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee's hearing on the nomination said members of the group he represented were unalterably opposed to confirmation because they were concerned about Mr. Sobeloff's stand on the matter of confrontation of witnesses, as illustrated particularly in the Dr. Peters case, and because they were concerned about the lengths to which he would go to further his ideas.

This witness referred also to Mr. Sobeloff's expressed philosophy of the function of the Supreme Court, which I shall discuss more explicitly later. He concluded his statement with the assertion:

"The relationship of the people to the courts is already strained, and it will be more so should Sobeloff be sent among us to preside over our pleadings."

Another Virginia witness at that hearing said members of his group opposed confirmation because they did not believe the nominee "is in a position to be impartial in the important cases involving integration which will necessarily come before this court." He pointed out that there are undecided issues involving school integration which are still to be decided by the courts and that Mr. Sobeloff already had committed himself on these not only as a Solicitor General, speaking for the United States when the school cases were before the Supreme Court, but also in his private utterances.

Still another witness, not from Virginia, but who expressed views similar to those which I have received in numerous letters from my State, said that legal and intellectual qualifications of a judicial appointee are by no means the only factors that should be considered. He said it would not be wise to impose on the Virgin Islanders or the people of any other territory a governor or a judge who was known in advance to be personally objectionable to them, and added: "The reasons that might underlie their opposition would be of little importance. The facts of their antagonism, and its intensity, are something which do merit and which we feel should merit your consideration. Surely the attitude of citizens of old and sovereign States should merit the attention and understanding that is at least equal to that which would be accorded to the likes and dislikes of the inhabitants of the Nation's most insignificant and outlying possession."

This witness said the nomination is regarded by the people he knows "as a sort of an insult and a provocation. Its approval will be like throwing fat into a fire. We feel that when so many other able men are available for this important position, that it would be an imposition and an error to grant power over our lives and fortunes to that individual who is most prominently associated in our minds with the attempt to overturn our way of life."

He added that at this tense moment in the affairs of the Nation, "it would be neither wise nor proper, we feel, to invest with the tremendous power of judicial review and decision any man who has acquired the reputation of a crusader, whether justly or not, upon one side of the very arguments over which he would be called upon most often to preside and to adjudge, and who is already the object of such bitter animosity as to preclude any public acceptance of his judgments as being fair and impartial."

Mr. President, we must be realistic about the point made by the witness from whom I have just quoted—that even if the prejudice which exists against this nominee did not have a solid foundation, the fact of the very existence of that prejudice would make it difficult if not impossible for him to function in this judicial role.

I know that at the subcommittee hearing in response to a question as to whether he would be absolutely fair in matters coming before him and would not be influenced by the opinions he had previously expressed Mr. Sobeloff said he felt that nothing he had done had disqualified him and that he could be fair and impartial.

The fact remains, however—as was stated from the bench during arguments before the

Supreme Court on the school segregation cases, and as is generally recognized—that cases involving racial integration are likely to constitute a large portion of the cases considered by Federal courts for the next generation.

The fact remains also that Mr. Sobeloff willingly, and apparently enthusiastically, entered into the argument of the school-segregation cases in opposition to the official position of the attorneys general representing Virginia and other Southern States. It may be said that as Solicitor General of the United States Mr. Sobeloff had no choice except to appear when it was decided that the Federal Government should intervene in these cases. The falsity of that claim is proved, however, by Mr. Sobeloff's action in the Peters case, when he declined, because of his personal views, to sign the brief or to appear for the Government against this alleged security risk.

The fact that Mr. Sobeloff does not hold the southern viewpoint on forced intregration of schoolchildren and that he officially represented the Federal Government in arguing that issue are less important, however, than the fact that in his argument to the Court he suggested that the Southern States be given only 90 days to comply with the Supreme Court's order.

Mr. Sobeloff explained to the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee that he did not suggest that the schools actually "effect desegregation in 90 days." His suggestion, he said, was "that the Court put a time limit requiring the school districts to say what they proposed. They should say 'when,' and then the district court could pass on that," he told the committee.

When I brought up this point in my testimony before the Judiciary Committee, it was suggested that Mr. Sobeloff's proposal to the Court was one of moderation, compared with harsher plans which others suggested and that the Court had followed his advice in taking a "medium" course between the two extremes.

Now, Mr. President, let us see exactly how "moderate" Mr. Sobeloff's proposal was. Here is what he actually said to the Supreme Court, as taken from the Court's official record:

"Mr. SOBELOFF. I think, Your Honor, that this Court ought to say to every district judge: Call for a plan within 90 days. Somebody here has said that 90 days is too short a time. I think a plan can be formulated in 90 days, especially after 11 months have already gone by since the decision. But I would say that if the plan cannot be formulated within 90 days, then the district judge, as a judge in equity, is applied to for further time, he ought to be permitted to give further time; but the burden ought to be on him who wants the delay to show that he needs it, that he is engaged in a good-faith effort to solve this problem, not that he is waiting for the day after tomorrow, the day after the expiration of the period; but that he is moving, and then when the plan is presented, there should be hearings and all these relevant considerations are to be addressed to the court, and they ought to deal with it as the facts would indicate; and he should require a bona fide beginning. * * *

"Mr. Justice Minton asked me, Would you put a deadline in at all," and I replied, 'I don't think I would put a deadline in the more complicated situations.'

"That answer is not clear. What I wanted to say is that I would not have the Supreme Court put in any deadline. I thought that the whole tenor of my argument yesterday was that there should be no opened orders by the district courts, that they should have deadlines but with freedom in proper cases on a proper showing of facts requiring further time to grant further time.

"Justice REED. You mean you would start with a deadline?

"Mr. SOBELOFF. I would start with a deadline first as to the requirement—we suggest 90 days for a plan to be submitted. * * *

"I don't think you ought to tie the hands of the district judge, but I think it would be useful to the district judge if you were able to say to the parties, I am required to require you to produce a plan within 90 days.

"See what you can do in the 90 days. If anybody comes before me and shows that there has been a good-faith attempt to produce the plan but cannot be done within the time limit, I will entertain an application for further time.

"There is the merit of requiring motion. That is also the saving grace of not tying people to a time limit that may prove in actuality unworkable."

In short, Mr. Sobeloff wanted the Court to demand that every district judge call for a desegregation plan within 90 days, putting the burden of proof on anyone who said he needed a longer time, and he felt it would be "useful" to the district judges if they could say to those who sought more time: "I am required to require you to produce a plan within 90 days."

As our colleague from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] pointed out to the Judiciary Committee, the Supreme Court required 86 years to discover the supposed constitutional requirement that schools must be integrated rather than merely equal, but Mr. Sobeloff felt that the local school boards should be able within 90 days to come into court and to say exactly what they expected to do about overturning the whole social patterns of their communities and then let the court tell them whether it liked their plan or if they must go back and try again.

Even the Justices of the Supreme Court, although they decided against the Southern States on the main issue, recognized the unreasonableness of Sobeloff's proposal for compliance and rejected it.

The strongest indictment I would make of Mr. Sobeloff in connection with his stand on the segregation issue as related to his future duties as a circuit judge is based on his own statements at the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee hearing.

Mr. Sobeloff was protesting that he had not advocated forcible enforcement of the Supreme Court's decree and said he had advocated "that there should be time given for the orderly accomplishment of what the Court said had to be done." Then, in giving assurance of his ability to handle future cases involving this subject in a fair manner, he said:

"I think the nature of the argument I made in this case shows that I am prepared to deal with consideration and understanding and moderation with the situations that may arise."

Now, Mr. President, my point is that a man who feels that he was being "moderate" when he suggested 90 days as an adequate time for the Southern States to renounce and abandon a social pattern which has existed since the founding of our Nation and who furthermore believes he was acting with "understanding" of the people and problems he was dealing with when he made that recommendation actually has shown such an insensitivity and such a lack of understanding that I consider him unqualified for the judgeship. And certainly a majority of the people of my State, on that ground alone, would consider him unqualified.

Concern for the dignity of the court over which he presides should lead any judge who has committed himself personally to the extent Mr. Sobeloff has on the racial integration issue to recuse himself in any case where that issue was involved. But that would mean, in Mr. Sobeloff's case, that he would stay out of so many cases that he would be of little help in carrying the burdens of the circuit. Furthermore, his failure to see any reason why he ought to recuse himself in these cases proves his unsuitability for the judgeship. This is the "blind spot" of an otherwise honorable man, to which I previously referred, and I believe it is important enough to disqualify him as a dispenser of justice in the fourth circuit.

When I appeared before the Senate Judiciary Committee in opposition to Mr. Sobeloff's nomination I was asked by the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] if I did not want a judge for the fourth circuit who was favorable to the southern viewpoint in the school segregation cases. I replied that nothing could be further from my mind. What we seek in Federal judges and what every Member of the Senate should seek is men of judicial temperament, fair and just who will decide all cases on their merits according to the law and the evidence.

Now, as to my third objection: I am concerned about the attitude of Mr. Sobeloff on the proper function of Federal courts not merely because of the influence that attitude would have on his conduct in office, but even more because I feel that deliberate confirmation of a man known to have such an attitude would be just one more precedent inimical to our constitutional system of government.

Here again, Mr. President, I am aware of the defense which the nominee offered in his own behalf when this point was raised at the committee hearing but Mr. Sobeloff's explanation of his previous public statements which had been criticized did not satisfy me, nor do I believe it satisfied any large number of those who share my concern over policymaking attempts by the courts.

On June 29, 1954, the month after the Supreme Court had handed down its school segregation decisions, Mr. Sobeloff spoke before the Judicial Conference of the Fourth Circuit, meeting at Hot Springs, Va., and said:

"In our system the Supreme Court is not merely the adjudicator of controversies, but in the process of adjudication it is in many instances the final formulator of national policy. It should therefore occasion no wonder, if the Court seeks the appropriate time to consider and decide important questions, just as Congress or any other policymaking body might. * * * In the decision of great constitutional questions, especially those which are in the realm of political controversy, timing can be of supreme importance."

When he was asked in the subcommittee hearing to comment on that statement Mr. Sobeloff said it was made before about 300 lawyers, mostly from the South, and that he heard no criticism of the speech. Parenthetically, Mr. President, I might say that I suspect Mr. Sobeloff took for agreement with his view what was no more than a demonstration of southern hospitality shown by members of the Judicial Conference to their invited guest speaker, because certainly I have heard criticism of and disagreement with his views freely expressed in many quarters ever since that speech was delivered.

Mr. Sobeloff, in the subcommittee hearing, went on to explain his views on the function of the courts by saying:

"The suggestion has been made that I was advocating some strange and heretical doctrine of law about the role of the Supreme Court in our system of government. I think what I said is as orthodox as any expression that has ever been made in the long legal history of this country. I was only saying what every judge and every lawyer knows. I was not advocating there any notion that courts have the right to set policy for the Nation over Congress. In fact, the very speech that is brought up contains a denial of that."

He then quoted from his speech a statement about the difficult dilemma facing courts which have an obligation "to respect the separation of powers, for the disregard of this principle would itself lead to tyranny." He quoted a statement about personalized judgments to meet particular cases being fruitful sources of future trouble and the conclusion of the speech in which he recognized his obligation as a lawyer for the Government and an officer of the court not to fall prey to his own fetishes but to be "obedient to the legislative policy laid down by others." This Mr. Sobeloff interpreted as giving recognition to the idea that "the legislative policy of the Nation is paramount, that Congress makes policy."

Despite his disclaimer, however, I would have Senators note that Mr. Sobeloff at Hot Springs did say that the Supreme Court is in many instances "the final formulator of national policy," and therefore it should consider questions of timing "just as Congress or any other policymaking body might." And in his statement before the Senate subcommittee he called this an "orthodox" expression of "what every judge and lawyer knows."

Then, when he was asked the direct question as to whether, if confirmed, he would undertake to elevate the Court to a policymaking branch of the Government, he rejected the opportunity to simply say he would not, but replied, instead:

"I would do what judges who are conscientious and who obey their oaths do; I would confine myself within the judicial sphere."

But, Mr. President, having said in so many words that every judge and lawyer knows that the Supreme Court is a policymaking body and in many instances the final formulator of national policy, he obviously left himself wide latitude when he said he would do what he believed other judges who are conscientious do.

At another point in his committee testimony, when his statement about the Court as the final formulator of national policy was reread to him, Mr. Sobeloff said:

"That is as true as the statement that 2 and 2 make 4."

Asked for a further interpretation of his language, Mr. Sobeloff said that when confronted with conflicting claims under State and National legislation, the Supreme Court tries "interpreting the national policy as laid down by Congress, to see what competing considerations of policy apply. If Congress has acted within its scope of authority of the Constitution, the Court has no function except to give force to that, to give effect to that congressional will."

He said that where Congress has exceeded its power, it is the duty of the Court to say so, as was asserted by John Marshall 150 years ago, and has been said periodically ever since.

With all of that, Mr. President, I have no quarrel; but Mr. Sobeloff went on to give illustrations of cases in which an issue is raised not covered in terms by any clause of the Constitution or by any act of Congress. These, he said, were perfect examples of where the Court, considering all the policies, declares what is the real meaning of the Constitution and the acts of Congress. Then he said he did not and would not say the Court has the right to substitute itself for Congress in declaring national policy.

At that point, Mr. President, we come to what seems to me to be either a contradiction or else evidence that Mr. Sobeloff holds views of the functions of the Court which I consider dangerous.

What he seems to be saying is that if Congress has explicitly preempted the field by declaring policy on a specific subject, the Court must respect that policy; but whenever the Court can find an area in which the Constitution is silent or indeterminate, and where Congress has not spoken in terms, it is the privilege of the Court to step in and make the policy.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I feel certain that the distinguished Senator from Virginia will agree that that statement, when it is boiled down and stripped of all its window dressing, is simply a declaration that a court in some instances has legislative power.

Mr. ROBERTSON. There can be no doubt about it. That is our major objection to this man, who, if his nomination shall be confirmed, will be a presiding judge of the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals, influencing all district courts and influencing the adjoining circuit courts by his belief in the policymaking powers of the courts, as I have just explained.

Mr. RUSSELL. Not only with respect to policymaking power, but he is really saying that the court has legislative power.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is what he means; because if the Constitution does not prohibit and if Congress has not spoken in terms, then, if the Court has some predelictions about social or economic views, it can write them into law and thereby become a legislator.

Mr. RUSSELL. We hear so much today about Congress surrendering its prerogatives as one of the coequal branches of the Government. The Founding Fathers thought that, if there were to be a predominant branch of the Government, it would be the legislative branch.

But when Congress, through the Senate, confirms the nomination to a high judicial position of a man who openly declares that the judicial branch has legislative power, Congress cannot expect anything else than to reduce its power and prestige in relation to the other branches of the Government and thereby bemeans itself in the public mind.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I could not agree more fully with my distinguished colleague, who is an able lawyer, from Georgia. I hope it will be possible for him to remain in the Chamber while I point out that this is the first time in recent years the Senate has had a clear-cut opportunity to go on record against a trend of the highest Court to become a legislation-making body.

As the Senator from Georgia said, if the Senate confirms the nomination of a man who holds those views, how can we afterward be heard to complain about legislation by the courts? How can we be certain that such legislating will stop on matters relating to school segregation, and will not apply to questions affecting the West or the North. When will we put a stop to an eroding process which will eventually undermine, as Daniel Webster said, the foundations of our American constitutional liberties, by its denial of the separation of powers as between the Federal Government and the States and the people thereof?

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senate shall confirm the nomination of a man who has announced publicly those views, I cannot see how we shall be doing other than putting ourselves in a position secondary to the judicial branch of the Government, and doing so deliberately and with our eyes open.

I may say, further, that to me this nomination is a very clear indication of how the Senate, in certain instances, becomes subservient to the political power of the executive branch of the Government.

I may say also, without the slightest fear that my statement can be contradicted, or that anyone will undertake to contradict it, because it is a fact which is known to everyone who has served here for any reasonable period of time, that if this nomination had been submitted to the Senate by either Franklin D. Roosevelt or Harry S. Truman, we would have found our brethren on the other side of the aisle assailing it with almost unanimous voice. They would have said, "Here is a New Deal judge who proclaims the power of the judiciary to legislate."

If that question had been raised, as it surely would have been, our friends on the other side of the aisle would have been joined by some Senators on this side of the aisle who still adhere to the Constitution of the United States and who still have respect for the prerogatives of the legislative branch of the Government. In that event, in my opinion, the nomination would have been withdrawn, or would never have been confirmed, in the administrations of either President Roosevelt or President Truman, if the nominee had publicly proclaimed and insisted upon the right and power of the judiciary to legislate. A change in party power and administrations often causes miraculous reversals in the public positions and constitutional opinions of Members of this body.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, when the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] asked me to yield, I said I preferred to proceed without yielding. He desired to ask me a brief question.

However, I could not refrain from yielding to my friend from Georgia, and I appreciate the very helpful suggestions he has made concerning the subject we are discussing.

But with all due deference to other Senators who might wish me to yield, I point out that I plan to have this speech reprinted and sent to the lawyers of my State. So, without making it too expensive, I wish to complete my statement; then I shall yield for as long as daylight remains for us to stay.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I apologize for my interruption. I did not hear the Senator make the statement. If I had, I would not have interrupted him.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I understand, but I am happy the Senator asked me to yield.

This attitude of Mr. Sobeloff was well illustrated by the school decisions in which the Court declared the policy to be forced integration although the 14th amendment, under which it purported to act, plainly says "The Congress shall have power to enforce by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article," and although the Congress which approved that amendment, at a time when there were segregated schools, and every subsequent Congress, well knowing that there were segregated schools, refused to legislate integration but indicated satisfaction with the "separate but equal" doctrine recognized by the Court.

Did it not occur to Mr. Sobeloff that there is an alternative to the Supreme Court making national policy on points not covered in terms by the Constitution and by congressional acts? Did he not recognize the possibility of the Court simply calling attention to these gaps and saying this is a field in which we will await determination through legislation or an amendment to the Constitution?

That admittedly would be a slower method of trying to obtain some of the changes sought by social reformers, but it would provide a needed safeguard to prevent our Constitution from being, as some of its early critics feared it might become, "all sail and no anchor."

In his testimony Mr. Sobeloff also referred to a speech he made at the Ninth National Conference on Citizenship meeting in Washington in September 1954, in which he repeated his Hot Springs statement before an audience including several Justices of the Supreme Court. Perhaps because by then he realized the need for limiting his previous statement he said in that speech that judges have no right to disregard the separation of powers, and said this was a principle of our Government which "needs to be continuously reaffirmed and revitalized."

Also during the hearing, when Mr. Sobeloff was asked if it would be his policy continuously in all cases brought before him to recognize the separation of powers in the Constitution of the United States, he replied:

"I certainly would. That would be my oath of office and that is entirely consistent with the philosophy of government that I have always had."

However, that pledge must be considered in the light of other testimony when Mr. Sobeloff was questioned about usurpation of power by the Supreme Court and said "I am opposed to usurpation," but quickly qualified that statement by saying "there is always argument about what is 'usurpation'" and "what is usurpation is a matter that requires very careful consideration."

Here again, as in his statement that he would do only what any conscientious judge would do, the candidate left himself quite uncommitted. He would not try to "usurp" powers as a judge, but we do not know exactly what he would regard as usurpation, except that he cannot see any conflict between separation of powers and a court which is "in many instances the final formulator of national policy."

This gives me concern, Mr. President, especially since, as Mr. Sobeloff himself remarked during the committee hearings, "increasingly the courts of appeals are the final deciders of questions, not the Supreme Court."

Before concluding, therefore, I want to recall a little background of a theory which is, I regret to say, and as Mr. Sobeloff pointed out, so widely held that he has no fear of being called a "heretic" when he espouses it.

Attempts by judges and courts to broaden their powers at the expense of other branches of the Government, and the concern that such efforts cause, are not new things.

Sir Winston Churchill, in his "History of the English Speaking People," for example, said the statutes of Edward I, "which settled questions of public order, assigned limits to the powers of the seignorial courts and restrained the sprawling and luxurious growth of judge-made law, laid down principles that remained fundamental to the law of property until the mid-19th century."

Concern over the role that courts would play in the United States was evidenced by discussion in the Federalist Papers and elsewhere, even before the Constitution was ratified, and an active struggle for an acceptable balance of power already was underway in Washington's administration.

Louis B. Boudin, in his "Government by Judiciary," has pointed out that the first Justices of our Supreme Court also did circuit duty and held district courts along with the district judges. It was the practices of these judges, Boudin said, "to make political harangues to the grand juries in giving them instructions for guidance in the deliberations and while this practice aroused opposition to the Federal courts the gravity of the situation consisted in the unwarranted assumption of power by the judiciary in constituting themselves lawmakers on a grand scale by the adoption of the English common law without any congressional action on the subject."

This writer also recalled that before John Marshall became Chief Justice, there were two theories of judicial control. One was that so-called eternal principles of "right and justice" were supposed to give the judiciary power to disregard legislation which was contrary to the courts' requirements, the judges, of course, being the ones to discover and apply this "higher law." The other theory was that claims for judicial control must be based on the written Constitution, which was declared to be a higher law. This theory disavowed any right of the judiciary to control legislation generally, and measured that control by the express provisions of the Constitution, which was the basis of power.

It was this latter theory which prevailed and found its classic expression in Marshall's famous opinion in Marbury against Madison. Marshall, who gave new prestige to the Court, and did more than any other man to establish its future trend, freely conceded that once the power of the legislature to legislate on a subject is admitted, there can be no further question as to the constitutionality of a law, and that the judiciary has no business to inquire into the wisdom or propriety of legislation.

Even the power to review, with the Constitution as a measure, which was claimed by Marshall, was unacceptable to Thomas Jefferson, who denounced Marshall's position as "despotism." Writing to Abigail Adams in 1804, and referring to the Marbury against Madison decision, Jefferson said:

"The opinion which gives to the judges the right to decide what laws are constitutional and what not, not only for themselves in their own sphere of action, but for the legislature and executive also, in their spheres, would make the judiciary a despotic branch."

Jefferson argued that each branch of the Government had an equal right to decide what is the meaning of the Constitution in cases submitted to its action, and that the Court which claimed exclusive right to make such decisions was assuming to itself power to alter the will of the people and was attempting to effect by stealth, through judicial interpretation, an undesirable concept of centralized government which extreme nationalists, such as Hamilton, had urged in vain at the Constitutional Convention in 1787.

It was Jefferson's contention that judges called upon to pass on the validity of National and State legislation would be plunged into the most heated controversies and that in those controversies they would be influenced by the same passions and prejudices which sway other men. They would decide like legislators, but, Jefferson complained, they would be exempt from the responsibility to the public, which controls other legislators.

After his retirement from the Presidency, Jefferson continued to express concern over the attitude of the judiciary. Writing to Thomas Ritchie in 1820, for example, he said:

"The judiciary of the United States is the subtle corps of sappers and miners constantly working underground to undermine the foundations of our confederated fabric. They are construing our Constitution from a coordination of a general and special government to a general and supreme one alone. This will lay all things at their feet, and they are too well versed in English law to forget the maxim, 'boni judicis est ampliare jurisdictionem' * * *. A judiciary independent of a king or executive alone is a good thing; but independence of the will of the Nation is a solecism, at least in a republican government."

And again in 1825 Jefferson, writing to Edward Livingston about judicial restraint, said:

"With no body of men is this restraint more wanting than with the judges of what is commonly called our General Government, but what I call our foreign department. They are practicing on the Constitution by inferences, analogies, and sophisms, as they would on an ordinary law. They do not seem aware that it is not even a Constitution, formed by a single authority, and subject to a single superintendence and control; but that it is a compact of many independent powers, every single one of which claims an equal right to understand it, and to require its observance."

Jefferson added, in this letter, that the judiciary, first considered the most harmless and helpless of the organs of Government, "has proved that the power of declaring what the law is, ad libitum, by sapping and mining, slyly and without alarm, the foundations of the Constitution can do what open force would not dare to attempt."

I know, Mr. President, that we have come a long way in our conceptions of the Federal Government since Jefferson's day, and I do not pretend that we could go back and accept in toto his ideas about the rights of each branch of the Government and of each State to be its own interpreter of the Constitution.

On the other hand, the tendency toward abuse of judicial power against which Jefferson spoke continued after his day, and its danger was clearly recognized by Woodrow Wilson, whom I consider our greatest political philosopher since Jefferson.

In a lecture on "Government Under the Constitution" Wilson said:

"Laws can have no other life than that which is given them by the men who administer and the men who obey them."

He said our Constitution has an advantage over the basic laws of other countries in that it is "perfectly definite" and "is preserved by very formidable difficulties of amendment against inconsiderate change," but he added: "It is not in having such a Constitution but in obeying it that our advantage lies."

Continuing, Wilson said:

"This legal conscience manifestly constitutes the only guarantee, for example, of the division of powers between the State and Federal Governments, that chief arrangement of our constitutional system. The integrity of the powers possessed by the States has from the first depended solely upon the conservatism of the Federal courts. State functions have certainly not decayed; but they have preserved, not by virtue of any forces of self-defense of their own, but because the National Government has been vouchsafed the grace of self-restraint."

Wilson said further that there is "no balance between the State and Federal Governments, but only the safeguard of a customary 'constitutional morality' on the part of the Federal courts."

It is on behalf of the cause of judicial self-restraint that I am speaking today, and I am concerned about the influence of our action if we confirm without at least a word of warning a Federal judge who has said that the statement that the Supreme Court should be the "final formulator of national policy" is "as true as the statement that 2 and 2 make 4."

Going back once more to our earlier experiences with politically minded judges, we find that James Madison, the father of our Constitution, said in a letter to Edward Everette in 1830:

"It is perfectly consistent with the concession of this power to the Supreme Court * * * to maintain that the power has not always been rightly exercised. To say nothing of that period, happily a short one, when judges in their seats did not abstain from intemperate and party harangues, equally at variance with their duty and their dignity, there have been occasional decisions from the bench which have incurred serious and extensive disapprobation."

The significant point for us, I believe, about the protests of Jefferson, Madison, and others against the direction in which they felt John Marshall was leading the Supreme Court, is that they had an effect. Marshall asserted in his Marbury against Madison decision, in 1803, the right of the Court to strike down an act of Congress; but as a practical matter the Court did not attempt to exercise that privilege again for more than 50 years. And when, in 1857, the Dred Scott decision negated another act of Congress, it created a new backwash of opposition to the Court which once more checked the Court's expansive urge.

As Boudin and others have pointed out, Marshall, in the 32 years he remained the head of the Court after his 1803 decision, never again attempted to declare an act of Congress unconstitutional; and his most brilliant opinions, on which his fame as a jurist and statesman must rest, were those in which acts of Congress were upheld and its legislative competence asserted and maintained.

An indication that the present Supreme Court can not and does not rely on the philosophy of John Marshall for some of its decisions may be seen in the address given by a member of the Court last September at exercises observing the bicentennial of Marshall's birth. Mr. Justice Frankfurter said in that speech that Marshall was the "chief architect" of a "new body of jurisprudence" by which "judges are entrusted with a solemn and hitherto unheard of authority and duty"; but he added that if Marshall could listen to this conference at Harvard University on government under law, "nothing would be bound to strike him more than the enlarged scope of law since his day."

Justice Frankfurter said:

"Marshall would be amazed by the interpretation of law in government because during his whole era he was concerned with the Constitution as an instrument predominately regulating the machinery of government, and more particularly distributing powers between the Central Government and the States. The Constitution was not thought of as the repository of the supreme law limiting all government, with a court wielding the deepest cutting power of deciding whether there is any authority in government at all to do what is sought to be done."

In that address, Mr. President, which I must confess I found much sounder than some of the opinions in which he has concurred, this member of the Supreme Court referred to judicial review as "a deliberate check upon democracy through an organ of government not subject to democratic control." He said also that certain provisions of the Constitution, such as the due process and equality of laws phrases, "are defined neither by history nor in terms"; and that while their lack of a fixed technical meaning is their strength, "that is also their dubious appropriateness for judicial enforcement. Dubious because their vagueness readily lends itself to make of the Court a third chamber with drastic veto power. This danger has been pointed out by our greatest judges too often to be dismissed as a bogey."

Mr. President, I would recommend caution as to use of parts of the Constitution not defined "in terms" to the candidate for judicial office who has said that the Court should declare "what is the real meaning of the Constitution and the acts of Congress," when there is nothing in any clause of the Constitution and nothing in any act of Congress "which deals with that in terms."

I would further commend to him Mr. Justice Frankfurter's statement that "If judges want to be preachers, they should dedicate themselves to the pulpit; if judges want to be primary shapers of policy, the legislature is their place."

But, to continue, briefly, our historical review of the Supreme Court as a policymaking body: As I have said, following Marshall's 1803 decision, the Court did not attempt to overthrow another act of Congress until the Dred Scott decision of 1857; and of that decision Boudin, in his book "Government by Judiciary," said:

"Chief Justice Taney and a majority of his associates decided that the moment was opportune for the Supreme Court's taking a hand in the disturbed condition of the country, unsettled as it has become by the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, and they attempted to establish by judicial decision that 'peace and harmony' which Congress could not establish by legislation.

"That this change of mind on the part of the majority of the Court was actuated by purely political considerations, and had nothing to do with the requirements of the case, is shown by the opinions of the judges as actually delivered, and is now fully proven as a matter of historic fact; although it was for a long time denied by the Court as well as by its defenders. It is a minor point in this chain of proof, but significant of the purpose of the decision, that it was communicated to President-elect Buchanan in advance of its official announcement, contrary to the proprieties, so as to enable Mr. Buchanan to foreshadow the happy solution of the problem and the restoration of 'peace and harmony' to the country in his inaugural addresss delivered on March 4, 1857, a memorable day in the judicial annals of this country."

Mr. President, that example from history illustrates why some of us are alarmed when we hear Mr. Sobeloff talk about the importance of the Supreme Court's "timing" its decisions with other considerations in mind than settlement of the case before it. How often, we wonder, might the "timing" be determined by political considerations?

The timing of the Dred Scott decision, as I need hardly remind you, turned out to be a poor choice from the Court's standpoint, because Wisconsin and other States openly defied the Court, which was unable to make its decision effective up to the start of war sparked by the issue. In his inaugural address of 1861 Abraham Lincoln rebuked the Court by saying:

"If the policy of the Government, upon vital questions affecting the whole people, is to be irrevocably fixed by the decisions of the Supreme Court the instant they are made, in ordinary litigation between parties in personal actions, the people will have ceased to be their own rulers, having to that extent practically resigned the Government into the hands of that eminent tribunal."

Incidentally, those who now regard the Supreme Court as the primary guardian of the colored people, should not forget that the same tribunal was on the opposite side when it decided the Dred Scott case; and before trusting their fate too completely to the opinions of any nine men, they might also consider the actions of the Court in the post-Civil War period.

Discussing this period Boudin said:

"A careful study of the judicial history of the 14th amendment leads to the conclusion that the entire purpose of the majority of the Supreme Court when they 'caved in' in the Slaughter-House cases, was to give the 14th amendment an interpretation which would nullify the primary effect and purpose—protection of Negro civil rights. And once that object was obtained the Court receded from its position—gradually, under various covers and in various disguises * * * thus giving the 14th amendment, in the end, a much broader scope than had ever been intended by the people who adopted it."

This writer also said that—

"The subject of Negro rights constitutes the most disgraceful chapter in the judicial history of this country; and this quite apart from the Dred Scott case."

He said the first cases, narrowly interpreting the 14th amendment "meant the sacrifice of Negro rights, and incidentally of the Constitution, as a peace offering from the North to the South."

And on this same point Dean Alfange in "The Supreme Court and the National Will," said:

"The Court's decision (in the Slaughter-House cases) was probably dictated by its determination so to interpret the 14th amendment as to halt the rapid postwar progress of nationalism and, incidentally, to reaffirm its independence after a long period of acquiescence in presidential and congressional dictatorship."

Later in his book Alfange said:

"A different and much more pronounced manifestation of political-mindedness was the adoption of the rule of reason in interpreting the Sherman Antitrust Act. This was undeniably a direct incursion of the Supreme Court into the legislative field, the more flagrant because it not only reversed previous decisions but limited the scope of the act after express refusal of Congress to amend it in the same restrictive sense."

Fred V. Cahill, in his "Judicial Legislation," has pointed out that whereas up to 1860 the Supreme Court found only 4 Federal statutes unconstitutional, there were 15 such declarations between 1860 and 1937 and along with increasing willingness of the courts to impose judicial veto on congressional acts there was a broadening of judicial control over State legislation. He said interpretation of "due process of law" was found "ideally suited to permit the entrance of extraconstitutional notions into constitutional interpretation" and that other sections of the 14th amendment also were expanded in meaning "at the expense of the police power of the States," not merely where personal rights were concerned but also for the benefit of economic interests seeking to escape State regulation.

The course taken by the Supreme Court in its 20th-century march to greater power has been interestingly outlined by Dr. Alpheus Thomas Mason, of Princeton University, in a series of lectures he gave at Boston University in 1953 titled "The Supreme Court: Vehicle of Revealed Truth or Power Group."

Dr. Mason said rising complaints that the Justices "blithely usurped power and flagrantly misused it" had brought by 1912 not only demand for the popular recall of judges but even demands for radical amendment of the Constitution or its abolition. He recalled that in 1916 when President Wilson nominated Louis D. Brandeis to the Supreme Court his nomination was opposed by those who regarded the Court as "an invincible fortress protecting vested interests and who felt Brandeis' confirmation would make every citizen feel insecure. By 1930, however, Dr. Mason said "the shoe was on the other foot" when President Hoover nominated Charles Evans Hughes for the Court and opponents attacked him as "a representative of corporate wealth" and insisted his public attitude and views on economic questions must be considered along with his legal ability.

Mason recalled that during the debate on Hughes' confirmation my predecessor in the Senate, Carter Glass, said:

"The Supreme Court in recent years has gone far afield from its original function and has constituted itself a court in economics and in the determination of social questions rather than in the interpretation of statutes passed with reference to the Constitution itself."

Other Members of the Senate expressed similar sentiments.

Hughes was confirmed but the next nominee to the Court, Judge John J. Parker, of North Carolina, was attacked because of his personal views, particularly with regard to labor legislation and racial legislation, and he was defeated. In this instance Carter Glass voted with the minority to confirm Parker, and during the Senate debate said he wanted to remark upon—

"The amazing circumstances that we are asked in this pending contest to constitute as practical arbiter of the personnel of the Supreme Court of the United States a northern Negro association for the advancement of the black race. That is what we are warned to do, under penalty of political reprisal, and that is what the defeat of Judge Parker will mean."

Mr. President, it is an interesting sidelight that the very groups which insisted Judge Parker must not be confirmed because of his racial views are now insisting that Mr. Sobeloff should be confirmed because they like his racial views. Both cases, however, illustrate the evils of encouraging the courts to become makers of policy in the social and economic fields and then choosing judges on political grounds, rather than keeping the Court within the limits which the Constitution contemplated.

When Franklin D. Roosevelt took office in 1933, Dr. Mason said:

"The Court had by its own decisions established for itself such preeminence in our politics that it could deny important powers to both State and Nation on principles nowhere found in the Constitution itself. It could and did allocate power as between State and Nation, or as between Congress and the Executive. In this way it could and did exercise control over the economic and social policy of the country."

Dr. Mason then recalled how this powerful Court was challenged by President Roosevelt with his Court-packing plan and how that assault on the independence of the Court swung the pendulum of public opinion back in favor of the Court. The people agreed with Justice Stone, who said packing the Court was too high a price to pay for correction of some decisions which he personally felt were unfortunate.

The important point for our present discussion, however, is that after the battle against the packing plan had been won some members of the Court, as Dr. Mason said, "could revise their habits of mind and thus allow the Constittuion to function as a workable charter of government." Here, as was the case after Marshall's 1803 decision and after the Dred Scott decision, a dangerous tendency of the Court was curbed and power restored to the kind of balance which the Constitution contemplated.

The point I should like to make, in conclusion, Mr. President, is that we have had recent evidences of a renewed tendency of the Court to expand judicial review into a legislative and political function.

In May 1954 the Supreme Court decided the school segregation cases with a unanimous opinion which Mr. Sobeloff commended in several speeches as an example of fine timing. A former member of the Court and of this body, the Honorable James F. Byrnes of South Carolina, has said, however, that "the Court did not interpret the Constitution—the Court amended it." And our distinguished colleague from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] accurately characterized this decision as—

"Based on this astounding philosophy: The Constitution automatically amends itself from time to time without any change in its wording and without any action by the Congress and the States as required by article V; and the scope and times of the automatic amendments are determined by the Supreme Court alone."

It was this same opinion that the Vice President of the United States referred to at a political rally as having been delivered by "a great Republican Chief Justice," which recalls the statement of Alfange that "judicial appointments, even when their motives are not consciously political, are of political origin and the Court is being constantly recreated by Presidents in their own image."

The Vice President's attitude in regarding the Supreme Court as a tool of politics rather than as guardian of the Constitution was echoed more recently at a political rally in Washington when Richard Tobin, public relations director of Citizens for Eisenhower said a switch of from 5 to 10 percent of the Negro voters would insure election of a Republican Congress as well as reelection of the President, and referred to "Supreme Court decisions under a Chief Justice appointed by President Eisenhower—decisions as historic as the Emancipation Proclamation of Lincoln."

Then in April of this year the Court gave two more decisions, one of which declared unconstitutional the sedition statutes of 42 States while the other invalidated a provision of the New York City charter under which an employee was dismissed for failure to answer questions in an authorized inquiry on the ground that it might incriminate him.

In the sedition law case the majority of the Court held that the State laws were invalid because Congress had occupied the field to the exclusion of parallel State legislation, but the dissenting opinion by Justices Reed, Burton, and Minton quoted Chief Justice John Marshall in its argument that the Court was going too far in its invasion of reserved powers of the States.

The dissenting opinion said this was "a jurisdictional problem of general importance because it involves an asserted limitation on the police power of the States," and that this was "a recurring problem." The three Justices said Congress has not specifically barred the exercise of State power to punish the same acts under State law which are punishable under the Federal Smith Act.

Saying the conflict between Federal and State jurisdiction should be "clear and direct before this Court reads a congressional intent to void State legislation into the Federal sedition acts," the dissenting opinion quoted Marshall who wrote in Cohens against Virginia:

"To interfere with the penal laws of a State, where they * * * have for their sole object internal government of the country, is a very serious measure, which Congress cannot be supposed to adopt lightly or inconsiderately."

The minority went on to say that since Congress was well aware of existing State legislation on sedition "this Court should not void State legislation without a clear mandate from Congress." It said exercise of Federal police power carries no such dominancy over similar State powers as might be attributed to Federal regulations concerning such things as foreign affairs or coinage and added: "We are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein we reside and are dependent upon the strength of both to preserve our rights and liberties." The opinion said also: "Mere fear by courts of possible difficulties does not seem to us in these circumstances a valid reason for ousting a State from exercise of its police power. These are matters for legislative determination."

Some of the dangers of the Supreme Court's preemption doctrine were pointed out to the Senate recently by the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], who pointed out that there are State as well as Federal laws against kidnaping and the narcotics traffic which could be struck down as were the sedition laws. My colleague added: "I can think of no more direct way to destroy our system of government than to preclude State taxation in fields now occupied by Federal taxes. I cannot imagine that a responsible court would be capable of such a decision. But 5 years ago I would not have believed that the Court would ever strike down antisedition laws in practically every State in the Union."

One other recent Supreme Court opinion to which I would direct attention is the one delivered on May 21, 1956, which knocked down State right-to-work laws as applied to the railroad industry because of conflict with a 1951 amendment of the National Railway Labor Act which authorized union shop agreements notwithstanding State laws against them.

I am not concerned at the moment with the implications of this decision itself but do find encouragement in the language of the opinion delivered by Mr. Justice Douglas which said "Much might be said pro and con if the policy issue were before us," but that the question of policy was one with which the judiciary has no concern. The opinion said Congress has the final say on policy issues, and continued: "If it acts unwisely the electorate can make a change. The task of the judiciary ends once it appears that the legislative matter is relevant and appropriate to the constitutional power which Congress exercises." The opinion also said ingredients of industrial peace may vary from age to age and industry to industry, and what would be needful one decade might be anathema the next. "The decision," it said, "rests with the policymakers, not the judiciary."

That language, Mr. President, seems to indicate a new feeling among members of the Court that they should repudiate suggestions that the Court is the final formulator of national policy.

It is getting closer to the position taken by a distinguished Virginia jurist, Judge Alexander Rives of the Virginia Supreme Court of Appeals in 1868 when he in the case of Taylor against Stearns and others, with obvious reluctance, ruled against the constitutionality of a statute passed by the general assembly to protect property owners from forced sales at a time when there was no stable currency available and they might be paid with virtually worthless paper. Judge Rives said:

> Great as might be the sufferings growing out of a judicial sentence against this law, and widespread as might be the ruin of individuals and the sacrifice of property under it, they are not, for one moment, to be compared with the evils likely to attend the demoralizing example of a judiciary seeking, however covertly, popular favor by some skillfully disguised compromise of its highest and most imperious duty—that of disdaining every pretext, however plausible, and withstanding every temptation, however strong, to betray in the slightest particular, the requirements of the State and Federal Constitutions.
>
> Such a spectacle of weakness and subserviency upon the bench, if it did not shock, would incurably deprave public sentiment; destroy confidence in the administration of the laws; spread corruption through other branches of the public service and fearfully depress the hopes of the friends of constitutional freedom.

Today, Mr. President, we need not only upon the Supreme Court but upon the bench of our circuit courts and our district courts men who have that kind of attitude toward the sacredness of our Constitution, and the public utterances of Mr. Sobeloff have not convinced me that he would be a constitutional rather than a political judge.

Although making a valuable contribution during the Revolutionary War to our fight for freedom, Tom Payne was never willing to admit the full implication of the new form of Government he had helped to establish. "Credit," he said, "is suspicion gone to sleep." That was his cynical way of admitting that confidence was the foundation stone of the new business and social order. Of all phases of our unique form of self-government, confidence in the judiciary is the most vital and we should be able to say of everyone confirmed for a judicial position, as Daniel Webster did of George Washington's first Chief Justice; his character was "a jewel in the sacred treasure of national reputation, and when the spotless ermine of the judicial robe fell upon him, it touched nothing not as spotless as itself."

You, my colleagues, must make your own decisions but, referring once more to the action of the Senate in 1939 when it rejected the nomination of Judge Roberts, I want to leave with you the words of former Senator Thomas of Utah, who said:

"America's only contribution to the theory of political science is our Federal system; making that Federal system work is America's greatest contribution to the art of government. In the light of history, American democracy is important to the people of the whole world. That it has been able to function for 150 years may be deemed a miracle; that it should continue to function is a necessity. But the proper interpretation of 'by and with the advice and consent' (of the Senate) we may have a key to its continuance on the basis of free association, exchange of opinion, deliberation, and action only after a meeting of minds at the end of free discussion."

WHEAT FOR UNFRIENDLY GOVERNMENTS

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, a very thought provoking editorial was published in the St. Paul, Minn., Pioneer Press on December 30, 1964. It is entitled, "Wheat for Insults." It points up a problem meriting the attention of Congress.

I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHEAT FOR INSULTS

Less than a week after President Nasser of Egypt made an anti-American speech inviting the United States to "drink from the sea"—(equivalent to "go jump in the lake")—our Department of Agriculture authorized another $16,994,000 subsidized shipment of wheat to his government.

This is turning the other cheek with too much humility. It is an invitation to more insults and bullying.

Nasser has made a profitable business out of playing off America and Russia against one another. He got the Aswan Dam from the Soviet Union and hundreds of millions of dollars from the United States in various assistance programs, including vast amounts of grain and other foods.

Now he is supplying arms to the Congolese rebels and using the cold war to try to enhance his own dream of leadership of all Africa. His aims there are directly against those of the United States.

Nasser has been getting $140 million worth of subsidized grain and other foodstuffs each year for the past 3 years. On top of this he recently demanded an additional $35 million worth of supplies. When Lucius Battle, American Ambassador to Egypt, failed to recommend immediate granting of this, Nasser unleashed a bitter attack against him and the United States, and in the same speech boasted of his anti-American role in the Congo and declared this will continue.

Disregarding these developments, the Agriculture Department on Monday gave its formal approval to the new $17 million wheat deal. It is true that this had been verbally agreed upon previously, but no final papers had been signed and there was no reason the plan could not have been held up for further consideration in view of Nasser's bullying and threats.

Nasser gets American wheat under the so-called food-for-peace program. In this case it might better be termed a food for war plan—for it helps Nasser finance his own troublemaking adventures in Africa and his continued rabble rousing against Israel among the Arab peoples.

The situation points up the fact that the U.S. Department of Agriculture has built up a vested interest in promoting subsidized shipments of American surplus crops into "underdeveloped" foreign countries. The Agriculture Department, headed by Secretary Orville Freeman, of Minnesota, wants to make a record in reducing surplus wheat stocks, and this is one of the principal ways of doing so. Congress of course has encouraged this by its legislation.

There is a growing awareness in America that the food-for-peace policy, undoubtedly of sincere and philanthropic origin, does not always have the intended results. There is no doubt that in some cases it serves to discourage backward countries from developing their own agricultural resources and retards their ability to feed their own people. Present food shortages in India would not be nearly so serious if more American aid had gone to promoting expansion of India's agriculture instead of for other purposes.

Without an assured American surplus grain supply, Nasser's Egypt today might be more interested in raising Egyptian crop production and less concerned with building up armaments and interfering in Africa.

MAJORITY PARTY MEMBERSHIP ON THE STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE FOR THE 89TH CONGRESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the benefit of the Senate, I submit a resolution (S. Res. 19) announcing the Democratic membership on standing committees of the Senate, as agreed to by the steering committee, which reads as follows:

Resolved, That the following shall constitute the majority party's membership on the standing committees and the Small Business Committee of the Senate for the Eighty-ninth Congress:

On the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences: ANDERSON, chairman; RUSSELL, MAGNUSON, SYMINGTON, STENNIS, YOUNG of Ohio, DODD, CANNON, HOLLAND, MONDALE, and TYDINGS.

On the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry: ELLENDER, chairman; JOHNSTON, HOLLAND, EASTLAND, TALMADGE, JORDAN of North Carolina, MCCARTHY, MCGOVERN, BASS, and MONTOYA.

On the Committee on Appropriations: HAYDEN, chairman; RUSSELL, ELLENDER, HILL, MCCLELLAN, ROBERTSON, MAGNUSON, HOLLAND, STENNIS, PASTORE, MONRONEY, BIBLE, BYRD of West Virginia, MCGEE, MANSFIELD, BARTLETT, PROXMIRE, and YARBOROUGH.

On the Committee on Armed Services: RUSSELL, chairman; STENNIS, BYRD of Virginia, SYMINGTON, JACKSON, ERVIN, CANNON, BYRD of West Virginia, YOUNG of Ohio, INOUYE, MCINTYRE, and BREWSTER.

On the Committee on Banking and Currency: ROBERTSON, chairman; SPARKMAN, DOUGLAS, PROXMIRE, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, MUSKIE, LONG of Missouri, NEUBERGER, MCINTYRE, and MONDALE.

On the Committee on Commerce: MAGNUSON, chairman; PASTORE, MONRONEY, LAUSCHE, BARTLETT, HARTKE, MCGEE, HART, CANNON, BREWSTER, NEUBERGER, and BASS.

On the Committee on the District of Columbia: BIBLE, chairman; MORSE, MCINTYRE, KENNEDY of New York, and TYDINGS.

On the Committee on Finance: BYRD of Virginia, chairman; LONG of Louisiana, SMATHERS, ANDERSON, DOUGLAS, GORE, TALMADGE, MCCARTHY, HARTKE, FULBRIGHT, and RIBICOFF.

On the Committee on Foreign Relations: FULBRIGHT, chairman; SPARKMAN, MANSFIELD, MORSE, LONG of Louisiana, GORE, LAUSCHE, CHURCH, SYMINGTON, DODD, SMATHERS, CLARK, and PELL.

On the Committee on Government Operations: MCCLELLAN, chairman, JACKSON, ERVIN, GRUENING, MUSKIE, RIBICOFF, HARRIS, and KENNEDY of New York.

On the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs: JACKSON, chairman; ANDERSON, BIBLE, CHURCH, GRUENING, MOSS, BURDICK, HAYDEN, MCGOVERN, NELSON, and METCALF.

On the Committee on the Judiciary: EASTLAND, chairman; JOHNSTON, MCCLELLAN, ERVIN, DODD, HART, LONG of Missouri, KENNEDY of Massachusetts, BAYH, BURDICK, and TYDINGS.

On the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare: HILL, chairman; MCNAMARA, MORSE, YARBOROUGH, CLARK, RANDOLPH, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, PELL, KENNEDY of Massachusetts, NELSON, and KENNEDY of New York.

On the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service: JOHNSTON, chairman; MONRONEY, YARBOROUGH, RANDOLPH, MCGEE, BREWSTER, HARTKE, and BURDICK.

On the Committee on Public Works: MCNAMARA, chairman; RANDOLPH, YOUNG of Ohio, MUSKIE, GRUENING, MOSS, METCALF, JORDAN of North Carolina, INOUYE, BAYH, HARRIS, and MONTOYA.

On the Committee on Rules and Administration: JORDAN of North Carolina, chairman; HAYDEN, CANNON, PELL, CLARK, and BYRD of West Virginia.

On the Select Committee on Small Business: SPARKMAN, chairman; LONG of Louisiana, SMATHERS, MORSE, BIBLE, RANDOLPH, BARTLETT, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, MOSS, NELSON, and MONTOYA.

Mr. President, I send to the desk the resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The Senator from Montana sends a resolution to the desk. He has just read the resolution and the clerk will report it by title.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, that is with the stipulation that this will not abridge the rights of any Senator.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

S. RES. 19

Resolved, That the following shall constitute the majority party's membership on the standing committees and the Small Business Committee of the Senate for the Eighty-ninth Congress.

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. Is there objection to the unanimous consent request? The Chair hears none, and the resolution is agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, there is now a resolution pending, is there not?

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. No. The Senator from Montana was about to offer a resolution.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thought two were submitted.

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. This resolution was submitted, and it has been agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I wanted to be sure, according to protocol, so far as the rules are concerned, that it was proper, because I wanted to observe to the distinguished majority leader particularly that the minority recognizes the right and the authority and the responsibility of the majority party to determine and fix the ratios and numbers of Members on committees as between majority and minority. As a general thing, we undertake to do it percentagewise, on the basis of the whole number of posts or seats that are available. I am sure the majority has tried always to be fair and meticulously careful in trying to do so. Sometimes there must be a little give and take on this committee or that committee in order to consummate those percentages. But I have discussed the matter on a number of occasions with the majority leader and others. While there may be some Members who are not content to abide, we cheerfully abide by the ratios presented by the majority.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate will state it.

Mr. RUSSELL. Is it necessary for the Senate to elect members of the committees?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is necessary for the Senate to elect members of the committees.

Mr. RUSSELL. Have they been elected?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. By the resolution submitted by the Senator from Montana the majority members have been elected.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to express my deep appreciation to the distinguished minority leader for the understanding and tolerance he has shown in arriving at the appropriate ratio dividing the two parties insofar as representation on Senate committees is concerned. It sounds easy to divide on a two-to-one basis, but when one gets down to considering all committees, it is a most difficult task.

In this respect, also, I think the secretary to the majority, Mr. Valeo, and the secretary to the minority, Mr. Trice, are entitled to the Senate's commendation for the fine work they have done in this respect and for the agreement, which I think is most reasonable, which has been worked out. Great credit should go to them.

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Legislative Review Committee on the Democratic side will continue this year under the chairmanship of the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], and be comprised of the following Senators: The Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], and the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE].

PRESIDENTIAL INAUGURATION AND LINCOLN DAY SPEECHES

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, we are right on the heels of inaugural week. Certainly for the majority it will be a very busy season. It will not be very long thereafter before Members on this side of the aisle will be facing the Lincoln anniversary week and meetings and speeches that they will be called upon to make in all 50 States of the Union.

I should like to ask the majority leader whether he has given this matter some thought. We have on other occasions, in other years, discussed this matter. I inject it at this time only because I am in receipt of a good many inquiries from Members on this side of the aisle who will want to be away at that time, and they will not want to miss any of the essential business of the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I had not given the subject any thought, but I shall get together with the distinguished minority leader this afternoon and we will lay the groundwork for a brief period of respite during those momentous days.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, before the conclusion of the morning hour, I suggest the absence of a quorum. This will be a live quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 4 Leg.]

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Bartlett
Bass
Bayh
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Dominick
Douglas
Eastland
Ellender
Fannin
Fong
Fulbright
Gore
Gruening
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Mansfield
McClellan
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Miller
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Morse
Moss
Mundt
Murphy
Nelson
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Robertson
Russell
Saltonstall
Scott
Simpson
Smith
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE] are necessarily absent.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONTOYA in the chair). A quorum is present. Is there further morning business?

DESTRUCTION OF AMERICAN PROPERTY IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, with increasing frequency discussions are being had about the destruction of American libraries, embassies, and other property of our country in foreign nations. The destruction has occurred in countries that have been the beneficiaries of our bounty.

Evidence shows that in some instances the law-enforcement officials of the countries in which the destruction has occurred failed to take any action to protect the libraries, embassies, and other property of our Nation. I have had prepared a tabulation of the instances in which such destruction has occurred. The tabulation goes back to July 1962, and continues to December 1964. In 51 instances our country suffered assaults upon our honor and destruction of our property.

Other Senators have expressed the view that they favor taking into consideration these transgressions or offenses against our Nation when the subject of granting aid comes before the Senate. I wish to declare that so far as I am concerned, when those nations apply for help, and if there is proof that they suffered assaults to take place upon our integrity, honor, and property, I shall be prone to disallow their applications to our country.

We cannot afford to suffer unchallenged the abuses that have been committed. When we allow one abuse to go unchallenged, we give encouragement to other similar abuses being perpetrated.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a tabulation of 51 instances in which we have suffered these abuses at the hands of foreign countries, and especially those within the countries which do not believe in our system of government.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DAMAGES TO U.S. GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS OVERSEAS THROUGH MOB VIOLENCE RIOTS OR OTHER CAUSES SINCE JULY 1962, INDICATING DATE, PLACE, AND DAMAGE

July 1962: Santiago de los Caballeros, Dominican Republic. A crowd of nearly 300 teenagers set fire to a small leased USIS building. Extensive damage was prevented by the police. Damage $25. Cost borne by USIA.

August 1962: Anellaneda, Argentina. A rock was thrown through a window of the leased USIS office on a Sunday, when the office was closed. A paper was found on the floor bearing the legend "Cuba si, Yanqui No." Damage $40. Cost borne by USIA.

October 1962: London, England. Brick was thrown through a window of the Chancery. No record is available in Washington as to who paid for damage.

October 1962: Fort-de-France, Martinique. The leased USIS center was disfigured with black paint. Cost of $50 for repainting borne by USIA.

October 1962: Anellaneda, Argentina. About 27 teenagers invaded the leased USIS offices. They threw rocks at a nearby newspaper agency, and three Molotov bombs which did not explode, but broke the plate glass window of the USIS library. Damage $40. Cost borne by USIA.

November 1962: Surabaya, Indonesia. Leased office building, consulate residence and USIS Center were attacked by Communist-inspired demonstrators. Damage in the amount of $532 was inflicted by thrown stones and signs painted on walls. Cost was borne by Indonesian Government.

December 1962: Brussels, Belgium. Minor damage was sustained to the leased USIS Center building when bricks were thrown breaking one window glass. Damage $20. Cost borne by USIA.

December 1962: Fortaleza, Brazil. On the night before the inauguration of USIS office, unknown group tarred entrance area and display windows. Damage $100. Cost borne by USIA.

February 1963: Mogadiscio, Somalia. Stones thrown at leased office building by Somalia demonstrators. The damage amounted to $22. No final reply has been received to claim against the Somali Government.

April 1963: Chittagong, East Pakistan. Leased USIS building was stoned by student rioters, breaking a few windows. Damage was $50. Cost borne by USIA.

May 1963: Managua, Nicaragua. Fire bomb placed in doorway of leased AID building. Damage slight. Cost borne by AID.

June 1963: Caracas, Venezuela. Building housing U.S. Army mission owned by the host Government was burned. Damage to the building amounted to $11,000 and was paid by the Venezuelan Government. A loss of $700 in military uniforms was paid by $300 from insurance and $400 paid by Department of Army.

June 1963: Caracas, Venezuela. Leased house occupied by the political officer was attacked, and the interior was smeared with painted slogans. Damages amounted to $341. The Foreign Office has not replied to claim.

June 1963: Maracaibo, Venezuela. A pipe bomb was placed in front of the leased USIS Center. The bomb sputtered and fizzled out, and no damage was done.

August 1963: Caracas, Venezuela. Host Government house occupied by an Air Force sergeant was attacked and bomb thrown into house. Damage to house $2,800, paid by Venezuelan Government. Personal property loss amounted to $1,400 and was paid by the Army.

September 1963: Maracaibo, Venezuela. A powerful, 10-pound dynamite bomb, fused to explode at midnight, was discovered at the leased USIS Center during a routine check by a police guard. Bomb disposal squad removed the bomb and reported it was sufficiently powerful to have levelled the building.

September 1963: Dacca, Pakistan. Students demonstrated in front of leased USIS office and painted signs on walls. Cost of repairs borne by USIA.

September 1963: Fortaleza, Brazil. Leased USIS office was attacked by students who were demonstrating against proposed bus rate increase. Damage $20. Cost borne by USIA.

October 1963: Mogadiscio, Somalia. Stones thrown at leased USIS building breaking one window glass. Also a glass exhibit case at the Embassy was smashed. Damage $20. Cost borne by USIA.

October 1963. Constantine, Algeria. Glass broken in two exhibit cases at leased USIS Center. Damage $20. Cost borne by USIA.

October 1963: Maracaibo, Venezuela. Terrorists attacked leased USIS Center, evidently with intent to bomb the premises. They were resisted by police guard, who killed one and wounded another. No damage to building.

November 1963: Saigon, Vietnam. Leased Marine Guard quarters was damaged by accident during coup. Damage was $1,121. The Department has directed the post to file a claim with the Vietnamese Government.

December 1963: Caracas, Venezuela. Host Government house occupied by Army Mission officer was attacked by terrorists, incendiary bomb thrown into house. Damage of $500 was paid by Venezuelan Government.

December 1963: Caracas, Venezuela. Inter-American Geodetic Survey offices located in leased building were burned. Damage to furniture and equipment was $4,935, $670 was stolen from a safe. No reply has been received to claim filed with the Venezuelan Government.

December 1963: Sofia, Bulgaria. A crowd of approximately 3,000 gathered in front of the leased Legation office building and hurled bricks, steel bars, and stones, breaking windows on the first three floors. Apparent reason for riot was high feeling generated over trial in Sofia of Bulgarian diplomat accused of spying for the United States. The Bulgarian Government is now repairing the damage. The Legation was required to expend $200 on overtime for local employees to clean up the debris.

January 1964: Panama City, Panama. Rioting mob broke window glass and damaged walls of Government-owned Chancery. Damage, $1,500. Leased USIS offices were severely damaged. The library on the first floor was a complete loss. Second floor sustained good deal of property damage but most of the equipment was removed in good shape. Building probably structurally unsafe due to fire. Damage, $110,000. No claim has yet been filed with the Panamanian Government.

January 1964: Colón, Panama. Mob stoned Government-owned consulate building, breaking windows. Damage, $300. No claim has yet been filed with the Panamanian Government.

January 1964: David, Panama. Leased USIS branch office building ransacked; good deal of property damage but building is not believed to be structurally damaged. Damage is estimated at $2,000. No claim has yet been filed with the Panamanian Government.

February 1964: Nicosia, Cyprus. Two bombs exploded against the exterior walls of leased chancery building. Amount of loss is not known completely, but the Cyprus Government has agreed to make all necessary repairs at its own expense.

February 1964: Accra, Ghana. Demonstrators attempted to seize U.S. flag. No property damage.

March 1964: Libreville, Gabon. Shotgun blasts damaged ground floor facade and shattered windows of offices in leased chancery building. One hour later large explosion occurred in rear of building. Damages amounted to $1,000. Cost borne by the Department.

March 1964: Oruro, Bolivia. Leased office of USIS Center dynamited by unknown persons damaging door and window casements and shattered glass. Damage amounted to $100. Embassy has filed a claim with the Bolivian Government.

March 1964: Phnom Penh, Cambodia: Leased chancery, Embassy residence, USIS building and library were attacked by large mob of demonstrators. Premises were badly ransacked and disfigured. Three official and one privately owned vehicles completely wrecked. Damages amount to $123,424. Formal claim has been submitted to the Cambodian Government.

May 1964: Surabaya, Indonesia. A crowd of approximately 150 persons forced entry into USIS leased building and surged through theaterette, broke movie projector and destroyed movie film. Written protest presented to local authorities.

June 1964: Pretoria, South Africa. Great Seal at entrance of leased Embassy building defaced and spot from which removed defiled. Unidentified persons threatened Embassy with bombing if U.S. policy toward South Africa not altered. Protest note answered with an official apology by South African Government.

June 1964: Ankara, Turkey. Two shots fired through second floor window of Embassy building. Aside from small holes in window, no damage inflicted.

August 1964: Dacca, Pakistan. USIS library stoned and vandalized by mob which broke windows and overturned shelves and smashed telephone. Damage estimated at $1,000. Note sent to Government of Pakistan.

September 1964: Oruro, Bolivia. Demonstrating students stoned and broke virtually all windows in the USIS subpost office. Mob attempted to overturn a USIS vehicle but failed. Formal note of protest delivered to the Ministry of Foreign Relations.

September 1964: Sucre, Bolivia. Demonstrating secondary school teachers, students, and hangers-on threw rocks at USIS subpost offices breaking 21 windows. Formal note of protest delivered to the Ministry of Foreign Relations.

September 1964: Gochabamba, Bolivia. Groups of rioting students stoned leased consulate building breaking many windows.

September 1964: Montevideo, Uruguay. Leftwing demonstrators attacked several binational centers and placed incendiary devices beneath automobiles of two Embassy employees. The devices were safely removed. No damages to Government-held property.

October 1964: Oruro and Potasi, Bolivia. USIS leased buildings windows smashed and some furniture damaged, by rioting students.

November 1964: Khartoum, Sudan. Rioting students and demonstrators smashed two front windows of leased Embassy building and broke library display case. An American employee was injured by stone thrown at vehicle. Later same week, U.S. flag was torn down, and demonstrators attempted and failed to enter building but tore sign from door.

November 1964: Brazzaville, Congo. After advance notice from Foreign Office on information that Congolese youth were going to demonstrate in protest to Belgo-Anglo-American action in Stanleyville, leased USIS center building was closed, equipment removed, and notices displayed stating center was closed on orders of Government. Demonstrations did not take place.

November 1964: Sofia, Belgrade. Demonstrators led by African students broke street floor windows in leased office building. Windows of official car also smashed. Protest note sent to government which included request that all damages be paid by the Bulgarian Government.

November 1964; Cairo, United Arab Republic. Government-owned USIS library and Marine Guard quarters building set afire and completely destroyed. In addition, there was damage to fences and grounds and eight official and two personal vehicles. Mob composed of African students. Protest note delivered to Foreign Minister requesting full and prompt compensation for damages.

November 1964: Prague, Czechoslovakia. African students demonstrating in front of Government-owned Embassy office building broke into courtyard wrecked and overturned 12 Embassy cars, threw rocks breaking many windows and tore down flag. Damage $10,000. Repair costs borne by Czech Government.

November 1964: Moscow, U.S.S.R. Leased Embassy building was attacked by mob of 500 persons, about half Africans. Fifty-six windows were broken, Embassy seal and brass plate torn off wall. One car belonging to American newsman was set afire and completely gutted. Damage estimated at over $1,700. Note requesting payment sent to Foreign Ministry.

November 1964: Bujumbura, Burundi. Demonstration by some 150 persons occurred in front of leased Embassy building. Paint was smeared on building walls and doors obliterating Embassy seal and shrubbery of garden was uprooted. Similar defacing occurred USIS building. Damage to both premises estimated at $300. Note to Ministry of Foreign Affairs requested payment of damages.

November 1964: Djakarta, Indonesia. Demonstrators broke windows of leased USIS Cultural Center.

December 1964: Surabaya, Indonesia. Youthful demonstrators attacked and entered the leased American Cultural Center, destroying or damaging 15,000 books. The U.S. flag and seal were ripped down and desecrated. Most of the windows on both floors were broken and considerable furniture was wrecked. Two Government-owned vehicles were badly damaged. Damage estimated at $15,000. Note of protest sent to Foreign Department, requesting the Indonesian Government to reimburse the U.S.

Government fully for cost arising from this destruction.

December 1964: Lima, Peru. Effort made to set off Molotov-cocktail type bomb in ladies' room of the Binational Center. Device burned but did not explode, causing only minor smoke damage. Slogan scrawled on wall in the same room. Police informed Embassy of tip to the effect that a bomb was in the Chancery. Thorough search produced nothing.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. What is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is considering morning business. Is there any further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TUESDAY, JANUARY 12

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Tuesday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF CLOTURE RULE OF THE SENATE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the pending question, which is on agreeing to the motion to consider Senate Resolution 6, which will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution amending the Standing Rules of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senate Resolution 6 and the Douglas resolution S. 8 (to amend rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate relative to cloture) be committed to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows: That the resolution be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, which shall make its report on said resolutions to the Senate on March 9, 1965.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that the request of the majority leader would protect all existing rights?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes, of course.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. What motions must now be withdrawn in order to clear the Senate Calendar?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent those questions were taken care of, and there is no motion pending.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I withdraw the request for the quorum call.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the order for the quorum call is dissolved.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senate Joint Resolution 2 remain at the desk until Tuesday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TUESDAY, JANUARY 12

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move, pursuant to the order previously entered, that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon Tuesday, January 12.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 6 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until Tuesday, January 12, 1965, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JANUARY 11, 1965

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Matthew 5: 6: *Blessed are they which do hunger and thirst after righteousness: for they shall be filled.*

Almighty God, may our noonday prayer be a sincere surrender to Thy holy will and submission to the dispensations of Thy divine providence for Thou alone canst satisfy our deepest yearnings and loftiest aspirations.

May we bring our faltering and faithless spirits into tune and harmony with Thy spirit for in the great business of useful and joyous and successful living, our own better self is continually reminding us that we were not created for failure but for victory.

Grant that when we stand at the crossroads and are smitten by fear, not knowing which way to take, we may be confident that where Thou dost guide, Thou wilt provide.

Inspire us to put ourselves on the side of that which is noble and true and may the trend and direction of our minds and hearts always bear clear and unmistakable witness that we have heard and are heeding Thy voice, "This is the way, walk ye therein."

In Christ's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

AVERY STARTS TERM AS GOVERNOR OF KANSAS TODAY

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, this noon in Topeka, Kans.—12:15 Kansas time—our friend, William H. Avery, the former colleague of many in this Chamber, is being inaugurated as Governor of the great State of Kansas.

Bill Avery spent 10 distinguished years in these halls and served his district and his Nation well. In continuing a career dedicated to public service, he ran for Governor last fall and was elected chief executive of his native State.

As he takes over his duties and responsibilities today, I know that he does so with the good wishes of the Members of the House of Representatives, many of whom, I am sure, will want to join me in sending a message of congratulations and best wishes to the new Governor of Kansas, William H. Avery.

IMPORTS OF PETROLEUM

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a measure, which is designed to promote the general welfare, the foreign policy, and the security of the United States through the enactment of a legislative limitation upon the quantity of imports of petroleum.

In 1955, the Congress for the first time incorporated a national security provision in the Trade Act. Since that time it has become an established aspect of our foreign policy. This provision of the law was amended and strengthened in 1958. It was reenacted as a part of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 and, therefore, is an important provision of existing law—19 United States Code Annotated 1352a.

Under the national security provision, the President is delegated very broad authority which he may exercise whenever it is deemed that the national security is threatened. This authority as applied to petroleum was exercised in 1959 and since that time we have had an administrative program which limits the volume of imports of oil. We have now had almost 6 years' experience under this program. It seems to me, therefore, that it is appropriate and also advisable that, based upon this experience, the Congress should reexamine the problem and where appropriate provide the Executive with additional and more specific guidelines. I wish to hasten that this is not intended to be critical of those who are responsible for the administration of the program. It is widely recognized that the program during these past 6 years has served a most useful purpose. It has been effective in preventing a deluge of imports of oil which, had it not been for the program, would have brought chaos to the domestic petroleum industry. The administration, therefore, is to be commended for the manner in which it has exercised the authority delegated to it under the national security provision.

It is clear, however, that the present program is not fully serving its objective of keeping the domestic oil industry strong for national security reasons. The responsibility for taking corrective action first lies with the Congress. It is the duty of the Congress to provide the executive branch with proper legislative guidelines so that the policy and objective of the national security provision can be made more effective.

The need for a further strengthening of the oil import program is persuasively demonstrated by an examination of the evidence that is available relative to the exploration and development activities of the industry and the economic condition of the industry.

For the past 10 years, the domestic oil industry has suffered a continuous decline. As a result, we are not finding and developing adequate reserves of petroleum. For example, during 4 of the past 7 years, we found less crude oil than we used. Historically, the industry has found substantially more each year than was consumed and it is necessary that we do so in the future if we are to remain strong in our position as to energy.

We are adequately forewarned, therefore, that unless positive action is taken now, we will endanger the future security of the Nation.

It is the responsibility of the Congress to take cognizance of this situation and to provide the Executive with a legislative directive designed to correct the adverse trends that have plagued the domestic petroleum industry for a decade. The bill I have introduced is designed to serve this purpose. The following is a section-by-section analysis of my proposal.

At the outset, I would like to point out that the bill I have introduced does not cover imports of residual fuel oil. I know that my colleagues from coal-producing States are vitally interested in the matter of residual fuel oil and have given a great deal of study and thought to this problem. I am entirely sympathetic with those Members who are concerned about the impact of residual fuel oil imports on the coal industry but I have not endeavored to cover the matter in this bill as I defer to those who are better qualified to deal with the subject than I am.

Paragraph (e): This paragraph of the bill would limit imports of petroleum into the United States east of the Rocky Mountains to not more than 10 percent of production in that area of crude petroleum and natural gas liquids. Under the present oil import limitation program, imports into the eastern part of the United States are limited to 12.2 percent of production. Imports have been at approximately that level for the past 6 years but during this time we have seen that the domestic industry has continued to suffer depressed conditions. This experience shows that the 12.2 rate is too high if the domestic industry is to be revitalized and encouraged to find and develop enough reserves to safely provide for the future. An examination of the history of imports prior to the time that the domestic industry began its decline in the mid-1950's will show that the rate of imports previously had been for a number of years at a rate in the neighborhood of 10 percent of domestic production. For this reason, it seems to me to be logical to conclude that the present 12.2 rate is too high and that a level of 10 percent is suggested by previous experience. At present total imports of oil, excluding residual fuel oil, into the United States average about 1,500,000 barrels daily. This reduction of the 12.2 rate to 10 percent would reduce imports by about 175,000 barrels daily.

Paragraph (f): Under the present oil import limitation program, there are in effect two separate programs—one for the United States east of the Rockies and another for the United States west of the Rockies. The need for separate treatment is brought about by the fact that within the Western States there is inadequate local production as compared with consumption; whereas within the eastern part of the United States there is a large shut-in and unused surplus producing capacity. In the area west of the Rockies, under the present oil import program during the past 6 years, imports have been substantially increased. As a result, this large area has become increasingly dependent upon foreign oil—a result which is inconsistent with the security objectives of the national security provision of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 and of the oil import limitation program.

In 1958, imports into the United States west of the Rockies amounted to about 20 percent of local production; whereas today, imports are more than 50 percent of local production. This is a dangerously high reliance upon foreign sources for a vital peacetime energy source and an indispensable item in time of war. Something must be done to restore the energy security position of the Western States. It is unwise to permit a large portion of our Nation to become so dependent upon an uncertain foreign source for such an important commodity. I have, therefore, included a directive to the administrators of the program to take every possible action that will encourage increased production of oil within the Western States and also an increased movement of oil from the surplus eastern portion of the Nation into the deficit western areas.

It is illogical to continue to permit the Western States to become more and more dependent on foreign sources when we have a large surplus of crude oil available in the Midcontinent States. In addition, I have included a provision which hereafter would require that if any increase over the 1964 level of imports is needed in the Western States to meet demand that a commensurate decrease be made in imports into the Eastern States. This would keep the Nation as a whole from becoming more dependent upon foreign oil.

Paragraph (g): This provision provides that hereafter imports of petroleum products would be prohibited. In other words, only crude petroleum could be imported. Historically, the United States has never been a substantial importer of oil products. In fact, we have always been a large exporter of products although in recent years exports have been less important. In addition, for many years now, the domestic refining industry has been operating at well below capacity, in the neighborhood of 80 to 90 percent. There is no need, therefore, to import finished or unfinished products. The present program, however, provides that those importers who imported products in 1957 may continue to import the same quantity as they did in that year. In other words, imports of products are frozen at the 1957 rate and those persons permitted to import are also frozen. No newcomers are permitted, only those who happened to import in 1957 are permitted to import products today. A permanent freezing of the 1957 position does not seem justified and since product imports are unnecessary, it seems logical that imports of products should be prohibited.

Paragraph (h): Under the present program, there are several categories of shipments of petroleum into the United States which do not technically qualify as "imports." All physical shipments into the United States should be included within the import program in order to avoid circumvention of the objectives of the program. I have, therefore, included provisions in my bill covering the following:

First, shipments from Puerto Rico into the United States. At present, there are approximately 30,000 barrels daily of oil products being shipped into the United States and there is a proposal now pending before the Government which would approximately double this rate.

Second, shipments of foreign oil into the United States by the Department of Defense for use outside the United States. Jet fuel and aviation gasoline are in ample supply within the United States and there is no justification for the Department of Defense to import oil into the United States for use offshore. It is my understanding that this is not currently being done, at least to any substantial extent, but such shipments could be made. This constitutes a loophole in the program which should be closed.

Third, under the Foreign Trade Zones Act, shipments of petroleum or any other commodity into a foreign trade zone located within the United States are not, technically, an "import," and, therefore, such shipments are not covered by the present import program. There is now pending before the Foreign Trade Zones Board a proposal to ship petroleum products into a trade zone to be located within the United States, which products will be utilized as feedstock for a petrochemical plant. If this proposal is approved, other petrochemical companies have indicated they will seek similar treatment. If this is permitted, the domestic industry will lose a substantial market which it now enjoys in providing feedstocks to chemical plants within the United States.

Fourth, shipments of petroleum products, other than residual fuel oil, into the United States which are entered in bond and later withdrawn for commercial use in aircraft or surface vessels engaged in foreign trade. Recently such shipments of jet fuel have increased substantially. This is a market outlet which historically has been supplied by the domestic industry, and unless this loophole is closed, this market will be lost to the domestic industry.

Paragraph (i): The Department of Defense now purchases for worldwide use more than 600,000 barrels daily of light petroleum products. Of these total purchases, more than 200,000 barrels daily or about 35 percent are purchased from foreign sources. The portion of total purchases obtained abroad has increased substantially in recent years. For example in 1954, only 13 percent of total purchases were from foreign sources. While the domestic industry is in depressed condition and there is a large shut-in capacity within the United States, there is no justification for the Department of Defense to purchase 35 percent of its requirements for light products from foreign sources It seems to me to be extremely unwise for the military to be dependent upon foreign sources for 35 percent of its petroleum supplies.

I, therefore, propose that such foreign purchases of light products be limited to 15 percent of requirements. This would permit the Department of Defense to continue to purchase some 100,000 barrels daily from foreign sources. It would require the Department to divert some 100,000 barrels daily of purchases now being made abroad, to domestic sources. In addition, this provision provides that the approximately 100,000 barrels daily which the Department will be permitted to continue to purchase abroad shall be treated as imports into the United States.

In other words, total imports permitted into the United States would be reduced by the amount of foreign purchases. The purpose of this provision is to enable the domestic industry to maintain itself in a position to supply the Defense Department in the event that supplies purchased from foreign sources are disrupted.

In summation, the bill I have introduced would result in a substantial increase in the demand for domestic oil. Under this proposal, imports would be reduced in the neighborhood of 375,000 barrels daily. In addition, the Department of Defense would be required to divert some 100,000 barrels daily now purchased abroad to domestic sources. In total, therefore, domestic producers would enjoy an increase in domestic production of almost 500,000 barrels daily or an increase in total production of about 5 percent.

Such an increase in domestic production of oil would give the industry a meaningful economic boost. It would encourage the domestic industry to reverse the declining trends of the past decade which threaten our security as to oil. At the same time, such a reduction in imports would not seriously harm any of the importing countries. The large importing countries have enjoyed very substantial growth during the past 10 years as compared with the United States. A comparison of the production of crude oil in 1964 with 1956 shows the following: Middle East up 127 percent; Canada up 64 percent; Venezuela up 38 percent; United States up 7 percent. Under my proposal the importing countries would continue to enjoy substantial growth.

Mr. Speaker, the proper limitation of imports of oil into the United States is a matter of extreme importance to the 33 oil-producing States such as my State of Texas. The petroleum industry is a keystone to the fiscal position of the oil-producing States and to the economy of the local communities throughout the oil-producing areas of the United States. I am firmly convinced, however, that this matter is beyond the interest of the oil-producing States and that it is a subject that should have the attention of the Members of the House from the consuming States as well. Petroleum has become a necessity to our peacetime economy. It is indispensable to our military defense. For these reasons, I invite and urge my colleagues from every State to give this matter their attention because in my judgment the matter warrants your interest and careful consideration.

FREEDOM ACADEMY AND FREEDOM COMMISSION

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to establish a Freedom Academy and a Freedom Commission for the purpose of conducting research into the methods and means of meeting the threats of communism all over the world, to educate and train selective private citizens, as well as governmental personnel, as to how to win the cold war and to provide leadership in encouraging and assisting our universities and other institutions to more effectively contribute to the conflict.

The Freedom Academy and the Freedom Commission are not products of my original thinking. They are not even ideas of recent origin. Their origin dates back to 1950 and lies with a group of dedicated Americans headed by Alan G. Grant, Jr., of Orlando, Fla. This bill is not new to the Congress. As a matter of fact, a similar bill was passed by the Senate late in the 1960 session and later died through inaction in the House. Bills were introduced last session by the gentleman from Louisiana, Congressman HALE BOGGS and others, on which extended hearings were held by the House Un-American Activities Committee. As a result of those hearings I am today joining in the introduction and intend to press for immediate and decisive action by the House.

Let us face the problem squarely. We have already delayed too long. The Communists have systematically prepared themselves to wage thousand-pronged aggression in the nonmilitary area all over the world. In many areas they have moved ahead because we do not know or do not have the means to oppose them. I am firmly convinced that this measure will improve our capability in the nonmilitary area. A Gallup poll some years ago showed that five out of six Americans favored the idea.

I hope that the Members will have an early opportunity to pass on this measure so overwhelmingly favored by their constituents.

CONGRESS CAN AID EDUCATION WITHOUT NATIONALIZATION

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill which would provide for the return to each State at the end of each fiscal year 5 percent of the Federal income tax collected from that State to be used for public education. This is the simplest, the fairest, and the most expeditious way to aid education.

This bill would make it possible for the States and the local communities to continue their fantastic progress in the field of education. There would be no additional bureaucracy; there would be no threat of nationalization or Federal control. This is the quickest way to help education. No studies, no comprehensive plans, and no long drawn out hearings would be necessary.

In high-level discussions on education here in Washington and in the many national educational conferences held and even in the committees of Congress, there has been little acknowledgment of the magnificent job that has been and is being done by local communities throughout the Nation. Parents, school trustees, taxpayers, teachers, and professional educators have built the greatest public school system in the world. They have moved forward to meet the challenges of the cold war and the age of astronautics.

Mr. Speaker, the bill I am introducing today is a vote of confidence in these local instrumentalities of education. This bill will complement them and give them the means to further expand to meet the challenges of the year 2000. Any Federal control of education or any Federal revenue allotted on the basis of conformity or curriculum would be a step backward. We must never lead our people to believe that the problem of education can be solved in Washington. To educate our people to look to Washington rather than themselves would be turning the wheels of progress backward.

The greatest single need of education in my own area is the need for higher teachers' salaries. I believe this to be true of all areas needing assistance in education. We must permit our teachers to compete with their counterparts in industry, in the military, in government, and in other fields of endeavor. Nothing is more important to the future of our country than securing the most qualified and dedicated to teach our children.

Of course, we need expanding facilities, laboratories, and research; but, Mr. Speaker, I repeat, the greatest single need is to secure the best teachers that we can possibly employ. The very best educational program is the only real, sure answer to the problem of poverty, depressed areas, delinquency, and citizenship responsibilities.

Last year, it was my privilege to address high school students and educators all the way from Pennsylvania to Miami, Fla. I spoke to more than 24,000 students in 38 schools, colleges, and educational assemblies. I was tremendously impressed with the magnificent job being done by our teachers, trustees, and professional educators. I was thrilled and elated by the excellent questions propounded by students during discussions and question and answer periods. Education is moving forward. Our teachers and students are looking ahead. The vast majority of them favor this type of approach in aiding education. This bill will not penalize some States to help other States. It will treat all communities and each State fairly. This bill will permit us to build a truly Great Society.

WE TREAT OUR MILITARY SHABBILY

Mr. **RIVERS** of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include an article.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. **RIVERS** of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD an article which appeared in the Saturday Evening Post, on January 16, entitled "We Treat Our Military Shabbily," by a former Army major, Marion T. Wood, who resigned his commission after 13 years of service as an officer "frustrated and disillusioned."

This is an article that should be read by every Member of the Congress and by every American citizen who is concerned about our national security.

We may develop the most exotic weapons systems in the world; we may build the finest missiles; we may construct fantastic underwater missile launchers; we may lead the world in equipment, but if we do not have men and women provided with a standard of living equivalent to the standard of living they are defending, then one of these days we will awaken to the sad realization that our Armed Forces are sadly deficient in two indispensable ingredients—leadership and motivation.

Former Major Wood has summarized in one article the contents of thousands of letters that I have received over the past few years from members of the armed services and their dependents. We would all do well to heed the warning contained in this penetrating article.

WE TREAT OUR MILITARY SHABBILY

(By Marion T. Wood)

After 13 years as an officer of the U.S. Army, I recently resigned, frustrated and disillusioned. I was supposed to be guarding something grandly called the American way of life. But, by a cruel paradox, the society I had sworn to protect is a society that is indifferent and even hostile toward me and my comrades.

Built into the very foundation of this Nation is a distrust of soldiers, especially in peacetime. The Declaration of Independence denounces the British for keeping standing armies in the Colonies "in times of peace." The third amendment in the Bill of Rights specifically prohibits the quartering of soldiers in peacetime "in any house without the consent of the owner." In war, the historic pattern has always been the same: When war was declared, the Nation suddenly rallied an Army of civilians, trained and led by professionals who had long endured the persistent apathy and frequent scorn of their country. After the war, the civilians discarded their uniforms and became, as veterans, members of a privileged class. They were rewarded for service after getting out of the Army; those who stayed in were neither rewarded nor even long remembered.

After World War II, the pattern of hostility toward soldiers continued. Typically, the benefits of the GI bill were extended to veterans, but not to those who decided to make the Army (or any other service) a career. Then, however, for the first time in history we found ourselves in a twilight state of neither peace nor war. The cold war suddenly challenged our historic attitude that soldiers were good in wartime and bad in peacetime, and that the best soldier was an ex-soldier.

It was in this twilight that I chose the Army as a profession. Many friends and relatives were stunned. "You must be out of your mind," said one friend. Like so many civilians, they felt that the Army was a place for people who, as it was usually put, "could not do well on the outside." As a matter of fact, I had been doing well on the outside, which in my case was a small college. Membership in the Reserve Officers Training Corps—ROTC—was required for the first 2 years. I enjoyed the experience enough to continue it during my last 2 years in college. My scholastic record was high enough to qualify me for a Regular Army commission at graduation. As a new infantry lieutenant in June 1950, I fully intended to make the Army my career.

As I look back I still see patriotism as the basic reason I decided to become an Army officer. I have not been able to find a more sophisticated explanation. Soldiers are generally embarrassed when they try to explain what it means to be a soldier. Phrases such as "service to your Nation" and "guardians of democracy" stick in a soldier's throat, as well they should. Good soldiers are soldiers because soldiering is a very real, very meaningful profession. This is especially true in a society where many men with high-paying jobs make no contribution to society. Soldiers, at least, have the satisfaction of knowing their nation needs them. Yet from that nation, soldiers often receive shabby treatment.

My introduction to how the Army treats its own came when the Army took 6 weeks to transform me from a college boy to a rifle-platoon leader, responsible for the lives of some 40 men. Six weeks is not much time. Then I was shipped to Japan, where the Army was frantically putting together outfits to send to Korea. Some consisted mainly of stockade soldiers—men taken from military jails—and untrained South Koreans. I landed in Wonsan, North Korea, in November 1950, without winter clothing.

Our equipment was often shoddy or in short supply. Weapons misfired; ammunition was scarce. There were not enough magazines for our automatic rifles. We were on the line 8 out of 9 months. There were few formal battles or engagements. It was a dirty little war, and the worst part of it was the feeling that no one really cared.

When I got back in the States in 1951, after my tour in Korea, I suddenly was a peacetime soldier. I had been warned that a soldier was a second-class citizen in many Army towns, the communities that live off the payrolls of military bases. The principal industry in most of these towns was taking soldiers for every dime they had.

In many Army towns the citizen most discriminated against is the soldier. Some policemen arrest them with flagrant entrapment techniques. I have seen police wait for a soldier to walk out of a tavern and enter his car. As he pulled away, he was stopped and arrested for driving while intoxicated. Instead of protesting such injustice, the Army condoned it. Man after man was hauled before civilian authorities on such charges, convicted, and fined. Then these men were usually turned over to the Army, which fined them for conduct unbecoming a soldier or an officer. The usual fine in one Army town a few years ago for an officer was $151.50, and a similar fine was paid to the Army. At one post where I served soldiers were told officially that they should let their wives drive, for a wife could be fined only once—as a civilian.

When I was on my fourth tour of duty at Fort Benning, in 1956, about 9,000 families were living off post. Many families lived in slums. Some used outdoor privies. Others shared bathrooms and kitchens, and slept in shifts because there were not enough bedrooms to go around. Finally, the Government authorized the Army to build 4,000 homes. But members of an area real estate board complained to Washington that the building of so many homes would ruin the local housing market. The authorization was cut down to 1,000 homes. The Army consistently caves in when challenged by local political-pressure groups.

Most civilians think that a soldier's pay is tax-free, that he is financially coddled with extras that more than make up for his low pay. Soldiers do pay Federal income taxes and social security, regardless of where they are stationed in the world. They pay a 3-percent tax on food in all military commissaries. They also pay sales taxes where there are such taxes. The post exchange is highly overrated as a place for bargains. In many cases a soldier can buy goods cheaper at an off-post discount store. PX prices are deliberately pegged high enough to prevent area civilian merchants from suffering.

On-post Government housing is not free, and it certainly is not cheap. For example, at my last post, in a Government-owned housing project, I paid $145.05 a month for a small two-bedroom apartment. My next-door neighbor paid $175 a month for an identical apartment because he happened to be a colonel; I was a major.

Financially, the professional soldier is a second-class Federal employee. Until the cynically timed election-year pay raise recently voted by Congress, the pay of second lieutenants with less than 2 years' service had not been raised since 1958. The starting salary for a married second lieutenant, including all benefits, was about $4,500 a year. The average, new, Government civilian employee starts at $5,400. The civilian works a 40-hour week and is eligible for overtime pay. The soldier puts in a workweek of 50 or more hours; even a 65-hour workweek is not unusual. Of course, there is no overtime.

I am not suggesting that soldiering should be a 9-to-5 job with weekends and holidays off. A soldier is a soldier. It is a tough, demanding profession, and it has to be that way. As noncivilians, soldiers do not have many civilian rights. No civilian can be arrested for refusing to show up in his office or factory on a day he does not feel like working. A soldier can be court-martialed. The Army, rightfully, insists on extraordinary power over its men. The Army's mission is to defend the Nation, and to carry out this mission the rights of the Army must transcend the rights of the individual. No good soldier disputes this. And, in giving up rights guaranteed to all other U.S. citizens, no soldier expects extra privileges. This is in keeping with a fine American tradition that contrasts sharply with that of more militaristic nations.

America's long and unbroken tradition as a nonmilitaristic nation is not being questioned by the military men who serve this Nation. They do not want more recognition or more power. They simply want a more equitable share of that American way of life they hear so much about. Their demand is not merely for better pay and benefits; they are asking for a realistic attitude toward the military.

From the military man's point of view, the society he guards is unable to make up its mind. The American society demands a first-class Military Establishment. Yet, by keeping military pay scales low, by seemingly equating a military career with low-status employment, this same society makes it difficult for dedicated men to enter, and stay in, military service.

Rather than a savior of his country, the American fighting man is looked upon as a parasite of an affluent, peacetime society. From Congressmen on down, Americans have refused to look realistically at what brush-fire wars like Vietnam mean to the soldier who has to fight, and perhaps die, in them. The soldier is willing to fight and die, but he has a right to ask that he be treated as a first-class citizen.

It is nothing less than immoral for the American public, through its political and military leaders, to perpetuate a policy of deception and distrust toward the serviceman. Today's victim of this policy is lured into a military career by appeals to his patriotism—and promises of security that are callously broken. I resigned from the Army because I sought a new and more satisfying way of life. I wanted security for myself and my family. I found little of the security the Army had led me to expect. The Army told me, in a pamphlet promoting the Army as a career, that the Army was striving to stabilize duty assignments, improve family stability, increase career attractiveness. The pamphlet emphasized what was supposed to be a basic Army policy: "The normal tour of duty will be for 3 years." In 13 years I moved 33 times, including 10 times in 9 years of marriage. And my experience was typical; I was a victim of the system.

The supreme irony comes when a man, with sorrow and reluctance, finally decides to resign from the Army. The same civilians who thought him foolish for joining the Army now look on him as foolish for resigning. They eye his rows of ribbons; they see a man of experience and valor withdrawing from their defense. They seem to sense that his absence is a chink in their armor. Perhaps they feel less secure.

In the year ending last June 30, a total of 1,483 regular officers resigned from all the armed services. The total was 1,622 in 1962 and 787 in 1961. The Nation cannot afford to lose these dedicated men. Nor can the Nation continue to believe it is possible to maintain a large Military Establishment whose members merely subsist on the fringes of the society they protect. Thousands of the men who guard America are raising families on incomes at or below the Government's own definition of a "poverty income."

If American civilians want the security provided by a large Military Establishment, they must provide more security to the men in that establishment. These men are not hired gunslingers; most of them are husbands and fathers with families to support. These men would die for their Nation, and these families would mourn them with pride. These Americans are among our finest. And our finest should be nothing less than cherished.

When I decided to resign from the Army, I wrote a letter to myself to justify my decision. I want the opportunity, I wrote, to grow personally and financially, according to my own ability; I want to be part of a stable community; I want a home; but mostly I want my children to grow up in an atmosphere which will more adequately prepare them to face the future with confidence. The U.S. Army does not offer these possibilities to me.

Now that I am a civilian, and proud of my military service and the U.S. Army, perhaps I should change that last sentence. For I know now that the Army was not alone in letting me down. America did, too.

GRIEVANCE COMMITTEE IN HOUSE WOULD IMPROVE THE ETHICAL STANDARDS

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, from the beginning of time, where man has devised a system of government, human failure of character has been a limiting factor on the achievement of the good that was planned. The pages of history are littered with the ugly scars of those who forgot that public confidence feeds on the honesty of the men who administer the government, whatever its form.

This Nation has made substantial progress in rooting out corruption from government, but the days when everyone accepted the motto, "To the victors go the spoils," are not far behind.

The matter of ethics in government has always been of deep concern to me, and since my election to Congress in 1948 I have consistently worked with others to raise existing standards, introducing remedial legislation in every Congress since the 82d.

In 1958 with others I was successful in securing adoption of the Code of Ethics for Government Service. This code, as you know, applied not only to employees of the executive and judicial branches of Government, but to the legislative as well and to all Members of the House and Senate.

Since the passage of the Code of Ethics I have continued to push for the creation of a Commission on Ethics in the Federal Service to interpret and implement the Code of Ethics—House Joint Resolution 36, 89th Congress. This Commission would investigate complaints of unethical conduct in Government service and recommend modifications and improvements in statutes relating to ethics.

Another proposal I have introduced is one calling for the creation of a grievance committee for the House—House Resolution 18—to study complaints concerning the conduct of Members of the House of Representatives and to make investigations and appropriate recommendations.

Last year I appeared before the Senate Rules Committee investigating the conduct of employees of the Senate and presented my idea of the grievance committee. The Senate, by a vote of 50 to 33, established a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct to receive complaints and investigate allegations of improper conduct of Senate Members and employees. I understand the leadership of the Senate will soon name the members of the committee and it will begin functioning immediately thereafter.

My bill, House Resolution 18, would add "teeth" to the Code of Ethics and would allow recommendations to correct unethical conduct, including expulsion, censure, impeachment and criminal prosecution. The committee would also be authorized to require any Member of the House to make a full and complete disclosure to the committee of his personal income and investments. Several Members of Congress, including myself, have filed with the Clerk of the House our personal income and investments to comply with this section of my bill.

The grievance committee would be appointed by the Speaker of the House and it would be analogous to procedures in the legal profession and would conduct any investigations of complaints and make recommendations.

I have respectfully requested the Rules Committee to have early hearings on this measure, which I believe is realistic and needed in this juncture in our history.

SURPLUS PROPERTY FOR EDUCATIONAL USE

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD in explanation of a bill I have introduced.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, one of the forward-looking provisions of our laws relating to the administration of Federal property is found in the procedure by which surplus Federal property is made available free or at reduced cost to educational institutions. A great deal of surplus property is generated by the operation of the Federal Government; it is important that we put this property to the best possible use and the program which I have mentioned is one phase of the effort to assure that this goal will be met.

This idea and this program, as I have noted, are sound, but, like any program, improvements can be made in it. I have today introduced a bill which I believe will improve it. This bill broadens the scope of the definition of education so that this surplus property can be used in ways which are not presently permitted for it.

Specifically, the qualifications for receipt of this property under the heading of educational uses are extended to include those situations in which an educational institution for the physically or mentally handicapped provides activities for its students to experience and learn to participate in outdoor activities. Surely, teaching a blind child how better to make his way in the outdoors is a part of his education, a part of bringing him closer to leading a normal and productive life which, I believe, must be the basis for all of our efforts in the education and training of the handicapped.

This proposal came about from contact I had with an educational institution in my district which does an excellent job in helping the handicapped. I am sure it is not the only such institution whose program might be strengthened by the bill which I have offered. I would urge consideration of this bill which is both consistent with the theory behind our surplus property disposal priority system and highly beneficial to the fuller education of our handicapped children.

A BILL TO REPEAL THE EXCISE TAX ON BUSINESS MACHINES

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD in explanation of a bill I have introduced.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, last session the Ways and Means Committee held hearings on the whole scope of the excise taxes. At that time we heard representatives from the business machines industry who informed us how that industry and particularly the consumers of that industry are affected by the excise tax on business machines. After doing some research on this subject I introduced a bill to repeal those excise taxes on business machines last session, and I am reintroducing it now.

The present 10 percent manufacturers excise tax on business machines was enacted in 1941 as an emergency World War II defense measure. Its sole purpose was to discourage civilian consumption, thereby conserving critical materials, and to devote the skills of the business machine industry to the war effort. The enactment of this provision was opposed not only by the business machine industry but also by the Treasury Department and was passed by Congress primarily on the basis of a strong request by the Office of Price Administration and Civilian Supply, whose concern at that time was the curtailing of civilian consumption. It was never considered by any party as permanent legislation appropriate to the peacetime economy.

Basically there are five points to be considered in developing a case against the excise tax on business machines:

First, the tax is contrary to the clear intention of Congress to encourage capital investment. Business machines are virtually 100 percent capital goods items essential to the operation of the modern office. Thus any tax on them would be opposed to the present economic policy of encouraging and stimulating investment in capital goods, as illustrated by the 1962 Revenue Act which was designed with this end in mind. Under the provisions of that act, a 7-percent income tax credit against the purchase of such capital goods was provided. Under the terms of the 1964 Revenue Act, the 7-percent tax credit provision of the law was amended so as to increase even further the incentive for capital investment. As a corollary to the congressional action the Treasury has issued new and more favorable depreciation guidelines on capital goods. Business equipment was specifically listed in these new regulations. But despite these encouragements from the Congress and the Treasury, their effect has been largely nullified by this discriminatory excise tax leveled directly at these items.

The tax on these machines does not primarily victimize the manufacturers of these products. It is passed on to the customer—the purchaser of the machine—and then ultimately the consumers of goods and services who pay the price of this tax.

Second, Mr. Speaker, this tax is a tax on the cost of doing business and is added to the cost of nearly every product and service. Unlike most other types of capital goods, business machines are used in some form or other in virtually every service industry, as well as every level of distribution in all manufacturing and processing industries. Thus the burden of the tax is passed on and pyramided over the cost of most of the products and services in the country. In many States, it is part of the tax base for sales tax purposes and therefore takes on aspects of double taxation.

Thirdly, the excise tax on these machines is becoming increasingly discriminatory against small business. In the 1941 law, which initiated this tax, there were listed some 43 business machines that were in existence at that time. But this list is completely obsolete and inadequate when one considers the many new machines and functions that have been developed since that time. These new machines are, of course, untaxed, and properly so because of their relation to industrial efficiency and of the intent of Congress to stimulate capital investment as a means of increasing industry growth, increasing employment, and enhancing the ability of American business to compete in international trade. As business grows larger, the tendency is to utilize the more modern equipment, which is usually untaxed. On the other hand, the small enterprise is generally dependent on the standard equipment—that which existed in 1941 and is taxable under the law.

Fourth, the tax has become exceedingly difficult to administer, and is raising some serious compliance problems. The technological revolution which this country has seen includes the business machine industry. That being the case, the Treasury Department has been forced to make rulings to interpret the statute. Even so, it has been an almost impossible task for those charged with the duty of collecting the revenue to keep pace with the sweeping technological changes that are taking place in that industry. There are numerous examples where the old law, even with new rulings, is inequitable and producing inconsistent results. A machine for coding documents which uses holes in the coding system is taxable as a punchcard machine. Another system which is not dependent upon holes for the code is not taxable. In another example, the duplicating machines are taxable but the new electrostatic machines, which are competitors, are not. The development of the electronic data processing industry alone has created a vast gray area between the taxable and the nontaxable which is not capable of clarification.

Aside from the burden that it places on the Treasury Department for constant and individual rulings, it is also placing an undue burden on the industry and its customers. Until the Treasury Department rules on the taxability aspect, manufacturers must either collect an amount equivalent to the possible excise tax, which is then held in escrow, or else insert a provision in the contract of sale for later payment by the customer should the item later be taxed. The burdens this imposes are obvious. Either the customer's capital is indefinitely tied up in escrow or else the manufacturer has the impractical job of collecting this added payment on equipment previously sold to the customer, often many years prior to the ruling.

Compounding the administrative problem, which I have mentioned, is the marketing characteristic of the business machine industry in which the customers often desire to rent the equipment rather than purchase it. On such leases, the manufacturer must maintain detailed excise tax records on each piece of equipment, setting forth the monthly rental payments, and what part of them are allocated to the payment of the excise tax, and the cumulative excise tax paid, until the tax paid on the rentals equals the tax that would have been paid if the equipment had been sold. It is interesting to note that it is possible for the user to rent two identical machines—one on which he must pay the excise tax, and not on the other. This inequity arises because it is possible to rent equipment which has been previously rented a sufficient amount of time to pay off the entire excise tax. And it is possible that one user may rent a machine and have to pay the tax while his competitor rents an identical machine and pays none.

The Federal Government is one of the largest renters of business equipment. The Treasury, recognizing the complications that I have outlined above, has exempted the collection of excise tax on equipment rented to the Federal Government but still collects it on equipment sold to the Government. This contradiction discriminates severely in favor of those companies which rent to the Government. Furthermore, such divergent treatment complicates the sound evaluation by Government agencies as to the economic desirability of purchase versus rental of equipment.

Fifth, the tax does not produce substantial net revenue for the Federal Government. The increase of new machines and new functions has had a marked effect on this specific tax as a revenue producing agent for the Treasury. Total revenues from this tax in fiscal 1963 were $74.8 million, the lowest collection since 1956. This figure reflects a steady decline in collections from a high of $99 million in 1960. This is due primarily to the increasing proportion of sales of electronic data processing and related equipment. It is expected that 1964 will show an even further erosion of this as a revenue producing measure.

It should be further noted that the gross amount of revenue collected under this excise tax does not represent added income for the Government. Depreciation on the taxed machines is fully deductible for Federal income purposes as a necessary business expense. Therefore, the excise tax itself becomes a deduction which would not otherwise be available and results in lower income tax collections. Moreover, the industry's largest single customer is the Federal Government itself, and all sales to it, which are taxed, do not constitute real revenue, but reflect only a series of such transactions.

Mr. Speaker, for these reasons I am today reintroducing a bill to repeal the excise tax on business machines sold after December 31, 1965. My bill also takes into account the lease payments made on these business machines and repeals the tax with respect to payments made after December 31, 1965, for leasing periods after that date.

I have also considered in this bill the matter of floor stock refunds. In the case of some types of business machines—typewriters, for example—dealers will have stocks of taxpaid business machines on hand at the time of termination of the tax. If refunds were not provided, they would presumably have to absorb the tax because the customers would have the ready alternative of buying from some dealer who had purchased the equipment from the manufacturer after the termination of the excise tax. In view of this, my bill provides that where dealers have a stock of business machines on hand on the effective date of the repeal of the tax and they have paid the tax on those articles, a tax credit or refund may be claimed on those taxes. These refunds or credits are available only in those cases where the manufacturer has reimbursed the dealer for the tax, or has obtained the dealer's consent to the allowance of the credit or refund.

PRO RATA DIVISION OF CORPORATIONS

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD in explanation of a bill I have introduced.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I have today reintroduced an amendment to the Internal Revenue Code to permit the division of a corporation into two corporations on a fully non pro rata basis. It is designed to permit a tax-free transaction for the division of a corporation into two smaller economic units without a pro rata division of ownership in the new corporations. Last session, the bill was numbered H.R. 3061.

At present such a division is possible but section 355, which permits it, requires that the corporation divided be engaged in the active conduct of two separate businesses for the 5 years preceding the distribution. This bill questions the requirement for the conduct of a trade or business for a fully non pro rata distribution.

An explanation of the bill follows:

Subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) of paragraph (1) of section 355(c), which the bill would add to the code, are practically self-explanatory and state the mechanical and arithmetical limits of the transactions which will be permitted to occur tax free. The two survivor corporations must be of comparable size and must not have any common shareholders.

Subparagraph (D) provides that 90 percent of the stock of the distributing corporation must have been acquired more than 5 years before the distribution or received as a gift, devise, or bequest from a person who acquired it more than 5 years before the distribution. It should be observed that for purposes of this section a tax-free acquisition of stock is considered an acquisition at the time of the tax-free exchange or distribution, so that the requirement of the subparagraph is not satisfied if stock was acquired in a reorganization or in a section 351 transaction less than 5 years before the distribution.

Subparagraph (E) is intended to prevent stockholders from achieving a taxable exchange or purchase through the use of contributions to capital. Thus, for example, if stockholder A—owning 50 percent of the stock—contributes an apartment house to the corporation while stockholder B—owning 50 percent of the stock—contributes investment securities to the corporation before the distribution, and after the distribution each shareholder owns stock of a corporation which owns the property contributed by the other shareholder, the transaction will not qualify under subsection (c)(1)(E). Such a transaction will be treated as a total liquidation, even if the distributing corporation is not formally liquidated, but retained by one of the shareholders.

Subparagraph (F) is intended to guard against the use of the subsection for tax avoidance purposes. While the courts would probably read this requirement into the statute in any case, a clear statement is believed desirable in view of the fact that the bill brings a new concept into the code.

Proposed section 355(c)(2) makes it clear that section 356 does not apply to any transaction which fails to meet the requirements of subsection (c)(1) because some or all of the shareholders own stock of more than one corporation—directly or constructively by application of section 318—after the transaction. In such a case, the transaction is treated as a partial or total liquidation immediately preceded by a distribution to which section 301 applies. This may be illustrated by a simple example: A and B each own 50 percent in value of the stock of corporation Z. One-half—in value—of the assets of corporation Z are transferred to corporation X and the other one-half—in value—are transferred to corporation Y. Immediately thereafter all of the stock of X and Y is distributed to A and B and Z is liquidated. In the distribution A receives 90 percent of the stock of corporation X and 10 percent of the stock of corporation Y, while B receives 90 percent of the stock of corporation Y and 10 percent of the stock of corporation X. The transaction fails to meet the requirements of subsection (c)(1) and under subsection (c)(2) it is taxed as follows: A is treated as having received a dividend of 10 percent of the stock of corporation Y and B is treated as having received a dividend of 10 percent of the stock of corporation X immediately before the distribution of all the other stock distributed. A is also treated as having received 90 percent of the stock of corporation X in a total liquidation and B is similarly treated as having received 90 percent of the stock of corporation Y in a total liquidation.

It should be observed that the Commissioner's authority under existing section 312(1) to allocate earnings in section 355 transactions will, of course, extend to transactions permitted by the new subsection which the bill will add to section 355.

HEALTH CARE FOR THE AGED

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, the No. 1 issue before this 89th Congress and the Nation is health care for the aged.

There is no question but that this is a national problem which must be resolved. Our senior citizens need help to meet their medical costs. Modern medical miracles have greatly added to the span of life in our society. Now all of us can look forward to many more of the golden years of life. But this great blessing has also brought with it sharply increased medical expenses. Periods of illness are much longer and the costs of hospital, doctors, nurses, and drugs have skyrocketed.

Millions of our senior citizens are fully able to care for their ordinary expenses of living, but are in constant fear of a major sickness which they cannot pay for.

This is a national problem which this Congress must resolve. This Nation has an obligation here—to provide decent medical care to its senior citizens in their declining years. We are a prosperous Nation with great resources of wealth. We can well afford to provide medical care to those of our citizens who have contributed so much in their working and productive lives to our Nation's wealth.

The real question before this Congress is not whether we shall do this, but how shall we do it.

We have two paths down which to travel. We can go down the Government road, of creating a whole new Federal bureaucracy to handle this problem, with countless new rules and regulations, tons of paperwork, and countless new thousands of bureaucrats. We can have socialized medicine. This is what this administration wants to cram down our throats.

By taking this path, we will hamstring our hospitals and doctors. We can well place in jeopardy far and away the best overall medical care that any nation in the world enjoys.

Proponents of socialized medicine keep telling us about how well it has worked in European countries. I believe the facts are otherwise. At any rate, it cannot be denied that private enterprise here in this Nation has produced the world's best health care.

Or, we can take another path—that of private enterprise. Let Uncle Sam finance this needed health care for our senior citizens, but let our Nation's health care problems be handled in the same fine manner that exists today. This is the path I will follow. This is the American way.

I am introducing today a bill, modeled after the medical care bill first introduced by the gentleman from Ohio, Representative FRANK BOW.

My bill provides for comprehensive medical care for our senior citizens over 65 through private enterprise, using the facilities of health insurance carriers.

The bill provides for insurance paying for hospital costs up to 90 days, convalescent home care up to 30 days and surgery, doctors calls, and ancillary charges.

The cost of the health insurance plans would be paid out of general revenues of the Government. The method would be by permitting the individual senior citizen to deduct the cost of the health insurance up to $150 from his annual income tax due Uncle Sam, or in those cases where he paid no tax, then Uncle Sam would pay for the insurance.

The health insurance would be available to single citizens over 65 with incomes less than $4,000, and to married citizens over 65 with incomes less than $8,000. Thus, it would be geared to need.

Why is my bill better than the administration bill, H.R. 1, which is essentially the same highly controversial, King-Anderson bill of other years? There are many reasons. Of first and greatest importance, my bill provides greater medical coverage. It not only covers basic hospital room costs, but also doctors' calls, surgery charges, drugs, and miscellaneous hospital charges. It helps our senior citizens far better than the administration bill.

It employs the same methods now used in this Nation for health care. There are almost countless millions of health insurance plans in force in this Nation. Our citizens, hospitals, and doctors are all familiar with these methods. Why impose unnecessary new Government rules and regulations under a new system of socialized medicine?

My bill, while covering nearly 15 million people, is confined to those people who need the coverage. Why pay for the medical costs of our citizens who can well afford to pay their own bills?

Under the administration bill, our already hard-pressed workers would be paying for the health care of millionaires.

Best of all reasons for my bill, is that the cost is paid out of the general revenues of the Government. In other words, every taxpayer shares the cost, the wealthy as well as our wage earners, and the big powerful corporations, too, in accordance with their ability to pay.

Under the administration bill the cost is placed upon the worker with an added social security deduction from his paycheck. And believe me, the first deduction will be the beginning only, it will go up and up in later years just as the social security deductions have gone up.

Most of all, my bill keeps the Government out of medicine. My bill rejects socialized medicine as have the vast majority of thinking citizens over the years. My bill follows the same system of private enterprise, health insurance plans which have proven so phenomenally successful in this Nation.

We have a superb medical care system in this Nation. Let us not tamper with it by experimenting with socialized medicine.

We have seen how, in some nations, it has laid the heavy hand of bureaucracy on medical care and hurt it.

Let us simply expand our present system of private health insurance that has worked so well.

Let us reject out of hand this un-American socialized medicine scheme of the administration.

Let us not overburden our workers by new cuts out of their paychecks.

Let us care for our senior citizens adequately, with a good bill, such as the one I have just introduced.

THE NATIONAL COPPER STOCKPILE

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing legislation to authorize the temporary release of 100,000 short tons of copper from the national stockpile. The need for this measure extends far beyond the bounds of my congressional district; it is of importance to our entire national economy.

Our domestic copper fabricators and the myriad of industrial users of copper supplies are in a most difficult position through no fault of their own. I am not attempting to simplify a complex problem, but in, brief, lengthy labor disputes—disputes which have now been resolved—are the key to the existing crisis. Copper is now in short supply and, although prospects for the future are brighter, immediate action must be taken to help alleviate the present situation.

The seriousness of the current predicament is immediately evident when one realizes that in my district steady employment prospects for more than 4,000 workers are jeopardized by the existing copper crisis. On a national scale, many, many times that number of workers stand to be adversely affected by this situation unless we here in the Congress take appropriate action.

At a time when all of us here on Capitol Hill are exploring new programs designed to create more jobs, let us not miss this opportunity to preserve existing jobs.

The bill that I am introducing would give authority to the Office of Emergency Planning to release, on a loan basis, 100,000 short tons of copper from the national stockpile to domestic copper producers. The rules and regulations governing the release of the copper would be prescribed by the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning; however, I want to stress that there should be an equitable distribution that is fair to large and small producer alike.

At present, the Federal Government has more than 1 million short tons of copper in the national stockpile. Under Public Law 520, the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning is authorized and directed to determine from time to time what materials are strategic and critical as well as the quality and quantity of such materials which shall be stockpiled.

I fully recognize the need for this activity and am well aware that copper is a strategic material. For this reason, the bill that I am introducing calls for a short-term loan rather than an outright sale of copper.

One of the major terms of this measure is that any producer receiving copper under the proposed plan shall agree to restore to the national stockpile an amount and grade of copper at least equivalent to that received, first, not later than 1 year after the receipt thereof, or second in the event of an emergency, as determined by the President, not later than 60 days after notice thereof.

Favorable action on this bill will demonstrate our sincere interest in coming to grips with a serious problem and solving it without in any way endangering our national security objectives or expending vast sums of money. Clearly, the Federal Government has an opportunity, in fact an obligation, to help preserve jobs and strengthen our economy. I believe passage of this bill will do just that.

THE SERIOUS FARM LABOR PROBLEM IN CALIFORNIA

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, all of us have read and know about the disaster that has struck northern California in the form of floods. An equally disastrous tragedy has struck southern California. Due to our inability to harvest our agricultural crops because of the expiration of the bracero program, there are hundreds of thousands in dollar value and soon there will be millions in dollar value of agricultural crops in southern California going unharvested. This has already resulted in the shutting down of one packinghouse, the moving of some agricultural production to Mexico, and the loss of thousands, tens of thousands, and it will soon be hundreds of thousands of jobs for domestic workers in packinghouses, driving trucks, and so forth.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully call the attention of the Members to an article which appeared in one of the newspapers in my district in the last few days which accurately depicts this whole tragic story.

The article referred to is as follows:

Labor Lack Closes One Packinghouse

(By Murray Norris)

One citrus packinghouse has closed in Ventura County and most of the remainder are receiving only a fraction of the fruit needed, due to the farm labor shortage.

The good demand for lemons coupled with low supplies in Ventura County sheds is extremely frustrating to many packinghouse managers. They can see the fruit on the trees, they have a market to sell them at good prices, but they can't get them off the trees.

Because they are unable to harvest the citrus crop, some growers and packers are becoming worried about the 3 million boxes of export citrus which Ventura County was able to sell last year. The higher costs of production could easily price local citrus producers out of the export market. A short supply of harvested fruit would keep most of the citrus on the domestic market.

"Right now, I doubt that you could get a box of export fruit in Ventura County—our supplies are too low," said Carl McKnight at the Saticoy Lemon Association Packinghouse.

CLOSES PACKINGHOUSE

T. A. Lombard, manager of Rancho Sespe outside of Fillmore, said he has closed his citrus packinghouse because of the high costs of production.

"Our costs of picking increased 60 percent as soon as the braceros left," said Lombard. "If this continues, we will be out of the lemon business in a very short time."

He didn't think that higher prices for produce or citrus was the answer to the higher production costs. If Americans raise their prices, the foreign producers will flood the country with their farm products.

IMPORTS

"Italians are already shipping lemon juice into this country way below what we can produce it for," he said. "If we raise our prices they'll only pour in lots more."

Last year, some 20 percent of the State's lemon crop, and between 15 and 17 percent of the Valencia orange crop was exported to Europe. In Ventura County, 25 percent of the lemon crop was exported.

This year, there may be no exports unless the citrus crop can be harvested.

"It all depends on what fraction of your crop you can harvest," said Bill Craig, manager of Limoniera Ranch at Santa Paula. "If you can only get half of your crop off the trees, you will sell it as domestic fresh. Export is the market for a surplus. If you can't get your harvest in you won't have any surplus."

At Limoniera, all types of workers have been turned out into the fields to pick citrus.

EVERYONE PICKS

"We have a number of men who are multiple-occupation workers who are available for picking," said Craig. These men work all year at the ranch and live in ranch housing. They have been taken off other jobs to keep the fruit flowing into the ranch packinghouse.

"We have about 20 percent of the men we need at the peak," said Craig. "As soon as the weather dries off and more fruit comes on, we will be in a pickle."

However, Limoniera is apparently lucky compared with other packinghouses that are receiving only one-sixth of the fruit they need and want.

Jess Phillips, manager of a local packinghouse said his crews were picking only 500 boxes a day when the packinghouse could use 3,000.

ONLY 200 BOXES

Riley Besand, plant manager for Ventura Coastal Lemon at Montalvo, said he was getting between 15 and 20 percent of the fruit needed. He wants 1,500 boxes a day; he is getting 200.

Both Phillips and Besand said their packinghouse women were working only a few hours a week and were drawing partial unemployment insurance. Like other county packinghouses, these two are using this slack period to catch up on maintenance. Within a week or two, or three at the most, all maintenance will be finished.

"Then they [the men] will either go into the fields and pick, or be laid off," said Besand. He wasn't sure what to do with the women.

One plant manager predicted: "We will all be out there with bags by the end of the month, if something doesn't improve."

While a Los Angeles group of Mexican-Americans was asking for a congressional investigation into the "passing over" of farm skills of that ethnic group, local farmers were high in their praise of the abilities of the Mexican-Americans who work the county farms.

PASSED OVER

Both farmers and State employment officials insisted that no Mexican-American had been passed over in this area.

"I don't think there has been even a whisper of anything like that," said Francis Bowden, manager of the Ventura office of the State department of employment. "I'm sure that every Mexican-American knows we are actively working to do everything we can."

This was reaffirmed by the State farm labor office at Oxnard where a spokesman said: "No one has been turned away who was able to do the work and willing to do the work." He said his office was referring more laborers than ever before and everyone was "doing the same as we always have."

MORE WORKERS

Because of the rains up north and the rains in Ventura County, the demand for farm labor is the closest to being filled by domestic workers that it will ever be, say both farmers and State officials.

Bill Tolbert of the Ventura County Citrus Growers Committee said that his group of farmers have used as high as 2,500 workers at this time of the year. However, because of the rain, they only need 1,000 this year. They had 554 working in the fields yesterday, 21 of whom quit.

A spokesman for the State farm labor placement office in Oxnard said the oranges were coming on late this year and this was making the demand for workers far below normal. Many of the farmworkers now asking for jobs in Ventura County will be migrating north in April just when the labor demand will be increasing here.

Tolbert said he has started the navel orange harvest in the Piru area this week, and he hoped to have enough workers next week to send some pickers into the orange groves in the Ojai area.

He said he was promised two busloads (76 men) from Los Angeles on Wednesday. His buses brought back only 20 workers. He needs at least 450 more pickers immediately.

Lemon men were concerned over both the rain and the labor shortage. The rain is making the lemons grow too rapidly, and the lack of labor may make it impossible to harvest them before they become oversized. There is little market for oversized fruit.

REVIEW OF THE SORDID DETAILS OF THE BOBBY BAKER SCANDALS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I call attention to the splendid article in yesterday's Washington Star in which the Star's staff writers, Paul Hope and John Barron, review the sordid details of the Bobby Baker scandals and propound 15 important questions the answers for which the Senate Rules Committee ought to have sought months ago.

No single newspaper in this country and no two reporters have done more than the Washington Star and Mr. Hope and Mr. Barron to try to keep this rotten, immoral mess from being swept under the most convenient rug.

I suggest that for its valiant efforts to root out and fix responsibility for the evils implicit in these scandals, efforts that have met with obstacles at almost every turn, the Washington Star and its staff writers be nominated for the next award of the Pulitzer Prize.

Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to make such an unofficial nomination.

MINORITY EMPLOYEES

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 96 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That pursuant to the Legislative Pay Act of 1929, as amended, five of the minority employees authorized therein shall be the following-named persons, effective January 4, 1965, until otherwise ordered by the House, to wit: Harry L. Brookshire and William B. Prendergast to receive gross compensation of $23,059.64 per annum, respectively; William R. Bonsell to receive gross compensation of $18,741.89 per annum; Tommy Lee Winebrenner, to receive gross compensation of $16,214.50 per annum; and

Walter Patrick Kennedy (minority pair clerk), to receive gross compensation of $18,270.00 per annum.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT IN THE MISSOURI RIVER BASIN

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. Andrews] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, last November, Chairman Wayne N. Aspinall of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, one of the acknowledged leaders in the field of conservation and reclamation, delivered an excellent speech before the annual joint convention of the North Dakota Water Users Association and the North Dakota Water Management District Association, in Bismarck, N. Dak. Chairman Aspinall discussed legislative responsibility in connection with water resources development in the Missouri River Basin and elsewhere throughout the West. I believe that his discussion of past problems in connection with the Federal reclamation program and his appraisal of future actions that are needed will be of interest to every Member of this body. I am, therefore, including Chairman Aspinall's address as a part of these remarks.

Commissioner Floyd Dominy also delivered an excellent speech to the convention which I am including for the information of my colleagues:

Remarks of Hon. Wayne N. Aspinall Before the Annual Meeting of the North Dakota Water Users Association, November 19, 1964, Bismarck, N. Dak.

I am pleased to have this opportunity to participate in the sixth annual convention of the North Dakota Water Users Association and North Dakota Water Management District Association, Inc., particularly in the company of your outstanding Governor, who has done so much for your State, and who did everything humanly possible earlier this year to obtain favorable action on the Garrison project legislation. I will say more about Garrison a little later, but first I want to leave with you a few thoughts I have relative to water resource development in the Missouri River Basin and the legislative responsibility which those of us in the Congress have for this program.

I have had a direct interest in the development of your water resources much longer than most of you realize. In 1952, I served as a member of President Truman's Missouri Basin Survey Commission along with your own senior Senator Milt Young. As I contemplated what I should talk to you about tonight, I recalled some of the issues and problems relating to water resources development which that Commission considered 12 years ago. I recalled also some of the recommendations of that Commission, which, incidentally, no one paid any attention to. We submitted our report to President Truman on January 12, 1953, and the new administration which took over a week later showed no particular interest in it. However, I have always considered that it was a worthwhile study and report. The resource principles which that Commission recommended to guide the development in the Missouri Basin are as relevant today as they were 12 years ago—not just for the Missouri Basin but for the entire Nation. They include such items as comprehensive and coordinated planning, proper balance among all phases of resource development, maximum use of resources, local participation to the greatest extent possible, priority of water uses, and economic and financial feasibility. The Commission stated that "the overall purpose of resource development should be to enhance economic opportunity for the people of the basin, improve their welfare and enlarge their contribution to the Nation." Time has not changed that objective.

To implement its recommendation for comprehensive planning, the survey commission recommended that Congress establish a Missouri Basin Commission which would be responsible for directing Federal resource activities in the Missouri Basin and coordinating those activities with resource development activities of the States. Other recommendations of the survey commission related to national policy with respect to land and water resource development and to State and local participation in the Missouri River Basin program. There were also recommendations on economic procedures and practices to be followed in the Missouri River Basin.

I've often wondered what the situation in the Missouri Basin might be today with respect to resource development if the recommendations of the Missouri Basin Survey Commission had been adopted and activated. Take, for instance, the commission proposal. There was some disagreement among the survey commission members as to the type of organization which should be established to direct and coordinate the development of the land and water resources in the basin but there was no disagreement on the need for a central organization of some kind. So far as comprehensive planning is concerned, the proposal to establish a Missouri Basin Commission is very similar to the present proposal embodied in S. 1111, which passed the Senate this year and was approved by my committee. If we had established a Missouri Basin Commission, or a similar central organization 12 years ago and had adopted other recommendations made at that time, I wonder if resource development in the basin would not be in better order today. I say this because, to a great extent, our problems in the Missouri Basin have stemmed from lack of cooperation and coordination as well as inadequate study. To be perfectly frank with you, there has been more inefficiency and waste in the Missouri River Basin than in any other major water development program. The Bureau of Reclamation alone has spent around $70 million for investigations and planning and they've done no worse than the other Federal agencies. While the Missouri River Basin project was authorized as a single integrated development, and this is as it should be, it did come about as the result of a "shotgun wedding" between the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation, and it was authorized without adequate study and information. While some of the project features authorized in 1944 had been investigated in some detail, the majority of them had been given only a quick reconnaissance survey. Had the plan been considered as a framework within which specific projects could be further studied and recommended to the Congress as we have done in other areas it would have been fine, but the plan was not adequate to provide construction authority, as has been proven over the last 20 years.

This was the plan that gave us the third division of the Riverton project, which apparently we are about to abandon after nearly 20 years of trying to make it work. This is also the plan which gave us many additional problems. Some units, such as the Bixby, were abandoned after construction had started. Some of the reservoirs that were constructed primarily to serve irrigation, for one reason or another, have never done so. We built the Tiber Dam at a cost of more than $20 million primarily to serve irrigation but then we found no sentiment for irrigation development in the area and the irrigation facilities have never been built. Other problem units in the Missouri Basin include Cedar Bluff, Heart Butte, Keyhole, Moorhead, and Shade Hill. Even with this experience I know that there are many in the Basin who are quite unhappy with the policy we adopted last year that no new units of the Missouri River Basin project could be started without reauthorization. However, I believe you can see that this is the only way we can know where we stand on the overall project, both with respect to development and the financial position.

I doubt if many of you realize the extent of the criticism of the entire reclamation program as a result of problems caused by hasty and politically inspired actions, or the burdens placed upon those of us who are responsible for justifying the reclamation program in the Congress. Perhaps a nationwide program that provides "something for everybody" can survive this kind of criticism but, in my opinion, a sectional program such as reclamation can not. I don't believe that in the years ahead, as we face a national water crisis, the Nation can afford inefficiency and waste.

I hope I have not left the impression that I am critical of the physical development we find in the Missouri River Basin today. I certainly am not because it has already contributed immensely to the economy of not only the 10 States of the basin directly affected but to the Nation as a whole. I am only critical of how we got to where we are today and the waste and inefficiency involved. But certainly no one questions the wisdom of the program. The main stem of the Missouri has been harnessed. Some 85 million acre-feet of storage capacity has been provided. Control of main stem flood waters has, for the most part, been achieved and navigation below Sioux City has been greatly enhanced. The Missouri River Basin power system, with a total capacity of about 3 million kilowatts, is contributing greatly to the economy of the entire basin. The entire development is a single entity from a financial standpoint in order that maximum use of basin resources can be accomplished. Thus, as we look at the development already in being, we know that this has been a highly successful venture. However, we must think about the future and the role that reclamation is to play. This integrated development is only partially complete and the water resources are not being fully used. Irrigation development has lagged behind development for the other purposes. To a great extent, the benefits flowing from the project at the present time accrue to downstream interests at the expense of the up-river States. I know that several hundred thousand acres of prime agricultural and wildlife lands in the North Dakota flood plain of the Missouri River are now inundated and removed from use by the main stem control structures. I know that towns and villages have been uprooted and that thousands of Indians had to be relocated. I know what these actions have meant to your State in terms of reduced income and reduced tax base. Up to this time the overall impact of the Missouri River Basin project on your State has probably been negative. The values and benefits to North Dakota from this great basin program will be realized only when we have achieved balanced development which will come about with completion of the reclamation projects including the Garrison unit.

My objective is to get the overall program in the Missouri Basin in order and on the firm foundation necessary to survive critics of today and tomorrow so that the project may be completed as originally envisioned. That is why I sponsored the legislation which, in effect, requires all new units to be authorized or reauthorized by the Congress. This is why, also, I insisted that the Interior Department review the financial aspects of the project and determine what actions were necessary to put the project in a sound financial position. Development of the Missouri River Basin project as a single entity permits the use of power revenues to assist in paying irrigation costs. This is a sound conservation principle to which I thoroughly subscribe and which I have always supported. However, power revenues cannot assist irrigation development when power can't even pay its own way. If we can get the Missouri River Basin power system on a paying basis, the financial assistance needed for irrigation development will cease to be a problem.

It was about a year ago that the Department of the Interior submitted its report and recommendations to the Congress with respect to the financial position of the Missouri River Basin project. Its proposal essentially met our requirement for repayment of all reimbursable costs within a 50-year period. The two major recommendations called for an average increase in firm power rates of a quarter of a mill for kilowatt-hour and the use of a 2½-percent interest rate in amortizing the unpaid power investment in Corps of Engineers projects. The Department has not put the rate increase into effect, pending a decision by the Congress with respect to the interest rate. The interest rate provision was in the Garrison legislation. This provision was acceptable to me and it was acceptable to my committee because it is the same interest rate that is used in repaying the cost of other major Federal power systems in which the Department of the Interior markets power from the Corps of Engineers powerplants. The Bonneville Power Administration system, the Southwestern Power Administration system, and the Southeastern Power Administration system all market power and energy under repayment schedules using the 2½ percent interest rate for past expenditures. However, since the Garrison legislation was not enacted the Department has not been in position to put the rate increase into effect. Thus, the Missouri River Basin project is still not in a sound financial position, and we have this problem to resolve next year.

Those of you who were in Palm Springs last week heard me discuss legislative responsibility in connection with the reclamation program. I do not intend to repeat all that I said there, but I do want to report briefly on how we are trying to meet our responsibility because it has a direct bearing on further development in the Missouri River Basin. The reclamation program, including the Missouri River Basin project, is the responsibility of the Congress. Congress has the responsibility for establishing the policies and guidelines for Federal participation in the development of water resources. We cannot meet this responsibility, however, unless we in the Congress receive the full cooperation of the Executive, including all the agencies having responsibility in the water field, and the full cooperation of the States and others interested in water development. We can be successful in making maximum use of our limited resources only if there is the fullest cooperation and coordination and a willingness to adopt uniform policies and procedures. We must remove agency competition and partisan politics from project consideration and authorize projects on the basis of merit and their ability to meet the needs of the American people. Only by measuring up to these standards can we place reclamation on the sound foundation necessary for continued service in the decades ahead.

Since I have been Chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs we have been attempting to meet this legislative responsibility because I believe it is necessary in the national interest. We have been trying to reverse this every-agency-for-itself trend and to make a start toward establishing general policies and procedures that will provide the cooperative and coordinated national effort in the water field which is essential. Our objective is a national approach to water resources development. It is now clear that all the Nation's water resources must be developed to the fullest extent, whether the water is eventually to be used for agriculture, industry, or for our rapidly growing cities and towns. Planning, therefore, must be on a comprehensive and coordinated basis to provide multiple benefits and Congress must establish the Federal role and the roles of the various water development agencies.

In the 88th Congress we have made considerable progress in the direction of uniform policy. The Land and Water Conservation Fund Act, for example, will now provide an urgently needed and rational method of financing an accelerated program for recreation development at water resources projects, as well as help preserve and develop other potential recreation opportunities across the Nation. By authorizing a system of user fees it also establishes a cost-sharing policy for the direct beneficiaries of recreation development at Federal reservoirs—all Federal reservoirs, not just Bureau of Reclamation reservoirs.

The Water Research Act, in addition to bringing to bear the talents of our colleges and universities for resolving numerous water problems to assist our national effort, also provides for full coordination and cooperation among all agencies responsible for water research and for establishing agency responsibilities in water research. I emphasize all Federal agencies, not just agencies in the Department of the Interior.

While the Water Resources Planning Act was not enacted, the fact that it passed the Senate and was approved by my committee indicates congressional recognition that it is needed legislation and I predict that it will be given early consideration in the 89th Congress. This legislation provides the planning guidance for the Nation which all planning agencies—Federal, State, and local—must follow—not just planning agencies of the Department of the Interior.

The Water Project Recreation Act was developed by my committee with the cooperation of the administration. Although it was not enacted it nevertheless provides a policy which my committee is following and which the administration is following in submitting water projects to the Congress. I believe that this legislation will also be considered early in the next Congress and will be enacted. It is urgently needed for establishing cost-sharing policies in connection with recreation and fish and wildlife aspects of all water projects—not just projects of the Department of the Interior or the Bureau of Reclamation. I'm sure you will remember that this legislation resolved one of our major problems in connection with Garrison.

The extension of the Small Reclamation Projects Act was not enacted but we are now in position to go forward with consideration of this legislation on the basis of uniform treatment of recreation in all small local water projects. We now have the administration's recommendations for treating recreation and fish and wildlife alike in small reclamation projects and watershed projects of the Department of Agriculture.

In addition to these specific items, project legislation enacted in the 88th Congress makes it clear that Congress is going to require full repayment of reimbursable costs of water projects in a 50-year period and that projects must be economically justified and reauthorized if plans become outdated. I have already mentioned this in relationship to the Missouri Basin project.

So you see, considerable progress was made in the 88th Congress toward a national approach to water development and the standardization of policies although our authorization program was below expectations. I was, of course, disappointed that Garrison was not authorized because it was ready and in position and I was further disappointed because of your great effort that now must be repeated. However, I am not greatly concerned merely because the actual dollar amount for projects authorized in the 88th Congress is below the average of our construction program. With some reclamation projects extremely large and others very small, it is not practical to expect the dollar amount of our authorization program to be the same every year or every Congress. For instance, in the 84th Congress, we authorized projects costing more than $1½ billion and, in the 85th, we authorized projects costing only about $60 million. With around $2.5 billion remaining in the going construction program, it is my view that the critical factor for reclamation is the annual level of spending authorized by the appropriations acts. As you know I have appeared before the Appropriations Committee every year recently, urging that the level of appropriations be increased. We were finally able to get the construction program up to about $300 million in fiscal year 1964, but this year it was reduced for the first time since the 83d Congress. I think the important thing is not that we authorize a lot of projects in any particular year just to make a record but, instead, that we have a sound, progressive and expanding program which is an integral part of our national water resources development task and which meets the needs of the American people.

In my opening remarks I indicated that I had had a direct interest in Missouri River Basin development since 1952. Some of you know that I have also been acquainted with the Garrison project for some time. I was chairman of the Irrigation and Reclamation Subcommittee that came to North Dakota 7 years ago and held the new-famous hearings in Devils Lake. I recall that I was surprised to see the show of interest and the united support for the project at that time. I also recall that, at the close of those hearings, I cautioned you against overoptimism, but I surely didn't anticipate that it would take us this long to get the unit in position to be authorized. We ran into many unexpected problems.

In closing, let me repeat that I am fully aware of what North Dakota has given up in the interest of overall development and in order to bring multiple-purpose benefits to others outside your borders, and that nothing less than full development of the Garrison unit can provide North Dakota with the benefits and values to which it is entitled from the integrated project. No one knows better than I that the Garrison unit cannot be considered alone but only as a part of the overall basin development. Without the Garrison unit and other irrigation projects we would not have a balanced development and the Congress would not have kept faith with North Dakota and the other upriver States.

I share with you the disappointment over the delay in Garrison authorization. However, I believe the end of your long wait is in sight. I feel confident that, when you meet a year from now, the Garrison authorization will be a reality. It had been my hope to authorize the Garrison unit this year. Had there not been unexpected roadblocks which related more to the rush for adjournment and to the fact we were in an election year than to the merits of the Garrison project we would have been successful. The important thing now is that we are in position to move the Garrison legislation without delay next year. The problems we have had in the past—particularly those relating to cost-sharing policy and to the financial position of the overall Missouri River Basin program—have, I hope, been resolved. As far as I am concerned, the Garrison project will be the first order of business before the Irrigation Subcommittee next year.

REMARKS BY FLOYD E. DOMINY, COMMISSIONER, BUREAU OF RECLAMATION, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, BEFORE THE ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE NORTH DAKOTA WATER USERS ASSOCIATION IN BISMARCK, N. DAK., NOVEMBER 20, 1964

It is good to be here and to see again the many friends I have come to know and cherish during our long, mutual efforts to develop the water resources of the State of North Dakota—a development this State so strongly needs and deserves.

Water development struggles, like military campaigns and athletic contests, generate strong and abiding friendships. We all have a feeling that we have been involved in something that we believe in and actively desire to win—even those of us who are actually engaged in a nonbelligerent capacity as planners and consultants.

And from my vantage point, I have been impressed that this organization has always been a powerful driving force in North Dakota water development efforts as well as one of the major organizations which has made possible impressive and continuing progress in the development of our country's resources. Throughout the West, a significant number among your membership are recognized as leaders and men of action who have demonstrated the ability to go beyond their role of leadership in the State to contribute, as well, to the national reclamation and water conservation effort. As a group you are to be especially commended for your capacity to promote forward action and unanimity in water resource development, not only at the "grassroots" but also on a much broader level.

Today and tomorrow there is an adequate challenge to that leadership and that organizational morale.

The Garrison diversion unit, and all that it means for North Dakota and the Nation, now stands near the threshold of authorization.

In football parlance, the ball has been advanced to the 10-yard line, and the project supporters, the whole team, are poised for a final effort to cross the goal line.

The struggle has been rough and drawn-out and some "summer patriots" may be getting a little tired and war weary. Some have difficulty in recognizing that real progress has been made in recent months. We have, as you are aware, cleared the way with the payout study for the Missouri River Basin project, putting our financial house in order, both to contribute to the stability of the MRB and to reduce opposition to continued development in the basin. We have seen the enactment of needed companion legislation on rights-of-way, and fish and wildlife and recreation matters. The proposed development has won warm friends in the Department, in the White House, and in the Congress. It has a high legislative priority for the coming session.

With all these things now going in favor of Garrison diversion, there is little doubt in my mind that the North Dakota Water Users Association will fire up its offensive effort for the goal line drive in this coming session. The fight for the authorization and development of the Garrison diversion unit will go on—not only because North Dakota wants it and vitally needs it, but also because our Nation needs major resource developments of this kind so that we may continue to grow and prosper and to maintain the abundance that typifies America.

As I look back on the long struggle for authorization of this great unit of the Missouri River Basin project, I know how the farsighted economists and the humanitarians of our world feel in facing the daily disputes and obstacles they encounter as they constantly strive to make the people of the world lift their eyes from the present to the future. If we are to feed the vastly growing world population from our rapidly shrinking per capita acreage, we must look ahead and we must now, more than ever before, increase our efforts to obtain long-range resource development projects that are worthwhile and financially sound—in short, projects like the Garrison diversion unit. We who know the vital importance of water to economic growth in the West must continue the struggle and put forth ever more diligent effort toward maintaining our determination and aggressive actions to reach our goal of orderly water resource development.

It may seem discouraging to all of us that the 88th Congress did not give the "green light" to authorizing legislation, but let us not overlook that we have made good progress in the last 4 years. Two years ago the bill was reported by the Senate Interior Subcommittee, a major accomplishment. Its lack of progress in the House was understandable, because the Garrison diversion unit seemed to face the many and varied problems that had to be resolved in order to get the entire program in the Upper Missouri River Basin back on the track. Two years ago we were still trying to firm our MRB cost estimates; there were questions and local arguments unresolved about fish and wildlife, and questions particularly on cost allocation to these functions. There was the overriding question on power payout in the Missouri River Basin, a problem which plagued the committees of the Congress and the Office of the Secretary of the Interior for a long time. As you know, these questions, and others, were resolved and put squarely on the line with the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation in February 1964. This was another solid accomplishment.

My longtime personal friend, counselor, loyal supporter, and informed critic, the Honorable WAYNE ASPINALL, showed himself in that later role last evening as your banquet speaker when he mentioned waste in our planning efforts in the Missouri River Basin.

I will not attempt to deny that there have been some inefficiencies, waste motion, and duplication of effort in putting the comprehensive, multipurpose Missouri River Basin project into motion. In percentage of total construction costs of this great project directly affecting the daily welfare of the inhabitants of 10 basin States, these inefficiencies and waste motion in planning and getting the program underway become of minor significance.

Having said that, I admit, however, that this doesn't excuse inefficiency. I would point out that there are extenuating circumstances. In the case of reclamation, the Missouri River Basin undertaking involves the first attempt to bring the benefits of controlled water supply to areas already fully developed and settled under a dryland pattern of agriculture. All of the early reclamation developments had been planned and developed around arid areas where practically no agronomic benefit was realizable under natural rainfall conditions. The semiarid regions involved in the Missouri River Basin area brought into consideration an entirely different set of circumstances which never before had been evaluated and taken into account in developing and constructing reclamation projects. This was an important factor involving some of the waste motion and inefficient planning efforts in the early days of this great multiple-purpose project.

Another first for the Missouri River Basin is that it was the first area of this magnitude where a comprehensive multiple-purpose undertaking involving several agencies of the Federal Government was attempted. So, again there was some waste motion and duplication of effort that is being avoided and will be avoided in the future since this was the guinea pig for this type of undertaking.

And I would point out also that the Congress by placing water management responsibilities in four different departments of government, each reporting to a different authorizing committee of the U.S. Congress, has built in some inescapable traps which make duplication of effort difficult, if not impossible, to avoid.

Congressman ASPINALL lists several projects, such as the Tiber Dam, Cedar Bluff Dam, Shadehill Dam, Heart Butte Dam, and Keyhole Dam, that were constructed under the 1944 Missouri River Basin authorization with significant allocations to irrigation in addition to flood control and other multiple-purpose functions but where, for one reason or another, irrigation has not yet been developed. We recognize that until the irrigation potential is developed, the full benefits from these already constructed dams will not be realized. On the other hand, most of these dams have paid for themselves several times over from the flood control benefits alone.

A graphic example of this was there for all to see last June in the case of the Tiber Dam, where there was 154,000 second-feet of water pouring into the reservoir and the flood was contained completely with only 1,200 second-feet being released, which was well within the channel capacity of the river. The nearby uncontrolled Teton River served as a terrible contrast where flooding and great destruction to life and property resulted.

In summary, I cannot and will not contend that the Missouri River Basin project development has been planned and constructed with ultimate wisdom and efficacy.

I can and will, however, defend before any tribunal that this project is in the national interest. It has already harnessed the rivers for the most part to avoid destructive floods that were characteristic of it in the past. About 2,400,000 kilowatts of electric capacity has been developed to stimulate industry. Navigation for 800 miles on the Missouri River is now a reality and additionally navigation on the Mississippi River below the confluence of the Missouri with that great river has been aided and abetted. Recreational opportunities have been created which were last year utilized by 9 million visitor-days of use. Municipal and industrial water supply for numerous cities and towns also comes from project works. A firmer economic base is assured by providing irrigation water to 250,000 acres of land previously subject to the vagaries of erratic rainfall with the accompanying feast and famine for the local communities. And there is much yet to be done and many benefits yet to be realized.

I was pleased to note that, on balance, Mr. ASPINALL finds that which has been accomplished to be worthwhile and that future development must proceed in an orderly and efficient manner. Now, I have conceded that mistakes were made and have enumerated some of the reasons why, in our judgment, some of them were unavoidable. There is one additional point that should be mentioned in this connection, and that is the fact that the comprehensive plan was actually authorized to provide a backlog of post World War II antidepression measures which, of course, never proved to be needed for that purpose. Nevertheless, this established the tempo of the times and coupled with major floods in the basin in 1947, resulted in a concensus decision to proceed with construction of units, the detailed design and functioning of which had not been established to the requisite degree of detail.

This psychology of management has long since been abandoned by all concerned and there has not been a new construction start in the Missouri River Basin project since 1951 that has not been investigated in more detail than is now customary for authorization of new projects. Legislation supported by the Bureau of Reclamation and the Department of the Interior in the 88th Congress has now been enacted to effectively safeguard against any repetition of the 1940's in the future.

The Garrison diversion unit, as we have presented it, is no different from major projects we have developed elsewhere in the Western States. Perhaps in the past we have been too optimistic that this unit would be quickly approved by the Congress, and that we would soon have construction underway. But we have won friends and sympathetic interest and laid a legislative base for action that lends new optimism. Surely this is no time to bury our heads in the sand or relax our position. Rather, now is the time to step up efforts and to continue the good fight for the completion of your share of the Missouri River Basin plan of development; a development you have so vigorously supported for more than a quarter century, and one that will mean more to the future of North Dakota than any program ever considered in your State.

Our task is akin to nearly a century of great struggles for full development of our western resources. Just for a moment consider the odds faced by such man as Maj. John Wesley Powell, the redoubtable, one-armed crusader who risked his very life to explore the West of the 19th century, document data on its geography, its land, and rivers, and determine how best to develop the public domain. Powell was quick to realize that this vast unknown area was neither a great American desert which would be forever desolate, nor the great utopia of promoters where "rainfall would follow the plow." Although Powell died in 1902, he passed on with at least one evidence of success for his persistent crusade: the Congress had just passed the Reclamation Act, putting the U.S. Government in the business of reclaiming the arid region in accord with principles that great man and bona fide prophet had long suggested.

There's another classic story of prolonged struggle and eventual success in the Columbia River Basin of the Pacific Northwest. In mid-1930, Rufus Woods, editor of a small daily newspaper in Wenatchee, Wash., journeyed out to the deserted river channel of the Columbia River and said: "This desert would bloom like the Garden of Eden if there were a dam across the river." For 13 long years Rufus Woods talked about the potential of what became Grand Coulee Dam. For 13 years his ideas met resistance from everyone, but today this great multipurpose water development project majestically carries out its place in the overall development of our United States.

The Columbia Basin project is an engineering marvel, the result of the creative imaginative thinking and persistence of the people. However, there were others who condemned the project and there were those who said the power potential would never be put to use. How wrong they were. Today on the Columbia Basin project more than 450,000 acres are under ditch and work continues in orderly development to bring irrigation to the entire million-acre project. Electricity produced at the project aided significantly in the research and development of plutonium for an atomic arsenal, and within 4 years from the time the dam was completed we had developed the atomic bomb. Today, Grand Coulee power flows to all parts of our Pacific Northwest and under plans approved in the 88th Congress will even be shipped southward within a few short years on high-voltage direct-current lines to light homes and turn the wheels of industry in areas as far away as Los Angeles and San Diego. Truly, the Columbia Basin project is a success story of its own, made possible by the dogged persistence of hundreds of persons over more than a decade of delay and discouragement.

Many great reclamation proposals have had their setbacks before enactment. Consider the central Arizona project which has been a subject of litigation for the past 15 years. Also consider the Fryingpan-Arkansas development now underway in Colorado. It was before the Congress for at least 12 years before its authorization in 1962. These projects and many others, including the Garrison diversion unit, have been in the minds of men for many years. And many of them have been authorized and initiated. I want you to keep in mind that for more than 60 years reclamation has met the challenge of helping the West keep abreast of the race to build a new, rapidly growing empire. Our dams, reservoirs, pumps, canals, and hydropowerplants, and the network of ditches and drains built by our irrigation farmers are economic links that strengthen our ever-expanding region, and the Nation as a whole.

The Garrison diversion unit is a natural to fit into the future pattern of western growth and development. And you in North Dakota, who have worked long and hard for this development can feel fortunate that both major political parties in the recent campaign promised early action for the Garrison diversion unit. This, together with assured support by the administration, gives the unit a built-in priority for the coming 89th Congress.

One of the many things in your favor for early enactment of legislation and for appropriations for the Garrison diversion unit is that we are in the midst of a crisis affecting the whole broad field of our natural resources, particularly with respect to the water resources of our Western States. This crisis is not so dramatically apparent at this time in North Dakota. Here you have had 7 good crop years out of the last 10—an unusual situation for the high plains area. But it is a challenge nonetheless real and critical to your future position in our Nation's growth.

Crises in water conservation seem to come at 30-year intervals. The present crisis is not now coming upon us as it did in the 1870's from a lack of understanding, or the need for national policies of the 1900's, or the drought and economic crisis of the 1930's. Rather, in the 1960's it comes from the very success of our Nation; the rush of progress symbolized by our expanding population, thriving industry, and our future requirements for food, all occurring simultaneously with a dwindling of our productive crop acreage. By the year 2000 our daily per capita water requirements are expected to triple.

There is little we can do in the field of water conservation that will materially alter our situation in the next 3 to 5 years. But we can, and must, build for the 1970's and 1980's and thereafter; just as those great men of foresight at the end of the last century were aware of us and our needs, we must be aware of the water requirements of the future. In our search for wise utilization of our water resources, we seek abundance and order, and we manifest our interest in land, esthetics and sound conservation as well as a sense of responsibility for utilization needs of future generations. We stress the unity of all resources and recognize the philosophical "live and let live" logic in the great chain of life.

Yes, there have been setbacks to resource development, but I am sure you will agree that we are making progress on the important challenge of developing the water resources of our West. Our most recent construction programs—in fiscal 1964 and 1965—are testimony to this fact.

The $318 million 1965 Bureau of Reclamation program tops that of all other years since 1950, except for the last year when a $354 million program was in effect. Six new construction starts are funded in our 1965 program, including the Pacific Northwest-Pacific Southwest electrical power transmission line intertie. The intertie, made possible by public and private electric power cooperation, includes the Nation's first and the world's longest direct-current transmission line.

This 2-year construction program involves a total of $672 million. It will increase substantially not only our water resource facilities, but also our opportunities for water-based recreation, as well as provide important flood control benefits, enhance fish and wildlife resources, and provide pollution abatement, hydropower, and other multiple-purpose water development benefits.

Even without the authorization of Garrison diversion, this program did not overlook North Dakota.

As you are aware, we are currently working in North Dakota to develop the resources of the Knife and Cannonball River Basins. We are also working through the International Joint Commission for development of the Pembina River in northeastern North Dakota, and doing other work in the State.

We already have begun an investigation to reappraise the Knife division, and completion of the report is planned for 1965. Our most recent studies indicate a development potential of about 10,000 acres.

Mott Dam and Reservoir, a multipurpose development on the Cannonball River near Mott, would provide conservation storage and river regulation and permit irrigation of from 5,800 to 10,000 acres of new land by pumping to small tracts. Flood control, municipal water, recreation, and fish and wildlife enhancement also would be provided.

The Pembina unit in Cavalier and Pembina Counties also is currently under investigation. This is a part of the joint studies being made under the auspices of the International Joint Commission which is considering a plan for joint development by the United States and Canada of the water resource potential of the basin. Reclamation is participating with other Federal agencies in these joint studies. In the United States, it is planned that water would be stored in the potential Pembilier Reservoir for irrigation of about 8,000 acres in North Dakota.

We all recognize that important as these tributaries are—and we want to move ahead on them in an orderly fashion—Garrison diversion is, of course, by its size and significance, the primary water resource interest of this State.

As Commissioner of Reclamation, I cannot promise authorization of this great irrigation development because it is beyond my power. This is a job that can only be done by the Congress. I know that your Governor, your State legislature, your congressional delegation, your State agencies, the North Dakota Water Users Association and other groups, and the many, many solid individuals—many of whom participated in presenting the Garrison unit plan to Congressmen last year—have not given up the fight because of the inability to get complete action in the 88th Congress. I know that you will unitedly pursue your cause in the 89th Congress with renewed hope and vigor when the new session begins on January 4, 1965.

Be assured that you can count on me and my staff, and Secretaries Udall and Holum, as you have in the past, to vigorously support this long overdue project which is so vital to the future generations here and elsewhere in this great land of ours. With the kind of spirit and hard work you have already demonstrated, I know you will be successful in scoring a touchdown in your authorization drive, in eventually realizing the fruition of the diligent efforts to bring to North Dakota a well balanced, long-needed water resource development.

GARRISON DIVERSION UNIT

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. ANDREWS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, for the information of my colleagues, I am presenting herewith a resolution passed by the North Dakota State Legislature. North Dakota has waited a long time for the vital Garrison diversion project. To illustrate its importance to our State, our legislature, as its first resolution in this legislative session, urged the Congress for speedy reauthorization of this project which was originally authorized for our State 20 years ago as part of the overall plan for development of our great Missouri River Basin:

GARRISON DIVERSION UNIT

Whereas a substantial irrigation development for North Dakota was not only promised, but was specifically authorized as an integral part of the Missouri River Basin project in the Flood Control Act of 1944, to partially offset the loss experienced in the State by the acquisition of over 550,000 acres of valuable agricultural lands by the Federal Government for the construction of the Garrison and Oahe Dam and Reservoir projects on the Missouri River; and

Whereas the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation has determined from exhaustive studies and investigations conducted over the past 20 years, that the multiple-purpose Garrison diversion unit and irrigation development proposed therein is engineeringly and economically justifiable and feasible; and

Whereas legislation that would reauthorize the Garrison diversion unit has been proposed in each Congress since 1957, and has been the subject of extensive and thorough congressional hearings held during the intervening years, at which strong and consistent project support has been given by the State's congressional delegation, Governor, legislature, potential irrigators, farm, business, labor, industrial, professional, and agricultural organizations and leaders, as well as from basinwide and national water resources organizations, and by the last two administrations; and

Whereas the U.S. Senate in the 88th Congress, 2d session, passed a bill authorizing the construction of the initial 250,000-acre phase of the Garrison diversion unit, and the U.S. House of Representatives Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in the same session, reported out favorably and recommended for passage a bill, H.R. 1003, as amended, authorizing the construction of the initial phase of the Garrison diversion unit, which report and amended bill were acceptable to the sponsors of the reauthorizing legislation, but said H.R. 1003 failed to receive House action because of lack of time before sine die adjournment of the 88th Congress: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota (the Senate concurring therein), That the 39th Legislative Assembly of the State of North Dakota hereby expresses its unequivocal support for the early development of the Garrison diversion unit and fully concurs in and endorses the presentations by Gov. William L. Guy and other proponent witnesses at the hearings in the 88th Congress on S. 178 and H.R. 1003, and companion bills; and be it further

Resolved, That the 89th Congress be and it is hereby most respectfully urged to take early action to effect enactment of legislation authorizing the construction of the Garrison diversion unit along the lines of S. 34, H.R. 1718, and H.R. 237, 89th Congress; and be it further

Resolved, That copies hereof be transmitted by the secretary of state to the members of the North Dakota congressional delegation, the chairmen of the Senate and House Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs, President of the Senate, Speaker of the House, the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior, the Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Water and Power, and the Commissioner, Bureau of Reclamation.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO PERMIT INDIVIDUAL STATES TO APPORTION ONE HOUSE OF THEIR STATE LEGISLATURE ON FACTORS NOT LIMITED SOLELY TO POPULATION

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, today I have submitted a bill calling for the adoption of a constitutional amendment which would permit individual States to apportion one house of their State legislatures on factors not limited solely to population. I believe that failure to adopt the amendment would result in a drastic change in our whole concept of representative democracy.

It would be a change completely at variance with the concept laid down by the Founding Fathers of the Republic and followed for more than 180 years of American history. The most significant thing about the Supreme Court decision is that the judicial branch of Government, which is not directly chosen by the people and which is appointed, not elected to positions of lifetime tenure, has in effect changed the law of the land without regard to the Congress, the only lawmaking body created in the Constitution. It has made law, not interpreted it.

If the Supreme Court decision on reapportionments is allowed to stand, the States of the Nation are precluded from electing their State legislative assemblies on the same basis which now prevails at the Federal level. Missouri's "little Federal system" will be scuttled if the Supreme Court carries out the same line of reasoning. It ultimately may decide that Missouri should have fewer Senators in the U.S. Senate than does New York because there are more people in New York.

The reason for establishing a bicameral system in Missouri and in 49 of the 50 States is to prevent a majority of one from trampling the rights of the minority at any given moment. It is an inherent part of our national system of checks and balances reflected at the State level. But under the Supreme Court ruling, the question is certain to arise, what reason is there for maintaining two houses, both of which are based on the same factor—population, to the exclusion of all other factors including community interests, economic factors, and diverse needs? The ruling almost certainly will mean that State legislators will be further removed from the people they represent due to concentration of power in huge metropolitan areas. In most rural counties, most of the people know their State legislator as well as they do the elected officials in the county courthouse. Make the same survey in cities of a half million people or more and you will find that not 1 out of 10,000 has ever met or even knows the name of their representative in the State assembly.

This situation usually leads to legislation by pressure groups and voting blocs in large urban areas, where legislators are responsible not to individuals but to pressure groups which purport to represent individuals.

How ironic that at a time in our history when we have never been more cognizant of the rights of minorities, the Supreme Court has passed a law which threatens to wipe out consideration for minority viewpoints.

Whether the constitutional amendment which I and others have submitted will be voted on in the House of Representatives depends on whether the people care enough to want the very best form of government ever devised maintained for posterity.

NEEDED CUT IN CERTAIN EXCISE TAXES

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MACGREGOR] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, in his state of the Union message President Johnson spoke of the need to keep the Nation prosperous, and of the need for seeking full employment. He made a reference to providing more money to be left in the hands of consumers through a cut in excise taxes.

Republicans in the House have for several months asked for a cut in certain excise taxes, and are encouraged to know now that our proposal will have bipartisan support. The need has been with us for some time.

Today I am reintroducing my bill of last year calling for a two-stage reduction in the existing Federal retailers excise taxes on jewelry, furs, toilet preparations, and luggage and handbags.

My bill calls for a reduction from the current 10-percent tax to 5 percent on

July 1, 1965, and the complete repeal of the tax a year later. There may be proposals made for a single stage repeal of the tax to be effective on enactment. The method by which we repeal the tax is not so vital as the need for repeal, and I know that a reasonable plan recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means will enjoy wide support in this body.

The Third District of Minnesota is a suburban district. Most suburban residents, even more than others in the country, are overtaxed. The costs of new schools and community services of all kinds fall most heavily on the young families who are setting up their homes in newly developed residential areas around our large cities.

It is neither feasible nor desirable to increase substantially the existing State income taxes, or real estate taxes, personal property taxes, and general sales taxes.

One way to relieve the burden on suburban families is to get the Federal Government out of the retail excise tax field so far as it is possible to do so consistent with the need for Federal fiscal responsibilty.

The Federal Government entered the excise tax field in a so-called temporary and "emergency" move when we were involved in general war. Our continued wrongful usurpation of this revenue source reminds me that "there is nothing so permanent as a temporary Federal program."

An effort to eliminate the taxes in two stages was made during 1964 by Republican Members of the House. On June 17, 1964, our effort failed on a vote of 207 to 185. All but one Republican voted for the cut, and 206 Democrats voted "No."

Our 1964 Republican Party platform affirms the pledge to remove Federal excise taxes. And the 1964 Democratic Party platform says:

> We should carefully review all our excise taxes and eliminate those that are obsolete.

We should have acted on the campaign pledges of both parties during 1964. Now with the President's support there is all the more reason to move ahead in this area, and I urge support for my bill.

A bill to reduce the retailers excise taxes on jewelry, furs, toilet preparations, and luggage and handbags from 10 percent to 5 percent on July 1, 1965, and to repeal such taxes on July 1, 1966

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. REDUCTION ON JULY 1, 1965, OF RETAILERS EXCISE TAXES ON JEWELRY, FURS, TOILET PREPARATIONS, AND LUGGAGE FROM 10 PERCENT TO 5 PERCENT.

The following provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 are each amended by inserting "(except that in the case of sales at retail after June 30, 1965, the rate shall be 5 percent in lieu of 10 percent)" after "10 percent of the price for which so sold":

(1) Section 4001 (relating to jewelry and related items).

(2) Section 4011 (relating to furs).

(3) Section 4021 (relating to toilet preparations).

(4) Section 4031 (relating to luggage, handbags, etc.).

SEC. 2. REPEAL OF RETAILERS EXCISE TAXES ON JEWELRY, FURS, TOILET PREPARATIONS, AND LUGGAGE ON JULY 1, 1966.

(A) IN GENERAL.—Effective with respect to articles sold at retail after June 30, 1966, subchapters A (relating to jewelry and related items), B (relating to furs), C (relating to toilet preparations), and D (relating to luggage, handbags, etc.) of chapter 31 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 are repealed.

(b) TECHNICAL CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Effective with respect to articles sold at retail after June 30, 1966:

(1) Chapter 31 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to retailers excise taxes) is amended by striking out the heading and table of subchapters and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"CHAPTER 31—RETAILERS EXCISE TAX ON SPECIAL FUELS

"SUBCHAPTER A. Tax on special fuels.
"SUBCHAPTER B. Special provisions applicable to tax on special fuels."

(2) The table of chapters for subtitle D of such Code is amended by striking out

"CHAPTER 31. Retailers excise taxes."

and inserting in lieu thereof

"CHAPTER 31. Retailers excise tax on special fuels."

(3) Subchapter E of chapter 31 of such Code is redesignated as subchapter A, and the heading of such subchapter is amended to read as follows:

"Subchapter A—Tax on special fuels"

(4) Subchapter F of chapter 31 of such Code is redesignated as subchapter B, and the heading of such subchapter is amended to read as follows:

"Subchapter B—Special provisions applicable to tax on special fuels"

(5) Sections 4051 through 4053 of such Code are repealed and the table of sections for subchapter B (as redesignated by paragraph (4) and this subsection) is amended by striking out the items relating to sections 4051, 4052, and 4053.

(6) Sections 4055 and 4057 of such Code are each amended by striking out ", in the case of the tax imposed by section 4041,".

(7)(A) Section 4224 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to exemption for articles taxable as jewelry) is repealed.

(B) The table of sections for subchapter G of chapter 32 of such Code is amended by striking out

"SEC. 4224. Exemptions for articles taxable as jewelry."

(8) Section 6011(c) of such Code (relating to return of retailers excise taxes by suppliers) is repealed.

(9) Section 6416 of such Code (relating to certain taxes on sales and services) is amended as follows:

(A) Subsection (a)(1) is amended by striking out "chapter 31 (retailers taxes),".

(B) Subsection (a)(1)(B) is amended by striking out clause (i) and redesignating clauses (ii) and (iii) as clauses (i) and (ii), respectively.

(C) Subsection (a)(2) is amended to read as follows:

"(2) This subsection shall not apply to an overpayment of tax under paragraph (1), (3) (A) or (B), or (5) of subsection (b) of this section."

(D) Subsection (a)(3) is amended by striking out subparagraph (B), by redesignating subparagraphs (C) and (D) as subparagraphs (B) and (C), respectively, and by striking out "(ii)" in the subparagraph so redesignated as subparagraph (B) and inserting in lieu thereof "(i)".

(E) Subsection (b)(1) is amended by striking out "31 or" and by striking out "(in the case of a tax imposed by chapter 32)".

(F) Subsection (b)(5) is amended by striking out "4053(b)(1) or" each place it appears.

(G) Subsection (d) is repealed.

(H) Subsection (e) is amended by striking out "subchapter E" and inserting in lieu thereof "subchapter A".

(10)(A) Section 7261 of such Code (relating to criminal penalty for representation that retailers' excise tax is excluded from price of article) is repealed.

(B) The table of sections for subchapter B of chapter 75 of such Code is amended by striking out

"Sec. 7261. Representation that retailers' excise tax is excluded from price of article."

PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO REPLACE CURRENT LEGISLATION FOR WHEAT AND FEED GRAINS

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, my proposal (H.R. 1595) to replace current legislation for wheat and feed grains, is intended to create conditions under which farmers may earn and get a high per-family real income in a manner which will preserve freedom and opportunity.

This objective, in my opinion, can best be accomplished by preserving the market price system as the principal influence in allocating the use of farm resources. The American farmer is more capable than government of planning the use of his acreage and other productive resources.

Freedom to produce and market carries with it the duty to accept the discipline of competition.

PRESENT PROGRAMS HAVE FAILED

Experience with the present temporary wheat certificate plan clearly indicates the need for a sounder and less complex approach to the economic problems of wheat growers.

New wheat legislation should be enacted in time to eliminate the necessity for another referendum on the wheat certificate plan provided by existing law which was rejected by wheat growers in 1963.

The present "emergency" feed grain program was initiated in 1961 and has been extended with minor modifications since that time. Considering the vast acreage of land diverted from production by the program, the growth in market attained during its 4 years of operation, the poor crop in 1964, and the continuing surplus of feed grains, the program clearly has failed to solve the feed grain problem.

Furthermore, the programs for wheat and feed grains have aggravated the price and income problems of livestock producers and have proved an enormous financial burden on the Federal Treasury.

My proposal for meeting the economic problems of wheat, feed grain, and livestock producers, is as follows.

Authority for wheat marketing quotas and acreage allotments would be terminated, and the multiple-price wheat plan provisions of the 1962 Farm Act would be repealed. The provision of the Agricultural Act of 1964, authorizing the 1964 and 1965 program for wheat would be allowed to expire. The 1963 Feed Grain Act, which applies only to the 1964 and 1965 crops of feed grains, would be allowed to expire.

These actions are necessary in order to clear the slate, beginning with the 1966 crops, for a new approach to the wheat and feed grain problem. Efforts to control wheat and feed grain production by means of acreage allotments and marketing quota programs have failed dismally. They have created inefficiences in the production of farm commodities. They have increased production costs. They have shifted the surplus problem from one commodity to another.

My bill would enable each farmer to decide for himself which grains he should grow, how much of each he can best produce, and whether he would be better off to place a part or all of his farm under a transitional cropland retirement contract.

PRICE SUPPORTS BASED ON MARKET PRICES

Beginning with the 1966 crop, price supports for wheat would be set at the U.S. farm price equivalent of the average world market price during the immediately preceding three marketing years—currently about $1.34 per bushel. Premiums and discounts would be used to reflect market demand for milling and baking quality. For corn, supports would be 90 percent of the average price received by farmers for corn during the immediately preceding 3 years. Currently this would mean a price support of about $1 per bushel for corn. Supports for other feed grains would be related to corn with differentials to reflect differences in feeding value.

Under no circumstances would the price support level be less than 50 percent of the applicable parity price, currently about $1.26 per bushel for wheat and 78 cents per bushel for corn. At the present time support prices computed by the market price formulas would be considerably higher than 50 percent of parity in all cases. This approach would eliminate administrative discretion with respect to price support levels for wheat and feed grains. It would automatically adjust support prices to changing supply and demand conditions.

Support prices set in this manner would not impede the workings of the market; would not be an incentive to increase production; and yet, would provide protection against any substantial drop in wheat and feed grain prices.

Because price supports set in this manner would not be an artificial stimulant to production, it would not be necessary to couple them with restrictions on production or marketing of grains.

LIMITED CROPLAND RETIREMENT

My bill provides a limited land retirement program to ease the adjustment of agricultural production to effective market demand. It would be temporary and voluntary, provide for competitive bids, take cropland out of production for 3 to 5 years—except that land being diverted to timber could be placed under contract for up to 10 years—with emphasis on whole farms, and prohibit the grazing of retired acres. Under no circumstances could total rental payments in any one year exceed $750 million.

The Secretary would be authorized for a period of 3 years to enter into contracts for the voluntary retirement of cropland with emphasis on whole-farm retirement.

A cropland retirement program of this nature would lead to the withdrawal of much greater productive capacity per dollar cost and would eliminate most of the administrative problems associated with the emergency-type programs of recent years. Cropland retirement would terminate completely after the limited transitional period.

Producers of all commodities would be given an opportunity to participate in the cropland retirement program. Producers would be required to establish and maintain proper vegetative cover and control of noxious weeds on the retired acres. They would not be allowed to graze or harvest any crop off the land. The voluntary nature of this proposed cropland retirement program minimizes the likelihood that it could have any adverse effects on individual counties or communities; however, to make certain that no area would be adversely affected, the Secretary would be directed to place a maximum limitation on the percentage of total cropland which could be retired in any one State or county.

Cost would be less than one-half the cost of present programs.

CCC DUMPING PROHIBITED

To protect farmers against competition from the release of CCC surplus stocks of wheat and feed grains, sale of these stocks at less than 125 percent of prevailing support levels, plus reasonable carrying charges, would be prohibited except for sales that are offset by open-market purchases. This exception is designed to provide needed flexibility for the maintenance of good inventory management practice.

The isolation of CCC stocks from the market would reinstate immediately the traditional functions of the market system in establishing farm commodity prices and guiding agricultural production. Farmers should not be handicapped by ceilings put on current commodity prices through the dumping of CCC stocks, which have been built up under unsound programs of the past. Farmers' experience with the CCC dumping of both feed grains and wheat in the last 4 years has been disastrous.

The proposal to terminate both wheat allotments and the present feed grain program and to institute a cropland retirement program puts all grains on the same basis. It provides no restrictions on individual farm operations except those applying to land voluntarily retired under the program. All farmers will be completely free to use all their noncontracted cropland as they wish, except for crops under marketing quotas. This would lead to a restoration of competitive markets and more efficient production. Thus, it would lead also to more efficient and more profitable livestock, dairy, and poultry production.

This program would provide farmers the opportunity to use their land, capital, and labor for the production of commodities which promise greatest returns and highest possible net income.

It gets away from historic bases, yield factors, minimum allotments, and the other problems inherent in Government efforts to regulate individual farming operations. It preserves the opportunity for each farmer to make his own decisions. It provides for needed adjustments in resource use without forcing every farmer to retire a part of his farm without regard to his individual situation. It uses support prices to encourage orderly marketing and orderly adjustments in production rather than to fix prices. In order to give the market an opportunity to function it provides protection against the dumping of CCC stocks.

This program gives assurance of increasing family farm income, and improving farmers' ability to build markets at home and abroad.

The general public will support a reasonable expenditure for Government farm programs, provided we can demonstrate that these programs will improve the situation instead of making it worse. The program I propose would be a bridge to an improved agricultural situation in which the need for Government expenditures will be greatly and permanently reduced.

BREAD TAX ON WHEAT SHOULD BE DROPPED

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, in a letter today, I suggest that President Johnson begin his program to reduce Federal excise taxes by dropping the bread tax, the excise tax on wheat processed for food.

This fee was provided in the wheat certificate bill enacted by Congress last year at the President's behest.

I also invited Presidential support for my bill, H.R. 1595, a proposal replacing current programs for both wheat and feed grains and of course dropping the bread tax. It would base price supports on market prices and authorize Government rental of farmland within fixed limits during a 3-year transition period.

The bread tax is the heaviest, most excessive and most regressive of all Federal excise taxes. It hits hardest the lowest income people who have the least ability to pay. It has frequently—and accurately—been described as a tax on poor people.

By a country mile, it is the most burdensome Federal excise tax on the books. Last year it amounted to 50 percent of the market value of wheat. The Secretary of Agriculture fixed the tax at 70 cents for each bushel of wheat milled for food. The support level was only $1.30, and the market price averaged about $1.37. Therefore the tax amounted to half the price of the wheat.

Of all Federal excise taxes, I know of none that even approaches 50 percent of the commodity value. The tax on luxury furs, for example, is 10 percent.

And to make matters worse, the Department of Agriculture has announced that the excise tax on wheat for food this year is even higher—75 cents a bushel—and the price support is even lower—$1.25 a bushel.

If the Department of Agriculture continues its policy of massive dumping of Government wheat stocks, the market price will undoubtedly again decline with the drop in the support level. Therefore, the excise tax on wheat for food this year will be about 60 percent of wheat's market value.

The wheat certificate plan was enacted very reluctantly last year by the Congress. It passed the House of Representatives by only 10 votes, and that margin clearly would have not developed without the President's support and insistence. I am sure the Congress will gladly and gratefully respond if he will insist that it be dropped.

The bread tax seems totally out of place in the President's antipoverty program. Indeed, it has all the earmarks of an anti-anti-poverty program. The cost of this tax is, of course, passed on to consumers, and Department of Agriculture statistics show clearly that wheat flour consumption goes up sharply as family income goes down.

Home use of wheat products per person per week

Annual income per family	Southern United States (pounds)	U.S. average (pounds)
Under $2,000	4.44	3.83
$2,000 to $2,999	3.68	3.15
$3,000 to $3,999	3.41	2.84
$4,000 to $4,999	3.29	2.59
$5,000 to $5,999	3.11	2.58
$6,000 to $7,999	2.90	2.46
$8,000 to $9,999	2.56	2.29

Annual income per family:	*Percent spent for wheat products*
Under $2,000	6.6
$2,000 to $2,999	5.9
$3,000 to $3,999	5.8
$4,000 to $4,999	5.3
$5,000 to $5,999	5.1
$6,000 to $7,999	4.8
$8,000 to $9,999	4.6

Last year the bread tax totaled $350 million, and this year it will reach still more deeply into the pockets of those least able to pay.

Ironically, most of the proceeds of this tax on poor people are handed to the highest income wheat farmers of the country. Department of Agriculture statistics last year showed that 1,300 big wheat farmers would qualify for annual payments averaging $15,000, but the little fellows—over a million of them—would qualify for annual payments averaging only $58. It was such a bad deal for the small farmers in 1964 that two-thirds of those eligible did not sign up.

In the President's state of the Union message he called for revamp of farm programs to benefit the farmers that need help the most. By this standard, the wheat certificate program is headed 180 degrees in the wrong direction.

I hope the President will begin this program to reduce Federal excise taxes by dropping the excise tax on wheat for food. Farmers, consumers and taxpayers alike would welcome this action. It would be a special blessing to poor people.

FEDERAL FARM FABLE

I was impelled to make this suggestion to President Johnson when I recorded this Federal farm fable of the 1960's, an account of the remarkable experiences of Zig Wheat and Zag Cotton.

Once upon a time not so long ago several of the best fed farm creatures were sitting around planning how to improve the lot of the very same best fed farm creatures. The leaders of this friendly group were Zig Wheat and Zag Cotton.

It was after the sad 21st of May in the year 1963 when the wheat growers had rejected by an overwhelming margin the strict control wheat certificate program. Earlier, the wise turkey growers had rejected a turkey control program.

Zig Wheat and his cohorts in and out of Government reminisced about the farmer's perversity in rejecting the certificate program. It would have required the wheat miller to pay a 50-percent manufacturers' excise tax amounting to $350 million which would be shifted to consumers in the form of higher bread prices. A large majority of this huge tax take would then be handed to the largest wheat growers. Zig Wheat knew that the lowest income people consume the most wheat products per capita. He knew that one-half of the nonwhite population has an annual income of less than $3,000. Thus, the tax must fall on those least able to pay and nonwhite people would be hit hardest of all.

Also, he knew that the small wheat growers were required to cut back more sharply than the largest producers. Thus, the whole program was an anti-anti-poverty proposal.

The Nation's poor heaved a sigh of relief when the farmers rejected the straitjacket. But this made best fed Zig Wheat and his control-minded friends in Government unhappy.

Zig Wheat turned to Zag Cotton and said "What is your problem?" Zag Cotton replied: "The present cotton program prices cotton too high to the mills in the United States. We are losing markets to manmade fibers here at home. Also, foreign mills get U.S. cotton at lower prices through the export subsidy. They manufacture cotton cloth and ship it back to the United State at cut-rate prices. Therefore, U.S. cotton mills are losing markets every which way."

Zig Wheat stroked his straw beard for a moment, then said to Zag Cotton, "Why don't you meet this problem with a program which includes lower market prices and payments to the producers?"

Zag answered, "We are afraid that the public will be upset by the tremendously large individual payments it would entail and will insist that Congress put a maximum on payments. You and I know how big a proportion of the money goes to the big plantation boys."

Zag replied, "Oh, we don't worry about that. We know our way around."

Zag then suggested that each develop his own program and try their luck when the 1964 Congress convened.

They wished each other a happier New Year and each went to work with a vigor inspired by the motto, "Take what your country can be made to give you."

Several months later, they were ready. Each had worked out his own program. The two proposals were unrelated, dissimilar and contradictory in policy. They were as different as night and day, except that in each scheme long-suffering Mr. American Taxpayer-Consumer would foot the bill.

The legislative problem called for a classic example of back scratching, log rolling and arm twisting.

Zig Wheat, in fear of losing another farmer referendum, asked for and got a so-called voluntary program that had no referendum.

Zag Cotton asked for and got a compulsory program with a farmer referendum.

Zig Wheat asked for and got a payment program financed by a $350 million manufacturers' excise tax on wheat at 50 percent of the raw value, to be paid for by the consumer. The wheat millers had a very poor year in 1964 and expect another poor year in 1965.

Zag Cotton asked for and got a direct payment program for farmers financed from general tax funds. In addition, provision was made for a $350 million manufacturers' excise tax in reverse which authorized multi-million-dollar payments to cotton mills from the Federal Treasury. Although supposedly designed to reduce the cost of cotton textiles to the consumer, the prices of most cotton textiles are actually higher today than they were a year earlier. And profits of cotton mills are substantially higher too.

Zig Wheat asked for and got a provision under which small wheatgrowers had to take a double acreage cut in order to be eligible for payments.

Zag Cotton asked for and got an increased payment for the small cottongrower for which the farmers had to do nothing additional in the way of compliance. They just had to keep doing what they had been doing all along.

Zig Wheat asked for and got a provision under which only those who complied—about 40 percent—mainly the largest farms, got payments.

Zag Cotton asked for and got payments for all farms, big and small, plus extra bonus payments for the small farms. All the cotton mills, big and small, would share the financial bonanza of the Treasury payments—excise tax in reverse. The Textile Workers Union hoped to share in the golden shower and lobbied for the bill. However, now they are complaining and saying the mills failed to share the benefits with the workers.

Zig Wheat argued that the bill would not cause prices for flour and bread to rise.

Zag Cotton argued that the bill would cut the price of cotton textiles.

Zig and Zag knew that neither group had a bill which by itself could pass the

Congress. But, by marriage, they could produce an offspring.

Zig Wheat and his cohorts worked the wheat States; Zag Cotton and his cohorts worked the cotton States; the textile labor unions and the mills worked their own backyards; and all this plus some fancy arm twisting got the wheat-cotton bill of 1964 through Congress.

And this is how the first nonrelated Siamese twins—who really were not twins at all—came into being. Zig Wheat and Zag Cotton had made medical history on the legislative operating table.

FIRST SEA TRIALS OF THE U.S.S. "SAM RAYBURN"

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCormack] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of the first successfully completed sea trials of the U.S.S. *Sam Rayburn*, the 28th Polaris type submarine and the 50th nuclear submarine to become operational, I received a letter from Adm. H. G. Rickover which I herewith include as a part of my remarks.

Among the many observations made by Admiral Rickover about our late beloved Speaker, and my dear and valued friend, the admiral well said:

> There is hardly a name in our history so bound up with democratic traditions and ideals as that of the man for whom this ship is named.

The letter follows:

U.S.S. "Sam Rayburn" (SSBN635),
Care of Fleet Post Office,
New York, N.Y., November 4, 1964.

Hon. John W. McCormack,
U.S. House of Representatives.

Dear Mr. McCormack: We have just successfully completed first sea trials of the U.S.S. *Sam Rayburn*, our 28th Polaris-type submarine and the 50th nuclear submarine to become operational. The *Rayburn* was built by the Newport News Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co. of Newport News, Va.

This ship is named for one of the Nation's foremost legislators and parliamentary technicians, Sam Rayburn, of Texas (1882–1961). A public servant during his entire adult life, a politician in the best sense of the word, Rayburn served in the House of Representatives longer than anyone before him: almost half a century, or more than one-fourth the life span of the United States. During the last 24 years of his life he was either majority or minority leader or Speaker of the House. He held the speakership for 17 years—the longest record and double the one previously held by Henry Clay.

His tenure in the House coincided with a period of tremendous change in the fortunes of our country, of innumerable crises and as many triumphs; a period which saw the United States rise from relative obscurity to the pinnacle of world power, its population more than doubling, its affluence multiplying many times over. Government grew accordingly, as reflected in the Federal budget which rose from $1 to $84 billion.

Rayburn's name is connected with many important pieces of legislation, particularly after he became chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in 1931. He was the author of the Federal Communications Act, the Securities Exchange Act, the Rayburn-Wheeler Holding Company Act, and the Rural Electrification Act. He has been called the principal architect of the legislative program of the Roosevelt era. In August 1941 he persuaded the House to extend the draft act. The vote was 203 to 202. Thus narrowly was dissipation of our military manpower averted just 4 months prior to Pearl Harbor.

Rayburn's reputation as a statesman and skilled parliamentarian, however, rests chiefly on his handling of the speakership. To quote the late Clarence Cannon: "The foundations of the growing power of the speakership were laid under Speaker Thomas Reed, flowered under Speaker Joseph Cannon, and have culminated under Speaker Rayburn * * * in all the long and stately procession of illustrious men who have occupied that exalted position he is the greatest and the most powerful."

The speakership is an ancient and venerable institution going back to 14th century England. Congress took it over from the colonial legislatures. Curiously, the office now puts its incumbent next in succession after the Vice President. If Rayburn's life did not quite follow the tradition of log cabin to White House, it came close; for the speakership is held to be the second most important public office in the land.

Sam Rayburn was born in Tennessee, 1 of 11 children of a Confederate cavalryman. The family moved to a 40-acre cotton farm in Texas when he was 5. There he attended a 1-room schoolhouse and did the usual chores expected of farm children. When he wasn't farming he read voraciously. As he later remarked, "By the time I was 9 or 10 I had read every history book I could find * * * everything I could get hold of about Washington, Hamilton, Jefferson, the Adamses, Monroe, Madison, and all I could about the men then in public life." By the time he was 13, he had decided on a public career. He didn't lose time reaching his goal.

At 17 he entered college, working his way through by sweeping floors and milking cows. Upon graduation he taught school. At 24 he was elected to the State legislature, serving 6 years, the last 2 as speaker of the house. He studied law between sessions and was admitted to the bar. He was 30 when first elected to Congress.

Despite his rise to positions of power and influence, Rayburn remained a plain, homespun man. President Johnson said of him that there wasn't anyone in the United States who couldn't see him "if they were willing to sit a spell. To the dismay of his staff, he made his own appointments—often on the back of an old envelope in his hip pocket. And he read his own mail. 'When someone writes me on tablet paper with a lead pencil,' he once told me, 'I figure what he's writing me about is pretty important to him.' " And once, in talking of Flag Springs, the little town where he attended school, Rayburn said: "All of us are just a little way from Flag Springs. You know I just missed being a tenant farmer by a gnat's heel."

There is hardly a name in our history so bound up with our democratic traditions and ideals as that of the man for whom this ship is named.

"He was the last tie between the frontier concepts and ideals of Thomas Jefferson, Andrew Jackson, Davy Crockett, Sam Houston, and Abraham Lincoln and the new frontier of science."

Respectfully,

H. G. Rickover.

SALUTE TO THE IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Gonzalez] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, one of the most popular of indoor sports in this country—and I suppose everywhere else—is the fine art of baiting bureaucrats. In fact, Mr. Speaker, the bureaucrat is nothing more nor less than a man doing a job. Public service demands people who are dedicated to the ideal of serving the public. I want to take note today of the fine work of the Immigration and Naturalization Service and salute them for doing an efficient and effective job from the district level all the way to the Commissioner's level.

In San Antonio, the district office of the Immigration Service probably processes more work than any comparable office in the Southwest or the entire United States. John Holland—a career man in his job—and his fine staff of dedicated people administer a difficult law in a quiet, effective, and most important, humane way.

Immigration involves every human condition and problem. It takes years of experience to learn to cope with these problems, and it takes a real desire for compassionate service to mankind to work well with the situations immigration men must face.

My office processes several hundred immigration cases every year and I address dozens of queries to John Holland and Commissioner Farrell and his staff. I have always had a prompt and informed response; I have always been treated with courtesy and always found the help I sought.

Commissioner Farrell, his staff people, his district director, John Holland, and his line officers in my area have proved time and again to be the kind of people we need in Government. Theirs is a difficult assignment; it may well be one of the most difficult assignments in our Government. I am proud to say that the job is being done well.

WE TREAT OUR MILITARY SHABBILY

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Gonzalez] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, last week, on January 4, I introduced H.R. 1026, a bill to increase the subsistence allowance of all members of the uniformed services to $75 per month. I originally introduced this measure during the 88th Congress. Its purpose is to improve the standard of living of the military man. Specifically, it would permit tens of thousands of men in the Armed Forces to purchase enough food each month so that they might have a nutritious diet.

In the current issue of the Saturday Evening Post a former major in the U.S. Army speaks his mind on the reasons that compelled him to resign his commission after 13 years as an officer. It is a tale that should cover each and every one of us with shame. It is a tale of substandard housing at outrageous costs to the military man, of low wages, and of the general frustrating conditions that prevail in the Armed Forces today. This article by Marion T. Wood needs to be read by all Americans, for in the process of analyzing his own experiences in the Army he placed military life in a perspective rarely seen by the average civilian. Yet, it is a perspective built on truth and on fact.

Mr. Wood raises questions in his article that need to be answered. Perhaps the most important question is, Why do we treat the military man as a second-class citizen? This question strikes at the very cornerstone of our society. It is strange indeed that a free and open society as ours would create a second-class citizenry and leave our national defenses to it. Such a course of action, in my opinion, is suicidal.

Men are leaving the Armed Forces every day in disgust and frustration, humiliated by the country which asked them to dedicate their lives in service to it. Do we really believe that our missiles and bombs will defend us by themselves? Do we not know that it takes men—dedicated men—who are willing to live under the civil disabilities of military life, and then die defending their country? Where will we get such men after they have left us, as Marion D. Wood did, wondering why they allowed themselves to be played for suckers? Shall we hire mercenaries?

With unanimous consent I am inserting the article by Marion T. Wood, entitled "We Treat Our Military Shabbily," from the January 16, 1965, issue of the Saturday Evening Post:

WE TREAT OUR MILITARY SHABBILY

(By Marion T. Wood)

After 13 years as an officer of the U.S. Army, I recently resigned, frustrated and disillusioned. I was supposed to be guarding something grandly called the American way of life. But, by a cruel paradox, the society I had sworn to protect is a society that is indifferent and even hostile toward me and my comrades.

Built into the very foundation of this Nation is a distrust of soldiers, especially in peacetime. The Declaration of Independence denounces the British for keeping standing armies in the Colonies in times of peace. The third amendment in the Bill of Rights specifically prohibits the quartering of soldiers in peacetime "in any house without the consent of the owner." In war, the historic pattern has always been the same: When war was declared, the Nation suddenly rallied an army of civilians, trained and led by professionals who had long endured the persistent apathy and frequent scorn of their country. After the war, the civilians discarded their uniforms and became, as veterans, members of a privileged class. They were rewarded for service after getting out of the Army; those who stayed in were neither rewarded nor even long remembered.

After World War II, the pattern of hostility toward soldiers continued. Typically, the benefits of the GI bill were extended to veterans, but not to those who decided to make the Army (or any other service) a career. Then, however, for the first time in history we found ourselves in a twilight state of neither peace nor war. The cold war suddenly challenged our historic attitude that soldiers were "good" in wartime and "bad" in peacetime, and that the best soldier was an ex-soldier.

It was in this twilight that I chose the Army as a profession. Many friends and relatives were stunned. "You must be out of your mind," said one friend. Like so many civilians, they felt that the Army was a place for people who, as it was usually put, "could not do well on the outside." As a matter of fact, I had been doing well on the outside, which in my case was a small college. Membership in the Reserve Officers' Training Corps—ROTC—was required for the first 2 years. I enjoyed the experience enough to continue it during my last 2 years in college. My scholastic record was high enough to qualify me for a Regular Army commission at graduation. As a new infantry lieutenant in June 1950, I fully intended to make the Army my career.

As I look back I still see patriotism as the basic reason I decided to become an Army officer. I have not been able to find a more sophisticated explanation. Soldiers are generally embarrassed when they try to explain what it means to be a soldier. Phrases such as "service to your nation" and "guardians of democracy" stick in a soldier's throat, as well they should. Good soldiers are soldiers because soldiering is a very real, very meaningful profession. This is especially true in a society where many men with high-paying jobs make no contribution to society. Soldiers, at least, have the satisfaction of knowing their nation needs them. Yet from that nation, soldiers often receive shabby treatment.

My introduction to how the Army treats its own came when the Army took 6 weeks to transform me from a college boy to a rifle-platoon leader, responsible for the lives of some 40 men. Six weeks is not much time. Then I was shipped to Japan, where the Army was frantically putting together outfits to send to Korea. Some consisted mainly of stockade soldiers—men taken from military jails—and untrained South Koreans. I landed in Wonsan, North Korea, in November 1950, without winter clothing.

Our equipment was often shoddy or in short supply. Weapons misfired; ammunition was scarce. There were not enough magazines for our automatic rifles. We were on the line eight out of nine months. There were few formal battles or engagements. It was a dirty little war, and the worst part of it was the feeling that no one really cared.

When I got back in the States in 1951, after my tour in Korea, I suddenly was a peacetime soldier. I had been warned that a soldier was a second-class citizen in many Army towns, the communities that live off the payrolls of military bases. The principal industry in most of these towns was taking soldiers for every dime they had.

In many Army towns the citizen most discriminated against is the soldier. Some policemen arrest them with flagrant entrapment techniques. I have seen police wait for a soldier to walk out of a tavern and enter his car. As he pulled away, he was stopped and arrested for driving while intoxicated. Instead of protesting such injustice, the Army condoned it. Man after man was hauled before civilian authorities on such charges, convicted, and fined. Then these men were usually turned over to the Army, which fined them for "conduct unbecoming a soldier or an officer." The usual fine in one Army town a few years ago for an officer was $151.50, and a similar fine was paid to the Army. At one post where I served, soldiers were told officially that they should let their wives drive, for a wife could be fined only once—as a civilian.

When I was on my fourth tour of duty at Fort Benning, in 1956, about 9,000 families were living off-post. Many families lived in slums. Some used outdoor privies. Others shared bathrooms and kitchens, and slept in shifts because there were not enough bedrooms to go around. Finally, the Government authorized the Army to build 4,000 homes. But members of an area real estate board complained to Washington that the building of so many homes would ruin the local housing market. The authorization was cut down to 1,000 homes. The Army consistently caves in when challenged by local political-pressure groups.

Most civilians think that a soldier's pay is tax free, that he is financially coddled with extras that more than make up for his low pay. Soldiers do pay Federal income taxes and social security, regardless of where they are stationed in the world. They pay a 3-percent tax on food in all military commissaries. They also pay sales taxes where there are such taxes. The post exchange is highly overrated as a place for bargains. In many cases a soldier can buy goods cheaper at an off-post discount store. PX prices are deliberately pegged high enough to prevent area civilian merchants from suffering.

On-post Government housing is not free, and it certainly is not cheap. For example, at my last post, in a Government-owned housing project, I paid $145.05 a month for a small two-bedroom apartment. My next-door neighbor paid $175 a month for an identical apartment because he happened to be a colonel; I was a major.

Financially, the professional soldier is a second-class Federal employee. Until the cynically timed election-year pay raise recently voted by Congress, the pay of second lieutenants with less than 2 years' service had not been raised since 1958. The starting salary for a married second lieutenant, including all benefits, was about $4,500 a year. The average, new, Government civilian employee starts at $5,400. The civilian works a 40-hour week and is eligible for overtime pay. The soldier puts in a work week of 50 or more hours; even a 65-hour work week is not unusual. Of course, there is no overtime.

I am not suggesting that soldiering should be a 9-to-5 job with weekends and holidays off. A soldier is a soldier. It is a tough, demanding profession, and it has to be that way. As noncivilians, soldiers do not have many civilian rights. No civilian can be arrested for refusing to show up in his office or factory on a day he does not feel like working. A soldier can be court-martialed. The Army, rightfully, insists on extraordinary power over its men. The Army's mission is to defend the Nation, and to carry out this mission the rights of the Army must transcend the rights of the individual. No good soldier disputes this. And, in giving up rights guaranteed to all other U.S. citizens, no soldier expects extra privileges. This is in keeping with a fine American tradition that contrasts sharply with that of more militaristic nations.

America's long and unbroken tradition as a nonmilitaristic nation is not being questioned by the military men who serve this Nation. They do not want more recognition or more power. They simply want a more equitable share of that American way of life they hear so much about. Their demand is not merely for better pay and benefits; they are asking for a realistic attitude toward the military.

From the military man's point of view, the society he guards is unable to make up its mind. The American society demands a first-class Military Establishment. Yet, by keeping military pay scales low, by seemingly equating a military career with low-status employment, this same society makes it difficult for dedicated men to enter, and stay in, military service.

Rather than a savior of his country, the American fighting man is looked upon as a parasite of an affluent peacetime society. From Congressmen on down, Americans have refused to look realistically at what brushfire wars like Vietnam mean to the soldier who has to fight, and perhaps die, in them. The soldier is willing to fight and die, but he has a right to ask that he be treated as a first-class citizen.

It is nothing less than immoral for the American public, through its political and military leaders, to perpetuate a policy of deception and distrust toward the serviceman. Today's victim of this policy is lured into a military career by appeals to his patriotism—and promises of security that are callously broken. I resigned from the Army because I sought a new and more satisfying way of life. I wanted security for myself and my family. I found little of the security the Army had led me to expect. The Army told me, in a pamphlet promoting the Army as a career, that the Army was striving to stabilize duty assignments, improve family stability, increase career attractiveness. The pamphlet emphasized what was supposed to be a basic Army policy: "The normal tour of duty will be for 3 years." In 13 years I moved 33 times, including 10 times in 9 years of marriage. And my experience was typical; I was a victim of the system.

The supreme irony comes when a man, with sorrow and reluctance, finally decides to resign from the Army. The same civilians who thought him foolish for joining the Army now look on him as foolish for resigning. They eye his rows of ribbons; they see a man of experience and valor withdrawing from their defense. They seem to sense that his absence is a chink in their armor. Perhaps they feel less secure.

In the year ending last June 30, a total of 1,483 regular officers resigned from all the armed services. The total was 1,622 in 1962 and 787 in 1961. The Nation cannot afford to lose these dedicated men. Nor can the Nation continue to believe it is possible to maintain a large Military Establishment whose members merely subsist on the fringes of the society they protect. Thousands of the men who guard America are raising families on incomes at or below the Government's own definition of a "poverty income."

If American civilians want the security provided by a large military establishment, they must provide more security to the men in that establishment. These men are not hired gunslingers; most of them are husbands and fathers with families to support. These men would die for their Nation, and these families would mourn them with pride. These Americans are among our finest. And our finest should be nothing less than cherished.

When I decided to resign from the Army, I wrote a letter to myself to justify my decision. I want the opportunity, I wrote, to grow personally and financially, according to my own ability; I want to be part of a stable community; I want a home; but mostly I want my children to grow up in an atmosphere which will more adequately prepare them to face the future with confidence. The U.S. Army does not offer these possibilities to me.

Now that I am a civilian, and proud of my military service and the U.S. Army, perhaps I should change that last sentence. For I know now that the Army was not alone in letting me down. America did too.

CHANGE IN OUR COINAGE SYSTEM

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, during this next Congress no doubt there will be a change in our coinage system. The basic reason for this need for legislation is because of the great demand for silver. The short supply of silver and the present worldwide uses thereof exceed the 400 million ounces per year, of which the United States uses nearly 250 million ounces per year.

The worldwide supply of silver is slightly over 200 million ounces, 50 percent of world consumption.

The U.S. production of silver is less than 40 million ounces per year; less than 17 percent of our own demand.

The shortage of silver is supplied by sales from the U.S. Treasury at $1.29 per ounce.

In January 1964 the Treasury had 1.53 billion ounces of silver.

In January 1965 the Treasury had 1.19 billion ounces—a loss of 340 million ounces of silver, during the last calendar year.

At this rate of loss the Treasury will run out of silver within 3 years.

The U.S. and Treasury supply of silver is already below the critical point.

We need at least 500 million ounces in strategic reserve, for space exploration, for photographic uses, for electrical contacts, brazing alloys, for monetary needs, and for shoring up friendly countries' currencies, as past examples in China and India prove.

At present the coinage demand alone in the United States is nearly 200 million ounces per year.

You have heard a great deal about the coin shortage. I suggest that the coinage shortage is not due to a lack of silver supply, but to lack of minting facilities, coin hoarding, and increased demand from vending machines. Over $3 billion in sales were made by vending machines in 1964.

If the laws of supply and demand were allowed free play, the price of silver on the world market today would be in excess of $1.29 an ounce. If it were not for the Treasury Department selling at that price, the price of silver would be much higher.

If our present Treasury stocks are depleted, the Treasury would not have silver to sell at $1.29 per ounce and the world market price would be so great that it would be profitable to melt down our coins. During 1942 and 1943 we minted silver nickels, which at the present price of silver, are worth seven cents. There are in the United States today two firms refining these nickels for the silver they contain; one in the State of New York, the other in the State of Utah.

It is evident that the Treasury must maintain the $1.29 per ounce price until we change our coinage system. The Treasury Department has finally recognized this, and is attempting to come up with an answer. It has a private organization conducting a research program with regard to the coinage problems and its report was to have been made in December, then in January, then on February 1, and it may be the month of April before we receive it.

At the present time there is considerable sentiment within the Treasury Department to completely debase our coins and to substitute cupro-nickel, or some other base metal, for silver. I think this would be to the detriment of the United States. We have at present in silver stocks, 1.19 billion ounces of silver stored at West Point, which could be used as a coinage reserve for some considerable time. I believe that by reducing the silver content of our coins, we could provide a coinage of intrinsic value, and one that would meet the needs of vending machines. At the same time, this procedure would provide coinage acceptable in the United States, maintain the prestige of our coins throughout the world, and keep the dollar respected wherever it is traded.

This morning I viewed a TV program on which an official of the Treasury Department was interviewed. He indicated a possible complete debasement of our coinage. Not long ago, there appeared a comic strip in the Washington Post showing a need for coinage debasement. The strip suggested that we would have paper money, such as shinplasters, as they were called in the 1830's, and 1840's, in the place of our present silver coins.

I think the West has a vital interest in this matter, but my interest arises, not just because I come from a Western State. If I were from the State of Florida, I would be just as interested in the integrity of our coinage.

Most of the silver produced in the United States is mined as a byproduct. Our copper, lead, zinc, and other metal mines interestingly extract ores that contain silver as an impurity. I do not think that with the maintenance of the $1.29 per ounce price, these mines will produce additional amounts of silver, the need for which is evident.

The need for a change in our silver policy and coinage system has been, after years of warnings by the Congress, recognized by the Treasury Department. At present, a study within the Department is underway. A private firm has been engaged to explore the metallurgic possibilities for coinage changes. Even before the results of these studies have been established, the opponents of silver coinage within the Treasury Department are voicing the hopes of the Silver Users Association by stating that the future coins of the United States will contain no silver.

The critical coin shortage is related in the silver opponents' statements to the silver shortage, when, in fact, there is no direct connection between the two. The coin shortage is due to inadequate mint facilities, increasing populations, greatly expanded sales through vending machines—approximately $3 billion in 1964—and coin hoarding, as I said before. The credibility of the study will be in doubt due to the preconceived notions within the Treasury, and the manner in which some of its officials are waging a campaign against silver.

Even if those persons within the Treasury Department who have a historic dislike for silver coins prevail in the report of that Department, the ultimate decision is that of the Congress. The Constitution explicitly imposes the responsibility for coining money and the regulation of its value upon the Congress. We surely will enact legislation affecting coinage this year, and it is my hope that we will provide coins befitting the dignity of this country. In short, I believe we must retain silver in our coinage system, not only for the intrinsic value for such coinage, but also to properly fit the commerce of the United States. A reduction in the present silver content will alleviate the silver shortage problem, and will maintain a coin of prestige of our Nation.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. First of all, I want to compliment the gentleman from Idaho for bringing this subject to the floor of the House today because I think it is very vital to a sound dollar and sound coins in this country. But I want to ask more specifically if you can give us any figure or any source of figures to justify the statement that there is a loss of silver from the storage in West Point.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. I would say that the daily statement of the U.S. Treasury at the beginning of 1963 showed more than 1,650 million ounces of silver were in storage at West Point and the one I received just yesterday showed 1,191 million ounces or a net loss of almost 600 million ounces during the last year and one-half.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. All of that 600 million ounces did not go into coinage then?

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. It did not, but a great amount went into coinage and a lot of it was sold, or redeemed as the Treasury Department likes to say, for silver certificates when they were presented at the assay offices in New York and San Francisco.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Is the Treasury Department just redeeming silver certificates or are they actually selling silver to silver users such as jewelers and photographic industry and then, in turn, going out and soliciting the silver certificates to come in.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. I think you would find that at first the administrative procedure was that the Treasury would collect silver certificates and would provide them to anyone desiring to convert them to silver for any acceptable credit. But they changed this through notification in the Federal Register so that the redeemer must collect his own silver certificates. But I think this could be arranged very easily through a Federal Reserve bank. The bank collects the silver certificates, and exchanges them for Federal Reserve notes. The purchaser can then exchange his silver certificates for silver at the assay office.

This silver then finds its way into industrial uses as well as into the hands of speculators now hoarding silver.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Obviously, then a great amount of silver is being diverted from coinage directly by going to various silver manufacturers.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. That is correct. I believe you will find also certain of our coins find their way into other nations of the world through the tourist trade and are being diverted directly into industrial uses by being melted down. In Canada, I have been told that some of our coinage which enters Canada is melted down for silver solder; it being more economical than buying the copper and the silver separately then alloying them.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Obviously then the price of only $1.29 an ounce or the value of $1.29 an ounce is not a very realistic one.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. It very definitely is not.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. And there should be a very much higher price or a higher value placed on each ounce of silver otherwise we are going to lose silver to the whole world; are we not?

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. I will say to the gentleman from Montana, I agree that the pressure for a higher price for silver is due to the fact that we have a deficiency of 200 million ounces a year. In other words, we are providing one-half of the silver demands of the free world out of Treasury stocks.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. In effect, we are subsidizing silver users not only in the United States but all over the world by putting silver out at a price of $1.29 an ounce.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. And when you say, "we" that means the taxpayers of the United States selling millions of ounces of silver at a certain price when it should be sold through a price established by supply and demand. Then the taxpayers of the United States would benefit from any profit that would accrue from the sale of such silver rather than subsidizing users of this silver or the speculators.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. It is not only an injustice to the taxpayers of the United States but it is an injustice to the silver miners and the other metal miners because they, in turn, are not able to get the right price for their silver in competition with this cheap silver coming out of the Treasury.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. That is correct. They are in direct competition with the miner. He should be a beneficiary of this higher price which would be in effect if the law of supply and demand were allowed to exercise itself.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. I thank the gentleman from Idaho again for bringing this matter to the floor of the House.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I commend my distinguished and able colleague from Idaho for bringing this to the attention of the House today, for bringing it to the attention of Congress and to the attention of the people of this country.

I do not have a silver mine in my State, nor is there a copper, a nickel, or a zinc mine, nor a mine of any of these metals, but I can foresee a time when our currency may be depreciated and possibly wrecked.

I do not wish to see paper money substituted for 50-cent pieces or 25-cent pieces or dimes. I want to see the coinage continued.

I do not want to see the taxpayers defrauded.

I commend the gentleman. This is an urgent matter. It is very important to this Congress and to the people of this country. I pledge the gentleman my support, though I come from an area which is not directly concerned with mining at all. I am concerned.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. I thank the gentleman. I would suggest to those who are listening that the name of the gentleman from South Carolina who just spoke, WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN DORN, is qualified in many ways, particularly in name, to make his comments.

I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SAYLOR. I wish to commend my colleague from Idaho for bringing this matter before the House. Members will recall that in the last session, when we had the proposition brought before us to get rid of silver certificates, the gentleman in the well of the House led the fight against that action. I believe the country is now realizing that Congress then made a mistake.

The gentleman from Idaho is one of the best informed persons in the United States on these matters it has been my pleasure to know. I commend him, and I commend the speech he is making to all Members of the House.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

At the present time, I am preparing legislation, which would require that the silver content of our coins be reduced. The bill will have a lower limit, or "not less than" provision for the percentage of silver to be contained in our future coins. The bill would permit the Secretary of the Treasury to adjust the silver content between the present number of grains and approximately one-third that amount. Discretion would be given to the Secretary regarding the time and manner of the adjustment, in order to preserve the outstanding coinage.

There are seven distinct advantages to the policy I propose:

First. The United States would preserve a coinage of intrinsic value. It is important for the world's economic, military, political, and cultural leader to maintain a prestige coinage. Other nations have reduced or eliminated silver from some or all of their coins, but those of the greatest stability recognize the necessity for providing silver content coins for their citizens.

I have in my possession a 5-franc piece from Switzerland which is about 85 percent fine. I have in my possession coins from Italy. Despite all the talk about the coins from Italy, they still have some coins in circulation which are about 85 percent fine, like the 500-lire piece. Even in Great Britain there is the florin, or the 2-shilling piece, which contains 50 percent silver.

It would be a great blow to our international standing if the United States adopted a token coinage system.

Second. The threat to the present coinage from commercial melting would be eliminated. An interim step that the Secretary might use would be to revalue all the present coins, so that they would be more valuable in purchasing power than for industrial use.

Third. Reduction of the silver content in the coins, by definition, increases the monetary value of the 1 billion ounces of silver owned by the Treasury. The benefit of doubling or tripling the value of any asset is obvious.

Fourth. The present ceiling of $1.29 per ounce for silver not only discourages production but prevents a fair return to the miners of this metal. An increase in the monetary value of silver would allow the market price of silver to seek its true level and certainly would stimulate production, so that supply and demand could be brought into line.

Fifth. Continuance of a silver coinage would continue to prevent coin counterfeiting. A token coinage would be easy to counterfeit and the cost of materials would be such that it would be profitable.

Sixth. The increased monetary value of silver held by the Treasury would allow the issuance of more silver certificates, thus relieving the increasing pressure for higher interest rates. The substitution of Federal Reserve notes for silver certificates created a demand for more credit. The pressure on our gold reserve by issuance of more Federal Reserve notes was increased. Through the use of higher value silver to back silver certificates, the need for 25 percent gold backing and 75 percent U.S. credits on Federal Reserve notes would be alleviated.

Seventh. Silver has a much higher electrical conductivity than any base metal. The vending machine industry, which had gross sales of over $3 billion in 1964, relies upon this conductivity for its sophisticated rejection devices. No substitute metal or alloy has been found which would work in these rejection devices. The preservation of silver in our coins would allow this American vending machine industry to grow according to the demands of the American public. If base metal coins were substituted, havoc would result for the vending machine owners.

Mr. Speaker, I have listened to many recommendations in the past from the Treasury Department with respect to coinage. As you will recall, in the last session of the 88th Congress there was included in an appropriation bill for the Treasury Department a provision to mint 45 million additional silver dollars. It would seem a Member from the State of Idaho, where silver dollars are in general circulation, would be in favor of such an appropriation to cover the minting of additional silver dollars.

However, realizing that the silver dollars which would be minted would immediately be following the same path of millions of other silver dollars that we had in the Treasury at the beginning of last year, which disappeared into the corners and into the hands of coin collectors, realizing that they would go the same way, I therefore opposed that proposition at that time.

The appropriation bill we passed would have used 38 million ounces of silver and would have cost the taxpayers $600,000 in minting costs.

Now I would like to read to you a letter written by Mr. Dillon, Secretary of the Treasury, to Mr. Gary, who was then the chairman of the Subcommittee on Treasury Appropriations, who carried the conference report here in the House of Representatives. I will not read the entire letter, but I would like to read from it some of the things that were said by Mr. Dillon, the Secretary of the Treasury, as reasons for minting the silver dollars and the general effects it might have:

> Also, use of the silver dollar will, to a great extent in the West at least, alleviate the heavy demands we have had on the quarter and 50-cent pieces.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot understand how Mr. Dillon could say that the minting of silver dollars would relieve the demands on quarters and 50-cent pieces.

He also said at this time:

> Under this program we are acquiring many presses from the Department of Defense, GSA, and private industry and converting them for emergency use, although they will not be suitable nor economical on a long-range basis. With these presses now, however, and the continued purchase of bronze and nickel strip, we will be able to produce the 45 million silver dollars without cutting down on the production of coin of smaller denominations.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest to the Members of the House that they might check the recent press in general circulation in Washington, D.C., and note where Secretary Dillon has said that it would be improper to mint the silver dollars and that they were going to hold this minting production in abeyance.

Mr. Speaker, in view of type of information emanating from the Treasury Department with respect to coinage in the case of the silver dollar, I do not see how we can depend upon information coming from them regarding other coins.

Mr. Speaker, I realize that the gentlemen in the Treasury Department have an immense problem. I have attempted in the course of the past 2 years in this Congress to try to point out the problem to the Members of this body and hoped that some officials in the Treasury Department might have at least referred to some of the things that were said on this floor.

Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago I attempted to preclude the possibility of the demonetization of silver; that is, the removal of silver certificates. At the same time I asked that we increase the monetary price of silver so that we could maintain silver dollars and silver certificates, which are kept in circulation without additional cost to the taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, I have prepared legislation for the Congress' consideration which I hope will provide the things which I have suggested here today.

We will also have to consider the possibility of a strategic reserve of silver, because the pressure today from the industrial users of silver is as great as the coinage demand.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, permit me to say to the gentleman from Idaho that I share his concern about silver reserves and the silver contained in our coins. In fact I share the concern of many others about the overall matter of silver. This is something which is very vital to the security and stability of our coinage system and to our entire monetary system. We must not make the monetary system suspect.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to assure the gentleman from Idaho that I shall work with him and others here in the Congress this year in an effort to try to achieve some satisfactory solution to this problem.

I appreciate the gentleman bringing this matter to the attention of the Members of the House today.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. I thank the gentleman from Louisiana for his comments.

I am hopeful that the legislation, which I will soon introduce, will receive favorable consideration from the Committee on Banking and Currency that we will have an opportunity to consider it here on the floor of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I shall endeavor to keep the Congress informed of my activities in this area. My only purpose in so doing is to maintain an adequate coinage for the United States and at the same time provide the necessary backing for the currency in such manner as to be economical to the taxpayers of the country and to the people in general.

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to compliment the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE] and to assure him of the sincere interest of virtually all of my constituents in the State of Wyoming in this matter. I further wish to assure the gentleman of my unqualified support in an effort to bring about the preservation of this institution, silver coins, to the people of my State of Wyoming.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. I thank the gentleman from Wyoming.

THE QUESTION OF CYPRUS SHOULD BE PLACED ON THE AGENDA OF THE UNITED NATIONS GENERAL ASSEMBLY

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask permission today to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a series of documents prepared by His Excellency Zenon Rossides, permanent representative of Cyprus to the United Nations, in support of his Government's formal request to the United Nations that the question of Cyprus be included as a supplementary item in the agenda of the 19th session.

It is my firm conviction that the excellent presentation made by Ambassador Rossides deserves the most earnest attention of our own State Department and those Americans who earnestly hope for justice for Cyprus.

It is regrettable that the excellent arguments set forth by the Cyprus Government have not received wider attention in the United States and the rest of the free world.

I have recently introduced a resolution which calls for free elections on the island of Cyprus to help, once and for all, resolve the problem of administration for this very important bastion of freedom in the Mediterranean.

One has a right to ask why the voices of those who proclaim most loudly their support for the doctrine of self-determination, appear to be conspicuously silent on this whole question of self-determination for Cyprus.

It is interesting that in the United Nations the very newly emerging nations which seem to be most concerned about the survival of self-determination in their own republics, are conspicuously silent on the question of giving the same principles of self-determination to the people of Cyprus.

It is proper, Mr. Speaker, that we ask in this assembly whether the United States itself has a double standard of justice dealing with the entire principle of self-determination. I have not seen the same degree of enthusiasm voiced in behalf of the Cypriots as we hear in behalf of many other nations, some with much shorter traditions of self-government.

Mr. Speaker, I am fully aware of the difficult position which confronts the free world in resolving the Cypriot problem. But then, Mr. Speaker, the tangled affairs of the entire world present many difficult problems. I do not believe that we should fail to remain resolute in demanding self-determination for Cyprus, when we have taken a very strong position on this principle in so many other parts of the world.

There is no easy solution to the problem of Cyprus but the free world only compounds the complexity of this issue by failing to push resolutely for self-determination.

Ambassador Rossides makes out an excellent case for the people of Cyprus, and it would be my hope that at least our Government will have the courage to support the compelling logic of Ambassador Rossides' presentation.

This question must be placed on the agenda of the 19th session of the United Nations General Assembly this year.

Ambassador Rossides' excellent analysis follows:

THE JUSTICE FOR CYPRUS COMMITTEE REPRINT OF "QUESTION OF CYPRUS" BEFORE THE UNITED NATIONS GENERAL ASSEMBLY, DECEMBER 4, 1964, AND OTHER RELATED DOCUMENTS

(Compiled by the Justice for Cyprus Committee, Chicago, Ill.)

[United Nations General Assembly, 19th session]

REQUEST FOR THE INCLUSION OF A SUPPLEMENTARY ITEM IN THE AGENDA OF THE 19TH SESSION: QUESTION OF CYPRUS

(Letter dated December 4, 1964, from the permanent representative of Cyprus to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General.)

Further to my letter dated September 25, 1964,[1] whereby I requested, on behalf of my Government, that the item entitled "Question of Cyprus" be included in the agenda of the forthcoming 19th regular session of the General Assembly as a supplementary item, I have the honor to furnish here below the text of the explanatory memorandum in relation thereto, in accordance with rule 20 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly.

ZENON ROSSIDES,
Permanent Representative of Cyprus to the United Nations.

EXPLANATORY MEMORANDUM

1. The problem of Cyprus appears exceedingly complicated and involved, but in essence it is very simple. It stems from a virtual denial to the people of Cyprus of its fundamental right to self-determination and from an effort to deprive the Republic of Cyprus of the substance of its sovereignty and independence.

2. Since the establishment of the United Nations, 49 new countries emerged to independence and joined the organization. For all, except Cyprus, the right of self-determination under the charter was applied. For all, except Cyprus, the structure of the external and internal independence of the country conformed with the universally accepted democratic principles of majority decision and majority rule. Hence the regrettable situation in Cyprus threatening world peace. Its origins lie in the colonial policy of divide and rule, in the name of which Turkey was in 1955 unjustifiably encouraged to inject itself in the affairs of Cyprus. It did so with the aim of provoking intercommunal division and strife in Cyprus in order to serve neocolonialist purposes alien to the interests of the Cypriot people, whether of Turkish or Greek origin.

3. The General Assembly in its declaration against colonialism, adopted in 1960, declared that all peoples have the inalienable right to complete freedom and self-determination, the exercise of their sovereignty and the integrity of their national territory. It declared that transfer of all powers to the peoples of colonial territories should be "without any conditions or reservations, in accordance with their freely expressed will and desire * * * in order to enable them to enjoy complete independence and freedom."

4. In the case of Cyprus, however, such encumbrances were attached to its independence as purported to prevent it from enjoying the full independence and freedom to which it was entitled. This situation was created by the Zurich and London agreements of 1959. They provided for a basic constitution for the retention by the United Kingdom of two areas as sovereign military bases, and for two other treaties. A treaty of guarantee with Greece, Turkey, and the United Kingdom as the guarantor powers, and a treaty of alliance between Cyprus, Greece and Turkey.

5. These agreements, which were concluded while Cyprus was still a colony, were not the result of the free consent of the Cypriot people. They were imposed upon them from outside with a pressure that under the prevailing circumstances at the time left no possibility of choice for the Cypriot leadership. Rejection of the agreements would have meant denial of independence, continuation of colonial rule, and increased bloodshed.

6. Cyprus was declared an independent state as the Republic of Cyprus by act of the British Parliament of August 16, 1960. Under the aforesaid agreements the basic constitutional structure, abnormal in its nature, proved in practice wholly unworkable. It created unprecedented conditions of imbalance by subjecting the majority of the 82 percent to the minority of 18 percent and through its sharply divisive built-in provisions led to antagonism and trouble in the island. A striking example of the paralyzing veto power granted to the minority is the unreasonable requirement of separate Turkish Cypriot majority for any legislation on taxation. Thus, in a House of Representatives of 50 members (of whom 35 Greek and 15 Turkish Cypriots), 8 Turkish Cypriot votes could prevent the passage of any fiscal measure, even though the remaining 42 votes were in favor. This unprecedented arrangement is contrary to all accepted norms of democratic government. By the exercise, and indeed the abuse, of this right, a small Turkish Cypriot minority defeated the passing of the main fiscal legislation, thus blocking the normal functioning of the state.

7. The people of Cyprus, who were never given the opportunity to discuss the basic structure of their constitution, were deprived even of the possibility to amend it, in any of its details of internal administration without the consent of three outside countries.

8. The treaty of guarantee purported to give three other states, Turkey, Greece, and the United Kingdom, the power to interfere in the domestic affairs of Cyprus and in its internal administration. The unprecedented constitutional encumbrances, interlocked with the aforementioned treaties, were in effect intended to rob Cyprus of the very substance of its sovereignty and its internal independence and to place it under the tutelage of three foreign powers.

9. On September 20, 1960, Cyprus was admitted to the United Nations as a sovereign and equal member of the organization. This admission was unanimous and without any reservation. By virtue of it, the rights of equal sovereignty, full independence, and territorial integrity attaching to membership in the United Nations were, in effect, fully recognized to Cyprus. This reality can neither be denied nor ignored. All states members of the United Nations, including the signatories of the aforementioned treaties, have a responsibility under the charter to respect the aforesaid rights of the Republic of Cyprus. The treaty of guarantee comes into direct conflict with the principles and specific provisions of the charter. This conflict was brought into sharper focus through the actions of one of the signatories, Turkey, who, on a pretended right from that treaty, resorted to threats and acts of aggression against Cyprus.

10. In carrying out such policy of force and violence, Turkey raided Cyprus by air, killing

---

[1] a/5752.

and maiming hundreds of innocent men, women, and children, in an attack of terror including the use of napalm incendiary bombs—all this by using the treaty of guarantee as an excuse. Such flagrant violation of the charter, however, could not be sanctioned by any treaty, particularly having regard to article 103 of the charter.

11. The other imposed treaty, the treaty of alliance, ostensibly concluded for the purpose of defending Cyprus against outside aggression, has actually been used by a supposed ally as an instrument of aggression, and has thus been repeatedly and continuously violated by Turkey. The Turkish troops which were stationed in Cyprus under the said treaty, instead of remaining in their allocated base as those of an ally under tripartite command, have been and still are arbitrarily deployed in hostile occupation of Cypriot territory, thereby committing continuing aggression.

12. The underlying cause for the divisive policy and hostile actions by Turkey was its aim to force partition of the island, thereby also promoting neocolonialism. In furtherance of this policy, the extremist Turkish Cypriot leadership was incited to rebellion by Ankara. This attempt to disrupt the state was calculated to cause conditions which would justify invasion by Turkey under the right allegedly contained in the treaty of guarantee. The objective was to advance the aforesaid aim of partition by intensifying division.

13. In the past 11 months, Turkey has constantly and repeatedly threatened armed intervention in Cyprus, notably on December 27, 1963, and March 13, 1964. Its plans to invade the island were thwarted by the timely recourse of the Government of Cyprus to the United Nations Security Council.

14. The Security Council, in its capacity as the organ entrusted under the charter with the primary responsibility for the maintenance of peace and security, has dealt with certain specific aspects of the problem confronting Cyprus in respect of the threats of outside aggression and their internal repercussions on the basis of the complaint of the Government of Cyprus against the Government of Turkey for "acts of aggression and intervention in the internal affairs of Cyprus by the threat and use of force against its territorial integrity and political independence" (letter dated December 26, 1963, from the permanent representative of Cyprus addressed to the President of the Security Council, document S/5488 and subsequent communications). The Security Council has adopted interim measure intended to achieve pacification and normalization of the situation in Cyprus.

15. The Government of Cyprus has repeatedly declared its readiness to insure full respect for the human rights of all citizens in accordance with the universal declaration of human rights and to agree to international safeguards for the protection of the legitimate rights of minorities. In this connection the Government of Cyprus is prepared to accept United Nations observation in respect of the implementation of the above rights.

16. The Republic of Cyprus, an equal member of the United Nations, looks to the General Assembly to uphold its unrestricted and unfettered sovereignty and independence, thereby allowing its people to determine freely, and without any foreign intervention or interference, the political future of the country, in accordance with the charter of the organization. In this spirit the General Assembly is expected to call upon all states, in conformity with their obligations under the Charter of the United Nations, and in particular article 2, paragraphs 1 and 4, to respect the sovereignty, unity, independence, and territorial integrity of Cyprus and to refrain from any threat or use of force or intervention directed against Cyprus.

EXPLANATORY MEMORANDUM BY AMBASSADOR ROSSIDES

Cyprus appealed to the General Assembly to uphold the "unrestricted and unfettered sovereignty and independence" of the island. The appeal came in a memorandum from Mr. Zenon Rossides, the permanent representative of Cyprus to the United Nations, explaining his country's request that the question of Cyprus be placed on the General Assembly's agenda.

Mr. Rossides said that Cyprus "looks to the General Assembly to uphold its unfettered sovereignty and independence, thereby allowing its people to determine freely, and without any foreign intervention or interference, the political future of the country." His letter, addressed to Secretary-General U Thant, called on the Assembly to urge "all states" to respect the "sovereignty, unity, independence, and territorial integrity of Cyprus and to refrain from any threat or use of force or intervention directed against Cyprus."

Turkey, had "constantly and repeatedly threatened armed intervention," had carried out air raids "killing and maiming hundreds of innocent men, women, and children," and had deployed its forces "in hostile occupation of Cypriot territory." In essence, the problem of Cyprus was simple, Mr. Rossides said. It steemed from a "virtual denial to the people of Cyprus of its fundamental right to self-determination and from an effort to deprive the Republic of Cyprus of its sovereignty and independence." The treaty of guarantee and the treaty of alliance, which established Cyprus Constitution and its relations with Turkey, Greece, and Britain, were imposed from outside, he said. The Constitution was "abnormal in its nature" and "wholly unworkable" in practice because it gave a "paralyzing veto power" to the Turkish minority on the island. Eight Turkish Cypriot votes in the House of Representatives could prevent the passage of any fiscal measure, he said. The arrangement was unprecedented as "contrary to all accepted norms of democratic government."

The treaty of guarantee purported to give Turkey, Greece, and Britain the unprecedented constitutional right to interfere in internal Cyprus affairs. It was intended to rob Cyprus of the very substance of its sovereignty, Mr. Rossides said. The treaty came into direct conflict with the Charter of the United Nations, under which Cyprus was admitted as a sovereign and equal member state, he added.

The treaty of alliance, ostensibly concluded for the purpose of defending Cyprus against outside aggression, has actually been used by a supposed ally as an instrument of aggression and has thus been repeatedly and continuously violated by Turkey. Turkish troops on the island were committing continuing aggression, Mr. Rossides said.

Turkey's divisive policy and hostile actions were aimed at forcing partition of the island, and the extremist Turkish Cypriot leadership had been incited by Ankara authorities to rebel for this reason, he added. The Nicosia government had repeatedly declared its readiness to insure full respect for the human rights of all citizens in accordance with the universal declaration of human rights and was prepared to accept United Nations observers who could see that this guarantee was carried out, he said.

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y.

The enclosed communication dated December 15, 1964, is transmitted to the permanent missions of the states members of the United Nations at the request of the permanent representative of Cyprus to the United Nations.

DECEMBER 15, 1964.

PERMANENT MISSION OF THE
REPUBLIC OF CYPRUS,
TO THE UNITED NATIONS,
New York, N.Y., December 15, 1964.

His Excellency U THANT,
Secretary General United Nations,
New York, N.Y.

EXCELLENCY: The reply of the permanent representative of Turkey of December 4 (S/6083) to my communication of November 24 (PO. 210. Cypr.) makes it obvious that the policy of his government continues to be one of division, disruption, and conflict in Cyprus. This is regrettable.

Mr. Eralp is unable to conceal his disappointment that for over 2 months now complete calm prevails in Cyprus. He opposes all steps taken toward normality and peaceful living between Greek and Turkish Cypriots; he resents the return of judicial order through the establishment of integrated courts of law, now functioning satisfactorily all over the island, with Greek and Turkish judges fully cooperating and impartially administering justice without any racial or ethnic discrimination; he bypasses the significant progress toward good will by the Government of Cyprus; he tries to ignore all other constructive steps taken by the Cypriot Government, with the cooperation of UNFICYP, as concretely enumerated in my letter.

Mr. Eralp, furthermore, passes in complete silence a main premise of my said communication; namely, the irrefutable documentary evidence, therein reproduced, which he could not deny and which proves the terrorism still exercised by the extremist Turkish leadership against thousands of Turkish Cypriot citizens, forcing upon them compulsory segregation, in an effort to keep up division and strife and to hinder the return to peaceful and normal life. Nor could he deny the most recent instance of such terrorism reported in my said letter; namely, that of the killing of Hassan Hussein alias Kivatch, who was shot by Turkish terrorists in the presence of his wife and children, merely because he wanted to escape captivity and return to his village. The numerous appeals made by such victims to the moderate Turkish leader, Dr. Ihsan Ali, and the latter's relevant communications to the Secretary General and the UNFICYP commander, in an effort to relieve the suffering of his fellow Turks from terrorist captivity, are an impressive piece of evidence that cannot be wiped out by Mr. Eralp describing Dr. Ali as a turncoat, presumably for not supporting terrorism.

While taking such negative attitude, Ambassador Eralp finds no difficulty to complain that the Government of Cyprus does not open its doors to Dr. Kutchuk and his rebellious set, so that they may be able to pursue from within their nefarious work of disrupting the state.

It is, moreover, significant that in purporting to reply to my letter of November 24, which dealt in a spirit of positiveness with developments of the last two months, the Turkish representative prefers to speak of the preceding period, nostalgically reverting to its strife and recrimination by dwelling on controversies exhaustively dealt with at the time. He even goes back 8 years and tries to distort the historic reality that during the independence struggle Turkish Cypriots, instigated by Ankara and acting as the agents of divisive colonialism, were opposing by force the fight for freedom, and in the process were engaged in indiscriminate attacks against the Greek Cypriots, killing, burning, and looting, in order to bring confusion and a setback to the liberation movement.

Similarly, with the aim now of depriving the Republic of the substance of its independence, the same policy is followed by Turkey, for whom division and strife in Cyprus has become an objective in itself, as a means toward the hopelessness of partition with an eye to annexation.

I cannot help saying that it is this divisive and expansionist policy, so far pursued by Turkey in the service of neocolonialism and in violation of the United Nations Charter, that has been, and continues to be, the cause of the whole trouble in the area. Through its menace to the territorial integrity, the sovereignty and the independence of Cyprus, it constitutes a threat to international peace and security.

We hope and trust that, with the help of the United Nations, reasonableness may prevail, so that enduring peace may come to Cyprus through a just and democratic solution of its problem.

Your Excellency is kindly requested to have this letter circulated to all member states.

Please accept, Excellency, the assurances of my highest consideration.

ZENON ROSSIDES,
Permanent Representative of Cyprus to the United Nations.

NATIONAL HUMANITIES FOUNDATION

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to represent a district which includes some of the great academic institutions of this Nation. This is a wonderful distinction, for no one can doubt the role of intellect in our national life.

In the education of the whole man, the role of humanities is supreme. The legislation which I am introducing today proposes the establishment of a National Humanities Foundation to promote progress in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes.

The legislation is based on the report of the Commission on the Humanities produced under the sponsorship of the American Council of Learned Societies, the Council of Graduate Schools in the United States, and the United Chapters of Phi Beta Kappa.

Suffice it to say at this time, I am immensely proud to join a number of my distinguished colleagues in working for the enactment of this legislation.

CCC GRAIN DUMPING NEEDS HALTING

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation which will prevent the Commodity Credit Corporation from selling food or feed grains at less than 120 percent of the current loan support price. In my judgment, it is one of the most urgently needed pieces of farm legislation which will come before this Congress. It may literally mean whether many of our hard-pressed farmers retain a toehold on the land, or whether they are swept into overcrowded cities already burdened with unemployment.

This legislation has been made necessary because of the flagrant dumping policies of the CCC. CCC dumping has disastrously dropped farm prices and created serious new problems for the livestock industry by encouraging overproduction of beef and hogs on cheap feed.

The seriousness of the CCC marketing manipulations cannot be overestimated. One out of every two farmers in America receives part of his income from wheat alone. Yet, during last year's harvest period, the CCC dumped 150 million bushels of wheat in competition with current crops.

The Grain Terminal Association of St. Paul, Minn., has estimated this action dropped wheat prices 20 cents a bushel. Thus, the experts tell us, some $240 million were lost on last year's total crop of 1,200 million bushels.

I want to point out this sorry practice is not confined merely to wheat. It involves all the feel grains. As an example, Charles Shuman, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, has pointed out that the CCC dumped more than 1.6 billion bushels of corn from CCC stocks in the period 1961 through September 1, 1964.

The reason for the punitive approach of CCC has been, as every farmer knows, to try and force noncompliers into the Government support program for feed grains. Aside from the shaky ethics of this course, the punitive measures are a dismal failure.

Compliers as well as noncompliers have been hurt by a Department of Agriculture agency which should be working in the best interests of both. Nor did such antics assist appreciably in ridding the Government warehouses of excess grain stocks. On the contrary, prices at last year's harvest time fell so low, many farmers elected to put their crops under Government seal, thereby replacing what the Government had sold.

MASSIVE PUBLIC LAW 480 FOOD SHIPMENTS TO THE UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC SHOULD BE CUT OFF

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RUMSFELD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, the recent attacks against U.S. interests and property by Egyptian President Nasser are without question a vindication of last year's effort by House Republicans to cut off massive Public Law 480 food shipments to the United Arab Republic.

The State Department has continued to disregard congressional directives prohibiting U.S. foreign aid to aggressor nations.

In September 1964, many House Republicans attempted, almost successfully to remove Nasser's United Arab Republic from among those nations which receive surplus foods under the food for peace program—Public Law 480.

Certainly, administration policymakers must accept major responsibility for indirectly subsidizing Nasser's assistance to Communist rebels in the Congo; his war in Yemen involving an expeditionary force of at least 60,000 troops; his subversion in south Arabia; and his threats against U.S. airbases in Libya. Without our $140-million-a-year food shipments, the time would be long since past when Nasser would have been forced to turn more of his attention to the pressing economic needs of his own people.

Under the terms of the 1963 Foreign Assistance Act, Congress directed the President to withhold all foreign economic aid and Public Law 480 aid from those nations committing aggressive acts against any other countries receiving our aid. This directive has been ignored in the case of Nasser's unprovoked war in Yemen and continues to be ignored in the face of Nasser's recent boasts concerning his role in the Congo massacres. Unless Nasser changes his tune, and changes it fast, Congress should overwhelmingly approve a rigid prohibition against further aid of any kind to the United Arab Republic.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert the following article from the New York Times in the RECORD:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Dec. 24, 1964]

NASSER, ANGERED BY CRITICISM, SAYS UNITED STATES CAN "JUMP IN LAKE"—ASSERTS CAIRO WOULD REFUSE AID RATHER THAN ACCEPT DICTATION OF POLICY

(By Hedrick Smith)

CAIRO, December 23.—President Gamal Abdel Nasser lashed back tonight at American criticism and delays on economic aid. He told the United States in Egyptian slang to "jump in the lake" if Washington disapproved of Cairo's recent behavior.

He also declared that the Egyptian people were ready to "cut our rations" and do without $140 million in American aid rather than let the United States dictate Egyptian policy.

The President was replying to expressions of American irritation over the burning of the U.S. Embassy library in Cairo last month and the downing of an American oil company plane by Egyptian jets 4 days ago.

(In Washington, officials said that Mr. Nasser's attack could imperil the United Arab Republic's chances of receiving U.S. surplus food.)

The Egyptian leader accused the United States and Belgium of aggression in the Congo and rejected an appeal, reported to have been sent to him by President Johnson through diplomatic channels that Egypt stop sending arms to the Congolese rebels.

"Our policy is clear and we say it openly," Mr. Nasser told a cheering crowd at Victory Day celebrations at Port Said.

"We say that we sent arms to the Congolese people and we shall keep on sending arms to the Congo."

In his speech, which marked the anniversary of the departure of British troops from

Port Said after the invasion of Suez by British and French forces in 1956, Mr. Nasser chided the United States on its relationship with Iran. He referred to Iran as an "American colony subjected to American and Zionist influences."

He was apparently most provoked by what he called the U.S. Ambassador's refusal to discuss Egyptian requests for economic aid because of irritation over Cairo's handling of the library-burning and plane-downing incidents.

Mr. Nasser said that Ambassador Lucius D. Battle met yesterday with an Egyptian official, but "was so upset over Egyptian conduct, he stayed only 2 minutes."

The Egyptian leader said that if the Ambassador did not approve of Egyptian behavior, he could "drink from the sea."

"And if the Mediterranean Sea is not big enough," he went on, "we will give him the Red Sea to drink it, too."

Egyptians said that this was the equivalent of telling the Ambassador to "jump in the lake."

READY TO CUT RATIONS

Elsewhere in his speech, Mr. Nasser implied that the United States was trying to attach strings to its huge economic aid program.

"The Americans," he declared, "want to give us aid and dominate our policy. I say we are sorry. We are ready to cut our rations and minimize the daily consumption so that we keep our independence."

With a high-level Soviet delegation at his side, Mr. Nasser said that Egypt had received about 50 million Egyptian pounds, or $115 million, in American wheat, meat, and chickens. But he scoffed at reports of serious food shortages in Egypt.

"If need be," he said of the American aid program, "we will save 50 million pounds. We do not want their money."

The bulk of American aid to Egypt is in the form of surplus food shipments under a 3-year agreement signed in 1962 that extends through next fall. The present dispute is over an extra $35 million worth of corn, meat, and chickens that the Egyptian Government requested in September to help combat food shortages. U.S. officials have been drafting a response to that request.

Turning to the Congo question, Mr. Nasser compared the November 24 American-Belgian operation to rescue white hostages in Stanleyville to the British-French and Israeli attack on Egypt in 1956.

In the view of some experienced observers, Mr. Nasser's speech was the toughest anti-American position he had taken publicly since 1956 when the proposal for U.S. assistance for the Aswan High Dam fell through and Egypt turned to the Soviet Union for help.

LABOR LEGISLATION

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include in the RECORD of this date an editorial from the United Mine Workers Journal, dated December 1, 1964.

My reason for presenting this to the House is to show the interest of the workers of our Nation in the measures sponsored by Congressman ADAM CLAYTON POWELL which have been endorsed recently by the President as the type of legislation needed to help this Nation sustain a healthy economic atmosphere.

While some Members of the Congress are always ready to introduce into the RECORD any derogatory news items affecting other Members and especially the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL], they seem to ignore or prefer not to see the good work performed by the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] as well as others in the Congress.

As a member of the Committee on Education and Labor headed by the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] I believe I can speak from experience when I say that Chairman POWELL is the most cooperative chairman on legislative matters I have ever served with in over 30 years of legislative experiences.

While all of us have faults, by the same token, all of us have virtues. Chairman POWELL's handling of the committee and its work assignments even with a restricted budget can best be judged by the great record of achievement in legislation passed and signed by the President in the fields of Education and Labor.

The United Mine Workers Journal appears to be fully aware of Mr. POWELL's record for the migrant workers, and in the field of fair labor standards legislation.

I present the editorial from the United Mine Workers Journal:

[From the United Mine Workers Journal, December 1, 1964]

LABOR COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN POWELL'S PROGRAM FOR 89TH CONGRESS MAKES SENSE

We don't happen to agree with the newspapers, politicians and so-called labor leaders who make a point of picking on Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, Democrat, of New York, at every opportunity. Representative POWELL is chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor. He is a good chairman and probably—from labor's standpoint—one of the best the committee ever has had. He certainly is so much better than the Dixiecrat who formerly was chairman that there is no comparison.

Representative POWELL recently outlined a legislative program that includes a 32-hour week, a $2 an hour Federal minimum wage (it is now $1.25 an hour) and Federal aid to primary and secondary schools. He also said he would ask the 89th Congress to boost spending on President Johnson's antipoverty program to $3 billion a year. The Congress appropriated only $850 million for the program's first year of operation.

POWELL also wants additional protection for migrant workers.

The Powell proposals made good sense to us. We would even go farther on some of the proposals.

Certainly a shorter workweek must come eventually. Certainly a Federal minimum wage of $2 an hour is not out of line with reality. Certainly aid to education is a must. Certainly the antipoverty program will remain just a pilot program until Congress appropriates enough money to make a real dent in long-term, technological unemployment. Certainly migrant workers are at the bottom of our economic ladder and need all the help they can get from the Federal Government.

We say more power to ADAM CLAYTON POWELL. We need more men in Congress with the guts to stand for what is right.

CRIME AND CORRECTIONAL REHABILITATION

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to help meet one of the most critical needs of our time. As this Congress already knows, much has been accomplished in the field of vocational rehabilitation; in large part because of the well-designed program of Federal assistance. Yet within this field there is a neglected area, the area of correctional rehabilitation, and today there is a need for an objective, thorough and nationwide analysis and reevaluation of the extent and means of resolving the critical shortage of qualified manpower in the field of correctional rehabilitation.

Last week President Johnson in his state of the Union message called the Nation's attention to this matter when he reiterated the right of every citizen to feel secure in his home and on the streets of his community and when he expressed his desire for the recommendations and constructive efforts of the Congress in attacking the national problem of crime and delinquency. I hope that many of us will rise to this challenge, since crime and delinquency indeed constitute a problem of increasing seriousness and magnitude in a society characterized by sharp increases in population, growing concentrations of people in cities and towns, industrialization, automation, assimilation of minority and immigrant groups in the American middle class, and changes in cultural values. All these developments have wide implications for the incidence and nature of crime and delinquency.

For example, behavior once regarded as normal in a largely rural and pioneer society, such as discharge of firearms in village streets or the taking of a small amount of farm produce from fields, is now regarded as illegal in a more crowded world. This is true because the danger of wounding another individual or of having one's crop ruined, has been increased by the sharp rise and concentration of population. Industrialization has brought an enormous number of new crimes never known to an agrarian world, such as stock swindles, pure food and drug law violations, and a host of other offenses. Minority and immigrant groups, with predominantly non-middle-class values, have swelled the crime rates because of their lack of understanding of and adjustment to our modern American world. Too often, they lack the resources or skills to employ legal counsel or other kinds of help to minimize prosecution for offenses sometimes committed out of ignorance or apathy.

The United States of the 1960's is not necessarily a less moral society than the United States of the 1760's. In fact, the general level of moral and ethical behavior may well be far higher. The problem is rather that our citizens today face a more complex world in a more crowded country with more laws and more opportunities to violate the laws.

Our approaches to crime today may therefore need to be tailored to a different world. The very causes may be different and the methods of prevention and control may need to be different.

This is not to suggest that we should simply tolerate more misconduct or law violations, or that we should drop all our laws from the statute books. Such actions may reduce official crime statistics, and indeed many laws may need to be dropped for various reasons. But failure to prosecute for law violations or removal of offenses from the statute books obviously would attack symptoms rather than causes.

I suggest that our approaches to crime and delinquency control have been very primitive and groping in comparison with our approach to other social problems such as mental health or public health because we have never seriously undertaken to provide the kind and number of personnel required for workable prevention and control programs. We would never for a moment imagine that good public health laws or preventive vaccines or sanitation laws alone would insure good public health. Our attention is directed immediately to establishing enough facilities and resources to turn out an adequate number of qualified physicians, nurses, and other personnel. We think also of ways to induce them to enter public health careers and to remain there. Yet we have naively assumed in our halting and uncertain attempts to prevent and control crime that good laws and a great many institutions and jails alone should do the job.

Let us remember too that all our people are entitled to rehabilitative services when they have committed offenses, both because they are people in need as well as because curing their problems will also protect the rest of us. Research shows that the vast majority of offenders have remediable physical, mental, emotional, or other defects.

The American system of criminal justice, and its counterpart for children and youth in the juvenile courts, has received increasing attention in recent years as a part of our striving toward equality of opportunity and justice for all our people. This attention has so far been directed toward revising the antiquated criminal and juvenile codes, toward improving law-enforcement facilities, toward updating archaic bail bond requirements, and toward strengthening judicial and legal processes.

But there is a serious gap in our remedial approaches so far. We have failed to give adequate attention to the services and facilities for the redirection and treatment of identified and adjudicated offenders, adult and juvenile. Our prisons remain overcrowded, poorly staffed, and subject to riots and disturbances. Our probation services are so inadequate that proponents of the juvenile court philosophy claim that such inadequacies have prevented any real testing of the juvenile court idea. Training schools for delinquents are notoriously poor in program and services, with very few exceptions. Parole staffs in most of our States have enormous caseloads and are ill equipped to offer constructive guidance. Private correctional agencies, planning and prevention programs, camps, halfway houses, and other correctional machinery are far more promising in their hopes than successful in their accomplishments.

There is fairly clear evidence, and a growing consensus, that the major key to genuine and lasting improvement of correctional services lies in the substantial increase of well-qualified personnel who will enter permanent career service in prisons, probation, parole, and other correctional programs. Good correctional laws, sound program planning, and innovative and promising services are only as effective as the people who will put meaning into the laws, activate the plans, and staff the services.

Unfortunately, to date our interest has been only in devising and demonstrating new laws, new techniques, and new approaches. A comparatively small number of highly qualified personnel have moved around from new project to new project, "testing out" these new ideas. But, as they move on to newer and more exciting programs, each of the previous demonstrations has faded into comparative oblivion. There has been no permanent well-qualified cadre of personnel to pick up on the "demonstrated" idea.

We will never capitalize on our research findings in crime and delinquency until we have enough skilled rehabilitation and prevention personnel. For example, we know that over 90 percent of our offenders shift back and forth from legitimate to illicit careers at one time or another and are not genuinely "career criminals." This 90 percent or so can therefore be potentially directed into permanently legitimate careers. Yet there are only 50 full-time psychiatrists in all the prisons and reformatories serving adult offenders in the Nation, a ratio of approximately 1 psychiatrist to 4,400 offenders. How much genuine rehabilitation can any one person, no matter how qualified, be expected to bring about in such a small army of offenders?

The situation with respect to psychologists is little better, about 1 to 2,000. And there is 1 teacher for every 400 prisoners.

Research evidence indicates that such a drastic shortage of professional personnel has alarming consequences. Too few professionals may be worse than none at all. Prison education, for example, contributes significantly to postrelease success only when the education is extensive and intensive, and a small amount of education impairs postrelease prospects by inspiring unrealistic job aspirations.

Is it any cause for wonder, with such shocking lack of qualified personnel to steer offenders into productive careers, that the value of property stolen in 1963 was $785 million, and, when the cost of police court and correctional services are added, the total cost of crime exceeded $2 billion a year? Is it any cause for wonder that since 1958 crime has increased five times faster than the population growth? Is it any cause for wonder that the population of the prisons, reformatories, training schools, jails, and workhouses on any given day reaches almost 400,000?

Yet research clearly shows that the prison employee who has the greatest reformative influence on the offender is the one who is able and prepared to demonstrate sincere and sustained concern for and confidence in the offender's rehabilitation.

Recognizing the critical need for attention to problems of recruitment and retention of a large cadre of well-qualified and professionally prepared men and women in crime prevention and control services, I have encouraged the national organizations interested in correctional manpower and training to meet together and to provide the Congress with an analysis of needs and a blueprint for action. They have followed these suggestions. In June 1964, 61 organizations sent almost a hundred official delegates to an Arden House conference which was the result of 2 years of planning, writing, and discussions. A blueprint for action at State, Federal, and nongovernmental levels was agreed upon, and I am including a copy of one of the decisions of that conference as a part of the Congressional Record.

Joint Commission on Manpower and Training

Many of the action proposals being considered by the Arden House Conference on Manpower and Training for Corrections cannot be undertaken by existing organizations alone for a variety of reasons. Many of these proposals require a degree of unity and cohesiveness in the field of corrections which will take staff time and concentrated effort to attain. Other activities lie closer to the objectives of the existing organizations or have higher priority. Funds and staff time in existing organizations are lacking. Some proposals require studies, coordinated recruitment campaigns, liaison with many organizations. Again, much concentrated effort will be needed. For all these reasons a joint commission whose interests and activities will be in the area of correctional manpower and training should be established.

THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A JOINT COMMISSION

A Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training should be established for a 3-year period.

TASKS

This joint commission should:

(a) Identify the goals of corrections;

(b) Identify the several tasks to be performed to achieve these goals;

(c) Identify the knowledge, skills, and other qualifications needed to perform the tasks;

(d) Identify the preparation necessary to achieve these skills;

(e) Identify the disciplines which should contribute to, and the professions which should take responsibility for, the preparation of correctional personnel;

(f) Take an inventory of present correctional jobs and project future needs;

(g) Inventory and identify existing and needed resources for training;

(h) Promote vigorous recruitment activities by the various professions;

(i) Promote the development of added training resources;

(j) Take such other action as in its opinion will further the cause of correctional manpower and training.

MEMBERSHIP

The membership of the joint commission should be composed of representatives of the various national and regional organizations related to the correctional field, and members at large from the communications me-

> dia, business, industry, labor, and other key groups in the Nation.
>
> FINANCING
>
> The joint commission should be financed by public and voluntary funds.
>
> THE INTERIM COMMITTEE
>
> The five sponsoring organizations are hereby authorized by the Arden House Conference on Manpower and Training for Corrections to establish an interim committee composed of representatives of these sponsoring organizations and others as appropriate, to implement the formation of the joint commission.

As this indicates, one outstanding decision was to establish a 3-year Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training to compile the known data about correctional manpower to accumulate new findings, and to launch a massive national action program at all levels and in all parts of the Nation. I have given my full support to the group planning this joint commission. As the commission arrives at a point of consensus as to detailed plans and programs, I shall propose a White House conference to launch the national action program in this field.

It is my sincere conviction that a carefully planned multidisciplinary effort such as this involving all the national groups and bodies is a far more promising venture for leadership in crime prevention and control in a democratic society than any narrowly based effort involving a single approach, a single philosophy, or a single discipline. I urge the Congress to support what is truly one of the great democratic action programs of our times to alleviate a serious and growing social problem.

The bill which I have introduced today would amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act and would provide a comprehensive 3-year study of current and anticipated needs for all levels of personnel in the correctional field, a study of current and anticipated requirements for educational and training facilities, a study of recruitment and retention of personnel, a study of curriculum changes in undergraduate and professional education, and a thorough review of the changing trends and developments in correctional tasks and correctional training. Known as the Correctional Rehabilitation Study Act of 1965, the legislation provides a $500,000 appropriation for the first year of the study and $800,000 for each of the 2 succeeding years. Additional funds are being sought from a number of foundations. The act is fully backed by over 60 national organizations which approved the study at an Arden House Conference on Manpower and Training for Corrections in June 1964. It has the support of the Federal agencies concerned with correctional rehabilitation, and the national Governors' conference will shortly consider a resolution supporting the act as recommended by the Council of State Governments.

THE PROBLEM OF THE MINUTEMEN

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Joelson] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I have asked the chairman of the House Un-American Activities Committee to make the committee's first order of business in 1965 a deep and thorough investigation of an organization known as the Minutemen.

As anyone who read the newspapers knows, this organization encourages and importunes its members to own firearms and to become proficient in the use of them, and to force governmental policies by violent means. In my opinion, nothing can be more un-American than that.

Following the recent presidential election, the head of the Minutemen, Robert De Pugh stated:

> The course for all conservatives now is to join the Minutemen's secret underground army for training as America's last line of defense against communism.

The November issue of On Target, which is the official publication of the Minutemen, flatly declares:

> The hopes of millions of Americans that the Communist tide could be stopped with ballots rather than bullets have been turned into dust.

It goes on to state:

> Among the weak-kneed conservatives, many will be shaking their heads sadly and saying "we simply must win in 1968." I hope the readers of this newspaper are not naive. We are not going to have a free election in 1968.

The above-mentioned Mr. De Pugh in an open bid for subversion has stated:

> The Communists are winning by infiltration, subversion, and psychological warfare. We must turn our enemies own tactics against them.

Lest anyone think these wild men do not mean business, I remind you that, according to the New York Times, since the organization of the Minutemen 4 years ago individual members have been charged for violating firearm statutes, and a wide variety of weapons have been confiscated.

The Times article states:

> Membership is secret, but has been variously estimated at a few thousand to 100,000. The current campaign is for an army of a million operating in guerrilla bands of a dozen or so each.
>
> Mr. De Pugh said last summer that there were more than 26,000 Minutemen and that each member supplied his own rifle, shotgun, sidearms and other survival equipment. Each member, he has said, is required to fire at least 500 rounds of ammunition annually at target practice.

We are, of course, united in our unremitting opposition to communism. The time has now come to make it crystal clear that under the guise of anticommunism, no extreme rightwing fascist group will be allowed to threaten the peace and tranquillity of our beloved Nation.

APPALACHIA PROGRAM IS MOST URGENT NEED

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Moeller] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson outlined in his state of the Union address an imaginative program designed to keep America "free, growing and full of hope." This is a laudable goal, indeed. It is one which all thoughtful persons can endorse and work toward. For example, the need for a comprehensive, low-cost hospital care program for the aged is absolutely necessary and, I might say, long overdue. Our senior citizens have contributed much to the growth and prosperity of this great Nation. They must not now be forgotten. We cannot allow them to be overwhelmed by the staggering costs of illness and infirmity. Nor can we afford to shirk our responsibility to the generation now coming up. No nation can be any greater than its own system of education. I support the President's call for a far-reaching program to improve the quality of public education from the preschool years on through the college years. Surely, we owe that much to our sons and daughters.

I am in easy agreement with the administration's desire to effectively combat the pollution that is fouling the air we breathe and poisoning the waters of our rivers and streams. Contamination is a growing menace, one that must be solved in the interest of health and for the preservation of our dwindling natural resources.

The President's recommendation for substantial reductions in burdensome excise taxes will be widely applauded. Some of these temporary taxes have been on the statute books since World War II, and can now be reduced or eliminated altogether.

As one who believes that the small farmer is the backbone of our country, I was especially glad to hear the President call for a thorough review of our agricultural program. Without effective Federal assistance, I am apprehensive that the heavy numbers of small farmers being forced off the land may grow progressively worse.

All the recommendations I have discussed, and still others under consideration, are necessary. I support them in fact and principle. But, Mr. Speaker, no program, no goal of this administration is more urgently essential than the revitalization of that region of America known as Appalachia.

While the Nation as a whole is experiencing the longest and most dramatic economic boom in history, Appalachia is mired in grinding poverty and chilling despair. It alone of all the regions of America is being denied the blessings of our more fruitful and abundant society.

Appalachia cuts through parts of 11 States, including my own area of Ohio, and Pennsylvania, Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Kentucky, Tennessee, and on into the hill country of Alabama.

I know the people of Appalachia as well as any man does, and, perhaps, better than most. They are a proud and independent people. They are willing to work and work hard. I think most of us recognize that the economic problems of these people cannot be met and solved by them alone. Their plight arises not out of any lack of self-reliance, or out of any lack of individualism on their part. It stems, rather, from the complexities of a changing society; it stems from the underdevelopment of the region in which they live, and from the steady march of progress in industrial America which has made obsolete many of the skills and trades of yesteryear.

Industrial progress is sometimes a two-edged sword. It cuts both ways. While benefiting the many, it can sometimes have disastrous effect on certain segments of our population. The coal mining industry serves as a specific example of what I am talking about.

For generations, many of the men of Appalachia worked in the coalfields of southern Ohio, Kentucky, West Virginia, Pennsylvania, and Alabama. It was the No. 1 industry.

But, automation, changing heating methods and increased use of diesel fuels served to blight a good part of the coal region. Of the multiple thousands of miners gainfully employed in Appalachia just a few years ago, a staggering number have been forced out of their jobs and, in many cases, onto the relief rolls. The same fate even now awaits hundreds and thousands of other miners in Appalachia.

Many of these people had toiled in the coal mines since their earliest working days. They had no trade to fall back on. So they unwillingly joined the ranks of the more or less permanently unemployed.

More than 15 million people live in Appalachia. It is a region characterized, in part at least, by low incomes and high unemployment, by low educational achievement, and below average standards of living. To be specific:

Appalachia accounts for 35 percent of the unemployment in all the Nation's redevelopment areas, from Florida to Alaska, from Maine to Hawaii.

Incomes in Appalachia are up to 80 percent below the national average.

One in every five of Appalachia's 15 million inhabitants is subsisting on commodity doles or food stamp welfare.

This is not the kind of America I want. It is not the kind of America that you want.

The assertion by some that Congress should do no more for Appalachia than it has done for other, more fortunate regions of America does not impress me. It smacks of Anatole France's satirical statement that the law in its majestic equality forbids the rich, as well as the poor, to sleep under bridges, to beg in the streets, to steal bread for the dinner table.

We of this Congress have the opportunity to lend a helping hand in time of dire emergency to the people of Appalachia, who deserve far better than they have been getting.

Appalachia can be helped along the road to economic recovery by the legislation which I have introduced today. It is identical to H.R. 4, which was introduced on January 4 by the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Public Works, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON]. Let me assure you that this is no giveaway program. The bread that we are being asked to cast upon the waters will come back many times over.

If Appalachia's economy merely equaled the national average—and passage of this bill will start it in that direction—if Appalachia's economy equaled the national average, $12 billion a year could be added to our gross national product through increased retail sales.

If Appalachia's economy equaled the national average—and passage of this measure will start it in that direction—if this happened, $5.2 billion would be added each year to your country's annual rate of personal income.

If Appalachia's economy matched the national average—and passage of this bill will start it in that direction—another billion dollars worth of new housing starts could be made in America each year.

Most assuredly, what is good for Appalachia is good for the United States.

The objective of this bill is to provide a Federal investment program that will assist Appalachia toward fuller participation in our Nation's robust economic growth. This bill authorizes an appropriation of $840 million for the Appalachian development highway system—a system that will open up the most remote areas of Appalachia to modern, industrial America.

Appalachia lies just beyond the reaches of the greatest concentration of wealth and population in this Nation. But its lack of adequate transportation facilities has effectively isolated it from the broad sweep of industrial growth which has blessed most of our Nation in the years since World War II. We all know that industry does not and cannot go into areas that lack first-rate distribution routes.

As the President's Commission on Appalachia has said:

> Its [Appalachia's] penetration by an adequate transportation network is the first requisite of its full participation in industrial America.

I want to emphasize that the Appalachian States are not seeking something for nothing. They are ready and willing to provide $360 million from their own scarce funds to help finance the highway building program—a program acknowledged to be the first requisite for bringing better times to Appalachia and its people.

The legislation I propose would establish the Appalachia Regional Commission, consisting of the Governors of each Appalachian State and one Federal representative. This Commission, made up of the men who best know the problems of Appalachia, would prepare plans and programs needed to revitalize that region of our country. The Commission would guarantee local and State participation in all phases of the program. It would be a politically bipartisan body of both Democratic and Republican Governors.

Another important provision provides Federal assistance in modernizing the health facilities of Appalachia. The low income of Appalachia is reflected in the lack, if not nonexistence, of the kind of health facilities that most Americans take for granted. The committee report lists this finding:

> Sound health services can play as much a role in the economic development of a region as any other instrument of development. Without such service, no community or subregion can hope to attract modern industry. In many sections of Appalachia, this problem is particularly acute. The low income in these sections impairs a reasonable support of private medicine and the tax base necessary for even rudimentary public health facilities is nonexistent.

My bill provides for grants for the development, equipment, and operation of multicounty demonstration health facilities, including hospitals, regional health diagnostic and treatment centers and other facilities necessary for good health.

Mr. Speaker, I urgently and earnestly urge this great House to proceed with all deliberative speed toward enactment of this essential legislation. It will give new hope to the people of Appalachia. It will complement the other farsighted and far-reaching economic programs which Congress, in its wisdom, has authorized for the good of the Nation during the past 4 years.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. JOHNSON of California (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for the week of January 11, 1965, on account of official business.

Mr. HARSHA (at the request of Mr. LAIRD), for the week of January 11, 1965, on account of official business.

Mr. JONES of Alabama (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for the week of January 11, 1965, on account of official business.

Mr. WRIGHT, for January 11 through January 14, 1965, on account of Public Works Subcommittee inspection of west coast floods.

Mr. KING of New York (at the request of Mr. FORD), beginning January 13, 1965, for an indefinite period, on account of personal reasons.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN (at the request of Mr. LAIRD), for the week of January 11, 1965, on account of official business.

Mr. ELLSWORTH (at the request of Mr. FORD), for today and through January 14, 1965, on account of death in his family.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. WHITE of Idaho, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. SIKES, for 20 minutes, on Wednesday, January 13.

Mr. PUCINSKI, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. HALPERN (at the request of Mr. HUTCHINSON), for 30 minutes, January 12, 1965; for 60 minutes, January 13, 1965; and for 20 minutes, January 14, 1965.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. BLATNIK.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HUTCHINSON) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. PELLY.

Mr. POFF.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FARNUM) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. POWELL.

Mr. CALLAN.

Mr. VANIK.

Mr. HÉBERT.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S.J. Res. 3. Joint resolution extending the date for transmission of the budget and the Economic Report.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, January 12, 1965, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

304. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the annual report on the Puerto Rican hurricane relief loans, pursuant to section 6 (45 Stat. 1067) and (70 Stat. 525); to the Committee on Agriculture.

305. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 8(e) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

306. A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a report showing by age and grade above major, officers on flying status and receiving flight pay as of August 31, 1964, and average monthly flight pay authorized for period March 1 through August 31, 1964, pursuant to 301(g), title 37, United States Code; to the Committee on Armed Services.

307. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to authorize payment of special allowances to dependents of members of the uniformed services to offset expenses incident to their evacuation, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

308. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, "A bill to authorize payment of incentive pay for the performance of hazardous duty on the flight deck of an aircraft carrier"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

309. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide gold star lapel buttons for the next of kin of members of the Armed Forces who lost or lose their lives in war or as a result of cold war incidents"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

310. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the unnecessary cost to the Government due to excessive rentals for electronic data processing equipment at Lockheed Missiles & Space Co., Sunnyvale, Calif., Department of Defense; to the Committee on Government Operations.

311. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize a contribution to certain inhabitants of the Ryukyu Islands for death and injury of persons, and for use of and damage to private property, arising from acts and omissions of the U.S. Armed Forces, or members thereof, after August 15, 1945, and before April 28, 1952"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

312. A letter from the Acting Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to provide for the regulation of rates and practices of air carriers and foreign air carriers in foreign air transportation, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

313. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend provisions of law relating to the settlement of admiralty claims"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

314. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to transfer certain functions of the Secretary of the Treasury and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

315. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. Porter F. Sheldon, U.S. Air Force"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

316. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill for relief of Capt. Richard A. Ingram and Capt. Arthur R. Sprott, Jr., U.S Air Force"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

317. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill for relief of Lt. Col. John E. McRoberts and T. Sgt. Harold C. Fisher, Jr., U.S. Air Force"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

318. A letter from the Commission, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting reports concerning visa petitions which the Immigration and Naturalization Service has approved according the beneficiaries of such petition first preference classification under the act, pursuant to section 204(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

319. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend chapter 147 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, to dispose of telephone facilities by negotiated sale"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

320. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for the restriction of certain areas in the Outer Continental Shelf, known as the Corpus Christi offshore warning area, for defense purposes, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

321. A letter from the Sergeant at Arms, U.S. House of Representatives, transmitting a statement exhibiting the several sums drawn by him pursuant to sections 78 and 80 of title 2, United States Code, the application and disbursement of the sums, and balances, if any, remaining in his hands, pursuant to the provisions of title 2, United States Code, section 84; to the Committee on House Administration.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 2168. A bill to provide a hospital insurance program for the aged under social security, to amend the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system to increase benefits, improve the actuarial status of the disability insurance trust fund, and extend coverage, to amend the Social Security Act to provide additional Federal financial participation in the Federal-State public assistance programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota:

H.R. 2169. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H.R. 2170. A bill to establish a new program of grants for public works projects undertaken by local governments in the United States; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 2171. A bill to amend the act relating to the multiple use of the surface of the same tracts of the public lands in order to provide that certain varieties of sand and gravel shall be considered as valuable mineral deposits under the mining laws of the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H.R. 2172. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to make extraordinary grants for acquisition of rights-of-way; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 2173. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make loans to Indians for purchase of certain real property; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 2174. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 so as to require additional precautionary measures aboard certain aircraft in the interest of the safety of the traveling public; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2175. A bill to amend title XI of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to provide that certain provisions of insurance contracts covering loss of life or personal injury of passengers being transported in air transportation shall be null and void; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BONNER:

H.R. 2176. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain property to the county of Dare, State of North Carolina, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BURLESON:

H.R. 2177. A bill to promote the general welfare, foreign policy, and security of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CALLAWAY:

H.R. 2178. A bill to provide for the medical and hospital care of the aged through a system of voluntary health insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H.R. 2179. A bill to create and prescribe the duties of a Commission To Investigate Electoral College Reform; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 2180. A bill to provide for the greater protection of the President and the Vice President of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 2181. A bill making Columbus Day a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2182. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to the rate of duty on brooms made of broom corn; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2183. A bill to provide for the right of persons to be represented by attorneys in matters before Federal agencies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2184. A bill to establish a U.S. mint in Lake or Cook County, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 2185. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2186. A bill to establish a National Economic Conversion and Diversification Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H.R. 2187. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to provide for a mid-decade census of population, unemployment, and housing in years 1966 and 1975 and every 10 years thereafter; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2188. A bill to provide certain adjustments in amounts of group life and group accidental death and dismemberment insurance under the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 in accordance with the current salary structure for Government officers and employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H.R. 2189. A bill to amend section 203(k) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit the transfer of surplus property for certain uses by educational institutions; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 2190. A bill to repeal the excise tax on business machines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2191. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code so as to permit the division of a corporation into two corporations on a fully non pro rata basis; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DORN:

H.R. 2192. A bill to provide aid to States for educational purposes only; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FISHER:

H.R. 2193. A bill to strengthen democratic processes respecting the calling of strikes, to protect employees against unjustifiable pay losses from strikes, to protect employers from needless production interruptions arising out of strikes contrary to the wishes of employees, and to minimize industrial strife interfering with the flow of commerce and the national security by amending the National Labor Relations Act to require economic strikes to be authorized by a secret ballot; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2194. A bill to limit and prevent certain concerted activities by labor organizations which interfere with or obstruct or impede the free production of goods for commerce or the free flow thereof in commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2195. A bill to extend the application of the Classification Act of 1949 to certain positions in, and employees of, the executive branch of the Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2196. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the value of a decedent's real property (or interest in real property) which was used as a ranch or farm or in some other trade or business may at the election of the executor be determined, for estate tax purposes, solely by reference to its value for such use; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H.R. 2197. A bill to amend title I of the Housing Act of 1949 to permit loss of goodwill to be taken into account in computing the amount of the relocation payment which may be made to a business concern or nonprofit organization displaced by an urban renewal project, and to increase the maximum amount of such payment; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 2198. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2199. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to increase the amount of outside income which a survivor annuitant may earn without deduction from his or her annuity thereunder; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2200. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the manufacturers excise tax on sporting goods; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2201. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without any deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 2202. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2203. A bill to prevent the use of stopwatches or other measuring devices in the postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FUQUA:

H.R. 2204. A bill to provide for participation of the United States in the Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center in Dade County, Fla., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H.R. 2205. A bill to amend section 901(b) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to provide for the carriage by U.S.-flag commercial vessels of certain cargo in excess of the 50 percent gross tonnage limitation contained in such section; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GURNEY:

H.R. 2206. A bill to provide for the medical and hospital care of the aged through a system of voluntary health insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HANLEY:

H.R. 2207. A bill to allow a deduction for income tax purposes, in the case of a disabled individual, of expenses for transportation to and from work; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARSHA:

H.R. 2208. A bill to modify the flood control project on the Scioto River, Ohio; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 2209. A bill to provide public works and economic development programs and the planning and coordination needed to assist in the development of the Appalachian region; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HARVEY of Indiana:

H.R. 2210. A bill to adjust wheat and feed grain production, to establish a cropland retirement program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H.R. 2211. A bill to provide for continuity and support of study, research, and development of programs for peaceful uses in science, commerce, and other activities related to Antarctica, which shall include, but shall not be limited to, gathering, evaluating, correlating, and dispersing of information and knowledge obtained from exploration, research, and other mediums relating to weather, communications travel, and other areas of information; also to coordinate Antarctic activities among those agencies of the U.S. Government and private institutions interested in or concerned directly with the promotion, advancement, increase, and diffusion of knowledge of the Antarctic; and to direct and administer U.S. Antarctic programs in the national interest; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 2212. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make disposition of geothermal steam and associated geothermal resources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 2213. A bill to provide for the medical and hospital care of the aged through a system of voluntary health insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HULL:

H.R. 2214. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt schoolbuses from the manufacturers' excise tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ICHORD:

H.R. 2215. A bill to create the Freedom Commission and the Freedom Academy, to conduct research to develop an integrated body of operational knowledge in the political, psychological, economic, technological, and organizational areas to increase the nonmilitary capabilities of the United States in the global struggle between freedom and communism, to educate and train Government personnel and private citizens to understand and implement this body of knowledge, and also to provide education and training for foreign students in these areas of knowledge under appropriate conditions; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 2216. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 so as to allow containers for certain petroleum products and derivatives to be temporarily imported without payment of duty, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 2217. A bill to provide for the medical and hospital care of the aged through a system of voluntary health insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LENNON:

H.R. 2218. A bill to provide for a comprehensive, long-range, and coordinated national program in oceanography, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H.R. 2219. A bill to amend section 1913 of title 18, United States Code, to make clear that the prohibition against lobbying with appropriated funds applies to the heads of executive departments and agencies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2220. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish a Court of Veterans' Appeals and to prescribe its jurisdiction and functions; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2221. A bill to provide for the medical and hospital care of the aged through a system of voluntary health insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2222. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Commission on Federal Taxation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2223. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an additional income tax exemption for a taxpayer, spouse, or dependent who is a student at an institution of higher learning; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2224. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction from gross income for medical, legal, and related expenses incurred in connection with the adoption of a child by the taxpayer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2225. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an additional income tax exemption for a taxpayer or spouse who has had a laryngectomy; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McDADE:

H.R. 2226. A bill to amend section 6(b) of the Area Redevelopment Act to permit the 10 percent of the financing of industrial projects required to be met by a local public or semipublic body to be repaid over the same period as the Federal share of such financing; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 2227. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a tax credit for expenses of higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2228. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase from $600 to $1,000 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemptions for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McGRATH:

H.R. 2229. A bill to provide for the establishment of a veterans' hospital in southern New Jersey; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska:

H.R. 2230. A bill to amend section 1(14)(a) of the Interstate Commerce Act to insure the adequacy of the national railroad freight car supply, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.R. 2231. A bill to establish a National Economic Conversion and Diversification Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MOELLER:

H.R. 2232. A bill to provide public works and economic development programs and the planning and coordination needed to assist in the development of the Appalachian region; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.R. 2233. A bill to amend section 610 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 to prohibit the serving of alcoholic beverages to airline passengers while in flight; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2234. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to provide for the greater protection of the President and the Vice President of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 2235. A bill to permit certain Government employees to elect to receive compensation in accordance with section 401 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945 in lieu of certain compensation at a saved rate, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PIRNIE:

H.R. 2236. A bill to authorize the temporary release of 100,000 short tons of copper from the national stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PRICE:

H.R. 2237. A bill to amend titles 10 and 37, United States Code, so as to provide authorization of 4 years' constructive service credit to veterinary officers now on active duty with the uniformed services, and that those veterinarians hereinafter appointed as veterinary officers, be so credited; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 2238. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp honoring the coal miners and coal industry of America; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2239. A bill to provide assistance to certain States bordering the Mississippi River in the construction of the Great River Road to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. RACE:

H.R. 2240. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RONAN:

H.R. 2241. A bill to provide a hospital insurance program for the aged under social security, to amend the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system to increase benefits, improve the actuarial status of the disability insurance trust fund, and extend coverage, to amend the Social Security Act to provide additional Federal financial participation in the Federal-State public assistance programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 2242. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish a Court of Veterans' Appeals and to prescribe its jurisdiction and functions; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 2243. A bill to amend Public Law 88–573, to permit the Farmers Home Administration to expend certain appropriated funds for recreational development; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.R. 2244. A bill to provide for the medical and hospital care of the aged through a system of voluntary health insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H.R. 2245. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct Gilbert Dam and Reservoir on the Buffalo River in Searcy County, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 2246. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct Pine Mountain Dam on Lee Creek, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 2247. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to extend to veterans of the induction period certain benefits enjoyed by veterans of periods of war; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 2248. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act so as to make that act applicable to smoking products; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2249. A bill to amend the act of June 29, 1940, relating to the administration of the Washington National Airport, to transfer to the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency certain additional real property of the United States to facilitate the expansion of such airport for general aviation purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2250. A bill to provide that for the purpose of disapproval by the President each provision of an appropriation bill shall be considered a separate bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALKER of New Mexico:

H.R. 2251. A bill to provide a hospital insurance program for the aged under social security, to amend the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system to increase benefits, improve the actuarial status of the disability insurance trust fund, and extend coverage, to amend the Social Security Act to provide additional Federal financial participation in the Federal-State public assistance programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHALLEY:

H.R. 2252. A bill to adjust wheat and feed grain production, to establish a cropland retirement program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 2253. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit donations of surplus personal property to State agencies for use by volunteer firefighting organizations; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 2254. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Adm. Henry Forry Picking National Monument; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 2255. A bill to provide for the establishment of national cemeteries in the State of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 2256. A bill to impose quota limitations on imports of foreign residual fuel oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H.R. 2257. A bill to provide a 1-year period during which certain veterans may be granted national service life insurance; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2258. A bill to protect funds invested in series E U.S. saving bonds from inflation and to encourage persons to provide for their own security; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YOUNGER:

H.R. 2259. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to conduct a survey of all streams which drain directly to the Pacific Ocean from San Mateo County, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H.R. 2260. A bill to amend the act of February 28, 1958, relating to the withdrawal, reservation, or restriction of public lands, insofar as it applies to procedures for restriction on mineral leasing in the Outer Continental Shelf, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ASPINALL (by request):

H.R. 2261. A bill to provide for the restriction of certain areas in the Outer Continental Shelf (known as the Eastern Test Range) for defense purposes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FISHER:

H.R. 2262. A bill to provide for the right of persons to be represented by attorneys in matters before Federal agencies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.R. 2263. A bill to provide for an objective, thorough and nationwide analysis and reevaluation of the extent and means of resolving the critical shortage of qualified manpower in the field of correctional rehabilitation; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H.R. 2264. A bill to authorize the coordinated development of the water resources of the Pacific Southwest, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.R. 2265. A bill to limit the authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation to sell any food grains and feed grains owned or controlled by it; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 2266. A bill to provide for the settlement of claims resulting from an explosion at a U.S. ordnance plant in Bowie County, Tex., on July 8, 1963; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURLESON:

H.J. Res. 163. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H.J. Res. 164. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution to enable the Congress to function effectively in time of emergency or disaster; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.J. Res. 165. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the second Sunday in September of each year as Bataan Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOWDY:

H.J. Res. 166. Joint resolution to provide for an urban renewal code enforcement project in the Adams-Morgan area, and to encourage and assist rehabilitation of homes and businesses in such area; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. FISHER:

H.J. Res. 167. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 168. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to place a limit on the extent to which social security taxes (or taxes under any similar Federal retirement or disability insurance system) may be increased; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 169. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALL:

H.J. Res. 170. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARVEY of Indiana:

H.J. Res. 171. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to preserve to the people of each State power to determine the composition of its legislature and the apportionment of the membership thereof in accordance with law and the provisions of the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H.J. Res. 172. Joint resolution to create a Joint Committee on Executive Orders; to the Committee on Rules.

H.J. Res. 173. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MAY:

H.J. Res. 174. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.J. Res. 175. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROUDEBUSH:

H.J. Res. 176. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to preserve to the people of each State power to determine the composition of its legislature and the apportionment of the membership thereof in accordance with law and the provisions of the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WAGGONNER:

H.J. Res. 177. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H.J. Res. 178. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATES:

H. Con. Res. 86. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress on representation of China in the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H. Con. Res. 87. Concurrent resolution to request the President of the United States to urge certain actions in behalf of Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H. Con. Res. 88. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to prosecutions for war crimes in the Federal Republic of Germany; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Con. Res. 89. Concurrent resolution to favor the establishment of an international living museum of anthropology and ethnography; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Con. Res. 90. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the distribution and viewing of the film, "Years of Lightning, Day of Drums," prepared by the U.S. Information Agency on the late President Kennedy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MINISH:

H. Con. Res. 91. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the adoption by the United Nations of a universal declaration opposing religious intolerance and discriminatory practices; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H. Res. 97. Resolution authorizing a Captive Nations Committee; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 98. Resolution amending clause 2(a) of rule XI and clause 4 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MINISH:

H. Res. 99. Resolution condemning persecution by the Soviet Union of persons because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. Res. 100. Resolution establishing a special Committee on Captive Nations; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 2267. A bill for the relief of Thelma Anderson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2268. A bill for the relief of Zita Brackenridge; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2269. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe DiGiovanni; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 2270. A bill for the relief of Moapa Valley Water Co., of Logandale, Nev.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATES:

H.R. 2271. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Helene (Papadopoulos) Chappell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2272. A bill for the relief of Helen Stathopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 2273. A bill for the relief of Nicanor Sabino and Victria Y. Sabino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLANCY:

H.R. 2274. A bill for the relief of Dr. Sophocles Sakellariou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 2275. A bill for the relief of Clara S. Chann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H.R. 2276. A bill for the relief of Mo Tseng Hsu and Cheng Hsing; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 2277. A bill for the relief of Louis Stephen Edouard St. Laurent; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 2278. A bill for the relief of Sophie Yancopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2279. A bill for the relief of Elisa Bonifacio Bordonaro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2280. A bill for the relief of Eleftheria Raisopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 2281. A bill for the relief of Krystyna Zielinski (formerly Krystyna Widz); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 2282. A bill for the relief of Doris Stain Idolly Patten and Radiance Eleanore Gabourel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2283. A bill for the relief of Amnon and Ruth Kaminer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2284. A bill for the relief of Jan Piotr Spolnik; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FISHER:

H.R. 2285. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Concetta Cioffi Carson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRASER:

H.R. 2286. A bill for the relief of Dedrick A. Maanum; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 2287. A bill for the relief of Dr. Vida D'Souza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2288. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jose Castro Sicat; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H.R. 2289. A bill for the relief of Ibrahim Takla; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GURNEY:

H.R. 2290. A bill for the relief of Charlotte Schulz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2291. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Shi Ming Hu; Miss Chen, Shau-Ley; Miss Cheng, Shau-Nee; and Mrs. Hu, Lai Shu-Jee; to the the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANLEY:

H.R. 2292. A bill for the relief of Dr. Virginia Valenzula; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2293. A bill for the relief of Sesinando S. Calalang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2294. A bill for the relief of Nicholas Jean Petrou and Rachel Arbib Harari Petrou, husband and wife; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 2295. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Kermanoohi Iskander Artinian Parsekian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2296. A bill for the relief of Rafael T. Raad and his wife, Anaisa Alves Raad; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2297. A bill for the relief of Fanny Mar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JONES of Alabama:

H.R. 2298. A bill to authorize and direct the Administrator of the Farmers Home Administration to quitclaim certain property in Jackson County, to Skyline Chruches Cemetery, a corporation; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 2299. A bill for the relief of Robert L. Yates and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LOVE:

H.R. 2300. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Voula Rozakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H.R. 2301. A bill for the relief of Sister Alfreda (Cesira Calcagni); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2302. A bill for the relief of Sister Antonia (Ida Conforto); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDADE:

H.R. 2303. A bill for the relief of Ernest J. Carlin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 2304. A bill for the relief of Aurora Macedo de Faria de Ornelas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 2305. A bill for the relief of Zenaida Z. Lazaro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 2306. A bill for the relief of Leonardo Mazarese; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2307. A bill for the relief of Isola Dias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2308. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Tabile; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2309. A bill for the relief of Kathleen Lothian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2310. A bill for the relief of Stamatios Coutsoumbaris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2311. A bill for the relief of Giuseppa Sicurella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2312. A bill for the relief of Maria Freni; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2313. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Stellario; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2314. A bill for the relief of Emmanuel Georgious Sopassakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2315. A bill for the relief of Estena Adella Grant; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2316. A bill for the relief of Carl McDonald Farrell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2317. A bill for the relief of (Jimmy) Ching Wu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2318. A bill for the relief of Panagiotis Vatalidis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2319. A bill for the relief of Zenaida Maano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2320. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Lentini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2321. A bill for the relief of Herminia Concha Moreno Cortes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2322. A bill for the relief of William O'Connor Swainson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2323. A bill for the relief of Nicoletta Esposito; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2324. A bill for the relief of Nicholas Koumarianos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2325. A bill for the relief of McField and Mavis Bowman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2326. A bill for the relief of Doris Gunter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2327. A bill for the relief of Rukmin Bachan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2328. A bill for the relief of Kiriakoula Hristoforatou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2329. A bill for the relief of Vilma Angela Roberts (nee Keller); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2330. A bill for the relief of Edward George Roberts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2331. A bill for the relief of Pang Jooi Tuck; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRICE:

H.R. 2332. A bill for the relief of Antoni Stanislaw Blicharski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2333. A bill for the relief of Antonio Tito and his wife Kalyopi Tito; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2334. A bill for the relief of Etsuko Yano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2335. A bill for the relief of Anastasoula E. Tryfona (Anastasia Efstathios Trifonas); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RESNICK:

H.R. 2336. A bill for the relief of Mehmet Tahir Kaplan and Sevim Alton Kaplan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY of New York:

H.R. 2337. A bill for the relief of Dr. Tapas Kumar Das Gupta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 2338. A bill for the relief of Izhak Sokolski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2339. A bill for the relief of Dr. Ricardo Jara, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2340. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Meliha Caylioglu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2341. A bill for the relief of Zvi Mordetsky; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2342. A bill for the relief of Nachman Erlichman and his wife, Michal Erlichman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H.R. 2343. A bill for the relief of Dr. Romeo Puruganan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER:

H.R. 2344. A bill for the relief of Angeliki Krimigis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TALCOTT:

H.R. 2345. A bill for the relief of Pham Thi Ly (also known as Mrs. Hai-Linh Tran); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2346. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Tran Kim Lang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2347. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Josip Gojanovic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2348. A bill for the relief of Miss Catherine Cariotaki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2349. A bill for the relief of Robert Dean Ward; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2350. A bill for the relief of Mr. Seu Seng Tang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2351. A bill for the relief of Teresita Centeno Valdez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2352. A bill for the relief of Mr. Marciano H. Hibi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:

H.R. 2353. A bill for the relief of Shih Chang Wu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLL:

H.R. 2354. A bill for the relief of William L. Chatelain, U.S. Navy, retired; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2355. A bill for the relief of Harry J. Alker, Jr., and the estate of Alfred A. DuBan, deceased; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UTT:

H.R. 2356. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Sophia Takacs and Sophia Kondor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2357. A bill for the relief of Domingo Hernandez Valdez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2358. A bill for the relief of Tony Boone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2359. A bill for the relief of Frank Yeny Horne Powlan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WELTNER:

H.R. 2360. A bill for the relief of Dr. Antonio R. Perez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

65. By Mr. MOORE: Petition of the City Council of Clarksburg, W. Va., favoring construction of the Stonewall Jackson Reservoir; to the Committee on Public Works.

66. Also, petition of the Water Board of the City of Clarksburg, W. Va., is favoring construction of the Stonewall Reservoir; to the Committee on Public Works.

67. Also, petition of the Weston, W. Va., Rotary Club, favoring construction of the Stonewall Jackson Reservoir; to the Committee on Public Works.

68. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Reginald B. Naugle, Conyngham, Pa., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to a redress of grievance relative to the presidential election; to the Committee on House Administration.

69. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to requesting Congress to discontinue use of the concurrent resolution unless the provisions of article I, section 7, clause 3, U.S. Constitution are adhered to; the Committee on Rules.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Agriculture Loses a Great Pioneer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLAIR CALLAN

OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 11, 1965

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, those of us who have long been involved in the field of agriculture have suffered the loss of one of the men responsible for the abundant capabilities of the American farmer. Prof. Lloyd W. Hurlbut died after serving many years as a leader in agricultural engineering.

Professor Hurlbut served as president of the American Society of Agricultural Engineers from 1960 to 1961, and was an international authority on tractor testing. He was chairman of the University of Nebraska Department of Agricultural Engineering.

Dean E. F. Frolik, of the University of Nebraska College of Agriculture and Home Economics, said:

> Professor Hurlbut's untimely death comes as a shock to thousands of friends in Nebraska, the Nation, and numerous foreign countries. He made outstanding contributions professionally and was a dynamic leader.

Dean Frolik termed Professor Hurlbut "one of the most forward looking persons I have ever known." Nebraska's agriculture—in fact the agriculture of the world—has suffered a great loss in the death of Lloyd Hurlbut.

Professor Hurlbut was a pioneer in development of pneumatic tires for farm tractors in the 1930's. More recently, he was a moving force behind the development and widespread use of the combine for harvesting corn, artificial drying of corn, and the minimum tillage system for raising corn and other row crops. He was granted patents on several devices, including a pneumatic seeder which uses air to meter and deposit seed in a seedbed.

At the time of his death, Professor Hurlbut was chairman of the Nebraska Tractor Test Board, which supervises operation of the tractor testing laboratory, established in 1921 under law of the State of Nebraska.

Professor Hurlbut was the leader of a research project which showed that unheated, forced air could be used effectively for drying high-moisture grain in bulk storage.

In cooperation with other engineers, Professor Hurlbut developed the V-type tillage blades now widely used to work soil and leave crop residues on the surface.

In the early 1950's Professor Hurlbut was instrumental in construction and testing of the first mechanical harvester of castor bean seeds. A patent was issued on the harvester and assigned to the University of Nebraska.

Professor Hurlbut was a native of Kansas, received his B.S. degree in engineering from Kansas State College in 1932. He received his M.S. from the University of Nebraska in 1934.

He joined the University of Nebraska staff as an assistant in agricultural engineering in 1934, was appointed an instructor in 1936, and promoted to assistant professor in 1938.

He served with the U.S. Navy on active duty from 1943 to 1945 in the Pacific theater, becoming a lieutenant commander in the U.S. Naval Reserve in 1946. In the same year he joined the staff of Purdue University at Lafayette, Ind. In 1947, he returned to the University of Nebraska as professor and chairman of the department of agricultural engineering.

Self-Help for Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RICHARD H. POFF

OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 11, 1965

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, at the age of 13, it was necessary for me to begin work to help finance my education. After school, on Saturdays, and through the summer vacations, I worked as a store clerk, a laborer, a farmhand, truckdriver, and carpenter's helper. When I enrolled in college, I continued to earn my way until I entered the military service in World War II, and when I returned and married, both my young wife and I worked so that I might complete my education.

It was apparent to me then that one of the best forms of aid to education would have been a tax deduction for at least part of the income I earned from extracurricular work and applied toward educational expenses. Yet, then and now, when a boy and girl has to work full time during the summer and part time during the school year to pay for his or her books and tuition, the Federal Government taxes their meager income without consideration that most of it is being used for an educational purpose. On the other hand, the affluent philanthropist who makes a financial contribution to an educational institution is allowed a tax deduction.

Feeling that the Federal Government has an obligation to encourage our young people to secure an education, and recognizing that many other approaches to Federal financial aid involve the inherent danger of Federal control, I have introduced a package of three education bills, one of which would allow students who are working to pay their way through college to deduct for tax purposes certain expenses incurred in obtaining a higher education. The deduction to be allowed is only for books, tuition, fees, and supplies and does not apply to such things as expense of room and board. My bill would allow an undergraduate student to deduct up to $1,500 per taxable year. To be eligible the student must be enrolled in an accredited institution pursuing a baccalaureate or graduate degree.

I sincerely hope the committee which has jurisdiction over this field will act favorably early in this session of Congress. One who has worked hard to pay for his or her education appreciates it all the more, and the Nation's policy should be to foster self-help in this endeavor.

Independence Day of Chad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 11, 1965

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, today marks the fifth anniversary of the independence of the Republic of Chad. On this memorable occasion, we wish to extend farm felicitations to His Excellency Francois Tombalbay, President of Chad; and to His Excellency Boukar Abdoul, the Chad Ambassador to the United States.

The Republic of Chad came into being very early in 1960. Thus as an independent and sovereign entity it is less than 5 years old. It has an area of some 450,000 square miles with a population just under 3 million. For a long time part of French Equatorial Africa, it became a member of the French community as a state late in 1958, and a few months later it formed an economic union with the three other territories of French Equatorial Africa. All these successive steps represented carefully planned preliminaries to the proclamation of Chad's independence on January 11, 1960, and the founding of the Chad Republic.

The people of the Republic of Chad have done well in keeping the vast expanse of their country in relative peace and quiet. It is one of the few countries in Africa, and certainly one of the few among the newly created independent states on that continent, in which there is little internal disturbance, and in which the republican form of government has had fair success. The people of Chad, who are hard workers and quite jealous of the freedom they have acquired, seem determined to maintain it at any cost. In many ways the people of the Republic of Chad, with their democratic institutions and their zeal to improve their economy through sheer hard work, have set a fine example to their immediate neighbors and other states in Africa.

The country is not abundantly rich with resources. Cotton cultivation and animal husbandry are the most important activities in the country. There are certain potential possibilities for some extractive industries, and in the developmental budget, with French financial aid, some definite improvements are envisaged. The Republic of Chad is part of the French community of states, and it is also a member of the United Nations. On the fifth anniversary of their Independence Day we wish success to the people of the Republic of Chad in all their worthwhile endeavors.

Hospitalization Care of the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 11, 1965

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I see on today's UPI news ticker that the American Medical Association is calling its house of delegates together to approve a new alternative plan to medicare. Much as many of us know and respect members of the medical profession, I must say I anticipate that any such action by the American Medical Association is going to be a case of too little or too late. Only a few days ago, we read that the American Medical Association would not compromise; it was against any plan. Now, I gather there has been a change of mind. All of this gives the public more of the same old negative, regressive image that unfortunately has become associated with membership in the great medical profession.

Let us face it, Mr. Speaker; the doctors have been fearful—and rightly so—of steps that would eventually lead to government medicine. There are so-called liberal organizations, like the Americans For Democratic Action, that honestly believe—I am sure—that socialization of the medical profession would benefit suffering humanity. However, I think the American people and most Members of Congress want free choice of hospital and doctor. At the same time, a great many persons, recognizing the need of a plan to underwrite the high cost of multiservice health and medical needs of older citizens, favor a nationwide program along the lines of medicare. They feel the need and importance of the program transcends any danger of socialization.

Like other Members of the House, Mr. Speaker, I admire and respect the chairman of the House Committee on Ways and Means—our colleague the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS]. We know how conscientiously he has guarded the financial health of the social security system. In this connection, after I read last fall that Chairman MILLS had said he would support a payroll tax to finance health benefits for the aged, I immediately wrote him a letter saying I was anxious to learn the details of his proposal—that I wanted and was seeking a plan that was fiscally sound and would provide protection for the elderly, with guarantees against unwarranted medical control in the lives of private citizens, because I think it could be provided by permitting an individual the choice of cash benefits or medical care.

Mr. Speaker, I go along with our colleague, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS], when he suggests a payroll tax calculated separately from old age, survivors, and disability insurance. Also, I reserve the right to support any other suggestion which may be made by the American Medical Association to improve existing proposals. But, meanwhile, I want to make my position clear; namely, that I believe there is a real need for such legislation. The time has come, it seems to me, to act, and with an open mind I intend to examine the administration's proposal and others similar to the suggestions of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS]. As I understand, one of these latter suggestions would be to gear Government health-care benefits to the income levels of recipients, which makes sense to me, because the wealthy can afford hospital care where the modest-income person cannot.

Meanwhile, Mr. Speaker, I intend to testify in person when committee hearings are held, because I want the record of medicare hearings to show that in States like my own State of Washington, the Kerr-Mills Act has not filled the need.

The Partners of Alliance Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. VANIK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 11, 1965

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I deem it timely and significant to inform my colleagues that a distinguished team from my State has arrived today in the state of Parana, Brazil, to develop a partnership program between the private sectors of the two States. The team, headed by Dr. Paul L. Noble, dean of the College of Business Administration at Ohio University, represents the Ohio Partners of the Alliance Committee.

Now operating in 22 American States, this partners program, under the Alliance for Progress and the Agency for International Development, serves to establish contact between private groups and organizations in the United States and Latin America. It is fulfilling a need for establishing closer bonds between all the peoples of the American Republics. The basic objective of the partners effort is to help Latin groups who measure up to the self-help principle. It seeks to improve health, education, and general living conditions by helping provide basic items for the completion of small projects in Latin rural and slum areas.

Other members of the Ohio team are Mr. Lynn A. Brua, private housing expert; Mr. Don Newkirk, of the Ohio Hospital Association; and Dr. Mervin Smith, agriculturalist at Ohio University. Also accompanying the team is Mr. James H. Boren, director of the partners of the Alliance programs in Washington, D.C. Mr. Boren will be meeting with U.S. AID mission officials in Brazil and private sector leaders for the purpose of discussing the development of specific activities in regard to the partners program. He will be meeting with leaders in both south and northeast Brazil. He is also scheduled to visit with a number of State Governors and leaders of local committees to discuss the partners program.

I know that the people of Ohio are participating in the partners of the Alliance program with an eagerness to accept the responsibility for a fruitful citizens' program in concert with their counterparts in Brazil. I am pleased to associate myself with these timely and worthy objectives of my constituents.

Local Public Works Act of 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 11, 1965

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill, the Local Public Works Act of 1965, to provide Federal grants-in-aid for towns and cities of all sizes to help them finance virtually the whole range of needed local public works—water and sewer systems, hospitals, public buildings, community centers, parks and playgrounds, and the like. This will help to meet one of the most urgent needs now facing us, the need for increased public investment.

No one can deny that public facilities are essential to community life. They are a prerequisite to public investment and economic growth. They are also necessary to the livability of our towns and cities and the achievement of President Johnson's "Great Society."

It is equally undeniable that State and local governments today face a financial crisis. The rapid urbanization of our people and the rising standards of services and facilities demanded by our citizens have placed impossible burdens on the limited tax bases of State and local governments. No local government can continue to raise its taxes indefinitely without the danger of driving industry and employment elsewhere. No local tax base enjoys the diversity or the strength of the Federal Government which rightly or wrongly has largely preempted the most fruitful source of revenues through the Federal income tax. By far the largest part of these Federal revenues comes from the people and business firms in our towns and cities and it is only right that we should reinvest those funds to help meet urgent local needs.

State and local governments have struggled valiantly to meet their responsibilities. Their taxes have risen more rapidly than Federal taxes and their debt has risen more rapidly than Federal debt. In spite of this, a backlog of needed improvements and additions to our inventory of community facilities has built up running into billions of dollars. Even in our most prosperous years public investment has been an economic stepchild and had to step aside for the satisfaction of other wants. Given the tremendous annual increase in our needs in this field to serve our rapidly growing urban population, we cannot expect to eliminate this backlog overnight. It will require a continuing effort and one which will grow larger and more costly every year that we delay. Meanwhile, the quality of life in our cities suffers in ways ranging from threats to health from polluted water to threats to economic growth from overcrowded traffic and other facilities.

There is also a growing recognition among economists that expanded public investment is essential to continued prosperity. The current uptrend has lasted far longer than most analysts had expected and now there is almost a chorus of prediction that the economy will level off or perhaps even dip in the second half of this year. Given our ever expanding labor force, even a leveling off is a critical problem which can add heavily to the millions of American men and women now out of work.

Just yesterday I read in the Washington Post of an interview with Gardner Ackley, Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, in which he expressed concern for the latter part of 1965. He stated, and I quote: "on balance I would expect a somewhat faster expansion in the first part of the year and some slowing down in the latter half." He went on to say that "if there is cause for disappointment about the 1965 outlook it is that the foreseeable gains in output are not sufficiently large to sustain our recent progress in reducing unemployment." Many economists express even deeper concern over the outlook and a recent analysis in the U.S. News & World Report suggested that unemployment by the end of 1965 might be one million higher than our present intolerable level. I believe this clearly indicates that now is the time to launch a program to step up local public construction activity.

There is growing recognition of the fact that only a Federal grant program has the power to stimulate local public works investment to the extent needed. Such a program was strongly endorsed by the AFL–CIO last November and it has the warmest endorsement of the mayors of our towns and cities. It is also endorsed by the National Association of Home Builders who know from firsthand experience how the shortage of community facilities inflates land prices by creating an artificial shortage of land available for development and adds to the burden of local real estate taxes. These factors have the effect of pricing many middle income families out of the market for new homes.

Mr. Speaker, my bill would authorize $2 billion annually to cover up to two-thirds of the cost of nearly the whole range of local public works—schools, which will be treated under separate legislation, would not be covered by my bill. These grants would be available to every town and city without regard to size and there would be the further provision that economically depressed areas would receive grants up to 75 percent. I believe that this bill is urgently needed and I anticipate that the Committee on Public Works will place it high on its agenda and begin action on it in the near future.

Congress and the Military

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 11, 1965

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina and the new chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, the Honorable L. Mendel Rivers, came into the Congress at the same time I did, in 1941. He has not only been my colleague but also my close personal friend.

I anticipate serving under his leadership on the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. Rivers has the ability, diligence, and desire to make an outstanding chairman. The challenge is great when it is realized that he follows the great Carl Vinson, at whose feet both Mr. Rivers and I sat for 25 years.

I believe Mr. Rivers admirably stated his philosophy on "Congress and the Military" in the interview which appeared in the January edition of Air Force and Space Digest magazine.

It is a pleasure to include this definitive article into the Record, and I suggest that each Member, especially each new Member, read it closely:

Congress and the Military

(An exclusive interview with the Honorable L. Mendel Rivers, U.S. Representative from South Carolina)

(Everything that affects members of the Armed Forces—food, pay, clothing, shelter, medical care, promotions, equipment, bases, and missions—is the concern of the House Committee on Armed Services. In the 89th Cong., for the first time in 10 years, a new chairman takes over that committee. To find out how he looks at his job and current military problems, the editors of Air Force/Space Digest interviewed him recently in his Washington office. Here is a transcript of that exclusive interview.—The Editors.)

(L. (for Lucius) Mendel Rivers has represented the First Congressional District of South Carolina, embracing nine counties in the southeastern section of the State, since 1940. Born in 1905 in Gumville, Berkeley County, part of his district just upriver from Charleston, he attended the College of Charleston and the University of South Carolina, earning a law degree in 1931. After serving in the South Carolina Legislature from 1933 to 1936 and 4 years as a special U.S. attorney, he was elected to the 77th Cong. in 1940 and has been there ever since. Coming from a seacoast district which includes the Charleston Navy Yard, he requested and got an appointment to the House Naval Affairs Committee, then led by Representative Carl Vinson of Georgia. In 1948, when the House Military and Naval Affairs Committees were merged to form the Armed Services Committee, Mr. Vinson became its chairman and headed it for all but 2 years (1952–54, when the Republicans controlled the House), until his retirement this year. "I have been in Mr. Vinson's university ever since I got here," says Mr. Rivers. "If anyone has ever had on-the-job training, that fellow is Rivers.")

Question. Congressman Rivers, how do you see the role of the legislative in dealing with the executive branch on defense matters?

Answer. I am on a committee whose members are quite sensitive about that section of the Constitution which deals with the role that Congress plays in governing the military.

To explain how I feel about it, I want to read you what the Constitution says. Article I, section 8, of the Constitution sets forth the powers of the legislative branch of the Government. It says the Congress shall have the power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States, to declare war, and so on.

In that same article, it says this: "To raise and support armies, but no appropriation of money to that use be for a longer term than 2 years." This is so that we can reappraise what we have done. "To provide and maintain a Navy. To make rules for the Government and regulation of the land and naval forces. To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia."

I take this to mean that, of all the branches of the Government, there is vested in the Congress the exclusive right to deal with the military. I don't mean a quasi-right. I mean the exclusive right.

That is the base from which I proceed. I think that the proper committee—which is ours—should have access to all information dealing with the military. It is as simple as that. I don't know why we should always wait for proposals to emanate from the Executive. I am not implying that I don't plan to cooperate fully with the President and Secretary of Defense, but there should be a mutuality.

I am going to head my own committee, and I am going to get along with my committee and the Pentagon, but I have my ideas and I will insist on them.

Question. We understand it is unlikely that the administration will propose a military pay bill, other than possibly another cost-of-living adjustment. What are your views on military pay?

Answer. We should very definitely consider a new pay bill for the military this year, because they have not been treated fairly. The bill passed last year was little more than a gesture. It was not exactly an insult, but it certainly was no compliment.

Question. The Air Force, after long study, is supposed to have come up with a pay package for all services which totals between $800 and $900 million to bring the military up to some parity with the civilian economy. Do you envision that the Congress might act favorably on a bill of that scope in this session?

Answer. I haven't seen the Air Force study, but I have already drafted a pay bill.

Question. Of this magnitude?

Answer. It would be about that size. With a $630 billion gross national product, I say we can afford to give the military a pay raise of this size.

Question. Mr. Chairman do you think there will be any chance of writing into this law a provision for annual review such as is in the law for civil service employees?

Answer. I think a review, possibly annually, should be provided by law.

Question. What about housing?

Answer. We have a great shortage of housing. Mind you, I used to handle housing. I think it is one of the most vital areas. Let me answer your question like this: Housing, pay, food, commissaries, oversea expenses in highly inflated cost areas—all of these things will be reviewed very carefully.

Wherever we can, we are going to write these benefits into law rather than leave it to the discretion of some transitory Secretary. This is no reflection on Mr. McNamara. He has done a lot of things I approve of, and he and I, I am sure, will get along very well.

I have always favored appropriated housing but when you have to pay the money on the barrelhead to build houses, you don't get as many as you did under the Capehart Act. We cut off Capehart just about the time it was beginning to do a pretty good job.

Question. Can we assume you intend also to look into hospitalization—medical care and dental care?

Answer. Of course. I have a report on medical care. This is one area we are really going to watch. Hospitalization is a vested right. I don't like the term benefits. Hospitalization is as much a right for the serviceman and his dependents as a pair of shoes. Our report gives my view on hospitals.

Over the years the recruiters have told those whom they recruited: "Your dependents and you will have hospitalization and when you retire you will get it." I think that is a contract, and I think it is an obligation.

Unless we change the law, that is still my view—that they are entitled to it. The Congress has passed a medicare bill and all of these things, and they have only scratched the surface because these things have never been fully implemented. I don't know why we can't do something about it.

Question. Do you see any chance to add dental care along with medicare?

Answer. It all gets down to morale. I wrote the Navy dental bill, you know. Are you asking me if dependents should have dental care?

Question. Yes.

Answer. Why not? Have you ever tried to do a job with a toothache or gone home and held your wife's hand when she has a toothache? What I am trying to get over is that we are going to try to do everything we can to give the serviceman a well-rounded set of rights—benefits, prerogatives, privileges, and emoluments, so whenever he is called to fight or go on long patrols he won't have to be worried about his folks back home. We want to do something about whatever affects his morale. If denticare is one of them, we want to do something about that.

Question. And the same for retirees?

Answer. My report speaks about that. Let me quote it: "The subcommittee is convinced * * * that the traditional benefit of hospital care to military retirees and their dependents must be continued." It goes back to what I said. Congress has let somebody else handle these decisions so long that they wait for the decisions to come up from downtown. I think that is a mistake.

Question. We have been talking about money and its relationship to morale. There's also another side to it, isn't there—the regard in which the military is held by the public and by the people in the Pentagon?

Answer. Absolutely. When I was a boy, people used to join the Navy and the Army just to get the pay. That day is gone. We've got to pay them adequately, yes—but we've got to do more.

I don't believe for a minute that, as some say, our young people are delinquents. I don't assume that any of them are. Neither do I agree that they're unpatriotic. The people I talk to don't think the man in uniform alone should be saddled with all the patriotism. Why shouldn't others be patriotic, too?

These men are putting in long, tedious hours away from their families, often in remote, isolated areas. If they don't get paid enough money to pay their bills, if they aren't confident their families are being looked after while they're away, they're not going to stay.

There is only one way to keep them—to make them know that their country wants them, to pay them what we pay our civil servants; to help them in looking after their families. We are not doing these things, because we try to cut corners. So we lose them, but we spend time and money to train replacements. It doesn't make sense.

Question. What do you think has been the effect of the new DOD directive on standards of conduct—the one that says military personnel cannot eat lunch at someone else's expense, or if they do, they have to report it within 48 hours?

Answer. I think it is too strict. I am sure it will be modified. Either a fellow is honest or he is not honest. If suspicion has to surround everybody who is in the military, this, too, will cause a lot to leave.

Question. Do you anticipate any changes in the existing retirement system—since the money involved has now reached a billion dollars a year for military retirement pay?

Answer. I think we should look into the subject. We might have a lot of people we want to keep longer. I don't know why we should give the military the privilege to retire after 20 years. I have always felt that way.

Question. You have been very much interested in the Reserve and Guard programs over the years. What is your view toward DOD plans to transfer Reserve units to the National Guard?

Answer. I don't know why things like this should not be thoroughly reviewed by the proper committee. I hate to see these drastic changes being proposed when the Congress is out of session. Such proposals should be made when we are in session so that we can go into them.

Question. Another subject DOD is studying is the draft. How does that look to you?

Answer. I won't know until we go into it. At this point I can only give you a curbstone opinion. As of this date (December 9), I don't favor terminating the draft.

Question. Congressman, you have had extensive experience with sealift and airlift. How do you evaluate the relative merits of rapid deployment of forces by sea versus air?

Answer. One should complement the other, and implement the other. One service can't do the whole business. I saw that on Steelpike in Spain in November. Exercise Big Lift (in 1963) demonstrated a capability of reinforcing our European allies fast. In that one, the ground forces used prepositioned equipment. In Steelpike the Navy demonstrated it can deliver the equipment as well as the manpower. We need both sealift and airlift.

Question. Do you feel we have enough airlift now to meet the requirements of the military, particularly the Army?

Answer. No, sir, not to meet our commitments. We have more commitments than we have airlift. New equipment is coming in, but it is not inclusive enough. We should immediately go ahead with the CX–HLS (cargo experimental, heavy logistic system) transport plane.

Question. What do you think of the C–141A?

Answer. It's a wonderful plane. When we created that—I headed the subcommittee—the Air Staff put out the guidelines, and the C–141 has met every requirement they asked for. But it is not big enough.

Question. Are you satisfied generally with the structuring of our forces? Are we pressing technology hard enough or translating technology into new weapons quickly enough?

Answer. No. I am positive we are not.

Question. In what specific areas are we standing short?

Answer. I think we have made a mistake in the Defense Department by not pressing to get enough performance out of conventional systems and by jumping headlong into the unmanned systems. We have become overbalanced in unmanned systems and have not achieved the ultimate in what conventional systems can do. To add to our problem, we may be saddled with only conventional war for the foreseeable future, as in Vietnam and some other places.

You know and I know we don't have a follow on for the B–52. We don't have, in my opinion, a modern interceptor. In these areas we have not done what I would like to see done.

Question. Do you include the YF–12A in that?

Answer. Is that an interceptor?

Question. The Pentagon said it is an interceptor.

Answer. Is that an interceptor? I stand on what I say. I don't think we have an all-purpose plane yet. The nearest thing we have to a versatile plane is the McDonnell F–4 series. But I just don't believe we have an all-purpose plane.

Question. There is some talk that a version of the YF–12A is also being considered for a bomber role. Do you think this kind of approach is going to meet the needs for a follow-on to the B–52?

Answer. That aircraft has been developed in secret. We will have to go into that and question the people who are in the business of strategic bombing. The only people who can advise us on that are people like Generals LeMay and Power, the authorities on what these planes can do. I don't think it is big enough to do the B–52's job. But we will go into it and see.

Question. Is there any way of getting at this problem of Congress and the executive branch, particularly with hardware systems?

Answer. In what respect?

Question. We have been through it with the B–70 and so on, where the Congress asserts its will and interest through making money available, and in one case even directing that it be spent. But when it comes right down to it, the Executive can spend it or not as it sees fit. Isn't this a pretty severe limiting factor on any kind of coequal arrangement?

Answer. You can't make the man spend the money. But I believe that with my friendship with the President, we won't have any impasse.

I have had a lot of service with President Johnson, an awful lot. I think where we have problems, he will want to get along with us. I wouldn't have any hesitancy at all urging that he listen to the congressional viewpoint.

Question. All in all, it looks as though you're heading into a very eventful session.

Answer. The point I want to get over to you—this is my own viewpoint—is that I know good and well this country can afford the best military on earth. We have the best, but we cannot rest and still keep the best. The best thing we have going for us is 190 million people behind us. If there is anything the American people want, it is a first-class military man, well dressed, well housed, well fed, well paid, with the best equipment. If the Congress does not provide these things, we are out of step with the grassroots and the city roots. It is as simple as that. That is my position.

SENATE

TUESDAY, JANUARY 12, 1965

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, God, with our burdened lives tense and strained in a world so agitated and divided, we would seek the peace which is the gift of Thy grace to all those who, with true purpose of heart, turn unto Thee.

In the midst of a new week, with human problems pressing for solution, we humbly bow at this wayside shrine, praying that to Thy servants here in the high functions of government there may be given open ears, that they may hear voices calling to high endeavors; open minds, ready to receive and welcome new light and truth as they are revealed to them; open eyes, quick to discover Thine indwelling in all the wondrous world Thou hast made; open hands, ready to share, holding all good things in trust for Thee and Thine other children.

We ask it in the name of the Holy One who came, not to be ministered unto, but to minister. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 7, and of Friday, January 8, 1965, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

FULL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 45)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

To the Congress of the United States:

In 1787, the Continental Congress declared in the Northwest Ordinance:

> Schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged.

America is strong and prosperous and free because for 178 years we have honored that commitment.

In the United States today—

One-quarter of all Americans are in the Nation's classrooms.

High school attendance has grown eighteenfold since the turn of the century—six times as fast as the population.

College enrollment has advanced eightyfold. Americans today support a fourth of the world's institutions of higher learning and a third of its professors and college students.

In the life of the individual, education is always an unfinished task.

And in the life of this Nation, the advancement of education is a continuing challenge.

There is a darker side to education in America:

One student out of every three now in the fifth grade will drop out before finishing high school—if the present rate continues.

Almost a million young people will continue to quit school each year—if our schools fail to stimulate their desire to learn.

Over 100,000 of our brightest high school graduates each year will not go to college—and many others will leave college—if the opportunity for higher education is not expanded.

The cost of this neglect runs high—both for the youth and the Nation.

Unemployment of young people with an eighth grade education or less is four times the national average.

Jobs filled by high school graduates rose by 40 percent in the last 10 years. Jobs for those with less schooling decreased by nearly 10 percent.

We can measure the cost in even starker terms. We now spend about $450 a year per child in our public schools. But we spend $1,800 a year to keep a delinquent youth in a detention home, $2,500 a year for a family on relief, $3,500 a year for a criminal in State prison.

The growing numbers of young people reaching school age demand that we move swiftly even to stand still.

Attendance in elementary and secondary schools will increase by 4 million in the next 5 years. Four hundred thousand new classrooms will be needed to meet this growth. But almost one-half million of the Nation's existing classrooms are already more than 30 years old.

The post-World War II boom in babies has now reached college age. And by 1970, our colleges must be prepared to add 50 percent more enrollment to their presently overcrowded facilities.

In the past, Congress has supported an increasing commitment to education in America. Last year, I signed historic measures passed by the 88th Congress to provide:

Facilities badly needed by universities, colleges, and community colleges.

Major new resources for vocational training.

More loans and fellowships for students enrolled in higher education.

Enlarged and improved training for physicians, dentists, and nurses.

I propose that the 89th Congress join me in extending the commitment still further. I propose that we declare a national goal of full educational opportunity.

Every child must be encouraged to get as much education as he has the ability to take.

We want this not only for his sake—but for the Nation's sake.

Nothing matters more to the future of our country: not our military preparedness—for armed might is worthless if we lack the brainpower to build a world of peace; not our productive economy—for we cannot sustain growth without trained manpower; not our democratic system of government—for freedom is fragile if citizens are ignorant.

We must demand that our schools increase not only the quantity but the quality of America's education. For we recognize that nuclear age problems cannot be solved with horse-and-buggy learning. The three R's of our school system must be supported by the three T's—teachers who are superior, techniques of instruction that are modern, and thinking about education which places it first in all our plans and hopes.

Specifically, four major tasks confront us:

To bring better education to millions of disadvantaged youth who need it most.

To put the best educational equipment and ideas and innovations within reach of all students.

To advance the technology of teaching and the training of teachers.

To provide incentives for those who wish to learn at every stage along the road to learning.

Our program must match the magnitude of these tasks. The budget on education which I request for fiscal year 1966 will contain a total of $4.1 billion. This includes $1.1 billion to finance programs established by the 88th Congress. I will submit a request for $1.5 billion in new obligational authority to finance the programs described in this message. This expenditure is a small price to pay for developing our Nation's most priceless resource.

In all that we do, we mean to strengthen our State and community education systems. Federal assistance does not mean Federal control—as past programs have proven. The late Senator Robert Taft declared:

> Education is primarily a State function—but in the field of education, as in the fields of health, relief, and medical care, the Federal Government has a secondary obligation to see that there is a basic floor under those essential services for all adults and children in the United States.

In this spirit, I urge that we now push ahead with the No. 1 business of the American people—the education of our youth in preschools, elementary and secondary schools, and in the colleges and universities.

I. Preschool program.

My budget will include up to $150 million for preschool projects under the community action program of the Economic Opportunity Act.

Education must begin with the very young. The child from the urban or rural slum frequently misses his chance even before he begins school. Tests show that he is usually a year behind in academic attainment by the time he reaches third grade—and up to 3 years behind if he reaches the eighth grade. By then the handicap has grown too great for many children. Their horizons have narrowed; their prospects for lifetimes of failure have hardened. A large percentage of our young people whose family incomes are less than $2,000 do not go beyond the eighth grade.

Preschool programs have demonstrated marked success in overcoming this initial handicap:

In New York City, children from slum neighborhoods who attended nursery school have performed better when tested in the third and fourth grades than those who did not attend.

In Baltimore, children with language and cultural handicaps are being helped greatly by a preschool program. According to preliminary reports, two-thirds of them are in the top 50 percent of their kindergarten and first-grade classes on a citywide measure; one-sixth of them are in the top quarter.

But today, almost half of our school districts conduct no kindergarten classes. Public nursery schools are found in only about 100 of our 26,000 school districts. We must expand our preschool program in order to reach disadvantaged children early.

Action on a wide front will begin this summer through a special head start program for children who are scheduled to begin school next fall. In addition, funds for low-income schools, regional education laboratories, and supplementary educational centers and services—recommended below—will be devoted to these vital preschool programs.

II. Elementary and secondary schools.

Elementary and secondary schools are the foundation of our education system.

Forty-eight million students are now in our grade and high schools.

Seventy-one percent of the Nation's expenditures for education are spent on elementary and secondary schooling.

If these schools are to do their job properly, they need help and they need it now. I propose that we give first priority to a program of:

A. Aid to low-income school districts.

I recommend that legislation be enacted to authorize a major program of assistance to public elementary and secondary schools serving children of low-income families. My budget for fiscal year 1966 will request $1 billion for this new program.

One hundred years ago, a man with 6 or 7 years of schooling stood well above the average. His chances to get ahead were as good as the next man's. But today, lack of formal education is likely to mean low wages, frequent unemployment, and a home in an urban or rural slum.

Poverty has many roots but the taproot is ignorance.

Poverty is the lot of two-thirds of the families in which the family head has had 8 years or less of schooling.

Twenty percent of the youth aged 18 to 24 with an eighth-grade education or less are unemployed—four times the national average.

Just as ignorance breeds poverty, poverty all too often breeds ignorance in the next generation.

Nearly half the youths rejected by Selective Service for educational deficiency have fathers who are unemployed or else working in unskilled and low-income jobs.

Fathers of more than one-half of the draft rejectees did not complete the eighth grade.

The burden on the Nation's schools is not evenly distributed. Low-income families are heavily concentrated in particular urban neighborhoods or rural areas. Faced with the largest educational needs, many of these school districts have inadequate financial resources. This imbalance has been increased by the movement of high income families from the center of cities to the suburbs—and their replacement by low-income families from rural areas.

The five States with the lowest incomes spend only an average of $276 per pupil, less than half the average of the five highest income States.

Despite a massive effort, our big cities generally spend only about two-thirds as much per pupil as their adjacent suburbs.

In our 15 largest cities, 60 percent of the 10th-grade students from poverty neighborhoods drop out before finishing high school.

This is a national problem. Federal action is needed to assist the States and localities in bringing the full benefits of education to children of low-income families.

Assistance will be provided:

On the basis of census data showing the distribution of low-income families among the counties or school districts within States.

Through payments made to States for distribution to school districts.

With the assurance that the funds will be used for improving the quality of education in schools serving low-income areas.

On the condition that Federal funds will not be used to reduce State and local fiscal efforts.

For the benefit of all children within the area served, including those who participate in shared services or other special educational projects.

B. School library resources and instructional materials.

I recommend legislation to authorize Federal grants to States to assist in the purchase of books for school libraries and for student use, to be made available to children in public and private nonprofit elementary and secondary schools.

Thomas Carlyle once said:

> All that mankind has done, thought, gained or been: it is lying as in magic preservation in the pages of books.

Yet our school libraries are limping along.

Almost 70 percent of the public elementary schools have no libraries. Eighty-four percent lack librarians to teach children the value of learning through good books.

Many schools have an average of less than one-half book per child.

To meet the accepted standards for library materials would require a fourfold increase in current expenditures in our major cities.

The explosion of knowledge and the rapid revision of curriculums in the schools has created new demands for school textbooks. The obsolete text can suffocate the learning process. Yet the cost of purchasing textbooks at increasing prices puts a major obstacle in the path of education—an obstacle that can and must be eliminated.

C. Supplementary educational centers and services.

I recommend a program of Federal grants for supplementary education centers and services within the community.

We think of schools as places where youth learns, but our schools also need to learn.

The educational gap we face is one of quality as well as quantity.

Exciting experiments in education are underway, supported by the National Science Foundation, by the Office of Education and other Government agencies, and by private philanthropic foundations. Many of our children have studied the new math. There are highly effective ways of teaching high school physics, biology, chemistry, and foreign languages.

We need to take full advantage of these and other innovations. Specialists can spark the interest of disadvantaged students. Remedial reading courses open up new vistas for slow learners. Gifted students can be brought along at a faster pace.

Yet such special educational services are not available in many communities. A limited local tax base cannot stand the expense. Most individual schools are not large enough to justify the services.

The supplementary center can provide such services as—

Special courses in science, foreign languages, literature, music, and art.

Programs for the physically handicapped and mentally retarded.

Instruction in the sciences and humanities during the summer for economically and culturally deprived children.

Special assistance after regular school hours.

Common facilities that can be maintained more efficiently for a group of schools than for a single school—laboratories, libraries, auditoriums, and theaters.

A system by which gifted persons can teach part time to provide scarce talents.

A means of introducing into the school system new courses, instructional materials, and teaching practices.

A way of tapping the community's extracurricular resources for the benefit of students—museums, concert and lecture programs, and industrial laboratories.

Within each community, public and private nonprofit schools and agencies will cooperate to devise the plan and administer the program for these supplementary centers. Their services should be adapted to meet the pressing needs of each locality.

D. Regional education laboratories.

I recommend the establishment under the Cooperative Research Act of regional educational laboratories which will undertake research, train teachers, and implement tested research findings.

I further recommend amendments to the act to—

Broaden the types of research organizations now eligible for educational projects.

Train educational research personnel.

Provide grants for research, development of new curriculums, dissemination of information, and implementation of educational innovations.

Support construction of research facilities and the purchase of research equipment.

Under auspices of the National Science Foundation, educators have worked with scientists—including Nobel laureates—to develop courses which capture the excitement of contemporary science. They have prepared totally new instructional materials—laboratory equipment, textbooks, teachers' guides, films, supplementary reading and examinations. After testing, they are made available to public and private schools.

We need to extend our research and development—to history, literature, and economics; to art and music; to reading, writing, and speaking; to occupational, vocational, and technical education. We need to extend it to all stages of learning—preschool, elementary and secondary schools, college and graduate training.

Regional laboratories for education offer great promise. They draw equally upon educators and the practitioners in all fields of learning—mathematicians, scientists, social scientists, linguists, musicians, artists, and writers. They help both to improve curriculums and to train teachers.

E. Strengthening State educational agencies.

I recommend a program of grants to State educational agencies.

State leadership becomes increasingly important as we seek to improve the quality of elementary and secondary education.

We should assist the States by strengthening State departments of education in their efforts to—

Provide consultative and technical assistance for local school districts and local school leadership.

Formulate long-range plans.

Expand educational research and development.

Improve local and State information about education.

Identify emerging educational problems.

Provide for the training of State and local education personnel.

Conduct periodic evaluation of educational programs.

Promote teacher improvement courses.

These new programs will substantially augment community resources in the war against poverty. As provided by sections 611 and 612 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, I will see that the new efforts are kept in step with our other antipoverty efforts.

In those localities where the community has undertaken a community action program under the Economic Opportunity Act, the community agency should participate in the planning of these new educational programs and in their coordination with ongoing and developing antipoverty efforts.

Enactment of these proposals for elementary and secondary education is of utmost urgency. I urge early and favorable consideration by the Congress.

III. Higher education.

Higher education is no longer a luxury, but a necessity.

Programs enacted by Congress in the past have contributed greatly to strengthening our colleges and universities. These will be carried forward under my 1966 budget, which includes—

An additional $179 million to assist construction of college classrooms, libraries, and laboratories.

An additional $25 million for 4,500 more graduate fellowships to overcome college teaching shortages.

An additional $110 million to further basic research in the universities, to provide science fellowships, and to promote science education.

But we need to do more:

To extend the opportunity for higher education more broadly among lower and middle income families.

To help small and less well developed colleges improve their programs.

To enrich the library resources of colleges and universities.

To draw upon the unique and invaluable resources of our great universities to deal with national problems of poverty and community development.

A. ASSISTANCE TO STUDENTS

1. Scholarships.

I recommend a program of scholarships for needy and qualified high school graduates to enable them to enter and to continue in college.

Loans authorized by the National Defense Education Act currently assist nearly 300,000 college students. Still the following conditions exist:

Each year an estimated 100,000 young people of demonstrated ability fail to go on to college because of lack of money. Many thousands more from low-income families must borrow heavily to meet college costs.

Only one out of three young people from low-income families attend college compared with four out of five from high-income families.

For many young people from poor families loans are not enough to open the way to higher education.

Under this program, a special effort will be made to identify needy students of promise early in their high school careers. The scholarship will serve as a building block, to be augmented by work-study and other support, so that the needy student can chart his own course in higher studies.

My 1966 budget provides sufficient funds for grants to help up to 140,000 students in the first year.

2. Expansion of work-study opportunity and guaranteed low-interest loans:

I recommend—

That the existing college work-study program be made available to more students and that authority for the program be transferred to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

That a part of the cost of interest payments on guaranteed private loans to college students be paid by the Federal Government.

Going to college is increasingly expensive. A student must pay nearly $2,400 a year in a private college and about $1,600 in a public college. These costs may rise by one-third over the next decade.

Two aids should be extended to meet the heavy costs of college education.

First. The existing work-study program should be expanded for students from low-income families and extended to students from middle-income families. Under this program the Federal Government pays 90 percent of the wages earned by students on useful projects. This will enable a student to earn on the average of $450 during a school year, and up to $500 more during the summer.

Second. Many families cannot cover all of college expenses on an out-of-pocket basis. We should assure greater availability of private credit on reasonable terms and conditions. This can best be done by paying part of interest cost of guaranteed loans made by private lenders—a more effective, fairer, and far less costly way of providing assistance than the various tax credit devices which have been proposed.

B. AID TO SMALLER COLLEGES

I recommend that legislation be enacted to strengthen less developed colleges.

Many of our smaller colleges are battling for survival. About 10 percent lack proper accreditation, and others face constantly the threat of losing accreditation. Many are isolated from the main currents of academic life.

Private sources and States alone cannot carry the whole burden of doing what must be done for these important units in our total educational system; Federal aid is essential.

Universities should be encouraged to enter into cooperative relationships to help less developed colleges, including such assistance as:

A program of faculty exchanges.

Special programs to enable faculty members of small colleges to renew and extend knowledge of their fields.

A national fellowship program to encourage highly qualified young graduate students and instructors in large universities to augment the teaching resources of small colleges.

The development of joint programs to make more efficient use of available facilities and faculty.

In union there is strength. This is the basic premise of my recommendation.

C. SUPPORT FOR COLLEGE LIBRARY RESOURCES

I recommend enactment of legislation for purchase of books and library materials to strengthen college teaching and research.

Fifty percent of our 4-year institutions and 82 percent of our 2-year institutions fall below accepted professional standards in the number of volumes possessed.

As student enrollment mounts, we must look not only to the physical growth of our colleges and universities. They must be developed as true centers of intellectual activity. To construct a library building is meaningless unless there are books to bring life to the library.

D. UNIVERSITY-COMMUNITY EXTENSION PROGRAM

I recommend a program of grants to support university extension concentrating on problems of the community.

Institutions of higher learning are being called on ever more frequently for public service—for defense research, foreign development, and countless other programs. They have performed magnificently. We must now call upon them to meet new needs.

Once, 90 percent of our population earned its living from the land. A wise Congress enacted the Morrill Act of 1862 and the Hatch Act of 1887 which helped the State universities help the American people. With the aid of the land-grant colleges, American agriculture produced overwhelming abundance.

Today, 70 percent of our people live in urban communities. They are confronted by problems of poverty, residential blight, polluted air and water, inadequate mass transportation and health services, strained human relations, and overburdened municipal services.

Our great universities have the skills and knowledge to match these mountainous problems. They can offer expert guidance in community planning; research and development in pressing educational problems; economic and job market studies; continuing education of the community's professional and business leadership; and programs for the disadvantaged.

The role of the university must extend far beyond the ordinary extension-type operation. Its research findings and talents must be made available to the community. Faculty must be called upon for consulting activities. Pilot projects, seminars, conferences, TV programs, and task forces drawing on many departments of the university—all should be brought into play.

This is a demanding assignment for the universities, and many are not now ready for it. The time has come for us to help the university to face problems of the city as it once faced problems of the farm.

E. SPECIAL MANPOWER NEEDS

We must also ask the colleges and universities to help overcome certain acute deficiencies in trained manpower. At least 100,000 more professional librarians are needed for service in public libraries and in schools and colleges. We need 140,000 more teachers for handicapped children.

I recommend—

Grants to institutions of higher education for training of school, college, and community librarians and related services.

Extension and expansion of grants for training teachers and handicapped children.

CONCLUSION

In 1838, Mirabeau B. Lamar, the second President of the Republic of Texas and the father of Texas education, declared:

> The cultivated mind is the guardian genius of democracy. It is the only dictator that free man acknowledges. It is the only security that free man desires.

Throughout the history of our Nation, the United States has recognized this truth. But during the periods when the country has been most astir with creative activity, when it most keenly sensed the sturdiness of the old reaching out for the vigor of the new, it has given special attention to its educational system.

This was true in the expansive 1820's and 1830's, when the American people acted decisively to build a public school system for the lower grades. It was no less true at the vigorous turn of the 20th century, when high schools were developed for the millions. Again, during the questing 1930's, fresh ideas stirred the traditions of the ruler and blackboard.

We are now embarked on another venture to put the American dream to work in meeting the new demands of a new day. Once again we must start where men who would improve their society have always known they must begin—with an educational system restudied, reinforced, and revitalized.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 12, 1965.*

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (S.J. Res. 3) extending the date for transmission of the budget and the economic report, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour. I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON EDUCATION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak to the extent of 1 or 2 minutes in excess of the limitation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I invite the attention of Senators to the message on education which President Johnson sent to the Congress this morning. It is, I believe, a milestone in its comprehensive and enlightened approach to providing full educational opportunity for every American.

As President Johnson says: "In the life of this Nation, education is a continuing challenge." And in this message he has pinpointed these challenges and suggested specific programs to meet them. The four major tasks which he sees facing the Nation are:

> To bring better education to millions of disadvantaged youth who need it most.
>
> To put the best educational equipment and ideas and innovations within reach of all students.
>
> To advance the technology of teaching and the training of teachers.
>
> To provide incentives for those who wish to learn at every stage along the road to learning.

To accomplish these tasks the President proposes, with regard to primary and secondary education, a broad variety of new programs. They include a major program of assistance to public and secondary schools serving children of low-income families, Federal grants to States to assist in the purchase of books for school libraries and student use, a program of Federal grants for supplementary education centers and services, and Federal grants to State educational agencies for the improvement of the methods and programs.

To strengthen our system of higher education and make it available to all qualified Americans, the President recommends, in addition to the continuation of existing programs, a system of college scholarships for needy and qualified high school graduates, expansion of the work study opportunity and low-interest loan programs, aid to our less-developed struggling small colleges, legislation for the purchase of books to strengthen college teaching, and a program of grants to support university extension concentrating on the problems of the community.

Mr. President, education, the best education that every American can absorb, is a key not only to the welfare and happiness of the individual, but to the strength and well-being of the Nation. President Johnson has done much in this message to suggest how full educational opportunity can be achieved. I am confident that the Congress will give his proposals the most careful consideration and do its part with equal vision and enlightenment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to associate myself with the comments of the majority leader in regard to the President's great message related to education that has come to the Congress today. As I assured the President this morning in a discussion on his message, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Education, I shall proceed promptly to set hearings on the bill that will be introduced later today. It is a bill which, with the permission of the majority leader, will remain at the desk for 3 days to provide an opportunity for other Senators who may wish to cosponsor it to do so. I plan to start hearings on the bill within the next 2 weeks, because I believe it is of the utmost importance that we proceed with dispatch, but thoroughly in making our record upon the President's great message on education as incorporated in this great piece of proposed legislation.

I hail the farsighted vision of the President in thus showing us how we in the Congress can bring to bear, in concentrated form, the resources of the Federal Government to improve the quality of education we afford the boys and girls who are most in need of it. As I told the President this morning, and I now make the statement publicly, I highly commend and congratulate the President for his great statesmanship in this major area of education as well as in other fields.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I congratulate the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon for the remarks which he has made. As always, it will be his subcommittee to which the bill will be referred. He has shown great skill, managerial ability, and great knowledge, and I am very happy that he has decided to hold hearings within the next 2 weeks. We look for early action on the measure.

STRENGTHENED TIES BETWEEN MEXICO AND THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, events during the past several years have served to strengthen the ties that bind Mexico and the United States. They have brought about a basic and mutual understanding which has served to dim the differences of the past and to light a very bright future for Mexican-American relations. At this point, it can be said that these relations are at an unprecedented height of mutual tolerance, mutual understanding, and mutual respect.

In the past year alone our countries have sought to solve two monumental problems which, unsolved, might have opened a chasm between us. These solutions came about because each party dealt with the other with maturity, restraint, and respect. I am referring, of course, to the approval of the El Chamizal Treaty and the serious negotiations now in process seeking a solution of the water salinity problem of the Colorado River.

Mr. President, on the 1st of December it was my pleasure to visit Mexico once again in the company of the official U.S. delegation to the inauguration of President Gustavo Diaz Ordaz. This "Ceremony for the Transmission of Executive Power" was an extraordinarily impressive event. Particularly noteworthy was the grouped presence of the five former Presidents of Mexico. Each of these men, in his turn, had given much of himself to help fulfill the promises of the Mexican Revolution. The special contribution of the outgoing President, Adolfo Lopez Mateos, was noted in the inaugural speech of Diaz Ordaz, who said:

> A fruitful period of Mexican history ends. President Lopez Mateos increased our spiritual and physical patrimony: he enlarged our country in all orders; he took Mexico to the world, with its ideas and hopes of universal brotherhood; he was concerned for the fate of all Mexicans, within the concert of the great family formed by mankind. Today I receive from his hands the spotless flag of Mexico.

Mr. President, we sometimes overlook the fact that Mexico is now the largest Spanish-speaking nation in the world. It is fulfilling a role of leadership in the development and progress of the Western Hemisphere. There is every reason to expect that the progress of the last decade will be consolidated and that even greater achievements will be recorded under President Diaz Ordaz. He is eminently qualified by experience, dedication, and temperament to take up the burdens which Lopez Mateos carried so well. His dedication to the ideas of democracy, eloquently expressed in the Charter of Punta del Este, is emphasized in his magnificent inaugural address. They are words of great significance not only to Mexico but to this Nation, the hemisphere, and the world as a whole.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Presidential address previously referred to be printed in its entirety at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> Honorable Members of the Congress of the Union, in a fervent civic demonstration which the people of Mexico turned into a national feast, the vote of the citizens entrusted in my hands the banner of their hopes. I receive it with the cleanest of purposes to defend and serve it.
>
> The trust of my people is great, and much will it demand from me; I am conscious of the enormous responsibility I now assume, but I accept it with optimism born of my faith in the destinies of Mexico.
>
> The mission to accomplish excludes delays as well as improvisations. It is a task whose width and depth requires the continuous effort not of one man nor of a group of men, but of all society for several generations, that combining and succeeding themselves, will be inspired, as they have been in the course of our history by a sole passion: the welfare of our country.
>
> We have an ideology that, through the foresight of our forefathers, is alive today and, through the persevering action of our people, is continually enriched in the face of new realities and the most complex problems.
>
> Each Chief Executive in his term makes an effort in the permanent task of reaching the highest goals and sets the foundations to carry on in the next stage.
>
> Our democratic system has man as its starting point, not as a simple number of pure abstraction, but rather as a subject of rights, as a person whose attributes of dignity and freedom we consider fundamental; these attributes guarantee the sacred solidity of the family which in turn, forms and tightens the links of what must be unbreakable social solidarity. Man, family, country, humanity, are essential and inseparable concepts.
>
> We have noted with optimism the first results of the recent electoral reform. I believe that the representatives of the majority as well as those of the minorities, products of a new right, measure their responsibilities to the nation; responsibility as great for one as for the other: Mexico demands and deserves the serene and conscientious presentation of its problems, their weighty analysis, and the honest exposition of ideas.
>
> We have faith in that by doing this within the roads marked by law, improves our democracy and helps us to preserve all that which through the efforts of many years we have achieved.
>
> The political and economical stability that we enjoy are not a gift. They are the result of a dynamic society that modifies the inconvenient situations and creates, instead, all those that, based on reality are demanded by our ideals.
>
> To assure stability implies to continue economic, political, and social transformation, without fear of reforms and not forgetting reality; but always within one path: the path set forth by the fundamental Constitution of Mexico, and which is our constitution.
>
> From the time we were first born to our independent life we have fought to have a constitution to fit the ideals of our people; through many struggles we have perfected our constitutional laws and we must now dedicate our best efforts to uphold and safeguard our fundamental charter.
>
> To preserve economic stability and political tranquillity is even more difficult than to have conquered them. It is true that the weight of responsibility falls mainly on government, but no Mexican can consider himself alien to it, because these are an invaluable treasure that all of us, absolutely all of us, must guard.
>
> Mankind has had a very long experience, and yet it seems to disregard a double lesson: violence does not help to solve problems, but rather to enlarge and aggravate them; no matter how acute they are, a solution can always be found in peace, with the invincible weapons of law.
>
> Power belongs to the people. Government authority is based on popular will which, in turn, is a product of the freedom of the people. Therefore the obligation to maintain—in all their scope—the freedoms and guarantees consecrated in our legal system.
>
> Freedom and authority do not exclude each other. It is not easy to reconcile them, but neither is it impossible: the responsible exercise of one and the other, within the limits of the law, insures them reciprocally.
>
> They who, with deliberate perversity, demand their rights so as to violate the rights of others, who invoke the Constitution only to tread on the Constitution; who pretend to take refuge in freedom only to end all freedoms, take note here and now, that we well know these two indivisible and inseparable obligations of government, that complement and uphold each other: to avoid that, in the name of freedom it be intended to do away with order, and to impede that, in the name of order, it be intended to destroy freedom or diminish the rights of citizens.
>
> Our unity is born from the full exercise of our freedoms, and from our unity stems what we have achieved and what we must yet accomplish.
>
> What has been won through long years of efforts can be lost, if we do not care for it with daily determination. And if it should ever be threatened, we as Mexicans must think of all that which draws us together and compare it with the little that may separate us.
>
> Let us repeat, that for the good of the country, we must abandon the passions that divide us, and only retain the one that unites us: our passion for Mexico. This shall be our best weapon to continue being a united nation that progresses in freedom, social justice, and human solidarity.
>
> Because of it, we seek national unity as an unbreakable rule of government. But national unity is not uniformity of thought nor unanimity of conduct, but rather it is something that results from the preservation of unique personalities, the rich mixture of all thoughts, even from extreme shades, within a free debate of ideas, that turns into one concept of what the country means, in one conjunction of all the efforts to preserve the independence of the nation, the freedom, dignity and progress of Mexicans, the progress in economical development to create riches that may be shared in equity by all, in accordance with the unchangeable principles of social justice.

I conceive Mexico as a febrile grouping of men devoted to work, but above that zeal and effort, I conceive Mexico as a creative emotion. Nothing consolidates so strongly the sentiment of country as the enjoyment of freedom and the possession of social justice, which are inseparable; because liberty without social justice is a gross and hollow formula, and social justice without liberty is the privation of the most fruitful stimulus to living.

Without the respect of law and juridical certainty, no progress is solid. Strengthening the Federal judiciary power and heightening its efficiency will deserve our utmost attention.

Federal justice, by solving individual conflicts and by checking abuses of power or in repairing them, fulfills a decisive function for the orderly life of the Nation.

The national armed forces come from the people and are devoted to serving the people. They are an image of Mexico, guardians of its sovereignty and institutions, irreplaceable auxiliaries in the fulfillment of civilian tasks, for the benefit of the people from whence they came. To better their economic, social, and technical conditions will be a permanent preoccupation of this administration.

I publicly and solemnly express my trust in that the Mexican soldier will continue to honor the sacred mission the country has deposited in him. As for me, I assure them that I will live up to the honor of being their Commander in Chief.

To govern in Mexico is, in a good measure, to conquer physical limitations. To retain the water that avaricious nature gave us sparingly in most of our territory; to control it in other zones where it ruins and destroys; to overcome an abrupt orography that makes material and spiritual communications between Mexicans difficult; to find land susceptible to cultivation and to bear fruit; to banish sickness engendered by a hostile climate; to change the geography of complete zones to make them habitable; to reclaim the desert for production; to defend our lands from erosion that attacks us without mercy. Many and great are the physical limitations we have had to overcome and must continue to conquer.

This situation establishes economic development as a fundamental task. There is no inexorable design superior to our wills that assures us or denies us its possibilities: to obtain it depends on our efforts, on doing what we must do.

We live times that demand caution and decision. We are on the threshold of a development that sustains itself, since it generates development. This is the difficult stage of transition, in which we have to suffer, at the same time, the problems of underdevelopment as well as those of the beginning of development. To reach the next stage we must coordinate action, complete and integrate accomplishments, and initiate others in order to reach new goals.

The road of the Mexican Revolution takes us to our objective of economic development and this origin clearly establishes the ends that we pursue and the means to which we have recourse.

We seek economic development to fully utilize our natural resources, to provide productive and remunerative occupation to the growing population of Mexico, to raise the living standards of the great majorities of the Nation, to strengthen our independence and increase our capacity for international cooperation.

The basic problem of Mexico is the lack of capital as related to the utilization of its natural and human resources. To occupy our demographic growth productively and remuneratively and to eliminate unemployment, it is imperative that the Nation create approximately 400,000 new jobs per year. To attain this, we must create capital and be able to allocate it.

It is urgent that we expand the necessary consumption of the majority and reduce the unnecessary consumption of the minority.

Mexico must not create its capital by sacrificing fair wages nor by reducing the consumption of those in the lower income bracket. It would be unjust if the most needy were to support the full weight of our development.

To economically strengthen the majorities also creates capital, for there is no greater stimulus to economic growth than an ever-growing market. Without a market there is no production. And without purchasing power in the masses, there is no market. We reiterate that no business can prosper if surrounded by poverty.

The economic growth reached until now is the result of policies which were initiated in Mexico more than three decades ago: investment in infrastructure: irrigation, electrification, communications, nationalization of basic natural resources; the creation of fundamental industries and social reform in the labor area, as well as, and above all, in the agrarian area.

Direct foreign investment can play an important role to accelerate economic progress, and is welcome as long as it respects our laws, operates in a manner which complements our national effort, and helps in the attainment of the social objectives which guide our nation.

To consolidate and continue this growth we will be guided by the principle of balanced development. We must maintain a balance between farm and industrial production; between the exploitation and conservation of our natural resources; between the development of the different regions of the country, the different types of industry, the different economic and social investments, their effect, productivity, and recuperation; a balance, in short, between the creation of capital and its proper distribution.

We can no longer put off the fight against economic and social regional differences: To that end, we will carry forward full planning by regions, we will continue vigorous investment in infrastructure, we will erect poles of economic development in poverty-stricken zones, and will bring to reality the multiple activities which the full integration of the Indian communities in our national society may require. By attacking regional inequality we shall stop the exodus of the farm worker to urban areas and avoid unemployment. The reallocation of population, when this is inevitable, shall be carried out in a thoroughly planned and organized manner.

The indestructible solidarity in the common destiny is such that in this age no Mexican is alien to the fate of another Mexican, no matter how distant they may be. Either the benefits of progress are available to all, or there is no real progress.

Our general goal, based on numerous specific goals, is that the rate of annual growth shall not be less than 6 percent and the increase in annual per capita income be the highest possible.

Economic planning must begin with public financing. The three sectors which constitute the mixed economy of Mexico: public, private, and social, must operate coordinately and in a complementary manner avoiding conflict and interference.

I must repeat, once again, that public investment neither competes with private investment nor does it intend to supplant it. It substitutes it in basic resources, expressly reserved by the Constitution, or when private initiative does not want or cannot or does not know how to participate in fields in which the country needs investment. There is a vast field in Mexico for both types of investment and we still need more and better private initiative, and more and better public initiative.

Nothing needs unity as much as government, because government can be defined as unity of purpose.

More than in the creation of new governmental agencies I put my trust in unity of action and of thought, in the coordination between the diverse organs in order to serve the people more efficiently within our system of government.

We will counteract any tendency toward raising the cost of living, trying to avoid irritating and negative deflationary measures.

The preservation of monetary stability within our traditional free exchange, expanding at the same time our economic activity, requires a delicate financial policy which, without departing from a balanced budget and maintaining a circulation of currency in accordance with the production of goods and services and their exchange, may broaden the credit allotted to production and reduce that which is channeled to speculation. The selective orientation of credit applied simultaneously with vigor and flexibility, plays a decisive role in this respect.

Only for productive and self-liquidating investments, shall we use foreign credit, adhering strictly and at the same time to our capacity to pay.

It is up to our farm production to meet the growing demand for food. If the supply of food does not augment in the proportion required by the increase in the per capita income, this would be canceled by the rise in prices. Furthermore, farm production must supply raw material to industry and contribute to finance national economic progress.

We will stimulate the yield of our soil, we shall promote export of our products and we shall defend to the utmost their international price.

The greatest possible amount of financial resources shall be channeled to the rural sector, and we will encourage the participation of private banking.

The natural resources of Mexico sustain our economic development. The exploitation of the nonrenewable must be carried out in the benefit of the nation by creating with them riches and permanent sources of employment. The rational exploitation of the nonrenewable helps to create important industries and insures the supply of raw materials for the future.

A poorly exploited forest means dilapidation of resources and breaks down an important defense against erosion. A rational forest policy is in order * * * one that will neither result in sterile conservation nor in merciless exploitation.

Six million Mexicans, half of the working force of the nation, toil in the fields. For their benefit and that of the country we will carry agrarian reform to its ultimate conclusion: we will accelerate the distribution of land until that which is available is exhausted; all simulations, concealment and whatever other forms of violations of the law, will disappear, for outside of or against the law one can only live for a relatively short period of time, but never indefinitely; we will also be systematically against preversion in distribution, such as the concentration of land grants to farmworkers or the illegal subletting; we will insure the peaceful enjoyment of communal lands by the people and we shall provide ample guarantees to the authentic small property owners.

The agrarian problem is not only physical, but fundamentally human: population grows faster than the land that we can put at the disposal of the farmworkers. To complement this we must face the urgency of giving employment to the people who come to the cities because they no longer earn a living in the fields. We will not fool the farm laborer. Those to whom it is impossible to grant lands shall honestly and quickly be told so.

Granting of land is not enough to solve the agrarian problem: we know that the implements available in the majority of the "ejidos" are inadequate, that they not only require credit for sowing, but also to form, if only gradually, the necessary equipment to obtain better fields, as well as the acquisition of the knowledge that will make them better citizens and better farmers.

As far as possible, we will take to the fields the economic elements and the necessary technical and scientific efforts. The main thing is to make the land produce more and to accelerate the process of industrialization of its products.

The fields have contributed without reserve and in a basic manner to industrial development; today, industry must contribute to resolve the problems of the fields.

These questions are intimately related to the economic and social growth of the nation.

To conquer them we will meet new problems with courage and will not fear the solutions which some of them are urgently demanding.

Mexico, through it agrarian reform, foresaw, by many years, the international recommendations which today qualify it as a previous requirement for economic development.

Agrarian reform is on the march and it will continue forward until it is integral.

Speeding up of our economy warrants a decisive policy of public works. We must continue small, medium, and large irrigation projects; we must complete our national communications network with new highways and roads to transport food and encourage trade; we must complete the rehabilitation of our railways; we must adapt and build ports which are close to important commercial zones, we must improve our own highway transportation system and consolidate our national merchant marine.

Without basically balanced and integrated industries our industrial progress will be precarious. We will contribute toward realization of its expansion plans by coordinating private initiative with that of the state.

As refers to basic state industry, primarily with regard to oil and electricity, we will stimulate expansion that will anticipate demand and foster other economic development. Integration of the petrochemical industry will permit us, within a short time, to have a diversified chemical industry. Basic petrochemistry constitutes a national industry.

The industrial movement of Mexico must be at the service of Mexico, but this is not so when it enriches a few but impoverishes many through persistent low productivity, through poor localization, through low wages and through exorbitant profits or high prices.

We will try to avoid industrial deformations which translate themselves into increasing pressures which affect prices, aggravating natural inflationary tendencies.

An adequate highway and transportation system will provide the smoother flow which is required by the interchange of commerce and transportation of people. In like manner, it is the basis of the promotion of foreign commerce and for obtaining new levels of national and international tourism.

In international tourism we not only see an important source of foreign currencies, but also a means of bringing our peoples closer together in order to attain a better understanding among men; the type of understanding which is so urgently needed in the world in which we live.

Work should enhance the dignity of the individual and not depress it. We shall fight against necessity which reduces freedom. No Mexican should become so strong, and let us reiterate this, that he may oppress another—nor so weak that he may see himself oppressed by his equal.

The right of association in a union and the right to strike constitute inviolable guarantees. The conscience which the labor movement has derived from its own strength reaffirms the rights of a union when they are exercised in a responsible manner toward aims of revindication, improvement and solidarity, which have been assigned by law.

A sense of security in one's work, adequate wages, social security, profit sharing, all are instruments whose purpose it is to raise consistently the standard of living for the worker.

The extension of social security, the improvement of fringe benefits and the inclusion of others, shall be the permanent objective of the Government. We intend that social welfare reach the largest possible number of Mexicans. We must coordinate the work of the different organisms of social security and branches of public health in order to avoid duplicity of effort and investment. Hospitals, clinics, sanatoriums, and dispensaries must cover the country as sole and interwoven network of services that will convert into a practical possibility the right of the Mexican to combat disease with the help of science.

We will take particular care in extending preventative medicine, the basis of which is environmental health. Demographic growth and industrialization present a deficit with regard to housing which has not been met despite governmental zeal. The necessities are great and force us to avoid dispersion and disorder. We will systematize the work of the different organisms which are directly or indirectly concerned with the policy of popular housing seeking not only to build new units, but also to condition and improve those which do not fill the minimum requirements.

We will establish a plan of social credit for the construction and improvement of popular housing. We have the support of the construction industry, the organs of social security, and private as well as national banking.

The construction industry must modernize itself from its foundations, with a tendency toward reducing costs.

The direction of our education is founded in history and moves toward the future. Mere teaching is not education. Education is teaching with ethical, historical, and social content. It does not end in the schoolroom; for there, only the basis is set to develop in harmony all of the faculties of the human beings and to install in him, at the same time, the love of country and the conscience of international solidarity based on independence and justice.

Equal opportunities for all Mexicans, in accordance with their vocation and aptitude is the supreme goal of our social development and this requires an educational system that will relentlessly attack ignorance, starting with illiteracy.

Elementary, medium, and higher education nourish each other and it is not possible to advance in one if we hold back in another. Their vigorization, by elevating and extending them harmoniously, is the unavoidable duty of all Mexicans.

The centers of higher culture, universities, normal, polytechnic and technological schools will receive constant support.

Our people demand even greater learning of greater education. Our educational needs have no boundaries: and our efforts must be in accordance with those unlimited necessities.

Therefore, the budgets for education will show increase in a sustained manner to provide the tools, from free text books, to higher education and investigation, limited only by the possibilities of the country and the necessary equilibrium between the investment for economic development and intellectual investment.

We concede special importance to the educational forces that operate outside the school in a direct and tenacious manner, creating opinions, preferential systems, and styles of conduct. We will try to utilize them adequately by means of coordinating the resources which science and modern techniques placed at the service of human culture. As important as the scholastic work is that of cultural diffusion.

We do not exclude private participation in educational endeavors; it can and must be augmented when it is adjusted to our constitutional concepts and national programs, and concurs with a sense of service and not one of profit only.

The resources which industry may devote to technological research, to professional formation and to the training of laborers will contribute to national prosperity and development of industry itself.

Education channeled toward productive work is vital to modern Mexico. We must rapidly prepare all our personnel, from the high-ranking scientist to the semiqualified laborer that Mexico demands. The need for hand labor of a higher level grows faster than the number of qualified laborers. We will connect educational planning with employment policy in an effort to balance supply and demand of qualified and semiqualified labor forces.

I ask for unanimous cooperation and, particularly, from those who participate in the gigantic task of national education, so that we may increase our intellectual investment as well as its benefits. Our people have such an urgency for education that it must be considered as a crime against the country if there is any educational decline derived from the lack of discipline, negligence, discord, loss or waste of resources, energy or time.

The colossal job that it is, national education cannot wait nor be delayed one hour, not even one moment which rightly should be devoted to it; no pretext is valid before the people to interfere with or reduce the efficiency of educational work which requires love, emotion, and constant dedication.

The outstanding fact in international affairs is that the postwar period is over. The world is on the threshold of a new historic era whose characteristics cannot yet be precisely defined; but we can venture that they will be different from those of the immediate past.

Naturally, the spectacular conquest of man in the infinitely great, such as outer space, and in the amazing minuteness of the atom, gives the impression that the borderline between the possible and the impossible has been erased. It now seems that everything is possible, or will be very shortly. This is perhaps one of the reasons which explain the impatience of those who for centuries suffered and waited and that is bringing them much closer together than any of the ideologies which were willed to us by the 19th century.

The mere fact that we live in these fascinating moments of human history signifies an immense responsibility, greater still if one occupies a position of command.

My voice is that of a typical Mexican, like many other Mexicans; however, the vote fully expressed by my people makes me the voice of Mexico. I wish that the message carried by that voice be one of optimism and harmony; but I want it to carry also my appeal to all peoples, and very specially to those whose greater power invests them with greater responsibilities so that they may use that power in a joint struggle or at least use it in a parallel manner, against the enemies or mankind: poverty, ignorance, sickness, insecurity, injustice, bellicose fanaticism, all of which are sterile remnants of a world which has already ceased to exist. Why is it that if man has achieved such spectacular victories in technology and in science, how can one conceive that he cannot advance in that which is political, economical, or social.

The most elevated idealism as well as the most elementary commonsense inspires one to defend peace because today peace is a requisite for the survival of man. To want peace is to fight against the conditions that make war possible. We are partisans of disarmament starting with denuclearization. We hold that peace can only be guaranteed in the measure in which objective conditions are created which will make all peoples join in its consolidation.

We must repeat that peace is not only the absence of war, but effective cooperation between nations to face the ancestral problems which have afflicted man in all latitudes. Only by means of a great conjunction of efforts can we firmly establish the basis for a true peace, which even then, shall require bold and permanent efforts to maintain it in its true sense.

Mexican international policy is determined by essential principles, and not by whims or arbitrary attitudes of men, for we are perishable. It is the product of our struggling history and a result of our unrelinquishable experience. It nourishes on old ideals and is implemented in accordance to principles of permanent validity. In a world such as that of our times, of fast changes, our international policy is, and must also continue to be, an instrument to serve the integral development of the community.

Mexico projects itself in the panorama of our era as a nation that confirms, each day with greater vigor, its independence. It is, nevertheless, an independence which is conscious that no country, rich or poor, big or small, weak or powerful, can live isolated. This conviction, together with the cordial and open spirit of the Mexican, leads us to offer and desire the friendship with all the peoples of the world, understanding as friendship that sentiment that begins by respecting the integrity and dignity of the friend, that insists in understanding him, in order to serve him better. It is the noblest bond that can unite men.

Our ambition is that the individual may decide his own destiny in society, and that each community, based on that right, freely reach its own destiny.

Nonintervention and the right of self-determination are principles that we have maintained invariably for more than a century.

We were born in an era of anticolonialism and in the past we suffered invasions, aggressions, and interventions. Therefore, it is the essence of our nationality to condemn any preeminence of one country over another, no matter where it comes from or the form or shape it takes.

Reason and right tell us that among men, as among peoples, there is no conflict that cannot be solved by peaceful means. We feel we have a special responsibility to fight for this principle in inter-American relations.

When the mighty bows before justice, his attitude does not diminish or debase him, rather it honors and ennobles him; as for the weak, law has always been his best shield.

In moments in which the world shortens its distance, but enlarges its problems, national and international solidarity must be made stronger and tighter.

We are firmly convinced that peace and international cooperation need efficient operation and vigorization of the general and specialized international organs, such as the United Nations and the regional inter-American agencies. We will not deny them our support.

When Mexico proposes a policy of independence for itself, we are thinking of the full independence of all nations, so from their participation, voluntarily agreed to be nations equal and free, authentic international solidarity will be born.

We have developed, and continue to develop, thanks mainly to our own efforts, although we recognize the cooperation that we have honorably received. We believe we have good reason to state that in vast regions of the world, and of course some in our own hemisphere, there are countries that need foreign aid much more than others, and have a right to receive it through procedures respectful of their dignity, sovereignty, and way of being.

If in the domestic sphere it was possible to check many injustices through systems such as social security, minimum wages, and guaranteed prices, there is no reason why in the international sphere, and specifically in the regulation of trade and financial cooperation, a moral conscience of justice, human solidarity would also be a healthy foresight. We cannot avoid the growth of the distance between the well-being of the few, in the face of the poverty of the many, if only these latter are willing to work toward that end. We know that, fundamentally, not even well-being or happiness comes to anyone from the outside.

We will continue to make efforts so that specially in the vital orbit of foreign trade, cooperation will turn into formulas that combine equity and efficiency.

Mexico desires peace for all the world; it wants the friendship of all peoples, but obviously stronger and warmer, with the nations that constitute the hemispheric community.

To our immediate neighbors, north and south, we reiterate the decided will to make our relations with them an example of a cordial and constructive way of living together.

The Punta del Este Charter gave the solemnity of a hemispheric obligation to goals that for a long time guided the efforts of the Mexican people, in the noblest of their struggles.

It leaves to each country the responsibility of planning and guiding its progress; but makes social justice a condition of it, and adopts cooperation as a supplementary instrument, although indispensable, in the noble, long and difficult task of raising the standard of living that is so dishearteningly low in many rural areas of the Americas.

It is unfair to Mexico to be pointed at as wishful of turning into the leader of Latin America. We do not seek this nor do we desire it. Within the Latin American community Mexico could go, according to circumstances, ahead or behind, or in a middle position, in some aspects of our life; but it aspires only to be just another member in the group that joins its efforts for the common improvement.

What Mexico wholeheartedly wishes is to be a brother to its brothers of Latin America.

Congressmen, Senators, Justices of the Supreme Court: In our past, there is a long historical process to guard and to cherish, and a dreamed-of tomorrow to be fulfilled.

History, to be real history, must tend to close disputes that belong to the past and not revive old rancors; for history to be noble, it must be an efficient instrument of present harmony on which to base a fruitful effort, capable of creating a better future.

The use of the best of our past should be the premise and prize of the tasks that the country demands. Our continued path gives us, with the insurgents, an unwavering will for independence; with the Reform, an imperishable will for freedom; with the revolution, a nonvariant will for social justice.

Overcoming apparent contradictions, we must link permanently these three wills in order to fulfill the destinies of Mexico.

The souls of our illustrious dead watch over us in our struggle; they have never abandoned us; but under their guidance, the Mexicans, all of us, must make efforts, each day, not only in the free exercise of our rights, but also in the strict fulfillment of our duties.

The Mexican woman is with us in this undertaking. Her decorum, delicateness, her exceptional qualities, have given dignity and nobility to political activities. Her tenderness, that traditionally she kept only for her home, is projected now toward the vast limits of the country.

New generations emerge to national life. The young receive, every day, opportunities to become better prepared; they are therefore each day more indebted to the nation, obliged to fight for a great cause, a just and pure cause: the cause of Mexico. In the joint efforts, we can count on Mexican youth, with their constantly renewed vigor for the struggles, full of generosity and gallantry that the country may require; confident that they will always know how to defend the noble banners of peace, equality, security, and justice.

A fruitful period of Mexican history ends. President Lopez Mateos increased our spiritual and physical patrimony: he enlarged our country in all orders; he took Mexico to the world, with its ideas and hopes of universal brotherhood; he was concerned for the fate of all Mexicans, within the concert of the great family formed by mankind. Today I receive from his hands the spotless flag of Mexico.

Power, simply as power, lacks attraction. What is more, it leads to a lessening of the person that intends to use it in such a sterile manner, and in a moral breakdown of the people unfortunate enough to suffer him.

Power is responsibility, the gravest, the most relentless of all responsibilities; it implies total dedication, the most absolute surrender of oneself.

I called for the vote of the Mexican people knowing that electoral victory would entail that responsibility to my people, the most sacred responsibility of my entire life, determined to fulfill it to the utmost limit of my strength.

A man, however, even if inflamed with the most fervent passion for his country, and invested with the highest republican representation, needs the assistance of all his compatriots to give direction and true range to his country. The mandatary, that is, he who responds to the mandate of the community, receives with the free expression of the will of the people, the strength that supports his action, and never the other way around. The mandatary, as I see it, must be a servant: he who serves, he who watches over, he who guards, he who caters to the common well-being. The great Morelos wished to be called "Servant of the people," when he was offered the title of generalissimo.

Those who have accepted to share the tasks of the executive power know with me that we are Mexicans equal to the rest and we are not different from our compatriots except in that we have greater responsibilities and a greater obligation to serve, because that is precisely what we are: servants of the people. And we must be so without arrogance, without disappointments, with loyalty, with efficiency, with honesty as a standard and not as a merit, and expecting, as our only real compensation, the satisfaction of having done our duty.

As for me, I put my seal on this great obligation: all interests which are genuinely Mexican shall be sacred to me. I shall watch so that nothing or no one will diminish them. And by genuinely Mexican I understand that which has the warmth of Mexico, that which places the supreme interest of Mexico above any other interest, that which moves man, woman and child to passionately love Mexico.

From the very heart of the Mexican people I come and to them I must return; they gave inspiration and sense to my life; they are my only comfort and my only strength;

they have given me great and undeserved honors, and in my hands they have confidently deposited their hope. I give myself fully to the task of understanding, obeying and serving my people.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to pay my respects to the work that has been done by the Senator from Montana in improving our relationships with the Republic of Mexico—not that the Republic of Mexico was not friendly to the United States to begin with. But the work that has been done by the Senator from Montana, and also by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse] the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman] and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright], has added materially to the mutual esteem which now prevails between the two countries.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator from Vermont. The distinguished senior Senator from Vermont has had much to do with bringing about a better understanding and a better respect between our two nations.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on American Republics Affairs.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to take a moment to express deep appreciation to the Senator from Montana for the able leadership that he provided as the head of our delegation to Mexico at the time of the inauguration, recently, of the new President of Mexico. Over the years, the Senator from Montana has been one of the very best friends that Mexico has had in the U.S. Senate. In carrying out that service, he has also performed a great service for the people of the United States in helping to strengthen United States-Mexican relations.

I share the high opinion of the new President of Mexico, expressed by the Senator from Montana. One need only read the inaugural address, which the Senator from Montana has just placed in the Congressional Record, to obtain adequate support of my high appraisal of the new President of Mexico.

Next month, the month of February, we shall again have our annual Inter-Parliamentary Conference between representatives of the Congress of the United States and the Congress of Mexico. It will be held this year in Mexico. A good many of the problems that exist between the two countries, problems referred to by the Senator from Montana and also referred to in the briefing this morning in the Committee on Foreign Relations by Mr. Mann, Assistant Secretary of State for Latin American Affairs, will be taken up at that Conference. As the Senator from Montana and all other members of the Committee on Foreign Relations know, these annual conferences at the parliamentary level have undoubtedly produced good results in strengthening relationships between Mexico and the United States. Our water problems, our salinization problems, our border problems, and even some of our migratory labor problems have been helped very much in the reaching of a better solution as a result of parliamentarians getting together.

I commend my leader for the great work that he has done in strengthening relations between the peoples of these two great Republics.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Oregon.

APPOINTMENT BY THE PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Pursuant to Public Law 86–1, the Chair appoints the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Talmadge] to be a member of the Joint Economic Committee, vice the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pell], excused.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

Report on Title I Agreements Under Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954

A letter from the Associate Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on title I agreements under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, for the month of December, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Report on Reapportionment of an Appropriation

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, that the appropriation for the Forest Service for "Forest protection and utilization" for the fiscal year 1965 had been reapportioned on a basis indicating the need for a supplemental estimate of appropriation (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations.

Amendment of Provisions of Law Relating to Settlement of Admiralty Claims

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend provisions of law relating to the settlement of admiralty claims (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Amendment of Title 10, United States Code, To Provide Gold Star Lapel Buttons for Next of Kin of Certain Members of the Armed Forces

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide gold star lapel buttons for the next of kin of members of the Armed Forces who lost or lose their lives in war or as a result of cold war incidents (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Payment of Incentive Pay for Performance of Certain Duties

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize payment of incentive pay for the performance of hazardous duty on the flight deck of an aircraft carrier (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Amendment of Chapter 147, Title 10, United States Code, Relating to Disposition of Certain Telephone Facilities

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend chapter 147 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, to dispose of telephone facilities by negotiated sale (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Amendment to Title 37, United States Code, Relating to Payment of Special Allowances to Certain Dependents of Members of the Uniformed Services

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 37, United States Code, to authorize payment of special allowances to dependents of members of the uniformed services to offset expenses incident to their evacuation, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report of Federal Aviation Agency

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that agency, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

Report of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co.

A letter from the vice president, the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that company, for the calendar year 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Contributions to Certain Inhabitants of the Ryukyu Islands

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize a contribution to certain inhabitants of the Ryukyu Islands for death and injury of persons, and for use of and damage to private property, arising from acts and omissions of the U.S. Armed Forces, or members thereof, after August 15, 1945, and before April 28, 1952 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Audit Report on Federal Prison Industries, Inc.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on Federal Prison Industries, Inc., Department of Justice, fiscal year 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Examination of Financial Statements, Fiscal Year 1964, Commodity Credit Corporation

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on examination of financial statements, fiscal year 1964, Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Restriction of Certain Areas in the Outer Continental Shelf (Corpus Christi Offshore Warning Area)

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the restriction of certain areas in the Outer Continental Shelf, known as the Corpus Christi offshore warning area, for defense purposes, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Report on Quality of Water, Colorado River Basin

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a progress report on quality of water, Colorado River Basin, dated January 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE, RELATING TO PENALTIES FOR INTERFERENCE WITH DEFENSE SECURITY SYSTEMS

A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect the security of the United States by providing penalties for interference with defense security systems (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CAPT. TED M. RICHARDSON

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Capt. Ted M. Richardson, U.S. Air Force (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

A letter from the Assistant Attorney General for Administration, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by that department, during the fiscal year 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

LEWIS H. NELSON III

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Lewis H. Nelson III (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

TERENCE J. O'DONNELL, THOMAS P. WILCOX, AND CLIFFORD M. SPRINGBERG

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Terence J. O'Donnell, Thomas P. Wilcox, and Clifford M. Springberg (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS ON APPROVAL OF PETITIONS TO ACCORD FIRST PREFERENCE STATUS TO CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports on approval of petitions to accord first preference status to certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF BOARD OF ACTUARIES, CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT SYSTEM

A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Board of Actuaries, Civil Service Retirement System, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

JOINT RESOLUTION OF NEW JERSEY LEGISLATURE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, as follows:

ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 28—STATE OF NEW JERSEY

Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to implement the Federal Flood Insurance Act of 1956

Whereas the Congress of the United States, in 1956, enacted the Federal Flood Insurance Act of 1956; and

Whereas the Congress found in said act that "In the case of recurring natural disasters, including recurring floods, insurance protection against individual and public loss is not always practically available through private or public sources"; and

Whereas the avowed purpose of said act was to establish a program of Federal insurance and reinsurance against the risk of floods and to encourage private insurance covering such flood risks; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States has heretofore failed to appropriate the funds necessary to implement the Federal Flood Insurance Act of 1956; and

Whereas since 1956 there have been numerous disasters, storms, and floods in many of the States of this Nation, causing untold damage to public and private property; and

Whereas in the State of New Jersey, as a result of the storm and flood of March 1962 alone, the damage to public and private property exceeded $100 million; and

Whereas the public and private losses suffered as a result of such storms and floods has caused widespread distress and hardship adversely affecting the general welfare without regard to State boundary lines; and

Whereas much of said distress and hardship could have been avoided, reduced or guarded against if the Federal Flood Insurance Act of 1956 had been properly and adequately implemented at the time of its original passage; and

Whereas it is in the common interest of all of the States of this Nation to support the program of insurance protection provided for in the Federal Flood Insurance Act of 1956; and

Whereas it appears timely for the Legislature of the State of New Jersey to renew the request for action in this regard previously made by Joint Resolution 5 of the 1962 legislature: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and General Assembly of the State of New Jersey:

1. The Congress of the United States is memorialized to enact the legislation necessary to fully implement the Federal Flood Insurance Act of 1956.

2. The secretary of state shall transmit forthwith a duly attested copy of this resolution to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, the Senators from New Jersey and to each member of the House of Representatives of the United States elected from New Jersey.

3. This joint resolution shall take effect immediately.

ROBERT M. FALERY,
Acting Secretary of State.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

John A. Carver, Jr., of Idaho, to be Under Secretary of the Interior.

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Commerce:

John T. Connor, of New Jersey, to be Secretary of Commerce.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Ralph A. Dungan, of Pennsylvania, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Chile;

William H. Sullivan, of Rhode Island, a Foreign Service officer of the class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Kingdom of Laos;

William A. Crawford, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Rumania;

Ben H. Brown, Jr., of South Carolina, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Liberia; and

Antonio Certosimo, of Arizona, and sundry other persons, for appointment and promotion in the Foreign Service.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 364. A bill for the relief of Pericles Ioanis Zombolas;

S. 365. A bill for the relief of Leonardo Storino;

S. 366. A bill for the relief of Maria Papakonstantinou; and

S. 367. A bill for the relief of Kiriakos Delalis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LAUSCHE (for himself, Mr. SCOTT, and Mr. HARTKE):

S. 368. A bill to provide for a study by the Secretary of the Interior of strip and surface mining operations in the United States and for a report to Congress of the results of such study, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. LAUSCHE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. TALMADGE:

S. 369. A bill for the relief of Philip R. Codd; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE (for himself, Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. CLARK, and Mr. RANDOLPH):

S. 370. A bill to strengthen and improve educational quality and educational opportunities in the Nations' elementary and secondary schools; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. MORSE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 371. A bill for the relief of Zofia Walasek and her daughter, Barbara Walasek;

S. 372. A bill for the relief of Antonio Jesus Senra (Rodriguez) and his wife, Mercedes M. Miranda de Senra;

S. 373. A bill for the relief of Dr. Victor M. Ubieta;

S. 374. A bill for the relief of Dr. Guillermo Castrillo (Fernandez); and

S. 375. A bill for the relief of Pedro Antonio Julio Sanchez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 376. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to impose a duty upon the importation of certain bread; and

S. 377. A bill to increase benefits under the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system, to provide child's insurance benefits beyond age 18 while in school, to provide widow's benefits at age 60 on a reduced basis, to provide benefits for certain individuals not otherwise eligible at age 72, to improve the actuarial status of the Trust Funds, to extend coverage, to improve the public assistance programs under the Social Security Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. DODD:

S. 378. A bill for the relief of Luka Pecarina;

S. 379. A bill for the relief of Mitar Damjanovic; and

S. 380. A bill for the relief of Vukota Vukadinovic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

S. 381. A bill for the relief of Roy O. Riddle; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOGGS:

S. 382. A bill for the relief of Canelos Roditis;

S. 383. A bill for the relief of Ejnar Christen Pedersen;

S. 384. A bill for the relief of Ioannis (John) Van Vures;

S. 385. A bill for the relief of Dr. Ali Ziarati Hameli;

S. 386. A bill for the relief of Lena Woo Djeu and Vung-Shung Djeu (also known as Victor Djeu);

S. 387. A bill for the relief of Eugenia Kuntic and Ivan Kuntic;

S. 388. A bill for the relief of Dr. Chong Hyok Un; and

S. 389. A bill for the relief of Teresa Marangon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOGGS (for himself, Mr. Williams of Delaware, Mr. Scott, Mr. Johnston, and Mr. Brewster):

S. 390. A bill to extend to volunteer fire companies the rates of postage on second-class and third-class bulk mailings applicable to certain nonprofit organizations; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. Boggs when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HAYDEN (for himself and Mr. Cooper):

S. 391. A bill to provide for the acquisition of certain property in square 758 in the District of Columbia, as an addition to the grounds of the U.S. Supreme Court Building; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MORTON:

S. 392. A bill for the relief of Dr. Salwan Baban; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FANNIN:

S. 393. A bill for the relief of Lim Wey Nan John (or John Wey Nan Lim), and Maude Lim (or Lim Wang Maude Luella); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOWER:

S. 394. A bill for the relief of Alexa Daniel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself, Mr. Aiken, Mr. Cotton, Mr. Morton, Mr. Prouty, and Mr. Scott):

S. 395. A bill to amend the Social Security Act so as to provide Federal financial assistance for establishing and maintaining State programs of voluntary health insurance for the aged; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Saltonstall when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. METCALF:

S. 396. A bill to provide needed facilities and services not otherwise available for the accommodation of visitors in the areas administered by the National Park Service, by authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to guarantee loans which are part of concessioner investments in such facilities and services, and for other purposes; and

S. 397. A bill relating to the establishment of concession policies in the areas administered by National Park Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ELLENDER:

S. 398. A bill to authorize extension of conservation reserve contracts through 1965, and increase the limit on annual payments under the cropland conversion program to $20,000,000; and

S. 399. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, and to encourage the reduction of excess marketings of milk, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. McINTYRE:

S. 400. A bill to authorize assistance under the Area Redevelopment Act for certain additional areas which have sustained, or are about to sustain, sudden and severe economic hardship; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. McIntyre when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BARTLETT:

S. 401. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to grant relief concerning an oil and gas lease; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. NEUBERGER:

S. 402. A bill for the relief of Oh Wha Ja (Penny Korleen Doughty); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

S. 403. A bill for the relief of certain persons who were employed by the L. L. Constantin Electronics Corporation;

S. 404. A bill for the relief of Gizella Bruder; and

S. 405. A bill for the relief of Gabriel A. Nahas, Vera Nahas, Albert Gabriel Nahas, and Frederika-Maria Nahas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 406. A bill to suspend for a temporary period the import duty on polyethylene imine; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 407. A bill to provide for the expansion of the Beverly National Cemetery, Beverly, N.J.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. Bartlett, Mr. Bible, Mr. Montoya, Mr. Cooper, Mr. Morse, Mr. Moss, Mr. Randolph, and Mr. Yarborough):

S. 408. A bill to authorize a study of methods of helping to provide financial assistance to victims of future flood disasters; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. Williams of New Jersey when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 409. A bill for the relief of Betty Tin-Sang Chan Cho;

S. 410. A bill for the relief of Jakob Blagaich (also known as Jakov Blagaic);

S. 411. A bill for the relief of Regidor Nava Aguirre (also known as Felipe Capulong);

S. 412. A bill for the relief of Vito Portuese and his sisters, Maria Portuese and Maddalena Portuese;

S. 413. A bill for the relief of Felipa Quintero Sanchez;

S. 414. A bill for the relief of Alfonso Ruiz Coronado (also known as Francisco Ojeba); and

S. 415. A bill for the relief of Roberto Biteranta Mejorada; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McINTYRE:

S. 416. A bill for the relief of Sister Aurora Martin Gelado (also known as Sister Nieve); and

S. 417. A bill for the relief of Miss Wladyslawa Kowalczyk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONDALE:

S. 418. A bill for the relief of Laura Poblete Carbonell;

S. 419. A bill for the relief of Dr. Soon Duk Koh; and

S. 420. A bill for the relief of Jessie Hunter Todd; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

S. 421. A bill to provide certain increases in annuities payable from the civil service retirement and disability fund; and

S. 422. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, to provide for the recomputation of annuities of certain retired employees who elected reduced annuities at the time of retirement in order to provide survivor annuities for their spouses, and for the recomputation of survivor annuities for the surviving spouses of certain former employees who died in service or after retirement; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 423. A bill to provide a residence for congressional and Supreme Court pages; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. Yarborough when he introduced the first two above-mentioned bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. MOSS:

S. 424. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Army to convey certain land in the State of Utah to the Cerebral Palsy Center for Multiple Handicapped, Salt Lake County, Utah; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 425. A bill authorizing construction of a dam and reservoir on Mill Creek in Grand County, Utah, in the interest of flood control and allied purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. Moss when he introduce the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JACKSON (by request):

S. 426. A bill to provide for the restriction of certain areas in the Outer Continental Shelf (known as the Eastern Test Range) for defense purposes, and for other purposes;

S. 427. A bill to provide for the restriction of certain areas in the Outer Continental Shelf for defense purposes, and for other purposes (Gulf Test Range, Gulf of Mexico); and

S. 428. A bill to provide for the restriction of a certain area in the Outer Continental Shelf for defense purposes, and for other purposes (Matagorda water range); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Jackson when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McCARTHY:

S. 429. A bill for the relief of Khachik H. Tatian;

S. 430. A bill for the relief of Jessie Hunter Todd; and

S. 431. A bill for the relief of Behjat Bakshian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 432. A bill to establish the office of Deputy President, to provide for the continuous discharge of the powers and duties of the office of President, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the remarks of Mr. McCarthy when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SIMPSON (for himself and Mr. McGee):

S. 433. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell certain land in Lander, Wyo., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. Simpson when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CHURCH:

S. 434. A bill for the relief of Juan Pablo Castano Zapata; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHURCH (for himself and Mr. Jordan of Idaho):

S. 435. A bill to extend the boundaries of the Kaniksu National Forest in the State of Idaho, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Church when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SCOTT:

S. 436. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Scott when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DODD:

S. 437. A bill to authorize the disposal, without regard to the prescribed 6-month waiting period, of zinc from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 438. A bill to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to regulate the manufacture, compounding, processing, distribution, delivery, and possession of habit-forming barbiturate drugs, amphetamine, and other habit-forming central nervous system stimulant drugs, and other drugs that have a potential for abuse resulting in psychotoxic effects or antisocial behavior; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Dodd when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. HART:

S. 439. A bill for the relief of Samy Antoun Kassab, Geliana Antoun Kassab, Bader Antoun Kassab, Julet Antoun Kassab, and Adel Antoun Kassab;

S. 440. A bill for the relief of Jose L. Rodriguez;

S. 441. A bill for the relief of Amir H. Mehregan;

S. 442. A bill for the relief of Carleen Coen;

S. 443. A bill for the relief of Resan Rokad;

S. 444. A bill for the relief of Christina Zielinski (formerly Krystyna, Widz);

S. 445. A bill for the relief of Francesco Scardina, his wife, Maria, and their children, Salvatore and Antonia;

S. 446. A bill for the relief of Wilhelm Konyen, his wife, Susanne Fritsch Konyen, and their children, Susanne Konyen and Willy Konyen;

S. 447. A bill for the relief of Romeo D. Brion;

S. 448. A bill for the relief of Modesta Ogoy;

S. 449. A bill for the relief of Stanislaw Bialoglowski;

S. 450. A bill for the relief of William John Campbell McCaughey;

S. 451. A bill for the relief of Dev Kumar Mojunder;

S. 452. A bill for the relief of Vladimir Stakich; and

S. 453. A bill for the relief of Kraemer Mills, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 454. A bill for the relief of Lee Hyang Na; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FONG:

S. 455. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Kum Soon Kim; and

S. 456. A bill for the relief of Koon Chew Ho; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURDICK (for himself, Mr. Young of North Dakota, Mr. Nelson, Mr. McGovern, Mrs. Neuberger, and Mr. McCarthy):

S. 457. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act, as amended, in respect of the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission over nonprofit cooperatives; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. TOWER:

S. 458. A bill to provide educational assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces in the southeast Asia theater of operations; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 459. A bill to designate Vietnam as a combat zone for Federal tax purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Tower when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BAYH (for himslf and Mr. Hartke):

S. 460. A bill authorizing construction of a deep-draft harbor by the State of Indiana on the shore of Lake Michigan in the vicinity of Burns Waterway, and assumption by the Federal Government of an appropriate part of the cost of construction thereof; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. Bayh when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DODD:

S. 461. A bill to provide that the 12th day of October in each year, known as Columbus Day, shall be a national holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Dodd when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JACKSON:

S. 462. A bill for the relief of Moise Negrea; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARTKE:

S. 463. A bill for the relief of Simo Miskin; and

S. 464. A bill for the relief of Milorad Segrt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

S. 465. A bill for the relief of Luisa Gertrudes Goncalves; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 466. A bill to amend the Administrative Procedure Act to provide for the disclosure of certain communications received by Government agencies from Members of Congress with respect to adjudicatory matters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Javits when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MORSE (for himself and Mrs. Neuberger):

S. 467. A bill authorizing construction of a navigation project at Port Orford, Oreg.; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 468. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain lands situated in the State of Oregon to the city of Roseburg, Oreg.; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Morse when he introduced the first above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. FONG:

S. 469. A bill for the relief of Timoteo A. Tuazon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. Tower):

S.J. Res. 20. Joint resolution providing for the establishment of a Commission on the Revision of Federal Agricultural Laws and Programs; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. Javits when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTIONS

TO PRINT AS A SENATE DOCUMENT A HISTORY OF THE PIMA INDIANS AND THE SAN CARLOS IRRIGATION PROJECT

Mr. HAYDEN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 22); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. Res. 22

Resolved, That there be printed as a Senate document a history of the Pima Indians and the San Carlos irrigation project.

TO PRINT AS A SENATE DOCUMENT CERTAIN CENSUSES OF THE TERRITORY OF NEW MEXICO AND TERRITORY OF ARIZONA

Mr. HAYDEN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 23); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. Res. 23

Resolved, That there be printed as a Senate document excerpts from the decennial census of 1860 for Arizona County in the Territory of New Mexico, excerpts from the decennial Federal census of 1870 for the Territory of Arizona, together with excerpts from the Special Territorial Census of 1864 taken in Arizona under the authority of the Act of September 9, 1850 (9 Stat. 448).

INVESTIGATION OF CERTAIN MATTERS RELATING TO MIGRATORY LABOR BY COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 24); which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

S. Res. 24

Resolved, That the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to migratory labor including, but not limited to, such problems as (a) the wages of migratory workers, their working conditions, transportation facilities, housing, health, and educational opportunities for migrants and their children, (b) the nature of and the relationships between the programs of the Federal Government and the programs of State and local governments and the activities of private organizations dealing with the problems of migratory workers, and (c) the degree of additional Federal action necessary in this area.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1965, to January 31, 1966, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,105 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1966.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $75,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

ARMING OF AMERICAN SERVICEMEN FIGHTING IN VIETNAM

Mr. TOWER submitted a resolution (S. Res. 25) expressing the sense of the Senate as to the arming of American servicemen fighting in Vietnam, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. Tower, which appears under a separate heading.)

CODE OF ETHICS FOR MEMBERS, OFFICERS, AND EMPLOYEES OF THE SENATE

Mr. JAVITS submitted a resolution (S. Res. 26) to provide a code of ethics for Members, officers, and employees of the Senate, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. Javits, which appears under a separate heading.)

STRIP MINE RECLAMATION STUDY BILL

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleagues, the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hartke], the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott], and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for a study by the Secretary of the Interior of strip and surface mining operations in the United States and for a report to Congress of the results of such study.

Strip and surface mining operations in many sections of our country, in recent years, have made possible the tapping of some of our mineral resources in quantities of great magnitude and at costs far below those of deep-shaft and other mining methods. While one might justifiably say this progress has been beneficial to our economy as a whole, nevertheless, we must face the fact that it also, in a majority of instances, has destroyed all other usefulness of the land and has left abominable, grotesque scars. Plainly stating it, Mr. President, in many areas the land has been robbed of its resources and abandoned to the wrath of the elements. Time alone will not heal these wounds.

There are large areas in Ohio and other States where, as a result of stripping operations, public highways have suffered severe damage by reason of slippage; streams, lakes, and wells have been polluted; wildlife cover has been destroyed; and, finally, the entire areas themselves have been abandoned as unproductive and virtual wasteland. The future economy of these areas is seriously threatened.

Mr. President, during my administration as Governor of Ohio, after many unsuccessful attempts, there was finally enacted a strip mine reclamation law requiring strip mine operators to restore the usefulness of the land by a degree of leveling of the spoil banks and planting of them in grasses and trees. While the law has been helpful in land restoration, I have always felt that it should have required more strict conservation measures. Faced with almost insurmountable opposition, it was the best that I could get.

While some other States have had some strip mining regulation laws enacted in recent years, there remain throughout the country thousands upon thousands of acres of pre-law spoil banks, which can, it is my belief, be converted to some useful purpose with a little help.

Strip and surface mining operations are no longer confined to the once-limited areas. These operations are spreading daily in many of the mineral producing States. With the cooperation of the several States and the Department of the Interior, as my bill provides, a very beneficial land use study would be made in order that the Congress could determine in what manner and in what degree it would have responsibility in helping to restore to usefulness these ever-growing numbers of acres of desolation.

During the 88th Congress, an identical bill received the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, the Department of Interior and the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire text of this bill be printed in the Record as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 368) to provide for a study by the Secretary of the Interior of strip and surface mining operations in the United States and for a report to Congress of the results of such study, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Lausche (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 368

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, (a) in order that the extent and effect of strip and surface mining operations in the United States can be ascertained, and in order to develop information which may aid in determining what remedial action with respect to such operations can be taken by Congress and by the several States, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to make a survey and study of strip and surface mining operations in the United States.

(b) The Secretary of the Interior shall make the study and survey authorized in subsection (a) in full cooperation with appropriate Federal and State agencies, including the Department of Agriculture.

Sec. 2. The survey and study authorized by the first section of this Act shall include, but not be limited to, the following matters—

(1) the nature and extent of strip and surface mining operations in the United States;

(2) the ownership of the real property involved in strip and surface mining operations;

(3) the safety of the conduct of such strip and surface mining operations;

(4) the hazards to public health and safety resulting from such operations;

(5) the effect of strip and surface mining operations on highway programs of the United States and the several States;

(6) the effect of strip and surface mining operations on the scenic features of the United States and the several States;

(7) the effect of strip and surface mining operations on the fish and wildlife and other natural resources of the United States and the several States; and

(8) the public interest in and public benefits which may result from the appropriate development and use of areas subjected to strip and surface mining operations.

Sec. 3. (a) The Secretary of the Interior shall transmit to Congress a report on the survey and study authorized by the first section of this Act. Such report shall contain all information developed as a result of such survey and study together with the recommendations of the Secretary, based on the finding of this study and on techniques developed by Federal agencies as part of their continuing programs, and shall be made as soon as practicable after the completion of the survey and study, but not later than two years after the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) The Secretary of the Interior shall transmit a copy of the report which he submits to Congress under subsection (a) of this section to the Governor of each State of the United States and the Governor of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

A BILL TO PERMIT VOLUNTARY FIRE COMPANIES TO BE CLASSIFIED IN NONPROFIT CATEGORY OF POSTAL LAWS

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to permit volunteer fire companies to be classified in the nonprofit category of the postal laws.

At the present time religious, educational, philanthropic, labor, veterans, and fraternal organizations are able to use the nonprofit rate, which is approximately one-fourth the cost of the first-class rate.

Since the volunteer fire companies of this country render such an extremely valuable service to their communities, and since they operate almost exclusively on contributions received from public-spirited citizens, they certainly deserve to be permitted to send mail at the nonprofit rate.

These volunteer companies, I know from experience in Delaware, often use the mails both to report on company activities and to solicit funds.

A saving in their mailing costs would mean that this money could be put to use in providing better volunteer fire service to their communities.

I would like to thank my colleague, Senator Williams of Delaware, as well as Senator Johnston, Senator Brewster, and Senator Scott for cosponsoring the bill with me. An identical bill I introduced during the last session was passed by the Senate on August 6, 1964.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 390) to permit voluntary fire companies to be classified in the nonprofit category of the postal laws was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

HEALTH CARE FOR THE AGED

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senators Aiken, Cotton, Morton, Prouty, and Scott, I send to the desk, for appropriate reference, a bill designed to assist States in improving the health care of individuals 65 years and over of low and moderate income by enabling them to obtain protection against the expenses of health services.

This is a subject of concern to all of us and one to which we in the Congress shall be devoting our attention in the months ahead. Soon 20 million Americans will be 65 years of age or older. Rising medical costs, reduced incomes, and the increased medical services which older people require combine to create a situation in which many of our aged citizens cannot afford to pay for the help they need.

The number of Americans participating in private health plans is rising steadily and this is a trend which is commendable. The passage of the Kerr-Mills Act by Congress in 1960 was also a step forward. Directed toward helping the medically indigent, programs under the act are in operation in 40 States and 4 other jurisdictions and have been authorized in 3 additional States. Massachusetts, I am pleased to say, was among the first to implement Kerr-Mills and has a program which is considered an excellent one. Other States are adjusting their programs so that they will meet the needs of their people more adequately. At least 15 have liberalized eligibility requirements since implementing Kerr-Mills, and a like number have increased program benefits. But there is evidence that, to date at least, the Kerr-Mills Act has not proved sufficient to meet the need which exists.

There has been criticism that the act as implemented in some States imposes burdensome means test requirements, and excludes certain individuals who need assistance in meeting their medical costs. In my opinion this criticism is generally justified.

We have medical aid for the aged today. What we want to do is to improve its quality, to extend the number of people eligible to receive assistance, and to soften the sometimes onerous requirements which must be met before eligibility is established. At the same time, I personally believe a program that is voluntary and administered locally as far as possible is wiser and in the end more helpful than one administered and controlled from Washington. I believe, too, that ability to pay as well as age should influence eligibility, and I lean to the view that financing the program from general revenue is more equitable than levying a payroll tax or adding its cost to social security. Obviously the method of financing determines on which group in our society the burden of the cost will fall. Unlike the graduated income tax—general revenue approach—which taxes persons according to their ability to pay, the payroll tax which has been proposed by some would require a person earning $5,200 a year to pay as much as a person earning $52,000 annually. We want to make sure that in any changes in the law we are helping our aged and not handicapping all of our fellow citizens.

There are, of course, many approaches to the goal which we all seek: meeting the health care needs of our older citizens and meeting them with dignity and in an equitable manner. A number of suggestions have already been advanced. My colleagues and I offer this proposal for the consideration of Congress. We do so in the belief that its main features are desirable ingredients of a national health care for the aged program. We recognize that the problem is a complicated one which defies simple solutions, and we join with many others in the search for the most helpful and wise approach. Further careful analysis of our bill may lead to refinements of some of its provisions. I note, for example, that within the past year advocates of the payroll tax approach have decided to authorize an association of private insurance carriers to sell policies covering health costs not included under the social security plan. Participating carriers would be exempt from antitrust laws. This and other recent changes represent an improvement in that method.

We offer the bill as a serious effort to meet the problem which exists. Briefly stated, the major features of the bill are as follows:

First. It is a voluntary program financed with general revenues and not one based on compulsory social security financing.

Second. It involves Federal-State matching and State administration.

Third. It builds upon Kerr-Mills rather than replaces it, since one requirement of State participation in this program is that it have a Kerr-Mills program in effect.

Fourth. It extends benefits to individuals who are not eligible for assistance under Kerr-Mills, and also provides an alternative to Kerr-Mills enrollees.

Fifth. It offers a choice of three actuarily equivalent plans so that participants can select the one which best meets their specific needs.

Sixth. It includes a private insurance policy option.

Seventh. It involves contributions by individual enrollees based on their income.

Eighth. It avoids the undesirable features of a means test, yet by establishing an income limitation on eligibility it excludes individuals fully able to meet their own medical costs.

Participation in this program would be open to individuals of 65 years of age or over who are not recipients of old age assistance or other Federal public assistance programs, excluding Kerr-Mills enrollees. The income limitation for single people is $3,000 and for married couples a combined income of $6,000 is permitted. Individuals would be required to pay an enrollment fee which would vary with income. The minimum enrollment fee would be $10 annually and would apply to individuals receiving $1,000 or less in income. For persons with income in excess of $1,000, the fee would be as follows:

Income of individual	*Amount of enrollment fee*
More than $1,000 but not more than $1,500	$10 plus 2½ percent of income in excess of $1,000.
More than $1,500 but not more than $2,000	$22.50 plus 3½ percent of income in excess of $1,500.
More than $2,000 but not more than $2,500	$40 plus 7 percent of income in excess of $2,000.
More than $2,500 but not more than $3,000	$75 plus 9 percent of income in excess of $2,500.

Under the terms of this bill three options are available to individuals:

First. A preventive diagnostic, short-term program which would provide as a minimum:

(a) Twenty-one days of inpatient hospital services which include physician, nursing, and intern services as well as laboratory and X-ray services, ambulatory services, drugs, and appliances related to care and treatment.

(b) Sixty-three days of skilled nursing home care. State plan can provide more. However, the number of days for which participants will have the costs of inpatient hospital services paid shall be reduced by 1 for each 3 days he receives skilled nursing home care.

(c) Surgical services provided in a hospital.

(d) Physicians' services for 12 days outside a hospital.

(e) One hundred dollars of ambulatory, diagnostic, laboratory, and X-ray services rendered outside a hospital or nursing home.

The State may include additional health services if it wishes to do so.

Second. A long-term major illness program which would provide as a minimum:

(a) One hundred and twenty days of inpatient hospital services.

(b) Skilled nursing home care.

(c) Prescribed drugs.

(d) Diagnostic laboratory services—including X-ray—not exceeding $200.

(e) Outpatient hospital services.

(f) Physicians' services including surgery.

Under this option, the State may also include additional health services if it so desires.

Payment would be made for not less than 80 percent nor more than 90 percent of above costs in excess of $50 during an enrollment year.

Third. Private insurance policy program: Instead of enrolling in the short-term or long-term program, an individual may elect to receive a certificate to be used in assisting him to defray the premium costs of a qualified private health insurance policy of which he is a beneficiary. The total payment cannot exceed an amount equal to the amount of the actuarial value of the short-term and long-term programs minus the enrollment fee persons would pay under either short-term or long-term programs. Such private health insurance policy would have to provide health benefits having an actuarial value at least equal to that of the benefits provided by either the short-term or long-term program.

Federal participation in State program costs would consist of grants of 50 percent of State administrative costs and from 60 to 80 percent of other costs—exclusive of enrollment fee receipts—depending on a State's per capita income, up to a maximum Federal contribution of $150 per enrollee.

A single State agency would be designated to administer the program. If it desires to do so, a State could utilize, through agreements or contracts with voluntary private organizations, the services of such organizations in the administration of one or more health benefits programs under the State plan.

An Advisory Council on Health Care Benefits for the Aged would be established in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to advise the Secretary on matters relating to general policies and administration. It would consist of 12 members appointed by the Secretary for 4-year terms—4 from among representatives of various State or local government agencies concerned with the provision of health care or insurance against the costs thereof, 4 from among nongovernmental persons concerned with the provision of such care or with such insurance, and 4 persons from the general public to represent consumers of health care—and 2 ex officio members, the Surgeon General and the Commissioner of Social Security.

Cost: Based on an estimated 80 percent participation of the 13.8 million persons eligible for the first year of the program, Robert J. Myers, chief actuary of the Social Security Administration, estimated that the cost to the Federal Government would be $1,315 million. States would contribute another $710 million while the amount received from enrollment fees would be approximately $285 million.

In my State of Massachusetts there are nearly a half million individuals 65 or over who would be eligible for this program. If 80 percent of these participated, 360,000 persons would be enrolled.

Mr. Myers estimated that it would cost Massachusetts $29.8 million for the program with another $44.6 million as the Federal contribution. Enrollment fees could be expected to raise another $11.8 million, bringing the total cost in Massachusetts to about $86.2 million.

Mr. President, as I have indicated, my colleagues and I offer this proposal for consideration because we believe it represents a sound approach to the important problem of assisting our older citizens to obtain the health care they need. We hope that it will be considered carefully.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 395) to amend the Social Security Act so as to provide Federal financial assistance for establishing and maintaining State programs of voluntary health insurance for the aged, introduced by Mr. Saltonstall (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

PROPOSED AUTHORITY UNDER AREA REDEVELOPMENT ACT TO RENDER ASSISTANCE TO STRICKEN AREAS

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize assistance under the Area Redevelopment Act for certain areas and ask that it remain at the desk for 7 days to allow any Senators who desire to do so to cosponsor it. I ask unanimous consent to have the text of the bill printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, it will remain at the desk as requested by the Senator from New Hampshire, and the text of the bill will be printed in the Record, as requested.

The bill (S. 400) to authorize assistance under the Area Redevelopment Act for certain additional areas which have sustained, or are about to sustain, sudden and severe economic hardship, introduced by Mr. McIntyre, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 400

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 5(a) of the Area Redevelopment Act is amended by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph as follows:

"To assist in the economic readjustment of, and to provide new employment opportunities in, certain areas which have sustained, or are about to sustain, sudden and severe economic hardship, the Secretary shall also designate as 'redevelopment areas' those areas within the United States in which he determines that a natural disaster, or the loss, removal, or closing of a major source of employment (including the closing of military installations), has caused, or is about to cause, an unusual and abrupt rise in unemployment or underemployment of such magnitude that the area can reasonably be expected to become eligible for designation under the other provisions of this subsection, or under subsection (b), within two years unless the authority conferred by this paragraph is exercised."

Mr. McINTYRE. The bill is designed to help remedy a situation which has existed for a number of years and which has dramatically revealed itself in the recent announcement of the Secretary of Defense relating to the closing down of military installations throughout the country.

In brief, the bill provides that area redevelopment assistance shall be available to those areas of the Nation which, although they do not presently meet the requirements for such assistance, can reasonably be expected to meet the requirements within 2 years as the result of a recent, or a pending, removal of a major source of employment.

This situation could follow the closing down of a major military installation, the departure of a privately owned industry, or a natural disaster which resulted in severe underemployment.

Enactment of this bill would provide a permanent standby authority for the Department of Commerce to extend immediate aid in situations such as the phasing out of the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard, the closing of the Studebaker plant in South Bend, or the Alaskan earthquakes. Available aid, of course, would be in the form of regular ARA grants and loans, 4-percent SBA loans, and increased funds for urban planning and urban renewal grants, among others.

FLOOD INSURANCE STUDY

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, in the past two Congresses I have introduced proposed legislation authorizing a study by the Housing and Home Finance Agency of a possible Federal flood insurance program. In both cases the proposed legislation was endorsed by the administration and passed by the Senate but not enacted into law.

Yet each year the need for such a study has become more urgent. My interest in this problem resulted from the 1962 storms which ravaged the coast of New Jersey and other northeastern States. Now, as we have seen, even more tragic floods have devastated our western coastal States in the closing days of 1964.

It is imperative that we delay no longer in seeking a solution to the crushing economic burdens and hardships suffered by the victims of such disasters. I am therefore introducing this essential measure again, as my first bill of the 89th Congress, and I am pleased that Senators Bartlett, Bible, Cooper, Montoya, Morse, Moss, Randolph, and Yarborough have joined as cosponsors. I also ask unanimous consent that it may lie on the table through the close of business on January 19 to give other interested Senators the opportunity for cosponsorship.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will remain at the desk until January 19, as requested by the Senator from New Jersey.

The bill (S. 408) to authorize a study of methods of helping to provide financial assistance to victims of future flood disasters introduced by Mr. Williams of New Jersey (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. For many generations, the Federal Government has accepted the responsibility for action in cases of floods and other disasters. This has sometimes taken the form of relief for the victims, and in other cases has involved financial assistance for the construction of flood control works. But the sad fact is that despite such assistance we have not attacked the basic problem. We have been swatting flies instead of draining the swamp.

As soon as there is a flood disaster, there is a scramble to have the location declared a disaster area so that inexpensive Federal loans can be made available to permit businessmen to reestablish themselves. But neither the language of the Small Business Administration Act nor the amount of money available under it is liberal enough to permit the average farmer or homeowner to obtain relief. What is needed is some way for the victims of flood disaster to obtain protection at a reasonable rate which would forestall economic disaster.

Mr. President, hearings on this legislation in the past have clearly developed the fact that the cost of flood insurance for crops, buildings, beaches, and other property is beyond the reach of almost everyone. In the case of insurance policies for coastal areas, for example, generally only wind damage is covered. Even if it has been possible to obtain the always extremely expensive flood coverage, there is considerable dispute over whether the damage was caused by floodwaters or wind.

The problem was vividly described in a Wall Street Journal article of December 29, 1964, on the recent tragic floods on our west coast. It reports that the spokesman for a northern California lumber company which may suffer up to $10 million in damage stated his company has "absolutely zero" insurance, and that this is also the case with all lumber operations in the Eel River Canyon where the cost of insurance is prohibitive precisely because of the flood danger. The article further reports that the damages resulting from the terrible floods in Oregon and California are nearing $1 billion.

Flood losses, moreover, affect not only individuals directly involved but all the taxpayers of flooded communities, for often a great deal of publicly owned land is inundated.

In Asbury Park, N.J., for example, the taxpayers faced $1,500,000 in damage to the estimated $15 million of public beachfront properties maintained by the city as a result of the northeast coastal storms of March 1962. Federal aid available to provide essential shore protective works was only a little over $250,000. Municipal taxpayers can no longer afford to carry this burden without some assistance. The State of New Jersey clearly recognized the magnitude of the problem, and in this connection I ask unanimous consent that following my remarks there be printed in the RECORD the text of a joint resolution adopted by the State legislature on December 29, 1964, urging Congress to implement the Flood Insurance Act of 1956.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, this bill, in brief, would direct the Housing and Home Finance Agency Administrator to undertake a study of alternative programs to help provide financial assistance to victims of flood disasters. The study would be conducted in close cooperation with appropriate Federal departments, such as the Corps of Engineers, the Geological Survey, and the Weather Bureau. A report would be made to Congress which would include information on the feasibility of each program studied, estimates of costs to both the Federal Government and to property owners and the legal authority for State financial participation. The study would be submitted within 9 months from the enactment of the act or the appropriation of funds, whichever is greater.

As I have mentioned, the bill has always had the full support of the HHFA, the Small Business Administration, and the Budget Bureau, and in 1962 President Kennedy issued a statement endorsing it. It has also received the endorsement of the Council of State Governments, which for many years has been keenly interested in flood plain zoning and flood insurance.

Mr. President, we have already delayed too long in attacking this problem. We must not wait to express our concern until the floods come again to destroy homes and livelihoods. I urge early action on this measure to seek ways to permanently solve the problems.

EXHIBIT 1

STATE OF NEW JERSEY, ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 28

Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to implement the Federal Flood Insurance Act of 1956

Whereas the Congress of the United States, in 1956, enacted the Federal Flood Insurance Act of 1956; and

Whereas the Congress found in said act that "In the case of recurring natural disasters, including recurring floods, insurance protection against individual and public loss is not always practically available through private or public sources"; and

Whereas the avowed purpose of said act was to establish a program of Federal insurance and reinsurance against the risk of floods and to encourage private insurance covering such flood risks; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States has heretofore failed to appropriate the funds necessary to implement the Federal Flood Insurance Act of 1956; and

Whereas since 1956 there have been numerous disasters, storms, and floods in many of the States of this Nation causing untold damage to public and private property; and

Whereas in the State of New Jersey, as a result of the storm and flood of March 1962 alone, the damage to public and private property exceeded $100 million; and

Whereas the public and private losses suffered as a result of such storms and floods has caused widespread distress and hardship adversely affecting the general welfare without regard to State boundary lines; and

Whereas, much of said distress and hardship could have been avoided, reduced, or guarded against if the Federal Flood Insurance Act of 1956 had been properly and adequately implemented at the time of its original passage; and

Whereas it is in the common interest of all of the States of this Nation to support the program of insurance protection provided for in the Federal Flood Insurance Act of 1956; and

Whereas it appears timely for the Legislature of the State of New Jersey to renew the request for action in this regard previously made by Joint Resolution 5 of the 1962 legislature: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and General Assembly of the State of New Jersey:

1. The Congress of the United States is memorialized to enact the legislation necessary to fully implement the Federal Flood Insurance Act of 1956.

2. The secretary of state shall transmit forthwith a duly attested copy of this resolution to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, the Senators from New Jersey and to each Member of the House of Representatives of the United States elected from New Jersey.

3. This joint resolution shall take effect immediately

BILLS TO INCREASE ANNUITY PAYMENTS TO RETIRED FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the American people in recent years have become increasingly aware of the desirability of attracting topflight people to Government service. One means to be used toward this end is sufficient salaries. Another is the promise of adequate retirement benefits.

Therefore I send to the desk two bills intended to raise retirement annuities to a more adequate level.

Mr. President, in addition to their importance in attracting the best qualified persons to Government service, adequate annuity payments are of course demanded by considerations of social justice. Consider the following facts:

Records of the Social Security Administration show that there are 23,000 annuitants who retired prior to 1948, when salaries were less than half what they are today and when the maximum annuity was only half of a person's pay.

The 164,000 persons who retired between 1948 and 1956 are receiving considerably smaller annuities than the 265,000 who retired after 1956.

As of 1963, out of 453,000 civil service employee annuitants, 124,000 were receiving less than $100 per month and 289,000 were drawing less than $200 per month.

Here is the most shocking part: Out of a total of 190,000 civil service survivor annuitants—widows—we were paying less than $100 per month to 153,000 in 1963.

The cost of living has increased 15 percent since 1955.

The only increase in civil service annuities during this period was limited to 5 percent. Civil service annuitants have fallen behind by 10 percent in their battle with inflation.

To end this situation I propose a 10-percent increase in each annuity up to $2,400 per year. This is not a large increase; it does not do full justice to the needs of the retired Federal employees. However, it is a constructive step that should be enacted at a very early date.

Also I propose that retirees electing a reduced annuity in order to provide an annuity for a surviving spouse not have their annuity reduced by the present 2½ percent of the first $3,600, but that they continue to pay for the provision of survivors annuities by a 10-percent reduction of any annuity over $3,600.

The second of the two bills which I am introducing deals with the fact that former employees who retired before 1956 still have annuity reductions up to 25 percent to provide survivor benefits for their spouses, while more recent retirees have much smaller deductions. To correct some of the inequities in the survivor annuities program, I propose to recompute all annuities of those retiring before October 11, 1962, to give the retirees the advantage of the more recent formula, and to bring up all survivor annuities to 55 percent of the annuity of the retiree.

Mr. President, I urge early consideration of these two bills which would go far toward increasing the quality of the Civil Service at the same time that they represent an act of social justice toward those directly affected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills will be received and appropriately referred.

The bills, introduced by Mr. YARBOROUGH, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, as follows:

S. 421. A bill to provide certain increases in annuities payable from the civil service retirement and disability fund; and

S. 422. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, to provide for the recomputation of annuities of certain retired employees who elected reduced annuities at the time of retirement in order to provide survivor annuities for their spouses, and for the recomputation of survivor annuities for the surviving spouses of certain former employees who died in service or after retirement.

CONSTRUCTION OF A DAM AND RESERVOIR ON MILL CREEK, GRAND COUNTY, UTAH

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize construction of a dam and reservoir at Mill Creek, in Grand County, Utah.

Mr. President, nothing holds greater promise for the future of the people of Utah than the full development of their slender water resources. Although the water outlook in my State of Utah is much better this year than it has been recently, we are still facing a water shortage.

The people of Grand County, Utah, are particularly anxious to adopt feasible means of conserving for beneficial use every drop of water which falls in their arid section of the State. Too much of this precious water is now being lost. Even in good water years, streams flood in the springtime, and during cloudbursts, destroy farms and homes, only to run completely dry by midsummer and fall.

At my request, the U.S. Corps of Engineers began a study, sometime ago, of Mill and Pack Creeks, in Grand County, which in the cloudburst season have been flooding into the basements and homes of some of the newer areas of the town of Moab, and destroying considerable property in this important county seat. In May of 1963, a public hearing was held in the courthouse there, and was attended by about 140 people, including representatives of the town of Moab, of Grand County, of agencies of the State of Utah, of Federal agencies, and a representative of General Frye, South Pacific division engineer, together with members of the district engineer's staff and the district engineer.

This hearing brought out very forcibly the interest of the people of the area in the construction in the Mill and Pack Creek Valleys of a multiple-purpose dam which would control floods, make water available for domestic and irrigation uses, and establish a recreation area around the dam. The people also indicated their desire for channel improvements on both Mill and Pack Creeks, within the city of Moab.

The engineers study is estimated to cost $225,000, and $115,000 has been allocated through fiscal year 1965. I realize that it will take some time to evaluate the studies already made, and to undertake the further investigations which will be necessary before it can be determined whether such a plan is economically justified. At the present rate of allocation it will be another 2 years before the study will be completed, but I am convinced that the Mill Creek and Pack Creek Valley has a potential of far greater water resource development than has yet been planned, and I want to do everything possible to move forward a multiple-purpose project. I am, therefore, today introducing a bill to authorize such a project, to be constructed by the Chief of Engineers, U.S. Army, with appropriations of the necessary sums to be provided to carry the project out.

Comprehensive and coherent development of the area's water resources now, under a plan which is sound, and will, therefore, avoid costly modifications later on, is most important to the people of this rugged and beautiful section of Utah. Tourism is a growing industry. My Canyonlands National Park bill has now become law and Moab and Grand Counties are on the brink of a great economic development. This is the time to be preparing the area to cope with that future growth.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 425) authorizing construction of a dam and reservoir on Mill Creek in Grand County, Utah, in the interest of flood control and allied purposes, introduced by Mr. Moss, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION RELATING TO RESTRICTION OF CERTAIN AREAS FOR DEFENSE PURPOSES

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I send to the desk, for appropriate reference, three bills which I am introducing at the request of the Department of the Air Force. Each of these measures provides for the restriction of certain specified areas of the submerged lands of the Outer Continental Shelf off the coasts of Florida and Texas for Defense Department and National Aeronautics and Space Administration purposes.

Approval by Congress of such restriction is required by Public Law 85-337.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the text of each of these bills and a letter of explanation concerning each signed by Secretary Zuckert appear in the body of the RECORD at this point so that interested persons may be informed of the proposed restriction.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bills and letters of explanation relating to each will be printed in the RECORD.

The bills, introduced by Mr. JACKSON, by request, were received, read twice by their titles, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 426. A bill to provide for the restriction of certain areas in the Outer Continental Shelf (known as the Eastern Test Range) for defense purposes, and for other purposes:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) so much of the Outer Continental Shelf as is within the area described in section 2 of this Act is hereby restricted from the operation of the mineral leasing provisions of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1331–1343) for the use of the Department of Defense for a period of 10 years with an option to renew the restriction for an additional period of 5 years with the concurrence of the Secretary of the Interior, and subject to the condition that the restriction made by this subsection may be terminated, as to any or all of the area described in section 2 of this Act, at any time during either of such periods by the Secretary of Defense upon notice to the Secretary of Interior.

(b) Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to prohibit applications for further restrictions at the time of termination or expiration of any restriction under subsection (a) of this section, under laws and regulations then existing.

(c) The right to enter the areas described in section 2 of this Act and to use them for the defense purposes set forth in the application for restriction becomes effective upon the date of enactment of this Act.

(d) Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to limit the authority of the Secretary of the Interior under section 11 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1340), except that such authority shall be exercised only with the concurrence of the Secretary of Defense.

(e) Nothing contained in this Act shall impair or affect the application of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 in accordance with the provisions of Executive Order 10854 of November 27, 1959, in the airspace overlying the area described in section 2 of this Act.

SEC. 2. The area restricted by this Act is so much of the outer Continental Shelf as is within the area described as follows:

Beginning at a point latitude 29 degrees 25 minutes 18 seconds north, longitude 81 degrees 02 minutes 30 seconds west; thence on a curved line following an arc with a radius of 35 nautical miles from a center point located at latitude 28 degrees 53 minutes 00 seconds north, longitude 80 degrees 47 minutes 30 seconds west, east and south to a point at latitude 29 degrees 08 minutes 48 seconds north, longitude 80 degrees 12 minutes 00 seconds west; thence on a straight line to a point at latitude 28 degrees 43 minutes 30 seconds north, longitude 70 degrees 57 minutes 18 seconds west; thence on a curved line following an arc with a radius of 35 nautical miles from the Cape Kennedy Lighthouse at latitude 28 degrees 27 minutes 36 seconds north, longitude 80 degrees 32 minutes 37 seconds west; to the intersection of an arc having a 35 nautical mile radius from a point near Cape Canaveral harbor entrance located at latitude 28 degrees 25 minutes 00 seconds north, longitude 80 degrees 35 minutes 18 seconds west; thence southwesterly along a line following the last described arc to a point at latitude 27 degrees 51 minutes 42 seconds north, longitude 80 degrees 23 minutes 18 seconds west; thence northward along the line 3 nautical miles from mean low water (MLW), for a meander distance of approximately 104.27 nautical miles to the point of beginning, being latitude 29 degrees 25 minutes 18 seconds north, longitude 81 degrees 02 minutes 30 seconds west, containing approximately 2,630,000 acres, more or less.

The letter presented by Mr. JACKSON is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
Washington, D.C., January 4, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR HAYDEN: There is forwarded herewith a draft of legislation "To provide for the restriction of certain areas in the Outer Continental Shelf (known as the eastern test range) for defense purposes, and for other purposes."

This proposal is pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 85-337, and is part of the Department of Defense legislative program for the 89th Congress. The Bureau of the Budget has advised that, from the standpoint of the administration's program, there is no objection to the presentation of this proposal for the consideration of the Congress. The Department of the Air Force has been designated as the representative of the Department of Defense for this legislation. It is recommended that this proposed legislation be enacted by the Congress.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

The purpose of this proposed legislation is to restrict the utilization of certain lands, described in the attached draft, of the Outer Continental Shelf adjacent to the State of Florida in the vicinity of Cape Kennedy, and to restrict the operation of mineral leasing laws therein. A letter of intent to continue the restriction of the utilization of the land and water areas has been submitted to the Department of the Interior.

The installation involved is the eastern test range consisting of a land and water area of approximately 2,630,000 acres used by the Air Force for missile and space research and development. The utilization of areas by various agencies of the Department of Defense and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, will prohibit exploitation of mineral resources.

COST AND BUDGET DATA

The area involved is currently in use by the Departments of the Air Force, Army, Navy, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. There will be no change in Department of Defense appropriations.

Sincerely,

EUGENE M. ZUCKERT.

S. 427. A bill to provide for the restriction of certain areas in the outer Continental Shelf for defense purposes, and for other purposes (Gulf Test Range, Gulf of Mexico):

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) so much of the outer Continental Shelf as is within the area described in section 2 of this Act is hereby restricted from the operation of the mineral leasing provisions of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1331-1343) for the use of the Department of Defense for a period of five years with an option to renew the restriction for a period not exceeding five years upon the request of the Secretary of Defense and after consultation with the Secretary of the Interior, and subject to the condition that the restriction made by this subsection may be terminated at any time during either of such periods by the Secretary of Defense upon notice to the Secretary of the Interior.

(b) Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to prohibit applications for further restrictions at the time of termination or expiration of any restriction under subsection (a) of this section, under laws and regulations then existing..

(c) The right to enter the areas described in section 2 of this Act to use them for the defense purposes set forth in the application for restriction becomes effective upon the date of enactment of this Act.

(d) The Secretary of the Interior may, with the concurrence of the Secretary of Defense, grant mineral leases pursuant to the provisions of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1331-1343) and subject to such other terms and conditions as they shall agree upon within the area described by section 2 of this Act.

SEC. 2. The area restricted by this Act is so much of the outer Continental Shelf as is within the area described as follows:

Beginning at a point 29 degrees 43 minutes 00 seconds north, 84 degrees 00 minutes 00 seconds west; thence southeast to 28 degrees 56 minutes 00 seconds north, 83 degrees 31 minutes 00 seconds west; thence south southeast to 27 degrees 52 minutes 00 seconds north, 83 degrees 02 minutes 00 seconds west; thence meandering south southeast along the three marine league line to 27 degrees 15 minutes 00 seconds north, 82 degrees 45 minutes 30 seconds west; thence south southeast to 26 degrees 10 minutes 00 seconds north, 82 degrees 17 minutes 00 seconds west; thence south southeast to 25 degrees 45 minutes 15 seconds north, 82 degrees 07 minutes 00 seconds west; thence west to 25 degrees 45 minutes 00 seconds north, 83 degrees 27 minutes 00 seconds west; thence south southwest to the 100 fathom curve being 25 degrees 13 minutes 00 seconds north, 84 degrees 19 minutes 15 seconds west; thence meandering along the said curve northerly, northeasterly, northerly, and northwesterly to 29 degrees 40 minutes 30 seconds north, 86 degrees 48 minutes 00 seconds west; thence north to the three marine league line being 30 degrees 12 minutes 40 seconds north, 86 degrees 48 minutes 00 seconds west; thence meandering along said line of three marine leagues easterly, southeasterly, easterly, and northeasterly to 29 degrees 43 minutes 00 seconds north, 84 degrees 27 minutes 00 seconds west; thence east to point of beginning being 29 degrees 43 minutes 00 seconds north, 84 degrees 00 minutes 00 seconds west, containing 24,328,601 acres, more or less.

The letter presented by Mr. JACKSON is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
Washington, January 4, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR HAYDEN: There is forwarded herewith a draft of legislation "To provide for the restriction of certain areas in the Outer Continental Shelf for defense purposes, and for other purposes." The areas involved constitute the gulf test range, Gulf of Mexico.

This proposal is pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 85-337 and is part of the Department of Defense legislative program for the 89th Congress. The Bureau of the Budget advises that, from the standpoint of the administration's program, there is no objection to the presentation of this proposal for the consideration of the Congress. The Department of the Air Force has been designated as the representative of the Department of Defense for this legislation. It is recommended that this proposal be enacted by the Congress.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

The purpose of this proposed legislation is to restrict the utilization of certain submerged lands, described in the attached draft, of the Outer Continental Shelf off the gulf coast of the State of Florida, and to restrict the operation of mineral leasing laws therein.

The installation involved is a portion of the gulf test range constituting of approximately 24,328,601 acres of submerged land which is used by the Air Force and Navy in the testing and development of weapons systems and in the training of personnel.

The Air Force Systems Command and the Strategic Air Command conduct launching, scoring and impacting of missiles, space probes, and other weapons systems on the gulf test range. Air Defense and National Guard units deploy from all parts of the United States to Tyndall Air Force Base to use this overwater range for weapons delivery training and testing. The Tactical Air Command also fires ordnance on this range to maintain air crew proficiency in the operation of weapons systems.

Established air space warning areas W-151, W-470, W-168 and W-174, provide the necessary air space control to conduct testing and training on a safe and economical basis.

COST AND BUDGET DATA

The area involved is currently in use by the Department of the Air Force and there will be no change in the Department of Defense appropriations.

Sincerely,

EUGENE M. ZUCKERT.

S. 428. A bill to provide for the restriction of a certain area in the outer Continental Shelf for defense purposes, and for other purposes (Matagorda Water Range):

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) so much of the outer Continental Shelf as is within the area described in section 2 of this Act is hereby restricted from the operation of the mineral leasing provisions of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1331-1343), at the request of the Department of the Air Force, for the use of the Department of Defense for a period of three years with an option to renew the restriction for an additional period of three years upon notice to the Secretary of the Interior. The restriction made by this subsection may be terminated, as to any or all of the area described in section 2 of this Act, at any time by the Secretary of Defense upon notice to the Secretary of the Interior.

(b) This Act does not prohibit applications, under laws and regulations then existing, for further restrictions at the time of termination or expiration of the restriction made by this Act.

(c) The right to enter the area restricted by this Act and to use it for the defense purposes set forth in the application for restriction becomes effective upon the date of enactment of this Act.

(d) This Act does not limit the authority of the Secretary of the Interior under section 11 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1340), except that the authority may be exercise within the area restricted by this Act only with the concurrence of the Secretary of Defense.

SEC. 2. The area restricted by this Act is so much of the outer Continental Shelf as is embraced in an area described as follows:

Beginning at a point 28 degrees 10 minutes 00 seconds north, 94 degrees 45 minutes 00 seconds west; thence east to 28 degrees 10 minutes 00 seconds north, 94 degrees 14 minutes 00 seconds west; thence south southeast to 27 degrees 22 minutes 00 seconds north, 93 degrees 26 minutes 00 seconds west; thence southwesterly to 26 degrees 00 minutes 00 seconds north, 95 degrees 05 minutes 00 seconds west; thence north northeasterly to point of beginning, being 28 degrees 10 minutes 00 seconds north, 94 degrees 45 minutes 00 seconds west, containing 3,874,291 acres, more or less.

The letter presented by Mr. JACKSON is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
Washington, January 4, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR HAYDEN: There is forwarded herewith a draft of legislation "To provide for the restriction of a certain area in the Outer Continental Shelf for defense purposes, and for other purposes (Matagorda water range)."

This proposal is pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 85-337 and is part of the Department of Defense legislative program for the 89th Congress. The Bureau of the Budget advises that, from the standpoint of the administration's program, there is no objection to the presentation of this proposal for the consideration of the Congress. The Department of the Air Force has been designated as the representative of the Department of Defense for this legislation. It is recommended that this proposed legislation be enacted by the Congress.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

The purpose of this proposed legislation is to restrict the utilization of certain submerged land, described in the attached draft of the Outer Continental Shelf off the coast of Texas, and to restrict the operation of mineral leasing laws therein. A letter of intent to restrict the utilization of the submerged land area has been submitted to the Department of the Interior.

The installation involved is the Matagorda water range consisting of 3,874,291 acres of airspace, water, and submerged land which is used by Strategic Air Command B-58, B-52 and B-47 combat air crews for operational readiness inspections and day-to-day aerial gunnery training. Air crews from numerous bombardment wings located in the South Central United States require this range on a full-time basis in the support of live firing training and testing to maintain combat proficiency.

COST AND BUDGET DATA

The area involved replaces the old Matagorda water range and there will be no change in Department of Defense appropriations.

Sincerely,

EUGENE M. ZUCKERT.

ESTABLISHMENT OF OFFICE OF DEPUTY PRESIDENT

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to establish the office of Deputy President to provide for the continuous discharge of the powers and duties of the office of President.

The Senate showed its concern about the problem of succession at the last session when it approved the proposal for a constitutional amendment to deal with the question of succession and disability. I supported the amendment and am a cosponsor of the resolution introduced by Senator BAYH this year dealing with the same problem.

However, as we know, the method of amending the Constitution is often a slow process. Even if both Houses of Congress were to approve the amendment, there is no certitude it would be approved by the States or, if they do approve, it might take several years before the required three-fourths of the States would act favorably. Of course, no President has attained office under any of the succession laws enacted by Congress, but even if the possibility is remote, we should act now to provide a better procedure by statute.

The office of Vice President, has been vacant on 16 occasions in our national history—8 times because the Vice President succeeded to the Presidency, 7 times through the death of the Vice President, and once following resignation of the Vice President. The Constitution authorizes Congress to provide for succession by statute. The presidential succession laws enacted by Congress in 1791, 1886, and 1947 have been adequate to protect the national interest. But the responsibilities of the President have increased greatly in recent years, and so has the need for the official next in line of succession to be experienced and well-informed about the duties he may be called up to assume.

The bill I am introducing would create a new office of Deputy President. This office would be filled only in the event that the office of Vice President is vacant. Nomination to the position would be made by the President within 30 days following the vacancy in the office of Vice President and confirmation by the Senate would be required. The bill also designates the Deputy President as first in line of succession to the Presidency in event of the death or disability of the President. The President would make his nomination from among the highest Federal officers—the members of the Cabinet, the Supreme Court, and the Congress—and the Governors of the States.

In effect, my proposal returns to the succession policy in effect from 1886 to 1947. During this period the Secretary of State, a Presidential appointee confirmed by the Senate under constitutional procedures, was next in line. Under my proposal the Deputy President would be first in line of succession, to be followed by the Secretary of State and other Cabinet officers.

The President has need of a Vice President, or equivalent officer such as the Deputy President provided under this bill, to assist him in the performance of his duties. The Nation should have the assurance that the Vice President, or other officer, has acquired daily familiarity with the operations and policies of the office to which he may succeed and with the executive personnel with whom he must work.

A major advantage of creating a new office of Deputy President is that the choice of a Deputy President would be made only when the office of Vice President was vacant, and it would be with the understanding that the Deputy President would have the right of succession. A weakness of our previous succession laws has been that the designated official often attained his position for reasons and considerations quite apart from the possibility of succession.

Another weakness has been that the designated officials under previous legislation have had other responsibilities which require their full attention. The official next in line should be able to give full-time assistance to the President and be able to acquire the practical experience of the responsibilities of the Presidency. Neither the Speaker of the House, as under the present law, nor the Secretary of State, as once provided, can as adequately fulfill this twofold responsibility. They hold important positions in their own right, and their offices necessarily take their full time. On the other hand, their responsibilities are specialized and do not provide the broad range of experience which the officer next in line of succession needs at this time in our national history.

Finally, the proposal would guarantee leadership by the political party which won the previous election. In 8 of the past 18 years, the Speaker of the House has been a member of a different party from the President. In event of a double vacancy, a complete change of administration would have followed. The succession law should respect the mandate of the people, who vote not only for a man but also, in a broad way, for his party and its program. The elevation of a leader of another party in midterm is undesirable in principle and could have most unfortunate practical effects.

We are all, of course, most hopeful that the succession law will never be needed. Yet history requires us to be objective and to use prudent judgment to provide procedures that, in event it must be, will best provide an experienced successor. Enactment of the bill I am introducing will not prejudice action on a constitutional amendment; rather, it provides a means by which the succession law can be improved now and also in the event that a constitutional amendment is not approved or its approval takes the full 7 years following submission by Congress, as provided in the proposed amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 432) to establish the office of Deputy President, to provide for the continuous discharge of the powers and duties of the Office of President, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. McCARTHY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

SALE OF CERTAIN LAND IN LANDER, WYO.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, on behalf of Senator McGEE and myself, I send to the desk a bill for proper reference that will authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell certain land in Lander, Wyo.

The Forest Service in the middle 1930's acquired two city lots on which were built a warehouse and a garage.

During the last 5 years, the town has grown and now the business district surrounds these two city lots. Consequently, they have appreciated in value.

Because of the increased activities of the Forest Service, this land and its facilities are not adequate, nor does it appear feasible for them to attempt to remodel the buildings. The Forest Service must expand if it is going to properly carry out its functions in the mountainous areas which fall in the jurisdiction of the Lander office. The Forest Service wants to acquire land outside of the city, which would give them room to house and store their equipment. This piece of legislation would permit the Forest Service to sell the presently occupied land at fair market value and use the benefits from the sale for acquiring new land and building new structures.

I am hopeful that the committee to which this bill is referred will act on this at its earliest possible convenience.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 433) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell certain land in Lander, Wyo., and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. SIMPSON (for himself and Mr. McGEE), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

UPPER PRIEST LAKE IN IDAHO PROPOSED AS ADDITION TO KANIKSU NATIONAL FOREST

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, Upper Priest Lake in the Panhandle of northern Idaho is a gemlike body of water in a setting encircled with evergreen forests and rugged mountains. It is less than 4 miles long and three-fourths of a mile wide, and located near the Washington State and Canadian borders. Its beauty is unmarred by commercial development of any kind. Trout dimple the lake surface and deer and moose come down to drink at a shoreline dotted with sandy beaches. And the only marks of man are two well-concealed campgrounds and an emergency fireguard station.

No road or trail penetrates this wilderness locale, and the only approach is by the Thoroughfare River, a slowly meandering stream deep enough for outboard motorboats and wide enough to permit one boat to pass another. The Thoroughfare connects Upper Priest Lake with Priest Lake proper. Thus Upper Priest remains in its natural state—a bit of God's handiwork unspoiled by man.

But, Mr. President, unless we can act, and act soon, commercial development will invade this idyllic setting. The west side of the lake is part of the Kaniksu National Forest, and the east side owned by the State of Idaho, with the exception of three separate and privately owned parcels. The owners of a 140-acre parcel have planned to subdivide it for cabin sites.

More than 4 years ago the Idaho wildlife federation set out to prevent this type of commercial development. Last year, when it appeared the development was a certainty, a national semiscientific organization, Nature Conservancy, came to the rescue with a loan to the owners to buy an extra year's time in which to save the lake. During this period the owners have agreed to negotiate with public agencies for the disposition of their land.

Last August I introduced a bill designed to add the threatened areas to the Kaniksu National Forest, where they would be protected and preserved for the use of the public. The Department of Agriculture subsequently issued a favorable report on the bill, and in October, at my request, field hearings were conducted at Priest Lake by the Senate Public Lands Subcommittee under the able chairmanship of the distinguished senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], and with my colleague [Mr. JORDAN], and the Congressman from Idaho's First District [Mr. WHITE], and myself attending. Nearly all of the witnesses were greatly in favor of saving Upper Priest. The printed field hearing report should soon be available, clearing the way for early action.

Therefore, Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to purchase, at a fair market value, the 417 acres involved in the three parcels of land which I have mentioned, and to include them within the boundaries of the Kaniksu National Forest. This year, my colleague, Senator LEN JORDAN, joins with me as a cosponsor of the bill.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the text of the bill will be printed in the RECORD, as requested by the Senator from Idaho.

The bill (S. 435) to extend the boundaries of the Kaniksu National Forest in the State of Idaho, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. CHURCH (for himself, and Mr. JORDAN of Idaho), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, to promote protection and conservation of the outstanding scenic values and natural environment of Upper Priest Lake in Idaho and lands adjacent thereto for public use and enjoyment, the boundaries of the Kaniksu National Forest are hereby extended to include those of the lands hereinafter described which are not now within such boundaries. In order that they may be managed under the principles of multiple use and sustained yield, the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized to acquire the following lands at their fair market value:

Township 63 north, range 4 west, Boise meridian:

section 18, southeast quarter southeast quarter;

section 19, northeast quarter northeast quarter, lot 3 (southeast quarter northeast quarter);

section 20, southwest quarter northwest quarter;

section 33, lot 1 (northeast quarter northwest quarter), lot 2 (southeast quarter northwest quarter), lot 3 (northeast quarter southeast quarter); lot 6 (southeast quarter southwest quarter), west half southwest quarter northeast quarter, west half northwest quarter southeast quarter, southwest quarter southeast quarter.

Township 63 north, range 5 west, Boise meridian:

section 24, northeast quarter northeast quarter, east half northwest quarter northeast quarter, northeast quarter northeast quarter southwest quarter northeast quarter, northwest quarter southeast quarter northeast quarter, lot 2 (northeast quarter southeast quarter northeast quarter), lot 3 (northeast quarter southeast quarter southeast quarter northeast quarter).

SEC. 2. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such funds as are needed to carry out the purposes of this Act.

REMOVAL OF DISCRIMINATORY NATIONAL ORIGINS QUOTA SYSTEM FROM IMMIGRATION LAWS

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to remove the discriminatory national origins quota system from U.S. immigration laws.

Our present laws, based upon the national origins of our population in 1920, say in effect that persons from Italy, Greece, and Poland, for example, are less welcome than persons from other parts of Europe. They mock the immortal words inscribed on the Statue of Liberty, "Give me your tired, your poor," by adding the qualification "if they come from certain countries only and are not too tired and too poor."

I am unalterably opposed to this repugnant philosophy. There is no room in our free society for this degrading concept of subjecting human beings to the indignity of being judged on the basis of their place of birth or racial ancestry rather than on their merits and qualifications.

Indeed, it does not even conform to the intent of the Congress. Under present law, 156,700 quota immigrants may enter the United States each year. But because some countries are not using their full quotas, 60,000 numbers are wasted each year, while numerous Americans are waiting for their relatives to obtain permission to join them.

My legislation will eliminate once and for all this stain on our national ideals and honor. It conforms with a pledge I made to the people of Pennsylvania last fall, and I urge its early consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 436) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. SCOTT, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RELEASING OF ZINC FROM THE NATIONAL STOCKPILE

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the disposal of 150,000 short tons of zinc from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile without regard to the prescribed 6-month waiting period.

There exists at present a critical shortage of zinc on the American and world markets, a shortage which promises to become even worse in the days ahead.

In this country, the shortage is creating serious problems and hardships for many industries. In my own State of Connecticut there are more than 25 companies, many of them substantial in size, altogether employing many thousands of workers, which must have zinc for various diecasting and galvanizing processes and for the production of bronze and brass.

These firms are located in Bridgeport, Bristol, Groton, Hartford, New Britain, Waterbury, and a number of other cities and towns throughout the State.

Many of these firms have contacted me regarding the difficulties they face in obtaining zinc. Because of the drastic curtailment of operations and the layoffs caused by the shortage, they have been unanimous in urging congressional action to provide effective emergency relief.

The domestic and world shortage can be met only by release of metal from our national stockpile, since there is no other readily available supply of zinc in the free world.

Even though 75,000 tons of zinc were released last year, this limited amount obviously was not enough to alleviate the persistent shortage.

The national economy continues to expand, the demand for zinc will undoubtedly continue to grow and the shortage will continue to worsen unless Congress takes prompt action.

In accordance with the provisions of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act and the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, congressional approval is required for the disposal of materials from both the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile.

The Federal Government now holds over 1½ million short tons of zinc in the national and supplemental stockpiles.

The irony of the situation is that in 1960 the stockpile objective for zinc was reduced to zero from the 1958 figure of 178,000 short tons.

Think of that for a moment. Our stockpile objective is zero and the Government still holds over 1½ million short tons of zinc.

Thus while there is a growing industrial shortage of this metal, the Government has a very large supply which has been declared nonessential.

The measure I am introducing today would authorize release of 150,000 tons of zinc for disposal on the domestic market. By providing a waiver of the 6-month waiting period that is ordinarily required, it would make the metal immediately available to producers and consumers.

Official estimates of the amount of zinc needed to ease the present shortage range as high as 200,000 tons.

The Department of the Interior has urged release of 150,000 tons. This proposal has been endorsed by the Office of Emergency Planning, general overseer of the Government stockpile materials, and by the General Services Administration, which would be responsible for the actual disposal of such material.

Industry representatives have met a number of times with Government officials to discuss all aspects of the shortage and possible courses of corrective action, and they, too, support strongly Government sale of stockpiled zinc.

As soon as Congress approves this bill, and I hope and expect it will be approved early this year, GSA would continue these consultations with both zinc consumers and producers in working out the terms and conditions for its sale on the open market.

The present supply is so short and the demand is so great that there is no danger that the sale of 150,000 short tons would depress the price of zinc or in any other way disrupt the regular operation of the zinc market.

At the same time enactment of this legislation would bring in substantial returns to the Federal Government as a result of the sale of metal now held in the stockpiles.

Actually this bill is part of a two-pronged effort on my part to help Connecticut industry. Copper is also in very short supply and I have joined with our distinguished majority leader, Senator Mansfield, and a number of other colleagues in sponsoring a proposal to make 100,000 tons of copper available to private industry on a repayable loan basis.

The critical shortages of both zinc and copper have caused grave problems, and it would serve the best interests of industry, the Government, and the national economy for Congress to take remedial action immediately.

Thus I urge prompt and favorable consideration of my bill to provide relief for the many businesses which continue to suffer from this acute shortage of zinc and of the bill to release copper.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 437) to authorize the disposal, without regard to the prescribed 6-month waiting period, of zinc from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile, introduced by Mr. Dodd, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

ILLEGAL TRAFFIC IN DANGEROUS DRUGS

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to control the illegal traffic in stimulant and depressant drugs. This measure is a refined version of legislation which members of the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee and I have toiled upon for 44 months.

I ask unanimous consent that this bill be left at the desk until January 16, so that other Senators who wish to do so may have an opportunity to join as cosponsors. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, will remain at the desk as requested, and will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 438) to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to regulate the manufacture, compounding, processing, distribution, delivery, and possession of habit-forming barbiturate drugs, amphetamine, and other habit-forming central nervous system stimulant drugs, and other drugs that have a potential for abuse resulting in psychotoxic effects or antisocial behavior, introduced by Mr. Dodd, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Drug Control Act of 1965".

FINDINGS AND DECLARATION

Sec. 2. The Congress hereby finds and declares that there is a widespread illicit traffic in barbiturates, amphetamines and other habit-forming central nervous system stimulant drugs, and other drugs producing psychotoxic effects moving in or otherwise affecting interstate commerce; that the use of such drugs, when not under the supervision of a licensed practitioner, may cause a wide variety of acute and chronic changes in psychological functioning, social behavior, or personality, such as difficulties in judgment and coordination, disorderly thinking, disturbances in mood, bizarre and abnormal perceptual experiences and more severe behavior disturbances such as attempted suicide and antisocial activities; that this illicit traffic results in extensive sale and distribution of such drugs to juveniles and youths, as well as adults, not under the supervision of a licensed practitioner; that the use of such drugs by juveniles, when not under the supervision of a licensed practitioner, may lead them to perform acts of delinquency and crime and to experiment with narcotic drugs, which experimentation may result in narcotic addiction; that the use of such drugs, when not under the supervision of a licensed practitioner, often endangers safety on the highway and otherwise has become a threat to the public health and safety, making additional regulations of such drugs necessary regardless of the intrastate or interstate origin of such drugs; that in order to make regulation and protection of interstate commerce in such drugs effective, regulation of intrastate commerce is also necessary because, among other things, such drugs, when held for illicit sale, often do not bear labeling showing their place of origin and because in the form in which they are so held or in which they are consumed a determination of their place of origin is often extremely difficult or impossible; and that the regulation of interstate commerce without the regulation of intrastate commerce in such drugs, as provided in this Act, would discriminate against and depress interstate commerce in such drugs.

CONTROL OF CERTAIN DRUGS

Sec. 3. (a) Section 201 of the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(v) The term 'controlled drug' means—

"(1) any drug which contains any quantity of (A) barbituric acid or any of the salts of barbituric acid; or (B) any derivative of barbituric acid which has been designated by the Secretary under section 502(d) as habit forming;

"(2) any drug which contains any quantity of (A) amphetamine or any of its optical isomers; (B) any salt of amphetamine or any salt of an optical isomer of amphetamine; or (C) any substance which the Secretary, after investigation, has found to be, and by regulation designated as, habit forming because of its stimulant effect of the central nervous system; or

"(3) any drug which contains any quantity of a substance which the Secretary, after investigation, finds as, and by regulation designates as (A) affecting or altering to a substantive extent, consciousness, the ability to think, critical judgment, motivation, mood, psychomotor coordination, or sensory perception, and (B) (i) to be substantially involved in drug abuse ('drug abuse' being deemed to exist when drugs are used for their psychotoxic effects alone and not as therapeutic media prescribed in the course of medical treatment or when they are obtained through illicit channels); or (ii) to have a substantial potential for such abuse by reason of the similarity of its effect to that of a drug already subject to this paragraph (v); except that the Secretary shall not designate under this subparagraph, or under clause (C) of subparagraph (2), any substance that is now included, or is hereafter included, within the classifications stated in section 4731, and marihuana as defined in section 4761, of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (26 U.S.C. 4731, 4761)."

(b) Chapter V of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

CONTROLLED DRUGS

"Sec. 511. (a) No person shall manufacture, compound, or process any controlled drug, except that this prohibition shall not apply to the following persons whose activities in connection with such drug are solely as specified in this subsection:

"(1) Manufacturers, compounders, and processors who have listed their names and places of business with the Secretary and who are regularly engaged or seek to be engaged, and are otherwise qualified, in preparing pharmaceutical chemicals or prescription drugs for distribution through branch outlets, through wholesale druggists, or by direct shipment, (A) to pharmacies or to hospitals, clinics, public health agencies, or physicians, for dispensing by registered pharmacists upon prescriptions, or for use by or under the supervision of practitioners licensed by law to administer such drugs in the course of their professional practice, or (B) to laboratories or research or educational institutions for their use in research, teaching, or chemical analysis.

"(2) Wholesale druggists who maintain establishments in conformance with local laws and are regularly engaged in supplying prescription drugs (A) to pharmacies, or to hospitals, clinics, public health agencies, or physicians, for dispensing by registered pharmacists upon prescriptions, or for use by or under the supervision of practitioners licensed by law to administer such drugs in the course of their professional practice, or (B) to laboratories or research or educational institutions for their use in research, teaching, or clinical analysis.

"(3) Pharmacies, hospitals, clinics, and public health agencies, which maintain establishments in conformance with any applicable local laws regulating the practice of pharmacy and medicine and which are regularly engaged in dispensing prescription drugs upon prescriptions of practitioners licensed to administer such drugs for patients under the care of such practitioners in the course of their professional practice.

"(4) Practitioners licensed by law to prescribe or administer such controlled drugs, while acting in the course of their professional practice.

"(5) Persons who use such controlled drugs in research, teaching, or chemical analysis and not for sale.

"(6) Officers and employees of the United States, a State government, or a political subdivision of a State, while acting in the course of their official duties.

"(7) An employee of any person described in paragraph (1) through paragraph (5), and a nurse or other medical technician under the supervision of a practitioner licensed by law to administer such drugs, while such employee, nurse, or medical technician is acting in the course of his employment or occupation and not on his own account.

"(b) No person, other than—

"(1) a person described in subsection (a), while such person is acting in the ordinary and authorized course of his business, profession, occupation, or employment, or

"(2) a carrier or warehouseman, or an employee thereof, who, while acting in the usual course of his business or of his employment, delivers any such controlled drug to a person authorized by subsection (a) to manufacture, compound, or process such drug, shall sell, deliver, or otherwise dispose of any controlled drug to any other person.

"(c) No person, other than a person described in subsection (a) or subsection (b) (2), shall possess any controlled drug otherwise than (1) for the personal use of himself or of a member of his household or (2) for administration to an animal owned by him or a member of his household.

"(d)(1) Every person engaged in manufacturing, compounding, processing, selling, delivering, or otherwise disposing of any controlled drug shall, upon the effective date of this section, prepare a complete and accurate record of all stocks of such drug on hand and shall keep such record for three years. On and after the effective date of this section, every such person manufacturing, compounding, or processing any controlled drug shall prepare and keep, for not less than three years, a complete and accurate record of the kind and quantity of such drug manufactured, compounded, or processed and the date of such manufacture, compounding, or processing; and every such person selling, delivering, or otherwise disposing of any controlled drug shall prepare or obtain, and keep for not less than three years, a complete and accurate record of the kind and quantity of each such drug received, sold, delivered, or otherwise disposed of, the name and address of the person from whom it was received and to whom it was sold, delivered, or otherwise disposed of, and the date of such transaction.

"(2) Every person required by paragraph (1) of this subsection to prepare or obtain, and keep, records, and any carrier maintaining records with respect to any shipment containing any controlled drug, and every person in charge, or having custody, of such records, shall, upon request of an officer or employee designated by the Secretary permit such officer or employee at reasonable times to have access to and copy such records. For the purposes of verification of such records and of enforcement of this section, officers or employees designated by the Secretary are authorized, upon presenting appropriate credentials and a written notice to the owner, operator, or agent in charge, to enter, at reasonable times, any factory, warehouse, establishment, or vehicle in which any controlled drug is held (or they have reason to believe that it is), manufactured, compounded, processed, sold, delivered, or otherwise disposed of, and to inspect, within reasonable limits and in a reasonable manner, such factory, warehouse, establishment, or vehicle, and all pertinent equipment, finished and unfinished material, containers, and labeling therein, and all things therein (including records, files, papers, processes, controls, and facilities) bearing on violation of this section or section 301(q); and to inventory any stock of such drug therein, and obtain samples of such drug. If a sample is thus obtained, the officer or employee making the inspection shall, upon completion of the inspection and before leaving the premises, give to the owner, operator, or agent in charge a receipt describing the sample obtained.

"(3) The provisions of paragraphs (1) and (2) of this subsection shall not apply to a licensed practitioner described in subsection (a)(4) with respect to any controlled drug received, prepared, processed, administered, or dispensed by him in the course of his professional practice.

"(e) The Secretary may by regulation exempt any controlled drug from the application of all or part of this section when he finds that regulation of its manufacture, compounding, processing, possession, and disposition, as provided in this section or in such part thereof, is not necessary for the protection of the public health."

PROHIBITED ACTS

SEC. 4. Section 301 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(q)(1) The manufacture, compounding, or processing of a drug in violation of section 511(a); (2) the sale, delivery, or other disposition of a drug in violation of section 511(b); (3) the possession of a drug in violation of section 511(c); (4) the failure to prepare or obtain, or the failure to keep, a complete and accurate record with respect to any drug as required by section 511(d); (5) the refusal to permit access to or copying of any record as required by section 511(d); or (6) the refusal to permit entry or inspection as authorized by section 511(d)."

GROUNDS AND JURISDICTION FOR JUDICIAL SEIZURE AND CONDEMNATION

SEC. 5. The first sentence of section 304(a) of such Act is amended by inserting before ": *Provided, however,*" the following: ", and any such drug which is a controlled drug within the meaning of section 201(v) and which has been manufactured, compounded, processed, sold, delivered, disposed of, or is possessed, in violation of section 511, or with respect to which there is a failure to prepare, obtain, or keep any record required by such section, shall be liable to be proceeded against at any time on libel of information and condemned in any district court of the United States within the jurisdiction of which the article is found".

PENALTIES

SEC. 6. (a) Section 303(a) of such Act (21 U.S.C. 333(a)) is amended by inserting after the final word "fine" and before the period the following: ": *Provided, however,* That any person who, having attained his eighteenth birthday, violates section 301(q) (2) by selling, delivering, or otherwise disposing of any controlled drug (as defined in section 201(v)) to a person who has not attained his eighteenth birthday shall, if there be no previous conviction of such person under this section which has become final, be subject to imprisonment for not more than two years, or a fine of not more than $2,000, or both such imprisonment and fine, and for the second or any subsequent conviction for such a violation shall be subject to imprisonment for not more than six years, or a fine of not more than $15,000, or both such imprisonment and fine".

(b) Section 303(b) of such Act (21 U.S.C. 333(b)) is amended by inserting after the word "shall" the following: "(except in the case of an offense which is subject to the provisions of the proviso to subsection (a) relating to second or subsequent offenses)".

REGULATIONS

SEC. 7. The first sentence of section 701(e) (1) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act is amended by inserting "201(v)," immediately before "401".

AUTHORITY OF INSPECTORS TO CARRY FIREARMS

SEC. 8. Section 702 of such Act (21 U.S.C. 372) is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(g) Officers or employees of the Department designated by the Secretary to conduct examinations, investigations, or inspections under section 511 of this Act may, when authorized by the Secretary, carry firearms."

APPLICATION OF STATE LAW

SEC. 9. Nothing in this Act shall be construed as authorizing the manufacture, compounding, processing, possession, sale, delivery, or other disposal of any drug in any State in contravention of the laws of such State.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 10. The foregoing provisions of this Act shall take effect on the first day of the seventh calendar month following the month in which this Act is enacted; except that the Secretary shall permit manufacturers, compounders, and processors referred to in paragraph (1) of subsection (a) of section 511 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as added by this Act, to list their names and places of business with the Secretary prior to such effective date, and except that the definitions of terms in subsection (v) of section 201, as added by this Act, and the provisions of section 9 shall take effect upon the date of enactment of this Act.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, in our investigations we found that during the past 6 years the illegal use of the 5 billion pills which are annually sold illegally in this country was causing grave damage to our young people.

We further found that, beyond question, the reason for this situation is the lack of adequate Federal controls over the distribution of these drugs.

The bill I am introducing today will provide these controls by requiring that:

First. Manufacturers, compounders, and processors of barbiturates and amphetamines be required to register their names and addresses with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Second. Manufacturers and others engaged in receiving or disposing of such drugs be required to keep records of the quantities of such drugs they handle and make these records available to food and drug inspectors.

Third. Adequate authority be given to drug inspectors to inspect establishments, inventory stocks, vehicles, and other facilities relevant to the proper investigation of the disposal of drugs.

Fourth. Possession of these drugs be illegal, except if the drugs are for one's own use or for the use of a member of his family.

In emphasizing the seriousness of illegal trafficking in these drugs, I have made the bill call for severe penalties for those found selling to children and teenagers.

Mr. President, last August, in its wisdom and concern for the welfare of the youth of our Nation, the Senate passed an earlier version of this bill to help control and regulate the flagrant abuse of certain dangerous stimulant and depressant drugs that are today manufactured, distributed, and sold throughout the 50 States almost as if they contained qualities no more harmful than popcorn.

Because the proposal was not considered by the other body before the 88th Congress adjourned, I rise to introduce it again, early in this session so that, hopefully, the bill can be enacted into law by the end of this year.

I think it is regrettable that we have hesitated this long with our legislative deliberations in this area, since with every passing month the dangerous drug trade gains a more solid base in our society and becomes more difficult to eradicate.

Last November, it was confirmed by the Food and Drug Administration that organized criminal rings are moving into the bootlegging of sleeping pills and pep pills because of the profits that allow 1,000 pills costing $1 to be sold for $30 wholesale and then retailed at 10 to 25 cents apiece or as much as $250 profit. The attractiveness of such a return to our criminal underworld is obvious.

The dangerous drug trade is a relatively new development as compared with the traffic in hard narcotics, the traditional stronghold and source of income for the criminal underworld. But time is of the essence if we are to have effective means for thwarting the big-time criminals from moving in and taking over this new field. Today, all to often, Federal officers must stand helplessly by because they have no law, because they cannot identify the source of the drugs they confiscate, and because no records are required to show by whom the drugs are produced, how they are obtained, and how they are sold.

The dangerous drug traffic is new in terms of the segments of the population it affects and in its impact on the rate and location of crime and delinquency in this country.

The peddling of hard narcotics was once confined to high delinquency and slum areas of our cities. But dangerous drug use has invaded suburban areas and is now contributing to lawlessness among youth in middle-class residential districts. Such a report was released last October by the head of the police narcotics unit in Chicago who tells us that the present users of these drugs are often young people in the so-called white collar class who have no previous criminal records. Here again, time is running out on us. If we are to stop a new wave of delinquency from a new source, Congress must act quickly. This is a development we can ill afford in view of the already formidable delinquency problem facing us at the present.

In addition to these urgent reasons for quick enactment of a law in this area, I want to remind the Senate of the facts which were disclosed in our committee's previous investigations of the drug trade. They are:

Over 50 percent of the 10 billion amphetamine and barbiturate pills which are produced in this country annually eventually end up in the illicit traffic.

Increasing misuse of these drugs by teenagers and young adults has resulted in actions which eventually lead to the misuse of the hard-core narcotics such as heroin.

Misuse of these drugs has resulted in violent, antisocial, and criminal behavior.

Youngsters with no prior records of delinquency from the so-called better families in the suburbs, are included among those who frequently misuse these drugs and commit crime.

Law enforcement arrest figures reflect the increasing seriousness of this problem.

Large quantities of these drugs have been transshipped to Mexico for illegal reentry into the United States.

The lack of effective Federal regulation of the interstate traffic in these drugs substantially contributes to the seriousness of the problem.

In view of the subcommittee's findings, I believe that no prudent person would contest the need for remedial legislation. However, after almost 4 years of urging the Congress to act, I again appear to present this much-needed bill.

Opponents of my efforts, all from the drug industry, have indicated that the problem is one which should rest with State and local authorities and they have so testified. I find this view to be totally unacceptable because the very crux of the problem lies in the interstate traffic in these drugs.

Drug industry representatives have testified that drug production figures could be sought voluntarily from the manufacturers and compounders of drugs and thus, there would be no need for the recordkeeping provision of my bill.

I need only point to the testimony of Commissioner George P. Larrick of the Food and Drug Administration in order to dispel this contention. He testified in August of 1964 before the Subcommittee on Health of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, that such voluntary cooperation had been sought by the Food and Drug Administration. It has been unsuccessful to date due to the fact that two of the largest manufacturers of these drugs refused to cooperate. And, I might add, they are well within their rights in so doing under the present law. In addition, the records of other firms were not adequate or were incomplete.

Another complaint of the drug industry is that the provisions of my bill are discriminatory and would be overly burdensome on the pharmaceutical profession.

I do not believe that this is true. It is a fact that 78 percent of the convictions achieved by the Food and Drug Administration concern pharmacists, pharmacies, or pharmaceutical employees. Thus, to relieve that profession of responsibility under my bill would, in effect, contribute to the defeat of its intended purpose. I do not mean to malign or in any way discredit members of the pharmaceutical profession who, by and large, would not traffic illegally in these drugs. I do not believe, however, that we can ignore facts which have a direct bearing on the problem with which we are concerned.

Mr. President, I would like to point out that these fears on the part of the drug industry came to the surface in the waning days of the 88th Congress.

The years of the development of this bill by the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee were years of close cooperation with the drug industry. Their facilities and research were at our disposal. The subcommittee and the industry mutually benefitted from the experience. One drug company, becoming more and more aware of the abuse of the dangerous drugs, established a drug identification laboratory and made its services available to the police and other authorities. A commendable effort.

Thus, when S. 2628 went to public hearings last summer before the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, it had the full support of the harassed and already overworked law-enforcement agencies of the country, police officials who are faced with large increases in ever more serious crimes triggered by the abuse of these drugs.

It had the almost unanimous support of the 100 drug experts who framed the report and recommendations of the White House Conference on Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs. President Kennedy had asked specifically that this bill be made law. And, importantly, after years of cooperative research on the threat that the abuse of these drugs pose to public safety, the legislation, S. 2628, had the broad support of the drug industry.

I outlined all of this last summer as one of the first witnesses to appear before the Senate Labor Committee in hearings on this bill. Later in those hearings, I detected an uneasiness in the trade. As it became more apparent to me that the bill would clear the Senate, as it did shortly thereafter without objection, I found that the biggest ingredient in the drug industry's support for the legislation was lipservice.

Even before the matter was approved in the Senate, criticisms of the measure, all of them emanating from the pharmaceutical industry, began appearing in the trade press. The camaraderie of years of investigating a problem, which all concerned agree imposes a serious threat to communities across the Nation, was suddenly dropped by the drug industry.

Here are just two examples: In the August 18, 1964, Drug Trade News, a bylined article by Robert Barr announced that "Some drug interests are known to be trying to kill the bill in the House [of Representatives] Committee."

In the September 1, 1964, issue of the same journal, under the byline of Richard Wightman, a lengthy story was announced under a headline which said: "Industry Fights To Delay Action on RX Files Bill." The article began:

> Retail and manufacturing sections of the pharmaceutical industry are pressing hard this week to delay House action on the controversial psychotoxic drug bill (S. 2628).

The story then went on to explain, among other things, that the bill, just recently passed unanimously by the Senate, was unacceptable to the National Association of Retail Druggists and also to the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association.

I can only observe once again that the chief ingredient in the years of apparent support and cooperation given by the industry was lipservice, possibly compounded with a dash of the gambler's instinct that the bill would not be passed in the legislative rush of an election year. I think that the resentment of the American public will present the drug industry with a much more effective compound in this Congress. They will support only effective legislation and will not hold for the lightweight, intramural arguments that, thus far, have withheld the drug industry's support for the measure at the expense of the public health and safety.

And it is at the expense of the public.

Let me quote from reports that reached the subcommittee while the 88th Congress dallied:

> August 1964.—Baltimore police broke a major pill ring when they arrested a woman who had sold 200,000 pills to undercover officers over a 7-month period.
>
> August 1964.—The city of Yonkers, N.Y., in Westchester County, was shocked when police revealed that of the 900 local teenage users of these drugs, the highest concentration was in the fashionable upper middle class northwest section of the city.
>
> October 1964.—Chicago police indicate that the traffic in these drugs to teenagers is getting out of hand and that youngsters from white-collar families who have had no previous records of delinquency are often found to be users.
>
> November 1964.—The Food and Drug Administration indicated that organized criminal rings have taken up bootlegging sleeping pills and pep pills in a very substantial way.

And what of the overall problem as it exists in some of our major addiction centers.

The attorney general of California told my staff that dangerous drug arrests in California had increased 75 percent from 1960 to 1963.

The Illinois Division of Narcotic Control reported a 100-percent increase in dangerous drug cases from 1960 to the present.

Chicago alone reported that 1964 cases increased by 65 percent over 1963.

Baltimore reported a 60 percent increase for 1964 over 1963.

The New York City Police Department prepared a special report for me on dangerous drug arrests and drug seizures for the first 11 months of 1964, compared to a similar period in 1963. The results of that report are startling:

Barbiturate arrests increased 131 percent; seizures, 28.2 percent.

Amphetamine arrests increased 23.9 percent; seizures, 393 percent.

The New York police further identified the latest troublemaker in that city, a powerful amphetamine drug popular with heroin addicts, called Desoxyn. Seizures of this drug increased 237 percent last year.

Mr. President, these facts need no further elaboration. As far back as July 15, 1964, President Johnson issued a statement calling for a higher priority on government efforts against narcotics and drug abuse. President Johnson's directive followed the lines of the first 25 recommendations of his Commission's report on narcotic and drug abuse.

I would like to quote recommendation 13 from that report:

> The Commission recommends that all nonnarcotic drugs capable of producing serious psychotoxic effects when abused be brought under strict control by Federal statute.

The report states further:

> On January 28, 1963, Senator Thomas J. Dodd submitted to the Senate a bill (S. 553) to provide close Federal regulation of the manufacture, sale, and distribution of certain dangerous drugs, notably the barbiturates and amphetamines.
>
> A similar bill (H.R. 6848) was submitted to the House of Representatives by Congressman James J. Delaney.

The report concluded:

> The Commission favors the plan of regulation proposed by the Dodd-Delaney bill.

As recently as January 6, 1965, in President Johnson's health message to the Congress, he said:

> I recommend legislation to bring the production and distribution of barbiturates, amphetamines, and other psychotoxic drugs under more effective control.

Mr. President, since May 23, 1961, when I first introduced this bill, it has been subjected to the scrutiny of the President's Commission on Narcotics and Drug Abuse; the Departments of Health, Education, and Welfare; Treasury; Justice; and State; the law enforcement agencies in New York City and the State of California, where this problem is greatest; the Association of Juvenile Court Judges, the International Juvenile Police Officers Association, and the distinguished representatives of a number of religious faiths. All of these groups have approved of or endorsed this bill over the past 3½ years. Thousands of parents have written to me urging passage of the bill.

Mr. Walter A. Munns, president of the largest producer of stimulant drugs in the United States, Smith Kline & French Laboratories, wrote to me on September 9, 1964, and endorsed this legislation.

Mr. President, the bill which I introduce today is the culmination of many years of hearings by different committees in both the House and the Senate. It is the culmination of more than 3 years of work by the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee.

This is a bill which tightens acknowledged inadequacies in the law, inadequacies which are permitting a wave of narcotic addiction to go unchecked in this country.

It is a good piece of legislation and one that has the approval of just about everyone familiar with the dangerous drug problem. I would like to urge my colleagues in the Senate and especially those on the Labor and Public Welfare Committee to give top priority to this much-needed bill.

EXTENSION OF SPECIAL BENEFITS TO SERVICEMEN ON DUTY IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, throughout our Nation's modern history the American citizenry has extended special benefits to those servicemen who are called to duty and who face combat conditions. This is a time-honored tradition and one which Americans have proudly respected.

It seems to me only right and appropriate that this tradition be extended to encompass the present conflict in southeast Asia. There can be little doubt that Americans in the Vietnam area are facing combat conditions.

There has been in past months a general reluctance by some strategists to regard Vietnam as a combat zone, but I think we can no longer flout reality.

And so I rise. Not to offer the elusive panacea of peace in Asia—would that I, or anyone else, could offer that. But, I do arise to urge this Senate to extend to American servicemen in today's battle zone the recognition and the subsequent opportunities and benefits which this Nation has afforded for service in the far too frequent combat zones of the past.

I propose three pieces of legislation designed to recognize reality and to deal with it as an honorable American citizenry should.

I propose:

First. A Vietnam GI bill.

Second. Extension of normal combat-zone tax benefits to our men in southeast Asia.

Third. A declaration by this Senate that Americans fighting there must be provided the best available weapons, equipment and aircraft.

VIETNAM GI BILL

It is my belief that veterans whose military service approximates that of wartime are entitled to educational benefits like those extended in the Korean and World War II GI bills. My Vietnam GI bill will extend 1½ days of educational assistance for each day of service not to exceed 36 months of schooling. The aid would be in the form of a monthly cash allowance to the veteran enabling him to select his own school, correspondence course, or technical training program.

The Vietnam GI bill also provides home and farm loan assistance with a loan fee included to offset all losses.

Six months of active service would be necessary to qualify for benefits. In addition, widows would be eligible for the loan benefits, and children of combat dead would be eligible for the educational benefits.

I ask permission that a more detailed explanation of the Vietnam GI bill be printed at the end of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

VIETNAM TAX BENEFITS

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, the second bill I offer would designate the southeast Asian area as a combat zone under the Internal Revenue Code. This will extend to men and women, serving the cause of freedom there, the tax benefits already prescribed in the law for combat zone service.

This means enlisted men would pay no income tax on their salaries, and officers would receive a $200 per month tax exemption.

VIETNAM EQUIPMENT RESOLUTION

I believe that my proposed resolution on Vietnam and Laos speaks for itself. I quote it:

S. RES. 25

Whereas American military servicemen are fighting and dying in the Republic of Vietnam; and

Whereas these Americans and their comrades-in-arms from the Republic of Vietnam are fighting to preserve freedom and liberty from the treachery and brutality of Communist aggressors; and

Whereas the United States does not regard its soldier sons as mere mercenaries fighting only for pay, but as dedicated and courageous protectors of liberty who are committed to battle to preserve and defend principles which Americans hold to be of utmost importance; and

Whereas American servicemen go into battle knowing that they will not be betrayed in trust or in support by their Government or their fellow citizens for whom they offer their lives if need be: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That American servicemen fighting in the Republic of Vietnam, or at any other place, be provided promptly and in adequate numbers with the most effective weapons, equipment and aircraft available in American military inventories.

Mr. President, I ask that the three measures I have introduced—the Vietnam GI bill, the Vietnam tax benefits measure, and the Vietnam equipment resolution—may be held at the desk for 1 week so that other Senators may become cosponsors of any or all of the measures, if they so desire.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills and resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the request of the Senator from Texas that they be held at the desk for 1 week will be granted.

The bills, introduced by Mr. TOWER, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred, as follows:

To the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

S. 458. A bill to provide educational assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces in the southeast Asia theater of operations.

To the Committee on Finance:

S. 459. A bill to designate Vietnam as a combat zone for Federal tax purposes.

The resolution (S. Res. 25) expressing the sense of the Senate as to the arming of American servicemen fighting in Vietnam, submitted by Mr. TOWER, was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

EXHIBIT 1

DIGEST OF VIETNAM GI BILL OFFERED BY SENATOR TOWER

This bill provides readjustment assistance for veterans of the southeast Asian theater who perform active duty between January 1, 1961, and the termination date of the draft law (now July 1, 1967). Discharge other than dishonorable is required. The President delimits the southeast Asian theater periodically. Readjustment assistance authorized is similar to that afforded in the Korean GI bill.

Educational and vocational training assistance: Eligibility is conditioned upon more than 180 days of active duty or discharge for service-connected disability. Education or training period cannot exceed 36 months and is calculated by multiplying 1½ times each day of active duty. During the educational period the monthly allowance is as follows: For full-time college training—no dependents, $110; one dependent, $135; more than one dependent, $160. Lesser benefits are prescribed for proportionately less study. Veteran must begin education within 3 years after discharge or enactment of bill, whichever is later, and must complete education within 8 years after discharge or enactment. No allowance is paid for study before January 1, 1965. All education and training end 10 years after the draft law is terminated, with limited exceptions for career enlisted men. Children of combat dead are eligible for these educational benefits.

Loan assistance: Eligibility for guarantee and direct loans is conditioned upon more than 180 days of active duty, or discharge for service-connected disability. Widow of veteran who died of service-connected disability also eligible. Loans are for purpose of purchasing (a) homes, including farm homes, and (b) farmlands, livestock, and so forth, to be used by veteran in farming operations. Banks or other lenders make loans with Government guaranteeing 60 percent, up to $7,500, on residential real estate, and 50 percent, up to $4,000, on nonresidential real estate. Loans are subject to guarantee fee not to exceed one-half of 1 percent of loan amount, to be used to cover losses on loans. Direct loans not exceeding $13,500 may be made to veterans in certain small towns and rural areas when private capital is not available for guarantee loans. Interest rates and maturities of loans controlled by laws applicable to World War II and Korean veterans, now and in the future. (Under Public Law 86-73, maximum interest rate is 5¼ percent per annum.) Termination date of guarantee and direct loan program is 10 years after end of induction period except for loans on which VA commitments have been issued before such date.

AUTHORIZATION OF DEEPWATER HARBOR ON LAKE MICHIGAN, IN NORTHERN INDIANA

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to authorize a deepwater harbor on Lake Michigan, in northern Indiana.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 460) authorizing construction of a deep-draft harbor by the State of Indiana on the shore of Lake Michigan in the vicinity of Burns Waterway, and assumption by the Federal Government of an appropriate part of the cost of construction thereof, introduced by Mr. BAYH (for himself and Mr. HARTKE), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, the passage of this measure, which is similar to one cosponsored by my senior colleague from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE] and me in the last session, and with whom I have joined in its introduction at this session, will, I hope, after it has made the journey through both Houses, mark the consummation of a dream which has been held by many citizens of Indiana since the beginning of statehood.

There has been a strong, sincere effort on the part of my senior colleague and me, as well as of other members of the committee—the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] and the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE] and also the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] to reach a compromise between the two seemingly irreconcilable points; namely, the interest, on one side, to have a deepwater harbor, and the interest, on the other hand, to preserve the natural resources in that area, the dunes area.

With the help of the Senators whom I have mentioned, a bill was introduced in the Senate during the last week to create, almost within sight of the port area, a Dunes National Lakeshore Park, which would provide, first, for the development of two great resources, deepwater transportation and rapidly growing economic industrial opportunities in this area; and second, the preservation of natural resources and provision for recreational opportunities for workers and business people who are coming into the area in rapidly growing numbers.

I ask unanimous consent that a statement, prepared by me, relating to the bill, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BAYH

I have introduced today a bill to authorize the State of Indiana to construct a deep-draft harbor on Lake Michigan and assumption by the Federal Government of its appropriate share of the cost of the construction.

Leaders of the State of Indiana have dreamed of operating a public harbor on Lake Michigan almost since statehood. With the authorization provided by this bill, our dream can become reality in the near future.

I know that my colleagues are aware of the controversy that surrounded the Indiana port construction for a number of years. During that period, the harbor stood as the symbol of the industrialization of a section of Indiana's Lake Michigan shoreline. Conservationists opposed this industrialization and sought to preserve all of the remaining Indiana shoreline.

This controversy is behind us. It has been resolved by development of a plan which will provide more than 11,000 acres for conservation and recreation purposes and still provide an extensive area for industrial expansion. I am a sponsor again this year of a bill to create the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore, and it is my hope that it will be passed again by the Senate so that action can be taken in the House of Representatives.

The State of Indiana must move rapidly to develop a deep-water harbor on Lake Michigan. Industrial users of the facility are already operating in the area and are in need of waterborne transportation.

The need to begin construction within the next year requires that the State assume the responsibility for construction, as other States have done from time to time, with the Federal Government maintaining its responsibility for the cost of the Federal portions of the navigation structure. The corps has estimated these costs to be in excess of $25 million.

Gov. Roger Branigin of Indiana has announced plans to ask the Indiana Legislature for an advance of $25.5 million so that harbor construction can move forward. It is expected that these funds will be appropriated and be available on July 1. The State timetable provides for planning and design of the facilities to be accomplished by the end of 1965 so that construction can begin in the spring of 1966. The Corps of Engineers has been fully advised of the action by the State and it agrees that State construction will be required to meet the completion date dictated by need for the facility.

Indiana has been patient. Indiana has worked hard to secure the benefits of the Federal harbor improvements program. Now that parties are in agreement with the compromise developed by the administration and the Bureau of the Budget, let us now proceed to authorize this important harbor facility.

DESIGNATION OF COLUMBUS DAY, OCTOBER 12, AS A NATIONAL LEGAL HOLIDAY

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to designate Columbus Day, October 12, as a national legal holiday.

Columbus Day marks the sailing of a courageous man and three now famous little ships into Western waters on one of the world's most historic ventures.

It is in effect the point where the story of America begins, and it certainly is appropriate and right that we give proper recognition to this date.

There is significant State and National precedent for this legislation.

October 12 is celebrated in all but 13 States and the District of Columbia.

It is officially observed in 30 States as Columbus Day and in 7 other States under varying appropriate designations.

In addition, under title 36, section 146, of the United States Code, the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation "designating October 12 of each year as Columbus Day and calling upon officials of the Government to display the flag of the United States on all Government buildings on said date and inviting the people of the United States to observe the day in schools and churches, or other suitable places, with appropriate ceremonies expressive of the public sentiment befitting the anniversary of the discovery of America."

In the 88th Congress I was one of the cosponsors of a bill to make Columbus Day a legal holiday. Because of a special appeal I made, in cooperation with a number of colleagues, to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Federal Charters, Holidays, and Celebrations, hearings were held and the bill passed the Senate last August.

Unfortunately, the House took no action on the measure before adjournment and it died with the end of the 88th Congress.

This same bill was reintroduced last week, with the identical bill number (S. 108) and I have again cosponsored it.

But I thought it would be appropriate for me to introduce my own bill since I am a member of the Judiciary Committee, which has jurisdiction over legislation establishing national holidays and celebrations, and since my proposal is drafted differently.

My bill makes specific reference to the statute I have cited making Columbus Day a ceremonial day. Then it adds to this statute by giving Columbus Day legal stature similar to that enjoyed by Washington's Birthday, Memorial Day, Labor Day, Veterans Day and the other national legal holidays.

In introducing this alternative approach, I pledge that I will make committee consideration and approval by the Senate one of my first objectives this year.

If we can get this bill through the Senate at an early date, the House will have ample time to consider and approve similar legislation and we will not run the risk of having our efforts come to naught as they did the end of last year.

Many millions of persons throughout the United States observe Columbus Day, paying homage to this historic figure and to the men who accompanied him across the sea, and paying tribute to the many fine Americans of Italian origin or descent who have played such an important part in the growth of this great Nation.

It is only fitting that this year we start to honor October 12 as a national legal holiday and I urge favorable consideration of this Columbus Day proposal.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 461) to provide that the 12th day of October in each year, known as Columbus Day, shall be a national holiday, introduced by Mr. Dodd, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AUTHORIZATION OF PORT ORFORD, OREG., HARBOR PROJECT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague [Mrs. Neuberger] and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize construction of a navigation project at Port Orford, Oreg.

This bill is a companion to the bill which has been introduced today in the House of Representatives by my colleague, Congressman Robert B. Duncan, of Oregon's Fourth Congressional District. We of the Oregon congressional delegation are particularly proud to sponsor this project, because it is one which has not heretofore received Federal assistance by way of construction of harbor improvements.

The people of the Port Orford area are to be commended for the fact that over a period of almost 30 years they have endeavored to develop harbor facilities on their own initiative. The work they undertook without Federal assistance reflects expenditures of more than $425,000. A community which has sought to help itself in such a convincing manner deserves every tangible encouragement the Federal Government can render.

After a careful study, the Corps of Engineers recommended the project as a feasible and necessary harbor improvement. It has a very impressive 1.9-to-1 cost-benefit ratio. A fully developed harbor is essential to the economic development of the Port Orford area; and if this excellent deepwater harbor is to serve adequately the community and the commerce of our Nation, it must be protected from winter storms by the 550-foot extension of the breakwater which is proposed under this authorization bill.

The authorization calls for a Federal expenditure of $696,000; and in the opinion of the sponsors of the Port Orford Harbor authorization bills, this development would constitute a wise investment of Federal funds and a great asset to the Nation.

We urge prompt and favorable action in committee and in the Senate on this outstanding harbor project.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 467) authorizing construction of a navigation project at Port Orford, Oreg., introduced by Mr. Morse (for himself and Mrs. Neuberger), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

CONVEYANCE OF FEDERAL LAND TO THE CITY OF ROSEBURG, OREG.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague [Mrs. Neuberger] and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey to the city of Roseburg, Oreg., certain lands originally donated to the United States for use in connection with the operation of a veterans hospital. This bill is identical to a bill which was introduced today on the House side by Congressman Robert Duncan, of Oregon's Fourth Congressional District.

In 1932, the city of Roseburg donated to the United States approximately 413.7 acres of land near Roseburg lying north of the South Umpqua River. At the same time, the State of Oregon donated another tract of 40 acres of land lying immediately south of the river. Subsequently, the Veterans' Administration constructed a veterans hospital on the donated land.

The city of Roseburg desires to obtain reconveyance of a certain 47-acre tract of the land originally donated to the United States in order that the area may be converted to a major recreation facility as a portion of Roseburg's Stewart Park.

When this bill was introduced in the last Congress, the Veterans' Administrator supplied a report, suggesting the inclusion of certain conditions and limitations. These are set forth in section 2 of the bill which is being introduced today.

The gratuitous conveyance, which would be authorized under this bill, does not violate the so-called Morse formula. The formula does not apply in those cases wherein the bill is designed to bring about a reconveyance of land donated to the Federal Government by the beneficiary named in the bill. One of the first cases in which this principle was announced involved a conveyance of land to the city of Roseburg. The subject was discussed in some detail in the Senate and appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 102, part 7, page 9323.

In view of the meritorious nature of the proposed conveyance, it is my hope that the committee to which the bill is referred will schedule prompt hearings and take early action on the measure.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 468) to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain lands situated in the State of Oregon to the city of Roseburg, Oreg., introduced by Mr. MORSE (for himself and Mrs. NEUBERGER), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

COMMISSION TO REEXAMINE FEDERAL AGRICULTURAL PROGRAMS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I introduce on behalf of myself and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] for appropriate reference, legislation to establish a commission to reexamine the effectiveness of our Federal agricultural laws and programs. This measure takes the form of legislation which I previously introduced in the 87th Congress as S.J. Res. 238 and in the 88th Congress as S.J. Res. 152 in order to permit a new and much needed fresh look at our present agricultural programs and objectives. On November 12, 1963, during the 88th Congress, the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS] introduced S. 2299, a bill to establish a Commission on National Agricultural Policy, and on January 16, 1964, the senior Senator from Minnesota, now our Vice President-elect, introduced similar legislation, which measures were referred to the Agriculture Committee.

During Senate debate on H.R. 6196, the wheat-cotton bill, on March 2–4, 1964, Senator HUMPHREY and I each introduced amendments to the pending bill which would have authorized the establishment of such a commission. Assurances were given at the time my amendment (No. 452) was withdrawn, that hearings would be held by the Agriculture Committee on the proposals offered by the above-mentioned Senators. I am hopeful that hearings on the establishment of a commission to examine our Federal agricultural policies may be possible in the new Congress.

The need for reappraising the effectiveness of our agricultural programs, with the objective of improving them, is very much upon us. The commission sought to be established by this legislation is of the Hoover type consisting of 12 members, 4 appointed by the President of the Senate, and 4 by the Speaker of the House, with not more than 6 members to be of the same political party. Six members would be picked from nongovernmental fields. This Commission would provide basic machinery for the conduct of an important study. The legislative recommendations to be provided by it will, it is hoped, provide a valuable basis for confronting still unsolved basic agricultural problems.

The Commission would reexamine existing agricultural legislation and consider the desirability of improvement and/or elimination of existing programs and consider: First, the effectiveness of price support and production limitations; including acreage allotments, and production and marketing quotas, which may be in effect for certain commodities; second, the future requirements of the United States and the world for such commodities; third, suitable uses for land which may not be needed at the present time for the production of such commodities, but which may be needed for such purpose in the future; fourth, methods for effectively coordinating domestic agricultural policies with export opportunities for such commodities; fifth, the effective use of surplus commodities in support of our foreign policies; sixth, problems of rural economic opportunity in the United States; seventh, the national requirements for stockpiling agricultural commodities, and eighth, the need for consolidating the activities of the U.S. Department of Agriculture with other Federal agencies on the development of rural resources. The Commission would also give particular attention to the formation of programs to ease the economic adjustment of farmers who wish to move into other occupations. Assistance in such cases might take the form of retraining programs, relocation allowances, and aid in obtaining alternative employment opportunities.

The recent disclosure of the tremendous wheat needs of the Soviet Union has pointed up the failures of the monolithic, centrally controlled Soviet farm management program. In the light of these Soviet failures, we must not forget the motivating forces of our own agricultural system. We must continue to place emphasis on the blessings of bountiful productivity, the free competitive forces of the market, on private enterprise, on the profit motive, and on individual productive efficiency.

I do not believe that the Department of Agriculture, involved as it is in carrying out the agricultural policy of the administration and the day-to-day administration of the existing agricultural laws, would be able to devote the needed deliberation and objectivity to this study of overall effectiveness of our agricultural programs. I am hopeful that the Department would profitably lend its expertise to such an effort and in a major way would contribute to it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the end of my remarks, a text of the joint resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 20) providing for the establishment of a Commission on the Revision of Federal Agricultural Laws and Programs, introduced by Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. TOWER), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S.J. RES. 20

Whereas agricultural production in the United States has achieved levels of both quantity and quality unprecedented in world history; and

Whereas today some two billion people of the world are inadequately fed and many millions already benefit greatly from the surplus agricultural production of the United States; and

Whereas it is vital to the interest of the United States and to the world that our present agricultural productive level be maintained and that our productive potential be increased in order to meet the current and future needs of the United States and the world; and

Whereas the people of the United States engaged in the production of food and fiber comprise a vital segment of this Nation's economic productive force and its social structure; and

Whereas the welfare of that important segment of our population is critical to the welfare of the country in general; and

Whereas the attainment of an effective balance between the agricultural production of the United States and domestic and foreign consumption of such production is and has been the goal of Federal agricultural programs throughout our history and must continue to be so in the future; and

Whereas Federal programs formulated for achieving that goal have had little success when compared to the marked increase in agricultural production; and

Whereas such agricultural programs have been responsible for an increasingly intolerable burden on the people of the United States in both taxes and higher prices, have been responsible for placing many buyers, sellers, and users of agricultural commodities in this country at a competitive disadvantage in world trade, and have failed in assuring an adequate standard of living to many medium- and small-scale agricultural producers: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

DECLARATION OF POLICY AND PURPOSE

SECTION 1. It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress to promote the effective utilization of the agricultural production of the United States so that (1) the markets for United States agricultural commodities, insofar as possible, will be competitive in the markets for such commodities in the world, (2) the present and future requirements for such agricultural commodities in the United States and the world can be fully met, (3) the interests of taxpayers and consumers may be fairly safeguarded, and (4) the producers of agricultural commodities in the United States will receive a return on their investment and labor commensurate with their contribution to the national welfare. It is further declared to be the policy of the Congress to promote programs recognizing the necessity for consumers in this country to be assured an adequate supply of agricultural commodities of the best possible quality and at the lowest possible prices. It is, therefore, the purpose of this joint resolution to provide for a study and investigation of the Federal laws and programs pertaining to agriculture with a view to revising and modernizing such laws and programs in order to achieve the policies stated above.

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE COMMISSION ON REVISION OF FEDERAL AGRICULTURAL LAWS AND PROGRAMS

SEC. 2. In order to achieve the purpose set forth in section 1 of this joint resolution, there is hereby established a bipartisan commission to be known as the Commission on Revision of Federal Agricultural Laws and Programs (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission").

MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 3. (a) NUMBER AND APPOINTMENT.—The Commission shall be composed of twelve members as follows:

(1) Four appointed by the President of the United States, two from the executive branch of the Government and two from private life.

(2) Four appointed by the President of the Senate, two from the Senate and two from private life.

(3) Four appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representtaives, two from the House of Representatives and two from private life.

(b) POLITICAL AFFILIATION.—Of each class of two members mentioned in subsection (a), not more than one member shall be from each of the two major political parties.

(c) VACANCIES.—Vacancies in the Commission shall not affect its powers but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

ORGANIZATION OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 4. The Commission shall elect a Chairman and a Vice Chairman from among its members.

QUORUM

SEC. 5. Seven members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 6. (a) MEMBERS OF CONGRESS.—Members of Congress who are members of the Commission shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as Members of Congress, but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(b) MEMBERS FROM THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH.—Any member of the Commission who is in the executive branch of the Government shall each receive the compensation which he would receive if he were not a member of the Commission, plus such additional compensation, if any, as is necessary to make his aggregate salary not exceeding $22,500; and he shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence and other necessary expenses incurred by him in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(c) MEMBERS FROM PRIVATE LIFE.—The members from private life shall each receive not exceeding $75 per diem when engaged in the performance of duties vested in the Commission, plus reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties.

STAFF OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 7. The Commission shall have power to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable in accordance with the provisions of the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949.

EXPENSES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 8. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, so much as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this joint resolution.

EXPIRATION OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 9. Sixty days after the submission to Congress of the report provided for in section 10(b), the Commission shall cease to exist.

DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 10. (a) INVESTIGATION.—The Commission shall make a comprehensive study and investigation of all Federal laws and programs pertaining to agriculture with a view to revising and modernizing such laws and programs to achieve the aims set forth in section 1 of this joint resolution. In carrying out such study and investigation the Commission shall consider such matters relating to agriculture as it deems necessary or appropriate, but shall specifically consider, with regard to the various agricultural commodities produced in the various regions of the United States, (1) effectiveness of price support and production controls, including acreage allotments and production and marketing quotas, which may be in effect for such commodities, (2) the future requirements of the United States and the world for such commodities, (3) suitable uses for land which may not be needed at the present time for the production of such commodities, but which may be needed for such purpose in the future, (4) methods for effectively coordinating domestic agricultural policies with the export opportunities for such commodities, (5) the effective utilization of surplus commodities in support of our foreign policies, (6) the problems of rural economic opportunity in the United States, (7) the national requirements for stockpiling of agricultural commodities, and (8) the need for consolidating the activities of the U.S. Department of Agriculture with other Federal agencies on the development of rural resources.

The Commission shall also give particular attention to the formulation of programs to facilitate the economic adjustment of agricultural producers who decide to transfer to other occupations. Such programs may include, but shall not be limited to, retraining programs, relocation allowances, assistance in obtaining alternative employment opportunities, early retirement, and provision for minimum compensation for land, dwellings, and equipment which such producers no longer want or need.

(b) REPORT.—The Commission shall make a report of its findings and recommendations to the Congress on or before February 1, 1966, and may submit interim reports prior thereto.

POWERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 11. (a)(1) HEARINGS.—The Commission or, on the authorization of the Commission, any subcommittee thereof, may, for the purpose of carrying out its functions and duties, hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places, administer such oaths, and require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses, and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents as the Commission or such subcommittee may deem advisable. Subpoenas may be issued under the signature of the Chairman or Vice Chairman, or any duly designated member, and may be served by any person designated by the Chairman, the Vice Chairman, or such member.

(2) In case of contumacy or refusal to obey a subpoena issued under paragraph (1) of this subsection, any district court of the United States or the United States court of any possession, or the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, within the jurisdiction of which the inquiry is being carried on or within the jurisdiction of which the person guilty of contumacy or refusal to obey is found or resides or transacts business, upon application by the Attorney General of the United States shall have jurisdiction to issue to such person an order requiring such person to appear before the Commission or a subcommittee thereof, there to produce evidence if so ordered, or there to give testimony touching the matter under inquiry; and any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by the court as a contempt thereof.

(b) OFFICIAL DATA.—Each department, agency, and instrumentality of the executive branch of the Government, including independent agencies, is authorized and directed to furnish to the Commission, upon request made by the Chairman or Vice Chairman, such information as the Commission deems necessary to carry out its functions under this Act.

CODE OF ETHICS FOR MEMBERS, OFFICERS, AND EMPLOYEES OF THE SENATE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am submitting a resolution requiring the Select Senate Committee on Standards and Conduct, established last year, to prepare and submit to the Senate a code of ethics for Senators and legislative employees. In the meantime, my resolution would provide for an interim code based on disclosure of financial interest until a permanent code of ethics can be adopted by the Senate. The resolution also authorizes the Select Committee to render advisory opinions on questions of ethics when requested to do so by Senators or officers and employees of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 26) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

S. RES. 26

SECTION 1. (a) One of the most vital concerns of a free and representative government is the maintenance of moral and ethical standards for their representatives which are above cause for reproach and warrant the confidence of the people. The people are entitled to expect from their elected representatives in the Federal Government and the employees of the legislative branch a standard above that of the marketplace, for these public servants are entrusted with the welfare of the Nation. Yet these standards must be practical and should be fairly representative of the people who elect their representatives. Some conflicts of interest are clearly wrong and should be proscribed by sanctions in the criminal law; however, many are composed of such diverse circumstances, events, and intangible and indirect concerns that only the individual conscience can serve as a practical guide. But there are many possibilities of conflict in that shadowland of conduct for which guidance would be useful and healthy, but for which the criminal law is neither suited nor suitable. Therefore, the Senate finds that a Code of Ethics is desirable for the guidance and protection of its Members and the officers and employees of the Senate, by establishing the standards of conduct reasonably to be expected of them.

(b) It is also the purpose of this resolution to provide for a thorough study and investigation to determine necessary and desirable changes in existing conflicts of interest statutes applying to Members of the Senate and to officers and employees of the Senate, and to develop a comprehensive code of ethics for the guidance of such Members, officers, and employees, by which the purposes of this resolution may be more fully assured in the conduct of the public business in the Senate.

DUTIES OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS AND CONDUCT

Sec. 2. (a) It shall be the duty of the Select Committee on Standards and Conduct (referred to hereinafter as the "Select Committee") to undertake a thorough study and investigation of the ways and means by which the policy objectives set forth in section 1 of this resolution can further be assured. In the conduct of such study and investigation the Select Committee shall, among other things, determine to what extent existing conflict of interest laws or regulations applicable to the legislative branch should be strengthened, and it shall recommend a comprehensive Senate Code of Ethics, in the formulation of which it shall have considered the following subjects:

(1) Outside employment or professional or business activity by Members of the Senate or officers or employees of the Senate;

(2) Disclosure by Members of the Senate or officers or employees of the Senate of confidential information acquired in the course of official duties or the use thereof for personal advantage;

(3) Use of their official position by Members of the Senate or officers or employees of the Senate to secure unwarranted privileges or exemptions for themselves or others;

(4) Dealing by Members of the Senate or officers or employees of the Senate in their official capacities with matters in which they have a substantial pecuniary interest;

(5) Conduct by Members of the Senate or officers or employees of the Senate which gives reasonable cause for public suspicion of violation of public trust; and

(6) Other matters concerning official propriety and the integrity of the public service as it relates to Members of the Senate and to officers or employees of the Senate.

(b) The Select Committee shall report to the Senate the result of its investigations together with such recommendations for the establishment of a Senate Code of Ethics as it may deem advisable. Such report shall be submitted no later than one year after the effective date of this resolution.

INTERIM CODE OF ETHICS

Sec. 3. Senate Resolution 338, 88th Congress, agreed to July 24, 1964 (relating to the establishment of the Select Committee on Standards and Conduct), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"Sec. 6. For the purposes of guidance for Members of the Senate and officers and employees of the Senate during the period during which the Select Committee is considering the provisions of an appropriate Senate Code of Ethics, the Senate hereby adopts the following standards as a guide to such Members, officers, and employees:

"(a) No Member of the Senate, or officer or employee of the Senate, should have any interest, financial or otherwise, direct or indirect or engage in any business transaction, or professional activity or incur any obligation of any nature whether financial or moral, which is in substantial conflict with the proper discharge of his duties in the public interest; nor should any Member of the Senate, or any officer or employee of the Senate, give substantial and reasonable cause to the public to believe that he is acting in breach of his public trust.

"(b) In addition to the general rule set forth in paragraph (a), the following standards are applied to certain specified transactions:

"(1) No Member of the Senate, or any officer or employee of the Senate, should accept other employment which will tend to impair his independence of judgment in the exercise of his official duties.

"(2) No Member of the Senate, or any officer or employee of the Senate, should accept employment or engage in any business or professional activity which will tend to involve his disclosure or use of confidential information which he has gained by reason of his official position or authority.

"(3) No Member of the Senate, or any officer or employee of the Senate, should disclose confidential information acquired by him in the course of his official duties or use such information for other than official purposes.

"(4) No Member of the Senate, or any officer or employee of the Senate, should use or attempt to use his official position to secure unwarranted privileges or exemptions for himself or others.

"(5) A Member of the Senate, or an officer or employee of the Senate, should not by his conduct give reasonable cause for belief that any person can improperly influence him or unduly enjoy his favor in the performance of his official duties, or that he is affected by the kinship, rank, position, or influence of any person or political party.

"(6) A Member of the Senate, or an officer or employee of the Senate, should endeavor to pursue a course of conduct which will not give reasonable cause for belief that he is likely to violate his trust.

"(7) Any Member of the Senate, and any officer or employee of the Senate having a financial interest, direct or indirect, which has a value of $5,000 or more, in any activity which is subject to the jurisdiction of a regulatory agency, should file with the Comptroller General a statement setting forth the nature of such interest in such reasonable detail, and in accordance with such regulations as shall be prescribed by the Comptroller General. As used herein, the term 'regulatory agency' shall include such agencies as shall be designated by the Comptroller General, which list shall be published in the Federal Register as soon as practicable.

"(8) Any Member of the Senate who has any direct or indirect pecuniary interest in the passage or defeat of any legislative measure should declare the nature and extent of such pecuniary interest before casting any vote with respect thereto upon the floor of the Senate or in any committee or subcommittee of the Senate.

"(9) Any officer or employee of the Senate who has any direct or indirect pecuniary interest in the passage or defeat of any legislative measure, before engaging in the rendition of any service with respect to that measure for or on behalf of any Member of the Senate or any committee or subcommittee of the Senate, should declare to such Member, committee, or subcommittee the nature and extent of such pecuniary interest.

"(10) No Member of the Senate, and no officer or employee of the Senate, should solicit or accept any substantial loan or gift from any other person who has or may have any substantial direct or indirect pecuniary interest in the passage or defeat of any legislative measure upon which such Member has or may have occasion to cast his vote as a Member of the Senate, or with respect to which such officer or employee has or may have occasion to render any service as an officer or employee of the Senate."

ADVISORY OPINIONS

Sec. 4. Section 2(a) of Senate Resolution 338, 88th Congress, agreed to July 24, 1964, is amended by—

(1) striking out the word "and" in line 9, page 3;

(2) striking out the period in line 12, page 3, and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and the word "and"; and

(3) inserting, between lines 12 and 13, page 3, the following new paragraph:

"(5) render advisory opinions upon questions of ethics arising under the rules of the Senate or any code of ethics of the Senate when so requested by Members of the Senate or officers or employees of the Senate.".

DEFINITIONS

Sec. 5. As used in this resolution, the term "officer or employee of the Senate" shall have the meaning given thereto by section 5 of the Senate Resolution 338, 88th Congress, agreed to July 24, 1964.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am also introducing a separate bill requiring that any communication between a Senator or a member of his staff and a regulatory agency in adjudicatory proceedings be made a part of the public record of those proceedings. This bill would amend the Administrative Procedure Act.

Companion legislation governing Members and employees of the House of Representatives is also being introduced today in the other body by Representative Ogden R. Reid. The Reid bill would establish a select House committee to parallel the Senate committee already in being.

The public interest requires a clearly defined, enforceable code of ethics for Senators and their staffs to support public confidence in the Senate, confidence shaken by the disclosures made in the Robert Baker hearings.

In similar legislation which with my former colleague I introduced in the last Congress, a Joint Committee on Ethics would have been established and the proposed code of ethics would have been applicable to Members of both Houses of Congress and to the more than 25,000 employees of the legislative branch. Since the Senate in the last session establish a select Senate committee to consider matters of ethics solely as they pertain to the Senate, the subject of the bill I am introducing today is limited to Members and employees of the Senate, to make effective use of a committee already in existence.

My proposal would set basic standards for the conduct of Senators and their staffs, taking into consideration the necessary differences between the responsibilities and financial requirements of members of the executive branch and Members of Congress. I feel it is completely incongruous for Senate committees rigorously to question executive appointees on their financial affairs when those of us in Congress and our staffs are not subject to similar standards and requirements. We cannot continue to function on this double standard of ethics—one standard for the executive branch and another for the legislative branch.

The bill I introduce today would go a long way toward eliminating this double standard as far as the Senate is concerned. If enacted it would immediately establish an interim code of ethics pending the adoption of a permanent code. One provision of this interim code would require a Senator, officer, or employee of the Senate to disclose financial interests of $5,000 or more in any activity which is subject to the jurisdiction of a Federal regulatory agency. Another provision would require Senators to disclose any pecuniary interest in the passage or defeat of legislation before voting on it.

Other prohibitions would limit outside employment, ban the disclosure or use of confidential information acquired in the course of official duties for other than official purposes, prohibit using official influence to gain special privileges or exemptions. In the years 1963 and 1964 I have made disclosures on the Senate floor of my own financial position in accordance with the proposed interim code.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 466) to amend the Administrative Procedure Act to provide for the disclosure of certain communications received by Government agencies from Members of Congress with respect to adjudicatory matters, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Javits, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PROPOSED STANDING COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Washington [Mr. Jackson] be added as a cosponsor to Senate Resolution 20, to create a Standing Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

APPORTIONMENT

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, last week I introduced Senate Joint Resolution 2 which deals with the question of apportionment. The distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. Javits] had fully intended to join us. He is in complete accord with the purposes we have in mind and the objectives which are sought to be attained. However, he believes that perhaps some modification in terminology might be necessary, from his standpoint, at least. Accordingly, he will probably introduce a joint resolution dealing with the same subject matter, seeking the same objective.

I now ask that Senate Joint Resolution 2 be taken from the desk and referred to the appropriate committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois has stated exactly the three points which I feel must be covered by the constitutional amendment in order to give the people in each State the right to have one house apportioned not on the basis of population. They are: First, that the Supreme Court shall retain jurisdiction of the one-person one-vote basis for the house which is not the subject of the people's action under that constitutional amendment; second, that compliance with the amendment—the way in which a house is to be apportioned not on the basis of population—also be subject to the review of the Supreme Court; and third, that the people have continued control so that having apportioned one house not on the basis of population, they might make changes in their determination, or even reverse their determination without having a built-in permanent constitutional amendment to that effect.

In that way, the people will have the same power that they had when they established the Senate of the United States in the Constitution. I am confident that we can work this out.

I believe that Senator Dirksen's purposes are precisely the same as mine. I hope to be in complete accord with Senator Dirksen and the cosponsors of his amendment.

In due course, I shall introduce a resolution to that effect. I compliment my leader on taking this kind of leadership, which is, in my judgment, taking a moderate course, in the middle of the road, in respect to this very critical matter to the American people.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 1

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Williams] and the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. Lausche] be added to the growing list of cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 1, which deals with the double-barreled problem of vacancies occuring in the office of Vice President and of Presidential disability.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

APPALACHIA—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, for myself and the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph], I ask unanimous consent that the bill S. 3, popularly known as the Appalachia bill, remain at the desk for cosponsors through Friday, January 15.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONFIRMATION OF POSTMASTERS—ADDITIONAL TIME FOR BILL TO LIE ON THE DESK FOR COSPONSORS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Proxmire], I ask unanimous consent that S. 252, his bill to end Senate confirmation of postmasters, remain at the desk until Monday, January 18, for additional cosponsors.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION RELATING TO WATER RESOURCES—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, on January 6 I introduced three bills, S. 22, S. 23, and S. 24. I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Bartlett] be added as a cosponsor of these bills at the next printing of the bills.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 6 TO REMAIN AT THE DESK

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senate Joint Resolution 6 be kept at the desk until the close of business on Friday, January 15.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS, ETC.

Under authority of the orders of the Senate of January 6, 1965, the following names have been added as additional cosponsors for the following bills and concurrent resolution:

S. 1. A bill to provide a hospital insurance program for the aged under social security, to amend the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system to increase benefits, improve the actuarial status of the disability insurance trust fund, and extend coverage, to amend the Social Security Act to provide additional Federal financial participation in the Federal-State public assistance programs, and for other purposes: Mr. Kennedy of New York and Mr. Monroney.

S. 21. A bill to provide for the optimum development of the Nation's natural resources through the coordinated planning of water and related land resources, through the establishment of a water resources council and river basin commission, and by providing financial assistance to the States in order to increase State participation in such planning: Mr. Bible, Mr. Tower, and Mr. Yarborough.

S. 22. A bill to promote a more adequate national program of water research: Mr. Bible and Mr. Tower.

S. 23. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a program in five areas of the United States to increase usable precipitation, and for other purposes: Mr. Dominick, Mr. Long of Missouri, Mr. Tower, and Mr. Yarborough.

S. 24. A bill to expand, extend, and accelerate the saline water conversion program conducted by the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes: Mr. Bible, Mr. Long of Missouri, Mr. Moss, Mr. Tower, and Mr. Yarborough.

S. 288. A bill to amend Public Law 874, 81st Congress, in order to provide assistance to local educational agencies in the education of children of needy families and children residing in areas of substantial unemployment with unemployed parents: Mr. Long of Missouri.

S. Con. Res. 2. Concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress: Mr. Fannin, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Jordan of Idaho, Mr. Mansfield, Mr. Mondale, and Mr. Symington.

NOTICE OF RECEIPT OF NOMINATIONS BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I desire to announce that today the Senate received the nomination of Maurice M. Bernbaum, of Illinois, to be Ambassador to Venezuela; and Wymberley DeR. Coerr, of Connecticut, to be Ambassador to Ecuador.

In accordance with the committee rule, these pending nominations may not be considered prior to the expiration of 6 days of their receipt in the Senate.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, January 12, 1965, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled joint resolution (S.J. Res. 3) extending the date for transmission of the budget and the Economic Report.

APPROVED STATEMENTS ISSUED BY SENATE AND HOUSE MINORITY LEADERS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on Monday, January 11, the joint Senate-House Republican leadership, which has been operating as a joint group throughout the 87th and 88th Congresses, and which continues into the 89th Congress, approved statements issued by the two minority leaders.

I ask unanimous consent that they be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR DIRKSEN

When defeat comes to a major political party in this country invariably there are outcries for revolutionary changes in party structure, party leadership, and party policies. The Republican defeat of 1964 has produced these manifestations of uncertainty, unrest, and uneasiness. Many suggestions, both formal and informal, for action pour from numerous sources.

We, the members of the joint Senate-House Republican leadership, are fully cognizant of the situation. There is no doubt in our minds that action is indicated and we are taking it. In our conversations since the November defeat we have discussed among ourselves and with other recognized party leaders, numerous paths that might be followed. Always, certain basic facts have emerged:

First, that the only elected Republican officials of the Federal Establishment are the 32 Republican Members of the U.S. Senate and the 140 Members of the House of Representatives. Obviously and beyond dispute, they will guide Republican Party policy at the national level, in the absence of a Republican President and Vice President, by the record they write in the Congress. It is their responsibility.

Second, that an additional repository of advice and counsel on party policy exists in former Presidents and nominees for President, in our present elected Governors, in the members of the Republican National Committee and the State chairmen of our several States, and, of course, in active Republican advocates at all other levels of the party structure. Their wisdom must be channeled into party policy formulation.

In the conviction that the Republican Party for a century has been and is an essential element in this Nation's forward progress, and with the firm belief that all Republicans must join the effort, we, the members of the joint Senate-House Republican leadership, have on this day initiated a proposed mechanism to achieve a broad consensus on vital objectives for our country and our party. It is an honor to introduce my colleague, the new Republican leader of the House, JERRY FORD, to provide the details of the proposal.

STATEMENT BY REPRESENTATIVE FORD

We propose to give the Republican Party a unified leadership. As a chart we are making public will show, we are inviting the five living Republican nominees for President—one of whom, Dwight D. Eisenhower, served two terms in that office—and representatives of the Republican Governors Association to join with us in the establishment of a Republican Coordinating Committee to continuously examine party policy and party operations.

We have asked the presiding officer of the joint Senate-House Republican leadership, the Republican National Chairman, Mr. Dean Burch, to serve as presiding and administrative officer of the new Republican Coordinating Committee, and through the Republican National Committee to provide such staff assistance and funds as may be necessary. As Mr. Burch, himself, suggested, we regard this role an implicit responsibility for him or whoever may occupy his office in the future.

It will be the function of the Republican Coordinating Committee, composed of the 11 members of the joint Senate-House Republican leadership, the five living Republican nominees for President, and five representatives of the Republican Governors Association to facilitate the broadest party representation and the establishment of task forces for the study and examination of major national problems and issues. The recruiting sources for these task forces, which would report to the joint leadership, are clearly delineated on the organization chart which we are making public.

For the joint leadership, I have been asked to add these two pertinent points: First, the Republican National Chairman has been requested to immediately invite the other participants to join us in forming the Republican Coordinating Committee. Second, we are convinced that the Republican Party is not only a great force in the American way of life, but it is the only living political instrument which can make the American dream a reality, not a mere collection of words and promises. Our only goal is results and we intend to achieve them.

INTERVIEWS OF SENATOR CHURCH CONCERNING VIETNAM

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, recently, the Senate appointed the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations. Senator CHURCH has made an excellent statement with regard to what our policy should be in southeast Asia.

I ask unanimous consent that this statement, together with a number of editorials from the New York Times of December 28, 1964, the Evening Star of Washington, December 30, 1964, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of December 30, 1964, the Salt Lake Tribune of December 31, 1964, the Idaho Statesman of December 18, 1964, and the New Britain Herald of December 28, 1964, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Ramparts magazine, January–February 1965]

INTERVIEW WITH SENATOR FRANK CHURCH

I think that if there is a basic fault with our Asian policy, it might well be our failure to confine it to the practical limits of our power. We conquered the Pacific in the Second World War. Afterward, the Pacific was a very broad moat protecting the United States against hostile encroachment. Had we established, as our westernmost rampart, the island chain which rims the Asian continent, and had we made it clear that we were prepared to meet—with our own military force—any hostile penetration of the Pacific, we would have established a boundary line fully within our military power to maintain. The United States is essentially a naval and aerial power, and there is no way for the landlocked forces of Asia to drive us from the Pacific. The elephant cannot drive the whale from the sea nor the eagle from the sky. But it is also true that neither the whale nor the eagle can drive the elephant from his jungle. I think our failure to establish such an island rampart, conforming to the character of our military power, has been a fundamental cause for some of the difficulties that now face us in Asia.

Question. Senator CHURCH, you would restrict American intervention to the defense of this string of islands. Is that correct?

Answer. That might have been our posture, but it has not been.

Question. If you are going to limit the line like that, how can you justify our presence in Korea, which is on the mainland?

Answer. I think that we were right, in the first instance, to intervene in Korea. An invasion by North Korea had occurred, and we undertook, in the name of the United Nations, to defend the independence of South Korea against that invasion. Many other countries joined us, at least in a token way, to uphold the U.N. shield against an aggression of this kind. Our mistake was not in undertaking the defense of South Korea, but in having remained there afterward longer than required. Today, for example, there still are 55,000 American troops on the 38th parallel. From all appearances, they are permanently entrenched as though the 38th parallel had become an American boundary, and this, despite the fact that the South Korean Army has been equipped as a modern military force, nearly twice as large as the North Korean Army which faces it. There is no military necessity for so large a continued American presence along the 38th parallel, and I think that we would give added credibility to our oft-spoken purpose of leaving Asia for the Asians if we were to commence to withdraw American forces from Korea.

Question. There are some who argue that even though the North Korean forces are much smaller, there is the vast army of Red China just across the Yalu River. From that point of view, wouldn't it seem advisable to keep American troops in there?

Answer. If we were to accept that premise, then it would follow that American troops must remain permanently on the 38th parallel so long as Red China endures. I think that this is a faulty argument. It may lead China, North Korea, and other Asian countries to conclude that we are, in fact, interested in maintaining some kind of permanent foothold on the Asian mainland. Remember, we have a large and mobile military force on Okinawa, within easy striking distance of Korea, should another invasion ever occur. Moreover, we could, if necessary, leave a single regimental combat team, rather than two full divisions, on the line in Korea, which would be a sufficient "trigger force" to guarantee our renewed participation in the defense of South Korea, if the need were ever to arise again. But, no matter how one looks at it, there is no military requirement for keeping a whole American army there indefinitely, in view of the present strength and capacity of the South Korean Army to defend their boundary line.

Question. If there is no military need for the 55,000 troops, is there a possibility that there is a political need?

Answer. The only political reason for maintaining so large an American army there would be to assist in buoying up the weak South Korean economy. But this is, in itself, an admission of the failure of American policy in Korea. Twelve years after the end of the war, South Korea is still a garrison state, incapable of self-support, and each year it is necessary for the United States to give South Korea close to half a billion dollars in rations. We can't continue indefinitely to finance the South Korean nation and yet, we seem unable to find an alternative to this dole.

Question. Senator CHURCH, returning to the matter of the island string, what about our being in Formosa? Is this compatible with traditional American policy in Asia?

Answer. Of course, we are not in Formosa with a whole American army as we are in Korea. I think we were correct in giving formal assurances to Formosa that we will defend her against Communist attack. Our commitment extends not only to the island of Formosa, but the Pescadores as well. I would view these islands as a part of the ocean rampart I previously mentioned, and well within the American military capacity to defend. Our 7th Fleet is, indeed, the shield for Formosa. My only criticism of American policy in Formosa is that we have helped to finance the maintenance of an army for Chiang Kai-shek, which is twice too big for the needs of the island's defenses and not a tenth big enough to retake the mainland. So the policy has been unduly costly for us, and at the same time, may well be giving China cause to suspect that we are preparing Chiang Kai-shek to act as a spearhead for an invasion of the mainland. I do not regard this as our objective, but it may seem so to the Government of Red China.

Question. It might seem, from the two instances of South Korea and Formosa, that we are trying to preserve an American grip upon Asia. Do you think Asians so view the situation?

Answer. It disturbs me that we may well be creating such an impression even though this is not, in fact, our objective. We fully understand the importance of credibility when it comes to our military forces. We take great precautions to make certain that our nuclear deterrent is a credible one in order to avoid a nuclear war through enemy miscalculation. But we seem to give precious little attention to making our diplomatic objectives credible. I think we have, to some degree, committed this error both in South Korea and Formosa.

Question. The dilemmas we seem to have vis-a-vis South Korea and Formosa appear to find their ultimate expression in the situation in South Vietnam. Wouldn't you agree, Senator?

Answer. Yes, I think that's so. And here again, it is a fact that we are in South Vietnam only because the Communists refuse to let the Saigon government alone. If they were to call off the insurrection against that government and leave South Vietnam and her neighbors alone, we'd be only too willing to withdraw our forces from that region of the world. Nevertheless, it may not seem this way to many Asians. I remember spending some months in India during the Second World War. I had the opportunity to talk to Indian intellectuals and revolutionaries. They made a sharp distinction between me, as an American, and my English friends. They understood that the United States had been the first colony to achieve its independence from George III. They had read our Declaration of Independence; they could quote passages from Thomas Paine, from Thomas Jefferson and from Abraham Lincoln. But once I left their company and went out onto the great flatlands of India itself, and encountered ordinary Indian people, it was apparent from the way they treated all Americans, that they made no distinction between us and the British. We were all white men. To them, we all represented Western imperialism. I'm afraid that in South Vietnam today, there are a great many of the indigenous peoples who make little distinction between our American uniforms and the old French uniforms, and therefore, we are once again faced with the problem of making our position in Vietnam credible to the Asian people with whom we must deal.

Question. Then that raises probably the most fundamental question of all. Should we have gone into South Vietnam in the first place?

Answer. Looking back upon it, I would say that Mr. Dulles was mistaken when he persuaded President Eisenhower that we ought to intervene in South Vietnam after the French defeat. After all, the French had fought for years with an army of some 400,000 men in a vain effort to preserve French Indochina, and that proud army was defeated by ragged guerrilla forces which could not be overcome. Nevertheless, we did make that decision and we now have to live with it.

Question. Thus far, the Saigon government has not been able to win the war. Do you think that the war can ever be won?

Answer. I really don't know. I think that we have to continue to honor our commitments to the Saigon government to make sure that it has all of the weapons, the equipment, food, and financial assistance needed to carry on the war. We have given such help in massive quantity, and I think that we must continue to do so.

But in the end, the capacity of Saigon to win the war will depend on the cohesiveness of public support that can be achieved. Some political stability will be essential. The people themselves must have the will to continue the fight. For nearly 20 years now, fighting has been going on in this unhappy region of the world. The people are weary of war. If the spirit to fight on is preserved, we can provide the material aid necessary, and the war eventually can be won. To do this, I think South Vietnam must be sealed off from supplies from the north, both over the jungle trails and from the sea. But in the last analysis, victory or defeat will depend upon the South Vietnamese people themselves. The thing we must remember is that there is no way for us to win their war for them. It is a guerrilla war, at root an indigenous revolution against the existing government, the kind of war where it's exceedingly difficult to tell the enemy from the people. It can only be won by the people themselves.

Question. When you say seal off supplies to the Vietcong from North Vietnam and from the sea, are you implying that the South Vietnamese have sufficient military capability to do this?

Answer. I think that it's possible for them to accomplish this militarily, particularly if we can bring about a joint military effort in Laos which will interdict the Ho Chi Minh trail. It's possible, also, that we can find a role for the United Nations to play in maintaining the integrity of the boundaries in this area.

Question. Isn't it true that a lot of the warfare is being waged by captured American arms, with the result that the insurrectionists are already rather self-sufficient?

Answer. Yes. It isn't well enough understood that the war in the south cannot be won in the north, even though it would be helpful to cut off the supply lines which continue to give aid and comfort to the Vietcong. Basically, the Vietcong consists of South Vietnamese; the bulk of their weaponry is captured, and they have the capability of maintaining their attacks, independent of North Vietnam. Therefore, it's folly to think that, by extending the war northward, there is a way out for us. All one needs to do is to look at the map to see that this is the way in, not out, and that the war can be more easily won, not by taking on the whole North Vietnamese army, but by confining it to the 25,000 hard-core Vietcong that are involved in the south. If they cannot be put down by the Saigon government, with all of the aid and assistance we are giving it, then our predicament will only be worsened by extending the war northward and increasing the enemy force many times.

Moreover, let us remember that, within the past 2 years, China invaded India. Also, it was Red China that came down from the north when she felt herself threatened by approaching American troops in Korea. Thus, there is little basis for us to assume that China might not respond in like fashion to Vietnam, if the war were to be extended northward. Then, we would have the whole of the Chinese army to contend with as well, and we would be faced with a tragic trail of casualties in this region of the world, out of all proportion to the vital interests of the United States.

Question. Assuming that South Vietnam could be insulated and assuming further that we kept pouring in more and more supplies, what should be the policy of the United States if this effort failed nonetheless, and the war in South Vietnam could not be won?

Answer. I would hope that we could then find the maturity to accept that fact. France did so, both here and in Algeria. Algeria, incidentally, meant a great deal more to the economy of France than Vietnam does to ours. Besides, Algeria was for many years considered a part of France where more than a million Frenchmen lived. When, in the end, the French Government found that there was no way to put down the insurrection against it, that the will for independence in Algeria was irresistible, the statesmanship of De Gaulle made it possible for the French to recognize the inevitable and to make a peaceful settlement in Algeria. This involved a French withdrawal.

Now, South Vietnam has never been, nor do we want it to be, an American possession. It is alien to the United States in almost every way, and it is as remote from the United States as any country in the world. If, despite all of its material advantages, the Saigon government can't prevail, because it simply lacks the indigenous support of the people of the country, then I would hope that we would recognize that it is not our country and never has been. The war is there for them to win or to lose. If it is lost and there is no way left to win it, we should accept that fact.

Question. And by that, do you mean that we should withdraw our support?

Answer. I think in that event, withdrawal would be forced upon us, for the Vietnamese themselves would form some kind of government which would invite us out. I hope it never comes to that, but we must be prepared for that possibility.

Question. Wouldn't it be possible, even before that time, for the United States to make certain diplomatic moves to support the French proposals advocating neutrality for all of southeast Asia? Wouldn't that bring about a resolution of the problem, particularly as it wouldn't require withdrawal in the face of defeat?

Answer. Neutrality for all of southeast Asia, for the whole of that great peninsula, is a proper objective, providing that it is not a camouflage for a Communist takeover. If we were able to sustain the Saigon government sufficiently long to permit it to win its war, or if we were to stabilize the situation in this region in such a way that it would be possible to go with some trump cards to the conference table, then I think we might reach an international agreement, declaring this whole region to be neutral, and requiring the withdrawal of all foreign troops. We could guarantee the integrity of that agreement with our own military power. If it were violated by invasion from China or any other country, we could commit ourselves, along with the other nations joined in the international accord, to the maintenance of its integrity.

Question. That would only guarantee territorial integrity from external aggression. How would that help in terms of internal insurrection?

Answer. The only answer to Communist subversion, burrowing from within a country, is to be found within that country itself. If its government is a decent one and enjoys general popular support, the internal Communist problem can be successfully dealt with. Malaya is a good example. There, a few years ago, Communists undertook the same kind of guerrilla war against the Malayan Government as South Vietnam is plagued with today. The same tactics were used. The same dedicated, hard-core revolutionaries were at work and, too, there was a very large Chinese population in Singapore which might have given shelter and support to the Communist activity. Yet, Malaya was able to deal with this problem, to isolate the Communist guerrillas from the rest of the population, and to stamp out the insurrection. Malaya had the kind of government that enjoyed the confidence and support of the people. The thing for us to remember is that, unless the people themselves are willing to rally behind their government, unless they regard a Communist insurrection as a menace to their own well-being, there is no way that American forces can intervene to save the day. If we move in and take over in an effort to thwart the impending success of a Communist insurrection, the Asian peoples involved will forget entirely our good motivation, and will come at once to regard the war as one between a white Western force on the one hand, and indigenous Asian forces on the other. And there is no way for us to win such a war on the Asian continent. We have to recognize that the period of Western occupation and control in Asia is gone. It is now Asia for the Asians. Nothing would be more futile than to permit ourselves to be sucked into a war which would pit Western forces against Asian forces, for even if we were able, by brute musclepower, to take a large chunk of Asian territory, we could not stay there long. Our only harvest would be implacable hostility on all sides and the tides of history would, in the end, wash over us. No lasting victory could be achieved.

Question. Everything you say seems to fit the situation in South Vietnam at the time that we are talking. We have had, in the last year or two, any number of regimes in South Vietnam, plus a war that seems to be hopelessly bogged down. Is it because of the failure of the Saigon government, or I should say governments, to fulfill the needs of the people?

Answer. I think that the Government in South Vietnam has been incompetent, to say the least. It must be viewed for what it is, a military despotism. Communist North Vietnam is also such a despotism, but this hardly gives the people of South Vietnam a clear-cut choice between free government and tyranny. Nor should we think of this war in terms of preserving a free economic system against the imposition of a Socialist system, for the fact is that both the Governments are committed to socialism.

Question. Taking into consideration everything that you've said so far about our policy toward Asia, don't we face a rather difficult future now that China is a nuclear power?

Answer. Yes. The situation will become increasingly difficult once China has a nuclear arsenal. Of course, the recent detonation of a nuclear device is significant in terms of prospects, but the ultimate significance will be realized, say, about 10 years from now when the Chinese will probably have an effective nuclear arm. This would change the power balance in Asia immensely, and China might well seek to use her newfound power to establish a hegemony over southeast Asia, where China has traditionally enjoyed a sphere of influence. I would hope, by then, that we will have drawn our lines in strict conformity with our vital interests, so that we never find ourselves faced in southeast Asia with the dilemma that confronted Khrushchev in Cuba, when he was compelled to withdraw under highly humiliating circumstances, simply because his gamble was not worth the candle. When it comes to nuclear confrontation, countries must make their stand conform to their mortal interests. The stakes must be absolute, for the consequences are too terrible to permit the frivolous commitment of nuclear weapons.

Question. In other words, once China has atomic capability, any South Vietnam situation would be almost certain to end with the humiliation of having to withdraw or face a nuclear threat from virtually next door. Is that what you are implying, Senator?

Answer. Yes. Unless we look ahead and undertake now to revise our policy in Asia, we could face such a debacle some time in the future.

Question. Assuming that China will have a nuclear capability in the foreseeable future, does this automatically imply that China is going to take over all of Asia?

Answer. I wouldn't think so. Chinese divisions decisively defeated the Indian troops defending India 2 years ago, but China recognized that the conquest of India would not only strain her own resources to the limit, but would also result in greater problems for her than solutions, and, therefore, elected—having shown her capabilities—to withdraw her forces once more. In the event that China establishes her own nuclear arsenal, it is much more likely that she will seek to create a sphere of influence in southeast Asia, similar to the one the old Chinese emperors once enjoyed, which would leave other countries like Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos somewhat independent, even though these countries may become Communist in name. The important thing to remember is that there is now an unraveling within the Communist world. It isn't all one great Red dominion as it appears on the maps. Today, even those who would regard it this way concede that there are at least two Romes, and Moscow and Peiping grow increasingly hostile. Moreover, in Eastern Europe we see the satellite countries asserting their independence in more and more obvious ways, striving with some success to loosen the Russian grip upon them. The point is, that the same unraveling process is likely to occur in Asia as is now occurring in Europe, and that these satellite countries will become increasingly independent of domination from either Peiping or Moscow. Thus it will become more and more possible for us to establish our separate relationships with them, as we are even now doing in the case of both Poland and Yugoslavia.

One final question: vis-a-vis South Korea, Formosa, and South Vietnam, we seem to be in a position that can best be described as involvement. If the world situation changes or the war, for example, in South Vietnam cannot be won, how can we prepare ourselves as a nation, psychologically and politically, for a change from involvement to disengagement?

Answer. It's especially hard for a free, popular government to change course. We have a tendency to oversell our policy with respect to any given country in such a way that public opinion hardens behind it, and then it becomes very difficult to change course. I think we have to find the statesmanship to do this. It's possible that we have swung on the pendulum of public opinion, from the extreme of isolationism 30 years ago, when the prevailing opinion in this country was that it didn't matter to us what happened abroad, to the opposite extreme where we regard it as an American responsibility to maintain the governments of all those countries that are now nominally non-Communist. This, in a sense, is an imperial attitude, even though we seek no possessions, and even though we are not attempting to impose American rule upon any of these countries. However, unless we come to accept the fact that it is neither within the power nor the interest of the United States to preserve the status quo everywhere, our policy is doomed to failure. Here again, the requirement for statesmanship is very high, but if we strive to inform the American people of the upheaval and ferment of our times, and if we give them all the facts, I think the American people will be prepared to support a flexible foreign policy, better tailored to serve the real interest of the United States in a changing world.

[From the New York Times, Dec. 28, 1964]

A FRESH VOICE ON VIETNAM

Senator FRANK CHURCH, in his interview with the liberal Catholic magazine, Ramparts, has said publicly what many U.S. officials are saying privately about Vietnam. Mr. CHURCH argues that the United States should never have got in in the first place and, while there is no immediate way out, the ground should be laid for ultimate extrication.

The tough line Washington is taking in regard to the military purge of the South Vietnamese National Council would indicate a belief that General Khanh's position is not strong as he has made it out to be. His defiance of a few days ago has now been tempered by a warm Christmas message to the U.S. forces expressing "grateful appreciation" for what the Americans are doing.

This represents no assurance, however, that General Khanh will yield to American demands. The political crisis in Saigon gives many signs of being beyond repair. It can be papered over or it can be held down forcibly by the military, but so long as the Buddhists refuse to cooperate and oppose both the war against the Vietcong and American aid to wage it, no solution to the Vietnamese crisis can offer much real hope.

Senator CHURCH deserves to be heard, not only because he is a thoughtful voice but because he has been right in the past on Vietnam. In the autumn of 1963, when Secretary McNamara and General Taylor were giving out optimistic reports on the Diem regime, Mr. CHURCH was publicly skeptical and critical. He now argues that "neutrality for all of southeast Asia is a proper objective, providing that it is not a camouflage for a Communist takeover." Senator MANSFIELD, the Democratic majority leader, has taken a similar line; but his colleague, Senator MONRONEY, returns from an Asian tour convinced that neutrality would be a mistake.

The proviso of keeping the Communists out is all important. The basic objective of the United States in southeast Asia is what was called "containment" in 1954. The American aim was to stop the Communists from taking over all Vietnam, and that is still our objective. A true neutrality would serve that purpose, but it is unrealistic to think that weak nations on the fringe of Communist China can preserve a Swiss-type of neutrality. A Yugoslav-type, perhaps, but then the definition of neutrality would have to be stretched.

As Senator Church points out in his Rampart interview, a number of Democratic Congressmen are dissatisfied with the present policies toward southeast Asia. The dilemma is that no one has an alternate course to suggest that does not involve the enormous risks of an expanded war or an abandonment of all our commitments in the area.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Dec. 30, 1964]

Senator Church Calls for Caution

(By Max Freedman)

Senator Frank Church, a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, deserves the highest praise for speaking so frankly, in his interview with Ramparts magazine, about the situation in Vietnam.

He has not ignored the hazards and humiliations that now face the United States; but he has not advocated the abandonment of South Vietnam to Communist domination as an easy way for the U.S. Government to escape from its growing difficulties.

He is ready to support military aid to South Vietnam while its rulers and people are willing to fight for their freedom. The test of this willingness is to be provided not by the wishes of Washington but by the actions of Saigon.

One of the great misfortunes of the United States entanglement with Vietnam has been the lack of clarity in defining long-term purposes. Perhaps Church is right in blaming the late John Foster Dulles for making Laos, Vietnam, and Cambodia so important to U.S. security. But Church surely will agree, on reflection, that the blame cannot be carried by Dulles alone. The Dulles initiative took place as long ago as 1954. The U.S. absorption with the affairs of Vietnam has continued steadily.

Our military, economic, and emotional commitment seemed to grow more intense as our failure to control events became more evident. President Kennedy did not reduce former President Dwight Eisenhower's commitment, he increased it; and President Johnson is under growing pressure to increase that commitment still further.

During all these years there has been no critical protest in Congress, except by a few notable Senators, at this enlargement of U.S. risks and responsibilities. Secretary of State Dean Rusk and Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara discouraged open debate. They preferred to testify before secret congressional committees. As the war continued to go badly, there was a growing reluctance to challenge U.S. policy in Congress. Responsible Members wished to do nothing that would endanger U.S. security or weaken the fighting resolve of the hard-pressed Vietnamese Government.

But Church is not alone in thinking that continued silence imposes greater risks on the United States than a responsible challenge that will force this country, at a calamitously late hour, to answer some hard questions about its purposes in southeast Asia.

In his interview, Church has discussed some of the first principles of U.S. policy that should have been fully examined years ago. In essence, he has asked two basic questions. Has the United States made the best use of its limited resources in the Pacific? And has the United States assumed more responsibility in southeast Asia than can be justified by its own national interest? Not everyone will agree with Church's answers, but there will be wide agreement with his contention that the present policy cannot be continued without the gravest risks for this country. He is even more opposed to launching a war on North Vietnam.

Church will no doubt take the first opportunity in the new session of Congress to amplify his proposal for giving the United Nations special duties for protecting a neutralized southeast Asia. He recognizes, what President Charles de Gaulle, of France, has failed to admit, that these neutral borders would soon fall under Communist control unless they were placed under some kind of supervision and protection. This means that outside countries would have to assume economic and military duties in southeast Asia, under the guidance of the United Nations, to prevent a Communist attack and to assure the people of Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia that their national independence would remain intact.

This theme, and similar proposals, will be taken up by Church and other Democratic Senators in the new Congress. They do not want to embarrass the Johnson administration. They want to save the country from mistakes and perils in Asia that can yet be avoided. The somber misfortunes in Vietnam assure that their criticisms and suggestions will be more favorably considered by the public now than in the past.

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch, Dec. 30, 1964]

A Senator on Vietnam

Senator Church, of Idaho, made perceptive comments on U.S. policy in South Vietnam in an interview published in Ramparts magazine. He is one of a small group of Democratic Senators who have shown growing uneasiness over the course of events in Saigon, and there is a belief in Washington that a major discussion of foreign policy may be in the making.

Senator Church believes the United States must continue to honor its commitments; he does not advocate an immediate end of U.S. economic and military support for the floundering Vietnamese Government. He thinks the United States should not have picked up the burden of the defeated French in Indochina in 1954, but he recognizes that the problem is not to deplore the past but to decide what to do about the present and future.

The Senator, a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, advocates neutralization for southeast Asia as a fair objective of U.S. policy, and he hopes that the United Nations can be brought into the picture as a guarantor of national boundaries. He also hopes the United States will never be forced to withdraw, but he thinks "we must be prepared for that possibility."

Anyone who reads the dispatches from Saigon must share that feeling. The Communist rebels now are reported to control three-fourths of South Vietnam and half the people; there have been six upheavals in the Saigon government in the last 14 months. If the South Vietnamese are to have any bargaining power in a move for a new Geneva conference or some sort of U.N. intervention there is no time to lose—if, indeed, there is any time left. A U.N. presence would be desirable, but since Red China, not a U.N. member, would have to participate in guarantees, there are many complications.

Senator Church is right when he says we must find the statesmanship to change our course, and must accept the fact that "it is neither within the power nor the interest of the United States to preserve the status quo everywhere." We have failed to distinguish the difference between our vital national interests and our emotional commitments. A constructive debate in this field might serve the Nation well.

[From the Salt Lake City Tribune, Dec. 31, 1964]

Another Possibility in Vietnam Policy

Amid the uneasiness and the welter of suggestions as to U.S. policy in the long, drawn out war in South Vietnam, one of the newest voices is that of Senator Frank Church, of Idaho, who is becoming somewhat of a foreign policy figure in the Senate.

In a recent magazine article, Senator Church recommends the neutralization of all southeast Asia and suggests that a role be found for the United Nations as a guarantor of national boundaries in that area.

Along with several other prominent members of the majority party, Senator Church is showing the restiveness that many Americans feel about the Government policy in Asia generally and in South Vietnam in particular.

SOME FAVOR WITHDRAWAL

Senators Ernest Gruening, of Alaska, and Wayne Morse, of Oregon, have favored withdrawal of U.S. forces from Vietnam now while Senator Mike Mansfield, of Montana, the majority leader, has indicated support for the neutralization of South Vietnam only.

Another Democratic Senator, George D. McGovern, of South Dakota, has proposed a 14-nation conference to seek a political settlement.

It is clear that the new Congress convening next month will stage a major foreign policy debate and that possibly the heaviest opposition to the administration's policies may well come from Democrats.

Senator Church's recommendations deserve careful study. If the kaleidoscopic changes of the government in South Vietnam continue at the pace they have in recent months and if the most powerful figures, militarily speaking, such as Gen. Nguyen Khanh, continue to mutter about U.S. interference while demanding astronomical aid for a war which is far from won (and, it seems from all dispatches, pursued desultorily by the Vietnamese), then it may not be a bad idea to throw the whole matter into the hands of the Security Council of the United Nations.

ASSEMBLY'S VIEW

The U.N. General Assembly would, of course, view the Vietnam struggle as a "colonial adventure" by the United States, thanks mainly to the new and excessively touchy nations of Africa and Asia.

But, the Security Council could take up the matter and possibly work out a solution which, while it may not satisfy all conditions of both sides in the dispute, could at least bring the whole southeast Asian question into the world forum, relieving this country of the odor as well as the actuality of dictating to the unstable politicians in Vietnam.

One problem in the U.N. Security Council, of course, would be the veto power of the Soviet Union. However, it is not impossible that, due to the rift with the Red Chinese, the Russians would refrain from vetoing U.N. action in Vietnam.

FOLLY TO ESCALATE

In his magazine article, Senator Church declared that it would be folly to escalate the present military operations into North Vietnam because such an expansion of the fighting would inevitably bring Communist China into the war.

This is probably true for Peiping is much more aggressively doctrinaire than Moscow and assumes the mask of protector against white colonialism all over the world with an unction which only deceives those who wish to be deceived.

Yet the complete and immediate withdrawal of all U.S. forces and aid from South Vietnam would be a massive loss of "face" in the Asian world (although what "face" is left is certainly bruised and bloody).

So, the Senator from Idaho may have an acceptable solution for the Vietnam dilemma which President Johnson and his advisers would do well to examine closely.

[From the Boise (Idaho) Statesman, Dec. 18, 1964]

CHURCH VIEWS THE FAR EAST

In the current Catholic laymen's magazine, Ramparts, Senator FRANK CHURCH, Democrat, of Idaho, gives an interview, stating: "I think that if there is a basic fault with our Asian policy, it might well be our failure to confine it to the practical limits of our power."

The Senator, as a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, looks back and pinpoints mistakes: "We conquered the Pacific in the Second World War. Afterward, the Pacific was a very broad moat protecting the United States against hostile encroachment. Had we established, as our westernmost rampart, the island chain which rims the Asian Continent, and had we made it clear that we were prepared to meet—with our own military force—any hostile penetration of the Pacific, we would have established a boundary line fully within our military power to maintain."

That lengthy sentence sets the theme for a present-day critique of our policies in the Far East. Senator CHURCH finds the United States still a major naval and aerial power with no way for the landlocked forces of Asia to drive us from the Pacific.

"The elephant cannot drive the whale from the sea nor the eagle from the sky," CHURCH philosophizes with his usual eloquence. "But it is also true that neither the whale nor the eagle can drive the elephant from his jungle."

The Senator "might" restrict American intervention to the defense of this string of Pacific islands. How does that theory fit in with our presence in South Korea?

He answers that the United States was correct in intervening in Korea, but erred in remaining there long after "our presence was no longer required." He finds no military necessity for so large (55,000 American troops) a continued presence along the 38th parallel and "I think we would give added credibility to our oft-spoken purpose of leaving Asia for the Asians if we were to commence to withdraw American forces from Korea."

The Idahoan would retain an American regiment in South Korea. He believes the present South Korean Army could defend alone their boundary line.

Senator CHURCH views the island of Formosa and the Pescadores as being part of the ocean rampart he has delineated.

As to South Vietnam, he thinks that possibly former Secretary of State Dulles was mistaken in persuading President Eisenhower to intervene after the French defeat. The Senator notes that France had an army of some 400,000 men fighting in a vain effort to preserve French Indochina.

The Senator declares the United States must continue to honor her commitments to the Saigon government, to make sure it has all the weapons, equipment, food, and financial assistance necessary to carry on the war. He is concerned about a lack of political stability, a certain amount which will be necessary for the South Vietnamese to pursue their Communist invaders.

"To do this," CHURCH said, "I think South Vietnam must be sealed off from supplies from the north, both over the jungle trails and from the sea. But in the last analysis, victory or defeat depend upon the South Vietnamese people themselves."

The Senator is critical of the South Vietnam Government, recalls its incompetency and views it as a military despotism. "Communist North Vietnam is also such a despotism, but this hardly gives the people of South Vietnam a clearcut choice between free government and tyranny."

In other matters, Senator CHURCH considers the Far Eastern situation more complex with Red China on the way toward becoming a potential nuclear power. But he is not forecasting that Red China will take over all Asia. He cited the Chinese invasion of India and the decisive defeat which the Indian army suffered. "But China recognized that the conquest of India would only strain her own resources to the limit."

The Senator is correct when he acknowledges no sure way for resolving the Far East conflicts. His remarks in Ramparts were scholarly and thought provoking. There is no easy way out. The United States must stand by its commitments and continue to work for the cause of freedom.

[From the New Britain (Conn.) Herald, Dec. 28, 1964]

DISINVOLVEMENT

A popular, young Senate Democrat who is widely respected in both political parties had some things to say in a just-published magazine interview which ought to set a lot of Americans to thinking.

Senator FRANK CHURCH, of Idaho, writing in the Ramparts magazine, a Catholic layman's publication, expresses the view that the United States ought to be setting its sights on getting out of southeast Asia. He doesn't think that we, as a nation, ever should have been in there in the first place.

What makes the Senator's view worthy of more than passing comment is that it is a position widely talked about privately in Washington, seldom publicly.

His view is not simply a throwback to isolationism. It is, rather, a carefully conceived attitude which calls for gradual reduction of all foreign involvements throughout Asia, and as a substitute therefore, guaranteed maintenance of national boundaries through the United Nations.

In Vietnam, in particular, Senator CHURCH feels that continuation of the present course of guerrilla involvement is folly, leading nowhere. He believes that escalation of the war would likewise be futile, leading to dangerous possibilities. The United States, he feels, ought to be making plans for gradual elimination of its troops from South Vietnam.

Likewise, he feels that continued maintenance of the Korean truce line by American troops is a situation which could go on as long as China is under a Communist government.

The important part of his thesis is that he would not simply have the United States withdraw and create a power vacuum. Rather, the United Nations would become the guarantor of peace in that far-off continent.

The American people would not be unhappy to learn of some alternative to the Vietnam situation which does not call for expansion of the war or abandonment of our commitments to the people of Asia.

[From the Lewiston (Idaho) Morning Tribune, Dec. 21, 1964]

ANOTHER SETBACK IN SOUTH VIETNAM

Another military putsch, the latest in a long series, has brought new upheaval to the Government of South Vietnam, illustrating again the dilemma that faces American policymakers in Asia. American troops are in South Vietnam to support the Government in a civil war with the Communist-backed Vietcong rebels, but there is no real government to support.

In its latest show of force, the military junta which rules South Vietnam dissolved the National Council, the country's legislature, and set about arresting many of its members. The civilian premier, Tran Van Huong, seems not to have been deposed, and the chief of state, Phan Kac Suu, was evidently still in power Saturday night. This doesn't mean a great deal, however, since it is clear that the military chiefs could depose either of them whenever they wished. The situation does not encourage confidence in the ability of the Government to secure the country against rebellion, and so long as the Government remains helpless there is little the United States can do to help it save itself.

South Vietnam has been without an effective government since the French were forced to pull out. At no time have the South Vietnamese people felt a national identity with the Government, and so it has been a simple matter for the Communists to stir up trouble in the villages. Senator FRANK CHURCH, Democrat, of Idaho, discussed the problem in an interview published in this newspaper yesterday. "The only answer to Communist subversion, burrowing from within," CHURCH said, "is to be found within that country itself. If its Government is a decent one and enjoys general popular support, the internal Communist problem can be successfully dealt with * * *. The thing for us to remember is that, unless the people themselves are willing to rally behind their Government, unless they regard a Communist insurrection as a menace to their own well-being, there is no way that American forces can intervene to save the day."

This is why CHURCH, Senator WAYNE MORSE, and some others in and out of Congress now consider American policy in Vietnam fruitless. We are caught in a civil war on the side of a government which is barely functioning and we find ourselves unable to avoid taking sides in a religious conflict between Buddhists and Catholics. What is worse, as Senator CHURCH pointed out, we are white people fighting against Asians in Asia, and in the eyes of many Asians simply carrying on where the French left off. And our position there deteriorates with each new demonstration of the Government's incapacity to govern.

DEDICATION OF ARKANSANS TO THE ARKANSAS RAZORBACK FOOTBALL TEAM

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the people of Arkansas are warm, friendly, and lighthearted about most matters, but on one question we are deadly serious. Where the Arkansas Razorbacks football team is concerned, Arkansans have a dedication not unlike that of the most fervent true believer.

As the only non-Texas team in the Southwest Conference, we have the formidable prospect each fall of playing seven Texas football teams; and as everyone knows, Texas football players, like most things from that State, come pretty big.

In less prosperous times when Arkansas teams had all they could do to stay in the league, Arkansas fans displayed the dogged devotion which many believed to be the peculiar possession of New York Mets followers. However, like all things in Arkansas, the Razorbacks in recent years have steadily risen the ladder of success. This year this devotion was repaid. We reached the top. Last week the Razorbacks, who won 10 in a row in the regular season and defeated Nebraska in the Cotton Bowl, were announced as the winner of the Grantland Rice Award as the No. 1 team in the country.

All of Arkansas is very proud of the team which was not as ponderous as its opponents and did not have any superstars in the lineup but which played each game as a team and with steady improvement. Much of the credit for the team's success must go to the student body of the university and to the people of the State who have given the Razorbacks solid support. But to Coach Broyles must go much of the credit for having given the essential training and having created the spirit in both the players and the public.

Having played a little football at Arkansas some 40 years ago, I can truthfully say this year's team is one of the best ever, possibly the best—at least since my last year on the squad.

To my colleagues from Texas I cannot offer much hope for the future. All reports indicate that our freshman team is better than ever.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article from last night's Washington Star about the selection of the Arkansas Razorbacks to receive the Grantland Rice Award be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Award Completes Arkansas Dream—Irish Second in Rice Vote

HONOLULU.—"I'm prouder than I've ever been in my life," said Coach Frank Broyles Wednesday on learning that his unbeaten, untied Arkansas Razorbacks will receive the Grantland Rice Award.

The memorial to the late sports-writing great goes to the team rated No. 1 in the United States by a five-man committee representing the Football Writers Association of America.

"This is something I know the people of Arkansas have dreamed about for a long time," he said. "I know that this has to be the proudest moment in the athletic history of Arkansas—for the players, the university, and our fans.

"They all rank No. 1," Broyles said.

Arkansas, the Southwest Conference champion, defeated Nebraska, 10 to 7, in the Cotton Bowl game for an 11 to 0 record. Arkansas was the only major college football team without a loss.

SECOND IN ASSOCIATED PRESS POLL

The Razorbacks finished second in the final Associated Press football poll, which was released before the bowl games. Alabama, No. 1 in the last poll, lost in the Orange Bowl to Texas, which was defending national champion and No. 1 when it lost by a point to Arkansas.

The Razorbacks received four first-place votes and one for third. Notre Dame was runner-up with five second-place votes. Texas had one first-place vote and one third-place vote for four points and Michigan received three third-place votes for three.

Alabama received no votes for first, second, or third place.

The five-man committee was composed of Si Burick, Dayton News; Fred Russell, Nashville Banner; Blackie Sherrod, Dallas Times-Herald; Steve Weller, Buffalo Evening News, and Paul Zimmerman, Los Angeles Times.

HULA BOWL COACH

Broyles is here to coach the South squad in the Hula Bowl game, which has been won every year by the North.

"The award is a great reward for this Razorback team," he said. "The players dedicated themselves to this end after our victory over Texas.

"It required hard work, tremendous leadership and unselfishness," Broyles said. "They improved steadily each week and climaxed the season with a championship drive in the Cotton Bowl against an outstanding Nebraska team.

"We received the greatest support of any team in America from our students and fans throughout the State," he said. "I think it's wonderful for our squad and the State. We had such great effort all year long. I'm as excited as everybody in Arkansas is."

CAN THE STATE LIVE ON CRUMBS?

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, State governments face what is probably the worst fiscal crisis in their history.

Most State legislatures meet in odd-numbered years. Before 1963 had ended, no less than 35 State legislatures had passed tax increases, estimated to raise annual collections by $1 billion.

The revenue sources in many instances are in direct conflict with Federal taxation.

In 5 years—1958–63—State and local tax rates rose twice as fast as Federal taxes.

State and local taxation is now increasing twice as fast as income.

Since World War II Federal debt has gone up only 20 percent—State and local debt has gone up six times or 600 percent.

John Anderson, former Governor of Kansas, and past chairman of the Governors' conference, has written a very outstanding article on the problems of Federal and State taxation. This article appeared in the January 9 issue of the Saturday Review. I ask unanimous consent that it be made a part of these remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Challenge of Prosperity: Can the State Live on Crumbs? What Happens When Washington Cuts Into the Pie of Local Revenue?

(By John Anderson)

The choices which Americans must make over the next 2 or 3 years concerning the critical question of Federal-State fiscal relations will greatly affect the future nature of the Federal system. The best way to begin a consideration of Federal and State fiscal relations is to sort out the salient facts about Federal, State, and local governmental revenues and expenditures. Some of these facts are startling and all of them have serious implications for the future. (By "serious" I do not necessarily mean "discouraging.") But first, some facts and figures:

1. Amazing as it may sound to some, Federal expenditure needs are leveling off while at the same time State and local expenditures are continuing to skyrocket.

2. By 1970 or thereabouts, barring drastic changes in the international situation, annual State and local expenditures will have passed total Federal expenditures, including those for defense and foreign aid. In the fiscal year 1963 Federal expenditures for civilian government totaled about $30 billion, in comparison to State and local outlays of $64 billion. I would guess that by 1971 State and local expenditures will have reached $120 billion compared with a Federal budget of $110 to $115 billion by that time.

3. State and local government employment is rising steeply. These governments now have about 7,500,000 employees, compared with 2,500,000 Federal employees.

4. During the past decade State and local outlays grew more than 8 percent annually, or double the growth rate of the national income.

5. During the past decade State and local governments have had to increase tax rates repeatedly. At the Federal level there have been two large tax cuts, in 1954 and 1964, with talk of more good things to come.

6. State and local debt increased by 170 percent from 1952 to 1962, with over $80 billion outstanding at the end of the period.

7. The most costly functions at the State and local level have been and will continue to be those of education, roads, health, and welfare.

8. Taxes by all governments took about 25 percent of the gross national product in 1952, and the same proportion a decade later. However, the share taken by the State and local government continues to rise and the Federal share continues to decline.

9. In round figures, the State-local tax take is made up of 45 percent property taxes; 12 percent income taxes (most of which are only mildly graduated, if at all); 15 percent general sales taxes; 13 percent gasoline and motor vehicle taxes; and 15 percent miscellaneous, such as cigarette, liquor, and inheritance taxes.

	Percent
Property tax	45
Income tax	12
General sales tax	15
Gasoline and motor vehicles tax	13
Miscellaneous	15

10. Federal grants-in-aid continue to grow apace in both magnitude and variety. This aid tripled between the years 1952 and 1962. It now stands at $11 billion. The last Congress alone added between 10 and 30 new grant programs, depending on what one calls a separate program category.

11. The rate of tax mortality among State and local political leaders is very high. A Governor or mayor must raise taxes in order to meet his increasing responsibililites—but he is often voted out of office for doing so. Were he to choose to cut services rather than to raise taxes, he would also be likely to get kicked out—so he usually tries to raise taxes at the beginning rather than the middle of his term. Also, we are told continually that any further increases in State and local taxes will drive industry out of the State or discourage new industry from coming in. In other words, political and economic pressures at the State and local levels are against tax increases.

12. We are told that Federal revenues are likely to outstrip expenditure needs over the next few years, with a budgetary surplus the likely result unless new domestic spending programs are undertaken by the Federal Government or unless the Federal debt is reduced.

These 12 basic facts generally tell where we have been, where we are now, and where we are tending in Federal-State fiscal relations. The essence of what they tell us is this:

The responsibilities for nonmilitary public services in government over the next few years are going to fall largely on State and local levels of governments. However, State and local revenue systems are much less responsive to economic growth than is the Federal revenue system. Consequently, State and local expediture needs are going to outstrip revenues at current rates, while it appears that at the Federal-level revenue at current rates is going to outstrip expenditure needs. The big question before us is: Which of several alternate courses should be taken?

An obvious possibility is to utilize judiciously any Federal budgetary surpluses for reductions in the debt or reductions in tax rates, according to the economic outlook at the time. It may be the result of an outdated Puritan ethic even to consider the reduction of debt. But I think we would all agree that, in years of full employment and firm or rising prices, an application of Federal surpluses to debt retirement would not be unduly deflationary.

On the other hand, to confine the use of Federal surpluses solely to Federal tax reductions or to debt retirements is objected to on two grounds. First, it does nothing in a direct sense to ease the pinch on State and local governments. Second, if Federal tax rates are steadily reduced and State and local taxes continue to increase, the result will be increased burdens upon property and consumption taxes, and lessened burdens on income taxes.

A second possibility is to utilize Federal surpluses for the initiation of some new and large Federal grant-in-aid programs in areas having a strong element of national interest. Some of the obvious fields would be education, highways, and mental health. It is not difficult to dredge up several other fields of State and local activity in which Federal financial assistance would be welcome.

However, this approach meets with some strong objections. In the first place, Federal aid in these new fields would inevitably be accompanied by Federal controls. Our existing Federal aid programs are accompanied by controls. New ones would be, too. In the second place, at Federal, State, and local levels we are approaching the limits of manageability in the variety and complexity of Federal grant programs. We can add new ones, but getting rid of old ones is practically impossible.

As the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations has observed there is nothing so permanent as a temporary grant-in-aid. Many thoughtful people are coming to the conclusion that there must be simpler and better ways of making future Federal funds available to the States.

A third possibility is to initiate the concept of an unconditional Federal grant to the States—often referred to as a "block grant." The difficulty with this approach in the past has been that its advocates have coupled it with simultaneous elimination of present Federal grants. In addition to other arguments against such an approach, it is not feasible from a political standpoint. It would be hard enough to get Congress to agree with the concept of an unconditional grant; it would be impossible to get it to carry on a corollary fight with all of the interest groups that are involved in the existing program grants.

In our new situation of projected Federal surpluses, however, the possibility is advanced of initiating a block grant to the States to be used for virtually any purpose except highways and with no matching or other strings attached, leaving undisturbed the existing pattern of Federal grants in the various program areas. This approach has the advantage of administrative simplicity and a transfer of Federal funds to the States without accompanying controls. Furthermore, to the extent desired, the distribution of such a grant could be keyed to the fiscal capacity of the various States so that any desired degree of equalization between low- and high-income States could be accomplished. This general approach seems to be the one most favored by the administration.

The principal argument against this approach is the alleged lack of political feasibility. Specifically, how could one persuade Congress to turn loose billions of dollars of Federal funds each year, without any specifications as to their use by the recipient States?

Another argument is advanced against this type of approach—namely, that local governments, as well as State governments, should receive unconditional Federal grants and that the sharing of these funds between State and local governments should not be left to the discretion of the individual State. However, as a Governor, I cannot subscribe to this argument.

In the first place, the local governments are subdivisions of the State and operate under the provisions of State constitutions and statutes. Secondly, the division of responsibilities and, consequently, fiscal burdens between State and local governments varies from State to State. Thirdly, no yardstick exists by which Federal funds could be distributed directly to localities on anything other than a per capita basis, because we have no measures by which to compare fiscal capacities of local government on a nationwide basis. Finally, the reapportionment of State legislatures on the basis of one man, one vote, may relieve some of the fears that the Federal funds would be disproportionately divided.

A fourth possibility, would be to ease the State-local tax bind by means of a credit against the Federal personal income tax for State and local taxes paid. Such a credit would necessarily be less than 100 percent but would cover all State and local taxes. This would leave it up to each State and local government to determine the most equitable taxation method to be employed in meeting the massive increases in State and local expenditures, but at the same time would make it possible for a designated portion of such tax increases to be borne indirectly by the Federal Government. This would make tax raising more politically feasible at the State and local levels. It would also meet the argument of local governments that they should not have to depend on the State for a distribution of Federal aid. It is also one of the most politically feasible of all the approaches from the standpoint of the Congressman or Senator because it combines a Federal tax reduction with automatic help to State and local governments.

This approach, however, is open to the objection that it would be regressive in nature and would not benefit the people who pay State and local taxes—particularly sales taxes—but whose incomes are not sufficiently high to place them in a Federal tax bracket. This argument could be partially met by having the credit apply in a decreasing scale as one moves up in the tax brackets.

A fifth alternative would be to rebate a percentage of Federal income taxes to the State of collection. This has been proposed at various times in Congress. It would be a tax sharing rather than a tax credit arrangement. It would be simple to administer and would leave State and local governments free to chart their future policies on taxes and expenditures. However, it is objected to on the ground that existing fiscal disparities among the States could not be recognized in the rebate arrangement. New York and California, for example, being relatively high-income States with many citizens paying taxes in the higher Federal brackets, would get back a much larger per capita share than would low-income States.

I have attempted to describe briefly the present Federal-State fiscal situation, the major trends, and some alternate proposals for improving the balance in the fiscal relationships between our various levels of government. Up to this point, I have tried to be completely objective in stating the problem and in presenting the arguments for and against the various solutions that have been suggested.

At this point I would like to give you my own views on the most desirable path to be pursued.

Unlike some, I do not view the Federal tax system as ideal, either from the standpoint of equity or from the standpoint of maximum encouragement to economic growth. The corporate income tax rate is still at a high level. I am confident that further reductions in the corporate income tax would, for the most part, find their way into new investment in plant and equipment. Investment in new plant by private enterprise is an ideal stimulant to growth.

Next, I should explain the absence from the list of the five foregoing alternatives of a proposal that has been viewed fondly by many Governors over the years—that of exchanging some Federal tax sources for some existing Federal grants-in-aid. While I would like to see something of this sort accomplished, I and all of my fellow Governors know that it is neither equitable nor feasible. It was tried a few years ago during the Eisenhower administration when it was proposed that the Federal telephone tax be repealed and this tax source turned over to the States, while at the same time a group of grants-in-aid equal to the amount of Federal telephone tax be discontinued—leaving it to the States to pick up the responsibility for the functions formerly aided.

This plan collapsed when it became apparent that the transfer of the tax source would aid the wealthy States most and the poor States least, while the cessation of the grants would hurt the wealthy States least and the poor States most. Governors and Congressmen alike lost little time in turning their backs on that one.

I think that, whatever steps are taken to provide increased Federal aid to the States, the implication should not be left that the State and local governments can relax and stop trying to improve their respective revenue systems. The States are not trying to duck their responsibility; they recognize that much remains to be accomplished in strengthening the structure of State government and improving their tax systems, particularly with regard to the local property tax.

Now, let's get to the heart of the matter. Which of the five possibilities would be best for the States and best for the Nation, and what are the political feasibilities?

It is always an easy answer to say that the best Government is that which is closest to the people. It is also easy to say, and it always sounds good, that Federal bureaucracy will be our downfall and that our strength lies in a strong free enterprise system.

These statements may be true, but what virtue they have lies in their generality.

It seems to me we must rely on a combination of programs in the fiscal fields—active in strengthing the State and local governments, yet utilizing, when needed, the combined strength of financial resources of the entire Nation.

If we reach the point of Federal tax surplus, we should not only consider tax reductions, but also apply some of the surplus to debt reduction.

I favor a rebate or tax-sharing program, the objections notwithstanding. It seems to me that such a tax-sharing program could be effective in strengthening the State governments and thwarting the ever-increasing trend toward centralized control. Such tax sharing should not preclude continued use of grant-in-aid programs. While I favor tax-sharing over grant-in-aid programs, because of the extensive controls attached to some of the latter, I think it extremely likely that the Federal Government will favor a block grant plan so as to give States with lower gross State products relatively larger amounts of money, probably in combination with tax cuts and added grant programs.

There should be few strings attached except the requirement for a well-developed State spending plan. Performance should be measured, perhaps annually.

Every State will have to put more energy, talent, and money into planning, because the Federal money will likely go to education, environment control, perhaps urban and rural renewal. These will be fields of endeavor for both State and local governments. They will therefore require exceptional planning activities.

A Federal tax return program might be a major catalyst. Long overdue, it is needed to initiate regional thinking and action on public problems. Despite the practical difficulties in arranging useful cooperation among present groups across political boundaries, regional solutions are clearly mandatory, with the likelihood that political obstacles will be readily overcome when sizable rebate funds are the incentive.

The Midwestern Governors' Association is currently working toward effective regional cooperation in the fields of equalization in Federal defense spending, in research and development, and in the interstate cooperation for utilization of graduate and professional school facilities in the colleges and universities by means of reciprocal contracts. Mental health programs and penal programs are also being explored for regional cooperative effects.

These trends point in one direction—the need for more management-trained and professional staff people in State and local government. Finding these people, integrating them into State governments, and paying for their services will be a major problem, and State governments must then compete with private industry, universities, Federal Government, and other institutions for the same people. The market will remain tight for another 7 to 10 years, because of the population-age distribution. States may want to consider contracting out some of their problems to skilled groups throughout the country.

Perhaps the Federal Government can be prevailed upon to distribute back to the States some of the talented people it now employs, along with money. This might have a considerable beneficial effect on the "brain drain" that is now such a major issue among many States. It could also mean that States like Kansas might celebrate the return of expatriates who have left Kansas to work in the Federal establishment because of the lack of challenging, adequately reimbursed opportunities at home.

All these points are supported by the increasing regard and responsibility with which the voting public views Government solutions to public problems. More professionals in State government should further enhance in the public mind the stature and status of government employment.

There is, of course, no easy solution, no pat formula. I hope my remarks may be interpreted as being related to a great opportunity to realize the federalist idea of solving the local problems at the local level, and utilizing the combined resources of all the people in solving the interstate problems for the common good.

HEALTH CARE FOR THE AGING AND THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that on health care for the aging, the American Medical Association has come forward allegedly with a solution.

First, I welcome the fact that at last the association recognizes that a problem does exist.

However, the solution which is proposed, that the Government pay the difference between the cost of private insurance and what the individual can afford to pay, is a bad one; first, because it is again a means test for the individual; and second, because the dignity of the individual requires that he shall know he will be covered. The difficulty with the AMA proposal is that the individual does not know that he will be covered until such time as he has established his indigency. Finally, the AMA continually wishes to rely upon the Kerr-Mills Act, which has been shown to be too expensive and that too few States are willing to go into it with the amount of coverage that the aged need to be adequately covered.

In addition, it has the defect of not assuring care to an individual before such time as he actually becomes sick.

Dependence upon insurance without the underlying benefit of a bill such as the one which was passed by the Senate last year—which I am now cosponsoring—giving hospitalization is ineffective because insurance is, today, even under the 65-plus plans, much too expensive. We must have the Anderson-Gore-Javits bill, and I hope Congress will make it the first order of business.

One of the objectives of the health care for the aging program under social security which I have sponsored is to assure the independence and dignity of the retired person. It achieves this objective by seeking to prevent the individual from becoming dependent on public relief because of increasing health care costs in the declining years of his life.

The AMA program clearly is not a solution. In the 5 years that medicare proposals have been before the Congress this approach has been thoroughly thrashed out and rejected. By its nature, the Kerr-Mills program cannot help older citizens until dependency actually occurs; the Anderson-Gore-Javits bill, which includes the Republican sponsored private carrier insurance program, provides health care coverage at a cost which is manageable by the overwhelming majority of individuals and prevents dependency caused by extended illness.

No matter how we may modify Kerr-Mills, it still remains a public assistance program for the indigent. It is a very costly program in which the State and Federal Governments share the expense. In New York State, for example, the average monthly cost per person is over $300, and the only way in which a State can reduce this expenditure is by limiting the benefits it provides. This has in fact happened in some States which could not afford a broad medicare program for its indigent citizens even under the generous Federal cost-sharing formula. And some States have never entered the program at all even though it has been in existence since 1960.

There are some of the reasons why in my opinion Kerr-Mills, which is a necessary program for the indigent elderly, cannot become a workable program for the health care problems of the millions of aging Americans who are not now indigent.

The proposal to subsidize health insurance policies on a graduated income basis has also been carefully explored in the past and found wanting. Apart from the important fact that it would be excessively costly, extremely cumbersome to administer and would lead to escalation of rates, this part of the AMA proposal assumes that private health insurance alone can do the job of covering health care at reasonable cost. The facts show that this is not the case. Even the statewide nonprofit 65-plus plans, now in effect in New York, Connecticut, California, Texas, and many other States—which are among the best private plans available—even these plans are now beyond the reach of most older persons, and their costs and premiums are continuing to rise.

These plans call for a substantial deductible and for at least 20 percent coinsurance—all of which adds up to much more than the retired citizen can afford. For a couple, the premium rate alone is over $450 a year, and the States which pioneered in this plan have had to increase premium rates by almost 20 percent because membership was limited and hospital costs high.

In one State less than 10 percent of the eligible persons enrolled, and of these a majority took only one part of the program because of its high cost. Premiums for commercial insurance plans for benefits comparable to the nonprofit 65-plus plans run considerably higher.

The inescapable conclusion is that only an approach on a nationwide scale, such as the Anderson-Gore-Javits bipartisan approach, can achieve the broad objectives of a health care program which is adequate, available at genuinely low cost and which safeguards the independence and dignity of the older citizens. It is the program which best meets the recommendations of the National Committee on Health Care for the Aged, which was organized at my suggestion in 1962 and which has the potential of best meeting an urgent social need.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL FRIDAY NEXT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12 o'clock noon on Friday next.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TENTATIVE HOLIDAY SCHEDULE, 89TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I have discussed the tentative holiday schedule, and I should like to announce that the following plans have been made accordingly:

Inauguration Day is Wednesday, January 20. From the conclusion of business on Friday, January 15, the Senate will go over until Tuesday, January 19, and then meet on Wednesday, January 20, when the Senate must meet.

Lincoln's birthday is on Friday, February 12. From the conclusion of business on Thursday, February 11, until noon, Wednesday, February 17, the Senate will not be in session. There will be a pro forma meeting at noon on Monday, February 15.

Easter, which falls on Sunday, April 18, the Senate will not be in session from the conclusion of business Thursday, April 15, until noon on Wednesday, April 21. Tentatively, a pro forma meeting will be held at noon on Monday, April 19.

Memorial Day falls on Sunday, May 30. The Senate will not be in session from the conclusion of business on Thursday, May 27, until noon on Tuesday, June 1. A pro forma meeting will be held at noon on Friday, May 28, probably. That will be tentative.

July 4 falls on a Sunday. The Senate will not be in session for the transaction of business from the conclusion of business on Thursday, July 1, until noon on Tuesday, July 6. A pro forma meeting will be held at noon on Friday, July 2.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am glad to yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is apparent from this list that February 22, Washington's Birthday, is not included. Of course, it is traditional that the Senate be in session on that day for the purpose of listening to Washington's Farewell Address.

I make that comment because I am quite sure that the majority leader had that in mind at the time the list was prepared.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I had forgotten that. I am glad that the distinguished minority leader reminded me. That is correct.

INVESTIGATION OF ROBERT G. BAKER BY SENATE COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, in the January 10 issue of the Washington Sunday Star there was published an excellent article entitled "Questions Still Abound as Senate Wrestles With Baker Case."

Mr. John Barron and Mr. Paul Hope have put a tremendous amount of research in, and deserve a lot of credit for, developing this story, in which they point up many of the questions still remaining unanswered in the Baker case.

The Senate must not overlook the fact that this investigation involves charges concerning its own operations and there must be no compromise short of full and complete disclosure.

The integrity of the Senate is at stake.

I ask unanimous consent that this article, as published in the January 10 issue of the Washington Sunday Star, be printed in the RECORD, and I urge every Member of the Senate read it.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

QUESTIONS STILL ABOUND AS SENATE WRESTLES WITH BAKER CASE

(By Paul Hope and John Barron)

"I think we have demeaned ourselves long enough over one fallen angel and I think it is about time to stop."

So spoke Senator EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, Republican minority leader, when the Senate was agonizing over the Bobby Baker scandals last July.

The Democratic majority eagerly agreed, as the investigation of its former secretary was causing increasing political embarrassment in an election year. Amid furious oratory, the Senate hopefully laid the Baker case to rest.

But the obsequies were premature. And the new 89th Congress finds itself tormented by an old problem: Is it more dangerous to proceed with the investigation or more dangerous to abandon it again?

The dilemma confronting the Senators is simply this:

If investigators are ordered to plunge ahead in an earnest attempt to answer the multitude of questions which have been left unanswered or half answered, there is no telling whose toes will be stepped on.

But if the Senate arranges still another premature funeral, there is no assurance that the Baker scandals will not again be resurrected in even more distressing form. Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS, Republican, of Delaware, who forced the Senate to begin the investigation in the first place, and who twice forced his colleagues to resume it when they had dropped it, has warned that he intends to keep digging no matter what the rest of the Senate does.

Few congressional investigations have had the potential of the Baker case for revealing influence peddling and other gross improprieties at the top levels of Government.

But after 15 months of investigation, the Senate is not much further along toward solving the real issues of the Baker affair than it was when the inquiry was authorized in October 1963.

The investigation has been a stop-and-go affair that has raised more serious questions than it has answered. And the Senate has done next to nothing in the way of remedial action.

The questions still pending go to the very heart of the legislative process and involve the integrity of Congress. They concern such explosive matters as improper pressure in the handling of legislation, payoffs and questionable political contributions, and the patronizing of call girls by highly placed persons. Here are a number of these questions and some of the information which raises them:

QUESTION 1

What was the source of Baker's cash? Why was it given to him? What, if anything, did he do to earn it? Why did he elect to transact so much of his business in cash, anyway?

There has been testimony that large sums of cash flowed through Baker's Capitol Hill office and that at times he kept stacks of $100 bills on his Government desk.

Baker, who claimed in financial statements that his net worth increased from $11,000 to $2.1 million in 7 years, deposited at least $106,000 in cash in his personal bank account between 1959 and November 1, 1963. His top Government salary during that time was $19,600.

QUESTION 2

Why were lobbyists so eager to do business with Baker? Did he ever attempt to influence legislation or policy decisions in their behalf?

As secretary to the majority, Baker advised Senators of pending legislation and of the attitude of the Democratic leadership toward it.

Rules Committee records show that while in his Senate job he habitually and intimately associated with lobbyists or self-styled Washington representatives paid to promote certain legislation and governmental decisions.

He was in business deals with Fred B. Black, Jr., who at the time was Washington representative for North American Aviation Corp., a large defense contractor. He also was in business or closely associated with persons representing electronics plants having or seeking Government contracts.

Two days after the Senate enacted a bill beneficial to ocean freight forwarders, a representative of that group paid Baker $5,000.

After a California group received a bank charter, Baker cashed a $5,000 check at the Senate disbursing office made out to a lobbyist engaged to help secure the charter.

QUESTION 3

Did Baker play any role in the passage of sugar legislation?

This is an area the Rules Committee has never touched, despite the fact that Baker was associated with people interested in legislation granting sugar import quotas for foreign countries.

Some sugar lobbyists reportedly maintained season suites at the Carousel, Baker's plush motel at Ocean City, Md. It also is reported that after the passage of the 1962 bill revising quotas for sugar suppliers, the sugar interests held a party at the Carousel.

Baker once delivered to a congressional committee a questionnaire filled out by I. Irving Davidson, a Washington representative of Ecuador sugar interests. No one asked why Davidson gave Baker the questionnaire to deliver to the committee.

Baker prevailed upon John D. Lane, a representative for Peruvian sugar interests, to buy some stock for him in Mortgage Guaranty Insurance Corp. of Milwaukee. Baker's ownership of stock in MGIC, a firm which received a favorable tax ruling from the Government, was acquired through the help of several people with interests on Capitol Hill. Lane also is an attorney for Tennessee Gas & Transmission Co., from which Baker bought his house.

QUESTION 4

Why was the Murchison financial empire of Texas so interested in Baker?

Names of persons associated with the Murchisons run all through the Rules Committee record of Baker's activities.

Thomas D. Webb, Washington representative for Murchison, was involved in business deals with Baker.

Robert F. Thompson, executive vice president of Tecon Corp., a Murchison heavy construction outfit that does most of its $75 to $90 million a year business under Government contract, was involved in stock deals with Baker. Thompson either put up the money or arranged the financing for the deals.

Thompson once offered to buy the Carousel from Baker when the motel was in bad financial condition. And Thompson once gave Baker a star sapphire ring.

Baker was involved in a meat deal with Webb and others that gave him a two-way cut on the operations of a meat-processing company owned by the Murchisons in Haiti.

Davidson, the sugar representative, played at least a minor role in obtaining a buyer for the Haitian meat on which Baker was getting a commission. In a foreign agent's report filed with the Justice Department, Davidson listed Tecon Corp. as one of his clients.

Baker once accompanied Clint Murchison, Jr., to see Gov. Pat Brown of California about a race track.

Webb and Bedford Wynne, an official of the Dallas Cowboys football team, another Murchison enterprise, were described as organizers, along with Baker and others, of the Pasantic Corp., a Washington development firm which foundered after the Baker scandal broke.

QUESTION 5

What was Baker's role in the handling of campaign funds, and in the conduct of campaigns themselves?

While a Senate employee, Baker also served for 5 years as secretary and 2 years as treasurer of the Senate Democratic campaign fund and political contributions passed through his hands.

The Rules Committee has a statement from a former vice president of International Telephone & Telegraph Corp., who said his superiors in 1960 pressured him into donating $1,200 to a Lyndon Johnson campaign fund. He said he was told he could recover the contribution by falsifying his expense accounts. He also said Baker picked up the contribution.

The former vice president quoted an I.T. & T. official as saying that such contributions were paying off big in Washington.

Another source has told the committee that contributions were also made to the Republican vice-presidential campaign that year.

Jay McDonnell, former assistant to Baker on Capitol Hill, has told reporters that Baker's office resembled a political headquarters during the 1960 presidential primary campaign in West Virginia. McDonnell also told reporters that campaign literature was stacked in or around Baker's office. He said he understood it was for distribution in West Virginia during the contest between Hubert Humphrey and the late President John F. Kennedy.

N. Joe Rahall, a Beckley, W. Va., businessman who lent Baker $10,000 in 1962, confirmed to a reporter last spring that Baker was indeed working on the scene in West Virginia for Humphrey and that he "touched base two or three times" in Beckley during the campaign.

McDonnell claimed Baker's real interest in the Humphrey campaign was to try to slow down the Kennedy drive and put Johnson in a better spot for the nomination.

Johnson, then majority leader, also was trying for the presidential nomination that year. After Johnson became the vice-presidential nominee, Baker was heavily involved in the operation of Johnson's campaign.

Baker had McDonnell fired because they disagreed on the way things should be run in the Democratic secretary's office.

The Rules Committee has refused to call McDonnell to testify even though he was closely associated with Baker, and even though he was one of a long list of witnesses requested by Republican members of the committee.

The committee repeatedly has refused to examine the issue of campaign funds, contending that it is irrelevant to its job in the Baker case. However, the Baker case aside, the Rules Committee does have general jurisdiction over campaign activities and even has a standing subcommittee assigned to the subject.

Committee Democrats justified their refusal to go into the I.T. & T. matter with the comment that there was no indication that Baker was any more than a messenger in picking up the contributions.

QUESTION 6

Was there any relationship between a free flight to a fundraising dinner and the certification of an airline for Government contracts?

While Baker was majority secretary, Riddle Airlines of Florida flew lobbyists, congressional staff members and Baker's secretary, Carole Tyler, to Las Vegas free of charge. The occasion was a fundraising dinner for Senator HOWARD CANNON, Democrat, of Nevada, who is a member of the committee investigating Baker.

Later, Columnist Jack Anderson, who is a director of the airline, had a bill presented to Baker for the flight. The bill never was paid. Anderson subsequently said that it was submitted to Baker by mistake and that someone else really arranged the flight from Washington.

Riddle, a cargo carrier, had been having trouble for 3 years keeping its authorization for Government contracts. Recertification for further Government business was authorized in May 1963, a month after the Las Vegas flight.

QUESTION 7

Were party girls employed to influence legislation, Government decisions, or business deals?

When the Rules Committee last July submitted what it thought would be its final report, the majority members told the Senate:

"The committee reports it found no more than a mere scintilla of evidence that Baker or any other officer or employee of the Senate had used call girls or other immoral women for promoting their outside business and financial activities, and that no evidence other than rumors was produced."

But last February—months before the foregoing statement was drafted—a Puerto Rican businessman, Paul Aguirre, informed committee investigations that Baker once brought two beautiful women to a rendezvous in New Orleans. One of them was the German party girl, Ellen Rometsch.

At the time, Baker was contemplating a business deal with Aguirre. Last spring, Aguirre made a $60,000 loan to Baker, who was having difficulty borrowing money elsewhere.

When the committee abandoned the inquiry last July, it did not disclose this evidence.

In secret session last month, insurance agent Don B. Reynolds, the controversial witness who long was an intimate of Baker, testified in detail about party girls. He described episodes allegedly involving immoral women and at least four Senators or former Senators. One of the Senators he named is a member of the Rules Committee.

Reynolds, a key witness in the inquiry, was a longtime friend of Baker and operates a Silver Spring, Md., insurance company that lists Baker as vice president.

Representative H. R. GROSS, Republican, of Iowa, has suggested on the House floor that the Rules Committee might learn much of importance from Joseph A. Fabianich who, according to the FBI, ran a call girl operation in Washington. Fabianich is reported to have boasted he could "blow the lid off this town" with disclosures related to the Baker case.

After being convicted of white slavery in December 1961, he was imprisoned in the District jail until last February when he was transferred to Leavenworth Penitentiary in Kansas. Penal officials here described the transfer as routine, adding that Fabianich was not a wholesome influence upon other criminals.

The Republican minority report submitted to the Senate last July included a statement by Senator CARL T. CURTIS, Republican, of Nebraska, who charged:

"Party girls and entertaining were part of the business promotion apparatus. The facts are available if we pursue it. Individuals were induced to enter into certain business arrangements as part of that promotion. Girls were solicited on Government telephone lines, taken to the place, entertained the prospective customer, and it is part and parcel of the transaction."

Mrs. Rometsch, the wife of a West German sergeant stationed here, was hustled out of the country in 1963 after authorities learned of her relations with men highly placed in Washington.

Democratic members of the committee last month voted not to investigate the affairs of Mrs. Rometsch, contending that her activities were not within the scope of the inquiry. They insisted that the committee has "no legal right to probe into the private conduct of individuals."

The vote did not exclude the possibility that the committee might scrutinize the behavior of other women, but all indications are that the majority still regards the party-girl subject as a forbidden one.

QUESTION 8

Were illegal abortions arranged through an office in the U.S. Capitol?

In testimony released last January, Don Reynolds swore that he once referred a girl seeking an abortion to Baker's office on the Hill. He said that the girl subsequently obtained the abortion. Since receiving this testimony, the committee in all of its public sessions and in all of its public reports completely has ignored the question of abortions.

QUESTION 9

Just what was the relationship between a key Senate employee and organized gambling?

Baker was a partner with Las Vegas gambler Edward Levinson in the Serv-U Corp., a vending machine company that obtained lucrative concessions from defense contractors. At least one other gambler and a close friend of Levinson also were among the original stockholders.

Part of stock in District of Columbia National Bank in Baker's name actually was owned by Levinson.

Baker tried to get gambling concessions in the Caribbean for Nevada gamblers.

He once set up an appointment for Levinson, Clifford Jones, and Jacob Kozloff with John Gates, chairman of Intercontinental Hotel Corp., a subsidiary of Pan American Airways, which operates some casinos in the Caribbean.

Gates said Baker described the three as his clients and friends. Levinson operates the Freemont Hotel in Las Vegas. Jones, a former Lieutenant Governor of Nevada, and Kozloff, have gambling interests in the Caribbean.

Levinson was a stockholder, along with Baker and others, in a new savings and loan association in Honolulu. He also was in a deal with Baker and Black involving the purchase of stock in a State bank in Oklahoma. Black arranged through the late Senator Robert S. Kerr, Democrat, of Oklahoma, to buy the stock.

When Baker refused to testify before the Rules Committee, his attorney claimed that telephone conversations between Baker and Levinson had been recorded by Government agencies.

QUESTION 10

Why did Baker have such a close relationship with the savings and loan industry? And why did Mortgage Guaranty Insurance Corp., a company with close ties to the savings and loan business, favor him?

In 1959, Baker was permitted to make an insider's purchase of $28,750 of MGIC stock. The stock later soared in value and by February 1963 Baker listed his holdings in MGIC as totaling 15,130 shares worth nearly $700,000.

MGIC insures mortgage loans, many of which are made by savings and loan associations. Several of the top officials of MGIC formerly were officers of savings and loan associations or had close ties with the industry.

MGIC, with the help of Representative JOHN W. BYRNES, Republican, of Wisconsin, obtained a tax ruling from the Government which was essential to its growth.

Among documents in the Rules Committee record is a letter from MGIC President Max Karl asking Baker to help a John Grogan get "appointed to the advisory council which is set up under the bill referred to in his letter." When Karl testified, nobody asked him who Grogan was nor what the reference to an advisory council and the bill was all about.

During the hearings, Senator CLAIBORNE PELL, Democrat, of Rhode Island, urged that the committee ascertain whether Senators or Congressmen, other than BYRNES, had profited through investments in MGIC.

"I believe we have that information, Senator," said Committee Counsel Lennox P. McLendon.

If the committee does have such information, it has never made it public.

Baker spoke to the Savings and Loan League's convention in San Francisco in 1958. In 1960 Reynolds gave Baker a $1,000 check which he said was to cover Baker's expenses to a savings and loan convention in Miami. Baker received a $500 honorarium from the league for speaking at the convention.

Baker reportedly hosted a reception for Senators and their staffs in the old Supreme Court Chamber in the Capitol in 1962 when savings and loan legislation was under consideration, and the reception reportedly was paid for by the savings and loan industry.

Baker financed the Carousel Motel through a Baltimore savings and loan firm. Attached to the loan was a note from Baker stating the date on which the Baltimore firm could open a new branch—a branch that once had been turned down by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board.

Glen Troop, lobbyist for the savings and loan industry, was a close friend of Baker and joined him in organizing the Quorum Club.

Baker once borrowed $10,000 from the District of Columbia National Bank and documents filed with the Rules Committee indicate it was for a person who was organizing a savings and loan association in Prince Georges County, Md.

QUESTION 11

Has any influence been used by Capitol Hill officials in the chartering of national banks?

Baker was allotted 1,500 shares of the original stock offering of District of Columbia National Bank, an offering that was oversubscribed. Several others on Capitol Hill also were among the subscribers, including Senator JOHN J. SPARKMAN, Democrat, of Alabama, second ranking Democrat on the Senate Banking Committee, and five members of the Alabama House delegation. The wife of Representative ABRAHAM MULTER, Democrat, of New York, chairman of the House Subcommittee on Bank Supervision and Insurance, was listed as a stockholder.

Baker's reference on his subscription application was Max Kampelman, an organizer of the bank and a former aid to Senator HUMPHREY.

Baker was allowed to make several loans from D.C. National, including one for $125,000 to buy a home in fashionable Spring Valley. The loan was not secured by a mortgage but was bought through an arrangement under which an officer of the bank was listed as trustee for the property. Baker signed a promissory note for the $125,000.

A California group hired a friend of Baker, Wayne Bromley, to help push for a national bank charter. After the charter was granted, Bromley was paid $5,000. The check for the $5,000 was delivered to Bromley through Baker and the check, bearing both Bromley's and Baker's endorsements, was cashed at the Senate Disbursing Office.

Representative JACK BROOKS, Democrat, of Texas, is a major stockholder in a new national bank at Silsbee, Tex. The Brooks bank obtained a charter after another group who wanted to open a bank in Silsbee was turned down.

Former Representative Oliver Bolton, Republican, of Ohio, sought an investigation of bank chartering last year by the House Banking Committee but nothing came of it. The Senate Rules Committee has shown no disposition to venture into this area.

QUESTION 12

What were Baker's connections with labor?

Testimony has shown that a Florida business venture in which Baker was involved was financed with a Teamster Union loan.

A former Teamster official, sentenced 4 years ago on a conspiracy charge and once described as a "scoundrel" by Senate Rackets Committee Chairman JOHN MCCLELLAN, was hired by Baker's Serv-U Corp. as a labor consultant.

A Boilermakers' Union official bought MGIC stock through Baker for $2,300 and a year later sold it to Baker for $4,600 although it was worth more than $30,000 when transferred to Baker. About the same time the Federal Housing Administration was approving a $2.5 million loan for an old folks' home sponsored by the Boilermakers' Union, a loan that has been defaulted on because the home has never had an occupant.

QUESTION 13

Why did William N. McLeod, Jr., while clerk of the House District Committee, accept $1,500 from Reynolds? Why did McLeod ask District officials if Reynolds could write the insurance on District of Columbia Stadium? Why did Reynolds buy a Cadillac for Representative JOHN MCMILLAN, chairman of the House District Committee, a purchase for which MCMILLAN later reimbursed Reynolds?

Reynolds said he gave the $1,500 to McLeod for helping get the District of Columbia Stadium bill through Congress and for other favors over the years. McLeod called the payment a gift, one of the nicest he had ever received.

Reynolds explained the Cadillac transaction as a friendly gesture on his part for MCMILLAN whom he has known for many years. At the time the Cadillac was bought in 1961, when Reynolds was trying to get the stadium insurance business, MCMILLAN explained in a press release that he had Reynolds buy the car for him so no one would think he had taken advantage of his official position to obtain a discount. The matter has never been explored further.

QUESTION 14

Did Baker play any role in the awarding of a contract for the construction of the District of Columbia Stadium?

The Reynolds insurance firm, in which Baker had an interest, was allowed to handle the $73,000 performance bond which had to be obtained by the contractor, McCloskey & Co. of Philadelphia.

Matthew McCloskey, then head of the firm, said he gave Reynolds the business because Baker asked him to. There was discussion with McCloskey about the bond in Baker's Capitol Hill office even before bids were taken on the project.

Reynolds claims there was a $35,000 kickback in connection with the bond. He said the McCloskey firm overpaid the bond cost and that $10,000 went to him as "bagman" and $25,000 went to Baker to use in the 1960 presidential campaign. At the time, McCloskey was treasurer for the National Democratic Committee.

McCloskey heatedly denied Reynolds' kickback charge. He said the extra $35,000 was for other insurance Reynolds was to provide but never did.

He said his company actually paid twice for the extra insurance coverage Reynolds was supposed to provide, once to the company that regularly handled the McCloskey firm's insurance and once to Reynolds. He said this was a "goof" that was never discovered until the issue was raised in the Baker inquiry.

QUESTION 15

What was Baker's relationship with the D.C. Transit System?

D.C. Transit supplied the buses that carried Washingtonians to the opening of Baker's Carousel motel. Baker never paid for the service.

Webb, the Murchison representative who has been so close to Baker, is a director of the D.C. Transit System.

In September 1963, shortly before the Baker investigation began, Baker showed up as a member of a group calling itself the District of Columbia Committee for Balanced Transportation. One of the vice chairmen of the committee was Morris Fox, vice president of D.C. Transit.

One of the first acts of the committee was to sponsor a $100-a-plate dinner honoring O. Roy Chalk, president of D.C. Transit. A letter sent out by the committee chairman said, in part:

"I am certain that you will want to join with other community and national leaders in giving testimony to his (Chalk's) many accomplishments for the area's mass transportation system. Tickets for the affair are $100 each. The proceeds * * * will be used to help effect the completion of the already approved District of Columbia freeway and bridge system. We have made reservations in your name for two tickets to the dinner."

The letter foresaw a long and expensive struggle ahead to effect the completion of our freeway and bridge system and then to integrate it with a practical mass transit system.

Chalk has opposed any mass transit system for Washington unless the D.C. Transit Co. has a major role in its operation.

To understand why the 15 questions set forth above are still unanswered one must consider three important facets of the Baker case—Bobby Baker's tremendously important role in the Senate when he worked there; the Johnson administration's deep interest in the case, and the reluctant and often inept handling of the investigation from the day it started.

THE SENATE

Bobby Baker is literally a product of the Senate, where he spent much of his boyhood and most of his adult life.

The son of the Pickens, S.C., postmaster, Baker came to Washington at 14 to work in the Senate as a page. Senators were his mentors, and whatever he became, it was partly through the influence of the men who make up what they like to call the world's greatest deliberative body.

One of the Senators he was closest to was the late Senator Kerr, the Oklahoma oilman whose business and legislative interests often overlapped.

Baker saw how important influence is in government. And he saw the junketing, the partying and the other extracurricular activities that often accompany the legislative process. He became more than a servant of the Senate; he became an important functionary in its operations. Senators confided in him and often sought his guidance.

In 1957, 2 years after he became secretary to the Democratic majority, President Johnson, then majority leader, praised Baker unstintingly in a speech on the floor of the Senate.

"He is a man who truly serves his country and I consider him one of my most trusted, most loyal and most competent friends," Johnson said. Johnson said that Baker, then only 28 years old, had "gone farther in life than many others of far greater years and it is my personal opinion that he is just getting started."

Later, Johnson was to describe his ubiquitous young protege as "my strong right arm, the last man I see at night, the first one I see in the morning, and to call him as valuable as any man in the Senate."

In 1961, when Baker received an honorary degree from American University, he won bipartisan accolades on the Senate floor. Republican Leader DIRKSEN observed "the efficiency with which he labors" and "the knowledgeable way in which he serves the Senate and the country. Of all the persons I could name, I could name no other who so richly deserves this honor."

Now, the boy wonder of the Senate—the angel, as Senator DIRKSEN called him—has fallen. But as several Senators have said, it is not the fallen angel who is on trial but the Senate.

Although the resolution authorizing the inquiry was not restricted to Baker, there has been practically no effort to find out if there are other Bakers on Capitol Hill.

There has been little effort to establish whether individual Senators have had business dealings with Baker, or whether any of the many outside business interests of Senators result in conflicts with their official duties.

The committee chairman, B. EVERETT JORDAN, Democrat, of North Carolina, has said the committee "is not investigating Senators."

It has been disclosed that Baker was involved with at least one Senator, GEORGE SMATHERS, Democrat, of Florida, in a business venture.

THE ULTIMATE QUESTION

So far as the Senate is concerned, the ultimate issue in the Baker case is what it is going to do about policing its own morals and ethics. Up to now, it has shown little taste for doing anything in this direction.

It has debated long and bitterly the suggestion that it require Members and employees to disclose financial holdings and sources of income.

Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, a member of the Rules Committee, said during a debate last July:

"The real question before the Senate is whether the Senate should require disclosure by its Members and its officers and employees, whether the Senate should prohibit the kind of 'moonlighting' that got Bobby Baker and the whole Senate into trouble, whether the Senate should require that certain activities by Members of the Senate or by officers or employees should be prohibited because they are not in the public interest, and whether Senators, when called upon by one of their committees, shall be required to testify, unless they state in writing they know nothing of the subject matter under investigation. I suggest there is nothing radical, nothing new, nothing extraordinary about these proposals."

It was during this debate that DIRKSEN, a consistent opponent of disclosure proposals, made the comment that the Senate had demeaned itself long enough over one fallen angel.

A disclosure resolution proposed by CLARK was voted down, 62 to 25. The only member of the Rules Committee whose support CLARK could enlist was Senator HUGH SCOTT, Republican, of Pennsylvania.

Another disclosure resolution authored by Senator WILLIAMS was voted down the same day, 59 to 27. This time there were three members of the Rules Committee supporting it—CLARK, SCOTT, and JOHN SHERMAN COOPER, Republican, of Kentucky.

The Senate turned down even milder reforms recommended by the Rules Committee itself.

TOOK ONE STEP

It did, however, approve a resolution proposed by Senator COOPER to create a permanent select committee of three Democrats and three Republicans to police the behavior of its members. But the committee has never been appointed, and when Senator WILLIAMS forced a reopening of the inquiry later, the Senate turned it back to the Rules Committee rather than the select committee.

Two days after COOPER's resolution was passed, the Senate had some additional thoughts on the matter. It accepted a proposal by DIRKSEN that a grand commission of 19 members be appointed by the President to make a study of the general problem of ethics throughout Government.

But DIRKSEN never got around to putting it into the form of a resolution which the Senate and House could formally act on. So it has produced precisely nothing.

Senate Democratic Leader MANSFIELD of Montana said last week he hoped to have the committee authorized by the Cooper resolution appointed in a week or so. He said, however, that he didn't think it would become involved in the Baker investigation.

Rules Committee Chairman JORDAN told the Senate, though, that he thought the new committee should take over the Baker case if the Senate wants to pursue it further. It has been no secret that JORDAN and some other Democrats on the committee are sorry they ever got into the case which has brought them so much criticism.

THE WHITE HOUSE

As the Baker inquiry has limped along, it has touched not only the Senate and other governmental units but also the White House. The administration has been stung by the conduct of the man who once was described by Lyndon Johnson as his strong right arm. It came even closer when Walter Jenkins, Johnson's longtime administrative assistant, was brought into the case.

There can be little doubt that the influence of the White House significantly affected the progress or lack of progress of the investigation.

The first indication that names of White House personnel would be involved came in a private interview investigators had in late November 1963 with Don Reynolds.

When newsmen learned that Reynolds had sworn he supplied a free stereo set to President Johnson, then Senate majority leader, and was pressured by Jenkins to buy advertising time on the Johnson television station in Austin, Tex., calls went out to newspapers from people close to the White House trying to suppress or alter stories that were being prepared for publication.

There was direct intervention with the Star by Attorney Abe Fortas after the Star asked the White House for comment about the stereo set. Fortas, one of Johnson's closest unofficial advisers, was Baker's attorney until he withdrew from the case after Johnson became President. The story was nevertheless published.

REYNOLDS ATTACKED

About the same time, officials at the top levels of the executive branch told some Washington newsmen covering the Baker case that Reynolds' background was such that he was not a reliable witness.

In at least one case, reporters were shown a report said to be based on material about Reynolds in confidential Air Force and State Department personnel files. The files themselves were not produced.

But a confidential Air Force memorandum based on the Air Force and State Department files was used by Washington columnist Drew Pearson in articles questioning Reynolds' reliability. Republicans on the Rules Committee accused the White House of deliberately leaking confidential records to Pearson to discredit Reynolds. Pearson and the White House denied such a leak.

In a statement to the Senate last July, Senator CURTIS said he received an anonymous phone call in which a person who said he worked at the Pentagon claimed people who were blocking the Bobby Baker investigation were going through the private confidential files of Don Reynolds in order to smear him.

WILLIAMS COMMENTS

At the same Senate session, Senator WILLIAMS SAID:

"I am not unmindful of the fact that the nationally known columnist to whom this was leaked and who tried to discredit this witness had a stepson (Tyler Abell) who was appointed Assistant Postmaster General under President Johnson. His stepson's wife is (social) secretary to the wife of the President * * * and his partner (Jack Anderson) is a director of Riddle Airlines, which is involved in one of Mr. Baker's payoffs."

WILLIAMS said that Reynolds, who had written an insurance policy on Johnson's life, "was considered honorable enough that Senator Lyndon Johnson and Mr. Robert Baker each accepted a stereo set from him." Johnson has said he thought the stereo was a gift from Baker.

Much of the Pearson information came from a report allegedly prepared for the Secretary of the Air Force by Benjamin W. Fridge, the Air Force's special assistant for manpower, personnel and Reserve forces.

An Air Force spokesman refused to comment on the report or to say why the Air Force has a special interest in the Baker case that would require the preparation of the Fridge memorandum about Reynolds' background.

THE INVESTIGATION

The conduct of the Baker investigation has been marked by bickering between Republicans and Democrats on the committee, sketchy questioning and puzzling changes in direction.

Republicans on the committee have consistently claimed that witnesses have been treated unequally. They contend the handling of Jenkins is an illustration.

Republicans wanted Jenkins called to testify about Reynolds' claim that he pressured Reynolds into buying advertising time on the Johnson television station.

But the committee handled it another way. Committee Counsel L. P. McLendon and Chief Investigator W. Ellis Meehan went to the Executive Office Building next to the White House to interview Jenkins. McLendon and Ellis prepared a memorandum of the interview which was then shown to Jenkins and which Jenkins certified to be correct.

In the memorandum, McLendon and Ellis wrote that Jenkins denied having "any knowledge of any arrangements by which Reynolds purchased time on the TV station." McLendon went to pains to point out later that Jenkins didn't deny knowing that Reynolds purchased time on the station.

Reynolds claimed committee investigators harassed and tried to intimidate him. In a statement filed with the committee, here's how Reynolds described a session he had with McLendon and Ellis:

"When he [Meehan] asked me who discussed the purchase of television advertising space with me and I stated that Walter Jenkins and Walter Jenkins alone had, he, the interrogator, thereupon threw a book on the floor and in a boisterous manner informed me that I did not discuss this with Walter Jenkins, that I had discussed it with Bobby Baker.

"At this point I became somewhat reluctant to discuss openly anything further, knowing that his attitude was more toward defending certain people than toward ascertaining the real facts of the case. At two subsequent appearances before the Rules Committee I soon learned that the majority of that committee was more interested in discrediting me as a person and as a witness than it was in developing the actual facts of the case."

M'LENDON'S COMMENT

McLendon's feeling about Reynolds is summed up in a draft he wrote of the committee's report to the Senate. He said:

"The committee can only conclude that Reynolds, being of at least a questionable character himself, glories in the role of a character assassin with little respect for the truth and even less respect for the time honored rules of fair play and common decency."

This language was changed by the Democratic majority to read: "It appears rather obvious that Mr. Reynolds in his effort to enjoy the limelight of this investigation was not reluctant to draw on his imagination and to add to his store of knowledge as time passed."

Reynolds, a former Air Force officer and a former State Department consular officer, has admitted in published interviews that he is no saint. His testimony and a résumé of his Government services records which have been entered in the minutes of the Rules Committee, but which have not yet been made public, bear out Reynolds' own assertion.

But Senator WILLIAMS once told the Senate that without Reynolds' cooperation "we could never have exposed the Bobby Baker case." He added:

"I do not mind saying that I have greater respect for him, even though what he did was wrong, than I have for those who try to discredit him and try to cover up for Mr. Baker."

In its report to the Senate, the committee majority defended its refusal to call Jenkins with this comment: "In reality, the evidence of Jenkins as given or as he might testify in person has no significant importance insofar as the committee's legislative function is concerned."

That was last July when Jenkins was a top aid in the White House. Last month, after Jenkins had been arrested on a morals charge and had resigned his White House post, the Democrats on the committee changed their minds and agreed with the Republicans to call Jenkins to testify.

Asked why the committee now thinks it appropriate to question Jenkins when it insisted last year that there was no point in summoning him, Jordan last week said: "That's a good question."

He added, "Some of them wanted to call him and it was all right with me."

JORDAN ASTONISHED

No one has been more astonished at the Baker revelations than Chairman JORDAN, the easygoing 68-year-old Sunday school teacher from Saxapahaw, N.C., who said that on his first day in the Senate he sat where Bobby Baker told him and stayed there until Baker told him he could leave.

JORDAN said in the early stages of the inquiry that he could see no significant political implications in the Baker case.

A picture of Baker which once hung on the wall in JORDAN'S office was removed after the investigation began.

JORDAN'S chief role has been to swear in witnesses and read them a statement of the committee's function. It was JORDAN who recommended the 74-year-old McLendon as the head of the investigative staff, a recommendation that was approved unanimously. Republicans on the committee have had some second thoughts about the appointment and Senator CURTIS has suggested that McLendon turn in his resignation.

During a heated exchange last month after McLendon accused Senator WILLIAMS of lying, CURTIS accused McLendon of unfair treatment of witnesses and of frustrating the Republicans' attempt to dig further into the case.

Another Democratic member is CARL HAYDEN, who at 87 is the oldest man in the Senate. HAYDEN, of Arizona, has never asked a question of a witness.

Democratic Senator CANNON, for whose dinner the Riddle Airlines flight was chartered, has shown little interest in the inquiry.

The same is true of Senator ROBERT C. BYRD, Democrat, of West Virginia. His biggest contribution, at least in the public phases of the inquiry, was a hostile interrogation of one of the anti-Baker witnesses, Ralph Hill, in the early stages of the investigation.

Senator CLAIBORNE PELL, of Rhode Island, has been one of the most conscientious of the Democrats about attending hearings. He has not asked many questions either but he was the only one who could get much of a response from Baker when Baker invoked the fifth amendment more than 100 times rather than answer questions.

PELL asked Baker whether he thought it would be a good idea to change the system of selecting and handling page boys. Baker suggested it might be a good idea to use orphans from the District of Columbia.

After the last round of hearings, PELL indicated to a reporter that he had developed a new interest in the investigation.

Senator CLARK has found himself in a painful position. He has been a leading advocate of reform in the Senate but because of the partisan nature of the case has gone along with the rest of the Democrats in most of the votes on the conduct of the investigation.

REPUBLICANS FIGHT

The Republicans have been more aggressive, no doubt inspired in large part by the political capital to be gained. Without their pressure—and without the help of Senator WILLIAMS—the inquiry would have been dead long ago.

Senator CURTIS, an experienced investigator from the McClellan committee, has pursued witnesses relentlessly. But when it came to a vote on the disclosure resolution on the floor of the Senate, CURTIS was with most of his Democratic colleagues on the Rules Committee and with his Republican leader, DIRKSEN.

Senator SCOTT also has been a vigorous questioner. But when the kickback charges were being heard against McCloskey, a big wheel in Pennsylvania, SCOTT was in Tasmania. CLARK also found it convenient to absent himself when his constituent McCloskey testified.

Senator COOPER, Republican, of Kentucky, has been so tied up with other things, such as the Warren Commission's investigation of the assassination of President Kennedy, that he hasn't been able to devote much time to the Baker investigation. But he has told reporters privately that recent revelations have opened his eyes about the Baker case. He has been a vigorous advocate of extending the investigation into new areas.

Dozens of witnesses requested by the Republicans have been turned down by the Democrats on the committee. Some of those turned down last spring, including McCloskey, on grounds their testimony would be merely cumulative and repetitive were called in the latest round of public hearings. Somehow, their testimony, like that of Jenkins, became pertinent in the interval.

WILLIAMS WATCHES

Always in the background as the Senate considers the Baker dilemma is Senator JOHN WILLIAMS, by all standards the Hill's most feared sleuth.

Because of his role in the case, WILLIAMS has been ostracized by the White House, called a liar, and been made the target of insulting innuendo by some of his colleagues. But nothing has halted his pursuit of Baker and Baker's confederates.

When he declared himself through with the Rules Committee last month, he warned that he would be watching the progress of the investigation with great interest.

Few who know him doubt that he now is trying to assemble the material for more bombs to drop on the Senate floor should the investigators, whoever they turn out to be, do less than he thinks they should.

Although President Johnson made a last-minute, personal appeal for his defeat, WILLIAMS was reelected to the Senate last November.

Recently, he was asked how long he thinks the Baker case will continue. "I have 6 more years," he answered.

CONSERVATION OF DIMINISHING WILDERNESS

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the 88th Congress passed the wilderness bill—the most significant and far-reaching step ever taken along the road to conservation of our diminishing wilderness. I am very proud to have had a part in helping pass this tremendously important legislation.

In debate on the measure, many supporters of the bill spoke of its objectives in clear and unmistakable terms, writing a record which revealed their determination to preserve for posterity great natural scenic and recreational areas of the Nation.

It remained, however, for Frances Zaunmiller, a correspondent of the Grangeville (Idaho) Idaho County Free Press, in writing about Idaho's famed primitive area, to express the very essence of what wilderness means to mankind.

> It is a place—

She wrote—

> where trees grow that were not planted, and a man can walk and he is not trespassing. * * * And the man takes that part of the stillness, that has soaked into his being, with him, even out of the mountains.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this excellent column printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(By Frances Zaunmiller)

CAMPBELL'S FERRY.—Back in the days when the United States was a rich nation, there were men, both in and out of Washington, who did not have a cataract in their mind's eye. They could see the time coming when a tree would not be a tree, but would be "board feet" for the saw or pulp mill.

They saw in the future when a creek would not be a place to cool tired feet, nor would a river be only for men to play with fishing gear. No, they saw the time when these United States would be so poor, that creeks and rivers would only be recognized as water power, and could not be used for playthings.

Those men were not blind, nor were they stupid. They knew that the souls of men need the stillness of forested mountains and canyons. So, after long deliberation and due process of law, the primitive area of Idaho came into being.

It is a place where trees grow that were not planted, and a man can walk and he is not trespassing.

He can spend a day or a week or as long as he wants, soaking into his being the stillness of the mountains, that brings healing peace to man.

He sees the creeks running free and clear, with fish in quiet pools. While he sits on the trunk of a fallen tree and eats his lunch, he looks at all that is around him, and his mind is not closed to understanding, but listens to the voice of the stillness that is the mountains. And he listens to the story of how the half-rotten tree trunk he is using for both chair and table came to be there, at the edge of the clearing.

No, the trees are not planted in the primitive area, yet they grow, as the tiny little one, so small you'd think something would step on it and it would be crushed.

But it has a toughness not dreamed of in nursery rows, and it will grow, each year lighting its candles to the spring. Until the time when the tree, too, will be a monarch of the mountains, tall and straight with slender strength, asking only for its top in the sun while the rich brown dirt covers its feet.

And it still grows, offering shelter from sun and storm to both two- and four-legged people, and to the ones that fly and wear feathers.

The tree only grows, and asks nothing—'til a summer storm comes over the ridges from the high peaks and crags. Then it bows its head and prays, even as you and I:

"Let not the thunder notice me and call my name, for then the lightning will find my place and use my length as a path for its journey to its marriage with earth.

"Let not the wind twist my branches, for should they break and fall to earth, the nest that they shelter will be broken.

"Let not the wind and rain come together—else the dirt will be washed from my roots and the wind will bend my body, and I will fall to earth, no longer a tree.

"Let me pass safely through this storm, as through those in the past, so that I might give shade and shelter as I have done in the past."

And the man sitting on the trunk of a fallen tree, sees the nest of a grouse in the tangled branches. He hears the squeak of a mouse that has built its home in the dry needles. And a chipmunk comes from somewhere and tells him the local gossip.

And the man takes that part of the stillness, that has soaked into his being, with him, even out of the mountains.

No, it was not a wasteful United States that set aside the primitive area of yesterday and today and tomorrow. Even as the belly needs meat and bread, so does the soul of man need a quiet place, apart from cities and people, where he can reach an understanding with his inner being.

It is for this that they made it the primitive area. A gift to you and to your son who is not yet born, to play in and keep for all time, yours.

NATURAL DISASTER INSURANCE: AN IMMEDIATE NEED

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, it is with considerable pleasure that I join the distinguished junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] in cosponsoring his proposal for a study of methods of providing financial assistance to victims of future flood disasters. I trust that the Senate will act promptly upon it. The fact that it has once before, on November 8, 1963, received the approval of the Senate should speed its progress through committee and floor consideration.

The need for a comprehensive natural disaster insurance program aiding the private sector of the economy has often been expressed, most recently in Senator JACKSON's proposal in the last session for earthquake insurance. At the hearings held in connection with his bill, we were all reminded that there is already on the statute books a Federal flood insurance program, 42 Stat. 2401–2421. However, this program has never been funded because of the failure of Congress to appropriate the necessary money. This failure has, in turn, been caused by a lack of sufficient actuarial data for determining the amount which would be needed to fund its provisions. Senator WILLIAMS' bill will enable the Housing and Home Finance Agency to make a recommendation to the Congress concerning the amount of money necessary to establish the Federal flood insurance program.

The number of private homes destroyed or suffering major injury in natural disasters in this country in the last year can be seen from the following table. The materials tabulated here have been obtained from the American Red Cross and represent, except in the case of the recent west coast floods, their final figures for the various disasters:

Disaster	Homes destroyed	Homes suffering major damage
Ohio Valley floods, March 1964	181	1,870
Alaska earthquake, March 1964	494	452
Pacific coast tidal wave, related to Alaska quake	55	21
Wichita Falls, Tex., tornado, April 1964	205	85
Southeast Michigan tornado, May 1964	132	70
Montana and Idaho floods, June 1964	135	260
Eastern Nebraska floods, June 1964	6	441
Hurricane Cleo, west coast of Florida, August 1964	106	1,393
Hurricane Dora, west coast of Florida, September 1964	93	728
Hurricane Hilda, Louisiana, October 1964	169	2,622
West coast floods, December-January 1964:		
Idaho	2	50
Washington	10	42
Oregon	574	1,499
California	977	1,273
Total	1,564	2,864
Grand total	3,140	10,806

In view of the disastrous Alaska earthquake of last spring, the ever-present possibility of other quakes around the Pacific basin and the certainty in the years ahead of other natural disasters throughout the Nation, I feel that both Senator WILLIAMS' proposal and the Federal Flood Insurance Act should be amended to cover earthquake and, perhaps, other natural disasters. At the appropriate time, I shall introduce amendments to accomplish this result.

In the meantime, I shall be watching with continuing interest the progress of the legislation which I cosponsor at this time.

ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, Sunday night, January 10, a distinguished New Jersey team departed from Kennedy International Airport in New York City bound for Brazil. They arrived Monday morning in Rio de Janeiro for briefings by the American Embassy and AID officials and will leave today for the State of Alagoas in northeast Brazil.

This program development team represents the New Jersey Partners of the Alliance Committee which was organized by the citizens of my State in order to participate in a new program designed to match private sector groups and organizations in the United States with similar groups in Latin America. The objective of the partners concept is to help those in Latin rural and slum areas who are striving to help themselves attain a better life. It is that part of the Alliance for Progress that seeks to utilize the full energies of the peoples of the Americas toward hemispheric development.

The New Jersey team consists of Dr. Jesse B. Aronson, director, local health services, division of the New Jersey Department of Health; Mr. Everett C. Curry, president, New Jersey Education Association; Mr. Louis J. Fontanelli, engineer, retired, Fibro Corp.; Mr. Charles C. Phillips, district governor, Rotary International; Mr. Frank A. Saraci, director, plant industry division, New Jersey Department of Agriculture.

The experts will visit small projects undertaken by Brazilians in the State of Alagoas. They will seek to formulate a program whereby the private sector organizations and groups in New Jersey can join in a partnership action to help complete these projects. It may be a gasoline generator for a night literacy class, a blackboard or pencils and paper for a rural school, tools or equipment for agricultural projects involving irrigation or the provision of funds for the purchase of drugs and medicines for mobile health units or health centers. It is the kind of help that recognizes the efforts being made by many Latin Americans to help themselves.

I was personally pleased to participate in the initial organizational meeting of the New Jersey Partners in Newark last September 30. Mr. Wade B. Fleetwood, special assistant in the partners of the Alliance programs, in the Agency for International Development, attended and outlined the work and accomplishments of the Alliance for Progress in this hemisphere and explained the partners of the Alliance program that is now actively functioning in 19 States. He also indicated that another 10 States are in advanced stages of organization. This meeting, then, was the first step of the New Jersey participation in a citizen's "alliance" with Latin America. Subsequently, a nominating committee, headed by Mr. Albert A. Acken, executive vice president, New Jersey State Chamber of Commerce, was named by the planning group to select experts from various fields to constitute the team. Many people have donated much time and energy to get the program off to a good start. It has been a bipartisan effort in which a number of members of the New Jersey congressional delegation have participated.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a news release which explains the project in greater detail in regard to the departure of the New Jersey team. I am sure they will accredit themselves well on this mission for the people of New Jersey.

There being no objection, the news release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FIVE-MAN TEAM OF NEW JERSEYITES TO SET UP ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS PARTNERSHIP WITH CITIZENS OF BRAZILIAN STATE OF ALAGOAS

NEWARK, N.J.—A mutual self-help partnership between citizens of New Jersey and of the Brazilian State of Alagoas is being established under the Alliance for Progress program of the Agency for International Development.

Five prominent New Jerseyites—a doctor, an engineer, an agriculturalist, a businessman, and an educator—departed by air to Brazil Sunday evening (January 10) for a 2-week visit to that northeastern Brazilian State. They will meet with local citizen groups and set up a nongovernmental program to assist Alagoans with specific problems eminating from self-help projects aimed at securing a better life for themselves and future generations.

The delegation of New Jerseyites is headed by Charles C. Phillips, of Neptune, president of Edgar Phillips & Son, Inc., and a district governor of Rotary International, who is also serving as temporary chairman of the sponsoring organization—New Jersey Partners of the Alliance for Progress. Other members of the delegation are: Dr. Jesse B. Aronson, director, division of local health services, New Jersey Department of Health, who is a resident of Trenton; Everett C. Curry, president of the New Jersey Education Association and a resident of Atlantic Highlands; Louis J. Fontenelli, an engineer recently retired from the Fibro Corp. (a division of the

Drackett Co.), Clark, and a resident of Garwood; Frank A. Soraci, director of the division of plant industry, New Jersey Department of Agriculture, Trenton, a resident of Titusville.

The delegation received a special AID briefing in Newark Sunday afternoon from Wade B. Fleetwood, a representative of the Washington office of the Partners of the Alliance for Progress. Later they transferred by helicopter from Newark to Kennedy International Airport for departure to Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, aboard a 9 p.m. Pan American Airways flight. Following additional briefing at the U.S. Embassy in Rio, the group will fly on to Macieo, the capital of Alagoas, to familiarize themselves with that state's basic human needs and to establish the citizen contacts through which the program will subsequently function.

During their stay in Macieo, the group will meet with the Governor of Alagoas, Gen. Luiz Cavalcante, and will present him with an official letter of greetings from New Jersey's Gov. Richard J. Hughes, as well as a New Jersey State flag.

New Jersey's participation in the "partners" program was initiated through efforts of Senators CLIFFORD P. CASE and HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR., along with Congressmen PETER W. RODINO, JR. and PETER FRELINGHUYSEN. At the group's initial meeting, held in Newark some weeks ago, Senator CASE related how the program has received enthusiastic bipartisan support in the Congress because of its unusual effectiveness and its modest cost.

The partners program, Phillips explained, is now functioning in 19 States. It provides a channel through which community organizations—business, professional, educational, labor unions, service groups, State or city institutions, or even private citizens in the United States can work directly with the people of a Central or South American nation or state, encouraging their efforts to improve their own way of life. It supplements cooperative assistance between the governments and public and private institutions within the two nations involved. Most of the individual partners projects, he said, will be of a modest nature—a portable electric generator for a rural school so that night literacy classes can be conducted for adults; a pump or pipeline to complete a local irrigation project; typewriters or foot-powered sewing machines to help children in an orphanage develop employable skills; operating room supplies for a small hospital, etc.

"Because such projects directly benefit the people, we are told they have as much, if not more, impact in our struggle against Communist anti-Americanism than do the large undertakings that are conducted at the intergovernmental or interinstitutional level. They provide tangible evidence of the average U.S. citizen's genuine interest in the welfare of our Central and South American neighbors," Phillips said.

"Financial support for projects of this kind can be generated directly by citizen organizations in New Jersey," Phillips continued. "While our New Jersey Partners organization is so new that it does not as yet have permanent officers, the underlying membership already includes representatives of the major service clubs, organized labor, and statewide business groups so that we have a sound basis for implementing our program and meeting some of the small but important human needs of the people of Alagoas."

Phillips emphasized that the program is not one of charity. The projects to be undertaken by New Jersey participants will be solely to supplement self-help projects initiated by the citizens of Alagoas. He also pointed out that the partnership is not a one-way program, citing the experience of one Western State which has already received important agricultural help from its South American "partner."

Present at the briefing in Newark Sunday were several members of the New Jersey Partners temporary steering group including Russell Armstrong, of Alpine, a district governor of Rotary International; Bertram J. Bertolamy, of Garwood, international counselor for Lions International, and John L. Wetten, of Caldwell, New Jersey district governor of Kiwanis International. Albert H. Acken, executive vice president of the New Jersey State Chamber of Commerce, and Arthur M. Cox, Jr., the chamber's public relations director, remained with the five-man New Jersey team until their international flight departure. Acken, who resides in Orange, is serving as chairman of the group's nominating committee, and Cox, a resident of Maplewood, is acting as temporary secretary.

The New Jersey team is expected to return to Newark on Sunday, January 24, and shortly thereafter will present a report to the organization's entire membership.

AN APPRAISAL OF FARM SUBSIDIES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, last year a constituent, Richard Hansen, of Joplin, Mont., sent me a paper he prepared in defense of agricultural subsidies. "The Distorted Image" is an excellent analysis of the subsidy issue as it affects the farm economy, both from the practical aspect and the public relations aspect of the issue.

In the not too distant future, Congress will again be faced with a review of our farm policies. With this thought in mind, I ask unanimous consent to have the Hansen article printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE DISTORTED IMAGE

(By Richard E. Hansen, Jr.)

In a speech not long ago, Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman presented a chilling prospect for the millions of Americans engaged in the business of farming. With the Nation's farms growing fewer in number and larger in size each year, he warned, the balance of power is also shifting.

"In the future," he said, "legislation dealing with all agricultural matters will become more and more dependent upon the votes of those who represent urban States and areas other than agricultural for passage."

With the heavy burden of responsibility these legislators already have to their constituents in regard to the complexities of modern-day urban problems, it seems doubtful that many will be either willing, or able, to devote the time and attention necessary to fully understand or intelligently act upon the needs of the suburban population.

Of real concern to many farmers in this image-conscious age, is the distorted view which many urban residents have of those who make their living by farming, or, to use more recent terminology—agribusiness. A barrage of criticisms, half-truths, and innuendoes has for years been leveled periodically against the farming industry. This bombardment—largely undeserved, has with the exception of a few isolated cases, remained mostly unanswered—resulting in one of the most lop-sided examples of public relations ever experienced by any group in this country.

Probably the most flagrant area of distortion and misinformation lies in the yearly appropriation which Congress makes to the Agriculture Department.

A great many of those responsible for keeping the public informed, frequently leave the impression that this figure—representing billions of dollars of taxpayers' money, is simply divided up and handed out equally to all of the Nation's farmers to subsidize them for not growing anything at all on their acres.

In all fairness, it must be said that some of the blame for the failure to fully inform its citizens as to the expenditure of these tax dollars originates from within the circles of Government itself.

The result of these implications has been to implant firmly in the minds of a majority of the Nation's urban citizens that nowadays the farmer's main harvest field is the U.S. Treasury. It has been suggested that 90 percent of the country's nonfarm population, if asked for a synonym for the word subsidy, would unhesitatingly answer "farming."

The ironical fact is, that while lashing out at farm subsidies, many publishers choose to ignore the fact that they themselves are being heavily subsidized by this same Government. A number of these publishers have testified before congressional committees that, without this aid, it would be difficult, if not impossible, for them to continue in business.

Perhaps then, this would be a good time to take a brief look at Federal aid in general, and a longer look at farm support in particular, in an attempt to see just how Mr. and Mrs. John Q. Public fares, and what they are getting in return for some of this golden harvest which many intimate is being handed out so lavishly to the Nation's farmers.

U.S. Representative Fred Marshall, of Minnesota, in a special report on subsidies to the House Agricultural Subcommittee, stated, "The subsidy is as ancient as time. It has an honorable purpose and tradition. The subsidy is indispensable in this day of increasing population, with the world shrunken in size by rockets and travel at speeds faster than sound."

In his report, Representative Marshall points out the fact that the oldest recorded subsidy is the gift to Adam and Eve of the Garden of Eden. Since then, history is studded with examples of subvention in one form or another. Kings and kingdoms were dependent upon subsidies. The original colonists of our country were aided by the gift of the land which formed the original colonies, as well as in other ways.

In fact, the whole history of the growth and development of this country is one of subsidization, from the formation of our Navy and merchant fleets, to our railroads and industries. The early-day pioneers were subsidized in their westward migration by the Homestead Act of 1862. This same year, education in the Nation was assisted by the Land-Grant College Act, whereby free land was donated by the Government for the establishment of colleges of agriculture and mechanical arts.

A limited study of the history of subsidies, made by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, shows that the first direct subsidy of record which was paid by our Federal Government, was when Congress authorized the Postmaster General to award payments for carrying mail in 1845.

Since we intend to take up the matter of Government aid to farmers at a later point, it is interesting to note here that postal deficits from mail subsidies during the 10-year period, 1946 to 1956, have cost the taxpayer more than the entire losses from the agriculture price support program from its inception in 1933, to date.

It should be pointed out also, that while it is not a direct money grant, the tariff system, enacted in 1789, is considered to be our most monumental example of the subsidy. In fact, the entire principle of subsidy was established by this legislative act of our first Congress. Today, tariff revenues to the Government alone are running at something like three-quarters of a billion dollars a year. In addition to this, industry, business, agriculture, and other groups reap uncalculable millions in benefits from this system.

One can only speculate on how far the storied U.P. Trail would stretch today were it not for the support of the Government. One estimation of the total amount of Federal aid given to encourage railroad construction puts the figure at nearly $1.3 million. Much of this has been in the form of land grants, consisting of some 183 million acres during the last half of the past century alone. This figure is considerably more than the total acreage planted to corn, wheat, cotton, and soybeans last year.

Although subsidies are normally thought of as a direct payment of money, this is not always the case. It is doubtful if any person in this country does not benefit in some way—either directly or indirectly, from Government help. Each time a person uses one of the Nation's highways, for example, or mails a letter or receives a publication by mail, travels by rail, sea or air, or attends a public school, he is in effect profiting from our Federal subsidy system.

Not only do our own people benefit from our Federal subsidies, but in one way or another—either through our foreign aid program, military aid, direct grants of money, or technical assistance—a large part of the world's population also feels the effects of our subsidization.

During the fiscal year 1959–60, a period of especially vitriolic attacks against Federal aid to farmers, out of the $82 billion Government budget, aids and special services—according to the Budget Bureau's own analysis—accounted for $1.5 billion, or about one-fifth of the total budget. Of this sum, nearly $1.5 billion went to business for such items as postal service operations losses, maritime operating and other assistance to the shipping industry, as well as air navigation aids.

Labor received almost three-quarters of a billion, largely for unemployment benefits, while about $5 billion went to veterans for pensions, medical care, education, and other costs. Our foreign economic and military aid programs accounted for slightly over $3.7 billion during this same period.

Additional grants included $2.3 billion for assistance to the needy, aged, blind and disabled, aids to Indians, etc. Funds for stockpiling metals for defense and other purposes also accounted for a share. Homeowners and tenants profited through such direct Federal aid programs as Housing and Home Finance Agency, slum clearance, and urban renewal.

Not included in this figure are such indirect aids as fast tax writeoffs for defense-related industries, depletion allowances for oil and mining companies and many others. Hardly a segment of our economy failed to profit in some manner or share in some way in the billions ladled out by the Government to assist private enterprise, needy or deserving citizens, or for general economic pump priming.

The amount which was budgeted to agriculture at that time was $6,450 million. If, as is frequently intimated, this amount was divided up among the Nation's farmers, there should then be some 4 million multimillionaires living on farms in this country. Since this is obviously not the case, just where did this money go? Who benefited from it if not the farmers of the Nation?

The answer is, practically everybody in this country shared in a part of it, as well as millions of persons in foreign lands. If you bought meat—either wholesale or retail—drank milk, used any lumber, or if your child participated in the school lunch or school milk programs, or if you enjoyed a vacation in one of the national forests, then you were receiving benefits from some of the funds allocated to the Department of Agriculture.

A breakdown of Agriculture Department expenditures for that year reveals about 45 percent of this $6.450 billion, or a total of $2.874 billion, was expended upon programs having multiple benefits, and not directly chargeable to the farmer.

Of this total, the largest share—$1.396 billion, was used for programs having foreign relations and defense aspects, including donations and gifts of food overseas under Public Law 480. Another $510 million went to REA and FHA in the form of loans which are repayable with interest. School lunch programs, food distribution and school milk accounted for another $323 million of these funds. Such items as meat inspection, research, disease and pest control, education, market development and services, and forest and public land management used an additional $645 million.

It is perhaps worthy of mention also, that of this total budget figure, approximately 11 percent was siphoned off in the form of administrative expenses, for such things as personal services, salaries, travel, supplies, etc. These expenses include the costs of preparing, printing and distributing many of the speeches given by Department officials, and it may interest some taxpayers to know that a random sampling of these speeches show their cost to average out at about $246.58 each.

While every citizen of our country, as well as those in other parts of the world shared equally in the benefits of these programs, the amounts expended to obtain them are often a part of the total figure which critics use in their blasts at farm subsidies.

And the remaining 3½ billion? Is this the amount which was handed out to the Nation's farmers?

Handouts—no. Subsidies, yes—to some extent—received by a great many farmers and ranchers. However, much of this was received in the form of loans—secured and subject to interest payments. Department of Agriculture figures show that in regard to programs predominantly for the benefit of farmers, the greatest amount, $2.955 billion went for Commodity Credit Corporation price support, supply and related programs, National Wool Act, acreage allotments, and marketing quotas. Conservation programs, acreage reserve, conservation reserve, and Sugar Act programs accounted for the balance.

Since Government price support programs for such commodities as wheat often bear the brunt of attacks by farm critics, it should be pointed out that any money farmers receive from price support comes in the form of a loan. This loan is subject to repayment within a definite time period, either in cash with interest, or through forfeiture of the collateral commodities.

These loans—in the words of Department officials themselves—constitute neither payments nor losses. Commodities acquired by the Government through loan forfeiture or purchase, have a definite value which, when recovered through sale or other means, substantially reduces the net cost to the taxpayer.

Further, during the year in question, a very large percentage of these loans were repaid in cash by farmers, along with interest payments which amounted to approximately $14 million alone.

Many farmers use these loans simply to postpone selling until more favorable market conditions prevail, or, to defray income for tax purposes over into the following year. It might be argued that these commodity loans represent subsidies to the farmer to the same degree that Government loans to those engaged in any private business or industry, or to the veteran buying a home can be considered a grant.

Touching briefly upon the payments farmers receive for carrying out projects relating to conservation type activities, a simile might be drawn between conservation programs and the depletion allowances operators of oil wells and mines are granted. Theoretically, recognition is made that these operators are depleting wealth of their property by production. Being an exhaustible natural wealth, it is further theorized that these persons are entitled to Federal aid, which in this case is received in the form of tax relief.

Conservation payments to farmers might be termed as soil depletion, or fertility depletion allowances, since this farmer is also depleting natural wealth in producing from the soil. In this case though, the farmer must take the initiative and usually bear a part of the cost of restoring this natural wealth himself before the Government chips in with a percentage.

Perhaps though, the area which is of most concern to the nonfarm taxpayer is that of the much publicized payments which farmers receive for not producing anything on part of their acreage. This concern is shared by a great many farmers as well, since in a considerable amount of cases, these payments are not nearly equal to the amounts which would have been realized had the farmer been allowed to use this acreage for productive purposes.

Under the law, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to determine each year the total number of acres in this country upon which can be grown crops which are currently considered as being in surplus. Out of this total, each grower of a given commodity is allocated a certain percentage of his total acreage which he is allowed to use in producing these specified products.

His remaining acreage can be utilized to raise crops which are not in surplus, or, can be allowed to remain idle, in which case the Government compensates the farmer to some extent for his loss of income from these acres by some form of payment.

Unfortunately, particularly in the case of many dryland wheat farms, there is no alternate crops which can be profitably grown on these remaining acres. Their only recourse in most instances, is to allow this land to lie idle and accept payments to partially offset their losses, while at the same time, striving for increased yields from the land which is in production to try and make up the difference.

When one compares the per acre income potential of most average-to-good farmland when used for production, against the Government payment per acre for not producing on this land, it becomes readily apparent that such of the land taken out of production under soil bank and similar programs was hardly worth farming in the first place.

It should be established here, that farming represents one of the principle remaining outposts of the rugged individualist. Farmers have long cherished the freedom and independence which were basic to their way of life.

Some proof of this is offered in the tenacity with which many continue to cling to their farms, in spite of the fact that roughly 55 percent of all farm-operator families are classed as being among the lowest income fifth of all families in the United States. The shackles imposed upon their way of life by Government restrictions are galling indeed to the majority of these individuals.

Still, no group is more aware of the problems which exist in connection with their industry. Recognition is generally, albeit reluctantly, granted by farmers that there is need for some sort of controls, particularly in the face of present day surplus production of many commodities. This is a situation which, paradoxically, they have brought about themselves largely through their own progressiveness.

Few others in this country have been more quickly responsive to technological advancements during the past two decades than farmers. As a result, we are the best fed, best clothed people of any nation on earth. At the same time, the farmers share of increases in food prices during this period have been so slight as to be almost negligible.

Wheat growers, like many other farm commodity groups, have been more than willing to assume their share of the responsibility for doing something about their problems.

Nearly every Western and Midwestern State where wheat and other cereal grains are grown now has a large scale, farmer organized and supported, program of education, sales promotion, marketing, and research. In most cases, this program is financed entirely by the growers themselves through a system of voluntary per-bushel assessments on the grain they produce.

Much of the efforts of these groups is directed at expanding existing markets in foreign countries, as well as creating new markets for their products. Continuing research is also being carried out toward finding new uses for these products, improving present grain varieties, and searching for new and improved varieties.

As was pointed out, farmers—while perhaps not as vociferous as other groups in the Nation—are among the sharpest critics of Government interference in the business of farming. At the same time, they are fully cognizant of the folly of divorcing theirs—or any other single industry in this country—entirely from all Federal control; i.e., aid and support.

To do so, would place them in a position of competing against their own tax dollars, since nearly all of the goods and services they are required to buy are in some way, shape or form, Government subsidized.

Speaking before the House some time ago, the Honorable HAROLD D. COOLEY, of North Carolina, said, "Our Government provides the minimum wage and collective bargaining powers to protect our labor forces, and our industry is favored by many laws that soften the impacts of harsh and unrestrained competition."

There are today, he pointed out, more single units of enterprise in agriculture, more individual capitalists, than all other industry and business combined.

"This Nation," he said, "will not permit more than one-half of its free enterprise units to struggle constantly on the edge of insolvency."

Farming is not only one of our oldest forms of free enterprise in this country, it is also our basic industry. Farmers are among the Nation's largest users of steel, paint, chemicals, rubber, and automotive products.

If the farmer—as typified by the family-type operation—is allowed to wither on the economic vine, then the considerable segment of our business, industry, and labor community which exists to serve him will certainly shrivel accordingly.

CONTRIBUTIONS BY THE COAST GUARD IN WAR AND IN PEACE

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, Adm. E. J. Roland, Commandant of the U.S. Coast Guard, has written a most interesting and illuminating article regarding the Coast Guard's many contributions to our country, both in war and in peace.

As one who served in the U.S. Coast Guard during World War II, and as a member of the U.S. Coast Guard Reserve, I am especially pleased to have an opportunity to bring this excellent article to the attention of my colleagues.

Admiral Roland points to the 174-year-old history of our Coast Guard, its long record in defending and safeguarding principles we cherish, and, particularly, its use of new technologies directed toward increasing the effectiveness of its services. These include experiments with thermoelectric nuclear generators in navigational aids, and new offshore light structures to designate more accurately safe channels for passage near land. One such structure has recently been put into operation at Brenton Reef, off my home city of Newport, R.I.

Admiral Roland also explains that during the last 10 years the Coast Guard has rescued almost 32,000 persons, and has saved property valued at over $15 billion. This is, indeed, an outstanding record of achievement.

To maintain and build on such a record requires vigilant and resourceful leadership. The Coast Guard is fortunate to have a Commandant possessed of these qualities.

I ask unanimous consent that Admiral Roland's article, entitled "The U.S. Coast Guard: Helping Hand and Armed Force," which was published in the December issue of the Officer magazine, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE U.S. COAST GUARD: HELPING HAND AND ARMED FORCE

(By Adm. E. J. Roland, Commandant, U.S. Coast Guard)

The U.S. Coast Guard is an armed service with an important difference: While other Armed Forces operate in the Defense Department, the Coast Guard is a Treasury Department agency in peacetime.

In time of war or on direction of the President, it operates under the Navy. But in war or peace it always remains a military service, never losing its Coast Guard identity. This is a point often missed by many persons otherwise well informed on military matters.

Aside from its unusual position in the Defense Establishment, the Coast Guard is also unique in that it has a traditional and well-defined peacetime mission to promote maritime safety and marine law enforcement. Its dual character as an armed force and marine safety agency gives it a personality distinct from that of the other services.

In view of the Coast Guard's complexity, it's not surprising that a large segment of the American public does not have a clear concept of the part played by this 174-year-old service in our national life. Perhaps a look at the Coast Guard would help to dispel some of the confusion.

FAR BEYOND U.S. WATERS

First, let's take up the size and geographic scope of the Coast Guard. Compared to the other services, the Coast Guard is small with a total military strength of about 32,000 men. It has few large units, and many isolated in remote parts of the world. Instead of hugging the coast, as its name implies, the Coast Guard is scattered around the globe—from the Mediterranean in the east to Japan and the Philippines in the west—from the Arctic to the Equator, and at times the Antarctic. Obviously, the Coast Guard's functions range far beyond the coastal waters of the United States.

The great bulk of the Coast Guard's duties in peacetime are concerned with the safety of life and property on the high seas and waters under Federal jurisdiction.

Generally, its activities in maritime safety may be divided into two classes: Those intended to reduce the occurrence of accidents or other distress at sea, and those activities aimed at alleviating distress once it exists. While search and rescue often makes the headlines, the less spectacular preventive activities are no less important, and in many ways predominate in our day-to-day work. They underlie many of our operations, especially those involving merchant marine safety, aids to navigation, and recreational boating safety. More and more we are coming to realize that the key to increased safety at sea may well lie in the preventive approach to marine safety.

Relatively few persons are aware of the Coast Guard's merchant marine safety program which includes administration and enforcement of laws and regulations governing the safety and efficiency of the U.S. merchant marine. Broadly stated, this embraces the development of safety standards for the design, construction, equipping, and operation of merchant ships; inspection of merchant vessels and their gear during building and periodically thereafter to insure their conformity with prescribed standards. It also extends to the setting of personnel standards, and the issuance of licenses and certificates to merchant marine personnel. Another function is the control and supervision of the loading and transportation by merchant vessels of explosives and other hazardous cargoes. When, despite these safeguards, casualties occur, the Coast Guard investigates and takes corrective action in whatever area it may be needed.

THE FIRST NUCLEAR SHIP

In recent years, the Coast Guard's long experience in setting the criteria for marine safety was employed in the construction of the first nuclear-powered merchant ship, the *Savannah*.

As part of its continuing effort to make the sea safer for those who sail it, the Coast Guard maintains a vast network of more than 2,000 aids to navigation, including a worldwide network of loran stations. These aids are located along our coasts, in the Great Lakes and navigable rivers, in our island possessions, and as required for defense purposes, at oversea locations. Improvements to waterways and other changing circumstances create new or different requirements for aids. In the last several years, many secondary lights have been converted to automatic operation, oil and gas burning lights and buoys have been converted to electric power, and other changes made to provide better service at lower cost.

In this connection, the Coast Guard has been experimenting with a thermoelectric nuclear generator installed in a lighted buoy in Chesapeake Bay. This generator, one of a series developed by the Atomic Energy Commission, is similar in principle to the atomic generators now used in the Transit navigational satellites and in automatic weather stations in the Arctic and Antarctic. Strontium 90, a byproduct of nuclear reactors, provides the best source for this generator. Recently, the Coast Guard placed in operation its first atomic powered lighthouse in Chesapeake Bay.

A further advance in navigational aids is the offshore light structure which is being used at points where the depth of water permits. Eventually, many of the Coast Guard's colorful lightships will be supplanted by these offshore structures. One of them is now functioning in Buzzards Bay at the southern approach to the Cape Cod Canal. A second is in operation at Brenton Reef off Newport, R.I., and a third is about to go into commission replacing the Frying Pan Shoals lightship off Cape Fear, N.C.

DARING RESCUES AT SEA

With increasing thousands of Americans taking to the waterways, recreational boating safety has become another major area of interest for the Coast Guard. In recognition of this upsurge of interest in pleasure boating, the Coast Guard has established a Recreational Boating Safety Division at its headquarters in Washington, D.C.

Primarily, the Coast Guard seeks to encourage adherence to safe boating practices through education. Assisting in this effort is the Coast Guard Auxiliary, a voluntary, nonmilitary organization of boatowners, functioning under the administration of the Commandant. Among other things, this organization exists for the purpose of assisting the Coast Guard to promote efficiency in the operation of motorboats and to foster a wider knowledge of laws, rules, and regulations governing motorboat operations. Auxiliarists conduct courtesy boating examinations and provide courses in safe boating which are open to the public.

Nearly everyone is familiar with daring rescues at sea carried out by the Coast Guard. No matter how far we may advance in preventive safety, we can never altogether eliminate the many hazards of the sea. There will always be need for the Coast Guard's search and rescue work.

One of the most important developments in this vital field was the inauguration of the Atlantic merchant vessel reporting program (Amver) in 1958. Under this program, vessels report their courses and speeds periodically to the Coast Guard in New York. These data are processed by an electric computer and provide the most current information for Coast Guard rescue coordination centers. Hundreds of vessels of foreign and U.S. registry have taken part in the program and next year, coverage will be extended to include the North Pacific Ocean.

SAVES FIVE TIMES COST

In carrying out its search and rescue function, the Coast Guard, over a period of the last 10 years rescued 31,888 persons in peril and saved property valued at more than $15 billion. This figure represents more than 5 times the total appropriation for the service during the same period of time, a remarkable record for a service of less than 32,000 men.

In the past, oceanography has been a relatively obscure science. Today, it is rapidly becoming one of our most important activities, with enormous implications both for peace and war. Reflecting a growing national interest in oceanography, the Coast Guard is intensifying its efforts in this field. Its involvement in this vital area started in 1867, shortly after the purchase of Alaska from the Imperial Russian Government.

In that year the cutter *Lincoln* was dispatched on the first official exploration of Alaskan waters. Since then the Coast Guard has been moving steadily forward in the marine sciences. Through oceanic studies carried out by its International Ice Patrol, Alaskan Patrol, and its ocean weather ships in both the Atlantic and Pacific, the Coast Guard is contributing significantly to the national oceanographic effort.

The Coast Guard, however, is a military organization and does have military functions to perform along with its many peacetime tasks. It is in this connection that the Coast Guard Reserve plays a major part and we rely to a great extent upon our reservists to prepare for and be ready to carry out the Coast Guard's wartime missions.

ENTER COAST GUARD RESERVE

Prior to the outbreak of World War II we had no Organized Reserve and our entire strength numbered less than 20,000 officers and men. The Coast Guard found it necessary to expand as rapidly as possible due to our ever-increasing duties. As a result, the Coast Guard Reserve was born.

With the outbreak of war in Europe in September 1939, Coast Guard ships, planes, and stations were ordered to carry out extensive patrols to insure that merchant ships in our waters did not violate the neutrality proclaimed by President Roosevelt. The next summer the Coast Guard began its port security operations under the revised Espionage Act of 1917 and the newly enacted Dangerous Cargo Act.

On November 1, 1941, the Coast Guard was ordered to operate as part of the Navy. The next month Pearl Harbor was bombed and we were in the war. As in World War I, a big part of the Coast Guard's task was antisubmarine warfare. Coast Guard cruising cutters and convoy escorts helped win the battle of the Atlantic as they destroyed 11 U-boats. At the same time, more than 4,000 survivors of torpedoings and other enemy action were rescued from the Atlantic and Mediterranean by Coast Guardsmen.

But there were losses too. The cutter *Hamilton* went down while in tow after she had been torpedoed off Iceland. The *Acacia* was sunk in the Caribbean; *Escanaba, Leopold, Muskeget,* and *Natsek* in the Atlantic; *Serpens* in the Pacific. Only two of the crew survived *Escanaba*—no one, on board *Muskeget, Serpens,* or *Natsek.* More than 90 percent of those who went down with these vessels were members of the newly established Reserve component of the Coast Guard.

RESERVISTS ON THE BEACHES

Many more reservists manned landing craft that hit the invasion beaches with assault troops at Guadalcanal, Anzio, Tarawa, Attu, North Africa, Salerno, Makin, Kwajalein, Eniwetok, Normandy, southern France, Luzon, Guam, Saipan, Iwo Jima, Okinawa—the Coast Guard made all those stops and a lot in between.

At its peak strength the service had 802 vessels (over 65 feet) of its own, and in addition manned 351 Navy and 288 Army craft. Shore stations increased from 1,096 to 1,774 and by June of 1945 total personnel reached 172,000. There were only 10,000 more men ashore than at sea, as many of the shore billets were taken over by temporary reservists and 10,000 women reservists who became known as Spars.

At the conclusion of the war approximately 150,000 of our total personnel were reservists who had entered the Coast Guard for wartime duty. Many of this number formed the nucleus for the establishment of our regular peacetime Reserve and are still serving with Reserve components. Others have completed their 20 years and are now retired under the Reserve Retirement Act which the Reserve Officers Association was so instrumental in having enacted.

Today, we have approximately 150 Reserve port security training units with more than 11,000 men attending regular weekly drills. Many of these reservists are also qualified for assignment to floating units should conditions dictate.

Other Organized Reserve training units are of a support nature, providing additional trained personnel for vessel augmentation and activation, search and rescue, aviation, electronics, coastal forces, and mobilization detachments. During the past 12 months 3,565 members of these organized units received 2 weeks' active duty for training (ACDUTRA) at our Reserve Training Center at Yorktown, Va.; another 1,600 at Alameda, Calif., while many more received their 2 weeks' training in their particular specialty at regular Coast Guard units and installations or at Coast Guard or other service schools. The Reserve Officers Association with its precept for a strong, well-trained Reserve can take pride in the fact that its contribution to this program was, and continues to be, a most substantial one.

Currently, we are training approximately 17,000 reservists in Organized Reserve training units. This is the maximum number our present budget of $20.7 million will support. Additional personnel are needed to meet our mobilization requirements. There are other important needs with respect to facilities and equipment.

However, I can state with a great deal of conviction that from my experience and association with the Reserve and its members, the Coast Guard Reserve will, within the limitations of its operating budget, be both ready and reliable.

I have found that its members, whatever their individual backgrounds, reflect one thing in common—devotion, pride, and a feeling of national responsibility.

Without this loyalty and devotion my work and the Coast Guard's mission could not succeed.

THE PRESIDENT'S EDUCATION MESSAGE

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, if ever there was a capital investment that we as citizens of the United States should make, it is investment in the education of our children. I congratulate the President on his program, and I will support it as hard as I can. My objective is to have every youngster in America receive as much education as he is capable of absorbing and wants, and not to have financial consideration play any role in his securing such an education.

I like the President's approach, too, in that its thrust is directed at our children because only if children want to go to college and are adequately prepared for college can they take advantage of such education. I think all too often at the Federal level we have been putting the cart before the horse, in thinking in terms of advanced education, when we should also be thinking in terms of providing earlier in students' lives more opportunity, or in terms of solving problems such as the one we face when far too many of our youngsters become second generation or even third generation school dropouts.

Education is for far more than economic reasons. But sound reasoning also must include consideration of the fact that persons with an eighth-grade education or less earn $176,000 in the course of a lifetime; high school graduates earn $273,000; and college graduates earn $453,000.

This has an impact on our Nation's economy.

THE USE OF LOOKOUT GALLERIES FOR PREVENTION OF MAIL THEFT

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, recently there seems to have developed a controversy over the advisability of the so-called lookout galleries built into post offices, for observation of mail work rooms by postal inspectors.

Quite contrary to my aversion to any police procedures of the "big brother is watching you" variety, I express my support of the use of these lookout devices for the prevention and detection of theft from the U.S. mails. Our postal system represents one of this country's major lifelines for communication and commerce, and we must use all reasonable measures to keep it open and to keep it worthy of our confidence.

I believe that a good description of the need for the lookout galleries is contained in an article written by Miriam Ottenberg, and published in the January 3 issue of the Washington Evening Star.

I ask that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POST OFFICE PROMISES FIGHT FOR GALLERIES

(By Miriam Ottenberg)

The Postal Inspection Service rates the lookout galleries in post offices such an "indispensable tool" to prevent looting of the mail that a determined fight will be waged against any effort to eliminate them.

The observation galleries built into the larger post offices are being eyed on both sides of the Capitol.

On the House side, several Members introduced bills to eliminate the lookout posts, held a press conference and announced they would call for an investigation at this session. On the Senate side, the Senate Administrative Practice and Procedure Subcommittee has asked the Post Office Department for information about the galleries.

The congressional attacks on post office surveillance, however, came before Postmaster General John A. Gronouski closed the observation posts in post office men's rooms last month.

The Postmaster General said he thought the washroom lookout stations were an "unfortunate invasion of privacy" but he stressed at the time that he did not consider that observation galleries elsewhere in post offices violated anyone's rights.

Chief Postal Inspector Henry B. Montague concurred with the Postmaster General on banning washroom lookouts although thieves have used the plumbing to destroy such evidence as money wrappers and envelopes.

For the rest of the post offices, where galleries permit a view of the mail workroom, Chief Montague insists that the lookouts benefit postal employees as well as the mailing public. Without the lookouts, he is convinced, the mail will be much less safe than it is today.

He is determined to keep the lookout galleries and considers that calling them peepholes is strictly "smear tactics."

AID TO WORKERS

He said the lookouts are useful where a businessman complains that he's not getting valuable mail. In about 100 cases last year, Chief Montague reported, the business firms' own employees were rifling the mail.

If it hadn't been for the lookouts, he said, suspicion would have fallen on postal employees. The way it works now, he explained, the lookout galleries enable inspectors to clear postal workers of any suspicion and enlist their help in solving the theft.

He stressed the incalculable value in terms of money and merchandise going through the mail—from diamonds in New York to the suburban bank-by-mail deposits. The overall value has been placed at trillions of dollars.

Postal inspectors, he said, only move into the lookout galleries when a complaint is received that mail is not reaching its destination. Supervisors on the mail floor cannot spot thefts when their backs are turned but inspectors in the gallery can narrow down exactly where the theft is occurring and exactly who is responsible.

GALLERIES CALLED DETERRENT

"Instead of rounding up all the employees on one side of the room and saying we want to talk to you," Chief Montague argued, "we can go to the right man and know he has the evidence in his pocket. We think it is to the advantage of all honest employees that we can prevent them from being under suspicion."

He stressed that the lookout galleries are a deterrent since the employees know of their existence and the vast majority of postal employees are honest. Over the past 5 years, however, close to 3,000 employees have been caught stealing from the mails.

The legislators who attacked the lookout galleries said they were old-fashioned snooping devices and should be replaced by more modern methods of detection. Chief Montague said he's still looking for another method that works.

Closed circuit television had been suggested but experiments showed it didn't have the quality needed for this work. He said he had been advised that Canada invested a considerable amount to install television at the main post office in Peterborough, Ontario, but was tearing it out and installing lookout galleries.

SBA DECENTRALIZATION ACTION REPRESENTS COMING OF AGE FOR ITS ALASKA AND PUERTO RICO PROGRAMS

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, yesterday it was announced that the Small Business Administration will undertake a major decentralization of its headquarters' functions, by transferring its operations, programing, and decisionmaking from Washington, D.C., to its field offices.

In the course of this change, the facilities at Anchorage, Alaska, and those at 47 other branch offices will be elevated to the status of regional offices.

This reorganization is in accord with the progressive conduct of the Small Business Administration by its present Administrator, Eugene P. Foley. With all that the SBA does for the Nation's 4½ million small businesses, it is somewhat surprising that this remarkable agency operates at a net cost to the taxpayer of only $8 million a year, with 80 percent of its $35 million budget of 1963 offset by fees and interest from its loans and programs.

The decentralization, in addition to saving an estimated $1 million a year in handling charges, will place decisionmaking closer to the people and to their particular geographic problems.

The advantage of this to Alaska is illustrated by the earthquake which struck on Good Friday, March 27, 1964, covering an area containing 60 percent of Alaska's population, and producing over 55 percent of the State's revenue.

The SBA responded vigorously, through its disaster loan program. Additional staff was mobilized to conduct more than 3,000 interviews and inquiries of victims; and Administrator Foley visited Alaska, to coordinate the overall effort. By the end of 1964, the SBA had processed 1,388 applications for business and home loans, of which 1,217, in the amount of $61,753,394, have already been approved. Furthermore, at year's end the agency had actually disbursed checks totaling $48,210,060, covering 1,175 of the approved applications. The effect of such prompt and substantial support to individuals and businesses can readily be imagined.

Since its inception, the SBA has meant much to Alaska's economy. Through September 1964, aside from earthquake assistance, 476 business loans, totaling $25,732,000, had been approved. In addition, 999 prime contracts, totaling over $55 million, have been awarded under the SBA set-aside program for small businesses in Alaska.

A similar regional situation was brought to my attention when a special subcommittee of the Senate Small Business Committee held hearings last April, in Puerto Rico, on the tax treatment of American companies with Puerto Rican affiliates and the participation by small business in the economic progress of Operation Bootstrap.

The Small Business Office of Puerto Rico, an island of 4.2 million population, consistently ranks among the top half dozen offices in the Nation in loan activity, and has done an outstanding job in servicing the local small business community and helping to foster its growth.

As a consequence, in May 1964, I recommended to the SBA that its office in San Juan be upgraded to a regional office, so that loan authority could be increased, decisions speeded, and programing and operations be closer to the local language and culture.

It is gratifying to note that last week's action puts this recommendation into effect.

I understand that the goal of this decentralization is, beginning on February 1, to delegate full operational authority to the SBA's eight area offices, for redelegation to the regional offices, such as those at Anchorage and San Juan. Accordingly, as soon as the regional offices attain their full experience and capacity, they will be able to take any loan action pursuant to the Small Business Act that the Washington office formerly could have performed.

For both of these offices, whose areas of service are not contiguous with the rest of continental United States, this grant of authority represents a highly desirable coming of age under the Nation's small business program. Thus, I heartily commend the SBA and Mr. Foley for this action.

FRANK P. BRIGGS

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I rise to join in the tribute to Frank P. Briggs, who is retiring as Assistant Secretary of Interior for Fish and Wildlife.

More than most men could ever hope to do, Frank Briggs has managed to confuse his vocation and his avocations. He worked all his life at the wise use of natural resources, while supporting himself with such avocations as successful newspaperman, potent political leader, and beef farmer.

His conservation interest began with hunting, as such awareness has begun with so many of us; but it branched on and out to the realization that earth and air and water are the basis of all life. Yet he never lost interest in hunting the quail of Macon County, Mo.; and he flushed them before his bird dogs last November, although he was just recovering from a major operation. However, he did modestly admit that he could no longer qualify as America's greatest wing shot.

But for all his reputation as a hunter, he was always the resource manager who adopted the principle of harvestable surpluses. As Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife, and in his earlier State conservation work, he demanded research and regulations based upon the idea that hunters would harvest only the excess, the annual increase in wildlife production that could not be carried into the next year. This was his guide in duck-hunting controversies, in waterfowl management, and in dealing with the endangered species of wildlife, for which he demanded full protection.

He brought to the Assistant Secretaryship of the Department of the Interior a great background. He had been a newspaperman in Oklahoma and in Missouri; he had been for 30 years the publisher and the active editor of the Macon (Mo.) Chronicle-Herald; for 14 years he served, most actively, on the four-man, bipartisan Missouri Conservation Commission that controls fish, game, and forests on a model basis. Prior to that contribution, he had served his native commonwealth as State senator; and, by gubernatorial appointment, he completed the U.S. Senate term of Harry Truman when Mr. Truman was elected Vice President of the United States.

Mr. Briggs' service on his State's conservation commission was a unique preparation for his Assistant Secretaryship, for he made policy decisions on fishing and hatcheries; on the game species of his native land, ranging from mourning doves to deer; and on the forestry and land-use practices in an area of 45 million acres. In his capacity of commissioner, he traveled to national and international meetings, met the great men of conservation, and became one of those great men.

When he came to Washington, as Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife, he brought with him a knowledge of the political demands within a democracy, a realization of the need for State-Federal cooperation, an understanding of the delicate relations between State wildlife departments and the Federal bureau in game management, and an understanding of public information needs.

This was not enough, perhaps, to enable him to succeed. But he had something more—what Aldo Leopold called "the ecological conscience," the recognition that all things have a right to living space, a place in the scheme of things. This, with his other qualities, made him a great leader in the wildlife field. When Frank Briggs now goes back to Macon, Mo., and to the daily newspaper which for so many years has been that small town's public conscience, he will carry with him the knowledge that although he has served his country in several capacities, his country has given him a single title: "Conservationist."

REPORT ON ACTIVITIES OF KEENE, N.H., REGIONAL INDUSTRIAL FOUNDATION

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, the contribution of the Manpower Development and Training Act to our economic growth and development cannot be overemphasized. Training and education programs, established under this act, to prepare unskilled workers to meet the changing demands of today's labor market form an integral part of our struggle to reduce unemployment.

Typical of the gains in creating new job opportunities, new jobs, and saving old jobs are the accomplishments of the Keene Regional Industrial Foundation, of Keene, N.H. Current estimates are that 300 to 400 new jobs or job opportunities are being created in this community of 18,000.

Not only have these programs resulted in the training of adults, but they have also stimulated cooperative efforts between local schools and industry to provide vocational training for young people.

Mr. President, I heartily commend the farsighted efforts of the Keene Regional Industrial Foundation to upgrade the skills of existing manpower, as well as to equip high school students with the skills necessary for entering industry. With the thought that it will be of interest to my colleagues, I ask unanimous consent that the comprehensive report on the activities for the past 18 months of the Keene Regional Industrial Foundation be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Keene Regional Industrial Foundation Comprehensive Activity Report for Year and One-half Ended December 1964

Most people think of the work of the industrial foundation as primarily devoted to seeking out new industry and persuading it to move into our area. Actually the work of the Keene Foundation, as with most other local foundations, is primarily directed to the assistance of local existing industry and to concern over the local industrial and economic climate.

To get things in the proper perspective same background information is needed.

In the United States, in 1 year, 300 to 500 industries move or open a branch. There are 15,000 organizations, such as our own foundation, seeking these 300 to 500 prospects. The organizations range in size from those like our own, with one part-time employee, to those employing as many as 50 to 60. Taking an average of three employees to each organization, there would be about 45,000 people competing with us for new industrial plants.

Industries are attracted to an area primarily because of an adequate supply of manpower with needed skills; secondly by a fair and equitable tax situation. Housing, recreation, climate and educational facilities are less important factors.

Tax advantages are less of a factor now than they were some years ago. Then, enticements were being offered by some areas, such as no real estate taxes for 10 years or a building put up with State or municipal funds to be sold to the occupant at less than true value at a later date. Today, most communities recognize that an industry attracted by a free ride is not a great asset and would be all too ready to move elsewhere when initial advantages expire.

New Hampshire and Keene are competitive in taxes, and we seek no one who wants a free ride. At the same time we do have the means to build a plant and to lease or sell it on favorable terms comparable to any other State. However, the new industry must expect to shoulder its fair share of the cost of local services through its tax payments.

Keene does not have a large supply of labor. An industry considering a new community normally seeks a ratio of about five interviews to one hiring. We have only 450 unemployed in the area, most of whom are unskilled. In addition many lack other qualities which any employer would seek. While this relatively low unemployment reflects a healthy local economy, it also makes it difficult to attract new industry.

A shortage of low-rent housing is part of the reason we are short of labor. Keene has no low-rent housing projects financed by Federal funds or otherwise. Until we have such housing, immigration of labor cannot be expected in any significant quantity. Without a larger supply of labor, more rapid economic growth cannot be expected.

In general, the following five factors characterize the present Keene industrial picture:

1. Keene's industry is tremendously diversified. The total loss of our largest employer or group of employers in one field would affect only 15 percent of our labor force.
2. Our industry is healthy and progressive.
3. Our industry, generally speaking, needs to expand and wishes to do so.
4. We have no pool of trained manpower.
5. We have insufficient housing for trained personnel from other areas, if they were recruited.

All these factors dictate major emphasis on assisting in the health and growth of existing industry.

Over the past year and a half much of the activity of the foundation has been devoted to establishing training and education courses for our unskilled people. With great help and cooperation from our local State employment office, as well as the employment office in Concord and the State education department, Keene has obtained a relatively large share of the funds available in our State for adult education and training. In addition, cooperation of local industry and our local school systems has been of vital importance.

Specifically, what has been accomplished?

Funded and in operation are two machine operator's courses at Keene High School and two machine operator's courses at Monadnock Regional High School.

These courses are designed to fill a forecasted need by our local machine tool industry of some 200 new jobs in the next 2 years. They will all be completed by July 1, 1965, and will graduate 60 to 80 machine operators, trained to industry requirements in courses edited and approved by local industrial men. Actually the first instructors in the course are foremen at two local plants.

Funded and in operation are two clerk-typist courses at Keene High School and two stenographic-secretarial course at Monadnock Regional High School.

These courses are also to be completed by July 1, 1965, and will graduate 50 to 70 women capable of entering local offices, especially the home office of one of our larger industries: insurance.

The expansion planned by National Grange Mutual Insurance Co. and the normal attrition in their work force, due to marriages and so forth, call for about 50 women per year to enter this industry for the next 2 to 3 years.

The foregoing programs have been established under the Manpower Development and Training Act, utilizing Federal funds. They have placed in our two high schools industrial-type and modern office equipment worth close to $100,000. This equipment is available to the schools for their own vocational courses during school hours. It does, however, remain the property of the Federal Government.

Under the same act, the foundation has worked with the U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training, to obtain on the job training programs.

Miniature Precision Bearings, Inc. now has in operation a course given in the plant by MPB instructors to teach the new skills required in the manufacture and assembly of the Redeye Missile. Forty-five people are being trained, most of whom are not now employed; others will be upgraded from other jobs within the plant, but in either case 45 new jobs are being opened up.

Troy Mills now has in operation a similar program to train 20 people in the new skills of running a plastic film casting range. This range is replacing 12 blanket looms and brings this mill into a new market of artificial leather and similar products.

American Optical Co. has awaiting approval a program to train for the new function of this Keene plant. It has now been assigned the building of machines required by the entire parent company. Machine shop skills and new assembly skills will be taught by American Optical's own men. About 75 new jobs are involved.

Roberts-Hart, Inc., has awaiting approval a program to train 16 new stitchers for 24 weeks under expert instructors. This course will enable Roberts-Hart to substantially increase production to meet larger sales of newly designed shoes.

In addition to education and training, the foundation has been of help in getting the Pittsburgh Plate Glass Building into partial operation. One-half of the plant is now in use and employs 20 to 30 woodworkers.

The Foundation also helped in the sale of the Abbott Co., to a new concern, Abbott Industries. This sale prevented the complete liquidation of the plant, and it will soon be back in operation, employing 40 to 50 woodworkers. It will be expanded by the inclusion within the plant of the Harry Skinner & Son wood dimension plant formerly located in North Swanzey.

We assisted in the establishment of a nutrient blending plant in North Walpole. This new $100,000 plant will employ 10. Thus new job opportunities have been created for: 60 to 80 machine operators; 50 to 70 female office personnel. Thus new jobs have been created for: 45 at MPB, 20 at Troy Mills, 75 at American Optical, 16 at Roberts-Hart, 10 at North Walpole, 20 to 30 at Lane Bucket in the PPG building. Thus jobs were saved for 40 to 50 at Abbott Industries.

In total, 336 to 396 new jobs, new job opportunities or jobs saved were involved in the foundation's activity in recent months.

We should fully appreciate the tremendous importance to a community like ours of the Manpower Development and Training Act. During the past year the Federal Government allocated $1 million to New Hampshire for education and training programs, with no State funds required. Under the act, State participation will be required in the next 2 years. It will be asked to provide one-third of the total cost next year and two-thirds the following year. It is of great importance that we do all we can here in Keene to point out what has been accomplished under the act and to urge adoption by the State of its share in this absolutely vital program for the next 2 years.

In addition to training adults under programs already described, utilization of the act has placed in our two high schools equipment which will train our vocational students on industrial-type machinery or modern office machines and make them ready to enter industry at graduation. It has stimulated thinking about the great value of good vocational courses in the schools, has stimulated cooperation between educators and industrialists and has brought them together working for vocational courses which will graduate young people ready to take a responsible place in the community.

The foundation is assisting in planning a cooperative program by education and industry under which pupils may attend school in the morning and then go to work in a local plant or office in the afternoon. All of this is to be planned and scheduled as a complete vocational program which will train the pupils in the particular skill needed by a particular industry. In addition to earning a minimum wage while working at the plant or office, upon his graduation a job will be waiting for the student for which he has been specifically prepared.

This program is only in the planning stage but, properly set up and scheduled, can be of inestimable value to our economy as well as to scores of young people in the area. It should give the vocational program the prestige and dignity it deserves. The effect on school dropouts can only be surmised, but it should help tremendously to keep young people in school and earning a small income at the same time.

Visible evidence of confidence in Keene by our industrial community is demonstrated by expansions at Kingsbury Machine Tool Co., Markem Machine Co., and Marlboro Manufacturing Co.; by activity in the Pittsburgh Building and at Abbott Industries. If we are correct in saying that 300 to 400 new jobs or job opportunities are being created, this should mean $1 million to $1,500,000 of additional payroll coming into the community in the next 12 to 18 months.

What of the future? Given conditions as they exist, with a shortage of skills and a shortage of housing to attract skilled manpower, our attention must be focused on continued training and education. Every possible means must be utilized to upgrade skills of our existing manpower, to graduate high school students with skills to enter industry and to educate technicians and engineers at the college level. The remarkable growth of industry around Boston has been fostered by its great educational complex. We must emulate this in a smaller way using our high schools and the new liberalized program of the Keene State College.

HATS OFF TO THE CITY OF MADISON

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in November, the Secretary of Defense made a decision to close 95 military installations.

As expected, the decision brought on a flow of stormy protests from communities affected, but not from the city of Madison, which suffered the shutdown of the Truax Air Force Base, in Madison—a $25 million a year loss to this city of 150,000 people.

I quote from a resolution adopted on November 24 by the Common Council of the City of Madison:

> Although our economy may suffer temporarily, we recognize the overall good to the country, and therefore commend the Department of Defense for its decision.

Here is an inspiring example of statesmanship.

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF CITY OF MADISON, WIS.

By Mayor Henry E. Reynolds, Council President James O. Pfefferle, and all other members of the common council, as follows: John P. Connell, Leo J. Cooper, Harrison L. Garner, James C. Gill, James P. Goulette, Robert L. Guerin, Lyle O. Johnson, Richard D. Kopp, James A. Marks, Lawrence J. McCormick, William S. McCullough, Robert C. McMurray, George R. Olp, George H. Reger, Robert L. Reynolds, Jr., Harold E. Rohr, Pete Schmidt, Donald H. Smith, William Bradford Smith, Thomas J. Stavrum, Ellsworth J. Swenson.

"Whereas Truax Air Force Base has been located in the city of Madison for nearly a quarter of a century; and

"Whereas during this period of time, the Madison area has derived considerable financial benefit from the location of Truax Air Force Base in this city; and

"Whereas the city of Madison and its citizens have been justly proud of the location of the base at this city, have been pleased to have many Air Force families living within the city, and have derived considerable prestige from the fact that Truax Air Force Base was a part of our city; and

"Whereas many persons who performed military duties at Truax Air Force Base have since returned to our city to make it their permanent home; and

"Whereas many of these Air Force veterans are now numbered among our most distinguished and useful citizens; and

"Whereas the Department of Defense has announced that Truax Air Force Base will be deactivated during 1698: Now, therefore, be it and it hereby is

"*Resolved*, That the city clerk by a copy of this resolution, inform the commanding officer of Truax Air Force Base and the Secretary of Defense that in spite of this loss to our community, the common council wishes it to be known that:

"1. We will miss all of the military and civilian personnel and their dependents who will be leaving this area in the near future, and we will welcome their return in the future, either as civilians or as military personnel;

"2. Although our economy may suffer temporarily, we recognize the overall good to the country and therefore commend the Department of Defense for its decision; and

"3. If at any time in the future military services desire to return to our area, we will be pleased to have them serve here and be a part of our community.

"4. We will always regard Truax Field as a living memorial to Lt. Thomas LeRoy Truax, of Madison, and to all who have died in the service of their country."

This is to certify that the foregoing resolution was adopted by the Common Council of the City of Madison, Wis., at a meeting held on the 24th day of November 1964.

ELDON L. HOEL,
City Clerk.

PROPOSED NATIONAL SEASHORE AT ASSATEAGUE ISLAND

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, during the past few days, I have attempted to apprise my fellow Senators and the rest of the American people of the need for a national seashore at Assateague Island. Last Wednesday, I introduced proposed legislation which would create such a seashore. Ten of my colleagues joined me at that time, and I am pleased to say that four more have subsequently added their names as cosponsors of this bill.

Late last week, I brought to the attention of the Senate several editorials which pointed out the need for quick action on the bill. At this time I ask unanimous consent that two more editorials—one from the Balitimore News-American of January 8, and one broadcast by Washington radio station WWDC—be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Baltimore (Md.) News-American, Jan. 8, 1965]

ASSATEAGUE A NATIONAL PARK

At long last, the outlook for prompt congressional action to establish Assateague Island as a national seashore park is bright.

Senator DANIEL B. BREWSTER and Representative CARLTON R. SICKLES have introduced companion bills to bring this about, and Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall has called on the Senate and House committees which will handle them to give them "the highest priority."

The Brewster-Sickles bills would permit the setting aside of 600 acres on the island for overnight tourist facilities. This represents a compromise. The original Interior Department plan made no provision for such facilities, but they were included in the plan last year to enlist the support of Representative ROGERS C. B. MORTON, who represents the Eastern Shore where Assateague is located.

Private lot-owners will, of course, be compensated under the government plan.

As Secretary Udall points out, the time to act is now. If the Maryland Court of Appeals sustains a lower court decision which overturned a State refusal to allow private interests to build on Assateague, it will be difficult to forestall private development which would greatly complicate the situation.

The controversy over the future of Assateague has simmered for over a dozen years now. During that time, the people of Maryland could have been enjoying the facilities of a park on the island. We hope the Secretary is justified in his optimism, and that the delays are finally at an end.

[From WWDC, Washington, D.C.]

THE PUSH FOR ASSATEAGUE

To all of us who have pushed the national seashore plan proposed for Maryland's Assateague Island, these recent words by President Johnson offer hope: "We must make a massive effort to save the countryside and establish—as a green legacy for tomorrow—more large and small parks, more seashores and open spaces than have been created during any period in our history."

We trust the President's words indicate the White House will side with the Interior Department, the Maryland congressional delegation, the Governor of Maryland, and millions of ordinary people living in Virginia, Maryland, Delaware, and Pennsylvania. The prevailing view of all of these officials and citizens is that—properly developed—Assateague could become an invaluable recreational resource within reach of 33 million Americans.

In fact, the only opposition to the idea continues to come from the Worcester County Commissioners. They insist that most of the island develop as privately owner seaside cottages with the inevitable honkytonks, souvenir stands, and similar resort-type blight that has already gobbled up most of the vanishing shoreline. They apparently have no faith at all in the economic bononza that millions of annual visitors to a great national seashore park would bring to the adjacent areas of Worcester County.

No one likes to brush aside the wishes of a local minority. But in this case there is clearly a need for a broader view than the county officials seem able to take.

THE HARTKE HIGHER EDUCATION BILL AND THE PRESIDENT'S GUIDELINES

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, today we have received President Johnson's recommendations entitled "Toward Full Educational Opportunity." For some time, I have concentrated my attention on the great enterprise of education, whose scope from kindergarten to graduate and postgraduate levels is so all-encompassing. At this time, I shall comment briefly on the part dealing with the needs for college students.

I point out to the Members of the Senate the close parallel or identity between the concern the President has expressed and the program in the college assistance bill, S. 5, which I introduced last Wednesday.

That bill is still on the desk, and will be open to cosponsors until the close of business on Friday. At the present moment, 24 Members of the Senate have expressed their desire to join me in sponsoring this measure.

Let me call attention, Mr. President, to the portion of the President's message labeled "A," in the "higher education" section, dealing with "assistance to students," since this is the area of S. 5.

Title I of my bill deals with the first area of the message. The student grants or scholarships, which title I of my bill proposes, will amount to $75 million annually. This is clearly in the neighborhood of the sum to which President Johnson referred when he spoke of helping in this way up to 140,000 students in the first year.

My bill calls for an expansion of the work-study program, under the Office of Education, as the message recommends. In fact, the existing program under the poverty effort is couched in terms for the most part identical in language to that which appeared in my bill, S. 2490, last year, and which is retained in S. 5. An authorization of $250 million a year for this purpose would aid, it is estimated, 330,000 students annually. Assistance would go to students who need help, even though they come from middle-income, rather than lower income, families.

The federally guaranteed loan program embodied in title II of my bill is also supported by the message of President Johnson. Embodied in it is a provision which the President specifically endorsed—"that a part of the cost of interest payments on guaranteed private loans to college students be paid by the Federal Government."

Specifically, under the Hartke bill, this part of the interest load paid by the Federal Government would be 2 percent, making possible a likely effective rate of 4 percent to the student. The need for this kind of self-help for private loans to the student himself, at a low cost, with repayment out of later earnings, is vast. Under the Hartke bill, provision is made for $700 million of private credit, guaranteed by the Federal Government, and with aid to the student on the interest burden. This will open doors to scores of thousands who have been waiting for just such effective aid to be undertaken, with the burden for repayment on their own individual responsibility.

The package principle involved both in the Hartke bill and in the recommendations of the President's message has been endorsed by leading educators and their associations. This appears clearly from the hearing record developed last year in connection with the consideration of S. 2490. Acceptance of these principles is reflected further in the approval by the Education Subcommittee of such legislation last year, and the recommendation to the Senate by the full Labor and Public Welfare Committee.

I note a further point on which the President's view corresponds to my own. It is at the point where he stated unequivocally that the kind of measures he recommends, and which I have already introduced, comprises—"a more effective, fairer, and far less costly way of providing assistance than the various tax credit devices which have been proposed.

This was my contention on the day when I first introduced S. 2490. It is still my contention.

Therefore, Mr. President, I am pleased to note that in this entire section President Johnson agrees with the approach of the Hartke bill. Based on the experience of last year's hearings, Senate bill 5 deserves the full support it is finding, which I hope will be further extended to it. I hope and trust that this bill will receive early enactment.

NOMINATION OF JOHN CARVER TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR—STATEMENT BY SENATOR MORSE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, today I had the great privilege of presenting to the chairman and the members of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs my strong support for the nomination of John Carver to be Under Secretary of the Department of the Interior. Because of my high regard for John Carver, I should like to read that statement at this time and I crave the indulgence of my colleagues as I do so.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to submit this statement in support of the nomination of John Carver to serve as Under Secretary of the Department of the Interior. In my opinion, Mr. Carver is eminently qualified for this position and it is my pleasure to cite two outstanding achievements which demonstrate that he has the ability to serve well in this new assignment.

The members of this committee, especially Senators ANDERSON and BIBLE, will remember that in 1961, I suggested a totally new approach to rangeland conservation. I urged a program of direct investments where surveys showed a need both to reduce grazing and to treat a deteriorated watershed. I urged a program of comprehensive watershed development for our rangeland.

This led to four pilot projects in Oregon, New Mexico, Nevada, and Idaho.

These have produced outstanding conservation results and in the process have stabilized—yes, increased—grazing use.

John Carver played a large and constructive role in the implementation of this program.

On Columbus Day, 1962, a hurricane swept the Pacific Northwest, blowing down billions of board feet of timber in the State of Oregon, as well as in the State of Washington. As the chairman knows, John Carver responded at once. He acted as a catalyst to unite public and private efforts in what became a most successful endeavor to salvage for economic use the greatest amount of timber to have been destroyed by an act of nature. The prompt action that John Carver spearheaded averted the destruction of billions of additional board feet of standing timber by insects and disease.

John Carver, as Assistant Secretary of Interior, has done an outstanding job in the public interest for conservation. I am delighted that the President has submitted his name for the post of Under Secretary, and I urge his prompt confirmation, both by this committee and by the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

STATUS OF AGRICULTURE IN THE ECONOMIC, SOCIAL, AND POLITICAL PICTURE OF THIS NATION

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, in President Johnson's address to the joint session of Congress on January 4, he made this statement:

> Our economy owes much to the efficiency of our farmers. We must continue to assure them the opportunity to earn a fair reward. I have instructed the Secretary of Agriculture to lead a major effort to find new approaches to reduce the heavy cost of our farm programs and to direct more of our effort to the small farmer who needs help most.

This statement has been widely interpreted as a recommendation for the reduction or elimination of Government services to farmers including crop price support programs.

While I do not believe that the President contemplates drastic action in this direction, I readily agree that some farm programs have been costly in terms of value received and are in need of review and revision.

I cannot, however, let the all too prevalent impression that the American farmer is wallowing in a wealth of Government handouts—or that American agriculture is expendable in terms of international trade and investment go unchallenged.

Just yesterday, I read this statement in a weekly magazine:

> Aid for small farmers: The President is annoyed by the fact that 80 percent of the Government's commodity assistance funds (total: $2.3 billion last year) goes to 1 million farmers who earn more than $9,500 annually, while some 2.5 million poorer farmers must share the remaining 20 percent. Agriculture Department officials are working on a detailed plan to meet the President's specifications.

This is only one instance in which the public is misled as to the income of farmers.

The $9,500 referred to is not income to the farmer, but receipts from farm sales from which must be deducted costs of supplies, interest, taxes, insurance, selling charges, transportation, and other costs.

Imagine a manufacturer having gross sales of $9,500 a year and regarding that amount as his income.

Yet the public is supposed to believe that the gross sales from a farm are clearly income to the farmer.

As for farmers with gross sales of less than $9,500 per year, they are certainly not wallowing in prosperity.

For the information of those who may have gained a false impression of the status of agriculture in the economic, social, and political picture of this Nation, I am now going to present certain facts for the record, hoping that some of our people, especially the people of the large urban areas of America, may find time to read them.

How important is agriculture to the welfare of the United States?

To what extent does it contribute to our military and economic security?

The figures I shall give you have all been furnished to me by U.S. Government agencies.

What percentage of the people now gainfully employed are directly or indirectly dependent on agriculture?

Let us start off with the 6.5 million workers on the land itself.

Then, we must add 6 million more workers who produce the supplies and equipment which farmers use.

Dependency on the farm does not end with the harvesting of the crop, however, for 10 million more people are engaged in transporting, storing, processing, handling, and selling the products of agriculture.

Add these categories together and we find that 3 out of every 10 persons employed in private industry look to the farm for their income.

What do farmers require that keep so many nonfarm people employed?

Let me give just a few examples.

Farmers last year spent well over $3 billion for new tractors, motor vehicles, and other equipment, or more than three times as much as the entire iron and steel industry spent for new equipment and new plants.

Farmers spent over $3.3 billion for maintenance of equipment and fuel and lubricants with which to run it.

Let those who would trade off agriculture in return for petroleum markets abroad stop and realize that the best market in the world for petroleum products is the American farm.

The American farmer uses billions of dollars worth of fertilizer, lime, spray material, rubber tires, and hundreds of other items, the production of which keeps 6 million workers employed.

Except for agriculture, the transportation systems of America would deteriorate and decay.

Some of our more profitable rail lines would find themselves in the red were it not for the business of hauling supplies to the farm and crops from the farm to consuming centers, processing plants, and shipping ports.

The United States is the world's largest exporter of farm commodities supplying last year—fiscal 1964—one-fifth of the world's agricultural exports.

This business required financing, inland transportation, storage, and ocean transportation for 55 million long tons—enough to fill 1½ million freight cars or 5,500 cargo ships.

Processing and packing plants for meats, poultry, milk, grain products, and fruits and vegetables alone employ well over a million nonfarm employees.

What about the investment on the farms?

The total value of agricultural assets amounts to $226 billion, or two-thirds as much as the value of the current assets of all the corporations of the United States put together—and nearly 2½ times the value of all U.S. investments in the rest of the world.

We had better think twice before we do anything to depreciate the solid investment in American agriculture in favor of more tempting and more precarious oversea lures.

Up to now, I have directed my remarks to the domestic economic importance of agriculture.

It should be clear to everyone who reads, listens, or thinks, that any serious decline in the volume of our agricultural production or the income of our farm people would be the surest way to bring on a national economic depression. It has happened before. It could happen again.

It is not only that farm production is a low-cost source of food and fiber for our own people that should concern us.

It is also the fact that the United States is the principal supplier of food products to the world.

Sixty-three million acres of our 300 million harvested acres produce for export.

This amounts to about the same acreage of cropland that is harvested in the three great farming States of Nebraska, Iowa, and Kansas.

Our export of farm products now amounts to nearly $6 billion a year, or nearly one-third of our total export business.

Our agricultural abundance is a powerful force for world peace.

It has helped to prevent hunger and has promoted economic growth in the newly developing countries of the world.

It has encouraged sorely distressed nations to adhere to more democratic principles of government.

As an example of what U.S. food abundance is doing to stabilize governments elsewhere, let me read a news dispatch which came over the wires on January 7 of this year:

> NEW DELHI, INDIA.—India's food crisis came home today with jolting impact for this capital's 3 million residents. The Government announced rationing of sugar, wheat, and rice will begin next month.
>
> The three staple foods for vegetarian Hindus have been in short supply for months. But the capital has been spared the grinding hunger that has sparked food riots elsewhere.
>
> This week, however, retail prices hit new highs, spreading fear of even greater shortages. This kicked off a wave of hoarding.
>
> To halt panic, the Government announced seven special trains speeding toward New Delhi from the west coast of Bombay with wheat imported from the United States. It will be sold in 830 fair-price shops.

What we are doing in India to help stave off inflation, hunger, and possible riots is only one manifestation of the effect of America's crop production bounty.

Now, I would like to comment on this part of the President's statement:

> I have instructed the Secretary of Agriculture to lead a major effort to find new approaches to reduce the heavy costs of our farm programs and to direct more of our effort to the small farmer who needs help most.

I wish to commend the President for his desire to cut the costs of Government and hope that he will apply such good intentions not only to agriculture but to expenditures for other factors of our economy as well.

I am sure that a near miracle can be achieved in that field if the effort is applied with equal vigor to industry—the armed services, space exploration, international operations, and all other governmental operations.

A fine start could be made by reducing some of the seemingly exhorbitant tax deductions allowed certain phases of industry.

Lest we be tempted to use the meat ax on agricultural program costs, however, it would be well to know what we are now spending in the name of farm programs and who would be most affected by a reduction in such programs.

According to the figures which the public sees, the budget expenditures for agriculture amounted to $7,926 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964.

It is anticipated that this figure may be reduced a billion dollars or more in fiscal year 1965.

These figures are indeed formidable and would give us cause for much concern if accepted at face value.

What the people are not told is that well over half of the costs charged to agriculture are, in fact, spent for the general public rather than the farmer.

Over much of the country, well over half of the work of the Extension Service and the Agricultural Research Service is now directed to the needs of nonfarm people.

Let me give you just a few examples to show how thoroughly the appropriations for agriculture are now being diverted to public use.

I shall use the preliminary figures for fiscal year 1964.

First. Sales of surplus agricultural commodities for foreign currencies amounted to $1,452 million, the cost of which was all charged to agriculture while the proceeds were made available to State Department, Defense Department, and other agencies of Government.

Second. Emergency food relief to friendly people in other nations amounted to $215 million.

Third. Payments to Veterans' Administration and armed services for purchase of dairy products amounted to $45 million.

In that connection, a disturbing rumor came to me yesterday, that the administration may possibly recommend elimination of the practice of furnishing of milk to the Armed Forces in present quantities.

This cost to the Department of Agriculture started a few years ago after complaints were received from young men stationed at Fort Dix and at other camps in this country that they could not get milk, and were give a half-pint for breakfast, which they could use on their cereal, or drink it and then eat their cereal dry. Additional supplies of milk were subsequently made available. An arrangement was made whereby the Department of Agriculture was charged half the cost of the milk furnished to the camps, and the armed services supposedly paid the other half of the cost.

I earnestly hope that the rumor that the supply of milk to the armed services is to be restricted is not true.

Fourth. The cost of school programs amounted to $277 million, all of which was charged to agriculture.

Fifth. The cost of the U.S. Forest Service and other conservation programs for the benefit of the public amounted to $512 million.

Finally, I would also point out that when loans are made by Rural Electrification Administration and Farmers Home Administration, they are charged as an agricultural expense, but when they are repaid with interest, as they are, the receipts, amounting to several hundred million dollars a year, are paid into the U.S. Treasury with no credit given to agriculture.

Rather than bore the Senate with further examples at this time, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD tables furnished me by the U.S. Department of Agriculture giving a breakdown between the costs of programs which are predominantly for the benefit of agriculture and the costs of programs benefitting the public or those who have little or no direct connection with farming.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Budget expenditures, fiscal years 1964 and 1965 (based on 1965 midyear budget review)

[In millions of dollars]

	1964 [1]	Estimated, 1965
Programs which clearly provide benefits to consumers, businessmen, and the general public:		
Programs having foreign relations and defense aspects:		
Sales of surplus agricultural commodities for foreign currencies	1,452	1,301
Emergency famine relief to friendly peoples	215	244
Donations of commodities acquired by CCC	345	298
International Wheat Agreement	86	20
Transfer of bartered materials to supplemental stockpile	83	89
Long-term supply contracts	53	183
Payments to Veterans' Administration and armed services under sec. 202 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, for milk and other dairy products used in excess of normal requirements	45	41
Total	2,279	2,176
Food distribution programs:		
Commodity purchases under removal of surplus agricultural commodities	236	239
Commodities acquired by CCC	246	179
Pilot food stamp plan	30	51
School lunch program	180	193
Special milk program	97	100
Total	789	762
Investment in REA and FHA loans, which are subject to repayment:		
REA loans	330	383
FHA loans	220	219
Total	550	602
Long-range programs for the improvement of agricultural resources, including research, meat inspection, disease and pest control, education, market development and services, protection of soil and water resources, and forest and public land management:		
Forest Service	315	321
Agricultural Research Service	197	199
Soil Conservation Service	193	198
Programs, etc.—Continued		
Long-range programs, etc.—Continued		
Extension Service	79	78
Cooperative State Research Service	41	43
Agricultural Marketing Service, marketing services	38	44
Farmers Home Administration, salaries and expenses	38	44
Other, including FCS, FAS, CEA, FCIC, REA, expenses, and staff offices	89	98
Subtotal	990	1,025
Total	4,608	4,565
Other programs which are predominantly for stabilization of farm income, but which also benefit others:		
Agricultural conservation program	217	225
Conservation reserve program	290	200
Cropland conversion program	7	10
Total	514	435
CCC price-support, supply, and related programs:		
CCC price-support, supply, and related programs	1,244	−192
Acreage diversion payments:		
Feed grains	646	876
Wheat	115	34
Price-support payments:		
Feed grains	382	374
Wheat	79	----------
Cotton equalization payments	63	561
Wheat marketing certificate program	----------	−108
National Wool Act program	73	39
Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service expenses	115	114
Total	2,717	1,698
Sugar Act program	87	88
Total	3,318	2,221
Grand total	7,926	6,786

---

[1] Subject to revision when final Treasury figures are available.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, according to these figures, it appears that for the fiscal year 1964 the costs of programs which are predominantly for stabilization of farm income was $3,318 million, while the costs of programs benefiting consumers, businessmen, and the general public was $4,608 million.

For 1965, the estimated expenditures are $2,221 million for farmers and $4,565 million for the others.

An especially flagrant example of how farmers are charged with the cost of expenditures, subsidies or plain handouts for the benefit of others will be found in the so-called wheat-cotton bill enacted in the spring of 1964.

This act was approved by the administration and passed the Congress although opposed by the chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee and myself.

As a result of the subsidy provided in this act, the price of cotton to the mills for domestic use is now 8.29 cents per pound less than it was a year ago. The result has been: The price to the cotton producer has not increased. The textile mills have made record profits. The taxpayer will pay the bill which will be at the rate of well over $300 million a year.

This expense is not a farm expense in any sense of the word but is plainly a subsidy to the textile mills and their stockholders although it is charged to the farm program.

As for the wheat program provided for in the Wheat-Cotton Act, we have not done so well with that, either.

After the act went into effect, the price of wheat dropped materially and the price of bread went up.

If the President seriously intends to substantially reduce the budget of the Department of Agriculture, he can do so in many ways which will result in these estimated savings:

First. He can promptly eliminate the cotton textile mills subsidy by recommending that we do not extend the cotton mills subsidy—and save $300 million.

Second. He can charge the subsidy to the merchant marine for transporting agricultural commodities to the Department of Commerce where it belongs—this would save $155 million.

Third. He can charge the full cost of dairy products for the military to the armed services, where it belongs—$45 million.

I reiterate, I hope that the rumor the Administration intends to eliminate this milk supply to the boys in the service is not well founded.

Fourth. The President can charge the cost of agricultural commodities used to promote good will and relieve want among friendly and developing nations to the State Department and other agencies of Government, where it belongs—$1,250 million.

Fifth. He can charge the cost of food used in school lunches and donations to needy people to Health, Education, and Welfare—$500 million.

These five items alone will reduce the agricultural appropriations bill by over $2 billion.

I remind Senators—I am not advocating the repeal of all these programs for many of them are very much worth while—and they have contributed materially to the welfare of the people of the United States. I simply wish to point out that they are not programs especially designed to aid the farmer but are programs primarily designed for the public good.

At least another billion dollars could be taken from the agricultural appropriation by putting conservation and flood control practices and consumer research in the proper perspective and crediting the Department of Agriculture with repaid loans and other income now credited to other agencies.

Having made these deductions in items which are clearly for the benefit of the general public or nonfarm people, there will still remain $3 billion or more which no one can deny is appropriated primarily for the benefit of the farmer. Can this amount be reduced? My answer is "Yes."

For 30 years or more Congress has been monkeying with price supports and other farm programs—mostly on a temporary basis. These programs have done much good. There have also been plenty of mistakes made.

We have been and are now using as a criteria for farm prices a parity formula which has been outmoded for at least 15 years.

The nature of farming has been virtually revolutionized during this period. The pushbutton and the computer have taken their place in agriculture.

The number of farmers has been reduced over half in a short period of years. Those who remain are better farmers.

The excuse for much of our farm legislation is that we are plagued with surpluses. Reasonable surpluses are not a plague if they are put to proper use.

The proper use of food supplies is a far more effective means of maintaining good relations with the world than the more costly and dangerous military ventures in which we have been involved.

During recent years we have tried to reduce our commodity supplies by paying farmers to let their land lie idle or diverting cropland to other uses.

I do not say that this program has failed. In some areas it has been quite successful. It has been very costly in proportion to the results achieved.

The whole program of support prices and land use adjustment needs a complete review and should be put upon a more permanent basis—if that is possible.

Price supports should not be wholly abandoned unless we are determined to have an economic crisis in the United States.

Price supports should be at a level which will insure adequate production and a decent income to the farmer but not such as will bring about an imbalance of production between commodities or deter the natural evolutionary changes which would normally take place in agriculture.

The American farmer has grown up. He is a big boy now. He does not want Government to hold his hand or feed him with a teaspoon.

He does ask, however, that he be afforded equal protection with business and commerce and the investment companies.

He does not like the idea of being downgraded or subordinated to the aspirations of others.

He does not like all this talk about agriculture being expendable and being traded off in our dealings with other countries.

He expects the President to see that he does not get the short end of the stick in foreign trade agreements.

If President Lyndon Johnson will make sure that agriculture has equal opportunity and equal protection with other industries, both at home and abroad, he will not only find it possible to reduce farm program costs, but better than that he will get along fine with the farmers.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO MEET DURING SESSIONS OF THE SENATE OF THE 89TH CONGRESS

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations be authorized to sit during the sessions of the Senate of the 89th Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARTLETT in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO REPORT APPROPRIATION BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS DURING 89TH CONGRESS

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during adjournments or recesses of the Senate during the 89th Congress, the Committee on Appropriations be, and it is hereby, authorized to report appropriation bills, including joint resolutions, with accompanying notices of motions to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of offering certain amendments to such bills or joint resolutions, which proposed amendments shall be printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE RADICAL RIGHT IS STILL ON THE RAMPAGE

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, What is an extremist?

Why, that is a guy who keeps his socks up by walking on his hands.

So went some of the banter in the recent campaign. If it had all been so flippant, we could give the country high marks for ready humor. American politics, after all, grew robust around the cracker barrel on many a jibe and belly laugh.

But the real menace of extremism cannot be laughed away. It is, unfortunately, a fever that has not been overcome by the election results.

This is the first of several speeches I plan to give on the subject of the radical right. The substance of my remarks today will appear, in article form, in the edition of Look magazine, which reaches the newsstands tomorrow.

Sensible Americans become most concerned about the threat of radical elements during election campaigns. When an election is over, too many of us tend to take it easy, to assume that the forces of irrationality and vituperation have been vanquished. This is a dangerous assumption. From what I saw in the recent campaign, and what has happened since, I know we have cause for serious concern about the future of freedom in America.

To understand why, we might begin with the frog story that keeps popping up in rightwing literature. Put a frog in cold water and heat the water very slowly. Before the frog catches on, he is cooked. This story is used to illustrate their thesis that, with each Government program, we creep along the road to communism—until suddenly we are there before we know it.

A friend of mine in Idaho tried the slow-boil experiment the other day on one of our frogs. You might, Mr. President, have guessed it, the frog jumped out of the pan. However, Idaho frogs may be smarter than most. I checked with U.S. Department of Agriculture scientists and I learned that in a properly controlled experiment, an ordinary frog's internal system will fail to sound the alarm in time to save him.

The same can happen to our internal political system—through the slowly boiling outrages of extremism. We have already become accustomed to a level of political absurdity that would have seemed, a few years ago, quite impossible.

A distressed schoolteacher writes to warn me that "our defenses are being destroyed and we are rapidly becoming sitting ducks for our enemies." If the Communists are successful in seizing control of the country, she continues, "we will go down together. You, as well as all leaders, will be liquidated. None will be spared unless they are members of the Communist organization."

Mr. President, how do you answer such a letter? Its implication—that this sturdy country of ours is about to be taken over—is preposterous. Yet, this honest, deeply disturbed woman is being trapped into the belief that treason seethes around her.

Hardened adherents to the conspiracy theory of the radical right send a different kind of letter, filled with insult and invective, often neatly typed on fine letterheads, though occasionally scribbled on scraps of paper and smudged with handprints in red ink to signify their suspicion that I, along with most other public officials, am either an unwitting tool, or a conscious agent, in a sinister plot to betray the country.

These people cannot be shrugged off as a "crackpot" fringe; their numbers alone compel us to be concerned, and they spread the virus like Typhoid Marys. In many places, they dominate the letters-to-the-editor columns of the local newspapers. Here is a sample from the Sunday Statesman, in my home city of Boise, Idaho:

> The social studies program [in the high schools] was initiated 30 years ago by American education intelligentsia after the Soviet plan, for the acknowledged purpose of promoting the collectivist society in America.

Another letter brings the startling news:

> The present administration is working hard to undermine our whole defense system to make it much easier for the Communist Party to make more gains overseas and in our own country.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield.

Mr. MOSS. First, let me congratulate the Senator from Idaho for the speech he is making on this problem, which is so prevalent now—the working of the rightwing. The reason why I asked the Senator to yield at this point is that last night, quite unexpectedly, I found in my mail an envelope, addressed to me, in which was a magazine called the American Mercury. I was not familiar with this publication. I leafed through it and found that the military editor is one Edwin A. Walker, formerly Maj. Gen. Edwin A. "Ted" Walker, resigned.

The letter referred to by the Senator stated that as a part of the Communist conspiracy the military is being undermined. It reminded me to look at the section in the magazine entitled "The Guard versus National Defense versus the Reserve."

I find here the same sort of writing that the Senator is discussing. The thesis by Edwin A. Walker is that the proposal of Secretary McNamara to merge the Reserve and the Guard is substantially the conspiracy about which he spoke.

I quote:

> Reservists is often too effective and embarrassing to the administration. The Reserve's close association with the Regulars, the full-time military, and its complimenting views and objectives provide a natural bridge between the American citizens and their military forces. This is a bridge of understanding, appreciation and common purpose. It must be destroyed. Secretary of Defense, R. Strange McNamara, is the man to do it. He wants "absolute" control. Politics and political intimidation are the means to "absolute" control. They are the means to destruction of independent thinking and any form of opposition.

Mr. President, this same thesis is played over and over again through all of the thread and fabric of our national life by means of literature of this sort which comes unsolicited into our homes through the mail every day.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I thank the Senator very much. It is a great tragedy that the targets of this scurrilous attack are men of the patriotism and integrity of the Secretary of Defense. Anyone who has followed the record of the Secretary of Defense has been greatly impressed with his efficient administration of the Defense Department. Even those who know our Secretary of Defense, but who have disagreed with decisions he has made would concur in my statement that there is no more devoted, or more loyal public servant in Washington today. But he is not a solitary victim. The targets of the radical right extent to the highest ranking men in Government. The Chief Justice of the Supreme Court is under the same kind of attack. The President himself is not spared from the vicious insinuation that he is somehow engaged in a nefarious scheme to betray the country he serves.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I commend the Senator for his esteem of Secretary McNamara. While I might not agree with everything that he does, I recognize that he does it from the highest motive of patriotism in an attempt to build the strongest possible national defense force for this country.

The Senator made reference to the fact that there were other targets of this attack. I quote from an earlier paragraph in the same article, in which the author, Edwin A. Walker, states:

> The signing of the test ban treaty found six notorious, appeasing Senators (one of whom is now Vice President) in Moscow. The decision finalized under a foreign environment with all the assurance that it decreased tensions and increased the opportunities of "peaceful" relations.

It is the same thesis again, that this was all part of the Communist plot of surrender being effected by Members of this body through selecting former Senator Humphrey, who is now Vice-President-elect.

Mr. CHURCH. I thank the Senator very much for his contribution. I know that in conversations we have had privately since his own reelection in the State of Utah—a reelection, I might say, that reflects great credit upon the good judgment of the people of his State—the Senator has mentioned that he encountered, in larger numbers than he had ever previously experienced, people who would ask him some damning question, and then refuse to permit him to answer it. Their minds were closed, obviously affected by the belief that highly placed members of the Government in both parties were aiding and abetting the enemies of the United States.

These are angry people, but they suffer more from folly than from hatred.

> Folly is a more dangerous enemy to the good than malice—

Deitrich Bonhoeffer, the theologian, said in 1942:

> Malice always contains the seeds of its own destruction, for it always makes men uncomfortable.

This Christian pastor wrote these words from a Nazi prison before foolish men hanged him.

The treachery theme, in assorted versions, inspires a virulent fanaticism that many Americans have not yet learned to deal with. Most of us recognize, and dismiss, the extremists on the racial front, both white and black, who openly flaunt their bigotry. Such inciters may draw a following for a while, but the great bulk of our people, in their abiding decency, will not be taken in.

The same commonsense accounts for the decline of the Communist Party in the United States. Back in 1932, it ran candidates in 39 States, and garnered a total of 102,991 votes. In those desperate depression days the Communists were at work in labor unions and on college campuses. But the reforms of the thirties, the resurgence of free enterprise and its spreading abundance, robbed the class struggle of its credibility. The unions cleaned shop, the Communist groups faded on campus, and the Communist Party itself was outlawed by Congress.

In view of this collapse of the radical left as a political force within the United States, the precipitous rise of the radical right is all the more curious. Lacking a flesh-and-blood adversary with which to grapple, the right has improvised one, conjuring up a phantom of its own. It takes the vague form of conspiracy, which supposedly involves the top offices of the land. As the monthly bulletin of the John Birch Society trumpeted in 1964, "Washington has been taken over. By which we mean that Communist influences are now in full working control of our Federal Government."

Here, in the Birch Society, is the taproot of the conspiracy doctrine. It was no slip of the tongue when the society's Robert Welch charged Dwight D. Eisenhower with knowingly accepting and abiding by Communist orders and consciously serving the Communist conspiracy for all his adult life. Mr. Welch listed similar charges against Milton Eisenhower, Allen and John Foster Dulles, Gen. George C. Marshall, and Chief Justice Earl Warren.

The basic thesis, that our leaders are Red-tainted, has to be regularly updated by the radical right. The newest summation appears in "None Dare Call It Treason." During the election campaign, more than 8 million copies went out—1 for every 6 families. Its potential effect is sobering to contemplate, for it could work its poison through our body politic for years to come like the slow, half-life chemistry of radiation. Bruce Felknor, director of the Fair Campaign Practices Committee, a nonpartisan group that studies smear tactics, says that the burden of treason is to "make the Democratic Party appear to be selling out to the Reds, and to make liberal Republicans out as coconspirators with the Democrats in advancing the cause of world communism."

I saw the marks of the conspiracy doctrine in some communities of my own State. For the first time, I found an ugly force trying to disrupt the orderly processes of the election.

Ralph Harding, an able young Democratic Congressman, had criticized the Birch Society on the floor of the House of Representatives. His supporters often told me of threats they received. Drury Brown, Republican editor of the Blackfoot News, backed Harding. One morning, Brown found his car with a red swastika painted on the door, the tires slashed, and sugar in the gas tank. Later, a female voice came over his phone: "Last time it was your car; next time it will be your home."

In Wyoming, Senator GALE McGEE, an outspoken critic of the radical right found youngsters in Laramie and Cheyenne on a house-to-house canvass distributing mimeographed leaflets. They were instructed to say, "This is an enemy agent. Here are the facts about Communist McGEE." The Senator's wife, Lorraine, had her husband's campaign cards grabbed from her hands, torn into pieces, thrown at her feet, and then spat upon.

A State director of a charitable foundation, whom I know, came home one night to find "Reds" painted on the mail box in front of his house, "Damn Socialist" daubed on the lawn chairs, the house lights and windows, which were beyond the reach of children, painted bright red. What made him an enemy? A picture of the President of the United States in his window.

In the face of such vehemence, people voted heavily for the moderates. The landslide, some concluded, smothered the radical right.

I do not agree.

> In the past several months the conservative message has received unprecedented exposure—

Says the Reverend Billy James Hargis, who directs what he calls the Christian Crusade, and like other leaders of the rightwing movement, styles himself a conservative. Without doubt, this exposure is paying off, at least for the moment.

The radical right reports rapid growth. Since 1955, its organized membership has been expanding at an average annual rate of 22 percent. The Birch Society, the largest and most influential group, reports that the campaign months from August to October established alltime records in new-member recruitment. The 30 largest organizations raised their annual budgets from $4,906,000 in 1958 to $14,300,000 in 1963. Total spending by all rightwing outfits hit $30 million in 1964, researchers estimate, half again more than both major parties spent in the presidential campaign. The Birch Society will boost its 1965 budget by a whopping 25 percent.

The propaganda network of the radical right forms a giant web. Its 20 largest publications boast a combined circulation in excess of a million. The right also makes its pitch on the public air through 7,000 separate radio broadcasts each week. The case history of one spokesman measures the menace: The Reverend Carl McIntire began his broadcasts in 1958 from a single radio station. He later accused the National Council of Churches—Methodists, Presbyterians, and 29 other denominations—of being "apostate, Communist, and modernist." Today, the avalanche of contributions he solicits from gullible listeners underwrites daily broadcasts on 617 stations.

McIntire is only one of several Big Scare purveyors on radio–TV. Their conspiratorial interpretation of each event, and their endless debasement of loyal leaders, cannot help reaching the credulous in their huge audience. So the seeds of suspicion are sown, and the harvest already is bitter.

Robert B. DePugh, leader of the Minutemen, claims to have recruited more than 25,000 "patriots" into his secret army. In a postelection newsletter, DePugh exudes desperation:

> The hopes of millions of Americans that the Communist tide could be stopped with ballots instead of bullets have turned to dust.

The St. Petersburg, Fla., unit of the Minutemen quickly responded with its own call to arms:

> If you are ever going to buy a gun, buy it now. Form a secret Minutemen team. This is your best guarantee that someone will act promptly to help secure your freedom when the time comes that you unexpectedly turn up missing.

Wild-eyed? Fanatical? Indeed, but only an extreme symptom of the rightwing affliction which, if it keeps on spreading will infect millions more with the fever of fear.

Mr. MOSS. Will the Senator from Idaho yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONDALE in the chair). Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. CHURCH. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. MOSS. I was very much interested in the quotation of the Senator from Idaho concerning the Minutemen. I thought perhaps I could add one more quotation from this same little magazine to which I earlier referred. In this magazine there is published an article entitled "The November Mandate, 1964."

Here is the lead paragraph—it is rather short:

> The Communist Party, U.S.A., accepted the November 3 election of Lyndon Baines Johnson and HUBERT H. HUMPHREY as the greatest mandate the party had ever received. Not Johnson but the Communist Party acquired a 42-million-vote mandate from the U.S. voters. The party only has the justification of immemorial and habitual usage and the historical precedent to reap the harvest.

Mr. CHURCH. It is unbelievable. But the Senator from Utah has extracted a quotation which is typical. The mischief is that this kind of spreading, political extremism in America can only result in the undermining of public confidence in elected officials, and in the institutions of free government itself. That, and that only, constitutes the threat to the life of freedom in America.

Years ago, when Adolf Hitler sought to bring down the Weimar Republic in Germany, he first sought to undermine public confidence in the institutions of popular government and in the men who ran them. This is the basic reason why we must begin to talk back to the radical right in contemporary American politics. All of us who believe in free government know that the men who head up both parties are dedicated and loyal men, worthy of the respect of the people of the United States.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I am glad to yield.

Mr. BAYH. I should like to compliment the Senator from Idaho for the great amount of research and the diligent effort which he has expended in the preparation of his remarks today. If there is one contribution that has and will be made above any other in the studies and remarks of the Senator from Idaho, and the colloquy between him and the Senator from Utah, it is to stimulate the minds of young Americans to ask questions about some of the documents, books, and articles to which they have access.

During the last campaign, it was my experience—and I am certain it was the same experience of every Senator—to talk about government and the duties of a Senator before many high school and college groups.

In one appearance which I made before a high school group, it was alarming to have a young girl arise and quote from one of the paperback books—which I do not care to dignify by quoting in the Record—as if she were quoting from the Gospel.

As Americans, we have a decided responsibility to make decisions based upon fact and not upon fiction, upon truth and not upon prejudice.

I believe that this type of analysis—on which I wish to compliment the Senator once more for his initiative—points out the shortcomings, the barefaced lies, if I may use these words, in a manner which will encourage young Americans not to accept at face value everything which is published. Let them read this type of information if they wish to do so, but then let them examine and cross-examine it and make a determination on the basis of facts.

Mr. CHURCH. I thank the Senator very much. I could not possibly agree more with what he has said. One of the paperbacked books to which the Senator has referred is entitled "None Dare Call It Treason." At a later date, I propose to speak at some length upon the subject content of this book, because I believe it is necessary for us to repudiate the treachery theme presented in this book in the most direct and effective way possible.

No one, for a moment, would suggest that the American people ought not to have access to anyone's book on any subject. My only point is that we cannot ignore such books any longer. We cannot afford the easy assumption that people are not reading them, or that few are being taken in. Eight million copies of the book, "None Dare Call It Treason," are now on the bookshelves of the Nation.

Some people reading this book have not read many others which deal with political subjects. They are without needed perspective. The book is written in a style which reflects the propaganda genius of a Goebbels. Anyone, without his own references with which to evaluate what he reads in this book, could easily and innocently be taken in. He can be trapped into believing that there really is a conspiracy that goes beyond government, that goes to the press, to our educational institutions, to our labor unions, and to our business foundations, if one were to believe what one reads in "None Dare Call It Treason." This ruling establishment, according to the author, is engaged, wittingly or unwittingly, in an effort to weaken this country and to promote the cause of world communism. We cannot let so infamous a charge go unanswered.

Mr. BASS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield.

Mr. BASS. I do not fear the threat or the growth of these fringe groups and organizations, nor do I fear the propaganda that is being spread by the books to which the Senator has referred—unless the procedure continues, as in recent months, in which these books and organizations were given some dignity by operating under an umbrella provided by one of our major political parties during the past few months.

I believe the failure of the leaders in these areas to denounce the books and the organizations that were supporting this sort of sputum and vile accusations across the country is the thing that has disturbed not only me, but many other people in government today. I hope that the Senator will address himself to that subject during the remarks that he makes today. I commend him for the effort that he has put forth in bringing this situation to the attention of the Senate today.

Mr. CHURCH. I thank the Senator from Tennessee. Inasmuch as this is the first time he has had an opportunity to speak as a Member of the Senate, I wish to say how pleased I am that he is here, and that the people of Tennessee have chosen him to join with his senior colleague [Mr. Gore] in representing them in this body.

I respond in this way: I intend at a later date to treat with "None Dare Call It Treason"; but I think it fair to say that this book was repudiated by both the Republican National Committee and the Democratic National Committee, so neither major political party ever gave the book any official endorsement. It is true, however, that large numbers of copies of this book were funnelled out through some local Republican party headquarters.

Mr. BASS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield.

Mr. BASS. It was distributed through local party organizations in my own State, and it was found on tables and was discussed inside the various headquarters during the recent campaign as being something that was official and a document that was to be believed by intelligent Americans. That is what disturbs me.

Mr. CHURCH. I concur wholeheartedly in the sentiments that the Senator has expressed.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Alaska.

Mr. BARTLETT. Shortly before the colloquy began, the Senator from Idaho described what he termed a "call to arms" on the part of the St. Petersburg, Fla., unit of the Minutemen. That call was in these words:

> If you are ever going to buy a gun, buy it now! Form a secret Minutemen team. This is your best guarantee that someone will act promptly to help secure your freedom when the times comes that you unexpectedly turn up missing.

I say that this is an invitation to mob rule; it is nothing else. It is completely foreign to the form of government we have, and it must be rejected by all sensible men.

I grieved when the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss] mentioned, in a colloquy with the Senator from Idaho, the American Mercury. I have not seen this magazine for some years. I am aware of its present editorial policy; but I recall its earlier and better days. I was one of the early subscribers to the American Mercury when it was one of the great magazines published in the United States, under the editorship of Henry L. Mencken and George Nathan. It has indeed come upon sorry days now.

Mr. CHURCH. I thank the Senator from Alaska for his comment.

The important question now is: What is to be done about it? First of all, I think, we must undertake to reclaim the precious words of our own heritage. "Freedom," "Christian," "Americanism," are not nameplates to be exploited by charlatans. Nor, for that matter, is the time-honored term, "conservative."

There is plenty of room in this country for the whole spectrum of opinion, from the most progressive to the most reactionary. The sweep of opinion is the essence of a free society. In the Senate, one quickly learns not only to tolerate but to respect, the integrity of another man's point of view. The range of opinion, within each party, extends from a Wayne Morse to a Harry F. Byrd, from a Strom Thurmond to a Jacob Javits. But each Senator recognizes the essential loyalty and good faith of his colleagues. All understand that free government rests upon the foundation of mutual confidence, and upon its ruin tyranny is built.

Robert Welch, taking a radically different position, describes democracy as "merely a deceptive phrase, a weapon of demagoguery, and a perennial fraud," and admonishes his followers to understand that "the John Birch Society will operate under completely authoritarian control at all levels." This is neither the language of the true conservative, nor the method of freedom.

Scholars differ on why so many conscientious Americans are being caught up in the Radical Right. It is, clearly, a revolt against the established order by the discontented, motivated by a mixture of reasons; a quest for some higher purpose than is satisfied by the commercial standards of our times; a fear of the new relationships being generated by the burgeoning growth, urbanization, and automation of the country; a resistance to the complexities of modern life, to the bigness of government, to the racial revolution, to a cold war that never ends, to the absence of quick and easy solutions; a frustration over the inability of the United States, in the nuclear age, to swiftly work its will upon the world. These are the conditions of life with which all of us must cope, but they stir many a rebel to go forth in search of a cause.

The rebel may find his cause when asked to join a study group where big things are being "considered"—communism, the Constitution, the need for recapturing traditional values. Do the neighbors care about communism? They seem to care only about bowling, bridge, and barbecues.

So a convert is made. He is taught that the Communists are corrupting the children by creating an allegiance to the

United Nations, which is actually Communist inspired—by Alger Hiss—and operated by U Thant along with some Red generals and judges. Obviously, in order to save the children, the high school textbooks must go.

Now the institutions of the town itself are directly challenged. How will the teachers react, the parents in PTA, the ministers in their pulpits, the editors in their news columns? Will the sensible citizens fight back, or remain uninvolved? I cannot really blame those who choose the easy way out, when so many men in high public office also duck for cover.

For too long, too many politicians have used our national repugnance to communism as a convenient crutch in their races. Little wonder that they now hesitate, though many see the need, to take issue with constituents who regard themselves as superpatriots, waving the compelling banner of anticommunism.

But the local and national community can no longer afford to hesitate. The radical right is not so much the enemy of communism as it is the enemy of freedom. It opposes the only programs that fight the real Communist threat—which festers on the miseries of the people in Asia, Africa, and Latin America—and focuses instead on a strawman specter here at home. The resulting fear undermines public confidence in the very institutions of popular government, in the men of Congress, the Supreme Court, and the Presidency itself. When mutual confidence is destroyed, then and then only shall we have cause to fear the loss of freedom in America.

The time has come to affirm that this country of ours is not a Victorian haunted house, its foundations eaten away by Red termites. This country is a great, free land, rich beyond dreaming, powerful beyond belief; a land still striving, in ever larger measure, to reach the goals of equality and personal liberty, toward which we pledged our Nation in the days of its infancy.

The world is not a big Red sea in which this country is being scuttled, but a vast arena of political upheaval, in which the quest for freedom, ever stronger, has overthrown the colonial empires of the past. It is not a tidy world, nor is it a secure one. But it is one for which the United States itself set the revolutionary example.

To put this world, and the Nation, in a proper perspective for the American people—this is the urgent business of statesmanship today. The job cannot be done without first exposing the delusions of the fanatical right. Its propaganda, its frequent resort to outright intimidation and coercion, represent nothing less than totalitarian methods. They must be repudiated by all responsible citizens, Republicans and Democrats, liberals and conservatives, who will not run at the first cry of "Comsymp."

If our inner strength fails, we may end like the frog, cooked before we know it. Daniel Bell, scholar of mass movements, put the danger wisely:

> Barbarous acts are rarely committed out of the blue. * * * Step by step, a society becomes accustomed to accept, with less and less moral outrage, and with greater and greater indifference to legitimacy, the successive blows. What is uniquely disturbing about the emergence of radical right in the 1960's is the support it has been able to find among traditional community leaders who have themselves become conditioned, through an indiscriminate anticommunism, to judge as respectable a movement which, if successful, can only end the liberties they profess to cherish.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield.

Mr. McGOVERN. I join my colleagues in commending the senior Senator from Idaho on his courageous and thoughtful speech this afternoon. I had the privilege of reading his article in the current issue of Look magazine, in which he deals with the same subject.

It is my hope that the article will find its way into every home and every classroom in the Nation, because I think it is one of the most searching and most thorough analyses of the dangers of the radical right that has been prepared.

I commend the Senator for the article, as well as for his remarks on the Senate floor.

The Senator from Idaho is a student of American history. He knows as well as any of us that movements of this kind have occurred throughout our history. There are certain similar characteristics in many of these movements and the ways in which they try to appeal for widespread support. For one thing, we find them under superpatriotic banners. We find in such movements flattering appeals made to the Constitution and the flag, leaving the impression that if one is really a 100-percent patriot he ought to give his loyalty and support to these organizations. Yet, as the Senator has said, in a deeper sense, they are really the most subversive groups among us, in the sense that they have lost faith in our political system. They have lost faith in our democratic institutions. They have lost faith in the leadership of both our great political parties. They have lost faith in the capacity of the American people to see and understand the truth without regard to propaganda. They have lost faith in our great churches and in our educational institutions. For all these reasons, they represent an attack on the things that true patriots hold dear.

Again I commend the Senator for calling the attention of the Senate and of the Nation to this very real danger.

Mr. CHURCH. I thank the Senator for his fine remarks. I appreciate everything he has had to say.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield now to the Senator from Ohio, whom I am also happy to welcome back into the Chamber.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I thank the distinguished Senator from Idaho. I commend my great colleague from the State of Idaho on the outstanding service he has performed for the benefit of all Americans today in the address he has made in the Senate, and also in the excellent article on the same subject entitled, "Conspiracy, U.S.A.," which appears in the January 26 issue of Look magazine. I think it is one of the greatest and most timely articles written by any American in the last decade. I hope it will be universally read in this Nation.

One of the most important issues confronting our Nation today is, of course, the radical, lunatic rightwing extremists. I was faced recently in the course of my campaign for reelection with statements being made that I was soft on communism.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I interrupt the Senator to say that, knowing him as well as I do, I believe I am qualified to state that he is not soft on anything.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CHURCH. Especially not on communism.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. My opposition was misled on one occasion. The distinguished Senator from Arizona, former Senator Goldwater, in a speech last April in California, said that only in Red China do we behold raw communism. Former Senator Goldwater went on to say, "the United States could wind up on the side of the Russians if there is a conflict with China."

Mr. President, one of the hilarious things that occurred in the course of my campaign for reelection was that some of the brainless trust around my opponent gave that quotation to him, and he attributed it to the junior Senator from Ohio, and said that in light of that quotation the junior Senator from Ohio was soft on communism.

Of course I said that Senator Barry Goldwater had made that statement, not STEVE YOUNG. Furthermore, I said I approved the statement as made, that it is a sensible statement, and that it might well come true.

In that connection, only the other day I received a letter written on the letterhead of the American Legion of Ohio by a self-appointed vigilante. In this letter, which was sent to me by the manager of a radio station in Springfield, Ohio, who believed this drivel and who quoted this self-appointed bush league vigilante, it was stated that Antioch College in the State of Ohio was the massive center of communism in the Midwest.

As adverted to by the Senator from Idaho, these extremists berate the Protestant clergy, by talking about Communists among the Protestant clergy. They talk about Communists on the faculties of our colleges and universities. Yet they could not name one Communist and they could not name one Communist sympathizer on the faculty of Antioch College or of any college or university in the State of Ohio or of any college or university in the State of the distinguished Senator from Idaho.

They overlook altogether the threat of Communist aggression from abroad, they refer to their neighbors as tools of the enemy, and claim that only they are the purveyors of the real truth.

The Senator adverted to this scurrilous trash "None Dare Call It Treason" which was used in the recent campaign and was part of the bag of tricks of the hysterical mass movement of Fascist-minded, radical extremists. What "Das

Capital" is to the Communists and "Mein Kampf" was to the Nazis, books like "None Dare Call It Treason" are to the American extremists. They all resort to rewriting history to justify a preconceived course of action. They follow the technique of the big lie, the big smear, and the big racial fear.

One great danger, to which the Senator has so thoroughly called the attention of the American people, arises from the fact that millions of well-meaning Americans embrace these programs as valid solutions to deeply complex problems. The tactics of the extremists, the disorders they create, arise when they try to inject into community life their oversimplified approach to bewildering national problems.

It seems to me—and I believe the Senator will agree with me—that, unable to impeach Chief Justice Earl Warren, a great and loyal American who was a candidate of his party for Vice President of the United States, and who will be remembered for generations to come as not only a great American but also a truly great jurist, his detractors are willing to settle temporarily for the head of a schoolteacher in the Senator's State, or a clergyman in the State of Texas, or a professor in Antioch College in my State of Ohio. Unfortunately, that type of vigilantism is based on contempt of law. The demagogs of the extreme right sell their followers the diagnosis that internal communism is the disease which causes all ills, and then prescribe local vigilante action as the cure.

Speaking of that lunatic, radical rightwing fringe, J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, as the Senator from Idaho knows, warned:

> Attributing every adversity to communism is not only irrational but contributes to hysteria and fosters groundless fears. The way to fight it is to study it, understand it, and discover what can be done about it. This is neither the time for inaction or vigilante action.

I am reminded that Dr. Robert Hutchins, when he was president of the University of Chicago, was asked by a lady, "Is it really true that you teach Communism in the University of Chicago?" He said, "Yes, and we teach cancer in our medical school, too."

Inasmuch as I have referred to J. Edgar Hoover, let me also mention that he has stated—but we will not hear this from any of the self-appointed, sandlot witch hunters, the super-duper, self-appointed patriots—that the Communist Party in the United States has lost 90 percent of its membership since reaching the peak of its numerical strength some 18 years ago.

The FBI report states that there were 80,000 Communists in the United States in 1944—that was 21 years ago. At that time, the Soviet Red Army was crushing Hitler's supermen and in America we were preparing for the end of the war. J. Edgar Hoover stated that was their high point—in 1944, maybe in 1945. Now he reports that according to the best estimate of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the numerical strength of the Communist Party has nosedived and is around 8,000 members.

The Senator from Idaho and I do not know how many of those 8,000 are probably agents of the FBI who are doing their job in connection with the investigation of their activities.

Mr. CHURCH. I do not know whether the Senator has made the computation, but, I believe, based upon the latest FBI reports, the figures would indicate that we are considerably purer than Ivory soap.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, for the sake of uniformity, will the distinguished Senator from Idaho ask unanimous consent to waive the Pastore rule; otherwise the rule of germaneness will apply.

Mr. CHURCH. I thank the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the rule of germaneness may be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. As the Senator from Idaho said a moment ago, that figure would show that we are certainly purer than Ivory soap, for it would mean that for every Communist there would be at least 23,000 non-Communists. In other words, the odds in favor of free institutions in this country are approximately 23,000 to 1. Among 80,000 persons attending a Big Ten football game or any other spectacular, statistically there might possibly be 3 or 4 of those 80,000 who are members of the Communist Party or Communist sympathizers. I think that we do not need the John Birch Society or any other lunatic rightwing organization to protect us.

I thank the Senator very much; and again I praise the Senator from Idaho for the great public service that he is rendering today.

Mr. CHURCH. I thank the Senator from Ohio very much for his remarks.

Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I rise to commend the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] for his masterful discussion on the influence of the radical right in the recent election campaign. Although the election returns showed that rightist influence was several decibels below the noise that they made, we must not believe for one instant that they have been discouraged. Already we are being subjected to new, lavishly financed, broad-based campaigns to scare a greater number of people into supporting rightist philosophy and candidates in the 1966 elections.

Earlier I quoted from the American Mercury magazine that was delivered in the mail yesterday.

The rightwing lost the last election in Utah by a decisive margin. They lost because of the many, many people in Utah, as elsewhere in America, who used knowledge and reason and understanding. But it took Herculean efforts on the part of thousands of these sensible people to turn back at the very gates of the election, the well-mounted rightist campaigns of distortion and fallacy which had been started years ago. And the American electorate suffered through one of the ugliest campaigns of our history.

The Birchers and their allies have been active for some time in my State of Utah. They tried out their muscle several times in hand-to-hand combat with the Utah State Legislature. In 1961 they organized against a bill to provide for community health services. Mrs. Jane Thomas, executive director of the State comprehensive mental health planning program, has related what happened. The community health service bill was endorsed by the State medical society, the community welfare council, and many other professional groups. Its worth was so obvious that everybody thought it was sure to receive favorable legislative consideration.

But a rightist organization called the Utah Citizens Community for Constitutional Mental Health decided there was something subversive about helping the mentally ill, and set out to defeat it. They had the support of W. Cleon Skousen, former chief of police in Salt Lake City, and Reed Benson, then Utah State coordinator, and now a representative for the John Birch Society here in Washington, D.C.

When hearings were set on the bill, representatives of each of the supporting organizations appeared to testify, only to find the hearing room packed with hordes of rightists. Advocates of the bill had to testify from the doorway, under the heckling of the crowd and catcalls of Communist.

The bill got through the legislature, but only after it had been amended to make it a felony punishable by a prison term to give anyone a psychiatric treatment without written consent of the next of kin or a clergyman.

During the past campaign, in which I was a candidate for reelection to the U.S. Senate, I was subjected a number of times to heckling from the closed mind that so often betrays a convert to the radical right.

For example, I would be approached after a speech by a citizen who would snarl: "What are you going to do about Vietnam?"

I would start to summarize the situation in Vietnam as background for my reply to the question, but before I could get out more than a few words, the questioner would throw another snarling question.

Patiently, I would try to continue, only to be interrupted with shouts and fist shaking.

I found I had to give up. The questioner had already made up his mind. He did not want information; he only wanted a chance to insult me.

Again and again during the campaign my billboards and campaign posters were defaced. This was not the usual prank of high-spirited youngsters—a curling mustache or popeyes—it was a systematic defacement with a paint spray gun, and a systematic alteration of the Moss campaign slogan. It seemed to be the product of minds distorted by extremist fears.

The rightwing was very active in the Utah campaign in other ways. A chief example was the hard drive to distribute campaign paperback books. Thousands of copies of "None Dare Call It Treason" were handed out. Discussions about the book flooded the "Letters to the Editor" columns, and nearly swallowed them up. Businessmen, industrialists, students, educators, members of organized labor, and intelligent citizens from all walks of life—including many Republicans—countered with answers to specific misstatements within the book. The Rocky Mountain Review, a fine weekly newspaper published in Salt Lake City, printed a page-by-page refutation of the statements made. It was a studied effort to correct, by facts, the emotional impact the book was having on people who had no way to get these facts—or who were disregarding them. The flood of letters to the editor grew so large that the Salt Lake Tribune had to declare an end to the discussions in its columns—only to have to reopen them under pressure of numbers. Recently another moratorium was finally declared—and kept.

The reaction of average citizens to the half-truths and scare tactics of the radical right in the past campaign is one of the hopeful signs of the times. Hate and fear and demagogy were discarded in the face of reason and intelligence. This is the proper way—the American way—to deal with campaigns designed only to appeal to the emotions. I believe we must continue to bring the rightist organizations, and their points of view—out into the open where they can be examined and discussed.

As the Senator from Idaho has so well pointed out, "The radical right is still on the rampage." Their activity will continue to grow, not diminish.

What we must do is to see that the moderate view gets more attention. For every John Birch society and every Minuteman group, we need counterorganizations of well-informed and intelligent citizens to expose the tactics of fear and fallacy upon which the haters thrive. For every Dean Manion Forum and Dan Smoot broadcast we need a reasoned and thoughtful presentation of the middle-of-the-road programs and philosophy which the majority of Americans espoused in the last campaign.

We should not wait for the frenzy of a campaign to again turn back the radical right. We should not take the chance. As has been so often said, campaigns are won between elections.

The campaign of 1964 was long and exhausting—and ugly. I hoped when it was over that America would never have to face another like it. The Deseret News, in Salt Lake City, agreed. In an editorial, November 4, the News stated:

> The Democratic Party's historic landslide victory at the polls Tuesday represents a thunderous mandate for the course the Johnson-Kennedy administration has followed in world and domestic affairs.
>
> It represents a repudiation of the conservative wing that succeeded in taking control of the Republican Party nationally and, to a considerable extent, here in Utah.
>
> * * * * *
>
> In either case, the party should realize that support of the hate-mongering extremist groups is the kiss of death. The American people obviously are unpersuaded by the fear and suspicion sown so desperately by such groups. The Republican Party and America generally would be better off without them.

But there will be more campaigns like 1964 if we do not start now to meet the offensive of the radical right—so I commend again my colleague from Idaho for his penetrating speech on this subject, and for his intention to continue to discuss it in the coming months.

Mr. CHURCH. I thank the Senator from Utah for his remarks and for the important contribution he has just made to the discussion that is taking place on the floor of the Senate this afternoon.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield to my good friend the distinguished Senator from Alaska.

Mr. BARTLETT. The Senator from Idaho has performed a distinguished public service today in calling to the attention of the Senate and of all Americans this vexing, continuing problem. His analysis has been penetrating and incisive with respect to this strange, festering sore in American society, a movement directly contrary to all that this country has stood for for so long.

One can understand—although with difficulty—that a man of twisted mind might call Dwight Eisenhower an agent of the Communist conspiracy; but it is impossible to understand why and how other Americans could share in such a belief. It is altogether impossible for me to comprehend that a magazine article could have been printed, following the November election, saying that the election of Lyndon B. Johnson and HUBERT H. HUMPHREY constituted a victory for the Communist Party and for Communists everywhere. This is, of course, arrant nonsense.

The Senator from Idaho put this question: How do you answer the charges made by such people; how do you answer the letters of those who have been misled by these charges? I suggest that the Senator from Idaho has given many of the answers in his address today. I join other Senators in congratulating the Senator from Idaho for his courage and effectiveness. What he said needed to be said. He said it logically and eloquently.

Mr. CHURCH. I thank the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I am happy to yield to my seatmate, the distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I commend my old friend and colleague, the distinguished Senator from Idaho, for the splendid address directed against the radical right, which he has just made. I commend also the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG], the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], and the distinguished Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] for the contributions they have made to this discussion.

I should like to present a point of view to my friend from Idaho and ask him, perhaps, to comment briefly on it. It occurs to me that the radical right is nothing really very new. We have had it all during the course of American history. Those of us who recall the frenetic attacks against President George Washington in the late days of the 18th century can, I think, identify many of those attacks with the same general philosophy that is presently being portrayed throughout the country by the modern radical right.

I suggest that the Alien and Sedition Acts in the administration of President John Adams were another exemplification of the same kind of philosophy.

We all know of the rather substantial growth of the Know Nothing or American Party in the middle years of the 19th century.

Then we come down—and those are not by any means all the examples anyone could cite—to the real scare, of which the principal proponent was former Senator McCarthy, of Wisconsin, which began to show its teeth in 1950, if not before, when the distinguished father of our present able junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] was maligned, his position distorted, and fake photographs published, showing him falsely in the company of the head of the Communist Party. It is all a part of the same thing. I suppose we shall have this kind of movement so long as we have a republican form of government and rely, as we do, as we must and as we should, on the right of free speech. These people have the right to speak their piece; they have no right to distort the truth. But the only way, under our laws, since recent decisions of the Supreme Court indicate that much reliance is not to be placed any more on the law of libel, is simply to meet falsehood with truth.

In the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania the radical right is not very active. I have had a check made on my mail. I should say that I do not receive more than two or three letters a month from individuals who could be clearly identified as belonging to the radical right, or even from people who are mentally disturbed or are cranks. But I do receive about 50 pieces of mail a month, printed or mimeographed material, sent out by various organizations which the radical right sponsors. Most of that mail seems to originate either in Texas or California. I suspect that the reason for this is that there appears to be a certain number of rather fuzzy-minded millionaires in those States who made a certain amount of money rather rapidly, who have not a wide educational background, and who apparently have very little understanding of the purposes of America, her ideals, or her traditions. They appear to identify the status quo ante, a return to an era of many years ago, what might be called the robber baron era, with Americanism—quite falsely, of course.

So I suggest that what this really represents, and usually has represented throughout our history, is a sort of revolt against civilization; a desire to go back to the never-never land, a dream world that never existed in the past; a frustration with the strains and stresses of modern life; and a rather affirmative but quite human desire to find a scapegoat—any scapegoat—but preferably a scapegoat that is not content with the status quo but would like to move ahead to a New Deal, a Fair Deal, a Square Deal, as in Teddy Roosevelt's day, a New Frontier, and a new Great Society. Those people, I think, must be ferreted out and their activities given the full light of day.

The Senator from Idaho has written a magnificent article for Look magazine, just published, which I had a chance to read before I came into the Chamber.

I wonder whether he would not agree that perhaps the best way to handle these attacks on freedom and, indeed, on Christianity in the world is to do what he is doing and the rest of us are trying to do; namely, resort to publicity and resort to the truth.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I thank the Senator very much for his keen insight into this problem which is manifest in the remarks he has just made.

First of all, it is true that throughout our history there have been groups that have propagated the conspiracy doctrine. These have always been extremist groups, although they have varied in size and character. Early in our history, there was a very strong anti-Masonic movement in this country. Certain extremists tried to circulate the line that the Masons were engaged in a conspiracy to tear down the churches and other traditional institutions of the land.

Later there was another extremist movement in this country. This group had as its target—not Masons, but Catholics and certain nationals like the Irish, coming in from the Catholic areas of Europe, who were, by their numbers, changing the ethnic complexion of our society.

These earlier nativist groups, feeling that they were being pressured out by the newly arriving immigrants, furnished many recruits for a new extremist movement, directed against the Catholics of the country. Again, the treachery doctrine was utilized. The argument was made that Catholics were involved in an insidious plot to hand the country over to the Pope.

But I suggest to the Senator that this is the first time we have had a movement directed against, not some particular minority group, as has been the case in the past, but against the entire prevailing American establishment, against the leaders of the Nation in both parties, against the foremost educators of the land, against the business foundations, against the labor unions, against the press itself.

This is a different kind of extremism. We have had our know-nothings before. Today's extremist movement, however, began, I believe, with McCarthyism, which seeded the bed for the radical right of today. The attack is of a different and more ominous character.

It is incumbent upon us to come to grips with this problem. We must not ignore it any longer.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I highly commend the Senator from Idaho for his truly great speech this afternoon. It is a speech that I believe should have the subtitle "Defense of Individual Freedom in the United States and Political Liberty for the People."

What the Senator has to say about the extremists on the right is equally applicable to the extremists on the left. As the Senator indicated in his speech, and as the Senator knows, we have done something about what I consider to be reasonable constitutional checks under a government by law, dealing with the extremists on the left.

Some years ago, the then Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. Kennedy, the then Senator from Minnesota, Mr. HUMPHREY, and the senior Senator from Oregon introduced in this body, as coauthors, an amendment to outlaw the Communist Party in the United States. The legislation passed Congress and was signed into law by the President. It is the law of the land today.

It does not mean that we destroyed any individual rights of any person merely because of his political ideology. But we did make illegal a hunting license on their part to destroy the freedom of the people of the country as a whole, which is the conspiracy objective, of course, of the Communists.

I believe the time has come, and is, in fact, long overdue, for the great speech that the Senator from Idaho has made this afternoon. I do not believe that this speech should be entombed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, although it will receive some public notice. I am sure it will be a passing notice. I believe it is a speech that should be readily available to the representatives in Congress for dissemination to the people.

Therefore, I suggest, for the benefit of the people in this country who are interested in the preservation of their freedom that this speech be reprinted in a large volume of reprints and that those reprints be made available by Senators who can send them out in answer to the mail which they receive from sincere and dedicated citizens who are very much concerned about the propaganda that they, too, receive, dealing with the falsification of the radical right.

I hope, if it becomes possible to reprint the speech of the Senator from Idaho, that we shall receive his complete cooperation and authorization in having the speech reprinted for broad dissemination.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Oregon very much for his remarks. He compliments me very highly with his suggestion. I shall be happy to cooperate in any way that I can.

I am happy now to yield to the distinguished Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I commend the distinguished orator from the West, our colleague, for calling to the attention of the American people the prophets of discord, the know-nothings of today, which the recent election seemed to have brought out of the woodwork.

I personally had some opportunity to observe the same type of extremists do their worst in 1950. I observed a campaign in Maryland where, among other types of campaigning, they did not hesitate to doctor an original photograph taken of my father and mother—my father then being the senior Senator from Maryland.

In the original photograph, my father had his arm around my mother. They were pictured as listening to a radio program on the election returns some years before. The original photograph was doctored. The picture of my mother was removed from the photograph, and a picture of the then head of the American Communist Party was inserted in the photograph in my mother's place.

Then the photograph was published in a newspaper, purporting to allege that my father was soft on communism. This doctored photograph was disseminated at the 12th hour to almost the entire electorate of our State.

The great service which the distinguished Senator from Idaho is performing for the American people is that he is calling to their attention some of the problems which extremism on the right and on the left cause in a democracy.

I am satisfied in my own mind that so long as the American people know the facts, so long as they have courageous Senators like the young orator from the West, we have nothing to fear from extremists, be they on the left or on the right; but the American people must have an opportunity to know the facts.

For that reason, I commend the distinguished Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CHURCH. I thank the Senator very much. One of the principal reasons why I have derived such satisfaction from the election of the junior Senator from Maryland is that his presence here today stands in vindication of the great public service and reputation of his illustrious father.

AMENDMENT OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR CERTAIN SUBCOMMITTEES

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, Senate Resolution 7, which, under the rule, has come over from the previous legislative day, under the precedents of the Senate, will now be placed on the calendar. The resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 7) to amend appropriations for certain subcommittees passed February 10, 1964.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I move that the resolution be laid before the Senate and made the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Illinois.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, with the consent of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and on behalf of the chairman of the Select Committee on Small Business, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Alaska will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to add the following section:

> SEC. 4. That section 4 of S. Res. 284, Eighty-eighth Congress, second session, authorizing an examination, investigation, and

study of the problems of American small and independent business, agreed to February 10, 1964, is amended by striking out "$125,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$132,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Alaska.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, without losing my right to the floor, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be suspended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution, as amended (S. Res. 7) to amend appropriations for certain subcommittees passed February 10, 1964.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. What is the business before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to Senate Resolution 7, as amended.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, as originally submitted, Senate Resolution 7 would have provided funds for three subcommittees of the Senate Judiciary Committee in order to comply with the provisions of the Pay Increase Act passed last year. Only today, the resolution was amended by the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Alaska to include the Small Business Committee in the amount of $7,000.

I think I should recite the general chronology of what happened to make clear what the situation is.

On August 13, 1964, after Congress had enacted and the President had signed the pay increase bill, the Judiciary subcommittees, nine in number, filed resolutions for an increase in their allowance in the sum of $150,000.

On August 20, the Senate, by unanimous consent, approved the resolution, but we failed to ask that the vote be reconsidered so that it could be closed up.

Subsequently a motion to reconsider was filed by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. We were getting close to adjournment. The only time we had to consider this matter was on the 2d or 3d of October. Had we pressed and had we been unsuccessful, we would have lost altogether. We still hoped a settlement could be consummated.

So the resolution now before the Senate was filed by the distinguished majority leader and me as of January 6. All it does is try to take care of three judiciary subcommittees plus the one added today, which is the Small Business Committee. The total would be $61,500 plus $7,000 for the Small Business Committee, or a total of $68,500.

If we fail to take favorable action, it will only mean that we are discriminating against staffs of committees and subcommittees that have received pay raises.

I earnestly hope that the Senate will approve the resolution. It is only fair to the clerical staffs of these subcommittees, notwithstanding any objection that might be interposed.

That is the whole story in capsule form. I submit the case and leave it right there, knowing that our distinguished friend the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] has some remarks he wishes to make on a rather extended basis, I believe.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, it is not very pleasant for me, at the beginning of each new session of Congress, to lay before the Senate the numerous so-called temporary subcommittees that are either created or revived from one session of Congress to another.

As the distinguished Senator from Illinois has stated, I objected to the approval of certain resolutions in August of last year. I felt then, as I feel now, that the various committee chairmen should, in my opinion look into the many large salary increases allowed by Congress, and provided for by the resolutions sponsored by certain of the Judiciary subcommittees. Those salary raises were not automatic. The chairmen of the various standing committees could have made any provision they thought fit and proper.

For instance, in the case of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as chairman of the committee, I consulted the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]. We agreed that the salary raises should be a certain amount, percentagewise, but not in accord with the pay increases allowed by Congress.

The resolution of August 1964, included nine subcommittees of the Committee on the Judiciary, for a total of $150,700. However, the resolution now before us shows that of the nine subcommittees all but three were able to obtain the extra money from savings that they made. Evidently, substantial savings have been made, for the amount in the resolution was reduced from $150,700 to $61,500. Senate Resolution 7 would provide an additional $28,500 for the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee, $10,000 for the Subcommittee on Immigration, and $23,000 for that group supposedly studying juvenile delinquency.

Mr. President, I ask that a table showing the effects of the August resolutions be included at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution	Subcommittee	Request	Appropriated by Senate February 1964	Resolution for supplemental	Additional amount requested
S. Res. 261	Administrative Practice and Procedures.	$120,000	$120,000	S. Res. 352	$10,000
S. Res. 262 [1]	Antitrust and Monopoly	512,000	512,000	S. Res. 353	49,000
S. Res. 264	Constitutional Amendments	68,215	55,000	S. Res. 354	4,000
S. Res. 265	Constitutional Rights	165,000	165,000	S. Res. 355	17,000
S. Res. 266 [1]	Immigration and Naturalization	135,000	135,000	S. Res. 356	10,000
S. Res. 268	Internal Security	360,000	360,000	S. Res. 357	26,600
S. Res. 271	Refugees and Escapees	87,500	87,500	S. Res. 358	6,300
S. Res. 272	Revision and Codification	28,200	28,200	S. Res. 359	2,800
S. Res. 274 [1]	Juvenile Delinquency	188,000	188,000	S. Res. 360	25,000
Total					150,700

[1] Indicating subcommittees requesting additional funds in S. Res. 7. All other subcommittees were able to stay within their original budgets.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, we have an enormous number of employees on Capitol Hill and it seems to me that if we are to help President Johnson in cutting back expenses, as he is trying to do now, the place to begin is here. We could save a good deal of money if only the chairmen of the various committees and the chairmen of the subcommittees did what some of us have done: that is, take the schedule of rates paid to the various employees, and find out what they do and then pay them in accord with their capabilities.

That was not done at all in most cases; as seems readily apparent. I tried to get the full information from the Secretary of the Senate, but I was informed that the book which was usually published quarterly will now be published only semiannually. The information I desired, showing how much the pay has increased to the various subcommittees, special committees, and standing committees will have to await the time when this information is given to us in book form by the Secretary of the Senate.

It goes without saying that the committee chairmen and the chairmen of the subcommittees proceeded to pay money that was not available, money that Congress had not appropriated. That is why those subcommittees are in trouble today. Now we are being asked to supply the money, and put a stamp of approval on some serious mismanagement. It would seem to me that there was a violation of the rule when this extra pay in salaries was given to the subcommittees, although the money was not at hand.

That is why I objected last August to the adoption of the resolution. I am glad to note that of the nine subcommittees of the Committee on the Judiciary, who had applied for an additional $150,700, six found money somewhere to pay their staffs.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Am I to understand that if the resolution is adopted, it will not return to the Judiciary Committee that portion of the $150,000 that otherwise would have gone to these subcommittees?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MORSE. It will not go back?

Mr. ELLENDER. No; it will not go back. They found they did not need it after all. In August they asked for $150,700, and today they are asking for $61,500.

Under the new salary bill—and I wish Senators would listen to this—every standing committee will receive $168,432.89 to pay its regular employees. Who are these regular employees? They are six clerical employees and four specialists. Each standing committee can appoint those employees on its own. In order to disburse the pay for these 10 staff members, as I have said, each standing committee obtains $168,432.89. Of the standing committees, the Appropriations Committee is the only committee which is not limited to employing 10 persons.

There appears to be no limit to the number the Appropriations Committee can employ. The 15 committees of which I now speak are the 15 standing committees other than the Appropriations Committee.

The entire sum that could be paid to these 10 employees for each of the standing committees amounts to $2,526,493.35. With that money, these 15 standing committees can employ 150 people.

Let us see what has happened with the subcommittees and the number of people employed by many of the standing committees, in addition to the 150 provided under the Reorganization Act of 1946.

As of March 31 of last year, the various subcommittees created by the standing committees employed 245 persons in addition to the 150 regular staff members provided for by the Reorganization Act.

In addition to that, we had regular employees on the standing committee, other than those provided for by law, numbering 110.

In addition to those two categories, we had special employees for several committees aggregating 33.

Thus, the total number of employees from the subcommittees and from the regular committees—that is, in addition to the 150 which they could ordinarily employ—shows 388 employees hired by these various subcommittees and the standing committees.

Mr. President, I just think it is shameful for the business of the Senate to be handled in such a manner.

The entire cost of paying for the employees of the regular committees, as provided by the Reorganization Act of 1946, as I have just indicated, was $2,526,493.35. But to pay these extra employees selected from these committees and the special committees, the authorized amount was $4,552,955.

Mr. President, just stop and think. To run the regular committees, we started out with each committee having 10 regular employees. Multiply the 15 that I am accounting for by the 10, and that means 150 employees. But all committees together, in addition to the regular 150 employees provided for under the Reorganization Act of 1946, last year employed 388 persons.

If we add the 150 to that, it makes over 500 employees on Capitol Hill doing work for Senators.

Mr. President, in the next few days we are going to have the chairmen of the regular committees, particularly the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, coming before us and asking for money to operate the various subcommittees for the year ending next February—for the next 12 months.

I hope that the chairman of that committee, as well as the chairmen of the subcommittees, and the chairman of the Rules Committee, look into these matters and try to work out a schedule so that employees will be paid in accordance with their duties and their capabilities, if it is at all possible.

Running down the list of a few employees on the Committee on the Judiciary, here is what happened under the new pay bill. This list contains only those receiving $10,000 or more. It does not include all the clericals and those receiving less than $10,000.

It would seem to me that the chairmen of these committees should look into this situation and try to adjust these salaries to the end that there will be some kind of fairness among the employees and that the most capable will receive their just due.

Most of the employees on these committees apparently were given the full amount of the pay raise provided for under the law, irrespective of whether they deserved it or not. That is why those three subcommittees are in trouble today. Most of them received an increase of from 14 percent on up to 20.5 percent.

I am hopeful, as I have stated, that when the chairmen of various committees present the resolutions for their subcommittees, they will look into this matter and evaluate the employees and pay them according to the work they do and not according to their titles. I notice that there are legislative assistants, editors, and editorial directors, minority staff members, chief counsels, records managers, and many other titles, which more than likely means that little real work is done.

Mr. President, I cite specifically the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly, of which my good friend the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] is chairman. In this resolution there is a request for $28,500. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], as chairman of this subcommittee, has under him 41 employees. I could go down the list and show where there are economists, a minority counsel, an editorial director and office manager, a chief economist, an assistant counsel, and so on and so forth. The salaries are, to my way of thinking, very large. Some of those salaries are almost as large as the salary a Senator received prior to enactment of the pay bill.

Although I could not ascertain the amount that was actually paid to all the employees of the subcommittees of the committees that I have mentioned in the document on the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly, I am informed that this subcommittee gave the full measure of increase in most cases. I assume that the same thing was done as to all other subcommittees. I ask unanimous consent to have these documents printed in the RECORD.

Exhibit 1, from which I read, indicates the salary which could be paid under the act by these various subcommittees.

Exhibit 2 presents a list of the employees of these subcommittees named in Resolution 7. It also shows their titles and what they received before the pay bill went into effect, together with what they are receiving at the present time.

There being no objection, the exhibits were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXHIBIT 1

Subcommittee	Name	Job	Present salary	Percent increase	New salary
Immigration and Naturalization	Blair, Drury H	Staff member	$17,305.20	20.5	$20,775.20
	Brown, James M	Legislative assistant	13,130.64	15.5	15,166.75
	Buckner, Catlett L	Staff member	14,371.68	16.5	16,743.01
	Mesmer, Fred M	do	17,305.20	20.5	20,775.20
	Piotrow, Phyllis	do	12,904.92	15.5	14,905.18
	Stevens, William A	Minority staff member	15,951.36	18.5	18,902.36
Federal Judicial System	Finzel, Hubert H	Chief counsel	17,305.20	20.5	20,775.20
Internal Security	Baker, Dorothy C	Records manager	11,757.36	14.5	13,462.17
	Hutto, Ralph H	Assistant editorial director	12,792.12	15.5	14,774.90
	Littman, A. Warren	Associate counsel	12,792.12	15.5	14,774.90
	Jefferson, Louis	Research analyst	10,888.56	13.5	12,358.38
	Lowell, William E	Editorial director	12,792.12	15.5	14,774.90
	McArthur, Alan D	Associate counsel	17,305.20	20.5	20,774.20
	McManus, Robert	Investigation analyst	15,500.04	18.5	18,367.55
	Mandel, Benjamin	Research director	16,515.48	19.5	19,736.00
	Schroeder, Frank	Chief investigator	16,515.48	19.5	19,736.00
	Sourwine, J. G	Chief counsel	18,563.48	21.5	22,554.63
	Tarabachia, Alfonso	Investigator	10,888.56	13.5	12,358.38

Exhibit 1—Continued

Subcommittee	Name	Job	Present salary	Percent increase	New salary
Patents, Trademarks, Copyrights	Brennan, Thomas	Assistant counsel	$13,243.44	15.5	$15,296.17
	Dinkins, Clarence	Chief counsel	17,305.20	20.5	20,775.20
	Haaser, Stephen G	Chief clerk	13,243.44	15.5	15,296.17
Administrative Practices and Procedures	Coulter, Kathryn	Special assistant	11,012.64	12.5	12,389.22
	Fensterwald, Bernard	Chief counsel	17,305.20	20.5	20,775.20
	Kennedy, Cornelius	Minority counsel	17,305.20	20.5	20,775.20
Antitrust and Monopoly Legislation	Bailey, James	do	15,274.32	17.5	17,947.32
	Blair, John M	Chief economist	17,230.08	19.5	20,590.00
	Brown, E. Wayles	Economist	16,176.96	18.5	19,169.96
	Chumbris, Peter N	Chief minority counsel	17,230.08	19.5	20,590.00
	Clifford, George E	Assistant counsel	13,807.56	16.5	16,085.56
	Cohen, S. Jerry	Staff director and chief counsel.	17,192.40	19.5	20,544.92
	Corkey, James E	General counsel	17,192.40	19.5	20,544.92
	Flurry, Horace L	Assistant staff director and chief counsel.	17,230.08	19.5	20,590.00
	Hamilton, Irene	Economist	16,176.96	18.5	19,169.96
	Leban, Abbott A	Minority counsel	14,484.48	17.5	17,019.26
	Measday, Walter S	Economist	15,951.36	18.5	18,902.36
	Raitt, Ronald D	Minority counsel	15,274.32	17.5	17,947.32
	Sharp, Dean E	Assistant counsel	13,356.24	15.5	15,426.45
	Waters, Bernard	Minority counsel	15,274.32	17.5	17,947.32
Constitutional Rights	Creech, William A	Chief counsel	17,305.20	20.5	20,775.20
Statutes of the United States	Kitchin, A. Paul	Counsel	17,305.20	20.5	20,775.20
Juvenile Delinquency	Connell, Patricia	Assistant counsel	10,888.56	13.5	12,358.38
	Gleason, Eugene W	Editorial director	15,048.72	17.5	17,682.24
	Glick, Edward M	Special assistant	13,017.72	15.5	15,035.47
	Perian, Carl L	Staff director	16,064.16	18.5	19,036.03
	Sturm, Rex L	Minority counsel	15,506.36	18.5	18,375.04
Refugees and Escapees	Chang, Donald M	do	15,838.44	18.5	18,768.55
	Moskowitz, Jack	Staff director	17,305.20	20.5	20,775.20
	Ziemba, Carl	Counsel	15,838.44	18.5	18,768.55

Exhibit 2

Committee on the Judiciary

SUBCOMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION, UNDER AUTHORITY OF S. RES. 266, AGREED TO FEB. 10, 1964

Name	Title	Compensation		Name	Title	Compensation	
		Basic annual salary	Gross annual salary			Basic annual salary	Gross annual salary
Ann Ashcraft	Clerk	$2,340	$6,320.81	Mary J. McCloskey	Clerk	$3,120	$8,305.11
Drury H. Blair	Staff member	8,040	20,852.89	Fred M. Mesmer	Staff member	8,040	20,852.89
Catlett L. Buckner	do	6,480	16,743.10	William A. Stevens	Minority staff member	7,320	18,902.37
Franzetta R. DeGooyer	Clerk	3,120	8,305.11				

SUBCOMMITTEE ON JUVENILE DELINQUENCY, UNDER AUTHORITY OF S. RES. 274, AGREED TO FEB. 10, 1964

Adele V. Beaton	Secretary	$2,940	$7,802.82	Mary M. Goulart	Secretary	$2,460	$6,602.96
Susan G. Bennett	Staff assistant	2,820	7,518.06	Anne M. Ketcham	do	3,120	8,305.11
Margaret C. Bray	Secretary	2,640	7,090.94	Elizabeth A. Knipe	do	2,040	5,615.46
Alexandra V. de Smitt	Assistant chief clerk	2,040	5,615.46	Elizabeth T. McGill	Chief clerk	4,140	10,942.09
Peter Freivalds	Research director	4,080	10,795.83	William C. Mooney, Jr	Investigator	3,900	10,264.93
Eugene W. Gleason	Editorial director	7,380	19,036.06	Carl L. Perian	Staff director	7,920	20,410.18
Edward M. Glick	Special assistant	5,760	15,035.58	Jean Wegner	Secretary	2,460	6,602.96
Terry L. Golden	Secretary	2,220	6,038.66	Milton H. Wernstrom	Clerk	5,100	13,462.23

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ANTITRUST AND MONOPOLY, UNDER AUTHORITY OF S. RES. 262, AGREED TO FEB. 10, 1964

		Salary as of June 30, 1964	Salary as of January 1965			Salary as of June 30, 1964	Salary as of January 1965
Lois E. Alexander	Economist	$10,900.12	$12,499.44	Horace L. Flurry	Assistant staff director and chief counsel.	$17,230.08	$20,589.96
James E. Bailey	Counsel for the minority	15,274.32	17,947.43				
Charles E. Bangert	Assistant counsel	14,811.12	18,367.55	Dorothy D. Goodwin	Assistant counsel	12,192.12	14,130.27
Patricia Y. Bario	Editorial director and office manager.	6,749.72	9,540.06	O. Marie Graffam	Telephone operator	5,045.52	5,423.94
				Paul S. Green	Investigator and editor	4,225.48	16,611.65
John M. Blair	Chief economist	17,230.08	20,589.96	Irene T. Hamilton	Economist	16,176.96	19,169.75
Giacomo J. Bologna	Assistant Counsel		15,035.58	Helen L. Kelly	Secretary	8,851.28	7,660.46
E. Wayles Browne, Jr	Economist	17,230.08	19,169.75	Abbott A. Leban	Counsel for the minority	14,484.48	17,019.39
Lucile Bryant	Stenographer	9,055.80	7,945.21	Catherine McQuaid McCarthy.	Stenographer	6,345.72	6,948.58
Fred B. Burke	Investigator	16,402.68	18,902.37				
Katherine Ford Chaney	Information clerk	6,475.68	7,375.72	Walter S. Measday	Economist	15,951.36	18,902.37
Peter N. Chumbris	Chief counsel to the minority	17,230.08	20,589.96	Gladys E. Montier	Clerk	9,454.68	10,795.83
George E. Clifford	Assistant counsel	13,807.56	16,085.87	Ronald D. Raitt	Counsel for the minority	15,274.32	17,947.43
S. Jerry Cohen	Staff director and chief counsel.	19,192.40	20,545.01	Arlone Read	Stenographer	7,645.92	8,736.13
				Eurydice Richman	do		6,038.66
Raymond C. Cole, Jr	Investigator	7,838.20	13,462.23	Dean E. Sharp	Assistant counsel	13,356.24	15,426.51
James E. Corkey	General counsel	17,192.40	20,545.01	Wilbur D. Sparks	do	13,085.44	15,296.19
Kirkley S. Coulter	Economist for the minority	16,515.48	19,736.03	Sara N. Van Oosterhout	Secretary for the minority	5,435.52	5,897.58
Antoinette M. DeFelice	Stenographer	3,976.56	3,402.65	Bernard J. Waters	Counsel for the minority	15,274.32	17,947.43
Thomas A. DiMattina	Investigator	6,232.96	6,948.58	Thomas C. Williams	Assistant counsel		16,085.87
Esther H. Esmond	Secretary to the counsel for the minority.	6,995.76	7,660.46	Jo Anne Youngblood	Stenographer	6,909.04	7,660.46
				Robert R. Zanes	Messenger	4,525.32	4,864.83
Margie R. Felton	Stenographer		6,038.66	Emily W. Zayyani	Stenographer	9,055.80	7,945.21

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I do not wish to take any more time of the Senate, except to emphasize and repeat what I have said. Something should be done to reduce the number of employees who are hired by the various subcommittees. As I tried to point out a moment ago, four categories of regular employees are provided under the Reorganization Act. Then there are employees of the subcommittees. As I have said, subcommittee employees number

245, and while I do not know whether the entire amount appropriated for the purpose was spent or not, in order to take care of the 245 special employees of the subcommittees there has been set aside $3,039,600.

There is yet another category. Funds are made available to certain committees for the hire of special investigators. I point out the case of the Committee on Space and Aeronautical Sciences. The amount of money provided for that committee was $88,500. The committee employed six additional people, and much of that money was spent by hiring people on a reimbursable basis.

The Committee on Commerce received $360,000. All of this is in addition to the amount appropriated for the subcommittees that I have mentioned. The Committee on Commerce has employed 30 additional people.

The Committee on Foreign Relations has employed 10, with $150,000 allocated.

The Committee on Government Operations has employed 24, with $450,000 appropriated for that purpose.

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has been given $105,000, for 10 employees.

The Subcommittee on Small Business has been given $125,000, for 14 additional employees. The is in addition to the regular contingent.

The Committee on Aging has been given $213,016 for a total of 16 employees who, as I said, have been added to the subcommittee employees. The 133 additional employees make a total of 388 people.

I hope that the Committee on Rules and Administration will look into these subjects with the view that some money can be saved the Government. I believe that President Johnson is making an effort to curtail expenses. In the Senate we could do a good job of leading the way.

I do not like to mention my own personal experience, that is, with the Agriculture Committee. I do not wish to appear as one leading the way, or anything like that. But the moment that the bill providing for an increase in pay was enacted, I proceeded to fix reasonable salaries for the employees of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I heard no complaints from those employees. But I have noted that the employees of other committees received whatever the traffic would bear—whatever the bill provided that they might receive.

I am very hopeful that something will be done in order, first, to reduce the number of employees. Unless we do so, we shall have to start constructing additional buildings to take care of the additional employees. I am sure that if Senators who have the responsibility of subcommittees would work together and coordinate their efforts with the Committee on Rules and Administration, a good deal of saving could be accomplished. There is no doubt in my mind that the work necessary in order to keep the Senate going could be done at a lesser cost and with fewer employees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to Senate Resolution 7, as amended.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That S. Res. 262, Eighty-eighth Congress, agreed to February 10, 1964 (authorizing an investigation of antitrust and monopoly laws of the United States), is hereby amended on page 3, line 8, by striking out "$512,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$540,500".

SEC. 2. S. Res. 266, Eighty-eighth Congress, agreed to February 10, 1964, to study matters pertaining to immigration and naturalization, is hereby amended on page 2, line 16, by striking out "$135,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$145,000".

SEC. 3. S. Res. 274, Eighty-eighth Congress, agreed to February 10, 1964 (authorizing an investigation of juvenile delinquency), is hereby amended on page 3, line 2, by striking out "$188,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$211,000".

SEC. 4. That section 4 of S. Res. 284, Eighty-eighth Congress, second session, authorizing an examination, investigation, and study of the problems of American small and independent business, agreed to February 10, 1964, is amended by striking out "$125,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$132,000".

Mr. HART. Mr. President, very briefly, the comments made by the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] on this subject, as has been the case in past years, have been helpful. In a sense I feel a responsibility to reply for those who are on the staffs of some of the subcommittees. The quality of professional skill represented by many of the members of the staffs of its subcommittees is extraordinarily high. None of us in the abstract, I suppose, could say that their services would be worth $22,900, $21,700, or $18,500.

Those of us with a measure of responsibility for proposing budgets for subcommittees seek prudently to measure the capacity of a staff and then reflect it in the recommended salaries.

For the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly, I assure the Senator from Louisiana that some rather substantial economies were made subsequent to the August failure of the Senate to act on the motion to reconsider. I think perhaps that action was a good lesson, and that we shall discover that in the operation of the subcommittee, we may be able to operate with less money than heretofore, but I think not primarily in the area of service salaries, but rather in the area of other expenses.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HART. Certainly.

Mr. ELLENDER. Could the Senator tell us the extent to which the number of employees was reduced?

What actually happened that caused the amount to be cut? That action ought to stand out as an example to all others. For example, in the case of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments, the subcommittee had requested $4,000, and it did with what it had. In the case of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, the subcommittee asked for $17,000. It evidently did with what it had. In the case of the Subcommittee on Internal Security, there was an additional amount of $26,600 requested, and that amount remained as was. It would seem to me that, as the Senator states, we learned a little lesson, and it is apparent from what was asked heretofore that some effort was made to cut back.

While I am on my feet, and if the Senator will permit me to say so, I notice that in the case of the juvenile delinquency study there was a reduction in the staff of 11, as I recall.

Mr. DODD. Nine.

Mr. ELLENDER. Nine, but there was a reduction. I hope that the same result will be accomplished when the Senator presents his request to continue these subcommittees. I am sure they will, particularly as to the Committee on the Judiciary.

As I have stated on many occasions, the Committee on the Judiciary has more subcommittees than all the rest of the committees combined. I realize that much more work is done in that committee than in the average standing committee, for the reason that the Committee on the Judiciary deals with numerous claims and naturalization cases. I have often heard the chairman state that more than 50 percent—sometimes as much as 52 percent—of the bills enacted by Congress emanate from these two subcommittees. I can appreciate that because before reorganization, I was chairman of the Committee on Claims. Oftentimes 52 percent of the bills that were enacted by Congress came from the Committee on Claims.

The subcommittees that handle claims and naturalization matters do a large amount of work. I realize that. Still, it seems to me that the staffs of those subcommittees could be trimmed down somewhat because, as I have said on many occasions, most of the preparatory work is done by the departments in which the requests are first made for the payments of the claims.

I hope that in all subcommittees, not only the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly, but all other committees, an effort will be made to reduce the number of employees, in an effort to assist the President in balancing the budget.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, as I indicated, and as the Senator from Louisiana noted, following the August failure on the part of the Senate to act on the reconsideration motion, economies were effected.

I rise only to voice this caution. I know this is not the purpose or motive of the Senator from Louisiana. Let us recognize a hard fact of life. Many forces in this country would be delighted if there were no Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee of the Senate. While we must seek prudently to effect economy, let us be cautious not to lend ourselves to an effort to destroy the effectiveness of the committee which in this body has primary responsibility for attempting to draw a balance between some strong, competitive forces and the general society. I voice that caution for what lies ahead.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Has the question been put?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution, as amended, has been agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it is with enthusiasm and a sense of high expectation that today, on my own behalf and on behalf of those members of the subcommittee of which I am chairman whom I have been able to talk with this afternoon, I introduce for appropriate reference the administration's Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. I ask unanimous consent that I may introduce the bill out of order for appropriate reference on the basis of the time factor that I shall discuss in a moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Harris in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 370) to strengthen and improve educational quality and educational opportunities in the Nation's elementary and secondary schools, introduced by Mr. Morse (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Senators who are joining with me this afternoon in the introduction of the bill are the Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNamara], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph]. I am sure that many other Senators will, by next Friday night, wish to cosponsor the bill with us. I ask unanimous consent that the bill may lie at the desk until 5 p.m. on Friday next, to receive the signatures of other Senators who may wish to become cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I know that many Senators who have fought valiantly for education legislation in the past would wish to be associated in this important educational endeavor, which we hope will soon be enacted.

Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record the text of the President's message on education, the text of the proposed act, and a fact sheet relevant to it, which was developed by the Office of Education.

There being no objection, the message, bill, and fact sheet were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

In 1787, the Continental Congress declared in the Northwest Ordinance: "Schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged."

America is strong and prosperous and free because for 178 years we have honored that commitment.

In the United States today:

One-quarter of all Americans are in the Nation's classrooms.

High school attendance has grown eighteenfold since the turn of the century—six times as fast as the population.

College enrollment has advanced eightyfold. Americans today support a fourth of the world's institutions of higher learning and a third of its professors and college students.

In the life of the individual, education is always an unfinished task. And in the life of this Nation, the advancement of education is a continuing challenge.

There is a darker side to education in America:

One student out of every three now in the fifth grade will drop out before finishing high school—if the present rate continues.

Almost a million young people will continue to quit school each year—if our schools fail to stimulate their desire to learn.

Over 100,000 of our brightest high school graduates each year will not go to college—and many others will leave college—if the opportunity for higher education is not expanded.

The cost of this neglect runs high—both for the youth and the Nation.

Unemployment of young people with an eighth grade education or less is four times the national average.

Jobs filled by high school graduates rose by 40 percent in the last 10 years. Jobs for those with less schooling decreased by nearly 10 percent.

We can measure the cost in even starker terms. We now spend about $450 a year per child in our public schools. But we spend $1,800 a year to keep a delinquent youth in a detention home, $2,500 a year for a family on relief, $3,500 a year for a criminal in State prison.

The growing numbers of young people reaching school age demand that we move swiftly even to stand still.

Attendance in elementary and secondary schools will increase by 4 million in the next 5 years—400,000 new classrooms will be needed to meet this growth. But almost one-half million of the Nation's existing classrooms are already more than 30 years old.

The post-World War II boom in babies has now reached college age. And by 1970, our colleges must be prepared to add 50 percent more enrollment to their presently overcrowded facilities.

In the past, Congress has supported an increasing commitment to education in America. Last year, I signed historic measures passed by the 88th Congress to provide: facilities badly needed by universities, colleges, and community colleges; major new resources for vocational training; more loans and fellowships for students enrolled in higher education; enlarged and improved training for physicians, dentists, and nurses.

I propose that the 89th Congress join me in extending the commitment still further. I propose that we declare a national goal of full educational opportunity.

Every child must be encouraged to get as much education as he has the ability to take. We want this not only for his sake—but for the Nation's sake.

Nothing matters more to the future of our country: not our military preparedness—for armed might is worthless if we lack the brain power to build a world of peace; not our productive economy—for we cannot sustain growth without trained manpower; not our democratic system of government—for freedom is fragile if citizens are ignorant.

We must demand that our schools increase not only the quantity but the quality of America's education. For we recognize that nuclear age problems cannot be solved with horse-and-buggy learning. The three R's of our school system must be supported by the three T's—teachers who are superior, techniques of instruction that are modern, and thinking about education which places it first in all our plans and hopes.

Specifically, four major tasks confront us: to bring better education to millions of disadvantaged youth who need it most; to put the best educational equipment and ideas and innovations within reach of all students; to advance the technology of teaching and the training of teachers; to provide incentives for those who wish to learn at every stage along the road to learning.

Our program must match the magnitude of these tasks. The budget on education which I request for fiscal year 1966 will contain a total of $4.1 billion. This includes $1.1 billion to finance programs established by the 88th Congress. I will submit a request for $1.5 billion in new obligational authority to finance the programs described in this message. This expenditure is a small price to pay for developing our Nation's most priceless resource.

In all that we do, we mean to strengthen our State and community education systems. Federal assistance does not mean Federal control—as past programs have proven. The late Senator Robert Taft declared: "Education is primarily a State function—but in the field of education, as in the fields of health, relief and medical care, the Federal Government has a secondary obligation to see that there is a basic floor under those essential services for all adults and children in the United States."

In this spirit, I urge that we now push ahead with the No. 1 business of the American people—the education of our youth in preschools, elementary and secondary schools, and in the colleges and universities.

I. PRESCHOOL PROGRAM

My budget will include up to $150 million for preschool projects under the community action program of the Economic Opportunity Act.

Education must begin with the very young. The child from the urban or rural slum frequently misses his chance even before he begins school. Tests show that he is usually a year behind in academic attainment by the time he reaches third grade—and up to 3 years behind if he reaches the eighth grade. By then the handicap has grown too great for many children. Their horizons have narrowed; their prospects for lifetimes of failure have hardened. A large percentage of our young people whose family incomes are less than $2,000 do not go beyond the eighth grade.

Preschool programs have demonstrated marked success in overcoming this initial handicap:

In New York City, children from slum neighborhoods who attended nursery school have performed better when tested in the third and fourth grades than those who did not attend.

In Baltimore, children with language and cultural handicaps are being helped greatly by a preschool program. According to preliminary reports, two-thirds of them are in the top 50 percent of their kindergarten and first-grade classes on a citywide measure; one-sixth of them are in the top quarter.

But today, almost half of our school districts conduct no kindergarten classes. Public nursery schools are found in only about 100 of our 26,000 school districts. We must expand our preschool program in order to reach disadvantaged children early.

Action on a wide front will begin this summer through a special "headstart" program for children who are scheduled to begin school next fall. In addition, funds for low-income schools, regional education laboratories, and supplementary educational centers and services (recommended below) will be devoted to these vital preschool programs.

II. ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS

Elementary and secondary schools are the foundation of our education system.

Forty-eight million students are now in our grade and high schools.

Seventy-one percent of the Nation's expenditures for education are spent on elementary and secondary schooling.

If these schools are to do their job properly, they need help and they need it now. I propose that we give first priority to a program of:

A. Aid to low-income school districts

I recommend that legislation be enacted to authorize a major program of assistance to public elementary and secondary schools serving children of low-income families. My budget for fiscal year 1966 will request $1 billion for this new program.

One hundred years ago, a man with 6 or 7 years of schooling stood well above the average. His chances to get ahead were as good as the next man's. But today, lack of formal education is likely to mean low wages, frequent unemployment, and a home in an urban or rural slum.

Poverty has many roots but the tap root is ignorance. Poverty is the lot of two-thirds of the families in which the family head has had 8 years or less of schooling. Twenty percent of the youth aged 18 to 24 with an eighth grade education or less are unemployed—four times the national average.

Just as ignorance breeds poverty, poverty all too often breeds ignorance in the next generation. Nearly half the youths rejected by selective service for educational deficiency have fathers who are unemployed or else working in unskilled and low-income jobs. Fathers of more than one-half of the draft rejectees did not complete the eighth grade.

The burden on the Nation's schools is not evenly distributed. Low-income families are heavily concentrated in particular urban neighborhoods or rural areas. Faced with the largest educational needs, many of these school districts have inadequate financial resources. This imbalance has been increased by the movement of high income families from the center of cities to the suburbs—and their replacement by low-income families from rural areas.

The five States with the lowest incomes spend only an average of $276 per pupil, less than half the average of the five highest income States.

Despite a massive effort, our big cities generally spend only about two-thirds as much per pupil as their adjacent suburbs.

In our 15 largest cities, 60 percent of the 10th grade students from poverty neighborhoods drop out before finishing high school.

This is a national problem. Federal action is needed to assist the States and localities in bringing the full benefits of education to children of low-income families.

Assistance will be provided: On the basis of census data showing the distribution of low-income families among the counties or school districts within States; through payments made to States for distribution to school districts; with the assurance that the funds will be used for improving the quality of education in schools serving low-income areas; on the condition that Federal funds will not be used to reduce State and local fiscal efforts; for the benefit of all children within the area served, including those who participate in shared services or other special educational projects.

B. School library resources and instructional materials

I recommend legislation to authorize Federal grants to States to assist in the purchase of books for school libraries and for student use, to be made available to children in public and private nonprofit elementary and secondary schools.

Thomas Carlyle once said, "All that mankind has done, thought, gained, or been: it is lying as in magic preservation in the pages of books."

Yet our school libraries are limping along. Almost 70 percent of the public elementary schools have no libraries. Eighty-four percent lack librarians to teach children the value of learning through good books. Many schools have an average of less than one-half a book per child. To meet the accepted standards for library materials would require a fourfold increase in current expenditures in our major cities.

The explosion of knowledge and the rapid revision of curriculums in the schools has created new demands for school textbooks. The obsolete text can suffocate the learning process. Yet the cost of purchasing textbooks at increasing prices puts a major obstacle in the path of education—an obstacle that can and must be eliminated.

C. Supplementary educational centers and services

I recommend a program of Federal grants for supplementary education centers and services within the community.

We think of schools as places where youth learns, but our schools also need to learn.

The educational gap we face is one of quality as well as quantity.

Exciting experiments in education are underway, supported by the National Science Foundation, by the Office of Education and other Government agencies, and by private philanthropic foundations. Many of our children have studied the "new" math. There are highly effective ways of teaching high school physics, biology, chemistry, and foreign languages.

We need to take full advantage of these and other innovations. Specialists can spark the interest of disadvantaged students. Remedial reading courses open up new vistas for slow learners. Gifted students can be brought along at a faster pace.

Yet such special educational services are not available in many communities. A limited local tax base cannot stand the expense. Most individual schools are not large enough to justify the services.

The supplementary center can provide such services as: Special courses in science, foreign languages, literature, music, and art. Programs for the physically handicapped and mentally retarded.

Instruction in the sciences and humanities during the summer for economically and culturally deprived children. Special assistance after regular school hours. Common facilities that can be maintained more efficiently for a group of schools than for a single school—laboratories, libraries, auditoriums, and theaters. A system by which gifted persons can teach part time to provide scarce talents. A means of introducing into the school system new courses, instructional materials, and teaching practices. A way of tapping the community's extracurricular resources for the benefit of students—museums, concert and lecture programs, and industrial laboratories.

Within each community, public and private nonprofit schools and agencies will cooperate to devise the plan and administer the program for these supplementary centers. Their services should be adapted to meet the pressing needs of each locality.

D. Regional educational laboratories

I recommend the establishment under the Cooperative Research Act of regional educational laboratories which will undertake research, train teachers, and implement tested research findings.

I further recommend amendments to the act to: Broaden the types of research organizations now eligible for educational projects. Train educational research personnel. Provide grants for research, development of new curriculums, dissemination of information, and implementation of educational innovations. Support construction of research facilities and the purchase of research equipment.

Under auspices of the National Science Foundation, educators have worked with scientists—including Nobel laureates—to develop courses which capture the excitement of contemporary science. They have prepared totally new instructional materials—laboratory equipment, textbooks, teachers' guides, films, supplementary reading and examinations. After testing, they are made available to public and private schools.

We need to extend our research and development—to history, literature, and economics; to art and music; to reading, writing, and speaking; to occupational, vocational, and technical education. We need to extend it to all stages of learning—preschool, elementary and secondary schools, college and graduate training.

Regional laboratories for education offer great promise. They draw equally upon educators and the practitioners in all fields of learning—mathematicians, scientists, social scientists, linguists, musicians, artists, and writers. They help both to improve curriculums and to train teachers.

E. Strengthening State educational agencies

I recommend a program of grants to State educational agencies.

State leadership becomes increasingly important as we seek to improve the quality of elementary and secondary education.

We should assist the States by strengthening State departments of education in their efforts to: Provide consultative and technical assistance for local school districts and local school leadership. Formulate long-range plans. Expand educational research and development. Improve local and State information about education. Identify emerging educational problems. Provide for the training of State and local education personnel. Conduct periodic evaluation of educational programs. Promote teacher improvement courses.

These new programs will substantially augment community resources in the war against poverty. As provided by sections 611 and 612 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, I will see that the new efforts are kept in step with our other antipoverty efforts.

In those localities where the community has undertaken a community action program under the Economic Opportunity Act, the community agency should participate in the planning of these new educational programs and in their coordination with ongoing and developing antipoverty efforts.

Enactment of these proposals for elementary and secondary education is of utmost urgency. I urge early and favorable consideration by the Congress.

III. HIGHER EDUCATION

Higher education is no longer a luxury, but a necessity.

Programs enacted by Congress in the past have contributed greatly to strengthening our colleges and universities. These will be carried forward under my 1966 budget, which includes: An additional $179 million to assist construction of college classrooms, libraries and laboratories. An additional $25 million for 4,500 more graduate fellowships to overcome college teaching shortages. An additional $110 million to further basic research in the universities, to provide science fellowships, and to promote science education.

But we need to do more:

To extend the opportunity for higher education more broadly among lower and middle income families. To help small and less well-developed colleges improve their programs. To enrich the library resources of colleges and universities. To draw upon the unique and invaluable resources of our great universities to deal with national problems of poverty and community development.

A. Assistance to students

1. Scholarships: I recommend a program of scholarships for needy and qualified high school graduates to enable them to enter and to continue in college.

Loans authorized by the National Defense Education Act currently assist nearly 300,000 college students. Still the following conditions exist: Each year an estimated 100,000 young people of demonstrated ability fail to go on to college because of lack of money. Many thousands more from low-income families must borrow heavily to meet college costs. Only 1 out of 3 young people from low-income families attend college compared with 4 out of 5 from high-income families.

For many young people from poor families loans are not enough to open the way to higher education.

Under this program, a special effort will be made to identify needy students of promise early in their high school careers. The scholarship will serve as a building block, to be augmented by work-study and other support, so that the needy student can chart his own course in higher studies.

My 1966 budget provides sufficient funds for grants to help up to 140,000 students in the first year.

2. Expansion of work-study opportunity and guaranteed low-interest loans:

I recommend: that the existing college work-study program be made available to more students and that authority for the program be transferred to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—that a part of the cost of interest payments on guaranteed private loans to college students be paid by the Federal Government.

Going to college is increasingly expensive. A student must pay nearly $2,400 a year in a private college and about $1,600 in a public college. These costs may rise by one-third over the next decade.

Two aids should be extended to meet the heavy costs of college education. First, the existing work-study program should be expanded for students from low-income families and extended to students from middle-income families. Under this program the Federal Government pays 90 percent of the wages earned by students on useful projects. This will enable a student to earn on the average of $450 during a school year, and up to $500 more during the summer.

Second, many families cannot cover all of college expenses on an out-of-pocket basis. We should assure greater availability of private credit on reasonable terms and conditions. This can best be done by paying part of interest cost of guaranteed loans made by private lenders—a more effective, fairer, and far less costly way of providing assistance than the various tax credit devices which have been proposed.

B. Aid to smaller colleges

I recommend that legislation be enacted to strengthen less developed colleges.

Many of our smaller colleges are battling for survival. About 10 percent lack proper accreditation, and others face constantly the threat of losing accreditation. Many are isolated from the main currents of academic life.

Private sources and States alone cannot carry the whole burden of doing what must be done for these important units in our total educational system. Federal aid is essential.

Universities should be encouraged to enter into cooperative relationships to help less developed colleges, including such assistance as: A program of faculty exchanges, special programs to enable faculty members of small colleges to renew and extend knowledge of their fields, a national fellowship program to encourage highly qualified young graduate students and instructors in large universities to augment the teaching resources of small colleges, the development of joint programs to make more efficient use of available facilities and faculty.

In union there is strength. This is the basic premise of my recommendation.

C. Support for college library resources

I recommend enactment of legislation for purchase of books and library materials to strengthen college teaching and research: 50 percent of our 4-year institutions and 82 percent of our 2-year institutions fall below accepted professional standards in the number of volumes possessed.

As student enrollment mounts, we must look not only to the physical growth of our colleges and universities, they must be developed as true centers of intellectual activity. To construct a library building is meaningless unless there are books to bring life to the library.

D. University-community extension program

I recommend a program of grants to support university extension concentrating on problems of the community.

Institutions of higher learning are being called on ever more frequently for public service—for defense research, foreign development, and countless other programs. They have performed magnificently. We must now call upon them to meet new needs.

Once, 90 percent of our population earned its living from the land. A wise Congress enacted the Morrill Act of 1862 and the Hatch Act of 1887 which helped the State universities help the American people. With the aid of the land-grant colleges American agriculture produced overwhelming abundance.

Today, 70 percent of our people live in urban communities. They are confronted by problems of poverty, residential blight, polluted air and water, inadequate mass transportation and health services, strained human relations, and overburdened municipal services.

Our great universities have the skills and knowledge to match these mountainous problems. They can offer expert guidance in community planning, research and development in pressing educational problems, economic and job market studies, continuing education of the community's professional and business leadership, and programs for the disadvantaged.

The role of the university must extend far beyond the ordinary extension-type operation. Its research findings and talents must be made available to the community. Faculty must be called upon for consulting activities. Pilot projects, seminars, conferences, TV programs, and task forces drawing on many departments of the university—all should be brought into play.

This is a demanding assignment for the universities, and many are not now ready for it. The time has come for us to help the university to face problems of the city as it once faced problems of the farm.

E. Special manpower needs

We must also ask the colleges and universities to help overcome certain acute deficiencies in trained manpower. At least 100,000 more professional librarians are needed for service in public libraries and in schools and colleges. We need 140,000 more teachers for handicapped children.

I recommend: Grants to institutions of higher education for training of school, college, and community librarians and related services. Extension and expansion of grants for training teachers and handicapped children.

CONCLUSION

In 1838, Mirabeau B. Lamar, the second President of the Republic of Texas and the father of Texas education, declared: "The cultivated mind is the guardian genius of democracy. It is the only dictator that free man acknowledges. It is the only security that free man desires."

Throughout the history of our Nation, the United States has recognized this truth. But during the periods when the country has been most astir with creative activity, when it most keenly sensed the sturdiness of the old reaching out for the vigor of the new, it has given special attention to its educational system.

This was true in the expansive 1820's and 1830's, when the American people acted decisively to build a public school system for the lower grades. It was no less true at the vigorous turn of the 20th century, when high schools were developed for the millions. Again, during the questing 1930's, fresh ideas stirred the traditions of the ruler and blackboard.

We are now embarked on another venture to put the American dream to work in meeting the new demands of a new day. Once again we must start where men who would improve their society have always known they must begin—with an educational system restudied, reinforced, and revitalized.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 12, 1965.*

S. 370

A bill to strengthen and improve educational quality and educational opportunities in the Nation's elementary and secondary schools

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965".

TITLE I—FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES FOR THE EDUCATION OF CHILDREN OF LOW-INCOME FAMILIES

SEC. 2. The Act of September 30, 1950, Public Law 81–874, as amended (20 U.S.C. 236–244), is amended by inserting:

"TITLE I—FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES IN AREAS AFFECTED BY FEDERAL ACTIVITY"

immediately above the heading of section 1, by striking out "this Act" wherever it appears in sections 1 through 6, inclusive, and inserting in lieu thereof "this title", and by adding immediately after section 6 the following new title:

"TITLE II—FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES FOR THE EDUCATION OF CHILDREN OF LOW-INCOME FAMILIES

"DECLARATION OF POLICY

"SEC. 201. In recognition of the special educational needs of children of low-income families and the impact that concentrations of low-income families have on the ability of local educational agencies to support adequate educational programs, the Congress hereby declares it to be the policy of the United States to provide financial assistance (as set forth in this title) to local educational agencies serving areas with concentrations of children from low-income families to expand and improve their educational programs by various means (including where necessary the construction of school facilities) which contribute particularly to meeting the special educational needs of educationally deprived children.

"Kinds and duration of grants

"SEC. 202. The Commissioner shall, in accordance with the provisions of this title, make payments to State educational agencies for basic grants to local educational agencies in the period beginning July 1, 1965, and ending June 30, 1968, and he shall make payments to State educational agencies for special incentive grants to local educational agencies in the period beginning July 1, 1966, and ending June 30, 1968.

"Basic grants—Amount and eligibility

"SEC. 203. (a) (1) In any case in which the Commissioner determines that satisfactory data for that purpose are available from the Department of Commerce, the maximum amount of a basic grant which a local educational agency in a State shall be eligible to receive under this title for any fiscal year shall be (except as provided in paragraph (2)) an amount equal to the Federal percentage (determined pursuant to subsection (c)) of the average per pupil expenditure in that State multiplied by the number of children aged five to seventeen, inclusive, in the school district of such agency, of families having an annual income of less than the low-income factor determined pursuant to subsection (c). In any other case, the maximum basic grant for any local educational agency shall be determined on the basis of the aggregate maximum amount of such grants for all such agencies in the county or counties in which the school district of the particular agency is located, which aggregate maximum amount shall be equal to the Federal percentage of such per pupil expenditure multiplied by the number of children of such ages and families in such county or counties and shall be allocated among those agencies upon such equitable basis as may be determined by the State educational agency in accordance with basic criteria prescribed by the Commissioner. For purposes of this subsection the 'average per pupil expenditure' in a State shall be the aggregate current expenditures, during the second fiscal year preceding the fiscal year for which the computation is made, of all local educational agencies in the State (without regard to the sources of funds from which such expenditures are made), divided by the aggregate number of children in average daily attendance to whom such agencies provided free public education during such preceding year.

"(2) If the maximum amount of the basic grant determined pursuant to paragraph (1) for any local educational agency for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, is greater than 30 per centum of the sum budgeted by that agency for current expenditures for that year (as determined pursuant to regulations of the Commissioner), such maximum amount shall be reduced to 30 per centum of such budgeted sum.

"(b) A local educational agency shall be eligible for a basic grant for a fiscal year under this title only if it meets the following requirements with respect to the number of children aged five to seventeen, inclusive, of families having an annual income of less than the low-income factor (as determined pursuant to subsection (c)):

"(1) In any case (except as provided in paragraph (3)) in which the Commissioner determines that satisfactory data for the purpose of this subsection as to the number of such children of such families are available on a school district basis, the number of such children of such families in the school district of such local educational agencies shall be—

"(A) at least one hundred, or

"(B) equal to 3 per centum or more of the total number of all children aged five to seventeen, inclusive, in such district, whichever is less, except that it shall in no case be less than ten.

"(2) In any other case, except as provided in paragraph (3), the number of children of such ages of families with such income in the county which includes such local educational agency's school district shall be one hundred or more.

"(3) In any case in which a county includes a part of the school district of the local educational agency concerned and the Commissioner has not determined that satisfactory data for the purpose of this subsection are available on a school district basis for all the local educational agencies for all the counties into which the school district of the local educational agency concerned extends, the eligibility requirement with respect to the number of children of such ages of families of such income for such local educational agency shall be determined in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Commissioner for the purposes of this subsection.

"(c) For the purposes of this section, the 'Federal percentage' and the 'low-income factor' for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, shall be 50 per centum and $2,000, respectively. For each of the two succeeding fiscal years the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall determine the Federal percentage and the low-income factor on such basis, in the light of the sums appropriated for that year for making grants under this title, as he determines will best carry out the purposes of this title.

"(d) For the purposes of this section, the Commissioner shall determine the number of children aged five to seventeen, inclusive, of families having an annual income of less than the low-income factor (as determined pursuant to subsection (c)) on the basis of the most recent satisfactory data available from the Department of Commerce. When requested by the Commissioner, the Secretary of Commerce shall make a special estimate of the number of such children in each county or school district, and the Commissioner is authorized to pay (either in advance or by way of reimbursement) the Secretary of Commerce the cost of making this special estimate.

"Special incentive grants

"SEC. 204. Each local educational agency which is eligible to receive a basic grant for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, shall be eligible to receive an additional special incentive grant equal to not more than the amount by which the current expenditures of that agency for the preceding fiscal year exceeded 105 per centum of such expenditures for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965. Each such agency which is eligible to receive a basic grant for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, shall be eligible to receive an additional special incentive grant equal to not more than the amount by which the current expenditures of that agency for the preceding fiscal year exceeded 110 per centum of such expenditures for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965.

"Application

"SEC. 205. (a) A local educational agency may receive a basic grant or a special incentive grant under this title for any fiscal year only upon application therefor approved by the appropriate State educational agency, upon its determination (consistent with such basic criteria as the Commissioner may establish)—

"(1) that payments under this title will be used for programs and projects (A) which are designed to meet the special educational needs of educationally deprived children in school attendance areas having high concentrations of children from low-income families and (B) which are of sufficient size, scope, and quality to give reasonable promise of substantial progress toward meeting those needs;

"(2) that, to the extent consistent with the number of educationally deprived children in the school district of the local educational agency who attend nonpublic schools, such agency has made provision for including special educational services and arrangements (such as dual enrollment, educational radio and television, and mobile educational services) in which children can participate without full-time public school attendance;

"(3) in the case of any project for construction of school facilities, that the project is not inconsistent with overall State plans for the construction of school facilities and that the requirements of section 209 will be complied with on all such construction projects;

"(4) that effective procedures will be adopted for making continuing and periodic evaluations of the effectiveness of the programs in meeting the special educational needs of children of low-income families;

"(5) that the local educational agency will make an annual report and such other reports to the State educational agency, in such form and containing such information, as may be reasonably necessary to enable the State educational agency to perform its duties under this title, and will keep such records and afford such access thereto as the State educational agency may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports, and

"(6) that wherever there is, in the area served by the local educational agency, a community action program approved pursuant to title II of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (Public Law 88-452), the programs and projects have been developed in cooperation with the public or private nonprofit agency responsible for the community action program.

"(b) The State educational agency shall not finally disapprove in whole or in part any application for funds under this title without first affording the local educational agency submitting the application reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing.

"Assurances from States

"SEC. 206. (a) Any State desiring to participate in the program of this title shall submit through its State educational agency to the Commissioner an application, in such detail as the Commissioner deems necessary, which provides satisfactory assurance—

"(1) that except as provided in section 207(b) payments under this title will be used only for programs and projects which have been approved by the State educational agency pursuant to section 205(a) and which meet the requirements of that section, and that such agency will in all other respects comply with the provisions of this title, including the enforcement of any obligations imposed upon a local educational agency under section 205(a);

"(2) that such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures will be adopted as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of, and accounting for, Federal funds paid to the State (including such funds paid by the State to local educational agencies) under this title; and

"(3) that the State educational agency will make an annual and such other reports to the Commissioner, in such form and containing such information, as may be reasonably necessary to enable the Commissioner to perform his duties under this title, including such reports as the Commissioner may require (A) to evaluate the effectiveness of payments under this title and of particular programs assisted under it in improving the educational attainment of educationally deprived children and their financial status and requirements, and (B) to determine the amount which the local educational agencies of that State are eligible to receive for any fiscal year, and assurance that such agency will keep such records and afford such access thereto as the Commissioner may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports.

"(b) The Commissioner shall approve an application which meets the requirements specified in subsection (a) and he shall not finally disapprove an application except after reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing to the State educational agency.

"Payment

"SEC. 207. (a) (1) The Commissioner shall, subject to the provisions of section 208, from time to time pay to each State, in advance or otherwise, the amount which the local educational agencies of that State are eligible to receive under this title. Such payments shall take into account the extent (if any) to which any previous payment to such State educational agency under this title (whether or not in the same fiscal year) was greater or less than the amount which should have been paid to it.

"(2) From the funds paid to it pursuant to paragraph (1) each State educational agency shall distribute to each local educational agency of the State which is not ineligible by reason of section 203(b) and which has submitted an application approved pursuant to section 205(a) the amount for which such application has been approved, except that this amount shall not exceed an amount equal to the total of the maximum amount of the basic grant plus the maximum amount of the special incentive grant as determined for that agency pursuant to sections 203 and 204, respectively.

"(b) The Commissioner is authorized to pay to each State amounts equal to the amounts expended by it for the proper and efficient performance of its duties under this title, except that the total of such payments in any fiscal year shall not exceed 1 per centum of the total of the amount of the basic grants paid under this title for that year to the local educational agencies of the State.

"(c) (1) No payments shall be made under this title for any fiscal year to a State which has taken into consideration payments under this title in determining the eligibility of any local educational agency in that State for State aid, or the amount of that aid, with respect to the free public education of children during that year or the preceding fiscal year.

"(2) No payments shall be made under this title to any local educational agency for any fiscal year unless the State educational agency finds that the combined fiscal effort (as determined in accordance with regulations of the Commissioner) of that agency and State with respect to the provision of free public education by that agency for the preceding fiscal year was not less than such combined fiscal effort for that purpose for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964.

"Adjustments where necessitated by appropriations

"SEC. 208. If the sums appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, for making the payments provided in this title are not sufficient to pay in full the total amounts which all local and State educational agencies are eligible to receive under this title for such year, such amounts shall be reduced ratably. In case additional funds become available for making payments under this title for that year, such reduced amounts shall be increased on the same basis that they were reduced.

"Labor standards

"SEC. 209. All laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors on all construction projects assisted under this title shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276a–276a-5). The Secretary of Labor shall have with respect to the labor standards specified in this section the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176; 5 U.S.C. 133z–15) and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276c).

"Withholding

"SEC. 210. Whenever the Commissioner, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to any State educational agency, finds that there has been a failure to comply substantially with the assurances set forth in the application of that State approved under section 206(b), the Commissioner shall notify the agency that further payments will not be made to the State under this title (or, in his discretion, that the State educational agency shall not make further payments under this title to specified local educational agencies affected by the failure) until he is satisfied that there is no longer any such failure to comply. Until he is so satisfied, no further payments shall be made to the State under this title, or payments by the State educational agency under this title shall be limited to local educational agencies not affected by the failure, as the case may be.

"Judicial review

"SEC. 211. (a) If any State is dissatisfied with the Commissioner's final action with respect to the approval of its application submitted under section 206(a) or with his final action under section 210, such State may, within 60 days after notice of such action, file with the United States Court of Appeals for the circuit in which such State is located a petition for review of that action. A copy of the petition shall be forthwith transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Commissioner. The Commissioner thereupon shall file in the court the record of the proceedings on which he based his action, as provided in section 2112 of title 28, United States Code.

"(b) The findings of fact by the Commissioner, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive; but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Commissioner to take further evidence, and the Commissioner may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action, and shall file in the court the record of the further proceedings. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive if supported by substantial evidence.

"(c) Upon the filing of such petition, the court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Commissioner or to set it aside, in whole or in part. The judgment of the court shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in title 28, United States Code, section 1254.

"Comprehensive study

"SEC. 212. The Commissioner shall submit to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for transmission to the Congress on or before December 31, 1967, a full report of the operation of this title, including its effectiveness in improving the educational attainment of educationally deprived children, and his recommendations as to whether this title should be extended and, if so, as to what amendments thereto should be made."

SEC. 3. (a) The Act of September 30, 1950, Public Law 81–874, as amended (20 U.S.C. 236–244), is further amended by inserting "TITLE III—GENERAL" above the heading for section 7 and by redesignating sections 7, 8, and 9, and references thereto, as sections 301, 302, and 303, respectively.

(b) Subsections (b) and (c) of such section 302 are amended by striking out "this Act" wherever it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "title I".

SEC. 4. (a) Paragraph (2) of the section of such Act herein redesignated as section 303 is amended to read as follows:

"(2) The term 'child', except as used in section 203, means any child who is within the age limits for which the applicable State provides free public education."

(b) Paragraph (4) of such section 303 is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof ", except that for the purposes of title II such term does not include any education provided beyond grade 12".

(c) (1) Paragraph (8) of such section 303 is amended by inserting "American Samoa," after "the District of Columbia,".

(2) Sections 3(d) and 6(c) are each amended by inserting "American Samoa," after "Guam," each time that it appears.

(d) Such section 303 is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraphs:

"(11) The term 'county' means those divisions of a State utilized by the Secretary of Commerce in compiling and reporting data regarding counties.

"(12) The term 'construction' includes the preparation of drawings and specifications for school facilities; erecting, building, acquiring, altering, remodeling, improving, or extending school facilities; and the inspection and supervision of the construction of school facilities.

"(13) The term 'school facilities' means classrooms and related facilities (including initial equipment) for free public education and interests in land (including site, grading, and improvements) on which such facilities are constructed, except that such term does not include those gymnasiums and similar facilities intended primarily for exhibitions for which admission is to be charged to the general public."

TITLE II—SCHOOL LIBRARY RESOURCES AND INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS

Appropriations authorized

SEC. 201. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated $100,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and such sums for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for each of the three succeeding fiscal years as may be necessary for making grants under this title for the acquisition of school library resources and printed and published instructional materials for the use of children and teachers in public and nonprofit private elementary and secondary schools in the State.

Allotments to States

SEC. 202. (a) From the sums appropriated pursuant to section 201 for any fiscal year the Commissioner shall allot to each State an amount which bears the same ratio to the amount so appropriated as the number of children enrolled in the public and nonprofit private elementary and secondary schools of that State bears to the total number of children enrolled in such schools in all of the States. The number of children so enrolled shall be determined by the Commissioner on the basis of the most recent satisfactory data available to him.

(b) The amount of any State's allotment under subsection (a) for any fiscal year which the Commissioner determines will not be required for such fiscal year shall be available for reallotment from time to time, on such dates during such year as the Commissioner may fix, to other States in proportion to the original allotments to such States under subsection (a) but with such proportionate amount for any of such other States being reduced to the extent it exceeds the sum the Commissioner estimates such State needs and will be able to use for such year; and the total of such reductions shall be similarly reallotted among the States whose proportionate amounts were not so reduced. Any amount reallotted to a State under this subsection during a year from funds appropriated pursuant to section 201 shall be deemed part of its allotment under subsection (a) for such year.

State plans

SEC. 203. (a) Any State which desires to receive grants under this title shall submit to the Commissioner a State plan, in such detail as the Commissioner deems necessary, which—

(1) designates a State agency which shall, either directly or through arrangements with other State or local public agencies, act as the sole agency for administration of the State plan;

(2) sets forth a program under which funds paid to the State from its allotment under section 202 will be expended solely for (A) acquisition of library resources (which for the purposes of this title means books, periodicals, documents, magnetic tapes, phonograph records, and other related library materials) and printed and published instructional materials for the use of children and teachers in public and nonprofit private elementary and secondary schools in the State, and (B) administration of the State plan, including the development and revision of standards relating to library resources and printed and published instructional materials furnished for the use of children and teachers in the public elementary and secondary schools of the State, except that the amount used for administration of the State plan shall not exceed for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, an amount equal to 5 per cent of the amount paid to the State under this title for that year, and for any fiscal year thereafter an amount equal to 3 per cent of the amount paid to the State under this title for that year;

(3) provides assurance that only such library resources and printed and published instructional materials will be furnished to schools under this title as are approved by an appropriate State or local educational authority for use, or are used, in public elementary or secondary schools of the State;

(4) sets forth the criteria to be used in allocating library resources and printed and published instructional materials provided under this title among the schools of the State, which criteria shall—

(A) take into consideration the relative need of the schools of the State for such library resources or instructional materials, or both, and

(B) provide assurance that to the extent consistent with law such library resources and instructional materials will be provided on an equitable basis for the use of children and teachers in nonpublic elementary and secondary schools in the State which comply with the compulsory education laws of the State or are otherwise recognized by it through some procedure customarily used in the State;

(5) sets forth the criteria to be used in selecting the library resources and instructional materials to be provided under this title and for determining the proportions of the State's allotment for each fiscal year which will be expended for library resources and for printed and published instructional materials, respectively, and the method (such as grant, loan, or otherwise) by which such library resources and instructional materials will be made available for the use of children and teachers in the schools of the State;

(6) sets forth policies and procedures designed to assure that Federal funds made available under this title for any fiscal year will be so used as to supplement and, to the extent practical, increase the level of State, local, and nonprofit private school funds that would in the absence of such Federal funds be made available for library resources and instructional materials, and in no case supplant such State, local, and nonprofit private school funds;

(7) sets forth such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of, and accounting for, Federal funds paid to the State (including any such funds paid by the State to other agencies, institutions, or organizations) under this title; and

(8) provides for making such reports in such form and containing such information as the Commissioner may reasonably require to carry out his functions under this title, and for keeping such records and for affording such access thereto as the Commissioner may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports.

(b) The Commissioner shall approve any State plan and any modification thereof which complies with the provisions of subsection (a).

Payments to States

SEC. 204. (a) From the amounts allotted to each State under section 202 the Commissioner shall pay to that State an amount equal to the amount expended by the State in carrying out its State plan. Such payments may be made in installments, and in advance or by way of reimbursement, with necessary adjustments on account of overpayments or underpayments.

(b) In any State which has a State plan approved under section 203(b) and in which no State agency is authorized by law to provide library resources or printed and published instructional materials for the use of children and teachers in any one or more elementary or secondary schools in such State, the Commissioner shall arrange for the provision on an equitable basis of such resources or materials, or both if necessary, for such use and shall pay the cost thereof for any fiscal year ending prior to July 1, 1970, out of that State's allotment. The library resources and printed and published instructional materials made available pursuant to this subsection shall be limited to those which have been approved by an appropriate State or local educational authority for use, or are used, in public elementary or secondary schools of the State.

Administration of State plans

SEC. 205. (a) The Commissioner shall not finally disapprove any State plan submitted under this title, or any modification thereof, without first affording the State agency administering the plan reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing.

(b) Whenever the Commissioner, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to such State agency, finds—

(1) that the State plan has been so changed that it no longer complies with the provisions of section 203(a), or

(2) that in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any such provisions, the Commissioner shall notify such State agency that the State will not be regarded as eligible to participate in the program under this title until he is satisfied that there is no longer any such failure to comply.

Judicial review

SEC. 206. (a) If any State is dissatisfied with the Commissioner's final action with respect to the approval of its State plan submitted under section 203(a) or with his final action under section 205(b), such State may, within 60 days after notice of such action, file with the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which such State is located a petition for review of that action. A copy of the petition shall be forthwith transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Commissioner. The Commissioner thereupon shall file in the court the record of the proceedings and the record on which he based his action, as provided in section 2112 of title 28, United States Code.

(b) The findings of fact by the Commissioner, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive; but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Commissioner to take further evidence, and the Commissioner may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action, and shall certify to the court the record of the further proceedings. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive if supported by substantial evidence.

(c) The court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Commissioner or to set it aside, in whole or in part. The judgment of the court shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in title 28, United States Code, section 1254.

TITLE III—SUPPLEMENTARY EDUCATIONAL CENTERS AND SERVICES

Appropriations authorized

SEC. 301. For the purpose of enabling the Commissioner, through grants for supplementary educational centers and services, to stimulate and assist in the provision of vitally needed educational services not available in sufficient quantity or quality in elementary and secondary schools and in the development and establishment of exemplary elementary and secondary school educational programs to serve as models for regular school programs, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated $100,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and such sums for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and each of the three succeeding fiscal years as may be necessary for such purposes.

Apportionment among States

SEC. 302. (a) From the sums appropriated pursuant to section 301 for each fiscal year, the Commissioner shall apportion $50,000 each to American Samoa, Guam, and the Virgin Islands and $200,000 to each of the other States. The Commissioner shall apportion the remainder of such sums among the States as follows:

(1) he shall apportion to each State an amount which bears the same ratio to 50 per centum of such remainder as the number of children aged five to seventeen, inclusive, in the State bears to the number of such children in all the States, and

(2) he shall apportion to each State an amount which bears the same ratio to 50 per centum of such remainder as the population of the State bears to the population of all the States.

(b) The number of children aged five to seventeen, inclusive, and the total population of a State and of all the States shall be determined by the Commissioner on the basis of the most recent satisfactory data available to him.

(c) The amount apportioned under this section to any State for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, shall be available for payments to applicants with approved applications in that State during that year and the next fiscal year.

(d) The amount apportioned to any State under subsection (a) for any fiscal year which the Commissioner determines will not be required for the period for which that amount is available shall be available for reapportionment from time to time, on such dates during that period as the Commissioner may fix, among other States in proportion to the amounts originally apportioned among those States under subsection (a) for that year, but with the proportionate amount for any of the other States being reduced to the extent it exceeds the sum the Commissioner estimates that State needs and will be able to use for that period; and the total of these reductions shall be similarly reapportioned among the States whose proportionate amounts were not so reduced. Any amount reapportioned to a State under this subsection from funds appropriated pursuant to section 301 for any fiscal year shall be deemed to be a part of the amount apportioned to it under subsection (a) for that year.

Uses of Federal funds

SEC. 303. Grants under this title may be used, in accordance with applications approved under section 304(b), for—

(a) planning for and taking other steps leading to the development of programs designed to provide supplementary educational activities and services described in paragraph (b), including pilot projects designed to test the effectiveness of plans so developed; and

(b) the establishment, maintenance, and operation of programs, including the lease or construction of necessary facilities and the acquisition of necessary equipment, designed to enrich the programs of local elementary and secondary schools and to offer a diverse range of educational experience to children of varying talents and needs by providing supplementary educational services and activities such as—

(1) comprehensive guidance and counseling, remedial instruction, and school health, psychological, and social work services designed to enable and encourage persons to enter, remain in, or reenter educational programs, including the provision of special educational programs and study areas during periods when schools are not regularly in session;

(2) comprehensive academic services and, where appropriate, vocational guidance and counseling, for continuing adult education;

(3) developing and conducting exemplary educational programs, including dual-enrollment programs, for the purpose of stimulating the adoption of improved or new educational programs in the schools of the State;

(4) specialized instruction and equipment for students interested in studying advanced scientific subjects, foreign languages, and other academic subjects which are not taught in the local schools or which can be provided more effectively on a centralized basis, or for persons who are handicapped or of preschool age;

(5) making available modern educational equipment and specially qualified personnel, including artists and musicians, on a temporary or other basis to public and other nonprofit schools, organizations, and institutions;

(6) developing, producing and transmitting radio and television programs for classroom and other educational use;

(7) providing special educational and related services for persons who are in or from rural areas or who are or have been otherwise isolated from normal educational opportunities, including, where appropriate, the provision of mobile educational services, special home study courses, radio, television, and related forms of instruction, and visiting teachers' programs; and

(8) other specially designed educational programs which meet the purpose of this title.

SEC. 304. (a) A grant under this title may be made to a local educational agency or other duly constituted public or nonprofit private agency or organization which has authority to establish, maintain, and coordinate a program of supplementary educational services, but only if there is satisfactory assurance that in the conduct of such program there will be representation of, or participation by, a local educational agency (if not itself the grantee) and one or more of the following: institutions of higher education, the appropriate State educational agency or agencies, and other public or nonprofit private agencies, organizations or institutions. Such grants may be made only upon application to the Commissioner at such time or times, in such manner, and containing or accompanied by such information as the Commissioner deems necessary. Such applications shall—

(1) provide that the activities and services for which assistance under this title is sought will be administered by or under the supervision of the supplementary educational services agency or organization;

(2) set forth a program for carrying out the purposes set forth in paragraph (a) or paragraph (b) of section 303 and provide for such methods of administration as are necessary for the proper and efficient operation of the program;

(3) set forth policies and procedures which assure that Federal funds made available under this title for any fiscal year will be so used as to supplement and, to the extent practical, increase the level of funds that would, in the absence of such Federal funds, be made available by the applicant for the purposes described in paragraphs (a) and (b) of section 303, and in no case supplant such funds;

(4) in the case of an application for assistance under this title which includes a project for construction of necessary facilities, (A) provide satisfactory assurance (except in the case of minor remodeling or alteration) that upon completion of the construction title to the facility will be in a State or local educational agency and (B) provide assurance that the requirements of section 308 will be complied with on all construction projects assisted under this title;

(5) provide for such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of and accounting for Federal funds paid to the applicant under this title; and

(6) provide for making an annual report and such other reports, in such form and containing such information, as the Commissioner may reasonably require to carry out his functions under this title and to determine the extent to which funds provided under this title have been effective in improving the educational opportunities of persons in the area served, and for keeping such records and for affording such access thereto as the Commissioner may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports.

(b) Applications for grants under this title may be approved by the Commissioner only if—

(1) the application meets the requirements set forth in subsection (a);

(2) the program set forth in the application is consistent with criteria established by the Commissioner for the purpose of achieving an equitable distribution of assistance under this title within each State, which criteria shall be developed by him on the basis of a consideration of (A) the size and population of the State, (B) the geographic distribution of the population within the State, (C) the relative need of persons in different geographic areas and in different population groups within the State for the kinds of services and activities described in paragraph (b) of section 303, including their financial ability to provide those services and activities, and (D) the relative ability of particular local educational agencies, institutions of higher education, and other public or nonprofit agencies and institutions within the State to provide those services and activities;

(3) in the case of an application for assistance for carrying out purposes described in paragraph (b) of section 303, the Commissioner determines (A) that the program will utilize the best available talents and resources and will substantially increase the educational opportunities in the area to be served by the applicant, and (B) that each person in that area will have an opportunity, to the extent consistent with law and with his educational needs, to receive the services and participate in the activities carried out under this title; and

(4) the application has been submitted for review and recommendations to the State educational agency.

(c) Amendments of applications shall, except as the Commissioner may otherwise provide by or pursuant to regulations, be subject to approval in the same manner as original applications.

Payments

SEC. 305. (a) From the amounts apportioned to each State under section 302 the Commissioner shall pay to each applicant in that State which has an application approved under this title an amount equal to the total sums expended by the applicant under the application for the purposes set forth therein.

(b) Payments under this title may be made in installments and in advance or by way of reimbursement, with necessary adjustments on account of overpayments or underpayments.

Advisory committee

SEC. 306. (a) The Commissioner shall establish in the Office of Education an Advisory Committee on Supplementary Educational Centers and Services, consisting of the Commissioner, who shall be Chairman, and eight members appointed, without regard to the civil service laws, by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary.

(b) The Advisory Committee shall advise the Commissioner (1) on the action to be taken with regard to each application for a grant under this title, and (2) in the preparation of general regulations and with respect to policy matters arising in the administration of this title, including the development of criteria for approval of applications thereunder. The Commissioner may appoint such special advisory and technical experts and consultants as may be useful in carrying out the functions of the Advisory Committee.

(c) Members of the Advisory Committee shall, while serving on the business of the Advisory Committee, be entitled to receive compensation at rates fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $100 per day, including travel time; and, while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

Recovery of payments

SEC. 307. If, within twenty years after completion of any construction (except minor remodeling or alteration) for which Federal funds have been paid under this title—

(a) the owner of the facility shall cease to be a State or local educational agency, or

(b) the facility shall cease to be used for the educational and related purposes for which it was constructed, unless the Commissioner determines in accordance with regulations that there is good cause for releasing the applicant or other owner from the obligations to do so,

the United States shall be entitled to recover from the applicant or other owner of the facility an amount which bears to the then value of the facility (or so much thereof as constituted an approved project or projects) the same ratio as the amount of such Federal funds bore to the cost of the facility financed with the aid of such funds. Such value shall be determined by agreement of the parties or by action brought in the United States district court for the district in which the facility is situated.

Labor standards

SEC. 308. All laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors on all construction projects assisted under this title shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276a–276a–5). The Secretary of Labor shall have with respect to the labor standards specified in this section the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered

14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176; 5 U.S.C. 133z–15) and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276c).

TITLE IV—EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND TRAINING

SEC. 401. The second section of the Act of July 26, 1954, 68 Stat. 533 (20 U.S.C. 331), entitled "An Act to authorize cooperative research in education", is redesignated section 3 and the material which precedes it is amended to read as follows:

"Purpose

"SECTION 1. The purpose of this Act is to enable the Office of Education more effectively to accomplish the purposes and to perform the duties for which it was originally established.

"Educational research and research training

"SEC. 2. (a)(1) The Commissioner of Education (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the 'Commissioner') is authorized to make grants to universities and colleges and other public or private agencies, institutions, and organizations and to individuals, for research, surveys, and demonstrations in the field of education, and for the dissemination of information derived from educational research (whether or not financed under this Act) and, without regard to sections 3648 and 3709 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 529; 41 U.S.C. 5) to provide by contracts or jointly financed cooperative agreements with them for the conduct of such activities; except that no such grant may be made to a private agency, organization, institution, other than a nonprofit one.

"(2) No grant shall be made or contract or jointly financed cooperative agreement entered into under this subsection until the Commissioner has obtained the advice and recommendations of specialists who are competent to evaluate the proposals as to the soundness of their design, the possibilities of securing productive results, the adequacy of resources to conduct the proposed research, surveys, or demonstrations, and their relationship to other similar educational research already completed or in progress.

"(b) The Commissioner is authorized to make grants to public and other nonprofit universities and colleges and to other public or nonprofit agencies, institutions, and organizations to assist them in providing training in research in the field of education, including the development and strengthening of training staff and curricular capability for such training. Grants under this subsection may, when so authorized by the Commissioner, also be used by such grantees (1) in establishing and maintaining research traineeships, internships, personnel exchanges, and pre- and post-doctoral fellowships, and for stipends and allowances (including traveling and subsistence expenses) for fellows and others undergoing training and their dependents not in excess of such maximum amounts as may be prescribed by the Commissioner, or (2) where the grantee is a State educational agency, in providing for such traineeships, internships, personnel exchanges, and fellowships either directly or through arrangements with public or other nonprofit institutions or organizations.

"(c) In addition to the authority granted by section 603(b) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, funds available to the Commissioner for grants or contracts or jointly financed cooperative agreements under this section shall, with the approval of the Secretary, be available for transfer to any other Federal agency for use (in accordance with an interagency agreement) by such department or agency (alone or in combination with funds of that agency) for purposes for which such transferred funds could be otherwise expended by the Commissioner under the foregoing provisions of this section, and the Commissioner is likewise authorized to accept and expend funds of any other Federal agency for use under this section.

"(d) The Commissioner shall transmit to the Congress annually a report concerning the research, surveys, demonstrations, and the training in research, initiated under this Act, the recommendations made by research specialists pursuant to subsection (a)(2), and any action taken with respect to such recommendations."

SEC. 402. The section of such Act redesignated section 3 is amended by striking out "this Act" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 2".

SEC. 403. Such Act is further amended by inserting the following new sections at the end of such Act:

"Construction of regional facilities for research and related purposes

"SEC. 4. (a) There is authorized to be appropriated over a period of five fiscal years beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, $100,000,000 in the aggregate, to enable the Commissioner to carry out the purposes of this section. Sums so appropriated shall remain available until expended for payments with respect to projects for which applications have been filed under this part before July 1, 1970, and approved by the Commissioner before July 1, 1971.

"(b) When the Commissioner finds that in any case the purposes of this Act can best be achieved through the construction of a facility for research, or for research and related purposes (as defined in this section), and that such facility would be of particular value to the Nation or a region thereof as a national or regional resource for research or related purposes, he may make a grant for part or all of the cost of constructing such facility to a university, college, or other appropriate public or nonprofit private agency or institution competent to engage in the types of activity for which the facility is to be constructed, or to a combination of such agencies or institutions, or may construct or make arrangements for constructing such facility through contracts for paying part or all of the cost of construction or otherwise. The Commissioner may, where he deems such action appropriate, make arrangements, by contract or otherwise, for the operation of such facilities or may make contributions toward the cost of such operation of facilities of this nature whether or not constructed pursuant to, or with the aid provided under, this section. Title to any facility constructed under this section, if vested in the United States, may be transferred by the Commissioner on behalf of the United States to any such college or university or other public or nonprofit private agency or institution, but such transfer shall be made subject to the condition that the facility will be operated for the purposes for which it was constructed and to such other conditions as the Commissioner deems necessary to carry out the objectives of this title and to protect the interests of the United States.

"(c) All laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors in the performance of work on construction of any project under this section shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276a–276a–5). The Secretary of Labor shall have with respect to the labor standards specified in this clause, the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Number 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176; 5 U.S.C. 133z–15), and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276c).

"(d) Payments under this section shall be made in advance or by way of reimbursement, in such installments consistent with construction progress, and on such conditions as the Commissioner may determine.

"(e) As used in this section, the term research and related purposes means research, research training, surveys, or demonstrations in the field of education, or the dissemination of information derived therefrom, or all of such activities, including (but without limitation) experimental schools.

"Definitions

"SEC. 5. As used in this Act—

"(1) The term 'State' includes, in addition to the several States of the Union, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands.

"(2) The term 'State educational agency' means the State board of education or other agency or officer primarily responsible for the State supervision of public elementary and secondary schools, or, if there is no such officer or agency, an officer or agency designated by the Governor or by State law.

"(3) The term 'nonprofit' as applied to any agency, organization, or institution means an agency, organization, or institution owned and operated by one or more nonprofit corporations or associations no part of the net earnings of which inures, or may lawfully inure, to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual.

"(4) The terms 'construction' and 'cost of construction' include (A) the construction of new buildings and the expansion, remodeling, and alteration of existing buildings, including architects' fees, but not including the cost of acquisition of land or off-site improvements, and (B) equipping new buildings and existing buildings, whether or not expanded, remodeled, or altered.

"Short Title

"Sec. 6. This act may be cited as the 'Cooperative Research Act'."

TITLE V—GRANTS TO STRENGTHEN STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Appropriations authorized

SEC. 501. For the purpose of enabling the Commissioner to make grants to stimulate and assist States in strengthening the leadership resources of their State educational agencies, and to assist those agencies in the establishment and improvement of programs to identify and meet the educational needs of States, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated $10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and such sums for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and each of the three succeeding fiscal years as may be necessary for such purposes.

Apportionment among States

SEC. 502. (a)(1) From 85 per centum of the sums appropriated pursuant to section 501 for each fiscal year, the Commissioner shall apportion $50,000 each to Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands and $100,000 to each of the other States, and shall apportion to each State such part of the remainder of such 85 per centum of such sums as the number of public school pupils in the State bears to the number of public school pupils in all the States, on the basis of the most recent satisfactory data available to him.

(2) Fifteen per centum of the sums appropriated pursuant to section 501 shall be reserved by the Commissioner for grants for special projects pursuant to section 505.

(b)(1) The amount apportioned to any State under paragraph (1) of subsection (a) for any fiscal year which the Commissioner determines will not be required for that year shall be available for reapportionment from time to time, on such dates during that year as the Commissioner may fix, to other States in proportion to the amounts originally apportioned among those States under subsection (a)(1) for that year, but with the proportionate amount for any of the other States being reduced to the extent it exceeds the sum the Commissioner estimates that State needs and will be able to use for that year; and the total of these reductions shall be similarly reapportioned among the States whose proportionate amounts were not so reduced. Any amount reapportioned to a State under this subsection from funds appropriated pursuant to section 401 for any fiscal year shall be deemed part of the amount apportioned to it under subsection (a)(1) for that year.

(2) In accordance with regulations of the Commissioner any State may file with him a request that a specified portion of the amount apportioned to it under subsection (a)(1) be added to the amount apportioned to another State under that subsection for the purpose of meeting a portion of the Federal share (as defined in section 503(b)) of the cost of carrying out one or more programs or activities under an approved application of that other State. If the Commissioner finds that the programs or activities with respect to which the request is made would meet needs of the State making the request and that use of the specified portion of the amount apportioned to that State, as requested by it, would assist in carrying out the purposes of this title, that portion shall be added to the amount apportioned to the other State under subsection (a)(1) to be used for the purpose referred to above. The Federal share of the total funds expended for such programs or activities shall be adjusted on the basis of the proportion of such total funds so expended by each participating State or from the amounts originally apportioned to each such State.

Grants from apportioned funds

SEC. 503. (a) From the amount apportioned to any State for any fiscal year under section 502 the Commissioner may, upon approval of an application or applications therefor submitted to him by such State through the State educational agency, make a grant or grants to such agency equal to the Federal share of expenditures incurred by such agency for the planning of, and for programs for, the development, improvement, or expansion of activities promoting the purposes set forth in section 501 and more particularly described in such application and for which such application is approved, such as—

(1) educational planning on a statewide basis, including the identification of educational problems, issues, and needs in the State and the evaluation on a periodic or continuing basis of education programs in the State;

(2) providing support or services for the comprehensive and compatible recording, collecting, processing, analyzing, interpreting, storing, retrieving, and reporting of State and local educational data, including the use of automated data systems;

(3) dissemination or support for the dissemination of information relating to the condition, progress, and needs of education in the State;

(4) programs for conducting, sponsoring, or cooperating in educational research programs and projects such as (A) establishing and maintaining curriculum research and innovation centers to assist in locating and evaluating curriculum research findings, (B) discovering and testing new educational ideas and more effective educational practices, and putting into use those which show promise of success, and (C) studying ways to improve the legal and organizational structure for education and the management and administration of education in the State;

(5) publication and distribution, or support for the publication and distribution, of curricular materials collected and developed at curriculum research centers and elsewhere;

(6) programs to improve the quality of teacher preparation, including student-teaching arrangements, in cooperation with institutions of higher education and local educational agencies.

(7) studies or support for studies concerning the financing of public education in the State;

(8) support for statewide programs designed to measure the educational achievement of pupils;

(9) training and otherwise developing the competency of individuals who serve State or local educational agencies and provide leadership, administrative, or specialist services throughout the State, or throughout the area served by a local educational agency, through the initiation, improvement, and expansion of activities such as (A) sabbatical leave programs, (B) fellowships and traineeships (including educational expenses and the cost of travel) for State educational agency personnel to pursue graduate studies, and (C) conducting institutes, workshops, and conferences (including related costs of operation and payment of the expenses of participants); and

(10) providing local educational agencies and the schools of those agencies with consultative and technical assistance and related services relating to academic subjects and to particular aspects of education such as the education of the handicapped, school building design and utilization, school social work, transportation, and educational administrative procedures.

(b) For the purposes of this section the "Federal share" for any State shall be 100 per centum less the State percentage, except that (1) the Federal share shall in no case be more than 66 per centum or less than 50 per centum, and (2) the Federal share for Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands shall be 66 per centum. The "State percentage" for any State shall be that percentage which bears the same ratio to 50 per centum as the per capita income of that State bears to the per capita income of all the States (excluding Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands).

Approval of applications for grants from apportioned funds

SEC. 504. An application for a grant under section 503 may be approved by the Commissioner only upon his determination that—

(a) each of the proposed projects, programs, and activities for which it is approved meets the requirements of section 503 (a) and will make a significant contribution to strengthening the leadership resources of the applicant or its ability to participate effectively in meeting the educational needs of the State;

(b) the application contains or is supported by adequate assurance that Federal funds made available under the approved application will be so used as to supplement, and to the extent practical, increase the amounts of State funds that would in the absence of such Federal funds be made available for projects and activities which meet the requirements of section 503(a);

(c) the application sets forth such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of, and accounting for, Federal funds paid to the State (including any such funds paid by the State to agencies, institutions, or organizations) under this title; and

(d) the application provides for making such reports, in such form and containing such information, as the Commissioner may require to carry out his functions under this title, and for keeping such records and for affording such access thereto as the Commissioner may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports.

Special project grants

SEC. 505. Fifteen per centum of the sums appropriated pursuant to section 501 for each fiscal year shall be used by the Commissioner to make grants to State educational agencies to pay part of the cost of experimental projects for developing State leadership or for the establishment of special services which, in the judgment of the Commissioner, hold promise of making a substantial contribution to the solution of problems common to the State educational agencies of all or several States.

Payments

SEC. 506. Payments pursuant to grants under this title may be made in installments, and in advance or by way of reimbursement, with necessary adjustments on account of overpayments or underpayments, as the Commissioner may determine.

Interchange of personnel with States

SEC. 507. (a) For the purposes of this section, the term "State" means a State or any agency of a State engaged in activities in the field of education, but it does not include a local educational agency; and the term "Office" means the Office of Education.

(b) The Commissioner is authorized, through agreements or otherwise, to arrange for assignment of officers and employees of States to the Office and assignment of officers and employees in the Office to States, for work which the Commissioner determines will aid the Office in more effective discharge of its responsibilities as authorized by law, including cooperation with States and the provision of technical or other assistance. The period of assignment of any officer or employee under such an arrangement shall not exceed two years.

(c)(1) Officers and employees in the Office assigned to any State pursuant to this section shall be considered, during such assignment, to be (A) on detail to a regular work assignment in the Office, or (B) on leave without pay from their positions in the Office.

(2) Persons considered to be so detailed shall remain as officers or employees, as the case may be, in the Office for all purposes, except that the supervision of their duties during the period of detail may be governed by agreement between the Office and the State involved.

(3) In the case of persons so assigned and on leave without pay—

(A) if the rate of compensation (including allowances) for their employment by the State is less than the rate of compensation (including allowances) they would be receiving had they continued in their regular assignment in the Office, they may receive supplemental salary payments from the Office in the amount considered by the Commissioner to be justified, but not at a rate in excess of the difference between the State rate and the Office rate; and

(B) they may be granted annual leave and sick leave to the extent authorized by law, but only in circumstances considered by the Commissioner to justify approval of such leave.

Such officers and employees on leave without pay shall, notwithstanding any other provision of law, be entitled—

(C) to continuation of their insurance under the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, and coverage under the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959, so long as the Office continues to collect the employee's contribution from the officer or employee involved and to transmit for timely deposit into the funds created under such Acts the amount of the employee's contributions and the Government's contribution from appropriations of the Office; and

(D) to credit the period of their assignment under the arrangement under this section toward periodic or longevity step increases and, upon payment into the civil service retirement and disability fund of the percentage of their State salary, and of their supplemental salary payments, if any, which would have been deducted from a like Federal salary for the period of such assignment and payment by the Commissioner into such fund of the amount which would have been payable by him during the period of such assignment with respect to a like Federal salary, to treat (notwithstanding the provisions of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1959, under the head "Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund") their service during such period as service within the meaning of the Civil Service Retirement Act;

except that no officer or employee or his beneficiary may receive any benefits under the Civil Service Retirement Act, the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959, or the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, based on service during an assignment hereunder for which the officer or employee or (if he dies without making such election) his beneficiary elects to receive benefits, under any State retirement or insurance law or program, which the Civil Service Commission determines to be similar. The Office shall deposit currently in the funds created under the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, the Federal Employees' Health Benefits Act of 1959, and the civil service retirement and disability fund, respectively, the amount of the Government's contribution under these Acts on account of service with respect to which employee contributions are collected as provided in subparagraph (C) and the amount of the Government's contribution under the Civil Service Retirement Act on account of service with respect to which payments (of the amount which would have been deducted under that Act) referred to in subparagraph (D) are made to such civil service retirement and disability fund.

(4) Any such officer or employee on leave without pay who suffers disability or death as a result of personal injury sustained while in the performance of his duty during an assignment hereunder, shall be treated, for the purposes of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, as thought he were an employee, as defined in such Act, who had sustained such injury in the performance of duty. When such person (or his dependents, in case of death) entitled by reason of injury or death to benefits under that Act is also entitled to benefits from a State for the same injury or death, he (or his dependents in case of death) shall elect which benefits he will receive. Such election shall be made within one year after the injury or death, or such further time as the Secretary of Labor may for good cause allow, and when made shall be irrevocable unless otherwise provided by law.

(d) Assignment of any officer or employee in the Office to a State under this section may be made with or without reimbursement by the State for the compensation (or supplementary compensation), travel and transportation expenses (to or from the place of assignment), and allowances, or any part thereof, of such officer or employee during the period of assignment, and any such reimbursement shall be credited to the appropriation utilized for paying such compensation, travel or transportation expenses, or allowances.

(e) Appropriations to the Office shall be available, in accordance with the standardized Government travel regulations, for the expenses of travel of officers and employees assigned to States under an arrangement under this section on either a detail or leave-without-pay basis and, in accordance with applicable law, orders, and regulations, for expenses of transportation of their immediate families and expenses of transportation of their household goods and personal effects, in connection with the travel of such officers and employees to the location of their posts of assignment and their return to their official stations.

(f) Officers and employees of States who are assigned to the Office under an arrangement under this section may (1) be given appointments in the Office covering the periods of such assignments, or (2) be considered to be on detail to the Office. Appointments of persons so assigned may be made without regard to the civil service laws. Persons so appointed in the Office shall be paid at rates of compensation determined in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949, and shall not be considered to be officers or employees of the Office for the purposes of (1) the Civil Service Retirement Act, (2) the Federal Employees Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, or (3) unless their appointments result in the loss of coverage in a group health benefits plan whose premium has been paid in whole or in part by a State contribution, the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959. State officers and employees who are assigned to the Office without appointment shall not be considered to be officers or employees of the Office, except as provided in subsection (g), nor shall they be paid a salary or wage by the Office during the period of their assignment. The supervision of the duties of such persons during the assignment may be governed by agreement between the Commissioner and the State involved.

(g)(1) Any State officer or employee who is assigned to the Office without appointment shall nevertheless be subject to the provisions of sections 203, 205, 207, 208, and 209 of title 18 of the United States Code.

(2) Any State officer or employee who is given an appointment while assigned to the Office, or who is assigned to the Office without appointment, under an arrangement under this section, and who suffers disability or death as a result of personal injury sustained while in the performance of his duty during such assignment shall be treated, for the purpose of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, as though he were an employee, as defined in such Act, who had sustained such injury in the performance of duty. When such person (or his dependents, in case of death) entitled by reason of injury or death to benefits under that Act is also entitled to benefits from a State for the same injury or death, he (or his dependents, in case of death) shall elect which benefits he will receive. Such election shall be made within one year after the injury or death, or such further time as the Secretary of Labor may for good cause allow, and when made shall be irrevocable unless otherwise provided by law.

(h) The appropriations to the Office shall be available, in accordance with the standardized Government travel regulations, during the period of assignment and in the case of travel to and from their places of assignment or appointment, for the payment of expenses of travel of persons assigned to, or given appointments by, the Office under an arrangement under this section.

(i) All arrangements under this section for assignment of officers or employees in the Office to States or for assignments of officers or employees of States to the Office shall be made in accordance with regulations of the Commissioner.

Administration of State plans

SEC. 508. (a) The Commissioner shall not finally disapprove any State plan submitted under section 504, or any modification thereof, without first affording the State educational agency submitting the plan reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing.

(b) Whenever the Commissioner, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State educational agency administering a State plan approved under this title, finds—

(1) that the State plan has been so changed that it no longer complies with the provisions of section 504(a), or

(2) that in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any such provision,

the Commissioner shall notify such State educational agency that the State will not be regarded as eligible to participate in the program under this title until he is satisfied that there is no longer any such failure to comply.

Judicial review

SEC. 509. (a) If any State is dissatisfied with the Commissioner's final action with respect to the approval of its State plan submitted under section 404(a) or with his final action under section 407(b), such State may appeal to the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which such State is located. The summons and notice of appeal may be served at any place in the United States. The Commissioner shall forthwith certify and file in the court the transcript of the proceedings and the record on which he based his action.

(b) The findings of fact by the Commissioner, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive; but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Commissioner to take further evidence, and the Commissioner may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action, and shall certify to the court the transcript and record of the further proceedings. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive if supported by substantial evidence.

(c) The court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Commissioner or to set it aside, in whole or in part. The judgment of the court shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in title 28, United States Code, section 1254.

Periodic review of program and laws

SEC. 510. (a) The Secretary shall, during 1968, appoint an Advisory Council on State Departments of Education for the purpose of reviewing the administration of the programs for which funds are appropriated pursuant to this title and making recommendations for improvement of such administration, and reviewing the status of and making recommendations with respect to such programs and this title and with respect to other Acts under which funds are appropriated to assist State educational agencies to administer Federal programs relating to education.

(b) The Council shall be appointed by the Secretary without regard to the civil service laws and shall consist of twelve persons who shall, to the extent possible, include persons familiar with the educational needs of the Nation, persons familiar with the administration of State and local educational programs, and persons representative of the general public.

(c) The Secretary is authorized to engage such technical assistance as may be required to carry out the functions of the Council, and the Secretary shall, in addition, make available to the Council such secretarial, clerical, and other assistance and such pertinent data prepared by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare as it may require to carry out such functions.

(d) The Council shall make a report of its findings and recommendations (including recommendations for changes in the provisions of this title and other education Acts) to the Secretary, such report to be submitted not later than March 31, 1969, after which date such Council shall cease to exist. The Secretary shall transmit such report to the President and the Congress together with his comments and recommendations.

(e) The Secretary shall also from time to time thereafter (but at intervals of not more than five years) appoint an Advisory Council on State Departments of Education, with the same functions and constituted in the same manner as prescribed for the Advisory Council in the preceding subsections of this section. Each Council so appointed shall report its findings and recommendations, as prescribed in subsection (d), not later than March 31 of the second year after the year in which it is appointed, after which date such Council shall cease to exist.

(f) Members of the Council who are not regular full-time employees of the United States shall, while serving on business of the Council, be entitled to receive compensation at rates fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $100 per day, including travel time; and while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in Government service employed intermittently.

TITLE VI—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Definitions

SEC. 601. As used in titles II, III, and V of this Act—

(a) The term "Commissioner" means the Commissioner of Education.

(b) The term "construction" means (1) erection of new or expansion of existing structures, and the acquisition and installation of equipment therefor; or (2) acquisition of existing structures not owned by any agency or institution making application for assistance under this Act; or (3) remodeling or alteration (including the acquisition, installation, modernization, or replacement of equipment) of existing structures; or (4) a combination of any two or more of the foregoing.

(c) The term "elementary school" means a school which provides elementary education, as determined under State law.

(d) The term "equipment" includes, in addition to machinery, utilities, and built-in equipment and any necessary enclosures or structures to house them, all other items necessary for the functioning of a particular facility as a facility for the provision of educational services, including items such as necessary furniture, printed and published instructional materials, and books, periodicals, documents, magnetic tapes, phonograph records, and other related materials.

(e) The term "institution of higher education" means an educational institution in any State which—

(1) admits as regular students only individuals having a certificate of graduation from a high school, or the recognized equivalent of such a certificate;

(2) is legally authorized within such State to provide a program of education beyond high school;

(3) provides an educational program for which it awards a bachelor's degree, or provides not less than a two-year program which is acceptable for full credit toward such a degree, or offers a two-year program in engineering, mathematics, or the physical or biological sciences which is designed to prepare the student to work as a technician and at a semiprofessional level in engineering, scientific, or other technological fields which require the understanding and application of basic engineering, scientific, or mathematical principles or knowledge;

(4) is a public or other nonprofit institution; and

(5) is accredited by a nationally recognized accrediting agency or association listed by the Commissioner pursuant to this paragraph or, if not so accredited, is an institution whose credits are accepted, on transfer, by not less than three institutions which are so accredited, for credit on the same basis as if transferred from an institution so accredited: *Provided, however,* That in the case of an institution offering a two-year program in engineering, mathematics, or the physical or biological sciences which is designed to prepare the student to work as a technician and at a semiprofessional level in engineering, scientific, or technological fields which require the understanding and application of basic engineering, scientific, or mathematical principles or knowledge, if the Commissioner determines that there is no nationally recognized accrediting agency or association qualified to accredit such institutions, he shall appoint an advisory committee, composed of persons specifically qualified to evaluate training provided by such institutions, which shall prescribe the standards of content, scope, and quality which must be met in order to qualify such institutions to participate under this Act and shall also determine whether particular institutions meet such standards. For the purposes of this paragraph the Commissioner shall publish a list of nationally recognized accrediting agencies or associations which he determines to be reliable authority as to the quality of education or training offered.

(f) The term "local educational agency" means a board of education or other legally constituted local school authority having administrative control and direction of public elementary or secondary schools in a city, county, township, school district, or political subdivision in a State, or any other public institution or agency having administrative control and direction of a public elementary or secondary school.

(g) The term "nonprofit" as applied to a school, agency, organization, or institution means a school, agency, organization, or institution owned and operated by one or more nonprofit corporations or associations no part of the net earnings of which inures, or may lawfully inure, to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual.

(h) The term "secondary school" means a school which provides secondary education, as determined under State law except that it does not include any education provided beyond grade 12.

(i) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

(j) The term "State" includes, in addition to the several States of the Union, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands.

(k) The term "State educational agency" means the State board of education or other agency or officer primarily responsible for the State supervision of public elementary and secondary schools, or, if there is no such officer or agency, an officer or agency designated by the Governor or by State law.

Advisory councils

SEC. 602. (a) The Commissioner may, without regard to the civil service laws, and subject to the Secretary's approval in such cases as the Secretary may prescribe, from time to time appoint an advisory council or councils to advise and consult with the Commissioner with respect to carrying out his functions under this or any other law.

(b) Members of such an advisory council who are not regular full-time employees of the United States shall, while attending meetings or conferences of such council or otherwise engaged on business of such council, be entitled to receive compensation at a rate fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $100 per diem, including travel time, and, while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

Federal Administration

SEC. 603. (a) The Commissioner may delegate any of his functions under this Act or any Act amended by this Act, except the making of regulations, to any officer or employee of the Office of Education.

(b) In administering the provisions of this Act or any Act amended by this Act, the Commissioner is authorized to utilize the services and facilities of any agency of the Federal Government and of any other public or nonprofit agency or institution in accordance with appropriate agreements, and to pay for such services either in advance or by way of reimbursement, as may be agreed upon.

Federal control of education prohibited

SEC. 604. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the curriculum, program of instruction, administration, or personnel of any educational institution or school system, or over the selection of library resources or printed or published instructional materials by any educational institution or school system.

Limitation on payments under this title

SEC. 605. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to authorize the making of any payment under this Act, or under any Act amended by this Act, for religious worship or instruction.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, OFFICE OF EDUCATION,
Washington, D.C., January 12, 1965.

FACT SHEETS: ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965

	Authorization for fiscal 1966
Title I: Education of Children of Low Income Families	$1,000,000,000
Title II: School Library Resources and Instructional Materials	100,000,000
Title III: Supplementary Educational Centers and Services	100,000,000
Title IV: Educational Research and Training; Cooperative Research Act	45,000,000
Title V: State Departments of Education	10,000,000
Total	1,255,000,000

FACT SHEET 1: ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965

TITLE I: IMPROVEMENT OF THE EDUCATION OF CHILDREN OF LOW INCOME FAMILIES

Background

"Every child must have the best education our Nation can provide," the President said in his 1965 state of the Union address.

Poverty paralyzes efforts to bring proper educational services and facilities within the reach of all the Nation's children. Left unchecked, poverty's adverse effects become chronic and contagious, often leading to delinquency and crime.

Two-thirds of the families whose head has fewer than 9 years of education are in poverty. Of those youths aged 18 to 24 with an eighth grade education or less, 20 percent are unemployed. In the Nation as a whole in 1960, there were 2.3 million school-age children living in families earning less than $1,000 annually; 5 million children living in families earing less than $2,000 a year.

In the slums, the schools are overcrowded; many are obsolete and unsafe. At least 30 percent of our school children go to school in classes averaging 30 or more pupils. In remote rural areas, schools often offer inadequate programs in inadequate facilities.

Of the 1.7 million classrooms now operating, nearly one-third were opened prior to 1930 and have since fallen far below acceptable standards. In some of our city slums, about half of all classrooms are at least 50 years old; many are still not fireproof.

Despite a massive effort on the part of our major cities, they generally spend only two-thirds as much per pupil as their suburbs. Up to one-third of the children in these cities are culturally and economically deprived, and from their number stem about 80 percent of all dropouts.

Public schools would be eligible for payments for programs designed to meet the special educational needs of children in school attendance areas having high concentrations of disadvantaged children. In these areas, the school district would design special educational services and arrangements, including those in which all children in need of such services could participate without full-time public school attendance. These special programs might include dual enrollment (shared services) arrangements, educational radio and television, mobile educational services, remedial education, preschool or afterschool programs, additional instructional personnel, equipment and facilities, and others judged necessary for improving the education of disadvantaged children.

Local educational agencies in a given county would be eligible for payments equal to one-half the average per pupil expenditure in that State multiplied by the number of children in that county (aged 5–17) in families having an annual income of less than $2,000.

The disadvantaged child is a year behind in mastering schoolwork by the time he reaches the third grade and up to 3 years behind if he reaches the eighth. Research shows that culturally disadvantaged children have only one chance in 1,000 to acquire effective learning habits without the benefit of special preschool orientation. This points to the need for services and facilities in behalf of deprived youngsters.

Over the 1963–73 period, public elementary school enrollments are expected to climb from 29.4 million to 32.1 million, an increase of 9 percent. Meanwhile, in nonpublic elementary schools, the estimated rise is from 5.4 to 5.9 million, also a 9-percent increase. Public secondary school enrollments will go from 10.9 million to an anticipated 14.2 million, up 30 percent; and the nonpublic secondary school enrollments are expected to rise by 38 percent, from 1.3 to 1.8 million.

Since 1946, State and local bonded indebtedness has risen approximately 450 percent, while Federal debt has increased approximately 14 percent. During the same period, State and local taxes have increased approximately 340 percent, while Federal taxes increased approximately 140 percent—before the 1964 Federal tax cut. Quality education requires increased Federal aid.

Few educational agencies have the resources to rehabilitate the victims of poverty or to provide educational programs that will adequately meet the needs of the greatly increased school age population.

Proposal

Title I adds a 3-year program to Public Law 874 (School Assistance for Local Educational Agencies in Areas Affected by Federal Activity) which is designed to encourage and support the establishment, expansion, and improvement of special programs, including the construction of minimum school facilities where needed, to meet the special needs of educationally deprived children of low-income families.

Children in low-income families in selected States and counties

State and county	Children (aged 5 to 17) in families with less than $2,000 annual income	Percentage of total children (aged 5 to 17)	Federal payment
Alabama	226,700	25	$31,738,000
Montgomery	8,311	19	1,163,540
Arkansas	139,702	29	21,095,002
Cleburne	1,176	51	177,576
California	227,007	6	70,137,510
Los Angeles	80,545	6	21,344,425
Florida	143,795	13	$27,896,230
Dade (Miami)	22,519	11	4,368,680
Illinois	155,694	7	37,288,765
Cook (Chicago)	57,054	5	13,664,433
Kentucky	188,101	24	28,215,150
Metcalfe	1,132	56	169,800
Maryland	56,202	7	13,741,401
Baltimore City	20,902	10	5,110,540
Mississippi	232,603	37	28,028,704
Tunica	2,965	54	357,283
New Mexico	37,998	14	8,351,640
Sierra	622	50	136,840
New York	213,201	6	75,127,295
Erie (Buffalo)	12,432	5	4,382,280
Oregon	25,399	6	6,853,177
Multnomah (Portland)	6,291	5	1,726,880
Tennessee	213,694	23	31,092,525
Hancock	1,155	51	168,053
Texas	386,599	16	74,580,048
Comanche	1,189	49	230,072

The State educational agency would be responsible for distribution of the allotments within the State based on its approval of plans for special programs submitted by the local school districts. However, upon approval of their plans, the school districts in any given county would receive the total amount for which that county would be eligible under the distribution. In multidistrict counties, the total amount for the county would be allocated by the State agency among the districts.

Federal funds made available under this title would be used essentially for improving the education of educationally deprived students, not for the general educational programs of the schools. State and local educational effort must also be maintained and, if possible, increased as a condition of receiving these funds.

Special educational efforts directed to those at the lower end of the economic spectrum will have a salutory effect on the entire educational system and will broaden the range of educational opportunity available to all children. School districts in approximately 95 percent of the Nation's 3,100 counties would be eligible for these poverty-linked funds.

First-year authorization would be approximately $1 billion.

Fact Sheet 2: Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965

TITLE II—SCHOOL LIBRARY RESOURCES AND INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS

Background

At all levels of education, teaching programs have become increasingly dependent upon a well-stocked library, the services of a professional librarian, and up-to-date textbooks. Basic courses in nearly all academic subjects, as well as the most advanced courses, are dependent on libraries and instructional materials. That dependence will grow.

The great majority of our public schools do not have adequate library resources. In many schools, there is an average of less than one-half book per child and some cities spend less than 15 cents a year per child for library books. Today more than 2 out of every 3 public elementary schools have no libraries at all and more than 8 out of 10 lack trained librarians. The current public school levels or 6.2 library books per pupil and $2.28 annual expenditure for books per pupil are well below the recommended professional standards of 10 books and $4 to $6 annual expenditure for books per pupil.

To meet the accepted minimum standards for cities with populations above 500,000, there is a need for a fourfold increase in current expenditures for school library materials. The cost of books is up 82 percent since 1948. Using the base period 1957–59, the cost of books has risen more than a third while wholesale prices remained constant and consumer prices rose less than 7 percent. This naturally works the greatest hardship on poor school districts.

Textbook sales in the Nation in 1963 amounted to $293 million, or only $6.11 per student. In some States, as much as $12.32 was spent per student; in others as little as $4.76. A single modern, hardbound textbook in many subjects often costs as much or more than the entire year's budget for new instructional books. Moreover, a fourth of all the Nation's public high school systems do not provide free textbooks and it has been stated that high textbook fees are one of the reasons for the school dropout problem.

A new instructional development is the increased use of programed learning textbooks. From 1962 to 1963, programed texts increased from 122 to 352, over half in science and mathematics. But these new materials are expensive; they average $10 to $15 each, thus constituting a barrier to their adoption in all but the wealthier school districts.

Proposal

Title II provides for a 5-year program to make available for the use of schoolchildren school library resources and other printed and published instructional materials including textbooks essential to improved educational quality in the schools of the Nation.

A State plan would provide for a method of making available books, periodicals, documents, magnetic tapes, phonograph records, and other printed and published materials for the use of all schoolchildren in the State.

Materials purchased with Federal funds would not be used for sectarian instruction or religious worship and when made available for the use of students in nonpublic schools would be the same as those used or approved for use in the public schools of the State. In those States legally unable to provide materials for students in nonpublic schools, the Commissioner of Education would make available to such children those materials used in the public schools of the State.

Funds would be allotted to the 50 States, District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands on the basis of the number of children enrolled in public and nonprofit private elementary and secondary schools in each State or territory. The previous level of non-Federal support for these materials would be maintained and, if possible, increased.

First-year authorization would be $100 million.

Fact Sheet 3: Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965

TITLE III: SUPPLEMENTARY EDUCATIONAL CENTERS AND SERVICES

Background

While the problems existing in school districts impacted by poverty are particularly acute, there are also chronic limitations in elementary and secondary schools throughout the Nation regardless of the level of community wealth. A fundamental weakness is the uneven distribution and inconsistent quality of educational, scientific, and cultural resources presently available.

Among the variety of supplementary services that make the difference between a poor school and a good school are special instruction in science, languages, music, and the arts; counseling and guidance; health and social work; and access to such resources as technical institutes, museums, art galleries, and theaters. In these respects there are many unmet needs.

Today less than one-quarter of our elementary schools have the services of a guidance counselor one or more days a week. More than 3 million elementary school children are estimated to be in need of social work or psychological services. At present, however, there are only about 3,000 school social workers on the staffs of the public schools; most school systems cannot afford to hire them. Although surveys show that today 7 to 14 percent of schoolchildren have significant emotional problems, more than 9 out of 10 schools systems have no special programs for these children and are unable to deal with them effectively through their regular programs.

Reforms and improvements in science and language instruction appear in uneven quality throughout the country. In only 10 States do all secondary schools have science laboratory facilities. Science specialists generally agree that modern science cannot be taught properly without laboratories for teacher and student experimentations. Moreover, less than 30 percent of public secondary schools now have language laboratories available.

By 1968, at least 25,000 additional science laboratories will be needed in elementary schools to meet increases in enrollments—a 500-percent increase. At least 40,000 additional labs will be needed in the high schools, almost a 100-percent increase. Just to keep pace with growth, by 1968, elementary schools will need 8,000 additional language laboratories and high schools will need at least 20,000 more such labs. Centralized laboratory facilities serving a number of schools and systems are one of the answers to meeting this need where individual labs cannot be provided.

Although educational research is demonstrating the increased capability and advantages of early school experiences, about one-half of the Nation's 26,000 school districts today maintain schools without kindergartens, and in only 1 school district out of 260 is a nursery school available.

At a time of greatly accelerating needs, the Nation's educational structure is weakened both by the lack of these special programs and staffs within the schools and by the frequent insulation of students from the cultural, social, and scientific life of the community. Enrichment of the curriculum of elementary and secondary schools through supplementary services is essential to the total strength of education.

Proposal

Title III proposes a 5-year program to provide vitally needed educational services not available in sufficient quantity or quality in elementary and secondary schools and to develop and establish exemplary elementary and secondary school educational programs to serve as models for regular school programs. Special personnel, equipment, and other costly educational services not normally available in most schools would be made available for the widest possible participation of the entire community.

Grants would be made to a supplementary educational center and services organization created to establish and coordinate a program of supplementary educational services. Funds would be made available on the basis of an application reviewed by the State educational agency and approved by the Commissioner of Education. The governing board of the organization would include representatives of the agencies and institutions participating in the conduct of the program. The participants would include at least one local educational agency and one or more of the following: institutions of higher education, State educational agencies, public agencies such as health and welfare units, and private nonprofit agencies including nonpublic schools, museums, art galleries, educational television stations, and other cultural organizations.

Federal funds would be used for planning, pilot projects, and the establishment and operation of programs offering a diverse range of educational experience to children and adults of varying talents and needs. Programs might include guidance and counseling; remedial instruction; school health, psychological and social work services; enriched academic programs; afterschool study halls; continuing adult education; dual enrollment (shared services); specialized instruction and equipment; specially qualified personnel (including artists and musicians) on a temporary or other basis; educational radio and television programs; special educational services for persons in isolated rural areas; and other specially designed educational programs. Grants could also be used for the lease or construction of necessary facilities.

Children attending nonpublic as well as public schools and out-of-school youth and adults would have the opportunity to receive the services and participate in these educational and cultural activities.

An Advisory Committee on Supplementary Educational Centers and Services would advise the Commissioner on the action to be taken on each application for a grant.

Initially, American Samoa, Guam, and the Virgin Islands would each receive $50,000. The 50 States, District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico would each receive $200,000. The remainder of the funds would be distributed among the States and territories on the basis of (1) the number of children aged 5 to 17 and (2) the total population of each jurisdiction.

The first-year authorization would be $100 million.

FACT SHEET 4: ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965

TITLE IV—EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND TRAINING; AMENDMENTS TO THE COOPERATIVE RESEARCH ACT OF 1954

Background

Eleven years ago Congress authorized the Commissioner of Education to enter into contracts or jointly financed cooperative arrangements with colleges, universities, and State educational agencies to conduct research, surveys, and demonstrations in the field of education. The program that has subsequently emerged from this decade of experience has two basic purposes: (1) to develop new knowledge about education, and (2) to develop new ways of applying existing knowledge.

Significant progress has been made in educational research. For example:

Programs have been developed to guide elementary pupils in "discovering" the basic concepts of modern mathematics; results are so encouraging that many school systems throughout the country are adopting these methods.

Two-year-old children have been taught to read—and to read well—in experimental programs that stimulate their curiosity and intellectual drive.

Grade school pupils have been successfully taught college-level economics, indicating that curriculum evaluation and research are necessities at all levels.

A New Jersey study of the education of migrant children points to new and more fruitful directions for handling a problem that plagues most of our States.

A total of about $16 million is being spent in fiscal year 1965 on cooperative research. Some 280 projects are involved. This is, however, a small answer to a great need. Only $3 of every $1,000 of Federal expenditures for research and development were devoted to education in 1964.

Education, with a total annual expenditure of about $34 billion is the Nation's No. 1 industry. Yet we spend only $72 million—one-fifth of 1 percent of our total educational outlays—for research and development in this vital field. By contrast, we spend $8 billion annually for research and development on our Nation's defenses. Many progressive private industries invest as much as 10 percent of their total annual expenditures for research and development.

To carry out research is to assume the obligation of disseminating the findings, so that education as a whole may benefit. In medicine the average lag between research and its application is estimated at 2 years. In education, the process often takes 30 years or more. The record of education in publishing research findings has not been satisfactory. To help in finding a solution to this problem, pilot research and development centers have been established at a cost in 1965 of about $1,900,000—at the Universities of Pittsburgh, Oregon, Wisconsin, and Harvard.

Each of these centers will conduct activities stretching across the research and development spectrum, including basic research, development of educational procedures and materials, field testing, and demonstration and dissemination. At the University of Pittsburgh, where the first center was etsablished, significant results are being obtained. In one project, for example, courses of study have been tailored to fit the needs of the individual learner; in another, new educational devices are employed to motivate preschool children to read.

Such educational research and its dissemination help the schools and colleges of the Nation to carry on educational programs more efficiently, more effectively, and with greater economy of resources. But a mere four centers, with all their promise, cannot serve the needs of 26,000 school districts and a 10th as many institutions of higher learning. Other regions of the country and many other segments of education need assistance in the form of new R. & D. programs.

Proposal

Title IV would amend the Cooperative Research Act of 1954 (Public Law 83-531) by authorizing the training of research personnel and improved dissemination of information derived from educational research and development. Authority would be granted to utilize the research competence of research organizations not now eligible to contribute to the program, such as private noncollegiate research organizations and professional associations. In addition, the program would provide for the construction and operation of centers to improve the quality of teaching in our schools and for the purchase of research equipment.

Together, these amendments would permit the continued growth of educational research programs in the United States and an accelerated funding of research and development centers or regional educational laboratories. The goal: a national network of federally supported but State- and university-operated research centers.

Regional educational laboratories offer a promising way of meeting problems of research, development, and dissemination. They will help to train teachers and improve curriculums. They will draw equally upon educators and the practitioners in all the fields of learning—mathematicians, scientists, humanists, historians, economists, social scientists, linguists, musicians, artists, and writers.

These laboratories will have close ties with the State departments of education. They will also work directly with the schools and supplementary education centers in order to bring innovation directly to the student. They will train teachers as well as those who teach teachers.

First-year cost of these amendments would be $45 million, in addition to the regular cooperative research budget of $25 million in fiscal year 1966.

FACT SHEET 5: ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965

TITLE V—STRENGTHENING STATE DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION

Background

The immediate responsibility for providing professional counsel and direction to the schools lies with the various State departments of education. At the very time that demand for this kind of counsel and direction is on the increase, the ability of the State departments to respond is inadequate. The necessity of meeting school operating costs, of spending what it takes to keep sufficient classrooms available, exerts increasing pressure on the share of the school dollar made available to State departments of education. Moreover, the responsibility of insuring the wise and proper use of Federal funds dispensed in a variety of Federal-State cooperative programs generally rests squarely with State educational agencies.

The States vary greatly in their educational expenditures. Some States spend barely $200,000 a year for State educational leadership, while others spend more than 70 times that amount. Some States employ 500 professional educators; other States, as few as 35. Professionals to oversee school library services are lacking altogether in one-third of the State departments of education, while only 11 States have consultants in school social work. Moreover, during the past 5 years there has been a 40-percent turnover in State supervisory personnel; the majority have gone into better paying positions at the local level and in colleges and universities.

The department of education in a typical, middle-income State has 75 professional staff members available to serve as consultants to 20,000 school people—superintendents, principals, teachers, and others. On the average, these professionals are able to visit the State's schools for only one-half day each 7 years. Demands on the education budget are such in this State that no likelihood is foreseen in the ability of its department of education to improve its services.

If the States are to be strengthened and American education kept both strong and decentralized, measures are needed to bolster the administrative and legal foundations of our educational system.

Proposal

Title V proposes a 5-year program to stimulate and assist in strengthening the leadership resources of State educational agencies. The State educational agency would identify educational needs of the State and design programs to meet these needs.

Programs and activities might include long-range educational planning; improved collecting, processing, and analyzing of educational data (including use of automated data systems); conducting, sponsoring, or cooperating in educational research; developing the competency of individuals who serve State or local educational agencies and provide leadership, administrative or specialist services; cooperation with institutions of higher education and local educational agencies to improve the quality of teacher preparation, including student teaching; and other special needs of State departments of education.

Eighty-five percent of the funds appropriated would be apportioned as follows: $50,000 each to Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands and $100,000 to each of the States, District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico. The remainder of the 85 percent would be apportioned among the States and Territories based on the number of public school pupils. State agencies would apply to the Commissioner for a grant or grants for part of the costs of their proposal. The Commissioner would approve applications if he determined that the proposal would be within the purposes of the law.

Fifteen percent of the funds appropriated would be reserved to the Commissioner to make special grants for research and demonstrations and for the establishment of special services which promise to help solve educational problems common to all or several of the State educational agencies.

First-year authorization would be $10 million.

A second part of title V would permit an interchange of personnel between States and the Office of Education for cooperative educational activities and technical and other assistance which would assist in the strengthening of American education.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, Senators will be receiving a large amount of mail asking for information about the bill. It is my hope that the material I have just placed in the RECORD will be helpful to them in meeting these requests.

The fact sheet, which was developed by the Office of Education, will, I am sure, be most helpful and I congratulate the Commissioner and his associates for having made it available to us. It provides Senators with a succinct and accurate description and explanation of the contents of this major educational measure.

Mr. President, the primary interest of those who are concerned with education at this moment is the language in which the President of the United States couched this most significant educational advance in his message and in his bill. I shall therefore at this time not dwell at length upon the specific provisions of the bill. I shall only as chairman of the Education Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, pledge to Senators that hearings on this measure will be scheduled at a very early date and that prompt but careful consideration will be given to the views of all who wish to be heard upon the measure.

I have already advised committee counsel to proceed to schedule hearings on this elementary and secondary school bill on the following dates: January 26, January 29, February 1, February 2, February 4, and February 11.

I hope that it will be possible for my subcommittee on those days, if the Senate is in session, to receive unanimous consent of the Senate to conduct the hearings beyond the 12 o'clock noon cutoff, when the Senate usually convenes. I am sure that permission to meet will be given unless there is some legislative emergency, in the Senate, which would preclude my subcommittee from receiving that courtesy.

Senators who serve with me on the Education Subcommittee will agree, I am sure, that we are under a great obligation to proceed with dispatch to complete our hearings on this bill at the earliest possible date. I do not know whether we can complete the hearings on this bill in the 6 days that I have just announced, but I have reason to believe that we can come close to it if we are able to obtain the necessary unanimous consent from the Senate to hold our hearings during the period when the Senate is in session. If we do not receive the unanimous consent of the Senate to do so, I shall then announce subsequent hearing dates for the purpose of completing the hearings at the earliest possible time. The hearings on this bill should be concluded at the earliest date possible consistent with careful consideration of the bill provisions.

In the very near future, the President will send us draft legislation on higher education. As soon as hearings on the elementary and secondary school bill are completed, I shall proceed without delay to schedule hearings on the higher education legislation.

At this time, I issue a general invitation to the educational community of the country and other interested organizations and individuals to advise the Education Subcommittee, room 4230, New Senate Office Building, telephone number 225-5375, as soon as possible of their interest in presenting testimony on this bill in order that the subcommittee may be able to plan the details of the hearings with dispatch.

With respect to the framework and the substance of the bill itself which I enthusiastically endorse, I merely make this additional comment, since I know that Senators and their constituents will want to know immediately what will be the total cost of this legislation on the first year. The total cost for the fiscal year 1966 would be $1.225 billion. Of this $1.225 billion, $1 billion is earmarked for the improvement of education provided children of low-income families.

Let me dwell momentarily on that point. I refer to this recommendation of the President with some personal pride and enthusiasm. This proposal carries out the principle of the Morse bill of last year—S. 2528 of the 88th Congress.

If we think that the education process does not work in this country, I offer this proof that it does. I introduced S. 2528 last year, to expand our impacted area laws to include funds for children in the low-income school districts of the country. I used as an index for payments to schools the number of children attending whose parents either are unemployed, or are in receipt of welfare funds for their children. These children are attending our schools, and many of those schools are in areas which suffer from the blight of poverty. Thus schools do not have the financial tax base to offer education of the caliber and scope afforded by schools in more favored communities. The children attending these schools are educationally disadvantaged just because their parents are economically disadvantaged. The impact of disadvantage is a burden on the community as well as the burden of new installations of the Federal Government is upon the municipal resources of a country town or rural school district.

As the presiding officer knows, the impacted area legislation, passed in 1950, has poured billions of dollars into certain school districts of this country. It has assisted school districts which educate approximately one-third of the schoolchildren in the public elementary and secondary schools of our Nation. The 1950 acts were passed on the theory that the Federal Government has a responsibility to reduce the burden it has created by locating in an area. It was felt that it is not fair to the taxpayers of a local government or school district to establish a great Federal installation, an air base, a shipyard, or an atomic energy plant, in a locality without providing a payment to offset the burden of increased school costs necessary to provide a decent education to the children of the Federal employees. Congress has supported the Federal impacted area legislation for many years, and rightly so. No one has been a more ardent supporter of Public Law 815 and Public Law 874 than the senior Senator from Oregon.

Yet, in the 87th Congress and the 88th Congress, evidence presented before my subcommittee was overpowering over the years, in proof of the fact that there are many school district facilities attended by little boys and girls and our young men and women which are inferior to those attended by students in schools which receive Federal impacted areas aid. The compelling evidence caused us to ask: What are the causes of this situation? What can be done about it?

The causes are those to which I have referred. In short, poverty, and unemployment of parents. These conditions bring in their train, poor to squalid housing, a physical environment in which it is difficult or impossible to study. It is an environment certainly that is characterized by little economic opportunity or advantage.

As I worked on the subcommittee and I listened in hearing after hearing to the mounting evidence of the cause-to-effect relationship between school dropouts and the socioeconomic environment from which the students come, I found that the evidence was unanswerable. We shall have an increasing percentage of school dropouts from the slum areas, the underprivileged areas, and the poverty-stricken rural areas.

The able counsel of my committee went to work, with me, and we came forth last year with S. 2528, which sought to expand the impacted area program by providing some Federal assistance to the schools in such underprivileged areas.

I was a little surprised during our hearings on the bill to hear the witnesses for the administration testify against it. But I forgave them, for they had not then done their bookwork. I forgave them because they had not taken the necessary time to study fully the facts. I was very respectful to the Government witnesses when they were before my subcommittee. I conduct my hearings and my subcommittee work on a seminar basis with the witnesses for the administration as the graduate students. When I heard their testimony against the bill I was forced to tell them, most respectfully, that they had just flunked; that they had not passed the test. I intimated gently that a return to the library and to the books was indicated. They were good natured about it. They did just that.

I shall never forget the day that I went down to the signing last fall, after Congress had adjourned, of the National Defense Education Act Amendments of 1964. One of the chief assistants for the administration came to me and said, good naturedly, "Senator, we are going to pass your course next time. We are going to come up next session to testify for the principle of your bill."

I have explained the matter somewhat jocularly here this afternoon, but I think I have made my point. The Johnson administration, however, this year has gone me one better. The administration has even expanded upon the Morse bill of last year. I am delighted about it, because the administration in this legislation has covered some areas that I had hoped to reach some time in the future. But there is no better time than now. So I thank the President; I thank the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; and I thank the U.S. Commissioner of Education for not only approving the basic principle of the Morse expanded impacted area bill of last year, but for having expanded it even further, because their expansion in this bill is completely sound. I applaud them for their educational statesmanship.

Senators have heard me say before, but I should like to repeat it in my brief discussion this afternoon. It is a truism that a democracy, so far as its enlightened action is concerned, can be no stronger than its educational system. When we are dealing with the schools of America, which should be dedicated to the development, to the maximum extent possible, of the intellectual potential of our own people, we are dealing, I think, with the greatest security weapon a democracy ever possesses.

When the President recognizes this, as he does in this great bill that I have the high honor of introducing this afternoon in behalf of the administration, and when he recognizes the need for strengthening the elementary and secondary school systems of this country, he is demonstrating what a great Jeffersonian Democrat he is. What he is doing is to implement the great lesson that Jefferson taught us, namely, that a democracy can be no stronger than the enlightenment of its people. I would footnote that statement by saying that our people can be no more enlightened than the educational opportunities open to them. It is up to us to provide them opportunities. This President Johnson is seeking to do, to a degree that never before has been proposed by a Chief Executive of this country, in the great bill he offers this afternoon.

When President Johnson took office, he faced us with a challenge of the obligations we all have to continue to bring into being the great program of the New Frontier that the late John F. Kennedy inaugurated. This bill is a continuation of a great educational program that President Kennedy initiated and which the 88th Congress did so much to implement.

The Kennedy omnibus bill, S. 580, in its 6 titles had 24 legislative components or topics connected with it. As I said a few days ago in the Senate, I am very proud of the fact that there was recommended to the Senate during the 88th Congress, legislation that called for action on 20 of the 24 sections of the Kennedy education program. Not only the Senate, but the Congress as a whole, passed, in major principle, those 20 sections of the 24 of the so-called Kennedy omnibus education bill. President Johnson is continuing the educational idealism, the sound idealism, and the educational practicalities of President Kennedy, enlarging upon them, and expanding them. We find them in this bill in regard to primary and secondary education.

As I earlier indicated, title I of this new bill provides $1 billion for the education of children of low-income families.

Title II of the bill provides $100 million for school library resources and instructional materials.

Title III of the bill provides $100 million for supplementary educational centers and services.

Title IV of the bill provides $45 million for educational research and training; Cooperative Research Act.

Title V provides $10 million for State departments of education.

The total is $1.255 billion.

It would be very helpful to my subcommittee and to the full committee of the Senate dealing with educational problems if Members of the Senate would familiarize themselves with the contents of this bill. That is why I have referred to the explanatory information I have placed in the RECORD this afternoon.

Let me say also to Members of the Senate that they will always be most welcome to attend my hearings, to bring to the hearings educators from their States who are vitally interested in the educational problem, to the end that we may dispose of this bill with dispatch, and then to get on with the problem of considering and passing a higher education bill.

THE EAST AND GULF COAST LONGSHOREMEN'S STRIKE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, turning to another matter I wish to make a few comments in regard to the very serious strike that is occurring on the east and gulf coast docks at a cost of a good many millions of dollars each day to the economy of this country. I speak on the subject this afternoon because of the part I played some 2 years ago as Chairman of the special Commission appointed by President Kennedy to seek to bring an end to the costly strike that had the east coast and the gulf coast tied up at that time in the longshore strike. We reached a mediation settlement that resulted in the end of that strike.

It will be recalled that the most troublesome issue involved was the issue pertaining to allegations of the shipowners concerning "make work" policies, sometimes referred to as "featherbedding" policies, practiced by the union on the east coast and gulf coast docks in the longshore industry.

Of course, it was impossible, in the 5 days President Kennedy gave to my Commission, to make any findings factually in regard to the so-called job utilization program, or featherbedding practices that were alleged to prevail on the docks.

But it seems to me that the shipowners were entitled to a consideration of their allegations on the basis of whatever supporting facts could be presented by way of proof of such uneconomic practices, because featherbedding cannot be justified as a proper economic practice on the part of any labor group.

This is not a new position for the senior Senator from Oregon to take. I believe the records will show that I wrote the first decision in a major labor arbitration dispute in this country, dealing not only with the legal aspects but also with the economic aspects of make-work policies in the longshore industry. That involved the well-known Seattle Harbor tieup of the late 1930's, when the longshoremen on the west coast insisted upon being given the right to engage in obvious featherbedding practices.

That decision pointed out that it was not only unjustifiable from the standpoint of the best economic interests of the employees and of the public, but also was unjustifiable from the standpoint of the longtime best interests of the workers themselves.

Any policy that is based upon the destruction of economic values—and that is what a make-work program amounts to—cannot possibly accrue to the benefit of any one of the three parties in a labor dispute, namely, the workers, the employers, and the general public.

Therefore, in the east coast dock strike of some 2 years ago, our Commission provided in that settlement that there would be set up by the U.S. Department of Labor a committee or commission of qualified experts in the field of job utilization, to make a 15-month analysis of job utilization on the docks on the east coast and on the gulf coast; that following such study, the Department of Labor would make its findings and its recommendations in respect thereto; and that there would follow a period of time for negotiations between the parties prior to the negotiation of a new contract.

The study was made; and it is a classic. It is a very thorough and able study. Those who participated in it deserve a great deal of credit for what they did. The person in charge of it was Mr. David Stowe, a former administrative assistant to President Truman and well-known labor arbitrator and mediator. He was brought to the Department of Labor on the basis of the settlement that my Commission handed down, which brought the strike of more than 2 years ago to an end. He was brought to the Department of Labor by Secretary Wirtz and Assistant Secretary of Labor James Reynolds, and given the authority to supervise the manpower utilization study program in all ports from New York to Galveston.

He and his associates did a tremendous job.

Following the submission of the report, the parties to the dispute, in accordance with the terms of the mediation settlement which the Commission handed down, proceeded with negotiations.

But they ended up in disagreement. The able President of ILA, Mr. Teddy Gleason, made it very clear that his union was adamant in opposition to certain recommendations contained in the job utilization report.

Under Taft-Hartley Act procedures, a special board was set up under Mr. Herbert Schmertz, a former aid to the Director of the Federal Mediation Service. When this board failed to produce an agreement, there followed, as provided for in the mediation settlement my Commission had handed down, further negotiations with Mr. James Reynolds, the Assistant Secretary of Labor, as chairman; Prof. James Healey, professor of industrial relations of Harvard Business School in Boston, as a member of the special panel; and Mr. Theodore Kheel, a well-known lawyer, one of America's outstanding arbitrators, of New York City, as the third member of the panel.

Professor Healey and Mr. Kheel were the two other members of my Commission of 2 years ago which brought forth the proposed mediation settlement of the dock strike of that time, which was accepted by the parties to the dispute and served as the basis for the agreement in regard to the manpower utilization study on the docks.

Jim Reynolds, by my insistence and appointment, was the Chief Counsel of the Commission of 2 years ago. I do not know of anyone in the field of labor arbitration and mediation and negotiation whom I would put above Mr. James Reynolds in ability and judicial handling and understanding of labor disputes in this country.

Mr. President, when President Johnson asked me, toward the end of the congressional session last year, to assume a part in an attempted settlement of the oncoming east coast dock strike, I satisfied him that my work in the Senate would make it impossible for me to be away from the Senate during the latter weeks of the last session, which would have been the time that I would have had to serve in New York City on this project.

In my judgment, President Johnson very wisely agreed that no one could possibly do a better job than the Assistant Secretary of Labor, James Reynolds. The President appointed him as chairman of the panel.

I wish to say to Mr. Reynolds, Professor Healey, and Mr. Kheel that the negotiated settlement which brought forth the signing of a new contract by the officials of the union and the shipowners was a masterly substitution of reason and commonsense for economic force in a dispute which, after all, can be settled rightly only by the application of the rules of reason, rather than the application of the picket line.

I am sure that none of us familiar with the operative facts of this dispute could have been more surprised than to read that in the vote on the settlement by a majority of approximately 800 out of the total vote cast, which was a total vote of some 3,000, the contract was turned down.

Sometimes I am accustomed to tread where angels fear to tread, but I have a great many friends in the Longshore Union on the east and gulf coasts, both in the rank and file and in the officialdom of that union. I also have a great many friends among the shipowners in this industry. I shall always prize the memories of the expressions of those friendships on the part of both labor and management during the very difficult negotiations that my Commission conducted some 2 years ago.

This afternoon, I take the liberty to give this piece of advice to the parties to this dispute, on the good faith belief that they know my advice comes from complete sincerity of motivation and dedication to the settlement of this dispute on the basis of a fair and equitable proposal.

Therefore, I say pleadingly to the rank and file membership of the Longshore Union on the east and gulf coasts: Take another look at it, and be sure that you are satisfied you really have analyzed the contents of the contract that your elected union officials have signed in your behalf.

Mr. President, I am convinced that if they will take the time to study this contract, they will—when the contract is put to them again for another vote—approve it.

In my judgment, this contract represents not only great progress with the Longshore Union on the east coast, but also represents a great leap forward in improvement of their economic lot.

As one who has had a great deal to do with maritime disputes for many years, I believe that this contract is the greatest step forward economically which the Longshore Union on the east coast has ever had an opportunity to take.

It is a remarkably fair contract. It is well to note that the agreement was entered into by the top officials of the International Longshore Union and representatives of the shipping industry with an absolute minimum of Government intervention.

It is a generous and honorable agreement. The failure of the rank and file to ratify it is a great tragedy. In my opinion, failure to ratify it resulted from an inadequate job of thoroughly informing the rank and file of the generous and fair terms of the agreement.

There is one added factor which I have not seen mentioned in the press, but which I believe might very well have had some influence in the voting which took place on the contract—knowing longshoremen as I know them—and that was the inclusion of an issue completely irrelevant to the contract. It had nothing to do with the contract. However, the ballot was so presented that when the longshoremen cast their vote, yes or no, they were also voting on this item.

What was the item?

It was a proposal to increase the dues payments of the ILA International from 1 cent an hour to 2 cents an hour.

If anyone is at all familiar with the individualism which prevails in longshore unions and locals—and I would not have it any other way if they are to remain free workers—I can well understand the report that was given to me this morning from one who has had a great opportunity to observe what happened in this voting.

Apparently, in some locals there was as much or more talk about this 1-cent-an-hour increase in union dues than there was in regard to the terms of the contract itself. I sincerely hope that when the contract is put to the membership for a vote again—and the report is that the very able president of the International Longshoremen's Union, Mr. Teddy Gleason, is giving favorable consideration to putting the contract to a vote again—there will be a separation of the dues-increase question from the question of approval or rejection of the contract.

Mr. President, I am not saying on the floor of the Senate this afternoon that this issue might have made a controlling difference in the voting result. But that might very well be the case. At least there should be a second vote with the dues issue separated.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a résumé of the New York Shipping Association-International Longshoremen's Association agreement. That résumé sets forth item by item the major provisions of the contract. It is desirable to have it publicly available, because the reading of that résumé in my judgment will cause any reasonable person to reach the same conclusion that I have reached. The contract is fair and good, and I hope that it will be approved.

There being no objection, the résumé was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Résumé of New York Shipping Association-International Longshoremen's Association Agreement

1. Wage increases: 36 cents per hour spread over 4 years, as follows: October 1, 1964, 10 cents per hour; October 1, 1965, 10 cents per hour; October 1, 1966, 8 cents per hour; October 1, 1967, 8 cents per hour.

2. Paid holidays: 3 new holidays (bringing total paid holidays to 12).

3. Vacations: A fourth week of vacations for regular employees with 12 years' seniority (effective October 1, 1964).

4. Guaranteed annual hours: All crafts (longshoremen, checkers, clerks, etc.) are guaranteed 1,600 hours per year, whether or not work is available. All employees qualify for the guarantee who worked 700 or more hours in the preceding year. (Guarantee effective April 1, 1966.)

5. Pensions:

Effective April 1, 1965, the monthly pension (for current pensioners and those who retire prior to January 1, 1966), will be increased from $100 to $125 per month.

Effective January 1, 1966, pensions will be increased to $175 per month and will be eligible to all employees with 25 years of service at age 62.

Effective January 1, 1966, widows of employees with 25 years of service who die before reaching age 62 will receive $87.50 per month.

6. Hospitalization: Surgical, major medical: 5 cents per hour added during life of the contract.

7. Clinics: 3 cents added during life of the contract.

8. Manpower changes:

Longshoremen: The current general cargo gang size is 20 members plus a foreman. Effective April 1, 1966, two men shall be eliminated from each general cargo gang. Effective October 11, 1967, one additional man shall be eliminated from each general cargo gang.

Terminal labor and checkers: All terminal employees will continue to be employed, but may be assigned to other work if idle. However, terminal labor will not be assigned to ship work (or vice-versa). Hatch checking may gradually be eliminated, where desired, by natural attrition (approximately 250 regular employees). After April 1, 1966, checker details, when idle, may be temporarily reassigned.

9. Human relations committee: The parties agreed to the establishment of a special committee to handle problems growing out of the agreement, particularly with respect to the annual guarantee and manpower utilization.

10. Stability of the workforce: The parties agreed to take steps to stabilize the longshore workforce (close the register of longshoremen).

11. Length of contract: A 4-year contract, extending from October 1, 1964, to October 1, 1968.

12. Summary: The agreement reached, following a year-long study of the industry's manpower utilization-job security problems by the Department of Labor but with a minimum of Government intervention in the collective bargaining process, includes these key features:

(a) An 80 cents per hour increase spread over 4 years, including 36 cents per hour in wages; 3 additional paid holidays (a total of 12); 4 weeks of vacation for 12-year employees; pension increase from $100 to $175 per month; $87.50 to widows of long service employees who die before retirement age; additional contribution to hospitalization, surgical, major medical, and clinic plans.

(b) Income guarantee of 1,600 hours per year to all employees who worked more than 700 hours the preceding year.

(c) Gradual reduction in general cargo gang size from 20 to 17 members. Elimination, through attrition, of frozen details in terminals and the right to use terminal labor, when idle, on other terminal jobs.

(d) Establishment of a human relations and implementation committee to deal with problems that may arise in the administration of the agreement and joint agreement to stabilize the workforce through limiting entry into the industry.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record a tabulation of various locals of the ILA on January 8, 1965, in respect to the contract that was submitted to them for a vote.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Jan. 8, 1965, ILA vote

Craft	Area	Local No.	Delegate	Yes	No	Total
Checkers	Portwide	1	Gleason	1,092	1,209	2,301
Longshore	North of 42d St.	824	Bowers	684	652	1,336
	Chelsea	791	Lynch	169	672	841
	Canal St.	895	Coughlin	48	329	377
		1258	Hickey	49	392	441
	Lower Manhattan	856	Fields	247	378	62
Total, Manhattan				1,197	2,423	3,620
	Brooklyn	1814	Scotto	4,013	2,741	6,754
	Green Point	955	Johnson	27	167	194
Total, Brooklyn				4,040	2,908	6,948
	Hoboken	2	Murphy	178	280	458
		1198	D'Onofrio	80	149	229
	Jersey City	1247	Murray	13	395	408
	Port Newark	1233	Walker	202	259	461
		1235	Leonardis	215	400	615
	Bayonne	1588	De Lap	3	136	139
	Staten Island	920	Di Brizzi	72	281	353
Total, Jersey City and Staten Island.				763	1,900	2,663
Total, longshore				6,000	7,231	13,231
Maintenance	Manhattan and Jersey	1804-1	Cashiw	265	89	354
	Brooklyn	1277-1	Scannavino	86	54	140
Total, maintenance				351	143	494
Carpenters	Manhattan and Jersey	901	Walker	67	125	192
	Manhattan	901-1	Cummerford	26	4	30
	Brooklyn	958	Nicotra	44	73	117
Total, carpenters				137	202	339
Coopers	Portwide	1171	Porto	9	3	12
Grand total				7,589	8,788	16,377

Mr. MORSE. As one looks at the tabulation, when locals are compared with locals, apparently the great disparity in results would seem to indicate that probably a much better information job was done in explaining the contents of the contract in some locals in comparison with others. That is the only explanation that I can think of that will explain the wide divergency in the voting results among locals.

I know some of these locals very well. It is difficult for me to understand how in one local in Jersey City 375 would vote "no" and 13 would vote "yes." I only raise the question—"I wonder if they fully understood the benefits that would accrue to them from this contract?"

It is said that the feature of the contract that seemed to raise the greatest amount of opposition was the part that dealt with the size of the gangs. But the contract would not automatically reduce the size of the gangs the next hour. It does provide for a period of time over which the standard gang would be reduced from 20 men to 17 men. The manpower utilization study that was made would seem to indicate very clearly that attrition alone would almost take care of that problem because of the timespan that would be involved in the application of the recommendation.

I doubt very much if that part of the contract would result in any great number losing their jobs. But here again let us face it. If on the merits the evidence shows that the shipowners are being charged for economic waste—that the shipowners are paying for jobs that in fact are not needed—we cannot justify asking the shipowners or any other employer to subsidize unneeded work.

I wish to say most respectfully that that gets back to the decision, to which I referred, that I wrote many years ago in relation to economic waste practiced by workers. I yield to no one, as these workers know, in supporting proposed legislation necessary to provide people in this country with the economic protection which they deserve. But I shall not go on record in ever supporting a perpetuation of any "make work" program in connection with any dispute that has come to involve the rights of the employers in a labor dispute. I do not need to explain my consistent record over the years of standing up for the protection of legitimate economic rights of labor.

Mr. President, if one defends a "make work" program, as such, if the facts show it, the effort amounts to defending people taking the property of others without payment.

There are all sorts of ways to engage in an economic embezzlement; and a make-work program, in my judgment, constitutes a form of economic embezzlement.

Secretary Reynolds has made clear, and rightly so, that, so far as the Government is concerned, it does not intend to participate in further negotiations or hearings in regard to this contract. The shipowners have made clear that they stand on the contract that they have signed. To the everlasting credit of the officers of the union, through Mr. Gleason, their public announcements have been to the effect that the contract speaks for itself, and that they are not asking for a reopening of the proposed contract and further negotiations on that basis. I think the shipowners, the Government, and the union officials are completely correct in the position that they have taken.

Then I hear the statement, "But the fact remains, Senator, that a strike is going on."

That statement causes me again to walk where others might advise one not to tread. That causes me to give the following gratuitous advice to the rank and file of the longshoremen:

You know, as well as I do, that, of course, a strike in an industry as major as this one, long existing, costing the economy of this country many millions of dollars a day, is bound to create a serious domestic issue. For 20 years I have been opposing any legislation that proposed the substitution of compulsion for free collective bargaining and volunteerism in the relationships between management and worker.

I can be counted upon to continue to oppose it. I would cast the same vote today that I cast some 2 years ago, along with one other Member of the Senate, in opposition to the first compulsory arbitration bill that ever passed this body.

I do not believe in compulsory arbitration, because of its infringement on the precious right of economic freedom on the part of free workers and free employers. I consider that compulsory arbitration is as detrimental to the economic freedom of employers as it is to that of workers.

But I do not keep my head in the political sand. I would urge the longshoremen of the east coast also not to sink their heads in political sand, for we already read in today's press various trial balloon stories about rumbling movements that are on foot to seek to bring this dispute, if the situation worsens, to compulsory arbitration on the legislative stage. That would be a great mistake.

The longshoremen have two major, feasible courses of action open to them. The first is to restudy the contract, to be sure that they would cast the same vote against it that they cast before, after they have taken more time to analyze it, and to insist upon the right to vote on the contract separate and distinct from any issue involving internal union affairs, such as union dues.

I have a feeling that if the longshoremen will follow that wise course, they will, upon reflection, in their second vote, approve the contract. They should. It is a fair contract. I do not recommend that they vote for the contract in the belief that the contract gives them unfair advantages over the shipowners, because, in my judgment, it does not. The contract is equally fair and square to both sides to the dispute. That is why, with pleasure and justification, I heap my praises upon Jim Reynolds, Jim Healy, and Ted Kheel. I particularly pay high commendation to Jim Reynolds, because his two associates have made it very clear to me that it has been Jim Reynolds who, in these last critical stages resulting in the approval of the contract, has carried the great load.

My hunches and intuition tell me that if the longshoremen get a chance to vote a second time, the odds are in favor of their reconsideration and support for the contract. But if I should be mistaken in those hunches, I hope, as I have said before on the floor of the Senate in connection with other disputes, that the workers will not forget that the most precious right they have is the right to retain voluntarism in their relationship with their employers. In keeping with that principle of voluntarism, I hope that if they turn down the contract—it will be a tragic mistake if they do—they will at least give favorable consideration to offering to submit the dispute to voluntary arbitration on the basis of procedures that the parties can seek to negotiate between themselves, but with agreement in advance that they will agree to the decision handed down by the arbitrator or the board of arbitrators that may be established.

Let me quickly say, in closing, in order that there may be no question as to my meaning in respect to this proposal, that if the longshoremen follow the latter course, all the issues must be submitted to arbitration. It would be quite unfair and improper for the longshoremen to select only certain issues and ask that they go to arbitration, because the contract involves a package proposal, and the interrelationships of the various sections of a collective bargaining agreement bear heavily upon one another. It would be like serving a cake to one's children. Sometimes they may be tempted to eat only the frosting; then it is necessary to make clear to them that they must eat the whole cake, and not limit themselves to the sweeties.

I hope it will not be necessary for the membership of the Longshoremen's Union to have to consider suggesting the type of voluntary arbitration I have outlined this afternoon. I hope that upon a re-vote upon the contract, following a further explanation of it to the membership, and a further study by the individuals, they will vote to approve the contract. But if they do not, as a friend of the collective bargaining and the settlement of disputes by peaceful procedures, not by compulsory mandate, I urge them not to put their heads in the political sand and blind themselves to what I believe would be the ugly reality of proposals in Congress to have compulsory arbitration. Although I would vote against such proposals, experience has already shown in the railroad case that a majority of Congress has voted for such proposal in the past, and I do not know of anyone who can give assurance that that would not happen again.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL FRIDAY

Mr. **MORSE.** Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate adjourn until Friday next, at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 19 minutes p.m.), the Senate adjourned, in accordance with the order previously entered, until Friday, January 15, 1965, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 12, 1965:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Maurice M. Bernbaum, of Illinois, a Foreign Service officer of the class of Career Minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Venezuela.

Wymberley DeR. Coerr, of Connecticut, a Foreign Service officer of the class of Career Minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Ecuador.

ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL

John Doar, of Wisconsin, to be an Assistant Attorney General vice Burke Marshall, resigning.

IN THE COAST GUARD

The following-named officers of the Coast Guard for promotion to the grade of rear admiral:

Capt. Charles (n) Tighe.
Capt. Frank V. Helmer.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JANUARY 12, 1965

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., quoted a twofold promise of the Scriptures, Psalm 29: 11: *The Lord will give strength unto His people; the Lord will bless His people with peace.*

O Thou God of all goodness may we daily become increasingly sensitive and aware of the glorious certainty that Thou hast placed at our disposal and made available Thy bountiful providence.

May our minds and hearts expand with pride that our beloved country, conceived in sacrifice, and dedicated to Thy glory, is sharing its blessings with all mankind.

Show us how we may release the hidden splendor of humanity and bring to fulfillment and fruition its capacities for the true, the beautiful, and the noble qualities of the greater society and the more abundant life.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

EDUCATION LEGISLATION IN THE FIELD OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOL PROGRAMS

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, under the leadership of President Kennedy and President Johnson, as well as the chairman of the House Education and Labor Committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL], and the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committees, the 88th Congress became known as the educational Congress.

I am introducing today the President's educational legislation in the field of our elementary and secondary programs.

Ever since I came to the Congress in 1948, I have been convinced of the great need for Federal financial assistance in strengthening elementary and secondary school programs so as to assure every child in the United States, and in particular, those school districts with limited financial resources, an opportunity for a solid foundation in the basic educational skills.

I am extremely pleased today in President Johnson's education message to the Congress, not only because of the total commitment it represents to strengthening elementary and secondary education, but also because it represents a realistic approach to the needs. I feel confident that it will be supported by all who are sincerely concerned as I am about the great need for strengthening our elementary and secondary school programs.

President Lyndon B. Johnson has indeed translated words of commitment into positive action in transmitting to the Congress today his legislative recommendations for elementary and secondary education and for the continued Federal concern and support that it evidences of programs to assist our institutions of higher learning.

The formula for the distribution of $1 billion in Federal funds among the States for the support of elementary and secondary school programs will enable each county, and in turn, each school district to know precisely the amount of Federal support for its school program so that school administrators will be in a position to plan elementary and secondary school expenditures so as to best enrich, expand, and strengthen learning opportunities. The use of funds apportioned to each school district is sufficiently flexible so as to enable the school district to meet the particular pressing needs confronting that district whether it be the construction of facilities, the improvement of teachers salaries structures, purchase of equipment and materials or the provision of supplementary school services.

The legislation, I feel confident, will meet the growing deficiencies in our elementary and secondary schools which have been occasioned by diminishing local financial resources in many areas.

In the educational programs strengthened through legislation enacted by the 88th Congress, we have done much to improve conditions in the special educational fields of higher learning and in vocational training. However, the success of these programs depends upon the ability of our elementary and secondary school systems to provide full opportunity for a strong academic background in basic educational skills. Elementary and secondary education is the foundation of our educational system and the message of the President recognizes this fact in the strengthening of the Federal aid program recommended.

I am very pleased to sponsor today the administration's bill and hereby insert for the RECORD additional information regarding this the most significant educational legislative proposal to be transmitted from the Office of the President to the Congress.

[From the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, Washington, D.C., Jan. 12, 1965]

FACT SHEETS ON ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965

Authorization for fiscal 1966

	Millions
Title I—Education of children of low-income families	$1,000
Title II—School library resources and instructional materials	100
Title III—Supplementary educational centers and services	100
Title IV—Educational research and training; Cooperative Research Act	45
Title V—State departments of education	10
Total	1,255

[Fact sheet 1]

TITLE I—IMPROVEMENT OF THE EDUCATION OF CHILDREN OF LOW INCOME FAMILIES

Background

"Every child must have the best education our Nation can provide," the President said in his 1965 state of the Union address.

Poverty paralyzes efforts to bring proper educational services and facilities within the reach of all the Nation's children. Left unchecked, poverty's adverse effects become chronic and contagious, often leading to delinquency and crime.

Two-thirds of the families whose head has fewer than nine years of education are in poverty. Of those youths aged 18 to 24 with an eighth grade education or less, twenty percent are unemployed. In the Nation as a whole in 1960, there were 2.3 million school-age children living in families earning less than $1,000 annually; 5 million children living in families earning less than $2,000 a year.

In the slums, the schools are overcrowded; many are obsolete and unsafe. At least 30 percent of our schoolchildren go to school in classes averaging 30 or more pupils. In remote rural areas, schools often offer inadequate programs in inadequate facilities.

Of the 1.7 million classrooms now operating, nearly one-third were opened prior to 1930 and have since fallen far below acceptable standards. In some of our city slums, about half of all classrooms are at least 50 years old; many are still not fireproof.

Despite a massive effort on the part of our major cities, they generally spend only two-thirds as much per pupil as their suburbs. Up to one-third of the children in these cities are culturally and economically deprived, and from their number stem about 80 percent of all dropouts.

The disadvantaged child is a year behind in mastering school work by the time he reaches the third grade and up to three years behind if he reaches the eighth. Research shows that culturally disadvantaged children have only 1 chance in 1,000 to acquire effective learning habits without the benefit of special preschool orientation. This points to the need for services and facilities in behalf of deprived youngsters.

Over the 1963–73 period, public elementary school enrollments are expected to climb from 29.4 million to 32.1 million, an increase of 9 percent. Meanwhile, in nonpublic elementary schools, the estimated rise is from 5.4 to 5.9 million, also a 9-percent increase. Public secondary school enrollments will go from 10.9 million to an anticipated 14.2 million, up 30 percent; and the nonpublic secondary school enrollments are expected to rise by 38 percent, from 1.3 to 1.8 million.

Since 1946, State and local bonded indebtedness has risen approximately 450 percent, while Federal debt has increased approximately 14 percent. During the same period, State and local taxes have increased approximately 340 percent, while Federal taxes increased approximately 140 percent—before the 1964 Federal tax cut. Quality education requires increased Federal aid.

Few educational agencies have the resources to rehabilitate the victims of poverty or to provide educational programs that will adequately meet the needs of the greatly increased school-age population.

Proposal

Title I adds a 3-year program to Public Law 874 (school assistance for local educational agencies in areas affected by Federal activity) which is designed to encourage and support the establishment, expansion, and improvement of special programs, including the construction of minimum school facilities where needed, to meet the special needs of educationally deprived children of low-income families.

Public schools would be eligible for payments for programs designed to meet the special educational needs of children in school attendance areas having high concentrations of disadvantaged children. In these areas, the school district would design special educational services and arrangements, including those in which all children in need of such services could participate without full-time public school attendance. These special programs might include dual enrollment (shared services) arrangements, educational radio and television, mobile educational services, remedial education, preschool or afterschool programs, additional instructional personnel, equipment and facilities, and others judged necessary for improving the education of disadvantaged children.

Local educational agencies in a given county could be eligible for payments equal to one-half the average per pupil expenditure in that State multiplied by the number of children in that county (aged 5 to 17) in families having an annual income of less than $2,000.

Children in low-income families in selected States and counties

State and county	Children aged 5 to 17 in families with less than $2,000 annual income	Percent of total children aged 5 to 17	Federal payment
Alabama	226,700	25	$31,738,000
Montgomery	8,311	19	1,163,540
Arkansas	139,702	29	21,095,002
Cleburne	1,176	51	177,576
California	227,007	6	60,137,510
Los Angeles	80,545	6	21,344,425
Florida	143,795	13	27,896,230
Dade (Miami)	22,519	11	4,368,686
Illinois	155,694	7	37,288,765
Cook (Chicago)	57,054	5	13,664,433
Kentucky	188,101	24	28,215,150
Metcalfe	1,132	56	169,800
Maryland	56,202	7	13,741,401
Baltimore City	20,902	10	5,110,540
Mississippi	232,603	37	28,028,704
Tunica	2,965	54	357,283
New Mexico	37,998	14	8,351,640
Sierra	622	50	136,840
New York	213,201	6	75,127,295
Erie (Buffalo)	12,432	5	4,382,280
Oregon	25,399	6	6,853,177
Multnomah (Portland)	6,291	5	1,726,880
Tennessee	213,694	23	31,092,525
Hancock	1,155	51	168,053
Texas	386,599	16	74,580,048
Comanche	1,189	49	230,072

The State educational agency would be responsible for distribution of the allotments within the State based on its approval of plans for special programs submitted by the local school districts. However, upon approval of their plans, the school districts in any given county would receive the total amount for which that county would be eligible under the distribution. In multidistrict counties, the total amount for the county would be allocated by the State agency among the districts.

Federal funds made available under this title would be used essentially for improving the education of educationally deprived students, not for the general educational programs of the schools. State and local educational effort must also be maintained and, if possible, increased as a condition of receiving these funds.

Special educational efforts directed to those at the lower end of the economic spectrum will have a salutory effect on the entire educational system and will broaden the range of educational opportunity available to all children. School districts in approximately 95 percent of the Nation's 3,100 counties would be eligible for these poverty-linked funds.

First-year authorization would be approximately $1 billion.

[Fact sheet 2]

TITLE II—SCHOOL LIBRARY RESOURCES AND INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS

Background

At all levels of education, teaching programs have become increasingly dependent upon a well-stocked library, the services of a professional librarian, and up-to-date textbooks. Basic courses in nearly all academic subjects, as well as the most advanced courses, are dependent on libraries and instructional materials. That dependence will grow.

The great majority of our public schools do not have adequate library resources. In many schools, there is an average of less than one-half book per child and some cities spend less than 15 cents a year per child for library books. Today more than two out of every three public elementary schools have no libraries at all and more than 8 out of 10 lack trained librarians. The current public school level of 6.2 library books per pupil and $2.28 annual expenditure for books per pupil are well below the recommended professional standards of 10 books and $4 to $6 annual expenditure for books per pupil.

To meet the accepted minimum standards for cities with populations above 500,000, there is a need for a fourfold increase in current expenditures for school library materials. The cost of books is up 82 percent since 1948. Using the base period 1957–59, the cost of books has risen more than a third while wholesale prices remained constant and consumer prices rose less than 7 percent. This naturally works the greatest hardship on poor school districts.

Textbook sales in the Nation in 1963 amounted to $293 million, or only $6.11 per student. In some States, as much as $12.32 was spent per student; in others as little as $4.76. A single modern, hardbound textbook in many subjects often costs as much or more than the entire year's budget for new instructional books. Moreover, a fourth of all the Nation's public high school systems do not provide free textbooks and it has been stated that high textbook fees are one of the reasons for the school dropout problem.

A new instructional development is the increased use of programed learning textbooks. From 1962 to 1963, programed texts increased from 122 to 352, over half in science and mathematics. But these new materials are expensive; they average $10 to $15 each, thus constituting a barrier to their adoption in all but the wealthier school districts.

Proposal

Title II provides for a 5-year program to make available for the use of schoolchildren, school library resources and other printed and published instructional materials including textbooks essential to improved educational quality in the schools of the Nation.

A State plan would provide for a method of making available books, periodicals, documents, magnetic tapes, phonograph records and other printed and published materials for the use of all schoolchildren in the State.

Materials purchased with Federal funds would not be used for secretarian instruction or religious worship and when made available for the use of students in nonpublic schools would be the same as those used or approved for use in the public schools of the State. In those States legally unable to provide materials for students in nonpublic schools, the Commissioner of Education would make available to such children those materials used in the public schools of the State.

Funds would be allotted to the 50 States, District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands on the basis of the number of children enrolled in public and nonprofit private elementary and secondary schools in each State or territory. The previous level of non-Federal support for these materials would be maintained and, if possible, increased.

First-year authorization would be $100 million.

[Fact sheet 3]

TITLE III—SUPPLEMENTARY EDUCATIONAL CENTERS AND SERVICES

Background

While the problems existing in school districts impacted by poverty are particularly acute, there are also chronic limitations in elementary and secondary schools throughout the Nation regardless of the level of community wealth. A fundamental weakness is the uneven distribution and inconsistent quality of educational, scientific, and cultural resources presently available.

Among the variety of supplementary services that make the difference between a poor school and a good school are special instruction in science, languages, music, and the arts; counseling and guidance; health and social work; and access to such resources as technical institutes, museums, art galleries, and theaters. In these respects there are many unmet needs.

Today less than one-quarter of our elementary schools have the services of a guidance counselor 1 or more days a week. More than 3 million elementary school children are estimated to be in need of social work or psychological services. At present, however, there are only about 3,000 school social workers on the staffs of the public schools; most school systems cannot afford to hire them. Although surveys show that today 7 to 14 percent of schoolchildren have significant emotional problems, more than 9 out of 10 school systems have no special programs for these children and are unable to deal with them effectively through their regular programs.

Reforms and improvements in science and language instruction appear in uneven quality throughout the country. In only 10 States do all secondary schools have science laboratory facilities. Science specialists generally agree that modern science cannot be taught properly without laboratories for teacher and student experimentations. Moreover, less than 30 percent of public secondary schools now have language laboratories available.

By 1968 at least 25,000 additional science laboratories will be needed in elementary schools to meet increases in enrollments—a 500-percent increase. At least 40,000 additional labs will be needed in the high schools, almost a 100-percent increase. Just to keep pace with growth, by 1968 elementary schools will need 8,000 additional language laboratories and high schools will need at least 20,000 more such labs. Centralized laboratory facilities serving a number of schools and systems are one of the answers to meeting this need where individual labs cannot be provided.

Although educational research is demonstrating the increased capability and advantages of early school experiences, about one-half of the Nation's 26,000 school districts today maintain schools without kindergartens, and in only 1 school district out of 260 is a nursery school available.

At a time of greatly accelerating needs, the Nation's educational structure is weakened both by the lack of these special programs and staffs within the schools and by the frequent insulation of students from the cultural, social, and scientific life of the community. Enrichment of the curriculum of elementary and secondary schools through supplementary services is essential to the total strength of education.

Proposal

Title III proposes a 5-year program to provide vitally needed educational services not available in sufficient quantity or quality in elementary and secondary schools and to develop and establish exemplary elementary and secondary school educational programs to serve as models for regular school programs. Special personnel, equipment, and other costly educational services not normally available in most schools would be made available for the widest possible participation of the entire community.

Grants would be made to a supplementary educational center and services organization created to establish and coordinate a program of supplementary educational services. Funds would be made available on the basis of an application reviewed by the State educational agency and approved by the Commissioner of Education. The governing board of the organization would include representatives of the agencies and institutions participating in the conduct of the program. The participants would include at least one local educational agency and one or more of the following: Institutions of higher education, State educational agencies, public agencies such as health and welfare units, and private nonprofit agencies including nonpublic schools, museums, art galleries, educational television stations, and other cultural organizations.

Federal funds would be used for planning, pilot projects, and the establishment and operation of programs offering a diverse range of educational experience to children and adults of varying talents and needs. Programs might include guidance and counseling; remedial instruction; school health, psychological and social work services; enriched academic programs; afterschool study halls; continuing adult education; dual enrollment (shared services); specialized instruction and equipment; specially qualified personnel (including artists and musicians) on a temporary or other basis; educational radio and television programs; special educational services for persons in isolated rural areas; and other specially designed educational programs. Grants could also be used for the lease or construction of necessary facilities.

Children attending nonpublic as well as public schools and out-of-school youth and adults would have the opportunity to receive the services and participate in these educational and cultural activities.

An Advisory Committee on Supplementary Education Centers and Services would advise the Commissioner on the action to be taken on each application for a grant.

Initially, American Samoa, Guam and the Virgin Islands would each receive $50,000. The 50 States, District of Columbia and Puerto Rico would each receive $200,000. The remainder of the funds would be distributed among the States and Territories on the basis of (1) the number of children aged 5 to 17 and (2) the total population of each jurisdiction.

The first-year authorization would be $100 million.

[Fact sheet 4]

TITLE IV—EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND TRAINING; AMENDMENTS TO THE COOPERATIVE RESEARCH ACT OF 1954

Background

Eleven years ago Congress authorized the Commissioner of Education to enter into contracts or jointly financed cooperative arrangements with colleges, universities, and State educational agencies to conduct research, surveys, and demonstrations in the field of education. The program that has subsequently emerged from this decade of experience has two basic purposes: (1) To develop new knowledge about education, and (2) to develop new ways of applying existing knowledge.

Significant progress has been made in educational research. For example:

Programs have been developed to guide elementary pupils in discovering the basic concepts of modern mathematics; results are so encouraging that many school systems throughout the country are adopting these methods.

Two-year-old children have been taught to read—and to read well—in experimental programs that stimulate their curiosity and intellectual drive.

Grade school pupils have been successfully taught college-level economics, indicating that curriculum evaluation and research are necessities at all levels.

A New Jersey study of the education of migrant children points to new and more fruitful directions for handling a problem that plagues most of our States.

A total of about $16 million is being spent in fiscal year 1965 on cooperative research. Some 280 projects are involved. This is, however, a small answer to a great need. Only $3 of every $1,000 of Federal expenditures for research and development were devoted to education in 1964.

Education, with a total annual expenditure of about $34 billion is the Nation's No. 1 industry. Yet we spend only $72 million—one-fifth of 1 percent of our total educational outlays—for research and development in this vital field. By contrast, we spend $8 billion annually for research and development on our Nation's defenses. Many progressive private industries invest as much as 10 percent of their total annual expenditures for research and development.

To carry out research is to assume the obligation of disseminating the findings, so that education as a whole may benefit. In medicine the average lag between research and its application is estimated at 2 years. In education, the process often takes 30 years or more. The record of education in publishing research findings has not been satisfactory. To help in finding a solution to this problem, pilot research and development centers have been established at a cost in 1965 of about $1,900,000—at the Universities of Pittsburgh, Oregon, Wisconsin, and at Harvard University.

Each of these centers will conduct activities stretching across the research and development spectrum, including basic research, development of educational procedures and materials, field testing, and demonstration and dissemination. At the University of Pittsburgh, where the first center was established, significant results are being obtained. In one project, for example, courses of study have been tailored to fit the needs of the individual learner; in another, new educational devices are employed to motivate preschool children to read.

Such educational research and its dissemination help the schools and colleges of the Nation to carry on educational programs more efficiently, more effectively, and with greater economy of resources. But a mere four centers, with all their promise, cannot serve the needs of 26,000 school districts and a tenth as many institutions of higher learning. Other regions of the country and many other segments of education need assistance in the form of new R. & D. programs.

Proposal

Title IV would amend the Cooperative Research Act of 1954 (Public Law 83-531) by authorizing the training of research personnel and improved dissemination of information derived from educational research and development. Authority would be granted to utilize the research competence of research organizations not now eligible to contribute to the program, such as private noncollegiate research organizations and professional associations. In addition, the program would provide for the construction and operation of centers to improve the quality of teaching in our schools and for the purchase of research equipment.

Together, these amendments would permit the continued growth of educational research programs in the United States and an accelerated funding of research and development centers or regional educational laboratories. The goal: a national network of federally supported but State- and university-operated research centers.

Regional educational laboratories offer a promising way of meeting problems of research, development, and dissemination. They will help to train teachers and improve curriculums. They will draw equally upon educators and the practitioners in all the fields of learning—mathematicians, scientists, humanists, historians, economists, social scientists, linguists, musicians, artists, and writers.

These laboratories will have close ties with the State departments of education. They will also work directly with the schools and supplementary education centers in order to bring innovation directly to the student. They will train teachers as well as those who teach teachers.

First-year cost of these amendments would be $45 million, in addition to the regular cooperative research budget of $25 million in fiscal year 1966.

[Fact sheet 5]

TITLE V—STRENGTHENING STATE DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION

Background

The immediate responsibility for providing professional counsel and direction to the schools lies with the various State departments of education. At the very time that demand for this kind of counsel and direction is on the increase, the ability of the State departments to respond is inadequate. The necessity of meeting school operating costs, of spending what it takes to keep sufficient classrooms available, exerts increasing pressure on the share of the school dollar made available to State departments of education. Moreover, the responsibility of ensuring the wise and proper use of Federal funds dispensed in a variety of Federal-State cooperative programs generally rests squarely with State educational agencies.

The States vary greatly in their educational expenditures. Some States spend barely $200,000 a year for State educational leadership, while others spend more than 70 times that amount. Some States employ 500 professional educators; other States, as few as 35. Professionals to oversee school library services are lacking altogether in one-third of the State departments of education, while only 11 States have consultants in school social work. Moreover, during the past 5 years there has been a 40-percent turnover in State supervisory personnel; the majority have gone into better paying positions at the local level and in colleges and universities.

The department of education in a typical, middle-income State has 75 professional staff members available to serve as consultants to 20,000 school people—superintendents, principals, teachers, and others. On the average, these professionals are able to visit the State's schools for only one-half day each 7 years. Demands on the education budget are such in this State that no likelihood is foreseen in the ability of its department of education to improve its services.

If the States are to be strengthened and American education kept both strong and decentralized, measures are needed to bolster the administrative and legal foundations of our educational system.

Proposal

Title V proposes a 5-year program to stimulate and assist in strengthening the leadership resources of State educational agencies. The State educational agency would identify educational needs of the State and design programs to meet these needs.

Programs and activities might include long-range educational planning; improved collecting, processing, and analyzing of educational data (including use of automated data systems); conducting, sponsoring or cooperating in educational research; developing the competency of individuals who serve State or local educational agencies and provide leadership, administrative or specialist services; cooperation with institutions of higher education and local educational agencies to improve the quality of teacher preparation, including student teaching; and other special needs of State departments of education.

Eighty-five percent of the funds appropriated would be apportioned as follows: $50,000 each to Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands, and $100,000 to each of the States, District of Columbia and Puerto Rico. The remainder of the 85 percent would be apportioned among the States and Territories based on the number of public school pupils. State agencies would apply to the Commissioner for a grant or grants for part of the costs of their proposal. The Commissioner would approve applications if he determined that the proposal would be within the purposes of the law.

Fifteen percent of the funds appropriated would be reserved to the Commissioner to make special grants for research and demonstrations and for the establishment of special services which promise to help solve educational problems common to all or several of the State educational agencies.

First-year authorization would be $10 million.

A second part of title V would permit an interchange of personnel between States and the Office of Education for cooperative educational activities and technical and other assistance which would assist in the strengthening of American education.

Estimated Federal payments under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965

State	Education of children of low-income families	Supplementary educational centers and services	School library resources and instructional materials	Strengthening State departments of education	Total
United States and outlying areas	$1,000,000,000	$100,000,000	$100,000,000	$8,500,000	$1,208,500,000
Alabama	31,738,000	1,848,183	1,743,209	161,458	35,490,850
Alaska	1,336,472	318,630	119,467	104,208	1,878,777
Arizona	9,100,006	937,181	819,362	127,384	10,983,933
Arkansas	21,095,002	1,100,693	942,684	133,576	23,271,955
California	60,137,510	8,263,535	9,356,424	410,041	78,167,510
Colorado	7,721,560	1,109,926	1,071,419	135,638	10,038,543
Connecticut	6,155,076	1,436,389	1,400,169	141,940	9,133,574
Delaware	1,966,851	425,768	258,226	107,837	2,758,682
Florida	27,896,230	2,710,131	2,617,466	188,687	33,412,514
Georgia	34,517,871	2,235,274	2,185,906	178,025	39,117,076
Hawaii	1,904,676	531,380	393,138	111,804	2,940,998
Idaho	2,100,136	537,339	372,489	112,917	3,122,881
Illinois	37,288,765	4,943,134	5,389,313	253,009	47,874,221
Indiana	18,424,129	2,458,260	2,541,258	182,383	23,606,030
Iowa	16,346,232	1,491,506	1,491,407	146,459	19,475,604
Kansas	9,090,592	1,233,866	1,152,628	137,925	11,615,011
Kentucky	28,215,150	1,691,776	1,557,466	149,679	31,614,071
Louisiana	37,904,234	1,882,932	1,932,808	158,875	41,878,849
Maine	3,780,000	660,364	528,537	116,335	5,085,236
Maryland	13,741,401	1,783,996	1,818,913	155,096	17,499,406
Massachusetts	11,908,492	2,588,350	2,635,630	174,363	17,306,835
Michigan	29,765,556	4,062,794	4,695,888	243,670	38,767,908
Minnesota	19,248,386	1,867,997	1,998,425	159,008	23,273,816
Mississippi	28,028,704	1,341,527	1,224,582	143.346	30,738,159
Missouri	25,957,735	2,194,717	2,321,138	171,011	30,644,601
Montana	3,511,907	538,784	384,799	112,351	4,547,841
Nebraska	6,774,304	881,108	779,136	123,765	8,558,313
Nevada	631,040	377,940	212,853	104,473	1,326,306
New Hampshire	$1,451,592	$496,163	$337,963	$109,388	$2,395,106
New Jersey	17,777,548	3,159,017	3,250,467	193,995	24,381,027
New Mexico	8,351,640	699,717	593,744	119,486	9,764,587
New York	75,127,295	8,034,171	8,336,439	334,342	91,832,247
North Carolina	48,496,960	2,514,127	2,447,947	188,249	53,647,283
North Dakota	4,834,410	513,786	349,089	111,055	5,808,340
Ohio	35,235,338	4,926,076	5,434,535	266,996	45,862,945
Oklahoma	14,777,840	1,325,618	1,273,402	144,929	17,521,789
Oregon	6,853,177	1,069,776	980,782	133,013	9,036,748
Pennsylvania	44,890,181	5,407,680	5,938,648	265,660	56,502,169
Rhode Island	3,399,750	601,767	430,178	111,285	4,542,980
South Carolina	25,519,125	1,452,925	1,326,833	147,371	28,446,254
South Dakota	6,142,156	542,251	388,881	112,284	7,185,572
Tennessee	31,092,525	1,970,661	1,835,751	167,730	35,066,667
Texas	74,580,048	5,097,472	5,373,277	284,529	85,335,326
Utah	2,373,062	691,632	590,688	121,164	3,776,546
Vermont	1,489,957	390,835	209,098	106,137	2,196,027
Virginia	29,312,850	2,221,193	2,106,138	172,557	33,812,738
Washington	9,525,713	1,592,775	1,599,956	153,808	12,872,252
West Virginia	15,554,250	1,072,551	929,563	132,645	17,689,009
Wisconsin	14,471,631	2,123,991	2,290,563	162,258	19,048,443
Wyoming	1,358,100	363,499	188,433	106,592	2,016,624
District of Columbia	3,825,800	534,934	347,598	110,588	4,818,920
American Samoa	----------	62,258	16,814	50,505	208,231
Canal Zone	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------
Guam	----------	82,921	44,901	51,215	368,109
Puerto Rico	----------	1,531,408	1,407,539	146,269	48,219,573
Virgin Islands	----------	67,316	26,033	50,687	768,576

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. I want to compliment the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky, who has done so much in this field for so many years, on the statement he has made in reference to the message on education which President Johnson has sent to the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the President has sent the Congress a great and challenging message on education. It should be broadcast throughout the land.

He has laid his case in eloquent terms for a massive assault on ignorance. All Americans should know why his cornerstone for the building of a Great Society, why his master battle plan of the war against poverty, is the creation of full educational opportunity.

America is more than the land of the free. It is equally the land of opportunity. Today, more than ever, freedom and opportunity are the creation and children of education.

Our schoolrooms are crowded by the postwar baby booms. Our labor force suffers from the upgrading of skills demanded by automation. Our local school districts—especially those in low-income areas—are strained to raise the means to support the school systems demanded by the times.

President Johnson made the case that education is the No. 1 business of the American people. In the coming decade, education must become the No. 1 industry in America. To do less is to jeopardize freedom, curtail opportunity, and risk the birthright of every American.

I am confident this Congress and this administration, together with the 50 States and the local school authorities, will meet the educational challenge of today.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Kentucky yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. HECHLER. I would like to add my compliments to those of the majority leader. I think the gentleman from Kentucky has made a magnificent contribution in this field.

Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's great education program will provide exciting new breakthroughs from the top to the bottom of our educational system. Education is the keystone of the arch in building the Great Society. We have suffered by failing to recognize the terrible urgency of action; we have suffered through internecine warfare over religious and other matters; precious time has been lost by squabbling, shibboleths, and scapegoats. The President has now sounded the clarion call and made education the national imperative.

As a former teacher, I have the deep conviction that we must act now to bolster education or be resigned to the role of a second-rate power. Long ago we should have realized the truth of the President's statement that education is more important than military expenditures. The President very correctly noted that "armed might is worthless if we lack the brainpower to build a world of peace."

We in West Virginia, Mr. Speaker, are acutely aware of the extremely close relationship between education and economic progress. We are making great strides in vocational training and retraining programs, in implementing the tremendous boost given to higher education by the 88th Congress, and in devising new educational programs under the Economic Opportunity Act. Under the terms of the President's proposals for elementary and secondary education, out of $1.2 billion nationally, the State of West Virginia would receive $15,554,250 to aid in the education of children of low-income families; $1,072,551 for supplementary educational centers and services; $929,563 for strengthening school library resources and instructional materials; and $132,645 for strengthening the West Virginia State Department of Education.

The President's new education program contains many features which will prove particularly beneficial to West Virginia. Children of low-income families and in areas where the tax base is inadequate have the right to get an education just as much as those children who grow up in wealthy suburbs. I am glad to see the emphasis placed on improving school libraries, on setting up supplementary educational centers and regional education laboratories. The student assistance features of the President's higher education proposals and the strengthening of smaller colleges will aid also in building higher education in West Virginia and throughout the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I have seen, as a member of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, that we face a critical shortage and serious future demand for trained scientists. Yet we must train not only in the sciences, but it is also vital to educate for future leadership in the social sciences and the humanities. Dr. Albert Schweitzer once said that this is the most dangerous period in all human history because up to now nature has controlled man, but now man has learned to harness and control certain elemental forces before he has learned to control himself. The genius in the laboratory must be matched by the genius in social organization, human relationships, the proper use and enjoyment of leisure, and above all the nurturing of those spiritual qualities without which humanity cannot survive. Yes, Mr. Speaker, we must seek out and cultivate excellence and superiority in every field of human endeavor.

President Johnson has blown the trumpet call to action. On this 12th day of January, I am proud to be a Member of the Congress of the United States as we rise to our responsibility to enact a program for education which now constitutes America's great unfinished business.

LITERACY AND CONSTITUTIONAL INTERPRETATION TESTS MUST BE ABOLISHED

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, in his state of the Union message on January 4 the President proposed that "we eliminate every remaining obstacle to the right and opportunity to vote."

The right to vote is a fundamental principle, upon which rests the very foundation of our democracy. The 15th amendment to the Constitution recognizes the vital importance of the right to vote and declares:

> The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

Despite the constitutional guarantee, the right to vote has been denied to a substantial number of American citizens.

The fact of discrimination against Negro citizens in voting is well established. In Mississippi only 5 to 6 percent of the Negroes of voting age are registered to vote. In Alabama only 18.7 percent of the nonwhites are registered. In Virginia nonwhite registration is 24.8 percent, while in South Carolina and Louisiana it is 30 percent and 31.4 percent, respectively.

The events of last summer focused national attention on the efforts of the State of Mississippi to deny Negro citizens the right to vote. Terror, intimidation, and even murder are used to keep the Negro from the voting booth.

However, more subtle means are also used to accomplish this unconstitutional result. The literacy test, including constitutional interpretation tests, is a primary tool employed to flaunt the 15th amendment.

I have seen at firsthand how the constitutional interpretation test is used in Mississippi to discriminate against Negro citizens.

Section 244 of the Mississippi constitution requires that an applicant "be able to read and write any section of the constitution of the State and give a reasonable interpretation thereof to the county registrar." County clerks have complete discretion in administering and grading the test. They select the section to be interpreted. I have seen sections selected for Negroes which constitutional lawyers would find difficult to explain. On the other hand, white applicants are given the easiest sections.

Even when a reasonable interpretation has been given by a Negro, the application has been rejected. In many instances whites who were unable to interpret the simple sections have been accepted.

Mr. Speaker, the fact that the Civil Rights Act of 1964 does not abolish constitutional interpretation tests and similar devices is a glaring omission which must be corrected immediately. The time is long overdue to end discrimination in voting and abolish all literacy tests.

Today I have introduced the first bill to amend the Civil Rights Act of 1964. It outlaws all literacy tests as a qualification for voting in any election—State or Federal. Literacy tests, interpretation and comprehension tests, tests designed to test reasoning ability or power of analysis are obstacles to the right and opportunity to vote which must be eliminated.

The abolition of literacy tests will also make it possible for large numbers of Spanish-speaking citizens of New York and other States to exercise their rights to vote which have been impeded by the existence of literacy requirements—no matter how fairly and objectively administered. In a democracy there is no reason to erect barriers to the franchise, and Congress must remove them wherever they exist.

HARBOR AT PORT ORFORD, OREG.

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, the bill I am introducing today seeks the assistance of the Federal Government in improving the harbor at Port Orford, Oreg., the only port on the Oregon coast that has relied solely on its own efforts to create a safe harbor for commerce and refuge. Port Orford has never had a Federal project for navigation.

The people of Port Orford, at their own expense 30 years ago, constructed a lumber and fish pier. This was destroyed by storm the following year, and the people rebuilt the pier again with only local funds and constructed a breakwater to protect the harbor to the extent they could from the ravages of winter storms.

But this was not enough protection because they had to rebuild the pier four times and extend the breakwater for additional protection, again with local funds only.

This harbor is vital to the livelihoods of the people in the Port Orford area but, as the Army Corps of Engineers study points out, the exposure to winter storms hampers the use of the harbor. The corps has recommended a 550-foot extension of the breakwater to eliminate damages to the terminal structures, assure more efficient and economical movement of wood products, and permit safe moorage of fishing boats and other small craft. Corps studies showed a 1.9 cost benefit ratio for this feasible and necessary harbor improvement.

The people of the Port Orford area are to be complimented for their willingness to carry this burden alone for decades. They have invested almost $500,000 to create a commercially efficient harbor as well as a safe refuge port.

Port Orford is a deepwater port. No bar hampers ingress and egress. Its development is essential to the economic growth of the community.

If this port is to serve the commercial needs of the area upon which the people depend for their livings, and if the port is to be protected from winter storms and serve as a refuge, the breakwater must be extended. It is economically feasible. It is necessary. But local people can no longer carry the burden alone. The estimated total cost of the project would be $696,000.

I am confident this project will have the support of the Congress.

CODE OF ETHICS FOR MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE AND THEIR LEGISLATIVE EMPLOYEES

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a House resolution which would establish a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct to recommend to the House a comprehensive code of ethics for Members and their legislative employees. It specifically requires the select committee to make its recommendations within 1 year. My distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from New York, JACOB K. JAVITS, is also introducing today in the other body similar legislation relating to Senators and their legislative employees.

It is essential in my judgment that the House regain to every extent possible the confidence of the American people in the area of congressional ethics.

We cannot continue to function with a double standard of ethics—one set for the executive branch, but none for the legislative branch. In 1962 the Congress passed a modern conflicts-of-interest code for the executive branch of our Government. This was a signal achievement and represented the first major overhaul of our conflicts-of-interest laws in the 20th century. However, an appropriate code for employees and Members of the Congress totaling some 25,000 was not enacted. This is an omission which should be promptly remedied.

The resolution would establish an interim code of ethics—which would require a Member of the House to file with the Comptroller General a record of any financial interests valued at $5,000 or more—in an activity which is subject to the jurisdiction of a Federal regulatory agency. It would ban the use of confidential information for other than official purposes; and would bar the use of official influence to gain special privileges or exemptions. Another provision would require Members of the House to disclose any pecuniary interest in the passage or defeat of legislation before voting on it.

Mr. Speaker, I am also introducing a companion measure which would amend the Administrative Procedure Act to require that any written or oral communication between a Member of the Congress or his staff and a regulatory agency in adjudicatory proceedings be made a part of the public record.

In a word, I, along with others of my colleagues, urge the need for Congress to put its own Houses in order. Only in this fashion can we be a respected and truly coordinate branch of the Government.

TOWARD FULL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 45)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

In 1787, the Continental Congress declared in the Northwest Ordinance:

> Schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged.

America is strong and prosperous and free because for 178 years we have honored that commitment.

In the United States today—

One-quarter of all Americans are in the Nation's classrooms.

High school attendance has grown eighteenfold since the turn of the century—six times as fast as the population.

College enrollment has advanced eightyfold. Americans today support a fourth of the world's institutions of higher learning and a third of its professors and college students.

In the life of the individual, education is always an unfinished task.

And in the life of this Nation, the advancement of education is a continuing challenge.

There is a darker side to education in America:

One student out of every three now in the fifth grade will drop out before finishing high school—if the present rate continues.

Almost a million young people will continue to quit school each year—if our schools fail to stimulate their desire to learn.

Over 100,000 of our brightest high school graduates each year will not go to college—and many others will leave college—if the opportunity for higher education is not expanded.

The cost of this neglect runs high—both for the youth and the Nation.

Unemployment of young people with an eighth-grade education or less is four times the national average.

Jobs filled by high school graduates rose by 40 percent in the last 10 years. Jobs for those with less schooling decreased by nearly 10 percent.

We can measure the cost in even starker terms. We now spend about $450 a year per child in our public schools. But we spend $1,800 a year to keep a delinquent youth in a detention home, $2,500 a year for a family on relief, $3,500 a year for a criminal in State prison.

The growing numbers of young people reaching school age demand that we move swiftly even to stand still.

Attendance in elementary and secondary schools will increase by 4 million in the next 5 years. Four hundred thousand new classrooms will be needed to meet this growth. But almost one-half million of the Nation's existing classrooms are already more than 30 years old.

The post-World War II boom in babies has now reached college age. And by 1970, our colleges must be prepared to add 50 percent more enrollment to their presently overcrowded facilities.

In the past, Congress has supported an increasing commitment to education in America. Last year, I signed historic measures passed by the 88th Congress to provide—

Facilities badly needed by universities, colleges, and community colleges;

Major new resources for vocational training;

More loans and fellowships for students enrolled in higher education;

Enlarged and improved training for physicians, dentists, and nurses.

I propose that the 89th Congress join me in extending the commitment still further. I propose that we declare a national goal of full educational opportunity.

Every child must be encouraged to get as much education as he has the ability to take.

We want this not only for his sake—but for the Nation's sake.

Nothing matters more to the future of our country: not our military preparedness—for armed might is worthless if we lack the brainpower to build a world of peace; not our productive economy—for we cannot sustain growth without trained manpower; not our democratic system of government—for freedom is fragile if citizens are ignorant.

We must demand that our schools increase not only the quantity but the quality of America's education. For we recognize that nuclear age problems cannot be solved with horse-and-buggy learning. The three R's of our school system must be supported by the three T's—teachers who are superior, techniques of instruction that are modern, and thinking about education which places it first in all our plans and hopes.

Specifically, four major tasks confront us:

To bring better education to millions of disadvantaged youths who need it most;

To put the best educational equipment and ideas and innovations within reach of all students;

To advance the technology of teaching and the training of teachers;

To provide incentives for those who wish to learn at every stage along the road to learning.

Our program must match the magnitude of these tasks. The budget on education which I request for fiscal year 1966 will contain a total of $4.1 billion. This includes $1.1 billion to finance programs established by the 88th Congress. I will submit a request for $1.5 billion in new obligational authority to finance the programs described in this message. This expenditure is a small price to pay for developing our Nation's most priceless resource.

In all that we do, we mean to strengthen our State and community education systems. Federal assistance does not mean Federal control—as past programs have proven. The late Senator Robert Taft declared:

> Education is primarily a State function—but in the field of education, as in the fields of health, relief and medical care, the Federal Government has a secondary obligation to see that there is a basic floor under those essential services for all adults and children in the United States.

In this spirit, I urge that we now push ahead with the No. 1 business of the American people—the education of our youth in preschools, elementary and secondary schools, and in the colleges and universities.

I. PRESCHOOL PROGRAM

My budget will include up to $150 million for preschool projects under the community action program of the Economic Opportunity Act.

Education must begin with the very young. The child from the urban or rural slum frequently misses his chance even before he begins school. Tests show that he is usually a year behind in academic attainment by the time he reaches third grade—and up to 3 years behind if he reaches the eighth grade. By then the handicap has grown too great for many children. Their horizons are narrowed; their prospects for lifetimes of failure have hardened. A large percentage of our young people whose family incomes are less than $2,000 do not go beyond the eighth grade.

Preschool programs have demonstrated marked success in overcoming this initial handicap:

In New York City, children from slum neighborhoods who attended nursery school have performed better when tested in the third and fourth grades than those who did not attend.

In Baltimore, children with language and cultural handicaps are being helped greatly by a preschool program. According to preliminary reports, two-thirds of them are in the top 50 percent of their kindergarten and first-grade classes on a citywide measure; one-sixth of them are in the top quarter.

But today, almost half of our school districts conduct no kindergarten classes. Public nursery schools are found in only about 100 of our 26,000 school districts. We must expand our preschool program in order to reach disadvantaged children early.

Action on a wide front will begin this summer through a special "head start" program for children who are scheduled to begin school next fall. In addition, funds for low-income schools, regional education laboratories, and supplementary educational centers and services—recommended below—will be devoted to these vital preschool programs.

II. ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS

Elementary and secondary schools are the foundation of our education system.

Forty-eight million students are now in our grade and high schools.

Seventy-one percent of the Nation's expenditures for education are spent on elementary and secondary schooling.

If these schools are to do their job properly, they need help and they need it now. I propose that we give first priority to a program of:

A. Aid to low-income school districts:

I recommend that legislation be enacted to authorize a major program of assistance to public elementary and secondary schools serving children of low-income families. My budget for fiscal year 1966 will request $1 billion for this new program.

One hundred years ago, a man with 6 or 7 years of schooling stood well above the average. His chances to get ahead were as good as the next man's. But today, lack of formal education is likely to mean low wages, frequent unemployment, and a home in an urban or rural slum.

Poverty has many roots but the taproot is ignorance.

Poverty is the lot of two-thirds of the families in which the family head has had 8 years or less of schooling.

Twenty percent of the youth aged 18 to 24 with an eighth-grade education or less are unemployed—four times the national average.

Just as ignorance breeds poverty, poverty all too often breeds ignorance in the next generation.

Nearly half the youth rejected by Selective Service for educational deficiency have fathers who are unemployed or else working in unskilled and low-income jobs.

Fathers of more than one-half of the draft rejectees did not complete the eighth grade.

The burden on the Nation's schools is not evenly distributed. Low-income families are heavily concentrated in particular urban neighborhoods or rural areas. Faced with the largest educational needs, many of these school districts have inadequate financial resources. This imbalance has been increased by the movement of high-income families from the center of cities to the suburbs—and their replacement by low-income families from rural areas.

The five States with the lowest incomes spend only an average of $276 per pupil, less than half the average of the five highest income States.

Despite a massive effort, our big cities generally spend only about two-thirds as much per pupil as their adjacent suburbs.

In our 15 largest cities, 60 percent of the 10th-grade students from poverty neighborhoods drop out before finishing high school.

This is a national problem. Federal action is needed to assist the States and localities in bringing the full benefits of education to children of low-income families.

Assistance will be provided—

On the basis of census data showing the distribution of low-income families among the counties or school districts within States.

Through payments made to States for distribution to school districts.

With the assurance that the funds will be used for improving the quality of education in schools serving low-income areas.

On the condition that Federal funds will not be used to reduce State and local fiscal efforts.

For the benefit of all children within the area served, including those who participate in shared services or other special educational projects.

B. School library resources and instructional materials:

I recommend legislation to authorize Federal grants to States to assist in the purchase of books for school libraries and for student use, to be made available to children in public and private nonprofit elementary and secondary schools.

Thomas Carlyle once said:

> All that mankind has done, thought, gained or been: it is lying as in magic preservation in the pages of books.

Yet our school libraries are limping along.

Almost 70 percent of the public elementary schools have no libraries. Eighty-four percent lack librarians to teach children the value of learning through good books.

Many schools have an average of less than one-half book per child.

To meet the accepted standards for library materials would require a fourfold increase in current expenditures in our major cities.

The explosion of knowledge and the rapid revision of curriculums in the schools has created new demands for school textbooks. The obsolete text can suffocate the learning process. Yet the cost of purchasing textbooks at increasing prices puts a major obstacle in the path of education—an obstacle that can and must be eliminated.

C. Supplementary educational centers and services:

I recommend a program of Federal grants for supplementary education centers and services within the community.

We think of schools as places where youth learns, but our schools also need to learn.

The educational gap we face is one of quality as well as quantity.

Exciting experiments in education are underway, supported by the National Science Foundation, by the Office of Education, and other Government agencies, and by private philanthropic foundations. Many of our children have studied the "new" math. There are highly effective ways of teaching high school physics, biology, chemistry, and foreign languages.

We need to take full advantage of these and other innovations. Specialists can spark the interest of disadvantaged students. Remedial reading courses open up new vistas for slow learners. Gifted students can be brought along at a faster pace.

Yet such special educational services are not available in many communities. A limited local tax base cannot stand the expense. Most individual schools are not large enough to justify the services.

The supplementary center can provide such services as:

Special courses in science, foreign languages, literature, music, and art.

Programs for the physically handicapped and mentally retarded.

Instruction in the sciences and humanities during the summer for economically and culturally deprived children.

Special assistance after regular school hours.

Common facilities that can be maintained more efficiently for a group of schools than for a single school—laboratories, libraries, auditoriums, and theaters.

A system by which gifted persons can teach part time to provide scarce talents.

A means of introducing into the school system new courses, instructional materials, and teaching practices.

A way of tapping the community's extracurricular resources for the benefit of students—museums, concert, and lecture programs, and industrial laboratories.

Within each community, public and private nonprofit schools and agencies will cooperate to devise the plan and administer the program for these supplementary centers. Their services should be adapted to meet the pressing needs of each locality.

D. Regional education laboratories:

I recommend the establishment under the Cooperative Research Act of regional educational laboratories which will undertake research, train teachers, and implement tested research findings.

I further recommend amendments to the act to—

Broaden the types of research organizations now eligible for educational projects.

Train educational research personnel.

Provide grants for research, development of new curricula, dissemination of information, and implementation of educational innovations.

Support construction of research facilities and the purchase of research equipment.

Under auspices of the National Science Foundation, educators have worked with scientists—including Nobel laureates—to develop courses which capture the excitement of contemporary science. They have prepared totally new instructional materials—laboratory equipment, textbooks, teachers' guides, films, supplementary reading, and examinations. After testing they are made available to public and private schools.

We need to extend our research and development—to history, literature, and economics; to art and music; to reading, writing, and speaking; to occupational, vocational, and technical education. We need to extend it to all stages of learning—preschool, elementary and secondary schools, college and graduate training.

Regional laboratories for education offer great promise. They draw equally upon educators and the practitioners in all fields of learning—mathematicians, scientists, social scientists, linguists, musicians, artists, and writers. They help both to improve curricula and to train teachers.

E. Strengthening State educational agencies:

I recommend a program of grants to State educational agencies.

State leadership becomes increasingly important as we seek to improve the quality of elementary and secondary education.

We should assist the States by strengthening State departments of education in their efforts to—

Provide consultative and technical assistance for local school districts and local school leadership.

Formulate long-range plans.

Expand educational research and development.

Improve local and State information about education.

Identify emerging educational problems.

Provide for the training of State and local education personnel.

Conduct periodic evaluation of educational programs.

Promote teacher improvement courses.

These new programs will substantially augment community resources in the war against poverty. As provided by sections 611 and 612 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, I will see that the new efforts are kept in step with our other antipoverty efforts.

In those localities where the community has undertaken a community action program under the Economic Opportunity Act, the community agency should participate in the planning of these new educational programs and in their coordination with on-going and developing antipoverty efforts.

Enactment of these proposals for elementary and secondary education is of utmost urgency. I urge early and favorable consideration by the Congress.

III. HIGHER EDUCATION

Higher education is no longer a luxury, but a necessity.

Programs enacted by Congress in the past have contributed greatly to strengthening our colleges and universities. These will be carried forward under my 1966 budget, which includes:

An additional $179 million to assist construction of college classrooms, libraries, and laboratories.

An additional $25 million for 4,500 more graduate fellowships to overcome college teaching shortages.

An additional $110 million to further basic research in the universities, to provide science fellowships, and to promote science education.

But we need to do more:

To extend the opportunity for higher education more broadly among lower and middle income families.

To help small and less well developed colleges improve their programs.

To enrich the library resources of colleges and universities.

To draw upon the unique and invaluable resources of our great universities to deal with national problems of poverty and community development.

A. ASSISTANCE TO STUDENTS

1. Scholarships:

I recommend a program of scholarships for needy and qualified high school graduates to enable them to enter and to continue in college.

Loans authorized by the National Defense Education Act currently assist nearly 300,000 college students. Still the following conditions exist:

Each year an estimated 100,000 young people of demonstrated ability fail to go on to college because of lack of money. Many thousands more from low-income families must borrow heavily to meet college costs.

Only one out of three young people from low-income families attend college compared with four out of five from high-income families.

For many young people from poor families loans are not enough to open the way to higher education.

Under this program, a special effort will be made to identify needy students of promise early in their high school careers. The scholarship will serve as a building block, to be augmented by work-study and other support, so that the needy student can chart his own course in higher studies.

My 1966 budget provides sufficient funds for grants to help up to 140,000 students in the first year.

2. Expansion of work-study opportunity and guaranteed low-interest loans.

I recommend—

That the existing college work-study program be made available to more students and that authority for the program be transferred to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

That a part of the cost of interest payments on guaranteed private loans to college students be paid by the Federal Government.

Going to college is increasingly expensive. A student must pay nearly $2,400 a year in a private college and about $1,600 in a public college. These costs may rise by one-third over the next decade.

Two aids should be extended to meet the heavy costs of college education. First, the existing work-study program should be expanded for students from low-income families and extended to students from middle-income families. Under this program the Federal Government pays 90 percent of the wages earned by students on useful projects. This will enable a student to earn on the average of $450 during a school year, and up to $500 more during the summer.

Second, many families cannot cover all of college expenses on an out-of-pocket basis. We should assure greater availability of private credit on reasonable terms and conditions. This can best be done by paying part of interest cost of guaranteed loans made by private lenders—a more effective, fairer, and far less costly way of providing assistance than the various tax credit devices which have been proposed.

B. AID TO SMALLER COLLEGES

I recommend that legislation be enacted to strengthen less developed colleges.

Many of our smaller colleges are lacking proper accreditation, and others face constantly the threat of losing accreditation. Many are isolated from the main currents of academic life.

Private sources and States alone cannot carry the whole burden of doing what must be done for these important units in our total educational system; Federal aid is essential.

Universities should be encouraged to enter into cooperative relationships to help less developed colleges, including such assistance as:

A program of faculty exchanges.

Special programs to enable faculty members of small colleges to renew and extend knowledge of their fields.

A national fellowship program to encourage highly qualified young graduate students and instructors in large universities to augment the teaching resources of small colleges.

The development of joint programs to make more efficient use of available facilities and faculty.

In union there is strength. This is the basic premise of my recommendation.

C. SUPPORT FOR COLLEGE LIBRARY RESOURCES

I recommend enactment of legislation for purchase of books and library materials to strengthen college teaching and research.

Fifty percent of our 4-year institutions and 82 percent of our 2-year institutions fall below accepted professional standards in the number of volumes possessed.

As student enrollment mounts, we must look not only to the physical growth of our colleges and universities. They must be developed as true centers of intellectual activity. To construct a library building is meaningless unless there are books to bring life to the library.

D. UNIVERSITY-COMMUNITY EXTENSION PROGRAM

I recommend a program of grants to support university extension concentrating on problems of the community.

Institutions of higher learning are being called on ever more frequently for public service—for defense research, foreign development, and countless other programs. They have performed magnificently. We must now call upon them to meet new needs.

Once, 90 percent of our population earned its living from the land. A wise Congress enacted the Morrill Act of 1862 and the Hatch Act of 1887 which helped the State universities help the American people. With the aid of the land-grant colleges, American agriculture produced overwhelming abundance.

Today, 70 percent of our people live in urban communities. They are confronted by problems of poverty, residential blight, polluted air and water, inadequate mass transportation and health services, strained human relations, and overburdened municipal services.

Our great universities have the skills and knowledge to match these mountainous problems. They can offer expert guidance in community planning; research and development in pressing educational problems; economic and job market studies; continuing education of the community's professional and business leadership; and programs for the disadvantaged.

The role of the university must extend far beyond the ordinary extension-type operation. Its research findings and talents must be made available to the community. Faculty must be called upon for consulting activities. Pilot projects, seminars, conferences, TV programs, and task forces drawing on many departments of the university—all should be brought into play.

This is a demanding assignment for the universities, and many are not now ready for it. The time has come for us to help the university to face problems of the city as it once faced problems of the farm.

E. SPECIAL MANPOWER NEEDS

We must also ask the colleges and universities to help overcome certain acute deficiencies in trained manpower. At least 100,000 more professional librarians are needed for service in public libraries and in schools and colleges. We need 140,000 more teachers for handicapped children.

I recommend:

Grants to institutions of higher education for training of school, college, and community librarians and related services.

Extension and expansion of grants for training teachers and handicapped children.

CONCLUSION

In 1838, Mirabeau B. Lamar, the second President of the Republic of Texas and the father of Texas education, declared:

> The cultivated mind is the guardian genius of democracy. It is the only dictator that freeman acknowledges. It is the only security that freeman desires.

Throughout the history of our Nation, the United States has recognized this truth. But during the periods when the country has been most astir with creative activity, when it most keenly sensed the sturdiness of the old reaching out for the vigor of the new, it has given special attention to its educational system.

This was true in the expansive 1820's and 1830's, when the American people acted decisively to build a public school system for the lower grades. It was no less true at the vigorous turn of the 20th century, when high schools were developed for the millions. Again, during the questing 1930's, fresh ideas stirred the traditions of the ruler and blackboard.

We are now embarked on another venture to put the American dream to work in meeting the new demands of a new day. Once again we must start where men who would improve their society have always known they must begin—with an educational system restudied, reinforced, and revitalized.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 12, 1965.*

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON EDUCATION

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL], chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, may extend his remarks at this point on the President's message and include extraneous matter, fact sheets, and other pertinent data.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the administration's proposals on education as enumerated above, I would like to insert at this point in the RECORD a summary fact sheet on the proposals, as embodied in "The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965":

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965

Authorization for fiscal 1966

	Millions
Title I—Education of children of low-income families	$1,000
Title II—School library resources and instructional materials	100
Title III—Supplementary educational centers and services	100
Title IV—Educational research and training; Cooperative Research Act	45
Title V—State departments of education	10
Total	1,255

TITLE I—IMPROVEMENT OF THE EDUCATION OF CHILDREN OF LOW-INCOME FAMILIES

Background

"Every child must have the best education our Nation can provide," the President said in his 1965 state of the Union address.

Poverty paralyzes efforts to bring proper educational services and facilities within the reach of all the Nation's children. Left unchecked, poverty's adverse effects become chronic and contagious, often leading to delinquency and crime.

Two-thirds of the families whose head has fewer than 9 years of education are in poverty. Of those youths aged 18 to 24 with an eighth-grade education or less, 20 percent are unemployed. In the Nation as a whole in 1960, there were 2.3 million school-age children living in families earning less than $1,000 annually; 5 million children living in families earning less than $2,000 a year.

In the slums, the schools are overcrowded; many are obsolete and unsafe. At least 30 percent of our schoolchildren go to school in classes averaging 30 or more pupils. In remote rural areas, schools often offer inadequate programs in inadequate facilities.

Of the 1.7 million classrooms now operating, nearly one-third were opened prior to 1930 and have since fallen far below acceptable standards. In some of our city slums, about half of all classrooms are at least 50 years old; many are still not fireproof.

Despite a massive effort on the part of our major cities, they generally spend only two-thirds as much per pupil as their suburbs. Up to one-third of the children in these cities are culturally and economically deprived, and from their number stem about 80 percent of all dropouts.

The disadvantaged child is a year behind in mastering school work by the time he reaches the third grade and up to 3 years behind if he reaches the eighth. Research shows that culturally disadvantaged children have only 1 chance in 1,000 to acquire effective learning habits without the benefit of special preschool orientation. This points to the need for services and facilities in behalf of deprived youngsters.

Over the 1963–73 period, public elementary school enrollments are expected to climb from 29.4 million to 32.1 million, an increase of 9 percent. Meanwhile, in nonpublic elementary schools, the estimated rise is from 5.4 million to 5.9 million, also a 9-percent increase. Public secondary school enrollments will go from 10.9 million to an anticipated 14.2 million, up 30 percent; and the nonpublic secondary school enrollments are expected to rise by 38 percent, from 1.3 million to 1.8 million.

Since 1946, State and local bonded indebtedness has risen approximately 450 percent, while Federal debt has increased approximately 14 percent. During the same period, State and local taxes have increased approximately 340 percent, while Federal taxes increased approximately 140 percent—before the 1964 Federal tax cut. Quality education requires increased Federal aid.

Few educational agencies have the resources to rehabilitate the victims of poverty or to provide educational programs that will adequately meet the needs of the greatly increased school-age population.

Proposal

Title I adds a 3-year program to Public Law 874 (school assistance for local educational agencies in areas affected by Federal activity) which is designed to encourage and support the establishment, expansion, and improvement of special programs, including the construction of minimum school facilities where needed, to meet the special needs of educationally deprived children of low-income families.

Public schools would be eligible for payments for programs designed to meet the special educational needs of children in school attendance areas having high concentrations of disadvantaged children. In these areas, the school district would design special educational services and arrangements, including those in which all children in need of such services could participate without full-time public school attendance. These special programs might include dual enrollment (shared services) arrangements, educational radio and television, mobile educational services, remedial education, preschool or afterschool programs, additional instructional personnel, equipment and facilities, and others judged necessary for improving the education of disadvantaged children.

Local educational agencies in a given county would be eligible for payments equal to one-half the average per pupil expenditure in that State multiplied by the number of children in that county (aged 5 to 17) in families having an annual income of less than $2,000.

Children in low-income families in selected States and counties

State and county	Children (aged 5 to 17) in families with less than $2,000 annual income	Percentage of total children (aged 5 to 17)	Federal payment
Alabama	226,700	25	$31,738,000
Montgomery	8,311	19	1,163,540
Arkansas	139,702	29	21,095,002
Cleburne	1,176	51	177,576
California	227,007	6	60,137,510
Los Angeles	80,545	6	21,344,425
Florida	143,795	13	27,896,230
Dade (Miami)	22,519	11	4,368,686
Illinois	155,694	7	37,288,765
Cook (Chicago)	57,054	5	13,664,433
Kentucky	188,101	24	28,215,150
Metcalfe	1,132	56	169,800
Maryland	56,202	7	13,741,401
Baltimore City	20,902	10	5,110,540
Mississippi	232,603	37	28,028,704
Tunica	2,965	54	357,283
New Mexico	37,998	14	8,351,640
Sierra	622	50	136,840
New York	213,201	6	75,127,295
Erie (Buffalo)	12,432	5	4,382,280
Oregon	25,399	6	6,853,177
Multnomah (Portland)	6,291	5	1,726,880
Tennessee	213,694	23	31,092,525
Hancock	1,155	51	168,053
Texas	386,599	16	74,580,048
Comanche	1,189	49	230,072

The State educational agency would be responsible for distribution of the allotments within the State based on its approval of plans for special programs submitted by the local school districts. However, upon approval of their plans, the school districts in any given county would receive the total amount for which that county would be eligible under the distribution. In multidistrict counties, the total amount for the county would be allocated by the State agency among the districts.

Federal funds made available under this title would be used essentially for improving the education of educationally deprived students, not for the general educational programs of the schools. State and local educational effort must also be maintained and, if possible, increased as a condition of receiving these funds.

Special educational efforts directed to those at the lower end of the economic spectrum will have a salutory effect on the entire educational system and will broaden the range of educational opportunity available to all children. School districts in approximately 95 percent of the Nation's 3,100 counties would be eligible for these poverty-linked funds.

First year authorization would be approximately $1 billion.

TITLE II—SCHOOL LIBRARY RESOURCES AND INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS

Background

At all levels of education, teaching programs have become increasingly dependent upon a well-stocked library, the services of a professional librarian, and up-to-date textbooks. Basic courses in nearly all academic subjects, as well as the most advanced courses, are dependent on libraries and instructional materials. That dependence will grow.

The great majority of our public schools do not have adequate library resources. In many schools, there is an average of less than one-half book per child and some cities spend less than 15 cents a year per child for library books. Today more than two out of every three public elementary schools have no libraries at all and more than 8 out of 10 lack trained librarians. The current public school levels of 6.2 library books per pupil and $2.28 annual expenditure for books per pupil are well below the recommended professional standards of 10 books and $4 to $6 annual expenditure for books per pupil.

To meet the accepted minimum standards for cities with populations above 500,000, there is a need for a fourfold increase in current expenditures for school library materials. The cost of books is up 82 percent since 1948. Using the base period 1957–59, the cost of books has risen more than a third while wholesale prices remained constant and consumer prices rose less than 7 percent. This naturally works the greatest hardship on poor school districts.

Textbook sales in the Nation in 1963 amounted to $293 million, or only $6.11 per student. In some States, as much as $12.32 was spent per student; in others as little as $4.76. A single modern, hardbound textbook in many subjects often costs as much or more than the entire year's budget for new instructional books. Moreover, a fourth of all the Nation's public high school systems do not provide free textbooks and it has been stated that high textbook fees are one of the reasons for the school dropout problem.

A new instructional development is the increased use of programed learning textbooks. From 1962 to 1963, programed texts increased from 122 to 352, over half in science and mathematics. But these new materials are expensive; they average $10 to $15 each, thus constituting a barrier to their adoption in all but the wealthier school districts.

Proposal

Title II provides for a 5-year program to make available for the use of schoolchildren school library resources and other printed and published instructional materials including textbooks essential to improved educational quality in the schools of the Nation.

A State plan would provide for a method of making available books, periodicals, documents, magnetic tapes, phonograph records and other printed and published materials for the use of all schoolchildren in the State.

Materials purchased with Federal funds would not be used for sectarian instruction or religious worship and when made available for the use of students in nonpublic schools would be the same as those used or approved for use in the public schools of the State. In those States legally unable to provide materials for students in nonpublic schools, the Commissioner of Education would make available to such children those materials used in the public schools of the State.

Funds would be allotted to the 50 States, District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands on the basis of the number of children enrolled in public and nonprofit private elementary and secondary schools in each State or territory. The previous level of non-Federal support for these materials would be maintained and, if possible, increased.

First year authorization would be $100 million.

TITLE III—SUPPLEMENTARY EDUCATIONAL CENTERS AND SERVICES

Background

While the problems existing in school districts impacted by poverty are particularly acute, there are also chronic limitations in elementary and secondary schools throughout the Nation regardless of the level of community wealth. A fundamental weakness is the uneven distribution and inconsistent quality of educational, scientific, and cultural resources presently available.

Among the variety of supplementary services that make the difference between a poor school and a good school are special instruction in science, languages, music, and the arts; counseling and guidance; health and social work; and access to such resources as technical institutes, museums, art galleries, and theaters. In these respects there are many unmet needs.

Today less than one-quarter of our elementary schools have the services of a guidance counselor one or more days a week. More than 3 million elementary school children are estimated to be in need of social work or psychological services. At present, however, there are only about 3,000 school social workers on the staffs of the public schools; most school systems cannot afford to hire them. Although surveys show that today 7 to 14 percent of schoolchildren have significant emotional problems, more than 9 out of 10 school systems have no special programs for these children and are unable to deal with them effectively through their regular programs.

Reforms and improvements in science and language instruction appear in uneven quality throughout the country. In only 10 States do all secondary schools have science laboratory facilities. Science specialists generally agree that modern science cannot be taught properly without laboratories for teacher and student experimentations. Moreover, less than 30 percent of public secondary schools now have language laboratories available.

By 1968 at least 25,000 additional science laboratories will be needed in elementary schools to meet increases in enrollments—a 500-percent increase. At least 40,000 additional labs will be needed in the high schools, almost a 100-percent increase. Just to keep pace with growth, by 1968 elementary schools will need 8,000 additional language laboratories and high schools will need at least 20,000 more such labs. Centralized laboratory facilities serving a number of schools and systems are one of the answers to meeting this need where individual labs cannot be provided.

Although educational research is demonstrating the increased capability and advantages of early school experiences, about one-half of the Nation's 26,000 school districts today maintain schools without kindergartens, and in only one school district out of 260 is a nursery school available.

At a time of greatly accelerating needs, the Nation's educational structure is weakened both by the lack of these special programs and staffs within the schools and by the frequent insulation of students from the cultural, social, and scientific life of the community. Enrichment of the curriculum of elementary and secondary schools through supplementary services is essential to the total strength of education.

Proposal

Title III proposes a 5-year program to provide vitally needed educational services not available in sufficient quantity or quality in elementary and secondary schools and to develop and establish exemplary elementary and secondary school educational programs to serve as models for regular school programs. Special personnel, equipment, and other costly educational services not normally available in most schools would be made available for the widest possible participation of the entire community.

Grants would be made to a supplementary educational center and services organization created to establish and coordinate a program of supplementary educational services. Funds would be made available on the basis of an application reviewed by the State educational agency and approved by the Commissioner of Education. The governing board of the organization would include representatives of the agencies and institutions participating in the conduct of the program. The participants would include at least one local educational agency and one or more of the following: Institutions of higher education, State educational agencies public agencies such as health and welfare units, and private nonprofit agencies including nonpublic schools, museums, art galleries, educational television stations, and other cultural organizations.

Federal funds would be used for planning, pilot projects, and the establishment and operation of programs offering a diverse range of educational experience to children and adults of varying talents and needs. Programs might include guidance and counseling; remedial instruction; school health, psychological and social work services; enriched academic programs; afterschool study halls; continuing adult education; dual enrollment (shared services); specialized instruction and equipment; specially qualified personnel (including artists and musicians) on a temporary or other basis; educational radio and television programs; special educational services for persons in isolated rural areas; and other specially designed educational programs. Grants could also be used for the lease or construction of necessary facilities.

Children attending nonpublic as well as public schools and out-of-school youth and adults would have the opportunity to receive the services and participate in these educational and cultural activities.

An Advisory Committee on Supplementary Educational Centers and Services would advise the Commissioner on the action to be taken on each application for a grant.

Initially, American Samoa, Guam, and the Virgin Islands would each receive $50,000. The 50 States, District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico would each receive $200,000. The remainder of the funds would be distributed among the States and territories on the basis of (1) the number of children aged 5 to 17 and (2) the total population of each jurisdiction.

The first-year authorization would be $100 million.

TITLE IV—EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND TRAINING; AMENDMENTS TO THE COOPERATIVE RESEARCH ACT OF 1954

Background

Eleven years ago Congress authorized the Commissioner of Education to enter into contracts or jointly financed cooperative arrangements with colleges, universities, and State educational agencies to conduct research, surveys, and demonstrations in the field of education. The program that has subsequently emerged from this decade of experience has two basic purposes: (1) To develop new knowledge about education, and (2) to develop new ways of applying existing knowledge.

Significant progress has been made in educational research. For example:

Programs have been developed to guide elementary pupils in "discovering" the basic concepts of modern mathematics; results are so encouraging that many school systems throughout the country are adopting these methods.

Two-year-old children have been taught to read—and to read well—in experimental programs that stimulate their curiosity and intellectual drive.

Grade school pupils have been successfully taught college-level economics, indicating that curriculum evaluation and research are necessities at all levels.

A New Jersey study of the education of migrant children points to new and more fruitful directions for handling a problem that plagues most of our States.

A total of about $16 million is being spent in fiscal year 1965 on cooperative research. Some 280 projects are involved. This is, however, a small answer to a great need. Only $3 of every $1,000 of Federal expenditures for research and development were devoted to education in 1964.

Education, with a total annual expenditure of about $34 billion is the Nation's number one industry. Yet we spend only $72 million—one-fifth of 1 percent of our total educational outlays—for research and development in this vital field. By contrast, we spend $8 billion annually for research and development on our Nation's defenses. Many progressive private industries invest as much as 10 percent of their total annual expenditures for research and development.

To carry out research is to assume the obligation of disseminating the findings, so that education as a whole may benefit. In medicine the average lag between research and its application is estimated at 2 years. In education, the process often takes 30 years or more. The record or education in publishing research findings has not been satisfactory. To help in finding a solution to this problem, pilot research and development centers have been established at a cost in 1965 of about $1,900,000—at the Universities of Pittsburgh, Oregon, Wisconsin and at Harvard University.

Each of these centers will conduct activities stretching across the research and development spectrum, including basic research, development of educational procedures and materials, field testing, and demonstration and dissemination. At the University of Pittsburgh, where the first center was established, significant results are being obtained. In one project, for example, courses of study have been tailored to fit the needs of the individual learner; in another, new educational devices are employed to motivate preschool children to read.

Such educational research and its dissemination help the schools and colleges of the Nation to carry on educational programs more efficiently, more effectively, and with greater economy of resources. But a mere four centers, with all their promise, cannot serve the needs of 26,000 school districts and a tenth as many institutions of higher learning. Other regions of the country and many other segments of education need assistance in the form of new research and development programs.

Proposal

Title IV would amend the Cooperative Research Act of 1954 (Public Law 83-531) by authorizing the training of research personnel and improved dissemination of information derived from educational research and development. Authority would be granted to utilize the research competence of research organizations not now eligible to contribute to the program, such as private noncollegiate research organizations and professional associations. In addition, the program would provide for the construction and operation of centers to improve the quality of teaching in our schools and for the purchase of research equipment.

Together, these amendments would permit the continued growth of educational research programs in the United States and an accelerated funding of research and development centers or regional educational laboratories. The goal: a national network of federally supported but State- and university-operated research centers.

Regional educational laboratories offer a promising way of meeting problems of research, development, and dissemination. They will help to train teachers and improve curriculums. They will draw equally upon educators and the practitioners in all the fields of learning—mathematicians, scientists, humanists, historians, economists, social scientists, linguists, musicians, artists, and writers.

These laboratories will have close ties with the State departments of education. They will also work directly with the schools and supplementary education centers in order to bring innovation directly to the student. They will train teachers as well as those who teach teachers.

First-year cost of these amendments would be $45 million, in addition to the regular cooperative research budget of $25 million in fiscal year 1966.

TITLE V—STRENGTHENING STATE DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION

Background

The immediate responsibility for providing professional counsel and direction to the schools lies with the various State departments of education. At the very time that demand for this kind of counsel and direction is on the increase, the ability of the State departments to respond is inadequate. The necessity of meeting school operating costs, of spending what it takes to keep sufficient classrooms available, exerts increasing pressure on the share of the school dollar made available to State departments of education. Moreover, the responsibility of ensuring the wise and proper use of Federal funds dispensed in a variety of Federal-State cooperative programs generally rests squarely with State educational agencies.

The States vary greatly in their educational expenditures. Some States spend barely $200,000 a year for State educational leadership, while others spend more than 70 times that amount. Some States employ 500 professional educators; other States, as few as 35. Professionals to oversee school library services are lacking altogether in one-third of the State departments of education, while only 11 States have consultants in school social work. Moreover, during the past 5 years there has been a 40-percent turnover in State supervisory personnel; the majority have gone into better paying positions at the local level and in colleges and universities.

The department of education in a typical, middle-income State has 75 professional staff members available to serve as consultants to 20,000 school people—superintendents, principals, teachers, and others. On the average, these professionals are able to visit the State's schools for only one-half day each 7 years. Demands on the education budget are such in this State that no likelihood is foreseen in the ability of its department of education to improve its services.

If the States are to be strengthened and American education kept both strong and decentralized, measures are needed to bolster the administrative and legal foundations of our educational system.

Proposal

Title V proposes a 5-year program to stimulate and assist in strengthening the leadership resources of State educational agencies. The State educational agency would identify educational needs of the State and design programs to meet these needs.

Programs and activities might include long-range educational planning; improved collecting, processing, and analyzing of educational data (including use of automated data systems); conducting, sponsoring, or cooperating in educational research; developing the competency of individuals who serve State or local educational agencies and provide leadership, administrative or specialist services; cooperation with institutions of higher education and local educational agencies to improve the quality of teacher preparation, including student teaching; and other special needs of State departments of education.

Eighty-five percent of the funds appropriated would be apportioned as follows: $50,000 each to Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands and $100,000 to each of the States, District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico. The remainder of the 85 percent would be apportioned among the States and territories based on the number of public school pupils. State agencies would apply to the Commissioner for a grant or grants for part of the costs of their proposal. The Commissioner would approve applications if he determined that the proposal would be within the purposes of the law.

Fifteen percent of the funds appropriated would be reserved to the Commissioner to make special grants for research and demonstrations and for the establishment of special services which promise to help solve educational problems common to all for several of the State educational agencies.

First-year authorization would be $10 million.

A second part of title V would permit an interchange of personnel between States and the Office of Education for cooperative educational activities and technical and other assistance which would assist in the strengthening of American education.

FAIR SHARE EDUCATION—EVERY SCHOLAR AN EQUAL DOLLAR

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, the President's message on education is a call for the 89th Congress to continue along the path of educational excellence which we traveled so well in the 88th Congress. It is not only a call to continue but to accelerate and escalate.

It would be premature for me to comment on the context of the message or to evaluate the details of the Department program.

However, I do note that a piece of legislation which I have been advocating for some time is included in substantial form in the program.

I refer to my bill, H.R. 13, which I introduced on January 4, the first day of this Congress. This bill would provide for textbooks in critical subject matter areas for all children in all schools.

I view this as a logical extension of categorical assistance to elementary and secondary education and I submit that better books, more modern texts are indispensable to better education.

It is gratifying to note that the President is recommending greater support for this school lending library approach to the Congress.

I have made a number of addresses on this subject to educational groups throughout the country in the past year.

Speaking to the Publications Conference, held at Fordham University on October 3, 1964, I made specific recommendations on:

First. Amendment of the National Defense Education Act to authorize grants to all schools for mechanical facilities in critical subject matter areas.

Second. Support for book loan programs in these same stress areas for all children in all schools.

I include the text of my address on this subject at this point:

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE HUGH L. CAREY, DEMOCRAT, OF NEW YORK, TO THE PUBLICATIONS CONFERENCE AT FORDHAM UNIVERSITY, NEW YORK, N.Y., OCTOBER 3, 1964

I have been serving on the House Education Committee during the 88th Congress which has made more legislative educational progress in pursuit of scholastic excellence than any other in history. For that reason I believe you and I are full partners in the search and spread of truth, understanding, wisdom and justice in the era of the educated man.

It is a summons to full participation in the era of equality and justice in the education that I serve upon you now.

You are here as a highly representative segment of the 900,000 students who receive your education in nonpublic schools in this State. You have an attribute which Benjamin Bradlee ascribed to our late President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, as "that special grace of intellect." Recognizing that attribute I call upon you as editors and writers to use that grace to advance the cause of great freedoms that must thrive in education in order that we may survive as a free and godly nation.

These freedoms exist in the hierarchy of liberty which is anterior to government and most precious to the dignity of the human person.

We possess and must preserve freedom to know, not only all that is secular but freedom to know God without the sanction of the state.

We possess and must preserve freedom of conscience, free from the totalitarian conformity of state monopoly in education.

We possess and must preserve freedom of choice in education which is the key to cultural diversity and pluralism in the free society at home and in the free world.

I say that these freedoms can exist and extend only if 900,000 students in this State and the 7 million students in this country who attend private schools fully participate in opportunities for educational excellence on equal terms with all other Americans.

The record of the 88th Congress is a testament that this can be done not only under our Constitution but in support of the cardinal constitutional principles of equality, freedom of choice, freedom of conscience and freedom to know.

Extensive hearings, intensive study, open debate and fastidious draftsmanship produced these great laws in the education Congress to give substance to that testament:

1. The Higher Education Facilities Act in which Fordham and St. John's will participate with the city and State universities in the first grant and loan program for college construction.

2. The Health and Nursing Professions Acts in which Georgetown, St. Vincent's, and Yeshiva will share on equal terms with State medical schools in a direct grant program for the healing arts.

3. The Economic Assistance Act—or Antipoverty Act—in which student work study programs and aid to educationally disadvantaged individuals will enable us to break the sequence that poverty begets ignorance and ignorance begets poverty.

The spirit of Thomas Jefferson is in these acts for it was he who said:

"If you expect a people to be ignorant and free you expect what never was and never will be."

And the spirit of Jefferson, the great friend to higher education, was advanced in the National Defense Education Act which we passed for the President's signature only 2 days ago.

This act increased fellowships for graduate study sevenfold, adjusted the imbalanced incentive forgiveness between public and private schoolteachers, and extended quality education institutes to all education for the benefit of all children in all schools.

* * * * *

And if we must mention separation of church and state when we mention Jefferson let it be said here and now, we not only preserved the principle of separation but, by its true and constructive application, advanced education for all Americans, proving that when fairminded men and women legislate, fairness can prevail.

In doing so we set guidelines and laid down these principles that will aid lawmakers in the balance of this century of knowledgeable man to meet our educational needs with equality, justice, and freedom.

The first principle is that aid to the individual is distinguishable from aid to institutions. Therefore, while the state may not give direct economic support to the church and the church has no wish to interfere in the secular functions of the state, there is no law which precludes the state from assisting a student because he is also the beneficiary of assistance from a church. We recognized that as an individual he is a citizen of one and a member of the other and both have a common interest in his mental and moral development.

Specifically, in the tradition of the GI bill, this principle is identified in fellowship, scholarship, and student loan and loan forgiveness titles; in quality institutes for individual teachers and work study and remedial education aid to low-income individuals, in the poverty bill.

The second principle that is educationally sound and constitutionally permissible to give selective aid to specific secular categories to public and private institutions with precise safeguards and appropriate delineations.

This second principle is exemplified in the Higher Education Facilities Act where we provided matching grant funds for the construction of classroom and other buildings in the categories of science, languages, mathematics, and libraries, in similar provisions in the Health Professions and Nursing Act, and even in the new milestone legislation of the Mental Retardation Act.

Most importantly, there are enacted new directions in the National Defense Education Act providing for audiovisual and mechanical facilities, maps, globes, and other teaching materials in the categories of geography, civics, history, English, and reading.

Federal support equal to about $1.50 per child in elementary and secondary schools is provided in this program through grants to public schools and loans to private schools.

This is the area where I seek your help today.

I want to change this to a grant program for all schools and I believe I will have the support of my colleagues in the committee in doing so. A loan is a limited grant of credit and full grants can be justified since 7 million children in private schools are required by the State to know just as much about civics, history, English, geography, and mathematics as are the children in the State schools.

I want to raise the ante from $1.50 per child in this $100 million program to $15 per child for every school child in America, by the addition of a major new category of assistance.

This category of assistance is in the field of your special interest—publications for education.

I plan to introduce legislation to authorize the Federal Government to assist State educational agencies in the development, publication, and distribution of textbooks, research works, manuals, and teaching aids to be made available to all children in all schools in such categories of secular subject matter and as are now covered in the National Defense Education Act.

These textbooks would be chosen by State boards whose membership would be broadly comprehensive of all the educational interests in the State, public and private.

These textbooks would remain the property of the State and be on loan to the students in all schools which choose to use them exactly as are the books in our public libraries today.

The Federal Government would have no authority or participation in the selection of texts, preserving the principle of local and parental control in education.

The Federal textbook assistance program would be optional with the States who would participate on a voluntary basis only, based upon State educational policy.

This program would encourage other States to initiate programs for equality in educational excellence such as those which have already been enacted in Rhode Island and Louisiana.

To finance the program I would suggest a figure of exactly $651 million. I chose the amount because this is precisely the total that the Federal Government is currently spending on aid to education through publication support which does not directly aid our elementary and secondary schoolchildren, public or private.

In fact, this Government subsidy of publications for education in some cases is actually an educational and moral detriment to the minor child.

The aid to publications program curiously is not in the Office of Education but in the Postmaster General's Office. I refer to the fact that since 1879 postal subsidies specially designed by intent of Congress to assist in the education of the American people by encouraging the wide dissemination of reading matter have been in effect in our country and they now amount to $651 million.

If we can justify, and I do justify the expenditure of that sum for aid to publications to those not involved in formal education, surely we can make out a good case, in justice and logic for similar aid to those who not only need but are required to have school books.

The record speaks for itself, category by category. Since 1939, through the fourth-class subsidy, books, texts, library materials, and phonograph records have been subsidized in distribution to the extent of $651 million. I say here and now that I am not "anti-Beatle," but the Beatle records are distributed through subsidized fourth-class privilege. If we can subsidize the Beatles but not textbooks in biology, where is the justice in this?

Since 1890 newspapers and magazines considered as educational matter have enjoyed a second-class subsidy, which amounts to $300 million. This extends from the secular press to the religious newspapers, from the New York Times to the Christian Science Monitor and even to the antireligious and the extremist publications.

If we can subsidize the Police Gazette—or 50 pages of trash—but not a textbook on English, where is the justice of that?

Since 1879 we have subsidized bulk mailing of circulars, catalogs and advertisements under the third-class privilege which amounts to $300 million, as an inducement to the migration of knowledge through reading of anything on the printed page. Under this subsidy we encourage everything from instant beauty aids to surplus elephants, whether the public wants them or not. In fact, through this privilege comes most of the "come-on" circulars for pornography and perversion. If we can subsidize borderline obscenity or Lydia Pinkham's Compound but not a textbook on geography, mathematics, or civics, where is the justice in that?

I believe that with the knowledge explosion before us and the intellectual and cultural craving of 65 million young students willing and anxious to be served we can and must provide publications and new teaching materials for all Americans.

No people, no nation, no generation ever had the opportunity for the bold, the new, the dynamic advance in education you have now. But we must make a commitment and an investment to take advantage of that opportunity.

It will avail us little if a few of the highly trained and highly skilled soar in space while the masses below sink in culture and knowledge.

We have the means and the minds to make the printed page, the projector, the electronic teaching machine bring us to a new plane of understanding in all the sciences and in all the humanities.

With these means and minds before us we must not be a dog-eared society cramped within the covers of outworn texts and backward books.

Dr. Zacharias and 50 of our country's greatest physicists are developing a totally new course of instruction in physics which will make old methods as modern as the crystal radio. Will their work be available to all or the fortunate few?

Sister Jacqueline, the great president of Webster Grove College is working with Syracuse University in the development of a new system of mathematics instruction, teaching high school mathematics to grade school children.

Will this work be available to all or the fortunate few?

The answer is up to you.

You are the leaders on campus and you will be the leaders in the community. You are the doers of the word, the voices of truth and the propagandists for progress.

You owe a great commitment to education for what it has given you.

You owe a great commitment to private education for preserving the great freedoms it stands for.

You owe your Creator and your country a commitment to organize, to discuss, to debate, and to resolve the great questions in education so that we can continue to make the kind of progress we made in the 88th Congress.

Through your journals and your yearbooks and your activities in the community, I summon you to aid us, all of us, in advancing the cause of freedom of choice, of conscience, of knowledge, through educational excellence for all Americans.

In the words of our late President, John F. Kennedy before Congress in 1961:

"May we be worthy of the unlimited opportunities which God has given us."

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I include the text of my bill, H.R. 13 in full at this point in the RECORD:

H.R. 13

A bill to authorize the Commissioner of Education to make available to students in all elementary and secondary schools textbooks selected by such schools.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Children's Educational Assistance Act of 1965".

DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

SEC. 2. It is the purpose of this title to authorize a four-year program of financial assistance in the improvement of educational quality for all elementary and secondary schoolchildren in all of the States.

It is the intent of Congress that the Federal Government recognize its continuing responsibility to assist in the achievement of educational excellence and the elimination of inequalities and disadvantage for every American child. In the fulfillment of that responsibility the Congress further intends that there be no distinction or discrimination among the children of this Nation in the distribution of educational benefits in order that every child may be enabled to acquire knowledge to the full extent of his or her capacity.

To that end it is the purpose of this bill to extend the span and depth of knowledge among all students by providing funds for modern and effective texts and teaching materials and instructional aids.

In order to achieve equality of educational opportunities to the greatest possible degree the Congress intends that the Commissioner of Education provide such criteria as are necessary to give priority in the use of moneys under the title to those children most in need, handicapped or otherwise disadvantaged.

APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

SEC. 3. (a) The Commissioner of Education (hereinafter referred to as the "Commissioner") shall carry out during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and each of the four succeeding fiscal years, a program for making textbooks in certain critical subject areas available on a loan basis to students in public and private elementary and secondary schools in accordance with this Act; the selection of such textbooks to be made by the appropriate educational agency.

(b) For the purpose of making grants under this Act, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $650,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966; but for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and each of the three succeeding fiscal years, only such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law.

ALLOTMENTS TO STATES

SEC. 4. (a) Funds appropriated pursuant to section 101 for any fiscal year shall be allotted among the States so that the allotment to each State will be an amount which bears the same ratio to the amount so appropriated as the number of students enrolled in grades 1 to 12 (both inclusive) of elementary and secondary schools in such State bears to the total number of students enrolled in such grades in such schools in all of the States. Determination of the number of students in such schools in a State and in all the States shall be made by the Commissioner on the basis of data for the most recent year for which satisfactory data with respect thereto are available to him.

(b) The amount of any State's allotment under subsection (a) for any fiscal year which the Commissioner determines will not be required for such fiscal year for carrying out the State plan (if any) approved under this Act shall be available for reallotment from time to time, on such dates during such year as the Commissioner may fix, to other States in proportion to the original allotments to such other States under such subsection for such year, but with such proportionate amount for any of such States being reduced to the extent it exceeds the sum the Commissioner estimates such State needs and will be able to use for such year for carrying out the State plan; and the total of such reductions shall be similarly reallotted among the States whose proportionate amounts were not so reduced. Any amount reallotted to a State under this subsection during a year shall be deemed part of its allotment under subsection (a) for such year.

STATE COMMISSIONS AND PLANS

SEC. 5. (a) Each State which desires to have students in all elementary and secondary schools in the State receive textbooks on a loan basis under this Act shall designate an existing State agency which is broadly representative of the public and of educational agencies in the State, or, if no such State agency exists, shall establish such a State agency, and submit to the Commissioner through the agency so designated or established (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the "State commission"), a State plan for its participation in the textbook program provided for in this Act. The Commissioner shall approve any such plan which—

(1) provides that it shall be administered by the State commission;

(2) provides that it will receive applications from educational agencies under this Act and assign them a priority for approval relative to other applications received by it;

(3) provides for affording to every applicant, which has submitted an application to the State commission, an opportunity for a fair hearing before the State commission as to the priority assigned to such application; and

(4) provides (A) for such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of an accounting for Federal funds paid to the State commission under this Act; and (B) for the making of such reports in such form and containing such information, as may be reasonably necessary to enable the Commissioner to perform his functions under this Act.

(b) The Commissioner is authorized to expend not exceeding $1,000,000 during each fiscal year of the program under this Act in such amounts as he may consider necessary for the proper and efficient administration of the State plans approved under this Act, including expenses which he determines were necessary for the preparation of such plans.

BASIC CRITERIA FOR DETERMINING PRIORITIES AND AMOUNT OF ASSISTANCE

SEC. 6. (a) As soon as practicable after the enactment of this Act the Commissioner shall by regulation prescribe basic criteria to which the provisions of State plans setting forth standards and methods for assigning to applications their relative priorities for approval, and the application of such standards and methods to such agencies under such plans, shall be subject. Such basic criteria shall be such as will best tend to achieve the objectives of this Act while leaving opportunity and flexibility for the development of State plans, standards, and methods that will best accommodate the varied needs of educational agencies in the several States. Subject to the foregoing requirements, such regulations may establish additional and appropriate basic criteria, including provision for considering the degree to which applicant educational agencies are making an effort commensurate with their financial resources toward meeting their textbook needs, and for allowing State plans to group or provide for grouping, in a reasonable manner, educational agencies according to functional or educational type.

(b) Section 4 of the Administrative Procedure Act shall apply to the prescription regulations under this section, notwithstanding the provisions of clause (2) thereof.

APPLICATIONS FOR GRANTS AND CONDITIONS FOR APPROVAL

SEC. 7. (a) Each educational agency which desires to obtain textbooks suitable for use in providing education in science, mathematics, history, civics, geography, modern foreign language, English, or reading from the Commissioner for use by its students, on a loan basis, shall submit an application therefor to the Commissioner. Each such application must (1) have been assigned a relative priority for approval by the appropriate educational agency, (2) specify the textbooks to be made available by the Commissioner and the estimated cost of providing such textbooks, and (3) be in such form and contain such additional information as the Commissioner may prescribe by regulation.

(b) The Commissioner shall approve any application submitted by an educational agency if (1) it meets the requirements of this Act, and regulations issued pursuant thereto, (2) the application has been assigned a priority for approval by the State commission higher than that assigned any other application, and (3) there are sufficient funds available in the applicable State allotment to meet the costs which the Commissioner determines would arise if the application were approved.

(c) Amendments of applications shall, except as the Commissioner may otherwise provide by or pursuant to regulation, be subject to approval in the same manner as original applications.

TEXTBOOK PROGRAM

SEC. 8 (a) When the Commissioner approves an application under this Act, he shall proceed to acquire the textbooks suitable for use in providing education in science, mathematics, history, civics, geography, modern foreign language, English, or reading provided for in the application, if sufficient numbers thereof are not otherwise available. The textbooks provided for under the application shall be made available to the applicant educational agency which shall distribute them to students as provided in the application. Such textbooks shall at all times remain the property of the United States.

(b) The Commissioner shall make appropriate regulations to assure that textbooks made available under this Act are used in accordance with the provisions of this Act and regulations issued thereunder throughout their useful life, or returned to the Commissioner.

ADMINISTRATION OF STATE PLANS

SEC. 9. (a) The Commissioner shall not finally disapprove any State plan submitted under this Act, or any modification thereof, without first affording the State commission submitting the plan reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing.

(b) Whenever the Commissioner, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State commission administering a State plan approved under this Act, finds—

(1) that the State plan has been so changed that it no longer complies with the provisions of section 4(a), or

(2) that in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any such provision,

the Commission shall notify such State commission that the State will not be regarded as eligible to participate in the program under this Act until he is satisfied that there is no longer any such failure to comply.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 9. For the purposes of this Act—

(a) The term "State" includes, in addition to the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa, and trust territories of the Pacific islands.

(b) The term "elementary or secondary school" means any public or nonpublic school providing elementary or secondary education, which satisfies the compulsory education law of the State or which is accredited or approved under State law.

(c) The term "public" as applied to a school does not include a school of any agency of the United States.

(d) The term "educational agency" means a public or other school authority having administrative control and direction of one or more schools in a State.

FEDERAL ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 10. (a) The Commissioner may delegate any of his functions under this Act, except the making of regulations, to any officer or employee of the Office of Education.

(b) In administering the provisions of this Act, the Commissioner is authorized to utilize services and facilities of any agency of the Federal Government and of any other public or nonprofit agency or institution in accordance with appropriate agreements, and to pay for such services either in advance or by way of reimbursement, as may be agreed upon.

(c) The Commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, may appoint one or more advisory committees to advise and consult with the Commissioner with respect to the administration of his functions under this Act. Members of any such committee, while attending conferences or meetings of the committee, shall be entitled to receive compensation at a rate to be fixed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare but not to exceed $75 per diem, and while away from their homes or regular places of business they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

ADMINISTRATIVE APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

SEC. 11. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for each fiscal year thereafter such sums as may be necessary for the cost of administering the provisions of this Act.

FEDERAL CONTROL NOT AUTHORIZED

SEC. 12. (a) No department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States shall, under authority of this Act, exercise any direction, supervision, or control over, or impose any requirement or conditions with respect to, the personnel, curriculum, methods of instruction, or administration of any educational agency or institution.

(b) Neither the Commissioner nor any State commission shall attempt to affect the selection of by educational agencies of textbooks to be made available under this Act.

NATIONAL DIVIDENDS FROM A NUCLEAR NAVY

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include an article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, the January 1965 edition of Navy—the magazine of seapower—contains an excellent article by our colleague the gentleman from Tennessee, the Honorable WILLIAM R. ANDERSON. The article is entitled "The National Dividends From a Nuclear Navy."

I am sure that all of us are aware of the fact that Representative ANDERSON commanded the submarine *Nautilus* when it made its dramatic voyage from Pearl Harbor to London via the North Pole and thence to New York, between July 23 and August 25, 1958. In this brief and searching article, Representative ANDERSON points to the great dividends which have and will come from the nuclear program, as the Nation takes stock on the 10th anniversary of nuclear propulsion.

Mr. Speaker, we appreciate our new colleague from Tennessee not alone for his prowess on the high seas, but because of his deep and sensitive interest in issues which concern all Americans. As a West Virginian, I personally wish to pay tribute to him for the pioneer work which he did in blazing the trail for what is now known as the VISTA program—Volunteers in Service to America—under the Office of Economic Opportunity.

The article referred to follows:

The National Dividends From a Nuclear Navy

(By Representative William R. Anderson)

A few years ago a Navy surgeon mentioned to Vice Admiral Rickover the need for a great deal more knowledge regarding the chemistry of the human body. The physician cited as an example the behavior of stainless steel pins when used for bone repairs. Apparently such pins last indefinitely in some cases, while in others the surgeon must reoperate and replace them after just a few years. The pins corrode away.

Admiral Rickover inquired as to the specifications used in purchasing the pins, having learned long before that the difference in performance among various grades and types of stainless steel can be remarkable. Now, thanks to Navy nuclear power and its stringent requirements for extremely durable stainless steel, you can count on your steel pins lasting longer, if unfortunately you have to have some bones put back together this way.

Technical developments made for military purposes more often than not result in important side benefits to our economy, national stature, and well-being. How remarkably this has been true in the aircraft field, where most features of commercial aviation can be traced back to military drawing boards and conference tables. Certainly, it is also true in the Navy nuclear propulsion program and perhaps it is appropriate that we appraise the matter on this 10th anniversary of the operating end of that program.

RESOURCEFUL ENGINEERING

Just as a new business or new factory tends to beget another, developments in one area of engineering often provide an uplifting in other areas of engineering. To develop the *Nautilus* powerplant, Admiral Rickover and his team had to solve many unprecedented problems. Engineers and manufacturers who had thought in terms of tolerances measured in thousandths of an inch had to start dealing with millionths. Quality control had to be pushed to a new and much higher plateau. In many instances new materials and fabrication processes had to be developed. For example, zirconium, an exotic metal and a laboratory curiosity prior to the *Nautilus* development, had to be called on for the cladding of reactor fuel plates. Today zirconium forms the basis for a booming industry of vital importance to the entire nuclear energy program.

The approach to the problems of developing naval reactors will, I believe, prove to be as significant as the solutions so successfully gained. Resourceful and honest engineering has been and remains the hallmark of the nuclear propulsion program—a tidal wave of engineering inspiration and leadership already spilling on many seemingly unrelated beaches. If the wave had but sooner reached the entire field of submarine design, perhaps the *Thresher* would not be at the bottom of the sea.

Thus one very valuable side benefit of the nuclear Navy is the significant uplift provided to other engineering efforts.

Though the methods used to select and train nuclear propulsion crews have not been without controversy, one does find universal agreement that the people who operate and maintain the plants and ships are the very zenith of the program. As they branch out to other duties or to related civilian careers they comprise a continuing prime national asset. (I hasten to emphasize "related civilian careers" to subtract myself from those I describe. There is not much connection between nuclear propulsion duties and politics, but my experience has been that the former sure hasn't hurt me in pursuing the latter.)

PROGRAM'S IMPACT

The Navy nuclear program has had a tremendous impact on most developments relating to the practical and peaceful applications of atomic energy.

Next to the land, the water, and the air, energy is by far the most important of our terrestrial resources. Although our own supply of coal and oil is vast, we are consuming these materials at such a rapidly increasing rate that if not supplemented they will begin to approach exhaustion within the span of a few generations.

Other nations, less fortunately endowed with coal and oil reserves, will face the problem much sooner than the United States. Thus we must pursue a vigorous civilian nuclear power policy not only to satisfy our own needs but to meet our world leadership responsibilities as well.

The *Nautilus* and the nuclear submarines which followed provided the first long step toward these essential goals. The propulsion plants in these ships provided both the fundamental technology and the confidence to undertake the Shippingport plant—this Nation's first nuclear central power station. Every dollar used in developing the Navy's various nuclear plants would have been well spent if the net result were only a safe and successful situation at Shippingport. The investment made in developing Navy nuclear propulsion has produced technology and manufacturing abilities applicable to the complete civilian nuclear power industry.

Since January 17, 1955, the United States has enjoyed a commanding lead over all other nations in the use of nuclear power for ship propulsion and the accompanying benefits to our prestige have been immense. This lead has been dramatized in many ways and my thoughts, when we reached the North Pole in the *Nautilus,* were built around the pride that it was a United States submarine that arrived there first, not a Russian.

SPIN-OFFS

These polar voyages, besides giving a boost to our prestige, have supplied a remarkable increase in our knowledge of the Arctic Ocean. The greatest surprise of the *Nautilus* voyage in 1958 was the revelation of a completely unpredicted underwater plateau which reached up some 8,000 feet from the surrounding ocean floor. I understand that this feature, located about a third of the way between Alaska and the pole, has been determined to be about the size of the State of Connecticut.

The spin-offs from the Navy nuclear program are indeed many and varied.

It is fitting on the 10th anniversary of nuclear propulsion that the Nation take stock of the vast dividends that have come from this program. We can sleep a great deal better at night because of its contribution to our defense posture. We stand a great deal taller as a nation because of its contribution to man's ability to use the atom for his own benefit.

The late Prof. Albert Einstein once said, "If you can utilize the nuclear physical findings for peaceful purposes, it will lead to a new paradise." Distinctly, the Navy nuclear propulsion development brightens the future for mankind.

FPC CONTINUES HARASSMENT

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post of last Sunday carried an excellent article under the heading: "The Kid Gloves Are on Toward Business." It points out that no President, in recent years, has worked as effectively as President Johnson to gain the confidence of the business community. I believe that this is quite true.

I have watched the President over the years and have noted, with great appreciation, how hard he has worked in behalf of all segments of our economy, private enterprise no exception, and how determined he has always been to keep the Government out of business wherever possible.

The Post article mentions the Federal Power Commission and the problem which it poses to the industries with which it is involved. This brings to mind the attitude of the FPC in such matters as investment credit and the determination of that Agency to take away from industry the tax incentives which the Congress intended to give to all industry. We straightened this out after much effort and some rather pointed legislation which said, in effect, that the Congress knows what it is doing and expects Federal bureaus to act accordingly.

Recent actions show the FPC majority to be disregarding a principle of law set forth by a U.S. court of appeals even though no appeal of the court's decision was filed with the Supreme Court. The issue involved who was to receive the congressionally authorized tax incentive resulting from a group of affiliated corporations filing a consolidated tax return. The tax incentive was not consumer contributed but arose from corporate losses having no relation to any regulated enterprise. As intended by Congress the incentive acts as a stimulus to new industry by allowing the investor to reduce the initial losses incurred when starting a new business. In its decision in the Cities Service Gas Co. rate case, the FPC majority decided to ignore congressional intent and gave the investors tax loss savings to the gas consumer. Cities Service was a regulated transportation company while the tax losses resulted from the operations of other companies.

On October 9 of 1964, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the 10th Circuit unanimously reversed the Commission's ruling, stating that "the Commission would transgress the jurisdictional lines which Congress wrote into the act." It is reasonable to assume that if the FPC had disagreed with the court's ruling and wish to seek affirmation of its own decision, an appeal would have been taken to the Supreme Court. But no appeal was taken, thus leaving the court's decision as the law of the land, that is, to all but the Federal Power Commission.

Recently, the FPC refused to comply with the principle enunciated by the court. In a rate settlement proceeding involving United Gas Pipe Line Co., the Commission decided to ignore the court's ruling by refusing to settle the tax issue on the basis of the court's decision, obviously hoping to squeeze out a more favorable decision from another court of appeals. Meanwhile, business uncertainty is continued and compounded.

Thus, after years of litigation before the Commission and courts, a bare majority of the FPC still attempts to breathe life into a doctrine repugnant to Congress and rejected by the courts. For over 20 years industry had utilized this tax incentive to venture into new businesses. In 1963, for the first time, a majority of the FPC decided that all prior Commissions had been wrong.

This, to me, would appear to be heckling business and indicates an unwillingness to accept a court decision just as the same agency was so reluctant to accept the mandate of the Congress.

I venture the hope that all Federal agencies and particularly those so directly involved in business affairs will heed the President's often demonstrated desire, and help rather than harass private enterprise. The results of the President's friendly attitude are already bearing fruit and they should be encouraged rather than hampered.

SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving social security benefits.

There never has been any ceiling on the amount of investment income a person can have and still receive the full social security for which he is eligible.

The lid on earnings discriminates against persons who must work for a living.

This was a depression device that was designed to create job opportunities by putting financial pressure on persons eligible for social security benefits to retire and make way for others.

It never accomplished this purpose even in the depression years. In these times of high employment and inflated prices, the earnings ceiling helps no one and imposes a severe financial hardship on many retired heads of families and widowed mothers of young children.

It is cruel to cut off payments to people in these circumstances who are capable and willing to work to provide a better life for their families. Social security income went further during the depression. Now it often is not enough to provide the necessities of life, let alone some of the comforts.

The Johnson administration considers families with less than $3,000 annual income to be living at the poverty level. If this is true, I should think that repeal of the earnings limit would be the most effective antipoverty measure we could take.

The Government's own figures show that 16.2 percent of the families in the below $3,000 income bracket are headed by women under 65. Another 30.5 percent of such families are headed by persons 65 or older.

So almost 47 percent of families at the poverty income level are potentially eligible for social security benefits. Many are denied benefits because the family heads must work to get an income of even $3,000 or less.

These families could be helped by passage of my bill and it will not cost one dime for the type of bureaucracy needed to run the antipoverty programs.

Along with my bill to repeal this archaic and senseless provision of the Social Security Act, I have also introduced a separate bill to increase the present monthly $100 limitation on earnings to $200.

Although I am firmly committed to full repeal of the ceiling, I know that it is doubtful that my goal can be achieved in this Congress. I do believe, however, that we will be able to get a substantial increase. The present limitations were established in 1961. Wage levels have risen considerably during the last 4 years so, at the very least, a sizable rise of the ceiling is long overdue.

Both Houses of the Congress, as my colleagues know, agreed last year on an increase to $1,500 a year. This certainly would be an improvement but, if we are not able to remove the ceiling completely, I believe we should double it to $2,400, a figure that is still below the poverty income level. My bill to raise the monthly permitted earnings to $200 would accomplish this.

AID TO THE UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to express my unequivocal opposition to further extension of aid to the United Arab Republic and other countries which substantially damage our Nation's policy interests and materially disrupt the peace of the world.

I do so with the hope that my remarks, and the thinking of like-minded colleagues, will stir a consensus sufficient to set our course straight.

It has been the strategy of the State Department to tender aid to Egypt as a diplomatic lever. Their feeling persists that the Public Law 480 grants constitute an effective instrument in influencing the United Arab Republic Government toward arms limitation. They insist that the aid keeps the American foot in the door. Additionally, the Department does not believe that a stoppage of aid, producing greater economic hardship, would necessarily limit the Egyptian military buildup.

I have received from the Department of State, in answer to my inquiry of December 14, a succinct outline of their policy. The message is unmistakable. The Assistant Secretary, Mr. Phillips Talbot, replied thusly:

> DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
> *Washington, D.C., January 5, 1965.*
>
> DEAR CONGRESSMAN HALPERN: Thank you for your letter of December 14 in which you set forth your views on our relations with the United Arab Republic and ask us to comment specifically on an article by Hedrick Smith in the December 10 New York Times.
>
> As you know, under the multiyear Public Law 480 agreement which we have with the United Arab Republic there are periodic reviews of the quantities of various commodities programed at the beginning of the year. At the moment the Department has under consideration a request from the United Arab Republic for certain additional amounts of corn and poultry. The amount which would be involved, incidentally, would be considerably less than the $35 million reported by Mr. Smith of the New York Times.
>
> On the second point which you raise, the desirability of bringing the arms race in the Middle East under control, we have put a great deal of thought and effort into finding ways and means of making progress on this serious problem. We have explored the matter with the various governments concerned, and these efforts will continue. As far as the United Arab Republic is concerned, one of the few effective tools which we have to influence its government toward this objective, as well as responsible policies in other areas, is our Public Law 480 program. A cutback in our aid would unquestionably compound the United Arab Republic's economic difficulties. I do not think it follows that Nasser would therefore necessarily spend less for military purposes or that he would be induced to pursue a more reasonable course in the field of arms control.
>
> I appreciated having your views on our relations with the United Arab Republic, and I hope that you will not hesitate to write again if we can be of any further assistance.
>
> Sincerely yours,
>
> PHILLIPS TALBOT,
> *Assistant Secretary.*

The importance of American surplus assistance to Egypt is undeniable. The United Arab Republic's position in the International Monetary Fund is precarious at best. A UPI dispatch datelined January 5, printed in the New York Times of January 6, sums up the bewildering economic situation confronting President Nasser. He is faced with severe conditions; the Cairo and Alexandria Stock Exchanges have been closed temporarily; a number of key factories were shut down due to the lack of raw materials, and others will also face temporary stoppages.

Egypt has accumulated $250 million of short-term debt to Western countries, half of which is overdue. Three hundred million dollars is owed to the Communist bloc. Recently, the United Arab Republic Government sold $30 million of gold for hard currency, for expedient purposes. The situation is, indeed, harsh and growing more dangerous. The State Department is correct in establishing the significance of American surplus food.

Mr. Speaker, the Department's letter to me indicates how fully the political motivations are shaping our aid program vis-a-vis the United Arab Republic.

In my view, the official justification for continuing this aid program, whether based on political or economic arguments, is false. I question whether American policy is and will secure the political objectives envisaged.

The United Arab Republic military advance surely contradicts our Government's thinking that by the Public Law

480 leverage, the United States is succeeding in impressing upon Mr. Nasser the urgency of arms limitation in the Middle East. If, as the Assistant Secretary states, the Public Law 480 extensions to Egypt are mainly intended to counter upward military expenditures, this has hitherto failed conclusively.

Now I think it is legitimate to question the aid criteria applied to Egypt. It is important that we have an understandable impression of what our foreign aid program is and what it seeks to achieve.

In whatever form, assistance abroad becomes intuitively an arm of American foreign policy. In this process there must be both political, economic, and strategic motivations.

My conception of aid is a mixture of the possible and the prudent. It must conform with U.S. long-range goals for the countries and regions where it is directed. In this sense, aid is partially a political instrument.

We therefore fuse political and economic thought. For the future, aid is important in the attempt to achieve reasonably independent, reasonably viable, and reasonably stable governments in the underdeveloped world. We do not wish that newly free states, weak and insecure, come to lean too heavily upon enemy forces, thereby losing their maneuverability and neutrality. Economic assistance is part and parcel of this vital American interest.

At the same time, on humanitarian grounds, it is foolhardy to isolate the genius of productivity and its overabundant wealth. We are a civilized nation and I think one of the grand exercises of this generation must be the extension of our knowledge and surplus to meet human want.

And so one must view foreign assistance as a mixture of ideologies, a mixture of emotion and motivation. It is self-interest and world interest at the same time. Admittedly, it is a difficult criteria and the practical judgments which must be made from day to day are difficult and thus rarely questions of pure white and black.

It is my contention here, nonetheless, that Egypt has transgressed the outer limits of eligibility. This applies similarly to Indonesia.

Presently, the Public Law 480 agreement with the United Arab Republic is still in effect. The 3-year contract will terminate next June 30. We must insist that no further assistance is granted until the Egyptian Government has shown itself willing to live in peace, and until their leaders adopt a more responsible course which is reasonably allied with U.S. vital interests.

Mr. Speaker, I have heretofore expounded upon my reasons in the House. Let me briefly touch upon a few of them in light of recent developments.

The Government of Egypt is destroying the principle of American foreign aid. It is ruining the rational thinking which proponents of our programs have for so long adopted in defending the principle in this House and before an increasingly hostile public opinion. I fear that additional aid to Egypt will render our programs almost indefensible, opening the floodgates to unwise and indiscriminate trimming, subjecting the principle to even greater unpopularity througout the country.

In the first place, the awesome Egyptian arms buildup is contrary to U.S. interests. Our assistance is underwriting this adventure. Relative military superiority in the hands of the Egyptian leaders cannot possibly further American aims in the Middle East; it will make the resolution of old enmities and conflicts less possible; it will enhance the means of subversion and indirect aggression.

We have the Egyptian intervention in the Yemen as an example of duplicity and hostility. The Government is expending millions on this sad project. U.S. assistance is helping to feed Egypt's poor, enabling the Government to divert its resources to war engagement and making it possible to avoid the cruel internal demands which arise. In this sense, the validity of American aid has already been damaged.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me quote briefly from President Nasser's speech at Port Said on December 23 last:

Nasser then sneered at the $1½ billion of U.S. aid that he has received:

> I want to say that we are getting wheat from the Americans. We must disclose the matter openly. [Laughter and jeers.] We get wheat, meat, and leftovers * * * yesterday the American Ambassador called on the Deputy Premier for Supply and sat for a few minutes looking glum and sulky. He was supposed to talk about supplies we are obtaining from America in accordance with the products law. The Ambassador told the Deputy Premier that he cannot at present talk about this matter at all. Why? Because he does not like our currency, that is the currency of Egypt. I would like him to know that whoever does not like our currency can go and drink up the sea. If the Mediterranean is not enough, there is the Red Sea. We can give him that as well. * * * As for American aid * * * we tell them "Thank you" and "May you have plenty," but we are not prepared to accept words and arrogance.

It might be of interest for you to consider the United Arab Republic representative's statement on aid to the General Assembly, United Nations:

> Foreign aid in both the financial and technical fields is an essential element for enabling the developing countries to reach a reasonable stage of development. Foreign aid, however, should not be a means of bringing pressure on developing countries, nor should it be a method of political or ideological interference. Rather, it is a right to which developing countries are entitled.

Regarding Colonel Nasser's remarks, it must be said that they were meant for internal consumption. But it refutes the official apologetic attitude that the United States, through its aid program, is acquiring leverage. And if one object of our aid is to build some understanding of American goals and standards throughout the world, the hysterical outbursts of Mr. Nasser, along with his controlled, anti-Western communications media, is certainly not affording America a very reliable opening.

The second statement poses an irrational thought; that aid to the developing countries is expected as a matter of right. It is not. This presumption affirms my earlier contention that the Egyptians have not the slightest concept of what our aid program is and why it exists. They have got their thinking wrong because we have failed to enforce understandable criteria. While I agree that aid should not constitute a direct, short-term political instrument, it would not hurt to explain to the Egyptian gentleman that the United States, as well as Egypt, has certain worldwide objectives not inimical to those of the United Arab Republic, and that we are not wholly selfish in pursuing them. This is not wanton interference in domestic affairs, a much abused phrase. The fact of the matter is that we live in a world of competing interests, and that these must be adjusted to strengthen the peace.

Now we have learned that Egypt is materially supporting the rebellion against the legal Congo Government—Leopoldville. Aside from the question of whether this is affordable—financially justifiable—this assistance is directly contrary to our interest in a stable Congo situation. Any growing strength of the rebels means greater military difficulty for the central government forces, which we are supporting. Will a steadily worsening picture mean that American policy is once again faced with the agonizing decision of extended involvement in Afro-Asia? I do not want us to be faced with this untimely choice, should the rebellion recoup substantially and turn the tide against the Tshombe regime.

In essence, Nasser's policy is contrary to our immediate goals in the Congo and our long-range objectives in Africa.

Mr. Speaker, I regret very much that the original amendment to the food-for-peace program, offered by the former Representative of Ohio, Mr. Bolton, was not agreed to in 1964. This would have helped to set our course right.

I have attempted to report on my thinking as to why our aid program to Egypt is self-defeating. Manifestly, our policymakers have gotten themselves embroiled in a maze of worried counterpressures. The scare is always that in forthrightly denying assistance, and explaining the decision carefully, our country will lose a friend.

The hurtful tendency in this respect is always to think in terms of tomorrow and not the future. We are frozen by a checkerboard of short-term gains and losses. Nations are more likely to have permanent interests rather than permanent friends, and even interests should not become hardened for all time. Fate often plays dirty tricks, and the one sure factor of international politics is that adherences and interests will shift because no one state can control absolutely the world scene, and no two nations have precisely similar instincts.

The validity and success of our foreign aid program, never easily tested, should not be subjected to risk by the unreasoned pressures of any one recipient.

I would like to see now a firm declaration of purpose. The request of Egypt for an additional surplus should be denied and a full explanation given.

In this connection, we would be implementing the antiaggressor amendment of 1963 which states that no assistance be rendered to countries which are engaging in or preparing for war against the United States or her other aid recipients.

Second, I firmly urge that upon completion of the current Public Law 480 agreement, Egypt be forewarned that no extension can be granted under present circumstances. The Egyptian Government, and other interested governments, should be advised of this decision with a full explanation so that there will be no excuse for misunderstanding.

In so doing, we will be acting to reaffirm the validity of our assistance program, and our vital policy interests can be pursued.

THE FAMOUS UCLA-LABOR REPORT

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. TALCOTT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, "chaotic" is the most accurate description of the agriculture situation in California's fresh fruit and vegetable industries.

In anticipation of the termination of the bracero program—for supplying necessary supplemental labor during peak harvesting and cultivating seasons—California farmers and governmental agencies experimented thoroughly with every conceivable suggestion to replace foreign workers. Every proposal failed. There is still no practical, satisfactory solution. The situation is deteriorating hourly. California produces more than 40 percent of the Nation's fresh vegetables. Chaos in California will adversely affect all Americans.

Unfortunately, the U.S. Departments of Labor and Agriculture are not publishing reports about the situation and have not proposed satisfactory solutions. There are some reports you probably will not see.

The UCLA Institute of Industrial Relations' report on problems of farm labor recruitment has created quite a disturbance.

One chapter of their rather voluminous report was entitled "Can Recipients of Public Assistance Be Recruited for Farm Work?" Here are some facts taken from the report.

The bureau of public assistance in Los Angeles County had 177,026 open cases in July 1964. These cases covered 303,458 persons. Of the 177,026 case files, the largest category consists of 100,230 persons who were 65 years of age or older. The average age was about 75.

There were 4,489 blind persons, 18,359 permanently disabled, 5,653 children who were placed in boarding homes or institutions, and 9,653 cases of unemployables who did not come into any of these categories.

Included in the 177,026 cases were 33,997 families receiving aid to their dependent children. In 9 out of 10 of these families the mother was the only adult in home and had an average of 3 children, more than 80 percent of whom were under 12 years of age.

Because of the large number of preschool children in these homes, the mother was needed in the home and could not become self-supporting. Even so, their number is not static, for 9,021 families left the relief rolls in 1963, often because the mothers obtained adequate supervision of their children and employment which made them self-supporting.

An examination of these cases leaves 3,879 in which there was at least 1 clearly employable person. Of these, 2,993 were added since February of this year when the bureau began administration of the new aid to families with dependent children—unemployed, and 886 were classed as general relief cases.

Thus, in seeking the number of public assistance cases in which persons clearly might become more gainfully employed, we are talking about 1¼ percent of the persons receiving aid.

Well, we get up to this point in the report and we have been quoting directly from the report in hopes that the makeup of the welfare rolls would be of interest to you. Then the people making this survey decided to send a questionnaire to social caseworkers to get their views on the feasibility and desirability of recruiting unemployed persons for farmwork. The caseworkers were those who help administer the program of aid to families with dependent children including unemployed parents.

The following are some of the answers given by social caseworkers to the question, "From your experience, what response would you make to persons who make the charge that most people would rather stay on welfare than do farm or any other type of work?" Fifteen percent of the social workers agreed with the statement, 45 percent disagreed, and 31 percent cautiously recoiled from the question.

Following are some of the answers given by social workers to the question:

Social status of aid is better than farm labor.

People would rather be on aid than do strenuous farm labor.

I would think that persons who make this charge are ill advised, nearsighted, have little or no respect for the unfortunates, gage human worth primarily by wealth, and believe that all poverty is the wages of sin.

Hard work is no longer considered dignified.

Farm work provides no incentive.

Planning toward future self-maintenance is an eligibility requirement for receipt of current aid.

Many clients specifically state that they left the South to free themselves from a rural economy.

Generally, when people make the above charge, I ask them if they have ever spoken to anyone on welfare. They say "No," and I first smirk; second, look surprised; third, look superior, and/or give a brief speech on the "Dignity of Man in the 20th Century." Then I change the conversation to something less controversial like Goldwater or birth control.

I would agree with them for the following reasons: First, men generally seek pleasure, not hardship; second, farming connotes the simple, the unlearned, the square; third, our clients envisage any kind of work to mean something menial, difficult, nonunion, and odious; and, fourth, why work when you can get paid for doing nothing?

Offer them a job and find out.

As long as society offers them no better position, why should they not be supported by that society?

Some people are just plain lazy.

Why should they not have a choice to work in a field in which they are skilled?

Transportation would be a tremendous problem for most of my clients.

Many, many clients have financial security for the first time in their lives when they first begin to receive public assistance. They are reluctant to give up this security for the uncertainty of competing in the labor market, especially when they know layoffs may be frequent. Besides, many clients work at casual labor while receiving aid and thus have two incomes.

It is a matter of simple economics. Until farm wages are raised and conditions improved, people would rather stay on welfare, just to eat. This does not mean they prefer welfare, but only that they do that which is most economically feasible. The above listed statement is not a charge, it is a cold fact.

URBAN RENEWAL PROBLEMS THAT MUST BE MET

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, one of the most controversial books ever written on the Federal urban renewal program, "The Federal Bulldozer," has, in effect, been condensed for the January-February issue of the Harvard Business Review, by its author, Dr. Martin Anderson.

I do not agree with Dr. Anderson's final conclusion that the urban renewal program must immediately be repealed. It is not necessary to agree with the author's conclusion of repeal to recognize that the facts he presents pose important problems in the urban renewal field, problems which this administration has yet to meet or even admit exist.

Last year, when the Republican minority presented a housing program prior to that offered by the administration, we pointed out that an overemphasis on high-rent commercial developments and luxury apartments had sacrificed the original goal of providing low- and moderate-income housing. At the same time, private developers without Federal assistance had, with less delay and more success, renewed downtown areas in many of our Nation's cities. For that reason, the Widnall bill and companion measures proposed a strict priority for housing redevelopment, and the placing of commercial renewal on a loan basis.

Relocation problems, particularly for minority groups, the elderly, and small businesses, and the lack of adequate compensation for property taken, were also noted last year. The Widnall bill again met these problems by providing for a physical verification of decent, safe, and sanitary housing at the time of relocation, advanced planning for small businessmen, and a complete overhaul of the concept of just compensation. All of these, as Dr. Anderson's article shows, are problems contained in or caused by the urban renewal program.

Over the past year, in hearings held before the House Special Housing Subcommittee, I have raised questions concerning the alleged increase in tax revenues to localities as a result of urban renewal programs. The increase, as the answers to my questions show, is still in the "estimated" stage, one it has been in since the beginning of the program. This same "myth" has been dealt with by Dr. Anderson.

And a recent report by the General Accounting Office on relocation in Washington, D.C., confirms the suspicion I have expressed before, and Dr. Anderson has also developed, that standards for relocation housing are sometimes not as high as housing code standards used to declare an area "blighted."

Most of the suggestions by the minority were not acted upon last year. In two cases, however, Congress did begin major new programs that I had proposed. As Dr. Anderson's figures indicate, the number of dilapidated structures suitable for clearance is in a continuing decline, yet the administration still insists on the bulldozer technique. Congress last year, however, provided for a new $50 million rehabilitation loan program, proposed in my bill, to allow the individual homeowner and small businessman a chance to survive. The second proposal enacted into law provides for a code enforcement urban renewal project, and a cutoff of funds in the future if cities do not take enough local responsibility in this area.

The administration's reaction to these new laws has done nothing to insure against future criticism by scholars such as Dr. Anderson. First the Bureau of the Budget refused to fund the loan program, then the Urban Renewal Administration ignored the code enforcement program, although many cities have expressed interest in it. Perhaps a reading of Dr. Anderson's article will shake them out of their lethargy.

I include the article at this point:

[From the Harvard Business Review, January–February 1965]

THINKING AHEAD

Business leaders have heard many times in recent years that our housing and our cities are decaying, that private enterprise cannot save them, that the Government must step in and help private enterprise with urban renewal, and that they—as responsible citizens and businessmen—should collaborate with the Government in this effort.[1] In my judgment, none of these statements is true.

The purpose of this article is to evaluate the Federal urban renewal program—its goals, its methods, its accomplishments—and to compare them with those of the free marketplace. A comparison of the results that these two forces—the Federal urban renewal program and private enterprise—have produced since 1949 brings out some fundamental issues and questions that have been obscured in a fog of good intentions and platitudes. The basic question is this: Should the Federal urban renewal program be continued and expanded, or should it be stopped? I shall argue that it should be stopped.

GOALS OF RENEWAL

In response to continual exhortation and pressure to do something to "save" the cities and improve housing, Congress enacted the Federal urban renewal program in 1949, proceeding on the conviction that a program of this type would help to eliminate substandard and other inadequate housing through clearance of slums and blighted areas.

Stimulate sufficient housing production and community development to remedy the housing shortage.

Realize the goal of a decent home and a suitable living environment for every American family.

I doubt that anyone can argue with these goals. Better homes, improved neighborhoods, and the elimination of slums—all are desirable. The difficulty is not with the goals, but with the means of accomplishing them and with the consequences that result.

HOW PROGRAM WORKS

In essence the Federal urban renewal program attempts to rebuild rundown areas of cities by feeding large amounts of public money and government power into the normal operations of the private marketplace. It does not complement the private market; it short-circuits it.

This is how the program works. First, a section of a city is designated as an urban renewal area, and plans are drawn up and approved by the local renewal agency, the local governing body, and the Federal authorities in Washington. A public hearing is then held at which local renewal officials document their case for urban renewal. At this time other persons interested in the project have the opportunity to speak for or against it.

Once the planning is complete, execution starts. Though some execution activities may be carried on simultaneously, there are six basic steps:

1. Land acquisition: The land and the buildings are usually acquired by negotiation with the owners, but, if this fails, the renewal authorities will use the power of eminent domain to force the recalcitrant owners to sell; in cases like this, the purchase price is determined by independent appraisers.

2. Displacement and relocation: Individuals, families, and businesses located in the area are forced to move and find homes or establish businesses elsewhere. The law provides for some compensation and requires renewal authorities to relocate them satisfactorily, although in practice this does not always happen.

3. Site clearance: The wrecking cranes and the bulldozers demolish any buildings not considered useful by the renewal authorities.

4. Site improvements and supporting facilities: The cleared land is usually improved by the construction of streets, sewers, water mains, lighting systems, schools, libraries and parks.

5. Disposition of improved land: The cleared and improved land can be sold, leased, donated, or retained by the renewal agency. Usually the land is sold to private persons either by competitive bidding or by negotiation between renewal officials and the private buyer.

6. New construction: The new construction may be residential, industrial, commercial, or public; so far it has been predominantly private residential. The private developer is usually obliged to build according to a general plan approved by the renewal authorities.

This, then, is urban renewal—damned by some, praised by many, and understood by very few. At first glance, urban renewal would seem to be a most desirable program, both plausible and appealing. The picture is often painted like this: before—dirty, dark, ugly slums; after—clean, bright, beautiful buildings. The contrast is clear, the appeal seductive, but this picture shows only the hopes and wishes of urban renewal. The realities of its costs and consequences are drastically different.

EVERYBODY PAYS

Urban renewal is, of course, expensive. The gross project cost of urban renewal includes all expenses incurred by a local renewal authority—planning costs, land, buildings, overhead, interest, relocation, site improvements, and supporting facilities.

Assume that all this costs $9 million for a good-sized project. Where does the money come from?

Some of it comes from private developers who buy the cleared and improved land. On the average, private developers have been buying urban renewal land for about 30 percent of the gross cost of the project—say $3 million for our $9 million project. This leaves the city with a net cost of $6 million. The Federal Government will pay two-thirds of this net cost, or, in this case, $4 million.

Thus, for our $9 million project, we get $3 million from the private developer who becomes the new owner, $4 million from taxpayers all over the United States, and $2 million from taxpayers living in the community with the urban renewal project. Additional features called noncash grants-in-aid, can reduce the net cost to the city still further.

Because the Federal Government subsidizes two-thirds of the net cost to the city, some people feel that urban renewal is a bonanza that cannot be passed up. This might be true if only one city were engaged in urban renewal, but there are over 1,500 projects in about 750 cities throughout the country. Through Federal taxes, the residents of any one of these cities are helping to pay for all the other projects. As more and more cities attempt to "get their share" and the overall cost of the program rises, the cost to all necessarily increases.

BETTER HOUSING?

One of the most serious consequences of the Federal urban renewal program is the effect that it has had on the supply of housing, especially low-rent housing. This is ironic because one of the goals of the program is to improve living conditions. Why has this goal not been realized?

The typical urban renewal project destroys a great many homes. Between 1950 and 1960, the program was responsible for the destruction of approximately 126,000 housing units. Of these homes, 101,000 had been classified as substandard by the local renewal authorities, while 25,000 were in good condition. The good ones were destroyed because they were judged to be incompatible with the proposed plan for the area.

I have estimated that in this same decade approximately 28,000 new housing units were completed within urban renewal areas.[2] About 25,000 of these were privately owned homes; 3,000 or so were public housing units. Score: 126,000 down, about 28,000 up. This means that almost four times as many homes were destroyed as were built.

The total effect on housing conditions was even worse. All the 126,000 homes that were destroyed were located in older sections of cities, and almost all were low-rent units. It is doubtful whether the average rent paid exceeded $50 or $60 a month. On the other hand, the rents of the new privately owned homes were very high. For example, those homes built in 1962 in urban renewal areas had rents averaging $195 a month. (A small percentage rented for over $360 a month.) Hence it was virtually impossible for any person displaced from an urban renewal area to move back in: he could afford it only if he moved into public housing. And only 3,000 units of public housing were built—an insignificant number in comparison to the number of units destroyed.

---

[1] See, for example, Leland Hazard, "Are We Committing Urban Suicide?" Thinking Ahead, HBR July–August 1964, p. 152.

[2] "The Federal Bulldozer" (Cambridge, the Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press, 1964), pp. 65–67.

Thus the net effect of the Federal urban renewal program in the field of housing for the period I have studied can be summed up in this way:

More homes were destroyed than were built.

Those destroyed were predominantly low-rent homes.

Those built were predominantly high-rent homes.

Housing conditions were made worse for those whose housing conditions were least good.

Housing conditions were improved for those whose housing conditions were best.

IMPROVED LIVING CONDITIONS?

Private studies indicate that the people displaced by urban renewal usually move into housing of approximately the same quality as the housing they were forced out of—but they often pay more for it. Their predicament is compounded, not alleviated, by urban renewal. Government studies, on the other hand, indicate that about 80 percent of the displaced people move into standard housing. Obviously, both the private studies and the Government studies cannot be correct.

I suspect the reason for the discrepancy between them is that local government officials decide whether or not a dwelling unit in an urban renewal area is standard or substandard, and their estimates are therefore subject to bias. An official interested in speeding up the process of an urban renewal project may be tempted to apply high housing standards to justify the taking of the property, and then, when it comes to relocating the people displaced, he may be tempted to use quite low housing standards to justify the quick relocation of these people.

The notion that over 80 percent of the displaced people move into good housing is difficult to reconcile with other relevant facts. The people living in these areas are relatively poor. A great many of them come from minority groups; approximately two-thirds of all those forced to move are Negroes and Puerto Ricans. Good-quality, conveniently located housing costs so much more than poor housing that it is difficult to conceive of hundreds of thousands of low-income people, many of them subject to racial discrimination, suddenly moving from low-quality housing into higher quality housing at rents they can afford.

And then one might ask the following question: If it is true that all this good-quality, conveniently located, low-rent housing is available, why then is it necessary to force these people out of their homes with a bulldozer? Would it not be far simpler, more just, and much cheaper just to tell them about the better homes available elsewhere?

ONE MILLION EVICTIONS

The number of people affected by the program was small during its first few years of operation. But I have estimated that as of December 31, 1962, approximately 1,665,000 persons were living or had lived in urban renewal areas. This is about the same number of people that live in Detroit, Mich.—the fifth largest city in the United States. Some of these people have already been forced out; the rest will be on their way eventually.

The number of people actually evicted so far is very large. By March 31, 1963, about 609,000 persons had been forced to move, and the number has, of course, continued to go up. I estimate that at least 1 million people will be evicted by the end of 1965. And this is by no means the end; in fact, it is probably just a small start. In 1962, William Slayton, the Commissioner of the Urban Renewal Administration, stated that approximately 1 million families would be displaced during the next decade. This means that somewhere around 4 million persons will be actually displaced by 1972—or about 1 person out of every 50 living in the United States.

GOOD FOR BUSINESS?

Although most urban renewal areas are predominantly residential, they often contain a number of businesses. These businesses range from one-man offices to industrial concerns with several hundred employees. According to a 1960 report financed by the Small Business Administration:

"It is estimated that there are over 100,000 business firms in all 650 project areas. The approximately 100,000 firms scheduled for dislocation from project areas on December 31, 1959, represent a beginning only. Now projects have been started at an increasing rate. Although no precise forecasts have been made, it is expected that the volume of business dislocations from renewal areas over the 1960–70 decade will be at least twice the 100,000 already underway or planned."[3]

What happens to a business when it is forced to move? Does it stay in business? Where does it move to?

According to the study quoted above, many firms never relocate at all. This study covered 14 cities with 21 urban renewal projects containing a total of 2,946 displaced firms. The finding: 756 of them either went out of business or disappeared. Similar findings have been made by others.

A study conducted by Brown University in the city of Providence, R.I., found that 40 percent of the businesses displaced went out of business.[4]

A study prepared by the Library of Congress concluded that urban renewal projects "are destroying small businesses and jobs and contributing to the unemployment problem."[5]

What about rents for firms forced to relocate? In the study prepared for the Small Business Administration, a sample was taken of 4 cities that contained 1,142 displaced firms. Only 41, or 3.1 percent, actually moved back into the urban renewal area. The researchers observed:

"Approximately 75 percent of those who do relocate find quarters within 1 mile of their former location; and nearly 40 percent within one-quarter mile. They generally occupy about the same floor area they did before (which is less than they claimed to want or need), at a square foot rental at least double what they were paying (which is much more than they claimed to be able to afford or to be willing to pay)."[6]

THE TAX MYTH

One of the most valued arguments presented by those who favor expansion of the urban renewal program is that it will strengthen and increase the tax base and thus increase tax revenues to the city. Unfortunately this has not happened, and the chances of urban renewal producing a significant tax revenue increase in the future are small.

The latest data I have on new construction actually started in urban renewal areas goes through March 31, 1961. It shows that the urban renewal programs actually decreased the tax revenues flowing into the cities' tax coffers. By the end of 1960, approximately $735 million of real estate had been destroyed in urban renewal project areas. About $824 million of real estate construction had been started, $577 million of which was privately owned and thus taxable. If we optimistically assume that 70 percent of this total amount privately started was ever finished, the net result is about $400 million worth of taxable property—$335 million less than we had before urban renewal.[7]

Is this a temporary situation, or is an adverse tax effect a fundamental quality of urgan renewal? Several factors militate against net tax increases:

1. Interim tax losses from real estate destroyed are often overlooked. Once buildings are down, no taxes are paid on them. Nor are any taxes paid until new buildings have been put up. The new buildings will probably be worth much more than the old ones. But the length of time between the destruction of the old buildings and the construction of the new ones can easily be 5 years or more. During this time the city is losing tax revenue.

2. Tax revenue increases that would have occurred in the absence of urban renewal must be considered. In most cases, a certain amount of new construction and rehabilitation would probably have been accomplished with private funds, thereby increasing the tax base with no cost to the city.

3. Much of the new construction in the urban renewal area would have been built elsewhere in the city anyway. Some experts in the field estimate that from 50 to 75 percent of this construction would have been accomplished by private enterprise.

4. Many of the new tenants in an urban renewal area will come from other parts of the city. What happens to the value of the buildings they vacate?

5. Some cities have had to give special tax abatements to induce private developers to come in. This, of course, will further reduce any net gain in tax revenues that might materialize.

To be sure, some of the factors operating may tend to increase the tax revenues. If an urban renewal project is successful, it is possible that the value of the surrounding buildings may increase. But before this is translated into increased taxes, the assessment on the buildings must be raised.

The whole issue of tax revenue changes is still a cloudy one and will probably remain so. It should be kept in mind that the net change will be the result of many complex factors. It is not enough just to compare the value of the old real estate with the proposed value of the new real estate. Timing of payments, effect on the rest of the city, what would have happened without urban renewal—these must all be considered, along with the fact that the process of urban renewal itself costs the city a considerable amount of money.

CONSTITUTIONAL?

Under the Constitution of the United States, it is understood that a man is free to use his property as he desires as long as he does not interfere with the rights of others. Traditionally, public use is the only reason for which the Government may seize private property. The Supreme Court changed this in 1954, and today, under the Federal urban renewal program, it is possible for the Government to seize the property of one man, destroy it, and then sell the cleared land to some other man at a negotiated price.

---

[3] William N. Kinnard, Jr., and Zenon S. Malinowski. "The Impact of Dislocation From Urban Renewal Areas on Small Business," prepared by the University of Connecticut under a grant from the Small Business Administration, July 1960, pp. 2–3.

[4] Chamber of Commerce of the United States, "Washington Report," December 20, 1963.

[5] Ibid.

[6] W. N. Kinnard, Jr., and Z. S. Malinowski, op. cit., p. 75.

[7] See "The Federal Bulldozer," pp. 180, 181.

The Constitution clearly states that the power of eminent domain may be used only to seize private property for public use. Approximately 70 percent of the new construction in urban renewal areas is privately owned. By no distortion of the thinking process can this be construed to be a public use; it is clearly a private use.

The Supreme Court essentially justified this procedure on the grounds that it was in the public interest. They neatly sidestepped the problem of clearly defining the public interest. The use of the public interest to justify a Government program often means that one group of people will gain at the expense of some other group. Those who do not mind sacrificing the rights of a few persons in the name of the public interest eventually may end up sacrificing the rights of the public in the name of the public interest.

The equation of public interest with public use is a dangerous principle to accept. It means that the Government theoretically could seize anyone's property for any reason that an official claimed was in the public interest if he could justify it to the satisfaction of the Court. Every citizen has the responsibility of questioning the decisions of the Supreme Court. The Court is not infallible in its interpretation of the law; and its decisions can be reversed.

POWER OF FREE ENTERPRISE

According to certain experts, things are getting worse in urban housing. In a report of the President's Commission on National Goals in 1960, Catherine Bauer Wurster stated:

"There is a great deal of seriously substandard housing in American communities, and spreading 'gray areas' in various stages of actual or potential decay, plus commercial and industrial blight. It is quite evident that economic progress alone does not cure these evils, and that local governments cannot do the necessary job alone." [8]

Others have made similar statements. If they are correct, it seems that we are in for serious trouble. Fortunately, the actual developments of recent years contradict these pessimistic opinions.

Impressive progress has been made toward achieving the objectives set forth by Congress in 1949. Overall housing conditions have improved dramatically, in cities and outside of cities for the poor and the rich, and for the nonwhites as well as the whites. This progress has been furthered by businessmen operating in the free marketplace. The improvements in housing quality and the increase in the housing supply accomplished through private enterprise. To summarize some of the more important aspects of the record:

Both the relative and absolute changes in housing quality between 1940 and 1960 were striking. In 1940, 51 percent of all housing in the United States was considered standard or sound; in 1950 the proportion had moved up to 63 percent; and in 1960, fully 81 percent was classified as standard. If this trend continues, it is likely that the Census of 1970 will reveal that 90 to 95 percent of all our housing is standard.

From 1950 to 1960 alone the total number of standard homes increased from 29.1 to 47.4 million, a 63-percent increase in just 10 years. This increase of over 18 million standard homes was the result of both new construction and rehabilitation. Over 12 million new units were built, and the number of substandard units declined from 17 million to under 11 million. Virtually all of this was accomplished by private construction, rehabilitation, and demolition efforts; massive amounts of private funds were invested in housing. These investments were in no way connected with the Federal urban renewal program.

From 1945 to 1960, private mortgage debt outstanding increased by almost $170 billion. Although approximately 40 percent of this total was insured by the Federal Government through the Federal Housing Administration and the Veterans' Administration, this does not mean that the Government was responsible for the increase in housing quality. The underlying demand for housing and the growing income of those who desired better housing were clearly the predominating factors. The effect of government insurance programs was probably to produce a slight increase in the amount of housing starts; but it should be kept in mind that if these government insurance programs had not existed, private insurance companies, such as the Mortgage Guaranty Insurance Corporation would have surely developed at a much faster rate than they did.

The amount of really bad housing—that classified as dilapidated by the Bureau of the Census—declined from 9.8 percent in 1950 to 5.2 percent in 1960. The 1960 overall vacancy rate was slightly over 9 percent. The number of dilapidated homes was actually smaller than the number of vacant homes. Vacancy rates were much higher for poor housing than for good housing. In 1960, 6.8 percent of the standard housing was vacant, whereas the vacancy rate was 20 percent for dilapidated housing. Then, as now, the fact seemed to be that there were a certain number of people who either could not or would not spend enough money to rent or to buy the available standard housing.

HOUSING FOR MINORITIES

It is sometimes charged that the free working of capitalism cannot produce gains for some groups of people, particularly the nonwhite population. Many are convinced that the only answer must lie in the direction of greater Government intervention and higher public subsidies.

In fact, the nonwhite population of the United States has enjoyed a very substantial increase in the quality of its housing. From 1950 to 1960 there was an overall net increase of 1,813,000 standard units and a decrease of 537,000 substandard units. Between 1950 and 1960 the percent of standard housing occupied by nonwhites doubled—going from 28 to 56 percent. Most of the bad housing is now located in the South, where only 38 percent is standard. In the Northeast, 77 percent is standard; in the North Central, 73 percent; in the West, 79 percent. In comparisons like this it should be remembered that the rents paid by whites are about 29 percent higher than those paid by nonwhites, and that the values of the homes owned by whites are over 82 percent higher.

The housing conditions of nonwhites have improved substantially, and although the quality of their housing does not yet equal that of the whites, it is rapidly approaching it, particularly in areas outside the South. Compared to the Federal urban renewal program, the private marketplace is making swift, substantial progress.

MARCHING METROPOLISES

The same type of improvement in housing quality that has taken place throughout the country has taken place in our cities. In 1960, fully 88.6 percent of the housing located in central cities of over 100,000 population was classified as standard. In these same 128 central cities, the dilapidated housing had declined to slightly over 3 percent of the total. In our 13 largest cities, taken as a group, 90.1 percent of all housing was standard in 1960; only 2.6 percent was dilapidated.

Housing quality in cities has been continually improving, and now, as in the past, housing in cities is substantially better than in the country taken as a whole. Today the bulk of the relatively small amount of bad housing that still exists lies outside of our cities, particularly in the rural areas. Only 18 percent of the substandard housing lies within cities having populations of more than 100,000. There appears to be a definite correlation between the degree of urbanization and the amount of good housing.

Since the war, construction activity has been booming all over the United States and its cities. From 1950 to 1960, approximately $52.6 billion of new building construction went up in cities with populations over 100,000. Only a little over 1 percent of this was urban renewal construction. If our cities are declining, as is often claimed, how does one account for the steady increase in building activity?

What about the worrisome claim that the middle-income group is disappearing from the city? The city of the future is prophesied by some as the city of the very rich and the very poor. The facts indicate that this has not happened and probably will not happen. If we define "middle income" as $4,000 to $10,000 a year, we find that almost 57 percent of all people living in large cities fall within this range. In fact, the income distribution in large cities is roughly the same as that for the country as a whole. Today's city is not the city of the very rich and the very poor; it is predominantly the city of the middle-income group.

By any objective measure, the indications are clear that our cities—in overall terms—are continually improving and that today they are better than they ever were before.

Validity of data: The foregoing facts were taken from the data on housing quality collected every 10 years by the Bureau of the Census. These Census data were the result of observations made by 150,000 enumerators, all of whom were given careful instructions on how to classify housing.

The three categories used in 1960 were "sound," "deteriorating," and "dilapidated." Categories or definitions of categories vary slightly from decade to decade, but adjustments were made to make the data comparable in time, and the effect of the slightly changed definitions was negligible. Generally speaking, "sound" housing has no defects or has slight defects that would normally be corrected during regular maintenance (lack of paint, for example). "Deteriorating" housing needs more repair than that required by normal maintenance (a shaky porch or broken plaster, for example). "Dilapidated" housing does not provide safe and adequate shelter.

Although the Bureau of the Census data can be criticized, they are by far the best available today—most accurate, broadest in scope, and most consistent over time. I emphasize this because a considerable number of self-styled experts consider their lone opinions superior to those of 150,000 trained enumerators. They would justify their conclusion that the city or housing is deteriorating solely on the basis of their visual impressions. This is not a valid way to measure changes in housing quality. The amateur's experience is very limited, his standards cannot be identified, and there is no way of knowing whether his standards change from year to year.

The next time you hear that the city is deteriorating ask: "In what way? By whose standard?"

CONCLUSION

Since 1949 two different methods have been used to grapple with the "problems" of housing and cities. One of these is basically the system of free enterprise, guided by the complex interplay of the marketplace. The other force is the Federal urban renewal program guided by overall plans prepared by city planning experts and backed up with the taxpayers' money and the police power of the Government.

---

[8] "Framework for an Urban Society," "Goals for Americans—The Report of the President's Commission on National Goals" (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1960), p. 229.

The facts tell us that private enterprise has made enormous gains, while the Federal program has not. Contrast, for example, the fantastic increase of 18 million homes in areas outside urban renewal projects with the net decrease of homes within urban renewal projects. Consider also the decrease in low-rent housing and the increase in high-rent housing in the urban renewal areas; urban renewal actually subsidizes high-income groups and hurts low-income groups. Add to this the destruction of businesses and the forcible displacement of people from their homes. The program endangers the right of private property—commercial and residential—in its equating of public interest with public use.

The overall results of the Government program when compared to the results of private forces are negligible. Its overall costs when compared with its results are high. On balance the Federal urban renewal program has accomplished little of benefit in the past and it appears doubtful that it will do better in the future.

However, there are times when participating in a Federal urban renewal project—as a contractor, a banker, or a businessman—may be attractive if only shortrun gains or profits are considered. Participation may make it possible for a businessman to get that location he wants from an owner who has been unwilling to sell. It may renovate an adjacent area and thus increase the value of his property. It may eliminate buildings that are visually offensive to him and he may even make some money out of it.

But in supporting the program for these or other reasons, the businessman should be aware that he is supporting a Government program that, in the long run, is detrimental to his own interests. It uses the concept of eminent domain in such a way that private property—business as well as residential—can be taken and resold by the Government to other private persons for their own use simply because it is supposed to be in the public interest. It implies acceptance of the idea that private enterprise cannot work effectively in the field of housing and that Government must intervene, when, in fact, this is not true. It subsidizes some businesses and construction interests that are in direct competition with those of other private businessmen. During execution it lowers the tax base of the city—in some cases perhaps permanently—and thus increases the tax burden for the rest of the city.

And, finally, the businessman may be hurt directly when the local renewal authorities decide that the area in which he is located is blighted. The irony of Washington's urban renewal program is that without the enthusiastic collaboration of many businessmen it would come to a grinding halt.

In my judgment, the program should be repealed now. This could be accomplished simply by not authorizing any new projects. All projects currently under contract could be carried through to completion if the individual cities desired to do so.

As the Greek Philosopher Aristotle stated more than 2,200 years ago: "Even when laws have been written down, they ought not always remain unaltered."

What would be the results of such clearcut, positive action? Would slums proliferate? Would housing get worse? Would cities die? Clearly, no. The record of what has been achieved outside of the Federal urban renewal program by private forces is concrete evidence of what can be done by an essentially free enterprise economic system. If this is what can be accomplished by free enterprise, the rational course of action is to encourage it to function, not to attack it or to sabotage it.

LEGISLATION TO ESTABLISH A NATIONAL LOTTERY NEEDED

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Fino] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, during each of my prior six terms in Congress, I have introduced legislation to establish a national lottery. Despite the fact that each of our NATO allies sponsors a national lottery, the Congress has not even held hearings on my bills. Few of my colleagues have the public courage of their private convictions.

I am hopeful that the success of the New Hampshire lottery will prod some of our reluctant legislators into action. America badly needs a national lottery. It shocks me that so internationally plausible a revenue-raising device has been ignored by the United States. The Federal Government, always on the alert for new revenue sources, has, with typical ineptness, missed the obvious one right under its nose.

Not only will the national lottery raise badly needed revenue—which I estimate at $10 billion—but it would strike at the heart of organized crime by knocking out crime's financial bulwark. The reasons for a national lottery are many—each complementing the other. To me, they are convincing. I strongly urge the Congress to adopt this much-needed measure now.

NEED FOR REFORMS IN THE METHOD BY WHICH WE ELECT OUR PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MacGregor] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, in his state of the Union message President Johnson made reference to the need for reforms in the method by which we elect our President and Vice President. He said, specifically:

> I will propose reforms in the electoral college leaving undisturbed the vote by States—but making sure no elector can substitute his will for that of the people.

Responsible press statements have indicated that what the President has in mind is a plan for automatically awarding a State's electoral votes to the candidate who wins a majority of the popular vote in the State. The plan would abolish either the function or the whole existence of the electoral college. It would serve to make impossible the election of unpledged electors and also would prevent an elector pledged to one candidate from switching his vote to another candidate.

In my opinion this plan is a good one. It serves to preserve the integrity of our election system, and should be supported.

However, I believe we need to go beyond that and work for a solution of the electoral college problem which is considerably deeper than the matter of unpledged electors.

The problem has been obvious for some years. And every so often proposals are made and we see some newspaper editorials citing the need for a solution. But we have made no real progress, and progress is overdue. Further delay makes a mockery of our democratic process.

Today I am reintroducing my proposal for a change in our electoral college system. The plan is essentially the same as I put forth in 1961 and in 1963. I urge its consideration at an early date.

We talk about "one man one vote" at the State legislative level, and properly so. Each citizen ought to be able to know that his vote carries the same weight as every other citizen's vote. The Supreme Court has affirmed this principle.

But the fact is that we do not have this system prevailing at the presidential election level. One vote in Minnesota, for example, does not carry the same weight in electing a President as one vote in New York City or in Los Angeles.

What we have in each State is the "winner take all" system. The winning presidential candidate in each State takes all of the State's electoral votes. And the President is actually elected, as we know, by the electoral votes, and not by popular votes at all.

If a presidential candidate carries the State of New York by 500 votes he wins all of New York's 45 electoral votes. But he could carry Alaska by 8,000 votes, and he gets only 3 electoral votes allotted to Alaska.

The 5 largest States have a total of 185 electoral votes, and this gives much greater weight to these big States and to the huge cities within those States as opposed to the other 45 middle-sized and smaller States in the Nation.

Actually, in 14 different presidential elections the man elected President had won only a minority of the popular vote. The Constitution does not make any provision for the "winner take all" electoral system. It simply evolved in practice, and there is no good reason why it should not and could not be changed.

Several specific changes have been proposed. Some feel that we should rely simply on the popular vote alone, and abolish the electoral college altogether.

I prefer a compromise between that plan and our present system. I propose that we retain the electoral college itself with a total of 538 electoral votes. But the system of allocating electoral votes should be improved. Under my plan two electoral votes in each State would be cast for the presidential candidate winning the popular vote in that State. This provision would be in accord with our Federal system which gives each State two Senators in Congress regardless of the State's size.

But then, with 100 of the 538 electoral votes accounted for, plus the 3 from the District of Columbia, the remainder of the electoral votes—435—would be divided according to the ratio of the popular vote in the country as a whole.

This would insure integrity of our system. It would refine our democratic process in a way which is long overdue.

LIMITING THE TENURE OF OUR CONGRESSMEN

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I have once again introduced a proposal, in the form of a constitutional amendment, to limit the tenure of U.S. Senators and Representatives. In operation, this proposal would limit a Member of Congress to 12 consecutive years of service; two Senate terms or six House terms, and then require that he take a 2-year sabbatical leave before he would once again be eligible to serve in our National Legislature.

This proposal, which I have offered in earlier Congresses, has often appeared in lists of "legislation least likely to succeed." And, to that conclusion I must sadly agree. Sadly, I say, because I believe that there is a kernel of real hope in this proposal, hope to improve the operation of our Congress and to help its Members do a better job in framing the policies for our country. Yet, despite the possible help which this amendment might provide, it receives no serious consideration from the Congress and little more from outside these two Chambers.

The kernel of hope which I see is this proposal is in two areas. First, it would help to overcome the detrimental aspects of the seniority system. I see many valid bases for recognizing the length of service in this body and in its committees as one of the factors of leadership. I have defended the system as the best compromise we can achieve under our present rules of operation when shallow criticism calls for scrapping it without offering any valid alternative. The proposal which I have offered would allow a continued use of the seniority system but the chain of seniority would be broken from time to time and greater flexibility would be permitted in congressional leadership.

The second aspect of this hope deals with the work of the individual Congressman. As the name implies, it is the function of Representatives, and no less of Senators, to represent the people from whom they have been sent to Washington. Representation, in this context, has two facets; to represent, the Congressman must use his best abilities in studying and understanding the legislation which is brought before him, and further he must strive to understand the community of which he is a part and which he is called upon to represent. This does not mean that he is to be a personified public opinion poll. There is more to representation, as the former part of my definition indicates, than being a mirror to the unstudied reactions of one's constituency.

This sabbatical leave would give the chance to the Congressman to get reacquainted with his constituents and their feelings. It would put his feet back on the ground and would put him back into the mainstream of his community. Certainly the experience of recent Congresses, running for 9 and 10 months each year, indicates that there is to be precious little time for such a process of reaquaintance in the normal congressional year. I sincerely believe the Congress would be stronger for having its Members better attuned to the crosscurrents of the districts which they represent.

There is one further facet of this problem of lack of "representation" that should be considered here. During the past few sessions of Congress adjournment did not come until late in the year, long after the date set by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. Theoretically, if a Congressman stayed in the Washington area attending the meetings of Congress, this would mean that he would never have much time to return to his district. This could then mean that many of the Representatives and Senators would never see their districts between the time elected and nearly the next time that they had to run. This is not to my mind being "a Representative from," or "a Senator from." Practically, however, a solution has been worked out—the Tuesday-Thursday club—when the work of the Congress really begins on Tuesday and terminates on Thursday, thereby allowing a 4-day recess each week. As a remedy to this weakness, it was last week—Congressional Record, January 7, 1965, page 423—that I proposed that the Congress conform to the "work a full week" idea, and adjourn at the proper time.

To my mind, if the Congress worked a full week for a full session, adjourned at the proper time, then a sabbatical such as I am proposing today would be welcomed by the Members.

Perhaps once again it can be said that these proposals are among the least likely to succeed. I hope, however, that they will be given serious consideration by those interested in improving the institution, and making the Congress more representative in these modern times.

A copy of an article that I wrote for the American Legion magazine, January 1964, a reply of Congressman Hale Boggs, and the text of the bill appear, as follows:

Should Congressional Service Be Limited to 12 Consecutive Years?

YES

(By Representative Thomas B. Curtis, Republican, of Missouri, Second District)

The quality of the work of the Congress and, as a result, the functioning of our Federal Government would be improved by requiring Congressmen to take 2 years off after 12 consecutive years of service before they could once again run for a seat in the Congress.

This idea is not as novel as it might at first seem. The sabbatical, or seventh year leave, is common in our institutions of higher learning. It permits professors a chance to recharge their batteries.

And it is catching hold in other fields. Corporations are using it as a way to refresh their executives, and community charities are putting the idea into use with their boards of directors.

The way limited tenure is employed by charities and business gives a good example of the advantages it offers. It attracts top caliber people to serve by letting them know their tenure is limited; they are not trapped, there is a graceful way for them to step down after giving a certain number of years of service. It requires rotation so that "deadwood" directors can be eased out tactfully, without bruised feelings, when their terms are up. And, in those cases in which the individual maintains a high interest in serving with this charity or organization and it wants him back, he can be named to a new series of terms once the period of required leave has run.

It would work much the same way in the Congress. A Senator or Representative could serve 12 consecutive years—two consecutive terms in the Senate or six consecutive terms in the House if the people elected him each time. He would then have to sit out 2 years before he would once again be eligible for election. But, in addition to the advantages noted above, there are further benefits to be gained from applying his system to the Congress.

First, it would give the individual Member of Congress a chance to get out gracefully. If he wished to continue a political career, it would give him an opportunity to get acquainted with his constituents, and to get his feet back on the ground. In these days of nearly year-round sessions of Congress it is difficult for a Member of Congress to keep in close touch with his people and represent them well. It would also give him the chance to reflect on national issues away from the day-to-day pressures of lawmaking.

Second, it would break the chain of seniority which now concentrates power in the hands of Congressmen from safe districts whose reelection is guaranteed. Posts of leadership, such as committee chairmanships, would be rotated and would gravitate more to ability than political long-livedness.

Finally, the man who really wishes to continue in public service, and whose constituents wish to be represented by him, will be able to return refreshed and give another 12 years service in the Congress.

NO

(By Representative Hale Boggs, Democrat, of Louisiana, Second District)

No. Congressional service should not be limited to 12 consecutive years for a number of reasons:

1. Governing the most powerful and the most prosperous nation on earth—a nation of 190 million people—and the leader of the free world—is perhaps the most difficult task being undertaken by any group of men in the world today.

As a result, the complex problems confronting the Members of Congress are hard to grasp. The intricacies of international affairs, the problems of the nuclear age, the conservation of our natural resources, the complexities of urban congestion—these are but a few of the complicated fields in which the Congress must make decisions on which the future of the United States depends. Wisdom comes in large measure from experience; of experience, of wisdom, we never have enough.

To deprive the Nation of the service of our wisest, most competent, and most knowledgeable lawmakers at the end of 12 years service seems very detrimental to our national welfare.

2. No business, industry, college or other institution in our country would adopt a personnel policy which said, "after each employee has been here 12 years—just long enough to have achieved thoroughly familiarity with his work—he must be discharged for 2 years before being given an opportunity to return, and then only in a junior capacity once again." Yet this is exactly what this proposal would mean for the U.S. Congress.

The late Speaker of the House Sam Rayburn often said that if the people of a congressional district were wise, they would carefully pick a good man as their Congressman, and then elect and reelect him term after term, because the longer a good man serves, the better service he can render to his people and country.

3. Our Government never has all the good men and women it needs. We need more and more talented people who are willing to dedicate their lives to public service.

I am afraid that this proposal would discourage people from considering public service in the Congress as a career. If a man knows that he will not be allowed to remain in Congress more than 12 consecutive years, he probably would be reluctant to give up his livelihood to go to Congress in the first place.

4. This idea of limiting public service is not a new one. In the early days of our Nation, our forefathers tried it. Under the Articles of Confederation, delegates to the Continental Congress could not serve for more than any 3 out of 6 consecutive years. This deprived the Congress of the able services of such delegates as James Madison and others, thus impairing seriously the work of the Congress.

When the Founding Fathers drafted our present Constitution, some delegates proposed to make Members of Congress ineligible for reelection. Remembering the unhappy experience of the Continental Congress, the Founding Fathers rejected this idea without debate or dissent.

I think that we should continue to respect the wisdom of their decision.

H. Res. 95

Resolved, That the Rules of the House of Representatives of the Eighty-eighth Congress, together with all applicable provisions of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, be, and they are hereby adopted as the Rules of the House of Representatives of the Eighty-ninth Congress, with the following amendments therein as a part thereof, to wit:

In rule XI, strike out clause 23 and insert:

"23. The Committee on Rules shall present to the House reports concerning rules, joint rules, and order of business, within three legislative days of the time when ordered reported by the committee. If such rule or order is not considered immediately, it shall be referred to the calendar and, if not called up by the Member making the report within seven legislative days thereafter, any member of the Committee on Rules may call it up as a question of privilege and the Speaker shall recognize any member of the Committee on Rules seeking recognition for that purpose. If the Committee on Rules shall adversely report, or fail to report within twenty-one calendar days after reference, any resolution pending before the committee providing for an order of business for the consideration by the House of any public bill or joint resolution favorably reported by a committee of the House, on days when it is in order to call up motions to discharge committees, it shall be in order for the chairman or any member of the committee which reported such a bill or joint resolution who has been so authorized by said committee to call up for consideration by the House the resolution which the Committee on Rules has so adversely reported or failed to report, and it shall be in order to move the adoption by the House of said resolution adversely reported, or not reported, notwithstanding the adverse report, or the failure to report, of the Committee on Rules and the Speaker shall recognize the Member seeking recognition for that purpose as a question of the highest privilege. Pending the consideration of said resolution the Speaker may entertain one motion that the House adjourn; but after the result is announced he shall not entertain any other dilatory motion until the said resolution shall have been fully disposed of."

In rule XX, strike out clause 1 and insert:

"1. Any amendment of the Senate to any House bill shall be subject to the point of order that it shall first be considered in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, if, originating in the House, it would be subject to that point: *Provided, however*, That a motion to disagree with the amendments of the Senate to a House bill or resolution and request or agree to a conference with the Senate, or a motion to insist on the House amendments to a Senate bill or resolution and request or agree to a conference with the Senate, shall always be in order if the Speaker, in his discretion, recognizes for that purpose and if the motion is made by direction of the committee having jurisdiction of the subject matter of the bill or resolution."

In rule XXI, strike out clause 1 and insert:

"1. Bills and joint resolutions on their passage shall be read the first time by title and the second time in full, when, if the previous question is ordered, the Speaker shall state the question to be: 'Shall the bill be engrossed and read a third time?', and, if decided in the affirmative, it shall be read the third time by title, and the question shall then be put upon its passage."

INTERNATIONAL HOME LOAN BANK

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest contributions that our country can make in the field of foreign aid is to help underdeveloped countries emulate the success that this country has had in certain areas, and then urge them to understand and then to adapt them to their own way of life. With this thought in mind, I have reintroduced a proposal which I have made in conjunction with a number of my colleagues in the Senate and House over the past several years—an International Home Loan Bank.

This proposal, which is favored by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board and the U.S. Savings and Loan League—though the Agency for International Development has expressed some reservations—has as its purpose the development of a savings and loan system to promote thrift, encourage homeownership, and aid in the rise of the middle class of people in the underdeveloped countries. The mechanism of this bill, by which these goals would be accomplished, would be an International Home Loan Bank through which financial backing could be given to the developing savings and loan industry abroad.

This bill would utilize the lesson that we learned in our own savings and loan experience. It would provide for an agency to charter, examine, and supervise the local thrift and home financing institutions, corresponding to the functions now performed by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board for Federal institutions and the State authorities for State-chartered organizations. It would provide these new associations with a facility much like the Federal home loan banks to provide funds to local institutions so they could meet the needs for seasonal and emergency funds. It would establish a facility much like the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation to insure funds placed in these associations, and lastly it would provide a facility to insure residential mortgages in a manner similar to the Federal Housing Administration.

Clearly these functions as set forth above would encourage homeownership in the underdeveloped countries. This development would be meaningful even considered apart from any Communist threat that is being experienced in many such countries today. It is a real step forward in the structure of the society of the nation establishing these institutions. It meets problems which exist independent of the cold war, and it envisions the involvement of the people of the recipient nation—indeed their involvement as a primary force in this matter—in the effort to overcome these problems.

I note that the Committee on Banking and Currency held hearings on this matter during the last Congress, on August 22, 23, and September 12, 1963, on H.R. 8143, a bill very similar to the one that I am proposing today. I trust that some legislation on this matter will be forthcoming in this session.

As illustrative of the statements that I have made above, I wish to include at this point an article which appeared in the New York Times on October 21, 1962, which points up the importance of the problem:

Spurs Are Sought in Latin Housing

(By Philip Shabecoff)

In much of Latin America, a penny saved is a rare coin—and therein lies one of the chief reasons for Latin America's acute shortage of housing.

"There are 18 million Latin American families now living in urban slums who can afford some kind of decent housing," Rodman C. Rockefeller said recently.

The problem, he explained, is that in most areas of Latin America, a lack of individual savings means that mortgages simply are not available for middle and lower class housing.

Mr. Rockefeller, eldest son of Gov. Nelson Rockefeller, is vice president in charge of housing for the International Basic Economy Corp. (IBEC). The company, a financing development and investment concern controlled by Rockefeller interests, soon will build its 10,000th home in Puerto Rico and South America.

Although most Latin American governments have set up housing programs, often with grants from U.S. agencies such as the Agency for International Development, millions of people continue to live in tin shacks and apartment house slums. The answer to this blight, Mr. Rockefeller believes, lies in private rather than government housing.

Some 50 percent of South America's urban population earns enough money to amortize mortgages, he asserted. But mortgages generally are available only for luxury housing, and on exorbitant terms.

FEW INDIVIDUALS SAVE

The reason for this, Mr. Rockefeller explained, is that there is little individual saving in Latin America. Inflation and low income levels discourage savings in most of the countries there, and virtually no savings institutions exist in an effective form. And lack of individual savings means a dearth of capital for mortgages.

What is needed in Latin America, Mr. Rockefeller said, is a system of insured savings and loan associations similar to that in this country. But except for recently organized projects in Chile and Peru, these institutions are rare in Latin America.

Help may be on the way, however, as a result of a bill introduced in the Senate on October 2 by Senator GEORGE SMATHERS, Democrat, of Florida.

The legislation, which was designed to help Latin Americans save their own money for private housing, was a casualty of the recent congressional scramble for adjournment and never got out of the Committee on Banking and Currency. However, Senator SMATHERS plans to reintroduce it when the Senate next convenes.

The bill, an amendment to previously proposed legislation to alter the Federal Home Loan Bank Act and the Home Owners Land Act, called for the establishment of an "International Home Loan Bank."

FOREIGN INVESTMENT PERMITTED

Through this bank U.S. savings and loan companies will have the privilege of investing up to 1 percent of their assets in similar institutions in Latin America and elsewhere overseas, laying the groundwork for the establishment of savings and loan systems in those areas.

The bill, which also was sponsored by Senator JOHN SPARKMAN, Democrat, of Alabama, is reported to have a good chance of passing in the next session of Congress.

The U.S. savings and loan organizations which might invest in counterpart institutions in South America are regarding the Chilean experiment with keen interest. A little more than a year ago, at the advice of American economic experts, 18 associations were started there under the supervision of a central bank, with American capital serving as seed money.

The associations pay 6 percent interest on savings and charge 10 percent on mortgages, Mr. Rockefeller said. They also operate under an unusual inflation-protection mechanism which adjusts interest and principal on both savings and mortgages on the basis of an index of wages and prices.

By the end of the first year, 23,000 people were participating in the program, and 1,780 mortgages had been approved or were in the process of approval.

DEMAND EXCEEDS BUILDING

Because of the associations, many new houses are being built in Chile. However, there is evidence that the mortgage system has grown faster than the construction business. Demand for houses is far exceeding actual production, Mr. Rockefeller said.

In most cases, he explained, builders are short of sufficient working capital. It is also difficult to convince them that the new system is here to stay and that their profits for building homes will not be wiped out by inflation.

This is where IBEC steps in. The company has built most of its houses in Puerto Rico, but it believes the establishment of savings and loan companies will provide opportunity in South America.

IBEC already has under construction 750 houses in Santiago, Chile, and plans to build more. Most of the houses are three-bedroom dwellings that sell for $7,000 to $8,000. The company also is building in Peru, where two associations have been established, one by a Roman Catholic priest.

One of IBEC's basic functions, Mr. Rockefeller said, is to demonstrate that U.S. industrial methods and techniques are applicable abroad.

"It is not an original idea, but we try to concentrate on businesses, such as housing, that directly affect people. We also make a profit by doing so," he said.

One of these techniques is the IBEC method of home construction. This makes use of a house-sized steel form to mold reinforced concrete on a previously prepared floor slab. Once a site is prepared, the company can produce six houses a day on that site.

PRECAST PANELS HELPFUL

IBEC also uses precast concrete wall panel and roof systems in its housing projects.

Recently, however, IBEC has recognized that its methods are not always applicable in South America. Often, the absence of materials and large-scale demand makes the mass construction method too expensive. Construction also is slowed by government inspection methods and equipment breakdowns. The company, therefore, is beginning to turn to local manual labor as the cheapest method of building in some areas.

As soon as the new bill is passed, Mr. Rockefeller predicted, at least five U.S. savings and loan companies will invest in South American countries. IBEC will be prepared to construct about 2,500 housing units a year to meet the expected demand for homes.

Mr. Rockefeller believes that the middle class housing shortage in Latin America must be alleviated for the security of this country as well as for the needs of the Latin Americans.

"The middle class in Latin America, which certainly has the ability to revolt, has been denied the normal material rewards that the middle class expects in the United States," he said. "While the Latin middle class is loyal to the Western concept of government, this denial puts a tremendous strain on its loyalty."

COMMITTEE ON INDEPENDENT UNIONS AND UNRECOGNIZED GROUPS

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, one of the most able definitions of that category of economic entities known as small business is the expression that a small business is one that does not have a Washington representative. Implicit in this definition is the importance to any group in our country, with the ever-increasing role being played by the Federal Government, of having a voice in Washington, a way in which its views on the matters affecting it can be drawn to the attention of America's policymakers.

There are various channels through which these interest groups can make their feelings known. A common way is through the employment of lobbyists and Washington attorneys knowledgeable in the ways of the Congress and the regulatory agencies. The agencies and departments themselves often act to give a forum to representatives of interest groups in the consideration of matters within their special province.

Similarly, the work of congressional committees in areas of their jurisdiction help to give a voice to the needs and opinions of the groups whose interests are touched by the legislation the committee studies. The Select Committees on Small Business of the House of Representatives and the Senate are excellent examples of this, and go along well with the definition of small business which I noted earlier.

I have today reintroduced a proposal to create in the House of Representatives a Committee on Independent Unions and Unrecognized Groups. The purpose of this proposal is to offer to these organizations a chance to have their interests weighed in with those of the other segments of our society. Just as small business before the advent of the House and Senate select committees, these groups have no representative in Washington assuring that their voices are heard, nor is there any congressional or executive body specifically attuned to meeting their problems.

In many ways these groups can be found parallel to small business. They are generally small, struggling in a competitive world to find a place and often provide an organizational context for a new idea. The idea may be good, perhaps even great, yet without a fair chance of survival in a competitive world, it might be lost. One element of survival in the United States is assuring that full consideration be given the interests of the group involved. With the many voices clamoring to be heard in the process of making public policy, it is too easy to overlook one which does not have an adequate sounding board on the Washington scene. This committee, which I suggest, would offer the type of sounding board which would permit the interests of these groups to be given the recognition they deserve.

An example of this is found in the labor field. Concern is properly given the AFL–CIO as the largest representative of organized labor in our country. Similarly the large independent unions, an example being the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, gain recognition. Yet, some 2.7 million workers are joined in small, independent unions whose voices are seldom heard in deliberations of the Congress or policies of the executive departments and agencies. Beyond this number are many other workers, not organized into unions as such but represented to some extent by a formal grouping. It is to give a forum to these groups that I offer the proposal for the Committee on Independent Unions and Unrecognized Groups.

As I mentioned before, I introduced this legislation in the last Congress. I also had the occasion to comment further on the situation in some remarks on the floor of the House under the title "The Case for the Independent Unions" which appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 110, part 4, page 4329. Under unanimous consent, I include those remarks in the Record at this point:

THE CASE FOR THE INDEPENDENT UNIONS

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, we have shown a proper concern in our society for the problem of small business, recognizing that small business is the lifeblood of our economic endeavor and that big business which is also beneficial, started as small business. However for some reason or other we have not shown a similar concern for the counterpart of small business, the small or independent unions.

The AFL–CIO represents approximately 15 million workers out of our work force of around 70 million. Probably 30 million workers are members of unaffiliated independent unions. The voice and point of view of the independent unions is little heard in the councils of the great Government far away in Washington. Indeed, the Department of Labor is oversolicitous of big labor whose voice is heard in all its corridors. There are many areas where big labor is the opponent of independent unions, just as big business in some areas is in opposition to small business. It is important that the voice of independent labor be heard, particularly when it expresses a point of view contrary to that of big labor.

Part of the difficulty is that the story of the independent union labor movement has not been told widely enough. I was particularly happy, therefore, to see in the New York Herald Tribune of February 23, 1963, an article entitled "The Case for the Independent Unions" which tells part of the story, and refers to a recent book written by Prof. John J. Collins telling the story. I am placing this material in the Record because this story needs to be broadcast throughout our land and certainly needs to be known in the Congress.

I also wish to again call to my colleagues attention House Resolution 137 which I reintroduced in this Congress to create a House Committee on Independent Unions and unrecognized labor groups to particularly look after and give a forum to the problems of independent unions and nonunion workers. The remarks I made at the time of introducing this legislation appear in the Congressional Record, volume 109, part 1, page 527.

"CASE FOR THE INDEPENDENT UNIONS

"(By Walter Hamshar)

"Since 1945 the Nation's maritime industry has been wracked by 38 major seamen's strikes. During the same 19-year period, a sizable group of American-flag tankers has never been held up by a work stoppage because their licensed officers and unlicensed crewmen are members of independent unions.

"John J. Collins, a professor of history at Fordham University, who has been the adviser to those unions since 1938, tells the story of independent unions in 'Never Off Pay,' a book published last week by the Fordham University Press.

"The title of the book is the keynote of Mr. Collins' many arguments in favor of independent unions in an industry which only lately has won for itself the title of 'Strike-Strangled Merchant Marine.'

"Independent unions, meaning organizations which are not industrywide affiliates of the AFL–CIO are in a better position to bargain for their members, Mr. Collins argues.

"'Each [union] has the right to, and does, negotiate agreements which to them seem most suitable to their type of operation,' he said. 'This control at the local level and the ability to tailormake an agreement is one of the reasons why an independent union confined to the employees of one company or one plant is so often preferred by those employees to the large affiliated union.'

"Officers of small independent unions are more receptive to ideas from their members and usually, through their own experience, are familiar with the peculiar problems of the membership. This is not true of large unions, Mr. Collins contends, where the leadership is too frequently influenced by political motives rather than the needs of members. Thus, in independent unions there are no propaganda buildups by power-hungry officers; no strikes called to strengthen the leaders' political power; no theatrics of marathon bargaining, and no feuds which result in costly work stoppages without gains to the members.

"'In their use of commonsense, the independent tanker associations have never sought to push for an economic gain which, if achieved, would have become a pyrrhic victory,' he stated. 'Perhaps it is this quality of commonsense that can be exercised so widely in a nonpolitical atmosphere that has enabled these associations to have had such unique success.'

"While Mr. Collins attributes the success of the independence among crewmen to commonsense collective bargaining which has produced high pay and working conditions without work stoppages, he does not highlight two other factors which have also contributed to the independent union's prosperity.

"First, there was the willingness of the big oil companies to negotiate agreements which gave the independent unions better contracts than those of the large affiliated organizations. Mr. Collins relates that these agreements were negotiated. But the generosity of the companies is implied, not described.

"The second factor is that the big unions have created the climate under which the independents exist. The reader cannot help but get the impression that cordial relations between companies and independent unions are actually the result of the existence of larger affiliated labor organizations poised to organize dissatisfied tanker crewmen. It is to the advantage of the companies to encourage independents, Mr. Collins said. As long as the powerful, big unions stand in the offing, they will continue to prefer the independents.

"But there never were grounds for the charges so frequently made by the big unions that the independents were company organizations. These charges have been thoroughly investigated on several occasions by the National Labor Relations Board and found to be without foundation.

"The independent unions cover officers and unlicensed seamen in the fleets of the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, the Socony Vacuum Fleet Co., Tidewater, and the officers of Texaco and Cities Service.

"These companies, as well as their crewmen, have benefited from the contracts with independent unions. The advantages go beyond the avoidance of the periodic strikes which have plagued relations between maritime management and unions.

"One important benefit enjoyed by the oil companies is that they are not required to hire their ship personnel through union hiring halls. This requirement by the big unions has given them a powerful weapon in securing the loyalty and obedience of their members.

"A second benefit is that the welfare and pension plans of the independents are confined to company personnel. This has encouraged continuity of service within the companies. It also has encouraged a company loyalty rather than a loyalty to unions contrasted to the psychological impact on the seaman in large unions who get their welfare or pension payments from the NMU or SIU plans.

"Mr. Collins' book shows that these two factors, never opposed by the independents, have done much to promote cordial relations between management and labor. So cordial have these relations been that the National Maritime Union, the Seafarers International Union, or any of the large ship officers unions have been unable to make any headway in organizing within the membership of the independents."

IMPROVING THE BOND MARKET FOR MUNICIPALS

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, as a recognition of the importance of bond financing for State and local governmental bodies, our present Internal Revenue Code provides that interest on these obligations shall be free from Federal income taxation. This exemption from taxation is effective in making State and local government obligations attractive to investors and permits their sale at lower interest than would be possible otherwise.

The role of bond financing is not difficult to trace. School bond issues, sewer bond issues, and hundreds of others are commonplace in financial circles. The need for adequate debt financing capital to our State and local governmental bodies cannot be overemphasized, and the availability of this capital at advantageous interest rates, made possible by the tax-exempt nature of their interest, depends upon a ready market for these bonds.

I have today reintroduced a bill which would help expand and improve the market for municipals. While individual bondholders may receive the interest from municipals tax free, when this interest is channeled to them through a corporate investing mechanism the investors fail to get the full benefit of tax exemption. The interest comes to the investment corporation tax free, just as it does to individuals, but there is no carry-through provision. Thus, the entire income of the corporation, from tax-free and taxable sources, is merged and divided and the entire amount received by each shareholder in the investment corporation is fully taxed. What my bill suggests is that there be allowed exclusion on the part of the individual taxpayer of his pro rata share of the tax-exempt interest received by the corporation thereby giving the taxpayer the direct benefit of the tax-exempt status of these securities.

By making municipal bonds more attractive to investment corporations, which control a very large amount of capital, a better market will be created for these securities and the problem of financing State and local government will be eased.

Today I am reintroducing the bill which was H.R. 3062 in the last Congress.

OUR TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, I know of no one better able to give us a prognostication of what our transportation system will be like in the year 2000 than Mr. Morris Forgash, president of the United States Freight Co.

Mr. Forgash outlined his ideas in a speech before the Second Annual European Regional Conference of the National Defense Transportation Association at the Hotel Intercontinental in Frankfurt, Germany, on October 30, 1964.

His very interesting and provocative predictions follow:

Transportation—Year 2000

(By Morris Forgash, president, United States Freight Co.)

I deeply appreciate the opportunity to meet with you and to participate in your interesting and challenging program. To all those responsible for the staging of this Second Annual European Regional Conference of NDTA, I extend congratulations upon an excellent idea splendidly executed.

No oracle, prophet, or seer was ever called upon to deal with a more elusive or demanding subject than the one assigned to me. I have no occult powers but I speak with utmost assurance, for if time proves me wrong I will very likely be out of the jurisdiction when the verdict is brought in.

Transportation in the year 2000. Why should any of us have any concern today about mobility in a world that by the year 2000 may be only a tiny way-station in a universe of worlds—or, by accident or design, a cloud of dust in the galaxy of limitless space? Because we have faith. Faith that we can shape the course of future events and write on the scrolls of time the terms of our own legacy for ourselves and our posterity.

Essayist William Hazlitt said man is the only animal that laughs and weeps for he is the only animal that is struck by the difference between what things are and what they ought to be. This awareness of imperfection is responsible for the fact that man is the only animal that has acquired the ability to modify his own environment. And in straining at the leash of his environment man has achieved a measure of his manifest and only laudable destiny—civilization.

Kipling wrote that transportation is civilization. He was not quite right. Transportation certainly has paced civilization from the time when man first came to inhabit the earth. But transportation is an instrumentality which produces nothing in itself. Transportation is the mobility of human resources but humanity charts its own course. Transportation can carry us over any horizon but what we find there we bring in our own hearts.

How will we go in the year 2000? By what media, responsive to what energy, with what degree of dispatch will people and the people's resources then be moved from one place to another? The intelligence accumulated through all the milleniums of recorded and derivative history sheds only a flickering light on the mists that shroud the path of transport during the next 35 years. But we must nevertheless scan the pages of history if we expect to sit in the jury box of time.

Where will we go in the year 2000? Over what horizons, to what destinations will the restless race of man then be traveling to make another rendezvous with destiny?

If we are to find any answers to the questions I have posed, we must realize that the caliper of history is our only tool of measurement and our only certainty is that there will be change. The fact of change is immutable. It is only the acceleration or rate of change with which we must be concerned as we try to illuminate the road to the future with the torchlight of the past.

THE DAWN OF TRANSPORTATION

Why should it be difficult to anticipate developments that may reasonably be expected to transpire in transportation in the next 35 years? Can we not make a simple projection based on the rate of progress in the past? The calendar measures time as the earth turns and 35 years is an imperceptible speck in the spectrum of history. The beginnings of civilization can be traced back at least a million years, and in that perspective we are dealing with a period of time that would transpire many times over during the next tick of the clock.

The problem is not so simple. Progress is not measured by the calendar but by human accomplishment. And if it be taken that man has lived on earth for a million years it follows that for the first 990,000 years his progress in transportation was absolutely nil. During all of that time he walked on the legs he was born with and what he transported he carried in his arms. For it was only about 10,000 years ago, give or take a few hundred, that man first conceived the idea of employing animals as a media of transport. This oldest form of transportation has survived to this day—the ox, the camel, the elephant, the reindeer, the dog, and the horse are still important carriers.

A historic breakthrough in transportation occurred when man discovered the secret of propulsion by animal, giving us the standard of measurement called horsepower. During the next 3,000 or 4,000 years such marvelous inventions as the sled, the raft, the dugout, and the canoe made their appearance and added immeasurably to the mobility of humanity. Then came the sail—first instrument of transport to harness the forces of nature to man's bidding. Wonders were unceasing.

The wheel—there is an invention to remember! It still is a nominee for the greatest discovery of the human race. The wheel evolved only about 5,000 or 6,000 years ago. It will stand forever for the first revolution in transportation. But giddy as the pace of progress in transportation had become, wheel and sail were destined to continue to be powered by wind and muscle for another 5,000 years or more. This does not detract from the significance of those fabulous instrumentalities. They made it possible for man to explore, to colonize, and in a degree to civilize the globe on which he lived. Of course they also made it possible for him to annihilate people, to destroy civilizations, and to topple the world into dark ages. But in the slow and painful process of recovery from the consequences of his own folly man added to the sum of human intelligence, and as he marched forward the chapters of transportation history covered less time and embraced ever greater accomplishment.

TRANSPORTATION FINDS MECHANICAL POWER

The 35 years that lie immediately ahead cannot reasonably be focused against the million years of man's sojourn on earth, or against the 10,000 years since the discovery of horsepower, or even against the 5,000 years since the advent of the wheel and sail. Change has compounded the rate of change with such astonishing rapidity that such comparisons are no longer valid. Actually, all we are talking about is simply what remains of two centuries of transportation progress.

For it was not until after the beginning of the last century, less than 165 years ago, that the era of transportation in the accepted sense began. The age of mechanical power—the goal toward which man had been struggling since he was first invested with the power of rational thought—had its birth in the last century. When steampower was first successfully employed as a propellant of the instrumentalities of transport man crashed through a barrier which had defied the ages and eluded countless generations of highly intelligent and ingenious men.

The year 2000 seems a more distant target of speculation when it is realized that in point of time 35 years is 20 percent of the entire era of transportation. It seems more distant still when it is appreciated that as time has marched on progress in transportation has compressed centuries into decades, decades into years, and years into days, so that what we and those who come after us may expect to witness in 35 years may make everything that has been developed heretofore as rudimentary as the canoe.

How has transportation gone since the paddle wheels of "Fulton's Folly" churned dreams into realities 157 years ago? Well, steamship and iron horse served the 19th century very well, but during all that time dreamers who knew that this was not the outer periphery of man's environment were at work on other things. Self-propelled land vehicles were sputtering about on the streets and roads causing amusement and some consternation before the end of the last century. When, a few years later, the internal combustion engine made these monsters of the road practical a new dimension in mobility was created.

But as the world spun into the present century man had not yet realized his oldest dream—he had not found his wings—he was still confined to the surface of the globe. Then at Kitty Hawk, in North Carolina, on December 17, 1903, when some of us in this room had already been born, the Wright Brothers inaugurated the age of flight.

What secrets of mobility then remained to be wrested from nature? With great efficiency and dispatch people and things could be transported anywhere on the surface of the earth or in the earth's atmosphere. For half a century the prevalent view was that transportation had crossed its last horizon and that the future was for improvement of existing media. Improvement there certainly was.

The diesel engine vastly increased the economy and efficiency of railroading. World War I speeded the inauguration of the trucks as a carrier of freight. Improved roads and better automobiles put the world on rubber tires. The 1940's ushered in the jet age in air transport. In 1954 the atom was harnessed to transportation with the launching of the *Nautilus*, first atomic-powered submarine. Nuclear-powered merchant shipping was inaugurated in 1959 when the SS *Savannah* was launched. Then the hydrofoil, a ship on stilts, made its appearance.

But 50 years of tinkering with the same media of transport was all that the modern mind could take. New frontiers were beckoning genius and enterprise. A sort of in-between machine—an air-cushion vehicle which rolls on a cushion of air over land, sea, swamp, sand, or snow made its appearance in the sixth decade of this century and soon may be cutting across all lines of existing transportation, revolutionizing all modes.

The air-cushion phenomenon did not, however, take us across an unknown border—it simply created a new dimension of transport. The latest barrier of mobility was crashed in 1957, with the orbiting of the space vehicle Sputnik I. Four years later, in 1961, the first earth man made the first trip to outer space and returned. He was not yet an explorer of the universe—he had only invaded the majesty of space. That is something which may be corrected very soon. On July 31, 1964, the spacecraft Ranger VII zeroed in for a crash landing on the moon, sending back to earth more than 4,000 pictures of that inscrutable globe.

OF PROGRESS, DREAMS AND PERSEVERANCE

That, in brief compass, is a panoramic view of where we stand in transportation today. How and where do we go from here? We go however and wherever we have the vision and determination to go. For all the progress which we have made to this point in time has been the slow and tardy consequence of long-held dreams. Let history speak to that point for just a moment.

When the steam engine gave birth to the mechanical age in transport just over a century and a half ago it simply represented the practical application of a principle that had been known for hundreds of years. Hero of Alexandria, Greek scientist of the second century before Christ, developed a toy-like machine for deriving power from thermal energy. A man named Savery developed a steam engine for pumping water from mines in 1698. When James Watt patented his very practical steam engine in 1769 he was only improving on an engine developed by Thomas Newcomen in 1705. In 1707, a hundred years before Robert Fulton's *Clermont* made its maiden run, Denis Papin of France built and launched the steam-powered *Cassel* in Germany. Angry boatmen, fearing for their livelihood, destroyed Papin's boat and nearly killed its inventor. Where would we stand now if modern transportation had been inaugurated just 100 years earlier, as it would have been except for an accident of history?

The idea of human flight has fascinated all peoples throughout the ages. The famous legend of Daedalus and Icarus, related by Ovid, is only one of a multitude of tales of human flight that date back more than 6,000 years. Magic carpets, flying chariots, flying horses, characterized all mythologies. By the 13th century A.D., man had begun seriously to try to make his dreams of flight come true. Roger Bacon anticipated the balloon and suggested heavier-than-air craft propelled by flapping wings.

Leonardo da Vinci discovered the helicopter principle of vertical lift from rotating wings, and his model helicopters actually flew. About 1490 he designed a man-carrying flying machine, but his craft was never built because da Vinci undoubtedly realized that there was then no source of power capable of lifting it. Around the turn of the 19th century Sir George Cayley began investigations of flight which formed the basis of modern aerodynamics. One of his gliders carried a man a distance of 900 feet. It was 500 years after human flight was theoretically demonstrated to be possible before the Wright brothers made flight a reality.

Jet propulsion, which began to revolutionize air transport less than a quarter of a century ago, is founded on laws formulated by Sir Isaac Newton in the 17th century. But the theory was not then new. At least 100 years B.C. the Alexandrian philosopher, Hero, designed and demonstrated a jet engine. All those things which may transpire between now and the year 2000 might have happened long ago if man had mobilized the resources to capitalize on his own inventiveness several hundred years sooner than he did.

Rocket propulsion is even older than the jet. The Chinese are said to have employed the principle of the rocket several centuries B.C. Rockets were used in the War of 1812. The bazooka of World War II was only one of a number of types of rocket used in that conflict. Developed as implements of war, rockets now have become symbols of the conquest of outer space. Perhaps it is as well for mankind that the destructive potential of the rocket was not recognized sooner, but the inertia of the human mind is responsible for failure to have recognized its peaceful uses long ago.

Incidentally, Ranger VII was not the first projectile to land on the moon—at least in the imagination of man. Jules Verne's projectile carried three men to the moon in 1863. The journey required approximately 4 days, or 96 hours. Ranger VII made the trip in 68 hours and 35 minutes. Who is to fault Jules Verne for a miscalculation of 30 hours? After all, his ship got stuck for a while in the "weightless" band which, perhaps out of sheer perversity, he pictured as only a narrow strip between earth and moon. And he brought his men back to earth because his capsule was equipped with rockets to kick it out of the moon's orbit and back into earth's gravity.

The most awesome secret which man has extracted from nature is the release of energy from the atom. This knowledge, which is no longer a secret, can incalculably advance the cause of civilized man, or it can render him completely obsolete. This most potent of all sources of energy was not a sudden discovery. The Greek philosophers Epicurus and Democritus postulated the atomic concept at least 300 years before the Christian era. Beginning as early as A.D. 1500, a long succession of professional people contributed to the accumulated knowledge which led to the operational use of the atom—Boyle, Newton, Dalton, the Curies, Rutherford, Becquerel, the enigmatic Albert Einstein, and a host of others.

The instinct for staying alive provided the ultimate incentive which led to the discovery of the means for extinguishing all life. In the dark days of World War II the United States and her allies, impressed with the knowledge that the enemy was as well aware as they of the potential of the atom, simply decided to apply the old axiom of getting there "fustest with the mostest." Mobilizing the scientific intelligence of the allied nations into the greatest scientific and engineering project of all time—the Manhattan project—the atomic bomb was developed in a period of about 4 years. The dropping of the first atomic bomb on the city of Hiroshima on August 6, 1945, is fixed as the dawn of the atomic age. That is not quite accurate. A test bomb was exploded at Alamogordo, N. Mex., on July 16, 1945, and it was on that date that a handful of men assumed the fearful responsibility of releasing a force which even they could not be sure would not obliterate the world.

So it has happened that man has dreamed, then theorized about his dreams, then studied the scientific basis of his theories, and centuries later other generations have made his dreams come true. And the important consideration always has been not what man has discovered but the uses which he makes of his discoveries. The greatest challenge facing the peoples of the world today is how they shall use the sources of energy represented by the atom. Depending on how that challenge is met we will have a better world or no world at all.

THE WORLD AND THE PEOPLE, A.D. 2000

On this philosophic note I think I should turn from the pages of history on which the accomplishments of man in his search for mobility have already been written and, with the temerity if not the foresight of a Jules Verne, undertake to project history a short distance into the future.

The ingredients or "mix" with which we have to work as we stir the brew of transport in the cauldron of tomorrow are railroads, highway carriers, water-borne vessels, aircraft, pipelines, and those exotic developments still standing on the horizon—air-cushion vehicles, hovercraft, monorails, pneumatic tubes, rockets, continuous belts and others not yet categorized.

Will all of these existing and embryonic media of transport still be in use in the year 2000? My answer is: Yes, and more. But some of them will not look the same. If, perchance, any agency of transport that we know today joins the pony express and other museum pieces of transport history it will be because it failed to accept the inevitability of change.

Standing clear among the unknown quantities which cloud the horizon of the year 2000 are certain things which we can postulate as fact. The people will determine for themselves the kind and quantity of transportation they want—and what they demand they will get. The engineering has been done, the horizons are unlimited and the choice is the people's choice. We knew this too: There will be a great many more people in the world of A.D. 2000 than there are today, and they will have a great deal more leisure time to dispose of, en masse and per capita. They will know more about their world and themselves than the people of today. They will be able to communicate, face to face through space, with other people everywhere. They will be able to read the news media of the world on screens in the comfort of their own homes. These people will have different tastes, a different outlook, a different philosophy of life, leisure, civilization, and the dignity of man.

We will be wise to put on some brakes on the exploding population, but we will have no choice except to support and transport what the world produces and requires. The world population of 3.2 billion is increasing at a rate that will cause it to very nearly double in 35 years. That means 5 to 6 billion people in the year 2000. There will be neither the need nor the opportunity for that many people to work a 5-day, 40-hour week. A 3- or 4-day, 20-hour workweek will be standard. Six billion people with 4 days of leisure each week adds up to a great deal of leisure.

The time was not far back when anybody who was not a member of the "leisure classes" would turn aside from his daily pursuits only on special holidays of which there were few. This was by design as well as necessity. The old saying, "The Devil finds work for idle hands to do" sprang from a popular belief that too much leisure would expose the average man to the temptations of evil. Leisure was for the rich. In the middle ages the creators of the world, the artists, writers, sculptors, architects, were not expected to earn their livelihood by toil and trade. They were patronized by those who were born to blood and wealth. Whatever the fault of such a system it is a fact that it spawned the great Renaissance of the 15th and 16th centuries which changed the course of history and immeasurably enriched the lives of men everywhere.

But in the next 35 years we will experience a new renaissance, kindled not by patronage but by opportunity—the opening of new vistas to a new leisure class which will embrace the whole population not just the upper crust. Leisure and the economic freedom to enjoy it will come to the "common man." In the United States the average family income will be at least $15,000 a year, which will be commensurate with the gross national product of $2 trillion per year which will maintain in the year A.D. 2000. In Europe and other places in the world comparable advances will be made.

Not only will the average citizen living in the year 2000 have more leisure during his working years, he will retire at an earlier age with guaranteed minimum income that will permit him to live in comfort and enjoy the finer things of life. I foresee, for that time, a voluntary retirement age of 55 and a retirement income of $500 per month. With an estimated population of 350 million in the United States, there will be upward of 45 million persons of age 55 years and over receiving retirement payments in excess of $130 billion annually. Not only will this add an entirely new layer of consumer spending to our economy, but of particular significance is the fact that the availability of these pension dollars will have been insured by prior funding. Therefore, we are contemplating in excess of $130 billion of additional consumer spending that will not be dependent upon the year-to-year prosperity of our economy, but instead will act as a stabilizer and a deterrent against business depressions.

All of these factors will free the resources of the human mind and rekindle the instincts of the human spirit so as to bring about not only a renaissance of culture and civilization but a closer unity of governments and peoples. The curiosity and desire for enrichment which leads the people of one nation to travel to far lands will cause the people of those lands to reciprocate. The barriers to world travel will be eliminated. The complicated visa systems will disappear and a single document, issued by a world organization, will be acceptable.

Ideologies and concepts which offer the people utopia in the distant future in return for sacrifice and the loss of personal identity in the present will have little appeal in a world where the people have already created their own utopia without the sacrifice of human dignity.

Trade and tariff barriers will crumble before the needs and desires of peoples drawn closer together by the common bonds of understanding and the ability to communicate and move swiftly across international boundaries. Geographic affinity will breed political, sociological, and moral affinity among nations and populations. The relationships among nations will improve, and the emphasis on sovereign rights will diminish as the common goals of humanity become visible to more people. Common control of the instrumentalities of destruction, cherished by all men of good will, will cease to be a mirage and will become a reality when we achieve that unity of purpose without which we know that none will survive.

Confederations of nations will develop in direct ratio to the infusion of understanding and the dissipation of fear of aggression. Neighbors quarrel and insulate themselves from each other because of lack of understanding and as transportation and communication shrink the physical world the bonds of understanding will be strengthened.

In undertaking to project the course of transportation to the year 2000 we must take these political, social, economic, and moral factors into account. For as the people shape a better world they will create the demand which will insure the ultimate in mobility.

What will the people demand—and demanding get—in the way of personal transport in the year 2000? Curiously enough there may be less demand for commutation and business travel than there is today. The reason—communication. People come together to promote enterprise because they have a need to communicate. But when everybody is equipped with a Dick Tracy wrist radio and wide-screen, closed-circuit TV is a commonplace fixture of every business organization there will be very little need to commute in order to communicate. The board chairman will call his meeting to order in his own living room. The secretary will dictate the minutes into an automatic machine which will file them for all future reference and reproduce copies instantly on demand. Surely there will be less need for people to congregate together in cities when instantaneous and universal communication is perfected.

THE AGE OF HYPERSONIC FLIGHT

But business is one thing and leisure is another and man will always want to go places to see an art treasure or an opera—to sun, surf, and chase golf balls. Knowing that distance is no longer a matter of miles but of time he will demand the ultimate in speed and the airlines will oblige. When the "man on the street"—any street—in the year 2000 decides to take his lady for a night "on the town" he will offer her a choice of Paris, Rome, or Reno. A weekend at the beach of the Sioux City set may mean Catalina or the Riviera, Miami Beach or Travemunde.

The supersonic airliner will not serve the day we are talking about. Of course the supersonic flying machine will still be with us. In fact it will be standard among the transports that ply the earth's atmosphere, and mach 3 speeds will be at the minimum not the maximum end of the scale.

The man in a hurry will take a rocket in the year 2000. In our preoccupation with space travel and exploration of the universe we have given too little attention to the very practical potentials of the rocket for transport on earth. In the interest of security we have developed rockets that can hit any target on earth. All that remains is to adapt the craft to carry a different cargo.

Without hesitation I predict that in the year 2000 people and things will be transported between all the more distant points on earth by rocket-powered craft. Instead of the 2,000 miles an hour already known to be a practicable speed we will achieve a speed of perhaps 20,000 miles per hour.

THE IRON HORSE IN THE ATOMIC ERA

Rockets to railroads is quite a jump, but let's consider the future of the mode of transport that on the land mass of the earth has the most illustrious past. In most places in the world the railroad has occupied the center of the stage of land transport during almost the entire history of the era of modern transportation. Why? Because it creates less propulsive resistance over a wider range of speeds than any other mode of transport. In other words a railroad uses less horsepower in relation to load carried than any other form of land transportation. Ironically, this colossus of mobility, conqueror of time, terrain, and distance, has run a troubled course for a long time. Everywhere except in the United States and a few other countries it has become necessary or expedient for Government to manage and maintain the railroads in order to save for the people the only mode of transport capable of fully serving their needs. For my purposes today I need not explore the reasons for this enigma. There is nothing in the picture that modernization of thinking and method, and aggressive exploitation of inherent advantages, will not cure. And the railroads will survive because we cannot afford to let them die.

But the railroad that greets the 21st century will have only vestigial resemblance to the industry of today. Today's railroad is the most efficient instrumentality yet invented for moving goods between given terminals, but things that are shipped do not all originate or find their destination at rail terminals. Traffic moves between the suburbs of St. Louis and the outskirts of Baltimore or Bremerhaven. Railroad transport has to be harmonious with all forms of transportation, land, sea, and air, so that when goods are put into one end of the transit pipeline they will come out of the other and not get stuck in the joints.

Traditional methods established during a century and a quarter of proud history are not easily broken, but the railroads are slowly yet surely making their equipment compatible, interchangeable, and versatile. Long before the year 2000 the boxcar will have completely disappeared. Everything except commodities requiring specialized equipment—grain, ore, lumber—will move in containers that will hardly interrupt their journey as they are transferred swiftly from highway to rail or ship or air for continuous movement from the door of the shipper to the platform of the consignee. One bill of lading and one rate will apply to the movement of anything from anywhere to anywhere else. It is in these areas that the freight forwarder will play the indispensable role in coordinating the services of the underlying modes of transport.

More dramatic will be the breakthroughs in power, speed, efficiency, and the pattern of rail operations. All locomotives will be nuclear powered. For this and other reasons locomotives will be wider and tracks will be widened. Tracks also will be straighter and grades will be reduced to a minimum. With today's techniques of earthmoving there is no need to run over a mountain. Speeds of as high as several hundred miles per hour may be attained and consistently maintained, if not on rails then on air cushions or monorails.

Cars will be cut out, switched (sideways), and loaded and unloaded automatically by radio-controlled devices. Yards and humps, for which there will be only minimal necessity, will be completed automated and computer controlled. Somebody may ride the locomotive in token to tradition but he will have little to do. Arrivals and departures will be scanned on closed-circuit TV. Radar will measure distance to obstacles and signal automatic retarders on the tracks which will prevent collisions.

Passenger and freight trains will effectuate a compatible marriage long before A.D. 2000. People pods will be whisked from convenient locations in the major cities and deposited by helicopter on special flatcars to ride in streamlined comfort with the less distinguished freight. Those who wish to insure their continuous mobility will be able to drive their own automobiles onto a special rail car and go up to the passenger lounge above. The speed, comfort, and convenience of this combined form of travel will make it attractive to a wider range of patrons than simply the people who have an antipathy for those "flying contraptions."

In the United States, at least, there will be fewer railroads—perhaps three or four systems at the most. There will be a greater number of main-line tracks and practically no feeder lines. Archaic regulations which have prevented the acquisition of other media of transportation will have been swept aside to make way for progress. Rail movements will be confined to the area where rail transport is most efficient and feeder service will be performed by truck, helicopter, or air-cushion machine, whether these supplemental services are performed by the railroad, the shipper, or by a carrier of different ownership.

The iron horse, fascinator of the youth of yesterday, is not about to ride into the sunset like the heroes of old. With renewed vigor this trusty steed is about to charge the dawn.

HIGHWAY TRANSPORT—ON, UNDER, AND ABOVE GROUND

First to successfully challenge the supremacy of the railroad in almost half a century was the motor carrier—automobile and truck. The private automobile, later joined by the bus and the airline, made the once profitable rail passenger business a deficit operation. Then, beginning about 35 years ago, the motortruck began to eat into the rail freight business with an ever-increasing appetite. We have been content to try to referee the fight between the modes by regulation in the United States whereas most governments have found it necessary to take stronger measures.

There is a place in the future for both road and rail transport and by one means or another each will find its economic sphere. My concern now is to highlight some of the dramatic developments in highway transport which I think the next three and a half decades will unveil.

Versatility is the lever which hoisted motor transport into its position of eminence. The truck brought transportation to the door of the patron. The automobile made every man his own charioteer. The maneuverability of each was limited only by the availability of a street or way upon which to run. That, it turns out, has come to be quite a problem. We have built vehicles at a faster rate than we have built highways to accommodate them. City streets are not elastic. In the United States we are at the midpoint of the greatest public works project ever undertaken in the annals of time—a 16-year project to construct 41,000 miles of interstate and defense highways. We are on schedule, but already we are making plans to feed new mileage into the system.

So swiftly does the magic wand of time now alter the face of transportation that motor transport, circa 2000, will bear as little resemblance to that of today as Cinderella's coach and six to a pumpkin and six white mice. Mammoth truck and midget auto will no longer vie for position on the highways, for private and commercial vehicles will move on separate ways. These thoroughfares will be laid out side by side or double or triple decked with one deck above and one below the surface. The arteries for trucks will be freed of obstructions which now limit the size of rig and load.

Highway travel will still frequently be bumper to bumper but traffic will move at high speeds with complete safety because of the built-in control devices of radar and electronics to regulate speed and prevent collisions. Trucks and autos will stop themselves before they collide with another object.

We will have advanced highways equipped with radio beams so that drivers can put their vehicles on automatic pilot. Between certain important centers there may be conveyor networks. Vehicles will be automatically whisked onto the system at terminals and will ride a belt or electrified rail to an exit point where they will automatically be discharged.

The truck train will be as common in the year 2000 as the rail freight train is today. Five, six, or even more bottoms will be moved as a unit, pulled by one huge tractor or by a tractor and one or more automatically controlled booster units. Some highway trains will be made up of self-propelled units, all controlled by the driver of the leading vehicle. Self-propelled units will add great maneuverability. The consist of the train can be changed by adding and dropping units at interchange points along the superhighway.

Nuclear propulsion for trucks, to say nothing of automobiles, seems a rather remote possibility today, but nuclear energy certainly will be harnessed to the larger units of A.D. 2000, and even more exotic forms of power will be in vogue. We have already unlocked the secret of taking energy from the sun, and I confidently believe that private automobiles will, in time, be powered by solar energy, which will constantly restore itself from the rays of the sun.

Metropolitan area transit has reached a saturation point and there is no place for it to go now except up, or down, or both. First of all, trucks will be banned from city streets. From terminals in the outskirts goods will be transported to and from points in the city through pneumatic tubes, by helicopter, or in some other fashion. Monorails high in the air, or "people pipelines" running underground will relieve the congestion which is choking our cities to death. We will not, like the author of Dick Tracy, wait for the people on the moon to show us how to construct individual air cars for personal transport. The town car of tomorrow will look more like a flying saucer than like a pullman car on rubber tires, and it will be able to park on the roof or the balcony, or simply remain suspended in the air.

OF PIPELINES AND THINGS

The pipeline or underground conduit, already a major instrumentality of transport, will be in much wider use and will have a much wider range of usefulness in the year 2000. Not only will the pipeline be used to relieve the traffic of city streets—it will be employed to move all types of commodities over long distances. Coal slurry has been transported by pipeline. In Canada plans are underway to build a pipeline to carry wood chips. Britain's Transport Minister has announced that a tunnel under the English Channel will join England and France within 10 years. As land becomes more valuable for other purposes transit pipelines will become more prevalent.

Incidentally, coal and petroleum may be too valuable to use as fuel by the year 2000. As a source for the manufacture of synthetics and a wide range of things which come from other sources today, these products will be precious gems of science. When land becomes too valuable for the grazing of sheep, wool will cease to be the staple commodity of cloth and synthetic fibers made from the storehouses of nature will take its place.

And while I am out of context let me point out that farmland to produce the food necessary to feed the teeming population in the year 2000 will be in short supply but we will solve that problem by tapping the inexhaustible protein resources of the measureless oceans.

MIRACLES OF THE SEA

Now, let us turn the long-range binoculars on that ancient, fabled, challenging pathway of transport, the "bounding main" with its fingers of water reaching into all the land areas of the earth. Tradition and custom have kept a tight grip on water transport, but change is about to break over the fleets of the world like a storm.

Exciting, almost incredible, developments in the area of water transport crowd across the pages of the daily press. Automation, nuclear power, hydrofoils, hydroskimmers, containerization. But wait. Look a little closer and you will see just beneath the surface an industry encrusted with the barnacles of time and obsolescence of thought. During the past quarter of a century and more, when newer forms of transport were breaking barrier after barrier, the improvements in ship design, speed, and efficiency have been relatively insignificant.

Water covers three-fourths of the earth's surface, and world geography plus vital statistics will force us to make better use of water transport in the future. There is a limit to the highways of concrete and steel that we can build, and to the space available for their building, but the pathways of the seas are almost limitless.

It is now just a decade since nuclear energy was first successfully employed to power the submarine *Nautilus,* launched in 1954. During that decade we have invaded outer space, put new stars in the heavens, landed a rocket on the moon, and established worldwide communications through relay stations in the sky. But we have been slow to exploit the greatest breakthrough in water and land transport since the inauguration of mechanical power. It was not until 1959, with the launching of the SS *Savannah,* that this fantastic new source of energy was employed to propel a cargo-passenger ship.

In an age where miracles abound the miracle of nuclear propulsion is just breaking free. The *Savannah* can operate for 3½ years on a single core of fuel. She can cruise at 21 knots for 336,000 nautical miles on a single fuel load. But like Robert Fulton's Clermont, the *Savannah* is only the beginning. Last month a large U.S. manufacturer announced that it is developing a reactor plant that will require refueling only once during the entire life of a ship. When history writes the saga of ocean transport from the vantage point of the year 2000, the chapter headed "Nautilus, 1954" will be longer than the chapter headed "Christopher Columbus, 1492."

The ship of the future will be mass-produced—certainly production methods will be revolutionized—from one of the strong, light metals or even plastic. All will be nuclear powered and propelled at speeds of at least 30 knots per hour. The size will be suited to the environment and the type of cargo to be handled. The bottleneck of shipping is the port operation. That handicap will be overcome in a number of ways. All cargo that is susceptibile of being boxed will be containerized and will move between ship and land vehicles without breaking bulk—by crane, conveyor, monorail, or some other device. Bulk cargoes will be loaded and discharged automatically by remotely controlled mechanical devices.

What will happen to the containers when they are emptied at destination? The answer is a "world bank" of containers under the control and direction of an international organization. This could be a branch of the United Nations or some specially constituted world organization. The establishment of such a worldwide pool of standard, interchangeable, multiple-use containers will require diplomacy and the cooperation of all governments, but in the face of necessity and in the interest of humanity it can and will be worked out.

The only limitation on the size of ships is the facility for docking at ports, and it will be possible for the ship of tomorrow to take on and discharge cargo at almost any place, so that vessels of mountainous size will ply the seas. The screw propeller probably will be supplanted by jet-type propulsion using either air or water to provide the thrust. Oceangoing barges, with capacity almost unlimited, will move anything that needs to be moved.

The subsurface ship, or submarine, may carry a substantial part of the heavy or bulk cargo of the world in A.D. 2000. It has many advantages. The submarine is capable of much higher speeds with less resistance than surface ships. There is no wave or wind resistance. Storms which slow down and sometimes imperil surface craft have no effect on the submerged vessel.

As the giant submarine torpedoes its way through the oceans under the surface of the water a greyhound of the seas, the fleet hydrofoil will be skimming over the waves, adding a dimension of mobility the uses of which will be infinite. The ship on "stilts" or hydrofoil, like many other departures from the normal has been known and employed for a long time, but its potentials are just beginning to be realized. Jet propelled, these ships which rise on their foils like a water skier, are capable of tremendous speeds. Consequently, they reduce the time differential between air and water travel to a minimum. Carrying their hulls above all except the highest waves they are not subject to pounding. Their power-to-speed curve, contrary to that of surface vessels, climbs steadily as speed increases.

By the year 2000 the hydrofoils will be the buslines of the oceans. Millions will commute between home and office by this fast and economical form of taxi service. But hydrofoils will have even more vital roles in transportation. Since they can operate in very shallow water they will be used as a supplemental carrier, making it possible for the giant ocean liners to transfer their cargo to hydrofoil or hydroskimmer and discharge it on any beach. These shallow-draft vessels also can act as ferries to carry oceangoing freight between a shipside and interior river ports. This should prove especially beneficial in the emerging nations of the world which are deficient in road and rail transport but which are traversed by many natural waterways.

Transportation always has developed in response to the will and the needs of the people. The 5 or 6 billion people who will live in the year 2000, having more time to travel, a keener appreciation of the cultural aspects of life, an unquenchable desire to see and to explore the far reaches of the world, will create a demand for more, better, and cheaper ocean transport. The largest passenger liners today accommodate only about 2,000 passengers. Nuclear-powered superliners can be built to accommodate 10,000 or more passengers—a complete city on water—a traveling resort or cultural center.

The cost of such mass-produced transportation can be reduced to as low as $100 between the United States and Europe—a world cruise for as low as $500. No need for hotels for those who wish to make their traveling city a home. By helicopter and hydroskimmer the vacationeer will explore the interior of all countries from the ports of call. These floating cities will provide ideal convention facilities and places to "get away from it all" or facilities from which to "see the world, depending upon the whim of the passenger."

I have mentioned before the one phenomenal, newly emerging, mode of transport which, because it cuts across all known media seems destined to have a more profound effect on the pattern of transportation in the year 2000 than anything else on the horizon today. That is the vehicle that rides on a cushion of air. These strange craft are called, variously, hydroskimmers, air-cushion vehicles, and ground-effect machines (GEM). In England one of these types of air-cushion vehicles is called the Hovercraft on which considerable progress is now being made. The principle on which these vessels operate has been known and explored for more than 20 years but it is only in recent times that serious efforts were begun to make practical application of the idea.

The feasibility of the air-cushion vehicle has been established. It can hover inches above the surface of land or water or rise to a considerable height. It can be powered by propellers, by jet engines, or by air jet. Fantastic speeds will be possible. Since it can go where no other surface craft can go it will be an indispensable adjunct to rail, motor, water, and air transport. It can take frozen foods and medical supplies to peoples in heretofore inaccessible places, over swamps, marshes, rocky cliffs, or frozen wastes. This machine can and will immeasurably advance the cause of civilization.

In the year 2000 the flying saucer myth or mystery will be no more—there will be flying saucers everywhere, and if some of them are from Mars no one will worry except the man responsible for selling license plates. There will be no need for bumpers on the machines because radar will prevent crashes and computers will direct traffic.

CONCLUSION

What a confluence of centuries—what a juncture of history—when the sun sets on the 20th century and rises on the 21st. If all the dreams I have spun come true in the next 35 years, the bells will ring loudly and the people will cheer wildly and there will be peace on earth when the clock ticks in the first syllable of the next century. But have I dealt with dreams? Is anything that I have predicted more improbable than that a manmade satellite known as Syncom III is standing out in space right now through the instrumentality of which these very proceedings could be made to come alive in the living rooms of people everywhere?

Were Da Vinci, Marconi, and Watt, or Stevenson, Fulton, and the Wright brothers dreaming dreams or paving the way for the future when they postulated things that had never theretofore been achieved?

Before you mark off anything that I have predicted for the next three and a half decades look back on the startling developments of the recent past. The breaking of the sound barrier. Space travel. Substitution of a cushion of air for the ageless wheel. The broadcasting of a message of good will to the world by a President of the United States not by cable, phone, or radio, but from a satellite circling around the globe in outer space—then the erasure of the message and substitution of another while the satellite was in orbit. The Olympic games in Tokyo brought into the homes of people on the far side of the earth through the medium of a relay station in space. Multiply these miracles of science by the rate of change which is being constantly compounded and see if my predictions do not come out on the modest side even to the point of reticence.

I believe the most important fact for us to understand is that transportation, though it opens new worlds and changes old concepts of time and distance, will not shape the world of A.D. 2000. Transportation is the servant of the people—the genie which makes their dreams come true—the magic carpet of their future—the mobility of their desires, their aspirations, and their resources.

A long time ago one of those great men who are born with a mission to change the environment of their time, Benjamin Franklin, wrote to his friend Joseph Priestly, that he sometimes regretted he was born too soon, because he found it impossible to imagine the height to which might be carried, in a thousand years, the power of man over matter. And after speculating for a while about a great many things that might come to pass, much as I have speculated here today, Franklin ended his letter with a sentence which I should like to leave with you: "O, that moral science were in as fair a way of improvement that men would cease to be wolves to one another and that human beings would at length learn what they now improperly call humanity."

OPENING AT FRANKFURT (MAIN), GERMANY OF THE JOHN F. KENNEDY LIBRARY EXHIBIT

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on November 15, 1964, at Frankfurt (Main) in Germany, the John F. Kennedy Library Exhibit was opened, and present on this occasion was Mrs. Joan Kennedy, the wife of U.S. Senator EDWARD M. KENNEDY.

An eloquent and most touching address was made on that occasion by one of Germany's leading citizens, Mr. Walther Casper.

In my remarks, I include the appropriate and splendid address delivered by Mr. Casper:

ADDRESS BY MR. WALTHER CASPER AT THE OCCASION OF THE OPENING OF THE JOHN F. KENNEDY MOBILE LIBRARY EXHIBIT IN THE PRESENCE OF MRS. EDWARD KENNEDY AT THE GERMAN-AMERICAN INSTITUTE IN FRANKFURT (MAIN), NOVEMBER 15, 1964

Mrs. Kennedy, Mr. Mayor, ladies, and gentlemen, in the name of the German Committee for the John F. Kennedy Memorial Library I would like to welcome you and open the exhibit of documents and personal effects of the late President. You will permit me to welcome especially Mayor Brundert and his predecessor, a member of our committee, Dr. Bockelmann, as representatives of all present on the German side and Consul General Ford and commander of the 5th Army Corps, General Polk, for our American friends in the Frankfurt area. At the same time I would like to thank the city of Frankfurt and our friends from the America House. Only your exemplary cooperation in the extensive organizational preparations and your hospitality made today's event possible.

I may then turn right away to our guests from the United States and welcome you heartily in our midst. Above all you, Mrs. Kennedy, who together with your sister, Mrs. McMurrey, and Miss Keyes, who worked many years with President Kennedy, accompany the exhibition and plan to spend 2 days in our city. It is also a pleasure for me to have a number of labor union leaders with us including Mr. Walter Reuther, president of the United Auto Workers of America, and his brother, Mr. Victor Reuther.

Originally the exhibit that we are opening here in Frankfurt today was selected to enlist support for the Kennedy Memorial Library in the United States. In Germany, following the desire of the Kennedy family, it is to have another purpose. The family of the deceased President and the board of trustees of the Kennedy Memorial Library have made available to us the collection of personal effects and extremely important documents from President Kennedy's period in office as an expression of thanks for the affection with which the President was met during his visit to Germany and the deep sorrow which the German people manifested over the terrible occurrence of last November. We are especially grateful to your family, Mrs. Kennedy, that this exhibit, at the express wish of Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy, is being shown during these November days in Frankfurt and next weekend in Berlin.

Even if no support is enlisted and no funds collected with this exhibit, a direct relationship with the institute in Boston clearly exists, a relationship to the idea of this institute with which in the next 2 weeks the students of 15 German universities will be concerned during collections, speeches, and discussions. The youth of at least 20 other German cities will be doing the same. As climax and conclusion of these assemblies, the President of the Federal Republic will speak on this theme in the University of Cologne on November 27 to representatives of all German youth and student organizations assembled there.

I think this is the place to remember a member of our committee who passed away yesterday evening: Dr. Heinrich von Brentano.

His performance and services as a human being, a politician, and as one of the architects of postwar Europe will be given recognition from more qualified voices. I may, however, assure you that Heinrich von Brentano supported wholeheartedly the idea of the John F. Kennedy Memorial Foundation. His last deed before his serious operation last November was the moving obituary that he dedicated to President Kennedy. When he then heard of the plans of the youth and student organizations, he immediately declared himself ready to speak in one of the universities. Only a few days ago at the advice of his doctors did he have to decline.

The library on the land of Harvard University in Boston (Cambridge), which will come into being in the next 3 years, will not only be dedicated to the memory of a great man. In an Institute for Contemporary History, equipped with the most modern technical devices, scholarship students from all countries of the world will have the opportunity to work on the decisive questions of our time, and it will occur that, above all, these questions will be those which President Kennedy, as no one else before him, brought to the center of our attention: the questions of the Atlantic partnership and the developing countries, the questions of atomic weapons and of world peace.

Commensurate with the contributions of the individual countries, their political and scientific younger generations will have the opportunity to work in this international meeting place as holders of scholarships.

I believe it is clear to us all that it is not a question of sentimental reminiscences or idolization of Kennedy here; it is, however, a concern that future politicians from the entire world through mutual acquaintance and discussion together learn to recognize the temporary and piecemeal solutions which are so often praised with the words "real" and "practical" and that their vision be clarified for the whole of this one world and the problems to be solved by this generation.

What is more necessary, as Kennedy made apparent in his short period of office, than that the bearers of political responsibility demonstrate that power and spirit, politics and intelligence are not opposed but that their union more than all else is capable of creating the proper and genuine spirit of citizenship.

Ladies and gentlemen, among us are sitting 23 development helpers who are taking off today in a chartered plane for Tanganyika. They will cooperate for 2 years on slum clearance projects in Dar es Salaam. The Government of Tanganyika has decided upon a 5-year program for building 5,000 houses, and the German Federal States under guidance from the State of Hesse have made the building equipment and tools available. The program will largely be carried through with the self-help of the population concerned. Our male development helpers are bringing technical knowledge to thousands of unskilled Africans and hundreds of trained craftsmen, who on their part should carry the knowledge on to volunteers and trained craftsmen of their own country. At the same time our women development helpers are working as nurses in health education and as home economics and kindergarten teachers. They too, following the principle of multiplication, are to pass on their abilities and skills to the largest possible number of African counterparts and thereby help to assure that this slum clearance project can become an example for other parts of east Africa.

It is by no means a digression from the purpose of our assembly when we ask you, development helpers, goodby here; you are in a manner of speaking the living witnesses for the continued presence of one of the noblest of President Kennedy's ideas. He took a most personal part in the coming into being of the German Development Service, and he allowed nothing to prevent him from being present at the founding of our Development Service on June 24, 1963. He said at that time: "I hope that outside of the American Peace Corps and the new German Development Service young people from still many other countries will cooperate in this work * * * and that we can make a great common effort in the solving of these problems in the 1960's."

Today numerous volunteers from France, Norway, Holland, Switzerland, Great Britain, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand are standing on this frontline of peace. Preparations are underway in Sweden, Italy, Austria, and Japan, and finally, this idea has taken hold also in several developing countries, such as Argentina, Peru, El Salvador, Zambia, Tanganyika, Thailand, and the Philippines.

President Kennedy's vision of the future, that during this decade the community of volunteers from many countries might represent an important contribution to understanding among peoples and to peace in the world, therefore, does not seem unrealistic.

The Federal President also, in his capacity as patron of the German Development Service, has commissioned me to extend to you, development helpers, his greetings and wishes on your way and to remind you of the admonition that he gave in wishing the first 55 volunteers goodby on July 15 of this year: "To see it through voluntarily when you are witness to great want, and to consider yourselves as representatives of a country that abhors war, that rejects it as a means of politics, and would like to wash every stain from its name through peaceful efforts."

Ladies and gentlemen, we must now bring to a close the reflections which have united us in this hour in the memory of President Kennedy.

President Kennedy in his image of the New Frontier has brought to the attention of our time that the difference between men and ants does not lie in their physical order of magnitude but in their possession of freedom, and, that wherever this blessing is threatened, from within ourselves or from outside, the New Frontier becomes visible.

Thank you.

EDITORIAL BY JAMES L. HARRINGTON EXPRESSING WORLDWIDE FEELINGS AND SENTIMENTS FOR THE LATE BELOVED PRESIDENT JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCormack] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my remarks, I include a splendid and touching editorial written by James L. Harrington, and appearing in the November 13, 1964, issue of the Boston Naval Shipyard News.

The editorial expresses the worldwide feelings and sentiments of people everywhere who not only deeply respected, but had an intense affection for the late beloved President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy:

He Left Us a Legacy

"He led an entire Nation and found his way to the secret hopes of man. He was Irish, and he was Massachusetts born, and he was Boston bred.

"He belongs to the world. But part of him belongs especially to you.

"When he died the sound of mourning was heard in every street of the earth. But tears came more plentifully to Boston eyes, and grief more painfully to Boston hearts.

"His qualities were many. But two especially explain his hold on men. He made them feel they were better than they thought they were; that perhaps, on earth, God's work could truly be their own.

"And he could absorb, in his imagination, the dreams, and longings, the fears and ambitions, of others; whether they lived in mud huts in Africa or in the palaces of kings. And somehow, they understood this was so.

"No memory is more fresh, none is so bright, none so mingles pain and gratitude, as that of John Fitzgerald Kennedy of Massachusetts."

President Lyndon B. Johnson, speaking in the fading twilight of Boston's Postoffice Square, was paying tribute to a beloved fallen leader and speaking of a national legacy left behind by the 35th President of the United States.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy engaged himself in a struggle against the common enemies of man: Tyranny, poverty, disease, and war itself.

When he was taken from our midst on a warm day in Dallas almost a year ago, a hidden assassin's bullet snuffed out the life of a man of wisdom, strength and peace—who molded and moved the power of our Nation in the service of a world of growing liberty and order. All who loved freedom mourned his death.

Within a few days the Nation and the world will observe the first anniversary of his passing from the American scene—a Nation and world that was enriched by his brief presence. And what better way is there to pay tribute to the fallen leader, John Fitzgerald Kennedy?

Carry out the aims, ideals, and objectives of the national legacy left to us by him.

Now that he is relieved of the almost superhuman burdens we imposed on him, let us follow the paths of intelligence and reason to which John Fitzgerald Kennedy pointed. History has judged him well—for his wisdom, compassion, and grace.

Let history judge us as we carry out his legacy—while we seek life, liberty, equality, and the pursuit of happiness—the time-worn words of a Republic that fought tyranny, oppression, and hunger from its birth.

If we fulfill this legacy, then the final words of his inauguration address will be brought to a fruitful close:

"Finally, whether you are citizens of America or citizens of the world, ask of us here the same high standards of strength and sacrifice which we ask of you. With a good conscience our only sure reward, with history the final judge of our deeds, let us go forth to lead the land we love, asking His blessing and His help, but knowing that here on earth God's work must truly be our own."

A MINIMUM WAGE FOR FARMWORKERS

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Gonzalez] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a bill to provide minimum wages for certain farmworkers. Employees covered by this proposed amendment to the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 would be entitled to $1 an hour during the first year following the effective date of the act, $1.15 during the second year, and $1.30 during the third year. Farmworkers who are members of the employer's immediate family and sharecroppers are not covered by this bill.

The American farmworker is the most underpaid, and unprotected labor group in the Nation. This is supposed to be a land of plenty. We boast of the most efficient and productive agricultural system in the world. Yet, the wages paid to most farmworkers are at shockingly low levels, far below the minimum wage standards established by the Fair Labor Standards Act.

The authors of the Fair Labor Standards Act intended to provide protection for farmworkers. President Roosevelt stated in his message to Congress on May 24, 1937:

> Legislation can, I hope, be passed at this session of the Congress further to help those who toil in factory and on farm.

And, although the exemption for farmworkers was placed in the original act of 1938, since that time there have been a number of proposals in Congress to bring this disadvantaged group under FLSA. The Tolan committee of 1941 and the La Follette committee of 1942 each recommended placing a floor under farm wages. Bills similar to mine were introduced in the Senate in the 87th Congress and the 88th Congress. In 1960 the Department of Labor stated in a report that it would be both desirable and feasible to extend Federal minimum wage legislation to agriculture in order to improve the wage structure of hired farm labor.

Recent data demonstrates more than ever the need and the desirability of extending FLSA protection to farmworkers, especially migrant farmworkers. In May 1963 average hourly earnings of farmworkers were 89 cents an hour. This was equivalent to about one-fourth the earnings of workers in contract construction, to about one-third the earnings of workers in mining, manufacturing, and wholesale trade, and to about one-half the earnings of employees in retail trade. Statistics from the Bureau of the Census show that in 1957, when the average family income in the United States was about $5,000, 45 percent of the families of farm laborers had cash incomes below $2,000. That means $2,000 for an entire family. Individual farmworkers were averaging just $892 per year, including earnings for nonfarm work. Of course, the majority of farmworkers work less than 150 days a year at seasonal jobs, and they have to do the best they can during the off season when there is no farm work to be had. Even during the periods when they are employed, if weather or other conditions prevent them from working they are not paid for the days that are lost. For the migrant farmworker, it is common for housing to be inadequate and, in fact, deplorable, for sanitation facilities to be nonexistent, and for educational opportunities for their children to be absent.

The relative position of the farm laborer is growing worse instead of improving. Since World War II the differences between farm and nonfarm wage rates has become greater. Between 1947 and 1962, average hourly wages in contract construction increased 115 percent; in manufacturing, 96 percent; in wholesale trade, 94 percent; in retail trade, 93 percent; in mining, 84 percent; but in agriculture, only 56 percent. This gap is widening despite the fact that farmworkers' output per man-hour increased 2.4 times during that period, while for nonfarmworkers it was only 1.5 times as great.

The minimum wages provided in my bill are in line with the new schedule recently promulgated for foreign workers under Public Law 414. These hourly wage rates vary from 95 cents to $1.40, and after April 1 of this year the lowest hourly wages allowed under Public Law 414 will be $1.15.

Mr. Speaker, no lobbyists will come to Washington and buttonhole Members of Congress on behalf of the farmworkers. They are perhaps the most underrepresented and unorganized group in the country. No pressure groups, therefore, will organize letterwriting campaigns, purchase full-page ads in newspapers and magazines, or distribute newsletters or circulars for them. But it is right and proper for every Member of Congress to consider the plight and the miserable pay of the American farmworker. I urge each and every one of my colleagues to support my bill to place a floor under the wage levels of the men and women who help produce the bounty in which all of us share.

LEGISLATION TO AUTHORIZE AND DIRECT THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE TO CONDUCT RESEARCH AS TO QUALITY AND HEALTH FACTORS OF TOBACCO

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KORNEGAY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, on January 6, 1965, I introduced House Joint Resolution 138, to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct research into the quality and health factors of tobacco and other ingredients and materials used in the manufacture of tobacco products.

On January 7, I noted in the Evening Star a very cogent and thoughtful story by James J. Kilpatrick, on the editorial page entitled "The Smoking Report, a Year Later." Mr. Kilpatrick has written a full and accurate summary of the year that has elapsed since the Surgeon General's report linking tobacco and cancer was published. Mr. Kilpatrick's article points out the various reactions to the controversial report of Government agencies, of the tobacco industry, and of the consumer market. The facts, Mr. Kilpatrick states, that the sales of tobacco products have again risen, that the prices of tobacco stocks are at their previous level, that the price supports for tobacco will be continued, that the tobacco industry has placed restrictions on its own advertising, and that several research investigations have found doubtful data in the Surgeon General's report—all demonstrate the Federal Government's principal responsibility in the tobacco controversy: to launch a thoroughgoing investigation into the production and use of tobacco products, in order to determine what factors, if any, are detrimental to human health and to discover ways in which these elements may be eliminated.

I am particularly impressed with Mr. Kilpatrick's belief in voluntarism as an essential part of the American way of life. The role of the Federal Government, as he sees it, is not to discipline the people in their use of tobacco—and this could refer to food, drink, and automobiles, as well—but to present the whole truth concerning this product and allow the American people to choose for themselves.

I am inserting this article by Mr. Kilpatrick in the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues in the Congress, since it so adequately presents the tobacco question, pointing up the need for research and investigation into the adverse health factors which may be found to exist in tobacco and/or tobacco products and clearly emphasizing the lack of concise and scientific pinpointing as to what these elements are in the smoking and health report to the Surgeon General, and since it is so germane to the resolution which I have introduced.

Mr. Speaker, again I say that we must launch such a crash research program without further delay, under the direction of the Secretary of Agriculture, in the interest of the smoking public and of the tobacco industry, which is of such significant import to the economy of our Nation.

The article follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Jan. 7, 1965]

THE SMOKING REPORT, A YEAR LATER

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

Almost a year has passed since the Surgeon General, on January 11, brought forth the now famous report of his advisory committee on smoking and health. Certain things have happened in the meantime.

Cigarette consumption, after a precipitate drop, has returned to former levels.

The market in tobacco stocks has followed the same course.

A Federal trial jury has refused to hold a manufacturer liable for the lung cancer of a regular smoker.

The tobacco industry has adopted a self-policing advertising code.

A number of responsible research investigations have tended to cast doubt on some of the conclusions of the Surgeon General's report.

One agency of the Government has conducted a referendum to assure the continuation of Federal price supports for tobacco. Another agency of the Government has recommended a 3-year, $10 million Federal campaign to persuade people to stop smoking.

Each of these events contributes not merely to the confusion of the times, which are perhaps sufficiently confused already, but more usefully to an understanding of a free society, what is good about it and how it gets fouled up. We may not learn a great deal about the causal relationship, if any, between cigarettes and cancer, but we can learn a good deal about certain ailments of the body politic.

Why this reaction? It was because this was the Government speaking. It was the U.S. Surgeon General. The report carried on its title page the seal of a Federal agency. Copies were obtainable from the Government Printing Office. All of the trappings and publicity advantages that attach to Government helped to give the report an authority it did not deserve. This was the voice of "Big Brother" speaking; we tend to pay it too much heed.

If the President's Commission on Heart Disease, Cancer and Stroke has its way, Big Brother will speak even more forcefully over the next 3 years. The recommended appropriation would finance not only a campaign against smoking but also a network of smoking control clinics. The whole weight of Government pressure would be thrown behind a habit that Government officially concludes is bad for us.

As the Wall Street Journal has observed, a whole lot of other things are probably bad for us, too. Automobiles, for example: They kill 40,000 persons a year. Liquor is bad for us; witness the tolls of alcohol. Rich food is a real danger; so are sweets; so is the lack of exercise. The world is full of perils, most of them as alluring as a third martini, and most of them we bring on ourselves. At what point should the compulsions of law and the awful powers of Government intrude upon our private lives?

That is the question that ought to be pondered in this whole controversy over cigarettes. Free men have to be left some room to turn around in, some room to be wrong in. If the tobacco industry is willing voluntarily to curb its appeals, why not let voluntarism have a try at this thing? Meanwhile, instead of supporting tobacco through Orville Freeman and condemning it through Anthony Celebrezze, why not let the Government (if it must do something) aid in the financing of the statistically valid research that remains to be done? It now is clear, to those who have taken the time to analyze the Surgeon General's report, that the committee's most publicized conclusion was based upon remarkably flimsy evidence. In the hullabaloo a year ago, it was widely overlooked that the committee itself undertook no new investigations of its own. The committee went over seven studies of smokers and nonsmokers, consolidated certain findings and conclusions, and came up with the ominous headline: "Cigarette smoking is causally related to lung cancer in men."

On close examination, it is seen that two of these studies were based on reports from untrained volunteers who chose their statistical sample "from among their acquaintances." The other five studies suffered from large rates of nonresponse to questionnaires. Almost half of 78,000 Canadian pensioners, in one study, failed to respond.

The commission itself noted that some figures were "inadequate" and others were marred by "discrepancies." Four of the five studies curiously agreed that the death rate among ex-pipe smokers is higher than the death rate both for nonsmokers and cigarette smokers; the commission could not explain "this puzzling phenomenon."

These statistical shortcomings—and remember that these were the best statistics the committee could find—were simply ignored a year ago. In point of fact, the various findings and conclusions were nothing new.

As the jury sensibly was to conclude in the Florida case, no man in his right mind imagines that cigarettes are really good for him; every rational being comprehends that if a man smokes very much he most likely will cough. Cigarettes have been known as "coffin nails" for at least a hundred years. Yet a year ago, when the report came out, veteran smokers shuddered and ran for their gum drops, and cigarettes stocks took a tumble.

Government was not meant to be preacher, parson, or grade school principal; Government was meant to be servant. And when Uncle pulls out a $10 million switch, those of us who smoke would rather fight.

FAIRNESS TO FEDERAL EMPLOYEES UNDER PERFORMANCE RATING SYSTEM

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Montana [Mr. Olsen] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill which would return fair employment practices to our dedicated Federal classified employees, by restoring use of the time-honored system of performance rating, by which the employee has rights of appeal from an unfair rating.

Such bill would remove from the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, one of its few really undesirable provisions which was put there by the Salary Reform Act of 1962.

That act provides as one of the conditions for an employee receiving a within-grade salary increase the requirement "that his work is of an acceptable level of competence as determined by the head of the department." At first this provision appears to be a statement of good personnel procedure. His competence to perform certain assigned duties should be at an acceptable level below which he should be considered as one who is not fully qualified to fill a particular position. However, this provision is not as desirable or as innocuous as it may appear.

The first objection is that it is unnecessary. The Performance Rating Act of 1950, as amended, is still in effect, and it fully provides for the establishment and administration of satisfactory performance rating plans for the majority of employees in the legislative and executive branches of the Government. It does not cover the Field Service of the Post Office Department, the Foreign Service of the United States, or the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration, and several Federal corporations and independent establishments because rating systems for those agencies are elsewhere provided in law. This act required each department to establish and use one or more performance rating plans "for evaluating the work performance of such officers and employees."

When the performance rating system was established, satisfactory performance was stipulated in section 701 of the Classification Act as a requirement for advancing to the next rate within a grade. Satisfactory performance was established as the criterion for determining satisfactory discharge of duties. Now there is set up another and conflicting standard. In effect the requirement of showing an acceptable level of competence establishes a conflicting method of measuring employee performance. It does more than that, in that it does not offer the protection afforded under the performance rating system. That system required supervisors to give an employee a 90-day warning before rating an employee as unsatisfactory. If the unsatisfactory rating is recorded, the supervisor is required to explain the rating, and the employee has the right of appeal to a board which includes an employee member.

The most confusing aspect of the level of competence provision is that it has been asserted that an employee can achieve satisfactory performance and yet fail to attain an acceptable level of competence.

This provision has been described by the Civil Service Commission as making it possible for an agency to deny within-grade increases to purely marginal workers. It is difficult, however, to think of an employee who would be rated satisfactory under the performance rating system and yet not be working at an acceptable level of competence. It appears to be a strange concept that an employee rated as satisfactory by one set of standards is considered substandard by another measurement of his performance.

Federal employees have been greatly disturbed by this requirement of showing an acceptable level of competence and they have expressed their fears through their organizations. Employees believe that this provision offers every opportunity for discrimination and reprisal. There have been some indications that such fears have been well founded.

What this provision does in practice is give a supervisor an unrestricted opportunity to withhold an employee's within-grade increase without having to explain his action. Nothing could be more undesirable in the entire field of personnel administration, particularly in the civil service which should provide true leadership.

The fact is that this requirement can denote as much or as little as a supervisor wishes, and therein lies the danger. This provision offers perhaps the greatest opportunities possible for reprisal by supervisors. As such, it should be removed from the law.

One further reason for eliminating this level of competence provision from the law is that it singles out only the Federal employees subject to the Classification Act and imposes on them a dual standard of performance which is inequitable and inconsistent. This requirement was not written into that portion of the 1962 Salary Reform Act which related to the postal service. Nor was it applied to the Foreign Service under the State Department or to the Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration. The performance of classified employees is not only susceptible to appraisal in accordance with the Performance Rating Act but must be further reevaluated in accordance with another system which has yet to be clearly and satisfactorily explained.

THE SYSTEMATIC BREACHES OF THE PEACE AND DISREGARD OF LAW BY AMERICAN NAZIS

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Joelson] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, on the opening day of Congress, the Members of Congress were witnesses to a disgraceful incident when Robert Lloyd, a self-proclaimed member of the American Nazi Party, forced himself into the House Chamber and engaged in an ugly racist demonstration.

As a result I wrote the following letter to Chester H. Gray, Corporation Counsel for the District of Columbia:

> I am of the opinion that if Mr. Lloyd and other self-proclaimed members of the American Nazi Party get the impression that this course of action can be continued, they will feel that they are purchasing a license to disturb the peace. I believe that the incident of January 4, 1965, was so disgraceful and reprehensible that it should not be allowed to end with the forfeiture of bail, but that Mr. Lloyd should be apprehended and promptly tried on the charge pending.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to report I received the following letter from Mr. Gray:

> I thoroughly agree with you that Robert Lloyd should be prosecuted and punished for his disturbance of the Congress of the United States.
>
> Upon receipt of your letter of January 6, 1965, I directed my assistant at the court of general sessions to take the necessary steps to have the forfeiture set aside and a prosecution initiated. A warrant for Robert Lloyd's arrest has already been issued. Upon his apprehension my assistant will prosecute vigorously and upon his conviction bring Mr. Lloyd's record to the attention of the court for consideration in the imposition of sentence.

I understand that the warrant for Lloyd's arrest can only be served within the District of Columbia. I hope that he will come in and stand trial, but if he does not, the outstanding warrant should serve to keep him out of the District which will be a blessing.

I am gratified with the action of Corporation Counsel Gray, and I hope it will serve as a warning to hoodlums that they will no longer get by with forfeiture of bail.

QUESTION OF AID TO UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, concerning the question of aid to the United Arab Republic and the views of some of the interested parties, I think it would be of benefit to the members of this House to have available to them a communication from His Excellency Seif Al-Islam Al-Hassan, Prime Minister of the National Government of Yemen, to the Secretary General of the United Nations, which is as follows:

> Two years ago the United States and other countries recognized the military usurpation of power in Yemen on the condition that Egyptian armed forces would withdraw promptly from Yemen.
>
> Two years have, however, passed and large Egyptian land and air forces still continue to wage war against the people of Yemen on behalf of the rebels who were originally created by Cairo.
>
> Individuals and governments, influenced by Cairo, ignore the fact that these rebels have no real authority in Yemen.
>
> Egypt, officially and publicly, has admitted that no republican authority or government exists in Yemen, when President Nasser, and others, declared "that the Egyptian forces will not withdraw until the revolutionary government is established and secured."
>
> International law and the United Nations Charter only recognize as sovereign those who govern themselves. The national government of Yemen alone has this sovereign power, and, therefore, insists that its representative take his seat at the United Nations—a seat that has belonged for 18 years to the legitimate Yemen Government.
>
> The national government protests against the continued seating of military usurpers who exist only because of tens of thousands of heavily armed Egyptian occupation forces.
>
> The national government reminds the Communist governments that tens of thousands of Yemeni men, women, and children have been made homeless, and are suffering from hunger, poverty, and disease as the direct result of Communist guns and aircraft used against them by the Egyptian forces.
>
> The national government points out that large-scale American economic aid is supplied to the aggressor country, the United Arab Republic, and that this aid helps it carry out its criminal actions.
>
> The people of Yemen and their legitimate government appeal for justice from you and from the members of the United Nations.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. HUTCHINSON) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. PELLY.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HATHAWAY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. COOLEY.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN.

Mr. HAWKINS.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 57 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, January 13, 1965, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

322. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States transmitting an examination of financial statements, fiscal year 1964, Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture (H. Doc. No. 46); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

323. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting an audit of Federal Prison Industries, Inc., Department of Justice, fiscal year 1964 (H. Doc. No. 47); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

324. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, transmitting the 43d Annual Report of the Board of Actuaries of the Civil Service Retirement System for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1963, pursuant to section 16 of the Civil Service Retirement Act (H. Doc. No. 48); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and ordered to be printed.

325. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report on title I, Public Law 480, agreements signed during December 1964, pursuant to provisions of Public Law 85–128; to the Committee on Agriculture.

326. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report that miscellaneous appropriations have been apportioned on a basis which indicates a necessity for supplemental estimates of appropriations, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

327. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report that the appropriation for the Forest Service for "Forest protection and utilization" for the fiscal year 1965 had been reapportioned on a basis indicating a need for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

328. A letter from the vice president, Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., transmitting a report of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. for the year 1964, pursuant to law; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

329. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the biennial report on continuing studies of the quality of water of the Colorado River system, pursuant to section 15 of the act of Congress approved April 11, 1956; of section 15 of the act of June 13, 1962, and of section 6 of the act of August 16, 1962; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

330. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entiled "A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to employ aliens in a scientific or technical capacity"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

331. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, transmitting the 19th annual report of the Federal Aviation Agency's operations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, pursuant to Public Law 377, 79th Congress, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

332. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in the Federal Communications Commission as of November 30, 1964, pursuant to section 5(e) of the Communications Act, as amended July 16, 1952, by Public Law 554; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

333. A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill for the relief of Capt. Ted M. Richardson, U.S. Air Force"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

334. A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect the security of the United States by providing penalties for interference with defense security systems"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

335. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General for Adminstration, Department of Justice, transmitting a report of the administrative tort claims paid by the Department during the 1964 fiscal year, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 2673; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

336. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to fix the fees payable to the Patent Office, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

337. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report and recommendation to the Congress concerning the claim of Lewis H. Nelson III against the United States, pursuant to 45 Stat. 413, 31 U.S.C. 236; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

338. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill for the relief of Terence J. O'Donnell, Thomas P. Wilcox, and Clifford M. Springberg"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

339. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 753(f) of title 28, United States Code, relating to transcripts furnished by court reporters for the district courts"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

340. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill relating to the retirement of judges of the territorial district courts"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

341. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 144 of title 28 of the United States Code"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

342. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to extend to 30 days the time for filing petitions for removal of civil actions from State to Federal courts"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

343. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 1871 of title 28, United States Code, to increase the per diem and subsistence, and limit mileage allowances of, grand and petit jurors"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PATMAN: Joint Committee on Defense Production. Fourteenth Annual Report of the Activities of the Joint Committee on Defense Production (Rept. No. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 2361. A bill to strengthen and improve educational quality and educational opportunities in the Nation's elementary and secondary schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 2362. A bill to strengthen and improve educational quality and educational opportunities in the Nation's elementary and secondary schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ANNUNZIO:

H.R. 2363. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. AYERS:

H.R. 2364. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide education and training for veterans who served overseas for 90 days or more after January 31, 1955, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.R. 2365. A bill to facilitate the procurement of physicians and dentists for the Armed Forces by establishing scholarships, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 2366. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for a program of scholarships for students of medicine, osteopathy, and dentistry; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2367. A bill to provide for participation of the United States in the Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center in Dade County, Fla., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H.R. 2368. A bill to authorize hospitalization in civil hospitals for retired members of the armed services under group insurance sick and accident policies, based on specified payment of premiums from retired pay; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 2369. A bill to revise the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, 1925, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 2370. A bill to provide for the control of mosquitoes and mosquito vectors of human disease through research, technical assistance, and grants-in-aid for control projects; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2371. A bill to protect the public health by regulating the manufacture, compounding, processing, distribution, and possession of habit-forming barbiturate and amphetamine drugs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2372. A bill to incorporate the American Academy of Actuaries; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2373. A bill to amend the Submerged Lands Act to establish the seaward boundaries of the States of Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana as extending 3 marine leagues into the Gulf of Mexico and providing for the ownership and use of the submerged lands, improvements, minerals, and natural resources within said boundaries; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2374. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to provide for the greater protection of the President and the Vice President of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2375. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Army to establish a national cemetery in the southern portion of Louisiana; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 2376. A bill to provide increases in annuities granted under the Panama Canal Construction Service Annuity Act of May 29, 1944; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 2377. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, to provide annuities for additional personnel engaged in hazardous occupations; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2378. A bill to amend the River and Harbor Act of 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 2379. A bill to create the Freedom Commission and the Freedom Academy, to conduct research to develop an integrated body of operational knowledge in the political, psychological, economic, technological, and organizational areas to increase the nonmilitary capabilities of the United States in the global struggle between freedom and communism, to educate and train Government personnel and private citizens to understand and implement this body of knowledge, and also to provide education and training for foreign students in these areas of knowledge under appropriate conditions; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

H.R. 2380. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt nonprofit hospitals from certain excise taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2381. A bill to remove the excise tax on musical instruments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2382. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to set forth the treatment processes considered as mining for percentage depletion purposes in the case of sodium chloride; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2383. A bill to amend section 37 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to equalize for all taxpayers the amount which may be taken into account in computing the retirement income credit thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2384. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide, as a substitute for the existing requirement of production before 1830, that antiques may be imported free of duty if they exceed 100 years of age at the time of importation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2385. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended, by provision of a deduction for expenditures for reconversion of structures in a slum clearance program or rehabilitation project; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2386. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a 30-percent credit against the individual income tax for amounts paid as tuition or fees to certain public and private institutions of higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2387. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2388. A bill to amend section 302(b)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2389. A bill to amend section 72 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit retired employees to elect use of either subsection (b) or subsection (d) to report income from employees' annuities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2390. A bill to grant an additional income tax exemption to a taxpayer supporting a dependent who is blind or otherwise permanently and totally disabled; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2391. A bill to provide that amounts paid for music program service shall be exempt from the Federal excise tax on communications; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2392. A bill to exempt from the manufacturers' excise tax on automotive parts and accessories certain modifications involving lengthening of truck trailers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2393. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction or credit against tax for contributions to National and State political committees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2394. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit a gift to an educational institution to be deducted as charitable contribution even though it is made to provide a scholarship for a specified individual, so long as such individual is not a relative of the donor; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2395. A bill to amend, clarify, and make certain the applicability of section

4233 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, relating to exemptions from tax imposed under section 4231 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRAY:

H.R. 2396. A bill to protect consumers and others against misbranding, false invoicing, and false advertising of decorative wood and simulated wood products; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CAMERON:

H.R. 2397. A bill to authorize investigations and reports on the water resources and requirements of the Colorado River Basin, and to protect existing economies in the course of development of such resources; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CARTER:

H.R. 2398. A bill to provide public works and economic development programs and the planning and coordination needed to assist in the development of the Appalachian region; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.R. 2399. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to initiate with the several States a cooperative program for the conservation, development, and enhancement of the Nation's anadromous fish, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. COLMER:

H.R. 2400. A bill to limit jurisdiction of Federal courts in reapportionment cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2401. A bill to establish rules of interpretation of the effect of acts of Congress on State laws; to limit the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court in certain cases; and to provide that confessions and other evidence shall be admissible in U.S. courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2402. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

H.R. 2403. A bill to provide for an ad valorem duty on the importation of shrimp; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2404. A bill to regulate the foreign commerce of the United States by establishing quantitative restrictions on the importation of hardwood plywood; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H.R. 2405. A bill to amend the Civil Rights Act of 1960 to authorize the Attorney General to reduce, in certain circumstances, the period of time for which certain election records are otherwise required to be retained; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H.R. 2406. A bill to authorize the establishment of an International Home Loan Bank to assist in the development of savings associations and building societies in countries where they do not now exist in order to accomplish improved living standards, to increase employment, and to better social and political conditions through facilities for savings and homeownership for the millions of people of modest but stable earning capacity; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 2407. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the income tax treatment of dividends paid by certain corporations which hold obligations of State and local governments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 2408. A bill to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to regulate the manufacture, compounding, processing, distribution, delivery, and possession of habit-forming barbiturate drugs, amphetamine, and other habit-forming central nervous system stimulant drugs, and other drugs that have a potential for abuse resulting in psychotoxic effects or antisocial behavior; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 2409. A bill to amend the bonding provisions of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 and the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 2410. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirment Act, as amended, to provide that accumulated sick leave be credited to retirement fund; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2411. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil service retirement and disability fund; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2412. A bill to amend section 402 of the Federal Employees Uniform Allowance Act, approved September 1, 1954 (title IV, Public Law 763, 83d Cong.), as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon:

H.R. 2413. A bill authorizing construction of a navigation project at Port Orford, Oreg.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 2414. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain lands situated in the State of Oregon to the city of Roseburg, Oreg.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee:

H.R. 2415. A bill to extend Federal meat inspection and to permit cooperation with State meat inspection services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 2416. A bill to provide for Federal lotteries to raise funds to provide for a reduction in the national debt and a reduction in the Federal individual income taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FUQUA:

H.R. 2417. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the State of Florida; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.R. 2418. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to make certain acts against the person of the President and Vice President of the United States and certain other Federal officers a Federal crime; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2419. A bill to provide that the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation in the Department of Justice shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 2420. A bill to provide a hospital insurance program for the aged under social security, to amend the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system to increase benefits, improve the actuarial status of the disability insurance trust fund, and extend coverage, to amend the Social Security Act to provide additional Federal financial participation in the Federal-State public assistance programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 2421. A bill to amend section 203(e) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to facilitate the procurement of certain surplus personal property by State agencies; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 2422. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act, 1938, as amended, to provide for minimum wages for certain persons employed in agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2423. A bill to curb monopolistic control of professional boxing, to establish within the Department of Justice the Office of the National Boxing Commissioner, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 2424. A bill to amend the Standard Time Act of March 19, 1918, in order to establish two new time zones and so as to provide that the standard time established thereunder shall be the measure of time for all purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2425. A bill to establish a new program of grants for public works projects undertaken by local governments in the United States; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HAGEN of California:

H.R. 2426. A bill to permit the withdrawal from social security coverage of policemen, firemen, and district attorney investigators in Kern County, Calif.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 2427. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2428. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, so as to provide for the establishment of a White Fleet designed to render emergency assistance to the people of other nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 2429. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to authorize the retirement of employees after 30 years of service without reduction in annuity; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2430. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, to provide that accumulated sick leave be credited to retirement fund; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2431. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, in order to prevent the use of work measuring devices in the postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HARVEY of Indiana:

H.R. 2432. A bill to provide for the medical and hospital care of the aged through a system of voluntary health insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARVEY of Michigan:

H.R. 2433. A bill to authorize the temporary release of 100,000 short tons of copper from the national stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 2434. A bill to amend the Veterans' Pension Act of 1959 to permit certain veterans to elect to receive pensions under title 38 of the United States Code, as in effect on June 30, 1960; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

H.R. 2435. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, so as to make its provisions applicable to agriculture; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2436. A bill to amend the act of June 6, 1933, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Labor to develop and maintain improved, voluntary methods of recruiting, training, transporting, and distributing agricultural workers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2437. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Council to be known as the "National Advisory Council on Migratory Labor"; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2438. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to extend the child labor provisions thereof to certain children employed in agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2439. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act, 1938, as amended, to provide for minimum wages for certain persons employed in agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2440. A bill to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and section 705(b) of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 and to amend the first proviso of section 8(a) (3) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HOWARD:

H.R. 2441. A bill to authorize a study of methods of helping to provide financial assistance to victims of future flood disasters; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 2442. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a taxpayer a deduction from gross income for tuition paid by him for the education of a dependent child at an institution of higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEE:

H.R. 2443. A bill to establish quota limitations on imports of foreign residual fuel oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 2444. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the excise tax on communications; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCLORY:

H.R. 2445. A bill to provide for the medical and hospital care of the aged through a system of voluntary health insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 2446. A bill to allow credit or refund of gift tax erroneously paid by reason of treating nontaxable divisions of community property as gifts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McGRATH:

H.R. 2447. A bill to authorize a study of methods of helping to provide financial assistance to victims of future flood disasters; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MacGREGOR:

H.R. 2448. A bill to reduce the retailers excise taxes on jewelry, furs, toilet preparations, and luggage and handbags from 10 percent to 5 percent on July 1, 1965, and to repeal such taxes on July 1, 1966; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 2449. A bill to provide that any person who illegally sells a narcotic drug to a minor shall be imprisoned for not less than 20 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H.R. 2450. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide that members of the Armed Forces shall be retired in the highest grade satisfactorily held in any armed force, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 2451. A bill to provide for the medical and hospital care of the aged through a system of voluntary health insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H.R. 2452. A bill to extend the benefits of the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951, the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944, and the Classification Act of 1949 with respect to employees of county committees established pursuant to section 8(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'HARA of Michigan:

H.R. 2453. A bill to provide labor standards for certain persons employed by Federal contractors to furnish services to Federal agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 2454. A bill to amend the Classification Act of 1949 to restore the granting of step increases on the basis of performance ratings of satisfactory in lieu of the standard of acceptable level of competence, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2455. A bill to set a definite limit on the number of employees supervised by a foreman of mails; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2456. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, to provide that accumulated sick leave be credited to the retirement fund or that the individual be reimbursed; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2457. A bill to increase to 15 percent the night differential of postal field service employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2458. A bill to amend section 3574 of title 39 relating to nightwork compensation; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2459. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, to change the computation of annuity; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2460. A bill to create a presumption that certain impairment of health caused by hypertension or heart disease of a Federal or District of Columbia employee is incurred in line of duty for purposes of certain retirement and disability compensation laws or systems; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2461. A bill to amend provisions relative to overtime in the Postal Field Service Compensation Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2462. A bill to amend provisions relative to compensatory time in the Postal Field Service Compensation Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2463. A bill to extend the benefits of the retired Federal employees entitled to deferred annuity; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 2464. A bill to provide a hospital insurance program for the aged under social security, to amend the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system to increase benefits, improve the actuarial status of the disability insurance trust fund, and extend coverage, to amend the Social Security Act to provide additional Federal financial participation in the Federal-State public assistance programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 2465. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a survivor beneficiary shall not lose his or her entitlement to benefits by reason of a marriage or remarriage which occurs after he or she attains age 62; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2466. A bill to create a Joint Committee on Education; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. POAGE:

H.R. 2467. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 2468. A bill to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 2469. A bill to amend the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 in order to increase the limitation on the amount of loans which may be insured under subtitle A of such act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PURCELL:

H.R. 2470. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt certain farm vehicles from the highway use tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REID of New York:

H.R. 2471. A bill to amend the Administrative Procedure Act to provide for the disclosure of certain communications received by Government agencies from Members of Congress with respect to adjudicatory matters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H.R. 2472. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds for the construction, reconstruction, and improvement of the Alaska Highway; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ROONEY of New York:

H.R. 2473. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to increase to 2½ percent the multiplication factor for determining annuities for certain Federal employees engaged in hazardous duties; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 2474. A bill to direct the Commissioner of Education to assist in the establishment of a Carver Memorial Library, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2475. A bill to amend the bonding provisions of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 and the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2476. A bill to provide a hospital insurance program for the aged under social security, to amend the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system to increase benefits, improve the actuarial status of the disability insurance trust fund, and extend coverage, to amend the Social Security Act to provide additional Federal financial participation in the Federal-State public assistance programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 2477. A bill to amend the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to provide that all citizens of the United States may vote at all elections without being required to take literacy tests; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 2478. A bill providing for the distribution and viewing within the United States of the film "Years of Lightning, Day of Drums" prepared by the U.S. Information Agency on the late President Kennedy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SELDEN:

H.R. 2479. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2480. A bill to amend title IV of the Social Security Act to deny Federal assistance, under the program of aid to dependent children, for the families of women who are the mothers of two or more illegitimate children; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SPRINGER:

H.R. 2481. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2482. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without any deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 2483. A bill to amend section 8(b) (4) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, with respect to strikes at the sites of construction projects; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. UTT:

H.R. 2484. A bill to provide that tips received by an employee in the course of his employment shall be included as part of his wages for old-age, survivors, and disability insurance purposes and for purposes of income-tax withholding; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHITE of Idaho:

H.R. 2485. A bill to amend section 615 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the tax treatment of exploration expenditures in the case of mining; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON:

H.R. 2486. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, to provide for the recomputation of annuities of certain retired employees who elected reduced annuities at the time of retirement in order to provide survivor annuities for their spouses, and for the recomputation of survivor annuities for the surviving spouse of certain former employees who died in service or after retirement; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2487. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide for the adjustment of inequities and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WYDLER:

H.R. 2488. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a credit against the individual income tax for certain amounts paid as educational expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H.J. Res. 179. Joint resolution providing for a study of the possibility and desirability of establishing a University of the Americas; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.J. Res. 180. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the second week of March in every year as Volunteers of America Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLMER:

H.J. Res. 181. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue annually a proclamation designating the first week in March of each year as Save Your Vision Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H.J. Res. 182. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to limit the tenure of Senators and Representatives in Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.J. Res. 183. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to succession to the Presidency and Vice-Presidency and to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MacGREGOR:

H.J. Res. 184. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.J. Res. 185. Joint resolution to create and prescribe the functions of a Commission on the Establishment of a National Humanities Foundation; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H. Con. Res. 92. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the distribution and viewing of the U.S. Information Agency film on the late President Kennedy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H. Con. Res. 93. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the distribution and viewing of the film "Years of Lightning, Day of Drums," prepared by the U.S. Information Agency on the late President Kennedy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H. Con. Res. 94. Concurrent resolution proposing the recognition of the village of Whitehall, Washington County, N.Y., as the birthplace of the U.S. Navy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLMER:

H. Res. 101. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H. Res. 102. Resolution to create a committee for small unions; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H. Res. 103. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States should ratify the Genocide Convention recommended by the General Assembly of the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MURRAY:

H. Res. 104. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to conduct investigations and studies with respect to certain matters within its jurisdiction; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 105. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigations and studies authorized by House Resolution 104; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. REID of New York:

H. Res. 106. Resolution to establish a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct in the House of Representatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANNUNZIO:

H.R. 2489. A bill for the relief of Pasquale Signorile; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H.R. 2490. A bill relating to the transportation and gas distribution facilities operated by New Orleans Public Service, Inc., a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Louisiana and operating in the city of New Orleans, La., and all the shares of whose common stock are owned by Middle South Utilities, Inc.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2491. A bill for the relief of Alicia Concepcion Zea; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2492. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Dora Fabro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2493. A bill for the relief of Lt. Gen. Bryant L. Boatner, U.S. Air Force, retired; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 2494. A bill for the relief of Maria Mantia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:

H.R. 2495. A bill for the relief of Victor Neagu Manoliu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2496. A bill for the relief of Allah P. Asker, Ahlam P. Asker, Talal P. Asker, Dia P. Asker, Samir P. Asker, and Samira P. Asker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2497. A bill for the relief of Giuseppina Serra; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2498. A bill for the relief of Marietta C. Bibeau; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 2499. A bill for the relief of Remedios Ocampo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2500. A bill for the relief of Yoshihiro Okamoto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2501. A bill for the relief of Wai Sing Ko; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2502. A bill for the relief of Isola Arrighi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2503. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maria Melchiori; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2504. A bill for the relief of Alojz Grudenic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2505. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Kay Sue Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2506. A bill for the relief of Jack Sun (also known as Sun Hun Chak); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2507. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maxima E. Chua; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2508. A bill for the relief of Tom Wai Min; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2509. A bill for the relief of Tom Keng Foo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2510. A bill for the relief of Leonardo Milana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2511. A bill for the relief of Lee Foo Sai; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2512. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Wan Yau Louie; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2513. A bill for the relief of Mohammed Ali Amooi and his wife, Sedighi Tan Hai; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CABELL:

H.R. 2514. A bill for the relief of Sadat S. Zulfkar, Said H. Sharawi, Khadiga E. Arsalan, Hassan S. Sharawi, and Sherif S. Sharawi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONABLE:

H.R. 2515. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maria Curatolo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2516. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Whenna Eugenia Clark; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H.R. 2517. A bill for the relief of Girolamo Catalino, his wife, Maria Donati Catalino, and their daughter, Maria Catalino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2518. A bill for the relief of Harbhajn S. Sandhu and his wife, Malathi Sandhu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2519. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Carol Bright; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2520. A bill for the relief of Si Chul Kim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2521. A bill for the relief of Clementina Filippotti Florenza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2522. A bill for the relief of Meguerditch Avakian, his wife, Loosin Avakian, and their minor children, Ayda Avakian, Verjine-Eugenia Avakian, and Chazaros Avakian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2523. A bill for the relief of Joseph Benudiz and his wife, Carmen Arregui Zuluaga Benudiz, and their children, Carlos Benudiz, Salmon Benudiz, and Messod Prosper Benudiz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2524. A bill for the relief of Mijo Zeljeznak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORMAN (by request):

H.R. 2525. A bill for the relief of Douglas A. Smithers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DULSKI (by request):

H.R. 2526. A bill for the relief of Miss Estherina Zonghetti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California:

H.R. 2527. A bill for the relief of Chin-Yao Cheng and Chin-Sui Cheng; to the Committee on the Judicary.

H.R. 2528. A bill for the relief of Alfred Siniora; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2529. A bill for the relief of Helen Pappa Konstantinou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 2530. A bill for the relief of Mario Dossi and Giuseppina Dossi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2531. A bill for the relief of Francesco Fidelio and Concettina Fidelio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2532. A bill for the relief of Francesco Trapani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 2533. A bill for the relief of Nicola, Vera, Franco, and Ezio Milella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 2534. A bill for the relief of Ayhan Turkbas and his wife, Ozel O. Turkbas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 2535. A bill for the relief of Rosa Vexelman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2536. A bill for the relief of Cyla Gurewicz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2537. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Antonio Ferrante; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2538. A bill for the relief of Pei-Chi Pan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2539. A bill for the relief of Claudine Annie Madec Hersh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2540. A bill for the relief of Ordella Agatha Aldred; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2541. A bill for the relief of Aram Bagdasar Dinkci and Araksi Dinkci; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2542. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Adelaide Hoffman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANLEY:

H.R. 2543. A bill for the relief of Guiseppe Carcione; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARVEY of Michigan:

H.R. 2544. A bill for the relief of Guzin Delman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2545. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Bonifacia Cruz Wojcik; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2546. A bill for the relief of Dr. Rebii Mehmet Hankan and his wife, Mesadet Seher Hankan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H.R. 2547. A bill for the relief of Yusef N. Musalli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEITH:

H.R. 2548. A bill for the relief of Maria Rosalinda de Medeiros Pacheco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2549. A bill for the relief of Marjorie E. Woodward; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2550. A bill for the relief of Ana Santos Nogueira; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2551. A bill for the relief of Branco da Gloria Franco Freitas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2552. A bill for the relief of Mario Miranda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2553. A bill for the relief of Ramiro Jesus Lopes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2554. A bill for the relief of Ernesto Manuel Amaral Furtado; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2555. A bill for the relief of Rui Ferreira Marques; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2556. A bill for the relief of Manuel Paulo Tavares; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCLORY:

H.R. 2557. A bill for the relief of Frank Simms; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of Illinois:

H.R. 2558. A bill for the relief of Chaido Giannopoulis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2559. A bill for the relief of Fang-Tsun Kuo and his wife Agatha Mei-Tso Kuo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2560. A bill for the relief of Bienvenido V. Ticsay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2561. A bill for the relief of Nandalal Yepuri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 2562. A bill for the relief of Carmela Togni; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2563. A bill for the relief of Avriel Cubas Price and Clinton L. Price; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2564. A bill for the relief of Michele Buffa, his wife Orsola Buffa, and children Juan and Geronima Buffa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H.R. 2565. A bill to provide for the free entry of one mass spectrometer for the use of the University of Chicago; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 2566. A bill for the relief of Capt. Vernon H. Detrick, U.S. Air Force; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PICKLE:

H.R. 2567. A bill for the relief of Tancredo Townsend; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POAGE:

H.R. 2568. A bill for the relief of Louis Jung Shaw Gore, his wife, Sue Won Wong Gore, and their two sons, Jone Yee Gore and Jone Fon Gore; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 2569. A bill for the relief of Dr. Eulalia Sayas DeBattiste; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBISON:

H.R. 2570. A bill for the relief of Mui Kim Chen Liang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2571. A bill for the relief of Ralph S. DeSocio, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2572. A bill for the relief of Dr. Vincent Palumbo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 2573. A bill for the relief of Kenneth Peter Sampson, also known as Kenneth Peter Henderson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.R. 2574. A bill for the relief of Amy Ann James; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of California:

H.R. 2575. A bill for the relief of Miss Anahid Nerses Grashian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By. Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:

H.R. 2576. A bill for the relief of Joao Pereira Morais and Maria da Gloria Morais; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TODD:

H.R. 2577. A bill for the relief of Gary Rosenhagen Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2578. A bill for the relief of Maxie L. Rupert; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAN DEERLIN:

H.R. 2579. A bill for the relief of Elvira Cammisa-Viggiani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

70. By Mr. MOORE: Petition of the Clarksburg Chamber of Commerce, Clarksburg, W. Va., favoring construction of the Stonewall Jackson Reservoir; to the Committee on Public Works.

71. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the city of Richmond, Calif. petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the challenge by the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party of the five Mississippi Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

A Clash in Basic Assumptions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 12, 1965

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, we all know that a great deal of what is said during a national political campaign is intended only for the moment. Much of it takes on a peculiarly hollow ring when read or repeated several weeks after an election.

No such disadvantage attaches to the remarks of a colleague which I have obtained permission to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. During the campaign, the Honorable RICHARD HANNA, who represents a portion of my neighboring Orange County, Calif., was asked to discuss a foreign policy conflict which had emerged in positions taken by the two major candidates for President.

With many of us, I am afraid such an opportunity would have become the occasion for intensely partisan remarks. But DICK HANNA, displaying the breadth and charity that have marked his outlook as a Member of this House, chose instead the clinical approach. He analyzed the dialogs developing on foreign policy. And he found that there existed a clash in basic assumptions which seemed to bar any sort of consensus. His assessment of the radical right—with which Mr. HANNA disagrees as strongly as with the radical left—is based on considerations of cause and effect, rather than what he sees as good or evil.

I commend this address to the attention of other Members.

U.S. FOREIGN POLICY—A CLASH OF BASIC ASSUMPTIONS

(By Hon. RICHARD T. HANNA)

We have had, in this campaign, a real conflict between the two presidential candidates over questions of foreign policy. To a marked degree that conflict has highlighted the obvious sharp division which the subject of foreign policy occasions in our country today. We surely ought to look at some of the differing assumptions about it, and try for a more basic understanding of these differences.

Maybe one of the reasons we are so badly split as a national right now, on basic questions affecting our very survival, is that we have done very little examining of our assumptions. I mean both sides here, the assumptions of those, including myself, who for almost two decades since the end of World War II have supported an essentially bipartisan, internationalist, pro-United Nations, proforeign aid, pro-nuclear-test-ban foreign policy, and advocated the containment of communism, perhaps with some emphasis on the liberation of peoples under Communist rule. For want of a better term, let us call this group the "mainstream" in America, it being understood that we do not mean the mainstream of one party alone, but the mainstream, until recently, of the dominant elements of both. This broad mainstream or center position—center at least until the major challenge to it grew up on the right—would contain the foreign policies of the Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson administrations. The mainstream position also generally received the support during these administrations of a powerful bipartisan majority in both the House and the Senate.

I also want to look at the assumptions of the conservative group on the political right which is now so strongly challenging and cutting into this formerly bipartisan policy of the mainstream. This broad sector, which I will call the Right Branch, has grown to the point where it took over the leadership of the Republican Party at the GOP convention in San Francisco in July. The Right Branchers include those of both parties who are to a greater or lesser degree against the United Nations, against foreign aid, and against agreements with Communist countries. The Right Brancher expounds not the containment of communism or containment with some emphasis on liberation, but rather, complete victory over communism.

To complete a very rough division of the political spectrum in regard to foreign policy, I should mention three other categories. On the far right we have the familiar rightwing extremists, such as the John Birchers, the Ku Kluxers, the Minutemen and other groups which exaggerate the positions of the Right Branchers to the point where they fall wholly outside the democratic framework. Corresponding to them, but on the extreme political left, are the leftwing extremists, the American Communist Party and other revolutionaries seeking the overthrow of our Government by force and violence. Our fifth group, within the democratic consensus but to the left of the American mainstream, is what I'll call the Left Branch. For one reason or another, members of this group do not support the mainstream of American policy, often objecting to our system of alliances or our military power buildup or our possession of nuclear weapons. They may disagree fundamentally with our policy in particular areas, such as Vietnam, usually from the standpoint that it is too interventionist or belligerent. In this group are the pacifists, those who would disarm unilaterally, and those members of so-called peace groups who differ basically with the mainstream's foreign policy.

When you're looking at basic assumptions that shape your views on foreign policy, where do you begin? I suppose with your views about the nature of man. I'll ignore at this point the assumption built into the question, the question of whether a man's philosophical assumptions do indeed shape his politics. At least it is clear that some syndromes of political views tend to go along with certain basic ideas about the nature of man. And perhaps the first thing on which our mainstreamers and Right Branchers would split has to do with people's similarities and differences. The Right Brancher tends to stress the uniqueness of each individual as well as the individual's natural rights, particularly his freedom from restraint by government. This is fine, by itself. But the idea that individuals are all different from each other somehow gets mixed up with the view that, across international boundaries, whole peoples too are very different from each other. Moreover, within countries, the Right Brancher often sees great and scarcely bridgeable differences between racial groups, religious groups, and social classes. Somehow the foreign groups, and the other groups within his own society, usually turn out to be inferior, if not actually subversive. If we shift our lens from the Right Brancher to the right wing extremist, we note that just about anyone who dares to disagree with him is so different that he is considered mildly or wholly traitorous.

Point 1 then about the nature of man, from Right Brancher's standpoint, is the differences he has with others of his kind. Point 2 follows closely behind: Since men have little in common with each other, particularly across different economic, social, religious, racial or national groupings, there is accordingly little basis for real agreement in a world that consists essentially of conflict rather than cooperation.

Point 3 has to do with how much free will a man has. He has a great deal of free will, in Right Brancher's view, with very little of his life or thinking determined by outside forces. Moreover, Right Brancher considers his politics to be primarily the product of his own mind, through right reasoning. This contrasts rather sharply with the various forms of determinism which may be encountered in the thinking of Left Brancher. Those on the left incline to the view that a man's politics is wholly determined by his economic interest, or perhaps by his relationships with his parents before the age of 7, or by his sense of social justice, or by his total environment.

As a middle-of-the-roader on this issue, I would myself guess that there are rather greater limitations on free will than Right Brancher assumes, but more than the various determinists of the Left Branch would allow. Right Brancher's assumption finds little or no support in psychology or other behavioral sciences. Still, Right Brancher would be merely a harmless, though negative and pessimistic, sort of fellow were it not for some other basic assumptions and characteristics. These transform him into an active threat to all that man has laboriously constructed over the centuries.

A primary factor in human events, in Right Brancher's view, is the dominance of physical force over the realm of ideas. Force rules the world in almost unchallenged rein, the sword is mightier than the pen; power is worthy of respect for its own sake; and respect for her power is what America must demand from the disorderly nations of the world. The American military man is to be glorified and trusted, while civilian authority is at least somewhat suspect, if indeed it is not actually selling America down the mainstream.

We have then men who are very different from each other, their thoughts very little influenced by the social conditions under which they live, and among whom there is very little basis for agreement or cooperations. It is a world of conflict, in which force dominates. Moreover (and this will be highly significant when we consider the ability of the Right Brancher to understand the appeals of the Communist enemy), it is a world in which social justice will pretty well take care of itself. Social welfare should not of course be any major concern of government, particularly at the national level. It should be left basically to the individual's own efforts and the operation of the economic laws of the marketplace. Government should not, above all, employ such devices as the graduated income tax, in a misguided effort to create an artificial, unnatural equality. If wealth tends to concentrate in the hands of a small class, this is only a fitting reward for those of superior ability and effort.

The Right Branch's assumptions about the nature of communism are also significant. Communism is an unmitigated, unchanging evil, uniformly so, everywhere. The fact that it seeks world rule and the downfall of the United States is a hidden truth which must somehow be made known, and which the leaders of the Government of the United States have stubbornly refused to believe. Any U.S. official who may have known this and who still supports U.S. policies toward Communist countries is at least soft on communism, and perhaps even infected with treason.

Like most of the other assumptions of the Right Branch, this one overlaps with and becomes stronger and more exaggerated among rightwing extremists. Its high point is the published view of Robert Welch that President Eisenhower is a dedicated, conscious agent of the Communist conspiracy.

In addition to its assumptions, we should mention certain characteristic tendencies of the Right Branch approach: They can be summarized as the tendency to oversimplify, to be highly impatient, to be intolerant, and to be extremely suspicious. International politics is viewed in terms similar to those of a very short western, in which the good cowboys face down or shoot up the bandits. The plot is thickened only to the extent that meanwhile, back at the ranch, some dirty work is usually being plotted.

Another characteristic of the Right Brancher, and a particularly strong characteristic of the rightwing extremist, is a tendency to stress the menace, peril or threat of communism, and to play down or ignore any nonthreatening accomplishments in Communist countries. This is in part a natural inference from basic Right Branch assumptions. However, in some cases it is no doubt a consciously used technique in the Right Branch's bid for political support. The political strength of the right tends to increase with increases in the strength of the Communists and fears of them. This political phenomenon has been observed in many countries, and was particularly clear in the Nazi and Communist election returns under the Weimar Republic of Germany during Hitler's rise to power.

Our analytical groupings within the American foreign policy spectrum may not of course describe the views of any one man at all times. A man's views may be in one category one day and slip into another the next. Still, for those who at any given time are basing their thinking on the Right Branch assumptions we have outlined, a number of specific conclusions about American foreign policy logically follow.

The Right Brancher's basic aim for America is characteristically simple, negative, and forceful: complete victory over communism. This does not mean anything so mild as the evolution of communism in the direction of greater economic and political freedom. Such changes would be at least partly contrary to his assumption about the nature of communism. In any case, they would be complex, would take a lot of time, and would be wholly unsatisfying. Communism must be overthrown or, if war comes, defeated in war.

All American policies should be judged, according to the Right Brancher, according to whether they contribute to the defeat of communism. Anything which contributes to our victory is good, anything which hinders it is evil.

To the Right Brancher, most contacts with Communist countries fall into the category of helping communism and impeding victory. Trade, aid and cultural exchange should be cut off; diplomatic relations of any kind are at best of dubious value, and might well be severed. Communist countries should in general be cut off from the free world and denied membership in international organizations.

The United Nations, owing to the very nature of the conflict in the world, can at best be a sort of debating society. It is useful only to the extent that it can serve as an instrument of U.S. policy. It is dangerous to the extent that the United States alters its policies to accommodate the U.N., which is increasingly made up of immature, nonwhite, new members.

Disarmament is, of course, a complete mirage as well as undesirable in itself, Right Brancher maintains. It can only be a screen under which the Communists seek to gain a decisive military advantage. The partial nuclear test ban is a dangerous indication of our willingness to be lulled to sleep. The Communists can be counted upon to break the ban whenever they believe this is in their interests.

Foreign aid is a drain on the U.S. taxpayer and a frightful example of waste and inefficiency. It is founded on the fallacious notion that if we fill people's stomachs, we can turn their minds from communism. On the contrary, Right Brancher holds, if they would merely straighten out their thinking, they could liberate the energies to improve their own economies. In short they have no one to blame but themselves. Certain types of aid might be extended to countries which are already our proven friends. None should go to Communist or neutralist countries.

Our alliances have limited value. Their worst feature is that they are essentially defensive. They do not adequately protect the free world against either internal subversion or overt aggression, and our main reliance must continue to be on our own power, particularly the capacity to wage limited nuclear wars. Our allies are socialistic and politically unreliable in many cases, and refuse to bring themselves into line with strong anti-Communist policy. We must be prepared on occasion to go it alone.

In general, negotiations with the Communist world are to be avoided, because they always seem to involve some right or territory of the free world which the Communists want. If what's theirs is theirs, and what's ours is negotiable, we can never hope to gain, we can at best hold even, according to Right Brancher. Since world tensions are created by the Communists, they can be relaxed by the Communists also, unilaterally, without negotiation. Since any agreement worth making with the Communists must be in the interests of the Communists to keep, there is no need to negotiate a treaty about it in the first place. The Communists will go ahead and do what's in their interest in any case.

As is evident, the foreign policy of the Right Branch would repeal much of existing U.S. foreign policy. But what would it put in its place? It is strong on what it is, and what it is, is strength. This means military strength, economic strength, strength to promote revolt in Communist countries and strength to participate ourselves in operations against vulnerable Communist regimes. Characteristically, it does not seem strong on other ideas, and appears to have little or no economic or social content. These things would presumably take care of themselves largely without interference by national governments or international organizations, once world communism were overthrown.

These are, in summary form, the main assumptions, characteristics, and policy recommendations of the Right Branch in this country. In general, I would have to take strong exception to most of the assumptions made in the Right Branch's challenge to American foreign policy. I also believe the characteristics associated with this approach are harmful in the conduct of foreign relations, and that the specific recommendations which the Right Branch offers would be disastrous. Far from achieving victory over communism, I believe they would result in the loss of America's position in the world to the point where we would indeed be forced to choose between allout war and surrender. Either one would be a catastrophe beyond measure.

I am proud to belong to what has until recently been the bipartisan mainstream of American policy. I disagree with those of the opposite Left Branch who hold that we can disarm unilaterally before our potential adversaries do likewise, in the hope that they will follow suit. Military power is an undeniable reality in the anarchic world from which we are slowly emerging, and during this process our country must be able to deal from a position of military strength.

And I recognize, as have successive American Presidents and Secretaries of State from the time of the Truman Doctrine in 1947, that this country must use its power effectively to thwart the attempted expansion of the Communist empire. But I must confess that just assembling the main assumptions and proposals of the Right Branch is itself an indication of their almost pathetically distorted, shallow and inadequate nature.

Of the major assumptions we have reviewed, one to which I have already entered a vigorous dissent, is the view that we have little in common with other peoples. I would concede that, in the absence of an effective rule of law in the world, force has dominated the relations of states. Potential agreements among nations in developing a more secure, prosperous world are everywhere impeded by the requirements of military preparedness. But this in no way denies that the potential is there. Even in the case of the deepest gulf, that between the Communists and ourselves, I would argue that we have certain strong interests in common.

I believe that everybody likes to be able to get his family enough to eat and enough of the other things they need, and would welcome the end of the financial burden he pays for military security; I think that everybody has an interest in seeing that his family and friends can live in a world without the threat of war. It seems to me every Russian, Communist or not, and every American, too, has a common interest in seeing that nuclear weapons do not spread all over the world. I believe we all have an interest in the health and perfection of coming generations of children.

With such common interests as these, there is, I believe, a basis on which to work for the achievement of arms control and disarmament. Our country should, with all awareness of the difficulties and risks involved, keep everlastingly at it.

I believe in the importance of looking at things from the longrun as well as the shortrun standpoint. When you do this, a number of assumptions of the Right Branch collapse in a heap. Ideas, which may be secondary in importance to military power in any given crisis, take on added importance as the time span increases. Over the decades and the centuries, the power of ideas is determining, while the power of armies fades. The ability of any social system to satisfy the yearning of most men for social justice will be crucial to its longrun survival. In these vital areas, the Right Branch would leave us defenseless.

A recent United Nations report has found that while considerable wealth was concentrated in the hands of 5 percent of the population, more than half the people of all of Latin America made a per capita income of only $120 a year. This is probably far less than many members of the wealthier group might spend on entertainment alone in a short period of time. This is a situation inviting Communist revolution. It breeds revolution not so much because people with empty stomachs tend to go Communist, but because it appalls any who may have a sense of social justice, whatever their income level.

The Right Branch's suggestion that whatever helps victory over communism is good is not a useful standard for American foreign policy. It ignores all the myriad problems of this world with which a great country such as ours must be concerned, and which exist wholly independently of the Communist movement: hunger, poverty, disease, ignorance, exploding population, to name but a few.

This suggested standard has no power to command the allegiance of men, being wholly negative. And most ludicrous of all, those who propose it are obviously unqualified to judge when we are, and when we are not, making progress in the basic battle for men's minds, both inside the Communist orbit and in the contested areas. About all the Right Branch can do is see where the red is on the map, and then seek to combat it with ultimatums or force. It proposes, in fact, that we surrender the main part of the battle, because it doesn't understand it.

The American foreign policy which has developed over the years since 1945 is essentially sound. It will be improved, adjusted to changing conditions, and made more effective as we proceed. But above all, we must face the future with our minds open and with respect for our fellow man in our hearts.

The President's Message on Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 12, 1965

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson rang the bell with me in his message to Congress on education, when he stated unequivocally that the education of our youth is the No. 1 business of the American people.

On the other hand, the President's bill is complex and requires more study than I have given it—especially the part that includes benefits for parochial schools. I understand that the administration estimates that 15 percent of the funds could go to private schools, mostly indirectly rather than directly, although they could share in some direct programs.

Personally, I am going to refrain from any comment on such details at this time, pending a thorough airing in the House Education Committee. In general, however, I agree with the President that our national goal should be full educational opportunity for all, and I likewise agree with President Johnson—and this should be emphasized—that education is primarily a State function.

In this latter connection, Mr. Speaker, there is a potential danger that I foresee. It could be that the $1.5 billion asked by the President in his message could give the various States the idea that the Federal Government, by this new bill, would be assuming their traditional responsibility. On the contrary, this program—large as it may seem—is not intended to relieve the States of their financial responsibility. Under this program, State legislatures—and this is true of my own State of Washington—are not intended to reduce their expenditures for schools; and, speaking of Washington State, as an example, its established pattern of taxation has resulted in serious inequities. The burden on taxpayers has been inequitable. Our per capita expenditure is high compared with most States, but responsible school leaders admit there is a dangerous emergency facing Washington State in financing its schools adequately. In our State, we should revise our system of raising funds for education, and to properly carry out the State's own constitutional responsibility, the State legislature must increase and equalize school support. Getting back, however, I must point out that the headlines and news reports on the President's message could falsely indicate that new Federal aid is on the way to ease the cost of education in the States. But, as I see it, the reverse is true. The Federal Government, under the President's proposal, will actually require more in the way of State matching funds.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would comment that President Johnson has given Congress and the American people a most persuasive argument for more Federal encouragement and support of our schools at all levels. If the proposed program is free of Federal domination and control, I would certainly expect to vote for it, because I believe that the answer to America's problems such as poverty and full employment lies in upgrading our youth and adequately financing our educational system at the secondary as well as the higher levels.

In conclusion, let me repeat, the President's program does not meet all the Nation's educational needs; it does not afford anything like the resources needed for new school construction, teacher recruitment, or the improvement of teachers' salaries.

I sincerely hope that State and local governments will take care of these aspects of the problem.

We Must Say to Them That They Cannot Win "Elections" From a System Based on Murder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 12, 1965

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, on January 4, the opening day of this 89th Congress, my good friend and colleague, the Honorable JAMES ROOSEVELT, made a speech in the House of Representatives of great significance on the subject of the seating of the Mississippi delegation. I commend him for his depth of thought and courage of expression, and recommend to all the reading of his poignant remarks, which begin on page 52 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The Family Farm: A Blueprint for Its Doom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 12, 1965

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have read with dismay and shock a recent magazine article by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, Mr. Kermit Gordon, embracing a blueprint for doom of the family farm system in America.

Since the Bureau of the Budget is the policy arm of the White House, many people are asking if this blueprint, this prescription, this pattern for the destruction of the farm system that has become the envy of the world, soon may be presented to the Congress.

There are now 3,500,000 farms in the United States. As recently as 1940 there were 6,350,000 farms.

This rural attrition already has changed the face of our Nation, and we now are struggling in the Congress and in the executive department to deal with poverty, crime, and other pressing emergencies among the impacted populations in our cities.

Now, Mr. Gordon tells us, "One million farmers could produce all the Nation's farm needs, including large commercial exports," and he says the other 2,500,000 farmers "require assistance in the painful transition to nonfarm jobs, to which most of them or their children will certainly have to move."

Mr. Speaker, such a transition for 2,500,000 farmers and their families would move perhaps 7,500,000 farm people out of rural America. Where would they go, except into the poverty program in the cities?

Thousands of Main Street towns would become ghost towns. What would become of all the businesses and all the people who populate our rural towns?

Mr. Speaker, I am confident that the President of these United States has greater wisdom than to follow such a course.

Moreover, Budget Director Gordon is an honorable man; he is an able man of very substantial accomplishments. Most of his experience has been in Government employment. I cannot find that he ever has had any direct association with agriculture. I can explain his position with respect to farmers, as stated in the magazine article, only by surmising that he has been listening to the wrong people. I am certain that when he broadens his knowledge his fine mind will impel him to become a foremost advocate of the family farm system that has blessed this country with the greatest abundance any people on earth ever has enjoyed.

Mr. Speaker, there has been, in recent days, a great deal of newspaper comment, along with the magazine article I have mentioned, which has treated in a very cavalier fashion the share of the national budget that goes for commodity programs in agriculture.

Considering the value of these programs to America's free agriculture, and the importance of new legislation in the present session, I think it is essential that we set in order some of the misstatements and misunderstandings that are reflected in these articles. Most of them, I might add, are authored by people without connection with farming and with little or no background in the subject.

It is always a fair and worthy enterprise—in any legislative year—to examine critically the ongoing programs of the Government as well as those proposed. It is essential—in fairness to taxpayers—that we examine the worth to the Nation and to the economy of every part of every program that is budgeted with public funds. So I welcome this examination of the farm programs—which are, after all, reckoned in a great many dollars.

I am troubled, however, by a number of quick assumptions which find ready acceptance among the unknowing, and eager credence among people who are looking for easy ways to cut Federal costs. And all of us are eager to find budget savings—to ease the burden on the taxpayer. So it is only too easy to fall into the trap of easy budget cutting—particularly when we cannot readily see a direct loss to our own families and our own security.

I am troubled.

I am troubled by the tendency to see the farm programs as welfare programs—programs that can only be justified as a handout to a submerged and needy peasantry. The price support and acreage adjustment programs are not welfare programs—and they never have been. They are not means of distributing funds to the needy—and they never have been. The real purpose is to enable U.S. agriculture to attain and maintain a level of income and family living that is fair in terms of the remainder of America's free society. And that was the basic idea, back in the 1930's, when we first began to develop effective commodity programs.

I am troubled—by repeated references to the so-called top million of America's farmers. These are the farmers who gross cash sales above $10,000 or more in the average year—and as a result are supposedly ready to set sail in a sea of laissez faire which does not prevail for any other segment of our economy. What is overlooked is this: The average farmer in this top million class is able to keep, as operator's earnings, only 20 percent of the dollars he gets for products sold. After allowing 5 percent interest on capital and hired hand wages for himself and family, he still is not earning a return on his capital, labor, and management comparable with returns earned by nonfarmers.

Remember, too, that in order to produce $2,500 in earnings the farmer enterprise needs on the average an investment in the $50,000 range. Also that in order to earn even the $2,500, some farmers may have cash sales well over $20,000. These are, of course, subject to wide variation.

But most important: If some of these top million farmers have climbed near to income parity—they have climbed there, and are remaining there, in a farm economy stabilized by farm programs. Many, many farmers would drop out of this top group in a hurry, if they had to face the kind of price declines they would be up against in the absence of farm programs.

I am talking about a drop in wheat prices of almost half—a drop in feed grain prices of more than a fifth—severe drops in other commodities, including a 20-percent decline in the price of cattle, which are not even price supported. Indicated price declines in this magnitude are so well established by numerous nongovernmental studies that they cannot be doubted or ignored.

I am troubled because to suggest that the top million farmers no longer need income protection is like saying that the top 27 percent of industrial workers can now be deprived of union protection, because they are so well off. It is like saying that the top 27 percent of bank depositors should be deprived of deposit insurance. It is like saying that investors in the top 27 percent of U.S. corporations should all be deprived of the protection provided by limited liability under the law—by antitrust legislation, and countless other legal protections.

What some writers have been doing is to take the top 27 percent of America's farmers, compare their incomes with the average of industrial workers, and declare that their incomes are almost up to parity. And then say: These 1 million farmers are no longer peasants—so let them eat cake.

I am troubled by all this misunderstanding because I know that the support of income is only part of the tremendous job that commodity programs perform. The commodity programs are important in putting land to the uses that are best suited for it and in avoiding the waste and expense of excessive production that cannot be put to use here or abroad even with the best in salesmanship and the ultimate in generosity.

It is simply a matter of too many resources available to agriculture. For every 2 acres we harvested in 1964, there stood on the sidelines an additional acre that could easily have come into the game. With only two out of every three acres needed to produce abundantly for us all—it made more sense to conserve this extra acre. About half of this extra acre was in fallow, in temporary pasture, perhaps idle for one reason or another—but the other half was kept out of surplus production by a public program designed to do that very thing.

This is the resource situation as it exists in agriculture, and it is not well understood. For every 2 acres harvested, we have another acre in unneeded cropland, as I have said. But we also have between four and five acres in grassland and another four to five acres in woodland. In a real pinch, many of these acres could come into cropland use.

Without acreage adjustment programs, certainly much of the extra cropland would come into production. And this condition of excessive resources will continue into the future because rising technology is increasing the productive power of each acre. Meanwhile the individual farmer, acting alone, can do very little about this—and this would be true even if you sent 2½ million of him to town and kept only a million farmers in food and fiber production.

I am troubled because if that happened I fear for the traditional structure of our rural communities, town and farm alike. If a million farmers can produce food for all of us—why not a half million, a quarter of a million, a hundred thousand?

Then, where will these few thousand large individual or corporate operated farms get their supplies? From the local machinery dealers? The feed dealer? The seed dealer? Not on your life. You would see direct buying from wholesaler and manufacturer that would leave little room for the local farm supply dealer and little need for the other local retailers who would be depending on a dwindling hinterland.

You would create poverty in rural America faster than you could lick it—even with the best intentions.

It has been suggested that food production might eventually be concentrated in a few strong hands—which by that time might be able to exert sufficient control to manage their production as auto builders manage theirs. And this would avoid surpluses and get the Government out of agriculture. But would this be a happy solution?

Would the American public then be at the mercy of a few giant producers who would control their very sustenance? Or would the American people take it upon themselves to regulate food production publicly as they regulate any other public utility controlling the Nation's lifeline? Both of these have been suggested as serious possibilities.

Am I overdramatizing? I do not believe so. We have already gone a long way down a road marked by abandoned farms and dying towns. And this is no time to run out on agriculture. A famous farm economist said prophetically, just a few days ago, that agriculture is heading along a collision course—toward a point where the welfare and existence of family farm agriculture will clash with concern for the Federal budget.

I am truly concerned about the future of our traditional American freeholding agriculture. The agriculture that has done so much to sustain our democratic traditions. The agriculture that has made possible the great industrial society that is now America. The agriculture that stands, more than any other element of our society, as an example to the world.

A Japanese farmer once said:

> A farmer without land is like a man without a soul.

And, wherever in this world, the peasant and the sharecropper and the agrarian oppressed look for a better life on the land, they look for their model to the free agriculture of America.

In the world, America's farmers have not only exported food, they have exported hope. In America, they have not only sent their sons to become industrial and business and professional leaders, they have made food the biggest bargain in history. Indeed, American farmers for the last 10 years have not been subsidized by the public—farmers have instead subsidized the American consumer.

They have done this by providing food at a constantly declining real cost. The average family buys food for less than 19 percent of its take-home pay—compared with about 23 percent in the early 1950's. As an example, if the 23 percent had continued to this day, Americans would now be spending each year—for every man, woman, and child—better than $95 more for food than we are now spending. For a family of five, almost $500.

Even at subparity prices agriculture now contributes about $42 billion a year in new wealth, which jangles local cash registers and feeds a giant sector of the total economy. All this for 1½ cents of the Federal tax dollar. Let us search for budget savings, Mr. Speaker, but let us keep things in proportion.

May I say again that the farm commodity programs are not welfare. They are programs that help to strengthen and stabilize our entire economy—just as other economic groups have their protections. But let us not forget that U.S. agriculture is the way it is, and the success it is, because we have made it that way. As public policy, the encouragement of agrarian settlement goes back to the very beginnings—to colonial times and the early days of the Republic. The early grants of kings' lands. The grants of extensive rights-of-way to encourage railroad building and settlement. The Homestead Act.

The American public has, almost from the start, subsidized research and the improvement of crops and livestock. The extension idea developed as a natural sequence—and one that was unique in the world. The credit programs were developed, because we could see that wherever farmers have been oppressed and submerged, it was partly because they had no means of obtaining control of the land they farmed.

Our freeholding system of agriculture, widely held, is our own creature—developed in a free society, by a free society, because we thought it the best system and encouraged its growth along these lines through public policy. It is important that we not cast away lightly—in the name of economy—a farming system that has been 300 years in the making. Mr. Speaker, this is why I am troubled.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 13, 1965

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

The words of St. Peter: I Peter 3: 12: *The eyes of the Lord are over the righteous, and His ears are open unto their prayers.*

O Thou infinite and eternal God, as we turn to Thee in prayer, we beseech Thee to inspire us with a renewed sense of the sanctity of our tasks and responsibilities.

Help us to give our human life a more sacred and glorious image by measuring and manifesting its lofty meaning and mission in terms of service for Thee, for our country, and all mankind.

May we earnestly strive to fasten the dawning of that better and brighter day when men and nations shall no longer live in a social order that is haunted and assailed by poverty and ignorance.

We thank Thee for the joy and peace which fills our own souls when we commit ourselves to the guiding power of Thy divine spirit and share in its redeeming grace and saving ministry.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

COMPOSITION OF VARIOUS COMMITTEES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 107

Resolved, That during the Eighty-ninth Congress the Committee on Agriculture shall be composed of thirty-five members;

The Committee on Appropriations shall be composed of fifty members;

The Committee on Armed Services shall be composed of thirty-seven members;

The Committee on Banking and Currency shall be composed of thirty-three members;

The Committee on Education and Labor shall be composed of thirty-one members;

The Committee on Foreign Affairs shall be composed of thirty-six members;

The Committee on Government Operations shall be composed of thirty-one members;

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs shall be composed of thirty-three members;

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce shall be composed of thirty-three members;

The Committee on the Judiciary shall be composed of thirty-five members;

The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries shall be composed of thirty-one members;

The Committee on Public Works shall be composed of thirty-four members; and

The Committee on Science and Astronautics shall be composed of thirty-one members.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE PIG WAR NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, 105 years ago an American shot and killed a British pig. As a result, two great nations nearly went to war. This incident led to the final clarification of the boundary between the United States and Canada and paved the way for the international friendship now existing between these nations that share 3,000 miles of common border.

On June 15, 1859, an American farmer, Lyman A. Cutler, stepped out of his house on the island of San Juan, located northeast of the Strait of Juan de Fuca in what was then the Oregon Territory. He saw a pig belonging to the British Hudson's Bay Co. rooting in his potato patch. Enraged, he shot it.

Fate willed that the same day a director of the Hudson's Bay Co., the son-in-law of the British Columbia Governor, arrived on the island.

The inevitable difficulty that developed between the two men sparked into flame a disagreement that had long been smoldering between the two nations. When the Hudson's Bay Co. threatened to take Cutler forcibly to Victoria for an English trial, the ambiguities of exactly where the international boundary lay caused an international incident. The treaty of 1846 established the middle of "the channel" as part of the boundary. The framers of the treaty were apparently unaware that there were at least two channels. For years friction had been developing around this territorial question. The Hudson's Bay pig's fondness for Cutler's potatoes was all that was needed to set it off.

American residents immediately called for armed support. Three days later Capt. George Pickett, later famed for leading "Pickett's Charge" at Gettysburg during the Civil War, was ordered from his post in Bellingham to the island "to resist all interference by the British authorities." Arriving on July 26, Pickett established the American camp and pronounced the island to be U.S. territory.

During the next week an array of British warships and 61 marine and Royal engineers arrived on the island.

Finally, tempers were smoothed somewhat when two older and wiser military men arrived on the scene. British Rear Adm. Robert Lambert Baynes refused to open hostilities over the shooting of a pig. He is reported to have chided those involved saying "Tut, tut, no, no. The damned fools."

American Gen. Winfield Scott, no less than the U.S. Army commanding general, arrived to investigate the situation on the spot. He worked out an agreement whereby the "menacing attitude" of the opposing forces was cooled and arrangements were made for both sides to withdraw all forces except for one company, not to exceed 100 men each. This joint occupation was to continue until final settlement of the boundary question. And so on March 21, 1860, a detachment of British Royal marines arrived on San Juan Island and under terms of the agreement established a post now known as English Camp.

For 12 years, while the American Civil War was being fought in the East, two lonely contingents of men jointly occupied far western outposts on San Juan Island.

Finally, the Treaty of Washington of 1871 referred the matter to the German Emperor for arbitration and on October 21, 1872, Emperor Wilhelm I upheld the contention of the United States regarding the San Juan Island. This ended a long and often dangerous series of border disputes and for the first time in the history of the United States, the Republic had no boundary disputes with Great Britain.

Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill to establish the Pig War National Historical Park on the sight of this historical incident on San Juan Island. Its establishment will protect historic features at English and American camps, points where British and United States troops were stationed during the 12-year confrontation. Docking facilities and adequate campgrounds to meet the expected influx of tourists are proposed for the American Camp. Earthworks of the American Camp will be repaired. A visitors' center, trails, and a boat dock are proposed for the English Camp, as well as restoration of the military compound at Garrison Bay.

Hearings have already been conducted in Friday Harbor, Wash., by Senator HENRY M. JACKSON, of Washington, chairman of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee and Mr. A. Clark Stratton, Associate Director of the National Park Service. Their findings indicate that interest in the establishment of the park goes far beyond San Juan Island. The Park Service estimates that visitors would number about 50,000 the first year and would grow to more than 100,000 annually within a few years. The Washington State Park and Recreation Commission is in support of this proposal.

The original campsites are intact and remnants of some buildings still stand. But rapidly expanding interest in subdivision and sale of property on San Juan Island emphasizes the need for early action if these features are to be preserved and restored.

Mr. Speaker, that a petty incident in a rough and raw section of a young nation should have brought about a dozen years of hostility is a significant milestone in the history of our national maturation. In the 105 years since the death of that pig, vastly more serious problems have been raised between this Nation and Canada. But, never in that time has either nation felt the need to resort to arms in solving these differences. The Pig War

National Historical Park will stand in the westernmost end of the longest unguarded border in the world as a permanent reminder of that international restraint and cooperation and of both countries' national maturity.

AUTHORIZING CONSTRUCTION OF THE PASSAMAQUODDY-ST. JOHN HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I have the pleasure of introducing today a bill to authorize the construction of the Passamaquoddy-St. John hydroelectric project. My colleague, the gentleman from Maine [Mr. TUPPER], is introducing an identical bill. This project would bring to reality the dream of Franklin Roosevelt to harness the tides of Passamaquoddy and Cobscook Bays in Maine and New Brunswick and would develop the resources of the Upper St. John River to the advantage of Maine, New England, and the Maritime Provinces of Canada.

The advantages of this project to the northeastern part of our country are manifold. The reduction of power costs, the jobs, income, and opportunity made available by the construction of the project itself, and the industry and tourists attracted would be a boon to a section of this Nation which is in need of economic assistance.

However, this is not merely a local project. President Johnson has indicated in his state of the Union message that there exists throughout the Nation the problem of revamping our crowded urban centers. This power project with its incidental benefits could go a long way toward decentralizing the population and thereby diminishing the congestion in our large cities.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, this project fits into the national power scheme. As President Kennedy said, when he endorsed the project on July 16, 1963:

> Any proposed natural resource development must, of course, meet the national interest test. It must strengthen the economy of the whole Nation and enable America to better compete in the marketplaces of the world. The Passamaquoddy-St. John project now meets the national interest test. Each day, over a million kilowatts of power surge in and out of the Passamaquoddy Bay. Man needs only to exercise his engineering ingenuity to convert the ocean's surge into a national asset.

COMPENSATION OF CIVILIAN FIREFIGHTERS EMPLOYED BY THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I sponsored H.R. 2235, to correct a serious inequity that has developed involving the compensation of civilian firefighters employed by the Federal Government. These firefighters are required to remain at their stations during longer than ordinary periods of duty, and a substantial part of the periods of duty consists of remaining on a standby status.

Section 208(a) of Public Law 763, 83d Congress, authorizes the head of a department to pay certain of these employees on an annual premium basis. The amount of the premium cannot exceed 25 percent of the basic pay and is in lieu of all other types of premium compensation such as overtime, night differential, and holiday pay.

When section 208(a) was enacted, some firefighters were receiving more pay than they would under the new annual premium rate and, therefore, section 208(b) was added to protect these employees. This section saved this higher rate of pay until the employee left his position or until the annual premium rate exceeded the saved pay through within-grade pay increases.

For the purposes of conversion from the saved-pay rate to the premium rate, a formula was adopted to compute saved pay. This formula included 48 hours night differential and 16 hours overtime for each of the 26 pay periods and holiday premium pay for 6 holidays. If the figure which resulted from computation under this formula was greater than the premium pay rate, the employee remained on saved pay. However, the resultant figure has been used for conversion purposes only and often is fictitious. The employee's actual pay often is less than the computed figure as he is paid only for overtime, night, and holiday duty actually performed. Therefore, even though his actual pay is less than the "computed" saved-pay figure and also less than the premium rate, he is required to remain on saved pay as long as the "computed" figure is higher than the premium rate.

Still other circumstances operate to depress the actual pay of a firefighter on saved pay. The Comptroller General's decision B-121783 of November 1954—unpublished—ruled that periodic step and longevity increases could not operate to increase saved pay but that such increases should be processed. This resulted in saved pay firefighters having two rates of basic compensation: One is the basic rate in effect on November 6, 1954, called the frozen-base rate; the other is the basic rate of the employee's current grade and step within the grade, called the current-base rate. Deductions for retirement, insurance, and other benefits are calculated on the current-base rate and not on the frozen-base rate. As a result of periodic step increases—which he does not receive while on saved pay but which are processed—the amounts deducted from the employee's pay for retirement, et cetera, tend to increase with a consequent decrease in his actual take-home pay.

In an attempt to correct these inequities, the Navy by regulation in January 1958 permitted firefighters being paid at the saved-pay rate to convert voluntarily to the premium rate whether or not the "computed" saved pay was higher than the premium rate. The Navy felt that the purpose of section 208(b) was to protect the firefighter or to save him compensation under the section only so long as it was to his advantage. This intention seems implicit in the mere fact of enactment of the saved-pay provisions in section 208(b).

However, the Comptroller General subsequently ruled on September 28, 1959, that a firefighter could not convert to the premium rate if his computed saved pay was more than the premium rate even though his actual pay was below the premium rate. The Comptroller General further stated that he would not question "at this time" elections to convert to premium pay made prior to his decision provided no further elections were permitted and the Department of the Navy requested Congress to amend section 208(b) to authorize such elections.

H.R. 2235 will supply this needed remedy by authorizing voluntary elections by firefighters to convert from saved pay to premium pay regardless of which is higher and by sanctioning those elections heretofore made. In addition, it will hasten the conversion of all firefighter employees to the annual premium rate at the earliest possible time without reducing their pay, which was the original purpose of Public Law 763, 83d Congress.

Mr. Speaker, our Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and the House of Representatives have favorably considered similar bills during the 87th and 88th Congresses, but the Senate has yet to act on this legislation. I believe we are permitting a serious inequity to continue unnecessarily in the case of these firefighters, and I intend to do everything I can during the 89th Congress to assure that these employees are relieved of this inequity.

STABILITY FOR DOMESTIC COPPER MARKET

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced a bill for the purpose of providing more stability in the present world and domestic copper market. The bill proposes that the Office of Emergency Planning be given the opportunity to loan from the national stockpile 100,000 short tons of copper to the primary producers to cover a period no longer than 1 year. In the event of an emergency, these loans could be recalled within a 30- to 60-day period. The Director of the Office of Emergency Planning would be given the responsibility for setting the necessary rules and regulations.

Currently there is a shortage of copper in the domestic market. It is estimated that it would take from 6 months to 1 year for distributors to meet current demands.

Current price of copper is 30 to 34 cents a pound. On the other hand, substantial quantities of refined scrap copper have been sold at prices as high as 65 cents per pound. If this situation is allowed to go unchecked, it will also affect other areas of our economy. Plastics and synthetics could be introduced into the market of current copper areas taking advantage of a temporary shortage of copper, and creating catastrophe in other economic areas.

Relief cannot be given administratively so it is hoped that the Congress will act on this legislation to avert further danger to the market. Favorable action on this proposal would stabilize the economy and allow the necessary time for the copper industry to make up the lag that now exists.

GOVERNOR OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON, DANIEL J. EVANS

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, at noon today in Olympia, Wash., a young man aged 39 will be inaugurated as Governor of the great State of Washington. His name is Daniel J. Evans.

Governor Evans has spent most of his young life in public service, having served in two wars plus 8 years in the Washington State Legislature in 4 of which he served as Republican house leader.

In taking the reins of the executive branch of the State of Washington he is continuing his dedication to public service. As he takes over his duties and responsibilities I am sure my colleagues wish to join in sending a message of congratulations and best wishes to the new Governor of the State of Washington, Daniel J. Evans.

AMENDMENT OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code so as to provide additional deductions and exemptions for the expenses of medical care of persons 65 years of age and over.

While there are many proposals under consideration dealing with medical care for the aged, I believe this measure is worthy of enactment regardless of the outcome of other measures that involve direct assistance. The bill I have introduced involves no direct assistance. Rather it liberalizes the Internal Revenue Code to permit medical costs which persons over 65 incur, whether paid for by themselves, or someone else, to be a legitimate deduction for income tax purposes.

Specifically it would accomplish these objectives:

First. It would permit the Internal Revenue Code to permit the taxpayer to deduct, in full the amounts paid for medical and hospital care of any person who has attained the age of 65, irrespective of whether that person receives the majority of his support from the taxpayer as presently required. There is no reasonable basis for restricting the taxpayer to a smaller deduction merely because the dependent is not a parent. The financial hardship to the taxpayer is the same regardless of the degree of family relationship, and a brother or sister or even a friend who undertakes to help someone in need should not be penalized for doing so.

Second. Another provision in my bill would permit a taxpayer who has not attained the age of 65 to deduct in full the cost of prepaid medical care insurance which is to be effective when he reaches this age. I believe such a provision would encourage the insurance industry to further develop this type of insurance coverage. Certainly people ought not to be penalized for providing on a voluntary basis, for medical expenses which may occur in their retirement years.

Third. My bill would provide for additional exemptions for catastrophic medical care expenditures. A taxpayer, aged 65, who pays medical care expenses which amount to 25 percent or more of his adjusted gross income would be given one additional exemption and a taxpayer who pays such expenses in an amount equal to 50 percent or more would be given two additional exemptions.

Fourth. A final feature of the bill would permit medical care deductions to be carried back for as many as 5 years, or if necessary carried forward for the same period, so that the taxpayer over 65 can receive full tax benefit for such expenses by charging them against years when income was earned, and on which taxes were or are to be paid. This carryback and carryover principle already is part of the system by which corporations are subject to income tax, and it should be made available to our senior citizens so they can take equal advantage.

One reason why we now have the problem of how to deal with medical costs of persons who have reached retirement age, is that our tax structure has penalized those who have tried to secure their own future as well as others who would like to lend assistance.

I would like to see us take this first step and remove some of the tax inequities which exist. On one hand the Federal Government penalizes, through the tax system, those who try to secure their future, while on the other hand it proposes to install a new tax program under social security to meet the problem it has helped to create.

VETERANS' AFFAIRS FACILITIES

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to inform the House that there will be issued a news release this afternoon announcing the closing of 11 VA hospitals, 4 domiciliaries, and 17 regional offices. I want also to inform the House that there are documents furnished by the Veterans' Administration in the Veterans' Affairs Committee room, 356, so any Member requesting information on these closings may get that information in the committee room.

LAWS DEALING WITH IMMIGRATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 52)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

A change is needed in our laws dealing with immigration. Four Presidents have called attention to serious defects in this legislation. Action is long overdue.

I am therefore submitting, at the outset of this Congress, a bill designed to correct the deficiencies. I urge that it be accorded priority consideration.

The principal reform called for is the elimination of the national origins quota system. That system is incompatible with our basic American tradition.

Over the years the ancestors of all of us—some 42 million human beings—have migrated to these shores. The fundamental, longtime American attitude has been to ask not where a person comes from but what are his personal qualities. On this basis men and women migrated from every quarter of the globe. By their hard work and their enormously varied talents they hewed a great nation out of a wilderness. By their dedication to liberty and equality, they created a society reflecting man's most cherished ideals.

Long ago the poet Walt Whitman spoke our pride: "These States are the amplest poem." We are not merely a nation but a "nation of nations."

Violation of this tradition by the national origins quota system does incalculable harm. The procedures imply that men and women from some countries are, just because of where they come from, more desirable citizens than others. We have no right to disparage the ancestors of millions of our fellow Americans in this way. Relationships with a number of countries, and hence the success of our foreign policy, is needlessly impeded by this proposition.

The quota system has other grave defects. Too often it arbitrarily denies us immigrants who have outstanding and sorely needed talents and skills. I do not believe this is either good government or good sense.

Thousands of our citizens are needlessly separated from their parents or other close relatives.

To replace the quota system, the proposed bill relies on a technique of preferential admissions based upon the advantage to our Nation of the skills of the immigrant, and the existence of a close family relationship between the immigrant and people who are already citizens or permanent residents of the United States. Within this system of preferences, and within the numerical and other limitations prescribed by law, the issuance of visas to prospective immigrants would be based on the order of their application.

First preference under the bill would be given to those with the kind of skills or attainments which make the admission especially advantageous to our society. Other preferences would favor close relatives of citizens and permanent residents, and thus serve to promote the reuniting of families—long a primary goal of American immigration policy. Parents of U.S. citizens could obtain admission without waiting for a quota number.

Transition to the new system would be gradual, over a 5-year period. Thus the possibility of abrupt changes in the pattern of immigration from any nation is eliminated. In addition, the bill would provide that as a general rule no country could be allocated more than 10 percent of the quota numbers available in any one year.

In order to insure that the new system would not impose undue hardship on any of our close allies by suddenly curtailing their emigration, the bill authorizes the President, after consultation with an Immigration Board established by the legislation, to utilize up to 30 percent of the quota numbers available in any year for the purpose of restoring cuts made by the new system in the quotas established by existing law.

Similar authority, permitting the reservation of up to 10 percent of the numbers available in any year, would enable us to meet the needs of refugees fleeing from catastrophe or oppression.

In addition, the bill would—

(1) Permit numbers not used by any country to be made available to countries where they are needed;

(2) Eliminate the discriminatory "Asia-Pacific Triangle" provisions of the existing law;

(3) Eliminate discrimination against newly independent countries of the Western Hemisphere by providing nonquota status for natives of Jamaica, Trinidad, and Tobago;

(4) Afford nonquota status to parents of citizens, and fourth preference to parents of resident aliens;

(5) Eliminate the requirement that skilled first preference immigrants needed in our economy must actually find an employer here before they can come to the United States;

(6) Afford a preference to workers with lesser skills who can fill specific needs in short supply;

(7) Eliminate technical restrictions that have hampered the effective use of the existing fair-share refugee law; and

(8) Authorize the Secretary of State to require reregistration of quota immigrant visa applicants and to regulate the time of payment of visa fees.

This bill would not alter in any way the many limitations in existing law which prevent an influx of undesirables and safeguard our people against excessive or unregulated immigration. Nothing in the legislation relieves any immigrant of the necessity of satisfying all of the security requirements we now have, or the requirements designed to exclude persons likely to become public charges. No immigrants admitted under this bill could contribute to unemployment in the United States.

The total number of immigrants would not be substantially changed. Under this bill, authorized quota immigration, which now amounts to 158,361 per year, would be increased by less than 7,000.

I urge the Congress to return the United States to an immigration policy which both serves the national interest and continues our traditional ideals. No move could more effectively reaffirm our fundamental belief that a man is to be judged—and judged exclusively—on his worth as a human being.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 13, 1965*.

PROPOSED RESERVE REDUCTIONS HAVE NOT BEEN THOUGHT THROUGH

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include certain supporting material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, this is my first public comment on the matter of cutbacks of the Reserve program. Frankly, I have not known enough about it to comment. I was not one of the very few entrusted with advance information by the Department of Defense, although I have some responsibilities in Congress in this field. The statements that I have seen from DOD are vague, and in fact, I am convinced that DOD does not know how its own directive is going to be put into effect. I think this is a computer product. The DOD owns nearly a billion dollars worth of computers and all sort of strange ideas are being developed from them. Some of these look good on paper but they may be impractical in application. As of yesterday, DOD could not tell me the details of the manner in which they expect to carry out the directive on the Reserves which was announced as an accomplished fact some weeks ago.

I am convinced this matter has not been thought through. The proposal for the Reserve cutback should not have been announced without full consultation with Congress and it should not be implemented until such time as Congress is furnished with detailed information on the proposal and is afforded an opportunity to make a thorough study and review and has acted on the matter.

I echo the words of Senator STENNIS, who holds a prominent place in the defense committees of the Senate, who said:

> Any effort to change or alter the provisions of the Reserve program without concurrence of the Congress would constitute a departure from the intent and instruction of the legislative branch of Government by the Constitution and should be done only after full hearings and with the consent and concurrence of the Congress.

Certainly the action of the Defense Department preempted the constitutional rights of Congress and violates the spirit of amity between the administrative and legislative branches of Government by not seeking a cooperative solution to the problem with Congress.

One of the really disturbing things about this proposal is that it is legislation by appropriation. There is a very strong feeling on Capitol Hill against bypassing legislative committees. The proposal of Secretary McNamara will bypass the legislative committee and present the dismemberment of the Reserves to Congress for approval by a simple reduction in appropriations.

Now let us get down to cases. Under the Kennedy administration we achieved a badly needed buildup of conventional forces and added to our nuclear capabilities. As a result we have had for the past 2 or 3 years the best balanced and the strongest force in America's peacetime history. Now we are starting to whittle away at that strength. The cutback in the Reserves is not going to cripple our defense but it is a step in the wrong direction. It leaves a weakness and the Reds are going to exploit any military weakness that they see in our posture. They have been doing it for 20 years.

The proposed saving of $150 million annually is one of the chief attractions of the plan. This is in my opinion largely a fallacy. This is the saving which is expected to result after the reduction is completely accomplished. Personnel funds for the coming year have, I am told, been reduced by an arbitrary $150 million in the forthcoming budget. This means nothing. If Congress fails to provide enough money for pay, food, travel, and allowances, it is obvious DOD will submit a supplementary request. Personnel must be paid, fed, clothed, transported, and housed.

It is significant that although reduction of 2,600 personnel is claimed, it is also admitted that the increase in the National Guard headquarters staff to handle added responsibilities will be from 4,000 to 8,500. I am told there is to be an additional $138 million for equipment. Congress has sought for years to have additional modern equipment for both the Guard and Reserves. These two items automatically eliminate this year's proposed saving of $150 million. The same could be true year after year. Equipment is not a one-time purchase item. It has to be replaced and modernized. Nor is there a prospect of reductions of the increased National Guard staff.

The claim has been made that early deployment capability and combat readiness will be improved. This can be accomplished only by intensification of training and improved unit structures. This certainly will not be achieved by placing qualified reservists in standby status. It is ridiculous to state that there will be a place for all of them in the National Guard. This simply is not true. Many of them are not in areas where National Guard units are available. Others simply do not fit into the Guard spaces that are open. Reserve units reach into the small towns and communities which cannot qualify for Guard units. They provide skills in individual capabilities which cannot be utilized in the Guard. Their skills will rust out in standby status.

Trying to build an effective Reserve organization from inactive standby reservists is like building a football team by correspondence. You can read about passing, punting, end runs, off-tackle plays, blocking, and so forth, until you have spots before your eyes. But you do not learn football until you have a playing field and players. Reservists can be effective only if they have proper instruction and units with which to train.

This step is a blow at civilian control. It strengthens the Pentagon professionals, some of whom have always fought the Reserves. They are glad to have the Reserves for cannon fodder during war but they do not want to accept them as equals in peacetime. This action assumes there will be no future need for filler and support units which are not provided by the Guard. It places reliance more specifically on the professional Army, which is the longtime dream of the Pentagon planners, but which history has shown is not practical for the United States. If it were desirable it is too costly.

For years the Nation has been told of steady improvement in the status and effectiveness of the Reserve components. There is not a word of testimony in Pentagon statements to the Congress that indicates other than satisfaction with the capabilities and progress of training of Reserve personnel. Now the ax has fallen and the inference is left that the Reserve program is largely a failure and that expenditures for the Reserves have been wasteful, inefficient, and possibly useless. This just is not borne out by the facts. Members of the Reserves have to meet the same qualification tests that members of the Regular forces meet. Reservists have been a major standby in every modern war, even in emergencies which did not lead to war. In World War II 98 percent of our forces were reservists or civilian soldiers. The Berlin emergency of 1961 and the Cuban crisis of 1962 required a callup of Reserves. In the latter instance, the work of the Air Force reservists was simply outstanding and was so categorized at the highest levels in the Pentagon.

For years DOD has sought a reduction in the Reserve components. Congress, which knows the value of the Reserves and knows it is the least costly kind of defense, has refused to accept the reduction. This is DOD's method of circumventing Congress.

The claim has been made that the Pentagon action brings the Reserve structure in line with contingency war plans. The fact is, our mobilization base should be structured to counter enemy capabilities in detail, not what economy minded comptrollers may conceive the enemy intends to do. It is wishful thinking to assume we can outguess the Russians or the Chinese Communists. They will always take advantage of the weaknesses which are revealed in our training programs. This action will leave an opening as big as a barn door by curtailing filler and support units and individual skills needed to strengthen the Regular forces and provide personnel for training.

A national play has been made in the press on the effect of this order on congressional reservists. I do not consider that emphasis to be proper. What will happen to the Reserves and to the national defense is much more significant and much more important.

However, the directive to eliminate key public officials from the Reserve program is saying in effect that if you succeed in Government you cannot get into the Reserve program. I consider it a bad thing for the Nation if Congressmen are called upon to vote on defense problems and to establish policy when they themselves are exempt from service in uniform. In my opinion, the activities of key congressional and Government reservists has acted as a leavening influence by strengthening civilian control of the Military Establishment.

It should be pointed out that reservists generally are patriotic citizens who have given their service unselfishly because of that patriotism and their desire to aid in the Nation's defense. They get very little in return other than satisfaction in a job well done. Arbitrarily taking top Government officials, and in some instances industrial leaders, out of the Reserve program will unnecessarily deny the Defense Establishment of their know-how and their experience. It is undeniable that the presence of this group has helped to stimulate the interest of other reservists and helped to encourage their patriotic participation in and support of defense programs.

Here is another point: For years the Army has depended very largely upon ROTC graduates for young officers. After completing their military obligation, many have come into the Reserve and National Guard units. The outlook now is that there will be no place for many of them in the Reserve structure; that they will not be able to maintain their proficiency in standby assignments and that their ROTC training would largely be wasted effort. It is my information that there has been a sharp drop in interest in ROTC since the Reserve cutback was announced. Young men simply feel there is no place for them and no reason to continue their interest in ROTC. They feel, too, that to embark on a Reserve career from which they would have to be dropped if they achieved prominence in public life or success in some key civilian positions would be futile.

Now, let us summarize for a moment. The proposed cutback of the Reserves has not been thought through. It was prepared in secret and based upon computer studies, not upon military requirements. It will cost the Nation 150,000 trained reservists. The savings are doubtful. The loss of know-how and experience can be serious to the Defense Establishment. The action preempts the functions of Congress and proposes legislation by appropriation without detailed consideration by the properly constituted legislative committees.

No one questions that there can be improvements in the Reserves, just as there can be improvements in the National Guard and in the Regular Forces. In fact, Congress has sought for years to strengthen and improve both the Guard and the Reserves without full support from the Pentagon. Regardless of the weaknesses, the treatment which is prescribed is worse than the cure. This is like amputating a foot to remove a thorn. The Reserve components represent a prudent and wise investment by the American taxpayers, with hundreds of thousands of officers and men organized in a modern system, carefully worked out under laws enacted on the basis of long experience.

I have discussed only the Army Reserves. What I have said may soon apply equally to the Air Force Reserves, Navy Reserves, and even the National Guard. The day of total dismemberment of the Reserve components may be approaching. It is well to be alerted to this possibility.

Mr. Speaker, I wish now to submit a point by point discussion of some of the claims made in support of the Reserve cutback.

First claim: The early deployment capability and combat readiness of the Reserve Forces will be significantly improved.

The facts: Improved early deployment capability and improved combat readiness can only be obtained by an intensification of training and an improved unit structure of competent, well qualified, experienced officers and noncommissioned officers to bring them closer to the readiness level of the active duty divisions. Nothing in the plan will bring them closer to this level.

The National Guard divisions can contribute no more than Reserve divisions toward this objective.

Second claim: The plan brings the Reserve structure in line with the contingency war plans and the related equipment program.

The facts: The expression "our contingency war plans" connotes secret, exhaustive studies of a probable enemy's capabilities, his intentions, his probable courses of action and our plans to counter them. As used in this case, it is a catchphrase to rationalize a reduction in force.

War plans contingent upon what? A partial mobilization of 100,000 men; 500,000 men; M-day requirements; M plus 3 months; M plus 6 months? This can be expanded and contracted like an accordion to rationalize any figure the Secretary may decide to use.

The fact is that our mobilization base should be structured to counter enemy capabilities; not what economy-minded comptrollers may conceive the enemy's intentions to be. Neither the Joint Chiefs nor the Army military planners, responsible for Reserve mobilization, produced or conceived the proposed plan.

Third claim: The plan would produce increased readiness of the units in the Reserve and National Guard.

The facts: Obviously, this statement is without validity for it will destroy the units of the Army Reserve.

Fourth claim: The plan would streamline the management structure of the Army Reserve forces and would result in a cost savings of $150 million per year.

The facts: The plan actually destroys the well thought out corps command system, established with congressional approval in 1957, which gave direct military, management, and training control to the Army Chief of Staff through his corps commanders and places the management of the only Reserve force left to the Army under the National Guard bureau system which was established in 1933, and which operates through the Governors of the States.

The elimination of the corps system will save 2,500 management and staff personnel, but the "streamlining" of the management structure as proposed will increase full-time support personnel attached to State headquarters from 4,000 to 8,500 personnel.

Any savings realized will be from a reduction in force of trained personnel amounting to 150,000 paid drill reservists with a consequent shrinkage of the mobilization base. The merger action itself will increase, not reduce, costs.

Fifth claim: The program will involve the transfer of the unit structure of the Army Reserve into the National Guard.

The facts: Neither the Secretary of Defense nor the Secretary of the Army has the authority to transfer Army Reserve units into the National Guard.

The Secretary of the Army can only do this by the indirect method of disestablishing Army units and establishing additional National Guard units in localities where he wishes the transfer to take place, and hope that the personnel attached to the Army units will volunteer to enlist in the National Guard. He must also hope that the officers will be acceptable to the adjutant general of the State concerned.

The new plan could kill the "6-month program" into which much cost and effort has gone. The net result can be heavy losses of experienced noncommissioned officers and of the obligated enlisted personnel followed by an extensive and costly National Guard recruiting campaign to replace these losses. In that case the replacements would be less well trained.

Sixth claim: The U.S. Army Reserve will consist entirely of individuals, rather than units and would provide individual trainees for the units at summer camps or upon mobilization.

The facts: This means that the Army Reserve will no longer be a reserve as such but will be a list of names subject to mobilization. Many ROTC officers, ex-Regular officers who accept Reserve commissions, Reserve officers with extensive active duty experience, experienced enlisted men and noncommissioned officers with 2 or more years of active duty—the cream of the Army Reserve—will have no place to go or train.

With the abolition of the corps system and without a centralized electronic data processing system, the clock would be turned back 30 years. We would be reverting to a system similar to that of pre-World War II, which has proven ineffective.

Seventh claim: Under the plan, the paid drill strength will be 550,000 well-equipped, well-trained officers and men; all in the National Guard.

The facts: The statement is true only to the extent that the paid drill strength of the Reserve force available to the Army will be reduced to 550,000 from the strength of 700,000 found necessary to the national defense in the past by the Defense Department, the Department of the Army, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the Congress to meet the Army's initial mobilization requirements.

The plan projects full equipment for the consolidated force. It costs $126 million to equip a standard infantry division. The cost of equipping two additional divisions and five additional brigades would be $585 million. The President's budget for 1966 is said to include only $138 million for Reserve equipment.

Then finally, Mr. Speaker, I submit a letter from the able pen of Col. John T. Carlton, as published in the Washington Post of January 12, 1965:

Reserve Viewpoint

Your editorial of January 3 fails to meet the issue properly raised by the critics of the proposal of the Secretary of Defense to merge the Army Reserve with the Army National Guard. This plan is an unwarranted weakening of our military strength by a decision without appropriate advice from those given this assignment.

Somehow you have fallen into the error of many of those who have sought to attack the Reserves by viewing service in the military as some sort of boondoggle which is sought to be preserved for the benefit of those participating. Military service by citizens of this Nation is arduous, often unpleasant, and sometimes fatal. It is endured by law, for the most part, as a public duty which must be done.

Your reference to "advantages and benefits" reflects to us an unfamiliarity with the requirements of military service. Congress voted certain incentives by law not to benefit individual participants, but to benefit the Nation by inducing men, in a continuing stream, to serve in the Reserves to meet the requirements of the cold war.

Your charge that someone is making a case for flabbiness is emotional nonsense.

In the early post-World War II days and in every session of Congress since this association has continually urged the high standards of fitness and qualification for Reserves on an equal basis with the requirements for the Regular service. The Reserve Officer Personnel Act, enacted in 1955 and improved by the omnibus amendments in 1960 on the basis of a 5-year experience, made certain the vigor and readiness was achieved and maintained.

Surely you must realize, as should every thinking American, that Mr. McNamara's criticism of the Reserve divisions for being understrength and underequipped is an invalid and unfair criticism. The current administration in the Pentagon has had 4 years complete authority over the entire military structure; their present state must be entirely the fault of the Pentagon which has restricted recruiting authority, withheld funds, and denied them equipment. Yet, it apparently is going to take another congressional investigation to make this clear, just as it did only 2 years ago when an official investigation was required to overturn stones in order to place responsibility for maladministration of the Reserves.

The present Reserve system provides for continuous training, which means regular improvement in knowledge, skills, and techniques as is provided for our Active forces.

One of Secretary McNamara's first acts was to abolish the offices of Assistant Secretary for Reserves in the various military services, thus depriving this great element of our national security force of any champion on the secretariat level who both understand and could speak for their cause—which is the cause of the United States.

We are now paying the price for that omission in the failures both in the Pentagon and out of the Pentagon to fairly evaluate and report what always has been the major strength of our Nation—the citizen-soldier force which is found in every walk of life, in every community, and in every age group of America. An objective and impartial investigation, of the type for which Congressman HÉBERT is far famed, must develop whether what faults there are can be corrected by turning over the Reserve forces to the National Guard Bureau (in its semi-independence from Federal authority) and the Governors of the States who have no responsibility for natural security, and cannot be held responsible therefor.

JOHN T. CARLTON,
Colonel, U.S. Army Reserve, Executive Director, Reserve Officers Association.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

ANNUAL MEETING OF THE AMERICAN INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION

Mr. POAGE. I would like to make an announcement.

Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the bylaws of the Interparliamentary Union, the annual meeting of the American Interparliamentary Group will be held on January 18, at 9:30 a.m. in room S–126, the Senate Committee on Appropriations hearing room, in the Senate wing of the Capitol Building. The agenda will include a report from the retiring President, the report of the Executive Secretary, the election of group officers, and plans for the 1965 conference. All Members of Congress are members of the U.S. group of the Interparliamentary Union. All Members are invited to attend.

IN SUPPORT OF BILL TO REPEAL RETAILERS EXCISE TAXES

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am again introducing a bill to repeal the excise taxes on toilet preparations, jewelry and related items, ladies' handbags, luggage and the like, and furs and fur-trimmed coats. My bill would repeal these taxes effective immediately upon enactment. When I offered a proposal to phase out the retailers excise taxes in the 88th Congress, it was rejected by a party-line vote of 207 to 185 with all Republicans save one supporting repeal. Now that the Johnson administration apparently agrees that the retailers excise taxes should be repealed, I see no reason for delaying congressional action.

I think that we will inflict irreparable damage to many small retailers and manufacturers if we delay the repeal of the retailers excise taxes, while we consider recommendations of the Johnson administration with respect to other excises. In the case of articles taxed at consumer level, there will be a tendency to defer purchases pending repeal of the tax. This could wreck, at least temporarily, the businesses of many small businessmen. In order to minimize as much as possible this adverse effect, repeal of the taxes should be accelerated. For this reason, I propose that we consider these taxes separately and, since everyone agrees that the taxes should be repealed, we take such action immediately.

I have long held the view, shared by the Republicans on the committee, that the retailers excise taxes are a "nuisance," and should have been repealed, irrespective of any action with respect to other taxes. In fact, it was the Republican majority in the 83d Congress who reduced these same taxes from the 1943 rate of 20 percent to the existing rate of 10 percent.

These retailers excise taxes were adopted in 1941, in part, as an emergency tax measure during World War II. Aside from revenue considerations, the rate was increased from 10 percent to 20 percent in 1943 in order to discourage the manufacturer from producing these items and to discourage the consumer from buying them. In 1954, the 1941 rate was reinstated at 10 percent where it has remained for the past 10 years.

These retailers excise taxes are directed particularly against women. Since there are no other comparable Federal sales taxes, the taxes also discriminate against the items being taxed at the retail level. Furthermore, the taxes constitute an invasion by the Federal Government in the field of consumer sales taxes, which has traditionally been reserved to the State and local governments. Finally, and most important, these retailers excise taxes constitute a very serious administrative burden and are extremely onerous to hundreds of thousands of small retail merchants. For these reasons, I believe that repeal of these taxes is long overdue.

NEED FOR IMMEDIATE TIGHTENING OF SECURITY MEASURES

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MINSHALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, invasion of the House floor on opening day of this Congress by a man costumed as a minstrel points up the need for immediate tightening of security measures at entrances to both the floor and gallery of this Chamber.

Despite a cordon of uniformed Metropolitan Police and plainclothesmen, supplementing Capitol Police and doormen, the night of that same day an unauthorized person was escorted from the floor only moments before the President of the United States delivered his state of the Union message. This individual was recognized and pointed out by one of our colleagues, who identified him as a known "crackpot." How he gained access to the floor is a mystery.

Every veteran Member of the House knows the ease with which strangers can wander onto the floor almost at will. Every Member can look up and see the bullet scars in the ceiling of this Chamber, grim reminders of the Puerto Rican nationalist attack on March 1, 1954, from the gallery.

Let me emphasize that we do not want a security barrier to separate American citizens from their national legislators. We do not want Capitol Hill turned into a garrison. But in the name of commonsense we should observe ordinary precautions which will protect both Members on the floor and spectators in the gallery from the dangers inherent in random excursions into the Chamber by strangers.

My words of concern are not to be construed as a lack of appreciation for the tireless efforts of our good friends Zeake Johnson, "Fish Bait" Miller, or Carl Schamp. They are doing the best possible job with the men and the guidelines provided them by the House. All of them express constant anxiety over the security situation.

The facts are that if a tragedy should occur in this Chamber it would be the fault of the Members, not theirs. At the present time, for example, the House Police Board includes the Sergeant at Arms, the Doorkeeper, and the Architect of the Capitol. It also should include ranking Members of both sides of the aisle.

The House has not insisted that its police force meet minimum qualifications nor undergo minimum training for police duty. Whether or not the police should be removed from patronage is debatable; what is not debatable is that Capitol Hill's uniformed men should not be appointed unless they meet minimum police standards, and unless they are fully prepared through adequate professional training for police work. Physical qualifications should be required for the position of doorman as well.

Adequate security should be provided every day that the House is in session. It will be recalled that it was a relatively quiet Monday, a District day, when the Puerto Ricans opened fire on the floor.

There are countless facets to the security problem, sufficient to call for introduction of a resolution creating a special committee to investigate security measures and to report its recommendations to the House within a period of 30 days.

I am introducing such a resolution today, with the suggestion that the committee be composed of three Democratic and two Republican Members of the House to be named by the leadership.

At the same time, I wish to include the text of an editorial from the January 9 Cleveland Plain Dealer expressing alarm over the security situation:

MORE SECURITY FOR CONGRESSMEN

In a nation alerted to the need for security safeguards for public officials by the assassination of President Kennedy, the incident on the House floor in Washington, Monday, in which a member of the American Nazi party created a scene comes as a shock.

The intruder, wearing blackface makeup, black tights and a stovepipe hat, ran out on the floor shortly after Congress convened. The fact that he was promptly seized by police does not lessen the seriousness of the breaching of security protection for the Members of the House.

Adding to the gravity of the affair is that the Chamber was the scene a few hours later of President Johnson's state of the Union address. Since this individual was able to penetrate into the Chamber, wearing garish attire that should have made him so conspicuous that he should have been prevented from entering the Capitol, it brings a question as to how extensive was security preparation in advance of the President's appearance.

Had the intruder been armed or carrying explosives, a terrible toll might have been taken among the Congressmen and authorized spectators.

The incident should result in prompt tightening of security measures in both Houses of Congress. The Capitol police force is composed of political appointees, many of them lacking in police training or experience. Admission to the spectators' galleries of the House and the Senate is too easily obtained. Stricter regulation is necessary.

The incident Monday could have resembled that of March 1, 1954, when four Puerto Rican nationalists in the House Gallery shot down five Congressmen. Following that attack, precautions were tightened, but in the intervening years have grown lax, as demonstrated Monday.

The Nation has entrusted its affairs to the Members of Congress. Their safety while serving the Nation should be assured.

TO MEET THE SOVIET ECONOMIC CHALLENGE

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the battles of the cold war are fought on many fronts, in space technology, the minds of men and the complexities of international trade and economics. These are difficult battles in which the advantage goes not to brute strength but to ideas. One of the most important of these cold war battles is fought in the field of international commerce, and this was one of the bases for the enactment of the Trade Expansion Act in the 87th Congress. To win in the area of international economics, we and our free world allies must keep strong the trade links which bind us and those which harmonize the economics of the uncommitted nations with the economics of the Western alliance.

The use of international trade as a weapon in international relations is as old as commerce itself. It is a refined game, played for high stakes. We must master it if we are to be secure against the threat of the international Communist movement.

The United States and its allies have some important advantages in this contest. We are far stronger than our opponents economically. In this context, I should like to make note of the excellent work which has been done by the Joint Economic Committee in bringing the facts of the comparative economic strength of the United States and the Soviet Union to light. Through the efforts of this committee, and the generous cooperation of experts throughout the country, much valuable information in this field has been brought to a focus. And the inevitable conclusion to be drawn from this information is the superiority of the United States and the free world's economy over that of the Soviets.

This is not to dismiss the threat which the Soviet Union poses, however. The Soviet economy is strong—overwhelming unless matched by the economic force of the free world leaders. And, as a controlled economy, it can be used in ways which are not open to the economic or political leaders of our free economy. The Soviet economy is subject to manipulation for the ends of the political state. There need be no economic justification for these acts; their political impact is the profit they seek. Thus the Soviet economy can be used effectively in spot situations, concentrating its strength in predetermined areas, even against the stronger and sounder Western economies.

The examples of such use are legion. Basically they come down to a pattern not unlike that of the classical monopoly. The monopolist, or the Soviet international trader, chooses a market within which to operate and by cutrate, cutthroat tactics drives all competition from the market. Then each seeks his own profits: The monopolist by forcing prices up where there is no longer any competition to keep them down and the Communist by infiltrating the economic and political structure of the trade partner it has chosen and welding it irrevocably to the Communist bloc. Or the Communist goal may be merely to disrupt a mutually advantageous trade relationship between two countries outside of the Communist bloc. In either event the result is detrimental to the goals of the free world.

The immediate targets of the Soviets in such a spot economic invasion are the free world companies doing business in a particular place. It is only through driving them from the market that the Soviet goals can be achieved, and they cannot long stand against the concentrated strength of the Soviet economy, which is willing to weaken itself overall for the chance of a particular victory.

To effectively counteract this threat of Soviet economic pressure, I have today introduced a bill to establish a U.S. Trading Corporation. This bill would create a corporate body under the aegis of the U.S. Government which would provide assistance to private enterprises against whom the weight of Soviet economic might is asserted in particular market areas. It would help nullify the short-range competitive advantage of the Soviet controlled economy and place American businesses in a position to compete sucessfully with the tactics of the Soviets in this phase of cold war battling. The powers of the Corporation are made broad in the bill, for great flexibility will be necessary to counter the broad range of challenges in the complex field of international commerce. Basically, however, the Corporation will be a service unit for American business, not controlling or coercing it but standing ready to assist when the challenge of concentrated economic power is placed against our firms.

This will not end the competition with the Soviet Union in the world's marketplaces. There is no one easy way in which we can achieve victory. This is one step, however, which will help strengthen the position of the United States and the free world in meeting the Communist threat.

NATIONAL PASSPORT POLICY

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the American Government should, so far as possible, encourage our people to travel. Close and friendly relations with the other countries of the world and a deeper understanding of the world can be gained for this country by continuing and increasing the flow of American visitors traveling to all parts of the world. Such visitors are often called ambassadors of good will. This is not entirely correct, however, for while there may be certain parallels between the actions of our diplomats and our traveling American public, the people who venture to other countries on their own have a chance for the type of person-to-person contact which, by the nature of the official duties of the diplomat, are unmatched. Our visitors abroad have the chance to, and do, make the close personal contacts which, more than any treaty, can insure international friendship.

It should be the job, then, of our Government to facilitate in every way the flow of Americans to the other countries of the world where people are anxious to know more of us and to meet us. As a step in that direction, I have today introduced a bill to establish a national passport policy and to reorient the administrative functions of the Department of State in this area to the greater accomplishment of this policy. It calls for a recognition of the beneficial effects of travel upon our international relationships; it seeks a minimization of travel restrictions and impediments.

At the same time that it calls for an emphasis on travel and an elimination of the burdensome formalities that accompany international travel, this bill recognizes the clear and present danger which the international Communist conspiracy poses to this country and to the free world and it makes specific provision for limitations of the right to travel in cases in which this would work to the detriment of America or where such travel would be dangerous to the individual.

I believe that much can be done to encourage Americans to travel abroad and make the kind of contacts that help cement a free and harmonious world. This bill, to establish a national passport policy, and to establish an administrative mechanism to support this policy, would help us achieve the goals which are possible through friendly international travel.

TAX CLASSIFICATION OF DEBIT LIFE INSURANCE SALESMEN

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, under the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, those who are classified as "outside salesmen" are allowed to take as deductions from gross income, the ordinary and necessary expenses of their business activities. What this means, in effect, is that having this status, one may take this form of deduction to reach adjusted gross income and then may take either the standard 10-percent deduction or his itemized deductions to compute his taxable income.

At present, most life insurance salesmen are classified as outside salesmen. One group, however, the so-called debit life insurance salesmen, are not and, because of the similarity in the job and the means of doing it between debit salesmen and other life insurance salesmen, I have today introduced an amendment to section 62(2)(D) of the Internal Revenue

Code to equalize treatment of these two groups.

Both of these groups of insurance salesmen must hold the same license for their profession and both sell basically the same lines of insurance. The debit agent, however, sells industrial insurance in addition to the other lines of insurance. These sales involve work away from the employer's place of business and much out-of-pocket expense for the agent. Industrial life insurance is subject to cancellation at will by the insured and the premiums on it are small and fall due weekly or monthly. The agent must collect the premiums and each collection is, in essence, a new sale. These debit agents are salesmen primarily and not collectors and drawing a distinction between them and other insurance agents on the basis of a collateral collection function is unwarranted for purposes of the outside salesmen section of the Internal Revenue Code.

FULL RIGHTS OF CITIZENSHIP FOR AMERICAN DEPENDENCIES

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, on the opening day of the 89th Congress, I introduced H.R. 269, a bill to authorize that the Virgin Islands be incorporated in the State of Florida, provided that the incorporation is approved by free elections in the Virgin Islands and in Florida.

My reason for introducing this legislation is that I am apprehensive that pressure upon the United States in the United Nations and other sources may make it difficult for the United States to retain the territory as part of our country. The recent U.N. Committee of 24 Report, dealing with colonialism, was critical of our Nation's control over the Virgin Island territory. The anticolonialism ground swell should not and cannot be overlooked by our country; and the fact that since 1944 one-third of the world's population has become independent is evidence enough that the trend toward anticolonialism is a definite threat to our retaining our dependencies. This includes not only the Virgin Islands, but American Samoa and Guam as well.

I am very interested that the Virgin Islands and our other dependencies be retained by our Government, and it seems to me that the most logical and feasible future course for the United States to take with regard to the Virgin Islands would be to incorporate them in a state of the United States. Originally, I introduced a bill to allow the Virgin Islanders and the people of Florida to vote on the idea of incorporation in Florida. However, from both the mainland and islands sources there has been a demand for a broader choice. I have introduced a substitute measure today that would allow the Virgin Islanders to vote for a union with any State, and if they favor this, a choice as to what State they might want to be attached to.

In a recent meeting with Gov. Ralph Paiewonsky, of the Virgin Islands, a distinguished representative of the fine Americans living in the islands, he pointed out that another State besides Florida might be considered by some people in the Virgin Islands as better suited to incorporation with the Virgin Islands, and that is the reason for my substitute measure.

It has been brought to my attention that the Virgin Islands Constitutional Convention, now in session in St. Croix, V.I., has presented several suggestions for stronger ties to the mainland United States. However, these suggestions fall short of my proposal which would allow the islanders to vote not only for the President of the United States, but also Senators and Congressmen. My proposal would allow full rights of citizenship on an equal basis with the 180 million Americans living in the 50 States.

The anticolonialism threat imperils the basic interests of the United States in its control over its territories and possessions. A halfway approach to full rights of citizenship cannot be an answer, and the sooner we settle this fully the better it will be for everybody.

The fact of self-government and allowing citizens to vote for President and representatives in the Congress can be accomplished by my legislation. It would take a constitutional amendment to allow American citizens in a territory to vote even for the President.

Permanent attachment of the Virgin Islands, American Samoa and Guam, with full citizenship rights might also be accomplished by establishment of a separate state combining all of these dependencies, which might also include the District of Columbia.

It is in the national interest to provide full rights of citizenship to these people, and particularly to the Virgin Islanders. The defense and national security value of the territory and its strategic location in the Caribbean area are my principal concerns in the retention of the Virgin Islands as a concrete part of the United States. The United States bought the Virgin Islands in 1917 from Denmark for defense reasons. We cannot afford to throw that defense value away.

The incorporation would serve as a cultural bridge between North and South America for a greater exchange of ideas and interests, and the tourism industry of the Virgin Islands would be greatly enhanced with a closer tie to the mainland. I know of nothing that the islands now have which would be in any way endangered or diminished by such a union. The Virgin Islands with 35,000 people is about the size of the average Florida county, and it is much too small to be considered for statehood, and this is also true of other U.S. possessions, Guam, with 67,044 people, and American Samoa, with 20,051 people.

In our modern times with rapid transportation, distances such as are involved here are no longer a serious problem. If you look at the much greater distances from the outermost inhabited islands of Hawaii and Alaska compared with the 1,100 miles from Florida to the Virgin Islands you can see that this is nothing very exceptional.

The State Department and the Interior Department are both concerned over the future of our possessions, not only in the light of the anticolonialism threat, but also in the right of all citizens to have full citizenship. In a recent press conference, Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall called my idea "a very stimulating one—a provocative one," and said this is one of the ways to solve the problem that the people of the Virgin Islands face in terms of their ultimate political future and sovereignty.

To accomplish my suggestion I have asked the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs for early departmental reports and hearings.

We must begin some hard and constructive thinking in this field. I believe my legislation is the most practical and feasible way to grant full rights of citizenship to not only the people of the Virgin Islands, but to all of the people now citizens in all our possessions, territories, and districts.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point newspaper comments:

[From the Tampa (Fla.) Tribune, Jan. 5, 1965]

VIRGIN ISLANDS EYED AS FLORIDA'S 68TH COUNTY

WASHINGTON.—A bill to incorporate the Virgin Islands as Florida's 68th county was introduced yesterday by Representative CHARLES E. BENNETT, Democrat, of Florida.

He called for elections in the Virgin Islands and in Florida for the citizens to express their views.

BENNETT said he has written Ralph M. Paiewonsky, the Governor of the Virgin Islands, requesting that the Virgin Islands constitutional convention, now in session, study his proposal.

The islands were acquired by the United States from Denmark in 1917 because of their defense value and strategic location in the Caribbean.

BENNETT said in a statement that a recent United Nations report criticizing the status of the Virgin Islands as a territory of the United States might bring about pressures making it difficult for this country to retain its rights to the islands.

CITES DEFENSE VALUE

"Personally, I am delighted that the Virgin Islands are part of the United States, and I believe the islands have a potential defense value in the future which could be greatly accelerated by proper attention and development," BENNETT wrote Paiewonsky.

"We must not lose this territory not only because of the importance to national security," BENNETT said, "But because all of the 50 States, not only Florida, have a great deal to gain with the incorporation of the Virgin Islands in the State of Florida.

"The islands as a part of Florida would provide a tangible and specific link between the United States and South America, boosting the cultural connections of the Western Hemisphere, and the tourist industry, so vital to both the islands and to Florida, would be mutually enhanced."

WILL PUSH PLAN

The Virgin Islands constitutional convention is in the process of preparing recommendations to Congress for modifying the organic act of 1954 which set up the government of the islands.

"The basic source of Federal authority in matters of territorial-government is the Congress," BENNETT said, "and I plan to vigorously push the plan of incorporation of the Virgin Islands in the State of Florida. I am certain it would mean a great deal to our national security, the promotion of tourism, and the general cultural development between North and South America."

[From the Orlando (Fla.) Evening Star, Jan. 7, 1965]

FLORIDA MAY GET NEW COUNTY

Congressman CHARLES E. BENNETT of Jacksonville has suggested that if the Virgin Islands wish to be annexed to the United States they should be as Florida's 68th county rather than as the Nation's 51st State.

How far the proposal may get is problematical but BENNETT is serious about it. He has already introduced a bill into the new Congress and has written the Governor of the islands to ask his cooperation.

The Virgin Islands are now a territory of the United States but the Communist-fanned outcry against colonialism has resulted in a sharp United Nations criticism of the islands' present status.

The emerging concept that every little dot of territory should become an independent nation fits in perfectly with the Communists' plans to divide and conquer.

It is Congressman BENNETT's hope that the strategic Caribbean islands just east of Puerto Rico may be kept under U.S. control as a national defense measure.

Since the territory is not suitable either by size, economy, or political stability to become a full-fledged member of the United States. BENNETT feels the natural move would be to incorporate it into the nearest sovereign State, Florida.

He has publicly asked Florida citizens to express their feelings in this matter but gives no indication what reaction he may have received from State legislators or the new administration in Tallahassee.

Anyhow, it's an interesting concept. If the Nation can absorb a State thousands of miles out in the middle of the Pacific Ocean perhaps it is not so fantastic for a State to add a county which is a mere 1,500 miles from its nearest shore.

[From the Orlando (Fla.) Sentinel, Jan. 10, 1965]

ISLAND COUNTY

Congressman CHARLES BENNETT has introduced a bill in Congress to incorporate the Virgin Islands as Florida's 68th county, suggesting that people of Florida and the Virgin Islands both vote to express their views.

His reason is that a recent U.N. report criticizing the status of the islands may bring about pressures making it difficult for the United States to retain its rights there.

We don't imagine Floridians would have any objection to adopting a new county, since this would make us one of the most farflung of the States. But as for the islanders, we don't know. They'd have a long trip if they ever wanted to go to the State capital.

TEMPORARY RELEASE OF COPPER FROM NATIONAL STOCKPILE

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. ST GERMAIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, for the past several months our copper industry has been adversely affected by the short supply of copper. The supply has been steadily dwindling and many industries in my State are dependent upon this metal for the manufacture of their prime products.

The copper economy is most important to the economy of my State of Rhode Island—8,000 employees are affected by this shortage in my State alone—as well as to the country, and I strongly believe that the Federal Government has a responsibility to see that this situation is stabilized.

Today I am introducing a bill which I believe will be helpful in stabilizing the present situation. We do not have adequate supplies of copper, but there is available copper in the national stockpile and this could be made available to domestic users on a loan basis.

Incidentally, since noting the short supply of copper available to the industry of my State, there have been two major breakthroughs during the past 2 months which were extremely helpful. No. 1—some 30,000 tons of copper were released from the Defense Production Act inventory to the Bureau of the Mint. They assisted the private industries, to some extent, since the Mint did not have to draw on supplies already short and available to the industry. No. 2—the Defense Production Act inventory announced that the Federal Government would sell 20,000 tons of copper for domestic consumption.

These two announcements and actions have been of help in alleviating the situation. However, the copper situation, as I have pointed out, is very serious. Relief cannot be given adequately by any administrative means, and I sincerely hope that the Congress will act expeditiously on my bill which will grant the necessary authority to loan 100,000 short tons of copper to our primary producers. Of primary concern to me is to see that when such loans are authorized, they are made on an equitable basis to all copper users. Under this bill, the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning would have the responsibility for making the necessary rules and regulations. There should be a great deal of thought put into the method of distribution. It should be more than a mere distribution on the basis of the amount used per year by the various manufacturers. The regulations should recognize the fact that many companies in the manufacturing business are also copper producers. For this reason the formula should take the above into consideration so that the firms that are not producing copper will receive equitable amounts in order that their employees may not suffer from the lack of work due to the shortage of copper.

An equitable distribution, taking these factors into consideration, is as important as the release or loan of the copper itself.

As I have stated, I believe that in this instance the Federal Government has the responsibility to promote stability and to assist both the producers and users of copper. Favorable action on this legislation would stabilize the economy and tide over the industry during the necessary period and it would do away with the speculation and trading at exorbitant prices which has made the situation so untenable.

SUMMARY, LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM OF COMMUNICATIONS WORKERS OF AMERICA ADOPTED BY 26TH ANNUAL CONVENTION, JUNE 1964

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. DULSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the legislative program of the Communications Workers of America which was adopted by their annual convention:

SUMMARY, LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM OF COMMUNICATIONS WORKERS OF AMERICA ADOPTED BY 26TH ANNUAL CONVENTION, JUNE 1964

Congressional reforms: Called on the 89th Congress to make its first order of business the revamping of its antiquated rules and procedures in such fashion that will guarantee a smooth flow of legislation to the floor where the will of the majority might readily be expressed.

Labor-management relations: Urged Congress to enact legislation (1) amending the Taft-Hartley and Landrum-Griffin Acts to restore the principles of the Wagner Act; (2) repealing section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley so unions will be able to represent and protect workers from unwarranted restrictions imposed by a few conservative-minded State authorities; and (3) redefining, fairly and reasonably, the "free speech" provisions of Taft-Hartley.

Appalachia: Convention agreed that the continued poverty of the Appalachia region in a time of great national prosperity is intolerable. Urged the early enactment of legislation to provide the basic facilities needed to foster economic development in the region; strongly support the administration's inclusion of human resources program of the Appalachian Commission in the President's poverty program.

Hospital Insurance Act of 1964: Reaffirmed support of amending the Social Security Act to extend practical, and fair method of social security to provide payment of hospital and related bills for the elderly and thus to permit them to live out the years of their lives free from the haunting fear of disastrous medical bills.

Consumer protection: Supported struggle for enactment of truth-in-lending and packaging legislation and drug industry reforms, all of which will protect the health and earnings of our members and of consumers in general. Also called on Congress to defeat the deceptively named quality stabilization bill that is really nothing more than a discredited price-raising, price-fixing "fair trade" legislation.

Conservation: Endorsed programs for the conservation of our national resources.

Public works: Endorsed continuation of the accelerated public works program, and urged Congress to authorize an additional maximum amount of money to carry on the fight against unemployment, recognizing that the needed public facilities that would be provided, would benefit distressed areas in which one-third of the Nation's population lives and which accounts for one-half of the unemployment in this country.

Area redevelopment: Cognizant of the fact that ARA represents an investment in the future of America which will pay sound human and economic dividends to all of its people, the 1964 convention of the Communications Workers of America wholeheartedly supported the ARA program and urged immediate passage by the House of the Senate-approved $455 million appropriation bill.

Minimum wage extension: Urged Congress to enact legislation providing for the extension of the Fair Labor Standards Act coverage to include under its protection the millions of workers in industry engaged in interstate commerce who are now protected by the act, and establishing a $2 an hour minimum wage.

Double time for overtime: The Convention supported an amendment to the Fair Labor Standards Act to raise the present overtime provision from time and one-half to double time. Further, it opposes any provisions to make application of double time contingent on approval by special industry committees.

SUMMARY

Housing and urban renewal: Convention reaffirmed its support for a Cabinet-level Federal Department of Housing and Urban Renewal. Called for a minimum of 200,000 public housing units a year. Urged a stepped-up urban renewal program to create beautiful and livable communities within these United States and to provide employment for our growing labor force. Also, urges encouragement of middle-income housing within our cities. Supported goal of equal opportunity in housing for all Americans. Called for provisions in all Federal, State and local housing programs of the requirement that the prevailing wage must be paid to all employees engaged in such projects.

Education: Convention urged a comprehensive program of Federal aid to our public schools to eliminate classroom shortage and improve educational opportunity for all children. Called for assistance to higher education which will provide adequate facilities so that no qualified child will be denied admission to an institution of higher learning. We favor extension of free public education through the 14th year or 2 years of junior college. Also, Congress should immediately enact the Hartke bill as a step toward universal higher educational opportunity. Urge the creation of a new congressional commission on higher education to report to the Nation the costs of a universal GI-type bill designed to meet the financial needs of all qualified youths who seek higher education.

Unemployment compensation: Convention urged Congress to establish an adequate unemployment compensation system that would provide uniform minimum standards to be applicable to the entire country. It would include raising the weekly benefits, extend the period for which benefits are payable, extend the system to many now denied any and all protection, and improve the financial structure of the system by providing some measure of equalization of cost.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF RETIRED CIVIL EMPLOYEES

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. DULSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the legislative program of the National Association of Retired Civil Employees. It was my pleasure to discuss the program with their officers and it is my hope the Congress will give it careful consideration. The legislative program follows:

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM, 1965

We seek improvements in the civil service retirement system, not only for the benefit of our members and of other retirees and their dependents and survivors, but also for the benefit of all of the people of the United States. Our Federal Government, which is so important in preserving our basic freedoms and security, cannot function without a capable efficient civil service. The retirement system helps in two ways to assure the necessary standards of excellence in our civilian employees. First, the promise of retirement benefits enables the Government to attract and retain the best qualified persons for its various activities. Second, the opportunity for employees to withdraw from active service after they have passed the prime of life, permits more frequent injection of new blood into important Government agencies. Furthermore, by providing the necessities of life to previous employees and their dependents, the retirement system permits savings in welfare services and expenditures at Federal, State, and local government levels. During the past 44 years, a continuing series of improvements has made the retirement system even more responsive to the needs of the people as well as to the needs of the beneficiaries.

In its dedicated effort to achieve additional improvements in this retirement system, for the benefit of all our members, all beneficiaries of the system, and all of the people, the National Association of Retired Civil Employees presents its legislative program for 1965, as follows:

PARAMOUNT OBJECTIVE: ANNUITY INCREASE

1. Ability to acquire the necessities of life is the most important problem to everyone, and this problem is most acute to those who have suffered a reduction in their living standard and must get by on low fixed incomes. The only general increase in civil service annuities since 1955 was in 1962, and was limited to 5 percent. The actual increase in the cost of living since 1955, as reflected in the official Consumer Price Index, is now more than 15 percent, leaving retiree and survivor annuitants 10 percent behind in the onward march of inflation. Civil Service Commission records show more than 500,000 retirees and survivors with annuities under $3,000 per annum, considered as poverty in current programs before the Congress. In order to restore this loss of purchasing power to those who need it most, and to give some measure of relief to all, we seek an immediate annuity increase of 10 percent in each annuity up to $3,000 per annum and 5 percent in that portion of each annuity above $3,000. At the same time, we demand the retention of the automatic cost-of-living increase approved in 1962, in order that future increases in the cost of living may be made without additional action by Congress.

MAJOR OBJECTIVES

2. End discrimination in survivor benefits: Many persons who retired before 1956 are still suffering annuity reductions up to 25 percent in order to provide survivor benefits for their spouses, while persons retiring more recently may provide similar benefits by deductions of only 2½ percent. Survivors of former employees who retired before October 11, 1962, cannot receive more than half of the annuities paid to their spouses, but in the cases of those who retired on or after that date, survivor annuities are 10 percent higher. We seek legislation (a) requiring the recomputation of annuities of all persons who retired before October 11, 1962, and who elected to provide survivor annuities, to give them the benefit of the more liberal formula authorized since that date, of 2½ percent on up to $3,600 of annuity, and 10 percent on the remainder; and (b) recomputation of all survivor annuities of spouses of former employees who retired before October 11, 1962, to increase them to 55 percent of the annuities of such retirees at the time of death.

3. Reinforcing the retirement fund: Although the retirement fund still shows a steady increase each year, we recognize the fact that prospective demands on it are increasing at a more rapid rate, and that it needs new reinforcements in order to maintain its solvency in the future. We declare our earnest support for additional Government contributions to the fund to safeguard all annuities now and hereafter.

ADDITIONAL OBJECTIVES

4. There are many inequities under the retirement laws for which we advocate corrections, particularly in cases as follows:

(a) Benefits under the Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act are denied to retirees from the Tennessee Valley Authority, some agencies of the Farm Credit Administration, deferred annuitants, and forgotten widows who were first granted annuities in 1958. We favor legislation to extend health benefits to all of these annuitants.

(b) There are a few forgotten widows of retirees who died before 1948 who are still denied annuities because they were not married 5 years before the death of their husbands. There are also a number of widows of employees who died in service before 1948 who do not receive annuities. We favor legislation to grant annuities and health benefits to these unfortunate widows.

(c) There is no provision under existing law for a retiree to marry after retirement and provide a survivor annuity for his spouse. We favor legislation authorizing a retiree married after retirement, after such marriage has continued 3 years, to elect a reduced annuity in order to provide a survivor annuity for such spouse.

(d) Under present law, a retiree who elects a reduced annuity in order to provide a survivor annuity for his spouse, in the event of such spouse's death and his remarriage, cannot designate such second spouse for a survivor annuity, although he still suffers the reduction in his own annuity. We favor legislation permitting a retiree in such cases to designate his second spouse to receive the survivor annuity.

(e) A survivor annuitant, under present law, loses the survivor annuity in the event of remarriage, and cannot reclaim it even if again widowed. We favor legislation to permit a survivor annuitant to remarry without loss of annuity, or at least if the annuity is lost by remarriage, to permit it to be reinstated upon the death of the second spouse.

(f) A retiree who has elected a reduction in annuity in order to provide an annuity for his spouse continues to suffer such reduction even if predeceased by the spouse. We favor legislation providing for a recomputation of the retiree's annuity in such cases to restore him to a full annuity.

(g) Persons who retired before 1956 with 30 years of service who had reached 55 years of age are suffering annuity reductions up to 15 percent while persons who retired under similar circumstances since 1956 lost only 1 percent of their annuities per year under age 60. We favor legislation to equalize the reductions for all persons who retired under age 60 under the more liberal 1956 formula.

(h) Persons who retired on or after July 12, 1960, who had rendered service and made contributions to the retirement fund after they had accumulated enough service to earn a maximum annuity, have received credit for such contributions in purchasing additional annuity, but those who retired before that date with excess service have received no equivalent adjustment. We favor legislation providing for the recomputation of the annuities of persons who retired before July 12, 1960, who had rendered service and made contributions to the fund after completing the service on which their annuities were based, to bring about annuity increases under a formula of one-half the ratio of such excess service to the service on which their present annuities are based.

(i) Since October 1, 1956, persons retired on account of disability have the benefit of an annuity floor equal to the annuity they would earn by service to age 60, or 40 percent of the average salary, whichever is less, but this benefit has been denied to persons who retired before October 1, 1956. We favor legislation to extend the benefit of this annuity floor to persons retired on disability prior to October 1, 1956.

5. Free survivor benefits: Survivor benefits are granted to spouses under the social security and railroad retirement systems without any reductions in the annuities of the persons retired. Also, spouses married after retirement can receive survivor annuities under these other retirement systems, but no comparable benefits are authorized under the civil service retirement system. We favor legislation providing an annuity to the surviving spouse of each retiree under the civil service retirement system, in the amount of 55 percent of the annuity of such retiree at date of death, without charge to the original annuity, provided such spouse was married prior to retirement, or, if after retirement, the marriage had continued at least 3 years; and restoring full annuities to all retirees who are now receiving reduced annuities in order to provide survivor annuities; provided further that no existing annuity or right to receive an annuity is reduced or impaired.

6. Government group life insurance: We favor legislaton to modify the reduction in Government group life insurance at age 65 (or at time of retirement, whichever is later) from 2 percent per month to 1 percent per month, and to limit the total reduction to 5 percent.

7. Other retirement systems: Since persons retired under other civilian retirement systems of the Federal Government (and the District of Columbia) are eligible for NARCE membership, we will support liberalization in such other systems, including but not limited to those for foreign service, CIA employees, lighthouse service, teachers, policemen and firemen in the District of Columbia, construction workers on the Panama Canal, and beneficiaries under compensation laws.

8. Matching salary increases: Since annuities under the civil service retirement system are definitely linked to salaries, we favor legislation to require annuity increases to match all general salary increases for civilian employees.

9. Early retirement without penalty: We will support legislation to authorize retirement for employees with 30 years of service upon attaining 55 years of age, providing such legislation contains a provision restoring full annuities to all persons retired previously with 30 years of service at age 55 or later, whose annuities were reduced because they retired before reaching age 60.

10. Postal rate advantages: All labor unions, employee associations, and many other nonprofit associations are enjoying preferential bulk mailing rates under Federal postal laws, while our association headquarters and many of our chapters have been denied this privilege. We will continue efforts to obtain postal rate privileges equal to those granted labor unions and employee associations.

11. Income tax laws: We favor reductions in Federal and State income tax laws to ease tax burdens on our members and we will be alert to protest any proposals that would discriminate against civil service annuitants.

12. Merger of health benefit systems: The retired Federal employees health benefits system, limited to persons who retired prior to July 1, 1960, is certain to dwindle in future years, and the costs of benefits may become prohibitive. We favor legislation to combine this plan with the Federal employees health benefits system which now serves all persons retired since July 1, 1960, in order to preserve equitable health services at reasonable costs for all of our members.

13. Veterans benefits: Many of our members are eligible for veteran or widow pensions in addition to their civil service retirement annuities, and we will continue to support amendments to veteran pension laws which would be beneficial to such members.

14. Opposing harmful legislation: While supporting legislation that would be of benefit to our members, we must also be constantly alert to oppose measures that would be objectionable, particularly—

(a) Price fixing: There is a determined campaign to get Congress to approve a law authorizing price fixing by manufacturers and distributors of branded items that all of us must use, including food and medicine. Sometimes, this is proposed under the guise of quality stabilization and sometimes as fair trade. Whatever the label, it is simply a scheme to force us to pay more for things we need than we do now. We will continue our opposition to all of these proposals.

(b) Merger with social security: Numerous NARCE conventions have declared opposition to any plan which would merge civil service retirement with social security, and we will be alert to follow this mandate.

(c) Preserve present benefits: We enjoy a number of current retirement benefits that might be attacked as, for example, the provision for annuity increases to match increases in the cost of living when the consumer price index advances 3 percent or more. We will scrutinize all proposals which might be adverse to us and oppose them.

(d) Income tax laws: In the revision of Federal income tax laws, there is always a chance for attacks on some of our present advantages, such as double exemptions at age 65, the retirement income credit, etc., which would increase the tax burdens of our members. We will be on guard against such threats.

(e) Liberty amendment: Our recent convention declared its opposition to the so-called liberty amendment, which would seriously curtail many governmental activities, and might endanger our civil service retirement system, veteran and social security benefits, etc. We will support the convention action in opposing this proposal.

AMENDMENT OF THE IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that I have today introduced the administration bill on immigration. Because a good many Members will follow suit, I offer for the RECORD a section-by-section analysis of the bill. This section-by-section analysis will prove most helpful for the Members of the House:

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

Section 1 amends section 201(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, under which quotas for each country are determined. It abolishes the national origins system by reducing present quotas by one-fifth of their present number each year for 5 years. As numbers are released from national origins quotas, they are added to the quota reserve pool established by the amendment to section 201 of the act made by section 3 of the bill. Thus in the first year, 20 percent (roughly 32,000) are released to the pool; in the second year, the pool will have 40 percent of present quotas (or 64,000); until in the fifth year and thereafter, all numbers are allocated through the pool. To provide some immediate relief to minimum quota areas, the minimum quota is raised to 200, but is then reduced in the same manner as other quotas.

Section 2 amends section 201(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act by changing a reference therein from "section 202 (e)" to "section 202(d)" in conformity with the redesignation of section 202(e) as 202(d) made by section 6(e) of the bill.

Section 3 amends section 201 of the Immigration and Nationality Act by adding a new subsection (f). This subsection establishes the quota reserve pool from which all quota numbers will be allocated by the 5th year. In each of the 5 years constituting the period of transition, the pool will consist of (1) the numbers released from national origins quotas each year, and (2) numbers assigned to the old quota areas but unused the previous year because insufficient demand for them existed in the assigned quota area.

Quota numbers are issued in the order of preference specified in amended section 203 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (see Sec. 10 of the bill). That is, first call on the first 50 percent is given to persons whose admission, by virtue of their exceptional skill, training or education, will be especially advantageous to the United States; first call on the next 30 percent, plus any part of the first 50 percent not issued for first preference purposes, is given to unmarried sons and daughters of U.S. citizens, not eligible for nonquota status because they are over 21 years of age; first call on the remaining 20 percent, plus any part of the first 80 percent not taken by the first two preference classes, is given to spouses and unmarried sons or daughters of aliens lawfully admitted for permanent residence; and any portion remaining is issued to other quota visa applicants, with percentage preferences to other relatives of U.S. citizens and resident aliens, and then to certain classes of workers. Amended section 203 further provides that within each class, visas are issued in the order in which applied for—first come, first served. These preference provisions, which under present law determine only relative priority between nationals of the same country, will now determine priority between nationals of different countries throughout the world.

To prevent disproportionate benefits to the nationals of any single country, a maximum of 10 percent of the total authorized quota is set on immigration attributable to any quota area. However, this limitation is not applied if to do so would result in reducing any quota at a more rapid rate than that provided by amended section 201(a). Ultimately, of course, the limitation applies to all.

Exceptions to the principle of allocating visas on the basis of time of registration within preference classes are provided to deal with special problems. Since some countries' quotas are not current, their nationals have no old registrations on file. To apply the principle rigidly would result, after

4 or 5 years, in curtailing immigration from these countries almost entirely. This would be undesirable not only because it would frustrate the aim of the bill that immigration from all countries should continue, but also because many of the countries that would be affected are our closest allies. Therefore, proposed section 201(f) would authorize the President, after consultation with the Immigration Board (established by section 18), to reserve up to 30 percent of the quota reserve pool for allocation to qualified immigrants (1) who could obtain visas under the existing system but not under the new system and (2) whose admission to the United States would further the national security interest by maintaining close ties with their countries. The number of quota visas so allocated may exceed the 10-percent limit on the number of immigrants from any country in the case of those countries which, under the existing system, regularly receive allocations in excess of that limit.

Subsection (f) also allows the President to reserve up to 10 percent of the quota reserve pool for allocation to certain refugees and permits him to disregard priority of registration within preference classes for the benefit of such refugees. Many refugees, almost by definition, are uprooted suddenly. They had no thought of immigration until they were forced to leave the country in which they were living because of natural calamity or political upheaval; or they may be refugees from persecution or dictatorship, in which case previous registration would have been dangerous.

Finally, subsection (f) provides that if the President reserves, against contingencies, any numbers during the year, but thereafter finds them not to be needed for the named purposes, such numbers are to be issued as if they had not been reserved. Similarly, the 10-percent limitation on the number of visas to be issued to any quota area is made inoperable if its application would result in authorized quota numbers not being used.

Section 4 amends section 201(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, which presently limits the number of quota visas issued in any single month to 10 percent of the total yearly quota. This limitation is needed to insure that persons entitled to preference by virtue of special skills or family ties will not be foreclosed from preference by a rush of earlier applications which exhaust the annual quota. To insure that all available quota numbers can nevertheless be utilized, present law provides that numbers not used during the first 10 months of any fiscal year may be used during the last 2 months of such year, without regard to the 10-percent monthly limitation. Often, if close to the full 10 percent of quota visas is not issued in each of the first months of the year, undesirable administrative problems result in the last 2. The amendment allows the issuance each month of the 10 percent authorized for that month plus any visas authorized but not issued in previous months. This permits a more even spacing of visa issuance during the year.

Section 5 amends section 201(d) of the Immigration and Nationality Act which now permits the issuance of quota immigrant visas to nonquota immigrants. Substituted for the provisions of section 201(d) is a specific direction that no quota immigrant visa shall be issued to a person who is eligible for a nonquota immigrant visa. This will prevent nonquota immigrants from preempting visas to the prejudice of qualified quota immigrants.

Section 6 amends section 202 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to eliminate the so-called "Asia-Pacific Triangle" provisions, which require persons of Asian stock to be attributed to quota areas not by their place of birth, but according to their racial ancestry. At the end of the 5-year transition period, this provision would be in any event superfluous, since national origin will no longer be a standard for the admission of qualified quota immigrants. But the formula is so especially discriminatory that it should be removed immediately, and not be permitted to operate even in part during the 5-year transition period.

Subsection (c) of the section amends section 202(c) of the act so as to raise the minimum allotment to subquotas of dependent areas of a governing country, thus preserving their present equality with independent minimum-quota areas. The dependent area's allotment is taken from the governing country's quota. To prevent a dependent area from preempting the governing country's quota disproportionately, it is provided that the dependent area's share of the quota will decrease as the governing country's quota is reduced.

Section 7 amends section 207 of the Immigration and Nationality Act by deleting the language of that section which prevents the issuance of visas in lieu of those issued but not actually used, or later found to be improperly issued. Thus in Germany alone over 7,000 quota visas are now taken by persons entitled to nonquota status, and 2,000 more quota visas are issued to persons who do not actually apply for admission to the United States. All these quota visas are lost under the present law. Such a result is inconsistent with the aim of the bill that all authorized quota numbers shall be used. The amended section 207 specifically authorizes the issuance of a quota visa in lieu of one improperly issued or not actually used, utilizing the same quota number.

Section 8 amends section 101(a)(27)(A) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, which grants nonquota status to spouses and children of U.S. citizens, so as to extend nonquota status to parents of U.S. citizens as well.

Section 9 amends section 101(a)(27)(C) of the Immigration and Nationality Act so as to extend nonquota status to natives of all independent Western Hemisphere countries. Under present law, such status is granted to natives of all independent North, Central, and South American countries, and of named Caribbean island countries which were independent when the Immigration and Nationality Act was enacted in 1952. The amendment extends nonquota status to natives of countries in these areas which have gained their independence since then, or may gain their independence hereafter.

Section 10 amends section 203(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, which establishes preferences for immigrants with special skills and for relatives of U.S. citizens and resident aliens.

Subsection (a) relaxes the test for the first preference accorded to persons of high education, technical training, specialized experience, or exceptional ability. Under present law, such persons are granted preferred status only if the Attorney General determines that their services are "needed urgently" in the United States. The amendment allows them first preference if their services, as determined by the Attorney General, would be "especially advantageous" to the United States.

Subsection (b) eliminates the second preference for parents of American citizens, now accorded nonquota status by the amendment made by section 8 of the bill.

Subsection (c) grants a fourth preference, up to 50 percent of numbers not issued to the first three preferences, to parents of aliens lawfully admitted for permanent residence. It also grants a subsidiary preference to qualified quota immigrants capable of filling particular labor shortages in the United States. Under present law, immigrants who do not meet the rigorous standards of the skilled specialist category are not preferred over any other immigrants even though they can fill a definite labor need which other immigrants cannot fill. The amendment allows to such immigrants a preference of 50 percent of the quota visas remaining after all family preferences have been satisfied or exhausted.

Section 11 amends section 204 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, which establishes the procedure for determining eligibility for preferred status under section 203.

The amendments made by paragraphs (1), (2), (3), and (4) cover the filing of petitions, on behalf of the workers accorded a fourth preference, by the persons who will employ them to fill the special labor needs. Paragraph (1) provides for approval of these petitions by the Attorney General, and paragraph (2) requires that he consult with the Immigration Board and interested departments of Government before granting preference to these workers.

Paragraph (2) also exempts first preference skilled specialists from the present petition procedure because under the bill a new procedure is established for such persons. Under present law, skilled specialists may qualify for preferred status only when a petition requesting their services is filed by a U.S. employer. This requirement unduly restricts our ability to attract those whose services would substantially enhance our economy, cultural interests, and welfare. Many of these people have no way of contacting employers in the United States in order to obtain the required employment. Even if they knew whom to contact, few openings important enough to attract such highly-skilled people are offered without personal interviews, and only a few very large enterprises or institutions have representatives abroad with hiring authority. Thus many such skilled specialists cannot obtain the employment presently required for first preference status.

Moreover, the requirement of prearranged employment is in fact unnecessary. Highly skilled specialists would obviously work at their specialty, provided that employment is open. The only check needed is that the Attorney General ascertain, upon consultation with appropriate Government agencies, that job openings exist in the specialist's particular field. Although the present petition procedure serves to confirm the individual's own evidence of his training, education, or skills, such confirmation is not essential if proper investigation is made of his qualifications before the preference is accorded.

Paragraph (5), therefore, allows the Attorney General to grant a first preference to skilled specialists upon their own petitions, supported by such documentation as the Attorney General shall require. In this connection it is to be noted that the existing law requiring an investigation by the Attorney General of the petitioner's qualifications and a determination of his eligibility for a first preference is continued.

Section 12 amends section 205(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, providing for petitions to establish eligibility for preference as a relative of a U.S. citizen of lawfully resident alien, to conform to the substantive amendments made by section 10.

Section 13 amends the "fair share" refugee law so as to remove a provision which has hampered its effective operation. Presently, the entry of refugees is subject to the condition that they be within the mandate of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. The mandate provision is eliminated, so that the refugee law will no longer be subject to outside control. In addition, subsection (b) enlarges the applicable area definition so as to allow the entry of refugees from North Africa generally, and Algeria particularly, who are unable to return to their countries because of their race, religion, or political opinions, and incorporates this new definition in the "fair share" law. The existing definition encompasses refugees from "any country within the general area of the Middle East," which is defined as the area between Libya on the west, Turkey on the north, Pakistan on the east, and Saudi Arabia and Ethiopia on the south. The new definition substitutes Morocco for Libya as the western border of this area.

Section 14 repeals the "fair share" law's special provision for 500 "difficult to resettle" refugees; all such persons have been taken care of, and the authority is therefore no longer necessary.

Section 15 amends section 281 of the Immigration and Nationality Act so as to grant discretionary authority to the Secretary of State to specify the time and manner of payment of the fees for visa applications and issuances. This discretionary authority will allow the Secretary to control two undesirable situations:

First, many people in countries with oversubscribed quotas register their names on visa waiting lists even though they have no present intention of emigrating; they regard the registration as insurance for possible future use. Such registrations have the effect of creating a distorted picture of visa backlogs and make efficient administration difficult. The amendment therefore would allow the Secretary of State to require a registrant to deposit a fee at the time of registration. While not unduly burdensome on those who wish to come here, such a procedure would serve to discourage registrations which are not bona fide.

Second, otherwise admissible immigrants, particularly refugees, are often unable to pay the required visa fee. Rather than bar them from obtaining a visa, the Secretary is given authority to postpone payment.

Section 16 is also directed to the problem of "insurance" registrations. Many applicants for visas have been offered visas repeatedly but have turned them down. They wish only to preserve their priority in registration for possible future use. To handle such cases, section 203(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act is amended so as to allow the Secretary of State to terminate the registrations of persons who have previously declined visas. This amendment is also important in connection with a contemplated reregistration of applicants in certain oversubscribed quota areas designed to ascertain whether registrants have died, emigrated elsewhere, or changed their minds; the Secretary is authorized to terminate the registration of all persons who fail to reregister.

Section 17 amends subsections (a)(1), (a)(4), and (g), as redesignated, of section 212 of the Immigration and Nationality Act so as to allow the entry of certain mentally afflicted persons. Under present law, no visas may be issued to aliens who are feeble-minded or insane, or have had one or more attacks of insanity, or who are afflicted with a psychopathic personality, epilepsy, or a mental defect. These provisions have created hardships for families seeking admission, where one member, often a child, is retarded. Such families are presented with the difficult decision as to whether they should leave the afflicted person behind or stay with him. Such a person cannot enter the United States even if the family is willing and able to care for him here and even if he is within the 85 percent of mentally afflicted persons whose condition can be substantially improved by adequate treatment.

The amendment gives the Attorney General discretionary authority to admit such persons who are the spouses, children, or parents of citizens or resident aliens, or who are accompanying a member of their family. The Attorney General, after consultation with the Surgeon General of the U.S. Public Health Service, would prescribe the controls and conditions on the entry of such persons, including the giving of a bond to insure continued family support.

The bar against the admission of epileptics is removed entirely, since this affliction can effectively be medically controlled. The amendment would also provide that the term "mentally retarded" be substituted for the present term "feeble-minded." This is not a substantive change in the law.

Section 18 establishes the Immigration Board, to be composed of seven members. Two members of the House of Representatives are appointed by the Speaker with the approval of the majority and minority leaders, two members of the Senate, by the President of the Senate, with the approval of the majority and minority leaders, and three members, including the Chairman, by the President. Members not otherwise in government service are to be paid on a per diem basis for actual time spent in the work of the Board.

The section provides that the Board's duties shall be to study, and consult with appropriate government departments on all facets of immigration policy; to make recommendations to the President as to the reservation and allocation of quota numbers, and to recommend to the Attorney General criteria for admission of skilled specialists and workers whose services are needed by reason of labor shortages in this country.

Section 19 grants consular officers discretionary authority to require bonds ensuring that certain nonimmigrants will depart voluntarily from the United States when required. This amendment to section 221(g) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, by providing an additional safeguard against a later refusal to depart, would allow the issuance of visas in many borderline cases in which visas are now refused to students and visitors.

Section 20 amends section 272 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, which imposes a penalty on carriers bringing to the United States aliens afflicted with certain defects, so as to make that section conform with the changes made by this bill and section 11 of the act of September 26, 1961.

KENNEDY FILM SHOULD BE RELEASED

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a House concurrent resolution, which would make possible the distribution and viewing of the film "John F. Kennedy: Years of Lightning, Day of Drums." Present regulations deny the people of the United States the opportunity to see this film, which has been widely acclaimed by the critics who have seen it.

The citizens of this Nation will not be able to view this unforgettable film unless the Congress takes special action to release it in the United States. It depicts the Kennedy presidency in six major fields and represents the highest type of cinematic creativity. It is my profound belief that the people of this Nation should not be denied the opportunity to see this film.

Produced with great insight for the U.S. Information Agency by Mr. George Stevens, Jr., it has been called "a fittingly affirmative film" by Mr. Richard Coe, drama critic of the Washington Post. Further, Mr. Coe has written, and I quote:

> The masterfully imaginative hour-and-a-half documentary is the first full-length feature and by all odds the finest film I've seen by the U.S. Information Agency * * *. This country's taxpayers cannot see it but during the past week it has started its rounds, in 30-odd languages, in 114 countries of the free world.

It is not on a partisan basis that I appeal to the Congress to take the necessary action. President Kennedy, as 35th President of the United States, held a close relationship with millions of his countrymen. It was a relationship that went beyond politics and cut across issues. When he became President, he became President of all the people and when the assassin's bullet struck, grief overtook all of America.

This country has always taken pride in itself, in a fluid world, and we regard ourselves as politically mature. For whatever storms swarm around the Presidency, he who holds it, holds, too, a close relationship with the history of our Nation.

I urge the Congress to act unanimously on the release of this film, so that the people of this country may share in witnessing a documentary which contains great and significant moments of the history of this Nation.

A TRIBUTE TO CARL CLYMA

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MONAGAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, there are few, if any, who have played any role in Connecticut politics in the present century who had not been influenced to some degree by the poignant pen and presence of the late Carl Clyma. Mr. Clyma, a constituent of mine by virtue of his residence in Prospect, Conn., a friend by virtue of our common interest in literary works, and a newspaper reporter of distinction, served as legislative chief of bureau in the State capitol at Hartford for the New Haven, Conn., Register. He succumbed in November 1964 to an illness which was attributable to his service overseas in World War I.

Although many weeks have passed since Carl Clyma's death, I believe that it is never too late to honor one whom we have respected and admired, and I therefore include, at this time, a column "A Tribute to Carl Clyma" written by the Connecticut Yankee, Alan Olmstead, as it appeared in the Waterbury, Conn., Republican and in other Connecticut papers on November 19, 1964:

A TRIBUTE TO CARL CLYMA: CONNECTICUT YANKEE

(By Alan Olmstead)

This columnist had so much friendly help and counsel over so many years from the late Carl Clyma, including even an occasional admonitary message from his retirement, that his death leaves us a little lonely in our viewing of the State political scene.

The former legislative chief of bureau for the New Haven Register had been around a long time, and he had been around with a character and an intelligence which were not easily teased this way or that by the shallower tides of partisan politics.

So when, with a slight studious stoop of his great height, and that impassive face, he moved among the policy-gossiping pools of legislators or the swirl of convention delegates, he was a reassuring sight, as if he himself were a part of the Connecticut scene, a guidepost to judgment and evaluation, a connection between the lessons of the past and the possibilities of the future.

If this could be the general familar image of Carl Clyma, the particular distinction of his career was his unique concentration on an area of public policy which some newspapermen, this columnist included, considered too difficult for their own mental efforts.

The State of Connecticut, over the three decades of Clyma's service at the State capitol, had a fine procession of financial officials, including legislative chairmen of the finance and appropriations committees, State commissioners of finance and control, State controllers, and State auditors.

When such individuals were bright and knew their figures, Clyma could figure with them.

If they were in beyond their natural depth, Clyma could conduct friendly private classes for them, as he so often did for his fellow newspapermen.

Not even Clyma, of course, was infallible. But if you wanted to know whether a budget had a real prospect of being balanced, or whether a claimed economy was real, or whether the explanation of some budgetary item was authentic or an exercise in deliberate obfuscation on the part of somebody who knew enough about figures to manipulate them, it would be Clyma you would seek out, and what you got from him would be as close to fact and truth as one can get in the realm of fiscal statistics.

He could read people in politics for their character and for their general worthiness, and this formed his private index. But the only judgment the public saw was his clinical and dispassionate presentation and analysis of fact and figure. And it was this judgment which the politicians and especially the financial officials of the State came to trust and respect. He was the unofficial watchdog of the State treasury, the unofficial public auditor, the untitled finance commissioner, and, summing it all up, a noteworthy example of what a newspaperman can become in and to his State when he mixes honor and incorruptibility with the career-ripened proficiency of the specialist.

This is this column's thanks to an old critic and friend.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Flood (at the request of Mr. Hanley), for 60 minutes, on January 25; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Flood (at the request of Mr. Hanley), for 60 minutes, on February 16; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. Dulski and to include extraneous matter.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 29 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, January 14, 1965, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

344. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a report of factors for use in apportioning funds for the national system of interstate and defense highways pursuant to section 104 (b) 5, title 23, United States Code (H. Doc. 42); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

345. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting the 17th Battle Act Report, pursuant to the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

346. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on inadequate evaluation of employment opportunities to be created by two industrial area redevelopment projects, Area Redevelopment Administration, Department of Commerce; to the Committee on Government Operations.

347. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the Department of Commerce to adopt improved accounting procedures"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

348. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, transmitting the proposed program of airport development for the fiscal year 1966, pursuant to section 4, Federal Airport Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

349. A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend certain laws in order to make adequate provision for an office staff and necessary services to wind up the affairs of a President who dies in office or of a former President after his death"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 2580. A bill to amend the immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 2581. A bill to provide for a Veterans' Administration general medical and surgical hospital of 200 beds at Clark County, Nev.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BATES:

H.R. 2582. A bill to designate a Veterans' Administration hospital in Bedford, Mass., as the Edith Nourse Rogers Memorial Veterans' Hospital; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.R. 2583. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the State of Florida; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 2584. A bill to authorize that the Virgin Islands be incorporated within any State of the United States of America, provided the incorporation is approved by free elections in the Virgin Islands and in the incorporating State; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 2585. A bill to provide for the medical and hospital care of the aged through a system of voluntary health insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 2586. A bill to revitalize the mint at San Francisco; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 2587. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H.R. 2588. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to protect the public from unsanitary milk and milk products shipped in interstate commerce, without unduly burdening such commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2589. A bill to repeal the retailers excise taxes on jewelry, furs, toilet preparations, and luggage and handbags; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H.R. 2590. A bill to repeal the manufacturers' excise tax on passenger automobiles and trucks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2591. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2592. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the retailers excise tax on luggage, handbags, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.R. 2593. A bill to amend part II of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, so as to authorize exemption from the provisions of such part, of services and transportation of such nature, character, or quantity as not substantially to affect or impair uniform motor carrier regulation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H.R. 2594. A bill to clarify the application of certain annuity increase legislation; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CURTIN:

H.R. 2595. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H.R. 2596. A bill to establish a national policy relating to U.S. citizens' travel abroad; to establish a service within the Department of State which shall be responsible for the direction, administration, and execution of passport and travel documentation for American citizens and nationals in the United States and abroad; to prescribe procedures relating to the issuance of passports; to establish terms of validity of passports; to establish fees for passports; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 2597. A bill to establish a U.S. Trading Corporation to meet the challenge of attempted Soviet penetration of world markets, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 2598. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that certain insurance agents shall be treated as outside salesmen for purposes of computing adjusted gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 2599. A bill to provide for the medical and hospital care of the aged through a system of voluntary health insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 2600. A bill to provide for the acquisition and preservation of the real property known as the Ansley Wilcox House in Buffalo, N.Y., as a national historic site; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. DWYER:

H.R. 2601. A bill to establish the U.S. Academy of Foreign Affairs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 2602. A bill to amend section 314 of the Public Health Service Act of 1944; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2603. A bill declaring October 12 to be a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2604. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an increase in the amount for which a credit may be allowed against the Federal estate tax for estate taxes paid to States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2605. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction for income tax purposes of expenses incurred by an individual for transportation to and from work; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 2606. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to increase the minimum amount of the monthly insurance benefits payable thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H.R. 2607. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Assateague Island National Seashore in the States of Maryland and Virginia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 2608. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 so as to provide for a method of certification and regulation with respect to certain transportation performed with hovercraft; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FUQUA:

H.R. 2609. A bill to extend for 2 years the definition of "peanuts" which is now in effect under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.R. 2610. A bill to provide for the designation of a highway from a point on Interstate Highway No. 4 in Tampa, Fla., to MacDill Air Force Base; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 2611. A bill to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and section 705(b) of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 and to amend the first proviso of section 8(a) (3) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor

H.R. 2612. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act in order to liberalize the formula for computing annuities for certain employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 2613. A bill to incorporate the 6th U.S. Infantry Association; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALL:

H.R. 2614. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to provide additional deductions and exemptions for the expenses of medical care of persons 65 years of age and over; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HATHAWAY:

H.R. 2615. A bill to authorize the international Passamaquoddy tidal power project, including hydroelectric power development of the upper St. John River, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HUTCHINSON:

H.R. 2616. A bill to authorize the sale, without regard to the 6-month waiting period prescribed, of zinc proposed to be disposed of pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KEE:

H.R. 2617. A bill to establish a new program of grants for public works projects undertaken by local governments in the United States; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H.R. 2618. A bill to authorize the coordinated development of the water resources of the Pacific Southwest, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McVICKER:

H.R. 2619. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H.R. 2620. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H.R. 2621. A bill to revitalize the mint at San Francisco; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.R. 2622. A bill to establish, in the House of Representatives, the office of Delegate from the District of Columbia; to provide for the election of the Delegate; and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MEEDS:

H.R. 2623. A bill to authorize the establishment of the Pig War National Historical Park in the State of Washington, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER:

H.R. 2624. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Compensation Act so as to permit injured employees entitled to receive medical services under such act to utilize the services of optometrists; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2625. A bill to prevent the use of stopwatches, work measurement programs, or other performance standards operations as measuring devices in the postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2626. A bill to provide that the National Bureau of Standards shall conduct a program of investigation, research, and survey to determine the practicability of the adoption by the United States of the metric system of weights and measures; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

H.R. 2627. A bill for the relief of certain classes of civilian employees of naval installations erroneously in receipt of certain wages due to misinterpretation of certain personnel instructions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2628. A bill to establish a National Economic Conversion and Diversification Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2629. A bill to designate the Veterans' Administration hospital at Martinez, Calif., as the Charles C. McGonegal Memorial Hospital; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2630. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide sufficient appropriations to the Veterans' Administration to allow for modern and adequate facilities commensurate with the increased needs of the veteran population of the United States; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2631. A bill to authorize additional social security coverage for certain employees of Alameda County, Calif., who were formerly city employees, so as to afford them the same coverage as is available to other employees of such county; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2632. A bill to amend the act of March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1449), as amended, to incorporate in the Organic Act of the National Bureau of Standards the authority to make certain improvements of fiscal and administrative practices for more effective conduct of its research and development activities; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

H.R. 2633. A bill to amend section 212A(4) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2634. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to initiate a program for the conservation, development, and enhancement of the Nation's anadromous fish in cooperation with the several States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 2635. A bill to provide a hospital insurance program for the aged under social security, to amend the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system to increase benefits, improve the actuarial status of the disability insurance trust fund, and extend coverage, to amend the Social Security Act to provide additional Federal financial participation in the Federal-State public assistance programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 2636. A bill to amend section 211 of the Public Health Service Act to equalize the retirement benefits for commissioned officers of the Public Health Service with retirement benefits provided for other officers in the uniformed services; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 2637. A bill to revise the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 2638. A bill to authorize the temporary release of 100,000 short tons of copper from the national stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 2639. A bill to modify the decrease in group life insurance at 65 or after retirement; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2640. A bill relating to rates of postage on third-class matter mailed by certain nonprofit organizations; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2641. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, to provide annuities for surviving spouses without deduction from original annuities and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2642. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to eliminate the reduction in annuity elected for a spouse when such spouse predeceases the person making the election; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2643. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide for the resumption of surviving widows annuities upon termination of subsequent remarriages; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2644. A bill to correct inequities in the Civil Service Retirement Act, the Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act and in other laws governing civil service retirement benefits and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2645. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, to provide for the recomputation of annuities of certain retired employees who elected reduced annuities at the time of retirement in order to provide survivor annuities for their their spouses, and for the recomputation of survivor annuities for the surviving spouses of certain former employees who died in service or after retirement; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H.R. 2646. A bill to provide a hospital insurance program for the aged under social security, to amend the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system to increase benefits, improve the actuarial status of the disability insurance trust fund, and extend coverage, to amend the Social Security Act to provide additional Federal financial participation in the Federal-State public assistance programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 2647. A bill to amend section 4242 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt from the club dues tax certain charges made by nonprofit clubs for the use of facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2648. A bill to amend section 4241 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to reduce the club dues excise taxes from 20 to 10 percent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 2649. A bill to amend section 2004(e) of the Revised Statutes to provide for the appointment of Federal registrars to protect the right to vote in Federal elections from discriminatory practices; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

H.R. 2650. A bill to limit the authority of the Veterans' Administration and the Bureau of the Budget with respect to new construction or alteration of veterans hospitals and the closing of such hospitals; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 2651. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 2652. A bill to authorize the temporary release of 100,000 short tons of copper from the national stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H.R. 2653. A bill to provide that the U.S. District Court for the District of Connecticut shall also be held at New London, Conn.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHISLER:

H.R. 2654. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SECREST:

H.R. 2655. A bill to amend section 503 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that payments to an individual under a public or private retirement, annuity, endowment, or similar plans or programs shall not be counted as income for pension until the amount of payments received equals the contributions thereto; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2656. A bill to amend subsection (a) of section 901 of title 38, United States Code, to prescribe the size of flags furnished by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to drape the caskets of decreased veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2657. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the amount payable on burial and funeral expenses; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2658. A bill to amend section 3203 of title 38, United States Code, to liberalize those provisions controlling amount of pension payable to those veterans without dependents receiving hospital or domiciliary care from the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 2659. A bill to provide for the restriction of certain areas in the Outer Continental Shelf for defense purposes, and for other purposes (Gulf Test Range, Gulf of Mexico); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H.R. 2660. A bill establishing certain qualifications for persons appointed to the Supreme Court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.R. 2661. A bill to authorize the coordinated development of the water resources of the Pacific Southwest, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TUPPER:

H.R. 2662. A bill to authorize the international Passamaquoddy tidal power project, including hydroelectric power development of the upper St. John River, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON:

H.R. 2663. A bill to authorize the coordinated development of the water resources of the Pacific Southwest, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HÉBERT:

H.R. 2664. A bill to amend the Submerged Lands Act to establish the seaward boundaries of the States of Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana as extending 3 marine leagues into the Gulf of Mexico and providing for the ownership and use of the submerged lands, improvements, minerals, and natural resources within said boundaries; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana:

H.R. 2665. A bill to amend the Submerged Lands Act to establish the seaward boundaries of the States of Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana as extending 3 marine leagues into the Gulf of Mexico and providing for the ownership and use of the submerged lands, improvements, minerals, and natural resources within said boundaries; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H.R. 2666. A bill to amend the Submerged Lands Act to establish the seaward boundaries of the States of Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana as extending 3 marine leagues into the Gulf of Mexico and providing for the ownership and use of the submerged lands, improvements, minerals, and natural resources within said boundaries; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PASSMAN:

H.R. 2667. A bill to amend the Submerged Lands Act to establish the seaward boundaries of the States of Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana as extending 3 marine leagues into the Gulf of Mexico and providing for the ownership and use of the submerged lands, improvements, minerals, and natural resources within said boundaries; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana:

H.R. 2668. A bill to amend the Submerged Lands Act to establish the seaward boundaries of the States of Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana as extending 3 marine leagues into the Gulf of Mexico and providing for the ownership and use of the submerged lands, improvements, minerals, and natural resources within said boundaries; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WAGGONNER:

H.R. 2669. A bill to amend the Submerged Lands Act to establish the seaward boundaries of the States of Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana as extending 3 marine leagues into the Gulf of Mexico and providing for the ownership and use of the submerged lands, improvements, minerals, and natural resources within said boundaries; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H.R. 2670. A bill to amend the Submerged Lands Act to establish the seaward boundaries of the States of Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana as extending 3 marine leagues into the Gulf of Mexico and providing for the ownership and use of the submerged lands, improvements, minerals, and natural resources within said boundaries; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. DWYER:

H.J. Res. 186. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution to enable the Congress to function effectively in time of emergency or disaster; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 187. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER:

H.J. Res. 188. Joint resolution providing for the erection of a memorial statue to the late Dr. Robert H. Goddard, the father of American rocketry; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H.J. Res. 189. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State with the approval of its electorate to consider factors in addition to population in the apportionment of one house of its legislature; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H.J. Res. 190. Joint resolution requesting the President to instruct the permanent representative of the United States to the United Nations to request the Security Council without delay to convene the Arab States and the State of Israel and other interested nations in a peace conference; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.J. Res. 191. Joint resolution to provide that a portion of the Garioa Fund shall be used to assist in the establishment of Oriental College; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H.J. Res. 192. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for mandatory retirement of Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States at the age of 70 years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 193. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution relating to the apportionment of districts from which members of a State legislature are to be elected; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLARK:

H. Con. Res. 95. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the motto "In God We Trust" should continue to be inscribed upon the coins of the United States, and that the words "under God" should continue to be a part of the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H. Con. Res. 96. Concurrent resolution to request the President of the United States to urge certain actions in behalf of Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HAYS:

H. Con. Res. 97. Concurrent resolution to authorize the printing as a House document the pamphlet entitled "Our American Government, What Is It? How Does It Function?"; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. KEE:

H. Con. Res. 98. Concurrent resolution establishing a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H. Con. Res. 99. Concurrent resolution to request the President of the United States to urge certain actions in behalf of Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H. Con. Res. 100. Concurrent resolution expressing the approval of the Congress for the disposal of raw silk and silk noils from the national stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. Res. 108. Resolution to provide funds for the expense of studies and investigations authorized by H. Res. 89; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DAWSON:

H. Res. 109. Resolution providing for the expenses of conducting studies and investigations authorized by rule XI(8) incurred by the Committee on Government Operations; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. Res. 110. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives with respect to the location of activities of the Committee on Government Operations; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mrs. DWYER:

H. Res. 111. Resolution to establish a House Committee on the Captive Nations; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MILLER:

H. Res. 112. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Science and Astronautics to conduct studies and investigations and make inquiries with respect to aeronautical and other scientific research and development and outer space; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MINSHALL:

H. Res. 113. Resolution providing for naming a special committee to investigate security measures in the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BELCHER:

H.R. 2671. A bill for the relief of Capt. Lloyd N. Campbell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2672. A bill for the relief of Katherine Anne Wilen Robinson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2673. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Gilda Rosa McDaniels; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 2674. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Evelyn Gatchalian Galdo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H.R. 2675. A bill for the relief of Ta Van Tai; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CULVER:

H.R. 2676. A bill for the relief of Despina E. Foundoulakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALL:

H.R. 2677. A bill for the relief of Irene Jakubowska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 2678. A bill for the relief of Joo Yul Kim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2679. A bill for the relief of Kyung Sook Hahn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KIRWAN:

H.R. 2680. A bill for the relief of Sister Mary Benigna (Maria Penta); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 2681. A bill for the relief of Shirley Shapiro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2682. A bill for the relief of Bozo Juravic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2683. A bill for the relief of Dr. Concepcion L. Yap; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2684. A bill for the relief of George Marer and his wife, Claire Vago Marer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2685. A bill for the relief of Fan Soe Yap; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2686. A bill for the relief of Giuseppa Costa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2687. A bill for the relief of Mihaly Bognar and his wife, Katalin Bognar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2688. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Jetta Barfod Greer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2689. A bill for the relief of Lone Isaksen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2690. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Iren Jenone Jakubovics; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H.R. 2691. A bill for the relief of Irene A. Halkias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER:

H.R. 2692. A bill for the relief of Gordon W. Heritage, Sr., and Sarah Martha Heritage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2693. A bill for the relief of Lam Chong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2694. A bill for the relief of John Allen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2695. A bill for the relief of Norman McLeod Riach; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2696. A bill for the relief of Lau Bo Wing; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2697. A bill for the relief of Chester Ray Woolverton, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2698. A bill for the relief of Bajanka Neigert; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2699. A bill for the relief of Kil Ja Ahn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORHEAD:

H.R. 2700. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ursula Huppertz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 2701. A bill for the relief of Maja Thomsen Hoffman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2702. A bill for the relief of Kwong You Huey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 2703. A bill for the relief of Gerardo Rubino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2704. A bill for the relief of Nicola Di Lorenzo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2705. A bill for the relief of Antonio Lo Iacono; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2706. A bill for the relief of Rajinder Singh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2707. A bill for the relief of Dr. Vugane Krishna Sundararaja Iyengar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2708. A bill for the relief of Angelo Trumbaturi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2709. A bill for the relief of Juana Kanashiro de Dias, Miguel Dias, and Anna Luisa Dias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2710. A bill for the relief of Calogero Coco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2711. A bill for the relief of Bernardita D. Bencio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2712. A bill for the relief of Antonio La Diana and Livia La Diana, his wife; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2713. A bill for the relief of Mariano Bonaccorso; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2714. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Addamo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2715. A bill for the relief of Jean Allenby Nicholas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2716. A bill for the relief of Vivencia O. Consing; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2717. A bill for the relief of Oswald E. Dempster; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2718. A bill for the relief of Alexis Harcourt Gilbert; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2719. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Clelia Grella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2720. A bill for the relief of Merickston L. Nicholson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2721. A bill for the relief of Mabel Generva Hayes (Wilson); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2722. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Cicco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2723. A bill for the relief of Santo Lipari; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2724. A bill for the relief of Luisa Masbad; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2725. A bill for the relief of Lydia V. Mejia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2726. A bill for the relief of Leonarda Pirello; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2727. A bill for the relief of Raffaele Di Maggio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2728. A bill for the relief of Stella Travlos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2729. A bill for the relief of Maria Ermelinda Vargas Castro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2730. A bill for the relief of Mola Jane Douglas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2731. A bill for the relief of Arnold Williams, his wife, Rose Eloise Williams, and their minor children, Delorese Williams, Claude Williams, and Audley Williams; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2732. A bill for the relief of Esperanza M. Toledo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2733. A bill for the relief of Victoria Frederick; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2734. A bill for the relief of Dr. Lourdes Tabique; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2735. A bill for the relief of Dr. Genuina T. Dizon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2736. A bill for the relief of Grace Cordner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2737. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Belmonte; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2738. A bill for the relief of Bernardo Randazzo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2739. A bill for the relief of Etheline Garriques; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2740. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Vanda Paolina, her minor daughter, Carla Paolina, and her mother-in-law, Mrs. Italia Paolina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2741. A bill for the relief of John H. L. Dye; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2742. A bill for the relief of Lilia Cortes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2743. A bill for the relief of Alexandros Andreopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2744. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Giallombardo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2745. A bill for the relief of Christine Johnson (also known as Christine Cayenne); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2746. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Maniace and Esopia Maniace (nee Pruiti) and their children, Sarafina Maniace, Rosaria Maniace, and Benedetta Maniace; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RACE:

H.R. 2747. A bill for the relief of Dimitra Petta and Demetra Koutroumbi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 2748. A bill for the relief of Antoni Wichryk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2749. A bill for the relief of Antonios Jabbour Mikhail, his wife, Ivette Jabbour Mikhail, and Jabbour Antonios Mikhail and Mikhail Antonios Mikhail; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 2750. A bill for the relief of Gilberto Caldera Martinez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2751. A bill for the relief of Masako Adachi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2752. A bill for the relief of Kock Kong Fong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2753. A bill for the relief of Youssef Michel Ayoub, his wife, Yvette Maria Michaela Ayoub, and their minor children, Cherif Youssef and Wafih Youssef Ayoub; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2754. A bill for the relief of Jesus T. Kangleon and his wife, Solita A. Kangleon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2755. A bill for the relief of Helene Auguste Marie Niesel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2756. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Woo Shee Quon (also known as Chung Oi Woo and Chung Oy Quon); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 2757. A bill for the relief of Maria Alexandros Siagris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2758. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Helen N. Papoulias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2759. A bill for the relief of Gemma Lee (also known as Chin Ok Lee); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2760. A bill for the relief of Anna Pitaoulis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of New York:

H.R. 2761. A bill for the relief of Enrico DeMonte; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2762. A bill for the relief of Manlio Massimiliani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2763. A bill for the relief of Dr. Consan Cu Dy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2764. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ellen Mary Taylor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2765. A bill for the relief of Juana Brandariz Sanchez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2766. A bill for the relief of Dr. Wei-Tsung Chin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2767. A bill for the relief of Lucio Marinucci; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2768. A bill for the relief of Emilia D'Addario Santorelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STALBAUM:

H.R. 2769. A bill for the relief of Calliope Res; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLL:

H.R. 2770. A bill for the relief of Dr. Theodora P. Virvilli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLL (by request):

H.R. 2771. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Angelina Cardellina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UTT:

H.R. 2772. A bill for the relief of Ksenija Popovic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VIGORITO:

H.R. 2773. A bill for the relief of Dr. Chul Nam Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2774. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hae Kyong Han, and her minor children, Myong Suk Lee, Ki Dong Lee, and Kyong Dong Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON:

H.R. 2775. A bill for the relief of Stanislav F. Granec; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

A Tribute to Taras Shevchenko

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 13, 1965

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, on December 20, 1964, the Ukrainian community in Buffalo, N.Y., held a dinner-banquet and paid tribute to a great Ukrainian poet and freedom fighter—Taras Shevchenko. Three Buffalo men were also honored at this banquet, and I am very proud that I was chosen to be one of these.

The principal address, delivered by Dr. Nestor Procyk, who is an outstanding citizen in our great City of Good Neighbors, together with my speech, follows:

ADDRESS OF DR. NESTOR PROCYK, DELIVERED AT THE DINNER-BANQUET GIVEN BY THE UKRAINIAN COMMUNITY OF BUFFALO TO PAY TRIBUTE TO CONGRESSMAN T. J. DULSKI, MAYOR CHESTER KOWAL, AND COUNCIL PRESIDENT CHESTER C. GORSKI, BUFFALO, DECEMBER 20, 1964, UKRAINIAN HOME "DNIPRO"

Distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, I do feel certain that all of you, gathered here tonight—in this modest but our own home "Dnipro"—the Ukrainian headquarters of Buffalo, will share my views and feelings, when I'll say that this is an especially joyous night for us Ukrainians of the Buffalo area, in this year's Christmas season, as it is a night of a historical significance to our community. For, we have assembled here tonight to honor—and again should I say, in our modest but from the depths of our hearts and in our most sincere way—three distinguished men of our Buffalo community: the Honorable T. J. DULSKI, Hon. Chester Kowal, and Hon. Chester C. Gorski; to honor them and to pay tribute to their dedication to their people, to the duties of their office, but most of all, to their living up to good American citizenship.

We are gathered here to pay tribute to them for their human approach to life's human problems in a most humane way. We look at these three honored men as representing the symbols of good public servants, who work with understanding and dedication, who serve their community and all parts of it to the best of their ability and—of course—to the extent the community itself, as a whole, or as part of it, deserves, by and through its own initiative, understanding, and efforts, toward its own life and progress and the life and progress of the Nation.

We, the Ukrainian community of Buffalo and everywhere do honor these men and men like them because—in the days of our turbulent and often discouraging time we need individuals with initiative, faith, courage, and desire to work for people's cause, serving both—the people and the cause. We need men of character and stature to show the others the proper way of life to follow. We need people with firm patriotic ideas and principles which would not break nor weaken under pressure of the temptations of the day or the easy way out of public duty which we too often see. We need men of vision and imagination to sow and nurture the seeds of truth and justice in our democracy, of freedom and order, of duties to one's country, of faith in the high values of our personal and community life and of courage to stand firm for these values, principles, and truths.

We do need such men and many such people now and we will need them in the days to come, because, ladies and gentlemen, America is in a grave danger. It would be childish on our part if we should fail to understand this gravity and seriousness of the present situation.

Abroad, thanks to our chief adversary—Russia and communism melted into one—we Americans are being presented as ugly and imperialistic, as inhuman exploiters and killers of mankind. Unfortunately, the number of those who do believe in this skillfully manufactured and spread propaganda rapidly increases. Instead, the number of our genuine friends and people who have had faith in us and who believed in our principles of freedom and human liberties, in our high standards of justice and truth, decreases as rapidly. The nations enslaved and oppressed by Russia and communism begin to shake their heads hopelessly and to offer us a disappointed grin, disguising their deep pain and sorrow. Our people are being told—and many, including those of high rank in our administrative branch of Government, seem to delude themselves or, maybe, to pretend—that we are in a state of cold war while the clear logic and down-to-earth reality proves that we are now in the hottest type of war because we are in the midst of a total war with an enemy who aims at our total destruction.

For, I venture to say, the so-called hot war is not now limited to South Vietnam, Congo and other areas marked by more pronounced restlessness, like political hoodloomism by attacking U.S. institutions in foreign countries. As another example, I would see a tragic mistake if anyone would consider the Russian so-called oceanographic studies of the Caribbean waters only a peaceful maneuvering of the Russian submarine fleet. No, ladies and gentlemen, we are in a state of very hot and total guerrilla-type war launched against us and the rest of the free or good world by the most unscrupulous, cunning, inhuman, and cruel enemy the world has ever known. And this type of total guerrilla-type war is being launched by our enemy in all aspects and dimensions: physical, moral, spiritual, and cultural as well. We are in a total war with an enemy who, in his wild drive to conquer for the sake of conquering, will never stop, give up or give in, unless he is forced down to his knees and kept so for the time necessary to make him understand his wrongdoings. The sooner all of us in these United States of America do realize that, have courage and are ready to face it and to do the necessary things about it, the less sacrifice we are going to pay in the long run. We must provide hope, we must nurture faith in our ability to win this total struggle.

Therefore, we need more men and women of the stature of our honored guests tonight, because they know what situation we are in, they are facing it and are doing all they can about it.

We may discuss, of course, the situation inside the United States, too. But I do not feel that tonight is either the place or the time for doing it. I would like to mention only that this aspect of the matter—the aspect of the internal situation—is not too rosy either. For, there are too many signs and symptoms of the enemy introjected within the realm of this very country, guerrilla-type warfare, that are tending to destroy our culture, spiritual and moral values of our traditions, our ideals, our system and way of life. We are doing fine—or even wonderfully—where material values of life are concerned, but, are we doing as fine in the social, interpersonal and community life aspects? I leave this question open with you, ladies and gentlemen, as I am sure that you are as much concerned with it as I am and, as I know, are the gentlemen we are honoring tonight as well as all the distinguished guests at the dais. As for myself I am most concerned with the problems of our youth—the new generation.

Thomas Paine once said that "The duty of man is plain and simple and consists but of two points; his duty to God, which every man must feel; and his duty to his neighbor, to do as he would be done by." In full agreement with that, I would like only to add that into our duties to our neighbors I would include the duties to our country and Nation and our duties to all nations and all men. And in that respect I, again, am happy to say that the men honored by us tonight have proven their understanding of these duties. Here again is the reason why we render them this tribute.

But we, Ukrainians, have another good reason for paying tribute to these gentlemen and to their alikes.

We are relatively new in America, this country blessed with freedom, liberties, and abundance. Few of us, only, came in the previous century, some of us came before and between two wars and most of us came only after World War II. All of us were driven from our beloved Ukraine by political and economic tyranny enforced upon our land by Ukraine's enemies. We came here in poor financial condition with empty pockets and, some of us, with just the clothes on our backs.

However, we didn't come quite empty handed, as a matter of fact, not empty handed at all. We brought in our hearts a piece of our dear country, and a score of great and noble Ukrainian traditions, Ukrainian historical and cultural heritage; we brought in our minds the knowledge, experience and the ability to think and to act; and we brought in our souls a strong faith in God's justice and in freedom for all nations and men, including Ukrainian nation and the Ukrainian people. But, above all, we brought with us—in our minds and our souls and our hearts—an extreme love to our country and to all that is good, the love which we were and are willing to and anxious to offer to America and her people. We are not extremists, as a matter of fact we are against any bad extremism, but we cherish extreme love in our hearts to Ukraine and to America alike. With this love and with other assets mentioned above we came to this country and we were received with warmth and friendliness by many, but, with understanding, sincerity, and equal love by few. Among these few we found the distinguished guests we are honoring tonight. For, they were the ones among the first few, who seem to have recognized that we didn't come here to just eat and digest America's food, but, to work, contribute with our assets whatever we can to the development and further cultural, social, and economic progress of this great country. In other words "to honor, love, and cherish, for better or worse, till death or fate do us part."

That is why we chose these gentlemen for our tribute tonight as representatives of those who showed us this sincerity, understanding and love. It goes without saying, may I add here, ladies and gentlemen, that all our guests at this dais, as well as at the main tables, have distinguished themselves, one way or another, by being our sincere and understanding friends which we have cherished, are delighted with and very very proud of them.

As you see, in our choice we were not motivated by party affiliation, and the fact that Mayor Kowal is not among us is due only to his ailment that temporarily ties him to the hospital bed. We like and subscribe to a two party system and hope and pray that they both get equally on the ball and united within themselves. We chose those who in addition to their political parties, and above them, recognize America first.

Finally we chose them for tribute tonight because all three of them, each in his own way, did not only show their sincerity, understanding and warm feeling in words, but they proved it by their acts and actions.

The Ukrainians are the kind of people that, while reserving themselves the right to constructively criticize whatever they feel is necessary, they also and first of all like to exercise their right to pay tribute and offer recognition and public acknowledgement whenever and to whomever they feel it is due.

It seems to us that few public officials escape criticism but still less are given adequate recognition for a work well done. Our Ukrainian community of Buffalo feels that it is fitting to give public acknowledgement to men in office. It seems especially fitting to do this, apart from free election periods and noisy election confusion, but just this Christmas season—the season of brotherly understanding.

Our committee felt therefore that it is essential to render this tribute to our three deserving men, as this is the only way unselfish devotion to duty is properly recognized.

Our mayor, the Honorable Chester Kowal, deserves the gratitude and thanks of the Ukrainian community of Buffalo metropolitan area and we acknowledge it publicly. For he was among the first ones who, as a public official, had the understanding of our needs and desires and who first gave us a helping hand as far back as in the early fifties when he served as the city's comptroller. To him we are indebted, that we are in possession of this home which represents to us—as I mentioned earlier—the headquarters of Ukrainian mainstream in Buffalo. In the period of his tenure of the office of the mayor he never refused to give us his full official and personal cooperation and support in any endeavor of ours that required his attention, help, or approval. Besides, Mayor Kowal has always been a stanch supporter of the Ukrainian freedom's cause as he is for freedom of all captive nations. He is also known to us for his motto that "Freedom is everybody's business" and he has always lived up to this motto.

We certainly regret very much that our mayor's ailment prevents him from being among us and from enhancing our joy by his personal participation at our gathering tonight, but this will not prevent us from paying tribute to him and to express our feelings of appreciation and acknowledgement for all his endeavors in our behalf, along with our wishes for a speedy recovery and a very merry Christmas and a happy New Year. The committee has made arrangements to visit Mayor Kowal in his hospital room tonight, following our dinner, and to present to him our token of esteem, gratitude, and appreciation.

Hon. Chester C. Gorski, president of the Common Council of the City of Buffalo, is another stanch supporter of the cause of captive nations and among them the Ukrainian nation, of course. The Ukrainian community of Buffalo became acquainted with council's President Gorski through the UCCA representative in the latter fifties and this contact has remained uninterrupted. It was thanks to Mr. Gorski's understanding that our request for permission to observe the anniversary of Ukrainian independence in the common council chambers of the city hall, in January 1960, was granted and such observances took place for the first time, which was and will remain of great historical significance for the Ukrainians of Buffalo as well as America. It is to be hoped that such observances will continue in the years to come. He never refused the chambers for any other solemn observance of the Ukrainian community which we always have greatly appreciated. When called upon, he was kind to give his personal time to render addresses or to otherwise personally participate in our community observance. This year, the year of 150th anniversary of birth of the poet-laureate of Ukraine Taras Shevchenko, Mr. Gorski presented us with a special encouragement: he promised to introduce the bill to common council that one of the main streets in the waterfront area to be developed, be named Taras Shevchenko Boulevard. This, by the way, was in full consent with ideas of Mayor Kowal as it was with former Mayor Frank A. Sedit's and his legal counsel H. Buswell Roberts, whom we are honored to have present with us tonight, as well as his charming wife. Should this naming of the street after the greatest Ukrainian take place and we strongly hope it will, our Ukrainian community would receive a spiritual booster and the city of Buffalo and name of Mr. Gorski and all those, who contributed to it would enter the golden pages of the history of Ukrainian immigration and the Ukrainian people. The city of Buffalo, too, would have reason to pride herself with Shevchenko's name as is our Nation's capital, Washington, D.C., with his monument.

Thus, Mr. Council President, Hon. Chester C. Gorski deserves fully the respect, appreciation, and public acknowledgment by the Ukrainian community of Buffalo. The committee, therefore, presents to him tonight a token of our appreciation; with it go our thanks and warm wishes for the best of success in his days to come and in all his noble endeavors. Our best wishes go also to Mrs. Gorski, of course.

Our third honored man tonight, but far from the last and still further from being the least, is the Honorable THADDEUS J. DULSKI, U.S. Congressman of the 41st District. We do know our dear Congressman for several years and he has always been of great help to the Ukrainian community on the local level but still greater on the national scene. Congressman DULSKI is known as a firm opponent of communism and Russian imperialism and a stanch defender and promoter of the freedom to all nations and men in the world. In him we have one of the greatest and best informed supporters of captive nations' cause, including Ukrainian cause and we know that from his multiple speeches in Congress and at civic affairs. And as I understand Congressman has been nominated and will soon receive a well-deserved Captive Nation Award from New York City. What the Ukrainian community in particular is concerned, Congressman Dulski has rendered innumerable services to us and here again both on the national and local level. His work in Congress and spreading upon the official record of the Congress all those events, observances, and special occasions concerning the cause of submerged Ukraine are well known to us. He has been in the forefront in our successful endeavors regarding the erection of the T. Shevchenko monument which now stands in our nation's capital as a national shrine to freedom. His endeavors to secure a national Shevchenko memorial stamp and a special section in the Library of Congress for the works of T. Shevchenko have been inspiring and most encouraging to our people all over the nation. Knowing our Congressman as we do we are confident all his efforts will be crowned with victory.

Congressman Dulski nominated one of our young men, Mr. Bohdan Sahan, as his candidate to the U.S. Military Academy at West Point. Mr. Sahan is present with us tonight and we will give him the opportunity to express his appreciation to our Congressman.

There are many more things that Congressman Dulski has done or is doing for the Ukrainians as part of his constituency, which time would not permit us to review. I summarize it shortly only by saying that in Congressman T. J. Dulski the Ukrainian community in Buffalo have found truly a people's Congressman. And for all these reasons which I have stated we do feel that Congressman Dulski fully merits our heartfelt appreciation, our grateful thanks and the assurance of our unwavering support in all his dedicated endeavors.

Only a few weeks ago our Congressman and his wife celebrated their 25th wedding anniversary, and the birthday of Mrs. Dulski only last week. Our congratulations to them, joined by our fervent hope that God will bless them and their family with many more happy anniversaries.

Now, since this is Taras Shevchenko year for Ukrainians the world over, we present to each of our honored guests a token of our esteem in a form which symbolizes the highest meaning of gratitude to Ukrainians the world over—an oil painting duplicating the self-portrait of Taras Shevchenko—the poet-patriot of Ukraine.

Mr. Dulski. Thank you for that eloquent and generous introduction.

I am deeply honored to have been asked to join your fine group here this evening. When Ukrainians get together, you can be sure it is a joyous occasion—but more than that, it is usually for a purpose—a purpose for uniting behind a cause that serves the good of the community, the Nation, or their homeland.

Ukrainian Americans are known the country over for their devotion to the principles of liberty and national independence. I had occasion to witness this myself when they came to Washington last year and again this year for the groundbreaking and dedication of the Shevchenko statue.

They are a great people, and America has been blessed with their many fine contributions in every field of endeavor.

Taras Shevchenko is proclaimed as the champion of liberty for all mankind. He rose from serfdom and once his own freedom was won, he dared losing it in his fight for the freedom of all Ukrainians and of all peoples. So, too, Ukrainians today—in the United States and all parts of the world—continue the fight to liberate their homeland from the modern Russian Communist oppressors.

Some of you here attended the Shevchenko ceremonies in Washington. The 86th Congress performed an invaluable service to our national interest when it legislated the act permitting all Americans to honor the works and achievements of Shevchenko. This name is a historic symbol of freedom throughout Eastern Europe. The spirit of his fight lives forcefully and brightly in the hearts of all the freedom-loving peoples, who are under the yoke of the Soviet Russian imperiocolonists. It was little wonder that in 1960–61 Moscow and its puppets reacted vehemently and viciously against our congressional action.

I am proud that, as a Member of Congress, I had the opportunity to make American soil available for the erection of the Shevchenko memorial.

It has also been my privilege to introduce legislation which would provide a Shevchenko memorial section in the U.S. Library of Congress. Considerable support for such a memorial section has been indicated, and I intend to reintroduce my bill in the next session, and to continue to solicit support among my colleagues in an endeavor to bring this proposal to the House floor at an early date.

The encouragement and assistance I have received from the Ukrainian Congress Committee, your own Buffalo group, and from Ukrainian organizations throughout the country has been most gratifying.

One of the most important issues before the American people today is the captive nations. I have sponsored legislation calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. No public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively, all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself. Such a committee could serve as a beacon throughout the world to show the solidarity and determination of the American people that these captive nations are not forgotten in their struggle for liberation and true independence.

This year we celebrated the sixth annual observance of Captive Nations Week. This most important observance has a meaning for both the imprisoned peoples of the world and our own citizens. The deprivation of liberty does not remove the desire for it. We must show the citizens of the Soviet, and Red Chinese, satellites that we care and that their appeals for help are heard and understood.

The Ukrainians have been among the most unfortunate peoples in modern history. Reviewing events endured by your brave people over the years bids us to pause and reflect on their sufferings in their thirst for freedom. It is a thirst for freedom that has never once wavered, and is as strong today as it ever was.

We are on the threshold of great events. In our power is the ability to carry forward the great struggle for the national independence of Ukraine and of every other enslaved and subjugated nation of the world.

It is an undertaking in which we must not fail. It is an undertaking in which we must succeed and be victorious. Thank you.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JANUARY 14, 1965

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., called attention to this verse of Scripture before leading in prayer: I John 3:1: *Behold, what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called the sons of God.*

Most merciful and gracious God, incline our minds and hearts to recognize the need of Thy presence and guidance in all of the deliberations and decisions of this day.

May we always be sensitive and responsive to the promptings and persuasions of Thy Holy Spirit seeking to fortify us against those temptations which would undermine our character and cause us to break faith with our better self.

Show us how the leaders in the affairs of church and state may strengthen and enrich the moral and spiritual life of our Republic.

Inspire them to help the people of our beloved country to cultivate those virtues which are the secret of a nation's cohesive and conquering power.

To Thy name we shall ascribe the praise. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the President pro tempore, pursuant to Public Law 86-1, appointed Mr. Talmadge to be a member of the Joint Economic Committee, vice Mr. Pell, excused.

SELECTION OF MINORITY WHIP

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Republican conference and by direction of the Republican conference, it is my privilege to announce the selection of the minority whip for the 89th Congress, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Arends].

REVISION OF THE IMMIGRATION LAWS

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced the administration's immigration bill. President Johnson's proposal, as did President Kennedy's which I also sponsored, represents a new departure and a giant step forward in the direction of a humane and sensible immigration policy.

Before World War I our Nation, as the land of freedom, was looked upon as a haven for the oppressed where all were welcome to develop their potential in a democratic society. And our Nation was enriched by those who came from foreign lands. However, after World War I, the word "foreigner" became an epithet as fear, anxiety, and xenophobia gripped our land. In this atmosphere, a highly restrictive immigration policy based on the 1920 census was born. The national origins quota system based on a judgment that people from one nation are better than people from another is still with us today. As President Johnson said yesterday in his immigration message, "We have no right to disparage the ancestors of millions of our fellow Americans in this way." The President also pointed out with respect to the national origins quota system, "Relationships with a number of countries, and hence the success of our foreign policy, is needlessly impeded by this proposition."

The administration's immigration bill eliminates the invidious national origins quota system over a 5-year period. With the passage of this measure, the results of the 1920 census will no longer shape our immigration policy. The bill also deals with the backlog of applications accumulated over the years in a number of our consulates abroad by providing for the administration of those on the waiting list during the transitional period and by weeding out those who are not serious applicants. This measure will benefit our Nation by providing for the admission on a preferential basis of those whose skills would be advantageous to the economy.

The bill will also end discrimination against the newer nations in the Western Hemisphere whose citizens are now bound by minimum quotas, while citizens of other nations in the same geographic area are entitled to nonquota admission.

Mr. Speaker, I join with President Johnson in urging "the Congress to return the United States to an immigration policy which both serves the national interest and continues our traditional ideals. No move could more effectively reaffirm our fundamental belief that a man is to be judged—and judged exclusively—on his worth as a human being."

A FIRM STAND IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, article 19 of the Charter of the United Nations provides that a member nation 2 years in arrears in payment of its financial contributions shall lose its vote in the General Assembly. One-fifth of the members of the United Nations are in default of their peacekeeping assessments. The rule is clear and so is the penalty for failure to adhere. Today I have introduced a resolution calling for the United States to stand firm in its position that article 19 should be complied with by all member nations. I do not consider this a vindictive stand. I do consider it a stand in support of basic principle. If the integrity of the United Nations is to be preserved then that body must follow the course set out in its charter. This is not a minor issue. A deviation on this point establishes a precedent for ignoring other provisions of the charter and the end result would be the dissolution of the U.N. into a debating society. If those nations in default do not pay their share then the United States would be justified in not meeting its obligation which now represents almost one-third of the total U.N. budget. If this should happen the result would be a total break down of the United Nations and its noble purposes. The United Nations must maintain its constitutional integrity if it is to be effective in dealing with world problems.

A MANY-SPLENDORED THING

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, in his state of the Union message on January 4, President Johnson set forth a prescription for the Nation to follow in order to guarantee its future welfare and being. It is in general form, of course, as these broad statements must be, but it does represent his careful appraisal of the problems which face the Nation with his recommendations for action.

All of the President's recommendations will not be realized by him. Some may never come to fruition, but he has furnished us with a broad blueprint that will be helpful to us as we begin our work in the 89th Congress.

I note that he gave the first third of his speech to a discussion of the international problems in which he expressed our willingness to move toward better relations with the European communities while maintaining our firm resistance to the spread of communism in Asia.

From the domestic point of view I was pleased with the emphasis which the President placed on the fight against water pollution as well as recommendations for an excise tax cut. I was pleased to note his emphasis on the need for improved public transportation and his use of the Boston-Washington route as an example for a possible improvement. His recommendations for legislation dealing with presidential disability and providing for a National Foundation of the Arts were pleasing to me since I have filed and sponsored legislation in both fields.

The general reaction to the President's message has been favorable. One of the most cogent comments I have seen was published in the January 5 edition of the Ansonia, Conn., Evening Sentinel, with which I conclude my remarks at this point:

A MANY-SPLENDORED THING

President Johnson unveiled his plan for the Great Society. It is a many-splendored thing.

In the sense of long-term goals, it is an architect's sketch of cornucopia, a comprehensive enumeration of the needs and wants and hopes of people everywhere.

But the message was a far more specific document than the usual state of the Union message. It requires careful analysis over a period of time.

The President unveiled a vast package of domestic programs most of which must await evaluation when they are finally spelled out in detailed legislative proposals.

He proposes:

A big new program of Federal aid to education.

A Federal plan of hospitalization for the aged financed by social security.

A substantial cut in excise taxes.

A budget designed to move the economy forward with no hint whether it will pass his $100 billion limit.

Federal participation in birth prevention to control population.

Reforms in the electoral college to bind electors to conform with the expressed will of the electorate.

A massive attack on disease through regional medical centers.

Enforcement of the Civil Rights Act, especially of the right to vote.

Repeal of the Taft-Hartley provision permitting States to pass right-to-work laws.

A doubling of the war on poverty.

An expanded open spaces program.

Increased Federal power to prevent pollution of streams and air.

A possible new department of housing and urban development to attack the problems of cities.

A regional approach to planning to meet the problems of Megalopolis.

Congressional readiness to make swift income tax cuts if there should be signs of a recession.

These are just the highlights among the domestic proposals. There are many others.

On the world scene, he invited Soviet leaders to visit the United States to address the American people on television and hoped American leaders might be privileged to address the Soviet people on Soviet television—an exchange whose relative propaganda values sound dubious and whose elaboration will be interesting to evaluate.

He pledged to continue U.S. aid to South Vietnam but made scant reference to the particulars of a serious situation.

The new Senate Democratic leader, RUSSELL LONG, observed that some of the suggestions are new and should be explored by the proper legislative committees. This should be a careful, down-to-earth process.

The new House Republican leader, GERALD FORD, said the ultimate goals set forth in the message are the goals of all Americans and have been the goals of America since its beginning but there are honest questions of implementation. Indeed there are.

So enormous a program demands the most careful inquiry as to how much, as well as how good. It must be studied in relation to its full impact on the whole Nation's economy, as well as the usual pros and cons of the individual proposals.

PROPOSING RECORD VOTE ON ALL APPROPRIATIONS BILLS

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation changing the rules of the House to require a record vote on all appropriations bills.

At present there is no requirement in the Congress that votes be recorded on bills appropriating money for Federal spending. If each Congressman's vote on every spending bill before the House were made a matter of public record I believe such bills would be considered more closely and unnecessary spending would be reduced.

During the 88th Congress 35 percent of the votes cast on appropriations bills passing the House were unrecorded. These bills involved funds totaling over $22 billion. The taxpayers are certainly entitled to know how their elected officials voted on such sums.

In addition, requiring the roll to be called when votes are taken on appropriations bills would also improve attendance during House consideration of such measures.

The record shows that an average of 13 percent of the House membership was absent when votes were taken on appropriations bills in the 88th Congress. There is room for improvement in view of the seriousness of the appropriations process.

THE U.S. INFORMATION AGENCY

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to deplore in the strongest terms possible the activities of the U.S. Information Agency in making a "phony propaganda movie" of our red hot war in Vietnam.

As smoke bombs broke in brilliant colors and Vietnamese troops supposedly captured an enemy village, a U.S. captain said that "if they want to portray the war, they should try to do it at least like it really is." I share his views.

The USIA was founded to tell the truth about America to the entire world. Now the Agency has been exposed as conducting the same sort of misleading operation with its Vietnamese war film that the entire administration has been conducting with the American people on the overall situation in southeast Asia. This is deceitful.

To me, it is unfortunate enough that we must ask the American people to spend close to $2 million a day to finance a war that we are apparently losing. But it is even worse to ask our citizens for another $100,000 in tax money to finance a phony, simulated film in an effort to fool the world about the truth in Vietnam with a peek through rose-colored glasses.

Of course, the USIA had no alternative but to announce a ban on this fake film. The fact is, it should never have been contracted for in the first place—and it causes one to wonder how much more is being spent to sugar-coat the news. This should be looked into. I say further, it is time the administration started to give the American people the truth about Vietnam.

THE HONORABLE ROBERT J. CORBETT, OF PENNSYLVANIA, RECEIVES FIRST GEORGE WASHINGTON CARVER AWARD

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, as we all know, last Tuesday, January 5, was George Washington Carver Day—a day set aside each year by act of this Congress when a grateful nation that has benefited so greatly from his genius commemorates the passing of the great scientist, teacher, and humanitarian.

At impressive ceremonies held here in the Nation's Capital on that day, the man most responsible for the designation of January 5 each year as George Washington Carver Day, our distinguished colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT] was appropriately honored by receiving the first George Washington Carver Award.

The award was presented to Mr. CORBETT in the form of a handsomely inscribed bronze and walnut plaque by Dr. Rosa Gragg, chairman of the Career Commemoration Committee of the District of Columbia, "in appreciation for his pioneering efforts in introducing legislation in the 79th Congress of the United States to honor a great scientist and insure future recognition of Carver's outstanding contributions."

I am pleased to bring this to the attention of the Members of the House as I know that all his colleagues feel as I do that this is an honor which Mr. CORBETT richly deserves and that they all join with me in offering him sincere congratulations.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I know the Members of the House share in congratulating the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT] on receiving the first George Washington Carver Award. This award for Congressman CORBETT's efforts in introducing legislation in the 79th Congress to honor a great scientist is certainly merited. I take particular pleasure in joining in the tribute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania because the George Washington Carver Monument is located at Diamond, Mo., in the district I am privileged to represent. Thousands of visitors come annually to pay tribute to his memory.

NO WITHDRAWAL FROM VIETNAM

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, like other Americans I am well aware that the situation in Vietnam has been going badly. I do not claim to have, any more than anyone else, a pat or simple solution to our military difficulties there.

But I have watched with increasing concern and uneasiness in recent days as individual Members of the Congress, in the face of these mounting discouragements, have proposed abandoning our commitments in Vietnam and retreating or disengaging there in one fashion or another. I do not believe that these sentiments, though they may have come in for special attention in the press, represent the thinking of the overwhelming majority of the Members of the House or the Senate and I believe it is important for some of us to say so publicly without delay.

For nearly two decades America has led the worldwide fight for freedom and against Communist aggression and encroachment. We formalized that commitment in the Truman doctrine, and expounded it in the policy of containment. We underwrote it with money and courage and blood in the Marshall plan, in military and economic aid, in the Korean war, in the Berlin airlift, in Lebanon, in the Formosa Straits, and in the Cuban missile crisis. Over the years as we have discharged these responsibilities we have had our ups and downs. But we have continued to honor this commitment. Never before have we seriously considered quitting just because the going was getting tough. Most emphatically we should not do so now.

For what is at stake today in Vietnam is far more than the current military situation in one faraway corner of the world. It is nothing less than the leadership and credibility of the United States of America. Having put our hand to the plow we cannot now possibly turn back without disastrous results not merely in southeast Asia but around the world. If the United States, once sufficiently harassed and embarrassed, can be persuaded to back down on its commitment in Vietnam, who then can ever again put faith in our commitment in any other part of the world? What better proof that Uncle Sam is after all just a paper tiger, that our will and determination simply do not measure up to the megatonage of our nuclear arsenal? What more dramatic evidence that American democracy just does not have the stomach to stay the full distance, that communism, not democracy, is the real wave of the future? If America can be harassed and frustrated out of southeast Asia, how could she then be counted on to stand firm if the going suddenly got tough in Berlin or Cuba or Latin America?

Mr. Speaker, I believe these counsels of retreat and discouragement do a grave disservice to the American tradition of world leadership and I believe they must emphatically be rejected. However long and hard the road may be, America in my judgment has no honorable alternative but to stay in Vietnam until the independence of the people of Vietnam has been assured.

I was gratified that President Johnson made it clear in his state of the Union message that this Nation will continue to honor its commitment to freedom in Vietnam. As one Member of this Congress and as one member of its Committee on Armed Services, I intend to support whatever additional commitments of American power to Vietnam may be necessary to insure the continued freedom of the people of this area and the continued denial of their country to the forces of aggressive and totalitarian communism, whether Soviet or Chinese.

FARM PROBLEMS

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation designed to attack farm problems on three fronts and wish to take this opportunity to urge my colleagues to give this measure their fullest consideration.

We in the Congress have been witness to a vast number of farm programs that have been enacted over the years. Many of us have been opposed to several of these programs for two prime reasons. First, although the need to help the individual family farmer was most pressing, it was the corporate farms that obtained the greatest advantage from the majority of these programs. Second, and certainly equally significant, far too many of these programs have failed to give the farmer an option as to whether or not he would participate, thus serving to usurp the farmer's control over his own operation and placing it in the hands of the Federal Government.

I have steadily maintained that this trend has served to give the little farmer a "big brother" complex and must be abated. I strongly feel that the farmer should retain the right to make major decisions with regard to the production and sale of his products and should not be dictated to by an impersonal authority in a distant city.

The bill that I am introducing is geared to first, increase per family farm income; second, reduce the surplus of wheat and feed grains; and third, decrease the public costs of maintaining farm programs. Its principal provisions call for adjustments to wheat and feed grain production programs and the establishment of a cropland retirement program.

I anticipate that the programs will help to stabilize feed grain prices so as to make more nearly possible the planning that is requisite for successful farming and, with regard to the cropland retirement program, protect the Nation with respect to future needs of an expanding population.

This measure was prompted by lengthy discussions with my farmer constituents. It reflects our combined thinking and sincere desire to arrive at sensible and workable solutions to many of the problems that plague our existing farm programs. I do not claim that it is a cure-all; however, I feel that it constitutes a giant step in the right direction.

At this time, I would like to include in my remarks several salient points pertaining to the main features of this bill. These points were developed in my several conferences with spokesmen from and for the farm community.

New wheat legislation should be enacted in time to eliminate the necessity for another referendum on the wheat certificate plan provided by existing law which was rejected by wheatgrowers in 1963.

The present "emergency" feed grain program was initiated in 1961 and has been extended with minor modifications since that time. Considering the vast acreage of land diverted from production by the program, the growth in market attained during its 4 years of operation, the poor crop in 1964, and the continuing surplus of feed grains, the program clearly has failed to solve the feed grain problem.

Furthermore, the programs for wheat and feed grains have aggravated the price and income problems of livestock producers and have proved an enormous financial burden on the American taxpayer.

The bill that I am introducing states that authority for wheat marketing quotas and acreage allotments would be terminated and the multiple-price wheat plan provisions of the 1962 Farm Act would be repealed. The provisions of the Agriculture Act of 1964, authorizing the 1964 and 1965 program for wheat would be allowed to expire. The 1963 Feed Grain Act, which applies only to the 1964 and 1965 crops of feed grains would be allowed to expire. These actions would clear the slate, beginning with the 1966 crops, for a new approach to the wheat and feed grain problem.

Beginning with the 1966 crop, price supports for wheat would be set at the U.S. farm price equivalent of the average world market price during the immediately preceding 3 marketing years—currently about $1.34 per bushel. Premiums and discounts would be used to reflect market demand for milling and baking quality. For corn, supports would be 90 percent of the average price received by farmers for corn during the immediately preceding 3 years. Currently this would mean a price support of about $1 per bushel for corn. Supports for other feed grains would be related to corn with differentials to reflect differences in feeding value.

Under no circumstances would the price support level be less than 50 percent of the applicable parity price. At the present time support prices computed by the market price formulas would be considerably higher than 50 percent of parity in all cases. This approach would automatically adjust support prices to changing supply and demand conditions.

The cropland retirement provisions of this measure deserve special attention. They are both temporary and voluntary in nature. Producers of all commodities would be given an opportunity to participate in the cropland retirement program. The voluntary nature of this proposed program minimizes the likelihood that it would have any adverse effects on individual counties or communities; however, to make certain that no area would be adversely affected, the Secretary of Agriculture would be directed to place a maximum limitation on the percentage of total cropland which could be retired in any one State or county.

The key to this entire bill that makes it attractive to me, a number of my colleagues and, most important, to the farmers, is that it preserves the opportunity for each farmer to make his own decisions. It provides for needed adjustments in resource use without forcing every farmer to retire a part of his farm without regard to his individual situation. It uses support prices to encourage orderly marketing and orderly adjustments in production rather than to fix prices. In short, it demonstrates our sincerity to maintain our partnership with the farmer and willingness to do all that we can to assist him and preserve his role as a bulwark in our society.

HON. LUTHER H. HODGES, SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, as Members of Congress we have an opportunity of associating with and observing the work of many outstanding Americans who perform brilliant services in various stations of our Government. It has been my privileges, as well as yours, to work with so many outstanding, capable, experienced, and dedicated persons who have rendered service to America and added strength to our country in its great institutions.

I wish to pay tribute today, Mr. Speaker, to one of our great Americans who has served his country so well and contributed so much over the past two decades. In addition to outstanding public service he has rendered in many stations in Government, serving his country since the early part of World War II, the Honorable Luther H. Hodges has served as a member of the Cabinet in the high post of Secretary of Commerce for the past 4 years with brilliance, courage, and dedication.

It has been my privilege and certainly a very great pleasure to have worked closely with him during his service, which I would describe as that of a truly great Secretary of Commerce of the United States. Since it has been my pleasure to have had the association with him officially and personally during these years, I wish to take this occasion, Mr. Speaker, to acknowledge our Nation's debt to this dedicated public servant as he retires from this outstanding Cabinet post.

As President Johnson so well said to him as he leaves his post:

> Your leadership in the Commerce Department has been marked by prudence and progress. You have given of your wisdom and your tolerance not only to your own Department, but to the entire Cabinet as well.

As is well known, Secretary Hodges came to the Commerce Department already highly successful in both business and politics—as an executive in the great American textile industry, and as a Governor of the populous and progressive State of North Carolina.

In leaving his Cabinet post tomorrow, Secretary Hodges will be leaving that great Department with a legacy of purpose that is unique in our time. He has reorganized it and revitalized it, and given it a new sense of mission in its service to the business community and to all the American people.

In our century so many of the great decisions in the lives of men and nations are economic decisions—choices grounded in the very stuff of our individual and national existence, our livelihoods, and our security. In these economic decisions, the Commerce Department has a vital role and a growing responsibility—for supplying information and services, and the leadership and guidance to help us, individually and as a nation, to make the most of our opportunities.

Secretary Hodges has stirred the Department to its organizational roots, bringing forth a new vitality, a new awareness of its mission to promote growth at home and the fulfillment of the grand concept of expanding free trade in a free world society. He was a tower of strength in the battle to enact the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, and he has gone around the country with missionary zeal preaching to American businessmen the need to get into the mainstream of international trade. And in these years of developing world markets our shipments of American goods abroad have soared by more than $5 billion or 27 percent to a record last year of $25 billion.

He has also traveled tirelessly to every continent promoting the sale of U.S. goods and extending a personal invitation to businessmen and tourists alike to come to the United States, to make this great country the No. 1 travel destination of the world. In these and other efforts, he has made the Commerce Department a major force in our increasingly successful effort to alleviate the persistent deficit in our international balance of payments.

Secretary Hodges has brought science and technology into focus as a vital economic determinant, affecting our ability to compete abroad and to maintain a rapidly rising American standard of living in an atmosphere of price stability. He has promoted the modernization of our industrial plant, the development of techniques for making existing technology more readily available to the production line and the small business firm. He has helped to bring new prosperity to the great textile industry, and has shown great courage in spotlighting the problems of our national transportation system.

Throughout the Department he has made its activities more responsive to the needs of American business and the American economy. Never before have businessmen had such a broad range of services, and never before has there been a greater effort to bring these coordinated services to the attention of those who need them, when they need them, and where they need them—from New England to Hawaii, from Alaska to Puerto Rico.

Luther Hodges has had a leading part in the growing involvement of businessmen in the civic and social goals of our country.

We bid farewell tomorrow to a great Secretary of Commerce. Our country and our future is the richer because of his labors. His efforts will live in the industrial spirit that has made America the envy and the hope of mankind.

We wish for him and his lovely companion, Mrs. Hodges, who has been a tower of strength sustaining him throughout the years, continued good health, joy, and happiness, and all blessings of life which they so richly deserve.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I am very happy to yield to our majority leader, the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, first of all the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas is to be commended for taking this time to pay this tribute which is so well deserved, to a great American as he leaves this area of high public service in the Nation's Capital.

Governor Hodges has had a long and distinguished career of public service as Governor of his State, as a Cabinet officer, and in many other positions of importance and public trust. He is a big man. He is a kind man. He is a wise man. He carries those attributes of greatness in a frame and habit that becomes the greatest of men.

It has been a great pleasure and privilege to have known him and his good wife for a number of years. Secretary Hodges is certainly one of the great men of this generation and I join the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, who in his committee work has worked so closely with Secretary Hodges during the past 4 years, in wishing them all the richest blessings of life as they leave us.

Mr. HARRIS. I thank the gentleman for his most appropriate comments.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from Florida, a member of the committee who has observed the work of Secretary Hodges throughout the last 4 years as I have been privileged to do.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to join in these remarks in expressing our best wishes to Secretary Hodges as he retires from his Government service.

As the chairman has said, it has been my honor to observe his work, being a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce myself. I think the great confidence that Luther Hodges brought to Government and the people who came in contact with him was one of his greatest contributions. I think the business community certainly had their confidence reestablished in the way he ran the Department of Commerce. It certainly was a great privilege to work with him as a member of this committee and my chairman working with him, to see the success and the progress of the programs that he initiated.

So I too, Mr. Speaker, would like to join with my chairman and colleagues in wishing for Secretary Hodges and Mrs. Hodges Godspeed in their voyage through life in the days ahead.

Mr. HARRIS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members wishing to do so may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

DEMOCRATIC CAUCUS ON MONDAY, JANUARY 18, AT 10 A.M.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of informing colleagues on this side of the aisle that there will be a caucus of Democratic Members of the House here in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Monday, January 18, at 10 a.m., for the purpose of agreeing to recommendations of the Democratic committee on committees in designating Democratic members of the several committees and their assignment thereon.

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution, House Resolution 114, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 114

Resolved, That during the Eighty-ninth Congress, the Committee on Government Operations shall be composed of thirty-four members.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Would the gentleman from Oklahoma indicate the distribution of the three additional members?

Mr. ALBERT. This is an addition of three memberships to the Committee on Government Operations, two of which will be assigned to the majority and one of which will be assigned to the minority.

This is a matter which has been worked out, as a few other matters have been, between the leadership on both sides for the convenience of the House.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time for the purpose of asking the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT], the majority leader, if he can give us a schedule for next week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Next week there will be one or more messages received. I know the Defense Department message is coming up. We expect to receive that on Monday.

There will be considered a resolution designating Members on this side of the aisle to serve on committees; and I assume that a similar resolution will be offered for the Republican side of the aisle.

The District of Columbia budget is expected to come up next week.

Except for resolutions and procedural matters, I know of no legislative business for next week. There will be, of course, the inaugural procedures next week. We hope to be able to expedite matters and to meet at appropriate times for the House to participate in those ceremonies.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Will the House go over until Monday when it adjourns today?

Mr. ALBERT. It will be my purpose, since we do not have any business which requires a meeting of the House tomorrow, to make such a request. If the gentleman will yield for that purpose, I will make the request now.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman for that purpose.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, JANUARY 18, 1965

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

FOREIGN AID—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 53)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I

We live in a turbulent world. But amid the conflict and confusion, the United States holds firm to its primary goal—a world of stability, freedom and peace where independent nations can enjoy the benefits of modern knowledge. Here is our difference with the Communists—and our strength. They would use their skills to forge new chains of tyranny. We would use ours to free men from the bonds of the past.

The Communists are hard at work to dominate the less-developed nations of Africa, Asia, and Latin America. Their allies are the ancient enemies of mankind: Tyranny, poverty, ignorance, and disease. If freedom is to prevail, we must do more than meet the immediate threat to free world security, whether in southeast Asia or elsewhere. We must look beyond—to the long-range needs of the developing nations.

Foreign assistance programs reach beyond today's crises, to offer:

Strength to those who would be free;

Hope for those who would otherwise despair;

Progress for those who would help themselves.

Through these programs we help build stable nations in a stable world.

II

Acting on the experience of the past 4 years, I am presenting a program which—

Is selective and concentrated;

Emphasizes self-help and the fastest possible termination of dependence on aid;

Provides an increasing role for private enterprise;

Improves multilateral coordination of development aid;

Reflects continuing improvement in management.

Specifically, for fiscal year 1966 I recommend—

No additional authorizations for development lending or the Alliance for Progress; existing authorizations for those purposes are adequate;

Authorizations of $1,170 million for military assistance;

Three hundred and sixty-nine million dollars for supporting assistance;

Two hundred and ten million dollars for technical cooperation;

One hundred and fifty-five million dollars for contributions to international organizations;

Fifty million dollars for the President's contingency fund; and

Sixty-two million dollars for administrative and miscellaneous expenses.

I am also requesting a special standby authorization for use if necessary in Vietnam only.

My appropriation request for fiscal year 1966 under these authorizations is for $3,380 million—$1,170 million will be used for military assistance; $2,210 million is for the other categories of aid.

This is a minimum request, the smallest in the history of the foreign aid program. It is $136 million less than requested last year, and will impose the smallest assistance burden on the American people since the beginning of the Marshall plan in 1948.

This minimum request reflects my determination to present to the Congress the lowest aid budget consistent with the national interest. It takes full account of the increasing efficiency of the assistance program, and the increasing availability of assistance funds from international agencies in which the costs are shared among a number of countries.

I believe that in carrying out this program the American people will get full value for their money. Indeed, we cannot afford to do less. Russia and Red China have tripled their promises of aid in the past year. They are doing more than they have ever done before; the competition between them has led to increased efforts by each to influence the course of events in the developing nations.

If, during the year, situations should arise which require additional amounts of U.S. assistance to advance vital U.S. interests, I shall not hesitate to inform the Congress and request additional funds.

III

I am requesting $1,170 million for the military assistance program. This is an increase of $115 million over the total appropriation for military assistance for the current fiscal year. In order to meet urgent requirements in southeast Asia during fiscal year 1965, we cut back programs in other countries which are under pressure. Some of the fiscal year 1966 appropriation will be needed to make up what we have left undone.

Still, the program is highly concentrated. Nearly three-quarters of the money will go to 11 countries around the great arc from Greece to Korea. Vietnam alone will absorb an important share.

Military assistance makes it possible for nations to survive. It provides a shield behind which economic and social development can take place. It is vital to our own security as well. It helps to maintain more than 3½ million men under arms as a deterrent to aggression in countries bordering on the Sino-Soviet world. Without them, more American men would have to be stationed overseas, and we would have to spend far more for defense than we now do.

IV

As a supplement to military assistance, I am requesting $369 million for supporting assistance—economic aid which is directly related to the maintenance of stability and security. Eighty-eight percent of the money will be used in Vietnam, Laos, Korea, and Jordan.

V

The world's trouble spots—the Vietnams and the Congos dominate the headlines. This is no wonder, for they represent serious problems. Over $500 million of the current request for military and supporting assistance will be deployed to meet the frontal attack in Vietnam and Laos.

Indeed, $500 million may not be enough. I am therefore requesting for fiscal year 1966 an additional standby authorization for military or supporting assistance which would be used only in Vietnam and only in case we should need more funds to protect our interests there. Any program which would make use of this additional authorization will be presented to the authorizing committees of the Congress concurrently with the appropriation request.

Our past investment in the defense of the free world through the military assistance and supporting assistance programs has paid great dividends. Not only has it foiled aggression, but it has brought stability to a number of countries. Since the beginning of this decade, the funds used each year for military aid and supporting assistance have been sharply reduced. Today, we are spending $1 billion less on these accounts than we did in 1960 and 1961.

VI

Military security in the developing world will not be sufficient to our purposes unless the ordinary people begin to feel some improvement in their lives and see ahead to a time when their children can live in decency. It follows that economic growth in these regions means as much to our security as their military strength. That is an important reason why the United States has taken the lead during the past few years in organizing, on an international basis, a program of development assistance.

Of course, such assistance is and must be concentrated where it will contribute to lasting progress. Experience has demonstrated that certain requirements need to be met by the developing countries if such progress is to occur.

They need to undertake sound measures of self-help—to mobilize their own resources, eliminate waste, and do what they can to meet their own needs. And they need to avoid spending their resources on unnecessary armaments and foreign adventures. Our aid can contribute to their economic and social progress only if it can be provided within a framework of constructive and sensible policies and programs.

Fortunately, most of the developing countries recognize the relationship between the wise use of their own resources and the effectiveness and availability of external aid.

It is a cardinal principle of U.S. policy that development assistance will go to countries which have undertaken effective programs of self-help and are, therefore, able to make good use of aid. During fiscal year 1964, for example, 64 percent of our development assistance went to seven such countries: India, Nigeria, Pakistan, Tunisia, Turkey, Brazil, and Chile. In other countries as well, including a number of smaller countries, sound self-help efforts are making it possible for us to provide effective development aid.

With development assistance we seek to help countries reach, as rapidly as possible, the point at which further progress is possible without external aid.

A striking example of how, through self-help, a developing country can reach the point where it can carry on without concessional aid is the Republic of China. Little more than 10 years ago, free China faced enormous security and development problems. The prospects for economic growth looked dim. But in only 10 years, as a result of determined self-help supplemented by effective U.S. aid:

Per capita gross national product has risen 45 percent;

Saving accounts for one-fifth of the national income;

Exports have tripled;

Industrial output has tripled;

The private share of output has doubled, and now accounts for two-thirds of all industrial production;

Agricultural production has increased by 50 percent.

Free China has also joined other nations as a good cash customer for U.S. exports, particularly agricultural commodities.

This remarkable cooperative effort has brought the Republic of China to the point where it no longer needs AID assistance. Fiscal year 1965 marks the end of this successful program.

I am requesting $580 million as our fiscal year 1966 aid commitment to the Alliance for Progress. This is an increase of $70 million over last year's appropriation.

Impatient expectations of this great joint undertaking have sometimes in the past blinded us to its achievements—achievements which now touch the lives of nearly half of the 200 million people of Latin America. Increasingly, however, the people of the United States have come to recognize what the Alliance means.

To date, as a result of U.S. assistance in support of the Alliance—

Over 75,000 teachers have been trained;

Nearly 10 million schoolbooks have been put in circulation;

Over 12 million children are now participating in school lunch programs—an increase of over 8 million in the past 2½ years;

Development banks and other credit institutions which support the private sector have been established in 15 countries;

Over 300,000 houses have been or are being built;

Savings and loan associations, nonexistent a few years ago, have now accumulated and are investing local deposits of $75 million;

Twenty-five of our own States have joined the partners for the Alliance program—they bring to bear a vital people-to-people effort on our relationships with Latin America.

Forty U.S. colleges and universities are working to modernize teaching and training in Latin America.

The Inter-American Committee for the Alliance for Progress (CIAP), established to provide even closer ties for mutual economic effort, successfully completed its first review of country performance under the Alliance. The work of this Committee is further evidence that the governments and people of Latin America are accepting increasing responsibility for their own development. The failure of Castroism is becoming clearer each day. More and more, Latin America is facing up to the fundamental problems of poverty, a rapidly growing population, and financial disorder. Increasingly, more and more of these countries are moving toward economic viability and self-sustaining growth.

The Alliance is taking hold. The war on poverty in Latin America is underway. We in the United States are proud of the way our good neighbors to the south are meeting the challenge of development. We are proud, too, of the role the United States is playing in this great effort and pledge our steadily enlarged support.

The problem of food requires special mention.

Growing population and rising standards of living increase the demand for food. Production in most developing countries is barely keeping pace. In some countries, it is actually falling behind.

In the years ahead, if the developing countries are to continue to grow, they must rapidly enlarge their capacity to provide food for their people. Up to a point, they can and should improve their ability to buy some of their food from abroad. For the most part, however, they must expand and diversify their own production of food. This will require many things: changes in traditional methods, abundant use of fertilizer, greater incentives for producers, and, frequently, changes in pricing practices and more effective organization of distribution.

To meet their needs for food, the developing countries will need help.

We, in the United States, are uniquely equipped to give it.

We are rightly proud of our dynamic and progressive agriculture, with its record of success which contrasts so sharply with the agricultural failures of the Communist countries. We must use our agricultural abundance and our extensive technical skills to assist the less developed countries to strengthen their ability both to produce and to buy agricultural commodities and, more generally, to support rural development.

We can and must mount a more comprehensive program of technical assistance in agriculture engaging the U.S. Department of Agriculture, our State universities and land-grant colleges, and the most creative of our people in agriculture, marketing, and industry.

At the same time, we can help meet the food needs of the developing nations through our food-for-peace program under Public Law 480. Even under the most favorable conditions, it will be a number of years before the developing countries can produce and import on commercial terms all the food they need. In the interim, our own agricultural plenty can help provide for the hungry and speed the day when these countries can stand on their own feet and pay for their food imports on commercial terms, as happened in the case of Japan and Europe.

VII

We are placing increasing emphasis on the role of private institutions and private enterprise in the development process, and we shall continue to do so.

Foreign aid cannot succeed if we view it as a job for Government alone. For Government can only do a small part of the job. We must bring to bear on the problems of the developing world the knowledge and skills and good judgment of people from all walks of American life. The Agency for International Development provides the means for utilizing the resources of private business, of our universities and colleges, of farm groups, labor unions, banks, cooperatives, savings and loan associations, and professional groups.

I am happy to report that most AID-financed capital projects and a large and growing part of technical assistance are already administered by contract with private American firms and institutions.

In this connection, the privately managed International Executive Service Corps has an important role to play. I welcome the interest of business executives in serving overseas.

The Advisory Committee on Private Enterprise in Foreign Aid established by the 88th Congress has been meeting for a number of months. It is working hard. We are looking forward to their report which we hope will suggest new ways of enlarging the role of the private sector in the aid program.

To mobilize additional private capital, and the skills which go with it, I am asking the Congress to enact an investment tax credit. I am also asking for expanded authority in connection with the investment guarantee program of the Foreign Assistance Act. However, such measures to encourage the flow of capital to the developing world can do only a part of the job. The less-developed countries must pursue policies that will create new opportunities for their own businessmen and a favorable climate for investors from abroad.

We are making a special effort to encourage private enterprise in the developing countries, through—

Technical assistance for private enterprise;

Productivity centers and schools of business administration for training in management and new techniques;

Commodity loans to provide materials and parts for private business;

Loans to industrial development banks and agricultural credit banks;

Loans to private business.

All of these programs have one object—to get private enterprise more heavily engaged in the task of development.

VIII

We will persist in our efforts to put more aid on a multilateral basis, to improve the coordination of bilateral aid, and to increase the share of the burden borne by other free world nations.

A growing proportion of economic assistance is directly administered by international financial institutions such as the World Bank, IDA, and the Inter-American Bank. In the past 4 years, such multinational institutions increased their capital assistance to the developing nations by 50 percent. We, in turn, are prepared to increase our contribution to those organizations—as rapidly as other members do so. It is essential that these institutions maintain their international character.

To strengthen multinational aid, and further to strengthen the Alliance for Progress, I urge the Congress promptly to approve the 3-year authorization of $750 million which constitutes the U.S. contribution to the Fund for Special Operations of the Inter-American Development Bank.

Besides channeling aid through multilateral institutions, we are increasingly relying on international consortia and consultative groups to coordinate our bilateral aid with that of others. India, Pakistan, Turkey, Nigeria, and Tunisia are among the countries where such arrangements have been established, in most cases under the auspices of the World Bank. The Inter-American Committee for the Alliance for Progress (CIAP) is fast becoming a most useful forum for the coordination of assistance to Latin American countries.

In addition to these arrangements in support of individual countries and regions, the United States consults regularly with other major donor countries and international agencies in the Development Assistance Committee of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development.

All in all, in fiscal year 1966, 85 percent of U.S. development loans in Asia and Africa will be committed under international arrangements. All U.S. aid to Latin America is made available within the international framework of the Alliance for Progress.

We are continuing to urge other donors to give more aid on better terms.

Since 1960, new commitments of bilateral economic assistance by other free world nations have increased by 50 percent. In the past year, the United Kingdom has organized a Ministry of Overseas Development. Canada has undertaken a program of lending on terms which are more liberal than ours.

We are particularly concerned about the terms of aid. The burden of debt borne by the developing countries is rising. Their accumulated public foreign debt now runs to about $30 billion. The volume of repayments comes to nearly $5 billion per year and it is rising by 15 percent each year. This is a heavy load for nations with small resources struggling to raise the capital they need for economic and social betterment.

We will continue to emphasize in our discussions with other donors during the coming year the need to improve the terms on which aid is extended.

IX

Tight, effective management is essential for a tight, effective aid program.

I am especially pleased to report to the Congress about the progress being made by the Administrator of the Agency for International Development in improving the management and operations of the program. The result is greater efficiency for less money.

In keeping with our Government-wide economy program, the Agency—

Cut direct hire employment during fiscal year 1964 by 1,200; the downward trend has continued during the past 6 months;

Cut superstructure and overhead: during the past 18 months, separate AID organizations in 13 countries and 27 positions at the mission director and deputy level have been eliminated;

Streamlined management procedures.

Since the Congress adopted the unified approach to the organization of assistance which is reflected in the 1961 Foreign Assistance Act, our aid programs have been better coordinated, better planned, and have better served the requirements of U.S. foreign policy.

We are giving continuing attention to the problem of improving the Agency's personnel structure and achieving the highest possible quality in our staff. We expect to do so in the context of a program which is designed to strengthen the personnel capabilities of all the foreign affairs agencies of the Government.

AID has made great progress in reducing the effect of economic assistance on our balance of payments.

The bulk of our assistance—well over 80 percent—now takes the form of U.S. goods and services, not dollars. Dollar payments abroad have sharply declined. In 1960, the dollar drain to other countries which resulted from the aid program measured over $1 billion. This year and next, the drain is expected to be less than $500 million. Moreover, a significant part of this is offset by interest on and repayment of past U.S. loan assistance.

In my message on the state of the Union, I spoke of the need to create a harmony between man and society—a harmony which will allow each of us to enlarge the meaning of his life and all of us to elevate the quality of our civilization. This summons is not—and cannot be—addressed to Americans alone. For our own security and well-being, and as responsible freemen, we must seek to share our capacity for growth, and the promise of a better life, with our fellow men around the world.

That is what foreign aid is all about.

We have pledged our strength—economic and military—in defense of those who would be free and in support of those who would join in working toward a stable, prosperous world.

I call upon the Congress to join with me in renewing this pledge and to provide the tools to do the job.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 14, 1965*.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON FOREIGN AID

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States has presented to us today one of the soundest and most prudent foreign aid programs in the history of this country's involvement in international development assistance.

Last year I commended his proposal to Congress as a "bare bones" bill which restored public confidence in the foreign aid program but did not sacrifice our objectives in asking Congress for only that amount of money which was necessary to run the program.

This year the President has presented to us an even more concentrated and effective program with an honest appraisal of funds to carry it out. It should not be difficult for this Congress to support such a program. It emphasizes our commitment to the developing countries but at the same time exercises selectivity. It is the smallest aid request in history, $136 million less than the amount requested last year. It provides that aid efforts will be directed to a fewer number of countries where the indications of need and willingness to help themselves are most evident. As the President says in his message:

> This minimum request reflects my determination to present to the Congress the lowest aid budget consistent with the national interest. It takes full account of the increasing efficiency of the assistance program, and the increasing availability of assistance funds from international agencies in which the costs are shared among a number of countries.

At the same time, the President should be commended for his foresight in emphasizing greater coordination with free world bilateral aid and multilateral aid organizations. U.S. aid contributions in the past have acted as the seed money to increase the contributions of other free world donors. I am confident that our future bilateral coordination and increased multilateral subscriptions will continue to do so, ultimately reducing the U.S. foreign assistance burden of the future.

Improved management of the aid program and the encouraging figures showing the transition of developing countries from aid recipients to self-support also deserve our every confidence in the U.S. aid effort.

The President also is to be commended for emphasizing the responsibility of less-developed nations to help themselves, and to use their own resources wisely. U.S. assistance, as the message says, "must be concentrated where it will contribute to lasting progress. Experience has demonstrated that certain requirements need to be met by the developing countries if such progress is to occur. They need to undertake sound measures of self-help—to mobilize their own resources, eliminate waste, and do what they can to meet their own needs. And they need to avoid spending their resources on unnecessary armaments and foreign adventures. Our aid can contribute to their economic and social progress only if it can be provided within a framework of constructive and sensible policies and programs."

In addition, the President has asked to expand the investment guarantee program and enact investment tax credit legislation to augment the important role private enterprise has assumed in the AID program, laying the foundation for the growth of the best tradition of the private enterprise system in the developing countries.

The President's tight budget request for 1966, his prudent modifications, and the AID program's history of progress and improvement will facilitate congressional consideration of this legislation in order that AID can carry on its work of high priority to the Nation's well-being and to the world's security.

FOREIGN AID PROGRAM

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I urge full support of the foreign aid program as outlined by the President in his message to Congress today.

I take this stand on the basis of the President's sincere efforts in the last Congress to tighten up the estimates and to submit what was truly a minimum funding request.

Now that he is President in his own right, and has made a commitment to overcome the serious flaws in foreign aid, he should be given the chance to show he is tightening and correcting the abuses of the program and to justify the figure on which we will have to act both in authorizing and appropriating.

As pointed out by the President, the request for $3,380 million for fiscal year 1966 is the smallest in the 20-year history of our foreign aid program. It is $136 million less than the fiscal year 1965 request which, you will recall, was described as a "barebones" request.

Indeed, this year's request by the President is a modest one.

I am convinced that the fiscal year 1966 request is the absolute minimum that could realistically be expected to sustain our foreign aid program at the level which already has produced dramatic results in the developing countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

Despite the frustrations we have encountered in Vietnam, Indonesia, the United Arab Republic and the Congo, the overwhelming evidence of our experience since World War II is that our foreign aid programs have been the key factor in our ability to build a world in which more nations can move toward freedom, and in which our own freedom can remain secure.

In preoccupation with current problems we sometimes tend to forget the dramatic success of the Marshall plan in helping the countries of Western Europe and Japan to recover from the ravages of the world's most destructive war.

We sometimes tend to forget that just a little over a decade ago, the Republic of China on Taiwan was as heavily dependent on U.S. assistance to stay afloat as Vietnam is today, and that Taiwan's economic development has now reached the point where it no longer needs our help and that our aid program is being phased out in Taiwan this year.

We sometimes tend to forget that just 5 years ago, Korea was still a war casualty surviving on U.S. supporting assistance and, to most observers, had little prospect for the kind of vigorous, aggressive economic development being carried out there today.

Lasting and solid progress has been made in many other countries—in India, Pakistan, Turkey, Nigeria, Tunisia, Chile, and Brazil, for example—the kinds of countries in which our economic assistance is concentrated today. More than two-thirds of our development assistance during the year ahead will go to these countries all of which have undertaken strong self-help measures and have demonstrated their ability to make the best use of our aid.

I am also convinced that foreign aid is good business. More than 80 percent of AID's economic assistance funds are now being used to buy products made in the United States. It is estimated that the production of commodities and equipment for our foreign aid creates more than 500,000 full-time jobs. The "Buy American" policies rigidly enforced by AID in recent years mean that the foreign aid program continues to open up markets for U.S. business and industry throughout the developing nations of the world. Today, the AID program finances about a billion dollars a year in exports from American factories to the developing countries—countries that will become tremendous export markets as they develop and as their citizens get jobs and money.

Our biggest present export customers are the developed countries of Western Europe and Japan, former recipients of our aid under the Marshall plan. U.S. exports to Europe have more than doubled in the last 10 years. U.S. exports to Japan have quadrupled since 1950. The same thing is happening now in the developing countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America. Over the past 5 years, for example, there have been increases in U.S. commercial exports—not aid financed—of 14 percent to Taiwan, 28 percent to Colombia and 76 percent to Israel.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that the President will continue his policy of placing increasing emphasis on the role of private institutions and private enterprise in the development process. For, in the final analysis, no matter how much or how little money is appropriated by Congress from year to year for our foreign aid commitments, it is still not enough to fully accomplish our objective of helping the developing countries to attain economic self-sufficiency. If this objective is to be realized, private capital must join hands with our Government to make the impact of foreign aid more meaningful and more realistic.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would remind my colleagues on both sides of the aisle that it is not only our own national security but our fundamental humanitarian concern that demands our continued support of foreign aid. The world is still a dangerous place, and most of its people still live in conditions of hunger, poverty, and disease—conditions described by the President as the "grim recruiting sergeants of communism." We must continue to do all we can to alleviate human suffering in the world.

For we cannot expect to have the kind of stable and progressive world in which free institutions can survive and flourish, unless the people of Asia, Africa, and Latin America can look forward to social progress and economic security.

The destiny of the free world depends ultimately on the degree to which the hopes and dreams of people of a better life for themselves and their families are capable of fulfillment.

If we are to continue in our role as leader of the free world—and I think we have no alternative—we cannot afford to ignore the hopes and dreams of people elsewhere who are struggling for a better life.

The aid program is an investment in peace, prosperity, and people, and I urge full support for the President's requests.

AMENDMENT TO ENCOURAGE RECREATIONAL ACTIVITIES AND WIDER USAGE OF THE RURAL RENEWAL ACT

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962 authorized a program of technical assistance and loans to stimulate long-range economic development in rural counties where family incomes are abnormally low. In late 1963, limited funds were made available and the program was implemented on a pilot basis in a few designated areas in five States. In my State, Walton, Holmes, and Washington Counties requested and received designation. The experience of these Florida counties, with local people working together to plan, develop and carry out rural renewal programs and projects, has been encouraging. However, the effort of the local groups to implement their programs has been limited by the requirement of the law that Federal assistance is available only to State and local public bodies. Moreover, the concept of full utilization and conservation of land in rural areas should permit plans and financial assistance in devoting to recreational purposes, land which is best suited for that use. Therefore, I am proposing an amendment to title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act to provide for additional means and measures for land conservation and land utilization. This bill is as follows:

A bill to amend title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, to provide for additional means and measures for land conservation and land utilization, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 31 of title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act (50 Stat. 525), as amended, is amended by inserting after the words "protecting fish and wildlife," the word "recreation" and by amending section 32(e) of said Act by inserting after the words "and local public agencies" the words "and local nonprofit organizations" in both first and second sentences of said subsection.

The rural renewal program is designed to provide for greater and better utilization and conservation of the resources of the area with the result of improving the economy of the area and the income of rural people. The present authorization of the Food and Agriculture Act enables local public groups to acquire lands and do certain development. However, it has been interpreted as falling short of providing one of the best possible uses of some land by the development of recreation facilities. In many areas, such facilities are needed to justify the basic resource development and to provide for their maximum beneficial use. Funds for such development and for technical assistance in connection therewith are usually not available to local groups on terms which would permit the proper kind of development. Under this amendment the local public agency could borrow needed funds to assist them in implementing the recreational portion of their total development plan.

The second part of the amendment would authorize making rural renewal loans to nonprofit local organizations. It has been found that in many low-income areas no public body is or can be empowered under State constitutions, as presently interpreted, to fully utilize the assistance and authority available under the Federal Act. Moreover, even though their power may be adequate, either the artificial boundaries of the public body embrace only a part of the economic or geographic area which should be renewed, or the public body boundaries include areas larger than those which can feasibly be developed for rural renewal. In the latter case, the lack of uniform local interest in the whole area deters or defeats the needed development. In order to carry out a coordinated program of land conservation and land utilization as an aid to the economic development or redevelopment of an area, the sponsoring local organization should have more flexibility in methods than has been found generally available to local public agencies.

However, many nonprofit corporations exist or can be organized which can accomplish much good in land utilization and conservation and the resulting economic development. Such corporations could assist the local public agency in implementing a complete development program for the area. Throughout the Nation many nonprofit corporations and associations have been formed to cooperate with rural areas development committees. These public-spirited groups are not recognized as public agencies within the meaning of the term in the statute and are not eligible for rural renewal loans.

FOREIGN GIVEAWAY PROGRAM

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, on one day we hear from the White House that this Nation is wallowing in poverty and on the next we hear that it is wallowing in prosperity to the extent that we are called upon to dish out around the world at least $3.5 billion through the foreign giveaway program. I wonder how much longer the people of this country are going to tolerate this kind of doubletalk.

PRESIDENT'S FOREIGN AID MESSAGE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Fraser] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, a major criticism in the past of the foreign aid program has been its diffusion, and the President has presented to us today a request that stresses selectivity in its every aspect. He has asked us to approve a tight, realistic request for funds, a program of highly concentrated assistance to developing countries around the world based on conditions of self-help. He has expressed his confidence in the improved management of the foreign assistance program. The President has requested the enactment of measures which will help to reduce the U.S. Government's share of the world's foreign assistance burden through coordinating our efforts with other donor nations and multilateral organizations and by increasing the role of private enterprise in foreign aid programs.

It is not too much to ask for $3.38 billion for our aid program. We can easily afford this amount and we certainly cannot afford less. President Johnson's request for this year is the smallest in the history of our foreign aid program since its beginning in 1948.

President Johnson's confidence in the AID program, his obvious pride in its accomplishments, and his faith in its future success are well founded. Today it is one of the best managed programs in our Government as a result of better planning and management.

Following the enactment by Congress in 1961 of the Foreign Assistance Act, the whole aid program has been reshaped. Aid money is now concentrated in fewer nations showing the greatest potential for development. Today, assistance is given primarily on a loan basis rather than as grants.

For years U.S. aid was given on a project-by-project basis. Now a more comprehensive countrywide planning approach is taken, and assistance is contingent upon certain performance conditions.

Since 1961, there has been tighter control over management and purchasing with the net effect of greater savings. Reports of misuse of funds, improper procurement procedures and conflict of interest are now carefully investigated and administrative or legal action is initiated where necessary.

In addition to administrative improvements, new concepts in planning have been put into effect. Today, before U.S. foreign assistance agreements are made, there is an intensive overall analysis of countrywide problems, and a comprehensive plan is drawn up for an effective national growth program. We also encourage and assist the recipient nations to study their own problems and formulate their own development assistance plans. An assistance strategy is devised in accordance with the country's present state of development. Then assistance is determined in proportion to the country's ability for self-help and development capacity. To insure maximum results from our aid efforts, careful follow-up studies are made on the progress of the recipient country.

Aid is also dependent upon the willingness of a receiving nation to agree to certain conditions. Cost sharing and self-help are normal conditions for U.S. assistance, on the assumption that progress occurs when a country is willing to use its every resource toward development. In all AID recipient countries our assistance for specific projects is dependent on conditions attached to those projects. Aid through the Alliance for Progress is made contingent on certain countrywide internal reforms such as improved tax collection, administration, reduction of budget deficits and inflation control, and increased agricultural productivity. Increasingly, the United States will not promise assistance until the recipient country can assure aid from other free world sources.

It goes without saying that the United States will not loan development funds unless the economic climate insures us of repayment. If repayment is uncertain, the United States insists upon reorganization of the project or program before loan arrangements are made. AID also requires that adequate and qualified technical advisers are on hand to carry out programs.

There have been instances where assistance has been held back until the recipient government had taken satisfactory self-help steps. Although we cannot measure progress in terms of our own growth, nor do we substitute our values for theirs, nevertheless it is reasonable to expect adherence to a projected national growth program. A country's political climate and other factors often make flexibility necessary in enforcing conditions and, whenever possible, reasonable adjustments in performance standards are made to insure that the program ultimately is carried out and that time, money, and effort will not be in vain.

Our experience throughout the years since the inception of U.S. foreign aid has profited us well. There is now better administration, planning, and a new set of concepts in aid conditions—changes which denote dynamism and a willingness to keep abreast of the world's needs. The President's foreign aid message makes it clear that next year's program will be even better administered and more effective than ever before.

WASHINGTON REPORT OF THE AIR

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILLIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, last September a former President of the United States, Gen. Dwight David Eisenhower, inaugurated the American Security Council "Washington Report of the Air" as a 5-day-a-week feature on 500 radio stations. About 1,000 stations in this country now feature the program regularly. The series, which is devoted to the subjects of communism and the security of our Nation, is edited by Senator DODD, of Connecticut, and former Congressman Walter Judd, of Minnesota.

By unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD at this point the text of the American Security Council "Washington Report of the Air" of January 4 of this year. This report, made by Mr. Judd, was broadcast not only over approximately 1,000 radio stations in this country, but it was also rebroadcast behind the Iron Curtain by Radio Free Europe in 6 foreign languages.

This report, I believe, deserves the consideration of all Members of this body because it concerns one of the committees of the House, the Committee on Un-American Activities, and also an issue which certain Members have brought before the House—the suggestion that the committee be abolished.

In view of some of the statements that have been made about the committee by persons who are attempting to bring about its abolition, I think it is pertinent to recall at this time statements made by the former President of the United States when he initiated this program last September 28.

Dwight David Eisenhower stated, at the time, that this country cannot use Communist methods to defeat the end-justifies-the-means efforts of the Communists. Instead, he said—and I quote his exact words:

> To combat their insidious and dangerous tactics, we must first be alert and informed and then we must use truth incessantly and vigorously as our mightiest weapon to defeat them.

On the issue discussed by our former colleague, Walter Judd, in this radio broadcast, the Committee on Un-American Activities fully intends to follow Mr. Eisenhower's advice. We will stick to the truth—and use it incessantly and vigorously. It is my hope that those who take the opposite view on the question will do the same.

The above mentioned follows:

"WASHINGTON REPORT OF THE AIR": EFFORTS TO ABOLISH HOUSE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Dr. JUDD. This is the American Security Council, "Washington Report," Walter H. Judd reporting.

In 1938, the House of Representatives brought into being the House Committee on Un-American Activities. Since then, that committee has spent a great deal of its time investigating subversive activities in the United States; and from its findings, recommending legislation to protect our internal security. As a result of the committee's efforts, the Congress has passed 42 laws to date.

It has been the thinking of the vast majority of the Members of the House of Representatives over the years—myself included—that there are few committees of the House which have a more important task to perform. This view has been supported by most Americans and overwhelmingly by the Congress. More than that, the committee's constitutionality, its basic jurisdiction and powers, have been upheld by the Supreme Court time and again. In a decision reached on June 8, 1959, the Court found, and I quote: "In the domain of National Security, the House has clothed the Un-American Activities Committee with pervasive authority to investigate Communist activities in this country. It can hardly be seriously argued that the investigation of Communist activities generally, and the attendant use of compulsory powers was beyond the purview of the committee's intended authority."

In the summer of 1960, an organization was formed called the National Committee To Abolish the House Un-American Activities Committee. It set up headquarters on the west coast and launched a campaign attacking the committee on the grounds of being dictatorial, truly un-American, and conducting investigations into activities that were none of its business. In 1961, six Congressmen put on a drive to abolish the committee, and voted against appropriations to continue its existence. In March 1964, there were 20 Congressman who voted against the committee's continued appropriations.

Now that the new Congress has convened, a vote will again be taken on whether the committee will continue its 27th year of work. I have every confidence that it will, but you may have noticed in the past few months how sharp and sustained the attack against the committee has become. And who are these attackers? Many are sincere liberals who are perennially misled into backing left-wing causes. But the heart of the drive, however, is directed by known, hard-core Communists and goodly host of fellow travelers. The drive has progressed to the point so that a recent Washington Post headline ran: "100 Legal Experts Petition House for Abolition of HUAAC." In a letter dated October 30, 1964, the committee for abolition spoke of January 4 being its target date—the opening of the new Congress. The date is here, and what the House of Representatives decides on the committee's future will be a good indication of how dedicated the Congress, reflecting the public purpose, remains to resistance against the internal workings of communism.

This is Walter H. Judd speaking, hoping you will join me regularly on the "Washington Report."

FLOOD CONTROL IN OREGON

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ULLMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, in February of 1957—only a month after I had been sworn in as Congressman from Oregon's Second District—I received news of a disastrous flood that swept through one of our communities. Damage was so severe that the President declared the county a disaster area, and for many months I was deeply concerned with efforts to assist in the rehabilitation of public facilities and private property in the flooded area.

One of the aftermaths of that flood was the authorization and construction of a much-needed reclamation and flood control project upstream from the community. Upon its completion 2 years ago, I was proud to make the dedicatory address and expressed optimism about the role of that dam in the future protection of downstream areas from periodic flooding.

Today, 8 years from the date of the 1957 flood, Oregonians are cleaning up from the most disastrous flood in its history, but the Bully Creek Dam has already demonstrated its worth in protecting lives and property in the area of Vale, Oreg. I would like to quote a sentence from a news report of December 24, 1964, in the Idaho Daily Statesman:

> Bully Creek Dam near Vale is storing the entire flow of 6,000 record feet in Bully Creek, and is a major help in reducing flood damage on the main stream of the Malheur River in the Vale area.

I cite this example to illustrate the point that many segments of the public and some Members of the Congress need to achieve a greater understanding concerning the water resource developments of the West—and indeed the whole Nation—which are so frequently and onerously labeled pork barrel measures.

I have addressed a letter to President Johnson emphasizing the need for full river control and development in our Nation. I have requested that he direct the Secretaries of Interior, Army, and Agriculture to evaluate the contribution of existing flood control, reclamation, and watershed projects in the alleviation of life and property damage during the recent Northwest floods.

It would be of the greatest benefit to know precisely the savings in dollars and in resources that have resulted directly from the existence of these projects.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, may I emphasize my conviction that the accomplishment of the task I propose will be an invaluable asset in carrying on the fight for full utilization of our diminishing water and land resources. Following is the text of my letter to President Johnson:

January 13, 1965.

Hon. Lyndon B. Johnson,
President of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: The recent floods in Oregon, California, and Idaho point up the utmost importance of full river control and development in our Nation. As a lifelong supporter of western river projects you are aware of their great value, but many Americans do not share this understanding. Watershed development, river storage systems, soil and forest management practices are all of vital importance in this total effort.

It would be of the greatest benefit to this cause to know precisely the savings in dollars and in resources that have resulted directly from the existence of presently installed water control facilities in the western flood areas during the present emergency. The estimates that have been made to date indicate the enormity of those savings but are at most a horseback analysis. Accurate analysis in depth on this question is badly needed.

Background data from which we may determine priorities of manpower and dollar allocations for future projects is of great importance. Of equal significance is the need for a more realistic and understanding view, in the Congress and among the public, of water resources projects so frequently given the onerous "pork barrel" label.

Accordingly, I should like to request that you direct the Secretaries of Interior, Army, and Agriculture to evaluate the contribution of water retention, reclamation, and regulatory works, watershed management and soil conservation practices as basic factors in the alleviation and retardation of the high frequency flooding recently experienced in the northwest.

Such a study, conducted in a region where executive branch natural resource agencies are perhaps the best coordinated of any area in the country, could well provide important evaluation criteria for future project consideration, point the way to further improvement in agency coordination and functional assignment and provide data of national significance even though the resource problems may be of regional type and dimension.

I fully realize that the accomplishment of such a task will require great effort but it will be an invaluable asset in carrying on the fight for fuller utilization of our diminishing water and land resources.

Sincerely yours,

Al Ullman,
Member of Congress.

"LE DEJEUNER DE BOUCHERIE ACADIEN"

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Willis] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, each year in January the State comptroller of Louisiana, Mr. Roy J. Theriot, of my congressional district, plays host to what is known as Le Déjeuner de Boucharie Acadien.

Mr. Theriot takes great pride in sponsoring this event—and for good reason. It has become a showcase of one particular type of south Louisiana French-Acadian cuisine.

I place in the Record at this point the interesting and unusual menu to which this year's guests were treated:

> You are cordially invited to attend Le Déjeuner de Boucherie Acadien, Bellemont Motel, Carribbean Room, January 12, 1965, 8 a.m.
>
> Pain De Maïs, couche-couche, sirop de canne, gratons, lait, fromage de tête de cochon, boudin, saucisses fumées, patates douces frites, café.
>
> This is an Acadian hog butchery breakfast strictly typical of the Acadian people of Louisiana. The French-Acadian cuisine is world renowned and is recognized as most palatable. The fine cooking of the French-Acadian people together with their unexcelled hospitality endear them to all who come in contact with them.
>
> (Host: Roy R. Theriot, State comptroller.)

TO STEM THE MENACE OF AIR POLLUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Monagan). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Halpern] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, during my tenure in the House I have been concerned with the problem of air pollution and its costly damage to public health and urban welfare.

In my own New York City the ill effects of air pollutants constitute a tangible everyday experience. Yet we have still to awaken the general public to the perilous and ugly conditions. Urban inhabitants breath in unclean air as a normal fact of life in the city.

In the latter part of 1963 the Congress for the first time took action and so recognized the gravity of the situation. Public Law 88–206—the Clean Air Act—earmarked funds to local control bodies to spur the attack upon pollution.

Air pollution is a far-reaching infection. Evidence exists that air contamination contributes to the progress of varying types of heart disease. Certainly it generates and aggravates a wide range of respiratory ailments. The emissions are known to cause corrosion of building materials and blighting of food produce.

The Queensboro Tuberculosis and Health Association, which has concentrated a great deal of effort on air pollution, estimates in a pamphlet that air contamination damages property nationwide to the tune of $11 billion annually.

It is recognized that the affliction can be reduced substantially through effective planning and control measures. Public Law 88–206 is based on the assumption. Mr. Vernon MacKenzie, Chief of the Air Pollution Control Division in the Public Health Service, told the New York Academy of Medicine in April 1963, that "the prevention of most air pollutant emissions is feasible technically."

The Public Health Service, and metropolitan areas, are not engaged in the effort meaningful programs to combat the harmful emissions.

In this field one of the most encouraging of recent developments has been the achievement of an agreement with the auto industry in California to equip all automobiles shipped there with control devices. This is significant, for two reasons. Automobile exhaust causes perhaps 50 percent of the national air pollution menace. And the agreement in California shows that we can obtain the cooperation of industry in planning our programs.

At the same time, we need countrywide uniformity in dealing with automobile exhaust emissions. For this purpose, Mr. Speaker, I have introduced H.R. 463 authorizing the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to issue standards for motor vehicle exhaust discharges.

The special subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Public Works recommended, as a first step, that consideration be given to legislation of this type. In its informative report, entitled "Steps Toward Clean Air," the subcommittee launched this proposal based on its lengthy studies in this field.

All varieties of motor vehicles, numbering about 82,500,000 in the United States, form the largest contributing category of pollution problems. The Senate subcommittee, in its report, stated:

> Industrial spokesmen and others advised the subcommittee that techniques for the control of motor vehicle exhaust and, specifically, for the reduction in the amount of pollutants which lead to the formation of photochemical smog, have passed the research stage and are now capable of large scale application on new, and potentially on used, automobiles in this country.

The California accord indicates that we now can produce reliable instruments which substantially reduce harmful exhaust discharge, chiefly hydrocarbons and carbon monoxide. My bill does not require the use of any particular device, as the California agreement specifies. I remain confident, moreover, that the technique can be improved and made more economical with time. H.R. 463 does require that the Secretary publish standards of emission not later than 6 months after the date of enactment, and that these criteria shall become effective for all gasoline-powered vehicles manufactured and used in the United States 1 year following publication. The standards will apply to imported vehicles; they will not affect automobiles manufactured or imported prior to the effective date of the prescribed standards.

The Senate Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution also pointed out that the contracted emission of some injurious pollutants would increase the discharge of others; namely, oxides of nitrogen. Similarly, it has concluded that 15 percent of the hydrocarbon loss, coming from the carburetor and fuel tank, could not be effectively contained at this time. Section 1(b) of my legislation permits the Secretary to revise standards from time to time in keeping with fresh technological findings.

One underdeveloped aspect is the question of diesel powered vehicles. Evidently these types of motors are increasing in quantity. We do not, as yet, have effective and practical control mechanisms. Section 5 of H.R. 463 authorizes the Secretary to issue standards applicable to diesel-powered vehicles when he finds that developments in technique warrant such action.

Mr. Speaker, I think we have already established both the need and feasibility of this legislation. I want to stress the importance of obtaining conformity of standards throughout the country on a legal basis. With this bill we can seize an important and convincing tool in our fight against air pollution.

Local units have done an admirable job. Some have benefited enormously from the provisions of Public Law 88-206. The Clean Air Act recognized that air pollution was a truly national problem.

H.R. 463 builds upon this initiative. Automobiles are a national fact; their injury to public health and welfare must be considered nationally.

The 89th Congress must confirm its earlier action by attacking the problem of vehicle exhaust, the principal national cause of air pollution.

INDEPENDENT RETAIL DRUGGISTS IN THE GREAT SOCIETY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday of this week, January 12, 1965, Mr. Willard B. Simmons, executive secretary of the National Association of Retail Druggists, made a very interesting speech to the Massachusetts College of Pharmacy on its 142d founders day observance.

Mr. Simmons is my neighbor in Texarkana, Tex. We were both born and reared in that section of the country.

Willard Simmons is one of the best men I ever knew and one of the outstanding citizens in our area. He has always taken an interest in religious, civic, patriotic, and other public-spirited affairs. He has always been a leader in his community—highly respected and regarded by all.

His family was one of the early pioneer families to settle in what is now referred to as the center of the gulf Southwest. Many of them were ministers, teachers, merchants, and farmers.

Willard has been a druggist as well as a pharmacist all of his adult life; in fact, he owns a popular drugstore in Texarkana, Tex., at this time.

I do not know of anyone whose opinions I regard more highly than his opinions and views. It has been my pleasure to know and be associated with him over a long period of time and I can truthfully say that I have never known a better man from a better family who has always been on the alert for the purpose of being helpful in all undertakings embodying local community, the State, and the Nation.

The National Association of Retail Druggists I consider one of the most powerful—if not the most powerful—trade associations working for small business in the United States. When other small business organizations would sometimes be weak in their support for any reason or no reason, if the proposition meant helping the small businessmen or small business, the National Association of Retail Druggists has always been at the front, doing fine, effective work.

I could name many good laws that would not be on the statute books today in the many States and especially in Congress had it not been for the splendid and effective efforts of the National Association of Retail Druggists. This organization is unique in that all of its 40,000 members are small businessmen themselves. The large drug-chain operator is not eligible for membership. It is strictly a small businessman's organization.

Anyone reading the speech made by Mr. Simmons in Boston last Tuesday can read it with the knowledge that it was prepared and delivered by one of the most knowledgeable persons in our country on the drug industry who is not only honest, sincere, and forthright in his efforts to be helpful to all the people of the Nation, but one who has been right at the front with the National Association of Retail Druggists, even before he was executive secretary, doing effective work in behalf of the plain people of the country—particularly the small businessman as well as being helpful to the people of the entire Nation.

The speech is as follows:

INDEPENDENT RETAIL DRUGGISTS IN THE GREAT SOCIETY

(Address of Mr. Willard B. Simmons, executive secretary, National Association of Retail Druggists, to the Massachusetts College of Pharmacy, on its 142d founders day observance, January 12, 1965)

The invitation to appear before you today was accepted with something like equal amounts of pride and hesitation. The privilege of addressing this audience would be a distinction under any circumstances. To be asked to do so on the occasion of this 142d anniversary of the founding of the Massachusetts College of Pharmacy is a signal honor, both for me and for the organization which I am pleased to represent.

Translating the full significance of this founders day into meaningful dimensions, as it relates to the profession of pharmacy, is not an easy assignment. Still, I shall try to do so. The required perspective can only be had by viewing this institution over the long span of years, during which time it has been in the vanguard of pharmacy's almost incredible growth and advancement.

The most cursory review of history discloses all we need to know about the state of our art in the year the Massachusetts College of Pharmacy was founded. Comparison with our present stage of professional development offers some dramatic facts for our consideration:

There were no anesthetics in 1822. Not until 1846—24 years after the founding of this school—was the first demonstration of ether made, right here in Boston.

At most, submiscroscopic organisms were a suspicion in the minds of a handful of researchers, in 1822. Three quarters of a century would pass before positive identification of a virus would be made.

Preventive medicine was little more than a topic of conversation in the professional circles of 1822. It would take another 100 years of study and exploration to bring forth the first clinically acceptable antibiotic.

While these facts are well known to you, I am sure, it's well to refresh our memory. By doing so we bring today's event into sharper focus. It takes no particular genius to forecast tremendous advances in pharmacy, from our present foundation of knowledge. However, the men of courage and vision who undertook to launch this college had to find a large measure of their inspiration in faith, alone. The frontiers of pharmacy were too restricted in that early day to offer more than a faint hint of things to come. Like so many of the truly notable achievements recorded in history, founding of this college was an exercise in faith by the men who did it.

They had faith in themselves.

They had faith in pharmacy as a profession.

They had faith in pharmacy as a servant of humanity.

They had faith in pharmacists, as devoted practitioners of a major art—and full partners in the professional alliance which wields the weapons of science in the protection of health and life.

From our vantage point of today, we can look back over the past 142 years and draw some positive conclusions about the judgment of the men who founded the Massachusetts College of Pharmacy. Appraisal can only be made in terms of human values, I'm sure you will agree—and such a yardstick exists.

In 1822, the life expectancy of a man was less than 38 years. A woman could reasonably expect to live 40 years.

Today, a newborn boy can look forward to 69 birthdays, while his female counterpart is a statistical certainty to live even longer. If you need some additional proof of the reliability of these figures, I refer you to the annual reports of the insurance companies. Their impressive profits are the result of people living longer than the mortality tables say they will.

There's no reason to review in detail the means by which each of us have been given more than 30 additional years of life. Suffice it to say that it's doubtful if any college student in this auditorium can remember a serious epidemic of any kind. Whole categories of sickness and disease have been taken out of the "normal" classification and labeled "optional"; perhaps unnecessary is a better word. Protections exist for our total population, if we take advantage of them.

Relief of physical pain was a major objective of research from the beginning of time. Successes in that area only served to whet scientific curiosity for more information about metabolism, emotion, appetite, and all the rest. Pharmaceuticals have gone well beyond the considerations of clinical illness. They are increasingly being used to augment natural processes in virtually the full range of body chemistry and function.

These facts, then, persuade me to say of the founders of this college: Their faith was well founded. Pharmacy is everything they hoped it would become. It has lived up to their high expectations—and more.

Pharmacy challenges the best efforts we can bring to bear, while offering us one of the most socially useful and personally rewarding careers imaginable for a properly trained person. Its full partnership with the other health professions imposes great responsibilities—and meeting those responsibilities brings an equally great sense of satisfaction and accomplishment. Many years of active engagement in pharmacy entitles me to a personal opinion on this matter, but there is no shortage of other qualified witnesses who agree.

As executive secretary of the National Association of Retail Druggists, I am in contact with thousands of pharmacists. Unanimity is hard to find on any topic, but pharmacists agree on this point: Ours is a distinguished career as well as a fine business for those who are able to measure up to its high level of professional, ethical, and social performance.

Having said this, we must hasten to add that ours is a complex field; beset, it sometimes appears, with more than its fair share of problems. The reason is clear—or it should be clear. The pharmacist must be skilled in two quite different realms. As a practitioner, he is both a professional and a merchant. He must operate in both spheres, with something like equal effectiveness, if he is to succeed.

Successful operation of a retail drugstore requires an impressive array of knowledge, attention to detail, and personal flexibility. In the professional area he must be above question; in public relations he must be above reproach. Helping our membership meet these widely diverse demands is the prime reason for existence of the National Association of Retail Druggists.

Founded 67 years ago, the National Association of Retail Druggists pursues a broad spectrum of activities designed to serve both the professional and the economic interests of its membership. To be an active member, the individual must own a pharmacy. Some of our members own more than one store, as evidenced by the fact that our active roster of 36,000 represents some 41,000 drugstores.

The formalized training of a pharmacist is, necessarily, focused principally in the scientific area. Recognizing this, the National Association of Retail Druggists performs a vital function in keeping its members up to date on drugstore management, business promotion, modernization, inventory control, and the other elements of retail store operation.

We maintain a constant flow of information on commercial and technical topics, through the vehicle of a twice-monthly magazine. Whether a member needs help in laying out a more efficient sales floor arrangement; needs to know the certification requirements of a particular drug; or needs to know the compounding procedure for a strange emulsion, the National Association of Retail Druggists has a staff of highly qualified specialists available to search out the information required.

Another less understood but most important function is that of representing the views of our profession before local, State, and national legislative bodies. The National Association of Retail Druggists maintains a full-time staff in the Nation's Capital, whose sole responsibility is to stay close to legislative and administrative developments which relate to the practice of pharmacy and/or the operation of a retail store. By keeping in constant touch with the lawmakers and the agencies, we are able to protect the interests of our members. In some instances this might take the form of opposing a piece of proposed legislation. In another case, we might be working for passage of a bill. Oftentimes, however, the most valuable service we can provide the Senators and Congressmen is in giving them reliable information about pharmacy. Given the facts, it has been our experience that these hard-working people make every effort to develop sensible and equitable procedures.

As a typical example of the kind of projects the National Association of Retail Druggists gets into in Washington, we have steadfastly supported the idea of "quality stabilization." We believe a manufacturer is entitled to protect the good name of his products from the questionable mercies of the so-called discount houses and others who destroy product image and customer confidence by price trickery. We hope to see the passage of a law which will protect customers as well as manufacturers and competitors from unscrupulous merchandising practices.

We have campaigned long and hard against encroachments of public, private, and government hospitals, into the retail field of pharmaceutical services. We do not believe an outpatient department should be permitted to capture retail drug business. While granting their qualifications to prepare and dispense the materials in question, we are convinced that fair competition also means equal competition. A tax-exempt institution is on a vastly different cost basis than a taxpaying drugstore. Expecting these unequal competitors to perform the same services for the same price is an economic absurdity which can hardly be overlooked.

Another of our legislative targets has been the 10-percent excise tax levied on toiletries, cosmetics, costume jewelry, and leather goods. This tax was enacted in the yearly years of World War II, as an emergency measure, and it still remains. We think 25 years is a long emergency, indeed, and we have finally won the point. Removal of these excises, we are assured, will be an early order of business for the new Congress which has just convened.

The last legislative matter to which I want to give some brief attention is the so-called medicare program. The Nation's professional pharmacists yield to none in their conviction that adequate medical attention should be available to all who need it. Alleviation of suffering and the protection of life is a basic tenet of the thing we call civilization. Our religious heritage, our social conditioning, and our professional obligations are all in perfect agreement that the individual should have the attention he requires to protect his health and life. Much of this is done in the name of philanthropy, but pharmacists realize, perhaps better than most, that treatment of disease may be no less a favor to the well than it is to the sick. This is especially true where communicability or other extension through the population is a consideration.

The millions of prescriptions filled each year by our professional pharmacists—with little, if any, hope of payment—should document their willingness to handle the human problem first and worry about the economic problem later. Druggists know there are people who cannot pay for doctors and medicines. Inability to pay should not deprive them of health services, most reasonable people will agree.

Conversely, however, most people are able to handle their routine medical expenses. To the extent an individual is able to maintain himself, the National Association of Retail Druggists agrees with Lincoln's philosophy that you cannot permanently help a man by doing for him, those things which he can and should do for himself.

Our misgivings about medicare do not relate to the portion of the undertaking which would provide treatment for those who could not obtain it privately. This should be done, by one means or another.

The National Association of Retail Druggists feels that the deserving needy can be adequately served without blanketly including all of the people 65 and older in the program. We fail to see the slightest justification for providing medical care at public expense for those who do not need it.

Moreover, we view incorporation of the medicare program into the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system, as needlessly threatening both activities. To begin with, OASDI, or social security, is an insurance program. The beneficiaries of it have paid into the fund for a period of time and thereby bought their entitlement. Since payments under social security are fixed, accurate forecasts can be made on costs well into the future.

The medicare program, otherwise known as the King-Anderson proposal, would eventually become a form of insurance, but for a good many years it would be nothing less than a gross earnings tax on the Nation's wage earners and other producers of income. The immediate beneficiaries of the program have made no contribution to the fund, nor would they, ever.

But other aspects in the medicare package give us even greater concern. While social security payments can be accurately predicted, medical costs cannot be. Even if the statisticians could predict the number of people who would take advantage of the program, who would try to guess the daily cost of a hospital bed or a nurse, 5 or 10 years from now. All we know for sure is that they have increased over the past 10 years at a rate roughly 50 percent greater than the increase in wages and salaries.

The National Association of Retail Druggists takes the position that inclusion of health services in the social security system can endanger its very existence. Projected costs of medicare are at best a combination of estimates and approximations. We would dislike seeing social security encumbered with a program, the cost of which at this point, can't even be determined.

By outlining some of the interests and functions of the National Association of Retail Druggists, I hope I have given you a somewhat greater insight into the organization, as well as its membership. Druggists are, for the most part, independent professional businessmen. There is a difference between being independent and being alone. National Association of Retail Druggists is the difference, for those we serve.

In these days of big business, big labor, and big government, it's increasingly difficult for the individual—any individual—to make his voice heard. The people already engaged in pharmacy recognize this reality. Those of you who will be entering the profession in the near future should also understand this hard fact of life, and be aware of the National Association of Retail Druggists as an important force in your chosen field. It's part of your inheritance as a professional pharmacist.

Our profession is a legacy, passed to us from other hands. We are the heirs of both the art and the substance of our predecessors. The list of our benefactors is a long one.

It includes such names as Galen, Paracelsus, Schmeiderberg, Remington, and Howard. It also includes the founders of this distinguished institution.

Other names will be added to our roster of pioneers in years to come, because ours is an ever-changing and never-satisfied science. The earliest practitioners of pharmacy saw in it the means of helping people escape illness, overcome disease and live longer, happier, and more productive lives. Almost everything else has changed in pharmacy, but the objective is still the same.

President Lyndon Johnson undertook to detail the essential characteristics of the Great Society, in a speech delivered on May 22, last. His remarks treated the topics of education, social relationships, economics, and housing. I was surprised, as you may have been, to note that in the President's Ann Arbor, Mich., speech he failed to include the most important element in any society which would be deemed great. Of course, I speak of health facilities and services which must stand vigilantly between the individual and the illnesses and infirmities which threaten him every day of his life.

In his recent state of the Union message, however, the President gave heavy emphasis to the topic of health and medical programs and followed these remarks up on January 7 with a special message to Congress outlining his legislative desires. Part of the administration program, it seems clear, calls for the establishment of area diagnostic and treatment centers.

The pharmacists of the country have a deep interest in the solutions of health problems. The National Association of Retail Druggists will watch developments and at all times be conscious of our responsibilities to the public and the independent retail pharmacists.

The Great Society is a new label—but it's an old idea. It was the vision of this Great Society which prompted an ancient Babylonian to chip the first version of a pharmacopoeia into a stone tablet, about 1,700 years before the birth of Christ.

A vision of the Great Society and the role of the healing sciences in making it a reality provided impetus for the founding of this college.

It was a striving toward the Great Society which led to the founding of the National Association of Retail Druggists, and sustains it, as a force for protecting the prerogatives and upgrading the usefulness of our profession.

Robert Browning exclaimed: "Ah, but a man's reach should exceed his grasp, or what's a heaven for?"

President Johnson put it somewhat differently when he said: "The Great Society is not a safe harbor, a resting place, a final objective, a finished work. It is a challenge constantly renewed, beckoning us toward a destiny where the meaning of our lives matches the marvelous products of our labor."

The Great Society may not be attainable in a century or a millenium. No matter. The only thing of consequence is that we never lose sight of the objective—never lose interest or heart for the endless march toward a more perfect world. Few of us can hope to lead the way into new territory, as did the men who founded the Massachusetts College of Pharmacy, but we can try.

Immortality, it seems to me, is a reasonable objective for every man. Aside from whatever other requirements we may assign, historical immortality must certainly be earned. The test might well be that we leave this world a somewhat better place than we found it upon our arrival.

The founders of this institution are among those who did so. Their courage, devotion, and faith has brought us all a bit closer to the ultimate objective. They founded a college, and in doing this important work, added to the form and substance of the Great Society which beckons us all.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—BUREAUCRACY AT WORK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, January 13, 1965, at the invitation of the Government Workers Union Local No. 1, American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees, AFL–CIO, I joined a group of interested local citizens in inspecting the building used as headquarters for the public assistance and child welfare divisions of the District of Columbia's Department of Public Welfare. The building is a converted warehouse located at 1291 Taylor Street NW. Others in the group included J. C. Turner, president of the Greater Washington Central Labor Council, Mrs. Jane Schwartz, of the Public Welfare Advisory Council, and Mrs. Secundi, of the Washington Urban League. The inspection tour was conducted by the cochairman of the welfare chapter of local No. 1, Myles Johnson and James Wallace.

Mr. Speaker, it is shocking for the Nation's Capital to use this totally inadequate facility for vital welfare purposes. The converted warehouse is noisy and crowded; the air is uncomfortably stagnant in some areas, drafty in other areas; the lunchroom facility is ridiculously small; the space for clients to wait, with their children, is small and crowded, cold in the winter and almost unbearably hot in the summer; interview space makes privacy and confidentiality impossible. The aged and infirm who seek aid must negotiate a flight of stairs to reach the receptionist, climb those stairs again, cross the street in all kinds of weather for further interviewing, only to return once more before receiving assistance.

In addition to being intolerable for both workers and clients, the building is located far from the homes of most of those who seek service. Although a start toward decentralization is being made as part of the antipoverty program, it is obvious that the District government has made no real effort to relocate services where they are most needed.

The history of the building is illustrative of bureaucracy at its worst. In 1962 Congress refused to allow an increase in rent to cover air-conditioning costs and turned down a request for authorization for a long term lease, making it clear the building should be vacated. Since then, the District government has been urged by the union concerned, the Greater Washington Central Labor Council, the Democratic Central Committee, and a host of civic groups, many expert in the welfare field, to move out of this building and decentralize its services.

However, no plans have been made. The union was once assured that it would be fully consulted on any plans. Instead, it was abruptly informed last month that it would be necessary to renew the lease, which expires on June 30, 1965, until June 30, 1966. There is only vague talk about moving then.

Mr. Speaker, the District should keep faith with workers and clients alike by moving out at the expiration of the present lease. The union has asked for a conference with Commissioner John B. Duncan, who has responsibility for the District's welfare program. I believe Mr. Duncan should meet immediately with the union. Alternate measures should be explored. For one thing, instead of renewing the lease for 12 months, it could, if necessary, be renewed on a month-to-month basis. If the move cannot be made in July, perhaps it can be accomplished in October.

Mr. Speaker, as long as the Congress of the United States acts as a city council for the District of Columbia, we have an obligation to scrutinize its management. The intolerable working conditions which I have described and the apparent decision to renew the lease on the Taylor Street warehouse merits a close examination.

MINORITY MEMBER OF THE HOUSE BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, the Small Business Administration has exhausted the money in its revolving fund established to provide loans for small business, disaster victims, and contract and investment company assistance. As a result victims of the terrible yearend floods in parts of Washington, Oregon, Idaho, and California must wait in line for a trickle of assistance from the return flow of funds through repayments to and possible sale of loans held by SBA. To further assist such victims SBA is endeavoring to obtain additional private lending assistance through encouraging banks to make deferred participation loans to disaster victims.

Such a situation need not have occurred and should not be allowed to continue. It points up a serious deficiency in amendments made to the SBA law 3 years ago when Congress amended the act.

Prior to that time, there had been a separate authorization for disaster loans in the Small Business Administration Act. The Administration sent up a proposal for additional authorization for SBA activities including a recommendation for merging the authorizations for regular small business loans, disaster loans and investment company assistance. At the insistence of the minority members of the House Banking and Currency Committee the bill was amended to maintain separate authorization for these three programs. That was the way the bill was reported to the House and that was the way it passed the House.

Unfortunately when the bill was in conference a change was made merging the business loan and disaster loan authorizations. A provision was included requiring the SBA to notify the Congress when a stated amount of disaster loan funds had been committed. Apparently no such notice has been given to the House Banking and Currency Committee even though the amount of disaster loans outstanding on November 30, 1963, exceeded the amount calling for notification to the committee. The Republican Members of the Congress believed so strongly that eliminating the separate disaster loan authorization was so serious a mistake that they refused to sign the conference report.

Subsequently, when the conference report was brought back to the House we again expressed our deep concern at that conference action. At that time in my own remarks I said, speaking for the minority conferees:

> We sincerely regret that as this bill comes back from conference a grave error, in our opinion, has been made. The conference substitute leaves the disaster loan authority with the regular small business loan authority. We think that is wrong. No one can tell when natural disaster will again strike to plague our people. The only way the Congress can be sure there will be funds available to assist our people in rehabilitating their homes and businesses when disaster occurs is to maintain the disaster loan program as a separate and distinct authorization—a trust fund if you please—to be available without any question and for the specific purpose for which the authorization was granted. That is just plain good commonsense.

Mr. Speaker, unfortunately time and tragic circumstances have proven the wisdom of those words. Today I have introduced a bill which again will establish a separate and inviolate authorization for disaster loans in SBA. The new separate authorization proposed is in the amount of $200 million. This compares with the outstanding volume of disaster loans and commitments in the amount of $168 million according to recent figures from SBA, which of course would be charged against existing SBA authorizations rather than the new $200 million disaster loan authorization provided in the bill. I hope, Mr. Speaker, for prompt enactment of the measure so that future victims of disasters may once again look to SBA with assurance for assistance under the disaster loan program. With billions of dollars being spent for foreign aid grants, surely we can provide this special additional loan assistance to our own victims of natural disasters.

CAMPAIGN COSTS THREATEN REPRESENTATIVE GOVERNMENT

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. Cleveland] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, the press throughout the country, along with a growing number of citizens, is becoming increasingly concerned with the looseness of both Federal and State election laws whereby it is apparently possible for candidates of great wealth or with the backing of great wealth to spend without limit in their campaigns. Two examples of this concern by the press are submitted herewith for the Record. One is taken from a recent column by David Lawrence, who writes with point and effect on the need for a "great morality" as a prerequisite for the social greatness, which is the order of the day. The other consists of pertinent observations which appeared last month in an editorial in the Holland, Mich., Evening Sentinel.

I commend both to the earnest attention of the House:

Today in National Affairs—The Great Morality Lacking in Government

(By David Lawrence)

Washington.—The Great Society is a utopian objective, but the realistic truth is that it never will be achieved until something is done to introduce a "great morality," particularly in the environment of the Government itself.

The evidence piles up that seats in Congress are bought, that private interests buy their way to the attainment of special favors in Congress and that there are more efforts to get around than to obey the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, which governs elections.

Congress is reluctant to investigate itself, as the Bobby Baker case shows. But the image of Congress throughout the country is tarnished by such episodes. Despite all the talk of a Great Society, the slogan isn't likely to be widely accepted as long as the Government itself condones wrongdoing.

* * * * *

The New York Herald Tribune said in an editorial:

"The trouble is, first, that these limits are so absurdly low as to be totally unrealistic; and second, that the laws have loopholes large enough to drive a Brink's truck through.

"The upshot is that candidates don't even try to conform to the spirit of the law; they simply twist their campaign organization—and multiply their committees—to fit its flexible letter. There may come a time, eventually, when the whole structure of campaign finances and campaign expenses reporting will be put on a rational basis, with realistic limits, proper incentives for small contributions, and full disclosure. Then, perhaps, we'll have an enforced and enforceable law, which both permits the kind of expenditures needed and contains some safeguards against 'buying' an election."

It boils down to the fact that, if you are a rich man, you can easily finance a campaign to win a seat in Congress. If you are a poor man, you have to depend on contributions from others, and often the contributors exact their pound of flesh in one way or another by demanding special favors.

Campaign financing is only one of the factors which have helped to produce the impression that Washington has a corrupt environment. The lobbyists in the National Capital spend huge sums annually to entertain and to cultivate good relationship with Members of Congress. It isn't clear why such expenditures are thought necessary in a nation which boasts about freedom of speech and the right of petition.

The Senate in recent years has interrogated prospective appointees to offices in the executive branch of the Government and has frowned upon any conflict of interest. It is being assumed today that, once a nominee is confirmed, he will see to it that there is no conflict of interest with any business or company in which he may previously have been associated. But there is no similar prohibition on the conflict of interest which exists today in the executive branch of the Government as a result of huge campaign contributions by labor organizations and other groups which have a direct interest in legislation.

Union labor contributed vast sums to help elect the Johnson-Humphrey ticket and has proudly boasted that it aided a majority of the Members of Congress to get elected. As long as organizations which have a special interest in legislation are permitted to contribute to the campaigns of individual Members and virtually assure their election, there will remain a conflict of interest.

[From the Holland Evening Sentinel,
Dec. 15, 1964]

Campaign Costs

Almost every day there is a story that breaks about the cost of votes and the millions of dollars spent in the last campaign.

The Robert F. Kennedy-Senator Kenneth B. Keating campaign for the U.S. Senate from the State of New York is reported to have approached $2 million for each candidate. This, to our way of thinking, is a lot of money even with our present inflated dollar. These reports are no doubt taken from the reports that the candidates filed.

We wonder just how far this trend will move before there will be some kind of legislation that will come before the legislatures and the Congress of the United States with some kind of a program. We understand that there is also some talk about the donations to county, State, and national organizations whereby some amendment to the Federal income tax laws would allow these donations to earn some kind of tax deduction.

Time for all media is an important factor. Many people to whom we have talked, are of the impression that no ordinary individual can aspire to high office. They cannot come forth with the millions it takes to keep their name before the public, along with the people who spend millions of their own money and that of the taxpayers who are asked to support the county, State, and national programs. It would seem that with all of our education and more and more people living off the Government that we should start to work on some kind of an equitable program.

What is your opinion?

EQUALIZATION OF TAX TREATMENT IN LIFE INSURANCE TRANSFERS

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, under the present Internal Revenue Code, section 101(a)(2), the proceeds of life insurance contracts transferred for value are taxable as to the amount over the value given and premiums paid by the transferee. Certain exceptions have been created to this general rule. The first of these deals with the situation in which the transferor's basis is passed to the transferee for gain and loss purposes. The second deals with the status of the transferee, and I have today introduced legislation to broaden the scope of the second exception to include such transferees as the spouse, former spouse, parent, lineal descendant, or adopted child of the insured or the shareholder of a corporation when the policy is transferred as part of a buy and sell agreement for corporate stock.

All of these additional transferees which are included in my proposal would have an insurable interest in the insured in any situation. They could take out a policy such as the one transferred to them without having the proceeds taxable. This bill would equalize treatment for a new policy and a transferred policy.

Because of the present state of the tax laws, transfers covered by this extension rarely occur, the tax detriment being what it is. Thus, enactment of this bill, which is supported by the three major life insurance trade associations, would cause little or no revenue loss to the Government.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON FISCAL ORGANIZATION AND PROCEDURES

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, faced with the size and complexity of today's Federal Government, the Congress has found itself increasingly unable to cope with the problem of keeping its fiscal and appropriative procedures in proper perspective. Too often we lose touch with the broader aspect of these important matters in the necessary concentration on their details.

The gentleman from California [Mr. Lipscomb] has offered an intelligent approach to resolving our difficulties in this area. He, in his House Resolution 42, proposes the creation of a Select Committee on Fiscal Organization and Procedures to look into the way in which the Congress handles these matters and the defects in the present budgetary practices of our Government. He has been joined by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Laird] in introducing this proposal. I take the greatest pleasure in joining my colleagues in sponsorship of this resolution which offers a chance for a real step forward in our quest for fiscal responsibility in our Government.

SOCIAL SECURITY DISABILITY AND WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION: CURING THE OVERLAP

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, Congress enacted the social security law in 1935 and 21 years later, in 1956, amended the law to provide for the payment of social security disability benefits. This was the beginning of the social security disability program.

Since that date important changes have taken place in the program. Originally, disability benefits were restricted to persons 50 years of age and over. Provision was made to offset against social security disability benefits, all benefits received under workmen's compensation laws.

In 1953, the provision for deduction of workmen's compensation benefits was eliminated. Also in that year, benefits for the dependents of a beneficiary under the program were made available.

In 1960, the age 50 limitation was eliminated so that all qualified persons totally and permanently disabled became entitled to benefits.

From these facts, it is apparent that there has been a considerable expansion of the social security disability program. There is demand for still further extension.

In 1961, H.R. 4571 proposed to extend disability benefits to persons temporarily disabled. Under such a provision, which received the support of President Kennedy and very serious consideration by the Ways and Means Committee, more people would have been placed upon the social security disability rolls. Many of these already would have been receiving workmen's compensation benefits. This provision was eliminated from the bill which was enacted.

In 1962, bills to broaden even further the disability provision of the Social Security Act at even higher costs were pending at the adjournment of the 87th Congress.

Mr. Speaker, factually speaking, there has been considerable change from the original disability program as enacted by Congress. Some of the results flowing from this expanded program are surprising indeed and not the results which, in my opinion, were envisioned by Congress.

For instance, with the elimination of the offset provision in 1958, it is now possible for a beneficiary to draw both State workmen's compensation and social security disability benefits for a single injury. Consider the results of this particular change in the law.

A disabled employee with a wife and two dependents who earns $400 per month would be entitled to receive $254 in social security disability benefits. In addition, if he were a workmen's compensation covered employee in the State of Massachusetts, he would be entitled to receive $294.67 per month under workmen's compensation. He would thus receive $548.67 per month tax free while disabled, as compared with his former earnings of $400 per month which would be subject to Federal income tax of more than $400 per year.

Mr. Speaker, workers in 47 jurisdictions receive through this duplication of benefits more than their take-home pay. I am firmly of the opinion that Congress did not intend this result.

From this result, also the program for the rehabilitation of these injured persons will suffer. No longer will there be any incentive for the injured person to return to a productive livelihood. Reports have reached me that the drop in the number of rehabilitated persons has reached alarming proportions.

Mr. Speaker, the tired story of Federal encroachment is having its impact upon the individual State compensation programs. Some States already are resisting this dual Federal-State plan. In Minnesota, a partial "reverse offset" law has been enacted which provides that State compensation benefits will be reduced by social security disability benefits. Legislation has been introduced this year in the States of Colorado and Maryland to enact the "reverse offset."

The handwriting is clear, Mr. Speaker, that the demise of the State programs is a matter of fact under such laws. I do not believe the Congress intended to bring about the destruction of the State workmen's compensation programs through enactment of the Social Security Disability Act.

Mr. Speaker, any detriment done to the State workmen's compensation program by the Federal social security program would be irreparable injury. The State programs for 50 years have been the basic disability programs in this country for work-connected disabilities. The Federal program under social security cannot compare favorably at all with the benefits under the State program, that is, payments and unlimited medical benefits. Thus, destroying the State programs, in effect, is only hurting our disabled people.

Enough has been said here to reveal some problem areas in the social security disability program. Informed persons acquainted with these areas have suggested two approaches as solutions. One approach would be to limit the amount of dual benefits to a certain percentage of disabled worker's average weekly wage, not to exceed a maximum sum.

The other approach would be to reinstate the offset provision in the Federal act which was repealed in 1958. This would reduce social security disability benefits by the amount of benefits received under the State compensation programs. Under both of these approaches, persons receiving benefits under the present laws would not be affected. The purpose here is not to take away benefits from disabled people but to make sound and workable the disability programs of the States and the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, there is a collateral problem regarding dual compensation in connection with the so-called medicare bill which the Ways and Means Committee has studied in the past. Under the medicare proposals which have been submitted to Congress, no provision was made for the possible overlap of the medical benefits under State workmen's compensation programs and the benefits to be paid for under the medicare proposals. Under State workmen's compensation programs, very broad medical, surgical, and hospital benefits are provided. They are unlimited in most

States. These benefits would be, in part, duplicated under the social security medicare amendment.

It may be argued that only a limited number of persons 65 years and older would be receiving medical benefits for industrial injuries. However, this principle, once established, would be applicable to any extension of medicare that might be made in the future. This has already been the case with respect to disability benefits.

Such dual compensation problems are also recognized in the 1965 Report of the Social Security Advisory Council entitled "The Status of the Social Security Program and Recommendations for Its Improvement." On pages 88 and 89 of that report, the same problem of dual entitlement is also recognized, and that although the amount of this dual compensation is not now a problem, it could be expected to increase in the future. The Council further recommends that it would be desirable to prevent any "excessive payments resulting from dual entitlement to whatever extent they may incur."

Mr. Speaker, I feel that the duplication of such benefits under the Social Security Act would needlessly increase costs under the social security system, besides being unsound in principle, unnecessary, and detrimental to the operation of the State workmen's compensation system. Although the bill I am introducing today does not offer a legislative solution to these collateral problems, I feel that it is important for me to note these relationships here.

I am pleased to note, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Herlong] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Thompson] have introduced bills.

AMENDING COASTWISE LAWS

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Mailliard] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, it is imperative that we amend our coastwise laws to protect the American traveling public both from the standpoint of each passenger's personal safety while afloat as well as from the standpoint of protecting him against the loss of his hard-earned dollar.

In recent years, the popularity of the so-called cruise business has increased substantially, and such business involves almost exclusively the expenditures of U.S. citizens. Foreign-flag vessel operators have obviously focused their attention on the profitability of this business, and while some of them are engaged in legitimate business on seaworthy vessels, unfortunately this area of tourism has been plagued by "sail-by-night" operators who have been financially irresponsible. For example, only recently several hundred cruise passengers who had paid their fares on a foreign-flag cruise ship were left waiting at the dock when one such vessel was forced to sail in order to avoid its creditors. These American vacationers who had paid their hard-earned dollars to the foreign-flag operator were left with no greater souvenir of their Caribbean cruise than a receipt for passage from a bankrupt corporation. And today, Mr. Speaker, this same ship is back in business, only her name has been changed to protect her shady past.

We must realize that cruise passengers from the United States are not really making trips to any foreign port. These American tourists generally book passage for round trips which merely visit foreign ports for usually a maximum of a day or two.

I ask for changes in the law primarily to aid the thousands of unsuspecting Americans who jeopardize their lives every day they spend aboard certain foreign flag "floating junkyards." So often the cruise announcements in our travel magazines and daily newspapers invite American tourists to join the fun and frolic in the Caribbean. But what is advertised as the "glamorous, luxurious, opulent, SS *Arabian Nights*" turns out to be a souped-up, overage freighter, a converted overnight boat, or a passenger liner long overdue at the scrap yard. To the layman, this floating scrap heap may look fine with only a new coat of paint, but if she were under U.S. registry she would be ruled unseaworthy by the U.S. Coast Guard.

We can be truly proud of our Coast Guard, which stands ever watchful in enforcing the rigid standards that make U.S. ships the safest in the world. However, under existing inspection laws the Coast Guard is limited in its power to protect Americans from the hazards of travel on substandard foreign-flag ships which operate out of U.S. ports. These foreign vessels need only adhere to the regulations of the International Safety of Life at Sea Convention of 1948, which are minimal in comparison to the more stringent safety standards covering U.S. passenger ships.

For this reason, I ask that our coastwise laws be amended to eliminate the serious hazards of "shoestring" operations which continually peril the unsuspecting American passenger. The risk of life and limb goes on day after day:

One foreign-flag ship, vintage World War I, went through a series of five owners—and five different names. Only after acquiring such a shadowy reputation that travel agencies refused to book passage, did the owners take her off the market.

Another oldtimer until recently steamed out of New York for summer cruises but was not certified for winter service in the Atlantic, so her operators put her in the Florida cruise circuit for that season.

Another so-called luxury liner on the Miami to West Indies run, in earlier days was chartered for ferry service between Sweden and England.

Mr. Speaker, the ship cruise business is continually expanding as more Americans have more leisure time at their disposal and more money to spend. The potential of sea disasters in the future will likewise grow in proportion unless our traveling public is protected from the hazards of substandard unsafe foreign-flag vessels.

I am today introducing a bill which would permit more U.S. cruise business for U.S. ships, and would help stem the gold outflow, but these benefits are auxiliary to my main purpose. Of utmost importance is the basic fact that my amendments would lessen the risks to the lives of American citizens who unsuspectingly travel the cruise circuit on substandard foreign-flag ships.

Let me make it clear that it is not my intention to prohibit all foreign-flag operators from cruising from U.S. ports. It is my intention to extend the coastwise laws to require licensing and supervision in the "cruise business" operation. The Secretary of Commerce, under this amendment, would have discretionary power to authorize cruises by foreign-flag operators who conform to proper standards of safety and financial responsibility.

ECONOMY IN REVERSE

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, the President is getting headlines for submitting the lowest foreign aid budget in recent history, but the important fact is that his request is $130 million more than Congress appropriated for the current year aid program. This seems to be economy in reverse.

Inasmuch as the Presidential message gives great weight to the increased efficiency of the foreign aid program, and fails to state wherein the current appropriation was inadequate, it seems to me that the Congress is obligated to determine why increased appropriations are requested.

I hope this message does not indicate a trend toward increasing other 1966 programs over our 1965 appropriations. If it does, I am confident the Congress will demonstrate that we can cut budgets, as we did by $11 billion in the fiscal year 1964 and 1965 appropriations.

A TRAINED REPORTER'S OBSERVATIONS ON THE SOVIET BLOC

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Derwinski] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Record excerpts from an article about Eastern Europe which appeared in the New York Times of January 11 under the byline of Max Frankel.

These are not the views of a partisan or a politician but the observations of a trained reporter representing a liberal newspaper, and I commend the observations he makes to the attention of all Members of this body. I intend to make a speech on our policy toward Eastern Europe in the near future:

Talking Tour of the Soviet Bloc Discloses Bitterness and Hope

(By Max Frankel)

It would take more than a journey of 2 months through Communist Europe to report with certainty on the moods and thoughts of its 120 million people, but it often takes less than 2 minutes of conversation there to hear a revealing fragment of some of their dominant attitudes.

"You will find much official bitterness here about the Western propaganda radio broadcasts," a Polish Communist confided recently. "But you should have seen how the biggest complainers ran to their shortwave sets when Nikita Khrushchev fell, when they really wanted to know what was going on."

"Of course we are materialists," an East German salesman remarked. "What else is there for people to do except to make a better life for themselves and their children and to worry about how much better things are in the West? But ask people whether they want you to help us through the Communists and they will all tell you, 'no, that would make them worse.' You might say that underneath, we are still idealists, we still hope for something."

* * * * *

The nationalism so fervently preached by the states and schools of Eastern Europe throughout this century erupts on all sides and so does the materialism, the concern with the hard realities of daily life and with the baubles of better living that the Communists so piously deplore in the West.

The overwhelming impression of hundreds of conversations in Communist Europe is that these traditional prejudices and concerns outweigh all others and that they buttress the hostility that the great majority of people feel toward the Communist minority that rules them.

They blame that powerful minority for depressing living standards and injuring national pride.

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Albert). If there is no objection on the part of gentlemen having previous special orders, the gentleman is recognized.

There was no objection.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, every 2 years when a new Congress is organized the enemies of the Committee on Un-American Activities mount another attack on the committee. Some want to split the committee, transferring its functions to other committees, and others want to terminate both the committee and its functions altogether. In my opinion this biennial attempt to strangle the committee has more noise than substance, but it is potentially capable of achieving its aims and therefore must be actively opposed. I say any attack and any attacker must be met toe-to-toe and beaten back. If they ever get a real toehold the future of the committee is threatened.

In May 1962, Communist leaders from many nations gathered in Czechoslovakia to plan future operations of their international conspiracy. The proceedings of this meeting were published in the "World Marxist Review" in 18 languages. The document listed seven separate recommendations termed "essential" to victory for the Communist Party in the United States. One of these was: "Abolition of the House Un-American Committee."

So far as I am concerned the mere fact that abolition of the committee is an important aim of the Communists is good enough reason for supporting the committee. But for those who need additional facts to lean on, the record of the committee is impressive.

Legislativewise, the accomplishments of this particular committee concern national security. This is hardly subject to comparison with the production of other standing committees of Congress on a qualitative basis.

But a mathematical comparison of production is not at all unfavorable. The committee has provided Congress with about 150 legislative proposals of which 45 have been enacted into law. Others were accepted as policy recommendations by the executive branch and put into effect by Executive order or administrative action.

Some of the work of the committee has been dramatic and spectacular, such as the Alger Hiss case and the exposures of Gerhart Eisler, Harry Dexter White, and Nathan Silvermaster. But many times as much effective work of equal or even greater importance has been done and is unknown to the public. For example, the committee investigated internal security practices in the National Security Agency following the shocking defection to the Soviet Union of two of its employees. The results were a thorough shakeup of the Agency, personnelwise, and drastic revision of its internal procedures.

The files of the Committee on Un-American Activities contain the names of thousands of Communists, former Communists, and fellow travelers. These files are used by the FBI, the Civil Service Commission, and other agencies in checking security risks. This practice, initiated by President Truman and continued through other administrations, is a vital link in our security chain.

The late Representative Francis E. Walter, who chaired the committee for so many years, said just 2 years ago when the committee was under attack:

> Abolishing the Committee on Un-American Activities—let's face it—means destroying the agency that has developed more security legislation, given the Congress more information about communism and done more harm to the Communist Party than any other institution, public or private, in this country. To do this at a time when world Communist strength is at an alltime high, is suicidal.

Communism dominates areas of the earth today which were free 2 years ago when the late Francis Walter uttered the foregoing. Communism's goal continues to be world domination, including the United States. The practice of communism is certainly un-American.

The prime objective of the Un-American Activities Committee is to expose communism wherever and whenever it can be found in the United States. One Communist cell after another has been exposed by this great committee.

To terminate the committee would be hailed in Moscow as the Communist victory of this era.

Mr. Speaker, when the fight is made, and it will be made, as it has been every 2 years, to terminate or emasculate the committee, I hope Members of the House who support the committee will face the opposition toe to toe. Anything short of an overwhelming vote by Members of this body in support of the Un-American Activities Committee would be a victory for the cause of communism around the world.

I urge the House to stand strong in support of this great committee.

SHORTEN PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGNS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Albert). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. Monagan] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, my first action after receiving the oath of office for my fourth term as Representative in Congress from Connecticut's Fifth Congressional District, was to file House Joint Resolution 16 and H.R. 96, both of which limit presidential campaigns to 60 days. I ask permission to append the text of these bills to my remarks.

I have advocated legislation of this character since I came to Congress in 1959.

Through the years public support for this objective has been mounting, but I am frank to report that the enthusiasm which is registered during and immediately after each succeeding presidential campaign tends to wane after the campaign is over.

I have compiled a substantial file of supporting statements, the most recent of which has come to me from Vice-President-elect Hubert H. Humphrey, and it is gratifying to note the growing interest among peoples at all levels of the community who have communicated with me to urge that I continue my efforts toward enactment of this change in our election procedures.

I am not speaking for myself particularly in urging an abbreviated campaign, for those of us in the House who serve active districts realize that we must campaign in one form or another without letup from one year to the next. However, the protracted and unseemly circus type of presidential campaign that is known only in this Nation is, in my opinion and in the opinion of many others, an expensive, boring, unnecessary and provoking imposition upon the public, and an exhausting and shattering experience for the principal candidates themselves. I am convinced that excessive exposure soon lends to boredom and lack of interest on the part of the electorate and thus frustrates the main objective of the candidates—discussion of issues with the people.

India, England, Canada, Israel, and many other nations of the world perform their national electoral tasks in roughly 30 days, and I believe that we would be well advised to follow their example. I have long been convinced that this vaudeville circuit type of American campaign should have passed into oblivion with the departure of the stagecoach and the carrier pigeon. Today our transportation and communication facilities are such that lengthy campaigns are no longer necessary. Our campaign procedures are certainly not in keeping with the potentials and realities of the jet plane, television, radio, and the thorough reporting of our news and information media.

I have asked my colleagues in the House to join with me in urging immediate consideration of H.R. 96 by the Committee on House Administration and House Joint Resolution 16 by the Committee on the Judiciary. The former disqualifies from office any candidate for President or Vice President who was nominated for the office more than 60 days before the day established for the appointment of electors of President and Vice President of the United States for that term. The latter deals with the problem through amendment of the Constitution, placing in the qualifications for President and Vice President a requirement that no person nominated for the office shall be eligible to serve if the nomination was made more than 60 days before election day.

In further support of my proposals, I want to make available to the House copies of letters, statements, newspaper editorials, and radio commentaries which I shall submit to the appropriate committees at the appropriate time. Certainly these comments eloquently testify to the need for a reduction in the time of our campaigns, a cutting down in our expenditures and a proper use of the energies of our candidates.

Following is the text of House Joint Resolution 16:

H.J. RES. 16

Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to qualifications for election to the offices of President and Vice President of the United States

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, and shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"ARTICLE—

"SECTION 1. No person nominated as the candidate of a political party for election to the office of President or Vice President of the United States shall serve in such office for the term for which he was nominated if such person was nominated with respect to that election as the candidate of such political party for such office more than sixty days before the day established for the appointment of the electors of President and Vice President of the United States for that term.

"SEC. 2. This article shall take effect at the beginning of the first calendar year which begins after the date of ratification of this article.

"SEC. 3. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission."

Following is the text of H.R. 96:

H.R. 96

A bill to establish certain qualifications for election to the offices of President and Vice President of the United States

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That no person nominated as the candidate of a political party for election to the office of President or Vice President of the United States shall serve in such office for the term for which he was nominated if such person was nominated with respect to that election as the candidate of such political party for such office more than sixty days before the day established for the appointment of the electors of President and Vice President of the United States for that term.

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, D.C., November 25, 1964.

The Honorable JOHN S. MONAGAN,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JOHN: Thanks so much for sending to me a copy of your bill to establish a Federal Presidential Election Board.

I fully agree that we must think seriously about commonsense ways and means to limit the length of our presidential campaigns. Believe me, I know from experience.

I know your interest in this problem will bs of substantial importance in pursuing the kind of solution which is acceptable to our political parties and the people of the United States.

Best wishes.
Sincerely,
HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

[From the Meriden (Conn.) Morning Record, Jan. 6, 1965]

REPRESENTATIVE MONAGAN'S BILL

As Congress convened this week, Representative JOHN MONAGAN, whose expanded Fifth District now includes Meriden, has introduced again a bill to limit presidential election campaigns to 60 days.

This is not the first time Congressman MONAGAN has proposed such legislation, but if experience is of any value, his bill should attract greater support during this session. The 1964 election campaign is still fresh in the minds of the voters and of the candidates, and there is general recognition that a long drawn out campaign is no longer necessary.

Time was in an earlier era when it was necessary to have a long campaign. Means of transportation were fewer and slower then. A candidate went from region to region by train, and it took longer to cover the country. There were no airplanes to enable him to speak in San Francisco and New York within a matter of hours, if necessary. There was no television to bring his image and his argument simultaneously into every home in the land.

Now that these means of communication are available, the need for a long campaign no longer exists. Under present conditions, the protracted campaign is a disservice: it exhausts the strength of the candidates; it tries the patience of the voters, wearying them to the point of disenchantment with the democratic process; and it is needlessly expensive.

In terms of time, money, conservation of energy, and political efficiency, the Nation would be well served if there were a limit imposed on the length of the presidential election campaign. Congressman MONAGAN's bill recognizes this need. Examination and debate may lead to some modification, but in essence his bill is sound and deserves to be approved.

[From the Sacramento Bee, the Fresno Bee, the Modesto Bee, Jan. 5, 1964]

TO ABSURD LENGTHS

The clamor is mounting to shorten appreciably the extraordinary circus which occupies American life every 4 years—the presidential campaign. Old ways die hard, however, and few expect urged reforms will be resolved by 1968.

Look at England. Its recent elections for Parliament produced campaigns lasting but 3 weeks and nothing important was left unsaid. The most recent Canadian election lasted but 30 days; there were no complaints from the voters that they could not make up their minds in this time.

By contrast, the American presidential election campaign in 1964 began really in January with the primaries and drummed on, ad nauseum, through October. How is an officeseeker to fill that near vacuum responsibly and intelligently?

There have been many suggestions for reform.

Congressman JOHN S. MONAGAN of Connecticut introduced legislation, which died aborning, to limit the presidential campaign, convention to election, to 60 days. U.S. Senator THOMAS J. DODD of Connecticut has suggested a 4-week campaign.

There is no reason whatsoever to justify the tiring, grinding campaigns, now fantastically costly. They produce little heat, less light. There was a time perhaps when they were necessary, when candidates stumped by buggy and by train and when it took time to reach the people. In this age of instant communication, however, the long campaign has become an absurdity.

[From the New York Times, Dec. 27, 1964]

SHORTER CAMPAIGNS WANTED

To the EDITOR:

Every thoughtful American must share your editorial concern about the appalling cost of modern political campaigns. Croesus has a more effective claim upon high office than Pericles.

The 30-day campaign limit as employed in other countries suggests one way to reduce costs. It makes sense financially and psychologically for a nation blanketed by communications media which are intensive.

Even more to the point is the proposal that publicly licensed communications media ought to earn their franchise by providing free broadcast time to parties in rough proportion to voter registration.

The published expense figures for the last election suggests that national chairmen would rejoice in such a proposal. I believe, furthermore, that such a scheme would provide bracing tonic for the body politic.

BRUCE McCLELLAN.
LAWRENCEVILLE, N.J., *December 15, 1964.*

[From the Bridgeport (Conn.) Post, Dec. 20, 1964]

LAW TO LIMIT CAMPAIGN TIME

(By Carey Cronan)

Representative JOHN S. MONAGAN's proposal that legislation be enacted to limit presidential campaigns to 60 days should meet with favor from most of the Nation if not from the majority of Congress.

Representative MONAGAN has proposed such a limitation before but his pleas have not produced any legislation to ease the burden of running for national office.

Whether he will secure effective support for the legislation to be offered next month is not certain but he will not be alone in endorsing such a restriction.

Just now, when the campaign is of recent memory, there is no doubt that most citizens are weary of being harangued not only in person, but over the airwaves and through the press, magazines, pamphlets, posters, pictures. They are weary of the arguments pro and con, weary of the free-flowing phrases, the histrionic rebukes, the gaudy slogans, the innuendoes, the reckless claims, the inadequate explanations, the soul searching, the panoply of issues, the appeals to pressure groups and by pressure groups, the obvious moves for voter support, the tremendous physical efforts, the bands and the bunting, the parades and demonstrations, the noise of the crowds, and the calculated statements never ending.

Democratic process: Of course there are some who say we should be thankful that the democratic process permits such freedom, such liberty to campaign and to be campaigned upon. That is correct but we can have too much of a good thing.

The cost of campaigning is itself a major item for the candidates and the parties, not only at the presidential level but all the way down the line. The longer the campaign the greater the cost will be and even at the congressional level it is questionable that the average citizen could even attempt to run for office in most of the districts of this country. Suggestions that tax deductions for campaign contributions up to certain amounts, be passed into law have not gotten beyond the stage of academic discussion. There are more people contributing today but substantial parts of the burden are borne by a few who are able to dash off a check in several figures.

Forever new: It is also difficult for a candidate who is heard and seen and recorded almost every waking hour to be forever new. He has to say the same thing over and over again and try to give it a twist that will deliver it up as a novel concoction fresh from his desire to be of public service. Television stars who have to come up with a new program weekly have found that in the long run they wear upon the public and inevitably wear out.

There was a time when an actor, even with a small repertoire, could glean success from county to county because he made one night stands and his audience was limited. Today the camera's eye reduces him to mediocrity if he makes too many appearances.

Humphrey's reply: Representative Monagan wrote to Vice President-elect Hubert H. Humphrey and the retiring Minnesota Senator replied: "I fully agree that we must think seriously about commonsense ways and means to limit the length of our presidential campaigns. Believe me, I know from experience. I know your interest in this problem will be of substantial importance in pursuing the kind of solution which is acceptable to our political parties and the people of the United States."

Situation watched: Representative Monagan says he is watching the situation around the country to see what support he may get from the hustings. He feels that the new Congress may be willing to consider such restricting legislation to save the wear and tear not only on the candidates and their parties but on the Nation as a whole. Anyone who can't say what he wants to say in 60 days would be a pretty poor standard bearer and the voter who isn't able to judge the field in that time should be in the minority. No matter what happens, Representative Monagan will stir up comment that may eventually help to find the answer the majority are seeking.

WATR Radio-TV,
Waterbury, Conn., December 4, 1964.

Mr. Elman: Our Congressman, John S. Monagan, is out to get legislation passed that will limit presidential campaigns to 60 days.

Mr. Monagan objects to long campaigns as being wasteful of money and time that "they exhaust the nervous and physical resources of the candidate" and bore the elector.

WATR agrees with Congressman Monagan entirely. We would add that in these days of mass electronic media communications a campaign longer than 60 days is not necessary. If a candidate cannot get his story over to the electorate in 60 days he won't do it in 120 days either. The last election campaign would seem to prove the point.

WATR congratulates John Monagan on another piece of forward-looking legislation and hopes for its passage in Congress.

[From the New York Times, Nov. 17, 1964]

Is This Convention Necessary?

It is none too soon, as we observed a day or two ago, to make a serious effort to shorten the quadrennial presidential campaign. It is also none too soon to undertake a revision of the national political convention in order to make it something more than the archaic and disorganized jamboree it has become.

The essential ailment of the conventions as they now exist is technological lag. In the days of the horse-and-carriage and slow surface mail, a national party convention lasting a week or more every 4 years was necessary and useful. People who rarely came together needed that much time to get acquainted and to do their business. Delegates often balloted 40 or 50 times before settling upon a nominee for President.

Radio was the first intruder on the old, closed world of the long party convention. Ever since radio reported the Democratic Convention of 1924 in all its rancor and tedium, the pressure has been on the leaders of both parties to speed up their proceedings. That convention took 103 ballots to choose a nominee; no convention of either party has since needed more than 6.

Television has even more profoundly altered the character and coherence of the convention. The keynote speaker and other orators who used to bellow happily for an hour or more to the furthest balconies now think first of the bemused citizen viewing them close up on his home television screen. Previously, the innumerable seconding speeches served the purpose of enabling the lesser party figures to be heard and looked over by their political peers—the other delegates. Now, however, camera towers and other impediments of television have distorted the physical arrangements within the hall to such an extent that many delegates would with good reason rather watch a convention than attend one. Ironically enough, the network—fearing to bore the viewers back home—shift their cameras during the minor speeches from the rostrum to their own commentators. No one, therefore, gets publicity exposure from these speeches except the network "anchor men," who scarcely need it.

What is to be done? The convention might well be limited to the only activity that now interests most of the delegates and most of the public—the nomination of candidates. If the oratory were cut back to one talk by the presiding officer or some other prominent leader, then the calling of the roll for nominations, the balloting and the acceptance speeches could easily be completed in 2 or 3 days.

The party platform would gain importance and fresh seriousness if it were divorced from the nominating procedure. A much smaller and more leisurely party conference could consider the platform before the presidential election.

Short conventions and a short campaign—these would vastly improve the presidential election.

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 14, 1964]

For Shorter Campaigns

In all American history there has been no more propitious moment than the present to strike a blow for shorter campaigns. Almost everyone was weary of the recent presidential contest before it ended. Many were almost frantically closing their eyes, plugging their ears and avoiding their friends. There was a strong feeling that everything had been said some weeks before November 3 and that prolongation of the uneven contest merely invited vituperation and the throwing of verbal grenades.

Now there is much talk of shortening the 1968 campaign, and Representative Monagan has indicated that he will introduce a bill designed to keep the cannonading within a 60-day period. Of course the two parties could accomplish the same result by agreeing to hold their conventions after Labor Day. That would allow 6 or 7 weeks of full-fledged campaigning, which is certainly ample. In these days of television, radio and many other means of mass communications there is simply no need for barnstorming of the type that every candidate used to think necessary.

[From the Meriden (Conn.) Morning Record, Nov. 13, 1964]

For a Shorter Campaign

When Congress convenes after the first of the year Representative John S. Monagan of Waterbury, whom Meriden voters helped to reelect last week, will introduce legislation to limit presidential election campaigns to 60 days.

"There is no reason why our campaign cannot be carried on with dignity and brevity. Canada, Israel, and India do it, why can't we?" he asks.

Actually, there's no reason why we can't—if we want to. There are good reasons for wanting it, too, and never a better time to press for the legislation than right now in the wake of one of the dreariest and most bitter presidential campaigns within memory.

"Our American electoral circuses are ridiculous. They are wasteful in time and money; they exhaust the nervous and physical resources of the candidate. Above all, after the first informative period, they bore the elector, and thus fail to serve a purpose," says Representative Monagan.

The Congressman is right. Most of his constituents will agree with him and they will hope that a reasonable restriction can be put upon campaigns in future. All that needs to be said can be said in 60 days or less, and there will be a great saving not only in nervous and physical energy, but in money as well. The voters, the nominess, the political parties, and the Nation itself will benefit by a shorter presidential campaign.

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 9, 1964]

A Move To Shorten Campaign

(By Edward T. Folliard)

Now that it is all over, some of the politicians are echoing what many voters said of the 1964 campaign—that it was too long, on the dull side, and finally, a bore.

Representative John S. Monagan, Democrat, of Connecticut has announced that, when the 89th Congress meets in January, he will introduce a bill to limit presidential campaigns to 60 days.

"Our American electoral circuses are ridiculous," Representative Monagan says. "They are wasteful in money and time, and they exhaust the nervous and physical resources of the candidate. Above all, after the first informative period, they bore the elector and thus fail to serve a purpose.

"There is no reason why our campaigns cannot be carried on with dignity and brevity. Canada, Israel, and India do it. Why can't we?"

Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, the Vice-President-elect, agrees that "the public becomes a little tired" of America's long drawn out campaigns. In a taped interview with Ray Scherer, a National Broadcasting Co. correspondent, who traveled with him, the Minnesotan said:

"Maybe we can have a little bipartisan soul searching and negotiation and come to an understanding that it might be well if we had our political conventions in September rather than in July and August."

Senator HUMPHREY said that there could then be 2 weeks of preparation "and maybe a 6 weeks' campaign instead of a 10 weeks' campaign."

President Johnson, the big winner, hasn't been heard from on this, but he would be very much surprised to hear anybody say that the campaign was dull, a bore. For him it was a thrilling experience that seemed to bring him stimulation rather than fatigue.

The Texan probably is the most thoroughly political man ever to occupy the White House. Politics is for him both a vocation and an avocation.

He looks upon a crowd at an airport or along the streets as political treasure. He wants to get close to that treasure, and that is why he plunges into crowds and reaches out for them until his own hands are raw and bleeding.

Mr. Johnson was confident of winning a 4-year term from the time he took over his office; he was certain of victory once the Republicans had nominated Senator Barry Goldwater. It was really not necessary for him to go out on the campaign trail, and he knew it, but he chose barnstorming and loved every minute of it.

The really brutal part of campaigning for the presidency is not what comes after the big political conventions; it is the part that comes before them—that is, fighting in the primaries for delegates in order to win a party's nomination. This involves trudging through the ice and snow of New Hampshire, which holds its primary in March; dashing then to the other side of the continent to campaign in Oregon, and on and on.

That was the biggest ordeal for the late John F. Kennedy on his way to the White House.

It was an ordeal for Adlai Stevenson, too, not in 1952 (he was drafted that year) but in 1956 when Estes Kefauver gave him a battle for the Democratic nomination. Ambassador Stevenson is not an unfriendly man, but he thought Senator Kefauver overdid the handshaking business.

However, having been forced into it, Stevenson engaged in a handshaking duel with the Tennessean in a Florida primary. In his quest for hands to shake, he went into department stores, shipyards, liquor stores, and barber shops. He won the Florida primary but he later said that kind of campaigning was "lunacy."

[From the New Haven (Conn.) Register, Nov. 8, 1964]

LONG ELECTION CAMPAIGNS COSTLY, WEAR DOWN CANDIDATES, SUPPORTERS

(By James MacGregor Burns)

WILLIAMSTOWN, MASS.—Most voters and probably all candidates ended up the campaign agreeing on one thing:

Our election campaigns last too long.

The final 2 or 3 weeks of this fall's battles were a dreary anticlimax. The exhausted candidates said little that was new. Their speechwriters cranked out the same old charges and countercharges. Many campaigns deteriorated into mudslinging as the candidates gave in to their frayed nerves.

Long campaigns are dull. After a few weeks people become bored by the tired old war cries. There is a natural limit to the extent that voters can focus their attention. Our campaigns are like plays with especially long fifth acts that no one knows quite how to bring to a close.

Long campaigns are expensive. President Kennedy's Commission on Campaign Costs estimated that the total expenditures on behalf of all candidates for all public offices in the United States probably reached $165 million in 1960. Part of this cost is due to the sheer length of the campaigns.

ENORMOUS TOLL

Long campaigns are hard on the candidates Both Barry Goldwater and William Miller felt that the presidential race had gone on too long. Senator Goldwater told a Delaware crowd that it would be good if "we could change this crazy system in this country whereby we have to campaign for months and months and months." The toll of endless intensive campaigning on men in their mature years—the toll of little sleep, constant pressure, sporadic eating, incessant clamor, worry, rush, irritations—must be enormous.

And long campaigns are hard on the voters. Most of them make up their minds much earlier during the campaign. They do not need all this time to come to a verdict. What can be done?

I have a simple proposal: Hold elections about 3 weeks earlier, around the middle of October. Zealous candidates would probably start their campaigns that much earlier, but there is a natural limit. August is not a good time to begin open campaigning because of the number of people on vacation. A mid-October election date would give candidates about 6 weeks for campaigning, which is more than ample. Party candidates could be chosen in primaries or conventions either during the summer or during the previous spring.

BRITAIN DOES IT

Six weeks may seem a short time compared to our present months-long campaigns, but that period of time is enough to present the candidates and elucidate the issues. Britain conducts its national campaigns in a period of 3 or 4 weeks, and there are no complaints that the parties have been short of time to present their platforms and engage each other in debate. The shortness of the actual campaigns in Britain also compels the parties and politicians to engage in a moderate amount of year-round political activity and dispute—which also would be beneficial in this country.

A shorter presidential campaign would also help straighten out the awkward schedules that new Presidents now face. Under the present arrangement, the man who wins the Presidency does not enter the White House until January 20. This period of time was sensible in horse-and-buggy days, but today it subjects the Nation to a long interim period of confusion and delay while we wait for the lameduck President to fill out his term.

Another difficulty with our present scheduling is that the lameduck President must deal with Congress during the first part of January while the new House and Senate are organizing and beginning to take up their business. The new President does not take office and begin proposing specific measures until several weeks after Congress has assembled.

DECEMBER 1 INAUGURAL

A mid-October election date could help on both these problems. Such a date would enable the President to be inaugurated as early as December 1. His inaugural talk could lay out the broad design of his administration; he could still have December to line up his Cabinet and other major appointments and prepare the specifics of his program. He would then be ready at the beginning of January to present his legislative program to the new Congress. Governors and other executive officials in the States might also benefit from such a schedule.

The weather is a final argument for such a change. October 15 is a good time for ending electioneering across the tier of Northern States. After that time the weather turns colder, the days are much shorter (especially with the time change), and campaign color and excitement seem to decline. And considering the weather we have had at such inaugurals as John F. Kennedy's in January 1961, December 1 would seem a much more seasonable time for the big day in Washington.

[From the Waterbury (Conn.) Sunday Republican, Nov. 8, 1964]

AGREED, BUT * * *

"If the presidential campaign started all over again tomorrow, there would be mass emigration."

U.S. Representative JOHN S. MONAGAN has promised to reintroduce legislation limiting presidential campaigns to 60 days, and if millions of Americans who just about made it through the last one could influence Congress Representative MONAGAN's proposal might have some chance of adoption.

But it is generally believed that any congressional resolution telling the major parties what they should do is almost impossible to pass, and one that would cut down on their time to try to win votes would meet strenuous objection.

Not that Representative MONAGAN hasn't got a point. Long campaigns, even in an immense country with 50 States and nearly 200 million people, can become nauseously boring, as the recent presidential contest proved again. It was one of the least uplifting national campaigns within memory.

But we suspect that the nominating conventions are not going to be pushed closer to election day until the leadership of Mr. MONAGAN's party and the opposition party so desire. Perhaps sooner or later commonsense, voter outrage, or the hard bite of campaign expenses will lead the major parties to abbreviate their quadrennial efforts. In the meantime Representative MONAGAN will help if he keeps raising the question.

[From the Ansonia (Conn.) Evening Sentinel, Nov. 3, 1964]

SHORTENING THE CAMPAIGNS

Congressman MONAGAN had been the author of a bill in the last session which would have limited the politicking period to 60 days—as is done in England.

The Fifth District Representative thinks the lengthy campaign just ending offers substantial proof of the need for some such measure. The people get wearied of extended campaigns.

How many have you heard remark: "I'll be glad when it's over."

And don't think candidates don't get exhausted, and aren't glad when the hustle and bustle ends.

Besides, perhaps a shorter campaign would mean less money spent in the drives for votes—maybe.

There's only one drawback—the incumbent, whatever he does, and whenever he does it, can always get in a few political licks, and long before the start of the 60-day period.

And the outs won't take it lying down if they can't give tit for tat.

[From the News of the World, Aug. 23, 1961]

MR. MONAGAN AND THE ROADBLOCK AGAINST COMMONSENSE IN POLITICS

(Radio broadcast by Morgan Beatty)

For several years now an alert and enterprising Congressman from Connecticut has been campaigning his political fingers down to the quick for a reform that 90 percent of the voters approve.

JOHN S. MONAGAN has been fighting for a short presidential election campaign and a remodeling of the Roman circuses * * * called national political conventions.

Tonight he has decided to challenge the roadblock that has stopped him cold. He mapped out a plan to persuade the powerful Judiciary Committee to spring his two bills to the House floor for debate and action. They provide, either by constitutional amendment or by plain legislation, to forbid any candidate for President to start campaigning before September the first on election year. This would reduce the 3 months of hullabaloo to 60 days. Sparking the Congressman's decision is an article appearing tomorrow in the current McCall's magazine. Author: Robert W. Sarnoff, chairman of the board, National Broadcasting Co. Mr. Sarnoff points out that the present long campaign was a part of the stovepipe locomotive era. In that day William Jennings Bryan had to huff and puff along 18,000 miles to make 600 speeches and reach only 5 million voters. In the last campaign, says Mr. Sarnoff, with the help of radio and TV both candidates spoke to 120 million Americans, coast to coast on four different evenings in a mere 4 hours. What's more, President Kennedy has assured the Nation he will face his next opponent if he is renominated in the same way. The Sarnoff idea is, the chairmen of the two political parties should work out an agreement for a shorter campaign beginning as late as mid-September.

Mr. MONAGAN wants to put the force of law behind the idea. Surveys show 90 percent of the people want shorter campaigns. Mr. MONAGAN suspects some of the old-line pros in both parties * * * some of whom date back to the stovepipe locomotive * * * oppose the short campaign because * * * well, some say Truman would have lost in 1948 if he had had to shorten his "give 'em hell" campaign. Maybe a Republican would want extra time in the next campaign. But the pressure is on—and it's building toward a modern and dignified appeal to the voters.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Jan. 3, 1961]

MORE TALK OF CAMPAIGN MONEY

In the wake of a national election Congress invariably frets for a while about the high cost of running for public office. Last year was no exception. The House Special Committee To Investigate Campaign Expenses and Corrupt Practices conducted hearings when recollections of the biennial ordeal of the Representatives were still very fresh.

Judging by the past, these lose their sting rather rapidly. Yet since there always must be hope for reform, it is interesting that much emphasis was put on shortening campaigns. This would save energy, and maybe it would save money. Representative JOHN MONAGAN, a Connecticut Democrat, spoke up for his bill which provides that no person nominated more than 60 days previous to the election shall run for President. Charles P. Taft, chairman of the National Fair Campaign Practices Committee, said that campaigns are so long that they become boring. Maurice Rosenblatt, of the National Committee for an Effective Congress, also favored shortening campaigns, but he emphasized that the law should require and enforce complete and rapid disclosure of all campaign contributions. And there, we believe, he came closer to the real need.

Gov. Luther Hodges, of North Carolina, who is to be Secretary of Commerce in the Kennedy administration, offered the opinion that no legal length on campaigns is needed since campaign managers avoid the saturation point. But he did add that it would be wise to put a ceiling on the amount of campaign expenditures, since, as it is now, the expenditures are far too great and put a premium either on wealth or dishonesty. He said: "I think stringent laws should govern contributions and expenditures."

The regulations now on the books are anything but stringent. The major national committees are held to unrealistically low limits, but the doors are left wide open for all manner of unreported campaign gifts. These are all too likely to come from persons with purposes which are anything but in the public interest. If money is not to taint democratic elections, there must be a reasonable limit on the amount to be used, and there must be full disclosure of its sources, insofar as possible before election day.

The necessary formula is clear enough, yet Congress after Congress has shied away from it. So long as this continues, there will be a shadow, more or less dark, over the Members of Congress and all elected with them.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

PATENTS AND FOREIGN POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROUDEBUSH] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, at several times during the past 2½ years, I have expressed the view that the patent system, as it presently exists, is a prime source of research and inventiveness in this country and thus is in great measure responsible for the continued preeminence of the United States in science and technology. In light of this fact, our patent system also plays a vital role in the transfer of that technology and know-how to the new and underdeveloped nations of the world, and in shaping our trade relations with foreign nations in general.

The Congress of the United States has always recognized and been concerned with the importance of patent protection in the world market—a market that is composed of nations having divergent laws and offering varying degrees of protection to Americans who file applications for patents in those foreign nations. Nearly 78 years ago, in 1887, this country became a signatory to a treaty that had been formulated in 1883 at the Convention of Paris for the Protection of Industrial Property. Today, more than 50 nations adhere to this accord, which, although not constituting an international patent system, affords a measure of protection to nationals of member countries who, after filing an application for a patent grant in their own nation, are granted a 12-month priority in filing an application for the same patent in any other member nation. I have said, Mr. Speaker, that this mutual agreement between the adhering countries does not amount to an international patent system, because whatever rights a patentee obtains by the patent grant of any member nation are governed by the law of that country. And these laws differ materially.

This treaty made at the Paris Convention continues to be among the greatest factors governing the grant of an international patent and is made effective in this country by title 35, United States Code, section 119. The convention met again at Lisbon as recently as 1958 for the purpose of updating and revising the treaty, giving particular attention to the extension of the priority rights granted applicants filing for patents to subsequent filings of applications for the same patent after the first has been withdrawn or abandoned. This most recent revision was incorporated into section 119 by a law signed on October 3, 1961.

With the emergence of the new African and Asian nations after World War II, and the continued existence of a substantial number of older countries whose economies have not been developed to their fullest, U.S. policy was and still is directed at aiding these countries to become self-sufficient. Perhaps the most effective means of implementing that policy is to encourage the transfer of American technology and know-how to these underdeveloped nations by insuring firm protection of an American patentee's rights. These countries have neither the technical know-how nor the funds to build, manage, or run the physical plant required to produce products born of American technology. Thus, unlike the case where a patent application is filed in an industrialized nation and the production burden is assumed by a trained and self-supporting licensee, the American obtaining a patent grant in an underdeveloped country must usually first supply the funds to the foreign licensee to build the tools of production, and then the personnel with the requisite knowledge to first train and later manage the workers who will be utilizing those tools.

Consequently, aside from the protection necessary to insure the patentee a reasonable and just return from the fruits of his genius, a substantial capital investment over and above that originally incurred in the research and development of the product must be guarded. A strong patent system, offering at least as much protection as the one under which industry has developed and prospered in this country, must take its place high on the legislative agenda of any country that desires the benefits of American technical know-how and investment dollars. And these benefits will have far-reaching effects on any first-developing or immature economy, for the creation of an industry with its resulting reduction in dependence upon imports of the product involved is a substantial step in the direction of self-sufficiency and increase in standard of living.

It is my firm conviction, then, that without a patent system that encourages free enterprise and insures the patent owner that he will receive a just reward for his inventiveness and a fair return of profit on his investment the economies of these young or underdeveloped nations will be slow to mature, and they may never see the day when they can take their place among the economically self-sufficient and free nations of the world.

Our Founding Fathers realized the importance of rewarding and protecting inventiveness, for our Constitution provides for the right of Congress to enact legislation granting patents. The first patent law was signed by President Washington on April 10, 1790. The Japanese also recognized the value of the patent system as early as 1900. Many of the less industrialized nations of the world also acknowledge that a patent system must exist in their countries in order to stimulate the process of economic development. In a recent United Nations report, several less industrialized countries, responding to a questionnaire circulated among the member nations, evaluated their respective patent systems. Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert excerpts from these evaluations at this point in my remarks. The Republic of Korea had the following to say regarding its patent system:

> Foreign inventions and know-how are considered to be imported into this country through the existence of a national patent system. Though many foreign inventions and know-how might have been introduced to Korea under private or personal contract not through the patent system, the patent system has helped both parties to invest their properties in this country with confidence that their property could be protected from misuse by others.[1]

Mexico responded to the questionnaire by evaluating its patent system in the following language:

> It may be stated * * * that equality before the law of national and foreign inventors facilitates the availability of foreign inventions and know-how.[2]

The quoted passages reflect the general view of the less industrialized nations which responded to this United Nations questionnaire.

Looking at this problem from the other side, it must be concluded that the guarantee of an American patentee's rights in the underdeveloped nations, thereby creating a climate conducive to the transfer to technology and the investment of American dollars, tends to have a salutary effect upon the U.S. position in the world marketplace. The filing of an application for a patent grant and the subsequent working of the patent results in an immediate income flow to this country, both in terms of the royalties paid by the licensee and the creation of new export markets for products necessary in the manufacture of and intimately related to the patented article. It has been recently pointed out that investment in underdeveloped nations has an immediate and substantial return, usually exceeding the capital outlay.—Walter S. Salant et al., "The United States Balance of Payments in 1968," the Brookings Institution, 1963, page 145.

Mr. Speaker, these facts must inevitably lead to the conclusion that it is within the vital interests of the United States to insure that the new and underdeveloped nations of the world establish strong, restraint-free patent systems if basic U.S. foreign policy is to be carried into effect. Clearly, one method of creating this climate abroad—a climate conducive to the investment of American know-how and dollars—is to maintain our own patent system as it presently exists, for the American patent system, one of the first of the modern systems, has served as an example to other nations all over the world, many of which have copied it in both concept and language. Still another approach was taken by the Commerce Department in July of 1964 when it suggested that the President form a Commission to study and report upon a world patent system, a change so basic that it would make uniform what has traditionally been diverse.

Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that this body must closely follow the progress of this study and carefully examine the report when it is released. Particular attention must be given to such questions as the degree of protection offered to an American patentee by any legislation stemming from the Commission's recommendations; the items, if any, which would be considered to be unpatentable; the restrictive provisions contained within any such legislation, particularly those dealing with compulsory licensing; and other provisions which might seek to change the basic concepts of the American patent system as it presently exists. The potentialities of uniform patent legislation must be of vital interest to my colleagues, for through such a concept this country might well be able to take a hand in shaping the protection given to a patentee in a foreign country.

The idea of a multinational patent system is not new. There presently exists, among others, the African and Malagasy Organization for Economic Cooperation, which by agreement among its 14 nations in 1962 established the African and Malagasy Industrial Property Office, where patent applications must be filed, and subscribed to a common patent law. This uniform patent legislation took effect in these 14 African countries in January of 1964.

Another example of potential accord among several nations aiming at a uniform patent system is the draft convention relating to a European patent law, established by the member nations of the European Economic Community in 1962. The activities of this convention, and the draft legislation submitted by it, have been followed with great interest by organizations such as the Patent, Trademark, and Copyright Foundation of George Washington University. Of particular concern, and apparently as yet unanswered, is the question of the accessibility of the proposed European patent to nationals of countries other than those belonging to the ECC.—See "The Patent, Trademark, and Copyright Journal of Research and Education," the Patent, Trademark, and Copyright Foundation of the George Washington University, volume 6, No. 4, 1962, pages 479–513, and volume 7, No. 3, 1963, pages 314–320.

Obviously, it is too soon to arrive at any conclusions regarding the workability of a uniform patent system, but the concept has created considerable interest in recent years and must be fully explored.

Mr. Speaker, no remarks pertaining to the patent system and our foreign policy would be complete without some reference to the impact of that system upon the ever-increasing problem of the deficit in the United States balance of payments and the threatened inroad into our gold holdings. I have previously stated in these remarks that a strong patent system in the underdeveloped countries, with its inducement to American investment, results in an immediate income flow to this Nation which exceeds the outlay of capital. It follows, then, that such investment cannot have a weakening effect upon our balance of payments. But a capital investment in a European manufacturing enterprise, with its vastly greater expenditure of funds, presents a somewhat different problem. The conclusion, however, is the same—favorable conditions for capital investment in an industrialized society leads to a long-term reduction in the deficit of our balance of payments.

The Brookings Institution recently conducted a comprehensive study of the balance of payments problem, and, Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert an excerpt from its report at this point in my remarks:

> [Our] estimate indicates that the weakening in the balance of payments caused by a new flow of funds from the United States is matched by the cumulation of annual inflows of funds resulting from the original investment somewhat between the fifth and sixth year following the investment. By the end of the 10th year, the sum of inflows is more than double the original outflow and the beneficial effects continue at a growing rate thereafter.[3]

It must also be pointed out that the maintaining of our patent system in this country as it presently exists—a proven inducement to invention and productivity—also tends to strengthen the balance of payments in our favor, for at least part of the problem is attributable to our weakening competitive position in the world marketplace. Any basic change in the present structure of our patent law which would tend to lessen the incentives for research, development, and productivity must result in the purchase of these products from countries where they have been developed and produced under more favorable patent provisions. It naturally follows that such a situation can only lead to the increase in the number of imports into and the decrease in the number of exports from this country with a detrimental effect on our balance of payments.

Mr. Speaker, whether our patent system is examined in light of the contributions that it has made, and continues to make, in developing this country into the strongest, richest nation in the world, or the contributions that it makes in implementing our policy in regard to other nations of the world, one inescapable conclusion must be reached: Not only must we avoid changes of any consequential nature in the basic system, we must strive to present it as a model for foreign countries to copy. In this way can basic U.S. foreign policy best be carried into effect while at the same time adding materially to the productivity and growth of our own Nation.

---

[1] United Nations Economic and Social Council, "The Role of Patents in the Transfer of Technology to Underdeveloped Countries," report of the Secretary-General, annex C, p. 8 (1964).

[2] Ibid., p. 9.

[3] Walter S. Salant et al., "The U.S. Balance of Payments in 1968," The Brookings Institution (1963), pp. 145–146.

THE FOREIGN ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLAGHER] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, today the President has submitted to us the outlines of his proposal on one of the most important issues facing this session of the Congress—the foreign assistance program. I should like to take this opportunity to express my strong support for the foreign aid program. The President has presented a sound and realistic program to the American people. He has asked the Congress to accept—for the American people—the lightest burden for foreign assistance in the history of the program.

Less than a year ago, the President requested what was called a barebones minimum for foreign aid. The Congress responded to his request because it was a sensible one. His request this year continues the same tight and careful planning that characterized last year's program. Indeed, the present request is even smaller than last year's.

This minimum request is based on a simple, realistic approach—we are not asked to do all that we could do with our abundant material and human resources. Neither are we asked to do all that the recipient nations have requested. Rather, we are asked to support only that assistance which can be effectively utilized. I know of no sounder approach to our foreign aid program.

The President's request for a minimum foreign aid program does not mean that the challenge before us has in any way diminished or that we are less dedicated to the pursuit of our objectives. On the contrary—the task before us is as difficult as ever. The past year has witnessed ominous developments as well as marked successes. If some countries have moved closer to self-sustaining growth, others are still in a situation in which population growth outstrips economic growth. If our Communist antagonists have appeared to be divided among themselves, they are still united in their goal of subverting our effort to develop a world of free and progressive nations. To our friends and enemies alike, it should be clear that the President in his message rededicates our determination to pursue, firmly and wisely, the objectives of our foreign aid program.

He has pledged anew our commitment to safeguard our national interest by strengthening the free world economically and militarily.

He has pledged anew our commitment to work toward a stable world order in which all nations can enjoy political independence and freedom.

He has pledged anew our commitment to that fight which he mentioned in his first address to Congress in a joint session—our fight against poverty and misery, ignorance, and disease.

Perhaps we do not need to be reminded so much about why we have a foreign aid program as much as we need to be reminded of how these purposes are to be accomplished.

First, we realize no long-range effort of economic and social development can succeed unless the nations involved have political and military security. Therefore, we have our program of military and supporting assistance. I know we all understand the need for this program, and I need not dwell on it. But I do want to underline the President's statement that this type of assistance is highly concentrated in a few countries and that most of it goes to those peoples facing the gravest threat of Communist subversion. I know we all would like to wish away problems in southeast Asia and elsewhere, but we must face the world as it is—not as we wish it to be. If these countries cause us frustration today, we should remember that in other countries at other times our assistance has not been in vain. And, given a firm resolve, we need not fail in these critical areas today.

Second, we should realize that our economic aid is concentrated in a few countries that are making a considerable self-help effort. If our aid program is to succeed, it must be joined by an eager receptiveness on the part of those countries we are aiding. We seek to help those who demonstrate the willingness and capacity to help themselves.

For this reason we have chosen to make a major effort in seven countries. The President's message reveals that, in next year's program, over two-thirds of our development assistance will go to these countries. They all provide leadership in their areas of the world. They contain a sizable portion of all the people reached by our aid program. These are certainly important considerations but the fundamental reason for our assistance is the strong self-help effort which they have all demonstrated.

Furthermore, we not only seek to assist those countries helping themselves, but we seek to assist them to reach the level of a self-sustaining economy as soon as possible. The American people cannot be expected to provide aid endlessly. Fortunately the number of countries where our aid is necessary should continue to decline. Although Taiwan is the shining example today of countries reaching a self-sustaining level, Greece, the Philippines, and Israel—to mention several—will soon reach that stage. Many other countries are approaching the stage of development when they will no longer require soft loans or grant assistance from us. Taiwan's emergence marks an important landmark in our aid program. Until now, our successes have been related to Europe and Japan. Now we begin to see the fruits of our efforts in Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

A third aspect of our aid program is the effort to increase assistance on a multilateral basis. We all realize that our aid efforts will be successful in large measure only if the free world unites in the great challenge before us. We must step up our efforts to encourage other free world donors and international organizations to increase their participation. As the total commitment increases, the need for better multilateral coordination will become greater. It is satisfying to know that steady progress is being made in this direction, but much remains to be done. The President has indicated he intends to continue to seek improved multilateral coordination. I am certain that we all encourage his efforts.

Finally, the objectives of our aid program can be accomplished only when the wholehearted support of the American people is enlisted and the vast reservoir of talent which they possess is utilized. The President's message clearly emphasizes the important role which private citizens and institutions must play in our aid program. To me there is no more encouraging development than the increasing numbers of private citizens and institutions that are taking part in this great adventure. The list continues to grow—not only our great universities, but labor unions, cooperatives, business executives—to mention but a few—are among representatives of the private sphere that are participating in oversea projects. Another outstanding development is the success of the partners for the Alliance program. One-half of our States have joined in partnership with various regional sections of Latin America so that the Alliance can draw closer to a people-to-people level. Our aid program must continue to emphasize this human dimension, for in essence, the program is a people-to-people effort.

I have stressed the primary means by which the objectives of our aid program must be pursued—securing internal security and freedom; helping those who help themselves; increasing multilateral aid efforts; and utilizing the resources of the private citizenry. None of these, or other means which I have not mentioned today, can be effective alone. They all must be employed with considerable effort if we are to achieve our purposes. The President's message has placed proper emphasis on all of them and—I trust—so will the Congress.

President Johnson has been honest with the Congress. He has presented a minimum request. His message assures us that next year's aid program will be sound and realistic. I am sure that the Congress will justify the faith the President has shown in us. I urge you to give full support to his foreign aid program.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. PATMAN, for 15 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RYAN, for 5 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. MONAGAN, for 15 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. LIPSCOMB (at the request of Mr. HUTCHINSON), for 15 minutes, on Monday, January 18; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH (at the request of Mr. HUTCHINSON), for 30 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. COOLEY (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for 60 minutes, on Tuesday, January 19; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. OTTINGER, for 60 minutes, on Monday, January 18.

Mr. GALLAGHER (at the request of Mr. KEE), for 10 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. BURKE and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CAMERON in three instances.

Mr. DORN in two instances.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 54 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, January 18, 1965, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

350. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a copy of a letter dated January 8, 1965, by the Administrator of the National Capital Transportation Agency relative to contemplated construction of the George Washington Memorial Parkway and a north-central freeway, pursuant to section 204(b)(2) of the National Capital Transportation Act of 1960; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

351. A letter from the Steptoe & Johnson, attorneys, transmitting the annual report of the Georgetown Barge, Dock, Elevator & Railway Co. for the year ended December 31, 1964, pursuant to act of Congress approved September 26, 1888; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

352. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on unnecessary costs incurred in the procurement of radar components and related parts; Department of the Navy; to the Committee on Government Operations.

353. A letter from the General Manager, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting a report of actions taken during the calendar year ended December 31, 1964, pursuant to Public Law 85-804 and Federal Procurement Regulations 1-17.000; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

354. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide the same life tenure and retirement rights for judges hereafter appointed to the U.S. District Court for the District of Puerto Rico as the judges of all other U.S. district courts now have."; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

355. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 376 of title 28, United States Code."; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

356. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report for the calendar year 1964 on positions in grades GS-16, GS-17, and GS-18 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, in the U.S. General Accounting Office, pursuant to section 503 of 70 Stat. 762; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANNUNZIO:

H.R. 2776. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASHMORE:

H.R. 2777. A bill to provide for the inscription in the courtroom in the U.S. Supreme Court Building of the phrase "In God We Trust"; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BATTIN:

H.R. 2778. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Bighorn Canyon National Recreation Area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:

H.R. 2779. A bill to provide for a program whereby the Federal Government may guarantee bonds issued by States and municipalities in carrying out construction programs for certain public sanitary facilities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 2780. A bill to repeal the manufacturers' excise tax on passenger automobiles and trucks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2781. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a credit against the income tax for contributions made to institutions of higher learning by individuals who pay tuition and fees to such institutions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2782. A bill to provide that certain aircraft may travel between the United States and Canada without requiring the owners or operators thereof to reimburse the United States for extra compensation paid customs officers and employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2783. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2784. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside income which a widow with minor children may earn without suffering deductions from the benefits to which she is entitled under such title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 2785. A bill to provide a hospital insurance program for the aged under social security, to amend the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system to increase benefits, improve the actuarial status of the disability insurance trust fund, and extend coverage, to amend the Social Security Act to provide additional Federal financial participation in the Federal-State public assistance programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAMERON:

H.R. 2786. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to provide for the greater protection of the President and the Vice President of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 2787. A bill relating to the salaries of the Chief Justice of the United States and of the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H.R. 2788. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that full benefits (when based upon attainment of retirement age) will be payable to men at age 63 and to women at age 60; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2789. A bill to increase benefits under the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system, to provide child's insurance benefits beyond age 18 while in school, to provide widow's benefits at age 60 on a reduced basis, to provide benefits for certain individuals not otherwise eligible at age 72, to improve the actuarial status of the trust funds, to extend coverage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2790. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 2791. A bill to authorize the retirement on full annuity after 30 years of service of employees subject to the Civil Service Retirement Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H.R. 2792. A bill to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide further for the prevention of accidents in coal mines; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H.R. 2793. A bill to amend the Copyright Act by repealing the jukebox exemption, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H.R. 2794. A bill to provide for declaratory judgment procedures in cases involving refusal of witnesses to testify or produce papers before congressional committees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2975. A bill to amend section 104 of the Revised Statutes, with respect to contempt citations in the case of witnesses before congressional committees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2796. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the proceeds of life insurance contracts transferred for a valuable consideration to certain persons shall not be subject to income taxation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2797. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to prevent duplication of benefits based on disability in cases where the disabled individual receives workmen's compensation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 2798. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide a new system of overtime compensation for postal field service employees, to eliminate compensatory time in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 2799. A bill to amend section 165 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the taxable year for deducting losses sustained by reason of the seizure of property by a foreign government; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DENTON:

H.R. 2800. A bill to provide for the establishment and administration of the Lincoln Trial Memorial Parkway in the States of Kentucky, Indiana, and Illinois, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 2801. A bill to establish a national sinking fund to be used to reduce the national debt; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.R. 2802. A bill to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide further for the prevention of accidents in coal mines; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2803. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to prohibit the discrimination in employment against individuals on account of their age; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2804. A bill to provide that primary elections and runoff primary elections for nomination of candidates for the House of Representatives shall be held on the same day throughout the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 2805. A bill to provide for the procurement and installation of mechanism for recording and counting votes in the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 2806. A bill to protect the public health by regulating the manufacture, compounding, processing, distribution, and possession of habit-forming barbiturate and amphetamine drugs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2807. A bill to provide for the enforcement of support orders in certain State and Federal courts, and to make it a crime to move or travel in interstate and foreign commerce to avoid compliance with such orders; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2808. A bill to provide for the greater protection of the President and the Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2809. A bill to provide for the construction of a 500-bed general medical and surgical Veterans' Administration hospital at or near Evansville, Ind.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2810. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit an individual to waive his right to receive benefits thereunder in order to preserve his right to receive benefits under other laws; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2811. A bill to amend title X and XVI of the Social Security Act to prohibit any State from imposing a lien on a blind individual's property as a condition of aid or assistance thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2812. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside income which a blind individual may earn without suffering deductions from his or her benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 2813. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the manufacturers excise taxes on automobiles and on parts and accessories, and to reduce the manufacturers excise tax on trucks and buses to 5 percent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOWDY:

H.R. 2814. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 2815. A bill to amend section 610 of title 38, United States Code, to authorize the furnishing of hospital care at Veterans' Administration facilities for Gold Star Mothers; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H.R. 2816. A bill to provide for a comprehensive study and investigation of the adequacy of the present system of compulsory military training under the University Military Training and Service Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 2817. A bill to provide for the striking of medals to commemorate the 1,000th anniversary of the founding of Poland; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 2818. A bill to provide for an increase in the maximum amount of insurance coverage for bank deposits and savings and loan accounts, to protect further the safety and liquidity of insured institutions, to strengthen safeguards against conflicts of interest, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 2819. A bill to amend title I of the Housing Act of 1949 to provide more equitable procedures for the relocation of persons displaced from their homes or places of business by urban renewal projects, to increase the amount of the relocation payments authorized to be made to such persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 2820. A bill to facilitate the obtaining of employment by older workers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2821. A bill to amend section 312 of title 38, United States Code, by providing a 2-year presumptive period of service connection for malignant tumors (cancer) which develop within 2 years from the date of separation from active service; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2822. A bill to amend section 312 of title 38, United States Code, by providing a 2-year presumptive period of service connection for the psychoses which develop within 2 years from the date of separation from the service; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2823. A bill to increase, in the case of children who are attending school, from 18 to 21 years the age until which child's insurance benefits may be received under title II of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2824. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the provisions which reduce the old-age or wife's insurance benefits of a woman becoming entitled to such benefits before she attains age 65; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2825. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction for income tax purposes of certain expenses incurred by the taxpayer for the education of a dependent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2826. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase from $1,200 to $3,600 the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2827. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that monthly benefits based on age may be paid at age 55 rather than only at age 62 (subject to the existing actuarial reduction in the amount of such benefits in certain cases); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2828. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to reduce from 62 to 55 the age at which a woman otherwise qualified may become entitled to widow's insurance benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOLEY:

H.R. 2829. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Manson unit, Chelan division, Chief Joseph Dam project, Washington, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FUQUA:

H.R. 2830. A bill to amend Public Law 88-573, to permit the Farmers Home Administration to expend certain appropriated funds for recreational development; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.R. 2831. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to make a comprehensive study of certain future highway needs; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GURNEY:

H.R. 2832. A bill to amend section 620 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to prohibit assistance to any country which fails to provide adequate protection for property of the United States in such country; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HARVEY of Indiana:

H.R. 2833. A bill to authorize the sale, without regard to the 6-month waiting period prescribed, of zinc proposed to be disposed of pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HUTCHINSON:

H.R. 2834. A bill to provide an exemption from participation in the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program for individuals who are opposed to participation in such program on grounds of conscience or religious belief; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING of Utah:

H.R. 2835. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase to $2,400 the annual amount individuals are permitted to earn without suffering deductions from the insurance benefits payable to them under such title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H.R. 2836. A bill to amend the coastwise laws, protect the balance of payments, and to further protect the traveling public and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. McCULLOCH:

H.R. 2837. A bill to extend certain special fourth-class postage rates to certain training cards designed for use in, or in conjunction with, classroom instruction; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LOVE:

H.R. 2838. A bill to extend certain special fourth-class postage rates to certain training cards designed for uses in, or in conjunction with, classroom instruction; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McDADE:

H.R. 2839. A bill to eliminate cumulative voting of shares of stock in the election of directors of national banking associations unless provided for in the articles of association; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 2840. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Auburn-Folsom South unit, American River division, Central Valley Project, California, under Federal reclamation laws; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 2841. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit retirement by all persons in the United States at the age of 60 years with benefits that will assure full participation by elderly persons generally in prevailing national standards of living, to provide like benefits for disabled persons, and to provide benefits for certain female heads of families and for certain children; and to provide for the establishment and operation of this system of social security by an equitable gross income tax; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 2842. A bill to amend the act of March 3, 1899, to authorize the United States to recover by civil action the cost of removing certain obstructions from the navigable waters of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 2843. A bill to amend the Trade Expansion Act of 1962; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 2844. A bill to amend the act of July 26, 1954, to establish a National Advisory Council on Education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2845. A bill to designate a Veterans' Administration hospital in Bedford, Mass., as the Edith Nourse Rogers Memorial Veterans' Hospital; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H.R. 2846. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to establish a national system of minimum retirement payments for all aged, blind, and disabled individals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PIRNIE:

H.R. 2847. A bill to adjust wheat and feed grain production, to establish a cropland retirement program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 2848. A bill to amend Public Law 815, 81st Congress, with respect to the construction of school facilities for children in Puerto Rico, Wake Island, Guam, or the Virgin Islands for whom local educational agencies are unable to provide education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. REID of Illinois:

H.R. 2849. A bill to provide for the medical and hospital care of the aged through a system of voluntary health insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 2850. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 2851. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SICKLES:

H.R. 2852. A bill to strengthen and improve educational quality and educational opportunities in the Nation's elementary and secondary schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. STEED:

H.R. 2853. A bill to amend title 17, United States Code, with relation to the fees to be charged; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TALCOTT:

H.R. 2854. A bill to improve the 1965 cotton program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 2855. A bill to expand the market for cotton, to assist in the orderly marketing of cotton, to strengthen the cotton industry and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TENZER:

H.R. 2856. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 2857. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to provide for a mid-decade census of population, unemployment, and housing in years 1966 and 1975 and every 10 years thereafter; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.R. 2858. A bill to provide for the payment of debt service construction charges, and increased operation and maintenance charges when irrigable lands are taken for nonagricultural uses under Federal programs; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H.R. 2859. A bill to provide aid to States for educational purposes only; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 2860. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to authorize additional funds to be available exclusively for disaster loans; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WYATT:

H.R. 2861. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to authorize additional funds to be available exclusively for disaster loans; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H.J. Res. 194. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to the States of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, and the District of Columbia to negotiate and enter into a compact to establish a multistate authority to construct and operate a passenger rail transportation system within the area of such States and the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.J. Res. 195. Joint resolution to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to promulgate special regulations for the period of the American Legion National Convention of 1966, to be held in Washington, D.C.; to authorize the granting of certain permits to the American Legion 1966 Convention Corp. of the District of Columbia on the occasion of such convention, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.J. Res. 196. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States pertaining to the offering of prayers in public schools and other public places in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TALCOTT:

H.J. Res. 197. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.J. Res. 198. Joint resolution providing for the transmission by the Bureau of the Budget to the legislative and appropriations committees of the Congress of certain material relating to General Accounting Office reports; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H. Con. Res. 101. Concurrent resolution establishing a Joint Committee of the Senate and House of Representatives on Organization of the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DADDARIO:

H. Con. Res. 102. Concurrent resolution establishing a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H. Con. Res. 103. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the proposed article on the elimination of racial discrimination submitted to the General Assembly of the United Nations by the Commission on Human Rights; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. Con. Res. 104. Concurrent resolution establishing a Joint Committee on Intelligence Matters; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MORSE:

H. Con. Res. 105. Concurrent resolution to request the President of the United States to urge certain actions in behalf of Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H. Con. Res. 106. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President should instruct the U.S. mission to the United Nations to bring the Baltic States question before that body with a view to obtaining the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia; the return of exiles from these nations from slave labor camps in the Soviet Union; and the conduct of free elections in these nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Con. Res. 107. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to prosecutions for war crimes in the Federal Republic of Germany; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Con. Res. 108. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the persecution by the Soviet Union of persons because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROUSH:

H. Con. Res. 109. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to U.S. support of the provisions of article 19 of the Charter of the United Nations relating to member nations in arrears in the payment of their financial contributions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. Con. Res. 110. Concurrent resolution establishing a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H. Res. 115. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct a study of the fiscal organization and procedures of the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. Res. 116. Resolution creating a nonlegislative select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the aged and aging; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. Res. 117. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina:

H. Res. 118. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Armed Services to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of all matters relating to procurement by the Department of Defense, personnel of such Department, laws administered by such Department, use of funds by such Department, and scientific research in support of the armed services; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 119. Resolution to provide for the further expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 118; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 2862. A bill for the relief of Enrico Carlesi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2863. A bill for the relief of Ruy Keen Ng; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H.R. 2864. A bill for the relief of Loh Sze Ching; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H.R. 2865. A bill for the relief of Lt. Cmdr. Henry P. Krienke and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2866. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Aubrey John Lewis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAREY:

H.R. 2867. A bill for the relief of Joo Yung Shang (also known as Sing Yung Shang and Sing Yang); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

R.R. 2868. A bill for the relief of Mohamed Ahmed Mohamed; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHELF:

H.R. 2869. A bill for the relief of Maurice R. Black and Rebecca T. Black; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 2870. A bill for the relief of Miss Evelina Persello; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DADDARIO:

H.R. 2871. A bill for the relief of Dorota Zytka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2872. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Camilla Incorvaia Todaro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2873. A bill for the relief of Antonio Forlini Santopietro and his wife, Annita Lombardi Santopietro, and their children, Giuseppina Forlini Santopietro, Rosa Forlini Santopietro, and Giovanni Forlini Santopietro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2874. A bill for the relief of Dr. Pompeyo B. Montemayor and Mrs. Angeles P. Montemayor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2875. A bill for the relief of Martin Gerald Freedman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2876. A bill for the relief of Kam Wah Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2877. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Vincenza Marino and Fortunato Marino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2878. A bill for the relief of Vincenzo Zocco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2879. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Joyce Louise Palmer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2880. A bill for the relief of the Green Manor Construction Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DENTON:

H.R. 2881. A bill for the relief of George A. Grabert; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOW:

H.R. 2882. A bill for the relief of Demir Alp Barker, Mufide Barker, and Ali Halim Barker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama:

H.R. 2883. A bill for the relief of Miss Teodora Guillamon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 2884. A bill for the relief of Dr. Hooshang Behroozi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2885. A bill for the relief of Irena Romkowska Pol; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 2886. A bill for the relief of Vladimira Saveri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2887. A bill for the relief of Chen Chin Wu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GURNEY:

H.R. 2888. A bill for the relief of Sabas Murillo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 2889. A bill for the relief of Aharon Zavdi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2890. A bill for the relief of Helen H. Charles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2891. A bill for the relief of Leslie L. Clarke and his wife Una S. Clarke (nee Tomlinson); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2892. A bill for the relief of Antonina Mandracchia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2893. A bill for the relief of Rachel Ben-Shalom; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2894. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Josephine Giron; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2895. A bill for the relief of the the DiCuia family; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.A. 2896. A bill for the relief of Giacomo Impastato; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2897. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Aranka Mlinko; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 2898. A bill for the relief of Venovia Anthony; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of Utah:

H.R. 2899. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Genevieve Olsen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H.R. 2900. A bill for the relief of George, Danae, and Maria Kerassoglou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2901. A bill for the relief of Stavros P. Tourlis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2902. A bill for the relief of Ioannis Petropoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2903. A bill for the relief of Sotirios and Eugenia Salapatas; George and Pipina Salapatas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2904. A bill for the relief of Marie Pergamalis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2905. A bill for the relief of Efsthathia Papadoliopoulou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 2906. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lily Ning Sheehan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 2907. A bill for the relief of Jimmie Kazu Uyemura and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGRATH:

H.R. 2908. A bill for the relief of Rev. Shoyu Hanayama and family; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.R. 2909. A bill for the relief of Rear Adm. Arthur A. Ageton, U.S. Navy, retired; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2910. A bill for the relief of Michael Isa Shihadi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 2911. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Annuziata Angiuli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 2912. A bill for the relief of Miss Eugenia Elizabeth Rosenberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PIRNIE:

H.R. 2913. A bill for the relief of Lt. Thomas A. Farrell, U.S. Navy, and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POLANCO-ABREU:

H.R. 2914. A bill for the relief of Pedro Irizzary Guido; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 2915. A bill for the relief of Rosario Mannino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2916. A bill for the relief of Giovanno Restivo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2917. A bill for the relief of Carmela Fountana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2918. A bill for the relief of Rosario Zangri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2919. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lucy Eleanor Wickfield Denhert; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2920. A bill for the relief of Brussel Folder; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2921. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Paul M. Bissessar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REIFEL:

H.R. 2922. A bill for the relief of Darlyne Marie Cecile Every; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 2923. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Varsha H. Patel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H.R. 2924. A bill for the relief of Outlet Stores, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY of New York:

H.R. 2925. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Tuva Berger and Miss Ester Berger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 2926. A bill for the relief of Efstahia Giannos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 2927. A bill for the relief of Jacob Jambor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2928. A bill for the relief of Tien Shou (Terrence) Hao; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2929. A bill for the relief of Rita Castillo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 2930. A bill for the relief of Eduardo B. Sapigao; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2931. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Sally Annette Solano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2932. A bill for the relief of Charles E. Gardiner and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2933. A bill for the relief of Kim Jai Sung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2934. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Chun Wu Dea and her children, Suey Son Dea, Fung Hay Dea, and Fung Mo Dea; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WATTS:

H.R. 2935. A bill for the relief of Dr. Joaquin Merida; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2936. A bill for the relief of Dr. Theresa Directo Cachuela; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H.R. 2937. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Agnes Geidi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2938. A bill for the relief of Przemyslaw Marianski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2939. A bill for the relief of Manojlo Vrzich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2940. A bill for the relief of Sister Myriam (Marta Krzyzowska); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

72. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., requesting Congress to create a standing committee on reports to Congress by the Comptroller General to investigate accusations of waste and inefficiency that are being made; which was referred to the Committee on Rules.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Dedication of the John F. Kennedy Elementary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES A. BURKE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 14, 1965

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure to be the principal speaker on Sunday, November 22, 1964, at the dedication ceremonies of the John F. Kennedy Elementary in Holbrook, Mass. I presented a flag which had been flown over the Capitol as well as Senate Document No. 59, Memorial Addresses in the Congress of the United States.

Following are my remarks:

Mr. Chairman, on Friday, November 22, 1963, the assassination of President John Fitzgerald Kennedy brought shock and grief to both great and humble people throughout the world. The inspiration of President Kennedy's courageous, stirring leadership will live through the years to strengthen and sustain our great Nation and time will enrich the greatness of this outstanding American, who shall always be remembered for his courage and his dedication to freedom, peace, and the cause of humanity.

How impressive was his magnetic personality, how appealing his alert mind. How appreciated the lightning of his ready wit. How admired his lofty ideals, his intrepid courage, his concern for those unable to speak for themselves, his inspired battle for social justice, for equality of right and opportunity for the cause of the oppressed. His determined struggle for peace and order and a world organized on the rule of law, his firm resolve to preserve the integrity and security of our Nation and the free world, to uphold the basic moral and ethical principles of the American way of life.

The name of John Fitzgerald Kennedy will go down the long unbroken annals of history like a great gleaming beacon light casting its warming glow of toleration and justice over the Nation and the world and showing us, and generations to come, the way to prosperity and peace.

My friends, rarely in the history of America has one man blazed his path of glory across the horizons of this Nation in so short a time and with such momentous impact as did John Fitzgerald Kennedy. He was fashioned of the heroic stuff of which great Americans are made. Yet we who knew him best can testify before all the world that here was a man of gracious charm, broad intellect, and rare wisdom, a man with all the courage, faith, and compassion which real manhood forever requires.

And as if aware of the tragic limitations which destiny was to impose upon him, he swept with power and purpose out of the mists of relative political obscurity to burst upon the consciousness of the American people as few men before him have ever done, symbolizing in his vigor, his leadership, and his vision a new generation of Americans. In all of his formative years, it is difficult to find a time when John Kennedy was not testing himself, when he was not sharpening and perfecting his moral and intellectual capacities for that fateful moment when he would keep his long appointed rendezvous with destiny as President of the United States. His entire life became a hymn of preparation for the brief but critical months of service he would undergo as leader of the country he loved so dearly and for which he finally gave every last ounce of devotion that there was in him to give.

Though he wrote three books, he considered himself no author. Though he was a decorated war hero, he was no militarist. Though he served with honor as a distinguished political figure, he was no politician. But, first and foremost, he was a great patriot. Above personal ambition, above party affiliation, above petty conceits, John F. Kennedy will forever be a challenge and an inspiration to all those patriots, present and future, who would take their place among History's honor roll of the brave and the good. Though many men are called to serve their God and their country, a very few men in any generation are chosen to walk the solitary path to glory which he walked. His entire life was a noble overture to his sudden and tragic death.

No man so captured the imagination of his age as did John F Kennedy. No man so mirrored the ideals and aspirations of the American people as did he. When John Kennedy died, people the world over felt hope within them die. When John Kennedy was struck down, men everywhere saw reason and sanity and understanding being struck down with the same brutal senselessness and violence.

But the ideals which were so much the immortal part of John F. Kennedy shall endure beyond the grave. The assassin's gun and the assassin's bullet has not been made which can destroy freedom's dream—a dream that is indelibly impressed upon the minds and hearts of men. The dream of freedom shall endure so long as man himself endures. On January 20, 1961—nearly 4 years ago—John F. Kennedy said:

"Let the word go forth from this time and place, to friend and foe alike, that the torch has been passed to a new generation of Americans. * * * Let every nation know, whether it wishes us well or ill, that we shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe to assure the survival of liberty."

John Fitzgerald Kennedy has borne his burden. Now let us take up ours. With God as our shield, with freedom as our cause, let us labor to create a new and even greater America so that historians, in the years to come, will not find us unworthy of the sacrifice made by one of the noblest men of this or any other age.

A list of the members and programs is as follows:

BUILDING COMMITTEE

Thomas F. Hoell, chairman; Henry L. Dye, secretary; Thomas Ahern, Andrew H. Card,[1] Stanley R. Christianson,[1] secretary; Walter W. Donovan,[1] Peter George, Francis Hoban, Edward Huntington, George T. Jameson, Jr., Gerard Lane, Frances MacWilliams, James F. Magrath, Donald J. Martin,[1] chairman; Miss Grace G. McCarthy,[1] Irene A. Moran, Roger F. Poole, Ralph A. Samuels, John C. Sarhans.

Superintendent of schools, I. D. Reade; assistant superintendent of schools, John E. Zoino; principal, Irving Waitz; architect, Korslund, LeNormand & Quann, Inc.; contractor, Marshall Contractors, Inc.; clerk of the works, Irving Winslow.

Hosts: Holbrook Parent-Teacher Association.

DEDICATION PROGRAM

Presentation of the flag, main entrance: John J. Kelly.

Invocation: Rev. Charles B. Murphy, pastor, St. Joseph Church.

Welcome: Thomas F. Hoell, chairman, school building committee.

Introduction of platform guests

Music: Kennedy School Glee Club, director, Marcia Galway.

Presentation of keys

Contractor to architect.

Architect to building committee.

Building committee to school committee.

School committee to superintendent of schools.

Music: Kennedy School Glee Club, director, Marcia Galway.

Presentation of John F. Kennedy portrait

Council No. 5046 Knights of Columbus, William Godfrey.

"God Bless America": Audience.

Benediction: Rev. Roy Bruce, pastor, Brookville Baptist Church.

Open house: 3 to 5 p.m.

---

[1] School committee.

Foreign Aid: The Price Is Right

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RONALD BROOKS CAMERON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 14, 1965

Mr. CAMERON. Mr. Speaker, the American taxpayer frequently asks: "Why foreign aid when there is so much to be done here at home?" The answer is not easy to see but it is my view that the price is right. To paraphrase President Kennedy, surely the Nation that cannot help the many who are poor cannot save the few who are rich.

The actual expenditure President Johnson is asking for the foreign aid program this year is less than one-half of 1 percent of our national income—and this amount is primarily for a loan program. As the President has pointed out this is the smallest assistance burden on the American people since the Marshall plan. It is a minimum request—but one which will get the job done.

Sixty-nine percent of our economic aid is in the form of loans which must be repaid by American dollars. Moreover, U.S. foreign loans have an excellent credit record. Of the $25.7 billion lent since World War II, we have received back over $10 billion on the principal and $4 billion in interest. Generally, collections have been received on time and in some cases ahead of schedule. As an example of this, in 1963 the United States lent $2.1 billion and in the same year more than $1.4 billion was returned on payment of interest and principal on old loans.

Along with the satisfaction of seeing progress in the cause of freedom, foreign aid has yielded unexpected financial returns. Beside contributing to the economic strength of developing countries it directly benefits the U.S. economy through creating new purchasing power for U.S. exports and by financing development projects requiring the importation of U.S. goods and services.

More than 80 percent of our foreign aid money is spent within the United States for goods and services. In fact, a recent study by the House Foreign Affairs Committee showed that U.S. military aid in 1963 resulted in U.S. procurement amounting to more than 100 percent of total expenditures. AID was responsible for more than $855 million worth of U.S. exports in the year 1963 alone. In 1962 for example, AID-financed purchases were responsible for one-third of U.S. exports in locomotives, one-third of U.S. fertilizer exports, and one-fourth of the U.S. iron and steel exports.

Actually, the foreign aid program has been a catalyst in creating new markets for American exports and increasing old ones for U.S. products. One study of 32 countries receiving foreign aid shows that over a 5-year period, U.S. exports increased 4 times the amount of aid. Since the Marshall plan and the beginning of European recovery, our Western European exports have doubled and our exports to Japan have tripled. Our European markets have made possible a favorable balance of trade of over $3 billion. U.S. wheat and milk donated to Japan in earlier years has contributed to making Japan today the single largest consumer of American agricultural products today.

U.S. aid is so familiarizing the world with American products and techniques that it is creating a market which is potentially four times that of the Marshall plan countries. As these countries achieve economic growth and stability so will demand and purchasing power for buying U.S. goods.

The President has stated that the role and responsibilities of the U.S. private sector in the aid program is growing. More opportunities will result from the enactment of the President's request to expand the existing investment guarantee programs and the enactment of the investment tax credit program. At the same time, the foreign assistance program affords many chances for advancement for the private sector in the developing countries. The program loans to small business and development and agricultural credit banks as well as technical asistance will encourage private enterprise and provide a favorable climate for investors from abroad.

These aspects—the expansion of U.S. exports, earnings from U.S. foreign investments and acquainting nations with U.S. goods and services—mean that the foreign assistance program, contrary to some popular beliefs, actually contributes to the long-range improvements in our balance of payments.

Aside from the benefits to U.S. business and export, American products have added new dimensions to the living standards of developing countries. U.S. wheat and milk which went to Japan during assistance days created a market for additional quantities of milk, wheat, and corn products now important nutritional ingredients to the Japanese diet. U.S. technology and business enterprise have appealed to the inventiveness of the developing countries and by their example have importantly contributed to better living standards, future industrialization, with accompanying job opportunities.

The foreign aid record is particularly encouraging in light of these facts. It certifies the prudence of our loan record and responsibility with which recipient countries have carried out their agreements. It proves itself a sound investment for the U.S. business community. It represents an investment which will increase U.S. exports and further reduce the U.S. balance-of-payment deficit. Most important, it is a sound investment in creating a world of modern and secure nations.

Dr. Albert Schweitzer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 14, 1965

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, today is Dr. Albert Schweitzer's 90th birthday. He is one of the greatest humanitarians in all the history of the world. It will be interesting to my colleagues who are often visited with ingratitude for doing good that Dr. Schweitzer upon one occasion said, "Anyone who proposes to do good must not expect people to roll stones out of his way, but must accept his lot calmly if they even roll a few more stones upon it."

Dr. Schweitzer's magnificent philosophy can be summed up in this statement he made early in life, "It is an uncomfortable doctrine which the true ethic whispers in your ear. You are happy, it says; therefore you are called upon to give much. Whatever more than others you have received in health, natural gifts, working capacity, success, a beautiful childhood, harmonious family circumstances, you must not accept them as a matter of course. You must pay a price for them. You must show more than an average devotion to life."

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Schweitzer has devoted his life to others and his "reverence for life" has inspired countless millions throughout the world. I wish Dr. Schweitzer a happy birthday and the greatest New Year of all.

SENATE

FRIDAY, JANUARY 15, 1965

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. METCALF).

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou Holy One, whose sanctuary is the spirit of man: When there comes a sense of Thy searching presence, we know that only from strands of penitence and forgiveness can there be woven a garment of righteousness to cover our selfish and willful hearts.

Toiling amid the pressures of epochal days, we humbly invoke Thy guidance, as with a sense of awesome responsibility there are faced in this forum of a nation's will the thorny problems of our shadowed and saddened world.

These are the sins we fain would have Thee take away—
Malice and cold disdain; hot anger, sullen hate;
Scorn of the lowly, envy of the great;
And discontent that casts a shadow, gray
On all the brightness of a common day.

We ask it in the spirit of the One who mirrored Thy goodness in a human life. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, January 12, 1965, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting a nomination was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

IMMIGRATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 52)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TYDINGS in the chair). The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States relating to immigration. Inasmuch as the message has been read in the House of Representatives, without objection, the message will be referred, without reading.

There being no objection, the message was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

A change is needed in our laws dealing with immigration. Four Presidents have called attention to serious defects in this legislation. Action is long overdue.

I am therefore submitting, at the outset of this Congress, a bill designed to correct the deficiencies. I urge that it be accorded priority consideration.

The principal reform called for is the elimination of the national origins quota system. That system is incompatible with our basic American tradition.

Over the years the ancestors of all of us—some 42 million human beings—have migrated to these shores. The fundamental, longtime American attitude has been to ask not where a person comes from but what are his personal qualities. On this basis men and women migrated from every quarter of the globe. By their hard work and their enormously varied talents they hewed a great nation out of a wilderness. By their dedication to liberty and equality, they created a society reflecting man's most cherished ideals.

Long ago the poet Walt Whitman spoke our pride: "These States are the amplest poem." We are not merely a nation but a "Nation of nations."

Violation of this tradition by the national origins quota system does incalculable harm. The procedures imply that men and women from some countries are, just because of where they come from, more desirable citizens than others. We have no right to disparage the ancestors of millions of our fellow Americans in this way. Relationships with a number of countries, and hence the success of our foreign policy, is needlessly impeded by this proposition.

The quota system has other grave defects. Too often it arbitrarily denies us immigrants who have outstanding and sorely needed talents and skills. I do not believe this is either good government or good sense.

Thousands of our citizens are needlessly separated from their parents or other close relatives.

To replace the quota system, the proposed bill relies on a technique of preferential admissions based upon the advantage to our Nation of the skills of the immigrant, and the existence of a close family relationship between the immigrant and people who are already citizens or permanent residents of the United States. Within this system of preferences, and within the numerical and other limitations prescribed by law, the issuance of visas to prospective immigrants would be based on the order of their application.

First preference under the bill would be given to those with the kind of skills or attainments which make the admission especially advantageous to our society. Other preferences would favor close relatives of citizens and permanent residents, and thus serve to promote the reuniting of families—long a primary goal of American immigration policy. Parents of U.S. citizens could obtain admission without waiting for a quota number.

Transition to the new system would be gradual, over a 5-year period. Thus the possibility of abrupt changes in the pattern of immigration from any nation is eliminated. In addition, the bill would provide that as a general rule no country could be allocated more than 10 percent of the quota numbers available in any one year.

In order to insure that the new system would not impose undue hardship on any of our close allies by suddenly curtailing their emigration, the bill authorizes the President, after consultation with an Immigration Board established by the legislation, to utilize up to 30 percent of the quota numbers available in any year for the purpose of restoring cuts made by the new system in the quotas established by existing law.

Similar authority, permitting the reservation of up to 10 percent of the numbers available in any year, would enable us to meet the needs of refugees fleeing from catastrophe or oppression.

In addition, the bill would:

First. Permit numbers not used by any country to be made available to countries where they are needed;

Second. Eliminate the discriminatory Asia-Pacific triangle provisions of the existing law;

Third. Eliminate discrimination against newly independent countries of the Western Hemisphere by providing nonquota status for natives of Jamaica, Trinidad, and Tobago;

Fourth. Afford nonquota status to parents of citizens, and fourth preference to parents of resident aliens;

Fifth. Eliminate the requirement that skilled first-preference immigrants needed in our economy must actually find an employer here before they can come to the United States;

Sixth. Afford a preference to workers with lesser skills who can fill specific needs in short supply;

Seventh. Eliminate technical restrictions that have hampered the effective use of the existing fair-share refugee law; and

Eighth. Authorize the Secretary of State to require reregistration of quota immigrant visa applicants and to regulate the time of payment of visa fees.

This bill would not alter in any way the many limitations in existing law which prevent an influx of undesirables and safeguard our people against excessive or unregulated immigration. Nothing in the legislation relieves any immigrant of the necessity of satisfying all of the security requirements we now have, or the requirements designed to exclude persons likely to become public charges. No immigrants admitted under this bill could contribute to unemployment in the United States.

The total number of immigrants would not be substantially changed. Under this bill, authorized quota immigration, which now amounts to 158,361 per year, would be increased by less than 7,000.

I urge the Congress to return the United States to an immigration policy which both serves the national interest and continues our traditional ideals. No move could more effectively reaffirm our fundamental belief that a man is to be judged—and judged exclusively—on his worth as a human being.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 13, 1965*.

S. —

A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 201(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 175, 8 U.S.C. 1151(a)) be amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 201. (a) The annual quota of any quota area shall be the same as that which existed for that area upon enactment of subsection (f) of this section: *Provided,* That the minimum quota for any quota area shall be two hundred: *Provided further,* That beginning with the first fiscal year commencing after the enactment of subsection (f) of this section and for each of the four succeeding fiscal years the annual quota of every quota area shall be reduced by 20 per centum of its present number for each such fiscal year. The quota numbers so deducted from quotas of quota areas shall be added to the quota reserve established by subsection (f) of this section and shall be available for distribution in accordance with the provisions thereof."

SEC. 2. Section 201(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 175, 8 U.S.C. 1151(b)) is amended by substituting "section 202(d)" for "section 202(e)" after the words "provided for in".

SEC. 3. Section 201 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 175, 8 U.S.C. 1151) is amended by adding the following additional subsection:

"(f) Quota numbers made available at the commencement of any fiscal year as a result of the reduction of the annual quota of any quota areas pursuant to subsection (a) of this section, together with quota numbers not issued or otherwise used during the previous fiscal year, shall then be made available (1) during the five fiscal years following the enactment of this subsection, to quota immigrants, if otherwise admissible under the provisions of this Act, who are unable to obtain prompt issuance of visas due to oversubscription of their quotas or subquotas as determined by the Secretary of State, and (2), thereafter, to quota immigrants if otherwise admissible under the provisions of this Act. These quota numbers shall be allocated within the percentage limitations and in the order of priority specified in section 203 without regard to the quota to which the alien is chargeable: *Provided,* however, that the combined number of quota numbers issued to any quota area in any year, under the provisions of this subsection and subsection (a) of this section, shall not exceed 10 per centum of the total quota numbers authorized for that year: *Provided further,* That in no case shall this limitation operate to reduce any quota in any of the five fiscal years following the enactment of this Act by more than the 20 per centum specified in subsection (a) of this section: *Provided further,* That the President may, after consultation with the Immigration Board, reserve—

"(1) Not to exceed 30 per centum of such numbers for allocation to quota immigrants, if otherwise admissible under the provisions of this Act, whose admission is determined by him to be required (A) to avoid undue hardship, resulting from the reduction of annual quotas pursuant to subsection (a) of this section, which is not otherwise avoided under the provisions of this subsection, and (B) in the national security interest of the United States: *Provided,* That the limitation on immigration from any single quota area in any year included in the first proviso to this subsection shall not apply to visas issued under this clause; and

"(2) Not to exceed 10 per centum of such numbers for allocation to quota immigrants, if otherwise admissible under the provisions of this Act, whose admissions will further the traditional policy of the United States of offering asylum and refuge to persons oppressed or persecuted, or threatened with oppression or persecution, because of their race, color, religion, national origin, adherence to democratic beliefs, or their opposition to totalitarianism or dictatorship, and to persons uprooted by natural calamity or military operations who are unable to return to their usual place of abode. After consultation with the Attorney General, the Secretary of State shall establish by regulation the requirements for qualification within this class, with reference to current world conditions.

In no case shall the authority to reserve such numbers, or the limitation on the combined number of quota numbers to be issued to any quota area in any year, operate so as to require that authorized quota numbers be unused."

SEC. 4. Section 201(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 176, 8

U.S.C. 1151(c)) is amended to read as follows:

"There shall be made available for the issuance of immigrant visas to quota immigrants (1) in any fiscal year no more quota numbers than the total quota for such year, and (2) in any calendar month of any fiscal year, no more quota numbers than 10 per centum of the total quota for such year in addition to that portion of the quota authorized for issuance but not issued during any preceding calendar month or months of the same fiscal year; except that during the last two months of any fiscal year immigrant visas may be issued without regard to the 10 per centum limitation contained herein."

Sec. 5. Section 201(d) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 175, 8 U.S.C. 1151(d)) is amended to read as follows:

"A quota immigrant visa shall not be issued to any alien who is eligible for a nonquota immigrant visa."

Sec. 6. (a) Section 220(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 176, 8 U.S.C. 1152(a)) is amended by deleting paragraph (5) thereof.

(b) Section 202(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 177, 8 U.S.C. 1152(b)) is repealed.

(c) Section 202(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 177, 8 U.S.C. 1152(c)) is redesignated section 202(b) and is amended to read as follows:

"Any immigrant born in a colony or other component or dependent area of a governing country for which no separate or specific quota has been established, unless a nonquota immigrant as provided in section 101 (a)(27) of this Act, shall be chargeable to the quota of the governing country, except that no more persons born in any such colony or other component or dependent area overseas from the governing country shall be chargeable to the quota of its governing country in any one year than a number which bears the same relation to the quota of its governing country as the number two hundred bears to the quota of the governing country prior to the enactment of this Act."

(d) Section 202(d) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 178, 8 U.S.C. 1152(d)) is redesignated section 202(c).

(e) Section 202(e) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 178), as amended (75 Stat. 654), (8 U.S.C. 1152(e)) is redesignated section 202(d) and is further amended by substituting "section 202(b)" for "section 202(c)(1)" after the words "issued under."

Sec. 7. Section 207 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 181, 8 U.S.C. 1157) is amended by deleting the words "no immigrant visa shall be issued in lieu thereof to any other immigrant" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "an immigrant visa may be issued in lieu thereof to any other immigrant".

Sec. 8. Paragraph (27)(A) of section 101 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 169, 8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(27)(A) is amended to read as follows:

"(A) An immigrant who is the child, spouse, or parent of a citizen of the United States;".

Sec. 9. Paragraph (27)(C) of section 101 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 169, 8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(27)(C) is amended to read as follows:

"(C) An immigrant who was born in any independent foreign country of North, Central, or South America, or in any independent island country adjacent thereto, or in the Canal Zone, and the spouse and children of any such immigrant, if accompanying or following to join him;".

Sec. 10. (a) Section 203(a)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 178, 8 U.S.C. 1153(a)(1)) is amended by deleting the words "needed urgently in" and substituting the words "especially advantageous to".

(b) Section 203(a)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 178), as amended (73 Stat. 644), (8 U.S.C. 1153(a) (2)), is amended by deleting the words "parents of citizens of the United States, such citizens being at least twenty-one years of age or who are the".

(c) Section 203(a)(4) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 178), as amended (73 Stat. 644), (8 U.S.C. 1153(a) (4)) is amended by—

(1) inserting after the words "married daughters of citizens of the United States" a comma, followed by the words "or parents of aliens lawfully admitted for permanent residence," and

(2) adding at the end thereof the following:

"Qualified quota immigrants capable of performing specified functions for which a shortage of employable and willing persons exists in the United States shall be entitled to a preference not to exceed 50 per centum of the immigrant visas remaining available for issuance under this paragraph after the preference to the named relatives of United States citizens and resident aliens is satisfied or exhausted."

Sec. 11. Section 204 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 179, 8 U.S.C. 1154) is amended as follows:

(1) Subsection (a) is amended by deleting the words "or section 203(a)(1)(A)" and substituting a comma, followed by the words "section 203(a)(1)(A) or the last clause of section 203(a)(4)."

(2) Subsection (b) is amended (A) by deleting the words "section 203(a)(1)(A)" and substituting the words "the last clause of section 203(a)(4)" and (B) by inserting after the words "required by the Attorney General" the words "after consultation with the Immigration Board."

(3) Subsection (c) is redesignated (d) and is amended to read as follows:

"(d) After an investigation of the facts in each case, and after consultation with appropriate agencies of the Government, the Attorney General shall, if he determines that the facts stated in the petition are true and that the alien in respect of whom the petition is made is eligible for an immigrant status under section 101(a)(27)(F)(i), section 203(a)(1)(A) or the last clause of section 203(a)(4) approve the petition and forward one copy thereof to the Department of State. The Secretary of State shall then authorize the consular officer concerned to grant such immigrant status. The Attorney General shall forward to the Congress a report on each approved petition for immigrant status under section 203(a)(1) stating the basis for his approval and such facts as were by him deemed to be pertinent in establishing the beneficiary's qualifications for the preferential status. Such reports shall be submitted to the Congress on the first and fifteenth day of each calendar month in which the Congress is in session."

(4) Subsection (d) is redesignated (e) and is amended by deleting the words "or section 203(a)(1)(A)," and substituting a comma, followed by the words "section 203(a)(1)(A) or the last clause of section 203(a)(4)."

(5) The following new subsection is inserted after subsection (b):

"(c) Any immigrant claiming in his application to be entitled to an immigrant visa under section 203(a)(1)(A) of the Act shall file a petition with the Attorney General. The petition shall be in such form as the Attorney General may by regulations prescribe and shall contain such additional information and be supported by such documentary evidence as may be required by the Attorney General. The petition shall be made under oath administered by any individual having authority to administer oaths, if executed in the United States, but, if executed outside of the United States, administered by a consular officer."

Sec. 12. The first sentence of section 205 (b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 180), as amended (73 Stat. 644), (8 U.S.C. 1155(b)) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Any citizen of the United States claiming that any immigrant is his spouse, child, or parent, and that such immigrant is entitled to a nonquota immigrant status under section 101(a)(27)(A) of this Act, or any citizen of the United States claiming that any immigrant is his unmarried son or unmarried daughter and that such immigrant is entitled to a quota immigrant status under section 203(a)(2) of this Act, or any alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence claiming that any immigrant is his spouse or his unmarried son or unmarried daughter and that such immigrant is entitled to a quota immigrant status under section 203(a)(3) of this Act, or any citizen of the United States claiming that any immigrant is his brother or sister or his married son or his married daughter and that such immigrant is entitled to a preference under section 203(a)(4) of this Act, or any alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence claiming that any immigrant is his parent and that such immigrant is entitled to a preference under section 203(a) (4) of this Act, may file a petition with the Attorney General."

Sec. 13. Section 1 of the Act of July 14, 1960 (74 Stat. 504), is amended to read as follows:

"That (a) under the terms of section 212 (d)(5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act the Attorney General may parole into the United States, pursuant to such regulations as he may prescribe, an alien refugee-escapee defined in subsection (b) of this section, if such alien (1) applies for parole while physically present within the limits of any country which is not Communist, Communist-dominated, or Communist-occupied, and (2) is not a national of the area in which the application is made.

"(b) For the purposes of subsection (a), the term 'refugee-escapee' means any alien who, because of persecution or fear of persecution on account of race, religion, or political opinion has fled or shall flee (A) from any Communist, Communist-dominated, or Communist-occupied area, or (B) from any country within the general area of the Middle East, and who cannot return to such area, or to such country, on account of race, religion, or political opinion. The expression 'general area of the Middle East' means the area between and including (1) Morocco on the west, (2) Turkey on the north, (3) Pakistan on the east, and (4) Saudi Arabia and Ethiopia on the south."

Sec. 14. Section 2 of the Act of July 14, 1960 (74 Stat. 504), as amended (76 Stat. 124), is amended by deleting (1) the letter "(a)" immediately following the words "Sec. 2." and (2) subsection (b) thereof.

Sec. 15. Section 281 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 230, 8 U.S.C. 1351) is amended as follows:

(1) Immediately after "Sec. 281." insert "(a)".

(2) Paragraph (2) is amended to read as follows:

"(2) For the issuance of each immigrant visa, $20; except that such fee shall be $10 in the case of any alien who is the beneficiary of a petition required under sections 204(b) or 205(b)."

(3) The following is inserted after paragraph (7), and is designated subsection (b):

"The time and manner of payment of the fees specified in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a) of this section, including but not limited to partial deposit or prepayment at the time of registration, or postponement for an appropriate period, shall be prescribed by the Secretary of State."

(4) The paragraph beginning with the words "The fees * * *" is designated subsection (c).

Sec. 16. Section 203(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 179, 8 U.S.C. 1153(c)) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"The Secretary of State, in his discretion, may terminate the registration on a quota waiting list of any alien who fails to evidence his continued intention to apply for a visa in such manner as may be by regulation prescribed."

Sec. 17. (a) Paragraph (1) of section 212(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 182, 8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(1)) is amended by deleting the language "feebleminded" and inserting the language "mentally retarded" in its place.

(b) Paragraph (4) of section 212(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 182, 8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(4)) is amended by deleting the word "epilepsy" and the commas before and after it.

(c) Section 212 (f), (g), and (h) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as added by the Act of September 26, 1961 (75 Stat. 654, 655, 8 U.S.C. 1182) are hereby redesignated sections 212 (g), (h), and (i), respectively, and section 212(g) as so redesignated is amended to read as follows:

"Any alien who is excludable from the United States under paragraphs (1), (2), (3), or (4) of subsection (a) of this section, and any alien afflicted with tuberculosis in any form, who (A) is the spouse or the unmarried son or daughter, or the minor unmarried lawfully adopted child, of a United States citizen, or of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence, or of an alien who has been issued an immigrant visa, or (B) has a son or daughter who is a United States citizen, or an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence, or an alien who has been issued an immigrant visa, may, if otherwise admissible, be issued a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence in accordance with such terms, conditions, and controls, including the giving of a bond, as the Attorney General, in his discretion, may by regulations prescribe, after consultation with the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service."

Sec. 18. (a) There is hereby established the Immigration Board (hereafter referred to as the "Board") to be composed of seven members. The President of the United States shall appoint the Chairman of the Board and two other members. The President of the Senate, with the approval of the majority and minority leaders of the Senate, shall appoint two members from the membership of the Senate. The Speaker of the House of Representatives, with the approval of the majority and minority leaders of the House, shall appoint two members from the membership of the House. The members of the Board shall be selected by virtue of their high personal integrity, their capabilities, and their experience in and expert knowledge of immigration laws and international migration problems. A vacancy in the membership of the Board shall be filled in the same manner as the original designation and appointment.

(b) The duties of the Board shall be—

(1) to promulgate, after consultation with the Attorney General, such regulations as are necessary to insure its efficient functioning under the provisions of this Act;

(2) to make a continuous study of such conditions within and without the United States, which, in the opinion of the Board, might have any bearing on the immigration policy of the United States;

(3) to consider, after consultation with the Secretary of State, to recommend to the President, such allocation of quota immigrant visas, under section 201(f) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as will best fulfill the purposes of that section;

(4) to consider, and after consultation with the Secretaries of Labor, State, and Defense, to recommend to the Attorney General such criteria for admission of immigrants under section 203(a)(1)(A) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended, and the last clause of section 203(a)(4), as amended, as will further the policy of the United States to secure the immigration of persons of high skill, education, or training, or who are capable of performing specified functions for which a shortage of employable, willing persons exists in the United States;

(5) to study such other aspects of the Immigration and Nationality Act as the President shall assign to the Board for study, and make recommendations with respect thereto;

(6) to conduct such investigations and to hold such public and executive hearings in such places within and without the United States and at such times as the Board deems necessary.

(c) All Federal agencies shall cooperate fully with the Board to the end that it may effectively carry out its duties.

(d) Each member of the Board who is not otherwise in the service of the Government of the United States shall receive the sum of $75 for each day spent in the work of the Board, shall be paid actual travel expenses, and per diem in lieu of subsistence expenses, when away from his usual place of residence, in accordance with section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended.

(e) Each member of the Board who is otherwise in the service of the Government of the United States shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for such other service, but while engaged in the work of the Board shall be paid actual travel expenses, and per diem in lieu of subsistence expenses, when away from his usual place of residence, in accordance with the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended.

(f) There is authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, so much as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.

Sec. 19. Section 221(g) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 192, 8 U.S.C. 1201(g)) is amended by deleting the period at the end thereof and adding the following:

": *Provided further,* That a visa may be issued to an alien defined in section 101(a)(15)(B) or (F), if such alien is otherwise entitled to receive a visa, upon receipt of a notice by the consular officer from the Attorney General of the giving of a bond with sufficient surety in such sum and containing such conditions as the consular officer shall prescribe, to insure that at the expiration of the time for which such alien has been admitted by the Attorney General, as provided in section 214(a), or upon failure to maintain the status under which he was admitted, or to maintain any status subsequently acquired under section 248 of the Act, such alien will depart from the United States."

Sec. 20. So much of section 272(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 226, 8 U.S.C. 1322(a)) as precedes the words "shall pay to the collector of customs" is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 272. (a) Any person who shall bring to the United States an alien (other than an alien crewman) who is (1) mentally retarded, (2) insane, (3) afflicted with psychopathic personality, (4) a chronic alcoholic, (5) afflicted with any dangerous contagious disease, or (6) a narcotic drug addict,".

Section-by-Section Analysis

Section 1 amends section 201(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, under which quotas for each country are determined. It abolishes the national origins system by reducing present quotas by one-fifth of their present number each year for 5 years. As numbers are released from national origins quotas, they are added to the quota reserve pool established by the amendment to section 201 of the act made by section 3 of the bill. Thus in the first year, 20 percent (roughly 32,000) are released to the pool; in the second year, the pool will have 40 percent of present quotas (or 64,000); until in the fifth year and thereafter, all numbers are allocated through the pool. To provide some immediate relief to minimum quota areas, the minimum quota is raised to 200, but is then reduced in the same manner as other quotas.

Section 2 amends section 201(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act by changing a reference therein from "section 202(e)" to "section 202(d)" in conformity with the redesignation of section 202(e) as 202(d) made by section 6(e) of the bill.

Section 3 amends section 201 of the Immigration and Nationality Act by adding a new subsection (f). This subsection establishes the quota reserve pool from which all quota numbers will be allocated by the fifth year. In each of the 5 years constituting the period of transition, the pool will consist of (1) the numbers released from national origins quotas each year, and (2) numbers assigned to the old quota areas but unused the previous year because insufficient demand for them existed in the assigned quota area.

Quota numbers are issued in the order of preference specified in amended section 203 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (see section 10 of the bill). That is, first call on the first 50 percent is given to persons whose admission, by virtue of their exceptional skill, training or education, will be especially advantageous to the United States; first call on the next 30 percent, plus any part of the first 50 percent not issued for first preference purposes, is given to unmarried sons and daughters of U.S. citizens, not eligible for nonquota status because they are over 21 years of age; first call on the remaining 20 percent, plus any part of the first 80 percent not taken by the first two preference classes, is given to spouses and unmarried sons or daughters of aliens lawfully admitted for permanent residence; and any portion remaining is issued to other quota visa applicants, with percentage preferences to other relatives of U.S. citizens and resident aliens, and then to certain classes of workers. Amended section 203 further provides that within each class, visas are issued in the order in which applied for—first come, first served. These preference provisions, which under present law determine only relative priority between nationals of the same country, will now determine priority between nationals of different countries throughout the world.

To prevent disproportionate benefits to the nationals of any single country, a maximum of 10 percent of the total authorized quota is set on immigration attributable to any quota area. However, this limitation is not applied if to do so would result in reducing any quota at a more rapid rate than that provided by amended section 201(a). Ultimately, of course, the limitation applies to all.

Exceptions to the principle of allocating visas on the basis of time of registration within preference classes are provided to deal with special problems. Since some countries' quotas are not current, their nationals have no old registrations on file. To apply the principle rigidly would result, after 4 or 5 years, in curtailing immigration from these countries almost entirely. This would be undesirable not only because it would frustrate the aim of the bill that immigration from all countries should continue, but also because many of the countries that would be affected are our closest allies. Therefore, proposed section 201(f) would authorize the President, after consultation with the Immigration Board (established by section 18), to reserve up to 30 percent of the quota reserve pool for allocation to qualified immigrants (1) who could obtain visas under the existing system but not under the new system and (2) whose admission to the United States would further the national security interest by maintaining close ties with their countries. The number of quota visas so allocated may exceed the 10-percent limit on the number of immigrants from any country in the case of those countries which, under the existing system, regularly receive allocations in excess of that limit.

Subsection (f) also allows the President to reserve up to 10 percent of the quota reserve pool for allocation to certain refugees and permits him to disregard priority of registration within preference classes for the benefit of such refugees. Many refugees, almost by definition, are uprooted suddenly. They had no thought of immigration until they were forced to leave the country in which they were living because of natural calamity or political upheaval; or they may be refugees from persecution or dictatorship, in which case previous registration would have been dangerous.

Finally, subsection (f) provides that if the President reserves, against contingencies, any numbers during the year, but thereafter finds them not to be needed for the named purposes, such numbers are to be issued as if they had not been reserved. Similarly, the 10-percent limitation on the number of visas to be issued to any quota area is made inoperable if its application would result in authorized quota numbers not being used.

Section 4 amends section 201(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, which presently limits the number of quota visas issued in any single month to 10 percent of the total yearly quota. This limitation is needed to insure that persons entitled to preference by virtue of special skills or family ties will not be foreclosed from preference by a rush of earlier applications which exhaust the annual quota. To insure that all available quota numbers can nevertheless be utilized, present law provides that numbers not used during the first 10 months of any fiscal year may be used during the last 2 months of such year, without regard to the 10 percent monthly limitation. Often, if close to the full 10 percent of quota visas is not issued in each of the first months of the year, undesirable administrative problems result in the last two. The amendment allows the issuance each month of the 10 percent authorized for that month plus any visas authorized but not issued in previous months. This permits a more even spacing of visa issuance during the year.

Section 5 amends section 201(d) of the Immigration and Nationality Act which now permits the issuance of quota immigrant visas to nonquota immigrants. Substituted for the provisions of section 201(d) is a specific direction that no quota immigrant visa shall be issued to a person who is eligible for a nonquota immigrant visa. This will prevent nonquota immigrants from preempting visas to the prejudice of qualified quota immigrants.

Section 6 amends section 202 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to eliminate the so-called Asia-Pacific triangle provisions, which require persons of Asian stock to be attributed to quota areas not by their place of birth, but according to their racial ancestry. At the end of the 5-year transition period, this provision would be in any event superfluous, since national origin will no longer be a standard for the admission of qualified quota immigrants. But the formula is so especially discriminatory that it should be removed immediately, and not be permitted to operate even in part during the 5-year transition period.

Subsection (c) of the section amends section 202(c) of the act so as to raise the minimum allotment to subquotas of dependent areas of a governing country, thus preserving their present equality with independent minimum-quota areas. The dependent area's allotment is taken from the governing country's quota. To prevent a dependent area from preempting the governing country's quota disproportionately, it is provided that the dependent area's share of the quota will decrease as the governing country's quota is reduced.

Section 7 amends section 207 of the Immigration and Nationality Act by deleting the language of that section which prevents the issuance of visas in lieu of those issued but not actually used, or later found to be improperly issued. Thus, in Germany alone over 7,000 quota visas are now taken by persons entitled to nonquota status, and 2,000 more quota visas are issued to persons who do not actually apply for admission to the United States. All these quota visas are lost under the present law. Such a result is inconsistent with the aim of the bill that all authorized quota numbers shall be used. The amended section 207 specifically authorizes the issuance of a quota visa in lieu of one improperly issued or not actually used, utilizing the same quota number.

Section 8 amends section 101(a)(27)(A) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, which grants nonquota status to spouses and children of U.S. citizens, so as to extend nonquota status to parents of U.S. citizens as well.

Section 9 amends section 101(a)(27)(C) of the Immigration and Nationality Act so as to extend nonquota status to natives of all independent Western Hemisphere countries. Under present law, such status is granted to natives of all independent North, Central, and South American countries, and of named Caribbean island countries which were independent when the Immigration and Nationality Act was enacted in 1952. The amendment extends nonquota status to natives of countries in these areas which have gained their independence since then, or may gain their independence hereafter.

Section 10 amends section 203(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, which establishes preferences for immigrants with special skills and for relatives of U.S. citizens and resident aliens.

Subsection (a) relaxes the test for the first preference accorded to persons of high education, technical training, specialized experience, or exceptional ability. Under present law, such persons are granted preferred status only if the Attorney General determines that their services are needed urgently in the United States. The amendment allows them first preference if their services, as determined by the Attorney General, would be especially advantageous to the United States.

Subsection (b) eliminates the second preference for parents of American citizens, now accorded nonquota status by the amendment made by section 8 of the bill.

Subsection (c) grants a fourth preference, up to 50 percent of numbers not issued to the first three preferences, to parents of aliens lawfully admitted for permanent residence. It also grants a subsidiary preference to qualified quota immigrants capable of filling particular labor shortages in the United States. Under present law, immigrants who do not meet the rigorous standards of the skilled specialist category are not preferred over any other immigrants even though they can fill a definite labor need which other immigrants cannot fill. The amendment allows to such immigrants a preference of 50 percent of the quota visas remaining after all family preferences have been satisfied or exhausted.

Section 11 amends section 204 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, which establishes the procedure for determining eligibility for preferred status under section 203.

The amendments made by paragraphs (1), (2), (3) and (4) cover the filing of petitions, on behalf of the workers accorded a fourth preference, by the persons who will employ them to fill the special labor needs. Paragraph (1) provides for approval of these petitions by the Attorney General, and paragraph (2) requires that he consult with the Immigration Board and interested departments of Government before granting preference to these workers.

Paragraph (2) also exempts first preference skilled specialists from the present petition procedure because under the bill a new procedure is established for such persons. Under present law, skilled specialists may qualify for preferred status only when a petition requesting their services is filed by a U.S. employer. This requirement unduly restricts our ability to attract those whose services would substantially enhance our economy, cultural interests, and welfare. Many of these people have no way of contacting employers in the United States in order to obtain the required employment. Even if they knew whom to contact, few openings important enough to attract such highly skilled people are offered without personal interviews, and only a few very large enterprises or institutions have representatives abroad with hiring authority. Thus many such skilled specialists cannot obtain the employment presently required for first preference status.

Moreover, the requirement of prearranged employment is in fact unnecessary. Highly skilled specialists would obviously work at their specialty, provided that employment is open. The only check needed is that the Attorney General ascertain, upon consultation with appropriate Government agencies, that job openings exist in the specialist's particular field. Although the present petition procedure serves to confirm the individual's own evidence of his training, education, or skills, such confirmation is not essential if proper investigation is made of his qualifications before the preference is accorded.

Paragraph (5), therefore, allows the Attorney General to grant a first preference to skilled specialists upon their own petitions, supported by such documentation as the Attorney General shall require. In this connection it is to be noted that the existing law requiring an investigation by the Attorney General of the petitioner's qualifications and a determination of his eligibility for a first preference is continued.

Section 12 amends section 205(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, providing for petitions to establish eligibility for preference as a relative of a U.S. citizen or lawfully resident alien, to conform to the substantive amendments made by section 10.

Section 13 amends the fair share refugee law so as to remove a provision which has hampered its effective operation. Presently, the entry of refugees is subject to the condition that they be within the mandate of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. The mandate provision is eliminated, so that the refugee law will no longer be subject to outside control. In addition, subsection (b) enlarges the applicable area definition so as to allow the entry of refugees from north Africa generally, and Algeria particularly, who are unable to return to their countries because of their race, religion, or political opinions, and incorporates this new definition in the fair share law. The existing definition encompasses refugees from "any country within the general area of the Middle East," which is defined as the area between Libya on the west, Turkey on the north, Pakistan on the east, and Saudi Arabia and Ethiopa on the south. The new definition substitutes Morocco for Libya as the western border of this area.

Section 14 repeals the fair share law's special provision for 500 "difficult to resettle" refugees; all such persons have been taken care of, and the authority is therefore no longer necessary.

Section 15 amends section 281 of the Immigration and Nationality Act so as to grant discretionary authority to the Secretary of State to specify the time and manner of payment of the fees for visa applications and issuances. This discretionary authority will allow the Secretary to control two undesirable situations:

First, many people in countries with oversubscribed quotas register their names on visa waiting lists even though they have no present intention of emigrating; they regard the registration as insurance for possible future use. Such registrations have the effect of creating a distorted picture of visa backlogs and make efficient administration difficult. The amendment therefore would allow the Secretary of State to require a registrant to deposit a fee at the time of registration. While not unduly burdensome on those who wish to come here, such a procedure would serve to discourage registrations which are not bona fide.

Second, otherwise admissible immigrants, particularly refugees, are often unable to pay the required visa fee. Rather than bar them from obtaining a visa, the Secretary is given authority to postpone payment.

Section 16 is also directed to the problem of insurance registrations. Many applicants for visas have been offered visas repeatedly but have turned them down. They wish only to preserve their priority in registration for possible future use. To handle such cases, section 203(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act is amended so as to allow the Secretary of State to terminate the registrations of persons who have previously declined visas. This amendment is also important in connection with a contemplated reregistration of applicants in certain oversubscribed quota areas designed to ascertain whether registrants have died, emigrated elsewhere, or changed their minds; the Secretary is authorized to terminate the registration of all persons who fail to reregister.

Section 17 amends subsections (a)(1), (a)(4), and (g), as redesignated, of section 212 of the Immigration and Nationality Act so as to allow the entry of certain mentally afflicted persons. Under present law, no visas may be issued to aliens who are feebleminded or insane, or have had one or more attacks of insanity, or who are afflicted with a psychopathic personality, epilepsy, or a mental defect. These provisions have created hardships for families seeking admission, where one member, often a child, is retarded. Such families are presented with the difficult decision as to whether they should leave the afflicted person behind or stay with him. Such a person cannot enter the United States even if the family is willing and able to care for him here and even if he is within the 85 percent of mentally afflicted persons whose condition can be substantially improved by adequate treatment.

The amendment gives the Attorney General discretionary authority to admit such persons who are the spouses, children, or parents of citizens or resident aliens, or who are accompanying a member of their family. The Attorney General, after consultation with the Surgeon General of the U.S. Public Health Service, would prescribe the controls and conditions on the entry of such persons, including the giving of a bond to insure continued family support.

The bar against the admission of epileptics is removed entirely, since this affliction can effectively be medically controlled. The amendment would also provide that the term "mentally retarded" be substituted for the present term "feeble-minded." This is not a substantive change in the law.

Section 18 establishes the Immigration Board, to be composed of seven members. Two members of the House of Representatives are appointed by the Speaker with the approval of the majority and minority leaders, two members of the Senate, by the President of the Senate, with the approval of the majority and minority leaders, and three members, including the Chairman, by the President. Members not otherwise in Government service are to be paid on a per diem basis for actual time spent in the work of the Board.

The section provides that the Board's duties shall be to study, and consult with appropriate Government departments on all facets of immigration policy; to make recommendations to the President as to the reservation and allocation of quota numbers, and to recommend to the Attorney General criteria for admission of skilled specialists and workers whose services are needed by reason of labor shortages in this country.

Section 19 grants consular officers discretionary authority to require bonds insuring that certain nonimmigrants will depart voluntarily from the United States when required. This amendment to section 221(g) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, by providing an additional safeguard against a later refusal to depart, would allow the issuance of visas in many borderline cases in which visas are now refused to students and visitors.

Section 20 amends section 272 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, which imposes a penalty on carriers bringing to the United States aliens afflicted with certain defects, so as to make that section conform with the changes made by this bill and section 11 of the act of September 26, 1961.

FOREIGN AID—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 53)

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I

We live in a turbulent world. But amid the conflict and confusion, the United States holds firm to its primary goal—a world of stability, freedom, and peace where independent nations can enjoy the benefits of modern knowledge. Here is our difference with the Communists—and our strength. They would use their skills to forge new chains of tyranny. We would use ours to free men from the bonds of the past.

The Communists are hard at work to dominate the less-developed nations of Africa, Asia, and Latin America. Their allies are the ancient enemies of mankind: Tyranny, poverty, ignorance, and disease. If freedom is to prevail, we must do more than meet the immediate threat to free world security, whether in southeast Asia or elsewhere. We must look beyond—to the long-range needs of the developing nations.

Foreign assistance programs reach beyond today's crises, to offer: Strength to those who would be free; hope for those who would otherwise despair; progress for those who would help themselves.

Through these programs we help build stable nations in a stable world.

II

Acting on the experience of the past 4 years, I am presenting a program which: Is selective and concentrated; emphasizes self-help and the fastest possible termination of dependence on aid; provides an increasing role for private enterprise; improves multilateral coordination of development aid; reflects continuing improvement in management.

Specifically, for fiscal year 1966, I recommend:

No additional authorizations for development lending or the Alliance for Progress; existing authorizations for those purposes are adequate; authorizations of $1,170 million for military assistance; $369 million for supporting assistance; $210 million for technical cooperation; $155 million for contributions to international organizations; $50 million for the President's contingency fund; and $62 million for administrative and miscellaneous expenses.

I am also requesting a special standby authorization for use if necessary in Vietnam only.

My appropriation request for fiscal year 1966 under these authorizations is for $3,380 million; $1,170 million will be used for military assistance; $2,210 million is for the other categories of aid.

This is a minimum request, the smallest in the history of the foreign aid program. It is $136 million less than requested last year, and will impose the smallest assistance burden on the American people since the beginning of the Marshall plan in 1948.

This minimum request reflects my determination to present to the Congress the lowest aid budget consistent with the national interest. It takes full account of the increasing efficiency of the assistance program, and the increasing availability of assistance funds from international agencies in which the costs are shared among a number of countries.

I believe that in carrying out this program the American people will get full value for their money. Indeed, we cannot afford to do less. Russia and Red China have tripled their promises of aid in the past year. They are doing more than they have ever done before; the competition between them has led to increased efforts by each to influence the course of events in the developing nations.

If, during the year, situations should arise which require additional amounts of U.S. assistance to advance vital U.S. interests, I shall not hesitate to inform the Congress and request additional funds.

III

I am requesting $1,170 million for the military assistance program. This is an increase of $115 million over the total appropriation for military assistance for the current fiscal year. In order to meet urgent requirements in southeast Asia during fiscal year 1965, we cut back programs in other countries which are under pressure. Some of the fiscal year 1966 appropriation will be needed to make up what we have left undone.

Still, the program is highly concentrated. Nearly three-quarters of the money will go to 11 countries around the great arc from Greece to Korea. Vietnam alone will absorb an important share.

Military assistance makes it possible for nations to survive. It provides a shield behind which economic and social development can take place. It is vital to our own security as well. It helps to maintain more than 3½ million men under arms as a deterrent to aggression in countries bordering on the Sino-Soviet world. Without them, more American men would have to be stationed overseas, and we would have to spend far more for defense than we now do.

IV

As a supplement to military assistance, I am requesting $369 million for supporting assistance—economic aid which is directly related to the maintenance of stability and security. Eighty-eight percent of the money will be used in Vietnam, Laos, Korea, and Jordan.

V

The world's trouble spots—the Vietnams and the Congos—dominate the headlines. This is no wonder, for they represent serious problems. Over $500 million of the current request for military and supporting assistance will be deployed to meet the frontal attack in Vietnam and Laos.

Indeed, $500 million may not be enough. I am therefore requesting for fiscal year 1966 an additional standby authorization for military or supporting assistance which would be used only in Vietnam and only in case we should need more funds to protect our interests there. Any program which would make use of this additional authorization will be presented to the authorizing committees of the Congress concurrently with the appropriation request.

Our past investment in the defense of the free world through the military assistance and supporting assistance programs has paid great dividends. Not only has it foiled aggression, but it has brought stability to a number of countries. Since the beginning of this decade, the funds used each year for military aid and supporting assistance have been sharply reduced. Today, we are spending $1 billion less on these accounts than we did in 1960 and 1961.

VI

Military security in the developing world will not be sufficient to our purposes unless the ordinary people begin to feel some improvement in their lives and see ahead to a time when their children can live in decency. It follows that economic growth in these regions means as much to our security as their military strength. That is an important reason why the United States has taken the lead during the past few years in organizing, on an international basis, a program of development assistance.

Of course, such assistance is and must be concentrated where it will contribute to lasting progress. Experience has demonstrated that certain requirements need to be met by the developing countries if such progress is to occur.

They need to undertake sound measures of self-help—to mobilize their own resources, eliminate waste, and do what they can to meet their own needs. And they need to avoid spending their resources on unnecessary armaments and foreign adventures. Our aid can contribute to their economic and social progress only if it can be provided within a framework of constructive and sensible policies and programs.

Fortunately, most of the developing countries recognize the relationship between the wise use of their own resources and the effectiveness and availability of external aid.

It is a cardinal principle of U.S. policy that development assistance will go to countries which have undertaken effective programs of self-help and are, therefore, able to make good use of aid. During fiscal year 1964, for example, 64 percent of our development assistance went to seven such countries: India, Nigeria, Pakistan, Tunisia, Turkey, Brazil, and Chile. In other countries as well, including a number of smaller countries, sound self-help efforts are making it possible for us to provide effective development aid.

With development assistance we seek to help countries reach, as rapidly as possible, the point at which further progress is possible without external aid.

A striking example of how, through self-help, a developing country can reach the point where it can carry on without concessional aid is the Republic of China. Little more than 10 years ago, Free China faced enormous security and development problems. The prospects for economic growth looked dim. But in only 10 years, as a result of determined self-help supplemented by effective U.S. aid; per capita gross national product has risen 45 percent; saving accounts for one-fifth of the national income; exports have tripled; industrial output has tripled; the private share of output has doubled, and now accounts for two-thirds of all industrial production; agricultural production has incerased by 50 percent.

Free China has also joined other nations as a good cash customer for U.S. exports, particularly agricultural commodities.

This remarkable cooperative effort has brought the Republic of China to the point where it no longer needs AID assistance. Fiscal year 1965 marks the end of this successful program.

I am requesting $580 million as our fiscal year 1966 aid commitment to the Alliance for Progress. This is an increase of $70 million over last year's appropriation.

Impatient expectations of this great joint undertaking have sometimes in the past blinded us to its achievements—achievements which now touch the lives of nearly half of the 200 million people of Latin America. Increasingly, however, the people of the United States have come to recognize what the Alliance means.

To date, as a result of U.S. assistance in support of the Alliance, over 75,000 teachers have been trained; nearly 10 million schoolbooks have been put in circulation; over 12 million children are now participating in school lunch programs, an increase of over 8 million in the past 2½ years; development banks and other credit institutions which support the private sector have been established in 15 countries; over 300.000 houses have been or are being built; savings and loan associations, nonexistent a few years ago, have now accumulated and are investing local deposits of $75 million; 25 of our own States have joined the Partners for the Alliance program, they bring to bear a vital people-to-people effort on our relationships with Latin America; 40 U.S. colleges and universities are working to modernize teaching and training in Latin America.

The Inter-American Committee for the Alliance for Progress—CIAP—established to provide even closer ties for mutual economic effort, successfully completed its first review of country performance under the Alliance. The work of this Committee is further evidence that the governments and people of Latin America are accepting increasing responsibility for their own development. The failure of Castroism is becoming clearer each day. More and more, Latin America is facing up to the fundamental problems of poverty, a rapidly growing population, and financial disorder. Increasingly, more and more of these countries are moving toward economic viability and self-sustaining growth.

The Alliance is taking hold. The war on poverty in Latin America is underway. We in the United States are proud of the way our good neighbors to the south are meeting the challenge of development. We are proud, too, of the role the United States is playing in this great effort and pledge our steadily enlarged support.

The problem of food requires special mention.

Growing population and rising standards of living increase the demand for food. Production in most developing countries is barely keeping pace. In some countries, it is actually falling behind.

In the years ahead, if the developing countries are to continue to grow, they must rapidly enlarge their capacity to provide food for their people. Up to a point, they can and should improve their ability to buy some of their food from abroad. For the most part, however, they must expand and diversify their own production of food. This will require many things: changes in traditional methods, abundant use of fertilizer, greater incentives for producers, and, frequently, changes in pricing practices and more effective organization of distribution.

To meet their needs for food, the developing countries will need help.

We, in the United States, are uniquely equipped to give it.

We are rightly proud of our dynamic and progressive agriculture, with its record of success which contrasts so sharply with the agricultural failures of the Communist countries. We must use our agricultural abundance and our extensive technical skills to assist the less-developed countries to strengthen their ability both to produce and to buy agricultural commodities and, more generally, to support rural development.

We can and must mount a more comprehensive program of technical assistance in agriculture engaging the U.S. Department of Agriculture, our State universities and land-grant colleges, and the most creative of our people in agriculture, marketing, and industry.

At the same time, we can help meet the food needs of the developing nations through our food-for-peace program under Public Law 480. Even under the most favorable conditions, it will be a number of years before the developing countries can produce and import on commercial terms all the food they need. In the interim, our own agricultural plenty can help provide for the hungry and speed the day when these countries can stand on their own feet and pay for their food imports on commercial terms—as happened in the case of Japan and Europe.

VII

We are placing increasing emphasis on the role of private institutions and private enterprise in the development process, and we shall continue to do so.

Foreign aid cannot succeed if we view it as a job for Government alone. For Government can only do a small part of the job. We must bring to bear on the problems of the developing world, the knowledge and skills and good judgment of people from all walks of American life. The Agency for International Development provides the means for utilizing the resources of private business, of our universities and colleges, of farm groups, labor unions, banks, cooperatives, savings and loan associations, and professional groups.

I am happy to report that most AID-financed capital projects and a large and growing part of technical assistance are already administered by contract with private American firms and institutions.

In this connection, the privately managed International Executive Service Corps has an important role to play. I welcome the interest of business executives in serving overseas.

The Advisory Committee on Private Enterprise in Foreign Aid established by the 88th Congress has been meeting for a number of months. It is working hard. We are looking forward to their report which we hope will suggest new ways of enlarging the role of the private sector in the aid program.

To mobilize additional private capital, and the skills which go with it, I am asking the Congress to enact an investment tax credit. I am also asking for expanded authority in connection with the investment guarantee program of the Foreign Assistance Act. However, such measures to encourage the flow of capital to the developing world can do only a part of the job. The less-developed countries must pursue policies that will create new opportunities for their own businessmen and a favorable climate for investors from abroad.

We are making a special effort to encourage private enterprise in the developing countries, through technical assistance for private enterprise; productivity centers and schools of business administration for training in management and new techniques; commodity loans to provide materials and parts for private business; loans to industrial development banks and agricultural credit banks; loans to private business.

All of these programs have one object—to get private enterprise more heavily engaged in the task of development.

VIII

We will persist in our efforts to put more aid on a multilateral basis, to improve the coordination of bilateral aid, and to increase the share of the burden borne by other free world nations.

A growing proportion of economic assistance is directly administered by international financial institutions such as the World Bank, IDA, and the Inter-American Bank. In the past 4 years, such multinational institutions increased their capital assistance to the developing nations by 50 percent. We, in turn, are prepared to increase our contribution to those organizations—as rapidly as other members do so. It is essential that these institutions maintain their international character.

To strengthen multinational aid, and further to strengthen the Alliance for Progress, I urge the Congress promptly to approve the 3-year authorization of $750 million which constitutes the U.S. contribution to the Fund for Special Operations of the Inter-American Development Bank.

Besides channeling aid through multilateral institutions, we are increasingly relying on international consortia and consultative groups to coordinate our bilateral aid with that of others. India, Pakistan, Turkey, Nigeria, and Tunisia are among the countries where such arrangements have been established, in most cases under the auspices of the World Bank. The Inter-American Committee for the Alliance for Progress—CIAP—is fast becoming a most useful forum for the coordination of assistance to Latin American countries.

In addition to these arrangements in support of individual countries and regions, the United States consults regularly with other major donor countries and international agencies in the Development Assistance Committee of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development.

All in all, in fiscal year 1966, 85 percent of U.S. development loans in Asia and Africa will be committed under international arrangements. All U.S. aid to Latin America is made available within the international framework of the Alliance for Progress.

We are continuing to urge other donors to give more aid on better terms.

Since 1960, new commitments of bilateral economic assistance by other free world nations have increased by 50 percent. In the past year, the United Kingdom has organized a Ministry of Overseas Development. Canada has undertaken a program of lending on terms which are more liberal than ours.

We are particularly concerned about the terms of aid. The burden of debt borne by the developing countries is rising. Their accumulated public foreign debt now runs to about $30 billion. The volume of repayments comes to nearly $5 billion per year and it is rising by 15 percent each year. This is a heavy load for nations with small resources struggling to raise the capital they need for economic and social betterment.

We will continue to emphasize in our discussions with other donors during the coming year the need to improve the terms on which aid is extended.

IX

Tight, effective management is essential for a tight, effective aid program.

I am especially pleased to report to the Congress about the progress being made by the Administrator of the Agency for International Development in improving the management and operations of the program. The result is greater efficiency for less money.

In keeping with our Government-wide economy program, the Agency:

Cut direct hire employment during fiscal year 1964 by 1,200; the downward trend has continued during the past 6 months.

Cut superstructure and overhead; during the past 18 months, separate AID organizations in 13 countries and 27 positions at the mission director and deputy level have been eliminated.

Streamlined management procedures.

Since the Congress adopted the unified approach to the organization of assistance which is reflected in the 1961 Foreign Assistance Act, our aid programs have been better coordinated, better planned, and have better served the requirements of U.S. foreign policy.

We are giving continuing attention to the problem of improving the Agency's personnel structure and achieving the highest possible quality in our staff. We expect to do so in the context of a program which is designed to strengthen the personnel capabilities of all the foreign affairs agencies of the Government.

AID has made great progress in reducing the effect of economic assistance on our balance of payments.

The bulk of our assistance—well over 80 percent—now takes the form of U.S. goods and services, not dollars. Dollar payments abroad have sharply declined. In 1960, the dollar drain to other countries which resulted from the aid program measured over $1 billion. This year and next the drain is expected to be less than $500 million. Moreover, a significant part of this is offset by interest on and repayment of past U.S. loan assistance.

X

In my message on the state of the Union, I spoke of the need to create a harmony between man and society—a harmony which will allow each of us to enlarge the meaning of his life and all of us to elevate the quality of our civilization. This summons is not—and cannot be—addressed to Americans alone. For our own security and well-being, and as responsible freemen, we must seek to share our capacity for growth, and the promise of a better life, with our fellow men around the world.

That is what foreign aid is all about.

We have pledged our strength—economic and military—in defense of those who would be free and in support of those who would join in working toward a stable, prosperous world.

I call upon the Congress to join with me in renewing this pledge and to provide the tools to do the job.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 14, 1965*.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Gen. Hugh Pate Harris, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army), to be general, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour. I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TYDINGS in the chair) laid before the Senate the following communications and letters, which were referred as indicated:

Construction of Freeways in the District of Columbia

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a letter from the Administrator of the National Capital Transportation Agency, relative to the construction of freeways or parkways in the District of Columbia (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Amendment of Arms Control and Disarmament Act

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act, as amended, in order to increase the authorization for appropriations (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Amendment of Section 8(e) of Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 8(e) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Report on Flight Pay, U.S. Air Force

A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on flight pay, for the 6-month period ended August 31, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report on Reserve Forces

A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on Reserve Forces, for the fiscal year 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Employment by Secretary of Commerce of Aliens in a Scientific or Technical Capacity

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to employ aliens in a scientific or technical capacity (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

Report on Provision of Aviation War Risk Insurance

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the provision of aviation war risk insurance, as of December 31, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

Adoption of Improved Accounting Procedures by Department of Commerce

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Department of Commerce to adopt improved accounting precedures (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

Promotion of Economic Growth

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to promote economic growth by supporting State and regional centers to place the findings of science usefully in the hands of American enterprise (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Commerce.

Measurement of Certain Vessels

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the measurement of the gross and net tonnages for certain vessels having two or more decks, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

Report on Proposed Program of Airport Development

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on the proposed program of airport development for fiscal year 1965; to the Committee on Commerce.

Amendment of Federal Aviation Act of 1958

A letter from the Acting Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to provide for the regulation of rates and practices of air carriers and foreign air carriers in foreign air transportation, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Commerce.

Transportation of Certain Schoolchildren

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the transportation of severely handicapped children to schools or classes established for their use in the school system of the District of Columbia (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Report of Georgetown Barge, Dock, Elevator & Railway Co.

A letter from Steptoe & Johnson, Attorney at Law, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Georgetown Barge, Dock, Elevator & Railway Co., for the year ended December 31, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Statement of Receipts, Expenditures, and Balances of U.S. Government

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement of the receipts, expenditures and balances of the U.S. Government, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1964 (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on Finance.

Report on Operations Under the Battle Act

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on operations under the Battle Act, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Report on Inadequate Evaluation of Employment Opportunities To Be Created by Two Industrial Area Redevelopment Projects

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on inadequate evaluation of employment opportunities to be created by two industrial area redevelopment projects, Area Redevelopment Administration, Department of Commerce, dated January 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Reports of Comptroller General

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on savings in interest costs to the Government attainable by greater use of treasury checking account, Federal Home Loan Bank of San Francisco, dated January 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on weaknesses and problem areas in the administration of the imported fire ant eradication program, Agricultural Research Service, Department of Agriculture, dated January 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on erroneous payments made for military pay, leave, and travel at Elmendorf Air Force Base, Alaska, Department of the Air Force, dated January 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on unnecessary costs incurred in the procurement of radar components and related parts, Department of the Navy, dated January 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Receipt of Project Proposal Under Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, on the receipt of a project proposal under the Small Reclamation Project Act of 1956 from the Kays Creek Irrigation Co., Layton, Utah; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Report on Helium Act

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on matters under the Helium Act, for fiscal year 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Establishment of Fees Payable to the Patent Office

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to fix the fees payable to the Patent Office, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Report on Modification of Contracts To Facilitate the National Defense

A letter from the General Manager, Atomic Energy Commission, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on modification of contracts to facilitate the national defense, during the calendar year 1964; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF FUTURE FARMERS OF AMERICA

A letter from the Chairman, Board of Directors, Future Farmers of America, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on accounts of that organization together with audit reports of the Future Farmers Supply Service and the National Future Farmer magazine, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1964 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL CIRCUIT JUDGES FOR FIFTH CIRCUIT

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the appointment of four additional circuit judges for the Fifth Circuit on a temporary basis (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

TEMPORARY ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting temporary admission into the United States of certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN DEFECTOR ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting admission into the United States of certain defector aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF CERTAIN LAWS RELATING TO CLOSING OF AFFAIRS OF A PRESIDENT WHO DIES IN OFFICE

A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend certain laws in order to make adequate provision for an office staff and necessary services to wind up the affairs of a President who dies in office or of a former President after his death (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORT ON SCIENTIFIC AND PROFESSIONAL POSITIONS

A letter from the Director, U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on scientific and professional positions, for the calendar year 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORT ON POSITIONS IN GRADES GS–16, GS–17, AND GS–18

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on positions in grades GS–16, GS–17, and GS–18, for the calendar year 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REVISED ESTIMATE OF COMPLETING NATIONAL SYSTEM OF INTERSTATE AND DEFENSE HIGHWAYS

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a revised estimate of the cost of completing the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Works.

AMENDMENT OF ACT RELATING TO CERTAIN FACILITIES FOR ENFORCEMENT OF CUSTOMS AND IMMIGRATION LAWS

A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act entitled "An act to provide better facilities for the enforcement of the customs and immigration laws," to extend construction authority for facilities at Guam and the Virgin Islands of the United States (76 Stat. 87; 19 U.S.C. 68) (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Works.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

PETITION

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the Constitution Island Association of the State of New York, relating to the preservation and conservation of the Nation's natural resources, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPUBLICAN MEMBERSHIP ON THE STANDING COMMITTEES AND THE SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE OF THE SENATE OF THE 89TH CONGRESS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I submit a resolution, which I send to the desk. I ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the resolution, as follows:

S. RES. 27

Resolved, That the following shall constitute the minority party's membership on the standing committees and the Small Business Committee of the Senate for Eighty-ninth Congress:

On Aeronautical and Space Sciences, 16 (ratio 11–5): Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Hickenlooper, Curtis, Jordan of Idaho, Aiken.

On Agriculture and Forestry, 15 (ratio 10–5): Messrs. Aiken, Young, Cooper, Boggs, Miller.

On Appropriations, 27 (ratio 18–9): Messrs. Saltonstall, Young, Mundt, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Kuchel, Hruska, Allott, Cotton, Case.

On Armed Services, 17 (ratio 12–5): Mr. Saltonstall, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Thurmond, Miller, Tower.

On Banking and Currency, 14 (ratio 10–4): Messrs. Bennett, Tower, Thurmond, Hickenlooper.

On Commerce, 18 (ratio 12–6): Messrs. Cotton, Morton, Scott, Prouty, Pearson, Dominick.

On District of Columbia, 7 (ratio 5–2): Messrs. Prouty, Dominick.

On Finance, 17 (ratio 11–6): Messrs. Williams of Delaware, Carlson, Bennett, Curtis, Morton, Dirksen.

On Foreign Relations, 19 (ratio 13–6): Messrs. Hickenlooper, Aiken, Carlson, Williams of Delaware, Mundt, Case.

On Government Operations, 14 (ratio 10–4): Messrs. Mundt, Curtis, Javits, Simpson.

On Interior and Insular Affairs, 16 (ratio 11–5): Messrs. Kuchel, Allott, Jordan of Idaho, Simpson, Fannin.

On the Judiciary, 16 (ratio 11–5): Messrs. Dirksen, Hruska, Fong, Scott, Javits.

On Labor and Public Welfare, 16 (ratio 11–5): Messrs, Javits, Prouty, Dominick, Murphy, Fannin.

On Post Office and Civil Service, 12, ratio 8–4): Messrs. Carlson, Fong, Boggs, Simpson.

On Public Works, 17 (ratio 12–5): Messrs. Cooper, Fong, Boggs, Pearson, Murphy.

On Rules and Administration, 9 (ratio 6–3): Messrs. Curtis, Cooper, Scott.

Select Committee on Small Business: Saltonstall, Javits, Cooper, Scott, Prouty, Cotton.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

REPORT ON PROBLEM OF AIR POLLUTION (S. DOC. NO. 7)

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I present a letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a report on the problem of air pollution caused by motor vehicles and measures taken toward its alleviation, dated December 17, 1964, together with an accompanying report, in compliance with Public Law 88–206, the Clean Air Act.

I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed as a Senate document and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. McNAMARA, from the Committee on Public Works:

S. Res. 11. Resolution to provide additional funds for the Committee on Public Works; without admendment (Rept. No. 5); which resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

STUDY OF FOREIGN POLICY—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, I report an original resolution authorizing the Committee on Foreign Relations to examine and study the foreign policies of the United States, and I submit a report (No. 4) thereon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be received and printed, and, under the rule, the resolution will be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The resolution (S. Res. 28) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Relations, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make complete studies of any and all matters pertaining to the foreign policies of the United States and their administration.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee from February 1, 1965, to January 31, 1966, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures; (2) to employ, upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; (3) to hold such hearings, to take such testimony, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate, and to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents; and (4) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government, as the committee deems advisable.

SEC. 3. In the conduct of its studies the committe may use the experience, knowledge, and advice of private organizations, schools, institutions, and individuals in its discretion, and it is authorized to divide the work of the studies among such individuals, groups, and institutions as it may deem appropriate and may enter into contracts for this purpose.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $135,000 for the period ending January 31, 1966, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

FOURTEENTH ANNUAL REPORT OF ACTIVITIES OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON DEFENSE PRODUCTION

Mr. ROBERTSON, from the Joint Committee on Defense Production, submitted the 14th annual report of that committee, with material on mobilization from departments and agencies, which had been ordered to be printed as a House document.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana, from the Committee on Finance:

Sheldon S. Cohen, of Maryland, to be Commissioner of Internal Revenue, vice Mortimer M. Caplin, resigned;

Mitchell Rogovin, of Virginia, to be an Assistant General Counsel in the Department of the Treasury (Chief Counsel for the Internal Revenue Service), vice Sheldon S. Cohen;

Frederick Lewis Deming, of Minnesota, to be Under Secretary of the Treasury for Monetary Affairs, vice Robert V. Roosa, resigned; and

W. J. Driver, of Virginia, to be Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

S. 470. A bill for the relief of Constantinos N. Geranios (Konstantinos N. Geranios), his wife, Dionyssiak Nicholaou (Mouzaki) Geranios, and their children, Nicholas K. Geranios and Demitre K. Geranios;

S. 471. A bill for the relief of Cedomir Capic;

S. 472. A bill for the relief of Hallam E. Weed;

S. 473. A bill for the relief of Liliana Grasseschi Baroni; and

S. 474. A bill for the relief of Robert C. Lindstrom; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANSFIELD (for himself and Mr. Metcalf):

S. 475. A bill to permit a State to increase the mileage of its Federal aid primary system when provision is made for the completion and maintenance of 75 percent thereof; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MANSFIELD (for himself, Mr. Metcalf, and Mr. McGee):

S. 476. A bill to amend the act approved March 18, 1950, providing for the construction of airports in or in close proximity to national parks, national monuments, and national recreation areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 477. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit employers to withhold for 1964 and 1965 income tax not withheld currently from the wages of their employees, and to treat the amounts so withheld as having been paid by such employees on the dates on which returns are filed for such years; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Dirksen when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DIRKSEN (by request):

S. 478. A bill for the relief of Erman-Howell Division, Luria Steel & Trading Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIRKSEN (for himself and Mr. Douglas):

S. 479. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture to make a preliminary survey of the proposed George Rogers Clark Recreation Way within and adjacent to the Shawnee National Forest in the State of Illinois; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. RIBICOFF:

S. 480. A bill for the relief of Vincenzo A. Castaldo;

S. 481. A bill for the relief of Winnifred Evadne Newman;

S. 482. A bill for the relief of Miss Marie Arcache and Miss Verdun Arcache;

S. 483. A bill for the relief of Dr. Teofilo G. Gutierrez, Jr.;

S. 484. A bill for the relief of Antonios Giannopoulos;

S. 485. A bill for the relief of Dr. Florencio A. Hipona;

S. 486. A bill for the relief of Dr. Duck Sang Cheung; and

S. 487. A bill for the relief of Luciano N. Catale; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 488. A bill to amend title V of the Social Security Act to assist States and communities to establish programs for the identification, care, and treatment of children who are or are in danger of becoming emotionally disturbed; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Ribicoff when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JACKSON (for himself and Mr. Magnuson):

S. 489. A bill to authorize the establishment of the Pig War National Historical Park in the State of Washington, and for other purposes; and

S. 490. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Manson unit, Chelan division, Chief Joseph Dam project, Washington, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. METCALF (for himself, Mr. McGee, Mr. Mansfield, and Mr. Simpson):

S. 491. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Bighorn Canyon National Recreation Area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KUCHEL (for himself and Mr. Murphy):

S. 492. A bill to revitalize the mint at San Francisco; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. AIKEN (for himself and Mr. Mansfield):

S. 493. A bill to assist in the development of adequate rural water systems; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. Aiken when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CURTIS:

S. 494. A bill to provide for the increased use of agricultural products for industrial purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

S. 495. A bill for the relief of Catherine Lochart; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT:

S. 496. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims of Arlene Coats, a partnership consisting of Sidney Berkenfeld and Benjamin Prepon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 497. A bill to establish in the Executive Office of the President an Office of Community Development; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. Scott when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. FONG:

S. 498. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to permit child's insurance benefits to continue after age 18 in the case of certain children who are full-time students after attaining such age; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BIBLE (for himself and Mr. Cannon):

S. 499. A bill to establish the Great Basin National Park in Nevada, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Bible when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HART (for himself, Mr. Clark, Mr. Kennedy of Massachusetts, Mr. Dodd, Mr. Williams of New Jersey, Mr. Kennedy of New York, Mr. Bayh, Mr. Case, Mr. Douglas, Mr. Fong, Mr. Gruening, Mr. Hartke, Mr. Inouye, Mr. Javits, Mr. Kuchel, Mr. Lausche, Mr. Long of Missouri, Mr. McCarthy, Mr. Moss, Mr. Muskie, Mrs. Neuberger, Mr. Pastore, Mr. Pell, Mr. Proxmire, Mr. Ribicoff, Mr. Scott, and Mr. Young of Ohio):

S. 500. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Hart when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CASE:

S. 501. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code to increase the total mileage of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. Case when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota:

S. 502. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to exempt from tax musical instruments sold to students for school use; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. LAUSCHE:

S. 503. A bill to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, to make more specific the purpose for which loans may be made under section 2 and 4 of such act, and to modify the provisions relating to interest rates on loans made under such act; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. Lausche when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McGOVERN:

S. 504. A bill for the relief of Dr. Paulita T. Sikat; and

S. 505. A bill for the relief of Darlyne Marie Cecile Fisher Every; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 506. A bill to permit local expenditures made in connection with a certain sewer project in Jasper, Ala., to be counted as a local grant-in-aid under title I of the Housing Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself and Mr. Gruening):

S. 507. A bill to authorize the Veterans' Administration to extend aid on account of defects in properties purchased with financing assistance under chapter 37, title 38, United States Code; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HILL:

S. 508. A bill to authorize mortgage insurance and loans to help finance the cost of constructing and equipping facilities for the group practice of medicine or dentistry;

S. 509. A bill to authorize a 3-year program of grants for construction of veterinary medical education facilities, and for other purposes;

S. 510. A bill to extend and otherwise amend certain expiring provisions of the Public Health Service Act relating to community health services, and for other purposes;

S. 511. A bill to increase the authorization of appropriations for the support of the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory;

S. 512. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act provisions for construction of health research facilities by extending the expiration date thereof and providing increased support for the program, to authorize additional Assistant Secretaries in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and for other purposes; and

S. 513. A bill to authorize assistance in meeting the initial cost of professional and technical personnel for comprehensive community mental health centers; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. HARTKE:

S. 514. A bill for the relief of Terez Zackarian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MUSKIE (for himself, Mrs. Smith, Mr. Aiken, Mr. Kennedy of Massachusetts, Mr. McIntyre, Mr. Pell, Mr. Prouty, and Mr. Dodd):

S. 515. A bill to authorize the international Passamaquoddy tidal power project, including hydroelectric power development of the upper St. John River, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. Muskie when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SMATHERS (for himself and Mr. Holland):

S. 516. A bill to amend the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to establish the St. Augustine Quadricentennial Commission, and for other purposes," approved August 14, 1962 (76 Stat. 386), to provide that eight members of such Commission shall be appointed by the President, to provide that such Commission shall not terminate prior to December 31, 1966, and to authorize appropriations for carrying out the provisions of such joint resolution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 517. A bill for the relief of John William Daugherty, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 518. A bill for the relief of Joana K. Georgoulia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG of Ohio:

S. 519. A bill to direct the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to cause certain demonstration and research projects to be carried out to determine the economic feasibility of providing urban mass transportation service to elderly persons during non-rush-hour periods at reduced fares; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. Young of Ohio when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself, Mr. Allott, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Boggs, Mr. Carlson, Mr. Case, Mr. Cooper, Mr. Curtis, Mr. Dirksen, Mr. Dominick, Mr. Fannin, Mr. Fong, Mr. Hickenlooper, Mr. Hruska, Mr. Javits, Mr. Jordan of Idaho, Mr. Kuchel, Mr. Miller, Mr. Morton, Mr. Mundt, Mr. Pearson, Mr. Prouty, Mr. Simpson, Mr. Thurmond, Mr. Tower, and Mr. Young of North Dakota):

S. 520. A bill to authorize wartime benefits under certain circumstances for peacetime veterans and their dependents; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Saltonstall when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. FANNIN:

S. 521. A bill for the relief of Maria Gioconda Femia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLENDER:

S. 522. A bill to amend the Federal Farm Loan Act and the Farm Credit Act of 1933 to provide means for expediting the retirement of Government capital in the Federal intermediate credit banks, including an increase in the debt permitted such banks in relation to their capital and provisions for the production credit associations to acquire additional capital stock therein, to provide for allocating certain earnings of such banks and associations to their users, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

(See the remarks of Mr. Ellender when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BURDICK:

S. 523. A bill to provide for the entry free of duty of articles donated by Canadian residents to the International Peace Garden, Dunseith, N. Dak.; and

S. 524. A bill to extend the period for filing proof of support by certain dependents of insured workers; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 525. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to promote the welfare of the Indian tribes by making available to them surplus personal property; to the Committee on Government Operations.

S. 526. A bill to amend the authorization to appropriate money for the maintenance and operation of three experimental stations of the Department of the Interior, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 527. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code with respect to crimes in Indian country; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

S. 528. A bill to amend section 2104 of title 38, United States Code, to extend the time for filing certain claims for mustering-out payments; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 529. A bill to amend chapter 31 of title 38, United States Code, to extend to all totally disabled veterans the same liberalization of time limits for pursuing vocational rehabilitation training as was authorized for blinded veterans by Public Law 87-591, and to clarify the language of the law relating to the limiting of periods for pursuing such training; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Yarborough when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. BURDICK (for himself and Mr. Metcalf):

S. 530. A bill to amend sections 9 and 40 of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, as amended; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina:

S. 531. A bill for the relief of Hung-Tse Chien; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGEE:

S. 532. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth Anne Paul; and

S. 533. A bill for the relief of Teruko Sasaki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THURMOND:

S. 534. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to withdraw from courts of the United States jurisdiction with respect to State legislative apportionment proceedings;

S. 535. A bill to provide for a jury trial in all cases of criminal contempt in the U.S. courts;

S. 536. A bill to amend the provisions of the United States Code with respect to the jurisdiction of courts of appeals of the United States to review orders of administrative officers and agencies, and for other purposes; and

S. 537. A bill to amend title I of the Internal Security Act of 1950; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 538. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a 20-percent credit against the individual income tax for certain educational expenses incurred at an institution of higher education; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 539. A bill to equalize the treatment of Reserves and Regulars in the payment of per diem; and

S. 540. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to change the method of computing retired pay of certain enlisted members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 541. A bill to permit a taxpayer carrying on a trade or business in the conduct of which 10 or less persons are engaged to elect to take a standard deduction, in lieu of itemized deductions, for expenses attributable to such trade or business;

S. 542. A bill to repeal the Federal excise taxes on alcohol and tobacco;

S. 543. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to remove the limitations on the deductibility of medical expenses for the care of dependents who have attained the age of 65; and

S. 544. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase to $1,800 the annual amount individuals are permitted to earn without suffering deductions from the insurance benefits payable to them under such title; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 545. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to eliminate the provisions which reduce the annuities of the spouses of retired employees by the amount of certain monthly benefits payable under title II of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 546. A bill to provide increased punishment for a person convicted in the District of Columbia of a fourth or subsequent felony; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(See the remarks of Mr. Thurmond when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mrs. NEUBERGER:

S. 547. A bill to confer upon the Federal Trade Commission the power and duty to regulate the advertising and labeling of cigarettes; to the Committee on Commerce.

S. 548. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, to provide for the recomputation of annuities of certain retired employees who elected reduced annuities at the time of retirement in order to provide survivor annuities for their spouses, and for the recomputation of survivor annuities for the surviving spouses of certain former employees who died in service or after retirement; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mrs. Neuberger when she introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mrs. NEUBERGER (for herself, Mr. Morse, and Mr. Church):

S. 549. A bill to amend section 8c(2) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, so as to permit marketing orders issued under such section to be applicable to canned and frozen onions; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mrs. Neuberger when she introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SCOTT:

S. 550. A bill for the relief of Patrick Anthony Linnane; and

S. 551. A bill for the relief of Richard Bing-Yin Lam; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 552. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the U.S. Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Eugene E. Laird; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIMPSON:

S. 553. A bill to consent to the upper Niobrara River compact between the States of Wyoming and Nebraska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SIMPSON (for himself and Mr. McGee):

S. 554. A bill authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain property to the city of Cheyenne, Wyo.; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Simpson when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. DODD:

S. 555. A bill for the relief of Antonio Palmieri; and

S. 556. A bill for the relief of Angel D. Cortes, his wife, Concepcion Marti Cortes, and their children, Maria de los Angeles Cortes, Juan Francisco Cortes, and Avelina Cortes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FONG:

S. 557. A bill for the relief of Felomina C. Blanco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Kuchel, Mrs. Neuberger, and Mr. Hartke):

S. 558. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to carry out certain programs to develop and expand foreign markets for U.S. products, and to provide more effectively for assistance in the financing of certain foreign sales which are affected with the national interest; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Magnuson when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself, Mr. Moss, and Mr. Clark):

S. 559. A bill to regulate the labeling of cigarettes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Magnuson when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MUSKIE (for himself, Mr. Bartlett, Mr. Bayh, Mr. Boggs, Mr. Brewster, Mr. Fong, Mr. Gruening, Mr. Kennedy of Massachusetts, Mr. Miller, Mr. Monroney, Mr. Pearson, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Ribicoff, and Mr. Williams of New Jersey):

S. 560. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, and the Clean Air Act, as amended, to provide for improved cooperation by Federal agencies to control water and air pollution from Federal installations and facilities and to control automotive vehicle air pollution; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. Muskie when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MUSKIE:

S. 561. A bill to achieve the fullest cooperation and coordination of activities between the levels of government in order to improve the operation of our Federal system in an increasingly complex society, to improve the administration of grants-in-aid to the States, to provide for periodic congressional review of Federal grants-in-aid, to permit provision of reimbursable technical services to State and local governments, to establish coordinated intergovernmental policy and administration of grants and loans for urban development, to provide for the acquisition, use, and disposition of land within urban areas by Federal agencies in conformity with local government programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. Muskie when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BARTLETT (for himself, Mr. Gruening, Mr. Inouye, and Mr. Fong):

S. 562. A bill to amend section 601 of title 38, United States Code, with respect to the definition of the term "Veterans' Administration facilities"; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Bartlett when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MOSS:

S. 563. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Army to convey certain lands to the State of Utah; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. Moss when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. THURMOND:

S.J. Res. 21. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the establishment of a Court of the Union;

S.J. Res. 22. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the process of amending the Constitution;

S.J. Res. 23. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to religion in the United States;

S.J. Res. 24. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the balancing of the budget; and

S.J. Res. 25. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to provide for the succession of the Vice President to the office of President, and for the selection of a new Vice President whenever there is a vacancy in the office of Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S.J. Res. 26. Joint resolution expressing declaration of will of the American people and purpose of their Government to achieve complete victory over the forces of the world Communist movement; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. Thurmond when he introduced the above joint resolutions, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BURDICK:

S.J. Res. 27. A joint resolution providing for the establishment of annual National Farmers Weeks; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S.J. Res. 28. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution relating to the nomination and election of candidates for President and Vice President, and to succession to the office of President in the event of the death or inability of the President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Smathers when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS

WORLD'S FAIR IN CHICAGO IN 1976

Mr. DIRKSEN (for himself and Mr. Douglas) submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 7); which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

Whereas the United States of America will commemorate the two hundredth anniversary of its independence in the year 1976; and

Whereas it is appropriate that there be held a world's fair in the United States of America dedicated to the memory of the historic events that culminated in the signing of the Declaration of Independence in the year 1776; and

Whereas the President of the United States has declared that there will be held a gigantic world's fair in the United States in the year 1976 to celebrate the two centuries of independence of this Nation; and

Whereas the first city in the United States to commence planning for a gigantic world's fair to be held in the year 1976 to commemorate the two hundredth anniversary of the independence of this Nation was the city of Chicago where such planning was commenced in the year 1954 through a group of public spirited citizens residing in the State of Illinois and which group constituted the "Committee of '76"; and

Whereas the city of Chicago, located in the geographic heart of the United States, is the proper place to observe and celebrate this epic and historic event, since the transportation facilities, the housing facilities and restaurant accommodations of the city of Chicago are unsurpassed anywhere in the world and since the city of Chicago has a record of sponsoring successful world's fairs, such as the Columbian Exposition in 1893 and the Century of Progress in 1933; and since by 1976 the city of Chicago will not have sponsored a world's fair for more than forty years; and

Whereas the citizens of the city of Chicago, the mayor of the city of Chicago, the president of the board of commissioners of Cook County, and the Governor of the State of Illinois, and the Legislature of the State of Illinois have gone on record encouraging and promoting the holding of a world's fair in Chicago in the year 1976, and responsible and important planning has already taken place toward the objective of holding such a world's fair in Chicago in 1976: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the two Houses view with great favor and encouragement the activities of the Chicago citizens of the "Committee of '76" in their efforts to plan a world's fair in Chicago in the year 1976 to commemorate the two hundredth anniversary of the independence of the United States of America.

MEMORIAL TO SAKAKAWEA

Mr. BURDICK submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 8); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Whereas the Sakakawea Council of the Girl Scouts of America, on the seventeenth day of April 1964, at Bismarck, North Dakota, adopted the following resolution:

Whereas we, the Sakakawea Council of the Scouts of America, on the seventeenth day of April 1964, at Bismarck, North Dakota, Girl Scouts of America, residing in Bismarck, the capital city of North Dakota, recognize, appreciate, and honor the name and the memory of Sakakawea and her works, and salute her as the Nation's first Girl Scout; and

Whereas the Shoshone Indian girl became the guide and scout for the greatest land exploration in our Nation's history, the Lewis and Clark Expedition; and

Whereas Sakakawea joined the expedition in 1804 at a point near Bismarck, North Dakota, to spend twenty months traveling over rugged terrain extending from the Missouri River to the Pacific Ocean; and

Whereas this intrepid girl, with a newborn baby strapped to her back, facing hunger, danger, and the adversities of weather, led the expedition through Indian territory and uncharted areas; and

Whereas Sakakawea is a symbol of devotion to duty and country and an inspiration to the Girl Scouts of America: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Sakakawea Council of the Girl Scouts of America, consider and determine that proper respect, honor, and appreciation be symbolized through the erection of a fitting monument to her to be located in or near Bismarck, North Dakota, the place where she joined the history-making expedition; and it is further

Resolved, That the city of Bismarck, county of Burleigh, State of North Dakota, and the United States of America be and are hereby memorialized to assist in the perpetuation of the memory of Sakakawea.

This resolution was adopted on the seventeenth day of April 1964, by the Sakakawea Council of the Girl Scouts of America, in the city of Bismarck, North Dakota; and

Whereas recognition of Sakakawea, the first Girl Scout of America, as requested by the Sakakawea Chapter of the Girl Scouts of America, should be extended by the Congress of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States hereby recognize the part played by Sakakawea in the expansion of the United States westward, and hereby commends and encourages all efforts of the people of the United States to build a fitting memorial to the memory of Sakakawea, at an appropriate site near the place where she joined the Lewis and Clark Expedition.

RESOLUTIONS

REPUBLICAN MEMBERSHIP ON STANDING COMMITTEES

Mr. DIRKSEN submitted a resolution (S. Res. 27) relating to Republican membership on Senate committees, which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. DIRKSEN, which appears under a separate heading.)

STUDY OF FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 28) authorizing the Committee on Foreign Relations to examine and study the foreign policies of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. FULBRIGHT, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

TO PRINT THE COMPILATION ENTITLED "MINERAL POTENTIAL OF EASTERN MONTANA—A BASIS FOR FUTURE GROWTH" AS A SENATE DOCUMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 29); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That there be printed with illustrations as a Senate document the compilation entitled "Mineral Potential of Eastern Montana—A Basis for Future Growth", prepared by the Geological Survey and the Bureau of Mines, United States Department of the Interior, at the request of Senator MIKE MANSFIELD.

SEC. 2. There shall be printed 1,300 additional copies of such document for the use of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE RELATING TO THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. PROUTY submitted a resolution (S. Res. 30) to amend the Standing Rules of the Senate relative to the Select Committee on Small Business, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. PROUTY, which appears under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT OF RULE XVI RELATIVE TO AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS

Mr. THURMOND submitted a resolution (S. Res. 31) to amend rule XVI relative to amendments to appropriation bills, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. THURMOND, which appears under a separate heading.)

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself and Mr. SALTONSTALL) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 32); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the Select Committee on Small Business, in carrying out the duties imposed upon it by S. Res. 58, Eighty-first Congress, agreed to February 20, 1950, and S. Res. 272, Eighty-first Congress, agreed to May 26, 1950, is authorized to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of the problems of American small and independent business and to make recommendations concerning those problems to the appropriate legislative committees of the Senate.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, from February 1, 1965, to January 31, 1966, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ, upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $140,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

TO PRINT AS A SENATE DOCUMENT A REPORT ON STATUS OF COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT AND PARTICIPATING PROJECTS

Mr. ANDERSON submitted a resolution (S. Res. 33) to print as a Senate document a report on status of Colorado River storage project and participating projects, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. ANDERSON, which appears under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT OF RULE XXV, RELATING TO STANDING COMMITTEES

Mr. BURDICK submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 34); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate (relating to standing committees) is amended by—

(1) striking out subparagraphs 10 through 13 in paragraph (h) of section (1);

(2) striking out subparagraphs 16 through 19 in paragraph (l) of section (1); and

(3) inserting in section (1) after paragraph (p) the following new paragraph:

"(q) Committee on Veterans Affairs, to consist of nine Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:

"1. Veterans' measures, generally.

"2. Pensions of all the wars of the United States, general and special.

"3. Life insurance issued by the Government on account of service in the Armed Forces.

"4. Compensation of veterans.

"5. Vocational rehabilitation and education of veterans.

"6. Veterans' hospitals, medical care and treatment of veterans.

"7. Soldiers' and sailors' civil relief.

"8. Readjustment of servicemen to civil life."

SEC. 2. Section 4 of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by striking out "and Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences" and inserting in lieu thereof "Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences; and Committee on Veterans' Affairs."

SEC. 3. Section 6(a) of rule XVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate (relating to the designation of ex officio members of the Committee on Appropriations), is amended by adding at the end of the tabulation contained therein the following new item:

"Committee on Veterans' Affairs—For the Veterans' Administration."

SEC. 4. The Committee on Veterans' Affairs shall as promptly as feasible after its appointment and organization confer with the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare for the purpose of determining what disposition should be made of proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters theretofore referred to the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare during the Eighty-ninth Congress which are within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF RULE VII TO PERMIT MORNING BUSINESS STATEMENTS OR COMMENTS FOR 3 MINUTES

Mr. CHURCH (for himself, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. CLARK, and Mr. RANDOLPH) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 35) to amend rule VII to permit morning business statements or comments for 3 minutes, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. CHURCH, which appears under a separate heading.)

REVISION OF WITHHOLDING RATE ON INCOME TAX

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, when the Congress enacted the Revenue Act of 1964, the withholding rate was set at 14 percent. This action on the withholding rate which was taken at the urging of the administration, will create considerable widespread hardship on April 15 of this year, simply because the amount withheld by a 14-percent rate will not be sufficient to meet the taxes due by the taxpayer. As a result many taxpayers—in fact I suspect it will run into several million—will find that they owe taxes in addition to what has been withheld, an obligation, I might add, that was not the result of any mistake on their part but rather the result of too low a withholding rate.

Initially, the proposal was to have a 15-percent withholding rate for the first year and then to shift to a 14-percent withholding rate for the taxable year 1965. But as an article from the Evening Star of January 6, 1965, indicates:

> Since about 2 months of 1964 had gone by before the tax cut bill was passed, the withholding rate was set at 14 percent—the rate originally planned for 1965—instead of 15 percent. The administration wanted to deliver the full economic impact in 1964 as a pep-up pill for business.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire article be reproduced in full at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I do not believe that we should inflict a hardship upon some taxpayers simply because a benefit was to be provided for someone else.

In order to provide some relief from this hardship, I send to the desk a bill which will permit the taxpayer to authorize his employer to withhold an additional amount each month after the date he files his tax return, which amount will be applied to any tax deficiency. For the purpose of avoiding very minor accounts my proposed legislation would affect only taxpayers with a deficiency in excess of $50. The employer could withhold one-twelfth of the amount due each month for the succeeding 12 months. This additional withholding would be turned over to the Treasury to be credited to the deficiency of the taxpayer. I would visualize that a simple form could be prepared by Treasury which the employee could sign to authorize the employer to deduct this amount for the taxpayer.

Since the deficiency that will confront the taxpayer arises through no fault of his but rather from action by Congress, it is my feeling that penalties which would normally be applied to delinquent payments should be waived in this instance. This relief which I propose would only be granted for the taxable years 1964 and 1965.

I realize that we cannot initiate action on this measure in this body and that it must originate in the other body. However, I do want to place my colleagues on notice that I will offer this bill as an amendment to the first available legislation that comes from the House of Representatives.

In order to correct this condition which will continue to persist to a certain degree among taxpayers in the higher brackets I will shortly offer legislation which will provide for a progressive rate of withholding. I have requested the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue on Taxation to study this matter and to prepare such legislation. As soon as they have completed their efforts, I will introduce it in the Senate and will also offer it as an amendment to a proper House-passed measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 477) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit employers to withhold for 1964 and 1965 income tax not withheld currently from the wages of their employees, and to treat the amounts so withheld as having been paid by such employees on the dates on which returns are filed for such years, introduced by Mr. DIRKSEN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Jan. 6, 1965]

WITHHOLDING TAX RATE STILL SHORT OF LIABILITY

The second stage of tax reduction which took effect January 1 will bring withholding taxes in closer alinement with actual tax liability—but it will not solve a problem of underpayment for many middle and high bracket taxpayers.

Some administration officials have proposed a two-step withholding rate, including a higher rate for the middle and upper salary brackets.

An Internal Revenue Service official said he does not know whether the two-step plan is still under consideration. It would require action by Congress.

The net amount owed the Government this spring will be an estimated $1 to $2 billion higher because of underwithholding last year. In other words, refunds will be lower or tax bills higher by that amount. Many taxpayers simply will get lower refunds.

Refunds totaled more than $5 billion last year.

The disparity between the amounts withheld and the tax liabilities is due to the timing of the withholding rate. The tax cut was in two stages—one cut on 1964 income and a still lower rate for 1965 income.

Since about 2 months of 1964 had gone by before the tax-cut bill was passed, the withholding rate was set at 14 percent—the rate originally planned for 1965—instead of 15 percent. The administration wanted to deliver the full economic impact in 1964 as a pep-up pill for business.

The withholding rate on wages and salaries remains at 14 percent but tax liability has gone down slightly.

Even before the tax cut, there was little chance that a taxpayer's withholding would match his tax.

The IRS has suggested that taxpayers who want to avoid being stuck with a big bill in the spring of 1966 should claim one less dependent on withholding (while still listing the dependent on the tax return, of course). Or, if he can get his employer's cooperation, he may arrange for an extra amount to be taken out above the required withholding.

HELP FOR EMOTIONALLY DISTURBED CHILDREN

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, the report of the Warren Commission turned the clock back to the terrible day of November 22, 1963. On that evil day, we lost a great President, a beloved friend, and a young world leader who lifted the sights of men of good will everywhere.

The facts are now in—and from a most distinguished and unimpeachable source. The Warren Commission report detailed what happened. But the report does more than look to the past. It has meaning for the future as well. One portion of this sad story can have much meaning for the thousands of boys and girls who fall victim to the sort of serious emotional disturbance that warped the mind of Lee Harvey Oswald when he was young and helped lead to one of the great tragedies of history.

I think that from the history of Lee Oswald—from his record of mental disturbance, of near-treatment and nontreatment—we can draw some significant conclusions. We, the Members of the U.S. Congress, can act on these conclusions. And we can do so in a way which would have truly pleased the practical and constructive mind of John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

We can state these conclusions briefly. Lee Harvey Oswald, an unhappy child in a badly deranged home, grew up as a most disturbed youngster. Defiant, lost, alone, the victim of many failures, his inner anguish sometimes poured out and gave foreboding signs.

This was especially true during his brief stay in New York—a city with many "helping" agencies. Taunted while he was at junior high school, the 13-year-old preferred to sit in the apartment he shared with his mother and watch television. His persistent truancy finally brought him to Youth House—an institution in which children are kept for psychiatric observation or for detention pending court appearance or commitment to a child-caring or custodial institution like a training school.

Here he stayed for a month in 1953, and was examined by various professional personnel. They found no neurological impairment or psychotic changes, but made this diagnosis:

> Personality pattern disturbance with schizoid features and passive-aggressive tendencies.

At 13, Lee Oswald was found to be a child of more than average intelligence, detached, and withdrawn with serious "environmental problems."

Contrary to reports published immediately after the assassination, it was not officially recommended that Lee be institutionalized. Dr. Renatus Hartogs, chief psychologist of Youth House, felt that Oswald should be placed on probation on condition that he seek help and guidance through a child guidance clinic. There, he suggested Lee should be treated by a man—a psychiatrist who could substitute as a father figure. He also recommended psychotherapy for Mrs. Oswald. Commitment was to be considered only if the probation plan was not successful.

It was not.

> Few social agencies even in New York were equipped to provide the kind of intensive treatment that he needed—

The Warren Commission observed—

> and when one of the city's clinics did find room to handle him, for some reason the record does not show, advantage was never taken of the chance afforded to Oswald.

Would the story have had a different ending if Oswald and his mother had taken advantage of his chance; or if the city's institutions had reached out more effectively to guide them toward a solution of their problems? One cannot say precisely. As John Carro—Lee's probation officer—put it, at the time of the assassination:

> He had a lot to overcome, but he was not that far gone that he couldn't be helped. Some cases can be arrested, while others can't, no matter how much you put into them. He was only 13, though. He had youth on his side.

But, as it turned out, little else. The boy returned to school in the fall of 1953. He became a disciplinary problem—his mother failed to cooperate with school authorities—placement in a boy's home was finally considered—placement was postponed, perhaps because Lee's behavior improved. Before the Bronx Children's Court took any action, the Oswalds left New York.

We all know the rest of the sorry story. Oswald finished the ninth grade in New Orleans, left school to work for a year, then joined the marines. But even had society stepped in to help him as a young adult, it might not have been able to accomplish much; it might have been too late to uproot the seeds of his disturbance which were sown in his childhood years.

Experts estimate that there are about 500,000 children in our Nation suffering from evident or borderline psychosis. Certainly not all these 500,000 children can be labeled as potential Lee Oswalds. But certainly, too, thousands of them harbor potential for harm to themselves, and to society.

Of these 500,000 suffering children, only 10,000 are known to be under some sort of treatment. This means that only 2 percent of the children who need treatment are getting it. Conversely, we are letting 98 percent of this group slip through our society's fingers, condemning them to lives of futility and anguish and society to nameless perils.

We know that psychiatry is an infant discipline. Our doctors have much to learn about the workings of the human mind. But they have made progress, and they do have tools available. Surely these tools should be used by a modern nation on the behalf of its children who, for good or evil, are tomorrow's adult citizens.

These tools are not being fully used today. The facts are clear. For example:

A Los Angeles County study in 1958 showed that over 2 percent of more than 532,000 schoolchildren were severely disturbed. The same study reported that in 1955, Los Angeles County had 1,192 cases of emotionally disturbed delinquents under the age of 18 who were processed through the juvenile hall clinic, that this number represented only about one-third of the 3,500 children under the jurisdiction of the probation department during 1955 who were facing emotional problems and this number appeared to be increasing rather than diminishing. What is more, over 9 percent of the children in the process of foster home placement by the division of child welfare services were disturbed children and more than 45 percent of these were preschool or elementary school children.

In New York City, the health department estimates that about 20 percent of all children of school age are in need of guidance services and that many such children could be identified, if not prior to school, on the first routine health appraisal on admission to school.

In the District of Columbia, the case records of 60 children were studied to ascertain whether in those cases of early onset of the problem, prevention was possible. For the group of 60 cases, the time of the onset was the preschool period in 32, kindergarten in 20, the first grade 5, and the second grade 3. Thus, in 57 of the 60 children 5 to 17 years of age, the problem had been noted in the preschool, kindergarten or first grade period. The school records indicated the persistence of these problems in the same children, year after year from the early grades.

Studies of adolescents at the adolescent clinic at the University of Washington School of Medicine referred with health and school adjustment problems showed that the onset of the school adjustment problem was noted as early as the first grade for the majority of problems. The neglect of the basic problems over the years had resulted in impaired health and physical status in a significant number of these cases.

An article in the Journal of the American Public Health Association, November 1959, reports the general availability or lack of it of treatment services for disturbed children throughout the country. This report by a school psychiatric diagnostic and counseling clinic, staffed by a part-time psychiatrist and a full-time social worker showed that psychiatric therapy was recommended in 60 percent of the cases and referral to a social agency for another 20 percent. These recommendations could be carried out for less than 10 percent of the children because of limited resources in the community.

In 1959, National Institute of Mental Health studies show, 208,000 children under 18 years of age were seen in psychiatric outpatient clinics alone; of these, 86,000 were under 9 years of age. This is the picture we get from studies from reporting clinics only. Two-thirds of the children diagnosed as needing treatment left the clinic before treatment was started. Further, pediatricians estimate that only 40 percent of the parents of children in need accept pediatric referral for psychiatric and guidance clinic services and only about one-third of these return for help after the first contact. This information can only intimate the large number of seriously maladjusted children who were not referred to clinics because they were not available, or who, through lack of referral or failure to comply with referral, were not seen at a clinic.

Experience seems to show, then, that we have many disturbed children—as many as 10 to 15 percent of all our children. We also have services to offer these children. If these services are given to children with emotional problems at an early stage, the probability is that they can be helped.

But there are many obstacles: high costs, shortages of trained personnel, scattered and scanty services—and lack of continuity of treatment—to name just a few. What is needed is an all-out effort to help the child who, like Lee Oswald in the early 1950's, is in need of help but is not receiving it. What is needed is the development and expansion of community services—so they will be both more comprehensive and more accessible.

This means community-based treatment centers wherever they are wanted and needed for children in danger of becoming emotionally disturbed. It means treatment centers familiar to the citizens of their communities—where schools, social agencies, health departments, courts, and families can easily refer a child for diagnosis, treatment and followup.

If such a center already exists in a town or city, it could be used, and if necessary expanded. If not, it could be developed until it was able to assume responsibility to see that all necessary services were provided. If it could not provide such services itself, it would still accept responsibility to follow through to make certain other community agencies provided them. It would be able to pay for and supervise care in specialized foster homes—residential treatment centers—or any other type of treatment indicated by diagnosis and complete study. And it should be flexible, and willing to try and test new and experimental treatment methods.

For all these reasons, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide Federal matching funds to help States and communities to establish programs for the identification, care and treatment of children who are or are in danger of becoming emotionally disturbed. The bill amends title V, the children's title of the Social Security Act, to authorize this new program.

The bill would establish a flexible program to meet a variety of needs. It would enable the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make grants to community, public, and nonprofit agencies and institutions of higher learning engaged in providing services to children in danger of becoming emotionally disturbed. Under these grants, appropriate agencies could establish projects to develop community centers for children. Such centers would maintain continuing relationships with the schools, social agencies, clinics, courts, and other community agencies serving children and provide or cause to be provided continuing protective services for children served by the center.

Projects might include the cost of diagnostic and treatment services, payment for services in established community facilities—including payment for care in residential treatment centers of foster family homes—counseling services to parents and children, program research and evaluation, establishment of an advisory committee to the project and such other costs as the Secretary may determine to be reasonable. Up to 75 percent of the cost of these projects could be borne by the Federal Government.

The bill would establish an expert panel, advisory to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, whose chief duties would be to:

First. Examine the facts relative to providing preventive, diagnostic, treatment, and protective services from the standpoint of the rights of the child and the rights of the parents.

Second. Develop recommendations regarding the problem of assuring continuing services to a child.

Third. Make recommendations for a nationwide attack on the whole problem.

Such a study is urgently needed and wanted. Those professional people most concerned with emotionally disturbed children have called attention to the fact that the Joint Commission on Mental Illness and Health was unable to make it because of lack of funds. A conference of all the leading child psychiatrists in the Nation, held by the American Academy of Child Psychiatry and the American Psychiatric Association last year, recommended, and I quote:

> In sum, it was the consensus of the conference that what the Joint Commission had done by way of presenting the Nation with a program to combat mental illness as a whole should now be done in comparable manner and style for the problem of childhood mental illness. The conference members recognized and accepted their obligation to inform the public of the needs of children and registered their opinion that a national survey should be conducted under the leadership of representatives of the entire problem of child-care professions in the field of mental illness and health. They pledged to work for the launching of such a study, looking to the formulation of a national program to combat childhood mental illness and to secure the wherewithal to carry out such a plan.

The bill does not seek to achieve the millenium—in fact it authorizes a comparatively small amount of money—$1 million for 1965, $3 million for 1966 and 1967, and $5 million annually thereafter. It does not interfere with research and demonstration projects already underway which seek to help disturbed youngsters.

The bill does authorize the agency of the Government most directly responsible for the health of our children to provide the financial encouragement needed to give serious national attention to this most tragic childhood disability. Its intent and purpose complements the much larger effort—inaugurated by Public Law 88-164, the Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act of 1963.

Last year Congress authorized a total of $150 million to build community mental health centers. But experience has repeatedly shown that the existence of a building gives no assurance that an emotionally disturbed child will receive the treatment and follow-up care that could be given there. If we can spend $150 million to build, surely we can spend less than 1 percent of that sum to help the States finance the programs to spot and help children with severe emotional problems.

As the President said in his health message last week: "facilities alone cannot assure service." President Johnson has proposed a program of grants to provide personnel for these community mental health centers offering comprehensive services. He has, too, placed an entirely healthy emphasis on the health needs of "our most priceless resource of all—our children." My bill will complement the President's plans. It would channel desperately needed help directly into programs to spot and help children with severe emotional problems. Together with the facilities provided under the 1963 act and the President's proposals, my bill would mount an attack on the problems of emotionally disturbed children.

The attack would be but an ounce of prevention. We have learned through bitter loss and tragedy that it would have provided more than a pound of cure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 488) to amend title V of the Social Security Act to assist States and communities to establish programs for the identification, care and treatment of children who are or are in danger of becoming emotionally disturbed, introduced by Mr. RIBICOFF, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

REVITALIZATION OF SAN FRANCISCO MINT

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I introduce a bill, for appropriate reference, for the revitalizing of the mint at San Francisco.

In that connection, I ask unanimous consent that there be included at this point in my remarks a copy of a recently completed report on the feasibility of locating a new mint in San Francisco, prepared by the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the report will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 492) to revitalize the mint at San Francisco, introduced by Mr. KUCHEL (for himself and Mr. MURPHY), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The report presented by Mr. KUCHEL is as follows:

PROJECT MINT

(A statement of facts to the Honorable John F. Shelley, mayor of the city and county of San Francisco, and the mayor's committee to study a U.S. mint in San Francisco, prepared by the Greater San Francisco Chamber of Commerce)

A statement of facts has been prepared for use as a basis for further planning and discussion concerning the feasibility of locating a new U.S. mint in San Francisco.

The main stress of the data is on the population and economic growth of California, with selected projections of these power factors, and the relationship of the San Francisco metropolitan area to this growth. The various types of statistical indicators also reflect geographical comparisons, with specific indices showing the ratio of increase in California and the San Francisco area as compared to other leading States and areas. The continuing trend of these economic movements to the Far West is our strongest point.

The 12th Federal Reserve District, with its San Francisco headquarters, takes in the States of California, Oregon, Washington, Alaska, Hawaii, Nevada, Utah, Idaho, and parts of Arizona and Montana. Certain items have been included for comparison with other Federal Reserve districts, such as the fact that the 12th district receives the highest distribution of coin production. Regional statistics have also been grouped, showing the various economic factors in which the Western States have far outstripped other regions. This is shown even more dramatically when comparing California with other States.

Land cost data is not shown as it is the contention that a site should be acquired through the power of urban renewal. As to transportation, San Francisco is centrally located to serve the branch banks in Portland, Seattle, Salt Lake City, and Los Angeles, like a wide-sweeping pendulum. It is also a contention that the tremendous rate of economic growth in the West, and especially that of California and her metropolitan areas, can ameliorate any cost penalties for land or transportation.

The statistical information given on the following pages will graphically show that the population and economic power of California and the West could generate more than enough demand for a mint to be located in San Francisco, to adequately serve this area.

FLETCHER CHAN,
Manager, Research Department, Greater San Francisco Chamber of Commerce.

CREDIT FOR SOURCES OF INFORMATION

Annual reports of the Director of the Mint for fiscal years 1961, 1962, and 1963.

Copy of hearings held before the subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency, U.S. Senate, for "Additional Mint Facilities," March 26, 1963.

Copy of hearings held before the Subcommittee on Monetary Affairs of the House Committee on Governmental Operations, on "Coin Shortage," June 30 to July 2, 1964.

Final report on "Production Facilities in the U.S. Mint," by Arthur D. Little, Inc., February 11, 1963.

Information releases from the Treasury Department and the Bureau of the Mint.

U.S. News & World Report, January 13, 1964, "Special Report on Growth Selected Economic Data on the California Economy," by the economic research department of the Bank of America, September 1964.

The 1962, 1963, and 1964 editions of Survey of Buying Power by Sales Management.

The 1965 Editor and Publisher Market Guide.

1964–65 economic survey of San Francisco and the bay area by the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce.

Some statistics are taken directly from the source, but most data has been compiled, grouped, and tabulated by the research department of the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce.

SELECTED POWER RANKINGS OF THE SAN FRANCISCO METROPOLITAN AREA

Population: San Francisco-Oakland metropolitan area ranks sixth in the Nation.

Total income: Sixth in the Nation, included in the only six metropolitan areas of total income over $10 billion.

Total retail sales: Sixth in the Nation, among the first seven areas of retail volume over $4 billion.

Total food sales: Fourth in the Nation.

Per household income: Ninth in the Nation ($9,675); third highest in the Nation for Counties, ($10,949); [1] sixth highest for cities ($10,949).[2]

---

[1] First two leading counties: Westchester and Nassau, N.Y.

[2] First five highest cities: Greenwich, Stanford, Danbury, Winsted, and Middletown, Conn.

National rank of principal California manufacturing industries, 1962

In terms of value added by manufacture California is—	*Percent of U.S. total*
1st in food and kindred products	11.0
1st in miscellaneous manufactures	23.2
2d in transportation equipment	13.2
2d in petroleum and coal products	12.6
2d in lumber and wood products	11.4
2d in furniture and fixtures	9.8
2d in electrical machinery	11.9
3d in stone, clay, and glass products	9.3
3d in printing and publishing	7 9
3d in rubber and plastics products	7.2
3d in fabricated metal products	9.3
3d in instruments and related products	8.5
4th in apparel and related products	5.8
6th in machinery, except electrical	7.0
6th in paper and allied products	5.2
7th in primary metal industries	4.4
8th in chemicals and allied products	4.5

Population of leading States and rank in change

1965 rank	State	1965 estimate population (thousands)	Rank in population change since 1960	Percent of U.S. net increase, 1960–63
1	California	18,529	1	19.8
2	New York	17,789	3	6.1
3	Pennsylvania	11,783	11	2.7
4	Illinois	10,625	8	4.2
5	Texas	10,404	4	7.1
6	Ohio	10,269	5	6.2
7	Michigan	8,754	6	3.7
8	New Jersey	6,667	7	4.3
9	Florida	5,828	2	7.1
10	Massachusetts	5,555	21	(1)

[1] Not available.

1965 population estimates for the 10 largest standard metropolitan statistical areas

Rank	Areas	Population	Federal Reserve district
1	New York	11,291,051	New York.
2	Los Angeles-Long Beach	6,884,199	San Francisco.
3	Chicago	6,634,830	Chicago.
4	Philadelphia	4,744,023	Philadelphia.
5	Detroit	4,231,842	Chicago.
[1] 6	San Francisco-Oakland	3,032,157	San Francisco.
7	Boston	2,701,771	Boston.
8	Pittsburgh	2,515,494	Cleveland.
9	Washington, D.C	2,333,216	Richmond, Va.
10	St. Louis	2,268,060	St. Louis.

[1] The San Francisco-Oakland metropolitan area had the 3d largest rate of population growth among the Nation's 10 biggest metropolitan areas for the 1960–63 period. This was exceeded only by the Washington, D.C., and Los Angeles–Long Beach areas. This increase of over 7 percent for the 1960–63 period, as compared to a 5 percent average rate of increase for the other metropolitan areas, was made even more meaningful as Solano County has been deleted from the San Francisco-Oakland statistical area, giving a 5-county area growth instead of the former 6-county bay area complex.

Total retail sales

[In millions of dollars]

Year	California	United States	California as percent of United States
1950	$12,409.7	$143,688	8.6
1955	17,122.6	183,851	9.3
1960	21,514.4	219,529	9.8
1961	22,083.9	218,811	10.1
1962	24,024.2	235,356	10.2
1963	26,693.2	246,432	10.8

NOTE.—Percentage growth of California retail sales volume as compared to the U.S. total will continue to rise steadily. It is estimated that the total retail sales for California in 1965 will be nearly $32,000,000,000, and will rise to $40,000,000,000 in 1970.

Personal income

[Millions of dollars]

Year	California	United States	California as percent of United States
1950	$19,627	$225,473	8.7
1955	30,224	306,598	9.9
1960	43,183	399,028	10.8
1961	45,776	414,954	11.0
1962	49,187	439,661	11.2
1963	52,419	460,580	11.4

Per capita personal income

Year	California	United States	Percent California is above United States
1950	$1,839	$1,491	23.3
1955	2,297	1,866	23.1
1960	2,725	2,217	22.9
1961	2,794	2,267	23.2
1962	2,888	2,366	22.1
1963	2,980	2,443	22.0

Retail sales estimates

[In millions]

	1958	Percent of U.S. totals	1965	Percent of U.S. totals	1970	Percent of U.S. totals
Northeastern States: 9	$52,841	26.60	$70,752	25.71	$80,258	25.38
North Central States: 12	59,464	29.93	78,681	28.59	84,154	26.61
South Atlantic States: 8 plus the District of Columbia	24,674	12.42	36,031	13.09	44,335	14.02
South Central States: 8	27,496	13.84	37,608	13.66	43,967	13.90
West (mountains and Pacific): 13	34,209	17.22	52,172	18.95	63,561	20.10
Total, United States	198,684	100.00	275,244	100.00	316,275	100.00
Pacific States: 5	26,285	13.23	40,390	14.67	49,646	15.70
California	20,011	10.07	31,978	11.62	40,250	12.73

NOTE.—The dollar volume of sales in the West is rising faster and more steadily than in any other region. There is and will continue to be a percentage decline in the northeast and north central regions.

Population distribution

	1963	Percent of U.S. totals	1970	Percent of U.S. totals
Northeastern States: 9	46,372,000	24.60	49,780,000	23.90
North Central States: 12	52,890,000	28.05	55,710,000	26.75
South Atlantic States: 8 plus District of Columbia	27,705,000	14.60	31,660,000	15.20
South Central States: 8	30,512,000	16.18	33,345,000	16.01
West (mountains and Pacific): 13	31,052,000	16.47	37,765,000	18.13
Total	188,531,000	100.00	208,260,000	100.00
Pacific States: 5	23,408,000	12.42	28,490,000	13.66
California	17,670,000	9.37	21,690,000	10.89

NOTE.—The percentage growth rate of the West is climbing, while other areas are growing at a much slower rate. Again, the northeastern and north central regions will experience a decrease in percentage growth.

Projected rank of the 10 leading States in population and projected total retail sales estimates for 1965 and 1970

1965 rank	State	1965 population (thousands)	1970 rank	1970 population (thousands)	Retail sales estimate (millions)	
					1965	1970
1	California	18,529	1	21,462	$31,978	$40,250
2	New York	17,784	2	18,708	27,863	31,270
3	Pennsylvania	11,783	3	11,930	15,969	18,235
4	Illinois	10,625	5	11,687	17,395	18,500
5	Texas	10,404	6	11,331	14,764	17,265
6	Ohio	10,269	4	11,856	15,157	15,763
7	Michigan	8,754	7	9,589	11,202	11,565
8	New Jersey	6,667	8	7,267	10,629	11,900
9	Florida	5,828	9	6,112	9,670	13,800
10	Massachusetts	5,555	10	5,650	8,146	8,630

NOTE.—By 1970, California will have pulled away from any competitor in population and sales volume.

Selected marketing power of San Francisco and the metropolitan area

RETAIL SALES VOLUME

	1958 U.S. census	1964 estimate	1965 estimate
	Thousands	*Thousands*	*Thousands*
San Francisco-Oakland metropolitan area	$3,502,707	$4,670,925	$4,782,560
City of San Francisco	1,253,977	1,795,695	1,830,806

POPULATION, INCOME AND HOUSEHOLDS

	1960 U.S. census	1965 estimate	1960 estimate (thousands)	1965 estimate (thousands)	Number of households	1965 estimated income per household
San Francisco-Oakland metropolitan area	2,648,762	3,032,157	8,552,942	10,793,569	1,003,991	$9,675
City of San Francisco	740,316	755,122	3,070,520	3,623,214	297,815	10,949

San Francisco-Oakland metropolitan area—5 county bay area (San Francisco, Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, San Mateo), 1963 estimates

	Bay area totals	San Francisco County	San Francisco as percent of bay area totals
Households	953,900	293,000	32.4
Population	2,890,100	750,000	25.7
Families	953,900	293,000	30.7
Retail sales [1]	$4,440,205	$1,408,645	31.7
Food sales [1]	1,067,024	277,881	26.0
Packaged liquor stores [1]	120,095	38,120	25.8
General merchandise [1]	671,472	273,371	40.7
Apparel [1]	282,795	126,152	44.6
Furniture-household-radio [1]	245,959	87,616	35.6
Automotive [1]	743,820	176,298	23.7
Gas stations [1]	303,619	63,382	20.8
Lumber-building-hardware [1]	163,299	27,378	16.7
Drugs [1]	150,298	40,513	26.9
Net effective buying income [1]	8,159,745	2,383,278	29.2
Net effective buying income per capita	2,823	3,198	
Net effective buying income per family	8,554	8,134	

[1] In thousands of dollars.

Distribution of coins to the Federal Reserve banks, fiscal year 1963

Federal Reserve districts	Numbers of coins	Percent of U.S. total
1. Boston	198,470,000	5.52
2. New York	478,224,000	13.30
3. Philadelphia	284,273,826	7.90
4. Cleveland	249,350,000	6.93
5. Richmond	241,164,000	6.71
6. Atlanta	314,920,000	8.76
7. Chicago	509,527,000	14.17
8. St. Louis	208,630,000	5.80
9. Minneapolis	120,380,000	3.35
10. Kansas City	194,156,649	5.40
11. Dallas	194,925,000	5.42
12. San Francisco	602,173,254	16.74
Total	3,596,193,729	100.00

NOTE.—The San Francisco Federal Reserve District received the greatest amount of coin distribution in fiscal year 1963. See next page for fiscal year 1964 distribution.

Populations and distribution of coins to the Federal Reserve banks, fiscal year 1964

Federal Reserve districts	Population (in thousands)	Percent of U.S. total	Pieces of coins received (millions)	Percent of mint production
1. Boston	9,775	5.5	224	5.2
2. New York	21,852	12.3	527	12.3
3. Philadelphia	9,465	5.3	244	5.7
4. Cleveland	14,864	8.4	286	6.7
5. Richmond	16,259	9.1	395	9.2
6. Atlanta	18,120	10.1	428	10.0
7. Chicago	26,132	14.7	594	13.8
8. St. Louis	10,782	6.1	294	6.8
9. Minneapolis	6.245	3.5	145	3.4
10. Kansas City	9,498	5.3	229	5.3
11. Dallas	11,170	6.3	212	4.9
12. San Francisco	23,707	13.3	719	16.7
Total	177,874	99.9	4,297	100.0

NOTE.—Again, the San Francisco Federal Reserve district received the highest distribution of coin production. The population estimate for Federal Reserve districts was made in early 1963. In 1965, using the projected rate of increase, the population of the San Francisco Federal Reserve district is expected to equal the estimated population of the Chicago Federal Reserve district, its nearest competitor.

Estimates of new coin requirements by Federal Reserve banks for fiscal years 1965 and 1966

[In thousands of dollars]

Districts	1965	1966
1. Boston	10,751	10,976
2. New York	49,594	49,494
3. Philadelphia	80,100	84,100
4. Cleveland	36,966	34,750
5. Richmond	18,325	18,740
6. Atlanta	33,643	38,729
7. Chicago	55,964	31,935
8. St. Louis	19,750	21,474
9. Minneapolis	12,585	11,210
10. Kansas City	26,500	24,500
11. Dallas	28,907	27,157
12. San Francisco	55,400	55,000
Total	428,385	408,065

PRACTICAL METHOD FOR ESTABLISHING WATER SYSTEMS FOR THE RURAL AREAS OF AMERICA

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] and myself, I am introducing a bill which presents a practical method for establishing water systems for the rural areas of America.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 493) to assist in the development of adequate rural water systems, introduced by Mr. AIKEN (for himself and Mr. MANSFIELD), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, this bill is offered as an amendment to the Rural Electrification Administration Act and will, when approved, be one of the greatest stimulants, to the healthy growth of our Nation.

With an increase of a hundred million in population anticipated during the next generation, the question of where these people will live constitutes one of our gravest problems. The crowding of populations into great cities already has created what is probably the world's greatest crisis. The logical place for our expanding population to live is in the presently underpopulated areas.

Congress recognized this fact when it established the REA program which has proved its worth many times over. We have also improved our rural telephone service and our highway systems.

Full development of the most desirable areas in which to live cannot proceed until we have the foresight to conserve and make available through local systems the water resources of each area.

The bill which Senator MANSFIELD and I are introducing will make a major contribution to this end. It will be a major weapon in the war on unemployment, creating far more employment than the REA program, which has added billions of dollars each year to the economy of the country. It will furnish jobs for hundreds of thousands of people, urban as well as rural.

BILL TO MEET URBAN AND COMMUNITY PROBLEMS

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the increasingly urgent problems of urbanization can be most effectively met by creation of an office within the Executive Office of the President which would function somewhat along the lines of the Bureau of the Budget.

The growing complexities of urbanization are both directly and indirectly affected by a growing number of Federal programs dealing with schools, crime, health, highways, airports, railroads, enforcement of fair labor standards, and many others.

Many mayors and other local and civic leaders have also appealed for a "one-stop service" in Washington where they can take their problems, have them evaluated, and referred to the proper agencies.

Another problem has been the growing need for long-range planning and research to enable us to foresee problems before they arise, and have appropriate remedies ready, as well as achieving greater efficiency and economy.

For these reasons, I am, today, introducing a bill which will authorize formation of an Office of Community Development in the Executive Office of the President.

My proposal is designed to meet the problems of urbanization without creation of a vast, sprawling, and expensive new Federal bureaucracy—with more marble buildings and a new proliferation of long, chauffeur-driven black limousines for a burgeoning mass of new officeholders. Rather than building this huge new bureaucratic establishment, it would create an executive staff to cut across established bureaucratic lines, to coordinate the many and diverse Federal programs which affect the problems of urbanization, and to assist local officials in present problems and forsee and prepare to cope with future problems.

I have pressed for this type of legislation before and my present bill conforms with a pledge I made to the people of Pennsylvania last fall, and I urge its early consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 497) to establish in the Executive Office of the President an Office of Community Development, introduced by Mr. SCOTT, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

PROPOSED GREAT BASIN NATIONAL PARK IN WHITE PINE COUNTY IN EASTERN NEVADA

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the distinguished junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON] and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to create the Great Basin National Park in White Pine County in eastern Nevada.

Six years ago, I introduced legislation providing for a survey to determine the region's feasibility as a national park. The Advisory Board on National Parks recommended to the Secretary of the Interior that this area, known as the Wheeler Peak-Lehman Caves region, be included in the national parks system.

The Board considered the geological and ecological aspects of the 123,000-acre "sky island," in the heart of the Great Basin Desert, of national significance, making it suitable for preservation under the National Park Service.

Dr. Adolph Murie, an internationally known naturalist, who conducted the survey, listed the following reasons for his conclusions:

The spectacular view of mountain ranges and valleys across the central Great Basin, combined with natural park areas of forests, streams and lakes appropriate for camping, picnicking, hiking and exploration of nature, are in themselves of national park caliber.

The area includes half a dozen splendid stands of bristlecone pines believed to be the oldest living things on earth.

The Wheeler area is the superb example of Great Basin country, illustrating well the geological process of basin and range formation, having good examples of various types of rock and geologic structure, and illustrating the representative Great Basin vegetation and wildlife.

In addition, the area includes a small but active desert-bound glacier in the deep cirque of Wheeler Peak, 13,063 feet above sea level, and a limestone arch big enough to cover a six-story building.

During the past several years, extensive hearings in the field have been held to attempt to reconcile the divergent views of the conservationists on the one hand, and local mining and grazing interests on the other.

In order to protect the possibility of establishing a valuable industry that could employ as many as 400 men in this presently depressed mining area, I have included in the present measure a section that would permit the continuation of prospecting, exploration and mining within the park, limiting the activity to that necessary to the actual process of valid mining requirements.

Likewise, I have included a section that would permit present grazers to continue the use of the park area for 25 years plus the lifetime of the holders of grazing permits.

Both of these sections have precedent in other areas and cannot be considered an innovation in the establishment of national parks.

Mr. President, an identical measure passed the Senate on January 25, 1962, but failed to secure approval of the House of Representatives.

In view of the accepted urgency to protect great natural assets such as the area under consideration, I am hopeful that favorable action will be had during the 89th Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 499) to establish the Great Basin National Park in Nevada, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. BIBLE (for himself and Mr. CANNON), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AMENDMENTS OF IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

Mr. HART. Mr. President, on Wednesday of this week President Johnson sent to the Congress his strong recommendation for revision of our basic immigration law. Today it is my privilege and pleasure to introduce the bill designed to carry out the recommendations contained in that message—a bill the President asks be accorded priority consideration.

I send this bill to the desk on behalf of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG], and myself.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this bill remain at the desk until the end of business on Monday, January 25, so that others who wish to may join in sponsoring it.

Also, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the President's immigration message, the text of the bill, and a section-by-section analysis of the bill be printed at the conclusion of my remarks. It is to be expected many inquiries concerning the bill will be made of the Members of the Senate. I hope this record will be of help in making replies.

Mr. President, the time has long passed for the Congress to act to change our basic immigration quota system.

The new immigration policies proposed by President Johnson are designed to meet the modern manpower needs of the Nation, support our foreign policy objectives, and reflect the humanitarian principles which the American people have so often supported in meeting urgent refugee and emergency immigration needs.

It is my belief that the vast majority of Americans long ago rejected the narrow, fear-ridden view that is reflected in the continuance of an immigration policy based on the national origins concept. Most of our citizens agree with the President that a qualified newcomer to our shores should not be asked where he was born or how he spells his name, but rather what he can do for America.

I would like to comment, Mr. President, that the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], who is not able to be here today, telephoned to assure me of his full support for this immigration reform bill, and offered to participate and cooperate in any way that can be helpful in bringing this legislation to the Senate floor this session, and in obtaining final congressional approval. Since coming to the Senate, and before, Senator KENNEDY has been one of the most outstanding and loyal supporters for immigration reform. He carries on in a very great tradition, for there were few subjects more personally sensitive to President Kennedy than the prejudice and discrimination of the national origins quota system. All of us are grateful for the support and cooperation of our good friend from Massachusetts, and each of us wish him the very best in his final phase of recuperation from his most unfortunate accident. I know he intends to return to the Senate next week and has indicated to me that one of the first orders of business for him will be to make a major statement on behalf of this immigration bill, and the need for immigration reform. I look forward with great anticipation to that statement, because I—and I am sure most of the Senate—will not soon forget that moving and powerful statement he delivered last year on behalf of the civil rights bill which I feel had tremendous national and international effect, and greatly aided the cause of equality and justice in our Nation. We will be working with Senator KENNEDY in the days ahead toward what I hope will be a successful conclusion to this longstanding battle for immigration reform.

With the introduction of this bill, I ask the chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee to promptly schedule administration and public witnesses who wish to be heard on this legislation. As a high priority item in the President's legislative program, there is every reason to have expeditious hearings and early committee consideration.

Last, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the strong editorial, captioned "I Lift My Lamp," from the New York Times of yesterday be printed at the conclusion of these remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will remain at the desk as requested, and the President's message, the bill, the analysis, and the editorial will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 500) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HART (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 201(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 175, 8 U.S.C. 1151(a)) be amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 201. (a) The annual quota of any quota area shall be the same as that which existed for that area upon enactment of subsection (f) of this section: *Provided,* That the minimum quota for any quota area shall be two hundred: *Provided further,* That beginning with the first fiscal year commencing after the enactment of subsection (f) of this section and for each of the four succeeding fiscal years the annual quota of every quota area shall be reduced by twenty per centum of its present number for each such fiscal year. The quota numbers so deducted from quotas of quota areas shall be added to the quota reserve established by subsection (f) of this section and shall be available for distribution in accordance with the provisions thereof."

SEC. 2. Section 201(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 175, 8 U.S.C. 1151(b)) is amended by substituting "section 202(d)" for "section 202(e)" after the words "provided for in".

SEC. 3. Section 201 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 175, 8 U.S.C. 1151) is amended by adding the following additional subsection:

"(f) Quota numbers made available at the commencement of any fiscal year as a result of the reduction of the annual quota of any quota areas pursuant to subsection (a) of this section, together with quota numbers not issued or otherwise used during the previous fiscal year, shall then be made available (1) during the five fiscal years following the enactment of this subsection, to quota immigrants, if otherwise admissible under the provisions of this Act, who are unable to obtain prompt issuance of visas due to oversubscription of their quotas or subquotas as determined by the Secretary of State, and (2), thereafter, to quota immigrants if otherwise admissible under the provisions of this Act. These quota numbers shall be allocated within the percentage limitations and in the order of priority specified in section 203 without regard to the quota to which the alien is chargeable: *Provided, however,* That the combined number of quota numbers issued to any quota area in any year, under the provisions of this subsection and subsection (a) of this section, shall not exceed ten per centum of the total quota numbers authorized for that year: *Provided further,* That in no case shall this limitation operate to reduce any quota in any of the five fiscal years following the enactment of this Act by more than the twenty per centum specified in subsection (a) of this section: *Provided further,* That the President may, after consultation with the Immigration Board, reserve—

"(1) Not to exceed thirty per centum of such numbers for allocation to quota immigrants, if otherwise admissible under the provisions of this Act, whose admission is determined by him to be required (A) to avoid undue hardship, resulting from the reduction of annual quotas pursuant to subsection (a) of this section, which is not otherwise avoided under the provisions of this subsection, and (B) in the national security interest of the United States: *Provided,* That the limitation on immigration from any single quota area in any year included in the first proviso to this subsection shall not apply to visas issued under this clause; and

"(2) Not to exceed ten per centum of such numbers for allocation to quota immigrants, if otherwise admissible under the provisions of this Act, whose admissions will further the traditional policy of the United States of offering asylum and refuge to persons oppressed or persecuted, or threatened with oppression or persecution, because of their race, color, religion, national origin, adherence to democratic beliefs, or their opposition to totalitarianism or dictatorship, and to persons uprooted by natural calamity or military operations who are unable to return to their usual place of abode. After consultation with the Attorney General, the Secretary of State shall establish by regulation the requirements for qualification within this class, with reference to current world conditions.

In no case shall the authority to reserve such numbers, or the limitation on the combined number of quota numbers to be issued to any quota area in any year, operate so as to require that authorized quota numbers be unused."

SEC. 4. Section 201(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 176, 8 U.S.C. 1151(c)) is amended to read as follows:

"There shall be made available for the issuance of immigrant visas to quota immigrants (1) in any fiscal year no more quota numbers than the total quota for such year, and (2) in any calendar month of any fiscal year, no more quota numbers than ten per centum of the total quota for such year in addition to that portion of the quota authorized for issuance but not issued during any preceding calendar month or months of the same fiscal year; except that during the last two months of any fiscal year immigrant visas may be issued without regard to the ten per centum limitation contained herein."

SEC. 5. Section 201(d) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 175, 8 U.S.C. 1151(d)) is amended to read as follows:

"A quota immigrant visa shall not be issued to any alien who is eligible for a nonquota immigrant visa."

SEC. 6. (a) Section 202(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 176, 8 U.S.C. 1152(a)) is amended by deleting paragraph (5) thereof.

(b) Section 202(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 177, 8 U.S.C. 1152(b)) is repealed.

(c) Section 202(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 177, 8 U.S.C. 1152 (c)) is redesignated section 202(b) and is amended to read as follows:

"Any immigrant born in a colony or other component or dependent area of a governing country for which no separate or specific quota has been established, unless a nonquota immigrant as provided in section 101 (a)(27) of this Act, shall be chargeable to the quota of the governing country, except that no more persons born in any such colony or other component or dependent area overseas from the governing country shall be chargeable to the quota of its governing country in any one year than a number which bears the same relation to the quota of its governing country as the number two hundred bears to the quota of the governing country prior to the enactment of this Act."

(d) Section 202(d) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 178, 8 U.S.C. 1152 (d)) is redesignated section 202(c).

(e) Section 202(e) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 178), as amended (75 Stat. 654), (8 U.S.C. 1152(e)) is redesignated section 202(d) and is further amended by substituting "section 202(b)" for "section 202(c)(1)" after the words "issued under."

Sec. 7. Section 207 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 181, 8 U.S.C. 1157) is amended by deleting the words "no immigrant visa shall be issued in lieu thereof to any other immigrant" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "an immigrant visa may be issued in lieu thereof to any other immigrant."

Sec. 8. Paragraph (27)(A) of section 101 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 169, 8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(27)(A)) is amended to read as follows:

"(A) An immigrant who is the child, spouse, or parent of a citizen of the United States;".

Sec. 9. Paragraph (27)(C) of section 101 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 169, 8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(27)(C)) is amended to read as follows:

"(C) An immigrant who was born in any independent foreign country of North, Central, or South America, or in any independent island country adjacent thereto, or in the Canal Zone, and the spouse and children of any such immigrant, if accompanying or following to join him;".

Sec. 10. (a) Section 203(a)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 178, 8 U.S.C. 1153(a)(1)) is amended by deleting the words "needed urgently in" and substituting the words "especially advantageous to".

(b) Section 203(a)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 178), as amended (73 Stat. 644), (8 U.S.C. 1153(a)(2)), is amended by deleting the words "parents of citizens of the United States, such citizens being at least twenty-one years of age or who are the".

(c) Section 203(a)(4) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 178), as amended (73 Stat. 644), (8 U.S.C. 1153(a)(4)) is amended by—

(1) inserting after the words "married daughters of citizens of the United States" a comma, followed by the words "or parents of aliens lawfully admitted for permanent residence," and

(2) adding at the end thereof the following:

"Qualified quota immigrants capable of performing specified functions for which a shortage of employable and willing persons exists in the United States shall be entitled to a preference not to exceed 50 per centum of the immigrant visas remaining available for issuance under this paragraph after the preference to the named relatives of United States citizens and resident aliens is satisfied or exhausted."

Sec. 11. Section 204 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 179, 8 U.S.C. 1154) is amended as follows:

(1) Subsection (a) is amended by deleting the words "or section 203(a)(1)(A)" and substituting a comma, followed by the words "section 203(a)(1)(A) or the last clause of section 203(a)(4)."

(2) Subsection (b) is amended (A) by deleting the words "section 203(a)(1)(A)" and substituting the words "the last clause of section 203(a)(4)" and (B) by inserting after the words "required by the Attorney General" the words "after consultation with the Immigration Board."

(3) Subsection (c) is redesignated (d) and is amended to read as follows:

"(d) After an investigation of the facts in each case, and after consultation with appropriate agencies of the Government, the Attorney General shall, if he determines that the facts stated in the petition are true and that the alien in respect of whom the petition is made is eligible for an immigrant status under section 101(a)(27)(F)(1), section 203(a)(1)(A) or the last clause of section 203(a)(4) approve the petition and forward one copy thereof to the Department of State. The Secretary of State shall then authorize the consular officer concerned to grant such immigrant status. The Attorney General shall forward to the Congress a report on each approved petition for immigrant status under section 203(a)(1) stating the basis for his approval and such facts as were by him deemed to be pertintent in establishing the beneficiary's qualifications for the preferential status. Such reports shall be submitted to the Congress on the first and fifteenth day of each calendar month in which the Congress is in session."

(4) Subsection (d) is redesignated (e) and is amended by deleting the words "or section 203(a)(1)(A)," and substituting a comma, followed by the words "section 203(a)(1)(A) or the last clause of section 203(a)(4)."

(5) The following new subsection is inserted after subsection (b):

"(c) Any immigrant claiming in his application to be entitled to an immigrant visa under section 203(a)(1)(A) of the Act shall file a petition with the Attorney General. The petition shall be in such form as the Attorney General may by regulations prescribe and shall contain such additional information and be supported by such documentary evidence as may be required by the Attorney General. The petition shall be made under oath administered by any individual having authority to administer oaths, if executed in the United States, but, if executed outside of the United States, administered by a consular officer."

Sec. 12. The first sentence of section 205 (b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 180), as amended (73 Stat. 644, 8 U.S.C. 1155(b)), is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Any citizen of the United States claiming that any immigrant is his spouse, child, or parent, and that such immigrant is entitled to a nonquota immigrant status under section 101(a)(27)(A) of this Act, or any citizen of the United States claiming that any immigrant is his unmarried son or unmarried daughter and that such immigrant is entitled to a quota immigrant status under section 203(a)(2) of this Act, or any alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence claiming that any immigrant is his spouse or his unmarried son or unmarried daughter and that such immigrant is entitled to a quota immigrant status under section 203(a)(3) of this Act, or any citizen of the United States claiming that any immigrant is his brother or sister or his married son or his married daughter and that such immigrant is entitled to a preference under section 203(a)(4) of this Act, or any alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence claiming that any immigrant is his parent and that such immigrant is entitled to a preference under section 203(a)(4) of this Act, may file a petition with the Attorney General."

Sec. 13. Section 1 of the Act of July 14, 1960 (74 Stat. 504), is amended to read as follows:

"That (a) under the terms of section 212 (d)(5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act the Attorney General may parole into the United States, pursuant to such regulations as he may prescribe, an alien refugee-escapee defined in subsection (b) of this section, if such alien (1) applies for parole while physically present within the limits of any country which is not Communist, Communist dominated, or Communist occupied, and (2) is not a national of the area in which the application is made.

"(b) For the purposes of subsection (a), the term 'refugee-escapee' means any alien who, because of persecution or fear of persecution on account of race, religion, or political opinion has fled or shall flee (A) from any Communist, Communist-dominated, or Communist-occupied area, or (B) from any country within the general area of the Middle East, and who cannot return to such area, or to such country, on account of race, religion, or political opinion. The expression 'general area of the Middle East' means the area between and including (1) Morocco on the west, (2) Turkey on the north, (3) Pakistan on the east, and (4) Saudi Arabia and Ethiopia on the south."

Sec. 14. Section 2 of the Act of July 14, 1960 (74 Stat. 504), as amended (76 Stat. 124), is amended by deleting (1) the letter "(a)" immediately following the words "Sec. 2.," and (2) subsection (b) thereof.

Sec. 15. Section 281 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 230, 8 U.S.C. 1351) is amended as follows:

(1) Immediately after "Sec. 281," insert "(a)".

(2) Paragraph (2) is amended to read as follows:

"(2) For the issuance of each immigrant visa, $20; except that such fee shall be $10 in the case of any alien who is the beneficiary of a petition required under sections 204(b) or 205(b)."

(3) The following is inserted after paragraph (7), and is designated subsection (b):

"The time and manner of payment of the fees specified in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a) of this section, including but not limited to partial deposit or prepayment at the time of registration, or postponement for an appropriate period, shall be prescribed by the Secretary of State."

(4) The paragraph beginning with the words "The fees * * * " is designated subsection (c).

Sec. 16. Section 203(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 179, 8 U.S.C. 1153(c)) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"The Secretary of State, in his discretion, may terminate the registration on a quota waiting list of any alien who fails to evidence his continued intention to apply for a visa in such manner as may be by regulation prescribed."

Sec. 17. (a) Paragraph (1) of section 212(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 182, 8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(1)) is amended by deleting the language "feebleminded" and inserting the language "mentally retarded" in its place.

(b) Paragraph (4) of section 212(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 182, 8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(4)) is amended by deleting the word "epilepsy" and the commas before and after it.

(c) Section 212 (f), (g) and (h) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as added by the Act of September 26, 1961, (75 Stat. 654, 655, 8 U.S.C. 1182) are hereby redesignated sections 212 (g), (h), and (i), respectively, and section 212(g) as so redesignated is amended to read as follows:

"Any alien who is excludable from the United States under paragraphs (1), (2), (3), and (4) of subsection (a) of this section, and any alien afflicted with tuberculosis in any form, who (A) is the spouse or the unmarried son or daughter, or the minor unmarried lawfully adopted child, of a United States citizen, or of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence, or of an alien who has been issued an immigrant visa, or (B) has a son or daughter who is a United States citizen, or an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence, or an alien who has been issued an immigrant visa, may, if otherwise admissible, be issued a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence in accordance with such terms, conditions, and controls, including the giving of a bond, as the Attorney General, in his discretion, may by regulations prescribe, after consultation with the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service."

Sec. 18. (a) There is hereby established the Immigration Board (hereafter referred to as the "Board") to be composed of seven members. The President of the United States shall appoint the Chairman of the Board and two other members. The President of the Senate, with the approval of the majority and minority leaders of the Senate, shall appoint two members from the membership of the Senate. The Speaker of the House of Representatives, with the approval of the majority and minority leaders of the House, shall appoint two members from the membership of the House. The members of the Board shall be selected by virtue of their high personal integrity, their capabilities, and their experience in and expert knowledge of immigration laws and international migration problems. A vacancy in the membership of the Board shall be filled in the same manner as the original designation and appointment.

(b) The duties of the Board shall be—

(1) to promulgate, after consultation with the Attorney General, such regulations as are necessary to insure its efficient functioning under the provisions of this Act;

(2) to make a continuous study of such conditions within and without the United States, which, in the opinion of the Board, might have any bearing on the immigration policy of the United States;

(3) to consider, after consultation with the Secretary of State, to recommend to the President, such allocation of quota immigrant visas, under section 201(f) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as will best fulfill the purposes of that section;

(4) to consider, and after consultation with the Secretaries of Labor, State, and Defense, to recommend to the Attorney General such criteria for admission of immigrants under section 203(a)(1)(A) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended, and the last clause of section 203(a)(4), as amended, as will further the policy of the United States to secure the immigration of persons of high skill, education, or training, or who are capable of performing specified functions for which a shortage of employable, willing persons exists in the United States;

(5) to study such other aspects of the Immigration and Nationality Act as the President shall assign to the Board for study, and make recommendations with respect thereto;

(6) to conduct such investigations and to hold such public and executive hearings in such places within and without the United States and at such times as the Board deems necessary.

(c) All Federal agencies shall cooperate fully with the Board to the end that it may effectively carry out its duties.

(d) Each member of the Board who is not otherwise in the service of the Government of the United States shall receive the sum of $75 for each day spent in the work of the Board, shall be paid actual travel expenses, and per diem in lieu of subsistence expenses, when away from his usual place of residence, in accordance with section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended.

(e) Each member of the Board who is otherwise in the service of the Government of the United States shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for such other service, but while engaged in the work of the Board shall be paid actual travel expenses, and per diem in lieu of subsistence expenses, when away from his usual place of residence, in accordance with the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended.

(f) There is authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, so much as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.

Sec. 19. Section 221(g) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 192, 8 U.S.C. 1201(g)) is amended by deleting the period at the end thereof and adding the following:

": *Provided further,* That a visa may be issued to an alien defined in section 101(a) (15) (B) or (F), if such alien is otherwise entitled to receive a visa, upon receipt of a notice by the consular officer from the Attorney General of the giving of a bond with sufficient surety in such sum and containing such conditions as the consular officer shall prescribe, to insure that at the expiration of the time for which such alien has been admitted by the Attorney General, as provided in section 214(a), or upon failure to maintain the status under which he was admitted, or to maintain any status subsequently acquired under section 248 of the Act, such alien will depart from the United States."

Sec. 20. So much of section 272(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 226, 8 U.S.C. 1322(a)) as precedes the words "shall pay to the collector of customs" is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 272. (a) Any person who shall bring to the United States an alien (other than an alien crewman) who is (1) mentally retarded, (2) insane, (3) afflicted with psychopathic personality, (4) a chronic alcoholic, (5) afflicted with any dangerous contagious disease, or (6) a narcotic drug addict,".

To the Congress of the United States:

A change is needed in our laws dealing with immigration. Four Presidents have called attention to serious defects in this legislation. Action is long overdue.

I am therefore submitting, at the outset of this Congress, a bill designed to correct the deficiencies. I urge that it be accorded priority consideration.

The principal reform called for is the elimination of the national origins quota system. That system is incompatible with our basic American tradition.

Over the years the ancestors of all of us—some 42 million human beings—have migrated to these shores. The fundamental, longtime American attitude has been to ask not where a person comes from but what are his personal qualities. On this basis men and women migrated from every quarter of the globe. By their hard work and their enormously varied talents they hewed a great nation out of the wilderness. By their dedication to liberty and equality, they created a society reflecting man's most cherished ideals.

Long ago the poet, Walt Whitman, spoke our pride: "These States are the amplest poem." We are not merely a nation but a "nation of nations."

Violation of this tradition by the national origins quota system does incalculable harm. The procedures imply that men and women from some countries are, just because of where they come from, more desirable citizens than others. We have no right to disparage the ancestors of millions of our fellow Americans in this way. Relationships with a number of countries, and hence the success of our foreign policy, is needlessly impeded by this proposition.

The quota system has other grave defects. Too often it arbitrarily denies us immigrants who have outstanding and sorely needed talents and skills. I do not believe this is either good government or good sense.

Thousands of our citizens are needlessly separated from their parents or other close relatives.

To replace the quota system, the proposed bill relies on a technique of preferential admissions based upon the advantage to our Nation of the skills of the immigrant, and the existence of a close family relationship between the immigrant and people who are already citizens or permanent residents of the United States. Within this system of preferences, and within the numerical and other limitations prescribed by law, the issuance of visas to prospective immigrants would be based on the order of their application.

First preference under the bill would be given to those with the kind of skills or attainments which make the admission especially advantageous to our society. Other preferences would favor close relatives of citizens and permanent residents, and thus serve to promote the reuniting of families—long a primary goal of American immigration policy. Parents of U.S. citizens could obtain admission without waiting for a quota number.

Transition to the new system would be gradual, over a 5-year period. Thus, the possibility of abrupt changes in the pattern of immigration from any nation is eliminated. In addition, the bill would provide that as a general rule no country could be allocated more than 10 percent of the quota numbers available in any one year.

In order to insure that the new system would not impose undue hardship on any of our close allies by suddenly curtailing their emigration, the bill authorizes the President, after consultation with an Immigration Board established by the legislation, to utilize up to 30 percent of the quota numbers available in any year for the purpose of restoring cuts made by the new system in the quotas established by existing law.

Similar authority, permitting the reservation of up to 10 percent of the numbers available in any year, would enable us to meet the needs of refugees fleeing from catastrophe or oppression.

In addition, the bill would—

(1) Permit numbers not used by any country to be made available to countries where they are needed;

(2) Eliminate the discriminatory "Asia-Pacific triangle" provisions of the existing law;

(3) Eliminate discrimination against newly independent countries of the Western Hemisphere by providing nonquota status for natives of Jamaica, Trinidad, and Tobago;

(4) Afford nonquota status to parents of citizens, and fourth preference to parents of resident aliens;

(5) Eliminate the requirement that skilled first-preference immigrants needed in our economy must actually find an employer here before they can come to the United States;

(6) Afford a preference to workers with lesser skills who can fill specific needs in short supply;

(7) Eliminate technical restrictions that have hampered the effective use of the existing fair-share refugee law; and

(8) Authorize the Secretary of State to require reregistration of quota immigrant visa applicants and to regulate the time on payment of visa fees.

This bill would not alter in any way the many limitations in existing law which prevent an influx of undesirables and safeguard our people against excessive or unregulated immigration. Nothing in the legislation relieves any immigrant of the necessity of satisfying all of the security requirements we now have, or the requirements designed to exclude persons likely to become public charges. No immigrants admitted under this bill could contribute to unemployment in the United States.

The total number of immigrants would not be substantially changed. Under this bill, authorized quota immigration, which now amounts to 158,361 per year, would be increased by less than 7,000.

I urge the Congress to return the United States to an immigration policy which both serves the national interest and continues our traditional ideals. No move could more effectively reaffirm our fundamental belief that a man is to be judged—and judged exclusively—on his worth as a human being.

Lyndon B. Johnson.

The White House, *January 13, 1965.*

Section-by-Section Analysis

Section 1 amends section 201(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, under which quotas for each country are determined. It abolishes the national origins system by reducing present quotas by one-fifth of their present number each year for 5 years. As numbers are released from national origins quotas, they are added to the quota reserve pool established by the amendment to section 201 of the act made by section 3 of the bill. Thus in the first year, 20 percent (roughly 32,000) are released to the pool; in the second year, the pool will have 40 percent of present quotas (or 64,000); until in the fifth year and thereafter, all numbers are allocated through the pool. To provide some immediate relief to minimum quota areas, the minimum quota is raised to 200, but is then reduced in the same manner as other quotas.

Section 2 amends section 201(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act by changing a reference therein from "section 202(e)" to "section 202(d)" in conformity with the redesignation of section 202(e) as 202(d) made by section 6(e) of the bill.

Section 3 amends section 201 of the Immigration and Nationality Act by adding a new subsection (f). This subsection establishes the quota reserve pool from which all quota numbers will be allocated by the fifth year. In each of the 5 years constituting the period of transition, the pool will consist of (1) the numbers released from national origins quotas each year, and (2) numbers assigned to the old quota areas but unused the previous year because insufficient demand for them existed in the assigned quota area.

Quota numbers are issued in the order of preference specified in amended section 203 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (see section 10 of the bill). That is, first call on the first 50 percent is given to persons whose admission, by virtue of their exceptional skill, training or education, will be especially advantageous to the United States; first call on the next 30 percent, plus any part of the first 50 percent not issued for first preference purposes, is given to unmarried sons and daughters of United States citizens, not eligible for nonquota status because they are over 21 years of age; first call on the remaining 20 percent, plus any part of the first 80 percent not taken by the first two preference classes, is given to spouses and unmarried sons or daughters of aliens lawfully admitted for permanent residence; and any portion remaining is issued to other quota visa applicants, with percentage preferences to other relatives of U.S. citizens and resident aliens, and then to certain classes of workers. Amended section 203 further provides that within each class, visas are issued in the order in which applied for—first come, first served. These preference provisions, which under present law determine only relative priority between nationals of the same country, will now determine priority between nationals of different countries throughout the world.

To prevent disproportionate benefits to the nationals of any single country, a maximum of 10 percent of the total authorized quota is set on immigration attributable to any quota area. However, this limitation is not applied if to do so would result in reducing any quota at a more rapid rate than that provided by amended section 201(a). Ultimately, of course, the limitation applies to all.

Exceptions to the principle of allocating visas on the basis of time of registration within preference classes are provided to deal with special problems. Since some countries' quotas are not current, their nationals have no old registrations on file. To apply the principle rigidly would result, after 4 or 5 years, in curtailing immigration from these countries almost entirely. This would be undesirable not only because it would frustrate the aim of the bill that immigration from all countries should continue, but also because many of the countries that would be affected are our closest allies. Therefore, proposed section 201(f) would authorize the President, after consulation with the Immigration Board (established by section 18), to reserve up to 30 percent of the quota reserve pool for allocation to qualified immigrants (1) who could obtain visas under the existing system but not under the new system and (2) whose admission to the United States would further the national security interest by maintaining close ties with their countries. The number of quota visas so allocated may exceed the 10-percent limit on the number of immigrants from any country in the case of those countries which, under the existing system, regularly receive allocations in excess of that limit.

Subsection (f) also allows the President to reserve up to 10 percent of the quota reserve pool for allocation to certain refugees and permits him to disregard priority of registration within preference classes for the benefit of such refugees. Many refugees, almost by definition, are uprooted suddenly. They had no thought of immigration until they were forced to leave the country in which they were living because of natural calamity or political upheaval; or they may be refugees from persecution or dictatorship, in which case previous registration would have been dangerous.

Finally, subsection (f) provides that if the President reserves, against contingencies, any numbers during the year, but thereafter finds them not to be needed for the named purposes, such numbers are to be issued as if they had not been reserved. Similarly, the 10-percent limitation on the number of visas to be issued to any quota area is made inoperable if its application would result in authorized quota numbers not being used.

Section 4 amends section 201(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, which presently limits the number of quota visas issued in any single month to 10 percent of the total yearly quota. This limitation is needed to insure that persons entitled to preference by virtue of special skills or family ties will not be foreclosed from preference by a rush of earlier applications which exhaust the annual quota. To insure that all available quota numbers can nevertheless be utilized, present law provides that numbers not used during the first 10 months of any fiscal year may be used during the last 2 months of such year, without regard to the 10-percent monthly limitation. Often, if close to the full 10 percent of quota visas is not issued in each of the first months of the year, undesirable administrative problems result in the last two. The amendment allows the issuance each month of the 10 percent authorized for that month plus any visas authorized but not issued in previous months. This permits a more even spacing of visa issuance during the year.

Section 5 amends section 201(d) of the Immigration and Nationality Act which now permits the issuance of quota immigrant visas to nonquota immigrants. Substituted for the provisions of section 201(d) is a specific direction that no quota immigrant visa shall be issued to a person who is eligible for a nonquota immigrant visa. This will prevent nonquota immigrants from preempting visas to the prejudice of qualified quota immigrants.

Section 6 amends section 202 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to eliminate the so-called "Asia-Pacific triangle" provisions, which require persons of Asian stock to be attributed to quota areas not by their place of birth, but according to their racial ancestry. At the end of the 5-year transition period, this provision would be in any event superfluous, since national origin will no longer be a standard for the admission of qualified quota immigrants. But the formula is so especially discriminatory that it should be removed immediately, and not be permitted to operate even in part during the 5-year transition period.

Subsection (c) of the section amends section 202(c) of the act so as to raise the minimum allotment to subquotas of dependent areas of a governing country, thus preserving their present equality with independent minimum-quota areas. The dependent area's allotment is taken from the governing country's quota. To prevent a dependent area from preempting the governing country's quota disproportionately, it is provided that the dependent area's share of the quota will decrease as the governing country's quota is reduced.

Section 7 amends section 207 of the Immigration and Nationality Act by deleting the language of that section which prevents the issuance of visas in lieu of those issued but not actually used, or later found to be improperly issued. Thus in Germany alone over 7,000 quota visas are now taken by persons entitled to nonquota status, and 2,000 more quota visas are issued to persons who do not actually apply for admission to the United States. All these quota visas are lost under the present law. Such a result is inconsistent with the aim of the bill that all authorized quota numbers shall be used. The amended section 207 specifically authorizes the issuance of a quota visa in lieu of one improperly issued or not actually used, utilizing the same quota number.

Section 8 amends section 101(a)(27)(A) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, which grants nonquota status to spouses and children of U.S. citizens, so as to extend nonquota status to parents of U.S. citizens as well.

Section 9 amends section 101(a)(27)(C) of the Immigration and Nationality Act so as to extend nonquota status to natives of all independent Western Hemisphere countries. Under present law, such status is granted to natives of all independent North, Central, and South American countries, and of named Caribbean island countries which were independent when the Immigration and Nationality Act was enacted in 1952. The amendment extends nonquota status to natives of countries in these areas which have gained their independence since then, or may gain their independence hereafter.

Section 10 amends section 203(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, which establishes preferences for immigrants with special skills and for relatives of U.S. citizens and resident aliens.

Subsection (a) relaxes the test for the first preference accorded to persons of high education, technical training, specialized experience, or exceptional ability. Under present law, such persons are granted preferred status only if the Attorney General determines that their services are "needed urgently" in the United States. The amendment allows them first preference if their services, as determined by the Attorney General, would be "especially advantageous" to the United States.

Subsection (b) eliminates the second preference for parents of American citizens, now accorded nonquota status by the amendment made by section 8 of the bill.

Subsection (c) grants a fourth preference, up to 50 percent of numbers not issued to the first three preferences, to parents of aliens lawfully admitted for permanent residence. It also grants a subsidiary preference to qualified quota immigrants capable of filling particular labor shortages in the United States. Under present law, immigrants who do not meet the rigorous standards of the skilled specialist category are not preferred over any other immigrants even though they can fill a definite labor need which other immigrants cannot fill. The amendment allows to such immigrants a preference of 50 percent of the quota visas remaining after all family preferences have been satisfied or exhausted.

Section 11 amends section 204 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, which establishes the procedure for determining eligibility for preferred status under section 203.

The amendments made by paragraphs (1), (2), (3), and (4) cover the filing of petitions, on behalf of the workers accorded a fourth preference, by the persons who will employ them to fill the special labor needs. Paragraph (1) provides for approval of these petitions by the Attorney General, and paragraph (2) requires that he consult with the Immigration Board and interested departments of Government before granting preference to these workers.

Paragraph (2) also exempts first-preference skilled specialists from the present petition procedure because under the bill a new procedure is established for such persons. Under present law, skilled specialists may qualify for preferred status only when a petition requesting their services is filed by a U.S. employer. This requirement unduly restricts our ability to attract those whose services would substantially enhance our economy, cultural interests, and welfare. Many of these people have no way of contacting employers in the United States in order to obtain the required employment. Even if they knew whom to contact, few openings important enough to attract such highly skilled people are offered without personal interviews, and only a few very large enterprises or institutions have representatives abroad with hiring authority. Thus many such skilled specialists cannot obtain the employement presently required for first-preference status.

Moreover, the requirement of prearranged employment is in fact unnecessary. Highly skilled specialists would obviously work at their specialty, provided that employment is open. The only check needed is that the Attorney General ascertain, upon consultation with appropriate Government agencies, that job openings exist in the specialist's particular field. Although the present petition procedure serves to confirm the individual's own evidence of his training, education, or skills, such confirmation is not essential if proper investigation is made of his qualifications before the preference is accorded.

Paragraph (5), therefore, allows the Attorney General to grant a first preference to skilled specialists upon their own petitions, supported by such documentation as the Attorney General shall require. In this connection it is to be noted that the existing law requiring an investigation by the Attorney General of the petitioner's qualifications and a determination of his eligibility for a first preference is continued.

Section 12 amends section 205(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, providing for petitions to establish eligibility for preference as a relative of a U.S. citizen or lawfully resident alien, to conform to the substantive amendments made by section 10.

Section 13 amends the "fair share" refugee law so as to remove a provision which has hampered its effective operation. Presently, the entry of refugees is subject to the condition that they be within the mandate of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. The mandate provision is eliminated, so that the refugee law will no longer be subject to outside control. In addition, subsection (b) enlarges the applicable area definition so as to allow the entry of refugees from North Africa generally, and Algeria particularly, who are unable to return to their countries because of their race, religion, or political opinions, and incorporates this new definition in the "fair share" law. The existing definition encompasses refugees from "any country within the general area of the Middle East," which is defined as the area between Libya on the west, Turkey on the north, Pakistan on the east, and Saudi Arabia and Ethiopia on the south. The new definition substitutes Morocco for Libya as the western border of this area.

Section 14 repeals the "fair share" law's special provision for 500 "difficult to resettle" refugees; all such persons have been taken care of, and the authority is therefore no longer necessary.

Section 15 amends section 281 of the Immigration and Nationality Act so as to grant discretionary authority to the Secretary of State to specify the time and manner of payment of the fees for visa applications and issuances. This discretionary authority will allow the Secretary to control two undesirable situations:

First, many people in countries with oversubscribed quotas register their names on visa waiting lists even though they have no present intention of emigrating; they regard the registration as "insurance" for possible future use. Such registrations have the effect of creating a distorted picture of visa backlogs and make efficient administration difficult. The amendment therefore would allow the Secretary of State to require a registrant to deposit a fee at the time of registration. While not unduly burdensome on those who wish to come here, such a procedure would serve to discourage registrations which are not bona fide.

Second, otherwise admissible immigrants, particularly refugees, are often unable to pay the required visa fee. Rather than bar them from obtaining a visa, the Secretary is given authority to postpone payment.

Section 16 is also directed to the problem of "insurance" registrations. Many applicants for visas have been offered visas repeatedly but have turned them down. They wish only to preserve their priority in registration for possible future use. To handle such cases, section 203(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act is amended so as to allow the Secretary of State to terminate the registrations of persons who have previously declined visas. This amendment is also important in connection with a contemplated reregistration of applicants in certain oversubscribed areas designed to ascertain whether registrants have died, emigrated elsewhere, or changed their minds; the Secretary is authorized to terminate the registration of all persons who fail to reregister.

Section 17 amends subsections (a)(1), (a)(4) and (g), as redesignated, of section 212 of the Immigration and Nationality Act so as to allow the entry of certain mentally afflicted persons. Under present law, no visas may be issued to aliens who are feebleminded or insane, or have had one or more attacks of insanity, or who are afflicted with a psychopathic personality, epilepsy, or a mental defect. These provisions have created hardships for families seeking admission, where one member, often a child, is retarded. Such families are presented with the difficult decision as to whether they should leave the afflicted person behind or stay with him. Such a person cannot enter the United States even if the family is willing and able to care for him here and even if he is within the 85 percent of mentally afflicted persons whose condition can be substantially improved by adequate treatment.

The amendment gives the Attorney General discretionary authority to admit such persons who are the spouses, children, or parents of citizens or resident aliens, or who are accompanying a member of their family. The Attorney General, after consultation with the Surgeon General of the U.S. Public Health Service, would prescribe the controls and conditions on the entry of such persons, including the giving of a bond to insure continued family support.

The bar against the admission of epileptics is removed entirely, since this affliction can effectively be medically controlled. The amendment would also provide that the term "mentally retarded" be substituted for the present term "feeble minded." This is not a substantive change in the law.

Section 18 establishes the Immigration Board, to be composed of seven members. Two Members of the House of Representatives are appointed by the Speaker with the approval of the majority and minority leaders, two Members of the Senate, by the President of the Senate, with the approval of the majority and minority leaders, and three members, including the Chairman, by the President. Members not otherwise in Government service are to be paid on a per diem basis for actual time spent in the work of the Board.

The section provides that the Board's duties shall be to study, and consult with appropriate Government departments on all facets of immigration policy; to make recommendations to the President as to the reservation and allocation of quota numbers, and to recommend to the Attorney General criteria for admission of skilled specialists and workers whose services are needed by reason of labor shortages in this country.

Section 19 grants consular officers discretionary authority to require bonds ensuring that certain nonimmigrants will depart voluntarily from the United States when required. This amendment to section 221(g) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, by providing an additional safeguard against a later refusal to depart, would allow the issuance of visas in many borderline cases in which visas are now refused to students and visitors.

Section 20 amends section 272 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, which imposes a penalty on carriers bringing to the United States aliens afflicted with certain defects, so as to make that section conform with the changes made by this bill and section 11 of the act of September 26, 1961.

[From the New York Times]

I LIFT MY LAMP

President Johnson's forthright message on immigration reform revives an issue that should trouble the American conscience.

Since 1924 the United States has rigged admission to this country on a racist basis. The Nordic countries of northwestern Europe have large immigration quotas, while the Slavic and Latin countries of eastern and southern Europe have tiny quotas. This is the so-called national origins quota system designed to preserve the racial balance and implicitly the racial purity—then thought to exist in this country. The quota system was one ugly fruit of two generations of propaganda about race in Europe and America.

Sharply improved scholarship in ethnic history and in anthropology in recent decades should have had a chastening effect. But when Congress last confronted this problem, it flunked the test. The McCarran-Walter Immigration Act of 1952, which was passed over President Truman's veto, not only confirmed the racial quota system but introduced fresh anomalies and racist theories into the law.

Thus it is that the United States stands self-condemned before the world for imposing severe restraints on immigration by men and women from Athens and Rome—two of the chief sources of glory and greatness in that Western civilization Americans share and defend today. The people who produced Plato, Aristotle and Demosthenes are limited to 308 quota numbers a year. The people of Dante and Michelangelo are limited to 5,666. In this fashion the United States solemnly counts and calibrates the potential worth of all mankind. Is there not something terribly arrogant—and also absurd—in this self-righteous national posture?

President Johnson's proposal would eliminate the racial quota system and place admission to this country basically on a first-come, first-admitted basis. It deserves enactment. It is time to rekindle that lamp beside the golden door and banish forever those shadows that have dimmed its bright flame too long.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, the President has asked Congress to enact a new immigration law which would basically change American immigration policies. I am very happy to join in sponsoring this bill.

I am heartened that he recognized a compelling need to enact an immigration law that serves the national interest and reflects in every detail the principles of equality and human dignity to which our Nation subscribes.

He has proposed a bill which would eliminate altogether the national origins system for allocating quotas; the Asia Pacific triangle; and other racially discriminatory aspects of our present immigration laws.

The proposed legislation also would establish a series of priorities for admission: first, to immigrants with skills and training needed in our national economy; second, to persons closely related to U.S. citizens and permanent residents; and, third, to all other immigrants on a first-come, first-served basis, with no one nation receiving more than 10 percent of the quota numbers available in any one year.

I am happy to note that the President's proposals would correct two serious defects in our present immigration laws.

First, our present laws often deny admission to immigrants who have outstanding and badly needed skills and talents. The President's proposals would give priority to immigrants who have the kind of skills and talents our economy needs very badly, without affecting our unemployment rates.

Thus, our national economic growth would be enhanced, our economy would be stimulated, and new employment opportunities would be generated.

Second, our present laws often needlessly separate our citizens from their parents or other close relatives. The President's proposals would give preference to close relatives of citizens and permanent residents, and thus serve to promote the reuniting of families.

To insure that the new system would not impose undue hardship on any of our close allies by suddenly curtailing their emigration, the bill authorizes the President, after consultation with an Immigration Board established by the legislation, to utilize up to 30 percent of the quota numbers available in any year for the purpose of restoring cuts made by the new system in the quotas established by existing law.

Similar authority, permitting the reservation of up to 10 percent of the total authorized quota numbers available in any year, would enable us to meet the needs of refugees fleeing from catastrophe or oppression.

In addition, the administration's bill would, first, permit numbers not used by any country to be made available to countries where they are needed; second, eliminate discrimination against newly independent countries of the Western Hemisphere by providing nonquota status for natives of Jamaica, Trinidad, and Tobago; third, afford nonquota status to parents of citizens, and fourth preference to parents of resident aliens; fourth, eliminate the requirement that skilled first preference immigrants needed in our economy must actually find an employer here before they can come to the United States; fifth, afford a preference to workers with lesser skills who can fill specific needs in short supply; and sixth, authorize the Secretary of State to require reregistration of quota immigrant visa applicants and to regulate the time of payment of visa fees.

Under the President's proposal, existing national quotas would be reduced at the rate of 20 percent annually until the allotments were wiped out in 5 years. These quota numbers would go into a reserve pool for redistribution under the system of priorities I mentioned earlier.

The administration's proposal would not change any requirements under existing laws for preventing entry of undesirable persons. Applicants must still satisfy all security requirements we now have, and other requirements designed to exclude persons likely to become public charges.

The measure would only increase by less than 7,000 the total authorized quota immigration annually.

By seeking an immigration policy reflecting America's ideal of the equality of all men without regard to race, color, creed, or national origin, we would accomplish two purposes:

First. We would enhance America's image as leader of the free world in according equal dignity and respect to all peoples of the world, and thus accomplish a significant forward stride in our international relations.

Second. We would recognize the individual worth of each immigrant and his potential contribution to the development and growth of our national economy.

These basic changes in American immigration policy are long overdue. Revision of our immigration laws is a logical extension of our efforts to achieve our ideal of equality.

Last year we enacted the historic Civil Rights Act of 1964, which was designed to wipe out the last vestiges of racial discrimination against our own citizens.

As we reappraise the relationship of citizen to citizen under this law, it is also good for us to reexamine this same relationship of man's equality to man with respect to peoples of the world.

For as we move to erase racial discrimination against our own citizens, we should also move to erase racial barriers against citizens of other lands in our immigration laws.

I am encouraged that the President has called upon the Congress to accord priority consideration to immigration reform legislation.

I have long regarded this as an issue of fundamental policy. For our present immigration laws disparage our democratic heritage. They directly contradict the spirit and principles of the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution of the United States, and our traditional standards of justice, decency, and the dignity and equality of all men.

No legislation could more cogently and with more telling effect reaffirm our fundamental belief in the equality of man.

INCREASE IN MILEAGE OF NATIONAL SYSTEM OF INTERSTATE HIGHWAYS

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code to increase the total mileage of the National System of Interstate Highways from 41,000 miles to 50,000 miles.

The Federal Bureau of Public Roads has requests from numerous States, including New Jersey, for an additional 20,000 miles of highway, over and above the existing authorization. The Bureau cannot consider these because all of the mileage authorized under the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 has been allocated.

The growth of our population and the increasing use of motor vehicles make it advisable that the Interstate System be expanded now from its presently authorized 41,000 miles. We cannot wait until 1972 and then begin thinking about adding new highways.

The need is here and now. For example, in New Jersey there is the pressing need for an expressway to link Trenton with the shore area. But as I have already stated, because all mileage in the Interstate Highway System has already been allocated, New Jersey is unable to get additional 90–10 Federal funds for this much-needed road. There are also other expressways needed in our State which cannot be built for this same reason.

Equally important with meeting traffic needs are the safety features that a modern highway meeting Interstate System standards provides.

In 1963, there were over 43,000 fatalities in our Nation. In the first 10 months of 1964 this figure jumped 11 percent over the comparable 10 months in 1963. If we project this 11 percent increase for the entire year of 1964, traffic fatalities for the year just passed will amount to more than 48,000. This is an appalling figure.

Recent figures provided by the Bureau of Public Roads show that those portions of the Interstate Highway System now open have a traffic-accident fatality rate of 2.6 per hundred million vehicle-miles. On old conventional highways in the same traffic corridors, this figure rises to 9.7 fatalities per hundred million vehicle-miles.

Funds for the construction of the Interstate System are derived from the trust fund which was established by Congress and administered by the Federal Bureau of Public Roads, which is financed primarily through taxes on petroleum products used in motor vehicles. This fund is self-sustaining, and the revenues are derived solely from those making use of our roads. No additional tax assessment is required.

I hope the Senate will give early consideration and approval to my bill which would expand this great Interstate Highway System of ours.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of my bill be printed in full at this point in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 501) to amend title 23 of the United States Code to increase the total mileage of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, introduced by Mr. Case, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

> *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the first sentence of subsection (d) of section 103 of title 23 of the United States Code is amended by striking out "forty-one thousand miles" and inserting in lieu thereof "fifty thousand miles."

AMENDMENT OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ACT

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, to make more specific the purpose for which loans may be made under sections 2 and 4 of such act and to modify the provisions relating to interest rates on loans made under such act. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed at this point in the Record.

Mr. President, the bill would require the Rural Electrification Administration to finance its future operations in the open market, except in cases where it may be called upon to furnish electric power to rural areas to which central power service is not available. Secondly, the bill would require that loans made by the Rural Electrification Administration shall bear interest at a rate equal to the average rate of interest payable by the United States on its marketable obligations, having maturities of 10 years or more, issued during the last preceding fiscal year in which any such obligations were issued and adjusted to the nearest one-eighth of 1 percent.

This bill, in part, seeks to correct some of the inequities and loose practices described by the Comptroller General in his report to the Congress made in November of 1963. I contemplate at a later date to suggest to the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry amendments to this bill which would further implement the recommendations made by the Comptroller General.

Mr. President, amendments to the Rural Electrification Act of this nature are long overdue. The Rural Electrification Administration was originally established by Executive Order No. 7037, signed by President Roosevelt, May 11, 1935. The Department of Agriculture Organic Act of 1944, approved September 21, 1944, established a flat rate of 2 percent on unmatured, unpaid balances of REA borrowers. At that time, the Treasury Department was paying an average interest rate of 2.30 percent on its marketable issues of 10 years or more.

The reason for the differential in the interest rate charged REA borrowers as compared to the rate the Treasury was paying, was to lend more encouragement for the establishment of new REA units and the building of additional lines to serve the rural population. This obviously was successful for, according to the tabulation which I shall refer to later, 1944 marked the beginning of a very substantial increase in REA units and line construction.

I believe that the Rural Electrification Administration has been an outstanding asset and a program which has brought much comfort, lightened the burdens, and stimulated the economy of our Nation's rural areas. The purpose for which the Rural Electrification Administration was created has largely been fulfilled. Its continued operations under the same terms and provisions provided in the present law permit the REA to go far beyond the original intent of the Congress and its activities now are in direct conflict to our basic free enterprise system.

During the first 18 years of the REA's existence through fiscal 1954, about $2.3 billion in loans were granted for distribution systems to carry power directly to rural customers. Over the same period a total of $550 million was granted for generation and transmission—G. & T.—purposes. This was 18.8 percent of all electrification loans granted. During the 6 fiscal years 1955–60, G. & T. loans totaled $463 million, or 35.7 percent of all electrification loans. This was an average of $77 million a year for G. & T. purposes.

In fiscal 1961, G. & T. loans rose to $152 million, or 55.3 percent of total loans. The sharp increase in amount and proportion of G. & T. loans in 1961 was accounted for by approval on June 15, 1961, of a $60 million G. & T. loan which was the largest single REA loan ever granted. Loans for G. & T. purposes in 1962 amounted to $155 million, or 59.4 percent of total loans. The estimate for the current year is $250 million which would be about 62 percent of all loans. Of the $425 million authorization request for 1964, about $290 million would be available for G. & T. purposes. This would be 68 percent of the total authorization.

Thus, in the 4-year period 1961–64, the funds loaned and budgeted for G. & T. purposes total $847 million. This 4-year total is more than four-fifths of the $1,013 million total which was granted in G. & T. loans over the 24 years of REA's existence prior to 1961.

If the true economic cost of power financed by G. & T. loans were taken into account in justifying the loans, there would be few instances where such loans could be justified on the basis of cost. The economic cost of power sold by investor-owned utilities includes the cost of interest, operating expenses, depreciation, and taxes. The true economic cost of power sold by the G. & T. cooperatives includes these same elements of cost although the cooperative itself does not bear all the costs. By having to pay only 2 percent interest to the U.S. Treasury on money which costs the Treasury 4 percent, the cooperative shifts one-half of the true interest cost to taxpayers generally. Also by being exempt from the Federal income tax and a sizable portion of State and local taxes, the cooperative shifts to taxpayers generally the burden of taxes it foregoes.

Mr. President, the Rural Electrification Administration has been non-self-sustained financially and subsidized by the general taxpayer for a period far too long. After exhaustive studies the second Hoover Commission made the following report and recommendation to the Congress in 1954:

> It is our belief that the time has arrived for the reorganization of the Rural Electrification Administration into a self-supporting institution securing its own finance from private sources in a manner similar to that of other agencies. Moreover, the operations of Rural Electrification should be made subject to the Government Corporation Control Act in order to secure the advantages of more efficient organization under that act.

Unfortunately, that recommendation was ignored and the REA has gone ahead in ways that were never intended, and certainly never conceived of, when it was given its first instruction to bring electricity to the rural areas of our country.

A beginning of sanity in the Rural Electrification Administration's operations can be made by the adoption of my bill, for I am convinced that much of today's waste arises from the fact that easy 2 percent money is available in practically unlimited quantities—and that no one is watching to see what is done with it.

Mr. President, to illustrate that the REA has accomplished the mission for which it was created, I submit statistics supplied to me by the Rural Electrification Administration itself.

Of the 3,818,200 farms in the United States, 3,726,850—or 97.6 percent—had central station electric service as of July 1, 1962. Of these electrified farms, approximately 54 percent are served by REA-financed electric systems. The balance are served by other suppliers, principally commercial power companies. Therefore, REA has accomplished its intended mission to fill up that gap which could not profitably be served by private power companies. In 1935, when REA was created, 743,954 farms in the United States had central station electric service. This was only 10.9 percent of all farms in the Nation which then totaled 6,812,350.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the Record as a part of my remarks a table revealing the number of loans and amounts thereof for the years 1935 to 1964, inclusive. This table clearly reveals the recent expansion of this program.

PEGGED REA—2 PERCENT INTEREST RATE

Mr. President, I now want to refer to the pegged 2 percent interest rate charged on REA loans since 1945. This practice has caused an unjustified expense to the taxpayers in the sum of more than $1¼ billion. I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record at this point as a part of my remarks a table compiled by the U.S. Treasury Department showing interest rate charged by REA, computed annual interest rate paid by U.S. Treasury on securities outstanding, variance between interest rate charged by REA and paid by U.S. Treasury, average REA loans outstanding, and excess of interest cost to U.S. Treasury over interest rate charged by REA, all for the years 1936 to 1962 inclusive.

Mr. President, our country, a world leader and the richest and most progressive in the world, was able to attain this position largely because its economy was based on the philosophy of free enterprise. I will admit that there have been occasions when it was necessary for the Federal Government to underwrite and foster certain programs that could not be performed by private enterprise. It is only sensible, however, and in the best interests of our economy and the perpetuation of the free enterprise system that once these Federal Government-fostered programs have fulfilled their mission, they should be curtailed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may lie on the desk for 3 days in order that other interested Senators may join as cosponsors should they so desire.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and statistics will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 503) to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, to make more specific the purpose for which loans may be made under sections 2 and 4 of such act, and to modify the provisions relating to interest rates on loans made under such act, introduced by Mr. LAUSCHE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 503

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the next to the last sentence of section 4 of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended (7 U.S.C. 904), is amended by striking out "and shall bear interest at the rate of 2 per centum per annum; interest rates on the unmatured and unpaid balance of any loans made pursuant to this section prior to the effective date of this amendment shall be adjusted to 2 per centum per annum, and the maturity date of any such loans may be readjusted to occur at a date not beyond thirty-five years from the date of such loan:" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "and shall bear interest at a rate equal to the average rate of interest payable by the United States of America on its marketable obligations, having maturities of ten or more years, issued during the last preceding fiscal year in which any such obligations were issued and adjusted to the nearest one-eighth of 1 per centum:".

(b) Section 4 of such Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof a new sentence as follows: "No loan shall be made under authority of this section or section 2 of this Act after June 30, 1965, except for the sole purpose of furnishing electric energy to persons in rural areas who are not receiving central station service and who are not in a rural area being served by a central station; and the Administrator shall, with respect to any loan made under authority of this section or section 2 of this Act after June 30, 1965, impose such terms and conditions as may be necessary to insure that the proceeds of such loan are not used, directly or indirectly, for any purpose other than to furnish electric energy to persons in rural areas who are not receiving central station service and who are not in a rural area served by a central station."

SEC. 2. The last sentence of section 5 of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended (7 U.S.C. 905), is amended by striking out "and shall be at a rate of interest of 2 per centum per annum; interest rates on the unmatured and unpaid balance of any loans made pursuant to this section prior to the effective date of this amendment shall be adjusted to 2 per centum per annum", and inserting in lieu thereof "and shall bear interest at a rate equal to the average rate of interest payable by the United States of America on its marketable obligations, having maturities of ten or more years, issued during the last preceding fiscal year in which any such obligations were issued and adjusted to the nearest one-eighth of 1 per centum".

SEC. 3. The amendments made by this Act relating to interest rates shall be effective with respect to all loans made on and after the date of enactment of this Act.

The statistics presented by Mr. LAUSCHE are as follows:

Loans made by the Rural Electrification Administration, fiscal years 1935–64

Fiscal year	Electric loans	
	Number	Amount
1935-36	----------	$17,929,017
1937	----------	50,347,265
1938	----------	31,559,719
1939	----------	141,899,413
1940	----------	44,880,216
1941	----------	101,710,165
1942	----------	91,282,300
1943	----------	8,225,380
1944	----------	34,002,078
1945	----------	26,343,238
1946	----------	290,913,868
1947	----------	256,389,000
1948	----------	319,110,000
1949	----------	449,317,700
1950	651	376,199,000
1951	472	221,815,500
1952	295	165,758,731
1953	345	164,972,662
1954	325	167,104,100
1955	349	167,530,430
1956	344	189,804,800
1957	404	300,461,514
1958	337	241,636,865
1959	250	177,292,100
1960	276	220,108,000
1961	255	274,507,218
1962	242	261,374,500
1963	262	341,021,500
1964	285	261,500,000

LOAN FUNDS OUTSTANDING

The following amounts in REA loan funds were outstanding December 31, 1964:

Electric loans	$3,128,901,922
Telephone loans	827,566,993

The table below shows the estimated variances between the interest rate charged by REA and the rate paid by the U.S. Treasury on outstanding securities:

Year ended June 30	Interest rate charged by REA	Computed annual interest rate paid by U.S. Treasury on securities outstanding	Variance between interest rate charged by REA and paid by U.S. Treasury	Average REA [1] loans outstanding	Excess of interest cost to U.S. Treasury over interest rate charged by REA
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Thousands*	*Dollars*
1936	3.00	2.56	(0.44)	$412	(1,813)
1937	2.77	2.53	(.19)	6,344	(12,054)
1938	2.88	2.59	(.29)	35,954	(104,267)
1939	2.73	2.60	(.13)	90,974	(118,266)
1940	2.69	2.58	(.11)	170,771	(187,848)
1941	2.46	2.52	.06	254,539	152,723
1942	2.48	2.29	(.19)	315,722	(599,872)
1943	2.57	1.98	(.59)	343,245	(2,025,145)
1944	[2] 2.67	1.93	(.74)	346,239	(2,562,169)
1945	2.00	1.94	(.06)	362,603	(217,562)
1946	2.00	2.00	----------	415,289	----------
1947	2.00	2.11	.11	541,621	595,783
1948	2.00	2.13	.18	742,256	1,366,061
1949	2.00	2.24	.24	866,633	2,079,919
1950	2.00	2.20	.20	1,148,165	2,296,330
1951	2.00	2.27	.27	$1,403,926	3,790,600
1952	2.00	2.33	.33	1,629,020	5,375,766
1953	2.00	2.44	.44	1,832,024	8,060,906
1954	2.00	2.34	.34	2,011,927	6,840,552
1955	2.00	2.35	.35	2,148,828	7,520,898
1956	2.00	2.58	.58	2,274,876	13,194,281
1957	2.00	2.73	.73	2,431,114	17,747,132
1958	2.00	2.64	.64	2,623,500	16,790,400
1959	2.00	2.87	.87	2,825,500	24,581,850
1960	2.00	3.30	1.30	3,039,000	39,507,000
1961	2.00	3.07	1.07	3,243,500	34,705,450
1962	2.00	3.24	1.24	3,407,850	42,257,340
July 1 to Nov. 30, 1962	2.00	3.29	1.29	3,568,707	[3] 19,181,318
Total	----------	----------	----------	----------	240,215,813

[1] 1936 through 1948: mean value of principal balances outstanding at July 1 and June 30 each fiscal year on electric loans by REA. 1949 through 1962: mean value of loans by U.S. Treasury Department to REA. July 1, 1962, to Nov. 30, 1962: balance of U.S. Treasury loans outstanding to REA on June 30, 1962, plus ½ of REA loans granted in the interim.

[2] REA charged 2.49 percent on new loans during the period, July 1 to Sept. 20, 1944.

[3] Based on a 5-month period.

NOTE.—All figures shown in parentheses are negative amounts.

THE PASSAMAQUODDY TIDAL POWER PROJECT

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I introduce, on behalf of myself and my senior colleague from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], a bill to authorize the construction of the Passamaquoddy-St. John hydroelectric project, subject to appropriate agreements between the United States and Canada.

This bill, which would authorize harnessing of the vast tidal energy of Passamaquoddy and Cobscook Bays in Maine and New Brunswick, and developing of the resources of the upper St. John River, is significant to the economy of the Northeast region of our country, while at the same time serving the interests of the country as a whole. The bill is being cosponsored also by Mr. Aiken, Mr. Kennedy of Massachusetts, Mr. McIntyre, Mr. Pell, and Mr. Prouty, and it has the backing of members of both parties, in and out of Maine.

Sound and imaginative engineering studies have demonstrated the Quoddy project to be economically feasible.

Congressional hearings last August on technical studies by the Department of the Interior and by the U.S. Corps of Engineers reaffirmed Quoddy's economic feasibility.

In addition, the Quoddy-St. John project would be a pertinent and important step toward the protection and the development of the Allagash region of Maine, one of the most beautiful sections of our country.

Those of us who are concerned with the future of the Northeastern corner of our country see the Quoddy-St. John project as a vital link in the long-term expansion of the economy there and of the country as a whole.

To those of us with a desire to restore an area beset by adversity, where the unemployment rate ranges as high as 25 percent, Quoddy makes sense as resource utilization. We see Quoddy as essential to the revitalization of a sagging economy, and we see Quoddy opening the door to the integration of a natural economic unit, including the New England States and the Canadian Maritime Provinces.

And I repeat, Mr. President, that professional engineering surveys show that the Passamaquoddy-St. John project is economically feasible.

In addition to the many other advantages of this undertaking, Quoddy would provide electrical power for the northeast region at prices 25 percent below prevailing rates.

This legislation would authorize construction of the necessary civil works and powerplants by the Corps of Engineers, construction of high voltage transmission lines by the Department of the Interior, and the marketing of the power developed by the project by the Secretary of the Interior.

This legislation opens the way to the development of a million kilowatts of peaking power, 250,000 kilowatts of firm energy and a billion kilowatt hours of dependable off-peak energy annually for the northeast region.

Each day, more than a million kilowatts of power surge in and out of Passamaquody Bay. As President Kennedy said when he endorsed Quoddy:

> Man needs only to exercise his engineering ingenuity to convert the ocean's surge into a national asset.

President Kennedy said Quoddy meets the national interest test because it strengthens the economy of the whole Nation and enables America to better compete in the marketplaces of the world.

We hope our Government, and that of Canada, will negotiate an agreement on an equitable sharing of the benefits from this combined project. With this accomplished, we will be able to move ahead on Quoddy-St. John, and transform a potential asset into a national asset.

We want to take this opportunity to express our appreciation to Secretary Udall, the members of his Interior Department, to the Corps of Engineers and to the Department of State for their cooperation and the technical advice they have given us.

Since President Kennedy referred the 1961 International Joint Commission Report on the Quoddy project to Secretary Udall, we have enjoyed the closest cooperation and assistance as we have worked to make our dream a reality. The help we have received has given us great optimism in the pursuit of our goal of new opportunities from Quoddy for our region and our Nation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 515) to authorize the international Passamaquoddy tidal power project, including hydroelectric power development of the upper Saint John River, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Muskie (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

RELIEF FOR OUR ELDERLY

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, we have created a society in which most people now survive well beyond their retirement. The retirement age of 65 fixed by the German Chancellor von Bismarck 76 years ago, when the life expectancy of an individual was far less than it is today, makes the present retirement age enforced in many industries unrealistic. Today, many men and women who are retired from their employment at the age of 65 have 10 or 20 years of useful life before them. In the long span of three quarters of a century the life expectancy of men and women has lengthened by many years. In fact, in that period of time nearly doubled. However, because of the arbitrary retirement age of 65 our country now has 18 million elderly citizens, so-called, many of them unemployed, retired to idleness, and many in need.

For too many Americans, retirement really means the end of a worthwhile active, interesting life and an end to a comfortable standard of living. It too often means the beginning of poverty, substandard housing, lack of adequate medical care and days filled with nothingness. Our problem lies in the fact that to date the planning necessary to meet the economic, social, and medical needs of the aged has been inadequate. As a result, too many of our elderly citizens feel unwanted, unneeded, isolated, and neglected.

During the closing days of the 88th Congress, I spoke at length on the needs of our elderly citizens and on methods of fulfilling them. Among these needs is the right of access to community resources. Too many older persons are unable to obtain effective access to community health, recreation, and social services so essential to meaningful living in retirement. In many cases, this is due to lack of ability to pay for the services; in other instances, the elderly are unaware of the existence of these services; in still other cases, older persons hesitate to pay for the cost of public transportation to the facility.

Therefore, Mr. President, I send to the desk, for appropriate reference, a bill authorizing the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to make grants to metropolitan and other transportation systems which will carry on demonstration projects providing low fares for elderly citizens during the nonpeak hours of the day. As a minimum, elderly men and women should be permitted to ride on public transportation at one-half fare during the hours in which buses and streetcars are least used. This will add income to public transportation systems and benefit older people at the same time.

Similar programs have been tried in three major metropolitan areas—Detroit, Cleveland, and Los Angeles. I am informed that they have met with a great deal of success.

Section 6 of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 does provide a basis for beginning the project proposed in this bill. I hope that this proposed legislation for the welfare of more than 18 million of our fellow citizens will be enacted into law in the very near future.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 519) to direct the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to cause certain demonstration and research projects to be carried out to determine the economic feasibility of providing urban mass transportation service to elderly persons during nonrush-hour periods at reduced fares introduced by Mr. Young of Ohio, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

EXTENSION OF ARMED SERVICE BENEFITS TO VETERANS NOT ENGAGED IN ARMED CONFLICT

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, as the leader of the free world, the United States bears heavy responsibilities which we attempt to meet in many ways. In one expression of this leadership we have sought to assist many countries, which share our basic belief in democracy and freedom, to maintain their identity as nations and to resist attempts to oppress them. In providing this assistance we sometimes call upon the men and women in our Armed Forces to expose themselves to dangers to which they would not ordinarily expect to be exposed while serving in the armed forces of a nation which is not at war. The special circumstances in which some of our service personnel find themselves should be recognized by the Congress and special benefits should be provided.

It is with that purpose in mind that on behalf of myself and 25 of my colleagues I introduce for appropriate reference a bill designed to provide benefits substantially the same as those provided for veterans of the Korean conflict to veterans of our Armed Forces who, when the United States is not engaged in a formally declared war, serve in areas of the world in which armed conflict or other warlike conditions exist.

The President would be responsible for declaring an area an "area of hostilities" and for determining how long the area would be so regarded. If members of our armed services are to be sent to these critical areas of the world and are to be subjected to the risks involved, then it seems simple justice to me that they should be eligible for benefits similar to those received by men and women who served in the Korean conflict.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 520) to authorize wartime benefits under certain circumstances for peacetime veterans and their dependents, introduced by Mr. Saltonstall (for himself, Mr. Allott, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Boggs, Mr. Carlson, Mr. Case, Mr. Cooper, Mr. Curtis, Mr. Dirksen, Mr. Dominick, Mr. Fannin, Mr. Fong, Mr. Hickenlooper, Mr. Hruska, Mr. Javits, Mr. Jordan of Idaho, Mr. Kuchel, Mr. Miller, Mr. Morton, Mr. Mundt, Mr. Pearson, Mr. Prouty. Mr. Simpson, Mr. Thurmond, Mr. Tower, and Mr. Young of North Dakota), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL FARM LOAN AND FARM CREDIT ACTS

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I am introducing, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Federal Farm Loan Act and the Farm Credit Act of 1933 to improve the operations of the 12 Federal intermediate credit banks and the 482 production credit associations that operate under those laws. The credit banks finance the associations in making short- and intermediate-term loans to farmers and ranchers. The banks also finance agricultural lending by around 100 other institutions but about 95 percent of the business of the banks is with the associations. At present the associations have some $2.3 billion of loans outstanding to 290,000 members. The loanable funds are obtained largely by selling consolidated collateral trust debentures of the banks to the investing public. An overall purpose of the bill is better to assure a cooperative basis of operation and replacement of Government capital in the banks with private capital. This is what was intended when we passed the Farm Credit Act of 1956 but experience shows that further amendments will be necessary.

From 1923 through 1956, the United States owned all of the capital stock of the Federal intermediate credit banks. Under the 1956 amendments, the credit banks were changed to a cooperative basis of operation and it was intended that the Government capital gradually would be retired and that the associations eventually would own all of the capital stock of the credit banks. In the last 8 years, the associations through purchase and patronage have come to own about one-third of the total capital stock of the credit banks. During the same period, some Government capital was retired from all of the banks but it has also been necessary for the United States to purchase additional capital stock in six of the banks in order to meet their credit needs. This was because the demand of farmers and ranchers for loans was much greater than anticipated in some areas and, since the aggregate amount of outstanding debentures by which a bank provides loanable funds for the associations may not exceed 10 times the surplus and paid-in capital of the bank, more such capital had to be provided if the farmers and ranchers were to be served The amount of Government capital that had to be put into six of the banks, in order to keep them within the 10-to-1 debt-to-net-worth limitation, is nearly 3½ times the amount of Government capital retired from all of the banks since the 1956 amendments became effective. It seems clear, therefore, that further legislation will be necessary to complete the shift from Government to private ownership while at the same time fulfilling the credit needs of the farmers and ranchers.

The present bill is designed to reverse the trend of the Federal intermediate credit banks requiring more Government capital. The bill would do this both by reducing the level of required capital and providing another source for capital. The 10-to-1 debt-to-net-worth limitation would be changed to 15 to 1 and would be applied to the 12 banks collectively instead of individually—section 1(b). To provide capital to meet the credit needs of a Federal intermediate credit bank, the production credit associations in the farm credit district served by the bank may be required, in appropriate circumstances, to subscribe to additional capital stock in the bank; and the capital stock held by each association could be adjusted to bring the amount into proportion with the indebtedness of each association to the bank—section 1(c)(ii). While each bank annually determines the amount of its capital stock owned by the United States to be retired, there is a specified minimum to be retired whenever its net worth is more than one-eighth—instead of one-sixth as now—of the highest month-end balance of its debentures and other obligations outstanding during the immediately preceding 5 years—section 1(c)(i).

There would be no change in the limitation that a production credit association may not rediscount paper with or borrow from a Federal intermediate credit bank to the extent that the total liabilities of the association would exceed 10 times its paid-in and unimpaired capital and surplus (12 U.S.C. 1032); but the surplus against which the limitation is applied would be increased. Net earnings of each Federal intermediate credit bank applied to reserve account since January 1, 1957, would be allocated to the production credit associations and other financing institutions served by the bank in the same proportion that patronage refunds are now paid—section 1(d)(ii). Such amounts allocated to a production credit association would have the effect of increasing its net worth. A production credit association would also be authorized to obtain loans from the Federal intermediate credit bank without collateral to the extent authorized under rules and regulations prescribed by the Farm Credit Administration—section 1(a). Further, each production credit association would be given the option to allocate to borrowers future earnings retained in the surplus account of the association—section 2(a) and the option to require borrowers to invest in an equity reserve in the association as a means of providing capital other than selling capital stock to borrowers or investors—section 2(b).

It is estimated that the future demands of farmers and ranchers for loans from the production credit associations and other institutions financed by the Federal intermediate credit banks could be handled under the new amendments without calling on the United States to purchase more capital stock in the credit banks. The new amendments are also expected to expedite the return of the Government capital now in the banks.

I ask unanimous consent that a general explanation of the bill, a letter from the Farm Credit Administration, and a letter from the Bureau of the Budget, relating to the bill, be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the general explanation of the bill and letters will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 522) to amend the Federal Farm Loan Act and the Farm Credit Act of 1933 to provide means for expediting the retirement of Government capital in the Federal intermediate credit banks, including an increase in the debt permitted such banks in relation to their capital and provision for the production credit associations to acquire additional capital stock therein, to provide for allocating certain earnings of such banks and associations to their users, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Ellender, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The general explanation and letters presented by Mr. Ellender are as follows:

General Explanation of Proposed Bill Transmitted by Farm Credit Administration

On December 21, 1964, the Farm Credit Administration transmitted to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House a draft of a proposed bill to amend the Federal Farm Loan Act and the Farm Credit Act of 1933 as respects the 12 Federal intermediate credit banks and the 483 production credit associations that operate under those laws. In each of the 12 farm credit districts into which the country is divided, there is 1 Federal intermediate credit bank and from 26 to 77 production credit associations. Each association in its own territory makes short- and intermediate-term loans to farmers and ranchers. These loans are then rediscounted with or used as collateral for a loan from the Federal intermediate credit bank of the district which also serves certain other financing institutions in the same way. The Federal intermediate credit banks in turn obtain loan funds by selling their consolidated collateral trust debentures to the investing public.

The aggregate amount of outstanding debentures and similar obligations issued by or on behalf of a Federal intermediate credit bank may not exceed 10 times the surplus and paid-in capital of the bank (12 U.S.C. 1041). Once this maximum is reached, or nearly so, an increasing volume of loans and discounts can be handled within the statutory limitation only if the surplus and paid-in capital of the bank is increased. Although the banks have increased their surplus and paid-in capital from earnings and class B stock purchased by production credit associations by more than $80 million as hereafter noted, that has not been sufficient to support the increased lending by some of the banks. Under present law the practice is to provide additional capital from the revolving fund in the Treasury that is available for the purchase of class A (Government) capital stock in such amount as the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration determines is needed to meet the credit needs of the bank.

Since January 1, 1957, the intermediate credit banks have been operating under amendments made by the Farm Credit Act of 1956. Thereunder, the credit banks were changed to a cooperative basis of operation and started from exclusive Government ownership toward eventual private ownership by the production credit associations. The Government capital became class A capital stock. The patronage refunds declared by a bank each year are paid in class B stock to production credit associations and in participation certificates to other financing institutions. The production credit associations had to purchase class B stock of the credit banks in an amount equal to 15 percent of the class A stock then held by the Government. The amount so purchased was $13,112,015; and a corresponding amount of Government capital was retired.

In addition to the initial retirement of class A stock, each credit bank is to determine annually the amount of Government capital to be retired. Whenever its net worth at the close of any fiscal year is more than one-sixth of the highest month-end balance of its debentures and other obligations outstanding during the immediately preceding 5 years, the minimum amount of class A (Government) stock to be retired each year is an amount equal to the class B stock and participation certificates issued for that year. Under the annual retirement provisions, seven of the banks have retired $453,865 of Government capital.

The intent of the 1956 amendments was that the Government capital gradually would be retired and that the production credit associations in each district eventually would own all of the capital stock of the Federal intermediate credit bank. However, although a total of $13,565,880 of Government capital has been retired from the 12 banks while they were increasing their net worth by $67,133,740 from earnings, since the 1956 amendments became effective, it has been necessary for the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration to purchase $46,750,000 of additional capital stock in six of the banks to keep their debt-to-net worth ratio within the stautory limit of 10 to 1. In other words, the amount of Government capital that had to be put into six of the banks, in order to keep them within the 10 to 1 debt-to-net worth limitation, is nearly 3½ times the amount of Government capital retired from all of the banks since the 1956 amendments became effective. Experience indicates, therefore, that further amendments will be necessary to fully accomplish the shift from Government to private ownership.

The proposed bill recommended by the Farm Credit Administration is designed to reverse the trend of the Federal intermediate credit banks requiring more Government capital. The bill would do this both by reducing the level of required capital and providing another source for capital. The 10 to 1 debt-to-net worth limitation on a Federal intermediate credit bank would be changed to 15 to 1 and would be applied to the 12 banks collectively instead of individually (sec. 1(b)). To provide capital to meet the credit needs of a Federal intermediate credit bank, the production credit associations in the farm credit district served by the bank may be required, in appropriate circumstances, to subscribe to additional class B stock in the bank; and the class B stock held by each association could be adjusted to bring the amount into proportion with the indebtedness of each association to the bank (sec. 1(c)(ii)). The minimum amount of class A (Government) stock to be retired each year would equal the amount of class B stock and participation certificates issued for that year whenever the net worth of a Federal intermediate credit bank is more than one-eighth—instead of one-sixth as now—of the highest month-end balance of its debentures and other obligations outstanding during the immediately preceding 5 years (sec. 1(c)(i)).

There would be no change in the limitation that a production credit association may not rediscount paper with or borrow from a Federal intermediate credit bank to the extent that the total liabilities of the association would exceed ten times its paid-in and unimpaired capital and surplus (12 U.S.C. 1032); but the surplus against which the limitation is applied would be increased. Net earnings of each Federal intermediate credit bank applied to reserve account since January 1, 1957, would be allocated to the production credit associations and other financing institutions served by the bank in the same proportion that patronage refunds are now paid (sec. 1(d)(ii)). Such amounts allocated to a production credit association would have the effect of increasing its net worth. A production credit association would also be authorized to obtain loans from the Federal intermediate credit bank "without collateral to the extent authorized under rules and regulations prescribed by the Farm Credit Administration" (sec. 1(a)). Further, each production credit association would be given the option to allocate to borrowers future earnings retained in the surplus account of the association (sec. 2(a)) and the option to require borrowers to invest in an equity reserve in the association as a means of providing capital other than selling capital stock to borrowers or investors (sec. 2(b)).

The collective purpose of the amendments is to enable the Federal intermediate credit banks and production credit associations to continue the service expected of them while at the same time reducing or eliminating the need for more Government capital and expediting the return of Government capital now in the banks. It is estimated that the future demands of farmers and ranchers for loans could be handled under the new amendments without requiring the United States to purchase more capital stock in the credit banks.

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., December 21, 1964.
The Honorable the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is transmitted herewith a proposed bill to amend the Federal Farm Loan Act and the Farm Credit Act of 1933 to provide means for expediting the retirement of Government capital in the Federal intermediate credit banks, including an increase in the debt permitted such banks in relation to their capital and provision for the production credit associations to acquire additional capital stock therein, to provide for allocating certain earnings of such banks and associations to their users, and for other purposes. At appropriate places in the explanation of the present status and method of operation of the banks and associations which now follows, note will be made in parentheses of the relevant changes that would be made by the proposed bill. A more detailed explanation of such changes will be given later in this letter.

The Federal intermediate credit banks, one in each of the 12 farm credit districts into which the 50 States and Puerto Rico are divided, were established in 1923. They were organized and operate under title II of the Federal Farm Loan Act as added by the Agricultural Credits Act of 1923 and since amended. Their primary function is to discount for, or purchase from, production credit associations and other financing institutions, with their endorsement, notes representing loans made by them to farmers and ranchers; and to make loans and advances to such associations and other financing institutions secured by collateral approved by the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration. (The proposed bill, section 1(a), would also authorize loans and advances to be made to production credit associations without collateral to the extent authorized by the Farm Credit Administration.) There now are about 100 other financing institutions being served by the Federal intermediate credit banks but approximately 95 percent of the discounting and lending by such banks is for the production credit associations.

Throughout the country there are 483 production credit associations, with the number in the 12 farm credit districts varying from 26 to 77. The associations are chartered by the Farm Credit Administration and operate under the provisions of the Farm Credit Act of 1933, as amended. Each association has a prescribed territory, usually ranging from one or more counties up to as much as one State or more, within which it makes loans to farmers and ranchers. Loan maturities usually are not more than a year but loans may be made for terms up to 7 years.

Aside from its paid-in capital and surplus each association is financed by rediscounting the farmers' and ranchers' notes with, or using them as collateral for a loan from, the Federal intermediate credit bank of the district. The amount of the farmers' and ranchers' notes which a Federal intermediate credit bank may purchase from or discount for a production credit association, added to the other liabilities of the association, may not exceed 10 times the paid-in and unimpaired capital and surplus of the association (12 U.S.C. 1032). The banks in turn obtain the funds required for such financing, aside from their own surplus and paid-in capital, by selling their consolidated collateral trust debentures to the investing public and through other borrowings. This must be done, though, within the statutory limitation (12 U.S.C. 1041) that the debentures and similar obligations outstanding for a Federal intermediate credit bank may not exceed 10 times its surplus and paid-in capital. (Sec. 1(b) of the proposed bill would change the foregoing limitation from 10 to 1 to 15 to 1 and apply it to the 12 Federal intermediate credit banks collectively instead of individually.) When the debt-to-capital ratio of a bank is close to 10 to 1, and loans and discounts are increasing rapidly, the bank can continue to operate within the ratio only if additional capital is paid in.

From 1923 through 1956, the Federal intermediate credit banks were wholly owned by the United States. Beginning with 1957, under amendments made by the Farm Credit Act of 1956, the capital stock of the banks was divided into class A stock, to be issued to and held only by the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration on behalf of the United States, and class B stock to be issued only to production credit associations, and the plan of operation for the banks was changed toward a cooperative basis. Since then, and as long as there is Government capital in a Federal intermediate credit bank, its net earnings each year, after restoring any impairments of capital stock, participation certificates and surplus account, must be applied as follows: 25 percent to reserve account until it reaches a specified level; up to 25 percent of what then remains, but not more than the cost to the Treasury of the Government capital in the bank, is next paid to the United States as a franchise tax; and the remaining net earnings are distributed as patronage refunds, in the form of class B stock to production credit associations and in the form of participation certificates to other financing institutions. (Under sec. 1(d) of the proposed bill, amounts applied to reserve account also would be allocated on a patronage basis.)

Under the 1956 amendments, it was expected that the capital stock of the Federal intermediate credit banks held by the United States gradually would be retired and that eventually all of the capital stock of such banks would be owned by production credit associations. As a first step, the production credit associations were required to purchase class B stock of the banks in an aggregate amount equal to 15 percent of the total amount of class A stock of the banks then owned by the United States and a corresponding amount of class A (Government) stock was retired, or about $13.1 million. (Section 1(c) (ii) of the proposed bill would authorize each Federal intermediate credit bank, with the approval of the Farm Credit Administration, to require the production credit associations in its district to purchase additional class B stock of the bank.) In addition to the initial 15 percent retirement, each Federal intermediate credit bank annually must determine the amount of its class A (Government) stock that shall be retired. Whenever the total of the capital stock, participation certificates, surplus, and reserves (net worth) of the bank is more than one-sixth of the highest month-end balance of debentures and other obligations issued by or for the bank, outstanding during the immediately preceding 5 years, the minimum amount of class A (Government) stock to be retired is the total amount of class B stock and participation certificates issued for that year. (Section 1(c) (i) of the proposed bill would substitute "one-eighth" for "one-sixth" in the foregoing requirement.) Under the annual retirement provisions, seven of the banks have retired a total of $454,000 of class A (Government) stock out of earnings since January 1, 1957. During the same period, though, out of the revolving fund available for that purpose, it has been necessary for the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration to purchase some $46.75 million of additional class A (Government) stock in six of the banks to keep the debt-to-capital ratio within the statutory limit of 10 to 1.

In developing any proposals to expedite the retirement of Government capital from the Federal intermediate credit banks, there is also for consideration the statutory plan for the capitalization and operation of the production credit associations. Upon obtaining a loan from a production credit association, a farmer or rancher is required to own class B capital stock in the association in the amount of $5 per $100 of loan and such stock is not canceled or retired upon payment of the loan (12 U.S.C. 1131g). Two years after the holder ceases to be a borrower class B stock is required to be exchanged for class A stock. Class B stock may only be transferred to another farmer borrower or an individual eligible to become a borrower, but class A stock may be purchased and held by the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration and by investors (12 U.S.C. 1131e). There is also provision for a class C stock which may be purchased and held by the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration and by investors (12 U.S.C. 1131e–1), but only one of the production credit associations has such class C stock outstanding and all of it is held by the Governor. Through the Governor, and by drawing on the revolving fund available for that purpose, the United States owns a total of $65,000 of capital stock in the associations, i.e., $40,000 of class A stock in two associations and $25,000 of class C stock in one association. The other 480 associations have retired all Government capital. (As a further means of providing capital, section 2(b) of the proposed bill would authorize a production credit association, if its bylaws so provide, to require borrowers to invest in an equity reserve in the association.)

At the end of each fiscal year (12 U.S.C. 1131f) the earnings of a production credit association in excess of operating expenses must be applied, first, to restore any capital impairment and, second, to maintain a surplus account, the minimum amount of which is prescribed by the Federal intermediate credit bank. Dividends on capital stock not to exceed 7 percent a year may be paid when approved by the Federal intermediate credit bank and consistent with policies established by the Farm Credit Administration. Beyond this, 342 of the associations have adopted bylaws under which any remaining net earnings may be returned to their borrowers as patronage refunds. (Section 2(a) of the proposed bill would specifically authorize such bylaws also to provide for allocation and eventual distribution on a patronage basis of any net earnings retained in the surplus account.)

Under existing law the Federal intermediate credit banks have not been making the progress in retiring Government capital that was expected when the 1956 amendments were adopted. Although the 12 banks added $67.1 million to net worth out of earnings during the 7½-year period from January 1, 1957, through June 30, 1964, the growth in loan volume that caused some of the banks to obtain additional Government capital out of the revolving fund available for that purpose, in order to stay within the statutory 10-to-1 debt-to-capital ratio, has resulted in the banks now having nearly $33.2 million more Government capital than on January 1, 1957. To expedite the return of Government capital and help avoid going to the revolving fund for more, and yet enable the banks and associations to continue the service expected of them, the proposed bill includes certain provisions already mentioned that now will be discussed in more detail.

ANALYSIS OF PROPOSED BILL

Section 1

(a) Unsecured loans from FICB's to PCA's (12 U.S.C. 1031(1)): In addition to discounting for, or purchasing from, a production credit association, the farmers' and ranchers' notes representing loans made by the association, a Federal intermediate credit bank may also "make loans and advances to any such association secured by such collateral as may be approved by the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration." To this would be added authority to make loans and advances to production credit associations "without collateral to the extent authorized under rules and regulations prescribed by the Farm Credit Administration." This will provide greater flexibility in utilizing the resources of an association.

(b) Debt-to-capital ratio for FICB's (12 U.S.C. 1041): The amount of collateral trust debentures which the Federal intermediate credit banks now may have outstanding is subject to the statutory limitation "That the aggregate amount of the outstanding debentures and similar obligations issued individually by any Federal intermediate credit bank, together with the amount of outstanding consolidated debentures or other similar obligations issued for its benefit and account, shall not exceed 10 times the surplus and paid-in capital of such bank." The proposal is to change the foregoing limitation from a 10-to-1 to a 15-to-1 ratio and to apply it to the 12 Federal intermediate credit banks collectively instead of individually. The amended limitation would be "That the aggregate amount of the outstanding debentures and similar obligations issued by the Federal intermediate credit banks shall not exceed 15 times the surplus and paid-in capital of all such banks." To the extent practicable, the presently intended policy is that the debt-to-capital ratio of each bank should not be permitted to exceed 12 to 1 except for temporary periods such as seasonal peaks in outstanding borrowings.

(c) (i) Mandatory retirement of Government capital by FICB's (12 U.S.C. 1061(a) (1)): Annually at the end of its fiscal year, it is for each Federal intermediate credit bank to determine the amount of its class A (Government) stock which shall be retired. The only further requirement in this respect is that "Whenever the total of the capital stock, participation certificates, surplus, and reserves of the bank is more than one-sixth of the highest month-end balance of debentures and other obligations issued by or for the bank, outstanding during the immediately preceding 5 years, the minimum amount of class A stock to be retired shall be the total amount of class B stock and participation certificates issued for that year." The proposed change is to substitute "one-eighth" for "one-sixth" in the quoted sentence. This is deemed warranted because of the increase in the debt-to-capital ratio being proposed under the preceding amendment. The class B stock and participation certificates referred to in the quoted sentence includes not only those issued to the production credit associations and other financing institutions as patronage refunds but also any additional class B stock purchased by production credit associations as may be required under the next amendment.

(c) (ii) Additional purchases by PCA's of class B stock in FICB's (12 U.S.C. 1061(a) (2)): Under the amendments made by the Farm Credit Act of 1956, the production credit associations were required to purchase class B stock in the Federal intermediate credit banks in an amount equal to 15 percent of the class A (Government) stock outstanding on January 1, 1957, and a corresponding amount of such class A (Government) stock was retired. Subsequently, when increased business made more capital necessary in order for a bank to stay within the statutory 10 to 1 debt-to-capital ratio, the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration, out of the revolving fund available for that purpose, purchased additional class A stock on behalf of the United States. Under section 1(c) (ii) of the proposed bill, a Federal intermediate credit bank, in order to provide capital to meet its credit needs, may require the production credit associations of its district to subscribe for or otherwise acquire additional class B stock in the bank where necessary and feasible. The relative amount of class B stock in the bank to be held by each association would be in the general proportion that its indebtedness to the bank is to the total of all association indebtedness to the bank. All demands under the new legislation that the associations acquire additional class B stock in a bank would be subject to approval by the Farm Credit Administration and would be with due regard for the circumstances of the associations. The revolving fund mentioned above would continue available for further subscriptions to class A (Government) stock of the banks if needed.

(d) Allocation to users of FICB's of net earnings applied to reserve account (12 U.S.C. 1072): Since January 1, 1957, each Federal intermediate credit bank, at the end of its fiscal year, after restoring any impairments of capital stock, participation certificates and surplus account, is required to apply 25 percent of its net earnings then remaining to create and maintain a reserve account equal to 25 percent of the outstanding capital stock and participation certificates of the bank. And "if at the end of any fiscal year the sum of the surplus and the reserve account of any bank is less than its outstanding capital stock and participation certificates, the bank shall continue to apply such 25 percent of its net earnings to the reserve account until the sum of the surplus and the reserve account is equal to its outstanding capital stock and participation certificates." The net earnings finally remaining after paying a franchise tax to the United States, while there is Government capital in a bank, must be distributed as patronage refunds, in class B stock to production credit associations and participation certificates to other financing institutions. There now is no provision for allocating or distributing the earnings applied to reserve account.

Under the proposed bill, the 15 percent of net earnings remaining after restoring impairments would always be applied to the reserve account each year. All amounts so applied, whether heretofore or hereafter, would be allocated to the production credit associations and other financing institutions on a patronage basis. These allocations would have the same general treatment for tax and other purposes as is provided for patronage refunds. If a holder of such allocations is in default on indebtedness to the bank, it would be within the discretion of a bank to cancel and retire such allocations for application on the indebtedness. There would be a similar discretion to retire allocations when a holder is liquidated or dissolved. When the total of such allocations exceeds 25 percent of the outstanding capital stock and participation certificates of a bank, such excess may be distributed, oldest allocations first, in class B stock and participation certificates issued as of the date of the allocations and, whenever the bank has no class A stock outstanding, also in money. In brief, that is what paragraphs (i), (ii), and (iii) of subsection (d) of section 1 would provide.

Section 2

(a) Option of PCA to pay patronage refunds and allocate to borrowers net earnings retained in surplus account (12 U.S.C. 1131f): Presently 342 production credit associations have bylaws, adopted with the approval of the Farm Credit Administration, under which certain net earnings may be paid to the borrowers as patronage refunds. These are the net earnings remaining each year after applying earnings as specifically directed or authorized by statute or the bylaws. The pertinent statutory provisions are that earnings in excess of operating expenses must be applied, first, to restore any capital impairment and, second, to maintain a surplus account, the minimum amount of which is prescribed by the Federal intermediate credit bank. Dividends on capital stock not to exceed 7 percent a year may be paid when approved by the Federal intermediate credit bank and consistent with policies established by the Farm Credit Administration. The first sentence of section 2(a) of the proposed bill would provide that, when so specified in the credit bank approval, such dividends may may be paid even though the amount in the surplus account is less than the prescribed minimum. In addition to recognizing that the finally remaining net earnings may be paid as patronage refunds, the rest of section 2(a) of the proposed bill specifically would authorize an association to adopt a bylaw providing for allocation to the borrowers on a patronage basis of any part of the net earnings required to be applied to surplus account or otherwise retained therein. For tax and other purposes this would permit any net earnings hereafter applied to or retained in the surplus account to be accorded the same treatment as now is given the patronage refunds paid by associations. Inasmuch as all bylaws of the production credit associations are subject to approval of the Federal intermediate credit bank and the Farm Credit Administration, the policy presently intended to be followed is that bylaws should not be approved which would permit an association to allocate to its borrowers any allocations received by the association from the Federal intermediate credit bank with respect to net earnings included in the reserve account of the bank prior to July 1, 1965.

(b) Option of PCA to require borrowers to invest in equity reserve in the association as a means of providing capital (12 U.S.C. 1131g): In addition to the capital stock in the production credit association which a borrower is required to own, section 2(b) of the proposed bill would authorize an association, if its bylaws so provide, to require borrowers to invest in an equity reserve in the association upon such terms and conditions as may be provided in its bylaws. Such an equity reserve would be part of the surplus of the association in applying the 10-to-1 debt-to-capital ratio under which the production credit associations must operate. The equity reserve would serve that purpose and without the expense of dividends as would be expected if the same amounts were invested in class A capital stock of the association.

In addition to the draft of proposed bill, there is enclosed herewith a copy of those sections of the Federal Farm Loan Act and the Farm Credit Act of 1933 proposed to be amended, on which is indicated the changes that would be made by the proposed bill.

This submission is as directed by the Federal Farm Credit Board and early consideration and enactment of the proposed bill is recommended.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection from the standpoint of the administration's program to the basic objectives of the proposed legislation and has suggested that it be presented for congressional consideration. Such clearance was given us in a letter dated December 1, 1964, which also includes some further comment, and a copy of that letter is being included with this submission as requested by the Budget Bureau.

Very truly yours,
R. B. Tootell,
Governor.

Executive Office of
the President,
Bureau of the Budget,
Washington, D.C., December 1, 1964.

Hon. R. B. Tootell,
Governor, Farm Credit Administration,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Tootell: This is in further reference to your letter of February 7, 1964, transmitting a draft bill "To amend the Federal Farm Loan Act and the Farm Credit Act of 1933 to provide means for expediting the retirement of Government capital in the Federal intermediate credit banks, including an increase in the debt permitted such banks in relation to their capital and provision for the production credit associations to acquire additional capital stock therein, to provide for allocating certain earnings of such banks and associations to their users, and for other purposes." It also is in reply to your response of September 22, 1964, to our September 15 advice regarding this legislation.

Extensive discussions between our respective offices have not made it possible to resolve the matters referred to in our letter of September 15, 1964. Given all the circumstances, and since there is no objection from the standpoint of the administration's program to the basic objectives of the legislation, we suggest that it be presented for congressional consideration. However, it is requested that a copy of this letter accompany your submission of the draft bill to the Congress.

With respect to specific provisions of the bill, we regard the proposed section 1(d), relating to the allocation of FICB earnings, as adversely affecting the Government's interest and unnecessary to the basic objective of the bill. Further, we believe that the basis for computing the franchise tax paid by the FICB's should be modified to make it more consistent with the credit program policy guidelines. We also believe that, in line with general tax policy, patronage refunds received by the PCA's from FICB's in which the Government owns stock should be made taxable. Finally, we believe that there should be provision for the elimination, upon retirement of Government stock, of existing tax exemptions afforded the FICB's.

Sincerely yours,
Phillip S. Hughes,
Assistant Director for Legislative Reference.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR APPLICATION FOR MUSTERING-OUT PAYMENTS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the bill which I am introducing will rectify an unjust situation which has arisen in regard to mustering-out payments under section 2104 of title 38, United States Code. Under the present law, receipt of this mustering-out payment is precluded unless application was made prior to July 17, 1959. There is a small group of officers who were advised of their nonentitlement to these payments in 1957, but this decision was reversed in 1962. Hence, these officers are in the position of having their eligibility for the mustering-out payments conceded in 1962, but precluded from receiving them because they did not apply before 1959. It would certainly be an injustice to deny this payment to such officers because of their failure to make timely application for payment.

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to extend the time within which certain veterans who were discharged or relieved from active duty under honorable conditions before July 16, 1952, may file claims for mustering-out payments under section 2104 of title 38, United States Code. Under the provisions of that section as originally enacted—title V of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952—66 Statute 688, eligible veterans were required to make application for mustering-out payments within 2 years after July 16, 1952, the date of enactment of title V. By the act of July 26, 1955, chapter 388—69 Statute 380, the time within which veterans could file such applications was extended to July 16, 1956. By the act of August 14, 1958, Public Law 85–638—72 Statute 593—the time within which applications could be filed was extended to July 16, 1959. This bill would now extend that time to January 30, 1966.

Section 2101 of title 38, United States Code, provides that each member of an armed force, with certain exceptions, who served on active duty during the Korean conflict and who was discharged or released from active duty under honorable conditions is eligible for mustering-out payment in the amount of $100, $200, or $300, depending on length and type of service. Section 2102 of title 38, United States Code, provides that payment shall accrue and the amount thereof shall be computed as of the time of discharge for the purpose of effecting a permanent separation from the service or of ultimate relief from active service or, at the option of the member, for the purpose of enlistment, reenlistment, or appointment in a Regular component of an armed force. Payment to a member discharged or relieved from active duty after June 26, 1950, and before July 16, 1952, is precluded by section 2104 of title 38, United States Code, unless application for payment was made before July 17, 1959.

In interpreting the pertinent statute, the Comptroller General of the United States held that Reserve officers who became members of a Regular component were entitled to mustering-out payment because their acceptance of a Regular commission automatically terminated their Reserve commission—36 Comptroller General 283, 1956—while members of the Army or Air Force without specification of component whose orders appointing them as Regular commissioned officers of an armed force did not expressly terminate their prior status were held not to be entitled to the mustering-out payment—36 Comptroller General 645, 1957. Therefore, officers who held a commission in the Army or Air Force of the United States without specification of component and those who held both a commission in a Reserve component and a commission in the Army or Air Force of the United States without specification of component at the time of acceptance of an appointment in the Regular Army were advised of their nonentitlement to mustering-out payment, and collection action was taken in those cases in which payment had been made.

In the case of *Dowling* v. *United States*, Court of Claims No. 174-60, February 7, 1962, the Court of Claims held that under the provisions of section 2101 of title 38, United States Code, reservists serving on active duty in a temporary officer—without specification of component—status were entitled to mustering-out payment incident to appointment in a Regular component. Subsequently, the Comptroller General of the United States announced that the decision of the Court of Claims regarding mustering-out payment would be followed in similar cases—Ms. Comp. Gen. B-139107, June 21, 1961—and extended the holding to apply not only to an officer who held a dual status—Reserve and Army or Air Force of the United States without specification of component—at the time of acceptance of a Regular commission, but also to an officer who held only a commission in the Army or Air Force of the United States without specification of component. It was stated, however, that section 2104 of title 38, United States Code, precluded payment to officers otherwise eligible who were appointed in a Regular component after June 26, 1950, and before July 16, 1952, unless application for payment was made prior to July 17, 1959.

Consequently, while the majority of officers affected by court decision have now been paid mustering-out pay, a relatively small number of officers who were integrated into the Regular Army or Air Force after June 26, 1950, and before July 16, 1952, are still precluded from receiving payment as a result of failure to make application therefor prior to July 17, 1959, even though their entitlement to mustering-out payment was not conceded until 1962. It would be a gross injustice to continue to deny payment to such officers because of their failure to make timely application for payment.

While the exact number of officers in this category is not known, since the Dowling decision the Army has received and denied claims from 46 officers so affected. It is believed that the total number of Army officers involved does not exceed 100. It is estimated that a similar number of Air Force officers are involved. As no officers of the Navy served as members of the Navy without component during this period, no Navy officers are involved.

The bill (S. 528) to amend section 2104 of title 38, United States Code, to extend the time for filing certain claims for mustering-out payments, introduced by Mr. YARBOROUGH, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

AN ACT TO LIBERALIZE TIME LIMITS ON VETERANS REHABILITATION TRAINING

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the purpose of this bill is to extend to all totally disabled veterans entitled to vocational rehabilitation training under chapter 31, title 38, United States Code, the liberalization of the time limits for pursuing such training which was authorized for blinded veterans by Public Law 87-591. It also makes a number of changes which are designed to clarify the provisions of the vocational rehabilitation law relating to the delimiting periods during which vocational rehabilitation training may be afforded.

Public Law 87-591 added section 1502A to title 38, United States Code, and provided that a veteran who was in need of vocational rehabilitation to overcome blindness could be afforded rehabilitation training after the termination date otherwise applicable—but not beyond June 30, 1975—if:

> (1) he had not previously been rehabilitated (that is, rendered employable) as the result of training furnished under this chapter, or
>
> (2) his blindness either has worsened, or has developed as a result of the worsening of this service-connected disability, since he was declared rehabilitated to the extent that it precludes his performing the duties of the occupation for which he was previously trained under this chapter.

The report of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, to accompany the bill which became Public Law 87-591—Senate Report No. 1694, 87th Congress—stated the need for the legislation arose from the fact that there are a small number of World War II and Korean conflict veterans with disabilities "that have been slow in producing or progressing to a seriously disabling condition."

The committee in its report further recognized that, as the Veterans' Administration had pointed out in both its report and oral testimony on the bill, special legislation for blinded veterans excluded other classes of veterans with severe disabilities—for example, paraplegics—who rightly could urge their entitlement to similar treatment.

The current bill is designed to equalize the situation by affording the same treatment to other totally disabled veterans. It recognizes that with the passage of time injuries or conditions may so progress as to preclude continuance by the veteran in his present field of endeavor. Thus, the veteran who may have been trained to overcome the handicaps of a partial disability will have an urgent need for retraining as a totally disabled person. Examples of the types of cases which would be included by this amendment are veterans with progressive diseases, or paraplegics, who as time passes will become unemployable in the positions for which they are now trained, due to their deteriorating conditions, and will therefore need to be retrained in order to take their rightful places in society. In addition, recent medical developments, in the psychiatric field for example, are making it possible for many veterans who have been hospitalized for extended periods of time to avail themselves of vocational rehabilitation training.

While the broadening of what is now section 1502A to cover all other eligible totally disabled veterans is the sole substantive change made by the bill, the bill also clarifies the existing law. The current provisions are the result of numerous amendments and have not been thoroughly revised since the enactment of Public Law 87-815 which placed the vocational rehabilitation training program on a permanent basis. To the extent feasible the revision provides integrated delimiting requirements of general applicability rather than continuing to treat veterans of different service periods as discrete groups but subject to the same general rules.

The bill (S. 529) to amend chapter 31 of title 38, United States Code, to extend to all totally disabled veterans the same liberalization of time limits for pursuing vocational rehabilitation training as was authorized for blinded veterans by Public Law 87-591, and to clarify the language of the law relating to the limiting of periods for pursuing such training, introduced by Mr. YARBOROUGH, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION BY SENATOR THURMOND

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I send to the desk 6 Senate joint resolutions, 1 Senate resolution, and 13 bills and ask that they be appropriately referred.

These proposals, together with others which I am cosponsoring along with other Members of the Senate, represent a progressive and constructive conservative legislative program for the 89th Congress. I am confident that these measures, taken individually and as a group, have the overwhelming support of a vast majority of the citizens of this country. They are designed to encourage the State governments in the performance of their duties and responsibilities to the citizens of their State, and at the same time, provide solutions to those problems which are susceptible to solution by the Central Government.

Three of the Senate joint resolutions propose amendments to the Constitution whereby the authority and prerogatives of the States would be preserved and enhanced. One calls for the formation of a Court of the Union to be composed of the chief justices of the highest courts of the several States. This Court would be empowered to pass upon any decision of the Supreme Court which relates to the rights reserved to the States or to the people by the Constitution and would be the final judgment in such matters. Another of the Senate joint resolutions would provide a new method for amending the Constitution so that the States may initiate proposed constitutional amendments without being required to rely upon Congress to take any action. Another of the proposed constitutional amendments would reenforce the original meaning of the first amendment to the Constitution so far as it relates to the establishment of a religion clause. The next constitutional amendment which I propose would require a balanced budget, except in case of war or other grave national emergency. In the latter case the Congress may suspend the requirement for that fiscal year upon the recommendation of the President.

I am offering a proposed constitutional amendment dealing with the problem of selecting a new Vice President when a vacancy occurs in that office. Under this proposal, the electoral college would meet at a specified time after a vacancy occurs and elect a new Vice President. The proposed amendment provides a method for filling any vacancies which may occur among the electors.

Another Senate joint resolution expresses the indomitable will of the American people and purpose of their Government to achieve total victory over the forces of the world Communist movement. This entails maintaining a substantial military superiority over the forces of communism in order to deter armed aggression, while at the same time demonstrating the resolve to successfully combat their advances by other methods, such as psychological and economic warfare.

The Senate resolution which I am introducing proposes an amendment to rule XVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate and would require the approval of the Appropriations Committee for any proposal authorizing "backdoor" spending. Any bill, amendment to a bill, or joint resolution which authorizes either expenditures from debt receipts or the creation of obligations by contract in advance of appropriations would have to be referred to the Appropriations Committee for approval.

In addition to these proposals, the 13 bills I am introducing are as follows:

First. To withdraw from the Federal courts jurisdiction to hear and decide cases concerning the apportionment of State legislatures.

Second. To provide for a jury trial in all criminal contempt cases in the Federal courts, at the option of the accused.

Third. To change the appellate jurisdiction of Federal circuit courts in appeals from executive agency orders and to empower the district courts of the United States to hear and decide unfair labor practice cases.

Fourth. To clarify and safeguard the right of any officer or employee of a Federal agency or department to testify before a duly constituted and empowered congressional committee or subcommittee without being subjected to reprisals.

Fifth. To provide for a 20-percent credit against individual income tax for certain educational expenses incurred at an institution of higher education.

Sixth. To equalize the treatment of Reserves and Regulars of the armed services in the payment of per diem.

Seventh. To change the method of computing retired pay of certain enlisted members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps.

Eighth. To permit a taxpayer carrying on a trade or business in the conduct of which 10 or less persons are engaged to elect to take a standard deduction, in lieu of itemized deductions for expenses attributable to such trade or business.

Ninth. To repeal the Federal excise taxes on alcohol and tobacco in order to provide an additional field of revenue for the States.

Tenth. To remove the limitations on the deductibility of medical expenses for the care of dependents who have attained the age of 65.

Eleventh. To increase to $1,800 the annual amount individuals are permitted to earn without suffering deductions from the benefits payable to them under the Social Security Act.

Twelfth. To amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to eliminate the provisions which reduce the annuities of the spouses of retired employees by the amount of certain monthly benefits payable under title II of the Social Security Act.

Thirteenth. To provide a "habitual criminal" act for the District of Columbia similar to that which has been adopted by many of the States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The several measures will be received and appropriately referred.

The bills, joint resolutions, and resolution, submitted by Mr. THURMOND, were received and referred as indicated:

To the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 534. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to withdraw from courts of the United States jurisdiction with respect to State legislative apportionment proceedings;

S. 535. A bill to provide for a jury trial in all cases of criminal contempt in the U.S. courts;

S. 536. A bill to amend the provisions of the United States Code with respect to the jurisdiction of courts of appeals of the United States to review orders of administrative officers and agencies, and for other purposes; and

S. 537. A bill to amend title I of the Internal Security Act of 1950.

To the Committee on Finance:

S. 538. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a 20-percent credit against the individual income tax for certain educational expenses incurred at an institution of higher education.

To the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 539. A bill to equalize the treatment of Reserves and Regulars in the payment of per diem; and

S. 540. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to change the method of computing retired pay of certain enlisted members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps.

To the Committee on Finance:

S. 541. A bill to permit a taxpayer carrying on a trade or business in the conduct of which 10 or less persons are engaged to elect to take a standard deduction, in lieu of itemized deductions, for expenses attributable to such trade or business;

S. 542. A bill to repeal the Federal excise taxes on alcohol and tobacco;

S. 543. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to remove the limitations on the deductibility of medical expenses for the care of dependents who have attained the age of 65; and

S. 544. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase to $1,800 the annual amount individuals are permitted to earn without suffering deductions from the insurance benefits payable to them under such title.

To the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

S. 545. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to eliminate the provisions which reduce the annuities of the spouses of retired employees by the amount of certain monthly benefits payable under title II of the Social Security Act.

To the Committee on the District of Columbia:

S. 546. A bill to provide increased punishment for a person convicted in the District of Columbia of a fourth or subsequent felony.

To the Committee on the Judiciary:

S.J. Res. 21. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the establishment of a court of the Union;

S.J. Res. 22. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the process of amending the Constitution;

S.J. Res. 23. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to religion in the United States;

S.J. Res. 24. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the balancing of the budget; and

S.J. Res. 25. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to provide for the succession of the Vice President to the office of President, and for the selection of a new Vice President whenever there is a vacancy in the office of Vice President.

To the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S.J. Res. 26. Joint resolution expressing declaration of will of the American people and purpose of their Government to achieve complete victory over the forces of the world Communist movement.

S. Res. 31. Resolution to amend rule XVI relative to amendments to appropriation bills; to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

S. Res. 31

Resolved, That rule XVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended (1) by striking out the heading thereto and inserting in lieu thereof "AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS AND AMENDMENTS CREATING A CHARGE ON THE TREASURY", and (2) by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph as follows:

"8. No amendment to a bill or joint resolution shall be received or considered if it authorizes (A) expenditures from debt receipts, or the creation of obligations by contract in advance of appropriations, and (B) is not moved by direction of a standing committee of the Senate."

Sec. 2. Subsection (b) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Committee on Appropriations, to consist of twenty-seven Senators, to which committee shall be referred—

"(1) All proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the appropriation of the revenue for the support of the Government; and

"(2) All proposed legislation (other than legislation within the purview of paragraph (1) above, or relating to claims against the United States) authorizing expenditures from debt receipts, or the creation of obligations by contract in advance of appropriations; except that any proposed legislation carrying such authority which relates to a substantive matter within the jurisdiction of any other standing committee of the Senate shall be referred first to such committee."

CIGARETTE ADVERTISING AND LABELING ACT

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, 1 year ago this week the Surgeon General's Committee on Smoking and Health issued its report. The committee found cigarette smoking contributed substantially to mortality from certain specific diseases and to the overall death rate; that it was causally related to lung cancer in men, and that the data for women pointed in the same direction; and that it was the most important cause of chronic bronchitis and bronchitis deaths in the United States. In short, the report said:

> Cigarette smoking is a health hazard of sufficient importance in the United States to warrant appropriate remedial action.

What remedial action has in fact taken place in the intervening 12 months? The Public Health Service requested $1.9 million to finance a national clearinghouse for information on smoking and health. Thanks to the efforts of tobacco State representatives, even this modest request for funds to educate children to the potential dangers of smoking was denied.

In June of last year the Federal Trade Commission, after extensive public hearings, issued rules requiring appropriate health hazard warnings on cigarette packages and in cigarette advertising. It is obvious that until such warnings are required, it will be very difficult to convince the great majority of smokers that the Government takes the report seriously. Yet, in August the FTC was pressured by the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee to postpone for 6 months the enforcement of its rulings.

Legislation which would strengthen the FTC's proposed rules was introduced last year by me, and others; those measures called for congressional approval of the regulation of the labeling and advertising practices and for massive educational campaigns. But those measures were interred without ceremony in both the House and Senate.

Thus, 1 year from the delivery of the Surgeon General's unequivocal verdict against the cigarette, Congress has not provided funds for smoking education, or regulations to warn the smoker or potential smoker, of the hazards of smoking, or laws to inhibit cigarette advertising campaigns—nothing, in short, but a directive to the FTC to undo the steps which it had forcefully taken to fulfill its mandate to protect the consuming public.

What must be done? Last month, the President's Commission on Heart Disease, Cancer, and Stroke strongly endorsed the conclusions and recommendations of the Surgeon General's Advisory Committee on Smoking and Health, and urged the appropriation of $10 million to the Public Health Service "for a comprehensive national program of educational public information regarding the hazards of cigarette smoking." Such an appropriation is starkly minimal. But it will be a beginning.

Furthermore, the effort by the tobacco industry and its congressional friends to tie the hands of the FTC in pursuing its duty to require warnings on packages and the advertising must be thwarted.

Congress must not be permitted to enact legislation so mild as to be meaningless. It will not do to require each cigarette package to carry a label which says, "Cigarette smoking is definitely not a cure for cancer." The legislation Congress enacts must be meaningful and responsive to the severity of the problem. It must attack not only the labeling of cigarette packages, but the advertising, as well; and it must strengthen, not erode, the power of the FTC to protect the consumer.

To this end, I reintroduce today the Cigarette Advertising and Labeling Act. In addition to granting the Federal Trade Commission the power and duty to regulate the advertising and labeling of cigarettes, the act declares that Congress accepts the verdict of the Surgeon General's report that cigarette smoking is a critical health problem.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the act be printed in the Record, along with the addresses by Surgeon General Terry and Mr. Emerson Foote to a press conference on the occasion of the meeting of the National Interagency Council on Smoking and Health on January 11, 1965.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and address will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 547) to confer upon the Federal Trade Commission the power and duty to regulate the advertising and labeling of cigarettes, introduced by Mrs. Neuberger, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

Section 1. This Act may be cited as the "Cigarette Advertising and Labeling Act".

FINDINGS OF FACT

Sec. 2. The Congress hereby finds and declares that the unrestricted promotion and advertising of cigarettes in interstate commerce, in the light of the conclusive evidence that cigarette smoking is injurious to health, constitutes a grave threat to the public welfare.

DECLARATION OF POLICY

Sec. 3. It is therefore the policy of the Congress, and the purpose of this Act—

(a) to require that cigarette packages contain a warning that habitual smoking of cigarettes is injurious to health,

(b) to require that each cigarette package disclose the average yields of incriminated agents (as defined in section 4(f)) from the cigarettes contained therein, and

(c) to eliminate cigarette advertising that tends to make cigarette smoking attractive to children.

DEFINITIONS

Sec. 4. As used in this Act—

(a) The term "cigarette" means any roll of tobacco, wrapped in paper or any substance other than tobacco.

(b) The term "Commission" means the Federal Trade Commission.

(c) The term "Federal Trade Commission Act" means the Act entitled "An Act to create a Federal Trade Commission, to define its powers and duties, and for other purposes", approved September 26, 1914, as amended.

(d) The term "commerce" means commerce between any State, territory, or possession of the United States, or the District of Columbia, and any place outside thereof; or between points within the same State, territory, or possession, or the District of Columbia, but through any place outside thereof; or within any territory or possession or the District of Columbia.

(e) The term "United States" means the several States, the District of Columbia, and the territories and possessions of the United States.

(f) The term "incriminated agent" means any substance found in cigarette smoke which, as determined by the Commission, tends to contribute to the medical hazards of smoking.

FALSE ADVERTISING AND LABELING OF CIGARETTES

Sec. 5. (a) The Federal Trade Commission, with the cooperation of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, shall establish such standards and requirements for the labeling and advertising of cigarettes which are in commerce as it may deem necessary to protect the public health.

(b) Such standards and requirements for the labeling of cigarettes shall include the requirement that each package or container in which cigarettes in commerce are offered for sale to consumers bear a clear and distinct label which—

(1) contains the following words: "Caution—Habitual Smoking Is Injurious to Health"; and

(2) sets forth the average yield, or other index, of each incriminated agent to be found in the smoke of the cigarettes contained in such package or container.

(c) Such standards and requirements with respect to the advertising of cigarettes shall—

(1) provide that each cigarette advertisement contain the following warning: "Caution—Habitual Cigarette Smoking Is Injurious to Health"; and

(2) provide for the elimination of all advertising matter which tends to make cigarette smoking attractive to children.

(d) Any cigarette package or container or any advertisement of cigarettes which fails to comply with the standards and requirements established by the Commission under the preceding subsections of this section shall be deemed to be a false advertisement of drugs for the purposes of sections 12, 13, 14, and 15 of the Federal Trade Commission Act (38 Stat. 719; 15 U.S.C. 52, 53, 54, and 55), as amended, and the Commission shall have the duty and authority to proceed with respect to any such false advertisement in the same manner and to the same extent as with respect to other false advertisements of drugs which are unlawful under the Federal Trade Commission Act.

The address presented by Mrs. Neuberger is as follows:

Address Presented at the Conference of the National Interagency Council on Smoking and Health, by Luther L. Terry, M.D., Surgeon General, Public Health Service, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

A few weeks ago at our annual Christmas party a group of our people presented their annual good-natured spoof of some of the year's activities.

One of their verses, sung to the tune of "On Top of Old Smoky," went as follows:

"On Top of Old Smoking
A year has gone by
But the smoke we're deploring
Still gets in our eye."

I am happy to say, at this anniversary meeting, that while we still can—and do—deplore the amount of cigarette smoking still going on, measurable and encouraging progress has been made during the year. In a few moments, I shall present some statistical evidence on this progress.

What is equally heartening to me, however, is the national concern which has been expressed about the problem and the national action which has been generated. To my mind, the formation of the National Interagency Council on Smoking and Health represents the finest example of this concern.

All of us know that we are faced with a long, slow, and—to a considerable extent—uphill campaign. The fact that so many organizations represented here today are pooling their efforts on behalf of a single goal is our best guarantee of eventual success.

We are moving forward. And we are moving forward in a united and purposeful way.

When the announcement of the advisory committee's report was made 1 year ago today, there were many questions raised by the press and by others. Some of them were unanswerable then; some are still unanswerable. On the others we are making definite progress.

The principal and obvious question was: Would a substantial number of people stop smoking?

Today we can ask the same question. Many indexes suggest that, after a pronounced downward dip during the spring months, cigarette smoking is once more on the increase. Among these indexes are warehouse shipments and the figures on tax returns.

While these figures certainly have some significance—and I would not pretend that they are not disquieting—they do not tell the whole story.

We have very recently completed some studies which show a different result. Let me place them in historical perspective.

In 1955, a survey made by the Bureau of the Census at the request of the Public Health Service found that 59 percent of adult men and 31 percent of adult women were cigarette smokers.

In 1962, a survey undertaken by the American Cancer Society found that the proportion of male smokers had remained the same and that the proportion of female smokers had increased by 5 percentage points.

In July of last year, the Public Health Service's National Center for Health Statistics began including questions on smoking habits in its surveys.

A preliminary analysis of the Center's figures for the months of July, August, and September indicates that the proportion of adult cigarette smokers has actually declined.

Last fall the Service undertook a survey to gain more accurate data in depth on the smoking habits, knowledge, and attitudes of the general population. More than 300 items of information were sought from a random nationwide sample of 3,500 households. This survey also showed a drop in the proportion of adult cigarette smokers, estimated as follows:

Instead of the 59 percent of 1955 and 1962, there are now only about 52 percent male cigarette smokers in our population.

A decline of 7 percentage points does not appear to be much—and it is certainly less than we would wish. But if these figures stand up under final analysis it means that:

Nearly one out of four adult men has given up cigarettes.

There are now nearly as many men who are noncigarette smokers as there are smokers.

Smoking among women, according to our surveys, has also turned downward. Although the decline is small—only 2 to 3 percentage points—this is the first time on record in which the trend has been downward.

If we consider both men and women, it would appear that there are as many adults today who have never been cigarette smokers as there are smokers.

If smoking habits had continued at the level of 3 years ago, there would be about 3½ million more smokers than there actually are today.

I would repeat that we in the Public Health Service are by no means satisfied with the progress that has been made. On the other hand, I am convinced that our findings of a year ago, widely publicized and followed up throughout the year by an alert and responsible press, have had a discernible and encouraging effect on the smoking problem.

That public awareness of the hazards involved is widespread is evident in other ways.

In the area of beliefs and attitudes the data are both stimulating and encouraging. For this reason, I want to share the first results with you, well in advance of their publication. The figures, I am told, are preliminary but reasonably firm.

Many of the questions asked involved the subject's knowledge or beliefs about the relation of smoking to specific diseases. For example, people were asked: Is there anything a person might do that could cause lung cancer?

Sixty-nine percent spontaneously mentioned smoking cigarettes.

It is, of course, of great importance that smokers themselves become concerned about the habit. A large majority of the cigarette smokers surveyed indicated that they believed smoking to be harmful.

A number of questions sought to explore the possibility of remedial action. Presented with the statement: "Cigarette smoking is enough of a health hazard for something to be done about it," 7 out of 10 agreed and only 1 out of 6 disagreed.

Nine out of ten said they were in favor of more public education on the health hazards of cigarette smoking, for both adults and children.

Four out of five people said they were opposed to the practice of featuring athletes and celebrities in cigarette advertising.

By a ratio of about 2 to 1, those polled favored a compulsory warning on cigarette package labels and in advertising.

Eight out of ten—including 7 out of 10 smokers—also said they believed that a statement on tar and nicotine content should be required on each package.

The Public Health Service during this year has interested itself also in the behavior and attitudes toward smoking of students in the heatlh professions. A study conducted among more than 10,000 senior medical, dental, and osteopathic students is yielding interesting results.

Compared to the general male population of comparable age, senior medical students, for example, show far less tendency to take up cigarettes—55 percent as against 83 percent. And among medical students who take up the habit, there is far greater tendency to quit—44 percent as against 18 percent in a given time period.

This suggests that in groups which hold health important, have the facts, and understand the health implications of the facts, the cigarette habit is reversible. Because the medical profession is frequently able to set an example in personal health that the general population tends to follow, this finding among medical students is a hopeful augury for the future.

The experience of a year, in brief, demonstrates that a deeply ingrained personal habit can be changed where the facts are made widely known. I might add that, so far, most of this has been accomplished through the mass communications media. I doubt that any health message has ever reached so many in so short a time.

What have been some of our Service efforts during this past year?

You will perhaps be interested, first of all, in the distribution of the report itself.

Altogether during the first year, including sales by the Superintendent of Documents, more than 350,000 copies of the full report on smoking and health have been distributed. For a scientific publication, this is quite substantial. Equally gratifying have been the number and distribution of summaries and special-audience publications inspired by the report. The Service has worked closely wtih many Government agencies and voluntary organizations to make these "grandchild" publications both appealing and accurate. Five separate health information pamphlets on various aspects of the report, for example, were prepared and distributed by various units of the Public Health Service.

As one means of promoting distribution as well as assisting health agencies and education groups, we have distributed about 6,000 information kits of sample publications on smoking and health.

We are involved as well in some 15 behavorial studies to get at the psychosocial dynamics of smoking: why some people start smoking and others don't, why some can stop and others have difficulty. These include studies of adult and youth educational programs, withdrawal clinics, the roles of physicians and other professional health workers and the value of group treatment.

One of the most immediate and far-reaching byproducts of the smoking and health report has been the impetus it has given to research on the components of smoke and their physiological effects. Not only has the report stimulated more research, but the field has attracted competent investigators who previously had been giving priority to other problems.

In addition to expanded work at the National Institutes of Health, new research is being sponsored by universities and foundations, and, as you know, by the American Medical Association with financial help from the tobacco industry itself.

Additional data from three long-range studies—of U.S. war veterans, the American Cancer Society, and the study of the British physicians—continue to reinforce the earlier findings evaluated in the smoking and health report. All three strengthen the evidence that people who stop smoking are greatly benefited, even if they have smoked for many years.

The wealth of research information accumulated for the advisory committee is being kept up to date through the use of the

Medlars computer system at the National Library of Medicine. Plans are being developed for a continuing review and analysis of the worldwide literature on this subject.

Most of the activities I have mentioned today are joint programs with State and local health agencies, education institutions, and others I have omitted a great many which, in the absence of financial support, we have been able to assist only by consultation and technical advice.

One of the principal ways by which we keep informed is through the National Interagency Council, which has brought us together here today. The Public Health Service is delighted with the rapid progress being made by the Council.

We particularly want to welcome our distinguished new chairman, Mr. Emerson Foote, whose enlightened example will serve the Council's cause as it has recently served the President's Commission on Heart Disease, Cancer, and Stroke.

The report of that Commission, as most of you know, included a strong endorsement of the Report on Smoking and Health and recommended an expenditure of $10 million over a 3-year period.

Our request for a supplemental appropriation of $1.9 million last summer was deferred by the Congress. We received encouragement from a number of Members of the Congress to renew the request this year. This we hope to do in the weeks ahead. If we are to put the National Clearinghouse on Smoking and Health into full operation it is clear that funds will be needed.

Last year, the Congress did appropriate $1.5 million to study the health-related problems of tobacco. This appropriation, which was made to the Department of Agriculture, has been highly useful. The Department of Agriculture is working very closely with the Public Health Service in developing suitable research into the properties of tobacco smoke and leaf constituents and their biologic effects.

In summary, where do we stand today, 1 year after the report?

First of all, despite the charge that nothing has really happened, and that the smoking habits of the Nation are right back where they were, many changes have already taken place.

Adult cigarette smokers are showing a clear trend away from the habit. At least 18 million Americans are now ex-cigarette smokers—and they have been off long enough for most of them to stay off.

If we take into consideration the increase in population, the drop in total cigarette consumption this past year is substantial. If, in fact, "nothing had happened," cigarette consumption would now be much higher than it was a year ago—and it isn't.

Much more important have been the changes taking place below the surface—at the levels of attitude and belief, which are often the precursors of change in behavior.

Many smokers have become uneasy about the relationship of cigarettes to illness. Millions of adult cigarette smokers are ready to be fully convinced that the time has come to change their smoking habits. And, therefore, the opportunity to convince them in 1965 and the years ahead is great.

In view of the massive opportunity for positive action, the time is surely ripe to launch a truly national effort that will convince people of the dangers of cigarette smoking.

If we exert such an effort, I am convinced that many millions of smokers, now on the fence, will decide in favor of their own health and well-being.

The facts and figures and surveys I have cited are encouraging. They offer real hope for the future. But, as Winston Churchill phrased it, we are only at the beginning of the beginning.

Unless we continue to exert ourselves in the struggle that lies ahead, we can lose what ground has been gained. In the face of the threat to health which cigarette smoking presents, our gains have been more, perhaps, than we might have expected but they are less than we might have hoped for. The real job lies before us.

For our part, I promise that in the months ahead the Public Health Service will do all it can to bring about a reduction of cigarette smoking, in the clear and established interests of the Nation's health.

STATEMENT BY EMERSON FOOTE, CHAIRMAN, NATIONAL INTERAGENCY COUNCIL ON SMOKING AND HEALTH, JANUARY 11, 1965

The National Interagency Council on Smoking and Health is meeting here in Washington for 2 days to add impetus and planning to a movement already well underway in many parts of the United States.

This movement happens to be the greatest lifesaving and health improvement venture of our time. I refer to the national movement, made up of many local movements, to reduce the consumption of cigarettes.

For cigarettes kill people. And they kill people in very large numbers.

The U.S. Public Health Service knows this. The American Cancer Society knows this. The American Heart Association knows this. The American Public Health Association knows this. The National Tuberculosis Association knows this. The Royal College of Physicians knows this. Physicians all over the world know this.

Just how many people do cigarettes kill? Even the most expensive computer couldn't tell you exactly.

Estimates made by scientists, who have spent years studying the problem, vary depending upon the way that the data are interpreted. But it may be said with sureness that cigarette smoking is today responsible for at least 125,000 deaths each year in the United States. Cigarette smoking may be responsible for as many as 300,000 deaths per year in this country.

Either figure represents a national catastrophe.

There are, of course, many hazards in life but in peacetime there is nothing else like this hazard—not automobiles or anything else anyone can think of.

Now of course the death toll due to cigarette smoking is by no means the only harm that cigarettes do. The amount of illness and suffering short of death, caused by cigarette smoking, is truly of staggering proportions. It may be said that the emerging medical view is not that cigarette smoking seriously damages the health of some people who practice it, but that cigarette smoking damages the health of most people who continue to smoke. All this is why the 17 organizations which make up the National Interagency Council have before them such a great opportunity to help save lives and to help improve health.

It is most encouraging, as Dr. Terry pointed out this morning, that there has already been some reduction in cigarette smoking and we may expect more results from the many well organized education programs now being carried on in this country by thousands of dedicated people—such as the programs referred to by Dr. Merrill.

But we believe that most decisive progress toward reducing cigarette consumption cannot be made while cigarette advertising is allowed to flourish unchecked.

Cigarette advertising is now running at the rate of over $200 million a year. The continued existence of this volume of advertising offsets, or one might say engulfs, counter-educational efforts. Nobody in the Interagency Council believes that the sale of cigarettes should be prohibited, but we do have grave doubts about permitting the promotion of cigarette sales—to people of any age.

We believe it is not morally justifiable to encourage people to kill themselves.

Nevertheless the members of the Council would not favor a law prohibiting cigarette advertising. We do feel, however, that legislation may well be needed to counteract the effect of cigarette advertising—by requiring a warning message in all advertisements and promotional materials. However, there may be another way—even though it may sound rather outlandish on first hearing. That would be for the tobacco companies to voluntarily suspend cigarette advertising. This would be more in the American tradition than any sort of law requiring the restriction or altering of cigarette advertising.

I believe that the tobacco companies would do this now, except for one thing. I can only guess this: but I do not think the people who run the tobacco companies even yet believe the evidence about cigarettes. I think that if they felt as we do in the Council they would not wish to advertise cigarettes.

I have great respect for the tobacco companies of this country and for the contribution they have made to the economic welfare of our Nation for 300 years. I believe that these companies are run by responsible men, who want to do the right thing.

From public statements they have made, it is evident that some of the people in charge of the Nation's tobacco companies feel that tobacco has always been under attack by one group of zealots or another and that, to use a phrase: "this too, shall pass away." But the point is that when King James I was writing his "Counter-Blaste Against Tobacco," there were not any scientific facts on either side. It has only been within the past 30 years that science has really gone to work on the tobacco-health problem; and the evidence confirming the lethal effects of cigarette smoking now amounts to a tidal wave—coming from all countries of the world, on both sides of the Iron Curtain.

I would simply like to suggest, most respectfully, that the gentleman in charge of our tobacco companies rethink and reconsider the whole matter—reexamine the evidence open-mindedly. I think it is possible that such reconsideration might lead to a decision not to advertise cigarettes.

I do not mean to be presumptuous but such a decision would also appear to have this advantage to the companies: it would definitely improve their short-term profit position—during which time conversion to other activities could be undertaken.

Also, while we fully recognize that cigarettes today make up the largest and most profitable part of the tobacco business, they are not all of it. And both pipe smoking and cigar smoking fall into an entirely different category than do cigarettes.

Recent scientific studies indicate that inhaling is probably responsible for most of the health damage caused by cigarette smoking. Not many people inhale pipe or cigar smoke.

There is no question that serious illness is caused in some instances by both cigar and pipe smoking, but every mortality and morbidity study shows this to be at a very much lower level than the effect produced by cigarette smoking.

Speaking personally, I am not against tobacco. I am against cancer, heart disease, and emphysema which are so closely linked to the use of tobacco, specifically in the form of cigarette smoking. Even so, I am not against the sale of cigarettes; but only against the promotion of cigarettes. There are many things that people do for their enjoyment and pleasure which are not good for them; which, in some cases, detract from their longevity or cause their illness. But unless such activity affects a huge proportion of those engaging in them, then they should not become a matter of public concern.

Based on evidence accumulated up to this point, I would say that cigarette smoking is the only form of the use of tobacco which justifies any kind of restrictive action.

Many people say cigarette smoking is like drinking. But it is not. Only some people are very badly affected by drinking whiskey, or other alcoholic beverages. Recently Rutgers University, which has for years conducted extensive studies of alcoholism, reported that only 10 percent of people who drink alcoholic beverages suffer any ill effects therefrom.

If we thought that cigarette smoking adversely affected the health of only 10 percent of those who smoked cigarettes, we wouldn't be here this morning.

It is only because we feel certain that continued cigarette smoking adversely affects the health of a very large proportion of those who smoke cigarettes, and cause the premature death of a substantial proportion, that we believe special and unusual steps should be taken. And that is why this Council was formed in the first place.

We believe that it is a matter of fact, not of opinion, that cigarette smoking constitutes a totally unique health hazard, fortunately not matched or even approached by any other health hazard; and that it must be recognized and dealt with accordingly.

All members of this Council are well aware of the importance to the Nation's economic well-being of such things as jobs, farm income, profits and taxes. We are aware that a substantial reduction in cigarette consumption—for which we are working—would adversely affect all of these.

However, under no conceivable circumstances is the tobacco industry going to collapse overnight. In the first place, we are talking about suspension or restriction of cigarette promotion only, plus educational activities designed to reduce cigarette consumption. In Italy where cigarette advertising was banned by Government edict, cigarette sales gained at a smaller rate in the first year following the ban. In the 2 years preceding the ban cigarette sales in Italy increased 6 percent each year. In the first year following the ban, they increased only 1½ percent. This reduction was not necessarily a direct result of the ban, but it is one of the few clues we have as to what might happen if there were a suspension of cigarette advertising in this country. One might expect the effect in this country to be greater—because both the relative extent and relative effectiveness of cigarette advertising in the United States are probably at a higher level than they were in Italy.

In any event, cigarette sales are going to decrease slowly and there should be considerable time for all those engaged in the industry to make readjustment.

Outside of the tobacco industry a reduction in cigarette consumption would have economically negligible effects and, on the other hand, would probably promote economic gain through increased length of life and a cut in lost time due to illness. Furthermore, it is hard to think that money not spent for cigarettes would all go into savings. It would most likely be spent for something else; there are still many unsatisfied wants in this country. Finally on the economic side, a nation which has just experienced a $40 billion increase in gross national product cannot conceivably have any great difficulty adjusting to a gradual reduction in one segment of the economy which, by the most elastic computations, account for a total amount of economic activity under $10 billion. And the added productivity of people who live longer and are healthier must all be on the economic plus side.

Going back to the matter of cigarette advertising, if the companies do not wish to consider the matter of suspending this advertising, then we believe steps must be taken, in the public interest, to counteract the effectiveness of cigarette advertising. We believe that this can be done by requiring a clearly worded warning message to appear in all cigarette advertisements and at the end of all cigarette commercials on television and radio.

Senator Neuberger has already touched on this point. The council has appointed a legislative committee to recommend steps which we may believe to be necessary.

I am optimistic that it will not be long before people will no longer be encouraged to smoke cigarettes, either by the voluntary suspension of cigarette advertising or by reducing its effectiveness through legislation.

But even before that happens much progress can be made. What is now going on in California and what is being planned for the future in that State, as we have heard this morning, holds much promise. We are going to have a meeting this afternoon of representatives from 25 of the 29 States where interagency councils have been set up. This will be a meeting to exchange information on State programs and to help plan for the future. Most of these State activities are, and will be, carried out mainly by volunteers. These are people deeply devoted to the principle that other people shouldn't die and suffer unnecessarily, in large numbers, when this can be prevented. I know that they are going to accomplish great things.

When large numbers of Americans set out to help even larger numbers of Americans—through education, guidance, and encouragement—great things are bound to happen.

We are just beginning today the first major meeting of the National Interagency Council on Smoking and Health. We are a very new organization—only a few months old. We can tell you more about our future plans and operations after these 2 days are over. And we will be glad to furnish any information you want.

At the moment we are just certain of one thing: cigarette deaths and cigarette disability are largely preventable. And we are going to prevent all we can.

RECOMPUTATION OF ANNUITIES FOR SURVIVORSHIP BENEFITS

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, in the previous session of Congress I sponsored S. 2144, which provided for recomputation of annuities of retired Federal employees. Congress, in 1962, adopted Public Law 87–793, the Postal and Federal Salary Act of 1962, which wisely liberalized survivorship costs for Federal retirees. Under terms of this law, a Federal employee can provide survivorship benefits by having his annuity reduced by 2½ percent of the first $3,600 of the annual annuity and 10 percent of any amount in excess of this sum. The survivor would be entitled to 55 percent of the basic annuity.

This provision is applicable only to those who have retired after October 10, 1962, and elected survivorship benefits.

Mr. President, it seems only simple justice that the liberalized survivorship provisions should also apply to existing retirees who have elected a reduction in their annuities to provide survivorship benefits.

A vast and complicated pattern of annuity reductions takes place for those who retired previously. In all instances, the cost of annuity reductions to provide survivorship benefits is vastly higher than that given by law in 1962 to future retirees.

According to information supplied to me by the U.S. Civil Service Commission, Bureau of Retirement and Insurance, the four major categories of retirees who have elected survivorship benefits, depending on date of retirement, are:

First. Retired prior to April 1, 1948, with the reduction based on the ages of both the retiring employee and spouse, and calculated on an actuarially equivalent basis; that is, the value of the joint and survivor annuity was equal to the value of the single life annuity at retirement. The annuity to the survivor was 100 or 50 percent of the employee's reduced annuity, as elected by him.

Second. Retired in the period April 1, 1948–September 29, 1949. The reduction was 10 percent of the single life annuity, plus three-fourths of 1 percent for each full year the wife was under age 60. The election was available to men only. The total reduction could not exceed 25 percent, and the widow's annuity was 50 percent of the unreduced annuity.

Third. Retired in the period September 30, 1949–September 30, 1956. Same as B, except; first, the election was available to both men and women; and, second, the flat 10-percent reduction was liberalized to 5 percent on the first $1,500 of single life annuity, plus 10 percent on any excess.

Fourth. Retired October 1, 1956, and later. The retiring employee could choose any portion of his life annuity—excluding any increase under the minimum disability provisions—as a base. The survivor annuity was 50 percent of this base. The reduction was 2½ percent of the first $2,400 of the base, plus 10 percent of any excess.

Mr. President, I am introducing legislation to provide a uniform basis for figuring survivorship benefits for all retirees who have elected such benefits. Under the terms of the proposed legislation I am introducing, the benefits would be identical to Public Law 87–793, for those who retired on October 11, 1962, or after. This provides a simplified and uniform procedure in figuring all costs of survivorship benefits, and extends to those who retired prior to October 11, 1962, the benefits provided by Congress for those who retired after that date. Some 180,000 retirees, plus their survivors, will benefit under the terms of this proposed legislation.

I am reintroducing this important legislation, and urge again that it receive favorable consideration from the Congress. This bill is strongly supported by the National Association of Retired Civil Employees and its 150,000 members.

It is all too easy to overlook the needs of retired Federal employees who have devoted a lifetime to Government service. Their annuities, in most cases, are all too small. There is no reason why they all should not have the same benefits which were provided by law in 1962 to those who retired after October 10, 1962.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have my bill printed in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 548) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, to provide for the recomputation of annuities of certain retired employees who elected reduced annuities at the time of retirement in order to provide survivor annuities for their spouses, and for the recomputation of survivor annuities for the surviving spouses of certain former employees who died in service or after retirement, introduced by Mrs. Neuberger, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (A) the annuity of each retired employee who retired prior to October 11, 1962, and who elected a reduction in his annuity in order to provide a survivor annuity for his spouse, shall be recomputed under the formula enacted in section 1103 of Public Law 87–793, applicable to annuities of employees who retired on and after October 11, 1962.

(b) The annuity otherwise payable on the date of this Act to (1) each survivor spouse receiving or entitled to receive an annuity based on service which terminated prior to October 11, 1962, and to (2) each surviving spouse of a retired employee or Member of Congress described in subsection (a) of this section, shall be recomputed on the basis of 55 per centum of the annuity received (or entitled to be received) by such deceased spouse at the time of his death, including the benefit of all annuity increases since the death of such spouse: *Provided,* That there shall be no decrease in the annuity now received by any surviving spouse, or which any surviving spouse may be entitled to receive.

2. This Act shall be effective the first day of the third month after the date of enactment.

3. The provisions under the heading "Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund" in Title I of the Independent Appropriations Act, 1959 (72 Stat. 1064; Public Law 85–844), shall not apply with respect to benefits resulting from the enactment of this Act.

ONION MARKETING ORDER

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, a measure to amend the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 so as to permit marketing orders issued under the act to be applicable to canned and frozen onions. This bill is identical to S. 2904, which I submitted in the 88th Congress and which was also cosponsored by the senior Senators from Idaho and Oregon. I ask unanimous consent that the letter from the Department of Agriculture on S. 2904 be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 549) to amend section 8c(2) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, so as to permit marketing orders issued under such section to be applicable to canned and frozen onions, introduced by Mrs. NEUBERGER (for herself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The letter presented by Mrs. NEUBERGER is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., July 31, 1964.

Hon. ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, U.S. Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in response to your request for a report on S. 2904, a bill to amend the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended.

The Department recommends that this proposal be passed. S. 2904 would authorize regulations on onions handled for canning or freezing under marketing orders. At the present time the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, exempts all vegetables other than asparagus from regulations if they are handled for canning or freezing.

Two onion orders are currently in effect. Onions grown in Idaho and Malheur County, Oreg., are included in one and onions grown in designated counties of south Texas in the other. These two orders cover about 21 percent of the total U.S. onion crop based on the 1963 statistics. Both authorize regulation of grade, size, quality, containers, and packs of onions handled for fresh market. By supplying the fresh market with better quality and preferred sizes of onions, producers in these two areas are attempting to get better returns for their onions than they would in the absence of such regulations. However, since the act exempts shipments for canning or freezing from any regulations under marketing orders, an increasing portion of their production moves unregulated to these outlets for processing into onion products, many of which compete with the better quality regulated fresh onions. Because canning and freezing are usually salvage outlets for onions failing to meet marketing order regulations, growers receive low prices for such onions. Since such onions may not be marketed in other outlets from regulated areas, the bargaining power of canners and freezers for such supplies is greatly enhanced to the detriment of growers and program objectives.

The Department does not issue statistics on disposition by outlets of the onion crop. However, a recent report by Michigan State University's Agricultural Economics Department, "Onions and Their Processing Potential" (Ag. Ec. Mimeo 858), states that about 13 percent of the 1961 U.S. commercial onion crop was processed into primary onion products. Since 1961, however, there has been an upward trend in processed onion products because of market acceptance for such products as chopped and diced frozen onions, frozen French fried onion rings, and the increased use of dehydrated onions. Onions for dehydration are subject to regulation under the act and the two onion orders currently in effect.

The Department has in the past recommended the removal of the exemption for canning and freezing on other commodities. The Neuberger bill, S. 1506, which proposed removal of this exemption for potatoes is an example. The removal of the exemption for onions (as well as other commodities) would enhance the relative marketing power of growers, as compared to the processors, for that portion of the crop which fails to meet marketing order (fresh market) requirements.

Passage of the proposed legislation should not involve any additional cost. Both onion marketing orders now in effect contain authority for regulations which could be applied or extended to onions for processing as well as those for fresh market.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the presentation of this report from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely yours,
ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Secretary.

UPPER NIOBRARA RIVER COMPACT, WYOMING AND NEBRASKA

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, in 1963 the two great sister States of Wyoming and Nebraska, who share the waters of the Niobrara River, ratified and approved the upper Niobrara River compact as signed at Cheyenne, Wyo., on the 26th day of October 1962. It is necessary that Congress ratify this compact to give it full force and effect.

Last year legislation was introduced by the Senators representing these two States, Mr. HRUSKA and Mr. CURTIS, Mr. MCGEE and myself, but, unfortunately, no action was taken on the matter. I am hopeful that it will receive the immediate attention of this Congress.

The Niobrara River is the lifeline to some of the finest grasslands in the world. On the rolling hills of eastern Wyoming and western Nebraska you can see the hundreds of sleek, fat cattle that drink the waters of the Niobrara River.

The headwaters of this river are in Wyoming and as it flows eastward into Nebraska it broadens to become one of Nebraska's important rivers.

The major purposes of this upper Niobrara River compact are to provide for an equitable division or apportionment of the available surface water supply of the Upper Niobrara River Basin between the States; to provide for obtaining information on ground water and underground water flow necessary for apportioning the underground flow by supplement to this compact; to remove all causes, present and future, which might lead to controversies; and to promote interstate comity.

Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to consent to the upper Niobrara River compact between the States of Wyoming and Nebraska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 553) to consent to the upper Niobrara River compact between the States of Wyoming and Nebraska, introduced by Mr. SIMPSON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN PROPERTIES TO THE CITY OF CHEYENNE, WYO.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague, Mr. MCGEE, I introduce for proper reference, a bill which will authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain properties to the city of Cheyenne, Wyo.

In 1932, the city of Cheyenne donated 600 acres of land to the Veterans' Administration. Now on a portion of that 600 acres of land is a VA Center which houses the regional office and a 133-bed hospital. It is an excellent center that is serving its purpose with great distinction.

Throughout the history of the VA Center, the relationship of its administrators and officials with the city of Cheyenne has been outstanding. In 1948, 431 acres of the original 600 acres given to the Veterans' Administration were reconveyed back to the city without remuneration.

In 1955, the VA declared 90 acres to be excess property through the General Services Administration. Sixty of the 90 acres were subsequently conveyed to the city of Cheyenne, Wyo., without monetary consideration. The remaining 30 acres are still classified as surplus property with the GSA.

The Veterans' Administration has now determined that another 27 acres is no longer needed by the VA Center in Cheyenne and is willing to convey this land to the city of Cheyenne for park and recreational purposes.

The bill I am now introducing would authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey this 27 acres of unneeded land to the city of Cheyenne with the understanding that it be used only for the stated purposes. If the city of Cheyenne were to ever use the land for other purposes, title would revert to the U.S. Government.

I am hopeful that this bill will receive early consideration by the appropriate committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 554) authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain property to the city of Cheyenne, Wyo., introduced by Mr. SIMPSON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

EXPORT EXPANSION ACT OF 1965

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I send to the desk, for appropriate reference, a bill which would authorize the Secretary of Commerce to carry out certain programs to develop and expand foreign markets for U.S. products, and to provide more effectively for assistance in the financing of certain foreign sales which are affected with the national interest.

Mr. President, it has often been said that a modern country must export or die. The United States now possesses the strongest economy of any nation in the history of the world. But that economy will not long remain strong if the American export program does not continue to flourish and expand.

Increased exports are vital to the redressing of our international balance of payments. They are vital to the maintenance of U.S. political leadership in the free world, and they are vital to domestic employment, economic growth, and prosperity.

Yet there is one threat which runs through every report of every trade expert who has studied our oversea market problems. We are not now selling what we could or should be selling, and we are not selling because, despite the significant improvements in the export promotion programs of the last 4 years, the U.S. oversea sales' presence in many markets still ranges from sickly to nonexistent.

Nor is it likely that present sales and development programs, both public and private, will be capable of filling these gaps in that market presence.

Too often we simply do not know what markets or potential markets, on a product-by-product basis, exist abroad.

Where we do know, too often we lack continuing and coherent product promotion, suitable adaptation of products to meet local needs or efforts to develop local distribution systems.

In the lesser developed countries in particular, we often lack even sales and service personnel and facilities, including critical stocks of spare parts and other sales-supporting apparatus.

There are some 135 cities around the world which are national capitals, or have populations in excess of 1 million people. There are hundreds of smaller but significant commercial centers. Yet today, there are one or more full-time U.S. commercial offices in only 93 cities. At that, each individual commercial officer is severely limited in his knowledge of potentially salable U.S. products—which may range from adding machines to zoo equipment—and is customarily saddled with burdens unrelated to the job of export promotion. How many commercial attachés have the business background or the time to conduct market analyses or study business development potentials? Few, indeed.

Besides, the commercial officer is a representative of the U.S. Government and naturally inhibited in pursuing anything which might resemble a "hard sell" for U.S. products.

Trade fairs are a great help, yet the total annual number of U.S. Government sponsored commercial-type trade fair participations averages only 12 to 15 annually. Official trade missions reach no more than 8 or 10 countries each year. Clearly, neither type of promotion activity could cover all of the products which might be salable in a given market. The trade mission comes and goes. The trade fair opens and closes. There is limited followup.

A trade center does provide for the continuous exposure of a wide range of U.S. products. Yet today, there are only five such centers—in London, Frankfurt, Tokyo, Milan, and Bangkok, and current plans call for only one more, in Stockholm, in fiscal year 1965.

There is no built-in limitation to what private enterprise can do and the record of private achievement in expanding exports has been heroic. But the private firm operating alone encounters severe obstacles and frustrations in many parts of the world.

For example, an American manufacturer who wanted to establish his own sales and service facilities and to stock spare parts in a lesser developed country, would require an enormous initial investment for a sales return which is at best speculative. The same would be true of the expense of detailed market analyses or long term market development work in, say, a new African or Asian nation.

But of all of the gaps that exist in our export structure, none looms so formidable as the gap in export financing.

This country possesses an abundance of capital which could be made available for financing exports at the lowest interest rates and best terms in the world. But it is not doing so. The Export-Import Bank, our primary export financing facility, has found it necessary to reduce or cut off loans or guarantees in countries with relatively weak credit standing or impending balance-of-payments problems—notwithstanding the impact of such decision on our national economic and commercial interest.

For example, a major U.S. exporter of farm equipment recently carried out a carefully planned and executed market development program in a Latin American country. This program was successful to the point where, through market acceptance, establishment of spare parts depots and training of mechanics, he had effectively eliminated his European competitors. At this point, just as his orders for equipment rose to a substantial figure, Eximbank decided it had reached its exposure limit and would finance no further sales in that country that year. Another case involved jet transport equipment in a Latin American country where the British have offered liberalized credit terms in their eagerness to get the business but where Eximbank is unwilling to finance either of the two U.S. companies who are bidding on the business.

A second facet of our financing gap is primarily one of availability of credit, rather than its terms.

Here, we must deal with countries in the intermediate state of development, where AID programs have recently been or are about to be phased out. These countries, which are just approaching economic stability and full entry into the world market economy, today offer some of the greatest potential markets for U.S. exports. At present this group consists of about 15 countries such as Greece, Spain, Venezuela, Mexico, Iran and Tiawan. This number will expand rapidly in the two decades just ahead.

As these countries are phased out of low-interest, long-term development assistance loans, they must turn to commercial import financing. Most of them feel that they still need some form of intermediate concessionary financing softer than standard commercial loans and aggressively seek this kind of financing. Other developed countries, recognizing the potential for trade development which is involved, are hastening to fill the gap between development assistance terms and commercial terms with semicommercial concessionary financing. By so doing they establish themselves in these rapidly growing markets and assure for themselves the follow-on business which will affect the intermediate countries' trading habits for many years into the future.

The British on their part have arranged to compete in this arena by making available to their exporters $2.24 billion of credit guarantees for "national interest loans" under section 2 of the British Export Guarantee Act. Such loans are made in cases where normal prudent banking standards would regard the recipient countries as poor credit risks, but where national commercial interests are at stake. Other countries have similar facilities for making national interest loans. These countries also have arrangements for rediscounting private bank exporter loans at less than Treasury borrowing rates where necessary to be fully competitive.

At the present time, we are not meeting this competition.

With the aid of the Commerce Department and others, both in government and industry, I have attempted to develop a comprehensive export expansion program which will serve to fill these gaps and yet remain always consistent with our fundamental free enterprise system.

This program is embodied in the bill which I introduce today to be called the "Export Expansion Act of 1965."

Title I of the act will create three separate but interrelated trade development programs: First, a Trade Development Corps; second, a program of cooperative industrial export development; and third, a program of assistance in the establishment of sales and service centers in lesser developed countries.

The Trade Development Corps will recruit the services of private citizens who are in, or retired from, private industry to supplement existing Federal and private programs for developing and expanding foreign markets for U.S. goods and services.

A trade development corpsman might serve a year in a major capital, supplementing the work of the commercial attaché. Free from a desk, armed with preliminary grounding in the language and economy of the country, he can get out into the business community with a keen and experienced eye for sales opportunities.

Here is a man who could sit down with his sales counterpart in the business community of any country in the world. He could talk knowledgeably and in the language of trade that the businessman understands about American product lines, commercial practices, and product suitability for the local market. And he could lay to rest many of the hoary and ugly misconceptions about doing business with Americans.

Equally important, he will be able to convey back to the American businessmen at home an accurate and realistic picture of the opportunities for new market penetration.

He might follow up the findings of a trade mission in the Philippines or study the machinery and other needs of the automotive assembly industry in Colombia. He might survey the market in Denmark for U.S. accounting and office management services or, in a team composed of a market research man and one or two sales engineers, he might help prepare for and follow up each of the eight industry shows each year in the London trade center.

The cooperative export development program is directly modeled after the existing agricultural trade development program. On a cost-sharing basis, the Secretary of Commerce could agree with an industrial trade association to conduct such promotional activities as product exhibits, institutional advertising or consumer demonstrations similar to those already being carried out under agricultural agreements. The U.S. Government contribution, insofar as feasible, will be in the form of local currencies generated by Public Law 480 and AID operations.

The sales and service center program would authorize the Secretary of Commerce to provide financial assistance on a 50-50 basis to establish sales and service centers in any lesser developed country where no single private entrepreneur could shoulder such financial burdens alone. Such centers must be made open and available to all U.S. firms on equal terms and conditions; make reasonable charges for their use; pay a return to the Government from any profits; and, when fully established on a paying basis, repay all of the Government funds initially advanced.

Title 2 of the Export Expansion Act of 1965 establishes in the Export-Import Bank a separate $500 million national interest financing fund. It will be used primarily to guarantee or insure American exporters against political and credit risks where other financing is not available, but the sale is found to affect the national interest.

The act would create a Special Interdepartmental Advisory Committee on national interest financing to advise the Bank with respect to the national interest involved in specific proposals.

The act would also amend the basic charter of the Export-Import Bank so that the Bank is charged to "assure, within its statutory limitations, that the United States may fully and effectively compete in its financing arrangements with other countries in the development and maintenance of world markets."

I am pleased to announce also that a companion bill will be introduced by Representative Adams, of Washington, in the House and that the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. Jackson], the senior Senator from California [Mr. Kuchel], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. Neuberger] are joining me in cosponsoring the bill. I also ask unanimous consent that the bill lay over until January 22 for additional cosponsors, and that it be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record and will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Washington.

The bill (S. 558) to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to carry out certain programs to develop and expand foreign markets for U.S. products, and to provide more effectively for assistance in the financing of certain foreign sales which are affected with the national interest, introduced by Mr. Magnuson (for himself and other Senators) was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 558

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Export Expansion Act of 1965".

FINDINGS AND PURPOSE

Sec. 2. The Congress finds and declares that foreign trade is indispensable to the economic welfare of this Nation, that the expansion of such trade has taken on a new urgency in the present phase of the East-West confrontation, and that the legitimate role of Government in achieving such expansion is to provide where necessary aids to private enterprise. It is the purpose of this Act to provide assistance to meet certain demonstrated needs of private enterprise (1) in finding, developing, and servicing markets abroad for American products and services, and (2) in financing exports of such products and services where such financing is not otherwise available and such exports are affected with the national interest.

TRADE I—TRADE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

Trade Development Corps

Sec. 101. (a) In furtherance of the purposes of this Act, the Secretary of Commerce shall undertake a program for the recruitment and training of a Trade Development Corps (hereinafter referred to as the "Corps") to consist of United States citizens who (1) are or have been in private industry or are otherwise well qualified, (2) possess experience or skills which can be effectively utilized in the operations of the Corps, and (3) can make their services available from time to time for particular trade development assignments.

(b) The function of the Corps shall be to supplement existing Federal and private programs for developing and expanding foreign markets for United States goods and services by providing a readily available source of qualified personnel for undertaking specific projects or assignments including, but not limited to—

(1) serving with a trade mission, or making in-depth studies of types of markets indicated by trade mission findings;

(2) making market analyses or studies, including (i) studies of the needs of particular countries or areas for specific products or types of products, (ii) studies of market possibilities in developing countries, and (iii) analyses of markets for products revealed by trade pattern studies as likely sales possibilities;

(3) serving with an oversea mission of the United States to supplement the work of the regular commercial or economic officers, counselors, or attachés assigned thereto;

(4) assisting in the preparation for or the development of market leads from industry exhibitions in foreign trade centers;

(5) assisting Government personnel in developing a closer integration of foreign aid and trade; and

(6) investigating major proposed foreign puchasing or construction projects in the interest of expanding outlets for American goods and services.

Members of the Corps shall not be assigned functions involving the actual handling of sales or service contracts. Projects for the Corps shall be developed by the Secretary in cooperation with other interested agencies of the Government, and with trade and industry groups.

(c) Each member of the Corps shall be given a basic orientation course and such further training as the Secretary may determine to be necessary to enable such member to carry out effectively any project to which he is assigned. In providing such training the Secretary may, whenever he deems it necessary or desirable, utilize on a reimbursable basis services, facilities, and personnel of any other Government agency.

(d) The Secretary is authorized to make grants to members of the Corps accepting assignments under this section. Each such grant shall be in an amount determined by the Secretary to be sufficient to defray the necessary travel and living expenses of the member and his family and to provide a moderate compensation while engaged in carrying out his assignment, and shall be subject to such terms and conditions as the

Secretary may prescribe to assure the successful completion of the assignment and to protect the interests of the United States. Payment of any such grant shall be made whenever feasible in foreign currency.

(e) In carrying out the provisions of this section the Secretary shall encourage the participation to the maximum extent feasible of private persons, firms, organizations and associations, and the Secretary is authorized to accept any contributions of funds, property, or services made thereby to be utilized for the purposes of this section.

(f) Members of the Corps accepting assignments under this section shall be exempt from the operation of sections 203, 205, 207, 208, and 209 of title 18, United States Code, but such members shall be subject to such regulations as the Secretary of Commerce shall prescribe to assure that such assignments will be carried out in a manner consistent with the public interest.

Cooperative industrial export development projects

SEC. 102. (a) In furtherance of the purposes of this Act, the Secretary of Commerce is authorized to enter into agreements with such private organizations or associations as he determines to be qualified to carry out industrial export development projects. Any such project shall be designed to develop or expand the market in one or more foreign countries for specific articles or materials manufactured in the United States, including—

(1) the undertaking of market studies,

(2) arranging for regular or special product exhibitions and demonstrations,

(3) providing assistance to foreign buyers in locating domestic sources of supply, and to domestic manufacturers or exporters in developing a foreign market,

(4) arranging for visits of foreign trade teams, industry representatives, or other delegations in furtherance of trade objectives,

(5) arranging for the preparation and distribution of promotional or advertising materials, and

(6) the undertaking of such other activities as will further the objectives of this Act and are approved by the Secretary.

(b) In any agreement entered into under this section the Secretary may agree to make available for the execution of the project such sums, not to exceed 50 per centum of the total cost of the project, as he determines to be necessary to assure its successful completion; such sums to be made available whenever feasible in foreign currency. Each such agreement shall require such reports, and shall be subject to such other terms and conditions, as the Secretary deems necessary to protect the interests of the United States.

Assistance for the establishment of sales and service centers abroad

SEC. 103. (a) In furtherance of the purposes of this Act, the Secretary of Commerce is authorized to provide financial assistance to any organization or association for the purpose of establishing in any country (other than a country which is determined by the Secretary to be fully developed) one or more sales and service centers, if he finds that—

(1) the proposed center will fulfill a pressing need in the area, and there is reasonable doubt that the same can be provided without financial assistance under this section;

(2) the applicant for such assistance is fully qualified to carry out the undertaking; and

(3) the plans for the proposed center are fully adequate to meet the need without being unduly elaborate or extravagant.

(b) The amount of any financial assistance provided under this section with respect to any one sales and service center shall not exceed 50 per centum of the total development cost thereof.

(c) No financial assistance shall be made available with respect to any sales and service center under this section, unless the applicant agrees—

(1) that during any period in which the United States has a financial investment in such center it will (i) make the facilities of such center available to United States business firms on equal terms and conditions, (ii) fix reasonable charges for the use of the facilities and services of such center in accordance with schedules or standards approved by the Secretary, (iii) pay to the United States from any net profits accruing from the operation of such center a reasonable return, as determined by the Secretary, on the capital contributed by the United States, and (iv) comply with such other reasonable terms and conditions as the Secretary shall prescribe for the protection of the interests of the United States, and

(2) that in the event the United States receives a full return on its financial investment in such center, it will comply with such terms and conditions as the Secretary shall prescribe to assure that such center will not be operated in a manner which is inconsistent with the purposes of this Act.

(d) The Secretary may make payments pursuant to any contract for financial assistance under this section at such times and in such manner as may be specified in the contract; such payments to be made whenever feasible in foreign currency.

(e) As used in this section—

(1) the term "sales and service center" means one or more buildings for the display and sale of particular types or broad categories of articles or materials manufactured in the United States and for the servicing and repair thereof, and may include management and sales offices, together with facilities for the stocking of parts, for the training of personnel, and for such other or related activities as may be approved by the Secretary; and

(2) the term "development cost" means the cost of constructing, purchasing, improving, altering, or repairing a building or buildings for use as a sales and service center, purchasing and improving the necessary land, and providing fixtures, equipment, and facilities necessary thereto.

Reports

SEC. 104. The Secretary of Commerce shall make a detailed annual report to the Congress of his operations under this title.

Use of foreign currencies

SEC. 105. In carrying out the provisions of sections 101, 102, and 103 of this Act, the Secretary of Commerce may utilize, with the approval of the President and in such amounts as may be specified from time to time in appropriation Acts, foreign currencies or credits owned by or owed to the United States which are, under applicable agreements with the foreign country concerned, available for the use of the United States Government.

Authorization for appropriations

SEC. 106. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums, to remain available until expended, as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title.

TITLE II—EXPORT FINANCING ASSISTANCE

Amendments to the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945

SEC. 201. (a) Section 2(a) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 is amended by inserting after the second sentence the following: "In carrying out such objects and purposes the Bank shall (1) cooperate with private capital so as to further the expansion of exports of products and services from the United States and its possessions, and (2) assure, within its statutory limitations, that the United States is fully and effectively competitive in its financing arrangements with other countries in the development and maintenance of world markets."

(b) Section 2 of such Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(d) (1) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, it is the further policy of the Congress that the Bank shall, in utilizing such funds as may be appropriated pursuant to section 6(b) (2), assist in financing United States exports which can reasonably be expected to affect the national interest.

"(2) In furtherance of its objects and purposes and of the policy of the Congress as declared in paragraph (1) of this subsection, the Bank is authorized and empowered to utilize such funds as may be appropriated pursuant to section 6(b) (2) to guarantee, insure, coinsure, reinsure, make loans, and otherwise assist in the financing of United States exporters, and foreign exporters doing business in the United States, against political and credit risks of loss arising in connection with United States exports which can reasonably be expected to affect the national interest; to establish fractional reserves in connection therewith of not less than 25 per centum of the related contractual liability; and to purchase, discount or rediscount obligations or participations therein of foreign obligors in connection with those United States exports which can reasonably be expected to affect the national interest. The terms on which any guarantee, insurance or other financing assistance is provided under this subsection shall be determined by the Board of Directors of the Bank having due regard to the purposes of this subsection and may be set at less than prevailing commercial levels. The Bank may issue and service the guarantees, insurance, coinsurance and reinsurance herein authorized as provided in subsection (c) (2) of this section.

"(e) The obligations of the Bank heretofore or hereafter issued, whether in the form of guarantees, insurance or otherwise, shall be considered contingent obligations of the United States Government backed by its full faith and credit."

(c) Section 3(d) of such Act is amended by inserting "(1)" immediately following "(d)", and by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph as follows:

"(2) There is hereby established an Interdepartmental Advisory Committee on National Interest Financing which shall consist of the following members: The Secretary of Commerce, who shall serve as Chairman, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Agriculture, the President of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, and the Administrator, Agency for International Development. Each member of the Committee may designate an officer of his department or agency to act for him as a member of the Committee. The Committee shall when requested by the Bank advise with and make recommendations to the Bank with respect to the national interest involved in specific proposals for the extension of financial assistance under section 2(d). The Committee shall also establish such guidelines as it may deem advisable to assist the Bank in determining the national interest with respect to any particular category or categories of proposals."

(d) Section 6 of such Act is amended by inserting "(a)" immediately after "Sec. 6.", and by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(b) (1) To carry out the purposes of section 2(d), the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed, upon appropriation of funds for such purpose, to purchase from time to time such special obligations as the Bank may issue in any amount not to exceed $500,000,000 outstanding at any one time.

"(2) For the purpose of enabling the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase special obligations of the Bank pursuant to paragraph (1) of this subsection, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, at any time without fiscal year limitation, $500,000,000 to remain available until expended. Any funds paid to the Treasury by the Bank as repayment on account of the principal of such special obligations shall continue to be available for the purchase of additional special obligations by the Secretary of the Treasury under paragraph (1) of this subsection. Payment of interest by the Bank on account of any special obligations purchased under such paragraph (1) shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

"(3) The obligations issued by the Bank to the Secretary of the Treasury pursuant to paragraph (1) of this subsection shall be special obligations, payable by the Bank only out of its net receipts from its operations under section 2(d), and shall bear such interest and maturities as may be determined by the Board of Directors of the Bank with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury."

(e) Section 7 of such Act is amended by striking out the period and inserting in lieu thereof the following: ", except that this limitation and the limitation upon the aggregate amount of guarantees and insurance as provided in section 2(c) shall not be applicable to guarantees, insurance, or other financial assistance provided pursuant to section 2(d)."

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. HARTKE. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Washington if he would be so kind as to include my name as a cosponsor of the foreign trade bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE] be added as a cosponsor to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Indiana has been interested in expanding our foreign trade for a long time and has been one of the most active members of the committee in this particular field.

I am sure that many other Senators will wish to add their names to this bill, which will be one great stride forward in the advancement of foreign trade, particularly in the financing of American manufacturers who have an opportunity to get into foreign markets and expand their trade.

Mr. HARTKE. I commend the distinguished Senator from Washington for this worthwhile piece of proposed legislation. It will be one of the hopeful ways to use some of the foreign aid funds we have, especially in the economic field.

FOREIGN TRADE INCREASE

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, this week, Luther H. Hodges retires after 4 years of outstanding service as a most effective Secretary of Commerce.

Renowned for his unusual service as Governor of North Carolina and for his business ability, Secretary Hodges now has a new claim to historical fame. Of all the many areas to which my good friend, Luther Hodges, has given his mind, his talents, and his ability as a salesman and leader, he may be best remembered as the administrator of our most successful trade expansion abroad.

The new change in administrative direction at the Department of Commerce will not change the thrust of the program. This can be said with certainty because the trade expansion program has just begun to demonstrate the results foreseen by the late President Kennedy, by those of us who wrote the legislation, and by the careful work of Secretary Hodges.

The new Secretary inherits promotion of a dynamic and growing U.S. international trade which saw a sales expansion abroad of 14 percent in the year just ended. In 1964, our exports reached an annual rate of more than $25 billion. We will now have a trade surplus—exports over imports—of $7 billion—a vital piece of support to keep the dollar strong in the world marketplace. The flow of gold abroad has been cut drastically and our growth at home allowed to proceed without oversea interference.

Secretary Hodges understands that this is but the beginning. Recently, he advised that "much more needs to be done." Then he added, eloquently:

> We have arrived, I think, at one of those critical periods in world affairs that future historians could well point to and say, "There, in that period, occurred a turning point that helped us move toward a better, more peaceful world." And they will be referring in part to our successes or failures in developing world trade.

I believe that many Americans have begun to understand that one of the most dramatic areas to be developed in the coming decade by our country is our international trade.

Since 1957, we have had a serious problem with our balance of payments. The battle against this adverse balance was mounted in part by the trade expansion program begun by Congress and President Kennedy and continued by President Johnson—all under the capable administration of Secretary Hodges. The success of trade expansion has contributed to better business here at home and the creation of new jobs for Americans.

Government assumed a new role in this expansion. Never before had our Government been dedicated to acting for and with American private enterprise to promote the sale of U.S. goods. The people in our State and Commerce Departments had little precedent to follow as they began the task of helping to sell American goods in oversea marketplaces. It is not, after all, typical U.S. Government or simple service or superficial assistance.

Our people learned some promotional devices from Great Britain, France, and Japan—among others—because these nations have had to export in order to live. Their businessmen were used to being joined by their governments in joint promotions and were used to being represented effectively in oversea business operations.

While our international payments were overwhelmingly in our favor, American business seemed to need no such help—and they sought none.

But the dollar gap of the early 1950's gave way to the competitive challenges of adverse payments and the outflow of gold in the late 1950's and the early 1960's.

In this change, there has been a new role for Congress to play, a role which we have only partially accepted.

Close cooperation between government and business in furthering national interests through world trade is a continuing partnership in which Senators and Representatives share, and should increasingly share.

The truth is that where Congress has participated most fully, the programs appear to have been most successful. I believe there is much room for further effort by Congress and further accompanying success for our country.

One cooperative business-government program which has operated effectively, in part because of the close working relationship of its pilots in the administration and those of us in Congress, is the trade mission project.

U.S. trade missions, sponsored by the Bureau of International Commerce, are groups of private businessmen sent abroad to stimulate sales, locate distributors and help bring American companies, investors, oversea customers, and venture partners together. This program represents an unusual business-government cooperation which Reader's Digest last year called "A government-business team that works."

Today, the Department of Commerce conducts at least six special trade promotion programs to help American firms sell in emerging oversea markets. All this is with the assistance of the Foreign Service.

We have trade centers—miniature merchandise marts—in London, Frankfurt, Tokyo, Milan, and Bangkok. We support exhibitions at international trade fairs around the globe. We have sample product displays at smaller places. We mount business information centers at trade shows. We assist mobile trade fairs moving by ship and plane.

In the past 4 years, more than 2,000 U.S. firms have sold products and tested markets at exhibitions and centers from Sydney to Stockholm.

But the oldest program—and one of our most successful—is the trade missions. Another 2,500 firms have submitted 15,000 proposals to prospective buyers abroad through trade missions—face-to-face talks between key American businessmen and their counterparts in other countries.

The approach has had unusual success. Trade missions have cost the taxpayers $2 million in the last 4 years. But initial sales and investments have already resulted in more than $35 million being returned to this country. Continuing sales from these missions alone will account for between $100 and $500 million, according to the most reliable estimates.

Appropriations have dropped each year, but the number of missions has grown from 9 annually to more than 20. Its cost-benefit ratio is among the highest of any Government program.

Reader's Digest concluded:

> The cost of the program to the taxpayers is negligible compared to the profits and benefits to the free economy of the West.

This mission program is but one example of trade expansion. It is a great tribute to Secretary Hodges and to the Trade Missions Director Roy Gootenberg and Gene Braderman.

Congress helped create this program. In 1954, President Eisenhower asked for and was authorized a program to help create a better image of American business and culture overseas. The administration directed attention to trade fairs, missions, and sport and cultural presentations to build up mutual understanding. Experiments in this program developed some of the techniques used in the last 4 years when we had to sell more goods, equipment, and services in order to protect the dollar and bring the free world closer together through free enterprise.

In 1961, Secretary Hodges asked Congress to help as he sought to shift emphasis from helping foreign businessmen to service to U.S. businesses. We had a great need to find topnotch American businessmen to sell advantages of U.S. goods and know-how.

We in Congress have proposed many of the business and industrial leaders who have done this amazing sales job. Some of those distinguished leaders who have been on trade missions include: George Price, president of National Homes; Joseph Hall, chairman of Kroger's; Frank Cruger, chairman of the National Small Business Association, and Lester Wolff, president of Cooperative Marketing who only recently was elected to Congress. This month Alfred Stokely, president of Stokely-Van Camp, leaves on a mission.

In 1963, Secretary Hodges wisely turned to another kind of mission to work in a different sector. Industrial and trade associations, chambers of commerce, Governors, and others began running missioners with the aid and planning of the Government. The Department worked effectively with businessmen and manufacturers and consulted with Congress to make these missions work. At least six States have had successful missions. So have industries like apparel, lumber, furniture, leather and appliances.

Cooperation has been successful. Our $25 billion in exports—the annual rate—is up $6 billion in 4 years. That is at the rate of 30 percent. Yet, I believe this is nothing more than a significant start.

Cooperation involving Congress, the administration and free, private enterprise must be given new thrust in several directions. I believe an International Commerce Subcommittee within the Senate Commerce Committee is an essential part of the formula for continued and greater success in world trade. In addition, it would be a shining symbol of the Senate's desire to see trade flourish as the result of a government-business partnership.

Such a subcommittee also would be able to delve deeply into the myriad of problems which a shrinking world and a growing international trade create. It would help Congress to help lead in some vital areas:

First. Iron Curtain countries. The U.S. Chamber of Commerce recommends the Government "reevaluate its restrictions on trade with European satellites, with a view toward eliminating those restrictions not necessary for security and which are harmful to the U.S. competitive position." Increasing numbers of the business community are asking about doing business with the Soviet Union and other Eastern European countries. They say they do not want us to lose trade to European nations now dealing with the Russians.

What should our policy be on export control legislation?

What about most-favored-nation treatment for Eastern Europe?

What about long-term credit for trade with Russia?

What about the possibilities of trade with the Soviet bloc to build understanding and ease the cold war? Or as a wedge between the Soviets and the Red Chinese?

Second. Developing countries. My trip to Africa 2 years ago to seek out trade possibilities convinced me that we have not even begun to build markets in developing nations. To do so, we may have to help stimulate their annual growth and help them achieve the goal of 2½ percent increase a year. This means a new look at aid and at our trade policies and programs.

What should Congress do about improved export financing and credit to make them competitive in underdeveloped countries?

What about financing of construction and engineering tenders and contracts in Africa and Latin America?

What about bringing business investment and planning into AID programs?

Third. Trade Expansion Act changes. This act was a mandate to chop down tariff walls mutually with other free nations. The Trade Expansion Act was only a beginning. And the implementation through the Kennedy Round of GATT negotiations is only barely off the ground. Yet, weaknesses already are apparent and refinements are already necessary. Trade adjustment assistance authorized for injury from import competition is apparently a failure because of 11 cases denied relief by the Tariff Commission. Surely, Congress did not mean to make adjustment assistance as difficult to gain as the Commission has interpreted. The Trade Expansion Act has to be amended, it seems, in order to make adjustment meaningful and effective.

There is almost no end to the work for an International Commerce Subcommittee. The subcommittee could focus on opportunities for more trade and on problems in trade. It could help Congress lead the way to a more prosperous economy and a stronger free world.

The bridges of trade have already contributed mightily to peace and prosperity and to a sound dollar. They can be an even greater factor in a better world ahead whether we choose simply to compete with other friendly nations or with potential enemies or whether we choose to make trade itself a bridge of understanding.

In any case, if we are to lead effectively, we must legislate effectively. To do so, I believe we need an official part of this body to examine, to probe, to inquire, to weigh evidence, and to recommend. This is why I believe so fervently in the need for this new subcommittee.

FEDERAL CIGARETTE LABELING ACT

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I believe that an adult has the right to choose his own poison. But I also believe that he has the right to know just what kind of a risk he is taking. I am therefore today introducing a proposed Cigarette Labeling Act to require adequate warning and tar and nicotine statements on all cigarette packages.

The American people want this protection. A Public Health Service survey has disclosed that 7 out of 10 believe "cigarette smoking is enough of a health hazard for something to be done about it." And, by a ratio of nearly 2 to 1, those polled favored compulsory warnings.

This survey shows that though many Americans are now aware that smoking is harmful, too many others, particularly teenagers, have not yet got the message.

Too many are still tempted to say "if cigarettes were really so harmful, the Government would certainly do something about it."

I am convinced that only a prescribed warning on each cigarette package would really bring home to the smoker, or the teenager about to become a smoker, the sober fact that cigarette smoking can be injurious to him.

What about safer cigarettes? Do tar and nicotine yields really make a difference? The Public Health Service believes they do.

We are convinced—

The Assistant Surgeon General told a House committee last August—

> you can make a safer cigarette, much safer. Some cigarettes have been developed that have about a tenth of the nicotine and tars of the ordinary cigarette.

Eight out of ten people—including 7 out of every 10 of the smokers—polled by the Public Health Service wanted to be told just what the tar and nicotine score is.

As I have for many long years worked to promote the development and growth of the National Cancer Institute to seek the answers to the cancer mysteries that plague our Nation, so I now believe that it is our responsibility to arm the Public Health Service in its battle against smoking-caused cancer and other disease.

The Federal Cigarette Labeling Act will require each and every package of cigarettes to carry in a "prominent" place on the label, in "conspicuous and legible type" the statement "Warning: continual smoking may be hazardous to your health."

This bill would also require that each package label state the average tar and nicotine yield per cigarette as uniformly determined by the method approved by the Federal Trade Commission so that there will no longer be conflicting tar and nicotine claims.

Failure to comply with the requirements of this statute is to be made a criminal act to be enforced by fines up to $100,000.

The Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] has long been in the forefront of efforts to alert us to the hazards of smoking. The Commerce Committee is indeed fortunate to have her as a new member, and we are grateful that we will have the benefit of her expertise to assist the committee in developing the most appropriate legislation in this field.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement by Dr. Luther L. Terry, Surgeon General of the U.S. Public Health Service, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS[1] BY LUTHER L. TERRY, M.D., SURGEON GENERAL, PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

A few weeks ago at our annual Christmas party a group of our people presented their annual good-natured spoof of some of the year's activities.

One of their verses, sung to the tune of "On Top of Old Smokey," went as follows:

> "On Top of Old Smoking
> A year has gone by
> But the smoke we're deploring
> Still gets in our eye."

I am happy to say, at this anniversary meeting, that while we still can—and do—deplore the amount of cigarette smoking still going on, measurable and encouraging progress has been made during the year. In a few moments, I shall present some statistical evidence on this progress.

What is equally heartening to me, however, is the national concern which has been expressed about the problem and the national action which has been generated. To my mind, the formation of the National Interagency Council on Smoking and Health represents the finest example of this concern.

All of us know that we are faced with a long, slow, and—to a considerable extent—uphill campaign. The fact that so many organizations represented here today are pooling their efforts on behalf of a single goal is our best guarantee of eventual success.

We are moving forward. And we are moving forward in a united and purposeful way.

When the announcement of the Advisory Committee's report was made 1 year ago today, there were many questions raised by the press and by others. Some of them were unanswerable then; some are still unanswerable. On the others we are making definite progress.

The principal and obvious question was: Would a substantial number of people stop smoking?

Today we can ask the same question. Many indices suggest that, after a pronounced downward dip during the spring months, cigarette smoking is once more on the increase. Among these indices are warehouse shipments and the figures on tax returns.

While these figures certainly have some significance—and I would not pretend that they are not disquieting—they do not tell the whole story.

We have very recently completed some studies which show a different result. Let me place them in historical perspective.

In 1955, a survey made by the Bureau of the Census at the request of the Public Health Service found that 59 percent of adult men and 31 percent of adult women were cigarette smokers.

In 1962, a survey undertaken by the American Cancer Society found that the proportion of male smokers had remained the same and that the proportion of female smokers had increased by 5 percentage points.

In July of last year, the Public Health Service's National Center for Health Statistics began including questions on smoking habits in its surveys.

A preliminary analysis of the Center's figures for the months of July, August, and September indicates that the proportion of adult cigarette smokers has actually declined.

Last fall the Service undertook a survey to gain more accurate data in depth on the smoking habits, knowledge, and attitudes of the general population. More than 300 items of information were sought from a random nationwide sample of 3,500 households. This survey also showed a drop in the proportion of adult cigarette smokers, estimated as follows:

Instead of the 59 percent of 1955 and 1962, there are now only about 52 percent male cigarette smokers in our population.

A decline of 7 percentage points does not appear to be much—and it is certainly less than we would wish. But if these figures stand up under final analysis it means that: nearly one out of four adult men has given up cigarettes; there are now nearly as many men who are noncigarette smokers as there are smokers.

Smoking among women, according to our surveys, has also turned downward. Although the decline is small—only 2 to 3 percentage points—this is the first time on record in which the trend has been downward.

If we consider both men and women, it would appear that there are as many adults today who have never been cigarette smokers as there are smokers.

If smoking habits had continued at the level of 3 years ago, there would be about 3½ million more smokers than there actually are today.

I would repeat that we in the Public Health Service are by no means satisfied with the progress that has been made. On the other hand, I am convinced that our findings of a year ago, widely publicized and followed up throughout the year by an alert and responsible press, have had a discernible and encouraging effect on the smoking problem.

That public awareness of the hazards involved is widespread is evident in other ways.

In the area of beliefs and attitudes the data are both stimulating and encouraging. For this reason, I want to share the first results with you, well in advance of their publication. The figures, I am told, are preliminary but reasonably firm.

Many of the questions asked involved the subject's knowledge or beliefs about the relation of smoking to specific diseases. For example, people were asked: Is there anything a person might do that could cause lung cancer?

Sixty-nine percent spontaneously mentioned smoking cigarettes.

It is, of course, of great importance that smokers themselves become concerned about the habit. A large majority of the cigarette smokers surveyed indicated that they believed smoking to be harmful.

A number of questions sought to explore the possibility of remedial action. Presented with the statement: "Cigarette smoking is enough of a health hazard for something to be done about it," 7 out of 10 agreed and only 1 out of 6 disagreed.

Nine out of ten said they were in favor of more public education on the health hazards of cigarette smoking, for both adults and children.

Four out of five people said they were opposed to the practice of featuring athletes and celebrities in cigarette advertising.

By a ratio of about 2 to 1, those polled favored a compulsory warning on cigarette package labels and in advertising.

Eight out of ten—including 7 out of 10 smokers—also said they believed that a statement on tar and nicotine content should be required on each package.

The Public Health Service during this year has interested itself also in the behavior and attitudes toward smoking of students in the health professions. A study conducted among more than 10,000 senior medical, dental, and osteopathic students is yielding interesting results.

Compared to the general male population of comparable age, senior medical students, for example, show far less tendency to take up cigarettes—55 percent as against 83 percent. And among medical students who take up the habit, there is far greater tendency to quit—44 percent as against 18 percent in a given time period.

This suggests that in groups which hold health important, have the facts, and understand the health implications of the facts, the cigarette habit is reversible. Because the medical profession is frequently able to set an example in personal health that the general population tends to follow, this finding among medical students is a hopeful augury for the future.

The experience of a year, in brief, demonstrates that a deeply ingrained personal habit can be changed where the facts are made widely known. I might add that, so far, most of this has been accomplished through the mass communications media. I doubt that any health message has ever reached so many in so short a time.

What have been some of our Service efforts during this past year?

You will perhaps be interested, first of all, in the distribution of the report itself.

Altogether during the first year, including sales by the Superintendent of Documents, more than 350,000 copies of the full report on smoking and health have been distributed. For a scientific publication, this is quite substantial Equally gratifying have been the number and distribution of summaries and special-audience publications inspired by the report. The Service has worked closely with many Government agencies and voluntary organizations to make these "grandchild" publications both appealing and accurate. Five separate health information pamphlets on various aspects of the report, for example, were prepared and distributed by various units of the Public Health Service.

As one means of promoting distribution as well as assisting health agencies and education groups, we have distributed about 6,000 information kits of sample publications on smoking and health.

We are involved as well in some 15 behavioral studies to get at the psycho-social dynamics of smoking: why people start smoking and others don't, why some can stop and others have difficulty. These include studies of adult and youth educational programs, withdrawal clinics, the roles of physicians and other professional health workers, and the value of group treatment.

One of the most immediate and far-reaching byproducts of the smoking and health report has been the impetus it has given to research on the components of smoke and their physiological effects. Not only has the report stimulated more research, but the field has attracted competent investigators who previously had been giving priority to other problems.

---

[1] Presented at the Conference of the National Interagency Council on Smoking and Health, National Education Association Center Auditorium, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C., at 10 a.m.

In addition to expanded work at the National Institutes of Health, new research is being sponsored by universities and foundations, and, as you know, by the American Medical Association with financial help from the tobacco industry itself.

Additional data from three long-range studies—of U.S. war veterans, the American Cancer Society, and the study of the British physicians—continue to reinforce the earlier findings evaluated in the smoking and health report. All three strengthen the evidence that people who stop smoking are greatly benefited, even if they have smoked for many years.

The wealth of research information accumulated for the Advisory Committee is being kept up to date through the use of the medlars computer system at the National Library of Medicine. Plans are being developed for a continuing review and analysis of the worldwide literature on this subject.

Most of the activities I have mentioned today are joint programs with State and local health agencies, education institutions, and others. I have omitted a great many which, in the absence of financial support, we have been able to assist only by consultation and technical advice.

One of the principal ways by which we keep informed is through the National Interagency Council, which has brought us together here today. The Public Health Service is delighted with the rapid progress being made by the Council.

We particularly want to welcome our distinguished new chairman, Mr. Emerson Foote, whose enlightened example will serve the Council's cause as it has recently served the President's Commission on Heart Disease, Cancer, and Stroke.

The report of that Commission, as most of you know, included a strong endorsement of the report on smoking and health, and recommended an expenditure of $10 million over a 3-year period.

Our request for a supplemental appropriation of $1.9 million last summer was defererd by the Congress. We received encouragement from a number of Members of the Congress to renew the request this year. This we hope to do in the weeks ahead. If we are to put the National Clearinghouse on Smoking and Health into full operation it is clear that funds will be needed.

Last year, the Congress did appropriate $1.5 million to study the health-related problems of tobacco. This appropriation, which was made to the Department of Agriculture, has been highly useful. The Department of Agriculture is working very closely with the Public Health Service in developing suitable research into the properties of tobacco smoke and leaf constituents and their biologic effects.

In summary, where do we stand today, 1 year after the report?

First of all, despite the charge that nothing has really happened, and that the smoking habits of the Nation are right back where they were, many changes have already taken place.

Adult cigarette smokers are showing a clear trend away from the habit. At least 18 million Americans are now ex-cigarette smokers—and they have been off long enough for most of them to stay off.

If we take into consideration the increase in population, the drop in total cigarette consumption this past year is substantial. If, in fact, "nothing had happened," cigarette consumption would now be much higher than it was a year ago—and it isn't.

Much more important have been the changes taking place below the surface—at the levels of attitude and belief, which are often the precursors of change in behavior.

Many smokers have become uneasy about the relationship of cigarettes to illness. Millions of adult cigarette smokers are ready to be fully convinced that the time has come to change their smoking habits. And, therefore, the opportunity to convince them in 1965 and the years ahead is great.

In view of the massive opportunity for positive action, the time is surely ripe to launch a truly national effort that will convince people of the dangers of cigarette smoking.

If we exert such an effort, I am convinced that many millions of smokers, now on the fence, will decide in favor of their own health and well-being.

The facts and figures and surveys I have cited are encouraging. They offer real hope for the future. But, as Winston Churchill phrased it, "we are only at the beginning of the beginning."

Unless we continue to exert ourselves in the struggle that lies ahead, we can lose what ground has been gained. In the face of the threat to health which cigarette smoking presents, our gains have been more, perhaps, than we might have expected but they are less than we might have hoped for. The real job lies before us.

For our part, I promise that in the months ahead the Public Health Service will do all it can to bring about a reduction of cigarette smoking in the clear and established interests of the Nation's health.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that the bill lie on the table until Friday, January 22, for cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and will lie on the table as requested.

The bill (S. 559) to regulate the labeling of cigarettes, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Magnuson (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, on this subject, many people have asked me when we expected to start hearings on the bill. I believe that it is the consensus of most members of the committee that we wish to hold hearings on this particular legislation and other bills before the committee at a very early date. If possible, we wish to set the hearings within the next 30 days.

FEDERAL INSTALLATIONS POLLUTION

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, and the Clean Air Act, to provide for improved cooperation by Federal agencies to control water and air pollution from Federal installations and facilities and to control automotive vehicle air pollution. The bill, which had its origin in a suggestion by the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. Boggs], is cosponsored by him, Mr. Bartlett, Mr. Bayh, Mr. Brewster, Mr. Fong, Mr. Gruening, Mr. Kennedy of Massachusetts, Mr. Miller, Mr. Monroney, Mr. Pearson, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Ribicoff, and Mr. Williams of New Jersey.

The bill which I am introducing would provide the following in the water pollution control field:

First. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare may establish standards of water quality for discharges from Federal installations.

Second. There would be authorized appropriations to install, maintain, and operate waste disposal systems at Federal installations. Funds appropriated would be administered by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and be made available to other Federal agencies as required.

Third. There would be authorized a program for the training of personnel to operate and maintain waste water treatment facilities.

Fourth. Each Federal agency would be required to inform the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare of their waste disposal practices and the Secretary in turn would make an annual report to Congress on programs carried out.

In the field of Federal air pollution control the bill would provide for the following:

First. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare would be authorized to establish classes of potential air pollution sources for any Federal installation and to enter such building, installation, or property for inspection purposes.

Second. There would be authorized appropriations to install, maintain, and operate devices or other means of controlling air pollution from Federal installations. Funds appropriated would be administered by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and be made available to other Federal agencies as required.

Third. There would be authorized a program for the training of personnel to operate and maintain air pollution control devices or other means of controlling air pollution and the Secretary would be required to report to Congress annually on the status and effectiveness of actions taken.

Fourth. It would be required that, for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1965, and for each fiscal year thereafter, all automotive vehicles purchased for any of the Federal executive departments must be equipped with a device which would prevent or reduce pollutants from exhaust discharges to standards prescribed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The portion of this bill dealing with water pollution control activities at Federal installations was dealt with in part in S. 649 of the 88th Congress. However, after considering the nature and magnitude of the problem of water pollution from Federal installations, as well as the problem of air pollution at such installations, it became apparent that it would be best to make these and other related matters the subject of separate legislation.

The cooperation of Federal departments and agencies in controlling the wastes from buildings, installations, or other property, which find their way into our water courses and into our atmosphere, has not been equal to the leadership role in water and air pollution control rightfully contemplated for the Federal Government. Surely, if we expect private industry, municipalities, and others to make investments in facilities to protect and preserve our air and water resources we cannot, in all fairness, ignore Federal sources of pollution.

It is recognized that much is being done by many Federal agencies in studying ways of coping with the problems, but there is no coordinated aggressive program of determining the extent of air and water pollution from these sources, providing means of correcting them, and operating and maintaining facilities to control pollutants.

It has been found that Federal installations in December of 1960 discharged 46.1 million gallons per day of untreated sewage directly into surface waters and the ground. This untreated sewage should be subjected to treatment as soon as possible, even though the total untreated sewage discharged constitutes only 3 percent of the total estimated 1,500 million gallons of untreated municipal sewage that directly reaches surface waters and the ground. In addition, it is reported that about 88 million gallons per day of untreated industrial waste waters is discharged into surface waters and the ground. Much the same situation exists with respect to air pollution. Thus, it is evident that Federal agencies have not requested or utilized funds in adequate quantities to take care of the problem. For this reason, it is my proposal that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare be assigned the responsibility of coordinating necessary control programs and administering funds appropriated for both air and water pollution control activities at these installations.

In other legislative proposals an effort is being made to attack the problem of air pollutants being emitted by the millions of automotive vehicles operating on our Nation's streets and highways. Again, the Federal Government can and should, by its own example, encourage the provision of air pollution control systems on vehicles purchased for its own use.

I would like to note that the General Services Administration, which procures for civilian use about 35,000 automotive vehicles annually for nationwide use, has already taken steps to have all 1966 model motor vehicles, purchased by them, equipped with exhaust control systems. This agency is to be commended for taking this action which I expect was prompted as a result of the adoption of the Clean Air Act in December of 1963. I feel strongly that the action by the General Services Administration should be implemented by congressional approval and further that all vehicles purchased for military use should come equipped with air pollution suppression systems.

The ultimate responsibility of whether we do or do not eliminate air and water pollution from Federal installations and vehicles under Federal control rests with Congress. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare would advise Congress of the source of pollutants, the need for control measures, and request the necessary appropriations to carry on necessary programs.

I ask unanimous consent that the complete text of the bill, and a section-by-section analysis of the bill, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and section-by-section analysis will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 560) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, and the Clean Air Act, as amended, to provide for improved cooperation by Federal agencies to control water and air pollution from Federal installations and facilities and to control automotive vehicle air pollution, introduced by Mr. MUSKIE (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 560

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Federal Installations, Facilities, and Equipment Pollution Control Act."

TITLE I—AMENDMENTS OF FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT

SEC. 101. Section 9 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended (33 U.S.C. 466h) is amended by inserting "(a)" after "Sec. 9." and by adding at the end of such section the following:

"(b) In order to control water pollution which may endanger the health or welfare of any persons, any Federal department or agency having jurisdiction over any building, installation, or other property shall discharge wastes therefrom only in compliance with standards for such discharges which the Secretary may establish. The Secretary or his duly authorized representative is authorized to enter any such building, installation, or other property at reasonable times for the purpose of inspecting and investigating waste discharge practices.

"(c) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated necessary amounts to be expended for the installation, maintenance, and operation of waste disposal systems for any such building, installation, or other property and for which the Secretary has approved the plans and specifications as conforming to the purposes of this section. Such amounts shall be appropriated to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and shall be made available to the appropriate Federal department or agency concerned in accordance with a plan approved by the Secretary which will provide for prevention or control of discharges of waste and shall not be expended for any other purpose.

"(d) In order to assist in assuring appropriate maintenance and operation of the waste disposal systems, the Secretary shall provide training in such matters to personnel of the Federal departments and agencies.

"(e) Each Federal department or agency shall inform the Secretary of waste disposal practices in effect at any building, installation, or other property within its jurisdiction and shall promptly inform the Secretary of the absence, or failure to institute, waste disposal practices necessary and adequate for this purpose and the reason or reasons therefor. The Secretary shall report each January to the President and to the Congress on the status and effectiveness of actions taken to prevent and control pollution by such Federal departments and agencies."

TITLE II—AMENDMENTS OF CLEAN AIR ACT

SEC. 201. Subsection 7(b) of the Clean Air Act (77 Stat. 399) is amended to read as follows:

"In order to control air pollution which may endanger the health or welfare of any persons, the Secretary may establish classes of potential pollution sources for any Federal department or agency having jurisdiction over any building, installation, or other property. The Secretary or his duly authorized representative is authorized to enter any such building, installation, or other property at reasonable times for the purpose of inspecting and investigating discharge practices."

SEC. 202. Section 7 of such Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(c) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated necessary amounts to be expended for the procurement, installation, maintenance, and operation of devices or other means to prevent or control air pollution for any such building, installation, or other property and for which the Secretary has approved the plans and specifications as conforming to the purposes of this section. Such amounts shall be appropriated to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and shall be made available to the appropriate Federal department or agency concerned in accordance with a plan approved by the Secretary which will provide for prevention or control of emission of air pollutants and shall not be expended for any other purpose.

"(d) In order to assist in assuring appropriate maintenance and operation of the devices or other means of prevention or control, the Secretary shall provide training in such matters to personnel of the Federal departments or agencies. The Secretary shall report each January to the President and to the Congress on the status and effectiveness of actions taken to prevent and control pollution by such Federal departments and agencies."

TITLE III—COOPERATION BY FEDERAL AGENCIES TO CONTROL AUTOMOTIVE VEHICLE AIR POLLUTION

SEC. 301. Section 6 of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 1857e) is amended by adding after such section the following:

"(c) No appropriation made in any Act for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1965, and each fiscal year thereafter shall be available for the purchase of any automotive vehicle for the service of any of the executive departments or other Government establishments, or any branch of the Government service, unless such automotive vehicle is equipped with a device which will prevent or reduce the discharge of pollutants from exhaust of any such automotive vehicle in accordance with standards established by the Secretary."

The section-by-section analysis presented by Mr. MUSKIE, is as follows:

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF AMENDMENTS PROPOSED TO FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT, AS AMENDED, AND CLEAN AIR ACT TO PROVIDE FOR IMPROVED COOPERATION BY FEDERAL AGENCIES AND TO CONTROL AUTOMOTIVE VEHICLE AIR POLLUTION

TITLE I—AMENDMENTS OF FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT

Section 101, cooperation to control pollution from Federal installations: This section amends section 9 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended (33 U.S.C. 466h), by adding at the end of such section the following:

In order to control water pollution which may endanger the health or welfare of any persons, any Federal department or agency having jurisdiction over any building, installation, or other property shall discharge wastes therefrom only in compliance with standards for such discharges which the Secretary may establish. The Secretary or his duly authorized representative is authorized to enter any such building, installation, or other property at reasonable times for the purpose of inspecting and investigating waste discharge practices.

There would be authorized to be appropriated necessary amounts for the installation, maintenance, and operation of waste disposal systems for any such building, installation, or other property and for which the Secretary has approved the plans and specifications as conforming to the purposes of this section. Funds would be appropriated to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and made available to the appropriate Federal department or agency concerned in accordance with a plan approved by the Secretary which will provide for prevention or control of discharges of waste and shall not be expended for any other purpose.

In order to assist in assuring appropriate maintenance and operation of the waste disposal systems, the Secretary shall provide training in such matters to personnel of the Federal departments and agencies.

Each Federal department or agency shall inform the Secretary of waste disposal practices in effect at any building, installation, or other property within its jurisdiction and shall promptly inform the Secretary of the absence, or failure to institute, waste disposal practices necessary and adequate for this purpose and the reason or reasons therefor. The Secretary shall report each January to the President and to the Congress on the status and effectiveness of actions taken to prevent and control pollution by such Federal departments and agencies.

TITLE II—AMENDMENTS OF CLEAN AIR ACT

Section 201, cooperation by Federal agencies to control air pollution from Federal facilities: This section amends subsection 7(b) of the Clean Air Act to read as follows:

In order to control air pollution which may endanger the health or welfare of any persons, the Secretary may establish classes of potential pollution sources for any Federal department or agency having jurisdiction over any building, installation, or other property. The Secretary or his duly authorized representative is authorized to enter any such building, installation, or other property at reasonable times for the purpose of inspecting and investigating discharge practices.

Section 202 further amends section 7 of the Clean Air Act as follows:

There would be authorized to be appropriated necessary amounts for the procurement, installation, maintenance, and operation of devices or other means to prevent or control air pollution for any such building, installation, or other property and for which the Secretary has approved the plans and specifications as conforming to the purposes of this section. Funds would be appropriated to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and made available to the appropriate Federal department or agency concerned in accordance with a plan approved by the Secretary which will provide for prevention or control of emission of air pollutants and shall not be expended for any other purpose.

In order to assist in assuring appropriate maintenance and operation of the devices or other means of prevention or control, the Secretary shall provide training in such matters to personnel of the Federal departments or agencies. The Secretary shall report each January to the President and to the Congress on the status and effectiveness of actions taken to prevent and control pollution by such Federal departments and agencies.

TITLE III—COOPERATION BY FEDERAL AGENCIES TO CONTROL AUTOMOTIVE VEHICLE AIR POLLUTION

SEC. 301. Automotive vehicle and fuel pollution: This section amends section 6 of the Clean Air Act by adding the following:

No appropriation made in any act for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1965, and each fiscal year thereafter shall be available for the purchase of any automotive vehicle for the service of any of the executive departments or other Government establishments, or any branch of the Government service, unless such automotive vehicle is equipped with a device which will prevent or reduce the discharge of pollutants from exhaust of any such automotive vehicle in accordance with standards established by the Secretary.

INTERGOVERNMENTAL COOPERATION ACT OF 1965

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I am pleased to introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to enable greater cooperation and coordination among Federal, State, and local governments in order to strengthen our great Federal system and more effectively to meet the needs of the American people.

For over 2 years the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations, of the Committee on Government Operations, has been examining questions of Federal-State-local relations, including the rapid growth in number and complexity of Federal grant-in-aid programs, and the vexing problems of governmental relationships in our burgeoning metropolitan areas.

I think that the President, in his state of the Union message last week, had these problems in mind when he suggested that "we make an all-out campaign against waste and inefficiency." He also pointed out that "in our urban areas the central problem today is to protect and restore man's satisfaction in belonging to a community where he can find security and significance. The first step is to break old patterns—to begin to think, and work, and plan for the development of entire metropolitan areas."

In furtherance of both the concern and the goals stated by the President, I am introducing the Intergovermental Cooperation Act of 1965. This, I hope, is the first of an annual series of measures designed to keep our Federal system abreast of these rapidly changing times. This proposed act includes five titles: Title I: Improved Administration of Grants-in-Aid to the States; Title II: Periodic Congressional Review of Federal Grants-in-Aid to States and to Local Units of Government; Title III: Permitting Federal Departments and Agencies To Provide Specialized or Technical Services to States and to Local Units of Government; Title IV: Coordinated Intergovernmental Policy and Administration of Grants for Urban Development; and Title V: Acquisition, Use, and Disposition of Land Within Urban Areas by Federal Agencies in Conformity With Land Utilization Programs of Affected Local Governments.

Most of the provisions grow out of studies of the subcommittee, of which I am privileged to be chairman, and from recommendations of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, on which I and my colleagues, the senior Senators from South Dakota and North Carolina, serve as members.

The grant-in-aid is one of the most useful devices of our system of government for meeting a national problem while at the same time maintaining the strength of State and local government. The vitality of State and local government as we now know it would be diminished without the support of the various grant-in-aid programs. Further, it would be extremely difficult and highly undesirable for the Federal Government to establish its own direct operating programs in each of the more than 100 grant fields with the consequent expansion in the size of the Federal establishment.

It has been the particular responsibility of our subcommittee to observe the overall pattern and impact of these Federal aids. Our conclusion to date, and I believe it is shared by many, is that a welter of confusion and inconsistent procedures has been established, often pursuant to law, by many Federal departments and agencies administering these programs; many programs, once established, have not been reviewed and revised by the Congress in light of changing needs; Federal agencies often lack authority to provide technical services to State and local agencies that would prove economical for all three levels of government; in our urban areas there has been inadequate concern on the part of some Federal agencies with overall local goals and desires; individual Federal agencies sometimes overlook the interdependency of their program with other Federal, State, local, and private activities; some Federal programs have supported or encouraged the establishment of special districts, further complicating the pattern of local government; and there is insufficient recognition in Federal grant-in-aid programs of the need for the many governments in our metropolitan areas to work together to solve common problems.

Title I of this bill authorizes that full information be made available to the Governors on funds granted within their States, and provides for more uniform administration of Federal grant funds. This title would also improve the scheduling of Federal transfers of grant funds to the States, resulting in a saving in Federal interest costs. It permits the States to budget Federal grant funds in much the same way as they budget other revenues, thereby achieving a greater degree of regularity in financial planning for the operation of their agencies. The provisions of this title permit simplification of organizational arrangements at the State level for administering grant-in-aid programs.

Title II provides for periodic congressional review of new Federal grant-in-aid programs to insure that such programs are examined systematically and are reconsidered in light of changing conditions and new program requirements.

Mr. Kermit Gordon, Director of the Budget, writing in Saturday Review's special issue of January 9, 1965, on the "Challenge of Prosperity," emphasized the necessity for a "reexamination of the premises of existing programs, for a weighing of alternatives" to meet new challenges and opportunities. He stated that we should "look carefully at the programs that have already found a place in the Federal budget. They are not suspect simply because they are there; but neither does their long tenure exempt them from periodic scrutiny to determine whether their shape and size are appropriate."

This title was unanimously passed by the Senate as S. 2114 in the last session, but not acted upon by the House.

Title III authorizes Federal departments and agencies to render technical assistance and training services to State and local governments on a reimbursable basis. This will enable State and local governments to avoid the expense of unnecessary duplication of specialized or technical services, and permit more economical use of Federal facilities. Congress previously has authorized the provision of such arrangements in the case of the Bureau of the Census, the Internal Revenue Service, and a number of other agencies.

Title IV establishes a coordinated intergovernmental urban assistance policy. It also requires local government review of certain applications for Federal programs and encourages a broader approach for review, at the metropolitan area level, of applications for loans as well as grant projects affecting urban development. The title, therefore, serves to strengthen metropolitan planning machinery and encourages more orderly metropolitan growth. The fourth section of this title was unanimously passed by the Senate as S. 855 in the last session, but was not acted upon by the House.

Also, this title favors the eligibility of units of general local government—cities, towns, and counties—as recipients of Federal aids—in contrast to special purpose districts and authorities.

Finally, title V amends the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act by prescribing a uniform policy and procedure for urban land transactions and use undertaken by the General Services Administration. Acquisition, use, and disposal of land in urban areas by this agency shall be consistent, to the extent possible, with local zoning regulations and development objectives. Like title IV, this title will help make urban planning more effective.

The major organizations of governmental officials in this country—the Governors' Conference, the National League of Cities, the National Association of Counties, the U.S. Conference of Mayors, and the American Institute of Planners—have formally endorsed practically all of the principles embodied in this legislation. These officials and organizations are deeply interested in a full examination and subsequent action by the Congress to improve intergovernmental relations. Various Federal agencies and departments have also expressed interest and support on different provisions of the bill.

I look forward to prompt and thorough hearings on this important legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill, together with a section-by-section analysis, be inserted in the RECORD immediately following my remarks, and that the bill lie on the table for 10 days so that other Senators may join in cosponsoring it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the text of the bill and the section-by-section analysis will be printed in the RECORD. Also, without objection, the request that the bill lie on the table for 10 days is granted.

The bill (S. 561) to achieve the fullest cooperation and coordination of activities between the levels of government in order to improve the operation of our Federal system in an increasingly complex society, to improve the administration of grants-in-aid to the States, to provide for periodic congressional review of Federal grants-in-aid, to permit provision of reimbursable technical services to State and local governments, to establish coordinated intergovernmental policy and administration of grants and loans for urban development, to provide for the acquisition, use, and disposition of land within urban areas by Federal agencies in conformity with local government programs, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MUSKIE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Government Operations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows.

S. 561

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1965."

TITLE I. IMPROVED ADMINISTRATION OF GRANTS-IN-AID TO THE STATES

Full information on funds received

SEC. 101. Any department or agency of the United States Government which administers a program of grants-in-aid to any of the State governments of the United States shall, upon request, notify the Governor or other official designated by him, or the State legislature, of the purpose and amounts of recommended or actual grants-in-aid to the State, and of such other facts pertaining thereto as it makes to the State agency administering the program. No Act of Congress shall be construed to prevent the Governor or other designated officer from participating in the State's determination of its financial needs in the same manner as he does with respect to the budgeting of State funds.

When used in this Act—

(a) The term "grant-in-aid" means any payments made by the Federal Government to a State, whether the payments are made in advance, or as reimbursements for expenses already incurred, and whether subject to conditions or not, for the support of activities administered by a State. The term does not include shared revenues.

(b) The term "State" means any of the several States of the United States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, any territory or possession of the United States, or any agency or instrumentality of a State, but does not include the governments of the political subdivisions of the State.

Subject only to the procedures here enacted, nothing contained in this law shall limit the authority of any department or agency of the United States to make grants-in-aid to the States.

Uniform handling of grant funds

SEC. 102. Notwithstanding any other law, each grant-in-aid to a State shall be paid to the State treasurer or other officer that may be designated by the legislative authority (or by the Governor in the absence of a designation by the legislative authority) to receive said funds, and appropriate accounting advice with regard to the transmittal of funds shall be provided to such State officers as may require the data for purposes of financial management and control. The State may provide for the direct receipt of Federal funds in the case of State institutions of higher learning.

State salaries paid from grants-in-aid

SEC. 103. After July 1, 1967, and except as specificaly authorized pursuant to State law and agreed to by the Federal agency concerned, no Federal grant-in-aid to a State shall be used to pay a salary in excess of the regular salary standards applicable to State employees generally, nor shall a grant-in-aid be used to pay all or part of a salary the full time equivalent of which is in excess of the normal annual salary rates of employees of the State or of State institutions of higher learning.

Deposit of grants-in-aid

SEC. 104. Notwithstanding any other provision of law or regulation, no grant-in-aid to a State shall be required to be deposited in a separate bank account apart from other funds administered by the State. All Federal grant-in-aid funds made available to the States shall be properly accounted for as Federal funds in the accounts of the State. In each case the State agency concerned shall render regular authenticated reports to the appropriate Federal agency, covering the status and the application of the funds, the liabilities and obligations on hand, and such other facts as may be required by said Federal agency.

Scheduling of Federal transfers to the States

SEC. 105. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, heads of Federal departments and agencies responsible for administering grant-in-aid programs shall schedule the transfer of grant-in-aid funds consistent with program purposes and applicable Treasury regulations, so as to minimize the time elapsing between the transfer of such funds from the United States Treasury and the subsequent disbursement thereof by a State. States shall not be held accountable for interest earned on grant-in-aid funds, pending their disbursement for program purposes.

Eligible State agency

SEC. 106. Notwithstanding any other law which provides that a single State agency must be established or designated to administer or supervise the administration of any grant-in-aid program, the head of any department or agency may, upon request of the Governor or other appropriate executive or legislative authority of the State, waive the single State agency provision and approve other administrative structure or arrangements: *Provided,* That the head of the department or agency is assured that the objectives of the statute authorizing the grant-in-aid program will not be endangered by the use of such other structure or arrangements.

TITLE II. PERIODIC CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW OF FEDERAL GRANTS-IN-AID TO STATES AND TO LOCAL UNITS OF GOVERNMENT

Statement of purpose

SEC. 201. It is the purpose and intent of this title to establish a uniform policy and procedure whereby programs for grant-in-aid assistance from the Federal Government to the States or to their political subdivisions which may be enacted hereafter by the Congress shall be made the subject of sufficient subsequent review by the Congress to insure that (1) the effectiveness of grants-in-aid as instruments of Federal-State-local cooperation is improved and enhanced; (2) grant programs are revised and redirected as necessary to meet new conditions arising subsequent to their original enactment; and (3) grant programs are terminated when they have substantially achieved their purpose.

Expiration of grant-in-aid programs

SEC. 202. Where any Act of Congress enacted in the Eighty-ninth or any subsequent

Congress authorizes the making of grants-in-aid to two or more States or to political subdivisions of two or more States and no expiration date for such authority is specified by law, then the authority to make grants-in-aid by reason of such Act to States, political subdivisions, and other beneficiaries from funds not theretofore obligated shall expire not later than June 30 of the fifth calendar year which begins after the effective date of such Act.

Committee studies of grant-in-aid programs

SEC. 203. Where any Act of Congress enacted in the Eighty-ninth or any subsequent Congress authorizes the making of grants-in-aid over a period of three or more years to two or more States or to political subdivisions of two or more States, then during the period beginning not later than twelve months immediately preceding the date on which such authority is to expire, the committees of the House and of the Senate to which legislation extending such authority would be referred shall, separately or jointly, conduct studies of the program under which such grants-in-aid are made with a view to ascertaining, among other matters of concern to the committees, the following:

(1) The extent to which the purposes for which the grants-in-aid are authorized have been met;

(2) The extent to which such programs can be carried on without further financial assistance from the United States; and

(3) Whether or not any changes in purpose, direction, or administration of the original program, or in procedures and requirements applicable thereto should be made.

Each such committee shall report the results of its investigation and study to its respective House not later than one hundred and twenty days before such authority is due to expire.

Definitions

SEC. 204. For the purposes of this title—

(a) The term "State" means any of the several States of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, any territory or possession of the United States, or any agency or instrumentality of a State.

(2) The term "political subdivision" means a local unit of government, including specifically a county, municipality, city, town, township, or a school or other special district created by or pursuant to State law.

(3) The term "grant-in-aid" means money, or property provided in lieu of money, paid or furnished by the United States under a fixed annual or aggregate authorization—

(A) to a State or political subdivision of a State; or

(B) to a beneficiary under a State-administered plan or program which is subject to approval by a Federal agency; if such authorization either (i) requires the States or political subdivisions to expend non-Federal funds as a condition for the receipt of money or property from the United States; or (ii) specifies directly, or establishes by means of a formula, the amounts which may be paid or furnished to States or political subdivisions, or the amounts to be allotted for use in each of the States by the States, political subdivisions, or other beneficiaries. The term does not include (1) shared revenues; (2) payments of taxes; (3) payments in lieu of taxes; (4) loans or repayable advances; (5) surplus property or surplus agricultural commodities furnished as such; (6) payments under research and development contracts or grants which are awarded directly and on similar terms to all qualifying organizations, whether public or private; or (7) payments to States or political subdivisions as full reimbursement for the costs incurred in paying benefits or furnishing services to persons entitled thereto under Federal laws.

TITLE II. PERMITTING FEDERAL DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES TO PROVIDE SPECIALIZED OR TECHNICAL SERVICES TO STATE AND LOCAL UNITS OF GOVERNMENT

Statement of purpose

SEC. 301. It is the purpose of this title to encourage intergovernmental cooperation in the conduct of specialized or technical services and provision of facilities essential to the administration of State or local governmental activities, many of which are nationwide in scope and financed in part by Federal funds; to enable States or local governments to avoid unnecessary duplication of special service functions; and to authorize all departments and agencies of the executive branch of the Federal Government which do not have such authority to provide specialized or technical services to State and local governments.

Authority to provide service

SEC. 302. The Secretary of any department or the administrative head of any agency of the executive branch of the Federal Government is authorized within his discretion, upon written request from a State or political subdivision thereof, to provide specialized or technical services, upon the payment, by the unit of government making the request, of the cost of such services performed.

Reimbursement to appropriation

SEC. 303. All moneys received by any department or agency of the executive branch of the Federal Government, or any bureau or other administrative division thereof, in payment for furnishing specialized or technical services as authorized under section 302 shall be deposited to the credit of the appropriation or appropriations from which the cost of providing such services has been paid or is to be charged.

Reports to Congress

SEC. 304. The Secretary of any department or the administrative head of any agency of the executive branch of the Federal Government shall furnish annually to the respective Committees on Government Operations of the Senate and House of Representatives a report on the scope of the services provided under the administration of this title.

Definitions

SEC. 305. For the purposes of this title—

(a) The term "State" means any of the several States of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, any territory or possession of the United States, or any agency or instrumentality of a State.

(b) The term "political subdivision" means a local unit of government, including specifically a county, municipality, city, town, township, or a school or other special district created by or pursuant to State law.

(c) "Specialized or technical services" means special statistical and other studies and compilations, development projects, demonstration projects, technical tests and evaluations, technical information, training activities, surveys, reports, documents, and any other similar service functions which the Secretary of any department or the administrative head of any agency of the executive branch of the Federal Government is authorized by law to perform.

TITLE IV. COORDINATED INTERGOVERNMENTAL POLICY AND ADMINISTRATION OF GRANTS FOR URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Declaration of urban assistance policy

SEC. 401. (a) The economic and social development of the Nation, its strength in world affairs and the achievement of satisfactory levels of living depend in large degree upon the sound and orderly development of urban communities. In pursuit of this basic objective, the President shall establish rules and regulations for uniform application in the formulation, evaluation, and review of urban development programs and projects for the provision of federally aided urban facilities, and Federal projects having a significant impact on the development of urban and urbanizing communities. Such rules and regulations shall provide for full consideration of the concurrent achievement of the following specific objectives of urban development, and to the extent authorized by law reasoned choices shall be made between such objectives when they conflict:

(1) Appropriate land uses for residential, commercial, industrial, governmental, institutional, and other purposes;

(2) Wise development and conservation of natural resources, including land, water, minerals, wildlife, and others;

(3) Balanced transportation systems, including highway, air, water, pedestrian, mass transit, and other modes for the movement of people and goods;

(4) Adequate outdoor recreation and open space;

(5) Protection of areas of unique natural beauty, historical and scientific interest;

(6) Properly planned community facilities including utilities for the supply of power, water, and communications, for the safe disposal of wastes, and for other purposes; and

(7) Any other objective through which urban development activities can contribute to the economic, social, and cultural development of the Nation, its strength in world affairs, and the achievement of enhanced levels of living.

(b) All viewpoints—national, regional, state, and local—shall, to the extent possible, be fully considered and taken into account in planning urban development programs and projects. Regional, state, and local government objectives shall be considered and evaluated within a framework of national public objectives, and available projections of future national conditions and needs of regions, states and localities shall be considered in plan formulation, evaluation, and review.

(c) To the maximum extent possible, consistent with national objectives, all Federal aid for urban development purposes shall be consistent with and further the objectives of state and local government comprehensive planning for urban development. Consideration shall be given to all developmental aspects of the total urban community including but not limited to housing, transportation, economic development, natural resources development, community facilities, and the general improvement of living environments.

(d) Each Federal department and agency administering an urban development aid program shall, to the maximum extent practicable, consult with and seek advice from all other significantly affected Federal departments and agencies in an effort to assure fully coordinated programs.

(e) Insofar as possible, systematic planning required by individual Federal programs (such as highway construction, urban renewal, and open space) shall be coordinated with and made part of comprehensive local and areawide urban development planning.

Favoring units of general local government

SEC. 402. (a) Notwithstanding any law providing that special purpose units of local governments are eligible to receive loans or grants-in-aid for urban development, units of general local government (cities, counties, towns, and townships) acting singly or jointly, shall be eligible to receive such loans or grants-in-aid. Heads of Federal departments and agencies shall, in the absence of substantial reasons to the contrary, make such loans or grants-in-aid for urban development to units of general local government rather than to special purpose units of local government.

(b) In the event that a loan or grant-in-aid is made to a special purpose unit of local government, the chief executive officer or the governing body of each unit of general local government in which the loan or grant recipient is located or which would be affected by the loan or grant-in-aid project:

(1) shall be notified of the purpose, amounts, or other factors related to the proposed or actual, loan or grant-in-aid to such special purpose unit of local government;

(2) may participate in such normal procedures as relate to budgeting of said loan or grant-in-aid; and

(3) shall have the opportunity to have their comments made a part of the application for such loan or grant-in-aid.

(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, joint sponsorship of a project eligible for grant or loan funds by two or more units of general local government, two or more special purpose units of government, or any combination thereof, shall not limit the total amount of the loan or grant-in-aid to less than the aggregate available to the participating units of general local government and/or special purpose units of government acting singly.

Consistency with plans and objectives of general local governments

SEC. 403. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any application for a loan or grant made after June 30, 1966, for construction of hospitals, airports, water supply and distribution facilities, sewerage facilities and waste treatment works, water development and land conservation within any metropolitan area subject to the provisions of this title, shall be submitted to the unit of general local government with authority to operate in the area within which the project or facility is to be located. No action shall be taken by any Federal agency upon such application unless the governing body of the unit of general local government certifies that such project or facility is consistent with its planning objectivs. If said unit does not act on an application within thirty days after its submission, the application shall be deemed approved by said unit. The certification shall accompany the submission of such application to the areawide agency pursuant to section 404 of this title. The foregoing requirements shall not be applicable in the case of applications from units of government larger than and encompassing the unit of general local government within which the project or facility is to be located.

More effective utilization of certain Federal loans or grants by encouraging better coordinated local review of State and local applications for such loans or grants

SEC. 404. (a) In order to assist Federal, State, and local governments to increase their economy and efficiency of operations in meeting the governmental needs of the increasing concentration of population in metropolitan areas; to facilitate the coordination of intergovernmental relationships and activities on a continuing basis; to provide more effective exchange of information among the governments concerned at the earliest possible stage of planning and throughout the planning and development process; to encourage areawide comprehensive planning on a continuing basis; and to encourage state and local governments to establish or improve facilities for coordinating areawide development, all applications made after June 30, 1966, for Federal loans or grants to assist in carrying out urban renewal and open space land projects or for the construction of hospitals, airports, water supply and distribution facilities, sewerage facilities and waste treatment works, highways, transportation facilities, water development and land conservation within any metropolitan area shall be subject to the provisions of this title.

(b)(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2) of this subsection, each application for a loan or grant of the type described in subsection (a) shall be accompanied (i) by the comments and recommendations with respect to the project involved by an areawide agency designated to perform metropolitan or regional planning for the area within which the assistance is to be used, and which is, to the greatest practicable extent, composed of or responsible to the elected officials of the units of general local government within whose jurisdiction such agency is authorized to engage in such planning; and (ii) by a statement by the applicant that such comments and recommendations have been considered prior to formal submission of the application. Such comments shall include information concerning the extent to which the proposed urban development project or program is consistent with comprehensive planning developed or in the process of development for the metropolitan area and the extent to which such project or program contributes to the fulfillment of such areawide planning. The comments and recommendations and the statement referred to in this section shall, except in the case referred to in paragraph (2) of this subsection, be reviewed by the agency of the Federal Government to which such application is submitted for the sole purpose of assisting it in determining whether the application is in accordance with the provisions of Federal law which govern the making of the loans or grants.

(2) An application for a Federal loan or grant need not be accompanied by the comments and recommendations and the statement referred to in paragraph (1) of this subsection if the applicant certifies that (i) a plan or description of the project, meeting the requirements of such rules and regulations as may be prescribed under subsection (c) hereof, or such application has lain before an appropriate areawide agency or instrumentality for a period of sixty days without comments or recommendations thereon being made by such agency or instrumentality; of (ii) the application is consistent with and in furtherance of projects or plans previously reviewed by such agency or instrumentality in connection with prior applications.

(3) The requirements of paragraphs (1) and (2) shall also apply to any amendment of the application which, in light of the purposes of this title, involves a major change in the project covered by the application prior to such amendment.

(c) The Bureau of the Budget or such other agency as may be designated by the President is hereby authorized to prescribe such rules and regulations as are deemed appropriate for the effective administration of this title.

Definitions

SEC. 405. As used in this title—

(a) "Comprehensive planning" includes the following, to the extent directly related to area needs or needs of a unit of general local government: (i) preparation, as a guide for long-range development, of general physical plans with respect to the pattern and intensity of land use and the provision of public facilities, including transportation facilities, together with long-range fiscal plans for such development; (ii) programing of capital improvements based on a determination of relative urgency, together with definitive financing plans for the improvements to be constructed in the earlier years of the program; (iii) coordination of all related plans of the departments or subdivisions of the government concerned; (iv) intergovernmental coordination of related planned activities among the State and local governmental agencies concerned; and (v) preparation of regulatory and administrative measures in support of the foregoing.

(b) "Hospital" means any public health center or general, tuberculosis, mental, chronic disease and other type of hospital and related facilities, such as laboratories, outpatient departments, nurses' home and training facilities, and central service facilities normally operated in connection with hospitals, but does not include any hospital furnishing primarily domiciliary care.

(c) A "metropolitan area" or "area" means either (i) a standard metropolitan statistical area as defined by the Bureau of the Budget, except as may be determined by the President or by the Bureau of the Budget as not being appropriate for the purposes of this title, or (ii) any urban area, including those surrounding areas that form an economic and socially related region, taking into consideration such factors as present and future population trends and patterns of urban growth, location of transportation facilities and systems, and distribution of industrial, commercial, residential, governmental, institutional, and other activities, which in the opinion of the President or the Bureau of the Budget lends itself as being appropriate for the purposes hereof.

(d) "Areawide agency" means an official State or metropolitan or regional agency empowered under State or local laws or under an interstate compact or agreement to perform comprehensive planning in an area, or such other agency or instrumentality as may be designated by the governor (or, in the case of metropolitan areas crossing State lines, any one or more of such agencies or instrumentalities as may be designated by the Governors of the States involved) to perform such planning.

(e) "State" means any State, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and any territory or possession of the United States.

(f) "Special purpose unit of local government" means any special district, public-purpose corporation, or other strictly limited-purpose political subdivision of a State, but shall not include a school district.

(g) "Unit of general local government" means any city, county, town parish, village, or other general-purpose political subdivision of a State.

(h) "Urban development" means all projects or programs for the planning and carrying out of urban renewal, the acquisition, use, and development of open space land, the planning and construction of hospitals, airports, water supply and distribution facilities, sewerage facilities and waste treatment works, transportation facilities, highways, water development and land conservation, and any other public works facilities.

TITLE V. ACQUISITION, USE, AND DISPOSITION OF LAND WITHIN URBAN AREAS BY FEDERAL AGENCIES IN CONFORMITY WITH LAND UTILIZATION PROGRAMS OF AFFECTED LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Amendment of Federal Property and Administrative Services Act

SEC. 501. The Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (40 U.S.C. 471 et. seq.), is amended by adding at the end thereof a new title as follows:

"TITLE VIII. URBAN LAND UTILIZATION

"Short title

"SEC. 801. This title may be cited as the 'Federal Urban Land-Use Act.'

"Declaration of purpose and policy

"SEC. 802. It is the purpose of this title to promote more harmonious intergovernmental relations by prescribing uniform policies and procedures whereby the Administrator shall acquire, use, and dispose of land in urban areas in order that urban land transactions entered into for or on behalf of Federal agencies shall be consistent with zoning and land-use practices and shall be made to the greatest practicable extent in accordance with planning and development objectives of the local governments and local planning agencies concerned.

"Disposal of urban lands

"SEC. 803. (a) Whenever the Administrator contemplates the disposal for or on behalf of any Federal agency of any real property situated within an urban area, he shall, at least ninety days prior to offering such land for sale, notify the head of the governing body of the unit of general local government having jurisdiction over zoning and land-use regulation in the geographical area within which the land or lands are located in order to afford the government the opportunity of zoning for the use of such land in accordance with local comprehensive planning.

"(b) The Administrator, except as provided in subsection (c) below, shall furnish to all prospective purchasers of such real property, full and complete information concerning—

"(1) current zoning regulations and prospective zoning requirements and objectives for such property when it is unzoned; and

"(2) current availability to such property of streets, sidewalks, sewers, water, streetlights, and other service facilities and prospective availability of such services if such property is included in comprehensive planning.

"(c) If, within forty-five days after notifying such local governing body of the proposed disposal, the Administrator is not furnished with appropriate information relating to zoning, land use, and/or other regulations which would be applicable to the use and development of the property offered for sale, the Administrator may proceed wtih such sale or disposal as otherwise authorized by law.

"Acquisition or change of use of real property

"SEC. 804. (a) In the acquisition or change of use of any real property situated in an urban area by or on behalf of any Federal agency, the Administrator shall—

"(1) to the greatest practicable extent, comply with and conform to zoning regulations of the unit of general local government having jurisdiction with respect to the area within which such property is situated and the planning and development objectives of such local government; and

"(2) consider all objections made to any such acquisition or changed use by such unit of government upon the ground that the proposed acquisition or use conflicts or would conflict with such regulations or objectives.

"(b) Prior to a commitment to acquire any real property situated in an urban area, the Administrator shall notify the unit of general local government exercising zoning and land-use jurisdiction over the land proposed to be purchased of his intent to acquire such land and the proposed use of the property. To the extent practicable, such notification shall be given ninety days prior to such acquisition. In the event that the Administrator determines that such advance notice would have an adverse impact on the proposed purchase, he shall, upon conclusion of the acquisition, immediately notify such local government of the acquisition and the proposed use of the property.

"Definitions

"SEC. 805. As used in this title—

"(a) 'Unit of general local government' means any city, county, town, parish, village, or other general-purpose political subdivision of a state.

"(b) 'Urban area' means—

"(1) any geographical area within the jurisdiction of any incorporated city, town, borough, village, or other unit of general local government having a population of ten thousand or more inhabitants.

"(2) that portion of the geographical area within the jurisdiction of any county, town, township, or similar governmental entity which contains no incorporated unit of general local government but has a population density equal to or exceeding one thousand five hundred inhabitants per square mile; and

"(3) that portion of any geographical area situated adjacent to the boundary of any incorporated unit of general local government which has such population density.

"(c) 'Comprehensive planning' includes the following, to the extent directly related to area needs:

"(1) preparation, as a guide for long-range development, of general physical plans with respect to the pattern and intensity of land use and the provision of public facilities, including transportation facilities, together with long-range fiscal plans for such development;

"(2) programing of capital improvements based on a determination of relative urgency, together with definitive financing plans for the improvements to be constructed in the earlier years of the program;

"(3) coordination of all related plans of the department or subdivisions of the government concerned;

"(4) intergovernmental coordination of all related planned activities among the state and local governmental agencies concerned; and

"(5) preparation of regulatory and administrative measures in support of the foregoing."

The section-by-section analysis presented by Mr. MUSKIE is as follows:

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF THE INTERGOVERNMENTAL COOPERATION ACT OF 1965

TITLE I—IMPROVED ADMINISTRATION OF GRANTS-IN-AID TO THE STATES

Full information on funds received

Section 101: The multiplicity of grant-in-aid programs and their magnitude make it imperative that the Governor (and his principal assistant on budget and management matters) be in a position to become fully informed on such programs, if he is to be able to prepare a suitable budget with respect to the State's finances, and if he is to manage the departments and agencies of the State which are under his supervision. Grant-in-aid programs, however, are normally handled by various program agencies within the State who have the requisite competence in their particular fields. Without in any way detracting from the normal flow of communications between the State program agencies and the Federal program agencies in each case, section 101 provides that the Governor (or some other State officer designated by him or by the legislature) will be informed by the Federal department or agency administering a grant program, upon request, with such facts as it makes available to the State program agency. These facts may relate to grants-in-aid actually made, appropriated for, or recommended by the President to the Congress of the United States.

Most grant-in-aid programs involve some cost sharing between the Federal and State governments. With respect to some States and some programs, there have been confused budget procedures because the State's financial share is operated through normal budget procedures of the State, while the Federal financial share, even though obligated and disbursed by a State, has sometimes been outside the scope of budget review. It is impossible to make a meaningful budget review with respect to a program if only half, or less, of the program's cost is revealed to the Governor or other State officer designated for the purpose. Therefore, section 101 also provides that no Federal legislation shall be construed as preventing the Governor (or other State officer designated) from participating in the State's determination of its financial matters under Federal grants in the same manner as he does with respect to the budgeting of State funds. This provision does not, of course, extend to any authority to plan for, commit, or expend Federal funds in an amount or manner that would be inconsistent with the conditions which the Federal Government has attached to its grant. But it would place in the State's chief executive the means of bringing about a greater degree of regularity in financial planning and budgeting for all the funds which are used to operate State agencies.

The definitions in this section are intended to make it clear that the legislation covers grants-in-aid, but not shared revenues, made to the 50 States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, any territory or possession of the United States or any agency or instrumentality of a State. It does not cover grants-in-aid going from the Federal Government directly to the governments of the political subdivisions of a State.

Uniform handling of grant funds

Section 102: This section is intended to systematize the handling of cash in connection with grants-in-aid. It would require that grants be paid to the State treasurer unless the State itself has designated someone else to receive the grants. In recognition of the fact that some State universities keep their moneys apart from the State treasury, the bill authorizes in these cases the use of alternative procedures as may be authorized by State legislation such as the direct receipt of Federal funds by State colleges and universities.

This section also contains a provision that appropriate accounting advice with respect to the transmittal of funds shall be provided to such other State officers as may require the data. This would virtually always mean that advice would be given to the State program agency concerned. In addition, advice might be given to the State comptroller, State auditor, or State budget officer.

State salaries paid from grants-in-aid

Section 103: This section would prevent the use of a Federal grant-in-aid to supplement or bypass State laws with respect to the salaries of State employees. On the other hand, it would permit Federal grants to be used to pay higher salaries than the State pays where the State specifically decides to do so by enactment of an appropriate State law and it is agreed to by the Federal agency concerned. A period of grace is given (until July 1, 1967) before this section becomes operative in order to permit State legislatures to act in those cases where they wish to permit an exception.

Deposit of grants-in-aid

Section 104: This section would make clear the fact that there can be a proper accounting for Federal funds without the use of separate bank accounts. Some of the older Federal laws and regulations were so worded as to leave the impression that Federal money had to be kept in separate bank accounts by the State government. Some States, therefore, have set up a complicated maze of separate bank accounts relating to various Federal grant programs. With modern accounting methods, it is no longer necessary to require that the money be banked separately, so long as the accounting officer of the State keeps appropriate fund accounts to distinguish the balance which the State has received but not yet earned. Section 104 provides for the application of these principles.

The Federal Government has a legitimate concern to see that all grants are applied as intended, and to receive certain elementary facts with respect to the financial status of a program. Section 104 would also provide for regular reports to be made, at such intervals as the Federal program agency may require, covering the status and application of the funds, the liabilities and other obligations on hand, and such other facts as may be necessary.

Scheduling of Federal transfers to the States

Section 105: This section would enact into law a principle which is already being adopted administratively—the principle that grant money should not be advanced from the Federal Government to a State for longer time periods than are necessary prior to its use. Advances for 3 or 6 months at a time, formerly made in several programs, and still required by law for a few programs, result in expenditure of money from the Federal Treasury before it is necessary, with no advantage accruing to either the Federal program agency or the State program agency concerned. Modern methods of transmitting money, including telegraphic transfers, the letter of credit procedure, and sight drafts, make lump-sum advances at stated intervals archaic.

Past decisions of the Comptroller General of the United States required that a grantee return to the United States any interest earned on Federal grants prior to their use. However, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act, 1965, enacted on September 19, 1964 (Public Law 88–605), contains a provision (sec. 205, 78 Stat. 979) which precludes the Department requiring the payment of interest or other income earned by a State on grants for research, training, or demonstration projects made prior to July 1, 1964. In view of the legislative history of this matter, the Comptroller General, in a decision dated September 30, 1964 (B–152505), stated that no further action would be taken toward the recovery of interest or other income earned prior to July 1, 1964, on Federal grants made to colleges and universities. Section 105 broadens the principle established, and would not hold the States accountable for interest or other income earned on all grant-in-aid funds, pending their disbursement for program purposes. The new techniques, such as the letter of credit and sight draft procedures, which are now being used should minimize the amounts of grants advanced to States.

Eligible State agency

Section 106: This section would authorize Federal departments and agencies, upon the request of the Governor or other appropriate executive or legislative authority of the State, to waive the requirement for a single State agency and approve other forms of administrative organization, providing the objectives of the grant program are not endangered. This section is intended to remove obstacles to the administrative reorganization of a State government as long as the Federal grant program is not jeopardized.

TITLE II—PERIODIC CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW OF FEDERAL GRANTS-IN-AID TO STATES AND TO LOCAL UNITS OF GOVERNMENT

Statement of purpose

Section 201: This section sets forth the purpose of the bill, which is to provide for periodic congressional review of future Federal grants-in-aid to States and to local units of government. A uniform policy and procedure is established whereby future programs for grant-in-aid assistance from the Federal Government to the States or to their political subdivisions shall be the subject of review by the Congress, to insure (1) that the effectiveness of grants-in-aid as instruments of Federal-State-local cooperation is improved and enhanced, (2) that grant programs are revised and redirected as necessary to meet new conditions arising subsequent to their original enactment, and (3) that grant programs are terminated when they have substantially achieved their purpose. Grants in some fields have been subjected to scrutiny by the executive and legislative branches from time to time and have undergone consolidations and updatings. In general, however, the review and redirection of grants have proceeded on a sporadic and uncoordinated basis. There has not been continued systematic attention to the problem either from the congressional or executive side with a view toward eliminating areas of conflict and duplication in program operation and achieving more effective, efficient, and economic administration of existing and future grant programs and greater uniformity in their operation.

Expiration of grants-in-aid programs

Section 202: This section provides for expiration in the fifth calendar year beginning after the effective date of any act of Congress enacted in the 89th or any subsequent Congress authorizing the making of grants-in-aid to two or more States or to political subdivisions of two or more States if no expiration date for such authority is specified by law. Five years is suggested as a sufficiently long period in which to gain experience upon which to base a judgment as to continuance or discontinuance of a grant. This section does not apply to those future statutes where (1) the Congress has provided another expiration date, or (2) Congress has explicitly waived the application of this section to the new statute.

Committee studies of grant-in-aid programs

Section 203: This section provides for review by congressional committees of expiring grant programs subject to the act during a period of not less than 12 months immediately preceding the expiration date. The committees are charged with the responsibility of assessing—among other things—the extent to which the purposes for which the grants-in-aid are authorized have been met; the degree to which such programs can be carried on without further financial assistance from the Federal Government; and whether any changes in the purpose, direction, or administration of the original program, or in its procedures or requirements, should be made. It further provides for the submission of committee reports to the respective Houses not later than 120 days before the program expiration date.

Definitions

Section 204: This section provides definitions of the terms "State," "political subdivision," and "grant-in-aid."

TITLE III—PERMITTING FEDERAL DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES TO PROVIDE SPECIALIZED OR TECHNICAL SERVICES TO STATES AND TO LOCAL UNITS OF GOVERNMENT

Statement of purpose

Section 301: This section states the purpose of the title to encourage intergovernmental cooperation in the conduct of specialized or technical services; to enable State and local governments to avoid unnecessary duplication of special service functions; and to authorize Federal departments and agencies to provide such services.

An increasingly common characteristic of our Federal system is the extent to which similar governmental functions are performed by all three levels of government—local, State, and Federal. Cooperation and assistance among the three levels in carrying on such activities can yield economies for all. A number of Federal departments already provide specialized services to State and local governments on a reimbursable basis. The Census Bureau makes special censuses or tabulations and collects special additional information during decennial censuses. The Weather Bureau provides meteorological services, and the Bureau of Reclamation undertakes inventories of water resources for State and local governments. As recently as 1962, the Congress authorized the Internal Revenue Service to render statistical services to State and local tax agencies. This bill would extend on a governmentwide basis the principle embodied in these specific cases. Provision for depositing reimbursements to the credit of agency appropriations (sec. 303) would give the agencies an incentive to enter into such arrangements which they do not now have since, unless otherwise provided in law, such reimbursements for service must be paid into Treasury miscellaneous receipts.

Authority to provide service

Section 302: This section authorizes agencies in the executive branch to provide specialized or technical services on written request from a State or local government and upon payment of the cost of the services by the government making the request. Agencies would be permitted, not required, to provide the requested service.

Reimbursement to appropriation

Section 303: This section provides that payments received for furnishing specialized or technical services shall be deposited to the credit of the appropriation from which the cost of providing such services is paid. Performance of the service for State and local governments thus would not interfere with the agencies fiscal ability to fulfill their mandated responsibilities.

Reports to Congress

Section 304: This section calls for an annual report on the scope of the services provided to the Committee on Government Operations of the Senate and House of Representatives.

Definitions

Section 305: The term "State," "political subdivision," and "specialized or technical services" are defined in this section. "Specialized or technical services" means special statistical and other studies and compilations, development projects, technical tests and evaluations, technical information, training activities, surveys, reports, documents, and other similar service functions.

TITLE IV—COORDINATED INTERGOVERNMENTAL POLICY AND ADMINISTRATION OF GRANTS FOR URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Declaration of urban assistance policy

Section 401: This section establishes a national urban assistance policy and makes such a policy, consistent with individual program objectives, applicable to all Federal programs affecting urban development. With the increasing numbers of Federal aids for physical development facilities in urban areas, the need for a unified urban development policy and adequate interagency coordination at the Federal level has become imperative. A recent study by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations of 43 Federal programs of financial aid showed that they are administered by 13 different departments and agencies within the executive branch. A number of new programs have been enacted even since the Commission's study was made a year ago.

Federal program administrators are held responsible for carrying out specific legislative objectives, designed to meet such urban needs as those for urban renewal, area redevelopment, public housing, or highway transportation. But rapid urban growth, coupled with fragmented responsibilities for local government in urban areas and new technologies, are making these programs increasingly interdependent. Their impact on other community physical, economic, and social objectives is becoming more pronounced. Authority, machinery, and effort are needed in Washington as well as in the urban areas themselves to assure that each program contributes not only to the more limited program goals, but also to the general goal of orderly urban development. The legislation establishes the principle of Federal interagency coordination and provides a clear legislative mandate for the President to establish the machinery among the Federal departments and agencies to better meet National, State, and local objectives for urban development.

Favoring general purpose governments

Section 402: This section makes units of general local government, such as cities, counties, and towns, eligible to receive Federal loans and grants for urban development for which only special districts or other special purpose units of local government are now eligible. Although a majority of the acts establishing Federal aid to urban development allow local general government as recipients of such aid, there are a number that encourage establishment of special purpose organizations to carry out program objectives. Some examples of Federal encouragement for establishing counterpart special purpose organizations in local jurisdictions may be found in reclamation, area redevelopment, and agricultural programs. The elected officials of every unit of government should be responsible for a wide range of functions, so that the governing process involves resolution of possible conflicting interests with significant responsibility for balancing governmental needs and resources. The general purpose units of local government meet these conditions whereas, in many cases, special purpose districts do not.

The legislation would permit the opportunity to simplify intergovernmental relations and reduce the time and effort spent by public officials in coordinating additional independent units of government by providing that, to the extent possible, Federal departments and agencies make Federal aids available to general rather than special purpose units of local government. Any special purpose unit of local government receiving these Federal aids is required to provide full information concerning such aid to the appropriate unit of general local government in the area. Local governments, general or special purpose, are authorized to act as joint sponsors of any federally aided urban project without limiting the total amount of the aid to less than the aggregate available to the participating units of local government acting singly.

Consistency with plans and objectives of general local governments

Section 403: Provides that all applications made to the Federal Government after June 30, 1966, for construction of hospitals, airports, water supply and distribution facilities, sewerage facilities and waste treatment works, water development, and land conservation be certified within 30 days by the unit of general local government in which the project or facility is to be located that such proposed project or facility is consistent with the local government's planning objectives. State and certain regional applicants are exempt from this requirement.

A performance requirement that projects aided by certain Federal loans or grants be consistent with the local government's planning objectives can contribute to insuring effective use of the Federal funds and avoid conflicts with other State, local, and private development projects.

This section establishes similar requirements for consistency with planning efforts of local governments in metropolitan areas for Federal aid programs that significantly affect urban development not currently having such requirements.

More effective utilization of certain Federal loans or grants by encouraging better coordinated local review of State and local applications for such loans or grants

Section 404: Provides that all applications to the Federal Government made after June 30, 1966, for urban renewal and open space land projects and for the construction of hospitals, airports, water supply and distribution facilities, sewerage facilities and waste treatment works, highways, transportation facilities, water development, and land conservation within any metropolitan area shall be accompanied by (1) the comments and recommendations thereon of a planning agency performing metropolitan or regional planning for the area in which the assistance is to be used, and (2) a statement by the applicant that it has considered these comments and recommendations prior to formal application. This section makes it clear, however, that approval of the application by the appropriate Federal agency shall be in accord with pertinent Federal requirements without regard to a possible negative recommendation by the planning agency.

This section is designed to strengthen metropolitan planning and better coordinate local, State, and Federal development activities by (1) encouraging the establishment of responsible metropolitan planning agencies and procedures; (2) stimulating the flow of planning and development information among and between the various levels of government; and (3) assisting the Federal agencies in evaluation of project applications.

To avoid undue delay in the review and comment function, the section provides that the applicant need not include the comments or recommendations of a planning agency if (1) the agency has failed within a 60-day period to make any comments or recommendations on the application itself, or on a plan or description of the project; or (2) the applicant certifies that the application itself is consistent with or in furtherance of projects or plans previously reviewed by the planning agency.

Definitions

Section 405: Defines the terms "comprehensive planning," "hospital," "metropolitan area" or "area," "areawide agency," "State," "special purpose unit of local government," "unit of general local government," and "urban development."

TITLE V—ACQUISITION, USE, AND DISPOSITION OF LAND WITHIN URBAN AREAS BY FEDERAL AGENCIES IN CONFORMITY WITH LAND UTILIZATION PROGRAMS OF AFFECTED LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

Amendment of Federal Property and Administrative Services Act

Section 501: The Federal Government owns over 400 million acres of land throughout the Nation. A significant portion of that land is located in urban areas and the use to which it is put, either by a government agency or upon sale by a private person or corporation, can have a significant impact upon local government. In order to insure that the use of such land is, to the maximum extent possible, consistent with local zoning and land use practices and local planning and development objectives, it is essential that such local governments be fully informed of transactions involving Federal land acquisition or disposal and significant changes in use of Federal lands. Actions of these types can have a significant impact on local schools, highway and street patterns, demand for water and sewer services, and other activities of local government. Only by giving the types of notice herein authorized, and considering their needs in such matters while sufficiently protecting Federal interests, can the impact of such transactions or changes in use on local government be minimized. It might be stated further that last year the Congress enacted legislation establishing similar procedures for the sale and disposition of public lands by the Department of Interior.

This section amends the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 by adding a new Title VIII—Urban Land Utilization.

"Short title

"SEC. 801. 'Federal Urban Land Use Act.'

"Declaration of purpose and policy

"SEC. 802. This section states a general policy of promoting harmonious intergovernmental relations, and prescribes use of uniform procedures in the acquisition, use, and disposal of land in urban areas to secure consistency with local zoning, land use practices, and local planning and development objectives.

"Disposal of urban lands

"SEC. 803. Requires the Administrator of the General Services Administration to notify the head of the governing body of the unit of general local government (city, county, town, parish, or village) having zoning or land use jurisdiction over the land of the proposed transaction 90 days prior to sale. The notice is designed to give the local government an opportunity to zone the use of such land in accordance with local comprehensive planning objectives. The Administrator is directed to furnish prospective purchasers with local comprehensive planning information.

"Acquisition or change of use of real property

"SEC. 804. In the acquisition or change of use of any real property in urban areas the Administrator, to the greatest extent practicable, would be required to comply with local zoning regulations and planning development objectives of the unit of local government having such jurisdiction over the land. The Administrator is further directed to consider all objections to any such acquisition or change of use made by a local government because such action would conflict with its zoning regulations and planning objectives. Subsection (b) requires the Administrator to give notice to a unit of local government in an urban area at least 90 days prior to entering a commitment to acquire real property within its jurisdiction. He may proceed without giving such notice where he determines that it would have an adverse impact on the proposed purchase. In such situations, upon completion of the acquisition, he must immediately notify the appropriate local government.

"Definitions

"SEC. 805. This section defines the terms 'unit of general local government,' 'urban area,' and 'comprehensive planning'."

DEFINITION OF TERM "VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION FACILITIES"

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I introduce today, in behalf of the Senators from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE and Mr. FONG] and my colleague from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] a bill to amend section 601 of title 38, United States Code, with respect to the definition of the term "Veterans' Administration facilities."

Although bills similar perhaps in intent have been introduced in past years, this is a new bill.

I introduce it with the hopeful expectation that it will be considered as new by not only the appropriate legislative committees but by the Veterans' Administration and the Bureau of the Budget.

The bill I introduce today is designed to clarify a clause of existing law and to provide for a review of the merits of this clause in 10 years' time.

The clause, section 601(4)(c)(iii), provides that Veterans' Administration facilities means "private facilities for which the Administrator contracts in order to provide hospital care" in certain circumstances one of which is for veterans of any war, resident in U.S. territory other than the contiguous 48 States. This at least was the purpose of this clause when it was drawn and approved by the Congress. Unfortunately, the advent of statehood in Alaska and Hawaii, which in no way changed the geographical necessity for such a clause, did serve to make unclear the VA service to be furnished Alaska and Hawaii veterans. The intent of my bill is to clear up this confusion. I propose to do this by changing the clause to read "for veterans of any war in a State, territory, commonwealth, or possession of the United States not contiguous to the contiguous 48 States,". This establishes beyond a fathom of a doubt what it was the Congress wished to establish in originally approving this clause; that is that the application extends to veterans resident in any U.S. territory other than the contiguous 48 States.

My bill does one more thing. It provides that this clause shall expire at the end of 10 years. It does so because I believe that conditions change and that the conditions tomorrow may not be the same as the conditions of today, and the services provided by this clause may no longer be needed. Whether they are or not, it would be well for Congress to review the matter at that time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 562) to amend section 601 of title 38, United States Code, with respect to the definition of the term "Veterans' Administration facilities", introduced by Mr. BARTLETT (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

"THIS IS THE PLACE MONUMENT" STATE PARK

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I am today introducing a bill to transfer title to 47½ acres of land at the "This Is the Place Monument" State Park in Utah from the Department of the Army to the State of Utah.

The "This Is the Place Monument" is the most historic spot in Utah. The monument memoralizes the entry of the Mormon pioneers into the Great Salt Lake Valley on July 24, 1847. It was at the mouth of Emigration Canyon on a bluff overlooking the valley that Brigham Young announced to his hardy band of pioneers that they had arrived at the place where they would settle and which they would call home.

The "This Is the Place Monument" is administered by the Utah State Park and Recreation Commission as successor to Utah Pioneer Trails and Landmarks Association.

The monument was erected by Utah citizens pursuant to a permit which the U.S. War Department issued to the Utah Pioneer Trails and Landmarks Association on March 26, 1945. The permit was modified on December 20 of that year, giving the association the right to make other improvements.

In 1951, the Utah State Legislature assigned the responsibility for administering the "This Is the Place Monument" State Park to the State engineering commission. The action turning its administration over to the State park and recreation commission came 6 years later. Thus for some time the monument has been administered by an organization other than the one to which the permit for its construction and operation was issued, and the monument stands on land still owned by the Federal Government, although it is controlled and administered by the Utah Parks and Recreation Commission. The ownership of this land should be cleared. The monument is one of the show pieces of the Salt Lake Valley. Its significance to the people of Utah cannot be overstated.

I, therefore, send to the desk, for appropriate reference, a bill authorizing the Secretary of the Army to convey certain lands in Utah, which are a part of the "This Is the Place Monument" State Park, to the State of Utah. I ask that the bill lie on the table until the close of business Tuesday, January 19, for cosponsorship.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Utah.

The bill (S. 563) authorizing the Secretary of the Army to convey certain lands to the State of Utah, introduced by Mr. Moss, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I introduce at this time a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution relating to the nomination and election of candidates for President and Vice President, and to succession to the office of President in the event of the death or inability of the President when the death or inability occurs with 2 years or longer remaining for the President to serve. Specifically the resolution I offer contains three proposals. It would, first, establish a direct primary for the selection of presidential and vice-presidential candidates; second, abolish the electoral college; and third, set up a special election to fill any vacancy in the Presidency or Vice-Presidency under certain circumstances.

For more than 100 years, our candidates for President and Vice President have been nominated by party conventions, and for almost as many years this system has been the subject of severe criticism, sometimes even of ridicule.

Legislators, newspaper editors, professors of government, and countless average citizens have been clamoring for an overhaul of the procedure. With each succeeding election, the chorus of critics has grown louder. More and more people are calling for the demise of an archaic convention and electoral system, that is riddled with loopholes and inequities.

The criticism has been based upon a number of considerations. It has been said, with a great degree of accuracy, that the average voter has no voice in the selection of our national candidates.

It has been alleged that the conventions themselves are controlled by bosses operating in "smoke-filled rooms," rather than by convention delegates expressing a popular consensus after discussion and debate. The average television viewer could reasonably conclude that the national conventions are comprised of a small helping of deliberation served up with generous portions of noise, confusion and just plain hokum.

The wonder of it all is not that the functioning of the system sometimes goes awry, but that for so long a time it has worked as well as it has.

The system of presidential primaries, as they now function, have also been the object of growing criticism. A review of the laws governing these primaries explains why.

Presidential primary laws were first enacted in 1911 when seven States adopted such legislation. As of 1960 there were 16 States that held primaries. On the basis of even a cursory examination, it is obvious that these State laws constitute a curious collection of inconsistencies and contradictions. What is specifically required in one jurisdiction may be specifically forbidden in another.

In six States and the District of Columbia, the ballot must not show the delegate's preference among the candidates; delegates must run on a "no preference" basis on their ballots. In three States, the ballot may show the delegate's preference if the candidate consents, but delegates may also run on a "no preference" basis. In two States, the ballot may show the delegate's preference, whether or not the candidate consents, but delegates may also run on a "no preference" basis.

Finally, in four States, the ballot must show the delegate's preference for a candidate who has given consent; but delegates must not run on a "no preference" basis.

In some jurisdictions, the names of delegates pledged to major candidates do not appear on the ballot out of courtesy to favorite sons, and for reasons of their own, some candidates do not wish to compete in a particular State.

Since only about one-third of the States have primaries, it can happen that a major candidate enters and wins in all of them and still fails to receive the nomination of his party.

Clearly, this crazy quilt system is totally inadequate, and agreement on that point is will nigh universal.

In 1956, for instance, a public opinion poll taken after the conventions of that year showed that 58 percent of the voters favored a change in the method of selecting candidates for President and Vice President. Other polls have found that as much as 73 percent of the electorate would like to relegate to the history books that strange, exciting, but thoroughly unsatisfactory and inefficient spectacle, the national convention.

Mr. President, the resolution I offer would eliminate the convention system and replace it with a uniform national primary.

Under the terms of the joint resolution, both parties would hold their primaries in all States on the same day, under rules established by the legislatures of the States. The names of all candidates would be on the ballot in all States. Voters could vote only in the primary of the party in which they were registered.

Each party in each State would have a number of nominating votes equal to the number of seats it has in the Congress of the United States. Each candidate would receive a fractional part of the nominating vote corresponding to the proportion of his party's vote cast for him in the primary.

If a vacancy should occur on the ticket prior to the general election, due to death or resignation, it would be the duty of the national party committee to fill it.

This, it seems to me, would provide a nominating system that would insure popular control within the parties, and that would be practical and workable.

The second aspect of the resolution I offer concerns the electoral college system.

No part of our system of electing our President and Vice President has been criticized more often or more severely than the electoral college.

Because it has long been realized that the electoral college is an anachronism in the modern world, scores of proposals have been made for tinkering with it. I do not want to tinker with it; I want to abolish it. In doing this, we would be officially recognizing changes that have occurred in our society in the last 200 years.

It is a simple statement of fact that our Founding Fathers held a conception of democracy vastly different from ours. They were not convinced that democracy as we know it was either right or inevitable. It appears that to a certain extent they believed in government by the elite, the wise, the wealthy, and the well born.

After generations of experience, however, we know that our national interests are best served when there is broad participation on the part of the people in the determinations of overall government policy.

Now that the United States Supreme Court has laid down the "one man, one vote" doctrine, it is incumbent upon the Congress to eliminate the most glaring violation of that doctrine, the use of the electoral college.

Under the present system, the candidate who receives one less than a majority, even though his vote total runs into the millions, has all these votes count for nothing. They are as so many scraps of paper. This is hardly a stirring demonstration of democracy in action.

A glaring example of the inequity of our system occurred in the election of 1876. In that year, Samuel J. Tilden received 250,000 more popular votes than his opponent, Rutherford B. Hayes. Yet Hayes won more electoral votes, and he, not Tilden, became President.

While it is unlikely, this result could happen again. It will continue to be a possibility until we rid ourselves of a system that at best is cumbersome and, at worst, is in direct conflict with our carefully nurtured vision of democracy.

The third aspect of the resolution I offer today is concerned with filling the office of the Vice-Presidency in the event of the President's death or disability.

It would accomplish this by providing, under certain circumstances, for a special election for the office of President and Vice President in the event of the President's death or disability.

Under the Constitution today, when a Vice President succeeds to the Presidency, the country is without a Vice President until the next presidential election. History records some very extended periods when this was the case.

For example, President William Henry Harrison died in April 1841, 1 month after his inauguration, and was succeeded by John Tyler, who served for 3 years and 11 months without a Vice President. In another case, President James A. Garfield, who was shot on July 2, 1881, lingered until his death on September 19. He was then succeeded by Chester Arthur, who served the balance of the term without a Vice President. We have just been through a period of more than a year when the Nation has been without a Vice President.

If anything happened to President Johnson during the period from November 22, 1963, to January 20, 1965, we would have to rely upon the provisions of the Presidential Succession Act of 1886, as revised and amended in 1947. The original act provided for succession on the executive side, beginning with the Secretary of State. The 1947 amendment established a succession on the legislative side.

This change was justified on the merits of elevating to the presidency an elected official, the Speaker of the House, rather than the Secretary of State, who obtained his office by appointment.

I find it difficult to see where the new arrangements have any significant advantage over the old.

In times like the present, there is no adequate substitute for having an experienced Vice President, ready at a moment's notice—if need be—to take over the responsibilities of the Presidency.

Perhaps, in earlier times, when the tempo of events was slower and our matters of national concern were less complex, it did not make a great deal of difference if we were without a Vice President for months or even years. The office was not a very exacting one, to be sure, demanding few duties other than that of presiding over the Senate and casting a vote on those rare occasions when it was necessary to break a tie.

This is no longer the case. President Eisenhower made extensive use of the services of Vice President Nixon, in a variety of situations and capacities.

President Kennedy greatly expanded the duties and the responsibilities of the Vice President.

This mid-20th century evolution of the office of the Vice President is not likely to abate. Every indication points to the probability that President Johnson will make even more extensive use of the great ability of his Vice President, HUBERT HUMPHREY.

If the Vice President is to continue his vital role in the administration of the executive branch of our Government, then obviously the national interests demand that there be a Vice President in office at all times.

That is what I propose to accomplish in my constitutional amendment. I sincerely trust that the Senate will give this resolution favorable consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 28) proposing an amendment to the Constitution relating to the nomination and election of candidates for President and Vice President, and to succession to the office of President in the event of the death or inability of the President, introduced by Mr. SMATHERS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE RELATING TO THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, a resolution which is identical with one which I sponsored, together with 32 of our colleagues on January 15, 1963. During the 88th Congress other Senators joined us as cosponsors of the resolution.

The resolution provides essentially that the Select Committee on Small Business of the Senate shall have authority to have bills and resolutions referred to it and to report legislation for consideration on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. President, the Select Committee on Small Business does not now have this authority. It is empowered only to investigate and study problems peculiarly affecting the small business of this country. Such limited authority is unfortunate, to say the least, especially when problems are found to exist, can be identified, and yet are prevented from being considered by the Senate because the committee cannot report to the floor in a form upon which we can act.

This is in no way a criticism of other committees. Each of them does a very commendable job. But, we should not permit the problems of small business, some of which are acute indeed, to be laid aside because of other pressures.

Once the Select Committee on Small Business has isolated a problem, it should not be frustrated with the inability to bring such matters to the attention of the Senate for debate and vote.

This resolution, for which I have requested the same designation—Senate Resolution 30—as it had in the 88th Congress, simply gives to the Select Committee on Small Business the authority to report legislation to the Senate for its consideration, within certain areas relating solely to the small business of our country.

Mr. President, I am hopeful that some action might soon be forthcoming on this resolution. Because the Committee on Rules was pressed practically without relent during the 88th Congress, there was little time for action on this approval.

However, during the closing days of the past session, specifically on August 13, 1964, the chairman of the Committee on Rules, the distinguished Senator from North Carolina, gave his assurances that hearings will be held on this resolution during the present session of the Congress.

Mr. President, I thank the chairman for those words. I look forward to an early date for those hearings. The small businesses of this Nation and the millions of people whom they serve are entitled to nothing less than sincere consideration of this problem.

It is my hope that Senators who cosponsored this resolution during the 88th Congress will do so again. Certainly also, I would welcome any other Senators who might wish to join us.

I ask unanimous consent that this resolution might remain at the desk for a period of 1 week, until the close of business on Friday, January 22, for additional cosponsors.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The resolution will be received, appropriately referred; and, without objection, will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Vermont.

The resolution (S. Res. 30) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

S. RES. 30

> *Resolved,* That S. Res. 58, Eighty-first Congress, agreed to February 20, 1950, as amended, is amended to read as follows:
>
> "That there is hereby created a select committee to be known as the Committee on Small Business, to consist of seventeen Senators to be appointed in the same manner and at the same time as the chairman and members of the standing committees of the Senate at the beginning of each Congress, and to which shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the problems of American small business enterprises.
>
> "It shall be the duty of such committee to study and survey by means of research and investigation all problems of American small business enterprises, and to obtain all facts possible in relation thereto which would not only be of public interest, but which would aid the Congress in enacting remedial legislation.
>
> "Such committee shall from time to time report to the Senate, by bill or otherwise, its recommendations with respect to matters referred to the committee or otherwise within its jurisdiction."
>
> SEC. 2. Subsection (d) of XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by striking out in paragraph 2, the words "under this rule."

THREE-MINUTE STATEMENTS DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the custom of the 3-minute statement during the morning hour is a convenient and expeditious method for meeting a common need, and has been a regular part of Senate proceedings since 1953. By this custom, Senators have the opportunity to briefly comment on issues of the day, or on worthy editorials, speeches, and other matter which they insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD during this period.

Yet, this custom or practice is not based upon any existing rule of the Senate. It has developed from habit, on the basis of unanimous consent. Rule VII allows for the presentation of petitions and memorials, reports of standing and select committees, the introduction of bills and joint resolutions, and the introduction of concurrent and other resolutions, in that order. This is the only morning hour business expressly prescribed.

The Senate rules permit "brief statements," in connection with the business prescribed, but the customary 3-minute statement dealing with extraneous subjects lacks this sanction. It is necessary for the majority leader to request unanimous consent, and obtain it, before Senators can engage in this needed practice. Any one Senator can deny all other Senators the convenience of making 3-minute statements in the morning hour simply by voicing an objection.

I think it is high time that we fortify the morning hour 3-minute statement by appropriate revision of the rules. There surely exists every recommendation for making it a permanent privilege. The practice meets the needs of all Senators, providing a convenient time, before the Senate takes up its unfinished business, for them to express their views on current matters. If we are to honor the rule on germaneness during the 3 hours following the morning hour, then we have pressing need for this safety valve in our proceedings.

It is no accident that the 3-minute custom came into being. It took form in the Senate more than 11 years ago, and was partly fashioned by the late great Republican Senator, Robert A. Taft. It met a pressing need, developed as a functional tradition, and has earned the right of permanency. What custom has sanctified, the rules ought properly to prescribe.

I, therefore, send to the desk a resolution which would amend rule VII of the Standing Rules of the Senate by adding to the matters of morning business prescribed, the following: Statements or comments not to exceed 3 minutes.

Mr. President, this simple amendment which I propose would not alter the existing rules concerning the placing of insertions in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The resolution relates only to the 3-minute period that Senators should be allowed, in accordance with what has been, and is, customary practice for the making of such insertions. The insertions themselves, whether during the morning hour or afterward, would remain a matter for unanimous consent, thus leaving with the Senate the discretion to regulate against abuses.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the text of the resolution may be printed in the RECORD following these remarks, and that the resolution may lie on the desk for a period of 1 week so other Senators who may wish to join in cosponsorship shall have an opportunity to do so. I ask that it then be appropriately referred, in the hope that the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration may act favorably upon it.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the resolution will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Idaho.

The resolution (S. Res. 35) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

S. RES. 35

> ***Resolved,* That rule VII of the Standing Rules of the Senate be amended by inserting, after "Concurrent and other resolutions" in paragraph 1, a new clause, as follows:**
>
> **"Statements or comments not to exceed three minutes."**

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I may add that I submit the resolution on behalf of myself, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH].

PUBLIC WORKS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS TO ASSIST IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE APPALACHIAN REGION—AMENDMENT (AMENDMENT NO. 1)

Mr. HART (for himself, Mr. NELSON, Mr. MCCARTHY, and Mr. MONDALE) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them jointly to the bill (S. 3) to provide public works and economic development programs and the planning and coordination needed to assist in the development of the Appalachian region, which was referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed.

CORRECTION OF SENATE RESOLUTION 19

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it has been called to my attention that there is an error in Senate Resolution 19, which was adopted on January 7. I ask unanimous consent that the last two names on page 4, lines 7 and 8, be reversed and that a star print of the resolution as corrected be ordered.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

TO PRINT AS A SENATE DOCUMENT A REPORT ON STATUS OF COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT AND PARTICIPATING PROJECTS

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the 84th Congress, in 1956, enacted a most constructive and forward-looking law known as the Colorado River Storage Project Act. This is Public Law 485, 84th Congress, and is derived from S. 500 of that Congress, a measure which I had the honor to sponsor.

In reporting the bill on behalf of the Interior Committee to the Senate on March 30, 1955, I pointed out—

> S. 500, as amended, has four principal purposes. First, it would authorize a series of holdover storage reservoirs, with hydropower plants and incidental works. Second, it would authorize a number of consumptive use irrigation projects. Third, it would recognize, with a view to laying a foundation for eventual further action by the Congress, certain units and projects in several stages of planning, but plans for which are not sufficiently advanced to warrant final and unconditional authorization. Finally, the bill recognizes that the works authorized constitute only an initial phase of a comprehensive development of the water resources apportioned to the upper basin and that the specific authorizations in this bill are not intended to limit or preclude the consideration and authorization by Congress of other projects for the use of waters apportioned under the compacts as additional needs are indicated.

Section 6 of the law requires the Secretary of the Interior to report to the Congress each year "upon the status of the revenues from, and the cost of, constructing, operating, and maintaining" the project and "to reflect accurately the Federal investment allocated at that time to power, to irrigation, and to other purposes, the progress of return and payment thereon, and the estimated rate of progress year by year, in accomplishing repayment."

Of such widespread interest and value are these reports that each year since 1957 the Secretary's report for the preceding year has been published by the Senate as a Senate document. The eighth annual report was transmitted to the Interior Committee on December 30, and it sets forth both the progress and the problems in achieving the purposes of the enabling legislation.

Mr. President, I send forward a resolution calling for the printing, as a Senate document, of this eighth annual report on the status of the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and I ask for its appropriate referral.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 33) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

S. Res. 33

Resolved, That there shall be printed as a Senate document the Eighth Annual Report on the Status of the Colorado River Storage Project and Participating Projects, prepared by the Department of the Interior, and an introductory statement by Senator Anderson, and that five hundred extra copies be printed for the use of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS, AND SO FORTH

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of S. 4, the Water Pollution Control Act and S. 306, to amend the Clean Air Act, by Senator Muskie, my name be included as a cosponsor on each of them. I have checked with the Senator from Maine and have his consent to this request. Both are important measures and I would like to be associated with them.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of Senator Karl Mundt be added as a cosponsor to Senate Joint Resolution 5, to name the Washington Channel Bridge on Interstate Route 95 the Francis Case Memorial Bridge. I am very happy to have his support on this measure to honor a former Senator from South Dakota and a strong supporter of our interstate highway program.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the Senator from Florida [Mr. Holland] and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Ribicoff] be added as cosponsors of Senate Resolution 20, legislation to establish a standing Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, when the bill is next printed, the name of the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Williams] be added as a cosponsor of the bill S. 65 to provide for the payment of hospital and related health services for persons 65 years of age and older.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, when the bill is next printed, the name of the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart] be added as a cosponsor of the bill S. 255 to provide for the reduction over a 3-year period of the excise tax on passenger automobiles.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Washington [Mr. Jackson] be added as a cosponsor of S. 1 at the next printing of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson] be added as a cosponsor on S. 1, the Hospital Insurance, Social Security, and Public Assistance Amendments of 1965, at the next printing of this bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Bartlett] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGovern] be added as cosponsors of S. 21, the river basin planning bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of S. 306, amendments to the Clean Air Act, the names of the following Senators be added as cosponsors: Mr. Hruska, Mr. McGovern, Mr. Mondale, Mrs. Neuberger, Mr. Tydings, and Mr. Yarborough.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the the next printing of S. 4, the Water Quality Act of 1965, the names of the following Senators be added as cosponsors: Mr. Hartke, Mr. McGovern, Mr. Mondale, Mr. Tydings, and Mr. Yarborough.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Tydings in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of my distinguished colleague [Mr. Mundt] be added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 5, to name the Washington Channel bridge on Interstate Route 95 the Francis Case Memorial Bridge.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Hearing no objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McGOVERN. I am very happy to have the support of my colleague on the measure to honor our former colleague from South Dakota, who was a strong supporter of our interstate highway program, and a man who was a leader in the affairs of the District of Columbia.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my bill, S. 30, to establish an Economic Conversion and Diversification Commission, be held over at the desk an additional week until the close of business Friday, January 22, so that additional cosponsors may be added. This bill would set in motion a coordinated effort by Federal, State, and local governments and private initiative to meet the problems and opportunities created by shifts or reductions in the Defense Establishment. There has been considerably more interest expressed in the bill this year, and I would like all Senators who wish to join in this effort to have the opportunity to do so.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of the bill (S. 14) introduced by Senator Dodd on January 6, to amend the Federal Firearms Act, the name of the senior Senator from New York [Mr. Javits] be added as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Hearing no objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of the bill (S. 437) introduced by Senator Dodd on January 12, to release zinc from the national stockpile, the name of the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Ribicoff] be added as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Hearing no objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (S. 438) introduced by Senator Dodd on January 12, to control the traffic in stimulant and depressant drugs, be allowed to remain at the desk until the close of business Wednesday, January 20.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Hearing no objection, it is so ordered.

ECONOMIC CONVERSION AND DIVERSIFICATION COMMISSION

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my bill, S. 30, to establish an Economic Conversion and Diversification Commission, be held over at the desk for an additional week, until the close of business on Friday, January 22, so that additional cosponsors may be added to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Hearing no objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, the bill would set in motion a coordinated effort by Federal, State, and local governments, as well as by private industry and other private groups, to meet the problems and opportunities created either by shifts or by reductions in the Defense Establishment. I think it is one of the most important problems now confronting the country. There has been considerably more interest expressed in the bill this year than when it was introduced on October 31, 1963. I would like all Senators who wish to join in this effort to have the opportunity to do so. A considerable number of Senators have already joined in cosponsoring the measure. Similar measures are enjoying strong support in the other body on a bipartisan basis.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

Under authority of the orders of the Senate, as indicated below, the following names have been added as additional cosponsors for the following bills and joint resolution:

Authority of January 6, 1965:

S. 9. A bill to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces during the induction period: Mr. BOGGS, Mr. HART, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MONDALE, Mr. MONTOYA, Mr. MOSS, Mr. PELL, and Mr. TYDINGS.

S. 14. A bill to amend the Federal Firearms Act: Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. CLARK, and Mr. JOHNSTON.

S. 286. A bill to require Members of Congress, certain other officers and employees of the United States, and certain officials of political parties to file statements disclosing the amount and sources of their incomes, the value of their assets, and their dealings in securities and commodities: Mr. DOUGLAS.

S. 287. A bill to provide fellowships for graduate study leading to a master's degree for elementary and secondary school teachers: Mr. CASE, Mr. CLARK, Mr. LONG of Missouri, and Mr. PROUTY.

S. 289. A bill to amend Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, to provide financial assistance in the construction and operation of public elementary and secondary schools in areas affected by a major disaster: Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. CLARK, Mr. COOPER, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. LONG of Missouri, and Mr. YARBOROUGH.

S.J. Res. 2. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to preserve to the people of each State power to determine the composition of its legislature and the apportionment of the membership thereof in accordance with law and the provisions of the Constitution of the United States: Mr. HILL, Mr. LAUSCHE, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. SPARKMAN, and Mr. STENNIS.

Authority of January 7, 1965:

S. 296. A bill to authorize the temporary release of 100,000 short tons of copper from the national stockpile: Mr. BAYH, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. DODD, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. MONTOYA, and Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey.

NOTICE CONCERNING NOMINATION BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, the following nomination has been referred to and is now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary: Manuel L. Real, of California, to be U.S. attorney, southern district of California, for a term of 4 years (appointed during recess of Senate).

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in this nomination to file with the committee, in writing, on or before Friday, January 22, 1965, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning the above nomination, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearing which may be scheduled.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF EDWIN LANGLEY, OF OKLAHOMA, TO BE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE, EASTERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Friday, January 22, 1965, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2228, New Senate Office Building, on the nomination of Edwin Langley, of Oklahoma, to be U.S. district judge, eastern district of Oklahoma, vice Eugene Rice, retired.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearing may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], chairman, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA].

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

Article entitled "Gilding the Johnson Lily," written by Rowland Evans and Robert Novak; also address delivered by Senator MCNAMARA, at the AFL–CIO National Legislative Conference, in Washington, D.C., on January 12, 1965.

MEDICARE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR ANDERSON

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, on Tuesday, January 12, the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] addressed the National Legislative and Economic Conference of the AFL–CIO at the Mayflower Hotel in Washington on the subject of medicare.

Since the Senator's excellent speech on this important subject is of wide, general interest, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF SENATOR CLINTON P. ANDERSON BEFORE ECONOMIC AND LEGISLATIVE CONFERENCE, AFL–CIO, MAYFLOWER HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C., JANUARY 12, 1965

It has been 3 years since I last spoke to the Economic and Legislative Conference. In my discussion with you in 1962, I expressed the hope that organized labor would insist, "not that new bottles be found for old medicines, not that new nostrums be hastily mixed, not that new cures be advanced by the very large and well-financed propaganda machine of the AMA, but that the Congress decide once and for all whether working people can be permitted to take care of their old age health needs as a matter of right."

I can assure you that we in the Congress are on the eve of making this historic decision. You who have worked so diligently on this problem will be proud of that decision. And no 11th hour campaign, no matter how heavily financed or deceptively contrived, is going to deter us because the large majority of Americans want this program. They want it because they recognize that even the most sincere efforts so far to relieve the crisis so many of our aged face in paying for their health care have not been successful.

We know that hospital insurance through social security was not the issue in the election last fall. Confidence in President Johnson was the issue. But as he and Senator HUMPHREY traveled the Nation, they spoke repeatedly about the need for hospital insurance for our aged and many congressional candidates campaigned on it. So it was an issue, and I don't have to tell you what the election returns showed.

In my own State, a survey conducted last fall revealed that 72 percent of the registered voters interviewed, favored social security hospital insurance. Nineteen percent were opposed and 9 percent had not made up their minds. I found it especially significant that while 82 percent of those who intended to vote for the Democratic senatorial candidate, JOSEPH MONTOYA, favored that approach, that 61 percent of those who favored his Republican opponent—who was opposed to this approach—favored the social security method. I judge from those figures that recognition that more must be done for the aged crosses party lines.

The November elections have brought to the House and the Senate more Members ready to vote for a hospital insurance program for the aged financed through contributory payroll deductions. The change in ratio of Democrats to Republicans on the Ways and Means Committee is, of course, a tremendous boost to our course. Moreover, the Senate passed this proposal last September 1 by a vote of 49 to 44. Three Republicans—Senators JAVITS, CASE, and KUCHEL joined in cosponsoring the bill, S. 1—the first measure introduced in the Senate and the first bill introduced in the House. There, CECIL KING of California put in the bill, joined by many of his colleagues. Thus, we again have a King-Anderson bill.

It is entirely possible that the Ways and Means Committee will not hold public hearings on the bill. The committee held 10 days of hearings on social security and health care for the aged in 1961 but those hearings did not begin until 5 months after the bill was presented. It was almost a year before the committee went into executive session and failed to report out health care. In 1963 and 1964, 10 days of hearings again were held on social security and health care in Ways and Means. I am delighted with the reports that Chairman MILLS believes he can have a bill ready for the House floor by March. I believe it is entirely possible that the Senate Finance Committee and the Senate could move quite promptly once the bill comes over from the House. After all, the Senate debated a health care amendment from June 29 to July 7, 1962. The Senate Finance Committee held 7 days of hearings in 1964 and, as I said a moment ago, the Senate passed a social security health insurance program last September.

In his special message on health care last Thursday, the President declared: "I believe this year is the year when, with the sure knowledge of public support, the Congress should enact a hospital insurance program for the aged * * *. I ask that our social security system—proved and tested by three decades of successful operation—be extended to finance the cost of basic health services. In this way, the specter of catastrophic hospital bills can be lifted from the lives of our older citizens. I again strongly urge the Congress to enact a hospital insurance program for the aged."

You will remember that it was the President's recommendation on health insurance for the aged which drew the loudest applause in his state of the Union message earlier last week. I believe we could have this bill on the President's desk for signing by Easter.

There is really not much new under the sun as far as this problem goes and our proposal to relieve it. More public attention and intensive study probably have been devoted to this subject than any other current domestic issue. Since 1946, the average cost for 1 day of hospital care has risen from $9 to nearly $40. This situation is compounded by the fact that the aged hospital patient, on the average, spends three times as long in the hospital as a younger person. To make things worse, 55 percent of these aged have annual incomes of less than $1,000.

Those are the facts—and no nostalgic suggestions that thrift and virtue will solve this dilemma can substitute for an effective public response.

Such a response is the King-Anderson bill. It is a logical extension of the retirement protection already furnished through social security. The basic idea behind social security is that workers pay contributions (together with their employers) over their working lifetimes to provide benefits after retirement in old age. The proposal for hospital insurance for the aged follows the same principle. While earning, the worker would make small contributions toward protection against the high hospital costs that are a common occurrence in old age—costs which now represent the major remaining cause of personal financial disaster among our aged citizens. The worker would have the hospital insurance protection at age 65 without need to make further contributions after retirement.

Private health insurance, which has made larger health costs manageable for people in the working groups, has not proved to be an effective means of protecting older people against financial ruin. Despite great efforts and much ingenuity on the part of the voluntary insurance organization, today only a relatively few older people—perhaps 1 in 20—have insurance covering as much as 40 percent of their average health costs. Almost half of the elderly have no health insurance at all—not even inadequate coverage. The number of older people without any health insurance protection at all is nearly as large as it was 5 years ago.

Senator PAT MCNAMARA has been one of the stalwarts in the long effort to provide meaningful health protection to the aged. As chairman of the Special Committee on Aging and now as chairman of the Subcommittee on Health of the Elderly, he has been concerned with the protection afforded by private health insurance. He has provided me with some highly interesting facts about private health insurance. Robert R. Neal, general manager of the Health Insurance Association of America, recently wrote to PAT: "This association estimates that 10.6 million persons at ages 65 and over had some form of private health insurance as of the end of 1963. This total, which corresponds to 61 percent of the noninstitutionalized aged population as of that date, is the most current information we have on the subject." The point of interest is that the 61 percent represents only a 1 percent gain in the 12 months between December 1962 and the end of December 1963. In the 18 months between July 1961 and December 1962, the Health Insurance Association of America reported a 7 percent increase in insurance coverage of the aged, up from 53 percent. Thus, it appears from the Health Insurance Association's own data—and Senator MCNAMARA has challenged whether the data may be too optimistic—that the rate of increase in private health insurance for the aged has dropped sharply. With hospital costs rising more rapidly then income, it seems quite likely that private insurance has reached the saturation point in covering additional elderly Americans.

The Kerr-Mills law, the public assistance method for helping the medically indigent aged, has proved a disappointment. It is not a national solution to a national problem. Five States—New York, California, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, and Minnesota—get 68 percent of the Federal money, but have only 31 percent of the aged population. It is a program which helps—and not very adequately in most States—only after the elderly have exhausted their resources and savings and, perhaps, those of their families. We must not be content to deal with destitution after it occurs; we must prevent impoverishment.

I think the social insurance approach embodied in the King-Anderson bill is far more humane, far more effective, far more devoted to the American principle of individual dignity. Nearly 20 million persons aged 65 and over would be covered, most of them because they are under social security or railroad retirement. About 2 million not so covered would have their benefits paid for from general revenues. That number will be reduced as more and more persons come under social security by reason of work experience.

Let me review the major features of the King-Anderson bill. The benefits concentrate primarily on inpatient hospital services because of the great financial strain placed on the aged who must go to the hospital.

Last week's report of the Advisory Council on Social Security—on which Nelson Cruikshank and other nationally known experts served—stated: "Not only is hospitalization a virtually universal occurrence among older people but there is a high correlation between hospitalization and large total medical expenses. Older people who are hospitalized in a given year are the ones who have the big expenses. While medical care costs for all aged couples averaged about $442 in 1962, the medical expenses of aged couples with one or both members hospitalized averaged $1,220; for nonmarried elderly people, average medical expenses for the year were $270, whereas for those who were hospitalized, the average was $1,038. Both the averages and the differentials would be even higher now."

The benefits provided in the bill are:

1. Hospital inpatient services for 60 days in a benefit period, with a "deductible" of the national average cost of 1 day of care to be paid by the patient.

2. Home health services such as a visiting nurse—or a therapist—up to 240 visits a year.

3. Outpatient hospital diagnostic services—such as X-ray and laboratory services—with a deductible for services in any one month, equal to one-half of the deductible for inpatient hospital services, to be paid by the patient.

These three benefits would be provided after July 1, 1966.

4. Post-hospital extended care in a facility having an arrangement with a hospital for timely transfer of patients and medical information about patients for 60 days in a benefit period. The services would be covered only in the case of transfer from a hospital.

This benefit is effective January 1, 1967.

In the previous King-Anderson bill, an option was offered—45 days of hospital care with no deductible, 90 days with a maximum deductible of $90 or 180 days with a deductible of almost $92.50. The Advisory Council on Social Security recommended a straight 60-day hospital benefit. The option would confront the aged with a difficult choice and once made, would be irrevocable. It is a generous amount of inpatient care.

Payment would be made for drugs furnished to hospital and extended care facility patients for use while inpatients. Drugs prescribed to a patient as part of his home health care and outpatient services would not be paid for under our bill.

The hospital insurance program would be financed by allocating 0.60 percent of taxable wages paid in 1966; 0.76 percent of taxable wages paid in 1967 and 1968; and 0.90 percent of taxable wages paid thereafter, to a special hospital insurance trust fund that would be established for the program. Allocations of 0.45, 0.57, and 0.675 percent of self-employment income taxable under social security would be made, respectively, in 1966, 1967–68, and 1969 and thereafter.

In 1969 and thereafter, a worker earning $3,000 would pay $13.50 a year for the hospital insurance program; one earning $4,800 would pay $21.60; and a worker earning $5,600 a year, the maximum earnings subject to contributions under the bill, would pay $25.20 a year. The present base on which social security taxes is levied is $4,800.

The separate trust fund for the hospital insurance program would be in addition to the present old-age and survivors insurance trust fund and the disability insurance trust fund. Under the proposed law, hospital insurance benefits could be paid only from the hospital insurance trust fund, just as under present law disability insurance benefits can be paid only from the disability insurance trust fund.

The income to the hospital insurance trust fund is estimated actuarily to meet the costs into the indefinite future. Estimated contribution income to the new trust fund for 1967 (the first year of the program's full operation) would total $1.98 billion and estimated expenses $1.78 billion. Payments made on behalf of persons who are not eligible for social security or railroad retirement benefits would be made from the trust fund, but the fund would be fully reimbursed for all costs involved in such payments from general revenue.

The bill would provide the opportunity for considerable participation by private organizations in the administration of the program. Groups of providers, or associations of providers on behalf of their members, would be permitted to designate a private organization to act as an intermediary between themselves and the Federal Government. Such private organizations, serving as intermediaries between the Government and the providers, would reduce the concern expressed by some people that the Federal Government might try to interfere in hospital affairs.

I am in complete agreement with the Advisory Council on Social Security that social insurance should not cover all the costs of illness during old age. The American approach to income security has traditionally involved a cooperative partnership of private effort and governmental measures. Old-age survivors and disability insurance, for example, is supplemented by employer and trade union plans, by private insurance, and by individual savings and investments, and all contribute to the common goal of personal and economic independence throughout the later years. Backing up this combination of measures for individual self-support are the Federal-State public assistance programs which aid those who have needs which are still unmet.

This is why the bill incorporates the proposal of Senator JAVITS to authorize the creation of associations of private insurers to encourage the development of policies covering costs—primarily physicians' fees—not met under the Government program. I have always tried to assure ample room for private complementary insurance and to provide encouragement for private insurers to assume that role.

In addition to hospital insurance for the aged, S. 1 provides for a 7-percent increase in monthly cash benefits for some 20 million social security beneficiaries. This is an extremely important part of the King-Anderson bill. Had the conference committee reached agreement last October on hospital insurance, these beneficiaries would have received increased benefits beginning January 1, 1965. Our bill provides that on passage monthly benefits would be retroactive to that date. In this way those of us who would not accept a social security bill in conference that did not include hospital insurance and thus barred an increase in cash benefits will be keeping faith with America's aged. They will not have been financially hurt by the deadlocked conference.

S. 1 also contains improvements in the public assistance titles of the Social Security Act.

The next few months will see our efforts of many years crowned with success. Having been a part of this effort, I know how much the victory is the result of the unflagging labor of the American union movement. The entire Nation, not just millions of the aged, will owe you thanks.

NAZI WAR CRIMINALS

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, a great tragedy could take place in May 1965. The tragedy could occur on May 8, 1965, for if the German Bundestag fails to act, that date would mark the time when Nazi war criminals now at large charged with genocide or murder would cease to fear the punishment of law. If nothing is done before May 8, 1965, they can come from their places of hiding and come and go scot free.

On December 9, 1964, the German Bundestag called for intensified efforts in seeking out war criminals. The German Government issued a worldwide appeal for information on Nazi crimes on November 20, 1964.

The German Ambassador to the United States, His Excellency Heinrich Knappstein, wrote a most important and unusual article for the German language newspaper Aufbau in New York, pointing out that while thousands of war criminals have been brought to justice, still the possibility remains that "one or the other of the culprits, if he was never named in any context nor pointed out by any accusing witness, might under the shelter of the statute, dare to show himself again." The Ambassador's article concludes on an encouraging note:

> Parliament * * * will take measures to close the last gap through which a Nazi criminal might slip. For as I said in the beginning, it is the firm intention of Germany's political leadership to prevent this and to assure that particularly in cases of National-Socialist acts of violence, justice will take its course unhampered.

Mr. President, I commend the Ambassador for a forthright statement of the hopes of millions of Americans. Justice must be preserved.

I ask unanimous consent that Ambassador Knappstein's article be printed in full in the Record, together with the text of the December 9, 1964, Bundestag resolution, and the text of the German Government appeal of November 20, 1964.

There being no objection, the article, resolution, and German Government appeal were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Prosecution of Nazi Mass Murder Must Not and Will Not End Next May

In the past few weeks and months all of us, and particularly we in Germany's Embassy in Washington, have been greatly concerned with a problem that has evoked violent discussions, grave accusations, and deplorable misunderstandings—the problem of the application of the statute of limitations to Nazi crimes in Germany. I am, therefore, particularly grateful to the editors of the Aufbrau for giving me space in the pages of their courageous and truth-seeking paper to say something on the subject. In doing so I do not set out to justify the position of the German Government, but to present the facts without whose knowledge this complicated problem cannot possibly be judged.

The starting point of the debate was a provision in the German criminal code whereby a murder falls under the statute of limitations 20 years after it has been committed; i.e., after such a period has elapsed no trial proceedings can any longer be opened. That would imply that any murder committed before the end of the Hitler regime, i.e., before May 8, 1945, would be subject to this statute after May 8, 1965. The practical implication of this legal situation, unfortunately, has been so thoroughly misunderstood in the United States—and elsewhere—that some clarification is called for.

GERMAN "LIMITATIONS" STATUTE MISCONSTRUED

On one point there is undisputed agreement between the Federal Government, the German Parliament, all leading personalities in Germany, and the many organizations and individuals here in the United States who have sent me worried and even dramatic petitions: that the horrible mass murders of the days of the Hitler regime must not fall under this statute; that the Nazi criminals who have committed these deeds must have their proper punishment meted out to them, for the sake of justice. This goes for the petty sadists who strutted through concentration camps with bludgeon or pistol, and beat their victims to death or "finished them off" with a shot in the neck, as much as for those big bureaucrats of murder who organized the whole pandemonium. The German people know very well, and their leaders know it even better, that guilt can only be atoned for and that justice with regard to such criminals must take its course, regardless of legal technicalities. After all, thousands of Germans too—and certainly not the worst—became the tyrant's victims in their resistance against him.

During the past weeks, we have received a great number of petitions, letters, and telegrams from well-meaning and truly concerned persons and groups, particularly from Jewish circles and organizations in the United States. It pained us to see that most of them, but also many newspaper articles on this subject, were based on assumptions about the effects of this statute which are not in keeping with the facts, but profoundly mistaken. There seems to be a widespread impression that in Germany after May 8, 1965, all Nazi criminals not legally adjudicated by that time would go scot free; that hundreds or even thousands (one publication spoke of 10,000) of Nazi criminals who had tortured and murdered human beings could promenade freely in Germany's streets and jeer at all legal authorities: "You can't do a thing against us, our deeds are subject to the statute of limitations." All one can say with regard to this notion is that it is false.

Regrettably, we have also often been confronted with another, no less erroneous notion; namely, that the German courts did practically nothing to clean up the German house "except for a few show trials designed to throw dust in the eyes of the world" as someone said to me in a recent conversation. This notion, too, is false, as I shall demonstrate.

JUSTICE HAS BEEN AT WORK FOR YEARS NOW

To begin with the latter problems: What has actually become of the criminals of those evil years; what have the courts, particularly the German courts, done so far to bring them to justice?

Let me first delineate the five most important groups:

(1) It is known that a large number of Nazi criminals escaped the consequences of their crimes by biting the cyanide capsule or shooting themselves with their own service pistol. This not only includes Hitler, Himmler, Goering, Goebbels, Ley, and others, but also a long list of Gauleiters, leaders of "special groups" (Einsatz- und Sonderkommandos) and others. So to speak, they have, by their suicide, eradicated themselves from the list of Nazi criminals and escaped worldly justice. Their number is hard to ascertain but is very high according to present investigations.

(2) A great number of the perpetrators were sentenced or otherwise brought to justice in East European countries, for example in Poland where many concentration camps were located, or in Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, and the Soviet Union. We may be sure that none of the Nazi criminals caught there escaped justice, all the more as the Western Allies extradited suspects they had caught to those countries where these men had done their bloody work.

(3) In West European countries, too, numerous trials took place against those who had "administered" and oppressed Nazi-occupied countries, or been commanders of concentration camps located there. In this connection, mention should be made of verdicts pronounced in France, Belgium, Holland, Norway, Denmark, Italy, and Greece. So far, no figures have been assembled on this score, but we may be sure that justice was done there, too.

(4) The military tribunals set up by the three Western Allies in Germany after the war for the trial of Nazi criminals, as we now know, pronounced sentence on 5,025 persons, 806 of whom were sentenced to death. In turn, 486 of these, i.e., more than half, were executed, including the Nuremberg war criminals.

(5) As I know from my own activity in the denazification process, German courts during the early postwar years were not able—or only to a very limited degree—to try Nazi criminals, because the Allies reserved these cases almost entirely for themselves. Only with the establishment of the Federal Republic and the conclusion of the Bonn Conventions of 1954 was German judicature able to take on fully the prosecution of Nazi criminals. This was particularly difficult in the beginning as the most important documents were still in Allied hands, and because it was especially difficult, during those first turbulent years, to reach surviving witnesses who were essential for such trials.

Still German judicature pronounced the high number of 5,445 legal verdicts between May 8, 1945, and January 1964 with 12 death sentences among them (that could not, however, be carried out because the 1949 Constitution abolished the death penalty). I therefore believe that the charge that German judicature did nothing to clean up the German scene, can really not be maintained.

THOUSANDS INVESTIGATED BY LUDWIGSBURG OFFICE

Did these convictions in East and West, by Allied military tribunals and German courts, bring all or nearly all Nazi criminals to justice? This question may well be answered negatively, even though everyone must admit that a great deal of justice was done in this fashion. In the course of a trial in Ulm in 1958, it emerged that many of the crimes committed in the concentration camps and by the "special groups" had not yet been prosecuted or adjudicated.

The German judiciary therefore established a center in the town of Ludwigsburg, exclusively charged with examining and uncovering crimes commited in concentration camps and so-called special actions outside the Federal Republic. With German thoroughness, this center during the past 6 years reconstructed, on paper, all those places of horror where human beings were tortured and killed, and also the organizations set up to commit such mass murder; and it attempted to find the names of all those involved in these crimes, so that subsequently the regular courts could prosecute.

So far, the Ludwigsburg center has pieced together no fewer than 540 such "complexes" (of which, incidentally, the Auschwitz trial now taking place in Frankfurt is one). All these "complexes" encompass one or more participants who are known by name, and a criminal dossier was prepared in the case of every one of them. Involved in these 540 "complexes," are certainly several thousand suspects with whom the German courts will have to deal in the years to come.

"LIMITATIONS" PROVISION IN GERMAN CRIMINAL CODE

With this I return to the frequently so thoroughly misunderstood effects of the statute of limitations. German law provides—this is generally not known—that every statutory limitation can be interrupted by a simple action on the part of a judge; the statutory period then begins anew. What does that mean in practice? If the Ludwigsburg center forwards the dossier of a suspect to a regular court, and the judge merely makes a notation in the papers, such as: "The investigation is to be continued. Mueller, district judge"; the statutory limit is automatically set aside and the case runs for another 20 years. Therefore the statutory limitation is interrupted as regards those under suspicion by the Ludwigsburg center, regardless of whether it is known they are still alive, where they live, or whether they live somewhere under an assumed name, and the statute of limitations will not apply to them as of next May, but only 20 years after its interruption. Thus, this large number of persons will be excluded from the statute, so that justice can proceed unhampered in their cases.

GERMANY CALLS UPON WORLD FOR EVIDENCE

Finally, the German Federal Republic went to extra lengths on November 20, 1964, when it launched an appeal to the entire world asking everyone—individuals, organizations, or governments—to make available to the Ludwigsburg center (Zentralstelle der Landesjustizverwaltung zur Aufklaerung nationalsozialistischer Gewalttaten. Ludwigsburg, Schorndorfer Strasse 28) any documents, photostats, microfilms, or other information containing names of Nazi criminals so far not known to legal authorities of the Federal Republic. There are still 4 months to go before the statute takes effect, unless the statute is previously stayed by juridical action. This is further guarantee that no one will escape justice.

If we sum up objectively all measures so far taken against the Nazi criminals, such as the trials in the East European countries, the trials in Western Europe, the sentences by the Allied military tribunals, the convictions by German courts, the investigation efforts by the Ludwigsburg center that lead to an interruption of the statutory limitation in thousands of cases, and finally the appeal by the Federal Republic to the world to provide information on any Nazi criminals who have so far remained unknown—then one may confidently conclude that after May 8, 1965, there will by no means be hundreds or thousands of war criminals who will roam the streets of Germany and jeeringly point to the statute as protection against punishment.

CAN A FEW STILL ESCAPE JUSTICE?

In spite of all this, the theoretical possibility still remains, that one or the other of the culprits, if he was never named in any context nor pointed out by an accusing witness, might, under the shelter of the statute, dare to show himself again. Theoretically, I say; for in practice such a case is very improbable after all the lists of names of the concentration camp guards and the "special groups" have been combed, and so many convictions obtained.

But it must be admitted that, theoretically, the possibility remains and therefore—in my personal opinion—this possibility should also be blocked. It is not impossible, for example, that the authorities in the Soviet-occupied zone of Germany have some such cases in their files, in order to bring them out only after May 8, 1965. They most certainly would not do that to help justice triumph, but to capitalize on it politically to the detriment of the Federal Republic. Should the zonal authorities fail—now, after the appeal by the Federal Republic—to release such information, they would thereby protect Nazi criminals.

GERMANS CONTINUE STUDY ON EXTENSION OF LIMIT

What can be done to prevent abuse of the statute in the few theoretically possible cases—if there should be such cases at all? It is surely understandable that people in Germany are reluctant to change the Constitution because of these few possible cases, a change which in the opinion of some jurists, would be necessary in order to extend the time limits of the statute. Other jurists, however, are of the opinion that no constitutional change would be required, but merely a normal legislative act. In any event, the debate over the closing of this last small gap is not yet ended. A few days ago the German Parliament charged the Federal Government with the task of presenting a full report before March 1, 1965, on the extent to which National-Socialist crimes of violence have been solved, prosecuted, and punished. Parliament will then draw its conclusions from that report and take measures to close the last gap through which a Nazi criminal might slip. For, as I said in the beginning, it is the firm intention of Germany's political leadership to prevent this and to assure that particularly in cases of National-Socialist acts of violence, justice will take its course unhampered.

Resolution of the German Bundestag, December 9, 1964

In full recognition of the work of the state prosecutors and the courts in investigating and prosecuting the Nazi mass murders and with special recognition for the investigations carried out by the central office in Ludwigsburg with the goal of seeking atonement for these acts of murder and to mete out just punishment for the responsible and guilty, the German Bundestag calls for intensified and speedier efforts in order that the statute of limitations may be interrupted in every case where this is possible. It stresses its support for the call of the Federal Government of November 20, 1964, and expresses the hope that all who have evidence which sheds light on such acts of murder will place it at the disposal of the German authorities.

Therefore the Federal Government is called upon to deal directly with the governments of the Laender in reaching agreement on the following:

(1) The complete file of documentary material on acts of murder during the Nazi period is to be reviewed systematically.

(2) To be included in this review is all material insofar as (a) it is available within the Federal Republic but has not yet been thoroughly checked; (b) it is available from the archives of the Soviet-occupied zone; (c) it can be obtained from abroad, especially from the countries of Eastern Europe.

(3) The systematic review is to be undertaken by a central office of the Land Judicial Administrations. Irrespective of the place of the crimes, it should be made competent to investigate all acts of murder including instigation and abetment within the area which was under the control of the authorities and offices of the former German Reich and central Nazi organizations.

(4) The Federal Minister of Justice is requested to report to the Bundestag by March 1, 1965, whether charges have been initiated in pertinent cases of murder and the interruption of the statute of limitations has been assured, if necessary whether the Federal Government is prepared to review together with the German Bundestag the question of an extension of the statute of limitations in case it should conclude that there is no other way to assure the prosecution of such acts of murder.

German Government Appeals to World Public

(Note.—On November 20, 1964, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany issued an appeal for information regarding National Socialist crimes as follows:)

Allied and German courts have already passed final judgment on the great majority of National Socialist crimes, and penal proceedings have been instituted regarding a number of other crimes.

Determined to punish National Socialist crimes and to restore violated justice, but considering, on the other hand, that the period of limitation in respect to crimes committed prior to May 9, 1945, cannot, for constitutional reasons, be extended, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany requests all governments, organizations, and individual persons, both in Germany and abroad, to make available without delay to the "Zentralstelle der Landesjustizverwaltung zur Aufklaerung nationalsozialistischer Gewalttaten" (Central Office of the Land Judicial Administrations for the Investigation of National Socialist Crimes), Ludwigsburg, Schorndorfer Strasse 28, either original documents or photostat or microfilm copies of material in their possession relating to offenses and their perpetrators still unknown in the Federal Republic.

All diplomatic or consular missions abroad of the Federal Republic of Germany will accept and forward any documentation intended for the above-mentioned office.

CONGRATULATIONS TO PLUS POULTRY, INC., ON RECEIPT OF "E" AWARD

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I announce with pride the receipt of a Presidential "E" Award by Plus Poultry, Inc., of Siloam Springs, Ark. The award was presented for significant contributions to the export expansion program of the United States. Accepting the award for Plus Poultry was Mr. M. H. Simmons, president of the firm. In making the award, the Assistant Secretary of the Department of Agriculture for Marketing and Consumer Services, Mr. George L. Mehren, cited the personal efforts of Mr. Simmons to develop export markets for the entire U.S. poultry industry. He also pointed to a sevenfold increase in Plus Poultry export sales over a 2-year period as an example of what can be accomplished by aggressive foreign promotion programs.

"E" awards are made cooperatively by the Departments of Agriculture and Commerce under a program announced by the President in 1961 to encourage expansion of U.S. exports. I add my congratulations and commendations to those of Assistant Secretary Mehren. Mr. Simmons and his firm are to be commended for their splendid achievements. All of Arkansas is proud of this firm and the outstanding people who make its success possible.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the press release of the Department of Agriculture which announced this award be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the press release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

USDA ANNOUNCES PRESIDENTIAL "E" AWARD TO PLUS POULTRY, INC.

Plus Poultry, Inc., of Siloam Springs, Ark., received the Presidential "E" Award for significant contributions to the export expansion program of the United States at a special ceremony here today, December 18, the U.S. Department of Agriculture announced.

The award was presented by George L. Mehren, USDA Assistant Secretary for Marketing and Consumer Services. Accepting the award for Plus Poultry was M. H. Simmons, president of the firm.

Mr. Mehren cited the personal efforts of Mr. Simmons to develop export markets for the entire U.S. poultry industry, and pointed to a sevenfold increase in Plus Poultry export sales over a 2-year period as an outstanding testimonial to sales which can result from aggressive foreign promotion programs.

The firm received an official "E" certificate inscribed with this citation:

"By aggressive promotion, Plus Poultry, Inc., and its president, M. H. Simmons, through his personal leadership and devotion to the entire industry, have contributed to the development of export markets for U.S. poultry."

"E" awards are made cooperatively by the Departments of Agriculture and Commerce under a program announced by the President in 1961 to encourage expansion of U.S. exports, to improve the balance-of-payments situation and further America's responsibilities for advancement of world freedom.

Recipients of the awards, which are similar to those made for outstanding production in World War II, are authorized to fly a blue and white "E" banner over their plants and offices; display their certificates of commendation; issue "E" lapel pins to employees, and refer to the award in advertising.

POSITION OF THE UNITED STATES ON ARTICLE 19 OF THE UNITED NATIONS CHARTER

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the General Assembly of the United Nations will reconvene on next Monday. The major pending emergency item of business will be a determination of the position of the members thereof in respect to carrying out the obligations of article 19.

In the judgment of the senior Senator from Oregon, there is not the slightest justification at this time for the United States to take any other position than to insist upon the carrying out in full of the obligations of each and every signatory to the United Nations Charter in respect to article 19, which means not only the Soviet Union, but any other delinquent nation.

What the United States and other free nations do this coming week in New York City in the United Nations will determine whether or not that charter becomes a piece of paper instead of mankind's hope for maintaining a system of international justice through law.

We must keep in mind the juridical obligation that rests upon every signatory to that charter. The provisions of the charter provide for the use of the World Court in a determination of the international legal rights of the signatories thereto, through the handing down of an advisory opinion.

In keeping with the procedures of the charter, an advisory opinion of the World Court was requested and received. That opinion handed down the decision that the members whose signatures appear on the charter are obligated under article 19 on a mandatory basis to pay the assessments that are assessed by the United Nations, acting within its procedures.

Mr. President, the time has come for a determination as to whether or not article 19 shall stand as a part of the international charter or is to be a scrap of paper within the charter. If it is to be a scrap of paper within the charter, the entire charter becomes a scrap of paper. I only call upon the State Department and our Ambassador in New York City to recognize that the obligation is clear on the part of the United States to stand for the enforcement of the law. Then if the countries that are signatories to that charter believe the charter needs to be amended, the procedure for amendment is in the charter, and we should proceed with amendment of the charter. That might be welcome. On the floor many times in the past I have suggested amendments to the United Nations Charter, including an amendment respecting the makeup of the Security Council, the veto provisions, and possibly an amendment with regard to the formula or ratio that ought to be applied to the voting within the General Assembly. I am perfectly willing that this session should amend the charter, but article 19 ought not to be allowed to be violated by Russia or France or any other nation.

Mr. President, not only the eyes of the world will be on the General Assembly next week, but let me say to the State Department, the President of the United States, and our Ambassador in New York City, that the eyes of Congress and of millions of Americans will be on the session next week.

Mr. President, I shall be through in 30 seconds, if I may have that time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, if we have reached the point when we can have the Charter of the United Nations successfully defied by Russia, France, or any other country, then it can be successfully defied by all countries. If the charter is to be revised by practice rather than by amendment, then all members will be obliged to follow the practice rather than the letter of the charter.

I think it ought to be recognized that the American people, in my judgment, are in no mood to pay out millions of dollars for the support of the United Nations if it is to be carried out only at the discretion or sufferance of Russia, France, or other countries in defiance of article 19.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, next week the United Nations will go into session. One of the issues before it will be what shall be done with Red Russia's right to vote in the United Nations while it is in arrears in the sum of $54 million in the paying of its obligations. Article 19 of the United Nations Charter provides that when a nation is in arrears in the aggregate amount that has become due in a 2-year period, it shall lose its right to vote.

Efforts are now being made to abrogate the full impact and import of article 19 of the charter. It is being suggested that article 19 be disregarded, and that Russia be permitted to vote in spite of the delinquency in the payment of its dues.

The significance of the proposal to nullify article 19 is that many irresponsible nations are listening to the proposal, wishing completely to forget the absolute need of abiding by sacred agreements.

Our country, when it had subscribed its name to a document, has historically abided by the commitment that it had undertaken. Russia historically has broken its agreements. It is my recollection of 53 important agreements made by Russia since World War II, Russia has broken 52.

If the charter is to be amended, it should not be done by nullification and abrogation, but by following the procedure prescribed in the charter.

This is a matter of great importance. We cannot retreat in the face of the challenge of Red Russia that it will withdraw from the United Nations unless we violate article 19 of the charter. Our character is not built that way. We have been trained, as I have said, historically to abide by our word. Our word is our bond. Our signature is not required to induce us to conform to our word.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has made a brief statement on this subject, in substance expressing the views that I express. I do not believe our Government will yield on this subject. However, it needs the fortification that comes from words uttered on the floor of the Senate.

We shall be looking forward to see what happens, and we shall be looking forward to see what the Afro-Asian nations have to say on this subject, and thus demonstrate whether they believe in abiding by the commitments they make.

NOTABLE MILESTONE TO BE CELEBRATED BY THE DISTINGUISHED AMERICAN MUSICAL DIRECTOR AND ARTIST, LAWRENCE WELK

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the idiosyncrasies of public taste in entertainment and culture are an acknowledged phenomenon. The changing desires and interests of the American people are particularly reflected in the fields of literature, art, and diversion.

Periodically, on the strength of audience ratings, the effect of shifting interest is illustrated forcefully by the rescheduling of television programs. The mortality rate of such programs is almost unbelievably high.

It is well known that features which have endured for substantial lengths of time are very few. Those which do continue from season to season possess a unique appeal and sometimes an indefinable quality which sustains their popularity. One such program approaches a significant milestone.

On Saturday, January 23, Lawrence Welk and his champagne music "family" celebrate their 500th national performance on the ABC television network. This marks the completion of nearly a decade of wholesome, splendid, and unique musical entertainment emanating from my native State of California and the establishment of a tradition which engages the attention of an estimated 20 to 25 million viewers every week.

I salute Lawrence Welk, a farm boy from a German-immigrant community in North Dakota, who made his debut on national broadcasts as what the trade calls a "temporary summer replacement." Within 4 weeks after the initial performance in July 1955 this program shot to the top of the ratings and in the intervening years has maintained a popularity rivaled by few television features.

The Lawrence Welk story is one of dedication to admirable standards and to respect for good taste, together with competence in direction and performance. In this fashion, it is a testimonial to the American principle of free enterprise.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S FOREIGN AID PROPOSALS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, President Johnson's foreign aid proposals as set forth in his message are a great disappointment. All he has done is warm over the same old kettle of foreign aid hash. It is no longer palatable to the American people.

The basic trouble with American foreign aid is to be found in the crying need for policy changes. There are no basic policy changes in the President's rehash of the subject.

The Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate for the past 2 years has warned the White House and the State Department that basic changes in policy should be made in American foreign aid if continued public support is to be expected. In the same past 2 years, I have agreed with the criticisms of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee as set forth in the committee's annual report to the Senate on foreign aid, but in addition, I have taken the position that the Foreign Relations Committee had a clear duty to do more than just recommend policy changes. It should have written them into the foreign aid bill. The failure of the committee to do that caused me to vote against the foreign aid bill both of those years. I shall vote against it again this year unless basic policy changes are adopted. What are some of those changes?

First. We should reduce greatly the grant money program of foreign aid and insist upon a loan program for which an interest charge equaling the cost of the use of the money to the American taxpayers will be charged. The American people should not be fooled by the propaganda of the administration that the present foreign aid program is basically a loan program. Interest rates now charged are so low in most instances that they do not even cover the administrative costs of handling the money. The fact is the money policies of our foreign aid program are so loose that I doubt that more than a very small fraction of the so-called loans will ever be repaid.

Second. We should stop granting or loaning money direct to governments. I am a project man. I think the taxpayers' money under foreign aid should be invested in specific projects that will benefit the economic welfare of the mass of the people in the country in which the money is to be spent. Such a change in policy would eliminate much of the corruption and graft, waste, and inefficiency that has been found time and time again to characterize foreign aid expenditures of American taxpayer dollars. If a given project is not sound from both an economic and engineering standpoint, it cannot possibly be justified.

Third. The military aid program should be thoroughly revised and drastically modified. Military aid is still largely a giveaway program. Contrary to the propaganda of the White House, State Department, and Pentagon Building, it is not in the security interests of the United States but in large measure, is creating serious threats to the peace in various parts of the world.

It is not stopping communism but too frequently is making Communists. I have always been willing to support that type of military aid that is necessary to help a friendly government maintain internal security against threatened Communist revolutions and lawbreaking incidents, but the type of military aid we supply in most places in the world creates military oligarchies and military dictatorships which, in turn, play right into the hands of Communists.

Fourth. I strongly favor increasing the authority and administrative assistance of the private segment of the economy, both American and in the country in which the aid is to be spent. We have made a great mistake in not using our foreign aid program as an effective teaching lesson of the meaning of economic freedom. We need to export to underdeveloped lands what we know to be our system of economic freedom based upon our private enterprise system out of which is bound to grow political freedom. Without first preparing the seed beds of economic freedom in these underdeveloped countries, there is no hope of helping the people become politically free.

Lastly, let me say again we cannot buy the support and friendship of the people in the underdeveloped areas of the world with billions of dollars of American economic and military aid as we now spend the money. We can, however, help the people in other parts of the world help themselves in developing economic freedom by making sound loans to them for sound investments in needed economic institutions and services.

As to the amounts recommended by the President, they are at least a billion dollars too high and probably a billion and a half dollars too much if the money is to be spent on the basis of the policies recommended in the message.

Furthermore, no one should overlook the sleeper clause in the message which, in effect, leaves a proposal for an open end authorization for undeclared war in South Vietnam.

I hope that Congress will hear from the people on the foreign aid recommendations of the administration, because I am satisfied that if the people will speak up, the Congress will this year pass a bill that carries out the sound recommendations contained in the last two reports of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate.

LET US KEEP POLITICS OUT OF THE PANTRY

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, the question of Federal Government responsibility in the area of consumer protection is a timely one in light of current legislative proposals.

The chairman of General Foods Corp., Charles G. Mortimer, makes a number of points in a Look magazine article which I believe deserve thoughtful consideration. He argues, in brief, that laws now on the books effectively safeguard the purity of food products and control the information printed on food-container labels.

And, he says, competition among food companies, combined with the astuteness of the shopping American housewife, assures good food products at a fair price.

"I can testify from experience," he writes, "that when it comes to clever buying, the American housewife can give lessons to a Yankee horse trader."

Mr. Mortimer's article deserves a careful reading, in my opinion, and I recommend it to the attention of my colleagues. I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "Let's Keep Politics Out of the Pantry" be included at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Let's Keep Politics Out of the Pantry

The typical American housewife is intelligent, experienced, and better informed about running a home than her counterpart in any preceding generation. Let's call her Mary Jones. Right now, she's shopping at her favorite supermarket. Because it, too, is typical, its shelves are lined with some 8,000 different items. Yet Mary Jones knows just what she wants, and she gets it. Into her cart go the prepackaged meats, quick-frozen vegetables, canned soups, frozen juice concentrates, prepared cake mixes, heat-and-serve rolls, and all the other good things the Jones family will have served up to them at their dining room table in the week to come.

As she leaves the supermarket, Mary Jones takes it for granted that what she has bought is the purest, most nutritious, easiest-to-prepare food the world has ever seen. Having spent 40 years in the food business, I can attest to the fact that her assumption is correct and, what's more, that the prices she has paid are the most reasonable to be found anywhere on earth.

But what Mary Jones probably does not know—and what disturbs me deeply—is that the machinery of free competition which has made ours the best fed nation on earth is in danger of being tampered with. It is being attacked by certain people in Government who have the perverse notion that the Mary Joneses of America need more Government protection than the ample safeguards they already have.

The danger is substantial, but before I describe what I call "politics in the pantry," I would like to cite a few facts that show just how great a value food is in today's America. Since her family is average in size and income, we'll use Mary Jones as our example.

Back in 1948, out of every after-tax dollar earned by the Joneses, about 26 cents went to buy food. Today, because food prices have gone up less than other prices, and because incomes have soared, food purchases take only 19 cents of each take-home dollar. So the Joneses now have 81 percent instead of 74 percent of their net income left over to spend on everything else, from clothes and household furnishings to insurance and their children's education.

Compare this with conditions in other countries. In England, the average family spends 29 percent of its income on food. In France, 31 percent. In Japan, 47 percent. And in that so-called workers' paradise, Communist Russia, food takes fully half of each family's after-tax earnings.

But even this isn't the whole story. The Joneses are eating far better than the families in these other nations—and better, in fact, than the Joneses themselves used to eat, just a few years ago. They are eating more and choicer cuts of meat. They are eating foods never before matched in purity or nutrition. And they are eating delicious new foods—many of them convenience products that sharply reduce the amount of time Mary Jones must spend in her kitchen.

Thanks to these new products, Mary's daily cooking chores take only 90 minutes. (Not many years ago, women used to spend more than 5 hours preparing a day's meals.) With this extra free time, many Marys—14 million of our American housewives—are able to hold outside jobs as well as run their homes, thus contributing in a very material way to a better standard of living for their families.

What makes it possible for Americans to eat so well and so conveniently for so little? The answer lies in two potent forces that protect the housewife as she pushes her shopping cart down the supermarket aisle.

The first of these forces is the necessary and comprehensive Government regulation that is respected and adhered to by the various segments of the vast food industry. Through laws now on the books, Government agencies effectively safeguard the purity of food products and control the information printed on food container labels.

The second protective force is competition—the heart of our free-enterprise system. This force has been a mighty factor in making America's abundant food supply the finest to be found anywhere in the world, It is a major reason for all those new food products, since each processor is constantly seeking ways to gain new customers.

The wooing of consumers through new and improved products has wrought a tremendous change in the Nation's eating and food-preparation habits, a change more sweeping than many people realize. A friend of mine told me recently that he was in his kitchen one afternoon when his wife returned from a food-shopping trip.

"I looked at what she had bought—things like precooked rice and a prepared cheese-and-noodle dish—and I realized that more than half the items weren't even on the market when we were first married. Why, I'll bet," he said, "that there have been over a thousand new food products in the past 20 years."

His estimate was low. My own company alone introduced some 50 new food items in just the past year. The entire industry spends over $100 million annually on research and development of new grocery items.

With America's thousands of food processors competing for consumer patronage in a free economy, and with our Government enforcing essential health and labeling regulations, the food shopper is in an enviable position indeed.

Recently, however, some Government officials have started playing "politics in the pantry." Belatedly they have discovered the consumer as a politically potent entity. That's quite an audience because, of course, everybody is a consumer. So they are pitching emotion-charged appeals to that audience. Through headline-making innuendos, they imply that America's food-marketing system needs to be watched and regulated even more closely than it is.

Here are a few of their actions that are causing consumers to question the very system the Mary Joneses of this country find so satisfactory.

Senator PHILIP HART, Democrat, of Michigan, has introduced what he calls a truth-in-packaging bill. It implies that food manufacturers are taking advantage of consumers through deception in the sizes and weights of packages and the information printed on labels. Among other things, this bill with the politically appealing name would give the Government the right to dictate weights and other standards for food-product containers.

Mrs. Esther Peterson, Special Assistant to the President for Consumer Affairs, has held four consumer conferences at which housewives were not only invited but urged to submit complaints about the products they buy in their chosen supermarkets or other retail stores.

A National Commission on Food Marketing has been launched amid speculation that it would result in an exposé of what some Members of Congress have called profiteering by middlemen at the expense of both farmer and consumer.

Ostensibly, these actions were taken to help the consumer. Actually, they could, if implemented, hurt him. At the very least, they represent an unwarranted and unnecessary intrusion by Government into the American marketplace.

Take Senator HART's bill, for example. It ignores completely the fact that price competition is by no means the only competition which benefits the consumer. By making all packages "look-alikes" on the shelf, restrictive legislation would stifle innovation and put a halter on an indispensable form of competition: the freedom to bring out packages which are easy to open, easy to close, easy to handle, easy to store. Each of these represents an added value passed on to the consumer. My own company, for example, wouldn't have introduced instant coffee in a carafe or table syrup in a reusable pitcher if consumers didn't prize these containers as added values.

Advocates of more Government controls insist that food shoppers are often misled by nonstandard package shapes and deceptive labels. This is just not true. Any manufacturer who tries to trick the housewife into buying his products by packaging or labeling it deceptively will soon go out of business. She may buy it once, but she'll never buy it again. And since marketing a food product involves heavy costs, no processor can remain solvent on one-time sales. He depends on repeat volume.

Another contention of those who advocate still more governmental control is that labels are "hard to understand" and that the consumer is "confused" by odd-ounce weights on packages. Their assumption, apparently, is that package sizes and weights are produced willy-nilly. Again, my own company offers an example of the absurdity of that kind of thinking. We pack vanilla pudding and chocolate pudding in the same size box. As rightfully required by law, the label on every package shows the weight of the contents. The vanilla-pudding weight is 3¼ ounces, while the chocolate-pudding weight is 4 ounces. The reason is that this is the quantity of pudding mix which, in the case of each flavor (as stated on the label), will yield exactly four servings of one-half cup each when blended with two cups of milk.

Because of the difference in the density of the two flavors, to pack the vanilla in a 4-ounce size would necessitate giving America's housewives recipe directions with an odd measure of milk to be added—and more servings than she has planned on.

Is this what the consumer wants? Is this a Federal case—a matter calling for enactment of legislation by the Congress of the United States?

While Congress considers the demands for unnecessary new limiting controls, Mrs. Peterson has been holding public meetings and frequent press conferences inviting homemakers to register complaints.

I want to make it clear that I regard and respect Mrs. Peterson as a conscientious and dedicated public servant. But she is part of a political party and subject to pressures aimed at currying favor by offering the consumer "more protection," whether it is really needed or not.

The fact is that despite the best of motives, her consumer conferences—with their emphasis on complaints—have, in my opinion, resulted in more harm than good. For one thing, they have unnecessarily created doubts in the minds of consumers where none had existed, and indeed where none are warranted. For another, they represent just one more intrusion by Government into an area where, in our free society, Government does not belong.

But even more ludicrous than the politically slanted campaign to prod complaints from consumers is the image drawn of the typical American housewife. In their attempt to show why the housewife needs more Government protection, proponents of additional controls have created the impression that she is a timid, naive, confused little woman, hopelessly gullible, bewildered by the endless variety of products on the grocery shelves and exposed, as she shops, to the machinations of lurking profit-hungry figures who dominate the food business.

This, of course, is utter nonsense. I can testify from experience that when it comes to clever buying, the American housewife can give lessons to a Yankee horse trader. She knows exactly what she wants, and she knows precisely what it's worth to her. And if you don't provide her with what she wants at what she considers a fair price, you won't get her as a customer.

What politicians don't seem to understand is that no manufacturer can force a consumer to select his product, out of all those displayed, any more than a politician can force a voter to pull the lever by his name in a voting booth. Politicians need to be reminded also that we in the food business are up for election all the time.

Where a politician has to run for office once every 2, 4, or 6 years, every shopping day is election day for us. The homemaker casts her ballot—for or against—by taking our product off the shelf or leaving it there. She can make or break a product and can even vote a company right out of business. Every major food processor has in its files the stories of products that were developed at great expense only to languish on supermarket shelves because they failed to win a sufficient number of purchases by the only person qualified to control the American food industry: the American housewife. So my image of the American consumer is quite different from the one shared by the proponents of more and more Government regulations. The consumer is smart. She is alert. And she very effectively does everything that is necessary to keep the food processor in line.

All this is not to say that Government involvement in business is all, or per se, bad.

The National Commission on Food Marketing, for example, could be a very good thing. The study the Commission will complete by next July 1 could help bring to Americans much-needed understanding of how our advanced society gets food from farm to table. It could, for example, clarify just who is really a farmer, by distinguishing between those rural dwellers who raise crops for a living and those whose main income is from industrial employment, even though they do farm some very small acreage as a sideline.

Most importantly, the Commission's study could clear up, once and for all, the question of just what a middleman is. For centuries, this word has carried a connotation of all take and no give. Since earliest civilization, a middleman has been pictured as one who buys cheap and sells dear, contributing nothing to the value of the goods in the process.

That probably was true, way back. But today, the villain the politicians are chasing is no villain at all. Far from it. In our urbanized, industrialized society, the middleman is the one who takes raw food from the farm and then makes it possible for people to eat it.

Milk in a pail at a farmer's gate is worth nothing to the 9 out of 10 Americans who live off the farm. As a weekend dairy farmer, I am only too painfully aware of that. Consumers can't possibly all drive out and get their daily quart. The only way milk takes on value is through its availability when and where the consumer can conveniently get it. In other words, consumers simply won't pay for wheat in the barn, peas on the vine or hamburger on the hoof.

The food marketing chain of events encompasses all the vast activity that goes on from farm gate to checkout counter. This has created and sustained the Nation's market for processed farm products. And this adds value after value—at a reasonable cost—every step of the way.

I said the cost is reasonable. It is, in fact, surprisingly low. For example, the U.S. Department of Agriculture reports that the homemaker gets frozen orange-juice concentrate for less money per glass than she pays for juice she squeezes from fresh oranges. Similarly, a cup of excellent instant coffee costs her less than one she brews herself. She also saves money, as well as work, by buying processed frozen or canned peas and corn, frozen lima beans and spinach, canned spaghetti and chicken chow mein, among a great many others listed as bargains by the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Yet politicians prattle about consumers being forced to buy processed, packaged foods at premium prices.

Instead of hurting the farmer, the food-marketing complex actually helps him. It helps him just as it does the consumer. For at the same time that it makes it possible for people to eat, it creates sales for the farmer's crops.

We hear much about how small a share of each dollar spent for food goes to the farmer. Yet, the fact is this: If every single dollar of corporate profits made by the food marketing industry were eliminated—that is, all the profit of processors, wholesalers, food chains and independent food retailing corporations—the total marketing bill would be reduced only enough to add a single percentage point to the farmer's share of the retail food dollar.

So the farmer certainly is not victimized by the food marketing system. Neither is the homemaker. Yet the politicians say both are, and demand stricter controls.

Actually, my great concern in all this is not alone for the food industry, but for the free society of which the food industry is such a vital part. What disturbs me most is the destructive impact a heavier hand of Government is bound to have on the free choice we Americans now enjoy. For we are faced with the grim prospect of having Government officials tell the consumer what products she can buy and what kind of package she can buy them in. We see vote-conscious politicians informing the housewife that she doesn't really need all those things she's been purchasing; she has merely been gulled into wanting them.

The point really at issue—the point involving one of our cherished freedoms—is simply this: Who is to say what is a need and what is a want? Shall we, as individuals, continue to determine the answer, or shall we leave it to an allwise, paternalistic Government to decide?

I feel the danger is most acute in the area of food distribution. For in any standard of living, food is the No. 1 requirement. Before he can do anything else, man must satisfy his hunger and be nourished in the process.

As certain people in Government with political motives champion the case for more and more controls, there are others, fortunately, who speak out for freer free enterprise. Representative CATHERINE MAY, Republican, of Washington, made this statement, lauding the American homemaker for her competence and discrimination:

"She—the homemaker—has done and is doing a wonderful job in needling, inspiring, and in regulating American business enterprise. And to reward her, I want to protect her. Not with more Government regulations and laws. I want to protect her freedom of choice. I want to protect her right to reward or punish the businessman. I want her to stay the boss of the marketplace. As long as she is, there's no danger to our free-enterprise system."

OUR DISCRIMINATORY IMMIGRATION LAW MUST GO

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, there are few areas in our laws which more urgently demand change than our unfair and discriminatory system of selecting immigrants to be allowed to enter our country. No provision of any national law is more distasteful to millions of Americans than the concept of judging the worth of men and women for immigration on the basis of place of birth or the ancestry of parents.

Five successive Presidents—Franklin D. Roosevelt, Harry S. Truman, Dwight D. Eisenhower, John F. Kennedy, and President Johnson—have all asked for a revision in the present method of choosing immigrants on the basis of their nationality.

The only justification that can be made for the national origins quota system is that Americans with English or German or Irish names make better citizens than Americans of Italian, Greek, Polish, or Hungarian descent. This concept is utterly false. It contradicts all our traditions and ideals, and makes a mockery of the spirit expressed in the Declaration of Independence that all men are created equal.

As a people, we are morally committed to seek a national policy which will make real the simple truth of the words of St. Paul:

> God hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on the face of the earth.

Under the present system, no matter how skilled or badly needed a man or woman is, if born in the allegedly wrong country, such person must wait years for admission, if lucky enough to be admitted at all, while others less qualified come almost at will. An Italian scientist or Greek craftsman or Polish engineer may bring more to our country than an unskilled worker from some northern European country. Nevertheless, under existing law the unskilled worker would come first.

While the annual quotas for Great Britain, Germany, and Ireland are seldom completely filled, there is a huge backlog of applications from people living in eastern and southern Europe. For instance, an American citizen with a Greek mother or father must wait at least 18 months to bring his parents to this country. A citizen whose married son or daughter is Italian cannot obtain a quota number for 2 years or more.

President Johnson has again requested that Congress enact legislation to correct these deficiencies and to eliminate the national origin quota system. The distinguished junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] has today introduced legislation which will implement that request. This law would recognize that each immigrant has a special worth because of his potential contribution to the total manpower of our country and that he should be judged on his individual ability. Over a 5-year period, it would eliminate all quotas based on national origin. The total annual number of immigrants would be increased by less than 7,000.

People would be admitted on the basis of their skills, education, and training. Another governing factor would be the reunification of families now separated by our outmoded immigration laws.

Mr. President, along with many other Senators, I am cosponsor of the pending legislation proposed to carry out the recommendations of President Johnson.

I strongly urge that this bill be given top priority for consideration. We must right this wrong that stains our national conscience and blurs our image as the greatest democracy in the world. Let us remember at all times, we are the Nation which chiseled on our Statue of Liberty:

> Give me your tired, your poor,
> Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free;
> Send these, the homeless, tempest-tossed to me;
> I lift my lamp beside the golden door.

FLOOD DISASTER IN WESTERN STATES

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the Christmas week flood in the States of California, Oregon, Washington, and Idaho, mobilized the efforts of several Federal departments in an effort to reduce damage. The Office of Emergency Planning has compiled a preliminary report indicating that total damage in the four States is approximately $574 million.

Federal, State, and local agencies of government cooperated to the fullest extent during the flood crisis, thus reducing the toll taken by floodwaters. Citizens of the Western States have a gratitude to the dedicated public servants who took part in this flood fighting task.

Although the initial report from the Office of Emergency Planning is admittedly preliminary and incomplete, the heavy damage is evidence that Congress must act immediately to supply emergency funds for recovery and rehabilitation of the area. According to the report, highway damage was especially heavy in the States of Oregon and Washington. It is estimated that highways in these two States were damaged to the extent of $135 million and nearly a year will be required to accomplish effective restoration of the highway systems. It is essential that we move rapidly to restore this key portion of the West's transportation system.

The preliminary report also indicates extensive damage to federally owned facilities throughout the western region and these must be rebuilt so their functions and operations can continue. In order that Members of the Senate may know the extent of damage to public and private property in the four Western States, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD with my remarks a copy of a letter which I received from Deputy Director Franklin B. Dryden of the Office of Emergency Planning on January 8.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF
THE PRESIDENT,
OFFICE OF EMERGENCY PLANNING,
Washington, D.C., January 8, 1965.

Hon. MAURINE B. NEUBERGER,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR NEUBERGER: Since flooding began last month in the States of California, Oregon, Washington, and Idaho, representatives of the Office of Emergency Planning and other Federal departments have been in the disaster area assisting State and local authorities in the unprecedented task of flood fighting, rescue, and evacuation.

As a result of President Johnson's declaration of "major disaster" (under Public Law 81-875) in all four States, full Federal support has been mobilized to aid in the task of debris clearance, recovery, and rehabilitation.

Continuing rains and snow pose a constant threat in the disaster area and accurate estimates of damage are impossible until waters recede. It will be several weeks before reliable damage estimates are available.

Information now at hand—admittedly preliminary and incomplete—suggest total damage in the four States approximating $574,030,000 as follows:

State	Public	Private	Total
California	$175, 000, 000	$125, 000, 000	$300, 000, 000
Oregon	136, 000, 000	120, 500, 000	256, 500, 000
Washington	9, 000, 000	1, 000, 000	10, 000, 000
Idaho	5, 530, 000	2, 000, 000	7, 530, 000
Total	325, 530, 000	248, 500, 000	574, 030, 000

There is extensive damage to highway and railroad transportation systems in the affected States; many bridges have been destroyed, railroads beds have been swept away and Federal-aid highways, State, county, and timber access roads have been severely damaged.

On Tuesday, January 5, OEP convened a meeting of representatives of all Federal Departments with major disaster responsibilities. In addition to OEP, represented at the meeting were: Agriculture, Commerce, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Defense (Corps of Engineers), Interior, Labor, Small Business Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency.

Also present were representatives of the American Red Cross and the Bureau of the Budget. All actions taken to date and contemplated in the next few weeks were reviewed and approved. A summary of those actions by Department follows:

AGRICULTURE

The Department estimates $100 million damage to farm and forest areas in the four States. A donated feed grain program has been initiated to sustain stranded livestock in Humboldt County, Calif. Further livestock feed requirements in the rural areas are being investigated. In excess of 500 tons of Government-owned food supplies have been made available to sustain the population.

COMMERCE

Highway damage in Oregon and California alone is estimated at $135 million. It will require 8 to 12 months to accomplish effective highway system restoration. Full support is being extended to State and local authorities.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

The availability of stockpiled medical supplies was very helpful in meeting emergency medical requirements. Thirteen prepositioned emergency hospitals were set up and used. The hospital at Yuba City, Calif., was completely evacuated and reestablished in an available emergency hospital. State, county, and local health officials have been most cooperative in meeting the health problems. All communities have been advised of the health hazards and no special health problems are anticipated. Medical supplies are available to meet further requirements as they develop.

DEFENSE (CORPS OF ENGINEERS)

The corps has established 47 field offices in the flood area and has 867 personnel engaged in disaster relief activities. They estimate it will be at least 6 weeks before accurate damage surveys can be completed. In-place flood control projects are reported to have prevented $250 million damage in California and $500 million in Oregon. The corps is proceeding under its own authority and the direction of OEP under Public Law 81-875 with floodfighting, debris removal and repair actions.

INTERIOR

There is an estimated $5 million damage to six Indian reservations and extensive damage to other facilities under the jurisdiction of Interior, including fish hatcheries, the Bonneville Power Administration, stream measuring facilities, and the national park system.

LABOR

Key State employment security agencies in the disaster area have been operated on a 24-hour basis, serving as a clearinghouse for labor requests. The economic impact of the disaster is suggested by an increase of 5,600 unemployment compensation claims in Oregon for the first week of the disaster.

Unemployment compensation benefits are being paid to eligible recipients on an expedited basis; claim processors have been flown by helicopter to disaster communities with authority to make eligible payments on the spot. The Department is prepared to meet the demands of reconstruction when it begins.

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Because of an inadequacy in its loan account SBA, with approval of the Bureau of the Budget, has initiated a "deferred participation program" in which the major banks of California and Oregon are participating. Loans to eligible applicants will be made by participating banks under an agreement for repurchase of 90 percent of each loan by SBA when funds become available. The SBA portion of the loan will be at "not to exceed 3 percent." Full information on the "deferred participation program" is being communicated to eligible borrowers.

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

Arrangements have been made to expedite adaptation of the regular housing loan programs of HHFA to meet anticipated requirements. Heavy involvement of this Agency will not occur until rebuilding actually begins and urban renewal problems are considered.

RED CROSS

Red Cross surveys indicate that 20,156 families have suffered loss in the 4-State area. Over 12,000 (including some summer residences) have been damaged or destroyed. In excess of 300 natural disaster staff have been assigned to the disaster area to assist local Red Cross chapter volunteers in relief work. A number of community feeding centers have been established to feed evacuated personnel. Red Cross relief expenditures are anticipated to exceed $5 million.

OEP has established disaster field offices in Sacramento, Redding, and Eureka, Calif.; Salem, Oreg.; Olympia, Wash.; and Boise, Idaho, and will establish additional offices as demands develop.

Please be assured that our staff stands ready to be of any assistance possible to you in coordinating Federal efforts in minimizing losses brought about by this disaster.

Sincerely,

FRANKLIN B. DRYDEN,
Deputy Director.

AN INDEPENDENT FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM—PROPOSALS TO CHANGE IT

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the December 28 issue of U.S. News & World Report, in a report on the problems the President faces in financing Government programs, with inflation just below the surface at home, commented that the "British pound sterling is far from out of the woods abroad. The dollar could face real problems if anything serious should happen to the pound. The boom in the United States soon will be entering its fifth year. It is important to do nothing to disturb confidence of consumers or business investors."

Earlier in December, the Honorable A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, Senator from the State of Virginia, commented in an address in New York:

> There are many Senators and Representatives who are seriously concerned about the inflationary forces that are building up and who expect the Federal Reserve and the Treasury and the Congress to live up to their responsibilities in meeting these pressures.

I want to express wholehearted agreement with that statement, particularly in view of the recent announcement that once again in the coming session legislation will be introduced to modernize the Federal Reserve System.

For years the advocates of the proposal to modernize the Federal Reserve System have pressed for a policy of cheap money and low-interest rates regardless of the economic situation. They have claimed that the system is operating unlawfully, in conflict with policies of the President and the Congress; and have told the people that their Senators and Representatives have neglected their duties by allowing this to happen. It occurs to me that some of us who think sound money is important and that cheap money would be disastrous should speak up if only to show that we are no more asleep on the job than were Carter Glass and Robert Owen and our other predecessors who made the Federal System what it is today.

Money is easy now, and has been since the 1960 slump in business. Partly because credit has been amply available, at the lowest cost in the world, the American economy has recovered well from the 1960 recession. So far, this has been accomplished without the kind of inflation we have experienced too often in the past, even though, as Senator ROBERTSON has pointed out, the money supply is growing rapidly. Commercial bank loans are increasing at better than 10 percent a year. While their home mortgage loans grew at about the 10 percent rate from mid-1963 to mid-1964, their mortgage loans on nonresidential, nonfarm properties jumped by more than 16 percent in the same period. These figures simply confirm what we can see in our own cities—that office buildings, hotels, and apartments are springing up wherever a spot can be found. I happen to agree with those who are worried about whether banks are helping to blow up a bubble that can burst in financing some of this construction, but whether that is true or not, it is clear that bank credit is doing all and probably more than it can to stimulate the economy.

The only way I can see to conclude that money is tight today is by comparison with what it would be under the World War II bond-pegging policies that we are occasionally urged to return to. We are told that the Federal Reserve could save the taxpayers $5 billion a year in interest on the Federal debt, by restoring 1946 interest rates on Government obligations. In 1946, of course, the Federal Reserve System was following a policy of buying Government obligations in whatever amounts were needed to hold interest rates on Government bonds at 2½ percent—a policy that started as part of the war effort but continued into 1951. It resulted in a mammoth increase in the money supply, and contributed to an inflation that has cost the American people far more than $5 billion a year in taxes alone, not counting what they pay in higher prices.

Congress was not asleep at the switch when this bond-pegging policy was abandoned in 1951 by mutual agreement of the Treasury and the Federal Reserve. The 1951 Treasury-Federal Reserve accord followed extensive congressional hearings and a report urging a return to a flexible monetary policy as a means of fighting both inflation and recession.

That kind of monetary policy can best be achieved by maintaining the present degree of independence of the Federal Reserve System. What this independence means—and what it does not mean—is revealed in a recent statement by the Chairman of the Board of Governors:

> Independence of the System, to me, means simply that our decisions regarding extension of Federal Reserve credit must be made in the light of their long-range impact on the value of the dollar and the soundness of the credit structure on which our market system depends, and not out of solicitude for the momentary financing needs of the Government. Independence does not mean that the Federal Reserve can establish goals in conflict with those of the President or the Congress. We should, and do, use our limited powers to produce a monetary climate in which the economy can flourish, adding its strength to the attainment of whatever goals Americans may seek. The Federal Reserve cannot overcome all the maladjustments that keep some Americans from sharing in the general prosperity any more than we can guarantee perpetual continuance of that prosperity. The Federal Reserve cannot make the policy decisions that determine ultimately whether this country's international transactions will come again into balance or its gold will flow abroad. What we can do, and all we can do, is to make credit decisions as soundly as our ability permits, so that transactions in international markets may proceed with a minimum of interference from speculative forays against the dollar, and so that domestic markets, in performing their task of bringing together those who seek goods and services and those who can supply them, may have the benefit of a reasonably stable price level. If this kind of credit climate is to be maintained, the decisions on which it depends should be made by an institution devoted solely to that end and responsible for its achievement. This is my conception of what Congress did in setting up the Federal Reserve System. This independence of judgment strengthens the formulation of the Government's overall economic policy, and the achievement of our national economic goals, as well as strengthening the credit structure on which the Government must rely to accomplish its objectives.

I see no evidence to support charges that this independence has been used to obstruct programs established by the Congress and the President. On the contrary, President Johnson and President Kennedy both have endorsed the principle of independence and emphasized the harmonious relations that exist between the administration and the Federal Reserve.

In 1952, the Patman subcommittee of the Joint Economic Committee issued a report commenting that:

> The Federal Reserve System has been a helpful institutional development. Its roots are sunk deeply in the American economy and it has borne good fruit. This is more important than that each portion of it be subject to classification by species and genus according to the rules of a textbook on public administration.

During the 1964 hearings on the Federal Reserve System, Secretary of the Treasury Dillon testified that the—

> necessity to test policy proposals against the views of an independent Federal Reserve is, I believe, the best insurance we can have that the claims of financial stability will never be neglected.

He added that the Federal Reserve—

> is a living institution that has demonstrated its capacity to innovate and to change, and which has maintained an established tradition of independent judgment, a mixture of regional participation and policymaking, with the ultimate central control here in Washington, which is unique in our Government, and it has shown an ability to attract highly qualified officials and staff and has had the reputation for operating impartially and efficiently.

To change the present Federal Reserve System to facilitate the making of cheap money will be a mistake and not in the general long-range interest of our Nation.

MEETING OF INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION GROUP JANUARY 18

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, in accordance with the bylaws, the annual meeting of the Interparliamentary Union group will be held on January 18 at 9:30 a.m. in room S–126, which is in the Capitol. It is the Appropriations Committee hearing room in the Senate wing of the Capitol.

The agenda of the meeting will include the following subjects:

First. Report of the retiring president, Mrs. Katharine St. George.

Second. Report of the Executive Secretary.

Third. Election of group officers for the 89th Congress.

Fourth. Nomination of Mrs. St. George as an honorary member.

Fifth. Plans for IPU conferences in 1965.

Mr. President, all Members of the Congress of the United States are members of the United States group of the Interparliamentary Union, and are entitled to attend the meeting and vote on subjects that come before the group. A large attendance at this meeting is hoped for.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON RETURNS OUR IMMIGRATION POLICY TO BASIC AMERICAN PRINCIPLES

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, President Johnson is making history this week. It is great history. On Tuesday he sent a splendid education program to the Congress. On Wednesday he sent an epochmaking immigration message to the Hill.

The President's legislation will abolish the existing quota system based on national origins. He rightly says:

> That system is incompatible with our basic American tradition.

And he followed this radical and inspiring proposal of reform with the following equally inspiring elaboration:

> Over the years the ancestors of all of us—some 42 million human beings—have migrated to our shores. The fundamental longtime American attitude has been to ask not where a person comes from but what are his personal qualities. On this basis men and women migrated from every quarter of the globe. By their hard work and their enormously varied talents they hewed a great nation out of a wilderness. By their dedication to liberty and equality, they created a society reflecting man's most cherished ideals.

The President's proposal is reactionary in the true meaning of that word, which means merely a return to a former policy or tradition. His proposal reincarnates what was long the fundamental American idea, ideal, and practice.

> Violation of this tradition by the national origins quota system does incalculable harm—

The President wrote, pointing out that by it is implied that immigrants from some countries are less desirable than those from others.

The fact is that the pioneering quality which caused men and women to leave their ancestral lands in the Old World with their minds and hearts fixed in hope on this land of liberty and equality, coupled with the opportunities afforded by our freedom, created, as that perspicacious French observer, Alexis de Tocqueville, shrewdly concluded, a new race of people—the Americans.

As President Franklin Delano Roosevelt once remarked to the Daughters of the American Revolution, who needed that reminder:

> Remember always that all of us, you and I especially, are descended from immigrants.

And the miracle of America is that in one generation a refugee from oppression, from poverty, from lack of opportunity for advancement and self-betterment, has achieved either for himself or for his offspring a soaring from these depths to pinnacles of happiness and achievement.

Such examples abound in our midst. In his moving preamble to his keynote address at the Democratic Convention last August, Senator John Pastore, son of immigrant parents from Italy, said:

> This is not in my script, but, indeed, it is in my heart. I would be a strange person, indeed, if I did not acknowledge this marvelous and wondrous manifestation of good will.
>
> This is something that could happen in America alone. I am a first generation native American of immigrant parents who came to this great land at the turn of the century. My State has already honored me with the two highest positions in the gift of our people to bestow upon any citizen; namely, the governorship of the State and now membership in the U.S. Senate for 14 years.

A close parallel may be found in the record of another of our colleagues, Ed Muskie.

His father, too, was an immigrant—from Poland. His son, like John Pastore, a first-generation American-born, likewise was honored by his State—Maine—with election to the governorship and then to the Senate.

I was with Ed Muskie on a visit to Russia for the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs and on Public Works to study its hydro programs when he left our party to visit his father's native village in Poland.

It was located not many miles from the town—now in Poland but then in Germany, in East Prussia—where my father was born. He, like the millions of others, had a vision of what America meant. A teenager, he left Prussia for America, where he volunteered for enlistment in the Union Army and served in the 7th New Jersey Volunteer Infantry. Returning to New York after the Battle of Five Forks, in which he fought, and Appamattox, where he witnessed the surrender of General Lee, he studied medicine, specialized in ophthalmology and otology, receiving the highest honors in both fields, being elected in 1903 as president of the American Otological Society and of the American Ophthalmological Society in 1910.

Many of our colleagues are first-generation native Americans. Like John Pastore and Edmund Muskie, Frank Lausche and Abe Ribicoff, whose parents were born in Yugoslavia and Poland, respectively, before coming to the Senate served, in the case of Senator Lausche, as both a judge and Governor of Ohio, while Senator Ribicoff served as a judge and Governor of Connecticut as well as in the Cabinet; both the parents of our wonderful majority leader, Mike Mansfield, were born in Ireland; so were Senator McNamara's; the parents of Senator Clinton Anderson, previously Secretary of Agriculture, came to this country from Sweden; Senator Javits' mother was born in Palestine, his father in Austria; both of Senator Fong's parents were born in China; our Vice-President-elect's mother, Mrs. Humphrey, came to these shores from Norway, as did the mother of Senator Warren Magnuson; Dan Inouye's father was born in Japan.

These parents, born abroad, were admitted to the United States before the national origins quota legislation was enacted in the 1920's. Had it been in effect at that time, it is quite possible that the parents of some of these outstanding Americans might not have been admitted.

The President's bill will eliminate other discriminations in existing immigration law. It will rectify the hardships involved in the separation of families by existing quota restrictions. It will give, for the first time, favorable consideration to immigrants with special skills. It will extend more generous acceptance to victims of persecution, to exiles from tyranny in less happy lands.

If the Goddess of Liberty, whose statue has long been the symbol and beacon of hope in New York Harbor to the arriving immigrants, could speak, she would doubtless say: "Again, Mr. President, I can lift my lamp beside the golden door."

Perhaps it would be appropriate at this point to read into the Record Emma Lazarus' classic poem "The New Colossus," whose message has been revalidated by President Johnson:

Not like the brazen giant of Greek fame,
With conquering limbs astride from land to land;
Here at our sea-washed sunset gates shall stand
A mighty woman with a torch whose flame
Is the imprisoned lightning, and her name
Mother of Exiles. From her beacon-hand
Glows worldwide welcome; her mild eyes command
The air-bridged harbor that twin cities frame.
"Keep, ancient lands, your storied pomp," cries she
With silent lips. "Give me your tired, your poor,
Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free,
The wretched refuse of your teeming shore.
Send these, the homeless, tempest tossed, to me.
I lift my lamp beside the golden door.

MAJOR ISSUES FACING THE COUNTRY—ANALYSIS BY NATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR EFFECTIVE CONGRESS

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the National Committee for an Effective Congress has prepared an excellent analysis of some of the major issues which face the Congress, the Executive, and the Nation at large in the years ahead. In his state of the Union message, President Johnson demonstrated the kind of leadership which the National Committee for an Effective Congress calls for in its statement. I trust that every Congressman, and particularly those of the President's own party, will give generously of their assistance in helping to build a better America.

I ask unanimous consent to have excerpts from the committee's statement appear at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Analysis by National Committee for Effective Congress

THE CENTURY OF EXPLOSIONS

Our globe is in upheaval and even our private worlds are being altered beyond recognition under the impact of onrushing technological and social changes. Willy-nilly, and with bewildering speed, the entire human race is being swept into new ways of life as radically different from our present condition as modern society is from that of the stone age.

The world has been shaken by the explosion of the atom, but more profound are the upheavals being caused by five cultural explosions: of population, of technology, of urban life, of knowledge, and of human expectations.

Our species which 500 years ago did not even know the shape of its own planet now talks of populating the solar system. And the burgeoning of new capabilities has sparked a worldwide undisciplined demand for economic amenities and social opportunities undreamed of a generation ago.

Those who understand the rate of change and anticipate the problems it will bring are deeply worried. The dislocation of human perspectives is so universal and rapid that we are now crossing the historical equivalent of a sound barrier unaware, and we are entering a new mode of life unprepared.

It is a premonition of what is happening to us as individuals that causes many to recoil from reality and hide behind simple fantasies. No longer is there refuge in the "elaborate cake of custom" which mitigated the personal impact of past changes. "What seems to threaten the whole post-1914 world," says historian William McNeill, "is a general dissolution of local cakes of custom, leaving millions without precise convictions as to what they should do." The shaking of the standards and norms of even modern society has plunged the world into vast insecurity.

The impelling forces are beyond the power of any man or system of government to subtantially retard or abate. What can be hoped for—and possibly all that should be attempted—is to channel these forces in such a way as to preserve the decencies of a free society and assure continued exercise of individual aspiration and creativity. Theoretically, at least, we have the means to implement any reasonable choice as to the direction our efforts should take. The problem is to make the choice of goals and determine what course will get us there.

This is the essence of politics. It will be the task of statesmanship to understand that we live on the brink of a vastly different future and to communicate that understanding so that governmental action can anticipate and guide the flow of events. It will not be easy to convince comfortable Americans that they must determine to do something about the blight, unrest, anxiety and despair which are the byproducts of these revolutionary forces. For on the surface of our national life a shimmering prosperity obscures problems with a dazzling and bewildering abundance enjoyed by those who won or inherited a place in today's society.

A FORWARD LOOK AT FOREIGN POLICY

The upheaval is worldwide, churning all areas and peoples impartially. It seems bound, within the next 100 or 200 years, to cover the entire globe with a relatively uniform, automated and computerized civilization.

Everywhere the transition is profound and painful: from the problems of urbanization and automation that occupy the advanced societies, to the difficulty of reconciling electricity and cannibalism in the most primitive. Where we in the West have only to move from the 20th century into the 21st, others have to reach it from the stone age and from various intermediate stages.

To meet these forces of change since 1945 the United States has made many accommodations in foreign policy. But it is hard to think of any instance since the Marshall plan where American policy successfully joined with the forces of history in achieving a major success. Our diplomacy and military efforts have been largely protective, relying in essence on the force of arms in a balance of terror. Our other aid, trade, cultural exchange and people-to-people efforts, like the Peace Corps, have won modest successes. But while the postwar situation required the highest priority for military preparedness, events now call for a variety of initiatives along far broader and more imaginative fronts which would exploit what is still America's most potent resource, the compelling force of a free society.

To this end American statesmanship will have to be directed toward three major international opportunities facing the Johnson administration immediately:

(1) A recovered Europe is capable of standing on its own feet and determined to make its own choice as to where it should go. If the Atlantic community is to survive in any meaningful sense, it must now be on the basis of consensus and newly defined common purpose.

(2) The Soviets are encountering grave problems in overcoming economic inefficiency and political instability. These problems are our opportunity—not merely for respite in the cold war but also for a rollback of communism where it is most dangerous: in the minds of its adherents. Now that the frailties and frauds of the Soviet system are evident even to the Communists themselves, we have a chance to find ways of persuading them to make adjustments that will bring their society more into line with our own.

(3) In aiding the backward areas, we must act even more in terms of cultural and political effect than in economic terms. This is a matter of understanding the basis of our own accomplishment—that habeas corpus and freedom of speech preceded the industrial revolution. We must be able to communicate to others the value of freedom with such examples as the success of the American Homestead Act in contrast to the failure of the centrally administered Soviet virgin lands program.

We have shown too little creative initiative in promoting the democratic thesis through diplomacy, trade and politics, and have relied too much on frozen military postures. The ties that constricted the old power blocs are now falling apart, and a greater flexibility characterizes the international scene.

THE EXPLOSIONS HIT HOME

At home the problems intertwine and interact, but all stem from the explosions of our century:

The technological explosion, with automated production techniques requiring fewer people at higher educational levels.

A knowledge explosion in which data accumulation is growing at twice the rate of the rest of the economy.

A population explosion in which the 190 million Americans today may become 300 million in less than 40 years.

The effects of these explosions, which become cases in themselves, include:

Urbanization, the growth of megalopolis, requiring the doubling of dwellings and work spaces by the year 2000—building in 35 years the equal of everything constructed in North America since the Pilgrims landed.

Atomization and uglification of individual lives under increasing tension, frustration, noise, congestion, and endemic disorder.

"Underclass" sedimentation, the accumulation of professional poor who live on doles in subsidized ghettos outside the culture, which become political enclaves manipulated by demagogs who perpetuate the boroughs of blight, color being used to reinforce economic barriers.

Youth without hope who drop out of schools that can provide no motivation, expanding the number of unemployable in an increasingly technological economy.

Contraction of free enterprise and opportunity caused by concentration, merger, monopoly, and conglomerate monopoly, galloping toward corporate statism, and fostered by mass control of tastes and standards.

Obsolete governmental apparatus with overlapping and duplication of Federal, State, and local functions unsuited for complex problems which often spill over their arbitrary boundaries and require improvisation of new administrative units such as interstate port and highway authorities.

These are not problems which can be solved by nostalgic New Deal thinking. Today, many of the liberal welfare concepts of the past irritate rather than cure. The difficulties of the affluent society do not derive from poverty, and they may require the ministration of artists and psychologists as much as the ministration of Dr. Walter Heller. Economics is only one factor among many, and the solutions which alleviated starvation may not be equally applicable to glut.

THE EMPTY "IN" BOX AND THE EMPTY LOBBY

These historic imperatives have not yet matured as political issues. They are not found on the agendas of the great lobbies and there is no public clamor for their solution. Business, labor, agriculture, and the Government bureaucracy itself, which constitute the major pressures on policy formation, are not consciously involved with the explosive issues of tomorrow. Each interest group conserves its Sunday punch to protect its own economic base, jealously defending a special power domain within a heavily featherbedded status quo. For the most part, their influence is defensive as they exert vetoes rather than venture initiatives.

Even the intellectual community is not yet exerting a coherent influence upon Government or the public for attention to these problems. The folklore of liberalism is still dominated by memories of the great depression and the concept of a mature economy whose principal problems were distributive.

Administering the future is going to be vastly different from disposing of the accumulated agenda items of the past. In the words of a White House aid, retorting to the suggestion that the landslide made things easier for the President: "From here on our work is going to be mostly self-generating. It is a lot more challenging when you have to be creative than when you are fielding problems as they hit you."

President Johnson's "in" box is virtually empty. The leftover housekeeping problems from the last years of Eisenhower and the unfinished domestic program of the Kennedy administration have been substantially dealt with in Johnson's first, spectacular year. (Medicare seems almost certain of generous enactment by the incoming Congress.)

Lyndon Johnson now stands before a vast horizon on which he, more than any other individual in the world, can determine where the road should go. Never before in history has it been possible for a society to option its future to such a degree. The physical environment, including the production of food, has largely been conquered. The location of new cities can be arbitrarily fixed. Our society is being governed more and more by fiat. Population and industry flow to the district whose Congressman wins the research and development project. The computer has replaced the town meeting. The engineer, the economist, the other specialists will provide the data. How it will be used, the rate of change and the balance between human values and management efficiency, will be determined by the politician.

MR. JOHNSON'S BRAIN BANK

In approaching the complexities of the scientific age, Mr. Johnson has called upon school men and experts for suggestions and programs—bypassing Government departments cursed with routine thinking. The President must start anew because he does not have the backlog available to Franklin Roosevelt whose New Deal ideas and top command were assembled and rehearsed in Albany before he occupied the White House, or of John Kennedy who was presented with a 4-year accumulation of basic position papers for the New Frontier by the Democratic Advisory Council.

Since last June some 13 task forces have been preparing analytical studies and recommendations for the President. They were kept carefully out of sight, and premature disclosure of their findings avoided. These findings are now being conveyed to the President through the Bureau of the Budget.

The panel on education is one of the most impressive, and its thinking probably will rate very high when the legislative program is drawn at the White House. Its chairman is John W. Gardner, president of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, and its members include David Riesman, Jerrold Zacharias, Edwin Land, and Father Paul Clare Reinert. As with all panels, the executive secretary is a Budget official.

Robert Wood of MIT is chairman of the panel studying urban problems; Carl Kaysen heads the one on foreign economic policy; Paul Samuelson on unemployment; and Richard Goodwin on beautification of the physical environment. There are panels on resources and other major subjects. The President is known to have urged all panels to submit their "best thinking" on the various problem areas, and to let him worry about political feasibility.

Whether their recommendations will be welded together in one comprehensive program for Congress is not yet known. "The work is uneven, some of it imaginative, and some of it flat," says a White House confidant. "Don't look for a Great Society blueprint, with every White House proposal being another brick or doorknob to fit a master plan."

While the depth and impact of these task forces should not be exaggerated, they indicate that the President is reaching for fresh ideas. This fact will tend to give his proposals a degree of special authority with Congressmen. But the age when philosophers advise the king is not yet at hand, for the program must first survive its trial by Congress. In making the transition from the obese society to the Great Society, the Congress will be the President's prime vehicle and prime obstacle.

II. THE PRESIDENT

Whether Lyndon Johnson gets a footnote or whole chapters in history will depend on his ability to work in the fields of the future. In the broadest sense the President will have to be our prophet—the seer through whose eyes we perceive and prepare for the worlds of tomorrow. (As Senate leader, Lyndon Johnson was known as "the master of the immediate." Today the pace is so swift that the immediate is what is at the other end of the telescope.)

Within the past decade Mr. Johnson has served his country at three different levels—as the legislator-arbitrator, as the President-inheritor, and now as the President-leader. He proved masterful at the first two levels. His talent for flexibility and parliamentary maneuver made him a successful broker between contending forces. The same man must now raise an uncompromising standard and be the passionate champion for his own program.

There is much speculation in Washington as to how Johnson will carry this new role. He will be required to show a degree of creativity and inventiveness not demanded in his previous tasks. As a southern Congressman puts it: "He will have to probe deeply into what America means and where it ought to be 20 years from now. He will have to surround himself with mature and farsighted aids. Mere political competence won't carry him through." He will have to risk his popularity, and rebuff many of the divergent groups who rallied under that "one big tent" on election day, if he is to move a comfortable society toward difficult goals.

Many in Congress may realize the existence of the real imperatives but only the President can get the kind of visceral understanding from the country which is necessary for legislative action.

Whether Johnson has the requirements of history in mind as he moves will be tested by many benchmarks, such as whether he:

Does not intervene to protect the two southern Democratic bolters to Goldwater from being purged from the Democratic caucus in the House.

Resists efforts to tamper with reapportionment.

Urges an education program geared to upgrading curriculum content and quality rather than mere construction of school buildings.

Invents new regional frameworks for adjusting to urbanization.

Attempts to cure problems like traffic congestion and slum proliferation rather than merely subsidizing the problems by pouring money into existing agencies for servicing them.

Encouraging elimination of featherbedding in industry and labor along the direction he has already taken with respect to the military.

Can Johnson the tactician and administrator, also become Johnson the teacher and missionary? He has not been noted as a great orator, but few have resisted his rare gift of persuasion. One of the President's friends who has worked with him closely for many years says: "Lyndon knows there's no public understanding of the really fundamental problems so he tries to push them himself. He wants to develop a kind of onrushing consensus; then he will run around ahead of it so that he can lead it or have it push him. He will start from scratch on an issue and end with 80 percent of the public behind him. Lyndon is a very sophisticated man."

On the other hand, another knowledgeable Democrat doubts that President Johnson will try anything really creative with Congress: "The one word Lyndon learned in 24 years on Capitol Hill is 'do-able.' You only try the 'do-able.'"

But when you are President of the United States what is "do-able" depends in a large measure on what you try.

III. CONGRESS

New combination to unlock the House

The new Congress is the most heavily Democratic since 1937–38. Although there has been no significant change in the Senate, the Democrats in the House now have roughly the same 2-to-1 margin enjoyed by their colleagues in the other body.

On the surface it would appear that the President should have an easier task with his legislative program in the next 2 years than any predecessor for the past 26. In fact, it may be expected that President Johnson's legislative record will be as stunning in 1965 and 1966 as it was in the year just completed. Lyndon Johnson knows his Congress very well and it would not be in character for him to ask Congress for much that he is not sure he can get.

But if he tailors his program just to congressional expectations he may not try for what really is needed. And accepting such a limitation would in effect be accepting a hidden congressional veto. Since the President must deal in realities, he cannot ignore this hidden veto, but he can attempt to reduce it by public education and by encouraging such redeployment of power within Congress as will put it in a forward posture.

Many moves to reposition congressional power are about to be initiated by the Members themselves. The most significant will occur in the House where the election produced shifts in numerical strength to which the membership will now try to give expression in the power structure.

The election changed the party balance from 258 Democrats and 176 Republicans (and 1 vacancy) to 295 Democrats and 140 Republicans.

The ranks of the Democratic study group, which this year had its own campaign committee and gave important support to the incoming freshmen, will be increased from about 125 to about 165 Members. The time is ripe to obtain some needed reforms, and the DSG is planning to move on a broad front on opening day, with favorable prospects for Speaker McCORMACK's support on at least some of their proposals.

The Democratic study group aim is to make changes in three areas: (A) to strengthen the liberal position in the Democratic caucus, (B) to strengthen the position of the Speaker vis-a-vis the committee chairmen, and (C) to achieve some reforms in the operation of Congress itself.

(A) Within the Democratic caucus, the DSG will attempt to deny seats to JOHN BELL WILLIAMS, of Mississippi, and ALBERT W. WATSON, of South Carolina, who supported the Goldwater-Miller ticket. Exclusion from caucus would mean loss of their committee assignments and seniority rights and would probably cause the two Members to request designation as Republicans. The DSG also plans to move to require caucus approval of all committee assignments proposed by the Democrats' committee on committees so as to assure fairer assignment of committee posts. Finally, in this category, the DSG is proposing the establishment of a Democratic policy or steering committee "to discuss and implement leadership policy."

(B) The liberals are also advocating three proposals to strengthen the hand of the Speaker on the theory that as their elected leader he must be more responsive to their interests than are the committee chairmen whose power derives from seniority. These proposals include a "21-day rule" by which the Speaker could bring a bill to the floor despite the opposition of the Rules Committee, a rule to permit the Speaker to bypass the Rules Committee in sending a bill to conference with the Senate, and a provision easing the requirements for a petition to discharge a bill from the Rules Committee when the Speaker supports the petition.

(C) Also being advanced by the DSG is revision of the party ratios on all committees to reflect the new division in the House and reform of the Congress itself. Inclusion of the powerful Ways and Means and Appropriations Committees would be particularly rough on the Republicans, since by common consent their ratios were left undisturbed in past changes.

Finally, the DSG is calling for the establishment of a Joint Committee on Congressional Reorganization "to modernize House and Senate procedures." Sentiment for such a movement has been mounting for several years. If the Democrats show a willingness to give serious attention to Republican-advocated reforms (such as increased minority staffs on congressional committees and assurance of equal time for the minority in floor debates) it is likely that this move will be successful and that a new Legislative Reorganization Act may be passed before the next election.

A parallel Senate effort has been launched by Senator MIKE MONRONEY, Democrat, of Oklahoma, who has proposed a reorganization bill for introduction in January.

The Senate without Humphrey

In the Senate, where the numbers and names are virtually unchanged, the principal points of interest stem from the departure of HUBERT HUMPHREY and the party switch of STROM THURMOND.

The Democrats without HUMPHREY will suffer a loss of flavor regardless of who is elected to succeed him as whip. This is not a reflection on the present candidates for assistant leader, but on HUMPHREY's incomparable energy and instant and detailed familiarity with all the major issues. Even if the legislative aspects of the whip's job should be conducted as ably, the image projected to the public will be different, for few men convey such an ebullient awareness of the thrust of history as does the Vice-President-elect.

While THURMOND will not set any kind of denominator at all for the Republicans, almost all of whom come from areas remote from his influence, his presence in their Senate ranks will spark their first major intraparty conflict at the opening of the session. For they are confronted with the awkward problem of deciding whether to continue his membership on the Armed Forces and Commerce Committees to which he was assigned by the Democrats. Also, they must decide whether to allow him to retain his accumulated seniority or compel him to start at the bottom of the ladder. Pro-Goldwater Senators, grateful for THURMOND's help during the campaign, are virtually honorbound to insist that his status remain unchanged. But other Republicans, reluctant to see him preempt highly desirable committee seats or be ranked above Republicans who have been on those committees for many years, are preparing to make a fight. Senator HUGH SCOTT, of Pennsylvania, has vowed that "there will be blood on the moon" if the Goldwaterites attempt to push THURMOND to the head of their line.

Of possible greatest significance for the success of President Johnson's program in the new Senate stems not from the last election but from the prospect of the next. Although only one-third of the Senate is up for reelection every 2 years, 10 of the 22 southern Senators come up in 1966. All will be wanting things from the administration in the next 2 years—contracts, bases, and the like, to help shore up their positions with the voters. This is a kind of need Lyndon Johnson understands, and which he will use to good advantage.

In what shape is the elephant?

The record the Republicans make and the image they project in the new Congress will determine how they run for reelection in 1966, and ultimately what platform the presidential candidate runs on in 1968.

The making of this record and image will not be significantly hampered by the reduction in their numbers. The floor will still be open to Republicans in debate and reporters will still come to them for their view of administration proposals.

More significant will be what they do about their inner divisions. House Republicans especially have been too fearful of straying from the party fold on issues and their leadership has been too rigid in its conception of the obligations of party unity. The result has been a kind of sterile opposition which has proven disastrously unattractive to the voters and has not even had much effect in Congress. With a smaller membership oppositionism offers even less prospect of affecting either the legislative output or the public impression.

Simultaneous with growing realization of these facts there has arisen a desperate conviction on the part of moderate Republicans that they must be creative in their own right—that they must study problems and offer solutions that bear the stamp of their own principles and their own insights into the nature and requirements of our times.

Moves are afoot to change the Republican leadership structure in the House so as to permit greater flexibility on the part of the Members and to provide for more research and policy formulation. Whatever their success may be in the next few weeks, however, it is certain that individual Members and groups of Members will be moving much more boldly on their own in these areas.

The Republican moderates, though scarred in the recent election, did not suffer the gross amputations that befell the conservatives, altering the balance of power within their party—24 of 62 Republican Congressmen who signed a preconvention endorsement of Barry Goldwater will not be back in January, while only 4 of the 34 incumbent Representatives endorsed by the newly formed Committee to Support Moderate Republicans went down to defeat.

Looking around the country at the durability of moderate republicanism in winning and holding governorships in most of the major metropolitan States, and at their survival in the Congress, the moderates have much greater confidence than heretofore in the viability of their own political posture and in the possibility of building on their present base.

IV. THE TWO REVOLUTIONS

Whatever current political leadership may or may not see or accomplish—either at the presidential or congressional level—two revolutions are underway which are making our political system more representative, and which will greatly enhance our prospects for dealing with the problems ahead.

Polarization in the South

First, the revolution in the South is bringing millions of new voters into the electorate, hastening the development of a two-party system and liberating southern Members of Congress from the necessity to trade positions on economic issues in order to buy northern conservative opposition to civil rights measures. This revolution is a product of rising levels of Negro education and leadership, and of the advancing economic integration of the South with the rest of the country, creating new entrepreneur and middle classes which tend to divide politically along lines familiar elsewhere.

A common pattern has been evident in Texas and parts of Tennessee, Florida, North Carolina, and Georgia. Liberal and labor groups have begun to gain more influence within the one-party structure through reinforcement by Negro voters. As this has happened conservatives have left the Democratic party and joined the Republicans.

A polarization process is underway. Inevitably, it tends to accelerate. Some half dozen Congressmen and one Senator from formerly Confederate States voted for the civil rights bill. All were reelected because of the great new numbers of voting Negroes. In turn, the civil rights bill will hasten the entrance of new Negroes into the electorate. This fact and the example of the survival of all those who voted for the bill will encourage others to make comparable breaks in the future.

This process is now irreversible. Powerful forces remain which will attempt to slow it down; but the task of statesmanship is to help it to completion.

The prospective ousting of the two southern Goldwater supporters from Democratic ranks in the House has more than merely punitive significance. Involved is a decision by the party on whether to encourage other Dixiecrats to follow Senator Strom Thurmond. Most southern liberals feel that such an act is essential to hasten the progress of the revolution. They argue that the fewer antagonists of that revolution within the party, the easier the transition will be.

Although the President has expressed no position on the ousting of Williams and Watson, there have been brisk rumors that he is opposed. This would be consistent with his "everybody under one big tent" approach. Nevertheless, the rumors must be taken with a grain of salt because many southerners are fighting the ouster move, and their strongest weapon would be an impression that the President is on their side. Symbolically and practically what is at stake here is the future of the Democratic Party and of the revolution in the South; any position the President may take would be a clear signal of his own intent concerning that future.

Reapportionment everywhere

The second revolution in our political system is a result of the rapid urbanization of our population.

Urbanization created increasing inequities in the apportionment of Federal and State legislative seats, preserving an outdated imbalance in favor of rural areas. This gave rise to mounting pressure for court-ordered reforms which have finally been acknowledged by our judiciary. Now a vast process of reapportionment is underway.

Within a few years the metropolitan-rural balance of power in national and local government will be fundamentally and irrevocably altered. And for the first time political power in the new America will be deployed in such a way as to be responsive to the areas with the greatest problems.

The effects bear not only upon whether urban, suburban, and rural areas are equitably represented in Government bodies, but upon the internal character of the political organizations of the parties themselves.

Take a hypothetical case of a Midwestern State consisting of one large metropolitan area and a predominantly rural out-State area. Assume that presently 100 members of the State legislature are apportioned so that 70 represent the rural areas and 30 the metropolitan areas. Reapportion that State so as to reverse these numbers. The consequence will be that 40 of the legislative seats (more than half of those now held by rural representatives) will go to the metropolitan area. This means that 40 State legislators will have to shift their orientation and their views in order to survive—or be replaced by others of more metropolitan views. And reinforcing this there will evolve a shift in outlook of the organizations which try to elect their candidates.

Since outside of the South, the Republican Party has held most of these rural seats, the consequence will be an upward flowing reorientation of the entire party to a more modern and representative outlook. This suggests that the present Goldwaterite movement may well prove to be the last gasp of Main Street Republicanism as we have known it since World War I. Similar effects will occur in the Democratic Party in the South, enhancing the impact of the civil rights revolution.

REPRESENTATIVE WATSON'S DECISION TO BECOME A MEMBER OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on January 12, 1965, the able and distinguished Representative from my congressional district, the Honorable Albert Watson, announced his decision to become a member of the Republican Party. It was my pleasure to be present in Columbus, S.C., with Representative Watson on this occasion.

In making his announcement, Representative Watson presented a most eloquent statement outlining the reasons for his decision to switch from the Democrat to the Republican Party, and also to offer his resignation from the Congress so that the people of his district might have an opportunity to express themselves on his action.

In making this decision, Representative Watson again demonstrated great courage and sincerity in standing by his convictions as he did when he declared himself in favor of the Republican nominee for President in the general election campaign of last fall. In announcing his support of Senator Goldwater, Representative Watson realized that he would be subjected to abuse and retaliation by his Democratic colleagues in the House of Representatives. Nevertheless, he felt in his heart that he must follow his convictions regardless of the odds and regardless of the cost involved. On January 2, 1965, his Democratic colleagues in the House did choose to retaliate against him and another distinguished and able Representative, the Honorable John Bell Williams, of Mississippi, for exercising their free will and standing by their convictions in the presidential election.

Representative Albert Watson is not only a courageous gentleman, but he is also a man of outstanding ability who has so won the support and confidence of the people of his district that he was renominated and reelected to a second term in the Congress this past year without any opposition.

I am confident, Mr. President, that the people in the Second Congressional District in South Carolina will stand by Representative Watson with another strong vote of confidence when a special election is called to fill the vacancy which will be created by his resignation, and this will be a fitting testimonial to an outstanding Representative, a dedicated patriot, and a courageous American.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed in the Record a copy of Representative Watson's statement, and also a copy of a statement issued by me on January 4, 1965.

There being no objection, the statement and news release were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY CONGRESSMAN ALBERT WATSON, SECOND CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

This has been a most difficult decision, and, while I assume full responsibility for the consequences thereof, I am deeply grateful for the advice given me by many citizens from all walks of life. First, let me assure everyone that the action I am taking is not motivated by personal anger or vindictiveness. If only my personal welfare were at stake, I could withstand all of the abuses and insults given me by the Democrats, both in Washington and at home. However, the issue is not just punishment of me, but punishment of the people I am honored to represent.

When the Democratic caucus stripped me of my seniority, they likewise punished the people of South Carolina. When they denied my postal patronage, they likewise punished the people of South Carolina. When they relegated me to a position of second-class Congressman within the Democratic Party, they likewise relegated the people of this district to the same status, because my position in the last presidential election was overwhelmingly supported by the citizens of South Carolina. Personal abuse I can stand, but I will not tolerate abuse of the people I represent.

The question is not how much seniority I lost in being pushed behind some 70 freshmen Democrats in Congress, but the question is whether or not the punishment was just and correct. I refuse to have the Congressman of this district punished while the Congressman from Harlem, ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, is rewarded for the same offense. Obviously, the Democratic Party leadership of South Carolina has again swallowed this double standard and discriminatory practice against a fellow South Carolinian. Again, as in November, they are blindly following the national Democratic line, with utter disregard to the traditional beliefs of the South Carolina Democratic Party.

In my judgment, the Democratic Party of Jackson and Jefferson, indeed the Democratic Party of South Carolina, is dead. The party has abandoned its original ideals and principles and has become the party of special interests and pressure groups. Today the attitude of the liberal extremist within the Democratic Party is not only one of intolerance toward a conservative, but of actual vindictiveness toward a conservative in the South. Witness the 148 Members of Congress, primarily Democrats, who voted against the seating of the entire Mississippi delegation, which had been duly elected by the people of that State.

In reaching this decision, I was deeply concerned as to its effect upon Fort Jackson and Shaw Air Force Base. These are the finest military installations in America, and I am extremely grateful that both have been greatly expanded during the brief period I have served in Congress. This expansion was not because of politics, but because of need. We should all remember that these military facilities were not placed here for political reasons, but to meet a military need, and that need exists even more today than ever before in so-called peacetime history. While I have been sadly disappointed with the gradual deterioration of the Democratic Party, God forbid that it or its leaders would stoop to the low of playing politics with our military preparedness. Certainly, I shall continue to work with my esteemed friend, Congressman RIVERS, and the other responsible members of the Armed Services Committee, for the greater expansion of these installations.

A person does not lightly decide to leave the traditional party of his father, but in reality I am not leaving the party, because the Democratic Party has left us. Then too, it is not easy for a man to choose to affiliate with the Republican Party when it has just suffered a severe defeat in the last election. No doubt the easy road and the one of political expediency would have been for me to have apologized, sought to make amends with the Democratic leadership and gotten on the bandwagon. While such may have been the easy road politically, I believe it would have been the road of dishonor.

In choosing the Republican Party, I am joining those Congressmen who are fighting for South Carolina, on our side against the Supreme Court decision to reapportion, while the Democrats are fighting against us. In joining the Republican Party, I shall be working with those Congressmen who believe that South Carolina should have the right to retain its State right-to-work law, while the Democrats are fighting to destroy it. Yes, in choosing the Republican Party, I am joining those who are fighting for a strong, consistent, and sensible foreign policy, and for a sound domestic program within the limits of our budget, as well as for a limitation of the Federal bureaucracy which threatens the destruction of all individual's and States rights.

I have also considered the possibility of declaring myself as an Independent. Some for whom I have the highest respect have urged this course. However, with no Independent Party or organization in Congress, a person in such position would be seriously handicapped in trying to serve his people. Also, an Independent would be at the mercy of the majority party, in this case the Democrats, for his committee assignments. If, as a Democrat, they have stripped me of my seniority because of my refusal to put party before principles, you could well imagine how the Democrats would treat me as an Independent. Instead of being forced to eat the Democratic crumbs in the kitchen, while ADAM CLAYTON POWELL sits at the head of the banquet table, I would no doubt be assigned to the woodshed. The people of this district deserve better treatment.

In order to best represent the people of my district and State I must work within the framework of one of the national parties. The Republican leadership of the National Congress has assured me of its help and cooperation in serving the people of this State. The Democratic leadership has, by its very action, served notice on the people it will do all within its power to defeat any officeholder who refuses to support the national party line. The Republican leadership in South Carolina has demonstrated its interest in complete and free representation for the people, whereas the Democratic chairman of South Carolina is interested only in the National Democratic Party and the name "Democrat." Believing I was elected to serve all the people of the Second District, I have tried during the past 2 years to do just that. My doors were always open to all citizens—Republican, Democratic, independent alike—and no partiality was given in my efforts to be of service. This I shall continue to do.

Having decided that it is for the best interest of the Second Congressional District for me to affiliate with the Republican Party, I was next faced with the problem of whether or not I should resign from Congress, since I was elected as a Democrat.

Many citizens have said that I would be justified in making the change without resigning, since the Democratic caucus had unduly punished me, since I was elected by all the people and not just the Democrats, and further, since the people of this district overwhelmingly supported my position. While these are compelling arguments, I still feel that justification of my action can and must come from a free expression of the people.

Others have said my resignation is not necessary, since the State Democratic Party chairman has repeatedly called for my defeat and further urged me to join the Republican Party, as did that courageous and patriotic Senator, STROM THURMOND. Notwithstanding the statements made by these party leaders, I still feel that all of the people should be given an opportunity to express themselves on this matter.

Still others have said that, should I resign, it will necessitate an expensive special election for the people, as well as unnecessary campaign costs for me, which I can ill afford. I cannot believe you can equate the privilege of voting to dollars and cents, and certainly, I would never consider the financial problem imposed on me by resigning when the right of the people to settle an issue is at stake.

Accordingly, to remove all doubt as to whether or not I was right in standing by my convictions in November and in opposing the Democratic liberal extremists, I am submitting my resignation from Congress to the Speaker of the House, effective the date following a special election which will be set by the Governor. The reason I am delaying the date of my resignation is because I do not want the people of this district to lose their representation in Congress, and, notwithstanding the heavy demands of a campaign, I shall not neglect my responsibilities in Washington. In that special election I shall seek the nomination for Congress on the Republican ticket.

To those many friends who urged me not to resign, I can only say that I have done so because I believe it to be the most honorable course I can follow. Only the people themselves can resolve this issue. It will present problems for all of us, as I am voluntarily resigning from almost a full term in Congress, to which I was elected without opposition. Yet as our illustrious senior statesman, James F. Byrnes, has stated, "I am doing this because I believe it is right." Regardless of the political consequences for me, I shall have the assurance of doing what I believe is right.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR STROM THURMOND, REPUBLICAN, OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Under a Socialist system, freedom must necessarily be suppressed in order to bring about conformity with the will of the ruling power. This truism was proved again Saturday when House Democrats voted to punish Congressmen ALBERT WATSON, of South Carolina, and JOHN BELL WILLIAMS, of Mississippi, for exercising their free will and standing by their convictions in the presidential election.

This is the type of coercive action which can be expected from Socialist-Democrats who have changed the Democratic Party into the Socialist Party and who now are determined to make our Nation a Socialist America.

This should serve as a lesson, not to the two Congressmen, but rather to all Americans who wish to preserve their own free will. If these two Congressmen have committed any sin in refusing to support their party's national ticket, they must answer to the people who gave them their position of public trust and service—not to their colleagues in Washington.

It is especially discriminatory to select these two southern Congressmen for punishment while letting Congressman ADAM CLAYTON POWELL serve as chairman of a committee even though he exercised his right to dissent from the national party ticket in 1956. This is a point which will not be overlooked as the Democratic Party fades into further oblivion in the South as a result of this action.

Again, I commend both of these gallant men for standing by their convictions, even in the face of threats of reprisals. They have served well their consciences and in doing so have thus lived up to the trust reposed in them by their people to always stand for what they believe to be right.

THE NIKE X MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEM

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the most critical inadequacy in our strategic defense remains the absence of any defense against ballistic missiles. As time goes by, this inadequacy grows even more critical.

Currently a second generation ballistic missile defense system, the Nike X is under development. The Army has not recommended a production commitment for the Nike X for fiscal year 1966, reportedly because the production of the Nike X system is not yet at the point where technical progress dictates that failure to produce would result in obsolescence. This, of course, is a question at which Congress needs to look quite closely in the coming weeks.

The Army did reportedly request preproduction engineering funds for the system, but the request was denied by the Secretary of Defense. Certainly this is a matter which needs to be corrected in the authorization of funds which Congress will consider shortly.

It is encouraging to note that increasing public notice is being taken of the critical deficiency in the field of ballistic missile defenses and the urgency of deploying the Nike X system. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks a column by Joseph Alsop from the Washington Post of January 13, 1965, entitled "Next Year, the Nike X"; an article from Missiles & Rockets of January 4, 1965, entitled "Study Aids Case for Nike X"; and an editorial from the same issue of Missiles & Rockets entitled "The Threat."

There being no objection, the articles and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Jan. 13, 1965]

NEXT YEAR, THE NIKE X

(By Joseph Alsop)

A great deal of nonsense is being talked about the continuous future shrinkage of the U.S. defense budget—nonsense, at least, if President Johnson does not repeat the big mistake that so gravely marred President Truman's otherwise remarkable record.

The circumstances are not absolutely dissimilar, for there is very little doubt that the prime cause of Harry S. Truman's big mistake was the new self-confidence inspired by being elected President in his own right in 1948. The mistake was to cease to take the cold war seriously, and to cut the defense budget to ribbons. The result was the Korean war.

In the case of President Johnson, the test of his real intentions about defense policy will come, perhaps fortunately for him, only after another year has gone by. The test will be whether he decides to pay the heavy bill—perhaps as much as $40 billion over a period of years—to give the United States an effective antiballistic missile defense system.

Next year is the test's due date, because the Defense Department's brilliant Nike X development program will then reach the stage of large-scale contracting for hardware. When that time comes, it is going to be vastly more difficult for President Johnson to reject the Nike X program than it was for President Kennedy to reject Nike-Zeus.

President Kennedy's rejection of Nike-Zeus, though much criticized at the time, was undoubtedly wise. This first effective American antiballistic missile is a good weapon, but it has the grave defects that are normal in first essays in new kinds of weaponry.

Specifically, Nike-Zeus can be easily fooled by decoys attached to an attacker's ballistic missiles, and it is not capable of warding off a saturation attack. For just these reasons, President Kennedy overruled the U.S. Army, which wished to spend $10 billion on Nike-Zeus deployment, and instead ordered development of the vastly more advanced Nike X.

Nike X is like Nike-Zeus in being a point defense weapon, as all antiballistic missiles must almost certainly be for some time to come. But novel radar and other systems, now almost completely tested with striking success, protect Nike X from fooling by decoy devices. And this crucial improvement, plus much greater speed and other advantages, make a Nike X defense system fully capable of dealing with a saturation attack of enemy ballistic missiles.

A complete defense is of course impossible. Some attackers must always get through. Yet the figures are enough to show that despite its high cost, a Nike X defense system will be a worthwhile investment. The right way to think of it is to imagine a sound insurance policy, costing about $500 a head, on the lives of no less than 70 million Americans.

As of now, since this country has no antiballistic missile defense and no shelter system to speak of, a Soviet missile attack on the United States is estimated to be likely to cost the lives of rather more than half the population—around 110 million persons, in fact. But a complete Nike X defense system would save the lives of 70 million; and it would also save a proportional share of our cities and our industry, thus making it possible for our industrial society to survive as an organism. There is only one condition. Congress must overcome its aversion to a serious shelter program, which is needed to make the Nike X system work.

The annual cost of this $500-a-head life insurance policy for 70 million Americans will not be so intimidating as one might suppose. The shelter program will need an all-in investment of about $5 billion. Missile manufacture and deployment will require a further investment of about $35 billion. But the outlay will naturally be spread over a considerable period of time, making the yearly investment not much more than $5 billion.

Strategically, politically, and in every other imaginable way, the United States will gain immensely from possessing a defense system of this kind. In such a situation as Britain faced in 1939, there is all the difference in the world between a price tag on surrender amounting to the end of civilized life in the United States, and a price tag that may be very terrible yet still preserves the future for later generations of free Americans.

Such, then, is the nature of the choice that is going to have to be made next year, when the Nike X program reaches the hardware phase. A wrong choice, such as President Truman made with Louis A. Johnson, is of course imaginable. But further defense cuts should not be counted on, until this issue has been faced.

[From Missiles & Rockets, Jan. 4, 1965]

STUDY AIDS CASE FOR NIKE X: NO RECOMMENDATIONS MADE

(By James Trainor)

Primacy of offense over defense in strategic warfare—a shibboleth long accepted by defense planners—has been called into question by the Nike X threat analysis study.

Several other "truisms"—such as the "destabilizing" effect of a ballistic missile defense (BMD) system on deterrent posture, the severity of the "*n*th country" problem, and the cost of penetrating an anti-missile-missile defensive system—have been found to be either invalid or highly dependent on the scenario under which strategic nuclear war occurs.

In the making since July 1963, the highly classified, voluminous threat analysis has been completed and submitted to Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara. Presenting no recommendations, the analysis does provide the arithmetic underpinning upon which a decision to deploy or not to deploy Nike X can be based.

The trade-off studies involved in deploying a ballistic missile defense system are far from complete, however. Divided shelves or levels of deployment, protection of command and control centers versus protection of urban centers, protection of critical industry, the rate of recovery of the Nation in relation to the protection—and the survivability—of the civilian industrial base are but a few of the intricate questions still to be probed.

STUDY'S SCOPE

These analyses will not be conducted on the crash basis that the threat analysis study involved, nor will they be as centralized as was the basic study. The threat analysis study covered more than a year of intensive effort and involved more than 200 professionals full time.

The Hudson Institute pulled together inputs from a wide range of industrial and military sources. A Nike X threat analysis office was created within the Army staff and was headed by Maj. Gen. Austin W. Betts.

Stanford Research Institute has been retained by the Army to conduct further trade-off studies, but the special character of the threat analysis office is also to disappear, with future studies and analyses performed by elements of the Army staff, particularly the Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations.

OFFENSE VERSUS DEFENSE

Almost from the inception of the Nike-Zeus program, its critics have claimed that, given the character of modern strategic missiles, the defense would never be able to catch up to the offense. For a modest investment, the argument ran, the offense would be able to overcome any defensive system with ever more sophisticated penetration aids.

On the basis of the threat analysis study, however, the offense and defense "are very much closer to a standoff now," according to a Defense official, and the cost of one overcoming an advantage of the other are "in the general ball park of equivalence."

"Except for a few people on the outside of the problem," this official contends, "all of the people who have really studied the problem, including organizations such as the Rand Corp. and the Weapons System Evaluation Group (DOD), agree that ballistic missile defense is a useful contribution to a damage-limiting strategy."

The usefulness of ballistic missile defense is extremely sensitive to the scenario under which a strategic nuclear war takes place, this official points out. If such a conflict occurs as a result of an ever-deepening international crisis in which both sides steadily increase their readiness postures, the value of BMD is less than if a sudden attack were mounted against this country by the Soviets.

In the first instance, the United States could receive enough warning of Soviet intentions to strike before the Soviet missiles were launched. Under these conditions, it makes more sense to invest in such damage-limiting weapons as Minuteman ICBM's and antisubmarine weapons.

Also, the official says, if the Soviets are incapable of launching all their ICBM's in one salvo, offensive missiles would be effective in destroying these missiles before they could be launched. BMD, even in this scenario, would still contribute to damage limitation by countering at least partially those missiles which were launched against the United States.

A defensive system would be the major means of blunting a surprise attack. The system would not be able to counter all the ICBM warheads launched against the United States, but it would kill a percentage of them.

This is the important point: a BMD system "can be defeated in part, not in total." And the extent to which it is not defeated could determine the ability of the Nation not only to survive but to recover from a nuclear war.

Therefore, the proper mix of damage-limiting forces depends on the magnitude of the threat and the postulated scenario under which war occurs.

BMD DESTABILIZES NOTHING

"There isn't enough defense in the world to protect everyone. Therefore, the destabilizing argument is just not valid," is the way one Defense official disposes of the argument that to deploy a BMD system would upset the mutual deterrence brought into being by the possession by both major powers of the means of destroying each other's societies. There will always be deterrence, even with a ballistic missile defense system, he feels, because it is just not feasible to protect all the population.

On the subject of the "*n*th country" problems—the proliferation of nuclear weapons and their means of delivery by smaller, and presumably less responsible, countries—it now appears that this would not be as serious as first supposed. "Take the case of the mad Cuban with one missile. He is not likely to waste that missile on Podunk but is more likely to concentrate on New York or Washington—the prestige, high-density target." Therefore, the BMD deployment problem would be easier, with the defensive system concentrated around these centers.

If this "mad Cuban" did avoid the prestige target because of his awareness of the defenses surrounding it, BMD still has paid off by denying him an attack on the high-density centers.

[From Missiles and Rockets, Jan. 4, 1965]

THE THREAT

Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara has indicated that he will not seek funds in the fiscal 1966 budget for a Nike X preproduction program. Further, the Secretary has made clear his feeling that deployment of the anti-missile-missile system does not make sense unless it is accompanied by an adequate civil defense shelter program.

We quite agree with him about the shelters. Any nuclear exchange involving Nike X would result in an unacceptably high fatality rate among an unprotected civilian populace, to say nothing of the effects wrought by those incoming warheads which escaped interception.

Shelters for civilians therefore are a must for any credible missile defense. To date, there has been no adequate civil defense program—although a step was made in the right direction when authority over the program was transferred to the Pentagon.

Whether this administration now is willing to back an all-out civil defense effort is open to question, however. For one thing, the thought of alarming the Great Society at its very inception with strong support, both moral and financial, for blast and fallout shelters is a distasteful one to President Johnson. Also being taken into consideration is the question of whether initiation of such a program might not be taken by the Soviet leadership as an indication of a more belligerent policy by this country. There are those who strongly believe that it would and who watch closely for any sign that the Russians are undertaking a wide-scale shelter program. So far they have not.

The temptation in these circumstances is to do nothing and avoid alarming both Americans and Russians. There is also the hope that a continuing détente in the cold war might make the whole unpalatable Nike–X-cum-shelter business unnecessary. Just what move the Soviets will make next in the ICBM field also is under close scrutiny, again in the hope that they will do nothing to upset the comfortable offensive superiority now credited to this county by U.S. intelligence.

Unfortunately, the Nike X and fallout shelter decision is one which must be made soon. This is not an area in which we can stand around forever with our option in our hand. If and when an antimissile defense is needed, it will be needed immediately—not at some future date which will allow time for deployment.

Some comfort has been taken in certain circles from the belief that Nike X is not really important because missile defense can never catch up with missile offense. The just-completed Nike X threat analysis study sheds some interesting light on this theory. The study indicates that missile offense and defense are much closer to a standoff than many people believe.

The significance of this is considerable. For one thing, it means that a U.S. ballistic missle defense can play an important role in our strategic posture. More important, it means that the door is open for the Soviet Union to undertake an antimissle defense which can offset our present superiority in strategic missiles.

The administration belief that the Russians have not done so is indicated by the confident cutback by Secretary McNamara of 200 previously planned Minuteman missiles. But the questions remain of whether the Soviets could do so, and whether they could do so without our detecting the initiation of such a large-scale program.

An article in the December issue of Fortune by the very able Mr. Charles J. V. Murphy sheds some interesting light on this. Mr. Murphy details the history of the Soviet missile effort, as watched by the Turkish radars and the U–2 aircraft, as well as other intelligence sources.

Although we have detailed much of the history in this magazine as it developed, it is worthwhile noting what Mr. Murphy has to say about Soviet antimissile defenses: "Meanwhile, there had emerged, too, ominous indications that the Russians had begun to test an anti-missile-missile system, a concept that our scientists then held and still hold to be wholly impracticable. Indeed, the R. & D. center of this enterprise was finally located by a U–2 early in 1960 in Central Siberia, at Sary Shagan, a large community on Lake Balkash, about 400 miles east of the ICBM test establishment at Tyura Tam. It was established that the interception of rockets by other rockets had actually been attempted, with some success, and thereafter in U.S. intelligence calculations account had to be taken of the chance, however, improbable, that Soviet technicians might be close to a defense against the ICBM's."

As Mr. Murphy points out, this was in 1960. Dr. Harold Brown, chief of research and engineering in the U.S. defense establishment, acknowledged not long after taking office that the Soviets had a significant lead over the United States in this field. There is no reason to suppose the Russian effort has slackened.

The question remains: Could the Soviets conceal plans for deployment of an effective anti-ICBM system? With the Russians aware that they are being closely scrutinized by the Samos reconnaissance satellites, we find nothing surprising in the theory that a closed society such as the Soviet Union could hide its antimissile intentions until the last possible moment.

We then would be presented with a fait accompli which would offset our vast investment in Minuteman, Polaris, and Titan II.

Since it also is possible for the Soviets to carry out the same tactic in regard to new offensive missiles, we believe it necessary to move forward swiftly with both Nike X and a shelter program, no matter how unsettling it may sound.

A top Defense official has something to say about that also. He points out that any anti-missile-missile system will kill a percentage of incoming warheads, but not all of them.

"Therefore, the destabilizing argument is just not valid," he says. Missile defense does not upset the mutual deterrence of the two sides.

We therefore hope Secretary McNamara will seek an adequate civil defense program and that Congress will press both for this and for preproduction funds for Nike X.

WILLIAM J. COUGHLIN.

HOME RULE

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, in the January 18 issue of U.S. News & World Report, there was published a thoughtful article on what would be involved in home rule for the District of Columbia. Students of American history are well aware of the fact that the first Congress of the United States met in Philadelphia, because that was where sessions of the Continental Congress had been held and where our Declaration of Independence had been proclaimed. The seat of the new nation was moved from Philadelphia to New York because the police of the city of Philadelphia failed to protect the new Congress from pressure groups. New York was not a desirable site for a national capital, because it was too far removed from the Southern States; so the Congress, meeting in New York, passed a bill to establish the capital midway between the New England States and the Southern States, to be located on the Potomac River, in an area to be designated as the District of Columbia, and it was not to have the privilege of suffrage and home rule. Over my protest, the Senate has voted on several occasions to give home rule to the District of Columbia. In my opinion, this would do violence to the fundamental principle underlying its creation by Congress.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the article on this subject, from U.S. News & World Report.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IF NATION'S CAPITAL DOES RULE ITSELF

A unique experiment is being proposed for Washington, D.C., The experiment: "home rule"—self-government for the residents of the Nation's Capital. It has the backing of the White House.

Most of Washington's residents are Negroes, and the prospect is that they would elect a Negro government. This would make Washington the only major city in the world governed by Negroes.

For nearly a century, this Nation's Capital has been governed by Congress, acting as

Washington's city council, and the U.S. President, acting as the city's mayor.

Now political pressure is growing to give Washington, D.C., "home rule"—return the governing power to the people who live in the city and let them elect their own officials.

President Johnson has pledged the power of his administration behind a home-rule bill in the new Congress, in which the President has a heavy Democratic majority.

Chances of passage of such a measure are considered the best ever.

QUESTIONS AND PROBLEMS

Raised are these questions: What if the residents of Washington are given the power to rule themselves? Will a self-governing capital involve a unique experiment? What problems will it face?

In a nation whose population is 9-to-1 white, Washington is 58 percent Negro—the most heavily Negro of any big American city.

It is taken for granted that Negro voters, outnumbering whites, would elect Negro officials.

"It is my expectation that we will have a Negro for mayor," says Joseph Rauh, chairman of Washington's Democratic Central Committee and a leading advocate of home rule.

Whites also would be expected to give way to Negroes in other key posts—in the school system, police, and courts.

This would make Washington the only major city in the world governed by Negroes. And the United States would be the only predominantly white nation with a Negro as head of its capital.

Any new government in Washington would find itself beset by complex and growing problems, some of them unique.

Crime, increasing at a rapid rate, makes Washington's streets among the most dangerous in the Nation.

There is a strong and continuing migration of white families from Washington to nearby suburbs in Maryland and Virginia. Washington is becoming to a large extent a city of aging white couples with few children and Negro families with many children.

Washington schools—From 39 to 88 percent Negroes in 24 years

Year	White pupils	Negro pupils	Percent white	Percent Negro
1940	56, 547	36, 263	60. 9	39. 1
1950	46. 736	47, 980	49. 3	50. 7
1960	24, 982	97, 897	20. 3	79. 7
1964	17. 673	125, 016	12. 4	87. 6

Source: District of Columbia Board of Education.

Among those moving out of the city are many big taxpayers.

Government is Washington's biggest industry. The Federal Government owns 43 percent of the city's land area. Foreign governments, with their embassies and chancelleries, also own sizable chunks of valuable real estate. So do religious, educational, and charitable organizations.

Altogether 16,642 acres of Washington's land area are exempt from taxes. This is 54 percent of the city's total.

This raises tax problems such as are faced by no other city. Officials estimate that all these tax exemptions cost the city $53 million a year in lost taxes. This loss is only partially made up by Federal contributions to the city, now running at a rate of $37.5 million a year.

Many thousands of people who work in Washington don't live in the city. They commute from outlying suburbs—mostly by automobile. The Washington area has the Nation's greatest density of automobiles per square mile. It has no underground rail system. This means heavy spending for streets and bridges.

Other Washington problems include a big relief load, rates of illegitimate births, and venereal disease that are among the highest in the Nation, and public schools so heavily Negro that they defy attempts to achieve a "racial balance" in enrollments.

A CONSTRICTED CITY

Most cities, facing problems such as Washington's, can expand by annexing suburbs, thus enlarging their tax base and reclaiming some of the taxpayers lost by migration from the city.

Washington can't do this. Its boundaries—enclosing 69 square miles are fixed by Federal law. It is not a part of any State, so it cannot look to any State government for help.

Until the 1930's, when the Federal Government began to be big business, Washington was a relatively small city—only 486,869 in 1930.

Since then, Washington has grown to about 808,000 population, ranking ninth in size among all U.S. cities.

Yet Washington today has 146,900 fewer whites than it had in 1940—and 183,200 fewer than in 1950. The city's growth is in Negro population.

Suburbs surrounding Washington are growing even faster than the city itself. And the suburbs are predominantly white—ranging from 1.8 percent to 11.7 percent Negro in 1960. Add in the suburbs, and only 25 percent of the 2.3 million residents of Washington's metropolitan area are Negroes.

WHY HOME RULE ENDED

The city of Washington had self-government from 1802 to 1874. But friction developed between the city and Congress.

Racial issues created additional friction after the Civil War. Some 30,000 freed slaves flocked into the city, and Congress and the local government bickered over who should pay for their education. When Congress gave the ex-slaves the vote, many white people boycotted the polls.

Washington population—From 28 to 58 percent Negroes in 24 years

Year	Total population	White residents	Negro residents	Percent white	Percent Negro
1940	677, 200	484, 600	192. 600	71. 6	28. 4
1950	810, 500	520, 900	289. 600	64. 3	35. 7
1960	768, 700	345, 600	423, 100	45. 0	55. 0
1964	808, 000	337, 700	470, 300	41. 8	58. 2

A sign of the future: Among Washing residents under 20 years of age, more than 70 percent are Negroes.

Source: 1940-50-60, U.S. Census Bureau and District of Columbia Health Department; 1964, Census Bureau estimate; racial breakdown for 1964 is a projection by economic unit of U.S. News & World Report.

The showdown came when the city overspent its income and Congress had to bail it out of debt. Then Congress abolished home rule and took over the city's administration itself.

Washington now has a Board of Commissioners who do some of the work normally done by a city council and mayor. All three members of the Board are appointed by the U.S. President.

Washington's local laws are enacted by Congress, which also controls the city's taxing and spending. Special committees are set up in each House of Congress to handle Washington legislation.

In recent years, home-rule bills have passed the Senate five times. Each time, the bill was blocked in the District Committee of the House, which contains several southern Members and is headed by Representative JOHN L. MCMILLAN, Democrat, of South Carolina, an opponent of home rule for Washington.

A NEGRO GOVERNMENT?

It is generally recognized that one of the major obstacles to congressional passage of home rule is the large number of Negroes in Washington and the expectation that they would give the Nation's Capital a Negro government.

Many white Washingtonians share congressional reluctance on this account.

It is also argued that home rule would conflict with the concept of Washington as a Federal city, and that it might imperil the financial aid that Washington now gets from Congress.

Nearly one-fourth of all District adults hold Federal Government jobs that bar them, under the Hatch Act, from partisan politics.

A large segment of Washington's population is transient. Many residents do not really regard it as home. Those who have lived there long are not accustomed to voting. It was not until last year that Washingtonians were even permitted to vote for U.S. President.

Both the Democratic and Republican national platforms have endorsed home rule for Washington, however, and President Johnson recently wrote the Democratic city organization:

"I believe in home rule, and I pledge you here and now the best efforts of the next administration to provide local self-government for the District of Columbia."

All this is focusing new attention on Washington and its many problems.

THE CRIME PICTURE

While all big cities have reported a rise in the rate of crime in recent years, Washington's crime rate has increased faster than the average—83 percent in the last 7 years.

Police records show that of all persons arrested for major crimes last year, 87 percent were Negroes.

Much of the crime, in Washington as elsewhere, is committed by youths.

Largely as a result of the migration of white families to suburbs, more than 70 percent of all Washington residents under 20 years of age are Negroes.

This situation is reflected in the city's public schools, where 87.6 percent of all pupils are Negroes.

Washington's schools were segregated by race until the U.S. Supreme Court outlawed segregation in 1954. Then the school enrollment was only 57 percent Negro, and most of the city's schools soon became racially mixed.

Since integration, the flight of white families with school-age children from Washington to suburbs has speeded up—and many schools have, in effect, become resegregated. There are now 26 schools that are all-Negro and 63 other schools with fewer than 10 white pupils.

Busing pupils from one part of the city to another—a method of "race balancing" tried in some northern cities—would have little effect in Washington.

A HAVEN FOR NEGROES

Washington for years has been regarded as a haven by the Negroes fleeing segregation and poverty in the South. There is no discrimination in restaurants and theaters. Housing barriers are falling slowly but steadily as the Negro population spreads into more sections of the city.

Government payrolls offer jobs for Negroes. Of the 27,133 full-time employees of the District of Columbia government, 50.3 percent are Negroes. Of the 247,000 Federal employees in the Washington area, 24.2 percent are Negroes.

Now, with the prospect of home rule, Negroes in Washington stand to gain a new opportunity. The Nation's Capital could become the first major city in the modern world governed by Negroes.

WASHINGTON'S BIG PROBLEMS

Crime: Up 83 percent in last 7 years. Among cities of 500,000 to 1 million population, Washington now ranks, per capita: First in aggravated assaults, second in robberies, fifth in major crimes of all kinds.

Last year, 87 percent of all persons arrested for major crimes were Negroes.

Relief: Welfare costs exceed $11 million a year. Nearly 10,000 Washingtonians are on relief. Yet the unemployment rate in the Washington area is only 2.1 percent—which is far below the national average of 5 percent.

Tax exemption: City loses $53 million yearly in taxes. Of Washington's land area, 54 percent is tax exempt. Most of this exempt area is owned by Federal Government.

Part of Washington's tax loss is made up by Federal contributions, which totaled $37.5 million in fiscal year 1964.

Illegitimacy: District of Columbia rate highest of any city. Washington registered 4,529 illegitimate babies in 1963—a rate of 228.2 per 1,000 live births.

Of the 4,529 illegitimate babies, 4,145 were Negro.

Venereal disease: Widespread in Washington. Nation's capital has Nation's highest rate of gonorrhea—1,298 per 100,000 population. In syphilis, Washington ranks fourth among all big cities, with a rate of 235.3 cases per 100,000.

Washington, D.C., No. 1 Negro city in the Nation—Percentage of Negroes in total population

	Percent
Washington	58.2
Charleston, S.C	50.8
Augusta, Ga	45.0
Richmond, Va	41.8
Jacksonville, Fla	41.1
Birmingham, Ala	39.6
Baltimore, Md	39.2
Atlanta, Ga	38.3
New Orleans, La	37.2
Winston-Salem, N.C	37.1
Memphis, Tenn	37.0
Jackson, Miss	35.7
Montgomery, Ala	35.1
Newark, N.J	34.1
Detroit, Mich	28.9
St. Louis, Mo	28.6
Cleveland, Ohio	28.6
Philadelphia, Pa	26.4
Chicago, Ill	22.9
New York, N.Y	14.0

Source: All percentages from 1960 census, except that Washington's is a 1964 computation by the Economic Unit of U.S.N. & W.R. from a Census Bureau estimate of the total population; Baltimore's is a 1964 estimate by the Baltimore Health Department.

IMMIGRATION

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I am opposed to changing our immigration laws as recommended this week by the President. His proposals are substantially the same as those of President Kennedy in 1963, and include some steps that have been advocated for 20 years.

While there will be disagreement on the exact number of immigrants to be expected, there certainly will be some increase, and every immigrant will be competing with an American citizen for a job at a time when unemployment remains a major economic problem. And I do not see how anyone can categorically say the number of immigrants would be increased by less than 7,000, if no quota whatever is to be placed upon the Negroes to be admitted from Jamaica, Trinidad, and Tobago. Thousands from those former British possessions already have flooded England, creating a serious economic problem.

Neither can I agree that our present immigration laws are incompatible with our basic American tradition. Our American tradition is that the first settlers were of Nordic stock, and came from Great Britain. Shortly after the Revolutionary War, there was a substantial immigration, from Germany, of those seeking religious and economic freedom. With the division of the Northwest Territory into States, the area was settled by a fine group of farmers from the Scandinavian countries.

Ever since 1882, we have had laws prohibiting immigration to this country of Orientals. Those laws have been only slightly modified in recent years. That was the basic American tradition, until broken in the early part of the current century by some ruthless industrial magnates, who brought thousands of workers from southern Europe into the coal fields and steel mills of Pennsylvania and West Virginia, to break the back of a young and weak organized labor movement.

The Immigration Act of 1924 was passed for the deliberate purpose of protecting organized labor and of preserving the basic national characteristics of our Nation.

Following World War II, the United States, out of sympathy for stricken peoples, departed from its basic immigration policy, by passing, between 1948 and 1953, temporary laws under which thousands of displaced persons and refugees were admitted to the United States.

But in 1952, Congress reaffirmed its basic immigration policy, by passing the McCarran Act, which preserved the quota system and strengthened the safeguards against admission of Communists and other enemies of our democratic institutions.

President Kennedy said, and the claim is now repeated, that emphasis would be placed upon admitting immigrants who possess skill. That term is as vague as the word "discrimination" in the civil rights bill, and can mean anything that any bureaucrat sees fit to make it mean. But the door is left wide open to those without skill if they can claim relationship to someone already here. Most of the new immigrants will be of that character.

In other words, the removal of the limitation of national origins quotas is somewhat akin to removal of the gold backing for our currency. It is not a perfect system; but it furnishes an automatic brake, free from administrative manipulation.

If it be politically expedient at the present time to remove the handicap of the Immigration Act of 1924, why will it not be equally expedient at a later period to eliminate all restrictions, and to accept a flood of immigrants?

History has no example to equal the generosity shown by our Nation since the end of World War II to all of the so-called have-not nations of the world, and especially to the nations of southern Europe, who now are exerting pressure for the admission of more of their nationals.

We have loaned and given away about $105 billion, and the end is not in sight. Included in our gifts have been millions of dollars' worth of food. But we should not lose sight of the fact that through erosion we have lost two-thirds of our fertile top soil, and our other natural resources are being used up, in the face of a birth rate greater than that of any country in Europe.

I hope this Congress does not complicate our problem of caring for our own unemployed by admitting more foreign workers at the same time that we are removing tariff restrictions upon what those who stay in Europe see fit to ship to us.

GRANGE VIEWS ON THE FARM CRISIS

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a press release I have received today from the National Grange, in which Herschel D. Newsom, distinguished master of the Grange, expresses that organization's views of the present farm crisis.

I find myself very much in agreement with what Mr. Newsom has said to the Florida State Grange.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Grange Master Warns Against Reductions in Farm Income

Tampa, Fla., January 7.—"The war on poverty cannot be won until the basic inequity between agricultural interests and the rest of our economy is eliminated. This cannot be accomplished by further reduction in agricultural prices, whether that reduction is the result of market forces or the withdrawal of Government money," Herschel D. Newsom, master of the National Grange, told the officers and delegates of the Florida State Grange, meeting in Tampa, Fla., for their annual banquet.

Pointing out that American farmers receive only about 75 percent of that which would be received by other segments of the economy for similar investments of labor, capital, risk, and management, the farm leader state "The simple fact is that, whether we like it or not, the agricultural economy has been extended as far as it should be in terms of credit inputs. Rural banks have extended their lending capacity as far as is legally possible.

"Since 1951, American farm net income has dropped from $16.3 to $12.6 billion. During this same period, interest payments have increased from $6.3 to $27 billion, an increase of over 300 percent. Interest on farm debts has, in other words, increased from less than half net farm income to more than twice net farm income in this 12-year period.

"Farm debt last year increased about $3.4 billion, of which $2 billion was for nonreal estate loans. For the first time since 1961, farm real estate debt has risen considerably faster than nonreal estate debt," Mr. Newsom continued.

"With the present precarious situation being faced by American farmers, talk about continuing decreases in farm income, whether they are caused by decreasing expenditures or as a result of trade negotiations which permit our trading partners to erect unreasonable and discriminatory barriers against American agricultural exports is unrealistic and inconsistent with the economic and political facts of American life," the national master concluded.

WHEAT CERTIFICATE OPERATIONS WORKING SMOOTHLY

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record two items from the current issue of the Southwestern Miller, dated January 5, 1965.

The first of these articles is about the smooth operation of the voluntary wheat certificate program, which became effective last July 1. The Southwestern Miller, a trade magazine, has praise for the manner in which the Department of Agriculture has administered the program, when it says:

> Anyone who appraises the certificate program only from the standpoint of processor accounting can hardly avoid the conclusion that it is being quite well administered. ASCS is doing a far better job than the Internal Revenue people did on the processing tax of New Deal days.

The article reports that certificate payments on the 1964 crop will come to almost exactly what we anticipated when the bill was enacted—$450 million.

The second article is a report on the earnings of Pillsbury Mills for the 6 months ended November 30, 1964. The company's net profits after taxes set a record at $5,464,000. This was an increase of $720,000 over the earnings for the same period the year before. This indicates that the certificate plan has not had dire consequences in the milling industry.

There being no objection, the article were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Clocklike Wheat Certificate Remittances, About $450 Million a Year, Bring Compliments for Mills

HANDLING THE CERTIFICATE MONEY

Nine miles or so south of downtown Kansas City is the Government office that, among other things, receives remittances from millers and other processors for wheat certificates. In the building in which this program is centered are 1,000 employees, 450 of whom are on the staff of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Only seven or eight of this group are assigned to certificate accounting with processors. Some others work on reconcilement of drafts drawn by county ASCS offices to cover payments to eligible growers. The major part of the building is used for other ASCS functions, most extensive of which relate to handling and marketing of wheat that comes into the possession of that agency.

Processors' payments for certificates required in November operations amounted to $35,582,220.90, bringing receipts from this source up to more than $164 million since the certificate program began on July 1. Anyone wishing to project the wheat certificate total for a year should begin his calculations with September, because dollar receipts for July and August were affected by extensive use of transition certificates. Total for the September–November quarter is more than $113,500,000, which seems to point to an annual take of about $454 million—probably somewhat less, as flour production usually is a little greater in the fall months than in some other part of the year.

MILLS SPEEDY AND ACCURATE

The certificate program has now largely become clockwork as far as processors' payments are concerned, according to Arnold E. Ferguson, assistant to the ASCS director and in charge of certificate sales. "It can hardly be called routine, as handling more than $35 million per month is not a routine operation," he remarked recently. "Both we and the processors had plenty of humps to get over during the first 2 or 3 months, but these problems have been pretty largely resolved and a great majority of the reports are now arriving in complete order. There are still a few questions being raised, there are a few misunderstandings here and there, now and then we turn up errors on reports, but on the whole the processors are to be complimented upon the speed and accuracy with which they have conformed to the requirements of a new law."

INSPECTORS NOW ON THIRD ROUND

Mr. Ferguson added that a large majority of the difficulties now being encountered in the administration of certificate sales concern very small mills, mostly those that do a purely local business. Many of the people operating such mills did not have time, or did not take time, to acquaint themselves fully with the requirements of the law and the regulations. However, their problems are gradually being worked out. One of the factors that is helping considerably in this connection is the work of six traveling inspectors who are currently on their third round of calling on all wheat processors. Incidentally, the checks thus far made disclose only a very few cases in which apparent excessive quantities of wheat have been ground under the producer exemption and these are presently being investigated.

WEIGHT AND CONVERSION FACTORS

Inquiry of millers and other processors about the mechanics of wheat certificates has failed to turn up many baffling problems. At first, of course, there were a number of questions that had to be clarified, but making the reports has now become systemized in almost all cases even if time-consuming. Probably one of the most important issues to arise has been the choice between using weight of wheat and a standard conversion factor in determining certificate liability; a good many millers, chiefly those below average size, realized belatedly that it would be simpler and probably somewhat advantageous to them to use the conversion factor rather than weight of wheat. ASCS has authorized more than 30 such concerns to change their method of reporting in this respect, although it was stated earlier that once a choice had been made it would remain in force. Nearly all the larger and more efficient mills report on weight of wheat ground.

A BETTER ADMINISTERING RECORD

Anyone who appraises the certificate program only from the standpoint of processor accounting can hardly avoid the conclusion that it is being quite well administered. ACSC is doing a far better job than the internal revenue people did on the processing tax of New Deal days. The latter was a nightmare in more than a few respects; the regional internal revenue offices had little information for months and no consequential checking of compliance was done for a couple of years.

SERIES OF BURDENS UPON BUSINESS

The certificate program has nonetheless produced a series of burdens upon businesses that process wheat for human consumption. There is the clerical and executive time required to develop the data for accurate reports. There was a considerable loss on wheat inventories that were inevitably on hand July 1; the transition certificates that were heralded as a relief to the squeeze became in reality a means of saddling processors with a sizable expense item. Flour mills were the targets of a hard propaganda campaign by Government officials against rising prices stemming from higher material costs that were created by the program, a campaign that is at least partially responsible for heavy losses in this milling year. And a host of importunities have come from flour buyers for flour millers to undertake legal means to contest the use of wheat certificates, even though the prospect of success for such action would seem to be remote.

Millers have derived only one plus to date from the certificate program. The reduction in wheat prices that it brought about has in turn lowered the value of wheat inventories, so that interest costs have diminished. It is distinctly doubtful, however, whether savings in this quarter will offset any great part of the added costs referred to just above.

SOME DISTILLERS AND HEALTH FOOD

The vast majority of the 517 companies processing wheat for human consumption and therefore subject to the certificate tax are flour millers. The others include breakfast cereal manufacturers, a few soy sauce makers, a couple of distillers, and several dozen so-called health food stores. Most of the stores grind only small quantities, in some cases as little as 10 bushels per month, but they have the same proportionate liability as do the large proccessors.

The grind of the health food stores is so limited—as is also the certificate grind of flour mills doing mostly an exchange business—that it costs the Government much more to collect their certificate payments than it receives from them. This has led to proposals that very small operators be exempt from certificate purchases, but the problems that any such step would create for other processors might well prove to be staggering.

IN VERMONT AND LOUISIANA

Location of the certificate-tax payers is shown on the accompanying map. Dots in such unfamiliar places as Vermont, Massachusetts, and Louisiana—unfamiliar for wheat processors, at any rate—denote health food stores, as does a considerable share of the cluster in California.

GRAND TOTAL OF $231 MILLION

Total receipts from the 25-cent wheat export certificates through December were $67,138,537.64, including $990,000 as offsets against the export subsidy. When export figures are added to the processor payments, the grand total receipts to date are above $231 million.

TO KANSAS CITY FEDERAL RESERVE BANK

The funds received from wheat processors and wheat exporters for certificates are deposited in the Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City, in an account that is earmarked for payments to producers.

Record First-Half Earnings by Pillsbury—Net in 6 Months Ended November 30, 1964, Rises to New Mark of $5,464,000, With Gains From Consumer Foods, Foreign Business, Agriculture

Minneapolis, January 5.—Net earnings of the Pillsbury Co. in the first 6 months of its current fiscal year established a new alltime record.

For the 6 months ended November 30, 1964, Pillsbury reported net profits after taxes of $5,464,000, equal to $2.49 a share on the common stock. This compares with $4,744,000, or $2.16 a share, in the corresponding 1963 period.

Sales for the first 6 months of the 1964–65 fiscal year amounted to $224,308,000, up $1,746,000 from the corresponding period of the previous year. The gain was in face of the loss of about $12,500,000 in sales caused by withdrawals from operations that were not profitable.

THREE AREAS CONTRIBUTE TO GAIN

In the 6-month report to stockholders, President Paul S. Gerot emphasizes the contribution of new convenience food product developments, expansion of the company's international business, and an improvement in the agricultural area. Earnings from the latter area were increased by an integrated broiler operation and the sale of unprofitable formula feed mills.

IN MILLING IN JAMAICA, TRINIDAD

The 6-month report also includes the formal announcement of new Pillsbury operations in Jamaica and Trinidad. In Trinidad, the company will assist in the operation of a flour mill now under construction and will participate in the marketing of the mill's flour output. In Jamaica, Pillsbury will help establish both a flour mill and a livestock feed plant, and be part of the mill's marketing organization.

CONSUMERS PRODUCTS NOW ABOVE 100

Nine new products in the consumer area went from research and development to retailers' shelves nationally in the first half of the year, it is stated. This brings the number of Pillsbury consumer products in total distribution to more than 100.

The report notes that a $13 million capital expenditure program this fiscal year includes the equipping of a 174,000-square-foot consumer products plant at Terre Haute, Ind., which is scheduled to open in the early spring.

Mr. Gerot pointed to a favorable second half for Pillsbury "based on sound business judgments of our marketing people, coupled with conservative national economic forecasts."

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S GREAT EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, education and democracy are one and inseparable.

The foundation of a democratic society is a citizenry able to think for itself, and not merely willing but determined to do so.

In 1810 Thomas Jefferson wrote:

> The information of the people at large can alone make them the safe, as they are the sole, depositary of our political and religious freedom.

Thomas Jefferson said many times that education was the most effective weapon man had against tyranny.

He wrote in 1818:

> If the children * * * are untaught, their ignorance and vices will, in future life cost us much dearer in their consequences, than it would have done, in their correction, by a good education.

We know he was right.

In his January 12, 1965, education message to the Congress President Lyndon B. Johnson documented the need to encourage every child to get as much education as he has the ability to take. The President traced the development of education opportunities in this country from the time of the Northwest Ordinance of the Continental Congress in 1787 which proclaimed that schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged.

Times change. What was adequate becomes obsolete. What was once progressive no longer is adequate to meet the challenges of the Great Society.

The President compared the cost of educating a child for 1 year as opposed to keeping a delinquent youth in a detention home or a family on relief or a criminal in a State prison for the same period of time. He told the Congress:

> We now spend about $450 a year per child in our public schools. But we spend $1,800 a year to keep a delinquent youth in a detention home, $2,500 a year for a family on relief, $3,500 a year for a criminal in a State prison.

If we are to achieve the national goal of full educational opportunity the President seeks, we must, first, build the 400,000 classrooms to house 4 million new elementary and secondary pupils in the next 5 years; second, replace existing, old facilities; third, train 800,000 new teachers and give to those who serve education now the skills and techniques of the 20th century; fourth, make available in sufficient supply such tools as books, libraries, preschool facilities, modern language laboratories, scholarships, grants, and employment opportunities for students seeking higher education at the college or postcollege level.

These needs are national. They must be solved at the national level.

When I was Governor of the Territory of Alaska I stated in my January 1949 message to the Territorial Legislature:

> If education fails, government by consent of the governed is bound ultimately also to fail. No duty of government is more inescapable than giving our children the best educational opportunities possible.

President Johnson has sent to the Congress a great education message. I have, in turn, sent copies to the commissioner of the Alaska Department of Education, to the members of the Alaska State Board of Education, and to the president of the University of Alaska, Dr. William R. Wood.

Dr. Wood wired the President the following message:

> Senator GRUENING has just read to me by telephone the portion of your splendid message to Congress pertaining to higher education. The depth of insight into the problems of higher education and the scope of proposals for offsetting them provide a most encouraging basis for achieving the goals of a great people.

Already the portions of the education message dealing with the strengthening and improving of educational quality and opportunities in our elementary and secondary schools have been incorporated in bill form. I have joined as a cosponsor of S. 370 which was introduced Tuesday by the distinguished chairman of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee's Subcommittee on Education [Mr. MORSE]. The bill will be the subject for hearings beginning January 26 and I applaud my good friend from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] for acting so promptly.

When a bill incorporating the proposals of the President to improve America's higher education program is introduced, I shall give it my full support.

The education program proposed by the President is designed to make available to all children, regardless of environment or parental income, the opportunity to learn.

A generation ago President Franklin Delano Roosevelt in his memorable inaugural address told us of the need to correct inequalities wherein one-third of the Nation was ill clad, ill fed, and ill housed. The fact that over 30 years later the percentage of one-third so depressed has diminished to only one-fifth is nothing to cheer about. Our affluent four-fifths have done a lot better, and as a nation we should be greatly concerned about that other fifth. President Johnson has shown his great concern and is giving Congress the leadership in this field that is most heartening.

Poverty is widely distributed throughout the United States. It is both urban and rural. It is widespread throughout Alaska, among our native population—Indians and Eskimos—whose chief handicap has been their lack of educational opportunities in their youth.

We can do much to correct this situation if we enact S. 370 and its companion measure, yet to be introduced, to help higher education, which incorporate the recommendations of the President. The cost of these new programs ranges from $1.5 to $1.665 billion, according to reports I have seen.

The State of Alaska would receive $1,878,777 under programs proposed in S. 370.

Title I provides $1 billion for the education of children of low-income families. Alaska's share would be $1,336,472.

Title II provides $100 million for school library resources and instructional materials. Alaska's share would be $318,630. Libaries in the majority of our public schools are inadequate. The Office of Education reports that in many schools there is an average of less than one-half book per child and that some cities spend less than 15 cents a year per child for library books. Worse, more than two out of every three public elementary schools have no libraries.

In our high schools we are told that at least one-fourth of the Nation's public high school systems do not provide free textbooks and it has been stated, too, that high textbook fees are one of the reasons for the school dropout problem. The modest request of title II for $100 million to help correct this deficiency initiates a 5-year program. The program will make available for the use of school children school library resources and other printed and published instructional materials including textbooks essential to improve educational quality.

Title III provides $100 million for supplementary educational centers and services. Alaska's share would be $119,467. This money could be used to initiate reforms in science and language instruction which badly needed to be improved.

Title IV provides $45 million for educational research and training. The money would expand the existing program which seeks to disseminate nationally research findings made at a particular institution so that education as a whole may benefit.

Title V provides $10 million for State departments of education to help strengthen the leadership resources, modernize the collection, processing, and analyzing of educational data, and in other areas selected by the State. Alaska's share would be $104,208.

In his education message, the President said:

> We need to extend our research and development—to history, literature, and economics; to art and music, to reading, writing, and speaking; to occupational, vocational, and technical education. We need to extend it to all stages of learning—preschool, elementary and secondary schools, colleges and graduate training.

Regional education laboratories as proposed will help, but much more must be done in this area of the humanities which have been neglected.

To move America forward in the humanities field I introduced on January 6 a bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress, research, and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes. This proposed legislation implements the teaching of the humanities.

The great goal toward which we strive is to make certain that America is a land of continuing opportunity, of growing potentialities, of expanding vistas.

In the area of higher education the President will propose that the Nation spend $260 million for new programs to "extend the opportunity for higher education more broadly among lower and middle income families; to help small and less well developed colleges improve their programs; to enrich the library resources of colleges and universities; and to draw upon the unique and invaluable resources of our great universities to deal with national problems of poverty and community development."

Specifically, in his education message, the President says he will recommend a program of scholarships for needy and qualified high school graduates to enable them to enter and to continue in college. He advises us that he will recommend expansion of work-study opportunity and guaranteed low-interest loans.

More and more such aids will be needed. A college education is expensive. Today the parents and/or the student may expect to pay nearly $2,400 a year in a private college and about $1,600 in a public college. Experts predict these costs will increase by one-third during the next 10 years.

Because small colleges, which often are isolated, are burdened by spiraling costs, the President seeks a national fellowship program to encourage highly qualified young graduate students and instructors in large universities to augment the teaching resources of the smaller institutions.

He correctly observes that our great universities can help us solve the problems of the cities.

President Johnson's education message has been warmly received.

I ask unanimous consent that editorials appearing in the New York Times, January 14, 1965, the Washington Daily News, January 13, 1965, the Washington Post, January 13 1965, the New York World-Telegram and Sun, January 13, 1965, the Philadelphia Inquirer, January 13, 1965, the Baltimore Sun, January 13, 1965, and the Christian Science Monitor January 14, 1965, commenting on his message, be printed in the RECORD at the close of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Jan. 14, 1965]

Focus on Education

President Johnson's education message is a skillful effort to fix national priorities while avoiding paralyzing controversies. It emphasizes the vast cost to the United States in human misery and economic waste of educational neglect. Perhaps most important, it warns that the Nation dare not overlook quality in building up the world's largest mass-education enterprise.

All previous formulas have been brushed aside to break the deadlock over aid to public schools. The President wants the impact of poverty used as the yardstick for distributing $1 billion to the States as first aid for school districts in need of help. This is an imaginative approach—one that infuses Federal funds where they will serve best as an equalizing device.

Mr. Johnson has clearly chosen this new road to outflank Roman Catholic demands for direct aid to parochial schools. By way of a trade, he offers the concept of supplementary education centers, with facilities to be shared by public, private, and parochial schools.

Such centers hold great promise for improving education, especially in the big cities. They provide a means of breaking the confines of de facto segregation; they could become centers of excellence, spreading the benefits of vital—but often isolated—curriculum reforms.

But, despite their promise, it remains questionable that the joint use of these facilities by public and church-related schools can be made to conform with the Constitution's insistence on church-state separation. In some States, notably New York, the very letter of the State constitution now rules out the shared-time concept.

On the higher education front the President is on sound ground in asking for more generous support of students, especially through adding scholarships to the present loan programs. In general, the message focuses on critical areas for immediate action—preschool instruction for slum children, equalization of educational opportunities and upgrading of ill-trained teachers.

It would be absurd, however, to pretend that it represents a leap through the gates of "the Great Society," Mr. Johnson himself calls the first year's expansion of $1.5 billion in existing education funds "a small price to pay." It may well be too small a price unless rapidly followed by more massive aid. It in no way erases the need for a program of general support for public schools.

Equally urgent is the elevation of the President's chief education adviser to Cabinet status. The message clearly demonstrates that education is of highest national concern; it also shows that the Government's educational involvement threatens to be scattered over a wide variety of agencies and departments. A top-level spokesman for education is essential to prevent duplication and to assure that Federal support of education emerges not as a patchwork but as a policy consonant with the nobility of its aims.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, Jan. 13, 1965]

Education and Progress

If this country is to make real progress toward eliminating poverty, unemployment, and racial inequality, it will have to be done through education. No other approach can even begin to solve the problem involved.

It will do no good to create jobs, for example, if workers with the needed skills are not available to fill them. Nor can equal rights be legislated if the cultural gap between races is so wide that they live in two different worlds.

That is why President Johnson's proposals on education are worth serious study even from those who in the past have opposed Federal aid to the schools. For the first time, an effort is being made to tackle the Nation's basic problems where they begin—not at the level of the voting adult, but of the learning child.

Under the Presidential plan, $1 billion a year in Federal funds would be distributed to local school districts to improve the educational opportunities of the "disadvantaged" child. This would be supplemented by another $400 million annually to improve school libraries, provide preschool classes in poverty-stricken areas, and put more quality into teaching methods and facilities.

Parochial schools and other private institutions would share in the benefits indirectly through use of communitywide services—teaching specialists, language centers, science laboratories, and similar facilities. A separate program would devote $260 million a year to helping children of poor families finance their way through college.

The object, as President Johnson sees it, would be to provide every child the opportunity "to get as much education as he has the ability to take."

This is certainly not the case today. The child born in a slum home, of parents who themselves have known nothing but squalor and near illiteracy, often is far behind other youngsters even before he reaches the first grade. In a few more years—especially if he attends a substandard school—he is hopelessly mired for life.

As for the argument that the Federal Government should stay out of the educational field, the fact is that it is already there—and in a big way. Federal commitments to education, directly and indirectly, total more than $6 billion this fiscal year.

What the President proposes is to step up the spending and change its direction toward what he believes are vital national goals.

As sent to Congress, the program has some questionable points. A poor family is arbitrarily defined as one with an income of less than $2,000 a year. This may constitute poverty in some cases and not in others—depending on the family itself and the locality.

Basically, however, the program aims in the right direction. Poverty and ignorance are national problems. They breed on each other. They can be eradicated only by attack at the roots, which is what Mr. Johnson recommends.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Jan. 13, 1965]

No. 1 Business

Lyndon Johnson's genius for finding a way out of blind alleys is brilliantly exemplified in his message to Congress on education. It reflects political realism at its pragmatic best. To begin with, it puts first things first, attacking the most glaring and urgent aspects of the country's education problem. And, secondly, without imperiling vital constitutional principles, it moves around, if it does not actually resolve, the religious conflict which has for so long frustrated every effort to extend Federal aid to education.

The education of youth, says the President, is "the No. 1 business of the American people." It is, in truth, basic to every other form of national business—to the country's economic well-being, to its security at a time when science is the key to national strength, to its development of the arts and amenities of life. It is the indispensable weapon for the war which the President has summoned the country to wage on poverty. For poverty, as he put it, "has many roots but the taproot is ignorance."

It is directly at poverty, therefore, that the President's program is aimed. The essence of the program is a billion-dollar effort to be launched in the fiscal year 1966 to furnish assistance to public elementary and secondary schools serving children of low-income families. This means putting Federal aid where it is most needed and where it can do the most good—and where local resources are most strained and most inadequate.

The most controversial aspect of the President's program will undoubtedly be its proposal for the sharing of supplementary educational centers and services by the children in private nonprofit as well as public elementary and secondary schools. These facilities, under public control and with appropriate restraints and safeguards, can make an immensely useful contribution to the country's schooling. They can increase the resources for teaching science, foreign languages, music and the arts. And in doing so they will undoubtedly strengthen and support the quality of education in private as well as public institutions.

The President's message leaves a good deal of uncertainty as to the administration of these supplementary centers and services. Perhaps this is intentional; and perhaps it will lead to a gool deal of local variation which may prove exceedingly fruitful. It may also, however, lead to a good deal of acrimony and misunderstanding. For our part, we think it must be made indisputably clear that these facilities cannot under any circumstances be made the means or the site of any sort of religious observance or indoctrination. The Constitution, as well as every consideration of sound public policy, forbids it.

The President's program does not, of course, meet all the Nation's educational needs. It does not afford anything like the resources needed for new school construction or for teacher recruitment and the improvement of teachers' salaries. And at the college level, its scholarship proposals seem likely to aggravate the already frightening shortage of physical facilities.

But the program provides a beginning—and a sound beginning. Its focus on impoverished areas, its provisions for giving a good headstart to deprived children at the preschool years, its fostering of libraries and education research and innovation in teaching techniques—all these reflect an imaginative and resolute approach to the country's most pressing problem. The program can be expanded as it gets underway and finds community acceptance. Let us hope heartily that the President's resourceful and constructive compromises will evoke in every element of the Nation a readiness to find common ground and to move forward toward completion of America's "No. 1 business."

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Jan. 14, 1965]

Help for Schools

The founder of this newspaper, Mary Baker Eddy, was an ardent and lifelong supporter of public education. Even as a girl she had written: "No despot bears misrule, where knowledge plants the foot of power, in our God-blessed free school."

She believed schooling of the right sort to be requisite to mankind's highest moral, spiritual, and intellectual development.

Despite the great progress in education visible in the United States, despite the time, effort, devotion, and money spent on education, it is apparent that much remains to be done before it can be said that America is giving all its children the education they need and deserve. The problems of school dropouts, of schooling in poverty-stricken pockets of rural and urban life, of youths inadequately trained and counseled for earning their living in an increasingly competitive labor market, of brilliant students unable to get the education they deserve because of lack of funds—these and other unsolved problems show that America still faces a major educational challenge.

President Johnson in his special message to Congress proposes a $1,500 million attack on certain of these problems during the coming fiscal year. This would be in addition to the $2,600 million already in the Federal budget for education during that 12-month period.

This program is already being subjected to heated discussion. While much support for varying portions of the program is apparent, it is also clear that other portions will and should be subjected to searching criticism.

Mr. Johnson proposed "a national goal of full educational opportunity" wherein "every child must be encouraged to get as much education as he has the ability to take." He also declared that "in all that we do, we mean to strengthen our State and community education systems." We subscribe to each of such aims, nevertheless we question whether the President's proposals for raining funds on rich and poor States alike—in some cases benefiting the rich State far more than the poor one—actually preserve and strengthen local responsibility.

Summarized briefly, the President's proposals call for (a) preschool community projects to correct environmental handicaps, (b) major payments to States for distribution to low-income areas to improve public grammar and high schools, (c) grants to States for the purchase of books for both pupils and school libraries in both public and private nonprofit schools, (d) supplementary educational centers and services for special instruction, devised by public and nonprofit private schools in cooperation, (e) regional educational laboratories to improve educational methods, (f) strengthen State educational agencies, (g) scholarships for worthy and needy college students, (h) expansion of work-study opportunities and low-interest loans for college students, (i) legislation to strengthen the financial and educational standing of smaller, needy colleges, (j) help college libraries, (k) further university-community cooperation, and (l) step up training of teachers, instructors, and professors.

At many points this program will bring Federal assistance to bear on areas where additional help is needed. Further study is necessary, however, to determine whether in so tightly earmarking its funds for specific projects, Washington will get full value for its dollar. There are cases where communities may be lured if not even forced to spend their allocations in one direction, when the greatest need lies in another.

A serious constitutional question is raised by the open, as well as the implied, intention to give a portion of this money to other than public schools. At this moment there is a taxpayers' suit in Maryland challenging the payment of public funds to colleges of several different religious denominations. Reports from Washington state that the White House believed that such aid to private schools was necessary to break the roadblock which legislators sympathetic with parochial school needs had thrown across the path of aid to public schools. A real question arises as to whether such a breaching of the separation of church and State is too high a price.

Additional aid to education is clearly necessary at all levels. But further study is needed to make sure that the implementation of the President's proposals is accomplished in a sound and legal manner.

[From the New York (N.Y.) World-Telegram and Sun, Jan. 13, 1965]

Education and Progress

If this country is to make real progress toward eliminating poverty, unemployment and racial inequality, it will have to be done through education. No other approach can even begin to solve the problems involved.

It will do no good to create jobs, for example, if workers with the needed skills are not available to fill them. Nor can equal rights be legislated if the cultural gap between races is so wide that they live in two different worlds.

That is why President Johnson's proposals on education are worth serious study even from those who in the past have opposed Federal aid to schools. For the first time, an effort is being made to tackle the Nation's basic problems where they begin—not at the level of the voting adult, but of the learning child.

The object, as Johnson sees it, would be to give every child the opportunity to get as much education as he has the ability to take.

This is certainly not the situation today. The child born in a slum home, of parents who themselves have known nothing but squalor and near-illiteracy, often is far beyond other youngsters even before he reaches the first grade. In a few more years—especially if he attends a substandard school—he is hopelessly mired for life.

As for the argument that the Federal Government should stay out of the educational field, the fact is that it is already there—and in a big way. Federal commitments to education, directly and indirectly, total more than $6 billion this fiscal year.

What the President proposes is to step up the spending and change its direction toward what he believes are vital national goals.

As sent to Congress, the program has some questionable points. A poor family is arbitrarily defined as one with an income of less than $2,000 a year. This may constitute poverty in some cases and not in others—depending on the family itself and the locality.

Basically, however, the program aims in the right direction. Poverty and ignorance are national problems. They breed on each other.

They can be eradicated only by attacks at the roots, which is what Johnson recommends.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, June 13, 1965]

Education and Poverty

President Johnson's special message on education, submitted to Congress Tuesday, sets forth a bold and imaginative program to enlist the maximum potential of education as a weapon in the Nation's war on poverty.

The President has made far-ranging proposals but nearly all of them are centered on a common theme: to open new educational doors for children of poor and needy families. "A national goal of full educational opportunity" is the way Mr. Johnson expressed it.

There is undeniable truth in the President's pronouncement that "poverty has many roots but the taproot is ignorance." Considering the enormity of the task, the first-year cost of $1,660 million in Federal funds for new projects does not seem excessive.

Nonpublic schools, operated on a nonprofit basis, would be eligible for some Federal assistance under the Johnson proposals—as, for example, in funds for the purchase of books of a nonreligious nature for classroom or library use. Constitutional questions are certain to be raised in Congress about any use of public funds for nonpublic education and the issues may be resolved eventually in the courts.

It should be emphasized that all school aid proposed by the President would be channeled through States or local school districts and subject to control at those levels.

A major problem to be encountered, in translating the Johnson program into practical legislation, is directing aid to where it is most needed. The bulk of the expenditures—$1 billion the first year—is to be earmarked for elementary and secondary schools serving children of families with less than $2,000 annual income. It is planned to distribute the aid on a formula based on income data compiled by the Census Bureau.

Although "pockets of poverty" is a widely used phrase, census figures indicate that children in the under $2,000 family income category are scattered among approximately 90 percent of the school districts in the Nation. Many districts, if not most of them, have a fair representation of pupils from various economic levels. There seems to be no workable way to channel school aid solely to the poor and the needy. Giving the most aid to districts with proportionately high enrollments from poor families, as the President recommends, is better than distributing funds at random and without regard to economic need.

The President's education message—including provisions for assistance to preschool children and college students as well as to elementary and secondary schools—constitutes a sound starting point for Congress and ought to result in the enactment of constructive legislation this year.

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Evening Sun, Jan. 13, 1965]

AID FOR EDUCATION

President Johnson has presented his request for the expansion of the Federal aid to education by some $1.5 billion in the next year as "the No. 1 business of the American people." It springs from a faith both old and strong. As he pointed out, that faith runs back to a declaration of the Continental Congress that "education shall be forever encouraged". Nor can there be any doubt that the overwhelming majority of people agree with him that "every child" is entitled to "get as much education as he has the ability to take," that this represents a national need, and that "nothing matters more to the future of the country."

His proposals, running the gamut from a program in support of pre-school projects to higher education—"no longer a luxury but a necessity"—are as wide ranging as those contained in the health and medical program laid before the Congress on Monday. The core of the plan, however, is found in the billion dollars he asks for additional assistance to the elementary and secondary schools, "the foundation of our education system." Enactment of the proposals set forth in this section of the message is described by the President as "of utmost urgency."

Two aspects of the program are particularly noteworthy. Mr. Johnson has emphasized the note of "urgency" by keying this part of his scheme to the attack on poverty. The distribution of the aid through the States to the school districts would be designed to bring help especially to the schools "serving children of low-income families." In this way the President adds an extra dimension to the appeal in behalf of making "a national goal of full educational opportunity." And by stressing the desirability of making the benefits available to "all children within the area served," including students in nonprofit private schools as well as public schools, by means of "shared services" and some "common facilities" that "can be maintained more efficiently for a group of schools rather than for a single school," he seeks to offer a way out of, or around, the troublesome state-church issue.

Whether the effort will prove successful is not yet clear though it appears that it has already elicited support from some of those who had resisted earlier attempts to mediate the difficulties inherent in almost any formula that would make private and parochial schools eligible for help. If it proves that Mr. Johnson has in fact circumvented any strong opposition on this point the likelihood of favorable action on the program will be bright. But as to that we shall not know until all the details of the scheme are clearly exposed in actual measures Congress will consider. The President has made a strong case for his request, large and elaborate as it is. As in the case of the medical program, however, Congress will have the duty of studying the particulars with all the care they deserve to be given.

MINERALS INDUSTRY AND FEDERAL ACTION—ADDRESS BY SENATOR JACKSON

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, last Monday my colleague, the distinguished junior Senator from Washington, Henry M. Jackson, the chairman of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, addressed the American Mining Congress meeting in Washington.

Senator Jackson's remarks on "The Minerals Industry and Federal Action" is such an excellent summary of the present status of the mining industry with reference to assistance from the Federal Government that I feel it must be shared with this body. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the text of Senator Jackson's speech be inserted in the Record at the close of these remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, as the sponsor of legislation (S. 338) to liberalize tax deduction for exploration expenses of mining industries, I would call special attention to Senator Jackson's comment concerning the need for this legislation to stimulate additional exploration of mineral resources of the Nation.

The following are Senator Jackson's comments about S. 338 which I introduced with Senators Allott, Bartlett, Bennett, Bible, Cannon, Church, Dominick, Hart, Jackson, Jordan of Idaho, Long of Missouri, McGovern, Metcalf, Montoya, Moss, Mundt, Randolph, and Simpson, as cosponsors:

> To do this job of exploration the industry needs stimulation and help. I believe a tax incentive program which goes beyond the existing limitations in the internal revenue law would be in the national interest. As you are well aware, a bill for this purpose was introduced late in the last session of the Congress. It would have allowed all exploration costs to be deducted as a current business expense for tax purposes. The Treasury Department objected to the removal of deduction limitations as proposed in last year's bill on the theory these represent capital investment.
>
> A modified bill has just been introduced which attempts to meet these objections by including recapture provisions. The recapture provisions would provide for payment of taxes—after a mining operation becomes profitable—equivalent to the taxes which would have been paid in the absence of this bill. They would also provide for adjustment of tax on any realized gain in the disposition of mining properties to prevent conversion of ordinary income into capital gain.
>
> Although this bill is within the jurisdiction of the Finance Committee, I have instructed the staff of the Interior Committee to work closely with the Treasury and the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation as well as the Finance Committee in an effort to help obtain agreement on this proposal. This is a matter of great importance to our whole economy and I am hopeful the Congress will act favorably.

Mr. President, I am also greatly encouraged by the interest of Chairman Jackson in legislation to aid the gold miners. While mining as an industry has been the stepchild of Uncle Sam in comparison with subsidies and assistance granted to other segments of the economy, the gold miners have been orphans in the household. In my capacity as chairman of the Minerals, Materials, and Fuels Subcommittee of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, it has been one of my primary goals to find a solution to the overriding problem of the gold mining industry—the inflexible price at which the product can be sold. It is my intention to introduce again in this session of Congress legislation directed toward improving conditions in the gold mining industry.

I look forward to the welcome support of the chairman of the full committee in efforts to enact legislation to aid the gold miners.

EXHIBIT 1

THE MINERALS INDUSTRY AND FEDERAL ACTION

(Remarks by Senator Jackson before American Mining Congress, January 11, 1965)

Before this group of leaders of the American Mining Congress, I would be foolhardy indeed to try to speak as an expert on mineral production, processing, and marketing. I am the first to recognize the fact that you all know more in those fields than I could possibly tell you. I am a lawyer, and, along with some 534 other Members of the Senate and the House, am a lawmaker.

Yet I feel close to and identified with American mining. My own State of Washington is an important producer of minerals, and I am chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, which has initial responsibility for Federal legislation affecting the mining industry and the development of the mineral resources of the publicly owned lands of the United States.

From this perspective I would like to take a quick look at the present situation with you—briefly review the last Congress, and then discuss for a few minutes what the Interior Committee will be considering of interest to you in this, the 89th Congress. In so doing, I will try to present the picture as I see it. You are much too sophisticated a group for me to try to use what people out in my section of the country call the "bailing wire" approach. That is, I'm not going to tell you that we of the 89th Congress are going to pass this little bill for that little section of the minerals industry, or take this little action to give a little relief for that small group.

The minerals industry and its problems are much too big, much too important to the security and welfare of our country for any such "bailing wire" approach. For you are affected, directly and immediately, by international and national events, by what happens politically and economically in other nations, as well as in our own. Developments in Chile with respect to much greater Chilean participation in ownership of American mining properties there, is exhibit A of these facts. Exhibit B is the reflection in the minerals industry of the overall prosperity in the United States.

Probably few members of the American Mining Congress would agree that the state of the domestic minerals industry is good, yet good is a highly subjective term, and for the country as a whole the state of the minerals industry is at least better. It is better now, that is, than it has been for a number of years. Only last Friday, President Johnson and Secretary Udall announced that the Nation's mineral production in 1964 broke all previous records, establishing a new high of $20,400 million. This Bureau of Mines estimate is $800 million higher than the value reported for 1963, and $1.6 billion greater than the 1962 figure. It represents an increase of about 4 percent over mineral production a year ago.

Nearly all of the 80 mineral commodities, for which production figures are kept, shared in the upward trend. Of the three major groups of minerals, metals enjoyed the largest value gain, rising 10 percent above their 1963 level. The value of nonmetals (excluding fuels) rose 5 percent, and that of fuels rose 3 percent.

Happily, these increases are not solely the result of higher prices. Most minerals were produced in greater quantity. In the nonmetals group alone, 37 of the 46 commodities on which the Bureau reports were produced in greater volume than in 1963.

My own State of Washington shared in these better times, with mineral production rising to a value of some $76.8 million during 1964, an increase of nearly 8 percent over the 1963 figure.

Now, I want it clearly understood that I am not claiming that Congress enacted any specific legislation for the mining industry that is responsible for this relative prosperity. The mining industry shared in the overall prosperity and economic growth of our country. Our gross national product for 1964 is estimated by the Joint Committee on the Economic Report to have been at the rate of approximately $633 billion for 1964.

In other words, to paraphrase an expression that was famous a few years ago:

"What's good for the country is good for the mining industry."

Of course, Congress had a part in the attainment of this alltime high in prosperity. The tax relief bill helped the minerals industry as well as others. Mines and mining shared in the stimulation our economy received from the numerous other national economic measures.

This brings me to the second point, and that is the need, the necessity, for American mining men to concentrate on finding new ore deposits, new supplies and reserves of metals, fuels, and nonmetal minerals within the United States. I firmly believe that, in the words of the French philosopher Voltaire, "We must cultivate our own garden." We must develop our own resources and be able to stand on our own feet with respect to our essential needs of basic minerals.

Recent events abroad, and possibility of still more drastic developments, speak for themselves in this regard.

Let me make myself clear on this very delicate subject, involving as it does our foreign policy and the economic well-being of many American companies: I am not advocating that American companies pull out of oversea production of minerals. Of course, with respect to many of them, such as tin, there is little or nothing to leave, even if we would. In the case of others, any pullout would damage our relations with friendly governments as well as upset our own industrial relationships.

What I am urging is increased emphasis on discovery and development of new supplies of minerals in the Northern Hemisphere, and particularly in the United States itself. This can be done without upsetting our foreign trade-foreign relations applecart.

The recent extraordinary developments in the lead area of south-central Missouri are an example of what I mean. As I am sure you all know, through the use of modern prospecting methods, a tremendous new lead ore reserve has been discovered there and will, I am informed, be of great significance. Also, Bureau of Mines experts tell me, there is reason to believe that there still are vast reserves of lead, zinc, and silver in the Coeur d'Alene and Metalline Falls areas, and still a lot of unfound copper around Butte. These are but some examples of some of our domestic mineral potentials.

To do this job of exploration the industry needs stimulation and help. I believe a tax incentive program which goes beyond the existing limitations in the internal revenue law would be in the national interest. As you are well aware, a bill for this purpose was introduced late in the last session of the Congress. It would have allowed all exploration costs to be deducted as a current business expense for tax purposes. The Treasury Department objected to the removal of deduction limitations as proposed in last year's bill on the theory these represent capital investment.

A modified bill has just been introduced which attempts to meet these objections by including recapture provisions. The recapture provisions would provide for payment of taxes—after a mining operation becomes profitable—equivalent to the taxes which would have been paid in the absence of this bill. They would also provide for adjustment of tax on any realized gain in the disposition of mining properties to prevent conversion of ordinary income into capital gain.

Although this bill is within the jurisdiction of the Finance Committee, I have instructed the staff of the Interior Committee to work closely with the Treasury and the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation as well as the Finance Committee in an effort to help obtain agreement on this proposal. This is a matter of great importance to our whole economy and I am hopeful the Congress will act favorably.

Now, to touch briefly upon recent legislative developments affecting mineral production. The tax relief measure, as I have mentioned, probably had a greater impact than any other single piece of legislation in the just past 88th Congress. Another highly important legislative action was the repeal of the Silver Purchase Act. I shall have more to say on silver a little later.

More limited pieces of legislation that became public law were the tripling of the acreage limitation on coal leases to 46,080 acres, and the raising of the limitation on phosphate leases to 20,480 acres from the previous maximum of 10,240 acres. This measure should be of great help to western phosphate producers and to the fertilizer industry in general.

A measure of great potential interest was that of establishing the Public Land Law Review Commission. The Commission soon will be in the process of organizing itself, and I expect it will start its highly important work in the near future. We shall want the knowledge and the views of you members of the American Mining Congress.

Finally, a quick look ahead—and I shall mention only those measures directly affecting mines and mining likely to be considered by the Senate Interior Committee. Of most general interest, probably, will be a revival of the proposal to study strip and open pit mining methods and their effect on surface uses of the land. I am well aware that the end results of such a study well might be new burdens upon you mining men. It is in your own self-interest, as well as that of the public, for you to recognize and to take the lead in coming up with solutions of the problems arising from open pit mining, rather than leaving it to the Government.

Another probable measure that will be of interest to mining men in some localities is one which will authorize leasing of geothermal steam deposits on Federal lands. As all of you know, often geothermal steam is highly mineralized, and the mineral residue often is more valuable than the heat itself.

It will be recalled that last year our committee held comprehensive public hearings on Senator ANDERSON's flexible quota bill for lead and zinc. We reported the measure favorably, with a good strong record to support it. However, because quotas come within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Finance, the measure had to be re-referred to that committee and there it died. Senator ANDERSON is preparing to introduce his flexible quota lead and zinc bill again, and I think Senator ANDERSON's approach is a most carefully thought-out, constructive one. If it works with lead and zinc, it could well be applied to other basic minerals, the market for which has been highly unstable. I hope all of you will support it actively.

As to gold, the gold stabilization bill already has been introduced in the House, and a companion measure will soon be before us in the Senate. I am well aware of the plight of our domestic gold miners, and the urgent need of our country for more gold. Our committee most certainly will try to come to grips with the problem. But in view of the attitude of the Treasury Department toward what it insists on regarding as an attempt to upset the apparently sacrosanct $35 an ounce price, I cannot honestly hold out too much hope for concrete achievement. Treasury's hostility has been the same throughout Republican and Democratic administrations alike. In any event, our committee will try to do something about gold, and we will welcome your ideas.

I want to bring these remarks to a close by touching upon perhaps the most immediately pressing of all of our minerals problems. That is, of course, silver. Because silver is the basis of most of our coinage, the Interior Committee shares jurisdiction over silver with the Committee on Banking and Currency, and, in fact, it is in that committee that legislative action in the 89th Congress probably will center.

I don't need to tell any of you that silver, although a very old and revered metal through the ages, is a wonder metal of today. Industrial and national security needs for silver are so great as to threaten to overshadow even its historic role in coins and art.

These new industrial and defense requirements come upon us at a time when we need more coins than ever before in our daily life. We are entering a new age of merchandizing and retail distribution through vending machines which require more and more coins. Also our expanding toll road systems require coins and more coins. A trip by road from Washington to Boston costs something over $8 in tolls, for example, most of which has to be paid in coins.

Patently, greater production of silver is perhaps the most urgent of all of our minerals problems.

Some administrative action to help meet the need is being taken. The Office of Minerals Exploration in the Department of the Interior is offering to advance 75 percent of exploration costs for finding new silver deposits. Secretary Udall has instructed the Geological Survey and the Bureau of Mines to step up their activities to help find and produce more silver. The just-introduced bill to change the tax treatment of exploration expenditures, which I mentioned earlier, could be a great boost to silver production.

But I fear the immediate solution must be found in using existing supplies of silver differently. This may mean a change in the silver content of existing coins, and possibly minting new coins of, say 15-, 20-, 30-cent denominations using combinations of silver with other alloys. A great many vending machines now require the use of two coins, since many items are priced at 15 or 30 cents. New 15- or 30-cent coins using as little silver as possible and still permitting our coin machines to operate would of course ease the situation somewhat.

However, a change in the silver content of existing coins probably offers the most immediate solution to our need for more silver. I realize I am on delicate ground indeed. Let me make plain and emphasize that as a westerner, born and bred, and as a Senator from a great silver-producing area, I am in full support of silver coinage. But we are faced with a condition, not a theory. A great many responsible observers—persons whose views I respect—agree that a change in the composition of our dime, quarter, and half dollar is imperative. The shrinking Treasury reserves of silver and the rising demands for coins are the factors that have combined to force us to face a decision that cannot be long delayed.

But if there must be a reduction of the silver content in our coinage, I am strongly of the opinion we should be extremely wary of any suggestion that silver be removed entirely. I say this for two reasons.

In the first place, the United States has always had silver in its coinage. Coinage of intrinsic value has been, and is, an integral part of our American heritage. While the value of coins is not entirely dependent upon their silver content, the presence of silver provides a stabilizing effect and confidence in our money.

In the second place, complete elimination of silver from the coinage would mean a serious disruption to the vending machine industry, to which I have already alluded. Silver, as you all know, is high in electrical conductivity. Most vending machines identify dimes and quarters electrically.

And there is another vital factor. Our new coinage, whatever its content, must circulate side by side with our present coinage. The temptation to hoard must be discouraged. It seems feasible to me that the public would be less inclined to hoard the present coinage, if the new coins contained a significant amount of silver. The prospects for hoarding our present silver coins would be far greater if the new coins contained no silver whatsoever.

Of course, we must be realistic about his problem. The Treasury has to be assured that it will have an adequate supply of silver to meet coinage requirements over a long-term period. It cannot and should not be faced with a similar problem in a few short years.

The hard fact that must be faced is that at the present rate of depletion of Treasury holdings of silver, this source of supply could be completely exhausted in 4 or 5 years. This would eliminate the present ceiling on the price of silver. The price increase would make the melting down of coins in circulation the cheapest source of silver. The result would be economic chaos and the loss of our tradition of silver coinage.

This is where you gentlemen come into the picture. I am encouraged by the documented estimates I have seen indicating an increase in silver production of 18 percent in the next 4 years. There are 1.8 billion ounces of silver in our present coinage. It is quite possible that a goodly part of this silver will be recovered by the Treasury and converted to lower content coinage. This, coupled with present Treasury reserves and projected production increases, should certainly provide an adequate long-term reserve for coinage of reduced silver content and permit our Nation to continue its time-honored tradition of coinage of intrinsic value.

I want to express my appreciation for the opportunity to meet with you leaders of our minerals industry; and as chairman of the committee of the Senate that has great responsibility for Federal action in your field, I invite your views and assistance.

FACT SHEET: ESTIMATED FEDERAL PAYMENTS UNDER S. 370

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am advised that much interest in S. 370, the Johnson administration elementary and secondary schools bill, has been manifested by senatorial offices, which wish to know the extent to which the States will participate in each of the programs under the bill.

In an effort to be of assistance in answering such questions, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in my remarks in the RECORD a table prepared by the Office of Education. The table is entitled "Estimated Federal Payments Under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965." I feel sure this table will be most helpful to them.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Estimated Federal payments under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965

State	Education of children of low-income families	Supplementary educational centers and services	School library resources and instructional materials	Strengthening State departments of education	Total
United States and outlying areas	$1,000,000,000	$100,000,000	$100,000,000	$8,500,000	$1,208,500,000
Alabama	31,738,000	1,848,183	1,743,209	161,458	35,490,850
Alaska	1,336,472	318,630	119,467	104,208	1,878,777
Arizona	9,100,006	937,181	819,362	127,384	10,983,933
Arkansas	21,095,002	1,100,693	942,684	133,576	23,271,955
California	60,137,510	8,263,535	9,356,424	410,041	78,167,510
Colorado	7,721,560	1,109,926	1,071,419	135,638	10,038,543
Connecticut	6,155,076	1,436,389	1,400,169	141,940	9,133,574
Delaware	1,966,851	425,768	258,226	107,837	2,758,682
Florida	27,896,230	2,710,131	2,617,466	188,687	33,412,514
Georgia	34,517,871	2,235,274	2,185,906	178,025	39,117,076
Hawaii	1,904,676	531,380	393,138	111,804	2,940,998
Idaho	2,100,136	537,339	372,489	112,917	3,122,881
Illinois	37,288,765	4,943,134	5,389,313	253,009	47,874,221
Indiana	18,424,129	2,458,260	2,541,258	182,383	23,606,030
Iowa	16,346,232	1,491,506	1,491,407	146,459	19,475,604
Kansas	9,090,592	1,233,866	1,152,628	137,925	11,615,011
Kentucky	28,215,150	1,691,776	1,557,466	149,679	31,614,071
Louisiana	37,904,234	1,882,932	1,932,808	158,875	41,878,849
Maine	3,780,000	660,364	528,537	116,335	5,085,236
Maryland	13,741,401	1,783,996	1,818,913	155,096	17,499,406
Massachusetts	11,908,492	2,588,350	2,635,630	174,363	17,306,835
Michigan	29,765,556	4,062,794	4,695,888	243,670	38,767,908
Minnesota	19,248,386	1,867,997	1,998,425	159,008	23,273,816
Mississippi	28,028,704	1,341,527	1,224,582	143,346	30,738,159
Missouri	25,957,735	2,194,717	2,321,138	171,011	30,644,061
Montana	3,511,907	538,784	384,799	112,351	4,547,841
Nebraska	6,774,304	881,108	779,136	123,765	8,558,313
Nevada	631,040	377,940	212,853	104,473	1,326,306
New Hampshire	1,451,592	496,163	337,963	109,388	2,395,106
New Jersey	17,777,548	3,159,017	3,250,467	193,995	24,381,027
New Mexico	8,351,640	699,717	593,744	119,486	9,764,587
New York	75,127,295	8,034,171	8,336,439	334,342	91,832,247
North Carolina	48,496,960	2,514,127	2,447,947	188,249	53,647,283
North Dakota	4,834,410	513,786	349,089	111,055	5,808,340
Ohio	35,235,338	4,926,076	5,434,535	266,996	45,862,945
Oklahoma	14,777,840	1,325,618	1,273,402	144,929	17,521,789
Oregon	6,853,177	1,069,776	980,782	133,013	9,036,748
Pennsylvania	44,890,181	5,407,680	5,938,648	265,660	56,502,169
Rhode Island	3,399,750	601,767	430,178	111,285	4,542,980
South Carolina	25,519,125	1,452,925	1,326,833	147,371	28,446,254
South Dakota	6,142,156	542,251	388,881	112,284	7,185,572
Tennessee	31,092,525	1,970,661	1,835,751	167,730	35,066,667
Texas	74,580,048	5,097,472	5,373,277	284,529	85,335,326
Utah	2,373,062	691,632	590,688	121,164	3,776,546
Vermont	1,489,957	390,835	209,098	106,137	2,196,027
Virginia	29,312,850	2,221,193	2,106,138	172,557	33,812,738
Washington	9,525,713	1,592,775	1,599,956	153,808	12,872,252
West Virginia	15,554,250	1,072,551	929,563	132,645	17,689,009
Wisconsin	14,471,631	2,123,991	2,290,563	162,258	19,048,443
Wyoming	1,358,100	363,499	188,433	106,592	2,016,624
District of Columbia	3,825,800	534,934	347,598	110,588	4,818,920

MINING IN ALASKA LEADS THE WAY

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, in the story of our Nation's economic development, mining plays a major role. In many of our Western States, the first major industry to produce employment and to bring capital was mining. This is true not only of the Rocky Mountain States, but of Alaska, as well.

The first large groups of American settlers to come to Alaska came for gold. Some of our oldest cities were built on gold. Through the years, the State has produced millions of dollars of this metal, as well as millions' worth of copper, silver, and mercury.

The story of mining in Alaska is not over. A new and hopeful chapter has begun in the exploration and development of the copper showings at Ruby Creek, 250 miles up river from Kotzebue. The prospects there sound most encouraging; and it is fitting that this work is being done by the Kennecott Copper Corp., which was formed in Alaska almost half a century ago.

Mr. President, Mr. M. J. O'Shaughnessy, general manager of the New Mines Division of Kennecott, in an address before the Chamber of Commerce of Fairbanks, on December 3, outlined the history of the company and the plans it has for the Kobuk. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. O'Shaughnessy's remarks be made a part of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COPPER—50 YEARS IN THE 49TH STATE

(Address by M. J. O'Shaughnessy)

It is a long journey—no matter how measured—from a weatherbeaten mining shack in the Wrangell Mountains of Alaska to a towering skyscraper in New York City where one of the world's largest copper producers has its headquarters, but this is essentially the story of Kennecott Copper Corp. over the period of almost half a century.

Because the company I represent was formed in Alaska, and because Kennecott is once again helping to develop this State's great mineral resources, I am happy to take this opportunity tonight to trace some of the company's early history and to comment on prospects that lie ahead.

In reviewing the past in some detail this evening my purpose is not so much to recount history, as to focus attention on some important guidelines that our past experience may give us for the future.

Kennecott, Alaska—as many of you in the audience are aware—is located on the east side of the Kennecott Glacier, at an elevation of about 2,200 feet, on the south slope of the Wrangell Mountains. I am being meticulous in pinpointing the area because it was from this humble beginning that the Kennecott Copper Corp. of today emerged.

The Kennecott Glacier with a width of about 4 miles at Kennecott, runs in a general north-south direction and heads about 16 miles to the north in an enormous icefield stretching along the east-west summit of the Wrangell Range at elevations of 13,000 to 16,000 feet. Mount Blackburn is the highest mountain with an elevation of 16,140 feet. Four miles below Kennecott at the town of McCarthy the glacier is receding and becomes the headwaters of the Kennecott River.

Near Kennecott, three creeks—National, Bonanza, and Jumbo—join the glacier from a northeasterly direction. McCarthy Creek also joins the Kennecott Glacier and River at McCarthy, with its headwaters in the same general area as the three creeks. Nikolai Creek is a tributary to McCarthy Creek, joining it about 8 miles above McCarthy.

The Kennecott River flows into the Nizina which in turn joins the Chitina about 15 miles southwest of McCarthy. The Chitina then flows west for about 70 miles and flows into the Copper River at the town of Chitina. From there the Copper River flows south for some 130 miles to the Gulf of Alaska near Cordova.

Cordova and Valdez are the two principal seaports in this area and they are about the same distance—120 air miles—from Kennecott.

Implements of copper were reported to have been seen in the hands of Copper River Indians by early Russian explorers and traders who visited the mouth of the Copper River long before the mineral resources of Alaska were considered to be of value.

The first interest in such resources by the U.S. Government was in 1884 when an expedition directed by the Army under the command of W. R. Abercrombie was formed. Leaving Seattle on June 1, Lieutenant Abercrombie, with a doctor, 2 other officers, and a troop of 16 men, landed on June 16 at Nuchek on Hinchenbrook Island. This was the closest entry for the larger ships, and it was also the trading post used by the Copper River Indians.

The Copper is a large temperamental river, glacier-fed and joined by numerous other glacier-fed tributaries. In the early summer months these cause turbulent floods carrying large masses of ice and boulders. Fifteen miles above its outlet into the Gulf of Alaska, the Copper River starts to fan out from its one channel to form an enormous delta having a spread of 15 miles where it spills into the sea. The many channels through this delta are continually changing and the river is totally unsuitable for navigation.

Notwithstanding the warnings of the Indians against an attempt to ascend the river, Lieutenant Abercrombie and his troop made a valiant but futile effort. In a 2-month period of extreme hardship they had only reached the Childs and Miles Glaciers, about a 20-mile advance, and they then faced the dangerous rapids which were named Abercrombie. A retreat was made back to Alaganik, another Indian village close to the westernmost outlet, and from there the expedition made a sea voyage by canoes to the port of Valdez. They had just sufficient time to reach there and make a quick reconnaissance before the freezeup.

A second attempt to ascend the Copper River was made in 1885 by Lt. Henry T. Allen under the direction of the War Department. Heeding the experience of the Abercrombie Expedition, Lieutenant Allen was instructed to reach the mouth of the river at least by March, so as to ascend it on the ice. He was accompanied by Sergeant Robertson and Private Fickett. Landing at Nuchek they added Peter Johnson, a prospector, to their party. Johnson's partner, John Bremner, had started up the river in the preceding year with a group of the Indians from the interior, and Johnson was extremely anxious to follow and rescue Bremner, who was rumored to be stranded in an Indian village.

Lieutenant Allen left Nuchek on March 20, 1885, with his three white companions and three Indians. They experienced a rugged trip, using canoes to start from Alaganik, with their sleds loaded on the canoes, and alternating from boating to portaging for the first 10 miles. The balance of the journey was arduous and conducted under difficult weather conditions, but on April 15 they reached Tarel, an Indian village just below the mouth of the Chitina River. There they found John Bremner in destitute condition and practically starving, along with a small group of Indians belonging to the tribe of Chief Nikolai. After a short rest and physical recuperation from the Allen provisions, the Indians guided the expedition to the main village of Chief Nikolai by a torturous 4-day trip up the Chitina River to the mouth of the Nizina and then along the Nizina to Dan Creek. They found that this village was regarded as being in the heart of the area's mineral region, and the chief pointed out to them the locality of a vein which at that season of the year—April—was inaccessible. He also gave them some samples of bornite (sulfide of copper and iron) and they were told that some other samples obtained in the district had been sent to Boston for assaying with results showing up as high a content as 60 percent copper. The copper used by Nikolai and his people for utensils and bullets was found in the form of nuggets in nearby streams.

Concurrent with the discovery and activity of the Klondike, within a 100-mile radius from the Copper River and its tributaries, there was a rush of prospectors to Valdez in the spring of 1898. The same W. R. Abercrombie, now a captain, was given another assignment in Alaska. This time he was ordered to make a military reconnaissance of the Valdez-Copper River area. During 1898 and 1899, with adequate facilities, both in terms of men and pack horses, his troop surveyed and established a military road from Valdez to Copper Center.

Frank C. Schrader, Arthur C. Spencer, and Oscar Rohn, geologists of the U.S. Geological Survey, were attached to the Abercrombie expeditions of 1898 and 1899, and they contributed valuable information to guide the prospectors. The limestone-greenstone contact that is the dominating structure along which the Kennecott ore bodies occurred, was noted, studied, and described by them as an important geological horizon with favorable mineral possibilities.

As a result of this activity the importance of Valdez as a year-round seaport entry for both Alaska and possibly the Yukon was widely publicized. Stephen Birch, a young mining engineer in New York City, became interested. He convinced some influential friends, Mr. and Mrs. Havemeyer, that he was serious in a desire to go to Alaska in a quest for minerals, and the Havemeyers and several associates agreed to provide all expenses. Subsequently, Stephen Birch landed in Valdez with a request to Captain Abercrombie to attach him to his expedition in a civilian capacity. From that point on, Birch apparently traveled extensively with the troop and kept in close touch with all prospecting activities.

The Nikolai mine is located on the creek of the same name, a tributary of McCarthy Creek. The ore occurrence was probably the one that Chief Nikolai pointed out to Lieutenant Allen, since it is visible from Dan Creek. It was revealed to Edward Gates by an Indian named Jack, who was able to find it from directions furnished by the chief. It was located in July 1899 with ownership by the Chitina Mining & Exploration Co., an association of nine men headed by R. F. McClellan.

This group was returning to the Nikolai to develop their property in 1900 and at Valdez they were joined by two sourdough prospectors, Jack Smith and Clarence Warner. Smith and Warner accompanied the Nikolai crew as far as McCarthy, where they parted from them to follow along the east side of the Kennecott Glacier.

As one looks up at the mountains to the northeast from the Kennecott Glacier, a well-defined contour line immediately catches the eye at an elevation of about 6,000 feet. This is the same contact between the Nikolai greenstone and the Chitistone limestone noted and reported by the USGS geologists. It can be traced for about 75 miles in a northwest-southeast direction from the Chitistone River to the Kotsina River.

The Nikolai Mine is close to the contact, and all members of the Nikolai group had been in close touch with the USGS geologists and were aware of their opinions regarding the contact. Smith and Warner were searching for an approach to the western extension of this favorable structure from the Kennecott Glacier. They took off to the northeast at Bonanza Creek, and after following this up to timber line, about 4,000 feet elevation, they could not miss seeing the outstanding green cliffs of copper which crowned the Bonanza Mine. The story is told that the prospectors were looking for horse feed at the time and first mistook the malachite for green grass.

The discovery was made the first part of August 1900, and it was so rich that Smith and Warner immediately returned to the Nikolai to bring their mine friends to see the Bonanza. It was then located by the 11-member partner association, the Chitina Mining & Exploration Co.

The claims located by the stakers covered over a mile in length along the limestone-greenstone contact.

One mile to the northwest along the contact from the Bonanza, there was a small outcrop of chalcocite which flared on one of the limestone beds about 50 feet normally above the contact. This outcrop was 15 feet long by 12 feet thick. From it, a narrow vein which broke through the bedding, contained about 18 inches of chalcocite and malachite. This was the surface expression of the Jumbo Mine which was the greatest producer of the four mines, the Bonanza, Jumbo, Erie, and Mother Lode, which were eventually opened up in the district.

Stephen Birch was in Valdez when the members of the Chitina Mining & Exploration Co. returned there in the fall of 1900. He was greatly impressed by their reports of the unique outcrop of the Bonanza and when one of the owners needed cash he purchased a one-eleventh interest.

After visiting the property, he was more impressed and with the backing of the Havemeyers he purchased complete control of the property, paying $25,000 each to the other owners.

The property then passed into the ownership of Alaska Copper & Coal Co., with

H. O. Havemeyer as president. This company, with Stephen Birch as manager, opened up sufficient ore and favorable possibilities to interest a Guggenheim-Morgan combination. In 1908 the ownership passed to Kennecott Mines Co., and in 1915 it became the Kennecott Copper Corp. with Stephen Birch as president.

Valdez was first picked as the best seaport outlet for a railroad and the Havemeyers started surveys from there in 1907. Further consideration brought out the importance of coal deposits at Katalla and the project was switched to that port.

However, a safe harbor was not practicable at Katalla and Cordova was the next choice. In the meantime, M. J. Heney, financed by Boston capital, had started to build from Cordova. Competition arose but the Havemeyers were able to negotiate a deal for the right-of-way via the Copper River Valley with retention of M. J. Heney as construction manager.

The railroad passed over sloughs, streams, and deltas to mile 39 on the east side of the Copper River and then recrossed it over a steel bridge at mile 49. It then passed between Childs and Miles Glaciers into Abercrombie Canyon along its course on the west side of the Copper with magnificent scenery for 82 miles to Chitina. It was necessary to cross the Copper once more just above its junction with the Chitina River. Here, where the spring ice flows were terrific, another steel bridge was considered but found impractical. The alternative was a pile bridge with reconstruction of new bents each year after the floods took their toll. From Chitina the road followed the west of the Chitina River, then along the Nizina and Kennecott Rivers to mile 196 at Kennecott. Many construction problems were encountered but they were taken in stride by M. J. Heney, a great railroad builder, and his sturdy crew of engineers and construction men.

Thus the Copper River and Northwestern Railway was completed in 1911 at a total cost of over $20 million. Its maintenance required a crew as large as that needed to operate the mines and mill, and to keep the rails clear in the winter through the Copper River flats, the largest rotary snow plows then available in the world were required.

After the two prospectors, Jack Smith and Clarence Warner, had sold their interest in the Bonanza-Jumbo group of claims to Stephen Birch, they continued to prospect in the Kennecott area. They located another group to the north of the Bonanza, on the opposite slope of Bonanza peak. This was about a mile distant by air, but several miles by trail. They called this new prospect the Mother Lode group. The outcrop was in the higher beds of limestone, about 1,200 feet above the limestone-greenstone contact. A rather persistent fracture of 1 to 2 feet in width, with copper stain, and weak mineralization of chalcocite and malachite, outcropped for at least 200 feet. The Mother Lode Mine was started on this showing by the Mother Lode Mines Co. about 1910 or 1911 and continued until 1919.

The Mother Lode Co. did not have a mill, so its income was dependent entirely on high grade ore shipments. The operations had not been profitable and a large investment had been made by the shareholder.

There were some very severe snowstorms in the area in the spring of 1919, and destructive snowslides followed. The Kennecott Mines were completely cut off from all communications with the mill camp for several days, as all telephone lines were down and the trails could not be used because of continuous slides. Several towers on each tramway were demolished by the slides, and the cables were carried down the mountains as much as a mile from the tramway right-of-way.

The Mother Lode Mine suffered serious reverses as a result of the slides. The miners lived in the tunnels for a couple of days, while the massive snowslides were booming around the bunkhouse. The tramway and powerlines were badly wrecked. New capital was needed for repairing the damage and for further exploration, and a deal was made with Kennecott. Kennecott agreed to advance up to a certain sum for exploration work, for which it would receive a 51-percent interest and full operating control. Under the new management, in 1919 the Mother Lode became a very successful mine, its ore body eventually connected up with one of the ore bodies which was developed by the Bonanza-Jumbo crosscut to make the great Bonanza-Mother Lode vein.

The fourth mine of the Kennecott group, the Erie, was more or less of an "eagles nest" in the cliffs above the Kennecott Glacier, 4 miles north of Kennecott. The 12,000 foot crosscut, which connected it with Jumbo, made a producer of the Erie.

The Kennecott Mines were worked out by November 1938. The total tonnage mined at Kennecott was 4,626,000 tons containing an average grade of about 13 percent copper. In many of the open pit mines in the Western States today, we are processing ore averaging less than 1 percent copper, so you can see what a true bonanza this was. The total production was 591,535 tons of copper and about 9 million ounces of silver. A fitting tribute to the vision and courage of the men who found the ore, to the financial interests which provided the necessary risk capital, and to the operators who resolved it all into a successful conclusion.

There was quite a long period of inactivity for Kennecott in Alaska and it was not until the 1950's that exploration interest was renewed and intensified.

The copper showings at Ruby Creek on the upper reaches of the Kobuk River and above the Arctic Circle were discovered by goldseekers in 1901. After a very brief flurry of activity the prospects remained dormant until they were rediscovered by Rhinehart Berg in 1948. For the next 8 years Berg's faith in the property's potential and much hard work enabled the opening up of the best of the near-surface copper mineralization there. In this work he was assisted by Mr. Jack Bulloch, of Kotzebue.

In 1956 Mr. Russ Cradwick, of Bear Creek Mining Co., Kennecott's exploration arm, examined the showings exposed by Berg's work and as a result the property was taken under option and drilling started in 1957.

This was followed by 6 more years' drilling with field activities starting as early as March and extending as late as October in each of these various years.

The surface exposures did not prove to be very promising: However, better ore potential was developed below the surface, and as a result of this work a decision was made to go underground in order to prove the existence of the ore indicated by drilling and to determine the other physical characteristics of the deposit which would have a bearing on its economic worth and future development.

The deposits we are interested in today lie about 13 miles north of the village of Kobuk and 50 miles north of the Arctic Circle. Kobuk is 254 miles upriver from Kotzebue, or about 175 miles due east from that village. It is about 325 airmiles from Fairbanks, as you know.

Normal freighting access to the region is by ship or barge from the Seattle area through the Bering Sea, the Bering Strait, and to Kotzebue Sound to Kotzebue, thence by shallow river barge upriver to Kobuk and then overland 13 miles to the mine site. The sea route is hazardous and subject to delays caused by the everpresent icepacks and the river navigation is dependent upon the time and quantity of the seasonable rain in the Kobuk River Valley.

Our original plan was to take a small mining plant with 1 year's supplies into the mine site last summer and to commence shaft sinking this fall. However, the icepack prevented our equipment from reaching Kotzebue before late in July, and the Kobuk Valley was bone dry until the end of August. As a consequence, we only could shuttle our equipment and supplies about 75 miles upriver during the dry season and move our materials another 100 miles further upstream when the rains came this year. We then hope to complete the freighting project the last 50 miles overland by tractor train during this winter.

It is planned to sink a shaft some 1,100 feet in depth, take a good look at the ore under ground in order to evaluate its true potential, and then decide our future course of action. We hope, as you can well imagine, that we are successful in this venture.

I have gone into some detail in these two mining ventures as each represents a good example of the true Alaska challenge. Also, they highlight the factors which must be faced in seeking to develop and carry Alaska's minerals to the marketplaces of the world.

Let us now try and assess Alaska's mineral potential; some of the adverse factors we must face in developing it; and some of the possible solutions to the related problems.

Much has been written about the untapped mineral resources of Alaska, and we all recognize that it is difficult to develop a yardstick to measure its future potential. However, one of the clearest indicators to me is expressed by a comparison of the annual mineral production of Alaska per square mile of territory with other countries which have been developed to varying degrees.

When we do this we find that the figures show $27,800 per square mile for Great Britain, $8,110 for Poland, $4,500 for the mainland United States, $975 for Soviet Russia, $435 for Canada, and $105 for Alaska.

Perhaps you are as surprised as I am at these figures. If we can think of Alaska as having the same ultimate mineral output potential per square mile as Poland our annual production value would exceed $5 billion. And a reasonable part of this should be copper. Fantastic? I do not think so.

To develop this tremendous hidden potential we not only must have capital, but also motivation, knowledge, people, power, transportation, and markets.

From a mining viewpoint investment of capital requires a good tax climate: one which recognizes the inherent gamble in the search for minerals and permits a profit commensurate with the overall risk. We should push for the recognition of all exploration expense as an allowable operating cost before Federal taxes, the retention of the depletion allowance which recognizes the limited life of an ore body after it is found and developed, and the maintenance of a State tax structure which is not throttling and assesses only the fair share of the necessary contribution for the useful and essential government functions.

Our knowledge of the ways and means of finding ore bodies is growing daily. Remember that over 90 percent of the scientists who have ever lived are working today. This factor can help overcome the time element in the high productivity ratios for some of the older countries mentioned before.

We require people. Our free enterprise system has demonstrated time and again in the past that people are available if the motivation is sufficient to arouse the latent frontier spirit which has been so successful in the past.

We must increase our efforts to train people for the challenges ahead and in this respect our University of Alaska is making a rapidly growing contribution—it deserves our support as well as the other colleges in the State.

We should extend our vocational school training to supply the skilled journeyman, tradesmen and operators to keep the wheels of new industry turning. We need such schools not only in our urban areas, but in the interior native communities to train a skilled technical force as well as supply material for the professional group. We all recognize the inherent mechanical ability of the native Eskimos and Indians. This can be developed into a major source of essential talent for the future challenges. For power we have the unharnessed rivers—great and small as well as the stored resources of coal, gas, and oil.

Of all the factors essential to the successful development of Alaska's mineral wealth, I believe the most important is transportation.

You will recall that the solution of the transportation problem made the original Kennecott mine a successful venture.

The same problem faces us today at Bornite, and faces almost all of the State of Alaska.

Development of this State's great natural resources will provide jobs, economic growth and prosperity, but that development depends, in large part, upon expanding the means of transportation. Our main highway system should be extended to the Seward Peninsula and secondary feeder roads developed as necessary to open up the natural resources: and these are not limited to the mineral potential only.

Our highway system should be integrated with better use of our great inland waterways. Flood control and dredging possibilities should be investigated fully so as to develop cheap transportation as rapidly as practicable.

For exploration access and the movement of personnel, a better system of landing fields is needed for our interior airlines and bush pilots. The military has done a good deal of work in this area and has provided fields which can be used for civilian uses, but more fields are urgently needed.

It is obvious that our mineral wealth must be carried to the world markets and that it must be able to compete with similar products from all other sources. We must take a good look at our sea lanes and our harbor facilities.

The highway and inland waterway system should be integrated with the good harbors and they should be kept open by ice breakers when necessary and practicable.

Pipelines to carry the oil, coal, and gas for local industries to come, and for export, will follow the development of new consumers; and mining in all parts of the world always has advanced the frontiers and pioneered the way for other industries from the beginning of civilization.

Alaska is a frontier and a challenge to all of us. Every Alaskan family stands to benefit economically and socially by the development of industries, natural resources, transportation systems, educational facilities and market outlets of this great State. Let us join together to push the frontier into the Arctic Ocean and make Alaska a true land of oportunity for this and succeeding generations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

THE MILES CITY VETERANS HOSPITAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, yesterday, January 14, my office received a call from Great Falls, Mont. This call came in at 2:15 p.m. Mr. Emil Bauer, of Great Falls, called and said that a World War I veteran, Victor Brown, had a stroke the preceding night, and that Mr. Gue, manager of Columbus Hospital, called the veterans hospital at Fort Harrison to seek admission for Mr. Brown.

Mr. Bauer stated that Mr. Gue was informed that they could not take him because they did not have a bed available. Mr. Bauer stated that they found a card, which he gave Mr. Gue, which indicated that Mr. Brown recently made application to the Veterans' Administration for benefits, and that he would get that for the "C" number.

He stated that Mr. Brown was not able to talk. The doctor said that he had had a stroke on the left side. Mr. Brown lives in the home of Mr. Bauer's mother-in-law at 1008 Fourth Avenue North, Great Falls. He is not able to remain at Columbus Hospital because he has no income. They will have to try to get him on relief through welfare if he cannot be admitted to a veterans hospital.

Mr. Bauer called back about a half hour later, on yesterday, to say that he now had Brown's full name, Victor H. Brown, C-1988108. I might say parenthetically that numbers are evidently very important nowadays. He said the manager at Columbus Hospital told him that he, the manager at Columbus Hospital, had talked with the manager of the veterans hospital at Fort Harrison shortly before noon today. He said that Mr. Brown receives a pension and that the hospital is having difficulty trying to get him into the county hospital under welfare because the patient is not able to sign his name.

We contacted the Veterans' Administration in the District of Columbia. At 12:15 today, my office received a call from the Veterans' Administration, advising that Victor Brown will be admitted today to the Fort Harrison hospital. The hospital at Fort Harrison is now contacting Mr. Brown's physician to make the necessary arrangements.

Yesterday the Fort Harrison hospital was filled to capacity. Earlier this week, the Veterans' Administration announced that it was closing the veterans facility at Miles City, Mont., now filled almost to capacity by June 30 of this year.

I do not know where the Veterans' Administration gets its information. I do not know why it places so much stress on computors and not enough stress on human needs.

I assume it is known that at the present time there are 20,000 living veterans of the Spanish-American War, and that their average age is 85.6. I assume they know that there are 2,285,000 living veterans of the First World War, and that their average age is 69.5. I assume they know that there are 15,075,000 living veterans of World War II, with an average age of 44.5. I assume they know that there are 5,688,000 Korean war veterans, with an average age of 34.3. I assume they know that in 1950 the average daily patient load in veterans hospitals was 96,643. In 1955, it was 106,682. In 1960, it was 111,408.

In World Wars I and II, on a percentage basis, Montana furnished more members to the armed services than did any other State in the Union. As a reward we get notice that the hospital at Miles City, a veterans facility which is one of the new ones, having been put into operation in 1951, is to be closed.

I have in my hand a copy of the Miles City Star, dated Tuesday, January 12. This is a statement by Mr. Malcolm Randall, administrator of the Miles City VA hospital.

The paper states:

> The hospital is at near capacity as far as patients are concerned, Randall says. There is one patient bed unoccupied, he said.

The next day, there were two vancancies, because that night a veteran died in the Miles City veterans hospital.

It is my understanding—and I believe these figures are correct—that 75 percent of the patients in the Miles City VA hospital come from eastern Montana; 15 percent come from Wyoming; and 10 percent come from the western Dakotas, both North and South Dakota.

It is my further understanding that some time ago the Veterans' Administration decided that the computers should be called in to locate veterans hospitals which are small, which are relatively isolated, where the patient load was small, and where the facilities were removed from medical centers.

It is my further understanding that over the past weekend, over Saturday and Sunday, typographical crews typed letters which were to be sent up on Monday for signature, but most of them had to be retyped because of typographical errors. I understand that letters to Senators—mine was dated January 13—were typed over the weekend, to be ready for transmittal, on an "operation avalanche" basis. This was evidently a well-planned operation which a great many people knew something about, except Senators and Representatives from States concerned.

I note in the New York Times, under date of Wednesday, January 13, one of the reasons the Veterans' Administration gives. I quote from that newspaper:

> The VA now likes to concentrate its medical care in big-city areas close to teaching hospitals and medical schools.

I wonder if the Veterans' Administration realizes the fact that the closest facility to Miles City is at Fort Harrison. By air it is 300 miles, and by road it is 348 miles. If Mr. Brown, of Great Falls, who was finally admitted to Fort Harrison, had had to go to Miles City, it would have been 447 miles. The Miles City service area is bigger than all the New England States put together. The closest facilities, outside of Fort Harrison, are at Fargo, N. Dak., 450 miles, on the Minnesota line; Sioux Falls, S. Dak., 490 miles, on the Minnesota line; Grand Island, Nebr., 545 miles away; Cheyenne, Wyo., 370 miles away; Spokane, Wash., 570 miles; Boise, Idaho, 550 miles.

Those are the distances from the Miles City facility, which is supposed to go out of existence.

If the Veterans' Administration plan is carried through on June 30 of this year, where are veterans from the Dakotas, Montana, and Wyoming going to go? How are they going to get there? Who is going to bear the expense?

Are the veterans of Montana, the Dakotas, and Wyoming to be discriminated against? I say "No."

And, while they are abolishing hospitals, I note that in the past 5 years the following new hospitals have been built: Palo Alto, Calif., at a cost of $23 million. That is what we are going to save by closing these facilities, they say. Brecksville, Ohio, $25 million; Cleveland, Ohio, $18 million.

Those three were authorized in 1946. In 1956, Nashville, Tenn., $12 million; Martinez, Calif., $12 million; Downey, Ill., $22 million; and Jackson, Miss., $10 million.

Hospitals presently under construction: Washington, D.C., $21 million; Wood, Wis., phase I, $32 million; Charleston, S.C., $11 million; Atlanta, Ga., $13 million; Gainesville, Fla., $11 million; Temple, Tex., $8 million; Miami, Fla., $19 million; Memphis, Tenn., $19 million; Long Beach, Calif., phase II, $18 million; Oteen, N.C., $9 million.

But that is not all. Remember they are closing down 14 to 17 facilities.

But here is a list of hospitals not now being constructed but hospitals authorized for future construction. I repeat—future construction.

San Juan, P.R., $22 million; Hines, Ill., phase I, $21 million; Los Angeles, Calif., $23 million; Chicago, Ill., $18 million; Columbia, Mo., $12 million; Northport, N.Y., phase I, $16 million; San Antonio, Tex., $15 million; Tampa, Fla., $16 million; San Diego, Calif., $27 million; and Long Island, N.Y., $26 million.

It does not look too good for States with small populations.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Not now.

It does not look too good for the States with small populations but only for the large population areas or the sunny climes.

Just where does the small State fit in this Union?

I know where it fits in the Senate. I believe that what we should keep in mind is this: That those of us who come from the sparsely settled West have supported the programs of the folks in the urban areas time and time again—many times to our own political detriment.

But, we wish a fair deal. I believe that it is an outrage that the hospital in Miles City is to be discontinued. This is a hospital which is presently operating at capacity, as is the hospital at Fort Harrison near Helena, Mont.

Mr. President, let me note that last December two radar stations were closed in Montana, one at Miles City and one at Cut Bank. The first information I had was 3 hours before the official press release was issued.

In the same month, the great air base complex at Glasgow, Mont., the newest airbase in the country, was closed. That information, too, came to me on the same basis—on 3 to 5 hours' notice.

In January of this year, an announcement was made that the congressionally authorized minting of silver dollars at the Denver Mint, which was scheduled to begin after the first of the year, had been postponed indefinitely.

Did anyone in the bureaucracy bother to advise the Senators of the States most immediately involved before this action was taken? No.

That information came to us from the newspapers.

A few days ago, an announcement was made that the Miles City veterans hospital was slated for closing. I must say that the bureaucracy is improving because in this instance I received 1½ hours' notice from an official in the Veterans' Administration before the information became generally known.

Now, Mr. President, as I noted earlier, I recognize the need for change and sometimes the inevitability of change of this nature.

But I am persuaded that in these changes, the human needs could far better be met if there were some prior consideration of them with the elected Members of Congress, both Republican and Democrat, who are close to the people of the areas involved. As a minimum, there ought at least to be the courtesy of adequate notice to the Senators and Representatives of the States involved. Noification by avalanche, which the bureaucracy appears to be resorting to increasingly in these situations, is a ruthless, insensitive tactic, and it is going to be met by a snowballing protest until it is ended.

On Wednesday, the Veterans' Administration announced the closing of 14 hospitals and 17 regional offices. Among those listed is a general hospital at Miles City, Mont. Other Senators are fully capable of speaking to the effect of these closures in their States. As a Senator representing Montana, which I am before all else in the Senate, I shall confine my remarks to the injustice which is inherent in the closing of Miles City General Veterans Hospital.

This hospital is in eastern Montana. It serves an immense, sparsely settled area, not only of my State, but of North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wyoming. With its closing, the distances which veterans in the region will now have to travel for hospital care at the nearest veterans facility will be increased anywhere from 300 miles, upward.

Now, all of this, Mr. President, is in the name of economy. Whose economy? Not the veterans of the region who have every right under the law and simple justice to claim first-class service. Not the veterans who need prompt medical attention. Not their families who will have to travel great additional distances in order to provide the essential therapy which is involved in visits to patients. Not the region in and around Miles City whose economy has grown up in part around services supplied to the hospital complex.

Miles City, in Custer County, is in the heart of an eight county blizzard area which affected eastern Montana last month. It is in the heart of an area in which 25 to 50 percent of the calves due this spring will not be forthcoming. It is in the heart of the area in which Fort Keogh is being slowly liquidated. It is close to the area where the abolition of the Huntley project, we have been told, will soon take place.

Mr. President, that kind of economy is "milked" economy. It is the kind of economy which tends to accelerate the process of headlong flight of people to urban areas. The problems there are not growing less acute, for that is where veterans' hospitals, along with countless other public and private services, are steadily being concentrated. In accelerating this process, it is a false economy, because it multiplies problems and skyrockets costs in the cities.

It is the kind of economy which tends not only to increase urban blight, but to hasten rural decay. It is the economy of reduced service to the public with which we have become all too familiar in these years of the computer mentality. Mr. Driver, the head of the VA, in his letter, admits to the use of the word "computer" in the manner of arriving at decisions of this kind. Indeed, the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration in his letter on the closing makes much of the fact that computers are coming to play a larger and larger role in the operation of the agency.

In the first World War, I was only a seaman second class. Subsequently, I was a buck private in the Army. Then I was a private, first class, in the Marine Corps. In those days we had serial numbers, as servicemen have today. But to me a veteran is not a serial number. He is a human being. I can go back and show the promises that the Congress made. Nothing would be too good for the men who fought in the First World War, in the Second World War, or in the Korean war. We would take care of them. They could give 3, 4, 5, or 6 years of their lives, but, we told them, "Do not worry; if you come back, you will be given the best of care," and that included medical attention.

Mr. President, the closing of the Miles City and other veterans' hospitals is billed as motivated by economy—"the saving of the taxpayers' dollars."

The other day I found on my desk 150 maps of the United States of the kind which I hold in my hand. They were sent to me recently by some Federal agency or other. They are beautiful maps. They are historical maps. They came well wrapped. I did not ask for them. They are available to me, as they are to other Senators, for free distribution to whomever we may chose to give them.

Annually I receive thousands of pamphlets and bulletins from the Department of Agriculture on a wide variety of subjects. Not a day passes when a departmental organ or some other publication of one agency or another does not arrive at my office door and often in great quantity. Those, too, are available for free distribution. I do not question the value of those publications for the rather select audiences to which they are most often directed. But I do say that if we are to put stress on economy, we might better start with that sort of

Government expenditure for publications which involve countless millions of dollars of materials, labor and professional skill, the proofs of which more often than not are directed toward a very limited segment of the population.

I now hold in my hand an item issued by the Veterans' Administration. I suppose it could be called a human computer, because all one need do is to place the arrow in a certain position, push it up or down or turn it around, and he would find where all the Veterans' Administration hospitals in the country are located. Eighty-five copies of that item came to my desk. I did not ask for them. I do not need them. I wish the Veterans' Administration would spend the money on the veterans and give them the needed care by keeping open needed facilities. I do not believe we should start by cutting down on services which are designed to meet the human needs of the veterans, of whom there are now in excess of 20 million.

Mr. President, it is an old story. When we are in an emergency, nothing is too good for those who are called upon to make great sacrifices for the Nation's safety and benefit. When the emergency is over, we begin, after a while, to forget the earlier promises. The enthusiasm wanes; the apathy waxes.

If we continue in the manner in which we are operating, I wonder how long it will be before we arrive at the point which we achieved before World War II, when the administration of veterans hospitals was so inept and inadequate and so economized as to constitute a national scandal. I do not mean to reflect on the present management of the Veterans' Administration, but the warning flags are flying.

As a Senator from a western mountain State, I have always tried to understand and sympathize with the special needs of urban and depressed areas in various parts of the Nation. But I do not intend to acquiesce in any computed design of this nature for the future of the Nation which overlooks my State and my region. I wish to make it clear, here and now, that I expect the same kind of consideration for my part of the country and my State as I am prepared to extend. I expect it from the bureaucracies of the Government and from Congress.

I should like to support measures for Appalachia, Urbania, or whatever; but I do not propose to support them at the expense of establishing a new economic wasteland in Rockania.

Even if it were an isolated incident, the announcement of the impending Miles City closing would warrant a vehement protest of this kind. But it is not an isolated instance. We have seen a progression of this sort of thing in Montana. Not too long ago, the Government, through the Interstate Commerce Commission, sanctioned the closing of Milwaukee Railroad passenger train service between Deer Lodge, Mont., and Aberdeen, S. Dak. The line runs through Miles City.

Since the election, as I have said before, I have received notification that the radar bases at Cut Bank and Miles City, Mont., would be closed, and that the Glasgow Air Force Base would be phased out over a few years, even though it is the newest Air Force base in the country, and even though approximately $100 million was spent on it. Only last spring, $1 million was spent on extending its runways. Hundreds of people uprooted themselves from other parts of the State and Nation in order to locate at Glasgow in connection with this facility. The city expanded its service in education, water supply, and housing; and I believe the rural telephone association even entered into a contract with the base, a contract on which they may lose money. Now it all goes into the ashcan.

Similarly, the Miles City General Hospital is, I repeat, one of the newer veterans hospitals. It is well equipped to supply the needs of the veterans of two World Wars, the Korean war, and perhaps others, as well. The needs of the veterans are increasing, not declining. For a decade and a half, a community's way of life has grown around the presence of this hospital. Now it, too, goes into the ashcan.

MINTING OF SILVER DOLLARS

On another subject—this bears emphasizing—my distinguished colleague from Montana [Mr. METCALF] and I—last year urged Congress to authorize the minting of 45 million silver dollars. That may not mean a great deal to the people of the East and the large urban areas, where everything else is being concentrated, but it means much to us. In Montana, especially, and throughout the West, in general, these silver coins have a special significance and great general utility. They are not oddities. They are a tradition, and they are money.

Yet the news now reaches us that this authorized minting of silver dollars is held up somewhere in the bureaucracy. If I read the signs correctly, there is a possibility that it may be omitted altogether.

I say to the Senate and to the people of my State that had I known of these developments before the election, I would have put the truth on the line before the election. It has never been my practice, and it never will be my practice, to gild the lily before an election and then let the gold flake off thereafter.

I understand that a resolution of criticism was introduced in the Montana Legislature because of the silver dollar matter. This is politics, and I can accept it. But I say, without qualification, that if there is any suggestion that I knew of these developments before election and withheld that knowledge from the people of Montana, that is an utterly false suggestion.

If the people of Montana are surprised and dismayed by these developments concerning the silver dollar and the Miles City facility let them know that it is a surprise and a dismay which I share completely.

I recognize that changes in technology bring about changes in the way, and even the paces, in which both business and Government must carry on their function. Montana is no more immune from changes of that kind than any other part of the Nation. Let me say to the bureaucracies of this Government that they may not be able to put the human factor into the computers when decisions for change are made, but no Senator, no elected official of this Government can ignore that factor, nor should it be ignored.

I ask these bureaucracies:

On what side of the ledger of these so-called economy decisions do you put the losses of the man who is thrown out of a job by the change?

On what side do you put the losses of the bankrupt businesses?

On what side do you put the losses inherent in the forced movement of people, and especially young people, brought about by your changes?

On what side do you put the decline in property values?

On what side do you put the curtailed and inadequate services which result from the change to those who are entitled to the best by law and equity?

If changes are to be made, as they must be made from time to time, I would hope that they should be based, in part at least, on more commonsense and human sense than this closure at Miles City. If changes are to be made, the least which should be expected from this Government are adjustments which offset their adverse effects on the people involved.

The least which should be expected is tangible provision for a rapid conversion of valuable facilities and skills from one public purpose to another. The least which should be expected is a concrete plan which is meaningful in terms of the plight of those who are adversely affected by mechanical decisions in Washington.

Unless these expectations are met, we shall find ourselves pulling out the roots of poverty in one part of the country, only to transplant them to other parts, with ever-rising cost to the public everywhere.

Mr. President, I want to state that until these expectations are met in my State, as a Senator representing Montana, which is my primary responsibility, in concert with my able colleague, Senator LEE METCALF, I shall not let this matter be forgotten.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks an article entitled, "Treasury Dragging Feet on Minting Cartwheels," published in the Montana Standard and the Butte Daily Post on January 10, 1965; an article entitled, "Montanans Miss Their Beloved Silver Dollars," published in the Great Falls Tribune on January 10, 1965; an article entitled, "Miles City VA Hospital To Be Closed June 30," published in the Miles City Star, on January 12, 1965; an article entitled, "VA To Shut 14 Hospitals in Economy Move, Including 3 Upstate," published in the New York Times on January 13, 1965; a letter of notification dated January 13, 1965, from the Veterans' Administration, concerning Miles City; and a well thought out letter written by an old friend of mine, Mr. Harry E. Sawyer, director of the Veterans' Welfare Commission of the State of Montana, under date of January 13, 1965.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. **MANSFIELD.** Mr. President, I had intended to have printed in the RECORD more than 500 telegrams and letters to support my case and show how the people of Montana, the Dakotas, and Wyoming feel. But, in the interest of economy, I shall not do so.

THE MILES CITY VETERANS HOSPITAL

Before I close, I repeat what I said in the beginning. Yesterday we received a call from a veteran who had a stroke. He could not speak. He could not sign his name. He could not be admitted to the Veterans' Administration facility at Fort Harrison because it was full.

Today that man is going in, but only because, perhaps, two Senators and two Congressmen contacted the VA personally, and a way was found to do it. In other words that hospital is filled to capacity. Yet the Miles City hospital is to close down. On the night of January 12 I was advised that there was one vacancy in the Miles City hospital. On the night of January 13 I was informed that one patient died on the night of the 12th, and there were now two vacancies.

What is meant by the liquidation of these hospitals from sparsely separated areas? What is gained by closing a facility which serves a geographic area bigger than the New England States put together.

I repeat what I said before, that my State furnished 88,000 veterans out of a population of 700,000. This facility at Miles City will be taken away from a State that furnished more men in World Wars I and II, on a percentage basis, than any other State in the Union. We are entitled to a study of this question. They, the Veteran's Administration, are building more hospitals and they are authorizing more and, at the same time, they are closing down hospitals where they are needed. So we need to take a look into this question and see that hearings are held to see where the trouble is and take a look at the computer which seems to arrive at the decisions so far as our veterans and hospitals are concerned.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Montana Standard, Jan. 10, 1965]

TREASURY DRAGGING FEET ON MINTING CARTWHEELS

WASHINGTON.—Montana's congressional delegation ignored party differences Saturday in criticizing the Treasury Department for a delay in minting new silver dollars.

Silver dollars became a political issue in Montana last year until Congress authorized minting of 45 million new cartwheels.

Administration policymakers said Saturday Congress will be asked to rescind its authorization for the minting. Plans had been announced last year to start issuing the new coins either late last year or early in 1965.

There seems little doubt that the Treasury will ask for a reduction or elimination of silver content in all new coins.

If the silver dollars were minted, the Treasury would be put in the awkward position of recommending silver conservation in minor coins while consuming 38 million ounces of silver in the dollars.

A shortage of all coins has persisted for several years despite a tremendous increase in production. Treasury officials have said there are signs of some slight easing of the coin shortage. But there is usually some "flowback" of coins into Federal Reserve banks after the Christmas shopping season and officials probably will observe this flowback before making a final decision on silver coinage.

No silver dollars have been minted for about 30 years. Their use is limited to a few Western States and to trade promotions elsewhere.

Treasury officials believe the minting of 45 million dollars would not bring them back into general circlulation. There already have been advertisements in coin collectors' publications offering to sell the new coins at a premium of $3 to $5.

Senator LEE METCALF, Democrat, of Montana, reached immediately, said:

"This is another in a series of breaches of faith with westerners by the Treasury Department.

"It has been only a little more than a year since the Department informed me that it intended to take steps to assure a continuing supply of silver dollars. If such steps were taken they were neither far enough nor fast enough.

"This past fall, the Department advised Senator MANSFIELD that the new dollars would be minted shortly after the first of the year. It now is obvious that the Department has no intention of meeting this second commitment.

"That there is a general coin shortage does not justify failure by the Department to keep its word to continue the silver dollar, the traditional medium of exchange in the West. I shall have more to say on the whole mismanagement of the silver problem in a speech in the Senate early in this Congress."

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, Democrat, of Montana, also said the report disturbed him and that if true it would be "a breach of promise and a thwarting of congressional intent."

"A report of an accredited official of the Treasury Department to the effect that the administration will seek the de-authorization of the authority to mint an additional 45 million silver dollars disturbs me greatly and is a matter which requires early clarification," MANSFIELD said. "It is a matter of extreme importance to the West and I intend to do my utmost to see that previous commitments are carried out and that the people of Montana and the West are provided with additional silver dollars.

"The current silver shortage and the shortage of coins in no way minimizes the need for more silver dollars. This report comes as a complete surprise and I hope that the Treasury Department will live up to its previous commitments and proceed to mint the additional silver dollars as the Congress authorized at the earliest possible time."

Representative JAMES F. BATTIN, Republican, of Montana, commented:

"I regret the delay in minting silver dollars authorized by Congress and I feel it would be a real breach of faith if the authorization were rescinded.

"Inasmuch as the authorization was a political issue in several States, and was solved by passage of the legislation, I would think a reversal would indicate there had been some underhanded tactics involved and would leave you a black mark on the administration.

"Senator CANNON, of Nevada, was reelected by 86 votes and claimed considerable credit during his campaign for the silver dollars legislation."

Representative ARNOLD OLSEN, Democrat, of Montana, was out of the city and unreachable for comment.

[From the Great Falls (Mont.) Tribune, Jan. 10, 1965]

MONTANANS MISS THEIR BELOVED SILVER DOLLARS

HELENA.—From the bartender who tapes together the paper dollar bills his patrons tear up, to the Federal Reserve bank official who says banks don't even bother to order them any more, Montanans miss their beloved silver dollars.

Silver cartwheels may have become even more a thing of the past Saturday with news the Treasury Department has not minted the $45 million Congress had approved and would like to avoid it altogether.

Clement Van Nice, head of the Federal Reserve bank branch in Helena, said the last silver dollars from the U.S. Treasury were shipped to Montana member banks in April.

Montana banks aren't ordering dollars because they know they can't get them, he said in sharp contrast to a year ago when the supply began dwindling fast. New orders came into Helena as fast as the dollars went out.

It was at this point last year that a Bozeman businessman inspired some trade and chuckles by making his own silver dollars—gluing two half-dollars together, that is, until the Government told him to stop.

A Helena bank teller, who sees the public every day, said people have stopped asking for silver dollars but talk about them and ask when they will be available again.

In a spot check around Helena, two supermarket managers said there still is a heavy demand for silver dollars by customers, but probably less than a year ago.

One grocery store is checked regularly, usually unsuccessfully, by a woman whose husband owns a coin-operated service station.

Many Montanans rarely had seen and possibly never had used paper dollars before last summer.

Persons moving into Montana from other States made the switch back to paper dollars without difficulty.

But many persons have not.

A bartender on Helena's Last Chance Gulch, said, "I have to buy scotch tape by the roll now. They tear up the paper dollars and throw them at me."

[From the Miles City (Mont.) Star, Jan. 12, 1965]

MILES CITY VA HOSPITAL TO BE CLOSED JUNE 30

(By Bob Scanlan)

The Miles City Veterans' Administration hospital is to be closed effective June 30, 1965, according to reliable information received at the Star this afternoon. This action by the Veterans' Administration in Washington, D.C., also includes 13 other VA hospitals in the Nation.

As soon as this information was received, contacts were made with eastern Montana's Congressman JAMES F. BATTIN and Senator MIKE MANSFIELD. Both expressed great concern over the announcement and promised action to determine the reasoning behind such action.

Congressman BATTIN stated he could not understand what action would cause the Federal Government to cut down on the care of the men and women who received injuries and disabilities while defending America. Senator MANSFIELD is expected to call Miles City tonight with what information he might learn.

Local veterans organization leaders have called a meeting for 7 p.m. tonight to discuss the matter. The meeting is to be held at the new Veterans of Foreign Wars headquarters and is being called by Dale Stevenson, commander of the American Legion.

Malcolm Randall, administrator of the Miles City VA hospital, had not been officially notified of this action as of early this afternoon. He said he was "shocked" to hear that the rumor may be officially true.

The hospital is at near capacity as far as patients are concerned, Randall said. There is one patient bed unoccupied, he said.

The operating budget of the hospital is $1.6 million annually. There are 136 persons on the payroll which amounts to $847,000 each year.

OPENED IN 1951

The Miles City VA hospital was first proposed in 1945 before the end of World War II. The citizens of Miles City donated to a fund and raised $29,682 to purchase the land on which the hospital is built.

On September 22, 1948, the contract was awarded for the construction at a cost of $4,600,000. The groundbreaking ceremonies were held October 17, 1948, and the hospital was completed in 1951.

The first patient was admitted August 1, 1951. Since that time the hospital has provided medical care and service to over 1,000 veterans each year.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 13, 1965]

VA TO SHUT 14 HOSPITALS IN ECONOMY MOVE, INCLUDING 3 UPSTATE

WASHINGTON, January 12.—The Veterans' Administration advised Members of Congress today that it would close 14 hospitals and 17 regional offices across the country. It estimated the saving at $25 million a year.

Hospitals to be closed were picked on the basis of low patient demand, difficult staffing and outmoded structures, the Veterans' Administration said.

The functions of the regional offices on the list for closing are to be transferred to the nearest other available VA offices.

The scheduled date for all closing is June 30. Three New York State hospitals—at Bath, Castle Point, and Sunmount—are on the list.

Other hospitals scheduled for closing are at Clinton, Iowa; Dwight, Ill.; Fort Bayard, N. Mex.; Grand Junction, Colo.; Lincoln, Nebr.; McKinney, Tex.; Miles City, Mont.; Rutland Heights, Mass.; Thomasville Ga.; White City, Oreg., and the tuberculosis division at Brecksville, Ohio.

About 6,000 beds are involved. No new patients will be accepted in the listed hospitals, the Congressmen were told. Remaining patients will be transferred to other hospitals and all hospital employees are being offered jobs elsewhere.

The offices to be closed include those at Albany and Syracuse. Operations will be transferred to New York City and Buffalo, respectively. The Brooklyn and New York City offices will be continued physically, but under common management.

Other regional offices to be closed, and the offices with which they will be combined are:

Manchester, N.H., and White River Junction, Vt., both to Boston; Fargo, N. Dak. and Sioux Falls, S. Dak., both to St. Paul; Juneau, Alaska, to Seattle; Wilmington, Del., to Philadephia; Cheyenne, Wyo, to Denver; Reno, Nev., to Los Angeles.

Also, Lubbock, Tex., to Waco; San Antonio to Houston; Wilkes-Barre, Pa., to Philadelphia; Cincinnati to Cleveland; Kansas City, Mo., to St. Louis; Shreveport, La., to New Orleans.

The economy orders, while sure to stir protests from individual Congressmen, were not expected to be blocked in the House Veterans Committee.

The Veterans' Administration operates about 170 hospitals. For a long time the agency has expected to close some. The VA now likes to concentrate its medical care in big-city areas close to teaching hospitals and medical schools.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., January 13, 1965.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MANSFIELD: In accord with our policy of keeping you informed, I want to tell you of our plans to streamline operations in the Veterans' Administration through adjustments to be made in our field structure.

These changes provide for continued high quality service to veterans and a savings to taxpayers in administrative or overhead costs amounting to some $23,500,000 in fiscal year 1966.

The past decade has seen many changes in all programs administered by the Veterans' Administration, as well as significant changes in the management of these programs. Many of the benefit programs established to assist veterans in readjusting to civilian life are phasing out and will terminate in the not too distant future. Indeed, some have already done so; and, as is to be expected, participation in many of these programs has dropped sharply. At the same time, we have improved and simplified our operational procedures to maintain maximum efficiency at the lowest cost. As a part of our management improvement program, we have converted some of our benefit programs to automatic data processing, utilizing the most versatile electronic computers yet devised. Still other programs and functions, such as personnel data and payroll, are presently being converted to automatic data processing.

In our medical programs, we have seen significant breakthroughs in medical science which have greatly altered the type and nature of medical care and the facilities necessary for providing such care. Tuberculosis is a good example of this. Where formerly we had 21 hospitals devoted exclusively to long-term care of veterans with tuberculosis, today, as a result of chemotherapy, we have little need for entire hospitals devoted to nothing but the care of tuberculosis patients. The progress of medical knowledge requires additional diagnostic and therapeutic tools. The inability to provide these within the confines of existing physical plants has made some of our hospitals obsolete. These obsolete hospitals must be inactivated and replaced with modern facilities, if we are to continue to provide American veterans with the broadest possible spectrum of medical care. Hospitals also were established in some areas that now have a more than proportionate declining veteran population. As the number of hospital beds we may provide is limited, it is important that in establishing replacement beds, we place them where the greatest need exists and near the medical schools with which we are affiliated.

The characteristics of our domiciliary members have also undergone significant changes in recent years. This program was initially established to provide a home for indigent veterans who could not sustain themselves in their communities. Today we have a vast social security program which, together with increased veteran pensions, is providing more and more veterans with assurance of freedom from financial want. Additional wide ranging programs on both the Federal and local level are also providing more facilities to these veterans as well as to the rest of the population.

As you know, to cope with these changes, we have, in recent years, adjusted and readjusted our organizational pattern to keep pace with the changing needs. We have closed some hospitals; we have relocated others; we have merged some regional offices; closed a number of small VA offices, and consolidated program functions.

We have recently completed a thorough analysis of our programs and operations, both in the Department of Medicine and Surgery and the Department of Veterans Benefits. We find that additional organizational changes must be made if we are to continue to achieve maximum operational efficiency and economy, and at the same time maintain our high standards of service. Accordingly, I have approved the following actions:

Close the following hospitals: VA center, Bath, N.Y.; VA hospital, Lincoln, Nebr.; VA hospital, Castle Point, N.Y.; VA hospital, Rutland Heights, Mass.; VA hospital, Grand Junction, Colo.; VA hospital, Dwight, Ill.; VA hospital, Fort Bayard, N. Mex.; VA hospital, Brecksville, Ohio (Broadview Heights division); VA hospital, Miles City, Mont.; VA hospital, Sunmount, N.Y.; and VA hospital, McKinney, Tex.

Close the following domiciliaries: Bath, N.Y.; Thomasville, Ga.; White City, Oreg.; Clinton, Iowa.

Merge the following regional offices, New York: Merging station, Albany, Syracuse; receiving station, Buffalo.

(Brooklyn and New York functions will be consolidated under one manager, but remain in the same physical locations.)

Pennsylvania: Wilkes-Barre, Philadelphia; Ohio: Cincinnati, Cleveland; Missouri, Kansas City, St. Louis; Louisiana: Shreveport, New Orleans; Texas: Lubbock, Waco, San Antonio, Houston; Alaska: Juneau, Alaska, Seattle, Wash.; Delaware: Wilmington, Del., Philadelphia, Pa.; Nevada: Reno, Nev., Los Angeles, Calif.; Vermont: White River Junction, Vt., Boston, Mass.; New Hampshire: Manchester, N.H., Boston, Mass.; North Dakota: Fargo, N. Dak., St. Paul, Minn.; South Dakota: Sioux Falls, S. Dak., St. Paul, Minn.; Wyoming: Cheyenne, Wyo., Denver, Colo.

To insure that uninterrupted service will be continued at the same level, a VA office in the former regional office city will continue direct personal services to veterans, their beneficiaries, and others involved in VA program activities. A staff of employees will be retained at these offices for this purpose.

In our department of veterans benefits, for a number of years we have been adjusting our resources to the changing demand for benefits. These adjustments began soon after the peak workloads of the postwar years had passed. Initially, our actions involved the reduction of employment in regional offices and insurance activities, and in the past 10 years staffing dropped over 50 percent. In more recent years, major changes to the field organization were accomplished, reducing substantially the number and size of our offices in the local community.

In recent years, four regional offices have been merged with other offices. In each instance it was determined that the office into which the workload was consolidated could serve the VA public effectively and efficiently. This has been substantiated by actual experience.

One of the immediate benefits to be achieved by the consolidation of these offices is a substantial recurring annual salary savings. The economy factor is important, but continued provision of high quality service to veterans requires equal emphasis. Our planning considerations took this into account.

Since the VA's major objective is to provide high quality service to all veterans and their beneficiaries on a timely basis regardless of their location with respect to regional offices, we have given much thought to the important factors that contribute to provisions of service. We considered especially the factors of communications and distance as they affected service. In a recent analysis of regional offices, it was found that in fiscal year 1964 approximately 90 percent of contacts with regional offices were by mail and about 10 percent by personal contact or telephone. Further exploration to determine whether distance was a deterrent in securing benefits confirmed our belief that it has had no adverse effect. Veterans who are great distances from regional offices rely on the mails more heavily than do those who live nearby, but they obtain the same effective service.

In the scheduled consolidations, we are generally merging small offices with larger offices. This has the advantages of causing the least disruption of operations, necessitates the transfer of fewer people, and receiving stations generally have all programs.

This results in greater savings because operating cost is less per work unit produced at the larger stations.

With reference to our hospital program, the general guidelines used in determining which hospitals are marginal and necessitate closing are obsolescence of physical plant, which would be unduly costly to modernize; limited demand for hospitalization due to remote location; difficulty in attracting the number and caliber of professional staff required to assure a high quality of medical care; and the capability of surrounding VA hospitals to expand the boundaries of the geographic area served.

The domiciliary system in the Veterans' Administration has undergone gradual but profound changes from its inception dating back to the 19th century. To provide a complete spectrum of medical care, domiciliary activities must be integrated with hospital activities. In line with the general VA policy of affiliating hospitals with medical schools, or any other level of higher professional activity, the integration of hospital-domiciliary activities will result in improved care.

The relocation plan calls for offsetting a substantial portion of the total domiciliary operating bed loss by activating additional beds at most of the remaining domiciliaries pending reevaluation of nationwide domiciliary needs. A further offset will result from authority given by the Congress which permits VA to plan for nursing-type care, both in VA installations and in State or private facilities.

We expect to complete all of these actions before June 30, 1965, some of them before April 1, 1965. As stated earlier, the total savings to be realized in fiscal year 1966 will be approximately $23,500,000.

We have a high regard for the welfare of our employees and assure you that all employees who cannot be retained at their present location will be given an opportunity to follow their function to another field station, where applicable, or accept an offer of a position at another VA station. The VA is placing restrictions on hiring at its installations throughout the country. This will give maximum opportunity for placement of employees affected by these changes. The cost of moving will be paid by the Govment.

The decision to take these actions was not arrived at lightly. The feasibility of each was carefully considered. In every instance, primary consideration was given to our ability to continue to provide high quality service. I assure you this will be maintained throughout the Veterans' Administration.

Sincerely,

W. J. DRIVER,
Administrator.

FACTS RELATING TO VA HOSPITAL, MILES CITY, MONT.

The Miles City hospital was constructed by the Veterans' Administration in 1951 as a 100-bed general medical and surgical hospital. However, the average daily patient load approximates only 80 patients. By reason of its small size and isolation it is unable to provide the full spectrum of medical and rehabilitation services required by veteran patients. In addition, the hospital is costly to operate and recruitment of well trained professional staff is difficult. Hence, for reasons of better service to veterans and operating efficiency we have concluded that further operation of the Miles City hospital and the other 10 hospitals likewise situated cannot be justified and we have developed plans to close them no later than June 30, 1965.

To facilitate the closing we will stop all admissions other than emergencies to the Miles City hospital in the near future. Patients remaining will be transferred to the nearest appropriate VA hospital. The phasing out of this operation will extend over a sufficient period of time to safeguard the welfare of patients.

THE VETERANS' WELFARE
COMMISSION,
STATE OF MONTANA,
Helena, Mont., January 13, 1965.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MIKE: The closing of the Miles City Veterans' Administration hospital will be a terrific blow to the veterans of Montana. I wonder if the powers that be there in Washington, D.C., realize the problems we face in Montana. You have traveled and campaigned in Montana and you know our distances. Then, does anyone in the Veterans' Administration realize that there is no railroad or bus service between the northeastern part of Montana and Helena? A seriously ill veteran who cannot afford hospital care in Glasgow or Wolf Point and vicinities would have to be brought 400 miles by car. The temperatures this winter have been hovering below the zero mark for the past month. It would be at the risk of his life to bring such a veteran over snowy ice-packed roads for 8 to 10 hours to be hospitalized at Fort Harrison. It has only been a matter of a couple of hours trip to the Miles City VA hospital. Hour after hour the roads on the High Line are closed due to blizzards. A car can start from Plentywood in pleasant weather and be stalled in a blizzard between Glasgow and Malta. This is inhuman. The argument that these veterans were able to get to Fort Harrison before the Miles City hospital was built is not a valid argument, because in those days a veteran could get on the Great Northern train and ride in warmth and relative comfort to Helena. That means of transportation is gone forever. The veterans of southeastern Montana would be able to travel by means of the Northern Pacific railroad.

General Bradley and staff, after World War II when he was the VA Administrator, promised the veterans of the United States that they would have medical care second to none. This promise was kept by building and improving existing Veterans' Administration hospitals. The best possible medical doctors were recruited to staff these hospitals. Believe me, we have been proud of the Miles City hospital, and what it has accomplished. It has been appreciated by the veterans, and especially by their families. It has been a source of comfort for the family of an ill veteran that his family could travel a comparatively short distance to visit him. Can you visualize the trip of a veteran's family from Plentywood to Fort Harrison? The veteran is in the VA hospital because he has no financial means to be hospitalized in or near his hometown. Often there would be not enough money to pay his way to Fort Harrison, let alone the cost of a worried wife's roundtrip expense. The Miles City hospital is a splendid institution. In my visits there I have been impressed with the quality of medical care and attention given the veterans who are patients. This is very much true at Fort Harrison also, but the latter hospital is not being closed—yet.

Montana has suffered a very unfortunate year. There were the floods last spring; the blizzards and cold weather of this winter; the approaching closing of the Glasgow Air Base; the closing of the Radar stations, and now the closing of the Miles City VA hospital. All of the above have or will seriously affect our economy.

It is true we are not a very heavily populated State, but we do have vast distances. In the population of Montana there are approximately 80,000 veterans. Not all, by any means, will become patients in a VA hospital. Montana never failed to furnish all the manpower needed to defend our country in time of war. In fact, our record is the best in the Nation. Not all veterans upon their return from service are smiled upon by fortune. There was a pledge once that the honorable service within the Armed Forces in time of war would grant certain benefits. One of these was a medical program equivalent to the finest in civilian practice. See page 1 of the 1963 Annual Report of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. This, I am sure, does not mean a medical program for those who live in the immediate vicinity of a Veterans' Administration hospital. The beginning of chapter 3, of the same report, gives the mission of the VA medical program which in part states: "to provide hospital, outpatient, and domiciliary care to eligible veterans." The closing of VA hospitals is not carrying out this mission. Too much emphasis is given to the cost of these hospitals and not enough to the return for that expense. When the GI bill was being considered in 1944, the calamity howlers stated that such a program would ruin the country financially. Today the proud boast is made that those trained under this enlightened program have paid back the cost many times in the income tax from their increased income tax payments due to their economic advancement. Likewise, the VA hospitals that prevent seriously ill World War II or Korean conflict veterans from going into debt for hospital and medical care are making an investment. This man or woman, when restored to health, is returned to the employed rolls where their income tax continues to pay for their hospital care. A chronically ill, older veteran, is prevented from becoming a public charge through the hospitalization he gets in order to determine the amount of pension to which he will be entitled. Veterans as a whole are not parasites. They want help when needed, and are more than anxious to get back from an illness or injury and be returned to the employment rolls.

I have worked in the field of representing veterans in their claims before the Veterans' Administration since 1945. I believe I have gotten acquainted with them in every corner of this State. When in service I was well acquainted with the "goldbricks" and "yard birds." They came back to civilian life and are now just the same. Ninety-nine percent of the people in service were good service men and women. The same is true in civilian life. Ninety percent of them will never need or ask for VA hospitalization. As I said, there are approximately 80,000 veterans in Montana. If 10 percent of them ever will need hospital care, then 8,000 will need beds. The bed capacity at Fort Harrison is 160 beds, or at one time it can take care of one-fiftieth of the above veterans. We know this number could not be accommodated even with a rapid turnover of patients as all beds cannot be filled and emptied each week of the year. As it is, only about 1,600 or one-fifth of this 10 percent are hospitalized each year. The Miles City hospital can accommodate 96 patients regularly, or more if an emergency arises. Ordinarily the two hospitals can take care of the patient load. Yet a year ago Fort Harrison had a waiting list that became very large. What will be the effect when the 1,000 patients hospitalized each year at the Miles City VA hospital are added to the list?

Does the closing of VA hospitals mean that another economy act is contemplated by this present administration? Are non-service-disabled veterans to be put out onto the public to die in county poor farms and jails? It happened before, and one cannot but wonder if history is to repeat itself.

The news reports state that the data were put into a computer and the 14 hospitals, including Miles City, were selected to be closed. It's a hell of a thought that a cold, unthinking machine can control the health and welfare of a sick veteran from the prairies of northeastern Montana. Maybe he didn't vote right, who knows?

I know you will protest with every facility at your command this unwarranted and arbitrary closing of a needed hospital. Montana has more enormous distances, rugged winters, and less transportation than any State, other than Alaska. We are a special case because of them.

Very truly yours,

HARRY E. SAWYER,
Director.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. On Tuesday morning Mr. Driver, newly appointed Administrator of the Veterans' Administration, appeared before the Senate Finance Commitee. He was quizzed at length on a great many things. On the list of facilities to be closed was one at Dwight, Ill. I asked him two questions. First, Was this a proposal of the Budget Bureau and had it concerned itself with it, or had he concerned himself with it? The answer was that it was a Budget Bureau matter that came along with his participation in it. I then asked whether this was an administration program and had the approval of the President. I believe the answer was the President was very anxious to effectuate any economy he could in any activity of the Government.

I think, in order to round out the record, it should be indicated that this new Administrator, who is a career employee and who has administered the benefits program for a great many years is not entirely responsible for these actions, that we must include the Budget Bureau and likewise the President in this program.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I commend the Senator for his very impassioned speech protesting the closing of this institution in his State of Montana. From what he says, it will leave a hiatus in large areas where sick or injured veterans will have no hospitals and will have to be transported a considerable distance.

The same ax fell on one of the larger installations in my own State, the veterans' domiciliary institution at Thomasville, Ga., where between 700 and 800 men who have served their country in time of national danger, mostly veterans of World War I who are unable to do anything to help themselves and are incapacitated in some degree, have been receiving the benefits of the Veterans' Administration. That institution is to be closed under the present plans.

I inquired as to what would happen to the inmates, and officials expressed the hope that they would be taken care of at another veterans' hospital some 150 to 200 miles away. I investigated and found out that there were very few beds available there, and no facilities whatever for the type of care that has been afforded these men. If they find any place of refuge at all in a similiar domicilian facility it will be several hundred miles away.

In my opinion, this is poor economy. The closing down of this facility will furnish a great deal of material for the war on poverty, because these men do not own a thing on earth—they have no material wealth. Those who do, are not admitted to this institution. Thus, there will be a great deal of material there to work on with the war on poverty; but when it is all wound up, they will find it will cost just about as much to take care of them on relief as it would in this institution.

Mr. MANSFIELD. In other words, a veteran on relief, is certainly entitled to better care than that.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course he is, especially when he is in such a pitiable condition that he is unable to fend for himself.

In my judgment, this program should be carefully examined by the appropriate committees of Congress, institution by institution, because I cannot believe that we have as much surplus space in our hospitals and other facilities for the care of veterans as this closure would indicate.

My own experience in my own area has shown it is most difficult to even get an emergency case taken care of in a veterans' institution. It has to be a desperate case. It requires the expenditure of a great deal of time and a great deal of effort. In my opinion, these closures may not effect any real economy. It will only add to complexity of the problems which confront us in this country in dealing with distress, with poverty, and those who are unable to help themselves.

I therefore hope that the appropriate committees will look carefully into this whole situation.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I am not going to take time to comment on the statement of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], but I do wish to say that the people of this country, urban as well as rural, should be everlastingly thankful that the State of Montana is still permitted to be represented in the U.S. Senate, and that the State of Montana is represented in the Senate by such a courageous man as the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator from Vermont for his comments.

Mr. AIKEN. On the same subject, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter I wrote on January 14, 1965, to Mr. Driver, the Veterans' Administrator.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 14, 1965.

HON. W. J. DRIVER,
Administrator, Veterans' Administration,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DRIVER: Your letter of January 13 advising of additional plans to consolidate VA operations has been received and is further evidence of the policy to concentrate services and power in a few large cities of this country.

The trend toward concentration of facilities in large cities not only disturbs me from a national economy point of view, but fills me with apprehension over the possible danger of such concentration to our national security.

I hope we have not reached a point when men and women who serve their country become expendable to other costly interests which project more glamour.

In administering the VA program, I am emphatically of the opinion that the first and principal objective should be service to the veteran rather than to treat the VA facilities as a commercial enterprise.

While many Government programs can and should be put on a dollars and cents basis, it is unthinkable that service to the men and women who have served their country in times of crisis should be so considered.

In view of your claims for efficiency and economies, I urge that present consolidation plans be delayed until studies can be made toward advisability of decentralizing these services from the heavily populated, high cost urban areas toward the more rural and normally lower cost areas.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE D. AIKEN.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am glad to yield to my colleague.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I rise to concur in all the remarks that my colleague, the distinguished majority leader, has made. I wholeheartedly concur in this condemnation of the closing of the Miles City Veterans hospital.

Will the distinguished Senator from Montana yield further to me, so that I may direct a question to the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], who is the chairman of the Veterans Affairs Subcommittee?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am delighted to yield further to my colleague.

Mr. METCALF. The Senator from Texas, who is chairman of the Veterans Affairs Subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, has jurisdiction over veterans hospitals.

Yesterday, I wrote a letter to him asking him to hold a hearing promptly on the closing down specifically of the Miles City hospital and also on the general policy of closing down veterans hospitals at this time.

I renew that request while the Senator from Texas is in the Chamber, and suggest to him that he call his committee together as soon as it is organized and hold that hearing promptly.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the Senator from Texas for a question.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Will the Senator from Montana yield to me for an answer? I am in the Chamber on another matter, on the GI bill, and I did not know that this colloquy was going on when I came onto the floor.

Yesterday, I received a written request from the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF] for a hearing by the Veterans Subcommittee on the matter of the closing of the veterans hospital. This subject is properly under the jurisdiction of the Veterans Subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare according to rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate. I pledge to the distinguished Senator from Montana that we will set that hearing as soon as possible.

Prior to the time the request was received, the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] had already set hearings on the education bill before the Educational Subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare beginning on the 26th of January.

I am not going to wait until those hearings are over to call the hearing on the request of the distinguished Senator from Montana. I might add that we have also received protests, requests, and inquiries from other Senators, likewise suggesting the possibility of a hearing.

I believe the only formal request in writing has been the one that has been received from the distinguished junior Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF].

I pledge to Senators that these hearings will be held. We will get the staff together as soon as I leave the floor and work out a date for these hearings that will not conflict with the hearings on the education bills and the GI bill.

I received a protest from Texas this morning, from the county judge of Collin County, at McKinney, Tex., where a veterans hospital is located. A veteran was refused admission to the veterans hospital this morning. There was a very vehement protest from that judge.

We are receiving telegrams protesting the closing of Veterans' Administration offices in certain areas, in addition to protests on the closing of hospitals.

I assure the distinguished junior Senator from Montana that the hearings will be set at an early date. I will start to work immediately with the full staff of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, with which the distinguished Senator from Montana is fully familiar, because he was a member of that committee in the 88th Congress. He has been a distinguished, able, and hardworking member of the Veterans' Subcommittee, and he knows what that subcommittee has done.

It is sometimes said that the Veterans' Subcommittee is not an important subcommittee of the Senate. I am proud of the fact that I have the privilege of being the chairman of that subcommittee. Before he became President, the late John F. Kennedy was a member of the Veterans' Subcommittee. Furthermore, so long as he was a Member of the Senate, the Republican candidate for the presidency last year, former Senator Goldwater, of Arizona, was also a member of the Veterans' Subcommittee.

During the past year, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] followed in the footsteps of his older brother, the late President John F. Kennedy, as a member of that important subcommittee.

And so I assure the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF] that we will make as thorough a search as possible, to get at the root of this thing, to see why a veteran should be denied admission to a veterans hospital.

I remember that 2 years ago a disabled veteran did not get his check. The check did not come to him for 2 months. The veteran was starving. The veteran could not get that check from the Veterans' Administration. There was no reason why he should not have gotten that check. He was still disabled.

Finally, I phoned the Administration and said, "I want something done about this check. I want to know why it has not come through to the veteran." I told them that the veteran was still disabled.

Pretty soon the Administration phoned back to say that the machine had made an error at the computing center. The machine had kicked the veteran's card out of the machine, and that was the reason why the veteran had not received his check. Something or other went wrong and his card was kicked out of the machine. They agreed to walk the check through. People who are familiar with these machines know what is meant by walking a check around a machine. The check went to the center in Chicago, and there the check was walked around the machines, so that the veteran was finally able to get his check.

We make the mistake sometimes of thinking that everything can be done by machines. Machines are fallible. It still takes human beings to operate them. I pledge to the Senator from Montana a full and complete and expeditious investigation.

We certainly want to know which computer decided that the veteran who has been mentioned here has been kept out of a veterans hospital.

Mr. METCALF. The majority leader and I thank the Senator from Texas very much. If my colleague from Montana will yield to me further——

Mr. MANSFIELD. Certainly.

Mr. METCALF. On the first Monday in January of this year we listened to the President of the United States outline his total plan in the war against poverty. We heard him outline his total plan of war against disease, and his plans in his war against erosion.

We waited and waited and waited to hear something said by him about what he would do for the veterans.

There was not a word in the state of the Union speech as to what the Great Society would do for the veterans. We thought, "The subject will be deferred to a special message."

Some of us took heart in the health message when the President said that he would recommend a program for elder and senior citizens. I am in favor of that program. I have supported a medicare program such as the one proposed ever since I came to Congress more than 12 years ago. I thought, "There is the way in which we are going to fit into the program the medical needs of the veteran."

A day or so later we received the letter which the senior Senator from Montana has asked to have printed in the RECORD, after we were informed of it in articles in the Washington Post and the New York Times the day before. In that letter the writer said that in order to save $23.5 million as a part of the economy program the Veterans' Administration has gone to its automatic data processing machinery, utilizing the most versatile electronic computers yet devised, and has come to the conclusion that it should close the listed hospitals, regional offices, and domiciliaries.

Is there not to be anything in the Great Society for veterans? Will we in the West and in remote areas be at the mercy of machines into which the operators insert preordained answers to the questions they ask?

Should not veterans from remote and isolated areas, far from hospital centers, have the same privileges which their comrades in urban communities have? If the policy of the Veterans' Administration is to be that veterans from isolated areas, veterans from our sparsely settled population, and veterans far from the medical centers shall not have the benefits to which they are entitled, then I say that men from those areas should not be drafted. They should not have to render military service.

A veteran from Montana, Colorado, or Alaska who must go into the Army and is wounded is entitled to the same benefits, the same privileges, and the same opportunities as is a veteran from New York, Philadelphia, or Washington.

Mr. President, if the hospital in Montana is closed, it will be a 3-day trip for the loved ones of some person who is in the Fort Harrison hospital or some adjacent veterans' hospital to go to see him. A veteran in one of the metropolitan areas can have his people come in on visiting hours every day. Heartache is caused in the isolated areas, and that is a factor in addition to the actual services that are needed.

I have little to add to all that my distinguished colleague has said. I have received the same 500 telegrams. I have received the long-distance calls. I have heard about the need for the hospital.

I do not know why the Administration has said that it can get rid of a hospital that is operating to capacity and has operated to capacity since 1951. I do not know where they get those figures except from feeding questions into computers. But the day after that letter was delivered to my office telling me that the Administration would save $23.5 million by closing these veterans' hospitals, the domiciliaries and the regional offices, I received, less than 24 hours later, a statement from the President recommending that our Nation spend $3⅓ billion for foreign aid.

It does not make sense. The veterans of the State of Montana are entitled to the same assistance.

> Strength for those who would be free—

Said the President—

> hope for those who would otherwise despair; progress for those who would help themselves.

That is what we owe to our own veterans. Saving $23.5 million on one day and spending $3.3 billion in foreign aid on the next day cannot be justified to the veterans of a real war when we are embarking on a war against poverty and disease.

So I concur completely with the senior Senator from Montana, my distinguished colleague, the majority leader, that we cannot countenance the closing of this hospital. There is no justification for it. There is no warrant for it.

I welcome the statement of the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] that there will be prompt and early hearings as to what the policy of the present administration is to be on the treatment of our veterans.

Mr. ALLOTT. Will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I concur completely in what the two distinguished Senators from Montana and the Senator from Texas have said. No one could have said more eloquently or with more courage the things that the great majority leader has said.

The letter to which he referred was received by all of us involved. Back during World War II we called it a "Dear John" letter. We did so because some of the troops would receive letters addressed "Dear John" telling them that their wives had left them. We received those "Dear John" letters saying that the Veterans' Administration was about to close a hospital.

Mr. President, I wish to say one word in behalf of the Grand Junction veterans hospital in Colorado. It is in roughly the same situation as the hospital in Montana. All the computers available cannot show the heartaches and the trouble that taking one veterans' hospital away from an area like Grand Junction would cause.

Do the administrators realize that if they take away from Grand Junction the hospital which was put there to serve the veterans in that area, it will mean a 7- or 8-hour drive over two high mountain passes of 12,000 feet to go into Denver, an equivalent drive into Salt Lake City, or an even longer drive to Albuquerque?

The heartaches of people who would be involved cannot be compared. It is a 3-day trip, even in good weather, for anyone who is a veteran in that hospital, to go into Denver, make a reasonable visit, and return back home.

One hundred and sixty-eight families would be out of work when the hospital was moved.

The former Administrator of the Veterans' Administration, much to his shame, made a completely unjustified political removal from Colorado in moving the insurance division of the Veterans' Administration up to the Twin Cities. That is all on record. It is past. Nothing can be done about it.

The decision to close the Grand Junction veterans hopsital is a different case. I do not believe that Mr. Driver made that decision. I believe it was made by the Bureau of the Budget and at the insistence of the President.

If the people of our country are to be hoodwinked into believing that we are bringing economy by such measures, the President has them very badly fooled.

It is not that we mind doing the things for people that have to be done. But, I, for one, do not intend to support any of the President's pie-in-the-sky programs when we are emasculating the veterans services at the very level where they are meant to be effective.

If we followed the computers which the Veterans' Administration has, and which we should never have given them in the first place, we would put all the veterans in the United States in one hospital in Washington, D.C., because it would then be near the National Institutes of Health. We could put them all here and we could care for them in one hospital cheaper than we could perform the service in any other way.

The veterans facilities are spread out in the manner in which they are for the reason that veterans, who have earned the right for proper care from the Government—which is to say the people of this country—should have an opportunity to be hospitalized within a reasonable distance of their own homes.

I thank the Senator for his courtesy.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Alaska, who has been so patient and gracious.

Mr. GRUENING. I wish to associate myself with the very moving and eloquent remarks of both the senior Senator and the junior Senator from Montana. I share the rightful indignation which the senior Senator from Montana expressed in his voice. The same press release that wiped out the Miles City hospital also wiped out the one remaining veterans' installation in Alaska. As soon as the facility in Juneau is closed, veterans in Alaska will have to travel 1,000 miles to obtain service.

They cannot very well walk that distance. They will have to expend their money for airplane fare.

Mr. President, these decisions are unjust and unwise. I doubt whether they are sound economically.

As soon as I heard of the pending proposed closing of veterans hospitals and regional offices, I called Mr. Driver, the newly appointed head of the Veterans' Administration by phone. He was not in his office, but I protested strongly the elimination of Alaska's regional office at Juneau to the Deputy Administrator, and asked that Mr. Driver come to my office as soon as he could be located. He came later in the afternoon and my colleague Senator BARTLETT and I presented as strongly as we could our opposition to this closure. He declined to budge, no doubt having orders from the Bureau of the Budget. It is my hope that pending the hearings which both the Senators from Montana and I have requested be held by the Veterans Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, headed by Senator YARBOROUGH, that the proposed closing of the Juneau office be held in abeyance and that no final decision be made until all the protests can be heard and the necessity for this action, performed in the name of economy, be fully evaluated.

We have no veterans hospital in Alaska. It is a thousand miles to Seattle, the nearest place for treatment in a veterans hospital.

Alaska is an area larger than the large area served by the Miles City hospital, which is ordered closed. It is an area larger than Montana, Wyoming, and the Dakotas. From now on, if this order stands, we shall have no facility in Alaska supplied by the Federal Government for the veterans. Fortunately, Alaska has its own State veterans organization, which I sponsored as Governor toward the end of World War II, and supported wholly by State funds. But that does not relieve the Federal Government of its responsibilities.

I am hopeful that this investigation and the hearings will lead to a reversal of this policy.

I thank the Senator from Montana for his patience.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator from Alaska for his very great patience.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. PROUTY. First, I congratulate and commend the majority leader for the courage and objectivity which he has displayed today in discussing the question of veterans hospitalization.

Last Monday, Mr. Driver called me and said that 52 of the administrative personnel in Vermont's only veterans hospital, located at White River Junction, would be transferred to Boston.

Following the visit, Mr. Stratton, Deputy Benefits Director, was in my office with a Vermont delegation. We discussed at some length the justification for such a transfer. He said at that time that a smaller number—he was not certain of it offhand—would be transferred from White River Junction to Boston. But he did not answer our question—at least to our satisfaction—or indicate in any way that savings would be made or that services being rendered to veterans in my State would not be diminished.

I have already asked that no action be taken on the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Driver today. I hope the majority leader will find it possible to postpone action on the nomination for a week or 10 days or until hearings have been held, so that we can ascertain exactly what the situation is in various veterans hospitals and veterans centers throughout the country. I sincerely hope the majority leader will find it possible to do that.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I expressed the same hope, especially so far is Miles City is concerned, but generally speaking, so far as they are all concerned, because if new hospitals are being built, as they now are, and if new hospitals are to be authorized for the future, I believe this subject could well stand a good, close examination.

Mr. PROUTY. Am I to understand that the majority leader is willing to postpone action on the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Driver until hearings have been held?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I do not believe we ought to blame Mr. Driver for what has happened. He is new in his position. I assume that he has been acting under the orders of the Bureau of the Budget. I am sure the Senator is aware that any Senator can hold up action on the confirmation of the nomination. As a courtesy, the leadership will be glad to accommodate any Senator for that purpose. But I would hope that that would not be done in this instance, because I do not think the blame really lies with Mr. Driver.

Mr. PROUTY. That may very well be true; but I think this nomination gives us an opportunity to explore the question far more thoroughly than might otherwise be the case. So I, for one, shall certainly ask that it go over for 1 legislative day, and, if the majority leader would agree, for 1 week.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I will agree that it go over for 1 legislative day.

Mr. PROUTY. I thank the majority leader.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I do not criticize Mr. Driver for the closing of veterans hospitals. This is action by the Bureau of the Budget. The Bureau of the Budget has fought the GI bill under the last three Presidents. They have been the stumbling block in its way. I think the hearts, the aims, and the desires of the American people should be given some of the attention by the Bureau of the Budget that its computing machines receive. The Bureau of the Budget is thwarting the wills, aims, and hopes of the American people by the use of inanimate, cold computers, machinery manufactured by man out of steel. The Bureau is ignoring the hearts, aims, and ambitions of the people in deciding what legislation shall be pushed to completion.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I desire to speak briefly upon the recommendations of the President's foreign aid message, but first I wish to make a few comments about the speech of the distinguished majority leader, Senator MANSFIELD.

I was much impressed by the moving speech he made, expressing, I think, justified anger at the action of the Veterans' Administration in closing a veterans hospital in Montana, but a speech also marked by his compassion for our veterans and also by his constant sense of justice.

I agree with him that the sentiments expressed during World War I, World War II, and the Korean war, that our veterans would always be cared for, is not as marked today as it was in those sad and tragic days.

I earnestly hope that this particular hospital in Montana will be retained.

But the Senator from Montana has done something more. He has brought more sharply our attention to the fact that the Veterans' Administration is closing needed hospitals. I hope the committee will look into this situation; and that a chorus will go up from Members of the Senate and House of Representatives against the closing of needed veterans hospitals. I believe that if we act, the injustices will be corrected. I am glad to associate myself with the majority leader.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, South Dakota is not among the States slated to lose a veterans hospital facility. For that I am very grateful, because the hospital in Sioux Falls, S. Dak., as well as the hospital in Hot Springs, S. Dak., serves an absolutely essential purpose for the veterans in our area. However, we were disturbed to be informed that a number of the veterans service personnel, who are connected with the center at Sioux Falls, are being transferred to a larger center in St. Paul, Minn.

I am disturbed about that for several reasons. First of all, it means an inevitable decline in services for the veterans of our area. It means that our veterans will have to travel 300 miles farther in order to discuss special problems with Veterans' Administration service personnel.

Beyond that, Mr. President, I believe the Senator from Montana touched on the very fundamental dual problem that is aggravated by moves of this kind. Our society is faced with two problems which are very closely related. One is the decline or the stagnation of populations in rural States.

In my State we have a population which is essentially the same size as it was 30 years ago. We have related problems stemming from the lack of industrial and economic activities to support an expanding economy and a growing society.

On the other side of the coin we have the growing congestion and serious traffic tangles in the great metropolitan sections of the country. We have more and more problems with the pileup of urban populations that strain recreational facilities, housing, public facilities, and the commercial life of metropolitan centers.

Both these problems, it seems to me, the blight of our rural areas, and the pileup of populations in the cities, would be aided by public policies designed to encourage, wherever feasible, the stimulation of economic activity in our more sparsely populated States.

One way we can do it is by a deliberate policy designed to hold Federal installations, wherever possible, in our smaller, less populated States, instead of following the course that is outlined in the recent Veterans' Administration move.

The net result, admittedly small, of the VA transfer, as it affects our State, is to further complicate the drain of both resources and people from South Dakota, and to concentrate them in an area where there is already a problem with population pressures, where there is already a strain on transportation, housing, and recreation facilities.

Laying aside the important consideration which is the fundamental one in this case, of providing proper services to our veterans, we should think and consider this larger dual problem to which I have referred.

I hope that some consideration will be given in meeting the whole subject of the location and the possible transfer of Federal facilities.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. METCALF. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, I commend the able Senator from South Dakota for bringing this subject to the attention of the Senate. The situation at Sioux Falls, S. Dak., is almost identical with the situation that prevails in Fargo, N. Dak.

I was happy to learn yesterday that Representative TEAGUE of Texas has agreed to hold public hearings on this subject matter. Our colleague the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], who is chairman of the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, has also promised to hold hearings.

I am hopeful that civic leaders, employee representatives, veterans leaders, and other persons who are interested in the problem will come forward with their evidence. The question of whether we shall have adequate service for our veterans in smaller States is very much at stake.

Mr. McGOVERN. I thank the Senator for his remarks. They are very well taken. I too am pleased that hearings will be called by the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs. I certainly intend to appear and offer in more detail the views that I have suggested here this afternoon.

COLD WAR GI BILL—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] be added to the list of cosponsors of S. 9, the cold war GI bill, and that the bill so indicate at its next printing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, with that addition, 40 Members of this body are cosponsors of the proposed legislation and have associated themselves with the need of it. This is the largest number of cosponsors that the cold war GI bill has had in the 6 years that I have been working on the proposal. This increase in congressional support and attention is most timely, as I have also received a significantly larger response from the Nation's citizens than ever before in the history of the bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "We Need a New GI Bill," which was published in the Army, Navy, and Air Force Times of October 21, 1964. The article was distributed to 1½ million people around the globe and the response to it indicates that more people than ever are interested in correcting this injustice. I hope that Congress at this session will take the initiative in enacting the bill and correcting this great injustice to our veterans.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE NEED A NEW GI BILL

(By U.S. Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH, of Texas)

Although we have become familiar with the terminology of the cold war, the daily headlines which reveal injuries, armed conflict, and fatalities, seem to belie this label and serve to inform us that by whatever term we call present military duty, many of our returning veterans have been exposed to enemy fire, wartime hazards, injury, and even death.

Despite the comfort of the cold war tag, it is apparent that the main difference between military duty during the so-called cold war and that of World War II and the Korean conflict is that we are fortunate in having many more survivors among our veterans returning to civilian life today than in the past.

But military duty still takes its toll among our veterans. Today's casualties are of a different nature, as there are living unwounded battle casualties, cast back into society unprepared for the battle of civilian life and unequipped to compete with those 56 percent of men in their age group who never serve their country in uniform.

Thus they are the economically wounded, the cold war economic casualties. Since the Korean conflict these casualties have mounted to over 3 million veterans, and these ranks will swell to 5 million by 1973.

This is in sharp contrast to the treatment of survivors of World War II and the Korean conflict, who were given an opportunity for readjustment to civilian life through the greatest single piece of educational legislation in our history—the GI bill.

This law, in the words of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt as he signed the bill, gave "emphatic notice to the men and women in our Armed Forces that the American people do not intend to let them down."

The GI bill represented the belief that those who serve on the frontiers of the free world to maintain the peace should in turn have the opportunity to exchange their rifles for the arms of education to advance themselves as beneficial citizens.

The bill was an investment in the potential value of these veterans; it was a reflection of the American faith that, given the opportunity, these men would enrich the resources of our Nation and add to our national strength. In short, it changed the declaration of war from the armed front to a declaration of war on the enemies of progress, of opportunity, and of development.

This year marks the 20th anniversary of the original GI bill, and as we look at it in retrospect, we find that the singular success of this bill has marked it as one of the best investments ever made by this country.

As a strictly monetary investment, we are receiving $1 billion a year in additional taxes from the recipients of the GI benefits, and this return will increase in years to come. The Internal Revenue Service has said that these GI's have already paid back the total cost of the GI bill in additional taxes.

But the real yield of this investment cannot be measured in monetary terms; rather, it is found in the hope which it fulfilled for millions of returning veterans.

As a direct result of the World War II and the Korean GI bills, we have enriched our technological and professional skills to the tune of 625,000 more engineers, 375,000 more teachers, 165,000 more natural and physical scientists, and 220,000 more persons in medicine and related health fields.

Because of these GI bills, the unemployment rate among this educated group is much lower than among the corresponding nonveteran.

Due to almost 8 million veterans who received training under the World War II law, the median years of school for the World War II veteran is 12.2 years compared to 9.6 years for the corresponding age of nonveterans. The income of these veterans is from $2,000 to $3,000 higher per annum than the nonveterans in the same age group.

When the increment provided by 2½ million veterans who trained under the Korean GI bill is added, these two bills have indeed made an impressive impact on the economy.

If a GI bill trained veteran makes $2,000 to $3,000 higher annual earnings over others in the same age group, this means there will be a median average of $2,500 more a year for these veterans. Assuming even a very conservative average of 25 productive years from these GI bill educated veterans, this means an increased income of $62,500 in lifetime earnings.

Since about half of the eligible veterans take advantage of their educational benefits when offered, this means that we are passing up the opportunity for 2½ million veterans to benefit the national economy as much as $156 billion. The argument that "we cannot afford the GI bill" ignores the future benefits that would accrue through this additional income. And it flies in the face of all previous experience with the GI bills.

Measured in another way, the GI bill has been a large factor in providing this country with its essential leadership. Almost 10 percent of all U.S. Senators and 11.5 percent of the Members of the House of Representatives utilized their educational benefits under the GI bill. Add to this two Cabinet officers and seven Governors and this single piece of legislation has given a significant boost to the quality of leadership which we have in this country.

This impressive progress of the World War II and Korean veterans underscores the problems cold war veterans now encounter. These cold war veterans are the victims of a great inequality; only 44 percent of the draft-eligible men ever see active duty in the cold war, and they are placed at a 2- to 4-year disadvantage in their competitive standing with their peer group. These young men enter the service unskilled and upon discharge find themselves in the same plight—untrained, unemployable, and unable to compete for scarce jobs with the 56 percent of their age group who do not see military duty.

Last year there was an increase of $2 million in unemployment compensation paid to veterans—a total of $96 million, which if invested in education would have brought profits to our country. The discouraging aspect of this problem is that with the increase in automation and the continued necessity for education, this situation shows little prospect of improvement in the future.

The only solution is to provide these young veterans with the means of escaping the category of "uneducated, therefore unemployable." We must provide the arms of education before we can expect this group to take their place in the fight against unemployment and poverty.

It is essential for our Nation to provide readjustment assistance to these veterans in the pursuit of equality for all. These GI's should be leading the war on poverty, instead of being objects of it.

For these and many other good reasons, I have joined 38 other Senators in cosponsoring a cold war GI bill which would provide readjustment benefits to our veterans similar to those provided by previous GI bills. This bill would assist our cold war veterans in adjusting from military service to civilian life without the hazards of experimentation.

The bill is designed to render assistance to veterans who have served in the military for more than 180 days between January 31, 1955, and July 1, 1967. As with former GI bills, it is anticipated that the cost will be entirely self-liquidating through additional taxes paid by the veterans who benefit from the bill. Hence the bill is not a bonus bill, but it is readjustment training to help our veterans help our country in the future as they have done in the past.

Despite the fact that the cost of this bill would be only three-fifths of 1 percent of the total military budget, the Defense Department and the Bureau of the Budget have joined forces in opposition to the bill. Their objection is that the program would discourage military men from making a career out of the armed services.

Besides lacking any proof for this assertion, it fails to coincide with the fact that with increased benefits a military career becomes more attractive.

One of the major improvements of this bill over previous GI bills is that a serviceman does not lose his educational benefits because of extended service. Although that was sometimes the case under other GI bills, under the cold war GI bill a serviceman does not face this choice just because he continues to defend his country.

As this bill prepares our returning veterans for better roles in our expanding economy, it can make a major contribution for furthering the progress of our country. It is inconsistent for the United States as an international leader to boast of our defense facing the Communists around the perimeter of the free world, and then to cast our returning veterans out upon society, unskilled, uneducated, and unarmed for civilian pursuits.

In celebrating the 20th anniversary year of the original GI bill, I think that the experience and principles of our Nation demand that the cold war GI bill be written into public law by the hand of justice. I hope the Congress enacts this act of justice.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TUESDAY NEXT

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Tuesday next.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE PRESIDENT'S FOREIGN AID PROPOSALS

Mr. **COOPER**. Mr. President, I wish to comment on the President's message on foreign aid.

Our foreign aid program must be founded, first, on the interests of the United States—upon what it contributes to our security and freedom, and the security and freedom of other free countries. It embraces also our concern that developing countries will be strengthened in their independence and will be enabled to raise the living standards of their people.

I believe that the decisions and recommendations of the President in his message on foreign aid were based on these premises, and could go far in removing some of the defects of our foreign aid program—defects which have brought it to the verge of rejection.

Among his important recommendations is the President's emphasis on aid to Latin America. The security of the Western Hemisphere is essential, and the Alliance for Progress expresses our tradition of friendship for our neighbors, and our shared concern in the living standards of their people.

The President's recommendation that greater emphasis be placed on multilateral aid through the World Bank, the International Development Association, and the Inter-American Bank—to all of which we contribute—reflects the growing recognition that these professional organizations can make better judgments on the value of specific projects, and more effectively require self-help and reform on the part of recipient countries, than can our Agency for International Development.

I also hope that AID will carry out his recommendations that emphasis be placed on the development of agriculture, rather than industrial development, in many of the countries which seek our aid. For food is the first requirement of any country in raising the living standards of its people.

Even with the important improvements that the President has recommended, I hope very much that the President will take other steps to assure that our aid program is being used effectively. For, if it is not effective, it is my belief that this program will die.

Two years ago, a committee headed by Gen. Lucius Clay made an examination of the foreign aid program in its totality, and made many valuable recommendations. But I do not believe that the effectiveness of the program can be assured until a further step is taken. That necessary step is a searching examination of the program in specific countries, by committees composed of experienced private citizens and members of the AID organization.

I recognize that such examinations could not be accomplished quickly, but they could be started with respect to the 12 or 15 countries which receive the major part of our aid, and in others where there are specific problems which I shall discuss.

Two years ago, Congress adopted an amendment which I offered to the Foreign Aid Act, recommending that these specific examinations be undertaken. The President noted his interest in this recommendation in his message to Congress last year. I have no doubt that it will be implemented.

I make one further suggestion. It is that the President shall not make available to other countries any further aid, except to fulfill commitments and for humanitarian purposes, until an assessment of the effectiveness of our aid program be made in a number of countries receiving the major part of our foreign aid. This would give an opportunity, also, to withhold aid from those countries which are using their resources, supplemented by our foreign aid, to provide weapons and supplies to others for aggressive purposes, and from those countries which condone the destruction of our property, or its seizure without provision for payment.

To withhold aid for a time, and I mean a considerable time, until this assessment is made, would not, as some countries claim, be an interference in their internal affairs, or the offer of aid "with strings." It is our program, and the resources of our people that are extended.

We have the right to insist that our aid be used properly, and that the United States be treated with respect. Withholding aid to all countries for a time, until we know that it is being used effectively, would let all countries know that our aid program, established for good purposes, is our program, and not theirs; that it is not fair to our people who must pay the bill, or to their people whose welfare is its object, unless it is used effectively; and as a nation which has shown restraint and decency in its international relations, that we have the right to expect the same treatment and respect.

I have always believed that a President, at the beginning of his administration, has the great opportunity to break away from old molds and establish policies that will be more effective and will assert the dignity as well as the good purposes of our policy. I shall never forget the statement made to me years ago by the former Premier of Italy, Mr. DeGasperi, who, in speaking of our foreign aid program, said:

> No other country in all the history of the world could do, or would do, what the United States is doing.

I have confidence that the President is moving to make our foreign aid program effective and consonant with its purposes and with the dignity of the United States.

I repeat my chief recommendation: that, with the exception of commitments which we have made, and for humanitarian purposes, we should not extend any further aid to any country until an assessment is made of the effectiveness of the program in the countries which are receiving the major part of this aid, and in those countries which are condoning the destruction of our property, and which will not adhere to the international standards of conduct and decency to which our country adheres.

I thank the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN] for his courtesy in yielding to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURDICK in the chair). The Senator from South Dakota is recognized.

THE SITUATION IN VIETNAM

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I want to take a hardheaded, realistic look at the situation in South Vietnam. It is somewhat puzzling to me that the terms "hard line" and "soft line" seem to be reversed when we get over to the other side of the world. Those who discount the present and offer only hopes for the future are considered "hard" whereas those who look at the actual situation and point to the present map of Communist-controlled areas of Vietnam are accused of following a "soft line."

So far as I am concerned, it is both hard—in the sense of being difficult—and hardheaded—in the sense of being realistic—to admit honestly to ourselves what the facts are in Vietnam.

We are not winning in South Vietnam. We are backing a Government there that is incapable either of winning a military struggle or governing its people. We are fighting a determined army of guerrillas that seems to enjoy the cooperation of the countryside and that grows stronger in the face of foreign intervention, whether it be from the Japanese, some 20 years ago, the French, in the 1940's and 1950's, or from the United States.

In this circumstance, expanding the American military involvement is an act of folly designed in the end to create simply a larger, more inglorious debacle.

For nearly a quarter of a century, southeast Asia has been torn by military and political conflict. First was the Japanese invasion of World War II. Then came nearly a decade of struggle with the French, culminating in the collapse of the French Army at Dienbienphu in 1954.

The French lost the cream of their army—a force which reached 400,000 men—in an unsuccessful effort to reestablish French control over Indochina. U.S. aid to the tune of $2 billion financed 80 percent of the French war effort.

Then came the gradually deepening American involvement in southeast Asia in the 10 years after 1954 following defeat of the French.

American expenditures in Vietnam in addition to $2 billion in aid to the French, now approach $4 billion and, according to Defense Department figures, 248, and perhaps a total of over 300 Americans have died since 1964 trying to counsel and assist the Vietnamese forces.

It should be recognized, in the interest of truth, that, unlike the Japanese, who came to conquer southeast Asia, and the French, who set out to reestablish colonial control, we seek neither conquest nor colonies.

Yet we are further away from victory over the guerrilla forces in Vietnam today than we were a decade ago. The recent confrontation of the Vietcong Communist guerrillas and the South Vietnamese Army at Bhin Gia was a painful, dramatic demonstration that the struggle is going badly for our side. Government prestige was hurt seriously in that battle. Communist stock has gone up. Concerned Americans are asking, "What has gone wrong?" and it seems a fair question.

In my judgment, the first answer is that South Vietnam is not basically a military problem but a political one. Neither the Diem regime nor its successors has won the political loyalty and active support of the people of South Vietnam, especially those who live outside town and city limits.

There are rarely military answers to political dilemmas of this nature. Just as the multilateral force plan in Europe—a military gimmick designed to create closer political unity in nuclear policy—has not achieved its objective—in the last few days the Turks have announced their withdrawal from participation in any such scheme—so military proposals in South Vietnam, whether for special forces, strategic hamlets, insurgency programs, or more suitably designed airplanes are not likely to overcome the political weaknesses of the existing South Vietnamese Government. Even the sophisticated weapons of the nuclear age cannot overrule the basic precepts of successful government.

This is a political problem, and it is a South Vietnamese problem. The United States can accomplish much through foreign aid and military support, but we cannot create strong, effective, and popular national leadership where that leadership either does not exist or does not exert itself. That is not only expensive and impractical, it is just plain impossible.

For 9 years the United States helped the Diem government, to the tune of $3 billion.

I will not chronicle in detail the years of Diem's rule, the achievement of some measure of economic stability, but the increasing political disaffection. That disaffection was encouraged, of course, by

North Vietnam but basically Diem's own arbitrary rule made possible Vietcong gains. The very fact that Vietcong strength was and still is greatest in the Mekong Delta and around Saigon—more than a thousand miles away from North Vietnam—indicates that there is basic popular support for the guerrillas among the South Vietnamese peasants.

It is not isolationism, either of the old variety or the new, to recognize that U.S. advisers, however able, are simply no substitute for a competent and popular indigenous government. It is not idealism either; it is simply realism.

Only the Vietnamese themselves can provide the leaders and the sustained support to defeat the Vietcong. The United States can at most only hold a finger in the dike until the South Vietnamese find themselves.

Therefore, even at this 11th hour, when there is mounting pressure to increase U.S. troops in South Vietnam and step up aid policies, we must be hardheaded realists.

Americans in Asia are basically aliens, of a different race, religion, and culture. Moreover, the Vietnamese are nationalistic and race-conscious in their outlook. As one on-the-scene observer pointed out, "If you imagine a Chinese sheriff speaking Cantonese and trying to keep order in Tombstone, Ariz., in its heyday, you will begin to get the problem."

More Americans, over and above the 25,000 now in South Vietnam, would not mean more success because victory in the Vietnam countryside depends on accurate intelligence information, peasant support and quick action by Vietnamese troops. These factors cannot be controlled by Americans. They must depend on the South Vietnamese. We must recognize that fact.

I recently spent a long and interesting evening with an astute observer of the Vietnam struggle who argued that victory is possible with a proper military formula. American military advisers in South Vietnam, he said, are highly able men who know how to win a guerrilla war. They have tried without success to persuade the South Vietnamese army to engage in night patrols against the Vietcong. They have urged small, fast moving units to attack the enemy directly with small arms rather than relying so heavy on artillery, airpower, and large, cumbersome forces. But, said my friend, the South Vietnamese leaders and military forces will not accept this formula for victory.

Granted that my friend's analysis may be correct, this is still basically a political problem. If we are unable to persuade the Vietnamese to take either the military or nonmilitary steps necessary to insure the defeat of the Vietcong, we are indeed confronted by a dilemma that will not respond to larger imports of arms and advisers.

The more Americans are brought in to do what should be the responsibility of the Vietnamese Government, the greater one can predict, will be the tendency of the Government to rely on U.S. advisers rather than on able Vietnamese, the greater will be the prestige of the Vietcong and North Vietnamese for holding at bay not merely their own countrymen but also the gathered might of the United States and, finally, the greater will be the grassroots reaction against Americans. In theory, our Government has recognized that the South Vietnamese bear primary responsibility for the war and civilian policies. In practice, Americans have assumed roles of increasing influence and leadership with slight military gains but disturbing deterioration on the local political level.

Personally, I am very much opposed to the policy, now gaining support in Washington, of extending the war to the North. I am disturbed by the recent reports of American air strikes in Laos and North Vietnam.

Attacks on North Vietnam will not seriously weaken guerrilla fighters a thousand miles away, fighters who depend for 80 percent of their weapons on captured U.S. equipment and for food on a sympathetic local peasantry. The principal foe is not the limited industrial capacity of North Vietnam, nor the North Vietnamese who have remained at home, and have not become involved in the conflict in the south, nor even their training camps and trails. The target is the 30,000 individual guerrilla fighters from North and South who have no trouble, apparently, finding sanctuary within South Vietnam or the neighboring states of Laos and Cambodia. Bombing North Vietnam is not calculated to reduce their determination, but undoubtedly it would antagonize many other Asians and could easily lead to increased Red Chinese involvement in the whole Indochinese peninsula.

We might easily be confronted by the large and well-trained forces of North Vietnam, and perhaps the legions of Red China that took such a heavy toll of lives in the Korean conflict.

The present strength of the North Vietnamese army, an army that is thus far not involved in the conflict in the south, is twice that of the Japanese forces which overran all of southeast Asia during World War II. These are tough, disciplined fighters—tough divisions which defeated the large veteran French army at Dienbienphu over 10 years ago.

So, Mr. President, it seems to me that the most practical way, if we are to take further action in Vietnam, is to put pressure on North Vietnam quietly through infiltration and subversion by South Vietnamese units. The aim of any such infiltration should not be military victory, but bringing Ho Chi Minh to the negotiating table.

The most viable and practical policy for the United States in Vietnam is negotiation and a political settlement. Until such time as negotiation is possible and settlement can be devised which will not surrender South Vietnam to communism, the United States would doubtless not find it feasible or desirable to withdraw. If necessary, we can maintain our military position in Vietnam indefinitely, since it is essentially a policy of holding the cities while taking whatever attrition is possible of the guerrillas in the countryside. But the aim of that policy must be seen as a prelude to diplomatic settlement and not an occasion for war against North Vietnam, or even worse, against Red China, with all the dangers that holds for our own security and for the peace of the world.

There are many ways to approach such a diplomatic settlement. Last August, during the Bay of Tonkin crisis, I suggested that we might take up French President de Gaulle's proposal for a 14-nation conference, including the United States, the Soviet Union, Britain, France, China, Malaya, Thailand, Laos, Cambodia, Burma, Canada, Poland, India, and North and South Vietnam. More recently, the noted columnist, Walter Lippmann, raised the possibility of a Congress of Asia, dealing not only with Vietnam, but also with other problems relating to the stability and progress of Asia. The groundwork for any such gathering would have to be carefully laid, of course. Therefore, for the present, it would seem that the first step should probably be informal approaches to the interested nations and preliminary private talks. It is my understanding that it was in some such fashion that the conference of 1954 was created.

What are the objectives or terms on which we might be willing to put an end to fighting in South Vietnam? If military victory is impossible—and I am not talking about the stalemate in which we are presently involved, that we could probably continue for some time to come—but if a clear-cut military victory is impossible, we can only settle on the kind of terms that would be generally acceptable to ourselves to North Vietnam, and to other countries which have an interest in this area. We cannot simply walk out and permit the Vietcong to march into Saigon.

The minimum terms which might be acceptable on both sides would probably include:

First. Closer association or confederation between North and South Vietnam, not under a unitary Communist government from the North, but with local autonomy for the South as well as the North.

Second. Renewed trade and rail links between North and South Vietnam, which admittedly would be most useful to the North where there is a pressing need for the food grown in South Vietnam.

Third. Cooperative planning to benefit North and South Vietnam from the Mekong River development. For the South, it would mean primarily flood control. For the North, now outside of this promising Mekong watershed, it could mean valuable hydroelectric power for the industrial sector of the North.

Fourth. Neutralization of North and South Vietnam, meaning specifically guarantees that foreign troops and military advisers would gradually be eliminated as the situation permits.

Although this is a key point, it would not by any means eliminate all U.S. military forces from Asia nor would it bar AID and other civilian advisers. At the same time it would represent some protection to North Vietnam from the North as well as the South, which should be attractive to them.

Fifth. Establishment of a United Nations presence or unit in southeast Asia with the right to enter every country in the area to guarantee national borders, to offer protection against external aggression, and insofar as possible to insure fair treatment of tribal and other minority groups within the boundaries of a given state.

Would such terms be acceptable to North Vietnam? Why, someone might ask, should Ho Chi Minh settle for even half a loaf if he sees the prospect for ultimate victory or thinks the United States might soon be ready to pull out, if he resists any efforts at all toward a negotiated settlement?

Actually, North Vietnam cannot benefit, any more than South Vietnam, from a prolonged conflict. I would hope that we would be prepared to wage such a conflict rather than to surrender the area to communism. The North has much to fear from any spread of the war, even subversion or infiltration. The North Vietnamese know very well what happened to the people and resources of North Korea during that war. Even though the fighting was not on their territory, neither was the subsequent U.S. assistance which helped rebuild the war torn areas in the South. The economic burden was devastating both in North Korea and in North Vietnam.

Moreover, although Ho Chi Minh of North Vietnam is closely allied to Red China in what probably amounts to a marriage of convenience, the Vietnamese have for centuries regarded the Chinese with suspicion and even outright hostility and strong resistance.

Obviously, Peiping's desire to exert control over Indochina runs directly contrary to all Vietnamese ambitions.

Escalation of the war by the United States, on the other hand, would make North Vietnam increasingly dependent on Red China and would strengthen, not Ho Chi Minh's influence, but, rather, would strengthen the influence of Mao Tse-tung in southeast Asia.

In fact, apart from Red China, no nation, North Vietnam included, has anything to gain from a long drawn out and inconclusive, struggle in Vietnam. Only Red China gains from continuing the present confusion and weakness in Vietnam. Only Red China gains, in time and resources, so that it will be better able at some future time to exert its influence in southeast Asia.

France, for example, with considerable property and economic investment in North Vietnam, is eager for peace, putting economic stability ahead of almost any political consideration.

Great Britain, with a conflict looming between Malaysia and Indonesia, has never really endorsed U.S. policies in South Vietnam.

Even the Soviet Union can be expected to give quiet support to policies designed to prevent expansion of fighting and to reduce Peiping's influence in southeast Asia. New links, both economic and diplomatic, between Moscow and Hanoi in North Vietnam are now being forged. Moscow's influence could well be thrown, as it was in 1954, at the time the French left Vietnam, toward a negotiated settlement in southeast Asia.

The United States certainly is not anxious for broader commitments on the Asian mainland, but the key element in U.S. thinking is whether such a settlement would pave the way for Communist takeover in South Vietnam or elsewhere.

To that question, I recognize, there can be no simple answer, for the answer would depend on the abilities of the South Vietnamese to form a government with popular support and with the ability to cooperate in some fields with the North Vietnamese without losing their own independence.

To be realistic, any settlement in the foreseeable future will have to replace the present hostility between the North and the South, with greater economic cooperation and more political acceptance.

The policies and directions that Vietnam takes will depend on the character of the leadership from Saigon as well as Hanoi. The United States can help that leadership in a number of ways, but in this nationalistic day and age, the United States cannot offer American leadership or American soldiers as a substitute for popular and effective government from Saigon.

THE MESS IN VIETNAM WORSENS STEADILY—IT IS HIGH TIME THAT WE WAGED PEACE

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, since I first spoke in this Chamber on March 10, 1964, analyzing in detail the U.S. position in South Vietnam, the situation there and our position there has steadily deteriorated.

I said at that time, as I said repeatedly since that time and as I repeat now, the United States should take the most honorable route and employ the most effective means from the standpoint of U.S. prestige to disengage ourselves from our unilateral military foray in South Vietnam and withdraw our so-called advisory but actually combat troops there. But, in any event, get out we should and must, and stop both our killing and the killing of our American boys.

In my speech on March 10, 1964—10 months ago almost to the day—I pointed out:

> President Johnson, let me repeat, inherited this mess. It was not of his making. As he approaches the difficult task of making the necessarily hard decisions with respect to the problems in South Vietnam, problems created long before he was President, he should feel no compunction to act in such a way as to justify past actions, past decisions and past mistakes. He should feel entirely free to act in such a manner and to make such decisions as are calculated best to serve the interests of the United States and the free world—a world changed greatly from the time President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles initiated our southeast Asia policies.

From March 10, 1964, until the close of the 2d session of the 88th Congress, I repeated my admonitions on the floor of the Senate with respect to our steadily deteriorating legal, military, and moral position in South Vietnam.

I pointed out that we were "going it alone" there with our SEATO allies conspicuous by their absence. I pointed out repeatedly that Australia, France, New Zealand, Pakistan, the Republic of the Philippines, Thailand, and the United Kingdom had no fighting forces in South Vietnam—as we had—as thinly disguised "advisers." I emphasized the fact that many of our growing number of so-called advisers were right in the thick of battle fighting and being wounded and being killed in unfortunately growing numbers.

I have stated repeatedly that the legal position of the United States supporting our being in South Vietnam lacked substance and foundation. Our claim has been that we are in South Vietnam at the behest of the legally constituted Government of South Vietnam, irrespective of the fact that that Government has owed its continued existence on U.S. support and despite the fact that we have been actively taking sides in what is in reality a civil war. Of course, events of the last few weeks raise serious doubts as to whether we are actually in South Vietnam with our arms and military equipment at the invitation of the duly constituted Government of South Vietnam since we cannot tell, from day to day and from hour to hour who or what is the duly constituted legal Government of South Vietnam. As a matter of fact we now seem to be engaged in heated discussions controverting the claims of highly placed Vietnamese as to what constitutes their legal government. In fact we seem unable to get along with the various governments that we help install despite lavish aid and blandishments.

I have repeatedly referred to our obligations under the Charter of the United Nations to bring the South Vietnamese situation to the attention of that body. Thus I stated:

> There are ways to a peaceful solution in Vietnam and in all southeast Asia if we would but pursue them.

Last fall, when there was before this body a broad, blank check resolution on the crisis in southeast Asia, I voted against that resolution, explaining my position, in part, in the following words:

> By long established practice, the Executive conducts the Nation's foreign policy. But the Congress and particularly, by constitutional mandate, the Senate has a right and duty in these premises to "advise and consent." Especially is this true when it is specifically called upon by the Executive as is the case now, for its participation in momentous decisions of foreign policy. Therefore we in the Senate would be derelict in our duty if we did not individually express our views if those views embody doubt or dissent, and where a vote is called for, to cast that vote as our conscience directs.
>
> As early as March 10, nearly 5 months ago, I took the floor and in an address of considerable length urged that the United States get out of South Vietnam, at least to the extent of participation by our soldiery. Since that time, I have discussed U.S. participation in this area of the world repeatedly. I have stated and restated my view that this was not our war; that we were wholly misguided in picking up the burden abandoned by France 10 years ago after the French had suffered staggering losses running into tens of thousands of French young lives and vast sums of money to which the United States contributed heavily, and thereupon entering upon a policy which would be bound to result, as it has resulted, in the sacrificing of the lives of our young Americans in an area, and in a cause that in my reasoned

> judgment poses no threat to our national security.

Mr. President, since the Congress approved the southeast Asia resolution, the situation in South Vietnam has gone not only from bad to worse, but from worse to still worse.

In an excellent summary of the present "Shameful Mess" in South Vietnam, Richard Starnes, writing in the Washington Daily News on January 4, 1965, states:

> There are, sadly, times when such terrible risks must be taken. The Cuban missile crisis was one such time, for it threatened the very existence of the American Nation.
>
> No such threat exists in South Vietnam. The fact that the Vietcong are Communists does not make the war any less a civil war. Talk that we are fighting to keep a foothold on the Asian mainland makes no more sense than the Soviet gibberish that it was installing defensive missiles in Cuba. It is equally indefensible.
>
> American interests in the Western Pacific can be handsomely garrisoned from Okinawa, the Philippines, and South Korea. There is no more military rationale for risking war over South Vietnam than there is moral or legal justification.
>
> President Johnson needs to remind himself of Clemenceau's dictum that war is too important a concern to be left in the hands of generals, and he needs to find the courage and statecraft to extricate us from the shameful mess we are in in southeast Asia.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire article by Mr. Starnes be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNamara in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, our strained situation in South Vietnam causes us to assume a strained posture with respect to our allies and to make requests of them which are not to their advantage and which will ultimately prove to be to our disadvantage.

Those able political observers and commentators, Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott, writing in the Anchorage Daily Times on January 2, 1965, report:

> At least five Latin American countries are being strongly urged by the United States to send token military or economic units to strife-lacerated South Vietnam.

The article goes on to name the countries being strongly urged by the United States to send military or economic aid to South Vietnam as Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Peru, and Venezuela.

That list is obviously incomplete, since earlier this week I read where Uruguay was sending a token force to South Vietnam, so obviously that country had also been strongly urged by the United States to show the flag in South Vietnam.

Yesterday's Washington News carried a report that Argentina, at the request of the United States has agreed to send a medical team, medicine, sanitary equipment, and food to South Vietnam. It should be noted that the report specifically states that this contribution was made at the request of the Government of the United States not the Government of South Vietnam, whatever that may be.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire column by Allen and Scott be printed at the conclusion of my remarks, since what they report is highly significant.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNamara in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, in the first place it should be noted that they report that it was the Government of the United States and not the Government of South Vietnam that was "strongly urging" our Latin American neighbors to send the flag to South Vietnam. It is difficult to understand the legal right which the United States professes to exercise in extending an invitation to the Latin American countries to join us in the fighting in South Vietnam. Even the fact that the U.S. representatives in South Vietnam could not determine which was the legally constituted Government in South Vietnam when it was determined to approach the Latin American countries does not clothe us with any legal right to extend such an invitation, unless we are publicly proclaiming that the United States is in fact the Government of South Vietnam.

We should at least have kept up the pretense and made certain that the invitation to the Latin American countries to participate in the civil war in South Vietnam was issued in the name of the Government of South Vietnam.

In the second place, the pressures exerted by the United States on our partners in the Alliance for Progress will seriously retard the Alliance and will cast doubt upon its very objectives.

Our neighbors to the south need to devote all their energies and resources to their economic development. They have a long way to go in correcting the social and economic inequalities with which they are beset. Our efforts should be devoted to convincing them that they should begrudge every single dollar spent in their military budgets since such expenditures are economically unproductive. We should not be encouraging them to spend additional funds in the empty gesture of "showing the flag" in a war not of their concern waged thousands of miles away. Such activities are counterproductive even if the United States offers to pay the cost of such a "token" show of force. The money could better be spent on the construction of a new school or a new clinic, both of which are sorely needed in every country.

There is much which we must expect our partners in the Alliance for Progress to do to aid in their economic development. We cannot and should not add to the burden of the obligations which they must assume by calling upon them, in however small a way, to engage in extraneous and unnecessary military activities.

In his state of the Union message, President Johnson pledged that he would "steadily enlarge our commitment to the Alliance for Progress as the instrument of our war against poverty and injustice in the hemisphere." It is difficult for me to see how embroiling our partners under the Alliance can in any way further our commitment to help them wage war against "poverty and injustice in the hemisphere."

But, Mr. President, we are dealing in South Vietnam with more than U.S. dollars and U.S. military equipment. The war in Vietnam is costing the United States dearly in killed and wounded American military men, for, despite whatever labels may be attached to them, they are in the frontlines fighting the Vietcong.

According to an Associated Press dispatch from Saigon appearing in the January 6, 1965, Washington Star:

> The United States suffered nearly twice as many battle casualties in South Vietnam in 1964 as in the 3 previous years combined, official sources announced today.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire item as it appeared in the paper be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Hartke in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 3.)

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, translated into concrete figures, in the 3-year period from 1961 through 1963, 107 American servicemen were killed in the war in South Vietnam. In the last year alone, more men were killed—136—than in the previous 3 years. The ratio for men injured last year was even worse. In the 3 previous years, 615 men were injured. Last year, 1,037 American fighting men were injured.

It is extremely unfortunate when a single American military man is killed in the steamy jungles of South Vietnam fighting in a civil war for a people most reluctant to fight in a cause which cannot be settled by arms, but can only be settled politically, and cannot in any event be settled by the United States acting unilaterally.

But to suffer almost 1,800 casualties there is a national disgrace.

Even worse, the killings and the woundings continue almost daily. To what end?

Consider the lives that would have been saved and the number of men who could have been saved from battle wounds if the advice I have given over the past several months had been heeded and the South Vietnam mess had been taken to the conference table.

In his state of the Union message, President Johnson—explaining why we are fighting South Vietnam—stated:

> We are there, first, because a friendly nation has asked us for help against Communist aggression. Ten years ago we pledged our help. Three Presidents have supported that pledge. We will not break it.

I will not at this point discuss this interpretation of the pledge given 10 years ago or the implications of our being put in a position of agreeing to fight communism at the time and on the battlefield of their choosing anywhere in the world.

I will say that there is nothing inconsistent with this pledge—even as interpreted by President Johnson—and the course of action I have strongly advocated of taking the conflict in South Vietnam to the conference table. Even if our pledge of assistance to South Vietnam is interpreted as meaning that we agreed to send our fighting men to die in South Vietnam, even if we overlook the fact that the conflict is a civil war, nevertheless our pledge cannot and must not be interpreted as meaning that we agreed to continue a futile military effort until the United States had conquered South Vietnam and the last Vietcong had been wiped out.

We can keep our pledge to South Vietnam by seeking to bring peace to that beleaguered country via the conference route as well as by force of arms. This we should do without delay. I can well see the U.S. military forces taking part in peacekeeping efforts in South Vietnam under the aegis of the United Nations. That is the only way American men and American arms should be used there.

Since I first spoke out on this issue, my mail has been exceedingly heavy on this subject. The astonishing thing is that this heavy mail is running well over 100 to 1 in favor of my stand. The mail has come from all over the United States and from people in all walks of life.

I ask unanimous consent that a sampling of these letters be printed at the conclusion of my remarks, together with certain selected articles and editorials from various newspapers and periodicals.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 4.)

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, earlier in my remarks, I quoted from an article by Richard Starnes, entitled "Shameful Mess," but I did not quote the first four paragraphs which now have assumed a new pertinence which they did not have when the article was printed 10 days ago.

The four paragraphs read:

> The pretense of legality cloaking American intervention in southeast Asia grows more threadbare with every passing hour.
>
> U.S. aircraft are preparing to launch strikes against parts of the miscalled Ho Chi Minh Trail that cross Laos, in clear violation of the Geneva accord of 1962, which we signed.
>
> The 1962 pact, which undertook to neutralize Laos, prohibits introduction of foreign regular and irregular troops, foreign paramilitary formations, and foreign military personnel into Laos.
>
> Our excuse for this calculated violation of a solemn covenant is that North Vietnam violated it first. Even if this is true, it reveals a corrosive cynicism on the part of the one nation on earth that has always preached the rule of law in international affairs.

Mr. President, the disastrous consequences of the escalation of the war, which is only now revealed to the American people because of the loss of our jet planes, as well as its futility, is further discussed in another article by Richard Starnes in the Washington News of January 15, entitled "Raising the Ante." I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RAISING THE ANTE

(By Richard Starnes)

Whatever else may be said about the U.S. twilight war in Laos, it needs to be pointed out that it has conspicuously failed to fulfill its announced mission.

Bombing of Communist supply trails and depots in Laos was proposed (proposed after it was already underway, as it turns out) as a means of stifling the flow of arms to the Vietcong. This in turn was to reduce their ability to fight, and thus make them receptive to some species of negotiated settlement.

It has been revealed now that raids against Vietcong supply lines have been in progress since June. There has been no diminution of the Communist guerilla war potential during that time. Indeed, even the eternally optimistic Pentagon line has been modified to admit now what every honest correspondent has known for 2 years—that the war is going very bady indeed for our side.

As a consequence it is not even possible to argue that this extension of war in southeast Asia has the virtue of success. Raids in Laos apparently have been on a small scale, but experience in Korea taught that even large-scale air bombardment did not significantly reduct the enemy's ability to supply his troops.

This was understood, of course, before the first sortie was flown. Why, then, take the risks inherent in extending the war? And why further mortgage American prestige by an act that is clearly in violation of the 1962 Geneva accord on the neutralization of Laos, which the United States and 13 other nations signed? The agreement spells out a clear prohibition against warlike acts based in or carried out against Laos, and we are in clear violation of it.

The argument cannot be advanced that we have had to meet new aggression; the Laos supply routes were in use in 1962, when we signed, just as they are now. The only thing that has changed is the United States willingness to honor a solemn covenant.

The reason for this extraordinary—and extraordinarily dangerous—move is not hard to find. It is a manifestation of the growing mood of frustration in the Nation's $50 billion a year Defense Establishment. We cannot endure the knowledge that our costly war machine may be defeated by barefooted irregulars. We will, in the phase currently favor in the Pentagon, raise the ante. Make it tough and expensive enough, this reasoning goes, and the enemy will quit.

Unfortunately for our side, the lessons of history do not support this rationale any more than they support the efficacy of aerial interdiction of supply. We made it expensive in Korea, and the enemy saw our raise. It appears that half a year of raising the ante in Laos has had the same effect, since it has been half a year of almost unbroken Vietcong successes.

The trouble with raising the ante, to continue the poker analogy, is that the game stands in serious danger of turning into table stakes—that is, the players bet everything they can lay hand to. What is our response to be 6 months hence when it becomes clear that we have been called and we will have raise again or get out of the game?

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I hope that President Johnson and his advisers will read these paragraphs, take them to heart and move, instead of in the direction of escalating or even maintaining the war, in the direction of all-out effort to promote peace by negotiating. Why not enlist the United Nations?

We have not yet made that effort. We have not tried to take the matter to the conference table. We have not used the provisions in the United Nations Charter which spell out clearly half a dozen methods which are the legal and moral obligation of the signatories of that charter. It is high time that we use them and stop the killing of Vietnamese men, women, and children and of American boys.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Washington Daily News, Jan. 4, 1965]

SHAMEFUL MESS

(By Richard Starnes)

The pretense of legality cloaking American intervention in southeast Asia grows more threadbare with every passing hour.

U.S. aircraft are preparing to launch strikes against parts of the miscalled Ho Chi Minh Trail that cross Laos, in clear violation of the Geneva accord of 1962, which we signed.

The 1962 pact, which undertook to neutralize Laos, prohibits introduction of foreign regular and irregular troops, foreign paramilitary formations, and foreign military personnel into Laos.

Our excuse for this calculated violation of a solemn covenant is that North Vietnam violated it first. Even if this is true, it reveals a corrosive cynicism on the part of the one nation on earth that has always preached the rule of law in international affairs.

Leaving for the moment the moral and legal character of our resolve to enlarge the war, we find that the more practical aspects of the decision are no more durable. The theory (which even our most ardent war hawks cannot really believe) is that bombing the Ho Chi Minh Trail will somehow persuade North Vietnam and Communist China to withdraw support from the Vietcong insurgency that is winning South Vietnam.

There are three tragically dangerous fallacies involved here—fallacies that could cost a great many young American lives.

Fallacy No. 1: That any amount of bombing (short of laying a massive radioactive carpet across the waist of the peninsula) would be effective. Korea proved that no amount of conventional bombing could diminish the enemy's ability to supply his troops. There is, moreover, not one shred of credible evidence that the bulk of munitions used by the Vietcong originate in the north. At the outset, the Vietcong used crude homemade weapons, but the bulk of their arms now are captured or otherwise acquired from the woefully inept defenders of South Vietnam.

Fallacy No. 2: On no evidence at all, the proponents of escalation insist that this demonstration of Western armed power would create an atmosphere in which negotiations for peace could be undertaken from a position of strength. This reasoning simply won't float, for it assumes that North Vietnam and Red China would be willing to do what we ourselves are so unwilling to do—that is, negotiate from a position of weakness.

Underlying all else is fallacy No. 3: That the insurgency in South Vietnam is primarily an external war of aggression. Again, there is no real evidence of this. The war is nurtured and encouraged by North Vietnam, to be sure, but there is no assurance that Hanoi could stop the war even if it so willed.

In Korea we hypnotized ourselves into believing that Communist China would not enter the war. We are now in the process of repeating this catastrophic piece of self-deception. On past performance, Red China is calculated to respond in kind if the United States falls into the trap of stepping up the war in southeast Asia. It is a mistake to assume that this would simply result in another Korea. It would result in something infinitely worse, for we are now dealing with a Communist China that has the bomb.

Thus the smallest increment in the war contains the frightful seeds of nuclear holocaust.

There are, sadly, times when such terrible risks must be taken. The Cuban missile crisis was one such time, for it threatened the very existence of the American Nation.

No such threat exists in South Vietnam. The fact that the Vietcong are Communists does not make the war any less a civil war. Talk that we are fighting to keep a foothold on the Asian mainland makes no more sense than the Soviet gibberish that it was installing defensive missiles in Cuba. It is equally indefensible.

American interests in the western Pacific can be handsomely garrisoned from Okinawa, the Philippines, and South Korea. There is no more military rationale for risking war over South Vietnam than there is moral or legal justification.

President Johnson needs to remind himself of Clemenceau's dictum that war is too important a concern to be left in the hands of generals, and he needs to find the courage and statecraft to extricate us from the shameful mess we are in in southeast Asia.

EXHIBIT 2

[From the Anchorage Daily Times, Jan. 2, 1965]

SOUTH VIETNAM PUZZLE

(By Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott)

WASHINGTON.—At least five Latin American countries are being strongly urged by the United States to send token military or economic units to strife-lacerated South Vietnam.

They are Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Peru, and Venezuela.

Other South American nations reputedly are under similar backstage pressure, but this has not yet been positively established.

The five definitely known to be importuned are among the leading beneficiaries of U.S. aid. Latest available official figures show that since 1946 they have received the following huge totals:

Brazil, more than $2.25 billion. This does not include $1 billion in new credits the United States took the lead in arranging last month, with several other NATO countries, to enable the reform regime of President Humberto Branco to combat soaring inflation and other grave economic disorders.

Chile, upwards of $850 million, with new large-scale aid proposals pending.

Colombia, more than $550 million, with additional grants and loans under consideration.

Peru, upwards of $500 million, and like the others seeking more funds.

Venezuela, around $350 million, of which more than $317 million has been in loans and only $18 million in outright grants. Since 1962 this oil-rich nation has received less than $10 million in U.S. aid.

All these countries are markedly cool to getting involved in the increasingly chaotic and unpredictable South Vietnam conflict.

They are displaying distinct reluctance to dispatching even token forces, such as medical or logistic units, or teachers, agricultural experts, and technicians—as the State Department has pointedly "suggested."

Various objections are being raised, foremost among them lack of funds to meet the considerable cost of "showing the flag" in distant southeast Asia.

The United States countered by offering to foot the bill.

Presumably that would include financing transportation, pay, maintenance, and other charges.

These urgent backstage exhortations and proposals are in striking contrast to the administration's cold shouldering of offers from three U.S. Allies in the Far East to send thousands of combat troops to South Vietnam.

South Korea, National China, and the Philippines expressed readiness to send some 50,000 fully equipped and trained fighting men.

In each instance, they were turned down.

The official explanation was that employment of these Asian battle forces would seriously risk escalating the conflict into a major war. Secretary Rusk asked the three allies to dispatch instead noncombat elements, such as medical and logistic units.

All three have complied.

Another baffling South Vietnam enigma is the role of Thrich Tri Quang, leading Buddhist who was given refuge in the U.S. Embassy in the 1963 struggle with the late President Ngo Dinh Diem.

U.S. Intelligence has flatly tagged Quang as an agent of Communist North Vietnam acting on instructions from the Hanoi regime.

Yet Quang is a key adviser of both Maj. Gen. Nguyen Khanh and Buddhist members of the civilian council that was abolished by the so-called young turk generals with Khanh's backing.

Quang also has been consulted by Deputy Ambassador U. Alexis Johnson on establishing a stable government in Saigon.

Early last fall former Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge visited a number of NATO capitals seeking assistance for South Vietnam. He undertook this mission as the personal emissary of President Johnson.

Lodge's results were virtually nil.

None of the European allies offered any personnel. The only contribution was a small amount of economic aid from the Erhard regime in West Germany.

In the Washington diplomatic corps, one explanation being discussed for the administration's apparent strong desire for Latin American representation in South Vietnam is to broaden the Western base in preparation for shifting this tortuous problem to the United Nations.

Such a move, it is pointed out, could be the prelude to negotiations to neturalize not only South Vietnam, but Laos, Cambodia, and Thailand under "U.N. guarantees."

Secretary Rusk and Under Secretary Averill Harriman reputedly favor such a solution of the whole southeast Asian problem.

Rusk is credited as having discussed this with Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko in their series of Washington and New York talks last month. Rusk is said to have stressed the administration is willing to agree to coalition governments in these countries in which Communists would participate.

Also to allow Soviet economic missions and advisers to operate in these countries.

EXHIBIT 3

[From the Washington Star, Jan. 6, 1965]

U.S. CASUALTIES IN VIETNAM RISE

SAIGON.—The United States suffered nearly twice as many battle casualties in South Vietnam in 1964 as in the three previous years combined, official sources announced today.

A total of 1,173 U.S. battle casualties were reported for 1964, including 136 killed. The combined figure for 1961, 1962, and 1963 was 615 casualties, including 107 killed.

During the last year, the U.S. Army suffered 1,009 casualties, the Navy 25, the Marine Corps 39 and the Air Force 100.

Fourteen American servicemen were listed as missing in action for 1964.

EXHIBIT 4

CORNELL UNIVERSITY,
Ithaca, N.Y., August 9, 1964.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: Please accept my sincere congratulations and my strong support for your vote against the southeast Asia resolution.

I am not at all sure that the interests of our country are best served by our being involved in Vietnam. Your vote, expressing some serious doubts about this entire military enterprise, was extremely heartening. What is it that makes so many of the denizens of Capitol Hill so bellicose? Nowadays I find myself worrying less about the military and more about the military-minded civilians—who rattle their paper sabers with such frightening displays of toughness. I am fully persuaded that it takes a lot more courage not to be "tough" nowadays.

Your vote represented more than your Alaska constituents last week.

Sincerely yours,
ANDREW HACKER,
Associate Professor.

BEVERLY HILLS, CALIF.,
August 11, 1964.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: I am writing this letter to you to commend you on your thoughtful and sensible comments on the threatening situation in southeast Asia.

Though extremists may criticize your point of view, time will prove that your recommendations for a peaceful solution are the only course to follow if mankind is to survive.

Sincerely yours,
WALTER BRIEHL, M.D.,
Lieutenant Colonel, Medical Corps, U.S. Army Air Force (Inactive).

BERKELEY, CALIF.,
August 8, 1964.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING, of Alaska,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Applaud courage and good sense in position against Vietnam resolution.

Mr. and Mrs. WILLIAM PITT,
Department of Mathematics,
University of California.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.,
August 8, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: Although I am not one of your constituents, I would like to commend you for your courageous stand in voting against the recent resolution on Vietnam. I am not a pacifist (absolute style, I mean) nor am I a Communist sympathizer. But everything I read (e.g., your fine article in Fact) leads me to conclude that we are acting stupidly and dangerously over there.

Cordially,
PAUL E. MEEHL.

Same to Senator MORSE.

WILLAMINA, OREG.,
November 28, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: We were glad to receive your reply and learn that you received many letters in support of your opposition to our policy in Vietnam.

I do not know when this will reach you or if you will be in a position to act upon it when it does, but in any case I feel I must write. The point is that with Maxwell Taylor in Washington, D.C., and conferences scheduled, it would seem that in all probability important decisions will be made this week concerning our war in Vietnam. If there is anything you can do to influence our turning the whole thing over to the U.N., I am writing to urge you to do so.

Respectfully yours,
FRITZ MISHLER.

TACOMA, WASH.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: Keep up the fight on double standard of assistance. I hope the new Congress heeds your advice and cuts most of this foolish foreign aid.

As for the Vietnam war, I'm totally on your side. I think we have no business there at all especially losing American lives. I agree with you completely that the Vietnam affair is an internal affair of that nation. Let the Communist have it, and let us use the funds wasted there to rebuild and develop Alaska, further education throughout the United States, and the other so much more worthy and necessary causes—checking mental retardation, juvenile delinquency, etc.

ANDREW WM. VACHON, S.J.

Duluth, Minn.

Dear Sir: I understand you voted against the recent Vietnam resolution. Thank you. I agree that it's not worth our lives and money.

J. Stephens.

August 19, 1964.

Hon. Ernest Gruening,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Gruening: I am writing to commend you for your lonely struggle against the horrors and imbecilities of America's current military program in Vietnam. It is indeed a lamentable fact that men in your position must deal with a public opinion that, for the most part, is dreadfully mal-, mis-, and downright un-informed about the events and issues in question. Following its present course, this American military program seems inexorably destined to result in another unfortunate (and eventually highly unpopular) war with China. If that should happen, your present stand will, of course, be vindicated and this same public opinion will (just as monolithically, no doubt) howl for an end to the slaughter. Even if you happen to be "wrong" in regard to Vietnam, and this does not appear to be the case, I salute you for your courage.

Very truly yours,

T. G. Powell.

Brookline, Mass.

Dear Senator Gruening: I want to commend you for your good stand for the withdrawal of troops from Vietnam. I have already written to the Senators and Congressmen from my State to use their influence for such withdrawal.

Yours truly,

Celia Barap.

San Diego, Calif.,
August 12, 1964.

Senator Ernest Gruening,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Gruening: Although your vote against the President's plan for retaliatory action in Vietnam was in a pitiful, and to me strange, minority, you were, in a manner of speaking, voting for me, even though I be a Californian, and I am writing to thank you for that vote, and to assure you that there are many others who are not your constituents who are grateful to you for your stand.

Sincerely yours,

Zika Herz.

St. Matthew's Episcopal Church,
Louisville, Ky., August 5, 1964.

Hon. Ernest Gruening,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Gruening: I have just read your article in the recent issue of Fact magazine. It is one of the few stories about Vietnam which I have read which makes any sense to me.

Now we are having a flareup on account of attacks on our destroyers. It is inevitable that there should be such crises as this from time to time as long as we are messing around over in South Vietnam.

I am writing Senators Cooper and Morton today to tell them that I, for one, am in hearty agreement with the thoughts which you expressed.

Gratefully yours,

Wilfred Myll.

Bayside, N.Y.,
August 8, 1964.

Hon. Ernest Gruening,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Gruening: I read in the New York Times that you were one of the two Senators voting against the joint resolution approving President Johnson's actions in the Vietnam crisis.

While the voice of wisdom is thus reduced to a small whisper, I believe, nevertheless, that it will be heard throughout the land. If, by some miracle, we are spared the dread horrors of universal atomic war, the credit should, in a large measure, go to you and Senator Morse who have been consistent in counseling moderation.

Geographically, you are thousands of miles away from me and I will never be able to express my thanks for your refusal to be bulldozed into conformity by voting for your reelection. However, I am proud that in the Senate there are, even now in the time of hysteria, two men who think independently and vote according to their conscience. This, I am sure, is a good omen for our future and that of the world.

Respectfully yours,

John Strauss.

Mount Rainier, Md.,
August 13, 1964.

Hon. Ernest Gruening,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Gruening: Your courageous vote on the President's declaration concerning Vietnam is appreciated by every American citizen who is concerned with the moral basis of U.S. policy. Your action in this matter is what true patriotism is all about.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Marie G. Ali.

Oak Park, Ill.,
August 11, 1964.

Senator Gruening of Alaska,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Gruening: I want to thank you and praise you for voting against President Johnson's resolution last Friday.

I have recently visited Taiwan, Malaysia, Thailand, Burma and other spots in the Far East and Middle East and I feel very deeply that we are following a precarious and provocative course in that part of the world. It is tragic that a great Nation such as the United States of America could be so misled as to accept and approve such a resolution with only two dissenting votes. You should be proud to be one of the dissenters. I would like to join you.

May your reward be great as I am sure it will—if not in this life and time, in some future life.

Best wishes for your continued success and your good influence.

Sincerely,

Helen R. Laughlin.

The Wiscasset Inn,
Wiscasset, Maine, August 9, 1964.

Dear Senator Gruening: This is a short note to say bravo for your stand against gunboat diplomacy in southeast Asia.

May you win over many to your cause.

Sincerely,

Fanny Ventadour.

Denver, Colo.,
August 11, 1964.

Dear Senator Gruening: We wish to commend you for voting against supporting the President in the southeast Asia situation. Your forthright stand on important issues is very much appreciated.

We are very much alarmed at the possibility of spreading nuclear weapons and urge you to do all possible to get a full debate in the Senate on a concurrent resolution disapproving the agreement to permit NATO countries to share nuclear information.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. Dorothy Jacob.
Mrs. Ann Beatty.
Mrs. Anne R. Robnett.
Miss Sonia Ginsburg.

North White Plains, N.Y.,
May 7, 1964.

Senator Ernest Gruening,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Gruening: I wish to let you know that I support your efforts to find a peaceful solution to the costly and unjust war in Vietnam. I urge you to use your influence to set up procedure for negotiations to enable the termination of U.S. military involvement.

Respectfully yours,

Evelyn Malkin.

Radburn, Fair Lawn, N.J.,
August 7, 1964.

Dear Senator Gruening: Good for you. That was a brave vote against warmaking power for President Johnson. I hope you keep on fighting against the dirty business in southeast Asia, which can result only in disaster for us. Honest history will vindicate you.

Sincerely yours,

John Ackerson.

Burlington, Vt.,
August 10, 1964.

Senator Ernest Gruening,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Sir: This is to express sympathy with your stand on Vietnam and admiration for your courage in opposing endorsement of the President's actions.

With every good wish.

Yours sincerely,

Rowena P. Ansbacher,
H. L. Ansbacher.

Philadelphia, Pa.

Hon. Ernest Gruening,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Gruening: Please keep up your valiant opposition to further U.S. military involvement in Vietnam.

With gratitude and respect,

Lucy P. Carner.

Los Angles, Calif.,
August 8, 1965.

Senator Ernest Gruening,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Gruening: I wish to commend you for your courage in voting against the resolution giving war powers to the President in Vietnam.

I know it was not easy to go against the tide of hysteria on this issue, but I am glad you did, and I am sure that someday the historians will say you were right.

Best wishes.

Sincerely,

Duane Magill.

Marion, Iowa,
August 5, 1964.

Hon. Ernest Gruening,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Gruening: I read your article on Vietnam in the July-August issue of Fact, and so glad you wrote it. Am so afraid this war will continue in the north of Vietnam and on into China. This dirty war could easily get us into nuclear world war III.

Am sorry there is not more debate as to the advisability of continuing this war which was never declared.

Thanking you for the article.

Sincerely,

Irene G. Coonebes.

Portland, Oreg.,
September 24, 1964.

Senator Ernest Gruening,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Gruening: Thank you for your stand on Vietnam, calling for negotiations instead of military force.

Sincerely,
Mrs. Mildred Monroe.

Embarrass, Minn.,
August 8, 1964.

Senator Ernest Gruening,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: I am glad to see that the gentleman from our newest State expressed reason and a value for human life in the vote on the resolution regarding the President's action in Vietnam.

One voice may no longer matter in affecting the policies of this country, but I wish you to know that I admire your courage, and support your stand.

Sincerely,
Karen R. Kivela.

August 10, 1964.

Senator Gruening: We feel thankful for your stand against American aggression in Vietnam.

Michael Lurie.

Canandaigua, N.Y.,
July 28, 1964.

Hon. Senator Gruening,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Gruening: We commend the efforts you are making by speaking out aganist the consequences of our U.S. policy in Vietnam. We agree that there can be no winning of this kind of war, and that there are terrible dangers from the possibility of its escalating into something that no one, including the Chinese and the North Vietnamese, would want, but might be forced into. The more weapons we send to Vietnam, the more we are outfitting the guerrillas; they seem to have captured so many of our modern weapons—in fact, seem to get few from other sources in comparison.

If you and others can put pressure on our Government to stop wasting our money in this fashion, and to make a big, sincere effort to influence other countries in finding some way to work toward neutralizing the area, we will find our prestige in the eyes of the underdeveloped countries but also Russia, France and others will be increased. And the South Vietnamese people will fight harder with us if they know there is a goal—a possibility of peace—before they are annihilated or decide to join the Communists.

Yours very sincerely,
Mrs. Walter Gruen.

Lanesboro, Mass.,
August 8, 1964.

Hon. Ernest Gruening,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Gruening: Your forthright stand against the extension of the U.S. military involvement in southeast Asia has been repeatedly noted and appreciated in the last several years. I am indeed impressed by the simple clarity of your statements in this regard. You show an ability, all too rare these days, to rise about parties politics and sectional interests and even above selfish nationalism to see what is right. This is statesmanship and I commend you for it.

We are waging a losing battle for a lost cause, even a wrong cause, in southeast Asia. I am heartsick that there are so few voices courageous enough to speak out against this latest form of economic imperialism—but proud indeed that there are these few.

Congratulations and thank you—you speak for many of us.

Respectfully yours,
Mrs. Robert M. Pollock.

Hubbard Woods, Ill.,
August 7, 1964.

Senator Gruening,
Washington, D.C.

My Dear Senator: Thank you for your courageous stand. Would we had many more like you.

Sincerely,
Atlantis Marshall.

St. Petersburg, Fla.,
July 27, 1964.

Senator Ernest Gruening,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Senator: Permit me to commend you for your forceful, forthright opposition to our part in the "dirty war" in South Vietnam. I, too, am opposed to our intervention in that country's internal affairs. It is bound to hurt our prestige in southeast Asia as well as in the United Nations. I have received documents regarding this matter from other Members in Congress. After reading them, I have passed them on to other voters in this area. I never throw anything in my wastepaper basket like that, and find that most Americans are glad to read about the war in South Vietnam. I hope that our Government will find ways to withdraw our Armed Forces from South Vietnam without losing too much "face." Thank you again for your opposition to the "dirty war" in South Vietnam. I hope your efforts will be successful, at least in educating the citizens of the United States. Good luck and best wishes to you.

I am,
Very truly yours,
Edward K. Field.

Washington, D.C.,
May 23, 1964.

Hon. Ernest Gruening: We fully support your stand on nonexpansion of the fighting in southeast Asia and particularly South Vietnam.

It now seems that the United States will soon commit itself to even more extensive military action in this area. Continued involvement can only lead to further unjustified killings of women and children, as in the recent attack on Cambodian villages. In such cases, the United States will always be blamed, regardless of how much control our advisers have of the situation. This distresses us very much.

We strongly urge and hope that you will speak out for the removal of U.S. advisers.

Now is the time to start building a lasting peace in this area—by such means as another Geneva conference or neutralization of the area—in which foreign powers (from both sides) will not dominate.

Sincerely,
Mr. and Mrs. Peter Hunt.

Washington, D.C.,
August 9, 1964.

Senator Ernest Gruening,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Gruening: Thank you for your honesty and courage in taking a stand against extending the conflict in southeast Asia. I believe that a negotiated settlement of the issues is the only way to achieve a lasting peace.

Sincerely yours,
Edmond S. Harris.

Hayward, Calif.,
August 13, 1964.

Senator Ernest Gruening,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Hon. Senator Gruening: We wish to let you know that we appreciate and support the statement you made concerning southeast Asia.

Our country has abrogated its agreement to the decisions made at the SEATO Conference in 1954 with its military involvement in Vietnam. We share with you the attitude that in order to preserve the peace, the problem must be handled around the conference table. Otherwise, we are in grave danger of igniting a worldwide nuclear war, and of course, the destruction of mankind.

We cannot let ourselves be guided only by the militarists.

Sincerely,
Mr. and Mrs. Alex S. Treskin.

Madison, Wis.

Dear Senator Gruening: Just a note to affirm my support for your statements on South Vietnam. Keep it up, we cannot permit this war to continue.

Very truly yours,
Russell Jacoby.

Livingston, N.J.,
August 15, 1964.

Dear Senator Gruening: I wish to congratulate you for the position that you took with reference to the President's order for the bombing of North Vietnam.

It is unfortunate that there are only two voices of moderation in Congress. The use of the United Nations is bypassed. Our Constitution is worthless and a hollow mockery. The incident smacks of the *Maine* in Havana Harbor and such conduct on our part makes the Japanese at Pearl Harbor look like Sunday school children.

If there is any way I can help, please let me know. Just as in pre-Hitlerite Germany, to hold an unpopular view which is against that painted in the press makes one suspect I am fearful for my country, my family, and myself.

Respectfully,
Leon M. Mosner.

Burlington, Vt.

Dear Senator Gruening: May I commend you for your courageous stand against U.S. policy in Vietnam.

Sincerely,
David S. Moe.

Philadelphia, Pa.,
January 5, 1965.

Senator Ernest Gruening,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Gruening: Thank you for your unrelenting stand against the disastrous position which our country has taken in southeast Asia. Many stubbornly ignorant men oppose you. We are sure that you will keep on fighting interventionism in Asia, and must finally win, and we hope that it will be soon.

Very sincerely yours,
Helen and Arthur Bertholf.

San Anselmo, Calif.

Senator Ernest Gruening,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

My Dear Senator: I want you to know that your statements on U.S. foreign policy, particularly Vietnam, are greatly appreciated. Men like you, holding a responsible office, who speak out for a more intelligent policy are very important in these dangerous times. Please keep the fight up.

Sincerely,
Clare McKeage.

Indianapolis, Ind.,
August 11, 1964.

Dear Senator Gruening: This is to express appreciation for your vote against the extension of operations in Vietnam. Our people are confused on what is taking place there and it is to be hoped that your courageous and realistic stand will win many adherents.

Sincerely,
Gordon H. Graves.

AMHERST, MASS.,
August 9, 1964.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: I support your position on the Vietnam resolution, and I wish to express my respect for your willingness to stand almost alone in this serious matter.

I have had occasion to sit in on a few of the sessions of the World Assembly of Youth, now meeting here at the University of Massachusetts. Delegates and observers from over 100 countries are present. For the most part they are opposed to military action in Vietnam. They favor U.N. intervention and a return to the 1954 Geneva agreements, including withdrawal of foreign troops. I wish that our Senate might have had the opportunity, as I have had, to listen to articulate foreign opinion. And I wonder how much the ugly shadow of Goldwaterism may be already influencing U.S. foreign policy.

With best wishes.

Sincerely yours,

DEAN A. ALLEN.

BRONX, N.Y.

Hon. Senator GRUENING,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Your declaration that "All Vietnam is not worth the life of a single American" has my 100 percent approval.

Although, being just a poor physician, I know what it means for a mother to bear a child.

Just keep on opposing and try your best to uphold peace.

May God bless you always.

Very cordially yours,

JOSEPH S. FERACA, M.D.

SAN ANSELMO, CALIF.

Senator GRUENING.

DEAR SIR: I support your stand and vote on Vietnam.

Keep it up.

Sincerely,

J. BUCHWALD.

BETHESDA, MD.,
August 7, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: I wish to express my thanks to you for your sensible and courageous stand on the Vietnam resolution.

Sincerely,

EDWIN A. WEINSTEIN.

ANCHORAGE, ALASKA,
September 20, 1964.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: Our support and sincere respect goes with you on your stand on U.S. policy in southeast Asia.

Thank you for sending the very complete and informative CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 10 and August 7. The receipt of any future proceedings along this subject will be appreciated.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. C. S. SPARKS.

THE SOUTH PARK METHODIST CHURCH,
Hartford, Conn, December 29, 1964.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,
Senate Office Building,
U.S. Government, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: I want to express my support for a change in our Vietnam policy. I am glad to read in a recent New York Times story that you too feel that a change is in order.

Enclosed are two statements on Vietnam which I have recently distributed to our church members and to others. The response has been such as to convince me that the public would support an intelligent policy toward southeast Asia if such policy was forthrightly and persuasively presented.

Yours truly,

GEORGE G. HILL,
Minister.

Senator GRUENING,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: I want to write this line of strong support and very real gratitude for your stand in regard to the war in South Vietnam.

I, too, am disturbed by the actions of the U.S. Government in the choice of the Ambassador to replace Lodge, the overflights and bombings in Laos by U.S. planes, and the statements of Secretary Dean Rusk.

More power to you.

Yours gratefully,

Rt. Rev. W. APPLETON LAWRENCE,
Retired Bishop of the Episcopal Diocese of Western Massachusetts.

HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCE,
DEPARTMENT, MICHIGAN COLLEGE
OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY,
Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., August 3, 1964.

Hon. ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: Please accept my strong and sincere support of your position taken on southeast Asia and Vietnam—on the floor of the Senate, in press interviews, and volume, I, issue 4, Fact, July–August 1964 issue.

Keep up the good work.

MILTON E. SCHERER.

P.S.—I'm a Demo too. Best.

SILVER SPRING, MD.,
August 7, 1964.

Senator GRUENING,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Wholeheartedly support your endeavors to have Vietnam problem negotiated.

Mrs. J. WEICHBROD.

CRESCENT CITY, FLA.,
January 5, 1965.

MY DEAR MR. GRUENING: Now that a few more people in Washington seem to be awaking to the insanity of our southeast Asia policy I hope that you will again tell the American people that we have no business in Vietnam and that all military aid and all armies should be withdrawn, and southeast Asia made a neutral zone.

Sincerely,

EVELYN TEILLOS.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
August 12, 1964.

Hon. ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR: I support your stand on Vietnam and hope that disaster can be averted—total disaser, that is. It is already disaster. How can the American people follow such an evil course? If we continue there is no way to predict the results of our folly.

Respectfully yours,

LOLA BOSWELL.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: I wish to thank you for the position which you have taken on our military presence in South Vietnam. I have urged my friends to write to the President supporting your arguments to withdraw troops from the area and encourage a peaceful settlement in Vietnam. We are not supporting a free government nor adhering to the wishes of the Vietnamese people by fighting an unjust war.

Sincerely,

Mrs. LILLIAN MOED.

RIDGEFIELD, N.J.,
August 11, 1964.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Want you to know how much I appreciate your continuing to fight for a peaceful solution to the situation in Vietnam. Reconvening the 14 nations for a conference seems to be the only rational way to stop the war from escalating into a world holocaust.

It has been very evident that the Vietnamese people have no will to fight and only want an opportunity to solve their own affairs without interference.

By bringing devastation to their land and continuing to send more and more American boys to die there will not solve the problem.

Thanks again for your forthright position in calling for our withdrawal of troops and a peaceful solution around the conference table.

Sincerely yours,

MORRIS BRAUNSTEIN.

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX.,
August 8, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: Thanks sincerely for voting against the Vietnam resolution. History well may make you a prophet. Please send any of your speeches.

Appreciatively,

BILL RENKEL.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.,
September 17, 1964.

Hon. ERNEST GRUENING,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: May I hail you on the good sense, courage, and humanity which you demonstrated in your stand against the present policy of Vietnam (Fact magazine).

I support your position 100 percent and have written to my Congressmen and to President Johnson urging them to pull us out of Vietnam.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. PENNY ARONSON.

LEMON GROVE, CALIF.,
August 11, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: I want to express the appreciation we feel in your forthright expression of concern about President Johnson's recent action in South Vietnam. We need people like you in the Senate—people who look at situations clearly and freshly and who have the courage to stand.

Thank you.

OLIVIA W. DAVIS.

JUNEAU, ALASKA,
August 10, 1964.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: Three cheers for your recent vote against the war in Vietnam. I wish more Senators had the courage and commonsense to vote against sending American men and money into an area which is none of our business. The fact we have been pouring billions into Vietnam for years and have got nowhere should prove that a military solution is not the answer. The Vietnamese didn't want the Japanese or the French, so why should they want the Americans telling them what to do? This is a problem for the United Nations.

I hope your voice continues to be heard on this subject.

Yours sincerely,

RUTH M. POPEJOY.

MODESTO, CALIF.,
August 12, 1964.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: It was with heartfelt thanks that we noted your vote on the recent congressional support of President Johnson's actions in southeast Asia. As Quakers we have a high regard for unanimity, but we are well aware that truth often stands alone, shunned by the raucous cries of the multitude. Sir, persist in the best lights God has given you.

Our best religious insights tell us that war and violence never achieve good ends, though it does, at times, seem to bring some resolutions in man's affairs. Truly, the ends never justify the means when viewed dispassionately in the wider reaches of time and space.

As rationalists and humanitarians there are reasons enough to question the attitudes and acts of our national leaders in this and other areas of world conflict. If the United States is to continue its leadership of the free world, we desperately need a sober and mature voice; for we are dealing in areas where mankind is at stake.

Once again, may we thank you for your good services to our Nation as well as the world.

Sincerely,

Rudy Potochnik,
Acting Clerk, Delta Monthly Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends.

Cumberland Hospital,
Brooklyn, August 12, 1964.

Senator Ernest Gruening,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator: We all—although some of us don't know it—owe you a debt of gratitude for your wish to keep us from sinking into the quicksands of war in South Vietnam, and for your courage in taking a stand publicly.

Respectfully,

Harley Gerden, M.D.

Brooklyn, N.Y.,
January 11, 1965.

Hon. Ernest Gruening,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: We would like to commend you for speaking out so strongly on the unhappy situation in South Vietnam and to support your efforts to bring about a negotiated peace.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. Maxwell Nurnberg.

Columbus, Ohio,
May 4, 1964.

Senator Ernest Gruening,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Gruening: I very much admire your stand on the war in Vietnam. I hope you will continue to express your views on this vital subject.

Please know that you have the support of many Americans in your effort to save us from this folly.

Yours truly,

Benjamin B. Sherwin.

Coloma, Mich., *August 8, 1964.*

Senator Ernest Gruening,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations for your courageous stand on Vietnam. We need more statesmen like you.

Mrs. C. E. Killebrew.

Flushing, N.Y., *January 1, 1965.*

Senator Gruening, of Alaska,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Gruening: We want to thank you for your courageous stand in opposition to our present course of action in Vietnam.

It seems to us that our policy in Vietnam involves us in needless risk in an area where our national well-being is not threatened.

Sincerely,

Andrew L. Johnson.
Dorothy M. Johnson.
Grace H. Hinman.

Bayside, N.Y., *August 10, 1964.*

Dear Senator Gruening: I support your principled stand in opposition to the reckless bombing of North Vietnam and to the congressional resolution. You are not alone.

Yours truly,

Lawrence D. Hochman.

Cambridge, Mass.,
January 8, 1965.

Dear Senator Gruening: Congratulations to you for the courage you have displayed in condemning U.S. support to the war of atrocities taking place in Vietnam.

Yours truly,

Mark Smith.

North Chevy Chase, Md.,
August 8, 1964.

Hon. Ernest Gruening,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Gruening: Congratulations on your independent position regarding our bombings of North Vietnam. The Nation owes Alaska a debt of gratitude for sending to the Senate a man who does his own thinking and who holds the welfare of men in greater esteem than the traditions of narrow nationalism so dear to many of our mercantilist hearts.

Cordially,

Robert O. Link.

Chicago, Ill.,
August 8, 1964.

Hon. Ernest Gruening,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator: I wish to express my approval and admiration for your stand on Vietnam. Your voice is practically alone and therefore you deserve a lot of credit for having the courage of your convictions. Let me assure you that I share your convictions, and hope the present situation will be settled not by guns or bombs, but through negotiations.

Sincerely yours,

Sam L. Talmy.

St. Petersburg, Fla.

Senator Gruening.

Dear Sir: I certainly do think we should pull our boys out of Vietnam. Where are the United Nations troops?

Mrs. Wm. Long.

Washington, D.C.,
August 12, 1964.

Dear Senator Gruening: I thank my Heavenly Father for your humanitarian and statesmanlike stand concerning Vietnam.

Respectfully yours,

Miss Catherine Powell.

San Pedro, Calif.,
June 25, 1964.

Dear Senator Gruening: My heartfelt approval of your statement on the untenable position the United States has taken in southeast Asia.

I hope you continue to make your viewpoint heard on this explosive situation.

Sincerely,

W. I. Geismon.

Cranford, N.J.

Senator Ernest Gruening,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Gruening: My sincerest best wishes and deepest respect go out to you for your vote in the Senate against President Johnson's carte blanche resolution on Vietnam.

Your voice has been heard in New Jersey. You have consistently made sense.

If only a few others would show similar courage and good sense. Again, thank you.

Lester Goldberg.

Madison, Wis.,
January 7, 1965.

Senator Ernest Gruening,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: In the past several months, I and all other Americans have been concerned with events involving the United States in South Vietnam. I heartily congratulate you on your courageous stand on this question. As you know, the American press has hardly given your statements on the subject wide coverage. I would greatly appreciate it if you could send me a copy of your Senate speeches concerning American involvement in Vietnam, and any other information which you deem pertinent.

Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

Joseph M. Gorrell.

Philadelphia, Pa.,
November 24, 1964.

Senator Ernest Gruening.

Dear Sir: We are grateful to you for your fight for U.S. policy in southeast Asia based on commonsense and responsibility. Please do not get discouraged.

We would like to know the name of a newspaper in Alaska and address. Perhaps they need to be told what your patriotic stand means to the country and world.

Sincerely yours,

Arthur Bertholf.
Helen Bertholf.

San Francisco, Calif.,
August 11, 1964.

Dear Senator Gruening: I want to thank you for having the principle and courage to vote against the sheeplike resolution backing the military action in southeast Asia.

Many, many people deplore this situation and fear the consequences. Yet they have been intimidated to the point of remaining silent. An influential voice raised against madness in a time of hysteria goes a long way to give heart and backbone to the silent millions. May you have the strength to speak the truth and uphold your convictions if the going gets rougher.

Sincerely,

Mrs. C. H. Dorsey.

Copper Center, Alaska,
September 10, 1964.

Senator Gruening.

Dear Sir: I admire the stand you have taken in regard to withdrawing from Vietnam. Keep up the good work.

Samuel J. N. Lightwood.

Santa Monica, Calif.,
August 8, 1964.

Senator Ernest Gruening,
Washington, D.C.

Honorable Sir: Permit me to express my admiration for your courage in expressing your negative attitude to President Johnson's stand in the South Vietnam affair.

Sincerely,

Zachary Sagal, M.D.

The Fellowship of Reconciliation,
Nyack, N.Y., January 8, 1965.

Hon. Ernest Gruening,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Gruening: We would like to bring to your personal attention a copy of the letter we sent to President Johnson in November because of the increasing importance of its message. We cannot agree with the view expressed by the President on Monday evening that because we committed ourselves to a certain policy under President Eisenhower, we must continue it under subsequent administrations regardless of how wrong it is proven to be, how many thousands of human lives are lost or maimed every week, or how much anti-American feeling it generates.

We deeply appreciate what you are trying to do to bring about a realistic and constructive policy on Vietnam.

Sincerely,

Glenn E. Smiley,
Acting Executive Secretary.

Fellowship of Reconciliation,
Nyack, N.Y.

Dear Mr. President: Expansion of the war into North Vietnam appears to be a unilateral decision that would scrap previous agreements, flout the United Nations and brand the United States as aggressor in the eyes of uncommitted peoples. It would be an act of incredible folly that could easily serve to solidify the determination of the opposition to fight to the last survivor in this hapless peninsula as in the case of France's long and tragic struggle there.

It is a strange paradox that in southeast Asia we seem to be led by military advisers into a policy closer to that advocated by Mr. Goldwater than to that faith so well enunciated by you just a year ago which so endeared you to the American people. To us, this appears a blind and immoral policy that can end only in the most terrible tragedy because it considers the situation only in military terms. Considerations of human suffering and compassion are lost when a small nation whose people have apparently little interest in political doctrines, whether Communist or anti-Communist, is made the unwilling pawn in a cold or hot war struggle between these doctrines. In the past, Government and military personnel have erred in practically every judgment they have made on Vietnam because they have been insensitive to the heartbeat of these people. Their sources of contact and information come largely from a group enticed by the prospects of receiving some of the immense wealth we are pouring into that area in return for their "loyalty" to the United States in its war against the Communists. The pleas of the great masses go unheeded while bitterness against the United States mounts.

The Nation will never forget the way, 1 year ago, you lifted up and unified a sorrowing people, calling for a new sense of common responsibility: a morality based on consideration, mutual respect and compassion. Your sweeping victory in the recent election may be attributed in large measure to the widespread support of this policy as opposed to one based on mutual suspicion and irresponsible brinkmanship in foreign affairs.

We prayerfully urge you to stand against the powerful forces that are attempting to drive the present administration into the very policies of military adventure and expediency that were so firmly rejected by the electorate earlier this month. Vietnam represents a gaping hole in the reservoir of human decency and consideration you built a year ago. We urge you to mend this hole by statesmanlike means that could bring about a cease-fire, withdrawal of foreign troops and neutralization of the area. We believe this could only enhance your great moral leadership.

Sincerely,

Glenn E. Smiley,
Acting Executive Secretary for the Staff of the Fellowship of Reconciliation, Nyack, N.Y.

Portland, Oreg.,
July 29, 1964.

Senator Ernest Gruening,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Gruening: How many more American youths are to be sacrificed in a war with no chance of victory, a war with little support and much opposition from the people being "defended," a war that for U.S. soldiers hasn't even a name?

The people of southeast Asia have an indelible resentment of Western involvement in their affairs, a resentment acquired over decades of foreign rule. No military campaign lacking genuine support of the people has the slightest chance of success, regardless of how many dollars are siphoned from the rank-and-file American taxpayer to finance it. This has been amply demonstrated, of course, by the bankruptcy and collapse of French military involvement in Indochina.

If for no other reason, the cynical pronouncement made July 28 by Premier Khanh that he will send U.S. arms and men where he sees fit, in defiance of administration policy, should force us to withhold this extravagant assistance.

What "national interest" can possibly be served by continuing to invest potentially creative lives and vast amounts of money in a government which cannot rally the support of the population it purports to rule? The investment would be more to the point here at home, where many millions still lack the decent material conditions prerequisite to true freedom.

Very sincerely yours,

John P. Van Hyning.

Minneapolis, Minn.,
August 11, 1964.

Senator Ernest Gruening,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Gruening: We agree wholeheartedly with your stand on the war in Vietnam. We urge the withdrawal of all U.S. military personnel and military aid from Vietnam. We support the suggestion that that United States initiate and participate in a reconvened Geneva Conference at which such a peaceful political solution might be reached.

The values from which you work are humanistic and rational in contrast to those of your colleagues who assume that democracy may best be saved and communism defeated by nondemocratic means. Your nonconformist stand in Senate debate is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Anton H. Turrittin,
Jane Sawyer Turrittin.

New York, N.Y.,
August 11, 1964.

Hon. Ernest Gruening,
Senate of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Gruening: I am writing to express my extreme concern over the situation in Vietnam and the position which our Government has taken and continues to take with regard to it. In addition, I want to say that I appreciate your position particularly on the vote taken in the Senate Friday in which you did not support the President's military action.

I urge you to continue to press for our withdrawal from Vietnam. Time has become of the essence.

Sincerely yours,

Deborah A. Jackson.

August 7, 1963.

Senator Ernest Gruening,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations your patriotic stand for peace in southeast Asia.

W. C. Kelley.

Bronx, N.Y.,
August 8, 1964.

Senator Ernest Gruening,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Gruening: I commend you for your vote in the Congress yesterday and can only wish you were of a majority voting against the resolution, but then again, when has there ever been a majority voting, or doing anything, on the side of the angels?

Respectfully yours,

Harry Grant.

Bronx, N.Y.,
August 7, 1964.

Dear Senator: Though you will in all likelihood be much maligned for your extraordinarily courageous position in voting against support for the Vietnam war, I wish to express my humble and heartfelt support for your actions of recent months.

You are a great man.

T. Richards.

P.S.—I sincerely hope that you will someday run for national office so that nonresidents of Alaska can support you.

Pittsfield, Mass.,
August 5, 1964.

Dear Senator Gruening: I am writing to support your position on the U.S. involvement in Vietnam. I agree wholeheartedly that the United States has no proper concern in that area and cannot win a war where there is so little support for the policies and regimes among the people themselves.

This country is becoming more and more deeply involved in a war that could lead to gigantic proportions and the United States has not sought negotiations but has resorted to military action unilaterally. I'm sick at heart about the entire immoral involvement.

I hope you will be able to continue your intelligent opposition to the trend toward war. So many people agree with you.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. Albert Rowe.

August 8, 1964.

Hon. Ernest Gruening,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We applaud your courageous stand and integrity in opposing the President's recent action in Vietnam. We hope you will continue to show continued courage in the face of powerful majority who seem eager to escalate present crisis into a world war.

Ruth and Edward Roseland.

Evansville, Ind.

Hon. Ernest Gruening,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Gruening: I heartily commend you on your stand regarding the folly of supporting the war in South Vietnam. Missionaries and church publications report facts similar to those you have stated in the Congressional Record.

May your efforts to keep the peace of the world be blessed.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. L. E. Stahl.

Wheaton, Ill.,
August 19, 1964.

Hon. Ernest Gruening,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

My Dear Senator: May I voice my approval of your position with reference to the war in South Vietnam. Sure we must seek some settlement, with the help of everybody and the United Nations, and get the United States troops out of southeast Asia.

As I see it, there is no hope of stopping communism, taking the long time view, by military methods. The longer the war continues the greater will be the danger of some kind of totalitarianism taking over all of southeast Asia (not right away of course) because war, disorder and lack of internal harmony prepares the soil for some kind of extreme "ism".

After a long time of ignorance, I have come to see that the Vietnam war is a civil war mostly in the southern part of South Vietnam, aided on the one side by the United

States and on the other by North Vietnam. The problem is that so many people in South Vietnam are not loyal to their government, I mean that this creates a serious problem for the United States of America.

I saw a report of your speech at the dinner meeting sponsored by the Chicago Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy, on June 25, 1964, as reported in the Sun-Times.

Cordially,

FRED E. JOHNSON.

P.S.—I see extreme lack of wisdom in the idea of extending the war outside of South Vietnam. F.E.J.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
August 8, 1964.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,
Senator from Alaska,
Senate Office Building.

DEAR SENATOR: I wish to thank you sincerely for voicing your opposition to our policy regarding Vietnam. I can see no valid reason for our interference in the affairs of southeast Asia.

President Johnson speaks of a limited war. Facts show that when war begins there is no knowing when and how it will end.

Please continue your outcry. We need you.

ARLINE D. HAYS.

BEATRICE, NEBR.,
August 10, 1964.

Hon. ERNEST GRUENING,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: It is encouraging for the average citizen to know there are men in the U.S. Senate who believe that government should have a moral responsibility, and are willing to exercise that belief.

I wish to commend you on the stand you took against the President's Far East resolution which could plunge the whole world into total war.

Sincerely,

CHARLES SUTTON.

STANFORD, CALIF.,
August 10, 1964.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We wish to express our deep appreciation to you for your vote against the resolution authorizing President Johnson to take all steps necessary to "defend southeast Asia."

Although it may be the case, as asserted in section 2 of the resolution, that maintenance of international peace and security in southeast Asia is vital to the national interests of the United States and to world peace, it is not clear to us that U.S. military intervention is the best—or any—way to secure such peace.

We regret and fear the situation in southeast Asia. We are obviously not experts on U.S. foreign policy; but given the information available to us, we feel that it is a tragic error to risk an already tenuous peace by active participation in the civil war of another country.

It is our hope that your constituents will return you to the Congress that your pleas for sanity in foreign policy may continue to be heard.

Sincerely,

DONALD L. and MERRILL PROVENCE.

HAMPTON, VA.,
January 7, 1965.

DEAR SIR: Thank you for having the courage to state your views on Vietnam.

Most of the American people are completely in the dark about what's going on there and why.

My son is 22 years old and will be there as a helicopter pilot after only 5 months training. If the situation is that urgent, can't these young men and boys be given more training and all possible aid?

I don't want him to give his life in a place where the people don't seem to care one way or another, and the Americans are afraid to call it war and our boys are called advisers.

Now is the time to stop all this fence sitting and facesaving (too much of that has already been done at the cost of thousands of lives).

I'm sure you will hold your own in the upcoming full-scale debate on the situation in Vietnam.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

J. DENNIS.

STATE COLLEGE, PA.,
August 10, 1964.

Senator GRUENING,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: Congratulations on your recent statements concerning our actions in Vietnam. It is heartening to have one or two voices speaking out in an election year saying we are wrong and pointing out that sticking to a mistake is no virtue.

Sincerely,

MRS. ARI HOOGENBOOM.

EUGENE, OREG.,
November 28, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: This is to reaffirm my earlier support of your brave stand on Vietnam.

I should like to urge Congress and the President to think the unthinkable and help promote a peaceful solution of this problem at the conference table.

Thank you for all you have done.

Sincerely,

DOROTHY LEEPER.

AUGUST 6, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: I want to express my concern over the current crisis in Vietnam. Your previous remarks calling attention to the dangers in the situation there are supported and appreciated.

In a crisis situation, it is difficult to sound critical opinion, but at least questions and caution can be expressed. I know that you are aware of the questions to be raised.

I may well be that now is the time for the suggestion of a creative alternative. Could not a factfinding mission under the U.N. be proposed leading to a proposal for negotiation to create a policekeeping force for the area. Perhaps it is true that the Russians have suggested this, but what did we expect. Could it not be true that such a proposal would be in the interests of all sides. Certainly we have no interest, and nothing to gain by continuing the present course, unchanged.

Thank you for your concern and good luck.

Sincerely yours,

LOUIS F. BRAKEMAN,
Assistant Professor of Government,
Denison University.

CHAPEL HILL, N.C.,
August 8, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: I am glad to see you oppose our bristling military display against North Vietnam and would be glad to be placed on your mailing list. I recall meeting you here years ago.

Sincerely yours,

PHILLIPS RUSSELL.

EAST LANSING, MICH.,
December 17, 1964.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: Concerning the situation in Vietnam, we feel that:

1. an immediate cease-fire in all lands contested by the regimes of Indochina;
2. withdrawal—either staged or immediate of all troops not native to these regions;
3. convening of the Fourteen Nation Conference to neutralize all of southeast Asia;
4. the United States then to abide by the 1954 Geneva Agreement to plan free elections in both North and South Vietnam

is a pattern we would like to see followed. We are grateful for the good work you are doing for the cause of peace.

Very sincerely,

EARLE D. HARRISON.

LYNN, MASS.,
August 6, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: I admired your stand on South Vietnam and hope you continue to use your influence to help change our present policy. I feel a war there is a wrong war in the wrong place at the wrong time.

Thank you.

SOPHIE W. GASS.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.,
August 10, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: May I express my gratitude to you for your courageous vote against the surrender of Congress to executive power in the most basic area, that is, war and peace. It seems to me that our country's best hope lies in the rational thinking you have expressed. May I have a copy of your full statement on the subject of Vietnam and an advance declaration of war.

Sincerely yours,

SOL GORELICK.

ACTON, MASS.,
August 11, 1964.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: May I congratulate you on your vote against the joint resolution supporting further military action in southeast Asia.

I urge you to continue to voice disapproval of the use of armed force in settlement of this conflict.

Sincerely yours,

(MRS. J. H.) JANE WESTOVER.

BEL AIR, MD.,
August 7, 1964.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C:

Heartfelt thanks and strong support for your wise courageous decision regarding Vietnam.

ADELAIDE NOYES.

CHICAGO, ILL.

Senator GRUENING,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SIR: I wish you to know that I am in full accord with your position on Vietnam.

Let's get out of there now.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY GOOD.

CHICAGO, ILL.

Hon. ERNEST GRUENING,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: We wish to encourage you to continue your courageous stand regarding the Vietnam situation. The truth needs telling, and we admire your courage for informing the American people on the terrible dangers that are involved.

Our local papers have not published your speeches. Would you please send me copies of any that are available.

Please keep up this important work.

Sincerely yours,

Mr. and Mrs. S. L. STRINEL.

DeLand, Fla.,
December 23, 1964.

Senator Ernest Gruening,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator: I understand that you have said earlier this year, "The time has come to reverse our policy of undertaking to defend such areas as South Vietnam" * * *. Also, "A return of troops to our own shores should begin * * *."

I hope you are still of this same opinion.

What can we all do to give President Johnson a sense of strong support among U.S. citizens for a complete change of policy in South Vietnam?

That very unjust war must stop somehow.

Sincerely,
Vivian Davenport.

Hamden, Conn.,
August 8, 1964.

Senator Ernest Gruening,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Gruening: May we express our distinct approval of your logical, sane, and courageous stand on the Vietnam situation, particularly with respect to what seems to us the ill conceived and somewhat hysterical move on the part of the administration.

We believe that the United Nations should have been called into the case immediately rather than ex post facto.

Very sincerely,
Mr. and Mrs. Richard F. Mezzotero.

Menlo Park, Calif.,
August 9, 1964.

Dear Senator Ernest Gruening: We appreciate your courageous vote against military participation in Vietnam.

We agree that the United States should get out.

Cordially yours,
Miss Elsie R. Renne.

College Park, Md.

Dear Senator Gruening: Your vote against southeast Asia resolution was a vote for freedom and democracy. The United States has no right to aggression in southeast Asia. We should withdraw all troops and all aid to the Dictator Khanh.

For peace,
Allen Solganick.

Chicago, Ill.,
August 7, 1964.

Dear Senator Gruening: I wish to congratulate you on your courageous vote on the southeast Asia problem. Be assured that there are many who support your unpopular position. I hope that you will continue to voice a thoughtful dissident opinion.

Sincerely,
Leigh E. Rosenblum, M.D.

Ridgewood, N.J.,
August 1, 1964.

Dear Senator Gruening: I would like to take this opportunity to thank you for all that you have done for the State of Alaska and for the United States. You are truly a great patriot and a great American. At this time, when the free world is confronted with communism, we, the people of the United States, need truly great and strong leaders to represent us. I believe that you are such a leader. You are truly an inspiration to free men the world over, for it is men like yourself who make the world a better place in which to live.

Very sincerely,
John S. Schmolze, Jr.

Philadelphia, Pa.,
September 17, 1964.

Hon. Ernest Gruening,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Gruening: May I hail you on the good sense, courage, and humanity which you demonstrated in your stand against the present policy of Vietnam (Fact Magazine).

I support your position 100 percent and have written to my Congressmen and to President Johnson urging them to pull us out of Vietnam.

Very truly yours,
Mrs. Penny Aronson.

Woodmere, N.Y.,
August 7, 1964.

Dear Mr. Gruening: Thank you for your stand against escalating or continuing the war in Vietnam. We have indeed no business there that can justify the sacrifice of American lives. Nor, in fact, that can condone the death and travail that we are bringing upon the people of Vietnam.

Moreover, I am sure that anything worthwhile that is to be gained there could be secured better by means other than war and that the war we are waging is only driving the desperate peasants into the forces arrayed against us and greatly lessening any influence we could have in that area of the world.

I am grateful to have some voices such as yours raised in the cause of sanity and decency.

Sincerely yours,
Charles T. Jackson.

Los Angeles, Calif.,
August 8, 1964.

Dear Senator Gruening: I would like to express my deep admiration for your courage in taking a stand against what many people believe to be a preliminary step in the preparation for an extended land war in Asia. It is due to your courage, dedication to freedom and democracy, and tenacity in searching out facts that the realities of southeast Asia are coming to light. Your job is and will be a lonely one with little consolation from those quarters that should be most thankful. Nevertheless, I know you realize that you are performing an essential and crucial function that in the long run will not go unappreciated.

Fifteen years of the cold war have reduced our flexibility to respond to new situations. Too many people look at the world as a struggle between the forces of good and evil with unchanging truths and grand alternatives. This picture is not accurate, especially in southeast Asia and unless we begin to face this fact, we are in for serious trouble which can only culminate in defeat for all.

With profound gratitude,
Robert Friedman.

San Francisco, Calif.,
August 11, 1964.

Dear Senator Gruening: I strongly support your statement that "the road to peace in southeast Asia lies through the conference table."

I urge that the 14-nation Geneva Conference be reconvened to implement a United Nations settlement.

We need more complete information (and accurate) about our involvement in Vietnam and full public discussion and congressional debate.

Virginia Jackson.

Fairbanks, Alaska,
August 8, 1964.

Senator Gruening,
Washington, D.C.

Your debate and vote on southeast Asian joint resolution is commendable.

Larry Brayton, *Bulletin News.*

Evansville, Ind.

Dear Senator Gruening: Many people appreciate your endeavor to warn our Government of the folly of engaging in war in Vietnam. We cannot risk a world war for such a cause. Should the Chinese Communists take over it would certainly be a liability to them.

May you continue to receive guidance in the important work you are doing.

Sincerely yours,
Mr. and Mrs. George Hessenauer.

Detroit, Mich.,
August 8, 1964.

Hon. Ernest Gruening,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Sir: Your opposition to yesterday's congressional resolution of Vietnam was the last ray of light before a long age of darkness.

Yours very truly,
Richard Schick, M.A.,
School of Advanced International Studies of the Johns Hopkins University.

Bronx, N.Y.
January 9, 1965.

Hon. Senator Ernest Gruening of Alaska:

My friends and I applaud your stand in opposing our country's policy in Vietnam.

We urge you to continue your efforts until our men are withdrawn and peace is restored.

Respectfully,
Mrs. Rhoda Ganzer.

Germantown, Ohio,
September 19, 1964.

Dear Sir: We recently heard about your stand concerning the crisis of Vietnam. We wish to commend a person with courage to stand for what he believes when the majority is against him. May you continue to stand for the right.

Mrs. Doris Cooley.

St. Paul, Minn.,
November 24, 1964.

Dear Senator: Again I voice my heartfelt thanks to you for your firm stand against our getting more deeply involved in South Vietnam. I agree with you completely.

I feel we should negotiate peace and help set up democratic elections throughout that troubled country now.

It is obvious that the majority detest their present government so why should we sacrifice American lives to keep it in power?

James F. McEvoy.

Pawling, N.Y.,
August 24, 1964.

Senator Ernest Gruening,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator: In view of your declared opposition to the administration's policy in southeast Asia, with which I fully agree, I enclose herewith a copy of a letter I wrote the other day to the New York Times on the subject.

The Times did not see fit to publish this letter, pleading the familiar excuse of the "pressure of space," etc., which is hogwash, of course, as they have published much longer letters of mine in the past. This reminds me of a letter I read in the Times by Norman Thomas on June 23, wherein he refers to a bitter attack in the Senate on the administration's policy, by Senator Morse, but did not see it reported in the Times.

In my letter I make a point of the factor of destiny which I feel should play an important part in our calculations regarding the future. The significance to be attached to my letter, as I look at it, lies in the fact that even though we were to gain our objective in southeast Asia, whatever that may be, and however it is to be determined, the odds, over the years, will remain the same: South Vietnam is unlikely to be any stronger militarily, nor is its political position likely to be any more stable, while there will still be a North Vietnam, and more important, a China with a population of three-quarters of a billion people, sooner or later armed with atomic weapons, making Judge Edgerton's comment tragically pertinent. It is the future probabilities, it seems to me, about which we must think, not the present.

Respectfully yours,

EMERSON C. IVES.

PAWLING, N.Y.,
August 9, 1964.

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

I wholly agree with and commend the letter of Judge Henry W. Edgerton respecting our Vietnam policy appearing in today's Sunday Times.

I would particularly call attention to his comment that "When, if not before, Communist China has atomic weapons, it will no more tolerate American military action in southeast Asia than we would tolerate Russian military action in Cuba."

I would like to reiterate a comment I made in a recent letter to the Times to underscore his and Senators GRUENING's and MORSE's assertions "that we have no business in southeast Asia."

"What we and our Government officials seem unable to comprehend is the fact that these millions of people are permanent inhabitants of Asia, and that what we do there can be put of a temporary nature, and cannot alter the ultimate destiny that inevitably must rest in the hands of the people living in that part of the world."

Destiny is not a matter of the few years we may choose to concern ourselves in the affairs of southeast Asia, it is a matter that involves decades in time, and it is shortsighted and futile for us to think we can change the ultimate interrelationships of nations that inevitably must be resolved by the hundreds of millions of people permanently living contiguous to one another, and that thousands of miles from our shores on the opposite side of the world.

EMERSON C. IVES.

EXHIBIT 5

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Sept. 3, 1964]

CAPITOL PUNISHMENT: LODGE IN ORBIT

(By Art Buchwald)

Probably the man who has the toughest job in the world at the moment is Henry Cabot Lodge, who has been traveling around the world at the request of President Johnson, explaining our Vietnam policies to heads of state. It's a lonely job and a perilous one.

Although we haven't attended any of the briefings, we can just imagine what is going on as Ambassador Lodge is presenting his case, let us say, to the King of Denmark.

"Now, sir, let me say at the outset that the United States has the situation in Vietnam well in hand. Under the firm leadership of Gen. Nguyen Khanh many new reforms have been instituted."

As Ambassador Lodge is speaking, a courier from the American Embassy rushes in and gives him a telegram. The Ambassador reads it.

"Well, as I was saying, General Khanh has been dividing the country, and the United States feels he can no longer control the various factions. It is our belief that the best solution to the problem would be to support a general who has the confidence of the people."

The phone rings and the King hands it to Ambassador Lodge.

"Yes, I see, sir. Right, sir. I understand. Of course. Thank you."

He hangs up the phone and continues:

"You see, Your Majesty, our experts believe the best solution to the problem would be to have a three-man military junta govern until we can have elections. We feel General Khanh has been a handicap and we intend to support General Minh, whom General Khanh had disposed of several months ago with our help. Our strategy is to send the South Vietnamese Army out into the field to fight the Vietcong on their own terms."

An aide whispers something in Ambassador Lodge's ear. He nods and says, "Because of the rioting in Saigon our strategy has been flexible and we are now urging the South Vietnamese forces to return to Saigon to prevent the breakdown of law and order. We feel this can best be done with General Minh in command of the ———."

Another messenger from the American Embassy dashes in and hands Lodge a cable.

"Therefore, in line with what our people have worked out, we are happy to announce that Dr. Nguyen Xuan Oanh is now in charge of the Saigon government. Dr. Oanh is a Harvard-educated economist and gets along very well with Ambassador Taylor. General Khanh is now in Dalat resting up from a physical and mental breakdown."

The phone rings again and Ambassador Lodge answers it. "Thank you very much. That's very interesting.

"I want you to understand, Your Majesty, we have not ruled out General Khanh's contribution to our effort in Vietnam. We have decided that in spite of everything he still holds the title of Premier and we have every intention at this time of supporting his government."

The Ambassador's secretary hands him another paper.

"As you have probably read, the main problem in Vietnam is the friction between the Catholics and the Buddhists. Realizing this, the Americans have a plan to prevent rioting between the two factions."

The secretary hands him another paper.

"But we feel at the same time that some rioting would have a good effect and therefore we've authorized the riots now going on throughout the country.

"Our main objective, of course, is to win the war, but we realize that this cannot be done until there is a stable government in Vietnam. We feel we have such a government with Dr. Oanh and * * *."

The phone rings again and Ambassador Lodge answers it wearily. "Yes, sir. Whom did you say? Mme. Nhu? Thank you.

He turns back to the King. "Well, where was I?"

FRAMINGHAM, MASS.,
August 3, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: I want to congratulate you on your courageous stand regarding our escalating military involvement in Vietnam. Thousands of U.S. citizens are solidly behind you, and applaud your opposition to the present immoral policy in southeast Asia.

Sincerely,

MARGARET WELCH.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Jan. 14, 1965]

CAPITOL PUNISHMENT: CRACK TROOPS OF NONOMURA

(By Art Buchwald)

As you probably remember, the country of South Nonomura has been fighting the Communist guerrillas for 4 years. Thanks to American military aid and American advisers. South Nonomura now has one of the best equipped armies in the world, and when it comes to hardware the South Nonomuran soldier lacks nothing. Newsreels of the crack South Nonomuran army show them flying off into the jungle in American helicopters, armed to the teeth. You get a feeling of pride that a group of peasants like the South Nonomurans can be whipped into a first-class fighting outfit.

Unfortunately, despite all the aid, the South Nonomurans haven't been doing very well against the North Nonomuran guerrillas who are armed with nothing more than fishing rods and World War II rifles. Why, everyone asks, can't the South Nonomuran army contain the guerrillas?

One of our correspondents just came back after an interview with a crack South Nonomuran officer and showed us his notes. The interview shed some light on the problem.

Correspondent: Captain, how is the war going?

Captain. War going great. Tell Americans we like K-rations very much, but Q-rations lousy. We need more cigarettes and beer. Morale very low without beer.

Correspondent. Why hasn't your army been able to contain the guerrillas?

Captain. Our army trained by Americans to fight enemy in open. Lousy Communists hide in jungle.

Correspondent. Why don't you go into the jungle and get them?

Captain. You crazy or something? You can get bitten by snakes in the jungle. Besides, your uniform gets dirty. We have to keep uniforms nice and clean for coup d'etat.

Correspondent. That's true.

Captain. And don't forget, you have to walk in jungle, Since Americans came, my men won't go anywhere unless it's by truck or helicopter. Walking is for lousy Communists.

Correspondent. There have been many instances where you have had the Communists surrounded and they've disappeared. How do you explain this?

Captain. Very simple. As soon as we hear about lousy Communist attack, we send crack soldiers there to fight them. But crack soldiers must be supported by many men. We must have hot food, showers, officers' club, noncommissioned officers' club, PX, chaplain, movies, and comfortable living quarters. By the time my crack outfit is ready to fight, lousy Communists have escaped into jungle.

Correspondent. Wouldn't it be better if you fought the war without all these things?

Captain. We crack outfit. Thanks to American training and know-how we not going to fight dirty war like dirty Communists.

Correspondent. But you're not getting anywhere.

Captain. That's what you think. In another year I make colonel. Then I overthrow the Government. You see me then, I give you good interview.

Correspondent. But, Captain, isn't there some way of turning the tide against the guerrillas?

Captain. It's too late. My crack troops have taste of American way of life. We are so busy keeping them supplied, we don't have much time to fight lousy Communists. All they talk about these days is GI bill of rights.

Correspondent. Is there anything you need that would help speed up the war?

Captain. Yes, send us more Japs.

Correspondent. Japs?

Captain. You know, Jap transistor radios.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, Jan. 14, 1965]

AID FOR VIETS

BUENOS AIRES, January 14.—Argentina will send a medical team, medicine, sanitary equipment and food to South Vietnam, usually reliable sources said yesterday. The foodstuffs will consist mainly of tinned meats. The decision to make the shipments was understood to have been in response to an appeal by the United States.

VIETNAM "HAWKS" AND "DOVES"

(By Bernard B. Fall)

"In Vietnam today * * * we have the equivalent of about 4.8 divisions' worth of majors and captains, about 3.5 divisions' worth of lieutenants, and about 3 divisions' worth of master sergeants * * *. They * * * come out of our formally conceived deterrent forces."

That important statement was made last November by Gen. Creighton W. Abrams, Jr., Vice Chief of Staff, to the Association of the U.S. Army. When shorn of professional jargon it gives a vivid picture of the enormous cadre drain caused by the Vietnam war. Of a worldwide total of 16 U.S. Army divisions, between three and four operate without their combat leaders or, more likely, a great many more units experience serious cadre shortages.

As the Vietcong has hardly any Russian advisers and few if any Chinese advisers, the nasty little war in the mountains and swamps of South Vietnam represents a unilateral net drain to the United States in what every army lacks most—highly qualified junior leaders. In that sense as in many others the American commitment begins to resemble the French Indochina War. The French lost 1,300 lieutenants in Indochina; to date, the United States has suffered over 1,500 wounded and over 300 dead in South Vietnam, most of them junior combat leaders. What the drain would become if the war should be broadened to include North Vietnam or mainland China is anyone's guess, but no one in his senses believes it would be small.

It is in these circumstances that a small but extremely vocal group advocates full-scale American commitment, and contrariwise an ever-widening group, now including for the first time a broad spectrum of middle-of-the-road members of the Senate and House, advocates some sort of negotiated solution to the Vietnam problem. Recently there were rumors that "contacts" had been made with the Chinese in Warsaw to explore possible solutions of the Vietnamese problem, and that the Chinese had rebuffed those overtures. To the "hawks," the alleged Chinese rebuff was proof that only a military confrontation with China would solve the Vietnamese problem, just as an "eyeball-to-eyeball" confrontation with Russia over Cuba apparently solved the problem of Russian intervention in this hemisphere. To "doves," the mere report of "contact" with the other side about the problem was evidence of the basic moderation of the present policy as well as an implicit promise that further such contacts might well take place.

Many however are confused by it all and see no good way out of the mess at present; they hope that, by merely holding on and accepting the present rates of loss and levels of spending until the politicians and generals in Saigon finally realize that their country is at war, something acceptable can be snatched from the debacle.

The "hawks" seem to concentrate entirely on Red China rather than on North Vietnam or on the Vietcong, and on maximum use of military force to the exclusion of other means. The fact that almost all their premises are partly or wholly erroneous does not seem to bother them.

Once more the Saigon military are trotted out as the only guarantors of South Vietnam from the evils of neutralism, as if the woods were not full today of neutralist military leaders, from Egypt to Laos. In South Vietnam, General Khanh last year purged several of his brother generals on charges of "neutralism," and he himself has made noises sufficiently anti-American to qualify for good-conduct marks on the other side of the fence. It is true as the "hawks" assert that the South Vietnamese Army is the last organized force in the country—that is precisely what makes it important to any would-be neutralizing general. As in the case of the Chinese Nationalist generals who surrendered Manchuria, Peiping, or Yunnan to the Communists, such an army, with its shiny American equipment, would make an impressive wedding gift or bargaining counter.

The other major unreality is to regard the North Vietnamese and Vietcong as helpless Chinese puppets depending on Peiping for their everyday survival. We are being told about the obsolescence of the Chinese Air Force and the smallness of the Chinese forces in south China, but not that the North Vietnamese People's Army present strength is about twice that of the Japanese forces which captured all of mainland southeast Asia in 1941–42. The South Vietnamese situation on the ground is bad enough without adding the weight of four or five of those divisions which defeated the flower of the French forces at Dienbienphu.

The final unreality is to make believe that the war in South Vietnam is being lost by the American press. That nonsense is trotted out with suggestions of further tightening the already ludicruously tight censorship; not in Vietnam, but here. There has been no map published showing an actual military operation on a scale where it becomes intelligible. The South Vietnamese Army releases detailed reports on the Communist units it faces, which make of the enemy the respectable military force it has become. Here in the United States the authorities prefer to stick to "gooks anonymous." It is not the press which sank a helicopter carrier in the port of Saigon, allowed a major airbase to remain virtually unprotected, allowed a bomb to be smuggled into a key officers' billet, and bungled a whole Vietnamese marine battalion into a rescue operation for four dead American soldiers who, in all decency, could have remained buried in Vietnamese soil until it was certain that they would not be used as bait in a gigantic trap.

On the other side of the spectrum, little can be gained by believing that North Vietnam would seriously consider giving up all the political and military advantages which it has secured at a heavy price, for the sake of joining some sort of regional TVA. Americans with a nostalgia for Point 4, and Frenchmen who can see a role for France in a reconstituted, neutralist Indochina Federation, share that belief, which may be just as illusory as the "hawk" idea of treating the Vietnam crisis as "Cuba II." An Indochina Common Market, a TVA on the Mekong—well and good, but only as frosting on the cake, after some sort of political-military accommodation has been found. Can one be?

Pressures that may not seem ominous to 700 million Chinese—whether they involve a small "escalation" such as introducing saboteurs, an actual landing of an American expeditionary force, or a threat of some measure in between—may well appear thoroughly menacing to 18 million North Vietnamese, who know the shambles that 3 years of Sino-American fighting made out of North Korea. North Vietnam already faces in Laos (through the hardly vieled bombardment of Communist bases and supply lines), and along its own shores, mounting evidence of American strength. The possibilities of a diplomatic confrontation at the conference table exist in Vietnam today as they existed 14 years ago at Panmunjom in Korea, and it would be as unrealistic to underestimate America's leverage on Hanoi as it would be to overestimate Peiping's leverage on the guerrillas of South Vietnam.

FORBIDDEN THOUGHTS

It may well be that President Johnson will have no choice but to follow policies of peace abroad and welfare at home. The policies of globalism, as Walter Lippmann calls it, are a disastrous failure, in contrast to American success at home. By globalism Lippmann means intervention all over the world in regions where we have no primary vital interest, but where the policies of the past (going back to Harry Truman, Dean Acheson and John Foster Dulles) call for an attack on communism in whatever form it shows itself. As a corollary, we must ally ourselves with counterrevolution everywhere. The result is defeat and frustration. Despite the vast power of the United States, indeed, because of that power, we have overextended ourselves, and all over Africa and Asia we are defied and insulted both by our enemies and the governments whose freedom we are supposedly defending. Nasser, Nguyen Khanh, the Philippine masses, the African delegates in the United Nations and a host of others seem to hate us as much as the Communists do.

In this lugubrious situation, it is worth going back over a few of the harbingers that have appeared in the Nation over the past year. In the April 27 issue, Barrows Dunham, writing about the imperfections of the human mind that lead to unthinkable thoughts, suggested that they arise "not because the mind is too narrow or too distant from phenomena, but because some social body acts to prevent criticism of its purposes and policies. Thus unthinkable thoughts are, in fact, forbidden thoughts, that is to say, forbidden by some organization able to punish thinkers."

The policy of the Nation has always been to refuse to be proscribed in this fashion, and to knock down, as far as lies within its power, the delusions which the powers that be systematically disseminate in order further to addle the brains of their victims. A sample of the latter is the domino theory which for years has buttressed suicidal U.S. policies in southeast Asia. In the August 24 Nation, John Gange took a look at this fiction of "inevitable, irresistible and sequential massive defeat" that was supposedly the consequence of the fall of the first domino. This theory of course fits perfectly into the scheme of globalism or unlimited military intervention in civil wars. In Christmas week, Secretary Rusk ducked a press question as to whether the United States still subscribed to the domino theory. Probably he has his own doubts by now.

Another sacred tenet of American policy is the rice bowl theory—that Communist China is bent on expansion to the south in search of food. Warren Unna writes in the Washington Post that this argument is knocked down by "the fact that even that lush rice bowl would make only a marginal difference for China's vast needs." The Chinese leaders are quite sane, and they have computers. They know that the only solution for their population-food problem is birth control and more efficient agriculture.

On April 6, the Nation ran an article by Senator FRANK CHURCH, the lead sentence of which read: "American foreign policy tends to maintain fixed positions long after these have ceased to serve our best interests." Senator CHURCH pointed particularly to the 52,000 American troops still stationed in South Korea, and apparently there for all time. This forbidden thought was followed, 9 months later, by another, when the Senator gave an interview to the progressive Catholic magazine, Ramparts, calling for a new American policy in southeast Asia and consideration of a negotiated peace, with safeguards against a Communist takeover. Three weeks after the appearance of the story, the New York Times front-paged it. Did the Times want to suggest that there are American Catholics who do not follow Cardinal Spellman on Vietnam?

It seems possible. Once only Senators MORSE and GRUENING were in opposition, now they are joined by FULBRIGHT, MCGOVERN, NELSON, PELL, BARTLETT, and CHURCH, and who knows how many others who have not yet spoken out? Perhaps President Johnson is beginning to think forbidden thoughts himself. He will be difficult to punish.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GRUENING. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, as the distinguished Senator from Alaska knows, I, too, entertain serious doubts about our American policy in southeast Asia.

I commend the Senator especially for having referred in the course of his remarks to the nature of the American commitment to Saigon. As I understand—indeed, as it has always been reported to the American people under three different administrations—that commitment has been to give assistance in the form of military instruction, equipment, ammunition, and materiel, as well as economic aid, to the Government in Saigon, to be used in its effort to put down the Vietcong insurrection.

No one can say that we have not fulfilled that commitment. Indeed, so much equipment, materiel, food, and so many advisers have been sent to Saigon that the whole peninsula is in some danger of sinking under the weight of it.

Never, however, have we committed ourselves to converting the Vietnamese war into an American war. Never have we said that if, despite all of the assistance and support we have given to Saigon, it still is unable to cope with the uprising against it, we will then undertake to move in with American forces and transform the struggle into an American war.

Mr. GRUENING. That is true.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I could not feature any war that would be more foolish or futile than a war involving the full commitment of white, Western troops against Asian troops and the Asian mainland.

I commend the Senator for his address this afternoon. I believe it is important that we continue to stress the true nature of the American commitment, so that there will be no confusion over what we have obligated ourselves to do in Vietnam.

I have said, and I say again, that commitments solemnly made must be kept, whether made wisely or unwisely. But, there never, at any time, has been any commitment on the part of the United States to undertake to fight the war in South Vietnam. It is the kind of war that can only be won by the South Vietnamese themselves.

I commend the Senator for his address. I am sorry that I was not here at the time the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGovern] spoke on the subject of Vietnam. I want the Senator from South Dakota to know that he, too, is rendering a very important service in registering his independent views.

The Senate has a responsibility in the field of foreign affairs. We have suffered from too much conformity of thought on the matter of Vietnam. A dissent, constructively expressed, indeed, a full-fledged debate on the subject of Vietnam, is long overdue. At the very least, such a debate would give the American people a better idea of the alternatives available to us. It would give the President more elbowroom, should he need it, within which to deal with this difficult situation in southeast Asia.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Idaho for his very helpful and constructive contribution.

Does the Senator not fear that the very policy which he considers unthinkable and unwarranted; namely, a gradual takeover of the Armed Forces of the United States, is not actually taking place? In the first place, we know that many of our so-called advisers have been and are actually in combat. Within the last 48 hours, we have heard of strikes by American combat planes at installations outside of Vietnam.

In effect, this would seem to be a policy which could easily degenerate or escalate into total military participation. Therefore, I think the Senator's suggestion is excellent, that we keep our eyes fixed on these original pledges. I think that that is extremely important. Nevertheless, although we may keep our eyes upon it, it may be happening while we look. I feel very much that it is happening now.

As I stated in my remarks, the pledge to which the President alluded in the state of the Union message certainly does not preclude our taking this matter to the conference table. If we can stop the war, if we can have a cease-fire, if we can prevent a Communist military takeover by going to the peace table, I believe we would be fulfilling our pledge, and serving our own interests and those of mankind far better than by the mistaken policy which I deeply feel we are now pursuing.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I feel that there is much truth in what the Senator has said. I heard only this morning a news report out of Saigon that American and South Vietnamese planes have joined in attacks upon North Vietnam.

I was very much alarmed at this news. I am happy to say that the Secretary of State assured us this morning that there was no truth whatever in the report, and that American planes have not engaged in any attack upon the territory of North Vietnam, except, of course, in the one case where we retaliated against the torpedo attacks upon our destroyers in the Gulf of Tonkin. Nevertheless, as the Senator has pointed out, there is always the danger of our becoming more and more involved, and, step by step, finding ourselves drawn into a war which is not ours to fight.

Mr. GRUENING. There are subtle involvements. One of the brave and courageous fighters in the uniform of the United States—although we are not supposed to be fighting there—has received the Medal of Honor—all to his credit—but that is an indication that our military are actively fighting. Likewise legislation is being introduced to treat veterans of the war in Vietnam as we treated the GI's of World War I and World War II. These are indications that we are edging into the tragic situation upon which the senior Senator from Idaho says we must keep our eyes at all times, and not permit it to occur.

I welcome his support. I agree with him that there should be a full-fledged debate on this question, because in the Senate we have a responsibility in the field of foreign relations. Every alternative to the present tragic situation should be explored on the floor of the Senate.

THE PRESIDENT'S FOREIGN AID PROGRAM

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the Senate can find much cause for gratification in the President's message concerning the foreign aid program.

Our foreign assistance programs began with the passage of the Greek-Turkish aid bill in 1947. Our effort is 18 years old. There are signs that the program is coming of age.

We have accomplished much, and we have learned much in the accomplishment.

At the time of the Marshall plan we were engaged in an effort which required innovation and experimentation. Inevitably some of our best laid plans went awry.

We have, of course, not achieved the millenium. But we have achieved more than many thought possible after World War II. We have reached many of our goals; more are in sight.

Seventeen countries have moved from the need for outside aid to self-support; our economic aid programs have been ended in 15 European countries, Japan, and Lebanon.

In 14 more countries in Asia, Latin America, and Africa, the transition to economic self-support is underway. The need for U.S. foreign aid there is drawing to a close. These include Greece and Taiwan, where economic aid will end this year.

With our help, Taiwan has been expanding its gross national product at an average rate of 7 percent per year. Industrial production has gone up 12 percent annually. From a needy developing nation 15 years ago, it has grown into a net exporter, and a bastion of strength in the Pacific.

Encouraging signs of maturity and progress can be found in Latin America. We can now point to a third of a million houses which will be built by the end of fiscal year 1965, 36,400 classrooms, almost 12,000,000 schoolbooks, 300,000 farmers who will have received credit loans, 2,120 water systems constructed, and 734 hospitals and mobile health centers in operation.

These U.S. programs alone will, by then, have directly touched the lives of some 24 million people. The efforts of our partner nations in the alliance will multiply these figures many times.

This is progress. But even this tangible progress is less important than the willingness of the people of Latin America to move. The success of the alliance depends upon the people of Latin America. We are seeing a gradual but important shift in attitude, a willingness to discuss the heavy burdens of the commitment to develop that Latin America has assumed for itself and a willingness to enter into the self-help efforts required to achieve the alliance goals.

There are other reasons for encouragement. Events in Venezuela, Brazil, and Chile indicate that Castroism is not accepted as an answer to the problems of this hemisphere. Cuban interference has been significantly reduced by the sharp reaction of the hemisphere to the Cuban effort.

There are also encouraging signs of improvements in the management, of our foreign aid program. Where we once were using a shotgun, we are now more and more employing a rifle. This program would give some kind of assistance to some 70 countries. Nearly 90 percent of all our economic assistance would be directed to 25 of 70 countries receiving some kind of assistance.

In terms of the budget, we are presented with a rockbottom request. It is the smallest in the history of the foreign aid program. The sum requested is less than the amount appropriated to run the State of California for 1 year. It is less than six-tenths of 1 percent of the gross national product.

We are making progress in coordinating our aid with the efforts of other nations and multilaterial agencies. Eleven other free world countries now conduct aid programs of their own. The transition from AID economic help to more conventional resources of finance such as Export-Import Bank lending, World Bank lending, and private investment, is now underway in 14 countries where AID conducts programs.

Private enterprise will continue to have incentives for investment abroad and opportunity to expand trade and improve international standards of living.

There has been steady improvement in the efficiency of the administration of the aid program. We have developed a set of techniques for increasing economic progress in a variety of political and economic environments. The people working in AID are realists, not theorists. Their test of the aid program is—will it be effective?

The long list of countries where progress toward self-support is evident does not include countries like Vietnam where survival and stability must still be secured before development can begin. It does not include the newly independent nations of Africa where the first steps toward development are just being taken.

A WORD ON EXISTING MAJOR PROBLEMS

The problem of population growth remains a matter of grave concern. Also, it has been found easier to increase industrial output than farm production, and in countries where most people still earn their living from the land, this presents a challenge that cannot be ignored. There remain major problems in the world trade area. None of these problems will be easy to solve.

But we have demonstrated that we have both the ability and determination to help in the accelerated development of the free world, and we have given substance to the dreams of more than a billion people for a better life in freedom.

I believe it should be encouraged, not discouraged.

I believe the foreign aid program has come of age.

I believe we should enact the President's program, as proposed.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a table showing the fiscal year 1966 request as compared with the fiscal year 1965 request and appropriations.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mutual defense and development programs

FISCAL YEAR 1966 REQUEST COMPARED WITH FISCAL YEAR 1965 REQUEST AND FISCAL YEAR 1965 APPROPRIATIONS

[In thousands of dollars]

Category	President's request for fiscal year 1965	Congressional appropriation, fiscal year 1965	President's request for fiscal year 1966
Economic assistance:			
Development loans	922, 200	773, 728	780, 250
Technical cooperation	224, 600	204, 600	210, 000
Alliance for Progress:			
Development loans	465, 000	425, 000	495, 125
Technical cooperation	85, 000	84, 700	85, 000
Supporting assistance	405, 000	401, 000	369, 200
Contingency fund	150, 000	99, 200	50, 000
International organizations and programs	134, 400	134, 272	155, 455
American schools and hospitals abroad	18, 000	16, 800	7, 000
Survey of investment opportunities	2, 100	1, 600	------------
Administrative expenses, AID	52, 500	51, 200	55, 240
Administrative and other expenses, State	2, 900	2, 900	3, 100
Total economic assistance	2, 461, 700	2, 195, 000	2, 210, 370
Military assistance	1, 055, 000	1, 055, 000	1, 170, 000
Total, mutual defense and development program	3, 516, 700	3, 250, 000	3, 380, 370

MUTUAL DEFENSE AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

Budget requests fiscal years 1948–66 [1]

[In millions of dollars]

Fiscal year	Economic assistance	Military assistance	Total
1948–49	[2] 7, 370. 0	------------	7, 370. 0
1950	4, 280. 0	1, 400. 0	5, 680. 0
1951	2, 950. 0	5, 222. 5	8, 172. 5
1952	2, 197. 0	6, 303. 0	8, 500. 0
1953	2, 475. 0	5, 425. 0	7, 900. 0
1954	1, 543. 2	3, 931. 5	5, 474. 7
1955	1, 798. 1	1, 650. 0	3, 448. 1
1956	1, 812. 8	1, 717. 2	3, 530. 0
1957	1, 860. 0	3, 000. 0	4, 860. 0
1958	1, 964. 4	1, 900. 0	3, 864. 4
1959	2, 142. 1	1, 800. 0	3, 942. 1
1960	2, 330. 0	1, 600. 0	3, 930. 0
1961	2, 875. 0	2, 000. 0	4, 875. 0
1962	2, 883. 5	1, 885. 0	4, 768. 5
1963	3, 461. 3	1, 500. 0	4, 961. 3
1964	3, 120. 3	1, 405. 0	4, 525. 3
1965	[3] 2, 461. 7	[3] 1, 055. 0	[3] 3, 516. 7
1966	2, 210. 4	1, 170. 0	3, 380. 4

[1] Including supplementals and amendments initiated by the executive branch.

[2] Covers last quarter of fiscal year 1948 and full fiscal year 1949.

[3] Includes amended request for Vietnam.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARTKE in the chair). If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John A. Carver, Jr., of Idaho, to be Under Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I am more than proud to endorse John A. Carver, Jr., to be Under Secretary of Interior. He has been a remarkably diligent and adept public servant, and his many talents have demonstrated themselves in abundance since he came to Washington as my administrative assistant in 1957.

Before that he was a very successful lawyer in Boise, Idaho, and a person whose friendship I came to cherish. That friendship has been kept in repair. As my administrative assistant Mr. Carver quickly demonstrated that he had the intuition to locate the "jugular vein" of a difficult problem; that he could organize an office staff and inspire it to work efficiently and hard; and perhaps most of all, that he was dedicated to the public welfare, and evaluated legislative and administrative functions within that framework.

With his advent to an assistant secretaryship at Interior in 1961, Mr. Carver began the supervision of the work of half a dozen top Government agencies, and I firmly believe these have advanced considerably in their effectiveness under his leadership and administration. Mr. Carver kept an "open door" policy in his office, and people who came to see him and discuss their problems found a willing listener, and an official ready to move adroitly and effectively against redtape.

Mr. Carver also took to the road, not only to inform the public of Interior functions and programs, but to acquaint himself at the grassroots level with the problems of the rancher, the Indian on the reservation, the lumberman, the mine operator, and all others whose livelihood had a dependency on the Federal lands under his jurisdiction. I believe that he has made the agencies under his guidance more responsive to the public interest, more pliable in meeting the needs of today, and more alert to the requirements of the future.

Mr. President, I think we have in John A. Carver, Jr., that rare public servant who combines high honor, fine intelligence, and great capability for the administration of the laws we make here in the Congress. I recommend him without reservation for the undersecretaryship of the Interior.

Mr. President, following John Carver's appearance before the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, the committee, in a most unusual procedure, endorsed his nomination in a rising vote, that the members of the committee had without going into executive session, which is testimony to the confidence in this proven and able appointee.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record extracts from editorials in western newspapers praising the nomination of Mr. Carver for this new position.

There being no objection, the extracts were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Lewiston (Idaho) Morning Tribune, Dec. 30, 1964]

A Boise attorney before his latest move to Washington, D.C., Carver is thoroughly familiar with the intricacies of Federal Government. He began as a messenger for a Senate committee in 1936. He served in various civilian and military assignments for the National Government before he joined the staff of Gov. Robert E. Smylie, then Idaho's attorney general, in 1947. He practiced law at Boise from 1948 to 1957, then returned to Washington as administrative assistant to Senator Frank Church. There he was recognized as one of the ablest administrative assistants in the Senate, and Udall quickly selected him for a key Interior Department role after Udall's appointment as Secretary.

As Assistant Secretary in Charge of Public Lands, Carver has encountered some of the most complicated and controversial problems in domestic government. He has not evaded these problems, nor has he compromised the administration's basic principles of land management. Yet he has won not merely the respect but the outspoken admiration of most of the industries which largely depend upon the use of public lands. And he has accomplished this without alienating the liberals, whose ideas of public land management frequently clash with those who depend upon public land use for their income.

The secret of this remarkable record seems to be that Carver understands his field thoroughly and has the intelligence and courage to seek bold new solutions for vexing, old problems.

Lumbermen, mine operators, and cattlemen, for example, tend to froth at complex, detailed restrictions and regulations which they regard as obsolete and punitive. Confronted with such criticism, the average bureaucrat is likely to dismiss the objectors as greedy interests seeking to despoil the public lands. The bureaucrat is inclined to "go by the book" in judging complaints, fearful that concessions might undermine fundamental principles of conservation and mindful that "the book" is a maze of legislation and regulations which confounds even the experts in individual agencies.

Carver has probed into a multitude of such problems seeking not merely to understand the accumulated rules but also to determine how the underlying philosophy behind the rules can be better served by changes and adaptations. Where a regulation serves no purpose except to frustrate land users and custodians alike he has sought to eliminate it. Where the laws have created an administrative jungle, he has worked closely with Congress, the administration, and user interests to modernize them. He is only one of many, of course, who is pushing for a thorough revision of the Nation's public land laws to create a more workable pattern based upon the principles of conservation and multiple use. However, his efforts in this direction have been particularly effective because he often speaks clearly and candidly for the administration about such questions—to Congress, to the users, and to his subordinates in Government.

The result has been that the same Interior Department administration which has given the greatest emphasis in recent history to the preservation and protection of key public lands also has led the way to more sensible use of other public lands by commercial interests. Udall primarily has emphasized conservation and protection of scenic, historic, and wilderness areas, though he also thoroughly understands the West's dependence upon a public land economy. Carver has emphasized the other side of the coin—the wise and prudent use of public lands with a minimum of crippling regulations.

This is not to suggest that Udall and his assistant have been pursuing opposite goals. This is not the case at all. Udall may come to rank as the greatest conservationist in Government in several decades, but this does not mean that he wants to "lockup" all public lands for future generations. Carver has established an enviable reputation among user interests as a man who knows their problems and will help to solve them—but this does not mean that he wants to log off the national parks or eliminate wilderness areas. The public lands of America are infinitely varied. Their proper use is a tremendously complex matter. Udall and his new No. 1 assistant are simply concentrating on separate aspects of the same vast problem, and together they are achieving memorable results.

B.J.

[From the Grand Junction (Colo.) Sentinel, Dec. 6, 1964]

We sincerely hope that Assistant Interior Secretary John A. Carver will receive the appointment as Under Secretary of the Interior. If he does, it will be the biggest break the West has had for a long, long time.

John Carver is the best qualified of the men in the Department to take over the position. He is, as many local people will remember, the Interior representative who visited Grand Junction for the dedication of the new center at Colorado Monument.

This is not the only spot he has visited. Few of the Under Secretaries of the Department take so much interest in the areas they control. He is one of the few to take numerous field trips to learn what actually goes on in the field and to become acquainted with the problems in various sections of the country. He does it quietly and without fanfare, but thoroughly and intelligently.

Carver's appointment could be a major break for development in much of the West and particularly for the development of the oil shale industry.

Carver is a westerner and a practical operator. This is what is badly needed in a top position of the Department of the Interior.

[From the Twin Falls (Idaho) Times-News, Dec. 2, 1964]

He has been in demand as a speaker around the Nation and some users of the public domain have declared that Mr. Carver has found the delicate balance necessary when dealing with private range use while still keeping the Nation's general welfare in mind. No one has accused him of capricious, arbitrary action that is so common when dealing with the ordinary type of bureaucrat.

[From the Boise (Idaho) Statesman, Dec. 29, 1964]

He demonstrated a great capacity in performing administrative duties of Government, no matter how complex they may be. He seldom takes a fling into orbit, settling on cloud 9 for a too lofty view. He keeps his feet on the ground, can talk the language of the cattleman, the sheepherder, the lumberjack, the wilderness advocate, the park vendor, the Indian chief.

His willingness to listen in a rough and tumble debate marks him as a keen genius expressing the desire to understand and assist—not dominated by unreasonable bureaucratic directive.

Mr. Carver will preside well in his new position. There is never doubt as to the sincerity in purpose which this 46-year-old former Boisean evokes.

[From the Pocatello (Idaho) Intermountain, Dec. 10, 1964]

Mr. Carver has proven capabilities as an administrator, and a lifelong acquaintance with the public land economy of this region. We wish him well in his new post, and we expect a lot from him—the sort of thing that may yet force an admission from a public lands-use organization that progress has been made.

Thus far Mr. Carver's official concern for the public's stake in its own public domain, which is primary, has not caused him to forget that virtually every resident of the inland West feels some direct effect, whether economic or esthetic, from any significant policy change in the Interior Department. As that young sheepman said, things could be a lot worse.

P.S.

[From the Pocatello (Idaho) State Journal, Dec. 28, 1964]

Carver is an advocate of new approaches to public land management, and as such is interested in the activities of the Public Land Law Review Commission created by the last Congress. Carver was at one time considered for chairman of that body. He believes an intensive review of the public lands is long overdue.

The new No. 2 man in the Department is generally well versed and interested in areas that touch close to home. Carver's special interests and talents mesh with the special interests and problems of Idaho and Western States like Idaho.

But there is more good news to the appointment than having the right man in the right place. Carver is also an extremely competent administrator.

He first showed his talent for government and administration as chief assistant to Idaho Senator Frank Church, serving in that position from 1957 to 1961. He was known as a demanding man to work for, expecting and getting the most out of the Senator's staff. His reputation has been similar as assistant secretary since 1961. In fact, his willingness to put in long hours on the job partly explains his appointment by a man who also believes in extra effort and extra hours.

Carver is a man known for succeeding in his assignments. His position will give him more of a chance to demonstrate his ability. He is still a young man, and Idahoans and the Nation are bound to hear a lot more of John Carver in the years to come.

[From the Boise (Idaho) Statesman, Nov. 29, 1964]

He has shown attentiveness to the needs of the many users of Federal domain, has not ruled strictly on a basis of Washington planners, but often took to the grassroots to gain firsthand knowledge of pressing problems. From his vantage point in the country, discussing the issues with the miner, the stockman, the sheepherder, the Indian, outdoor enthusiast and conservationist, Mr. Carver made decisions compatible with both Federal policy and provincial needs.

He has worked well with Members of Congress, particularly those in the West. He appears to want to be in concert with their constituents in issuing policy which does not interrupt the economy of a given area.

He recognizes the requests of conservationists, understands the demands of wildlifers, the hunter, the fisherman. But he has shown the capacity to fit the needs of all users into a Federal policy. At the same time, he is not cheating the public, but guarding treasured resources of Idaho and other Western States from foolish exploitation and rapid deterioration.

Next year the new Public Land Law Review Commission will begin a study of archaic statutes now on the Federal books. Actually, Mr. Carver has been reported by some sources to be in line for the chairmanship of the important body, composed of lawmakers, administration officials, and laymen.

But his taking office as Under Secretary of the Interior should not preclude him from serving as chairman of the Public Land Law Review Commission, if the members of this organization favor him for that post.

[From the Denver (Colo.) Post, Jan. 3, 1965]

The promotion of John A. Carver, Jr., to the job of Under Secretary of the Department of Interior is good news for the Rocky Mountain region. As Stewart Udall's assistant, Carver will be able to bring his solid western background to bear on the problems of the West.

A native of Idaho, a graduate of Brigham Young University and a former staff member in the office of Senator FRANK CHURCH, Democrat, of Idaho. Carver has had 2 years as Under Secretary of Interior in charge of public lands. He has handled the job with tact and has gained the confidence of resource-minded westerners.

Coloradans, particularly, are interested in Interior policy. If and how the State's oil shale is developed depends to a great extent on policies of the Interior Department. Carver has shown interest in this subject and has become expert in its details. For this reason alone we would be glad for Carver's advancement. In general, however, his familiarity with all the West's problems is what makes his promotion welcome.

[From the Spokesman-Review, Dec. 30, 1964]

President Johnson's selection of John A. Carver, Jr., for the position of Under Secretary of the Interior should be acceptable throughout the Western States, where the activities of this Department of the Federal Government are important to the economy of the area.

Mr. Carver's experience as an Assistant Secretary in the Department for almost 4 years has shown him to be a sincere and knowledgeable custodian of the responsibilities assigned to that office. For the last few months the position of Under Secretary has been vacant, and the recent appointment has been overdue.

Political considerations are, of course, a major factor in a job such as this one. The Carver appointment must be approved by the U.S. Senate, but there should be little difficulty on that score.

Mr. Carver has displayed an understandable and energetic attitude toward the problems of the West. While his ideology must necessarily reflect the convictions of his superiors in the Federal Government, his concern for various points of view in various controversial matters has marked him as a reasonable administrator.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. I commend the senior Senator from Idaho for his magnificent support of this very fine appointment. Seldom have I heard a more eloquent or effective presentation on behalf of a candidate for high office than the one he delivered before the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee last Tuesday in behalf of John Carver's nomination to be Under Secretary of the Interior. A nomination which I was happy to support enthusiastically, as were the other members of the committee. I feel he will be an excellent Under Secretary; that he has a good career in store, and that in the years ahead the American people will be the beneficiaries of his dedicated ability and service.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, on the Executive Calendar is the nomination of John T. Connor, of New Jersey, to be Secretary of Commerce.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nomination will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John T. Connor, of New Jersey, to be Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the Senate Committee on Commerce held a hearing on this nomination on Tuesday, at which practically all the members of the committee were present. The nominee was questioned at great length regarding many of the facets of the responsibilities of Secretary of Commerce, other facets of his prior career, as well as a possible conflict of interest because of financial holdings of the nominee.

After lengthy questioning, the committee was satisfied, first, that John Connor would make a good Secretary of Commerce; and that his views were such that he was particularly well fitted for the post. The question of conflict of interest was cleared up by a legal opinion from the legislative counsel and questions from members of the committee. The nominee himself assured, and I think convinced, the committee, that there would be no question of it if he were confirmed by the Senate.

Mr. Connor has had wide experience. Briefly, let me state that he has resigned as president of Merck & Co., one of the large drug and commercial concerns of the United States. He has been a director of the General Motors Corp., and the General Foods Corp. He has had considerable experience in special fields in the Government, having served some years ago as chief assistant to the late James Forrestal, who was Secretary of the Navy. He was chosen by President Kennedy to be one of the incorporators of the original Communications Satellite Corp. So he was no stranger to the committee, because we had examined him in that particular field as recently as 1963 and asked him at that time questions regarding his interests.

We have had placed in the hearing record a comprehensive trust agreement he has worked out with the Morgan Guaranty & Trust Co., so far as his and his family's holdings are concerned. He is a man of considerable alertness and experience, as one can readily appreciate from the important posts he has held over the years. I think we are going to be fortunate to have him run this very important Department. The Department itself runs the gauntlet of many fields. Both business and labor—and there were many communications from both groups—endorse the appointment, saying that Mr. Connor can serve well in this capacity.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE—DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Department of State.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations for the Department of State and Diplomatic and Foreign Service be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McGOVERN in the chair). Without objection, the nominations for the Department of State and Diplomatic and Foreign Service will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

Without objection, the President will be notified of the nominations today confirmed.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TUESDAY

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, in accordance with the previous order, I now move that the Senate adjourn until Tuesday next at 12 o'clock.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 48 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the previous order, until Tuesday, January 19, 1965, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received January 15, 1965:

IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

The following-named officer to be placed on the retired list in grade indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3962:

To be general

Hugh Pate Harris, O18518, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 15, 1965:

DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR

John A. Carver, Jr., of Idaho, to be Under Secretary of the Interior.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

John T. Connor, of New Jersey, to be Secretary of Commerce.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Ben H. Brown, Jr., of South Carolina, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Liberia.

William A. Crawford, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Rumania.

Ralph A. Dungan, of Pennsylvania, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Chile.

William H. Sullivan, of Rhode Island, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Laos.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The following-named persons, who were appointed during the last recess of the Senate, to the offices indicated:

Now Foreign Service officers of class 2 and secretaries in the diplomatic service:

Antonio Certosimo, of Arizona, to be consul general of the United States of America.

Philip H. Chadbourn, Jr., of California, to be consul general of the United States of America.

William B. Connett, Jr., of New Jersey, to be consul general of the United States of America.

Livingston D. Watrous, of Massachusetts, to be consul general of the United States of America.

Now Foreign Service officers of class 3 and secretaries in the diplomatic service:

Frank C. Carlucci, of Pennsylvania, to be consul general of the United States of America.

Charles Gilbert, of Florida, to be consul general of the United States of America.

John L. Hagan, of the District of Columbia, to be consul general of the United States of America.

John P. Condon, of Oklahoma, to be Foreign Service officer of class 3, consul, and secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

Herbert G. Ihrig, Jr., of Washington, to be Foreign Service officer of class 3, consul, and secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

Lee S. Bigelow, of Texas, to be Foreign Service officer of class 7, vice consul of career, and secretary in diplomatic service of the United States of America.

Henry Clay Black II, of Illinois, to be Foreign Service officer of class 7, vice consul of career, and secretary in diplomatic service of the United States of America.

Edmund T. DeJarnette, Jr., of Virginia, to be Foreign Service officer of class 7, vice consul of career, and secretary in diplomatic service of the United States of America.

Denis Lamb, of New York, to be Foreign Service officer of class 7, vice consul of career, and secretary in diplomatic service of the United States of America.

George H. Lane, of Illinois, to be Foreign Service officer of class 7, vice consul of career, and secretary in diplomatic service of the United States of America.

Michael J. Mercurio, of Ohio, to be Foreign Service officer of class 7, vice consul of career, and secretary in diplomatic service of the United States of America.

Ned E. Morris, of Tennessee, to be Foreign Service officer of class 7, vice consul of career, and secretary in diplomatic service of the United States of America.

Geoffrey Ogden, of California, to be Foreign Service officer of class 7, vice consul of career, and secretary in diplomatic service of the United States of America.

Alan D. Romberg, of New York, to be Foreign Service officer of class 7, vice consul of career, and secretary in diplomatic service of the United States of America.

Charles B. Salmon, Jr., of New York, to be Foreign Service officer of class 7, vice consul of career, and secretary in diplomatic service of the United States of America.

David S. Wilson, of California, to be Foreign Service officer of class 7, vice consul of career, and secretary in diplomatic service of the United States of America.

Edward James Alexander, of Colorado, to be Foreign Service officer of class 8, vice consul of career, and secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

George T. Basil, of New York, to be Foreign Service officer of class 8, vice consul of career, and secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

David E. Brown, of Pennsylvania, to be Foreign Service officer of class 8, vice consul of career, and secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

Miss Patricia L. Guyer, of California, to be Foreign Service officer of class 8, vice consul of career, and secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

Richard J. Harrington, of California, to be Foreign Service officer of class 8, vice consul of career, and secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

John J. Hurley, Jr., of Massachusetts, to be Foreign Service officer of class 8, vice consul of career, and secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

Frank P. Kelly, of New Jersey, to be Foreign Service officer of class 8, vice consul of career, and secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

John H. Kelly, of Virginia, to be Foreign Service officer of class 8, vice consul of career, and secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

Thomas J. O'Flaherty, of New York, to be Foreign Service officer of class 8, vice consul of career, and secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

Roger E. Sack, of New York, to be Foreign Service officer of class 8, vice consul of career, and secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

Miss Eleanor Wallace Savage, of California, to be Foreign Service officer of class 8, vice consul of career, and secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

Robert D. Simon, of New York, to be Foreign Service officer of class 8, vice consul of career, and secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

Miss Elizabeth R. Thurston, of Indiana, to be Foreign Service officer of class 8, vice consul of career, and secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

William D. Wade, of Massachusetts, to be Foreign Service officer of class 8, vice consul of career, and secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

Foreign Service Reserve officers

Fentress Gardner, of Virginia, to be consul of the United States of America.

Anthony J. Gentile, of Ohio, to be consul of the United States of America.

Daniel M. Kennedy, of Massachusetts, to be consul of the United States of America.

S. Richard Rand, of Florida, to be consul of the United States of America.

Edward L. Robinson, of Illinois, to be consul of the United States of America.

Robert A. Rockweiler, of Wisconsin, to be consul of the United States of America.

Jerry J. Allinson, of New York, to be vice consul of the United States of America.

Walter C. d'Andrade, of Massachusetts, to be vice consul of the United States of America.

Vernon J. Goertz, Jr., of Virginia, to be vice consul of the United States of America.

Michael A. Kristula, of California, to be vice consul of the United States of America.

Edward H. Schulick, of New Jersey, to be vice consul of the United States of America.

William H. Brubeck, of Virginia, to be secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America

Philip Cherry, of Pennsylvania, to be secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

Edwin P. Earnest, of Maryland, to be secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

John C. Erskine, of Maryland, to be secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

Fred C. Fischer, of Virginia, to be secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

John F. Gilhooly, of Connecticut, to be secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

John G. Gloster, of Maryland, to be secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

John Heilman, of Pennsylvania, to be secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

William C. Ide, of Virginia, to be secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

Kenneth L. Mayall, of Washington, to be secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

Adger E. Player, of Colorado, to be secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America

Charles L. Stermer, of Illinois, to be secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

Donald H. Winters, of Ohio, to be secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

Foreign Service Staff officers:

Miss Mary Willis McKenzie, of Virginia, to be consul of the United States of America.

Miss Eleanor R. Paulson, of Washington, to be consul of the United States of America

Victor D. Russillo, of Rhode Island, to be consul of the United States of America.

Miss Ruth E. Wagner, of the District of Columbia, to be consul of the United States of America.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Senator McNamara Proposes Economic Assistance Act of 1965 as Part 2 of War on Poverty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, January 15, 1965

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, S. 3, will be the subject of hearings before the Public Works Committee next week on Tuesday, January 19, and Thursday, January 21. It is my hope that the committee will report the measure the following week and that the Senate will act on it during the last week of January or the first week of February.

I am informed that the leadership of the House of Representatives plans also to act quickly on similar legislation.

The priority which President Johnson has assigned to this proposed program is well recognized, and it is noted again in an article in today's Washington Post by Columnists Rowland Evans and Robert Novak. The writers also point out, however, the growing concern on the part of the Members of the Congress from other regions for Federal assistance in solving the problems of economic lag and chronic unemployment in those areas. I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Gilding the Johnson Lily

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

Two weeks ago, in his first serious talk with Democratic congressional leaders, President Johnson laid down the following as rule No. 1:

Get moving fast on medicare and the Appalachia development program.

Rule No. 2 followed:

Vote down any and all amendments to the 11-State Appalachia program, for which the President will ask $1.077 billion—no matter how hard the new liberals elected in the Johnson sweep last November press for special projects of their own.

"The President is hipped on controlling the budget," one of the participants in the late December White House meeting told us, "but he knows he can't control the budget if he can't control his own liberals in the House."

The first great test of Mr. Johnson's ability to prevent the House liberals from enlarging the Johnson legislative program ("gilding the Johnson lily," as one Democrat puts it) may well be the Appalachia bill.

Not only the new liberals, but such well entrenched and prestigious liberal leaders as Representative John Blatnik, from Minnesota's poverty-stricken iron region, are already fretting about voting for massive aid for the Appalachia States when parts of their own districts are no less in need.

As a leader of House liberals, Blatnik could be the deciding factor in any liberal move to load the bill with all manner of expensive amendments. As of today, he is inclined to go along with the President. But this could change.

The 11 States of Appalachia stretch diagonally from Pennsylvania down to the Deep South States of Alabama and Georgia. The new Democratic liberals from Iowa (to pick one conspicuous example), who have no regional aid plan of their own, don't like the idea of voting millions in special Federal aid to Republican Alabama. Alabama elected five new Republican Congressmen last November and gave its electoral votes to Barry Goldwater.

In general, northern liberals are not panting in anticipation of helping southern Democratic Congressmen, most of whom deserted the party position last week when the House voted to liberalize its rules.

What the Democratic liberals want is a pledge from the White House that after the Appalachia bill passes, the administration will back spending programs for their own chronically depressed regions.

At this stage in the session, there is no certainty that this pledge will be given. This is true despite the President's well-known plan to handle most if not all future Federal aid to depressed areas through regional plans similar to Appalachia.

One way to surmount political trouble from his own Democrats in Congress would be the traditional pork-barrel route. For example, another dose of accelerated public works, operating with a kitty of around a billion dollars or so, could satisfy some of the political needs of the new northern liberals who want to make a quick impression on their constituencies.

But Mr. Johnson told his legislative leaders that day in the White House that he was and will remain totally against accelerated public works. In the first place, it would dent his budget. In the second place, it conflicts with his principle of orderly and systematic planning.

By the time Appalachia reaches the floor of the House, the administration may have a spending package of some kind to satisfy the demands of non-Appalachian Democrats.

If so, the President has not told his congressional leaders. Instead, he is putting all his eggs in the Appalachia basket. At any rate, other regional plans won't be ready in time to affect the vote on Appalachia.

The President's leaders in Congress aren't complaining about any of this. They simply hope the White House doesn't underestimate the problem. Not since Mr. Johnson first came to Washington 30 years ago has the Democratic Party had a potential runaway majority in the House.

Beyond the question of Federal subsidies, whether the President can prevent this massive majority from greatly expanding his definition of the Great Society will be a major political test in the 89th Congress.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the issue of other regional development programs arose during the Senate debate last year on S. 2782, which was enacted by the Senate by a vote of 45 to 13. At that time I indicated that I would support such an approach for other regions when their programs are formulated, but that such considerations should not delay enactment of the Appalachian bill. This measure is the product of 4 years of planning at the local, State, and Federal levels.

Mr. President, the problem of regional economic lag in areas of the United States other than Appalachia was addressed earlier this week by the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan and chairman of the Public Works Committee [Mr. McNamara]. In a thoughtful and well-reasoned address before the national legislative conference of the AFL–CIO on January 12, Senator McNamara proposed as part 2 of the war on poverty the enactment of an Economic Assistance Act of 1965 which would concentrate on regional development of natural and physical resources. The McNamara plan would provide for first, establishment of Federal-State commissions similar to the Appalachian Commission; second, technical assistance to development districts; third, grants-in-aid for construction of public facilities; fourth, loans to industry; and, fifth, a coordinated manpower retraining program.

Mr. President, the proposal advanced by the senior Senator from Michigan merits the most serious consideration by the Congress and the administration. I therefore ask unanimous consent to have the address by Senator McNamara printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Remarks Delivered by Senator Pat McNamara, of Michigan, at the AFL–CIO National Legislative Conference, Washington, D.C., January 12, 1965

It's a pleasure to be here with you today. I know that you are interested in what the Senate Committee on Public Works may do this year.

That interest, I'm sure, results from the ever-increasing recognition that public works activities affect employment and long-range economic growth.

This has not always been the case. Too long, the mention of public works has been coupled with the derisive term "pork barrel."

For many years, the projects in the so-called rivers and harbors bills have been considered political chips to obtain support in other areas.

I do not share that view. Even historically, whether it was recognized or not, the use of navigation improvement on our Nation's rivers 100 years ago was as important to the development of commerce and our economy as our highway program is today.

Development of water resources not only saves lives and property from the ravages of floods, but provides a base for further economic improvement.

Economic improvement is becoming more and more a standard of measurement for public works.

And there has been an increasing demand upon the Public Works Committee to concern itself in this field.

The Federal-aid highway system plays an important role in developing the national economy. The present program came into being through enactment of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956.

As of April 1, 1964, some form of work has been completed or is under way on 34,474 miles—or 84 percent of the 41,000-mile Interstate System—and expenditures have totaled more than $19 billion.

This program has provided a substantial immediate employment boost, and as lanes of commerce and transportation network it has increased the ease with which the flow of goods has moved, thus becoming an important cog in improving our total economy.

The first program which took the committee directly into the unemployment problems of the Nation was the Accelerated Public Works Act.

President Kennedy recognized that public works provided a useful tool to combat recession before it might become fully developed.

At the same time, useful and needed works for long-term development would be speeded up.

In May 1962, the Congress passed an APW bill authorizing the President to spend $900 million for immediate acceleration of public works projects in areas of heavy unemployment.

Within 4 months after the President signed into law the APW program in 1962, the volume of applications for Federal assistance to State and local projects had exceeded the $900 million authorization.

By the end of October 1963, on-site employment generated by APW projects had reached almost 50,000 man-months.

The estimated total man-months of employment for all APW grant-in-aid projects was, by December 1963, 1,099,000.

Last year, I introduced legislation which would have increased by $1½ billion the authorization for the APW program. This fund would have allowed a continuation of the attack on those areas in the Nation which have lagged behind economically.

At the same time, with our growing involvement in economic improvement, the principle of accelerating public works and using public works for improving the physical conditions of an area so that its economy will benefit began to take on a different form.

This was the Appalachia regional development measure, which was introduced late last year by Senator RANDOLPH.

What is the value of improving, on a sectional basis, an economic picture such as Appalachia by pumping in Federal aid money?

Studies have demonstrated that if Appalachia's economy merely equaled the national average, $4 billion would be added to our gross national product through retail sales.

Our annual rate of personal income could be increased by $5 billion, and, to mention just one area of need, another billion dollars could be added in new housing construction.

The Appalachian Regional Development Act has been introduced again by Senator RANDOLPH as an administration measure, and hearings will be held on the bill next week.

But this mountain region in eastern and southeastern United States, although long-suffering economically, is not the only such area in the Nation.

Little touched by the general economic improvement in the last 4 years, for example, is the upper Great Lakes region, including a portion of my own State of Michigan.

Similar conditions of economic depression exist in the upper New England area and the Ozarks.

In the western part of the United States there exists an area in the Rockies falling behind the Nation economically.

The failure of these regions to share equally with the rest of the Nation in economic growth is like the weakest link in a chain. Our total growth potential is retarded while we pull at the lagging areas.

We are enjoying the longest sustained period of economic improvement since the depression of the 1930's.

Unemployment this month dropped below 5 percent. All the economic indicators demonstrate a high level of activity and suggest that this will continue for some time.

It is just at this time, when the economy is growing, that we should be best able to eliminate pockets of unemployment and resistance to economic improvement.

The tools we have used, including the area redevelopment program, have demonstrated that improvements can be made.

Our approach has been good; our criticism is that we have done too little, too late, and too piecemeal.

The outlook for a continued APW program is poor. The future of ARA, stymied in the last session, is doubtful.

Yet, without the principle of these programs available for depressed areas, even the success of an Appalachia regional program is questionable.

I believe that President Johnson recognizes this.

I believe that his reference to economic recovery in the state of the Union address was notice that he intends not to let economic assistance to disadvantaged areas evaporate, or even continue at the low-keyed or one-region level.

We have tried in the Kennedy-Johnson administration to combat three economic problems through:

First, assistance to areas that have suffered a long decline in economic activity.

Second, assistance to areas which, in this century at least, have never shared in economic prosperity.

Third, assistance to areas suddenly faced with economic upheaval as a result of automation, conversion from war to peace or cyclical unemployment.

By themselves, the four weapons employed to fight these problems are good weapons: Technical assistance, grant-in-aid for public works improvement and acceleration, loans to industry and manpower retraining.

Our weaknesses have been applying the remedy to areas too limited in size, and in poor coordination of the programs.

President Johnson has suggested he will correct these deficiencies.

He called for "a regional recovery program to assist development of stricken areas left behind by our national progress" and "special funds for job-creating public programs * * * made available for immediate use if recession threatens."

I propose these words be translated into an action program.

Such a program could and should be combined in one coordinated effort to aid improvement on all three geographic levels—regions, groups of counties, and labor markets.

It should be able to retard recession, as well as speed up economic growth.

This program should allow the President to make the same aid available to areas which are threatened with economic upheaval.

And it should allow the President to coordinate planning, public works grants, loans, and manpower training so that maximum benefit is received from all this aid.

This can be done by creating a National Regional Development Council composed of the Secretaries of the Departments most concerned with economic development, and chaired by a full-time Chairman appointed by the President.

Those Federal agencies now administering the economic aid program could continue to administer the program.

The funds for public works acceleration and improvement would be appropriated to the Council by the Congress, then allocated by the Council to the agencies to be granted in accordance with plans approved by the regions and local redevelopment districts.

The formation of other regional commissions, such as Appalachia, would be encouraged and aided.

Such public works spending is necessary if the physical resources of a depressed area are to be developed so as to attract new industry or new economic activity.

Our policy for aiding private industry through depressed area loans—should be broadened to induce the Nation's financial industry to be more active in supporting new efforts to increase economic activity in these areas.

Such a move would increase the amount of dollars available for loans, without increasing Federal expenditures.

This can be done through guaranteeing loans, such as we do in our housing program. It also can be done by establishing a mortgage loan association, as we have done in our housing program.

A manpower retraining program, geared to the needs of industry expanding or entering depressed areas with the aid of this loan program, is a must to complete the entire arsenal of weapons to fight economic depression and prevent recession.

Last year, the President proposed and achieved the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964: That was the war on poverty—part 1—for the development of human resources.

This year I hope he will propose and achieve the Economic Assistance Act of 1965: The war on poverty—part 2—for the development of physical resources.

Together, these programs can effectively carry on the battle to eliminate and prevent poverty.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JANUARY 18, 1965

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Center our thoughts upon these words of Scripture: Galatians 5: 13: *By love serve one another*.

O Thou whom we reverently worship and adore, as we enter upon this significant week in our national life, may we be inspired with an indomitable courage and determination to strive to have our beloved country more firmly rooted in moral principles.

Show us we may increase the ardor of our efforts in mobilizing our faith in the reality and potentiality of our spiritual resources.

Emancipate us from all selfish and provincial ways of thinking in our attitude toward our fellow men and may we be more helpful in cultivating a nobler skill in the art of brotherly living.

Grant that we may have the patience and perseverance to believe that our troubled and divided world is moving toward a new fellowship in which there shall be further reconciliations and agreements among men and nations.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 14, 1965, was read and approved.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The **SPEAKER** laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., January 13, 1965.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I beg leave to inform you that I have this day transmitted to the

Honorable Donald S. Russell, Governor of South Carolina, my resignation as a Representative in the Congress of the United States from the Second District of South Carolina, the resignation to become effective upon such date as the Governor may set for a special election to fill the vacancy. A copy of my letter to the Governor is attached.

Sincerely yours,

ALBERT WATSON.

JANUARY 13, 1965.

Hon. DONALD S. RUSSELL,
Governor of South Carolina,
Columbia, S.C.

DEAR GOVERNOR RUSSELL: I hereby tender to you my resignation as a Member of the House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States from the Second Congressional District of South Carolina, the resignation to become effective upon such date as you may set for a special election to fill the vacancy.

I have also informed the Speaker of the House of Representatives of this action.

Sincerely yours,

ALBERT WATSON.

EXPORT EXPANSION ACT OF 1965

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for time today to make a few brief introductory remarks in support of the Export Expansion Act of 1965, which I have introduced. I am pleased to announce that a companion bill has been introduced in the Senate by Senator MAGNUSON, of Washington, and many distinguished cosponsors.

This bill involves the providing of guarantees so that American private capital can be used to finance our private industrial exports to the emerging nations. The bill also provides for a Trade Development Corps, an improved system for using impacted currencies, and new U.S. sales and service centers throughout the world.

The newly emerging nations lack capital to finance purchase of manufactured products and must buy on credit. Our financial institutions and manufacturers are ready to meet these demands. We must improve our governmental mechanism so that our industries have credit facilities equal to those of foreign competitors.

I hope after examination of the bill in the RECORD some of my colleagues will join me in presenting this measure.

Our present limited policy for financing purchases by the underdeveloped nations is no longer adequate because of changed world conditions. Formerly, we were selling our industrial goods such as heavy machinery and jet transports to the developed European and Asian nations with whom we have long enjoyed stable commercial financial arrangements. Now our former customers for industrial goods in the highly developed nations of Europe and Asia are competing with us for sales to the emerging nations.

We must expect this to continue if we are to develop the healthy world trade necessary for world peace.

There are 135 cities around the world which are either national capitals or have populations in excess of 1 million people, yet today there are 1 or more full-time U.S. commercial offices in only 93 cities. Part of the bill is to provide for the creation of a Trade Development Corps and U.S. sales and service centers to correct this situation.

Probably the most important portion of the bill is to close the dangerous gap in our export financing. This involves the Export-Import Bank, our primary export financing facility, which has found it necessary to reduce or cut off loans or guarantees in countries with relatively weak credit standing, notwithstanding the impact of such decisions on our national interest.

For example, a major exporter of farm equipment recently developed a major exporting program in Latin America. As his orders began to rise to a substantial figure, the Export-Import Bank decided it had reached its exposure limit and could not guarantee any further loans for principal sales in that country that year.

A similar case involved jet transport aircraft sales in a Latin American country. The British, under section 2 of the British Export Guarantee Act, had the mechanism to compete successfully for this business, but two American aircraft manufacturers who were bidding against the British for the same business could not obtain the same results from the Export-Import Bank.

It seems clear, Mr. Speaker, that as part of a sound foreign policy, we should give the Export-Import Bank, and our exporters, the necessary tools to sell our products abroad. In so doing, we will assure the emerging nations that we respect their integrity and that we want their business. We will demonstrate to the world that we are moving to an era of regular trade and that we are looking forward to the day when we will exist as traders, not just as aiders. We will provide jobs here at home and produce a sound peacetime economy by expansion of our markets abroad. We will be supplying from our abundance the goods the world needs through normal channels of world trade.

If, upon examination of the bill and my extended remarks, any of the Members have any questions, I would welcome their inquiries. At a later point in the session, I hope to appear before you and discuss the provisions of this bill more thoroughly.

The text of the bill follows:

EXPORT EXPANSION ACT OF 1965

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Export Expansion Act of 1965".

FINDINGS AND PURPOSE

SEC. 2. The Congress finds and declares that foreign trade is indispensable to the economic welfare of this Nation, that the expansion of such trade has taken on a new urgency in the present phase of the East-West confrontation, and that the legitimate role of Government in achieving such expansion is to provide where necessary aids to private enterprise. It is the purpose of this Act to provide assistance to meet certain demonstrated needs of private enterprise (1) in finding, developing, and servicing markets abroad for American products and services, and (2) in financing exports of such products and services where such financing is not otherwise available and such exports are affected with the national interest.

TITLE I—TRADE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

Trade Development Corps

SEC. 101. (a) In furtherance of the purposes of this Act, the Secretary of Commerce shall undertake a program for the recruitment and training of a Trade Development Corps (hereinafter referred to as the "Corps") to consist of United States citizens who (1) are or have been in private industry or are otherwise well qualified, (2) possess experience or skills which can be effectively utilized in the operations of the Corps, and (3) can make their services available from time to time for particular trade development assignments.

(b) The function of the Corps shall be to supplement existing Federal and private programs for developing and expanding foreign markets for United States goods and services by providing a readily available source of qualified personnel for undertaking specific projects or assignments including, but not limited to—

(1) serving with a trade mission, or making in-depth studies of types of markets indicated by trade mission findings;

(2) making market analyses or studies, including (i) studies of the needs of particular countries or areas for specific products or types of products, (ii) studies of market possibilities in developing countries, and (iii) analyses of markets for products revealed by trade pattern studies as likely sales possibilities;

(3) serving with an overseas mission of the United States to supplement the work of the regular commercial or economic officers, counselors, or attachés assigned thereto;

(4) assisting in the preparation for or the development of market leads from industry exhibitions in foreign trade centers;

(5) assisting Government personnel in developing a closer integration of foreign aid and trade; and

(6) investigating major proposed foreign purchasing or construction projects in the interest of expanding outlets for American goods and services.

Members of the Corps shall not be assigned functions involving the actual handling of sales or service contracts. Projects for the Corps shall be developed by the Secretary in cooperation with other interested agencies of the Government, and with trade and industry groups.

(c) Each member of the Corps shall be given a basic orientation course and such further training as the Secretary may determine to be necessary to enable such member to carry out effectively any project to which he is assigned. In providing such training the Secretary may, whenever he deems it necessary or desirable, utilize on a reimbursable basis services, facilities, and personnel of any other Government agency.

(d) The Secretary is authorized to make grants to members of the Corps accepting assignments under this section. Each such grant shall be in an amount determined by the Secretary to be sufficient to defray the necessary travel and living expenses of the member and his family and to provide a moderate compensation while engaged in carrying out his assignment, and shall be subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary may prescribe to assure the successful completion of the assignment and to protect the interests of the United States. Payment of any such grant shall be made whenever feasible in foreign currency.

(e) In carrying out the provisions of this section the Secretary shall encourage the participation to the maximum extent feasible of private persons, firms, organizations and associations, and the Secretary is authorized to accept any contributions of funds, property, or services made thereby to be utilized for the purposes of this section.

(f) Members of the Corps accepting assignments under this section shall be exempt from the operation of sections 203, 205, 207, 208, and 209 of title 18, United States Code, but such members shall be subject to such regulations as the Secretary of Commerce shall prescribe to assure that such assignments will be carried out in a manner consistent with the public interest.

Cooperative industrial export development projects

Sec. 102. (a) In furtherance of the purposes of this Act, the Secretary of Commerce is authorized to enter into agreements with such private organizations or associations as he determines to be qualified to carry out industrial export development projects. Any such project shall be designed to develop or expand the market in one or more foreign countries for specific articles or materials manufactured in the United States, including—

(1) the undertaking of market studies,

(2) arranging for regular or special product exhibitions and demonstrations,

(3) providing assistance to foreign buyers in locating domestic sources of supply, and to domestic manufacturers or exporters in developing a foreign market,

(4) arranging for visits of foreign trade teams, industry representatives, or other delegations in furtherance of trade objectives,

(5) arranging for the preparation and distribution of promotional or advertising materials, and

(6) the undertaking of such other activities as will further the objectives of this Act and are approved by the Secretary.

(b) In any agreement entered into under this section the Secretary may agree to make available for the execution of the project such sums, not to exceed 50 per centum of the total cost of the project, as he determines to be necessary to assure its successful completion; such sums to be made available whenever feasible in foreign currency. Each such agreement shall require such reports, and shall be subject to such other terms and conditions, as the Secretary deems necessary to protect the interests of the United States.

Assistance for the establishment of sales and service centers abroad

Sec. 103. (a) In furtherance of the purposes of this Act, the Secretary of Commerce is authorized to provide financial assistance to any organization or association for the purpose of establishing in any country (other than a country which is determined by the Secretary to be fully developed) one or more sales and service centers, if he finds that—

(1) the proposed center will fulfill a pressing need in the area, and there is reasonable doubt that the same can be provided without financial assistance under this section;

(2) the applicant for such assistance is fully qualified to carry out the undertaking; and

(3) the plans for the proposed center are fully adequate to meet the need without being unduly elaborate or extravagant.

(b) The amount of any financial assistance provided under this section with respect to any one sales and service center shall not exceed 50 per centum of the total development cost thereof.

(c) No financial assistance shall be made available with respect to any sales and service center under this section, unless the applicant agrees—

(1) that during any period in which the United States has a financial investment in such center it will (i) make the facilities of such center available to United States business firms on equal terms and conditions, (ii) fix reasonable charges for the use of the facilities and services of such center in accordance with schedules or standards approved by the Secretary, (iii) pay to the United States from any net profits accruing from the operation of such center a reasonable return, as determined by the Secretary, on the capital contributed by the United States, and (iv) comply with such other reasonable terms and conditions as the Secretary shall prescribe for the protection of the interests of the United States, and

(2) that in the event the United States receives a full return on its financial investment in such center, it will comply with such terms and conditions as the Secretary shall prescribe to assure that such center will not be operated in a manner which is inconsistent with the purposes of this Act.

(d) The Secretary may make payments pursuant to any contract for financial assistance under this section at such times and in such manner as may be specified in the contract; such payments to be made whenever feasible in foreign currency.

(e) As used in this section—

(1) the term "sales and service center" means one or more buildings for the display and sale of particular types or broad categories of articles or materials manufactured in the United States and for the servicing and repair thereof, and may include management and sales offices, together with facilities for the stocking of parts, for the training of personnel, and for such other or related activities as may be approved by the Secretary; and

(2) the term "development cost" means the cost of constructing, purchasing, improving, altering, or repairing a building or buildings for use as a sales and service center, purchasing and improving the necessary land, and providing fixtures, equipment, and facilities necessary thereto.

Reports

Sec. 104. The Secretary of Commerce shall make a detailed annual report to the Congress of his operations under this title.

Use of foreign currencies

Sec. 105. In carrying out the provisions of sections 101, 102, and 103 of this Act, the Secretary of Commerce may utilize, with the approval of the President and in such amounts as may be specified from time to time in appropriation Acts, foreign currencies or credits owned by or owed to the United States which are, under applicable agreements with the foreign country concerned, available for the use of the United States Government.

Authorization for appropriations

Sec. 106. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums, to remain available until expended, as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title.

TITLE II—EXPORT FINANCING ASSISTANCE

Amendments to the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945

Sec. 201. (a) Section 2(a) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 is amended by inserting after the second sentence the following: "In carrying out such objects and purposes the Bank shall (1) cooperate with private capital so as to further the expansion of exports of products and services from the United States and its possessions, and (2) assure, within its statutory limitations, that the United States is fully and effectively competitive in its financing arrangements with other countries in the development and maintenance of world markets."

(b) Section 2 of such Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(d)(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, if it is the further policy of the Congress that the Bank shall, in utilizing such funds as may be appropriated pursuant to section 6(b)(2), assist in financing United States exports which can reasonably be expected to affect the national interest.

"(2) In furtherance of its objects and purposes and of the policy of the Congress as declared in paragraph (1) of this subsection, the Bank is authorized and empowered to utilize such funds as may be appropriated pursuant to section 6(b)(2) to guarantee, insure, coinsure, reinsure, make loans, and otherwise assist in the financing of United States exporters, and foreign exporters doing business in the United States, against political and credit risks of loss arising in connection with United States exports which can reasonably be expected to affect the national interest; to establish fractional reserves in connection therewith of not less than 25 per centum of the related contractual liability; and to purchase, discount or rediscount obligations or participations therein of foreign obligors in connection with those United States exports which can reasonably be expected to affect the national interest. The terms on which any guarantee, insurance or other financing assistance is provided under this subsection shall be determined by the Board of Directors of the Bank having due regard to the purposes of this subsection and may be set at less than prevailing commercial levels. The Bank may issue and service the guarantees, insurance, coinsurance and reinsurance herein authorized as provided in subsection (c)(2) of this section.

"(e) The obligations of the Bank heretofore or hereafter issued, whether in the form of guarantees, insurance or otherwise, shall be considered contingent obligations of the United States Government backed by its full faith and credit."

(c) Section 3(d) of such Act is amended by inserting "(1)" immediately following "(d)", and by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph as follows:

"(2) There is hereby established an Interdepartmental Advisory Committee on National Interest Financing which shall consist of the following members: the Secretary of Commerce, who shall serve as Chairman, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Agriculture, the President of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, and the Administrator, Agency for International Development. Each member of the Committee may designate an officer of his department or agency to act for him as a member of the Committee. The Committee shall when requested by the Bank advise with and make recommendations to the Bank with respect to the national interest involved in specific proposals for the extension of financial assistance under section 2(d). The Committee shall also establish such guidelines as it may deem advisable to assist the Bank in determining the national interest with respect to any particular category or categories of proposals.

(d) Section 6 of such Act is amended by inserting "(a)" immediately after "Sec. 6.", and by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(b)(1) To carry out the purposes of section 2(d), the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed, upon appropriation of funds for such purpose, to purchase from time to time such special obligations as the Bank may issue in an amount not to exceed $500,000,000 outstanding at any one time.

"(2) For the purpose of enabling the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase special obligations of the Bank pursuant to paragraph (1) of this subsection, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, at any time without fiscal year limitation, $500,000,000 to remain available until expended. Any funds paid to the Treasury by the Bank as repayment on account of the principal of such special obligations shall continue to be available for the purchase of additional special obligations by the Secretary of the Treasury under paragraph (1) of this subsection. Payment of interest by the Bank on account of any special obligations purchased under such paragraph (1) shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

"(3) The obligations issued by the Bank to the Secretary of the Treasury pursuant to paragraph (1) of this subsection shall be special obligations, payable by the Bank only out of its net receipts from its operations under section 2(d), and shall bear such interest and maturities as may be determined by the Board of Directors of the Bank with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury."

(e) Section 7 of such Act is amended by striking out the period and inserting in lieu thereof the following: ", except that this limitation and the limitation upon the aggregate amount of guarantees and insurance as provided in section 2(c) shall not be applicable to guarantees, insurance, or other financial assistance provided pursuant to section 2(d)."

EAST-WEST TRADE—THE NEED FOR A HOUSE SELECT COMMITTEE ON EXPORT CONTROL

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, are the Congress and the Nation to stand aside and allow our system of controls on trade with the Communist bloc to be rendered all but meaningless and ineffectual?

That, indeed, is what is bound to happen according to the present outlook. That is why this is one of the most pressing problems we face as Congress meets for the opening of the 89th Congress.

There can be no doubt that erosion of the controls established by the Export Control Act of 1949—controls, it must be added, which were placed on trade in the interest of our national security—is occurring on various fronts and that it presents a problem of deep concern.

Certainly we cannot say there has been no warning of what is to take place. Increasingly over recent years administration spokesmen have been talking about pulling out the stops on trade control. Clearances are being given authorizing shipments of many key products, equipment, and technical data to the Communist bloc.

Determined efforts are being made to stimulate and build up support for this position among industry and business groups.

One of the major ploys being used in the attempt to water down the controls on trade involves a modifying and weakening of the definition of what is strategic. Everyone can agree that strategic items should not be shipped to the bloc. But the crucial question is how do we define strategic? If it is interpreted to mean basically only weapons and equipment or data directly related to weapons and weapons production, essentially it is a meaningless test. The bloc is not interested in buying military items from us—but the U.S.S.R. and other bloc countries do want to buy factories, equipment, and new technologies. If we really want to prevent strategic materials and data from going to the Communist bloc, we have to bar shipment of items which the bloc can and will use to build up their overall strength, and a campaign is underway which will allow the bloc to do just that.

Clearances have been given authorizing shipment to the U.S.S.R. and other Communist bloc nations of products, equipment, and know-how which can and must be labeled strategic, involving such fields as electronics, agriculture, chemicals, petroleum, and others.

In May of last year representatives of the United States and Rumania met for a series of economic talks. Rumania, as could be expected, presented its pitch to obtain from the United States a large number of plants and technologies in such fields as petroleum and chemicals. It has just been reported that two American corporations came to preliminary agreement with the Rumanian Government calling for construction of a synthetic rubber plant and catalytic petroleum cracking unit in Rumania, the value of which it is stated may exceed $50 million. A synthetic rubber manufacturing plant and catalytic cracking plant were only two of the many specific items the United States promised Rumania it could buy in the conference last May. Furthermore, it is expected that credit will be extended to Rumania for their purchases.

Suppose the question were posed, for example: So we are going to sell a synthetic rubber manufacturing plant to Rumania—what is so alarming about that? A major company, Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., gave a very emphatic answer to the question. The firm believed it is so important that it refused to sell a synthetic rubber plant to Rumania.

In an editorial in the company newspaper, Goodyear said that though it is a profitmaking organization, "you cannot put a price tag on freedom."

The editorial further explained the turndown and the reasons, as follows:

> Because we foresee the knowledge that Rumania seeks to purchase from the United States in the potential role of an international agitator, we don't believe that the United States should allow any Communist nation to acquire the know-how to produce a synthetic rubber which competes head on with natural rubber.
>
> And that's what Natsyn—Goodyear's polyisoprene—does. As you know, Natsyn is an exact duplication of natural rubber, offering natural's many desirable qualities that have eluded duplication in all other manmade rubbers.
>
> While synthetic and natural rubber are now competitively priced, Goodyear believes the Communists could—if they wished—disrupt natural rubber markets in Malaysia, Liberia, and other so-called underdeveloped countries. The Communists are not governed by marketing conditions in setting their prices and in the past have, in fact, used cutrate prices as an economic club.
>
> The State Department, in commenting on the situation, has said that the Rumanians have assured the United States that they won't divulge the polyisoprene secrets they purchase from us to other Communist nations. With due respect for the State Department's belief in the Rumanians' promise, Goodyear would prefer not to entrust its production secrets to the Communists.

Mr. Speaker, the Communist bloc is considered to be well behind the West in the field of synthetic fibers. Naturally that is one of the items the bloc wishes to buy from us. Approval for such an export has already been granted. A license was issued by the Department of Commerce authorizing shipment of technical data for the design, engineering, construction, operation, repair, and maintenance of a plant to be constructed in the Soviet Zone of Germany which will be capable of manufacturing 20,000 metric tons of acrylonitrile annually.

This particular license was included in the Department of Commerce list of export licenses approved for July 14, 1964. It was listed as being for the export of technical data to East Germany and was footnoted as being for a manufacturing plant for acrylic fibers and plastic. In the space for the dollar value designation there appeared the notation "no value." However, the plant is expected to cost almost $19 million. Not only therefore will this license help the bloc build up its synthetic fiber industry, and I understand some of the technical data has already been shipped, but from all appearances this was done in such a way as to minimize the amount of information released to the Congress and the public as to the size and significance of the export.

I discussed with the House of Representatives on October 2, 1964, that an export license had been issued authorizing the sale to East Germany of $860,000 worth of subsidized butter. During November and December of 1964 licenses were issued authorizing the sale to East Germany of $2,338,450 in butter.

Members of Congress may have read of the trip to the Soviet Union in November by representatives of various top American industries. This trip, presumably undertaken with the full approval and cooperation of the administration, was labeled as a means of exploring new avenues of trade with the Soviets.

The group visited the White House on January 7, 1965, and according to news reports were assured by the President that studies will be made of ways to increase East-West trade. The state of the Union message also referred to the fact that ways would be explored to expand such trade.

It seems clear that we are confronted with a determined effort on the part of the administration to alter drastically policies in administering our export controls. An important aspect of this is the campaign designed to gain support for such policies in the business community and elsewhere here in the United States.

How can we truly consider deals such as those the executive branch is making with the Communist bloc as trade when in essence what the Communists are doing is simply attempting to acquire from the West equipment, plants, and technologies to build up their own industries?

This really is not trade. What it amounts to is that we are allowing them to buy from us means to build up the Communist economic and military potential.

Let us remember that we are dealing with a sworn foe of free governments and free peoples.

I would only ask that these developments and their implications be thoroughly appraised before it is too late. In my view Congress simply does not have an acceptable means of dealing with the problem. East-West trade problems involve many aspects of domestic and foreign policy coming under the jurisdiction of a number of different committees of the House of Representatives.

It is essential that we have the machinery to focus attention on export trade control matters and to appraise the problem thoroughly and objectively. I have, therefore, introduced a resolution calling for the creation of a House Select Committee on Export Control.

This select committee would be set up along the lines of the Select Committee on Export Control which the House created in the 87th Congress. The select committee in the 87th Congress performed needed work in reviewing the system of controls on exports and appraising developments in this field. It was due largely to the work of the committee that it was possible to achieve strengthening amendments to the Export Control Act.

According to the resolution I have introduced, the committee would give particular attention to the following items:

First. The problems involved in the control of trade between the United States and foreign countries, particularly the foreign countries comprising the Sino-Soviet bloc.

Second. Methods and procedures followed in the formulation of policy under the Export Control Act with respect to the determination of how the export of articles, materials, supplies, and technical data shall be controlled, and the extent of such control.

Third. Procedures followed under such act in obtaining information, advice, and opinions with respect to determinations of which articles, materials, supplies, and technical data shall be controlled under such act, from departments and agencies of the United States which are concerned with aspects of our domestic or foreign policies and operations which have a bearing on exports.

Fourth. The extent to which decisions made and policies formulated under such act concerning the control of exports adversely affect the security of the United States.

Fifth. The interrelationship between such act and related acts—such as the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951, and the Trading With the Enemy Act—and other discussions or agreements entered into by the United States, such as the coordinating committee—Cocom—discussions and agreements, which affect or relate to the control of trade between the United States and foreign countries.

I cannot emphasize too strongly my conviction that a committee of this type is needed by the Congress and urge that the Select Committee on Export Control be created without delay for it is essential that this important work get underway now.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEES

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 120) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 120

Resolved, That the following-named Members be and they are hereby elected members of the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

Committee on Agriculture: Harold D. Cooley (chairman), North Carolina; W. R. Poage, Texas; E. C. Gathings, Arkansas; John L. McMillan, South Carolina; Thomas G. Abernethy, Mississippi; Watkins M. Abbitt, Virginia; Paul C. Jones, Missouri; Harlan Hagen, California; Frank A. Stubblefield, Kentucky; Graham Purcell, Texas; James H. Morrison, Louisiana; Alec G. Olson, Minnesota; Spark M. Matsunaga, Hawaii; Maston O'Neal, Georgia; Thomas S. Foley, Washington; Joseph Y. Resnick, New York; Lynn E. Stalbaum, Wisconsin; Eligio de la Garza, Texas; Joseph P. Vigorito, Pennsylvania; John C. Mackie, Michigan; Rolland Redlin, North Dakota; Bert Bandstra, Iowa; Stanley L. Greigg, Iowa; Clair A. Callan, Nebraska.

Committee on Appropriations: George H. Mahon (chairman), Texas; Albert Thomas, Texas; Michael J. Kirwan, Ohio; Jamie L. Whitten, Mississippi; George W. Andrews, Alabama; John J. Rooney, New York; John E. Fogarty, Rhode Island; Robert L. F. Sikes, Florida; Otto E. Passman, Louisiana; Joe L. Evins, Tennessee; Edward P. Boland, Massachusetts; William H. Natcher, Kentucky; Daniel J. Flood, Pennsylvania; Winfield K. Denton, Indiana; Tom Steed, Oklahoma; George E. Shipley, Illinois; John M. Slack, Junior, West Virginia; John J. Flynt, Junior, Georgia; Neal Smith, Iowa; Robert N. Giaimo, Connecticut; Julia Butler Hansen, Washington; Charles S. Joelson, New Jersey; Joseph P. Addabbo, New York; John J. McFall, California; W. R. Hull, Junior, Missouri; D. R. (Billy) Matthews, Florida; Jeffery Cohelan, California; Thomas G. Morris, New Mexico; Edward J. Patten, New Jersey; Clarence D. Long, Maryland; John O. Marsh, Junior, Virginia; Robert B. Duncan, Oregon; Sidney R. Yates, Illinois; Billie S. Farnum, Michigan.

Committee on Armed Services: L. Mendel Rivers (chairman), South Carolina; Philip J. Philbin, Massachusetts; F. Edward Hébert, Louisiana; Melvin Price, Illinois; O. C. Fisher, Texas; Porter Hardy, Junior, Virginia; Charles E. Bennett, Florida; James A. Byrne, Pennsylvania; Samuel S. Stratton, New York; Otis G. Pike, New York; Richard (Dick) Ichord, Missouri; Lucien N. Nedzi, Michigan; Alton Lennon, North Carolina; Wm. J. Randall, Missouri; G. Elliott Hagan, Georgia; Charles H. Wilson, California; Robert L. Leggett, California; Donald J. Irwin, Connecticut; Jed Johnson, Junior, Oklahoma; Frank E. Evans, Colorado; Rodney M. Love, Ohio; Floyd V. Hicks, Washington; Hervey G. Machen, Maryland; Speedy O. Long, Louisiana; E. S. Johnny Walker, New Mexico.

Committee on Banking and Currency: Wright Patman (chairman), Texas; Abraham J. Multer, New York; William A. Barrett, Pennsylvania; Leonor K. Sullivan, Missouri; Henry S. Reuss, Wisconsin; Thomas L. Ashley, Ohio; William S. Moorhead, Pennsylvania; Robert G. Stephens, Junior, Georgia; Fernand J. St Germain, Rhode Island; Henry B. Gonzalez, Texas; Joseph G. Minish, New Jersey; Charles L. Weltner, Georgia; Richard T. Hanna, California; Bernard F. Grabowski, Connecticut; Compton I. White, Junior, Idaho; Tom S. Gettys, South Carolina; Paul H. Todd, Junior, Michigan; Richard L. Ottinger, New York; Earle Cabell, Texas; Thomas C. McGrath, New Jersey; John R. Hansen, Iowa; Frank Annunzio, Illinois.

Committee on the District of Columbia: John L. McMillan (chairman), South Carolina; Thomas G. Abernethy, Mississippi; Howard W. Smith, Virginia; William L. Dawson, Illinois; Abraham J. Multer, New York; John Dowdy, Texas; Basil L. Whitener, North Carolina; James W. Trimble, Arkansas; B. F. Sisk, California; Charles C. Diggs, Michigan; G. Elliott Hagan, Georgia; Don Fuqua, Florida; Donald M. Fraser, Minnesota; Carlton R. Sickles, Maryland; J. Oliva Huot, New Hampshire; George W. Grider, Tennessee; John Bell Williams, Mississippi.

Committee on Education and Labor: Adam C. Powell (chairman), New York; Carl D. Perkins, Kentucky; Edith Green, Oregon; James Roosevelt, California; Frank Thompson, Junior, New Jersey; Elmer J. Holland, Pennsylvania; John H. Dent, Pennsylvania; Roman C. Pucinski, Illinois; Dominick V. Daniels, New Jersey; John Brademas, Indiana; James G. O'Hara, Michigan; Ralph J. Scott, North Carolina; Hugh L. Carey, New York; Augustus F. Hawkins, California; Carlton R. Sickles, Maryland; Sam M. Gibbons, Florida; William D. Ford, Michigan; William D. Hathaway, Maine; Patsy T. Mink, Hawaii; James H. Scheuer, New York; Lloyd Meeds, Washington.

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Thomas E. Morgan (chairman), Pennsylvania; Clement J. Zablocki, Wisconsin; Omar Burleson, Texas; Edna F. Kelly, New York; Wayne L. Hays, Ohio; Armistead I. Selden, Junior, Alabama; Barratt O'Hara, Illinois; L. H. Fountain, North Carolina; Dante B. Fascell, Florida; Leonard Farbstein, New York; Charles C. Diggs, Junior, Michigan; Lindley Beckworth, Texas; Harris B. McDowell, Junior, Delaware; William T. Murphy, Illinois; Cornelius E. Gallagher, New Jersey; Robert N. C. Nix, Pennsylvania; John S. Monagan, Connecticut; Donald M. Fraser, Minnesota; Ronald Brooks Cameron, California; Benjamin S. Rosenthal, New York; Edward R. Roybal, California; John C. Culver, Iowa; Lee H. Hamilton, Indiana; Roy H. McVicker, Colorado.

Committee on Government Operations: William L. Dawson (chairman), Illinois; Chet Holifield, California; Jack Brooks, Texas; L. H. Fountain, North Carolina; Porter Hardy, Junior, Virginia; John A. Blatnik, Minnesota; Robert E. Jones, Alabama; Edward A. Garmatz, Maryland; John E. Moss, California; Dante B. Fascell, Florida; Henry S. Reuss, Wisconsin; John S. Monagan, Connecticut; Torbert H. Macdonald, Massachusetts; J. Edward Roush, Indiana; William S. Moorhead, Pennsylvania; Cornelius E. Gallagher, New Jersey; Wm. J. Randall, Missouri; Benjamin S. Rosenthal, New York; Jim Wright, Texas; Fernand J. St Germain, Rhode Island; David S. King, Utah; John G. Dow, New York; Henry Helstoski, New Jersey.

Committee on House Administration: Omar Burleson (chairman), Texas; Samuel N. Friedel, Maryland; Robert T. Ashmore, South Carolina; Wayne L. Hays, Ohio; Paul C. Jones, Missouri; Frank Thompson, Junior, New Jersey; Watkins M. Abbitt, Virginia; Joe D. Waggonner, Junior, Louisiana; Carl D. Perkins, Kentucky; John H. Dent, Pennsylvania; Sam M. Gibbons, Florida; Lucien N. Nedzi, Michigan; John Brademas, Indiana; John W. Davis, Georgia; Kenneth J. Gray, Illinois; Augustus F. Hawkins, California; Jonathan B. Bingham, New York.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs: Wayne N. Aspinall (chairman), Colorado; Leo W. O'Brien, New York; Walter Rogers, Texas; James A. Haley, Florida; Ed Edmondson, Oklahoma; Walter S. Baring, Nevada; Ralph J. Rivers, Alaska; Roy A. Taylor, North

Carolina; Harold T. Johnson, California; Hugh L. Carey, New York; Morris K. Udall, Arizona; Compton I. White, Junior, Idaho; Phillip Burton, California; David S. King, Utah; Walter H. Moeller, Ohio; John V. Tunney, California; Jonathan B. Bingham, New York; Thomas S. Foley, Washington; N. Neiman Craley, Junior, Pennsylvania; John A. Race, Wisconsin; Richard White, Texas; Teno Roncalio, Wyoming.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce: Oren Harris (chairman), Arkansas; Harley O. Staggers, West Virginia; Walter Rogers, Texas; Samuel N. Friedel, Maryland; Torbert H. Macdonald, Massachusetts; John Jarman, Oklahoma; Leo W. O'Brien, New York; John E. Moss, California; John D. Dingell, Michigan; Paul G. Rogers, Florida; Horace R. Kornegay, North Carolina; Lionel Van Deerlin, California; J. J. Pickle, Texas; Fred B. Rooney, Pennsylvania; John M. Murphy, New York; David E. Satterfield III, Virginia; Daniel J. Ronan, Illinois; J. Oliva Huot, New Hampshire; James A. Mackay, Georgia; John J. Gilligan, Ohio; Charles P. Farnsley, Kentucky; John Bell Williams, Mississippi.

Committee on the Judiciary: Emanuel Celler (chairman), New York; Michael A. Feighan, Ohio; Frank Chelf, Kentucky; Edwin E. Willis, Louisiana; Peter W. Rodino, Junior, New Jersey; Byron G. Rogers, Colorado; Harold D. Donohue, Massachusetts; Jack Brooks, Texas; William M. Tuck, Virginia; Robert T. Ashmore, South Carolina; John Dowdy, Texas; Basil L. Whitener, North Carolina; Herman Toll, Pennsylvania; Robert W. Kastenmeier, Wisconsin; Jacob H. Gilbert, New York; James C. Corman, California; William L. St. Onge, Connecticut; George F. Senner, Junior, Arizona; Don Edwards, California; William L. Hungate, Missouri; Herbert Tenzer, New York; John Conyers, Junior, Michigan; George W. Grider, Tennessee; Andrew Jacobs, Junior, Indiana.

Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries: Herbert C. Bonner (chairman), North Carolina; Edward A. Garmatz, Maryland; Leonor K. Sullivan, Missouri; T. A. Thompson, Louisiana; Frank M. Clark, Pennsylvania; Thomas L. Ashley, Ohio; John D. Dingell, Michigan; Alton Lennon, North Carolina; Thomas N. Downing, Virginia; Bob Casey, Texas; James A. Byrne, Pennsylvania; Harlan Hagen, California; Edith Green, Oregon; Paul G. Rogers, Florida; Frank A. Stubblefield, Kentucky; John M. Murphy, New York; Jacob H. Gilbert, New York; J. Russell Tuten, Georgia; William L. St. Onge, Connecticut; John G. Dow, New York; Raymond F. Clevenger, Michigan.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service: Tom Murray (chairman), Tennessee; James H. Morrison, Louisiana; Thaddeus J. Dulski, New York; David N. Henderson, North Carolina; Arnold Olsen, Montana; Morris K. Udall, Arizona; Dominick V. Daniels, New Jersey; Lindley Beckworth, Texas; Harley O. Staggers, West Virginia; Robert N. C. Nix, Pennsylvania; Joe R. Pool, Texas; William J. Green, Pennsylvania; Spark M. Matsunaga, Hawaii; Paul J. Krebs, New Jersey; Raymond F. Clevenger, Michigan; James M. Hanley, New York; John V. Tunney, California.

Committee on Public Works: George H. Fallon (chairman), Maryland; John A. Blatnik, Minnesota; Robert E. Jones, Alabama; John C. Kluczynski, Illinois; T. A. Thompson, Louisiana; Jim Wright, Texas; Kenneth J. Gray, Illinois; Frank M. Clark, Pennsylvania; Ed Edmondson, Oklahoma; Harold T. Johnson, California; W. J. Bryan Dorn, South Carolina; David N. Henderson, North Carolina; Arnold Olsen, Montana; J. Russell Tuten, Georgia; Ralph J. Rivers, Alaska; Ray Roberts, Texas; Robert A. Everett, Tennessee; Richard D. McCarthy, New York; James Kee, West Virginia; John R. Schmidhauser, Iowa; Robert E. Sweeney, Ohio; James J. Howard, New Jersey; Ken W. Dyal, California.

Committee on Rules: Howard W. Smith (chairman), Virginia; William M. Colmer, Mississippi; Ray J. Madden, Indiana; James J. Delaney, New York; James W. Trimble, Arkansas; Richard Bolling, Missouri; Thomas P. O'Neill, Junior, Massachusetts; B. F. Sisk, California; John Young, Texas; Claude Pepper, Florida.

Committee on Science and Astronautics: George P. Miller (chairman), California; Olin E. Teague, Texas; Joseph E. Karth, Minnesota; Ken Hechler, West Virginia; Emilio Q. Daddario, Connecticut; J. Edward Roush, Indiana; Bob Casey, Texas; John W. Davis, Georgia; William F. Ryan, New York; Thomas N. Downing, Virginia; Joe D. Waggonner, Junior, Louisiana; Don Fuqua, Florida; Carl Albert, Oklahoma; Roy A. Taylor, North Carolina; George E. Brown, Junior, California; Walter H. Moeller, Ohio; William R. Anderson, Tennessee; Brock Adams, Washington; Lester L. Wolff, New York; Weston E. Vivian, Michigan; Gale Schisler, Illinois.

Committee on Un-American Activities: Edwin E. Willis (chairman), Louisiana; William M. Tuck, Virginia; Joe R. Pool, Texas; Richard H. Ichord, Missouri; George F. Senner, Junior, Arizona; Charles L. Weltner, Georgia.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Olin E. Teague (chairman), Texas; W. J. Bryan Dorn, South Carolina; James A. Haley, Florida; Walter S. Baring, Nevada; Robert A. Everett, Tennessee; Thaddeus J. Dulski, New York; Harris B. McDowell, Junior, Delaware; Horace R. Kornegay, North Carolina; Ray Roberts, Texas; Robert T. Secrest, Ohio; George E. Brown, Junior, California; Charles H. Wilson, California; David E. Satterfield III, Virginia; Teno Roncalio, Wyoming; Henry Helstoski, New Jersey; Joseph Y. Resnick, New York; James M. Hanley, New York.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELECTION TO STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE RESIDENT COMMISSIONER TO THE UNITED STATES FROM PUERTO RICO

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 121

Resolved, That SANTIAGO POLANCO-ABREU, the Resident Commissioner to the United States from Puerto Rico, be, and he is hereby, elected an additional member of the following standing committees of the House of Representatives: Committee on Agriculture, Committee on Armed Services, and Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOUR OF MEETING ON WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 20, 1965

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 122

Resolved, That when the House adjourns on Tuesday, January 19, 1965, it stand adjourned until 10:30 a.m. Wednesday, January 20, 1965; that upon convening at that hour the House proceed to the east front of the Capitol for the purpose of attending the inaugural ceremonies of the President and Vice President of the United States; and that upon the conclusion of the ceremonies the House stand adjourned until Thursday, January 21, 1965.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE HONORABLE RICHARD L. OTTINGER

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am taking this time to advise the House that tomorrow I shall call up a privileged resolution to dismiss a contest of the election of the gentleman from New York, Mr. RICHARD L. OTTINGER, initiated by Mr. James R. Frankenberry, of 40 Woodland Avenue, Bronxville, N.Y.

Mr. Speaker, pursuant to this announcement, for the benefit of Members of the House, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a letter dated January 14, 1965, from Mr. H. Newlin Megill, assistant clerk of the House, and addressed to the Speaker:

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The letter referred to follows:

JANUARY 14, 1965.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Following the suggestion made by you in our telephone conversation, just prior to the convening of this session of the Congress, I received the Honorable RICHARD L. OTTINGER, and discussed with him the matter of the attempt by James R. Frankenberry to challenge his right to a seat in the 89th Congress, under the provisions of Revised Statutes 105–130, as amended (2 U.S.C. 201–226).

An examination of the questions raised by Representative OTTINGER and his counsel led me to the following conclusions which were conveyed to him orally, together with the copy of a draft of a resolution, which you may possibly hold to be privileged, for action by the House:

1. James R. Frankenberry is not a competent person to bring such action under this statute.

2. The said James R. Frankenberry was not a party to the election held November 3, 1964, in the 25th Congressional District of the State of New York, at which the Honorable RICHARD L. OTTINGER was elected. It would appear that Frankenberry is merely the campaign manager of former Representative Robert R. Barry, who was, in fact, the defeated candidate in this district. (See records of the secretary of state, State of New York, and the Clerk of the U.S. House of Representatives.)

3. A reading of the fact of the statute which has been provided by the House of Representatives as "a good and sufficient rule to be followed and not to be departed from except for cause" merely leads to the conclusion that a person availing himself of the provisions of this act should be a party to the election and have the expectation that as a "contestant" he would be able to establish "his right to the seat." Among the clear expressions in this act, as amended, there appears this language, "No contestee and contestant for a seat in the House of Representatives * * *. (2 U.S.C. 226.)

4. An examination of the various digests of all contest election cases in the House of Representatives fails to show that a single person has been permitted to use the statute in the manner proposed by Mr. Frankenberry in the matter at point.

5. The House of Representatives has decided that such an attempted action is not proper and that such a person is not competent to avail himself of the provisions of this act. (See H. Res. 54, agreed to January 10, 1941, *In re Locke Miller* v. *Michael J. Kirwan*, 19th Congressional District of Ohio.)

The House of Representatives may adjudicate the questions of the right to a seat in either of the following cases:

First. In the case of a contest between the "contestant" and the "returned member" of the House instituted in accordance with the provisions of the act of 1851, as amended.

Second. In the case of a "protest" or "memorial" filed by an elector of the district concerned.

Third. In the case of the "protest" or "memorial" filed by any other person.

Fourth. On motion of a Member of the House.

Every avenue of approach, cited above, is available to Mr. Frankenberry in his attempt to question the right of the Member to a seat, but the first case.

For the reasons heretofore cited, supported by other actions of the House in such matters, I have supplied a draft of the following language for the possible consideration, and such action as the House in its wisdom may take:

"Whereas James R. Frankenberry, a resident of the city of Bronxville, N.Y., in the Twenty-fifth Congressional District thereof, has served notice of contest upon RICHARD L. OTTINGER, the returned Member of the House from said district, of his purpose to contest the election of said RICHARD L. OTTINGER; and

"Whereas it does not appear that said James R. Frankenberry was a candidate for election to the House of Representatives from the Twenty-fifth Congressional District of the State of New York, at the election held November 3, 1964; nor was he a candidate for the nomination from said district at the primary election held in said district, at which RICHARD L. OTTINGER was chosen the Democratic nominee: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives does not regard the said James R. Frankenberry as a person competent to bring a contest for a seat in the House and his notice of contest, served upon the sitting Member, RICHARD L. OTTINGER, is hereby dismissed; and no petition or other paper relating to the subject matter contained in this resolution shall be received by the House, or entertained in any way whatever."

It would appear that the House should desire to take this action since:

(a) Mr. Frankenberry is attempting to misuse the statute provided by the House of Representatives.

(b) The House of Representatives has the responsibility of relieving the sitting Member from the burden of defending himself in this improper action, under the cumbersome statute, for a period of more than 10 months, so that he may participate fully in his constitutional duties of representing his congressional district.

(c) The courts held that questions as to the application of the statute are justiciable by the House and by the House alone. (See *In re Voorhis* (D.C.N.Y. 1923), 291 F. 673).

(d) Mr. Frankenberry has at least three other ways, which are proper, to proceed in this matter.

Such an action by the House of Representatives would put the question in proper perspective and preserve the rights of all parties.

Your interest prompted me to make this written report to you.

I am, Mr. Speaker,
Respectfully yours,
H. NEWLIN MEGILL.

THE PRESIDENT AND THE FILE CABINETS

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, some of us who have been laboring in the vineyard of Government records, reports, statistics, forms, and other paperwork were very pleased last week when President Johnson ordered the General Services Administration to cut down on purchases of file cabinets. According to the Washington Post of January 15 last, this move could result in a savings of $5 million a year to the Government and we applaud this action.

But, Mr. Speaker, to cut down on the number of file cabinets is to lock the barn door after the horse has been stolen. The records to be filed are already on our hands—25 million cubic feet of them and if you do not store them in file cabinets, you bundle them up and store them in Government buildings at a cost of $2 per square foot, on the average. As a matter of fact, the Government's records holdings are at an alltime high and the story about being buried in our own detritus may be more than apocryphal.

Mr. Speaker, as many of my colleagues know, last year our Subcommittee on Census and Government Statistics went into this matter of reports, forms, questionnaires, statistics, records, and all the rest. We made studies and investigations, held hearings in several cities, and took testimony from over 100 witnesses from public and private life, including a number of my colleagues here in the House. Last fall, in the closing days of the 88th Congress, we published some 800 pages of hearings testimony under the title "The Federal Paperwork Jungle." To those of my colleagues who have not examined this hearings testimony, let me urge you to do so.

ONE BILLION REPORTS

Our subcommittee will soon release its report on the "Federal Paperwork Jungle." The report will show that new Federal records are now being created at the rate of 4.5 billion a year and this, again, is the highest rate in history. It will show that the Federal agencies now require over 1 billion reports a year from industry, business, and the public or some 5 reports for every man, woman, and child in the United States. It will show that one Federal agency, alone, the Internal Revenue Service, accounts for about one-half of all Federal reports or some 500 million forms a year, if we include the new reporting system on dividends, rents, and interest authorized by Congress in the Federal Revenue Act of 1962. The other big Federal agencies in this paperwork game are: the Social Security Administration with over 300 million reports a year; the Bureau of Customs, 36 million; the Veterans' Administration, 33 million; the Census Bureau, 18 million; and the Bureau of Employment Security, 12.5 million.

DISBELIEF

Although the members of our subcommittee had received many, many complaints from business, industry, and the public about the number and complexity of reports required and requested by the Federal agencies, we were genuinely shocked when we learned about the paperwork requirements inflicted upon the public by the Federal agencies. In order to verify our findings, we requested the Government Printing Office to check our figures. The Public Printer keeps careful records of printing orders and requisitons placed by the agencies and here is what he reported: In fiscal year 1964, the Government Printing Office printed 2.3 billion public-use forms for the Federal agencies, or some 12 forms for every man, woman, and child in the United States. Now, this figure, of course, includes copies, duplicates, unused forms, and all that, but it does not include internal use forms or other materials which do not go out to the public.

RESPONSIBILITY

Mr. Speaker, 10 years ago the Second Hoover Commission found that "reporting to the Government is excessively expensive and burdensome," and in 1956, President Eisenhower directed the Bureau of the Budget to take actions necessary to reduce the unnecessary reporting burden on industry and the public. Our subcommittee report will show that now, some 10 years later, the situation is far worse than it was 10 years ago in spite of Presidential directives, Hoover Commissions, congressional investigations, and so forth. One Federal department has today 262 more reports than it had when the Hoover Commission reported in 1955. Last year one Federal regulatory agency came out with a questionnaire which will cost each company a minimum of $85,000 to complete. One firm told us that it will cost them $250,000 to supply the information. Some small business people told us that Federal and State reporting requirements are driving them out of business. In fact, our report will show that Government reports cost small businessmen some $2 billion every year.

Our subcommittee has made a careful study of this paperwork mess and our findings and recommendations will be released soon. There is no question but that both the executive branch and Congress must share the blame in this proliferation of Federal reports and paperwork. We found that Federal administrators often are unaware of the volume of paperwork their assistants are foisting upon the public. We found also that the Federal Reports Act, which Congress passed during World War II, is not being effectively administered by the Bureau of the Budget. In Congress, as we well know, we have permitted archaic and outmoded legislation requiring all kinds of ancient reports to remain on the books year after year and we grind out new legislation, each Congress calling for all kinds of new reporting systems even though they duplicate existing ones.

Mr. Speaker, time does not permit me to go on today, but to return to the President and the file cabinets, we all fully support his efforts to cut out waste and inefficiency everywhere, and I, for one, want to do everything I can to strengthen his hand. Millions of dollars in costs to the Government and to the public can be saved by cutting out excessive and unnecessary Federal reports.

But, believe me, it will take the best efforts of Congress and the executive branch to cut down on excessive and needless Federal paperwork. "Old forms never die, nor do they fade away. They outlast their author, their recipient and, in most cases, their purposes."

THE AMERICAN BLACK WALNUT

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, about 2 years ago I called attention on the House floor to the plight of the American walnut industry, so important in our great Midwest. The industry at the time, I pointed out, was faced with extinction as our giant logs, found nowhere else in the world, were being rapidly cut down for shipment overseas. Unless some action were taken soon this treasured raw material, the American black walnut tree, which takes 50 years or more to grow, would soon be as extinct as the dodo bird.

Fortunately, this warning was heeded by our Federal Government. I am reminded of this by the American Walnut Association, which is now happily celebrating its 50th anniversary.

Last year, for the first time other than in a world crisis, the U.S. Government has imposed export controls on this precious natural resource. The Department of Commerce is to be highly commended for taking control action to conserve this aristocrat of American hardwoods. The Department imposed consumption curbs not only on foreign shipments, which were growing to gigantic proportions, but on domestic marketing as well. Without this action this valuable American species was faced with depletion in less than 10 years. Now, with a proper balance of cutting and new planting the situation is entirely changed. We may write this as a chapter in the continuing battle to preserve our natural resources.

While the Department's restrictions on ruthless cutting of this fine lumber for shipment overseas now prevail, the domestic industry is also to be congratulated on steps taken since we brought this to the House's attention to do its part at home.

The Walnut Association informs me a major feature of the conservation program is the establishment of the Walnut Research Center at Southern Illinois University at Carbondale. The research center is designed to increase the volume and quality of walnut in the next decade and to accelerate the growth of existing immature trees.

We may give thanks that the stately old walnut tree, which we remember so well from boyhood, is being saved. I am most grateful for the part I was able to play in averting this great disaster.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 42, United States Code, section 2251, the Chair appoints as members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. HOLIFIELD, of California; Mr. PRICE, of Illinois; Mr. ASPINALL, of Colorado; Mr. THOMAS, of Texas; Mr. MORRIS, of New Mexico; Mr. HOSMER, of California; Mr. BATES, of Massachusetts; Mr. ANDERSON, of Illinois.

ESTABLISHMENT OF HUDSON HIGHLANDS NATIONAL SCENIC RIVERWAY, N.Y.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OTTINGER] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to establish the Hudson Highlands National Scenic Riverway in the State of New York. It is my sincere hope that this bill be enacted as part of a new conservation effort—an effort not only to protect and develop old resources but create new ones—not only to save our wilderness areas, but preserve the green spaces and scenic river valleys near our metropolitan areas.

The bill I have introduced sets up a mechanism for a regional plan of conservation and development. It emphasizes the necessity for local planning and zoning and at the same time permits the Federal Government, through the Secretary of the Interior, to preserve areas of scenic, historic, and recreational value, to assist in the abatement of water pollution and the protection of pure water, and to rehabilitate blighted and decaying areas.

As introduced, the bill defines the riverway as that section of the Hudson River running from the city of Yonkers to the city of Beacon on the east bank, and from the New York-New Jersey line to the city of Newburgh on the west bank. The riverway boundaries shall include generally the land extending 1 mile inland from both shorelines, as well as the river proper, and all islands, bays, and marshlands within the established boundaries.

A section of the bill authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to acquire an appropriate degree of control and management of the riverway by purchasing or otherwise acquiring scenic or other easements. In addition, he may acquire not more than 5,000 acres of land or interests in land to provide public access to recreational areas or other points of public use within the riverway. However, land or waters controlled or owned by the Palisades Interstate Park Commission, the State of New York, Rockland County, Orange County, Putnam County, Westchester County, or any other political subdivision of the State of New York may be acquired only with concurrence of the owner.

A section of the bill provides that the Federal Power Act shall not apply to the Riverway.

Because of the real need for communication between the governments and groups in the Riverway area, the bill establishes a Hudson National Scenic Riverway Advisory Commission to consult with the Secretary of the Interior on matters relating to the development of the Riverway and carrying out the provisions of the act.

Representation on the Commission would come from the counties of Putnam, Westchester, Orange and Rockland, the Palisades Interstate Park Commission and the Taconic State Park Commission. One member would be appointed from the recommendation of the Governor of New York. The Secretary of the Interior would designate three members, including a chairman.

Mr. Speaker, at the present time, no single agency has a really clear idea of what specific conditions prevail along the banks of the Hudson, what lands can be bought or reclaimed, who owns available land, and so on. Along the Hudson, several communities daily dump millions of pounds of raw sewage into the river in a continuing monument to bad planning over the past 100 years. Shellfish are already gone, oysters disappeared generations ago, the shad are diminishing and the whole striped bass fishing industry is threatened.

Some 60 years ago, when the towering, world-famous Palisades were first threatened by quarry operations, men of foresight and wisdom began a crusade to preserve this valley for posterity. Out of many joint efforts and generous contributions, we have the network of parks which supposedly were to protect for all time the valley and the shores.

Last November, the New York State Joint Legislative Committee on Natural Resources, chaired by the Honorable R. Watson Pomeroy, held hearings to receive recommendations as to the future of the Hudson Valley. The testimony of witness after witness demonstrated that life along the river must be subjected to plan, change and control. A program that encompasses the many separate interests and the public interest, is dictated by necessity.

I believe that the bill I have introduced here today will lead to such a program.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I would like to briefly analyze the bill section by section.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

Section 1: Authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to establish a Hudson Highlands National Scenic Riverway to: (a) save the Hudson River for the public use and benefit; (b) help local communities along the Hudson protect, rehabilitate, and develop the riverway and fight pollution.

Section 2: Describes the general boundaries of the riverway as extending about a mile outward from the Hudson so as to cover the visible shores of both sides of the river and running (a) on the west bank, from the city of Newburgh south to the New York-New Jersey State line; (b) on the east bank, from the city of Beacon in Dutchess County south to the southern boundary of Yonkers.

Section 3: Authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to work with State and local authorities and to assist local zoning and regulatory efforts.

Authorizes the Secretary to protect the riverway, where necessary, through the use of scenic easements, but limits the amount and type of land he can actually acquire and restricts the means of acquisition.

Section 4: Directs that the area of the riverway shall be administered, where appropriate, under the rules and regulations of the National Park Service and exempts the area from the provisions of the Federal Power Act.

Directs that the riverway shall be open to public recreational use.

Section 5: Authorizes the Secretary to undertake certain types of development and rehabilitation programs to further public use of, and benefit from, the riverway and to work with political subdivisions, agencies, and commissions of the State to achieve the purposes of the act.

Section 6: Sets up a nine-member Hudson Highlands National Scenic Riverway Commission to consist of (a) four members, one each appointed to represent the counties of Rockland, Orange, Putnam, and Westchester; (b) one to represent the office of the Governor of New York; (c) one to represent the Palisades Interstate Park Commission and the Taconic Park Commission; and, (d) three to represent the Department of the Interior.

Section 7: Authorizes an appropriation of $20 million to carry out the aims of the act.

Mr. Speaker, the application of the Consolidated Edison Co. of New York to construct a pumped-storage hydroelectric plant at Cornwall, N.Y., and run overhead transmission lines across Putnam County and through western Westchester County has dramatized the need for a comprehensive approach to the uses of the Hudson Valley. In view of the legislation I have offered here today, I have written the following letter to the Honorable Joseph C. Swidler, Chairman of the Federal Power Commission:

JANUARY 18, 1965.

Hon. JOSEPH C. SWIDLER,
Chairman, Federal Power Commission,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SWIDLER: I have today introduced legislation establishing a Hudson Highlands National Scenic Riverway in the counties of Westchester, Putnam, Rockland, and Orange, State of New York. This bill is a direct outgrowth of the public concern over the future of this beautiful and historic area.

In view of this concern and the legislation I have introduced, all of my colleagues in the New York State congressional delegation whom I have contacted have expressed their interest and join me in requesting the Federal Power Commission to postpone a decision on the application of Consolidated Edison Co. of New York for a license to construct a pumped-storage hydroelectric plant at Cornwall, N.Y., until the Congress has had an opportunity to study the situation and act on this matter.

As soon as the remainder of the New York State delegation are contacted, I will send you their names.

I hope you will give this matter your most serious consideration.

Sincerely,

RICHARD L. OTTINGER,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, as evidence of the great public interest in the Consolidated Edison matter and the future of the Hudson Highlands, I submit for the RECORD editorials which have appeared in the New York Times of November 17, 1964, the New York Herald Tribune of Wednesday, September 2, 1964, and Life magazine of July 31, 1964.

SAVING THE HUDSON HIGHLANDS

The question whether the Hudson Highlands can be preserved in their natural grandeur as one of the Nation's most beautiful and historic sites is nearing a final determination. The Federal Power Commission is hearing oral arguments in Washington today on the application of the Consolidated Edison Co. to build a $162 million powerplant on Storm King Mountain, transmit the power across the river by submarine cable and bring it down to the city through Putnam and Westchester Counties mainly by overhead transmission lines.

Conservationists who have opposed the project on esthetic grounds and residents of communities that would be traversed by the overhead lines will stage a last-ditch battle to save the splendor of this reach of the Hudson. The FPC hearing examiner reported—erroneously in our opinion—that the project would have relatively little adverse effect on the natural beauty of the area. He held, furthermore, that the alternative proposals for generating the needed power were not economically feasible—but here the question is, How much are the people willing to pay to preserve their scenic heritage?

The Federal Power Commission's staff has not only approved the Con-Ed plan but, interested in electricity rather than esthetics, has recommended an increase in its potential by 50 percent, from 2 million to 3 million kilowatts, which will enable Con-Edison to sell surplus power to other utilities.

Perhaps the best hope for persuading the Federal Power Commission to take a broader view of the matter than the economic and engineering arguments on which the Con-Edison case rests lies in the hearings which the State's Joint Legislative Committee on Natural Resources will hold at Bear Mountain on Thursday and Friday, on a proposal to establish a State commission to regulate and control uses of the river and its shore areas. While the State cannot negate the issuance of an FPC license, the FPC might well hesitate to grant a license if there seemed a reasonable prospect that the State was about to zone the area. In this route lies the last hope of preventing defacement of Storm King and preservation of the Highlands unspoiled.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Sept. 2, 1964]

STOP THE CON-ED WRECKERS

The Scenic Hudson Preservation Conference has just entered another spirited brief with the Federal Power Commission against licensing of the $162 million hydroelectric plant which Consolidated Edison wants to gouge into the side of Storm King Mountain.

After months of hassling, marked chiefly by Con-Ed compromising on details and by the FPC examiner's report favoring the utility, the issue is still clearcut.

This is simply one of public interest. Shall there be a tremendous pumped-storage development because the company argues that cheap electricity is more important than keeping hands off the Hudson highlands? Or shall this region, so indisputably unique in scenery, history, and recreational potential, be saved from industrialization?

We regret that such a fundamental decision should be left to the FPC at all. But the public has always been slow about saving its great resources. The result is that Con-Ed contends it will wreck the mountainside just a wee bit and, anyway, that the FPC has no legal authority to weigh esthetic values. This is the overbearing approach that only economics and engineering are to be considered. And if Con-Ed has its way, certainly the precedent will be set for despoiling the whole Hudson reach from Bear Mountain to Newburgh.

We think that history and landscape are more important than powerplants. There are other places and methods for the manufacture of electricity. Let us not for the shortsighted sake of economy make a mistake which can never be corrected. Keep the Hudson highlands as they are.

[From Life magazine, July 31, 1964]

MUST GOD'S JUNKYARD GROW?

When does a local conservation issue become national?

Up the Hudson River near West Point, Consolidated Edison proposes building the Nation's third largest hydroelectric station in a hole gouged out of the flank of Storm King Mountain. This is the gateway to the Hudson Highlands, one of the grandest passages of river scenery in the world. Shocked residents and conservationists, led by New York State Historian Carl Carmer, have carried their protest to the Federal Power Commission, which has yet to rule on Con-Ed's application. Con-Ed has made important scenery-preserving concessions in its plans for the site, whose natural economic advantages admittedly are great. But if its application is granted, chances for still another plant across the Hudson will be greatly enhanced and further mutilation of the stately hills rendered likely.

National or local? Apparently local, like the battle waged by New York sportsmen to preserve the Beaverkill and Willowemoc Rivers, the Nation's original dry-fly trout streams, from highway construction. Or like the battle to save what is left of the Indiana dunes on Lake Michigan from commercial exploitation. Or like the battle to keep California's Kings and Tehipite Canyons from being dammed and drowned. But, like these and other campaigns, some of which were described here recently under the title "the Creeping Junkyard" (Life, March 20), they also deserve to be called national issues. In a real sense the whole country suffers every time Americans make a bad choice, even a local one, that allows the needless waste of any of our natural treasures. The destruction of such resources is irrevocable; no one can pass that way again.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OTTINGER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SCHEUER. The gentleman has offered a bill which seems to be a thoughtful and constructive measure in the direction of conserving our natural resources, particularly around our great metropolitan areas. I should like to ask the gentleman from New York if he will explain to us the impact that this legislation would have upon the proposal of the Consolidated Edison Co. to develop a large hydroelectric plant at Cornwall, N.Y., overlooking the Hudson River.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, the bill is designed overall for the protection of the Hudson River banks rather than being specifically aimed at this one intrusion. This is the first intrusion in the Hudson highlands, and we rather hope that this case, which is pending before the Federal Power Commission, which is considering this matter, will be held up pending the action of the Congress.

Mr. SCHEUER. I thank the gentleman.

BANKERS ATTEMPT TO BLUDGEON PRESIDENT

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, blackmail is one of the foulest offenses known to man. It is indeed shocking to read accounts of ordinary citizens being blackmailed but far more shocking to learn of blackmail threats made against our leaders and the American people.

I feel it my duty, Mr. Speaker, to point out to this body and the American people that two of our most respected and leading newspapers, the New York Times and the Wall Street Journal, recently reported that certain banking interests are trying to blackmail the President of the United States and the public. The Wall Street Journal identifies the "blackmailers" as the American Bankers Association, a group which I characterized last August 3 on this floor as a pressure group as "ugly as any lobby in existence."

Some people feel my criticism of the ABA was too severe. But I am certain after I finish here today that those people will now realize that my description of the big banker's lobby was entirely accurate and even on the mild side.

The ABA, true to tradition, has wasted no time in the 89th Congress to move to hogtie, hornswaggle, blackmail, and blackjack the President, the Congress, and the American people.

What I am about to relate is merely the latest of the many arrogant and self-seeking maneuvers of the ABA. It concerns itself specifically with the U.S. balance of payments and "gold cover" problems.

The New York Times of January 8 reported:

> The banking community may condition its support for modification of the gold requirement on assurances from the Johnson administration that it will resist proposals by Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, Democrat, of Texas, to reduce greatly the independence of the Federal Reserve System.

Futhermore, the front page of the Wall Street Journal of January 15 put the finger on the actual ringleaders by reporting that:

> American Bankers Association officials agree the freeze of gold for currency backing should be thawed—if the administration stresses keeping the dollar sound, honoring Federal Reserve independence.

There can be no other interpretation of these two reports. The ABA is saying to the President and to the Congress that ABA will support a modification of the gold reserve requirement only if the President and the administration refuse to support the legislation introduced to coordinate the activities of the Federal Reserve Board with the economic policies and programs of the President.

I use the world "blackmail," Mr. Speaker, because there is no other word at my command which more aptly describes this disgraceful conduct.

There can be no doubt that the United States currently has a serious balance-of-payments problem which is causing substantial drains on our gold reserves. As we all know, gold serves as a reserve for Federal Reserve notes and deposits of commercial banks held by the Federal Reserve System. If we suffer from excessive balance-of-payments deficits and have to continue paying off such deficits with our gold supply, it means that we may find it necessary to once more reduce the gold cover requirements as we have in the past.

It is precisely this proposal that the ABA says it will support but only if the administration and the Congress will knuckle under and refuse to approve vital Federal Reserve legislation to assure coordination of monetary and fiscal policy.

Of course the gold cover problem has no direct relation to reform of the Federal Reserve System—except in the selfish scheming of the bankers' lobby. The gold cover problem is simply one of technical legal requirements that can be resolved easily without any harmful effect whatsoever on our monetary system. The administration is now working on legislation to deal with the question, and I have no fear about maintaining stability of the dollar.

I am much more concerned about our persistent balance-of-payments problem and the harmful and misguided "remedies" that the ABA and the Federal Reserve Board are palming off on the Nation.

I am informed that the last quarter of 1964 will show that gold and dollars have been leaving the United States at an annual rate of $5 billion. If this is so, this deficit rate will be the largest dollar and gold loss we have suffered since the second quarter of 1963.

It was the large payments deficit of 1963 that led to a drive by the big bankers who dominate the Federal Reserve System and the ABA to tighten credit and substantially raise short-term interest rates.

Tightening credit and raising interest rates never in our history or in the history of any modern industrial economy have solved the balance-of-payments problem. You do not cure a bloody nose with a tourniquet around the neck. The facts are clear and obvious. Short-term interest rates on Federal issues have risen 900 percent since 1946, and the current excuse for raising short-term rates even higher is that we need to do it for balance-of-payments reasons.

How many times, Mr. Speaker, are the American people going to be forced to swallow this monetary moonshine? In 1962, 91-day Treasury bills carried a rate of 2.778 percent and by the last quarter of 1963 this rate had increased to 3.523 percent. Currently the rate on this class of public debt is better than 3.8 percent and yet the balance-of-payments problem continues more severe than in the past. How then, I ask, can raising short-term interest rates solve our balance-of-payments problems?

Let me put this matter in more understandable perspective. Between 1946 and 1964 the interest rate on 91-day Treasury bills increased by 900 percent. From the end of 1963 to the present, the interest rate on this class of Government security has increased more than 20 percent. And yet our balance-of-payments problem still persists—indeed the problem is more severe.

What if we had the same degree of increase in prices of consumer commodities over the same time period? We would have experienced a period of inflation which would certainly rival that experienced by Germany after World War I, or Communist China after World War II.

Take the example of a pair of shoes. In 1946 a man could buy a respectable pair of shoes for $5. Currently this $5 pair of shoes would cost about $9.90. But if the price of shoes had increased between 1946 and the present as has the increase in interest costs on 91-day Treasury bills—this pair of shoes would now cost $89.10. Consider that during the war, the short-term rate was one-eighth of 1 percent for a time. If motor cars had increased as much as interest rates an automobile which now costs about $2,500 would cost $30,000. This is an example which the American people can understand.

The attempt to make such subjects as monetary policy, balance of payments and so forth, difficult to understand is the reason why the American people have not voiced their feelings on these subjects. If they were properly communicated with on these subjects, I am sure they would no more tolerate a 900-percent increase in the cost of financing 91-day bills over an 18-year period than they would tolerate a 900-percent increase in the price of a pair of shoes over the same period of time.

I have said it before and I say it again, raising interest rates at this time when we still have high levels of unemployment and unused industrial capacity is a tragic error. It will not solve our balance-of-payments problems but it will, as sure as I stand here, accentuate existing unemployment and poverty in the United States. If this is allowed to happen, then more capital will go elsewhere and our balance-of-payments problem will be worsened.

What are the reasons for our balance-of-payments problems? Certainly a major one is that private industry and the banking community—those handful of banks that are large enough to engage in foreign transactions—are making substantial private dollar loans and equity investments in foreign countries. Our problem also is accentuated by the fact that there very recently have been several susbtantial loans floated by either foreign governments or international lending agencies in the United States.

Contrary to the high interest fallacy this balance-of-payments problem can best be solved by maintaining low interest rates and an adequate money supply so that the productivity of our economy can be fully utilized and enable us to compete with world markets. Our immediate balance-of-payments problem can also be solved by direct intervention into those specific activities which are causing the problem. In this particular instance the President should exert his authority and close the loophole in the interest of equalization tax and make it apply to foreign loans made by U.S. banks.

This is how outrageous the situation is. The ABA hierarchy—engaging in broad daylight blackjack and holdup tactics—in effect is saying this to us: Allow the handful of banks to continue to make foreign loans. We, the ABA, will go along with reducing the gold reserve requirements so that we can create more money to lend and on which we will make an interest return. In other words, the big banks are in large part responsible for creating the balance-of-payments problem and the gold reserve problem, but here they are telling us that the blame rests some place else. Magnanimous are we, say the ABA, so we will help you solve your problem. But the quid pro quo, they tell us, is for the administration to make sure the Federal Reserve monetary reform bill is killed. This is truly a classic example of sending the goose to guard the shelled corn.

The best estimates indicate that we have a chronic hard-core balance-of-payments deficit of around $2.5 billion. Of this amount better than a billion dollars of it is brought about by the foreign loans of a handful of U.S. banks.

I say again the solution to this problem is not to raise interest rates. The solution does not lie in this direction at all. Rather it lies in the direction of direct intervention as I have indicated above and creating the environment in which the fruits of increasing American production and productivity can be used to maintain our position in world trade and a climate attractive to capital investment. To demand, as the ABA is doing, that they will trade off with the administration and the President a gold bill for Federal Reserve independence is both immoral and dishonest.

This whole matter is personally repulsive to me, Mr. Speaker, as I am sure it is to all other Members of the Congress and the administration. It is beyond my reason and belief that this arrogant and brazen group can succeed in their attempted deception.

I have made reference to the Federal Reserve reform bill in my address, Mr. Speaker. Legislation to accomplish these reforms has been introduced as H.R. 11. I shall at a subsequent time address this body on this most vital subject.

APPOINT A JOINT CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE TO DRAFT A CODE OF ETHICS FOR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Harvey] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a House concurrent resolution which would establish a joint congressional committee to be composed of five Members of the House of Representatives, appointed by the Speaker of the House, and five Members of the Senate, appointed by the President of the Senate, for the purpose of conducting a full and complete study and investigation in preparing a proposed code of ethics to govern the conduct of Members of Congress.

I introduced an identical resolution in the last Congress, April 25, 1963. Unfortunately, the measure died in committee. I still feel, however, that such legislation is important, for it is essential if our representative form of government is to succeed that our citizens have respect for those who serve. I do not pretend to know everything that a congressional code of ethics should contain, but I do suggest that we should at least give it consideration. I am mindful of the difficulty in legislating public morality, but it should be possible to establish a standard of conduct that would be helpful to all Members of Congress and reassuring to the public. Adoption of my resolution would permit the complete study and investigation that would be necessary to prepare a code of ethics. In addition, however, I am certain that the adoption of my resolution, and the study which would result, would emphasize the many fine dedicated public servants, both Democrat and Republican, who have worked long hours, often at considerable personal sacrifice, to make our Government work.

I hope that we can establish such a code of ethics and erase once and for all any shadows of doubt that are cast on this legislative body.

OLDER WORKERS

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Poff] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, in recent years, the tendency has been for industry to refuse to employ older workers and to terminate older workers when a reduction in force becomes necessary. A worker who loses his job after the age of 45 finds it almost impossible to obtain employment with a new firm, even though his training, experience, skill, and productive capacity may be at the peak of proficiency. At the age of 45 a worker's financial load is probably higher than ever before. His children are in the midst of their educational careers, and many promising young students in the scientific and professional fields are compelled to abandon college because their parents have lost their jobs.

The problem is just as important with reference to workers who are approaching their 60th birthday. They are too young to retire and too old to find a new job. Yet, they may be burdened with mortgages on their homes, heavy hospital and medical expenses, and other obligations peculiar to our elder citizens.

This is an acute national problem but one which is not easily solved by Government. Congress has no constitutional power to compel employers to hire older workers or to retain older workers in their employ. Even if Congress had the power, a compulsory statute would be offensive to our sense of economic freedom and to the principles of the free enterprise system. Moreover, such a compulsory statute could not be properly policed without greatly expanding the ranks of the Federal bureaucracy.

Accordingly, the only possible solution to the problem is an incentive program to encourage employers voluntarily to employ and retain in employment older workers. I have introduced a bill providing for a voluntary tax incentive program. Under that bill, an employer would be allowed to deduct as a business expense not only the gross salary paid to an employee but an additional 2 percent thereof for every employee between the ages of 45 and 50, 3 percent for every employee between the ages of 55 and 60 and 5 percent for every employee over the age of 60.

The passage of this bill would mean an initial loss of revenue, but over the long run there would be a corresponding increase in tax revenue from the salaries and wages paid to these older employees and there would be a corresponding reduction of unemployment and welfare benefits.

It might be argued that a policy encouraging the employment of older people would reduce the job availability of younger workers. Such an argument is at odds with the laws of economics. Economic history proves that the more people we have working, the more we produce; the more we produce, the more we transport and sell; the more we sell, the cheaper the price; the cheaper the price, the more we consume; the more we consume, the greater the demand; the greater the demand, the more we need to produce; the more we need to produce, the more jobs we have available. More jobs for everyone, regardless of age, must be our continuing policy.

We as a nation have, over the years, depended for our growth upon the wisdom, training, and acqiured skills that come only with age and experience. Some of our most revolutionary inventions and some of the greatest contributions to our economic, cultural, and scientific life have come from men and women of advanced years in both humble and exalted positions. This reservoir of wisdom and skills is one of America's greatest assets and one in which we have a great investment. We must protect that investment and use that asset to advance our national interests.

AUTHORITY FOR THE SPEAKER TO DECLARE A RECESS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order today for the Speaker to declare a recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may we have the assurance that there will be no business following the reading of the message we are presently awaiting?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I have no knowledge of any business whatsoever, I will say to the gentleman. The only reason for the request is the hope that the message will arrive in time to read it today.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

THE NEW YORK TIMES

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, one of the great and free newspapers in the United States is the New York Times. Over the years we have come to take for granted the objective and exhaustive coverage of the news that may be found daily in the Times. But the Times did not just grow, like Topsy. It was made with hard work, dedication to the finest principles of good journalism, and most of all with a sense of responsibility toward the public.

"All the News That's Fit To Print" is the well-known motto of the Times. It was conceived by Adolph Ochs, publisher of the Times from 1896 to 1935. The great traditions of the Times were also instituted by Ochs, and cultivated over the 39 years that he published the paper. His story is of historical importance both to the field of journalism and to the development of the free press in America. The following article, entitled "A Newspaperman's Newspaper" from News Front, January 1965, tells the highlights of Adolph Ochs' career with the New York Times. With unanimous consent, I am inserting the article at this point in the RECORD:

A NEWSPAPERMAN'S NEWSPAPER

During presidential election years, when partisan emotions run higher than normal, American newspaper readers expect and usually get a fair account of each candidate's views. It is taken for granted that the facts will be presented objectively in the news columns, no matter what political stand a paper may take on its editorial pages.

However, the standard of impartiality, now so commonplace, is a relatively recent phenomenon in the annals of U.S. newspaper publishing. While the 13 colonies were struggling for political freedom from England, the U.S. fourth estate, still in its infancy, gave American revolutionaries a powerful forum through which they could disseminate anti-British propaganda. After the Nation achieved independence, the U.S. press directed its vigorous activity toward the success of varying causes.

In those early days of fierce party strife over national goals and ideals, journalism became a highly personal field and continued in this tradition for over a century. Publishers were synonymous with their papers and individual interests and views determined the presentation of news. The outstanding newspapers were essentially platforms on which great editors displayed their erudition. News columns were as biased as the editorials.

Today, few recall such highly successful papers as the New York World and the New York Journal but many remember Joseph Pulitzer and William Randolph Hearst, the lions of turn-of-the-century reporting. They were flamboyant personalities whose internecine feuds and muckraking crusades made front page news and they never missed an opportunity to make headlines of their own on a "slow" news day.

The man who struggled to publish a newspaper in radical contrast to those of his times and who set an example for future generations of newspaper publishers rarely appeared in the columns of his own paper—or in the columns of his competitors' papers.

Adolph S. Ochs, publisher of the New York Times from 1896 to 1935, had no yearning for political office, abhorred the use of sensationalism to sell papers and built no monuments to himself such as Hearst who spent untold millions to construct and furnish his palatial California residence, San Simeon. In contrast to his larger-than-life contemporaries, whose well-publicized hi-jinks included such lively activities as duels, showgirl mistresses and yachting, Ochs appeared decidedly drab. His only interest was in honest, objective reporting and the New York Times.

His simple, yet revolutionary credo startled the world of "yellow journalism" in the 1890's. "It will be my earnest aim that the New York Times give the news, all the news, in concise and attractive form, in language that is permissible in good society, and give it as early if not earlier, than it can be learned through any other reliable medium; to give the news impartially, without fear or favor, regardless of party, sect, or interests involved."

Another idea—that a newspaper's most important product was news, not the fiction, comics, contests, gossip, sensational scoops and exposés, and free publicity that filled 90 percent of his competitors' pages—shook the foundations of the newspaper world. But Ochs was confident that somewhere there existed an intelligent reading public who bought papers for their news content. He encouraged readers to take an enlightened interest in the day's news events.

He proved that he could publish a clean, honest, impartial paper—a gigantic handicap in the eyes of practical newspapermen of his time—and still make it a financial success.

Ochs, always a modest man, denied that he had contributed any innovations to the journalistic profession.

"We have practiced, as best we could, the old journalism," he said, "the journalism that succeeded in small towns where the high standards of the profession are demanded and practiced by self-respecting men."

Ochs knew the newspaper business from the ground up. His publishing career had begun at the age of 20 when he took over the floundering Chattanooga Times and made it one of the most respected papers in the South.

On his 38th birthday, in 1896, he learned that the New York Times was about to fold and could be bought cheaply. There were no other prospective buyers for the once-great paper. Most people thought the Times was past saving.

For Ochs, it was the opportunity of his life. When he assumed control on August 19, 1896, the Times' daily circulation had dwindled to 9,000, compared to the half million circulations of the World and the Journal. Although the Times printed 19,000 copies daily, over half were returned unsold.

Nobody believed this obscure southern publisher had bought the Times on his own. Pulitzer immediately charged that Ochs was the front man for some enormous trust and blasted him as "the conductor and caretaker of the deficit." It was certain, most people thought, that he would be annihilated in the titanic circulation battle which was raging between Hearst and Pulitzer who spent millions to lure and keep readers.

This was the heyday of yellow journalism and nowhere was it practiced with more devastating skill than in New York City. In 1895, the 32-year-old Hearst had burst into New York journalism with all the discreet secrecy of a wooden-legged burglar having a fit on a tin roof. Pulitzer, who despite his faults was a crusading publisher, soon descended to Hearst's level to beat him at his own game.

The results were grossly misrepresented facts, deliberate lies, and screaming headlines to appeal to the sensation-hungry masses. A murder story would be headlined "Blood!" a collision, "Smash Crash!" (Heavy use of exclamation points was the journalistic vogue.)

Lurid sensationalism could be had for a penny, just about the best buy anywhere in town. Hearst particularly pandered to the lowest tastes. A newspaperman of the day recalled with disdain, "You always had to read the Journal to know whether a woman was shot in the right or left breast."

The yellow journals cannot be blamed entirely for it was a reckless era in U.S. history. Great industrial empires shot up overnight; Vanderbilt could say "the public be damned" without the public caring much; P. T. Barnum could "humbug" delighted audiences with hoaxes and freaks; the rapidly growing metropolises were crowded with people looking for raw excitement, if only second hand.

Into this madness stepped the high-principled Ochs with his intention of printing a paper for thoughtful, pure-minded people. He served notice the Times would not be a yellow paper with a motto on his front page, "All the news that's fit to print," which runs today.

This Sunday schoolish declaration was greeted up and down Park Row, New York's fleet streets of the nineties, with snickers and jeers. They called it arrogant nonsense and said it implied censorship. If God permitted an event to happen, they were not too proud to report it, most journalists contended.

Even one of Ochs' own editors demanded, "What is unfit to print?" "What is not true," Ochs replied.

But he also considered smut, trivia, sloppy writing and libel unfit to print. The Times changed quickly. Ochs substituted hard news for fiction, threw out free publicity items, rejected biased writing, and refused to print comics.

He ignored most sordid crime stories, although he could outdo his competition when he chose. Once asked about these lapses, he said, "The yellows see such stories only as opportunity for sensationalism. When the Times gives a great amount of space to such stories it turns out authentic sociological documents."

His novel ideas about publishing extended to the advertising pages. His competitors ran ads for immoral books, palmists, massage parlors with female attendants and dubious nostrums. In the New York Herald's notorious personals column, brothels solicited business and free lance prostitutes announced changes of address.

Although he needed all the revenue he could get, Ochs refused such items. "Advertising in the final analysis should be news. If it is not news, it is worthless."

At first the Times' new look was received by the majority of the public with an indifferent yawn. His well-wishers were limited mostly to clergymen, educators, and public officials. Elderly ladies applauded his advertising slogan: "It does not soil the breakfast cloth."

While his New York opponents still refused to take him seriously, a few out-of-town newspapers praised Ochs for "realizing the sewer and morgue fields were fully occupied by the World and the Journal" and lauded him for publishing a clean paper.

Disaster almost wiped Ochs out in 1898 with the advent of the Spanish-American War. His troubles were created by the press in general and by Hearst in particular. An artist whom Hearst had sent to Cuba wired, "No trouble here. There will be no war." Hearst cabled a memorable reply, "You furnish the pictures and I will furnish the war." When the Cuban campaign got underway, the Journal printed a box on the front page, "How Do You Like the Journal's War?"

Ochs didn't like it. The millions spent by his rivals for correspondents, artists, and cable tolls were beyond his means. Ochs was advised to raise the Times' price from 3 cents to 5 cents on the theory that people who wanted his kind of paper would pay the higher price. To everyone's astonishment, he cut his price to that of the yellows—1 cent. This move proved the turning point. Circulation began to leap and the audience Ochs had hoped for began to materialize.

By 1900, the Times was in the black and its life seemed assured. On the other hand, the prestige of yellow journalism had begun to wane. Ochs' feat assured others that a market existed for an unsensational newspaper and readers began to weary of scandal, comic opera wars, and personal invective.

Today the yellow titans are dead or absorbed. The Times remains a unique and venerable institution, a newspaperman's newspaper.

THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS: STEADY GAINS ARE MADE, NEW STEPS TAKEN

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, in our first weeks of a new session of Congress we should take note that our committees have already begun another long and searching examination of U.S. foreign policy and foreign assistance programs. One of the programs from which we can draw a good measure of satisfaction is the imaginative and ambitious effort initiated almost 4 years ago by the late President Kennedy—the Alliance for Progress.

In the past year the Alliance has made a number of significant advances.

Before citing those important gains, however, we should recall that the Alliance is a wide-ranging development program involving not only the United States and the other American Republics but also a host of international institutions and private resources. The Alliance is truly an international partnership effort. Of course, the Latin American people themselves have to provide the great bulk of resources to feed diverse development programs building toward long-term progress. Already, in fact, during the past 3 fiscal years the Latin American Republics have committed the equivalent of roughly $22 to $24 billion toward the development goals of the Alliance. In that same period, external assistance amounted to approximately $4.6 billion, of which about $3.4 billion in loans, grants, and foodstuffs was committed by the United States.

Let us remember also that putting together this vast cooperative effort was no easy task. Goals had to be agreed upon, a great variety of detailed plans had to be hammered out, experienced personnel had to be recruited and many more had to be trained. Above all, new and often controversial policies and laws had to be adopted.

Setting up the machinery of the Alliance naturally took a good deal of time and effort, but there are already many visible signs that the Alliance is reaching the people. By the middle of this year, U.S. assistance alone, both direct and through the institutions which Latin America now has, will have helped build over 300,000 homes; construct over 26,000 classrooms; print over 11 million textbooks; extend 280,000 agricultural credit loans; build 850 health centers, hospitals, or mobile health units; drill or install over 1,500 wells and water systems; and provide food for 22 million people.

At the same time, new road, irrigation, and power projects—in many instances financed by combined domestic and external means—are under construction or have been completed. Sound new fiscal policies have been widely adopted, and effective tax laws and agrarian reform programs are now the rule rather than the exception. A new urgency is gathering behind efforts to escape from overdependence on one-crop economies by shifting to export diversification. Common market arrangements are improving and, in some instances, producing major economic benefits.

In all these areas—despite some mistakes, despite immense and diverse difficulties, and despite constant public criticism—sure and steady progress has been made.

In the past year some vital and striking new gains were achieved.

Last month in Lima, Peru, during the third annual review of the Alliance for Progress, Assistant Secretary of State Thomas Mann called attention to the new steering group of the Alliance, the Inter-American Committee on the Alliance for Progress, which is headed by the able and dedicated Carlos Sanz de Santamaria of Colombia. The Inter-American Committee, which is called CIAP from its initials in Spanish, is less than 1 year old. Yet CIAP has completed the first cycle of country-by-country studies ever made in our hemisphere. It also has examined national and regional development plans, as well as the steps that have been taken to put them into effect. It also has checked up on the efforts each country is making to carry out its responsibilities in meeting the goals of the Alliance. And CIAP has forthrightly called for specific and concrete steps to be taken to speed up development programs.

What is needed now, as Secretary Mann put it, "is better execution, better performance by all of us in the Alliance."

Mr. Mann also stressed the need for greater attention to be paid to the diversification and expansion of exports since they are, as he said, "essential elements in any program to increase export earnings." Increased export earnings, I might add, are vitally necessary if these countries are going to gain the ability to pay for long-term progress. Another way of expending export earnings, as Mr. Mann points out, "is to get on with the job of making the Latin American regional trading arrangements more effective." In the Central American common market, incidentally, good progress continues to be made. In one of these countries, for example, exports to the regional market have increased from some 10 percent of total exports to about 50 percent in just the last few years.

A final and important point made by Secretary Mann at the Lima meeting is the need to increase the role of the private sector in the Alliance for Progress. He reminded the delegates that the private sector—principally the Latin American private sector—"makes by far the largest investment in job-producing, goods-producing, and tax-producing industries." With its capital, know-how, and efficiency the private sector, he emphasized, "is clearly essential to success."

Today the Alliance for Progress is a little more than halfway into its fourth year. It is now a going concern, and significant turning points have been passed. This year we can expect to see even greater advances, a more experienced and workmanlike performance, and a larger role played by the people themselves.

President Johnson has pledged that his administration intends to strengthen our special ties of interest and affection with our fellow American Republics. I would expect that Congress will support that endeavor and join the President in giving increasing support to the Alliance for Progress. For as he declared in his state of the Union message, the United States and the free Republics of Latin America "together—share and shape the destiny of the New World."

EXCERPTS FROM ADDRESS DELIVERED BY THE HONORABLE COLGATE W. DARDEN TO MEN'S CLUB OF THE FIRST PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH AT VIRGINIA BEACH

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, in a recent address, my most distinguished constituent, the Honorable Colgate W. Darden, reviewed a bit of history and presented his analysis of a singular and unique contribution which another great American, the Honorable James A. Farley, had made toward the promotion of religious tolerance in the political life of the Nation. Mr. Speaker, I believe that you and my other colleagues will appreciate and enjoy these comments which are excerpts from an address Mr. Darden made to the Men's Club of the First Presbyterian Church at Virginia Beach. This is what he had to say:

EXCERPT, MEN'S CLUB, FIRST PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH, VIRGINIA BEACH, VA.

Even the most casual review of the political cross currents of this century would be incomplete without some attention being given prohibition and religion. In our own area and in the Southern States as a whole these issues have been, I think, the most divisive of my lifetime. It is difficult, even now, for me to forget the intense bitterness of the Smith-Hoover campaign of 1928. Virginia, you will remember, ended in the Republican column that year. While there are many competent observers who attribute the State's decision to Mr. Smith's stand on prohibition, he being an avowed wet and having urged repeal of the prohibition amendment, I think it quite likely he would have failed in Virginia by reason of the fact he was a Roman Catholic. And I believe the same thing would have happened in other southern and many western States.

Certainly in the South and in the Middle West prohibition and religion were fiercely and bitterly debated. Each of the issues had an unique capacity to inflame the voters, but of the two I remember the religious issue as being the more difficult because it was so hard to get at. Voters were less inclined to discuss it than to talk about prohibition, although it seemed to me they felt more deeply about it.

It is worth remarking that within a very few years the Democrats won after having placed a prohibition repeal provision in their 1932 platform and in 1960 a Roman Catholic was elected President. This last event deserves a few comments. It detracts in no way from President Kennedy to suggest that the thorny religious issue had been resolved many years before he was nominated. Of course he could have revived it by ineptness, but he was not an inept person.

It was resolved in a most interesting and in a very unexpected way. The climate which made a solution possible was created in large part by the efforts of one individual, James A. Farley. So far as I know he never made an issue of the matter. His mighty accomplishment—and it was mighty—came by chance. In truth it could have come in no other way.

Mr. Farley was campaign manager of Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1932. Later he was chairman of the Democratic National Committee and Postmaster General in Mr. Roosevelt's Cabinet. He was a political organizer of unusual capacity, the ablest, I think, this century has seen. He was and is a devout Roman Catholic, of exemplary personal habits with friends in both political parties.

As chairman of the Democratic National Committee he knew personally thousands who were interested in politics—both professional and amateurs—and he endeared himself to them. His great strength rested upon this army of friends and well-wishers; with these individuals he saw to it that he kept in close and constant personal contact. As time went on the genuineness of the man impressed itself more and more upon those with whom he worked and they gradually changed their views as to the religious issue in politics, and equally important they changed the views of their friends. Without attempting to settle the religious question as such Jim Farley destroyed it as a political issue by his friendliness, forthrightness, and fairness.

The dark and disturbing arguments of those who attempted to make political capital of Roman Catholicism fell before the obvious determination of the chairman to deal fairly and openly, and to act without religious bias. So that when Mr. Kennedy opened his campaign in 1960 he faced a country in which there were millions of people who remembered the political activities of Jim Farley and who had been reassured by them. Thus it was that this individual in countless personal contacts with political leaders, great and small, and with friends scattered throughout the country, made a telling contribution to religious tolerance by reason of his political and personal life.

Events of 1940 support this conclusion. You will remember Mr. Farley was nominated for the Presidency in that year. Had Mr. Roosevelt not run for a third term and had Mr. Farley been chosen to lead the Democratic Party, it appears his religion would not have been an issue of any consequence in the campaign. It is important, in this connection, to bear in mind that his strength was far greater than the somewhat less than 100 votes which he received in the convention. Moreover, and this is even more significant, much of his strength—strength that would have shown had Mr. Roosevelt not been a candidate, was in the southern and western rural areas that had been so opposed to Al Smith on religious grounds. As Senator Glass said in presenting Mr. Farley's name to the convention, "if nominated there will not be a shadow of doubt as to his election next November." And so it would have been. All of which shows how great a change had been wrought.

Mr. Farley is a most valuable citizen. His greatest service, however, has never been fully understood. It was this successful assault on religious intolerance. He deserves to be long remembered for this and the Nation is in his debt by reason of it.

A PROPOSAL TO BLOCK THE FLOW OF MAIL-ORDER PORNOGRAPHY

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, it is my belief that we shall never create a Great Society in the United States until we first have established a good society. We cannot fulfill the inspiring vision of our President until our society is based firmly on principles of morality and justice.

The good society will not be established by bills or resolutions passed by the House and Senate. Morality cannot be established by legislative fiat. We can, on the other hand, legislate sanctions against men and activities which menace the moral welfare of our people.

President Johnson in his state of the Union address called upon the Congress to act in the fight against the pollution of our air and the pollution of our streams. Today I call upon my colleagues to join in the battle against still a third type of pollution: the pollution of our mails with the filth and smut of obscene literature.

While there are no firm figures on the scope of mail-order pornography, postal officials estimate that circulars, brochures, and catalogs offering objectionable material are sent out at the rate of 100 million a year. The business of peddling smut through the postal system is said to gross $500 million or more annually. Despite past legislative action by Congress and the best efforts of the Post Office Department, this foul traffic seems to be increasing.

When I speak of mail-order pornography, Mr. Speaker, I am not referring to provocative pinups or racy magazines which also may be purchased on the newsstands. I am referring to materials which are so perverted, so vile, so filthy that there can be no reasonable doubt that they are obscene. This is the kind of pornography which is reaching so many of our youth.

As Francis Cardinal Spellman said in a recent article in the Eagle magazine:

> Fathers and mothers, as well as brothers, sisters, teachers, and clergymen of all faiths are dismayed to find the young being exposed to a flood of pornography with all its corrupting influences. They know that salacious literature corrupts both young and old. However, it is especially cruel to the young in destroying moral values and inducing perversions.

What is more, there is solid evidence that the degrading influence of pornography often manifests itself in juvenile delinquency and crime, particularly sex crimes. The Honorable J. Edgar Hoover, in an article for Our Sunday Visitor last month, pointed out that there has been a steady increase in the number of sex offenses among teenagers. He pointed out that nearly one-fifth of the arrests for forcible rape in the United States involved persons under 18 years of age. This same group also accounted for over one-fifth of the arrests for other sex offenses.

While noting that it is impossible to estimate the number of crimes committed because of the influence of obscene materials, Mr. Hoover pointed out that—

> Authorities having contact with young offenders assert that there is a link between many crimes of sex and violence and smut literature.

Pornographic literature also has an effect on the health of our Nation. That conclusion has been drawn by the prestigious New York Academy of Medicine which has for several years been studying the medical aspects of the problem created by the increasing prevalence of salacious materials which are available to American young people. The findings of the academy were disclosed in a letter last fall from its president, Dr. Harold Brown Keyes, to President Johnson.

He informed the President that, as a result of its study, the academy believes that the problem of pornographic literature has deep-going sociomedical implications for the entire Nation. The academy believes that reading pornographic literature encourages a morbid preoccupation with sex and interferes with the development of a healthy attitude and respect for the opposite sex. In the opinion of its psychiatrists, salacious materials may have an especially detrimental effect on disturbed adolescents. The academy maintains that it is undeniable that concurrently with the flood of smut, there has been a resurgence of venereal disease, particularly among teenagers, and an appalling upswing in the rate of illegitimacy. Dr. Keyes stated:

> In short it can be asserted that the perusal of salacious literature has the potentiality of inciting some young persons to enter into illicit sex relations and thus of leading them into promiscuity, illegitimacy, and venereal disease.

The conscienceless profiteers who peddle this filth smugly declare that their perverted wares are meant only for sophisticated adult readers. But the facts give lie to this claim. On many occasions, unsolicited mailings of advertisements for obscene booklets and pictures are made to children.

Last year, for example, I received several letters from mothers in my congressional district protesting the unsolicited advertisement which their teenage sons had received through the mails. Some enclosed the materials. One was a highly suggestive brochure, advertising a book on ways for a single man to achieve a—quote—"satisfactory" sex life. There is no doubt that it was a come-on for pornographic materials.

Checking with the Post Office Department I learned that its officials had received numerous complaints about this ad and others from all over the country. The Post Office Department estimates that well over 1 million schoolchildren will get unsolicited obscene materials through the mail this year. The amount has been increasing annually.

As a major target of mail-order pornography, youngsters often are deluged with filth after merely answering an ad for gym equipment, acne pills, or foreign stamps. An 11-year-old girl in Kansas City, for example, ordered a phonograph record popular among teenagers and soon after was receiving foul circulars. A small boy sent 50 cents for a toy airplane. Not long after he received a photo of homosexual activity. An accompanying note asked, "Want to see more?"

Sometimes these cases have tragic results. Newsman Samuel Stafford in a series on the pornography problem for the Washington Daily News last year told the story of a 14-year-old boy who answered an ad for sports equipment, got hooked by an obscenity racketeer and was blackmailed into peddling pornography to his schoolmates. Postal inspectors later found in his home some of the most vile pornography they had ever seen.

One question which parents often ask of postal officials is: "How did this material come to be sent to my child?"

The answer in most cases is, because his name appeared on a mailing list used by a smut peddler. These mailing lists are compiled in a number of ways, but one seems to be most common. For example, a teenager enters a contest in a sporting magazine to win a motor scooter—all of it innocent enough. To defray the cost of the contest the magazine sells the names and addresses of the entrants to a mailing list broker.

The broker, in turn, is approached by a dealer in pornographic literature for a list of young single men under 20. The broker sells the contest entrants names, and our teenager is sent a come-on for obscene materials. If the boy is unfortunate enough to buy some materials from the dealer his name is likely to go on other mailing lists of other smut peddlers as a likely prospect for pornography.

Lists are also compiled from other sources such as telephone books, newspaper birth announcements, trade association directories, credit card files, rosters of department store customers, magazine circulation lists and from firms willing to rent their lists. In order to reach a market of young people, dealers in pornography have even gone so far as to purchase elementary and high school yearbooks, according to J. Edgar Hoover.

Recently the people of my own State of Wisconsin dramatically were made aware of the gutter world of mail-order pornography. It began when members of the Wisconsin Federation of Women's Clubs answered ads in several magazines found in drugstores, grocery stores, and teenage hangouts around the State to gather material for the Federation's campaign to strengthen laws against pornography. It ended with the disclosure of homosexual "pen pal" mail in the State and the arrest of one man.

Postal Inspector James P. Kelley, of Chicago, who conducted an investigation into the matter said that the amount of homosexual material being sent through the mails seems to be on the increase and more open. Of particular concern, he said, was that it was becoming easier for unknowing youngsters to get their names on mailing lists. He said:

> Anybody could be exposed to it. It's so insidious, it's like a cancer. Irate parents are daily sending the stuff to the post office.

Congress, reflecting this concern and alarm of parents, has been working for the past 15 years to stamp out the traffic in filth.

The first attempt came in 1950, during the 81st Congress, with the enactment of Public Law 81–531. This statute outlawed the transportation in interstate commerce of indecent materials, including motion pictures, letters, phonograph records, and printed matter.

This initial legislation was followed by an extensive investigation by a Senate subcommittee, headed by the late Senator Kefauver. Looking into juvenile delinquency, it found that obscene reading matter went hand in hand with the moral breakdown connected with juvenile delinquency. The filthy paperback, obscene cartoon books, and dirty pictures were found to be almost the sole reading material for many young offenders.

As a result of the Kefauver subcommittee disclosures and mounting public concern, the 86th Congress enacted the Impounding Act. This statute was designed to close loopholes against mailed pornography and gave postal authorities more legal muscle in curbing the dissemination of smutty materials through the mails. The law extended from 20 to 45 days the period during which the Post Office could impound obscene mail. It also placed the burden of proof upon the mailer that a post office injunction against his right to use the mails should not be sustained by the courts.

It was not long until it became obvious that even this law would not solve the problem. For that reason, in the 87th Congress, other statutes aimed at the smut peddlers were enacted. Post regulations were tightened and penalties for second offenses were made more stiff. Maximum penalties were set at $10,000 and 10 years in jail for a "two-time loser." In the past many first offenders were given a light fine and went right back into business. Today, with one conviction they are deterred from trafficking in obscenity again because of the stiff fine and jail sentence which may result.

Another provision written into the law allows the recipient of obscene mail to file a written request with the Post Office allowing its officials to detain and dispose of these materials.

In framing these statutes, Congress has been cognizant of two significant, restricting factors. First, the rights of individual citizens not to have their mail tampered with must be respected. After all, no one wants the Federal Government reading his private mail. Second, the rights of legitimate direct mailers must be respected. Many of them are religious and charitable organizations. Some measures to curb pornographic materials would also cripple the laudable efforts of these groups.

Armed with the legislative weapons which Congress has provided, the Post Office Department under Postmaster General Gronouski is today waging a vigorous campaign against the distribution of obscene materials through the mails. Depending upon the reports and complaints of postal patrons the Post Office is prosecuting those who are found to be mailing pornographic materials. The Post Office made 683 arrests during fiscal 1963. They obtained 565 convictions from these arrests—a laudable batting average.

As we have seen, however, the stream of smut through the mails has continued to widen. More—much more—needs to be done if we are to fully eradicate this grave threat to national health and welfare.

In this belief I began a study of the problem early last year. At that time pending before the House was a bill aimed at curbing mail-order pornography. Numbered H.R. 319, the legislation would have authorized anyone receiving mail which he deemed "morally offensive" to send it back to the Postmaster General who would then be obliged to notify the sender not to send any further mail of any sort whatever to the complaining recipient. If the sender violated this notice, a court order could be obtained against him and he could be punished for contempt of court.

There is no doubt that this bill was laudable in its aims and would have had some effect on the traffic in salacious literature. At the same time, however, its feasibility was questioned on three grounds:

First, since the determination of what was "morally offensive" was left to the postal patron himself, there might arise many cases of mail being found offensive by an individual which would be considered innocent by most people. For example, a postal patron of one religious belief might find it morally offensive to receive a publication of another denomination.

Second, carrying out the operation of the bill might have resulted in a heavy administrative burden for the Post Office Department. It undoubtedly would have required a significant number of new employees to take complaints, notify senders, and prosecute in the case of noncompliance.

Third, the mechanics of the mailing list business are so complex that it literally might be impossible for a sender to comply. Often lists are simply leased to a direct mailer for a single mailing. By the time an order to strike a recipient's name had been received, the list would have changed hands.

As a result of my study it became clear that any legislation aimed at curbing mail-order pornography should avoid the stigma of Federal censorship, should not place heavy administrative burdens on the Post Office Department and should not result in undue interference with legitimate direct mailers.

For those reasons, I believe that any new Federal legislation should be directed at the buying and selling of mailing lists. This is, so to speak, the "bottleneck" of a complicated and farflung industry. A little prevention here might eliminate the need for more drastic remedies elsewhere.

On April 28, 1964, I first announced my intentions of introducing legislation to regulate and review mailing list transactions and mailing list brokers. A story appeared in the daily press and elicited a gratifying response from interested persons around the country.

I was particularly pleased by the reaction of the direct mail advertisers themselves. For example, the Washington Newsletter of the Direct Mail Advertising Association reported that many members of the association volunteered that they would be quite willing to discuss in Washington my approach to the problem of mail-order pornography. The Mail Marketing Newsletter, another respected publication of the trade, gave its qualified endorsement to my proposal. In its July 1964 issue the newsletter said:

> Although we have not seen the legislation, we believe that Representative ZABLOCKI may have hit upon a practical means of discovering mailings that violate existing law prohibiting the mailing of pornographic material. There are literally thousands of small printers and lettershops whose activities are impossible to keep under surveillance, but there are relatively few firms in the list business. No mailing can take place without a list, and therefore providing for inspection at the point where sale or exchange of lists takes place offers the most practical means of eliminating pornographic mailings.
>
> We believe Representative ZABLOCKI's proposal offers more protection with less danger of damaging legitimate advertisers than the approach of Representative CUNNINGHAM, Republican, of Nebraska, which would permit the recipient to decide whether an individual mailing was "morally offensive" and to request that his name be removed from the mailer's list.

Subsequent to my announcement, Representative CUNNINGHAM's bill, H.R. 319, was reported from committee. Not wishing to appear to supersede it, I withheld introducing my proposal and continued to try to perfect it. As you know, Mr. Speaker the Cunningham bill, H.R. 319, later passed the House of Representatives on July 21. The Senate took no action, however, and it died with the adjournment of the 88th Congress.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I have introduced my bill and I earnestly request the attention of my colleagues to it. The text follows:

H.R. 3027

A bill to require the registration with the Postmaster General of the names of mailing list suppliers and buyers, and of transactions involving the sale or other exchange of mailing lists, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) chapter 53 of title 39, United States Code, relating to the several classes of mail, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"4061. Registration of mailing list suppliers, buyers, and transactions.

"(a) Each individual and each corporation, partnership, or other business organization or association buying, selling, leasing, renting, exchanging, or otherwise making available to others for profit, in the course of business, any list of addressees or similar mailing list shall furnish to the Postmaster General information in such form and detail, and at such times (but at least once a year), as the Postmaster General shall require, including, as the Postmaster General shall determine, the name of the individual, corporation, partnership or other business association or organization, the identity of individuals having a financial interest in any such organization or association (except holders of common stock), the responsible officers and employees thereof, the particulars of the transactions pertaining to such list of addressees or similar mailing list; and shall allow postal officials to see a copy of such list upon request.

"(b) The Postmaster General shall make appropriate rules and regulations to carry out the purposes of this section."

(b) The table of contents of such chapter 53 is amended by inserting

"4061. Registration of mailing list suppliers, buyers, and transactions."

immediately below

"4060. Foreign publications free from customs duty."

SEC. 2. (a) Chapter 83 of title 18, United States Code, relating to offenses against the postal service, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"1735. Mailing list suppliers, buyers, and transactions.

"Whoever, being required by section 4061 of title 39 to furnish information to the Postmaster General, fails or refuses to furnish such information as the Postmaster General shall require under such section, shall be fined not more than $3,000."

(b) The table of contents of such chapter 83 is amended by inserting:

"1735. Mailing list suppliers, buyers, and transactions."

immediately below

"1734. Editorials and other matter as 'advertisements'."

SEC. 3. The foregoing provisions of this Act shall become effective on the ninetieth day following the date of enactment of this Act.

This proposal, then, principally would accomplish three things: First, suppliers of mailing lists would be required to register with the Post Office Department. Second, buyers of mailing lists would be required to register with the Post Office Department. Third, all transactions in which lists of names are involved would have to be recorded for inspection by Department officials. Let us look more closely at each of these effects.

Suppliers of mailing lists may be divided into three principal categories. A list broker is an authority on what lists are available and how best they may be used in direct mailing. He is a middleman between the prospective list renter-user and the list owner. He earns a fee per thousand names from the list owner in return for locating prospective customers, securing orders, and making sure the transmittal procedure goes smoothly.

A list compiler is just what his name implies—he compiles lists of names and addresses from various sources. These names are either sold outright or rented on a one-time basis to users. A list owner is a man in any kind of business with a list to rent or sell. Often the owner is directly responsible for the addressing of the material sent to him by someone who buys the use of the list.

Under my bill, all three—brokers, compilers, and owners—would be required to register with postal authorities.

The bill would also affect those who buy mailing lists or buy the use of such lists through leasing or renting agreements. It would require the registration of every firm or individual which uses mailing lists supplied by someone else. Exempted would be those organizations which compile mailing lists for their own use, such as book clubs, charitable organizations, trade associations, and the like. As soon as one of these organizations sells a mailing list to someone else, of course, it and the purchaser would be required to register the transaction with the Post Office Department.

The recording of mailing list transactions is necessary if the Post Office Department is to be able to effectively check on the traffic in names. If these transactions records are available to Department officials they can more easily trace the sources of unsolicited pornography and mail-order smut.

Mr. Speaker, the bill calls for a $3,000 fine for failure to register as a buyer or seller of mailing lists, or for failure to record a particular transaction in which lists of addressees are involved. This will, in my opinion, give a powerful new weapon to the Post Office Department in stamping out the flow of smut through the mails. Legitimate operators will comply with registration procedures.

The distributor of pornography, however, is likely to be unwilling to give the Post Office Department the required information on his illicit business. It should not be too difficult to prove that he has bought or sold a mailing list as a part of his operation. He then would be liable to a fine of up to $3,000. It would not be necessary to prove that the materials he sent actually were obscene; he could be fined for failing to register as a buyer or seller of a mailing list or lists. Further because of the registration requirements, the Post Office Department could more easily trace the source of mailings brought to their attention by complaining postal patrons.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I would like to emphasize what my bill would not do.

First, it would not impose any kind of censorship. It does not call for determinations of what is offensive or obscene. It merely seeks to give to responsible authorities more information on the traffic in lists of addressees.

Second, the bill would not interfere with the operation of legitimate mailing list suppliers and buyers. Many of these conform to codes of ethics in their trade, and are careful about what kinds of materials are distributed to persons whose names are on their lists. The record which the firms would be required to keep under the bill are no different than those a business ordinarily has readily at hand.

Third, the bill would not eliminate mail-order pornography overnight, if enacted. It would require vigorous enforcement by the Post Office Department to stop irregularities in the transfer of mailing lists in order to shut the smut-peddlers off from their customary sources of names of potential customers. Prosecutions and other actions under already existing antiobscenity laws would have to be continued in order to attack the mail order pornography problem on a broad front.

I do not pretend that the bill which I have introduced today is the last word on the subject and cannot be perfected. For that reason I welcome the counsel and suggestions of my colleagues, of those directly interested in the mailing list and mail order industries, and of individuals and groups concerned about the rising tide of mail-order pornography. For that reason I am pleased to note that the Senate Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee plans to open hearings in February or March to investigate mail-order smut and the compilation and exchange of mailing lists that provide the market for dealers in pornography.

It is my hope that the subcommittee will examine the current situation closely, focus public attention on the problem and recommend effective solutions. In that regard, I hope to testify before the committee on my findings and on the remedial legislation which I have this day introduced.

The time has come, Mr. Speaker, for the Congress of the United States to act to protect our most precious heritage—our young people—from being corrupted and perverted by those malefactors whose greed and baseness causes them to spread the lewd and lacivious, the salacious and the obscene, to every corner of our Nation. It behooves us to act with dispatch. With each passing day more and more young people are faced with temptation which comes to them in the mail; more and more are touched by this corruption; more and more, I regret to say, fall into the hands of the smut peddlers.

In a very real sense, Mr. Speaker, the possibility of attaining the Great Society depends on this issue. It will never be achieved if our citizenry is riddled with perversion and erotic self-indulgence. Our goal can only be attained if Americans are self-disciplined and sustained by principles of morality and justice. Let us, therefore, determine that the 89th Congress will not adjourn without having taken effective action to clear pollution from our postal system.

PRESENT AND FUTURE HIGHWAY NEEDS OF THE NATION

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I have called for an immediate and comprehensive study of present and future highway needs of the Nation, and have introduced a bill, H.R. 2831, requiring the Secretary of Commerce to make a comprehensive study of the needs of the Federal-aid highway system, especially the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways. The report would be submitted to Congress not later than January 1, 1966.

There should be no lag between the completion of the presently authorized 41,000 miles of the Interstate System and inauguration of another program. Also, the growth of the population and its urban concentration since the program was first authorized, demands a resurvey now of present needs. In the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 the Congress declared it to be in the national interest to accelerate the construction of the Federal-aid highway systems, including the Interstate System. Subsequent law authorized funds to complete the 41,000-mile Interstate System in the year 1972. The Interstate System is so important that its rate of completion must be speeded up.

Lives are needlessly being lost because of inadequate highways. The Bureau of Public Roads estimated that with only 41 percent of the interstate mileage in use, the annual saving of lives is now 3,000. The Bureau of Public Roads estimated that in 1963 the interstate routes now in use prevented 60,000 injuries and 90,000 accidents.

We cannot afford not to accelerate the present program and to extend the system to other areas. Completion of the Interstate System earlier than the presently projected date of 1972 would be in the national interest as well as serving public convenience and necessity.

State and local funds finance 10 percent of costs of the Interstate System, with the remaining 90 percent financed out of a Federal highway trust fund made up of Federal excise taxes levied on highway users.

The longer we delay the construction of this highway, the more expensive it becomes to build. One of the major items is the cost of land acquisition which continues to increase with each passing year.

Of particular interest to Florida is I–75 which deadends in Tampa, which should have been in the original authorization. My first bill in the 89th Congress would extend I–75 to Miami, thus linking the two largest metropolitan areas in Florida.

The Florida State Road Department, chairmaned by Floyd Bowen, of Lakeland, has adopted a resolution endorsing and supporting my efforts to extend I–75 from Tampa, down the west coast, across to Miami.

NARCOTICS ADDICTION: A NEW FORMULA IS NEEDED

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 40 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I am here at this hour to concentrate upon the growing menace of narcotics addiction in the United States.

This problem has been with us for a long while. It is complex, not easily defined and measured in standard terms. I am convinced, from my experience in dealing with the subject, that the Federal Government can play an effective role in helping the States and local communities to meet the problem of drug abuse. I am equally convinced that without substantial changes in our approach to the issue, affecting treatment, law enforcement, and court procedure, the scourge of narcotics addiction cannot be rationally and successfully met.

In November of 1963, President Kennedy's Advisory Commission on Narcotics and Drug Abuse issued its final report. Many of its recommendations were termed revolutionary. While I do not subscribe to all of the Commission's proposals, its central approach and philosophic underpinning are the meat of any realistic attack upon the problem.

In the 87th Congress, I introduced a series of measures which, taken as a whole, would have revised official thinking. Since my earliest days here the multifaceted subject of narcotics addiction has drawn my concern.

The legislation which I have today introduced attempts to fuse many of the 1963 Commission proposals with previous legislative initiatives. I strongly urge that the 89th Congress come to grips with the issue, and I ask my colleagues to join in pressing for affirmative and meaningful action.

Although one of the Commission's notable conclusions was an awareness of the general dearth of statistical information, we do have sufficient knowledge to justify profound alterations in both the governmental and community approach to drug addiction.

We know a great many basic facts. Addiction is primarily city oriented. It infects mainly slum areas and exists predominantly among minority groups. The majority of addicts are teenagers and persons in their twenties; the affliction declines rapidly beyond the age 40 bracket.

Heroin is the choice among users. There are between 45,000 and 100,000 narcotic addicts in the country. Heroin is outlawed in the United States, so that dependence upon it results in international smuggling from opium plant producer countries; namely, Mexico, Bulgaria, Greece, Turkey, Yugoslavia, Russia, and Red China. We know that illegal processing laboratories exist in France and Italy.

The profits realized by gangsters and smugglers are enormous.

My own State of New York is particularly affected by this maze of illegal importation and human addiction. In 1962, the Subcommittee To Investigate Junvenile Delinquency of the Senate Judiciary Committee dealt deeply with the relationship between teenage crime and drug addiction. Police Commissioner Michael J. Murphy, of New York City, appearing before the subcommittee on September 30, indicated that in the first 6 months of 1962, 4.6 percent of all young people arrested in the city were admitted drug users. In the first half of 1962, 7 percent of all persons arrested in New York were admitted drug users. The hearings pointed to the probability that between 21 and 25 percent of all crime in New York resulted from the necessity to secure illicit drugs. In 1962, the Bureau of Narcotics estimated that 21,000 addicts live in New York.

These statistics are only part of the story. Not mentioned is the overwhelming damage to health and human resources which addiction brings in its wake. At the same time, the high degree of addiction among Negroes and other racial minorities suggests that the affliction is intimately related to poverty, ignorance, and the denial of opportunity. As amateur psychologists we cannot escape the realization that addiction will spread most rapidly where alternative courses of fulfillment are negligible or nonexistent.

Among the really young there are unquestionably a variety of motives. The "chicken" concept intrudes here, and the demand for "kicks" and excitement. Equally true is the underlying tendency of addiction among the abject poor, the frustrated and lonely castoffs who seek relief from the sameness and boredom of their daily existence.

The general philosophy of the 1963 Presidential Commission attempted to correct ill-founded cliches and to address the root causes of drug addiction. The Commission set forth its philosophy in three parts:

> 1. The illegal traffic in drugs should be attacked with the full power of the Federal Government. The price for participation in this traffic should be prohibitive. It should be made too dangerous to be attractive.
>
> 2. The individual abuser should be rehabilitated. Every possible effort should be exerted by all governments—Federal, State, and local—and by every community toward this end. Where necessary to protect society, this may have to be done at times against the abuser's will. Pertinent to all, the causes of drug abuse must be found and eradicated.
>
> 3. Drug users who violate the law by small purchases or sales should be made to recognize what society demands of them. In these instances, penalties should be applied according to the principles of our present code of justice. When the penalties involve imprisonment, however, the rehabilitation of the individual, rather than retributive punishment, should be the major objective.

In the legislation I have introduced, this approach is captured throughout. The first objective is to assist the States in establishing hospital facilities for the treatment, rehabilitation, and aftercare supervision of drug addicts.

In this bill we are not seeking splendid new hospitals for addicts. Many affected localities have adequate construction. I also agree with the Commission's feeling that to isolate the patients radically from all normal surroundings could be injurious to a treatment program.

Localities must submit thorough plans for rehabilitative efforts before the Federal Government will assist them financially. The burden rests upon local communities and the States. They must take the initiative. This provision was also incorporated into the legislation of prior sessions. The authority for the Federal Government to become a partner of the local bodies in meeting the addiction problem is a prime prerequisite of any meaningful proposal on narcotics.

This bill also emphasizes the importance of aftercare treatment. Cases prove that the rate of relapse among treated patients is fearfully high if adequate, long-term supervision is not provided.

The National Family Council on Drug Addiction, with headquarters in New York, recently made a study of followup care administered for 1 year among 300 addicts. They wanted to discover how effective posthospital care is in preventing recidivism. With respect to the addict, the Family Council warned:

> The strong emotional, compulsive drives, the feelings of inadequacy and dependence, the inability to cope with problems, to mention but a few patterns of behavior developed during his addication, are ever present and unless he is given proper followup care over a prolonged period of readjustment, he will inevitably return to the blurred dream world of narcotics, his only refuge of escape from the realities of life.

The council stated that any concentrated treatment plan which omits this factor is "doomed to failure."

Police Commissioner Murphy, of New York City, testified on September 20, 1962, before the Senate Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency, that to release addicts after treatment without adequate supervision destroys the whole rehabilitative effort.

Hence, the Federal endeavors in this field must involve not only assistance for the construction and operation of treatment centers, but also aid for the establishment of aftercare programs. After care facilities must be fused into the treatment center; for the rehabilitation of the addict the two areas are inseparable.

My second bill concerns the legal treatment of drug offenders. The approach is usually referred to as civil commitment. Also provided are revisions of current criminal penalties so that legal responses can be made to fit the gravity of varying drug abuses.

It is necessary to point out that allowance for civil commitment would be overbearing and somewhat inapplicable without the Federal assistance provided in my first bill.

Civil commitment is the instrument for rehabilitation featured in my approach to narcotics addiction. It means that we in society must differentiate between the criminal offender and the sick human being who feels compelled to use narcotics but is not engaged in the trade. It means that we believe that addicted persons, under a controlled environment and with adequate care, can overcome their dependence and assume a useful role in society.

There are, of course, a great many arguments in favor and against the theory that addicts can be cured. I am not a doctor of medicine, nor a psychologist. My position is that it is quite impossible to develop a flat thesis on the issue. Evidence suggests that most addicts under carefully predetermined conditions can be led back to normalcy. Experts have percentage figures on this, of course, and I do not dispute that there is always a relapse category.

But a certain amount of recidivism does not destroy the basis for rehabilitative efforts. The fact is that it can succeed among large numbers. And this is more than enough justification to incorporate within our statutes a civil commitment capability.

The purpose of my bill is to afford addicts an opportunity for treatment. This is to be federally recognized. In both New York and California civil commitment has been utilized as a legal mechanism in place of criminal punishment. The Commission on Narcotic and Drug Abuse, in its report, stated that both these State programs were too new to form a definitive judgment.

The Department of Justice has affirmed the constitutionality of civil commitment as practiced in New York. The President's Advisory Commission recommended that a Federal civil commitment statute be enacted to provide an alternative method of handling the Federal offender.

Under existing Federal statutes the rigidity is a barrier toward meeting the real problem of addiction. There is no room for option and maneuverability to judge cases in degree. Hence my legislation also seeks to revise statutory penalties in concert with the proposals of the President's Advisory Commission. Mandatory minimum sentences and a prohibition against both parole and probation for smugglers and sellers of the drugs is retained. For consumers apprehended for possession without the intent to sell, I am recommending that they be granted the option of submitting for treatment and rehabilitation during which their prosecution shall be held in abeyance.

No person is eligible for civil commitment if his offense involved the sale or transfer of narcotics; if there is pending a prior criminal charge against him; if he has been previously convicted of a felony; if he has already undergone civil commitment; or if the Surgeon General, certified that treatment facilities at hand are inadequate or otherwise unavailable. Moreover, the offender cannot be civilly committed to the custody of the Surgeon General if the court determines that his commitment would be contrary to the interest of justice.

And thus the discretion handed to the court in the prescribed cases of users is further limited. This legislation is not a reckless attempt to subvert law enforcement and due penalty. It does interpret a universally acknowledged thesis, which is the current inadequacy of both rehabilitative and legal methods.

For it is manifestly clear that we must also strengthen enforcement provisions. I continue to believe that rigorous application of the narcotics laws must form an important part of any general attack upon the addiction problem.

There is no doubt that the very stringent penalties, and the increasingly agile performance of investigative agents, serves as a deterrent to the trade. This aspect must be reenforced and we would be foolish to suppose a softening here is in order.

The smuggler and the pusher are criminals. To categorize them differently would cause infinite harm to every aspect of an enlightened and realistic approach to narcotics addiction.

In my view the Bureau of Narcotics and the Bureau of Customs, as well as the FBI, have performed superbly an immensely difficult task. At the same time, I think their tools must be updated and improved.

I am recommending that the number of Customs Bureau port investigators be increased by 100. These men are instrumental in attacking the smuggling of drugs into the country. I also propose that 50 additional personnel be authorized for the Bureau's force of criminal investigators.

The Bureau readily admits that its force is inadequate to meet its great responsibility. With personnel totaling 729, the Bureau must concentrate not only upon illegal drugs, but all illicit importation. The President's Advisory Commission concluded that under existing force levels, effective customs enforcement in narcotics is virtually impossible.

At the same time, I am of the opinion that the Bureau of Narcotics must be authorized additional strength. I propose that 50 more enforcement agent positions be earmarked for the Bureau.

I think these administrative adjustments will greatly enhance our law-enforcement capability in narcotics. There is convincing evidence that we are presently undermanned. In New York City, for instance, with an addict population which may reach 50,000, only 85 Federal narcotic agents are assigned. In Chicago the Bureau maintains 40 officials, despite the fact that this city is a major center of illegal drug shipment.

In conclusion, I would like the House to know that Mr. Henry L. Giordano, the very able Commissioner of Narcotics, agrees in principle with many of the legislative proposals I am asserting. He feels that a Federal civil commitment statute would be useful and recognizes the advantages and benefits of a Federal program to assist the States in meeting the problems of narcotics addiction.

Commissioner Giordano commented that aftercare treatment should be the responsibility of local communities and hence coordinated into the general construction and operations assistance. I subscribe to this view and have altered previous legislation authorizing the establishment of a special Federal program of posthospital care.

I ask that Commissioner Giordano's letter to me, dated November 16, 1964, be inserted into the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. His communication was in reply to my inquiry of October 22, 1964, seeking the Bureau's position on four bills I had introduced in the 88th Congress.

In the enforcement of narcotics laws, I have dealt with the need for additional personnel. But this will not wholly meet the difficulties confronting enforcement authorities. From expert advice I have become convinced that the Congress should authorize, under certain stringent conditions, the use of wiretapping in battling the international smuggling of illegal narcotic drugs.

The provision to this effect written into my bill is protective of individual freedoms. The legislation empowers a U.S. district court to authorize the use of wiretapping devices upon application by the Attorney General's office. Severe limitations are set forth in line with the criteria recommended by the President's Advisory Commission. The authorization is permitted only in cases involving the illegal importation of drugs; the device will be aimed solely at detecting and preventing the international smuggling combine. The court's authorization is subject to a definite duration of time and location, and any extension requires fresh processing.

This presentation has sketched a fresh and enlightened approach to narcotics addiction. We are indebted to the President's Advisory Commission on Narcotic and Drug Abuse, chaired by Judge E. Barrett Prettyman, for its commendable service in this field.

It is impossible to stress more strongly the need for new legislation. Narcotics addiction is a hideous evil with enormous adverse consequences to human health and social welfare. I want the Congress to recognize that existing statutes, and the philosophic approach which engendered them, are obsolete and increasingly incapable of meeting the criminal and medical conditions of drug abuse.

Each must decide on his own whether a Federal responsibility exists. I answered this long ago in the affirmative.

The legislation I am sponsoring does not seek a mammoth Federal bureaucracy to administer a special Federal program. On the contrary, we have learned that State and local officialdom is far more appropriate to the task. But we want to give these bodies the necessary framework and assistance so that they launch their own plans.

I fervently urge that the House devote its attention to the bitter contagion of narcotics addiction during this session. We cannot be satisfied now with anything less than concrete, positive action.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The House will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 48 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 1 o'clock and 41 minutes p.m.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

NATIONAL DEFENSE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 54)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

One hundred and seventy-five years ago, in his first annual message, President Washington told the Congress:

> Among the many interesting objects which will engage your attention that of providing for the common defense will merit particular regard. To be prepared for war is one of the most effectual means of preserving peace.

For the 89th Congress—as for the 1st Congress—those words of the first President remain a timely charge.

In the 20th year since the end of mankind's most tragic war you and I are beginning new terms of service. The danger of war remains ever with us. But if the hope of peace is sturdier than at any other time in these two decades, it is because we—and freemen everywhere—have proved preparedness to be "the most effectual means of preserving peace."

Arms alone cannot assure the security of any society or the preservation of any peace. The health and education of our people, the vitality of our economy, the equality of our justice, the vision and fulfillment of our aspirations are all factors in America's strength and well-being.

Today we can walk the road of peace because we have the strength we need. We have built that strength with courage. We have employed it with care. We have maintained it with conviction that the reward of our resolution will be peace and freedom.

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

We covet no territory, we seek no dominion, we fear no nation, we despise no people. With our arms we seek to shelter the peace of mankind.

In this spirit, then, I wish to consider with you the state of our defenses, the policies we pursue, and—as Commander in Chief—to offer recommendations on our course for the future.

I. THE STATE OF OUR DEFENSES

I am able to report to you that the United States today is stronger militarily than at any other time in our peacetime history.

Under our free and open society, the American people have succeeded in building a strength of arms greater than that ever assembled by any other nation and greater now than that of any combination of adversaries.

This strength is not the handiwork of any one administration. Our force in being and in place reflects the continuity and constancy of America's purpose under four administrations and eight Congresses—and this responsible conduct of our system is, of itself, a source of meaningful strength.

For the past 4 years, the focus of our national effort has been upon assuring an indisputable margin of superiority for our defenses. I can report today that effort has succeeded.

Our strategic nuclear power on alert has increased threefold in 4 years.

Our tactical nuclear power has been greatly expanded.

Our forces have been made as versatile as the threats to peace are various.

Our special forces, trained for the undeclared, twilight wars of today, have been expanded eightfold.

Our combat-ready Army divisions have been increased by 45 percent.

Our Marine Corps has been increased by 15,000 men.

Our airlift capacity to move these troops rapidly anywhere in the world has been doubled.

Our tactical Air Force firepower to support these divisions in the field has increased 100 percent.

This strength has been developed to support our basic military strategy—a strategy of strength and readiness, capable of countering aggression with appropriate force from ballistic missiles to guerrilla bands.

Our forces are balanced and ready, mobile and diverse. Our allies trust our strength and our adversaries respect it. But the challenge is unceasing. The forms of conflict become more subtle and more complex every day. We must—and we shall—adapt our forces and our tactics to fulfill our purposes.

If our military strength is to be fully usable in times requiring adaptation and response to changing challenges, that strength must be so organized and so managed that it may be employed with planned precision as well as promptness.

The state of our defenses is enhanced today because we have established an orderly system for informed decisionmaking and planning.

Our planning and budgeting programs are now conducted on a continuing 5-year basis and cover our total military requirements.

Our national strategy, military force structure, contingency plans, and defense budget are all now related in an integrated plan.

Our orderly decisionmaking now combines our best military judgment with the most advanced scientific and analytical techniques.

Our military policy under the Secretary of Defense is now more closely tied than ever to the conduct of foreign policy under the Secretary of State.

Thus, we now have the ability to provide and maintain a balanced, flexible military force, capable of meeting the changing requirements of a constantly changing challenge.

II. BASIC DEFENSE POLICIES

First. Four years ago, President John F. Kennedy stated to the Congress and the world:

> The primary purpose of our arms is peace, not war.

That is still their purpose. We are armed, not for conquest, but to insure our own security and to encourage the settlement of international differences by peaceful processes.

We are not a militaristic people, and we have long denounced the use of force in pursuit of national ambition. We seek to avoid a nuclear holocaust in which there can be neither victory nor victors. But we shall never again return to a world where peace-loving men must stand helpless in the path of those who, heedless of destruction and human suffering, take up war and oppression in pursuit of their own ambitions.

Second. The strength of our strategic retaliatory forces must deter nuclear attack on the United States or our allies.

The forces we now have give that capability.

The United States has more than 850 land-based intercontinental ballistic missiles; more than 300 nuclear-armed missiles in Polaris submarines; more than 900 strategic bombers, half of them ready at all times to be airborne within 15 minutes.

These strategic forces on alert are superior—in number and in quality—to those of any other nation.

To maintain our superiority, the immediate future will see further increases in our missile strength, as well as concentration on further technological improvements and continuing vigorous research and development.

We are—

Requesting more than $300 million to continue our program for extending the life and improving the capabilities of our B-52 strategic bombers, while eliminating two squadrons of B-52B's, the earliest—and least effective—model of this plane.

Continuing development of engines and other systems for advanced aircraft to retain our option for a new manned bomber, should the need arise.

Continuing deployment of the SR-71, the world's fastest airplane, which will enter the Active Forces this year.

Continuing installation of the new over-the-horizon radars, giving us almost instantaneous knowledge of ballistic missiles launched for attack.

Continuing procurement and deployment of our latest strategic missiles, Minuteman II and Polaris A-3, greatly extending the range, accuracy, and striking power of the strategic forces.

Replacing older, more costly, and vulnerable elements of our strategic forces. The outdated Atlas and Titan I missiles will be retired this year and the remainder of the B-47 forces will be phased out during fiscal year 1966.

All this is part of a continuing process. There will be always be changes, replacing the old with the new.

Major new developments in strategic weapon systems we propose to begin this year are:

A new missile system, the Poseidon, to increase the striking power of our missile-carrying nuclear submarines. The Poseidon missile will have double the payload of the highly successful Polaris A-3. The increased accuracy and flexibility of the Poseidon will permit its use effectively against a broader range of possible targets and give added insurance of penetration of enemy defenses.

A series of remarkable new payloads for strategic missiles. These include: penetration aids, to assure that the missile reaches its target through any defense; guidance and reentry vehicle designs, to increase manifold the effectiveness of our missiles against various kinds of targets; and methods of reporting the arrival of our missiles on target, up to and even including the time of explosion.

A new short-range attack missile—SRAM—that can, if needed, be deployed operationally with the B-52 or other bombers. This aerodynamic missile—a vast improvement over existing systems—would permit the bomber to attack a far larger number of targets and to do so from beyond the range of their local defenses.

Third. The strength, deployment, and mobility of our forces must be such that, combined with those of our allies, they can prevent the erosion of the free world by limited, nonnuclear aggression.

Our nonnuclear forces must be strong enough to insure that we are never limited to nuclear weapons alone as our sole option in the face of aggression. These forces must contribute to our strategy of responding flexibly and appropriately to varied threats to peace.

I have already cited the increases achieved during recent years in the strength and mobility of our Army, Navy, Marines, and of our air transport which gets them to the scene of battle and the tactical aircraft which support them there. These forces, furthermore, are now better balanced, better integrated, and under more effective command and control than ever before. We shall maintain our present high degree of readiness.

We must further improve our ability to concentrate our power rapidly in a threatened area, so as to halt aggression early and swiftly. We plan expansion of our airlift, improvement of our sealift, and more prepositioned equipment to enable us to move our troops overseas in a matter of days, rather than weeks.

To this end, we will:

Start development of the C–5A cargo transport. This extraordinary aircraft capable of carrying 750 passengers will bring a new era of air transportation. It will represent a dramatic step forward in the worldwide mobility of our forces and in American leadership in the field of aviation.

Build fast deployment cargo ships, capable of delivering military equipment quickly to any theater. This represents a new concept in the rapid deployment of military forces. These ships will have a gas turbine engine propulsion system, a major advance in marine engineering for ships of this size. Such vessels will be deployed around the globe, able to begin deliveries of heavy combat-ready equipment into battle zone within days or even hours.

Increase our forward floating depot ships stationed close to areas of potential crisis.

Begin large-scale procurement of the revolutionary sweptwing F–111 and the new A–7 Navy attack aircraft.

We will also begin construction of four new nuclear-powered attack submarines, and 10 new destroyer escorts. And we will continue to develop a much smaller, more efficient, nuclear powerplant for possible use in our future aircraft carriers.

Fourth. While confident that our present strength will continue to deter a thermonuclear war, we must always be alert to the possibilities for limiting destruction which might be inflicted upon our people, cities, and industry—should such a war be forced upon us.

Many proposals have been advanced for means of limiting damage and destruction to the United States in the event of a thermonuclear war. Shifting strategy and advancing technology make the program of building adequate defenses against nuclear attack extremely complex.

Decisions with respect to further limitation of damage require complex calculations concerning the effectiveness of many interrelated elements. Any comprehensive program would involve the expenditure of tens of billions of dollars. We must not shrink from any expense that is justified by its effectiveness, but we must not hastily expend vast sums on massive programs that do not meet this test.

It is already clear that without fallout shelter protection for our citizens, all defense weapons lose much of their effectiveness in saving lives. This also appears to be the least expensive way of saving millions of lives, and the one which has clear value even without other systems. We will continue our existing programs and start a program to increase the total inventory of shelters through a survey of private homes and other small structures.

We shall continue the research and development which retains the options to deploy an antiballistic missile system, and manned interceptors and surface-to-air missiles against bombers.

Fifth. Our military forces must be so organized and directed that they can be used in a measured, controlled, and deliberate way as a versatile instrument to support our foreign policy.

Military and civilian leaders alike are unanimous in their conviction that our armed might is and always must be so controlled as to permit measured response in whatever crises may confront us.

We have made dramatic improvements in our ability to communicate with and command our forces, both at the national level and at the level of the theater commanders. We have established a national military command system, with the most advanced electronic and communications equipment, to gather and present the military information necessary for top-level management of crises and to assure the continuity of control through all levels of command. Its survival under attack is insured by a system of airborne, shipborne and other command posts, and a variety of alternative protected communications.

We have developed and procured the postattack command control system of the Strategic Air Command, to assure continued control of our strategic forces following a nuclear attack.

We have installed new safety procedures and systems designed to guarantee that our nuclear weapons are not used except at the direction of the highest national authority.

This year we are requesting funds to extend similar improvements in the survivability and effectiveness of our command and control to other commands in our oversea theaters.

Sixth. America will continue to be first in the use of science and technology to insure the security of its people.

We are currently investing more than $6 billion per year for military research and development. Among other major developments, our investment has recently produced antisatellite systems that can intercept and destroy armed satellites that might be launched, and such revolutionary new aircraft as the F–111 fighter-bomber and the SR–71 supersonic reconnaissance aircraft. Our investment has effected an enormous improvement in the design of antiballistic missile systems. We will pursue our program for the development of the Nike X antimissile system, to permit deployment of this antiballistic missile should the national security require. Research will continue on even more advanced antimissile components and concepts.

About $2 billion a year of this program is invested in innovations in technology and in experimental programs. Thus, we provide full play for the ingenuity and inventiveness of the best scientific and technical talent in our Nation and the free world.

American science, industry, and technology are foremost in the world. Their resources represent a prime asset to our national security.

Seventh. Our soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines, from whom we ask so much, are the cornerstone of our military might.

The success of all our policies depends upon our ability to attract, develop fully, utilize and retain the talents of outstanding men and women in the military services. We have sought to improve housing conditions for military families and educational opportunities for military personnel.

Since 1961, we have proposed—and the Congress has authorized—the largest military pay increases in our history, totaling more than $2 billion.

To insure that the pay of military personnel, and indeed of all Government employees, retains an appropriate relation to the compensation of other elements of our society, we will review their pay annually. The procedures for this review will be discussed in my budget message.

It is imperative that our men in uniform have the necessary background and training to keep up with the complexities of the ever-changing military, political, and technical problems they face each day. To insure this, the Secretary of Defense is undertaking a study of military education to make certain that the education available to our service men and women at their academies, at their war colleges, and at the command and staff colleges, is excellent in its quality.

In recent years large numbers of volunteers have been rejected by the military services because of their failure to meet certain mental or physical standards, even though many of their deficiencies could have been corrected. To broaden the opportunity for service and increase the supply of potentially qualified volunteers, the Army is planning to initiate an experimental program of military training, education, and physical rehabilitation for men who fail at first to meet minimum requirements for service. This pilot program, which will involve about 10,000 men in 1965, will establish how many of these young volunteers can be upgraded so as to qualify for service.

Eighth. Our citizen-soldiers must be the best organized, best equipped reserve forces in the world. We must make certain that this force, which has served our country so well from the time of the Revolution to the Berlin and Cuban crises of recent years, keeps pace with the changing demands of our national security.

To this end, we are taking steps to realine our Army Reserves and National Guard to improve significantly their combat readiness and effectiveness in times of emergency. This realinement will bring our Army Reserve structure into balance with our contingency war plans and will place all remaining units of the Army Reserve forces in the National Guard. At the same time, by eliminating units for which there is no military requirement, we will realize each year savings approximating $150 million. Under our plan, all units will be fully equipped with combat-ready equipment and will be given training in the form of monthly weekend drills that will greatly increase their readiness. Under the revised organization, both the old and the new units of the National Guard, as well as individual trainees who remain in the Reserves, will make a much greater and continuing contribution to our national security.

We shall continue to study our reserve forces and take whatever action is necessary to increase their combat effectiveness.

Ninth. The Commander in Chief and the Secretary of Defense must continue to receive the best professional military advice available to the leaders of any government in the world.

The importance of a strong line of command running from the Commander in Chief to the Secretary of Defense and the Joint Chiefs of Staff to the unified and specified commanders in the field has been repeatedly demonstrated during recent years.

The Secretary of Defense will present to you certain recommendations to strengthen the Joint Staff.

Tenth. We will strengthen our military alliances, assist freedom-loving peoples, and continue our military assistance program.

It is essential to continue to strengthen our alliances with other free and independent nations. We reaffirm our unwavering determination that efforts to divide and conquer freemen shall not be successful in our time. We shall continue to assist those who struggle to preserve their own independence.

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization is a strong shield against aggression. We reaffirm our belief in the necessity of unified planning and execution of strategy. We invite our NATO allies to work with us in developing better methods for mutual consultation and joint strategic study. We shall continue to seek ways to bind the alliance even more strongly together by sharing the tasks of defense through collective action.

We shall continue our program of military and economic assistance to allies elsewhere in the world and to those nations struggling against covert aggression in the form of externally directed, undeclared guerrilla warfare.

In southeast Asia, our program remains unchanged. From 1950, the United States has demonstrated its commitment to the freedom, independence, and neutrality of Laos by strengthening the economic and military security of that nation. The problem of Laos is the refusal of the Communist forces to honor the Geneva accords into which they entered in 1962. We shall continue to support the legitimate Government of that country. The Geneva accords established the right of Laos to be left alone in peace.

Similarly, the problem of Vietnam is the refusal of Communist forces to honor their agreement in 1954. The North Vietnam regime, supported by the Chinese Communists, has openly and repeatedly avowed its intention to destroy the independence of the Republic of Vietnam through massive, ruthless, and incessant guerrilla terrorism against government and people alike.

Our purpose, under three American Presidents, has been to assist the Vietnamese to live in peace, free to choose both their own way of life and their own foreign policy. We shall continue to honor our commitments in Vietnam.

PRINCIPLES OF DEFENSE MANAGEMENT

First. To carry out our strategy and enforce our policies requires a large budget for defense.

The world's most affluent society can surely afford to spend whatever must be spent for its freedom and security. We shall continue to maintain the military forces necessary for our security without regard to arbitrary or predetermined budget ceilings. But we shall continue to insist that those forces be procured at the lowest possible cost and operated with the greatest possible economy and efficiency.

To acquire and maintain our unprecedented military power, we have been obliged to invest more than one-half of every dollar paid in taxes to the Federal Government. The defense budget has grown from $43 billion in fiscal year 1960 to more than $51 billion in fiscal year 1964. I now estimate the defense expenditures for fiscal year 1965 to be about $49.3 billion, or approximately $2 billion less than in fiscal year 1964. I further estimate that defense expenditures for fiscal year 1966 will be reduced still another $300 million.

There are two main reasons for this leveling off in defense expenditures:

First, we have achieved many of the needed changes and increases in our military force structure; second, we are now realizing the benefits of the rigorous cost reduction program introduced into the Defense Establishment during the past 4 years.

As I have stated—and as our enemies well know—this country now possesses a range of credible, usable military power enabling us to deal with every form of military challenge from guerrilla terrorism to thermonuclear war. Barring a significant shift in the international situation, we are not likely to require further increments on so large a scale during the next several years. Expenditures for defense will thus constitute a declining portion of our expanding annual gross national product, which is now growing at the rate of 5 percent each year. If, over the next several years, we continue to spend approximately the same amount of dollars annually for our national defense that we are spending today, an ever larger share of our expanding national wealth will be free to meet other vital needs, both public and private.

Let me be clear, however, to friend and foe alike. So long as I am President, we shall spend whatever is necessary for the security of our people.

Second. Defense expenditures in the years ahead must continue to be guided by the relentless pursuit of efficiency and intelligent economy.

There is no necessary conflict between the need for a strong defense and the principles of economy and sound management. If we are to remain strong, outmoded weapons must be replaced by new ones; obsolete equipment and installations must be eliminated; costly duplication of effort must be eliminated.

We are following this policy now, and so long as I am President, I intend to continue to follow this policy.

We have recently announced the consolidation, reduction, or discontinuance of defense activities in some 95 locations. When added to those previously completed, these actions will produce annual savings of more than $1 billion each year, every year, in the operations of the Defense Department, and release about 1,400,000 acres of land for civilian purposes. These economies—which represent more prudent and effective allocation of our resources—have not diminished the strength and efficiency of our defense forces, but rather have enhanced them.

We are the wealthiest nation in the world and the keystone of the largest alliance of free nations in history. We can, and will, spend whatever is necessary to preserve our freedom. But we cannot afford to spend 1 cent more than is necessary, for there is too much waiting to be done, too many other pressing needs waiting to be met. I urge the Congress to support our efforts to assure the American people a dollar's worth of defense for every dollar spent.

Third. While our primary goal is to maintain the most powerful military force in the world at the lowest possible cost, we will never be unmindful of those communities and individuals who are temporarily affected by changes in the pattern of defense spending.

Men and women, who have devoted their lives and their resources to the needs of their country, are entitled to help and consideration in making the transition to other pursuits.

We will continue to help local communities by mobilizing and coordinating all the resources of the Federal Government to overcome temporary difficulties created by the curtailment of any defense activity. We will phase out unnecessary defense operations in such a way as to lessen the impact on any community, and we will work with local communities to develop energetic programs of self-help, calling on the resources of State and local governments—and of private industry—as well as those of the Federal Government.

There is ample evidence that such measures can succeed. Former military bases are now in use throughout the country in communities which have not only adjusted to necessary change, but have created greater prosperity for themselves as a result. Their accomplishments are a tribute to the ingenuity of thousands of our citizens, and a testimony to the strength and resiliency of our economy and our system of government.

Fourth. We must continue to make whatever changes are necessary in our Defense Establishment to increase its efficiency and to insure that it keeps pace with the demands of an ever-changing world; we must continue to improve the decisionmaking process by those in command.

The experience of several years has shown that certain activities of the Defense Establishment can be conducted not only with greater economy, but far more effectively when carried out on a departmentwide basis, either by a military department as executive agent or by a defense agency. The Defense Communications Agency, established in 1959, and the Defense Supply Agency and the Defense Intelligence Agency, established in 1961, have all eliminated duplication of effort, improved management, and achieved better fulfillment of their missions. In addition, we have recently announced:

Consolidation of the Field Contract Administration offices of the Military Department under the Defense Supply Agency.

Formation of the Department of Defense Contract Audit Agency, to increase the efficiency and lower the cost of Government auditing of defense contracts.

Formation of the Traffic Management and Terminal Command, under the single management of the Department of the Army, to regulate surface transportation of military cargo and personnel within the continental United States.

Each of these actions will lead to better performance, surer control, and less cost. Most important, these actions are informing and expediting the decision-making process. We will continue to seek out opportunities to further increase the effectiveness and efficiency of our Defense Establishment.

CONCLUSION

The Secretary of Defense will soon come before you with our detailed proposals for the coming year. He will have recommendations for further strengthening of our strategic forces and our conventional forces. He will have additional suggestions for achieving greater efficiency, and therefore greater economy.

As you consider the state of our defenses and form your judgments as to our future course, I know that you will do so in the knowledge that today we Americans are responsible not only for our own security but, in concert with our Allies, for the security of the free world. Upon our strength and our wisdom rests the future not only of our American way of life, but that of the whole society of freemen.

This is an awesome responsibility. So far, we have borne it well. As our strength rose—and largely as a consequence of that strength—we have been able to take encouraging steps toward peace. We have established an Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. We have signed a limited nuclear test ban agreement with the Soviet Union. We have, at the same time, met the challenge of force, unflinchingly, from Berlin to Cuba. In each case, the threat has receded and international tensions have diminished.

In a world of 120 nations, there are still great dangers to be faced. As old threats are turned back, change and turmoil will present new ones. The vigilance and courage we have shown in the last 20 years must be sustained as far ahead as we can see. The defense of freedom remains our duty—24 hours a day and every day of the year.

We cannot know the future and what it holds. But all our experience of two centuries reminds us that "To be prepared for war is one of the most effectual means of preserving peace."

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 18, 1965*.

MISUSE OF OUR AID PROGRAM

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, in the last few years, this House has voiced concern about the misuse of our aid program in countries which pursue foreign policies in conflict with our own.

No one really expects that governments who benefit from our aid will permit us to dictate their foreign policies. But this does not mean that we must transform ourselves into mechanical dollar-dispensing machines, that aid must continue without some consideration for its overall effect on our objectives.

I refer to countries which fail to observe their obligations to the U.N. Charter and which pursue aggressive policies toward their neighbors. It is obvious that such countries are not entitled to any generosity from us. We do not wish to underwrite preparations for aggression.

Prime examples are Indonesia and Egypt. Indonesia has announced its withdrawal from the United Nations and it menaces its neighbor, Malaysia.

Egypt, along with Algeria, is boasting of its assistance to the rebels in the Congo. It is providing arms and other assistance to forces which are conducting a savage civil war against a legally constituted government. There is nothing new about this. Egypt refused to cooperate with the U.N. in the Congo after that country became independent. It has persisted in a steady campaign to incite the Congolese people against Europeans and Americans. It takes a similar attitude in other African countries. This tends to undermine our influence in Africa and at the same time to enhance the prestige and popularity of the Soviet Union and Communist China.

Our indictment against Egypt has many counts.

It arms the rebels in the Congo. It uses Sudan as a conduit for that purpose.

It employs German scientists to build a military machine.

It acquires large-scale Soviet military supplies, and it forces all its neighbors to be involved in a dangerous and costly arms race.

It demands the removal of the U.S. base in Libya.

It harasses the British in Aden. It menaces Saudi Arabia.

In violation of its promise to withdraw its troops, it keeps more than 40,000 soldiers in Yemen.

It threatens the destruction of Israel.

It preaches nationalization, and Syria, Iraq, and other Arab countries are adopting its policies, which are directed against free enterprise and investment.

Its air force shoots down a U.S. civilian plane, killing two crewmen.

Its street mobs destroy our USIS library.

And finally, its President, Colonel Nasser, tells us to "go to hell" with our aid, even while he presses us to increase it.

No wonder the people of our country are becoming indignant about a policy which provides for a continuation of U.S. aid to Egypt without question or condition, regardless of what Egypt does.

This opposition to aid to Egypt is not confined to any section of our country or any segment of its opinion.

It is a national consensus. I hope the administration will take note of it.

Editors in many newspapers around the United States have called for a revision of this policy. A recent issue of the Near East Report summarized editorials from more than 40 newspapers in many cities.

I would like to offer this article for the RECORD:

AN AVALANCHE OF ANGER IN NEW YORK

"The Nasser declaration makes it impossible for the United States to escape a recognition that the millions of dollars in surplus foods this country sends to Egypt operate—by freeing Egyptian funds—as an indirect subsidy in helping it carry out its policy of international disruption * * *. The United States does not provide aid * * * as a means of undermining world peace or enabling foreign adventurers to interfere in the affairs of their neighbors by military or other means."—The New York Times, December 25, 1964.

"What really matters is his public attack on international order made in the presence, if not with the encouragement, of the visiting Soviet Deputy Premier."—New York Herald Tribune, December 28.

"When our good and old friends Great Britain and France decided to take over the Suez Canal, we badly ruffled our allies' feelings. But did we get any credit or thanks or make a friend of Nasser? No, indeed.

"So let us leave Nasser alone, as he demands. We can and should cut off economic aid to him. Let Nasser turn to the Congo rebels for his food supply. And the same goes for Algeria and other nations whose dictators play the same game."—New York Journal-American, December 28.

The News told its huge circulation that Nasser and Ben Bella should be thrown off the "gravy train." It asked, "Is it any wonder that U.S. world prestige is skidding to an alltime low?"

The Post reaffirmed the view that American assistance should be primarily based on human need rather than employed as a diplomatic club. But it added: "When the recipient publicly scorns such assistance and fills the air with hymns of hate, he is visibly inviting reprisals."

SBA DECENTRALIZATION PROGRAM IS A PROGRESSIVE STEP

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, another important step toward provision of more effective Federal assistance to American small business has been taken with a major decentralization of the Small Business Administration, recently announced by the SBA's Administrator, Mr. Eugene P. Foley.

As chairman of the House Small Business Committee, I heartily commend Mr. Foley on the skill and judgment he has shown in formulating this reorganization, which will effect important economies as well as bring the SBA program closer to the people they serve.

Under this program, 48 branch offices of the SBA in 41 States, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia are being elevated to regional status and given authority to make decisions now being made at a higher level.

Economies that will be realized through this decentralization are estimated at $1 million a year.

Mr. Foley announced that the hub of the decentralization will be eight area offices set up in eight cities to provide general supervision and program guidance to States in their areas. These area offices will be located in Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Atlanta, Chicago, Dallas, Denver, and San Francisco. All present SBA branch offices will become regional offices.

The decentralization process is expected to be completed by June 30. After the transition is in full effect, the SBA's Washington office will handle program planning, evaluation, and policy development. Then it will be possible for each regional SBA office to take any loan action pursuant to the Small Business Act that the Washington office formerly could have performed.

Mr. Speaker, I desire to add that Administrator Foley has consistently shown conspicuous initiative, imagination, and ability in his conduct of the Small Business Administration.

DEDUCTION FOR EVACUATION EXPENSES INCURRED DURING NATURAL DISASTERS

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Thompson] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a deduction for evacuation expenses incurred during natural disasters. I believe it is of the utmost importance that this bill receive early and favorable consideration. Each year there are thousands of people who must, in order to protect their lives, evacuate their homes when a natural disaster is imminent. In my district, these disasters usually take the form of hurricanes, and almost every year people residing along the Louisiana coastline are ordered to evacuate at some time during the hurricane season. All of you well remember the tragic disaster that was caused by Hurricane Audrey in 1956 when hundreds of people in my district were killed. Fortunately, when Hurricane Hilda ripped across the Louisiana coastline in 1964, thousands of lives were saved because evacuation was effected in time. Recently in California, countless people were forced to evacuate because of the horrendous floods, and, of course, numerous other examples could be cited.

My bill would allow these people to deduct all ordinary and necessary expenses in connection with evacuation when such disasters occur. I would like to see us correct the inequity which presently exists by making it possible for them to deduct these expenses for tax purposes.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. Krebs (at the request of Mr. McGrath), for the week of January 18, 1965, on account of death in family.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Patman, for 30 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. Halpern (at the request of Mr. Talcott), for 40 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Rumsfeld (at the request of Mr. Talcott), for 30 minutes, on Wednesday, February 3; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. O'Hara of Illinois.

Mr. Gray and to include a speech by the Honorable John A. Blatnik, of Minnesota.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Talcott) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Bell.

Mr. Bates.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Scheuer) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Price.

Mr. Holifield.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Hungate) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Evins of Tennessee in three instances.

Mr. Fraser.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, January 19, 1965, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

357. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act, as amended, in order to increase the authorization for appropriation" (H. Doc. No. 55); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

358. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting report on the audit of the financial statements of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation for the year ended December 31, 1963, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 841 (H. Doc. No. 56); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

359. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on savings in interest costs to the Government attainable by greater use of Treasury checking account, Federal Home Loan Bank of San Francisco, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 841 (H. Doc. No. 57); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

360. A letter from the Director, Legislative Commission, the American Legion, transmitting a report on the proceedings of the 46th Annual National Convention of the American Legion, pursuant to Public Law 77–249 (H. Doc. No. 58); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

361. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting the annual report on the status of training of each Reserve component of the Armed Forces and the progress made in strengthening of the Reserve components during fiscal year 1964, pursuant to section 279 of title 10, United States Code; to the Committee on Armed Services.

362. A letter from the Director of Civil Defense, Office of the Secretary of the Army, Department of the Army, transmitting report on property acquisitions of emergency supplies and equipment for quarter ended December 31, 1964, covering items acquired under Executive Order 10952, pursuant to subsection 201(h) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

363. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for the transportation of severely handicapped children to schools or classes established for their use in the school system of the District of Columbia"; to the Committee on District of Columbia.

364. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on erroneous payments made for military pay, leave, and travel at Elmendorf Air Force Base, Alaska, Department of the Air Force; to the Committee on Government Operations.

365. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on illegal obligation of expired fiscal year 1964 appropriations, Department of State; to the Committee on Government Operations.

366. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on weaknesses and problem areas in the administration of the imported fire ant eradication program, Agricultural Research Service, Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Government Operations.

367. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed concession contract with the Brandy Creek Marina Corp. to provide services, etc., at the Whiskeytown Reservoir Area, Calif., pursuant to 67 Stat.

271 as amended by 70 Stat. 543; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

368. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report of receipt of a project proposal, the Kays Creek Irrigation Co. of Layton, Utah, pursuant to section 10 of the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

369. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report on matters contained in the Helium Act for fiscal year 1964, pursuant to Public Law 86–777; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

370. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a report of the activities under title XIII of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as of December 31, 1964, relative to providing aviation war risk insurance, pursuant to the act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

371. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the 52d Annual Report of the Secretary of Commerce for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1964, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 604; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

372. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to promote economic growth by supporting State and regional centers to place the findings of science usefully in the hands of American enterprise"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

373. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 1403 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to perfect certain provisions of the International Aviation Facilities Act"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

374. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases in which the authority contained in section 212(d)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act was exercised in behalf of such aliens, including names and dates of orders, pursuant to section 212(d)(6) of the act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

375. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered under the authority contained in section 13(b) of the act of September 11, 1957, as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to section 13(c) of the act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

376. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of the orders entered in the cases of certain aliens found admissible to the United States, pursuant to section 212(a)(28)(I)(ii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

377. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for the appointment of four additional circuit judges for the fifth circuit on a temporary basis"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

378. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 1825 of title 28 of the United States Code to authorize the payment of witness' fees in habeas corpus cases and in proceedings to vacate sentence under section 2255 of title 28, for persons who are authorized to proceed in forma pauperis"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

379. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to increase the fees of jury commissioners in the U.S. courts"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

380. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for the measurement of the gross and net tonnages for certain vessels having two or more decks and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

381. A letter from the Director, U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, transmitting the annual report for calendar year 1964 on 14 scientific or professional positions authorized for establishment in the Agency, pursuant to Public Law 313, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

382. A letter from the Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes"; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAMS:

H.R. 2941. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H.R. 2942. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the manufacturers' excise tax on household-type hot water heaters; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H.R. 2943. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that monthly benefits based on age may be paid at age 55 rather than only at age 62 (subject to the existing actuarial reduction in the amount of such benefits in certain cases); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2944. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to reduce from 72 to 70 the age at which deductions on account of an individual's outside earnings will cease to be made from benefits based on such individual's wage record; to the Committee on Ways and Means

H.R. 2945. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase from 18 to 22, in the case of a child attending school, the age until which child's insurance benefits may be paid thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 2946. A bill to amend the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, with respect to the manner of allotting funds among the States for construction of undergraduate academic facilities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CEDERBERG:

H.R. 2947. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the manufacturers excise tax on household-type incinerator and garbage disposal units; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2948. A bill to provide for the medical and hospital care of the aged through a system of voluntary health insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2949. A bill authorizing modification of the Saginaw River, Mich., navigation project; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 2950. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp, the central figure of which will be the likeness of the now extinct Michigan grayling fish, after which the town of Grayling, Mich., was named; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H.R. 2951. A bill to amend section 111 of title 23 of the United States Code relating to agreements concerning the use of an access to rights-of-way on the Interstate System; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 2952. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an individual to deduct, for income tax purposes, the expenses incurred by him for transportation to and from work; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2953. A bill to provide a program of tax adjustment for small business and for persons engaged in small business; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2954. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a taxpayer with adjusted gross income of $7,500 or less a deduction for the expenses of tuition and certain other fees and charges paid by him for his education or the education of his spouse or any of his dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2955. A bill to provide a tax incentive for the employment of physically handicapped workers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DEL CLAWSON:

H.R. 2956. A bill to authorize investigations and reports on the water resources and requirements of the Colorado River Basin, and to protect existing economies in the course of development of such resources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 2957. A bill to provide that the highway running from Tampa and St. Petersburg, Fla., through Bradenton, Sarasota, Venice, Punta Gorda, Fort Myers, Naples, and Miami, Fla., to Fort Lauderdale and Homestead, Fla., shall be part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 2958. A bill to amend section 129(b) of title 23, United States Code, relating to toll roads, bridges, and tunnels on the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 2959. A bill to amend Public Law 815, 81st Congress, with respect to the construction of school facilities for children in Puerto Rico, Wake Island, Guam, or the Virgin Islands for whom local educational agencies are unable to provide education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 2960. A bill to amend the title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2961. A bill to increase benefits under the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system, to provide child's insurance benefits beyond age 18 while in school, to provide widow's benefits at age 60 on a reduced basis, to provide benefits for certain individuals not otherwise eligible at age 72, to improve the actuarial status of the trust funds, to extend coverage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2962. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that full benefits (when based upon attainment of retirement age) will be payable to men at age 63 and to women at age 60; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2963. A bill to amend the Social Security Act and Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an exemption from coverage under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system for individuals who are opposed to participation in such system on grounds of religious belief; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 2964. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase from 18 to 22, in the case of a child attending school, the age until which child's insurance benefits may be paid thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H.R. 2965. A bill to amend section 162 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to clarify the deductibility of premiums paid for flood insurance or indemnity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2966. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act and the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 in order to exempt certain wages and salary of employees from withholding for tax purposes under the laws of States or subdivisions thereof other than the State or subdivision of the employee's residence; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 2967. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit a taxpayer to deduct tuition expenses paid by him for the education of his children; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FISHER:

H.R. 2968. A bill to strengthen the criminal penalties for the mailing, importing, or transporting of obscene matter, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H.R. 2969. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to purchase industrial and commercial evidences of indebtedness to promote certain industrial and commercial loans in redevelopment areas by lending institutions in order to help such areas plan and finance their economic redevelopment and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 2970. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2971. A bill to create the Interoceanic Canals Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 2972. A bill to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide further for the prevention of accidents in coal mines; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2973. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit the payment of disability insurance benefits, to an individual otherwise qualified therefor, from the beginning of such individual's disability; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2974. A bill to impose quota limitations on imports of foreign residual fuel oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.R. 2975. A bill to amend section 105 of the Social Security Amendments of 1960 to validate social security wage reports submitted for employees of certain tax-exempt organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2976. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and the Social Security Amendments of 1960 to extend the retroactive period for which certain tax-exempt organizations may elect social security coverage for their employees, and to validate certain social security wage reports submitted for employees of such organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 2977. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 2978. A bill making an appropriation for the appointment of certain additional investigators personnel in the Bureau of Customs and the Bureau of Narcotics; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.R. 2979. A bill to enable the courts more effectively to deal with the problem of narcotic addiction; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2980. A bill to provide for the general welfare by assisting the States, through a program of grants-in-aid, to establish and operate special hospital facilities for the treatment and cure of narcotic addicts; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 2981. A bill to amend section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959 and section 231 of the National Housing Act to improve and render more effective the Federal direct loan and mortgage insurance programs providing assistance to housing for the elderly; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HANSEN of Idaho:

H.R. 2982. A bill to require fresh potatoes purchased or sold in interstate commerce to be labeled according to the State in which such potatoes were grown; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. HANSEN of Washington:

H.R. 2983. A bill to provide for the disposition of judgment funds on deposit to the credit of the Quinault Tribe of Indians; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 2984. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act provisions for construction of health research facilities by extending the expiration date thereof and providing increased support for the program, to authorize additional Assistant Secretaries in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2985. A bill to authorize assistance in meeting the initial cost of professional and technical personnel for comprehensive community mental health centers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2986. A bill to extend and otherwise amend certain expiring provisions of the Public Health Service Act relating to community health services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2987. A bill to authorize mortgage insurance and loans to help finance the cost of constructing and equipping facilities for the group practice of medicine or dentistry; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 2988. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.R. 2989. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to prevent duplication of benefits based on disability in cases where the disabled individual receives workmen's compensation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2990. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the limitation on the amount of allowable charitable contributions which may be made by individuals to certain organizations for the benefit of churches, educational organizations, hospitals, and certain medical research organizations operating in conjunction with hospitals, and certain other organizations which are organized and operated for the benefit of certain colleges or universities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOWARD:

H.R. 2991. A bill to provide certain increases in annuities payable from the civil service retirement and disability fund, to improve the financing of the civil service retirement system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HUTCHINSON:

H.R. 2992. A bill to authorize the temporary release of 100,000 short tons of copper from the national stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KING of Utah:

H.R. 2993. A bill to provide a system of health and safety rules and regulations and proper investigation; health and safety training and education for metallic and nonmetallic mines and quarries (excluding coal and lignite mines); and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.R. 2994. A bill to amend titles I and XVI of the Social Security Act to prevent a State from denying medical assistance for the aged to any aged individual because of his income if such income is below certain specified limits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2995. A bill to amend titles I and XVI of the Social Security Act to permit a State to establish or designate a separate agency to administer the portion of its State plan relating to medical assistance for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2996. A bill to provide public works and economic development programs and the planning and coordination needed to assist in the development of the Appalachian region; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MATTHEWS:

H.R. 2997. A bill to amend the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to establish the St. Augustine Quadricentennial Commission, and for other purposes," approved August 14, 1962 (76 Stat. 386), to provide that eight members of such commission shall be appointed by the President, to provide that such commission shall not terminate prior to December 31, 1966, and to authorize appropriations for carrying out the provisions of such joint resolution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORGAN:

H.R. 2998. A bill to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act, as amended, in order to increase the authorization for appropriations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H.R. 2999. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide for the adjustment of inequities and for other purposes; to the Commission on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 3000. A bill to extend the benefits of the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951, the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944, and the Classification Act of 1949 with respect to employees of county committees established pursuant to section 8(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 3001. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, to exempt from coverage of the act officers and members of crews and vessels; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 3002. A bill to amend the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951, as amended, to exempt from coverage of the act officers and members of crews of vessels; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 3003. A bill to equalize compensation for overtime; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 3004. A bill to assist small business and persons engaged in small business by allowing a deduction, for Federal income tax purposes, for additional investment in depreciable assets, inventory, and accounts receivable; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3005. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to assist small and independent business, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NIX:

H.R. 3006. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 3007. A bill to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide further for the prevention of accidents in coal mines; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 3008. A bill to provide a system of health and safety rules and regulations and proper enforcement thereof; health and safety inspection and investigation; health and safety training and education for metallic and nonmetallic mines and quarries (excluding coal and lignite mines); and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 3009. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to assist in compensating for the hazardous and arduous nature of employment in certain occupations, and for the decreased life expectancy of persons engaged in such occupations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3010. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide for the adjustment of inequities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 3011. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.R. 3012. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Hudson Highlands National Scenic Riverway in the State of New York, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina:

H.R. 3013. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide gold star lapel buttons for the next of kin of members of the Armed Forces who lost or lose their lives in war or as a result of cold war incidents; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROGERS of Texas:

H.R. 3014. A bill to regulate the labeling and advertising of cigarettes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 3015. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to reduce the highway use tax in the case of certain motor vehicles used primarily to haul carnival, circus, and allied outdoor show business equipment, materials, and personnel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3016. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to authorize and facilitate the deduction from gross income by teachers of the expenses of education (including certain travel) undertaken by them, and to provide a uniform method of proving entitlement to such deduction; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SICKLES:

H.R. 3017. A bill to provide a hospital insurance program for the aged under social security, to amend the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system to increase benefits, improve the actuarial status of the disability insurance trust fund, and extend coverage, to amend the Social Security Act to provide additional Federal financial participation in the Federal-State public assistance programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 3018. A bill to amend title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, to provide for additional means and measures for land conservation and land utilization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 3019. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the State of Florida; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 3020. A bill to provide for participation of the United States in the Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center in Dade County, Fla., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of New York:

H.R. 3021. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt schoolbuses from the manufacturers excise tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.R. 3022. A bill to adjust wheat and feed grain production, to establish a cropland retirement program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 3023. A bill to adjust wheat and feed grain production, to establish a cropland retirement program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 3024. A bill to improve the 1965 cotton program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 3025. A bill to expand the market for cotton, to assist in the orderly marketing of cotton, to strengthen the cotton industry and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 3026. A bill to provide annuities payable from the civil service retirement and disability fund in additional cases for certain widows and widowers by eliminating the required period of marriage; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H.R. 3027. A bill to require the registration with the Postmaster General of the names of mailing list suppliers and buyers, and of transactions involving the sale or other exchange of mailing lists, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ADAMS:

H.R. 3028. A bill to provide for an export expansion act of 1965; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ASHMORE:

H.R. 3029. A bill to define a period of limitations for collection by the United States of indebtedness due to erroneous payments of money to civilian employees or to members of the uniformed services or dependents of any member of the uniformed services; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3030. A bill to amend sections 4837, 6161, and 9837 of title 10, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3031. A bill to amend the Military and Civilian Employees Claims Act of 1964; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 3032. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the State of Florida; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 3033. A bill to permit wire tapping by an authorized Federal officer engaged in the investigation of illegal importation of narcotic drugs into the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 3034. A bill for the relief of certain persons having summer homes in the Pinecrest Recreation Area, in the Stanislaus National Forest; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H.R. 3035. A bill to provide for the granting of limited preference in employment as officers or seamen aboard vessels of the United States to certain persons who served as officers and seamen aboard merchant vessels of the United States during World War II and the Korean conflict; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 3036. A bill to provide for humane treatment of animals used in experiment and research by recipients of grants from the United States, and by agencies and instrumentalities of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina:

H.R. 3037. A bill to amend section 1485 of title 10, United States Code, relating to the transportation of remains of deceased dependents of members of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 3038. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for participation by members of the Armed Forces in international sports activities; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 3039. A bill to amend section 1006 of title 37, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary concerned, under certain conditions, to make payment of pay and allowances to members of an armed force under his jurisdiction before the end of the pay period for which such payment is due; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 3040. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to prescribe the basic pay and allowances of an officer who is serving as supreme Allied commander, Europe; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 3041. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to exempt certain contracts with foreign contractors from the requirement for an examination-of-records clause; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 3042. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit members of the Armed Forces to be assigned or detailed to the Weather Bureau or the Office of the Federal Coordinator for Meteorological Services and Supporting Research, Department of Commerce; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 3043. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to authorize the payment of special allowances to dependents of members of the uniformed services to offset expenses incident to their evacuation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 3044. A bill to authorize payment of incentive pay for the performance of hazardous duty on the flight deck of an aircraft carrier; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 3045. A bill to authorize certain members of the Armed Forces to accept and wear decoration of certain foreign nations; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 3046. A bill to amend chapter 147 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, to dispose of telephone facilities by negotiated sale; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 3047. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit members of the Armed Forces to accept fellowships, scholarships, or grants offered by a foreign government; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WYATT:

H.R. 3048. A bill to permit certain land in Clatsop County, Oreg., to be used for public park and recreational purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H.R. 3049. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, with respect to the retirement of certain personnel engaged in hazardous occupations; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 3055. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act so as to provide for retirement on full annuity when age added to years of service totals 85; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CALLAWAY:

H.J. Res. 199. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CEDERBERG:

H.J. Res. 200. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the eligibility of certain persons to vote for any candidate for elector of President and Vice President or for a candidate for election as a Senator or Representative in Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 201. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 202. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.J. Res. 203. Joint resolution to provide for a study of needed Federal-aid highway programs for 10 years following the termination of the present interstate and defense highway program by requiring the Secretary of Commerce to make a comprehensive investigation and study of highway traffic and needs based upon 20-year projections, and the changes determined necessary in the Federal-aid highway systems as a result thereof, and to report the results of such study and his recommendations for a 10-year highway program commencing June 30, 1972, to Congress; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FALLON:

H.J. Res. 204. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H.J. Res. 205. Joint resolution to create a regional agency by intergovernmental compact for the planning, conservation, utilization, development, management, and control of the water and related natural resources of the Susquehanna River Basin, for the improvement of navigation, reduction of flood damage, reduction and control of surface subsidence, regulation of water quality, control of pollution, development of water supply, hydroelectric energy, fish and wildlife habitat, and public recreational facilities, and other purposes, and defining the functions, powers, and duties of such agency; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINDLEY:

H.J. Res. 206. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to preserve to the people of each State power to determine the composition of its legislature and the apportionment of the membership thereof in accordance with law and the provisions of the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANSEN of Idaho:

H.J. Res. 207. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States reflecting that the United States (a traditionally Christian nation) observes tolerance (a precept of Christianity) by permitting observance of certain nonsectarian religious practices in public schools and certain other places; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARSHA:

H.J. Res. 208. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LAIRD:

H.J. Res. 209. Joint resoultion to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland:

H.J. Res. 210. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.J. Res. 211. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to provide that factors other than the population may be taken into consideration in the apportionment of one house of a bicameral State legislature under certain circumstances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BELL:

H.J. Res. 212. Joint resolution honoring Art Linkletter for unique services rendered to his country and to the world; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAMERON:

H. Con. Res. 111. Concurrent resolution establishing a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin:

H. Con. Res. 112. Concurrent resolution establishing a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DENT:

H. Con. Res. 113. Concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. Con. Res. 114. Concurrent resolution relating to Panama Canal sovereignty treaty interpretations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Con. Res. 115. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress on representation of China in the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H. Con. Res. 116. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that arrangements be made for viewing within the United States of a film entitled "John F. Kennedy—Years of Lightning, Day of Drums," prepared by the U.S. Information Agency; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HARVEY of Michigan:

H. Con. Res. 117. Concurrent resolution to establish a joint congressional committee to conduct a full and complete study and investigation for the purpose of proposing a code of ethics to govern the conduct of Members of Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland:

H. Con. Res. 118. Concurrent resolution requesting the President to initiate action leading to the adoption of a United Nations resolution calling for the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia; the return of exiles from these nations from slave labor camps in the Soviet Union; and the conduct of free elections in these nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON:

H. Con. Res. 119. Concurrent resolution to request the President to initiate discussion of the Baltic States question before the United Nations with a view to gaining the independence of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia from the Soviet Union; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Res. 123. Resolution to provide funds for the Committee on the Judiciary under Public Law 86–272; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. Res. 124. Resolution to express the sense of the House of Representatives declaring the policy of the United States relative to the intervention of the international communistic movement in the Western Hemisphere; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H. Res. 125. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct a study of the fiscal organization and procedures of the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: A memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, relative to the enactment of legislation to implement the Federal Flood Insurance Act of 1956; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States expressing support for the early development of the Garrison diversion unit; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHMORE:

H.R. 3050. A bill for the relief of T. Michael Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3051. A bill for the relief of Vermont Maple Orchards, Inc., Burlington, Vt.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AYRES:

H.R. 3052. A bill for the relief of Consuelo Guia Ramoso; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BELL:

H.R. 3053. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ida Young; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3054. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the U.S. Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of Murray-Sanders Constructors and George A. Fuller Co. against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3056. A bill for the relief of Mrs. In Ha Cho; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3057. A bill for the relief of Alistair McEachen Ross; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3058. A bill for the relief of Nubar Zoryan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3059. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Virginia Suarez Tejon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3060. A bill for the relief of Haiguhi Sarkis Seringul; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3061. A bill for the relief of Gruja Apostolovic and his spouse, Desanka Apostolovic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3062. A bill for the relief of Son Chung Ja; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3063. A bill for the relief of Mehmet Adil Ozkaptan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 3064. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rita Francisca Ycmat; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3065. A bill for the relief of Charalampo Pappachristou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3066. A bill for the relief of Therese Yeun; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3067. A bill for the relief of Yim Mei Lam; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CEDERBERG:

H.R. 3068. A bill for the relief of Stanley A. Luczak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEL CLAWSON:

H.R. 3069. A bill for the relief of Ozhan (Mike) Simsek, Gungor Simsek, and Omer Simsek; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 3070. A bill for the relief of Anna Maria Bani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 3071. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Juan C. Jacobe, and their four children, Angela Jacobe, Teresita Jacobe, Leo Jacobe, and Ramon Jacobe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3072. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Joyce Marjorie Howell (nee Chin); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3073. A bill for the relief of Helene Vasilakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3074. A bill for the relief of Maxie L. Stevens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3075. A bill for the relief of Bryce A. Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3076. A bill for the relief of the estate of Bart Briscoe Edgar, deceased; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DULSKI (by request):

H.R. 3077. A bill for the relief of Dr. Konrad Wicher; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H.R. 3078. A bill for the relief of Lourdes S. (Delotavo) Matzke; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3079. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Eleni Bacola Ciacco, doctor of medicine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 3080. A bill for the relief of Maria Josefa Pariente; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3081. A bill for the relief of Frederik Cecil Marie Janssens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H.R. 3082. A bill for the relief of Yester Arpacioglugil; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 3083. A bill for the relief of Michele Nicosia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3084. A bill for the relief of Maria Gabriella Ligniti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3085. A bill for the relief of Antonino Cattano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3086. A bill for the relief of Annunziato Bernardi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3087. A bill for the relief of Pasquale Cutrone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3088. A bill for the relief of Demetrios Basdekis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3089. A bill for the relief of Donatangelo Cecere; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3090. A bill for the relief of Joseph Merendino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3091. A bill for the relief of Domenico Romano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3092. A bill for the relief of Angelo Recine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3093. A bill for the relief of Zdravko Drazic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3094. A bill for the relief of Domenico and Giuseppa Di Roma and their minor child, Catalina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H.R. 3095. A bill for the relief of Raymond B. and Alma S. Jeffrey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLYNT:

H.R. 3096. A bill granting jurisdiction to the Court of Claims to render judgment on certain claims of N. M. Bentley against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 3097. A bill for the relief of Dr. Mohsen Zabetian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 3098. A bill for the relief of Pietro Malleo and his wife, Maria Malleo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3099. A bill for the relief of Guido Parete, his wife, Giovanti Parete, and their children, Claudia and Mario Parete; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GURNEY:

H.R. 3100. A bill for the relief of Dr. Rafael P. Martinez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.R. 3101. A bill for the relief of Fatemeh Moussavi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H.R. 3102. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Sharon Tyner Govatos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOWARD:

H.R. 3103. A bill for the relief of Joanne Marie Evans; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 3104. A bill to remove a cloud on title to certain lands in California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 3105. A bill for the relief of Thurman and Wright; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3106. A bill for the relief of Wetsel-Oviatt Lumber Co., Inc., Omo Ranch, El Dorado County, Calif.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3107. A bill for the relief of Vicente Ybinarriaga-Lopategui; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3108. A bill for the relief of J. C. Player; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.R. 3109. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Georgia Mastrogianakos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3110. bill for the relief of Angela and George John Kapantais; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATTHEWS:

H.R. 3111. A bill for the relief of Victor L. Ashley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McEWEN:

H.R. 3112. A bill for the relief of Charles and Claude Pomerat and children, Jean Marie and Silvain Mirsamadzadeh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3113. A bill for the relief of Sara Schneider Pascu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGRATH:

H.R. 3114. A bill for the relief of Basile and Palagia Stavroupoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MINSHALL:

H.R. 3115. A bill for the relief of Mr. Lothar A. Koeberer, his wife Mrs. Agnes Koeberer and his minor child, Agnes Koeberer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3116. A bill for the relief of Mr. Yong Wha Kim and his wife, Mrs. Young Ja Kim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3117. A bill for the relief of Diego Perez-Stable; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H.R. 3118. A bill for the relief of Carolina Milazzo-Chillura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 3119. A bill for the relief of Heide Lomangino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3120. A bill for the relief of Sara Harari-Raful; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3121. A bill for the relief of Gaetano Gandolfo, Gaetana Gandolfo, Salvatore Gandolfo, and Rino Gandolfo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H.R. 3122. A bill for the relief of Maria Prymak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 3123. A bill for the relief of Salvador Vieira de Mendonca; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 3124. A bill for the relief of Lee Gen Quon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3125. A bill for the relief of Roger and Sandra Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3126. A bill to provide for the free entry of one mass spectrometer for the University of Washington; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 3127. A bill for the relief of Elvira Maniscalco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H.R. 3128. A bill for the relief of Angelo Iannuzzi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3129. A bill for the relief of Lim Wey Nan John (or John Wey Nan Lim), and Maude Lim (or Lim Wang Maude Luella); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY of New York:

H.R. 3130. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Emilia Pucci; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of New York:

H.R. 3131. A bill for the relief of Shafia Chinwala; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS:

H.R. 3132. A bill for the relief of Miss Melody P. de Guzman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YATES:

H.R. 3133. A bill for the relief of Mr. Giichi Yonekura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3134. A bill for the relief of Miss Hermitas Perez-Fernandez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3135. A bill for the relief of Asli Eshoo Shamalta Elias and Jennie D'Khedory Elias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3136. A bill for the relief of Dr. Ture Tuncbay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASHMORE:

H.R. 3137. A bill for the relief of McKoy-Helgerson Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

73. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the chiefs of staff, the Military Order of the World Wars, Washington, D.C., relative to designating the new Washington area veterans' hospital as the Gen. Melvin J. Maas Veterans Hospital; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

74. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., requesting aid in the distribution of "Madison's Notes," New York University Press, New York, N.Y.; to the Committee on House Administration.

75. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., requesting the appropriate subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary to make a study on the several States qualifications for membership in the U.S. House of Representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

In compliance with Public Law 601, 79th Congress, title III, Regulation of Lobbying Act, section 308(b), which provides as follows:

(b) All information required to be filed under the provisions of this section with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate shall be compiled by said Clerk and Secretary, acting jointly, as soon as practicable after the close of the calendar quarter with respect to which such information is filed and shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate jointly submit their report of the compilation required by said law and have included all registrations and quarterly reports received.

QUARTERLY REPORTS

The following reports for the second calendar quarter of 1964 were received too late to be included in the published reports for that quarter:

A. Active-Retired Lighthouse Service Employees Association, Post Office Box 2169, South Portland, Maine.
D. (6) $20. E. (9) $48.80.

A. American Cancer Society, 219 East 42d Street, New York City.
E. (9) $6,985.35.

A. American Carpet Institute, 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $295.53. E. (9) $295.53.

A. American Civil Liberties Union, Inc., 156 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,688.75. E. (9) $2,688.75.

A. American Dental Association, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $9,373.60. E. (9) $9,373.60.

A. American Humane Association, 896 Pennsylvania Street, Denver, Colo.
E. (9) $1,250.

A. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $532.63. E. (9) $48.60.

A. American National Cattlemen's Association, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $36,424.69. E. (9) $5,404.88.

A. American Podiatry Association, 3301 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $306.25.

A. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $10,290.06. E. (9) $13,914.04.

A. American Veterinary Medical Association, 600 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $883.03.

A. American Vocational Association, Inc., 1010 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $15,714.50. E. (9) $400.

A. Robert E. Ansheles, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Consolidated International Trading Corp., Empire State Building, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $312.25. E. (9) $38.44.

A. Arkansas Railroad Committee, 1100 Boyle Building, Little Rock, Ark.
B. Class One railroads operating in State of Arkansas.
D. (6) $301.70. E. (9) $774.94.

A. Arnold, Fortas & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Commissioner of Baseball, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $138.80.

A. Arnold, Fortas & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Lever Brothers Co., 390 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,620.

A. Arnold, Fortas & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Retail Merchants Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $520.

A. Association of Oil Pipe Lines, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $450.

A. A. V. Atkinson, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Communications Workers of America, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $3,570.26.

A. Atlanta Committee for Democratic Republican Independent Voter Education, 2540 Lakewood Avenue SW., Atlanta, Ga.
D. (6) $2,663.36. E. (9) $1,634.47.

A. Frank Baird-Smith, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Tank Truck Carriers, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert C. Barnard, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.

A. William G. Barr, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Parking Association, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Donald S. Beattie, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,050.

A. Lowell R. Beck, 1120 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. American Bar Association, 1120 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $ 50. E. (9) $15.

A. Daniel S. Bedell, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Union, United Automobile, Aerospace & Agricultural Implement Workers of America, 8000 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $2,605.76. E. (9) $1,046.85.

A. John H. Beidler, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor & Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,640. E. (9) $328.92.

A. Carl H. Berglund, 607 South Pine, Tacoma, Wash.

A. William S. Bergman, 201 Massachusetts Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee To Promote American-Made Motion Pictures, 6721 Melrose Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $648.

A. William S. Bergman, 201 Massachusetts Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
B. District Council of Plasterers & Cement Masons of Southern California, 3921 Burbank Boulevard, Burbank, Calif.
D. (6) $600.

A. William S. Bergman, 201 Massachusetts Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Dixie Project & Development Association, Inc., St. George, Utah.

A. William S. Bergman, 201 Massachusetts Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Legislative Council for Photogrammetry, 201 Massachusetts Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,200.

A. William S. Bergman, 201 Massachusetts Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
B. William Radkovich Co., 9133 Gravey Boulevard, Rosemead, Calif.
D. (6) $167.

A. Helen Berthelot, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Communications Workers of America, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $3,745.77.

A. Andrew J. Biemiller, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor & Congress of Industrial Organization, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,052. E. (9) $414.70.

A. Henry J. Bison, Jr., 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Retail Grocers, 360 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,600. E. (9) $969.

A. C. B. Blankenship, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Communications Workers of America, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $3,470.69.

A. Charles E. Bosley, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Committee for International Development, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,650.

A. Charles B. Bowling, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Grange, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $600.

A. Sam Boyce, 414 Second Street, Newport, Ark.
B. American Taxicab Association, Inc., 4415 North California Avenue, Chicago, Ill., and National Association of Taxicab Owners, 803 Leader Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) $2,200. E. (9) $1,300.

A. Florence I. Broadwell, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Federation of Federal Employees, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,432.73. E. (9) $3.

A. Wayne L. Bromley, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Coal Policy Conference, Inc., 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,950.

A. Brotherhood of Railway & Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express & Station Employees, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $3,134.41. E. (9) $3,134.41.

A. Charles H. Brown, Inc., 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Society of Composers, Authors & Publishers, 575 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $4,280. E. (9) $4,280.

A. Charles H. Brown, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Charles H. Brown, Inc., 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,800.50.

A. Charles H. Brown, Inc., 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $937.50. E. (9) $937.50.

A. Robert J. Brown, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Telephone Cooperative Association, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $110.

A. James E. Bryan, 2000 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Blue Shield Plans, 425 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $1,064.17.

A. Mrs. Fred L. Bull, 8124 Oakleigh Road, Baltimore, Md.
B. National Congress of Parents & Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $312.33.

A. John J. Burke, Finlen Hotel, Butte, Mont.
B. Pacific Northwest Power Co., Post Office Box 1445, Spokane, Wash.
E. (9) $200.

A. George B. Burnham, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Numerous stockholders of the Burnham Chemical Co., 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $210. E. (9) $210.

A. Charles S. Burns, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $584.50. E. (9) $69.68.

A. George H. Buschmann, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $4,539.57.

A. Monroe Butler, 550 South Flower Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. The Superior Oil Co., 550 South Flower Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Albert E. Carter, 19 Craig Avenue, Piedmont, Calif.
B. Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $4,500. E. (9) $3,143.92.

A. Casey, Lane & Mittendorf, 26 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. South African Sugar Association, Norwich Union House, Durban Club Place, Durban, South Africa.
E. (9) $815.34.

A. Donald E. Channell, 1120 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. American Bar Association, 1120 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $100. E. (9) $12.

A. Hal M. Christensen, 808 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Dental Association, 808 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,250.

A. Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,079.50. E. (9) $9,345.99.

A. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Colonial Sugar Refining Co., Ltd., 1–3 O'Conney Street, Sydney, Australia.

A. Joseph Coakley, 900 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Building Service Employees International Union, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. David Cohen, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Americans for Democratic Action, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,950. E. (9) $252.08.

A. Paul G. Collins, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Bankers Association, 90 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $125.

A. Paul B. Comstock, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Bernard J. Conway, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Dental Association, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,281.25.

A. John Shepherd Cooper, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $1,950. E. (9) $2,616.11.

A. Coordinating Committee for Fundamental American Freedoms, Inc., 301 First Street NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $122,693.81. E. (9) $128,296.52.

A. Council for Exceptional Children, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $500.

A. Council of State Chambers of Commerce, 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $882.74. E. (9) $882.72.

A. Credit Union National Association, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.
D. (6) $1,255.12. E. (9) $1,255.12.

A. Joseph M. Creed, 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Bakers Association, 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $10.

A. Cuba Claims Association, Inc., 407 Lincoln Road, Miami Beach, Fla.
D. (6) $825. E. (9) $303.81.

A. C. B. Culpepper, Post Office Box 1736, Atlanta, Ga.
B. National Conference of Non-Profit Shipping Associations, Inc.

A. John Curran, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor & Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,640. E. (9) $1,082.55.

A. Robert P. Daly, 5810 Biscayne Boulevard, Miami, Fla.
B. Inter-American Trade & Cultural Center Authority, Post Office Box 59–2294, Miami, Fla.

A. Michael P. Daniels, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $100.

A. F. Gibson Darrison, Jr., 4810 Fort Sumner Drive, Washington, D.C.
B. New York State Association of Railroads, 466 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. S. P. Deas, 520 National Bank of Commerce Building, New Orleans, La.

A. Ronald W. De Lucien, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $250. E. (9) $122.

A. Denning & Wohlstetter, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.
B. Western Publishing Co., Inc., North Road, Poughkeepsie, N.Y.

A. Leslie E. Dennis, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $540.

A. Division of Federal Relations, National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $18,047.17.

A. Henry I. Dworshak, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $553.14.

A. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., 1820 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $31.62.

A. Ernest J. Eaton, Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Independent Business Association, 835 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Ernest J. Eaton, Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Nebraska Mid-State Reclamation District, Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Ernest J. Eaton, Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Ocean Beach Club, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Ernest J. Eaton, Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Water Conversion Institute, Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Harold E. Edwards, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $3,370. E. (9) $300.

A. J. C. B. Ehringhaus, Jr., Post Office Box 1776, Raleigh, N.C.
B. Southern Railway System, Post Office Box 1808, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,500. E. (9) $1,355.

A. John Doyle Elliott, 808 North Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.
B. Townsend Plan, Inc., 808 North Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,625. E. (9) $699.43.

A. Warren G. Elliott, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $532. E. (9) $5342.

A. John H. Else, 302 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Lumber & Building Materials Dealers Association, 302 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $408.93.

A. John W. Emeigh, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $599.76. E. (9) $22.35.

A. Lawrence E. Ernst, 301 East Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.
B. National Star Route Mail Carriers Association, 301 East Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1,246.36.

A. Clinton M. Fair, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor & Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,640. E. (9) $485.82.

A. Robert L. Farrington, 313 The Madison Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Chinese Government Procurement & Services Mission, Division for Taiwan Sugar Corp., 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $3,500. E. (9) $47.69.

A. Arthur S. Fefferman, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Joe G. Fender, 2033 Norfolk Street, Houston, Tex.
B. National Conference of Non-Profit Shipping Associations, Inc.
D. (6) $2,300.

A. Mello G. Fish, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $2,835. E. (9) $300.

A. Forest Farmers Association Cooperative, Post Office Box 7284, Station C, Atlanta, Ga.
E. (9) $27.10.

A. James F. Fort, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $306.95.

A. Robert W. Frase, 1820 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Book Publishers Council, Inc., 58 West 40th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,896.85. E. (9) $2,043.85.

A. Milton Fricke, Papillion, Nebr.
B. National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.
D. (6) $140. E. (9) $140.

A. David C. Fullarton, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Telephone Cooperative Association, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $230.

A. William C. Geer.
B. The Council for Exceptional Children, National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500.

A. Mary Condon Gereau, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,257.49. E. (9) $423.09.

A. William P. Giglio, 1913 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Business Publications, Inc., 1913 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John A. Gosnell, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,833.34.

A. Harry L. Graham, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Grange, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Grain & Feed Dealers National Association, 400 Folger Building, Washington, D.C.

A. John R. Graves, 1736 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Oxy. Catalyst, Inc., Berwyn, Pa.
E. (9) $20.

A. Dale Greenwood, 302 Hoge Building, Seattle, Wash.
B. Washington Railroad Association, 302 Hoge Building, Seattle, Wash.

A. John F. Griner, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Government Employees, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,271.40. E. (9) $427.14.

A. Robert N. Hampton, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,750.00. E. (9) $133.66.

A. William A. Hanscom, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Oil, Chemical & Atomic Workers International Union, 1840 California Street, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $1,437.50. E. (9) $225.

A. William B. Harman, Jr., 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $100.60.

A. L. James Harmanson, Jr., 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,499.96. E. (9) $112.04.

A. W. Gibson Harris, 815 Mutual Building, Richmond, Va.
B. Household Finance Corp., 3220 Prudential Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $972.95.

A. Burr P. Harrison, Graichen Building, Winchester, Va.
B. Household Finance Corp., 3220 Prudential Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $750.

A. Kit H. Haynes, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert B. Heiney, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $875. E. (9) $1,001.39.

A. Noel Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $50.

A. Irvin A. Hoff, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. U.S. Cane Sugar Refiners Association, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $166.25.

A. Frank N. Hoffmann, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $4,000. E. (9) $1,000.

A. Floyd H. Huffman, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $599.76. E. (9) $24.15.

A. International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $2,110.31.

A. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $20,893.01.

A. Investors Diversified Services, Inc., Minneapolis, Minn.
E. (9) $13,657.37.

A. Iron Ore Lessors Associates, Inc., W-1481 First National Bank Building, St. Paul, Minn.
D. (6) $15,736.25. E. (9) $14,409.98.

A. Chas. E. Jackson, 715 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $664.58. E. (9) $42.23.

A. Raymond M. Jacobson, 1815 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Inter-American Trade & Cultural Center Authority, Post Office Box 59–2294, Miami, Fla.
D. (6) $2,400. E. (9) $171.91.

A. Glendon E. Johnson, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $460.03. E. (9) $41.80.

A. Johnson & Manuel, 105 East Holbrook Avenue, Fairfax, Va.
B. American Coalition of Patriotic Societies, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,959.57. E. (9) $5,959.57.

A. Charlie W. Jones, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Carpet Institute, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $187.50. E. (9) $40.98.

A. Max H. Jordan, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $599.76. E. (9) $28.10.

A. Sheldon Z. Kaplan, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Guatemala Sugar Producers Association, Guatemala City, Guatemala.

A. Jerome J. Keating, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,125.

A. Howard B. Keck, 550 South Flower Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. The Superior Oil Co., 550 South Flower Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
E. (9) $300.

A. Brooks J. Keogh, Keene, N. Dak.
B. American National Cattlemen's Association, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
E. (9) $169.05.

A. John A. Killick, 1820 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., 1820 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $12.50.

A. John A. Killick, 1820 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Independent Meat Packers Association, 1820 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $246.25.

A. Kenneth L. Kimble, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $601.75. E. (9) $8.44.

A. Joseph T. King, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Associated Equipment Distributors & Sprinkler Irrigation Association.
E. (9) $698.07.

A. Mr. and Mrs. Harry L. Kingman.
D. (6) $1,525. E. (9) $1,525.

A. James F. Kmetz, 1435 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Mine Workers of America, 900 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,546.

A. William L. Kohler, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $315.95.

A. Kominers & Fort, 529 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Board of Commissioners, Port of New Orleans, Post Office Box 60046, New Orleans, La.
D. (6) $7,300. E. (9) $230.82.

A. Kominers & Fort, 529 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Committee of American Steamship Lines, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,800. E. (9) $246.47.

A. Kominers & Fort., 529 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Marine Transport Lines, Inc., 60 Broad Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Philip M. Lanier, 908 West Broadway, Louisville, Ky.
B. Kentucky Railroad Association, Lexington, Ky.
E. (9) $212.93.

A. Dillard B. Lasseter, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $525.

A. Dillard B. Lasseter, Post Office Box 381, Washington, D.C.
B. Organization of Professional Employees of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Post Office Box 381, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $552. E. (9) $125.

A. J. Austin Latimer, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $900.

A. G. E. Leighty, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Donald Lerch, Jr. & Co., Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Shell Chemical Co., 110 West 31st Street, New York City.

A. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y., and 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,089.91. E. (9) $4,089.91.

A. R. C. Longmire, Pauls Valley, Okla.
B. National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.
D. (6) $351.07. E. (9) $351.07.

A. Harold O. Lovre, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $273.78.

A. John M. Lumley, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,338.37. E. (9) $948.48.

A. LeRoy E. Lyon, Jr., 11th & L Building, Sacramento, Calif.
B. California Railroad Association, 215 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $2,340. E. (9) $1,797.65.

A. J. A. McCallam, 1507 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $883.03.

A. McClure & Trotter, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Coca-Cola Export Corp., 515 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $245.34.

A. Stanley J. McCutcheon, 709 13th Avenue, Anchorage, Alaska.
B. Marathon Oil Co.

A. Joseph J. McDonald, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $3,370. E. (9) $300.

A. William J. McDonald, 3005 Fernside Boulevard, Alameda, Calif.
B. National Council of Naval Air Stations Employee Organizations, 3005 Fernside Boulevard, Alameda, Calif.

A. Joseph B. McGrath, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,323.05. E. (9) $368.63.

A. William H. McLin, Washington, D.C.
B. National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,226.44. E. (9) $1,637.06.

A. C. W. McMillan, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
B. American National Cattlemen's Association, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $4,250.04. E. (9) $489.86.

A. Ralph J. McNair, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $268.25. E. (9) $14.16.

A. Charles R. McNeill, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Bankers Association, 90 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $303.45.

A. James D. Mann, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Motor Bus Owners, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. James Mark, Jr., 1435 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Mine Workers of America, 900 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,046.

A. Frank D. Martino, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Chemical Workers Union, 1659 West Market Street, Akron, Ohio.
D. (6) $2,470.

A. Arnold Mayer, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amalgamated Meat Cutters & Butcher Workmen of N.A., 2800 North Sheridan Road, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,530. E. (9) $655.

A. George E. Meagher, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Government Employees, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,381.40. E. (9) $118.20.

A. M. Barry Meyer, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $873.20.

A. John R. Miles, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America.

A. Claude Minard, 215 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. California Railroad Association, 215 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Clarence Mitchell, 100 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 20 West 40th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,200.

A. Stephen A. Mitchell, Post Office Box 932, Taos, N. Mex.

A. M. D. Mobley, 1010 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Vocational Association, 1010 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Harry L. Moffett, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,737.50. E. (9) $12.70.

A. Joseph E. Moody, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Coal Policy Conference, Inc.
D. (6) $625.

A. Clarence W. Moore, 421 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Cuba Claims Association, Inc., 407 Lincoln Road, Miami Beach, Fla.

A. Jo V. Morgan, Jr., 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Humane Association, Post Office Box 1266, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. Dr. Emmett J. Murphy, 5737 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Chiropractors Insurance Co., American Building, Webster City, Iowa.

A. J. Walter Myers, Jr., Post Office Box 7284, Station C, Atlanta, Ga.
B. Forest Farmers Association Cooperative, Post Office Box 7284, Station C, Atlanta, Ga.

A. Kenneth D. Naden, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,874.98. E. (9) $294.20.

A. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 20 West 40th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. National Association of Agricultural Stabilization & Conservation County Office Employees, New Boston, Tex.
D. (6) $3,350. E. (9) $2,125.

A. National Association of Blue Shield Plans, 425 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $1,064.17.

A. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $13,735.14. E. (9) $13,147.93.

A. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $107,319.50. E. (9) $16,026.05.

A. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 36 South Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill., and 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $7,992.61.

A. National Association of Social Workers, Inc., 2 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y., and 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $450.

A. National Business Publications, Inc., 1913 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $421,375.72. E. (9) $13,351.72.

A. National Coal Policy Conference, Inc., 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $5,756.75.

A. National Committee for International Development, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $3,917.89.

A. National Committee for International Development, 1762 Church Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $1,699.75.

A. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,487.17. E. (9) $5,675.82.

A. National Council of Naval Air Stations Employee Organizations, 3005 Fernside Boulevard, Alameda, Calif.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $455.49.

A. National Counsel Associates, 421 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee for the Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 149 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $611.43.

A. National Creative Arts Committee for Better Copyright Laws, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $550.

A. National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., 2012 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,790.35. E. (9) $3,631.48.

A. National Federation of Federal Employees, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $81,177.32. E. (9) $11,721.34.

A. National Federation of Independent Business, Inc., 920 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $17,092.86. E. (9) $17,092.86.

A. National Grange, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $8,850.

A. National Independent Meat Packers Association, 1820 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,600.56. E. (9) $1,709.04.

A. National Livestock Feeders Association, Inc., 309 Livestock Exchange Building, Omaha, Nebr.
D. (6) $5,125. E. (9) $5,125.

A. National Livestock Tax Committee, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $6,590.09. E. (9) $284.58.

A. National Multiple Sclerosis Society, 257 Park Avenue South, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $748.30.

A. National Parking Association, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Reclamation Association, 897 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $21,518.12. E. (9) $17,302.25.

A. National Rehabilitation Association, Inc., 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,157.43. E. (9) $894.70.

A. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $936.80.

A. National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $34,606.50. E. (9) $11,965.09.

A. National Small Business Association, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $2,562.52.

A. National Tax Equality Association, 1000 Connecticut Avenue Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $18,147.69. E. (9) $8,065.03.

A. National Telephone Cooperative Association, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $340.

A. George R. Nelson, Machinists Building, Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $610.31.

A. Herschel D. Newsom, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Grange, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,750.

A. North Carolina Cotton Promotion Association, Post Office Box 5425, Raleigh, N.C.

A. Seward P. Nyman, 3301 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Podiatry Association, 3301 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $650. E. (9) $99.89.

A. Richard T. O'Connell, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,900. E. (9) $62.01.

A. O'Connor, Green, Thomas & Walters, 508 Federal Bar Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Upper Mississippi Towing Corp., 3033 Excelsior Boulevard, Minneapolis, Minn.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $218.69.

A. John A. O'Donnell, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,200.

A. Alvin E. Oliver, 400 Folger Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Grain & Feed Dealers National Association, 400 Folger Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Organization of Professional Employees of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Post Office Box 381, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $510.53. E. (9) $903.67.

A. J. Allen Overton, Jr., 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,200.

A. Raymond S. Page, Jr., Mill Creek Terrace, Gladwyne, Pa.
B. Campbell Soup Co., 375 Memorial Avenue, Camden, N.J.

A. Perry S. Patterson, 800 World Center Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Wurlitzer Co., 105 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill., et al.

A. Sandford Z. Persons, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington D.C.
B. United World Federalists, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,964. E. (9) $242.81.

A. Albert Pike, Jr., 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. James F. Pinkney, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $44.10.

A. Milton M. Plumb, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. J. Francis Pohlhaus, 100 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 20 West 40th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. William C. Prather, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. U.S. Savings & Loan League.
D. (6) $347.50.

A. Felix M. Putterman, 1712 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America, 1712 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,375. E. (9) $357.09.

A. James H. Rademacher, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,500.

A. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Record Industry Association of America, Inc., 1 East 57th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Stanley Rector, 520 Hotel Washington, Washington D.C.
B. Unemployment Benefit Advisors, Inc.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Geo. L. Reid, Jr., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $799.98. E. (9) $226.80.

A. John J. Riley, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,748.09. E. (9) $106.44.

A. John Rippey, 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Credit Union National Association, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.
D. (6) $446.29. E. (9) $51.

A. William Neale Roach, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $152.

A. John Forney Rudy, 902 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., Akron, Ohio.

A. J. T. Rutherford, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $267.97.

A. J. T. Rutherford & Associates, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Creative Arts Committee for Better Copyright Laws, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $550. E. (9) $550.

A. Francis J. Ryley, 519 Title & Trust Building, Phoenix, Ariz.
B. Standard Oil Co. of California, San Francisco, et al.

A. John C. Satterfield, Yazoo City, Miss.
B. Coordinating Committee for Fundamental American Freedoms, Inc., First and C Streets NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,000. E. (9) $1,404.10.

A. Hollis M. Seavey, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Clayton A. Seeber, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,337.47. E. (9) $1,056.54.

A. Theodore A. Serrill, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Editorial Association, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $130.02.

A. Sharp & Bogan, 1108 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Fly-World Corp., 924 Sligh Boulevard, Orlando, Fla.

A. Carroll M. Shaw, 6326 Southcrest Drive, Shreveport, La.
B. Amalgamated Transit Union, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Kenneth D. Shaw, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railway & Steamship Clerks, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $316.66

A. John J. Sheehan, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $300.

A. Bruce E. Shepard, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Laurence P. Sherfy, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $575.

A. Henry M. Shine, Jr., 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,492.31. E. (9) $241.16.

A. Richard L. Shook, 940 Federal Bar Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Hardware Wholesalers, Inc., Nelson Road, Fort Wayne, Ind.
E. (9) $20.

A. W. A. Smallwood, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Communications Workers of America, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Milan D. Smith, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Dr. Spencer M. Smith, Jr., 1709 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Va.
B. Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, 712 Dupont Circle Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,762.19. E. (9) $1,773.27.

A. Wayne J. Smith, 201 Massachusetts Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee To Promote American-Made Motion Pictures, 6721 Melrose Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $648.

A. Wayne J. Smith, 201 Massachusetts Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
B. District Council of Plasterers & Cement Masons of Southern California, 3921 Burbank Boulevard, Burbank, Calif.
D. (6) $600.

A. Wayne J. Smith, 201 Massachusetts Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Dixie Project & Development Association, Inc., St. George, Utah.

A. Wayne J. Smith, 201 Massachusetts Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Legislative Council for Photogrammetry, 201 Massachusetts Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,200.

A. Wayne J. Smith, 201 Massachusetts Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
B. William Radkovich Co., 9133 Garvey Boulevard, Rosemead, Calif.
D. (6) $167.

A. Marvin J. Sonosky, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Southern Pine Industry Committee, 520 National Bank of Commerce Building, New Orleans, La.
D. (6) $1,551.31. E. (9) $4,105.26.

A. Southwestern Peanut Shellers Association, Drawer 747, Durant, Okla.
E. (9) $701.42.

A. Lawrence Speiser, 1101 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Civil Liberties Union, 156 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Karl Stecher, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Mr. and Mrs. Christian Voss, Denison, Iowa.

A. Karl Stecher, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Warner Research Laboratories, 1937 Panama Drive, Sarasota, Fla.

A. Mrs. Alexander Stewart (Annalee), 120 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, 120 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $18,769.17. E. (9) $7,131.20.

A. Stitt and Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association To Acquire Compensation for Damages Prior to Peace Treaty, Naha, Okinawa; Association of Landowners of Okinawa, Naha, Okinawa.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Stitt and Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Japan General Merchandise Exporters Association and Japan Rubber Footwear Manufacturers Association of Tokyo, Japan; Miscellaneous Goods Division, Japanese Chamber of Commerce of New York, Inc., and Imported Footwear Group, National Council of American Importers.

A. Stitt and Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. New York Merchandise Co., 32 West 23d Street, N.Y., and Japan General Merchandise Exporters Association, care of Japan Trade Center, 393 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Nelson A. Stitt, 1000 Connecticut Avenue N.W., Washington, D.C.
B. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $50.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Federation of American Scientists, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. C. Austin Sutherland, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Tank Truck Carriers, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Russell A. Swindell, Post Office Box 2635, Raleigh, N.C.

B. North Carolina Railroad Association, Post Office Box 2635, Raleigh, N.C.

D. (6) $2,753.88. E. (9) $686.33.

A. J. Woodrow Thomas, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Trans World Airlines, Inc., 10 Richards Road, Kansas City, Mo.

E. (9) $125.95.

A. Julia C. Thompson, 1030 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Nurses' Association, 10 Columbus Circle, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $2,654.01.

A. Eugene M. Thoré, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $536.58. E. (9) $14.91.

A. Townsend Plan, Inc., 808 North Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $7,413.94. E. (9) $2,324.43.

A. Mrs. Hattie B. Trazenfeld, 2012 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Federation of Business & Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., 2012 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Paul T. Truitt, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Plant Food Institute, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. United States Cane Sugar Refiners' Association, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $3,142.86.

A. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $375. E. (9) $375.

A. United World Federalists, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $4,080.76. E. (9) $4,080.76

A. Arvin E. Upton & James A. Greer II, 1821 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Committee on Radiation Protection and Measurements, U.S. Department of Commerce, National Bureau of Standards, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $225. E. (9) $2.02.

A. Charles R. Van Horn, 17th and H Streets NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co., Charles and Baltimore Streets, Baltimore, Md.

A. Richard E. Vernor, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $72. E. (9) $6.80.

A. Veterans, World War I, USA, Inc., 40 G Street NE., Washington, D.C.

A. Paul H. Walker, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $13.50.

A. Washington Home Rule Committee, Inc., 924 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $3,358.25. E. (9) $3,653.05.

A. David Weinberg, 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Credit Union National Association, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.

D. (6) $700. E. (9) $57.83.

A. Wm. E. Welsh, 897 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Reclamation Association, 897 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $3,750.

A. Western Publishing Co., Inc., 1220 Mound Avenue, Racine, Wis.

A. Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc., 604 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif.

D. (6) $15,946.41. E. (9) $25.

A. Donald Francis White, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Retail Federation, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $2,212.50.

A. Albert Y. Woodward, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Flying Tiger Line, Inc., Lockheed Air Terminal, Burbank, Calif.

A. Albert Young Woodward, 1625 I Street, Washington, D.C.

B. Signal Oil & Gas Co., 1010 Wilshire Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Sidney Zagri, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $4,998.

A. Linda Bell Zimmer, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $25.

QUARTERLY REPORTS

The following quarterly reports were submitted for the third calendar quarter 1964:

(NOTE.—The form used for reports is reproduced below. In the interest of economy in the RECORD, questions are not repeated, only the essential answers are printed, and are indicated by their respective letter and number.)

FILE ONE COPY WITH THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE AND FILE TWO COPIES WITH THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

This page (page 1) is designed to supply identifying data; and page 2 (on the back of this page) deals with financial data.

PLACE AN "X" BELOW THE APPROPRIATE LETTER OR FIGURE IN THE BOX AT THE RIGHT OF THE "REPORT" HEADING BELOW:

"PRELIMINARY" REPORT ("Registration"): To "register," place an "X" below the letter "P" and fill out page 1 only.

"QUARTERLY" REPORT: To indicate which one of the four calendar quarters is covered by this Report, place an "X" below the appropriate figure. Fill out both page 1 and page 2 and as many additional pages as may be required. The first additional page should be numbered as page "3," and the rest of such pages should be "4," "5," "6," etc. Preparation and filing in accordance with instructions will accomplish compliance with all quarterly reporting requirements of the Act.

Year: 19------ ◄

REPORT

PURSUANT TO FEDERAL REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

P	QUARTER			
	1st	2d	3d	4th
(Mark one square only)				

NOTE ON ITEM "A".—(a) IN GENERAL. This "Report" form may be used by either an organization or an individual, as follows:

(i) "Employee".—To file as an "employee", state (in Item "B") the name, address, and nature of business of the "employer". (If the "employee" is a firm [such as a law firm or public relations firm], partners and salaried staff members of such firm may join in filing a Report as an "employee".)

(ii) "Employer".—To file as an "employer", write "None" in answer to Item "B".

(b) SEPARATE REPORTS. An agent or employee should not attempt to combine his Report with the employer's Report:

(i) Employers subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their agents or employees.

(ii) Employees subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their employers.

A. ORGANIZATION OR INDIVIDUAL FILING:

1. State name, address, and nature of business.

2. If this Report is for an Employer, list names or agents or employees who will file Reports for this Quarter.

NOTE ON ITEM "B".—*Reports by Agents or Employees.* An employee is to file, each quarter, as many Reports as he has employers, except that: (*a*) If a particular undertaking is jointly financed by a group of employers, the group is to be considered as one employer, but all members of the group are to be named, and the contribution of each member is to be specified; (*b*) if the work is done in the interest of one person but payment therefor is made by another, a single Report—naming both persons as "employers"—is to be filed each quarter.

B. EMPLOYER.—State name, address, and nature of business. If there is no employer, write "None."

NOTE ON ITEM "C".—(*a*) The expression "in connection with legislative interests," as used in this Report, means "in connection with attempting, directly or indirectly, to influence the passage or defeat of legislation." "The term 'legislation' means bills, resolutions, amendments, nominations, and other matters pending or proposed in either House of Congress, and includes any other matter which may be the subject of action by either House"—§ 302(e).

(*b*) Before undertaking any activities in connection with legislative interests, organizations and individuals subject to the Lobbying Act are required to file a "Preliminary" Report (Registration).

(*c*) After beginning such activities, they must file a "Quarterly" Report at the end of each calendar quarter in which they have either received or expended anything of value in connection with legislative interests.

C. LEGISLATIVE INTERESTS, AND PUBLICATIONS in connection therewith:

1. State approximately how long legislative interests are to continue. If receipts and expenditures in connection with legislative interests have terminated, ☐ place an "X" in the box at the left, so that this Office will no longer expect to receive Reports.

2. State the general legislative interests of the person filing and set forth the *specific* legislative interests by reciting: (*a*) Short titles of statutes and bills; (*b*) House and Senate numbers of bills, where known; (*c*) citations of statutes, where known; (*d*) whether for or against such statutes and bills.

3. In the case of those publications which the person filing has caused to be issued or distributed in connection with legislative interests, set forth: (*a*) Description, (*b*) quantity distributed; (*c*) date of distribution, (*d*) name of printer or publisher (if publications were paid for by person filing) or name of donor (if publications were received as a gift).

(Answer items 1, 2, and 3 in the space below. Attach additional pages if more space is needed)

4. If this is a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) rather than a "Quarterly" Report, state below what the nature and amount of anticipated expenses will be; and if for an agent or employee, state also what the daily, monthly, or annual rate of compensation is to be. If this is a "Quarterly" Report, disregard this item "C4" and fill out item "D" and "E" on the back of this page. Do not attempt to combine a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) with a "Quarterly" Report.◄

AFFIDAVIT

[Omitted in printing]

PAGE 1◄

NOTE ON ITEM "D."—(*a*) *In General.* The term "contribution" includes *anything of value.* When an organization or individual uses printed or duplicated matter in a campaign attempting to influence legislation, money received by such organization or individual—for such printed or duplicated matter—is a "contribution." "The term 'contribution' includes a gift, subscription, loan, advance, or deposit of money, or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make a contribution"—Section 302(a) of the Lobbying Act.

(*b*) IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN EMPLOYER.—(i) *In General.* Item "D" is designed for the reporting of all receipts from which expenditures are made, or will be made, in accordance with legislative interests.

(ii) *Receipts of Business Firms and Individuals.*—A business firm (or individual) which is subject to the Lobbying Act by reason of expenditures which it makes in attempting to influence legislation—but which has no funds to expend except those which are available in the ordinary course of operating a business not connected in any way with the influencing of legislation—will have no receipts to report, even though it does have expenditures to report.

(iii) *Receipts of Multipurpose Organizations.*—Some organizations do not receive any funds which are to be expended solely for the purpose of attempting to influence legislation. Such organizations make such expenditures out of a general fund raised by dues, assessments, or other contributions. The percentage of the general fund which is used for such expenditures indicates the percentage of dues, assessments, or other contributions which may be considered to have been paid for that purpose. Therefore, in reporting receipts, such organizations may specify what that percentage is, and report their dues, assessments, and other contributions on that basis. However, each contributor of $500 or more is to be listed, regardless of whether the contribution was made solely for legislative purposes.

(*c*) IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN AGENT OR EMPLOYEE.—(i) *In General.* In the case of many employees, all receipts will come under Items "D 5" (received for services) and "D 12" (expense money and reimbursements). In the absence of a clear statement to the contrary, it will be presumed that your employer is to reimburse you for all expenditures which you make in connection with legislative interests.

(ii) *Employer as Contributor of $500 or More.*—When your contribution from your employer (in the form of salary, fee, etc.) amounts to $500 or more, it is not necessary to report such contribution under "D 13" and "D 14," since the amount has already been reported under "D 5," and the name of the "employer" has been given under Item "B" on page 1 of this report.

D. RECEIPTS (INCLUDING CONTRIBUTIONS AND LOANS):

Fill in every blank. If the answer to any numbered item is "None," write "None" in the space following the number.

Receipts (other than loans)

1. $--------Dues and assessments
2. $--------Gifts of money or anything of value
3. $--------Printed or duplicated matter received as a gift
4. $--------Receipts from sale of printed or duplicated matter
5. $--------Received for services (e.g., salary, fee, etc.)
6. $--------TOTAL for this Quarter (Add items "1" through "5")
7. $--------Received during previous Quarters of calendar year
8. $--------TOTAL from Jan. 1 through this Quarter (Add "6" and "7")

Loans Received

"The term 'contribution' includes a . . . *loan* . . ."—Sec. 302(a).

9. $--------TOTAL now owed to others on account of loans
10. $--------Borrowed from others during this Quarter
11. $--------Repaid to others during this Quarter
12. $--------"Expense money" and Reimbursements received this Quarter

Contributors of $500 or more
(from Jan. 1 through this Quarter)

13. Have there been such contributors?
Please answer "yes" or "no": --------

14. In the case of each contributor whose contributions (including loans) during the "period" from January 1 through the last days of this Quarter total $500 or more:

Attach hereto plain sheets of paper, approximately the size of this page, tabulate data under the headings "Amount" and "Name and Address of Contributor"; and indicate whether the last day of the period is March 31, June 30, September 30, or December 31. Prepare such tabulation in accordance with the following example:

Amount	*Name and Address of Contributor*
	(*"Period"* from Jan. 1 through ------------------, 19----)
$1,500.00	John Doe, 1621 Blank Bldg., New York, N.Y.
$1,785.00	The Roe Corporation, 2511 Doe Bldg., Chicago, Ill.
$3,285.00	TOTAL

NOTE ON ITEM "E".—(*a*) *In General.* "The term 'expenditure' includes a payment, distribution, loan, advance, deposit, or gift of money or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make an expenditure"—Section 302(b) of the Lobbying Act.

(*b*) IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN AGENT OR EMPLOYEE. In the case of many employees, all expenditures will come under telephone and telegraph (Item "E 6") and travel, food, lodging, and entertainment (Item "E 7").

E. EXPENDITURES (INCLUDING LOANS) in connection with legislative interests:

Fill in every blank. If the answer to any numbered item is "None," write "None" in the spaces following the number.

Expenditures (other than loans)

1. $--------Public relations and advertising services
2. $--------Wages, salaries, fees, commissions (other than item "1")
3. $--------Gifts or contributions made during Quarter
4. $--------Printed or duplicated matter, including distribution cost
5. $--------Office overhead (rent, supplies, utilities, etc.)
6. $--------Telephone and telegraph
7. $--------Travel, food, lodging, and entertainment
8. $--------All other expenditures
9. $--------TOTAL for this Quarter (Add "1" through "8")
10. $--------Expended during previous Quarters of calendar year
11. $--------TOTAL from January 1 through this Quarter (Add "9" and "10")

Loans Made to Others

"The term 'expenditure' includes a . . . *loan* . . ."—Sec. 302(b).

12. $--------TOTAL now owed to person filing
13. $--------Lent to others during this Quarter
14. $--------Repayment received during this Quarter

15. Recipients of Expenditures of $10 or More

In the case of expenditures made during this Quarter by, or on behalf of the person filing: Attach plain sheets of paper approximately the size of this page and tabulate data as to expenditures under the following heading: "Amount," "Date or Dates," "Name and Address of Recipient," "Purpose." Prepare such tabulation in accordance with the following example:

Amount	*Date or Dates—Name and Address of Recipient—Purpose*
$1,750.00	7-11: Roe Printing Co., 3214 Blank Ave., St. Louis, Mo.—Printing and mailing circulars on the "Marshbanks Bill."
$2,400.00	7-15, 8-15, 9-15: Britten & Blaten, 3127 Gremlin Bldg., Washington, D.C.—Public relations service at $800.00 per month.
$4,150.00	TOTAL

PAGE 2

A. Charles D. Ablard, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Magazine Publishers Association, Inc., 575 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $418.81.

A. Clarence G. Adamy, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Food Chains, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $350. E. (9) $15.

A. Aerospace Industries Association of America, Inc., 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,541.68. E. (9) $4,541.68.

A. Aircraft Owners & Pilots Association, 4650 East-West Highway, Bethesda, Md.

A. Air Traffic Control Association, Inc., 528 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $800. E. (9) $500.

A. Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,284.74. E. (9) $4,284.74.

A. Donald C. Alexander, 603 Dixie Terminal Building, Cincinnati, Ohio.
B. National Piano Manufacturers Association of America, Inc., 1801 Gilbert Avenue, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $47.84.

A. George Venable Allen, 4370 Quebec Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Tobacco Institute, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Louis J. Allen, 1121 Nashville Trust Building, Nashville, Tenn.
B. Class I railroads in Tennessee.

A. Amalgamated Transit Union, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $284.38.

A. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. American Cancer Society, 219 East 42d Street, New York City.
E. (9) $7,294.46.

A. American Claims in Cuba Committee.
D. (6) $512. E. (9) $512.

A. American Coalition of Patriotic Societies, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $50. E. (9) $11,173.33.

A. American Committee for Flags of Necessity, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. American Farm Bureau Federation, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill., and 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $27,583. E. (9) $27,583.

A. American Federation of Labor & Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street, NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $37,996.13.

A. AFL–CIO Maritime Committee, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,279.60. E. (9) $3,111.29.

A. American Federation of Musicians, 641 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $375,577.98. E. (9) $6,274.76.

A. American Finance Conference, Inc., 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $600.

A. American Hotel & Motel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. American Israel Public Affairs Committee, 1737 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,935.57. E. (9) $2,944.99.

A. American Justice Association, Inc., Defense Highway, Gambrills, Md.
D. (6) $2. E. (9) $2.

A. American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $1,406.42. E. (9) $32,259.32.

A. American Maritime Association, 17 Battery Place, New York, N.Y., and 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $700. E. (9) $104.52.

A. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $9,307.94.

A. American National Cattlemen's Association, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $25,098.55. E. (9) $7,165.17.

A. American Optometric Association, Inc., 100 West Pine Street, Selinsgrove, Pa.
D. (6) $6,192.82. E. (9) $6,192.82.

A. American Osteopathic Association, 212 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $884.20. E. (9) $884.20

A. American Paper & Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. American Parents Committee, Inc., 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $997.01. E. (9) $316.97.

A. American Petroleum Institute, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $7,956. E. (9) $10,768.

A. American Pulpwood Association, 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,088.94. E. (9) $1,088.94.

A. American Stock Yards Association, 1712 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,350. E. (9) $900.

A. American Taxpayers Association, Inc., 326 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $10,379.50. E. (9) $2,042.16.

A. American Textile Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C.
D. (6) $11,417.67. E. (9) $11,417.67.

A. American Vocational Association, Inc., 1510 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $25,999.53. E. (9) $400.

A. American Warehousemen's Association, 222 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. American Waterways Operators, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,856.53. E. (9) $1,856.53.

A. Jerry L. Anderson, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Walter M. Anderson, Jr., Montgomery, Ala.
B. Alabama Railroad Association, 1002 First National Bank Building, Montgomery, Ala.
E. (9) $86.68.

A. George W. Apperson, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Division 689, Amalgamated Transit Union, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. David Apter, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Council of the Forest Industries of British Columbia, 550 Burrard Street, Vancouver, B.C.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $259.18.

A. R. J. Arbaugh, Post Office Box 525, Iowa, La.
B. 35 Hour Week Able Association, Post Office Box 817, Lake Charles, La.
E. (9) $71.82.

A. W. B. Ardery, Washington, D.C.
B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.

A. Carl F. Arnold, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,750. E. (9) $1,362.18.

A. Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., 1957 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Associated Railroads of New Jersey, Pennsylvania Station, Raymond Plaza, Newark, N.J.

A. Associated Third Class Mail Users, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Associated Third Class Mail Users.

A. Association of American Physicians & Surgeons, Inc., 185 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $525. E. (9) $525.

A. Association of American Railroads, 929 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,926.72. E. (9) $3,926.72.

A. Association on Broadcasting Standards, Inc., 1741 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $95.31.

A. Association of Casualty & Surety Cos., 110 William Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,512.85. E. (9) $2,512.85.

A. Association on Japanese Textile Imports, Inc., 551 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Association of Oil Pipe Lines, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $500.

A. Association of Western Railways, 224 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.

A. Atlantic Refining Co., 260 South Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
E. (9) $300.

A. Robert L. Augenblick, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. Investment Company Institute, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $50. E. (9) $10.

A. Richard W. Averill, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

A. Michael H. Bader, 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association on Broadcasting Standards, Inc., 1741 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Harry S. Baer, Jr., 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Aerospace Services Association, 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $97.40.

A. Charles B. Bailey, Sr., 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railway & Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express & Station Employees.
D. (6) $2,568.55. E. (9) $407.66.

A. Donald Baldwin, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $465.70.

A. Robert C. Barnard, 225 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.

A. William T. Barnes, 928 Investment Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Research & Development Corp., 200 Berkeley Street, Boston, Mass.

A. William T. Barnes, 928 Investment Building, Washington, D.C.
B. General Development Corp., 2828 Coral Way, Miami, Fla.

A. Arthur R. Barnett, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Cos., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $700. E. (9) $241.41.

A. Thomas C. Barringer, 301 Harvey Road, McLean, Va.
B. Simon Enterprises, Inc., 250 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,013.60.

A. A. Wesley Barthelmes, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Insurance Co. of North America and Life Insurance Co. of North America, 1600 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
D. (6) $476. E. (9) $109.47.

A. Laurie C. Battle, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. Roy Battles, 532 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Clear Channel Broadcasting Service (CCBS), 532 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Donald S. Beattie, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,050.

A. Lowell R. Beck, 1120 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. American Bar Association, 1120 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

A. John H. Beidler, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor & Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,640. E. (9) $274.59.

A. Ernest H. Benson, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $5,250.

A. Andrew J. Biemiller, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor & Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,940. E. (9) $423.15.

A. Walter J. Bierwagen, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amalgamated Transit Union, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John H. Bivins, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $605.

A. James C. Black, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Republic Steel Corp., Republic Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $500.

A. Richard W. Blake.
B. National Beet Growers Federation, 1113 10th Avenue, Greeley, Colo.
D. (6) $480.

A. Wm. Rhea Blake, 1918 North Parkway, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.

A. Blue Cross Association, 840 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $4,652.29.

A. William Blum, Jr., 1815 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee for Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 149 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $3,360. E. (9) $522.60.

A. William Blum, Jr., 1815 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Pacific Navigation System, Inc., 9 First Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $375. E. (9) $85.28.

A. Fred F. Bockmon, 405 Luhrs Building, Phoenix, Ariz.
B. Southern Pacific Co., 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif., and the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway, 121 East Sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $100. E. (9) $16.24.

A. Maurice G. Boehl, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. Eugene F. Bogan, 1108 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Investment Company Institute, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. Book Manufacturers' Institute, Inc., 25 West 43d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Joseph L. Borda, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. Lyle H. Boren, Seminole, Okla.
B. The Association of Western Railways, 224 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.

A. Joseph Borkin, 802 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Record Industry Association of America, Inc., 1 East 57th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Robert T. Borth, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,400. E. (9) $117.80.

A. Robert Bosch Corp., 40-25 Crescent Street, Long Island City.
E. (9) $6,871.11.

A. Charles E. Bosley, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Committee for International Development, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,890.

A. G. Stewart Boswell, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $100.

A. G. Stewart Boswell, 407 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Agricultural Employers, 407 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $22.50. E. (9) $3.

A. Charles N. Brady, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Joseph E. Brady, 122 Sheraton Gibson Hotel, Cincinnati, Ohio.
B. National Coordinating Committee of the Beverage Industry, 122 Sheraton Gibson Hotel, Cincinnati, Ohio.

A. W. Kenneth Brew, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Paper & Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Parke C. Brinkley, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Agricultural Chemicals Association.
D. (6) $150. E. (9) $6.

A. W. S. Bromley, 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. American Pulpwood Association, 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Derek Brooks, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Retail Furniture Association, 666 Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $778.11.

A. Brotherhood of Railway & Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express & Station Employees, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $2,830.71. E. (9) $2,830.71.

A. J. D. Brown, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Public Power Association, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $150.

A. Brown & Lund, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American & Foreign Power Co., Inc., 100 Church Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $96.89.

A. Brown & Lund, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Cos., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $1,448.40.

A. Robert W. Bruce, 140 New Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. The Pacific Telephone & Telegraph Co., 140 New Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $68. E. (9) $326.

A. Lyman L. Bryan, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Institute of Certified Public Accountants, 666 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $28. E. (9) $21.11.

A. George S. Buck, Jr., 1918 North Parkway, Memphis, Tenn.

B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.

A. Norman D. Burch, 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Retail Merchants Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) $54.55.

A. George J. Burger, 250 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.

B. Burger Tire Consultant Service, 250 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y., and National Federation of Independent Business, 921 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Burley & Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, Post Office Box 860, Lexington, Ky.

E. (9) $452.83.

A. Gustave Burmeister, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $1,375.

A. George B. Burnham, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.

B. Numerous stockholders of the Burnham Chemical Co., 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $205. E. (9) $205.

A. David Burpee, Fordhook Farms, Doylestown, Pa.

A. Orrin A. Burrows, 1200 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, 1200 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $3,999.99.

A. Hollis W. Burt, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Supervisors of State Banks, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $55.

A. Business Information Service, 300 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.

A. Monroe Butler, 550 South Flower Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

B. The Superior Oil Co., 550 South Flower Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Robert B. Byrnes, 1703 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Railroad Pension Forum, Inc., 2403 East 75th Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $300. E. (9) $24.24.

A. C. G. Caffrey, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Textile Manufacturer's Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C.

D. (6) $760.20. E. (9) $40.

A. Gordon L. Calvert, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Investment Bankers Association of America, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $500. E. (9) $334.82.

A. Carl C. Campbell, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.

D. (6) $69.23.

A. Camping Club of America, Inc., 945 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Canal Zone Central Labor Union-Metal Trades Council, Post Office Box 471, Balboa Heights, C.Z.

D. (6) $3,025.31. E. (9) $5,390.22.

A. Ronald A. Capone, 505 the Farragut Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Committee of European Shipowners, 3–6 Bury Court, St. Mary Axe, London, E.C. 3.

D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $306.07.

A. James R. Carnes, 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Manufacturing Chemists' Association, Inc., 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $2,500.

A. Braxton B. Carr, 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. The American Waterways Operators, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,400. E. (9) $170.72.

A. Robert S. Carr, 1220 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Hiram Walker & Sons, Inc., 8283 Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

A. H. Allen Carroll, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $325.

A. Eugene C. Carusi, 1619 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Committee for Flags of Necessity, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $100.

A. Central Arizona Project Association, 642 Security Building, Phoenix, Ariz.

D. (6) $20,168.17. E. (9) $20,200.97.

A. Donald E. Channell, 1120 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. American Bar Association, 1120 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $100. E. (9) $16.

A. Channing Service Corp., 85 Broad Street, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) $7,482.62.

A. Alger B. Chapman, Jr., 11 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

B. New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Chapman, Friedman, Shea, Clubb & Duff, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Taxicab Association, Inc., 4415 North California Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $750. E. (9) $25.80.

A. Chapman, Friedman, Shea, Clubb & Duff, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Bruynzeel Fabricken, Zaandam, Holland, and Bruynzeel Suriname, Paramaribo, Suriname.

D. (6) $5,746. E. (9) $558.08.

A. Chapman, Friedman, Shea, Clubb & Duff, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Hawaiian Botanical Gardens Foundation, Inc., 1527 Keeaumoku Street, Honolulu, Hawaii.

E. (9) $170.31.

A. Chapman, Friedman, Shea, Clubb & Duff, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Jeppesen & Co., 8025 East 40th Avenue, Denver, Colo.

D. (6) $10,000. E. (9) $56.82.

A. Chapman, Friedman, Shea, Clubb & Duff, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Strohmeyer & Arpe Co., 139–141 Franklin Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $625. E. (9) $94.32.

A. Chapman, Friedman, Shea, Clubb & Duff, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Union Nacional de Productores de Azucar, S.A. de C.V., Balderas 36, Primer Piso, Mexico D.F., Mexico.

D. (6) $8,625. E. (9) $898.18.

A. Chapman, Friedman, Shea, Clubb & Duff, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Western Geothermal, Inc., International Building, St. Mary's Square, San Francisco, Calif.

E. (9) $17.04.

A. Charitable Contributors Association, 100 Old York Road, Jenkintown, Pa.

E. (9) $200.

A. A. H. Chesser, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

E. (9) $52.

A. Christian Amendment Movement, 804 Penn Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.

D. (6) $2,814.95. E. (9) $2,814.95.

A. Citizens Committee on American Policy in the Near East, Box 368, McLean, Va.

D. (6) $1,584. E. (9) $1,525.20.

A. Citizens Foreign Aid Committee, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Allen C. K. Clark, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Shipbuilders Council of America, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Earl W. Clark, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Labor-Management Maritime Committee, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,035. E. (9) $90.61.

A. Robert M. Clark, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co., 80 East Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.

A. Clay Pipe Industry Depletion Committee, P.O. Box 2028, Kansas City, Mo.

D. (6) $15,969.19. E. (9) $794.85.

A. Clear Channel Broadcasting Service (CCBS), 532 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.

B. The Colonial Sugar Refining Co., Ltd., 1–3 O'Connell Street, Sydney, Australia.

D. (6) $400. E. (9) $7.60.

A. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.

B. The Oil Shale Corp., 680 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) $10.

A. Earle C. Clements, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The American Tobacco Co.

D. (6) $1,041.33. E. (9) $730.04.

A. Earle C. Clements, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corp.
D. (6) $1,041.33. E. (9) $730.04.

A. Earle C. Clements, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Liggett & Myers Tobacco Co.
D. (6) $1,041.33. E. (9) $730.04.

A. Earle C. Clements, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. P. Lorillard Co.
D. (6) $1,041.33. E. (9) $730.04.

A. Earle C. Clements, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Philip Morris Inc.
D. (6) $1,041.33. E. (9) $730.04.

A. Earle C. Clements, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co.
D. (6) $1,041.33. E. (9) $730.04.

A. Earle C. Clements, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Superior Oil Co.
D. (6) $500.

A. Joseph Coakley, 900 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Building Service Employees International Union, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Edwin S. Cohen, 26 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. Investment Company Institute, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. Coles & Goertner, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee of American Tanker Owners, Inc., 1 Chase Manhattan Plaza, New York, N.Y.

A. J. I. Collier, Jr., 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $175.

A. Collier & Shannon, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Shoe Manufacturers Association, Inc., 342 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $161.50.

A. Collier & Shannon, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Tool & Stainless Steel Industry Committee, Reading, Pa.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $102.

A. Paul G. Collins, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Bankers Association, 90 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $125.

A. Colorado Railroad Association, 702 Majestic Building, Denver, Colo.

A. Committee of American Steamship Lines, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,000. E. (9) $3,259.32.

A. Committee for Broadening Commercial Bank Participation in Public Financing, 50 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $6,025.

A. Committee for Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 149 Broadway, New York City.
D. (6) $6,450. E. (9) $13,511.37.

A. Ralph T. Compton, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. Paul B. Comstock, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Raymond F. Conkling, 135 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Texaco, Inc., 135 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $120. E. (9) $35.12.

A. John D. Conner, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Book Manufacturers' Institute, Inc., 25 West 43d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. John D. Conner, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Corn Starch Industry Committee, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Edward Cooper.
B. Motion Picture Association of America, Inc., 1600 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. J. Milton Cooper, 700 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

A. J. Milton Cooper, 15th and New York Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co., Winston-Salem, N.C.

A. John Shepherd Cooper, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $2,137.50. E. (9) $2,452.67.

A. Mitchell J. Cooper, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Council of Forest Industries, 550 Burrard Street, Vancouver, B.C., Canada.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $1.50.

A. Mitchell J. Cooper, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Footwear Division of Rubber Manufacturers Association, Inc., 444 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $6.

A. Corn Starch Industry Committee, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Council for a Livable World, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $19,092.78. E. (9) $29,433.95.

A. Council of Mechanical Specialty Contracting Industries, Inc., 610 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Council of Profit Sharing Industries, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Edsall Lee Couplin, 441 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
B. Michigan Hospital Service, 441 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $1,545. E. (9) $4.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Allentown Portland Cement Co., et al.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Machine Tool Distributors' Association, 1500 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Hawaiian Trust Co., Ltd., Honolulu, Hawaii.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. A. P. Møller, 8 Kongens Nytorv, Copenhagen, Denmark.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Machine Tool Builders' Association, 2139 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Tool, Die & Precision Machining Association, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Savings & Loan Bank of the State of New York, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Travelers Insurance Co., Hartford, Conn.

A. A. Harry Crane, 303 New England Building, Topeka, Kans.
B. Southern Railway System, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,241.53. E. (9) $208.10.

A. Credit Union National Association, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.
D. (6) $494.79. E. (9) $494.79.

A. Theodore F. T. Crolius, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $250. E. (9) $60.

A. William A. Cromartie, 1 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Park Sherman Co., 1200 Park Avenue, Murfreesboro, Tenn.

A. Robert E. Cronin, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Henry Ashton Crosby, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Council for a Livable World, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,153.86.

A. H. C. Crotty, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

A. Leo J. Crowley, 702 Majestic Building, Denver, Colo.
B. Colorado Railroad Association, 702 Majestic Building, Denver, Colo.

A. Bernard Cushman, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amalgamated Transit Union, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John R. Dalton, 1508 Merchants Bank Building, Indianapolis, Ind.
B. Associated Railways of Indiana, 1508 Merchants Bank Building, Indianapolis, Ind.

A. Louis S. Damiani, Box 54, Gatun, C.Z.
B. Canal Zone Central Labor Union & Metal Trades Council, P.O. Box 471, Balboa Heights, C.Z.
D. (6) $2,599.07. E. (9) $2,945.

A. John C. Datt, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $787.50. E. (9) 21.23.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. Chicago Bridge & Iron Co., 1305 West 105th Street, Chicago, Ill.

E. (9) $119.37.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. James S. Copley, 7776 Ivanhoe Avenue, La Jolla, Calif.

D. (6) $10,575.38. E. (9) $11.10.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 925 South Homan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $59,694.90. E. (9) $679.50.

A. Lowell Davis, 601 Ross Avenue, Mart, Tex.

D. (6) $142.50. E. (9) $142.50.

A. Donald S. Dawson, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. C.I.T. Financial Corp., 650 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Donald S. Dawson, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. D. C. Transit System, Inc., 36th and M Streets NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $500.

A. Donald S. Dawson, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Hilton Hotels Corp., Chicago, Ill.

A. Donald S. Dawson, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Indian Sugar Mills Association (Export Agency Division), Calcutta, India.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. C.I.T. Financial Corp., 650 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Indian Sugar Mills Association (Export Agency Division), Calcutta, India.

D. (6) $33,000.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Laundry Dry Cleaning Association of the District of Columbia, 2300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Variable Annuity Life Insurance Co., Washington, D.C.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Virgin Islands Gift & Fashion Shop Association, Inc., St. Thomas, Virgin Islands.

A. John F. Dawson, 1735 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The American Institute of Architects, 1735 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $250.

A. Tony T. Dechant.

B. The Farmers' Educational & Co-Operative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., and 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. L. E. Deilke, 165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.

B. The Inter-State Manufacturer's Association, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.

D. (6) $1,500.

A. L. E. Deilke, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.

B. National Association of Direct Selling Companies, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.

D. (6) $3,000.

A. James J. Delaney, Jr., 220 Central Building, Anchorage, Alaska.

B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Max A. Denney, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Finance Conference, Inc., 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $600.

A. Leslie E. Dennis, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Railway Labor Executives' Asociation, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $540.

A. Cecil B. Dickson, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.

B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $1,687.50. E. (9) $437.86.

A. George S. Dietrich, 1741 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Association on Broadcasting Standards, Inc., 1741 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $12.63. E. (9) $4.50.

A. James F. Dinneen, 141 Spring Street, Lexington, Mass.

B. Raytheon Co., 141 Spring Street, Lexington, Mass.

A. Disabled American Veterans National Service Headquarters, 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Disabled American Veterans, 1425 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

E. (9) $7,061.63.

A. Robert H. Distelhorst, Jr., 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

B. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $312.50. E. (9) $12.25.

A. District Lodge No. 44, International Association of Machinists, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $31,633.25. E. (9) $29,566.93.

A. Division 689, Amalgamated Transit Union, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert C. Dolan, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $450. E. (9) $238.89.

A. Paul R. M. Donelan, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.

B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $440.

A. James L. Donnelly, 200 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

B. Illinois Manufacturers' Association, 200 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Ronald D. Doremus, 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $22.50.

A. J. Dewey Dorsett, 110 William Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $150.

A. Jasper N. Dorsey, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $380.60.

A. C. L. Dorson, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the U.S. Government, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $2,104.62. E. (9) $249.

A. Evelyn Dubrow, 1710 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

B. International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, 1710 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $2,535. E. (9) $776.71.

A. R. Michael Duncan.

B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.

A. William E. Dunn, 1957 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., 1957 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., 1820 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $32.63. E. (9) $18.69.

A. Eastern Railroad Presidents Conference, 1 Exchange Place, Jersey City, N.J.

A. Herman Edelsberg, 1640 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, 315 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $140.

A. Wallace Edgerton, 1762 Church Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Anchor Corp., Westminister at Packer, Elizabeth, N.J., et al.

D. (6) $3,000.

A. Walter A. Edwards, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Chrysler Corp., 341 Massachusetts Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

D. (6) $250. E. (9) $100.

A. James B. Ehrlich, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $320. E. (9) $111.35.

A. John Doyle Elliott, 808 North Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.

B. Townsend Plan, Inc., 808 North Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,625. E. (9) $94.63.

A. John M. Elliott, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Amalgamated Transit Union, AFL–CIO, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Clyde T. Ellis, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $102.56.

A. Perry R. Ellsworth, 910 17th Street, NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Milk Industry Foundation, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John H. Else, 302 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Lumber & Building Material Dealers Association, 302 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $192.90.

A Ely, Duncan and Bennett, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.

B. American Public Power Association, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $2,100.

A. Ely, Duncan and Bennett, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Coachella Valley County Water District, Coachella, Calif.

D. (6) $1,200.

A. Ely, Duncan and Bennett, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Department of Water and Power of the City of Los Angeles, 207 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.

D. (6) $3,200.

A. Ely, Duncan and Bennett, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.

B. East Bay Municipal Utility District, 2130 Adeline Street, Oakland, Calif.

D. (6) $1,200.

A. Ely, Duncan and Bennett, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Imperial Irrigation District, El Centro, Calif.

D. (6) $2,100.

A. Ely, Duncan and Bennett, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Six Agency Committee, 909 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.

D. (6) $5,281.25.

A. Myles W. English, 966 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Highway Users Conference, Inc., 966 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Grover W. Ensley, 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

B. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $468.78. E. (9) $62.50.

A. John D. Fagan, 200 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.

B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

D. (6) $1,875. E. (9) $33.40.

A. William R. Falkner, 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Family Tax Association, 2110 Girard Trust Building, Philadelphia, Pa.

E. (9) $1,086.67.

A. Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union of America (National Farmers Union) 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.; 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $40,760.57. E. (9) $18,514.49.

A. Joseph G. Feeney, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. REA Express, 219 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $900. E. (9) $300.

A. Bonner Fellers, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Citizens Foreign Aid Committee.

A. Maxwell Field, 210 Lincoln Street, Boston, Mass.

B. New England Shoe and Leather Association, 210 Lincoln Street, Boston, Mass.

D. (6) $400. E. (9) $42.41.

A. Herbert A. Fierst, 607 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Council of Forest Industries of British Columbia, 400 Forest Industries Building, 550 Burrard Street, Vancouver, B.C., Canada.

D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $331.91.

A. William J. Flaherty, 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Disabled American Veterans, 1425 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

D. (6) $2,125.

A. Roger Fleming, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $1,225. E. (9) $23.09.

A. Donald G. Fletcher, 828 Midland Bank Building, Minneapolis, Minn.

B. Crop Quality Council, 828 Midland Bank Building, Minneapolis, Minn.

D. (6) $4,125. E. (9) $695.62.

A. Florida Citrus Mutual (Legislative Fund), Lakeland, Fla.

E. (9) $1,200.

A. Forest Farmers Association Cooperative, Post Office Box 7284, Station C, Atlanta, Ga.

D. (6) $58.78. E. (9) $31.68.

A. James W. Foristel, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.

B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $1,537.20. E. (9) $265.47.

A. Ronald J. Foulis, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. John G. Fox, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $142.66.

A. Morley E. Fox, Hotel Congressional, Washington, D.C.

B. Central Arizona Project Association, 642 Security Building, Phoenix, Ariz.

A. James H. French, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Book Manufacturers' Institute, Inc., 25 West 43d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. James H. French, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Corn Starch Industry Committee, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Milton Fricke, Papillion, Nebr.

B. National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. Philip P. Friedlander, Jr., 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The National Tire Dealers & Retreaders Association, Inc., 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $25,734.96. E. (9) $6,545.88.

A. Garrett Fuller, 836 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.

B. West Coast Steamship Co., 1210 Standard Plaza, Portland, Oreg.

A. Lawrence H. Gall, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $975.

A. M. J. Galvin, 207 Union Depot Building, St. Paul, Minn.

B. Minnesota Railroads.

D. (6) $500. E. (9) $57.96.

A. Gardner, Morrison & Rogers, 1126 Woodward Building, Washington, D.C.

B. American Metal Climax, Inc., 1270 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) $13.60.

A. Marion R. Garstang, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $50.

A. Aubrey D. Gates, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $170. E. (9) $133.60.

A. Joseph S. Gill, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.

B. The Ohio Railroad Association, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.

A. Neal P. Gillen, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Ginsburg & Leventhal, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.

B. U.S. Plastic & Chemical Corp., Metuchen, N.J., and Haverstraw, N.Y.

D. (6) $5,280. E. (9) $426.26.

A. Don A. Goodall.

B. Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Edward Gottlieb & Associates, Ltd., 640 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

B. Florists' Telegraph Delivery Association, 900 West Lafayette Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.

E. (9) $116.57.

A. Lawrence L. Gourley, 1757 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Osteopathic Association, 212 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $416.60.

A. Government Employes' Council, AFL-CIO, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $10,087.33. E. (9) $10,032.76.

A. Grain & Feed Dealers National Association, 400 Folger Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Grand Lodge of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen & Enginemen, 318–418 Keith Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

D. (6) $1,637.60. E. (9) $1,637.60.

A. John R. Graves, 1736 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Cornelius R. Gray, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Mrs. Virginia M. Gray, 3501 Williamsburg Lane NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Citizens Committee for UNICEF, 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $280. E. (9) $25.25.

A. Samuel A. Grayson, 611 Idaho Building, Boise, Idaho.
B. Union Pacific Railroad Co., 1416 Dodge Street, Omaha, Nebr.

A. Jerry N. Griffin, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. C.I.T. Financial Corp., 650 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Jerry N. Griffin, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Indian Sugar Mills Association (Export Agency Division), Calcutta, India.

A. Jerry N. Griffin, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Mutual Benefit Health & Accident Association, Omaha, Nebr.

A. Jerry N. Griffin, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Variable Annuity Life Insurance Co., Washington, D.C.

A. Ben H. Guill, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Automobile Dealers Association, American Smelting & Refining Co., and American Zinc, Lead & Smelting Co.
D. (6) $4,200. E. (9) $2,300.

A. Seymour S. Guthman, Woodward Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Syndicat des Distillateurs et Producteurs de sucre de Madagascar, 282 Boulevard Street, Germain, Paris 7, France.
D. (6) $3,750.

A. Robert W. Haack, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc.

A. Hoyt S. Haddock, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. AFL–CIO Maritime Committee, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,035. E. (9) $61.77.

A. Hoyt S. Haddock, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Labor-Management Maritime Committee, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $60.81.

A. Hal H. Hale, 421 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Harold T. Halfpenny, 111 West Washington Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Andrew G. Haley, 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association on Broadcasting Standards, Inc., 1741 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $66.67.

A. J. G. Hall, Detroit, Mich.
B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.

A. Robert A. Hall, 3502 East Kiest Boulevard, Dallas, Tex.
B. Kingdon Gould, Jr., and D. F. Antonelli, Jr., 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. E. C. Hallbeck, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Federation of Postal Clerks, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,291.70.

A. Hamel, Morgan, Park & Saunders, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Council of Private Lending Institutions, Inc., 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Hamel, Morgan, Park & Saunders, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Eastern Airlines, Inc., 10 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

A. Hamel, Morgan, Park & Saunders, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Standard Oil Co. (Indiana), 910 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $3,725. E. (9) $39.68.

A. W. C. Hammerle, 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. American Pulpwood Association, 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Robert N. Hampton, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $383.24.

A. William A. Hanscom, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Oil, Chemical & Atomic Workers International Union, 1840 California Street, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $1,437.50. E. (9) $225.

A. Mildred B. Harman, 212 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1730 Chicago Avenue, Evanston, Ill.
D. (6) $720. E. (9) $323.82.

A. L. James Harmanson, Jr., 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,499.96. E. (9) $227.09.

A. Eugene J. Hardy, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Bryce N. Harlow, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Proctor & Gamble Manufacturing Co., 301 East Sixth Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
E. (9) $84.

A. Herbert E. Harris II, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,562.50. E. (9) $66.35.

A. R. A. Harris, 38 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Railway Progress Institute, 38 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,749.98.

A. Robert B. Harris, 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Independent Dairies Association, 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. W. Gibson Harris, 815 Mutual Building, Richmond, Va.
B. Household Finance Corp., 3220 Prudential Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $7.34.

A. Burr P. Harrison, Graichen Building, Winchester, Va.
B. Household Finance Corp., 3220 Prudential Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $9.01.

A. Walter A. Hasty, Jr.
B. The Farmers' Educational & Co-Operative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., and 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,769.22. E. (9) $44.16.

A. Paul M. Hawkins, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $305.50. E. (9) $22.73.

A. Kit H. Haynes, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Hays & Hays, 920 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Motor Commerce Association, Inc., 4004 Versailles Road, Lexington, Ky.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $2.45.

A. Joseph H. Hays, 280 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
B. The Association of Western Railways, 224 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.

A. John C. Hazen, 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Retail Merchants Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $137.63.

A. Patrick B. Healy, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $196.35.

A. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,619.62. E. (9) $1,619.62.

A. George J. Hecht, 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, N.Y., and 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Parents Committee, Inc., 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Hedrick & Lane, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Comite de Productores de Azucar, Antonio Miro Quesada 376, Lima, Peru.
E. (9) $98.33.

A. Hedrick & Lane, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee on Constructive Price, 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $138.77.

A. Kenneth G. Heisler, 907 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National League of Insured Savings Associations, 907 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500.

A. Edmund P. Hennelly, 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Socony Mobil Oil Co., Inc., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,125. E. (9) $1,244.52.

A. John K. Herbert, 575 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Magazine Publishers Association, 575 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $957.85.

A. Maurice G. Herndon, 801 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Insurance Agents, 96 Fulton Street, New York, N.Y., and 801 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $273.20. E. (9) $273.20.

A. Hester, Owen & Crowder, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Boston Wool Trade Association, 263 Summer Street, Boston, Mass.

D. (6) $600. E. (9) $63.03.

A. Hester, Owen & Crowder, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Wool Manufacturers, 386 Fourth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $1,000.

A. Hester, Owen & Crowder, 432 Shoreham Building, Washintgon, D.C.

B. National Wool Growers Association, 414 Crandall Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.

E. (9) $14.87.

A. Hester, Owen & Crowder, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Wool Trade Association, 263 Summer Street, Boston, Mass.

A. Hester, Owen & Crowder, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

B. New York Wool Trade Association, 155 West 44th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Hester, Owen & Crowder, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Philadelphia Wool & Textile Association, Post Office Box 472, Station S, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Hester, Owen & Crowder, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

B. United States Brewers Association, 535 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $94.85.

A. M. F. Hicklin, 507 Bankers Trust Building, Des Moines, Iowa.

B. Iowa Railway Committee, 507 Bankers Trust Building, Des Moines, Iowa.

A. Robert L. Higgins, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Electrical Contractors Association, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John W. Hight, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $300. E. (9) $20.

A. James A. Hirshfield, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

B. Lake Carriers' Association, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Brig. Gen. J. D. Hittle, USMC (retired), 200 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.

B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

D. (6) $1,166.67. E. (9) $60.45.

A. Claude E. Hobbs, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Westinghouse Electric Corp., 3 Gateway Center, Pittsburgh, Pa.

D. (6) $900. E. (9) $120.

A. Lawrence S. Hobart, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Public Power Association, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $200.

A. Irvin A. Hoff, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. United States Cane Sugar Refiners' Association, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $191.55.

A. Lawrence J. Hogan, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Joint Committee on Transportation for Metropolitan Washington.

D. (6) $500. E. (9) $70.29.

A. Lawrence J. Hogan, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Apartment Owners Association, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $2,925. E. (9) $511.04.

A. Lawrence J. Hogan, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Council of Specialty Contractors' Associations, Inc., 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $380.82.

A. Holland & Hart, 500 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo.

B. National Livestock Tax Committee, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.

A. Fuller Holloway, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Toilet Goods Association, Inc., 1270 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $5,850. E. (9) $584.27.

A. Home Manufacturers Association, 1117 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $500. E. (9) $1,000.

A. Edwin M. Hood, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Shipbuilders Council of America, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Samuel H. Horne, 1145 Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Park Sherman Co., 1200 Park Avenue, Murfreesboro, Tenn.

A. Donald E. Horton, 222 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. American Warehousemen's Association.

A. Harold A. Houser, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Retired Officers Association, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $2,708.50.

A. Charles L. Huber, 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Disabled American Veterans, 1425 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

E. (9) $4,366.63.

A. W. T. Huff, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $275.

A. William J. Hull, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Ashland Oil & Refining Company, 1409 Winchester Avenue, Ashland, Ky.

A. William J. Hull, 326 Cafritz Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Ohio Valley Improvement Association, Inc.

E. (9) $12.

A. Elmer P. Hutter, Post Office Box 2255, Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $326.

A. Frank N. Ikard, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.

B. American Petroleum Institute, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.

A. Bernard J. Imming, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,250.

A. Industrial Union Department, AFL–CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,671.77. E. (9) $1,671.77.

A. Institute of Appliance Manufacturers, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Institute of Scrap Iron & Steel, Inc., 1729 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $300.

A. International Union of Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers, AFL–CIO, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $2,150.

A. Inter-State Manufacturer's Association, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.

D. (6) $2,975. E. (9) $4.10.

A. Iron Ore Lessors Association, Inc., 19 Summit Court, St. Paul, Minn.

D. (6) $22,372.78. E. (9) $14,995.49.

A. Robert C. Jackson, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Textile Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C.

D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $229.36.

A. Walter K. Jaenicke, 1957 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., 1957 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Japanese-American Citizens League, 1634 Post Street, San Francisco, Calif.

E. (9) $150.

A. Daniel Jaspan, Post Office Box 1924, Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Postal Supervisors, Post Office Box 1924, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $4,000. E. (9) $36.05.

A. Joe Jenness, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Charles B. Jennings, 1712 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Stock Yards Association, 1712 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $400.

A. Robert G. Jeter, Dresden, Tenn.

B. H. C. Spinks Clay Co., Paris, Tenn.; Old Hickory Clay Co., Paducah, Ky.; Bell Clay Co., Gleason, Tenn.; United Clay Mines Corp., Trenton, N.J.; Kentucky-Tennessee Clay Co., Mayfield, Ky.

E. (9) $32.72.

A. Peter D. Joers, 810 Whittington Avenue, Hot Springs, Ark.

B. Dierks Forests, Inc., 810 Whittington Avenue, Hot Springs, Ark.

A. Gilbert R. Johnson, 1208 Terminal Tower, Cleveland, Ohio.
B. Lake Carriers' Association, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Hugo E. Johnson, 600 Bulkley Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
B. American Iron Ore Association, 600 Bulkley Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Reuben L. Johnson.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America (National Farmers Union), 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.; 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,415.30. E. (9) $203.44.

A. George Bliss Jones, Montgomery, Ala.
B. Alabama Railroad Association, 1002 First National Bank Building, Montgomery, Ala.
E. (9) $150.05.

A. L. Dan Jones, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Petroleum Association of America, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $24.60.

A. Phillip E. Jones, 920 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. United States Beet Sugar Association, 920 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $250.

A. John E. Kane, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,187.50. E. (9) $744.24.

A. Allan M. Kearney, 1001 Broad Street, Johnstown, Pa.
B. Pennsylvania Electric Co., 1001 Broad Street; Johnstown, Pa.
D. (6) $261.24. E. (9) $56.62.

A. William J. Keating, 400 Folger Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Grain & Feed Dealers National Association, 400 Folger Building, Washington, D.C.

A. W. M. Keck, Jr., 9864 Wilshire Boulevard, Beverly Hills, Calif.
B. Superior Oil Co.
E. (9) $275.

A. Charles C. Keeble, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Humble Oil & Refining Co., Post Office Box 2180, Houston, Tex.
E. (9) $207.12.

A. Eugene A. Keeney, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the U.S.A.

A. Francis V. Keesling, Jr., 605 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. West Coast Life Insurance Co., 605 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. John T. Kelly, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association.

A. Ken Kendrick, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Wheat Growers, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,857.59. E. (9) $1,857.59.

A. I. L. Kenen, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Israel Public Affairs Committee, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Harold L. Kennedy, 420 Cafritz Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Marathon Oil Co., Findlay, Ohio.
E. (9) $115.35.

A. Brooks J. Keogh, Keene, N. Dak.
B. American National Cattlemen's Association, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
E. (9) $102.06.

A. William J. Kerwin, 18th and M Streets NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National League of Insured Savings Associations, 18th and M Streets NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500.

A. Ronald M. Ketcham.
B. Southern California Edison Co., Post Office Box 351, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $1,008. E. (9) $1,069.72.

A. Jeff Kibre, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Longshoremen's & Warehousemen's Union, 150 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $2,469.96. E. (9) $1,830.42.

A. Edward W. Kiley, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John A. Killick, 1820 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., 1820 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $12.50.

A. John A. Killick, 1820 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Independent Meat Packagers Association, 1820 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $306.25.

A. H. Cecil Kilpatrick, 912 American Security Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Rossmore Leisure World, Seal Beach, Calif.
E. (9) $39.19.

A. Ludlow King, 2139 Wisconsin Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. National Machine Tool Builders' Association, 2139 Wisconsin Avenue, Washington, D.C.

A. T. Bert King, 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $750.

A. Clifton Kirkpatrick, 1918 North Parkway, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $630. E. (9) $54.74.

A. James F. Knotz, 1435 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Mine Workers of America, 900 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,552.

A. George W. Koch, 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 925 South Homan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Robert M. Koch, 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $30.

A. Louis C. Krauthoff II, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Cormaine Krettek, 200 C Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. American Library Association, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $3,535.63.

A. Herman C. Kruse, 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $4,381.33.

A. Lloyd R. Kuhn, 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Aerospace Industries Association of America, Inc., 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,912. E. (9) $629.63.

A. Miss June Kysilko, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $40.

A. Labor Bureau of Middle West, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 11 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Labor-Management Maritime Committee, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $7,815. E. (9) $5,937.97.

A. Lake Carriers Association, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Kenneth C. Landry, 1735 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Institute of Architects, 1735 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $250.

A. Richard H. Lane, 1511 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Committee for Broadening Commercial Bank Participation in Public Financing.

A. Latham & Watkins.
B. Rossmoor Corp., Post Office Box 125, Seal Beach, Calif.
D. (6) $880. E. (9) $13.

A. J. Austin Latimer, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $900.

A. John V. Lawrence, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $38.

A. Warren Lawrence, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Standard Oil Co. of California, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $125. E. (9) $73.01.

A. Robert F. Lederer, 835 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Association of Nurserymen, Inc., 835 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $35. E. (9) $129.34.

A. Leonard F. Lee, 402 Solar Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Tennessee Gas Transmission Co., Post Office Box 2511, Houston, Tex.
E. (9) $41.15.

A. Legislative Committee, International Economic Policy Association, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $3,686.25.

A. Legislative Committee for the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $125. E. (9) $426.

A. G. E. Leighty, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Donald Lerch & Co., Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Shell Chemical Co., 110 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Roy T. Lester, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $375. E. (9) $16.75.

A. Morris J. Levin, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 6 Penn Center Plaza, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Hal Leyshon, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Federation of Musicians, 641 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $4,999.98. E. (9) $1,627.16.

A. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y., and 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,003.99. E. (9) $4,003.99.

A. L. Blaine Liljenquist, 917 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,250. E. (9) $10.

A. Lawrence J. Linck & Co., 53 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $1,830.87.

A. Lester W. Lindow, 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association of Maximum Service Telecasters, Inc., 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert G. Litschert, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Cos., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $701.25. E. (9) $45.40.

A. Basil R. Littin, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.
B. Continental Oil Co., Post Office Box 2197, Houston, Tex.

A. Fred Livingston, 802 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Record Industry Association of America, Inc., 1 East 57th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. John J. Long, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Printing Pressmen and Assistants' Union of North America, Pressmen's Home, Tenn.
D. (6) $1,300.

A. Paul H. Long, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Humble Oil & Refining Co., Post Office Box 2180, Houston, Tex.
E. (9) $114.74.

A. R. C. Longmire, Pauls Valley, Okla.
B. National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. Otto Lowe, Cape Charles, Va.
B. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Otto Lowe, Cape Charles, Va.
B. Norfolk & Western Railway Co., Roanoke, Va.
D. (6) $600.

A. James C. Lucas, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Retail Jewelers of America, Inc., 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $45.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mobile Homes Manufacturers Association, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. U.S. Cane Sugar Refiners' Association, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $750.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Western Medical Corp., 415–423 West Pershing Road, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. A. B. Luckey, Jr., 103 G Street SW., Washington, D.C.
B. Menlo L. Realty Co., 6303 Wilshire Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $1,850. E. (9) $271.57.

A. Milton F. Lunch, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Society of Professional Engineers.
D. $750.

A. John C. Lynn, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,437.50. E. (9) $25.90.

A. Breck P. McAllister, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. American Committee for Flags of Necessity, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. John A. McCart, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Government Employes' Council, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,884.56.

A. Albert L. McDermott, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Hotel & Motel Association, 221 West 59th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $27.

A. Angus H. McDonald.
B. The Farmers' Educational & Co-Operative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., and 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,038.46. E. (9) $50.32.

A. Joseph T. McDonnell, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Cos., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Joseph A. McElwain, 40 East Broadway, Butte, Mont.
B. The Montana Power Co., Butte, Mont.
E. (9) $458.49.

A. William F. McKenna, 18th and M Streets NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National League of Insured Savings Associations, 18th and M Streets NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $136. E. (9) $2.

A. George McLain, 1031 South Grand Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. National and California League of Senior Citizens.

A. Marvin L. McLain, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,250. E. (9) $35.75.

A. W. H. McMains, 1132 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Distilled Spirits Institute, 1132 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

A. William F. McManus, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $800. E. (9) $132.50.

A. C. W. McMillan, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
B. American National Cattlemen's Association, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $4,250.04. E. (9) $606.21.

A. Clarence M. McMillan, 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Candy Wholesalers Association, Inc., 1343 L Street, NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Charles R. McNeill, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Bankers Association, 90 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $504.64.

A. William P. MacCracken, Jr., 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. American Optometric Association, Inc., 100 West Pine Street, Selinsgrove, Pa.
D. (6) $3,500. E. (9) $7.20.

A. John G. Macfarlan, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. REA Express, 219 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,254. E. (9) $532.16.

A. James E. Mack, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Confectioners Association, 36 South Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. David I. Mackie, 1 Exchange Place, Jersey City, N.J.
B. Eastern Railroad Presidents Conference, 1 Exchange Place, Jersey City, N.J.

A. H. E. Mahlman, 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. American Optometric Association, Inc., 100 West Pine Street, Selinsgrove, Pa.
D. (6) $687.50. E. (9) $17.05.

A. Carter Manasco, 4301 Chesterbrook Road, McLean, Va.
B. National Coal Association, Coal Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,500. E. (9) $131.20.

A. D. L. Manion, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue N.W., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $564.38.

A. R. R. Manion, 1010 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. New York Central Railroad Co., 230 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Manufacturing Chemists' Association, Inc., 1825 Connecticut Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $3,000.

A. Olya Margelin, 1637 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Jewish Women, Inc., 1 West 47th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,242.02. E. (9) $98.71.

A. James Mark, Jr., 1435 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Mine Workers of America, 900 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,052.

A. Rodney W. Markley, Jr., Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich.
D. (6) $101.75. E. (9) $138.55.

A. Raymond E. Marks, 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Southern Pacific Co., 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Robert O. Marritz, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $40.

A. David M. Marsh, 837 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of Casualty & Surety Cos., 110 William Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $200.

A. Winston W. Marsh.
B. National Tire Dealers & Retreaders Association, 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Fred T. Marshall, 1112 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The B. F. Goodrich Co., 500 South Main Street, Akron, Ohio.

A. J. Paull Marshall, 925 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $233.04. E. (9) $232.06.

A. Thomas A. Martin, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association, 300 Tulsa Building, Tulsa, Okla.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $125.

A. Mike M. Masaoka, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Mike M. Masaoka, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association on Japanese Textile Imports, Inc., 551 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Mike M. Masaoka, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Japanese American Citizens League, 1634 Post Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $150.

A. Walter J. Mason, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Building & Construction Trades Department, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,124.90. E. (9) $1,263.76.

A. David Mathews, Jr., 345 Fourth Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.
B. Pittsburgh Coal Exchange.
E. (9) $209.76.

A. P. H. Mathews, 925 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $641.87. E. (9) $242.59.

A. Charles D. Matthews, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Cos., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $260. E. (9) $71.76.

A. C. V. & R. V. Maudlin, 1111 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Secondary Material Industries, Inc., 271 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Arnold Mayer, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amalgamated Meat Cutters & Butcher Workmen of North America, 2800 North Sheridan Road, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,530. E. (9) $665.

A. John S. Mears, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $2,916. E. (9) $16.80.

A. Kenneth A. Meiklejohn, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor & Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,640. E. (9) $425.01.

A. William R. Merriam, 1707 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Telephone & Telegraph Corp., 1707 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $1,375.

A. Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade, 1616 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Michigan Hospital Service, 441 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
E. (9) $1,550.79.

A. Midland Cooperative Dairy Association, Shawano, Wis., and Box 128, Cazenovia, N.Y.

A. Clarence R. Miles, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Legislative Committee, International Economic Policy Association, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,600. E. (9) $86.25.

A. Capt. A. Stanley Miller, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Committee for Flags of Necessity, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $100.

A. Miller Associates, Inc., 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Society of Composers, Authors & Publishers, 575 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $90.

A. Miller Associates, Inc., 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The League of New York Theatres, Inc., and the National Association of the Legitimate Theatre, Inc., 157 West 48th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,125. E. (9) $219.25.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Blue Cross Association, Inc., 840 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,881.25. E. (9) $140.11.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Investors Diversified Services, Inc., 8th & Marquette, Minneapolis, Minn.
D. (6) $35,000.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Carl M. Loeb, Rhoades & Co., 42 Wall Street, New York City.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $32.76.

A. Dale Miller, 377 Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C.
B. Dallas, Tex., Chamber of Commerce.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Dale Miller, 377 Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C.
B. Intracoastal Canal Association of Louisiana & Texas, 2211 South Coast Building, Houston, Tex.
D. (6) $2,625.

A. Dale Miller, 377 Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C.
B. Texas Gulf Sulphur Co., Newgulf, Tex., and New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,250.

A. Edwin Reid Miller, 1004 Farnam Street, Omaha, Nebr.
B. Nebraska Railroads Legislative Committee, 1004 Farnam Street, Omaha, Nebr.
D. (6) $3,465.

A. Lloyd S. Miller, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $535.75.

A. Luman G. Miller, 424 Henry Building, Portland, Oreg.
B. Oregon Railroad Association, 424 Henry Building, Portland, Oreg.

A. Joseph A. Millimet, 1838 Elm Street, Manchester, N.H.
B. C.I.T. Financial Corp., 650 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $3,042.06. E. (9) $30.06.

A. Joseph A. Millimet, 1838 Elm Street, Manchester, N.H.
B. National Association of Independent Insurers, 30 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $4,319.12. E. (9) $170.40.

A. Claude Minard, 215 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. California Railroad Association, 215 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Othmer J. Mischo, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amalgamated Transit Union, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Missouri Railroad Committee, 906 Olive Street, St. Louis, Mo.
E. (9) $961.29.

A. M. D. Mobley, 1510 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Vocational Association, 1510 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Marion S. Monk, Jr., Batchelor, La.
B. National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. G. Merrill Moody, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $23. E. (9) $36.20.

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, The Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. William S. Beinecke, 114 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $350. E. (9) $96.21.

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, The Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

B. The Sperry & Hutchinson Co., 114 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Motor Commerce Association, Inc., 4004 Versailles Road, Lexington, Ky.

D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $375.

A. Bernard R. Mullady, 1200 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers.

D. (6) $2,730.

A. T. H. Mullen, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Paper & Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. T. H. Mullen, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Pulpwood Association, 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. T. H. Mullen, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Pulp, Paper & Paperboard Institute (U.S.A.), Inc., 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Ray R. Murdock.

B. American Maritime Association, 17 Battery Place, New York, N.Y., and 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $700.

A. Dr. Emmett J. Murphy, 5737 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Chiropractors Insurance Co., American Building, Webster City, Iowa.

A. John J. Murphy, 420 Gardiner Drive, Hillsmere Shores, Annapolis, Md.

B. National Customs Service Association, 420 Gardiner Drive, Hillsmere Shores, Annapolis, Md.

A. Robert F. Murphy, the American Legion, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.

D. (6) $2,397.60. E. (9) $73.50.

A. William E. Murray, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. J. Walter Myers, Jr., Post Office Box 7284, Station C, Atlanta, Ga.

B. Forest Farmers Association Cooperative, Post Office Box 7284, Station C, Atlanta, Ga.

A. Kenneth D. Naden, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $6,874.98. E. (9) $880.43.

A. Augustus Nasmith, Pennsylvania Station, Raymond Plaza, Newark, N.J.

B. Associated Railroads of New Jersey, Pennsylvania Station, Raymond Plaza, Newark, N.J.

A. National Association of Direct Selling Cos., 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.

D. (6) $13,750. E. (9) $9.25.

A. National Association of Electric Cos., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $479.50. E. (9) $12,153.67.

A. National Association of Food Chains, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $365. E. (9) $365.

A. National Association of Frozen Food Packers, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.

A. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $1,792.76. E. (9) $1,792.76.

A. National Association of Plumbing-Heating-Cooling Contractors, 1016 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Association of Postal Supervisors, Post Office Box 1924, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $15,000. E. (9) $6,752.35.

A. National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1625 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,740.40. E. (9) $115.04.

A. National Association of Shoe Chain Stores, Inc., 51 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $4,200. E. (9) $339.44.

A. National Association of Social Security Beneficiaries, 1000 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $255. E. (9) $255.

A. National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

D. (6) $557.35. E. (9) $523.75.

A. National Association of Travel Organizations, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $41,184.65. E. (9) $682.50.

A. National Association of Wheat Growers, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,857.59. E. (9) $1,857.59.

A. National Automobile Dealers Association, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $7,625.58. E. (9) $7,625.58.

A. National Coal Association, Coal Building, Washington, D.C.

A. National Committee for International Development, 1762 Church Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $3,260. E. (9) $3,837.97.

A. National Cotton Compress & Cotton Warehouse Association, 1085 Shrine Building, Memphis, Tenn.

A. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.

D. (6) $2,081.23. E. (9) $2,081.23.

A. National Council of Agricultural Employers, 407 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $38.22. E. (9) $38.22.

A. National Council on Business Mail, Inc., 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $133.09.

A. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1616 H. Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $4,594. E. (9) $4,347.62.

A. National Council Junior Order United American Mechanics, 3027 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

E. (9) $171.24.

A. National Counsel Associates, 421 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.

B. Committee for the Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 149 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $3,000. E. $412.72.

A. National Electrical Contractors Association, Inc., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Electrical Manufacturers Association, 155 East 44th Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $1,095.30. E. (9) $1,095.30.

A. National Fisheries Institute, Inc., 1614 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $80.70.

A. National Housing Conference, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $32,731.14. E. (9) $32,550.63.

A. National Independent Dairies Association, 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $49.42.

A. National Independent Meat Packers Association, 1820 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,965.01. E. (9) $3,234.48.

A. National League of Insured Savings Associations, 18th and M Streets NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Member Associations of the League.

D. (6) $10,493.72. E. (9) $1,464.96.

A. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,671.50. E. (9) $1,671.50.

A. National Livestock Feeders Association, Inc., 309 Livestock Exchange Building, Omaha, Nebr.

D. (6) $2,625. E. (9) $2,625.

A. National Livestock Tax Committee, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.

D. (6) $4,339.05.

A. National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $5,305. E. (9) $6,094.47.

A. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $8,607.53. E. (9) $8,607.53.

A. National Multiple Sclerosis Society, 257 Park Avenue South, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) $785.35.

A. National Restaurant Association, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C. and 1530 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $16,716.54. E. (9) $16,716.54.

A. National Retail Merchants Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) $8,165.26.

A. National Retail Furniture Association, 666 Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.

A. National Retired Teachers Association & American Association of Retired Persons, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Rivers and Harbors Congress, 1028 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $4,281.86. E. (9) $12,718.30.

A. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $1,138.93.

A. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $68,634. E. (9) $3,203.

A. National Tire Dealers & Retreaders Association, 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1730 Chicago Avenue, Evanston, Ill.

D. (6) $1,803.49. E. (9) $1,635.37.

A. Nation-Wide Committee on Import-Export Policy, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $7,275. E. (9) $7,500.35.

A. Robert R. Neal, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $19.86.

A. Alan M. Nedry, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Southern California Edison Co., Post Office Box 351, Los Angeles, Calif.

D. (6) $250. E. (9) $501.29.

A. New England Shoe & Leather Association, 210 Lincoln Street, Boston, Mass.

D. (6) $442.41. E. (9) $442.41.

A. Mrs. Sarah H. Newman, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Consumers League, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,650.

A. Patrick J. Nilan, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. United Federation of Postal Clerks, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,458.32.

A. Stanley D. Noble, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Council of Profit Sharing Industries, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.

A. W. R. Noble, 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Farm & Power Equipment Dealers Association, Material Handling Equipment Distributors Association, and National Retail Hardware Association.

D. (6) $4,500.

A. Charles M. Noone, 1209 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Small Business Investment Cos., 537 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $364.77.

A. O. L. Norman, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Electric Cos., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $687.50. E. (9) $39.30.

A. Robert H. North, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers & Milk Industry Foundation, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Harry E. Northam, 185 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

B. Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, Inc., 185 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. E. M. Norton, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $200.

A. Michael J. Norton, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $100. E. (9) $366.70.

A. Ira H. Nunn, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Restaurant Association, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 1530 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $2,000.01. E. (9) $250.

A. Richrd T. O'Connell, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Council of Farmer Cooperative, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $3,900. E. (9) $171.55.

A. William B. O'Connell, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen, 2247 West Lawrence Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. John F. O'Connor, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. United Federation of Postal Clerks, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $2,916.64. E. (9) $110.05.

A. R. E. O'Connor, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

B. American Paper & Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. R. E. O'Connor, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

B. Pulp, Paper & Paperboard Institute (U.S.A.), Inc., 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. John B. O'Day, 11 East Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. Insurance Economics Society of America, 11 East Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $11,753.79.

R. Jane O'Grady, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, 15 Union Square, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $1,625. E. (9) $300.25.

A. Ohio Railroad Association, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.

A. Alvin E. Oliver, 400 Folger Building, Washingon, D.C.

B. Grain & Feed Dealers National Association, 400 Folger Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Clarence H. Olson, 1608 K Street NW., Washintgon, D.C.

B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.

D. (6) $3,888. E. (9) $248.15.

A. Samuel Omasta, 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $15.

A. Morris E. Osburn, Central Trust Building, Jefferson City, Mo.

B. Missouri Railroad Committee.

A. Kermit Overby, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $150.

A. John A. Overholt, 10315 Kensington Parkway, Kensington, Md., and 1106 Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1625 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,076.95.

A. Vaux Owen, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Federation of Federal Employees, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $3,692.34. E. (9) $6.

A. Raymond S. Page, Jr., Mill Creek Terrace, Gladwyne, Pa.

B. Campbell Soup Co., 375 Memorial Avenue, Camden, N.J.

A. Walter Page, Box 128, Cazenovia, N.Y.

A. Everett L. Palmer, 901 Hamilton Street, Allentown, Pa.

B. Pennsylvania Power & Light Co., 901 Hamilton Street, Allentown, Pa.

E. (9) $10.87.

A. Lew M. Paramore, Town House Hotel, Post Office Box 1310, Kansas City, Kans.

B. Mississippi Valley Association, 121 South Meramec, Clayton, Mo.

A. J. D. Parel, 244 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $16.04. E. (9) $20.

A. Holcombe Parkes, 38 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. Railway Progress Institute, 38 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $9,750.

A. James D. Parriott, Jr., 539 South Main Street, Findlay, Ohio.

B. Marathon Oil Co., 539 South Main Street, Findlay, Ohio.

A. Robert D. Partridge, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $214.30.

A. James G. Patton.

B. The Farmers' Educational & Cooperative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.; and 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,375. E. (9) $153.36.

A. Lynn C. Paulson, 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Independent Dairies Association, 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $49.79.

A. Philip C. Pendleton, Second Street Pike, Bryn Athyn, Pa.

B. Charitable Contributors Association, 100 Old York Road, Jenkintown, Pa.

D. (6) $200.

A. Philip C. Pendleton, Second Street Pike, Bryn Athyn, Pa.

B. Family Tax Association, 2110 Girard Trust Building, Philadelphia, Pa.

D. (6) $900. E. (9) $278.10.

A. Philip C. Pendleton, Second Street Pike, Bryn Athyn, Pa.

B. The Pitcairn Co., 100 West 10th Street, Wilmington, Del.

D. (6) $300.

A. Peter J. Pestilo, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Restaurant Association, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 1530 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $1,699.96. E. (9) $125.

A. Ervin L. Peterson, 1104 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Milk Industry Foundation & International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $115.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, Post Office Drawer BS, Lakeland, Fla.

B. Florida Citrus Mutual, Lakeland, Fla.

D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $43.50.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, Post Office Drawer BS, Lakeland, Fla.

B. Florida Fruit & Vegetable Association, P.O. Box 6787, Orlando, Fla.

E. (9) $9.26.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, Post Office Drawer BS, Lakeland, Fla.

B. West Coast Inland Navigation District, Court House, Bradenton, Fla.

D. (6) $600. E. (9) $38.62.

A. Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Richard N. Philleo, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.

B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $1,275.30. E. (9) $74.50.

A. Phinney, Hallman & Pulley, 617 First National Bank Building, Dallas, Tex.

B. Kingdom Gould, Jr., and D. F. Antonelli, Jr., 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $206.12.

A. Tom Pickett, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $76.67.

A. Albert Pike, Jr., 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

B. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. James H. Pipkin, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Texaco, Inc., 135 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $700. E. (9) $1,255.

A. The Pitcairn Co., 100 West 10th Street, Wilmington, Del.

E. (9) $345.54.

A. Plains Cotton Growers, Inc., 1720 Avenue M, Lubbock, Tex.

D. (6) $24,771.90. E. (9) $1,350.

A. Milton M. Plumb, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. James K. Polk, 522 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

B. Consolidated Edison Co. of New York, Inc., 4 Irving Place, New York, N.Y.

A. Robert R. Poston, 908 Colorado Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $900. E. (9) $276.65.

A. Ramsay D. Potts, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Investment Company Institute, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $4,999.98. E. (9) $417.58.

A. William J. Potts, Jr., 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Association On Broadcasting Standards, Inc., 1741 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Richard M. Powell, 1210 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Refrigerated Warehouses, 1210 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.

A. William I. Powell, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Independent Petroleum Association of America, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $24.20.

A. Graydon R. Powers, Jr., 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William H. Press, 1616 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $6,500.

A. Pulp, Paper & Paperboard Institute (U.S.A.), Inc., 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Luke C. Quinn, Jr., 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Cancer Society, New York, N.Y., et al.

D. (6) $10,624.97. E. (9) $6,616.16.

A. Alex Radin, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Public Power Association, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $282.80.

A. Ragan & Mason, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Bermuda Trade Development Board, Hamilton, Bermuda.

D. (6) $1,666.

A. Ragan & Mason, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Sea-Land Service, Inc., Post Office Box 1050, Newark, N.J.

D. (6) $900.

A. Ragan & Mason, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Seatrain Lines, Inc., 595 River Road, Edgewater, N.J.

D. (6) $900.

A. Edward F. Ragland, 6917 Marbury Road, Bethesda, Md.

B. The Tobacco Institute, Inc., 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Railway Progress Institute, 38 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $350. E. (9) $350.

A. Alan T. Rains, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Donald J. Ramsey, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Silver Users Association, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $450. E. (9) $118.57.

A. James A. Ransford, 1701 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Tidewater Oil Co., Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Joseph L. Rauh, Jr., 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Sydney C. Reagan, 3840 Greenbrier Drive, Dallas, Tex.

B. Southwestern Peanut Shellers Association, Drawer 747, Durant, Okla.

D. (6) $349.36. E. (9) $49.36.

A. Stanley Rector, 520 Hotel Washington, Washington, D.C.

B. Unemployment Benefit Advisors, Inc.

D. (6) $1,000.

A. Otie M. Reed, 1107 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $2,300.01. E. (9) $2,928.26.

A. W. O. Reed, 6254 Woodland Drive, Dallas, Tex.

B. Texas railroads.

D. (6) $115. E. (9) $108.

A. Lawrence D. Reedy, 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

B. American Association of Advertising Agencies, Inc., 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. J. A. Reidelbach, Jr., 1117 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Home Manufacturers Association, 1117 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $200.

A. Retired Officers Association, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $77,217.54.

A. Retired Officers Tax Credit Committee, Box 1965, Annapolis, Md.

D. (6) $2,571.50. E. (9) $594.76.

A. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the U.S. Government, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $16,348.88. E. (9) $7,041.52.

A. Theron J. Rice, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

A. James W. Richards, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Standard Oil Co. (Indiana), 910 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $1,133.34. E. (9) $16.47.

A. Dorsey Richardson, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

B. Investment Company Institute, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. Harry H. Richardson, 335 Austin Street, Bogalusa, La.

B. Louisiana railroads.

D. (6) $30.75. E. (9) $119.41.

A. James W. Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. C.I.T. Financial Corp., 650 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. James W. Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Committee of Consumer Finance Companies, Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

A. James W. Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Entertainment Law Committee, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

A. James W. Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Indian Sugar Mills Association (Export Agency Division), Calcutta, India.

A. James W. Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Mutual Benefit Health & Accident Association, Omaha, Nebr.

A. James W. Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. State Farm Mutual Automobile Insurance Co., Bloomington, Ill.

A. Richard J. Riddick, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Freight Forwarders Institute, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,375. E. (9) $267.93.

A. C. E. Rightor, 7211 Cedar Avenue, Takoma Park, Md.
B. Committee for Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 149 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $450. E. (9) $775.95.

A. Gloria Riordan, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Union of Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500.

A. John Rippey, 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Credit Union National Association, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.
D. (6) $446.29. E. (9) $48.50.

A. Paul H. Robbins, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $250.

A. Clyde F. Roberts, Jr., 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. Roberts & Holland, 405 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. I.O.S., Ltd. (S.A.), 119 rue de Lausanne, Geneva, Switzerland.

A. Rogers & Cowan, Inc., 598 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y., and 250 North Canon Drive, Beverly Hills, Calif.
B. Robert Bosch Corp., 4025 Crescent Street, Long Island City, N.Y.
E. (9) $4,893.61.

A. Donald L. Rogers, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association of Registered Bank Holding Cos., 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $437.50.

A. Frank W. Rogers, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Western Oil & Gas Association, 609 South Grand Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $5,260

A. Raymond A. Rourke, 333 Medford Street, Charlestown, Mass.
B. Revere Sugar Refinery, 333 Medford Street, Charlestown, Mass.

A. Edmond F. Rovner, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Union of Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. Royall, Koegel & Rogers, 1730 K Street, NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Pinkerton's National Detective Agency, Inc., 154 Nassau Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $3.69.

A. John Forney Rudy, 902 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., Akron, Ohio.

A. Albert R. Russell, 1918 North Parkway, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn

A. Oswald Ryan, 528 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Air Traffic Control Association, Inc., 528 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $33.40.

A. William H. Ryan, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. District Lodge No. 44, International Association of Machinists, 400 First Street, NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,999.88. E. (9) $60.

A. Kermit B. Rykken, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. O. H. Saunders, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Retired Officers Association, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,112.50.

A. William H. Scheick, 1735 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Institute of Architects, 1735 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $522.

A. Gordon H. Scherer, 1717 Carew Tower, Cincinnati, Ohio.
B. Research and Public Relations Committee of National Pan-Hellenic Conference, 2245 Grandin Road, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $6,500. E. (9) $985.11.

A. C. Herschel Schooley, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Bankers Association, Sauk Centre, Minn.
D. (6) $4,000. E. (9) $2,128.63.

A. Durward Seals, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Hollis M. Seavey, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Leo Seybold, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $665. E. (9) $166.35.

A. David C. Sharman, 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. American Optometric Association, Inc., 100 West Pine Street, Selinsgrove, Pa.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $482.72.

A. A. Manning Shaw, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brown & Lund, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C., and National Association of Electric Cos., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $968.

A. Carroll M. Shaw, 6326 Southcrest Drive, Shreveport, La.
B. Amalgamated Transit Union, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Kenneth D. Shaw, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railway & Steamship Clerks, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $474.99.

A. John E. Shea, 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Bruce E. Shepherd, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Ira Shesser, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert H. Shields, 920 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. United States Beet Sugar Association, 920 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $480.

A. Robert L. Shortle, 306 International Trade Mart, New Orleans, La.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 121 South Meramec, Clayton, Mo.

A. Charles B. Shuman, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $750.

A. Silver Users Association, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $30. E. (9) $1,360.53.

A. Six Agency Committee, 909 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
E. (9) $5,457.45.

A. John T. Skelly, 1730 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Samuel E. Stavisky & Associates, Inc., 1730 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $25.

A. Jack C. Skerrett, 717 South 19th Street, Arlington, Va.
B. The Camping Club of America, Inc., 945 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Carstens Slack, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Phillips Petroleum Co., Bartlesville, Okla.

A. Harold Slater, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,312.50. E. (9) $94.28.

A. Stephen Slipher, 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $3,125. E. (9) $12.

A. Dudley Smith, 732 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of Sugar Producers of Puerto Rico, 732 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Gordon L. Smith, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Edward Gottlieb & Associates, Ltd., 640 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $116.57.

A. Harold Arden Smith, 605 West Olympic Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. Standard Oil Company of California, 225 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $50.

A. James R. Smith, 1060 Omaha National Bank Building, Omaha, Nebr.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 121 South Meramec, Clayton, Mo.

A. Lloyd W. Smith, 416 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co., 547 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill., and Great Northern Railway Co., 175 East Fourth Street, St. Paul, Minn.

A. Robert B. Smith, 41 D Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $150.

A. Wallace M. Smith, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Mutual Insurance Alliance.

A. Wayne H. Smithey, 1200 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich.
D. (6) $669.15. E. (9) $138.55.

A. Lyle O. Snader, 244 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $123.75. E. (9) $152.

A. Frank B. Snodgrass, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Burley and Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, Post Office Box 860, Lexington, Ky.
D. (6) $325. E. (9) $127.83.

A. Edward F. Snyder, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,644.23.

A. J. R. Snyder, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

A. Society for Animal Protective Legislation, 745 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,037.59. E. (9) $5,699.82.

A. Marvin J. Sonosky, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. J. Taylor Soop, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, 330 South Wells Street, Chicago. Ill.

A. Southwestern Peanut Shellers Association, Drawer 747, Durant, Okla.
E. (9) $398.72.

A. William W. Spear, 214 Fremont National Bank Building, Fremont, Nebr.
B. Standard Oil Co. (Indiana), 910 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $729.17. E. (9) $7.99.

A. John F. Speer, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers & Milk Industry Foundation, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Marian S. Stafford, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Employment Association, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300.

A. Samuel E. Stavisky & Associates, Inc., 1730 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Pan-American Coffee Bureau, 120 Wall Street, New York City.
E. (9) $350.

A. Samuel S. Stavisky, 1730 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Samuel E. Stavisky & Associates, Inc., 1730 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $25.

A. Mrs. Nell May F. Stephens, Post Office Box 6234, Northwest Station, Washington, D.C.

A. Steptoe & Johnson, 1100 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Claims in Cuba Committee, 1100 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $495. E. (9) $17.

A. Steptoe & Johnson, 1100 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Hamilton Watch Co. and Elgin National Watch Co.
D. (6) $100.

A. Steptoe & Johnson, 1100 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. U.S. Foreign Investment Committee, 1100 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,958. E. (9) $38.

A. Eugene L. Stewart, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Trade Relations Council of the United States, Inc., 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Menahem Stim, 29 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. Rifzin Textiles Corp. and Ando International, Ltd., 450 Seventh Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,750. E. (9) $100.

A. Stoneman & Chandler, 44 School Street, Boston, Mass.
B. Woven Label Manufacturers of the United States of America, 1440 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $3000. E. (9) $115.37.

A. Sterling F. Stoudenmire, Jr., 61 St. Joseph Street, Mobile, Ala.
B. Waterman Steamship Corp., 61 St. Joseph Street, Mobile, Ala.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Federation of American Scientists, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Hualapai Tribe of the Hualapai Reservation, Peach Springs, Ariz.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Frier, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Laguna Pueblo of New Mexico, Laguna, N. Mex.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Metlakatla Indian Community, Post Office Box 142, Metlakatla, Alaska.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Nez Perce Tribe, Lapwai, Idaho.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Oglala Sioux Tribe of the Pine Ridge Reservation, Pine Ridge, S. Dak.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, Post Office Box 907-X, Scottsdale, Ariz.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The San Carlos Apache Tribe, San Carlos, Ariz.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Seneca Nation of Indians, 25 Main Street, Salamanca, N.Y.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Tuscarora Nation of Indians, Lewiston, N.Y.

A. Ronnie J. Straw, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Natural Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William A. Stringfellow, 6004 Roosevelt Street, Bethesda, Md.
B. National Association of Mutual Insurance Agents, 827 Investment Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Norman Strunk, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,875.

A. Sam S. Studebaker, Tipp City, Ohio.
B. National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. Walter B. Stults, 537 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Small Business Investment Cos., 537 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $600.

A. Barry Sullivan, 536 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of River & Harbor Contractors, 3900 North Charles Street, Baltimore, Md.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $205.83.

A. Roger H. Sullivan.
B. American Sugar Co., 120 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Frank L. Sundstrom, 1290 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
B. Schenley Industries, Inc., 1290 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.

A. Russell A. Swindell, P.O. Box 2635, Raleigh, N.C.
B. North Carolina Railroad Association, P.O Box 2635, Raleigh, N.C.
D. (6) $2,753.88. E. (9) $423.41.

A. Charles P. Taft, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Glenn J. Talbott.
B. The Farmers' Educational & Co-Operative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., and 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John I. Taylor, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $32.56.

A. J. B. Thayn, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,468.75. E. (9) $17.70.

A. Thirty-five Hour Week Able Association, Post Office Box 817, Lake Charles, La.
E. (9) $71.82.

A. Oliver A. Thomas, 1 East First Street, Reno, Nev.
B. Nevada Railroad Association, 1 East First Street, Reno, Nev.

A. Wm. B. Thompson, Jr., 244 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $82.50. E. (9) $96.

A. John N. Thurman, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Pacific American Steamship Association, 16 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $999. E. (9) $1,216.08.

A. J. R. Timmins & Co., 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $25,531.31.

A. William H. Tinney, 1223 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 6 Penn Center Plaza, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. M. S. Tisdale, 4200 Cathedral Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Armed Services Committee, Chamber of Commerce, Vallejo, Calif.
D. (6) $147.50. E. (9) $130.49.

A. Tobacco Associates, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $2,307.

A. H. Willis Tobler, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,125. E. (9) $369.48.

A. John H. Todd, 1085 Shrine Building, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Compress & Cotton Warehouse Association, 1085 Shrine Building, Memphis, Tenn.

A. Bert M. Tollefson, Jr., 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.
B. Blue Cross Association, 840 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,834. E. (9) $796.93.

A. Dwight D. Townsend, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Cooperative League of USA, 59 East Van Buren Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Townsend Plan, Inc., 808 North Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $10,497.86

A. F. Gerald Toye, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $105.50.

A. Trade Relations Council of the United States, Inc., 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $81.80.

A. Matt Triggs, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,850. E. (9) $53.83.

A. Glenwood S. Troop, Jr., 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,875. E. (9) $72.10.

A. Joel B. True, 1800 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. The Tobacco Institute, Inc., 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Galen Douglas Trussell, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. Dick Tullis, 307 Maple Terrace, Dallas, Tex.
B. Superior Oil Co., Houston, Tex., and Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $200.

A. William S. Tyson, 821 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Western Range Association, 375 North Fulton Street, Fresno, Calif.
E. (9) $59.88.

A. John W. Turner, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, B. of L. E. Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Union Producing Co. and United Gas Pipe Line Co., 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La.
E. (9) $687.75.

A. U.S. Beet Sugar Association, 920 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1,295.

A. United Federation of Postal Clerks, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $322,892.20. E. (9) $37,918.69.

A. U.S. Cane Sugar Refiners' Association, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $2,218.65.

A. U.S. Foreign Investment Committee, 1100 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,996. E. (9) $1,996.

A. U.S. Savings & Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $20,413.41.

A. Valicenti, Leighton, Reid & Stock, 70 Pine Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Channing Service Corp., 85 Broad Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $6,500. E. (9) $500.

A. Theodore A. Vanderzyde, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. District Lodge 44, International Association of Machinists, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,499.90. E. (9) $15.

A. John E. Vetter, 635 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. L. T. Vice, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Standard Oil Co. of California, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $100.

A. R. K. Vinson, 1400 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Machinery Dealers National Association, 1400 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. B. J. Viviano, 1223 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 6 Penn Center Plaza, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. The Voice of the People in Action, 621 Sheridan Street, Chillum, Md.
B. Dr. Russell Forrest Egner.
D. (6) $348. E. (9) $247.33.

A. Stephen M. Walter, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Cos., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $537.74. E. (9) $2.

A. William A. Walton, 920 Jackson Street, Topeka, Kans.
B. Kansas Railroad Committee, 920 Jackson Street, Topeka, Kans.

A. Jeremiah C. Waterman, 205 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Southern Pacific Co., 205 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500.

A. Waterways Bulk Transportation Council, Inc., 10 East 40th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $510.

A. Weaver & Glassie, 1527 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Atlantic Refining Co., 260 South Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
D. (6) $300.

A. Weaver & Glassie, 1527 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., 1820 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5.

A. Weaver & Glassie, 1527 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Independent Meat Packers Association, 1820 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $225. E. (9) $11.55.

A. Weaver & Glassie, 1527 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. J. R. Timmins & Co., 37 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $25,000. E. (9) $245.64.

A. William H. Webb, LaSalle Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Rivers & Harbors Congress, 1028 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,813.04. E. (9) $322.

A. Peter P. Weidenbruch, Jr., 510 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Socony Mobil Oil Co., Inc., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,125. E. (9) $244.60.

A. Dr. Frank J. Welch, 3724 Manor Road, Chevy Chase, Md.
B. The Tobacco Institute, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Joseph E. Welch, 1630 Locust Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
B. Wellington Management Co., 1630 Locust Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. West Coast Inland Navigation District, Court House, Bradenton, Fla.

E. (9) $618.92.

A. John C. White, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Private Truck Council of America, Inc., 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Marc A. White, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc.

A. Louis E. Whyte, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Claude C. Wild, Jr., 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Gulf Oil Corp., Pittsburgh, Pa.

D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $250.

A. Albert E. Wilkinson, Investment Building, Washington, D.C.

B. The Anaconda Co., 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $2,250. E. (9) $723.55.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Society of Travel Agents, Inc., 360 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Arapahoe Indian Tribe, Fort Washakie, Wyo.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Confederated Salish & Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation, Mont.

E. (9) $2.90.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Quinaielt Tribe of Indians, Taholah, Wash.

E. (9) $11.95.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Frank B. Rowlett, 143 Chatham Road, Ellicott City, Md.

E. (9) $17.45.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Spokane Indian Tribe, Wellpinit, Wash.

A. John Willard, Box 1172, Helena, Mont.

B. Montana Railroad Association, Helena, Mont.

A. Harding deC. Williams, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 36 South Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $1,833. E. (9) $116.04.

A. Robert E. Williams, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $465. E. (9) $238.95.

A. John C. Williamson, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 36 South Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $4,167. E. (9) $186.31.

A. Clark L. Wilson, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Consultant to Emergency Lead-Zinc Committee.

D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $869.40.

A. E. Raymond Wilson, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.

B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,448.35.

A. Everett B. Wilson, Jr., 732 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Association of Sugar Producers of Puerto Rico, 732 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Henry B. Wilson, 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey), 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) $19.60

A. Richard W. Wilson, 41 D Street SE., Washington, D.C.

B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $150.

A. W. E. Wilson, 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La.

B. Union Producing Co. and United Gas Pipe Line Co., 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La.

D. (6) $600. E. (9) $87.75.

A. Morton M. Winston.

B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Everett T. Winter, 121 South Meramec, St. Louis, Mo.

B. Mississippi Valley Association, 121 South Meramec, St. Louis, Mo.

A. Richard F. Witherall, 702 Majestic Building, Denver, Colo.

B. Colorado Railroad Association, 702 Majestic Building, Denver, Colo.

A. Lawton B. Wolfe, 1132 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Distilled Spirits Institute, 1132 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Venlo Wolfsohn, 1729 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Institute of Scrap Iron & Steel, Inc., 1729 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $300. E. (9) $0.75.

A. Russell J. Woodman, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Order of Railroad Telegraphers, 3860 Lindell Boulevard, St. Louis, Mo.

A. Albert Y. Woodward, 1625 I Street NW., Washington D.C.

B. The Flying Tiger Line, Inc., Lockheed Air Terminal, Burbank, Calif.

A. Albert Young Woodward, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Signal Oil & Gas Co., 1010 Wilshire Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. J. Banks Young, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.

D. (6) $510.

A. Zimring, Gromfine & Sternstein, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 11 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Gordon K. Zimmerman, Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

REGISTRATIONS

The following registrations were submitted for the third calendar quarter 1964:

(NOTE.—The form used for registration is reproduced below. In the interest of economy in the RECORD, questions are not repeated, only the essential answers are printed, and are indicated by their respective letter and number.)

FILE ONE COPY WITH THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE AND FILE TWO COPIES WITH THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

FILE TWO COPIES WITH THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE AND FILE THREE COPIES WITH THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

This page (page 1) is designed to supply identifying data; and page 2 (on the back of this page) deals with financial data.

PLACE AN "X" BELOW THE APPROPRIATE LETTER OR FIGURE IN THE BOX AT THE RIGHT OF THE "REPORT" HEADING BELOW:

"PRELIMINARY" REPORT ("Registration"): To "register," place an "X" below the letter "P" and fill out page 1 only.

"QUARTERLY" REPORT: To indicate which one of the four calendar quarters is covered by this Report, place an "X" below the appropriate figure. Fill out both page 1 and page 2 and as many additional pages as may be required. The first additional page should be numbered as page "3," and the rest of such pages should be "4," "5," "6," etc. Preparation and filing in accordance with instructions will accomplish compliance with all quarterly reporting requirements of the Act.

Year: 19______ ◄

REPORT

PURSUANT TO FEDERAL REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

P	QUARTER			
	1st	2d	3d	4th
(Mark one square only)				

NOTE ON ITEM "A".—(a) IN GENERAL. This "Report" form may be used by either an organization or an individual, as follows:

(i) "Employee".—To file as an "employee", state (in Item "B") the name, address, and nature of business of the "employer". (If the "employee" is a firm [such as a law firm or public relations firm], partners and salaried staff members of such firm may join in filing a Report as an "employee".)

(ii) "Employer".—To file as an "employer", write "None" in answer to Item "B".

(b) SEPARATE REPORTS. An agent or employee should not attempt to combine his Report with the employer's Report:

(i) Employers subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their agents or employees.

(ii) Employees subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their employers.

A. ORGANIZATION OR INDIVIDUAL FILING:

1. State name, address, and nature of business.

2. If this Report is for an Employer, list names of agents or employees who will file Reports for this Quarter.

NOTE ON ITEM "B".—*Reports by Agents or Employees.* An employee is to file, each quarter, as many Reports as he has employers, except that: (*a*) If a particular undertaking is jointly financed by a group of employers, the group is to be considered as one employer, but all members of the group are to be named, and the contribution of each member is to be specified; (*b*) if the work is done in the interest of one person but payment therefor is made by another, a single Report—naming both persons as "employers"—is to be filed each quarter.

B. EMPLOYER.—State name, address, and nature of business. If there is no employer, write "None."

NOTE ON ITEM "C".—(*a*) The expression "in connection with legislative interests," as used in this Report, means "in connection with attempting, directly or indirectly, to influence the passage or defeat of legislation." "The term 'legislation' means bills, resolutions, amendments, nominations, and other matters pending or proposed in either House of Congress, and includes any other matter which may be the subject of action by either House"—§ 302(e).

(*b*) Before undertaking any activities in connection with legislative interests, organizations and individuals subject to the Lobbying Act are required to file a "Preliminary" Report (Registration).

(*c*) After beginning such activities, they must file a "Quarterly" Report at the end of each calendar quarter in which they have either received or expended anything of value in connection with legislative interests.

C. LEGISLATIVE INTERESTS, AND PUBLICATIONS in connection therewith:

1. State approximately how long legislative interests are to continue. If receipts and expenditures in connection with legislative interests have terminated, ☐ place an "X" in the box at the left, so that this Office will no longer expect to receive Reports.

2. State the general legislative interests of the person filing and set forth the *specific* legislative interests by reciting: (*a*) Short titles of statutes and bills; (*b*) House and Senate numbers of bills, where known; (*c*) citations of statutes, where known; (*d*) whether for or against such statutes and bills.

3. In the case of those publications which the person filing has caused to be issued or distributed in connection with legislative interests, set forth: (*a*) Description, (*b*) quantity distributed; (*c*) date of distribution, (*d*) name of printer or publisher (if publications were paid for by person filing) or name of donor (if publications were received as a gift).

(Answer items 1, 2, and 3 in the space below. Attach additional pages if more space is needed)

4. If this is a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) rather than a "Quarterly" Report, state below what the nature and amount of anticipated expenses will be; and if for an agent or employee, state also what the daily, monthly, or annual rate of compensation is to be. If this is a "Quarterly" Report, disregard this item "C4" and fill out item "D" and "E" on the back of this page. Do not attempt to combine a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) with a "Quarterly" Report.◄

AFFIDAVIT

[Omitted in printing]

PAGE 1◄

A. Francis L. Adams.

B. Pacific Power & Light Co., Public Service Building, Portland, Oreg.

A. Milnor Alexander, 3306 Ross Place NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, 120 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.

A. Alive at 55 Inc., 2607 Jutland Avenue, Toledo, Ohio.

A. R. J. Arbaugh, Post Office Box 525, Iowa, La.

B. Thirty-five Hour Week Able Association, Post Office Box 817, Lake Charles, La.

A. Robert M. Armstrong, Post Office Box 25, Sugar Land, Tex.

B. Imperial Sugar Co., Post Office Box 25, Sugar Land, Tex.

A. William T. Barnes, 928 Investment Building, Washington, D.C.

B. American Research & Development Corp., 200 Berkeley Street, Boston, Mass.

A. William T. Barnes, 928 Investment Building, Washington, D.C.

B. General Development Corp., 2828 Coral Way, Miami, Fla.

A. Charles E. Bosley, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Committee for International Development, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. G. Stewart Boswell, 407 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Council of Agricultural Employees, 407 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Walter T. Brown, 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William R. Brown.

B. Missouri State Chamber of Commerce, Post Office Box 149, Jefferson City, Mo.

A. Max Frederick Brunswick, 945 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Camping Club of America, Inc., 945 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert M. Burr, 105 Mansfield Avenue, Darien, Conn.

B. Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Dan L. Butler, 1500 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Machine Tool Distributors Association, 1500 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. The Camping Club of America, Inc., 945 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Roger A. Clark, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Wine Conference of America, 1100 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Committee on Constructive Price, 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Robert J. Conner, Jr., 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Chrysler Corp., 341 Massachusetts Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

A. Harry N. Cook, 1130 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The National Waterways Conference.

A. Robert P. Daly, 5810 Biscayne Boulevard, Miami, Fla.

B. Inter-American Trade & Cultural Center Authority, Post Office Box 59-2294, Miami, Fla.

A. Leonard K. Dowiak, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Hotel & Motel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. James M. Earnest, 1000 Woodward Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Mauritius Sugar Syndicate, Plantation House, Place d'Armes, Post Office Box 312, Port Louis, Mauritius.

A. Robert B. Gerrie, 110 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

B. Morton Salt Co., 110 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill., and Salt Institute, 33 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Royce L. Givens, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.

B. National Conference of Police Associations, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.

A. Godwin, Procter & Hoar, 84 State Street, Boston, Mass.

B. National Association of Business Development Corporations.

A. Douglas W. Hartman, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Fischer Bearings Manufacturing Ltd., Post Office Box 280, Stratford, Ontario, Canada.

A. Hedrick & Lane, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Committee on Constructive Price, 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. William J. Keating, 725 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Grain & Feed Dealers National Association, 725 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. June Kysilko, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William H. Louviere, Post Office Box 25, Sugar Land, Tex.

B. Imperial Sugar Co., Post Office Box 25, Sugar Land, Tex.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. U.S. Cane Sugar Refiners' Association, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. L. M. McBride, 110 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

B. Morton Salt Co., 110 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill., and Salt Institute, 33 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Mrs. Barbara D. McGarry, 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Parents Committee, Inc., 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Edmund McIlhenny, 1500 National Bank of Commerce Building, New Orleans, La.

B. Morton Salt Co., 110 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill., and Salt Institute, 33 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. George McLain, 1031 South Grand Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.

B. National & California League of Senior Citizens.

A. Carl J. Megel, 1343 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Federation of Teachers, 716 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. T. H. Mullen, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Pulp, Paper & Paperboard Institute (U.S.A.), Inc., 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. National Committee for International Development, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Council of Agricultural Employers, 407 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.

A. National Utility Contractors Association, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Alan M. Nedry, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Southern California Edison Co., Post Office Box 351, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Patrick J. Nilan, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. United Federation of Postal Clerks.

A. R. E. O'Connor, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

B. Pulp, Paper & Paperboard Institute (U.S.A.), Inc., 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Pulp, Paper & Paperboard Institute (U.S.A.), Inc., 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Joseph L. Rauh, Jr., 1625 K Street, Washington, D.C.

A. George B. Roche, 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Raymond A. Rourke, 333 Medford Street, Charlestown, Mass.

B. Revere Sugar Refinery, 333 Medford Street, Charlestown, Mass.

A. Ira Shesser, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Menahem Stim, 29 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

B. Rifzin Textiles Corp. and Ando International Ltd., 450 Seventh Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Stitt & Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. A. D. Sutton & Sons, 1 West 37th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Stitt & Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Toyoshima & Co., Inc., 303 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Surrey, Karasik, Gould & Greene, 1116 Woodward Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Tibbals-Crumley-Musson, 965 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.

A. Thirty-five Hour Week Able Association, Post Office Box 817, Lake Charles, La.

A. Vegetable Growers Association of America, Inc., 226 Transportation Building, 815 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Nathan T. Wolkomir, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Federation of Federal Employees, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Congressman Anderson, Former Skipper of the "Nautilus," Speaks for Nuclear Power Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 18, 1965

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, in an address delivered on January 13 at the "Salute to the Nuclear Navy" program in Washington, our new colleague, the gentleman from Tennessee, WILLIAM R. ANDERSON, discusses our country's nuclear power development policy with particular reference to the part played by the Congress.

Congressman ANDERSON, is, as you know, the former captain of the nuclear-powered submarine *Nautilus* and was its commander on the historic first journey under the polar ice. He comes to this House from the Sixth Congressional District of Tennessee following his election last November.

As we welcome our distinguished new colleague from Tennessee, we have occasion to congratulate both him and the House leadership on his assignment to the Committee on Science and Astronautics, a congressional specialty closely related to his specialty as a famous Navy officer.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I include Congressman ANDERSON's remarks on the subject of nuclear propulsion's development in the RECORD.

The address follows:

ADDRESS OF REPRESENTATIVE WILLIAM R. ANDERSON, OF TENNESSEE, AT "SALUTE TO THE NUCLEAR NAVY," WILLARD HOTEL, WASHINGTON, JANUARY 13, 1965

I am very glad to be here and I appreciate the forbearance of all of you who must realize that I am a bit late to be a qualified Navy spokesman and considerably early to be a congressional expert.

My problem doesn't stop here. Despite all my efforts to acquire the image of lawmaker and statesman, I find I'm still more closely identified with the North Pole than with Capitol Hill. I assure you, it is twice as hard and much more dangerous to reach Congress.

I want to express my warm appreciation to the Washington Naval Reserve Public Relations Co. for conceiving and arranging this event. Having spent my last 3 years of Navy duty here in Washington, I am well aware of your versatility, your fine traditions and the great contributions your unit has made toward a more effective and better understood Navy.

The last 10 years of our nuclear Navy have been eventful and bright with performance and potential. It is certain that the next 10 years can be years of progress, achievement and consolidation.

The joint Navy-Atomic Energy Commission program has always been blessed with champions to serve the cause of nuclear propulsion.

Its number one champion originally stood almost alone. Tomorrow, that man, small in physical stature but gigantic in the breadth and depth of his character, intellect, and devotion, will leave his austere office to go to the White House to receive the Enrico Fermi Award from President Lyndon B. Johnson.

The Navy and the Nation are indeed fortunate that Adm. H. G. Rickover is willing to continue in his demanding assignment in the second decade of nuclear power.

There are also many champions of the nuclear Navy on both sides of Capitol Hill. I do not intend to diminish the credit due the Navy, but history will record that Congress, particularly during the early days, gave nuclear propulsion better attention, better service, and greater push than did the Navy itself.

We are most fortunate that two Capitol Hill champions of nuclear power have now moved to powerful positions. I refer to Congressman MENDEL RIVERS, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, and Congressman CHET HOLIFIELD, chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. The outlook for the next 10 years is brighter because of the judgment, vision, and leadership of these statesmen.

With the support and leadership of men of this type, the Navy now stands on the threshold of a historic changeover. The *Nautilus* and her successors and the dramatically powerful Polaris-firing submarines are a tremendous force in being. Nuclear task force 1, after its circumnavigation of the globe appears to be the prototype for the ships that will make our Navy the most powerful and adaptable the world has ever seen.

With more and more efficient nuclear propulsion systems being developed, the key question to a policy for the second decade of the nuclear Navy would seem to be how best to proceed with construction of nuclear surface ships.

The reason for our past timidity in this matter has, of course, been costs. In opening a discussion on nuclear surface ships, I want to make it clear that my purpose is not to criticize the decisions of the past but to make some suggestions bearing on future policy.

First of all, I think that in deciding whether to adopt an aggressive program of nuclear ship construction we should make sure all factors are considered.

It's important, first of all, that the figures on which we base decisions be true, complete costs of ship construction and operation, amortized over the useful life of the ship—development, construction, outfitting, operation, repairs, refueling.

Viewed on this basis, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has estimated that a nuclear carrier is just 3 percent more expensive in the long run than a conventional carrier. It is also, of course, much more effective than a conventional carrier. There are few Americans who would not be willing to invest this additional 3 percent in order to avoid dependence on obsolete, second-best ships for the defense of this country and the security of the free world.

Let us also remember the spin-offs, the side benefits and returned dividends that have and will come from the development of nuclear propulsion.

Take the Shippingport reactor, this country's first full-sized commercial atomic generating plant. Shippingport is really a larger version of the *Nautilus* powerplant. Eventually, I believe we will realize that if the only result of the *Nautilus* development program had been a safe, satisfactory situation at Shippingport, the money would have been well spent.

While our needs for commercial atomic power may not press us today, we must prepare for the time when they press in on us rapidly—as, indeed, they are pressing in already on many nations hard up for conventional energy sources.

Let us not forget, either, that the Stars and Stripes, flying from modern, swift, far-ranging nuclear ships comprises one of our most dramatic symbols of the success of the United States in harnessing the atom for practical, peaceful purposes—dramatic proof of this Nation's firm determination that the atom shall be used for mankind's good, rather than his destruction.

These considerations are difficult, I think, to place on the scale of cost accounting. But they must be included in our thinking. We cannot afford to deprive ourselves of our full potential power merely because it appears today to be a little more expensive, because what slide rule can measure the value of life and liberty?

So, as a new administration, with a sparkling mandate from the people, prepares to open new and ambitious vistas toward the fulfillment of the American dream, I think we must visualize ourselves as at a new departure, beyond which a wise nation will not only build fleets powered by the atom, but will embrace every opportunity to harness this elemental force for the benefit of all men, everywhere.

The 20th Anniversary of Art Linkletter's "House Party"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALPHONZO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 18, 1965

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, on January 15, 1965, Art Linkletter's award-winning show "House Party" celebrated its 20th anniversary of broadcasting on radio and television.

Art is a good friend of mine and I know that I can speak for the many thousands of his friends and fans in congratulating him for the outstanding contribution he has made not only to entertainment but also to humanitarian endeavors he has actively supported during his remarkable career.

I am therefore asking unanimous consent that the text of a joint resolution I introduced today be printed in the RECORD.

The resolution follows:

H.J. RES. 212

Joint resolution honoring Art Linkletter for unique services rendered to his country and to the world

Whereas on January 15, 1965, Art Linkletter celebrated his twentieth anniversary of broadcasting "House Party" on radio and television; and

Whereas "House Party" has for twenty years contributed to the wholesome entertainment and education of millions of listeners and viewers and has maintained a high standard of excellence; and

Whereas Art Linkletter has given unstintingly of time, talent, and energy to the welfare of children and to a rich variety of humanitarian causes throughout the world; and

Whereas Art Linkletter has been honored by a host of American organizations for his selfless devotion to charitable causes: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is authorized to present in the name of the people of America a parchment of appropriate design to Art Linkletter in recognition of the aforesaid services to his country and to the world, such parchment to include a suitably engrossed copy of this joint resolution.

Local Public Works Act of 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH J. GRAY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 18, 1965

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, two of the most urgent problems with which this Congress must come to grips are the need to help our towns and cities to grow and prosper and the need to maintain our economic expansion and thereby reduce the present intolerably high level of unemployment. An important step in achieving these aims is Federal aid for local public works. The success of this approach was most recently proven by the accelerated public works program. Because of this I was greatly pleased that our distinguished colleague, Congressman John A. Blatnik, Democrat, of Minnesota, introduced the Local Public Works Act of 1965 (H.R. 2170) which I have the honor of cosponsoring (H.R. 2425). I hope that we can act on this legislation promptly because the need for it is urgent. This need was clearly spelled out by Congressman Blatnik in his speech last week to a luncheon meeting of the AFL–CIO legislative conference. I hope that all of my colleagues will read his speech carefully and I request that it be reprinted here:

FEDERAL AID TO LOCAL PUBLIC WORKS: THE NEED FOR A CONTINUING PROGRAM

(An address by Congressman John A. Blatnik, to the AFL–CIO Legislative Conference)

The 89th Congress is scarcely 1 week old but it is already evident that this will be a hard-working and productive session. The House has made highly important changes in its rules to overcome obstacles which in the past have repeatedly thwarted the will of the majority. The benefits of these changes will be reflected in the sound and constructive record which I am confident that this Congress will achieve.

President Johnson's state of the Union message, one of the most notable ever given, has set the tone. Those who expected cautious generalizations must have been very much surprised. It was hard hitting, specific, and showed the President's determination to move ahead rapidly toward the realization of his Great Society. I was particularly pleased with the several references in the President's speech which recognized the importance of public works and the need for prompt action in this field. While details of administration proposals have to await specific messages, I believe that they will recognize the urgent need for increased public investment and the fact that only Federal grants have the power to provide the stimulation required.

At no time in the past 20 years has the setting been as favorable for the enactment of legislation designed to give a substantial and continuing boost to public works construction. The critical need for the many benefits of increased public works investment has created broad-based support for vigorous Federal action. The AFL–CIO has long been in the forefront of those who recognize that this aid is needed and are willing to fight for it. The resolution adopted by your executive committee in November is a strong reaffirmation of your traditional support and will carry tremendous weight with all of us in public office. This kind of Federal aid also carries the all-out support of the mayors of our towns and cities who know firsthand the extent of the need and the problems of State and local government in meeting it. Just last month the National Association of Home Builders, I believe for the first time, endorsed Federal grant assistance for local public works because they know from their own experience that the lack of adequate community facilities has resulted in inflated land prices and excessive real estate taxes which in effect have priced middle-income families out of the market for new housing in many areas. Undoubtedly other groups will add their support to proposals for stronger Federal aid to meet this problem.

In his message, President Johnson said, "I propose we launch a national effort to make the American city a better and more stimulating place to live." I am sure that all of us here share the President's desire and determination, and inevitably a vital element in that effort will be greater investment in all of the many public facilities essential to modern urban living. Perhaps many of these things seem unexciting and are too often taken for granted, but a city cannot exist and cannot be prosperous or satisfying without substantial investment in water and sewer facilities, public buildings, parks and playgrounds, streets, hospitals, community centers, and so forth. When these facilities are antiquated or inadequate, the quality of life in the community suffers and its ability to expand and attract new job-producing investment is severely limited.

We have a bold and vigorous program of urban renewal which is clearing the worst of our cities' slums and blighted areas and to which the Federal Government has already committed $4 billion in grants, and undoubtedly this Congress will be called upon to provide additional billions for this vital program which is doing so much to revitalize our cities. We have provided billions of dollars in grants for our long-term highway program much of which will be built within urban areas, and last year we took the first step toward providing grants for local mass transit systems. Meanwhile, there has been a growing need to supplement these efforts by providing grant assistance for a broad range of local public works which the city or other local government unit must build to meet the requirements of its citizens.

The fact is that we have not kept pace with the growing needs of our people for local public works. Today the backlog of needed improvements and additions to our supply of community facilities runs into billions of dollars. Our inventory of local public works is less adequate today than it was in 1940 when we had the benefit of the intensive building programs of the 1930's. This is reflected in the growing problem of water pollution, in traffic congestion, overcrowded public facilities, and in many other problems of daily life ranging from nuisances to outright threats to health and safety.

State and local governments are making heroic efforts to meet their responsibilities, but the fact is that their limited revenue resources simply cannot carry the whole burden. Rightly or wrongly, the Federal Government has preempted the most important and the strongest source of revenues through its corporate and personal income taxes. Where a State or city is limited by the prosperity and diversity of industries within its jurisdiction and the danger of driving investment elsewhere, the Federal tax structure is based on the entire American economy, the strongest and richest the world has ever known.

I believe that Federal assistance for local problems is not only justified but is an obligation on those of us who have the honor to serve in the Congress. The taxes which support the Federal Government come largely from the people who live in our towns and cities, our urban population, and it is only right that the Federal Government reinvest that money at the local level where it is most needed.

Increased investment in public works is not only needed for the growth and livability of our towns and cities but also for its broad economic benefits. We must not forget for one minute the plight of those millions of American men and women who are out of work today, who will be displaced by automation and other economic changes, or who will be entering the labor force in the coming year. No one knows better than you in this room what an awesome task it will be to provide employment opportunities for these millions. This would be true under the best of circumstances, but as we enter 1965 there is growing concern about the economic outlook. Most economists seem baffled that our present expansion has lasted as long as it has, for over 40 months. I believe that the reason is clear—the expansionist policies of the Kennedy-Johnson administrations have been making up for the preceding 8 years of restriction. I believe, however, that the economists are correct in their concern for the coming year. I cannot help but be perturbed when these doubts are expressed in some of the stanchest business quarters. For example, Fortune magazine, hardly a foe of business confidence, felt compelled to open the economic analysis in its January report with this statement, "A new period of subnormal growth is now in prospect for the U.S. economy after this quarter. Following 4 years of rapid gains in output * * * this means a real change in trend. As Roundup remarked 6 months ago, 'The really difficult task for the economy lies not behind us but ahead, i.e., after the spring of 1965.' This outlook is now more definite."

In the same vein, U.S. News & World Report began its recent economic summary with this statement, "Almost a chorus of prediction now is heard that the business upturn can slow or end in second half, 1965, that today's good times may face trouble."

I do not need to tell you that an actual downturn is not our only danger. With our growing labor force, even a leveling off of the economy poses a major menace. Again in the U.S. News & World Report had this to say, "The pattern of business activity that seems to be indicated promises little improvement in the problem of unemployment. It appears likely that total employment will expand by some 850,000 by this time next year. But that expansion will not be enough to absorb the indicated increase in the labor force. The result may be that by fourth quarter, 1965, unemployment may be nearly 1 million higher than now."

A phrase being used with increasing frequency by economists is "fiscal drag." This refers to the fact that Federal revenues under any given tax structure rise as the economy expands. In fact, because of the progressive nature of income taxes, these revenues rise faster than total national income. On the other hand, the rate of increase in Federal spending has slackened off over the past year or year and a half and although it is still going up, it is not rising as fast as the Government is taking money out of the economy. Whether or not this would be made up by an accelerated expansion in the private sector of the economy is debatable. We hear contradictory estimates of the outlook for business spending on new plant and equipment, but the best estimates at this time do not indicate enough of a rise to stimulate the economy to the extent needed. In the case of consumer spending there seems to be general agreement that people have spent the higher take-home pay from last year's tax cut somewhat more quickly than anticipated and the further rise from this source will not be great enough to give the economy the lift it needs. We all know the critical impact that follows the closing of a defense base or the cancellation of a defense contract. Though the effects are more subtle and harder to pin down, the same thing happens throughout the economy from a relative reduction in Federal spending—relative to tax revenues and to our economic needs.

We have made great gains in economic sophistication in the past few years. The Kennedy-Johnson tax cuts at a time when the Government was running a substantial deficit is clear evidence of this. We have also launched a long-term effort to get at the roots of unemployment, of low income, through the poverty and retraining programs. However, we cannot say to the unemployed worker and his family that he should be patient and wait for general overall improvement. He needs a job now and it is our responsibility to do whatever we can to provide full employment. Recognition of this fact was recently given by the National Planning Association, an organization of some of America's leading businessmen as well as labor leaders. In their latest report they state, "We endorse both tax reduction and training and retraining as useful and desirable first steps toward modernizing our economy. But we do not believe that they will create the very large number of additional job opportunities which will be needed to absorb present open and hidden unemployment and the large influx to the urban labor market from schools and farms in the years ahead, during which we obviously cannot forever resort to one large-scale tax reduction after another." I concur wholeheartedly with those views.

In these circumstances it is particularly timely that you should make public works the theme of your luncheon. Increased public works construction has proved its value both in improving our cities and in meeting the problem of unemployment through its direct impact in on-site jobs, materials consumption and transportation, and through its multiplier effect as this money is spent and respent for the whole range of consumer and business, goods and services. The academicians are fond of saying that they appreciate the impact which stepped up public works activity can have on the economy but that the leadtime required to get projects underway limits their usefulness. I hope that this time the economists will get behind us and support the effort to inaugurate a major public works program now, without waiting until the last minute. I would also say to them that they should study the experience under the accelerated public works program which proved to me that the money can be put to work promptly creating jobs and creating needed community facilities. The truth is that there is a substantial "shelf" of plans already completed or well advanced for local public works which can be started in a very short time. There are hundreds of millions of dollars worth of projects in applications pending under the APW program for which no Federal assistance is available, and undoubtedly an even larger amount of planning exists outside that limited program.

To meet the twin problems of needed local public works and increased employment opportunities, I have introduced H.R. 2170, the Local Public Works Act of 1965. This bill is designed to provide a large and continuing program of Federal grants for virtually the whole range of local public works. It would authorize $2 billion annually in Federal grants to cover two-thirds of the cost of sewer and water facilities, public buildings, streets, and road improvement, and other kinds of local facilities. These grants could be made to local public bodies without limitations on population size. Also there would be no employment criteria for eligibility but it includes the further provision that depressed areas, in view of their special needs and limited resources, could receive grants up to 75 percent of cost. I believe that this legislation could spark a sharp increase in public works construction, one which is particularly needed since the exhaustion of APW funds and the end of the boost which that gave to such construction might otherwise actually lead to a slackening in this vital part of our economy.

I am confident that the basic support for this kind of a proposal is there if only those who believe in the need for it will give it their determined support. Major legislation must have grassroots backing to make its way through the complex route it must follow here in Washington. I hope that all of you, while you are here in Washington and when you return to your homes, will keep this in mind. Certainly this bill is among my highest legislative priorities this year and I hope it will be among yours.

The 10th Anniversary of the U.S. Nuclear Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 18, 1965

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, on January 14 the President awarded the Enrico Fermi Award to Admiral Rickover. It is most appropriate that this award was made as we are observing the 10th anniversary of the U.S. Nuclear Navy.

When the Atomic Energy Commission announced the selection of Adm. H. G. Rickover as the recipient of the Enrico Fermi Award on November 21, 1964, in a public statement, I indicated my great pleasure at the receipt of this news. I said:

> In my opinion, Admiral Rickover has done more to further the development and uses of atomic energy than most of the prior recipients of this award. I believe his selection for the highest honor in the atomic energy field has been long overdue.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the Record at this point the President's remarks when he presented the award to Admiral Rickover and Admiral Rickover's response.

I would also like to include the Atomic Energy Commission's November 21, 1964, announcement of the selection of Admiral Rickover for this award. This announcement also contains a biographical sketch of Admiral Rickover which lists some of his outstanding accomplishments and a list of some of the honors which Admiral Rickover had earned and received previously:

Remarks by President Lyndon B. Johnson Upon Presentation of Enrico Fermi Award for 1964 to Vice Adm. H. G. Rickover, U.S. Navy, the White House, January 14, 1965

Admiral Rickover, it is a gratifying pleasure to participate in this ceremony recognizing your contributions to our Nation's security—and to our peaceful economic growth in the future.

The citation of this eighth Enrico Fermi Award states:

"For engineering and administrative leadership in the development of safe and reliable nuclear power and its successful application to our national security and economic needs."

In just 3 days, we shall be celebrating the 10th anniversary of the first sea voyage of a nuclear-powered submarine—the *Nautilus*. The Nation is grateful for your courageous and dedicated role in that historic development.

Over the 10 years since, the *Nautilus* has been joined by more than 50 other nuclear-powered naval vessels. Today our nuclear fleet numbers 22 attack submarines, 29 Polaris submarines, and 3 surface ships. Together these nuclear-powered vessels have traveled a total of more than 4,300,000 miles on patrol for peace and freedom.

Your personal leadership has made an invaluable contribution to our national security—and to our capacity for keeping the peace.

Your personal dedication to excellence—your personal faith in the future—offer examples which this Nation must emulate if we are to fulfill the potential that is ours.

In no field is the promise—and the challenge—more exciting that the peaceful potential of nuclear power.

Beyond the present naval applications, perhaps there may be much broader horizons for nuclear power on the high seas. I hope the day will come when nuclear power will be so economical for our merchant ships that the American Maritime Fleet will once again become preeminent—with a new generation of swift long-range nuclear-powered vessels.

You were instrumental in the construction of the world's first large nuclear generating station at Shippingport, Pa., in 1957. From that beginning, we are now able to foresee the day—only 15 years away—when we shall have some 70 million kilowatts of installed capacity from nuclear power generation stations.

I look forward to the day when this great energy resource can be applied to desalting the sea, assuring us the additional fresh water needed for our growing population and expanding industries. In these important years you have played a role of first importance in helping us to understand and use more rationally the great force of nuclear energy. It is often overlooked that your many accomplishments and contributions have been made while in the service of your Government. Your achievements and your career should stand as an example to the many present and future Government personnel that there is a large job that can be done—and that a job well done is recognized.

For these significant contributions to our national security and growth, I am privileged to present to you—on behalf of the Atomic Energy Commission and the people of the United States—the Enrico Fermi Award for 1964.

Remarks by Vice Adm. H. G. Rickover, U.S. Navy, the Enrico Fermi Award Ceremony, the White House, January 14, 1965

Thank you, Mr. President. I had the privilege of knowing Enrico Fermi. I admired him greatly for his scientific achievements and because he was a singularly warmhearted human being. To be a recipient of the award established in his name moves me deeply.

I have always felt that in honoring a person we must remember that all human achievement flows not only from individual effort but from associative effort as well. We, the living, are heirs to all the ideas and accomplishments of every human being who has ever lived. Nowhere is this more true than in the never-ending quest for new knowledge and for new ways to put this knowledge to practical use.

The developer of a new technology starts at the current technical level and seeks to raise it so as to profit from new scientific discoveries. By its very nature, this is a cooperative endeavor. Had our nuclear ship program not received the firm and constant support of the Congressional Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and of the Atomic Energy Commission, we would not today have a fleet of nuclear submarines and surface ships.

The naval reactors group which I am privileged to head designs the powerplants of these ships and supervises their construction and operation. This task is shared by all members of the group. The actual building of these plants is carried out by private industry working under close supervision and to the exacting standards necessitated by the nature of the atom.

In gratefully accepting this award I do so on behalf of the dedicated men and women in the laboratories, the factories, and the shipyards who build our ships, as well as the brave men who serve in them. All work long and hard to make it possible for the United States to have an effective and ready nuclear navy.

VICE ADM. H. G. RICKOVER TO RECEIVE AEC'S ENRICO FERMI AWARD FOR 1964

The Atomic Energy Commission has selected Vice Adm. H. G. Rickover as recipient of the Enrico Fermi Award for 1964 in recognition of his outstanding engineering and administrative leadership in the development of safe and reliable nuclear power and its successful application to our national security and economic needs. The award consists of a gold medal, a citation, and $25,000.

Admiral Rickover is the first engineer-administrator and the eighth person to receive the award, named for the late Enrico Fermi, leader of the group of scientists who achieved the first sustained, controlled nuclear chain reaction on December 2, 1942, at Stagg Field, Chicago.

The selection of Admiral Rickover for the award was made by the Commission after consideration of recommendations from its statutory General Advisory Committee. The award will be presented at a ceremony in January 1965.

Admiral Rickover first achieved national recognition for his leadership in the design, development, construction, and operation of nuclear propulsion systems for submarines and other naval ships. As early as 1946, before the Atomic Energy Commission was established, Admiral Rickover was assigned responsibility for investigating the use of nuclear reactors for this purpose. He assembled a team of naval officers and civilians at Oak Ridge, Tenn., and early in 1948 he headed the joint AEC-Navy program to develop the first naval nuclear propulsion system.

Utilizing the fundamental research on reactor materials and conceptual systems developed by the Oak Ridge and the Argonne National Laboratories, Admiral Rickover's group made steady progress in compiling the information and perfecting the techniques necessary to build the first nuclear submarine. He made American industry a partner in this effort at the Bettis Atomic Power Laboratory near Pittsburgh, the Knolls Atomic Power Laboratory near Schenectady, and at the National Reactor Testing Station in Idaho. At these places the development of naval nuclear propulsion systems was carried out. A landmark in this effort was the initial operation on March 31, 1953, of the submarine thermal reactor, Mark I, the land-based prototype of the first nuclear submarine propulsion plant. This prototype plant performed a continuous full power run of 66 days duration. This was enough time to have carried a ship twice around the world without refueling and contrasts with the 4-hour full power run which is required for acceptance of new naval ships. This run served to highlight the virtually unlimited cruising range of the *Nautilus*, even at high speed. On June 14, 1952, the keel of the *Nautilus*, the world's first nuclear submarine, was laid by President Truman at Groton, Conn. She was launched by Mrs. Eisenhower on January 21, 1954, and went to sea on January 17, 1955.

This event was the beginning of a revolution in naval strategy and tactics. For the first time a true submarine was possible—one that could steam long distances almost indefinitely at high speeds. In February 1957, the *Nautilus* completed operation on its first nuclear core, having traveled 62,500 miles in more than 2 years without refueling. The arctic region was accessible to the nuclear submarine, as demonstrated by the voyages of the *Nautilus* and the *Skate* under the North Pole icecap. A new record was established in naval history by the *Triton*, the first submarine to circumnavigate the world underwater, completely independent of the earth's atmosphere. The impact of the development of nuclear power on the Navy's surface fleet was recently demonstrated by the round-the-world cruise of the nuclear ships *Enterprise*, *Long Beach*, and *Bainbridge* without replenishment of supplies or fuel.

In addition to his contributions to the development of the nuclear Navy, Admiral Rickover also led the scientific, technical, and industrial team which developed and constructed the Shippingport Pressurized Water Reactor (PWR) at Shippingport, Pa. This project has served as the basic laboratory for much of the reactor technology which has gone into the Nation's atomic powerplants. The Shippingport power station has supplied more than 1.7 billion kilowatt-hours of electricity to users in the Pittsburgh area since its initial startup in late 1957.

Two of the most important contributions of the Shippingport (PWR) project have been in the fields of reactor physics and reactor fuel technology. The PWR, with its "seed and blanket" design, demonstrated that it is feasible to obtain large amounts of power from a blanket of natural uranium surrounding a "seed" of highly enriched uranium core which serves as the driving element in a reactor which is cooled and moderated with ordinary water. While producing power the seed-and-blanket design has the additional advantage of making possible the breeding of fissionable material from the very abundant element thorium in the blanket. As a result of Admiral Rickover's achievements in this program, the State of California has submitted a proposal for cooperative construction of a large thorium seed-blanket reactor which the Commission now has under consideration.

In the field of fuel metallurgy the Shippingport PWR project team, led by Admiral Rickover, has been responsible for the development of uranium oxide as a fuel material for large power reactors. Engineering studies of the PWR also produced many design improvements which have extended the life of reactor fuel elements and thus have contributed to the reduction in nuclear power costs. The first PWR core, placed in the reactor in late 1957, operated until February 1964, more than three times its original design life.

To extend the knowledge of basic reactor technology both in the United States and abroad, Admiral Rickover was also instrumental in establishing a school for reactor operators at Shippingport in which personnel from the United States and foreign utility companies are training as atomic powerplant operators. Admiral Rickover also established and maintains the Navy's program for the nuclear training of all officers and enlisted personnel involved in the operation of the Navy's nuclear powerplants.

In developing components and materials for naval propulsion and civilian power reactor systems, Admiral Rickover and those working with him soon discovered that the standards of reliability and safety established for conventional power systems were by no means sufficient for nuclear powerplants. The result has been the development of technical standards and specifications in the nuclear industry which would have been inconceivable a few years ago, and the formulation of realistic and comprehensive safety standards for propulsion and power reactors. So rigorous have been the standards for fabrication and operation of nuclear systems that they have surpassed conventional equipment in safety and reliability.

For his many achievements, Admiral Rickover has been awarded, among others, the following honors and awards:

American Legion of Merit for performance of duties as head of the electrical section, Bureau of Ships, 1946.

Made commander, Order of the British Empire, 1946.

Awarded Gold Star in lieu of Second Legion of Merit for performance of duty in development of nuclear ship propulsion program, 1952.

Awarded the Christopher Columbus Prize at the Fifth International Meeting of Communications in Genoa, Italy, October 1957.

Awarded Congressional Gold Medal for his accomplishments in successfully directing the development and construction of the world's first nuclear-powered ships and the first large-scale nuclear powerplant devoted exclusively to the production of electricity, 1959.

Presented the Distinguished Service Medal, for exceptionally meritorious service from January 17, 1955, to January 17, 1961, while in charge of the naval nuclear propulsion program in the Department of the Navy and in the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, January 1961.

Awarded Gold Star in lieu of the Second Distinguished Service Medal, for exceptionally meritorious service from January 1961 to January 1964 as manager, naval reactors, Division of Reactor Development, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission and as assistant chief of the Bureau of Ships for Nuclear Propulsion, February 1964.

He has also been awarded numerous degrees by universities.

In addition to numerous articles, he has written three books and made two reports to the House Appropriations Committee (issued as separate publications):

"Education and Freedom (1959)," E. P. Dutton & Co.

"Swiss Schools and Ours: Why Theirs Are Better (1962)," Little, Brown & Co. (under auspices Council for Basic Education).

"American Education—A National Failure (1963)," E. P. Dutton & Co.

"Report on Russia (1959)," Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives.

"Education for All Children: What We Can Learn From England (1962)," Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives.

The first recipient of an award under the provisions of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 was the late Dr. Enrico Fermi, who was granted a $25,000 award on November 16, 1954.

The Commission decided that subsequent awards should bear his name. The seven previous Fermi Award winners are:

Year 1956: The late Dr. John von Neumann, noted scientist and mathematician and member of the Atomic Energy Commission, "for his contributions to the theory, design, and construction of fast computers and to the role of computers in the control and use of atomic energy."

Year 1957: The late Dr. Ernest O. Lawrence, director of the Radiation Laboratory, University of California, which bears his name, "for his invention and development of the cyclotron and for his many contributions in nuclear physics and atomic energy."

Year 1958: Dr. Eugene Wigner, professor of mathematical physics, Princeton University, for "contributions to nuclear and theoretical physics, to nuclear reactor development and to practical applications of atomic energy."

Year 1959: Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg, Chairman of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, who was chancellor of the University of California when he received the award "for discoveries of plutonium and several additional elements and for leadership in development of nuclear chemistry and atomic energy."

Year 1961: Dr. Hans A. Bethe, professor of physics at Cornell University "for contributions to nuclear and theoretical physics, to peaceful uses of atomic energy and to the security of the United States."

Year 1962: Dr. Edward Teller, associate director of the E. O. Lawrence Radiation Laboratory at Berkeley, Calif., "for contributions to chemical and nuclear physics, for his leadership in thermonuclear research, and for efforts to strengthen national security."

Year 1963: Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer, director of the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton University, "for contributions to theoretical physics as a teacher and originator of ideas, and for leadership of the Los Alamos Laboratory and the Atomic Energy program during critical years."

The award citation for Admiral Rickover is as follows:

"For engineering and administrative leadership in the development of safe and reliable nuclear power and its successful application to our national security and economic needs."

The Enrico Fermi Award, authorized in section 157(b)(3) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, is international in scope, and may not be granted more often than once annually. Section 157(b)(3) reads in part:

"The Commission may also, upon recommendation of the General Advisory Committee, and with the approval of the President, grant an award for any especially meritorious contribution to the development, use, or control of atomic energy."

In 1964, the Commission reviewed the history of the Fermi Award and decided it would be desirable to extend the award criteria to recognize not only scientific achievement but also contributions to engineering and technical management in the development of atomic energy. The Commission also decided it would be consistent with the intent of the award if the monetary amount were returned to the level of $25,000 as awarded Dr. Fermi in 1954.

H. G. Rickover: Biographical Sketch

Vice Adm. H. G. Rickover was born in 1900. After graduating from the U.S. Naval Academy in 1922 he served in various seagoing duties and became a qualified submariner in 1930. He then requested and was assigned to engineering duty in 1937. He studied electrical engineering at the U.S. Naval Postgraduate School and completed the course at Columbia University, New York, N.Y., from which he received the degree of master of science in electrical engineering. During World War II he directed the electrical section of the Bureau of Ships and served briefly with the Manhattan district atom bomb project. After the war, he turned his attention to nuclear ship propulsion.

In 1946, he was assigned to the atomic submarine project, then under the Manhattan district, as assistant director of operations. Since 1947 he has worked in a dual capacity as manager, naval reactors, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission and as assistant chief for nuclear propulsion, Bureau of Ships, Department of the Navy.

Admiral Rickover first achieved national recognition for his leadership in the design, development, construction, and operation of nuclear propulsion systems for submarines and other naval ships. As early as 1946, before the Atomic Energy Commission was established, Admiral Rickover was assigned responsibility for investigating the use of nuclear reactors for this purpose. He assembled a team of naval officers and civilians at Oak Ridge, Tenn., and early in 1948 was made head of the joint AEC-Navy program to develop the first naval propulsion system.

Later, in collaboration with the outstanding scientists and engineers of the Oak Ridge and the Argonne National Laboratories, basic data on the nuclear properties of reactor materials were compiled and conceptual design systems for nuclear propulsion of ships were developed.

Admiral Rickover also brought industry into an active role, and at the Bettis Atomic Power Laboratory near Pittsburgh, Knolls Atomic Power Laboratory near Schenectady, and at the National Reactor Testing Station in Idaho the development of naval nuclear propulsion systems was carried out. A landmark in this effort was the initial operation on March 31, 1953, of the submarine thermal reactor, Mark I, the land-based prototype of the first nuclear submarine propulsion plant.

On June 14, 1952, the keel of the *Nautilus*, the world's first nuclear submarine, was laid by President Truman at Groton, Conn. The event marked the beginning of a revolution in the concepts of naval propulsion. In February 1957, the *Nautilus* completed operation on its first nuclear core, having traveled 62,500 nautical miles in more than 2 years. For the first time a true submarine has become possible. Nuclear submarines such as the *Nautilus* and the *Skate* voyaged under the North Pole icecap, demonstrating that the polar regions were no longer inaccessible to ships. The *Triton* became the first submarine to circumnavigate the world completely submerged, independent of the earth's atmosphere. A graphic demonstration of the scope of Admiral Rickover's efforts and the value of nuclear propulsion to the surface fleet was recently provided when the aircraft carrier *Enterprise*, the guided missile cruiser *Long Beach* and the destroyer *Bainbridge* cruised around the world without refueling. From operating experience at sea, and from land prototypes, the effort to further develop nuclear propulsion has continued with great success.

Comparably important, but not so well known, is his direction and leadership of the Shippingport pressurized water reactor (PWR) project near Pittsburgh, Pa., from which came not only most of the basic technology for submarine and surface ship reactors but also a large part of the reactor technology used in our present day water-cooled and water-moderated nuclear power plants.

The Shippingport project was established in 1953 as an important national goal. It was the first large-scale central station atomic powerplant in the world and has served as the technical foundation for other reactor plants both private and Government owned. This plant has supplied more than 1.7 billion kilowatt-hours of electricity to users in the Pittsburgh area since its initial startup in late 1957 and has clearly demonstrated that nuclear fission can reliably and safely supply electricity to a utility network on a useful scale.

Notwithstanding its success and the production of electricity, the primary goal of the Shippingport project, under Admiral Rickover's direction, was advancement of the basic technology of water reactors. Some of the specific gains in reactor technology resulting from the Shippingport operation are in the fields of fuel and nuclear poison and technology; reactor physics; reactor control; reactor thermal, hydraulic, and mechanical design; basic heat transfer studies; fuel element failure detection systems; refueling procedures; primary coolant water radiochemistry; and disposal of radioactive wastes.

Two of the most important contributions resulting from Admiral Rickover's direction of the Shippingport (PWR) project have been in the fields of reactor physics and reactor fuel technology. The PWR, with its "seed and blanket" design, demonstrated that it is feasible to obtain large amounts of power from a "blanket" of natural uranium surrounding a "seed" of highly enriched uranium which serves as the driving element in a reactor which is cooled and moderated with ordinary water. While producing power the seed-and-blanket design has the additional advantage of making possible the breeding of fissionable material from the very abundant element thorium in the blanket. As a result of Admiral Rickover's achievements in this program, the State of California has submitted a proposal for cooperative construction of a large thorium seed-blanket reactor which the Commission now has under consideration.

In the field of fuel metallurgy the Shippingport PWR project team, led by Admiral Rickover, has been responsible for the development of uranium oxide as a fuel material for large power reactors. Engineering studies of the PWR also produced many design improvements which have extended the life of reactor fuel elements and thus have contributed to the reduction in nuclear power costs. The first PWR core, placed in the reactor in late 1957, operated until February 1964, more than three times its original design life.

For his many achievements, Admiral Rickover has been awarded, among others, the following honors and awards:

Awarded Legion of Merit for performance of duties as head of the Electrical Section, Bureau of Ships, 1946.

Made commander, Order of British Empire, 1946.

Awarded Gold Star in lieu of second Legion of Merit for performance of duty in development of nuclear ship propulsion program, 1952.

Awarded the Christopher Columbus Prize at the Fifth International Meeting of Communications in Genoa, Italy, October 1957.

Awarded Congressional Gold Medal for his accomplishments in successfully directing the development and construction of the world's first nuclear-powered ships and the first large-scale nuclear powerplant devoted exclusively to the production of electricity, 1959.

Presented the Distinguished Service Medal, for exceptionally meritorious service from January 17, 1955, to January 17, 1961, while in charge of the naval nuclear propulsion program in the Department of the Navy and in the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, January 1961.

Awarded a Gold Star in lieu of the second Distinguished Service Medal, for exceptionally meritorious service from January 1961, to January 1964, as manager, naval reactors, Division of Reactor Development, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission and as Assistant Chief of the Bureau of Ships for Nuclear Propulsion, February 1964.

He has also been awarded numerous degrees by universities.

Admiral Rickover is married to the former Ruth D. Masters and they have one son, Robert. The Rickovers reside at 4801 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

In addition to numerous articles, he has written three books and made two reports to the House Appropriations Committee (issued as separate publications):

"Education and Freedom (1959)," E. P. Dutton Co.

"Swiss Schools and Ours: Why Theirs Are Better (1962)," Little, Brown & Co. (under auspices Council for Basic Education).

"American Education—A National Failure (1963)," E. P. Dutton & Co.

"Report on Russia (1959)," Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives.

"Education for All Children: What We Can Learn From England (1962)," Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives.

Security Measures of the House Strengthened

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 18, 1965

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, we are all concerned about security measures of the House and I am pleased to announce that security measures have been and are being improved and strengthened since the convening of the 89th Congress.

The House personnel and patronage committee, in cooperation with the House leadership, has acted to take every reasonable precaution against repetition of such untoward incidents as occurred in the Chamber of the House on the opening day of the present session.

This problem has been reviewed thoroughly at a conference with Speaker McCORMACK and, as a result, a decision has been reached to add additional security officers for the House. These men have been recruited on the basis of their experience, training, ability, and demonstrated dependability in police work—without regard to patronage considerations.

Members of this enlarged security force have been stationed at the five entrances of the Chamber of the House of Representatives.

They are there to assist and reinforce the watch maintained by the doormen of the House, who are on duty at all times.

In addition, as you know, our Capitol Police and doormen are supported by a detail of uniformed Metropolitan Police and plainclothesmen.

We believe that proper and effective steps have been taken to protect the House against invasions by troublemakers or disturbances on the floor and in the gallery.

I was present on the floor of the House on March 1, 1954, and a witness of the violent attack staged by a band of Puerto Rican nationalists. The lesson of that experience is lasting.

I fully share the conviction of my colleagues that maximum security can and must be provided for the orderly and safe transaction of the business of this House without isolating this body from the American citizens who desire to come here and observe the proceedings of their Representatives.

How Chicago District Changed From Republican to Democratic Stronghold

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 18, 1965

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, few, if any, of the States of the Union are more equitably divided into congressional districts than is Illinois. There are 24 congressional districts in Illinois, and the population of each of 12 districts, according to the 1960 census, was between 350,000 and 400,000.

How closely population compares in districts both in Chicago and downstate is shown by the census figures from the downstate 21st District, represented by Congressman GRAY, with a population of 363,196, a bare 2,300 under the 365,525 population of the Chicago-based 2d District, which I have the honor to represent, and about 10,600 over the population of the downstate 22d District, represented by Congressman SPRINGER, and 24,000 over the population of the downstate 17th District, which is represented by the distinguished, and I might add the ageless and fadeless minority whip, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS].

Four only of the Illinois districts have populations exceeding 500,000—the 10th District, represented by Congressman COLLIER topping the list with 552,582.

CHICAGO A DEMOCRATIC STRONGHOLD

Chicago is strongly a Democratic city because the regular Democratic organization, headed by Mayor Richard J. Daley, functions on the principle that good and honest, efficient, and courteous service to the people is good politics. In the Second District, which I have represented in the administrations of four Presidents of the United States, and to the electors of which I am forever indebted and deeply and humbly grateful, are the University of Chicago, the Headquarters of the 5th U.S. Army, the great Museum of Science, Art, and Industry, the steel mills, and I have been told more churches and synagogues than any similar area in the world. Every ethnic segment of the American population is well and numerously represented in the Second District.

I know of no district in the United States that offers a more exciting and rewarding challenge to the student of American politics and the tides and trends that determine the fate of parties and the course of the Nation.

DISTRICT ONCE A GOP STRONGHOLD

In my young manhood the Second District of Illinois was one of the strongest Republican districts in the Nation, and in some elections topped them all in the size of its Republican majority. It is true that the district has been changed several times since then, but Hyde Park and most of Kenwood always have been in the Second District; and in the old days, Hyde Park and Kenwood were so Republican that it was hard to spot a Democrat. I think there were only two other Democrats in the precinct where I voted when I was Lieutenant Governor of Illinois and living on Everett Avenue in Hyde Park, near the present home of Democratic Ward Committeeman Korshak.

Hyde Park is in the present fifth ward; Kenwood is largely in the 28 precincts in the fourth ward that remain in the Second Congressional District. In 1964, the fifth ward voted 24,806 to 4,231 to retain a Democratic Congressman and the 28 Kenwood precincts in the fourth ward voted 10,972 to 1,546. Fifty years ago it might have been the other way around.

Here are the official figures of the 28 precincts in the fourth ward, the alderman and ward committeeman of which is the Honorable Claude W. B. Holman:

	Precinct	Barratt O'Hara	William F. Scannell
Ward 4	16	400	15
	17	651	15
	20	414	7
	21	223	12
	22	306	32
	24	450	20
	25	496	10
	26	390	14
	29	244	196
	30	252	114
	31	424	85
	32	412	56
	33	330	73
	34	483	45
	35	442	34
	36	365	34
	37	345	16
	38	371	30
	39	400	42
	40	466	31
	43	342	41
	44	366	109
	48	307	120
	53	323	101
	55	288	2
	56	430	13
	59	503	15
	63	549	264
Total		10,972	1,546

Please note that in the 55th precinct the vote was 288 to 2, which I would call almost a perfect score. How the two dissenters got away from that Democratic precinct captain, I have no explanation. Please note, too, that in the 20th precinct, with 414 voting the way that brought gladness to my heart, only 7 voted the other way. And 496 to 10 in the 25th precinct, 503 to 15 in the 59th precinct, 651 to 15 in the 17th precinct, 430 to 13 in the 56th precinct, and on and on and on in the march of democracy under Committeeman Holman and his 4th ward stalwarts.

The best Republican precincts were the 29th and 63d. The former gave me 244 votes and my Republican opponent 196. The latter gave me 549, my opponent 264.

FIFTH-WARD RETURNS

Committeeman of the fifth ward is Hon. Marshall Korshak, former State senator with an outstanding record, present trustee of the santitary district and a topflight member of the Chicago bar. Here are the 1964 returns by precincts in the congressional election:

	Precinct	Barratt O'Hara	William F. Scannell
Ward 5	1	362	10
	2	286	167
	3	469	30
	4	482	25
	5	424	15
	6	472	33
	7	407	51
	8	371	125
	9	418	121
	10	266	183
	11	319	144
	12	340	124
	13	228	101
	14	340	181
	15	359	138
	16	266	79
	17	348	53
	18	468	18
	19	361	12
	20	364	80
	21	360	14
	22	404	53
	23	541	22
	24	348	158
	25	283	35
	26	372	78
	27	365	102
	28	375	16
	29	296	10
	30	413	137
	31	405	16
	32	333	25
	33	376	115
	34	512	24
	35	183	125
	36	568	21
	37	302	131
	38	312	157
	39	121	235
	40	233	113
	41	255	117
	42	375	110
	43	318	136
	44	497	17
	45	530	52
	46	394	9
	47	360	66
	48	417	28
	49	427	16
	50	441	14
	51	416	42
	52	390	55
	53	425	16
	54	527	21
	55	543	25
	56	484	10
	57	531	17
	58	497	13
	59	349	104
	60	473	10
	61	456	15
	62	420	14
	63	342	29
	64	487	9
Total		24,806	4,231

Please note, as I have with pride and appreciation, that 487 to 9 in the 64th precinct, that 484 to 10 in the 56th precinct, that 362 to 10 in the 1st precinct, 424 to 15 in the 5th precinct, 441 to 14 in the 50th precinct, 568 to 21 in the 36th precinct, and on and on and on in the march of democracy under Committeeman Korshak and the precinct stalwarts of the 5th ward.

There are 64 precincts in the 5th ward. One of the 64, the 39th precinct, went for my Republican opponent by a vote of 121 to 235. The next best Republican precinct was the 10th precinct, in which the Republican nominee received 183 to my 266.

SEVENTH-WARD RETURNS

Democratic committeeman of the seventh ward is the Honorable James A. Ronan, Democratic State chairman, member of Governor Kerner's cabinet, and one of the Democratic leaders in Illinois. This has been the ward of my residence for close to half a century. When I started running for Congress, the seventh ward was concededly Republican territory, but more and more came over to the Democratic side, the Democratic vote in 1964 setting the Democratic high water mark. Here are the returns by precincts in the 1964 congressional election:

	Precinct	Barratt O'Hara	William F. Scannell
Ward 7	1	462	28
	2	420	18
	3	529	33
	4	276	81
	5	231	131
	6	225	157
	7	305	114
	8	401	56
	9	397	96
	10	263	120
	11	246	133
	12	229	222
	13	264	284
	14	177	151
	15	157	154
	16	237	166
	17	340	159
	18	341	106
	19	210	194
	20	206	161
	21	401	78
	22	483	33
	23	180	190
	24	139	175
	25	479	110
	26	380	97
	27	250	112
	28	359	141
	29	248	164
	30	233	159
	31	274	261
	32	276	119
	33	187	365
	34	226	233
	35	211	277
	36	176	191
	37	226	232
	38	296	201
	39	204	185
	40	298	172
	41	255	154
	42	263	173
	43	418	116
	44	260	222
	45	296	113
	46	212	157
	47	315	188
	48	256	143
	49	202	181
	50	183	189
	51	312	180
	52	172	192
	53	274	235
	54	246	295
	55	258	243
	56	218	337
	57	153	204
	58	140	176
	59	163	198
	60	365	155
	61	310	123
	62	298	123
	63	243	108
	64	244	170
	65	339	88
	66	207	206
	67	351	151
	68	225	119
	69	191	209
	70	368	133
	71	213	274
	72	272	157
	73	185	127
	74	342	143
	75	248	180
	76	305	209
	77	297	140
	78	299	89
	79	288	93
	80	204	125
	81	226	207
	82	269	167
	83	306	87
	84	276	313
	85	190	213
	86	263	187
	87	295	321
	88	175	218
	89	161	215
	90	352	85
	91	257	145
	92	482	89
	93	382	27
Total		25,466	15,151

Please note with me the 420 to 18 in the 2d precinct, the 462 to 28 in the 1st precinct, the 529 to 33 in the 3d precinct, the 392 to 27 in the 93d precinct, and on and on and on in the march of democracy under Committeeman Ronan and the precinct stalwarts of the 7th ward.

Best Republican precinct was the home precinct of the Republican nominee, the 33d, which gave him 365 votes to my 187. There are 93 precincts in the fifth ward. They divided 73 Democratic, 20 Republican.

EIGHTH-WARD RETURNS

Until the last reapportionment, all the eighth ward was in the Second Congressional District and when I was first elected to the Congress, it was the strongest Republican ward of the district. Later, it became Democratic. The 31 precincts that remained in the Second District after the 1960 reapportionment, however, were inclined to go Republican. In 1962, I carried them by about 25 votes, 1 of 2 Democratic nominees who cleared the hurdle. In 1964, I was thankful to carry 24 of the precincts and to come close in the remaining 7. Here are the official figures:

	Precinct	Barratt O'Hara	William F. Scannell
Ward 8	2	207	144
	3	178	247
	4	187	165
	7	236	226
	13	198	173
	14	183	242
	19	152	240
	20	342	112
	21	276	207
	22	362	103
	23	249	233
	24	220	175
	25	186	139
	26	326	140
	27	369	89
	30	223	243
	33	201	155
	46	302	254
	48	141	180
	49	233	266
	50	301	212
	51	258	278
	57	285	160
	67	207	265
	68	202	143
	70	261	191
	72	236	194
	73	252	206
	77	256	226
	85	179	296
	88	217	155
Total		7,425	6,059

Please note the 369 to 89 in the 27th precinct, the 362 to 103 in the 22d precinct, the 342 to 112 in the 20th precinct. Best Republican precinct was the 85th, which gave my opponent 296 to my 179.

Russell O'Brien is the Democratic committeeman of the eighth ward, one of my longtime friends, as is his predecessor, James Sullivan, who as one of the then governing group sponsored my congressional candidacy in 1948 and earlier, in 1912, had rung doorbells for me as a candidate for Lieutenant Governor.

Hon. James Condon, former associate of mine in the office of the corporation counsel of Chicago, is the alderman of the eighth ward. Russell DeBow, formerly associated with me in the representation of the Second District, and now on the staff of Mayor Daley, is an important member of the eighth-ward team.

NINTH-WARD RETURNS

Ward committeeman of the ninth ward is the Honorable Leslie V. Beck, clerk of the appellate court. He is one of my oldest and dearest friends. Alderman of the ward is the Honorable Dominic J. Lupo, who has established an enduring record by his hard work and his willingness to give a tireless and helping hand on all worthy occasions. The Honorable Michael Hinko, onetime Democratic nominee for Congress and presently my personal representative, is a resident of the ninth ward.

Here are the returns by precincts from the ninth ward:

	Precinct	Barratt O'Hara	William F. Scannell
Ward 9	1	273	116
	2	173	254
	3	212	278
	4	189	217
	5	233	95
	6	268	153
	7	234	96
	8	295	168
	9	123	302
	10	259	139
	11	277	190
	12	162	297
	13	194	262
	14	216	238
	15	244	221
	16	286	153
	17	199	238
	18	194	268
	19	255	200
	20	179	272
	21	290	214
	22	251	207
	23	222	186
	24	463	15
	25	269	151
	26	169	179
	27	345	7
	28	406	11
	29	179	183
	30	251	218
	31	200	118
	32	217	261
	33	350	10
	34	187	176
	35	171	230
	36	205	219
	37	291	138
	38	222	204
	39	180	250
	40	196	219
	41	235	225
	42	493	12
	43	220	289
	44	234	198
	45	210	173
	46	193	169
	47	275	170
	48	250	120
	49	258	130
	50	331	63
	51	329	9
	52	210	261
	53	214	217
	54	208	218
	55	288	166
	56	238	172
	57	249	135
	58	174	188
	59	260	305
	60	218	290
	61	262	189
	62	225	261
	63	267	291
	64	183	287
	65	293	150
	66	262	192
	67	231	182
	68	177	200
	69	260	228
	70	351	94
	71	243	218
	72	227	159
	73	170	263
	74	279	165
	75	141	240
Total		18,187	13,982

Please note, as certainly have I, the 463 to 15 in the 24th precinct, the 345 to 7 in the 27th precinct, the 406 to 11 in the 28th precinct, the 350 to 10 in the 33d precinct, the 493 to 12 in the 42d precinct, the 329 to 9 in the 51st precinct, and on and on and on in the march of democracy under Committeeman Beck and the precinct stalwarts of the 9th ward.

TENTH-WARD RETURNS

Stanley Zima is the new ward committeeman of the 10th ward, succeeding the late Emil Pacini. It is no exaggeration to say that no party leader ever made a better showing in his first major campaign. He mapped and sparked the campaign that carried the 10th ward by a close to 2-to-1 majority. There are 70 precincts in the 10th ward and all but 6 went Democratic. Here are the figures of the congressional election by precincts:

	Precinct	Barratt O'Hara	William F. Scannell
Ward 10	1	369	183
	2	224	124
	3	280	103
	4	307	206
	5	254	144
	6	228	118
	7	237	186
	8	283	89
	9	314	185
	10	315	203
	11	400	166
	12	293	258
	13	339	212
	14	350	180
	15	295	159
	16	291	81
	17	275	68
	18	309	92
	19	286	219
	20	432	31
	21	334	170
	22	261	70
	23	246	106
	24	241	118
	25	327	148
	26	297	160
	27	282	147
	28	373	165
	29	287	211
	30	248	104
	31	414	139
	32	161	215
	33	183	180
	34	251	224
	35	202	201
	36	180	279
	37	238	219
	38	226	267
	39	300	195
	40	370	101
	41	283	201
	42	296	218
	43	433	28
	44	242	65
	45	304	130
	46	225	117
	47	236	84
	48	329	142
	49	341	184
	50	181	161
	51	307	172
	52	314	144
	53	369	9
	54	378	170
	55	337	184
	56	301	131
	57	236	293
	58	234	201
	59	455	168
	60	356	161
	61	459	158
	62	398	140
	63	238	320
	64	366	121
	65	312	255
	66	268	281
	67	206	52
	68	345	188
	69	373	267
	70	315	276
Total		20,939	11,447

Please note the 369 to 9 in the 53d precinct, the 433 to 28 in the 43d precinct, the 432 to 31 in the 20th precinct, and on and on and on in the march of democracy under Committeeman Zima and the precinct stalwarts of the 10th ward, not forgetting the great and invincible State legislative team of Daniel Dougherty, Nick Svalina, and Henry Leonard, and the steelworkers who have never been found wanting. My deepest thanks again to them, one and all, and to Joe LaMotte and Al Towers, who worked day and night with tireless dedication, and all the others this expression of a gratitude that will never fade.

TIDES AND TRENDS IN POLITICS

Mr. Speaker, in our high schools and colleges there is a healthy growth in political interest. The civic studies in our high schools and the courses in political science in our colleges have an ever-widening appeal to our youth. What makes our democracy click? What are the forces that bring changes to the status quo, how are they aroused, and concentrated into voter action? What is the how, when, and where of politics? I sincerely hope that the story of the Second District in Illinois, a district that in the span of my lifetime has changed from a Republican to a Democratic stronghold will make some contribution to better understanding of American politics and the tides and trends that determine the fate of parties and the course of the ship of state.

Ukrainian Americans Contribute to the American Way of Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 18, 1965

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, for 2 short years, from 1918 to 1920, the Ukrainian people had independence.

Since that time they have been swallowed up as part of the Soviet Union. Americans who have long held high the principle of self-determination of peoples pay special tribute to these wonderful people of Eastern Europe during this month, the 47th anniversary of the proclamation of the Ukrainian National Republic.

All of us here in Congress are well aware of the great contribution to American life made by the Ukrainian American immigrants, be they from the 19th century or among the 60,000 Ukrainian displaced persons who came to our shores and became a part of our national life after World War II. One of the best statements I have read about Americans of Ukrainian background was written by Joseph L. Dichten in "One America," edited by Brown & Roucek. I have unanimous consent to place part of that statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at this point:

CONTRIBUTIONS TO AMERICAN LIFE

The Ukrainian American immigrant has done more than his share in the building of the Nation. He has worked in great numbers in factories and farms, railroads and mines, and his unremitting labors have helped to strengthen the vast and crucially important industrial power of the United States. He has strongly identified himself with the cause of organized labor, and has zealously participated in the founding and growth of the American labor movement. The Ukrainian immigrant brought with him from the old country a love of his own home and his own piece of land; thus, the Ukrainian American family unit has always been a sturdy, stable entity.

Many areas of American culture have profited from the contributions of the Ukrainian immigrant. His music, songs, and folk dances have greatly influenced American composers and choreographers. George Gershwin used an old Ukrainian theme as a base for his "Don't Forget Me" from the operetta "Song of the Flame." The Ukrainian National and the United Ukrainian Folk choruses, composed mainly of young Ukrainian Americans born in the United States, have been acclaimed by critics as among the best ever heard in the United States. One reviewer described the Ukrainian National Chorus as "a human organ, an instrument of incomparable precision and incomparable expressiveness. It can rustle like leaves in the forest; it can be lyrical as a lark at dawn; it can be sonorous as thunder over mountains." These choral groups were created by Prof. Alexander Koshetz, a Ukrainian immigrant who lived in New York until his death in 1944. Professor Koshetz left behind him several notable compositions and arrangements of Ukrainian songs for American choruses.

Ukrainian dances are often considered among the most vivid and colorful of all folk dances by virtue of charm and expressiveness, and many of their basic steps have found their way into the American dance. The world-renowned sculptor, Alexander Archipenko, has made his contribution to modern American art. His sculptures, created in New York and California, can be found in many American museums. Movie stars John Hodiak and Anna Sten are of Ukrainian descent. Volodymyr Timoshenko, a recognized authority on the economy of the Ukraine and Russia, was a professor at Stanford University in California.

Many other individual contributions to American life by Ukrainians can be cited. Ukrainian American scientists, composers, singers, cartoonists, and athletes have gained positions of prominence and have contributed to the mainstream of American culture.

However, the greatest contribution to American life has been made by the Ukrainian group as a whole—by the hundreds and thousands of Ukrainian immigrants and their families. The Ukrainian churches, organizations, and press have become integral parts of the American culture, and are concrete examples of the best that can be attained through the realization of the concept of "cultural pluralism."

With best wishes.

Sincerely,

Donald M. Fraser.

The House Small Business Committee Reports to the Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 18, 1965

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the hearings, studies, and reports of the House Small Business Committee during the 88th Congress are summarized in the current issue of my weekly newsletter, Capitol Comments.

The reports contain many recommendations directed to the attention of the 89th Congress, in consonance with the declared policy of the Congress that our Federal Government should protect and promote the interests of American small business.

The newsletter summarizing the activities and recommendations of the House Select Committee on Small Business during the 88th Congress, on which I had the honor of serving as chairman, is included in the Congressional Record under unanimous consent.

The newsletter article follows:

House Small Business Committee Calls for Action on Wide Range of Problems

Approximately 80 specific recommendations for actions dealing constructively with major problems of American small business are set forth in the House Small Business Committee's final report on its work during the 88th Congress.

The House Small Business Committee, on which your Representative serves as chairman, summarized in this report the comprehensive studies and investigations of the full committee and its subcommittees during the last Congress. This report (H. Rept. No. 1944) has been made public and is available in printed form upon request, along with five other new reports of the committee.

The other reports, which discuss in detail some of the matters summarized in the final report, include:

Small Business Administration, its organization and operation: Seventeen recommended steps to make this important Federal agency more helpful and effective are outlined in House Report No. 1935. Included is the recommendation that Congress promptly consider supplementary appropriations to the revolving fund in order that the SBA's financial assistance program not be curtailed.

The SBA has a revolving fund of $1.6 billion through which more than $2.5 billion in loans has been made available to small business firms since this program was established in 1953 by Congress. There are today more than 4.6 million small businesses in the United States representing better than 90 percent of American business.

Small business investment program: House Report No. 1934 makes numerous recommendations designed to strengthen this financial assistance program, under which privately owned, organized, and operated investment corporations make equity capital and long-term loans available to small business firms. More than 10,000 concerns have received over one-half billion dollars in such assistance since this program was established by Congress.

Dual distribution: House Report No. 1943 covers testimony received from small businessmen in 46 industries concerning the impact upon small business of dual distribution and vertical integration. This is one of the most comprehensive studies ever made of small business distributional problems.

Government procurement: House Report No. 1937 outlines 15 administrative actions which should be taken by various Government departments and agencies to insure that small business obtains a fair share of the Federal Government's procurement dollars.

Lumber standards: House Report No. 1936 is based on the subcommittee hearings that were held in response to complaints of small businessmen in the U.S. softwood lumber industry that new size standards would have harmful effects on their business. The subcommittee recommended that the Department of Commerce reconstitute the American Lumber Standards Committee so as to provide broader representation on this advisory panel.

Our committee's final report includes chapters on each of the subjects covered in the five separate reports, together with informative chapters on taxation, tax-exempt foundations, small business problems in urban areas, the economy and small business, corporate mergers, and the monopoly problem.

A chapter on small business and foreign trade, based on extensive hearings conducted in 1963, is another of the significant sections of our committee's final report. A chapter is devoted also to the Federal Trade Commission's advisory opinion on joint ads. This relates to our committee's work which resulted in the reversal of an adverse FTC decision on joint advertising by retailers—a reversal beneficial to druggists, hardwaremen, merchants, and other small business retailers.

In sum, the committee's reports for the 88th Congress make available a vast store of vital information to all who are concerned with the problems and the welfare of American small business. Copies of each of these reports are available without charge upon request to your Congressman or the House Small Business Committee, Washington 25, D.C.

Washington Observance of 10th Anniversary of U.S. Nuclear Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. BATES
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 18, 1965

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, 10 years ago this past Sunday, January 17, these words signaled the successful launching of nuclear seapower by the U.S. Navy: "Underway on nuclear power."

In recognition of this important anniversary of the U.S. nuclear Navy, when the now Rear Adm. Eugene P. Wilkinson sent that message from the submarine *Nautilus*, ceremonies are taking place in various parts of the country. As a member of both the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and the House Armed Services Committee, I was privileged to attend the principal public event in Washington last Wednesday night, under the sponsorship of Naval Reserve Public Relations Company 5–4 at the Hotel Willard.

Today, the U.S. Navy is the world's largest operator of nuclear reactors, and the uses to which these phenomenal powerplants are being put, and will be in the future, were extremely well recorded at the Washington salute to the 10th anniversary of the nuclear Navy.

The addresses were delivered by Admiral Wilkinson, first skipper of the *Nautilus;* newly seated Congressman William R. Anderson of Tennessee, who was commanding officer of the *Nautilus* on her historic voyage under the North Pole, and Rear Adm. Bernard M. Strean, commander of the famed Nuclear Task Force 1 which recently completed Operation Sea Orbit by circumnavigating the world.

A similar message was delivered by Admiral Wilkinson in Boston today at a

10th anniversary luncheon cosponsored by the 1st Naval District and the Associated Industries of Massachusetts, which also is observing its 50th year of service to my home State. This is doubly appropriate in view of the fact that two of Admiral Stream's nuclear task force ships, the cruiser *Long Beach* and frigate *Bainbridge*, were built and commissioned in Massachusetts.

Mr. Speaker, our maritime nation has been underway on nuclear power for 10 years. The cause of freedom and security in the world demands that we continue on course into the future—at flank speed. It is with pleasure, therefore, that I join at this time with my colleagues, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE], in recognizing this great anniversary in our nuclear history. In that connection, I desire to enter into the RECORD at this point the informative Washington dinner messages of the three aforementioned distinguished pioneers of our nuclear Navy—with which it has also been my privilege to be closely affiliated since its inception, along with the stalwart father of nuclear seapower, Vice Adm. Hyman G. Rickover.

SIGNIFICANCE OF "UNDERWAY ON NUCLEAR POWER"

(Remarks of Rear Adm. Eugene P. Wilkinson, U.S. Navy, at the 10th anniversary of the nuclear Navy dinner, Willard Hotel, Washington, D.C., January 13, 1965)

Tonight we are saluting the 10th anniversary of the nuclear Navy, with zero time being 1100 hours, January 17, 1955, when Q.M.1c. Rayl, *Nautilus* quartermaster, sent a signal by flashing light to the U.S.S. *Sunbird* for further relay to commander submarine force, Atlantic Fleet—"underway on nuclear power."

Actually, 1100, January 17, 1955, wasn't the beginning at all. Just the opposite. That instant of time when *Nautilus* took in her No. 1 line and backed into the stream at Groton, Conn., marked the end of a job. A long, hard job that started with then Capt. H. G. Rickover and a select group of engineering duty officers at Oak Ridge National Laboratory in 1946. A job that, before it was through, involved a cross section of America, including Congress, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Navy, national laboratories, Federal bureaus, various colleges and universities, and a great segment of American industry. A job that included conception, controversy, congressional support, design, development, superior technical management, significant technological breakthroughs, construction, and test. A pioneering program that saw many frustrations and setbacks, redesign and retest, years of never-ending pressure, dedication, persistence, and at last consummation—*Nautilus* was ready to go to sea.

The dramatic end of this phase occurred only 17 days off a schedule made more than 6 years before; in 1948. A remarkable accomplishment for such a revolutionary development—and what a success. The ship worked perfectly from the first day. And then continued to do so, time after time, and every time thereafter.

The objective of the naval nuclear propulsion program is the design, development, production, and operation of nuclear propulsion plants having high reliability, maximum simplicity, and maximum fuel life for installation in ships ranging from small submarines to large combatant surface ships. This objective is being achieved. The tangible evidence of this is 92 nuclear-powered submarines and 4 nuclear-powered surface ships authorized to date. When completed this will be roughly 11 percent of our entire fleet numerically and about the same percent of the total tonnage. We should expect to see a similar, if not a greater, percentage increase in the next decade. The objective back in 1955 was simpler—just to get that one ship to sea. An inanimate mass of steel one day, the next a living ship that, those of us who were in her, will love all our lives.

Of the 96 nuclear ships authorized through fiscal year 1965, the surface ships: *Enterprise, Long Beach*, and *Bainbridge*—22 attack submarines, and 29 Polaris submarines have assumed their duties in the fleet. Others are operational, soon to report. In the more than 4½ million miles these ships have steamed, their accomplishments are legend. The Arctic explorations of Captain Anderson in *Nautilus*, followed by those of *Skate, Sargo*, and *Seadragon;* the submerged endurance runs of *Seawolf* and *Patrick Henry;* the speed and maneuverability of *Skipjack;* the first test firings of Polaris by *George Washington*; the increasing strength of the ever vigilant Polaris submarines on deterrent patrol; circumnavigation of the globe; first, submerged, by *Triton*, then, by Admiral Strean's Nuclear Task Force 1 in Operation Sea Orbit—all these exploits add in increasing tempo to naval history.

Nautilus' sailing marked the beginning of a new era in naval history—the age of nuclear naval power. The significance looms ever larger as our visions become realities in submersibles and ships with virtually unlimited range, endurance, and speed—making them some of the deadliest military weapons systems ever devised. The revolution in our Navy started by nuclear power has come a long way in the first 10 years, with greater possibilities ahead.

All of the combatant submarines being built or authorized will be nuclear powered. The advantages of nuclear propulsion are being carefully examined for their application to some of our future surface combatant ships. The Secretary of Defense has announced that a nuclear-powered aircraft carrier, using only two reactors instead of eight, is now practicable. This will stimulate further studies of the economics of surface ship nuclear propulsion. As reactor technology continues to advance, we in the Navy look to a future in which many of the new major combatant ships will be nuclear powered and these nuclear-powered ships will help keep our Navy modern and strong so that it can continue to fulfill its traditional role of assuring the freedom of the seas effectively.

NUCLEAR NAVY—ONE OF NATION'S GREATEST ASSETS

(Remarks by Congressman WILLIAM R. ANDERSON at the dinner celebrating the 10th anniversary of the nuclear Navy, Willard Hotel, Washington, D.C., January 13, 1965)

I am very glad to be here and I appreciate the forbearance of all of you who must realize that I am a bit late to be a qualified Navy spokesman and considerably early to be a congressional expert.

My problem doesn't stop here. Despite all my efforts to acquire the image of lawmaker and statesman, I find I'm still more closely identified with the North Pole than with Capitol Hill. I assure you, it is twice as hard and much more dangerous to reach Congress.

I want to express my warm appreciation to the Washington Naval Reserve Public Relations Company for conceiving and arranging this event. Having spent my last 3 years of Navy duty here in Washington, I am well aware of your versatility, your fine traditions, and the great contributions your unit has made toward a more effective and better understood Navy.

The last 10 years of our nuclear Navy have been eventful and bright with performance and potential. It is certain that the next 10 years can be years of progress, achievement, and consolidation.

The joint Navy-Atomic Energy Commission program has always been blessed with champions to serve the cause of nuclear propulsion.

Its number one champion originally stood almost alone. Tomorrow, that man, small in physical stature but gigantic in the breadth and depth of his character, intellect, and devotion, will leave his austere office to go to the White House to receive the Enrico Fermi Award from President Lyndon B. Johnson.

The Navy and the Nation are indeed fortunate that Adm. H. G. Rickover is willing to continue in his demanding assignment in the second decade of nuclear power.

There are also many champions of the nuclear Navy on both sides of Capitol Hill. I do not intend to diminish the credit due the Navy, but history will record that Congress, particularly during the early days, gave nuclear propulsion better attention, better service, and greater push than did the Navy itself.

We are most forunate that two Capitol Hill champions of nuclear power have now moved to powerful positions. I refer to Congressman MENDEL RIVERS, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, and Congressman CHET HOLIFIELD, chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. The outlook for the next 10 years is brighter because of the judgment, vision, and leadership of these statesmen.

With the support and leadership of men of this type, the Navy now stands on the threshold of a historic changeover. The *Nautilus* and her successors and the dramatically powerful Polaris-firing submarines are a tremendous force in being. Nuclear Task Force 1, after its circumnavigation of the globe appears to be the prototype for the ships that will make our Navy the most powerful and adaptable the world has ever seen.

ENTER, THE SECOND DECADE

With more and more efficient nuclear propulsion systems being developed, the key question to a policy for the second decade of the nuclear Navy would seem to be how best to proceed with construction of nuclear surface ships.

The reason for our past timidity in this matter has, of course, been costs. In opening a discussion on nuclear surface ships, I want to make it clear that my purpose is not to criticize the decisions of the past but to make some suggestions bearing on future policy.

First of all, I think that in deciding whether to adopt an aggressive program of nuclear ship construction we should make sure all factors are considered.

It's important, first of all, that the figures on which we base decisions be true, complete costs of ship construction and operation, amortized over the useful life of the ship—development, construction, outfitting, operation, repairs, refueling.

Viewed on this basis, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has estimated that a nuclear carrier is just 3 percent more expensive in the long run than a conventional carrier. It is also, of course, much more effective than a conventional carrier. There are few Americans who would not be willing to invest this additional 3 percent in order to avoid dependence on obsolete, second-best ships for the defense of this country and the security of the free world.

Let us also remember the "spinoffs," the side benefits and returned dividends that have and will come from the development of nuclear propulsion.

Take the Shippingport reactor, this country's first full-size commercial atomic generating plant. Shippingport is really a larger version of the *Nautilus* powerplant. Eventually, I believe we will realize that if the only result of the *Nautilus* development program had been a safe, satisfactory situation at Shippingport the money would have been well spent.

While our needs for commercial atomic power may not press us today, we must prepare for the time when they press in on us rapidly—as, indeed, they are pressing in already on many nations hard up for conventional energy sources.

FOR GOOD OF MANKIND

Let us not forget, either, that the Stars and Stripes, flying from modern, swift, far-ranging nuclear ships comprises one of our most dramatic symbols of the success of the United States in harnessing the atom for practical, peaceful purposes—dramatic proof of this Nation's firm determination that the atom shall be used for mankind's good, rather than his destruction.

These considerations are difficult, I think, to place on the scale of cost accounting. But they must be included in our thinking. We cannot afford to deprive ourselves of our full potential power merely because it appears today to be a little more expensive, because what slide rule can measure the value of life and liberty?

So, as a new administration, with a sparkling mandate from the people, prepares to open new and ambitious vistas toward the fulfillment of the American dream, I think we must visualize ourselves as at a new departure, beyond which a wise nation will not only build fleets powered by the atom, but will embrace every opportunity to harness this elemental force for the benefit of all men, everywhere.

TASK FORCE 1—AND LOOKING AHEAD

(Remarks of Rear Adm. B. M. Strean, U.S. Navy, in commemoration of the 10th anniversary of the nuclear Navy, Willard Hotel, Washington, D.C., January 13, 1965)

I am most happy to participate in this observance of that day in 1955 when Admiral Wilkinson signaled "Underway on nuclear power." I think it becomes increasingly clear that when the *Nautilus* got underway on the atom, the Navy got underway on the atom. In the intervening 10 years, much has been accomplished, and it was a great honor for me, this past year, to lead the surface manifestation of the progress we celebrate on a round-the-world cruise. I refer, of course, to all-nuclear Task Force 1—the aircraft carrier *Enterprise*, the cruiser *Long Beach*, and the frigate *Bainbridge*, and Operation Sea Orbit. It is this voyage and its implications for all of us that draws me here tonight.

As you know, Task Force 1 left Gibraltar at the end of July on a west to east track, rounded Africa, crossed the Indian Ocean, turned south to Australia, crossed the southern Pacific and rounded Cape Horn to proceed up the east coast of South America and thence to Norfolk, arriving on October 3. This nuclear circumnavigation of the globe took 57 steaming days plus 7 days in port on good-will visits, transiting approximately 31,000 miles. It was made on the absolute ground rule that there would be no stops for refueling or replenishment of any kind. The three ports visited were for good will and crew morale purposes.

To begin at the beginning, Sea Orbit probably would not have come about had it not been for the tireless insistence of the late Adm. Claude Vernon Ricketts. Word came from him to study such a round-the-world voyage of our three nuclear surface ships. When the completed study pointed out the many obstacles in the way, the answer from Vice Commander of Nuclear Operations Ricketts was typical: "Take out the obstacles and study the project again." Such was the man. His determination and foresight will prove to be correctly placed, I think, again and again.

The objectives of Sea Orbit were several. Among them:

We wanted to test the capability of nuclear-powered ships to maintain high speeds for indefinite periods of time and distance in all possible weather and sea states without refueling or replenishment of any kind.

We wanted to show these powerful modern ships and their potent airpower to peoples in distant areas of the world and thus enhance the political and military image of the United States.

We wanted to demonstrate the strategic mobility and the strategic utility of this new element of U.S. power.

And we wanted to demonstrate our ability to quickly reinforce U.S. power in remote areas of the world.

I think we accomplished these things and more. Time does not permit a full discussion here, but there are salient points which inevitably will leave a lasting and deep imprint upon the already illustrious nuclear progress we observe here tonight.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS

On the technological side, Sea Orbit erased any lingering doubts about the reliability of these ships and their ability to take it. In all the voyage, the engineering plants suffered no casualties nor incidents of any kind. I seriously doubt that conventionally powered ships could have given such trouble-free performance.

All the advantages of nuclear power had not been apparent to us when operating in conjunction with conventionally powered ships. It's the old story that the complexion of your force may be set by the slowest ship in it or those which need refueling most often. Sea Orbit gave us the opportunity to test the nuclear ships by themselves. I can tell you that the ships of Task Force 1 exceeded all expectations.

A thing brought into focus for me was the complete independence of seaborne or short logistic support. This will be an enormous advantage in any future conflict because logistic support will be far more difficult and hazardous to provide than in World War II. Oddly enough, there is an analogy in the old sailing ships as related to the nuclear force; using the winds for movement, they, too, were limited in operations only by the provisioning and endurance of the crew.

When we left Gibraltar, we knew we would buy no supplies or use any facilities along the way. There was no need of any. All the ships carry 4 months' food supply, they carry a 6 months' supply of ship and aircraft spare parts, and they have onboard a full load of ammunition and aviation fuel together with a virtually unlimited supply of ship's fuel in the reactors. An all-nuclear force can go anywhere on the seas of the globe, remain on station with 100 percent readiness for all operations, deliver their combat load and return—all without logistic support.

The other side of the coin is speed and instant readiness. The nuclear force is underway minutes after the word "go," not hours or days. As a matter of fact, there was no special preparation for Sea Orbit at all as far as the ships were concerned. We could have shoved off on the world cruise with little or no advance notice. The tactical and strategic advantages of such instant readiness need no belaboring here. Our speed of advance around the world was set at a modest 22 knots. This to allow for into-the-wind flight operations and the severe weather near the Antarctic. I only wish I were at liberty to tell you how much faster that rate could have been had we really wanted to press these ships.

What I have been saying here adds up to this: In addition to the many advantages of nuclear power, I know of no disadvantages except the much publicized one of somewhat higher initial cost. In this, I understand, there may be relief in sight through advances in reactor design and construction. I, for one, most fervently hope it is true. For as I mentioned earlier, a mixture of the conventional and the nuclear only inhibits the performance of the nuclear. I agree with those who say that any firstline warship in the future which does not have nuclear power is doomed to an early obsolescence where global combat operations are concerned.

As I stated, both a mission and an accomplishment of Sea Orbit was to show our nuclear wares to nations which were both friendly and remote—remote in the sense that the U.S. Navy does not normally frequent these areas. Along our track, top-ranking foreign government and military people were flown out to the *Enterprise* for an operational show. The demonstrations included the launching of aircraft, the firing of live ordnance, the recovery of planes, and extensive tours of the ship. This only reached a chosen few. For populaces on the beach at larger cities, our pilots did their stuff in aerobatics and flyovers. These were underway visits exclusive of a few port calls, and thousands of people and hundreds of influential leaders were exposed to modern nuclear seapower for peace, courtesy of the U.S. Navy.

"ON THE SIDE OF PEACE"

It will take me many a day to understand and appreciate completely the many and varied reactions of these people to Task Force 1. For one thing, I perceived three distinct comments on the broad plans from three different parts of the world. The gist if not the exact words of what the Africans said to us was "Thank God all this power is on the side of peace." Our English speaking friends said, "Thank God you are on our side." And our South American allies said, "Thank God this tremendous power is on the side of the free world." I must leave to the ethnologists and the demographers the unraveling of subtleties in these shadings of meaning.

All were impressed, if not dumbfounded, at the modernity of the ships and aircraft. They were amazed at the split-second timing of operations and they appreciated the teamwork of the crews. Invariably, they expressed wonder at the youth of our men, and that a 24-year-old could be the master of the Phantom II fighter aircraft. A ranking official from an African country probably spoke for all the underdeveloped countries when he said:

"My personal responsibility in my government is the training of our youth. I only wish that they all could have been here to see young Americans, to see what work really is and to see the faith and responsibility invested in 24-year-old pilots. It would have erased from their minds certain ideologies which are alien to economic development."

One of the most important dignitaries we met from "down under" was straight and to the point: "This is fantastic. I had to see it to believe it—but I can only comprehend what I have seen in retrospect."

On one of the thoughts that has come to me because of Sea Orbit, I, too, will need some time for contemplation. It is that other peoples in other lands just may have a sharper appreciation of mobile nuclear seapower than do we here at home.

I was amused at a question asked during one of our large press conferences, but I quickly sensed that the man's fellow correspondents saw no humor nor naivete in the question. It was: "Admiral, would you ever be ordered to destroy a whole continent?" Of course I put the nuclear fleet in perspective. But the point is that here was a pretty good understanding of the capabilities in the presence of powerful, modern, nuclear naval forces. Not only that, but I felt almost everywhere a good understanding of the uses of potent and flexible forces on the high seas to express or enforce the national intent. I also felt an appreciation that the intent of the United States was in the cause of free men. I refer again to the voices heard round the world saying, "Thank God all this power is on the side of peace."

I feel most privileged to have been invited here for this occasion. I think we can say that Sea Orbit actually began 10 years ago at Groton, Conn., with Admiral Wilkinson, and was helped further along the way by Congressman Anderson. Certainly it would not have been possible at all without the fine and astute hand of Admiral Rickover. In this sense, tonight is a time to pay tribute to the countless numbers of dedicated people within both Government and American industry who took the nuclear age to sea.

THE KEEL IS LAID

But tonight also is a time to look forward. Although nuclear submarines and surface ships hold a high degree of modernity, these might be considered as the laying of the keel for the true nuclear Navy to come.

The facts of life in the world of international politics and the peculiar relationship between the oceans and the affairs of men will combine to make the Navy of tomorrow an even greater contributor to the well-being of our country and our allies. May the spirit and the determination which brought forth the *Nautilus*, 10 years ago again prevail. I think we should face the days of our future with the most modern seagoing forces our technology can provide—nuclear ships. Thank you.

Nuclear Navy Message by Representative Holifield at U.S.S. "Truxtun" Launching

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 18, 1965

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the Record an important talk made by my esteemed colleague, Mr. Chet Holifield, at the launching of the Navy's newest nuclear-powered warship, the frigate, U.S.S. *Truxtun*. The *Truxtun* was launched on December 19, 1964. This is the only nuclear-propelled naval surface warship now under construction.

The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, of which Chet Holifield is chairman and Bill Bates and I are members, delved into the question of nuclear propulsion for surface vessels of the Navy in hearings in October and November of 1963 and found that the military advantages of nuclear power is acknowledged by all. But still the Department of Defense is only building conventionally powered warships. Cost effectiveness comparisons are always cited by the Department of Defense to support the contention that the military advantages of nuclear power are not important. The erroneous assumptions in such comparisons were brought out in the Joint Committee report—Report of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, "Nuclear Propulsion for Naval Surface Vessels," December 1963.

Only 4 days after the launching of the nuclear-powered *Truxtun*, the newspapers reported that the Secretary of Defense had turned down the Navy's request to build a nuclear-powered destroyer leader in the fiscal year 1966 program. The news reports cited relative costs of nuclear and conventional destroyers that were substantially different from the relative costs given to the committee in our hearings. According to the news reports there are to be no surface warships, conventional or nuclear, in the fiscal year 1966 shipbuilding program—as was the case in the fiscal year 1964 and 1965 programs.

We will surely want to review any new studies of nuclear power for surface warships completed since our hearings in 1963 including the basis for the latest comparative cost estimates.

We in Congress are all aware of the part Congress played in overcoming the initial reluctance in the Department of Defense to building nuclear-powered submarines. It is evident that if we are to complete the transition from sail to coal to oil to nuclear power in our surface fleet, the Congress will have to play a similar active role to lead the way. I urge all of you to consider Chet Holifield's remarks carefully:

Remarks by Congressman Chet Holifield at the Launching of U.S.S. "Truxtun" (DLG(N)35), New York Shipbuilding Corp., Camden, N.J., December 19, 1964

It is a great honor to take part in this memorable ceremony. The launching of the *Truxtun* marks another major step in the building of the new nuclear Navy for the defense of the United States.

Almost two centuries ago, Thomas Jefferson said in his first message to Congress:

"We should at every session of Congress continue to amend the defects * * * in the laws for regulating the militia * * *" and "* * * until we can say we have done everything for the militia which we could do were an enemy at our door."

Referring to this passage, President Johnson recently added these words:

"We need and we want our most able men—of all grades—to make the military a profession. We want them to be able to know their service to Amercia's defense will not be a disservice to their families' dignity. We cannot promise—they do not ask—assurance of comfort. None can know what tomorrow may require of any of us or all of us. But we can promise—and our citizens in uniform may expect that we shall provide them with—the best and most modern arms in the world."

It was this same philosophy that led the Congress 3 years ago to take the initiative to authorize and appropriate the extra funds to change the U.S.S. *Truxtun* from an oil-fired frigate to be our fourth nuclear powered surface warship.

JOINT COMMITTEE SUPPORT

I have been privileged to be a member of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy since its inception. The Joint Committee is charged, by law, with the responsibility for making continuing studies of problems relating to the development, use, and control of atomic energy. The committee has historically played a creative role in fulfilling the declared statutory policy of the United States that the development, use, and control of atomic energy shall be directed so as to make the "* * * maximum contribution to the common defense and security."

In furtherance of this responsibility, the Joint Committee, from its inception, has been interested in and vigorously supported research and development in the field of naval nuclear propulsion; first, for submarines and then for surface ships. The history of the early years was marked by a reluctance within the Defense Department to use nuclear power for the propulsion of submarines.

Now that we have over 50 nuclear submarines at sea—now that our Polaris armed nuclear submarines stand their watchful guard hidden under the oceans of the world—few remember that it was the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy that arranged to buy the nuclear powerplants for our first two nuclear submarines, the *Nautilus* and *Seawolf*, with Atomic Energy Commission funds, because the then Capt. H. G. Rickover was not able to get the necessary support in the Department of Defense for his project in the early 1950's.

Let us beware that history does not repeat itself. The military advantages of nuclear propulsion for naval surface ships have been acknowledged by all. We must be alert to assure that our future capital naval surface ships incorporate the proven advantages of nuclear propulsion.

The operations of our first three nuclear surface warships, the aircraft carrier *Enterprise*, the cruiser *Long Beach*, and the frigate *Bainbridge*, have been an outstanding success. However, only one more nuclear-powered surface warship, the *Truxtun*, we are here to launch today, is currently under construction. In the interval between starting the nuclear frigates *Bainbridge* and *Truxtun*, nine conventional frigates have been laid down.

HEARINGS ABOARD "ENTERPRISE"

Three years ago the Joint Committee flew to Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, to hold hearings abroad the aircraft carrier *Enterprise* during her shakedown trials. Our report of that hearing emphasized:

"The United States must prosecute vigorously the conversion of the Navy to nuclear propulsion in the surface fleet as well as in the submarine fleet."

Just as in the last century when the issue was between sail and coal, and early in this century when the issue was between coal and oil, so today is the issue between oil and nuclear power—and today's issue is no less vital.

Nuclear propulsion has the fundamental advantage of permitting our warships to go anywhere in the world, to deliver their combat load, and to return, all without logistic support. Nuclear propulsion in combatant ships will free the striking forces of our Navy from the obvious restrictions of reliance on a worldwide propulsion fuel distribution system.

As the number of foreign nuclear submarines increases and as the air striking capabilities of our potential enemies increase, the difficulty of providing logistic support will surely increase. After only a few days steaming at high speed, oil-fired warships must use fuel from their combat reserves unless a tanker is immediately available at the scene. The basic reason for developing nuclear power for surface warships is to reduce this logistic support, support which will be most difficult, if not impossible, to provide in wartime.

Last year, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy made an exhaustive study of the subject of nuclear propulsion for surface warships. Our committee concluded that each new warship the United States decides to build for our first-line naval striking force should be the best that our technology will allow and should, therefore, have nuclear propulsion, even if a somewhat higher cost is incurred to pay for the increase in military capability.

The committee was told by the Department of Defense that the choice we face is between a given number of conventional ships and a smaller number of nuclear ships for the same total cost. In other words, to improve a weapon system, we must reduce the number of weapons to pay for it. I do not share this view.

DEFECTS IN ANALYSIS

Cost effectiveness comparisons were cited by the Defense Department to support the contention that the advantages of nuclear propulsion are not particularly significant. These studies, however, contain a fundamental weakness that negates their validity. The comparisons were based on the assumption that in wartime logistic support forces operate unhampered and without losses. The defect in this analysis is immediately apparent. We must plan for times of crisis. It is precisely in such situations that the superior mobility, maneuverability, and reliability of nuclear warships will give the United States an unequaled naval striking force.

Our potential enemies may not use the same cost effectiveness criteria and thus oppose us with the best weapons technology can provide them. This could create an intolerable peril to our national security.

Our committee printed for the public record a report of these hearings in December 1963. In releasing this report, our chairman, Senator **Pastore**, said that "* * * the Joint Committee believes that cost cutting is important but it must eliminate the fat and not cut to the marrow. * * *

"It is my earnest hope that we will never again be forced to go to war, but if we do, I want our equipment to be second to none."

Just as men of vision in the past faced heavy opposition to bring about the change from sail to coal and the change from coal to oil, we who understand the great advantage of nuclear propulsion face an uphill struggle in obtaining support for its use in the surface fleet.

But we don't tire easily. We will undoubtedly look in on the studies which have been carried out in the past year since our hearing. I sincerely hope that the new studies will be more realistic in evaluating the advantages of nuclear power.

NUCLEAR MERCHANT SHIPS

In addition to the propulsion of firstline surface warships of the Navy, I believe it is time to consider nuclear propulsion for our firstline merchant ships. Nuclear propulsion could provide the revolutionary factor we need to strengthen our merchant fleet for peacetime and also provide vital military logistic support in times of emergency.

The views I have expressed are, of course, not in conflict with the advanced thinking of the new Navy. I know that the worth of nuclear propulsion under wartime conditions is known to many of you here. As you know, the advantages of nuclear power are most evident under wartime conditions and that is the basis under which systems of war should be evaluated.

There are encouraging signs that the true significance of the increased capability of nuclear propulsion is beginning to achieve recognition. The 30,000-mile cruise around the world of the first nuclear-powered task force was completed only 2 months ago. This cruise proved conclusively the feasibility of operating nuclear surface ships in the oceans of the world on a self-sustaining basis. It gave world leaders the opportunity to witness firsthand the capability of the U.S. Navy to operate nuclear-powered warships anywhere independent of support ships—a feat out of the question for conventionally powered ships. In the last 3 years, the *Enterprise, Long Beach,* and *Bainbridge* have proved their outstanding reliability during almost 500,000 miles of operation.

Further and even more encouraging is the recent decision announced by President Johnson to proceed with the development of a very high-powered, long-fuel-life nuclear reactor for application to a two-reactor nuclear-powered attack aircraft carrier. This carrier will require refueling only once during her life. The development of this reactor will be completed in time for it to be installed in the next carrier planned by the Navy.

In summary, if capital ships of the Navy are deemed necessary for the security of the Nation—and I believe they are—they should be nuclear propelled.

NUCLEAR POWER A "MUST"

The future is clear. Any capital ship in the future which does not have nuclear propulsion is doomed to obsolescence early in its expected life. The additional costs for nuclear propulsion are minor and, in fact, insignificant, when one considers how vitally important it is to the effectiveness of the ship as a weapons system.

As we celebrate today the launching of our latest nuclear warship, the *Truxtun*, I hope this event will mark the point in the history of the U.S. Navy where our Nation will accept the recommendation of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy "that the United States adopt a policy of using nuclear propulsion in all future major surface warships" thus adding another link to the inevitable chain from sail to coal, from coal to oil, and from oil to nuclear power.

Godspeed to all who will sail in *Truxtun*. Our freedom depends on the brave men who man such ships as this. The least we can do is provide them with the best that our technical resources will allow.

SENATE

Tuesday, January 19, 1965

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, in whose fear is the beginning of wisdom: We come, conscious that our only greatness is that we can lose ourselves in Thee and in Thy other children, and that in all our imperfections we can become the healing channels for what Thou dost desire and will for our common humanity.

Recognition of our oneness in Thee makes vivid our realization of the oneness of the human family across all separating barriers of distance or race or birth. May our human loyalties and sympathies be as wide as the divine fatherhood. Make us wise enough to give ourselves to the greatest purposes. Make us good enough to surrender to the best that beckons.

We ask it in the spirit of man's best Man, who, because of His inner goodness, went about doing good to all men. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. **Mansfield**, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, January 15, 1965, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

NATIONAL DEFENSE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 54)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

To the Congress of the United States:

One hundred and seventy-five years ago, in his first annual message, President Washington told the Congress:

> Among the many interesting objects which will engage your attention that of providing for the common defense will merit particular regard. To be prepared for war is one of the most effectual means of preserving peace.

For the 89th Congress—as for the 1st Congress—those words of the first President remain a timely charge.

In the 20th year since the end of mankind's most tragic war you and I are beginning new terms of service. The danger of war remains ever with us. But if the hope of peace is sturdier than at any other time in these two decades, it is because we—and freemen everywhere—have proved preparedness to be "the most effectual means of preserving peace."

Arms alone cannot assure the security of any society or the preservation of any peace. The health and education of our people, the vitality of our economy, the equality of our justice, the vision and fulfillment of our aspirations are all factors in America's strength and well-being.

Today we can walk the road of peace because we have the strength we need. We have built that strength with courage. We have employed it with care. We have maintained it with conviction that the reward of our resolution will be peace and freedom.

We covet no territory, we seek no dominion, we fear no nation, we despise no people. With our arms we seek to shelter the peace of mankind.

In this spirit, then, I wish to consider with you the state of our defenses, the policies we pursue, and—as Commander in Chief—to offer recommendations on our course for the future.

I. THE STATE OF OUR DEFENSES

I am able to report to you that the United States today is stronger militarily than at any other time in our peacetime history.

Under our free and open society, the American people have succeeded in building a strength of arms greater than that ever assembled by any other nation and greater now than that of any combination of adversaries.

This strength is not the handiwork of any one administration. Our force in being and in place reflects the continuity and constancy of America's purpose under four administrations and eight Congresses—and this responsible conduct of our system is, of itself, a source of meaningful strength.

For the past 4 years, the focus of our national effort has been upon assuring an indisputable margin of superiority for our defenses. I can report today that effort has succeeded.

Our strategic nuclear power on alert has increased threefold in 4 years.

Our tactical nuclear power has been greatly expanded.

Our forces have been made as versatile as the threats to peace are various.

Our special forces, trained for the undeclared, twilight wars of today have been expanded eightfold.

Our combat-ready Army divisions have been increased by 45 percent.

Our Marine Corps has been increased by 15,000 men.

Our airlift capacity to move these troops rapidly anywhere in the world has been doubled.

Our tactical Air Force firepower to support these divisions in the field has increased 100 percent.

This strength has been developed to support our basic military strategy—a strategy of strength and readiness, capable of countering aggression with appropriate force from ballistic missiles to guerrilla bands.

Our forces are balanced and ready, mobile and diverse. Our allies trust our strength and our adversaries respect it. But the challenge is unceasing. The forms of conflict become more subtle and more complex every day. We must—and we shall—adapt our forces and our tactics to fulfill our purposes.

If our military strength is to be fully usable in times requiring adaptation and response to changing challenges, that strength must be so organized and so managed that it may be employed with planned precision as well as promptness.

The state of our defenses is enhanced today because we have established an orderly system for informed decisionmaking and planning.

Our planning and budgeting programs are now conducted on a continuing 5-year basis and cover our total military requirements.

Our national strategy, military force structure, contingency plans, and defense budget are all now related in an integrated plan.

Our orderly decisionmaking now combines our best military judgment with the most advanced scientific and analytical techniques.

Our military policy under the Secretary of Defense is now more closely tied than ever to the conduct of foreign policy under the Secretary of State.

Thus, we now have the ability to provide and maintain a balanced, flexible military force, capable of meeting the changing requirements of a constantly changing challenge.

II. BASIC DEFENSE POLICIES

First. Four years ago, President John F. Kennedy stated to the Congress and the world:

> The primary purpose of our arms is peace, not war.

That is still their purpose. We are armed, not for conquest, but to insure our own security and to encourage the settlement of international differences by peaceful processes.

We are not a militaristic people, and we have long denounced the use of force in pursuit of national ambition. We seek to avoid a nuclear holocaust in which there can be neither victory nor victors. But we shall never again return to a world where peace-loving men must stand helpless in the path of those who, heedless of destruction and human suffering, take up war and oppression in pursuit of their own ambitions.

Second. The strength of our strategic retaliatory forces must deter nuclear attack on the United States or our Allies.

The forces we now have give that capability.

The United States has more than 850 land-based intercontinental ballistic missiles; more than 300 nuclear-armed missiles in Polaris submarines; more than 900 strategic bombers, half of them ready at all times to be airborne within 15 minutes.

These strategic forces on alert are superior—in number and in quality—to those of any other nation.

To maintain our superiority, the immediate future will see further increases in our missile strength, as well as concentration on further technological improvements and continuing vigorous research and development.

We are—

Requesting more than $300 million to continue our program for extending the life and improving the capabilities of our B-52 strategic bombers, while eliminating two squadrons of B-52B's, the earliest—and least effective—model of this plane.

Continuing development of engines and other systems for advanced aircraft to retain our option for a new manned bomber, should the need arise.

Continuing deployment of the SR-71, the world's fastest airplane, which will enter the Active Forces this year.

Continuing installation of the new over-the-horizon radars, giving us almost instantaneous knowledge of ballistic missiles launched for attack.

Continuing procurement and deployment of our latest strategic missiles, Minuteman II and Polaris A-3, greatly extending the range, accuracy, and striking power of the strategic forces.

Replacing older, more costly, and vulnerable elements of our strategic forces. The outdated Atlas and Titan I missiles will be retired this year and the remainder of the B-47 forces will be phased out during fiscal year 1966.

All this is part of a continuing process. There will always be changes, replacing the old with the new.

Major new developments in strategic weapons systems we propose to begin this year are:

A new missile system, the Poseidon, to increase the striking power of our missile-carrying nuclear submarines. The Poseidon missile will have double the payload of the highly successful Polaris A-3. The increased accuracy and flexibility of the Poseidon will permit its use effectively against a broader range of possible targets and give added insurance of penetration of enemy defenses.

A series of remarkable new payloads for strategic missiles. These include: penetration aids, to assure that the missile reaches its target through any defense; guidance and reentry vehicle designs, to increase manyfold the effectiveness of our missiles against various kinds of targets; and methods of reporting the arrival of our missiles on target, up to and even including the time of explosion.

A new short-range attack missile—SRAM—that can, if needed, be deployed operationally with the B-52 or other bombers. This aerodynamic missile—a vast improvement over existing systems—would permit the bomber to attack a far larger number of targets and to do so from beyond the range of their local defenses.

Third. The strength, deployment, and mobility of our forces must be such that, combined with those of our allies, they can prevent the erosion of the free world by limited, nonnuclear aggression.

Our nonnuclear forces must be strong enough to insure that we are never limited to nuclear weapons alone as our sole option in the face of aggression. These forces must contribute to our strategy of responding flexibly and appropriately to varied threats to peace.

I have already cited the increases achieved during recent years in the strength and mobility of our Army, Navy, Marines, and of our air transport which gets them to the scene of battle and the tactical aircraft which support them there. These forces, furthermore, are now better balanced, better integrated, and under more effective command and control than ever before. We shall maintain our present high degree of readiness.

We must further improve our ability to concentrate our power rapidly in a threatened area, so as to halt aggression early and swiftly. We plan expansion of our airlift, improvement of our sealift, and more prepositioned equipment to enable us to move our troops overseas in a matter of days, rather than weeks.

To this end, we will:

Start development of the C-5A cargo transport. This extraordinary aircraft capable of carrying 750 passengers will bring a new era of air transportation. It will represent a dramatic step forward in the worldwide mobility of our forces and in American leadership in the field of aviation.

Build fast deployment cargo ships, capable of delivering military equipment quickly to any theater. This represents a new concept in the rapid deployment of military forces. These ships will have a gas turbine engine propulsion system, a major advance in marine engineering for ships of this size. Such vessels will be deployed around the globe, able to begin deliveries of heavy combat-ready equipment into battle zone within days or even hours.

Increase our forward floating depot ships stationed close to areas of potential crisis.

Begin large-scale procurement of the revolutionary swept wing F-111 and the new A-7 Navy attack aircraft.

We will also begin construction of 4 new nuclear-powered attack submarines, and 10 new destroyer escorts. And we will continue to develop a much smaller, more efficient, nuclear powerplant for possible use in our future aircraft carriers.

Fourth. While confident that our present strength will continue to deter a thermonuclear war, we must always be alert to the possibilities for limiting destruction which might be inflicted upon our people, cities, and industry—should such a war be forced upon us.

Many proposals have been advanced for means of limiting damage and destruction to the United States in the event of a thermonuclear war. Shifting strategy and advancing technology make the program of building adequate defenses against nuclear attack extremely complex.

Decisions with respect to further limitation of damage require complex calculations concerning the effectiveness of many interrelated elements. Any comprehensive program would involve the expenditure of tens of billions of dollars. We must not shrink from any expense that is justified by its effectiveness, but we must not hastily expend vast sums on massive programs that do not meet this test.

It is already clear that without fallout-shelter protection for our citizens, all defense weapons lose much of their effectiveness in saving lives. This also appears to be the least expensive way of saving millions of lives, and the one which has clear value even without other systems. We will continue our existing programs and start a program to increase the total inventory of shelters through a survey of private homes and other small structures.

We shall continue the research and development which retains the options to deploy an antiballistic missile system, and manned interceptors and surface-to-air missiles against bombers.

Fifth. Our military forces must be so organized and directed that they can be used in a measured, controlled, and deliberate way as a versatile instrument to support our foreign policy.

Military and civilian leaders alike are unanimous in their conviction that our armed might is and always must be so controlled as to permit measured response in whatever crises may confront us.

We have made dramatic improvements in our ability to communicate with and command our forces, both at the national level and at the level of the theater commanders. We have established a national military command system, with the most advanced electronic and communications equipment, to gather and present the military information necessary for top level management of crises and to assure the continuity of control through all levels of command. Its survival under attack is insured by a system of airborne, shipborne, and other command posts, and a variety of alternative protected communications.

We have developed and procured the postattack command control system of the Strategic Air Command, to assure continued control of our strategic forces following a nuclear attack.

We have installed new safety procedures and systems designed to guarantee that our nuclear weapons are not used except at the direction of the highest national authority.

This year we are requesting funds to extend similar improvements in the survivability and effectiveness of our command and control to other commands in our oversea theaters.

Sixth. America will continue to be first in the use of science and technology to insure the security of its people.

We are currently investing more than $6 billion per year for military research and development. Among other major developments, our investment has recently produced antisatellite systems that can intercept and destroy armed satellites that might be launched, and such revolutionary new aircraft as the F-111 fighter-bomber and the SR-71 supersonic reconnaissance aircraft. Our investment has effected an enormous improvement in the design of antiballistic missile systems. We will pursue our program for the development of the Nike X antimissile system, to permit deployment of this antiballistic missile should the national security require. Research will continue on even more advanced antimissile components and concepts.

About $2 billion a year of this program is invested in innovations, in technology, and in experimental programs. Thus, we provide full play for the ingenuity and inventiveness of the best scientific and technical talent in our Nation and the free world.

American science, industry, and technology are foremost in the world. Their resources represent a prime asset to our national security.

Seventh. Our soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines, from whom we ask so much, are the cornerstone of our military might.

The success of all our policies depends upon our ability to attract, develop fully, utilize, and retain the talents of outstanding men and women in the military services. We have sought to improve housing conditions for military families and educational opportunities for military personnel.

Since 1961, we have proposed—and the Congress has authorized—the largest military pay increases in our history, totaling more than $2 billion.

To insure that the pay of military personnel, and indeed of all Government employees, retains an appropriate relation to the compensation of other elements of our society, we will review their pay annually. The procedures for this review will be discussed in my budget message.

It is imperative that our men in uniform have the necessary background and training to keep up with the complexities of the ever-changing military, political, and technical problems they face each day. To insure this, the Secretary of Defense is undertaking a study of military education to make certain that the education available to our servicemen and women at their academies, at their war colleges, and at the command and staff colleges, is excellent in its quality.

In recent years large numbers of volunteers have been rejected by the military services because of their failure to meet certain mental or physical standards, even though many of their deficiencies could have been corrected. To broaden the opportunity for service and increase the supply of potentially qualified volunteers, the Army is planning to initiate an experimental program of military training, education, and physical rehabilitation for men who fail at first to meet minimum requirements for service. This pilot program, which will involve about 10,000 men in 1965, will establish how many of these young volunteers can be upgraded so as to qualify for service.

Eighth. Our citizen-soldiers must be the best organized, best equipped reserve forces in the world. We must make certain that this force, which has served our country so well from the time of the Revolution to the Berlin and Cuban crises of recent years, keeps pace with the changing demands of our national security.

To this end, we are taking steps to realine our Army Reserves and National Guard to improve significantly their combat readiness and effectiveness in times of emergency. This realinement will bring our Army Reserve structure into balance with our contingency war plans and will place all remaining units of the Army Reserve Forces in the National Guard. At the same time, by eliminating units for which there is no military requirement, we will realize each year savings approximating $150 million. Under our plan, all units will be fully equipped with combat-ready equipment and will be given training in the form of monthly weekend drills that will greatly increase their readiness. Under the revised organization, both the old and the new units of the National Guard, as well as individual trainees who remain in the Reserves, will make a much greater and continuing contribution to our national security.

We shall continue to study our Reserve forces and take whatever action is necessary to increase their combat effectiveness.

Ninth. The Commander in Chief and the Secretary of Defense must continue to receive the best professional military advice available to the leaders of any government in the world.

The importance of a strong line of command running from the Commander in Chief to the Secretary of Defense and the Joint Chiefs of Staff to the unified and specified commanders in the field has been repeatedly demonstrated during recent years.

The Secretary of Defense will present to you certain recommendations to strengthen the joint staff.

Tenth. We will strengthen our military alliances, assist freedom-loving peoples, and continue our military assistance program.

It is essential to continue to strengthen our alliances with other free and independent nations. We reaffirm our unwavering determination that efforts to divide and conquer free men shall not be successful in our time. We shall continue to assist those who struggle to preserve their own independence.

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization is a strong shield against aggression. We reaffirm our belief in the necessity of unified planning and execution of strategy. We invite our NATO allies to work with us in developing better methods for mutual consultation and joint strategic study. We shall continue to seek ways to bind the alliance even more strongly together by sharing the tasks of defense through collective action.

We shall continue our program of military and economic assistance to allies elsewhere in the world and to those nations struggling against covert aggression in the form of externally directed, undeclared guerrilla warfare.

In southeast Asia, our program remains unchanged. From 1950, the United States has demonstrated its commitment to the freedom, independence, and neutrality of Laos by strengthening the economic and military security of that nation. The problem of Laos is the refusal of the Communist forces to honor the Geneva accords into which they entered in 1962. We shall continue to support the legitimate government of that country. The Geneva accords established the right of Laos to be left alone in peace.

Similarly, the problem of Vietnam is the refusal of Communist forces to honor their agreement in 1954. The North Vietnam regime, supported by the Chinese Communists, has openly and repeatedly avowed its intention to destroy the independence of the Republic of Vietnam through massive, ruthless, and incessant guerrilla terrorism against government and people alike.

Our purpose, under three American Presidents, has been to assist the Vietnamese to live in peace, free to choose both their own way of life and their own foreign policy. We shall continue to honor our commitments in Vietnam.

PRINCIPLES OF DEFENSE MANAGEMENT

First. To carry out our strategy and enforce our policies requires a large budget for defense.

The world's most affluent society can surely afford to spend whatever must be spent for its freedom and security. We shall continue to maintain the military forces necessary for our security without regard to arbitrary or predetermined budget ceilings. But we shall continue to insist that those forces be procured at the lowest possible cost and operated with the greatest possible economy and efficiency.

To acquire and maintain our unprecedented military power, we have been obliged to invest more than one-half of every dollar paid in taxes to the Federal Government. The defense budget has grown from $43 billion in fiscal year 1960 to more than $51 billion in fiscal year 1964. I now estimate the defense expenditures for fiscal year 1965 to be about $49.3 billion, or approximately $2 billion less than in fiscal year 1964. I further estimate that defense expenditures for fiscal year 1966 will be reduced still another $300 million.

There are two main reasons for this leveling off in defense expenditures: First, we have achieved many of the needed changes and increases in our military force structure; second, we are now realizing the benefits of the rigorous cost reduction program introduced into the Defense Establishment during the past 4 years.

As I have stated—and as our enemies well know—this country now possesses a range of credible, usable military power enabling us to deal with every form of military challenge from guerrilla terrorism to thermonuclear war. Barring a significant shift in the international situation, we are not likely to require further increments on so large a scale during the next several years. Expenditures for defense will thus constitute a declining portion of our expanding annual gross national product, which is now growing at the rate of 5 percent each year. If, over the next several years, we continue to spend approximately the same amount of dollars annually for our national defense that we are spending today, an ever-larger share of our expanding national wealth will be free to meet other vital needs, both public and private.

Let me be clear, however, to friend and foe alike. So long as I am President, we shall spend whatever is necessary for the security of our people.

Second. Defense expenditures in the years ahead must continue to be guided by the relentless pursuit of efficiency and intelligent economy.

There is no necessary conflict between the need for a strong defense and the principles of economy and sound management. If we are to remain strong, outmoded weapons must be replaced by new ones; obsolete equipment and installations must be eliminated; costly duplication of effort must be eliminated.

We are following this policy now, and so long as I am President, I intend to continue to follow this policy.

We have recently announced the consolidation, reduction, or discontinuance of defense activities in some 95 locations. When added to those previously completed, these actions will produce annual savings of more than $1 billion each year, every year, in the operations of the Defense Department, and release about 1,400,000 acres of land for civilian purposes. These economies—which represent more prudent and effective allocation of our resources—have not diminished the strength and efficiency of our defense forces, but rather have enhanced them.

We are the wealthiest nation in the whole world and the keystone of the largest alliance of free nations in history. We can, and will, spend whatever is necessary to preserve our freedom. But we cannot afford to spend one cent more than is necessary, for there is too much waiting to be done, too many other pressing needs waiting to be met. I urge the Congress to support our efforts to assure the American people a dollar's worth of defense for every dollar spent.

Third. While our primary goal is to maintain the most powerful military force in the world at the lowest possible cost, we will never be unmindful of those communities and individuals who are temporarily affected by changes in the pattern of defense spending.

Men and women, who have devoted their lives and their resources to the needs of their country, are entitled to help and consideration in making the transition to other pursuits.

We will continue to help local communities by mobilizing and coordinating all the resources of the Federal Government to overcome temporary difficulties created by the curtailment of any defense activity. We will phase out unnecessary defense operations in such a way as to lessen the impact on any community, and we will work with local communities to develop energetic programs of self-help, calling on the resources of State and local governments—and of private industry—as well as those of the Federal Government.

There is ample evidence that such measures can succeed. Former military bases are now in use throughout the country in communities which have not only adjusted to necessary change, but have created greater prosperity for themselves as a result. Their accomplishments are a tribute to the ingenuity of thousands of our citizens, and a testimony to the strength and resiliency of our economy and our system of government.

Fourth. We must continue to make whatever changes are necessary in our Defense Establishment to increase its efficiency and to insure that it keeps pace with the demands of an ever-changing world; we must continue to improve the decisionmaking process by those in command.

The experience of several years has shown that certain activities of the Defense Establishment can be conducted not only with greater economy, but far more effectively when carried out on a departmentwide basis, either by a military department as executive agent or by a defense agency. The Defense Communications Agency, established in 1959, and the Defense Supply Agency and the Defense Intelligence Agency, established in 1961, have all eliminated duplication of effort, improved management, and achieved better fulfillment of their missions. In addition, we have recently announced:

Consolidation of the Field Contract Administration offices of the Military Department under the Defense Supply Agency.

Formation of the Department of Defense Contract Audit Agency, to increase the efficiency and lower the cost of Government auditing of defense contracts.

Formation of the Traffic Management and Terminal Command, under the single management of the Department of the Army, to regulate surface transportation of military cargo and personnel within the continental United States.

Each of these actions will lead to better performance, surer control, and less cost. Most important, these actions are informing and expediting the decisionmaking process. We will continue to seek out opportunities to further increase the effectiveness and efficiency of our Defense Establishment.

CONCLUSION

The Secretary of Defense will soon come before you with our detailed proposals for the coming year. He will have recommendations for further strengthening of our strategic forces and our conventional forces. He will have additional suggestions for achieving greater efficiency, and therefore greater economy.

As you consider the state of our defenses and form your judgments as to our future course, I know that you will do so in the knowledge that today we Americans are responsible not only for our own security but, in concert with our Allies, for the security of the free world. Upon our strength and our wisdom rests the future not only of our American way of life, but that of the whole society of freemen.

This is an awesome responsibility. So far, we have borne it well. As our strength rose—and largely as a consequence of that strength—we have been able to take encouraging steps toward peace. We have established an Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. We have signed a limited nuclear test ban agreement with the Soviet Union. We have, at the same time, met the challenge of force, unflinchingly, from Berlin to Cuba. In each case, the threat has receded and international tensions have diminished.

In a world of 120 nations, there are still great dangers to be faced. As old threats are turned back, change and turmoil will present new ones. The vigilance and courage we have shown in the last 20 years must be sustained as far ahead as we can see. The defense of freedom remains our duty—24 hours a day and every day of the year.

We cannot know the future and what it holds. But all our experience of two centuries reminds us that "To be prepared for war is one of the most effectual means of preserving peace."

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 18, 1965*.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour. I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

Upon request of Mr. LONG of Louisiana, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Public Works was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business, to consider the nominations sent to the Senate by the President of the United States.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Sheldon S. Cohen, of Maryland, to be Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Mitchell Rogovin, of Virginia, to be an Assistant General Counsel in the Department of the Treasury (Chief Counsel for the Internal Revenue Service).

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that action on the remaining nominations be withheld.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nominations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

Amendment of Title 10, United States Code, To Increase the Size of the Joint Staff

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 10, United States Code, to increase the size of the Joint Staff, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report on Property Acquisitions of Emergency Supplies and Equipment

A letter from the Director of Civil Defense, Office of the Secretary of the Army, reporting, pursuant to law, on property acquisitions of emergency supplies and equipment, for the quarter ended December 31, 1964; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report of Secretary of Commerce

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

Amendment of Section 1403 of Federal Aviation Act of 1958

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 1403 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to perfect certain provisions of the International Aviation Facilities Act (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Commerce.

Authorization for Commissioners of the District of Columbia To Utilize Certain Funds for Snow and Ice Control

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to utilize certain funds for snow and ice control (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Amendment of District of Columbia Motor Vehicle Parking Facility Act of 1942

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the District of Columbia Motor Vehicle Parking Facility Act of 1942 to authorize maintenance and repair of parking meters and payment for parking meters from fees collected from such meters (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Appropriation of Funds for the Maintenance and Instruction of Deaf, Mute, and Blind Children in the District of Columbia

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the appropriation of funds for the maintenance and instruction of deaf, mute, and blind children of the District of Columbia (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Amendment of Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949

A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, to make title III thereof directly applicable to procurement of property and nonpersonal services by executive agencies, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Audit Report on Financial Statements of St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the financial statements of St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, calendar year 1963, Department of Commerce (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Overpayments of Per Diem Travel Allowances

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on overpayments of per diem travel allowances, Department of State, dated January 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Illegal Obligation of Expired Fiscal Year 1964 Appropriations

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on illegal obligation of expired fiscal year 1964 appropriations, Department of State, dated January 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Proposed Concession Contract in Whiskeytown Reservoir, Calif.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a proposed concession contract in the Whiskeytown Reservoir Area, Calif. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Receipt of Application for a Loan Under the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, an application for a loan under the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956, to assist the Camarillo County Water District of Camarillo, Ventura County, Calif. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Report on Kokee Water Project, Kauai, Hawaii

A letter from the Governor, State of Hawaii, transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a report on the Kokee water project, Island of Kauai, Hawaii, dated 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Report on Tort Claims Paid by Government Printing Office

A letter from the Public Printer, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by that Office, during the fiscal year 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Adjustment of Status of Certain Aliens

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered relating to the adjustment of status of certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Amendment of Section 1825, Title 28, United States Code, Relating to Payment of Witness' Fees

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 1825 of title 28 of the United States Code to authorize the payment of witness' fees in habeas corpus cases and in proceedings to vacate sentence under section 2255 of title 28, for persons who are authorized to proceed in forma pauperis (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Report on Positions in Grades GS–16 and 17

A letter from the Assistant Attorney General for Administration, Department of Justice, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on positions in grades GS–16 and 17, for calendar year 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Report of the Public Printer

A letter from the Public Printer, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, his report for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

Four joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Virginia; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"House Joint Resolution 5

"Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to call a convention to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States

"Resolved by the House of Delegates (the Senate of Virginia concurring), That the Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized to call a convention for the purpose of proposing the following article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

" 'ARTICLE —

" 'SECTION 1. Article V of the Constitution of the United States is hereby amended to read as follows:

" ' "The Congress, whenever two-thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, or, on the application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States, shall propose amendments to this Constitution, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of this Constitution, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States. Whenever applications from the legislatures of two-thirds of the total number of States of the United States shall contain identical texts of an amendment to be proposed, the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall so certify, and the amendment as contained in the application shall be deemed to have been proposed, without further action by Congress. No State, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate."

" 'SEC. 2. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission; and be it further

" '*Resolved,* That if Congress shall have proposed an amendment to the Constitution identical with that contained in this resolution prior to January 1, 1965, this application for a convention shall no longer be of any force or effect, and be it further

" '*Resolved,* That the clerk of the house of delegates is instructed to send copies of this resolution to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of the Congress from this State.'

"Agreed to by the house of delegates, December 2, 1964.

"Agreed to by the Senate of Virginia, December 3, 1964.

"GEORGE R. RICH,
"Clerk of the House of Delegates.
"BEN D. LACY,
"Clerk of the Senate."

"House Joint Resolution 6

"Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to call a convention to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States

"Whereas the history of freedom is a history of the limitation of governmental power, as the concentration of such power inevitably precedes and insures the destruction of human liberties; and

"Whereas the framers of the Constitution of the United States sought to protect and advance the cause of liberty primarily by distributing governmental power between the Nation and the States, each supreme within its sphere, thus forming an indestructible Union of indestructible States; and

"Whereas this division of governmental power is a fundamental principle of our constitutional system, designed to insure to each State the right to establish such forms of local government as it thinks best suited to the interests, temper, and customs of its people and most likely to effect the safety and happiness of its citizens; and

"Whereas, in recent years, this foundation principle of our Government has been imperiled by the ever-expanding power of the Federal judiciary, until at last the Supreme Court of the United States has undertaken to alter by judicial decree the very forms of Government under which we live; and

"Whereas the Constitution of the United States contemplates the separation of the legislative and judicial functions to distinct branches of the Government; and

"Whereas the Constitution of the United States specifically reserves to the States or to the people thereof all powers not conferred upon the United States or denied to the States by said Constitution; and

"Whereas the apportionment of the several States for legislative representation is exclusively a legislative function reserved to the States and one which has never been delegated to the United States; and

"Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States, until recently, has historically denied jurisdiction to the courts of the United States in suits or controversies regarding such apportionment; and

"Whereas courts of the United States have now assumed the jurisdiction and authority not only to declare invalid the legislative actions of the several States regarding such apportionment, but the further jurisdiction and authority to exercise the legislative function and apportion the States by judicial decree; and

"Whereas such action by the Federal courts endangers the very fabric of a republican form of government: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Delegates (the Senate of Virginia concurring), That the Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized to call a convention for the purpose of proposing the following article as an admendment to the Constitution of the United States:

" 'ARTICLE —

" 'SECTION 1. No provision of this Constitution, or any amendment thereto, shall restrict or limit any State in the apportionment of representation in its legislature.

" 'SEC. 2. The judicial power of the United States shall not extend to any suit in law or equity, or to any controversy relating to apportionment of representation in a State legislature.

" 'SEC. 3. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission': be it further

"*Resolved,* That if Congress shall have proposed an amendment to the Constitution identical with that contained in this resolution prior to January 1, 1966, this application for a convention shall no longer be of any force or effect;

"*Resolved further*, That the clerk of the house of delegates is instructed to send copies of this resolution to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of the Congress from this State.

"Agreed to by the house of delegates, December 2, 1964.

"Agreed to by the Senate of Virginia, December 3, 1964.

"GEORGE R. RICH,
"Clerk of the House of Delegates.
"BEN D. LACY,
"Clerk of the Senate."

"HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 9

"Resolution memorializing the U.S. House of Representatives to pass U.S. Senate Joint Resolution 139, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States

"Whereas the Senate of the United States on September 29, 1964, with commendable praise, passed Senate Joint Resolution 139, which proposes an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the succession to the Presidency and Vice-Presidency of the United States and to cases where the President of the United States is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office; and

"Whereas the American Bar Association has endorsed the contents of such resolution and urges its passage and submission to the legislatures of the several States for ratification: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Delegates of Virginia (the Senate concurring), That the Senate of the United States be commended for its passage of Senate Joint Resolution 139; be it further

"Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the United States is hereby memorialized to pass and submit to the legislatures of the 50 States for ratification Senate Joint Resolution 139, which is as follows:

" '*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein)*, That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission by the Congress:

" 'ARTICLE —

" 'SECTION 1. In case of the removal of the President from office or of his death or resignation, the Vice President shall become President.

" 'SEC. 2. Whenever there is a vacancy in the office of the Vice President, the President shall nominate a Vice President who shall take office upon confirmation by a majority vote of both Houses of Congress.

" 'SEC. 3. If the President declares in writing that he is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, such powers and duties shall be discharged by the Vice President as Acting President.

" 'SEC. 4. If the President does not so declare, and the Vice President with the written concurrence of a majority of the heads of the executive departments or such other body as Congress may by law provide, transmits to the Congress his written declaration that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, the Vice President shall immediately assume the powers and duties of the office as Acting President.

" 'SEC. 5. Whenever the President transmits to the Congress his written declaration that no inability exists, he shall resume the powers and duties of his office unless the Vice President, with the written concurrence of a majority of the heads of the executive departments or such other body as Congress may by law provide, transmits within 2 days to the Congress his written declaration that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office. Thereupon Congress shall immediately decide the issue. If the Congress determines by two-thirds vote of both Houses that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of the office, the Vice President shall continue to discharge the same as Acting President; otherwise the President shall resume the powers and duties of his office.'

"Resolved further, That the clerk of the house of delegates is instructed to send copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the clerk of each house of the legislature in the 50 States, the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of the Congress from this State.

"Agreed to by the house of delegates, December 2, 1964.

"Agreed to by the Senate of Virginia, December 3, 1964.

"GEORGE R. RICH,
'Clerk of the House of Delegates.
"BEN D. LACY,
"Clerk of the Senate."

"HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 13

"Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to call a convention to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States

"Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States has ruled that membership in both Houses of a bicameral State legislature must be apportioned according to population and has thus asserted Federal judicial authority over the basic structure of government in the various States; and

"Whereas this rule denies to the people of the respective States the right to establish their legislatures upon the same pattern of representation deemed advantageous for the Congress of the United States and provided by the Federal Constitution; and

"Whereas this action of the Supreme Court goes so far as to restrict the ability of the citizens of the respective States to designate the manner in which they shall be represented in their respective legislatures thereby depriving the people of their right to determine how they shall be governed; and

"Whereas the implications of this action by the Supreme Court raised serious doubts as to the legality of the present form of the governing bodies of many subordinate units of government within the States; and

"Whereas, the 17th Biennial General Assembly of the States, meeting at Chicago, Ill., December 3, 1964, has adopted a resolution urging that the Congress propose an amendment to the U.S. Constitution which would provide that (1) any State which has a bicameral legislature may utilize factors other than population in apportioning one house of its legislature if the plan of apportionment is specifically approved by vote of the electorate of the State, and (2) any State may determine how governing bodies of its subordinate units shall be apportioned; and

"Whereas the 17th Biennial General Assembly of the States has proposed that the legislatures of the several States take immediate and uniform action, in accordance with article V of the Constitution of the United States, to apply to the Congress to convene a constitutional convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution as herein set forth: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Delegates of Virginia (the Senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized to call a convention for the purpose of proposing the following article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

" 'ARTICLE —

" 'SECTION 1. Nothing in this Constitution shall prohibit any State which shall have a bicameral legislature from apportioning the membership of one house of such legislature on factors other than population, provided that the plan of such apportionment shall have been submitted to and approved by a vote of the electorate of that State.

" 'SEC. 2. Nothing in this Constitution shall restrict or limit a State in its determination of how membership of governing bodies of its subordinate units shall be apportioned.

" 'SEC. 3. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress': Be it further

"Resolved, That if Congress shall have proposed an amendment to the Constitution identical with that contained in this resolution prior to June 1, 1965, this application for a convention shall no longer be of any force or effect.

"Resolved further, That the clerk of the house of delegates is instructed to send copies of this resolution to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of the Congress from this State.

"Agreed to by the house of delegates, December 3, 1964.

"Agreed to by the Senate of Virginia, December 3, 1964.

"GEORGE R. RICH,
"Clerk of the House of Delegates,
"BEN D. LACY,
"Clerk of the Senate."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Public Works:

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION A

"GARRISON DIVERSION UNIT

"Whereas a substantial irrigation development for North Dakota was not only promised, but was specifically authorized as an integral part of the Missouri River Basin project in the Flood Control Act of 1944, to partially offset the loss experienced in the State by the acquisition of over 550,000 acres of valuable agricultural lands by the Federal Government for the construction of the Garrison and Oahe Dam and Reservoir projects on the Missouri River; and

"Whereas the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation has determined from exhaustive studies and investigations conducted over the past 20 years, that the multiple-purpose Garrison diversion unit and irrigation development proposed therein is engineeringly and economically justifiable and feasible; and

"Whereas legislation that would reauthorize the Garrison diversion unit has been proposed in each Congress since 1957, and has been the subject of extensive and thorough congressional hearings held during the intervening years, at which strong and consistent project support has been given by the State's congressional delegation, Governor, legislature, potential irrigators, farm, business, labor, industrial, professional, and agricultural organizations and leaders, as well as from basinwide and national water resources organizations, and by the last two administrations; and

"Whereas the U.S. Senate in the 88th Congress, second session, passed a bill authorizing the construction of the initial 250,000-acre phase of the Garrison diversion unit, and the U.S. House of Representatives Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in the same session, reported out favorably and recommended for passage a bill, H.R. 1003, as amended, authorizing the construction of the initial phase of the Garrison diversion unit, which report and amended bill were acceptable to the sponsors of the reauthorizing legislation, but said H.R. 1003 failed to receive House action because of lack of time before sine die adjournment of the 88th Congress: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota (the Senate concurring therein)*, That the 39th Legislative Assembly of the State of North Dakota hereby expresses its unequivocal support for the early development of the Garrison diversion unit and fully concurs in and endorses the presentations by Gov. William L. Guy and other proponent witnesses at the hearings in the 88th Congress on S. 178 and H.R. 1003, and companion bills; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the 89th Congress be and it is hereby most respectfully urged to take early action to effect enactment of legislation authorizing the construction of the Garrison diversion unit along the lines of S. 34, H.R. 1718, and H.R. 237, 89th Congress; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies hereof be transmitted by the secretary of state to the Members of the North Dakota congressional delegation, the chairman of the Senate and House Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs, President of the Senate, Speaker of the House, the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior, the Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Water and Power, and the Commissioner, Bureau of Reclamation.

"Arthur A. Link,
"*Speaker of the House.*
"Donnell Hangen,
"*Chief Clerk of the House.*
"Charles Tighe,
"*President of the Senate.*
"Gerald L. Stan,
"*Secretary of the Senate.*"

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 36) to provide additional funds for the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, which, under the rule, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

S. Res. 36

Resolved, That the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to Indian affairs; irrigation and reclamation; minerals, materials, and fuels; public lands; and territories and insular affairs.

Sec. 2. Pursuant to its authority under section 134(a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, the Committee is authorized to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, documents and to take such testimony on matters within its jurisdiction as it deems advisable.

Sec. 3. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1965, to January 31, 1966, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ, upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,100 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $105,000 shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Dirksen, Mr. Mansfield, Mr. Bartlett, Mr. Fannin, Mr. Allott, Mr. Church, Mr. Carlson, Mr. Long of Missouri, Mr. Bible, Mr. Montoya, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Gruening, Mr. Hayden, Mr. Dominick, Mr. Jordan of Idaho, Mr. Metcalf, Mr. Cannon, Mr. Williams of New Jersey, Mr. Moss, Mr. Magnuson, Mr. Harris, Mr. Symington, and Mr. Nelson):

S. 564. A bill to protect the domestic economy, to promote the general welfare, and to assist in the national defense by providing for an adequate supply of lead and zinc for consumption in the United States from domestic and foreign sources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Anderson when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 565. A bill to incorporate the McCarran Memorial Institution, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 566. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to prohibit the use of the term "mahogany" in connection with woods and other products which are not in fact mahogany; to the Committee on Commerce.

S. 567. A bill to modify the flood control project for the Kaskaskia River, Ill., with respect to certain requirements for local cooperation; and

S. 568. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Army to participate in the construction of a highway bridge across Carlyle Reservoir, Kaskaskia River, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DIRKSEN (by request):

S. 569. A bill for the relief of Pasqua D'Ingillo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE:

S. 570. A bill for the relief of Frank S. Chow; and

S. 571. A bill for the relief of Denise Hojebane Barrood; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SYMINGTON:

S. 572. A bill for the relief of Robert L. Wolverton;

S. 573. A bill for the relief of Dr. Sedat M. Ayata; and

S. 574. A bill for the relief of Lester W. Hein and Sadie Hein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 575. A bill to amend section 162 and section 832 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to clarify the deductibility of premiums paid for flood insurance or indemnity; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. COTTON (for himself, Mr. McIntyre, Mr. Young of North Dakota, and Mr. Burdick):

S. 576. A bill to encourage physicians and dentists who have received student loans under programs established pursuant to title VII of the Public Health Service Act to practice their professions in areas having a shortage of physicians or dentists; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Cotton when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. COTTON:

S. 577. A bill for the relief of Mary F. Morse; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COTTON (for himself and Mr. Eastland):

S. 578. A bill to amend section 47 of title 28, United States Code, to provide means for the disqualification of circuit judges for bias or prejudice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COTTON (for himself and Mr. McIntyre):

S. 579. A bill for the relief of the State of New Hampshire; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEARSON:

S. 580. A bill for the relief of Violeta V. Ortega, M.D.; and

S. 581. A bill for the relief of Phoebus Tongas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 582. A bill for the relief of Aleksandr Kaznacheev;

S. 583. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Yee Au-Yeung Chan;

S. 584. A bill for the relief of Ming Chup Chaw;

S. 585. A bill for the relief of Santiago Woo and Morjin Chee de Woo;

S. 586. A bill for the relief of Maria Tsilis; and

S. 587. A bill for the relief of Constantinos Pavlou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARTKE:

S. 588. A bill for the relief of Armando Alfandari, Irene Alfandari, Alessandra Alfandari, and Elena Alfandari;

S. 589. A bill for the relief of Haralambos Foufas;

S. 590. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Athanasia Dagniantis;

S. 591. A bill for the relief of Verra Hionis;

S. 592. A bill for the relief of Ioannis Kosmakos;

S. 593. A bill for the relief of Panagiotis Spirakis; and

S. 594. A bill for the relief of Nikolaos Vilos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILL:

S. 595. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve the educational quality of schools of medicine, dentistry, and osteopathy, to authorize grants under that act to such schools for the awarding of scholarships to needy students, and to extend expiring provisions of that act for student loans and for aid in construction of teaching facilities for students in such schools and schools for other health professions, and for other purposes;

S. 596. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to assist in combating heart disease, cancer, and stroke, and other major diseases; and

S. 597. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for a program of grants to assist in meeting the need for adequate medical library services and facilities; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. McGOVERN (for himself, Mr. Mansfield, Mr. Metcalf, Mr. Burdick, Mr. McCarthy, Mr. McGee, Mr. Moss, Mr. Mondale, Mr. Yarborough, and Mrs. Neuberger):

S. 598. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to provide for continuation of the voluntary wheat certificate program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. McGovern when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KUCHEL (for himself and Mr. Murphy):

S. 599. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Auburn-Folsom south unit, American River division, Central Valley project, California, under Federal reclamation laws; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Kuchel when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MORSE (for himself, Mr. Clark, Mr. Hartke, Mr. Mansfield, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Yarborough, Mr. Gruening, and Mr. Young of Ohio):

S. 600. A bill to strengthen the educational resources of our colleges and universities and to provide financial assistance for students in postsecondary and higher education; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Morse when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MOSS (for himself, Mr. Mundt, Mrs. Neuberger, Mr. Magnuson, Mr. Church, Mr. Curtis, Mr. Burdick, Mr. Byrd of Virginia, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Lausche, Mr. Hart, Mr. Gruening, Mr. Tower, Mr. Douglas, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Cooper, Mr. Allott, Mr. Inouye, Mr. Morse, Mr. Bartlett, Mrs. Smith, Mr. Smathers, Mr. Bible, Mr. Williams of New Jersey, Mr. Long of Missouri, Mr. McClellan, Mr. Pell, Mr. McGovern, Mr. McGee, Mr. Hill, Mr. Simpson, Mr. Yarborough, and Mr. Dominick):

S. 601. A bill to provide for the flying of the American flag over the remains of the U.S.S. *Utah* in honor of the heroic men who were entombed in her hull on December 7, 1941; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. Moss when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MOSS (for himself, Mr. Allott, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Bible, Mr. Burdick, Mr. Church, Mr. Kuchel, Mr. McGee, and Mr. Simpson):

S. 602. A bill to amend the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Moss when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HICKENLOOPER:

S. 603. A bill for the relief of Alicia A. Basco;

S. 604. A bill for the relief of Elena A. Basco; and

S. 605. A bill for the relief of Norma T. Sadumiano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRUENING:

S. 606. A bill for the relief of Daill Park;

S. 607. A bill for the relief of Bok Hi Lee Kang;

S. 608. A bill for the relief of Charles R. Hartew;

S. 609. A bill for the relief of George Orfanoudis; and

S. 610. A bill to increase the rates of compensation of the Chief Justice of the United States and of Associate Justices of the Supreme Court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Gruening when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. GRUENING (for himself and Mr. Bartlett):

S. 611. A bill for the relief of certain employees of the Mount Edgecumbe Boarding School, Alaska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GORE:

S. 612. A bill for the relief of Kevin Dillon Schofield; and

S. 613. A bill to require filing under chapter XIII of the Bankruptcy Act in certain bankruptcy proceedings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Gore when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CURTIS:

S. 614. A bill for the relief of Evanglia Moshou Kantas;

S. 615. A bill for the relief of Andreas, Gregorios, Eleni, Nikolaso, and Anna Chingas;

S. 616. A bill for the relief of Miss Choun Seem Kim; and

S. 617. A bill for the relief of Zehra Ener; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DODD (for himself, Mr. Cooper, Mr. Hartke, Mr. Kennedy of Massachusetts, and Mr. Javits):

S. 618. A bill for the relief of Nora Isabella Samuelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Dodd when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. COOPER (for himself, Mr. Dodd, Mr. Hartke, Mr. Javits, Mr. Kennedy of Massachusetts, and Mr. Pell):

S. 619. A bill for the relief of Nora Isabella Samuelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NELSON:

S. 620. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code, so as to provide for the appointment of one additional district judge for the eastern district of Wisconsin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Nelson when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PROUTY:

S. 621. A bill for the relief of Marija Malnar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NELSON (for himself, Mr. Clark, Mr. Williams of New Jersey, Mr. Ribicoff, Mr. Gore, Mr. Cotton, Mr. McIntyre, Mr. Muskie, and Mr. Tydings):

S. 622. A bill to facilitate the management, use, and public benefits from the Appalachian Trail, a scenic trail designed primarily for foot travel through natural or primitive areas, and extending generally from Maine to Georgia; to facilitate and promote Federal, State, local, and private cooperation and assistance for the promotion of the trail, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Nelson when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DODD:

S. 623. A bill for the relief of Jesus Miguez Miguez and Camilo Sotelino Miguez; and

S. 624. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to make unlawful certain practices in connection with the placing of minor children for permanent free care or for adoption; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Dodd when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SIMPSON:

S. 625. A bill to authorize the sale of isolated or disconnected tracts of lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Simpson when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LONG of Missouri:

S. 626. A bill to provide for the erection of a monument on Alcatraz Island to commemorate the founding of the United Nations in San Francisco, Calif., in 1945, and to serve as a symbol of peace; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Long of Missouri when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 627. A bill to exempt oceanographic research vessels from the application of certain vessel inspection laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Magnuson when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S.J. Res. 29. Joint resolution to authorize and direct the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries to conduct a survey of the marine and fresh-water commercial fishery resources of the United States, its territories, and possessions; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Magnuson when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CURTIS (for himself and Mr. Byrd of Virginia):

S.J. Res. 30. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the balancing of the budget; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Curtis when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF THE PRAYERS OF FORMER CHAPLAIN PETER MARSHALL

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, I send to the desk for appropriate reference a concurrent resolution which would allow the prayers of Peter Marshall, former Chaplain of the Senate, to be reprinted. These prayers were formerly printed as Senate Document No. 86 of the 81st Congress, 1st session, but the supply has now been exhausted. The demand for them continues to be great, however. This resolution would allow each Senator 100 copies and each Representative 50 copies.

The Joint Committee on Printing informs me that the estimated cost would be approximately $6,200.

Peter Marshall's prayers, inspirational in their simplicity and clarity, have been a source of personal strength to many. I believe that each Member of this body would appreciate having another printing of them for his own personal use and as a valuable resource to pass on to the constituents in his State. I hope this resolution will receive the prompt attention of both Chambers.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 9) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

S. Con. Res. 9

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed thirty-two thousand, two hundred and fifty additional copies of Senate Document No. 86, Eighty-first Congress, first session, being the prayers offered by the Chaplain, Reverend Peter Marshall, D.D. at the opening of the daily sessions of the Senate of the United States during the Eightieth and Eighty-first Congresses, 1947–1949; of which ten thousand three hundred copies shall be for the use of the Senate and twenty-one thousand nine hundred and fifty copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives.

RESOLUTION

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 36) to provide additional funds for the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, which, under the rule, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. JACKSON, which appears under a separate heading.)

STABILIZATION OF THE DOMESTIC SUPPLY OF LEAD AND ZINC

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, once again I must call the attention of the Senate to an item of congressional business that should receive our serious consideration and action during this session of the 89th Congress. I refer to enactment of a plan that will provide and stabilize a necessary domestic supply of the two metals, lead and zinc, and in so doing assure reasonable prosperity for the domestic miner, maintain adequate stocks of metal at reasonable prices for the domestic consumer and share a reasonable portion of our markets with other nations producing these metals for export.

I have discussed this matter many times in the past—in fact more often than I care to remember—but today I feel confident that the time is right and the plan we submit for consideration of the Senate is the correct method for obtaining the objectives cited above.

On previous occasions when I addressed the Senate regarding plans to assist the lead-zinc industry, we had to report that metal stocks were excessive as the quota plan of 1958 had not been effective and as a result metal prices were subnormal and mining activity depressed.

Today I can report that with increasing consumption, the metal stocks have dropped to near minimum levels and prices have risen to levels that once again encourage exploration, development, and mining. In fact, during 1964 a release of lead and zinc from the national stockpile was authorized by the Congress to supplement domestic stocks. This highlighted two important items. First, foreign lead and zinc prices increased to levels above those in the United States and attracted foreign production that normally would have reached our markets. Second, our domestic miners had suffered for years with unusually low prices and with no incentive to increase mine capacity. As a result there is a natural lag in time between an increased domestic price and increased mine production.

This experience has emphasized again that some stabilizing plan is essential to assure our domestic miner of a fair metal price over the long term to encourage continuation of exploration and development that leads to normal levels of lead and zinc mine production.

Our domestic smelters have also had their problems. With supplies of ores and concentrates limited by absolute quotas and elevated foreign prices during times of increasing consumption, there had not been sufficient material available for smeltering to meet domestic consumers needs. This problem needs correction.

The miner and the smelter operators have both been concerned, and rightly so, about their desire and obligation to provide the necessary metals at fair prices to the consumers, as consumption has increased with the general level of the economy. We wish to correct that situation.

Together with all these factors we must provide a legislative program that will accomplish the normal objectives within the framework of our announced policy of encouraging trade with the exporting nations.

Today I am introducing proposed legislation that will accomplish all these objectives, and I am happy to be joined by Senators from the 20 lead-zinc producing States of our great country. The Lead and Zinc Act of 1965 provides for flexible import quotas that will establish a basic quota equal to those now in effect, but will permit increased imports in a direct ratio to increased domestic consumption. This serves as a relaxation and liberalization of the present quota plan—an objective of our trade policy and certainly meets with the expressed desire of those countries serving our markets.

The initial quota allocations to specific countries conform to the current allocations, but the bill has provisions to transfer unused quota tonnage to a global quota that will be available to those countries having increasing amounts of material available for export. This will accommodate the changing conditions of mine and metal production around the world with a minimum of negotiation on the part of our Government and our foreign friends.

Mr. President, in summary, I must emphasize that now is the time to enact this legislation.

During this period of temporary recovery from the years of depressed activity, the mining industry can agree to and operate with import controls that are no more restrictive than the present quota proclamation. Furthermore, they can agree to a liberalization of these quota levels as domestic consumption increases. This is possible because the excessive metal stocks, hanging over the market for the past 7 or 8 years have been eliminated. We do not believe this unhealthy situation would recur under the proposed flexible import quota plan.

I mentioned above the temporary recovery within the industry. Its economic history has been one of recurring cycles of boom and bust. Conditions may look bright now, but we know from testimony presented during a Tariff Commission hearing of the lead-zinc industry last June that potential mine and smelter production from foreign countries through the next 2 or 3 years greatly exceeds any estimates of increased world consumption. The resulting surplus of ores and metal from those countries will once again flood our markets—close our mines—if we are not prepared with a plan to provide long-term stability of the domestic mining and smelting industry.

I urge serious and immediate consideration of this proposed legislation that will equitably accommodate the interests of all concerned—the domestic producers—the miner and smelter, the consumer and the importer of foreign production.

As stated during the Tariff Commission lead-zinc hearing of last June, the present absolute quotas were not sufficiently restrictive, when enacted in 1958 to correct the problems that existed at that time and that stayed with us until recent months. Under the present conditions of increasingly high foreign prices and changed world production patterns the absolute quotas can be too restrictive in some instances. We see that when world prices are higher than our own, then the foreign producers have no interest in flooding our markets. Now is the time to act. We must move to lend stability to the situation while prices are encouraging to domestic producers, yet not excessive to consumers; while our market is available to foreign producers, yet world demand prevents an oversupply and a depressing effect.

The Congress now has before it a plan workable and equitable for the producer, consumer, and importer—a long-range minerals policy for lead and zinc. Before any change is made in the present quota proclamation, this legislation must be enacted to solve industry problems that have troubled our communities, our States, our Federal Government, even our foreign policy since 1950.

Two years ago I introduced a bill which differed in method but not in goal. It was referred to the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee with the understanding that when consideration had been completed there it would be referred to the Committee on Finance since imports were involved.

The bill was the subject of hearings before the Interior Committee. As a result of that action further refinements have been made to the bill.

Accordingly, I ask that the bill be referred to the Committee on Finance where I hope hearings can be scheduled in the very near future.

I now send the bill to the desk and ask that it lie there for 10 days for additional cosponsors.

I introduce it for myself, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. FANNIN, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. MONTOYA, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. DOMINICK, Mr. JORDAN of Idaho, Mr. METCALF, Mr. CANNON, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. MOSS, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. SYMINGTON, and Mr. NELSON.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be referred to the Committee on Finance, where hearings will be held. The subject has been considered by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and previously reported. Therefore, I think it would expedite the matter if the bill were referred directly to the Committee on Finance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARRIS in the chair). The bill will be received and, without objection, it will be referred as requested, and will lie on the desk as requested by the Senator from New Mexico.

The bill (S. 564) to protect the domestic economy, to promote the general welfare, and to assist in the national defense by providing for an adequate supply of lead and zinc for consumption in the United States from domestic and foreign sources introduced by Mr. ANDERSON (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, I am very pleased to join with Senator ANDERSON of New Mexico and other Senators in supporting a bill to offer protection to our domestic lead and zinc miners and to assure needed supplies of lead and zinc for our custom smelters and consumers. We have experienced fluctuations in price for these metals for the past several years that have been inconsistent with our normal economic business cycle. These domestic changes in the market price disrupt the industry's plans and operations.

Mr. President, at one time we had nearly 100 lead and zinc mines in operation in Idaho. Now we have less than 25. During the period from 1950 to 1961 the output from these mines averaged $52.5 million annually, while in 1962 it was about $30 million. Our lead and zinc mines and processors at one time employed some 4,700 men but in 1962 this was down to 3,300. While there has been some improvement in the last year, we need much more stability if we are to explore, develop, and process these metals to our full potential in the future.

There is a definite relationship in most western lead and zinc mines and the production of silver in various percentages and proportions is usually recovered along with lead and zinc. We are facing a crisis in our domestic silver situation. Our supplies of silver bullion are being used up at an alarming rate. We have a shortage of silver coins. Hoarding of silver is another problem. We need to produce more silver to meet our increased usage of that metal. One of the ways to do this is to stabilize and encourage full development of our domestic lead-zinc mining properties.

This bill which would set up a flexible quota plan based on domestic production and needs would help to stabilize the industry to the benefit of all concerned, the miner, the processor, the consumer, and to a very great extent, the importer. I hope it will be favorably considered by the Congress early in this session.

ENCOURAGEMENT OF PHYSICIANS TO PRACTICE IN AREAS HAVING A SHORTAGE OF DOCTORS

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to encourage physicians who have received student loans under the Public Health Service Act to practice their profession in areas having a shortage of physicians.

The bill would permit the canceling of a portion of the unpaid balance of a student loan awarded to a physician who practices in a "shortage" area, as designated by the appropriate State health authority. For each year of practice in a shortage area, up to 5 years, 10 percent of the total of the outstanding loans, plus interest, could be canceled.

As S. 2220, the bill was overwhelming approved by the Senate last year, but did not pass the House.

I ask that the bill remain at the desk until the close of business next Tuesday, January 26, so that other interested Senators may have an opportunity to become cosponsors of this measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, will remain at the desk as requested.

The bill (S. 576) to encourage physicians and dentists who have received student loans under programs established pursuant to title VII of the Public Health Service Act to practice their professions in areas having a shortage of physicians or dentists, introduced by Mr. COTTON (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

EQUITY FOR WHEAT FARMERS

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I have sent to the desk for myself, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. METCALF, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MOSS, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. MONDALE, Mr. YARBOROUGH, and Mrs. NEUBERGER, a bill to increase the assured return of farmers from wheat produced for domestic food use—approximately 45 percent of a cooperator's crop—to full parity.

The bill extends the voluntary wheat certificate plan—which has worked well—for an indefinite period, and provides that the basic price support loan, which this year will be approximately 50 percent of parity, plus the certificate issued against domestic food wheat, shall total 100 percent of parity.

The bill would not require an increase in the value of the export certificates, which the Secretary of Agriculture sets within his discretion. It would not change the provision in regard to diversion payments.

We have been given to understand that any increase in costs of farm programs to the Government will be resisted. The measure I have just introduced will not increase Federal costs, since it does not change the export certificate or diversion payments which ultimately come from the Treasury.

If the bill is enacted into law, farmers who reduce their wheat acreage and cooperate in production control, to keep Government holdings and storage costs at a reasonable level, will get an average of about 76.7 percent of parity for their wheat crop, composed of the 100 percent for domestic food wheat, 62 percent on 35 percent of the crop earmarked export wheat, and 50 percent of parity on 20 percent of their crop against which no certificates are to be issued. They currently have supports of about 71.7 percent of parity average over the whole crop. Even the 76.7 percent this bill seeks would be substantially below the 90 percent of parity level which was once our goal.

In dollars and cents, the bill will have the effect of raising the valuation of domestic wheat certificates approximately 50 cents per bushel above the 75-cent level announced for the 1965 crop. Nationally, it will mean a $250 to $300 million increase in farm income.

Passage of the measure could mean an increase of 1 cent per loaf in the price of 1-pound loaves of bread. When we instituted the voluntary wheat certificate plan last year, wheat cost to millers was increased 10 to 12 cents per bushel. There were spotty increases in retail bakery products prices but no general bread price increase. Such a general small rise in bread prices may occur when this bill becomes effective.

I regret the necessity of any action which will increase consumer prices, Mr. President, but I am sure that any fair-minded person—legislator or housewife who buys the groceries—will agree that the farmers of the United States are entitled to a fair return for their labor and investment, and that they are not now getting such a fair return.

Realized net farm income was $15.2 billion in 1951. It fell to a low of $11.3 billion in 1959, was raised to $11.6 billion in 1961 and 1962. It dropped $100 million in 1963 and another $200 million last year, mostly as a result of decline in wheat income.

Production costs are rising while farm commodity prices are falling.

The parity index, which measures farm prices against the prices of things farmers have to buy, has dropped from 100 in 1949 and 107 in 1952 to 75 percent of parity now. Total farm income today buys farmers only three-fourths as much as their income did in 1952.

Much of the relative economic stability this country has enjoyed in recent years has occurred, not because prices in other sectors of the economy did not rise, but because farm prices were falling. Farmers have underwritten the cost of other price rises.

In 1958, midway in the 1957–59 base period on which price indexes are now based, farm prices stood at 104 on the index. They were at 97—7 points off—November 15, 1964, the last date for which I can get the figures. Prices paid by farmers for the products of others had advanced on the same index from 100 to 107—up 7 points, or the same number of index points that farm prices fell in the same period.

In this same period, Mr. President, total corporate profits after taxes have risen from $18.6 billion to a $22 billion annual rate last November 15. The average weekly earnings of workers in manufacturing industries have risen from $82.71 to $104.70.

I am not being critical of prosperity. I am only determined that farmers should share in it.

My purpose in citing these figures is not to be construed as an attack on profits or wages, but solely to indicate the serious situation in agriculture and the complete equity of improving farm prices.

One of the great difficulties those of us who plead the case of farmers face is translation of this sort of statistics into human terms—picturing their meaning in terms of people on the land. We can only resort to more statistics which are, unfortunately, averages which can be misconstrued.

The average personal income of people in agriculture from farming in 1963 was only $976 per capita. Because many of them are small farmers who work off the farm too, and a few have investments off the farm, the average disposable personal income of farm people in 1963 was $1,376 compared to an average disposable personal income of the nonfarm population of $2,181 per capita. The farm income figure includes the rental value of the farm home and the cash value of home produced foods. It was not all cash, and it was not quite two-thirds as much as nonfarm people had.

The consequences of low prices and low farm income are reflected in other statistics. There were 4,232,900 farms in 1958. The Statistical Reporting Service of the Department of Agriculture announced just a few days ago—January 14—that we now have only 3,376,000 farms. There has been an 857,000 decline in farm units in the last 7-year period.

The farmers who remain on the land are not as secure as they were a few years ago.

Total farm mortgage debt in the United States has increased almost 40 percent since 1960 from about $12.1 billion to $16.8 billion. In my own State of South Dakota, farm mortgage debt has increased from $172 to $277 million.

Non-real-estate loans to farmers since 1960 have increased almost 50 percent from under $7 billion to $10 billion. In South Dakota the increase is from $143 to $246 million.

The picture we have is of 100,000 farm families being forced off the land each year—and more hundreds of thousands lined up behind them, with increasing debt, who will have to go next year, and the next, or the next.

Their only future as of today appears to be the economic opportunity program and, unfortunately, the opportunities are not for people in the present farming age groups but for much younger age groups.

As the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] said, in a recent splendid discussion of the farm situation on the Senate floor, the displacement of a farm family means a great deal more economic dislocation than just that of the family directly involved. Bankers, merchants, lawyers, doctors—all types of residents of rural communities and towns are displaced because their patrons are gone. Workers back in the industrial cities also lose their jobs because the market for the products they make is constantly declining. The suggested displacement of all but 1 million farmers would involve 7 or 8 million farm people, and millions more who serve them.

Equity for agriculture, still the biggest patron of our steel industry, our oil industry, our chemical industry, and many others, is a must for all of us.

I have been engaged recently in editing a collection of selections for an anthology on agricultural policy development in the 20th century. In the course of that work, I ran across three paragraphs in a book by Liberty Hyde Bailey, published in 1911 on the country life movement, which Dr. Bailey chaired on appointment from Theodore Roosevelt. It represented a viewpoint of Dr. Bailey's time, which I believe has changed, but the moral of it is a good one.

Dr. Bailey wrote:

> The fundamental weakness of our civilization is the fact that the city and the country represent antagonistic forces. * * * The city lives on the country. It always tends to destroy its province.
>
> The city sits like a parasite, running out its roots into the open country and draining it of its substance. The city takes everything to itself—materials, money, men—and gives back only what it does not want; it does not reconstruct or even maintain its contributory country. Many country places are already sucked dry.
>
> The future state of the farmer, or real country man, will depend directly on the kind of balance or relationship that exists between urban and rural forces; and in the end, the state of the city will rest on the same basis. Whatever the city does for the country it does also for itself.

We have a great deal better understanding of the interrelationship of city and country today—a half century after Dr. Bailey wrote that passage—than existed in his lifetime. We learned, the hard way, perhaps, in the great depression, that the state of agriculture and city are intertwined.

A good deal of farm legislation has been made possible by city Members of the Congress. An enlightened labor movement in the cities has recognized the equity of fair farm prices and farm income support programs and has supported our farm bills.

In the last few years, agriculture unfortunately has been drained.

It has been the victim of oversight and of a misunderstanding of the extent of aid being given it, as Senator AIKEN pointed out in his able talk last week. The Senator demonstrated that $4.6 billion of this year's agricultural budget is for the benefit of businessmen, consumers, foreign assistance, and the general public, while only $2.2 billion is aid for the farmers themselves. Last fiscal year, the figures were $4.6 billion for nonfarm interests and $3.3 billion of farm aid. I refer anyone who wants detail on these figures to Mr. AIKEN's presentation at page 562 of the January 12 RECORD. Parenthetically, I would like to compliment the Senator from Vermont, and express my appreciation for the fine service he did for farmers and agriculture.

As a result of misunderstanding, and a lack of awareness of the depth of agricultural distress, farmers find themselves confronted with a strong resistance to further budgeted farm aid, and must turn—as the bill I have introduced does—to consumers with a plea for more equitable prices.

I have confidence that the small increase in consumer costs this bill may entail will be accepted. I am certain that they will be if a majority of the Members of Congress get not only the statistical picture of the situation, but some realization of the human tragedies that are occurring in rural areas, day after day after day. Those tragedies are reflected in my mail.

This morning I find a letter from Alfred Moeller, of Gary, S. Dak., in my mail. He writes:

> I am writing you in regard to egg prices. For the last 2 weeks we have been getting 20 cents per dozen for No. 1 eggs. We are on a small, family-type farm. We keep around 400 hens, milk 2 cows, and raise a few hogs. With present prices, we are just not able to make a go of it. The farmers in this area are in a desperate shape. Please, can you do anything for us?

A farm mother at Parker, S. Dak., writes me:

> Just a plea from a farmer's wife in regard to the prices we are getting for our products. After a severe drought last summer, we are having to buy feed, corn, oats, and hay and now when we sell our eggs we are getting 18 cents a dozen. Please tell me how can we continue on this way?
>
> We are not asking for handouts or relief or sympathy, but we want a better price for our eggs, and quick, too—that is our livelihood. Another thing, why do the city people have to pay so much for a dozen eggs, and for meat in the store when our hogs (if we have any) are only bringing $16?
>
> We have some nice brood sows but we cannot afford to buy any more feed for them. The same way with our milk cows.
>
> So please, Senator, cannot something be done to help us through this winter—not loans, just better prices.
>
> We have three children, one married, one graduating in May from high school and one girl age 11. Our other problem is the boy who will graduate in May. He is a diabetic—and that is what costs so much and nothing to pay for it with.
>
> Why do those medicines, pills, and doctors have to be so high? We should put him in the hospital again for a checkup but we just cannot do it, so he will have to get along as is—and what will he do after he is out of high school?
>
> He cannot get work because it seems nobody wants to hire a diabetic, why I do not know, and we cannot afford to send him on to school. So, please, won't you try to do some investigating on this problem, and see if somewhere something cannot be done so we can get better prices for our products. That is all we ask, is this too much?

The plight of farmers is the most serious I have known since I entered public life more than a decade ago.

It is no answer, Mr. President, to say that much of the benefit of improved farm income will got to a million larger farmers out of 3½ million.

We passed a tax reduction bill a year ago that will benefit individuals and corporations who are not going broke—who have enough profits and earnings to pay income taxes on them. We do not require a poverty oath of every beneficiary of every law which is enacted.

I have favored a family farm limitation on benefits from farm programs, but Congress has never seen fit to enact one.

It is true that there are large farmers who benefit more handsomely in dollars from farm programs than the small, family farmer, about to lose his land. But, I doubt that any large farmer gets more important help than the smaller producers. A small increase in price—the difference between 71.7 percent of parity for wheat and 76.7 percent of parity for wheat. It can mean the difference between solvency and insolvency to them; the difference between security in the way of life they have chosen and being forced to enter competition for jobs in an economy with a persistently too high rate of unemployment.

During the New Deal, Mr. President, this Nation sought to reduce the relief rolls by giving unemployed with some agricultural experience small loans for a cow, a pressure cooker, and some fruit jars to produce their own food. It saved tax money. It started many on their way toward self-sufficiency on the land.

It would be unwise to resume that program today, but I think it is equally unwise to knowingly reverse it. We should still be building toward greater security for the small farmers of the Nation, and a situation in which they can remain on the land, at least until attractive opportunities draw them away. They should not be driven by unfairly low returns from their production to join an army of unemployed.

The wheat bill which has just been introduced can keep thousands of farmers secure on the land who would otherwise fail. It will provide no more than a fair return to others who produce America's foodstuffs for the lowest percentage of consumer income ever achieved in a major nation in world history.

I am hopeful that the measure will receive sympathetic and speedy consideration by the appropriate committees and Members of the Senate, and that it can be enacted into law.

I am considering, in consultation with my cosponsors, two additional changes in the wheat program. One would permit some small increases in the acreage for export purposes only. The other possible change would apply the so-called family farm cutoff on the amount that could go to any one producer, perhaps a limit of 15,000 bushels.

I hope that these two amendments, which are now under consideration, will be gone into by the committee.

I ask unanimous consent that some letters that I have received from constituents recently pointing up the urgency of this matter may be included in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CASTLEWOOD, S. DAK.

DEAR SENATOR MCGOVERN: I have farmed for myself for 28 years. I have always gotten along pretty good; making a little money most every year except a few dry years.

I have had to increase my production: From farming a 240-acre farm to a 560-acre farm, from 10 cows to around 30 cows, from about 40 hogs a year to about 150 hogs a year, and from about 20 feeding steers to about 80 steers a year. To make any money I have had to do this, not because I wanted to. I own 360 acres and rent 240 acres. I lost money last year, the first time in 28 years. Things are getting tough for the farmer and I don't mean maybe. I had a pretty good crop also last year. But expenses are getting terribly high and our income is way too low for the price we have to pay for machinery and parts and most anything we have to buy. I am concerned about these things and I hope you will try to do something for us farmers by getting our prices in line with the things we have to buy. Getting our prices up will help everybody down the line. When we quit buying as a lot of us have done the last few years, it is going to hurt all down the line, labor and industry alike. Some more of us will be out looking for jobs; which there are not enough of now.

Hoping you will give us farmers some consideration in your work in Washington.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY WELLHOUSE.

ALPENA, S. DAK.

DEAR SENATOR MCGOVERN: Lately there has been farm family after farm family in this community selling out because they couldn't hold on any more; they couldn't make a living on the farm. Several young families near here are trying to supplement their farming with part-time work in order to make enough to stay on the farm but even this doesn't do it because just yesterday we learned that a young family who are friends of ours and who have been supplementing their income are selling out.

Our son, Scott, is nearly four and we have been hoping to have a second child so that he wouldn't be alone but last night when I said something about having this second child, Larry's reply was so halfhearted that I asked him what was wrong. Reluctantly he said, "I suppose finances aren't the right things to base our decision on of whether or not to have another baby, but I don't even know where we are going to get the money to live on." When I questioned him further as to why, he told me, "It is just a matter of fact that our farming expenses amount to more than our income. Interest rates are too high across the Nation, the banks and finance companies have more money than they know what to do with, and the high-interest rates are included in the things we have to buy." Then he voiced the thing that was really worrying him, "This is just the way it was in 1929 just before the depression, the banks were sitting high and the farmers were going broke. We just may go into a depression." He also added that because of the drought this year we are going to have to buy the feed to raise our pigs next year and this will take most of the money we ordinarily have for operating expenses and next year's calves would probably have to go for that.

Senator MCGOVERN, this isn't the dilemma of an eighth grade or high school graduate trying to start farming on his own, this is the dilemma of an agricultural graduate of State College who is taking over the operation of the established and productive farm of his father who is giving him all the assistance possible. Both are good farm managers and in a decent economy this would be a winning combination. But when such a seemingly ideal situation as this can't make it even with the help of FHA, then as Hamlet says, "There's something rotten in the state of Denmark."

And it isn't a matter of living or operating overly expensively. He and his brother share a grinder so they can grind and mix their own feeds, they went together on a used sheller so they can shell their own corn and even some for others. We don't even own a car, we drive the old 1950 Plymouth dad didn't trade in 3 years ago when he got a car. Our furniture is hand-me-down and we don't own a television because we don't have the money to get one. We are going to have to have a car because the old Plymouth is about done for. We planned to get a Volkswagen last year but when we sold our feeder pigs last year they brought in $1,200 less than the same amount of pigs the year before.

I'm sure that Larry would be embarrassed at my writing you such a personal letter, but I don't know how else to convey to you the situation which confronts us. However, it would be better if you could come out and visit some farms and see for yourself how the current situation stands.

This isn't a problem we can solve from here, as far as producing more, our expenses in producing are exceeding the income from it. Something must equalize things elsewhere since the packinghouses, steel companies and finance agencies are making more profit than ever before and we are going under. Once we go under, other industries fold also, but you know that process better than I. However, I do feel that the time for remedial measures to prevent the farm economy from folding is short.

Sincerely,

MRS. K. D. L.

FAULKTON, S. DAK.,
January 11, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MCGOVERN: The net income of the farm and ranch operators in South Dakota is going down. With a decrease of income the buying power of a very important segment of our economy is deeply cut.

Many people I do business with are still too proud to assume debts beyond their means. All they ask is a comfortable living with an opportunity to contribute to the good of our great Nation.

We ask that the price support on basic commodities be maintained.

The use of nonsurplus commodities in your food for peace program must be made. We ask your support in the change of Public Law 480 to permit the use of nonsurplus food.

The rural area development is a fine program, but very little tax money has ever been authorized for it. The community action programs authorized by the antipoverty act are commendable but, this far, only 5 percent of CAP funds have reached rural communities. Attention should be directed to these matters.

Your consideration and favorable action will be much appreciated by a very grateful rural South Dakota.

Sincerely,

KARL W. BACHMAYER,
President, Bachmayer Lumber Co.

BRYANT, S. DAK.,
January 5, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MCGOVERN: First of all, it is my feeling that the farmer didn't vote Democratic because he was satisfied. He voted Democratic because he thought the Democrats would help him. The outlook on the farms today is probably darker than it has been for 30 years. We don't see any of that prosperity we hear you talk about.

Well, what does the farmer need?

He needs an investigation of the buying and selling practices at the marketplace. There are a hell of a lot of things setting the price besides supply and demand.

After these investigations are completed it should be determined whether legislation is needed to limit the power and practices of these chain stores or—whether the farmers should be legislated bargaining power at the marketplace.

All the money or political talk in the world will never solve the farmers problem. The farmer has got to have an equalizer at the marketplace. The present marketing setup is an evil system that legalizes stealing. It is certainly so one sided it can no longer be called a free market.

We need new programs and new solutions and we need them now. The farmer was desperate 30 years ago, and so he is now.

Now is the time to decide where the farmer fits into this Great Society. Is he going to be included in it or is it going to built on him. I think we have supported the economy on our 75 percent of parity long enough. I think the farmer should be invited into the present society and then on into the Great Society. I hope you realize the 25 percent of parity he hasn't been getting is the money he should be living on, the money he should educate his kids with, the money he should vacation with, doing and enjoying the things you people do.

I think its time this great Nation, in the 20th century faced up to its obligations, stopped skimming off the rural cream and found some solutions to this rural problem.

I appreciate your consideration of my views and hope you will see fit to act upon them as I really feel this is urgent.

Sincerely,

KENNETH CRONKHITE.

BERESFORD, S. DAK.,
January 6, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MCGOVERN: As president of the First National Bank of Beresford, Beresford, S. Dak., I urge you, as U.S. Senator from South Dakota, to strengthen the economic conditions of our rural farmers.

If our farmers are to continue to feed livestock and grow field commodities, they will have to get a better price for their grain and livestock. It seems that the farmers always get the "short-end." This also affects the small businessmen in the rural areas. If Mr. Farmer does not make a profit in his operations the small businessmen will also get hurt.

Trusting you will give this some thought, I am,

Very truly yours,

T. A. PETERSON,
President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 598) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to provide for continuation of the voluntary wheat certificate program, and for other purposes introduced by Mr. MCGOVERN (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

CRUCIAL NEED FOR AUBURN-FOLSOM SOUTH PROJECT

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, for myself and my distinguished colleague from California [Mr. MURPHY], a bill to authorize the Auburn-Folsom south unit, American River division, of the great Central Valley project in the State of California.

As every Senator is well aware, northern California has been subjected in the last 30 days to devastating heavy rainfall and disastrous floods. As it was so dramatically phrased in the San Francisco Examiner, "Sacramento came within inches of being flooded."

The Department of the Interior has estimated that the Folsom Dam, on the American River above Sacramento, our State capital, is credited with saving $45 million in damages in the Sacramento area during the crisis, while an additional $40 million in damages in the Sacramento River Valley is estimated to have been saved by the floodwaters stored in Shasta Dam on the upper Sacramento River.

The Auburn Dam and Reservoir is a necessary vital adjunct to the protection of our State capital from future flood threats.

The bill I am introducing today is identical with that which was approved unanimously by the Senate Interior Committee in the last Congress. Companion legislation was also approved last year by the Interior Committee of the House of Representatives. The same project, but with a modified plan, was earlier approved by the Senate committee in the 87th Congress.

The plan thoroughly heard by the congressional committees and strongly endorsed by the administration in the 88th Congress represents maximum resource development. The Secretary of the Interior has already indicated that this project is high on the administration's priority list for the 89th Congress. This project represents the finest in multipurpose water development. It will be a gilt-edged addition to the gilt-edged Central Valley project.

The Auburn-Folsom project has the exceptionally favorable cost-benefit ratio of 3.71 to 1 and is financially, as well as engineeringly, feasible. Every million dollars invested by the Federal Government in this unit of the Central Valley project will produce nearly $4 million in benefits. The Senate Interior Committee found this to be a most sound investment.

California, with a population of over 18 million people, is the most populous State of the Nation, and at present rates of growth in just 15 years—by 1980—some 27½ million persons will reside in the State. In addition, California is the home of a great number of wide-ranging industries and its highly specialized, intensive agriculture makes it one of the country's leading food producers.

All of these factors require tremendous and ever-increasing supplies of water. This need has been translated into a requirement for enough new supplies of water every Monday morning in the year sufficient to service the equivalent of a new community of 12,000 persons. Clearly, California's population and economic growth give rise to water requirements that now are outstripping the combined efforts of local agencies, the State itself, and those of the Federal Government to date.

Local agencies, private enterprise, and the State and Federal Governments have all made a significant contribution toward meeting the water needs of a burgeoning population. California is in the midst of construction of its $1.750 billion bond-financed State project. But it will not serve the area to be served by the Auburn-Folsom south Federal project and is unrelated thereto. A sense of urgency for this project was stated by Secretary of the Interior Udall as follows:

> There is an urgency to the Auburn-Folsom south project as a logical next addition to the Central Valley project for many of the areas it will serve are plagued persistently by drought, while much needed water flows unused down the American and its tributaries. The State of California cannot undertake this merited project because of its tremendous obligation of $1.7 billion in other critically needed water-supply works.
>
> Here is a project, however, that will assure continued growth and which counts as one of its strongest points the unusually high ratio of benefits to investment. In it, local interests will do their part to provide facilities essential to the Federal plan of action.
>
> Traditionally, wide gaps of time always separate project authorization, appropriations, construction, and delivery of water. It is for this reason that I appeal for early authorization of Auburn-Folsom south unit of the Central Valley project.

The project involves a huge dam with a 2½-million-acre-foot capacity reservoir on the American River, effecting water conservation, flood control, fish, wildlife, and recreation values, and helping to meet the growing electric power requirements of the Central Valley. Downstream from this Auburn Dam and the presently existing Folsom Dam will begin the Folsom-South Canal to take water some 67½ miles for a valuable agricultural area already overdrawing its existing supplies. Municipal and industrial service will also be provided to several areas.

The bill would also authorize two smaller dams and reservoirs which, with appurtenant diversion works and conduits would also provide multipurpose water development to rapidly expanding adjacent areas to assure continued growth.

Mr. President, this project does not impinge upon the interests of any other State. The waters involved are solely intra-California. No part of this project is involved with any other, except other units of the wholly intra-California Central Valley project.

It stands on its own, a merited advance in the continuing efforts, for which Californians are eternally grateful, by which the Congress has sought to assist the people of my State in meeting the water and power needs of a burgeoning population.

Although Californians have bonded themselves extensively to undertake a huge water plan of their own, the Federal Central Valley project remains a vital complement to the maximum efforts which are being put forth at the State level. Both must go forward as rapidly as possible.

In a word, the bill I now send to the desk is one deserving of expeditious and favorable consideration by the Senate. Authorization of this project should be one of the primary conservation achievements of the 89th Congress.

On January 6, I submitted to the Senate a bill to develop the water resources of the Colorado River. I stated at that time the joint sponsorship of the authorization of the central Arizona project was necessary to solve the water problems of the whole Southwest. Today I submit a measure which we believe is essential to solve the water problems of northern California.

Two weeks ago I offered to cooperate with my distinguished colleagues from Arizona in authorizing the central Arizona project. Today I ask them to offer their cooperation in authorizing the Auburn-Folsom south unit of the Central Valley project.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 599) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Auburn-Folsom south unit, American River division, Central Valley project, California, under Federal reclamation laws, introduced by

Mr. Kuchel (for himself and Mr. Murphy), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 599

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the principal purpose of increasing the supply of water available for irrigation and other beneficial uses in the Central Valley of California, the Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary"), acting pursuant to the Federal reclamation laws (Act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and Acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto), is authorized to construct, operate, and maintain, as an addition to, and an integral part of, the Central Valley project, California, the Auburn-Folsom south unit, American River division. The principal works of the unit shall consist of:

(1) the Auburn Dam and Reservoir with maximum water surface elevation of one thousand one hundred and forty feet above mean sea level, and capacity of approximately two and one-half million acre-feet;

(2) a hydroelectric powerplant at Auburn Dam with initial installed capacity of approximately two hundred and forty thousand kilowatts and necessary electric transmission system for interconnection with the Central Valley project power system: *Provided,* That provision may be made for the ultimate development of the hydroelectric capacity (now estimated at approximately four hundred thousand kilowatts) and such installation may be made when the Secretary determines that it is economically justified and engineeringly feasible;

(3) the Sugar Pine Dam and Reservoir;

(4) the County Line Dam and Reservoir;

(5) necessary diversion works, conduits, and other appurtenant works for the delivery of water supplies to projects on the Forest Hill Divide in Placer County and in the Folsom-Malby area in Sacramento and El Dorado Counties;

(6) the Folsom south canal and such related structures, including pumping plants, regulating reservoirs, floodways, channels, levees, and other appurtenant works for the delivery of water as the Secretary determines will best serve the needs of Sacramento and San Joaquin Counties: *Provided,* That the Secretary is authorized to include in such canal and related operating structures such additional works or capacity as he deems necessary and economically justified to provide for the future construction of the East Side division of the Central Valley project, and the incremental costs of providing additional works or capacity in the Folsom south canal to serve the East Side division of the Central Valley project shall be assigned to deferred use for repayment from Central Valley project revenues. In the event that the East Side division is authorized, such costs shall be deemed a part of the cost of that division and shall be reallocated as the Secretary deems right and proper.

Sec. 2. Subject to the provisions of this Act, the operation of the Auburn-Folsom south unit, American River division, shall be integrated and coordinated, from both a financial and an operational standpoint, with the operation of other features of the Central Valley project, as presently authorized and as may in the future be authorized by Act of Congress, in such manner as will effectuate the fullest, most beneficial, and most economic utilization of the water resources hereby made available. Auburn and County Line Dams shall be operated for flood control in accordance with criteria established by the Secretary of the Army as provided for in section 7 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 887; 33 U.S.C. 709).

Sec. 3. The Secretary is authorized as a part of the Auburn-Folsom south unit to construct, operate, and maintain or otherwise provide for basic public outdoor recreation facilities, to acquire or otherwise to include within the project area such adjacent lands or interests therein as are necessary for present or future public recreation, and to provide for the public use and enjoyment of project lands, facilities, and water areas in a manner coordinated with the other project purposes. The Secretary is authorized to enter into agreements with Federal agencies or State or local public bodies for the operation, maintenance, and additional development of project lands or facilities, or to dispose of project lands or facilities to Federal agencies or State or local public bodies by lease, transfer, conveyance, or exchange, upon such terms and conditions as will best promote the development and operation of such lands or facilities in the public interest for recreation purposes. The Secretary is authorized to transfer jurisdiction over project lands within or adjacent to the exterior boundaries of national forests and facilities thereon to the Secretary of Agriculture for recreation and other national forest system purposes. Where any project lands are transferred hereunder to the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture, the lands involved shall become national forest lands: *Provided,* That the lands and waters within the flow lines of any reservoir or otherwise needed or used for the operation of the project shall continue to be administered by the Secretary of the Interior to the extent he determines to be necessary for such operation. The costs of land and basic facilities for the purposes of recreation or the enhancement of fish and wildlife resources shall be nonreimbursable. Joint costs of the unit allocated to the purposes of recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement shall also be nonreimbursable up to an amount not to exceed $18,000,000. Joint costs allocated to the purposes of recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement in excess of the foregoing limitation shall be reimbursable with interest from the date of first delivery of water or power from the unit at a rate comparable to that for other project functions.

Sec. 4. In locating and designing the works and facilities authorized for construction by this Act, and in acquiring or withdrawing any lands as authorized by this Act, the Secretary shall give due consideration to the reports upon the California water plan prepared by the State of California, and shall consult the local interests who may be affected by the construction and operation of said works and facilities or by the acquisition or withdrawal of lands, through public hearings or in such manner as in his discretion may be found best suited to a maximum expression of the views of such local interests.

Sec. 5. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed by implication or otherwise as an allocation of water, and in the studies for the purposes of developing plans for disposal of water as herein authorized the Secretary shall make recommendations for the use of water in accord with State water laws, including but not limited to such laws giving priority to the counties and areas of origin for present and future needs.

Sec. 6. For a period of ten years from the date of enactment of this Act, no water shall be delivered to any water user for the production on newly irrigated lands in the Auburn-Folsom south unit, American River division, Central Valley project, of any basic agricultural commodity, as defined in the Agricultural Act of 1949, or any amendment thereof, if the total supply of such commodity as estimated by the Secretary of Agriculture for the marketing year in which the bulk of the crop would normally be marketed and which will be in excess of the normal supply as defined in section 301(b)(10) of the Agricultural Act of 1938, as amended, unless the Secretary calls for an increase in production of such commodity in the interest of national security.

Sec. 7. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for construction of the Auburn-Folsom south unit, American River division, the sum of $425,000,000 plus or minus such amounts, if any, as may be justified by reason of ordinary fluctuations in construction costs as indicated by engineering cost indexes applicable to the types of construction involved herein. There are also authorized to be appropriated such additional sums as may be required for operation and maintenance of the project and for future costs incurred under section 1(2) of this Act.

ADMINISTRATION HIGHER EDUCATION PROPOSALS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it is with a sense of high privilege that I introduce this morning for myself and other Senators the administration higher education bill, described so eloquently by President Johnson in his recent message on education.

I ask unanimous consent that at this point in my remarks there be printed excerpts from the President's education message relating to the higher education components.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

III. HIGHER EDUCATION

Higher education is no longer a luxury, but a necessity.

Programs enacted by Congress in the past have contributed greatly to strengthening our colleges and universities. These will be carried forward under my 1966 budget, which includes—

An additional $179 million to assist construction of college classrooms, libraries, and laboratories.

An additional $25 million for 4,500 more graduate fellowships to overcome college teaching shortages.

An additional $110 million to further basic research in the universities, to provide science fellowships, and to promote science education.

But we need to do more:

To extend the opportunity for higher education more broadly among lower and middle income families.

To help small and less well developed colleges improve their programs.

To enrich the library resources of colleges and universities.

To draw upon the unique and invaluable resources of our great universities to deal with national problems of poverty and community development.

A. Assistance to students

1. Scholarships:

I recommend a program of scholarships for needy and qualified high school graduates to enable them to enter and to continue in college.

Loans authorized by the National Defense Education Act currently assist nearly 300,000 college students. Still the following conditions exist:

Each year an estimated 100,000 young people of demonstrated ability fail to go on to college because of lack of money. Many thousands more from low-income families must borrow heavily to meet college costs.

Only one out of three young people from low-income families attend college compared with four out of five from high-income families.

For many young people from poor families loans are not enough to open the way to higher education.

Under this program, a special effort will be made to identify needy students of promise early in their high school careers. The scholarship will serve as a building block, to be augmented by work-study and other support, so that the needy student can chart his own course in higher studies.

My 1966 budget provides sufficient funds for grants to help up to 140,000 students in the first year.

2. Expansion of work-study opportunity and guaranteed low-interest loans.

I recommend:

That the existing college work-study program be made available to more students and that authority for the program be transferred to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

That a part of the cost of interest payments on guaranteed private loans to college students be paid by the Federal Government.

Going to college is increasingly expensive. A student must pay nearly $2,400 a year in a private college and about $1,600 in a public college. These costs may rise by one-third over the next decade.

Two aids should be extended to meet the heavy costs of college education. First, the existing work-study program should be expanded for students from low-income families and extended to students from middle-income families. Under this program the Federal Government pays 90 percent of the wages earned by students on useful projects. This will enable a student to earn on the average of $450 during a school year, and up to $500 more during the summer.

Second, many families cannot cover all of college expenses on an out-of-pocket basis. We should assure greater availability of private credit on reasonable terms and conditions. This can best be done by paying part of interest cost of guaranteed loans made by private lenders—a more effective, fairer, and far less costly way of providing assistance than the various tax credit devices which have been proposed.

B. Aid to smaller colleges

I recommend that legislation be enacted to strengthen less developed colleges.

Many of our smaller colleges are battling for survival. About 10 percent lack proper accreditation, and others face constantly the threat of losing accreditation. Many are isolated from the main currents of academic life.

Private sources and States alone cannot carry the whole burden of doing what must be done for these important units in our total educational system. Federal aid is essential.

Universities should be encouraged to enter into cooperative relationships to help less developed colleges, including such assistance as a program of faculty exchanges; special programs to enable faculty members of small colleges to renew and extend knowledge of their fields; a national fellowship program to encourage highly qualified young graduate students and instructors in large universities to augment the teaching resources of small colleges; the development of joint programs to make more efficient use of available facilities and faculty.

In union there is strength. This is the basic premise of my recommendation.

C. More support for college library resources

I recommend enactment of legislation for purchase of books and library materials to strengthen college teaching and research.

Fifty percent of our 4-year institutions and 82 percent of our 2-year institutions fall below accepted professional standards in the number of volumes possessed.

As student enrollment mounts, we must look not only to the physical growth of our colleges and universities. They must be developed as true centers of intellectual activity. To construct a library building is meaningless unless there are books to bring life to the library.

D. University-community extension program

I recommend a program of grants to support university extension concentrating on problems of the community.

Institutions of higher learning are being called on ever more frequently for public service—for defense research, foreign development, and countless other programs. They have performed magnificently. We must now call upon them to meet new needs.

Once 90 percent of our population earned its living from the land. A wise Congress enacted the Morrill Act of 1862 and the Hatch Act of 1887 which helped the State universities help the American people. With the aid of the land-grant colleges, American agriculture produced overwhelming abundance.

Today, 70 percent of our people live in urban communities. They are confronted by problems of poverty, residential blight, polluted air and water, inadequate mass transportation and health services, strained human relations, and overburdened municipal services.

Our great universities have the skills and knowledge to match these mountainous problems. They can offer expert guidance in community planning; research and development in pressing educational problems; economic and job market studies; continuing education of the community's professional and business leadership; and programs for the disadvantaged.

The role of the university must extend far beyond the ordinary extension-type operation. Its research findings and talents must be made available to the community. Faculty must be called upon for consulting activities. Pilot projects, seminars, conferences, TV programs, and task forces drawing on many departments of the university—all should be brought into play.

This is a demanding assignment for the universities, and many are not now ready for it. The time has come for us to help the university to face problems of the city as it once faced problems of the farm.

E. Special manpower needs

We must also ask the colleges and universities to help overcome certain acute deficiencies in trained manpower. At least 100,000 more professional librarians are needed for service in public libraries and in schools and colleges. We need 140,000 more teachers for handicapped children.

I recommend:

Grants to institutions of higher education for training of school, college, and community librarians and related services.

Extension and expansion of grants for training teachers and handicapped children.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, Senators will recall that in the beginning of the 88th Congress, the omnibus education act, S. 580, was sent to us by President Kennedy. I had the high privilege then of introducing the measure for myself and with me I had as cosponsors members of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and the leadership of the Senate. Much of the omnibus education bill subsequently became law, as I pointed out in a recent floor statement.

Certain parts, however, of title I of S. 580, notably the student loan guarantee program and the scholarship program, remain as yet unenacted, and a third part, the work-study program, became law only in a somewhat curtailed fashion as a component of the Economic Opportunity Act.

Hearings on each of these portions of the omnibus education bill of the 88th Congress were held in conjunction with other portions of that bill during 17 days of hearings. Later in the session, in connection with S. 2490, further hearings were held upon the problems facing our young college students who need financial assistance if they are to complete their college careers. Finally, in the 88th Congress, the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare reported out S. 3140 favorably. This measure resulted from committee consideration of the administration proposals as incorporated in title I of S. 580, the proposal of Senator HARTKE as contained in S. 2490, and the proposals of Senator WILLIAMS of New Jersey with respect to interest rate subsidies by the Federal Government.

The administration higher education act of this Congress, which I am introducing today, continues the work that we had begun last session through recommending for the consideration of the Congress at this time the best features of our past legislative proposals while adding additional higher education proposals, notably the so-called domestic Fulbright teacher exchange program, which was pioneered on the House side by my highly respected colleague from the Third Congressional District, Representative EDITH GREEN.

Mr. President, at this point in my remarks I ask unanimous consent that for quick reference by all Senators there be printed the text of the proposed act, together with explanatory fact sheets which have been developed by the Office of Education relevant to it.

There being no objection, the bill and fact sheets were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Higher Education Act of 1965".

TITLE I—UNIVERSITY EXTENSION AND CONTINUING EDUCATION APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

SEC. 101. For the purpose of assisting the people of the United States in the solution of community problems such as housing, poverty, government, recreation, employment, youth opportunities, transportation, health, and land use by enabling the Commissioner to make grants and contracts under this title to strengthen continuing education and extention methods and teaching, and the public service resources, of colleges and universities, there are authorized to be appropriated $25,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and such sums for each of the four succeeding fiscal years as may be necessary for such purpose.

Allotments to States

SEC. 102. (a)(1) From 80 percent of the sums appropriated pursuant to section 101 for each fiscal year, the Commissioner shall allot $25,000 each to Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands and $100,000 to each of the other States, and he shall allot to each State an amount which bears the same ratio to the remainder of such 80 percent of such sums as the population of the State bears to the population of all States.

(2) Twenty percent of the sums appropriated pursuant to section 101 shall be reserved by the Commissioner for grants and contracts for experimental projects and for supplemental grants pursuant to section 106.

(b) The amount of any State's allotment under subsection (a) for any fiscal year which the Commissioner determines will not be required for such fiscal year for carrying out the State plan (if any) approved under this title shall be available for reallotment from time to time, on such dates during such year as the Commissioner may fix, to other States in proportion to the original allotments to such States under such subsection for such year, but with such proportionate amount for any of such States being reduced to the extent it exceeds the sum the Commissioner estimates such State needs and will be able to use for such year for carrying out the State plan; and the total of such reductions shall be similarly reallotted among the States whose proportionate amounts were not so reduced. Any amount reallotted to a State under this subsection during a year from funds appropriated pursuant to section 101 shall be deemed part of its allotment under subsection (a) for such year.

(c) In accordance with regulations of the Commissioner, any State may file with him a request that a specified portion of its allotment under this title be added to the allotment of another State under this title for the purpose of meeting a portion of the Federal share of the cost of providing extension or continuing education services or activities under this title. If it is found by the Commissioner that the services or activities with respect to which the request is made would meet needs of the State making the request and that use of the specified portion of such State's allotment, as requested by it, would assist in carrying out the purposes of this title, such portion of such State's allotment shall be added to the allotment of the other State under this title to be used for the purpose referred to above.

(d) The population of a State and of all the States shall be determined by the Commissioner on the basis of the most recent satisfactory data available from the Department of Commerce.

Uses of Allotted Funds

SEC. 103. A State's allotment under section 102 may be used, in accordance with its State plan approved under section 104(b), to provide new, expanded, or improved extension and continuing education activities and services designed to assist, particularly through new and advanced approaches, in the solution of community problems through activities and services such as—

(1) professional retraining and refresher programs for persons in professions such as architecture, engineering, law, medicine, pharmacy, science, social work, and teaching;

(2) training and consultative services to local, State, and Federal governments:

(3) training in leadership and in program planning for nonprofit voluntary associations and civic groups;

(4) special educational programs for adults with a view to increasing their opportunities for more productive employment and making them better able to meet their adult responsibilities;

(5) training and educational services relating to aging;

(6) training services related to labor education, management education, and employment opportunities;

(7) special educational programs for culturally disadvantaged adults;

(8) educational programs for women preparing to enter or reenter the labor market; and

(9) other training, demonstration, and public service programs.

State Plans

SEC. 104. (a) Any State desiring to receive its allotment of Federal funds under this title shall designate or create a State agency or institution which has special qualifications with respect to solving community problems and which is broadly representative of institutions of higher education in the States which are competent to offer extension or continuing education activities and services, and shall submit to the Commissioner through the agency or institution so designated a State plan. If a State desires to designate for the purposes of this section an existing State agency or institution which does not meet these requirements, it may do so if the aegncy or institution takes such action as may be necessary to acquire such qualifications and assure participation of such institutions, or if it designates or creates a State advisory council which meets the requirements not met by the designated agency or institution to consult with the designated agency or institution in the preparation of the State plan. A State plan submitted under this title shall be in such detail as the Commissioner deems necessary and shall—

(1) provide that the agency or institution so designated or created shall be the sole agency for administration of the plan or for supervision of the administration of the plan; and provide that such agency or institution shall consult with any State advisory council required to be created by this section with respect to policy matters arising in the administration of such plan;

(2) set forth a comprehensive, coordinated, and State-wide program of extension and continuing education activities and services under which funds paid to the State (including funds paid to an institution pursuant to section 105(c)) under its allotment under section 102 will be expended solely for activities and services which meet the requirements of section 103 and which have been approved by the agency or institution administering the plan;

(3) set forth the policies and procedures to be followed in allocating Federal funds to institutions of higher education in the State, which policies and procedures shall insure that due consideration will be given—

(A) to the relative capacity and willingness of particular institutions of higher education (whether public or private) to provide effective extension or continuing education activities and services designed to assist communities in solving community problems;

(B) to the availability of and need for extension and continuing education activities and services among the population within the State; and

(C) to the results of periodic evaluations of the activities and services carried out under this title in the light of information regarding current and anticipated community problems in the State;

(4) set forth policies and procedures designed to assure that Federal funds made available under this title will be so used as not to supplant State or local funds, or funds of institutions of higher education, but supplement them, and, to the extent practicable, increase the amounts of such funds that would in the absence of such Federal funds be made available for activities and services which meet the requirements of section 103;

(5) set forth such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of and accounting for Federal funds paid to the State (including such funds paid by the State or by the Commissioner to institutions of higher education) under this title; and

(6) provide for making such reports in such form and containing such information as the Commissioner may reasonably require to carry out his functions under this title, and for keeping such records and for affording such access thereto as the Commissioner may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports.

(b) The Commissioner shall approve any State plan and any modification thereof which complies with the provisions of subsection (a).

Payments

SEC. 105. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b), payment under this title shall be made to those State agencies and institutions which administer plans approved under section 104(b). Payments under this title from a State's allotment with respect to the cost of developing and carrying out its State plan shall equal 90 per centum of such costs for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, 75 per centum of such costs for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and 50 per centum of such costs for each of the three succeeding fiscal years, except that no payments for any fiscal year shall be made to any State with respect to expenditures for developing and administering the State plan which exceed 5 per centum of the costs for that year for which payment under this subsection may be made to that State.

(b) No payments shall be made to any State from its allotments for any fiscal year unless and until the Commissioner finds that there will be available for expenditure for university extension and continuing education programs from non-Federal sources during such fiscal year not less than the total amount actually expended for university extension and continuing education programs from such sources during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, plus an amount equal to not less than the non-Federal share of the costs with respect to which payment pursuant to subsection (a) is sought. In determining the cost for any fiscal year of carrying out a university extension and continuing education program set forth in a State plan approved under section 104(b), and the amounts available for expenditure, or expended, therefor from State or other non-Federal sources, there shall be excluded any amounts the Commissioner determines have been or will be realized during that year by participating institutions from fees or other charges to persons benefiting from that program.

(c) Payments to a State under this title may be made in installments and in advance or by way of reimbursement with necessary adjustments on account of overpayments or underpayments, and they may be paid directly to the State or to one or more participating institutions of higher education designated for this purpose by the State, or to both.

Experimental Approaches and Supplemental Grant

SEC. 106. Twenty per centum of the sums appropriated pursuant to section 101 for each fiscal year shall be used by the Commissioner to make grants to or contracts with institutions of higher education to pay part of the cost of experimental approaches to extension and continuing education related to the solution of community problems, or, as may be determined by the Commissioner, for such augmentation of grants awarded under this title from allotted funds as may be desirable to advance the purposes of this title.

Administration of State Plans

SEC. 107. (a) The Commissioner shall not finally disapprove any State plan submitted under this title, or any modfication thereof, without first affording the State agency or institution submitting the plan reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing.

(b) Whenever the Commissioner, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State agency or institution administering a State plan approved under section 104(b), finds that—

(1) the State plan has been so changed that it no longer complies with the provisions of section 104(a), or

(2) in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any such provision,

the Commissioner shall notify the State agency or institution that the State will not be regarded as eligible to participate in the program under this title until he is satisfied that there is no longer any such failure to comply.

Judicial Review

Sec. 108. (a) If any State is dissatisfied with the Commissioner's final action with respect to the approval of its State plan submitted under section 104(a) or with his final action under section 107(b), such State may, within 60 days after notice of such action, file with the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which the State is located a petition for review of that action. A copy of the petition shall be forthwith transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Commissioner. The Commissioner thereupon shall file in the court the record of the proceedings on which he based his action, as provided in section 2112 of title 28, United States Code.

(b) The findings of fact by the Commissioner, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive; but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Commissioner to take further evidence, and the Commissioner may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action, and shall certify to the court the record of the further proceedings. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive if supported by substantial evidence.

(c) The court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Commissioner or to set it aside, in whole or in part. The judgment of the court shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in section 1254 of title 28, United States Code.

National Advisory Committee on Extension and Continuing Education

Sec. 109. (a) The Commissioner shall establish in the Office of Education a National Advisory Committee on Extension and Continuing Education (hereinafter referred to as the "Advisory Committee"), consisting of the Commissioner, who shall be chairman, one representative each of the Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, Defense, Labor, Interior, and State, of the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the Office of Economic Opportunity, and of such other Federal agencies having extension education responsibilities as the Commissioner may designate, and six members appointed, for staggered terms and without regard to the civil service laws, by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Such six members shall, to the extent possible, include persons knowledgeable in the field of extension and continuing education, State and local officials and other persons having special knowledge, experience, or qualification with respect to community problems, and persons representative of the general public. The Advisory Committee shall meet at the call of the chairman but not less often than twice a year.

(b) The Advisory Committee shall advise the Commissioner in the preparation of general regulations and with respect to policy matters arising in the administration of this title, including policies and procedures governing the approval of State plans under section 104(b) and the approval of projects and activities under section 106.

(c) Members of the Advisory Committee who are not regular full-time employees of the United States shall, while serving on the business of the Advisory Committee, be entitled to receive compensation at rates fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $100 per day, including travel time; and, while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business, members may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b-2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

Review of Extension and Continuing Education Programs and of the Provisions of This Title

Sec. 110. (a) The Secretary shall, during 1968, appoint a Review Council on Extension and Continuing Education (hereinafter referred to as the "Council") for the purpose of reviewing the administration of the extension and continuing education programs for which funds are appropriated pursuant to this title and making recommendations for the improvement of that administration, and for purpose of reviewing the effectiveness of and making recommendations with respect to these extension and continuing education programs and with respect to this title.

(b) The Council shall be appointed by the Secretary without regard to the civil service laws and shall consist of twelve persons who shall, to the extent possible, include persons knowledgeable in the field of extension and continuing education, State and local officials having special knowledge, experience, or qualification with respect to community problems, and persons representative of the general public.

(c) The Secretary is authorized to engage such technical assistance as may be required to carry out the functions of the Council and the Secretary shall, in addition, make available to the Council such secretarial, clerical, and other assistance and such pertinent data prepared by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare as it may require to carry out its functions.

(d) The Council shall make a report of its findings and recommendations (including recommendations for changes in the provisions of this title) to the Secretary, such report to be submitted not later than March 31, 1969, after which date such Council shall cease to exist. The Secretary shall transmit such report to the President for transmittal to the Congress together with his comments and recommendations.

(e) Members of the Council who are not regular full-time employees of the United States shall, while serving on business of the Council, be entitled to receive compensation at rates fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $100 per day, including travel time; and while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business, members may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b-2) for persons in Government service employed intermittently.

Relationship to Other Extension Programs

Sec. 111. Nothing in this title shall modify authorities under the Act of February 23, 1917 (Smith-Hughes Vocational Education Act), as amended (20 U.S.C. 11-15, 16-28); the Vocational Education Act of 1946, as amended (20 U.S.C. 15i-15m, 15o-15q, 15aa-15jj, and 15aaa-15ggg); the Vocational Education Act of 1963 (20 U.S.C. 35-35n); title VIII of the Housing Act of 1964 (Public Law 88-560; or the Act of May 8, 1914 (Smith-Lever Act), as amended (7 U.S.C. 341-348).

TITLE II—COLLEGE LIBRARY ASSISTANCE AND LIBRARY TRAINING AND RESEARCH

Part A—College library resources

Appropriations Authorized

Sec. 201. There are authorized to be appropriated $50,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and such sums for each of the four succeeding fiscal years as may be necessary, to enable the Commissioner to make grants under this part to institutions of higher education to assist and encourage such institutions in the acquisition for library purposes of books, periodicals, documents, magnetic tapes, phonograph records, audiovisual materials, and other related library materials (including necessary binding).

Basic Grants

Sec. 202. From 75 per centum of the sums appropriated pursuant to section 201 for any fiscal year, the Commissioner is authorized to make basic grants for the purposes set forth in that section to institutions of higher education and combinations of such institutions. The amount of a basic grant shall not exceed $5,000 for each such institution, and a basic grant under this subsection may be made only if the application therefor is approved by the Commissioner upon his determination that the application (whether by an individual institution or a combination of institutions)—

(a) provides satisfactory assurance that the applicant will expend during the fiscal year for which the grant is requested (from funds other than funds received under this part) for all library purposes (exclusive of construction) (1) an amount not less than the average annual amount it expended for such purposes during the two-year period ending June 30, 1965, and (2) an amount (from such other sources) equal to not less than the amount of such grant;

(b) provides satisfactory assurance that the applicant will expend during the fiscal year for which the grant is requested (from funds other than funds received under this title) for books, periodicals, documents, magnetic tapes, phonograph records, audiovisual materials, and other related materials (including necessary binding) for library purposes an amount not less than the average annual amount it expended for such materials during the two-year period ending June 30, 1965;

(c) provides for such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of and accounting for Federal funds paid to the applicant under this section; and

(d) provides for making such reports, in such form and containing such information, as the Commissioner may require to carry out his functions under this section, and for keeping such records and for affording such access thereto as the Commissioner may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports.

Supplemental Grants

Sec. 203. (a) From the remainder of such 75 per centum of the sums appropriated pursuant to section 201 for any fiscal year, the Commissioner is authorized to make supplemental grants for the purposes set forth in that section to institutions of higher education and combinations of such institutions. The amount of a supplemental grant shall not exceed $10 for each full-time student (including the full-time equivalent of the number of part-time students), as determined by the Commissioner in accordance with regulations, enrolled in each such institution. A supplemental grant may be made only upon application therefor, in such form and containing such information as the Commissioner may require, which application shall—

(1) meet the application requirements set forth in section 202 except for the matching requirement set forth in paragraph (a)(2) of that section;

(2) describe the size and quality of the library resources of the applicant in relation to its present enrollment and any expected increase in its enrollment;

(3) set forth any special circumstances which are impeding or will impede the proper development of its library resources; and

(4) provide a general description of how a supplemental grant would be used to improve the size or quality of its library resources.

(b) The Commissioner shall approve applications for supplemental grants on the basis of basic criteria prescribed in regulations and developed after consultation with the Council created under section 205. Such basic criteria shall be such as will best tend to achieve the objectives of this part and they may take into consideration factors such as the size and age of the library collection, student enrollment, and endowment and other financial resources.

Special Purpose Grants

Sec. 204. Twenty-five percent of the sums appropriated pursuant to section 201 for each fiscal year, plus any part of the remainder of such sums as the Commissioner determines will not be needed for making grants under sections 202 and 203, shall be used by the Commissioner to make special grants (a) to institutions of higher education which demonstrate a special need for additional library resources and which demonstrate that such additional library resources will make a substantial contribution to the quality of their educational resources, (b) to institutions of higher education to meet special national or regional needs in the library and information sciences, including those in the bio-medical, physical, and social science fields, and (c) to combinations of institutions of higher education which need special assistance in establishing joint-use facilities. Grants under this section may be used only for books, periodicals, documents, magnetic tapes, phonograph records, audiovisual materials, and other related library materials (including necessary binding).

Advisory Council on College Library Resources

Sec. 205. (a) The Commissioner shall establish in the Office of Education an Advisory Council on College Library Resources consisting of the Commissioner, who shall be chairman, and eight members appointed, without regard to the civil service laws, by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary.

(b) The Advisory Council shall advise the Commissioner with respect to establishing criteria for the making of supplemental grants under section 203 and the making of special purpose grants under section 204. The Commissioner may appoint such special advisory and technical experts and consultants as may be useful in carrying out the functions of the Advisory Council.

(c) Members of the Advisory Council, while serving on business of the Advisory Council, shall receive compensation at a rate to be fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $100 per day, including travel time; and, while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

Accreditation Requirement for Purposes of This Part

Sec. 206. For the purposes of this part, an educational institution shall be deemed to have been accredited by a nationally recognized accrediting agency or association if the Commissioner determines that there is satisfactory assurance that upon acquisition of the library resources with respect to which assistance under this part is sought, or upon acquisition of those resources and other library resources planned to be acquired within a reasonable time, the institution will meet the accreditation standards of such agency or association.

Limitation

Sec. 207. No grant may be made under this part for books, periodicals, documents, or other related materials to be used for sectarian instruction or religious worship, or primarily in connection with any part of the program of a school or department of divinity. For purposes of this section, the term "school or department of divinity" means an institution or a department or branch of an institution whose program is specifically for the education of students to prepare them to become ministers of religion or to enter upon some other religious vocation, or to prepare them to teach theological subjects.

Part B—Library training and research

Appropriations Authorized

Sec. 221. There are authorized to be appropriated $15,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and such sums as may be necessary for each of the four succeeding fiscal years, for the purpose of carrying out this part.

Definition of "Librarianship"

Sec. 222. For the purposes of this part the term "librarianship" means the principles and practices of the library and information sciences, including the acquisition, organization, storage, retrieval, and dissemination of information, and reference and research use of library and other information resources.

Grants for Training in Librarianship

Sec. 223. (a) The Commissioner is authorized to make grants to institutions of higher education to assist them in training persons in librarianship, including the training of specialists in the communication of information in the biomedical, physical, and social sciences. Such grants may be used by such institutions to assist in covering the cost of courses of training or study for such persons, and for establishing and maintaining fellowships or traineeships with stipends (including allowances for traveling, subsistence and other expenses) for fellows and others undergoing training and their dependents not in excess of such maximum amounts as may be prescribed by the Commissioner.

(b) The Commissioner may make a grant to an institution of higher education only upon application by the institution and only upon his finding (1) that such grant funds will be expended for a new or enlarged program of the institution for training persons in librarianship, and (2) that such new or enlarged program will substantially further the objective of increasing the opportunities throughout the Nation for providing such training.

Research and Demonstrations Relating to Libraries and the Training of Library Personnel

Sec. 224. (a) The Commissioner is authorized to make grants to institutions of higher education and other public or private agencies, institutions, and organizations and to individuals, for research and demonstration projects relating to the improvement of libraries or the improvement of training in librarianship, including the development of new techniques, systems, and equipment for processing, storing, and distributing information, and for the dissemination of information derived from such research and demonstrations, and, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U.S.C. 5), to provide by contracts with them for the conduct of such activities; except that no such grant may be made to a private agency, organization, or institution other than a nonprofit one.

(b) The Commissioner is authorized to appoint such special or technical advisory committees as he may deem necessary to advise him on matters of general policy concerning research and demonstration projects relating to the improvement of libraries and the improvement of training in librarianship, or concerning special services necessary thereto or special problems involved therein.

(c) The Commissioner shall also from time to time appoint panels of experts competent to evaluate various types of research and demonstration projects under this section, and shall obtain the advice and recommendations of such a panel before making each grant under this section.

(d) Members of any committee or panel appointed under this section who are not regular full-time employees of the United States shall, while serving on the business of such a committee or panel, be entitled to receive compensation at rates fixed by the Commissioner, but not in excess of $100 per diem, including travel time; and they may, while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business, be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

Repealer

Sec. 225. Effective July 1, 1965, section 1101 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by adding the word "or" at the end of clause (2), by striking out clause (3), and by renumbering clause (4) as clause (3).

TITLE III—STRENGTHENING DEVELOPING INSTITUTIONS

Statement of Purpose, and Appropriations Authorized

Sec. 301. (a) The purpose of this title is to assist in raising the academic quality of colleges which have the desire and potential to make a substantial contribution to the higher education resources of our Nation but which for financial and other reasons are struggling for survival and are isolated from the main currents of academic life, and to do so by enabling the Commissioner to establish a national teaching fellow program and to encourage and assist in the establishment of cooperative arrangements under which these colleges may draw on the talent and experience of our finest colleges and universities, and on the educational resources of business and industry, in their effort to improve their academic quality.

(b) There are authorized to be appropriated $30,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and such sums as may be necessary for each of the four succeeding fiscal years, to carry out the provisions of this title.

Definition of "Developing Institution"

Sec. 302. As used in this title the term "developing institution" means a public or nonprofit educational institution in any State which—

(a) admits as regular students only persons having a certificate of graduation from a school providing secondary education, or the recognized equivalent of such a certificate;

(b) is legally authorized to provide, and provides within the State, an educational program for which it awards a bachelor's degree;

(c) is planning to award or has awarded a bachelor's degree in the academic year for which it seeks assistance under this title and in each of the five academic years before that year;

(d) is accredited by a nationally recognized accrediting agency or association determined by the Commissioner to be reliable authority as to the quality of training offered or is, according to such an agency or association, making reasonable progress toward accreditation;

(e) is making a reasonable effort to improve the quality of its teaching and administrative staffs and of its student services;

(f) is seriously handicapped in its efforts to improve such staffs and services by lack of financial resources and a shortage of qualified professional personnel, and

(g) meets such other requirements as the Commissioner may prescribe by regulation; and

(h) is not an institution, or department or branch of an institution, whose program is specifically for the education of students to prepare them to become ministers of religion or to enter upon some other religious vocation or to prepare them to teach theological subjects.

Advisory Council on Developing Institutions

SEC. 303. (a) The Commissioner shall establish in the Office of Education an Advisory Council on Developing Institutions (hereinafter in this title referred to as the "Council"), consisting of the Commissioner, who shall be Chairman, one representative each of such Federal agencies having responsibilities with respect to developing institutions as the Commissioner may designate, and eight members appointed, without regard to the civil service laws, by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary.

(b) The Council shall advise the Commissioner with respect to policy matters arising in the administration of this title and in particular shall assist the Commissioner in identifying those developing institutions through which the purposes of this title can best be achieved and in establishing priorities for use in approving applications under this title. The Commissioner may appoint such special advisory and technical experts and consultants as may be useful in carrying out the functions of the Council.

(c) Members of the Council who are not otherwise full-time employees of the United States shall, while serving on business of the Council, receive compensation at a rate to be fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $100 per day, including travel time; and, while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business, members may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b-2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

Grants for Cooperative Agreements To Strengthen Development Institutions

SEC. 304. (a) The Commissioner is authorized to make grants to developing institutions and other colleges and universities to pay part of the cost of planning, developing, and carrying out cooperative arrangements which show promise as effective measures for strengthening the academic programs of developing institutions. Such cooperative arrangements may be between developing institutions, between developing institutions and other colleges and universities, and between developing institutions and organizations, agencies, and business entities. Grants under this section may be used for projects and activities such as—

(1) exchange of faculty or students, including arrangements for bringing visiting scholars to developing institutions;

(2) faculty improvement programs utilizing training, education, internships, research participation, and other means;

(3) introduction of new curriculums and curricular materials;

(4) development and operation of cooperative education programs involving alternate periods of academic study and business or public employment;

(5) joint use of facilities such as libraries or laboratories, including necessary books, materials, and equipment; and

(6) other arrangements which offer promise of strengthening the academic programs of developing institutions.

(b) A grant may be made under this section only upon application to the Commissioner at such time or times and containing such information as he deems necessary. The Commissioner shall not approve an application unless it—

(1) sets forth a program for carrying out one or more projects or activities which meet the requirements of subsection (a) and provides for such methods of administration as are necessary for the proper and efficient operation of the program;

(2) sets forth policies and procedures which assure that Federal funds made available under this section for any fiscal year will be so used as to supplement and, to the extent practical, increase the level of funds that would, in the absence of such Federal funds, be made available for purposes which meet the requirements of subsection (a), and in no case supplant such funds;

(3) provides for such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of and accounting for Federal funds paid to the applicant under this section; and

(4) provides for making such reports, in such form and containing such information, as the Commissioner may require to carry out his functions under this title, and for keeping such records and for affording such access thereto as the Commissioner may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports.

(c) The Commissioner shall, after consultation with the Council, establish criteria as to eligible expenditures for which grants made under this section may be used, which criteria shall be so designed as to prevent the use of such grants for expenditures not necessary to the achievement of the purposes of this part.

National Teaching Fellowships

SEC. 305. (a) The Commissioner is authorized to award fellowships under this section to highly qualified graduate students and junior members of the faculty of colleges and universities, to encourage such individuals to teach at a developing institution. The Commissioner shall award fellowships to individuals for teaching at developing institutions only upon application by an institution approved for this purpose by the Commissioner and only upon a finding by the Commissioner that the program of teaching set forth in the application is reasonable in the light of the qualifications of the teaching fellow and of the educational needs of the applicant.

(b) Fellowships may be awarded under this section for such period of teaching as the Commissioner may determine, but such period shall not exceed two academic years or extend beyond June 30, 1970. Each person awarded a fellowship under the provisions of this section shall receive a stipend for each academic year of teaching of not more than $6,500 as determined by the Commissioner upon the advice of the Council, plus an additional amount of $400 for each such year on account of his dependents.

TITLE IV—STUDENT ASSISTANCE

Part A—Undergraduate scholarships

Statement of Purpose, and Appropriations Authorized

SEC. 401. (a) It is the purpose of this part to provide, through institutions that are participating in the higher-education work-study program and student loan program, scholarships to assist in making available the benefits of higher education to qualified high-school graduates from low-income families, who for lack of financial means of their own or of their families would be unable to obtain such benefits without such aid. It is further the purpose of the Congress to encourage such institutions to use such work-study and loan programs and any other means of student aid available to them to combine with or supplement scholarship aid under this part, as may be appropriate in any case.

(b) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated $70,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and such sums as may be necessary for each of the four succeeding fiscal years, to enable the Commissioner to make payments to institutions of higher education that have agreements with him entered into under section 407, for use by such institutions (1) for payments to undergraduate students for the initial academic year of scholarships awarded to them under this part and (2) for defraying (within the limits specified in section 407(b)) eligible costs of administration, by such institutions, of the cooperative motivational program for high-school students described in section 407(a)(5). There are further authorized to be appropriated, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and each of the six succeeding fiscal years, such sums as may be necessary for payment to such institutions for use by them for making scholarship payments under this part to undergraduate students for academic years other than the initial year of their scholarship. Sums appropriated pursuant to this subsection for any fiscal year shall be available for payment to institutions until the close of the fiscal year succeeding the fiscal year for which they were appropriated. For the purposes of this subsection, payment for the first year of a scholarship shall not be considered as an initial-year payment if the scholarship was awarded for the continuing education of a student who had been previously awarded a scholarship under this part (whether by anohter institution or otherwise) and had received payment for any year of that scholarship.

Amount of Scholarship—Annual Determination

SEC. 402. From the funds received by it for such purpose under this part, an institution of higher education which awards a scholarship to a student under this part shall for the duration of the scholarship, pay to that student for each academic year during which he is in need of scholarship aid to pursue a course of study at the institution, an amount determined by the institution for such student with respect to that year, which amount shall not exceed $800 or, if less, the amount deemed by the institution to be required by such student to pursue the educational program involved at the institution; except that if the amount of the payment so determined for that year is less than $200 no payment shall be made under this part to that student for that year. The Commissioner shall, subject to the foregoing limitations, prescribe for the guidance of participating institutions basic criteria or schedules (or both) for the determination of the amount of any such scholarship, taking into account the objective of limiting scholarship aid under this part to students from low-income families and such other factors, including the number of dependents in the family, as the Commissioner may deem relevant.

Duration of Scholarships

SEC. 403. The duration of a scholarship awarded under this part shall be the period required for completion by the recipient of his undergraduate course of study at the institution of higher education from which he received the scholarship award, except that such period shall not exceed four academic years less any such period with respect to which the recipient has previously received payments under this part pursuant to a prior scholarship award (whether made by the same or another institution). A scholarship awarded under this part shall entitle the recipient to payments only if he (1) is maintaining satisfactory progress in the course of study which he is pursuing, according to the regularly prescribed standards and practices of the institution from which he received the award, and (2) is devoting essentially full time to that course of study, during the academic year, in attendance at that institution. Failure to be in attendance at the institution during vacation periods or periods of military service, or during other periods during which the Commissioner determines in accordance with regulations that there is good cause for his nonattendance (during which periods he shall receive no payments), shall not be deemed contrary to clause (2).

Selection of Recipients of Scholarships

SEC. 404. (a) An individual shall be eligible for a scholarship award under this part at any institution of higher education which has made an agreement with the Commissioner pursuant to section 407 (which institution is hereinafter in this part referred to as an "eligible institution"), if the individual (1) has not attained the age of 21 and will not attain that age prior to the beginning of the fiscal year for which he is applying for the award, (2) is from a low-income family (as determined in accordance with the criteria or schedules prescribed pursuant to section 402), and (3) makes application at the time and in the manner prescribed by that institution.

(b) From among those eligible for scholarship awards from an institution of higher education for each fiscal year, the institution shall, in accordance with the provisions of its agreement with the Commissioner under section 407 and within the amount allocated to the institution for that purpose for that year under section 406, select individuals who are to be awarded such scholarships and determine, pursuant to section 402, the amounts to be paid to them. An institution shall not award a scholarship to an individual unless it determines that—

(1) he is in need of the scholarship to pursue a course of study at such institution;

(2) he is capable, in the opinion of the institution, of maintaining good standing in such course of study; and

(3) he has been accepted for enrollment as a full-time student at such institution or, in the case of a student already attending such institution, is in good standing and in full-time attendance there as an undergraduate student.

Apportionment of Scholarship Funds Among States

SEC. 405. (a)(1) From the sums appropriated pursuant to the first sentence of section 401(b) for any fiscal year, the Commissioner shall apportion an amount equal to not more than 2 percent of such sums among Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands according to their respective needs for assistance under this part. The remainder of the sums so appropriated shall be apportioned among the States as provided in paragraph (2).

(2) Of the sums being apportioned under this subsection—

(A) one-third shall be apportioned by the Commissioner among the States so that the apportionment to each State under this clause will be an amount which bears the same ratio to such one-third as the number of persons enrolled on a full-time basis in institutions of higher education in such State bears to the total number of persons enrolled on a full-time basis in institutions of higher education in all the States,

(B) one-third shall be apportioned by the Commissioner among the States so that the apportionment to each State under this clause will be an amount which bears the same ratio to such one-third as the number of secondary school graduates of such State bears to the total number of such secondary school graduates of all the States, and

(C) one-third shall be allotted by him among the States so that the apportionment to each State under this clause will be an amount which bears the same ratio to such one-third as the number of related children under eighteen years of age living in families with annual incomes of less than $3,000 in such State bears to the number of related children under eighteen years of age living in families with annual incomes of less than $3,000 in all the States.

(3) For purposes of paragraphs (1) and (2) of this subsection—

(A) the term "State" does not include Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands,

(B) the term "secondary school graduate" mans a person who has received formal recognition (by diploma, certificate, or similar means) from an approved school for successful completion of four years of education beyond the first eight years of schoolwork, and

(C) the number of persons enrolled on a full-time basis in institutions of higher education and the number of secondary school graduates shall each be determined by the Commissioner on the basis of the most recent satisfactory data available from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the number of related children under eighteen years of age living in families with annual incomes of less than $3,000 shall be determind by the Commissioner on the basis of the most recent satisfactory data available from the Department of Commerce.

(4) If the total of the sums determined by the Commissioner to be required under section 406 for any fiscal year for eligible institutions in a State is less than the amount of the apportionment to that State under paragraphs (1) or (2) for that year, the Commissioner may reapportion the remaining amount from time to time, on such data or dates as he may fix, to other States in such manner as he determines will best assist in achieving the purposes of this part.

(b) Sums appropriated pursuant to the second sentence of section 401 for any fiscal year shall be apportioned or reapportioned among the States in such manner as the Commissioner determines to be necessary to carry out the purposes for which such sums are appropriated.

Allocation of Appropriated Funds to Institutions

SEC. 406. (a)(1) The Commissioner shall from time to time set dates by which eligible institutions in any State must file applications for allocation, to such institutions, of student scholarship funds from the apportionment to that State (and of any reapportionment thereto) for any fiscal year pursuant to section 405(a), to be used for the purposes specified in the first sentence of section 401(b). Such allocations shall be made in accordance with equitable criteria which the Commissioner shall establish and which shall be designed to achieve such distribution of such funds among eligible institutions within a State as will most effectively carry out the purposes of this part.

(2) The Commissioner shall further, in accordance with regulations, allot to eligible institutions, in any State, from funds apportioned or reapportioned pursuant to section 405(b), funds to be used for the scholarship payments specified in the second sentence of section 401(b).

(b) Payments shall be made from allotments under this section to institutions as needed.

Agreements With Institutions—Conditions

SEC. 407. (a) An institution of higher education which has in effect an agreement for Federal capital contributions for a student loan fund under title II of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 and an agreement for assistance in the operation of a work-study program under part C of title I of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (including any agreement under such part C as amended by part C of this title), and which desires to obtain funds for scholarships under this part, shall enter into an agreement with the Commissioner. Such agreement shall—

(1) provide that funds received by the institution under this part will be used by it only for the purposes specified in, and in accordance with, the provisions of this part;

(2) provide that in determining whether an individual is an eligible student from a low-income family the institution will (A) consider the source of such individual's income and that of any individual or individuals upon whom the student relies primarily for support, and (B) make an appropriate review of the assets of the student and of such individuals;

(3) provide that in the selection of students to receive scholarships under this part preference shall be given to (A) students who are beginning their first year of undergraduate study and (B) students who are transferring from an institution of higher education which customarily offers only a two-year program of study to an institution which offers four or more years of higher education;

(4) provide that the institution will combine in an appropriate manner financial assistance in the form of loans under title II of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, work-study opportunities under part C of title I of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (as amended by part C of this title), and scholarships under this part, in an effort to meet the financial needs of students from low-income families;

(5) provide that the institution, in cooperation with other institutions of higher education where appropriate, will make vigorous efforts to identify qualified youths from low-income families and to encourage them to continue their education beyond secondary school through programs and activities such as—

(A) establishing or strengthening close working relationships with secondary-school principals and guidance and counseling personnel with a view toward motivating students to complete secondary school and pursue postsecondary school educational opportunities, and

(B) making, to the extent feasible, tentative commitments for scholarships to qualified students enrolled in grade 11 and lower grades or to secondary school dropouts who have a demonstrated aptitude for college study;

(6) provide assurance that the institution will continue to spend in its own scholarship and student-aid program, from sources other than funds received under this part, not less than the average expenditure per year made for that purpose during the most recent period of three fiscal years preceding the effective date of the agreement;

(7) include provisions designed to make scholarships under this part reasonably available (to the extent of available funds) to all eligible students in the institution in need thereof; and

(8) include such other provisions as may be necessary to protect the financial interest of the United States and promote the purposes of this part.

(b) An institution may spend up to 5 per centum of the funds paid to it for any fiscal year ending prior to July 1, 1970, for the administration of the program described in paragraph (5) of subsection (a).

Contracts To Encourage Full Utilization of Educational Talent

SEC. 408. To assist in achieving the purposes of this title the Commissioner is authorized (without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U.S.C. 5)), to enter into contracts, not to exceed $100,000 per year, with State and local educational agencies and other public or nonprofit organizations and institutions for the purpose of—

(a) indentifying qualified youths from low-income families and encouraging them to complete secondary school and undertake postsecondary educational training,

(b) publicizing existing forms of student financial aid, including aid furnished under this part, and

(c) encouraging secondary school dropouts of demonstrated aptitude to reenter educational programs, including postsecondary school programs.

(b) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this section.

Definition of "Academic Year"

SEC. 409. As used in this part, the term "academic year" means an academic year or its equivalent as defined in regulations of the Commissioner.

Part B—Insurance of reduced-interest loans to students in institutions of higher education and postsecondary schools

Appropriations Authorized

SEC. 421. For the purpose of enabling the Commissioner to insure eligible lenders (as defined in section 431), on behalf of the United States, against losses on loans made by them upon the conditions and within the limits specified in this part to students in eligible instituions (as defined in section 431) who do not have reasonable access to substantially similar loan insurance programs, and to pay a portion of the interest on loans insured under this part or under a program of a State or a nonprofit institution or organization which has an agreement with the Commissioner pursuant to section 426—

(a) there are authorized to be appropriated to the Student Loan Insurance Fund (established by section 429) (1) the sum of $1,000,000, and (2) such further sums, if any, as may become necessary for the adequacy to the Student Loan Insurance Fund, and

(b) there are authorized to be appropriated, for payments under section 426 with respect to interest on insured loans, such sums for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and such sums for succeeding fiscal years, as may be required therefor.

Such sums appropriated under this section shall remain available until expended.

Scope and Duration of Reduced-Interest Loan Insurance Program

SEC. 422. (a) The total principal amount of new loans to students covered by insurance under this part shall not exceed $700,000,000 in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, $1,000,000,000 in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and $1,400,000,000 in the fiscal year ending June 3, 1968, and each of the two succeeding fiscal years. Thereafter, insurance pursuant to this part may be granted only for loans made (or for loan installments paid pursuant to lines of credit as defined in section 431) to enable students, who have obtained prior loans insured under this part, to continue or complete their educational program; but no insurance may be granted for any loan made or installment paid after June 3, 1974.

(b) The Commissioner may, if he finds it necessary to do so in order to assure an equitable distribution of the benefits of this part, assign, within the maximum amounts specified in subsection (a), insurance quotas applicable to eligible lenders, or to States or areas, and may from time to time reassign unused portions of these quotas.

(c) If the Commissioner determines in accordance with regulations that students, or one or more classes of students, in a State or other area have reasonable access to another public or a private program of loan insurance which is at least substantially as beneficial to such students as is the program of loan insurance set forth in this part, he shall not, for so long as he determines such condition to continue, issue certificates of insurance to lenders under section 427 covering loans to such students or classes of students.

Limitations on Individual Loans and on Insurance

SEC. 423. (a) No loan or loans by one or more eligible leaders in excess of $1,500 in the aggregate to any student in any academic year or its equivalent shall be covered by insurance under this part. The aggregate insured unpaid principal amount of all such insured loans made to any student shall not at any time exceed $9,000 in the case of any graduate or professional student (as defined in regulations of the Commissioner, and including any such insured loans made to such person before he became a graduate or professional student), or $6,000 in the case of any other student. The annual insurable limit per student shall not be deemed to be exceeded by a line of credit (as defined in section 431) under which actual payments by the lender to the borrower will not be made in any year in excess of the annual limit.

(b) The insurance liability on any loan insured under this part shall be 100 percent of the unpaid balance of the principal amount of the loan. Such insurance liability shall not include liability for interest whether or not that interest has been added to the principal amount of the loan.

Sources of Funds

SEC. 424. Loans made by eligible lenders in accordance with this part shall be insurable whether made from funds fully owned by the lender or from funds held by the lender in a trust or similar capacity and available for such loans.

Eligibility of Student Borrowers and Terms of Student Loans

SEC. 425. (a) A loan by an eligible lender shall be insurable under the provisions of this part only if—

(1) made to student who (A) has been accepted for enrollment at an eligible institution or, in the case of a student already attending such institution, is in good standing there as determined by the institution, and (B) is carrying at least one-half of the normal full-time workload as determined by the institution, and (C) has provided the lender with a statement of the institution which sets forth a schedule of the tuition and fees applicable to that student and its estimate of the cost of board and room for such a student; and

(2) evidenced by a note or other written agreement which—

(A) is made without security and without endorsement, except that if the borrower is a minor and such note or other written agreement executed by him would not, under the applicable law, create a binding obligation, endorsement may be required,

(B) provides for repayment (except as provided in subsection (b)) of the principal amount of the loan in installments during a period of not less than five years (unless sooner repaid) nor more than ten years beginning (i) not earlier than one year following the date on which the student ceases to carry at an eligible institution at least one-half the normal full-time academic workload as determined by the institution, or (ii) if sooner, and if agreed upon between the borrower and the lender, not earlier than one year following the date on which the student completes or ceases to pursue the study program in which he was enrolled or had been accepted for enrollment, except that (iii) the period of the loan may not exceed fifteen years, and (iv) the note or other written instrument may contain such provisions relating to repayment in the event of default in the payment of interest or in payment of the cost of insurance premiums, or other default by the borrower, as may be authorized by regulations of the Commissioner in effect at the time the loan is made,

(C) provides for interest on the unpaid balance of the loan at a yearly rate, not exceeding the applicable maximum rate as prescribed and defined by the Secretary on a national, regional, or other appropriate basis, which interest shall be payable in installments over the period of the loan except that, if provided in the note or other written agreement, payment of interest may be deferred until not later than the date upon which repayment of the first installment of principal falls due, in which case interest that has accrued during such period may be added on that date to the principal (but without thereby increasing the insurance liability under this part),

(D) provides that the lender will not collect or attempt to collect from the borrower that portion of the interest on the note which is payable by the Commissioner under this part,

(E) entitles the student borrower to accelerate without penalty repayment of the whole or any part of the loan, and

(F) contains such other terms and conditions, consistent with the provisions of this part and with the regulations issued by the Commissioner pursuant to this part, as may be agreed upon by the parties to such loan, including, if agreed upon, a provision requiring the borrower to pay to the lender, in addition to principal and interest, amounts equal to the insurance premiums payable by the lender to the Commissioner with respect to such loan.

(b) The total of the payments by any borrower during any year of any repayment period with respect to the aggregate amount of all loans to that borrower which are insured under this part and held by any person shall not be less than $500 or the total of the amount payable during that year with respect to such loans, whichever amount is less.

Federal Payments To Reduce Student Interest Costs

SEC. 426. (a) (1) Each student who has received a loan which is insured under this part, and each student who has received a loan which—

(A) is insured under a State program, or under a program of a nonprofit institution or organization, covered by an agreement made pursuant to subsection (b),

(B) is insured under that program to the extent of at least 90 per centum of the unpaid balance of the loan, and

(C) was contracted for after the effective date of that agreement and was paid to the student either (i) prior to July 1, 1970, or (ii) prior to July 1, 1974, in the case of a loan made (or a loan installment paid pursuant to a line of credit) to enable a student who has obtained a prior loan insured under such program to continue or complete his educational program,

shall be entitled to have paid on his behalf and for his account to the holder of the loan, over the period of the loan, a portion of the interest on the loan. Such portion shall be determined pursuant to regulations of the Secretary in effect at the time the loan is paid, and shall not equal more than 2 per centum of the unpaid principal (excluding interest which has been added to principal) of the loan. The holder of that loan shall be deemed to have a contractural right, as against the United States, to receive this portion of interest from the Commissioner. The Commissioner shall pay this portion of the interest to the holder of the insured loan on behalf of and for the account of the borrower at such times as may be specified in regulations in force when the applicable agreement entered into pursuant to subsection (b) was made.

(2) Each holder of such an insured loan shall submit to the Commissioner, at such time or times and in such manner as he may prescribe, statements containing such information as may be required by or pursuant to regulation for the purpose of enabling the Commissioner to determine the amount of the payment which he must make with respect to that loan.

(b) Any State which has a program under which loans to students in eligible institutions are insured by the State, or by a State agency or instrumentality wholly owned by the State, and any nonprofit institution or organization which insures loans to students in eligible institutions, may enter into an agreement with the Commissioner for the purpose of entitling students who receive loans which are so insured to have made on their behalf the payments set forth in paragraph (1) of subsection (a). Such an agreement shall—

(A) provide that a loan to a student will be insured under the State program or by the nonprofit institution or organization, as the case may be, only if the loan meets the requirements of section 423(a) and paragraphs (1), (2)(A), (2)(D), and (2)(E) of section 425(a).

(B) provide that the holder of any such loan will be required to submit to the Commissioner, at such time or times and in such manner as he may prescribe, statements containing such information as may be required by or pursuant to regulation for the purpose of enabling the Commissioner to determine the amount of the payment which he must make with respect to that loan;

(C) include such other provisions as may be necessary to protect the financial interest of the United States and promote the purposes of this part and as are agreed to by the Commissioner and the State; and

(D) provide for making such reports in such form and containing such information as the Commissioner may reasonably require to carry out his function under this part, and for keeping such records and for affording such access thereto as the Commissioner may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports.

Certificates of Insurance—Effective Date of Insurance

SEC. 427. (a) (1) If, upon application by an eligible lender, made upon such form, containing such information, and supported by such evidence as the Commissioner may require, and otherwise in conformity with this section, the Commissioner finds that the applicant has made a loan to an eligible student which is insurable under the provisions of this part, he may issue to the applicant a certificate of insurance covering the loan and setting forth the amount and terms of the insurance.

(2) Insurance evidenced by a certificate of insurance pursuant to subsection (a)(1) shall become effective upon the date of issuance of the certificate, except that the Commissioner is authorized, in accordance with regulations, to issue commitments with respect to proposed loans, or with respect to lines (or proposed lines) of credit, submitted by eligible lenders, and in that event, upon compliance with subsection (a)(1) by the lender, the certificate of insurance may be issued effective as of the date when any loan, or any payment by the lender pursuant to a line of credit, to be covered by such insurance was made. Such insurance shall cease to be effective upon thirty days' default by the lender in the payment of any installment of the premiums payable pursuant to subsection (c).

(3) An application submitted pursuant to subsection (a)(1) shall contain (1) an agreement by the applicant to pay, in accordance with regulations, the premiums fixed by the Commissioner pursuant to subsection (c), and (2) an agreement by the applicant that if the loan is covered by insurance the applicant will submit such supplementary reports and statements during the effective period of the loan agreement, upon such forms, at such times, and containing such information as the Commissioner may prescribe by or pursuant to regulation.

(b) (1) In lieu of requiring a separate insurance application and issuing a separate certificate of insurance for each student loan made by an eligible lender as provided in subsection (a), the Commissioner may, in accordance with regulations consistent with section 422, issue to any eligible lender applying therefor a certificate of comprehensive insurance coverage which shall, without further action by the Commissioner, insure all insurable loans made by that lender, on or after the date of the certificate and before a specified cutoff date, within the limits of an aggregate maximum amount stated in the certificate. Such regulations may provide for conditioning such insurance, with respect to any loan, upon compliance by the lender with such requirements (to be stated or incorporated by reference in the certificate) as in the Commissioner's judgment will best achieve the purpose of this subsection while protecting the financial interest of the United States and promoting the objectives of this part, including (but not limited to) provisions as to the reporting of such loans and information relevant thereto to the Commissioner and as to the payment of initial and other premiums and the effect of default therein, and including provision for confirmation by the Commissioner from time to time (through endorsement of the certificate) of the coverage of specific new loans by such certificate, which confirmation shall be incontestable by the Commissioner in the absence of fraud or misrepresentation of fact or patent error.

(2) If the holder of a certificate of comprehensive insurance issued under this subsection grants to a student a line of credit extending beyond the cutoff date specified in that certificate, loans or payments thereon made by the holder after that date pursuant to the line of credit shall not be deemed to be included in the coverage of that certificate except as may be specifically provided therein; but, subject to the limitations of section 422, the Commissioner may, in accordance with regulations, make commitments to insure such future loans or payments, and such commitments may be honored either as provided in subsection (a) or by inclusion of such insurance in comprehensive coverage under this subsection for the period or periods in which such future loans or payments are made.

(c) The Commissioner shall, pursuant to regulations, charge for insurance on each loan under this part a premium in an amount not to exceed one-fourth of 1 percent per year of the unpaid balance of principal and accrued interest of such loan, payable in advance, at such time and in such manner as may be prescribed by the Commissioner. Such regulations may provide that such premium shall not be payable, or if paid shall be refundable, with respect to any period after default in the payment of principal or interest or after the borrower has died or becomes totally and permanently disabled, if (1) notice of such default or other event has been duly given, and (2) request for payment of the loss insured against has been made or the Commissioner has made such payment on his own motion pursuant to section 428 (a).

(d) The rights of an eligible lender arising under insurance evidenced by a certificate of insurance issued to it under this section may be assigned as security by such lender only to another eligible lender, and subject to regulation by the Commissioner.

(e) The consolidation of the obligations of two or more insured loans obtained by a student borrower in any fiscal year into a single obligation evidenced by a single instrument of indebtedness shall not affect the insurance by the United States. If the loans thus consolidated are covered by separate certificates of insurance issued under subsection (a), the Commissioner may upon surrender of the original certificates issue a new certificate of insurance in accordance with that subsection upon the consolidated obligation; if they are covered by a single comprehensive certificate issued under subsection (b), the Commissioner may amend that certificate accordingly.

Procedure on Default, Death, or Disability of Student

SEC. 428. (a) Upon default by the student borrower on any loan covered by insurance pursuant to this title, or upon the death of the student borrower or a finding by the insurance beneficiary that the borrower has become totally and permanently disabled (as determined in accordance with regulations established by the Commissioner) before the loan has been repaid in full, and prior to the commencement of suit or other enforcement proceeding upon any security for that loan, the insurance beneficiary shall promptly notify the Commissioner, and the Commissioner shall if requested (at that time or after further collection efforts) by the beneficiary, or may on his own motion, if the insurance is still in effect, pay to the beneficiary the amount of the loss sustained by the insured upon that loan as soon as that amount has been determined. The "amount of the loss" on any loan shall, for the purposes of this subsection, be deemed to be an amount equal to the unpaid balance of the principal amount of the loan, excluding interest whether or not that interest has been added to the principal amount of the loan, except that where the Commissioner has decided to make payment on his own motion the amount of the loss as so determined shall be deemed tentative and shall be increased by the excess, if any, over the tentative amount of any net recovery made by the Commissioner on the loan after deduction of the cost of that recovery (including reasonable administrative cost).

(b) Upon payment by the Commissioner of the insured portion of the loss, or tentative amount of loss, pursuant to subsection (a), the United States shall be subrogated to the rights of the holder of the obligation upon the insured loan and be entitled to an assignment of the note or other evidence of the insured loan by the insurance beneficiary.

(c) Nothing in this section or in this part shall be construed to preclude any forbearance for the benefit of the student borrower which may be agreed upon by the parties to the insured loan and approved by the Commissioner, or to preclude forbearance by the Commissioner in the enforcement of the insured obligation after payment on that insurance, or to require collection of the amount of any loan by the insurance beneficiary or by the Commissioner from the estate of a deceased borrower or from a borrower found by the insurance beneficiary to have become permanently and totally disabled.

(d) Nothing in this section or in this part shall be construed to excuse the holder of a loan from exercising reasonable care and diligence in the making and collection of loans under the provisions of this part. If the Commissioner, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to an eligible lender, finds that it has substantially failed to exercise such care and diligence or to make the reports and statements required under section 426(a)(2) and section 427(a)(3), or to pay the required insurance premiums, he shall disqualify that lender for further insurance on loans granted pursuant to this part until he is satisfied that its failure has ceased and finds that there is reasonable assurance that the lender will in the future exercise necessary care and diligence or comply with such requirements, as the case may be.

(e) As used in this section—

(1) the term "insurance beneficiary" means the insured or its authorized assignee in accordance with section 427 (d); and

(2) the term "default" includes only such defaults as have existed for (A) one hundred and twenty days in the case of a loan which is repayable in monthly installments, or (B) one hundred and eighty days in the case of a loan which is repayable in less frequent installments.

Insurance Fund

SEC. 429. (a) There is hereby established a Student Loan Insurance Fund (hereafter in this section called the "Fund") which shall be available without fiscal year limitation to the Commissioner for making payments in connection with the default of loans insured under this part. All amounts received by the Commissioner as premium charges for insurance and as receipts, earnings, or proceeds derived from any claim or other assets acquired by the Commissioner in connection with his operations under this part, and any other moneys, property, or assets derived by the Commissioner from his operations in connection with this section, shall be deposited in the Fund. All payments in connection with the default of loans insured under this part shall be paid from the Fund. Moneys in the Fund not needed for current operations under this section may be invested in bonds or other obligations guaranteed as to principal and interest by the United States.

(b) If at any time the moneys in the Fund are insufficient to make payments in connection with the default of any loan insured under this part, the Commissioner is authorized to issue to the Secretary of the Treasury notes or other obligations in such forms and denominations, bearing such maturities, and subject to such terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. Such notes or other obligations shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average market yield on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States of comparable maturities during the month preceding the issuance of the notes or other obligations. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to purchase any notes and other obligations issued hereunder and for that purpose he is authorized to use as a public debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under that Act, as amended, are extended to include any purchases of such notes and obligations. The Secretary of the Treasury may at any time sell any of the notes or other obligations acquired by him under this subsection. All redemptions, purchases, and sales by the Secretary of the Treasury of such notes or other obligations shall be treated as public debt transactions of the United States. Sums borrowed under this subsection shall be deposited in the Fund and redemption of such notes and obligations shall be made by the Commissioner from such Fund.

Legal Powers and Responsibilities

SEC. 430. (a) In the performance of, and with respect to, the functions, powers, and duties vested in him by this part, the Commissioner may—

(1) prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this part.

(2) sue and be sued in any court of record of a State having general jurisdiction or in any district court of the United States, and such district courts shall have jurisdiction of civil actions arising under this part without regard to the amount in controversy, and any action instituted under this subsection by or against the Commissioner shall survive notwithstanding any change in the person occupying the office of Commissioner or any vacancy in that office; but no attachment, injunction, garnishment, or other similar process, mesne or final, shall be issued against the Commissioner or property under his control, and nothing herein shall be construed to except litigation arising out of activities under this part from the application of sections 507(b) and 2679 of title 28 of the United States Code and of section 367 of the Revised Statutes (5 U.S.C. 316);

(3) include in any contract for insurance such terms, conditions, and covenants relating to repayment of principal and payment of interest, relating to his obligations and rights and to those of eligible lenders, and borrowers in case of default, and relating to such other matters as the Commissioner determines to be necessary to assure that the purposes of this part will be achieved; and any term, condition, and covenant made pursuant to this clause or any other provisions of this part may be modified by the Commissioner if he determines that modification is necessary to protect the financial interest of the United States;

(4) subject to the specific limitations in this part, consent to the modification, with respect to rate of interest, time of payment of any installment of principal and interest or any portion thereof, or any other provision, of any note or other instrument evidencing a loan which has been insured under this part;

(5) enforce, pay, or compromise, any claim on, or arising because of, any such insurance; and

(6) enforce, pay, compromise, waive, or release any right, title, claim, lien, or demand, however acquired, including any equity or any right of redemption.

(b) The Commissioner shall, with respect to the financial operations arising by reason of this part—

(1) prepare annually and submit a budget program as provided for wholly owned Government corporations by the Government Corporation Control Act;

(2) maintain with respect to insurance under this part an integral set of accounts, which shall be audited annually by the General Accounting Office in accordance with principles and procedures applicable to commercial corporate transactions, as provided by section 105 of the Government Corporation Control Act, except that the transactions of the Commissioner, including the settlement of insurance claims and of claims for payments pursuant to section 226, and transactions related thereto and vouchers approved by the Commissioner in connection with such transactions, shall be final and conclusive upon all accounting and other officers of the Government.

Definitions for Reduced-Interest Student Loan Insurance Program

SEC. 431. As used in this part—

(a) The term "eligible institution" means either—

(1) an institution of higher education; or

(2) a business or trade school, or technical institution or other technical or vocational school, in any State, which (A) admits as regular students only persons who have completed or left secondary school, (B) is legally authorized to provide, and provides within that State, a program of postsecondary vocational or technical education designed to fit individuals for useful employment in recognized occupations, and (C) is accredited by a nationally recognized accrediting agency or association listed by the Commissioner pursuant to this clause: *Provided, however*, That if the Commissioner determines that there is no nationally recognized accrediting agency or association qualified to accredit schools of a particular category, he shall appoint an advisory committee, composed of persons specially qualified to evaluate training provided by schools of that category, which shall prescribe the standards of content, scope, and quality which must be met by those schools in order for loans to students attending them to be insurable under this part and shall also determine whether particular schools meet those standards. For the purpose of paragraph (2) the Commissioner shall publish a list of nationally recognized accrediting agencies or associations which he determines to be reliable authority as to the quality of education or training offered.

(b) The term "eligible lender" means an eligible institution, or a financial or credit institution (including an insurance company) which is subject to examination and supervision by an agency of the United States or of any State.

(c) The term "line of credit" means an arrangement or agreement between the lender and the borrower whereby a loan is paid out by the lender to the borrower in annual installments, or whereby the lender agrees to make, in addition to the initial loan, additional loans in subsequent years.

Part C—College work-study program extension and amendments

Transfer of Authority and Other Amendments

SEC. 441. Effective July 1, 1965, part C of title I of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (Public Law 88–452) is amended as follows:

(1) By striking out "Director" in the first sentence of section 122(a) and inserting in lieu thereof "Commissioner of Education (hereinafter in this part referred to as the 'Commissioner')", and by striking out "Director" wherever that word appears in the other provisions of such part C and inserting in lieu thereof "Commissioner";

(2) By amending that part of section 121 that follows the section designation to read as follows: "The purpose of this part is to stimulate and promote the part-time employment of students, particularly students from low-income families, in institutions of higher education who are in need of the earnings from such employment to pursue courses of study at such institutions.";

(3) By redesignating clauses (2), (3), and (4) of paragraph (c) of section 124 as clauses (1), (2), and (3), and by striking out so much of such paragraph as precedes such redesignated clauses and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "(c) provide that in the selection of students for employment under such work-study program preference shall be given to students from low-income families and that employment under such work-study program shall be furnished only to a student who";

(4) By striking out "June 30, 1966," in paragraph (f) of section 124 and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1967".

Appropriations Authorized

SEC. 442. There are authorized to be appropriated $129,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and such sums as may be necessary for each of the four succeeding years, to carry out the purposes of part C of title I of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (Public Law 88–452). Any sums which prior to the enactment of this Act, were appropriated for carrying out such part C of that title for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, or were allocated from an applicable appropriation for that purpose, and which have not been expended prior to the date of the enactment of this Act, shall be available to the Commissioner for carrying out such part C.

Conforming Amendment

SEC. 443. Part D of title I of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1965 (Public Law 88–442) is amended to read as follows:

"Part D—Authorization of appropriations

"SEC. 131. The Director shall carry out the programs provided for in parts A and B of this title during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and each of the two succeeding fiscal years, and he shall carry out the program provided for in part C of this title during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965. For this purpose there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $412,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965; and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, such sums may be appropriated as the Congress mav hereafter authorize by law."

Part D—Extension of national defense student loan program

Extension of Appropriation Authorization

SEC. 461. The first sentence of section 201 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended—

(1) by striking out "and" after "June 30, 1967," and inserting after "June 30, 1968," the following: "$225,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, $250,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 3, 1970, and $275,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971,"; and

(2) by striking out "and such sums for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and each of the next three fiscal years as may be necessary to enable students who have received loans for school years ending prior to July 1, 1968, to continue or complete their education" and inserting in lieu thereof "and such sums for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and each of the next three fiscal years as may be necessary to enable students who have received loans for school years ending prior to July 1, 1971, to continue or complete their education".

Conforming Amendments

SEC. 462.(a) Section 202 of such Act is amended by striking out "1968" wherever it occurs therein and inserting in lieu thereof "1971".

(b) Section 206 of such Act is amended by striking out "1972" wherever it occurs therein and inserting in lieu thereof "1975".

TITLE V—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Definitions

SEC. 501. As used in this Act—

(a) The term "institution of higher education" means an educational institution in any State which (1) admits as regular students only persons having a certificate of graduation from a school providing secondary education, or the recognized equivalent of such a certificate, (2) is legally authorized within such State to provide a program of education beyond secondary education, (3) provides an educational program for which it awards a bachelor's degree or provides not less than a two-year program which is acceptable for full credit toward such a degree, (4) is a public or other nonprofit institution, and (5) is accredited by a nationally recognized accrediting agency or association or, if not so accredited, is an institution whose credits are accepted, on transfer, by not less than three institutions which are so accredited, for credit on the same basis as if transferred from an institution so accredited. Such term also includes any business school or technical institution which meets the provisions of clauses (1), (2), (4), and (5). For purposes of this subsection, the Commissioner shall publish a list of nationally recognized accrediting agencies or associations which he determines to be reliable authority as to the quality of training offered.

(b) The term "State" includes, in addition to the several States of the Union, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands.

(c) The term "nonprofit" as applied to a school, agency, organization, or institution means a school, agency, organization, or institution owned and operated by one or more nonprofit corporations or associations no part of the net earnings of which inures, or may lawfully inure, to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual.

(d) The term "secondary school" means a school which provides secondary education as determined under State law except that it does not include any education provided beyond grade 12.

(e) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

(f) The term "Commissioner" means the Commissioner of Education.

Method of Payment

SEC. 502. Payments under this Act to any individual or to any State or Federal agency, institution of higher education, or any other organization, pursuant to a grant, loan, or contract, may be made in installments, and in advance or by way of reinbursement, and, in the case of grants or loans, with necessary adjustments on account of overpayments or underpayments.

Federal Administration

SEC. 503. (a) The Commissioner is authorized to delegate any of his functions under this Act, except the making of regulations, to any officer or employee of the Office of Education.

(b) In administering the titles of this Act for which he is responsible, the Commissioner is authorized to utilize the services and facilities of any agency of the Federal Government and of any other public or nonprofit agency or institution, in accordance with agreements between the Secretary and the head thereof.

Federal Control of Education Prohibited

SEC. 504. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the curriculum, program of instruction, administration, or personnel of any educational institution, or over the selection of library resources by any educational institution.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, OFFICE OF EDUCATION,
Washington, D.C., January 19, 1965.

Higher Education Act of 1965

[In millions of dollars]

	Authorization for fiscal 1966
Title I: University Extension and Continuing Education	25
Title II: College Library Assistance and Library Training and Research	65
Title III: Strengthening Developing Institutions	30
Title IV: Student Assistance:	
A. Undergraduate Scholarships	70
B. Insured, Reduced-Interest Loans	15
C. College Work-Study Program Extension and Amendments	[1]45
D. Extension of National Defense Student Loan Program	(2)
Total	250

[1] In addition to $84 million contained in budget request for the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (Public Law 88–452).

[2] No additional cost.

Estimated Federal payments under the Higher Education Act of 1965

State	Total estimated Federal payments	University extension and continuing education	Scholarships	College work-study programs
United States and outlying areas	$219,000,000	$20,000,000	$70,000,000	$129,000 000
50 States and District of Columbia	214,646,115	19,626,115	68,600.000	126.420,000
Alabama	5,033,521	360,004	1,643,951	3,029,566
Alaska	269,685	118,869	53,051	97,765
Arizona	1,976,867	216,755	619,135	1,140,977
Arkansas	3,137,404	246,483	1,016,907	1.874,014
California	17,555,551	1,450,697	5,665.025	10,439.829
Colorado	2,321,636	247,716	729,520	1,344,400
Connecticut	2,397,545	309,097	734,630	1.353,818
Delaware	540,358	136,967	141,896	261.495
Florida	5,702,179	525,972	1,820,776	3,355,431
Georgia	5,681,445	424,774	1,849,080	3,407,591
Hawaii	828,825	152,756	237.813	438,256
Idaho	922,441	152.910	270,690	498,841
Illinois	9,786,575	899,574	3,126,080	5,760,921
Indiana	5,143,069	468,057	1,644,476	3,030.536
Iowa	3,682,710	312,178	1,185,614	2,184,918
Kansas	2,886.872	270,743	920,246	1.695,883
Kentucky	4,406,573	340,750	1,430,189	2,635,634
Louisiana	5,174,073	363,008	1,692,334	3,118,731
Maine	1,131,676	175,937	336,189	619,550
Maryland	3,218,435	358,156	1,006,128	1,854,151
Massachusetts	5,658,360	507,874	1,811,729	3,338,757
Michigan	8,361,732	718,511	2,688,570	4,954,651
Minnesota	4,451,308	368,938	1,436,010	2,646,360
Mississippi	4,299,709	276,057	1,415,355	2,608,297
Missouri	5,304,563	437,636	1,711,985	3,154,942
Montana	938,454	153,988	275,943	508,523
Nebraska	1,934,464	213,059	605,519	1,115,886
50 States and District of Columbia—Continued				
Nevada	$349,499	$129,959	$77,226	$142,314
New Hampshire	747,404	149,598	210,284	387,522
New Jersey	4,918,123	604,759	1,517,264	2,796,100
New Mexico	1,346,436	175,937	411,733	758,766
New York	15,713,873	1,462,865	5,012,917	9,238,091
North Carolina	7,378,367	468,673	2,430,546	4,479,148
North Dakota	1,105,428	149,675	336,194	619,559
Ohio	9,686,866	870,155	3,101,355	5,715,356
Oklahoma	3,392,171	287,995	1,091,921	2,012,255
Oregon	2,201,872	242,633	689,180	1,270,059
Pennsylvania	11,309,619	979,901	3,633,569	6,696,149
Rhode Island	984,852	168,698	287,089	529,065
South Carolina	3,993,122	292,847	1,301,604	2,398,671
South Dakota	1,154,353	154,527	351,698	648,128
Tennessee	5,525,596	388,577	1,806,992	3,330,027
Texas	12,720,907	887,714	4,162,430	7,670,763
Utah	1,529,921	174,782	476,681	878,458
Vermont	639,289	131,191	178,728	329,370
Virginia	4,914,858	429,780	1,577,666	2,907,412
Washington	3,367,720	328,043	1,069,233	1,970,444
West Virginia	2,670,941	239,629	855,236	1,576,076
Wisconsin	4,613,333	413,145	1,477,453	2,722,735
Wyoming	475,340	126,108	122,845	226,387
District of Columbia	1,160,195	161,458	351,315	647,422
Outlying areas	4,353,885	373,885	1,400,000	2,580,000
American Samoa		26,625		
Guam		30,114		
Puerto Rico		289,458		
Virgin Islands		27,688		

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in conclusion I wish only to reiterate to the Senate the pledge that I gave with respect to the elementary and secondary school bill. It is, that as soon as our hearings on the elementary and secondary school bill, S. 370, are completed, I shall attempt to move with dispatch into hearings on the higher education bill.

Mr. President, I send to the desk for appropriate reference the measure to which I have referred, for myself, the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE].

I also ask unanimous consent that it may be held at the desk until the close of business Friday, January 29, 1965, so that such Senators as may wish to join us in sponsoring this proposed legislation may have an opportunity to add their names to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Oregon.

The bill (S. 600) to strengthen the educational resources of our colleges and universities and to provide financial assistance for students in postsecondary and higher education, introduced by Mr. MORSE (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] may be added as a cosponsor, as well as that of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am sure that the leadership of the Senate will be adding their names as cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, may I have an additional minute?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, majority leaders themselves have introduced administration bills. But, Senator MANSFIELD is one who believes in the committees taking leadership on these bills. He joins in the cosponsorship of the bills. He gives his unfailing interest.

I thank both the Senator from Indiana and the Senator from Montana.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I thank the senior Senator from Oregon. He has done yeoman work in the field of education. Without his valuable and undying assistance in that field, we would have accomplished much less in the way of providing education for our younger people of today. Unless we provide a better education for them today than we have in the past, the future of America will suffer as well as the future of the young people.

Yesterday, Mr. President, the Washington Daily News published an editorial under the title "College Help for Whom?" The editorial pointed out that there are two approaches to the high cost of education which will be considered by the Congress in this session. One is that which is embodied in S. 5 and S. 600—the proposal for, in the editorial's words, help to students "through cash aid and Government-guaranteed private loans, with the taxpayers picking up part of the interest tab." The other is the tax-credit route. In judging between these two, the editorial made plain what I believe is the correct preference in these words:

> From the national standpoint, however, the choice seems clear. It is of more value to the country to invest tax funds in helping those who otherwise would never get beyond high school, than to ease the financial load for those who, through parental help, would go to college anyhow.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of this editorial may be printed at the close of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a second editorial, published in a recent issue of the Decatur Daily Democrat of Decatur, Ind., entitled "College Student Plan" be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Washington Daily News, Jan. 18, 1965]

COLLEGE HELP FOR WHOM?

Two approaches to the high cost of higher education are before the new Congress for consideration. Both seek to ease the heavy burden of putting a youngster through college. But they attack the problem in different ways and, in effect, are designed to aid different segments of the population.

One plan, proposed by President Johnson, is aimed primarily at helping students from poverty-stricken families, who otherwise could not go to college at all. It would do this through cash aid and Government-guaranteed private loans, with the taxpayers picking up part of the interest tab.

The other, proposed by several Members of Congress, is aimed at helping parents who can finance their children's higher education—but at considerable financial sacrifice to themselves. It would permit college expenses to be deducted by the parents for income tax purposes.

Either proposal would cost the taxpayers quite a bit—$260 million a year to start with for the President's plan and more than $1 billion annually for the tax deduction scheme. Assuming the goal is worthwhile, the question is: By which method would the national interest best be served?

This is admittedly a tough decision. It is easy to feel sympathy for the parent who finds his budget strained to the breaking point during his family's college years—especially if two or three are in school at the same time. On the other hand, many of our brightest youths are denied higher education simply because of lack of funds.

From the national standpoint, however, the choice seems clear. It is of more value to the country to invest tax funds in helping those who otherwise would never get beyond high school, than to ease the financial load for those who, through parental help, would go to college anyhow.

Parents may object that such an approach amounts to penalizing self-reliance while rewarding those who have been improvident. But it is certainly not the fault of a bright high school student if his parents are too poor or too ignorant to provide for further schooling. Nor does any special virtue rest with the indifferent pupil who happens to go to college just because his folks have the money to send him there.

The national interest is served by seeing that as many as possible of our brightest youngsters get a chance for all the education they can absorb. They will become our assets of the future. Painful as it may be to parents who already are footing the bills on their own, they should remember that that is what parents are for.

EXHIBIT 2

[From the Decatur (Ind.) Daily Democrat, Jan. 8, 1965]

COLLEGE STUDENT PLAN

(By Dick Heller)

Senator VANCE HARTKE today proposed a new broad-based program to help meet the Nation's education needs.

The three-point plan, designed to make college possible for every qualified student, implements the goals outlined by President Johnson in his state of the Union message.

The Hartke college student assistance bill, tagged with a high-priority number, S. 5, features a loan program similar to the FHA program, an expanded "work-study" program, and grants to undergraduate students. The plan advances the proposals made by Senator HARTKE last year, some of which are now law.

Here are the highlights of the Hartke plan:

1. Loan insurance program: This is a Federal insurance guarantee for loans arranged directly by the student with a lending institution. S. 5 calls for the insurance of loans up to a total of $700 million in fiscal 1966, with an increase of $100 million annually to a peak of $1 billion in the fourth year. These figures are for gross amounts of insured loans, not the cost to the Government. Two percent of the interest charges will be borne by the Government.

2. Work-study program: This plan, part of the original Hartke bill, introduced last year has been partially implemented as part of the new Office of Economic Opportunity. Senator HARTKE's new proposal would extend this concept by helping approximate 330,000 additional students a year at a cost of $250 million.

3. Student grants: These grants are intended to aid a student who has exhausted all other possibilities in financing his college education. Administered by the college or university, the grants would assist 100,000 students in the first year, with an additional 100,000 in each of the following years at a cost of $75 million per year, with a peak of $300 million in the fourth year of the program.

AID TO COLLEGE STUDENTS

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I am most happy to be a cosponsor of the administration bill for the improvement of higher education. It is a comprehensive effort to do two things—to improve the educational facilities, particularly the library facilities, and to strengthen the institutions for higher education; and to give much needed assistance to financially hard-pressed students to assure educational opportunity unhampered by financial problems so severe as to prevent attendance.

I am happy to know that the recommendations concerning student assistance so closely follow those which I have already presented in S. 5, with which 25 other Senators have now associated themselves as cosponsors. The proposal for scholarships in this bill is very close in amount to that of the Hartke bill—$70 million where I have proposed $75 million. The loan program starts with the same figures—the guarantee of $700 million, but whereas the sum increases to $1 billion in the program of S. 5, the administration would guarantee loans on an increasing scale to $1,400 million, a difference which is all to the good. Likewise, I am gratified that the administration bill so closely follows the work-study proposal of S. 5, which appeared last year also in S. 2490. Shifting the responsibility for this portion of the antipoverty program to the Office of Education, which will provide a single source of operations under both pieces of legislation, is a desirable change.

Much more might be said, and will be said in due time, for the virtues of the comprehensive higher education bill now before us. I have a concern for the entire program, and it is for that reason, together with the fact that I have concentrated much attention and effort on the higher education assistance features, that I am pleased to join in sponsoring this broader effort, which so well reinforces the program of S. 5.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield?

Mr. HARTKE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I wish the Senator from Indiana were an additional member of my Subcommittee on Education, for I desire to have the record show my sense of gratitude to him for the great help he has been to our committee during the past several years, as we have sought to carry out the pledges that we made when President Kennedy first offered S. 580. We said then that we would give the Senate an opportunity to vote on each section of the omnibus bill, S. 580. We have delivered on 20 of the 24 sections. The other four sections are included, in part, in the great educational message which President Johnson sent to Congress, to which I referred earlier today.

In particular, I commend the Senator from Indiana for his help in connection with the student loan program, for which he introduced a bill last year. As he knows, our committee held hearings. My subcommittee favors the principle of his bill. I am optimistic that with his continuing pledge, which he is making anew as a cosponsor of the higher education bill, we shall enact a loan program this year.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the distinguished majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD] be added to the list of sponsors of the higher education bill that I introduced earlier today. This is typical of the majority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

U.S.S. "UTAH"

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, almost everyone knows about the 1,102 American officers and men who lie entombed in the hulk of the U.S.S. *Arizona* at Pearl Harbor. Many tributes have been paid to them and their bravery under Japanese fire in the infamous attack of December 7, 1941. A grateful Nation has erected a handsome monument over the *Arizona* where the colors are flown every day.

But relatively few people realize that the same recognition has not been given to 54 other officers and men who also lost their lives in the Pearl Harbor attack, and who lie entombed in the U.S.S. *Utah* only a few miles away. Their resting place is identified only by a small plaque.

Mr. President, the dead of the U.S.S. *Utah* deserve recognition as do the dead of the U.S.S. *Arizona*. I am, therefore, today introducing for myself and Senators MUNDT, NEUBERGER, MAGNUSON, CHURCH, CURTIS, BURDICK, BYRD of Virginia, RANDOLPH, LAUSCHE, HART, GRUENING, TOWER, DOUGLAS, BENNETT, COOPER, ALLOTT, INOUYE, MORSE, BARTLETT, SMITH, SMATHERS, BIBLE, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, LONG of Missouri, MCCLELLAN, PELL, MCGOVERN, MCGEE, HILL, SIMPSON, YARBOROUGH, and DOMINICK, a bill directing the Secretary of the Navy to erect a flagpole over the hulk of the U.S.S. *Utah* on which the colors will be raised and lowered each day.

I introduced a similar bill in the 88th Congress, but no action was taken on it. I shall press for action this session in the hope that the flagpole can have been erected, and the colors raised for the first time, next December 7—on the 24th anniversary of the Pearl Harbor attack.

The impetus for this bill came from an article printed 2 years ago in the Navy Times by its able editor, Bill Kreh. This article stimulated a flood of letters from the American people, both to Bill Kreh and to me. At once I agreed to head the drive to give the men of the *Utah* the recognition they deserve.

The Department of the Navy insists that the flag which flies over the U.S.S. *Arizona* is for all of the Pearl Harbor dead. This implies that if our flag were flown also over the *Utah* it would detract from the flag and memorial over the *Arizona*. I do not agree. The *Utah* is on the opposite side of Ford Island out of view of the *Arizona*. It is a separate ship in a separate location. Moreover, there are separate flags flying over other Pearl Harbor dead who are buried in land cemeteries nearby—and the *Utah* is just as much a military cemetery as any plot of ground containing graves and the granite markers and flowers. Flying the flag over the *Utah*, and raising and lowering it each day, would give similar recognition to its men.

Almost every State, and certainly every area of the country, has one or more of its boys listed among the U.S.S. *Utah* dead. Of the 54 men whose bodies were not found or identified, 13 gave California as their home State; 11, Texas; 3 each Illinois, Iowa, Washington State, and New York; 2 each Colorado, Missouri, Virginia, and Massachusetts; 1 each Kentucky, Arkansas, Minnesota, Louisiana, Michigan, Oregon, Ohio, and Nebraska; and one who did not list his home. He was, however, born in Iowa. Another man was a native of the Philippine Islands. Many men showed next of kin in States other than their home at time of enlistment, so there is hardly a State which is not touched in some way by the ghostly hand of those entombed in the U.S.S. *Utah*. The roster of the men, as I received it from the Department of the Navy is as follows:

OFFICERS KILLED ON U.S.S. "UTAH," DECEMBER 7, 1941

Rudolph P. Bielka, lieutenant commander.

John E. Black, lieutenant, junior grade.

Herold A. Harveson, lieutenant, junior grade.

David W. Jackson, ensign.

John G. Little III, lieutenant, junior grade.

Charles O. Michael, lieutenant commander.

ENLISTED PERSONNEL KILLED ON U.S.S. "UTAH," DECEMBER 7, 1941

S2c. William D. Arbuckle.
F3c. Joseph Barta.
S1c. Virgil C. Bicham.
F1c. John T. Blackburn.
S2c. Pallas F. Brown.
F3c. William F. Brunner.
OC2. Feliciano T. Bugarin.
S2c. George Chestnutt, Jr.
S2c. Lloyd D. Clippard.
F1c. Joseph U. Conner.
F1c. John R. Crain.
S1c. David L. Crossett.
F2c. Billy R. Davis.
S2c. Leroy Dennis.
SM1. Douglas R. Dieckhoff.
S2c. William H. Dosser.
S1c. Vernon J. Eidsvig.
QM1c. Melvyn A. Gandre.
BM2c. Kenneth M. Gift.
S2c. Charles N. Gregoire.
S2c. Clifford D. Hill.
Bkr1c. Emery L. Houde.
S1c. Leroy H. Jones.
SC2c. William A. Juedas.
Y3c. John L. Kaelin.
GM3c. Eric T. Kampmeyer.
F1c. Joseph N. Karabon.
S1c William H. Kent.
GM3c. George W. La Rue.
S2c. Kenneth L. Lynch.
S2c. William E. Marshall, Jr.
EM3c. Rudolph M. Martinez.
S2c. Marvin E. Miller.
S2c. Donald C. Norman.
F2c. Orris N. Norman.
EM2c. Edwin N. Odgaard.
CSK (PA) Elmer A. Parker.
SC3c. Forrest H. Perry.
S1c. James W. Phillips.
MM1c. Walter H. Ponder.
SF3c. Frank E. Reed.
S1c. Ralph E. Scott.
F1c. Henson T. Shouse.
StM1c. George R. Smith.
S2c. Robert D. Smith.
S2c. Joseph B. Sousley.
F3c. Gerald V. Strinz.
CWT (PA) Peter Tomich.
F3c. Elmer H. Ulrich.
F3c. Michael W. Villa.
FC1c Vernard O. Wetrick.
F1c. Glenn Albert White.

Mr. President, I am not asking for an elaborate or costly memorial structure for the U.S.S. *Utah*. I am asking only for a simple standard from which our national emblem can be raised with each dawn and lowered with each sunset so that all who see it can remember and honor the brave men who lie under it. I ask only for the men of the U.S.S. *Utah* the same recognition which is willingly given to our other military dead wherever they may lie the world over.

This is a bill on which the Congress cannot afford to delay. This is a bill which I feel we must pass this session. I ask the support of my colleagues who are cosponsoring the measure in requesting early action on it.

Other Senators may wish to join as cosponsors. I request, therefore, that the bill lie on the desk for 1 week.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, will lie on the desk as requested.

The bill (S. 601) to provide for the flying of the American flag over the remains of the U.S.S. *Utah* in honor of the heroic men who were entombed in her hull on December 7, 1941, introduced by Mr. Moss (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF SMALL RECLAMATION PROJECTS ACT

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, for myself, and Senators ALLOTT, BENNETT, BIBLE, BURDICK, CHURCH, KUCHEL, MCGEE, and SIMPSON, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956.

The small water projects loan program has proved itself a most desirable supplement to the Federal Reclamation program. It has closed a gap in our water resource development. As of January 13, applications had been received and approved by the Secretary of the Interior and Congress for 29 separate projects, involving loans estimated at over $68 million, and 1 application for a loan of over $1.7 million is now pending before the Congress. Three applications totaling nearly $9.8 million have been approved by the Secretary of the Interior and will be submitted to the Congress in the near future, and 3 additional applications involving loans of over $6.7 million are under consideration by the Department. With favorable action on the pending applications, over $86.5 million of the original $100 million authorized for this program in 1956 will have been committed, leaving only about $13.5 million for future loans. However, 14 local agencies are actively working on loan applications involving over $30 million.

The idea of a small reclamation program was born in National Reclamation Association resolution in 1946. It took 10 years to translate that resolution into public law. There was doubt on the part of some Members of Congress that the plan was workable. It was finally given a chance because there was obviously a no man's land in our western reclamation development, and all were agreed that neither the western reclamation States, nor the Nation, can afford underdevelopment of any part of our water resources.

Irrigation by Anglo Saxons was introduced in America by the Mormon pioneers. That was over 115 years ago. Almost immediately after arrival in Utah, groups of Mormon pioneers joined together to build ditches and to construct small irrigation dams. As other Western States were settled and developed, small irrigation ditch groups and companies began to develop small irrigation projects, each of them monuments to private cooperative initiative.

Naturally the easy projects were developed first. Then the settlers began to work on those where the water was harder and more expensive to divert. The Reclamation Act of 1902 made possible the vast projects which have turned water onto millions of arid acres, and built community after community in the West. But left undeveloped were the smaller projects which fell outside the conventional reclamation program, and it gradually became evident that these smaller projects, like their larger counterparts, could not be developed without some Federal financial assistance. The Small Reclamation Projects Act has been the answer.

Enactment of this legislation has made it possible for local water users and small ditch companies to combine their efforts, talents, and investments with Bureau of Reclamation know-how and financing to broaden our water resource development. The program has been a success.

But experience has shown that improvements are needed to increase the scope and effectiveness of the program and to bring it more nearly in line with related water programs. I introduced a bill in the 88th Congress to amend the small water projects loan program, which a number of my colleagues joined as cosponsors, and it was favorably reported by the Senate Interior Committee and passed by the Senate. The bill I am introducing today contains the amendments agreed to by the Senate committee and passed by the Senate in the last Congress, together with some additional amendments. All are supported by the NRA.

The first amendment will increase the maximum amount of Federal funds that can be provided for such projects from an uncertain amount less than $5 million to $7,500,000. The present act requires the subtraction of a local contribution from the $5 million limitation in a manner that causes the maximum loan to vary with local conditions, which has resulted in some confusion and inequities. The amendment also increases the maximum loan to compensate for the increases in construction costs since the program was originally proposed. Other than these two changes, the remainder of the section is the same as before.

The second amendment redefines the amount of detail to be included in the report that is the application for a loan. The present act might be construed to require information that is unnecessary and incompatible with the scope and relative simplicity of these smaller projects. This does not contemplate an applicable change from the type of application now being required by the Secretary but is intended as reassurance to some organizations now fearful of the requirements that might be imposed.

The third amendment is a clarification. At present the requirement for a local contribution is related to the cost of construction. It has been found that differences of opinion exist as to what items are cost of construction and what might properly be other project development costs. Therefore, it is proposed to relate this to the total cost of the project.

The fourth amendment will amend subsection (d) of section 4 to permit the legislative committees of the Congress to reduce the 60-day waiting period for a specific project by resolution of both committees. At present, the full 60 days must run although the committees may be fully satisfied with the proposal. In several cases, this situation has delayed the projects by nearly a year. This amendment also permits the Secretary to make loans up to $250,000 immediately, for qualifying projects which he has approved, without prior approval by the House and Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committees. This would provide the Secretary with similar authority, although not so broad, as that given the Secretary of Agriculture in making the smaller loans under the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act.

The fifth amendment would adjust the wording of subsection (a) of section 5 to clarify the intent. As now worded, it might be construed as requiring an organization to accept a grant or to accept a lower loan because a grant might be unreasonable and incompatible with section 5(d) of the present act which provides authority for operation by the United States or for repayment of the grant in the event of noncompliance with regulations for the project operation to qualify for the grant.

The sixth amendment proposes to conform the treatment of recreation and fish and wildlife aspects of projects constructed under the Small Reclamation Projects Act with projects constructed under the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act. This amendment, proposed by the Department of Interior on behalf of the administration, instead of making all project cost properly allocable to fish and wildlife nonreimbursable as the present act permits, and all project costs properly allocable to public recreation nonreimbursable as in other reclamation projects, would provide that a maximum of only one-half of these costs would be nonreimbursable, in accordance with the practice now being followed under the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act.

The seventh amendment would change the interest formula to bring it into line with other related programs. This change is identical to that made a few years ago for the Colorado River storage project which originally had a formula similar to that of the existing Small Projects Act. The proposed formula is that of the Water Supply Act of 1958 which was adopted for the Colorado River storage project and has been used in other recent authorizations. This bill would make this change retroactive to loans already made under this program. In all cases, this would reduce the interest payments.

The bill proposes a new section 8 which would permit the Secretary to advance to the local organization, up to half of the funds required for planning its small project. Experience has shown that some organizations have been delayed and others have been unable to complete their applications because of a lack of funds while others have skimped on their planning to complete an analysis within a limited budget. To some extent, this has been a factor in the localization of activity on such projects. If financial assistance were available for planning it is probable that applications would have been received from more than half of the States. The amendment also contains a provision to allow repayment of other Federal agencies in the event that they had made planning funds available as loans. This will consolidate the obligations.

The new section 9 amends the present section 8 by naming the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act rather than reference to date and statute number. That act has been amended since the original Small Project Act was passed and might be in the future so that the general title reference is preferable.

Except for the section number, section 10 is the same as the old section 9. Section 11 amends the original section 10 to increase the limit on the authorization for this program. At present, appropriations are authorized up to $100 million. The proposed wording would, in effect, authorize appropriations up to $200 million of outstanding loans. If the limit were reached, loans could continue to be made at the rate at which past loans were repaid. The amendment also recognizes the fact that contracts or agreements will be required to carry out the provisions of section 8 to provide planning funds.

Sections 12 and 13 are unchanged from the original sections 11 and 12, except for the numbers.

The most significant changes are those which increase the limitation on Federal funds in the form of loans and grants for each project, the change in the interest formula, the authorization for financial assistance on planning, and the increase of the overall program authorization. The rest are minor changes to clarify the act or to remove operating difficulties.

Mr. President, full water resource development is the key to tomorrow. To serve the national interest properly we must use imagination, resourcefulness, and tenacity to develop every source of water available to us. There are numerous opportunities for the development of new small sources of irrigation water, and for the rehabilitation and betterment of existing irrigation projects through the Small Reclamation Projects Act. It offers us the type of cooperative local-Federal project which is most desirable. It has its roots in local initiative and local management, but it is made feasible through Federal technical and financial assistance.

I am hopeful that in this session the Senate will again take favorable action on this bill to expand and make more workable the Small Reclamation Projects Act, and that the House of Representatives will pass it likewise. We must move on with water development on every front.

I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the RECORD at this point a table showing the small reclamation projects program status as of January 1, 1965.

Mr. President, I also ask that my bill to amend the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956 may lie on the desk for 1 week for further cosponsorship.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received, appropriately referred, lie on the desk, as requested, and, without objection, the table will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 602) to amend the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956, introduced by Mr. Moss, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The table presented by Mr. Moss is as follows:

Small reclamation projects program status as of Jan. 1, 1965

Organization	Region	Loan
Construction completed:		
Bountiful Water Subconservancy District, Utah	4	$3,510,000
Centerville-Deuel Creek Irrigation Co., Utah	4	401.802
Georgetown Divide Public Utility District, California	2	3,877,670
Goleta County Water District, California	2	1,626.344
Haights Creek Irrigation Co., Utah	4	326.845
Klamath Basin Improvement District, Oregon	2	817,993
Pleasant Valley County Water District, California	2	2.040,000
San Benito County Water Conservation and Flood Control District, California	2	1,425.000
South Davis County Water Improvement District, Utah	4	570,933
South Sutter Water District, California	2	4,875,600
Weber-Box Elder Conservation District No. 1, Utah	4	302.458
Total completed	----------	19,774.645
Under construction:		
Banta-Carbona Irrigation District, California	2	964.000
Browns Valley Irrigation District, California	2	4,804,000
Cameron County Water Control and Improvement District No. 1, Texas	5	4,600,000
Donna Irrigation District, Texas	5	4,067,000
Eastern Municipal Water District, California	3	4,980,000
Georgetown Divide Public Utility District, California, supplemental	2	759,330
Hooper Irrigation Co., Utah	4	1,163,000
Jackson Valley Irrigation District, California	2	2,378,000
King Hill Irrigation District, Idaho	1	696,700
Molokai project, Hawaii	----------	4,514,000
Orchard City Irrigation District, Colorado	4	270,000
Roosevelt Irrigation District, Arizona	3	4,620,000
Santa Ynez River Water Conservation District, California	2	3,800,000
Settlement Canyon Irrigation Co., Utah	4	[1] 1,104,000
Walker River Irrigation District, Nevada	2	[2] 693,000
Weber-Box Elder Conservation District No. 2, Utah	4	811,000
Total under construction	----------	40,224,030
Applications approved and 60 days completed before Congress:		
Cassia Creek Reservoir Co., Idaho	1	[3] $2,498,000
St. John Irrigating Co., Idaho	4	[4] 853,000
Applications approved and sent to Congress:		
Byron-Bethany Irrigation District, California	2	1,756,700
Camarillo County Water District, California	2	4,800,000
Nevada Irrigation District, California	2	4,780,000
Total approved but not under contract	----------	14,687,700
Grand total applications approved	----------	74,686,375
Applications under consideration in Bureau and Department:		
Brown Canal Co., Arizona	3	200,000
Fallbrook Public Utility District, California	2	4,457,000
Kays Creek Irrigation Co., Utah	4	406,000
Teel Irrigation District, Oregon	1	1,885,000
Total applications under consideration	----------	6,948,000
Grand total applications received	----------	81,634,375
Applications under preparation: [5]		
Belridge Water Storage District, California	2	4,330,000
Colorado River Water Conservation District, Colorado	4	4,800,000
Huntsville-South Bench Canal Co., Utah	4	[6] 85,000
Malad Valley Irrigation Co., Idaho	4	1,190,000
Mitchell Irrigation District, Nebraska	7	1,240,000
Mosier Irrigation District, Oregon	1	800,000
North Extension Canal Co., Idaho	4	625,000
North Poudre Irrigation Co., Colorado	7	600,000
River Junction Reclamation District, California	2	480,000
Roosevelt Water Conservation District, Arizona	3	4,750,000
San Juan Ridge County Water District, California	2	970,640
Salmon River Canal Co., Idaho	1	775,000
Semitropic Water Storage District, California	2	4,800,000
Yolo County Flood Control and Water Conservation District	2	[6] 4,800,000
Total applications under preparation	----------	30,245,640
Grand total	----------	111,880,015

---

[1] Includes grant of $94,500.
[2] Includes grant of $130,000.
[3] Includes grant of $156,400.
[4] Includes grant of $122,000.
[5] May be incomplete listing; includes only those that have been submitted to Bureau for comment.
[6] Includes undetermined grant.

LET US RECTIFY AN INJUSTICE TO THE SUPREME COURT

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, last year, during the Senate's consideration of the Federal employees pay bill of 1964 (H.R. 11049), a motion was made to limit the increase of the Chief Justice of the United States to $38,000 instead of $43,000 as provided in the bill as reported, and to limit to $37,500 the increase of the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court instead of $42,500 as provided in the bill as reported.

The motion carried 46 to 40.

I voted in favor of the motion. At the time, and under the circumstances in which the motion and the bill were being debated, my vote seemed a reasonable and proper one. For it seemed to me that the tenor of the Senate debate and the amendments to the bill being proposed and adopted such as to downgrade the positions and prestige of Members of Congress while upgrading what should be the coordinate and equal other branches of the Federal Government—the judicial and the executive.

I recall how the distinguished majority and minority leaders both voiced their dissent at the way the Congress had downgraded itself in its provisions for its own salary arrangements in contrast with what it had done for the other branches of government. That view was shared by many of our senatorial colleagues. I suspect it affected their attitude on the action taken in regard to the salary increases for the Supreme Court.

It seemed to me at the time that the limitations proposed on the salaries of the Chief Justice and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court were, in the light of the other emoluments attaching to these offices, fair and equitable.

Upon reflection during the intervening months, I have come to the conclusion that my vote in favor of the motion was incorrect and that the adoption of the motion, even though partially corrected in conference, worked an injustice upon the Chief Justice and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court and that this injustice should be corrected.

Accordingly, I send to the desk a bill to amend the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1964 to provide compensation for the Chief Justice at the rate of $43,000 and for Associate Justices at the rate of $42,500. These amounts are the amounts recommended by both the Senate and House committees in reporting out the bill last year. I ask that the bill lie at the table for 10 days in order to give those who desire to do so an opportunity to join with me in sponsoring the bill.

The House of Representatives, on the basis of the report of its Committee on Post Office and Civil Service had previously approved an across-the-board salary increase of $7,500 for all Federal judges, including Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States. The Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service had likewise recommended a similar increase in the salary of a Supreme Court Justice. However, as a result of the adoption of the motion referred to, the Senate passed a bill setting the salary increase for a Justice of the Supreme Court at $2,500, an amount $5,000 below the salary increase unanimously recommended by the Senate committee. Subsequently, by way of compromise, the conferees appointed to reconcile differences between the Senate- and House-passed bills recommended a salary increase for Supreme Court Justices of $4,500.

This action by the Congress brought into imbalance the relationships heretofore recognized for high-echelon officers in the three branches of the Government. Traditionally, the salaries of Justices of the Supreme Court have equaled or exceeded salaries paid to both the Vice President and the Speaker of the House of Representatives. In 1874, when the salaries of the Vice President and Speaker of the House were set at $8,000, Justices of the Supreme Court were receiving $10,000 per annum. By 1925 the salaries of the Vice President and Speaker had increased to $15,000 per annum, but a year later in 1926 the salary of a Supreme Court Justice was fixed at $20,000 per annum. In 1946 the Vice President and Speaker of the House were receiving salaries, exclusive of any expense allowance, of $20,000 per annum and Supreme Court Justices were receiving salaries of $25,000 per annum. However, in 1949, independent of any increase in salaries for Members of Congress or for Federal judges, the basic salaries of the Vice President and Speaker of the House were increased to $30,000 per annum. The pattern of 25 years whereby Supreme Court Justices received $5,000 more in salary than either the Vice President or Speaker of the House, was thus reversed. However, this was again changed in 1955 when the basic salaries of the Vice President, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Supreme Court Justices were fixed equally at $35,000 per annum. The Chief Justice of the United States since the Judiciary Act of 1789 has traditionally received $500 more than the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court. This differential has always been maintained.

The Government Employees Salary Reform Act of 1964 increased the annual salary payable to the Vice President and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives to $43,000 per annum, exclusive of any expense allowance. This is the salary originally set out in the bill for the Chief Justice of the United States. Each Associate Justice was to receive $42,500 per annum. However, the salary of the Chief Justice of the United States, finally approved at $40,000 per annum, is $3,000 less than that of the Vice President and the Speaker of the House. The salaries of the Associate Justices, at $39,500 per annum, are $3,500 less.

With the exception of the salary of the Chief Executive, there appears to be no reason why the salaries of the highest officers in the three coordinate branches of the Government ought not to be comparable. The Commission on Judicial and Congressional Salaries, appointed pursuant to Public Law 220, 83d Congress, in its recommendation in 1954 for an appropriate salary to be paid to the Vice President of the United States reasoned as follows:

> Following historical precedents, the Commission determined that the Speaker of the House should receive a salary equal to that of the Vice President.
>
> The Commission also determined that the compensation of the Chief Justice of the United States, as head of the judicial branch of the Government, should be established (at an amount equal to the salary recommended for the Vice President).
>
> With the salaries of the three highest ranking officials in our governmental system, other than the President, thus determined, the Commission concluded that the historical relations and the differentials between the salaries of these highest officials and the others within the scope of the Commission's inquiry be retained.
>
> The salary of the first Chief Justice of the United States was fixed at $500 above the salary of the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court. This historical differential has been maintained throughout the history of our Government and the Commission finds its continuance desirable. Accordingly, the Commission finds that a salary ($500 less than the salary of the Chief Justice) would be appropriate for the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States.

The report of the Randall Commission in 1963 also recommended that the salaries of the Chief Justice of the United States, the Vice President, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives be fixed at the same level.

The action taken by the Congress in 1964 in refusing to grant salary increases to Supreme Court Justices comparable to those authorized for other officials in the Government, is inconsistent with all these recommendations. The action of the Congress should be reconsidered and the salaries of Supreme Court Justices should now be increased in the amount of $3,000 per annum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriated referred.

The bill (S. 610) to increase the rates of compensation of the Chief Justice of the United States and of Associate Justices of the Supreme Court, introduced by Mr. GRUENING, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

STRENGTHENING OF THE BANKRUPTCY LAW

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, our economy today operates on credit. This is the day of the installment purchase. This is a time when many prospective purchasers ask not the total price of an article; rather, most want to know the minimum monthly payment required. About this I do not complain.

But a concomitant situation has arisen which does disturb me. Altogether too many individuals who have good incomes but few tangible, unmortgaged assets deliberately run up large debts and then proceed to file a petition in bankruptcy. So common has this practice become that many credit managers, I learn, place those who have recently been through the bankruptcy mill in a preferred class, extending them credit freely, knowing that they cannot again file a petition in bankruptcy for a period of 6 years.

I think this is something of a national disgrace. There was a time when it was considered shameful to avoid the payment of just debts by filing a petition in bankruptcy. Unhappily, this is no longer true. A few years ago, the unfortunate member of the community who had "gone bankrupt" was something of a social pariah. But no longer. He can drive about in his new automobile, with his reputation enhanced by this evidence of this "sharpness," provided he properly prepares his path to the office of the referee in bankruptcy. I refer, of course, to the nonbusiness category of bankruptcies. I offer no criticism of the legitimate businessman who meets with reverses and must clear the decks legitimately and seek legal means of doing so.

During the past fiscal year, 171,719 petitions in bankruptcies were filed. This was an increase of more than 56 percent over 1960. But more disturbing to me than the total number of filings is the high percentage of non-business bankrupcies. In fiscal 1964, more than 90 percent of petitions were classified as nonbusiness. For the most part these represent individuals who have jobs, often good jobs, but who, for one reason or another, want to avoid payment of all or part of their legal obligations.

In Tennessee, in fiscal year 1964, 8,767 petitions in bankruptcy were filed. This is almost a 100-percent increase over the 1960 figure of 4,644. Nationally, some 90 percent of filings are classified as nonbusiness; in Tennessee, 97 percent are so classified. Statistics vary from State to State, of course, but the situation is not good in any State. I do not prejudge those individuals who filed nonbusiness petitions but I would like to make it possible for the court to determine which of them have good jobs, and order appropriate payment to creditors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GORE. It has been said that since some States do not have proper laws, or fail to enforce what laws they do have, to protect the ordinary workingman from loan sharks, a loose bankruptcy law is necessary as an escape valve.

This is poor reasoning, indeed. The answer is proper State laws and proper enforcement to control usurious activities by loan sharks, not ill-contrived Federal bankruptcy laws.

Shall we continue to let the loan sharks victimize the people for 6 years, and then allow a loose bankruptcy law to wipe away the debt? And then start all over on another 6-year cycle? Is this the proper answer?

I should hope we can do better than that.

At any rate, the bill is permissive in nature, and I do not visualize any Federal court ordering payment continued on a debt which is on its face usurious and illegal.

The history of our bankruptcy laws is interesting, but I shall not take the time to discuss that subject today. Let me say only that I do not approach this problem, as it has so often been approached historically, from the standpoint of property rights versus human rights. Anyone who is familiar with my record would know better.

But I am disturbed whenever I find a loophole in our laws by which anyone can shirk his duty to the community. Often I have spoken to the Senate on the subject of loopholes in our tax laws—provisions which allow one person or type of enterprise to escape carrying a fair share of the total tax load.

An analogy can be drawn here. For every person who purchases an article "on time" and does not pay for it, some other person must be found who will make up the deficit thus created. The merchant must mark up his remaining goods to cover his loss. In one way or another, you and I, Mr. President, must pay the debts of the person who can afford to pay those debts but who decides to take the easy road to bankruptcy.

Moreover, I am not concerned only for the economics involved. This sort of thing eats away at the moral fiber of the Nation. I realize we cannot legislate morals, but we, as responsible legislators, must bear the responsibility of writing laws which discourage immorality and encourage morality; which encourage honesty and discourage deadbeating; which make the path of the social malingerer and shirker sufficiently unpleasant to persuade him at least to investigate the way of the honest man.

So far as I am concerned, it is past the time for amending our bankruptcy laws, particularly as they affect individuals, and more particularly as they affect individuals with good jobs.

The bill I am introducing is a simple one. It would authorize the court, upon the application of a creditor, or upon its own motion, when it appeared feasible and desirable, to order the petitioner to proceed under chapter XIII. Under that provision, a petitioner could pay into court a certain sum of money each month, and this money could then be paid out to his creditors over a period of time.

In my view, some such change as this in our bankruptcy statutes will prove to be most desirable and healthy, both economically and morally.

Mr. President, I introduce the bill for appropriate reference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 613) to require filing under chapter XIII of the Bankruptcy Act in certain bankruptcy proceedings, introduced by Mr. GORE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

NORA ISABELLA SAMUELLI

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill for the relief of Nora Isabella Samuelli, a former Rumanian national who was imprisoned for 12 years by the Communist government of Rumania on charges that she had acted as a spy for the United States while employed by our legation in Bucharest.

In presenting this bill, I am honored to have as cosponsors Senators COOPER, KENNEDY of Massachusetts, JAVITS, and PELL.

I would like to point out to my colleagues that this bill was unanimously approved by the Judiciary Committee before Congress adjourned last year and that it was passed without dissenting vote by the Senate.

Unfortunately, Congress adjourned before the House could act on the measure. This is a most deserving case and it is my earnest hope that Congress will act expeditiously to provide Miss Samuelli with the relief to which she is entitled and for which, regrettably, she has already had to wait almost 4 years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 618) for the relief of Nora Isabella Samuelli, introduced by Mr. DODD (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

APPOINTMENT OF THIRD FEDERAL JUDGE FOR EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, today I am introducing a bill to give the eastern district of Wisconsin a third Federal judge. The bill is identical with those being introduced today in the House by Congressman ZABLOCKI and Congressman REUSS.

We clearly need a third judge for the eastern district of Wisconsin. Justice delayed is often justice denied. Yet there is now excessive delay in the disposition of many cases in the Milwaukee Federal court because Judges Robert E. Tehan and Kenneth P. Grubb face a docket which has become too large for two judges.

The addition of a new judgeship is urged by those most familiar with the workings of the Milwaukee court. Judges Grubb and Tehan support an added judge with the backing of Chief Judge John S. Hastings, of the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals. The Milwaukee Bar Association has appointed a special committee to work for a new judgeship under the leadership of Frederic Sammond.

The prospects for our bills depend largely upon the recommendations of the Judicial Conference of the United States. After making a study of caseload trends occasioned by Congressman REUSS' bill in the 88th Congress, the Judicial Conference's Committees on Judicial Statistics and Court Administration decided in September 1964, to recommend a temporary third judge for the eastern district of Wisconsin.

We expect that the conference at its March 1965, meeting will recommend an omnibus bill to create new judgeships, including a judge for Wisconsin. We hope it will be a permanent judge. If not, we shall work to have the bill amended to make the judgeship permanent. Senator PROXMIRE has pledged to support this effort.

The bills for a permanent new judgeship introduced today are an earnest of our desire for a lasting improvement of the administration of justice in the eastern district of Wisconsin.

I ask that the bill lay on the table for a day for the additional cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Wisconsin.

The bill (S. 620) to amend title 28 of the United States Code, so as to provide for the appointment of one additional district judge for the eastern district of Wisconsin, introduced by Mr. Nelson, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

FACILITATION OF MANAGEMENT, USE, AND PUBLIC BENEFITS FROM THE APPALACHIAN TRAIL

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Williams], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. McIntyre], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Gore], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Ribicoff], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Tydings], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Cotton], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill for the purpose of facilitating the management, use, and public benefits from the Appalachian Trail, a beautiful scenic trail designed primarily for foot travel through natural or primitive areas, and extending generally from the State of Maine to the State of Georgia; it also has the purpose of facilitating and promoting Federal, State, local, and private cooperation and assistance for the promotion of the trail. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be held at the desk until January 27 for additional cosponsors. I also ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the Congressional Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. President, I originally introduced this bill in May of last year with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Williams] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. McIntyre]. Subsequently, four other Senators joined us as cosponsors. I was gratified by the public response to our bill for, without exception, the conservation and recreation groups, the Appalachian Trail Conference, a private group which maintains the trail, and others who wrote me were enthusiastic in their support. I feel even more strongly now that we must act to provide protection for the trail against the many threats now confronting it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record and will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Wisconsin.

The bill (S. 622) to facilitate the management, use, and public benefits from the Appalachian Trail, a scenic trail designed primarily for foot travel through natural or primitive areas, and extending generally from Maine to Georgia; to facilitate and promote Federal, State, local, and private cooperation and assistance for the promotion of the trail, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Nelson (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 622

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) in recognition of the public benefits already received from the establishment of the Appalachian Trail, extending generally along the Appalachian Mountains from Maine to Georgia for a distance of more than two thousand miles, and in order to promote and perfect the delineation, protection, and management of such trail, the cooperation of Federal, State, local, and private organizations and persons, for these purposes, is hereby declared to be in the public interest.

(b) In furtherance of these purposes, the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Defense, and any other Federal officials who now or hereafter administer Federal properties traversed by the Appalachian Trail shall coordinate their efforts in providing uniform administration and protection of the trail; and they shall give encouragement to and cooperate with the States, local communities, and private organizations and persons in promoting the purposes of this Act.

Sec. 2. (a) The Appalachian Trail, together with sufficient land on both sides thereof to protect adequately and preserve its character, shall comprise the Appalachian Trailway, which shall be administered, protected, and maintained so as to retain its natural or scenic character in keeping with the purposes of this Act, excluding therefrom all inconsistent and nonconforming uses wherever this can be accomplished in the public interest: *Provided,* That such administration shall not render inapplicable to the lands within the trailway the pertinent laws and regulations governing particular Federal areas or lands traversed by the trailway.

(b) The Secretary of the Interior, with the concurrence of other Federal agencies administering lands through which the Appalachian Trail passes, is authorized to issue, and to amend from time to time, as required by circumstances, regulations to carry out the purposes of this Act and to serve as guidelines in its administration, protection, and general management.

Sec. 3. In furtherance of this Act and the objectives prescribed by the basic Act relating to outdoor recreation activities approved May 28, 1963 (77 Stat. 49), the Secretary of the Interior, with the advice, consent, and assistance of the aforesaid Federal agencies, States, and others, is authorized to define, redefine, and delineate, where advisable, the route of the Appalachian Trailway in order to retain wherever possible the natural or scenic character of the trail and adjoining lands. The Secretary shall cause public notice to be given concerning the trailway route, as soon as possible after the enactment of this Act and thereafter whenever additions or changes are made, either through publication in the Federal Register, or in such other manner as he shall consider practicable. The route of the trailway may be revised from time to time, as required by circumstances, with the consent of the Federal agencies directly involved. In determining the width and location of the trailway, the following principles shall govern—

(a) the trailway shall be of sufficient width and shall be so located as to provide the maximum retention of natural conditions, scenic or historic features, and the primitive nature of the trailway.

(b) the route of the trailway shall be selected to avoid, so far as possible and practicable, established highways, motor roads, mining areas, power-transmission lines, private recreational developments, public recreational developments not related to the trail, and other activities that would be inconsistent with the purposes of this Act and the protection in its natural condition and use of the trail for outdoor recreation.

Sec. 4. (a) In order to promote continuity of the Appalachian Trailway and its uniform administration as a continuous area throughout its full length, and to promote its use and management in keeping with the purposes of this Act, Federal agencies administering land through which the trailway passes are authorized to acquire, within the authorized boundaries of areas they administer, through donation or such other manner as they shall consider to be in the public interest, any land, interests in land, rights, or easements; or they may enter into agreements with private landowners for the purpose of promoting the said Appalachian Trailway.

(b) Where the trailway extends across the other non-Federal lands, the Secretary of the Interior and the heads of other Federal agencies involved in administering adjacent lands are authorized to cooperate with States, political subdivisions, and local and private organizations and persons for the purpose of encouraging their acquisition of land, interests in land, rights, easements, or the consummation of agreements with landowners that will further the purposes of this Act; and if private properties within such portions of the trailway are offered for sale for purposes of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior, to the extent of any funds that are made available therefor, may purchase such properties or interests therein for purposes of the trailway only from willing sellers, and he shall thereafter make such arrangements as he deems appropriate for the management of such properties.

INTERSTATE ADOPTION PRACTICES

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Connecticut is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill amending title 18 of the United States Code to make unlawful certain practices in connection with the placing of minor children for permanent free care or for adoption.

This proposed legislation, if enacted into law, would eliminate the deplorable practice of selling newborn babies for profit to the highest bidder.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be allowed to lie on the table for 5 days, so that additional Senators who so desire may join as cosponsors. I also ask unanimous consent that a copy of the bill be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, will lie on the desk as requested; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record as requested.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, this proposed legislation would establish criminal penalties for the activities of certain unscrupulous lawyers, doctors, and other assorted baby brokers who now act as organizers and middlemen in the interstate traffic in black-market infants. It will help safeguard the rights and welfare of the children and the parents who today all too often fall into the merciless hands of these slave traders grown fat on human misery, ignorance, and misfortune.

I should like to point out that this bill would not infringe upon State laws or responsibilities; that it would not abolish private or nonagency adoptions; that it would not abolish interstate or foreign adoptions; that it would not deprive parents of the right to seek new homes for their children without agency intervention; that it would not prevent childless couples from seeking to adopt a child directly from its natural mother; and that it would not prohibit receipt of professional fees for adoption-connected legal or medical services, childbirth, prenatal or postnatal care and the adoption proceeding itself.

Mr. President, this proposal is not entirely new. It was championed for many years by our late colleague Senator Estes Kefauver and it was passed by the Senate in the 88th Congress. It has received widespread support from governmental agencies, from welfare organizations, and from a large number of individuals concerned with child care.

One of the fears expressed against legislation of this type is that it might delimit private adoptions. This fear is coupled with the criticism that many times official adoption agencies turn couples from their doors because of unrealistic or arbitrary standards for parenthood. I wish to take this opportunity to point that if there is any truth to such charges, they must be investigated by the governmental and public authorities responsible for licensing these adoption agencies. But I emphatically state that whatever the agencies do or fail to do cannot excuse under any circumstances the vicious interstate trafficking in defenseless human infants which is the main target of the proposed legislation

One wrong does not justify another. There is no justification for cases described at our hearings last year involving a ring of doctors, lawyers, and housewives that sold babies for prices ranging from $1,100 to $4,000; of college professors peddling children born to school girls, and of assorted other crooks whose charges for illegal adoptions have gone up to $7,000.

There is no justification for selling a baby to a man convicted on the charge of a sexual offense involving children.

There is no justification for a doctor coercing a teenage mother to give up her baby to cover hospital expenses so he can then resell it for a huge profit.

There is no justification for these brokers to coerce prospective mothers to travel across State lines just to take advantage of more lenient adoption laws.

There is no justification for the misery and heartbreak of adoptive parents whose babies are taken away after improper adoption procedures by the middleman, concerned solely with the monetary gain from the deal and often showing complete disregard for the human beings they manipulate for selfish ends and for the lives they throw into havoc and often into tragedy.

Most of all, there is no justification for the passing of a newborn baby back and forth from hand to hand, a frequent occurrence in these black-market operations, while the two sets of parents decide what to do with the new life that, above all, needs protection, but which in this trade is handled like a piece of merchandise no different from a television set, an automobile, or a vacuum cleaner.

We have been told of a case where the adoptive parents who obtained a child in the black market wanted to return it because they were "dissatisfied" with the baby. They were then advised by the middleman-lawyer to try it out a little longer.

We have been told of a black-market sale of a baby who was subsequently found to be mentally defective. He was thereupon returned to the doctor who, in turn, hired a woman to take the child without notice to its natural mother, and, since she was not home at the time, it was simply left in her room.

We have been told of a black-market baby who was rejected by his father soon after adoption because he had a darker complexion than the rest of the family. Another child manifested racial characteristics incompatible with those of the adoptive parents and was turned over to an agency for readoption.

Mr. President, most of these shocking activities would not have taken place if these adoptions had been arranged through official agencies. Many of these so-called parents would not be given a child and many of them have in fact been rejected by agencies as unfit and incapable of taking proper care of children. Many of these deals that pass for adoptions would not have been made if there was a Federal law forbidding interstate adoptions arranged by unauthorized individuals or rings of racketeers.

The black market in babies thrives largely on the shame, guilt, or ignorance of unmarried mothers and on the frustration, impatience, and haste of childless couples. These are not qualities that assure adequate protection for the child, the innocent victim of irresponsible adults.

The Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency has studied the plight of children in this country for several years and we know the importance of a good family for their development into mature and constructive adults, but we know that a good home for babies in nonagency adoptions is a matter of chance rather than certainty.

The very recent emergence of the battered child syndrome throughout the Nation provides tragic evidence that not all adults are fit to be parents. It has made law enforcement and social agencies aware that some of these so-called parents have beaten, burned, maimed, mutilated, and killed their own or adopted children.

It will allow prosecution of baby racketeers by establishing a $10,000 fine and a 5-year term of imprisonment for criminal practices against infants that even today flourish unchecked throughout the United States, Canada, Mexico, and South America as well.

There is little assurance that a nonagency adoption will not put an infant into the hands of such people, because in some cases even the courts have no say in these operations when a fraudulent birth certificate is made out to show that a child delivered by an unmarried mother is born to the adoptive parents. Yet, during subcommittee hearings last summer, we learned that over 40,000 children per year are placed with no prior investigation by a social agency regarding the suitability of the home and other factors.

Mr. President, every child who is a victim of unsuitable parents is also a potential victim of delinquency. The bill I introduce today will help minimize this danger. It will not outlaw private adoption, but it will strengthen the case of the agencies.

No legislation can improve the quality of parents, but, if enacted into law, this measure will diminish the criminal rings to which unmarried prospective mothers now turn to dispose of their babies and will encourage them to seek aid from legitimate agencies.

It will help eliminate the nationwide scope of this racket by making it illegal for brokers to transport mothers and babies in interstate commerce for profit and for the purpose of evading State laws.

It will prevent persons who have been found to be sex deviates, who have been convicted in some cases of molesting minors, from adopting infants. This situation is going on in this country at the present time, and it is done through interstate traffic. The only way we can put an end to it is to get control over it through passage of this proposed legislation.

The Senate unanimously passed a similar bill last year. The late Senator Kefauver, of Tennessee, previously introduced the bill. It was his idea. He was responsible for getting it through the committee and bringing it to the floor of the Senate for passage. The bill was passed last year, but unfortunately it was late in the session and the House did not get an opportunity to act upon it. I am hopeful, therefore, that the bill will pass during this session of Congress.

Mr. President, the proposal has been supported by the U.S. Children's Bureau, by the National Conference of Catholic Charities, by the National Jewish Welfare Board, by the various denominational groups of the Protestant church, and by a large number of other regional and local organizations with special interest in the care and welfare of children.

I express once more the hope that it will receive favorable and speedy action by both Houses of Congress.

The bill (S. 624) to amend title 18, United States Code, to make unlawful certain practices in connection with the placing of minor children for permanent free care or for adoption, introduced by Mr. Dodd, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the

Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXHIBIT 1

S. 624

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That title 18 of the United States Code is amended by inserting at the end of chapter 53, a new chapter as follows:

"CHAPTER 54—INTERSTATE PLACEMENT OF CHILDREN FOR PERMANENT FREE CARE OR FOR ADOPTION

"§ 1181. Placing child for permanent free care or for adoption for compensation

"(a) Whoever, either by himself or through any agent or employee, or other person, directly or indirectly solicits, collects, or receives any money or anything of value, or the promise thereof, in any manner whatsoever, for placing or arranging for the placement of any child in any home for permanent free care or for adoption, under circumstances requiring or resulting in such child being transported in interstate or foreign commerce, shall be fined not more than $10,000, or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

"(b) The provisions of this section shall not apply in the case of (1) money received by or paid to a child-care or adoption agency in any State, either public or private, which is authorized or licensed by said State to provide permanent care for children or to place children for adoption, as reimbursement for providing services by said agency; (2) fees received solely for professional legal services; or (3) fees received solely for professional medical services directly in connection with the prenatal care of the natural mother or delivery, examination, or treatment of the child.

"(c) Nothing in this section shall be construed to penalize (1) any person for placing or arranging for the placement of any child in any home for permanent free care or adoption, if such person is the natural parent of such child; or (2) any person who arranges, or seeks to arrange, for the placement in his home of a child for the purpose of adopting such child or providing him with permanent free care.

"§ 1182. Coercion or enticement of natural parent or adoptive parents

"(a) Whoever, by himself or through any agent or employee or other person, whether in return for the payment or receipt of money or anything of value, or the promise thereof or without any such payment or receipt, in any manner whatsoever, persuades, induces, coerces, or arranges for a parent of a child (including a child in ventre sa mere) to travel from or to another place in interstate or foreign commerce to place said child for permanent free care or for adoption when the placement is made or will be made in return for the payment of money or anything of value, shall be fined not more than $10,000, or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

"(b) Whoever, by himself or through any agent or employee or other person, whether in return for the payment or receipt of money or anything of value, or the promise thereof, or without any such payment or receipt, in any manner whatsoever, persuades, induces, coerces, or arranges for a prospective adoptive parent, or prospective adoptive parents, to travel from or to another place in interstate or foreign commerce to obtain a child for the purpose of adopting such child or providing him with permanent free care, when the placement is made or will be made in return for the payment of money or anything of value, shall be fined not more than $10,000, or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

"(c) The provisions of this section shall not apply in the case of arrangements for the transportation of a natural mother in interstate or foreign commerce by (1) any child-care or adoption agency in any State, either public or private, which is authorized or licensed by such State to provide permanent care for children or to place children for adoption; (2) any licensed or authorized maternity home or shelter; or (3) any person who legally arranges or seeks to arrange for the placement in his home of a child for the purpose of adopting such child or providing him with permanent free care.

"§ 1183. Definitions

"As used in this chapter—

"(1) The term 'child' means any individual who has not attained the age of sixteen years; and

"(2) The term 'permanent free care' means the care given to any child on a permanent basis by any person who is not receiving compensation therefor, and is neither related to the child nor standing in such relation to the child or its mother as to create a legal interest in the child's welfare, but such term does not include the free care provided to any child by or through any licensed or authorized child-care agency or courts having juvenile jurisdiction."

SEC. 2. (a) The analysis of part 1 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by inserting after

"53. Indians........................ 1151"

the following:

"54. Interstate placement of children for permanent free care or for adoption........................ 1181"

(b) that part of the index to title 18 of the United States Code which describes the contents of part 1 of such title is amended by inserting after:

"53. Indians........................ 1151"

the following:

"54. Interstate placement of children for permanent free care or for adoption........................ 1181"

SALE OF CERTAIN ISOLATED OR DISCONNECTED TRACTS OF LAND

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill relating to the sale of isolated or disconnected tracts of public land.

A problem has developed in Wyoming, and I am sure in other States, concerning agricultural trespass. This comes about because in years gone by our pioneers and settlers had difficulty in laying out their homesteads and in fencing irrigable land. Often the settler would fence a unit of land which could be irrigated profitably, even though he might have known that a portion of that fenced-in area was Government land. More often than not the Bureau of Land Management knew of this but, because no one's rights were being damaged by the action, did not correct the fence lines. Now, after many years of this technical trespass, the Bureau of Land Management has been resurveying the lands and ordering the ranchers to build their fences on the boundary lines and pay fines for the back trespasses.

For the most part, these lands are isolated or disconnected tracts of public land which are of little, if any, value to the U.S. Government. However, the loss of these agricultural lands to the individual ranches involved would be severe.

I am pleased to report that the local, as well as Federal, Bureau of Land Management officials have been cooperative on this matter and have met with our local ranchers to explain the difficulties that have been encountered. It has been agreed by all those interested that the proper solution to the problem is for the ranchers to be given an opportunity to buy those isolated and disconnected areas which have been privately fenced in for so many years. Unfortunately, the Bureau of Land Management does not now have the authority to sell the land to the ranchers.

The purpose of the bill I am now introducing is to authorize the sale of these lands to the ranchers who are committing the "agricultural trespass." It is my understanding that the Secretary of the Interior has issued a directive to the Bureau of Land Management personnel instructing them to reach settlement on all agricultural trespass cases by July 1, 1965. With this in mind, I am hopeful that the committee to which this legislation is referred will act on it as soon as practicable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 625) to authorize the sale of isolated or disconnected tracts of lands, introduced by Mr. SIMPSON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ERECTION OF MONUMENT ON ALCATRAZ ISLAND TO COMMEMORATE THE FOUNDING OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, in a few months, the United Nations will celebrate its 20th anniversary. The years that have followed its creation in San Francisco have been years of tension, danger, and frustration, but they also have been years of achievement and hope.

The United Nations was founded in the closing days of the greatest war in history for the purpose of achieving the fondest and most noble goals of mankind: the maintenance of international peace and security, victory over the scourges of famine, disease, ignorance and pestilence, and promotion of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms.

When the U.N. Charter was drafted in 1945, most of the participants in the Conference envisioned a new kind of world emerging from the war. A world in which international cooperation could be brought to bear on solving the age old problems of man.

Unfortunately, this was not to be. Before many months had passed after the Charter's adoption, the Soviet Union made it clear that it had joined the U.N. in name only. The Soviet Union made it clear that while a new kind of world had emerged from the war, it was not the kind of world foreseen by most of the men who drafted the Charter.

But thanks to the competence of those men who gathered at San Francisco, the United Nations was able to function in the world that actually came out of the war. And in the ensuing years, it has been able to meet and serve the new requirements of an ever-changing world.

Fifty-one nations made up the original membership of the U.N. Today, only 20 years later, its membership numbers over 100. During this period, 50 nations passed from colonial status to some form of national independence. This breakup of the European colonial empire in a short two-decade period has been truly revolutionary. The Communists have tried hard to exploit the turmoil inherent in such rapid change. But not one new nation chose communism as a way of life or as a system of government. Membership in the United Nations has materially aided these nations in resisting domination from outside sources. The U.N. has provided them a forum in which to air attempts by other powers to interfere with their governmental process.

The agencies of the U.N. have performed yeoman service in the battle against disease, hunger, and ignorance. They have been instrumental in helping underdeveloped nations both new and old in their efforts to develop their economies looking toward the day when they will be self-sustaining economically as well as politically. These agencies in many respects are the unsung heroes of the world organization for their efforts and achievements usually go unpublicized and unnoticed by the world at large.

Conversely, the peacekeeping efforts of the United Nations have received an abundance of news coverage. During the 20 years, situation after situation has arisen threatening world peace. From Korea to Kashmir, from Cuba to the Congo, from Cyprus to New Guinea, and in many other troubled spots, the U.N. has been looked to to help smother flames of conflict before they could grow and possibly engulf the world. On each occasion, it has been instrumental in preserving peace. The role it has played in these instances has not necessarily been the one foreseen in 1945. However, this in no way detracts from the world organization's achievements. Rather, it proves that man's desire for peace is so strong and so enduring that given a vehicle for peace, he will strive to make it work.

Today, the United Nations is facing one of its most serious crises. I have the utmost confidence it will be resolved without the destruction of the charter's integrity. But a solution of the current difficulty will not by any means bring clear sailing for the organization. The imperfection of today's world is reflected in the U.N. Thus, we can foresee more crises in the future.

Those of us who endorse the purposes of the U.N. as outlined in the charter and believe the organization can serve these purposes must make clear our support of the charter and our support of our Nation's continued active participation in the U.N.

Last year, I had the honor of serving as Chairman of the Commission on the Disposition of Alcatraz Island. This Commission held extended hearings in San Francisco, receiving testimony from more than 40 witnesses. In addition, the Commission received and considered almost 500 letters containing proposals and suggestions for future use of the former prison island. The Commission, composed of four Californians and myself, filed its report with the Congress in accordance with the legislation establishing it on August 3, 1964. The Commission recommended that the island be used as the site for a monument to commemorate the founding of the United Nations in San Francisco in 1945 and to serve as a symbol of peace. The report further recommended the design of the monument be selected through an international architectural competition. Further, the island would be left in its natural state except for the monument and would be administered by the National Park Service. These recommendations followed a proposal submitted by the San Francisco chapter of the American Association for the United Nations. The AAUN also offered to raise and donate sufficient funds to remove the present structures on the island, to conduct the architectural competition, and to build the monument. The Commission included the acceptance of this magnanimous offer as a part of its recommendations.

On August 7, Congressman Jeffery Cohelan, a member of the Commission, and myself introduced bills in both Houses of Congress to carry out the Commission's recommendations. No action was taken prior to adjournment.

Today, Congressman Cohelan and I again join in introducing legislation in our respective Houses to carry out the Commission's recommendations.

This legislation provides the Congress a most unique opportunity. In the first place, Alcatraz Island is an unusual piece of property. As we all know, it is a dominant feature in one of our Nation's most important seaports. It is an historic landmark in one of our Nation's most beautiful harbors. It is an inherent part of one of our Nation's most lovely and most famous cities. Also, the island is one of the most universally known places in the United States. Today, the buildings on the island stand in a state of advanced deterioration. However, due to the type of construction, if nothing is done, the deteriorated structure may well stand forever. When the penitentiary was in operation and the buildings maintained, the island was considered by many as an eyesore. Presently, I believe all would concur that the island is becoming a serious blot on the beauty of our land.

Normal real property disposal procedures would not be an appropriate solution to this problem. Not only does the location of the island militate against such a solution but past use of the island does also. Due to its use for over 30 years as the Nation's maximum security prison, it has become well known throughout the world. Its reputation makes it highly susceptible to improper exploitation. Under no circumstances should anyone be allowed to use the island to glorify the criminal acts which brought men to Alcatraz or to exploit the human misery associated with crime.

These factors all point to a need for Federal action. The future use of the island will have a significant impact on the Nation as well as San Francisco and the State of California. The fact that the United Nations was founded in San Francisco gives us the opportunity to put the island to a good use and, at the same time, demonstrate our commitment to peace, security, and justice, the purposes for which the United Nations was founded. Also, through the bill I shall introduce, this action can be taken with only minimum expense to the taxpayer.

It is my hope that the Congress takes early action on this legislation to accept the offer of the San Francisco chapter of the American Association for the United Nations. It would be a significant contribution to the celebration of the U.N.'s 20th anniversary. Whatever is ahead for the world organization, let it never be said that the United States failed to exert every effort to make the U.N. work. This legislation would give the American people a chance to rededicate themselves to mankind's dream of a good world.

Therefore, Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for the erection of a monument on Alcatraz Island to commemorate the founding of the United Nations in San Francisco, Calif., in 1945 and to serve as a symbol of peace.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 626) to provide for the erection of a monument on Alcatraz Island to commemorate the founding of the United Nations in San Francisco, Calif., in 1945, and to serve as a symbol of peace, introduced by Mr. Long of Missouri, was received, read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

EXEMPTION OF OCEANOGRAPHIC RESEARCH VESSELS FROM THE APPLICATION OF CERTAIN INSPECTION LAWS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to exempt oceanographic research vessels from the application of certain vessel inspection laws. An identical bill last year was unanimously ordered reported by the Committee on Commerce on July 28, and on August 1 passed the Senate. However, no action on the measure was taken in the House.

As stated in the Committee on Commerce report on this earlier bill, the purpose of the proposed legislation is to encourage and facilitate oceanographic research by removing certain impediments which have been handicapping research vessel operation by both oceanographic institutions and private industry.

These impediments are described in reports on last year's bill submitted to the Committee by the Department of the Treasury, Department of Commerce, and the Department of the Navy, the latter expressing also the position of the Department of Defense. All of these reports were favorable and each of the Departments supported enactment of the bill. I would anticipate no change of departmental views on the identical bill being placed before the Senate today.

The General Counsel of the Treasury in his comment on the bill stated in part:

> The bill would remove several restrictions which have hampered the expansion of research in the marine sciences. Under existing law, scientific personnel carried on board a ship used in oceanographic research are classified either as passengers or members of the crew. If classified as passengers, the vessel would, depending upon the number of personnel carried, be classified as a passenger vessel, and would be subject to higher requirements under the marine safety inspection laws and the International Convention for Safety of Life at Sea. In order to avoid such stringent requirements, which are not appropriate to this category of vessel, research vessel operators have been required to limit their carriage of scientific personnel thus hampering full utilization of their vessels. If, on the other hand, scientific personnel are classified as members of the crew, they then become subject to the laws applicable to seamen which are not appropriate to scientists and technicians who perform duties considerably different from those usually performed by the members of a ship's crew.
>
> In addition to recognizing that persons on board oceanographic research vessels, who are engaged in scientific research, are neither passengers nor seamen, the bill also would give the Department authority to tailor the vessel inspection, manning, and other safety laws to the particular characteristics of vessels used in marine research.

Similar views were presented by the Department of the Navy, which assists in financing much of the oceanographic research undertaken by non-Government and nonprofit institutions, and by the Department of Commerce, with broad interests in the oceans.

Mr. President, in addition to the Departments, the objectives of the bill I have reintroduced today, are strongly supported by the Committee on Oceanography of the National Academy of Sciences, the Research Vessel Operators Council, and by industries operating vessels employed exclusively in scientific research.

Both the National Committee on Oceanography and the Research Vessel Operators Council have sought enactment of legislation such as proposed in this bill for several years. Institutional members of the Council are: Chesapeake Bay Institute, Duke University, Florida State University, Gulf Coast Research Laboratory, University of Hawaii Hopkins Marine Station, Lamont Geological Observatory, University of Miami, University of Michigan, Oregon State University, University of Rhode Island, Scripps Institution of Oceanography, Texas A. & M. Research Foundation, Virginia Institute of Marine Science, University of Washington, and Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution.

Mr. President, enactment of this bill will increase efficiency without additional costs, and will enlarge and strengthen the national oceanographic program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 627) to exempt oceanographic research vessels from the application of certain vessel inspection laws, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

SURVEY OF MARINE AND FRESH-WATER COMMERCIAL FISHERY RESOURCES

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate referral, a joint resolution to authorize and direct the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries to conduct a survey of the marine and fresh-water commercial fishery resources of the United States, its territories, and possessions.

Unanimous consent is requested that the joint resolution may lie on the table through January 27 to afford an opportunity for those of my colleagues who may wish to do so to be cosponsors.

The resolution is virtually identical to Senate Joint Resolution 174 of the 88th Congress which the Committee on Commerce unanimously voted to report favorably on August 4 of last year and which passed the U.S. Senate on August 19 without dissent.

A comprehensive survey of the fishery resources available to the United States is long overdue. No survey has been conducted since 1944, when the late Senator Josiah Bailey of North Carolina, chairman of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, initiated such a study with a joint resolution similar in its objectives to the one I am sending to the desk today.

Although the 1944 survey was largely limited to a description of the various commercial species in adjacent waters, it did contribute to recovery of an industry that had been sharply curtailed by the war, and to an acceleration of the catch of food species which continued through 1951.

Since 1951 the American fisheries industry has alarmingly declined.

The total catch of food species has dropped more than half a billion pounds.

So has the average price per pound received by fishermen.

The number of American fishermen has shrunk one-fourth.

So has the number of documented fishing vessels while the number of new documenations has shrunk two-thirds.

Decline of fisheries has brought acute depression to many areas and communities dependent almost entirely on harvesting the sea for basic income.

All of us know that many shore communities are located in terrain unsuitable for profitable agricultural production. They have been restricted in the past to one basic industry as surely as have some of the coal mining towns in Appalachia, and some of these fishing communities are equally depressed. But there is this difference.

The aggregate resources of the sea are not being depleted.

The demand for products of the sea has grown, not diminished.

The bounty of the sea is not challenged by substitute products.

While American fisheries are declining the American people are utilizing more fish and shellfish than ever before.

Forty-five percent of the edible fish consumed in the United States is imported; 65 percent of the fishery products used by industry or for animal feed.

We know that many of these imported products, both edible and inedible, were produced from fish harvested from waters contiguous to America.

Waters over our great continental shelves are among the most productive in the world, ocean eldorados that attract the fishing fleets of Japan, Russia, Poland, Spain, France, Norway, both West Germany and East Germany, and the United Kingdom.

World fisheries production has doubled in the past decade, and sea life in waters adjacent to America has contributed materially to this increase.

Every maritime nation in the world except the United States has shared in this expansion of the fishing industry.

Fisheries are revolutionizing the economy of some of the lesser developed countries of the world, while there are fishing localities in our own United States suffering increasing economic distress. The blight afflicting these localities in America must not continue. It need not continue.

The industry itself, given some incentive, some encouragement, scientific and technological assistance, can revive, expand, and prosper to the benefit of our national economy and health.

The Senate joint resolution now before you will, I am convinced, contribute substantially to revival of the industry, the first and oldest industry on this continent.

Two weeks ago the National Academy of Sciences—National Research Council, published a report titled: "Economic Benefits From Oceanographic Research," prepared by its Committee on Oceanography.

Many of the pages of this report are given to the economic potential of the American fishing industry.

A rational development of our domestic fisheries, the Committee states, could result in doubling production in the next 10 to 15 years, and it further contemplates a fourfold increase in American oversea fisheries.

> Both domestic and oversea fisheries depend for their development upon many things in addition to oceanographic research—

The report observes—

> but such research on a continuing basis is essential if the potential rates of growth are to be realized and maintained.

More directly applicable to the survey contemplated in the joint resolution I have introduced today, the Academy report states:

> Increasing the U.S. domestic catch of fish requires the existence of sufficient additional productive potential of fish stocks accessible to our fishermen, and the existence of markets for the catch. Both of these conditions, we believe, can be satisfied if the necessary research is done on the living resources of the sea and methods of harvesting them.
>
> For example, a large population of anchovies exists off the coast of California, which appears to be capable of sustaining a fishery of about a million tons a year. Tak-

> ing this catch should assist in rebuilding the stock of sardines with which they compete. A very large unused stock of hake exists in the same region. Both these species are used primarily as fish meal.
>
> Research has shown that the population of jack mackerel off the Pacific coast, now supporting a catch of about 45,000 tons a year, could support greatly increased catches.
>
> Large stocks of demersal fish exist in the Bering Sea and the Gulf of Alaska, as well as large populations of ocean perch (redfish) in the latter. Catches of over a million tons a year are being made by Russian and Japanese fishermen from these stocks. There is no reason why U.S. fishermen should not participate in this bonanza.
>
> During the past 2 years—

The report continues—

> a new high-seas fishery by U.S. tuna vessels for bluefin tuna and for skipjack tuna has begun in the Atlantic. The presence of skipjack in commercial abundance was not known a few years ago. The new fishery for these valuable species, and for the tropical tuna species further south in the Atlantic, may be expected to grow to rival the present tuna fishery in the eastern Pacific, which now produces landings valued at over $40 million a year.
>
> Continued growth of the Pacific tuna fishery is to be expected because, although the populations of yellowfin tuna and perhaps of albacore are near their level of maximum sustainable harvest, catches of skipjack tuna, certainly, and of bluefin tuna, probably, can be greatly increased. Continuing research will undoubtedly reveal many further new opportunities.
>
> So far as the domestic market is concerned, if our fishermen, through research and engineering, can recapture the share of the market lost to imports during the past decade and a half by cutting their production costs, an annual market for nearly 800,000 tons of edible fish, and a similar amount of industrial fish, would be provided.
>
> Additional markets exist in other countries, if prices are competitive. The world's burgeoning population increased consumption of fishery products should assure a market in the foreseeable future.

Referring again to the feasibility of doubling U.S. domestic fisheries and quadrupling U.S. fisheries overseas, the report adds this note of counsel and warning:

> However, this growth rate cannot be established or maintained, unless oceanic investigations are conducted on a worldwide basis to find: (1) how the locations and sizes of the fish population vary with changing conditions in the sea; (2) the ocean conditions that bring about economically catchable fish concentrations; and (3) those aspects of behavior that can be exploited to reduce the costs of catching the fish.

Within 10 years, the fisheries section of the Academy report concludes, "the addition to the gross national product from increased fisheries-oriented oceanic research can be in the neighborhood of $2 billion a year."

The fisheries section of the report, the Academy of Sciences advises, was prepared by Dr. Milner B. Schaefer, chairman of the Academy's Committee on Oceanography, director of the Institute of Marine Resources, University of California and, I am proud to state, an alumnus of the University of Washington.

It would be a small investment toward eliminating poverty in many communities dependent on commercial fisheries, and among thousands of citizens whose only source of livelihood are the living creatures of the seas, our bays and estuaries, and our lakes and streams.

Enactment of this joint resolution will be one achievement, in my opinion, in our national war on poverty.

I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be held at the desk through January 27, 1965, for additional cosponsors.

Mr. President, for the benefit of Members of the Senate who were not with us last fall when the Senate joint resolution was passed by unanimous consent, I ask unanimous consent that there may be appended to my remarks a summary of the joint resolution proposing this survey.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the summary will be printed in the Record, and the joint resolution will be held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from Washington.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res 29) to authorize and direct the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries to conduct a survey of the marine and fresh-water commercial fishery resources of the United States, its territories, and possessions introduced by Mr. Magnuson, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The summary presented by Mr. Magnuson is as follows:

Summary of Resolution

This resolution would authorize and direct the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries to conduct a survey of the character, extent, and condition of the marine and fresh-water commercial fishery resources, both present and potential, of the United States, its territories and possessions; the economic status and organization of the industry; the economic, legal and other institutional handicaps to industrial development and conservation of fishery resources; the effects thereon of existing conventions and treaties relating to the living marine resources of the high seas, and the nutritive and industry values of fishery products and byproducts affecting or potentially affecting the industry and its economy.

The survey also would include, but not be limited to:

(1) The current methods, practices, facilities, gear, craft, and equipment used in producing commercial fishery products.

(2) The accretion or depletion of the various species and stocks resulting from the methods, practices, facilities and equipment used in their production, not only by the fishery industry of the United States, but by other nations fishing in waters contiguous to the United States.

(3) The accretion or depletion resulting from agreements, conventions, or treaties with other nations, or with the indigenous inhabitants of this country.

(4) The methods, practices, facilities, and equipment used in processing, preserving, distributing, transporting, marketing and storing fishery products, including an assessment of measures existing or in the process of development for their augmented protection or preservation, among the latter the recent program for radiation-pasteurization of fishery products.

(5) Methods, practices, facilities, and equipment which may be practicable for expanding the utilization of existing or potential marine and fresh-water commercial fishery resources.

(6) Laws and regulations that govern the commercial fisheries.

The Bureau is directed in the joint resolution to submit a report to Congress as soon as practicable, but not later than January 1, 1968, on the results of the survey, and to make specific recommendations based on its survey findings.

Recommendations requested include:

(a) New and improved methods of capturing, landing, processing, storing, distributing and marketing fishery products.

(b) New and improved methods of increasing consumption as food and increasing industrial utilization of fishery products through public education, such recommendations to contemplate the full and cooperative use of personnel and facilities of State, territorial, county, local, and other public bodies, and of private, industrial, or other organizations.

(c) A program of economic stabilization of the fisheries, and for the orderly development and expansion of the commercial fisheries and allied industries.

(d) New and improved methods of stimulating and encouraging exports of U.S. fishery products and commodities.

(e) Advisability and opportunities for further international agreements, conventions, or treaties for the conservation of fishery resources of the high seas.

(f) Opportunities for coordinating fishery administration and management through State fishery compacts with the consent of Congress as authorized by article 1, section 10, of the Constitution of the United States.

(g) Special and regular appropriations necessary to carry out a program for the optimum utilization of our marine and fresh-water commercial fishery resources.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION RELATIVE TO BALANCING THE BUDGET

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I send to the desk a joint resolution and ask that it be appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 30) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the balancing of the budget, introduced by Mr. Curtis (for himself and Mr. Byrd of Virginia), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, for several years I have endeavored, together with a number of like-minded colleagues, to secure the approval of Congress to propose to the States a constitutional amendment designed to put an end to deficit financing by the Federal Government and, eventually, to restore order in our Government's fiscal affairs.

I am today again proposing this amendment, and am pleased to be joined in this effort by the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd]. I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution remain at the desk for 1 week for additional cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I am happy to add the name of the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. Lausche] as a cosponsor.

Mr. President, if made a part of our Constitution, this proposal would require that the Federal Government operate on a pay-as-you-go basis. It would further require the reduction of our national debt by at least a half-billion dollars a year.

The amendment would provide that Congress could not adjourn until provision had been made for a balanced budget and for the minimum payment on the national debt during the ensuing fiscal year.

The proposal does provide that, in case of war or other grave national emergency, the Congress may, by a three-fourths vote, follow a recommendation by the President to suspend the amendment's provisions for a year at a time.

The amendment would not become operative unless ratified by three-fourths of the States within 7 years of its submission to the States.

That, Mr. President, is the substance of our proposal. It is identical with Senate Joint Resolution 29 of the 88th Congress, and it is similar in its objective to proposals which have been before this body during the past several Congresses.

Mr. President, the rank and file of our citizens bear the great burden of our tax load. It falls directly and indirectly upon the workers, the farmers, the small businessmen, and white-collar people. Those of small- and middle-bracket incomes make up the large bulk of our taxpayers—and they pay the largest share of our taxes, both directly and indirectly. What I am saying, Mr. President, is that the burden is borne in most part by young people trying to get started in life, by farmers and businessmen and workers who are buying homes, educating children, trying to acquire the means for a better life for themselves and their families.

They are the ones, Mr. President, who are being dealt the greatest blow by runaway spending and evermounting deficits year after year.

The idea that Federal expenditures can be financed solely by taxing the rich is fallacious.

Our Federal budgets now approximate $100 billion annually. If the Federal Government were to tax at 100 percent, in other words confiscate, all individual incomes over $25,000 per year, we would realize about $1 billion additional revenue. The remaining $99 billion would come from all the rest of the Nation's taxpayers having lesser incomes.

If individual incomes over $100,000 a year were taxed at 100 percent, this would bring in an additional $100 million, and all the less wealthy taxpayers would carry the rest of the load. Both of these comparisons are based upon official figures of 1963 incomes and estimated at 1965 tax rates.

I believe this demonstrates, although in somewhat oversimplified manner, that the rank and file of the country's taxpaying citizens do indeed bear by far the greatest share of the tax burden. It is in the interest of these millions of Americans that I feel so strongly we should put the brakes on spending and cut back our national debt.

I commend our proposal to the Senate and urge its early and favorable consideration.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS, ETC.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I am happy to welcome as cosponsors of S. 309, the obscene literature bill, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Ribicoff], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Pearson], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening], and the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Fong]. I ask unanimous consent that their names be added to the bill as cosponsors, and that on the next printing of the bill their names may be shown as cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of S. 289 the name of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Williams] be added as a cosponsor.

I am delighted to be working shoulder to shoulder with him on this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hartke] be added as a cosponsor of S. 110, to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated to carry out the provisions of the Public Works Acceleration Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be joined as a cosponsor of Senate Resolution 20 at its next printing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Monroney in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Ribicoff]; the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Young]; the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph]; the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Church]; the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening]; the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGovern]; the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee]; the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Case]; the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Fong]; the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller]; the Senator from Delaware [Mr. Boggs]; the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Burdick]; the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss]; the Senator from California [Mr. Kuchel]; the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott]; the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. Mundt]; the Senator from New York [Mr. Javits]; the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Allott]; and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCarthy], be added as cosponsors of Senate Resolution 30, a resolution to give the Select Committee on Small Business the authority to have bills and resolutions referred to it, and to report legislation for consideration on the floor of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

Under authority of the orders of the Senate, as indicated below, the following names have been added as additional cosponsors for the following bills and joint resolution:

Authority of January 6, 1965:

S. 3. A bill to provide public works and economic development programs and the planning and coordination needed to assist in development of the Appalachian region: Mr. Gore, Mr. Mondale, and Mr. Yarborough.

S. 5. A bill to provide assistance for students in higher education by establishing programs for student grants, loan insurance, and work-study: Mr. Bartlett, Mr. Bayh, Mr. Burdick, Mr. Cannon, Mr. Church, Mr. Clark, Mr. Douglas, Mr. Gruening, Mr. Hart, Mr. Inouye, Mr. Jordan of North Carolina, Mr. Kennedy of Massachusetts, Mr. Long of Missouri, Mr. McCarthy, Mr. McGee, Mr. McGovern, Mr. McIntyre, Mr. Montoya, Mr. Moss, Mr. Muskie, Mr. Pell, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Tydings, Mr. Yarborough, and Mr. Young of North Dakota.

S. 110. A bill to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated to carry out the provisions of the Public Works Acceleration Act: Mr. Yarborough.

S. 201. A bill to provide for an investigation and study of means of making the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence Seaway available for navigation during the entire year: Mr. Dirksen, Mr. Hart, Mr. Hartke, Mr. Kennedy of New York, Mr. Lausche, Mr. McCarthy, Mr. Mondale, Mr. Nelson, and Mr. Young of Ohio.

S. 252. A bill to provide for appointment by the Postmaster General of postmasters at first-, second- and third-class post offices: Mr. Bennett, Mr. Case, Mr. Clark, Mr. Morse, Mr. Moss, Mr. Nelson, Mrs. Neuberger, Mr. Simpson, Mr. Tower, Mr. Tydings, and Mr. Young of Ohio.

S. 293. A bill to authorize the establishment of a public community college and a public college of arts and sciences in the District of Columbia: Mr. Clark, Mr. Douglas, Mr. Gruening, Mr. McGee, Mr. McIntyre, Mrs. Neuberger, and Mr. Young of Ohio.

S.J. Res. 6. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office: Mr. Allott, Mr. Curtis, and Mr. Dirksen.

Authority of January 7, 1965:

S. 310. A bill to amend the National Arts and Cultural Development Act of 1964 to authorize the National Council on the Arts to accept and receive bequests, gifts, and donations for use in carrying out the purposes of such act, and to establish the National Arts Foundation: Mr. Douglas, Mr. Scott, and Mr. Yarborough.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON THE NOMINATION OF ARTHUR M. OKUN TO BE A MEMBER OF THE COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I should like to announce that the Committee on Banking and Currency will hold hearings on the nomination of Arthur M. Okun, of Connecticut, to be a member of the Council of Economic Advisers. The hearing is scheduled to be held on Tuesday, January 26, 1965, in room 5302, New Senate Office Building, at 10 a.m.

Any persons who wish to appear and testify in connection with this nomination are requested to notify Matthew Hale, chief of staff, Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, room 5300, New Senate Office Building, telephone 225–3921.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION LEGISLATION

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, as chairman of the Immigration and Naturalization Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, I wish to announce the beginning of hearings on general immigration and naturalization legislation, particularly S. 500, Monday, February 8, 1965, at 10:30 a.m. in room 2228, New Senate Office Building.

Prospective witnesses desiring to be heard should contact the Immigration Subcommittee, room 2306, New Senate Office Building, so that a schedule may be arranged.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

Statement by him on the retirement of Frank H. Fuller, of the Associated Press.

By Mr. McGOVERN:

Debate between Senator Morse and Henry Cabot Lodge on U.S. policy on Vietnam, published in the New York Times Magazine on January 17, 1965.

TWO UNIQUE CALIFORNIA CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE INAUGURAL PARADE: SANTA BARBARA "BARBARETTES" AND DOS PALOS HIGH SCHOOL BAND

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the spectacle presented every 4 years when an impressive parade climaxes the swearing-in of a new President of the United States allows watchers across the land the chance to see a unique array of marching units, colorful floats, dignitaries, mounted riders, well-drilled military groups, and other awe-inspiring features.

To appear in this procession is a coveted honor. Especially this year, when efforts are made to keep the length of the parade within tolerable limits, an opportunity to take part is most cherished.

California, now the Nation's largest State in population, of course has innumerable units well qualified to represent her in this event. The marchers from the Golden State tomorrow celebrating President Johnson's inauguration will be an accomplished high school band from a typical small farming area town and a striking organization from a much larger municipality which has gained nationwide attention and prominence in less than a decade.

California's contribution to the color of the spectacle and entertainment of watchers will be the Santa Barbara "Barbarettes," a novelty drill team of 17 girls and 2 boys, and the Dos Palos High School Band.

Those viewing the procession in person or over television will be rewarded by the performance of the "Barbarettes," of which Jean Robbins is director, that has been featured at such a variety of events as the East-West Shrine football game, the Washington Redskins-Los Angeles Rams football game, the Las Vegas "Hell Dorado Days" and Santa Barbara "Old Spanish Days" parades, Salinas Rodeo, and a host of civic celebrations in California and neighboring States. This aggregation's precision and distinctiveness has brought it over 100 trophies and an equal number of blue ribbons in assorted competitions.

The Dos Palos High School Band is equally distinguished. Representing a community of only some 2,000 souls in the agricultural region of California's rich San Joaquin Valley, this musical group has gained fame in statewide competition. The justified civic pride in its achievements and competence prompted residents of the town to raise funds to meet expenses of sending the band to the National Capital for this occasion.

California is proud, indeed, to be represented by the Santa Barbara "Barbarettes" and the Dos Palos High School Band.

REAUTHORIZATION OF GARRISON DIVERSION IRRIGATION PROJECT, NORTH DAKOTA

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, the Pick-Sloan plan for development of the Missouri River Basin was authorized under the Flood Control Act of 1944. Much of this great program has already become a reality.

It includes five very large multiple purpose dams on the Missouri River. The people of the Missouri Basin have already realized untold benefits from these huge dams, including protection against the devastating floods of the past.

In making possible these vast reservoirs to store flood waters, it was necessary to acquire a large amount of very fertile land. North Dakota alone lost over 550,000 acres of its most valuable agricultural lands for the Garrison and Oahe Dams.

Under the Flood Control Act of 1944 one of the major commitments was to replace this lost acreage with irrigated land. The Flood Control Act of 1944 specifically authorized a large irrigation project for North Dakota.

Because of the long delay on the part of the Federal Government in embarking upon the irrigation phase of the Pick-Sloan plan, it is felt by many that the Garrison diversion irrigation project in North Dakota should be reauthorized.

The project for which we are seeking reauthorization would irrigate only about 250,000 acres as against approximately 1 million acres authorized under the Flood Control Act of 1944.

Mr. President, the Garrison diversion irrigation project, besides providing this most necessary irrigation, would also greatly enhance the fish and wildlife interests not only in North Dakota but the entire Nation. Too, it would provide badly needed and necessary water supplies to at least four of our larger cities.

Mr. President, the entire State of North Dakota is united in support of this project. The original authorization was endorsed by President Franklin D. Roosevelt when he signed the Flood Control Act of 1944 of which it was a part. The reauthorization, which we are now seeking, was endorsed by Presidents Dwight D. Eisenhower, John F. Kennedy, and Lyndon B. Johnson.

I am pleased to offer for the Record House Concurrent Resolution A, just approved unanimously by the State Legislature of North Dakota.

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Harris in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The concurrent resolution ordered to be printed in the Record is as follows:

House Concurrent Resolution "A": Garrison Diversion Unit

Whereas a substantial irrigation development for North Dakota was not only promised, but was specifically authorized as an integral part of the Missouri River Basin project in the Flood Control Act of 1944, to partially offset the loss experienced in the State by the acquisition of over 550,000 acres of valuable agricultural lands by the Federal Government for the construction of the Garrison and Oahe Dam and Reservoir projects on the Missouri River; and

Whereas the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation has determined from exhaustive studies and investigations conducted over the past 20 years, that the multiple-purpose Garrison diversion unit and irrigation development proposed therein is engineeringly and economically justifiable and feasible; and

Whereas legislation that would reauthorize the Garrison diversion unit has been proposed in each Congress since 1957, and has been the subject of extensive and thorough congressional hearings held during the intervening years, at which strong and consistent project support has been given by the State's congressional delegation, Governor, legislature, potential irrigators, farm, business, labor, industrial, professional, and agricultural organizations and leaders, as well as from basinwide and national water resources organizations, and by the last two administrations; and

Whereas the U.S. Senate in the 88th Congress, 2d session, passed a bill authorizing the construction of the initial 250,000-acre phase of the Garrison diversion unit, and the U.S. House of Representatives Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in the same session, reported out favorably and recommended for passage a bill, H.R. 1003, as amended, authorizing the construction of the initial phase of the Garrison diversion unit, which report and amended bill were acceptable to the sponsors of the reauthorizing legislation, but said H.R. 1003 failed to receive House action because of lack of time before sine die adjournment of the 88th Congress: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota, the Senate *concurring therein:* That the 39th Legislative Assembly of the State of North Dakota hereby expresses its unequivocal support for the early development of the Garrison diversion unit and fully concurs in and endorses the presentations by Gov. William L. Guy and other proponent witnesses at the hearings in the 88th Congress on S. 178 and H.R. 1003, and companion bills; and be it further

Resolved, That the 89th Congress be and it is hereby most respectfully urged to take early action to effect enactment of legislation authorizing the construction of the Garrison diversion unit along the lines of S. 34, H.R. 1718, and H.R. 237, 89th Congress; and be it further

Resolved, That copies hereof be transmitted by the secretary of state to the Members of the North Dakota congressional delegation, the chairmen of the Senate and House Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs, President of the Senate, Speaker of the House, the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior, the Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Water and Power, and the Commissioner, Bureau of Reclamation.

Arthur A. Link,
Speaker of the House.
Donnell Hongen,
Chief Clerk of the House.
Charles Tighe,
President of the Senate.
Gerald L. Stan,
Secretary of the Senate.

EARLY AND FULL DEBATE ON SOUTH VIETNAM IMPERATIVE

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, last Friday, January 15, 1965, the able and distinguished senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. Church], one very well versed in the foreign affairs of the United States, stated:

> The Senate has a responsibility in the field of foreign affairs. We have suffered from too much conformity of thought on the matter of Vietnam. A dissent constructively expressed, indeed, a full-fledged debate on the subject of Vietnam, is long overdue. At the very least, such a debate would give the American people a better idea of the alternatives available to us. It would give the President more elbow room, should he need it, within which to deal with this difficult situation in southeast Asia.

I concur wholeheartedly in Senator Church's recognition of the need for a full, frank, and open debate in the U.S. Senate of the situation in South Vietnam. The American people have a right to demand such a debate on a subject matter so important to their future welfare and to the welfare of the Nation as a whole.

As a matter of fact such debate has already started.

In the issue of the American Legion magazine for August 1964, some of the pro and con arguments for our present position in South Vietnam are set forth by the able and distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall] and myself. I ask unanimous consent that those arguments under the heading "Should U.S. Troops Be Withdrawn From Vietnam?" be printed in full in the Record at the conclusion of these remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, last Sunday, January 17, 1965, in the New York Times Magazine a similar discussion of the pros and cons of our continued unilateral presence in South Vietnam by the able and distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], and the former Ambassador to South Vietnam, Mr. Lodge, were set forth. I ask unanimous consent that this discussion also be printed in full in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, both of these debates in the Nation's periodicals serve a most useful purpose. But the debate on South Vietnam should be brought to the Senate floor for here there can be give and take which in years past has been used so often to focus public attention on vital issues.

And at this time there can be no more vital issue than our future course of action in South Vietnam.

The U.S. position in South Vietnam is steadily deteriorating. It is deteriorating despite the massive military and financial aid the United States is increasingly pouring into that country and despite the stepup and extension of our Air Force bombings which, although they have been going on for some time, were revealed to the American people only by the shooting down of two of our planes.

Not only is the stability of the Government of South Vietnam ebbing and flowing from day to day, but it seems to be losing—if indeed it ever had—the confidence and support of an increasing segment of the people. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at the conclusion of these remarks a report by United Press International in the New York Times for January 18, 1965, entitled "Four Students Shot in Vietnam as Rioting Sweeps Two Cities."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 3.)

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, as further indication of the rapidly deteriorating situation in South Vietnam and the impossibility of U.S. fighting advisers replacing South Vietnamese troops lacking the will to fight, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Congressional Record a dispatch by Jack Langguth in the New York Times for today, January 19, 1965, entitled, "Thirty Percent of Vietnam Draftees Desert Within 6 Weeks."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 4.)

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, in an excellent editorial published in the Christian Science Monitor for January 18, 1965, entitled, "Delay or Diplomacy in Vietnam," the alternatives facing the United States are set forth clearly and concisely. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 5.)

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the time is long overdue for the full airing on the floor of the Senate of all the facts on the U.S. position in South Vietnam and for a discussion of the alternative choice for future action open to the United States legally, morally, militarily, and politically.

It is my earnest hope that such a debate will take place without delay and will be participated in by as many of my colleagues as possible.

[From American Legion magazine, August 1964]

Exhibit 1

Should U.S. Troops Be Withdrawn From Vietnam?

YES

(By Senator Ernest Gruening, Democrat, of Alaska)

The war in South Vietnam is not and never has been a U.S. war. It is and must remain a fight to be fought and won by the people of South Vietnam themselves.

Will to fight and will to win must come from the spirit of the South Vietnamese. The United States cannot instill that will in them. For the past 14 years, U.S. military and economic aid to South Vietnam has totaled nearly $3 billion, but despite statements of leaders of both political parties, Vietnam continues to be rocked by internal strife which drains the nation of its resources.

The root of the present dilemma in which the United States finds itself in South Vietnam lies in the aftermath of France's defeat at Dienbienphu on May 7, 1954. Today—10 years later—the U.S. position resembles that of France although we haven't used a quarter of a million troops, yet.

Those who compare South Vietnam today with South Korea of the 1950's make a great mistake. South Korea had the will to fight and to win. South Korea was a country invaded from the north—South Vietnam is a country divided within itself by a civil war. More important—in Vietnam we are alone; in Korea we were in there as part of the United Nations effort.

Where are our allies in South Vietnam? Over 200 Americans have been killed in South Vietnam, as we fight alone. Prospects are that we will continue to do so.

The theory was advanced by the late John Foster Dulles that the United States must keep South Vietnam strong to prevent the fall of Cambodia and Laos to Red China like a row of dominos. We poured aid money into each domino, including $300 million into Cambodia, yet it recently neutralized itself and fell of its own accord, thereby voiding the Dulles progression theory advanced during the Eisenhower administration.

I consider the life of one American worth more than this putrid mess. Let us do a little hard rethinking. Must the United States be expected to jump into every fracas all over the world, to go it all alone, at the cost of our youngsters' lives, to stay blindly and stubbornly when a decade of bitter experience has shown us that expenditure of blood and treasure has resulted in failure?

The time has come to reverse our policy of undertaking to defend areas such as South Vietnam, whose people are so reluctant to fend for themselves. Let us keep on, by all means, supplying them with arms. Let us continue to give them the means if they wish to use them. But not our men.

We must reassess the Dulles doctrine of seeking to engage communism on its own ground—12,000 miles away.

The situation in South Vietnam and elsewhere in southeast Asia cries out for international solution. The problem will not be resolved in battle but around a conference table. The United Nations is such a conference table.

NO

(By Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, Republican, of Massachusetts)

The withdrawal of U.S. troops from South Vietam would assure the Communists of victory there and result in a drastic defeat for the United States—morally, politically, and psychologically.

The issues at stake in South Vietnam reach far beyond our minimum objective of preserving the non-Communist social order of that country. The war in Vietnam is a struggle for the survival of U.S. leadership in the fight against Communist expansion, not only in southeast Asia but throughout the world. Those who propose U.S. withdrawal, a negotiated settlement, or the neutralization of South Vietnam as alternative solutions for terminating the conflict there, have failed to grasp this underlying significance of the war and the importance of its outcome upon the U.S. world position.

While it may be debatable whether we were prudent in doing so, nevertheless, the unalterable fact remains that the prestige of the United States has been fully committed to the prevention of a Communist takeover of South Vietnam. If the United States should fail to honor that commitment by disengaging from South Vietnam, our default would disastrously affect world opinion and would surely be construed by the nations of the world as evidence of our weakness and vacillation in coming to grips with communism.

Moreover, from the military standpoint, the U.S. formula for advising and assisting the South Vietnamese to resist Communist-inspired wars of national liberation rests in the new concept of counterinsurgency—now undergoing its acid test in the rice paddies of the Mekong River Delta. If this defensive concept fails in its purpose to overcome the creeping aggressions of Communist guerrilla warfare, the United States will have to admit to a military defeat in being incapable of devising effective military tactics to cope with that type of warfare. As a consequence, an increase in guerrilla wars can surely be anticipated not only in southeast Asia but throughout the world as communism expands without U.S. military hindrance or resistance.

Politically, a defeat in South Vietnam will be the catalyst for the nations of the Orient to aline themselves with Communist China which would, as a result of U.S. disengagement, become the dominating influence of all of Asia. Should South Vietnam fall, it is more than likely that communism would eventually triumph in southeast Asia through subversion, bloodless coups, or guerrilla wars.

The neutralization of South Vietnam is appealing in principle but it has thus far failed in Laos. Similarly, a settlement under United Nations auspices is attractive in principle, but there is no assurance that the Communists would not undermine and subvert United Nations efforts in South Vietnam as they did in the Congo.

The United States, whether rightly or wrongly, is so involved morally, militarily and politically, and its prestige so fully committed in South Vietnam that it cannot countenance a defeat there. Consequently, under present conditions U.S. troops cannot be withdrawn if we are to avoid serious international repercussions.

EXHIBIT 2

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times Magazine, Jan. 17, 1965]

WE MUST LEAVE VIETNAM

(By WAYNE MORSE)

Ten years ago the United States embarked upon an adventure in South Vietnam that was just about 100 years out of date. While Britain, France, and the Netherlands were terminating their rule over their Asiatic colonies, the United States began trying to establish its own beachhead on the Asiatic mainland.

Although present at the Geneva Conference of 1954, which drew up the accord whereby France withdrew from its old colony of Indochina, the United States refused to sign the final agreement. So did one of the subdivisions of Indochina, South Vietnam. The United States began a heavy program of financial and military aid to a new Premier in South Vietnam who, we believed, was most likely to preserve a Western orientation. When it came time for the 1956 election throughout both North and South Vietnam required by the Geneva accord, we and our client in Saigon, Ngo Dinh Diem, realized it would be won by Ho Chi Minh's followers not only in his own North Vietnam but in the South as well. South Vietnam refused to proceed with the election.

In the last decade we have explained our policy as one of helping a free government resist Communist subversion. But South Vietnam never has had a free government. In its 10 years of existence its governments have been picked for it by the United States and maintained by our heavy doses of economic and military aid.

The fraudulence of our claim has been starkly exposed by the successive coups in Saigon and by the piecing together of one government after another by the American Embassy. Leaders suspected of favoring neutralism or any form of negotiation for settlement of the civil war are firmly excluded from Government ranks. The major tools we have used in manipulating political and military leaders have been various threats and promises regarding our aid, which now hovers around the level of $600 million a year in a country of 14 million people. This sum is exclusive of the cost of keeping 23,000 American "advisers" and large contingents of aircraft in the country.

In fact, our official explanations of why we are there now play down the "helping a free government" line and play up American security and American prestige as the stakes in Vietnam. At least, the explanations are getting closer to the truth, which is that the United States took over this quarter of Indochina in 1954 when the French pulled out. Having intruded ourselves into southeast Asia, where we never were before, it was this country and not the Communists who made our prestige in Asia the issue.

Our Secretary of State often says that "China must leave her neighbors alone." Under this premise, our officials have vaguely threatened to expand the war to North Vietnam and possibly China if we cannot win in South Vietnam. But there are no Chinese forces in South Vietnam nor Chinese equipment in appreciable amount. Americans are still the only foreign troops in South Vietnam.

Nonetheless, China has the same interest in what goes on in the subcontinent of southeast Asia as we have in Mexico, Cuba, and other countries of Latin America. She will increasingly resist having hostile governments on her borders, as do Russia and the United States. We recognize and accept this principle as regards Russia, but we refused to recognize it as regards China.

This has been true even though we have watched other Western nations ousted from Asia and Africa by rising nationalism. It was inevitable that once China became part of this tide she would reassert her interest in the governments on her borders. A reawakened China would assert this interest whether she were Communist or not. The more we escalate the Vietnam conflict, the more likely China is to intervene directly.

In South Vietnam, we invite China's apprehension, but more than that, in trying to surround China with American bases and pro-Western states, we have to buck not only communism but anticolonialism. One of our many mistakes is to equate the two, especially when antiwhite feeling is directed against the United States. Advocates of a containment policy for China, similar to that applied to Russia with some success in the late 1940's and 1950's, overlook the impossibility of maintaining Western strongholds in Asia, no matter what their purpose. What we could do in white Europe and even the Middle East is not to be imposed upon an Asia that is united in at least one respect—its determination to see the white man sent back to his own shores.

With our great wealth we can sustain the current war effort in Vietnam indefinitely, even if it is escalated. But it will never end because our presence and our selection of Saigon's rulers will always inspire rebellion.

Far from maintaining our prestige in Asia, our present policy in Vietnam is eroding it. The fact that we are losing despite the steady increase in our aid, the addition of 23,000 American advisers, and complete American air domination, has already led several Asian nations to throw out an anchor on the Chinese side. Of the famous dominoes that were all supposed to fall to China if we failed to take up the French burden in southeast Asia, Burma and Cambodia have already neutralized themselves. Pakistan has made it clear that the aid she gets from us is directed against India and not against China, Japan and India, the largest non-Communist nations of Asia, who might be expected to be the most helpful to us in Vietnam, have not associated themselves with what we are doing there. A few days ago India's Premier Shastri urged a new international conference to negotiate a settlement. He asked the United States not to press for a military decision and urged that we avoid a major military conflict.

Of all the nations touted as potential Chinese victims, only Australia and the Philippines have offered tangible help in South Vietnam. The Australian contribution amounts to some 66 advisers and 3 air-cargo planes. The Philippine offer of a force of volunteer veterans was turned down.

That is the extent of the local interest and support for the American view that we are saving all of Asia from communism by our policy in Vietnam. Surely if one of these so-called dominoes believed it, they would be fighting side by side with us in Vietnam. They are not, because they see us having to run faster and faster just to stay in the same place in Vietnam. They see that the bulk of its people are too indifferent to American objectives to resist the Vietcong. They know that sooner or later we will have to leave and they do not want to jeopardize their own standing in Asia by supporting a last-minute white intervention.

There are many ways this country could crawl back from the limb we crawled out on 10 years ago. Through the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization, the United Nations or a reconvened Geneva conference we could seek to establish an international presence in Vietnam to stabilize and pacify the country while it develops political institutions. Our refusal to sign the accord of 1954 has always made suspect our claim that we were enforcing it.

In truth, our enforcement has taken the form of violations far more massive than any violations by North Vietnam. Our jet air forces and bases, our helicopter fleet, the 23,000 U.S. military advisers are all violations of the 1954 accord. So are they violations of section after section of the United Nations Charter, under which we are pledged to seek peaceful solutions to disputes and to lay before the U.N. those disputes we are unable to solve peacefully through means of our own choosing. We have done neither in Vietnam.

A negotiated settlement in South Vietnam is the first solution we are obliged to seek. Of course, it would mean some guaranteed neutralization of the country. That would give its war-torn people the best chance they have yet had to construct a country of their own, something the French, the Japanese, the French again, and now the Americans have not given them.

If we fail to reach a negotiated settlement, then the U.N. Charter requires the dispute to be laid before a regional organization, such as SEATO, or one of the U.N. bodies. Both groups have the capacity to police the country; both the more likely to bring it some degree of cohesion than is the United States with its unilateral intervention in pursuit of our own interests.

Some Americans have busily erected an enormous pyramid of disasters they contend would result even from this limited American retrenchment. They see America as a power in the Pacific only if we and our friends control all its shores instead of just its northern, eastern, and southern shores, plus the island fringe off its western shore. Most important, they ignore the impossibility of creating an American foothold on that shore in mid-20th century, communism or no communism.

Many countries, East and West, have accommodated themselves to the end of the old order in Asia. We will, too, eventually. The only question is how much blood and money we will waste first trying to turn the clock back.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times Magazine, Jan. 17, 1965]

WE CAN WIN IN VIETNAM

(By Henry Cabot Lodge)

"Pulling out of Vietnam" is exactly the same as "turning Vietnam over to the Communists." Such a course would not be merely imprudent, but actually extremely dangerous.

Geographically, Vietnam stands at the hub of a vast area of the world—southeast Asia—an area with a population of 240 million people extending 2,300 miles from north to south, and 3,000 miles from east to west. The Mekong River, one of the 10 largest rivers in the world, reaches the sea in South Vietnam. He who holds or has influence in Vietnam can affect the future of the Philippines and Taiwan to the east, Thailand and Burma with their huge rice surpluses to the west, and Malaysia and Indonesia with their rubber, oil, and tin to the south. Japan, Australia, and New Zealand would in turn be deeply concerned by the communization of South Vietnam.

Historically, Vietnam has long played a part in the political development of the Far East. For many centuries it was under the occupation or influence of the Chinese and was used by the Chinese as a means of enforcing their hegemony over the whole of southeast Asia. The Vietnamese did not enjoy this experience and have traditionally done what they could to throw off Chinese overlordship. In a very real sense, therefore, the present struggle is one of self-determination.

But today Vietnam should be seen as one more instance in a long series of events which began in Iran, Turkey, and Greece after World War II; which include the seizure of Czechoslovakia; which led to the Marshall plan in Europe; which caused the Korean war, the Malayan emergency, the Huk rebellion in the Philippines, and the Berlin crisis. In all these widely separated places the Communist bloc has tried to subvert and to undermine the free world in order to spread its control and its suppression of freedom.

In opposing this Communist onslaught, the free world has stood together for nearly two decades. One manifestation of our common determination to frustrate the Communist design to conquer Europe was the creation of NATO. Elsewhere in the world we have formed other alliances. The United States alone has suffered 160,000 casualties since the end of World War II in this effort to contain the spread of communism.

This worldwide effort by nations of the free world has not been undertaken out of a simple quixotic delight in engaging in battles in distant places. Nor does it signify a desire to establish a new colonialism or any kind of special position. The war in Vietnam is not only the struggle of a small nation to exist, but it is also an open encounter between the doctrine that "wars of revolution," as the Communist call them, are the wave of the future, and our belief that in the future nations should be allowed to develop their own destinies free from outside interference.

Although the North Vietnamese have their own motives for their aggression in South Vietnam and have played the leading role, they have always been backed by the Chinese Communists. Should their aggression be successful, the Chinese Communists will have seen positive proof that their approach to international relations is correct.

Such an outcome might well lead the Soviets, in their desire to retain the leadership of the Communist bloc, to adopt a more belligerent stance in their relations with the outside world. This would surely affect the West.

It would also be regarded everywhere as a reflection of the inability or lack of will of the free world to prevent aggression. What, for example, would be the reaction in Europe if the United States were to withdraw from southeast Asia in the face of the commitment to assist the nations there?

The state of public opinion in the United States itself would also be affected. Should Vietnam be lost, many voices would be heard urging us in effect to "resign from the world," fall back onto our "fortress America" and gird up our loins for a contest with guided missiles. This too would be something which neither Europe nor the rest of the free world could ignore.

Because of all these considerations, the United States has undertaken to support the Vietnamese both politically and militarily, in an effort which has cost us lives and treasure. The effort has not been in vain.

Although we are not yet victorious, we have achieved a stalemate, which is surely much better than defeat. On the economic and social front the United States has contributed to the building of schools, clinics, and better farms, all of which are essential to gaining and holding the political support that must be had to win the war. And we try to help in every way in training civil administrators and in creating political energy in the country.

Some have said that despite this effort the war in Vietnam cannot be won. Yet recent history shows that we have been fighting wars of this sort for the past 20 years and that the record is creditable. We of the free world won in Greece, we thwarted the Communist aggression in Korea, we won in Malaya, we won in the Philippines, and we can win in Vietnam. We must persist and we must not play into the enemy's hands by counting on a quick, sensational, and easy way out and then being disappointed when it does not occur.

Persistent execution of the political and military plans which have been agreed to will bring victory—provided outside pressures do not become too great. These outside pressures occur in many forms such as the problem of sanctuaries from which Vietnam can be attacked and the Vietcong helped with impunity. Infiltration from such sanctuaries cannot be allowed to defeat the efforts the Vietnamese are making. We will not shrink from taking such measures as seem necessary to cope with it.

Another form of "outside pressure" is the desire in some quarters for an international conference here and now. We do not oppose the idea of holding international conferences as an abstract proposition—if they are held at the proper time and under the proper circumstances—but we think that to hold a conference now would serve no good purpose and would seriously undermine morale in South Vietnam. Consider the reasons:

1. There have already been two conferences on southeast Asia (one on Vietnam and another on Laos), the terms of which were satisfactory but which the Communists violated before the ink was dry. Before holding another conference there must be some sign that the Communists of Hanoi and Peiping are prepared to let their southern neighbors alone.

2. For the South Vietnamese to go to a conference now with a large and aggressive fifth column on their soil would amount to a surrender. A conference not preceded by a verifiable Communist decision to cease attacking and subverting South Vietnam would be nothing more than a capitulation.

3. There is clearly no agreement between us and the Communists on the simple proposition to let South Vietnam alone. A conference held in an atmosphere of bitter disagreement could only make matters more dangerous than they already are.

So-called neutralism is another outside pressure standing in the way of the successful prosecution of the war in South Vietnam. Neutralism that does not include some means of enforcement, that does not include North Vietnam, that means South Vietnam will be alone and disarmed, is nothing more than surrender. It should be opposed for Vietnam just as it is opposed for Berlin or for Germany. It takes strength to be neutral. South Vietnam is not strong enough today to be neutral.

In truth both Vietnams are "neutralized" now by article 10 of the Geneva accord of July 21, 1954, which said: "the two parties shall insure that the zones assigned to them do not adhere to any military alliance and are not used for the resumption of hostilities or to further an aggressive policy."

This provision was formally approved by article 5 of the final declaration of the Geneva Conference of 1954, which the U.S.S.R., Red China, France, the United Kingdom, the United States, Cambodia, Laos, North and South Vietnam attended.

We must therefore insist before there is any discussion of a conference or of neutralism, that the Communists stop their aggression and live up to the agreements which already exist. The minute the onslaught ceases, there can be peace. At present, the North Vietnamese seem only to understand force, and, of course, when they use force they must be met with force, as they were in the Gulf of Tonkin. They should also be met with the strong and united opposition of the free world.

It seems that conflicts in far-off places are precisely those which have often brought war and calamity to all of us. Manchuria seemed far away in 1931; the subversion of Czechoslovakia by Hitler seemed remote to the United States in 1938. Persistence, and unity in the face of Communist pressure have succeeded in Europe and in southeast Asia, and can succeed again.

Mao Tse-tung said: "Politics is war without bloodshed; war is politics with bloodshed."

The struggle in Vietnam is not a "war" in the sense that World War II—or Korea—was a "war," because total military success in Vietnam, unaccompanied by success in other fields, will not bring victory. A many-sided effort is needed; no single effort will solve the problem; the problem is thus the despair of the headline writer and the political stump speaker employing black-and-white phraseology.

Therefore, those who say that there is a quick solution or a simple solution or an exclusively military solution are doing as much of a disservice as are those who say that there is no hope, that we must pull out and that another southeast Asian conference (added to the two which have been already held—and dishonored) will do other than turn South Vietnam over to the Communists.

They also do a disservice who deny that much has been achieved, that the military program, the economic program, the social program, the informational program, and the various technical programs have all accomplished much—have indeed built the springboard of victory—and that it is the political, countersubversive, counterterrorist program which still needs special attention.

It is accurate to say that a glass is half full of water and it is also accurate to say that the glass is half empty. To dwell on the fact that we have not achieved victory does not negate the other fact that we have prevented defeat—and that a stalemate is much better than a defeat.

It is not the American tradition to get panicky whenever there is a little rough weather. If we decide only to interest ourselves in the nice, quiet, neat countries (which do not need our help) and abandon all the rough, tough, difficult places to the Communists, we will soon find ourselves surrounded by a rough, tough world which is aimed straight at the destruction of the United States and which will make our present effort in Vietnam seem like the mildest of pink teas.

EXHIBIT 3

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Jan. 18, 1965]

FOUR STUDENTS SHOT IN VIETNAM AS RIOTING SWEEPS TWO CITIES—2,000 AT HUE DEMAND OUSTER OF HUONG AFTER OUTBREAK OF VIOLENCE IN DALAT—TROOPS EVADE VIETCONG TRAP

SAIGON, SOUTH VIETNAM, January 17.—Anti-Government demonstrations by student and Buddhist groups swept the central Vietnamese cities of Hue and Dalat today. Four students were shot and wounded.

The rioting occurred as the Government reported two new clashes with Communist guerrillas. In one battle, a Government unit outwitted the Vietcong and inflicted heavy casualties as they were preparing an ambush.

At Hue, the ancient imperial capital near the North Vietnamese border, 2,000 students, including some Buddhists, massed outside the radio studio and shouted demands for the dismissal of Premier Tran Van Huong.

They were angered by reports that the four students wounded in Dalat had died. Actually the students were being treated at a private clinic and the nature of their wounds was not disclosed.

In the Dalat demonstration, 500 students paraded through the streets, forcing shops to close. Policemen and troops set up barricades to keep order, but the preventive measures shortened tempers and rocks were thrown.

A U.S. Embassy source said there were reports that a Vietnamese national policeman in civilian clothes had fired the shots.

The demonstrators were reported to include students from two Government-run high schools—the Hung Dao School for boys and the Bui Thi Xuan School for girls—and from a Buddhist school.

In the fighting at Tayninh, near the Cambodian border, meanwhile, Government forces killed 25 Communist rebels after discovering a Communist ambush plot.

Instead of breaking through the rebels' roadblock, the Government troops halted and called for reinforcements to steal behind the Vietcong troops lining the road.

Two Government soldiers were killed and one was wounded. A number of Vietcong weapons were seized, including 11 rifles, 2 pistols, 2 carbines, and a radio.

In other action, Government troops using 105-mm. artillery fire, supported by Vietnamese Air Force strikes, drove off two Vietcong companies 10 miles south of Binh Gia.

U.S. military spokesmen said two Government outposts had withstood the Vietcong assault despite casualties totaling 10 killed and 15 wounded. The artillery fire and the air strikes finally drove off the Communist forces, the spokesman said.

EXHIBIT 4

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Jan. 19, 1965]

THIRTY PERCENT OF VIETNAM DRAFTEES DESERT WITHIN 6 WEEKS

(By Jack Langguth)

PHU BAI, SOUTH VIETNAM, January 18.—Tram Niem, a 28-year-old potato farmer, was recently drafted into the South Vietnamese Army, and he does not like it.

"There has not been enough food for the past 3 weeks," the new private said.

Although the winds were raw on the rifle range, he was firing in his bare feet. He had never worn shoes before his induction and the boots the army issued to him had left bleeding blisters on his heels and toes.

Thirty percent of the draftees inducted with Private Niem 6 weeks ago like the army even less than he. They have already deserted.

That percentage is standard for the Dong Da National Training Center at Phu Bai, near Hue in central Vietnam. Some recruits leave to attend to family problems, then return to camp. There is no organized attempt to pursue and punish the men who do not come back.

TRAINING IS VERY HARD

Another private, Hoang Ton, the father of two children, said he was looking forward to leaving the army as quickly as possible.

Private Niem's thin face was alert and mobile as he gave his reasons for wanting to return to his nearby village. Private Ton's expression was sullen. "All of the training," he said through an interpreter, "is very hard for me."

Unless he also deserts, Private Ton's return to civilian life is far off. Both volunteers and draftees are usually held in the regular army for the duration. In some instances, men have been released after 3 years of service, but a new soldier cannot count on it.

During his service a soldier's pay is adequate. A private receives 1,600 piasters, almost $13 a month. Woodcutters in this province earn a quarter of that.

The training that perplexes Private Ton is based on U.S. Army manuals. It is divided into a 5-week basic course and a 4-week period of advanced combat training. An added 3 weeks of training, which had been trimmed to speed the output of recruits, will soon be restored.

The most time for any one aspect of military training, 50 hours, is given to teaching the new soldier to use a carbine. Eight hours is devoted to teaching him to use the heavier M–1 rifle.

Only 12 hours in the first 5 weeks are given over to political indoctrination.

Complaints about the food here go beyond the griping traditionally done by soldiers. The floods south of Hue have made transportation of supplies difficult and student protest demonstrations have kept many stores closed.

Lt. Col. Tran Heuu Tu, who commands the Dong Da center, is allotted 15 piasters a day, about 12 cents, to feed each trainee.

COOKING SOMETIMES EARLY

Rice and meat strips are cooked in outdoor vats. The food is then set out on plank tables hours ahead of time, sometimes with plastic sheets stretched across the plates to keep flies off. Soup is heated and served in scrub buckets.

Australian and American advisers at the camp do not interfere. "We're not here to lecture them on sanitation or anything else," one adviser said. "We save our nudging for those areas of tactics where we might be able to contribute something."

Dong Da is responsible for guarding Hue Airport ammunition dumps and a classified American radio-research unit in the area. Regular reconnaissance companies, back at the center for refresher training, handle most of the night patrols.

Although the hilly countryside is dotted with Communist-led Vietcong bands, the patrolling is generally uneventful. When the Communist guerrillas have ventured out in any numbers, Government troops, with an assist from the trainees, have driven them back and inflicted heavy casualties.

Despite these successes, the practice has been for Government patrols to huddle together at dusk and move only during daylight hours when Vietcong activity was limited.

After forceful objections by the Australian advisers, Colonel Tu this week changed the procedure. He ordered his men to travel at night in eight-man patrols.

The new method has not yet been perfected. On the first small patrol the Vietnamese troops set out with live geese and chicken slung over their shoulders.

While Western advisers deplore a prevailing lack of aggressiveness they have found that with proper leadership the Vietnamese make good soldiers.

"And when leadership fails," one Australian officer said, "You hear some lovely stories about our men picking up a few Vietnamese by the scruff of the neck and saying 'You're coming with me.' "

EXHIBIT 5

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Jan. 18, 1965]

DELAY OR DIPLOMACY IN VIETNAM?

Is U.S. military and diplomatic policy in South Vietnam the haphazard, improvisatory, Micawberish affair that it may seem when viewed from one angle? Is Washington—-as well as Saigon—merely waiting for "something to turn up," which could point out a new path through the jungle of American troubles in southeast Asia?

Or are recent American actions—specifically the heavy bombing raid against the bridge at Ban Ban in Communist North Vietnam and the presence of atomic weapon-bearing Polaris submarines in Asian waters—part of a well-thought-out and complex diplomatic maneuver?

We get no hint of an answer from Washington. This silence would be expected if Washington is conducting a delicate diplomatic maneuver. It would also be expected if, unhappily, Washington did not know in which way to move or what policy to follow. Three choices seem to lie before Washington in South Vietnam today: (a) to keep on helping South Vietnam fight to the bitter end, with a constant stepping up of American military action, (b) a negotiated peace with the Communist north, and (c) to abandon the entire effort as quickly and as decisively as possible.

Each of these courses is difficult. The first is the one which has been tried, but which does not seem to be succeeding. The third would cause a disastrous decline in American prestige in the area, and would raise grave doubts all over the world as to Washington's determination to live up to its many commitments.

The middle course is the one which appears to be receiving a wider and wider hearing in Washington. Yet, if the present American policy is veering toward negotiation, why the stepping up of the military effort? May it not be with the intention of sitting down at the conference table in as strong a position as an otherwise disastrous situation will permit?

If such is the case, it is understandable why Washington must refuse to answer the evermore insistent questions of those who demand to be told what the United States plans to do about southeast Asia. If the United States is seeking to build a strong bargaining position, through an increased demonstration of military might, it cannot be expected to weaken that position by talking about it.

Perhaps Washington is not following such a delicate diplomatic maneuver. Perhaps it is merely groping and hoping. Perhaps it is prepared to step up its military intervention to the point where it believes that North Vietnam can be made to reconsider the cost of its growing intervention in the Communist rebellion in the south. We do not know. But it is doubtful if, with the war going as badly as it has in recent months, the answer can be long delayed.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10:30 a.m. tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, and after discussing the matter with the distinguished minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN], I announce that there will be no business transacted on tomorrow, Inauguration Day. The Senate will move in a body, shortly after convening, to the Inauguration.

It is our intention after the prayer to suggest the absence of a quorum, and, at approximately 10:45, or thereabouts, adjournment will take place.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT FROM WEDNESDAY TO FRIDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that when the Senate adjourns tomorrow, it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Friday next.

The motion was agreed to.

THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION CLOSING OF LINCOLN HOSPITAL PROTESTED

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the Veterans' Administration has determined that several VA hospitals should be closed. The hospital at Lincoln, Nebr., is included among those to be eliminated.

Many of us in the Senate and in particular on the Appropriations Committee have a great appreciation for the importance of eliminating unnecessary spending. There are, however, other considerations in spending the taxpayer's money. One of these is the defense of our country, past as well as future. We have a continuing obligation and duty to provide adequate and necessary care for our veterans. When any doubts arise concerning the economy of cutting back on those who have given of their health and their lives, these doubts must be resolved in favor of providing adequate medical care for our ex-servicemen.

This obligation is not met by shipping veterans off to our overcrowded and distant urban centers to spend their more difficult days. It is not met by removing them from their homes, the places they have chosen to return after defending their country. It is not met by sending them somewhere because others have chosen to go there or, in some cases, can afford to go there.

Our veterans are human beings, not units or numbers to fill beds. We must see that they are treated as human beings who have come to the defense of their country when it needed them the most. The national conscience can allow no less.

The distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], has pointed out the losses suffered by the State of Montana in defense installations and now in defense obligations. Lincoln, Nebr., has suffered a similar fate. It and Miles City, Mont., are the only cities to be hit by both the closing of a veterans hospital and an Air Force base, all within a few weeks. We hear much talk about the computers which make these decisions, but are computers really coordinating all the factors which must be considered? If so, their communications have broken down.

When the Lincoln Air Force Base was closed, an economic development expert was sent by the Department of Defense to help Lincoln overcome the impact of the cutback. While he was busily giving advice, the hospital closing was announced. I am told that he had to call back in disbelief to the Veterans' Administration to confirm the announcement. Just as the Administration neglected to inform Members of Congress, it apparently failed to inform the Department of Defense.

The president of the Lincoln Chamber of Commerce, Thomas Pansing, said that a team sent out by the Federal Government to soften the blow of the airbase closing told him:

> The Federal Government would do everything possible to ease the impact of the closing. So far the only help we've received from the Federal Government is to close the veterans hospital.

Mr. Pansing summed up the feeling of many Nebraskans when he said:

> We can't afford too much more help like this.

My fellow Nebraskans and I know that our economy can withstand these closings. It will set us back but we will survive. The Federal Government may well find another activity to conduct in Lincoln. But that is not the question. The question is: Will this provide the care needed by our veterans?

I am gratified that the Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee will study this question. I ask unanimous consent that a letter sent to the chairman of that subcommittee, Senator YARBOROUGH, requesting that such a study be conducted be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, when the Veterans' Administration briefed members of the Nebraska delegation on this action, we were not satisfied that the closing of the Lincoln hospital was fully justified. Additional information has been requested from the VA on the future medical needs of veterans in the region served by the Lincoln facilities. It is my hope that the Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee will examine this factor in studying the decision.

Let it be clear that this decision to close these facilities is the decision of the Veterans' Administration, the Bureau of the Budget, and through the Bureau the ultimate decision rests with the Johnson administration. The sole elected official participating in this decision is the President.

As Members of the Senate, we did not receive notice that these closings were under consideration until the decision had been made. Within a few days after I was notified of the decision, an announcement was made that no more patients would be admitted to the Lincoln hospital. It is my hope, therefore, that the Veterans' Administration will take notice of the congressional hearings and reverse its policy of refusing admission to patients.

I am gratified at the announcement that hearings are scheduled on the subject of the closing of all Veterans' Administration hospitals, and I earnestly commend to the subcommittee the merits and facts which pertain to the proposed closing of the hospital in Lincoln, Nebr.

EXHIBIT 1

JANUARY 18, 1965.

Hon. RALPH YARBOROUGH,
Chairman, Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, U.S. Senate

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Announced closing of the Lincoln veterans hospital was received with sharp sense of loss and disappointment in Nebraska, as undoubtedly was the case as to the other facilities similarly treated.

No one that we know of would be against cuts of clearly demonstrated unnecessary spending; but in every case, due regard should be accorded the objectives of the program at issue. This is especially true of the national commitment made to our veterans, and the firm obligations flowing therefrom. If any doubts appear in the balancing of these factors, they must be resolved in favor of the medical care which our servicemen have earned and to which they are entitled.

It is strongly felt, as I am certain the consensus shows, that the Veterans' Administration should be put on very strict proof as to the humane, moral, and overall wisdom of the course it proposes.

To that end, I join with those of our colleagues who have already called upon you as chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee to make a thorough study and inquiry into all these closings, and that the situation in Lincoln and in Nebraska be given a searching scrutiny with them.

At once upon receipt of the Veterans' Administration announcement, my colleague

Senator Curtis and I held a conference in my office with Dr. Linus Zink who was courteously requested to be present by Mr. Driver, Administrator of the Veterans' Administration. He furnished us some information on which the Veterans' Administration decision was based. Frankly, at the close of the meeting, neither my colleague nor I were satisfied that a case had been made out to justify the announced action.

Dr. Zink agreed to transmit to us additional information which will be sent to you for the subcommittee records and consideration upon its arrival. Communications and protests from Nebraskans—veterans, patients, employees, and others—have come to me. They are being sent to you for the record also.

It is hoped that arrangements for hearings will be made and announced soon, and vigorously pressed.

Sincerely yours,

Roman L. Hruska,
U.S. Senator, Nebraska.

"COMMUNITY SERVICE—WE BUILD," KIWANIS THEME FOR 1965

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, Kiwanis International has adopted for its administrative theme for 1965, "Community Service—We Build."

An impressive presentation of the theme, the objectives and committee emphases for this year is being made this month at local Kiwanis clubs throughout the Nation.

Mr. Robert Hasebroock, member of Downtown Kiwanis Club of Omaha, Nebr., has sent me a copy of the presentation "as an outstanding example of what freemen, through voluntary action, can and will do without government assistance."

The Kiwanis program is characterized in this quotation from the presentation of its 1965 theme:

> There can be no building by freemen unless men are free. If we are to assume the continuity of Kiwanis service, we must assume the continuity of a society in which men are free to work toward goals which they themselves have chosen. Service clubs have no reason for existence, even if permitted to exist, in a society where all services are provided by the state; service clubs would have no sustaining force in a society where the state denies the existence of a Supreme Being.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the text of the theme presentation printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the theme presentation was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Community Service—We Build

They dreamed a dream.

In an age obsessed with the material, they dreamed that man could give primacy to the spiritual. Though nation was rising against nation, they dreamed that man could do to others what he would want others to do to him. They dreamed that, in the heart of man, apathy could be supplanted by awareness—that indifference could be transformed into concern, and self-concern into self-giving.

Fifty years ago—they dreamed a dream.

The merchant, the teacher—the farmer, the banker—men of all callings—joined in that dream, having faith in the ideal that men working together in community service might change the world.

Through the golden anniversary of Kiwanis International, we acknowledge our debt to those men of vision, and our awareness of the golden legacy which they created, nurtured, and now lay at our feet for us to protect, enrich, and bring to fruition. No other group of men has received a richer heritage than we.

But dreams can pass into nothingness, and fade away like morning dew. Each age must dream anew. "Each age is a dream that is dying or one that is coming to birth." With gratitude, we glance behind us; with a sense of destiny, we strive ahead, looking to the stars and hearing God's promise to Isaiah: "For behold, I create new heavens and a new earth."

Change and permanence are the only certainties in our future. Change will bring about its own enchanting miracles—new opportunities to serve, new resources to use, new dreams to dream. No seer can yet set down the course of man in the next century or the next decade. But as change is certain, so too is permanence. The star that led the camel caravan in the days of the Pharoah guides the astronaut in his orbit. The principles which have endured through the past 50 years of Kiwanis history will endure permanently, guiding us as surely as the Pole Star in determining the course we shall pursue. Man can change and produce change, but man cannot alter the eternal.

Let us then resolve to focus our sights on the principles which have characterized our 50 years of service: faith in God, the dignity and freedom of the individual, citizenship responsibility, patriotism, and good will. Let us resolve that as community service has been the dominant philosophy under which Kiwanians have served for 50 years, community service will be the dominant philosophy of Kiwanis for the next 50 years. Whatever changes may occur in our manner of life or fortunes, whatever changes may occur in our organizational structure or our immediate objectives, community service can be the permanent characteristic of Kiwanis history.

The past, then, is our introduction to a continuing drama. As we enter this golden anniversary year, we draw the curtain for act 2, playing our roles according to the scenario provided by our forebears. Reflecting our rededication to the spirit of Kiwanis-past, the renewal of our vows to Kiwanis-present, and the affirmation of our faith in Kiwanis-future, our administrative theme for 1965 is "Community Service—We Build."

The golden anniversary year provides no occasion for marking time while we celebrate the past. The need and the opportunities for Kiwanis service were never greater. The 1965 theme of "Community Service—We Build" not only provides the continuity for the mainstream of Kiwanis history; it challenges us to complete the unfinished work at hand. Stated in another way, the theme says: "Through services to our communities, we will build a better world in 1965."

But where shall we build, and what shall we build? What are our objectives for 1965?

There can be no building by freemen unless men are free. If we are to assume the continuity of Kiwanis service, we must assure the continuity of a society in which men are free to work toward goals which they themselves have chosen. Service clubs have no reason for existence, even if permitted to exist, in a society where all services are provided by the state; service clubs would have no sustaining force in a society where the state denies the existence of a Supreme Being. If the time should ever come when we look upon man and see him as no more than a well-fed, well-housed organism in a godless world, a statistic without individual freedom or dignity, then we can be certain that the service club movement is ancient history. Our whole existence depends upon the freedom of the individual to act independently and to serve his Creator according to the tenets of his faith, whatever that faith may be, so the first objective for 1965 is that we build, defend, and preserve our heritage of freedom, our belief in God, and the dignity of man in his human and spiritual relationships.

Two thousand years ago, it was recorded that a voice from Heaven spoke to shepherds tending their flocks and said: "Glory to God in the highest, and peace on earth to men of good will." Whatever our religious faith may be, none can deny that good will is essential for the maintenance of peace and the strengthening of bonds among the free nations of the world. Even among nations which would be friendly, the seeds of distrust, of envy, and of fear are always present; this is a fact of life. But distrust, envy, and fear can be germinated by ignorance and nurtured by misunderstanding. It is possible, as the people of Canada and the United States have so dramatically demonstrated, for men of different nations to do to others what they would want others to do to them, yet this would not be possible without understanding. We know too little about our brothers in the other nations of the free world; we must work purposefully in 1965 to bring about maximum contacts, maximum communication, and, in turn, maximum understanding. Our second objective for 1965 is that we build international understanding by demonstrating the basic principle of the Golden Rule, using as an example Canada-United States good will.

It is idle to speak of freedom without believing in economic freedom. Part of the heritage of freedom is that man has the right to own property, to operate a business, to pursue a profession of his choice, and to save, spend, or invest his earnings as he chooses. This economic system has brought us strength; it has brought us prosperity; it has made independence possible. It must be preserved from all substitutes and defended against all who would weaken it. We cannot well defend or preserve what we take for granted, what we do not understand. It is imperative that we ourselves and the youth of our nations understand the fundamental principles of a free economy. Therefore, our third objective for 1965 is that we build an understanding of and appreciation for the private ownership of property by educating ourselves and our youth in the principles of a free capitalistic system.

Government at any level takes on the character of those who govern. Where our leaders are weak, our government will be weak; where strong, our government will be strong. Patronage does not insure performance; integrity is not a necessary product of popularity. Character and competence are the hallmarks of responsible leaders. Kiwanis clubs should work aggressively to encourage the candidacy of able men and to provide a forum through which the public may become aware of the worthiness of candidates for office. Individual Kiwanians should offer themselves for offices for which they are qualified and speak out against all whom they believe to be incompetent and unworthy. Our fourth objective for 1965 is that we build responsible government by insisting upon worthy and competent men in all positions.

In a highly competitive society such as ours, there will always be individuals and groups who have no better guide than the end deserves the means. Kiwanis does not subscribe to such a guide. Since our founding, Kiwanis has stressed ethics in business and professional life. We have formulated for ourselves the Kiwanis code of ethics, and in 1965 we reaffirm our acceptance of this code in the conduct of our business and professional endeavors. Ethics cannot be regulated by law; ethics are moral principles which necessitate self-regulation. If a self-regulated code of ethics is a positive force in the lives of Kiwanians, it can also be a positive force in the lives of all men whose actions affect the public good. Therefore, our fifth objective for 1965 is that we build the highest standards of morality and integrity by encouraging organizations, businesses, professions, labor, and news media to adhere to self-regulated codes of ethics.

The first service rendered in the name of Kiwanis was service to youth. In our early years, we gave prime attention to underprivileged youth. More recently, through the development of key clubs and circle K clubs and our support of other youth organizations, our emphasis has been on developing leadership in youth. In 1965, we reaffirm this emphasis, believing that the greatest legacy we can leave the world is a generation of youth whose leadership potential has been identified and developed, a generation of youth committed to achieving excellence and responsibly building a better society. Our sixth objective for 1965 calls for all Kiwanians to work shoulder to shoulder with the younger generation in order that we may build youth for leadership through circle K and key clubs and other worthy youth organizations, and create a desire to achieve excellence.

The free nations of the world have been blessed with abundant natural resources. As our population and our standards of living increase, our natural resources are being consumed at an alarming rate. Pollution, erosion, and waste take their daily tolls. The redistribution of existing resources and the discovery and development of new resources can be only a part of the answer. Man must regard himself as a faithful steward of God's gifts, and he must work to preserve resources through wise and conservative use. To that end, we direct the seventh objective for 1965: Build a more abundant existence by effective programs to preserve natural resources.

In 1963, in the United States alone, 101,000 persons died from accidents, and more than 10 million persons are estimated to have received disabling injuries. In Canada, the death rate based on population was higher than in the United States. Catastrophes are news and shock us into action, but lives lost from major disasters are relatively few when compared to the day-by-day life losses from ordinary accidents. The program of service of every Kiwanis club should include some project of accident prevention—driver training, water safety, fire prevention, school patrols, farm safety, vehicle inspection, or law enforcement. The accident rate is a blot on our civilization, and we call for the greatest possible effort to reduce it. Our eighth objective for 1965 is that we build safer communities and preserve life.

In addition to the waste of natural resources and the waste of human life through accidental death, one of the tragedies of modern times is the waste of the skills and abilities of our aging population. Early retirement and increased longevity are annually and rapidly increasing the number of retired persons in our society. Many of these are men and women eager to make continued use of their accumulated skills in employment, in counseling, and in community service. Some need retraining, but most need only opportunities to use present skills. Retirement itself is no barrier to active membership in Kiwanis, nor should it be a barrier to community service, to the counseling of youth, or to employment in occupations where specialized skills are needed. In 1965, Kiwanis directs attention to the senior citizen, and our ninth objective is that we build opportunities for retiring and retired persons by developing programs which will enable them to make use of their skills and abilities.

On January 21, 1915, the first Kiwanis Club was organized in Detroit, Mich. On January 21, 1965, we celebrate the golden anniversary of Kiwanis International. We have experienced dramatic growth in clubs and membership through the first 50 years, but the story of the golden anniversary is not a story of numbers. We have carried Kiwanis from the great city to the crossroads village and across the seas, but the golden anniversary story is not the story of geography. We have been the voice of praise and the voice of protest, but the golden anniversary story is not the story of a voice. The pride of Kiwanis membership rests in the reputation of Kiwanis for community service, and this is the story we tell during our golden anniversary year. Community service is our cause for being; our record for community service can be a song of praise in which all mankind can join. In its 10th objective, Kiwanis calls upon every club to build pride of Kiwanis membership by dramatizing the golden anniversary and telling the Kiwanis story.

As we begin the golden anniversary year of Kiwanis International, we give thanks to God for those who dreamed and had faith in the capacity of freeman to place the spiritual above the material by doing to others as he would have others do to him. We take this moment to rededicate ourselves to the ideals of community service, renewing our vows to our communities that we will in all of our endeavors strive to fulfill the revered objects of Kiwanis. Join with me now in the act of rededication as we recite together our objects:

To give primacy to the human and spiritual, rather than to the material values of life.

To encourage the daily living of the Golden Rule in all human relationships.

To promote the adoption and the application of higher social, business, and professional standards.

To develop by precept and example, a more intelligent, aggressive, and serviceable citizenship.

To provide through Kiwanis clubs, a practical means to form enduring friendships, to render altruistic service, and to build better communities.

To cooperate in creating and maintaining that sound public opinion and high idealism which make possible the increase of righteousness, justice, patriotism, and good will.

May God give us the strength to serve our fellow man.

May He give us the courage of our convictions.

May we continue to build.

LIBERALISM AND DESPOTISM—A PROPHETIC VIEW

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, 22 years ago, Mr. W. E. Christenson, then associate editor and now president and editor of the Omaha World-Herald, addressed the Nebraska Bar Association on the subject of liberalism in the United States.

Although Mr. Christenson makes no claim to prophetic powers, the article is well worth rereading today, in the light of developments in the 22 years since the speech was given.

For example, it is interesting to recall, in the light of the ambitious blueprint for a Great Society drawn in the President's state of the Union message, these words from Mr. Christenson's remarks:

> We are not fighting a tangible program which can be faced and debated, but only an insidious trend. Trends are mighty tricky things to fight, as the people of Germany discovered in 1933.

Indeed, the trends which concerned Mr. Christenson in 1943 have become realities today, as the President's message clearly shows.

The Christenson speech recognized a handicap which still hampers those of us today who speak out against Government excesses:

> It is a little difficult to discuss such matters without seeming to defend some of the piratical practices which attached themselves to our economy during the earlier years of easy prosperity. The one who questions steps taken since 1933 is likely to be answered with, "Oh, so you prefer the Hoover depression." The one who questions the all-seeing, all-knowing wisdom of the bureaucracy is likely to be branded as a Tory and a latter-day edition of Mark Hanna. Yet those taunts will have to be braved if we are going to save the kind of personal liberty Americans love.

Mr. Christenson; early in his remarks, described what he called American liberalism of the post-Civil War period:

> Most westerners were liberals in those days. We have the breath of freedom in our nostrils. We wanted to live in a republic in which there was real opportunity for all. The great American liberal movement was libertarian in its aims and constitutional in its methods. Nothing was farther from its purpose than a return to the days when bureaucrats swarmed over the land, eating the substance of the people.

But in the thirties, he pointed out, a profound change had overtaken the liberal movement:

> Liberalism was in the saddle, but it was not the pure, historical American liberalism. The men and women who crowded into places of power were not in every case believers in the traditional American concept of liberty. There were experimenters in their ranks, and uplifters and social workers and dreamy-eyed doers of good—and a few zealots who had borrowed their ideas from other climes.

Finally, Mr. Christenson prescribed the solution to the problems he posed:

> The thing that is needed is to bring about a reawakening of embattled American liberalism, so that the people themselves will insist upon and get a restoration of the kind of liberty that made America great.

That call, Mr. President, for a return to American liberalism, is even more valid today than when it was sounded more than two decades ago.

I commend to my colleagues a thoughtful reading of this remarkable speech and for that purpose, I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Liberalism Rises to New Heights of Despotism

(Address by W. E. Christenson to Nebraska Bar Association, February 28, 1943)

(By W. E. Christenson)

To some people liberalism means Eugene Debs, to some it means George Norris, to some it means Joe Stalin, and to some it means Franklin Roosevelt.

To me it doesn't mean any of those, but it means a lot of people who, through the ages, have been leading the fight for the liberty of human beings—and particularly those who have been fighting against enslavement of people by their government.

It's nothing new. Dionysius said, "A love of liberty is implanted by nature in the breasts of all men." Tacitus wrote, "Liberties and masters are not easily combined." Thirteen centuries later William Wallace said to the Scots, "I tell you true, liberty is the best of all things; never live beneath the noose of a servile halter."

But while this feeling for liberty appears to be almost universal, it flourishes more luxuriantly on American soil than anywhere else on the globe. The reasons are not obscure. From the earliest settlements our country has been populated and repopulated by fugitives from tyranny. And when the time came for separation, it is noteworthy, I believe, that the colonists in their bill of complaints did not dwell on physical hardships. They did not say, "You have not protected us from the Indians," or "You have not taken care of our old people," or "You have not allowed us to have enough tea." The thing that caused them to rebel was that they were being treated as inferiors and dependents. They were revolting against the usurpations of the king and the violations of their liberties.

"He has refused his assent to laws the most wholesome and necessary. He has dissolved representative houses repeatedly. He has made judges dependent on his will alone. He has erected a multitude of new offices and sent hither swarms of officers to harass our people and eat out their substance. He has combined with others to subject us to a jurisdiction foreign to our constitution."

The colonists were fighting, not the particular brain trust which happened to be in power in London at that moment, but a totalitarian system.

NO END

The war against the mother country was won, but the battle for human liberty did not end. It continued until our own times.

But when the decades arrived which most of us look back upon as the days of our youth—the decades which marked the turn of the 20th century—the nature of the battle had changed. Political authoritarianism had been vanquished, we thought, for all time. But in its place there had come a sort of economic despotism which many free Americans found no less galling than earlier types of tyranny. The natural wealth of the land had been plundered to a considerable extent by the robber barons who flourished after the Civil War. Great wealth and great economic power became concentrated in a few hands. Workers in great industrial centers were ground down into a state of servility. The historical avenue of escape—flight to the West—narrowed and finally closed as the cheap land was occupied.

That was when modern liberalism was born.

Most westerners were liberals in those days. We were the sons of wild jackasses, we had the breath of freedom in our nostrils, and we didn't want to see ourselves or our children shackled into an industrial "class" system of society. We wanted to live in a republic in which there was real opportunity for all—economic opportunity as well as political opportunity. We wanted every child, even if born in the humblest home, to have a chance to become a Congressman or a president or a chairman of the board—according to the stuff there was in him.

SWINDLERS

Our thoughts in those days were largely concerned with what we called "the trusts" and the "malefactors of great wealth"; with swindlers who impudently sold worthless stocks; with manipulators who threw great railroad systems into bankruptcy so that they might plunder them; with sweatshops and company stores and kickbacks and blacklists and insolently juggled tariffs and adulterated food and short weight and all the other manifold evils that had attached themselves to the economic and political system.

But let this point be made—to borrow a phrase—"again and again." Most of us were not tired of individual liberty; we wanted more of it. We wanted the rules of living in a free land to be changed a little so that we, the people, would be more secure in our freedom and less endangered by the irresponsible authority of autocrats.

It is only fair to say that there were crackpots in the liberal movement—Socialists, anarchists, syndicalists and "ists" of many stripes who even then were thinking in terms of a dictatorship of the proletariat. But they were an insignificant minority. The great American liberal movement was libertarian in its aims and constitutional in its methods. Nothing was farther from its purpose than a return to the days when bureaucrats swarmed over the land, eating the substance of the people.

EXPERIMENTERS

Ten years ago American liberalism thought it had won its greatest political victory. But as time was to prove, that was in reality its hour of greatest danger.

For the men and women who crowded into places of power in the next decade were not in every case believers in the traditional American concept of liberty. They were not in every case well grounded in the practical mechanics of modern society. There were experimenters in their ranks and uplifters and social workers and dreamy-eyed doers of good—and a few zealots who had borrowed their ideas from other climes and non-American cultures.

Liberalism, so-called, was in the saddle, but it was not the pure, historical American liberalism. In too many instances it had overtones of the other kinds of isms then being advocated in Europe.

HERESY

The strange thing about this new, left-wing, self-styled liberalism was that it proposed to set up bureaucratic government controls, backed by executive directives, to preserve the liberties of the people. The Founding Fathers would have turned in their sacred graves if they had heard such heresy.

Perhaps the harassed businessman when he accepted the temporary shelter of the NRA, the farmer when he took a Federal check for what he had raised or had not raised, the humble WPA worker when he thanked Washington for his pittance, did not have time to think about the fundamental conflict involved. But the conflict was there, as clearly etched as ever it had been in history: The taxpayer versus the bureaucrat; the citizen versus the executive decree.

This is not an indictment of an administration. It should be said in fairness that many items in the program of the New Deal were beneficial changes in the rules—changes designed to permit the average American a chance to lead a better and more useful and freer life.

USURPED

But the overall trend of the decade has been toward strengthening the arbitrary authority of the State. The power of the courts has been assailed and the power of the Congress has been usurped and bypassed. Today no prudent attorney would dare to advise a client on any matter relating to the economic life of the Nation merely on the basis of what he could find in the statutes or in his volumes of judicial opinions. More important by far than these are the decrees and directives which come from the bureaucracy, and the rulings thereon which have been handed down by various ones of 2,500,000 civil employees of the Central Government.

It is a little difficult to discuss such matters without seeming to defend some of the piratical practices which attached themselves to our economy during the earlier years of easy prosperity. The one who questions steps taken since 1933 is likely to be answered with, "Oh, so you prefer the Hoover depression." The one who questions the all-seeing, all-knowing wisdom of the bureaucracy is likely to be branded as a Tory and a latter-day edition of Mark Hanna. Yet those taunts will have to be braved if we are going to save the kind of personal liberty Americans love.

MIRACLE

Only the naive will expect that the lawmaking and directive-issuing bureaucracy will meekly disband after the war and that its many practitioners will return forthwith to their studies and their social service settlements. So far as I am aware no such miracle has ever transpired in the long record of the struggle between the people and government. Rousseau was speaking for history when he said: "Liberty is never recovered if it is once lost."

There are plentiful signs that those former liberals who now are directing the managed economy do not propose to go against the tide of history. They propose, when victory is won, that "planning"—that new word for despotism—shall be carried to new heights.

Only a few weeks ago Henry A. Wallace, that most amazing of all planners, gave a glimpse of what is running through his mind. In the postwar world he said, there will be a new type of government which might be called, "the democracy of the common man." And this new democracy, he said, will be made up of approximately equal parts of our traditional (it is his phrase) "Bill of Rights democracy" and the newer—again quoting Mr. Wallace—"economic democracy" as exemplified in the Government of Soviet Russia.

DIFFERENT

If "economic democracy" fits the needs of Russia—whose history and traditions are far different from our own—then certainly no one in America should utter one word of criticism. Americans have reason to be eternally grateful for the stout Red Army which that "economic democracy" has produced. But does that mean that we, also, should adopt the democracy of the commissars and the collective farms? That we should consider borrowing for our own use any part of a type of regime whose final authority is based upon the firing squad? Perhaps some Americans will not agree with their Vice President.

Another postwar dreamer, who is not an official but who sometimes speaks for the prevailing attitude in Washington, said only a few days ago: "Soviet Russia is now functioning as a complete democracy within an overall totalitarian scheme."

Possibly as you think it over you may conclude that is a fair statement of the program which some of these totalitarian-minded citizens may have in view.

SPECULATIVE

Any talk about what those now in authority propose in the way of a postwar program for our own country—I am not now speaking of any international organization—must necessarily be speculative. No one has stated it formally. We can only see what is happening, read what is being said—and then use our God-given intelligence.

Perhaps that points to one of the greatest dangers of the times. We are not fighting a tangible program which can be faced and debated, but only an insidious trend. Trends are mighty tricky things to fight, as the people of Germany discovered in 1933.

This would be a grand hour for the old-time, fighting American liberals—if they were still on the scene. But unfortunately the movement in which they once joined is bankrupt. Some of its leaders have been shanghaied and taken on a political cruise which was never charted. Others are tired and dejected. The political power which they built up has been dissipated or subverted to opposite uses. The great American liberal movement which once spread its beneficent influence over both great parties has disappeared.

DEMAND

True, there are political leaders in both parties who take a strong stand against what is being done. But if they should be put in power, would they be strong enough, morally, to junk the enormously powerful and (to the driver) attractive governmental machine that has been created? Historically a mere policy of throwing the rascals out has never been entirely successful.

A demand from a few political leaders can be forgotten after the election; a demand from the American people can never be ignored. The thing that is needed is to bring about a re-awakening of embattled American liberalism, so that the people themselves will insist upon and get a restoration of the kind of liberty that made America great.

If we, the people, don't resist, day by day, the insinuating power of the government directive, the time may come in America when every lawyer will work for the bureaucracy and every newspaperman will get his copy from the ministry of propaganda, and every citizen will get his marching orders from Washington.

If that time should ever come it will not be because, to borrow another phrase, any one "planned it that way," but because we, the liberty-loving people, were too complacent—because we didn't start fighting in time.

SOVIET ANTI-SEMITISM

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, recent disclosures of continued persecution of persons of the Jewish faith in the Soviet Union, make it clear beyond question that such activities are conducted with premeditated design as part of Soviet policy to discount obvious failures in that nation's economy. Religious persecution anywhere is bad enough, but when a nation uses it as an instrument of national policy it becomes reprehensible and should be condemned as such. For that reason I intend to reintroduce, next week, the resolution approved by the Senate last year by a vote of 60 to 1 expressing the sense of the Congress that Soviet persecution of Jews and all other persons be condemned.

Last year the resolution was offered as an amendment to the then-pending foreign aid bill. Despite its almost unanimous approval on a rollcall vote, House and Senate foreign aid bill conferees struck the provision and replaced it with language generally condemning religious persecution of all peoples everywhere. While this action was commendable it cannot be taken as a substitute for the Senate-passed resolution condemning the Soviet Union, specifically, because of its policy of Jewish persecution.

This Soviet policy is not a mere historical throwback to the pogroms of the czars. It is even more insidious. It is designed, as the Washington Post pointed out yesterday, to protect the highest interests of the Soviet state—the need to deter economic crimes without shaking belief in the system itself.

The United States should take an official stand on the Soviet Government's systematic policy of attrition against the 3 million Jewish citizens of the U.S.S.R. The main components of that policy are: First, deprivation of cultural rights; second, deprivation of religious rights; third, the anti-Jewish propaganda campaign; fourth, the scapegoating of Jews; fifth, discrimination in education and employment; and, sixth, refusal of the right to emigrate.

It adds up to a policy of reducing the Jews to second-class citizenship in the U.S.S.R., of breaking their spirit and crushing their pride. It aims to shatter, pulverize, and gradually eliminate Jewish historical consciousness and Jewish identity. It goes beyond the usual form of religious persecution and becomes instead a spiritual strangulation—the deprivation of a people's natural right to know their past and to participate in their present. And without a past and a present, the future is precarious indeed.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point an editorial from yesterday's Washington Post entitled "Soviet Anti-Semitism."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOVIET ANTI-SEMITISM

An article published last August in the Ukrainian language press in the Soviet Union and which has just become available in the United States reports a trial of 48 people linked with a textile factory in Kiev and convicted of illegally manufacturing and selling textile goods. Of the people mentioned, most have Jewish names, including the two sentenced to death. Both this and earlier accounts of the case, one of which was subtitled "The Ark of a Haberdashery Noah," concentrated almost exclusively on the Jewish members of the gang and contained several anti-Semitic innuendos.

This is not an isolated case. Since the campaign against economic crimes began in 1961, the Soviet press has persistently given disproportionate coverage to Jewish defendants, portrayed the Jews as crafty, cunning, avaricious, etc., and has projected a generally negative image of the Jew. The U.S.S.R. is one of the few countries that impose capital punishment for economic crimes, and the number of Jews sentenced to be shot for economic crimes is vastly disproportionate to their numbers in the general population.

The fact that the Jews are being used as scapegoats for economic crimes in Russia—a phenomenon that is endemic in the system—is now generally recognized. Last year, the International Commission of Jurists released a 45-page study of economic crimes in the Soviet Union in which it concluded that the Kremlin was using Soviet Jews as scapegoats to divert attention from the moral malaise in Russia. Economic crimes were being linked systematically to the image of the money-grabbing Jew of anti-Semitic fancy, said the Commission, because it would be dangerous to reveal the names and numbers of party officials and members who are caught in such crimes.

The Jews were thus the tragic victims of the highest interests of state—the need to deter economic crimes without shaking belief in the system itself. This is the only plausible explanation yet advanced for the semiofficial campaign of anti-Semitism in Russia.

Secretary of State Rusk said last April that the United States was considering what it might do to relieve the lot of Russian Jewry. Since then the situation seems to have worsened. The administration may be compelled to take notice of a growing crisis.

CLOSING OF VETERANS HOSPITALS

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, since the Veterans' Administration made its announcement of the rather widespread closing of veterans hospitals, the matter has had my attention. My interest in this matter is twofold: First, adequate hospital and medical care for our worthy veterans; second, the wisest planning for such care, taking into account both short range and long range costs as well as economies.

Mr. President, in answer to an inquiry I made of the Veterans' Administration, I have been informed that the peak load for hospitals for World War II veterans will not be reached until 1980. In other words there is going to be an increasing load on these hospitals for the next 15 years. While this increase will be felt more acutely in populous centers, the increase will be nationwide. I believe that when the committee goes into this matter of closing of veterans hospitals they should explore these figures and take these factors into account.

The Veterans' Administration is building more hospitals. They are improving hospitals. They are enlarging hospitals. I believe the committee should study the VA's expansion program and see how much expansion will be necessary by reason of the closing of existing hospitals. They should study the overlap and ascertain the savings that might be had, if any, by a national policy of greater use of existing hospitals rather than a building program.

Mr. President, the Lincoln veterans hospital has done a good job. It has been well staffed. Local organizations both veteran and nonveteran have been most cooperative through the years. I believe that before it is closed the matter should be thoroughly studied to ascertain what is best for our veteran population.

There is wide interest, and a great degree of dismay, among Nebraskans about the closing of the facility at Lincoln, Mr. President. This interest and dismay is expressed by both veterans and nonveterans. My mail during the past week reflects this widespread concern.

I ask unanimous consent that a representative few of these letters may appear in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
DEPARTMENT OF NEBRASKA,
Elk Creek, Nebr., January 14, 1965.

Hon. CARL T. CURTIS,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing you this little note of protest to let you know how I feel toward the closing of the veterans hospital at Lincoln, Nebr.

Mr. CURTIS, I have been around this hospital on several different occasions and have also been a patient there several different times. I know these veterans receive the best of care there, I know there are many who have limited income and to have to travel to some hospital more distant than Lincoln would be more of a drain on their funds. I hope you will see our side of the picture and also protest the closing of this unit.

I feel it is high time to economize but I don't believe we should do so at the expense of the veteran.

Sincerely yours,
WM. A. WERMAN,
Commander, District 13,
American Legion.

Beatrice, Nebr.,
January 14, 1965.

Hon. Carl T. Curtis,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: We wish to express our feeling with regard to the close of the Veterans' Administration hospital at Lincoln, Nebr.

We think that whatever will be saved in the close of the hospital will be added to the veteran's expenses and their families due to the extra cost in travel to and from the Veterans' Administration hospital. All of the veterans from this area needing hospitalization use the Lincoln, Nebr., Veterans' Administration hospital.

Any help you can be in preventing this action would be very much appreciated.

Please advise if there is any action on our part at this time that could be done to curb this.

Thanking you, we are,
Sincerely,
Herbert Umphenour,
Commander, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Geddes-Thober Post 1077.
John Styskal,
Quartermaster.

Lincoln, Nebr.,
January 14, 1965.

Hon. Carl Curtis,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Curtis: As commander of VFW Post 131 and as a member of the American Legion Post No. 3, both of Lincoln, Nebr., I wish to advise you that I strongly oppose the closing of our veterans hospital here in Lincoln.

In considering the future needs of the many veterans in Nebraska, parts of Iowa, and parts of Kansas, the area of which our hospital serves, it is felt that a great injustice will be done if this source of hospitalization is taken away from them.

It is my belief that the supposedly money saved by the closing of the hospital now is nothing but false economy when one considers the expenditures which will be required for future medical needs of our World War I, World War II, and Korean veterans.

Your support in preventing the closing of the hospital in Lincoln, Nebr., will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,
Dietrick P. Frye.

Lincoln, Nebr.,
January 15, 1965.

Senator Carl Curtis,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: In regard to the closing of the VA hospital here in Lincoln isn't there something that our Senator can do to stop it. We are in need of it very bad. I am a World War I veteran and am getting old and need to go there every once in a while, and besides I am not the only one it will hurt. Please help us.

Sincerely,
Lester V. Fay.

Lincoln, Nebr.,
January 14, 1965.

Senator Carl Curtis,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: I am writing concerning the closing of Lincoln veterans hospital in Lincoln, Nebr.

It seems to me it is false economy to have funds for other projects to close a veteran's hospital.

My husband is World War II veteran—wheelchair since 1943—and we certainly need the hospital facilities close as he gets weekly treatment.

I am adjutant of the Disabled Americans Veterans Auxiliary and the chapter members of 250 here, need the services of this hospital, not a hundred miles from here. The World War II fellas are just getting in the age bracket where they'll need hospitalization.

I hope you see fit to try to reinstate the VA hospital here in Lincoln, Nebr.

Yours truly,
Mrs. James L. Fisher.

Plymouth, Nebr.,
January 15, 1965.

Dear Mr. Curtis: I am writing you in regard to the closing of the veterans hospital at Lincoln, Nebr. I realize it is sound government to try and save the taxpayer's money, but I do not feel it is wise to save money by closing an institution which serves the men who risked their lives for this country. Another thing to consider is the fact that most of the veterans of World War II are reaching the age at which these services will be needed.

It is my sincere hope that you can see your way clear to do whatever is in your power to keep the veterans hospital at Lincoln, Nebr.

Yours truly,
Harlan W. Burger.

Lincoln, Nebr.,
January 14, 1965.

Senator Carl Curtis,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Curtis: The proposed closing of the Lincoln veterans hospital is about as politically stupid as anything we have seen. The President proposes billions for antipoverty and then fosters ecoonmic policies that deal devastating financial blows to areas that have been no prior problem. The airbase closing we accepted with good grace and in the knowledge that it was an essential move in the defense of the Nation. The VA closing isn't essential and could not come at a worse time. How much will be spent in Appalachia and elsewhere to create the number of jobs, 353, that will be eliminated here with this closing.

Good heavens, we all know that the national interest and purpose is best served by discarding facilities which are not needed but how they can justify this move in view of the recent building program is a mystery. It's a good guess, Senator Curtis, that Uncle Sam will spend billions more than it costs to keep Lincoln open. What is being spent here on the VA hospital is a mere pittance, a mere drop in the bucket compared to the billions that are poured into projects in New York, Texas, and California.

Just a quick review of the medical facilities and the number of consultants in the Lincoln area ought to have given priority to this hospital to have kept it open. The VA hospital had a most unique program being carried on the dialysis, in addition, it was one of the three institutions in the Nation now taking pictures inside the stomach of patients.

It seems that this part of the Nation is fast becoming on the short end of things when it comes to public spending at the national level. Let's hope, Senator Curtis, that they will take a second look and keep the VA hospital open in Lincoln. One thing appears to be certain—keep it open, or should it close, the VA in Washington needs a good housecleaning.

Best of luck to you and during the session of Congress.

Cordially yours,
Larry O'Nele.

Lincoln, Nebr.,
January 14, 1965.

Administrator, Veterans' Administration,
Hospital Division,
Washington, D.C.

Gentlemen: The VA's decision to apparently close the Lincoln VA hospital is certainly an example of gross mismanagement and lack of competent planning by some individuals at the VA headquarters. Your announcement claims the hospital has been under consideration for closing for years. Someone certainly showed their lack of intelligent analysis and appraisal of the situation for allowing the surgical suite, laboratory and pharmacy to be constructed. Even now, remodeling projects were in progress. Now one of the finest units in the United States will set idle. Surely the next step is to go wild and start building additions at either Grand Island or Omaha or go to another State and start new to satisfy someone's empire.

One of the Washington VA representatives made the statement that the Lincoln hospital had to be closed because the interest of the veterans comes first. Be sure to give that man a bonus and a prize, then let's try and see if the VA can't practice the philosophy that they preach.. Thanks to your unsound decision, thousands of veterans in this area have been swept under the rug for medical care.

It is hoped that someone there at the VA headquarters can in the future use their imagination and foresight and anticipate better planning and stop this ratrace. Nobody's judgment is perfect and everyone makes a bad decision but let's hope you take a second look, it always pays and let's keep the Lincoln veterans hospital open.

Cordially yours,
Larry O'Nele.

American Legion Auxiliary,
U.S. Veterans Hospital,
Lincoln, Nebr., January 14, 1965.

Hon. Carl Curtis,
Senate Chambers,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Curtis: As the wife of a service-connected amputee and a paraplegic veteran who has been a patient in the veterans hospital at Lincoln, Nebr., 8 years and who can come home for a few hours on Sunday through the use of a lift attached to the car operated by hospital nursing assistants and who is too heavy for one person to assist in the home, I am pleading with you to assist in rescinding the order to close this hospital.

I do not speak from a purely selfish viewpoint in spite of the fact that it will utterly shatter my husband's ability to spend any time at home. My husband, the patient, until he became totally disabled, was national service officer for the Disabled American Veterans in this area, and formerly in Washington, D.C., area, and he is extremely interested in the welfare of the other patients.

We feel that this hospital should remain in operation because it is in a metropolitan area where the veteran population is heavy. Most of the patients are Lincoln or immediate area residents and we feel that if they must use Omaha, or Guard Island hospitals they are deprived of veterans hospital care to which they are entitled. If a Lincoln man becomes emergently ill, as many do before giving up, he will have to enter a private hospital and will not be moved 60 or 100 miles for recuperation. Therefore, he'll be on his own financially and hospital bills will be unduly burdensome. Lincoln is really the only metropolitan center in Nebraska besides Omaha and we feel that the veterans here will be sold short if this excellent hospital is closed. There are research and teaching programs, outstanding consultants available and modern attitudes and techniques apparent to even the casual visitor. The morale is very high among patients, personnel, and volunteers. This is a friendly hospital, where the patient feels at home and this factor is emphasized. I do wish you could experience the response to the announcement of closing. You'd understand the importance of attempting to rescind this order. Please do this for the people in this area—they are high type people with a real need for this service to veterans and they are your people and you are the representative in this crisis.

Thanks so much for anything you may do to help.

Sincerely,

Helen R. Williams.

Lincoln, Nebr.,
January 14, 1965.

Senator Carl T. Curtis: I, as a resident of Lincoln, Nebr., and also a disabled veteran, am very concerned over the closing of the Lincoln veterans hospital. This hospital has always served this area well. I feel the closing of Lincoln veterans' hospital should be investigated and carefully studied.

I would like for you to give this matter your undivided attention.

Sincerely,

Russell R. Loos.

Lincoln, Nebr.,
January 15, 1965.

The Honorable Carl Curtis,
Senate Chamber,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Curtis: I am deeply concerned over the news that the U.S. veterans' hospital might be moved from Lincoln. It is so near to all of our Nebraska veterans. Its equipment is the latest and finest. The workers are of the finest caliber. I know whereof I speak for my husband was a patient there several years ago. He had lung surgery. His treatment was of the latest type. There are other veterans' hospitals which are not as badly needed as this one is. There are many very able doctors available to the hospital in this city. Why change? The money would only be used for some less worthy cause.

Many of the fine workers would have to sacrifice their homes if their jobs were gone. Lincoln needs the hospital.

The airbase has been taken away and now you folks want to take away the U.S. veterans' hospital which would hurt the economy of this area.

Please fight to keep the hospital here. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Martha Leuck.

Lincoln, Nebr.,
January 14, 1965.

The Honorable Carl T. Curtis,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Sir: I suppose by this time you have received many, many letters of this nature about the deactivation of the U.S. veterans' hospital here in Lincoln. I'm sure that the people concerned with the closing were not fully aware of many things at the hospital. I have worked at the hospital for 15 years and most of that time in the operating room.

First, they stated low patient demand. During the war, the hospital was set up for about 250 beds. The capacity now is about 225. It has averaged just below 200 for some time. In going by the admission doctor's office, there is always a line of veterans waiting to see the doctor. The staff in the operating room are always busy operating. Of course, during the past holiday season the census has gone down. That's to be expected. I suppose we average between 200 and 250 operations a month. The operating room suite was completely new 3 years ago, costing $750,000. Everything is new and the equipment is the latest. There was a new conductive tile floor put in about 2 months ago, costing $7,000. There is no operating room any better in this part of the Nation.

About 3 years ago there was a complete set of three new boilers for heat and hot water, costing nearly $50,000. Now contract electricians are completing an overall new wiring system throughout the hospital to meet increased electrical demands. That will cost a large figure, too. To modernize the hospital further, they have contracted for four new elevators at $160,000. These elevators are contracted so I suppose the VA is stuck for them now. The contracting company already has the cages made and ready to go into the shafts.

I hope you can vision by this letter that I'm trying to tell you we have a well improved hospital for the patients. So why close it up, there surely is a lot of money invested in improvements.

Enclosed is a clipping from the Lincoln Evening Journal which expresses our feeling very well:

"PUBLIC MIND: COLDBLOODED

"Lincoln.—What are they going to use for veterans of World War II and Korea for the next 10 to 30 years, by closing this veterans' hospital for a few paltry millions? The Government (meaning us, the taxpayers) will have to spend many millions in the future for new and so-called improved hospitals.

"When a veteran is in need of help from the hospital, he does not see how good the TV sets are or if it has any air conditioning, etc. He looks for quality of the medical staff and their aides.

"We have the highest quality in their field, if not, why are the civilian hospitals here in Lincoln after our doctors to help them. Now's the time for them to help us if they want to prove they appreciate such help.

"As for lack of patients to fill this hospital, that is a very narrow and shortsighted way to look at it. There are patients waiting to get in here, at times more than there is room for.

"And whenever there is any cutting to do by either party which may be in power, why is it the veterans always get it in the back? Why cannot the foreign aid be cut or are they more important than the help and aid which rightfully should be expected by those who give parts of themselves?

"In short, it is nothing but coldblooded politics.

"H. H."

Lincoln, Nebr.,
January 15, 1965.

Dear Senator Curtis: Am writing this letter to tell you how hard it is on the people of Lincoln and vicinity in closing the veterans hospital here.

I have a very dear friend, Mrs. William Burlington, whose husband has been in the veterans hospital for 3 years or more. She has a retarded boy in his forties and has to have care. She has been so faithful to both and never complains. Now to have to move her husband to a VA hospital in some other town or State would sure be a hardship on her. She is just worried and heartbroken and she is not the only one. But knowing her personally, I naturally think of her.

Is not there something that can be done to keep the hospital here, as it is so badly needed?

Wish you could do something to assist these poor people as they sure need your help.

Thanking you,

Mrs. John Farrell.

Lincoln, Nebr.,
January 14, 1965.

Hon. Carl T. Curtis,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Curtis: It is our hope that you will do everything in your power to prevent the closing of the veterans hospital at Lincoln, Nebr.

From our observation there are many veterans who receive therapy at the veterans hospital, who are faced with the same problem we are. My husband is a totally disabled World War I veteran, who has disabilities which require physical therapy twice each week, and medical observation and care at least once each month. It would be physically impossible for him to go to either Omaha or Grand Island for this care.

This hospital has given us excellent care over a period of years, and has given the same excellent care to many others with whom we have come in contact. It is easily accessible by train, bus, and good highways.

Needless to say, it would be physically impossible for the hospitals at Omaha and Grand Island to absorb the patient load in addition to the patient load they already have. Thus many needy veterans would be deprived of very necessary care and treatment which they are now receiving.

We would be most appreciative if you will do what you can to keep this very necessary help available to the considerable number of us who now receive the outstanding help of the most execllent staff at the veterans hospital at Lincoln.

Respectfully yours,

Mrs. William L. Frampton.

Barneston, Nebr.,
January 15, 1965.

Hon. Carl T. Curtis,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: The closing of our veterans hospital in Lincoln is of great concern to us in the Barneston and surrounding area. We have had many veterans in this hospital the past year. In fact five at one time from just our own little Legion post. There will be an increased number as time goes on. These men were not able to travel a great distance at one time so could go in a car, otherwise it would mean an ambulance. This would result in increased transportation costs alone for many veterans and their families, many of whom are already hard pressed.

The stay in the hospital would have to be increased. Now they can come home for their families to care for them with a periodical checkup.

Won't you help us keep the hospital in Lincoln?

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. Clara G. Schultze.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, also as a part of my remarks, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Record an editorial from the January 13, 1965, Lincoln, Nebr., State Journal which discusses the VA hospital closing.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Time To Go to Work

If Lincoln today feels a little like the fellow whose wife took the family savings and ran off with the hired man, it's not too surprising.

In just a little more than 2 months, the city has received "Dear John" notices from two of its most cherished institutions, the Lincoln Air Force Base and the Veterans' Administration hospital. With them will flee many millions of dollars in annual payrolls.

Lincoln generally has taken a philosophic attitude about the closing of the airbase, scheduled for June of 1966. Most leaders have assumed that in due time the loss can be turned into a gain by getting a more stable enterprise as a replacement.

This, of course, is true. The same could be true of the loss of the VA hospital, slated to shut down June 30 of this year. But the city might be excused if it displays a momentary tinge of bitterness.

As chamber of commerce President Tom Pansing remarked as he recalled the promise of Federal help in overcoming the loss of the airbase: "So far the only help we've received from the Federal Government is to close the veterans hospital. We can't afford too much more help like this."

> Lincoln, after all, probably has been harder hit by recent Federal cutbacks than any city in the country. It is one of only two communities to lose both a military base and a Veterans' Administration installation.
>
> Perhaps some justification can be found for closing the VA hospital in Lincoln. It is the oldest of the three such hospitals in Nebraska, and it has not been used to capacity in recent years. If the closing is truly to reflect a saving for American taxpayers, it cannot be faulted.
>
> If, however, the closing of the Lincoln installation is to be followed by construction or expansion of VA hospitals in other parts of the country, the loss here will be doubly difficult to accept.
>
> And if President Johnson's Great Society is to come at the expense of the Nation's heartland, including his proposed reductions in the support of agriculture, maybe this is not the kind of society Nebraskans will care to associate with.
>
> Lincoln has taken the airbase closing with a minimum of grousing. It has not griped unduly over the loss of the Veterans hospital. For this the city should receive some credit and, let us hope, not another kick in the shins.
>
> Apparently the hospital closing is irrevocable, though. So the only constructive action for Lincoln now will lie in added effort and determination to gain productive uses of the airbase facilities and the Veterans hospital.
>
> Some moves in this direction had been initiated after the announcement of the airbase closing. But there still is no well-meshed coordinating program, no professional staff to devote its entire attention to the problem, no concrete plans of how to proceed.
>
> It there had tended to be any lethargy or disagreement attached to the job of finding alternate uses for the airbase, this surely has been shaken off by the imminent departure of the hospital. Any roadblocks which might have been in the way of urgent and energetic action certainly will have to be cleared now.
>
> One proposal made in the wake of the airbase announcement was to add an assistant to the mayor's staff to devote full time to finding new uses for the facilities. This proposal is still hanging fire. Maybe there is a better way to provide full-time direction to this task. But something of this nature is needed—and quickly.
>
> In view of the potential State uses for both the airbase and the VA hospital, Governor Morrison might assign some official or designate a team of department heads to examine the opportunity present in both these facilities.
>
> No question about it, Lincoln has taken its lumps, but good. Now it is time to do something about it.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, on the following day, January 14, the Lincoln Nebr. Star also editorialized on the subject, and I quote from that editorial:

> For one thing, President Lyndon B. Johnson is not as politically astute as he is given credit for. The timing on the VA closing here is about as politically stupid as anything we have seen. The President proposes billions for antipoverty and then fosters economic policies that deal devastating financial blows to areas that have been no prior problem. Sure, the Veterans' Administration institution here is one of the worst in the country from an efficiency point of view. But how much will be spent in Appalachia and elsewhere to create the number of jobs, 353, that will be eliminated here?
>
> It is a good guess that a lot more will be spent than it is costing Uncle Sam for inefficiency in Lincoln. A little mixing of apples and oranges in the same equation? Perhaps so, but it is good commonsense if not an intilligent political or economic analogy.
>
> Some might look aghast at such a blatant political observation as this. But those who do need to learn a few of the facts of life. The facts are that this part of the Nation has for a long time now been on the short end of things when it comes to public spending at the national level. Compared to the big metropolitan centers of the East and West, the Midwest hardly exists, in the minds and eyes of the politicians in Washington. What is being spent here on the VA hospital is a mere pittance, a mere drop in the bucket compared to the billions that are poured into projects in New York and California. And a lot of that is the result of politics—where the votes are and where the money will get them.

SITUATION IN THE CONGO

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, trouble for the free West is growing through the building of military strength by the Communists on the borders of the Congo. The word is current that before the passing of another month, intensified action in the Congo will be started by the rebels.

It is reliably reported that military equipment adequate to supply 30 battalions has been assembled on the borders of the Congo. All of it is aimed at the destruction of Tshombe, the friend of the West and a reliable leader of the forces that are fighting to prevent the Communists from expanding their holds in this land of Africa.

Demands are now being made that the Congo Government be reconstituted by a broadened base, taking into it dissatisfied elements. The establishment of a so-called neutral government in truth means a Communist government.

It is the old technique of the Communists.

Is the State Department of the United States going to join in this plea?

Are we of the United States to make the same mistake in the Congo that we made in South Vietnam?

The forces that are seeking to overthrow the Tshombe government in the Congo are after total control; they are mainly in the Communist camp.

The demands for broader based governments are being made only as a tactical operation in a final purpose to take over. We are at the threshold of a critical period in the Congo. The rebel Communists are being organized; the equipment is being supplied by Moscow, Peiping, Algeria, United Arab Republic, and Ghana.

President Bela of Algeria recently made the statement:

> It is not enough to demonstrate; what we are now doing is sending arms, rifles, and volunteers. We say that we are sending, and we will continue indefinitely to send arms and men.

The efforts of the Communists will be intensified enormously in the next few months to take control. What our State Department does will play an important role in determining whether that conversion to communism will or will not happen. Tshombe is the friend of the West in the Congo; he has the substantial respect of the people in general. In my judgment, he will bring order to the Congo, provided he is given the moral support of our Government and is not denied the aid which in the normal course—I repeat, normal course—the United States would make available to the people of that country.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. DODD. I wish to commend the Senator from Ohio for bringing up this subject today in his usual clear and logical manner. The Senator has well set out the situation.

I believe the President and the Secretary of State are deeply concerned about the situation in the Congo, and that they are aware of the possibility concerning which the Senator from Ohio has so well spoken.

I am also sure that the President and the Secretary of State will do all they can—and I am sure they can do a great deal—to make certain that the Congo does not fall prey to the Communists.

I compliment the Senator from Ohio on having raised this subject.

MEMORIAL TO JOHN F. KENNEDY BY RABBI ABRAHAM J. FELDMAN, OF TEMPLE BETH ISRAEL, HARTFORD, CONN.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I recently received a copy of a very fine memorial given at the Temple Beth Israel in Hartford, Conn., by Rabbi Abraham J. Feldman in honor of John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

Rabbi Feldman sums up my feelings and those of most Americans, I believe when he says:

> It is yet hard to adjust one's thinking to the acceptance of the fact that John Kennedy is no longer a living presence in our midst.

But the rabbi goes on to state that in the months that have passed since the assassination the American people, with an able leader in the White House, have carried on in an outstanding manner and face "the future with confidence reassured and with faith that is firm."

The American people and Government "renew their dedication by the glow of the flame on that hill in Arlington." I am sure that the spirit of John Fitzgerald Kennedy will always be with and inspire us as we go about our daily tasks.

I ask unanimous consent to have Rabbi Feldman's "In Memoriam—John Fitzgerald Kennedy" printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the memorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

In Memoriam—John Fitzgerald Kennedy

(By Rabbi Abraham J. Feldman, D.D., at Sabbath eve service, Temple Beth Israel, Hartford, Conn.)

> A year has passed since the tragic death of President Kennedy and it is yet hard to adjust one's thinking to the acceptance of the fact that that radiant personality, that noble example of 20th century American manhood, that gracious and firm exponent of the American ideal and the American way of life, that inspiring patriot in war and in peace, that truly great American—is no longer a living presence in our midst.
>
> Much has happened during the months since his assassination.
>
> A skillful American had taken over the administration of the U.S. Government—and

succeeded greatly in guiding the ship of state with a majesty of dedication, of character, and of talents incomparable—for which all of us should thank God in profound reverence and joy.

Again, the Nation has come through a national election which could have been disastrous for our country. But—a vast majority of our citizenry appreciated the skill and devotion demonstrated during the interim period and, by an overwhelming vote, asked the incumbent President to carry on. For this, too, we should thank and praise the Lord.

The dust of battle, the hideous shrieks and threats of the contest are now dying down and the American people are facing the future with confidence reassured and with faith that is firm.

And so—as we pause in aching remembrance in this Yahrzeit period, America, its Government and people, renew their dedication by the glow of the flame on that hill in Arlington where rest the remains of our martyred leader. In his spirit and in determined translation of his charge to us, we shall go forth a people united, a people envisioned, "asking not—what our country can give to us but what we can give to our country."

In tribute to the memory of John Fitzgerald Kennedy, in token of our pledge of acceptance of his charge and challenge, I ask now that when I begin the reading of the Kaddish the whole congregation rise and read the Kaddish with me.

(The Kaddish was read in its Aramaic original with this additional paragraph inserted in English: "John Fitzgerald Kennedy, whom we now remember, has entered into the peace of life eternal. He still lives on earth in the acts of goodness he performed and in the hearts of those who cherish his memory. May the beauty of his life abide among us as a loving benediction.")

THE TRUTH ABOUT POLITICAL PRISONERS IN HUNGARY

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I recently received from Dr. Bela Fabian, chairman of the Federation of Hungarian Former Political Prisoners, a memorandum dealing with the plight of political prisoners today and urging their early release.

Because political memories are short, we have for all practical purposes swept the Hungarian revolution under the rug. The historic United Nations report which found the Soviet Union guilty of flagrant military intervention in Hungary and which described the Kadar government as a quisling regime imposed by Soviet bayonets has been forgotten.

Also forgotten are the repeated resolutions of the General Assembly condemning Soviet intervention and calling for the withdrawal of Soviet troops.

The credentials of the Kadar delegates at the United Nations had been approved with our concurrence.

And the impression has been cultivated that all of these things have come to pass because the situation in Hungary has now returned to normal.

Among other things, the public has been led to believe that there has been a general amnesty for political opponents imprisoned after the suppression of the 1956 revolution. It is true that many of them have been released. But, as the memorandum I am inserting into the Record at the conclusion of my remarks demonstrates, there are still 463 political prisoners in the central prison of Budapest alone. The many thousands of Hungarian freedom fighters who were deported to Siberia at the time have still not been permitted to return to their country.

I heartily endorse the recommendation of the memorandum that we forcefully raise the matter of the political deportees and the political prisoners with the Hungarian authorities.

I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Fabian's memorandum be placed in the Record at this point, so that my colleagues will have a chance to read it.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Memorandum in Behalf of the Release of Hungarian Political Prisoners

The Federation of Hungarian Former Political Prisoners must state regretfully that, in spite of the promises made by the Kádár government to the representatives of the United States, there are still 463 prisoners in central prison of Budapest (Gyüjtőfogház), who have been arrested in connection with the 1956 revolution.

Among these are:

1. Eight of those young men whom the Kádár government would not execute due to their early age at the time of their sentencing. Originally the number of these was 150. These were kept in the so-called little prison inside the central prison. Of these 142 were eventually executed. The sentence of eight has been commuted to 10 to 12 to 15 years' imprisonment. The petition for the release of these eight minors has been recently refused for the third time by the Kádár government.

The mother of Béla Uvacsek, one of these minors, Mrs. Helen Dorosy, lives in California (4504 Castle Lane, La Canada, Calif.). She has petitioned Dean Rusk, the Secretary of State to intervene in behalf of her son that he be permitted to be represented by legal counsel. The intervention of Dean Rusk has been successful to the extent that a lawyer was finally procured for her son. However the petition for clemency introduced by this lawyer has been rejected.

2. Among the prisoners suffering in Central Prison in László Regéczy, who has been sentenced for 15 years. His crime was that he has smuggled Imre Nagy's book out of Hungary. Another is Gyula Obersovszky, who was editor of the daily paper, Igazság, published during the revolution. Most of the prisoners kept in Central Prison are young men, and they are not released because during the revolution they were apprehended with guns in their hands.

The Kádár government will not permit the representatives of Western countries, nor the newspapermen of Western publications to visit Central Prison. And when American newspapermen complained and said that in the United States one can always visit Sing-Sing, the answer was that the administration of justice is the internal affair of Hungary.

Six cement gallows have been removed from the yard of the little prison inside Central Prison. One hundred and forty-two minors were executed on these gallows, among others. The place of the gallows is covered with grass now, yet under the grass one can still see the cement bedding of the six gallows.

3. Ferenc Mateovics, former member of the Hungarian Parliament was sentenced recently to 10 years. Four of his comrades were sentenced to from 10 months to 5 years imprisonment. Their crime was that they conducted discussions on how to reorganize the Democratic People's Party, and the Liberal Party, after the Soviet Army has left Hungary.

4. The crime of the priests who were arrested and sentenced in December 1964, was that they were teaching religion to the children illegally, without a permit. This happened after Hungary has signed a solemn agreement with the Vatican.

5. Seventy-five thousand freedom fighters were deported from Hungary to Siberia in 1956–57. Of these 12,000 have been released from the distribution camps in Uzhorod and Darnitsa as unfit for work. These returned to Hungary in 1957. The rest of them were taken to Siberia, most of them to Khazakstan. In Norilsk the deported Hungarians have a soccer team of their own. These Hungarians were made to sign a declaration 2 years ago that they were staying in the Soviet Union voluntarily in order to build socialism.

There were three interventions with the Soviet Government in behalf of the Hungarian deportees to Siberia, all the three have occurred at our request.

In 1958 during a dinner in Moscow, Dag Hammarskjold, the Secretary General of the United Nations, has asked Mr. Khrushchev to permit the Hungarian deportees in Siberia to go home. When Khrushchev heard Hammarskjold's request he angrily turned his back on him. This was Khrushchev's answer.

In 1959, when Mikoyan was visiting in Washington, we have asked Senator Hubert Humphrey, who was then invited to an intimate dinner at the Soviet Embassy in Washington, to ask Mikoyan to intervene in behalf of the Hungarian political prisoners deported to Siberia. Senator Humphrey told the chairman of the Federation, right after dinner with Mikoyan, that the answer was: There are no political prisoners in Siberia.

Also in 1959 Richard Nixon discussed with Nikita Khrushchev in Moscow—without results—the fate of the Hungarians languishing in Siberia.

Eight years have passed since the Hungarian revolution. The world pays eloquent tribute at every occasion to the heroes of this struggle. The American and other newspapermen who have visited Hungary are constantly writing about the fact, that even though the revolt was crushed, nevertheless the demands of the uprising have been attained, at least in part. How is it possible then that the surviving heroes of the revolution are still suffering imprisonment in the jails of Hungary and the camps of Siberia?

Now the Kádár government is facing bankruptcy, mainly because of the resistance of the population against the Communist system. The Kádár government wants to save itself from the consequences of this economic and political bankruptcy mainly with the help of the West, primarily with the help of the United States.

To halt the deterioration of the economic situation they need food, machinery, and industrial equipment.

Therefore may we respectfully petition the Government of the United States:

Before any help is rendered, or any increase in diplomatic rank is granted, please do demand that the deportees be permitted to return to their home country and that the political prisoners in Hungarian prisons, especially in the Central Prison in Budapest be released.

Furthermore that the Kádár government halt the economic and employment discrimination practiced toward the former political prisoners thus far released.

Béla Fábián,
Chairman, Federation of Hungarian Former Political Prisoners.

TWENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CREATION OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I think it will be of interest to my colleagues to know that 1965 is the 25th anniversary of the creation of the Senate Select Committee on Small Business.

This is the second year that I have introduced Senate Resolution 30 which would give the committee the full legislative authority that it has long deserved.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD, at this point, a relevant letter which I received from George J. Burger, vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business, a long-time spokesman for the small businessman .

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF INDEPENDENT BUSINESS,
San Mateo, Calif., January 12, 1965.

Re Senate Resolution 30.

Hon. WINSTON PROUTY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR PROUTY: In view of your splendid consistent action in reintroducing your resolution, Senate Resolution 30, which would provide legislative authority for the present Senate Small Business Committee, it might be well to bring to the attention of your colleagues for action on your resolution in the Rules Committee in view of the fact of the promise made by the chairman of the committee, the Honorable EVERETT JORDAN, that hearings would be held early on your resolution in the present Congress.

The reason I am bringing this to your attention at this time is because of the fact that it so happens that 1965 will be the 25th anniversary when the Senate Small Business Committee was created for the first time then under the able leadership of the late Senator James E. Murray, of Montana.

It also marks the 15th anniversary, due to the action of the late Senator Kenneth Wherry, of Nebraska, when he sponsored legislation to make the Senate Small Business Committee a continuing committee of the U.S. Senate for the first time in the history of the Senate.

As we seem to be living in a day of memorials being created to various statesmen for their contribution in Government service this would be a wonderful tribute and a memorial to these late Senators in giving the present committee legislative authority.

It might be appropriate when the resolution appears in the RECORD for you to find it convenient to insert this letter at that time. Just a thought—as I have lived with the action of the committee these past 25 years, and know its worth in part to the overall good of independent business of this Nation.

Sincerely,

GEORGE J. BURGER,
Vice President.

COMMENDATION OF LUTHER H. HODGES

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the Honorable Luther H. Hodges has just ended 4 years of very able service to the people of the United States. I wish to commend him highly and to wish him Godspeed in his well-earned retirement, and to express the appreciation of the people in my own State of West Virginia for the inspiring leadership he has given to the Department of Commerce over that 4-year period.

People in my State recall with particular vividness the help they have received as a result of one of the programs of the Department of Commerce, that of the Area Redevelopment Administration.

I have been informed that, over the 3½ years of ARA's life, the agency has helped transfer close to 7,000 West Virginia workers from relief rolls to payrolls. It has done this through the launching of 31 separate financial assistance projects for a Federal investment of $39.4 million, most of it in the form of loans which will be repaid to the Federal Treasury—with interest. Other ARA projects which have been of great assistance to the people of my State include a series of technical assistance projects to help locate new sources of employment, and the retraining of nearly 3,000 jobless West Virginia workers to equip them with new and marketable skills.

This is an enviable record, and from my personal experience I know of the wholehearted support Secretary Hodges has given to the ARA program to create jobs in areas of economic dislocation, such as we have in West Virginia.

Again, let me commend Secretary Hodges, and extend my deep appreciation to him for his help to the people of my State.

THE BALANCE-OF-PAYMENTS POSITION OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a few days ago press reports indicated that the balance-of-payments position of the United States has taken a turn for the worse so serious that President Johnson is preparing a special message to Congress on the subject.

Last fall when it was reported that the World Bank would seek up to $400 million in new funds, it was also reported that Treasury Secretary Dillon has pointed out the adverse effect of World Bank borrowings on the American balance of payments and had urged that the new borrowings be in Europe.

The Bank's articles of agreement give a virtual veto to the country where the funds are to be raised. I wrote Secretary Dillon on October 13 of last year asking him whether this veto would be exercised in order to protect the American balance-of-payments position.

I ask unanimous consent to have our exchange of correspondence printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONRONEY in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, October 27, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR WAYNE: Thank you for your letter of October 13, 1964, regarding possible World Bank borrowing of $300 to $400 million of new capital in private markets this fiscal year.

In Tokyo, as you know, I did point out that the World Bank will soon have to reenter the capital markets on a substantial scale. I emphasized that the Bank should intensify its efforts to develop more effective facilities for mobilizing private savings in the capital markets of industrial countries that are accumulating reserves. I feel that more adequate capital markets in such countries are very important and hope that our oft-repeated views on this subject will be helpful in speeding their development.

I did not mean to imply, however, that the United States should prohibit any and all attempts by the Bank to mobilize private funds for development through bond sales to U.S. residents. While significant progress has been made since my ABA speech in Rome in May of 1962, the development of more adequate European capital markets takes time. There will be circumstances in the meantime where some accommodation to the needs of the World Bank will be in our interest. An absolute prohibition at this time of Bank access to our market might well cripple this uniquely valuable institution's operations on behalf of the international development effort.

Any application by the Bank for bond sales in our market will be reviewed on its merits in the light of the concrete situation at the time—including our own balance of payments and the effect of any Bank borrowing thereon.

I can assure you that the World Bank management is fully aware of the necessity for utilizing European capital markets to the maximum extent funds are available on reasonable terms. I do not expect any relaxation in our pursuit of developing the capital markets of the other industrial countries.

With best wishes.

Sincerely,

DOUGLAS DILLON.

OCTOBER 13, 1964.

Hon. C. DOUGLAS DILLON,
Secretary of the Treasury,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I enclose a photostat of an article appearing in the September 14, 1964, issue of the Wall Street Journal which suggests that the World Bank will probably seek to raise $300 to $400 million of new capital in the next fiscal year. I have noted that you have urged that the bulk of these funds be raised in the European markets.

Inasmuch as article IV, section 1, of the articles of agreement seems to give a veto to the member "in whose markets funds are to be raised," I would be interested to know whether you will propose that this veto be exercised to protect our balance of payments.

Sincerely yours,

WAYNE MORSE.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I particularly call attention to Mr. Dillon's words:

> Any application by the Bank for bond sales in our market will be reviewed on its merits in the light of the concrete situation at the time—including our own balance of of payments and the effect of any Bank borrowing thereon.

Yet at the end of December the World Bank announced that it will float a $200 million bond issue in the United States beginning on January 18, an announcement that coincided with the news that the U.S. balance-of-payment deficit had reached record proportions and required a special message from the President to the Congress regarding steps to curb it.

I trust that this special message will report the reasons for permitting this World Bank bond issue to proceed at the very time when it would have the worst possible impact upon our balance of payments.

Finally, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point a letter I have addressed to the Secretary on January 8 concerning this matter.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 8, 1965.

Hon. C. DOUGLAS DILLON,
Secretary of the Treasury,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I wish to recall my letter to you of October 13, 1964, in which I expressed concern over the prospect that the World Bank would seek to raise new capital in the U.S. market. In your response of October 27 you stated that the United States should not at present prohibit "any and all attempts by the Bank to mobilize private funds for development through bond sales to U.S. residents." There nevertheless was at least an implication that the bulk of the $300 to $400 million of new capital required by the World Bank might be raised outside this country. According to the New York Times of December 29, however, the World Bank has now announced it will float a $200 million bond issue in the United States beginning on January 18.

It seems to me that the key sentence in your October 27 letter was the following: "Any application by the Bank for bond sales in our market will be reviewed on its merits in the light of the concrete situation at the time—including our own balance of payments and the effect of any Bank borrowing thereon." Frankly, I am not aware of any measurable improvement in our balance-of-payments situation during the past 2 months; indeed, I would assume the contrary from the New York Times story of December 30, 1964, by Richard E. Mooney—a copy of which is attached. The article reports that the OECD annual review of the U.S. economy contains the advice "that more curbs on outflowing capital may be needed to put the country's international payments in better balance." Yet the proposed World Bank bond issue appears a dramatic move in the opposite direction.

In these circumstances, I would like very much to know just what sort of review of the Bank application took place within the U.S. Government. Specifically, was approval of the application given by the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems, and was the decision taken unanimously? How do you assess the impact on our balance of payments in concrete terms?

In short, I would appreciate learning the full story of this transaction and its implications; you need not be concerned about sparing me any details.

Sincerely yours,

WAYNE MORSE.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I express my appreciation to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], who has performed yeoman service for the Senate in his constantly challenging the administration's policies in regard to the balance-of-payments problem.

Most respectfully I say to my President, "You had better take a long, hard look at the record of your Treasury Department in this field before you send up any special message on the subject, because you are going to be confronted with a long series of questions here in the Senate in regard to the policies that have been followed by the Secretary of the Treasury, which, in my judgment, are unfortunate policies, to say the least."

U.S. ACTION IN LAOS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I see no other Senator who wishes to speak during the morning hour. I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for an additional 3 minutes on another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD a UPI article appearing in this morning's New York Times entitled "U.S. Terms Raids in Laos Justified by Red Violations."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. TERMS RAIDS IN LAOS JUSTIFIED BY RED VIOLATIONS—SAYS COMMUNISTS DISREGARD GENEVA ACCORDS—STRIKES TO CONTINUE IF NEEDED

WASHINGTON, January 18.—The Johnson administration contended today that U.S. military actions in Laos, such as the air strike last Wednesday against a bridge, were justified by Communist violations of the 1962 Geneva accords establishing Laotian independence and neutrality.

It also made clear that it intended to continue using U.S. military force, if necessary, to maintain Laos against Communist incursions.

The administration's position was made known in two forms—a Presidential defense message to Congress and a statement issued by the State Department.

ASIAN PROGRAM UNCHANGED

In his defense message, the President reaffirmed that "our program remains unchanged" in southeast Asia. He said the United States would continue to give military and economic assistance to nations such as Laos and South Vietnam, which are "struggling against covert aggression in the form of externally directed, undeclared guerrilla warfare."

In Laos, he went on, the United States has demonstrated since 1950 its commitment to freedom, independence, and neutrality by "strengthening the economic and military security of that nation."

"We shall continue to support the legitimate Government of that country," he declared.

The President stressed that "the problem of Laos is the refusal of the Communist forces to honor the Geneva accords in which they entered in 1962."

The State Department also said that the American military actions in Laos were "entirely justified" by the repeated Communist violations of the 1962 accords.

POSITION QUESTIONED

Whether the United States still felt bound by the 1962 accords was questioned after it was disclosed that Americans had conducted bombing missions against key points in the supply routes used by the Communists from North Vietnam into Laos. Reconnaissance missions were acknowledged earlier.

Senator WAYNE MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon, charged last weekend that such attack and reconnaissance missions represented a U.S. violation of a provision of the 1962 accords. This prohibits the introduction of foreign military troops in Laos.

When the question was raised last Friday, it was met by silence at the State Department.

Today, however, the Department was prepared with a statement providing a justification for the air missions. At the same time it still refused to confirm that the United States had been conducting bombing missions against Communist targets in Laos.

The statement, given by the Department Press Officer, Robert J. McCloskey, said:

"We continue to support the Geneva agreements and the independence and neutrality of Laos which they are intended to achieve."

Mr. McCloskey declined to say whether U.S. assistance included the air strike Wednesday by a squadron of U.S. fighter-bombers against a strategic bridge near Ban Ban in central Laos.

Mr. McCloskey did say that any "assistance" had been given at the request of Prince Souvannah Phouma, the Laotian Premier.

The Prince is understood to have demanded that there be no announcement about the missions.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to quote a paragraph or two of that article:

> The Johnson administration contended today that U.S. military actions in Laos, such as the air strike last Wednesday against a bridge, were justified by Communist violations of the 1962 Geneva accords establishing Laotian independence and neutrality.
>
> It also made clear that it intends to continue using U.S. military force, if necessary, to maintain Laos against Communist incursions.

That statement is shocking. Mr. President, I say there is no question about the fact that the U.S. military has conducted these raids. There is no justification on the part of my party's administration for concealing from the American people this fact and no justification for not issuing a formal official statement that the United States is making war in Laos and killing American boys in that war.

Mr. President, I am shocked that such a policy is being followed by the State Department and the Pentagon, and that we let the American people learn of our warmaking activities in southeast Asia through war correspondents. Then our State Department and our Pentagon attack those war correspondents. I happen to be one who defends these war correspondents, because time and time again they have demonstrated that they will not follow the propaganda line of the State Department and the Pentagon, for if they followed that line, they would be nought but kept journalists on the war front.

Mr. President, we are greatly indebted to the fact that at least our war correspondents abroad insist upon putting into practice the precious constitutional meaning of freedom of the press. But the article to which I have referred is very interesting. It states further:

> Whether the United States still felt bound by 1962 accords was questioned after it was disclosed that Americans had conducted bombing missions against key points in the supply routes used by the Communists from North Vietnam into Laos.

Mr. President, Britain, France, Russia, and China are some of the other countries that signed the treaty along with the United States.

The treaty set up an International Control Commission composed of India, Poland, and Canada, to investigate any violations of the treaty and of the ceasefire between the rival Laotian factions.

The London Observer reports that in the British view of the treaty, it is up to this Commission to investigate whether there has been any breach of the treaty. It is true that the American bombing raid took place in territory controlled by the Pathet Lao. Whether the Pathet Lao would permit the Commission to investigate U.S. complaints of violations is doubted by American authorities, hence the resort to force of arms.

Mr. President, my opposition to warmaking policies of the United States in Laos is the same as my opposition to the unjustifiable killing of American boys in South Vietnam in a warmaking policy of our Government there.

What we ought to do is live up to our obligations and call upon our allies to live up to their obligations under the United Nations treaty. Great Britain, Canada, France, and the other signatories to the United Nations Charter, including the United States, ought to be calling upon the United Nations to make a report to the world in regard to the violations of the Laotian treaty by North Vietnam, Red China, and possibly others. But, in my judgment, there is no hope of avoiding a massive war in Asia in the very near future if the United States continues to take this present attitude—an attitude which was expressed by the American Ambassador in the United Nations not so many weeks ago in that unfortunate speech he delivered before the Security Council, in which he said, in effect, that the United States intends to do what it thinks needs to be done in southeast Asia, and the rest of the world can take it and like it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONRONEY in the chair). The time of the Senator from Oregon has expired.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 2 more minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Oregon is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to say to our Ambassador to the United Nations and to the President of the United States that they are skating on thin ice. The danger is that we are going to see an outbreak of a massive war in Asia because of the unilateral action of the United States in making war in South Vietnam, in clear violation of the United Nations Charter, in violation of the Geneva accords of 1954, and in violation of our long standing, professed ideals that we are a nation that believes in substituting the rule of law for the jungle law of military might.

We are now practicing an application of the jungle law of military might as a substitute for our ideals. So long as there is any hope of avoiding that war and helping to bring my country back inside the framework of international law and laying this whole threat to the peace of the world before the United Nations, the voice of the senior Senator from Oregon will be raised in that cause.

I believe the time is long overdue when the President of the United States should proceed to make clear to the world that the United States stands ready for a review by the United Nations of the whole threat to the peace of the world. The issue of the Congo will be coming up. I hope that the United Nations will go back into the Congo. Yet there are forces in the United States that would have the United States go into the Congo on a unilateral basis and allow the killing of American boys there in carrying out a unilateral American military policy. I pray that before it is too late, we will try to put on the spot, so to speak, our alleged allies in the United Nations—Great Britain, France, Canada, Italy, and all the rest—who claim that they believe in the substitution of peaceful procedures for military force. Let us ask them: "Are you willing to stand with us in trying to work out an honorable peace that will not result in carrying out all the fears that are being expressed by increasing hundreds of thousands of sincere, patriotic Americans, who are raising the question: 'How much longer are we going to carry out a unilateral course of action and killing American boys in South Vietnam, when we have not yet exhausted peaceful procedures for the settlement of the dispute through the United Nations?' "

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the close of these remarks an editorial from the Wall Street Journal of today entitled "If Vietnam Falls."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IF VIETMAN FALLS

If the United States is forced out of Vietnam one way or another, what does it then do about the rest of southeast Asia?

The question may never have to be answered, and the U.S. Government undoubtedly hopes it won't have to be. Conceivably, in some fashion totally unclear at present, the Communist Vietcong attacks can be halted and stability at last restored in Saigon.

But since no one is putting many odds on that possibility, it is essential to consider the implications of failure and withdrawal. Though the United States has no known intention of suddenly up and leaving—its public statements emphasize just the opposite—it could be compelled to abandon the effort for at least a couple of imaginable reasons.

One might be a military determination that the war is unwinable even in the limited sense of getting the Reds out of South Vietnam; certainly there is nothing to indicate we are making headway after these lengthening years of costly struggle. Another reason might be that the Vietnamese would in effect ask the United States to leave, either through their leaders of the moment or through an evident unwillingness of the people to go on fighting.

The South Vietnamese in general haven't shown notable zeal for the fight anyway, and their attitude is understandable enough. Not only does the conceptual distinction between communism and freedom hold comparatively little meaning for most of them; they have also been in this war, with the support first of France and then the United States, practically since World War II.

As for the Saigon governments, if that is what they should be called, they have been unable to win the support of the people or exercise stable rule; the United States, with all its aid and influence, has been unable to promote or maintain such a government since the overthrow and killing of Diem in late 1963. While the Diem regime was obviously no model of abstract democracy, very few governments are that, in Asia or anywhere else, it did manage a degree of stability.

The United States which condoned the removal of Diem, is perhaps too preoccupied with governmental modes and deportment. If we have an important stake in southeast Asia, our policymakers need not to be so insistent that the government in Saigon be civilian and virtuously democratic; what should matter, from the point of view of our interests, is that it be an effective government able to invest citizens and soldiers with a will to rout the Communists.

If those objectives prove unattainable and the whole thing blows up in America's face, it is needless to say America's interests will have suffered severe damage. For our part, however, we are not convinced that it has to be catastrophic damage.

The basic U.S. interest in southeast Asia is not, or should not be, solely the preservation of a non-Communist South Vietnam as though it were in a vacuum; rather, the American concern is to keep Red China from expanding—insofar as the United States is reasonably capable of doing so. If that cannot be done with regard to South Vietnam, we still must consider the area as a whole.

In that broader context, failure in Vietnam, if it happens, does not automatically doom all southeast Asia. There are other, and maybe more defendable, areas of resistance to communism and to Red China in particular. Thailand is a large one. Malaysia, currently more directly menanced by Indonesia's pro-Communist Sukarno than by Peiping, appears to be a firm one.

The United States does, we believe, have to stand firm against Red Chinese imperialism. But whether the major stand is taken at Thailand, Malaysia, or indeed the Philippines or Australia should be determined by the cold considerations of a given nation's will to fight, terrain, logistics, and all the normal military bases for judgment. If we look only at South Vietnam as the be-all and end-all of our southeast Asia policy, we risk not only profound disappointment but also perhaps inadequate thinking and preparation for the larger problem.

To say we might lose in South Vietnam is not defeatism but military realism, no matter how much it may be hoped that the country can somehow be kept out of Communist hands. What must be hoped most of all, in our view, is that the officials in Washington are paying full attention to Asian strategy in the event they cannot hold Vietnam.

MONTANA'S "WAGONMASTER"

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, as my colleagues in the Senate are well aware, Montana has produced a number of distinguished sons and daughters who have achieved fame and success outside its borders. I am reminded of an important addition to this list by an article in the Western News of Libby. It concerns Mr. John McIntire, who portrays the wagonmaster in the popular television series, "Wagon Train."

Mr. McIntire spent his youth in Kalispell, Mont., before moving on to Los Angeles and a career first in radio, then in the movies, and television. His father was Kalispell's first lawyer. Despite his status as a Hollywood celebrity, John McIntire remains a Montanan. He owns a ranch in the Yaak Valley in the northwestern part of the State, and he tries to spend his spare moments there with his family.

He is married to actress Jeanette Nolan, whose career also spans many years of radio, movie, and television work. Although a native of California, Mrs. McIntire shares his enthusiasm for the rugged grandeur and beauty of Montana. The McIntires have two children.

Mr. President, Montana is proud of John McIntire, a native son who has brought credit to our State over many years as a competent professional actor. I ask unanimous consent that the article from the Western News of Libby be incorporated at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A VISIT WITH THE WAGONMASTER

A haven of Montana hospitality in bustling Los Angeles is the home of Mr. and Mrs. John McIntire, television stars whose hearts remain in the Yaak Valley while their profession keeps them in southern California.

Atop the Hollywood hills overlooking glamourous Sunset Strip, a winding street climbs through a steep canyon bordered by handsome houses to terminate at the McIntire home. An iron gate guards the entrance—not because of any desire for seclusion but because California law requires that the swimming pool be fenced off.

Best known as Wagonmaster Chris Hale of the "Wagon Train" series, John McIntire is a Montanan whose successful career in radio, movies and television has spanned 3 decades. Mrs. McIntire is known professionally as Jeannette Nolan, and her reputation as one of Hollywood's most talented actresses is firmly based on feature roles in "Hotel de Paree," the "Richard Boone Show" and the "Alfred Hitchcock Show." Her starring roles have included many guest appearances on other television shows.

Jeanette was the guest star on "Wagon Train" last Sunday night.

They spend most of the year in Hollywood, but John and Jeanette regard Lincoln County as home. During occasional interruptions of their professional careers, they have resided for varying periods in Eureka and at their ranch in the Yaak.

SON AND DAUGHTER

Daughter Holly and son Tim, who are regarded as two of Hollywood's most promising young talents, complete the family's artistic roster.

Tim recently completed a role in "Shenandoah," a feature movie starring James Stewart and was a guest start on a "Mr. Novak" show a few weeks ago. Tim celebrated his 20th birthday last year by flying to England to see Sir Laurence Olivier perform Shakespeare. He was denied this treat, however, when his vacation was cut short by an urgent request from the producer to hasten back to begin movie production.

Holly is married to Michael Butler, a young TV writer who is considered to have a bright future. Butler's mother and Jeanette Nolan worked together several decades ago in a radio series.

Holly was seen on network TV a few weeks ago as a guest star in "Rawhide."

Both Holly and Tim attended Eureka schools for several years.

SUGGESTS MONTANA LOCATIONS

Jeanette rhapsodized about the glories of Montana and told of her repeated attempts to persuade movie and television producers to shoot outdoor scenes in Montana, even suggesting the McIntire Ranch in the Yaak as a probable location. Most producers—hardheaded businessmen—rule out Montana as a location site because of the remoteness from Hollywood with the attendant large travel expenses.

John said the outdoor scenes for "Wagon Train" are shot at Palmdale, Calif., only 1½-hour drive from the McIntire home. Production of "Wagon Train" was in temporary recess during the holiday season. Twenty-six of the required 32 shows for the current season had been completed, and the wagonmaster was waiting call for filming of the remaining six.

The McIntires spoke enthusiastically of a new project in which they are involved with Spring Byington and Andrew Prine. This is production of a pilot for a half-hour comedy series in which the four would be featured.

A pilot is a sample show produced to outline the suggested story line and characterization of a proposed series. The McIntires are now seeking a sponsor to foot the bill to bring their pilot, as yet unnamed, to life as a TV series.

STAR-STUDDED NEIGHBORHOOD

The McIntires live comfortably in a beautiful but unpretentious home in a neighborhood populated by celebrities. Just a few doors away, McIntire pointed out the residence of Sammy Davis, Jr.

The McIntire home overlooks the city of Los Angeles, and at night the myriad lights of the sprawling city suggest the Milky Way spread out as a carpet at the feet of the many celebrities who inhabit the wooded hills.

On a clear day, the blue Pacific is visible from the McIntire home, and John and Jeanette say one of the day's thrills is to breakfast with an ocean vista.

The McIntires' love of the sea is exemplified in their 42-foot Norwegian-built boat—their major recreation when away from the Yaak ranch. The boat is berthed at San Pedro, and during the holidays John spent most of his vacation from the camera making repairs to the boat, an oceangoing craft in which the McIntires and Mr. and Mrs. Elmer Phillips, old friends from the Yaak who now live in Sequim, Wash., cruised the Straits of Juan de Fuca in 1963.

KALISPELL BOYHOOD

John McIntire missed being a native Montanan only because his mother decided to go to Spokane for his birth. John's father was the first lawyer in Kalispell. He moved there from Demarsville when the Flathead County seat was founded.

John lived at Kalispell until he moved to Los Angeles at the age of 15. Entering college, he intended to follow his father's footsteps and pursue the law as a livelihood. Enrollment in the school of speech, however, led to a career in radio during the thirties in which he first gained nationwide recognition on "The March of Time."

Jeanette Nolan is a native San Franciscan who grew up at Los Angeles and who also worked on "The March of Time." Other radio roles for which she is remembered includes one of the female personalities of "One Man's Family."

The McIntires were married in 1935, and several times since they have attempted to leave the performing arts to become permanent residents of the Yaak Valley. Each time, however, the demand for their talents in radio, television, or movies has taken them back to Hollywood.

John has a brother, Byron, who is well remembered in Libby. He is a chiropractor, practicing in the San Francisco area.

PROBLEMS OF PUBLIC HEALTH—ADDRESS BY BERNARD M. BARUCH

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, Bernard M. Baruch has been a successful businessman, and he served his Nation in positions of high public responsibility during two World Wars.

Mr. Baruch is now spending the winter in South Carolina; but he has forwarded to me a copy of a speech he made on November 19, 1947, to the Medical Society of the State of New York, the Coordinating Council of the Five County Medical Societies of Greater New York, and the Greater New York Hospital Association. This speech of some 17 years ago is worth calling to mind now, because Mr. Baruch set forth some of the most urgent problems facing the medical community in regard to public health.

He pointed out that the Nation was in need of improvement in health services, and he cautioned his audience of physicians "against fighting a rearguard action against public programs to improve public health." One of the necessities he highlighted that evening was the need for "some form of insurance, partly financed by the Government," for those who could not afford voluntary insurance. This now has a familiar ring, as we debate the best way to provide the aged with adequate insurance protection.

Mr. Baruch stated:

> A form of compulsory health insurance for those who cannot pay for voluntary insurance can be devised, adequately safeguarded, without involving what has been termed "socialized medicine." The needs can be met—as in other fields—without the Government's taking over medicine, or socializing it, something I would fiercely oppose.

I agree with his observations; and that is why so many of us favor the King-Anderson bill—because it provides specific safeguard against Federal control of medicine.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Baruch's speech be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH BY BERNARD M. BARUCH AT A DINNER SPONSORED BY MEDICAL SOCIETY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK, COORDINATING COUNCIL OF THE FIVE COUNTY MEDICAL SOCIETIES OF GREATER NEW YORK, GREATER NEW YORK HOSPITAL ASSOCIATION TO REPORT ON PROGRESS OF PREPAID MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL CARE IN NEW YORK CITY, AT THE BILTMORE HOTEL, NEW YORK CITY, NOVEMBER 19, 1947

You do me honor to ask me to talk to you about health. I almost became a doctor myself.

When I was a boy, my mother took me to a phrenologist. His office was across the street from where Wanamakers now is. He felt the bumps on my head and asked my mother what she expected to do with me.

She replied, "I am thinking of making him a doctor."

"He will be a good doctor," said this phrenologist, "but my advice to you is to take him where they are doing things in finance and politics—he might even make good there, too."

It has been a long detour for the prodigal. He has returned.

In many ways I am sorry I did not become a member of this noblest of professions, for I believe we approach a great adventure in health. That is our goal. I think it attainable. It would be gratifying to take a more active part in it.

All my thoughts on medicine are colored by memories of my father, Dr. Simon Baruch. He was the wisest man I ever knew. He pioneered in surgery, physical medicine and "incurable diseases." Often, I heard him tell prospective medical students:

"Do not enter the medical profession to make money. Study medicine only with the idea that your greatest compensation will be knowing that you help your fellow man. Do not expect gratitude, and you will never be disappointed."

As Chairman of the War Industries Board in the First World War, I realized how important to defense was the health of our citizens. That awareness was reinforced manyfold during the past war.

In preparing a report for the late President Roosevelt on manpower, I was shocked to learn that at least 4 million men had been rejected as 4F's—unfit to defend their country. Some, not all, of these defects were preventable.

How much more shocking would have been the record if everyone had received the same examination?

Since then, I have given the problems of medical care much thought. It deeply concerned me that we not fail the returning veteran; so I studied their medical needs. From that, it was only a step to related problems of general medical care for all.

Soon I was up to my neck in reports, statistics, speeches, and congressional hearings. I conferred with many persons—doctors and nondoctors, experts and amateurs.

May I tell you some of my conclusions. They may not be particularly new to you, pioneering this field. They may be helpful, coming from a nonprofessional mind.

But before I list them, I should like to point out that the medical science and art have conferred a new and great benefit upon society in the last generation. The years of our lives have been heavily increased. This helps not merely the individual, who wants to go on living—and living in dignity and self-respect—but all the people to live more comfortably and freer from fear.

And now to go on with my exposition:

There is no question—the need for more medical care exists.

Also, there is no question this need will have to be met.

The problem is how?

All over the world, the masses are stirring for higher living standards. Improved medical care is a foundation of that better standard. Without good health, of what advantage are higher wages, or shorter work hours, better education, or greater leisure?

The families whose earnings disappear with serious illness—the many who suffer disease which your skillful diagnosis and treatment could have prevented or halted—or whose limited means bar them from the medical attention available to you and me—these people will not remain content.

This striving of the masses for better living is felt everywhere. In health, your profession must steer that surging tide into channels of improvement. Then, the surge does not overspill into the revolutionary flood, which washes away more than it brings.

One of the last things Woodrow Wilson wrote—called "The Road Away From Revolution"—was this:

"In these doubtful and anxious days when * * * the road ahead seems darkened by shadows which portend dangers of many kinds, it is only common prudence that we should look about us and attempt to assess the causes of distress and the most likely means of removing them."

That was Wilson's method—to assess portending dangers, and anticipate them by timely action. So, he proposed the realistic League of Nations, which men rejected as a dream—and got a nightmare. Wilson knew social change was inevitable. He worked to steer that change into orderly channels.

You should take that as your guiding star.

Society usually divides into three broad groups.

At one end—the left end—are those who burn with a passion to change everything as quickly as they can—if not quicker.

At the other—right end—are those who want things just as they are.

In the middle are people, like Woodrow Wilson, to whose school I belong, who believe in intelligent progress and seek to guide it.

What differentiates these three groups is their attitude toward that vital element of life—time.

The leftenders feel time panting hot on their necks.

The rightenders use time to fight rearguard actions, all the way.

The middlers—sometimes both left and right call us "muddlers"—seek to come to terms with time, preserving the best of the past, discarding the outworn, and moving on to a better future.

In the matter of adequate medical care, too many doctors have been fighting a rearguard action for too long. I feel I must warn those doctors—time is running against them. The medical profession has justly earned great influence in the community. It can keep that hold only as it moves forward. It will lose that hold if it has nothing but objections to offer, if it has eyes only for what not to do.

We must look for what can be done—and do it.

The great question is how? I do not want to seem to say I know the answers. We do know the public is demanding better and more medical service through some action—political or otherwise.

What is this adventure in health I see dawning, and toward which you all have been keeping the doctor's vigil through the night? This adventure, which you will have to lead—or it will fail—has many elements:

(1) More and better doctors—in more places.

(2) An immediate, complete, survey to modernize medical education, with greater emphasis on chronic and degenerative diseases, mental hygiene, and preventive medicine.

(3) More hospitals more evenly spread through the country.

(4) Less specialists, more general practitioners.

(5) Reorganize medical practice, stressing group medicine where needed and voluntary health insurance.

(6) For those who cannot afford voluntary insurance, some form of insurance, partly financed by the Government covering people in by law. I would call this compulsory health insurance, if that term's proper meaning had not been lost.

(7) Increased medical research.

(8) Greatly expanded physical and mental rehabilitation.

(9) Education to make health a national habit.

(10) A vigorous, preventive medical program, reaching everyone, children, above all.

(11) A new Cabinet post for health, education, social security.

(12) Creation of a nonpolitical, watchdog committee to safeguard progress in medical care for veterans.

(13) Increased numbers of well-trained nurses and technicians.

(14) Adequate dental care.

(15) A stabilizing economy—inflation will make worthless any health program or anything else.

Each of these would take a speech by itself. I can but sketch some of them.

Even the least ambitious schemes for improving the Nation's health require more doctors, all competently trained. Why aren't more doctors being educated? In studying that question, I was struck by how expensive training a doctor has become—in dollars and in time. In its fine report on "Medicine in the Changing Order," the New York Academy of Medicine states:

"There seems no alternative other than Government aid if educational standards are to be raised or even maintained. If medical schools are to continue as centers of research * * * here also Government aid may be necessary."

If science and medicine ask the Government for aid—which even the conservative deems necesary—they must expect he who pays the fiddler will call the tune. This means the Government will rightly insist upon no discrimination in medical care because of race, color, or creed. It will rightly insist upon opportunity for all to enter the profession and advance on the sole basis of ability and character—without restrictions of race, color, creed—or sex. And, I hope, without fear of, or favor from, the State.

Minimum standards should be set for institutions getting financial aid.

How much more the Government is likely to insist upon will depend upon the more progressive leaders in your profession.

According to the Academy's report—I quote: "there has been no fundamental reorganization of American medical education since about 1910." That finding certainly calls for your profession undertaking—now—a most thorough, down-to-earth survey to modernize medical education, making recommendations so boldly inspiring the people will gratefully back them. No one can draw up a better program than doctors.

Chronic illness and preventive medicine deserve greater attention. In all fields—I hope in war as well—there is a new accent on prevention. From answering fire alarms, our thinking is progressing to fireproofing.

Preventive medical care should commence as close to the beginning as society can reach. I favor a major, sickness-prevention drive at the public school level. This should include compulsory examination of all children at regular intervals. Means should be made available for correcting defects disclosed.

How wonderful, if children were taught how to properly eat, sleep, sit, stand, play, and take care of themselves, developing both the knack for getting along together, and self-discipline—physical and mental.

Even when medical care is available, many adults neglect or refuse to use it—often because of social taboos, as in venereal diseases, or psychological dreads, as in cancer and tuberculosis. These attitudes reflect our not having outgrown the awkward age in thinking about disease and health. We do not really have a grownup, national health habit—although we are getting there.

People need to be educated on the virtue of medical care; how to use it; how to prevent disease. The greatest asset of any nation is a healthy, educated citizenry.

And now to what is perhaps, the toughest problem—how can better medical care be extended to those who cannot afford it?

Your organizations have been particularly active in pressing voluntary health insurance. You and others have proven group insurance to be a sound, practical way. That is a great achievement. You can be mighty proud of it.

But I would not be frank—nor friendly—if I did not add what you know. It is not good enough.

Rome was not doctored in 1 day. It may be, as some have told me, that the needs of the bulk of our people can be met, given time, through voluntary insurance. What troubles me most are the needs of that sizable segment of society, which does not earn enough to pay for voluntary insurance.

The American Medical Association—its bureau of medical economics—estimated in 1939 that families earning $3,000 or less—two-thirds of the population—cannot afford the cost of serious illness. Some of these can afford voluntary insurance, although inflation has reduced their number. But what of the little fellows who cannot?

I have asked that of nearly everyone with whom I have discussed medical care. Nothing has been suggested so far, which promises success, other than some form of insurance covering these people in by law and financed by the Government, at least in part—what some would call "compulsory health insurance."

Since doctors, nurses, technicians and hospitals already are strained, such insurance probably would have to move in stages. That requires careful study. Any program should utilize existing medical facilities to the maximum—it must to get started—and be organized to the local level.

Nationally, the program might well be administered by a body of doctors and nondoctors to keep medical care as free from politics as possible.

As to financing, my own preference runs toward the Government meeting only part of the cost, with part coming from payroll deductions from employers and workers. In time, these deductions will become absorbed in general costs of production. I have the utmost confidence in the efficiency of American industry—both labor and management—and which good health will stimulate. We can absorb these medical costs better than other countries which must also meet these needs.

The detailed problems raised by so-called compulsory health insurance are too numerous to be discussed tonight. I have weighed them most carefully. Many doctors and many lay people have sought to paint this issue as a choice—all black or all white. I have found every aspect of medical care to be gray—the happy color sensible compromise wears. All law imposes compulsion. A form of compulsory health insurance for those who cannot pay for voluntary insurance can be devised, adequately safeguarded, without involving what has been termed socialized medicine. The needs can be met—as in other fields—without the Government taking over medicine, or socializing it; something I would fiercely oppose.

Law protects society. It is the absence of law which destroys it.

I do not fear Government taking its legitimate part in medicine any more than I fear it in education or housing. I do oppose socialization here. It leads ultimately to the police state, degradation of the individual and lessened well-being. There should be just one Federal agency, with Cabinet rank, for all health and human welfare problems. I do not like Government agencies to be like Mahomet's coffin, suspended between heaven and earth.

Some say many people do not know how to pick their doctors. So, with any human activity. The best insurance against poor choice is improving the general quality of all doctors. But good or poor, it must be the patient's choice. No one else's.

May I interject this about inflation. Should health schemes fail, be sure to ask—were they killed by the plan itself—by incompetent administration—or by inflation which ruined the plan's financing.

In connection with this doctor-Government relationship, it is a pleasure to point to the excellent medical progress in the Veterans' Administration—thanks primarily to Gen. Omar Bradley and Gen. Paul Hawley. They would never have accomplished their good work, had they not refused to allow the politicos to move in on them.

I would like to see the President name a small committee of top-grade citizens—some doctors, some lay people—to act as a vigilant watchdog over the veterans' medical program, so the ground so arduously gained may not be lost when someone replaces General Bradley. He should be supported by the entire Nation—particularly by doctors. His is the kind of courage and vigilance which will assure good administration of any health program.

More doctors must be distributed to more places in the country, which requires, among other things, less stress on training specialists, more on general practitioners. A number of counties do not even have a doctor. This reflects, in part, a lack of facilities in which doctors can work. Happily, some of this will be corrected under the Hill-Burton Act for hospital construction, with Federal and State governments cooperating.

Orderly change is the American way of life. Remember the spirit of your Oath of Hippocrates. Use your own good judgment to move along with humanity's legitimate aspirations in its trek toward better living.

I would hate to see any medical care program under guidance of others than those who have the know-how. So would the American people. That is why I urge the doctors to get in and pitch—not stand by on the sidelines. You need fear politicians or bureaucrats only to the degree you fail yourselves. You must take the leadership—no—yours is now the leadership. Keep it.

This meeting is an outstanding example of your deep concern to meet the need for action.

I have met people in all fields of human endeavor. I respect no group more—for your unselfish zeal and devotion to the sick, for the jealousy with which you guard your professional virtue—placing beyond the pale the rare violator of your oath.

I envy you the thrill which comes from relieving a patient from pain, and, often, snatching one from death.

I still am sorry that phrenologist didn't let me become a doctor.

Your situation reminds me of something my father said back in 1873, while president of the South Carolina Medical Society:

"Let us not be silent, but offer our facts, and defend them while we may. As an Arabian sage has said, 'What good comes from Ali's sword, if it be sheathed? What good from Sadi's tongue, if it be silent?' "

"KHRUSHCHEV'S PAPER BEAR"—ARTICLE BY CHARLES J. V. MURPHY

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the December 1964 issue of Fortune magazine contains a very interesting article written by Mr. Charles J. V. Murphy, entitled "Khrushchev's Paper Bear." I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the body of the Record at the conclusion of these remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Khrushchev's Paper Bear

(By Charles J. V. Murphy)

It seems only yesterday that Nikita Khrushchev was threatening to blow up the West, or at least to bury it, and it was certainly his boast, in the event these more sanguinary solutions did not become necessary to him, that the American economy would soon be playing a miserable second fiddle to the Soviet system. Now this most gregarious of commissars has been done in by his party brethren, and the truth is beginning to emerge, for those who will see it, that Khrushchev was not only a reckless gambler but a bluffer besides. In his last years in power he was operating on a relative shoestring—relative, that is, to the overpowering assets arrayed against his own.

He was beyond doubt the most audacious political faker and charlatan that the 20th century has so far produced. As such, the peasant Khrushchev may well have drawn his model from a famous aristocratic Russian example, Prince Gregory Potemkin, who in the late 18th century was charged by Catherine the Great with colonizing the immense steppes of southwestern Russia. He made a hash of the job, and to hide the disaster he caused to be built through the countryside, along the roads opened for the Empress' inspection, any number of false-front villages—the "Potemkin villages" that today supply our language with a universal synonym for fakery.

Khrushchev, nearly two centuries later, had in his turn a truly colossal failure to hide, and not just from the Russian people but from the rest of the world as well, from his allies no less than from his enemies. Commencing in the mid-1950's, as the levers of power in the Soviet dictatorship came ever more readily to his hand, his stupefying activity stimulated a tremendous, if somewhat mystifying, upsurge of invention and productivity in the previously sullen, seemingly half-frozen empire of communism. By 1956 the annual average increase in the Soviet industrial growth rate seemed to have passed that of the United States. Soviet industry, at this stage, appeared to be growing nearly three times as fast as U.S. industry. Soviet harvests turned bountiful as Khrushchev opened the virgin lands to the east and north, and Soviet technology stunned and awed the world in 1957, as it cast forth the first space machines and the first intercontinental-range nuclear rockets. Soviet technicians were in Red China to encourage what was to have been the great leap forward, on the Nile to build the Aswan Dam, and in Africa, India, and southeast Asia to show nations new in independence how to industrialize overnight. It was at this very juncture, however, that Khrushchev's stupendous energy and vaulting ambition took leave of his practical competence, let alone the available Soviet supply of capital.

His enormous capital investment in long-range nuclear rocketry, far from making the Soviet Union the strongest military power on earth, as he had reasoned it would, had instead weakened the underpinnings of the entire national and international structure of communism. As early as 5 years ago, Khrushchev and his senior technicians came to realize that they had saddled themselves with costly, cumbersome, and, for the most part, obsolete weapons that already were far inferior to the American rockets in numbers and effectiveness. On the economic side, these ill-timed, lopsided investments in military technologies had critically starved the industrial sector, especially the light consumer industries.

At this point a chain reaction set in. The Soviet industrial growth rate began to slacken; agriculture failed catastrophically; and the long-overdue improvements in the Soviet standard of living could not be made. To cover the overdrafts being presented at home and from the close-in Eastern European satellites, Khrushchev was obliged to start trimming his capital commitments elsewhere, and most drastically in Red China. Then his welshing on his commitments to Mao Tse-tung further embittered the quarrel over cold-war tactics. This led to a widening of the doctrinal quarrel between the two, which exposed Khrushchev's inability to control the international apparatus any longer, and which in turn meant that his policies were sliding toward bankruptcy.

Very likely, being a shrewd man, Khrushchev himself realized that he was on the skids, and that only a colossal bluff could save him, or at least gain him breathing space for yet another try at recouping his losses. Quite deliberately, it now appears in hindsight, he set about the business of trying to scare the wits out of a still inexperienced President, John F. Kennedy. In the aftermath of the Bay of Pigs disaster, there occurred that chilling encounter of the two men at Vienna in June 1961. Then a glowering, seemingly immovable Khrushchev confronted Kennedy with the prospect of war over Berlin that winter, unless the Americans gave him what he wanted there.

Whether Kennedy ever fully accepted the positive fact of the U.S. military superiority, and the bona fides of the remarkable intelligence systems at his command, is a judgment over which his advisers are divided. He was obviously put to some strain to reverse his election-campaign assumptions that the U.S.S.R. was rapidly overtaking the United States. Even when Khrushchev tried and failed to pull off his final and most desperate gamble—the smuggling of the strategic rockets into Cuba—Kennedy was loath to exploit his known advantage.

THE BLUFF THAT WENT ON TOO LONG

That Khrushchev should have fooled his own people and the Communist brethren so long is not surprising. He presided, after all, over a closed, secretive system where only the party's word counted. What is disheartening is that Khrushchev not only bamboozled his own people but also bamboozled the United States. For beginning in the mid-1950's the United States began to invent means and techniques of intelligence gathering, both human and mechanical, for penetrating into the truth about whatever of consequence was going on inside the Soviet system and for refuting the fiction that Russia was still a riddle wrapped in a mystery inside an enigma.

So well has this job been done that a number of highly placed officials connected with national-security decisions have concluded, after profound soul searching, that some of the more hair-raising emergencies that Khrushchev contrived for us never really had to be tolerated at all. The intelligence collected by our Government from its myriad sources has now established, among other things, that the Soviet long-range rocket strength was vastly overrated. It has further been established to the satisfaction of thoughtful and cold-blooded intelligence analysts of the most senior rank that in 1961–62 Red China was truly a paper tiger; that the Russian bear was not at all composed only of sharp claws and coiled muscle; and that resolute action by us in support of President Chiang Kai-shek's fine forces would probably have brought down the regime of Mao Tse-tung, and without involving the United States in a war with Russia. This is at least an arguable thesis and the grounds for it will be discussed later.

Nevertheless, in the early Khrushchev years it did seem to most of us that if we escaped at all, it would be by the skin of our teeth. At the time of Stalin's death 11 years ago we had become aware of certain experiments underway in the Soviet Union that were calculated at their culmination to swing the world military balance of power decisively in the Russian favor, perhaps before 1960. One was aimed at beating the Americans to the invention of the thermonuclear warhead. The other was concerned with developing military rockets powerful enough to lift such warheads across the polar reaches into the American hinterland. The 6 years from 1953 through 1958—the years when Khrushchev came to power—were beyond doubt the most dangerous years the United States has ever negotiated.

This was the prolonged and nerve-racking interval when both sides struggled to master the thermonuclear solution and the long-range rocket techniques simultaneously. Fortunately, the United States was never completely in the dark about the scope and pace of Soviet nuclear testing. Friendly countries around the world permitted our intelligence services to set up systems of recording devices that, in combination with air sampling, made possible the immediate identification of any Soviet explosion of consequence. This apparatus functioning from afar in its unobtrusive way quickly pinpointed the main Soviet nuclear testing ground at a place called Semipalatinsk, in the center of the U.S.S.R. By the spring of 1953, moreover, it discovered that the Russians had, astonishingly, achieved a thermonuclear reaction there. This event came only a few months after U.S. physicists had made a primitive breakthrough in the course of a tremendous test in the Pacific. Disturbingly, chemical analysis of the Soviet debris suggested that the Russians were already headed toward much the same solution that our experimenters were groping for.

LIFTING THE VEIL OVER KAPUSTIN YAR

These preliminary warnings in the nuclear field aroused the intelligence experts who were charged with keeping track of Soviet rocketry. It had been known for some time in a general way that the Russians were making a big effort to increase the range of the German V–2 rocket that had been used against Britain in the closing months of World War II. Early in their occupation of Germany, they had rounded up all the scientists they could lay their hands on, particularly those who had worked with rockets at Peenemünde and elsewhere. In due course, after their heads had been emptied of secrets, the Germans were sent home, to be questioned all over again by Western intelligence. By the early 1950's it was known from this source that the Russians were experimenting with rockets of unprecedented size at a place called Kapustin Yar, on the east bank of the Volga, not far from Volgograd. The further discovery in 1953 that the Russians were simultaneously thrusting for the thermonuclear solution suddenly charged the accounts supplied by the repatriated Germans with the most serious kind of meaning.

One reason for the excitement was that the United States had itself decided in 1954 to commit billions of dollars in an attempt to develop on the highest of national priorities a 5,500-mile ballistic missile, an ICBM, equipped with a thermonuclear warhead. It now became of the utmost importance for U.S. military scientists to determine exactly what was going on at Kapustin Yar. Fortunately, a novel means for penetrating the Iron Curtain had come to hand. In the winter of 1954–55, at a village called Diyarbakir, situated in the mountains of Turkey that stare across the Black Sea, a full 630 nautical miles from Kapustin Yar, a small body of U.S. technicians began the construction in secrecy of the most powerful fixed-beam radar to be built until that time. The Turks, who can always be counted upon to forward any project calculated to undo the Russians, smoothed the way for its arrival. The antenna was half as long as a football field, and a considerable airlift was required to transport the structure, together with the necessary power units and other equipment, across the ocean. By the early summer of 1955 the installation was in operation, watching whatever arose above Kapustin Yar.

The first intelligence that was deducted from the electronic signals was fairly meager. The rockets entered the radar's field of vision, so to speak, only after they had risen above the horizon, and they could be tracked only for several seconds before their trajectory carried them out of view. Nevertherless, the data that was thus collected on magnetic tape and flown back to the United States furnished us with vital information. By the end of 1955 it was clear that the Russian testing program was a large one; that rockets potentially of ICBM range were being launched; that the firings were proceeding with a high degree of success; and that our own program was far behind.

FEINT WITH THE BOMBERS

As matters then stood, the rockets constituted but one side of the strategic threat being raised against us. The Russians were also making a show of producing strategic jet bombers much faster than we were. Two new Soviet classes of bombers had been verified—one corresponding to the B–52, which Western intelligence identified as the Bison, and the other corresponding to the B–47, which was called the Badger. At the May Day demonstration in Red Square in 1955, Western air attachés were startled to see nine Bison bombers in close formation swing low over the Kremlin. If, as seemed logical, the bombers in the air represented only a fraction of those coming off the production lines, then it looked as if the Russians were also building up their strategic bomber force with the same prodigies of energy that they were investing in rockets. According to U.S. Air Force projections that nervously materialized in the aftermath of the Moscow show, the Russians seemed to be aiming for a force of at least 500 heavy bombers by mid-1960. These estimates gave rise to the outcry in Congress and the press over what was called "the bomber gap," deriving from a supposed already dangerous and growing deficiency in our supply of B–52's compared to their supply of Bisons.

It is now the judgment of some analysts that the Russians set out deliberately to trick us into intensified production of the B–52 jet bomber while they leaped craftily into the whole new technology represented by the ICBM's. Proof was forthcoming some years later, for example, that the nine Bisons which paraded over Moscow that day in May were the only machines of the class which were in a condition to fly that day. It is also possible that, having started down both paths, as we did, and having decided at a much earlier date than we did that the ICBM was the more promising weapon system, the Russians may have tried to hoodwink us into believing that they still were pushing ahead with a massive manned bomber program. The great Soviet bomber force, in fact, never materialized. But the threat intensified the conflict within the Eisenhower administration over how much to press the costly ICBM program at the expense of SAC's bomber inventory. The immense costs and fantastic risks inherent in the alternatives compelled the Government to reach out for surer, still better means of keeping track of what the Russians were up to. The rising danger also argued the necessity of devising a timely warning of a possible surprise attack.

WHAT THE U-2 SAW

A machine that would brilliantly supply these needs was, in fact, already on the drawing boards. It was a single-engine, high-altitude jet reconnaissance for overflying the Soviet Union and Red China, the design for which the Lockheed Airplane Co. had already submitted to the Air Force. The Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, Allen W. Dulles, undertook to lay out a program for a systematic penetration of the Soviet air, and to organize the necessary force of airplanes. Eisenhower did not relish the idea of spying on Russia in this way. "Go ahead," he said to the CIA chief. "You order the plane. We'll decide later when and how to use it, and if at all."

The famous Clarence L. (Kelly) Johnson, the Lockheed vice president who designed the plane, promised to have the first machine ready for testing in 9 months. One of Dulles' CIA lieutenants, Richard M. Bissell, Jr., a former economist, was put in charge of the project. The agency undertook to pay all the costs connected with building the plane, except for the engines, which the Air Force supplied. In the end, the CIA ordered and operated about a score of the U–2's, and the Air Force bought a number for its own reconnaissance missions. From beginning to end, the operation was run with about 500 people, of whom about 30 were crack pilots, nearly all of them volunteers from the Air Force. In the interest of secrecy, the plane was built in sections at the Lockheed plant at Burbank, Calif., whence the sections were trucked to an assembly shed built on the premises of the Atomic Energy Commission's testing grounds in Nevada. There, in air closed to snoopers, it could be test flown with little risk of being identified for what it really was.

The first U–2 flew early in August 1955, and the following May the first detachment formed up on a SAC base in England. Having first welcomed the clandestine visitors, the British Government suddenly became apprehensive about providing sanctuary for spy planes, knowing that the Russians would find out in all good time where the U–2's were based. To avoid a possible argument in the future, Bissell quietly transferred the detachment to another U.S. airfield near Wiesbaden, in Western Germany, where Chancellor Adenauer hospitably welcomed it. Finally, one day in the middle of June 1956, Eisenhower authorized Dulles to overfly the Soviet Union for a period of 10 days.

In these 10 days the detachment based in Germany made five separate, long penetrations of the Soviet Union at an altitude of about 14 miles. One crossed Moscow searching for Bisons on their airfields. Another peered down on the region near Leningrad, picking out submarine facilities to photograph. Another crossed into central Russia, to look down on the rocket installations at Kapustin Yar. The photographs taken with cameras having a focal length of 36 inches were dumbfoundingly good. As Bissell recalls, "the detail was so sharp that one could almost read the tail markings on the bombers." The Russians awakened to the intrusion into their air with alarm and fury. Their radar picked up and tracked each one of the U–2's as they crossed the Soviet frontier. But their interceptors could not close with a machine that cruised 3 miles or so above them. Angry but private protests were addressed to the U.S. Ambassador in Moscow. Later, the Soviet press carried reports that U.S. warplanes had violated the Russian air space. It was some time, though, before the Russians identified the U–2 as an unarmed camera-carrying craft, and their reconstruction of the courses it flew were often confused.

A CAUTIOUS, SMALL OPERATION

For all the daring and imagination that went into the U–2 scheme, the operation itself was run with caution and restraint. From the opening sequence of flights in June 1956, until the shutdown of the operation nearly 4 years later with the shooting down of Francis Gary Powers near Sverdlovsk, in May 1960, only about 30 extended penetrations of the Soviet air space were made. Every flight was cleared in advance with the White House; the targets to be photographed were chosen only after the CIA had weighed the choices with the military services, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the State Department. Before long, the detachment charged with photographing European and central Russia moved its base to Adana, in Turkey, where the weather was better and the inquisitive people in the neighborhood could be more readily shooed away. It had been determined, too, that the weakest link in the early-warning radar system strung along the Soviet border was the stretch in front of western Pakistan; it was a fairly simple business for a U–2 to stage into Peshawar from Adana, presumably to allow the pilot to rest there and fuel up after a high-altitude air-sampling mission. A CIA transport, carrying a special crew of technicians, would have preceded it there. In a day or two, depending upon how soon the weather forecast for the intended zone of operations in the U.S.S.R. turned favorable, the two planes would leave—the U–2 to make its foray above the Iron Curtain, and the transport to return decorously to Adana. Soviet military installations in Siberia were photographed from the staging base in Pakistan, as well as from Japan. And there was, starting in 1957, a methodical high-altitude surveillance by camera of the more interesting areas in Red China, some of the later flights being made by U–2's that were sold to Chiang Kai-shek's air force.

The CIA's analysts were some time deciding the values and implications of the inventions and facilities that showed up in the photographs brought back by the U–2's. None of the evidence the intelligence networks of the Western Powers had collected in the usual way prepared them for the revelation of the stupendous air-defense complexes—interceptors, ground-to-air rockets, and electronic warning and control systems—that the Russians had constructed around their principal cities. From U–2 photographs came proof that the Russians were constructing a large force of nuclear and missile-armed submarines. But in due course, as the flight tracks widened, U–2 photographs proved that the alleged bomber gap was a fiction. The factories building the heavy bombers were located, the bombers at the factory door and on the airfields were counted, and the output was found to be modest—well below our own B–52 rate, in fact. So U.S. production was slowed down.

Forming an assessment of the Soviet rocket effort took longer, however, and at least over the first several years all judgments were admittedly speculative. It was quickly established that the Kapustin Yar complex was a test center for rockets of both intermediate and medium range. These weapons (with ranges extending from 500 to 2,500 nautical miles) were being developed primarily for use against Western Europe. The mystery was, where was the Soviet range for the ICBM's? In the early summer of 1957, shortly after the U–2's began to operate out of Pakistan, the place was found. It was situated on the Trans-Siberian Railway, at a place called Tyura Tam, near the Aral Sea, about 680 miles east of Kapustin Yar. Here was a huge establishment, comparable to the missile and space testing center that the United States was constructing at Cape Canaveral. From here the Soviet technicians were making ready to lob their big rockets toward Kamchatka Peninsula, some 3,000 miles to the east, and later into the Pacific Ocean. The discovery of Tyura Tam preceded by some weeks the first successful Soviet firing of an ICBM which occurred and was announced to the world in August 1957. The U–2 camera actually looked down on the first Soviet ICBM on its launcher. It also perceived on the same premises the elaborate preparations afoot for the sputnik spacecraft that were launched a few months later, the first in October, the second in November.

KHRUSHCHEV AT THE CREST

At this juncture, 1957–58, all the evidence seemed to point to the fact that Khrushchev, who meanwhile had taken full command of the state apparatus, was gathering up vast military power. The military worth of the Soviet ICBM was not in doubt. Liquid-fueled, as were our pioneer Atlas and Titan rockets, it was far bigger than either of these, with engines generating two to three times as much thrust as ours. The Russians had already deployed their first operational squadrons, and in this respect they had a big jump on us. Their grasp of nuclear techniques also was impressive. In 1958 in a well-intentioned, if ineffectual, effort to slow down the race for nuclear advantage, Eisenhower had ordered the AEC to desist from further testing. By then, however, the Russians for 3 years had been successfully testing thermonuclear warheads of a highly efficient character over the island of Novaya Zemlya, in the Arctic Ocean. The Russian bear then looked to be all claw and sinew as regards the material substance of power. In 1957, moreover, Khrushchev had entered exuberantly into the historic compact with Red China, under which Russia agreed to underwrite and oversee the industrialization of its Communist partner. Soviet military and economic aid was being proffered on a lavish scale to underdeveloped societies across the world. The entire Soviet system seemed to be flourishing, with industrial investment growing at an annual rate of increase of about 12 percent, and tourists beginning to remark on the variety of consumer goods starting to appear in the shops of Moscow.

All the reliable indicators argued that Khrushchev was in the process of committing his big rockets to quantity production. There is good evidence that he did so, up to a point. Soviet military spending had dropped somewhat in the mid-1950's as the conventional forces were cut back, following the U.S. example. In 1958, however, Russian military spending started up again. The rocket programs were then moving from the research and development phase into production and deployment phases. At about this time the CIA came up with a judgment that the Russians, if they decided then and there to make an all-out production effort, could probably deploy a force of some 500 ICBM's by mid-1960. In the nomenclature of the hour this was reckoned a "serious strategic capability," a force potentially powerful enough, that is, to destroy in a surprise blow the SAC bomber force on its bases and whatever token force of ICBM's the United States might then have operational. Actually, this was the "middle" or conservative judgment of the intelligence community taken as a whole. Part of the Air Force, for example, supported by many scientists who had no genuine service allegiances, was, in fact, arguing a much larger ICBM force was being built by the Russians. The public apprehensiveness caused by the Soviet feats with the Sputniks was intensified in July 1959, when the then Secretary of Defense, Neil McElroy, admitted before a congressional committee that a "missile gap" did exist, as Eisenhower's critics were vociferously claiming, and that it might be some years before the American deficiency could be corrected.

Meanwhile, there had emerged, too, ominous indications that the Russians had begun to test an anti-missile-missile system, a concept that our scientists then held and still hold to be wholly impracticable. Indeed, the R. & D. center of this enterprise was finally located by a U–2 early in 1960 in central Siberia, at Sary Shagan, a large community on Lake Balkash, about 400 miles east of the ICBM test establishment at Tyura Tam. It was established that the interception of rockets by other rockets had actually been attempted, with some success, and thereafter in U.S. intelligence calculations account had to be taken of the chance, however improbable, that Soviet technicians might be close to a defense against the ICBM's.

CORRECTING THE SIGHTS

Yet on looking back now, the near hysteria that swept the United States in the late 1950's and early 1960's, that Senator John F. Kennedy would exploit as a presidential candidate, appears all but incredible. The "missile gap" rested on assumptions of Soviet industrial capability that were highly speculative to begin with, and that, so far as the West's intelligence services could determine, had by no means been fully committed. Moreover, for all the evidence of a continuing move forward in Soviet ICBM technologies, there was a peculiar absence of evidence of a corresponding capital investment in production. And presently Central Intelligence got on to this highly significant fact. As the U–2 photographs accumulated, two conclusions started tentatively to crystallize, during the winter of 1959–60. First, the ICBM's were being deployed among the field forces at a rate that was puzzlingly slow compared to the delivery capability with which Soviet industry had been credited. Next, nearly all the operational ICBM units were situated along the Trans-Siberian Railroad, over a geographical arc that roughly followed the 55th parallel (north).

The explanation for these singularities was soon forthcoming. In deploying their huge ICBM's, the Russians were severely handicapped by the relative immobility of their rocket systems in the aggregate. Their rocket squadrons were sited in along the railroad because the missiles themselves, their fuel, and all the supporting equipment could be moved and serviced only by rail. That accounted for their being strung out across the Soviet hinterland all in a line more or less. The explanation for the fewness in numbers was of a piece with this. The ICBM was too large because a serious mistake had been made in the design. When the decision was taken, probably about 1953–54, to fix on the design of the rocket and particularly the engine thrust requirements, there was in all probability a gross underestimation of the saving in warhead weight that an efficient thermonuclear solution would later make possible. In consequence, the earliest Soviet ICBM's, although they were the first ever to be deployed, proved much too heavy to be dispersed at will about the countryside or to be put underground in concrete silos. They were further vulnerable for the reason that the cryogenic fuels they used were extremely unstable. It was impossible, therefore, to maintain them in a permanent, more or less automatic state of readiness.

In the face of these drawbacks, Khrushchev seems to have called, perhaps as early as 1958–59, for a stop to further quantity production of the military version. Was the mistake so clear to him then? If he had been following only the political debate in the United States over the supposed chaos of Eisenhower's military and space programs, he should have been encouraged, one might suppose, to plunge headlong with his own huge vehicles; their shortcomings, after all, were not being trumpeted to the world.

But there are excellent reasons for believing that he was anything but insensible of the fact that American technology, despite its overpublicized initial failures, was even then in the process of overtaking and passing his own. While Soviet policy had been staking everything on one big ICBM system, American technology was methodically covering all logical options as it pressed along. Two quite different kinds of liquid-fuel ICBM's, the Atlas and the Titan, were developed in parallel, and these first-generation vehicles were in turn being improved by continuing fundamental inventions, including the synthesis of more stable fuels, which would make it possible for the second-generation weapons to be maintained in a high degree of readiness in underground concrete chambers. More important even than these gains, as regards the long-term power balance, the U.S. investment in solid fuel as a rocket propellant was about to pay off brilliantly. The Minuteman and Polaris systems, ordered into production while Eisenhower was still in the White House and before the dependability of the pioneering systems had been verified, would arm the United States in the early 1960's with a more or less invulnerable force of strategic weapons, far cheaper to build and maintain than the liquid-fuel weapons, and much simpler to deploy, being smaller, less fragile, and with fewer delicate parts.

The American technical recovery must have been staggering for Khrushchev and the Soviet military scientists to contemplate. In the aftermath of the Korean war, at the expense of a rational growth in the Soviet civilian economy, they had strained, in the term associated with grand naval actions of the prenuclear era, to cross the American technological T, and thereby bring off a tremendous strategical maneuver, one that would usher in the twilight of American power. Instead, a massive surge of American invention and power had had the practical effect of turning the attempted trap around. It was the Soviet technology that was about to have its T crossed, and Khrushchev must have realized, perhaps some time in 1959, certainly not later than the spring of 1960, that the Soviet power base would fail his audacious schemes. It was too small. He had built too soon.

THE YEAR OF THE ROOSTING CHICKENS

It is altogether possible, too, that by early May 1960, Khrushchev also had to face up to the probability that the Americans knew that he, not they, was on the short side of the missile gap. The camera had been in operation before Powers' U–2 fell out of control. There were reports from Communist sources that the Russians, on developing the film recovered from the cameras, were stunned by the detail of their rocket installations registered thereon. This report may well have been exaggerated. Even if the film escaped serious damage, the Russians would have had difficulty in developing it properly. Nevertheless, the excellence of the U.S. equipment must have been plain to them; from their radar tracking of the U–2 flights, they must also have deduced long before that we were methodically inspecting their ICBM ranges, the nuclear testing grounds, and the airfields; and Khrushchev may well have concluded, with Powers' film before him, that the Americans were in a position to run an accurate count of his strategic weapons, right down to the last Bison on the runway and the last ICBM on its launcher. This could have brought on the display of fury that broke up the summit meeting in Paris.

It was the bluster, we see now, of a bully whose skin depended on his staving off a real showdown. The year 1960 was for Khrushchev the year his chickens came home to roost. The fraternal association with Red China had turned into a nightmare, for the dispute over doctrine covered a more serious separation. Having brutally stopped the flow of economic aid to Peiping, Khrushchev in the months of July and August called home the entire mission of Soviet technicians, totaling about 3,000 men, who had been loaned to Red China to hasten that country's industrialization. It had become plain to him that year, as the "great leap forward" lost its impetus, that the U.S.S.R. from its own poorhouse could not begin to subsidize Mao Tse-tung's vaster poorhouse on anything like the scale that the Chinese expected. And in the Soviet Union itself the command economy was no longer responding dutifully to the Kremlin command. The 1959 crop was a failure; the 1960 promised to be disappointing (and was). The rate of industrial investment was falling, with crippling effects especially in the chemical industry, as the investment in rockets, nuclear warheads, and associated electronic technologies kept increasing until it would absorb two-thirds of all military procurement. In an effort to check the rise in military costs and release manpower for the economy, Khrushchev in January disclosed that he was drastically reducing the number of men in the armed forces, but over the short swing he proved unable to make efficient use of the manpower in the factories or on the land. In short, by 1960 Stalin's successor was all but bankrupt.

THE TESTING OF KENNEDY

Now came the most ironical part of all. Khrushchev nervily decided to bluff the world—the Red Chinese along with the Americans—while he scratched and scraped for the miracle that would somehow restore his fortunes. After Eisenhower ordered the U–2 operation to stand down, he could count for a while on an end to the close surveillance to which his inferior strategic assets had been exposed. It would take some time before orbital satellites provided a full substitute for the U–2.

In any case Khrushchev decided to bluff Kennedy when he and the new President met in Vienna in June 1961. He had some grounds, plausible to himself, for supposing that he would gain the upper hand in the course of the encounter. In conversations earlier with Soviet colleagues, Khrushchev had noted Kennedy's anxiety to negotiate a way out of a difficult position in Laos, his eagerness for a nuclear test ban treaty, and his continued toleration of a Communist regime in Cuba after the Bay of Pigs affair as signs of an apparent infirmity of purpose. The Kennedy desire for an accommodation was manifest, too, in his ardent avowal, both public and private, that the most urgent business in United States-Soviet relationships was for the countries to end, or at least slow down, their competition in nuclear weaponry, the race, ironically enough, that Khrushchev had already lost to Eisenhower.

Khrushchev needed a political victory when he set off for Vienna. He sought it on the issue of Berlin, and he counted on Kennedy's buckling if presented with a situation carrying with it the risk of war. Khrushchev's private little game was to combine a hint of force with an intimation of Russian determination to sign an independent treaty of peace with the East German regime. This, he reasoned (the United States was advised by reliable sources), would scare Kennedy and his NATO partners into the start of a retreat from West Berlin; and the city would fall to him without the firing of a shot. That Khrushchev misjudged both Kennedy and the American character is now obvious. All the same, he ran the risks up higher than he should ever have been allowed to do. In the end, however, the cool, firm dispositions made by the Supreme Allied Commander in Europe, Gen. Lauris Norstad, with Kennedy's support, persuaded Khrushchev that he couldn't get away with the bluff in Europe.

Yet Khrushchev could not resist the temptation to try again. The poet Robert Frost, the President's friend, brought back from a conversation with Khrushchev in Russia the half taunt that Kennedy was "too much of a liberal to fight." Inasmuch as Khrushchev must have known about the overpowering American strategic advantage, it is impossible to explain his decision to smuggle the rockets into Cuba in the fall of 1962 except in light of a delusion on his part that the U.S. Government would in fearfulness try to close its eyes to the danger being advanced to its shore.

By then, however, time had run out on Khrushchev. Although U.S. intelligence was tardy in finding the rockets in Cuba, it did locate them in plenty of time for Kennedy to destroy or neutralize them decisively. Not only was the CIA, with its collaborators in military intelligence services, able to pinpoint and count the rockets in Cuba and to measure their degree of readiness; it was also able to tell the President almost exactly how the Soviet strategic order of battle across the world—bombers and rockets and long-range submarines—compared to our own. Probably never before in history has a head of state entered a war situation so well informed of the adversary's strengths and weaknesses as was Kennedy in October 1962, or, for that matter, with so absolute a knowledge of the overwhelming advantages that lay with him across the board.

Nearly 2 years after the October affair, the President's closest adviser on national security affairs, McGeorge Bundy, was to supply a strange epilogue in an article published in the April issue of Foreign Affairs. "The October crisis," Bundy concludes, "came out better than President Kennedy or any of his associates had expected." Considering that he had been caught redhanded and that the power factors were hopelessly stacked against him, Khrushchev would seem to have had the better reason, as he closed the books on the Cuba incident, to think that matters had turned out better for him than he had a right to expect. For one thing, he was permitted to bring the rockets home under a safe-conduct pass, without the on-the-spot inspection that the Americans had first demanded. For another, he and Castro believed that they had an American promise not to invade Cuba so long as the rockets didn't return. And, finally, the U.S. middle-range rockets based in Turkey and Italy, in the NATO interest, were dismantled and taken away, as Khrushchev long had demanded.

A FLEETING OPPORTUNITY

As matters turned out, Cuba was the last of Khrushchev's shoestring operations against the United States. Meanwhile, it appeared that the United States passed up what some observers think was a truly extraordinary opportunity in the western Pacific. By early 1962, U.S. intelligence was in possession of information that much of Red China was in ferment. Tens of thousands of refugees were pressing against the gates of Macao and Hong Kong; harvests had failed; there were public demonstrations, even rioting, by the hungry; in some communities the militia had refused to act against the people and certain detachments had in fact mutinied. At this point President Chiang Kai-shek pressed Washington for permission to attempt to establish a beachhead on the mainland with his own forces. The American decision was to leave matters as they were in China. Not only was the weight of American influence thrown on the side of restraining Chiang, the State Department was also assuring Peiping, through third parties, that if Chiang did start off, he would be on his own. It is now recognized in knowledgeable circles in Washington, however, that a demonstration by Chiang, with U.S. power, on the flanks and rear, would have subjected the Peiping regime to a test it was ill equipped to meet. Firmness on the U.S. part in the interest of an ally would have brought about at least an ebbing, perhaps even an end, to Mao's menace in Asia.

By the beginning of the 1960's the executive branch of the Government had both the information and the power to call Khrushchev's bluff and to finish off Castro. That we did not do so was due in part to a want of resolution, which one may hope will now be surmounted. For today the United States clearly stands at the pinnacle of power. The Communist system stands second, a very weak second—weak militarily, weak economically and industrially, weak in its international political connections.

EDUCATION AND TAX SOURCES—NEWSLETTER BY SENATOR THURMOND

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on January 15, 1965, I introduced a number of legislative proposals for consideration by the Senate. Among these was Senate bill 542, which would eliminate the Federal excise tax on alcohol and tobacco products. The purpose of this proposed legislation is set forth in my weekly newsletter dated January 18, 1965, and entitled "Education and Tax Sources."

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this newsletter be printed at this point in the RECORD, so that the purpose of this proposed legislation can be studied and considered by all who are concerned with the problem of providing additional funds for education without further intrusion of the Federal Government into this area of activity, which under the Constitution has been reserved for State and local governments.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EDUCATION AND TAX SOURCES

(By STROM THURMOND, U.S. Senator from South Carolina)

The 89th Congress has been asked by President Johnson to approve a massive program of general Federal aid to education.

There is little question about the importance of education. It is vital to our people for many reasons, foremost among these being the paramount responsibility of self-government. Great strides have been made in the individual States to increase the quality of public education. In fact, public education spending by the States has tripled in the past 12 years.

Long ago our Founding Fathers determined that the task of public education must be a responsibility of local government. They realized that education controlled by a central government could be used, as could a centralized police power, to destroy local self-government and individual liberty in the interest of establishing a monarchy or dictatorship.

Also, the Founding Fathers recognized that more and better education could be obtained for the dollar if administered by a local school board. Thus, the field of education was never delegated to the Federal Government under the Constitution, but rather was reserved to the States. In fact, the word "education" is not to be found in the Constitution. Because of this clear lack of constitutional authority, supporters of general Federal aid to education have in the past proposed only indirect or limited programs for the purpose of getting the "camel's nose under the tent." Even the national defense clause in the Constitution has been used in an effort to pervert the intent of the Constitution rather than seeking to amend the Constitution.

For the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1965, the President has requested authority to spend approximately one-third as much as is now being spent for education by all the States. This money will go to public, private, and church-supported schools at all levels, beginning with kindergarten and extending through college postgraduate work. Each year the Federal spending will go higher until total control and responsibility rests in Washington with Federal bureaucrats spelling out the contents of textbooks and curriculums and controlling teacher pay and standards.

The recent orders enforcing the fund withholding provisions of title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 provide all the proof necessary on the element of control which lurks behind all Federal aid dollars.

There is a good alternative for all Federal aid to public education, and I have introduced legislation to make this alternative possible. The President is suggesting the elimination of some Federal excise taxes. I have thus proposed that the Federal Government withdraw its excise taxes on alcoholic beverages and tobacco products so the States can have the full benefit of these tax sources. In 1963, the Federal Government collected approximately $6 billion in taxes on alcohol and tobacco. All States now tax alcohol and tobacco, but they are limited in their revenues here as elsewhere by the intrusion of the Federal Government.

In fact, preemption of tax sources by the Federal Government is one of the primary reasons for the gradual erosion of State and local powers of government and the shift of more and more authority to Washington.

If the President truly is concerned about promoting more progress in education and States responsibilities—as well as preserving States rights and our Federal system of divided powers—then he should support this proposal to keep tax dollars at home so progress for the people can be promoted at the appropriate level of government. He could also back a proposal I am cosponsoring to provide a tax credit for taxpayers who spend money to pay education expenses of students.

The only feature lacking in these two proposals is the element of control—which, in his education message, the President professes not to desire.

Sincerely,

STROM THURMOND.

THE STRUGGLE IN VIETNAM

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, last Saturday, January 16, 1965, Henry Cabot Lodge, our eminent and distinguished former colleague, addressed the 49th annual convention of the National Association of Secondary School Principals in Miami on the struggle being waged in Vietnam. The address is timely, and his views deserve careful attention as we consider South Vietnam and the programs of U.S. assistance there, as well as possible alternatives in policy. I ask unanimous consent that this address, containing important observations obtained by Ambassador Lodge in his experience in Vietnam, be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH BY THE HONORABLE HENRY CABOT LODGE, JANUARY 16, 1965, FOUNTAINEBLEAU HOTEL, MIAMI BEACH, AT THE 49TH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SECONDARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, you represent such a tremendous influence on America's youth and, therefore, such a decisive factor in America's destiny that it is indeed a privilege for me to have you give me a hearing tonight.

I submit some thoughts, born of personal experience, about Vietnam and what I say will be in two parts: First, on why Vietnam is important; and second, on what is the nature of the problem.

1. IMPORTANCE OF THE PROBLEM

Geographically, Vietnam stands at the hub of a vast area of the world—southeast Asia—an area with a population of 240 million people extending 2,300 miles from north to south, and 3,000 miles from east to west. The Mekong River, one of the 10 largest rivers in the world, reaches the sea in South Vietnam. He who holds or has influence in Vietnam can affect the future of the Philippines and Formosa to the east, Thailand and Burma with their huge rice surpluses to the west, and Malaysia and Indonesia with their rubber, oil and tin to the south. Japan is deeply concerned. All this affects Australia and New Zealand. Vietnam thus does not exist in a geographical vacuum—from it large storehouses of wealth and population can be influenced and undermined.

Historically, Vietnam has long played a part in the political development of the Far East. For many centuries it was under the occupation or influence of the Chinese and was used by the Chinese as a means of enforcing their hegemony over the whole of southeast Asia. The Vietnamese did not enjoy this experience and have traditionally done what they could to throw off Chinese overlordship.

But today Vietnam should be seen as one more instance in a long series of events which began in Iran, Turkey, and Greece after World War II: which includes the seizure of Czechoslovakia; which led to the Marshall plan in Europe; which caused the Korean war, the Malayan emergency, the Huk rebellion in the Philippines, and the Berlin crisis. In all these widely separated places the Communist bloc has tried to subvert and to undermine the free world in order to spread their monolithic control and their suppression of freedom.

In opposing this Communist onslaught, the free world has stood together for nearly two decades. One manifestation of our common determination to frustrate the Communist design to conquer Europe was the creation of NATO. Elsewhere in the world we have formed other alliances. The United

States alone has suffered 160,000 casualties since the end of World War II in this effort to contain the spread of communism.

This worldwide effort by nations of the free world has not been undertaken out of a simple quixotic delight to engage in battles in distant places. Nor does it signify a desire to establish a new colonialism or any kind of special position. The war in Vietnam is not only the struggle of a small nation to exist, but it is also an open encounter between the doctrine that "wars of revolution," as the Communists call them, are the wave of the future, and our belief that in the future nations should be allowed to develop their own destinies free from outside interference.

Although the North Vietnamese have their own motives for their aggression in South Vietnam and have played the leading role, they have always been backed by the Chinese Communists. Should their aggression be successful, the Chinese Communists will have seen positive proof that their approach to international relations is correct.

Such an outcome might well lead the Soviets, in their desire to retain the leadership of the Communist bloc, to adopt a more belligerent stance in their relations with the outside world. This would surely affect the West.

It would also be regarded everywhere as a reflection of the inability or lack of will of the free world to prevent aggression. What, for example, would be the reaction in Europe if the United States were to withdraw from southeast Asia in the face of its commitment to assist?

The state of public opinion in the United States itself would also be affected. Should Vietnam be lost, many voices would be heard urging us in effect to "resign from the world" to fall back onto our "fortress America," and to gird up our loans for a contest with guided missiles. This too would be something with grave consequences for Europe and the rest of the free world.

Because of all these consideration, the United States has undertaken to support the Vietnamese both politically and militarily in an effort which has cost us lives and treasure.

The effort has not been in vain. Although we are not yet victorious, much has been accomplished. We have learned by experience. There is more night-fighting by small units, there are able province chiefs, there are men of impressive ability in the national government, there are realistic plans for conducting the pacification program, and there is vivid recognition that the war is above all a political matter, in which the adherence of the people to the Government is the crucial factor.

To assist this effort the United States has built up an able organization in Vietnam to assist the Vietnamese. Ambassador Taylor, Ambassador Johnson, and General Westmoreland head an American organization which has trained and helped to build the Vietnamese Army. On the economic and social front the United States has contributed to the building of schools, clinics, and better farms, all of which are essential to gaining and holding the political support that must be had to win the war. And we try to help in every way in training civil administrators and in creating political energy in the country.

Some have said that despite this effort the war in Vietnam cannot be won. Yet recent history shows that we have been fighting wars of this sort for the past 20 years and that the record is creditable. We of the free world won in Greece, we thwarted the Communist aggression in Korea, we won in Malaya, we won in the Philippines, and we can win in Vietnam. We must persist and we must not play into the enemy's hands by counting on a quick, sensational, and easy way out.

Persistent execution of the political and military plans which have been agreed to will bring victory—provided outside pressures do not become too great. These outside pressures occur in many forms such as the problem of sanctuaries from which Vietnam can be attacked and the Vietcong helped with impunity. Infiltration from such sanctuaries cannot be allowed to defeat the efforts the Vietnamese are making. We will not shrink from taking such measures as seem necessary to cope with it.

Another form of outside pressure is the desire in some quarters for an international conference here and now. We naturally do not oppose the idea of holding international conferences as an abstract proposition—if they are held at the proper time and under the proper circumstances, but we think that to hold a conference now would serve no good purpose and would seriously undermine morale in South Vietnam. Consider the reasons:

1. There have already been two conferences on southeast Asia, the terms of which were satisfactory but which the Communists violated before the ink was dry. Before holding another conference there must be some sign that the Communists of Hanoi and Peiping are prepared to leave their southern neighbors alone.

2. For the South Vietnamese to go to a conference now with a large and aggressive fifth column on their soil would amount to a surrender. A conference not preceded by a verifiable Communist decision to cease attacking and subverting South Vietnam would be nothing more than a capitulation.

3. There is clearly no agreement between us and the Communists even on the simple proposition to leave South Vietnam alone. A conference held in an atmosphere of bitter disagreement could only make matters more dangerous than they already are.

So-called neutralism is another outside pressure standing in the way of the successful prosecution of the war in South Vietnam. Neutralism that does not include some means of enforcement, that does not include North Vietnam, that means that South Vietnam will be alone and disarmed, is nothing more than surrender. It should be opposed for Vietnam just as it is opposed for Berlin or for Germany.

In truth both Vietnams are "neutralized" now by article 10 of the Geneva accord of July 21, 1954, which said: "The two parties shall insure that the zones assigned to them do not adhere to any military alliance and are not used for the resumption of hostilities or to further an aggressive policy."

This provision has been formally approved by article 5 of the the final declaration of the Geneva Conference of 1954 in which the U.S.S.R., Red China, France, the United Kingdom, the United States, Cambodia, Laos, North and South Vietnam participated.

We must therefore insist before there is any discussion of a conference or of neutralism, that the Communists stop their aggression and live up to the agreements which already exist. The minute the onslaught ceases, there can be peace. At present the North Vietnamese seem only to understand force, and, of course, when they use force they must be met with force as they were in the Gulf of Tonkin. They should also be met with the strong and united opposition of the free world.

It seems that conflicts in far-off places are precisely those which have often brought war and calamity to all of us. Manchuria seemed far away in 1931; the subversion of Czechoslovakia by Hitler seemed remote to the United States in 1938. Yet the result was an untold outpouring of blood and treasure. Persistence, and unity in the face of Communist pressure have succeeded in Europe and in southeast Asia, and can succeed again.

2. NATURE OF THE PROBLEM

What you have in Vietnam is a new kind of fighting man. He is as distinct as the infantryman or the aviator. He is the terrorist. He's not only different from the infantryman and the aviator—he's different from a guerrilla fighter. He dresses like everybody else—and in those hot countries, a man wears a pair of pants and a top, and that's what the terrorist wears. But he is part of a very elaborate organization. He is carefully controlled, protected, and guided.

He'll be told, for example, to go in and terrorize some village where the Vietcong want to take over. So, Monday morning there will be 12 bodies on the street—old men, women, children. Nobody's done anything—nobody's guilty—they're just picked indiscriminately. The idea is to create terror. Then they'll kidnap the village chief, cut off his head, put it on a pole, and walk it around. Well, by 3 o'clock in the afternoon you don't have too much trouble getting 17- or 18-year-old boys to join the Vietcong. It's just as simple as that.

Now, you don't get rid of this man by putting in an infantry battalion. The infantry battalion comes in and it stays around for however long it wants to. The terrorists disappear into the houses—the grass and palm leaf houses of the inhabitants. Then the battalion moves on; it can't stay there forever. And the terrorists come out again. Nothing has been accomplished. In fact in many ways the situation is worse because a number of innocent people have been killed. You don't get rid of the terrorist by bombing, because if you drop a bomb and you kill 20 people, 19 of them are women and children, who have got nothing to do with the terrorists at all, and there's only one terrorist. So, that isn't any good—because the terrorist is in among the people.

Well, therefore, is it hopeless? No, it isn't hopeless. But you've got to organize the totality of the population—all of the people—to protect the local village officials, and that means you get a good man in each precinct—the smallest unit of government—to be chairman, and a good committee of young men who have a stake in the community, who have a family, who own a farm, or who own a home, or who want to get ahead in business or something—and you form a counterterrorist precinct committee.

And then, with the help of the police—and where there isn't any police (and there isn't any in most places in Vietnam), you have the army and the local militia backing you. You then conduct a census, issue identification cards, have a curfew, and everybody who is out after 8 o'clock has to explain why, or, if he doesn't, they give him the business. And thus you go through each precinct with a fine-tooth comb.

Now, that's how you get rid of terrorism. And it isn't very fast, but it can be very sure. It has worked in many places where it has been tried—in Kuala Lumpur; in Algiers; in the Philippines; and in the city of Saigon.

And then everybody gives the village chief and the chief of police where there is one some confidence that he may be going to live, and then he in turn can interest himself in the security of the people, and you begin to get an upward spiral. And then you can bring in your doctors, and your schoolteachers, and your welldiggers, and the animal husbandry people—and all the other people that make life worth while. So, that's one part of the problem.

One of the best things that any American has ever said about Indochina that I've read was said by the late Gen. Bedell Smith, who was the U.S. representative at Geneva in 1954, after the French had been defeated at Dienbienphu. Georges Bidault, who was then the Prime Minister of France, told Bedell Smith that he was thinking of relieving General Navarre because of the defeat at Dienbienphu. And General Bedell Smith said, "Any second-rate general could win in Indochina if there were a proper political atmosphere." A profound remark.

Because, you see, in this struggle there's no front, there's no rear, there are no flanks—and when the fighter wants to hide, he goes into the average Vietnamese man's home. When he wants to rest, he goes into the average Vietnamese man's home. When he wants something to eat, he goes into the average Vietnamese man's home. If he's wounded and he wants to get taken care of, he goes into the average Vietnamese man's home. If he wants information as to what the army is doing, and as to what the Americans are doing, he goes into the Vietnamese home—and the old lady, the old grandmother who is 85 years old, she can sit there and see what goes on, and she can tell him all about what she sees on the road—if she wants to.

Well, now, the minute the everyday citizen, living in his home in Vietnam, says to the Vietcong, "You can't come in here to hide, you can't come in here to sleep and rest, you can't come in here to get food, you can't come here to have your wounds bound up—we aren't going to give you any information"—the war's over.

I was asked this question recently: "I suppose when we get rid of this instability, then we can go ahead and win the war." I said: "When you get rid of the instability, there isn't any war. The instability is the problem."

This is an oriental country, a tropical country. Now think of what that means. In the tropics, nature is rich—much, much, richer than it is in the north. So, a poor man, living in the Mekong Delta looks at the water of the rice paddy where the rice grows and sees fresh water fish swimming around. There are also ducks swimming on the surface, that eat the fish. Then no place in Vietnam is far from the ocean. So this poor man can eat rice, fresh water fish, duck, and some of the most marvelous salt water fish in the world out of the South China Sea. There are also coconuts and pineapples and all manner of vegetables. Living right there, he can, for next to nothing, have a perfectly marvelous diet without traveling more than a few hundred yards.

So this oriental and tropical Vietnamese has everything he needs close to home. But, in addition to being oriental and tropical, he is also often a Confucianist. This means reverence for one's ancestors; it means great loyalty to family and to the small local group consisting largely of relations and near-relations. This is the loyalty which counts for him above all others—for which he is willing to die.

How natural for some of these oriental, tropical, and Confucianist Vietnamese to say to themselves: "Why should I extend my frontiers 500 miles and pay taxes, and have an army, and a navy, and a diplomatic corps, and all the trappings of a Western nation-state, when I don't need it? It's all right for these people in the north—they have to, but I don't need to." And, this would be an unanswerable argument—if it were not for Communist China. It is the nearness of Communist China which means that they must become a modern nation-state in order to survive. In 1964 more Vietnamese realized this than in 1954. But it still goes against their traditions.

Thus the concept of national government does not mean there what it meant in the West. And a loyalty to such groups as Hoa Hao and Cao Dai have a vitality for which there is no counterpart in the West.

So, what you see there—and I think I may have invented a word for it—is a strong sense of peoplehood—and of group and family loyalty—but not the same sense of nationhood that we have. These people think of themselves as Vietnamese, as being of a distinct race, which they are—you don't have to be there 5 minutes before you see that. They think of themselves as having their own language, which they have—their own literature, their own art, their own history. They go 'way back—it's a very old civilization. They do not want to be overwhelmed and absorbed by the Chinese. But their peoplehood often doesn't involve the same attitude toward the flag, and the republic, and the nation, and all those things that in the West we go out and die for.

These people are brave. I must have talked with 50 of our young West Point captains, and, believe me, there are some young men that we can all be proud of. They're with the Vietnamese army battalions. They are enthusiastic about the bravery of the Vietnamese soldier—his courage, his toughness, the long-suffering quality that he has. But his loyalty has a Vietnamese quality to it. He is loyal to his group, he is loyal to his region, he is loyal to his unit. In our own Western European history many years ago—there was, for example, the Duke of Burgundy, and the Duke of Normandy, and the Duke of Picardy, and finally it was put together and became France. Well, this country is evolving from this medieval lack of national organization into the 20th century. It's making progress. But it isn't—and it never was the same kind of country that we have in the West, and it shouldn't be judged that way.

In the case of Malaya, it took 12½ years to win the struggle against the Vietcong of Malaya. And the thing that turned the balance against the Vietcong, was when a political arrangement was reached between the Malay community and the Chinese community. When that was reached, then they were on their way. And I believe that, when a settlement is reached between the principal communities within Vietnam, then that will be the beginning of a new day for that country.

In conclusion: The struggle in Vietnam is an example of Mao Tse-tung's statement that "politics is war without bloodshed and war is politics with bloodshed." Thus, politics and war are opposite sides of a coin—or, as has been said, "the two wheels, or wings, of statecraft." Armed combat is thus only one—and not necessarily the most important—segment of war.

The struggle in Vietnam is thus not a war in the sense that World War II—or Korea—was a war, because total military success in Vietnam unaccompanied by success in other fields, will not bring victory. A many-sided effort is needed; no single effort will solve the problem; the problem is thus the despair of the headline writer and of the political stump speaker or of any kind of black and white phraseology.

Therefore, those who try to make you think that there is a quick solution or a simple solution or an exclusively military solution are doing you as much of a disservice as are those who tell you that there is no hope, that we must pull out and that another southeast Asian conference (added to the two which have been already held—and dishonored) will do other than turn South Vietnam over to the Communists.

They also do you a disservice who deny that much has been achieved, that the military program, the economic program, the social program, the informational program and the various technical programs have all accomplished much—have indeed built the springboard of victory—and that it is the political, counter-subversive, counter-terrorist program which still needs special attention.

It is accurate to say that a glass is half full of water and it is equally accurate also to say that a glass is half empty. To dwell on the fact that we have not achieved victory does not negate the other fact that we have prevented defeat—and that a stalemate is much better than a defeat.

It is not the American tradition to get panicky whenever there is rough weather—and to get desperate whenever it becomes clear—as it does every day—that a quick purely military victory is impossible. If we decide only to interest ourselves in the nice, quiet, neat countries (which do not need our help) and abandon all the rough, tough, difficult places to the Communists, we will soon find ourselves surrounded by a rough, tough world which is aimed straight at the destruction of the United States and which will make our present effort in Vietnam seem mild indeed. Win or lose, the stakes in Vietnam are enormous. And we need not lose.

THE NEED FOR CONGRESSIONAL REFORM CONTINUES

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, a recent editorial in the Washington Post, commenting on a study by the National Committee for an Effective Congress, reminds us that the need for congressional reform continues.

The recent changes in the rules of the other body are a recognition of this fact; and I am hopeful that, before long, both bodies will join in enacting legislation to set up a Joint Committee on the Modernization of Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the Washington Post be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Dec. 28, 1964]

Consensus on Congress

Among the most serious problems that the new Congress will have to face will be its own deficiencies. For many years it has limped along under the burden it has inherited from custom and tradition.

The will of the majority is often frustrated by minority obstruction, filibusters, committee oligarchies, the dead hand of seniority and the incrustation of privilege. Most Congressmen realize that their institution is out of joint with the times. Many fears are expressed that it has slid from first to last place among the three branches of Government. Yet the rescue of Congress from its worsening obsolescence has been repeatedly postponed.

The only consoling aspect of this situation is the fact that pressures are building up. Inside and outside of Congress there is now a healthy demand for rather sweeping reforms. Today the National Committee for an Effective Congress, in a searching study of contemporary problems, points to "explosions of population, of technology, of urban life, of knowledge and of human expectations" to bolster its belief that "we are now crossing the historical equivalent of a sound barrier unaware, and we are entering a new mode of life unprepared."

A large part of this unpreparedness lies on Capitol Hill. The House needs to strengthen the hands of its majority leadership so that it can steer a straight course instead of wobbling under the buffetings of contending factions. Several steps seem imperative.

1. The Speaker should be given a strong steering (or policy) committee to help shape the legislative agenda and carry it through.

2. The Speaker should have authority to take a bill to the floor for a vote if it should be held in the Rules Committee for 21 days or more.

3. The Speaker should be able to send to conference bills passed by both Houses without waiting on a balky Rules Committee.

4. The Speaker, with the approval of the Steering Committee, should exercise the authority now lodged in the Rules Committee to rescue any administration bill bottled up by a legislative committee after it has had a reasonable period in which to act.

5. Finally, both Houses should act to set up a Joint Committee on the Modernization of Congress for the consideration of numerous other proposed reforms.

These aims for the redeployment of power within Congress are stated in somewhat different form by different groups. But behind them there is a very substantial consensus. They are designed to make Congress responsive to the national will.

OPPORTUNITIES TO PRESERVE THE NATION'S SCENIC BEAUTY

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, the struggle to protect some of our natural heritage in the outdoors, for the enjoyment of future generations, is a continuing one which must be waged anew every day of our lives.

The Milwaukee Journal has called attention to a number of new opportunities which face us in our continuing effort to set aside some of the scenic beauty of our Nation for long-range public enjoyment.

The editorial discusses the efforts to preserve Assateague Island; to protect the beauty of the Hudson River highlands from industrial encroachment; to save the splendor of a portion of Grand Canyon National Monument; to preserve the irreplaceable Indiana dunes as a public park in an area of great population and industrial growth; and the controversy over the best development of the Potomac River basin.

The Journal is to be congratulated for this continuing discussion of our priceless natural resources; and I hope our citizens will pay attention to the timely warning the Journal offers.

I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial from the Milwaukee Journal printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Milwaukee (Wis.) Journal, Dec. 27, 1964]

Beauty Versus the Buck

You cannot put a price tag on scenic beauty, buy it, wrap it up, and carry it home. Being intangible, it cannot be weighed or measured. For this reason, much of our beauty is being eroded, a victim of more practical uses to which people can pin a value in dollars. Examples lie at every point of the compass.

Assateague Island is a narrow spit of unspoiled Atlantic seashore on the Maryland coast, the last major undeveloped stretch from Cape Cod to Cape Hatteras. Maryland, which hopes to see it set aside as a national park, recently had to get a court order to keep local developers from chewing up the island with bulldozers. The battle is far from over.

In New York State, a power company wants to build a mighty hydroelectric plant in the heart of the handsome Hudson River highlands at Storm King Mountain. Conservationists say it will deface the mountain and string powerlines through miles of beauty. Local people favor the plant; it will put new dollars in circulation, they say, and you can't feast on scenery.

The Federal Reclamation Bureau wants to dam up a new stretch of the Colorado River, creating a lake 80 miles long, inundating much of the magnificence of the canyon in Grand Canyon National Monument. Trapped water will help make the desert bloom, the Bureau argues; it's good for business.

For years there have been proposals in Congress to make a national park of the superb Indiana dunes at the south end of Lake Michigan. While Congress dallied, steel finishing mills have been built in the heart of the area and an industrial port is proposed. The park would "undermine the economic potential of the area," says Representative Halleck, Republican, of Indiana.

The Army Corps of Engineers has plans to dam and flood out a great section of the Potomac River basin at Seneca, Md., including 40 miles of wooded beauty along the old C. & O. Canal. The Maryland Department of Economic Development has figures which purport to prove that the new lake would get 40 times the use of the canal footpaths and offer fine tourism-recreation potentials.

During hearings on the proposed Hudson River powerplant, one speaker offered the stark prospect of a future world stripped of natural beauty. "Do we want the entire country to turn into one enormous Disneyland," he asked, "with little bits and pieces of the past preserved so when we fatigue of living in the make piece, papier mache world we go to a little amusement park for a little bit of normal land or real-life-o-rama?"

Potential economic benefits cannot be ignored in planning man's massive projects; neither can our heritage of esthetics. In the continuing contest between beauty and the buck, beauty too often is the loser.

TRIBUTE TO JOHN DOAR OF WISCONSIN

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, the President of the United States has nominated John Doar, of Wisconsin, to be an Assistant Attorney General, succeeding Burke Marshall as the Director of the Civil Rights Division in the U.S. Department of Justice.

Last summer, the President also presented Mr. Doar with the Distinguished Federal Civilian Award for his outstanding service as first assistant to the Director of the Civil Rights Division throughout the long and difficult rights controversies of the past few years.

I express the great pride of the State of Wisconsin in the accomplishments of this young man, and point out how thoroughly his spirit of public service is representative of the Wisconsin tradition.

John Doar is a native of Minneapolis; but he grew up in New Richmond, Wis. He practiced law in New Richmond, after being admitted to practice before the Wisconsin bar in 1950.

It is interesting to note that Mr. Doar's interest and activities in the field of civil rights do not arise from any partisan attitudes; and that is true also of the State of Wisconsin. Our State has a great tradition of belief in human rights which transcends political partisanship. Both the Republican and the Democratic Parties in Wisconsin have a deep commitment to civil rights legislation.

Our State passed its first civil rights bill way back in 1895, and it embodied most of the features of the public accommodations section of the historic Civil Rights Act of 1964. Wisconsin has had an excellent fair employment practices law since 1945, supported by both parties.

John Doar represents the same Wisconsin tradition. In New Richmond, Wis., he worked for the law firm of Doar & Knowles. Mr. Knowles is now the Republican Governor of Wisconsin. Here in Washington, he has distinguished himself in the administrations of President Kennedy and President Johnson.

Wisconsin is justifiably proud of John Doar; and we wish him well in the new work, which is of vital importance to the whole Nation.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an article on John Doar which was published in the New York Times of September 2, 1963.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Sept. 2, 1963]

Ubiquitous Rights Aid: John Michael Doar

The white man was surrounded by Negroes bent on avenging the murder of Medgar W. Evers. Sidestepping bottles and rocks, he moved along Farish Street, in Jackson, Miss., urging the mob to lay down its weapons.

At the street's end, a double line of police stood ready to move in with clubs and guns. "My name is John Doar, D-o-a-r," he shouted above the curses and jeers. "I'm from the Justice Department, and anybody around here knows I stand for what is right."

The scene, the man, the dialog, could have come from the imagination of a scriptwriter. But friends of John Michael Doar insist there's nothing theatrical about the performance of the Assistant Attorney General in the Civil Rights Division of the Justice Department.

Observers sometimes liken his manner to that of Gary Cooper, or his voice to that of James Stewart. They then add immediately that his total lack of self-consciousness and his aversion to publicity make comparisons with any actor misleading.

Yet his daily routine often sounds like a tour by a summer stock company.

"John Doar's in Birmingham," one reporter told another at dinner recently.

"No, he's in New Orleans," another said.

"No, I saw him here in Jackson," a third spoke up.

"You're all right," said a fourth. "He was in Birmingham this morning, argued a case in New Orleans this afternoon and arrived in Jackson tonight."

ACTIVE IN MEREDITH CASE

Yesterday he was in Tuskegee, Ala., where Gov. George C. Wallace delayed the opening of the public schools.

Last fall he was at the side of James H. Meredith when the Negro was turned away at the University of Mississippi by Gov. Ross R. Barnett. When Mr. Meredith finally entered "Ole Miss" on September 30, 1962, Mr. Doar again was there, sharing his dormitory room while a riot raged all night.

Top Negro leaders praise Mr. Doar for his honesty and his conviction. "He hears the dialog, and he understands it," one Negro leader, who has been critical of other Government officials, said.

However, Mr. Doar has detractors. Impatient young Negroes in Jackson, for example, thought his intervention with the mob was unwarranted. "What did he really accomplish?" one asked. "He got the police off the hook, that's all."

Segregationists in northern Mississippi took some pleasure in the early difficulties Mr. Doar had as he argued the Government's case in voter registration suits.

Reprimanded by one judge for failing to produce sufficient evidence, Mr. Doar has since showed up in court with stacks of affidavits and exhaustive records. "He goes in with evidence by the bale now," a court reporter said. "I'll bet that judge is sorry he opened his mouth."

Mr. Doar was born on December 3, 1921, in Minneapolis. He grew up in New Richmond, Wis., was graduated from Princeton University and served as a second lieutenant in the Army Air Corps in World War II.

After discharge from the service, he went West, graduating from the University of California's Law School at Berkeley in 1950.

Explaining his choice of school, he says, "California was the best place to make a fortune."

RETURN TO WISCONSIN

When his father, also an attorney, became ill, Mr. Doar returned to New Richmond to assist him in his practice. He stayed 10 years.

In the spring of 1960, Harold Tyler, chief civil rights attorney in the Eisenhower administration, called a friend of Mr. Doar's and offered him the division's No. 2 spot.

Since the administrtation was in its final months, the other man declined but suggested Mr. Doar.

"I liked trial work, and I knew this would be tough trial work," Mr. Doar said later. "Also, I had some clear ideas about civil rights in this country. It just appealed to me."

When Robert F. Kennedy became Attorney General, he appointed Burke Marshall to replace Mr. Tyler. Mr. Doar calls Mr. Marshall "the greatest 40-year-old lawyer in the country." Although he is a Republican, Mr. Doar stayed on his job when the Democrats came to Washington.

In the last 3 years, he handled dozens of tasks: Negro voting suits, freedom riders, and the case of the Mississippi Negro leader who had his home burned to the ground and then was charged with arson.

Mr. Doar's wife, Anne, and their four children wait for his return at their Chevy Chase home in Washington. The children are Gael, 11 years old; Michael, 7; Robert, 2; and a 3½-month-old son, John Burke.

When Mr. Doar quelled the bottle-throwing in Jackson, the baby, a month old, had no name. "We haven't had much chance to pick one," Mr. Doar explained then.

But he remembered when the child had been born.

"It was May 12," he said, "at the time of the Birmingham riot."

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

ADJOURNMENT TO 10:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, pursuant to the order previously entered, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 10:30 tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 16 minutes p.m.), under the order previously entered, the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, January 20, 1965, at 10:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 19, 1965:

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following persons for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grades indicated, under the provisions of section 8284, title 10, United States Code, with a view to designation under the provisions of section 8067, title 10, United States Code, to perform the duties indicated, and with dates of rank to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Air Force:

To be major, USAF (Medical)

Robert M. Dean, AO2089204.

To be captains, USAF (Medical)

Ramon Casanova-Roig, AO3112804.
Frank L. Jones, AO3141117.
John R. Morris, AO3111579.
Ross G. Olson, AO3123100.

To be first lieutenants, USAF (Medical)

Norman E. Beisaw, AO3142037.
Bradford L. Davis, AO3141994.

To be captains, USAF (Dental)

Herbert Abrams, AO3089005.
Jim R. Gerron, AO3043709.
Donald J. Mauthe, AO3113907.
Terrence J. Moriarty, AO3111009.
Michael J. Todaro.

To be first lieutenants, USAF (Dental)

Dwaine K. Cruser, AO3140472.
Ronald J. Lieb, AO3124891.
Richard H. Shanaman, AO3125099.
Bruce E. Shaver, AO3125498.
Raymond W. Taylor, AO3126038.
Maurice J. Tepper, AO3140616.
Robert J. Usseglio, AO3140482.

To be majors, USAF (Judge Advocate)

Campbell, Jim W., Sr., AO2249559.
Greene, James E., AO2251216.
Nelson, Deane D., AO2251305.
Shokes, Claude D., AO2238118.

To be captains, USAF (Judge Advocate)

Acker, William L., Jr., AO3073515.
Babcock, Dale L., Jr., AO0784275.
Babcock, Robert A., AO3071760.
Bruton, Thomas B., AO2205687.
Ellison, David R., AO3115910.
Gordon, Richard F., AO3059840.
Handley, Thomas A., AO2235488.
Johnson, James A., AO3051200.
Joyce, William J., AO3059980.
Lane, Frank W., Jr., AO2220220.
Langdell, Samuel F., Jr., AO3102252.
Mahoney, Shannon D., AO3102666.
Marcollo, William T., AO0679913.
Markham, Jerrold E., AO3014038.
Michalski, Jan K., AO3104152.
Monachino, Joseph V., AO3104472.
Mortell, James R., AO3102745.
Nelson, Kiethe E., AO3086913.
Ryan, John C., AO0711487.
Sansing, William A., AO3104349.
See, Marion J., Jr., AO3103390.
Shull, Charles J., AO4027984.
Thomas, Robert W., AO1863776.

To be first lieutenants, USAF (Judge Advocate)

Band, David S., AO3094539.
Barnes, Ned M., AO3121066.
Barrett, David P., AO3096197.
Bennett, Thomas F., AO3093915.
Bergman, Robert E., AO3118103.
Beske, Richard S., AO3121974.
Bies, Richard M., AO3093691.
Bolton, Robert S., AO3121894.
Busch, William S., AO3093919.
Campbell, John S., Jr., AO3121064.
Campisi, Peter I., AO3012239.
Ciucci, John A., AO3086714.
Coomes, Charles A., AO3121352.
Copperman, Seymour, AO3102819.
Crampton, Charles A., AO3121975.
Crowley, James E., AO3121076.
Dieterich, John L., AO3086374.
Dillman, Dewey G., AO3121976.
Douglass, Robert G., AO3121860.
Duenow, James M., AO3121864.
Esch, Lee E., AO3121870.
Eskridge, John S., AO3116137.
Feeney, Robert H., AO3121764.
Forman, William H., Jr., AO3120957.
Gallo, Simeo J., AO3121874.
Galloway, Bruce C., AO3121783.
Gaston, David E., AO3121787.
Gibbons, Boyd H., III, AO3095487.
Heerin, James E., Jr., AO3121862.
Hubert, Douglass E., AO3085616.
Ingram, John F., AO3099739.
Ingrao, Anthony P., AO3012264.
Jones, Roger A., AO3100375.
Kastl, Joseph W., AO3121965.
Keating, John A., AO3086004.
Kenyon, Karl L., AO3121755.
Keohane, Brian W., AO3121971.
Kolb, John G., AO3104532.
Koteles, John T., AO3121888.
Kroetz, Thomas W., AO3121876.
Logsdon, William H., AO3096288.
Lomax, John D., AO3105883.
Mandel, Jack K., AO3093252.
McCarthy, Michael W., AO3121961.
McElvenny, John F., AO3121949.
Mennell, John C., AO5505845.
Miller, James E., AO3121877.
Morgan, Jack W., AO3099745.
Mowery, Charles F., Jr., AO3121774.
Murphy, Edward W., AO3121972.
Negron, Victor H., AO3121788.
Nester, Charles A., AO3121776.
Olson, Theodore H., AO3121963.
O'Neill, Daniel J., AO3096810.
Orr, Orville O., Jr., AO3095597.
O'Shaughnessy, William J., AO3099320.
Persy, Arnold I., AO3055931.
Pitus, Thomas G., AO3060476.
Porter, James P., AO3116349.
Priest, Whayne C., Jr., AO3100791.
Proost, Robert L., AO3097203.
Ramirez, Joe, AO3119007.
Reed, Gayle R., AO3121872.
Rice, Norman J., AO3120968.
Roberts, Major C., Jr., AO2211817.
Roule, Arthur L., Jr., AO3121964.
Ruddock, Donn M., AO3121995.
Salve, Patrick J., AO3086956.
Shula, Robert J., AO3093885.
Sloan, Ralph S., Jr., AO3121770.
Stevens, George R., AO3115909.
Terrill, Lowell J., AO3094542.
Ulrich, Joseph E., AO3121865.
Whitaker, Benjamin P., Jr., AO3121968.
Wilson, Frank W., AO3074482.

The following persons for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grades indicated, under the provisions of section 8284, title 10, United States Code, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

To be major

Coonan, John F., AO432132.

To be captains

Acres, Robert D., AO3056173.
Agnello, Anthony M., AO3035832.
Alexander, Jimmie M., AO3066095.
Anderson, John J., AO3111722.
Anelli, Robert L., AO3067568.
Ashworth, William D., AO1910132.
Aunapu, Donald S., AO3065575.
Barott, Philip J., AO3064941.
Bartels, Allan E., Jr., AO3065125.
Baumann, Walter G., AO3087494.
Beckstrom, Arthur W., AO3065869.
Berrier, John D., AO3035859.
Biehn, Roland E., Jr., AO3065711.
Billings, Wilbur D., AO3004882.
Billingsley, Vincent H., AO2215648.
Black, Robert E., Jr., AO3056485.
Blood, Robert E., AO3066035.
Bolstad, Richard E., AO3065392.

Bolte, Wayne L., AO3065091.
Bond, Doyle H., Jr., AO3065792.
Bond, Parker L., AO3126606.
Boone, James L., AO3056589.
Boone, Samuel H., AO3056486.
Boswell, Stanley L., Jr., AO3055499.
Braden, Courtland R., AO3087529.
Braukman, William E., AO3087530.
Brenner, Clarence L., AO3066349.
Brent, Frank N., Jr., AO3080113.
Brumley, Wendell E., AO3066559.
Buehler, Daniel W., AO3065469.
Bunn, Lionel D., Jr., AO3056363.
Burdick, Jerry H., AO3087532.
Canon, Truman L., AO2222999.
Carner, Paul R., AO3056377.
Carter, Robert D., AO3087536.
Cataldi, Robert R., AO3087537.
Chambless, Loyd E., AO3056491.
Chinn, James E., AO3065926.
Christianson, Perry A., AO1910493.
Clark, Arthur C., AO3065435.
Cody, Leonard S., AO3065962.
Cole. Ronald, AO3056493.
Colonero, Alfred G., AO3053183.
Compton, Jack B., AO3065837.
Confer, Marion E., AO2224633.
Connelly, Gerald H., AO3065018.
Corey, Charles J., AO3065231.
Cornett, James E., AO3056381.
Courtright, Morris, Jr., AO3056382.
Coy, Clair B., AO3029458.
Cranwell, John A., Jr., AO3066365.
Crawford, John R., AO3056601.
Cunningham, Thomas L., AO3056494.
Currie, William R., AO3056603.
Dalton, Windal K., AO3065572.
Daniel, Joel N., AO3066343.
Decordova, Kenneth E., AO3065109.
Degraaf, John D., AO3056604.
Dickinson, Art L., Jr., AO3066366.
Dishong, Clyde E., AO3065338.
Doub, Logan J., AO3065983.
Driscoll, Bruce H., AO3066398.
Erickson, Donald E., AO3066116.
Fine, Frederick R., AO3065540.
Fisher, Robert M., AO3056388.
Ford, Clifford G., AO3056391.
Frazier, Lester G., AO3066399.
Friesel, Clarence E., AO3066332.
Gaffner, Gary L., AO3065235.
Gage Howard D., AO3065909.
Gaillardetz, Roger P., AO3065022.
Gerrish, Joseph R., AO3080097.
Giardino, John R., AO3056610.
Gibbons, Gerald G., AO3066427.
Glass, George J., AO3066370.
Gossett, Robert W., Jr., AO3056397.
Graves, William E., Jr., AO3080024.
Graybill, Paul V., Jr., AO3065151.
Gregelein, George M., AO3066019.
Griffith, John E., AO3087562.
Grillo, Thomas, Jr., AO3036568.
Gross, William J., AO3056507.
Guidi, Adolph M., Jr., AO3066119.
Hackley, William M., Jr., AO3080099.
Haeusler, Dean R., AO3065737.
Hafner, Patrick H., AO3066394.
Hansen, Russell K., AO3065176.
Harenski, Walter J., Jr., AO3056617.
Harris, Roland L., AO3087566.
Harrison, Tommy G., AO3080026.
Haynes, Zack T., AO3080182.
Heinisch, Richard B., AO3065543.
Helton, Dale D., AO3065130.
Henderson, William F., AO3056620.
Hendren, William L., AO3087568.
Herrman, Leroy, AO3066334.
Hickey, Zachariah J., AO3056403.
Hicks, Jerry N., AO3066312.
Hoffman, Donald W., AO3066313.
Holcombe, Kenneth E., AO3057433.
Holmes, Donald M., AO3056625.
Hopkins, Donald J., AO3036804.
Hunt, David R., AO3065744.
Hunter, Richard L., AO3065132.
Hurt, Thurston L., AO3065591.
Jackson, George D., AO3066041.
Jenrich, Edwin, AO3087639.
Jensen, Arnold A., AO3066062.
Jensen, Earl E., AO3056407.
Johns, Arthur L., AO3056518.
Johnson, Neal G., AO3080104.
Johnson, Thomas N., AO3069854.
Jones, Buddy F., AO3065987.
Joyce, James J., AO3065030.
Kadera, Ronald R., AO3065822.
Karaba, Vincent S., AO3080148.
Keene, Marcus B., Jr., AO3080032.
Keith, Chandler, AO3056631.
Keith, Robert C., AO3087577.
Keith, Robert M., AO3056632.
Keller, Bruce G., AO3066335.
Kinder, Richard J., AO3065991.
Kleopfer, Duane L., AO3066254.
Klick, Richard F., AO3066043.
Klinestiver, Lawrence R., AO2237572.
Kobelas, Stephen G., AO3056526.
Krumback, Randall L., AO3065811.
Lakey, Harvey L., AO3056411.
Lammerding, John J., AO3056528.
Landry, Hayes J., AO3056413.
Lankford, Ralph P., AO3065033.
Larabee, Frederick S., AO3066286.
Lashar, William L., Jr., AO3065405.
Lauruhn, Delbert W., AO3066316.
Leavitt, Robert E., AO3087583.
Light, Jack S., AO3056416.
Lilling, Paul, AO3028946.
Lindsay, Horace V., Jr., AO3064495.
Logan, Robert, AO3065035.
Lucas, Joseph R., Jr., AO3054296.
Luce, James R., AO3066078.
Luttrell, Willis W., Jr., AO3065080.
Martin, Paul W., AO1855183.
Martinez, Ruben H., AO3056422.
Mathews, Royce L., AO3067757.
McAdoo, Raymond C., AO3066661.
McCain, James M., AO3065444.
McGill, Bernard G., AO3080111.
McNew, Edward E., AO3066617.
McPherson, Ray C., Jr., AO3080170.
Meeter, Dudley F., AO3065527.
Mercer, Pollard H., Jr., AO2205670.
Merrill, Bennie L., AO3056429.
Mesenbourg, John L., AO3066618.
Miles, John D., AO3068239.
Miller, Robert C., AO3056549.
Miller, Walter D., AO3065280.
Miller, William B., Jr., AO3065249.
Moehling, Wayne A., AO3065113.
Monk, Ronald E., AO3065312.
Morgan, Charles R., AO3065064.
Morris, Bascome F., AO3065554.
Morrison, Jack H., AO3056541.
Morton, Raymond C., AO3056542.
Muscatello, William R., AO3056436.
Northgraves, John M., Jr., AO3087595.
Okimoto, Frederick S., AO3039156.
O'Leary, Brian H., AO3066595.
O'Leary, Francis S., AO3087472.
Pace, Addison N., AO3087476.
Pace, Edward L., AO3087596.
Patterson, Robert E., AO3048450.
Paxson, William C., AO3066551.
Peko, Paul E., AO3065555.
Pickett, John R., AO3040875.
Pilkinton, Bobby R., AO3065081.
Prather, Gerald L., AO3065357.
Proul, Blanche L., AL3059876.
Provencio, Arthur T., AO3027255.
Ramsey, Donald W., AO3065597.
Ray, Kenneth L., AO3056556.
Reed, Clyde, AO3065358.
Reynolds, Richard C., Jr., AO3054516.
Rodke, Phillip M., AO3066264.
Rohde, Roy F., AO3066445.
Roland, Ronald J., AO3066603.
Rynes, Donald E., AO3065558.
Sachse, Billy E., AO3065630.
Schwinghammer, Gregor J., AO3066621.
Sci, Frank M., Jr., AO3066086.
Scoltock, Richard G., AO3056563.
Sellers, Jerry A., AO3065119.
Shaw, Robert D., AO3067018.
Shelley, Kennedy K., Jr., AO3066605.
Shoemaker, Clyde L., AO3066448.
Shore, Willis L., AO3087490.
Simanek, Ferdinand A., AO3066239.
Simmons, John F., AO3087491.
Sims, Hiram L., AO3071102.
Sinclair, Waymon L., AO3087614.
Sjolund, David C., AO3066606.
Smith, Lawrence E., AO3056570.
Smith, Scott W., III, AO3055230.
Sommers, Glenn M., AO3056571.
Sorensen, Franklin W., AO3066397.
South, William R., AO3087498.
Spires, George E., II, AO3056572.
Steinkamp, Henry W., Jr., AO3066574.
Stollenwerck, Robert C., AO3087502.
Stone, Edgar C., AO3066005.
Stone, Ralph E., AO3066358.
Strand, George E., AO3065564.
Strand, Stanley G., Jr., AO3066269.
Strebel, Clarence E., AO3065818.
Struthers, Loretta J., AL3056461.
Sullivan, Reuben A., AO1911830.
Sullivan, William J., Jr., AO3066396.
Taylor, Edwin S., AO3036255.
Tebbs, Max O., AO3056575.
Terry, Bradlee, AO3065895.
Thomas, Donald B., AO3087509.
Thompson, Rector A., AO3056464.
Trevena, Charles D., AO3065608.
Truax, Edwin L., AO3065260.
Underwood, Rufus D., Jr., AO3080122.
Vaught, Wilma L., AL3059917.
Verner, Clara W., AL3056579.
Vinson, Billy J., AO3066113.
Vogelgesang, Clarence E., AO2254928.
Vowell, Jack R., AO3087628.
Walker, Guary O., AO3080086.
Walker, Robert H., AO3039733.
Walker, Vernon E., AO3065508.
Walker, William O., AO3066547.
Weeks, Richard V., AO3067847.
Weinberg, Richard M., AO3024128.
West, Dennis G., AO3065803.
Whitaker, Joseph T., AO3066296.
Whitaker, William A., AO3054398.
Whittaker, Loyal M., AO1853099.
Wilks, Carlton O., AO3066610.
Wilson, Donald, AO3087521.
Wilson, Samuel W., AO3056581.
Wolf, Pius J., AO3056473.
Wolfe, James L., AO3054636.
Woody, Charles D., AO3066413.
Wranosky, Robert W., AO3080160.
Wyant, Dalbert B., AO3065866.
Yarns, Lisle B., AO3066629.
Zarnowiec, Felix L., AO3056584.

The following distinguished military graduate of Air Force Officer Training School for appointment in the Regular Air Force in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 8284, title 10, United States Code, with a view to designation under the provisions of section 8067, title 10, United States Code, to perform the duties of a medical service officer, and with date of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

Zabezensky, M., AO3163590.

The following distinguished military graduates of Air Force precommission schools for appointment in the Regular Air Force in the grade indicated, under the provisions of section 8284, title 10, United States Code, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

To be first lieutenant

De Carlo, Louis N., AO3104826.

To be second lieutenants

Addison, Jon R., AO3154965.
Adkins, Ben F., AO3162495.
Alderman, James H., AO3161861.
Alexander, Ronald R., AO3134077.
Anderson, Fred R., AO3148596.
Andres, Hoyt C., AO3161340.
Angelos, Nicholas L., AO3148755.
Austin, James A., AO3159614.
Ayres, John D., AO3162563.

Ballard, John L., AO3146886.
Barg, William M., AO3148946.
Baskin, Michael S., AO3156932.
Bates, Charles V., AO3157224.
Becker, Leo E., AO3150492.
Bennett, John D., AO3148991.
Bennett, Richard B., AO3133480.
Benson, Ronald W., AO3149055.
Bingham, Wendell R., AO3148876.
Boldman, Michael I., AO3162398.
Bollenback, George W., AO3163632.
Bonar, Richard J., AO3162506.
Brackbill, Jeremiah U., AO3148556.
Branzell, Marshall E., Jr., AO3162498.
Brecheisen, Dee D., AO3157175.
Brewer, Edward Y., AO3149013.
Bronowski, James P., AO3155133.
Buchen, Jean R., AO3163200.
Burdge, Robert E., AO3160106.
Burford, Edward G., AO3146447.
Buttell, Duane A., Jr., AO3133960.
Casstevens, Jerry D., AO3162570.
Chasen, Marvin H., AO3148646.
Cheshire, Jimmie D., AO3146406.
Chierici, Louis R., AO3148686.
Christen, Jerold W., AO3162508.
Christensen, Roger E., AO3160069.
Clanton, Richard L., AO3148614.
Clark, Richard C., AO3162510.
Comly, David, AO3148990.
Cook, Robert D., AO3149047.
Crockett, John T., Jr., AO3162193.
Cwalina, Bruce A., AO3148602.
Dechance, Richard P., AO3148622.
Dejan, Charles R., AO3147499.
Dice, Ronald A., AO3162513.
Dirmeyer, John C., AO3161055.
Dorris, Ralph S., AO3148935.
Drace, Donal T., AO3162514.
Dunigan, John M., AO3162515.
Dunlap, Nathaniel W., Jr., AO3156390.
Dyal, Thomas B., AO3148779.
Edwards, James A., II, AO3162033.
Eichor, Perry R., AO3148304.
Elder, James R., AO3161287.
Ener, Ernest L., Jr., AO3156572.
Flanigan, Ronald E., AO3162518.
Foster, David, AO3162520.
Fox, Charles E., AO3162521.
Freedman, Harry S., AO3156885.
Garrett, Lawrence N., Jr., AO3162254.
Genet, Russell M., AO3162523.
Ghiglieri, James C., AO3161366.
Gooden, Hiram R., AO3133615.
Grant, Jerry A., AO3157250.
Graves, Rodney B., AO3150462.
Greene, Lawrence W., Jr., AO3160197.
Greger, George D., Jr., AO3162528.
Hanchett, Byron L., AO3162530.
Hancox, Charles T., AO3162539.
Hanly, Frank J., AO3162538.
Hansen, Earl B., AO3147441.
Harbolt, John A., AO3162536.
Haugen, Richard N., AO3157021.
Hedges, James M., III, AO3162535.
Heinze, Larry H., AO3157835.
Heivilin, Thomas S., AO3148554.
Henderson, Earl J., AO3156582.
Hiu, Hen M., AO3162534.
Hocker, Richard L., AO3156126.
Holley, Johnnie L., Jr., AO3156583.
Honeycutt, Larry L., AO3158616.
Hotinski, Richard M., AO3146686.
Hranicka, Thomas L., AO3159415.
Hughen, Willard M., AO3162531.
Ireland, Charles E., AO3148923.
Jackson, John R., AO3162540.
Janney, Richard N., AO3148683.
Johnson, Aaron J., AO3157441.
Johnson, Theodore A., AO3148333.
Karton, Simon M., AO3133730.
Kaufman, Harold R., AO3149078.
Kersten, John H., AO3149052.
Kleine, Walter J., AO3162991.
Knopf, Lee R., AO3149018.
Kochevar, James M., AO3148806.
Kroenlein, James H., AO3159059.
Kulp, Richard W., AO3157220.
Kupec, Joseph B., Jr., AO3149064.
La Salle, Charles C., AO3162544.
Lacey, Phillip M., AO3162543.
Laffey, James T., AO3149077.
Lang, Gary D., AO3161379.
Larkin, John C., AO3148634.
Lawlor, Michael C., AO3149062.
Layton, John F., Jr., AO3149001.
Lee, Robert M., AO3148605.
Lieberman, Max L., AO3149094.
Lindquist, Erik J., AO3162545.
Long, William J., AO3148604.
Maderia, Patrick F., Jr., AO3162547.
Marcussen, Douglas L., AO3160678.
Matus, Jerome F., AO3147039.
McCarthy, John, AO3148561.
McGrath, Michael F., AO3157984.
McMahon, William E., AO3156866.
McWhiney, Edgar E., AO3162550.
McWilliams, William D., AO3162551.
Merchant, John E., AO3163557.
Miller, Roger H., AO3148954.
Mitchell, Charles L., AO3148799.
Morilak, John H., AO3148672.
Mount, Michael H., AO3145979.
Murphy, Michael B., AO3148930.
Murphy, Michael J., AO3148947.
Myers, Glenn L., III, AO3163560.
Newton, David G., AO3163561.
Nickerson, David E., Jr., AO3162554.
Noy, Thomas W., AO3148560.
Oates, Fred D., AO3157446.
Olson, Merrill H., AO3148768.
Ott, Gunter E., AO3148880.
Palamaro, John M., III, AO3147007.
Pearson, Jack T., AO3163566.
Peters, Martin H., AO3163564.
Peterson, John E., AO3155119.
Pippin, Ernest H., Jr., AO3148774.
Pitt, Ronald E., AO3149093.
Plummer, James M., AO3162952.
Porter, William J., AO3158096.
Powell, Donald L., AO3161450.
Powers, Duane P., AO3163567.
Prater, Gladstone J., Jr., AO3133742.
Prust, Allan E., AO3163575.
Rainwater, Elbert L., AO3147072.
Rasinski, John E., AO3148583.
Ray, James E., AO3156615.
Revell, William R., AO3163571.
Rich, Lloyd L., AO3146680.
Rively, Joseph C., AO3161820.
Robertson, Michael G., AO3163569.
Robishaw, Howard C., AO3148684.
Romines, Jackie A., AO3148773.
Rook, Robert D., AO3149092.
Routt, William S., AO3159169.
Rubenstein, Larry J., AO3133867.
Saffel, John C., AO3163577.
Sanders, Emmett W., Jr., AO3150540.
Schell, Daniel P., AO3148562.
Schneider, Bernard G., Jr., AO3149022.
Schneider, John A., AO3150541.
Schneider, Roger W., AO3163246.
Schumack, Thomas A., AO3147362.
Schwinkendorf, William E., AO3163580.
Scott, Roger E., AO3162729.
Seeger, John R., AO3150481.
Shippey, Frederick L., AO3148678.
Sinclair, Albert R., AO3133158.
Skey, Anthony F. M., AO3148787.
Skinner, Toby L., AO3155981.
Smith, Michael H., AO3148582.
Steyer, Harold C., Jr., AO3155145.
Stierman, Tyrone M., AO3163583.
Stine, Terrence P., AO3130440.
Strickland, Charles L., AO3156360.
Struve, Roger L., AO3149067.
Sylvester, Delano J., AO3163587.
Taylor, Michael A., AO3149108.
Thompson, Robert A., AO3148631.
Tomlinson, Kenneth J., AO3163585.
Tourino, Ralph G., AO3148595.
Trammell, James A., AO3148866.
Tucker, George L., AO3150486.
Tudor, Ray G., AO3147823.
Vargas, Santiago, Jr., AO3148613.
Vergho, Gary L., AO3133753.
Vickerman, Bruce E., AO3158471.
Wall, Stephen H., AO3149063.
Wallace, Arthur M., AO3148525.
Wallace, Gary H., AO3149109.
Walters, Charles M., AO3163589.
Wankerl, Max W., AO3162503.
Ward, Alan A., Jr., AO3148783.
White, Kenneth N., AO3149028.
Whitfield, Glenn T., Jr., AO3163592.
Whitney, Raymond J., Jr., AO3157214.
Wiener, Dale O., AO3163591.
Wilcox, Joel G., AO3163593.
Williams, Theadora J., AL3148816.
Winegar, Rodger A., AO3148552.
Wold, Hal W., AO3163209.
Wollstadt, David C., AO3149019.
Worley, Gary G., AO3161572.
York, Ernest D., AO3148740.
Zeigler, Gary S., AO3163078.

Subject to medical qualifications and subject to designation as distinguished military graduates, the following distinguished military students of the Air Force Reserve Officers' Training Corps for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 8284, title 10, United States Code, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

Michael A. Ballard
William M. Banks, Jr.
Louis R. Barnett, Jr.
Robert W. Baucom III
Dennis H. Berry
Kirk R. Brimmer
Richard D. Clark
James R. Cross
Louis G. DeLaVergne, Jr.
David A. Garbrick
William H. Gilmore
Buster C. Glosson
Thomas C. Green
Joseph L. Hodges III
Warren S. Hubbard
John D. Hughes
James M. Huntsman III
Barry B. Hutsell
Raymond K. Itagaki
Gordon L. Jenkins
Louis I. Johansen
Richard H. Johnson
James T. Jones, Jr.
Larry M. Kanda
Hugh B. Kaufman
Thomas S. Lanier
George E. Leftwich III
Jasper L. Mathis
Steve M. Mihalchick
John B. Moelmann
Robert A. Moore
Rolland J. Moraine
Thomas E. Mueggenborg
Don J. Newell, Jr.
Charles M. Niggemeyer
Joseph L. Oberle
Daniel C. Parcell
Albert A. Pool
Theodore L. Ramirez
Larry P. Rogers
MacDonald Rogers
Robert C. Salisbury
Terrance E. Severson
David H. Shaffer
Homer C. Smith
Howard K. Sonoda
George A. Souza
Victor D. Stevens
Paul L. Tiley
Dennis C. Torrez

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary promotion to the grade of major, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

*Goar, John W.
*Baker, William H.
*Gamble, Ross M.
*Hawkins, David H.
*Cable, Wiley R.
*Joy, Lester H.
*Fojtlin, Louis
*Fauver, Ronald E.
*Bradberry, Joe E.
*Palmer, Charles B.
*Friberg, James W.
*Conrado, James S., Jr.
*Kent, Brian B.
*Ferrington, George B., Jr.
*Jenks, Harry E., II
*Slack, Thomas W.
*Cook, Walter T.
*Teague, Charles E.
*Strain, Donald H.
*Malovich, Arthur D.
*Newman, Buel B., Jr.
*Bird, Neale E.
*McDermott, Arthur T.
*Walcott, Frank B., III
*Rojo, Manuel, Jr.
*Morris, Clark S.
*Binney, Douglas C.
*Duphiney, Randall W.
*Alm, Richard A.
*Emmons, Charles D.
*Wood, Charles D.
*Chace, Frank C., Jr.
*Lippold, Orville V., Jr.
*Litzenberger, Earle D.
*Glidden, Thomas T.
*Hamilton, John A.
*Manhard, Albert H., Jr.
*Kraynak, John P.
*Cahill, John J.
*Hower, Raymond R.
*Alves, Edward R., Jr.
*Dumont, Thomas J.
*Walker, James H.
*Sullivan, Thomas L.
*Goodin, James C.
*Stoffelen, Peter L.
*Paro, Eugene E., Jr.
*Yelek, Don L.
*O'Neill, John E.
*Stiffler, Charles R.
*Breckenridge, Floyd S., Jr.
*Leisy, Robert R.
*Martin, Richard L.
*Orr, Arnold, J.
*Sears, Walter E., Jr.
*Goodall, Robert L.
*Eversole, Carl J.
*Lunsford, William T.
*Palmer, Richard L.
*Palmer, Robert P.
*Eddy, James R.
*Williams, Frank P., Jr.
*D'Arco, Anthony J.

*Mitchell, Frank H., Jr.
*Beauchamp, Glen T.
*Limbach, Walter R.
*West, Frank K., Jr.
*O'Connell, Patrick J.
*Egger, Charles H. F.
*Vidano, Albert J.
*Brooks, Thomas D.
*Mayer, Donald F.
*Sheahan, Robert R.
*Viers, Willard G., Jr.
*Sherlock, John, Jr.
*Jarman, Lewis W.
*Connolly, James J.
*Dunn, Hollis, T.
*Shauer, Walter H., Jr.
*Rogers, Lane
*Chaney, Earl D., Jr.
*Zimmerman, Eugene H.
*Merrill, Will A.
*House, William E., Jr.
*Snead, Douglas L.
*Alber, John W.
*McMonagle, James J.
*Carptenter, Donald R.
*Kittler, Simon J.
*Lono, Luther A.
*Ogden, Bruce F.
*Donovan, Orval E.
*Vandersluis, Jan P.
*Walker, John B., Jr.
*Bright, Ray E.
*Skipper, Kenneth J.
*Thatcher, John L.
*Gallagher, Edward W.
*Brower, Joseph P.
*Standish, Cameron
*Hunter, Earl R.
*Herron, David G.
*Salter, Martin E., Jr.
*Waters, George J.
*Elam, David L.
*Wood, Donald E.
*Sleger, Joseph, Jr.
Terrell, Daniel E., Jr.
Fischer, Robert W.
Tyson, Charles J., III
Cooper, Robert M.
Colbert, Arthur B.
Stice, Ray B.
Fry, Robert L.
Fortie, Ralph
Brause, Bernard B., Jr.
Chaney, Guy R.
Foster, Roger D.
Wheelock, Richard J.
Cretney, Warren G.
Jackson, Harold L., Jr.
Kutchmarek, Jene R.
Lee, Richard P.
Mead, John E.
Blakeman, Wyman U.
Stewart, Ray N.
Brandon, Virgil B.
Hubner, John
Warn, Lloyd K.
Lavelle, John B.
Micheels, Herman M.
Wright, Frank H.
Shea, Speed F.
Kron, Ronald W.
Overturf, Charles D.
Svoboda, Theodore D.
McDonald, Oliver G.
Johnson, Victor J., Jr.
Prather, James E., Jr.
Teichmann, David A.
Latall, Raymond F.
Peck, Matthew B., Jr.
Moriarty, James M.
Sherman, James R.
Redman, Carroll G.
Gebsen, Clarence U.
McCaughey, Douglas A., Jr.
Gascoigne, Donald G.
Dangelo, Samuel E., III
Leipold, Robert D.
Lovell, Earl F.
Ross, William H., Jr.
Brown, Rangeley A.
Keck, Louis K.
Herber, John A.
Patterson, Frederick D., Jr.
Black, Charles H.
Edwards, Raymond W.
Marosek, Joseph R.
Collier, James G.
Ladd, Bobby T.
Belli, Roy L.
Coombe, Donald E.
Murray, Michael P.
Miller, Clarence B., Jr.
Hubbard, William D.
Gipson, Thomas J., Jr.
Williams, Donald G.
Knowles, Charles H.
Doser, Joseph G.
Timmons, Dwight R., Jr.
Carson, William G., Jr.
Reese, Clifford E.
Dereng, Chester P.
Snyder, Robert L.
Ledet, Rodney H.
Reisinger, Frederick J.
Giubilato, John J.
Wojcik, Donald
Lang, Richard H.
Schaefer, Donald A.
Larson, Eddis R.
Daniels, Claude M.
Wilcox, Kenneth H.
Warner, James W.
Moore, Thomas R.
McCarthy, John J.
Creighton, Robert W.
Farley, Bob W.
*Rose, William W.
*Young, Fred F., Jr.
*Madore, Norman C.
*Morris, Frank B.
*Cumiskey, Francis P.
*Campbell, Henry C.
*Wilkinson, Henry E.
*Schwab, Charles F.
*Lark, Scott E.
*Bourbeau, Richard T.
*Spangler, Donald E.
*Dierickx, Phil A.
*Jenkins, Clarence E.
*Hallet, James G., Jr.
*Hattaway, Earle
*Harris, Jerry W.
*Corriveau, Orval J.
*McLaughlin, Melvin W.
*Nix, Casey R.
*McCue, Merrill W.
*Gandy, Austin O.
*Wright Ira L., Jr.
*Wilson, Warren L.
*Wyatt, John B.
*Cline, Frank E.
*Cushman, James R.
*Demmond, Jack W.
*Sophos, Michael
*Davis, Kenneth L.
*Morrisey, Robert B.
*Lane, Keary L.
*Hershey, Rodger E.
*Buckley, John D., Jr.
*Conroy, Eugene L.
Seaman, George W.
Block, Robert E.
McMillan, William W., Jr.
Bierhaalder, Dirk C.
Jordan, Thomas E.
Dyson, Frederick W.
Bressler, Alexander L., Jr.
Voss, Bethel A.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary promotion to the grade of captain, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

*Byrne, William A.
*Shannahan, John K.
*Volz, Carl W.
*Swigart, Robert W.
*Komar, John T.
*Rivera, Jules C., Jr.
*Breckenridge, Alexander D. N.
*Barbes, Alden H., Jr.
*Sherwin, Robert S.
*Hearn, George C., Jr.
*Collins, Thomas M.
*Waller, William W.
*Worley, Jerry W.
*Itchkawich, Harold E.
*Kilday, John J.
*Bean, Gary W.
*Mallard, Robert A.
*Stanton, James E.
*Calhoun, David H.
*Weidner, Richard J.
*La Van, Ray E., Jr.
*Archambault, Arthur E., Jr.
*Seeburger, John E., Jr.
*Snedeker, Munson R.
*Brown, Herman C.
*Heffley, Henry S., Jr.
*Lousma, Jack R.
*Workmon, David G.
*Ranta, Roger J.
*Riggs, James L., Jr.
*Hendricks, Dick D.
*Pool, Lloyd G.
*Craig, Herbert E.
*Calvert, John D.
*Reiman, Lawrence P.
*White, Joseph H.
*Dixon, Edward E.
*Jackson, Clifford A.
*Kaster, Stephen H.
*Anderson, Jesse E., Jr.
*Fisher, Roy E., Jr.
*Boston, John C., Jr.
*Rader, Russell W.
*Adams, Billy W.
*Lyman, Donald O.
*Thomas, Richard E.
*Dominguez, Michael E. P.
*Diffee, Gerald L.
*Hollingshead, Marshall L.
*Pegler, Richard N.
*Kelley, Reginald C., Jr.
*Koppang, James D.
*Butcher, Bobby G.
*Capen, Robert D.
*Land, Edward J., Jr.
*Hazlewood, Charles E.
*Whitmer, Glen M.
*Greisen, Clifford H., Jr.
*Hanrahan, James G.
*Bartel, Hubert M., Jr.
*Howe, David T.
*Schwarz, Manfred E.
*Miro, Richard A.
*Jolley, Hugh S.
*Baier, James F.
*Cooper, Melvin D.
*Bogard, Bobby D.
*Mickey, Robert B.
*Boggs, Paschal G.
*Bailey, Edward R.
*Mounes, Sylvan E., Jr.
*Neff, Robert L.
*Buske, Kenneth R.
*Allerton, George N.
*Todd, Harry G.
*Pieri, Francis L., Jr.
*Hastings, Barclay
*Arroyo, Alfred A. U.
*Curry, John E.
*Boone, Frederick E.
*Bertrand, Horace A., Jr.
*Tesulov, Vince
*Upshaw, Charles R.
*Horak, Frank J., Jr.
*Cates, George L.
*Cowperthwait, William C.
*Stanton, Donald R.
*Johns, Ronald P.
*Williams, Gary W.
*Seav. Olen A., Jr.
*Flessner, Matthew
*Santos, Joaquin S., Jr.
*Hummel, Jerome H.
*Bever, John C.
*Gundlach, Louis T.
*Hannel, Arthur G., III
*Hartley, Harry G.
*Pattillo, Charles E., Jr.
*Judkins, Cliff J., III
*Pless, Stephen W.
*Richey, Franklin D.
*Olson, William A.
*Field, Steven E.
*Shelor, Darrell S.
*Demko, Leonard R.
*Summe, Robert C.
*Kogerman, William G.
*Rauscher, Thomas J.
*Cooper, John R.
*Davidson, Jerry
*Barsky, Connie A., Jr.
*Everett, William E.
*Kilianski, Joseph R.
*Lary, James E.
*Warren, Robert F.
*Dyer, Wallace N., Jr.
*Steele, David L.
*Dameron, John R.
*Loveless, Graden II
*Klingele, Terence G.
*Shaw, H. W.
*Stoner, Donald L.
*Scarborough, Paul, III
*Gallery, Vincent R.
*Gentry, Harry R.
*Carlson, Paul L.
*Huckaby, Richard H.
*Wright, William E.
*Sewell, Welton C.
*Hughes, James L.
*Mayers, Joseph C.
*Capozza, Anthony M.
*Margolis, Myron B.
*Grega, Ronald R.
*Whittingham, David
*Bub, Ronald L.
*Nardo, Joseph F.
*Kellenbarger, Charles F.
*McIver, Werner W.
*Snyder, Robert E.
*Cooper, Gary J.
*Rhodes, William M.
*Joganic, Donald F.
*Marshall, John C.
*Nixon, Robert K.
*Marino, Gaetano
*Cotterman, Eugene P.
*Brown, Mark T.
*Clark, Read M.
*Tully, James M.
*Rivers, Ernest G.
*Durand, Edward R., Jr.
*Rollins, Gerald J.
*Driver, Robert J., Jr.
*Cadiz, David G.
*Bennett, Raymond H.
*Fanning, David E.
*Glaize, Samuel S.
*Scarbrough, Harold D.
*Cole, Bobby F.
*Dowling, Richard D.
*Myers, Roger E.
*Gallegos, David M.
*Horton, Ansley S.
*Williams, Charles A.
*Anderson, Edward J.
*Griffith, Frederick T.
*Heath, Richard A.
*Rowley, William B.
*Turner, George E., Jr.
*King, Paul F.
*Swyney, Thomas E.
*Weigand, Philip S.
*Jessen, Thomas F.
*Driskell, James M.
*Slusher, Leonard K.
*Ridgeway, William T.
*Connelly, Edmund J., Jr.
*Abele, William R., Jr.
*Payne, Robert M.
*Andrews, Donald W.
*Loveless, Mark E.
*Mullins, Robert R.
*Kirkpatrick, Robert E.
*Waters, Williams L.
*Huffines, Hollis E.
*Fricker, Jerrell, T.
*Bragan, David F.
*Norman, Kay A.
*Hammond, Jack B.
*Sims, Gerald W.
*Bohlscheid, Curtis R.
*Barker, Joseph L.
*Bomis, Matiss M.
*Ely, John C.
*Chambless, Bobby D.
*Holt, John M.
*Flaherty, Joseph E.
*McBride, Ernest J., III
*Dauksz, Edward D.
*Stewart, Stanley R.
*Channell, Wiley B.
*Deckel, Albert W.
*Beall, Ernest B., Jr.
*Miller, Thomas P.
*Pfrimmer, Ronald E.
*Sales, Joseph R.
*DeFries, Christian F., Jr.
*Braswell, Buford W., Jr.
*Vacca, Donald V.
*Albright, Jacob K., Jr.
*Chapple, Bennett, III
*Shoaff, John W.
*Lumsden, James L.
*Fallon, Timothy J.
*Thomson, Richard T., Jr.
*Peterson, Bruce R.
*Smelich, Walter R.
*Munson, Rolfe L.
*VanEs, John M.
*Tristany, John P.
*Wardlaw, Robert W., Jr.
*Sites, David T.
*Durham, Thomas R.
*Hovey, Julian R., Jr.
*Cooper, William J.
*Everill, Peter D.
*Craig, Frederick B.
*Clark, John L., Jr.
*Meredith, Martin W.
*Edwards, Charles J., Jr.
*Ransom, Albert J.
*Jacobs, Richard E.
*Harvill, William B.
*Bremner, Michael V.
*Quadrini, Frank J., Jr.
*Lewis, Thomas E.
*Kinser, George A.
*Telles, John, Jr.
*Norton, David S.
*Tanzman, Arnold
*Wibbelsman, Frederick P.
*Schlagel, Gordon R.
*Wood, Charles H.
*Kish, Julius P., III
*Ciccone, Ronald G.
*Black, David R.
*Mathews, Robert A., Jr.
*McMullin, Charles T.
*Hines, Oscar J.
*Coady, Eric J.
*Hays, Robert H.
*Shaver, William C.
*Gruning, Charles R.
*Knepp, Donald R.
*Burton, Lou L., Jr.
*Greene, Bruce A.
*Manning, Douglas R.
*Hitchcock, Gene R.
*Reed, Robert M.
*Grubbs, William A., III
*Baldwin, Larry L.
*Sirois, Benoit J. L.
*Cooke, John P.
*Smith, James M.
*Conner, Billy F.
*Bergman, Donald D.
*Klingler, Donald P.
*May, James S.
*Sturkey, Charles E.
*Connor, Briah K., Jr.
*Bilyeu, Byron L.
*Pearson, Jeremiah W., III
*Leiker, Robert
*Tilley, William A., Jr.
*Burke, Francis M.
*Morley, Guy H.
*Matson, Claude A.
*Stiegman, Donald L.
*Newton, David B.
*Gibbs, Joseph W., III
*Jones, Kenneth N.
*Fitzgerald, Ernest T.
*Grimm, Edward A.
Steele, James L.
McElroy, James R., Jr.
Diffen, Ray I.
Brown, Donald H., Jr.
Sawyer, John F.
Helm, John H.
Silva, Lionel M.
Myers, Oran L.
Smith, William S.
Richardson, Jimmy D.
Lohmeier, Donald L.
Jackson, Richard D.
Currell, John R.
Howe, Otis D., III
Barnhill, Dwight D.
Lawson, John H.
Pease, Donald C.
Somerville, Gary J.
Rasmussen, Robert J.
Garriott, John W.
Johnson, Robert L.
Ammons, Kenneth L.
Pridgen, Norman E., Jr.
Anderson, William M.
Crowley, John F.
O'Laughlin, Larry L.
Handrahan, Robert G.
Ward, Richard T.
Ash, David I.
Larsen, Robert A.
Winston, Herbert T.
Beaudoin, Leonard J., Jr.
McNeel, Ted C.
Karlen, Larry R.
Magyar, John A.
Bartnick, Stanley J.
Verbeck, Achille J., Jr.
Steger, George S.
Bane, Ronald E.

Martikke, Erwin J., Jr.
Ruffini, James R.
Nichols, John E.
Oliver, Troy R., Jr.
Fullem, Donald
Kelly, John F., Jr.
Mushallo, John M., Jr.
Young, Gordon K.
Dopko, Theodore G.
York, Wayne H.
Lindgren, Gerland E.
Bastian, Dean L.
Cervantes, Moses
Larson, Donald H.
Shaver, Wayne E.
Eisenhammer, John C.
Zike, Kenneth N.
McInteer, Robert C.
Zumbado, Robert F.
Loyd, Charles R.
Lent, James W., Jr.
Hudson, Robert E.
Kowalski, Thomas J.
Hendrix, Phillip N.
Witucki, Richard
Johnson, Richard A.
Ponsford, Reginald G., III
Dietrich, Robert H.
Sutton, Edward N.
Trimble, Henry L., III
Fox, Raymond F.
Turner, George P., Jr.
Werner, Evan C.
Baig, Mirza M.
Mehl, Spencer P.
Oots, Samuel E.
Gatz, Frederic L.
Elpers, David J.
Stewart, James J.
Bierman, Edward O.
Cox, Donald C.
McIntyre, William A., III
Roth, Ronald K.
Smith, Vincent M.
Baxter, Thomas W.
Harlan, Robert R.
Solak, Thomas J.
Ingebretsen, Carl R.
Morgan, Robert F.
Boomer, Walter E.
Slone, Hardy A.
Bowers, Gene W.
Griffin, Wayne G.
O'Connell, Maurice C.
Foster, Karl A.
Bell, Charles M.
Krimminger, Thomas W.
Mize, Alfred L.
Loving, Francis L.
Lokken, Wesley A.
Beck, Duane C.
MacDonald, Gerald E.
Rogers, Torrence W.
Hayes, Frank S.
Dabney, William H.
Hanson, Chester E.
Fordham, Ellis F.
Carroll, Thomas J.
Bowman, James H.
McKee, Samuel K., III
Keefe, Edmund M., Jr.
Williamson, John B.
Hale, Lynn, A.
Stensland, William C.
Bagwell, Charles H.
Johnson, Donald W.
Taylor, Lawrence A.
Gardner, Phillip E.
Cathell, Peter H.
Alexander, Joseph H.
Stefansson, David R.
Lowe, James W., Jr.
Aleksic, Walter P.
Bahnmaier, William W.
Baker, Clarence L.
Masters, Charles F.
Nolan, Vincent P.
Austenfeld, Robert B., Jr.
Holman, Robert S.
Loveland, Gary N.
Badolato, Edward V.
Entwistle, Charles C., Jr.
Giff, Urban L.,
Opean, Michael I.
Flaharty, John P., Jr.
O'Byrne, Elton C.
Peterson, Wayne A.
Pennell, Robert M.
Watson, Robert C.
Huey, Frank A.
Strand, Robert H.
Mayers, David Jr.
Uzzelle, George H., III
Clawson, Roger L.
Whitaker, Allen P.
Hannah, Herman G.
Brunelli, Austin R., Jr.
McLaughlin, Paul A.
Metzler, Harry R.
Daubenspeck, Lynn A.
Broadwell, Donald N.
Walker, Forest E.
Hackert, Paul E.
Meeks, Clarence I., III
Huggin, Gerald C.
Swedenborg, Thomas P.
Robinson, George K., Jr.
Ungar, Thomas D.
Bronson, James V.
Massey, Tom E.
Coulter, Robert S.
Sehulster, James T.
Barra, Paul V.
Gress, James A.
Smith, Gid B.
Coomes, Wayne A.
Meck, Robert S.
Schwab, William F.
Hathaway, John A.
Prue, David B.
Hracho, Eugene E.
Studds, John A.
Bailey, Alfred D.
Murphy, Robert E.
McDonald, John C.
Daniel, Jack N.
Gillespie, Gary L.
Noggle, Philip L.
Schamber, Joseph G.
Dokos, Chris G., Jr.
Cassingham, John D.
Byers, Larry E.
McAfee, Michael H.
Cazares, Alfred F., Jr.
Pate, Hugh P.
Gann, Robert B.
Morrison, Lenus C.
Tener, Frederick S., Jr.
Roche, William A.
Carroll, James J.
Quinlan, David A.
Thompson, Richard K.
Sabater, Jaime, Jr.
Mitchell, Larry G.
Friedl, Richard C.
Williams, Paul R.
Johnson, Anthon C.
Baker, Robert L.
Seats, Lavell P.
Olson, Joseph C., III
Weed, Leslie J.
Gale, Robert T.
Spence, Wesley F.
Puaa, En Sue Pung
Moore, Robert C.
Luther, Lawrence A.
Lutheran, Joseph A.
Holdaway, Karl S.
Ross, Robert A.
Crawford, Ronald W.
Van Fleet, James E.
Marshall, Robert D.
Todd, Gary E.
Landes, Burrell H., Jr.
May, Joel A., Jr.
Seaman, Lawrence E., Jr.
Weren, Arthur D.
Richardson, Tom V.
Bikakis, Charles N.
Hofmann, David H.
Vallese, Abromo L.
Dusse, Ronald J.
Wickens, Justin H.
Osgood, William H.
Wood, Herbert H.
Stacy, Richard M.
Hopkins, Harvard V., Jr.
McDonough, Joseph F., Jr.
Besch, Edwin W.
Kistner, Douglas H.
Scharf, Peter G.
Kreider, James W.
Wallace, Richard F.
Prestera, Richard A.
Caughron, Howard L.
Lynch, Charles L.
Adkins, Sidney C.
Gardner, Donald R.
Gorman, Merle W.
McCarthy, Peter R.
Boller, Lawrence J.
Kerr, James A., Jr.
Gregory, Donald W.
Wiseman, David L.
Tarr, James K.
Balash, Steve R., Jr.
Anderson, Clifford H.
Harbison, Charles E.
Darrow, Donnie L.
Bowers, Wilburn R.
McClanahan, Garrett W.
Burgess, Richard S.
Thomas, James N.
Glover, Douglas
Kinney, Willard E., Jr.
McLaurin, Robert L., Jr.
Bland, Richard P. L.
Brandtner, Martin L.
Mills, James D.
Flynn, Robert G.
Fulmer, Mark T.
Orr, Alan L.
Lefeve, David A.
Sammis, Norman W.
Terpak, John B., Jr.
Shea, James R.
Hoffman, Robert I.
Wallace, Arthur L., Jr.
Sullivan, Earl V., Jr.
Creadick, Lyle P.
Shaw, Walter C.
Birt, Wesley H.
Gruenberg, Ronald J.
Miller, Allen H.
Scott, Harold R.
Coll, Vincent S.
Sullivan, Harold D.
Gibbons, Joel W., III
McCallum, William J.
McCluskey, William C.
Reynolds, Arthur L.
Cauley, Bernard J.
Spevetz, Louis M.
Pease, Mark C.
Gay, Charles B., Jr.
Dycus, Jerry R.
Harris, Richard I.
Burkley, George W.
Connolly, James F.
Dickerson, Michael G.
Waters, Michael F.
Reardon, John M.
Cutcomb, David H.
Kirkpatrick, Joe J.
Young, Harry C., Jr.
Gibson, Albert F.
Martin, William R.
Sale, Charles L.
Tenney, Joseph R.
Betz, Thomas R.
Mathiesen, Robert A.
Peterson, Lawrence E.
Eirich, Donald G.
Kinder, Joseph D.
Whitfield, Howard M.
Carlson, Robert A.
Bower, James W.
Derbes, David G.
Bivens, Alfred H.
Markell, Elliott R., Jr.
Oxenreider, Lynn F.
Buesing, Elton N., Jr.
O'Neill, Raymond A.
Moore, David E.
Gaumont, George E., Jr.
Gaynor, Paul B.
Keys, William M.
Collins, William
Wilhelm, Frank J.
Sweetser, Warren E., III
Johnson, Gerald M.
Rippelmeyer, Karl
Tull, Martin N.
Kolbe, Frank P., Jr.
Hutzler, Karl H.
Ferich, Barry W.
Barker, Michael D.
Sampson, Charles W.
Ennis, Berlis F.
Ross, George C.
Dubak, John D.
Baker, Richard W.
Wiegand, Robert W.
Hallett, David
Pyle, Harold F., Jr.
Esser, Walter M.
Jenkins, Harry W., Jr.
Moran, Lawrence R.
Bertram, Barry J.
Childress, Clyde O., Jr.
Akin, Robert M.
Stockburger, Arthur L.
Brenan, Michael H.
Hull, Longstreet M.
Underhill, Lonnie S.
DeCastro, Howard L.
Ripley, Michael J.
Pinson, Raymond G.
Martin, John S.
Brown, George W.
Duncan, Hubert G.
O'Brien, Robert J.
Stull, Jay W.
Hatchett, James A.
Kaye, Richard S.
Reilly, John P.
Zensen, Roger
Corbett, David C.
Forbes, Philip A.
Gore, George W.
Giordani, Floyd S.
Meyer, Robert O.
Denton, David V.
Korman, Robert C.
Pearce, William M.
Walters, Francis M., Jr.
Frisenda, Alexander A., Jr.
Graham, Gordon L.
Chambless, Edward L.
May, James E., Jr.
Marshall, James H.
Babich, Ronald G.
Simpson, Jerry I.
Lewan, Lloyd S.
Bomkamp, Norman H.
Wood, Randolph L., Jr.
Vertuno, Anthony A.
Walters, Hugh L.
Joselane, Howard L.
Dickins, John E.
Courtemanche, Robert A.
Lindley, Edward A.
Cushman, Lowell R.
DeLano, Claff E.
Pycior, John L.
Quill, James E.
Gnibus, Thomas E.
Shelton, Jerry L.
Shea, Ronald M.
Lynch, Eugene A.
Valluzzi, Rocco F.
Pierce, Raymond E.
Miner, Larry J.
Gibson, Thomas M.
Salem, Donald L.
Sousa, Richard G.
Griffin, James R.
Holland, Kenneth D.
Baranowski, Joseph T.
Banks, Andrew B., Jr.
Sandvoss, Bert E. G.
Nicholson, Robert G.
Morris, John D.
DeJong, Gerald
Newsom, Bobby J.
Rea, John M.
Rummel, William H.
Guy, John W.
Yatsko, Anthony A.
Reichert, Donald P.
Thompson, Albert K.
Asanovich, Elie M.
Bennett, Jesse D., Jr.
Bowden, Howard J.
Hendricks, Nelson P.
McLaughlin, John L.
Seely, Rae C.
Salmon, Lawrence R.
Andrews, Louis P.
Bergstrom, Alfred R., Jr.
Sweeney, William T.
Pinson, Joseph W.
Webster, Ralph D.
Despotakis, John A.
Hanke, George F. R.
Lusk, Rudolph F.
Houlahan, Thomas J.
Peat, Harry C., Jr.
Jessen, Donald W.
Slater, John H.
Gow, W. Douglas
Gruner, John M.
Sloan, Robert W.
Olin, John H., Jr.
Pearson, Bruce G.
Porter, Raymond E.
Marshall, John T.
Ferris, Roger E.
Slovik, Frank M.
McLean, Allan T.
Perkins, Thomas H.
Parker, Whilden S.
Speights, Billy J.
Judd, David W.
Schussler, Robert W.
Price, Charles E.
Dalby, John D.
Dunn, Dick W.
Reusse, Edward O., Jr.
Allen, Ronald L.
Sasek, Richard J.
Wyrick, David A.
Murphy, Barry J.
Crowe, Douglas A.
Bechtol, Joseph A. L.
Sibley, Andy J.
Thomson, Ronald F.
Phillips, Albert H.
Carlisle, Richard P.
Machado, Robert F.
Burgess, Alan E.
King, Charles F., II
Batcheller, Gordon D.
Gleeson, Richard
Beach, Arthur J.
Cunniff, James A.
Pool, Corbett G.
Lutton, John M., Jr.
Coughlan, James R.
Sypult, Robert P.
Lopuszynski, Ted
Santo, Donald E.
Hefti, Marlin L.
Downey, Lawrence L.
Harris, Terry E.
Callison, George R.
Crews, Oliver J., Jr.
Hockersmith, Paul J., Jr.
Wylie, Moffatt F.
Hiltbrunner, Donnal E.
Renfro, Owen B.
DeBrincat, Ronald V.
Vincent, Nat H.
Sternburg, Joseph A.
Rose, Mason H., V
Cerney, William F.
Dudman, William R.
Ogle, William W.
Kehn, Alan B.
Willis, David J.
Morgan, Kenneth F.
Stanton, Joseph L.
Kelly, Francis D.
Adams, Andrew B.
Odgers, Gerald C.
Riley, John D.
Haines, Lynn M.
Christie, Robert F.
Nichol, Bernal J., Jr.
McGaa, Melvin E.
Green, Abram R., Jr.
Hicks, James B., Jr.
Brinker, Jack R.
Pomeroy, Robert W.
Nugent, James R., Jr.
Major, William D.
Rourke, Donald W.
Johnson, Kenneth W.
Williamson, Robert E.
Prouty, Russell C.
Haley, Harrison L.
Selway, James E.
Taylor, Andrew P., Jr.
Morigeau, Paul, Jr.
Whaley, John L.
Baisley, Thomas R.
Radcliffe, Henry J. M.
Austin, Henry W.
Donnelly, Thomas P.
Varvoutis, Francis G.
Carr, John J.
Sgambelluri, Adolfo P.
Schmid, Ronald W.
Montague, Paul J.
Lawson, David L.
Regan, Robert J., Jr.
Hartzell, Charles B.
Castillo, Frank G.
Golden, James T., Jr.
Brady, James J.
Beckman, Dennis D.
Davidson, Jerry R.
Coti, William A.
Garland, John D.
Houston, Arthur L., Jr.
Mediavilla, Antonio
Pinnick, James H.
Bullard, Clyde A., Jr.
Buckley, James E.
Gram, Ivar R.
Hadley, Allen C.
Eikenbery, Tod A.
Thrash, Ronald J.
Scholl, Robert B., Jr.
Councilman, John D.
McAllister, Peter M.
Folmar, David P.
Caynak, John P.
Petty, Charles R.
Gofas, Constantine
Padios, Arthur P., Jr.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of captain, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

*Cox, Frank J., Jr.
*Abner, Edward L.
*White, Richard
*Barberi, John M.
*Young, Lauritz W.
Greene, Robert W.
Jackson, Bobby N.
Gleim, Earl C.
Georgia, Daniel C.
Koyiades, John
Kropinack, Robert C.
Mullen, Frank C., Jr.
Busch, Peter M.
Johnson, Robert C.
Knight, Charles T.
Turbeville, Bobby G.
Nolen, Thomas A.
Moore, Lawrence R.
Raper, Donald L.
Snodgrass, Clyde R.
Lamb, Donald L.
Sanchez, Kelly J.
Bacon, James N.
Langford, Kenneth W.
Driscoll, Bruce W.
Fountain, Marcus T., Jr.

The following-named woman officer of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of major, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

*Wallis, Jane L.

The following-named women officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of captain, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Paul, Winnifred B.
Wheeler, Karen G.
Filkins, Eleanor E.
Davey, Judith A.
Mackie, Nancy J.
Roy, Barbara J.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of chief warrant officer, W-4, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

*Lucht, Robert W.
*Navolanic, Joseph G.
*Finkbohner, Edward C.
Darr, Charles H.
Thomas, Robert L.
Brown, Robert M.
Ronsvale, John
Meek, Donald L.
Kerr, John D.
Davi, Charles V.
Gibson, Herbert S.
Holl, Fredrick L.
Rook, James A.
Watson, Robert T., Jr.
Rafi, Paul H.
Young, Leonard R.
Strahan, John
Addington, William P.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of chief warrant officer, W-3, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Seymour, Edgar F.
Hoffmann, Leo O.
Witkoski, John A.
McLellan, Robert
Crocker, Ernest, Jr.
Williams, James T.
Gilbert, Clifford R.
Dyson, Frederick W.
Redmond, James E.
Stuckey, A. W.
Sheridan, Lawrence V.
Brewer, Patrick R.
Brearey, Leonard J.
Duncan, Orville H.
Clemons, William D., Jr.
Scroggs, Frank W., Jr.
Crawford, Roy H.
Russell, Robert H.
Newtown, Glenford A.
Kennedy, Jo E.
Corbett, William C.
O'Connor, Donald J.
Robertson, Margaret
Spikes, Aaron W.
Christ, Arthur J.
Conner, Gerald H.
Patterson, Merlyn M.
Williamson, Robert V.
Palmer, Robert M.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of chief warrant officer, W-2, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

White, Thomas A.
Foster, Ronald L.
Yon, Veo S.
Poe, William A., Jr.
Mason, Robert B.
Scherer, Edward D., Jr.
Fain, Carroll G.
Gauthier, James R.
Hamilton, Carl D.
Taylor, Kenneth E.
Greenleese, William E.
Clark, Roy L.
Sexton, William G.
Turner, Thomas W.
Woodroof, William B.
Golab, Alfred J.
Brassington, Richard C.
Weaver, John F., III
Garcia, Clarence D.
Lancaster, James E.
Bartell, Harold E.
Larvie, Roger E.
Barber, Donald N.
Hayes, William R., Jr.
Morgan, Bobby W.
Powell, William H.
Legge, Glenn F.
Frazier, Harold W., Jr.
Gage, Cecil O.
Holmberg, Eugene S.
Gordon, William H.
Steinken, William T., Jr.
Burns, James M.
Lentz, Harold Jr.
Bailey, Willard E.
Harmon, Tommy A.
Robinson, Clarence A., Jr.
Waters, Calvin R.
Hughs, Douglas W.
Burgett, E. A.
Cantrell, Bryan K.
Carr, William D., Jr.
Lathrop, David W., Jr.
Davis, Donald E.
Clark, Jessie R.
Waters, Francis A.
Earley, Gordon E.
Smith, Frank E.
Dullaghan, John F.
Wright, James E.
Stavros, Peter N.
Walker, Norman J.
Bonifay, Robert L.
Adams, Robert L.
Kenniston, George P.
Lee, Earl C.
Carter, Jackie M.
Macy, Ronald T.
Kiselicka, Stephen F.
DeHaven, Leslie B.
Dean, Paul A.
Skultety, Edward S.
Gipson, Carroll S.
Loftus, Edward P.
Blount, Earl C., Jr.
Ballenger, Glen A.
Smith, Ronald R.
Lesh, Thomas J.
Compton, Dale L.
Hall, Morton L.
Kondo, Herbert S.
Anti, Raymond L.
Taylor, Arthur J.
Wilsmann, William K.
Gregorius, Eugene W.
Siemion, Daniel L.
Catanzaro, Leonard J.
Osterberg, Richard R.
French, Alvin E.
Little, Roy F.
Johnston, Erich J.
Mac Kenzie, Robert B.
Bochenski, Leon J., Jr.
Sligar, Howard B., Jr.
Tobin, Harry J.
Eicher, Charles D.
Small, Vernard J.
Wenglare, William R.
Carlisle, Rayon H., Jr.
Davis, Carroll C.
Rhodes, John L.
Scott, Norvel M.
Warren, Robert T.
Masker, William A.
Kirkland, Golden C., Jr.
Miller, Ralph C., Jr.
Herd, Douglas R.
Ross, Leonard
Bradley, Robert G.
Mix, Tom A.
Emeney, John B.
Bovee, William C.
Houck, Harvey D., Jr.
Daubenspeck, Frederick E.
Mueller, Dewey E.
Jones, Edward T., Jr.
Taylor, Charles L.
Funk, Howard E., Jr.
George, Marvin J.
Mellon, Bruce
Frawley, Joseph R.
Jennings, Earl M.
O'Byrne, Joseph W., Jr.
Sanders, Richard K.
Kling, Harry A.
White, Vance E.
Skalski, Stanley A.
Whisnant, Donald L.
Turcott, Richard L.
Estes, Phillip M.
Cummings, John D.
Watson, Eric P., Jr.
Liebert, Karl F.
Keller, Kenneth K.
Moyer, Samuel L.
Armstrong, Clifford H.
Brennan, Charles J.
Cowart, Jerry J.
Cook, Darrell H.
Lake, James E.
Dexter, Harold E.
Colbert, Jarrett, Jr.
Spiker, Robert E.
Abrams, David P.
Phillips, Richard E.
Wolfe, Howard C.
Bean, Donald R.
McIlnay, Bernard L.
Manion, Robert G.
Usher, Lloyd J.
Ladner, Claudie J.
Douglas, Kenneth M.
Rose, Robert L.
Theriot, Jimmy R.
Watts, John C.
Steger, Robert A. J.
Moody, Johnney W.
Lindsey, Joel F.
Darroch, Robert G.
Gardner, Kenneth M.
Blake, James T.
Storch, Richard F.
Davis, James S.
Hankinson, Robert C.
Cipperly, William J.
Forehand, Gerald T.
Ross, Richard H.
Hoffmann, Ronald G.
Oehlers, Roy M.
McNulty, Jerry W.
Albert, Bruce M.
Penman, David T.
Stewart, William M.
Buelow, Frederick A.
Mitchell, Mack E.
Norton, Robert L.
England, Phillip L.
Manning, Paul M.
Davies, Ralph D.
Fain, Robert L.
Greenlaw, Donald B.
Layton, Billie R., Sr.
Catron, Le Roy E.
Keil, Richard L.
Tomlin, Zac C.
Hamm, Raymond L.
Crook, Arthur B.
Thomas, Edgar D.
Griffin, Joseph A.
Barber, William W.
Moreland, Edward H.
Cavett, Wallace E.
Mills, Carl
Blackwood, Donald C.
Cartmill, Lloyd J.
Bell, Eugene O.
Atwood, Robert E., Sr.
Corathers, John K.
Knox, Richard D.
Lambert, Earle L.
Wallace, Richard H.
Dodd, Robert D.
Holiman, Ralph L.
Wright, Clyde V.
Puricelli, Russell A.
Rike, Joe A.
Frickie, Frank J., III
Carlson, Robert F.
House, Donald C.
Bushnell, Louis G.
Brandl, Donald R.
Soltes, Anthony J.
Hagen, Anton O.
Pippin, James R.
Fitzgerald, Stuart W.
Doorack, Robert J.
Flom, William F.
Mallard, Ira T.
Mulford, Randolph M.
Ludwig, Robert M.
Wallace, Virgil E.
Ingram, Walter E.
Snow, Richard W.
Coleman, Paul F.
Caulfield, Thomas J., Jr.
Fogg, Donald L.
Griswold, Robert N.
Rotchford, Edward P.
Peterson, Henry A.
Devereux, Aiden J.
Ray, Thomas W.
Mac Geary, Fred E.
Bridges, Ernest V.
Henry, Carl J., Jr.
Kinnear, John H.
Flood, Henry D.
Brown, Ferris D.
Watkins, Price I.
Hancock, Troy W.
Curtis, Harry F.
Zettler, George A.
Dembrosky, Thomas E
Szabo, Thomas M.
Gamache, Henry J.
Richardson, Donald F.
Schiraldi, Anthony P.
Pedersen, Charles L.
LaMontagne, Robert N.
Moody, John E.
Kimble, Ralph R.
Smith, Lake, Jr.
Savage, Charles W.
Hendrickson, Kenneth J.
Dyberg, Richard H.
Richter, Robert E.
Davis, Muriel
Hoover, Warren A.
Scalzo, Salvatore J.
Barkhouse, Walter E.
Klesyk, Francis, Jr.
Trimmel, Edward Z.
Smith, George M., Jr.
Sayre, Orville L.
Daugherty, James E.
Chesnut, Bobby G.
Rasile, Robert
Moreau, Raymond P.
Deaton, Marvin D.
Leedle, James M.
Jones, William A.
Johnson, Laverne E.
Tandle, Thomas J.
Sanders, Stanley F.
Christenson, Howard J.
Hill, James E.
Tucker, Jacques E.
Daisey, James F., Jr.
Nicklin, Richard F.
Conrardy, William C.
Davidson, William L.
Early, Archie L.
Crum, Ralph W.
Simolin, Roy E.
Veater, Jimmie
Lawrence, Charles A. L.
Rafferty, Cleon H.
Louis, James
Norwood, Richard H.
Riley, Martin J., Jr.
Bagley, David L.
Tinney, John G.
Petty, John R., Jr.
Barauskas, Alphonsas A.
Gentemann, James L., Jr.
Peterson, John E.
Smith, Don L.
Hughes, Edward M.
Burkett, Glydon C.
Wenrich, John L., Jr.
Beresford, Eugene H.
Davis, Ernest M.
Rowe, Clark H.
Rentz, Homer A.
Gillespie, George E.
Brown, Donald E.
Johnson, Carl O.
Kendall, James E.
Barton, Charles R.
Boggs, Okey L.
Norton, Fredrick D.
Wheeler, Charles D.
Nicholas, Billy D.
Beiling, Francis J., Jr.
Morrow, Joseph M.
Wallace, Robert H.
Beier, John C.
Flynn, George R.
Brown, James E.
Llewellyn, William D.
Miller, Robert S.
Hickey, William C.
Rodick, Rodger J.
Schmid, Adolph
Richards, Millard L.
Petty, Robert H.
Cooke, Curtis V.
Burns, Raymond F.
Sparks, Alan J.
Fuller, David D.
Ritter, Harold L.
Heebner, Harry L.
Cole, Benny B.
Reeder, Edmond W.
Bolen, Glenn E.
Giusto, Donald S.
Milliron, Robert E.
Carrington, John H.
Mayes, Ronald J.
Morrill, Alan L.
Schuon, William W.
Sarver, Edmond S.
Toth, Francis A.
Golowski, Stanley A.
Lea, Franklin S.
Gilbert, William E.
Albright, Walter L.
Griffin, Kevin J.
Frazier, Jack E.
Thacker, John L.
Riley, William E.
Solomon, Arlon
Shore, Richard G.
Reyer, Alfred J., Jr.
Ramsey, Emma G.
Gates, Phillip E.
Brown, Vance E.
Alexander, Bruce D.
Granata, Peter J.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of first lieutenant, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

*Kozak, Gerald W.
Noe, Robert E.
Ashe, Thomas D.
Bartlett, Robert O.
Beaver, Dale S.
Bowden, Holland C.
Chavez, Lonnie S.
Church, Jorel B.
Curran, James E., Jr.
Demeo, Angelo C.
Faught, Robert J.
Franz, Howard A.
Girvin, Bobby G.
Golden, John J.
Gray, Edwin T.
Holbrook, Vernon J.
Incociati, Raymond F.
Jones, Robert E.
Joyce, Robert W.
Land, Carlton E.
Anthes, Fred W.
Carter, Kenneth L.
Manco, Edward J.
Roberts, Morris R.
Duncan, Dorris A.
McCurry, Kenneth D.
Mitchell, Robert L.
Mockenhaupt, Robert J.
Olson, Robert V.
Perry, Leon E.
Pitts, Thomas E.
Rickmon, James E.
Robinson, Jean O.
Scaplehorn, William E., Jr.

Scott, Gerald E.
Simmons, Clyde M.
Smith, Clarence D.
Starzynski, Paul M.
Tanksley, Lawrence E.
Van Grol, Daniel P., III
Wieden, Clifford, Jr.
Yaeger, Richard A.
Bode, Wichard H., Jr.
Clark, James A.
Merry, Bion E.
Rodgers, John H.
Huey, Benjamin M.

(Note: Asterisk (*) indicates ad interim appointment issued.)

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 19, 1965:

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Sheldon S. Cohen, of Maryland, to be Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

Mitchell Rogovin, of Virginia, to be an Assistant General Counsel in the Department of the Treasury (Chief Counsel for the Internal Revenue Service).

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JANUARY 19, 1965

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Use the verse of Scripture, Ephesians 3: 20: *Now unto Him who is able to do exceeding abundantly above all that we ask or think, according to the power that worketh in us.*

Almighty God, we earnestly beseech Thee to bestow Thy gracious favor and benediction upon our President, our Vice President, our Speaker, and the Members of the Congress.

Grant that they may know how to guide the Ship of State and embody and express that noble kind of patriotism which seeks in personal character and public service to protect and perpetuate the good name of our beloved country.

May we all aspire to emulate the faithful in doing high and helpful things for our Republic and share in the blessed ministry of healing the hurts and heartaches of bruised and broken humanity.

Now may Thy grace, mercy, and peace descend upon us, through Jesus Christ, our Lord, in whose name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER. The Chair designates the Honorable EMANUEL CELLER, of New York, to act as Speaker pro tempore tomorrow, January 20, 1965.

THE LATE HONORABLE CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a former distinguished Member of the U.S. House of Representatives—an outstanding native citizen of the State of Vermont—a friend of many of you who are still here—the late Charles A. Plumley, U.S. Representative from Vermont from January 16, 1934, to January 3, 1951.

Mr. Plumley died in the town where he was born, educated, and retired, Northfield, Vt., on October 31, 1964, following the adjournment of the 88th Congress. He was buried the day before Election Day, but as was true of him in life, so death did not cheat him from full participation in the politics of that day. For he had cast an absentee ballot for President and other offices just prior to his death.

Charlie Plumley served a long and notable career in this great body, as did his father, the late Frank Plumley, Representative from Vermont from 1909 to 1915. But it would be difficult to have categorized the life of Charles Plumley.

In the field of education, he was a principal and superintendent in the public school system of his hometown and in later years served as president of Norwich University, one of this country's outstanding military schools, from 1920 to 1934.

Mr. Plumley was commissioner of taxes for the State of Vermont for 7 years, after having served in administrative positions in both our State senate and house of representatives. As a member of the State house of representatives, he served that body as speaker.

After 17 years in this body, Charlie Plumley retired on his own, expressing the view in his own words:

> I thought, and still think, that some younger man should bear the burden of the responsibility for carrying out the ideas and the ideologies for which I have stood over the years.

Those of you who worked here in the Congress with Charlie Plumley knew him for his honesty and friendliness, and for the many years of valuable service he performed as a member of the important Appropriations Committee.

But of those who knew him best, I believe the words expressed following his death by a lifelong friend and classmate, Mr. William D. Hassett, of Northfield, come the closest to describing this memorable man. Mr. Hassett, former secretary to Presidents Roosevelt and Truman, wrote of his friend:

> In the quiet of an October morning the long life of Charles Plumley ebbed to a peaceful close.
>
> Few lives have touched the life of our Northfield community at so many angles as his. Born in the family home on Pleasant Street, as a boy he attended the graded school and prepared for Norwich University at Northfield High School. He was the only son of Frank Plumley, one of the foremost trial lawyers in New England and of Lavinia Fletcher Plumley. His mother was once preceptress of the local high school, of which her son was afterward principal. The Plumley household was a home of plain living and high thinking.
>
> In all the great relations of life Charles Plumley never was found wanting nor inadequate. He had a genius for friendship and in his daily walks around Depot Square, as long as he was able, he had a cheerful greeting for all and was loved alike by men, women, and children. As raconteur he had few equals as his long-to-be-remembered stories of old Northfield and its people bear witness in the memories of those whose world is a desolate place now that he has left it.
>
> A lover of beauty wherever he found it, his garden on Prospect Street brought joy to all, especially when his peonies and an occasional "piney" were at their height. If all, into whose lives he brought laughter and sunshine, could place one blossom on his grave he would sleep tonight in Mount Hope in a wilderness of flowers. He met life on its own terms always with an equable temper, cheerful courage, and steady faith.
>
> "Take him for all in all, we shall not look upon his like again."

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. STAFFORD. I would be delighted to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, as one who served here with Charlie Plumley, of Vermont, and as one who admired him, respected him, and loved him, I would just like to say that the gentleman from Vermont's appraisal of Charlie Plumley's record here, his character and his service, is entirely correct. Charlie Plumley was one of the finest gentlemen that I have ever known. His friendship meant a lot to me. I am sorry indeed that he has gone to his reward, but I am sure that all those who knew him would agree with me that he served here with distinction, that he contributed in full measure to the benefit of his Nation and his State.

Again I thank the gentleman for yielding to me that I might add my sincere words of tribute to a great friend of mine, Charlie Plumley.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. STAFFORD. I will be glad to yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I join my distinguished colleague from Vermont and the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] in this word of tribute to a former Member who performed outstanding service in this body and who had earned and received the highest respect of his colleagues. He loved the House and was loved by it.

I was shocked at the news of his death, and I extend my deepest sympathies to his friends and relatives.

Mr. STAFFORD. I appreciate the words of the majority leader.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, even before I came to the Congress I had heard of the good heart and the good works of the Honorable Charles Albert Plumley. The late Congressman Ralph Church had referred to him a matter in which I was interested, because the young man concerned, who formerly had been a constituent of Congressman Church, was then a resident of Vermont.

It was one of those personal matters, not of earthshaking importance, but of real concern to at least one young man and the members of his immediate family. I appreciated greatly the response of Vermont's veteran Congressman in the case of a young man, a stranger to him, only recently come to his State of Vermont and, moreover, a member of a Democratic family.

When I came to the 81st Congress I sought him out personally to tell him my appreciation. The friendship that followed was rich and rewarding. I am grieved to learn of his passing. In April next he would have reached the ripe age of 90. His indeed was a long and useful life and at every stage of a career that included the presidency of Norwich University, speaker of the Vermont House of Representatives, soldier, lawyer, banker, statesman. He made a friend of everyone with whom he worked.

Our late beloved friend and colleague was the son of another Congressman Plumley from Vermont, the Honorable Frank Plumley, who served in the 61st, 62d, and 63d Congresses.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 2 legislative days in which to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

TO IMPROVE THE HIGHER EDUCATION SYSTEM IN OUR NATION

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to introduce the administration's recommendations to improve the higher education system of our Nation.

A week ago, President Lyndon Johnson sent to the Congress an education message which, in my view, was the finest ever submitted to the National Legislature. In the course of the 13-page message, President Johnson made many eloquent statements on behalf of education. One such passage stands out in my mind.

It came when the President quoted Mirabeau B. Lamar, second President of the Republic of Texas and the father of Texas education:

> The cultivated mind is the guardian genius of democracy. It is the only dictator that free man acknowledges. It is the only security that free man desires.

Surely there are none among us today who cannot subscribe to President Johnson's invitation to us to join with him in declaring a national goal of full educational opportunity. Surely we can embark with the President on another venture to put the American dream to work in meeting the new demands of a new day. He continues:

> Once again we must start where men who would improve their society have always known they must begin—with an educational system restudied, reinforced, and revitalized.

The administration measure, Mr. Speaker, which developed out of mutual consultations among the executive branch and the legislative branch and the educational constituencies, is a commendable one. The most significant proposal, in my judgment, is the President's recommendation for university extension and continuing education. This I would like to call—as has a Portland university president—the "City Grant College Act." The Landmark Morrill Act of more than one century ago brought into being the land grant college system to serve a primarily rurally oriented Nation. Today, the situation has completely switched about and more than 70 percent of Americans live in urban areas. The City Grant College Act can do for our cities, beleaguered by bad housing, overcrowding, and a host of social problems, what the Land-Grant College Act did for the agricultural segments of our Nation. This recommendation by the Johnson administration may be the most significant of any recommendation of this generation. Today we cannot even envisage the results of this forward-looking program.

Among its many other fine features is the long-overdue proposal of a program of student assistance in the form of scholarships for 140,000 needy and qualified high school graduates. Surely, any qualified young man or woman who really wants a college education should have that opportunity.

Still another, is a faculty exchange program to strengthen less developed colleges. Many smaller colleges, apart from the mainstream of academic life for many reasons beyond their immediate control, face major financial problems, loss of accreditation, or difficulties in attracting top personnel. This proposal, which I introduced last year for purposes of discussion and study, would encourage our most advanced universities to enter into cooperative relationships with less developed colleges. I was most pleased that this administration has included this plan in the overall recommendations.

And finally, not without note, is the proposal to enable purchase of books and library materials to strengthen college teaching and research.

And so in the words of Lyndon Johnson on a far more somber day about 1 year ago, "Let us continue." Let us continue to expand and improve the partnership between the public and private colleges and the Federal Government that our children may be better equipped and better educated to face the challenges of tomorrow.

GEMINI SPACECRAFT SUCCESS

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I have received word from the Administrator, James E. Webb, of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, that the second unmanned Gemini spacecraft has been recovered by our naval forces 2,150 miles down range in the mid-Atlantic.

This spacecraft was launched at 9:03 this morning from Cape Kennedy on a 16,600-mile-an-hour course. If postflight tests indicate satisfactory performance during the flight, we have today passed a significant milestone in our space program. Early indications are that the mission met all requirements.

Today's launch was the second in the Gemini-Titan series. It was designed to complete the qualification of the launch vehicle and spacecraft for the program's two-man flights.

The first of these will carry NASA Astronauts Virgil Grissom and John Young into a three-orbital mission this spring. Later flights will be used to perfect space rendezvous and docking techniques, to study the performance of astronauts during periods of up to 2 weeks in space, and to test other operations that are basic to the lunar-landing Apollo program which will follow Gemini.

Gemini is the second major phase of our manned space-flight activities. We moved boldly into this two-man flight program after the brilliant success of the six manned flights of Project Mercury. We have confidence that Gemini and Apollo will prove equally successful and that this Nation will continue to move resourcefully with the help of its industries, its universities, its government, and the aspirations of all its citizens toward that day when the United States will stand preeminent in space as it is already preeminent on earth.

AKIO NAGAMINE, SPEAKER OF THE UNICAMERAL LEGISLATURE OF OKINAWA

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, it is my distinct honor and pleasure to announce that among many distinguished visitors to our Capital City during these busy days of inaugural festivities is a great friend of the United States, Mr. Akio Nagamine, speaker of the unicameral Legislature of Okinawa.

Mr. Nagamine, now 56, is a leader of the Okinawa Democratic Party. He has devoted all of his adult life to public service, having been a schoolteacher, vice principal, and principal. In 1946 he was appointed a school inspector by the Okinawa Civil Administration. He has also served as mayor of Oroku-son, and commissioner of the land acquisition examining committee of the Ryukyu Government. In 1956 he was elected to the Okinawan Legislature and reelected for an additional five terms. He was chosen speaker of the unicameral legislature in 1960 and has held that position ever since.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure I speak for the entire membership of this House when I say that we are greatly honored by the visit of the Honorable Akio Nagamine, speaker of the Legislature of Okinawa.

LEAD-ZINC ACT OF 1965 INTRODUCED

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I know that Members of the House are familiar in general with the various problems that have beset the lead and zinc industry in the last decade. I have been bringing these facts to the attention of this body because of the importance of the lead and zinc industry to the economy of many regions throughout the country and therefore to the overall economy.

In my district—the Fourth Congressional District of Colorado—lead and zinc mining is not only important but has added to the folklore of our Nation through the exploits of brave and adventurous prospectors in many districts. There is still a lot of ore in the ground at Leadville; but, there is little activity because the depressed conditions of recent years forced the mines to close. Other areas are likewise inactive although the minerals are there.

Since the 86th Congress it has been my responsibility, as chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, to consider measures that would help all domestic mining industries including lead and zinc. So, I have been actively seeking solutions to these problems. I have long felt that the key to the development and maintenance of domestic mining sources that can be relied upon to expand our domestic economy and to be available if we ever need them for a national emergency, is to make sure that we balance imports to the end that the domestic mining industry will be assured of a fair share of the domestic market and therefore will be encouraged to make investments for long-range development.

Those of us who have been laboring for the salvation of the lead-zinc industry are of the opinion, Mr. Speaker, that this year we have the combination, that we have found a formula that, when enacted into law, will be fair to this Nation, its producers and consumers, and will, at the same time, be fair to our friends in the community of nations whose economy to some extent is dependent upon exporting lead and zinc to the United States.

In this connection, let me emphasize for the record that the national policy as set forth in the Trade Expansion Act is recognized by many of the supporters of lead-zinc import legislation as being advantageous to the growth of the American economy generally, that many segments of the industry supporting this legislation have significant international trade, and that in my considered opinion there is no basic inconsistency between the type of legislation that we are offering today and an expansion of our international trade.

Let me also state for the record that there has been an improvement in the domestic lead and zinc mining industry in the last year and that prices of lead and zinc are at a level that will make it possible for the industry to operate economically if these prices are maintained. But let us not forget that this improvement, that these profits accrue to the benefit of those who have weathered the storm and remained in operation through the lean years when lead and zinc could not be mined profitably. This does not help those who were forced to go out of business; they cannot be helped unless and until they have some assurance that the industry will be stabilized during a long enough period of time to warrant the investment necessary to reopen old mines and open new ones.

We are at a stage of our economic development today where we need increased amounts of lead and zinc for domestic consumption. Some manufacturing and processing industries have told us that they are facing disastrous shortages of lead and zinc in the immediate future. The domestic lead and zinc mining industry cannot meet this short-range demand and the legislation has been introduced by Members of this body to provide for the release of additional supplies of lead and zinc from the national stockpile. Some further stockpile release appears justified, but I reserve for another day my judgment on the question of the quantity and the procedures of sale. However, I do make the firm observations that the stockpile was not created for the purpose of feeding supplies into the normal domestic markets and that stockpiled materials should not be utilized to influence the market.

The time to take the necessary steps to assure a continuing supply of lead and zinc for domestic use is now. We cannot accomplish this purpose by relying on either the stockpile or on foreign production and imports. And let me emphasize that it is not only in time of emergency that we cannot rely on foreign sources; we cannot rely on these sources at any time and particularly not at this stage of emerging and developing nations that have created new markets for these commodities at the very time that the highly industrialized nations, including ours, have created increased demands through expansion of their economies. Nonetheless, should there be a reduction in the rate of economic expansion, it would be at that very time that foreign producers would rush to take advantage of the U.S. market and once again possibly create the unfavorable conditions that caused the domestic lead-zinc mining industry to suffer the hardships it did during the last decade.

The time to assure a continuing flow of necessary lead and zinc is now; and the way to do it is by arrangement for a flexible import quota that will remove the threat of economic disaster for domestic mines while at the same time assuring foreign producers that they can continue shipping to this country at least as much lead and zinc as they are able to at the present time under the existing quotas, which were imposed by the President of the United States on October 1, 1958. Those quotas are rigid, absolute quotas which, in my opinion, were very liberal and to the advantage of foreign producers when they were imposed.

By utilizing the existing quotas as a base, our flexible quota plan assures friendly foreign governments that these quantities will remain the minimum eligible for import and that, whenever the U.S. market conditions require it, the import restrictions will be relaxed and additional quantities of lead and zinc could be imported. Likewise, of course, the flexible quota system would provide for decreasing the quotas when metals stock levels indicate that U.S. market conditions are such that lesser imports are required.

The bill that we are offering today has the support of all segments of the domestic lead and zinc industry—miners and smelters alike. This bill is a refinement of legislation that many of us sponsored in the last Congress. One of the features of the legislation which we think is an improvement over the terms of the earlier bills places in global quotas percentages of import allowances that are not being utilized under existing quota. In addition we think that we will provide greater assurance of stability for the domestic miner and consumer while at the same time assuring the importer of a share of the market.

By permitting a continuation of the allocation of existing quotas to those countries that now have such quotas and have substantially fulfilled them under the present plan, and can be expected to utilize them in the immediate future, we permit those countries to sustain their own present level of production. Stated another way: The flexible quota procedure will permit an increase in base quota levels in direct relation to any sustained growth of our economy resulting in increased consumption of lead and zinc and thereby permit foreign producers to share proportionately in our growth.

Finally, we have provided that whenever a country fills less than 90 percent of its assigned quota during a calendar year the deficiencies would be allocated to a global quota, available to any country, thereby providing supplies necessary to supplement domestic production and also automatically adjust imports to the fluctuations of mine and metal production available for export to the United States by other countries.

Those of us introducing this legislation today urge all Members to study it and we will welcome expressions of support in the form of additional cosponsors who would also introduce this legislation.

It is my hope, Mr. Speaker, that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Arkansas, the Honorable WILBUR D. MILLS, will obtain early reports on this legislation from the interested executive departments and agencies and thereafter schedule hearings on this measure. This is a bipartisan national project in which we have representation from the North, East, and South, as well as the West. I readily admit, however, that my interest is heightened by the fact that Colorado has consistently been one of the five principal States producing lead and zinc from among the 20 States that have produced lead and zinc in substantial quantities. New sources of lead and zinc are being tapped. We reasonably anticipate new significant production from Kentucky and Maine to maintain the pace and accelerate production to keep in step with the growing economy.

We must take the necessary legislative action at this time to forestall a recurrence of the broad differential that has occurred on other occasions resulting in uncertainty and economic disaster.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ULLMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise at this time to associate myself with the concept outlined by my colleague, the gentleman from Colorado, the Honorable WAYNE N. ASPINALL, who has been doing such an outstanding job as chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and particularly in discharging the responsibilities of that committee with regard to domestic mining and mineral industries.

For this reason, I am happy to join as a cosponsor of the Lead and Zinc Act of 1965. I, too, subscribe to the thought advanced by my colleague from Colorado to the effect that the flexible quota formula proposed in this import legislation is not inconsistent with our basic policy underlying the Trade Expansion Act. The fact is that we must assure ourselves of continuing adequate supplies of lead and zinc, and this can only be accomplished if we encourage the discovery and development of additional domestic sources.

It is a source of satisfaction and encouragement that those of us cosponsoring this legislation have been able to agree on a formula which starts from a base in which the present quotas are the minimum and that, therefore, when domestic consumption of lead or zinc increases, we will have a liberalization of the import controls permitting additional foreign material to enter the country.

The bills that we have introduced today are fair to all—domestic producer as well as foreign producer, the consuming industries as well as the consuming public.

I urge enactment of this legislation as an important part of our economic progress.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ICHORD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I have again this year joined the gentleman from Colorado, Chairman ASPINALL, of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, in the introduction of legislation designed to impose a flexible quota system on imports of lead and zinc to protect the domestic lead and zinc industry from devastating price levels that have resulted in the past.

For more than a decade this industry, so necessary and vital to our Nation's national defense, has experienced the throes of a holocaust of cancerous genus, which has slowly and constantly been destroying the lifeblood of the lead-zinc industry, and in its wake, closing our own mines and causing great proportions of unemployment. In view of the ills suffered by the industry, I think it is time for Congress to take positive action to stabilize and maintain a healthy lead-zinc mining industry.

The lead-zinc industry has had a series of ups and downs in the past decade. The price of lead per pound decreased progressively from $0.179 in 1948 to $0.092 in 1962. In 1963 the price rose to $0.11 and approximately $0.14 in 1964, in keeping with the trend of the general level of our economy, but how long can this industry endure on the premise of survival by chance? The price is still too low for satisfactory conditions in the industry. Of course, the improvement is gratifying, but we must look toward a long-term stabilization by improving trade policies and statutes.

The flexible import quota system proposed by this legislation is the only immediate answer to the serious problem. It is designed as a twofold purpose, to help our own domestic producers and to still maintain necessary trade on the world market.

How can we continue to justify the inaction of Congress to the U.S. mines and producers? In my own State of Missouri, where more than 40 percent of the Nation's supply of lead is produced, there are only 6 mines in operation today, as compared to 90 in 1948, 68 in 1950, 18 in 1955, and 5 in 1960. As the mines have closed the unemployment rolls have increased, until today there are hundreds of men out of work and as many families with little means of support, causing incalculable damage to the local economy and adding to the injuries of the industry.

Something has to be done and now, not next year, is the time.

It is my opinion, after much basic research into this matter, that the flexible, adjustable plan proposed by this legislation will provide the necessary control to stabilize the industry and solve the problems. Through the provisions of the bill it will be possible to assure a fair share of the domestic lead-zinc market to the domestic industry without disturbing international relations by the flexible, adjustable quotas.

There are only 20 States where lead and zinc mining is in operation today, but the problems I have briefly delineated are important enough to warrant the serious attention of every Member of the House of Representatives. I cannot exaggerate or overemphasize the necessity of immediate action by Congress to enact import controls in the interest of providing long-term stabilization of the lead-zinc industry at economic levels favorable to domestic producers by the flexible import quota plan presented by the gentleman from Colorado, Chairman ASPINALL.

I strongly urge passage of this legislation.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I am joining today in introduction of the Lead and Zinc Act of 1965, providing for a flexible import quota system for these two metals.

Conditions in the domestic lead and zinc markets have improved during the past year, because of a good rate of consumption, that has paced the generally satisfactory level of our economy. The domestic mining industry is finally approaching the point of recovery after a very long spell of reduced and unprofitable operation. Now is the time to consider and enact proper import controls to assure long-term stabilization of the industry at operating and economic levels favorable to domestic producers with assurance of adequate metal supplies for United States consumers.

For more than a decade the lead-zinc mining industry in the United States has been beset with serious problems and uncertainty arising from imports of these metals and ores. During this period the industry has appeared before the U.S. Tariff Commission on many occasions, each time with findings of import injury, but there still is no intelligent solution to its problems, although these problems have repeatedly been demonstrated and recognized.

A system of absolute quotas was imposed on October 1, 1958, but these quotas are not an effective instrument to meet the problems of the mining and smelting industries or of the consumers of lead and zinc in the United States. They were set too high to effectively and expeditiously correct the situation that called for their imposition in 1958, at a time when metal stocks were at extraordinarily high levels and metal prices were too low for profitable mine operation. Being of fixed quantity, they guaranteed to foreign producers a fixed quantitative participation in the U.S. market, regardless of the level of consumption, thus putting the entire burden of adjustment during low cycles of domestic consumption on the U.S. mines. Further, being of fixed quantity, they have no flexibility to meet changing levels of consumption, and under some conditions such as those prevailing today they approach the point of being too low.

The underlying conditions that caused the 1956–57 debacle have not changed and in the absence of adequate and effective import controls will continue as a threat to the stability of the U.S. mining industry. In fact, the strong trend to treatment of ores in countries of origin, with a view to selling the metal products in the United States, has widened the threat to stability of the lead-zinc smelting industry in the United States, and even to the continued existence of some segments of it.

Being aware of the deficiencies of the present quotas and the need for achieving and maintaining reasonable stability in the domestic lead-zinc industry, I have joined with Members of the Congress in seeking a means of curing these deficiencies and meeting this need. During the 88th Congress we introduced legislation for flexible quotas on lead and zinc, based on past experience with the existing quota plan.

Import quotas would be determined by the relative level of producers' metal stocks and would consider the interests of the miner, smelter, consumer, and importer.

The domestic lead-zinc industry has been held in uncertainty too long. Maintenance and development of the industry cannot proceed with confidence unless the industry can look to the future with assurance that it will not again be the victim of unwarranted invasion of the U.S. market.

Prompt adoption of flexible quota legislation in substantially the form proposed by Members of the Congress would provide this assurance and put to rest without further unwarranted delay a problem that has too long awaited solution.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SKUBITZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, I represent a congressional district that has been noted for its production of zinc and lead—so important to the growing economy of our country. Unfortunately this production has dwindled since the midfifties to a small proportion of previous annual totals as many mines were forced to close, with U.S. metal prices driven to unprofitably low levels.

These price reductions were caused by an influx of foreign imports, particularly during 1956 and 1957 that greatly exceeded our needs and our ability to assimilate in the American economy.

As a result an absolute quota plan was invoked in late 1958 but the damage had been done. Large metal stocks overhung our markets and kept U.S. prices at the unprofitable low levels, previously referred to, resulting in closure of domestic mines, not only in my district but in practically all the districts of our 20 States providing these metals.

Employment in U.S. mines was cut by 60 percent and the value of the products mined was cut in half compared to the early 1950's.

With the current change and improvement in consumption of zinc and lead, there is now a tight supply of both metals. The mines, lacking any incentive during the past 10 years to explore, develop, and mine new ore reserves, cannot cope with the rapid fluctuations in U.S. and world price changes experienced during the past decade. This reemphasizes the oft-repeated statement that "a mine is not a spigot—production cannot be turned on and off at will"—the natural factors of geologic occurrence and expensive maintenance and replacement of machinery as well as training of manpower must be considered.

At the present time the absolute quotas of 1958 appear too restrictive, but removal of these quotas would have little effect, as world market prices are higher than ours and some supplies formerly sent here by our foreign friends are going to greener pastures.

Mr. Speaker, the economics of zinc and lead mining do look better at the present time, but we know that other nations are already greatly expanding their capacity to mine zinc and lead ores and to increase smelting capacity to refine these two metals. This exceeds the reliable estimates of an increase in world consumption.

It is inevitable that a worldwide surplus of metal will again occur and this can happen within a short period of 1 to 3 years.

The flexible quota plan that I am introducing today, in a bill identical with the one introduced by the gentleman from Colorado, Chairman ASPINALL, will control imports of zinc and lead to necessary levels. This plan has been studied and approved by practically all segments of the U.S. mining and smelting industry. Their endorsement is made not on self-interest alone but with the overriding consideration that the consumer must have adequate metal supplies on a long-term basis and prices must be fair and equitable for all concerned with a minimum of fluctuation to enable long-term planning by both the producer and consumer. The flexible quota plan also provides for a fair sharing of our markets with the foreign nations producing zinc and lead and on an orderly basis. Stated another way, imports will be authorized as needed to supplement our own ability to produce; but, in addition, the plan guarantees the importer of zinc and lead a minimum quota at the level of the present allocation. As consumption increases, imports may increase.

The legislation also continues provisions to gradually change allocations from those who do not wish to participate in our markets to those countries desiring a greater share of our consumption.

In summary this is a plan that considers the needs of the miner, the smelter, and the consumer and the desires of the importer.

The present absolute quota system should be replaced by the flexible quota system for the good of our industry and our country. I urge speedy consideration and enactment of this important measure by the 89th Congress.

PREMIER SATO'S VISIT

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is now 2 years since I stated on this floor that the Communist threat in Africa came not from Russia but from Red China. Recent events have shown the growing seriousness of this threat, and upon that I shall speak at some length on a later occasion.

Today I have asked for this time to comment on this passage from a news story in the New York Times of January 14, 1965, on Premier Sato's conversations with President Johnson:

> The communique said President Johnson "emphasized the U.S. policy of firm support for the Republic of China (on Taiwan) and his grave concern that Communist China's militant policies and expansionist pressures against its neighbors endanger the peace of Asia."

Mr. Speaker, the column of William White is widely read by discriminating persons in the field of world affairs. I am certain he has spoken truly the mood of the administration and the thinking of the American people. Our interest and the interest of all the free world, including Japan, is in free China. Certainly trade with Red China, intended to bolster the economy of those intent on our destruction, is not what we would hope from a trusted ally.

It is my hope that the visit of the Japanese Prime Minister, which was so delightfully staged and so promising for the future of our two countries, will clear up any misunderstanding on the matter of trade with Red China. True allies, as true friends, must stand together. The strength of the free world in large measure is in the acceptance by all of concerted policies.

I commend President Johnson for making it clear, according to the New York Times, that our full support is with the Republic of China. Trade by our allies with Communist China could scarcely be called compatible. That, I trust, will be the message carried home to Japan by the Premier who so charmed us during his all too brief visit.

EQUITABLE AND REASONABLE DIVISION OF DEBATE ON CONFERENCE REPORTS

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a House resolution calling for amendment of rule XXVIII of the rules of the House to provide for an equitable and reasonable division of debate time on conference reports.

This House has indicated its concern for fair treatment of minorities and it can do no less than to establish fair ground rules for the conduct of its own affairs.

The proposed new paragraph to be inserted in the rule would read as follows:

> 3. When a motion to disagree to a conference report in its entirety has been made, it shall be in order, before a final vote is taken thereon, to debate the proposition to be voted upon for one-half hour to be given to debate in favor of, and one-half hour to debate in opposition to, such a proposition.

The ultimate object of the resolution, of course, is to assure the minority of an opportunity to state its case on these reports. There can be no question, moreover, that it guarantees to the majority the immense advantage of an effective opposition.

Under the rules as they now stand, conference reports are considered in the House under the 1-hour rule. The individual Member handling the report can move the previous question without yielding to the opposition, effectively gagging the minority and cutting off the possibility of constructive and effective criticism. There is no way that any minority views can be incorporated into the conference report.

I urge the adoption of the resolution, Mr. Speaker, as a matter of equity and commonsense.

THE PEOPLE ARE ENTITLED TO THE TRUTH

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, whether we are in favor of foreign aid or opposed to it, I am sure we are all agreed on one basic fact: Congress and the people are entitled to the truth as to the amount being spent and how it is distributed.

Following the President's message on foreign aid, great publicity was given by the White House and the news media leading us to believe that we would spend less on foreign aid this year than last. In fact, the President was quoted as saying his foreign aid request "is the smallest in the history of the foreign program since it was started in 1948."

What are the real facts, Mr. Speaker?

Fact No. 1 is that the President's request for foreign aid funds for fiscal 1966 is $130 million more than last year's appropriation and $380 million more than the appropriation for 1964.

Fact No. 2: He inserted in his message a separate request for an additional $750 million for aid to Latin America.

Fact No. 3: He said the amount asked for the Vietnam operation may not be enough, and he is requesting standby authorization to appropriate additional money if necessary.

Fact No. 4: There is already on hand $6.5 billion in unexpended funds, money previously appropriated by Congress, but not yet spent.

Mr. Speaker, it is not fair to the people of the United States to present budget requests in terms of juggled figures and statements which make us believe we are spending less money when the fact is we are spending more. Let the administration present to Congress legitimate budget requests, stated in plain language so we, and the people we represent, may have the opportunity to judge all proposed programs on their merits and in their true light.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE MAJORITY LEADER

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I have requested this time for the purpose of making a statement to my colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, I desire to alert my colleagues that when we adjourn today, we will meet tomorrow at 10:30 o'clock. I urge all the Members to be here promptly because the procession for Members of the House will leave in a body promptly at 10:35 a.m., so that the inaugural exercises on the platform at the east front might start precisely at 11 o'clock. There will be no opportunity for Members to join the procession after it leaves the House Chamber.

Members must display their official tickets in order to get a seat on the platform. There are no seats available for former Members on the platform. Therefore, former Members may not join the procession.

The seats to be occupied by Members of the Senate and House of Representatives have no cover. Members are urged to wear overcoats and take hats to protect themselves from the cold.

No children will be allowed upon the platform, and there will be no seats except for Members actually holding tickets for their own seats.

So, if you expect to be in the procession and get a seat on the platform, you must be in the Chamber at 10:30 a.m. tomorrow.

The procession will be headed by the Speaker pro tempore, then the chairmen of committees, and then the other Members in order of seniority.

Following the inaugural ceremonies on the east front, shuttle buses will be available at First and Independence Avenue, between 12:30 and 1:30 to take Members and their wives to the parade reviewing stands at the White House. The buses will also be available to bring Members back to the Capitol after the parade.

DISMISSAL OF CONTEST OF ELECTION OF RICHARD L. OTTINGER

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I call up a privileged resolution which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 126

Whereas James R. Frankenberry, a resident of the city of Bronxville, New York, in the Twenty-Fifth Congressional District thereof, has served notice of contest upon RICHARD L. OTTINGER, the returned Member of the House from said district, of his purpose to contest the election of said RICHARD L. OTTINGER; and

Whereas it does not appear that said James R. Frankenberry was a candidate for election to the House of Representatives from the Twenty-Fifth Congressional District of the State of New York, at the election held November 3, 1964: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives does not regard the said James R. Frankenberry as a person competent to bring a contest for a seat in the House and his notice of contest, served upon the sitting Member, RICHARD L. OTTINGER, is hereby dismissed.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this resolution is to dismiss a contest brought against the gentleman from New York [Mr. OTTINGER]. The notice of contest was given by letter dated December 19, 1964, by Mr. James R. Frankenberry, of 40 Woodland Avenue, Bronxville, N.Y. Mr. Frankenberry attempts to initiate this contest under the provisions of Revised Statutes 105 to 130, as amended, 2 United States Code 201–226 inclusive.

Mr. Speaker, the House is the exclusive judge of the election, returns, and qualifications of its Members under article 1, section 5, of the Constitution of the United States.

The application of the statutes in question is justifiable by the House and by the House alone—*In re Voorhis,* 296 Federal Report 673.

Mr. Speaker, under the law and under the precedents, Mr. Frankenberry is not a proper party to contest the election of the gentleman from New York [Mr. OTTINGER]. He is not a proper contestant within the applicable statutes, because he would not be able, if he were successful, to establish his right to a seat in the House. The contest involving Locke Miller and the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. MICHAEL KIRWAN, in 1941, is directly in point, as reported in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 87, part 1, page 101.

The proceedings in the House at that time read as follows:

"H. RES. 54

"Whereas Locke Miller, a resident of the city of Youngstown, Ohio, in the Nineteenth Congressional District thereof, has served notice of contest upon MICHAEL J. KIRWAN, the returned Member of the House from said district, of his purpose to contest the election of said MICHAEL J. KIRWAN; and

"Whereas it does not appear that said Locke Miller was a candidate for election to the House of Representatives from the Nineteenth Congressional District of the State of Ohio, at the election of November 5, 1940, but was a candidate for the Democratic nomination from said district at the primary election held in said district at which MICHAEL J. KIRWAN was chosen as the Democratic nominee: Therefore be it

"*Resolved,* That the House of Representatives does not regard the said Locke Miller as a person competent to bring a contest for a seat in the House and his notice of contest, served upon the sitting Member, MICHAEL J. KIRWAN, is hereby dismissed; and no petition or other paper relating to the subject matter contained in this resolution shall be received by the House, or entertained in any way whatever."

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. Speaker, the issue in the case brought by Locke Miller and the notice filed by Mr. Frankenberry are identical except that in the former case Locke Miller had been a candidate for the disputed office in the primary. The statutes under which this proceeding is initiated do not provide, and there is no case on record that we have been able to find to the contrary, that a person not a party to an election contest is eligible to challenge an election under these statutes.

Clearly under the precedent to which I have made reference, Mr. Frankenberry is not a contestant for a seat in the House, and his contest should be dismissed.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Goodell].

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 5]

Anderson, Tenn.
Ayres
Baring
Battin
Belcher
Blatnik
Bolling
Bolton
Bow
Burton, Utah
Cahill
Callaway
Casey
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clausen, Don H.
Collier
Corbett
Craley
Curtis
Davis, Ga.
Devine
Diggs
Dwyer
Edwards, Calif.
Ellsworth
Erlenborn
Everett
Farbstein
Fino
Fisher
Fraser
Grabowski
Gray
Grover
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Hébert
Holland
Hosmer
Hull
Ichord
Jarman
Jones, Ala.
Kelly
King, N.Y.
Kirwan
Landrum
Leggett
Lindsay
Long, La.
Long, Md.
McDowell
Macdonald
Mackay
Mailliard
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Mathias
May
Michel
Mills
Minshall
Morrison
Morton
Nelsen
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Neal, Ga.
Pirnie
Poff
Powell
Randall
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reuss
Roncalio
Roosevelt
Saylor
Shipley
Sickles
Staggers
Stalbaum
Steed
Stephens
Teague, Calif.
Thompson, La.
Thompson, Tex.
Toll
Tuck
Tupper
Van Deerlin
Watkins
Watson
Weltner
White, Idaho
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Wright
Wydler

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 334 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. Goodell] is recognized for 2 minutes.

DISMISSAL OF CONTEST OF ELECTION OF RICHARD L. OTTINGER

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, the privileged resolution before the House will in effect declare that only a candidate for the office of U.S. Representative may contest the election of a Congressman.

The gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. Cleveland] will follow me with a long series of precedents to the contrary.

This is the case where it has been alleged, and apparently reports have been made, that something close to $200,000 was spent in the campaign, a very large part of that sum by members of the family of the candidate.

I do not dispute the majority leader's statement that the House of Representatives is the exclusive judge of the qualifications of its Members, but the Corrupt Practices Act provides specifically for the taking of depositions and testimony which can be submitted to the House Committee on Administration. That procedure was being followed this morning in the New York State Supreme Court where one of our Members was subpenaed to appear and testify to these facts. But he did not appear. This resolution would in effect cover up this whole situation, and it would wipe this out before the House.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear that the election laws of this country are fast becoming a national disgrace. Certainly the House today should handle this kind of a matter in a dignified, thorough, and eminently fair manner. I would hope, therefore, that the House will defeat this resolution and that the matter will then go to the House Administration Committee for proper and deliberate action where the facts may be presented and where we may consider whether the Member should actually in this case be seated permanently.

There are many precedents with reference to the campaign contributions and excessive expenditures where the House has denied a Member a seat. Certainly, whatever our party, we must recognize in this kind of a situation that the reputation and dignity of the U.S. House of Representatives is involved. We should see to it that a full and complete hearing is held.

I ask that the Members give particular attention to the remarks of my colleague from New Hampshire [Mr. Cleveland], who will go into the details of this situation.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. Cleveland].

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, the manner in which I became interested and concerned regarding this case is set forth in some detail in the House Record at page 39. I will not restate the details of how I became interested in this matter at the present time, but I do wish to say that I have nothing personal against the gentleman from the 25th District of New York. It is simply a matter of the issues involved.

Indeed I read with interest his remarks appearing in the Record of yesterday, page 797. I am sure he is a fine person, but the issues involved in considering this resolution transcend such consideration.

The case for the resolution which has been offered by the distinguished majority leader is set forth in detail at page 795 of yesterday's Record. I do not know the gentleman who wrote this letter, Mr. H. Newlin Megill, but I respectfully submit that when he states the precedents are all his way I believe him to be incorrect.

I turn, first, to the Record for the first day of our session, page 17, and I wish to quote the distinguished majority leader who was then speaking in reference to seating the Mississippi delegation.

He said:

> Any question involving the validity of the regularity of the election of the Members in question is one which should be dealt with under the laws governing contested elections.

I agree with the majority leader, and I believe his statement at page 17 of the Record above quoted properly sets forth the law pertinent to this matter.

Let us turn to the law itself, the law that is given out to the general public, the law which was read by distinguished counsel from New York, and the law which was acted on in good faith in this present case. Here it is expressed in plain and precise language that all can understand—2 U.S.C. 201:

> Whenever any person intends to contest an election of any Member of the House of Representatives of the United States he shall—

And so forth. "Any person." It does not say a candidate only.

Let us look at the policy established by the House Committee on Administration and the special committee that handles these matters, and I quote from the Union Calendar No. 839, House Report No. 1946. This is the language of the committee of the House at page XVI:

> In order to avoid the useless expenditures of funds and the loss of time by the committee and the staff, it has been decided by the committee to conduct investigations of particular campaigns only upon receipt of a complaint in writing and under oath by any person, candidate, or political committee, containing sufficient and definite allegations of fact to establish a prima facie case requiring investigation by the committee.

Here it is specifically spelled out that it can be any person, candidate, or political committee.

I might add in connection with this same thought that this matter was referred to that committee last December, but that committee did not have time to act on this matter. In Mr. Davis of Tennessee's last report he transmitted the matter of the Ottinger contest to the Clerk of this House and respectfully asked to put before the Committee on House Administration the protests of James R. Frankenberry—see page VI.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLEVELAND. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. Is it not a fact that the gentleman has briefs from the Congressional Library which cite a series of precedents in which noncandidates have contested House seats, in which full investigations have been had by the House Committee on Administration, and that perhaps the most prominent one that comes to the mind of all of us is the case of our former colleague Brooks Hays, in which his opponent did not contest it but an individual was contesting it, and a full investigation was made by the House Committee on Administration.

Mr. CLEVELAND. The answer is yes. I have two briefs prepared by the Library of Congress. Both of these briefs will be inserted in the RECORD under my general right to include extraneous matter. I will discuss briefly these two briefs.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLEVELAND. I yield to the gentleman from New York for a question.

Mr. KEOGH. The gentleman mentioned the contest with regard to Brooks Hays. Was not that an investigation that was under a special resolution of the House Committee on Administration and not under the general law regarding the matter of elections? The answer is yes or no. Was not the Brooks Hays contest a special resolution adopted by the House, and it was not under the general laws regarding contested elections?

Mr. CLEVELAND. I will answer the gentleman's language and not yield further.

The contested election was not brought by Brooks Hays. It was brought by a gentleman from Arkansas by the name of Mr. John F. Wells. I will not yield further.

These two briefs from the Congressional Library, which will appear hereafter in the RECORD, both state that not only a defeated candidate but any person may institute such a contest under the contested-elections law.

The two briefs are as follows:

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
Washington, D.C., December 23, 1964.

[Provided at the request of Mr. CLEVELAND]

From: American Law Division.

Subject: House of Representatives Election Contest: Must a noncandidate proceed under 2 U.S.C. 201?

Section 201 of title 2 of the United States Code provides that whenever any person intends to contest an election he must give notice in writing of his intention to contest to the Member whose seat he intends to contest. The notice must specify the grounds on which he intends to rely and must be given within thirty days of the date on which the result of the election is determined. Subsequent sections require the Member to answer the notice within thirty days of service, set forth the procedures for taking testimony, and require that all testimony be taken within ninety days from the day on which the answer is served on the contestant.

Perhaps the first observation to make about these provisions of the Code is that they in no way limit the authority of the House under its constitutional power to be the judge of the elections, returns and qualifications of its own Members. The House can and frequently does ignore these statutory requirements.

Perhaps the second observation to make is that some authorities consider these statutory provisions inapplicable to challenges made against the election of a Member by anyone other than a candidate. Thus in Paine on "Elections" we read:

"A case adjudicated in the house on the protest of an elector, or other person, or on the motion of a representative. Is not an action inter partes. It is a proceeding under the constitution, and not under the statute. In that proceeding there is no contestant to serve the notice of contest prescribed by the statute; there are no parties to serve notices to take depositions, or to examine or cross-examine witnesses; no parties who have it in their power, by their acts, omissions, stipulations, admissions, waivers, or laches, to dispose of the questions and interests involved; no parties into whose hands the law intrusts the fate of the controversy. In that proceeding there is no contest, or deposition inter partes, or stipulation inter partes, in the sense of the provisions of the revised statutes. To that proceeding the provisions of the revised statutes have no applicability. Those provisions are framed clearly and distinctly for actions inter partes." (Halbert E. Paine. "A Treatise on the Law of Elections," pp. 837–838, Washington, D.C., 1888.)

Despite the logic in the observations of Paine, the language of section 201 is broad enough to embrace challenges made by any person as well as by a candidate who seeks a seat and there are precedents which indicate that the statute was intended to be interpreted broadly.

An interesting discussion on the intent of the statute took place on the floor of the House in connection with a Maryland election. Within 30 days, as required by the statute, a defeated candidate served notice on a sitting Member. Before any evidence was taken, however, the defeated candidate also petitioned the House to investigate the election on the ground that it had been carried out by fraud and violence. In his petition, he emphasized that he was not claiming the seat for himself but sought rather to have the House investigate his allegations of fraud and violence and conclude that no valid election had taken place. His petition was endorsed by several reputable citizens of the district. The petition was considered by the Committee on Elections and the majority of the committee found no reason for extraordinary action by the House and, while conceding that the House had the power to take such action despite the statute, recommended that the petitioner be required to proceed with the taking of testimony under the procedure set forth in the statute. They agreed that this was not a personal contest of an election but rather a popular remonstrance of its validity.

The minority considered that the statute was intended to apply only to a personal contest initiated by one claiming a seat and that the appropriate remedy was to give the Committee on Elections the power to send for persons and papers, etc., in order to investigate the election.

One of the most telling arguments against the minority contention that the statute was intended to apply only to one claiming a seat was made by Mr. Washburn, of Maine, immediately before he moved the previous question:

"If it [the minority contention] be right, then an individual who contests a seat has only to get some friend to send in a memorial making a contest for him, and the House must order the testimony to be taken at the expense of the Union, and to be brought here outside the law of 1851" (which is now embraced in 2 U.S.C. 201–226).

The proposition of the minority was disagreed to and the House adopted the resolution of the majority "that it is inexpedient to grant the prayer of the memorialist for the appointment of a committee to take testimony." (Debate reported in the Congressional Globe, 35th Con., 1st sess. at pp. 725–735, 745–746, Feb. 16–17, 1858.)

Since that time the House has on occasion authorized the investigation of an election by a House committee on petition of a noncandidate, most recently in connection with the election of Dale Alford to a seat from Arkansas in 1958. (See committee print, "Investigation of the Question of the Final Right of Dale Alford to a Seat in the 86th Congress Pursuant to House Resolution 1, July 28, 1959.") There are at least two additional precedents, however, which indicate that it would be unsafe for the noncandidate to rely solely on a petition to the House and suggest that he should also proceed under the provisions of the statute.

Five months after an election in South Carolina in which none of five candidates instituted a contest, the mayor of Charleston who was not a candidate filed charges with the House alleging violations of the Federal and State corrupt practices acts, in promising Federal offices and in the receipt and expenditure of large sums of money for which no accounting was made, and prayed that the charges be investigated and if substantiated that the House expel the successful candidate. The report of the committee to which the petition was referred held that the mayor had been guilty of laches in not instituting a proceeding to contest the seat. The mayor "could, and we think should, have filed a protest in the nature of a contest and within the time prescribed by the statute. Had he filed his contest within the time prescribed by the statute, a method of taking testimony would have been provided for and the sitting Member would have been given an opportunity to have known the nature and cause of the accusations, the right to answer thereto, and to examine and cross-examine the witnesses" (cited in 6 Cannon, sec. 78). The House adopted the committee's recommendation that the charges filed be dismissed.

In another case there was some question about whether a notice of contest had been served within the 30 days required by the statute. The committee held, however, that the notice had been filed in time but that it was defective because it failed to allege that the claimant was a candidate for Congress, or a voter in the district, or that he had any interest in the result of the election (6 Cannon, sec. 97).

The precedents would seem to indicate not only that a noncandidate may but will sometimes be required to follow the procedures set forth in the statute.

VINCENT A. DOYLE,
Legislative Attorney.

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
Washington, D.C., December 8, 1964.

[Provided at the request of Mr. CLEVELAND]

From: American Law Division.

Subject: Challenges to seating Members of the House of Representatives.

Reference is made to your request for material on challenging a Member-elect's right to his seat in the House. Enclosed is a copy of a memorandum of September 17, 1964, on the subject.

Additional information as requested, is as follows:

1. Copy of, "Recent Cases in Which a Member-elect of the House of Representatives Was Asked To Stand Aside Until His Contested Election Has Been Investigated," Mollie Z. Margolin, American Law Division, December 30, 1953.

2. Copy of Record of House Contested-Election Cases, 73d Congress (Mar. 9, 1933) through 85th Congress (Aug. 30, 1957).

3. Copy of Record of House Contested-Election Cases, 1951–60.

4. Copy of pages 9364–9365 of No. 81 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, August 19, 1937, listing House contested-election cases from 1907 to 1937.

5. Copy of "Cases of Congressmen Who Were Admitted to Membership While Not

Possessing Constitutional Qualifications," Legislative Reference Service, 1942.

6. Copy of Résumé of House Contested-Election Cases, 40th Congress (1867) to 51st Congress (1891), Legislative Reference Service, 1941.

In addition to the foregoing, further information includes—

(A) Instances of initiation of contested-election cases in the House by others than the contestant:

1. While there is no explicit statutory authority or rule of the House relating to the initiation of contested election cases by others than a defeated candidate, the House has long recognized this practice. In the South Carolina case of Richard S. Whaley, in the 63d Congress (1913), the House Committee on Elections, No. 1, described, in its report, the four instances in which the House could consider contested-election cases. The committee stated (Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives, vol. VI, sec. 78, p. 111):

"(a) The House may adjudicate the question of the right to seat in either of the four following cases:

"(1) In the case of a contest between the contestee and the returned Member of the House instituted in accordance with the provisions of law.

"(2) In the case of a protest or memorial filed by an elector of the district concerned.

"(3) In the case of the protest or memorial filed by any other person.

"(4) On motion of a Member of the House."

In this particular case, the protest was initiated by the mayor of Charleston, who filed charges of the violation of the Federal and State corrupt practices acts, some 5 months after the election. The committee held that since the protest had not been filed within 30 days after the determination of the result of the election as required by law (2 U.S.C. 201) the matter was not one of an election contest but of the expulsion of a Member for ineligibility.

The case was dismissed for lack of proof of the charges.

2. Nineteenth Congress, Pennsylvania case of John Sergeant, 1828 (Hinds' "Precedents of the House of Representatives," vol. I, sec. 555). A tie having resulted at the general election, a second election was held in which Sergeant was the winner. Citizens presented memorials purporting to show that Sergeant's opponent had won the first election, but the memorials were dismissed on the theory that whatever rights the parties had acquired as a result of the first election had been voluntarily relinquished. Sergeant was admitted to his seat.

3. Fourth Congress, Massachusetts case of Joseph Bradley Varnum, 1796 (Hinds', supra, vol. I, sec. 763). In February 1796, memorials were presented from sundry citizens and electors of the Second District of Massachusetts complaining of the "undue election and return" of Joseph B. Varnum and saying that the seat be declared vacant. The House, accepting a report that charges of illegal voting were unfounded, seated Varnum.

4. Twenty-sixth Congress, Pennsylvania case of *Ingersoll* v. *Naylor*, 1839 (Hinds', supra, vol. I, sec. 803). In December 1839 the House decided that as between two claimants to a seat from Pennsylvania, that Naylor should be seated. In late January 1840 a petition of citizens and electors from the Pennsylvania district was presented complaining of fraud and illegality in the election of Naylor. The House, after an investigation, accepted the report of the committee seating Naylor.

5. Twenty-eighth Congress, Massachusetts case of Osmyn Baker, 1840 (Hinds', supra, vol. I, sec. 808). In February 1840 a memorial was presented from citizens and electors of the Sixth District of Massachusetts alleging that Baker had not received a majority of the votes. The committee dismissed the case for lack of evidence.

6. First Congress, case of New Jersey Members, 1789 (Clarke and Hall, "Cases of Contested Elections," U.S. House of Representatives, 1789, 1834, p. 38). Petitions from sundry citizens of New Jersey complaining of illegality in the election of the New Jersey Members to Congress were received, as well as petitions favoring the validity of the election. It was determined that all Members were entitled to their seats.

7. Fourth Congress, Pennsylvania case of John Swanwick, 1795 (Clarke and Hall, supra, p. 112). Petitions of citizens and electors of Philadelphia were received complaining of the election of John Swanwick. The House seated Swanwick upon a failure to support the allegations contained in the petition.

8. Eighty-sixth Congress, Arkansas case of Dale Alford, 1959 (committee print, Subcommittee on Elections, Committee on House Administration, July 28, 1959, p. 3, letter of John F. Wells, of Little Rock, Ark., Dec. 3, 1958, complaining of irregularities in write-in votes and use of stickers in the election of Dale Alford). The House seated Mr. Alford on September 8, 1959 (H. Rept. 1172).

Also to be noted, is the statement by the House Committee on Elections, in the case of *Reeder* v. *Whitfield*, 34th Congress, March 5, 1856 (D. W. Bartlett, "Cases of Contested Elections in Congress," 1834–65, pp. 189–190) in which the committee referred to the power of the House to initiate election investigations on its own; "this House needs no parties in court, or names in the record, to guard its own rights and privileges; nor any extrinsic action to quicken it in the exercise of the exclusive power to judge of the election, returns, and qualifications of those who claim seats on this floor; and they may institute, and often have instituted, investigations of the rights of Members to seats, without any contestant at all. It is not only their right, but their duty, to see that no one shall occupy a seat on this floor whose title is imperfect, and to investigate of their own notion, whenever there is reasonable doubt cast upon the case."

(B) Right of Member-elect to vote prior to procedure for administering the oath.

Since the status of all Members-elect is similar at the start of a Congress, all may participate in the vote for the Speaker and before the oath is administered generally by the Speaker (see instance reported in the 16th Cong., Hinds', supra, vol. I, secs. 2 and 4, 1820).

In one instance, those who had not been sworn in with the other Members-elect, but had been asked to stand aside, were permitted to vote on the previous question in respect to a motion to refer their credentials to the Committee on Elections (Hinds', supra, vol. I, sec. 142, 41st Cong., 1869).

However, the names of Members-elect who have not been sworn in are not entered on the roll from which the yeas and nays are called for entry on the Journal (see, Hinds', supra, vol. V, sec. 6048, 59th Cong., 1906). In this situation, the Speaker distinguished between the organization of the House from the Clerk's roll, by statute (2 U.S.C. 26) wherein all Members-elect who are listed on the Clerk's roll may participate, and the state of events after organization and administration of the oath whereby the yeas and nays are called pursuant to the Constitution. In the latter case, when the House has been organized, the roll contains only the names of those who have taken the oath. Since such Members-elect are not entered on the rolls, they are not counted in the determination of a quorum (see Cannon's "Precedents of the House of Representatives," vol. VIII, sec. 3122, 63d Cong., 1913).

(C) Other rights of Members-elect before taking the oath: The House has permitted Members-elect to be appointed to committees before taking the oath (see, Hinds', supra, vol. IV, sec. 4477; sec. 4479, 59th Cong., 1905; 4489, 59th Cong., 1905; 4481, 57th Cong., 1902; 4482, 57th Cong., 1903), and they may even be appointed to chairmanships (Representative Melville Bull, of Rhode Island, as chairman of the Committee of Accounts, 57th Cong., 1902, IV Hinds', sec. 4481), but they cannot vote until sworn in (Hinds', supra, vol. IV, sec. 4477).

(D) Exclusion of Member-elect before he is given the oath: The House has determined that it can vote, by majority vote, to exclude a Member-elect, before he has taken the oath where he might have been guilty of the violation of a criminal statute, or of disloyalty, even though he might possess the constitutional qualifications (see case of Brigham H. Roberts, 56th Cong., 1899, charged with polygamy, Hinds', supra, vol. I, secs. 474–480); see also the case of B. F. Whittemore, of South Carolina, who on being reelected to the same House from which he had resigned to escape expulsion for bribery, was excluded from taking the oath and his seat (Hinds', supra, vol. I, sec. 464, 41st Cong., 1870; see also, ch. XV of Hinds', vol. I).

(E) Instances involving questioning of prima facie credentials: Although the House generally does not refrain from ordering the oath to be administered, where credentials indicate a prima facie election of a Member-elect (see attached memorandum), it has declined to admit on prima facie showing where elections and credentials appeared defective.

In the 38th Congress, in 1863, the administering of the oath was postponed in the case of three Members-elect from Louisiana (A. P. Field, Thomas Cottman, and Joshua Baker) on the ground that their credentials had been signed by a possibly specious Governor and that no pretense of an election had ever been held (Hinds', supra, vol. I, sec. 589).

In another instance, where the credentials of a Member-elect indicated that he had been elected before the resignation of his predecessor took effect, objection was made and the oath was not administered until new credentials were produced (Hinds', supra, vol. I, sec. 596, Representative Conner, of Iowa, 56th Cong., 1900).

The House, at times, has denied the oath to two persons who appeared with conflicting credentials which cast doubt on the right of either to the seat (see, Hinds', supra, vol. I, sec. 459, Georgia case of Wimpy and Christy, 40th Cong., 1868). But, where two claimants have credentials in apparently due form, the House has directed the administration of the oath to the one whom the Clerk had enrolled (Hinds', supra, vol. I, sec. 613, Oregon case of *Shiel* v. *Thayer*, 37th Cong., 1861).

Robert L. Tienken,
Legislative Attorney.

Mr. Speaker, the briefs make it clear that not only can a noncandidate contest under the contested elections law but, if he fails to do so, he does so at his peril.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLEVELAND. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GOODELL. I wonder if the gentleman from New York would, in the light of his comments, agree with them to support a resolution to have such an investigation in this case.

Mr. KEOGH. That point obviously is not relevant here.

Mr. GOODELL. It seems to me it is awfully relevant. We want to have the facts brought out.

Mr. KEOGH. The issue here is simply that the House will abide by the very clear precedents governing this kind of situation.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I have not yielded to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEOGH. The gentleman from New York asked me a question and yielded to me.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLEVELAND. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. First let me say I am very grateful for the time put in on this matter by the gentleman from New York [Mr. Goodell] and the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. Cleveland]. I think they have gone into the matter sufficiently to indicate very clearly that our election laws on the Federal level need a thorough analysis. Much time has passed since the enactment of existing legislation and it seems to me that it is very pertinent for us to update these laws to take into consideration conditions that have developed over the years in cases coming before the House such as those that have been discussed here today. I would strongly urge such action be taken by the House and by the other body during this session of the Congress.

Mr. CLEVELAND. I wish the Members to know before they vote on this resolution that the second of the aforesaid briefs provided me by the Library of Congress not only states that it is clear that the House has long recognized the practice of permitting a noncandidate to bring one of these actions under the contested elections law, but it then cites eight specific cases—eight specific cases where this was permitted.

Time will not permit me to read you all the cases cited but I will tell you this, and it is very important: One of these cases came up in a situation where a noncontestant had not proceeded under the contested elections law and he was thrown out of court, so to speak, because he had failed to proceed under this law. In other words, if you do not proceed under this law, you may be thrown out. Here was the reason behind that, and I think this will interest the Members.

I quote from my first brief on page 4:

> One of the most telling arguments against the minority contention that the statute was intended to apply only to one claiming a seat was made by Mr. Washburn of Maine immediately before he moved the previous question. I quote Mr. Washburn of Maine, "If it (that is the minority contention) be right then an individual who contests a seat has only to get some friend to send in a memorial making a contest for him and the House must order testimony to be taken at the expense of the Union, and to be brought here outside the law of 1851 (which is now embraced in 2 U.S.C. 201–226).

The rationale behind this was that under the contested election law the contestant bears the expense of the whole matter of taking depositions and gathering testimony. That is the reasoning behind it. That reasoning clearly specifies the fact that this law not only can be used by a noncontestant but it indeed must be used.

So what we are doing if we adopt this resolution is slamming the door shut for all time on this particular case. Whether this House wishes to do that is up to the House. Certainly I will respect the will of the majority but I am sure that every Member, including the Member from the 25th District, must feel that this matter should be at least be considered by a committee and that there should be full and free discussion of it. The committee might well come back with a finding that completely exonerates the gentleman in question. If, indeed, the committee should so find that is fine, but I do not think we ought to slam the door shut at this time before a committee has even had an opportunity to consider it, the parties heard and the evidence presented.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, the most important issue here is to understand just what procedures may be used and under what circumstances and by whom.

In this case, if we followed the recommendations of the gentleman from New Hampshire, we would be opening up to anybody or to any number of individuals, for valid or for spurious reasons, the right to proceed under these statutes, to contest the election of any Member of the House. These statutes place burdensome obligations on any contestee and should not be construed to open up the opportunity for just anyone to harass a Member of Congress or to impede the operations of the House.

Other remedies are available to the public generally and to Members of the House. Any individual or any group of individuals has a right to petition the Congress of the United States. Any Member of the House has a right to introduce a resolution at any time, calling for the investigation of any election. In the ordinary course of events, such a resolution would be referred to the Committee on House Administration, and thereafter to the Subcommittee on Elections, for proper investigation or hearings, as that committee or as the House might deem necessary under the circumstances.

What this statute provides—and I say it refers to the defeated candidate—is that prior to going to the House any defeated candidate may go before any court, mayor, or other official mentioned in the statute, obtain evidence, have subpenas issued, call in witnesses, and obtain documents; all this ultimately to be referred to the Clerk of the House for disposition by the House.

Further than that, to construe this statute as the gentleman from New York would have us construe it would enable a Member to be challenged by any number of individuals, one challenging on one ground and another on another, one on the ground of citizenship or residence, another on the ground of excessive campaign expenditures, and so on ad infinitum.

If the contention of the gentleman is correct, there is no limit to the number of individuals who could contest any seat in this House, if the contest were brought in due time.

I wish to quote from the statute. I have already quoted from the precedent of the Kirwan case. I say to the gentleman that it was intended that this case be limited to those who participated in the election, to one of the candidates in the election.

I will read the last section, section 226 of title 2 of the United States Code, relating to the matter of getting financial help.

This is what the section says:

> No contestee or contestant for a seat in the House of Representatives—

What does that mean—"contestant for a seat in the House of Representatives"?

> shall be paid exceeding $2,000 for expenses in election contests.

I say that the Congress never intended to give unqualified authority, pellmell, under this statute, to individuals, to good people or to bad people, to contest any Member's seat, for good reason or otherwise.

I say that this statute, which places a burden on the contested Member, is one which should be narrowly construed and which was narrowly construed in the Kirwan case.

I read from a letter of December 21, written by Mr. Frankenberry to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on House Administration:

> This is to advise that I will proceed under certain sections of the statute. Service subpenas will demand the production of all records of expenditures, checks, drafts, pledges, and so forth, insofar as gifts are concerned, as well as the nature, manner, and purpose of all expenditures relating to the Ottinger campaign.

Mr. Speaker, any Member can be required by anybody anywhere in the country, if the position of the gentleman from New Hampshire and the gentleman from New York is followed in the use of this statute, to be placed under such a burden. This statute should, I repeat, be narrowly construed, as it was narrowly construed, and as the language which I have read indicates it is to be construed. Otherwise, I repeat, any individual or group of individuals, for good reason or bad, could tie up every Member in the House of Representatives by requiring every Member to answer to subpenas, to submit evidence, to call witnesses, to examine witnesses, and whatnot. If this were allowed it would impede the legislative process and interfere with this House in the performance of its duties.

This was never intended by this statute. There is nothing within the action which we are taking today which prevents any Member, as was done in the Hays case, from filing a resolution and having it submitted to the Committee on House Administration for investigation or for hearings. There is nothing in the resolution which I have offered today which will prevent any Member of this House from doing that or which will prevent any number of electors from the 25th U.S. Congressional District or any citizens therein from petitioning the Congress to proceed with an investigation. The question here is should we give the powers conferred by this statute, to any one but a candidate for a seat in the House? Surely, we would not do that when there are other methods of proceeding under election practices, laws, and customs, such as by memorial, petition, or resolution. Certainly Mr. Frankenberry has neither under the law nor the precedents the right without previous action by this House to proceed under the statute to which the gentleman makes reference.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield me 5 minutes to answer his remarks?

Mr. ALBERT. I will yield the gentleman 2 minutes, because I want to yield to other Members.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, the remarks of the distinguished majority leader are, of course, persuasive, but the fact remains that the precedents that were cited in my brief are clearly against him. I think the membership should realize this. If a distinguished New York lawyer such as Mr. Kiendl, who advised Mr. Frankenberry on this matter, read this law as he did, and proceeded as he did, and if the Library of Congress tells me, as they have done, that to proceed under this law is to proceed as Mr. Frankenberry did, then I say to the distinguished majority leader where is this swarm of "crackpots" that he talks about plaguing us with all of these nuisance suits? Of course, the answer to that is this: He can cite none because there have been none. The purpose of this law is to safeguard the people of the United States against a situation where the defeated candidate might not either have the heart or the will or the desire to contest an election which clearly should be contested for the common good and for the cause of good government. I never would subscribe to an interpretation of this law that takes away the right of a freeborn American in a congressional district to come to Congress and proceed under our laws to question our elections, and I question whether the majority wishes to do that.

Mr. ALBERT. If the gentleman will yield to me, I am just as interested in honest elections and in proper procedures and in preserving the dignity of the House as anyone. The only question is whether citizen X should be entitled to use a statute which on its face says—and if the gentleman will read it, I think he can read it for himself——

Mr. CLEVELAND. I have read it and reread it and the statute says, "any person."

Mr. ALBERT. If the gentleman will listen to this, it says: "no contestee"——

Mr. CLEVELAND. That is the last section of the law.

Mr. ALBERT. Section 226: "or contestant for a seat in the House of Representatives shall be paid exceeding $2,000."

Mr. CLEVELAND. That is precisely correct, and the intent of that is clearly that any reimbursement will be confined either to a seated or to a defeated Member. It simply limits the amount of reimbursement of expenses to those two classes. It does not govern the first section that specifically says any person can contest an election. Actually my position is as I have said earlier the same as expressed in connection with the Mississippi case by the distinguished majority leader.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New Hampshire has expired.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON].

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished majority leader has clearly, and I think beyond reasonable doubt, stated the precedents and statutes correctly and as they have been applied historically by this House of Representatives. Now, even though we talk about the construction of the statutes in their narrow sense and the precedents which are involved, there are other fundamentals involved. Incidentally, I believe the precedents, if the gentleman from New Hampshire will observe, hold in some, if not all, cases, in which the contest was brought by a third party, that the contestant be seated instead of a Member who by this House had been permitted to take a seat temporarily.

These precedents are a little like apples and bananas. They just do not mix so you cannot tell them apart. Even though the precedents are clear and the statutes are very explicit, there is such a thing as equity. Every lawyer in this Chamber knows the old English adage that, if I may paraphrase, says that he who seeks equity must do so with clean hands. This is a unilateral action. How could this House in its collective judgment determine whether or not equity is being done when the other party to the election is not a party to this attempt at contest?

So, Mr. Speaker, as the majority leader has so ably and aptly said, anyone could bring these proceedings under prejudice, under bias, under some scheme surreptitiously—however it may be—to cause embarrassment on a duly certified Member of this body without his having opportunity of challenging actions on the other side. This is not to say that two wrongs make a right but it does say that he who demands equity must also show equity on his part.

More importantly, Mr. Speaker, should the people of the 25th District of the State of New York be denied proper representation in the Congress on this sort of allegation? It becomes a serious matter should that happen.

So I join the distinguished majority leader in this effort to clarify this matter and once and for all, so far as the House of Representatives is concerned, put it behind us.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. Certainly.

Mr. ALBERT. Reference has been made to the Hays-Alford matter. I call attention to the fact that in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 105, part 1, page 14, a resolution was adopted by the House which provided that the question of the final right of Dale Alford to his seat in the 80th Congress be referred to the Committee on House Administration, et cetera. The House can move on a resolution at any time; nobody questions that.

The gentleman undertakes to separate the section dealing with limitations of expenses of contests from other sections in the law. If I understand him correctly he thinks a contestant under that section must have been a candidate whereas in other sections he need not have been. I do not follow this argument. For instance, under title II, United States Code, section 206, we find this language:

> When any contestant or returned Member is desirous of obtaining testimony respecting a contested election—

Certainly the plain inference here, it seems to me, is that the contestant is someone who is trying to get a seat which he lost or which purportedly he lost in an election.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that what the gentleman is saying is that the brief from the Law Reference Service is completely wrong in saying that there are all these precedents for a noncandidate to contest an election. One of the most eminent counsels in New York City, and in the country, the gentleman inferentially says, was wrong in his interpretation of this law.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, may I ask whether this distinguished counsel and I am sure he is a distinguished lawyer was employed by the contestant in this case? Lawyers express opinions on both sides of legal issues. This House, not the Law Reference Service of the Library of Congress nor any individual lawyer anywhere in the country, has the responsibility of determining the qualifications of its Members and the interpretation of statutes dealing with election contests involving its Members.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield further to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. I do know that this counsel is distinguished. I do not know the terms of his employment but he was apparently employed by Mr. Frankenberry who is the contestant or the alleged contestant here.

There has apparently been $167,000 or more spent by the members of a congressional candidate's family in behalf of his candidacy. It seems to me that what the gentleman from Oklahoma is saying is that the only circumstance under which this can be investigated is by an affirmative vote by the majority of this House. There is a law with reference to contested elections designed to see to it that the American public is protected. Certainly enforcement of that law should not depend on a majority vote in the House. The law is so written to see to it that there is complete honesty and integrity in these elections.

Mr. ALBERT. The House of Representatives cannot escape the final responsibility in this matter. Under no circumstances can the House of Representatives escape its responsibility. It is our job and our duty to make the determination here.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma moves the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 245, nays 102, answered "present" 3, not voting 84, as follows:

[Roll No. 6]

YEAS—245

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, George W.
Annunzio
Ashbrook
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Bandstra
Beckworth
Bennett
Bingham
Boggs
Boland
Bonner
Brademas
Brooks
Brown, Calif.
Burke
Burleson
Burton, Calif.
Byrne, Pa.
Cabell
Callan
Cameron
Carey
Celler
Chelf
Clark
Clevenger
Cohelan
Colmer
Conyers
Cooley
Corman
Culver
Daddario
Daniels
Dawson
de la Garza
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Dorn
Dow
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Dyal
Edmondson
Edwards, Calif.
Evans, Colo.
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farnsley
Farnum
Fascell
Feighan
Fino
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Foley
Ford, William D.
Fountain
Friedel
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gallagher
Gathings
Gettys
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gilligan
Gonzalez
Grabowski
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Greigg
Grider
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Hall
Halpern
Hamilton
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Iowa
Hardy
Harris
Hathaway
Hays
Hébert
Hechler
Helstoski
Henderson
Herlong
Hicks
Holifield
Howard
Hull
Hungate
Huot
Irwin
Jacobs
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Okla.
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Keogh
King, Calif.
King, Utah
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Krebs
Lennon
Love
McCarthy
McFall
McGrath
McVicker
Machen
Mackie
Madden
Mahon
Marsh
Matsunaga
Matthews
Meeds
Miller
Minish
Mink
Moeller
Monagan
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Natcher
Nedzi
O'Brien
O'Hara, Ill.
Olson, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill, Mass.
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Poage
Pool
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Race
Redlin
Resnick
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, S.C.
Rivers, Alaska
Roberts
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Ronan
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Roush
Roybal
Satterfield
St Germain
St. Onge
Scheuer
Schisler
Schmidhauser
Scott
Secrest
Selden
Senner
Sickles
Sikes
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Va.
Stalbaum
Steed
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Sweeney
Taylor
Tenzer
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Todd
Trimble
Tunney
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Vanik
Vigorito
Vivian
Waggonner
Walker, Miss.
Walker, N. Mex.
Watts
White, Tex.
Whitener
Whitten
Williams
Willis
Wilson, Charles H.
Wolff
Yates
Young
Zablocki

NAYS—102

Adair
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, Glenn
Andrews, N. Dak.
Arends
Baldwin
Bates
Belcher
Bell
Berry
Betts
Bray
Brock
Broomfield
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burton, Utah
Byrnes, Wis.
Carter
Cederberg
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Conable
Conte
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis
Dague
Davis, Wis.
Derwinski
Dickinson
Dole
Duncan, Tenn.
Edwards, Ala.
Ellsworth
Erlenborn
Findley
Ford, Gerald R.
Frelinghuysen
Fulton, Pa.
Goodell
Griffin
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Halleck
Hansen, Idaho
Harvey, Mich.
Horton
Hutchinson
Johnson, Pa.
Keith
Kunkel
Laird
Langen
Latta
Lipscomb
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McEwen
MacGregor
Mailliard
Martin, Ala.
Mize
Moore
Morse
Mosher
Nix
O'Konski
Pelly
Quie
Quillen
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reinecke
Rhodes, Ariz.
Robison
Roudebush
Rumsfeld
Ryan
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Shriver
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Smith, N.Y.
Springer
Stafford
Stanton
Talcott
Teague, Calif.
Thomson, Wis.
Utt
Whalley
Widnall
Wilson, Bob
Wyatt
Younger

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—3

Duncan, Oreg.
Gross
Ottinger

NOT VOTING—84

Ayres
Baring
Barrett
Battin
Blatnik
Bolling
Bolton
Bow
Cahill
Callaway
Casey
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clausen, Don H.
Collier
Corbett
Craley
Davis, Ga.
Devine
Dwyer
Everett
Farbstein
Fraser
Garmatz
Gray
Griffiths
Hansen, Wash.
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Hawkins
Holland
Hosmer
Ichord
Jarman
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Kelly
King, N.Y.
Kirwan
Landrum
Leggett
Lindsay
Long, La.
Long, Md.
McDowell
McMillan
Macdonald
Mackay
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Mathias
May
Michel
Mills
Minshall
Morton
Nelsen
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Neal, Ga.
Pirnie
Poff
Powell
Randall
Reifel
Roncalio
Roosevelt
Rostenkowski
Saylor
Shipley
Staggers
Stephens
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Toll
Tuck
Tupper
Van Deerlin
Watkins
Watson
Weltner
White, Idaho
Wright
Wydler

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Holland for, with Mr. Chamberlain against.

Mr. Toll for, with Mr. Harvey of Indiana against.

Mr. Roosevelt for, with Mr. Collier against.

Mr. Garmatz for, with Mr. Martin of Nebraska against.

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey for, with Mr. Battin against.

Mr. Kirwan for, with Mr. Nelsen against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Mills with Mr. Jonas.
Mr. Barrett with Mr. Corbett.
Mr. Shipley with Mr. Ayres.
Mr. Farbstein with Mr. Cahill.
Mr. Staggers with Mrs Bolton.
Mr. Macdonald with Mr. Saylor.
Mrs. Kelly with Mrs. Dwyer.
Mr. Powell with Mr. Lindsay.
Mr. Rostenkowski with Mrs. May.
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Mathias.
Mr. Weltner with Mr. King of New Jersey.
Mr. White of Idaho with Mr. Bow.
Mrs. Hansen of Washington with Mr. Wydler.
Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Minshall.
Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Michel.
Mr. Leggett with Mr. Harsha.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Poff.
Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Pirnie.
Mr. Randall with Mr. Hosmer.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Don Clausen.
Mr. Stephens with Mr. Devine.
Mr. Ichord with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.
Mr. Gray with Mr. Tupper.
Mr. Everett with Mr. Reifel.
Mr. McDowell with Mr. Morton.
Mr. O'Hara of Michigan with Mr. Clancy.
Mr. Wright with Mr. Watkins.
Mr. Van Deerlin with Mr. Callaway.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION FOR AN ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT TO MAJORITY LEADER AND MINORITY LEADER

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 127) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 127

Resolved, That effective January 3, 1965, there shall be payable from the contingent fund of the House, until otherwise provided by law, for any Member of the House who has served as majority leader and as minority leader of the House, an additional $8,880 basic per annum for an administrative assistant.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CLOSING OF PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE HOSPITAL AT NORFOLK

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDY. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, I completely and wholeheartedly concur with the remarks of my colleague the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY].

No one can fairly object to the closing of a Federal facility for reasons of economy, if in fact, an economy is affected and if the services of the facility can be reasonably performed elsewhere.

If the Government closes the Public Health Service Hospital in Norfolk, Va., it means that the caseload presently being served by that facility will have to be transferred to other public and private hospitals in the surrounding area.

The only nearby Government facility is the Veterans' Administration at Kecoughtan which has a historic waiting list for admission of patients. Local hospitals are nearly filled to capacity. Any addition to the present caseload of these hospitals will severely tax the efficiency of these institutions and perhaps will require the construction of more private facilities.

Along this line, I think that we should also concern ourselves with the future. It is a reasonable certainty that some form of medicare will be passed during this session of the Congress. According to my information, the initial result of such legislation will amount to a more expanded and prolonged use of existing hospital facilities. This will mean that our local hospitals will have to accommodate an even larger number of patients. To close any existing hospital under these circumstances would further complicate an already complex situation.

I urge the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to reevaluate his proposal with these thoughts in mind.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, my friend from the adjoining district of Virginia has a lot of confidence. I want to express my gratitude to him for expressing that confidence.

Mr. Speaker, early this morning I received a telephone call from one of the newspapers in my district asking me for information about the closing of the Public Health Service hospital in my district in Norfolk. It was a complete surprise to me, as I had not heard anything about it at all. So, I was trying to find out something about this proposal and about 10 minutes before noon a gentleman from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare came to my office and presented me with these documents which I hold in my hand.

The opening sentence in this letter of transmittal reads as follows:

> Confirming the conversation between my representative and your office today, I am writing to inform you that we plan to close the U.S. Public Health Service hospital in Norfolk.

I suggested to the gentleman that maybe he would like to explain that and I asked him what conversation he referred to. And he said the conversation you and I are going to have now. Mr. Speaker, this is a new wrinkle. I am sure that we are now getting some really efficient people in some of our agencies, but I did not know that they had reached the point where they could anticipate the holding of a conversation with me and refer to it by letter as though it actually had taken place.

Mr. Speaker, I am very much disturbed about this. I am also disturbed about another thing that appeared in this letter of transmittal. A typical technique, which to me seems questionable, is exemplified in this sentence which reads:

> The plan is designed to improve services by providing more comprehensive care to Public Health Service beneficiaries.

Mr. Speaker, this I really cannot comprehend. I would like to know how you are going to improve the service to beneficiaries by closing the hospitals that serve them. And, Mr. Speaker, there is another sentence in this letter that is very interesting to me. It says:

> The conclusion to close the hospital was reached after a series of careful studies of the Public Health Service general hospital system.

It does not say by whom, but since the document refers to the VA, and to the Defense Department facilities, I had assumed they would know something about it. Up to this moment I have not been able to find anybody that knew anything about it. Perhaps this sentence in the letter gives us a clue. It says:

> It is part of the overall plan for the hospitals which is reflected in the President's budget for fiscal year 1966.

Clearly, this is an action of the Bureau of the Budget. And, Mr. Speaker, there is a provision in here which says:

> An average daily patient load of 26 active-duty uniformed service personnel would be cared for at the Portsmouth Naval Hospital.

I have talked to the commanding officer of that hospital and he said, of course, that he can absorb 26 uniformed personnel, which would be Coast Guard or Coast and Geodetic Survey personnel. But you and I know that every one he takes in will reduce the capacity for emergency treatment. Every one he takes in will reduce our mobilization reserve capacity. Then there is another statement that—

> An average daily load of 56 American seamen and 1 veteran originating in the Norfolk area would be cared for at a nearby VA hospital.

The only VA hospital we have is in the district of the gentleman from Newport News [Mr. DOWNING]. I have checked with the manager of that hospital this morning, and that hospital already has 25 more patients than their capacity.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to merchant seamen and Coast Guard personnel, the Public Health Service hospital serves a number of other categories. I am especially concerned about another group—retired uniformed personnel and their dependents. Last year a subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services made an extensive study with respect to policy regarding construction of hospital facilities by the Department of Defense and the obligation to retired uniformed personnel and to the dependents of such retired personnel. There is much that needs to be done in this area. A paragraph in the general release of HEW has this to say:

> All beneficiaries now receiving care in Public Health Service hospitals will continue to receive treatment under the new plan with one exception, retired uniformed personnel and their dependents. This group is now eligible for care financed by Federal funds only if beds are available and are not needed for other patients. Under longstanding policies, plans for expansion of facilities make no specific provision for this group and these plans may act to limit the availability of care for them. However, to the extent that beds may be available either in PHS hospitals or those of other uniformed services, they will continue to receive care.

Mr. Speaker, this flies in the face of the report issued by the Armed Services Committee last year, and the announcement, in effect, says that future retirees and their dependents will very likely have to provide needed hospital care themselves through the civilian community.

I call particular attention to the statement "under longstanding policies, plans for expansion of facilities make no specific provision for this group." It may be that we shall have to revise this policy somewhat if, in fact, it is one of long standing. However, it was the subcommittee's finding that these policies were instituted as a result of a Bureau of the Budget inspired study in 1962 which recommended a policy of not including any beds for retirees and their dependents in new hospital construction.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot help but feel that this announcement of closing of Public Health facilties was made without adequate study of the needs of the persons who are now served by these hospitals.

In testimony before the subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee last year, the Chief of Medical Services of the Public Health Service stated:

> Since the Medicare Act became effective in 1956, the division of hospitals has served in all its inpatient and outpatient facilities, active duty, dependents, and retired personnel of the military services on a cross-servicing basis. It also has responsibility for medicare activities for uniformed service personnel of the Public Health Service, Coast Guard, and Coast and Geodetic Survey.
>
> Cross-servicing in the division of hospitals since medicare has been valuable both to the Public Health Service and to its beneficiaries. It has provided comprehensive inpatient and outpatient medical care to beneficaries at locations convenient to them. The presence of pediatric and female patients in this group has changed the division of hospitals' clientle from a predominantly middle-aged male population to one which includes both sexes and all ages. This has been of particular benefit to our training programs for interns, residents, and other health personnel.
>
> In terms of cross-servicing workload, in fiscal year 1963 approximately 9,600 or 18.3 percent of the admissions to all hospitals of the division of hospitals were beneficaries of the military services; that is, active duty, dependents, and retirees. This same group constituted an average daily patient load (ADPL) of 322 or 6.9 percent of our total ADPL.

Of course, I am concerned with achieving governmental efficiency and I believe my record of performance in the Congress attests to my efforts in this direction. I do not, however, believe in false economy and I think this entire decision should be reviewed very carefully before these hospitals are permitted to be closed.

APPORTIONMENT OF STATE LEGISLATIVE DISTRICTS

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include the text of an article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Supreme Court has wrongfully usurped the right to decide how State legislative districts are to be apportioned.

Yesterday, I introduced a resolution calling for a constitutional amendment to reassert and reestablish this vital and fundamental principle of States rights.

The ruling of the Supreme Court last June requiring that both houses of State legislatures be apportioned solely on the basis of population wrongfully usurped a right from the people.

The Illinois Legislature has this month begun a remap of State senate districts not because the people of Illinois think it should be done, but because the U.S. Supreme Court has so ruled.

Clearly this development will shift still more power over Illinois State government to Chicago machine politics and therefore harm downstate Illinois interests.

The hour is late. Remap of legislatures is underway in many States. I have introduced a new resolution, and several other Congressmen have joined me in it. We hope the force of numbers will result in new hearings, and hopefully affirmative action. If the Congress should adopt my resolution, or one similar to it, I am confident it would be quickly approved by the necessary three-fourths of State legislatures.

The people are the sovereign power in our form of government. My resolution would establish and clarify the right of the people to decide whether they wish to follow the system always used by the Federal Government, in having one house of the legislature of their State apportioned on the basis of factors other than population.

I present here the text of a valuable study of the reapportionment battle prepared by Mr. Claude W. Gifford, associate editor of Farm Journal magazine:

THE STORY BEHIND THE REAPPORTIONMENT BATTLE

(By Claude W. Gifford)

There are a number of interesting, urgent matters that you and I could talk about on this occasion. Matters of extreme consequence and importance to us as farmers, as rural people, and as citizens.

We could talk about the need for us, as rural people, to recognize that we are a minority now in this maturing Nation * * * about the necessity for a program to keep rural residents from being oppressed by an uninformed majority * * * about things that we could, and should, do about that.

We could talk about the increasing tendency for the powers of government to become centralized and concentrated in the Federal complex in Washington, D.C.

We could talk about the failure of State governments to live up to the challenge of the day—with the unfortunate result that they are becoming weaker in spirit, in accomplishment, in purpose, and in reputation.

We could talk about the decline in the power of the Congress of the United States, partly because it is surrendering to the executive and judiciary branches, and partly because we are not always electing the kind of men to Congress who will see that the legislative branch is kept strong.

We could talk about the increased meddling of the Office of the Secretary of Agriculture in the affairs of farmers—particularly in the citizenship area of making farm policies.

We could talk about how radio and television—and the national political parties—have made the office of the President of the United States a far more powerful position than the framers of the Constitution ever intended.

We could talk about the fact that the Federal Government has usurped much of the tax revenue of the Nation, and has so taxed the people that local sources are hard put to find the money to carry out their all-important local governmental functions, with the result that the Nation sits with open palms directed toward Washington, D.C., which controls more and more government functions because it has reached over the heads of State and local governments and tapped the well which is the source of funds for governmental activity.

We could talk about the organized, full-scale efforts of some groups to make the Federal Government into a cradle-to-the-grave welfare agency whose purpose is not so much to govern lightly and well, but to give, and give heavily.

We could talk about the conscious effort to harness farmers perpetually with direct payments, controls, and dependence on political processes for markets—out of which it is hoped to crush farmers' historic independence and make them hopelessly reliant on political majorities.

Instead of these, however, let us talk about something that is far more serious, with consequences much more drastic, direct, and imminent, and something which worsens each of the problems we have mentioned. It is the 6-to-3 decision of the Supreme Court on June 15, 1964, which directed more than 40 States to overhaul their State legislatures, and tear up their State constitutions so that districts in both the upper and lower houses of their State legislatures will have substantially the same number of voters.

The six majority members of the Court held that the Constitution demands that population alone be considered in making up State senatorial districts and that each State senator must represent as close to the same number of people as practical.

We know it as the reapportionment problem—something which has caused its share of consternation in the State of Iowa.

The crux of the matter is that States have apportioned their upper houses since 1776—11 years before the National Constitution was written—on factors supplementing population alone; such as along county or other geographical, historical or political lines. The Colonies were doing it from 1700—87 years before we had a National Constitution.

Many of the Nation's citizens do not begin to appreciate fully the sweeping consequences of this June 15, 6-to-3 Supreme Court decision. This is so often true of any situation of great historical importance.

Let's tell a historical story, which will get us to where we now are in our reapportionment problem.

The story really starts on May 24, 1607, when three small ships bobbed up the river at Jamestown, Va., and planted 105 men and women on land. Thirteen years later in 1620 slightly more than 100 men and women landed in New England at Plymouth Rock after 64 cramped days on the *Mayflower*. Thus was the beginning of our Government—both in form and in philosophy.

The Virginia Colony was a trading company of 105 adventurers looking for fortune and new opportunities.

The Pilgrims of the Massachusetts Colony were a religious minority of 100 who had been persecuted in England because they didn't worship the way the majority thought they should. They had been so put upon for their beliefs that they left England to escape the oppression and had gone to Holland where a trading company raised money to send them to the new land in America. The investors put up money, the Pilgrims put up themselves, and after 7 years in America the backers and the Pilgrims were to divide the capital and profits equally.

The Pilgrims, before sailing, tried to get a charter from King James of England, giving their expedition official approval. He refused, but he was glad to get rid of these restless political agitators, and said that he wouldn't bother them if they behaved themselves. So they got a settling permit from the Virginia company and set out, only to land far north of their mark in New England. Being under no auspices there, they got together in the cabin of the *Mayflower* and formed a local government called the Mayflower Compact. Forty-one men signed the self-governing pact and elected John Carver their first Governor.

Massachusetts set up an almost independent State and got a taste of freedom and self-government. It wasn't until much later that they had to submit to the Crown.

In Virginia, the members of the trading company, operating with a charter, also formed a set of rules—a government. They made the laws to govern themselves in this New World.

Following this, all kinds of men and women came to America. Adventurers seeking new opportunities. Minorities seeking freedom from government oppression. Peace-loving men fleeing military conscription. Rebels fleeing their enemies. Debtors. Farmers. Religious enthusiasts.

You didn't leave everything behind and cross raging seas in a teacup of a ship without courage, daring, a burning desire to be free, and deep belief in Providence, and without being driven by an inner, compelling force. Many who came, came with a belly full of despotism and oppression. They were willing to sell their services for years to pay passage in order to find freedom.

A spirit of freedom and self-reliance grew as men fought the frontier together in a life-and-death struggle far from national governments. Your religion was your own business. What you had been didn't count—only how good a pioneer you were. And these men got practice in running their own affairs. They got used to being free. Men had value.

The genius of the developing American Government was that it started from small trading corporations which established the separate colonies. These people started out—not to make a new nation from political theories, but to make commercial ventures work in a completely new and difficult environment. These men came to America free of laws, but the first thing they did was make their own to govern a small group and improvise and test new governmental forms as the group grew larger.

The first instruments of government were charters from the mother country; much as the Rhode Island patent which said, in effect, to the trading company: You who are members make whatever rules the majority can abide by. First, the members of the trading companies met regularly and made the laws. Then as more people came, it was often inconvenient and awkward for all to meet—so, as in Massachusetts, they provided that when they couldn't all get together they could elect delegates to make the laws. They were to be guided by these laws made from time to time, they said, and when there were no laws they were to be guided by the word of God.

The Maryland Charter for the first time, in 1632, gave the lawmaking power directly to the people of the colony by electing delegates, if they chose.

From Massachusetts people migrated to an area around Hartford, Conn. There these people fashioned the first constitution made solely on American soil without any outside interference—without even a charter. It provided for a regular assembly of delegates to represent the people. The assembly counseled wtih the Governor and his council. The Governor's council, here and elsewhere, was the forerunner of the upper house, or senate. This became the basic form of government all through the colonial period.

What had started out as charters for members of trading companies became constitutions for the people.

In 1669 the Carolina constitution provided for two houses—an upper and lower house.

The Concessions of West Jersey followed in 1677, providing for trial by jury; the New Hampshire Royal Commission followed in 1680.

Two years later, in 1682, William Penn set up his Pennsylvania government, with a constitution, the second made in America with no outside influence. It said that governments were of divine origin. Governments, said Penn, depend on men rather than men on governments. The great end, he said, is to "secure the people from the abuse of power * * * any government is free to the people under it where the laws rule and the people are a party to those laws, and more than this is tyranny, oligarchy and confusion." And this was 94 years before the Declaration of Independence, and 105 years before our National Constitution was written.

Already established at this time were the Colonies of Virginia (1607), New York (1614), Massachusetts (1620), New Hampshire (1623), Maryland (1634), Rhode Island (1636), Delaware (1638), North Carolina (1650), New Jersey (1664), South Carolina (1670). The only 1 of the 13 Colonies not yet established was Georgia (1733).

But it was only 2 years before Charles II became convinced that the colonies had become so independent that they required overhauling; Massachusetts, most of all. So he annulled the Massachusetts Charter on June 18, 1684, and for 7 years Massachusetts chaffed under direct royal rule. Then Mary and William granted Massachusetts a charter again in 1691, providing a Governor appointed by the Crown, but the people could elect a general assembly which was to select 28 members of a second house to represent the 28 different provinces of Massachusetts. And the selection of this second house became the direct forerunner of the practice of selecting State senators to represent geographical areas. This was almost 100 years before we adopted our National Constitution.

By 1700 the American people had generally made the colonial senate an upper house with its members representing districts. And this was 87 years before the National Constitution was formed.

The period of 1700 to 1775 was one of colonial legislative experience and abuses. Governors were appointed by the Crown, and the Governors could dissolve the legislature at will, keeping them from meeting until ready to agree to their demands. You could be jailed for treason for speaking against the government. Your house could be searched without a warrant; you could be seized without protection of law, and not always with advantage of a trial by jury. Your property could be confiscated. You could be taxed without representation.

People learned that strong central governments, and majorities, could be most oppressive—in America, as they had been in Europe.

The Colonies, it was thought in Europe, existed for the benefit of the mother country. And the British Parliament, seeing the rising economic possibilities in the Colonies, began to make laws for a country they had ceased to understand—and for a people who had grown more and more to depend on themselves and their own local government. To the people on the frontier, the English King was far away. What could the King do for them in their struggle with the wilderness?

The Colonies saw the Stamp Act of 1765 as the final straw, tyranny from the outside. If England could do this without their consent, she could, and would, do more. The Colonies yelled so loudly that the Stamp Act was repealed. But in the protesting, they yelled about such things as liberty, as one Patrick Henry did in Virginia when he shouted the bold words "give me liberty or give me death," which rang in the hearts and minds of freedom-seeking men the length and breadth of the Colonies.

This wasn't theory of government. The pioneers had liberty, had tasted it, had lived it, and they intended to keep it.

Lord North, English Prime Minister, pompously announced that "America must fear you before she can love you." Let's show the Colonies that we can tax them by putting a tax on tea. It won't be much, but it will be something, and it will establish the principle that we can tax them.

So the two principles met head on. The English principle that she'd show the Colonies that they could be taxed, even without the representation they shouted about. The colonists' principle that if we let them do even this, we can expect more, so let's not pay the tax, even on tea. America had broken away from England, both politically and spiritually.

The tea came, with the tax. And a band of men from Boston met it in the harbor on December 16, 1773, and dumped it overboard. Little did they suspect the historical importance of what they were doing.

The English felt that they couldn't back down; the colonists knew they wouldn't. The English closed the port of Boston, and once again annulled the charter of those independent, rabble rousers from Massachusetts.

The colonists responded by calling a Continental Congress in Philadelphia the following September 1774. And on the next April 19, 1775, in Lexington, Mass., a small farm town, British regulars from Boston came to confiscate the munitions of farmer Minute Men.

"Disperse, you rebels," shouted the British captain.

The American captain responded to his men: "Don't fire unless fired upon—but if they want a war, let it begin here." Shots rang out. The Revolution began.

It was a war over what kind of government the Colonies were to have; over what kind of freedom men should have.

The call went out for the 13 Colonies to form State constitutions in keeping with the move for freedom and independent government. They did. The first was New Hampshire's on January 5, 1776. It provided for two houses in the State legislature—the upper house to consist of 1 person from each of 12 counties. It was a senate based on area apportionment. One house was to be a check on the other.

Next was the South Carolina constitution on March 26, 1776—two houses in its State legislature. The chief executive was called "President and Commander in Chief"—the first that this had appeared.

On June 7, Richard Henry Lee, of Virginia, rose in the Continental Congress and moved that "these United Colonies are and of right ought to be free and independent States."

Meantime, on June 29, 1776, Virginia completed her constitution. Two houses; one a senate which represented districts larger than counties. (This was the first time the word "Senate" was actually used to describe the upper house—but 11 years later at the time of the Constitutional Convention all but New Jersey and Delaware called it the senate.) Laws must pass both houses. The Virginia bill of rights was to make up the opening paragraph of the Declaration of Independence 5 days later. And the Virginia constitution made it clear that legislative, executive, and judiciary should be separate and no person should ever exercise two of the functions. They had seen the European despotism where one man was legislator, executive, and the judiciary all in one. And they had seen the oppression in the Colonies when these three functions of government were not clearly separated, one from another.

New York was next with a constitution on July 3, 1776—two houses; the lower house to originate all money bills, a principle which was to be copied 11 years later by the National Constitution.

On July 4th the Declaration of Independence was signed, announcing to the world the birth of a new nation. It set down the principle that governments derive their powers from the consent of the governed. "Governments are instituted among men," it said, "deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed * * * Prudence, indeed, will dictate that Governments long established should not be changed for light and transient causes."

The Delaware constitution came then on September 21, providing for the first method of amending a State constitution, to be done by the assembly.

Pennsylvania came next on September 28, providing for amendments to the constitution to be made by a vote of the people. Constitutions, the foundations of free governments, were to be made and changed by the people.

Pennsylvania provided for only one house in the State legislature, but it soon had more than enough of the recklessness of one body, unchecked, and set up two houses, one to be a check on the other.

Maryland was next on November 11, 1776. Her constitution carried an advanced bill of rights, copied later, and in many instances word for word, by the Bill of Rights of the National Constitution: Freedom of speech, trial by jury, right to petition, right of search, quartering troops. And senators were to be chosen by counties.

Then came the constitutions of North Carolina and Georgia; then New York on April 20, 1777, providing for a Governor's veto over legislative acts, but which could be overruled by two-thirds of the house and senate. The branches of government not only would be divided, one would be a check on the other. This is to be copied by the National Constitution 10 years later. They were well aware of the King's vetoes, where he had as many as 5 years to negate legislative acts, and then could do it absolutely.

Next came the constitutions of Vermont, South Carolina, Massachusetts, New Hampshire with a second constitution in 1784, Vermont with a second in 1786.

These constitutions were not copied from a foreign source; they were not the result of theories of government; they were the products of legislative practice, following nearly 200 years of colonial experience.

In the early colonial governments, the legislature checked on the Governor; but in 1776 the legislative lawmaking power became the foundation of representative government.

And fundamental was an upper house, a senate, representing geographic districts within the States—two houses to provide a check against each other.

(Anyone can check the development of the senate body. It started in Virginia in 1611, followed through the Massachusetts charter in 1629; the Fundamental Orders of Connecticut in 1638; in the Connecticut charter of 1662; in the Rhode Island charter of 1663; in the Concessions of East Jersey in 1665; in Locke's Carolina constitution of 1669; in the 1674 amendments to the Concessions of East Jersey; in the commission for New Hampshire in 1680; in the Pennsylvania Frame of 1696; in the Pennsylvania charter of 1701; in the Georgia charter of 1732; in the New Hampshire constitution of 1776; in the South Carolina constitution of 1776; Virginia constitution of 1776; New Jersey constitution of 1776; Delaware constitution of 1776; Maryland constitution, 1776; North Carolina constitution, 1776; Georgia constitution, 1777; New York constitution, 1777; Massachusetts constitution, 1778; South Carolina constitution, 1778; New Hampshire constitution, 1778; Massachusetts constitution of 1780; New Hampshire constitution of 1784; Randolph's plan for a national constitution in 1787; Pinckney's plan of 1787; and the National Constitution, 1787.)

While the State constitution making was going on, a revolution was raging. It was 7 years from the shots at Lexington until Cornwallis surrendered at Yorktown, Va., on October 19, 1781.

The new Nation staggered under debt. Its credit nil; its money not worth a continental.

There followed 6 years of Confederation of the 13 States: Loose government, bickering, State rivalries, import duties against each other, reprisals and retaliation, jealousies, riots in Pennsylvania and in New Hampshire. The Government grew weaker and by 1784 four States were absent from the Continental Congress; three withdrew in disgust; and the rest went home.

Then Noah Webster suggested that the Government act directly on the people instead of primarily on the States, and that the Government be modeled after the States.

The need for action was brought to a head with Shay's Rebellion in western Massachusetts in January, 1787. A call went out for a national Constitutional Convention to try to regulate commerce between the States and iron out the governmental problems of the new Nation. They came thinking that Noah Webster's idea had much merit, though he was never to get real credit for it.

Fifty-five came to the Constitutional Convention in the Nation's largest city of 30,000 inhabitants, Philadelphia, on May 25, 1787. They included Washington, Franklin, Madison, Hamilton, Randolph, Mason, and Dickinson.

The average age was 42. They were men tried by war and revolution. More than half, 29, were college graduates; 10 from Princeton. Fifteen owned slaves; 4 were under 30; Franklin, 81, the 10th son of a Boston soapmaker and who had left school at 10, but perhaps the most learned of the group, was so feeble that he asked others to read his notes to the Convention. George Washington had to borrow $500 to make the trip.

Jefferson was in France on a diplomatic mission; fiery Patriot Patrick Henry "smelled a rat" and refused to come.

For 4 hot months and 1,840 speeches the Convention made its history.

Through the Convention ran the conviction that the executive, legislative, and judiciary should by all means be independent. And there was a strong feeling against giving the Executive too much power.

Franklin reminded them that in a republic the people are the rulers, the officers are the servants.

The Convention sat continuously from May 25 to July 27 without a recess. The proceedings were secret, lest the people become alarmed about the many propositions they considered. But fortunately, a few of the delegates kept excellent notes, Madison most of all. The official transcript of the secretary was much less complete and revealing.

The delegates worked hard; debated; heard and voted down countless proposals; gave tentative approval to several.

One of the arguments was over representation in the upper House, or Senate. It was Franklin, from one of the largest States, with 400,000 population—10 times that of Delaware—who proposed on the convention floor "that the legislators of the several States shall choose and send an equal number of delegates who are to compose the second branch of the General Legislature."

On July 27 the Convention adjourned for 10 days while a committee of five could work out compromises and clear up wording. While Rutledge, of South Carolina, Gorham, of Massachusetts, Ellsworth, of Connecticut, Wilson, of Pennsylvania, and Randolph, of Virginia, labored over the 22 resolutions passed up to that time, Washington journeyed out 25 miles to Valley Forge to fish for trout. In his diary he scarcely mentioned how Valley Forge looked, 10 days after his encampment there, but he wrote at length about talking with some farmers along the way about methods of raising buckwheat.

In those 10 days the committee of detail made a basic constitution out of the summer's work which was completed and polished by a committee on style, and passed and signed on September 17, 1787. But was it that—only a summer's work by an inspired group of men? Gladstone wrote: "The American Constitution is the most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man." But it was more. It was the product of an evolutionary process that stretched across nearly 200 years of living experience on American soil. Very few things—and those minor—appeared in this Constitution that hadn't already appeared in 1 or more of the 13 State constitutions.

It wasn't a government of theory. It wasn't exactly what Franklin wanted; nor Hamilton; nor Randolph; nor Jefferson; nor Gouverneur Morris, who spoke more often than any other of the 55 men; nor a constitution of George Washington, the Convention chairman, who made only one speech from the Convention floor. But it was the best of these men and their experiences.

It was a government of practice. We had actually had more experience at the time in constitution making than any other people in the world. We had had as many years experience in making governments on American soil prior to 1787 as we have had since.

The Constitution arose from the evolving practice in 29 colonial charters and constitutions, 17 revolutionary constitutions, and 23 plans of union—in all, 69 different forms of government in actual or contemplated operation.

That is why the framers of the Constitution constructed a form of government unequaled in its genius, before or since.

They made a government with a division of powers. The legislative, executive, and judiciary were to be distinctly separate from each other. They were to be a check on each other to prevent a concentration of power.

Congress would make all the laws. All money bills were to originate in the lower House, whose delegates were to represent equal numbers of people. The Senate would "advise and consent" with the Executive on a variety of things; its Members to represent the historical, social, economic, and geographical entities—the States, two Senators to each one. Both Houses must pass on all laws—one being a check upon the other.

The Executive would carry out and apply all laws. He must sign all congressionally approved bills within 10 days or they would become law anyway; but he could veto legislative acts. A check on the legislature. But the Congress could pass laws over his veto by a two-thirds majority vote. A check on the Executive.

However, the Supreme Court was to serve as a brake on hasty legislation. If the Court declared a law unconstitutional, only the people could do anything about that. The people could, however, start a slow process of constitutional amendment to override Court decisions. The Convention delegates were well aware that courts needed a check—that King Charles I, of England, had gotten the judiciary to support the divine right of kings, just as Louis XVI did a century and a half later in France.

Basic then, was that all power was to flow from the people. The people were to make the Constitution, elect the Executive and the Legislature. Laws were to conform to the Constitution. And only the people could change the Constitution.

The power that the people were to give to the Federal Government was to be explicit, spelled out. Anything not spelled out for the Federal Government was to remain with the States. A check of the States on the Federal Government. The Bill of Rights ends with the statement: "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

It was a government of checks and balances; a government with an intentional, built-in slowness to change; the people to have all power, spelling out what they would permit the Federal Government to do, reserving the rest of their governmental functions and expressions to their own States and local governments.

And to prevent unnatural forms of governments from arising through the States to devour the Union, article IV declares that "The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a Republican form of Government."

It was a government that echoed the years: "Governments are of divine origin." "The great end is to secure people from the abuse of power." "Governments depend on men rather than men on governments." "The people are the rulers, the officers are the servants." "Governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed." "Prudence, indeed, will dictate that governments long established should not be changed for light and transient causes."

And it is with this background that we address ourselves to the June 15, 1964, 6-to-3 decision of the Supreme Court on apportionment of State senators.

Briefly, the six majority members of the Supreme Court said last June 15:

1. That seats in both houses of State legislatures must be apportioned solely on a population basis, and that the population in each district of the upper house, as well as in the lower house, must be as nearly equal as possible.

2. That political equality can mean only one thing: "One person, one vote." And that one political district being larger than another political district is "counter to our fundamental ideas of democratic government." And "legislators represent people, not trees or acres * * * people, not land or trees or pastures, vote * * * citizens, not history or economic interests, cast votes."

3. That the vote of a citizen in a district with larger population is debased inasmuch as his vote counts for less; that he is, therefore, less of a citizen; and, as such, he is denied equal protection of the law under the 14th amendment. The first section of the 14th amendment declares that no State shall "deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws."

4. That the Federal system of apportioning Senators by geographical area (two to a State) is not a sound example for State legislatures to copy because the Federal system grew out of unique historical circumstances and was conceived out of compromise between 13 large and small, independent, sovereign States. They said: "The Founding Fathers clearly had no intention of establishing a pattern or model for the apportionment of seats in State legislatures when the system of representation in the Federal Congress was adopted." They quote Thomas Jefferson as writing in 1816 that "a government is republican in proportion as every member composing it has equal voice in the direction of its concerns * * * by representatives chosen by himself." And in 1819: "Equal representation is so fundamental a principle in a true republic that no prejudice can justify its violation because the prejudices themselves cannot be justified."

The Court, therefore, ruled 6 to 3, that six States (Alabama, Colorado, Delaware, Maryland, New York, and Virginia) whose apportionment cases were before the Court on June 15, must reapportion both houses of their State legislatures on a population basis, and that alone. The following week the Court, in another series of decisions, nullified the legislatures of an additional nine States (Michigan, Washington, Oklahoma, Illinois, Idaho, Connecticut, Florida, Ohio, and Iowa). But the basic decision applies to more than 40 States which apportion districts in one or both houses of their State legislatures partly on population and partly along historical, economic, geographic, or county lines.

The June 15 decision was an astonishing departure from previous Court opinions dating from the 1800's. These previous Courts held that apportionment of State legislatures is a political question reserved for the States, and that the Supreme Court does not have jurisdiction in such cases.

Justice Harlan, in a vigorous dissenting opinion on June 15, said: "It is difficult to imagine a more intolerable and inappropriate interference by the judiciary with the independent legislatures of the States."

Of course, trees and acres, and economic interests don't vote, Justice Harlan acknowledged, "But it is surely equally obvious, and, in the context of elections, more meaningful to note that people are not ciphers, and that legislators can represent their electors only by speaking for their interests—economic, social, political—many of which do reflect the place where the electors live."

The aftermath of the decision of the majority, said Justice Harlan, "will have been achieved at the cost of a radical alteration in the relationship between the States and the Federal Government. (The Court) does not serve its high purpose when it exceeds its authority. * * * For when, in the name of constitutional interpretations the Court adds something to the Constitution that was deliberately excluded from it, the Court in reality substitutes its view of what should be so for the amending process * * * it has strayed from the appropriate bounds of its authority * * * what is done today deepens my conviction that judicial entry into this realm is profoundly ill-advised and constitutionally impermissible."

Justice Stewart joined Harlan in the dissent. "The Court's answer is a blunt one, and, I think, woefully wrong," said Justice Stewart. The majority holds that "the fundamental principle of representative government in this country is one of equal representation for equal numbers of people * * * I think this is not correct, simply as a matter of fact."

Justice Stewart quoted ex-Justice Frankfurter on an earlier case who said that this (equal representation) "was not the colonial system, it was not the system chosen for the National Government by the Constitution, it was not the system exclusively or even predominantly practiced by the States at the time of adoption of the 14th amendment, it is not predominantly practiced by the States today."

"To put the matter plainly," said Stewart, "there is nothing in all the history of this Court's decisions which supports this constitutional rule * * * (it) finds no support in the words of the Constitution, in any prior decision of this Court, or in the 175-year history of our Federal Union.

"Uncritical, simplistic, and heavyhanded application of sixth-grade arithmetic," summed up Justice Stewart "if geographical residence is irrelevant, as the Court suggests, and the goal is solely that of equally 'weighted' votes, I do not understand why the Court's constitutional rule does not require the abolition of districts and the holding of all elections at large."

To summarize, in our own words, and in less legal terms, we can see that the Supreme Court majority of six is claiming that the Court, not the people, has jurisdiction over how State legislatures will be set up. The Court declared a new Colorado apportionment plan invalid, even though the people in a 1962 statewide referendum had approved it in every county of the State. Colorado had rejected an alternative plan to place both houses on a straight population basis.

By this action, the majority Court declared that they, six men, can amend the Constitution—not only of the United States, but of the 50 States as well. The framers of the Constitution were careful to give this amending power to the people alone.

If in the Constitutional Convention of 1787 a plan had been proposed before Madison, Morris, Randolph, Hamilton, and the others that the Supreme Court should have jurisdiction over the makeup of State legislatures, it would have gotten nowhere.

If in 1787 these present-day majority six had proposed that the Supreme Court be given the power to amend the Constitution, they would have been run out of Franklin's town for proposing a centralization of power in one branch of the legislature—something that would have raised the hair on the necks of people that had been bowed before strong central government for generations. They who had just fought a war over the issue of a strong, despotic General Government that imposed itself on the people against their will.

By declaring on June 15 that what we have is not representative government, the majority six, in effect, charged that our American Government has been a farce since the Revolutionary War. They are indulging in pure theory. The Constitution guarantees each State a republican form of government, but the majority six did not use this part of the Constitution to attack the government of the States. What they said is that the States do not conform to their own ideas of representative government.

The majority six quote Jefferson as saying that proportional representation is a fundamental principle of a true republic.

They also could have quoted a Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, Earl Warren, now one of the majority six, but who while Governor of California in 1948 said: "The agricultural counties of California are far more important in the life of our State than the relationship their population bears to the entire population of the State. It is for this reason that I never have been in favor of restricting their representation in our State senate to a strictly population basis. It is the same reason that the Founding Fathers of our country gave balanced representation to the States of the Union, equal representation in one House and proportionate representation based upon population in the other.

"Moves have been made to upset the balanced representation in our State, even though it served us well and is strictly in accord with American tradition and the pattern of our National Government.

"Our State has made almost unbelievable progress under our present system of legislative representation. I believe we should keep it."

This agreed with Madison who wrote in The Federalist (No. 62): "In a compound republic, partaking both of the national and Federal character, the government ought to be founded on a mixture of the principles of proportional and equal representation."

But as we pointed out earlier, our Government arose from practical experience, not theory, and it is not the exact form that Franklin, Madison, Jefferson, or other individuals wanted. And let's hope that in this day, we don't make it a government of what six men want.

By their June 15 decision, these six men are saying that hundreds of court justices—equally omniscient as they—have been wrong down through the years for maintaining that State legislatures were a political matter for the States and the States people to determine.

In saying that States are not sound in copying the Federal Senate's geographical apportionment, the majority six are overlooking the fact that it was the Federal Constitution which copied State systems, and that State and colonial senators have been apportioned partly along geographical and political lines since 1700. In no case that I can find was an upper house in colonial and Revolutionary times elected by proportional representation of districts equal in population.

In saying that basic representation is based on equal numbers, and equal numbers alone, the six are overlooking that each State is "unique in terms of topography, geography, demography, history, heterogeneity or concentration of population, variety of social and economic interests, and in the operation and interrelation of its political institutions," as pointed out by Justice Stewart.

The Indianapolis Star commented: "The Court deals with people as a sack of marbles. They are to be rolled out on the table top and divided into equal piles."

The real essence of federalism is reserving certain defined powers to each component part. But democracy, in the sense of the majority six, is "winner take all" with minorities having no rights that the majority can't override, suggests Felix Morley.

What people really want is good and balanced representation. And good representation where one State senator looks outside his downtown city office and sees the rooftops of all his constituents in a compact area of homogeneous interests is quite different from good representation of constituents by a State senator who comes from a large rural area of farmers and many small towns—with their many interests, backgrounds, economic problems, and diversity.

Good representation in government for a citizen does not stem from equal numbers—it does not even start there. It is born of the relationship between citizens and their representatives; the availability of the representative; the feeling of rapport between citizens and their elected representative; the flow of information, ideas and response between citizens and their representative; and the effectiveness of the representative in understanding the interests of his people and relating it to the national welfare.

The great responsibility of American representative government is for the representative of districts to really represent—represent not just numbers, and equal at that, but represent the views and needs of the people in the crucible of the State legislature.

Rural people, and those in small towns, are by distance, availability, and diverse interests harder to represent effectively than more homogeneous concentrations of population in concentrated areas.

Counties perform many important functions for unincorporated areas—things such as zoning, park and recreation services, street and road construction, sanitation, schools, public welfare, police and fire protection, licensing—all of which justify county representation in the councils of State governments.

The majority six have violated the principle of the separation of powers. They have taken over the amending process reserved for the people themselves. The selection of one house on the basis of area has developed as a part of our American governmental system since colonial days; it has become intertwined in the warp and woof of our governmental fabric; and now six men seek to rent it apart, willfully and unilaterally, without consulting the Congress, without public debate, and without consulting the people of the Nation.

"It amounts to judiciary rewriting * * * shocking judicial arrogance," says Columnist William S. White.

The Court did not say to States who were admittedly delinquent in apportioning their State legislatures: "Live up to your State constitution and apportion as the people wish." Instead, the six said: "Live up to our ideas of what we think your constitution and apportionment should be." The six have roped off State reapportionment as an area for their judgment, and their judgment alone. The lower courts, they say, are going to be their agents as the sole authority for what is "proper" apportionment and representation. Not the people; not the States; but the courts.

And the haste with which the courts have proceeded to carry out the June 15 decision suggests that they want to get it done before people wake up to the seriousness of what has been proposed. Instead of being a brake on hasty governmental action, the Court is a party to it—and the perpetrator. They have invaded the political arena to settle a question of politics with judicial power—through a plan hastily conceived and hastily executed, without the benefit of thorough public discussion.

People never intended for appointed officials to determine political questions. They intended that these questions should be determined by themselves or by those who are both responsive to the voters and responsible to them.

If the Court can apportion a State against the will of the people, then it can dictate how your county, your township and your local school board will be run. "If nothing is done, this is only the beginning of Federal interference," says Representative **William M. McCulloch**, of Ohio. "The composition of every political subdivision in the Nation may be subject to the dictates of the Supreme Court * * * the circuit court of Kent County, Mich., pursuant to the Supreme Court decision, ruled (in September) that the county board of supervisors was elected under an unconstitutional apportionment. Every city council, city ward, irrigation, flood control and sanitation district, and board of supervisors, among others, may have their membership apportioned by the mandate of the Supreme Court."

The decision of the majority six is illogical. How can a voter in a State with unequal population districts be "debased" statewise and not be debased federally where 408,000 people elect two U.S. Senators in Nevada and 18 million people—45 times as many—elect two U.S. Senators in the State of New York? Is the city of New York debased in the U.S. Senate when that city has no Senators it can call its own, but has more population than 43 States that do have two Senators each? And is the majority six saying that the Federal Senate is a farce; not representative government? "They imply that it is somehow un-American and undesirable," writes Felix Morley.

The U.S. Senate is made up in such a way that 26 States having only 16 percent of the Nation's population exercise a majority in the Senate. Yet we haven't heard that the other 84 percent of the people are so deprived and debased that they want to throw out the Federal Senate and tear up the National Constitution. Or is this next for the majority six?

The two Iowa Senators do not represent trees or acres or pastures. Indeed not. They represent the great State of Iowa. They represent a State with a unique contribution to the Nation. A glorious State with its own economic, historical, and social history, strength, needs, problems, aspirations, honor, and people. It is a complex that the six men in Washington, D.C., have ceased to understand. I, for one, would not abide the charge that Iowa's two Senators represent trees and acres. And if I were one of Iowa's two Senators, I would be working day and night—as I trust they are—to see that the people had an opportunity to set the six men straight about that.

In summary we can say that the decision of the majority six:

1. Has no historical basis.
2. Has no basis in the Constitution, as constructed.
3. Is illogical.
4. Is a violation of the amending powers of the Constitution.
5. Is an invasion of States rights.
6. Is an overextension of historic, expressed powers of the Court.
7. Thwarts the checks and balances and caution built into our Government.
8. Is an impulsive creation of our overanxious Court.
9. Denies fundamental protection to the minority.
10. Propels an appointive Court into political matters.
11. Is government theory of six men, untested in the public processes.
12. Creates a centralized governmental monster.
13. Ignores the full content of the 14th amendment on which the decision is based.

For some unexplained reason, the majority of six, in groping for something on which to base a case last June 15, clutched the straw that is in the first section of the 14th amendment. This Reconstruction amendment was an outgrowth of the Civil War, and all reconstructed States were required to ratify it to gain admittance back into the Union. The first section says: "All persons born or naturalized in the United States * * * are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside." And no State shall "deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws." The reason for this, in view of the times, is obvious. It meant simply that whatever the law—it would apply to everyone, regardless of color.

But there is a second, and longer section, to the 14th amendment. It recognizes that States have exclusive power over who can vote and in what manner—so the second section provides that if the vote of any male citizen over 21 is denied or abridged in any way—in national or State elections—then the State population for purposes of governmental representation will be reduced by the proportion that the denied voters bear to the whole number of male citizens 21 or over in the State.

Justice Harlan, in his dissent, gives a clear history of the congressional debate that preceded offering the 14th amendment for State ratification. He shows that the Congressmen who constructed the 14th amendment at no time believed that it would render inoperative the several State constitutions of either loyal or reconstructed States.

Congressman Bingham, the author of the first section, said on the floor of Congress at the time that "the exercise of the elective franchise, though it be one of the privileges of a citizen of the Republic, is exclusively under the control of the States." Other speakers stated this repeatedly. This point was well understood in the Congress.

Furthermore, 15 of the 23 loyal States that ratified the amendment before 1870 had constitutions which provided for apportioning one of their houses on other than population considerations. "Can it be seriously contended that the legislatures of these States, almost two-thirds of those concerned, would have ratified an amendment which might render their own States constitutions unconstitutional?" asks Justice Harlan. And the constitutions of 6 of the 10 reconstructed Southern States provided for State legislature apportionment on bases other than population. Would these legislatures intentionally put themselves and their constitutions out of business without mentioning it?

For some reason, the majority six are silent about this part of the 14th amendment.

"I am unable to understand the Court's utter disregard of the second section which expressly recognizes the States power to deny 'or in any way' abridge the right of their inhabitants to vote for the members of the (State) legislature," says Justice Harlan. This section, he says, "precludes the suggestion that the first section was intended to have the result reached by the Court today."

Not everyone takes this view of the decision.

Organized labor was quick to sense the crippling blow to rural areas of the June 15 decision. The committee of political education of the AFL–CIO, in its COPE publication of June 29, said with obvious enthusiasm: "Curtains for rural-dominated horse-and-buggy State governments unresponsive to the needs of an increasingly urban nation."

COPE told its labor-union readers that the effect of the June 15 decision would be a "surge of responsible, progressive action within the States aimed at advancing the social and economic welfare of their citizens."

COPE applauded: "The Court pitched a third strike against lopsided representation which has given the rural voter a powerful advantage over his city and suburban counterpart. And, as in baseball, three strikes means you're out."

Senator **George Aiken**, of Vermont, says, "Once both houses of the State legislatures are apportioned in accordance with the rule, control of fully half the States will pass to an urban majority, leaving the rural areas of a State as a minority or possibly without representation at all."

What does this hold for rural areas? Probably it would mean less road aid; it could mean higher school taxes and less local school aid; it could mean greater consolidation of schools; it could seriously impair vocational agriculture and home economics programs; sales taxes might be imposed on farm production items; it could lead to an oppressive value added tax; water rights would change, with industrial areas of concentrated population taking over control of water; hunting and fishing laws probably would be altered; public domain land in rural areas for open spaces and recreation probably would be greatly expanded; it could well mean that control of county governments would pass to cities; it could launch a move to do away with township governments and consolidate them into counties; it could easily lead to consolidating county functions and redrawing county lines; it would certainly mean reapportioning congressional districts to the disadvantage of rural areas after the 1970 census; it would automatically mean a change in the control of local and State political parties, and this would certainly lead to a change in the kind of political candidates and political programs from local government on up the line.

It is with good reason that this is called the most sweeping overnight change in Government contemplated since the Civil War.

"If this Supreme Court decision is permitted to stand, the State of Kansas will be completely dominated from this day forward by urban areas. Rural areas will be virtually powerless," says Congressman **Bob Dole**, of Kansas.

It would mean that "the State of Illinois will be completely ruled from this day forward by Chicago," says Congressman **Paul Findley**, of Illinois. "Downstate will be powerless to keep a legislature dominated by Chicago machine politics from funneling the lion's share of State revenue into Chicago projects and programs."

The Wapakoneta (Ohio) Daily News commented: "Bigness is not a virtue, nor is smallness a fault. Centralization of authority, whether in Federal or State governments, can lead to despotism."

"We are now confronted with political minions surging forth from the controlling city machine to levy, collect and bring back the revenues to be used to perpetuate and further the grandeur and power of that machine," says Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN, of Illinois.

We might ask: If it is bad that a large geographic area with less than a majority of the State's population can control the State through one house of the State legislature, then is it automatically good that a small geographic area with a majority of the State's population can control the entire State? Which is better for the State of Illinois and the people in it? Weighing the prospect of the two possibilities should leave little question in the minds of thinking people as to which is more desirable. I know, because I lived in Illinois for many years.

Could the majority six really believe that the city of Chicago should rule all of the States of Illinois? Or that three or four counties should rule all of California, a diverse State 900 miles long?

While trees and acres and pastures and districts don't vote, it is a matter of practical politics that political machines do vote—or deliver the vote—and that these machines are most often found in cities where the history, economic interests, communications, citizens, and numbers are such that political machines can and do deliver large blocs of votes. I know; I work in such a city. The doctrine of the political equality of equal numbers when viewed in this setting does not paint a glowing picture of equal voters in equal numbers between districts meeting on equal ground to cast their equal-numbered votes.

"To be specific," says Senator AIKEN, "we are engaged in a struggle between the powerful machines of the great cities and the people of the United States. Make no mistake about it," he says, "this is a battle for the political control of the Nation and with the control goes the power to tax, the power to spend, and the power to enact programs that will affect the lives and welfare of every living person for generations to come."

To better see what this might mean to rural areas, I requested three State Farm Bureau organizations to make studies of the voting of their big-city Congressmen—in Chicago, Detroit, and Philadelphia—to add to a study that New York had already made of the vote in New York City.

The results may both surprise you and astound you:

In the State of New York, the Farm Bureau compiled the voting record of their Representatives in the National Congress on 10 representative issues, farm and nonfarm (feed grain program, foreign aid, tax cut, area redevelopment, Mexican farm labor, Cooley cotton bill, credit to Communist countries, food stamp, wheat-cotton bill, and antipoverty bill). There are 19 Congressmen from the city of New York; and voting on 10 issues gave them a possible 190 votes on these 10 issues. They actually voted 188 times. These New York City Congressmen voted for the Farm Bureau position 15 times—8 percent of the time—and voted against the Farm Bureau position 173 times—92 percent of the time.

Yet these same Congressmen in the 88th Congress voted for COPE's labor position 96 percent of the time and 98 percent of the time for the position of the Americans for Democratic Action (ADA), an ultraliberal group.

The other 22 Congressmen from the State of New York—outside the city of New York—voted with the Farm Bureau position 72 percent of the time (157 votes) and opposed the Farm Bureau 28 percent of the time (61 votes).

In the State of Illinois on the same 10 issues, nine Congressmen from Chicago voted 84 times—and 83 of those 84 votes opposed the Farm Bureau. Only one vote agreed with the Farm Bureau position. Yet in the 88th Congress they voted 97 percent of the time for the ADA position; and 98 percent of the time for COPE's position.

Congressmen in the rest of the State of Illinois—outside of Chicago—favored the Farm Bureau position 80 percent of the time.

In Pennsylvania, on the same 10 issues, five Philadelphia Congressmen voted 46 times, and cast every single vote against the Farm Bureau position. Yet in the 88th Congress they voted 98 percent in favor of COPE's labor position; and 97 percent of the time for the position of the ADA.

In the State of Michigan the Farm Bureau compiled the votes on eight representative issues. There, seven Representatives whose districts are primarily in the city of Detroit voted 48 times on these eight issues, and cast 47 of the 48 votes against the Farm Bureau position. Yet in the 88th Congress they voted 93 percent of the time for the position of the ADA and 99 percent of the time for COPE's labor position.

The other Congressmen in Michigan—outside of Detroit—cast 88 percent of their votes in favor of the Farm Bureau position.

A summary of the vote in the four States shows that in 366 votes cast by Congressmen from the four big cities, these city Congressmen voted with the Farm Bureau position just 17 times (15 of those from New York City) and against the Farm Bureau 349 times—5 percent for and 95 percent against.

The conclusion is rather obvious. These big-city political machines are not only almost unanimously opposed to the Farm Bureau position, they are also out of step with the Representatives from the rest of their own States. What this means to all people in light of the June 15 majority six decision is rather plain.

Can the people do something about this? You bet they can. And I count you on the side of those who want to see it done.

There are these things that you can do:

1. First, see that everyone recognizes that this June 15 decision is a fundamental question of constitution and government.

It is a question of whether the power in our government will really flow from the people, as it has since the Revolutionary War, or whether this will suddenly be changed.

It is a question of whether we, the people, will permit an appointed agency of our government to rise up and devour us.

It is a problem of the centralization of Federal power.

It is a matter of whether we in this Nation shall succumb to dictation by the Court.

It is a matter of whether we shall settle our important political questions through open, thorough public discussion and vote, or whether it shall be done hastily, in a court, or anywhere else, with six people making the decision.

This is a test of whether there is one Government in Washington, D.C., or whether there are also 50 State governments; it is a test of whether the form of government belongs to the people, or to the Supreme Court; it is, indeed, a test of whether the government belongs to the people and is a government with the consent of the governed, or whether it is a government of centralized power without the consent of the people.

2. Second, see that everyone recognizes that if this is to be a battle, it will be a struggle between big-city machines and the rest of the country.

It is not a farm-city fight. If this is a fight between citizens, it is a battle between counties and big cities; between the people and machine politics and ward leaders—and then, only if the big-city machine leaders chose to make it so by endorsing this action of the majority six.

Yours is a positive action to preserve the local functions of government where you can govern best—and to keep these functions as we the people want them.

3. Third, get your State, and all States, to call for a Constitutional Convention.

One way to amend the Constitution is to start with a Constitutional Convention, which can be called if two-thirds of the States (34) ask for it. This is a direct action that you can take—and you can see that it gets done in your State by talking with your State representative right at home.

4. Fourth, get Congress to pass a resolution putting a constitutional amendment before the States in a referendum. This is another way to amend the Constitution if three-fourths of the States (38) ratify the amendment.

A simple resolution has been proposed by Representative MCCULLOCH, of Ohio, and the general assembly of States. It says: "Nothing in the Constitution of the United States shall prohibit a State, having a bicameral legislature, from apportioning the membership of one house of its legislature on factors other than population, if the citizens of the State shall have the opportunity to vote upon the apportionment. And any State may determine how governing bodies of its subordinate units shall be apportioned."

This puts the question before the people twice:

First will be a vote on the constitutional amendment. This permits States to vote on the question of whether they want to reserve for themselves the power to apportion their own legislature.

Second will come an opportunity for the people to vote on any apportionment plans that might come up in the State.

Let that "one man, one vote" be on State apportionment—that is what we are asking for: That each man be allowed to vote whether apportionment of State legislatures shall be done by his State in its own political wisdom, or whether it shall be done by the Court, satisfying only the theories of six men.

Fundamentally, we ask that the people have the opportunity to make the decision on this question. Surely, this is what democracy and representative government is all about. And who can be opposed to the people exercising this right to vote on the issue? If anyone is opposed, now is the time to find out who it is.

5. Fifth, get Congress to pass a staying action on the majority six Court decision until the people have an opportunity to express themselves through a Constitutional Convention or through a constitutional referendum on a congressional resolution.

The courts are running full tilt to get apportionment wrapped up under their edict before the people have time to act. Others will help them. You are fighting a race against time.

Last August the House of Representatives in Washington passed the Tuck bill by an overwhelming majority. That bill would have denied all Federal courts jurisdiction over matters dealing with State legislative apportionment.

This was killed in the Senate as a rider on the foreign aid bill. Then a Dirksen-Mansfield rider was proposed to "buy time." This proposal would have provided a partial stay on the Court action so that there would be time to permit States to vote on a constitutional amendment. This bill was lost, primarily through a filibuster of four Senators.

Senator AIKEN commented: "It is significant that virtually all of the Senators taking part in the filibuster were from States with cities of 1 million and over; cities that are overwhelmingly in debt and are constantly seeking new sources of revenue either from taxes or public grants."

Two of the leaders of the filibuster were Senator DOUGLAS, from Chicago, and Senator CLARK, from Philadelphia. They didn't want the people in the States to have an opportunity to express themselves in a constitutional amendment referendum. It is interesting that these Senators, who plead that the majority should rule, resorted to a filibuster to keep the majority of the Senate from voting on the issue of whether to "buy time" so that the States could vote by a three-fourth's majority rule on whether to keep apportionment as a State matter.

6. Last, you can launch a personal and group educational program to see that people—not just farmers, but others as well—understand what is involved in this Court action. Read it; study it; write about it; talk about it; make speeches about it. Do this, not just through your State office or the national office; but right where you live. You can make it your personal No. 1 project for 1965; nothing is more important to you and to all the people in your community, your county, and your State.

You can call on and meet with your State representatives; your county officials; your local township and political officials. There shouldn't be a single township in the State of Iowa that doesn't have a full scale half-day or full-day meeting on this in the next few weeks.

And what is done in Iowa should be done in every State in the Union.

If you will do this, there will be no question about the outcome.

Anything less than this is losing faith with the people who, through extreme sacrifice, courage, God-given wisdom, and loss of life built this privileged Nation for us through colonial oppression, frontier travail, and the agony of great wars which harvested our young men—the price that others have paid for our liberty and freedom. Anything that we can do, will not be enough to pay for the priceless privilege that is ours.

ALCATRAZ ISLAND COMMISSION BILL

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, the 88th Congress, by means of Public Law 88–138, created a Commission on the Disposition of Alcatraz Island to study and recommend future use of this former maximum security penitentiary which has now been declared excess to Federal requirements.

Today, in conjunction and cooperation with the distinguished junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], I am introducing legislation which incorporates and carries out the recommendations of this Commission.

In brief, the five-man Commission on which Senator LONG as Chairman and I had the privilege of representing the House of Representatives, recommended, and this bill provides, that the Federal Government accept the offer of the San Francisco Chapter of the United Nations to build a monument on Alcatraz Island commemorating the founding of the United Nations in San Francisco in 1945 and as a symbol of peace.

The Commission's report, and this bill, further provide:

First. The creation of a commission to oversee, negotiate, and coordinate all matters associated with the realization of this proposal.

Second. The General Services Administration be given authority to transfer Alcatraz Island to the National Park Service without reimbursement.

Third. The National Park Service be authorized to accept from the San Francisco Chapter of the American Association for the United Nations the monument and any maintenance endowment or funding that might be offered from time to time.

Fourth. The National Park Service be given authority to administer the island.

Fifth. The monument be erected on the island under the supervision of the Commission in consultation and cooperation with the Secretary of the Interior with the remainder of the island being retained in its natural state.

Sixth. The Commission be given the authority to negotiate with the San Francisco Chapter of the American Association for the United Nations for the early demolition and removal of structures on the island.

Seventh. Provision be made for a reservation to the State of California for use of a part of the island for public purposes if the need should arise; provided such use by the State of California is compatible with and does not detract from the primary use.

Eighth. An international architectural competition be conducted by the San Francisco Chapter of the American Association for the United Nations with the winning design subject to final approval by the Commission after consultation with the Secretary of Interior.

Ninth. All costs incident to the international architectural competition, the demolition or removal of structures, and the construction of the monument be borne by the San Francisco Chapter of the American Association for the United Nations or a private nonprofit foundation created for this purpose, with any proceeds from salvage applied to the costs of demolition.

Mr. Speaker, the Alcatraz Island Commission, after inspecting the island, hearing more than 40 witnesses, and reading more than 400 written proposals, felt strongly and so emphasized in its report, that Alcatraz is not a "usual" piece of property to be disposed of through the normal procedure of public sale by the General Services Administration.

The island occupies a prominent position in one of the major ports of this country; its use as a penitentiary for hardened criminals has made it known the world over; and any future use will clearly have significant meaning for the San Francisco Bay area and the entire United States.

The Commission decided to recommend the offer of the San Francisco Chapter of the American Association for the United Nations because it recognized the formidable cost of constructing any new project on the island, yet did not look to any public source for money, and because it was in accord with a majority of the serious proposals presented that the most appropriate and fitting use would be some type of monument as a memorial to the principles of peace and human dignity.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend Senator LONG and the other members of the Alcatraz Island Commission—California's Lieutenant Governor, Glenn Anderson, California's State Senator J. Eugene McAteer, and San Francisco Attorney James Thacher—for their work on this project which holds so much promise for the people of this country and the world. It was a great privilege and pleasure for me to work with them and I thank the Members of the House for this opportunity.

I am very hopeful, Mr. Speaker, that the House will now be able to give early consideration to this proposal.

It has already been carefully screened and thoroughly thought through by a commission acting at the direction of Congress. It recommends a program committed to the highest ideals of man, yet offered with no thought of personal gain.

It is a proposal which represents our own great tradition of freedom and our hopes for a freer, more peaceful world for all men.

It is a proposal of which we can be justly proud.

The text of the bill follows:

H.R. 3143

A bill to provide for the erection of a monument on Alcatraz Island to commemorate the founding of the United Nations in San Francisco, California, in 1945, and to serve as a symbol of peace

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) for the purpose of providing for the erection of a monument on Alcatraz Island to commemorate the founding of the United Nations in San Francisco, California, in 1945, and to serve as a symbol of peace, there is hereby established a commission to be known as the United Nations Monument Commission (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission"), to be composed of seven members as follows:

(1) Five members who shall be appointed by the President of the United States of whom one shall be appointed from nominees submitted by the Governor of California, one from nominees submitted by the mayor of San Francisco, and two from nominees submitted by the San Francisco Chapter of the American Association for the United Nations;

(2) One member who shall be appointed by the President of the Senate; and

(3) One member who shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

(b) The President shall, at the time of appointment, designate one of the members appointed by him to serve as Chairman. Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(c) Members of the Commission shall serve without additional compensation by reason of their services as members, but shall be reimbursed for their actual and necessary traveling and subsistence expenses incurred by them in performing their duties.

(d) The Commission may employ, without regard to the civil service laws or the Classification Act of 1949, an executive director who shall be compensated at a rate not to exceed $18,000 per year, and such other employees as may be necessary in carrying out its functions.

(e) Expenditures of the Commission shall be paid by the executive director, who shall keep complete records of such expenditures and who shall account for all funds received by the Commission.

Sec. 2. (a) The function of the Commission shall be to develop and execute suitable plans for the erection on Alcatraz Island of a monument to commemorate the founding of the United Nations in San Francisco, California, in 1945, and to serve as a symbol of peace. In formulating and developing such plans, the Commission shall consult and cooperate with the Secretary of the Interior. The design of such monument shall be selected, subject to final approval by the Commission, through an international architectural competition conducted in accordance with the provisions of clause (3) of section 3 of this Act, but no design submitted in such competition shall be selected if it would result in a hazard to navigation.

(b) No appropriated funds shall be used in connection with the construction of such monument, including the demolition or removal of structures on such island, or the holding of such competition, but any proceeds from salvage of existing structures or other property on such island may be applied to the cost of such demolition and construction.

Sec. 3. In carrying out its function under this Act, the Commission is authorized to—

(1) construct, or provide for the construction of, a monument as provided for in this Act;

(2) accept donations of money, property, or personal services; to cooperate with State, civic, patriotic and other groups; and to call upon other Federal departments or agencies for their advice;

(3) negotiate or arrange with the San Francisco Chapter of the American Association for the United Nations or others for the early demolition or removal of the structures on the island, and for the holding of an international architectural competition for the purpose of selecting the design of such monument;

(4) make such expenditures for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act, as it may deem advisable from funds appropriated or received as donations for such purpose, subject to the provisions of subsection (b) of section 2; and

(5) exercise, subject to the provisions of this Act, such additional powers and functions as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

Sec. 4. The Commission shall, not later than February 1 of each year, transmit to Congress a report of its activities and proceedings for the preceding year, including a complete statement of its receipts and expenditures. A final report of the activities of the Commission, including a final accounting of its receipts and expenditures, shall be made to the Congress not later than ninety days following the completion of the monument authorized by this Act. The Commission shall terminate thirty days following the date of the submission of such final report.

Sec. 5. The authority granted by this Act shall cease to exist, unless within five years after the date of enactment of this Act (1) the erection of the monument is begun, and (2) the Commission certifies to the Secretary of the Interior the amount of funds available for the purpose of the completion of the monument and the Secretary determines that such funds are adequate for such purpose.

Sec. 6. The State of California is authorized, subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, to use a part of Alcatraz Island for public purposes, if any such use is compatible with and does not detract from the monument established pursuant to this Act.

Sec. 7. Any funds acquired by the Commission remaining upon its termination shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.

Sec. 8. The monument established pursuant to this Act shall be the property of the United States and, together with the land comprising Alcatraz Island, shall be set aside as a national monument and designated as the United Nations Monument. The National Park Service, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, shall administer, protect, and develop such monument, subject to the provisions of this Act and the Act entitled "An Act to establish a National Park Service, and for other purposes", approved August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535), as amended and supplemented.

Sec. 9. The land comprising Alcatraz Island is hereby transferred to the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior, without consideration, for use by him in carrying out the provisions of this Act.

Sec. 10. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

CUTBACKS IN VA SERVICES

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Harsha] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, last week, on January 13, Members of Congress were notified by the Veterans' Administration of a program of cutbacks and consolidations in the services to our veterans. Seventeen regional offices, 11 hospitals and 4 domiciliaries in several States, including Ohio, will be involved. While none of the installations affected are located in my district, any general deterioration of facilities will be reflected in poorer service to all our veterans in every district in our Nation.

Is there to be nothing in the Great Society for the veterans? Are veterans to become just numbers to be stuffed in computer machines? The care of our veterans must meet human needs, humanely and fairly considered in accordance with the best standards. The care of our veterans must not become subject to the cold calculations of an electronic computer. It is unconscionable to submit the health, care, and welfare of our veterans to a machine void of compassion. In administering the VA program the primary objective should be service to the veteran rather than to operate the facilities as a commercial enterprise.

This cutback is poor economy and will certainly provide additional material for the war on poverty. It makes little sense to spend billions to eradicate poverty in the United States, to spend additional billions in foreign aid to raise the standard of living over the entire world, and then virtually pull the bed out from under the veteran. Apparently, the Great Society is to bypass the veteran.

I have written to the chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee to request that committee to investigate the action of the Veterans' Administration in closing VA facilities.

I have also written directly to the Veterans' Administration to urge that it forgo its proposed cutbacks until such investigation can be completed by the committee.

I sincerely hope that action can be taken which will meet the human needs of our veterans rather than the budgetary desires of the administration.

WE BANDSMEN SAW EUROPE TOGETHER

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Derwinski] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, one of the most effective programs in which the image of the United States is properly presented abroad is that sponsored by the School Band of America. This past summer the School Band of America toured much of Europe.

One of its members was a talented young lady, Miss Emily Jane Canning, a resident of Homewood, Ill., in the Fourth Congressional District. Upon her return, Miss Canning wrote a special article for the November 1964 issue of the School Musician magazine, and I ask leave to place it in the Record at this point.

We Bandsmen Saw Europe Together

(By Emily Jane Canning)

As a music student, I had never really realized before my trip with the School Band of America the variance of American student musicians. They are different, but they can have fun living and traveling together for a month, and at the same time see Europe and learn to know about the people.

The European tour this past summer by the School Band of America and the School Chorus of America covered during this short month the Netherlands, Belgium, Germany, Austria, Italy, Switzerland, France, and England, followed by an exciting day at the New York World's Fair.

Concerts were given in The Hague, Rotterdam, Blankenberge, Brussels, Spa, Heilbronn, Nuremberg, Munich, Innsbruck, Venice, Piacenza, Genoa, Nice, Lausanne, Strasbourg, Paris, Horsham, Dorking, and New York.

Transatlantic crossings were by charter jetplane. Comparative strangers left from New York Kennedy International Airport on June 11; but they were well acquainted on the return flight which departed from London, July 9. European land travel was by four blue charter buses with drivers and couriers from the Netherlands.

Band and chorus members were from Alabama, Arizona, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Georgia, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Maryland, Minnesota, Missouri, New Jersey, North Carolina, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Texas, Utah, West Virginia, and Wisconsin. We have made new friends not only in Europe but throughout the United States.

The band, with 98 members, and the chorus, with 34 members, continued the tradition of presenting concerts to large enthusiastic audiences, the largest being 5,000 in the very famous St. Mark's Square in Venice. In each instance, 22 concerts in all, SBA–SCA was invited to return next year.

SBA–SCA since its beginning has covered 45,000 miles to play 71 concerts to a total audience of 150,000 persons, and has participated in 24 official receptions, 4 TV appearances, 18 radio broadcasts, and 9 youth gatherings.

Since its founding as a nonprofit, noncommercial organization on July 1, 1959, the School Band of America-School Chorus of America has established itself as an integral part of the American music education scene. The organization was founded primarily for the purpose of giving outstanding American school musicians an opportunity to use their talents in the area of international understanding, and at the same time acquire a firsthand knowledge of the cultural centers of Europe.

SBA–SCA has developed into a cooperative venture involving music educators, music teachers, music publishers, and music instrument manufacturers throughout the United States.

The European audiences were eager to hear the music of SBA–SCA. They clapped, whistled, and gave standing ovations for the tunes they particularly enjoyed, especially the "Stars and Stripes Forever," and "Battle Hymn of the Republic." It can be said the SBA–SCA has more than fulfilled its original purpose and has developed into a strong positive influence in the field of international relations. American Government officials in Europe and European government authorities have repeatedly stated that SBA–SCA concerts and related activities are the major events in their year's calendar. A dignified image of American youth is projected to the Europeans who draw many of their conclusions only from movies.

SBA–SCA has been accepted as an official project of the music committee of the people-to-people program, has been sanctioned by the Bureau of Cultural and Educational Affairs, Office of Cultural Exchange, U.S. State Department, and is assisted by the U.S. Information Agency. Files contain letters of commendation from Dr. Norman Vincent Peale, Leonard Bernstein, and Edward R. Murrow. The band and chorus have been personally commended by former Vice President Richard M. Nixon.

The reputation of SBA–SCA has grown considerably in the 4 years since the European tours were established. The band and chorus have become a tradition in many areas with a loyal following. An SBA–SCA fan club has been organized by students in Nuremberg, Germany, where a large youth gathering was held this year.

At Nuremberg an important concert was presented in Europe's newest and most beautiful concert hall, the Meistersingerhalle, which was filled to capacity of 2,200. A local orchestra director led us in "El Capitan" before an audience made up mostly of young people.

At Dorking, England, the SBA–SCA opened the annual music festival in grand style. Guests of honor were Prince and Princess Tomislav, of Yugoslavia, and Max Grossman, cultural attaché of the American Embassy, and Mrs. Grossman. The director of the British Broadcasting Corp. (BBC) television orchestra, Eric Robinson, was guest conductor. The chairman of the music festival committee publicly stated that he had never seen an audience in Horsham react so enthusiastically to any presentation.

Near the end of the tour at Strasbourg, the groups taped two albums of high fidelity records.

At the final concert at the New York World's Fair, July 10, SBA–SCA drew the largest crowd of the year at the Tiparillo Band Pavilion.

The repertoire of the School Band of America and School Chorus of America is representative of school instrumental and vocal groups throughout the United States. It is designed to please all audiences with a varied program including serious, contemporary, traditional, vocal, and band music; marches, musical comedy selections, and novelties.

Any school instrumental or vocal student in the United States between the ages of 15 and 21 may apply for membership. Final selection for the touring groups is made on the basis of musicianship, character, and personality. Musicianship is determined by audition, tape recording, or in person; character by letters of recommendation from a school official, music teacher, and pastor; personality by personal interview where practical. SBA–SCA has 16 representatives in 10 States and 2 foreign countries. They all volunteer their services.

The individual cost of the European concert tours was $878. This amount was determined on a prorated basis covering the expenses involved in developing and carrying out the concert tour. This relatively modest amount, which included all necessary expenses for the month-long tour from New York and return, was a result of the nonprofit feature of SBA–SCA and the fact that SBA–SCA is authorized by the Civil Aeronautics Board to charter transatlantic flights.

SBA–SCA functions within the philosophy that the free enterprise system is the central core of the American way. Therefore, Government financial assistance is neither sought nor desired. However, financial assistance in varying amounts to individual students on a local basis is recommended.

Considering the fact that the appearance, conduct, and quality of SBA–SCA reflect an image of all Americans, many students receive financial assistance from local civic and service clubs, church groups, school organizations, individuals, etc. A sponsor is defined as an organization or an individual who contributes $25 or more to a student's expense. The 1964 program listed approximately 600 friends and official sponsors.

Founder and director is Edward T. Harn of Bloomington, Ill. In addition to his directing duties with SBA–SCA, he is principal conductor of the all-star high school band which annually presents the grand finale concert at the Mid-East Instrumental Conference sponsored by Duquesne University School of Music in Pittsburgh.

European music critics have highly acclaimed his work with young American musicians. He received two medals this summer at Nervi and Venice, making eight he has received from European governments for his contribution to a better understanding between America and Europe.

Assisting with directing duties are Wayne M. Reger, authority on brass instruments, author of "The Talking Trumpets," and instructor in the public schools at Massillon, Ohio; Don McCathren, clarinet clinician, affiliated with H. & A. Selmer, and chairman of instrumental music at Duquesne University; and Cedric Cooke, director of music in the Greenview, Ill., public schools.

SBA–SCA concert tours are chaperoned by a select group of adults, mostly teachers, who pay their own expenses as do the students. Each chaperone is assigned 10 students. There are also two nurses. Following the tour, chaperones' reports are sent to parents of each member and to school officials.

Four concert tours are planned for 1965. The regular SBA–SCA European section tour of central Europe, June 12–July 11, will feature a command performance for Her Majesty, Queen Elizabeth, in Royal Festival Hall of London.

A new SBA Near East section tour of Israel and central Europe, July 21–August 19, will participate in the Israel Festival of Music, the first time a band has been honored with an invitation. Al Reed and Mr. McCathren will be conductors.

A new SBA Far East section tour of Japan, July 25–August 15, will be sponsored by the All-Japan Band League. SBA alumni will be given preference for this trip. School Band of America will be the featured band at the Japanese Music Federation Convention in Tokyo.

A new School Orchestra of America tour of central Europe, June 21–July 20, has been developed to provide additional incentive, quality, and prestige to the fast-growing string education program in the United States. SOA is to be directed by Don Miller, director of the string program at Lyons Township High School in LaGrange, Ill. He is well known in the field of music education and is in demand as a festival director and adjudicator.

Headquarters for the groups is 28 Harbord Drive, Bloomington, Ill., where information about the bands, chorus, and orchestra is available. Deadline for making application for 1965 concert tours is December 1, 1964.

MRS. MARY GABRIELLA GOMES

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing private legislation on behalf of Mrs. Mary Gabriella Gomes, the mother of Mrs. Keith Crawford, 51 Bowen Street, Jamestown, N.Y.

The bill, if approved, would grant permanent residence to Mrs. Gomes, who entered this country as a visitor on October 2, 1961. Mrs. Gomes is a native of British Guiana and a citizen of Great Britain.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO IMPROVE AND INCREASE SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill which would provide new, improved and increased social security benefits for an estimated 20 million Americans.

Mr. Speaker, the House and Senate are in agreement on the provisions of this proposal since it incorporates the amendments to the social security laws which had been agreed upon by the House and Senate conferees in the 88th Congress. The House should immediately adopt this proposal so that we can swiftly move to bring these new benefits to our retired citizens.

Aside from the provisions on hospital care for the aged which caused disagreement, everything in my bill had the approval of the Congress. It died in the 88th Congress because of the controversy over the hospital care provisions.

Apparently the hospital care provisions will require additional or new hearings. The improvements in the social security system should not be further delayed. We must do everything we can to start getting checks to our retired people under the new amendments as promptly as possible.

There has been too much delay already.

My bill would include:

First. An increase in benefits of 7 percent with a $5 minimum in the primary insurance amount.

Second. A minimum benefit of $35 each month for those over 72 who did not meet the work requirements in the present law.

Third. Liberalization of the earning limitations now in the law.

Fourth. Benefits for dependents in school up to age 22 instead of the present cutoff date at age 18.

Fifth. Benefits for our widows when they reach 60 rather than waiting until they reach 62.

Sixth. Liberalization of the gross income upon which farmers may decide to pay social security taxes.

Seventh. Provide for the objection of certain religious groups to the social security system.

This Congress has an obligation to enact this legislation to provide for our older citizens with dispatch and vigor. There is no reason for delay of these agreed-upon improvements in our law.

Equity demands the prompt passage of these amendments. I urge speedy action by the House of Representatives.

LEGISLATION TO CUT FEDERAL HIGHWAY COSTS

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. Cleveland] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, today I have reintroduced my bill to cut Federal highway costs by authorizing a program to assist the States to acquire rights-of-way in advance. This bill would enable States to acquire property needed for rights-of-way at comparatively low costs and at times when announcements of proposed routes have not drastically inflated real estate values.

Under the present law, States have not been able to utilize existing limited procedures for buying rights-of-way in advance. This is largely because they must use all available State and Federal funds in actual construction and are unable to tie up large amounts in rights-of-way that may not be used for several years. Some States, in fact, simply do not have the money to spend on an orderly program of acquiring advance rights-of-way.

As a result, there are numerous cases where owners have undertaken extensive improvements of their property and have forced the States to pay inflated prices for highway rights-of-way.

Under my bill, first introduced in the 88th Congress, the Secretary of Commerce would be authorized to advance Federal-aid highway funds to any States for early right-of-way acquisition. These funds would be free of any interest and would not be charged against current Federal-aid apportionments. They would be repaid by the State when actual construction on a right-of-way is authorized or at the end of a period not to exceed 7 years or on September 30, whichever occurs first.

Such a program, carefully administered, would pay rich dividends in savings to the governments and do much to eliminate hardship, inconvenience, and uncertainty for those whose property and businesses may be in the path of highway construction.

Funds advanced under this program would be paid by the highway trust fund and at no time could exceed a total of $200 million.

This bill meets a major problem which has been hampering the Federal highway program and causing much individual hardship. I hope the House will have an early opportunity to act on it.

THE PROBLEM OF ALCOHOLISM AMONG OUR YOUNG PEOPLE

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Rumsfeld] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, in our efforts today to direct and assist our young people so that they can successfully meet the challenges of their future, one of the continuing problems that must be met is alcoholism. Our young people must be made to realize that clear thinking and physical fitness, together with moral stamina, are the assets which lead to successful and satisfying lives.

The Youth Temperance Council, with headquarters in the 13th Congressional District of Illinois, which I am honored to represent, has performed outstanding service in educating the youth of our country to the dangers of alcoholism. Each year the council observes Youth Temperance Education Week, which has been officially proclaimed in the past by 75 percent of our State Governors and by the mayors of our larger cities. Recognition and endorsement of this endeavor by the Congress of the United States would have far-reaching effects; and I am, therefore, introducing today a joint resolution to designate the fourth week of April of each year as Youth Temperance Education Week.

I urge adoption of this resolution by the House.

RECENT CRASH OF AIR FORCE KC-135 TANKER

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Shriver] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I have just returned from my home city of Wichita, Kans., where on last Saturday morning, January 16, 1965, an Air Force KC-135 tanker crashed into a residential area in the northeast part of the city. The tragic accident took the lives of at least 23 civilians and 7 Air Force crewmembers on the aircraft. Some 15 homes were destroyed or damaged beyond repair, and approximately 75 were reported damaged by fire. There were 15 persons treated for injuries by local hospitals.

My purpose in rising today in the House is to express my heartfelt sympathy to those who lost loved ones in this air disaster. I also want to pay tribute to local, State, and Federal agencies which responded speedily and efficiently. On Sunday and Monday I witnessed the effective relief which was being given by the Red Cross, the Salvation Army, and other civilian agencies. Local police, fire, and civil defense officials handled their monumental tasks with dispatch.

The city of Wichita long has played an important role in our Nation's defense. Wichita indeed is the "air capital" of this great Nation. The people of Wichita recognize the importance of aircraft to the community and the Nation. Their courage and understanding in the disaster should not go unnoticed.

When disaster struck the city last Saturday morning, the city government and private citizens alike responded to the needs and anguish of their fellow Wichitans. In this tragic period for Wichita, I am proud of the manner in which the citizens have reacted with understanding and compassion.

It should be noted, too, that the seven Air Force crewmembers aboard the aircraft who lost their lives were performing a military mission for their country. There is evidence that they did everything within their power to avoid or prevent crashing into a residential area.

Finally, I want to commend the Air Force for the expeditious manner in which it has proceeded to investigate the cause of the tragedy and to assist the civilian population affected by the accident.

IN PURSUIT OF WORLD ORDER

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Fascell] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, as Members of the Congress are aware, 1965, which is the 20th anniversary of the United Nations, has been designated "International Cooperation Year." President Johnson has asked that this occasion be used to take stock of progress already underway in international cooperation and to chart new possibilities of cooperation in the future.

In this regard, I think the Members of the Congress will be interested in a new book which has been written in connection with International Cooperation Year by Richard N. Gardner, who has served since 1961 as Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization

Affairs. The book is entitled "In Pursuit of World Order: U.S. Foreign Policy and International Organizations."

"In Pursuit of World Order" is a thoughtful and a thought-provoking book. It provides an up-to-date account of the efforts of the U.S. Government to promote the common interests of mankind in peace and welfare through the United Nations and other worldwide organizations. It also deals with the practical politics of adjusting the relations of states without war. And it provides fresh insight into how the United Nations system is developing and on what lines it can evolve in the future.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I have handled legislation relating to the United Nations for a number of years. I have been increasingly concerned about the growing number of problems confronting that organization. The United Nations, as we are only too well aware, is facing perhaps the most serious crisis in its 20-year history. This makes it all the more important that the American people have available a clear and balanced account of the way the United States has sought to promote its enlightened self-interest in a decent world order through international organizations. By preparing such an account, Mr. Gardner, in my opinion, has rendered valuable public service.

An extra bonus in the book is the lucid foreword by Harlan Cleveland, who is known to most of us for his distinguished service as Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs.

I think the Members of the Congress may also be interested to know that Mr. Gardner wrote this book while carrying on his responsibilities in the Department of State and that he is assigning all his royalties to the American Foreign Service Scholarship Fund and the United Nations Association.

Mr. Gardner's introduction to his volume is an excellent summary of the crisis which now faces the United Nations and the approach our Government is taking to it.

Under unanimous consent, I place it in the RECORD at this point:

INTRODUCTION TO "IN PURSUIT OF WORLD ORDER"

(By Richard N. Gardner)

Not long ago, Secretary of State Dean Rusk was asked in a television interview whether the United States was pursuing a "no-win" foreign policy. The answer was delivered in the closely reasoned phrases that are his trademark:

"Well, I would not agree with this. What we are trying to accomplish in this world—the American people and most people in most other countries—is a victory for freedom, for the independence of states and the freedom of peoples * * * a victory for a decent world order under conditions of law * * *.

"Now we know that this struggle for freedom is constant, it is implacable, and it is necessary to win it. But you would not win it by a vast military orgy which would bring into jeopardy the existence of the Northern Hemisphere * * *.

"The problem here is to make it very clear that the vital interests of the free world will be defended with whatever is necessary. But the problem also is to defend these by peaceful means if possible. The easiest thing in the world to think of is to expand a war. But the human race needs something else if we can find it."

A central purpose of U.S. foreign policy under the Kennedy and Johnson administrations has been to find this "something else"—something that could lead to victory without war, a victory of human dignity not just for Americans but for all men everywhere.

It has been said many times but it bears repeating: Such a victory will not be won through the subjugation of any people. It will not be won by force of arms—although the free world must have adequate military strength and the will to use it in defense of freedom. It will be won by painstaking efforts to build the foundations of peace and the general welfare of mankind. Moreover, it will never be finally won—it will have to be fought for and earned, every day, by ourselves and our posterity.

Mankind is now divided by two competing concepts of world order—one based on coercion, the other based on consent. Because of the kind of society we are at home, because of the kind of order we seek abroad, we cannot simply impose our views on other peoples. Our method of building a world order is much more difficult than the Communist method, but it is also much more durable. It is through free association with other nations in bilateral, regional, and global diplomacy.

Much is heard these days about the protection of national sovereignty. But if sovereignty is more than a sterile legalism, if it means the real power of a nation to assure by itself the security and welfare of its citizens, then it is obvious that no nation is any longer truly sovereign. It is one of the great paradoxes of our time, and undoubtedly a major source of public frustration, that the most powerful nation in the world is less able to employ its power alone, in pursuit of national ends, then at any previous point in history. Compared to the destructive power the United States possesses today, all the destruction wrought in previous wars is, in President Johnson's words, "like a firecracker thrown against the sun." Yet the achievement of minimum security for the American people depends in part upon cooperation from other countries—even from our greatest adversaries.

What is true of security is true of other essential goals of our national policy. We can no longer assure the material well-being of American citizens by acting alone. The cooperation of other nations is now essential to protect our balance of payments, to assure us of access to raw materials and markets, to maintain the safety of our air and ocean transport, to enjoy the full benefits of space technology in communications and weather forecasting, and generally to bring about the kind of world environment congenial to our continuing prosperity.

All this is obvious. What is less obvious is that to encourage the cooperation of other nations which is necessary for our security and welfare, we have had to develop a new arm of diplomacy. This new diplomacy is carried on through international organizations. That is why President Johnson has pledged this country "to do its full share to assist in the development of sound, efficient international organizations to keep the peace, to resolve disputes, to promote peaceful change, to conduct a world war against poverty, to exchange technology, and for other purposes."

Someone once said that all revolutions seem impossible before they occur and inevitable after they occur, an observation that applies well to the diplomatic revolution of the last generation. At the beginning of World War II, it would have been difficult to conceive of the vast array of important functions now being discharged through international institutions. Today, it is hard to imagine a world without them.

This book is about the use of international organizations in our efforts to achieve a victory without a war—a decent world order in the interests of all mankind. It is not concerned with regional organizations in the North Atlantic community, the Americas, or elsewhere—important as these are as stepping stones toward our global objective. It concentrates instead on the major worldwide organizations, mainly the United Nations and its specialized and affiliated agencies, most of which comprehend not only our allies but also uncommitted and Communist nations.

A realistic appreciation of the work of these agencies is not a distinguishing feature of the contemporary scene. Discussion of whether or not we should be in the United Nations is about as useful as discussion of whether or not we should have a U.S. Congress. What we really need is to accept the fact that international organizations are here to stay and to turn to the much more difficult question of how we can use them better to promote our national interest. We need to discuss the U.N. and other international organizations in operational rather than in symbolic terms. We need to consider in professional detail just what these agencies do and how they could do it better.

Both the uncritical admirers of the U.N. and its uncritical opponents do a disservice to the institution and to U.S. foreign policy. One group regards any criticism of the U.N. as profanation of a religious shrine; the other never fails to point out the yawning chasm between U.N. aspirations and U.N. accomplishments. Neither group looks at the U.N. for what it is—a reflection of a turbulent and divided world, an arena for the interplay of national power, a limited instrument for the voluntary association of nations in areas where the interests uniting them are stronger than the interests dividing them. All too few of those forming judgments about the U.N. bring to the subject even a fraction of the professional attention they apply to local or national politics—to speak of the conduct of their private affairs. This is unfortunate, for the path to world order will not be found by those who are negligent of details, indifferent to obstacles, and hell bent on final solutions—whether in the form of a military showdown or instant world government.

Those who would make a responsible contribution to foreign policy—particularly to the field of multilateral diplomacy—should combine a passionate dedication to long-term goals with a sober appreciation of the difficult tasks of institution building that lie along the way. Technological and political imperatives are pressing the United States and other nations more and more to work through international institutions to promote their basic interests. Yet we also live in an era of resurgent nationalism which places severe limitations on what can be done in the short run.

President Johnson has asked that 1965—which the United Nations has officially designated "International Cooperation Year"—be used to take stock of the international cooperation already underway in international institutions and the ways in which it can be strengthened. This book is designed as a contribution to that effort. It is natural, therefore, that it should emphasize the positive more than the negative side of the equation—the constructive ways in which we and other nations have pursued our common interests and the new possibilities we have for doing so in the future. It is all too evident what international organizations have failed to do; the story of what they have succeeded in doing is largely unknown and therefore needs telling. Besides, we can usually get better results in dealing with the shortcomings of international organizations by working to correct them through quiet diplomacy than by denouncing them from the rooftops.

Emphasis on the positive contribution of international organizations does not mean we are uncritical. It would do no service to U.S. foreign policy—or to the United Nations—to hug that organization to death. We must continue to view the U.N. at a distance sufficient to permit a realistic look at its strengths and limitations and a clear appreciation of where and how it touches our national interest. Our approach to the United Nations and other international agencies is therefore pragmatic. In determining whether to pursue a particular foreign-policy interest in international agencies, we weigh the disadvantages as well as the advantages.

Law in our society has been well defined as consisting of "the wise restraints that make men free." In the international community, some restraints on the use of national power are obviously required in the common interest. Other restraints may be undesirable or impractical because common interests do not exist. International institutions require exchanges of mutual restraints and reciprocal concessions by the participating countries. And in each case, it is right and proper for the United States, as well as other countries, to ask whether the restraints and concessions undertaken by others are adequate compensation for the restraints and concessions undertaken by ourselves.

The central thesis of this book is that the pragmatic balancing of the advantages and disadvantages inherent in this system is yielding positive results over a widening range of subject matter. But not all governments share this conclusion. This is not because the national interest of their countries would not be furthered by the continued strengthening of international organizations. On the contrary, as this book argues, the long-term interest of all countries in survival and welfare requires a steady buildup of international institutions. Yet for one reason or another, the leaders of some countries do not share this concept of the national interest or are not prepared to act upon it. Not only are they reluctant to undertake bold new reforms in the direction of closer international cooperation; they are resisting some of the forms of international cooperation we already have.

This situation helps to explain why the U.S. Government has been unenthusiastic about proposals for a conference to review and amend the United Nations Charter. Some of the proponents of this idea believe such a conference would help to transform the U.N. into some kind of world government; others believe it would at least strengthen the organization in fundamental respects. But amendment of the charter requires approval not only of two-thirds of the member states but specifically of the Soviet Union, France, and other permanent members of the Security Council. If one examines carefully the attitude of U.N. members toward specific proposals for strengthening the organization, one quickly discovers that the most likely consequence of wholesale revision of the charter would be to diminish rather than enhance the strength of the organization.

The Charter of the United Nations, like the American Constitution, is a framework for organic growth in response to new demands and changing realities. The United Nations has been able, within the context of the charter, to assume ever greater responsibilities in the service of its members' long-term interest. An attempt to rewrite its constitution would arrest the continued growth of the United Nations, for some of the members would be reluctant to give explicit endorsement to some of the implicit powers that have been granted to the organization over the years. The fact is that the charter is a better instrument for the achievement of U.N. purposes than any that could be negotiated today. The same is true, by and large, of the constitutions of other major international agencies.

It is a very large question whether the impressive growth in the responsibilities of international institutions recorded in the last two decades and analyzed in this book can continue in the years ahead, or whether we are in for serious disappointments in our efforts to achieve a decent world order. "Crisis" has become an overworked word, but it is no exaggeration to say that the system of international institutions of which the U.N. is the center is now in crisis. The future of that system, and the pace of progress toward world order, will be determined to a large extent by what takes place in the vital period between the opening of the 19th General Assembly near the end of 1964, and the close of International Cooperation Year 13 months later.

During this relatively brief span, the nations of the world will be required to make decisions of unprecedented difficulty. They will be faced—if the Soviet Union and other countries do not cease their financial boycott—with the application of article 19 of the U.N. Charter, providing for loss of vote in the General Assembly to members more than 2 years in arrears in their assessed contributions. They will consider new arrangements for the initiation and financing of peacekeeping operations—arrangements giving a larger voice to the large and middle powers that bear the principal responsibility for supporting them. They will have to decide whether or not to ratify charter amendments enlarging the Security Council from 11 to 15 members and the Economic and Social Council from 18 to 27—a question which in the United States is certain to stimulate a wide-ranging review of the decisionmaking process in U.N. organs.

But the months ahead will be a time for decisions not only about peacekeeping operations, but also about cooperative endeavors for the general welfare of mankind. The members of the U.N. will try to establish new machinery to deal with the trade problems of the developing countries. They will consider proposals to merge the central U.N. institutions providing preinvestment aid in less developed countries. They will take a second long look at the world population problem and possibly measures to deal with it. They will make fundamental decisions about the work of the U.N. system in industrialization, housing, and provision of food to less-developed countries. They will examine pressing issues of human rights and the adequacy of existing machinery to deal with them. And, outside the U.N. itself, decisions will be made in the most ambitious negotiation ever undertaken to reduce trade barriers and on new measures for strengthening the world's monetary system.

These problems and prospects are considered in detail in the following chapters. It may be appropriate at this point to underline the critical importance of the decisions facing the U.N. in the peacekeeping field. Will the fiscal and constitutional integrity of the organization be maintained in the face of opposition from some of its members? Will improved procedures be found for initiating and financing peacekeeping operations? The answer to these questions cannot fail to have a decisive influence on the future of the United Nations not only as an instrument for peace and security but also as an instrument for the promotion of the general welfare. The work of the United Nations system in economic and social development is not likely to prosper if the countries that bear the principal burden of supporting it lose confidence in the constitutional integrity of the system.

How the United Nations survives this emerging crisis will be determined by the response of four groups of members:

The first group includes the Soviet Union and other Communist countries. In recent months, Soviet leaders have said uncommonly generous things about the importance of strengthening the peacekeeping work of the United Nations. Yet as these words are written, the Soviet Union still refuses to pay its peacekeeping assessments or negotiate meaningfully on new procedures for peacekeeping operations. In the final analysis, the peacekeeping work of the United Nations must continue—in the future as it has in the past—even without the cooperation of the Soviet bloc. Yet it is obvious that Soviet cooperation is greatly to be desired and that continued Soviet opposition will make progress more difficult.

The second group includes those countries from Africa and Asia which have recently achieved independence. Many of these countries describe themselves as "uncommitted." This term causes no problem if it means uncommitted as between parties, for rigorous adherence to an independent stance often serves the cause of freedom as well as choosing sides in the cold war. But the term is dangerous if it means uncommitted as to values, if it means that on any given subject, a country or a person takes a position that is halfway between the positions of the United States and the Soviet Union. Such a policy is the very negation of independence, for it makes the country or person applying it a dependent variable whose position on any given subject is determined by where the great powers stand. The day the members of the United Nations decide to be uncommitted to the principles of the charter, the organization will cease to exist.

If the Soviet Union fails to alter its policy on U.N. peacekeeping operations in the months ahead, it will test as never before the attitudes of the newly independent nations. The very future of the United Nations may be decided by the determination with which these countries implement their commitments to the charter in the face of Soviet opposition. If they respond to this new crisis as they have responded to similar crises in the past, they will rally to support the organization, out of a recognition of their basic interests in a stronger United Nations working in pursuit of freedom and economic advancement for all nations.

The third group includes the countries of Latin America and the older nations of Africa and Asia. In past years, they have helped to encourage a responsible dialog between the industrialized countries and the new members of the United Nations. Much depends on how they play this role in the future.

The fourth group includes the United States and the other countries of the North Atlantic Community, together with Australia, New Zealand, and Japan. These countries have provided the main material and moral support for the United Nations and other international organizations. The unusual obstacles that now obstruct the path to world order demand of them a much more unified and effective effort in the future. Such an effort will require a broader consensus than now exists on the ways in which the North Atlantic nations and their Pacific partners can employ international institutions to promote the common interest in peace and welfare. The development of this consensus should be an urgent item of public business for all these countries.

As anyone familiar with government knows, the making of policy is a corporate rather than individual effort. While the author has helped to shape the policy of our Government on most of the subjects discussed in this book, he has been but one small part of a very large enterprise in which many others have shared. This volume is the result of a personal effort and the responsibility for any shortcomings in exposition or argument rests solely with the author, yet it must be emphasized that the final manuscript draws greatly on the suggestions of many government colleagues.

Every book reflects the particular perspective of its author. The character of this book would have been different had I never left Columbia University to become a State Department official. In government, the view is different (not necessarily better or worse) from what it is in private life. Moreover, subjects must be handled differently on the printed page. The government official benefits from inside knowledge, but he also observes restraints that are vital to the conduct of modern diplomacy.

John F. Kennedy liked to quote the ancient Greeks' definition of "happiness"—"the exercise of vital powers in a life affording them scope." Those who came to Washington in the spring of 1961 were blessed with an extraordinary opportunity to enjoy that kind of happiness. It was a particular joy for one whose central professional interest has been the development of international law and organization to find himself with a broad mandate to assist in the development of U.S. policy in the United Nations and other international organizations. It was still a greater privilege to be associated with a group of men and women dedicated to the same concerns and embodying the best combination of thought and action—thinkers and doers in the best sense of both words.

The person responsible for bringing me to Washington and the guiding force in the development of the ideas contained in this book has been Harlan Cleveland, Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs. My indebtedness to him, intellectually and otherwise, is infinite. I owe a similar debt to Ambassador Adlai Stevenson, who continues to be an inspiration for all those beating paths to world order. I should also like to mention the other leading members of the team who helped to shape U.S. policy in international organizations in the Kennedy-Johnson administration, and whose contributions are reflected here—my colleagues Joseph J. Sisco, Elmore Jackson, and Thomas W. Wilson. And it is difficult to overestimate the continuing contribution to policy made by the extremely able members of the career service in the Bureau of International Organization Affairs, surely one of the most extraordinary concentrations of talent in this or any other government. Special thanks must be given to Mrs. Mary Frances Keyhole. who discharged with her usual good nature and efficiency the difficult assignment of preparing this manuscript.

Grateful acknowledgment is hereby made to Foreign Affairs, the Saturday Review, and the New York Times Sunday Magazine for permission to use material originally published in those periodicals.

LEGISLATION DESIGNED TO TEMPORARILY RELEASE 100,000 SHORT TONS OF COPPER FROM NATIONAL STOCKPILE

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. Monagan] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to authorize the temporary release of 100,000 short tons of copper from the national stockpile. In addition, I have today addressed a letter to Edward A. McDermott, Director of the Office of Emergency Planning, to request that he continue his discussions with other Federal agencies and representatives of the copper industry to determine whether additional relief can be provided administratively to alleviate immediately the hardships caused to the industry by the current shortage of the metal.

I was happy to announce in December the receipt of a communication from Director McDermott in which he informed me that he had authorized, at that time, the sale of 20,000 tons of copper from the Defense Production Act inventory. Last October there were 30,000 tons of stockpile copper released for use by the Bureau of the Mint. The producers of copper in my district have informed me that the release of 20,000 tons of copper to the industry will be helpful, but that it will not solve the problem of market stability. It has been estimated that it would take from 6 months to a year for distributors to meet current demands and I have, therefore:

First. Asked for further administrative action.

Second. Filed legislation authorizing the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning to make available to domestic producers of copper 100,000 short tons under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe. One of the terms would be the requirement that the producers receiving such copper agree to restore it in equal amount and grade not later than 1 year after its receipt or, in the event of an emergency as determined by the President, not later than 60 days after notice thereof.

Mr. Speaker, the industry and the economy of my district are dependent to a major degree upon the availability of copper. Similar bills have been filed by some of my colleagues. I hope that the House will support us in this endeavor.

SENATOR GAYLORD NELSON SAYS "KEEP ST. CROIX RIVER CLEAN"

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Fraser] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, an eloquent appeal for conservation of our river resources was made by Senator Gaylord Nelson, of Wisconsin, last Thursday, January 14. He appeared in Stillwater, Minn., at a hearing on the future of the St. Croix River, a beautiful clean river forming the boundary between Minnesota and Wisconsin.

Senator Nelson's speech, which follows, should be read by all Members of Congress:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR GAYLORD NELSON BEFORE A JOINT HEARING BY THE MINNESOTA CONSERVATION COMMISSIONER, WAYNE OLSON, AND THE MINNESOTA WATER POLLUTION CONTROL COMMISSION IN STILLWATER, MINN., JANUARY 14, 1965

I appreciate the opportunity to appear here today before this joint hearing of the Minnesota Conservation Commissioner and the Minnesota Water Pollution Control Commission. I want it to be clear at the outset that I am appearing here today on my own time and expense as a private citizen. I represent and speak only for myself. Though I grew up in a fine little village not far from the banks of the St. Croix, my prime concern over this river is neither parochial nor nostalgic. It is the same broad concern that all conservationists have about these matters whether it be the wilderness of the West, the Redwoods of California, the Indiana dunes, or the Appalachian Trail of the East.

This morning I want to speak briefly about conservation as an issue in American life, and about why it has been for so long an uphill fight and why, I believe, the tide must turn now or the cause be irretrievably lost.

I hope to outline the compelling reasons why the St. Croix River ought to be reserved for recreation development, and why this will be in the best interests not only of the Nation and the metropolitan area, but even of Washington County, Minn.

The agencies holding this joint hearing are the only public agencies that have any power under present legal arrangements to consider the broad issues involved in this dispute. I hope that you take these broad issues into consideration and that you examine the information now being gathered by the Federal-State Task Force on the St. Croix before you reach your decision.

With President Johnson's commitment to protecting our natural heritage and to preventive action on water pollution, the nationwide conservation movement has taken on a new political luster.

Let me quote for a moment from the state of the Union message:

"For over three centuries," the President said, "the beauty of America has sustained our spirit and enlarged our vision. We must act now to protect this heritage."

This statement reflects both wisdom and hard political sense. The wisdom is familiar to all of us from our schoolday acquaintance with John Muir, Henry Thoreau, and the other greats of the long, but losing 19th century battle to preserve some of our natural wilderness.

Wisdom has often seemed a kind of euphemism for the attractive but impractical position in that battle.

But times are changing. President Johnson is as much a reflection of that change as he is its leader.

The day when short-term economic gain could easily win over long range public conservation interests is about at an end. The vital need to preserve what is left is widely recognized.

To put it bluntly: There is a rapidly growing public interest in conservation that just was not there before. Perhaps some people care now who did not before because they have the money and the leisure to enjoy the out-of-doors; or perhaps it is because increasing tens of thousands of people in our vast metropolitan wastelands finally sense a growing isolation from nature; or because of the dawning awareness that the children have no place to play, the adults no place to relax in peace and the environment no place to accommodate the beauty and wonders of nature. Whatever the reasons, there most certainly is a developing sense of dismay over the wanton destruction of our resources.

I think one little-noted element in this change is a new recognition of the vital economic importance of outdoor recreation.

According to the highly regarded report to the President of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission (ORRC report), outdoor recreation is a $20 billion a year business—and it is growing by leaps and bounds.

The report, by the way, makes at least two statements directly relating to the decision before this hearing:

First, it states that the recreation resource in greatest demand and shortest supply is water-oriented recreational areas handy to metropolitan areas.

Second, it says, the area of the Nation that by 1980 will have the largest demand for outdoor recreational facilities is the north central census region. As you know, the Twin Cities are the great population center for the western part of that region.

It may be hard to realize for those who have lived their lives in the St. Croix Valley, but Minnesota and this entire region have a priceless recreation resource in this river—a clean, large, spectacularly beautiful river within a half hour's drive of a major population center.

I am appearing here today to express the hope that you preserve this river in its present state for yourselves and as a heritage for those who come after you.

The President said: "For 300 years the beauty of America has sustained our spirit."

Under industrious cultivation our rich and beautiful land not only sustained our spirit but has made us rich beyond our greatest dreams.

We have always been grateful, but I fear we have too often forgotten the need to conserve as much as possible of this rich inheritance we have received. Everyone, or nearly everyone, is in favor of conservation—in principle. But in fight after fight, the general public interest in conservation has lost out to the specific local interest in commercial development.

Perhaps the conflict goes back to the day when the white man first faced the original American.

The white man brought from Europe ideas of land management very different from the Indian's.

The Indian had great reverence for the land. He knew he depended upon it for life itself. The fruit of the earth confirmed the generosity of the gods. The land belonged not to the individual, but to all his people.

The white man, of course, thought in terms of individual exploitation—too often for private gain at public expense.

It is only gradually that we are coming to see that there is much truth for us in the original American's idea.

Thoreau and Muir, and our other early conservationists, had a good deal of the Indian about them. But the fight they waged was little more successful than the Indian's.

In most conservation contests—whether over the use of the Indiana dunes, of the Redwoods of California, or the St. Croix—there is usually a sizeable group of local people willing to grant the validity of the conservationist's arguments, but bowing in this specific instance to the strong local economic interest in the development of a specific forest, river, or bit of lakeshore.

The fight has been unequal—eloquent spokesmen preaching lofty conservation generalities on the one hand, determined people seeking their bread and butter on the other.

The country has always seemed so vast, its resources so endless, and economic progress so American, that the conservation interests, except in areas of marginal economic utility, have almost always lost the contest. No single one of these lost contests loomed large in the total picture. But down through the decades these thousands of lost contests have spelled the destruction of a major portion of America's resources.

In this way, most of the great rivers of America have been systematically destroyed, in the name of progress.

George Washington dreamed of the Nation's capital on the beautiful Potomac, the river praised by early travelers for its exceptionally sweet water.

But since Washington left us with his dream, tons of silt from exhausted tobacco plantations, acids leeching into the river from abandoned mines, industrial wastes and half treated sewage have fouled this once sweet river and turned it into a national disgrace. Stand on the lawn in front of George Washington's Mount Vernon home today, gaze across the broad expanse of the Potomac, and your view will be scarred by a sign proclaiming: "Danger, polluted water."

The U.S. Corps of Engineers has proposed to spend $500 million to build a system of dams to flush out this scenic sewer. And now the President is thinking in terms of a multi-million-dollar program to restore some measure of the river's great reputation.

Call the role of the great American rivers of the past, and you will have a list of the pollution problems of today—the Androscoggin in Maine; the Connecticut, that boundary water between the Green Mountain and the Granite States; the mighty Hudson; the thermally polluted Delaware; the Ohio; the Mississippi; the Missouri; and even your Minnesota, covered from time to time by flotillas of sugarbeet chips.

The story in each case is the same: they died for their country. They died in the name of economic development.

And now we must spend vast amounts of money if our people are not to become sick from their dying.

The story of America's commercial development, which is in large part the story of her rivers, is a glorious one. We all benefit. But we are only beginning to reckon the price we must pay for the foolish squandering of our limited supply of clean water.

The story of America's rivers warns us against that American spirit of optimism that presumes there is always more to be had and more to be carelessly wasted.

The vision of the frontier, with its promise of untapped land and fresh opportunity has always been part of our dream. It has not, however, been part of our reality for some 70 years. We are only now coming to realize this fact.

We must act now to plan, and to husband this heritage of land and water carefully. Our long tradition of private land ownership and management makes these things very difficult for us, but we are learning.

It seems logical to me that some rivers ought to be working rivers, kept as clean as possible, but recognized and designated as industrial and commercial arteries. The Mississippi is a most obvious candidate for classification.

Others ought to be classified as wild rivers, and still others as recreation rivers. Your favorite trout stream most certainly ought to be protected in a wild state. Rivers like the lower St. Croix, that offer unusual potential for recreational development, ought to be set aside for wise recreational development, especially when there are working rivers nearby.

The St. Croix is the last large clean river near a major metropolitan area in all of the Midwest. If we don't halt commercial exploitation here, where shall we stop?

The upper St. Croix is a river that got a second chance. By 1903 the stripping of the valley's forests had left it nearly bare—and made the river towns rich. But 60 years of quiet have reclothed its banks with trees and stabilized its soil with grass. Now it has been studied as a wild river, part of a new Federal program for the preservation of our dwindling supply of undeveloped streams. It looks like the upper St. Croix is going to be preserved. We can all be grateful.

The towns of the lower St. Croix thrived on timber fortunes and related industrial development while the upper valley was being stripped.

The magnificent period architecture in Stillwater is a tribute to those prosperous, highhanded old days.

But since World War I, the lower St. Croix valley has been industrially becalmed. Local citizens have kept up their hopes for a rebirth of industry, but without any luck. In 1938, as Mr. Chester Wilson so eloquently explained at our Senate subcommittee hearings in December, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers completed a 9-foot barge channel 23 miles up the river to Stillwater in hopes of attracting industry.

Washington County is already part of the Twin Cities metropolitan area. Even in 1960, according to the census, 50 percent of the county's wage earners worked outside its borders—in the Twin Cities, of course. The pressure on the schools of Free School District 834 comes from the children of Twin Cities' workers who are making their homes in this beautiful county.

By the year 2000—only 35 years away (those of you who remember 1930 will realize what a short time 35 years is)—the Twin Cities area population will hit the 2 million mark, according to a report by your metropolitan planning commission, and Stillwater will be practically downtown.

"In our urban areas," President Johnson said in his state of the Union message, "the central problem today is to protect and restore man's satisfaction in belonging to a community.

"The first step is to break old patterns—to begin to think, work, and plan for the development of entire metropolitan areas."

Now, but even more in the years immediately ahead, this great and growing metropolitan area will need the St. Croix as a recreational resource, not as an industrial site.

Despite its sparkling array of lakes and woods the Twin Cities area, again according to the metropolitan planning commission report, is even today short of outdoor recreational facilities. In fact it has only 30 percent of what is considered desirable (10 acres for every 1,000 residents).

The Upper Midwest Research and Development Council reports that in the next 15 years the Twin Cities area will bear the brunt of the continuing migration from the small towns and farms of the north central region.

With incomes going steadily up (the gross national product is predicted to jump 95 percent in the next 15 years) and more and more leisure time available, the need for and demand for outdoor recreation in the beautiful lower St. Croix Valley will be enormous.

Conservationists usually find themselves in the position of arguing for abstract values against men holding gilt edge balance sheets.

We are beginning, however, to develop some facts that help explain the dollar value of green space and recreational areas.

For instance, it was discovered in New York City that, over a 15-year period, property located on Central Park increased 18 times in value while similar property away from the park only doubled in value.

In Washington, D.C., it has been demonstrated that the total investment in lovely Rock Creek Park has been more than paid for by the increased tax income on the properties near the park.

Those who fear that without heavy industry Stillwater is doomed to be just another dying river town are looking to the past, not to the future. Recreation development offers more in the long run than the development of industry on the St. Croix.

The Northern States Power Co. proposes to begin construction this year on the first of two coal-operated steam-electric generating units at Oak Park Heights, Minn., just south of Stillwater. The first unit would have a capacity of 550,000 kilowatts. It would have a 785-foot smokestack, a half-mile coal pile, and require 660 cubic feet of river water per second for cooling and condensing steam. The second unit, a 750,000-kilowatt unit, would of course require even more cooling water.

Valley residents and thoughtful conservationists everywhere fear the heat pollution of the river, pollution of the air by the sulfur gases from the burning of low grade fuel, and the fiftyfold increase in barge traffic on the river that the first unit of the plant would require. In essence, this plant will simply and unnecessarily reduce the value of the river for recreation at a stage in history when the trend should be sharply reversed.

On the narrow question of water pollution danger, I have no new information to add. The Minnesota Water Pollution Control Commission is, I am confident, able to sift all the available evidence on that problem. If the evidence shows that the operation of the plan will have any adverse effect on the water quality or the ecology of the river, I am confident that the commission will either turn down the company's application for a permit to return heated water to the river, or at least require the construction of the proper cooling towers to insure the river against damage.

I would like to raise one question, however.

The national power survey just released by the Federal Power Commission indicates that it is generally considered sound practice to limit stream diversion for steam condensation to one-half the streamflow.

The first unit of the proposed Allen S. King plant would require, I understand, 660 cubic feet per seecond, well over half the 1,000 cubic feet per second which is the 10-year minimum flow of the St. Croix at Oak Park Heights. Since the second unit of the plant is even larger than the first, I am anxious to see evidence behind the company's assurances that no harm will be done to the river by such massive withdrawal of its waters.

I would like to make one other comment. The company asserts that the additional cost of constructing this plant on the Mississippi—say at the Prairie Island site, north of Red Wing, Minn.—would not be great enough to affect the electricity rates.

It has also argued the wisdom of developing the St. Croix site now on the grounds that the power requirements of the Twin Cities area in the years ahead will be so great that all available sites must be developed at one time or another, and the best time to develop the St. Croix site is now.

Given the fantastic pace in powerplant design and development—it was only in 1961 that the first 500,000-kilowatt steam-electric generating plant went into operation—would it not be wise to hold off on using the St. Croix site for the time being in the expectation that new developments in plant capacity would make using the site unnecessary?

The pollution questions you are expected to pass on. The larger questions, more crucial really, raise perplexing problems.

The fact is that the fight over the location of this plant reveals a gap in the fabric of our institutions. It raises the question of land-use evaluation. There is no agency available to resolve that question.

This is a genuine, honorable conflict. Which is to come first on the St. Croix—power development or recreation and conservation? Who can decide the question?

This case raises the age-old question of land use and resource use, a question that must daily be decided in situation after situation across the country.

Whose responsibility is it?

Are we to ask Northern States Power Co. officials to make their decision on the basis of the area's present and future recreational needs?

The Washington County officials? For the taxpayer that $68 million plant is a well-nigh irresistible tax windfall, although I believe there are some who see the long-range dangers.

In the absence of any regional, or metropolitan planning authority, the appeal must be made to this joint hearing to take the larger considerations into account.

I am aware there are differences of opinion over the scope of authority vested in the conservation commissioner by the words "health and welfare" in the pertinent section of the statutes. These are matters over which competent counsel are expected to differ. But since they do differ and the issue is so important, it surely is a matter that ought to be settled by the appropriate court before authorization is granted the company to proceed.

That there is a vested public interest in public waters as such is clear; that any reasonably liberal interpretation of the word "welfare" raises the question of the stake of the general public in this matter; that since this is a private utility with a monopoly in a service area set by the Government, the company can hardly argue that a few months of delay will cause irreparable damage—while whatever damage is done by the plant to the river will be irreparable.

Furthermore, I am advised that the company plans to proceed with construction on other sites including the Mississippi in the years immediately ahead.

I ask again, would it not be reasonable to develop another site now, saving the lovely St. Croix for exploitation at some future time and only if absolutely necessary?

I know you all realize this is a case of national significance. It has attracted attention of the press and magazines through the Midwest and from coast to coast. The New York Times, the Washington Post, the Nation and New Republic have written stories and editorialized about it.

During the past 100 years we have wrought more wanton destruction of our landscape than any previous civilization accomplished in 1,000 years. We now say, what a pity our ancestors didn't have the foresight to husband our bountiful resources more sensibly. How much richer we would be both in esthetic and material wealth had they had more vision and more courage. Before this case is decided I think we all should ask ourselves this question: What are our great-great-grandchildren going to say about us a half century from now?

I might add that beginning attempts at the industrialization of the St. Croix made it clear that Federal action is needed to protect the national interest.

Therefore, I am now drafting a bill to make the entire length of the St. Croix and its Wisconsin tributary, the Namekagon, into a national scenic waterway.

North of Taylors Falls the St. Croix would be designated a "wild river" as envisioned in the Federal study. A national recreation area would be laid out along the lower St. Croix.

A number of Washington county people seem to feel that Save the St. Croix, Inc. is made up of wealthy yachtowners who want to keep Lake St. Croix as their private playground.

This charge is not based on fact. But the fact is that if the St. Croix is to be made a recreation area for all, careful planning must begin now. Access points and riverside parks must be developed and proper zoning regulations worked out in cooperation with local property owners. The river must be made available to all the people of the area.

That is the purpose of the bill I am drafting.

The future establishment of a St. Croix National Scenic Waterway would, of course, have no legal effect whatever on the Northern States Power Co. proposal now before you. That decision rests with you.

SEMIANNUAL SESSION OF THE COUNCIL OF INTERGOVERNMENTAL COMMITTEE FOR EUROPEAN MIGRATION

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Willis] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure to attend, in November 1964, the regular semiannual session of the 29 member-governments session of the Council of ICEM—Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration—held in Geneva, Switzerland. The U.S. congressional delegation, of which I had the honor to be a member, was composed of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. Chelf], the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Rodino], the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. Rogers], the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Cahill], the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Mathias], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Byrd].

Permit me to say, Mr. Speaker, that the debates held in Geneva have once more acknowledged the vitality and the usefulness of ICEM, an organization conceived and founded by our lamented colleague and friend, Francis E. Walter, as a valuable and important instrument serving not only humanitarian principles and aims but—first and foremost—vital U.S. interests in the field of our national immigration policy and world migratory movements.

The most important task facing ICEM at the present moment is to find ways and means to cope with a rising trend of demands from new refugees for resettlement. While the generosity of many countries maintains their doors open—Australia, Canada, South Africa, Sweden, and New Zealand should be mentioned at this point together with the United States operating under the refugee fair share law—the increase of needs for expeditious movement of refugees creates for ICEM additional financial difficulties.

The current situation in the refugee sector of ICEM's operations was presented to the organization's Council by ICEM's new Deputy Director Walter M. Besterman, who served as our counsel for over 19 years.

When Walter Besterman resigned from the staff of the Judiciary Committee last September to assume his post in Geneva to which he was unanimously elected by ICEM's Council, the Speaker had this to say about him, among other things:

> Besterman researched and presented the facts with a strict and inflexible integrity for the whole truth and then he let the facts

and the history behind them speak for themselves. When, as so often happened, his counsel and personal advice were sought by those who were charged with the responsibility for legislation and for action, he provided it in a manner that cast a penetrating shaft of light on the facts of a situation.

The presentation of the current refugee problems by Walter Besterman was in his best tradition. No wonder he was vigorously applauded by all present at the meeting, a very infrequent occurence in Geneva meetings.

For the information of the House, his address follows:

Statement Made by Mr. W. M. Besterman, Deputy Director of ICEM, at the 193d Meeting of the Council of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration, Held at Geneva, November 10, 1964, on Refugee Migration

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I was requested by the Director to introduce to the Council document MC/INF/116, which is being presented pursuant to a specific directive incorporated in Resolution No. 315, document MC/663 of last May's session, and additional views of the subcommittee on Budget and Finance expressed in the course of its meeting held in Washington in September. The document reaches the Council forwarded by the executive committee under action taken last week. The administration respectfully submits it as an information paper, containing what we believe to be a comprehensive recital of the scope and the principal characteristics of existing demand for movements of refugees to areas of resettlement which have been opened to them through the generosity of various receiving governments.

As we see it, the problem of European refugees is far from being solved. In fact, the contrary seems to be the truth. What we consider to be legitimate demands for our assistance grow in their size and in their complexity, while the need for timely assistance in the movement of refugees becomes more acute.

Fully realizing that because of a variety of factors ICEM is and will be prevented from complying with every request for assistance in the movement of refugees, the administration, under directives given us by our governing bodies, presents to the Council and all governments of good will, our minimal approximation of the status of current demand for assistance to refugees as we are able to assess it in the realistic context of presently foreseeable income.

As I mentioned a while ago, Mr. Chairman, there are two basic points to be considered: (1) the size of the demand and (2) the need for timely assistance, if such is to be accorded at all.

First, how come we are faced with urgent requests for movement of refugees while camps in Europe have been closed long ago—with very few exceptions—and the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees indicates the need but for the movement of a modest number of residual or handicapped cases? Who are the refugees who knock at our door for assistance?

I am most happy, Mr. Chairman, to be able to report to this Council that this administration has been and is receiving full and complete understanding and cooperation of the High Commissioner. In Rome, 2 weeks ago, where I had the honor to represent ICEM at the meeting of the High Commissioner's executive committee, we found wholehearted support expressed in one of the resolutions adopted there.

Who are then the refugees who ask for our assistance? The answer is given, I believe, on pages 4 and 9 of the document I referred to which I would invite the Council to examine. Also, the information contained on pages 4 and 9, inclusive, is summarized briefly for the Council's convenience in two tables added as an annex, with the very final figure at the right hand of the second page of the annex indicating what is the financial size of the problem. It is $249,843, exactly 1 percent of this organization's total budget.

The influx of new refugees arriving in Western Europe shows a slight increase over the last annual average which was approximately 10,000. Most of the new refugees are the people that we have known for years: Czechs and Slovaks, Yugoslavs, Poles, and Hungarians but, significantly, because of political events an increasing number of Albanians. In addition to that, there is an increasing number of refugees transiting through Western Europe to areas of resettlement. This category of refugees includes those who succeed in obtaining visas or other type of entry permit from the receiving countries prior to the time they leave the countries which they are abandoning.

Although, legally, the great majority of refugees who apply for ICEM's assistance fall within the mandate of the High Commissioner, they do not show in the statistics including camp inmates. The reason for this is that voluntary agencies and ICEM begin to process them for movement to areas of resettlement before they obtain exit permits. It is precisely for this reason that they do not become camp residents. They do not become a burden upon the countries of asylum and upon the international community supplying funds for care and maintenance.

The Director has pointed out in his report on ICEM's policy and programs that we take pride in the fact that, thanks to the efforts of the voluntary agencies and the improvement of our own procedures, we are now moving to the receiving countries human beings not eroded by the depressing and demoralizing influence of camp life. We also believe that we are contributing to the welfare and the interests of the countries of first asylum by relieving them of the financial and administrative burdens stemming from maintenance of camps.

Under the well thought out intent of the framers of our charter, the Brussels resolution of 1951 and the Venice Constitution of 1953, this organization does not operate under the legal definition of "refugee" as does the United Nations High Commissioner and as did the old IRO. What prevails in our operations as far as determination of refugee status is concerned, is (1) the historical, traditional acceptance of the meaning of that term, and (2) national criteria, national policy determinations, and national legislative definitions used for admission purposes. Combining the two principles, ICEM assists in the movement of refugees strictly in accordance with the policy of the receiving countries and under one overriding governing principle: availability of funds.

The paper before you, Mr. Chairman, offers, I believe, the opportunity for the unequivocal application of these two principles in predicating the collective assistance to each movement upon the unencumbered freedom of choice of each money-contributing and immigrant-receiving government. Briefly, what we are offering on these pages 4 to 9 of the document—what we are offering each government—is the opportunity to indicate to us, specifically, the class or category of refugees it desires to assist through the use of our operational machinery. Thus, it is made abundantly clear, I believe, that only those refugees will be moved to areas of resettlement for whose assistance funds are provided. Consequently, as it was pointed out in our progress report, not all of the refugees requesting our assistance will be accorded it. Our budget paper for 1965 which the Council will consider subsequently brings out clearly, I submit, the fact that our refugee movements estimates are being adjusted to budgetary realities. In simple words, this means that the task cut out for us by the member governments in years past will not be carried out in full as long as the tools supplied us remain inadequate.

Obviously, it is for the governments to determine to what extent and which part of the task is to remain unfulfilled.

The paper under discussion makes it evident, we believe, that we are faced now with a refugee problem vastly different from the one World War II left the free world to cope with. Save for a few exceptions, we are not dealing with displaced persons and refugees as the international community knew them in the past. Today, the refugee who desires to obtain a new lease on life is the victim of circumstances which arose in the wake of World War II, after the guns were silenced but the world did not obtain tranquillity nor stability.

What are the causes of the continuing presence of the European refugee problem?

I shall attempt, Mr. Chairman, to summarize them, as briefly as I can.

One, the continued existence of political systems not acceptable to many of those who are forced to live under them—that produces more refugees. As someone said, people leaving the domains of oppressive regimes, "vote with their feet."

Two, political events resulting in the creation of new sovereignties, many of which are founded on religious and racial bases—that produces more refugees.

Three, new systems of persecution and discrimination based on political, religious or racial grounds—that produces more refugees.

Four, unfortunate manifestations of immature, often rampant nationalism directed primarily against those who bear the stamp of belonging to those European nationalities in whose name colonies were administered—that produces more refugees.

Five, successful attempts of some governments at forcing out of the countries those whom they call members of the former ruling and privileged classes—that produces more refugees.

Six, the displeasure of some governments with the disruptive influence of the flow of messages in which a happily resettled refugee reports from the free world back home to his unhappy relatives, his wife, child, parent, brother, or sister—that causes some governments, often after years of hesitation, to adopt the policy of "good riddance" expressed in an exit permit—and that produces the family reunion cases.

All of these refugees are listed in our paper in what we believe to be plain and judicious language. It is in the document before you, sir. The appearance of each group is the direct result of one or more of the circumstances I tried to identify.

All of them are Europeans, all of them stem from the same European stock that in centuries and decades past settled Latin America, Australia, Israel, South Africa, Canada, and the United States.

As I said, we full well realize that not all of their number may receive our assistance through your governments' generosity. We nevertheless list them all as we believe that they are all entitled at least to beg for assistance in their quest for a new happier life.

Now, in the course of last week's discussions held in our Executive Committee there was a very valid point raised, I believe, as to the European and oversea community's moral responsibility for the recognition that persons abandoning certain Mediterranean areas as a result of the various types of pressures I tried to describe may properly be classified as refugees.

Well, Mr. Chairman, personally, I think it will be presumptuous to suggest any policy determinations to any of the member governments of ICEM.

Nevertheless, permit me to bring to the attention of the Council some actions taken by my Government, by the U.S. Government. In the aftermath of the Suez crisis of 1956, realizing the change of attitude of certain countries of the Near East toward national and religious minorities—in plain language, Christians and Jews—the Congress of the United States approved an amendment to the Refugee Act of 1953, which was then on our statute books. Under that amendment the United States opened its doors to certain closely defined refugees "from any country within the general area of the Middle East," such area extending, under the language of the law, "from Libya to the west, to Turkey on the north, Pakistan on the east, and Saudi Arabia and Ethiopia on the south." The author of that amendment, which became the law on September 11, 1957, and remains in full force at the present time, was the then Senator John F. Kennedy, of Massachusetts. His amendment was successfully piloted through the House of Representatives by the late Representative Walter with the active, invaluable assistance of several distinguished gentlemen occupying today the seats in the U.S. delegation, such as the gentleman from Kentucky, the gentleman from New Jersey, the gentleman from Louisiana, and the gentleman from Colorado. It might be worthwhile to add, Mr. Chairman, that Senator Kennedy's amendment passed the Senate and the House of Representatives unanimously.

Three months before his martyr's death, President Kennedy formally requested the Congress to liberalize further the definition of a refugee by dispensing of certain encumbrances such as, for instance, the requirement of eligibility under the United Nations High Commissioner's mandate. That recommendation, endorsed by President Johnson, is pending before the Congress and by the time I left the committee, for whom I had the honor of serving for over 19 years, I found, personally, no opposition to that particular part of the proposal and if I am wrong I may stand corrected by my five former bosses who are in the room.

The second basic point I raised, Mr. Chairman, was timeliness of movement. Why do we believe that carrying out the movements as expeditiously as money and international arrangements permit, is essential? The answer lies, paradoxically, in our inability to foresee or forecast the next turn the policy of certain governments will take.

There is no assurance that the expired exit permit and the one-way passport would be renewed when, at expiration time, we are still not ready to effectuate the movement which we are theoretically authorized to carry out except that we have no money to pay for. There is no assurance that a change in the degree of internal or external pressures upon a government would not cause a change in its present exit policy.

In all frankness, how would we know if and when powerful influences will start objecting more vigorously to the exodus of Christians and Jews from north Africa? How would we know if and when personnel changes on the ruling level of the Soviet Union will result in pressures upon the captive governments to tighten up on exits or stop them altogether? How would we know if and when even the most meritorious program, the one of refugee family reunion, will be slowed down, curtailed or totally eliminated?

All of the present exit policies practiced by the governments with which this international organization maintains no contact may stop as suddenly as they started. This is the reason, Mr. Chairman, for the note of urgency for which we apologize, the note of urgency which is easily detectable from our papers.

We do believe, however, that the matter is urgent. Human beings are involved, and you know, Mr. Chairman, that even perishable goods are usually shipped under the label "Rush."

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may extend their remarks on House Resolution 126, which was passed today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. Hosmer (at the request of Mr. Gerald R. Ford), for today, on account of Government business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Gubser (at the request of Mr. Talcott), for 30 minutes, on January 25, 1965.

Mr. Cooley (at the request of Mr. Hungate), for 60 minutes, Tuesday, January 26, 1965, vacating his special order of today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. Talcott) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Quie.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, January 20, 1965, at 10:30 o'clock a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

383. Communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year 1965 in the amount of $1,742,209,000 for the Department of Agriculture (H. Doc. No. 59); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

384. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 10, United States Code, to increase the size of the Joint Staff, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

385. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Inter-American Development Bank Act to authorize the United States to participate in an increase in the resources of the Fund for Special Operations of the Inter-American Development Bank; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

386. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the appropriation of funds for the maintenance and instruction of deaf, mute, and blind children of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

387. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the District of Columbia Facility Act of 1942 to authorize the maintenance and repair of parking meters and payment for parking meters from fees collected from such meters; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

388. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to utilize certain funds for snow and ice control; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

389. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on overpayments of per diem travel allowances, Department of State; to the Committee on Government Operations.

390. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the 30th Annual Report of the Federal Communications Commission, pursuant to section 4(k) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

391. A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to remove the present $5,000 limitation which prevents the Secretary of the Air Force from settling and paying certain claims arising out of the crash of a U.S. aircraft at Wichita, Kans.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois:

H.R. 3138. A bill to adjust wheat and feed grain production, to establish a cropland retirement program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BELL:

H.R. 3139. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to provide for the greater protection of the President and the Vice President of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 3140. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to assist in combating heart disease, cancer, stroke, and other major diseases; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 3141. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve the educational quality of schools of medicine, dentistry, and osteopathy, to authorize grants under that act to such schools for the awarding of scholarships to needy students, and to extend expiring provisions of that act for student loans and for aid in construction of teaching facilities for students in such schools and schools for other health professions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 3142. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for a program of grants to assist in meeting the need for adequate medical library services and facilities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.R. 3143. A bill to provide for the erection of a monument on Alcatraz Island to commemorate the founding of the United Nations in San Francisco, Calif., in 1945, and to serve as a symbol of peace; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 3144. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to allow the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, under certain circumstances, to disclose information which he has relating to the whereabouts of individuals; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 3145. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to increase from 2 to 2½ percent the retirement multiplication factor used in computing annuities of certain employees engaged in hazardous duties; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 3146. A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, to provide compensation for certain additional losses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 3147. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3148. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that the child of an insured individual, after attaining age 18, may continue to receive child's insurance benefits until he attains age 22 if he is attending school; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 3149. A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act and title IV of the National Housing Act to increase the amount of insurance applicable to bank deposits and savings and loan accounts to $25,000; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 3150. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 so as to modify the decrease in group life insurance at age 65 or after retirement; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 3151. A bill to extend benefits under the Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act to the survivors of retiree annuitants who died before April 1, 1948, and to employees who retired from the Tennessee Valley Authority and Farm Credit Administration, prior to July 1, 1961; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon:

H.R. 3152. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Merlin division, Rouge River Basin project, Oregon, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FRASER:

H.R. 3153. A bill to provide a hospital insurance program for the aged under social security, to amend the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system to increase benefits, improve the actuarial status of the disability insurance trust fund, and extend coverage, to amend the Social Security Act to provide additional Federal financial participation in the Federal-State public assistance programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H.R. 3154. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 to provide for the increased use of milled or enriched rice by the Armed Forces, Federal penal and correctional institutions, and in certain federally operated hospitals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 3155. A bill to permit the exchange between farms of cotton acreage allotments for rice acreage allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HAGAN of Georgia:

H.R. 3156. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a woman who is permanently and totally disabled may become entitled to widow's insurance benefits without regard to her age if she is otherwise qualified; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 3157. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to eliminate the provisions which reduce the annuities of the spouses of retired employees by the amount of certain monthly benefits; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HUOT:

H.R. 3158. A bill to authorize assistance under the Area Development Act for certain additional areas which have sustained, or are about to sustain, sudden and severe economic hardship; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 3159. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an exclusion from gross income of interest on savings deposits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KUNKEL:

H.R. 3160. A bill to provide an exemption from participation in the Federal old-age and survivors insurance program for an individual member of a recognized religious sect who is conscientiously opposed to acceptance of benefits because of his adherence to the established tenets or teachings of such sect; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H.R. 3161. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt schoolbuses from the manufacturers' excise tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McDADE:

H.R. 3162. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to provide for the greater protection of the President and the Vice President of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACGREGOR:

H.R. 3163. A bill to increase benefits under the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system, to provide child's insurance benefits beyond age 18 while in school, to provide widow's benefits at age 60 on a reduced basis, to provide benefits for certain individuals not otherwise eligible at age 72, to improve the actuarial status of the trust funds, to extend coverage, to improve the public assistance programs under the Social Security Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 3164. A bill to authorize the temporary release of 100,000 short tons of copper from the national stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H.R. 3165. A bill to authorize the establishment of the Pecos National Monument in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. NEDZI:

H.R. 3166. A bill to provide a hospital insurance program for the aged under social security, to amend the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system to increase benefits, improve the actuarial status of the disability insurance trust fund, and extend coverage, to amend the Social Security Act to provide additional Federal financial participation in the Federal-State public assistance programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3167. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the manufacturers excise taxes on automobiles and on parts and accessories, and to reduce the manufacturers excise tax on trucks and buses to 5 percent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. QUIE:

H.R. 3168. A bill to provide assistance to certain States bordering the Mississippi River in the construction of the Great River Road; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H.R. 3169. A bill to establish a new program of grants for public works projects undertaken by local governments in the United States; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 3170. A bill to amend section 601 of title 38, United States Code, with respect to the definition of the term "Veterans' Administration facilities"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 3171. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to reduce from 1 year to 6 months the period for which an individual must have been married (in most cases) in order to be considered the wife, husband, widow, or widower of his or her spouse for benefit purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHWEIKER:

H.R. 3172. A bill to establish a Commission on Congressional Reorganization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SLACK:

H.R. 3173. A bill to provide public works and economic development programs and the planning and coordination needed to assist in development of the Appalachian region; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 3174. A bill to establish a new program of grants for public works projects undertaken by local governments in the United States; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 3175. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal certain retailers and manufacturers excise taxes and the excise tax on the use of safe deposit boxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of California:

H.R. 3176. A bill to authorize the coordinated development of the water resources of the Pacific Southwest, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H.R. 3177. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase dependency and indemnity compensation in certain cases; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana:

H.R. 3178. A bill to increase the minimum domestic allotments for cotton farms having two or more tenants; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 3179. A bill to establish a new program of grants for public works projects undertaken by local governments in the United States; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 3180. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a deduction for evacuation expenses incurred during natural disasters; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin:

H.R. 3181. A bill to extend certain benefits to persons who served in the Armed Forces of the United States in Mexico or on its borders during the period beginning May 9, 1916, and ending April 6, 1917, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WALKER of New Mexico:

H.R. 3182. A bill to authorize the establishment of the Pecos National Monument in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H.R. 3183. A bill to protect the domestic economy, to promote the general welfare, and to assist in the national defense by providing for an adequate supply of lead and zinc for consumption in the United States from domestic and foreign sources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 3184. A bill to protect the domestic economy, to promote the general welfare, and to assist in the national defense by providing for an adequate supply of lead and zinc for consumption in the United States from domestic and foreign sources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BATTIN:

H.R. 3185. A bill to protect the domestic economy, to promote the general welfare, and to assist in the national defense by providing for an adequate supply of lead and zinc for consumption in the United States from domestic and foreign sources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURTON of Utah:

H.R. 3186. A bill to protect the domestic economy, to promote the general welfare, and to assist in the national defense by providing for an adequate supply of lead and zinc for consumption in the United States from domestic and foreign sources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.R. 3187. A bill to protect the domestic economy, to promote the general welfare, and to assist in the national defense by providing for an adequate supply of lead and zinc for consumption in the United States from domestic and foreign sources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CURTIN:

H.R. 3188. A bill to protect the domestic economy, to promote the general welfare, and to assist in the national defense by providing for an adequate supply of lead and zinc for consumption in the United States from domestic and foreign sources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee:

H.R. 3189. A bill to protect the domestic economy, to promote the general welfare, and to assist in the national defense by providing for an adequate supply of lead and zince for consumption in the United States from domestic and foreign sources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H.R. 3190. A bill to protect the domestic economy, to promote the general welfare, and to assist in the national defense by providing for an adequate supply of lead and zinc for consumption in the United States from domestic and foreign sources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOLEY:

H.R. 3191. A bill to protect the domestic economy, to promote the general welfare, and to assist in the national defense by providing for an adequate supply of lead and zinc for consumption in the United States from domestic and foreign sources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 3192. A bill to protect the domestic economy, to promote the general welfare, and to assist in the national defense by providing for an adequate supply of lead and zinc for consumption in the United States from domestic and foreign sources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALL:

H.R. 3193. A bill to protect the domestic economy, to promote the general welfare, and to assist in the national defense by providing for an adequate supply of lead and zinc for consumption in the United States from domestic and foreign sources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ICHORD:

H.R. 3194. A bill to protect the domestic economy, to promote the general welfare, and to assist in the national defense by providing for an adequate supply of lead and zinc for consumption in the United States from domestic and foreign sources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 3195. A bill to protect the domestic economy, to promote the general welfare, and to assist in the national defense by providing for an adequate supply of lead and zinc for consumption in the United States from domestic and foreign sources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING of Utah:

H.R. 3196. A bill to protect the domestic economy, to promote the general welfare, and to assist in the national defense by providing for an adequate supply of lead and zinc for consumption in the United States from domestic and foreign sources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McVICKER:

H.R. 3197. A bill to protect the domestic economy, to promote the general welfare, and to assist in the national defense by providing for an adequate supply of lead and zinc for consumption in the United States from domestic and foreign sources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H.R. 3198. A bill to protect the domestic economy, to promote the general welfare, and to assist in the national defense by providing for an adequate supply of lead and zinc for consumption in the United States from domestic and foreign sources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. QUILLEN:

H.R. 3199. A bill to protect the domestic economy, to promote the general welfare, and to assist in the national defense by providing for an adequate supply of lead and zinc for consumption in the United States from domestic and foreign sources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 3200. A bill to protect the domestic economy, to promote the general welfare, and to assist in the national defense by providing for an adequate supply of lead and zinc for consumption in the United States from domestic and foreign sources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. REID of Illinois:

H.R. 3201. A bill to protect the domestic economy, to promote the general welfare, and to assist in the national defense by providing for an adequate supply of lead and zinc for consumption in the United States from domestic and foreign sources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H.R. 3202. A bill to protect the domestic economy, to promote the general welfare, and to assist in the national defense by providing for an adequate supply of lead and zinc for consumption in the United States from domestic and foreign sources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 3203. A bill to protect the domestic economy, to promote the general welfare, and to assist in the national defense by providing for an adequate supply of lead and zinc for consumption in the United States from domestic and foreign sources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 3204. A bill to protect the domestic economy, to promote the general welfare, and to assist in the national defense by providing for an adequate supply of lead and zinc for consumption in the United States from domestic and foreign sources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SENNER:

H.R. 3205. A bill to protect the domestic economy, to promote the general welfare, and to assist in the national defense by providing for an adequate supply of lead and zinc for consumption in the United States from domestic and foreign sources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SKUBITZ:

H.R. 3206. A bill to protect the domestic economy, to promote the general welfare, and to assist in the national defense by providing for an adequate supply of lead and zinc for consumption in the United States from domestic and foreign sources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin:

H.R. 3207. A bill to protect the domestic economy, to promote the general welfare, and to assist in the national defense by providing for an adequate supply of lead and zinc for consumption in the United States from domestic and foreign sources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 3208. A bill to protect the domestic economy, to promote the general welfare, and to assist in the national defense by providing for an adequate supply of lead and zinc for consumption in the United States from domestic and foreign sources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.R. 3209. A bill to protect the domestic economy, to promote the general welfare, and to assist in the national defense by providing for an adequate supply of lead and zinc for consumption in the United States from domestic and foreign sources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALKER of New Mexico:

H.R. 3210. A bill to protect the domestic economy, to promote the general welfare, and to assist in the national defense by providing for an adequate supply of lead and zinc for consumption in the United States from domestic and foreign sources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHITE of Idaho:

H.R. 3211. A bill to protect the domestic economy, to promote the general welfare, and to assist in the national defense by providing for an adequate supply of lead and zinc for consumption in the United States from domestic and foreign sources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 3212. A bill to protect the domestic economy, to promote the general welfare, and to assist in the national defense by providing for an adequate supply of lead and zinc for consumption in the United States from domestic and foreign sources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H.R. 3213. A bill to protect the domestic economy, to promote the general welfare, and to assist in the national defense by providing for an adequate supply of lead and zinc for consumption in the United States from domestic and foreign sources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H.R. 3214. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide for the inclusion in the computation of accredited service of certain periods of sick leave, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H.R. 3215. A bill to amend section 124 of title 23, United States Code, to provide for the financing of advance acquisition of rights-of-way for the Federal-aid highway system; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CLEVENGER:

H.R. 3216. A bill to provide the planning and coordination needed to assist the economic development of the upper Great Lakes region; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.R. 3217. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 3218. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide a 7-percent increase in all benefits, with additional future increases in benefits based on increases in the cost of living, to provide child's insurance benefits beyond age 18 while in school, to liberalize the retirement test, to reduce retirement age for women from 62 to 60 and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOODELL:

H.R. 3219. A bill to increase benefits under the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system, to provide child's insurance benefits beyond age 18 while in school, to provide widow's benefits at age 60 on a reduced basis, to provide benefits for certain individuals not otherwise eligible at age 72, to improve the actuarial status of the trust funds, to extend coverage, to improve the public assistance programs under the Social Security Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 3220. A bill to strengthen the educational resources of our colleges and universities and to provide financial assistance for students in postsecondary and higher education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.R. 3221. A bill to strengthen the educational resources of our colleges and universities and to provide financial assistance for students in postsecondary and higher education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 3222. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code, so as to provide for the appointment of one additional district judge for the eastern district of Wisconsin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H.R. 3223. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide education and training for veterans who served in combat or in certain campaigns after January 31, 1955, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 3224. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide pension benefits for veterans of campaigns and expeditionary services; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 3225. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to establish the rates of disability compensation on an equitable basis giving due consideration to the continuing increase in the cost of living; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H.R. 3226. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code, so as to provide for the appointment of one additional district judge for the eastern district of Wisconsin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASHBROOK:

H.J. Res. 213. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.J. Res. 214. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide that no person may be a Member of Congress who has not, when elected or appointed, been an inhabitant for at least 1 year of the State from which he is chosen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUMSFELD:

H.J. Res. 215. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the fourth week in April of each year as "Youth Temperance Education Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H. Con. Res. 120. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the distribution and viewing of the film "Years of Lightning, Day of Drums" prepared by the U.S. Information Agency on the late President Kennedy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MOSS:

H. Con. Res. 121. Concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H. Con. Res. 122. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the establishment of a commission to study the feasibility of Federal legislation requiring uniform threads on couplings of firehoses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CONTE:

H. Res. 128. Resolution establishing a Special Committee on the Captive Nations; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GOODELL:

H. Res. 129. Resolution to amend rule XXVIII of the rules of the House to permit 1 hour of debate on a motion to agree or disagree to a conference report; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KUNKEL:

H. Res. 130. Resolution to amend rule XXII of the Rules of the House of Representatives to permit Members to introduce jointly public bills, memorials, and resolutions; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 3227. A bill for the relief of Serafem J. Loucas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3228. A bill for the relief of Epifanios Tufexis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3229. A bill for the relief of Mario Barbati; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3230. A bill for the relief of Elie Andreakos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3231. A bill for the relief of Vincenza Crifasi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3232. A bill for the relief of Pietro Daidone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H.R. 3233. A bill for the relief of Emanuel G. Topakas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3234. A bill for the relief of Miss Orani Sarian (Sarioglu); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3235. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jose L. Guinot; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAREY:

H.R. 3236. A bill for the relief of Louis Shchuchinski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3237. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Filomena Daria Mannarella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3238. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lois Agatha Morrison (nee Daley); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3239. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Kajla Mandel Stachewsky de Balaban; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3240. A bill for the relief of Bianca Viola; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3241. A bill for the relief of Albert Griffith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3242. A bill for the relief of Vincenzo Cirone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3243. A bill for the relief of Stamatios Constantellos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3244. A bill for the relief of Petra John; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3245. A bill for the relief of Stavroula P. Stratigos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3246. A bill for the relief of Ignazio Barravecchio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3247. A bill for the relief of the DiCula family; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3248. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Di Norcia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3249. A bill for the relief of Peter George Raptakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3250. A bill for the relief of Alexander Camenzuli, his wife, Eileen Mary Camenzuli, and their minor son, George Camenzuli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3251. A bill for the relief of Tiang H. Ong and his wife, Hian Nio Ong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3252. A bill for the relief of Alberta Blanche Stevens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3253. A bill for the relief of Fotini Papadakou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3254. A bill for the relief of Luigi Renzi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3255. A bill for the relief of John Carassale; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3256. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Francavilla; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3257. A bill for the relief of Georgious Kaloides; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3258. A bill for the relief of Muriel Agatha Gauntlett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3259. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Basile; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 3260. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Camille Nuyt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3261. A bill for the relief of Miss Juana D. Dionisio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3262. A bill for the relief of Lugino Dario; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3263. A bill for the relief of Karim Youssef Bou-Semaan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 3264. A bill for the relief of Armenouhi Eghiazarian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOW:

H.R. 3265. A bill for the relief of Vincenzo Pettinato; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3266. A bill for the relief of Wiktor Truszkowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 3267. A bill for the relief of Horace Cassar and Catherine Cassar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3268. A bill for the relief of Emilia Botta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3269. A bill for the relief of Francesco Barone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H.R. 3270. A bill for the relief of Henryk Lazowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.R. 3271. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Caterina Wurzburger Varriale; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 3272. A bill for the relief of Rosa Kelly; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3273. A bill for the relief of Nicola Lante; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOODELL:

H.R. 3274. A bill for the relief of Mary Gabriella Gomes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGAN of Georgia:

H.R. 3275. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the U.S. Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of Mrs. Melba B. Perkins against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3276. A bill for the relief of Floyd Concrete Co., Mock Fence Co., Smith Contracting Co., John G. Butler Co., Inc., Cement Products Co., and B. A. Mock, doing business as B. A. Mock & Son; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3277. A bill for the relief of James Hubert Rhoden and Marjorie Joyce Rhoden; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGEN of California:

H.R. 3278. A bill for the relief of Wayne Gee (also known as Gee Kim Poy); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 3279. A bill for the relief of Maria Perel Kot; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 3280. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Myrtle Weir Prince; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGRATH:

H.R. 3281. A bill for the relief of Yoko Okura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORGAN:

H.R. 3282. A bill for the relief of Delia Pili; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 3283. A bill for the relief of Fu Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3284. A bill for the relief of Wu Tsai Chang (also known as Wu Tsai Cheng); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 3285. A bill for the relief of Strategoulas Petosa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3286. A bill for the relief of Anastasios Alexander Holdas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEDZI:

H.R. 3287. A bill for the relief of Czeslawa Podgorska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REINECKE:

H.R. 3288. A bill for the relief of Hwang Tai Shik; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 3289. A bill for the relief of Mr. Adolfo J. Torres; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3290. A bill for the relief of Esperanza Corral-Marin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHWEIKER:

H.R. 3291. A bill for the relief of Kemal Dincer, M.D.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.R. 3292. A bill for the relief of Consuelo Alvarado de Corpus; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3293. A bill for the relief of Severia Cortes Naranjo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

76. The **SPEAKER** presented a petition of LeRoy H. Woodson and others relative to abolishing the House Un-American Activities Committee, which was referred to the Committee on Rules.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Retirement of Frank Fuller

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 19, 1965

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement by me concerning Frank H. Fuller, of the Associated Press.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ROBERTSON

Along with many other Virginians, I am going to miss Frank H. Fuller, who is retiring from the Associated Press, after 38 years as chief of its Richmond bureau.

As head of Virginia operations for the Associated Press, he has directed with efficiency and speed the distribution of news to many newspapers and radio and television stations throughout the State. Newspaper readers seldom get to know the desk men of a news-gathering organization, who work quietly behind the scenes. But these are the men who see to it that we find out without delay what happened a few minutes or a few hours ago.

Mr. Fuller began his career with the Associated Press in the Atlanta bureau in 1923, shortly after his graduation from the University of Georgia. Before coming to Richmond, 4 years later, he served the Associated Press in Alabama, Arkansas, Mississippi, and Louisiana.

In addition to having many contacts with Frank during my 32 years of service in Congress, we had another interest in common—the love of the out-of-doors and an inborn fondness for duck hunting. One of the crosses that Frank bore with patience and fortitude was a broken leg which interfered with his hunting and fishing.

I join his many friends in wishing him many years of happiness in his well-earned retirement.

Debate on U.S. Policy on Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE McGOVERN

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 19, 1965

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, a continuing and, in my judgment, very constructive debate, on U.S. policy on Vietnam is underway. Right now, I believe, there exists what amounts to a deadlock between the state of South Vietnam, aided to an increasing extent by the United States, and the Vietcong guerrillas, aided to an increasing extent by North Vietnam. It would be difficult, and probably impossible, for South Vietnamese forces to win a final military victory, since there appears to be a grass roots cooperation with the Vietcong throughout much of the countryside. On the other hand, it would be equally difficult for the Communist forces to achieve a final victory over the South Vietnamese, with their strong U.S. military backing. The U.S. forces are undoubtedly able to remain there indefinitely and to prevent a Communist takeover in that manner; yet there is raised with increasing frequency the question of whether we might achieve basically the same results, over the long run, by a negotiated settlement which would spare the Vietnamese people the long suffering and economic devastation of continued warfare. It would also avoid the continued financial drain and loss of life now being suffered by the United States.

Few Americans favor an immediate and unqualified pullout. I believe the commitment we have given the leaders of South Vietnam and the concern we have for the people there would make it impossible for the United States to withdraw immediately. Yet it is not too soon to discuss the terms on which a withdrawal might ultimately be possible, and to assess the long-term requirements for the settlement of an issue which is basically political, not military. During the present struggle, we should not remain silent, with bated breath, as it were, waiting for a sudden resolution of the problem, which is most unlikely. Rather, we should use, here in Congress and throughout the country, the existing deadlock to discuss alternative policies and forms of settlement, so that the American people, as well as the administration, will be better equipped to take further action at an opportune time. Prolonging the conflict indefinitely could only mean continued painful losses for both sides.

In this connection, Mr. President, a debate over U.S. policy on Vietnam was published in the New York Times magazine of January 17. The debate was between the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and Henry Cabot Lodge, former Ambassador to South Vietnam. Both points of view—"withdraw now" or "fight on to victory"—were presented clearly and cogently. I ask unanimous consent that this presentation be printed following my remarks in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We Must Leave Vietnam

(By Wayne Morse)

Ten years ago the United States embarked upon an adventure in South Vietnam that was just about 100 years out of date. While Britain, France, and the Netherlands were terminating their rule over their Asiatic colonies, the United States began trying to establish its own beachhead on the Asiatic mainland.

Although present at the Geneva Conference of 1954, which drew up the accord whereby France withdrew from its old colony of Indochina, the United States refused to sign the final agreement. So did one of the subdivisions of Indochina, South Vietnam. The United States began a heavy program of financial and military aid to a new Premier in South Vietnam who, we believed, was most likely to preserve a Western orientation. When it came time for the 1956 election throughout both North and South Vietnam required by the Geneva accord, we and our client in Saigon, Ngo Dinh Diem, realized it would be won by Ho Chi Minh's followers not only in his own North Vietnam but in the South as well. South Vietnam refused to proceed with the election.

In the last decade we have explained our policy as one of helping a free government resist Communist subversion. But South Vietnam never has had a free government. In its 10 years of existence its governments have been picked for it by the United States and maintained by our heavy doses of economic and military aid.

The fraudulence of our claim has been starkly exposed by the successve coups in Saigon and by the piecing together of one government after another by the American Embassy. Leaders suspected of favoring neutralism or any form of negotiation for settlement of the civil war are firmly excluded from Government ranks. The major tools we have used in manipulating political and military leaders have been various threats and promises regarding our aid, which now hovers around the level of $600 million a year in a country of 14 million people. This sum is exclusive of the cost of keeping 23,000 American "advisers" and large contingents of aircraft in the country.

In fact, our official explanations of why we are there now play down the "helping a free government" line and play up American security and American prestige as the stakes in Vietnam. At least, the explanations are getting closer to the truth, which is that the United States took over this quarter of Indochina in 1954 when the French pulled out. Having intruded ourselves into southeast Asia, where we never were before, it was this country and not the Communists who made our prestige in Asia the issue.

Our Secretary of State often says that "China must leave her neighbors alone." Under this premise, our officials have vaguely threatened to expand the war to North Vietnam and possibly China if we cannot win in South Vietnam. But there are no Chinese forces in South Vietnam nor Chinese equipment in appreciable amount. Americans are still the only foreign troops in South Vietnam.

Nonetheless, China has the same interest in what goes on in the subcontinent of southeast Asia as we have in Mexico, Cuba and other countries of Latin America. She will increasingly resist having hostile governments on her borders, as do Russia and the United States. We recognize and accept this principle as regards Russia, but we refuse to recognize it as regards China.

This has been true even though we have watched other Western nations ousted from Asia and Africa by rising nationalism. It was inevitable that once China became part of this tide she would reassert her interest in the governments on her borders. A reawakened China would assert this interest whether she were Communist or not. The more we escalate the Vietnam conflict, the more likely China is to intervene directly.

In South Vietnam we invite China's apprehension, but more than that, in trying to surround China with American bases and pro-Western states, we have to buck not only communism but anticolonialism. One of our many mistakes is to equate the two, especially when antiwhite feeling is directed against the United States. Advocates of a "containment" policy for China, similar to that applied to Russia with some success in the late 1940's and 1950's, overlook the impossibility of maintaining Western strongholds in Asia, no matter what their purpose. What we could do in white Europe and even the Middle East is not to be imposed upon an Asia that is united in at least one respect—its determination to see the white man sent back to his own shores.

With our great wealth we can sustain the current war effort in Vietnam indefinitely, even if it is escalated. But it will never end, because our presence and our selection of Saigon's rulers will always inspire rebellion.

Far from maintaining our prestige in Asia, our present policy in Vietnam is eroding it. The fact that we are losing despite the steady increase in our aid, the addition of 23,000 American advisers, and complete American air domination, has already led several Asian nations to throw out an anchor on the Chinese side. Of the famous dominoes that were all supposed to fall to China if we failed to take up the French burden in southeast Asia, Burma and Cambodia have already neutralized themselves. Pakistan has made it clear that the aid she gets from us is directed against India and not against China. Japan and India, the largest non-Communist nations of Asia, who might be expected to be the most helpful to us in Vietnam, have not associated themselves with what we are doing there. A few days ago India's Premier Shastri urged a new international conference to negotiate a settlement. He asked the United States not to press for a military decision and urged that we avoid a major military conflict.

Of all the nations touted as potential Chinese victims, only Australia and the Philippines have offered tangible help in South Vietnam. The Australian contribution amounts to some 66 "advisers" and 3 air-cargo planes. The Philippine offer of a force of volunteer veterans was turned down.

That is the extent of the local interest and support for the American view that we are saving all of Asia from communism by our policy in Vietnam. Surely if one of these so-called dominoes believed it, they would be fighting side by side with us in Vietnam. They are not, because they see us having to run faster and faster just to stay in the same place in Vietnam. They see that the bulk of its people are too indifferent to American objectives to resist the Vietcong. They know that sooner or later we will have to leave and they do not want to jeopardize their own standing in Asia by supporting a last-minute white intervention.

There are many ways this country could crawl back from the limb we crawled out on 10 years ago. Through the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization, the United Nations or a reconvened Geneva Conference we could seek to establish an international presence in Vietnam to stabilize and pacify the country while it develops political institutions. Our refusal to sign the accord of 1954 has always made suspect our claim that we were enforcing it.

In truth, our "enforcement" has taken the form of violations far more massive than any violations by North Vietnam. Our jet air forces and bases, our helicopter fleet, the 23,000 U.S. military advisers are all violations of the 1954 accord. So are they violations of section after section of the United Nations Charter, under which we are pledged to seek peaceful solutions to disputes and to lay before the U.N. those disputes we are unable to solve peacefully through means of our own choosing. We have done neither in Vietnam.

A negotiated settlement in South Vietnam is the first solution we are obliged to seek. Of course, it would mean some guaranteed neutralization of the country. That would give its war-torn people the best chance they have yet had to construct a country of their own, something the French, the Japanese, the French again and now the Americans have not given them.

If we fail to reach a negotiated settlement, then the U.N. Charter requires the dispute to be laid before a regional organization, such as SEATO, or one of the U.N. bodies. Both groups have the capacity to police the country; both are more likely to bring it some degree of cohesion than is the United States with its unilateral intervention in pursuit of our own interests.

Some Americans have busily erected an enormous pyramid of disasters they contend would result even from this limited American retrenchment. They see America as a power in the Pacific only if we and our friends control all its shores instead of just its northern, eastern, and southern shores, plus the island fringe off its western shore. Most important, they ignore the impossibility of creating an American foothold on that shore in mid-20th century, communism or no communism.

Many countries, east and west, have accommodated themselves to the end of the old order in Asia. We will, too, eventually. The only question is how much blood and money we will waste first trying to turn the clock back.

We Can Win in Vietnam

(By Henry Cabot Lodge)

"Pulling out of Vietnam" is exactly the same as "turning Vietnam over to the Communists." Such a course would be not merely imprudent, but actually extremely dangerous.

Geographically, Vietnam stands at the hub of a vast area of the world—southeast Asia—an area with a population of 240 million people extending 2,300 miles from north to south, and 3,000 miles from east to west. The Mekong River, one of the 10 largest rivers in the world, reaches the sea in South Vietnam. He who holds or has influence in Vietnam can affect the future of the Philippines and Taiwan to the east, Thailand and Burma with their huge rice surpluses to the west, and Malaysia and Indonesia with their rubber, oil, and tin to the south. Japan, Australia, and New Zealand would in turn be deeply concerned by the communization of South Vietnam.

Historically, Vietnam has long played a part in the political development of the Far East. For many centuries it was under the occupation or influence of the Chinese and was used by the Chinese as a means of enforcing their hegemony over the whole of southeast Asia. The Vietnamese did not enjoy this experience and have traditionally done what they could to throw off Chinese overlordship. In a very real sense, therefore, the present struggle is one of self-determination.

But today Vietnam should be seen as one more instance in a long series of events which began in Iran, Turkey, and Greece after World War II; which include the seizure of Czechoslovakia; which led to the Marshall plan in Europe; which caused the Korean war, the Malayan emergency, the Huk rebellion in the Philippines and the Berlin crisis. In all these widely separated places the Communist bloc has tried to subvert and to undermine the free world in order to spread its control and its suppression of freedom.

In opposing this Communist onslaught, the free world has stood together for nearly two decades. One manifestation of our common determination to frustrate the Communist design to conquer Europe was the creation of NATO. Elsewhere in the world we have formed other alliances. The United States alone has suffered 160,000 casualties since the end of World War II in this effort to contain the spread of communism.

This worldwide effort by nations of the free world has not been undertaken out of a simple quixotic delight in engaging in battles in distant places. Nor does it signify a desire to establish a new colonialism or any kind of special position. The war in Vietnam is not only the struggle of a small nation to exist, but it is also an open encounter between the doctrine that "wars of revolution," as the Communists call them, are the wave of the future, and our belief that in the future nations should be allowed to develop their own destinies free from outside interference.

Although the North Vietnamese have their own motives for their aggression in South Vietnam and have played the leading role, they have always been backed by the Chinese Communists. Should their aggression be successful, the Chinese Communists will have seen positive proof that their approach to international relations is correct.

Such an outcome might well lead the Soviets, in their desire to retain the leadership of the Communist bloc, to adopt a more belligerent stance in their relations with the outside world. This would surely affect the West.

It would also be regarded everywhere as a reflection of the inability or lack of will of the free world to prevent aggression. What, for example, would be the reaction in Europe if the United States were to withdraw from southeast Asia in the face of its commitment to assist the nations there?

The state of public opinion in the United States itself would also be affected. Should Vietnam be lost, many voices would be heard urging us in effect to resign from the world, fall back onto our Fortress America and gird up our loins for a contest with guided missiles. This too would be something which neither Europe nor the rest of the free world could ignore.

Because of all these considerations, the United States has undertaken to support the Vietnamese both politically and militarily, in an effort which has cost us lives and treasure. The effort has not been in vain.

Although we are not yet victorious, we have achieved a stalemate, which is surely much better than defeat. On the economic and social front the United States has contributed to the building of schools, clinics and better farms, all of which are essential to gaining and holding the political support that must be had to win the war. And we try to help in every way in training civil administrators and in creating political energy in the country.

Some have said that despite this effort the war in Vietnam cannot be won. Yet recent history shows that we have been fighting wars of this sort for the past 20 years and that the record is creditable. We of the free world won in Greece, we thwarted the Communist aggression in Korea, we won in Malaya, we won in the Philippines, and we can win in Vietnam. We must persist and we must not play into the enemy's hands by counting on a quick, sensational and easy way out and then being disappointed when it does not occur.

Persistent execution of the political and military plans which have been agreed to will bring victory—provided outside pressures do not become too great. These outside pressures occur in many forms such as the problem of sanctuaries from which Vietnam can be attacked and the Vietcong helped with impunity. Infiltration from such sanctuaries cannot be allowed to defeat the efforts the Vietnamese are making. We will not shrink from taking such measures as seem necessary to cope with it.

Another form of "outside pressure" is the desire in some quarters for an international conference here and now. We do not oppose the idea of holding international conferences as an abstract proposition—if they are held at the proper time and under the proper circumstances—but we think that to hold a conference now would serve no good purpose and would seriously undermine morale in South Vietnam. Consider the reasons:

1. There have already been two conferences on southeast Asia (one on Vietnam and another on Laos), the terms of which were satisfactory but which the Communists violated before the ink was dry. Before holding another conference there must be some sign that the Communists of Hanoi and Peiping are prepared to let their southern neighbors alone.

2. For the South Vietnamese to go to a conference now with a large and aggressive fifth column on their soil would amount to a surrender. A conference not preceded by a verifiable Communist decision to cease attacking and subverting South Vietnam would be nothing more than a capitulation.

3. There is clearly no agreement between us and the Communists on the simple proposition to let South Vietnam alone. A conference held in an atmosphere of bitter disagreement could only make matters more dangerous than they already are.

So-called neutralism is another outside pressure standing in the way of the successful prosecution of the war in South Vietnam. Neutralism that does not include some means of enforcement, that does not include North Vietnam, that means South Vietnam will be alone and disarmed, is nothing more than surrender. It should be opposed for Vietnam just as it is opposed for Berlin or for Germany. It takes strength to be neutral. South Vietnam is not strong enough today to be neutral.

In truth both Vietnams are "neutralized" now by article 10 of the Geneva accord of July 21, 1954, which said: "* * * the two parties shall insure that the zones assigned to them do not adhere to any military alliance and are not used for the resumption of hostilities or to further an aggressive policy."

This provision was formally approved by article 5 of the final declaration of the Geneva Conference of 1954, which the U.S.S.R., Red China, France, the United Kingdom, United States, Cambodia, Laos, North and South Vietnam attended.

We must therefore insist before there is any discussion of a conference or of neutralism, that the Communists stop their aggression and live up to the agreements which already exist. The minute the onslaught ceases, there can be peace. At present, the North Vietnamese seem only to understand force, and, of course, when they use force they must be met with force, as they were in the Gulf of Tonkin. They should also be met with the strong and united opposition of the free world.

It seems that conflicts in far-off places are precisely those which have often brought war and calamity to all of us. Manchuria seemed far away in 1931; the subversion of Czechoslovakia by Hitler seemed remote to the United States in 1938. Persistence, and unity in the face of Communist pressure have succeeded in Europe and in southeast Asia, and can succeed again.

Mao Tse-tung said: "Politics is war without bloodshed; war is politics with bloodshed."

The struggle in Vietnam is not a "war" in the sense that World War II—or Korea—was a "war," because total military success in Vietnam, unaccompanied by success in other fields, will not bring victory. A many-sided effort is needed; no single effort will solve the problem; the problem is thus the despair of the headline writer and the political stump speaker employing black-and-white phraseology.

Therefore, those who say that there is a quick solution or a simple solution or an exclusively military solution are doing as much of a disservice as are those who say that there is no hope, that we must pull out and that another southeast Asian conference (added to the two which have been already held—and dishonored) will do other than turn South Vietnam over to the Communists.

They also do a disservice who deny that much has been achieved, that the military program, the economic program, the social program, the informational program and the various technical programs have all accomplished much—have indeed built the springboard of victory—and that it is the political, counter-subversive, counter-terrorist program which still needs special attention.

It is accurate to say that a glass is half full of water and it is also accurate to say that the glass is half empty. To dwell on the fact that we have not achieved victory does not negate the other fact that we have prevented defeat—and that a stalemate is much better than a defeat.

It is not the American tradition to get panicky whenever there is a little rough weather. If we decide only to interest ourselves in the nice, quiet, neat countries (which do not need our help) and abandon all the rough, tough, difficult places to the Communists, we will soon find ourselves surrounded by a rough, tough world which is aimed straight at the destruction of the United States and which will make our present effort in Vietnam seem like the mildest of pink teas.

One Response on Medicare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 19, 1965

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, few pieces of legislation have received greater publicly than the so-called medicare bill. It is interesting to note that few pieces of legislation have received less actual public interest in proportion to the amount of publicity about it.

This fact—the general public apathy toward such a measure—was amply demonstrated recently in one of the cities of my district, Red Wing, Minn. The editor of the Red Wing Republican-Eagle, a daily newspaper, wrote an editorial on November 25, 1964, in which he bluntly asked if there was one single elderly person in his area that does not receive adequate medical care because he cannot afford it. He asked with equally direct candor whether any such person could say that the Kerr-Mills law, which has been doing such a good job in Minnesota, has failed him while "medicare" would help him?

Following is the full editorial from the Red Wing Republican-Eagle:

What Case for Medicare?

Reelected Congressman Al Quie spoke at length against social security medicare when he appeared in Red Wing last week, and we are glad he did.

So many GOP Congressmen were buried under the anti-Goldwater avalanche November 3 that medicare appears almost certain to pass next year. Some believe the new Congress will rush it through shortly after convening in January. But nothing is preordained in politics or legislation, and minority Congressmen ought to keep pressing the case for not overburdening our social security system.

The Kerr-Mills approach to medical care for the elderly is well started in Minnesota. Goodhue County's welfare department has the program in full swing. And because Kerr-Mills offers so much broader protection than the social security plan—while limiting its coverage to those who can't afford to pay their own way—we agree with Quie that Kerr-Mills in infinitely to be preferred.

But are we wrong? Is there an elderly person living in this area who is not getting the medical treatment he ought to have because he can't afford it? Can such a person say that Kerr-Mills has failed to help him while social security medicare would?

If such a person exists, we wish he would step forward by writing us a letter or visiting the DRE's editorial offices. If his case is valid, it would make a wounderful case study in refuting the views that we have expressed here and Quie has so ably championed. If none such exists, on the other hand, it's hard to see much reason for Congress to impose social security medicare on an unwilling country.

Mr. Speaker, upon reading this fine editorial with its thought-provoking questions, I wrote Mr. Phil Duff, editor of the Red Wing Republican-Eagle, complimenting him, asking for a report on how many elderly people actually came forward to declare Kerr-Mills of no value, and asking his permission to share his views and information with my colleagues.

This is my letter:

December 4, 1964.

Mr. Phil Duff,
Red Wing Republican-Eagle,
Red Wing, Minn.

Dear Phil: Your editorial "What Case for Medicare?" on November 25 was a dandy, and I appreciate greatly your reference to my views on this issue.

It will be interesting to see how many elderly persons come forward to declare that the Kerr-Mills program is of no value, or that they are not getting proper medical treatment because of lack of funds. I wish that you would give me a report on the results of this appeal as I may want to include it with your editorial as an extension in the Congressional Record.

With every good wish, I remain,
Sincerely yours,
Albert H. Quie,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, on December 30, 1964, I received a reply to my letter from Mr. Duff. He stated that only one person had come forward with a response. Mr. Duff also kindly included two clippings from his newspaper. The first is a letter to the editor—the only response he received. The second is a followup editorial which Mr. Duff wrote. Following are his letter to me, the letter to the editor which I just mentioned, and the followup editorial:

Daily Republican-Eagle,
Red Wing, Minn., *December 30, 1964.*

Hon. Albert H. Quie,
Member of Congress,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Al: To answer your request of a little bit back, I received only one response to my suggestion that old people come forward with actual cases to show how Kerr-Mills didn't fill the bill but medicare would.

This one response—obviously not very clear—is marked on enclosed tearsheet. Another tearsheet shows my followup editorial. Nothing since.

Sincerely,
Philip S. Duff, Jr.,
Editor-Publisher.

Letter to the Editor—Other Nations Find Medicare Success

To the Editor:

In as much that Representative Albert Quie thanked you for your editorial and you had no word from older folks I will try to put in one little bit for as much as it might be worth.

It is real nice for older people that might have $200 or $300 stashed away so dad could get a new suit as his old one is 10 or 15 years old, or mother would like a new coat. But one of them needed medical attention and according to Kerr-Mills they had to go and bow down to the welfare board and were told: spend your money first so AMA can survive.

I would ask Quie as a good Norseman to take a trip to any one of the Scandinavian countries which all have medicare from the cradle to the grave and they would not part with it.

England started about 25 years ago and there if today you would speak against it you would be hung. Quie and the Farm Bureau are against everything the Government does. But their members are the first to take advantage of it. Quie and the Goodhue and Wabasha Counties newly elected representatives don't want reapportionment.

They, plus the Farm Bureau, think that 10,000 rural people should have the same voice in the legislature as 200,000 urban dwellers.

If Quie and these representatives would only consider that it is not only farmers they represent but about 50–50 labor which they are against, let them consider who buys their products.

An Oldster.

Lake City.

One Response on Medicare

The DRE several weeks ago invited readers to come forward with specific illustrations of the need for a social security medicare program. We asked for actual examples of elderly people who need and deserve the taxpaid care that the President's medicare bill would provide but who can't get this needed care through the local-State-Federal Kerr-Mills program.

Congressman Al Quie noted this editorial and wrote to express his interest. He would like to have the results, Quie said, in anticipation of the congressional medicare debate early next year.

So far only one response. A Lake City oldster wrote that Kerr-Mills may be "real nice for older people that might have $200 or $300 stashed away" to pay for a needed new suit or new coat. But if husband and wife needed medical care, "they had to go and bow down to the welfare board" under the Kerr-Mills program. And then they were told to go and spend their money first.

This writer provided no more information on his personal situation, but the above suggests he hasn't realized the full benefits of Minnesota's program under the Kerr-Mills law. This program—officially "medical aid to the aged"—would allow him to get the needed suit and coat and still get all the medical attention he or his wife should have.

A welfare worker must first take some confidential information to determine his eligibility. But then this couple can have as much as $200 in monthly income, $15,000 clear in a home, $1,000 in cash savings, and $1,000 each in cash value life insurance and still have the welfare office pay all their doctor, medicine, hospital, and nursing home bills after they have first paid $200 per year themselves. Nor is any lien attached to their home.

This splendid medical coverage is available to all Minnesotans 65 and older right now. Why should we want a medicare bill that will impose new taxes on family incomes $5,200 and under in order to pay hospital bills for elderly couples who have more than $200 monthly income, or more than $15,000 value in a house, or more than $1,000 in the bank, and $2,000 in cash value life insurance?

Mr. Speaker, taking into account the published circulation of the Red Wing Republican-Eagle and the National Editorial Association's estimate of how many individuals read each newspaper circulated, it is reasonable to assume that about 30,000 people read the Red Wing Republican-Eagle each day.

Yet, it would be reasonable to cut that 30,000 figure in half, or in fourths, or even smaller, and it would still be obvious that just one response hardly shows any great public support for medicare.

Moreover, Mr. Duff, in his followup editorial, met the argument of the letter with logical facts and statistics which must cause any reasonable person to conclude that the letterwriter, if possessed of the information contained in the editorial, might have earlier reconsidered his view.

Mr. Speaker, it would appear that if the response to such an editorial question were not greater in all the communities of America than it was in Red Wing, Minn., that medicare would not be considered of major importance.

It is interesting to note that, until now, there has been very little evidence to indicate that the response in any given city would be any greater than that which I have just shown.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 20, 1965

The House met at 10:30 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. Celler.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., used these words from King Solomon, reputed to be one of the wisest men who ever lived, I Kings 3: 9: *Give therefore thy servant an understanding heart.*

Let us pray.

Almighty God, Thou art the Supreme Ruler of the universe and the Guiding Intelligence in the life of men and of nations.

On this solemn and sacred day in the calendar of our national life we are invoking the blessings of Thy grace upon our newly elected President and Vice President, who are about to take the oath of office and pledge their allegiance to our country and the Constitution.

Grant that they may have a vital and vivid understanding of Thy divine spirit, walking with them in prayer in order that they may know how to march in step with the eternal will and wisdom of God and working with Thee in seeking first the kingdom of God and His righteousness.

May they be men of vision and of valor, richly endowed with clear minds and courageous hearts as they struggle to meet and master the challenge of arduous tasks and heavy responsibilities.

Inspire them with a filial trust in Thee and a fraternal attitude toward the citizens of our land and all the members of the human family.

We earnestly beseech Thee that this may be for each of us a time of renewed consecration when we shall highly resolve to live out each day in faith and in faithfulness.

May we receive the benediction of Thy praise through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. Brown of Ohio (at the request of Mr. Gerald R. Ford), on account of sudden death of his wife.

ANNOUNCEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair desires to announce that Members must display their official tickets in order to get a seat on the platform. There are no extra seats available, so former Members cannot join the procession.

The same holds true for children. They can neither go with the procession nor be seated on the platform.

The seats for Members of the House and Senate have no cover. Therefore, Members are urged to wear overcoats and take hats for protection against the cold weather.

The procession will be headed by the Sergeant at Arms bearing the mace. He will be followed by the Speaker pro tempore, then the chairmen of committees and other Members in order of seniority.

Following the Presidential oath of office proceeding on the east front, shuttle buses will be available at First and Independence Avenue, between 12:30 and 1:30, to take Members and their families to the parade reviewing stands at the White House. The buses will also be available to bring Members and families back to the Capitol after the parade.

And now, pursuant to House Resolution 122, the House will form in procession and go in a body to the east front to attend the swearing-in ceremonies for the President and Vice President of the United States.

Thereupon, at 10 o'clock and 35 minutes a.m., the Members of the House, preceded by the Sergeant at Arms and the Speaker pro tempore, proceeded to the east front of the Capitol.

ADJOURNMENT

At the conclusion of the inaugural ceremonies (at 12 o'clock and 33 minutes p.m.) the House, without returning to its Chamber, pursuant to House Resolution 122, stood in adjournment until tomorrow, Thursday, January 21, 1965, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

392. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, Chairman, National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems, transmitting the ninth special report of the Council on the operations and policies of the international financial institutions of which the United States is a member, for the period April 1, 1962, to June 30, 1964, pursuant to the Bretton Woods Agreements Act and other acts affected (H. Doc. No. 60); to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed.

393. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for the mandatory reporting by physicians and institutions in the District of Columbia of certain physical abuse of children"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

394. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a report for fiscal year ended June 30, 1964, of the Commissioner of Education on the administration of Public Laws 874 and 815, 81st Congress, as amended, pursuant to requirements of the two laws; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

395. A letter from the Public Printer, U.S. Government Printing Office, transmitting the annual report of the Government Printing Office for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1964, pursuant to 28 Stat. 603; to the Committee on House Administration.

396. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of an application for a loan under the Small Reclamation Projects Act to assist the Camarillo County Water District of Camarillo, Ventura County, Calif.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 3294. A bill to authorize the issuance of fractional currency in order to relieve the shortage of coins; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HALEY:

H.R. 3295. A bill to amend section 8e of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, so as to extend to imported tangerines the restrictions imposed by such section on certain other imported commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 3296. A bill to provide an increase in the retired pay of certain members of the former Lighthouse Service; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

77. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., relative to commending and congratulating the Speaker of the House for the truly patriotic way he has conducted himself during the 88th Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 20, 1965

The Senate met at 10:30 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

At the beginning of another Presidential term, let us offer the prayer written by the first President, George Washington:

"Almighty God, we make our earnest prayer that Thou wilt keep the United States in Thy holy protection; that Thou wilt incline the hearts of the citizens to cultivate a spirit of obedience to government, and entertain a brotherly affection and love for one another and for their fellow citizens of the United States at large; and, finally, that Thou wilt most graciously be pleased to dispose us all to do justice, to love mercy, and to demean ourselves with that charity, humility, and pacific temper of mind which were the characteristics of the Divine Author of our blessed religion, and without a humble imitation of whose example in these things, we can never hope to be a happy nation.

"Grant our supplication, we beseech Thee, through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen."

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO FRIDAY, AT NOON

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of a quorum call, which will be had shortly, the Senate stand in adjournment at the conclusion of the inaugural ceremonies until 12 o'clock noon on Friday, as agreed to yesterday.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT TO FRIDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Pursuant to the order previously entered, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Friday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 10 o'clock and 46 minutes a.m.), under the previous order, the Senate adjourned until Friday, January 22, 1965, at 12 o'clock meridian.

INAUGURATION OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES AND VICE PRESIDENT

At 10 o'clock and 46 minutes a.m. the Senate, headed by the President pro tempore [Mr. HAYDEN], the Secretary of the Senate (Mr. Felton M. Johnston), and the Sergeant at Arms (Mr. Joseph C. Duke), proceeded to the inaugural platform at the east front of the Capitol and took the spaces assigned to them on the left of the place reserved for the President-elect.

The Members of the House of Representatives, headed by the Speaker [JOHN W. MCCORMACK] and the Clerk of the House (Mr. Ralph R. Roberts), had preceded the Senate to the platform, and taken the spaces assigned to them on the right of the place reserved for the President-elect.

The Governors of the States were escorted by Mr. James Johnson to the places assigned them on the right of the inaugural platform.

The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Chief of Staff of the Army, the Chief of Naval Operations, the Chief of Staff of the U.S. Air Force, the Commandant of the Marine Corps, and the Commandant of the Coast Guard, with their aides, were escorted to the places assigned them on the right of the inaugural platform.

The diplomatic corps were escorted by Mr. Robert Dunphy to the places assigned them on the left of the inaugural platform.

The members of the President's Cabinet were escorted by Mr. Emery Frazier to the places assigned them on the left of the inaugural platform.

The members-of-the-Cabinet-designate of the President-elect were escorted to the places assigned to them on the left of the inaugural platform.

The Chief Justice of the United States and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States, preceded by its marshal, T. Perry Lippitt and its clerk, John F. Davis, were escorted by Mr. Gordon F. Harrison, staff director of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, to the inaugural platform, and took the places assigned them, to the left of the place reserved for the President-elect.

Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson and Mrs. Hubert H. Humphrey were escorted by Mrs. B. Everett Jordan, to the places assigned to them on the platform.

The Vice-President-elect of the United States, HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, was escorted by Senator B. EVERETT JORDAN, Representative CARL ALBERT, Mr. Joseph Duke, Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, and Mr. Zeake Johnson, Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives, to the place assigned to him.

The President-elect of the United States, Lyndon Baines Johnson, was escorted to the inaugural platform by the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate and the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives, and the Joint Committee on Arrangements, consisting of B. EVERETT JORDAN, chairman, U.S. Senate, North Carolina; JOHN SPARKMAN, U.S. Senate, Alabama; LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, U.S. Senate, Massachusetts; JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives, Massachusetts; CARL ALBERT, U.S. House of Representatives, Oklahoma; CHARLES A. HALLECK, U.S. House of Representatives, Indiana, accompanied by the Secretary of the Senate, Felton M. Johnston.

PLAYING OF "STARS AND STRIPES FOREVER"

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, distinguished guests, and fellow citizens of this great representative Republic, we are here today to inaugurate the 36th President of this Union of free peoples.

It is a great honor for me, as chairman of the Joint Congressional Committee on Arrangements for this event, to begin this event by presenting the U.S. Marine Band, under the direction of Lt. Col. Albert F. Schoepper, which will play a song we love.

The U.S. Marine Band played "Stars and Stripes Forever."

INVOCATION

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. The audience will please rise as the Most Reverend Robert E. Lucey pronounces the invocation.

The Most Reverend Robert E. Lucey, S.T.D., archbishop of San Antonio, offered the following invocation:

Almighty and eternal God, we ask a blessing upon all who are gathered here today to honor the Chief Executive of our Nation and our Vice President. We thank Thee for peace and prosperity; we are grateful for fertile soil, abundant harvests and the fruits of the earth by which we live. But we remember that man does not live by bread alone and so we are grateful too for the spiritual heritage of our Nation—a sense of justice to all mankind, a spirit of charity to the lowly and the oppressed.

In Thy divine providence, O Heavenly Father, the moral leadership of the world has been entrusted to us; the fate of humanity is in our hands; the nations look to us for survival; Western civilization stands or falls with America. In these days of tragedy and crisis all that we hold dear is challenged—belief in God, respect for human personality, honor, integrity, the very freedom of the human spirit. All these are at stake and our country, champion of truth and justice, must lead the nations of the world to the dawn of a brighter hope.

We pray that Almighty God may grant to the leader of our country wisdom and understanding, strength and courage. In these days of stress and strife, in the hour of fateful decision, may God make clear to our President the path of honor and of peace, the path of freedom and justice, the path of brotherhood and truth—that truth that makes men free. Amen.

SELECTION BY U.S. MARINE BAND

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. We shall now be favored with another number by the U.S. Marine Band.

(The U.S. Marine Band played "Hail, America.")

SOLO

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. We shall now have the pleasure of hearing a special arrangement of "America, the Beautiful" by Miss Leontyne Price, accompanied by the U.S. Marine Band.

(Miss Leontyne Price sang "America, the Beautiful.")

PRAYER

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Rabbi Hyman Judah Schachtel will now lead us in prayer.

Rabbi Hyman Judah Schachtel, Congregation Beth Israel, Houston, Tex., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we thank Thee for this inaugural, the living historic witness to our faith in Thee and to the choice and actions of a free people. Here at the Capitol of our Nation, the very sight of which exalts our hearts and awakens thrilling memories of the preeminent men of our resplendent past, we pray for Thy blessings upon our beloved President, the Vice President, and those associated with them in the sacred trust of leadership.

As Lyndon Baines Johnson and HUBERT HORATIO HUMPHREY each places his hand on the Bible to take his oath of office, let them know and let us feel that the hands of all of us join theirs in this symbolic avowal that Thou art supreme and Thy Holy Word our eternal challenge.

We ask for no miracles beyond the miracle which is always with us, if we will only use it, the power of love to transform foes into friends, slaves into freemen, the curse of war and poverty into the benediction of concord and plenty.

May this inauguration mark, O Lord, the renewal of a people unafraid of the tasks of greatness, a turning point in American history when we move closer to the realization of President Johnson's dream of a better life for every citizen, and of uniting with all who are dedicated to the continuance of humanity's immemorial, heroic journey toward freedom and prosperity, justice, and peace. Amen.

ADMINISTRATION OF OATH TO VICE PRESIDENT-ELECT

Speaker of the House of Representatives JOHN W. MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, administered to the Vice President-elect the oath of office prescribed by the Constitution, which he repeated, as follows:

I, HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, solemnly swear that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God.

PRAYER

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. The Reverend George R. Davis will now lead us in prayer.

The Reverend George R. Davis, minister, National City Christian Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

God of our fathers, to whom persons are of supreme importance, we lift up, this day, a man to be set apart in a special way. In our love and prayers, through this historic and exalting ceremony, we lift him up, as we do the Vice

President and their gracious families. To Thy strong help, we commend them and all men and women in all areas and branches of our Nation's life who share the terrible splendor of leadership and authority.

Bless, guard, and keep Thy servant, Lyndon Baines Johnson, that he may prosper in the sacred task to which he has been called by the decisive vote of the people and by divine providence.

We thank Thee for his magnificently significant service to his Nation and the world, already written on history's scroll. For his gallantry and stability, seen in times of greatest peril and in dark tragedy, as well as in the daily routine of his never-ending duties, we thank Thee.

For his careful preparation for such a time as this, by hard discipline and patient attention to details, we thank Thee.

For all of his skills in the political sciences and arts, and for his insights into the ways of government, we voice our gratitude to Thee, Giver of all good gifts to men.

To the President and the Vice President, continue Thy help, and to all those whose judgments and loyalties they must be able to rely upon.

Grant our President not to grow weary, as he must remind us that we are one people and that we are but one of many worthy nations in an aspiring family of nations.

For us, God of all the worlds, our dreams, our efforts, and our sacrifices, Thou wilt redeem to give them universal meaning and purpose. Uphold him, that he may encourage us to be able increasingly to reason together, to seek an essential consensus, to live in our strange and wonderful diversity with stable unity. Uphold our President, O God, as he leads us onward to that desirable society of persons who seek real worth, a society in which none shall live in fear, because justice, mercy, and brotherhood will flourish on the earth. This we pray in the name of Him who is the wonderful Counselor, the mighty God, the everlasting Father, and the Prince of Peace. Amen.

ADMINISTRATION OF OATH TO THE PRESIDENT-ELECT

The Chief Justice of the United States, Earl Warren, administered to the President-elect the oath of office prescribed by the Constitution, which he repeated, as follows:

I, Lyndon Baines Johnson, do solemnly swear that I will faithfully execute the office of President of the United States, and will, to the best of my ability, preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States. So help me God.

INAUGURAL ADDRESS BY PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON

Thereupon, the President of the United States delivered the following Inaugural Address:

President JOHNSON. My fellow countrymen: On this occasion, the oath I have taken before you and before God, is not mine alone, but ours together. We are one nation and one people. Our fate as a nation and our future as a people rest not upon one citizen but upon all citizens.

That is the majesty and the meaning of this moment.

For every generation, there is a destiny. For some, history decides. For this generation, the choice must be our own.

Even now, a rocket moves toward Mars. It reminds us that the world will not be the same for our children, or even for ourselves in a short span of years. The next man to stand here will look out on a scene that is different from our own, because ours is a time of change—rapid and fantastic change—baring the secrets of nature—multiplying the nations—placing in uncertain hands new weapons for mastery and destruction—shaking old values and uprooting old ways.

Our destiny in the midst of change will rest on the unchanged character of our people and on their faith.

They came here—the exile and the stranger, brave but frightened—to find a place where a man could be his own man. They made a covenant with this land. Conceived in justice, written in liberty, bound in union, it was meant one day to inspire the hopes of all mankind, and it binds us still. If we keep its terms, we shall flourish.

First, justice was the promise that all who made the journey would share in the fruits of the land.

In a land of great wealth, families must not live in hopeless poverty.

In a land rich in harvest, children just must not go hungry.

In a land of healing miracles, neighbors must not suffer and die untended.

In a great land of learning and scholars, young people must be taught to read and write.

For more than thirty years that I have served this nation, I have believed that this injustice to our people, this waste of our resources, was our real enemy. For thirty years or more, with the resources I have had, I have vigilantly fought against it. I have learned and I know that it will not surrender easily.

But change has given us new weapons. Before this generation of Americans is finished, this enemy will not only retreat—it will be conquered. [Applause.]

Justice requires us to remember: when any citizen denies his fellow, saying: His color is not mine or his beliefs are strange and different, in that moment he betrays America, though his forebears created this nation.

Liberty was the second article of our covenant. It was self-government, it was our Bill of Rights. But it was more. America would be a place where each man could be proud to be himself: stretching his talents, rejoicing in his work, important in the life of his neighbors and his nation.

This has become more difficult in a world where change and growth seem to tower beyond the control and even the judgment of men. We must work to provide the knowledge and the surroundings which can enlarge the possibilities of every citizen.

The American covenant called on us to help show the way for the liberation of man, and that is our goal. Thus, if as a nation, there is much outside our control, as a people no stranger is outside our hope.

Change has brought new meaning to that old mission. We can never again stand aside prideful in isolation. Terrific dangers and troubles that we once called "foreign" now constantly live among us. If American lives must end, and American treasure be spilled, in countries that we barely know, then that is the price that change has demanded of conviction and of our enduring covenant.

Think of our world as it looks from that rocket that is heading toward Mars. It is like a child's globe, hanging in space, the continent stuck to its side like colored maps. We are all fellow passengers on a dot of earth. And each of us, in the span of time, has really only a moment among our companions.

How incredible it is that in this fragile existence we should hate and destroy one another. There are possibilities enough for all who will abandon mastery over others to pursue mastery over nature. There is world enough for all to seek their happiness in their own way.

Our nation's course is abundantly clear. We aspire to nothing that belongs to others. We seek no dominion over our fellow man, but man's dominion over tyranny and misery.

But more is required. Men want to be part of a common enterprise—a cause greater than themselves. And each of us must find a way to advance the purpose of the nation, thus finding new purpose for ourselves. Without this, we will simply become a nation of strangers.

The third article is union. To those who were small and few against the wilderness, the success of liberty demanded the strength of the union. Two centuries of change have made this true again.

No longer need capitalist and worker, farmer and clerk, city and countryside, struggle to divide our bounty. By working shoulder to shoulder together we can increase the bounty of all.

We have discovered that every child who learns, and every man who finds work, and every sick body that is made whole—like a candle added to an altar—brightens the hope of all the faithful.

So let us reject any among us who seek to reopen old wounds and rekindle old hatreds. They stand in the way of a seeking nation.

Let us now join reason to faith and action to experience, to transform our unity of interest into a unity of purpose. [Applause.] For the hour and the day and the time are here to achieve progress without strife, to achieve change without hatred; not without difference of opinion but without the deep and abiding divisions which scar the union for generations. [Applause.]

Under this covenant of justice, liberty and union, we have become a nation; prosperous, great and mighty. And we have kept our freedom.

But we have no promise from God that our greatness will endure.

We have been allowed by Him to seek greatness with the sweat of our hands and the strength of our spirit.

I do not believe that the Great Society is the ordered, changeless, and sterile battalion of the ants.

It is the excitement of becoming—always becoming, trying, probing, falling, resting, and trying again—but always trying and always gaining. [Applause.]

In each generation—with toil and tears—we have had to earn our heritage again.

If we fail now, then we will have forgotten in abundance what we learned in hardship: that democracy rests on faith, that freedom asks more than it gives, and the judgment of God is harshest on those who are most favored.

If we succeed, it will not be because of what we have, but it will be because of what we are; not because of what we own, but rather because of what we believe. [Applause.]

For we are a nation of believers. Underneath the clamor of building and the rush of our day's pursuits, we are believers in justice and liberty and union. And in our own union. We believe that every man must some day be free. [Applause.] And we believe in ourselves.

That is the mistake that our enemies have always made. In my lifetime—in depression and in war—they have awaited our defeat. Each time, from the secret places of the American heart, came forth the faith that they could not see or that they could not even imagine, and it brought us victory. And it will again. [Applause.]

For this is what America is all about. It is the uncrossed desert and the unclimbed ridge. It is the star that is not reached and the harvest that is sleeping in the unplowed ground.

Is our world gone? We say farewell. Is a new world coming? We welcome it—and we will bend it to the hopes of man. [Applause.]

To these trusted public servants and to my family, and those close friends of mine who have followed me down a long winding road, and to all the people of this union and the world—I will repeat today what I said on that sorrowful day in November last year: I will lead and I will do the best I can. [Applause.]

But you must look within your own hearts to the old promises and to the old dreams. They will lead you best of all.

For myself, I ask only in the words of an ancient leader: "Give me now wisdom and knowledge that I may go out and come in before this people: for who can judge this, thy people, that is so great?" [Prolonged applause.]

SELECTION BY THE MORMON TABERNACLE CHOIR

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. We shall now have the pleasure of hearing a special selection by one of the world's greatest choirs, the Mormon Tabernacle Choir, conducted by Mr. Richard P. Condie, which will now sing for us "This Is My Country."

(The Mormon Tabernacle Choir sang "This Is My Country.")

BENEDICTION

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. The benediction will now be pronounced by His Eminence Archbishop Iakovos.

His Eminence Archbishop Iakovos, Greek Orthodox archbishop of North and South America, pronounced the following benediction:

Omnipotent and omniscient God who in Thy providence ordains that the destinies of men and nations upon this earth should be entrusted into the hands of the worthy, hearken, we beseech Thee, to our thanksgiving prayer of supplication.

From the time of the Pilgrims and Founding Fathers of our Nation, and throughout the course of our entire history, Thou hast been our guiding light, our constant inspiration and illumination, and an inexhaustible source of reinforcement and fortitude.

Having our trust in Thee, we have raised under the splendor of Thy skies the Stars and Stripes of our exalted ideals and national pursuits, and in the measure of Thy loving kindness, we selflessly serve the spiritual as well as the material welfare of our fellow man at home and abroad.

We believe it is Thy will that we continue in an unbroken continuity this honored tradition. And it is this belief that underlies the inaugural ceremonies and the installation of our 36th President in the person of an honorable and dedicated servant of our people—Lyndon Baines Johnson.

This inaugural ceremony, O Lord, is a most solemn act of rededication. We therefore pray to Thee to empower our beloved President, our Vice President, and their associates in the government of our Nation, to ever guard and preserve the image and beauty of our commonwealth as the land of the free and the home of the brave.

Shield and protect them from all ills and enable us ever to uphold the spirit that made our Nation the hope of the distressed and the joy of the oppressed.

We ask this in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, the lifegiving Trinity, for the benefit of our Nation and all nations believing or aspiring for freedom, justice, dignity, and peace. Amen.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Please remain standing while the U.S. Marine Band plays our "National Anthem."

(The U.S. Marine Band played "The Star-Spangled Banner.")

At 12 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m., the President and Vice President of the United States, escorted by the Joint Congressional Committee on Arrangements, retired from the platform, followed by the Senate and House of Representatives, the Chief Justice of the United States, the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States, and the other distinguished guests who had been invited to witness the ceremony.

* * *

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JANUARY 21, 1965

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Ephesians 4: 1: *I beseech you to walk worthy of the vocation wherewith ye are called.*

Almighty God, humbly and confidently, we are again turning unto Thee in the sacred attitude of prayer, mindful of Thy blessings in all our yesterdays and encouraged by Thy gracious promises of help for each new day.

Grant that we may have a clear vision and understanding of our problems and responsibilities, viewing them in their right perspectives and daring to face them bravely.

May we daily pledge allegiance and fidelity to the conviction of the Founding Fathers, and may we covet and cultivate the spirit of justice, liberty, and unity, for our beloved country cannot occupy a sacred place of influence and power in wisely shaping the life and destiny of mankind, so long as these virtues and principles are not regnant in our own life.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

YOUTH CORPS PAY FLOOR SET AT $1.25

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I am certain other Members were disappointed, as I was, in reading an Associated Press story which appeared in the Washington Post of yesterday where it says:

> The Labor Department, under considerable pressure from organized labor, has set a $1.25 minimum wage for youths working in Neighborhood Youth Corps projects under President Johnson's program to combat poverty.

Several days ago I had telephone conversations with people in the Department of Labor, and they told me that this was under consideration. Many school districts have been trying to cooperate in the Neighborhood Youth Corps program in trying to give employment to youngsters going to school. Then they get the ruling they will have to pay $1.25 an hour for unskilled, untrained labor working in cafeterias, custodial training, doing file work, and things of that sort.

To me it seems if the Department of Labor wants to cooperate in this program it could get somebody with good ordinary commonsense to make these rulings.

The Associated Press article pointed out that this question had been the cause of some controversy in the Department of Labor, when they reported that Secretary Wirtz tried to fire his Under Secretary John F. Henning, who apparently was the one insisting on the unrealistic $1.25 an hour for such "made" work. Unfortunately, Secretary Wirtz appeared to have capitulated under goading by Supreme Court Justice Goldberg, former Secretary of Labor.

I think it was generally understood by Congress when the poverty program was set up that there would be an opportunity to render some assistance to pupils who were being forced to drop out of school, but certainly no one openly suggested that a minimum wage of $1.25 an hour for unskilled, apprentice-type student labor was to be paid. As one of the school administrators from the 10th Missouri District pointed out in a letter to me:

> Payment of such wages to trainees in our schools in this area would also have severe implications for our distributive educational programs and our cooperative educational programs. These particular trainees are usually paid 60 to 80 cents an hour.

I think the wage which most schools had anticipated paying was in the neighborhood of 75 cents an hour. As this administrator further commented:

> It is difficult for us to understand why a public school training program, even under the poverty bill, should be handicapped by a minimum wage law which has no reference at all to professional educational training.

I think it is also significant, as reported in the Associated Press article:

> The decision, which figured in a recent high-level Labor Department dispute, was reached last week. No announcement was made at the time but Labor Department spokesmen confirmed the decision yesterday, January 19.

Incidentally, I have had no reply to my written inquiry, under date of January 11, in which I enclosed two typical letters from school districts in southeast Missouri setting forth why it was not only impractical, but impossible to cooperate in a program which requires such unrealistic wage schedules.

I, for one, would like to know who is making the decisions at the Department of Labor. If this program is to be turned over to organized labor, to be used as a vehicle for obtaining another round of inflation-creating wage increases, then I think Congress should be so informed before we get around to appropriating the millions of dollars which will be needed to finance the program.

THE DOS PALOS HIGH SCHOOL BAND, CALIFORNIA

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, the Dos Palos High School Band, which represented California in the inaugural parade yesterday, was from my district. For many of the youngsters in the band, as well as their parents and boosters, it was a first visit to Washington; and to commemorate this occasion and in recognition of the honor bestowed upon me as their Representative, I should like to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a brief history of the band.

In 1958, the band was made a class at Dos Palos High School. Prior to that time, it had been a part-time activity, but since then has blossomed into one of the outstanding departments of Dos Palos High School, under the enthusiastic and able direction of Gerald Parodi, who has directed it since its formation.

The high school is better known as the "home of the broncos" and the band is therefore referred to as the "Dos Palos Bronco Band." The high school has a student body of 1,050 students and serves also the cities of Firebaugh, Las Deltas, Oro Loma, South Dos Palos, and the Dos Palos "Y". The district extends into Merced, Fresno, and Madera Counties and is in the heart of the San Joaquin Valley.

The band was formed with the belief that it should be first a musical organization and secondly a marching organization, and even in the marching competitions seldom has a top band beaten their musical score. This year at the All Western Band Review, they placed fourth in marching, out of the 67 bands in competition.

The Dos Palos Bronco Band is a versatile band. It has performed at halftime during the 49'er games and has received praise throughout northern California. It also performs at all home football games.

The band always strives to play music above its classification. Their parade marches have included the Klaxon, National Emblem, Lights Out, and Invercangill. At their concerts they have always played good music, such as Suite in Eb-Holst, Finals, Fauchet Symphony, and so forth.

Mr. Jack Mulkey, superintendent of the Dos Palos High School, is to be congratulated for their well-organized and successful trip to Washington. With the help of the D.C. Transit System, he scheduled their time so that they were touring every possible moment, saw all the sights that could possibly be crowded into 4 days, and will, I know, long remember the 1965 inaurguration of President Johnson.

I should like to thank Mr. Ewing Haas, administrative assistant to Senator THOMAS KUCHEL, for his fine cooperation in joining me in greeting the band at breakfast today and later arranging their tour of the Senate. Also my sincere thanks to the Chief Justice for so graciously taking the time to greet the band on their tour of the Supreme Court.

I was proud of the band's performance in the parade and I know that the honor of representing California in this greatest of our national events will spur them on to further glory.

AMEND SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced two measures to amend the Social Security Act so that certain individuals will not lose portions of their social security benefits for which they paid in good faith. Both of these situations arose from a misunderstanding on the part of the nonprofit organization regarding the time of filing of the waiver certificate. Nonprofit organizations by law are exempt from coverage under the Social Security Act. Employees of such organizations may be covered under the social security program only if the organization arranges to have coverage by filing a waiver certificate with its district director of internal revenue.

The situations arising in my district affect employees of the Centro Asturiano Hospital and television station WEDU. The employees of these organizations, as did the organizations themselves, thought that the employees were covered by social security for certain years. Payments were accordingly made by the organizations and employees. Later, it was discovered that the waiver certificates were not timely filed. Although the funds can be recovered, social security coverage for several years will be lost unless legislative action is taken.

H.R. 2975 which I have introduced would permit employees to validate such reported coverage without regard to any action which the employing organization might choose to take or not to take, other than the filing of a waiver certificate. That is, the employees who had been reported would be able to secure coverage even if the hospital or other nonprofit organization did not agree to repay refunded contributions, or did not agree to provide for retroactivity under its waiver certificate.

Under the second proposal I have introduced, H.R. 2976, social security credits would be provided only where both employer and employee contributions are made.

The sections are explained, as follows:

H.R. 2975

Section 105(b) of the Social Security Amendments of 1960 provided that an employee of a nonprofit organization could, under certain circumstances, receive social security credit for remuneration erroneously reported on his behalf by the organization in any taxable period from January 1, 1951, through June 30, 1960. The suggested legislative language would, in brief first, reopen the 1960 amendments to permit employees of nonprofit organizations to validate remuneration erroneously reported through December 31, 1962; and, second, remove the requirement contained in the 1960 provisions that in cases where the employing nonprofit organization has obtained refunds of the employer contributions no credit can be given to the employee, with respect to the wages upon which such contributions were based, unless both the employer and employee share of the tax is repaid. Thus, under the proposed language, the employer's share of the taxes refunded would not have to be repaid in order for the employees concerned to obtain credit. However, the employees themselves, if they have received refunds, would have to repay the refunded employee contributions, including interest, if they are to receive credit for the earnings involved.

In order for an employee to secure credit for remuneration erroneously reported for him for periods before January 1963, the following conditions would have to be met:

First. The employee—or his fiduciary or survivor—to obtain credit, must file with the Social Security Administration a request that all of the remuneration erroneously reported for him by the employing nonprofit organization for periods before January 1963, be validated and credited to his social security account.

Second. The organization must have paid by February 11, 1963, social security taxes on at least part of the remuneration received by the employee. February 11, 1963, is the due date for wage reports for the fourth calendar quarter of 1962.

Third. The organization must have filed a waiver electing coverage on or before the date the employee files his request for validation.

Fourth. Any refund of the employee tax which the employee had received would have to be repaid no later than the end of 1967.

Fifth. An employee who did not choose coverage when his employing organization filed a waiver electing coverage would be compulsatorily covered for the future, beginning with the calendar quarter after the quarter in which he files his request for validation.

The bill would permit a nonprofit organization to elect coverage to be effective for a period of up to 5 years before the calendar quarter in which the certificate electing coverage is filed. Thus, by making its certificate retroactive a nonprofit organization could provide for the coverage under social security of remuneration erroneously reported for periods before the certificate was filed—as far back as the periods frozen by the statute of limitation. Organizations which had filed a certificate before the year in which the bill is enacted would be given an opportunity to amend the certificate to make coverage effective for a period of up to 5 years before the calendar quarter in which amendment to the certificate is filed. In addition, the bill makes provision for validating erroneously reported wages of workers no longer in the employ of the organization when the certificate is filed.

SECTION-BY-SECTION EXPLANATION

Section 1 of the bill provides that a nonprofit organization could make the waiver certificate which it files when electing coverage effective as early as the first day of the 20th calendar quarter preceding the quarter in which such certificate is filed. Under present law the certificate may not be made effective earlier than the fourth calendar quarter before the quarter of filing. By permitting an organization to provide retroactive coverage back to the periods frozen by the statute of limitation, section 1 would ordinarily permit the crediting of all remuneration reported for individuals by a nonprofit organization before the organization filed a certificate electing coverage.

Section 2 of the bill provides that an organization which files a certificate electing coverage in or prior to the year of enactment may during the year of enactment or the following year amend such certificate to provide the additional retroactivity authorized by section 1. This provision makes the remedy provided by section 1 available also to these organizations which had already filed a certificate.

Section 3 of the bill would amend section 105(b) of the Social Security Amendments of 1960, which provided that an employee of a nonprofit organization could, under certain circumstances, receive social security credit for remuneration erroneously reported on his behalf by the organization in any taxable period from January 1, 1951, through June 30, 1960. The amendments would permit validation only in situations where the individual is not employed by the nonprofit organization when it files its certificate electing coverage. Validation would be permitted only for periods during which the nonprofit organization had in effect a certificate—including a certificate amended to provide increased retroactivity—electing coverage.

The amended section 105(b) would, in brief, permit employees of nonprofit organizations to validate certain remuneration erroneously reported before the calendar quarter in which the organization filed a certificate electing coverage. In order for an employee to secure credit for remuneration erroneously reported for him for periods before such quarter the following conditions would have to be met:

First. The employee—or his fiduciary or survivor—to obtain credit, must file with the Social Security Administration a request that all of the remuneration erroneously reported for him by the employing nonprofit organization for periods before the calendar quarter in which the organization files a certificate electing coverage be validated and credited to his social security account.

Second. The organization must have paid by the due date of the tax return for the calendar quarter before the calendar quarter in which the organization filed a certificate electing coverage social security taxes on at least part of the remuneration received by the employee.

Third. The organization must have filed a waiver electing coverage on or before the date the employee files his request for validation.

Fourth. Any refund of the employer or employee social security tax which had been received would have to be repaid by the end of 1967 or, if later, by the end of the second year after the year in which the organization filed a certificate electing coverage.

THE CASTLE POINT VA HOSPITAL, NEW YORK

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, in my district, the 28th of New York, we have been proud to have, for 40 years, a truly wonderful institution, the Castle Point VA Hospital. It has served the area faithfully and well, not only the veterans but the entire community. As a result our community has taken this institution to its heart.

You can imagine the shock everyone, veterans and nonveterans alike felt by the VA announcement that this hospital was closing in a matter of months.

Why is this hospital being closed? It was not obsolete in any sense of the word. The VA has stated that Castle Point is being closed because of a VA policy not to operate hospitals in rural or semiurban areas. I ask each Member of this House to think how this policy will affect his district. Are we to deprive those of our veterans who wish to live in rural or semiurban areas of the medical services they need? Are we to impose new hardships on their families and force them to travel great distances to visit their loved ones?

I think this policy is wrong and it runs directly counter to President Johnson's announced goal to bring better hospital facilities to all our people, not only those living in metropolitan areas.

I also ask you, my colleagues, Why close down many hospitals that would cost $150 million to replace and then ask for $90 million to build new ones, and again I ask, Why the haste? Why must they be closed down by June 30?

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I should like to concur with the statement of the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. RESNICK]. The closing of facilities necessary to the well-being of our veterans may cause serious dislocations and inconvenience to those disabled who have served our country so well. We owe a debt to these men. This debt should be paid in full. I ask further consideration be given these hospital closings.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 131) and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

> *Resolved,* That the Committee on Appropriations and the subcommittees thereof be authorized to sit during sessions and recesses of the Eighty-ninth Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GOLDEN JUBILEE OF THE KIWANIS INTERNATIONAL

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of the Members of this House the fact that today is the golden jubilee of the Kiwanis International.

Fifty years ago, the first Kiwanis Club was founded. Three years ago, in April 1962, the 5,000th Kiwanis Club was chartered. This is the type of growth that comes with success—and the success is well deserved.

Kiwanis International is a great service organization. It has done such varied things as teacher recruitment, the setting up of soil erosion projects, aid to the mentally retarded and attempts to get out the vote.

Recent years have seen the Kiwanis Club spread beyond the boundaries of the United States into Canada and Mexico. I am confident that the Kiwanis International will continue to flourish, and I am confident that the centennial of the Kiwanis some 50 years hence will see the Kiwanis International pursuing its works of good will throughout the entire world.

My congratulations go to the Kiwanis International on this joyful occasion.

BUDGET FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 15, PT. 2)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I present the budget for the District of Columbia for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1965.

I have spoken in recent weeks of our resolve to advance toward the Great Society—in our cities, in our countryside, and in our classrooms. What we do in our Capital City, I believe, will stand as a measure of our overall progress to that end.

I shall shortly send to the Congress a special message defining the specific goals and the steps for achieving them that will lead the District of Columbia toward the Great Society. The budget which I am transmitting will provide the means by which progress toward many of those goals can be made in fiscal year 1966.

Adequate financial support is necessary if the District is to have needed services and facilities. Improvements were made by the last Congress, but provisions for the Federal payment to the District and for District borrowing for capital improvements are still inadequate, and certain local tax rates should be increased.

1. The Federal payment: The authorization for the Federal payment is a fixed amount. While this authorization was substantially increased by the last Congress, from $32 to $50 million, it still does not reflect an equitable sharing by the Federal Government of the expense of government in the District. Of even more importance, a fixed amount necessarily fails to reflect adjustments which should be made in the authorization in order to maintain an equitable balance between Federal and local responsibility in the future. I urge the Congress to enact legislation authorizing an annual Federal payment based on a formula which provides a continuing and equitable measure of Federal financial responsibility.

The formula proposed by President Kennedy and approved by the Senate in 1963 will accomplish this purpose. Under it, the payment will be computed on the basis of the assessed value of real estate and personal property owned and used by the Federal Government in the District, and will represent the amount the District would receive if Federal Government activities were subject to local District taxes. Such a formula will relate the Federal payment directly both to District needs and to the contribution of its own citizens through local taxes. Under this formula, the Federal payment authorized in fiscal year 1966 would be approximately $57 million—see table—and is estimated to increase to approximately $75 million by fiscal year 1971.

Requirements and financing of the general fund, 1965–71

[In millions of dollars]

	Estimates		Projections				
	1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
Funds required:							
Operating expenses	270.7	280.7	294.6	309.3	324.8	341.0	358.1
Capital outlay	31.9	54.1	55.0	54.1	54.1	54.3	37.2
Contribution for rapid transit system	-------	5.7	17.7	26.6	-------	-------	-------
Repayment of loans and interest	1.7	1.9	2.6	4.1	5.6	7.1	8.6
Repayment of loans and interest—Rapid transit system	-------	-------	-------	-------	2.4	3.1	3.1
Reserves for contingencies	.9	1.4	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Total funds required	305.2	343.6	370.9	395.1	387.9	406.5	408.0
Revenues and balances:							
From present sources:							
Taxes, fees, etc	231.4	243.1	255.9	268.9	281.9	295.3	308.9
Balances	6.1	1.8	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0
Federal payment	39.7	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0
Repayable advances	8.0	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
Loan authorization—Public works	20.0	26.0	20.1	19.4	3.2	-------	-------
Total from present sources	305.2	320.8	328.0	340.3	337.1	347.3	360.9
From proposed sources:							
Taxes	-------	10.1	13.3	13.7	14.0	17.9	21.7
Federal payment	-------	7.0	11.9	14.5	17.0	21.2	25.4
Loan authorization—Public works	-------	-------	-------	-------	19.8	20.1	-------
Loan authorization—Rapid transit system	-------	5.7	17.7	26.6	-------	-------	-------
Total from proposed sources	-------	22.8	42.9	54.8	50.8	59.2	47.1
Total revenues and balances	305.2	343.6	370.9	395.1	387.9	406.5	408.0

It has been suggested that the proposed formula would create a precedent requiring the Federal Government to make similar payments for Federal property located in other jurisdictions. This is not a valid argument. The Congress has recognized for well over a century the special responsibility of the Federal Government for providing a share of the funds needed for the operation of the District government. The Congress has often changed the amount authorized for that purpose. The Federal payment authorization which I am now recommending is equitable and will provide a predictable basis for determining the amount which is authorized for the Federal payment. The issue has never been whether there should be a Federal payment but only as to the proper amount.

2. Borrowing authority: While the limit of debt which may be incurred for purposes of the general fund of the District was increased by the last Congress to $175 million, it, too, is still a specified dollar limit, which must be renewed when exhausted. I recommend the enactment of legislation which will provide a flexible and at the same time prudent general fund debt limit based on ability to repay, namely, 6 percent of the 10-year average of the combined assessed value of taxable real and personal property—including property owned and used by the Federal Government as specified in the Federal payment formula. This would provide for the District a debt limit comparable in form with that in effect in most State and local jurisdictions. The adoption of this proposal would result in a general fund debt limit of approximately $233 million in fiscal year 1966, and of $293 million by fiscal year 1971. While borrowing will continue to require in each case the approval of the Congress, a debt limit of this kind will permit both the District and the Congress to make more soundly based long-range plans.

3. Local taxes: The major share of the expense of financing the District government is, and should be, borne by District residents. They should also assume their fair share of the increased costs which the District must incur if it is to maintain its development and achieve its proper place as a capital city worthy of our country. For this reason, I fully support legislation which will be recommended by the Commissioners to increase certain District taxes. Together with an accompanying increase in

the real estate tax planned by the Commissioners under existing law, these proposals will produce about $10.1 million of additional revenue in fiscal year 1966. This amount will accrue to the general fund, increasing the revenues from local taxes in that fund to a total of $253.2 million.

These tax changes, the change in the authorized Federal payment and the change in the District borrowing authorization, provide the basis for future stable general fund financing. There must be, however, a concurrent recognition of the responsibility of the Federal Government not only to authorize an equitable Federal payment but also to appropriate it. Meeting the legitimate financial needs of the District by authorizing larger borrowing by the District to compensate for a failure to appropriate the full amount of the Federal payment which has been authorized is neither sound nor fair.

It is quite appropriate for the District to incur long-term debt for capital improvements the useful life of which will extend over many years. It is equally appropriate to utilize more than might be considered a normal amount of such borrowing in order to catch up on capital improvement programs, such as for schools, in which the District has fallen far behind. It is neither appropriate nor prudent, however, to require the District to use borrowed money as a substitute for amounts which should be available on a current basis.

The District's budget is constructed in the belief that the Federal Government will provide its equitable share of District needs as indicated by the authorized Federal payment. The District is penalized unjustly when a portion of this proper Federal responsibility is transferred to the shoulders of future District taxpayers who must repay the loans.

New obligational authority, all funds

[In thousands of dollars]

Description	1964 actual	1965 estimate	1966 recommended
Current authorizations:			
Education:			
Operating expenses	63,861	71,844	77,679
Capital outlay	15,626	14,405	29,449
Welfare and health:			
Operating expenses	70,526	76,213	81,319
Capital outlay	1,310	486	7,849
Highways and traffic:			
Operating expenses	12,407	13,790	14,013
Capital outlay	11,280	13,769	13,843
Public safety:			
Operating expenses	66,126	74,138	77,557
Capital outlay	539	336	2,229
Parks and recreation:			
Operating expenses	9,114	10,100	11,087
Capital outlay	378	680	1,819
General operating expenses:			
Operating expenses	17,906	19,397	21,321
Capital outlay	1,088	4,059	2,186
Sanitary engineering:			
Operating expenses	21,963	22,288	22,952
Capital outlay	15,400	23,066	16,510
Repayment of loans and interest	4,992	5,364	5,690
Payment of District of Columbia share of Federal capital outlays	916	1,860	987
Contribution to rapid transit system			5,700
Additional municipal expenses, inaugural ceremonies		283	
Additional municipal expenses, Imperial Shrine Convention			221
Judgments, claims and refunds	1,000	7	
Current authorizations—Con.			
Purchase and installation of parking meters	220		
Total current authorizations	314,651	352,086	392,411
Permanent authorizations	1,404	1,598	1,607
Operations of District of Columbia trust funds	42,378	52,489	63,696
Repayment (−) of advances from Federal funds	7,000	−17,000	
Investments	2,316		
Total authorizations	367,749	389,174	457,714
Recapitulation of current authorizations:			
General fund	265,071	296,498	344,953
Highway fund	25,169	28,791	28,855
Water fund	11,375	11,038	11,394
Sanitary sewage works fund	13,003	15,677	7,126
Metropolitan area sanitary sewage works fund	33	82	83
Total, all funds	314,651	352,086	392,411

EDUCATION

Appropriations of $77.7 million are needed to provide for the operation of the District's school system in 1966, an increase of $3.8 million over 1965. The additional funds will provide for 517 new teaching positions needed to keep abreast of the requirements of a rapidly increasing school population, which will reach almost 150,000 by fiscal year 1966. The additional teachers will permit the achievement throughout the system of the pupil-teacher ratios approved by the Board of Education.

Funds are also provided to achieve the ratios recommended by the Board for school counselors and to provide librarians for about half of the elementary schools that now do not have them. Deficiencies will still remain but the budget reflects a major effort to remedy shortcomings and to make the District's educational system a model for the Nation.

The budget also includes $29.4 million for the vital program of improving the school plant. Construction of new schools and additions to existing school buildings will increase the capacity of the system by some 5,000 pupil spaces. Funds for sites and plans are provided to permit a similar enlargement in fiscal year 1967. Nothing less will suffice if the District is to have available modern, well-equipped school buildings, eliminate part-time classes, and provide adequate space for its increasing school population, including students who are staying in school rather than dropping out. In no other area has the District's capital construction program lagged so far behind. In no other area is the need to catch up more urgent.

The inclusion of the District in the program of Federal aid to school districts impacted by children of Federal employees does not lessen the need for these appropriations. The Federal aid provided under Public Law 88-665 is properly being allocated to those schools in the District most in need of enrichment of programs and services above the level provided in the regular budget. Use of these funds as a substitute for regular educational appropriations not only would deprive District children of these additional educational resources, but also would conflict with the intention of the Congress.

Special programs for the schools in the Cardozo area which have been funded through the Economic Opportunity Act and the program to prevent juvenile delinquency should also be regarded as additional to those provided in the regular budget.

WELFARE AND HEALTH

The budget includes appropriations of $81.3 million for operating expenses of the welfare and health departments, an increase of $5.1 million over 1965.

The welfare programs for which funds are provided are directed so far as possible to the rehabilitation of persons and families by positive action which will advance them toward self-sufficiency. Consistent with this, although not a part of the welfare budget, matching funds are provided to enable the District to participate in a number of training projects under the Manpower Development and Training Act.

The budget reflects my belief that the District should be in a position of leadership in putting into effect the welfare and health programs which the Congress has authorized in recent years. I remain particularly concerned with the plight of dependent children, and the continuing upward trend in the population of Junior Village. For that reason the budget contains funds which will permit the District to participate in the national program of aid to dependent children of unemployed parents. In the massive effort now being undertaken on many fronts to improve the conditions of the District's poverty-stricken families, we can ill afford not to utilize every available program which will help to maintain families intact. I strongly urge the Congress to reconsider its previous position on District participation in this program.

The budget continues the health programs already established and provides funds for more intensive efforts in the fields of maternal and child health, in the control of venereal disease, and in the food pesticide residue program.

Proposed capital outlays total $7.8 million. The substantial increase over last year is occasioned by the need to construct a facility for the detention and rehabilitation of District youths now being accommodated at the National Training School for Boys, which will be moved to Morgantown, W. Va., in 1967. A badly needed school activities building at Junior Village is also included in the Welfare Department budget.

The Health Department budget includes funds urgently needed to plan for community health centers. The establishment of such centers in several parts of the city is important to the District's general health program and is basic to the implementation in the District of new concepts in the prevention, treatment, and care of mental illness and mental retardation.

PUBLIC SAFETY

The budget provides operating expenses of $77.6 million for public safety, an increase of $3.4 million over 1965.

The District is engaged on many fronts in an attack on the prevention and punishment of criminal acts, and the elimination of the causes of crime. It is apparent that more must be done. I shall shortly make further recommendations on this subject to the Congress. The budget provides funds for the enlargement of the police force by 100 men, and continues the program to release officers for active police work by increased use of civilian personnel for administrative activities.

PARKS AND RECREATIONS

The funds provided in the budget for the Recreation Department will continue the improvements which were instituted last year, as well as accelerate the program of enlargement and improvement of playground and recreation facilities. The John F. Kennedy Playground in the near Northwest section of the District—an area seriously deficient in playground resources—is a welcome addition to the city's recreation facilities. Funds have been provided for a new site for Shaw Junior High School, thereby making it possible to preserve the needed playground.

HIGHWAYS AND TRAFFIC

The highway program has been coordinated with the proposed rapid transit program in order to achieve a balanced transportation system for the District and the Washington metropolitan area. I shall shortly send to the Congress my recommendations with respect to the rapid transit program. Funds to meet the District's share of initial costs are included in the budget.

The highway program, which is also urgently needed, will be delayed for lack of funds in fiscal year 1966 unless the resources of the highway fund are increased. I am, therefore, again recommending an increase of $35 million in the loan authorization for the highway fund and an increase of 1 cent in the gasoline tax. The new District gasoline tax rate of 7 cents will correspond with the rates in Maryland and Virginia, and will yield an additional $2 million annually, a sum sufficient to retire the $35 million loan in 30 years. This tax and borrowing program continues the sound policy of financing the street and highway system by taxes based upon use. Additional taxes of this kind may be necessary as the District faces increased expenses in maintaining its portion of the Interstate System and in constructing, maintaining, and improving other highways and streets. I am therefore instructing the Commissioners to consider proposals for financing the highway fund for the next decade.

CONCLUSION

The needs of the District, as of other great cities, continue to grow. As our Nation's Capital, the District of Columbia should exemplify the best in programs for the health, education, and welfare of its citizens. This budget, together with the proposals in this message for additional funds, will in my judgment significantly advance the District toward that goal. At the same time, it is designed, like the Federal budget, to avoid waste and inefficiency. The District is continuing to strengthen its management improvement programs. In the District, as elsewhere in our Government, staff must be used effectively, unnecessary work and positions must be eliminated, and additional personnel added only when absolutely essential.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

JANUARY 21, 1965.

MAKING IN ORDER CONSIDERATION OF A RESOLUTION CONCERNING ACTIVITIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order on Monday next or on any subsequent day next week to consider a resolution making appropriations for certain activities of the Department of Agriculture.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman from Texas explain what is involved?

Mr. MAHON. The issue involved is that impairment of the Commodity Credit Corporation's capital stock has to be restored in order for the Department of Agriculture to discharge its responsibility under the law for the support of commodities such as wheat, corn, and other feed grains, tobacco, and cotton. This is legislation which we, of course, consider from time to time. Last year we cut the budget estimate by $478 million. They are on the verge of being out of funds. That is the issue which is involved here. We shall discuss this matter in detail, of course, when the matter is before the House. It will be programed for some day next week by the leadership.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, as I understand, this becomes necessary in order to continue the price support program for farm commodities.

Mr. MAHON. That is correct. I have conferred with the gentleman and, as he knows, with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS], the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL], and others who are interested in this type of legislation.

Mr. JONAS. Will this be in the nature of a supplemental appropriation bill?

Mr. MAHON. Yes.

Mr. JONAS. And when it is called up there will be time for ample discussion?

Mr. MAHON. For ample discussion and debate.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, may I ask the chairman if the hearing is completed this afternoon on this supplemental request, will it be the intention to bring this matter up next week, but definitely not on Monday?

Mr. MAHON. The request is for Monday or any subsequent day, but I am informed it will not be possible to bring it up on Monday, so I do not anticipate calling it up on Monday.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEES

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 132

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

Committee on Agriculture: Paul B. Dague, Pennsylvania; Page Belcher, Oklahoma; Charles M. Teague, California; Albert H. Quie, Minnesota; Catherine May, Washington; Delbert L. Latta, Ohio; Ralph Harvey, Indiana; Paul Findley, Illinois; Robert Dole, Kansas; Laurence J. Burton, Utah; Prentiss Walker, Mississippi.

Committee on Appropriations: Frank T. Bow, Ohio; Charles Raper Jonas, North Carolina; Melvin R. Laird, Wisconsin; Elford A. Cederberg, Michigan; Glenard P. Lipscomb, California; John J. Rhodes, Arizona; William E. Minshall, Ohio; Robert H. Michel, Illinois; Silvio O. Conte, Massachusetts; Odin Langen, Minnesota; Ben Reifel, South Dakota; Glenn R. Davis, Wisconsin; Howard W. Robison, New York; Garner E. Shriver, Kansas; Joseph M. McDade, Pennsylvania; Mark Andrews, North Dakota.

Committee on Armed Services: William H. Bates, Massachusetts; Leslie C. Arends, Illinois; Alvin E. O'Konski, Wisconsin; William G. Bray, Indiana; Bob Wilson, California; Charles S. Gubser, California; Charles E. Chamberlain, Michigan; Alexander Pirnie, New York; Durward G. Hall, Missouri; Donald D. Clancy, Ohio; Robert T. Stafford, Vermont; Richard S. Schweiker, Pennsylvania.

Committee on Banking and Currency: William B. Widnall, New Jersey; Paul A. Fino, New York; Florence P. Dwyer, New Jersey; Seymour Halpern, New York; James Harvey, Michigan; Wm. E. (Bill) Brock, Tennessee; Burt L. Talcott, California; Del Clawson, California; Albert W. Johnson, Pennsylvania; J. William Stanton, Ohio; Chester L. Mize, Kansas.

Committee on District of Columbia: Ancher Nelsen, Minnesota; William L. Springer, Illinois; Alvin E. O'Konski, Wisconsin; William H. Harsha, Ohio; Charles McC. Mathias, Jr., Maryland; Frank J. Horton, New York; Richard L. Roudebush, Indiana; Joel T. Broyhill, Virginia.

Committee on Education and Labor: William H. Ayres, Ohio; Robert P. Griffin, Michigan; Albert H. Quie, Minnesota; Charles E. Goodell, New York; John M. Ashbrook, Ohio; Dave Martin, Nebraska; Alphonzo Bell, California; Paul Findley, Illinois; Ogden R. Reid, New York; Glenn Andrews, Alabama.

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Frances P. Bolton, Ohio; E. Ross Adair, Indiana; William S. Mailliard, California; Peter Frelinghuysen, New Jersey; William S. Broomfield, Michigan; J. Irving Whalley, Pennsylvania; H. R. Gross, Iowa; E. Y. Berry, South Dakota; Edward J. Derwinski, Illinois; F. Bradford Morse, Massachusetts; Vernon W. Thomson, Wisconsin; James G. Fulton, Pennsylvania.

Committee on Government Operations: Clarence J. Brown, Ohio; Florence P. Dwyer, New Jersey; Robert P. Griffin, Michigan; Ogden R. Reid, New York; Frank J. Horton, New York; Delbert L. Latta, Ohio; Donald Rumsfeld, Illinois; William L. Dickinson, Alabama; John N. Erlenborn, Illinois; Howard H. Callaway, Georgia.

Committee on House Administration: Glenard P. Lipscomb, California; Robert J. Corbett, Pennsylvania; Charles E. Chamberlain, Michigan; Charles E. Goodell, New York; Willard S. Curtin, Pennsylvania; Samuel L. Devine, Ohio; John N. Erlenborn, Illinois; William L. Dickinson, Alabama.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs: John P. Saylor, Pennsylvania; E. Y. Berry, South Dakota; Craig Hosmer, California; Joe Skubitz, Kansas; Charlotte T. Reid, Illinois; Laurence J. Burton, Utah; Rogers C. B. Morton, Maryland; Wendell Wyatt, Oregon; George Hansen, Idaho; Henry P. Smith III, New York; Ed Reinecke, California.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce: William L. Springer, Illinois; J. Arthur Younger, California; Samuel L. Devine, Ohio; Ancher Nelsen, Minnesota; Hastings Keith, Massachusetts; Willard S. Curtin, Pennsylvania; Glenn Cunningham, Nebraska; James T. Broyhill, North Carolina; James Harvey, Michigan; Albert W. Watson, South Carolina; Tim Lee Carter, Kentucky.

Committee on Judiciary: William M. McCulloch, Ohio; Richard H. Poff, Virginia; William C. Cramer, Florida; Arch A. Moore, Jr., West Virginia; John V. Lindsay, New York; William T. Cahill, New Jersey; Clark MacGregor, Minnesota; Charles McC. Mathias, Jr., Maryland; Carleton J. King, New York; Edward Hutchinson, Michigan; Robert McClory, Illinois.

Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries: William S. Mailliard, California; Thomas M. Pelly, Washington; Robert F. Ellsworth, Kansas; Stanley R. Tupper, Maine; Charles A. Mosher, Ohio; James R. Grover, Jr., New York; Rogers C. B. Morton, Maryland; Hastings Keith, Massachusetts; Jack Edwards, Alabama; G. Robert Watkins, Pennsylvania.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service: Robert J. Corbett, Pennsylvania; H. R. Gross, Iowa; Glenn Cunningham, Nebraska; Edward J. Derwinski, Illinois; Robert F. Ellsworth, Kansas; Albert W. Johnson, Pennsylvania; John H. Buchanan, Jr., Alabama.

Committee on Public Works: William C. Cramer, Florida; John F. Baldwin, Jr., California; William H. Harsha, Ohio; John C. Kunkel, Pennsylvania; James R. Grover, Jr., New York; James C. Cleveland, New Hampshire; Don H. Clausen, California; Charles A. Halleck, Indiana; Charlotte T. Reid, Illinois; Robert C. McEwen, New York; James D. Martin, Alabama.

Committee on Rules: Clarence J. Brown, Ohio; H. Allen Smith, California; John B. Anderson, Illinois; Dave Martin, Nebraska; James H. Quillen, Tennessee.

Committee on Science and Astronautics: Joseph W. Martin, Jr., Massachusetts; James G. Fulton, Pennsylvania; Charles A. Mosher, Ohio; Richard L. Roudebush, Indiana; Alphonzo Bell, California; Thomas M. Pelly, Washington; Donald Rumsfeld, Illinois; Edward J. Gurney, Florida; John W. Wydler, New York; Barber B. Conable, Jr., New York.

Committee on Un-American Activities: John M. Ashbrook, Ohio; Del Clawson, California; John H. Buchanan, Jr., Alabama.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: E. Ross Adair, Indiana; William H. Ayres, Ohio; Paul A. Fino, New York; John P. Saylor, Pennsylvania; Charles M. Teague, California; Seymour Halpern, New York; Robert F. Ellsworth, Kansas; John J. Duncan, Tennessee.

Committee on Ways and Means: John W. Byrnes, Wisconsin; Thomas B. Curtis, Missouri; James B. Utt, California; Jackson E. Betts, Ohio; Herman T. Schneebeli, Pennsylvania; Harold R. Collier, Illinois; Joel T. Broyhill, Virginia; James F. Battin, Montana.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR BALANCE OF WEEK AND WEEK OF JANUARY 25, 1965

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time in order that I might inquire of the majority leader if he can give the Members of the House any information as to any tentative legislative program for next week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Illinois yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma, yes.

Mr. ALBERT. First of all, Mr. Speaker, tomorrow is Ukrainian Independence Day. Members have expressed the desire that they be permitted to take special orders on that subject on Monday.

Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order for Members to discuss Ukrainian Independence Day on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, further pursuant to the inquiry of the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations has this day obtained unanimous agreement to call up a House joint resolution some day next week, making supplemental appropriations for the Department of Agriculture.

It will be our plan and intention to bring that matter up on Tuesday.

There may be Presidential messages next week. The budget message will probably come up on Monday.

Any further program we will announce later. We have no further program to announce at this time, and we have no further business for this week.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

CESSATION OF PUBLIC LAW 480 AID TO EGYPT

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL], is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, in 1956, our Government's policy permitted Nasser to confiscate the most valuable property in Egypt, the Suez Canal. Our Government's policy toward Nasser has also encouraged American banks to grant Egypt, on credit, vast quantities of industrial equipment. American aid to Nasser continues to flow, while Nasser, abusing and vilifying Americans, operates as a Soviet agent, serving as an instrument of Soviet foreign policy.

In the same period when American taxpayers were forced to give Nasser $1 billion in aid, Nasser spent about $1 billion on military equipment from the Soviet Union. How can it be denied that military equipment which Nasser sends to Communist rebels in the Congo was bought from the Soviets with American money?

Mr. Speaker, recent developments in the Middle East force us once again to examine our policies with respect to the United Arab Republic and its president, Gamal Abdel Nasser.

The disclosures on Tuesday—January 12—by an Egyptian secret policy official who asked for asylum in Iran provided us with additional proof that Colonel Nasser has been diverting American AID funds in order to pay for his interference in the affairs of other independent states. This new evidence, as well as the events of the past 3 months, should be enough to convince everyone that some changes must be made in the distribution of our agricultural surpluses, as well as our foreign economic aid.

Colonel Nasser's record of interference in the affairs of other countries in the past has been extensively documented many times. Under a variety of pretexts, our aid has nevertheless continued. The events of the last 3 months, however, provide us with an almost uninterrupted array of provocations, insults, and illegal actions. Permit me, Mr. Speaker, to enumerate them:

On November 26, 1964, the John F. Kennedy Memorial Library in Cairo was sacked and burned by mobs that the Government of the United Arab Republic was unwilling or unable to control;

On December 19, 1964, the Russian-built planes of Colonel Nasser's Air Force shot down an unarmed commercial plane belonging to the John Mecom Oil Co. of Texas;

On December 23, 1964, in a long speech at Port Said, Colonel Nasser not only insulted the United States by telling us to "jump in the lake" in Egyptian dialect, but also admitted he was supplying arms to the Congolese rebels.

We suspected before, and know now how he is able to do this by diverting resources from important agricultural development projects to the purchase of military equipment and supplies. Colonel Nasser is able to accomplish such a diversion because we supply him with $140 million worth of surplus wheat, beef, and poultry every year under the Public Law 480 food-for-peace program. The proceeds from the sale of these surplus foodstuffs is then loaned or granted to the Government, which in this case uses them for its own interventionist foreign policy.

Until 18 months ago, we had also granted or loaned Mr. Nasser nearly $900 million in economic and other aid programs. We provided no additional funds because the Egyptian Government refused to withdraw any of its troops from Yemen in order to pave the way for a peaceful settlement of that country's 2-year-old civil war. For humanitarian and diplomatic reasons, Congress was persuaded that the cutting off of surplus food shipments would not help to bring about any changes in the policies of the Egyptian leader.

I should like to quote two passages from Colonel Nasser's speech of December 23:

> When I speak about Yemen, I must refer with appreciation to the highly commendable civilizing and humanitarian role played by the Egyptian forces in Yemen while fighting for the sake of the Yemeni people.

Mr. Speaker, are these the words of a leader who has prided himself on his dedication to the cause of anticolonialism? Are not these words rather those of any statesman of the 19th century, used to justify the occupation and exploitation of another country? Would it be possible for Colonel Nasser to undertake such military intervention, involving thousands of troops thousands of miles away from Egypt's borders, if he had to concern himself with supplying his own population with sufficient food?

Again I quote:

> We consider that the national rebels in the Congo require every support from the national forces and the honorable forces in the world. We make it clear and public. We do not hide and have never denied that we have sent arms to the Congo, and we will still send them arms.

Mr. Speaker, are these the words of a man who claims he seeks to bring peace to that troubled continent? Would he be able to purchase and deliver these arms if he did not have our agricultural surpluses to feed his own people?

I think the answers are self-evident.

Mr. Speaker, under the terms of the 1963 Foreign Assistance Act, the President was directed by Congress to withhold all foreign economic aid, as well as food-for-peace aid, from any nation committing aggressive acts against any other country receiving our aid. I think we have here a clearcut violation of that act. Colonel Nasser has admitted publicly that he is supplying arms to the Congolese rebels, whose avowed intent is to overthrow the central government. The United States of America both recognizes and supports that central government. I think it is time that Congress acted.

If we do not wish to see the dignity of the laws of the United States flouted by every petty national leader who wishes to enhance his position, we must act.

But, what have we done? We acceded to an Egyption request, made only a few weeks ago, to ship another $17 million of surplus wheat. This shipment was approved before the end of the year, which means that the U.S. Government paid for the shipping costs.

The total amount of agricultural commodities in the Public Law 480 agreement signed October 1962 was $431.8 million of export value—$583.8 million of CCC value. As of this date we still have left to be shipped $36,914,000, which is made up of $22.4 million in wheat, $8.8 million in tobacco, and $5.6 million in vegetable oil, and so forth. In other words, authorizations have not yet been executed for the balance of roughly $37 million.

Despite boasts that Egypt can get along without us, Nasser has had the unbridled temerity to ask for this additional $37 million in aid within the very near future. Dispatches tell us that U.S. food shipments now provide one-fourth of Egypt's calorie intake. Egypt's foreign currency reserves have vanished and it has recently shipped $35 million in gold to Switzerland. It owes about $250 million to short-term creditors in the West. Its plants are idle for lack of materials; its food is short; its food prices are rising. Its security prices are falling and the exchange had to be shut for 3 days.

Mr. Speaker, Public Law 480 aid to the United Arab Republic is due to expire on July 1, 1965, unless we choose to renew it once again. I think that we now have an excellent opportunity to demonstrate to both Colonel Nasser and others like him that the American people and their elected representatives will not sit idly by while we have our property destroyed and our motives impugned.

In the words of our former Ambassador, John Badeau, if the Egyptians wish to improve their position with respect to the United States, they should "display more dedication to carrying out their word—for—they have seriously shaken American faith" in Nasser's promises, as well as intentions.

We, Mr. Speaker, have had little indication that the present Egyptian leader is interested in maintaining good relations with the United States. In fact, to quote him once again:

> If the Americans think that they are giving us a little aid to dominate us and control our policy, I would tell them we are sorry. We are ready to cut down in our consumption: if the need arises, we could spare these ($140 million) on our food, and it would not bother us a bit, by God.

Mr. Speaker, the Egyptian leader has directly contravened the provisions of the 1963 Foreign Assistance Act by aiding the Congolese rebels. At the same time, he has indicated clearly that he does not consider our aid necessary. I therefore find little reason for continuing to give him any aid. I suggest that Congress prohibit any further Public Law 480 shipments to the United Arab Republic unless and until Congress by joint resolution once again specifically authorizes such trade.

I have, therefore, this day introduced a joint resolution suspending shipments of agricultural commodities to the United Arab Republic under Public Law 480. The resolution follows:

> Whereas President Lyndon B. Johnson emphasized in his state of the Union message, "We are prepared to live as good neighbors with all, but we cannot be indifferent to acts designed to injure our interests, or our citizens, or our establishments abroad. The community of nations requires mutual respect. We shall extend it—and we shall expect it."; and
>
> Whereas Russian-built fighters of the Egyptian Air Force shot down a U.S. civilian plane, killing its two crewmen; and
>
> Whereas the John F. Kennedy Memorial Library in Cairo was sacked and burned by mobs of the United Arab Republic; and
>
> Whereas President Nasser has been intemperately critical in public of the United States; and
>
> Whereas President Nasser has boasted of the help which he has given to the Stanleyville dissidents in the Congo; and
>
> Whereas President Nasser has told the United States what could be done with the help hitherto given his country; and
>
> Whereas the donor, no less than the recipient, has pride in any foreign aid venture; and
>
> Whereas Egypt urgently needs the West and no one need pay a price for Egypt's favor: Therefore be it
>
> *Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That notwithstanding any other provision of law, no agricultural commodities may be delivered or sold to the United Arab Republic pursuant to title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 or any contract, agreement, or commitment thereunder, except to the extent that the Congress may hereafter by law permit.

NATIONAL CEMETERIES

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, for more than a hundred years Congress has by law provided a final resting place for those who have served in the Armed Forces and for certain of their dependents. National cemeteries not only offer a final opportunity to reflect the citizenry's gratitude toward those who served in the defense of their country, but also stand as a monument where future generations can pay their respect to the war dead and at the same time dwell upon the courage and patriotic fervor that must eternally be kept aglow if America is to remain free and independent.

Whether the national cemetery tradition is to continue, however, may well depend upon the attitude of the 89th Congress. As I have pointed out in the past, available burial space in national cemeteries is rapidly diminishing, and a complete reappraisal and redesign of the program is necessary to preclude complete abandonment before the termination of this century.

In the 87th Congress, the Subcommittee on National Parks of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, preliminary to hearings on the national cemetery problem, published a study containing shocking statistics indicative of the neglect that has persisted in this vital matter. The following paragraphs alone should be sufficient to alert Congress to corrective action:

> The Civil War and post-Civil War years not only provided the basic legislative pattern for the national cemetery system but also provided the bulk of the cemeteries that are now within that system and pretty much dictated what, looked at from the viewpoint of today's needs, appears to be lopsided distribution. During these years—that is, from 1862 to 1899—81 national cemeteries were established. Seventeen of these were established in Virginia, seven in Tennessee, six in Kentucky, four in Illinois, Louisiana, and North Carolina, three in Arkansas, Maryland, Mississippi, and Missouri, two in the District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Indiana, Kansas, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, and

> South Carolina, and one in Alabama, California, Iowa, Montana, Nebraska, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Texas, and West Virginia.
>
> In contrast to the 81 established during these years, only 17 have been created since 1900—2 each in California, Kentucky, and Texas, and 1 each in Alaska, Colorado, Hawaii, Illinois, Maryland, Minnesota, New York, Oregon, Puerto Rico, South Dakota, and Tennessee.

Mr. Speaker, while the pattern for unequal distribution during the first years of the program is understandable in view of the concentration of veterans in affected States at that time, there appears to be no logic in the selection of national burial sites that has taken place in the last six decades. The imbalance has become particularly acute since World War II, with many heavy centers of population far removed from national cemeteries.

If the dart-game type choosing of locations is not in itself evidence enough for action on the part of Congress, then a look at the overall space availability chart will certainly produce legislative action. The subcommittee's study showed that, of the 72 national cemeteries now open, 15 will have to close by 1969 and another 12 in the following decade. Obviously, then, America is presently on a course of abandoning the national cemetery system, and I should like to ask my colleagues whether they are willing to stand by and permit this hallowed tradition to be written off as an unnecessary function of government?

I think not, yet I must warn you that there are those in the administration who are unwilling to support the steps necessary to preserve the national cemeteries system. As late as March 19, 1963, a letter from the Bureau of the Budget to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL], contained this paragraph:

> We have again reviewed our position on this matter and continue to believe that expansion of the national cemetery system is undesirable. The administration firmly believes that burial benefits as now paid by the Veterans' Administration and under the social security system are far preferable to the furnishing of interment facilities by the Government.

Far preferable, Mr. Speaker? Because there are already available to veterans the funds presumed necessary for burial, is America satisfied to withdraw the pledge that we have made in establishing national resting places for our war dead?

I have introduced H.R. 143, designed to govern further development of the national cemetery system. It would establish a National Cemeteries Site Selection Advisory Board and, among other provisions, enable the Secretary of the Army to accept donations of land and of funds for the development, operation, and maintenance of national cemeteries. In short, it would open the way toward saving the national cemeteries system and in providing cemeteries in areas too long neglected by our antiquated selection program.

I appeal to my colleagues for quick enactment of this legislation. I am confident that you would not deprive bereaved families from burying their beloved veterans in national cemeteries if they so choose. And when a more equitable distribution of cemetery sites comes about, the young man of today or tomorrow can look to the burial grounds of military men and stand in respect to those who saved America for him to enjoy: those who pushed back the enemy at the Marne, who braved the terrors of World War II, who wallowed in the rice paddies of Korea, and who today are exposed to the snipers in the darkness of South Vietnam.

A high principle is at stake, and I trust that the 89th Congress will honor it.

COTTON BILL "$400 MILLION BONANZA"

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, during consideration of the wheat-cotton bill last year, I pointed to the danger that the massive payments to cotton textile mills provided in the cotton title might become multimillion-dollar windfalls to the mills.

In a statement to the House during debate on the bill I noted that the legislation provided no assurance that the payments to mills—financed by taxpayers—would result in either higher wages for mill workers or lower prices for consumers of cotton products.

The January 15 issue of the Wall Street Journal contained two items of special interest. One reported that a union which had supported the legislation in the belief that its benefits would be shared with employees, now terms the legislation a $400-million-a-year bonanza" for the mills. The other item reported a ruling of the Internal Revenue Service, under which the value of the subsidy payments must be counted immediately by the textile mills as taxable income, instead of being considered a reduction in inventory value.

Administration spokesmen, selling the controversial bill to the House last year, claimed the legislation would yield higher wages to mill workers and lower prices to cotton product consumers. These spokesmen are still around the House but their voices are now strangely quiet.

Here are the news items:

> TEXTILE WORKERS UNION WILL SEEK 15-PERCENT PAY RISE FOR MEMBERS IN NORTH: PENSION PLAN, MEDICAL COVERAGE, ALSO GOALS FOR 40,000 WORKERS IN COTTON-RAYON PLANT TALKS
>
> NEW YORK.—The Textile Workers Union of America said it will seek a 15-percent wage increase and other benefits for some 40,000 workers in northern cotton and rayon plants.
>
> Current contracts call for a reopening April 15 after 60 days' notice. The union said it also will demand a pension plan and improved fringe benefits, including medical coverage.
>
> A resolution by 200 union delegates attending a conference in New York said northern cotton-rayon workers receive an average wage of $1.73 an hour, which it said is 70 cents an hour below the national manufacturing average of $2.43 an hour. The resolution said northern workers have received only one pay increase since 1962, whereas southern mills have granted two raises in the same period.
>
> The delegates contended the textile industry is "enjoying another banner year" in production, sales, profit, and rising stock values.
>
> William Pollock, the union's general president, said legislation fixing a single price for cotton has become a "$400-million-a-year bonanza" for the industry. He said the union had supported the legislation in the belief that its benefits would be shared with employees.
>
> "Instead," he charged, "the industry is turning one-price cotton into a one-way street for profits."
>
> Mr. Pollock said local unions will shortly serve notice to reopen their contracts.
>
> COTTON SUBSIDY
>
> Payments voted by Congress in the 1964 farm law must be counted promptly by U.S. mills as taxable income, the IRS ruled. The payments of 6½ cents a pound to cotton handlers are aimed at keeping the fiber from being more costly to domestic than to export mills. Some cotton users wanted the payments, which can be either in cotton or in cash, to be treated as reducing their cotton inventory values, in which case the amounts involved usually wouldn't be subject to tax until the goods were sold. But the IRS held the recipients generally must treat the payments as "other income" in the year in which the Agriculture Department approves their applications for the subsidies.

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF KIWANIS INTERNATIONAL

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, today we are commemorating the 50th anniversary of Kiwanis International, a truly outstanding service organization.

My personal membership in Kiwanis has always been a great source of satisfaction, observing as I have the effective work of individual Kiwanis clubs throughout the United States and Canada, and in recent years, in rapidly expanding fashion in Mexico and other lands.

The Kiwanis clubs devote themselves specifically to work on behalf of crippled children and other worthwhile community and civic projects. Certainly this golden anniversary is most significant, marking as it does a half century of service that has grown in all areas of our country.

This anniversary marks the dawn of more effective and ever-expanding Kiwanis activity. This outstanding service group demonstrates the true vitality of our land and the leadership that continually stems from individual citizens working within public-spirited organizations such as Kiwanis.

INAUGURATION DAY SHOULD BE A NATIONAL HOLIDAY

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, as President Lyndon B. Johnson was inaugurated the world witnessed the culmination of the 1964 elections. The simple, dignified ceremony in which Chief Justice Earl Warren gave the oath of office to the new President of the United States was the crowning glory of our free, democratic, electoral process.

A crowd of over 1 million persons turned out to see the ceremony and to watch the glittering parade of floats and groups representing every part of America. Tens of millions viewed the proceedings on television.

In 1957 the 85th Congress enacted Public Law 85-1, declaring the 20th day of January of every fourth year to be a legal holiday in the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia, to be known as Inauguration Day. By this law all Federal employees and employees of the District of Columbia are granted the opportunity to witness, and in that respect, to participate in the inaugural ceremonies.

In this day of widespread TV and other forms of mass communication there is no need to draw a line around the metropolitan area of Washington, D.C., and to say that only those persons within the line are entitled to witness the swearing in ceremony or any of the other notable events of Inauguration Day. Why should not a Federal employee in Texas or some other State far removed from the Capital be permitted to view the inauguration over TV, or listen to it on the radio, or even fly to see it? It takes only 2½ hours to fly by jet from Texas to Washington, D.C., shorter than it takes many people to commute to work each day.

I propose, therefore, to introduce a bill next week to declare Inauguration Day to be a legal holiday for the entire Nation. Inauguration Day is in fact, if not by law, truly a national holiday, observed by one and all, as it should be, because of the importance of the occasion. I urge my colleagues to consider this proposal so that all Americans may be encouraged to observe and enjoy Inauguration Day.

THE SPIRITUAL DIMENSIONS OF LEADERSHIP

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the truth shines forth to us as a light in a world of darkness—giving us the courage and faith to travel through the perilous pathways of life.

In his sermon to the President on Inauguration Day at National City Christian Church, Dr. Billy Graham spelled out clearly the spiritual dimensions of leadership.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Graham brings home the overwhelming truth that only with the help of God can our Nation find peace, purpose and courage and continue to endure as a free nation.

Dr. Graham's sermon was inspiring, and I believe it only proper that Americans everywhere—as well as everyone else—be given an opportunity to hear his words.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I hereby include his sermon:

THE SPIRITUAL DIMENSIONS OF LEADERSHIP

(By Billy Graham)

On that day more than a year ago when the torch of leadership was transferred, I happened to be with a long-time friend of President Johnson's, and we went immediately to a quiet place to ask God to sustain him for the immense responsibilities which were thrust so suddenly upon him. That afternoon, when he was placing his hand on the Bible and being sworn in to the high office of President of the United States, we read together a passage of Holy Scripture. It was the prayer of King Solomon upon his ascension to the throne of Israel after the death of his father, King David.

Today, at high noon, as he takes that oath again and becomes President in his own right, I can still think of no finer prayer to begin with than that one (2 Chronicles 1: 7-12): "In that night did God appear to Solomon, and said unto him, ask what I shall give thee."

And King Solomon prayed, "Give me now wisdom and knowledge, that I may come in and go out before this people."

"And God said to Solomon, Because this was in thine heart, and thou hast not asked riches, wealth, or honor, nor the life of thine enemies * * * but hast asked wisdom and knowledge for thyself, that thou mayest judge my people, over whom I have made thee king:

"Wisdom and knowledge is granted unto thee; and I will give thee riches, and wealth, and honor, such as none of the kings have had that have been before thee."

Last February President Johnson said, "No man can live where I live now, nor work at the desk where I work now, without needing and without seeking the strength and support of earnest and frequent prayer." Humbled by the magnitude of the responsibilities of a high office, a man begins to probe the erratic swirl of events for a prophetic understanding of history; and when he is a spiritually sensitive man he will feel as Lincoln did—that he is a "humble instrument in the hands of Almighty God."

During the next 4 years many of you here today will have to make decisions of state, perhaps greater than those of any of your predecessors. You will hold in your hands the destiny not only of America, but of the world. You will lead the richest and the most powerful nation the world has ever known. It is a nation which has been abundantly endowed with material blessings, but it is also a nation in danger of losing its moral moorings and its spiritual perspective. Christ, in whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom, once said, "What shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world, and lose his own soul" (Mark 8: 36). This applies to nations as well as to individuals, for a nation that loses its spiritual courage will grow old before its time. Even if we gain all our material and social objectives, and lose our souls, it would be disastrous. Winston Churchill once said, "Man's destiny is not measured in material computations."

There is a spiritual dimension to leadership which this administration has already recognized. Theodore Roosevelt once said, "The White House is a bully pulpit." So it is. From this city you are already leading the Nation to new heights of social justice and economic prosperity. You have also the opportunity to lead the Nation to its greatest moral and spiritual heights. Jesus Christ said, "Unto whom much is given, of him shall much be required." Those who have the greatest power always need the greatest guidance.

No government rules except by the will of God. You are leaders, not only as a result of the greatest mandate the American people have ever given, but there is a mandate higher than the ballot box. You have responsibilities not only to all the people of America and to the peoples of the world, but you have also a great responsibility to the God of our fathers.

Even to the most casual observer, it is apparent that there is a growing spiritual vacuum in our Nation. Our wealth and our prosperity are in danger of making us complacent and careless in the matters of the spirit. Jesus said, "Man shall not live by bread alone." Many nations have tried it, and failed. Germany declared a neutrality in matters of religion during the thirties. That neutrality created a spiritual vacuum, and the first robust philosophy to come along filled that vacuum with a vengeance. And that, in my judgment, is how we got nazism, and the hell of World War II. The Bible says, "Where there is no vision, the people perish."

In foreign affairs, we are faced with overwhelming problems, from southeast Asia to the Congo. In domestic affairs, we are faced with an alarming crime rate, a moral crisis, and many individual psychological problems which fill our hospitals. These problems will become more intense and more demanding during the next 4 years.

There seems to be no permanent solution to our problems. We try this scheme and that, but we find that each one is only a stopgap measure. Could it be that we have failed to diagnose properly the ills of the world? Could General MacArthur have been right when he said, 20 years ago, "The problem, basically, is theological * * * there must be a revival of the spirit, if we are to save the flesh?"

I know the leaders of this administration, especially the President and Vice President, well enough to know that they believe he was right—and that our problems are basically spiritual and that they require a spiritual solution. That spiritual solution was outlined by God to King Solomon long ago, when he said,

"If my people, which are called by my name, shall humble themselves, and pray, and seek my face, and turn from their wicked ways; then will I hear from heaven, and will forgive their sin, and will heal their land" (2 Chronicles 7: 14).

To approach the problems of the next 4 years in a spirit of prayer and humble dependence upon God would bring a freshness of vision and purpose that could capture the imagination of the world.

During the next 4 years, there will be moments of discouragement, despondency, and even disillusionment. There may come times when some of you will feel like Woodrow Wilson did when the Senate voted against the ratification of Wilson's proposal for the League of Nations. The news was telephoned to the White House. "I feel like going to bed and staying there," Wilson said. He could not sleep that night, and he turned to Dr. Grayson about 3 o'clock in the morning, and said, "doctor, the devil is a busy man."

Later in the morning, he had Grayson read St. Paul's consoling words from Second Corinthians, "We are troubled on every side, yet not distressed; we are perplexed, but not forsaken; cast down, but not destroyed." Turning to Grayson, President Wilson said, "Doctor, if I were not a Christian, I think I should go mad, but my faith in God holds me to the belief that He is, in some way, working out His own plans, in spite of human mistakes."

Centuries ago Moses stood before the people of Israel and said, "When thou art in tribulation, and all these things are come upon thee * * * if thou turn to the Lord, thy God, and shall be obedient unto His voice. * * * He will not forsake thee * * * nor forget the covenants of thy father, which He sware unto them."

In the midst of the bloody Civil War, Abraham Lincoln read his Bible regularly. He memorized passages from its pages. He used the Word of God to help him make decisions and solve problems. In matters of right and wrong, the God of the Bible was Lincoln's final court of appeals. The overwhelming problems of his day drove him to the Scriptures and to his knees in prayer. Out of this humble dependence on God came the preservation of the Union.

History throbs with crisis, but the Gospel is that God is for man, and that, in the greatest crisis this world has ever known—when Jesus Christ went to the cross—God transformed that tragedy into triumph and wrought redemption for those who trust in Him.

Mr. President, on the wall of your office at the White House, I have seen a framed yellowed letter. It was written to your great-grandfather Baines more than 100 years ago, and it bears the bold—almost defiant—signature of Sam Houston.

Your great-grandfather led Gen. Sam Houston to a saving knowledge of Jesus Christ. This conversion transformed that troubled, rough hero of San Jacinto into a man of peace, happiness, and purpose. As Marquis James put it in his book "The Raven":

"The long quest for spiritual repose ended when Houston knelt before the altar and asked to be received into the church, and on the 19th of November 1858, the convert waded into the chilly waters of Rocky Creek, and was baptized. A church publication at that time said, 'The announcement of General Houston's conversion has excited wonder and surprise of many who have supposed that he was past praying for.' "

At the time, somebody said to Sam Houston, "Well, general, I hear all your sins were washed away." "I hope so," Sam Houston replied, "but if they were all washed away, the Lord help the fish down below."

On the day Sam Houston was baptized, he offered to pay half the minister's salary in the church. When someone asked him about it, he said, "My pocketbook was baptized, too."

This newness of spiritual life that the President's great-grandfather Baines helped introduce to Gen. Sam Houston is the same transforming faith we need in our Nation today if we are to meet successfully our rendezvous with destiny. That letter, written by a heroic Texan, to the great-grandfather of our President, is heartening evidence of a sense of moral direction. The letter itself is important, but the fact that the President chose to hang it in his office is also important. It is a shining symbol that from the very apex of Government, there is a spiritual emphasis in our national affairs.

Symbolically, it says that Lyndon Baines Johnson has respect for the "old faith" that has guided his family, his State, and his Nation, through generations.

On this solemn occasion, as a great Nation goes forward under its newly chosen leaders, I find great comfort for the future, symbolized by a yellowed scrap of paper on a White House wall.

DANGER OF WATERWAY TOLLS

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Edmondson] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, the dangers of imposition of a toll or tax on this Nation's historically free natural waterways cannot be emphasized too frequently. The majority whip, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Boggs], an eloquent champion of our waterways at all times, made an impressive statement outlining the consequences of such a user tax on waterways in a speech before the annual meeting of the National Waterways Conference in Memphis last December 10. It should be noted that Mr. Boggs represents the city of New Orleans, which is both a major river port and a major seaport. His comments on the consequences of tax or toll on America's industry-spawning natural inland waterways bear special attention. I have received Mr. Boggs' permission to insert this speech in the Record, and I commend his remarks to the attention of the other Members:

The Role of Waterways in Economic Development

(Remarks of Hon. Hale Boggs, Member of Congress from Louisiana, before the annual meeting of the National Waterways Conference, Inc., Memphis, Tenn., Dec. 10, 1964)

Colonel Dorland, Mr. Caruthers, Mr. Wright, Congressman-elect Grider, members of the National Waterways Conference, guests and friends, I am delighted to be with you this evening and take part on this opening program of your annual meeting. It is always a pleasure to meet with organizations such as the National Waterways Conference and talk about the wonders of the mighty Mississippi River and other great rivers and waterways. I am particularly happy to visit this scenic, historic river city on this occasion since there are so many ties that closely link New Orleans, my home, with Memphis.

Both cities gained worldwide reputations for their cotton markets, which thrived on the cotton-rich Mississippi River Delta. Indeed, they used to say that the delta began in the lobby of this hotel and ended in another hotel in New Orleans. But more than cotton binds our cities. In the world of music, for instance, what jazz fan has not heard of Beale Street, or Basin Street? New Orleans seaport is known as the gateway to Central and South America but I understand that Memphis has already established direct shipping trade with our friends and neighbors to the south.

So we have much in common, Memphis and New Orleans, but what really serves to unite our cities and our people is this grand river, the Mississippi. It is a pulsating avenue of intercity traffic, moving both upstream and down, a two-way exchange of commerce which gives economic heartbeat to our communities. As a representative of the port city of New Orleans, I bring greetings tonight to all of the citizens of this thriving port city of Memphis. It is a real pleasure to be here.

Speaking of New Orleans, I am very glad to see so many friends from the Crescent City in the audience. It is gratifying, of course, to know that more than 60 businesses and industries in and around New Orleans are members of your conference. They, of course, are working actively with you to maintain America's established system of toll-free waterways.

You may be interested in the fact that a form of waterway toll figured in the Louisiana Purchase. In the late 1700's, both the Spanish and the French threatened to tax boatloads of farm goods arriving in New Orleans. At one time, the French actually tried to collect such a user fee. This waterway tax aroused bitter feelings throughout the young Nation and awakened the Federal Government to the fact that whoever controlled New Orleans also controlled the river. And whoever controlled the river, of course, also dominated a major portion of the midcontinent. The rest is history, but it is clear that the right to free use of the Mississippi River influenced the Louisiana Purchase.

In those days, the river was mid-America's main highway. It was traversed by flatboats, keelboats, and packets. The first steamboat, *The New Orleans*, made its appearance on the Mississippi in 1811, just 8 years after the Louisiana Purchase. Thirty-five years later, more than 100 steamboats were launched in the Mississippi Valley system in a single year. Cities along the rivers began to flourish, and new river towns sprang up as fast as steamboat landings could be built. That was the time if one thought of adventure, as did Mark Twain, he thought of the Mississippi. This was a storied era, now a part of our rich cultural heritage. Its economic lessons must never be forgotten. Low-cost water transportation on the great waterways with which nature has so generously endowed this Nation is a vital element in the economic life of America—past, present, and future. We would neglect this great resource or shackle it at our peril.

The river was also a perennial cause of destructive floods. Harper's magazine once described it as a place "where all the steamboats are aground and the houses afloat." In fact, the Mississippi was once called the "great sewer" because it carried at least a million tons of mud every day in its rush to the gulf. This has all changed now, thanks to the wisdom of the Congress and the farsighted work of the U.S. Corps of Engineers. The development of the tributary rivers—the Ohio, the Tennessee, and the Missouri in particular—plus improvements on the Mississippi itself, including both channel and levee work, has put an end to the havoc the spring floods brought for years on end.

Changed, too, is the role of the river as an artery of transportation. During the last 140 years, the waterways of this Nation have been gradually developed for navigation. Each new segment has added to the efficiency of the entire system. Today, the navigable waterways, from the Atlantic to the Pacific coasts, number more than 20,000 miles in length. They provide low-cost water transportation to 38 States with 93 percent of our population. This expansion of the system has been coupled with a technological revolution in barge and towboat design in the last 20 years. The present-day result is a form of waterway transport which is a far cry from the steamboats of yesteryear.

Barge rates, consequently, have steadily declined since World War II. Year after year, the barges have hauled more and more commerce at cheaper and cheaper rates. Who benefits from this saving in transportation costs? The economies of water transportation are hard to measure with certainty, but it is safe to say that the American consumer is a prime beneficiary. Because coal for electric-generating plants is carried cheaper by water, the electricity bill is a few cents less each month. Gasoline at the service station will not cost so much. Neither will the farmer have to pay as much for grain or fertilizer. The fact is that the free competitive economy operates to convert these savings into direct consumer benefits.

Inland waterway development has brought a surge of industrial expansion in the river valleys. Major industries have shown a strong tendency to seek locations along navigable channels. According to one survey, riverfront sites have attracted more than 5,000 new and expanded plants since 1952. The rapid development of the President's Island industrial park here in Memphis is an example of such growth. Everyone is familiar with the concentration of heavy industry settling in the last decade in the Ohio Valley.

There is nothing like a waterway to generate industry. Most big plants need huge quantities of fresh water anyway. Barge transportation is also a main factor. Industries which require large volumes of materials, or fuels, find bulk shipments by water to be advantageous. It may be, however, that some waterfront industries never ship by water. But they enjoy the benefits of the availability of water transportation because water rates have historically served as an anchor on the rates of other modes of transport. Even if a plant receives its raw materials by water, chances are that the high-value finished goods are shipped out by rail or truck.

According to the records, the waterways have not hurt other forms of transportation. As a matter of fact, the eight railroads of the Mississippi and Ohio Valleys have produced operating revenues consistently superior to the rest of the railroad system since the end of World War II. In 1962, the freight revenues of these river valley lines were up 53 percent over 1946 as compared with an increase of only 35 percent for all other railroads in the Nation. There is ample evidence that the waterways are more complimentary than competitive to the railroads.

The railroads, the waterways, trucklines, airlines, and pipelines, all go together to form America's unsurpassed national transportation system. Shippers, of course, recognize the inherent advantages of each form of transportation. With barge traffic, the chief attraction is economy. But now, this advantage is in jeopardy.

In recent years, there have been repeated proposals to impose a tax on waterway users. Initially, this came as a jolt to those of us who took for granted the guarantee of free navigation of the waterways as set forth in the Northwest Ordinance of 1787. This document states that the waterways shall be "common highways and forever free * * * without any tax, impost or duty therefor." This is still the national waterways policy, but serious moves are afoot to advance a new economic theory. The objective, they tell us, is to recover Federal costs of the waterways from those who use the waterways. Such a move would have many grave, far-reaching consequences.

To upset a policy which has been in continuous effect since 1787 would have a profound impact on the American economy. Overnight, competitive balances would be upset. Agriculture would be affected because waterborne grain influences the location of key poultry and cattle producing areas, but water-oriented industries would be hardest hit. In recent years, many billions of dollars have been invested annually in waterfront sites. Any tax or toll on water transportation would bring economic hardship.

Specifically proposed is a waterway fuel tax on all American flag vessels having a maximum draft of 15 feet or less. Suggested legislation was sent to Congress last April, and it is likely that this matter will come before the next session. It is a timely topic, therefore, for discussion at this time. The draft legislation calls for a user tax of 2 cents per gallon on waterway fuel, which is estimated to bring the Treasury only about $10 million annually. If certain recommendations are followed, a cost-recovery toll would mean a fuel tax of about 30 cents a gallon.

It seems to me that a fuel tax on shallow-draft vessels would be discriminatory in many regards. Distance traveled over the inland waterways would tend to magnify the effect of such a toll, placing upriver points such as Pittsburgh and Minneapolis under a severe handicap. Plants on the inland waterways would be at a disadvantage with competing plants located on the seacoast. Shallow-draft commerce would have to pay a toll in plying deep-draft channels, which total more than 1,100 miles, while deep-draft vessels could operate toll-free. This discrimination is especially unjust since the expenditures for deep-draft channels were made solely for the benefit of deep-draft shipping. Moreover, for ports such as New Orleans, serving as a transshipping point for vast quantities of shallow and deep-draft commerce, a tax discriminating against shallow-draft vessels would be gravely injurious.

The list of disparities could go on and on. A waterway fuel tax would, in effect, give an edge to foreign suppliers at the expense of U.S. producers. American steel from the Ohio Valley and Chicago shipped down the Mississippi would be subjected to this new tax while foreign steel coming into New Orleans or Houston would be tax-exempt. And by the same token, the fuel tax would put a damper on the President's export expansion program, since added transportation costs would make our products less competitive on world markets.

These are serious inequities which would be brought about by the proposed shallow-draft fuel tax. Many industries would be damaged and businesses disrupted.

Furthermore, there is every indication such tolls might let loose inflationary forces in the economy. The industries affected by the increased cost of water transportation, as a result of a fuel tax, would be those with most effect on the price level: steel, chemicals, oil, coal, electric power, and aluminum. These are basic materials and fuels whose costs ultimately effect the prices of countless commodities before reaching the consumer, and price increases would necessarily be magnified.

This is a time when Congress and the Federal Government are placing emphasis on stimulating the economy through reduced taxation. The tax cut authorized by the 88th Congress has proved to be of great significance in invigorating the Nation's economy. It has aided business growth, created additional jobs, provided new incomes, and thus put more money into circulation. Continued business prosperity is a must if America is to move ahead in the second half of this decade.

The Congress is faced, on the one hand, with the task of inducing further economic expansion and, on the other, with demands for enactment of a totally new concept in Federal taxation which almost certainly would have an adverse effect on the national economy. As long as development of the economy is of paramount importance, it would seem to be a fundamental conflict of policy to undertake another program—tolls on the waterways—which is potentially so detrimental to the rate of industrial growth.

Another area of particular concern is the damaging effect which a waterway fuel tax or toll would have in fighting poverty. Toll-free water transportation is a vital factor in developing vast regions, particularly in the Appalachian area. The future of this area is closely tied to water resource development. Lack of access to markets has hampered the region in the past. Now, a system of modern highways is being built through the mountaineous terrain at considerable public expense. It would be a grave injustice to the Appalachian area—and self-defeating as well—to provide highway outlets but deny river access through imposition of Federal tolls.

In their supporting role to the basic industries, U.S. waterways contribute in no small measure to the Nation's economy. Pittsburgh steel shipped by water to markets as far away as the gulf coast represents the production of 15,000 steelworkers earning annual wages of $103 million. Mining the bituminous coal moved by barge annually provides jobs for 30,000 miners receiving wages of $170 million.

Many of the coal miners, in particular, owe their jobs to toll-free waterways. With cost-recovery tolls in effect, coal would doubtless lose out in large part to cheaper pipeline fuels in producing electricity. Thousands of other jobs and incomes would be likewise affected—those employed in the sand and gravel, oil and chemical industries located along inland rivers.

Not only would a waterway toll hurt depressed areas at a time when everyone wants to lend a helping hand. Tolls would also take away uncounted jobs in other areas, further damaging the general economy. Imposing a toll on the waterways would be imposing a penalty on America's labor force.

Since we are meeting here in an area which is generally called the mid-South, I want to bring up one point of specific importance. Of all the sections of the Nation which would be directly affected by a waterway fuel tax, the South has the most at stake. About two-thirds of all the commerce moving on our rivers and waterways is southern in origin or destination. Included are movements on the lower Mississippi, the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, the Tennessee, the Warrior-Tombigbee, and much of the Ohio River. Industrial development in the South is closely oriented to water transportation. Toll-free waterways are a necessity if regional development is to continue at the present pace.

Future growth of large portions of the South is largely dependent upon new water resource development projects. In the forefront are such developments, now in the final planning stages or under construction, as the Cross-Florida Barge Canal, Coosa-Alabama Waterway, Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway, and the Arkansas River channelization. Waterway tolls would seriously impair the prospects for navigational benefits from these forward-looking developments.

It was in the neighboring State of Arkansas just a little over 13 months ago that President Kennedy stood beside the new Greers Ferry Dam and spoke out for such projects. Let me quote his words:

"Which is more wasteful: to let the land lie arid and unproductive, and resources lie untapped, while rivers flow unused—or to transform those rivers into natural arteries of transportation, reclamation, power, and commerce with billion dollar benefits as in the case of the Arkansas and White River Basins?

"These projects protect and create wealth—new industries, new income, new incentives, and interests. And the wealth they assure to one region becomes a market for another—so that the benefits of this project also help those who manufacture automobiles in Detroit, and those who produce steel in Pittsburgh, and those who make shoes in Massachusetts."

This was President Kennedy's eloquent way of asserting that the benefits which accrue from waterway developments are far-ranging. So are the benefits of low-cost water transportation. The beneficiaries are millions upon millions of our fellow citizens who enjoy the savings afforded by America's superb waterway system. To impose tolls, in an abrupt change of national policy, would not be in the interest of a healthy economy. By contrast, toll-free waterways have contributed significantly to the Nation's postwar boom, and it is my contention that this established, historic waterway system should be preserved for the good of the country and the benefit of all our citizens.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. MICHEL, for 15 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. SAYLOR, for 15 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. FEIGHAN.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CABELL) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. OTTINGER.

Mr. MARSH.

Mr. MCVICKER.

Mr. MULTER.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. TALCOTT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BROOMFIELD.

Mr. SMITH of New York.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 39 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, January 25, 1965, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

397. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on unnecessary costs to the Government in the leasing of electronic data processing systems by McDonnell Aircraft Corp., St. Louis, Mo., Department of Defense; to the Committee on Government Operations.

398. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting reports of violations of section 3679, Revised Statutes, and Department of Defense Directive 7200.1, "Administrative Control of Appropriations within the Department of Defense," pursuant to provisions of section 3679(i)(2), Revised Statutes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

399. A letter from the Director of Civil Defense, Office of the Secretary of the Army, Department of the Army, transmitting a report of Federal contributions program—Equipment and facilities for the quarter ending September 30, 1964, pursuant to subsection 201(i) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

400. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on excessive rental costs for postal facilities at Washington, D.C., and Alexandria, Va., Department of the Post Office; to the Committee on Government Operations.

401. A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for the adjustment of the legislative jurisdiction exercised by the United States over land in the several States used for Federal purposes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

402. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 902 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 relating to penalties for falsification of records, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

403. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for the disposition of judgment funds on deposit to the credit of the Skokomish Tribe of Indians"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

404. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the act of July 29, 1954, as amended, to permit transfer of title to movable property to agencies which assume operation and maintenance responsibility for project works serving municipal and industrial functions"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

405. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the act of August 9, 1955"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

406. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 152(b)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 for the purpose of including nationals of the United States within the definition of the term 'dependent' in connection with deductions for personal exemptions"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H.R. 3297. A bill to provide for the licensing of operators of certain vessels on the navigable waters of the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H.R. 3298. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the Nebraska Centennial; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 3299. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALLECK:

H.R. 3300. A bill to authorize the improvement for navigation of Burns Waterway Harbor, Ind.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 3301. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide certain persons whose testimony has been compelled in State proceedings an immunity from Federal prosecution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.R. 3302. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the State of Florida; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 3303. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the exemption from the highway use tax of buses meeting the 60 percent passenger fare revenue test; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 3304. A bill to amend section 620 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to provide for the suspension of assistance to any country which does not protect American property and the rights of American citizens; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 3305. A bill to change the name of the Perry's Victory and International Peace Memorial National Monument, to provide for the acquisition of certain lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McGRATH:

H.R. 3306. A bill to provide for uniform annual observances of certain national holidays on Mondays; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MIZE:

H.R. 3307. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to pay fair value for improvements located on the railroad rights-of-way owned by bona fide lessees or permittees; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. O'HARA of Michigan:

H.R. 3308. A bill relating to certain inspections and investigations in metallic and nonmetallic mines and quarries (excluding coal and lignite mines) for the purpose of obtaining information relating to health and safety conditions, accidents, and occupational diseases therein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.R. 3309. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 3310. A bill to provide for a comprehensive, long-range, and coordinated national program in oceanography, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 3311. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase all benefits thereunder by 10 percent and to provide that full benefits (when based on attainment of retirement age) will be payable to both men and women at age 60, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3312. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to reduce from 62 to 50 the age at which a woman otherwise qualified may become entitled to widow's insurance benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PIRNIE:

H.R. 3313. A bill to amend titles 10 and 37, United States Code, to provide career incentives for certain professionally trained officers of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROUDEBUSH:

H.R. 3314. A bill to require premarital examinations in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 3315. A bill to determine the pro rata payments of the United States to the United Nations or any agencies or programs thereof; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SISK:

H.R. 3316. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 3317. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act for the purpose of prohibiting certain sales below cost; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.R. 3318. A bill to expand the market for cotton, to assist in the orderly marketing of cotton, to strengthen the cotton industry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 3319. A bill to improve the 1965 cotton program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 3320. A bill to authorize the establishment of the Hubbell Trading Post National Historic Site, in the State of Arizona, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 3321. A bill to establish a Commission on Executive, Legislative, and Judicial Salaries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 3322. A bill to amend the Federal Firearms Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VAN DEERLIN:

H.R. 3223. A bill to amend section 361(a) of the Public Health Service Act, relating to duties of the Surgeon General in controlling the spread of communicable diseases from foreign countries, to require additional preventive measures to control the spread of rabies; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WOLFF:

H.R. 3324. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TUPPER:

H.R. 3325. A bill to amend and extend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 and to provide certain tax relief for persons incurring expenses for higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H.J. Res. 216. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

H.J. Res. 217. Joint resolution designating March 30 of each year as "Shut-In's Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MICHEL:

H.J. Res. 218. Joint resolution suspending shipments of agricultural commodities to the United Arab Republic under Public Law 480; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MOORHEAD:

H.J. Res. 219. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to succession to the Presidency and Vice Presidency and to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORHEAD (by request):

H.J. Res. 220. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States on Presidential power and succession; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WYATT:

H.J. Res. 221. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H. Con. Res. 123. Concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Con. Res. 124. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the distribution and viewing of the film, "Years of Lightning, Day of Drums," prepared by the U.S. Information Agency on the late President Kennedy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HAYS:

H. Con. Res. 125. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing as a House document of inaugural addresses from President Washington to President Johnson, and providing for additional copies; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. Res. 133. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to conduct full and complete investigations and studies of all matters within its jurisdiction under the Rules of the House or the laws of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 134. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the studies, investigations, and inquiries authorized by House Resolution 133; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H. Res. 135. Resolution establishing a Special Committee on the Captive Nations; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

The **SPEAKER** presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to prevailing upon the West German Government to recall certain scientists developing missiles for the United Arab Republic, and to extend its statute of limitations relative to war crimes, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 3326. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Michelangelo Richiusa and their minor child, Maria Rosa Richiusa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3327. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Dimosthenis Fokas and their minor child, Anastos Fokas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3328. A bill for the relief of Rodney Knaul Douglas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.R. 3329. A bill to incorporate the Youth Councils on Civic Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 3330. A bill for the relief of Christos K. Tsappas (also known as Christos M. Chapas); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H.R. 3331. A bill for the relief of Oro and Mayer Yahes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 3332. A bill for the relief of Dr. Edna Valera Franco and Mr. Benjamin P. Franco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLANCY:

H.R. 3333. A bill for the relief of Jacob J. Gubbay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 3334. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Graziano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3335. A bill for the relief of John L. Afros; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3336. A bill for the relief of Ahouva Rubinstein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H.R. 3337. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Antonio de Oyarzabal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3338. A bill for the relief of Frank S. Chow; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IRWIN:

H.R. 3339. A bill for the relief of Margherita Pagano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3340. A bill for the relief of Sebastiano Nicolia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3341. A bill for the relief of Renato Magliocco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3342. A bill for the relief of Rose Franco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Michigan:

H.R. 3343. A bill for the relief of George Scargall; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REID of New York:

H.R. 3344. A bill for the relief of Ester Antoniolli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3345. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marie Meneshian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 3346. A bill for the relief of Merline E. White; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

78. The **SPEAKER** presented a petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., relative to promoting a national program for the memorization of the Constitution in high schools and colleges, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Lead and Zinc: Important Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1965

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I should like to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] in connection with the importance of giving attention to the strengthening of the position of the domestic lead and zinc industries.

While I have been reserving judgment as to the form in which the Federal Government should undertake to encourage and stabilize the domestic production of lead and zinc, I believe it essential, from the standpoint of national defense, that we not permit these industries to deteriorate—or, for that matter, any of the domestic mineral industries having strategic importance.

The current problems of the domestic lead and zinc producers deserve a full and sympathetic hearing by the Congress. The legislation being introduced today would seem to provide a sound basis for discussion, and it is to be hoped that all segments of the domestic industry, as well as all Federal agencies having an interest in lead and zinc, will be provided an early opportunity to present their views as to the most practicable course which might be taken in the interest of maintenance of a healthy domestic industry in this field.

United States-Israel Economic Ties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article from the November 1964 edition of American-Israel Economic Horizons.

The article, written by the distinguished Secretary of Agriculture, the Honorable Orville L. Freeman, reports the wide range of economic assistance made available to Israel under the provisions of Public Law 480. This excellent program has redounded to the benefit of both nations.

The article follows:

UNITED STATES-ISRAEL ECONOMIC TIES: PUBLIC LAW 480, FOOD AND FUNDS

(By Orville L. Freeman, U.S. Secretary of Agriculture)

Since 1964, total agricultural imports by Israel have accounted for one-fifth to one-sixth of the country's total imports, averaging about $100 million annually. Over the decade the United States has supplied approximately one half of them—nearly one-half billion dollars of agricultural products.

In recent years the share supplied by the United States has moved upward to about 55 percent of the total as compared to about 33 percent prior to the implementation of the Public Law 480 program in 1954. Agricultural products also have been accounting for a larger share of total imports from the United States—from less than 30 percent during the period 1949–52 to approximately 40 percent since 1960.

Wheat and feed grains have accounted for more than half of the agricultural commodities supplied under the Public Law 480 title I and mutual security programs. Although wheat has been the major commodity supplied to Israel under these programs, feed grains, which have played a major role in the development of livestock enterprises, have accounted for about one-fourth of U.S. exports under concessional sales programs.

Dairy products are the third most important category of imports under the Public Law 480 program, followed by fats and oils, cotton, meat, rice, and tobacco. Considerable quantities of dairy products have been made available under Public Law 480 title III for use in school lunch programs and for donations to the needy.

Soybeans have been the principal commodity provided in the fats and oils category. The title I program can be credited with the successful commercial introduction of soybeans into Israel. Since the early title I imports, Israel has become the world's largest importer of soybeans on a per capita basis. Less than 14,000 tons annually were imported by Israel prior to Public Law 480. By 1963 Israel imported 207,000 tons of soybeans, the equivalent of 35,000 tons of oil or $20 million of cash purchases from the United States. Israel also is importing large quantities of oilseeds from other countries. Oilseeds imports along with feed grains are also an important factor in the nation's growing livestock industry.

Israel has also increased its commercial purchases of rice and tobacco. For rice, commercial purchases in 1963 amounted to some 9,000 tons, nearly double the total rice imports of approximately 4,000 tons annually prior to Public Law 480. The United States as well as other countries are sharing in this growing market. Commercial purchases of tobacco have also risen, benefiting such neighboring countries such as Turkey, Greece, and Yugoslavia. The country also has become a substantial market for American cigarettes.

PART OF A BROAD PROGRAM OF ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE

Aid in the form of agricultural commodities became a major part of the overall U.S. economic assistance program to Israel beginning in 1954.

Total net economic assistance from 1950 through 1963 amounted to approximately $750 million. Of this amount, agricultural commodities under the Public Law 480 program and the Mutual Security Act accounted for approximately $345 million or 46 percent of the total Public Law 480 assistance which included title I sales for local currency, title II grants, and title III donations, amounted to $268 million from 1954 to 1963 while net mutual security food shipments amounted to approximately $77 million.

A study made by the Bank of Israel on "The Analysis and Assessments of the Economic Effect of the Public Law 480 Title I Program in Israel," published in 1963, concluded that the availability of title I commodities had numerous favorable effects on the Nation's economy. It was stated that "title I imports constituted part of the capital imports which served as the main source of the large-scale capital formation during this period, facilitating the country's rapid development."

The study also pointed out that supplies made available under the title I program made possible a continuous flow of raw material imports and the maintenance of adequate inventories resulting in fuller utilization of the Nation's productive capacity. The study concluded that, on balance, the title I program had no adverse effect on the Nation's agricultural development. In fact, the availability of title I wheat, feed grains, and oilseeds—commodities not well suited to Israel farms—actually contributed to long-range desirable structural development of the Nation's agriculture.

Therefore, the Public Law 480 title I program proved to be a very effective instrument in the overall U.S. economic assistance effort in Israel. Its impact has been felt in two important ways—the actual importing of commodities needed by the Israel economy and the investment financed with the title I local currency proceeds. It has been said that the need for agricultural imports during the early years of Israel's development and growth was sufficiently great—that aid in the form of needed agricultural imports was just as important as if such aid had been in the form of cash.

PUBLIC LAW 480 CONTRIBUTED TO LONG-RANGE EXPANSION OF COMMERCIAL TRADE

The Bank of Israel study also pointed out that the title I program contributed to the general expansion of efficient export industries with a high import component, which contributes to the country's long-range ability to increase commercial imports. Title I local currency loans also facilitated the development of these export industries so vital to the country's objective of reducing its trade deficit.

Israel has taken full advantage of a provision in Public Law 480 which provides for making loans to private enterprises from title I local currency proceeds.

These loans are known as Cooley amendment loans. Through June 30, 1963, some 50 loans, amounting to over $23 million, were made to private United States or Israel firms for business development, market expansion, and development of markets for U.S. farm products. Approximately 16 percent of local currency proceeds from title I sales have been set aside to be used for this purpose in Israel as compared to 6 percent for all other countries.

The first Cooley amendment loan of local currency proceeds in Israel was made in 1958 to Dagon Batey Mamguroth le-Israel, Ltd. Similar loans have been made to industrial enterprises in the fields of textiles, rubber, plastics, chemicals, paper, metals, and machinery. The Bank of Israel's analysis of the experience of 12 firms receiving such loans indicates that the local currency Cooley loans not only provided for additional investment needed to expand facilities in capital intensive industries but also contributed to increased employment, labor productivity, and net national product.

In addition to local currency loans in the private and public sectors of the economy, millions of dollars have been used for international educational exchange projects, for agricultural research, and for the translation of scientific papers. All of these projects serve as an example of progressive economic and technical cooperation.

The food-for-peace program embodying the technique of providing for the sale of surplus agricultural commodities for local currencies has been a success story in Israel—such a success that it serves as a model for the operation of food-for-peace programs in other developing countries.

The title I concept which permits trade to take place between countries when foreign exchange resources are inadequate to finance needed imports has been one of the most useful vehicles for extending foreign aid. The title I technique also has worked smoothly in Israel as it permits distribution and sale of agricultural commodities through the existing marketing system.

A Tribute to the Kiwanis International on the Occasion of Its 50th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1965

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like at this time to call attention to the 50th anniversary of an organization beloved and revered by hundreds of thousands of Americans—the Kiwanis International.

Founded January 21, 1915, as a federation of business and professional men's civic service clubs, the Kiwanis has stood forth over the years as a major contributor in the overall campaign for a better America.

The work of the Kiwanis in the interest of civic improvement includes activities in vital areas such as agriculture and conservation, boys' and girls' work, public and business affairs, support of churches in their spiritual aims, and vocational guidance.

A burgeoning membership of 262,000 is evidence enough that the Kiwanis International appeals to Americans in every walk of life. And the growth of two subsidiaries—the Key Club International and Circle K International, open respectively to high school boys and college men—reveals that youth, as well, is equally concerned for and dedicated to the grand, illustrious Kiwanis ideal.

On this occasion—the 50th anniversary of the founding of the Kiwanis International—I join with millions of Americans in a vote of confidence, a heartfelt salute, to a noble organization. Long may it flourish on this earth.

Ukrainian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY P. SMITH III

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1965

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, throughout the world we cry for peace and freedom, yet at times we tend to be unaware of the gross injustices committed by totalitarianism, the archenemy of democracy. We tend to overlook the vast numbers of peoples who are forced to live in captivity.

Ukraine is one of the many nations held in bondage. It is easy to forget that this proud country was not always a prisoner of despotism, so long has it suffered under the yoke of cruel alien oppressors. Today it has been so thoroughly incorporated into that vast imperialist Russia that we in the free world tend to regard it as an integrated part of the Soviet Union. The Ukraine is vital to the well-being of its despot; its rich and fertile food belt nourishes Russia while it languishes from lack of freedom and independence that it once knew.

The Ukrainian people have witnessed all types of foreign domination in their long and varied history, and it was not until January 22, 1918, that their dream of freedom was realized. For these stout hearted and courageous patriots, this day symoblizes their century-long struggle to be free and enjoy the basic rights we hold so dear. Yet they were destined to lose this hard-fought liberty at the hands of their most formidable foe, Russia, after only 2 years of enjoying political sovereignty. In 1920 the Red army, upon orders from Moscow, overran the eastern regions of the Ukraine and slowly set out to stifle their political freedom. Many brave and noble patriots died under the tyranny of Communist Russia; millions have been deported to the desolate wasteland of Siberia. Yet neither the forcible Russification or genocides could weaken the determination of the Ukrainian people to regain their freedom and independence. Despite the countless crimes committed by Russia against these courageous patriots, the Ukrainian people have resisted when possible and have maintained their sense of national integrity.

On this occasion of commemorating the 47th anniversary of the Ukrainian Independence Day, we must express once again our compassion and concern for the oppressed in the world. To those gallant Ukrainian people we extend a hand of friendship, and with them go our hopes for a future national life of dignity and happiness.

Waldemar Alfred Paul John

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1965

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, while we often honor the giants of industry whose technical brilliance made possible mass production, the great men with the vision to create the markets for the mechanical marvels are too often overlooked.

Last October, shortly after the 88th Congress became history, one of these great men, Waldemar Alfred Paul John—better known as W. A. P. John—died at the age of 69.

As did many others, I counted him as a friend and adviser whose uncommonly perceptive commonsense will be long remembered.

The son of a minister, Mr. John was born in New Albany, Ind. He graduated from the University of Michigan with a bachelor of arts degree in 1916, married Hildegarde Hagerman, and in 1917 left his first job in the advertising department of the Dodge Motor Co. to serve with the AEF in France.

After the war, he wrote for advertising firms in Cleveland and Detroit. In the midst of the depression in 1934, he and another young copywriter, the late Jim Adams, founded John-Adams, Inc., which shortly thereafter merged with MacManus, Inc., the company of another pioneer in the automotive advertising field, T. F. MacManus.

Legend has it that when the general manager of Pontiac Motors asked Mr. John what would be the first thing he would do if he received that firm's account, his reply was, "Well, sir, I think I'd go get a drink."

Mr. John received the account, and today MacManus, John & Adams does $70 million worth of business yearly for 90 firms.

In 1936, Mr. John became president of the young agency. A few years later, he suffered a massive heart attack, conquered it and told how in a Saturday Evening Post article entitled, "I Have a Scar on My Heart." Magazine executives have said it has been reprinted more than any other Post article.

In 1955, Mr. John retired as chairman of the board, but maintained his office in the agency's Bloomfield Hills headquarters.

The present president of MacManus, John & Adams, Mr. Ernest A. Jones, who first met Mr. John while a student at the University of Michigan, said:

> Over the years, his affection and the depth and warmth of his wisdom was an unfailing source of encouragement not only to me but to the many other young men to whom he opened both his heart and the doors of his business. I am afraid we shall not soon see his like again.
>
> Professionally, he was a living legend in the advertising world, particularly in the automotive area of the business. He was known, respected, and even loved by company presidents and dealers alike not only for his intensely human qualities but for his unique skills which helped the industry attain its present position.

It will be a long time, indeed, before the world sees another man with the qualities of courage, ambition, compassion, and talent which W. A. P. John cerried so well through life.

Salute to Jefferson County Mounted Sheriff's Posse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY H. McVICKER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1965

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, I should like to express my appreciation and that of the Congress to the Jefferson County Mounted Sheriff's Posse for the splendid manner in which they represented my home State of Colorado in the inaugural parade.

I should like to point out that this is not just a ceremonial group, but an active working posse, which has performed with great valor and selflessness for many years in search and rescue operations. It is composed of business and professional men, all of whom are expert horsemen and dedicated public servants. One condition of their membership in this organization is that they hold themselves available on 1 hour's notice for whatever service they may be called upon to render.

A hearty "Well done" to the following posse members who rode in the parade: Sheriff Harold Bray, Capt. John P. Chumbley, Lt. William Dillon, Lt. James Wildman, Lt. Robert Clark, WO Lester Longbrook, WO C. M. Pike, Jr., Ernest Benzie, William Brantley, Robert Burdick, Don Burleson, Richard Cox, Leland Good, Jack Gregg, John Humphreys, Dr. John Makris, Wayne McConnell, John Nelson, Dean O'Brien, Walter O'Hara, Dick Perkins, Kermit Reasoner, Richard Ritchie, Art Schrieber, Darrell J. Skelton, Charles Strong, Frank Strong, Enos Wilson, Fletcher Wood, and John Wood, Jr.

On 47th Anniversary of the Independence of Ukraine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 21, 1965

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, 47 years ago this month the Ukrainian National Republic declared her independence after centuries of subjugation. The independence and liberty of the freedom-loving Ukrainians was almost immediately stamped out by the Soviet Communist dictatorship, but the indomitable spirit of the Ukrainian people survives and the flame of liberty still burns brightly in their hearts and minds.

Ukraine represents one of the most powerful forces of patriotic nationalism in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union. Its invincible fight for national independence and freedom has forced Moscow to resort to a masquerade of Ukraine as an independent and free nation within the federal framework of the U.S.S.R.

Tomorrow, residents of Ukrainian extraction in the city of Yonkers, N.Y., are joining in the celebration of the 47th anniversary of Ukrainian independence. The mayor of Yonkers, the Honorable John E. Flynn, has designated tomorrow as Ukrainian Day and has given permission to raise the blue-gold flag of the free Ukraine on the city hall flagpole to commemorate the proclamation of January 22, 1918. The Very Reverend Basil Klos, pastor of St. Michael's Ukrainian Catholic Church of Yonkers has been designated as the honorary mayor for this occasion.

I am honored to pay tribute to this freedom-loving nation for her inspiring example in continuing the unabated struggle for recovery of the liberty which is rightfully hers. It is the sincere hope of America and the entire free world that soon the Ukraine will join them in the family of free nations.

SENATE

FRIDAY, JANUARY 22, 1965

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President, Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, who was greeted by applause.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, who hath made and preserved us a nation, at this noontide altar of devotion which our fathers builded, and on which they cut deep their founding faith in the devout confession in God we trust, we humbly bow with the deathless assurance that turns even seeming tragedy into triumph that the Eternal God is our refuge and underneath are the everlasting arms.

We beseech Thee to impart Thine enabling might on Thy servant who has served as an honored Member of this body, and who this day comes to this exalted chair of governance, as here he presides and in the Nation takes his place as the coadjutor of the Chief Executive. Reverently this hour he has taken into his hands the historic gavel into which seems to enter every decision since the Republic's beginning. May the mantle of the dedicated public servants whose hands have grasped it in the historic yesterdays, fall in double portion upon his shoulders, and upon all who here serve the public weal. Grant him, we pray, and those over whose deliberations he presides, fairness of appraisal, poise amid confusion, the nobility of goodness, the grace of understanding, and the sincere faith in one's comrades that is more than coronets.

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, January 19 and Wednesday, January 20, 1965, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

BUDGET FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 15, PT. 2)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying document, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BUDGET MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT

To the Congress of the United States:

I present the budget for the District of Columbia for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1965.

I have spoken in recent weeks of our resolve to advance toward the Great Society—in our cities, in our countryside, and in our classrooms. What we do in our Capital City, I believe, will stand as a measure of our overall progress to that end.

I shall shortly send to the Congress a special message defining the specific goals and the steps for achieving them that will lead the District of Columbia toward the Great Society. The budget which I am transmitting will provide the means by which progress toward many of those goals can be made in fiscal year 1966.

Adequate financial support is necessary if the District is to have needed services and facilities. Improvements were made by the last Congress, but provisions for the Federal payment to the District and for District borrowing for capital improvements are still inadequate, and certain local tax rates should be increased.

1. The Federal payment: The authorization for the Federal payment is a fixed amount. While this authorization was substantially increased by the last Congress, from $32 million to $50 million, it still does not reflect an equitable sharing by the Federal Government of the expense of government in the District. Of even more importance, a fixed amount necessarily fails to reflect adjustments which should be made in the authorization in order to maintain an equitable balance between Federal and local responsibility in the future. I urge the Congress to enact legislation authorizing an annual Federal payment based on a formula which provides a continuing and equitable measure of Federal financial responsibility.

The formula proposed by President Kennedy and approved by the Senate in 1963 will accomplish this purpose. Under it, the payment will be computed on the basis of the assessed value of real estate and personal property owned and used by the Federal Government in the District, and will represent the amount the District would receive if Federal Government activities were subject to local District taxes. Such a formula will relate the Federal payment directly both to District needs and to the contribution of its own citizens through local taxes. Under this formula, the Federal payment authorized in fiscal year 1966 would be approximately $57 million—see table—and is estimated to increase to approximately $75 million by fiscal year 1971.

Requirements and financing of the general fund, 1965–71

[In millions of dollars]

	Estimates		Projections				
	1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
Funds required:							
Operating expenses	270.7	280.7	294.6	309.3	324.8	341.0	358.1
Capital outlay	31.9	54.1	55.0	54.1	54.1	54.3	37.2
Contribution for rapid transit system		5.7	17.7	26.6			
Repayment of loans and interest	1.7	1.9	2.6	4.1	5.6	7.1	8.6
Repayment of loans and interest, rapid transit system					2.4	3.1	3.1
Reserves for contingencies	.9	1.4	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Total funds required	305.2	343.6	370.9	395.1	387.9	406.5	408.0

Requirements and financing of the general fund, 1965–71—Continued

[In millions of dollars]

	Estimates		Projections				
	1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
Revenues and balances:							
From present sources:							
Taxes, fees, etc	231.4	243.1	255.9	268.9	281.9	295.3	308.9
Balances	6.1	1.8	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0
Federal payment	39.7	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0
Repayable advances	8.0						
Loan authorization, public works	20.0	26.0	20.1	19.4	3.2		
Total from present sources	305.2	320.8	328.0	340.3	337.1	347.3	360.9
From proposed sources:							
Taxes		10.1	13.3	13.7	14.0	17.9	21.7
Federal payment		7.0	11.9	14.5	17.0	21.2	25.4
Loan authorization, public works					19.8	20.1	
Loan authorization, rapid transit system		5.7	17.7	26.6			
Total from proposed sources		22.8	42.9	54.8	50.8	59.2	47.1
Total revenues and balances	305.2	343.6	370.9	395.1	387.9	406.5	408.0

It has been suggested that the proposed formula would create a precedent requiring the Federal Government to make similar payments for Federal property located in other jurisdictions. This is not a valid argument. The Congress has recognized for well over a century the special responsibility of the Federal Government for providing a share of the funds needed for the operation of the District government. The Congress has often changed the amount authorized for that purpose. The Federal payment authorization which I am now recommending is equitable and will provide a predictable basis for determining the amount which is authorized for the Federal payment. The issue has never been whether there should be a Federal payment but only as to the proper amount.

2. Borrowing authority: While the limit of debt which may be incurred for purposes of the general fund of the District was increased by the last Congress to $175 million, it, too, is still a specified dollar limit, which must be renewed when exhausted. I recommend the enactment of legislation which will provide a flexible and at the same time prudent general fund debt limit based on ability to repay, namely, 6 percent of the 10-year average of the combined assessed value of taxable real and personal property—including property owned and used by the Federal Government as specified in the Federal payment formula. This would provide for the District a debt limit comparable in form with that in effect in most State and local jurisdictions. The adoption of this proposal would result in a general fund debt limit of approximately $233 million in fiscal year 1966, and of $293 million by fiscal year 1971. While borrowing will continue to require in each case the approval of the Congress, a debt limit of this kind will permit both the District and the Congress to make more soundly based long-range plans.

3. Local taxes: The major share of the expense of financing the District government is, and should be, borne by District residents. They should also assume their fair share of the increased costs which the District must incur if it is to maintain its development and achieve its proper place as a Capital City worthy of our country. For this reason, I fully support legislation which will be recommended by the Commissioners to increase certain District taxes. Together with an accompanying increase in the real estate tax planned by the Commissioners under existing law, these proposals will produce about $10.1 million of additional revenue in fiscal year 1966. This amount will accrue to the general fund, increasing the revenues from local taxes in that fund to a total of $253.2 million.

These tax changes, the change in the authorized Federal payment and the change in the District borrowing authorization, provide the basis for future stable general fund financing. There must be, however, a concurrent recognition of the responsibility of the Federal Government not only to authorize an equitable Federal payment but also to appropriate it. Meeting the legitimate financial needs of the District by authorizing larger borrowing by the District to compensate for a failure to appropriate the full amount of the Federal payment which has been authorized is neither sound nor fair.

It is quite appropriate for the District to incur long-term debt for capital improvements the useful life of which will extend over many years. It is equally appropriate to utilize more than might be considered a normal amount of such borrowing in order to catch up on capital improvement programs, such as for schools, in which the District has fallen far behind. It is neither appropriate nor prudent, however, to require the District to use borrowed money as a substitute for amounts which should be available on a current basis.

The District's budget is constructed in the belief that the Federal Government will provide its equitable share of District needs as indicated by the authorized Federal payment. The District is penalized unjustly when a portion of this proper Federal responsibility is transferred to the shoulders of future District taxpayers who must repay the loans.

New obligational authority, all funds

[In thousands of dollars]

	1964 actual	1965 estimate	1966 recommended
Current authorizations:			
Education:			
Operating expenses	63,861	71,844	77,679
Capital outlay	15,626	14,405	29,449
Welfare and health:			
Operating expenses	70,526	76,213	81,319
Capital outlay	1,310	486	7,849
Highways and traffic:			
Operating expenses	12,407	13,790	14,013
Capital outlay	11,280	13,769	13,843
Public safety:			
Operating expenses	66,120	74,138	77,557
Capital outlay	539	336	2,229
Parks and recreation:			
Operating expenses	9,114	10,100	11,087
Capital outlay	378	680	1,819
General operating expenses:			
Operating expenses	17,906	19,397	21,321
Capital outlay	1,088	4,059	2,186
Sanitary engineering:			
Operating expenses	21,963	22,288	22,952
Capital outlay	15,400	23,066	16,510
Repayment of loans and interest	4,992	5,364	5,690
Payment of District of Columbia share of Federal capital outlays	916	1,860	987
Contribution to rapid transit system			5,700
Additional municipal expenses, inaugural ceremonies		283	
Additional municipal expenses, Imperial Shrine Convention			221
Judgments, claims and refunds	1,000	7	
Purchase and installation of parking meters	220		
Total current authorizations	314,651	352,086	392,411
Permanent authorizations	1,404	1,598	1,607
Operations of D.C. trust funds	42,378	52,489	63,696
Repayment (—) of advances from Federal funds	7,000	−17,000	
Investments	2,316		
Total authorizations	367,749	389,174	457,714
Recapitulation of current authorizations:			
General fund	265,071	296,498	344,953
Highway fund	25,169	28,791	28,855
Water fund	11,375	11,038	11,394
Sanitary sewage works fund	13,003	15,677	7,126
Metropolitan area sanitary sewage works fund	33	82	83
Total, all funds	314,651	352,086	392,411

EDUCATION

Appropriations of $77.7 million are needed to provide for the operation of the District's school system in 1966, an increase of $5.8 million over 1965. The additional funds will provide for 517 new teaching positions needed to keep abreast of the requirements of a rapidly increasing school population, which will reach almost 150,000 by fiscal year 1966. The additional teachers will permit the achievement throughout the system of the pupil-teacher ratios approved by the Board of Education.

Funds are also provided to achieve the ratios recommended by the Board for school counselors and to provide librarians for about half of the elementary schools that now do not have them. Deficiencies will still remain but the budget reflects a major effort to remedy shortcomings and to make the District's educational system a model for the Nation.

The budget also includes $29.4 million for the vital program of improving the school plant. Construction of new schools and additions to existing school buildings will increase the capacity of the system by some 5,000 pupil spaces. Funds for sites and plans are provided to permit a similar enlargement in fiscal year 1967. Nothing less will suffice if the District is to have available modern, well-equipped school buildings, eliminate part-time classes, and provide adequate space for its increasing school population, including students who are staying in school rather than dropping out. In no other area has the District's capital construction program lagged so far behind. In no other area is the need to catch up more urgent.

The inclusion of the District in the program of Federal aid to school districts impacted by children of Federal employees does not lessen the need for these appropriations. The Federal aid provided under Public Law 88-665 is properly being allocated to those schools in the District most in need of enrichment of programs and services above the level provided in the regular budget. Use of these funds as a substitute for regular educational appropriations not only would deprive District children of these additional educational resources, but also would conflict with the intention of the Congress.

Special programs for the schools in the Cardozo area which have been funded through the Economic Opportunity Act and the program to prevent juvenile delinquency should also be regarded as additional to those provided in the regular budget.

WELFARE AND HEALTH

The budget includes appropriations of $81.3 million for operating expenses of the welfare and health departments, an increase of $5.1 million over 1965.

The welfare programs for which funds are provided are directed so far as possible to the rehabilitation of persons and families by positive action which will advance them toward self-sufficiency. Consistent with this, although not a part of the welfare budget, matching funds are provided to enable the District to participate in a number of training projects under the Manpower Development and Training Act.

The budget reflects my belief that the District should be in a position of leadership in putting into effect the welfare and health programs which the Congress has authorized in recent years. I remain particularly concerned with the plight of dependent children, and the continuing upward trend in the population of Junior Village. For that reason the budget contains funds which will permit the District to participate in the national program of aid to dependent children of unemployed parents. In the massive effort now being undertaken on many fronts to improve the conditions of the District's poverty-stricken families, we can ill afford not to utilize every available program which will help to maintain families intact. I strongly urge the Congress to reconsider its previous position on District participation in this program.

The budget continues the health programs already established and provides funds for more intensive efforts in the fields of maternal and child health, in the control of venereal disease, and in the food pesticide residue program.

Proposed capital outlays total $7.8 million. The substantial increase over last year is occasioned by the need to construct a facility for the detention and rehabilitation of District youths now being accommodated at the National Training School for Boys, which will be moved to Morgantown, W. Va., in 1967. A badly needed school activities building at Junior Village is also included in the Welfare Department budget.

The Health Department budget includes funds urgently needed to plan for community health centers. The establishment of such centers in several parts of the city is important to the District's general health program and is basic to the implementation in the District of new concepts in the prevention, treatment, and care of mental illness and mental retardation.

PUBLIC SAFETY

The budget provides operating expenses of $77.6 million for public safety, an increase of $3.4 million over 1965.

The District is engaged on many fronts in an attack on the prevention and punishment of criminal acts, and the elimination of the causes of crime. It is apparent that more must be done. I shall shortly make further recommendations on this subject to the Congress. The budget provides funds for the enlargement of the police force by 100 men, and continues the program to release officers for active police work by increased use of civilian personnel for administrative activities.

PARKS AND RECREATION

The funds provided in the budget for the Recreation Department will continue the improvements which were instituted last year, as well as accelerate the program of enlargement and improvement of playground and recreation facilities. The John F. Kennedy Playground in the near Northwest section of the District—an area seriously deficient in playground resources—is a welcome addition to the city's recreation facilities. Funds have been provided for a new site for Shaw Junior High School, thereby making it possible to preserve the needed playground.

HIGHWAYS AND TRAFFIC

The highway program has been coordinated with the proposed rapid transit program in order to achieve a balanced transportation system for the District and the Washington metropolitan area. I shall shortly send to the Congress my recommendations with respect to the rapid transit program. Funds to meet the District's share of initial costs are included in the budget.

The highway program, which is also urgently needed, will be delayed for lack of funds in fiscal year 1966 unless the resources of the highway fund are increased. I am, therefore, again recommending an increase of $35 million in the loan authorization for the highway fund and an increase of 1 cent in the gasoline tax. The new District gasoline tax rate of 7 cents will correspond with the rates in Maryland and Virginia, and will yield an additional $2 million annually, a sum sufficient to retire the $35 million loan in 30 years. This tax and borrowing program continues the sound policy of financing the street and highway system by taxes based upon use. Additional taxes of this kind may be necessary as the District faces increased expenses in maintaining its portion of the Interstate System and in constructing, maintaining, and improving other highways and streets. I am therefore instructing the Commissioners to consider proposals for financing the highway fund for the next decade.

CONCLUSION

The needs of the District, as of other great cities, continue to grow. As our Nation's Capital, the District of Columbia should exemplify the best in programs for the health, education, and welfare of its citizens. This budget, together with the proposals in this message for additional funds, will, in my judgment, significantly advance the District toward that goal. At the same time, it is designed, like the Federal budget, to avoid waste and inefficiency. The District is continuing to strengthen its management improvement programs. In the District, as elsewhere in our Government, staff must be used effectively, unnecessary work and positions must be eliminated, and additional personnel added only when absolutely essential.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

JANUARY 21, 1965.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, notified the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of 42 U.S.C. 2251, the Speaker had appointed Mr. HOLIFIELD of California, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. ASPINALL of Colorado, Mr. THOMAS of Texas, Mr. MORRIS of New Mexico, Mr. HOSMER of California, Mr. BATES of Massachusetts, and Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois as members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, on the part of the House.

AUTHORIZATION FOR PRINTING OF PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S INAUGURAL ADDRESS AS SENATE DOCUMENT (S. DOC. NO. 9)

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that President Johnson's inaugural address be printed as a Senate document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Veterans Affairs of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

GREETING TO VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Montana is recognized.

Mr. MANSFIELD. This is a most auspicious and comforting occasion. The fact that our former colleague, the Vice President of the United States, HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, has taken the place of the President pro tempore, the distinguished dean of this body, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], gives us two quiet men on the floor from now on. [Laughter.]

But we are delighted that one of our own has been accorded this signal honor, and we are very happy that a former Senator will now be the Presiding Officer of this body in his capacity as Vice President of the United States. You have been a great Senator—in my opinion, one of the greatest in the history of the Nation. You will be one of the great Vice Presidents in the history of the Republic. We welcome you. We are delighted to see you. We know that you will give your all in exercising your responsibilities as President of the Senate. HUBERT, we are exceedingly glad to have you back. [Applause, Senators rising.]

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the distinguished majority leader yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Perhaps I had better address the distinguished majority leader.

Only a few days ago it was my privilege to present the distinguished Vice-President-elect to a national convention at the Statler Hotel. I was advised that I might begin my speech, and that I would be interrupted when he arrived. The signal was to be that the chairman would pull my coattails to announce the fact that the Vice-President-elect had arrived.

When he appeared, I looked at his audience and said, "Ladies and gentlemen, permit me to split an infinitive and let a participle hang from the air for a moment while I present the distinguished Vice-President-elect of the United States."

His good fortune has been our good fortune. By electing him to office, we have now shorn him of a good deal of authority. His principal function now will be to break a tie—if ever there is a a tie in a body having a ratio of 2 to 1.

But we have now shorn him of any authority to discuss, with his eloquence and persuasion, the many items that will cross his desk.

Mr. Vice President, we are honored. We glory in your good fortune; we glory in our good fortune; and we think we ought to give you a hand. [Applause, Senators rising.]

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the assistant majority leader.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, on one occasion, the junior Senator from Louisiana informed the Senate that it was once his privilege to recommend that a young man from Minnesota represent Louisiana State University against a very able debating team that had been sent across the sea from the British Isles. I believe that was the only time Louisiana State University definitely defeated a British team. The performance of the young man from Minnesota on that occasion was great, as it always is.

The desk at which I stand at this moment was previously occupied by former President Harry Truman, of Missouri, and by Lyndon Johnson, of Texas, both of whom served as Senator, Vice President, and later President of the United States. Both of them, in my judgment, were great Presidents.

It was Lyndon Johnson who made the statement in this Chamber that HUBERT HUMPHREY was the greatest coordinator of mind and tongue of any man in the world. The time it took him to prepare a speech was the length of time it took to draw a deep breath.

On occasions when the Republican leadership was in charge of the majority, and it seemed that things were not going the way the Democrats wanted them to go, and that we should wait a while before voting, our friend from Minnesota would always be waiting and could be counted upon to make a very eloquent speech about how the price of eggs had gone down in Minnesota, and could lecture the Senate as long as necessary with no more than a few seconds to prepare himself. Now, he has lost all his civil rights. [Laughter.] No longer will he address this body. If he wishes to make a speech, he will have to go somewhere else.

As one Member of this body, I say that "it could not have happened to a nicer guy."

I congratulate him on his elevation to the position he now holds. We know that he will do more than preside over the Senate. He will go around the world, representing this great Nation. My guess is that if the President is successful in arranging for an exchange with the Soviets, so that someone can come over here and present the Soviet side of the argument on American television, no doubt we shall be treated to a presentation by the Vice President of the United States, representing the President, speaking to the Soviet Union.

So while we may not in the future enjoy his eloquence on the Senate floor, at least we can look forward to hearing from him again and again.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield to the senior Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, we have heard from the majority leader and from the minority leader that the Vice President can no longer talk. We have heard from the majority whip that it takes the Vice President a very short time to prepare a speech.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Vice President be permitted to make remarks for not to exceed 1½ minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Montana objects.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I shall object until more of our colleagues finish telling the Vice President in public of our affection, friendship, and admiration for him.

I now yield to the distinguished senior Senator from Vermont, the senior Republican in the Senate.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I am one Member of the Senate who is glad to see the former senior Senator from Minnesota in his present position. I think he will be a good Vice President and a good President of the Senate.

The senior Senator from Massachusetts took the words out of my mouth. I intended to ask that, regardless of the Constitution, the laws of the land, or the rules of the Senate, the Vice President be permitted to make one last speech, regardless of what rules might be violated, and that we suspend the rules and regulations and hear this last short speech from our former colleague, the Vice President.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, when any one of our colleagues expresses our thoughts, and especially when, as so often happens, they express them more eloquently than we could, we simply say that we associate ourselves with their remarks as I do with those of our distinguished majority leader and majority whip.

It is difficult to express how happy and delighted we are that our former associate for so many fruitful years, a Senator from Minnesota, has risen to such high office. I am more than happy to join my other colleagues who have risen in the past few minutes to pay well deserved tributes in an effort to demonstrate our affection, admiration, and love for the Vice President of the United States.

We shall miss him in this body because, as the distinguished junior Senator from Louisiana has said, he can no longer speak in the Senate. His ability to make a speech and our opportunity to hear it was one of our great treats and privileges. We enjoyed listening to his ready eloquence, to his mastery of words in the stimulating expression of his thoughts, to his keen analysis of great problems, to his wit, and to his kindly humor. But we rejoice in that he has risen to a more important place in government and in the history of the Nation.

We know that he will carry high the torch that he has carried so nobly for so many years on into the still greater leadership that we shall receive from him.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I have always thought that I was highly privileged to enjoy a special relationship with the Vice President, not only because we were both born and reared in the State of South Dakota, but also because it has been my pleasure and privilege to live next door to the Vice President for the past 8 years in a neighborhood close to Chevy Chase.

I fully recognize that the duties and responsibilities of the Vice President will require that he have a larger home than the one he now occupies, which home was designed to take care of the needs of a family of six. But I look on that possible move with considerable regret. I have enjoyed being a neighbor to this wonderful family. I am delighted for many reasons that my colleague has been given so high a place in our Government. I am delighted most of all because of the reason cited by the President—that he recommended him for this position because he is the best possible man in the country to assume the responsibility of President if that occasion should ever arise.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I now yield to the distinguished minority whip [Mr. KUCHEL].

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the theme of these delightful ceremonies has been set by your friends, Democrats and Republicans together, who have spoken. I join their theme. I have been a friend of those with whom you have served in the Senate; and I am very proud to call you my friend. I give you what is in the heart of every one of your colleagues—my sincere congratulations as you undertake a tremendous American responsibility which you must discharge impartially.

I believe the theme also would include a commiseration for you. Each of us who has served with you recalls with pleasure not only your friendly way of dealing with your colleagues, but also the constant ebullience which has impelled you on many occasions to rise in this Chamber and to expatiate upon problems—to use the word of my leader, to ventilate a whole variety of subjects.

It is quite regrettable that one of the pains and penalties of your high office is the constitutional denial of your right again to engage in that which you have always enjoyed in the past.

When the dean of the minority suggests that we abruptly brush aside the constitutional limitation in order to accommodate one last expression, I am a little shocked. However, if there is no real objection from any other Senator, there will be no objection from me. I look forward to continuing a happy relationship with you officially and personally.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER].

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I remind my colleagues that some of us are twice blest. We welcome the return to this body of the former senior Senator from Minnesota by reason of his elevation to the Vice Presidency, because his elevation permits his wife Muriel to be eligible to be a member of a kind of exclusive club in another part of the establishment; namely, the Senate Ladies Club. So we are delighted to have both members of the Humphrey family with us.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH].

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, we welcome the return of the Senate's former chief legislative architect of recent years, in your new role as Vice President of the United States.

Already, you are delivering on a campaign pledge to reduce unemployment, by rejoining the Federal service.

Our Vice President is a venturesome person and we are pleased that you return safe and well despite such hazardous undertakings as climbing aboard a Texas mustang, with nothing but the hard caliche soil of the Pedernales Valley and the limestone outcropping down below.

And we pray that you will be provided suitable office space, knowing our senior colleagues in the Senate will walk through fire, swim rivers, do anything to help you in this regard—except willingly give up their high ground of office space.

We have watched with pride, Mr. Vice President, as you proved to the Nation in these past months a willingness to undertake any assignment to help President Lyndon B. Johnson meet the awesome responsibility you now share with him.

Your record of achievement as a U.S. Senator, as a spokesman for the great goals of mankind is a proven one. President Lyndon B. Johnson said he selected his vice-presidential nominee on the basis of qualification to serve in this country's highest office. The people have shown their confidence in this choice.

We who have worked with you know that, regardless of allotted office space, you will be the hardest working Vice President in our Nation's history. Assignments already given to you make it clear that this is your challenge, and we know you will meet it successfully. Welcome home, Mr. Vice President.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, a little more than 9 years ago, shortly after I had first been elected to this body, I sought advice from the present Vice President of the United States as to how to conduct myself. We had a most heartening lunch together in New York. I said to him, "HUBERT, how shall I behave when I go to the Senate?"

One hour and a half later, I knew.

Since that time, I have tried to do as he said, but not always as he did. I have not always been successful, but during the past 9 years, whenever the time came when I felt some doubt as to the honorable course to pursue, the man I went to for advice—and sound advice—was the present Vice President of the United States.

A little while ago, when I achieved a longstanding ambition—not without the assistance, I suspect, of the Vice President of the United States—I received a little note from him saying, "Congratulations, Senator. Nevermore let it be said, 'What can I do for my country?' Just ask the question, 'What have I done lately for JOE CLARK?' "

Mr. Vice President, you cannot, for the moment reply. I thank you from the bottom of my heart for the many kindnesses and the deep friendship that you have afforded me during my years in public life.

I wish you Godspeed and well—looking forward, as I do, to the valuable additional contribution that I am sure you will make to the history of our times.

I express my gratification at your success.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Virginia commenced, early last summer, to address his then colleague as "Mr. President."

The junior Senator from Virginia does not claim credit for being a political prophet, because he was only saying what those with 20-20 vision could see—namely, that our colleague was to be the next Vice President of the United States. I merely started early addressing him as such.

Mr. President, Senators will recall that my public career started in 1916, 49 years ago. During that time I have known some Vice Presidents. I have heard other Vice Presidents; but I can truthfully say that I could not recognize more than two real orators in that position during the past 50 years. One was Senator Barkley, of Kentucky, and the other is our present distinguished Vice President from Minnesota.

Knowing that the country wishes to hear his oratory 4 years from now, I am about to introduce a bill today to wipe out equal time. Accordingly, I challenge anyone to ask him for debate. That is my contribution.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I wish to speak a word in defense of our new Vice President.

His former colleagues have spoken of the fact that he was somewhat loquacious on occasion, although all have conceded he was always eloquent.

I should like to say in his defense that he is totally unlike the wife of one of my early clients. He came to me and informed me that he wished to divorce her.

I happened to know his wife. I said to my client, "Do you not have several small children born of your marriage to your wife?"

He said, "Yes."

I said, "Has not your wife been a good mother to your children?"

He said, "Yes; she could not have been a better mother."

I said, "Has she not been a good housekeeper?"

He said, "Yes; she has been a perfect housekeeper."

I said, "Has she not been active in civic and religious affairs?"

He said, "Yes; she has been extremely active in both."

I said, "Why in the world do you want to get a divorce from her then?"

He said, "She just talks and talks and talks all the time."

I said, "What does she talk about?"

He said, "She doesn't say."

Such a remark as that could not possibly be made truthfully about our Vice President.

He has not only always spoken with eloquence, but also always with lucidity. On most occasions he has bested the rest of us in debate when he made his position clear, which he always did.

I congratulate him and the Senate and the country on his elevation to his present high office.

LIMITATION OF STATEMENTS TO 3 MINUTES DURING THE MORNING HOUR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a limitation of 3 minutes on statements in the morning hour.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the first one to be recognized under this morning hour rule be the Vice President of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. [Applause, Senators rising.]

RESPONSE BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT. Mr. Majority Leader, this is the beginning of what may well be a number of surprises in the 1st session of the 89th Congress.

But I want my colleagues to know how deeply grateful I am for this expression of friendship and fellowship which has taken place here today. It shall always live in my memory. I shall always be extremely grateful for it and mindful of it.

Many blessings come from change. One of them, perhaps, is that my colleagues will be able to go home a little earlier than usual. I shall be blessed by knowing that I shall be able to get away from the Senate a little sooner.

The Senate of the United States is a unique parliamentary body in the world. It is governed by its rules, to which this Presiding Officer shall pay due adherence and attention; and he will apply those rules fairly to the best of his ability and knowledge.

The Senate is a body that has been established by the Constitution. It is a legal body. Those of us who have served in the Senate know that it operates successfully primarily because of the mutual respect that exists among Members of the Senate, and because of their fairness, good sense, good humor, and fellowship.

It is in that spirit that this Presiding Officer will attempt to conduct himself. I shall never forget that those who are Members of this body are, above all, fine human beings, and distinguished Senators. I only hope that in the months ahead we may have the kind of warm regard for one another that will expedite the business of our Nation.

I pay my respects to the distinguished minority leader, as I do to the distinguished majority leader. The United States is very fortunate to have in the persons and beings of these two distinguished leaders some of the finest parliamentarians and legislators that the Nation has ever known; above all, they are men of unquestioned patriotism, loyalty, good character, and good sense.

I thank the President pro tempore of the Senate for the many fine things that he has done for all of us.

With that I believe my 3 minutes may well be at an end. Senators will hear little more from me from this podium. But I want them to know that I shall be working the lobbies. I shall be in the cloakrooms.

I thank the distinguished majority leader, the distinguished minority leader and my former colleagues. [Prolonged applause.]

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

Appropriations for Fiscal Year 1966 for the Armed Forces

A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1966 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels, and research, development, test, and evaluation, for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mandatory Reporting by Physicians and Institutions of Certain Physical Abuse of Children

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the mandatory reporting by physicians and institutions in the District of Columbia of certain physical abuse of children (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Amendment of Section 152(b)(3) of Internal Revenue Code of 1954

A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 152(b)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 for the purpose of including nationals of the United States within the definition of the term "dependent" in connection with deductions for personal exemptions (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

Report of National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, Chairman, National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems, and members of the Council, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Council, for the period April 1, 1962, to June 30, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Disposition of Judgment Funds on Deposit to the Credit of the Skokomish Tribe of Indians

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the disposition of judgment funds on deposit to the credit of the Skokomish Tribe of Indians (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Amendment of Act Relating to Transfer of Title to Certain Movable Property

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of July 29, 1954, as amended, to permit transfer of title to movable property to agencies which assume operation and maintenance responsibility for project works serving municipal and industrial functions (with an accompany paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Amendment of Act of August 9, 1955

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of August 9, 1955 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"Enrolled Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 5

"A concurrent resolution expressing opposition of the Oklahoma State Legislature to the proposed elimination of the U.S. Army Reserve and reorganization of the National Guard

"Whereas, during our Nation's history, it has been necessary to wage wars in order to destroy tyrannies which were dedicated to the destruction of our status as a free people, and such tyrannies continue to exist; and

"Whereas, the very history of our country attests to the wisdom of its traditional military concept that, as a democracy, it may best deter aggression by the effective implementation of relatively small but thoroughly trained professional armed forces, adequately supported, however, by civilian components of such Armed Forces; and

"Whereas, such civilian components have proven themselves equal to the tasks assigned to them both in peace and in war, and have provided our country with a reservoir of personnel dedicated to its defense in numbers which its economy could not support and which its citizens would not tolerate as a standing professional armed force; and

"Whereas, we adhere to the firm belief that although weapons have changed and no doubt will continue to change, as they have throughout the history of mankind, the successful defense of our country, and of its people, must, in the final analysis, depend upon the ability of the people of our Armed Forces to take and to hold ground; and

"Whereas, in such belief, we do not discount the effectiveness of any weapon or weapons, but rather deem it folly to rely solely on one instrument or on a few instruments of war to the exclusion of all others: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the 30th Oklahoma Legislature (the House of Representatives concurring therein):

"Section 1. The Oklahoma State Legislature hereby records its complete opposition to the recent move of the Secretary of Defense of the United States, the effect of which, if implemented, will be the destruction of the U.S. Army Reserve and the reduction of the National Guard to a status of ineffectiveness.

"Sec. 2. That a duly attested copy of this resolution be immediately transmitted by the secretary of the Oklahoma State Senate to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, to each Member of the Congress from Oklahoma, and to the presiding officer of each branch of each State legislature or assembly of the United States.

"Adopted by the senate the 7th day of January 1965.

"Leo Winters,
"President of the Senate.

"Adopted by the house of representatives the 13th day of January 1965.

"J. D. McCarthy,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Enrolled Senate Concurrent Resolution 3

"A concurrent resolution petitioning Congress to call a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States

"Be it resolved by the Senate of the 30th session of the Oklahoma Legislature (the House of Representatives concurring therein):

"Section 1. That the Congress of the United States is respectfully petitioned by the Oklahoma State Legislature to call a convention for the purpose of proposing the following article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

" 'ARTICLE —

" 'Section 1. Nothing in this Constitution shall prohibit any State which shall have a bicameral legislature from apportioning the membership of one house of such legislature on factors other than population, provided that the plan of such apportionment shall have been submitted to and approved by a vote of the electorate of that State.

" 'Sec. 2. Nothing in this Constitution shall restrict or limit a State in its determination of how membership of governing bodies of its subordinate units shall be apportioned.

" 'Sec. 3. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission to the States by Congress.'

"Sec. 2. That if Congress shall have proposed an amendment to the Constitution identical with that contained in this resolution prior to June 1, 1965, this application for a convention shall no longer be of any force or effect.

"Sec. 3. That a duly attested copy of this resolution be immediately transmitted by the secretary of the Oklahoma State Senate to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of the Congress from Oklahoma.

"Adopted by the senate the 7th day of January 1965.

"Leo Winters,
"President of the Senate.

"Adopted by the house of representatives the 12th day of January, 1965.

"J. D. McCarthy,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives."

The petition of Canton Reynolds, of Hindman, Ky., praying for a redress of grievances; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. STENNIS, from the Committee on Armed Services, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 37), which, under the rule, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Armed Services, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—

(1) Common defense generally;

(2) The Department of Defense, the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, and the Department of the Air Force generally;

(3) Soldiers' and sailors' homes;

(4) Pay, promotion, retirement, and other benefits and privileges of members of the Armed Forces;

(5) Selective service;

(6) Size and composition of the Army, Navy, and Air Force;

(7) Forts, arsenals, military reservations, and navy yards;

(8) Ammunition depots;

(9) Maintenance and operation of the Panama Canal, including the administration, sanitation, and Government of the Canal Zone;

(10) Conservation, development, and use of naval petroleum and oil shale reserves;

(11) Strategic and critical materials necessary for the common defense;

(12) Aeronautical and space activities peculiar to or primarily associated with the development of weapons systems or military operations.

Sec. 2. For the purpose of this resolution, the committee, from February 1, 1965, to January 31, 1966, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,600 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $175,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

REPORTS OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY—ORIGINAL RESOLUTIONS.

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported the following original resolutions, which, under the rule, were referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. Res. 39

Resolution to study administrative practice and procedure

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to make a full and complete study and investigation of administrative practices and procedures within the departments and agencies of the United States in the exercise of their rulemaking, licensing, investigatory, law enforcement, and adjudicatory functions, including a study of the effectiveness of the Administrative Procedure Act, with a view to determining whether additional legislation is required to provide for the fair, impartial, and effective performance of such functions.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1965, to January 31, 1966, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,100 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1966.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $150,000 shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

S. Res. 40

Resolution to investigate antitrust and monopoly laws of the United States

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to make a complete, comprehensive, and continuing study and investigation of unlawful restraints and monopolies, and of the antitrust and monopoly laws of the United States, their administration, interpretation, operation, enforcement, and effect, and to determine and from time to time redetermine the nature and extent of any legislation which may be necessary or desirable for—

(1) clarification of existing law to eliminate conflicts and uncertainties where necessary;

(2) improvement of the administration and enforcement of existing laws; and

(3) supplementation of existing law to provide any additional substantive, procedural, or organizational legislation which may be needed for the attainment of the fundamental objects of the laws and the efficient administration and enforcement thereof.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1965, to January 31, 1966, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,100 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1966.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $543,500, shall be paid from the contingent fund for the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

S. Res. 41

Resolution to consider matters pertaining to Government charters, holidays, and celebrations

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate to consider all matters pertaining to Federal charters, holidays, and celebrations.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1965, to January 31, 1966, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $7,500, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

S. Res. 42

Resolution authorizing a study of matters pertaining to constitutional amendments

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to constitutional amendments.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1965, to January 31, 1966, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,100 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its activities and findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1966.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $91,071.19, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

S. Res. 43

Resolution to investigate matters pertaining to constitutional rights

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to constitutional rights.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1965, to January 31, 1966, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selcted shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,100 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employe; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1966.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $195,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

S. Res. 44

Resolution to study matters pertaining to immigration and naturalization

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to immigration and naturalization.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, from February 1, 1965, to January 31, 1966, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,100 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1966.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $162,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

S. Res 45

Resolution to study and examine the Federal judicial system

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to conduct a study and examination of the administration, practice, and procedures of the Federal judicial system with a view to determining the legislation, if any, which may be necessary or desirable in order to increase the efficiency of the Federal courts in the just and expeditious adjudication of the cases, controversies, and other matters which may be brought before them.

Sec. 2. For the purpose of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1965, to January 31, 1966, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis professional, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,100 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of departments and agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1965.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $100,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

S. Res. 46

Resolution to investigate the administration, operation, and enforcement of the Internal Security Act

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, insofar as they relate to the authority of the committee, to make a complete and continuing study and investigation of (1) the administration, operation, and enforcement of the Internal Security Act of 1950, as amended; (2) the administration, operation, and enforcement of other laws relating to espionage, sabotage, and the protection of the internal security of the United States; and (3) the extent, nature, and effect of subversive activities in the United States, its territories and possessions, including, but not limited to, espionage, sabotage, and infiltration by persons who are or may be under the domination of the foreign government or organizations controlling the world Communist movement or any other movement seeking to overthrow the Government of the United States by force and violence.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, from February 1, 1965, to January 31, 1966, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,100 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $431,119.14, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

S. RES. 47

Resolution to investigate national penitentiaries

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and inspect national penitentiaries.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1965, to January 31, 1966, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1966.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $5,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

S. RES. 48

Resolution to examine and review the administration of the Patent Office

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to conduct a full and complete examination and review of the administration of the Patent Office and a complete examination and review of the statutes relating to patents, trademarks, and copyrights.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee from February 1, 1965, to January 31, 1966, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ, upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,100 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1966.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $120,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

S. RES. 49

Resolution to investigate problems created by the flow of refugees and escapees from communistic tyranny

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to the problems created by the flow of refugees and escapees from Communist tyranny.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of this resolution, the committee from February 1, 1965, to January 31, 1966, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ on a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,100 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1966.

SEC. 4. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $102,300 shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate by vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

S. RES. 50

Resolution to study revision and codification of the statutes of the United States

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to revision and codification of the statutes of the United States.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee from February 1, 1965, to January 31, 1966, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That if more than one counsel is employed, the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed, and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,100, than the highest rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1966.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $33,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

S. RES 51

Resolution to investigate the administration of the Trading With the Enemy Act

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to conduct a further examination and review of the administration of the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended, and the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, and consider proposed legislation affecting said Acts.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1965, to January 31, 1966, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,100 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1966.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $60,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

S. RES. 52

Resolution to investigate juvenile delinquency

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to juvenile delinquency in the United States, including (a) the extent and character of juvenile delinquency in the United States and its causes and contributing factors; (b) the adequacy of existing provisions of law, including chapters 402 and 403 of title 18 of the United States Code, in dealing with youthful offenders of Federal laws; (c) sentences imposed on, or other correctional action taken with respect to, youthful offenders by Federal courts; and (d) the extent to which juveniles are violating Federal laws relating to the sale or use of narcotics.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, from February 1, 1965, to January 31, 1966, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ, upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,100 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation, as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1966.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $220,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—FEDERAL STOCKPILE INVENTORIES

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, I submit a report on Federal stockpile inventories as of October 1964. I ask unanimous consent to have the report printed in the RECORD, together with a statement by me.

There being no objection, the report and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL STOCKPILE INVENTORIES, OCTOBER 1964

INTRODUCTION

This is the 59th in a series of monthly reports on Federal stockpile inventories. It is for the month of October 1964.

The report is compiled from official data on quantities and cost value of commodities in these stockpiles submitted to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures by the Departments of Agriculture, Defense, Health, Education, and Welfare, and Interior, and the General Services Administration.

The cost value of materials in inventories covered in this report, as of October 1, 1964, totaled $13,999,323,321 and as of October 31, 1964, they totaled $13,746,416,569, a net decrease of $252,906,752 during the month.

Different units of measure make it impossible to summarize the quantities of commodities and materials which are shown in tables 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5, but the cost value figures are summarized by major category, as follows:

Summary of cost value of stockpile inventories by major category

Major category	Beginning of month, Oct. 1, 1964	End of month, Oct. 31, 1964	Net change during month
Strategic and critical materials:			
National stockpile [1]	$5,633,596,400	$5,594,391,500	−$39,204,900
Defense Production Act	1,450,995,900	1,440,197,800	−10,798,100
Supplemental-barter	1,386,642,242	1,389,084,274	+2,442,032
Total, strategic and critical materials [1]	8,471,234,542	8,423,673,574	−47,560,968
Agricultural commodities:			
Price support inventory	5,118,376,141	4,912,819,890	−205,556,251
Inventory transferred from national stockpile [1]	61,831,675	57,974,259	−3,857,416
Total, agricultural commodities [1]	5,180,207,816	4,970,794,149	−209,413,667
Civil defense supplies and equipment:			
Civil defense stockpile, Department of Defense	11,866,576	11,882,027	+15,451
Civil defense medical stockpile, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare	200,830,651	200,878,138	+47,487
Total, civil defense supplies and equipment	212,697,227	212,760,165	+62,938
Machine tools:			
Defense Production Act	45,300	45,300	----------
National Industrial Reserve Act	87,885,300	88,379,300	+494,000
Total, machine tools	87,930,600	88,424,600	+494,000
Helium	47,253,136	50,764,081	+3,510,945
Total, all inventories	13,999,323,321	13,746,416,569	−252,906,752

[1] Cotton inventory valued at $128,409,100 withdrawn from the national stockpile and transferred to Commodity Credit Corporation for disposal, pursuant to Public Law 87-548, during August 1962.

Detailed tables in this report show each commodity, by the major categories summarized above, in terms of quantity and cost value as of the beginning and end of the month. Net change figures reflect acquisitions, disposals, and accounting and other adjustments during the month.

The cost value figures represent generally the original acquisition cost of the commodities deliveries to permanent storage locations, together with certain packaging, processing, upgrading, et cetera, costs as carried in agency inventory accounts. Quantities are stated in the designated stockpile unit of measure.

Appendix A to this report, beginning on page 19, includes program descriptions and statutory citations pertinent to each stockpile inventory within the major categories.

The stockpile inventories covered by the report are tabulated in detail as follows:

Table 1: Strategic and critical materials inventories (all grades), October 1964 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity, and excesses over stockpile objectives in terms of quantity as of the end of the month).

Table 2: Agricultural commodities inventories, October 1964 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity).

Table 3: Civil defense supplies and equipment inventories, October 1964 (showing by item net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity).

Table 4: Machine tools inventories, October 1964 (showing by item net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity).

Table 5: Helium inventories, October 1964 (showing by item net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity).

NEW STOCKPILE OBJECTIVES

The Office of Emergency Planning is in the process of establishing new stockpile objectives for strategic and critical materials.

Table 1 of this report reflects the new objectives established between May 1963 and April 1964, based on essential needs in the event of a "conventional war emergency."

Appendix B contains excerpts from Office of Emergency Planning statements setting forth the new policy and current studies with respect to objectives for strategic and critical materials required for "conventional war emergency" and "nuclear war emergency."

TABLE 1.—*Strategic and critical materials inventories (all grades), October 1964 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity, and excesses over stockpile objectives in terms of quantity as of the end of the month)*

Commodity	Cost value			Quantity					
	Beginning of month, Oct. 1, 1964	End of month, Oct. 31, 1964	Net change during month	Unit of measure	Beginning of month, Oct. 1, 1964	End of month, Oct. 31, 1964	Net change during month	Stockpile objective [1]	Excess over stockpile objective
Aluminum, metal:									
National stockpile	$487,680,600	$487,680,600	----------	Short ton	1,128,988	1,128,988	----------	----------	----------
Defense Production Act	408,508,600	405,539,700	−$2,968,900	do	810,216	804,586	−5,630	----------	----------
Total	896,189,200	893,220,300	−2,968,900	do	1,939,204	1,933,574	−5,630	450,000	1,483,574
Aluminum oxide, abrasive grain:									
Supplemental—barter	15,725,400	15,717,600	−7,800	Short dry ton	50,905	50,905	----------	(2)	50,905
Aluminum oxide, fused, crude:									
National stockpile	21,735,100	21,735,100	----------	Short ton	200,093	200,093	----------	----------	----------
Supplemental—barter	22,747,400	22,747,400	----------	do	178,266	178,266	----------	----------	----------
Total	44,482,500	44,482,500	----------	do	378,359	378,359	----------	160,000	218,359
Antimony:									
National stockpile	20,487,900	20,487,900	----------	do	30,275	30,275	----------	----------	----------
Supplemental—barter	13,545,800	13,550,900	+5,100	do	22,704	22,704	----------	----------	----------
Total	34,033,700	34,038,800	+5,100	do	52,979	52,979	----------	25,500	27,479

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 1.—*Strategic and critical materials inventories (all grades), October 1964 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity, and excesses over stockpile objectives in terms of quantity as of the end of the month)*—Continued

Commodity	Cost value			Quantity					
	Beginning of month, Oct. 1, 1964	End of month, Oct. 31, 1964	Net change during month	Unit of measure	Beginning of month, Oct. 1, 1964	End of month, Oct. 31, 1964	Net change during month	Stockpile objective [1]	Excess over stockpile objective
Asbestos, amosite:									
National stockpile	$2, 637, 600	$2, 637, 600		Short ton	11, 705	11, 705			
Supplemental—barter	9, 734, 027	9, 867, 562	+$133, 535	do	38, 820	39, 420	+600		
Total	12, 371, 627	12, 505, 162	+133, 535	do	50, 525	51, 125	+600	40, 000	11, 125
Asbestos, chrysotile:									
National stockpile	3, 356, 200	3, 356, 200		do	6, 224	6, 224			
Defense Production Act	2. 102, 600	2, 102, 600		do	2, 348	2, 348			
Supplemental—barter	4, 990, 072	4, 983, 954	−6, 118	do	7, 576	7, 576			
Total	10, 448, 872	10, 442, 754	−6, 118	do	16. 148	16, 148		13, 700	2, 448
Asbestos, crocidolite:									
National stockpile	702, 100	702, 100		do	1, 567	1, 567			
Supplemental—barter	10, 205, 907	10, 268, 600	+62, 693	do	39, 340	39. 591	+251		
Total	10, 908, 007	10, 970, 700	+62, 693	do	40, 907	41, 158	+251	(2)	41, 158
Bauxite, metal grade, Jamaica type:									
National stockpile	13. 925, 000	13, 925, 000		Long dry ton	879, 740	879, 740			
Defense Production Act	18, 168, 000	18, 168, 000		do	1, 370, 077	1, 370, 077			
Supplemental—barter	92, 509, 619	92, 995, 436	+485, 817	do	5, 999, 320	6, 038. 721	+39, 401		
Total	124, 602, 619	125. 088, 436	+485, 817	do	8, 249, 137	8, 288, 538	+39, 401	5, 000, 000	3, 288, 538
Bauxite, metal grade, Surinam type:									
National stockpile	78, 552, 500	78, 552, 500		do	4, 962, 706	4, 962, 706			
Supplemental—barter	45, 280, 400	45, 280, 400		do	2, 927, 260	2, 927. 260			
Total	123, 832, 900	123, 832, 900		do	7, 889. 966	7, 889, 966		5, 300, 000	2, 589, 966
Bauxite, refractory grade:									
National stockpile	11, 347, 800	11, 347, 800		Long calcined ton.	299, 279	299, 279		173, 000	126, 279
Beryl:									
National stockpile	9, 768, 400	9. 768, 400		Short ton	23, 230	23, 230			
Defense Production Act	1, 425, 800	1, 425, 800		do	2, 543	2, 543			
Supplemental—barter	22, 990, 300	23, 049, 952	+59, 652	do	12, 092	12, 277	+185		
Total	34, 184, 500	34, 244, 152	+59, 652	do	37, 865	38, 050	+185	28, 000	10, 050
Beryllium metal:									
Supplemental—barter	18, 703, 500	18, 703, 500		do	153	153		(2)	153
Bismuth:									
National stockpile	2, 674, 300	2, 674, 300		Pound	1, 342, 402	1, 342, 402			
Defense Production Act	52, 400	52, 400		do	22, 901	22, 901			
Supplemental—barter	5, 536, 700	5, 536, 700		do	2, 506, 493	2, 506, 493			
Total	8, 263, 400	8, 263, 400		do	3, 871, 796	3, 871, 796		3, 600, 000	271, 796
Cadmium:									
National stockpile	15, 194, 200	15, 163, 000	−31, 200	do	7, 740, 476	7, 724, 563	−15, 913		
Supplemental—barter	12, 326, 600	12, 326, 600		do	7, 448, 389	7, 448, 389			
Total	27, 520, 800	27, 489, 600	−31, 200	do	15, 188, 865	15, 172, 952	−15, 913	5, 100, 000	10, 072, 952
Castor oil:									
National stockpile	46, 033, 800	45, 809, 600	−224, 200	do	181, 083, 414	180, 187, 374	−896, 040	22, 000, 000	158, 187, 374
Celestite:									
National stockpile	1, 412, 300	1, 412, 300		Short ton	28, 816	28, 816			
Supplemental—barter	785, 434	812, 693	+27, 259	do	18, 569	19, 201	+632		
Total	2, 197, 734	2, 224, 993	+27, 259	do	47, 385	48, 017	+632	10, 300	37, 717
Chromite, chemical grade:									
National stockpile	12, 288, 000	12, 288, 000		Short dry ton	559, 452	559, 452			
Supplemental—barter	21, 930, 200	21, 930, 200		do	699, 644	699, 644			
Total	34, 218, 200	34, 218, 200		do	1, 259, 096	1, 259, 096		600, 000	659, 096
Chromite, metallurgical grade:									
National stockpile	264, 565, 500	264, 565, 500		do	3. 795, 292	3, 795, 292			
Defense Production Act	35. 879, 900	35, 879, 900		do	985, 646	985, 646			
Supplemental—barter	227, 000, 816	227, 024, 400	+23, 584	do	1, 558, 056	1, 558, 054	−2		
Total	527, 446, 216	527, 469, 800	+23, 584	do	6, 338, 994	6, 338, 992	−2	2, 970, 000	3, 368, 992
Chromite, refractory grade:									
National stockpile	25, 149, 300	25, 149, 300		do	1, 047, 159	1, 047, 159			
Supplemental—barter	5, 039, 000	5, 039, 000		do	179, 775	179, 775			
Total	30, 188, 300	30, 188, 300		do	1, 226, 934	1, 226, 934		1, 425, 000	(3)
Cobalt:									
National stockpile	169, 225, 700	169, 225, 700		Pound	76, 066, 657	76, 066, 657			
Defense Production Act	52, 075, 300	52, 075, 300		do	25, 066, 651	25, 066, 651			
Supplemental—barter	2, 169, 000	2, 169, 000		do	1, 065, 398	1, 065, 398			
Total	223, 470, 000	223, 470, 000		do	102, 198, 706	102, 198, 706		42, 000, 000	60, 198, 706
Coconut oil:									
National stockpile	2, 449, 000	2, 058, 800	−390, 200	do	16, 156, 229	13, 582, 369	−2, 573, 860	(2)	13, 582, 369
Colemanite:									
Supplemental—barter	2, 636, 400	2, 636, 400		Long dry ton	67, 636	67, 636		(2)	67, 636

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 1.—*Strategic and critical materials inventories (all grades), October 1964 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity, and excesses over stockpile objectives in terms of quantity as of the end of the month)*—Continued

Commodity	Cost value			Quantity					
	Beginning of month, Oct. 1, 1964	End of month, Oct. 31, 1964	Net change during month	Unit of measure	Beginning of month, Oct. 1, 1964	End of month, Oct. 31, 1964	Net change during month	Stockpile objective [1]	Excess over stockpile objective
Columbium:									
National stockpile	$24,777,200	$24,777,200		Pound	7,360,707	7,360,707			
Defense Production Act	50,238,900	50,238,900		do	7,966,341	7,966,341			
Supplemental—barter	799,100	799,100		do	371,426	371,426			
Total	75,815,200	75,815,200		do	15,698,474	15,698,474		1,176,000	14,522,474
Copper:									
National stockpile	523,849,000	524,012,800	+$163,800	Short ton	1,008,039	1,008,039			
Defense Production Act	50,237,200	45,924,000	−4,313,200	do	89,864	81,918	−7,946		
Supplemental—barter	8,252,100	8,252,100		do	12,382	12,382			
Total	582,338,300	578,188,900	−4,149,400	do	1,110,285	1,102,339	−7,946	775,000	327,339
Cordage fibers, abaca:									
National stockpile	37,034,400	37,034,400		Pound	146,934,136	146,934,136		100,000,000	46,934,136
Cordage fibers, sisal:									
National stockpile	41,868,300	41,868,300		do	309,571,655	309,571,655		300,000,000	9,571,655
Corundum:									
National stockpile	393,100	393,100		Short ton	2,008	2,008		2,500	(3)
Cryolite:									
Defense Production Act	5,740,100	5,651,300	−88,800	do	20,787	20,466	−321	(2)	20,466
Diamond dies:									
National stockpile	575,600	577,800	+2,200	Piece	18,654	18,667	+13	25,000	(3)
Diamond, industrial, crushing bort:									
National stockpile	61,601,800	61,601,800		Carat	31,109,411	31,109,411			
Supplemental—barter	15,800,500	15,800,500		do	5,550,579	5,550,579			
Total	77,402,300	77,402,300		do	36,659,990	36,659,990		24,700,000	11,959,990
Diamond, industrial, stones:									
National stockpile	100,509,400	100,509,400		do	9,319,183	9,319,183			
Supplemental—barter	186,341,500	186,341,500		do	15,425,827	15,425,827			
Total	286,850,900	286,850,900		do	24,745,010	24,745,010		16,500,000	8,245,010
Diamond tools:									
National stockpile	1,015,400	1,015,400		Piece	64,178	64,178		(2)	64,178
Feathers and down:									
National stockpile	33,976,300	32,838,100	−1,138,200	Pound	8,200,462	7,925,702	−274,760	3,000,000	4,925,702
Fluorspar, acid grade:									
National stockpile	26,167,500	26,167,500		Short dry ton	463,049	463,049			
Defense Production Act	1,394,400	1,394,400		do	19,700	19,700			
Supplemental—barter	33,531,100	33,531,100		do	673,232	673,232			
Total	61,093,000	61,093,000		do	1,155,981	1,155,981		540,000	615,981
Fluorspar, metallurgical grade:									
National stockpile	17,332,400	17,332,400		do	369,443	369,443			
Supplemental—barter	1,508,100	1,508,100		do	42,800	42,800			
Total	18,840,500	18,840,500		do	412,243	412,243		850,000	(3)
Graphite, natural, Ceylon, amorphous lump:									
National stockpile	937,900	937,900		do	4,455	4,455			
Supplemental—barter	341,200	341,200		do	1,428	1,428			
Total	1,279,100	1,279,100		do	5,883	5,883		5,500	383
Graphite, natural, Malagasy, crystalline:									
National stockpile	6,786,600	6,765,500	−21,100	do	32,938	32,836	−102		
Supplemental—barter	232,500	232,500		do	1,908	1,908			
Total	7,019,100	6,998,000	−21,100	do	34,846	34,744	−102	18,000	16,744
Graphite, natural, other, crystalline:									
National stockpile	1,894,400	1,894,400		do	5,481	5,481		2,800	2,681
Hyoscine:									
National stockpile	30,600	30,600		Ounce	2,100	2,100		(2)	2,100
Iodine:									
National stockpile	4,082,000	4,082,000		Pound	2,956,713	2,956,713			
Supplemental—barter	1,394,040	1,401,300	+7,260	do	1,333,563	1,333,563			
Total	5,476,040	5,483,300	+7,260	do	4,290,276	4,290,276		8,000,000	(3)
Iridium:									
National stockpile	2,525,800	2,525,800		Troy ounce	13,937	13,937		17,000	(3)
Bearings, jewel:									
National stockpile	4,305,700	4,564,600	+258,900	Piece	52,203,765	52,435,065	+231,300	57,500,000	(3)
Kyanite-mullite:									
National stockpile	734,300	734,300		Short dry ton	8,493	8,493		4,800	3,693
Lead:									
National stockpile	318,052,200	309,761,300	−8,290,900	Short ton	1,046,273	1,019,008	−27,265		
Supplemental—barter	78,398,500	78,398,500		do	327,998	327,998			
Total	396,450,700	388,159,800	−8,290,900	do	1,374,271	1,347,006	−27,265	0	1,347,006

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 1.—*Strategic and critical materials inventories (all grades), October 1964 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity, and excesses over stockpile objectives in terms of quantity as of the end of the month)*—Continued

Commodity	Cost value			Quantity					
	Beginning of month, Oct. 1, 1964	End of month. Oct. 31, 1964	Net change during month	Unit of measure	Beginning of month, Oct. 1, 1964	End of month, Oct. 31, 1964	Net change during month	Stockpile objective [1]	Excess over stockpile objective
Magnesium:									
National stockpile	$125,458,400	$125,242,200	−$216,200	Short ton	172,814	172,516	−298	145,000	27,516
Manganese, battery grade, natural ore:									
National stockpile	21,025,500	21,025,500		Short dry ton	144,485	144,485			
Supplemental—barter	13,621,900	14,064,600	+442,700	do	137,671	142,245	+4,574		
Total	34,647,400	35,090,100	+442,700	do	282,156	286,730	+4,574	80,000	206,730
Manganese, battery grade, synthetic dioxide:									
National stockpile	3,095,500	3,095,500		do	21,272	21,272			
Defense Production Act	2,524,700	2,524,700		do	3,779	3,779			
Supplemental—barter	442,663		−442,663	do	4,574		−4,574		
Total	6,062,863	5,620,200	−442,663	do	29,625	25,051	−4,574	6,790	18,351
Manganese, chemical grade, type A:									
National stockpile	2,133,300	2,133,300		do	29,307	29,307			
Supplemental—barter	7,922,100	7,922,100		do	117,607	117,607			
Total	10,055,400	10,055,400		do	146,914	146,914		68,500	78,414
Manganese, chemical grade, type B:									
National stockpile	132,600	132,600		do	1,822	1,822			
Supplemental—barter	6,669,800	6,669,800		do	99,016	99,016			
Total	6,802,400	6,802,400		do	100,838	100,838		64,000	36,838
Manganese, metallurgical grade:									
National stockpile	248,240,900	248,240,900		do	5,852,192	5,852,192			
Defense Production Act	175,197,800	173,911,300	−1,286,500	do	3,034,264	3,011,674	−22,590		
Supplemental—barter	257,715,424	259,307,917	+1,592,493	do	3,883,488	3,900,011	+16,523		
Total	681,154,124	681,460,117	+305,993	do	12,769,944	12,763,877	−6,067	7,900,000	4,863,877
Mercury:									
National stockpile	33,066,100	33,069,600	+3,500	Flask	184,501	184,456	−45		
Supplemental—barter	3,446,200	3,446,200		do	16,000	16,000			
Total	36,512,300	36,515,800	+3,500	do	200,501	200,456	−45	200,000	456
Mica, muscovite block:									
National stockpile	27,627,600	27,627,600		Pound	11,622,775	11,622,775			
Defense Production Act	40,689,700	40,689,700		do	6,432,569	6,432,569			
Supplemental—barter	6,342,045	6,392,241	+59,196	do	1,881,903	1,896,681	+14,778		
Total	74,659,345	74,709,541	+50,196	do	19,937,247	19,952,025	+14,778	6,000,000	13,952,025
Mica, muscovite film:									
National stockpile	9,058,100	9,058,100		do	1,719,308	1,719,308			
Defense Production Act	633,300	633,300		do	102,681	102,681			
Supplemental—barter	1,142,295	1,142,300	+5	do	116,558	116,558			
Total	10,833,695	10,833,700	+5	do	1,938,547	1,938,547		2,000,000	(3)
Mica, muscovite splittings:									
National stockpile	40,598,300	40,598,300		do	40,040,169	40,040,169			
Supplemental—barter	6,225,800	6,225,800		do	4,826,257	4,826,257			
Total	46,824,100	46,824,100		do	44,866,426	44,866,426		22,200,000	22,666,426
Mica, phlogopite block:									
National stockpile	303,600	303,600		do	223,239	223,239		17,000	206,239
Mica, phlogopite splittings:									
National stockpile	2,580,500	2,580,500		do	3,079,062	3,079,062			
Supplemental—barter	2,501,800	2,501,800		do	1,986,902	1,986,902			
Total	5,082,300	5,082,300		do	5,065,964	5,065,964		1,300,000	3,765,964
Molybdenum:									
National stockpile	82,463,700	78,293,200	−4,170,500	do	78,977,162	75,173,469	−3,803,693	68,000,000	7,173,469
Nickel:									
National stockpile	181,829,500	181,773,000	−56,500	Short ton	166,904	166,816	−88		
Defense Production Act	99,478,100	98,049,800	−1,428,300	do	52,014	51,413	−601		
Total	281,307,600	279,822,800	−1,484,800	do	218,918	218,229	−689	50,000	168,229
Opium:									
National stockpile	13,661,700	13,661,700		Pound	196,355	196,355		141,280	55,075
Palladium:									
National stockpile	2,079,000	2,079,000		Troy ounce	89,811	89,811			
Supplemental—barter	12,170,200	12,170,200		do	648,124	648,124			
Total	14,249,200	14,249,200		do	737,935	737,935		1,300,000	(3)
Palm oil:									
National stockpile	2,298,500	1,988,900	−309,600	Pound	12,770,893	11,050,613	−1,720,280	(2)	11,050,613
Platinum:									
National stockpile	56,879,900	56,879,900		Troy ounce	716,343	716,343			
Supplemental—barter	4,024,500	4,024,500		do	49,999	49,999			
Total	60,904,400	60,904,400		do	766,342	766,342		450,000	316,342
Pyrethrum:									
National stockpile	415,100	415,100		Pound	67,065	67,065		25,000	42,065

See footnotes at end of table.

Table 1.—*Strategic and critical materials inventories (all grades), October 1964 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity, and excesses over stockpile objectives in terms of quantity as of the end of the month)*—Continued

Commodity	Cost value			Quantity					
	Beginning of month, Oct. 1, 1964	End of month, Oct. 31, 1964	Net change during month	Unit of measure	Beginning of month, Oct. 1, 1964	End of month, Oct. 31, 1964	Net change during month	Stockpile objective [1]	Excess ove stockpile objective
Quartz crystals:									
National stockpile	$67,473,900	$67,473,900		Pound	5,470,013	5,470,013			
Supplemental—barter	3,519,200	3,519,200		do	232,352	232,352			
Total	70,993,100	70,993,100		do	5,702,365	5,702,365		650,000	5,052,365
Quinidine:									
National stockpile	1,846,000	1,846,000		Ounce	1,600,428	1,600,428		2,000,000	(3)
Quinine:									
National stockpile	2,617,000	2,617,000		do	4,137,733	4,137,733		4,130,000	7,733
Rare earths:									
National stockpile	7,134,900	7,134,900		Short dry ton	9,959	9,969	+10		
Supplemental—barter	5,830,900	5,830,900		do	5,810	5,810			
Total	12,965,800	12,965,800		do	15,769	15,779	+10	3,000	12,779
Rare earths residue:									
Defense Production Act	657,200	657,200		Pound	6,079,983	6,079,983		(2)	6,079,983
Rhodium:									
National stockpile	78,200	78,200		Troy ounce	618	618		(2)	618
Rubber:									
National stockpile	686,330,800	677,451,900	−$8,878,900	Long ton	887,714	876,264	−11,450	130,000	746,264
Ruthenium:									
Supplemental—barter	559,500	559,500		Troy ounce	15,001	15,001		(2)	15,001
Rutile:									
National stockpile	2,070,100	2,070,100		Short dry ton	18,599	18,599			
Defense Production Act	2,725,100	2,725,100		do	17,385	17,385			
Supplemental—barter	1,061,300	1,061,300		do	11,632	11,632			
Total	5,856,500	5,856,500		do	47,616	47,616		51,000	(3)
Sapphire and ruby:									
National stockpile	190,000	190,000		Carat	16,187,500	16,187,500		18,000,000	(3)
Selenium:									
National stockpile	757,100	757,100		Pound	97,100	97,100			
Supplemental—barter	1,430,800	1,441,819	+11,019	do	248,002	249,982	+1,980		
Total	2,187,900	2,198,919	+11,019	do	345,102	347,082	+1,980	475,000	(3)
Shellac:									
National stockpile	8,339,800	8,339,800		do	16,635,181	16,635,181		8,300,000	8,335,181
Silicon carbide, crude:									
National stockpile	11,394,500	11,394,500		Short ton	64,697	64,697			
Supplemental—barter	26,803,600	26,803,600		do	131,805	131,805			
Total	38,198,100	38,198,100		do	196,502	196,502		30,000	166,502
Silk noils and waste:									
National stockpile	1,232,100	1,232,100		Pound	979,924	979,924		(2)	979,924
Silk, raw:									
National stockpile	486,600	486,600		do	113,515	113,515		(2)	113,515
Sperm oil:									
National stockpile	4,775,400	4,775,400		do	23,442,158	23,442,158		23,400,000	42,158
Talc, steatite block and lump:									
National stockpile	494,800	494,800		Short ton	1,269	1,269		200	1,069
Talc, steatite ground:									
National stockpile	231,200	231,200		do	3,901	3,901		(2)	3,901
Tantalum:									
National stockpile	11,886,200	11,964,700	+78,500	Pound	3,142,473	3,142,473			
Defense Production Act	9,734,400	9,734,400		do	1,536,023	1,536,023			
Supplemental—barter	21,100	21,100		do	8,036	8,036			
Total	21,641,700	21,720,200	+78,500	do	4,686,532	4,686,532		3,400,000	1,286,532
Thorium:									
Supplemental—barter	17,994,400	17,991,700	−2,700	do	3,965,428	3,965,428		500,000	3,465,428
Thorium residue:									
Defense Production Act	42,000	42,000		do	848,354	848,534		(2)	848,354
Tin:									
National stockpile	749,863,400	743,055,800	−6,807,600	Long ton	308,391	305,590	−2,801		
Supplemental—barter	16,404,000	16,404,000		do	7,505	7,505			
Total	766,267,400	759,459,800	−6,807,600	do	315,896	313,095	−2,801	200,000	113,095
Titanium sponge:									
Defense Production Act	175,951,900	175,884,400	−67,500	Short ton	22,351	22,341	−10		
Supplemental—barter	32,097,700	32,097,700		do	9,021	9,021			
Total	208,049,600	207,982,100	−67,500	do	31,372	31,263	−10	20,500	10,862
Tungsten:									
National stockpile	369,128,200	369,128,200		Pound	120,069,151	120,069,151			
Defense Production Act	317,538,500	316,893,600	−644,900	do	77,864,447	77,700,912	−163,535		
Supplemental—barter	18,651,400	18,651,400		do	5,774,827	5,774,827			
Total	705,318,100	704,673,200	−644,900	do	203,708,425	203,544,890	−163,535	44,000,000	159,544,890

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 1.—*Strategic and critical materials inventories (all grades), October 1964 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity, and excesses over stockpile objectives in terms of quantity as of the end of the month)*—Continued

Commodity	Cost value			Quantity					
	Beginning of month, Oct. 1, 1964	End of month, Oct. 31, 1964	Net change during month	Unit of measure	Beginning of month, Oct. 1, 1964	End of month, Oct. 31, 1964	Net change during month	Stockpile objective [1]	Excess over stockpile objective
Vanadium:									
National stockpile	$31, 567, 900	$31, 567, 900		Short ton	7, 865	7, 865		1, 400	6, 465
Vegetable tannin extract, chestnut:									
National stockpile	10, 385, 900	10, 296, 900	−$89, 000	Long ton	37, 225	36, 906	−319	15, 000	21, 906
Vegetable tannin extract, quebracho:									
National stockpile	48, 855, 000	48, 855, 000		do	197, 456	197, 456		86, 000	111, 456
Vegetable tannin extract, wattle:									
National stockpile	9, 826, 900	9, 826, 900		do	38, 962	38, 962		15, 000	23, 962
Zinc									
National stockpile	355, 220, 600	346, 132, 900	−9, 087, 700	Short ton	1, 225, 129	1, 193, 513	−31, 616		
Supplemental—barter	79, 588, 400	79, 588, 400		do	323, 896	323, 896			
Total	434, 809, 000	425, 721, 300	−9, 087, 700	do	1, 549, 025	1, 517, 409	−31, 616	0	1, 517, 409
Zirconium ore, baddeleyite:									
National stockpile	710, 600	710, 600		Short dry ton	16, 533	16, 533		(2)	16, 533
Zirconium ore, zircon:									
National stockpile	116, 300	116, 300		do	1, 970	1, 970		(2)	1, 970
Total:									
National stockpile	5, 633, 596, 400	5, 594, 391, 500	−39, 204, 900						
Defense Production Act	1, 450, 995, 900	1, 440, 197, 800	−10, 798, 100						
Supplemental—barter	1, 386, 642, 242	1, 389, 084, 274	+2, 442, 032						
Total, strategic and critical materials.	8, 471, 234, 542	8, 423, 673, 574	−47, 560, 968						

[1] Stockpile objectives for strategic and critical materials are determined pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98–98h). The Office of Emergency Planning is currently in the process of revising stockpile objectives. (See app. B, p. 1018.)

[2] No present objective.

[3] Not in excess of stockpile objective.

Source: Compiled from reports submitted by the General Services Administration and the Department of Agriculture.

TABLE 2.—*Agricultural commodities inventories, October 1964 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity)*

Commodity	Cost value			Quantity			
	Beginning of month, Oct. 1, 1964	End of month, Oct. 31, 1964	Net change during month	Unit of measure	Beginning of month, Oct. 1, 1964	End of month, Oct. 31, 1964	Net change during month
Price-support inventory:							
Basic commodities:							
Corn	$1, 011, 290, 689	$1, 025, 414, 403	+$14, 123, 714	Bushel	828, 418, 696	841, 397, 409	+12, 978, 713
Cotton, extra long staple	34, 804, 891	34, 799, 098	−5, 793	Bale	131, 809	131, 803	−6
Cotton, upland	1, 498, 990, 084	1, 375, 966, 938	−123, 023, 146	do	9, 078, 124	8, 332, 975	−745, 149
Peanuts, shelled	8, 300, 776	5, 709, 862	−2, 590, 914	Pound	48, 584, 727	33, 332, 644	−15, 252, 083
Rice, milled	155, 581	30, 331	−125, 250	Hundredweight	17, 221	3, 405	−13, 816
Rice, rough	7, 470, 653	6, 385, 987	−1, 084, 666	do	1, 423, 651	1, 218, 923	−204, 728
Wheat	1, 591, 445, 531	1, 547, 268, 932	−44, 176, 599	Bushel	781, 113, 230	758, 123, 772	−22, 989, 458
Wheat, rolled	43, 970	2, 363	−41, 607	Pound	986, 338	53, 790	−932, 548
Wheat flour	178, 056	270, 747	+92, 691	do	2, 905, 000	4, 827, 000	+1, 922, 000
Bulgur	579, 349	100, 450	−478, 899	do	11, 579, 206	2, 328, 657	−9, 250, 549
Total, basic commodities	4, 153, 259, 580	3, 995, 949, 111	−157, 310, 469				
Designated nonbasic commodities:							
Barley	24, 048, 105	22, 775, 997	−1, 272, 108	Bushel	27, 386, 400	26, 087, 625	−1, 298, 775
Grain sorghum	687, 605, 871	677, 941, 801	−9, 664, 070	do	615, 194, 580	605, 005, 505	−10, 189, 075
Milk and butterfat:							
Butter	98, 713, 805	85, 943, 468	−12, 770, 337	Pound	169, 704, 786	147, 418, 978	−22, 285, 808
Butter oil	13, 154, 294	10, 617, 855	−2, 536, 439	do	17, 023, 509	13, 739, 810	−3, 283, 699
Cheese	19, 683, 678	16, 464, 951	−3, 218, 727	do	51, 731, 742	43, 159, 287	−8, 572, 455
Ghee	491, 148		−491, 148	do	633, 996		−633, 996
Milk, dried	38, 018, 310	34, 788, 191	−3, 230, 119	do	252, 257, 188	230, 262, 627	−21, 994, 561
Oats	20, 740, 287	20, 372, 776	−367, 511	Bushel	34, 439, 092	33, 804, 983	−634, 109
Rye	820, 603	762, 423	−58, 180	do	765, 148	704, 382	−60, 766
Total, designated nonbasic commodities	903, 276, 101	869, 667, 462	−33, 608, 639				
Other nonbasic commodities:							
Beans, dry, edible	9, 786, 411	6, 826, 619	−2, 959, 792	Hundredweight	1, 360, 133	961, 278	−398, 855
Cottonseed oil, refined, other	14, 449, 612	10, 062, 627	−4, 386, 985	Pound	128, 997, 622	89, 623, 441	−39, 374, 181
Cottonseed oil, refined, salad oil [1]	1, 098, 961	965, 293	−133, 668	do	6, 142, 071	5, 217, 904	−924, 167
Flaxseed	21, 222, 477	14, 796, 970	−6, 425, 507	Bushel	7, 159, 160	4, 984, 695	−2, 174, 465
Linseed oil	8, 171, 072	8, 399, 062	+227, 990	Pound	69, 206, 400	71, 052, 660	+1, 846, 260
Soybeans	7, 111, 927	6, 152, 746	−959, 181	Bushel	3, 038, 554	2, 629, 249	−409, 305
Total, other nonbasic commodities	61, 840, 460	47, 203, 317	−14, 637, 143				
Total, price support inventory	5, 118, 376, 141	4, 912, 819, 890	−205, 556, 251				
Inventory transferred from national stockpile: [2]							
Cotton, Egyptian	38, 469, 724	35, 049, 892	−3, 419, 832	Bale	45, 536	41, 488	−4, 048
Cotton, American-Egyptian	23, 361, 951	22, 924, 367	−437, 584	do	46, 448	45, 578	−870
Total, inventory transferred from national stockpile.	61, 831, 675	57, 974, 259	−3, 857, 416	do	91, 984	87, 066	4, 918
Total, agricultural commodities	5, 180, 207, 816	4, 970, 794, 149	−209, 413, 667				

[1] Reported as "Cottonseed oil, refined," prior to February 1964.

[2] Transferred from General Services Administration pursuant to Public Law 85-96 and Public Law 87-548. (See app. A, p. 1017.)

Source: Compiled from reports submitted by the Department of Agriculture.

TABLE 3.—*Civil defense supplies and equipment inventories, October 1964 (showing by item net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity)*

Item	Cost value			Quantity			
	Beginning of month, Oct. 1, 1964	End of month, Oct. 31, 1964	Net change during month	Unit of measure	Beginning of month, Oct. 1, 1964	End of month, Oct. 31, 1964	Net change during month
Civil defense stockpile, Department of Defense:							
Engineering equipment (engine generators, pumps, chlorinators, purifiers, pipe, and fittings)	$10,067,195	$10,082,438	$+15,243	10 mile units	45	45	
Chemical and biological equipment	1,799,381	1,799,589	+208	(1)			
Total	11,866,576	11,882,027	+15,451				
Civil defense medical stockpile, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare:							
Medical bulk stocks, and associated items at civil defense mobilization warehouse	136,529,552	135,870,496	−659,056	(1)			
Medical bulk stock at manufacturer locations	5,797,432	5,724,614	−72,818	(1)			
Civil defense emergency hospitals	52,149,299	53,306,755	+1,157,456	Each	2,002	2,012	+10
Supply additions (for civil defense emergency hospitals)	6,354,368	5,976,273	−378,095	(1)			
Total	200,830,651	200,878,138	+47,487				
Total, civil defense supplies and equipment	212,697,227	212,760,165	+62,938				

[1] Composite group of many different items.

Source: Compiled from reports submitted by the Department of Defense and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

TABLE 4.—*Machine tools inventories, October 1964 (showing by item net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity)*

Item	Cost value			Quantity			
	Beginning of month, Oct. 1, 1964	End of month, Oct. 31, 1964	Net change during month	Unit of measure	Beginning of month, Oct. 1, 1964	End of month, Oct. 31, 1964	Net change during month
Defense Production Act:							
On loan	$45,300	$45,300		Tool	7	7	
National Industrial Reserve Act:							
In storage	75,790,900	76,076,900	+$286,000	do	6,593	6,607	+14
On lease	27,500	27,500		do	1	1	
On loan to other agencies	10,900	10,900		do	2	2	
On loan to school programs	12,056,000	12,264,000	+208,000	do	2,857	2,923	+66
Total	87,885,300	88,379,300	+494,000	do	9,453	9,533	+80
Total, machine tools	87,930,600	88,424,600	+494,000	do	9,460	9,540	+80

Source: Compiled from reports submitted by the General Services Administration.

TABLE 5.—*Helium inventories, October 1964 (showing by item net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity)*

Item	Cost value			Quantity			
	Beginning of month, Oct. 1, 1964	End of month, Oct. 31, 1964	Net change during month	Unit of measure	Beginning of month, Oct. 1, 1964	End of month, Oct. 31, 1964	Net change during month
Helium:							
Stored aboveground	$241,625	$229,345	−$12,280	Cubic foot	21,300,000	20,300,000	−1,000,000
Stored underground	47,011,511	50,534,736	+3,523,225	do	4,526,200,000	4,787,000,000	+260,800,000
Total, helium	47,253,136	50,764,081	+3,510,945	do	4,547,500,000	4,807,300,000	+259,800,000

Source: Compiled from reports submitted by the Department of the Interior.

APPENDIX A—PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS AND STATUTORY CITATIONS

STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS

National stockpile

The Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98-98h) provides for the establishment and maintenance of a national stockpile of strategic and critical materials. The General Services Administration is responsible for making purchases of strategic and critical materials and providing for their storage, security, and maintenance. These functions are performed in accordance with directives issued by the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning. The act also provides for the transfer from other Government agencies of strategic and critical materials which are excess to the needs of such other agencies and are required to meet the stockpile objectives established by OEP. In addition, the General Services Administration is responsible for disposing of those strategic and critical materials which OEP determines to be no longer needed for stockpile purposes.

General policies for strategic and critical materials stockpiling are contained in DMO V-7, issued by the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning and published in the Federal Register of December 19, 1959 (24 F.R. 10309). Portions of this order relate also to Defense Production Act inventories.

Defense Production Act

Under section 303 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2093) and Executive Order 10480, as amended, the General Services Administration is authorized to make purchases of or commitments to purchase metals, minerals, and other materials, for Government use or resale, in order to expand productive capacity and supply, and also to store the materials acquired as a result of such purchases or commitments. Such functions are carried out in accordance with programs certified by the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning.

Supplemental—barter

As a result of a delegation of authority from OEP (32A CFR, ch. I, DMO V-4) the General Services Administration is responsible for the maintenance and storage of materials placed in the supplemental stockpile. Section 206 of the Agricultural Act of 1956 (7 U.S.C. 1856) provides that strategic and other materials acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation as a result of barter or exchange of agricultural products, unless acquired for the national stockpile or for other purposes, shall be transferred to the supplemental stockpile established by section 104(b) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1704(b)). In addition to the materials which have been or may be so acquired, the materials obtained under the programs established pursuant to the Domestic Tungsten, Asbestos, Fluorspar, and Columbium-Tantalum Production and Purchase Act of 1956 (50 U.S.C. App. 2191–2195), which terminated December 31, 1958, have been transferred to the supplemental stockpile, as authorized by the provisions of said Production and Purchase Act.

AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

The price-support program

Price-support operations are carried out under the charter powers (15 U.S.C. 714) of the Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture, in conformity with the Agricultural Act of 1949 (7 U.S.C. 1421), the Agricultural Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1741), which includes the National Wool Act of 1954, the Agricultural Act of 1956 (7 U.S.C. 1442), the Agricultural Act of 1958 and with respect to certain types of tobacco, in conformity with the act of July 28, 1945, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1312). Under the Agricultural Act of 1949, price support is mandatory for the basic commodities—corn, cotton, wheat, rice, peanuts, and tobacco—and specific nonbasic commodities; namely, tung nuts, honey, milk, butterfat, and the products of milk and butterfat. Under the Agricultural Act of 1958, as producers of corn voted in favor of the new price-support program for corn authorized by that act, price support is mandatory for barley, oats, rye, and grain sorghums. Price support for wool and mohair is mandatory under the National Wool Act of 1954, through the marketing year ending March 31, 1966. Price support for other nonbasic agricultural commodities is discretionary except that, whenever the price of either cottonseed or soybeans is supported, the price of the other must be supported at such level as the Secretary determines will cause them to compete on equal terms on the market. This program may also include operations to remove and dispose of or aid in the removal or disposition of surplus agricultural commodities for the purpose of stabilizing prices at levels not in excess of permissible price-support levels.

Price support is made available through loans, purchase agreements, purchases, and other operations, and, in the case of wool and mohair, through incentive payments based on marketings. The producers' commodities serve as collateral for price-support loans. With limited exceptions, price-support loans are nonrecourse and the Corporation looks only to the pledged or mortgaged collateral for satisfaction of the loan. Purchase agreements generally are available during the same period that loans are available. By signing a purchase agreement, a producer receives an option to sell to the Corporation any quantity of the commodity which he may elect within the maximum specified in the agreement.

The major effect on budgetary expenditures is represented by the disbursements for price-support loans. The largest part of the commodity acquisitions under the program result from the forfeiting of commodities pledged as loan collateral for which the expenditures occurred at the time of making the loan, rather than at the time of acquiring the commodities.

Dispositions of commodities acquired by the Corporation in its price-support operations are made in compliance with sections 202, 407, and 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, and other applicable legislation, particularly the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1691), title I of the Agricultural Act of 1954, title II of the Agricultural Act of 1956, the Agricultural Act of 1958, the act of August 19, 1958, in the case of cornmeal and wheat flour, and the act of September 21, 1959, with regard to sales of livestock feed in emergency areas.

Inventory transferred from national stockpile

This inventory, all cotton, was transferred to Commodity Credit Corporation at no cost from the national stockpile pursuant to Public Law 85-96 and Public Law 87-548. The proceeds from sales, less costs incurred by CCC, are covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts; therefore, such proceeds and costs are not recorded in the operating accounts. The cost value as shown for this cotton has been computed on the basis of average per bale cost of each type of cotton when purchased by CCC for the national stockpile.

CIVIL DEFENSE SUPPLIES AND EQUIPMENT

Civil defense stockpile

The Department of Defense conducts this stockpiling program pursuant to section 201 (h) of Public Law 920, 81st Congress, as amended. The program is designed to provide some of the most essential materials to minimize the effects upon the civilian population which would be caused by an attack upon the United States. Supplies and equipment normally unavailable, or lacking in quantity needed to cope with such conditions, are stockpiled at strategic locations in a nationwide warehouse system consisting of general storage facilities.

Civil defense medical stockpile

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare conducts the stockpiling program for medical supplies and equipment pursuant to section 201(h) of Public Law 920, 81st Congress, as delegated by the President following the intent of Reorganization Plan No. 1, of 1958. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare plans and directs the procurement, storage, maintenance, inspection, survey, distribution, and utilization of essential supplies and equipment for emergency health services. The medical stockpile includes a program designed to preposition assembled emergency hospitals and other medical supplies and equipment into communities throughout the Nation.

MACHINE TOOLS

Defense Production Act

Under section 303 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2093) and Executive Order 10480, as amended, the General Services Administration has acquired machine tools in furtherance of expansion of productive capacity, in accordance with programs certified by the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning.

National industrial equipment reserve

Under general policies established and directives issued by the Secretary of Defense, the General Services Administration is responsible for care, maintenance, utilization, transfer, leasing, lending to nonprofit schools, disposal, transportation, repair, restoration, and renovation of national industrial reserve equipment transferred to GSA under the National Industrial Reserve Act of 1948 (50 U.S.C. 451–462).

HELIUM

The helium conservation program is conducted by the Department of the Interior pursuant to the Helium Act, approved September 13, 1960 (Public Law 86–777; 74 Stat. 918; 50 U.S.C. 167) and subsequent appropriations acts which have established fiscal limitations and provided borrowing authority for the program. Among other things, the Helium Act authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to produce helium in Government plants, to acquire helium from private plants, to sell helium to meet current demands, and to store for future use helium that is so produced or acquired in excess of that required to meet current demands. Sales of helium by the Secretary of the Interior shall be at prices established by him which shall be adequate to liquidate the costs of the program within 25 years, except that this period may be extended by the Secretary for not more than 10 years for funds borrowed for purposes other than the acquisition and construction of helium plants and facilities.

This report covers helium that is produced in Government plants and acquired from private plants. Helium in excess of current demands is stored in the Cliffside gasfield near Amarillo, Tex. The unit of measure is cubic foot at 14.7 pounds per square inch absolute pressure and 70° F.

APPENDIX B—NEW STOCKPILE OBJECTIVES

The Office of Emergency Planning is in the process of establishing new objectives for strategic and critical materials. Table 1 of this report reflects the new objectives established between May 1963 and April 1964 for 79 materials (including 3 removed from stockpile list), based on essential need in the event of a "conventional war emergency." The new objective for each material has been noted in the reports, beginning with June 1963, for the months in which the respective objectives were established.

The following excerpts from OEP statements dated July 11 and 19, 1963, February 28, 1964, March 6, 13, 20, and 27, 1964, and April 3 and 10, 1964, set forth the new policy with respect to objectives for strategic and critical materials.

"The Office of Emergency Planning is now conducting supply-requirements studies for all stockpile materials which will reflect current military, industrial, and other essential needs in the event of a conventional war emergency. On the basis of recently completed supply-requirements studies for the foregoing materials, the new stockpile objectives were established with the advice and assistance of the Interdepartmental Materials Advisory Committee, a group chaired by the Office of Emergency Planning and composed of representatives of the Departments of State, Defense, the Interior, Agriculture, Commerce, and Labor, and the General Services Administration, the Agency for International Development, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Representatives of the Bureau of the Budget, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the Small Business Administration participate as observers.

"These new objectives reflect a new policy to establish a single objective for each stockpile material. They have been determined on the basis of criteria heretofore used in establishing maximum objectives, and reflect the approximate calculated emergency deficits for the materials for conventional war and do not have any arbitrary adjustments for possible increased requirements for other types of emergency.

"Heretofore, there was a 'basic objective' and a 'maximum objective' for each material. The basic objectives assumed some continued reliance on foreign sources of supply in an emergency. The former maximum objectives completely discounted foreign sources of supply beyond North America and comparable accessible areas.

"Previously, maximum objectives could not be less than 6 months' normal usage of the material by industry in the United States in periods of active demand. The 6-month rule has been eliminated in establishing the new calculated conventional war objectives.

"The Office of Emergency Planning also announced that the present Defense Mobilization Order V–7, dealing with general policies for strategic and critical materials stockpiling, was now being revised to reflect these new policies. When finally prepared and approved, the new order will be published in the Federal Register.

"New conventional war objectives for the remaining stockpile materials are being developed as rapidly as new supply-requirements data become available. They will be released as they are approved.

"The Office of Emergency Planning is also making studies to determine stockpile needs to meet the requirements of general nuclear war and reconstruction. Stockpile objectives for nuclear war have not previously been developed. Some commodity objectives may be higher and others may be lower than the objectives established for conventional war.

"After the nuclear war supply requirements studies are completed, stockpile objectives will be based upon calculated deficits for either conventional war or nuclear war, whichever need is larger.

"The Office of Emergency Planning stressed that any long-range disposal programs undertaken prior to the development of objectives based on nuclear war assumptions would provide against disposing of quantities which might be needed to meet essential requirements in the event of nuclear attack. While the disposal of surplus materials can produce many problems which have not heretofore arisen, every effort will be made to see that the interest of producers, processors, and consumers, and the international interests of the United States are carefully considered, both in the development and carrying out of disposal programs. Before decisions are made regarding the adoption of a long-range disposal program for a particular item in the stockpile, there will be appropriate consultations with industry in order to obtain the advice of interested parties."

The OEP statement of April 17, 1964, contained the following excerpts:

"Today's action completes supply requirements studies for all stockpile materials based on current military, industrial, and other essential needs in the event of a conventional war emergency. Objectives for 79 materials in the stockpile were established with the advice and assistance of the Interdepartmental Materials Advisory Committee, a group chaired by OEP and composed of representatives of the Departments of State, Defense, the Interior, Agriculture, Commerce, and Labor, and the General Services Administration, the Agency for International Development, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Representatives of the Bureau of the Budget, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the Small Business Administration participate as observers.

"These new objectives reflect a new policy which accords with the recommendation of the Executive Stockpile Committee to establish a single objective for each material in the national stockpile. These new objectives will be reviewed and revised as necessary each year. Because military requirements and estimated emergency supplies of stockpile materials are constantly shifting, the supply requirements balance for any material that is now or may become important to defense must be kept under continuing surveillance. Supply requirements studies of the conventional war needs of approximately 20 other strategic and critical materials, which do not have stockpile objectives, are underway and are expected to be completed in the next few weeks. At the same time, studies on supply requirements for nuclear war are going forward. No definite date for completion of these studies has been established as yet.

"OEP stressed that long-range programs for disposal of identified surpluses would take into account the interests of producers, processors, and consumers, as well as the international interests of the United States. Appropriate consultation with industry will precede all decisions for the adoption of every disposal program and the advice of interested parties will be sought."

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD OF VIRGINIA

The cost value of Federal stockpile inventories as of October 31, 1964, totaled $13,746,416,569. This was a net decrease of $252,906,752, as compared with the October 1 total of $13,999,323,321. Net changes during the month are summarized by major category as follows:

Major category	Cost value, October 1964	
	Net change during month	Total, end of month
Strategic and critical materials	−$47, 560, 968	$8, 423, 673, 574
Agricultural commodities	−209, 413, 667	4, 970, 794, 149
Civil defense supplies and equipment	+62, 938	212, 760, 165
Machine tools	+494, 000	88, 424, 600
Helium	+3, 510, 945	50, 764, 081
Total	−252, 906, 752	13, 746, 416, 569

These figures are from the October 1964 report on Federal stockpile inventories compiled from official agency data by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, showing detail with respect to quantity and cost value of each commodity in the inventories covered.

STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS

So-called strategic and critical materials are stored by the Government in (1) the national stockpile, (2) the Defense Production Act inventory, and (3) the supplemental-barter stockpile.

Overall, there are now 94 materials stockpiled in the strategic and critical inventories. Stockpile objectives—in terms of volume—are presently fixed for 76 of these 94 materials. Of the 76 materials having stockpile objectives, 63 were stockpiled in excess of their objectives as of October 31, 1964.

Increases in cost value were reported in 17 of the materials stockpiled in all strategic and critical inventories, decreases were reported in 23 materials, and 54 materials remained unchanged during October.

National stockpile

The cost value of materials in the national stockpile as of October 31, 1964, totaled $5,594,391,500. This was a net decrease of $39,204,900 during the month. The largest decreases were $9,087,700 in zinc, $8,878,900 in rubber, $8,290,900 in lead, $6,807,600 in tin, and $4,170,500 in molybdenum.

Defense Production Act inventory

The cost value of materials in the Defense Production Act inventory as of October 31, 1964, totaled $1,440,197,800. This was a net decrease of $10,798,100. The largest decreases were in copper and aluminum.

Supplemental-barter

The cost value of materials in the supplemental-barter stockpile as of October 31, 1964 totaled $1,389,084,274. This was a net increase of $2,442,032. The largest increase was in manganese.

OTHER STOCKPILE INVENTORIES

Among the other categories of stockpiled materials covered by the report the largest is $5 billion in agricultural commodities. Major decreases in agricultural commodities during October were reported for cotton, wheat, and milk and butterfat.

Inventories of civil defense supplies and equipment showed a net increase; the machine tools inventories showed a net increase, and the helium inventories showed a net increase during October.

REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—PERSONNEL AND PAY

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, I submit a summary of monthly personnel reports on civilian employment in the executive branch of the Federal Government issued during the recess of the Congress. These reports were concerned with employment and payrolls during the period August to November 1964, inclusive.

In accordance with the practice of several years standing, I ask unanimous consent that the summary, together with a statement by me, be printed in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the summary and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Personnel and pay summary, August through November 1964

Total and major categories	Civilian personnel in executive branch			Payroll (in thousands) in executive branch		
	In November numbered—	In August numbered—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)	In October was—	In July was—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
Total [1]	[2] 2, 493, 838	2, 495, 606	−1, 768	$1, 447, 278	$1, 430, 120	+$17, 158
Agencies exclusive of Department of Defense	1, 470, 354	1, 461, 960	+8, 394	848, 723	835, 445	+13, 278
Department of Defense	1, 023, 484	1, 033, 646	−10, 162	598, 555	594, 675	+3, 880
Inside the United States	2, 333, 506	2, 337, 527	−4, 021			
Outside the United States	160, 332	158, 079	+2, 253			
Industrial employment	544, 681	552, 522	−7, 841			
Foreign nationals	135, 079	135, 516	−437	24, 980	25, 106	−126

[1] Exclusive of foreign nationals shown in the last line of this summary.

[2] Includes 25,086 temporary employees (enumerators, clerks, supervisors, crew leaders, etc.) of the Department of Commerce engaged in taking the 1964 Agricultural Census.

TABLE I.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during November 1964, and comparison with August 1964, and pay for October 1964, and comparison with July*

Department or agency	Personnel				Pay (in thousands)			
	November	August	Increase	Decrease	October	July	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):								
Agriculture	100,520	111,637		11,117	$60,280	$62,470		$2,190
Commerce	[1] 56,358	32,345	24,013		23,022	23,471		449
Health, Education, and Welfare	83,407	83,813		406	48,648	48,817		169
Interior	[3] 62,722	[3] 68,239		5,517	40,230	43,428		3,198
Justice	32,649	32,802		153	22,991	24,165		174
Labor	9,177	9,313		136	7,534	6,628	$906	
Post Office	597,561	593,196	4,365		319,620	301,721	17,899	
State [4] [5]	41,306	41,678		372	24,576	24,289	287	
Treasury	85,914	87,393		1,479	57,149	58,294		1,145
Executive Office of the President:								
White House Office	337	350		13	283	268	15	
Bureau of the Budget	496	514		18	525	517	8	
Council of Economic Advisers	47	41	6		46	41	5	
Executive Mansion and Grounds	75	77		2	47	56		9
National Aeronautics and Space Council	24	26		2	29	25	4	
National Security Council	39	42		3	40	40		
Office of Economic Opportunity [6]	280		280		26		26	
Office of Emergency Planning	347	336	11		347	333	14	
Office of Science and Technology	53	76		23	48	55		7
Office of the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations	27	32		5	37	29	8	
President's Commission on the Assassination of President Kennedy	4	22		18	7	27		20
President's Committee on Consumer Interests	12	12			9	15		6
President's Committee on Equal Opportunity in Housing	10	10			9	8	1	
Independent agencies:								
Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations	24	26		2	22	31		9
American Battle Monuments Commission	416	440		24	83	103		20
Atomic Energy Commission	7,229	7,317		88	6,360	6,220	140	
Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System	634	637		3	467	471		4
Civil Aeronautics Board	829	838		9	780	736	44	
Civil Service Commission	3,791	3,812		21	2,693	2,624	69	
Civil War Centennial Commission	5	5			5	5		
Commission of Fine Arts	6	6			6	6		
Commission on Civil Rights	92	93		1	63	60	3	
Delaware River Basin Commission	2	2			3	3		
Export-Import Bank of Washington	300	295	5		240	210	30	
Farm Credit Administration	230	227	3		191	205		14
Federal Aviation Agency	44,941	45,480		539	35,854	36,576		723
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review	7	7			5	5		
Federal Communications Commission	1,536	1,520	16		1,223	1,210	13	
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,391	1,355	36		997	998		1
Federal Home Loan Bank Board	1,250	1,283		33	981	985		4
Federal Maritime Commission	240	238	2		210	205	5	
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	418	416	2		425	412	13	
Federal Power Commission	1,114	1,099	15		909	899	10	
Federal Radiation Council	5	4	1		5	4	1	
Federal Reconstruction and Development Planning Commission for Alaska [7]		6		6	3	5		2
Federal Trade Commission	1,156	1,140	16		951	950	1	
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	217	215	2		125	119	6	
General Accounting Office	4,266	4,355		89	3,250	3,273		23
General Services Administration	34,637	34,974		337	18,468	19,033		565
Government Printing Office	7,443	7,415	28		4,550	4,984		434
Housing and Home Finance Agency	13,781	13,779	2		9,682	9,739		57
Indian Claims Commission	20	20			26	21	5	
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,388	2,395		7	1,896	1,851	45	
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	32,982	33,066		84	28,844	27,485	1,359	
National Capital Housing Authority	438	439		1	219	224		5
National Capital Planning Commission	55	55			45	48		3
National Capital Transportation Agency	35	36		1	37	43		6
National Commission on Food Marketing [8]	8		8					
National Council on the Arts [9]	1		1					
National Gallery of Art	320	318	2		152	155		3
National Labor Relations Board	2,103	2,095	8		1,696	1,651	45	
National Mediation Board	133	127	6		140	127	13	
National Science Foundation	1,106	943	163		787	766	21	
Panama Canal	15,016	14,679	337		6,020	4,194	1,826	
President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity	56	62		6	45	47		2
Railroad Retirement Board	1,777	1,823		46	1,168	1,186		18
Renegotiation Board	195	199		4	197	195	2	
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	157	161		4	109	111		2
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,383	1,379	4		1,095	1,078	17	
Selective Service System	7,128	7,128			2,656	2,503	153	
Small Business Administration	3,489	3,401	88		2,564	2,503	61	
Smithsonian Institution	1,695	1,697		2	953	962		9
Soldiers' Home	1,107	1,120		13	395	403		8
Subversive Activities Control Board	26	28		2	29	24	5	
Tariff Commission	280	283		3	235	233	2	
Tax Court of the United States	153	157		4	155	147	8	
Temporary Alaska Claims Commission [10]	3		3					
Tennessee Valley Authority	16,959	17,612		653	11,588	12,230		642
U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency	157	159		2	187	158	29	
U.S. Information Agency	11,848	11,911		63	6,208	4,763	1,445	
United States-Puerto Rico Commission on the Status of Puerto Rico	12	4	8		4	1	3	
Veterans' Administration	171,678	171,273	405		86,105	87,364		1,259
Virgin Islands Corporation	320	451		131	115	204		89
Woodrow Wilson Memorial Commission	1	1			(11)	(11)		
Total, excluding Department of Defense	1,470,354	1,461,960	29,836	21,442	848,723	835,445	24,547	11,269
Net increase, excluding Department of Defense			8,394				13,278	

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE I.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during November 1964, and comparison with August 1964, and pay for October 1964, and comparison with July*—Continued

Department or agency	Personnel				Pay (in thousands)			
	November	August	Increase	Decrease	October	July	Increase	Decrease
Department of Defense:								
Office of the Secretary of Defense	2,076	2,084		8	$2,086	$1,967	$119	
Department of the Army	[12] 364,870	372,206		7,336	212,099	204,209	7,890	
Department of the Navy	[12] 327,331	330,165		2,834	195,539	[3] 201,475		$5,936
Department of the Air Force	[12] 291,484	293,343		1,859	166,900	166,948		48
Defense Atomic Support Agency	1,892	1,911		19	1,052	1,070		18
Defense Communications Agency	940	908	32		758	741	17	
Defense Intelligence Agency	2,150	2,110	40		1,660	1,636	24	
Defense Supply Agency	[12] 32,203	30,389	1,814		18,134	16,302	1,832	
U.S. Court of Military Appeals	40	41		1	40	38	2	
Interdepartmental activities	9	8	1		5	5		
International military activities	56	55	1		39	44		5
Armed Forces information and education activities	433	426	7		243	240	3	
Total, Department of Defense	1,023,484	1,033,646	1,895	12,057	598,555	594,675	9,887	6,007
Net change, Department of Defense			10,162				3,880	
Grand total, including Department of Defense [13]	2,493,838	2,495,606	31,731	33,499	1,447,278	1,430,120	34,434	17,276
Net change, including Department of Defense			1,768				17,158	

[1] Includes 25,086 temporary employees (enumerators, clerks, supervisors, crew leaders, etc.) engaged in taking the 1964 Agricultural Census.

[2] Includes 10 employees in the Job Corps employed under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (Public Law 88-452).

[3] Revised on basis of later information.

[4] November figure includes 15,375 employees of the Agency for International Development as compared with 15,564 in August and their pay. These AID figures include employees who are paid from foreign currencies deposited by foreign governments in a trust fund for this purpose. The November figure includes 4,028 of these trust fund employees and the August figure includes 4,083.

[5] November figure includes 1,132 employees of the Peace Corps as compared with 1,139 in August and their pay.

[6] New agency, created pursuant to Public Law 88-452.

[7] Agency abolished pursuant to Executive Order 11182 dated Oct. 2, 1964.

[8] New agency, created pursuant to Public Law 88-354.

[9] New agency, created pursuant to Public Law 88-579.

[10] New agency, created pursuant to Executive Order 11144 dated Mar. 5, 1964.

[11] Less than $500.

[12] In November 1,893 employees and their functions were transferred to the Defense Supply Agency as follows: 699 from the Department of the Army, 715 from the Department of the Navy, and 478 from the Department of the Air Force.

[13] Exclusive of personnel and pay of the Central Intelligence Agency and the National Security Agency.

TABLE II.—*Federal personnel inside the United States employed by the executive agencies during November 1964, and comparison with August 1964*

Department or agency	November	August	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	99,277	110,402		11,125
Commerce	55,352	31,687	23,665	
Health, Education, and Welfare	82,740	83,122		382
Interior	62,087	[1] 67,641		5,554
Justice	32,291	[1] 32,436		145
Labor	9,069	9,215		146
Post Office	595,974	591,596	4,378	
State [2] [3]	10,919	11,113		194
Treasury	85,238	86,718		1,480
Executive Office of the President:				
White House Office	337	350		13
Bureau of the Budget	496	514		18
Council of Economic Advisers	47	41	6	
Executive Mansion and Grounds	75	77		2
National Aeronautics and Space Council	24	26		2
National Security Council	39	42		3
Office of Economic Opportunity [4]	280		280	
Office of Emergency Planning	347	336	11	
Office of Science and Technology	53	76		23
Office of the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations	27	32		5
President's Commission on the Assassination of President Kennedy	4	22		18
President's Committee on Consumer Interests	12	12		
President's Committee on Equal Opportunity in Housing	10	10		
Independent agencies:				
Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations	24	26		2
American Battle Monuments Commission	7	7		
Atomic Energy Commission	7,195	7,281		86
Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System	634	637		3
Civil Aeronautics Board	829	838		9
Civil Service Commission	3,789	3,810		21
Civil War Centennial Commission	5	5		
Commission of Fine Arts	6	6		
Commission on Civil Rights	92	93		1
Delaware River Basin Commission	2	2		
Export-Import Bank of Washington	300	295	5	
Farm Credit Administration	230	227	3	
Federal Aviation Agency	43,818	44,367		549
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review	7	7		
Federal Communications Commission	1,533	1,517	16	
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,389	1,353	36	
Federal Home Loan Bank Board	1,250	1,283		33
Federal Maritime Commission	240	238	2	
Independent agencies—Continued				
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	418	416	2	
Federal Power Commission	1,114	1,099	15	
Federal Radiation Council	5	4	1	
Federal Reconstruction and Development Planning Commission for Alaska [5]		6		6
Federal Trade Commission	1,156	1,140	16	
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	192	183	9	
General Accounting Office	4,209	4,287		78
General Services Administration	34,609	34,950		341
Government Printing Office	7,443	7,415	28	
Housing and Home Finance Agency	13,568	13,576		8
Indian Claims Commission	20	20		
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,388	2,395		7
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	32,966	33,054		88
National Capital Housing Authority	438	439		1
National Capital Planning Commission	55	55		
National Capital Transportation Agency	35	36		1
National Commission on Food Marketing [6]	8		8	
National Council on the Arts [7]	1		1	
National Gallery of Art	320	318	2	
National Labor Relations Board	2,070	2,061	9	
National Mediation Board	133	127	6	
National Science Foundation	1,101	940	161	
Panama Canal	160	169		9
President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity	56	62		6
Railroad Retirement Board	1,777	1,823		46
Renegotiation Board	195	199		4
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	157	161		4
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,383	1,379	4	
Selective Service System	6,975	6,978		3
Small Business Administration	3,430	3,343	87	
Smithsonian Institution	1,674	1,677		3
Soldiers' Home	1,107	1,120		13
Subversive Activities Control Board	26	28		2
Tariff Commission	280	283		3
Tax Court of the United States	153	157		4
Temporary Alaska Claims Commission [5]	3		3	
Tennessee Valley Authority	16,956	17,610		654
U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency	157	159		2
U.S. Information Agency	3,487	3,485	2	
United States-Puerto Rico Commission on the Status of Puerto Rico	9	4	5	
Veterans' Administration	170,693	170,285	408	

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE II.—*Federal personnel inside the United States employed by the executive agencies during November 1964, and comparison with August 1964*—Continued

Department or agency	November	August	Increase	Decrease
Independent agencies—Continued				
Woodrow Wilson Memorial Commission	1	1		
Total, excluding Department of Defense	1,406,976	1,398,904	29,169	21,097
Net increase, excluding Department of Defense			8,072	
Department of Defense:				
Office of the Secretary of Defense	2,028	2,035		7
Department of the Army	[9] 316,998	324,207		7,209
Department of the Navy	[9] 304,146	307,221		3,075
Department of the Air Force	[9] 265,706	269,381		3,675
Defense Atomic Support Agency	1,892	1,911		19
Defense Communications Agency	892	860	32	
Defense Intelligence Agency	2,150	2,110	40	
Department of Defense—Continued				
Defense Supply Agency	[9] 32,203	30,389	1,814	
U.S. Court of Military Appeals	40	41		1
Interdepartmental activities	9	8	1	
International military activities	33	34		1
Armed Forces information and education activities	433	426	7	
Total, Department of Defense	926,530	938,623	1,894	13,987
Net decrease, Department of Defense			12,093	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	2,333,506	2,337,527	31,063	35,084
Net decrease, including Department of Defense			4,021	

---

[1] Revised on basis of later information.

[2] November figure includes 2,971 employees of the Agency for International Development as compared with 3,110 in August.

[3] November figure includes 733 employees of the Peace Corps as compared with 748 in August.

[4] New agency, created pursuant to Public Law 88-452.

[5] Agency abolished pursuant to Executive Order 11182 dated Oct. 2, 1964.

[6] New agency, created pursuant to Public Law 88-354.

[7] New agency, created pursuant to Public Law 88-579.

[8] New agency, created pursuant to Executive Order 11144 dated March 5, 1964.

[9] In November 1,893 employees and their functions were transferred to the Defense Supply Agency as follows: 699 from the Deaprtment of the Army, 715 from the Department of the Navy, and 478 from the Department of the Air Force.

TABLE III.—*Federal personnel outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during November 1964, and comparison with August 1964*

Department or agency	November	August	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	1,243	1,235	8	
Commerce	1,006	658	348	
Health, Education, and Welfare	667	691		24
Interior	635	[1] 598	37	
Justice	358	[1] 366		8
Labor	108	98	10	
Post Office	1,587	1,600		13
State [2] [3]	30,387	30,565		178
Treasury	676	675	1	
Independent agencies:				
American Battle Monuments Commission	409	433		24
Atomic Energy Commission	34	36		2
Civil Service Commission	2	2		
Federal Aviation Agency	1,123	1,113	10	
Federal Communications Commission	3	3		
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	2	2		
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	25	32		7
General Accounting Office	57	68		11
General Services Administration	28	24	4	
Housing and Home Finance Agency	213	203	10	
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	16	12	4	
National Labor Relations Board	33	34		1
National Science Foundation	5	3	2	
Panama Canal	14,856	14,510	346	
Selective Service System	153	150	3	
Small Business Administration	59	58	1	
Independent agencies—Continued				
Smithsonian Institution	21	20	1	
Tennessee Valley Authority	3	2	1	
U.S. Information Agency	8,361	8,426		65
United States-Puerto Rico Commission on the Status of Puerto Rico	3		3	
Veterans' Administration	985	988		3
Virgin Islands Corporation	320	451		131
Total, excluding Department of Defense	63,378	63,056	789	467
Net increase, excluding Department of Defense			322	
Department of Defense:				
Office of the Secretary of Defense	48	49		1
Department of the Army	47,872	47,999		127
Department of the Navy	23,185	22,944	241	
Department of the Air Force	25,778	23,962	1,816	
Defense Communications Agency	48	48		
International military activities	23	21	2	
Total, Department of Defense	96,954	95,023	2,059	128
Net increase, Department of Defense			1,931	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	160,332	158,079	2,848	595
Net increase, including Department of Defense			2,253	

---

[1] Revised on basis of later information.

[2] November figure includes 12,404 employees of the Agency for International Development as compared with 12,454 in August. These AID figures include employees who are paid from foreign currencies deposited by foreign governments in a trust fund for this purpose. The November figure includes 4,028 of these trust fund employees and the August figure includes 4,083.

[3] November figure includes 399 employees of the Peace Corps as compared with 391 in August.

TABLE IV.—*Industrial employees of the Federal Government inside and outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during November 1964, and comparison with August 1964*

Department or agency	November	August	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	3,649	3,594	55	
Commerce	5,640	5,769		129
Interior	9,600	9,635		35
Post Office	264	276		12
Treasury	5,395	5,410		15
Independent agencies:				
Atomic Energy Commission	255	272		17
Federal Aviation Agency	2,565	2,709		144
General Services Administration	2,483	2,061	422	
Government Printing Office	7,443	7,415	28	
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	32,982	33,066		84
Panama Canal	7,248	7,282		34
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	156	160		4
Tennessee Valley Authority	13,843	14,477		634
Virgin Islands Corporation	320	451		131
Total, excluding Department of Defense	91,843	92,577	505	1,239
Net decrease, excluding Department of Defense			734	
Department of Defense:				
Department of the Army:				
Inside the United States	[1] 135,316	[2] 138,553		3,237
Outside the United States	[1] 4,378	[2] 4,331	47	
Department of the Navy:				
Inside the United States	184,090	186,360		2,270
Outside the United States	1,279	1,274	5	
Department of the Air Force:				
Inside the United States	125,366	126,922		1,556
Outside the United States	832	886		54
Defense Supply Agency:				
Inside the United States	1,577	1,619		42
Total, Department of Defense	452,838	459,945	52	7,159
Net decrease, Department of Defense			7,107	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	544,681	552,522	557	8,398
Net decrease, including Department of Defense			7,841	

---

[1] Subject to revision.

[2] Revised on basis of later information.

TABLE V.—*Foreign nationals working under U.S. agencies overseas, excluded from tables I through IV of this report, whose services are provided by contractual agreement between the United States and foreign governments, or because of the nature of their work or the source of funds from which they are paid, as of November 1964 and comparison with August 1964*

Country	Total		Army		Navy		Air Force	
	November	August	November	August	November	August	November	August
Crete	82	83					82	83
England	2,538	2,470	104		91	83	2,343	2,387
France	16,075	16,295	12,729	13,011	8	9	3,338	3,275
Germany	67,423	67,226	56,731	56,635	70	71	10,622	10,520
Greece	308	294			36	35	272	259
Japan	42,233	42,655	14,484	14,688	12,427	12,502	15,322	15,46
Korea	5,441	5,471	5,441	5,471				
Morocco	561	609			561	609		
Netherlands	50	53					50	53
Trinidad	368	360			368	360		
Total	135,079	135,516	89,489	89,805	13,561	13,669	32,029	32,042

STATEMENT OF SENATOR BYRD OF VIRGINIA

Civilian employment in the executive branch of the Federal Government decreased 1,768 during the period August through November 1964. The total in August was 2,495,606. In November there were 2,493,838 civilian employees, including 25,086 temporary employees of the Department of Commerce engaged in taking the 1964 agricultural census.

Employment by civilian agencies of the Federal Government showed a net increase of 8,394 during the period from August through November 1964, increasing from 1,461,960 in August to 1,470,354 in November. Civilian employment in the Department of Defense decreased 10,162 during the same period, decreasing from 1,033,646 in August to 1,023,484 in November.

Inside the United States civilian employment decreased 4,021 from 2,337,527 in August to 2,333,506 in November. Outside the United States, civilian employment increased 2,253 from 158,079 in August to 160,332 in November. Industrial employment by Federal agencies decreased 7,841 from 552,522 in August to 544,681 in November.

In July the Federal civilian payroll was running at an annual rate of $17,161 million and in October it was running at an annual rate of $17,367 million. These figures summarize compilations of monthly personnel reports certified by executive agencies to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures since Congress adjourned October 3, 1964.

In addition to this regularly reported civilian employment, there were foreign nationals working under U.S. agencies overseas, excluded from usual personnel reporting, whose services are provided by contractual agreement between the United States and foreign governments, or because of the nature of their work or the source of funds from which they are paid. These numbered 135,516 in August and 135,079 in November, a decrease of 437.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. SALTONSTALL, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Paul R. Ignatius, of Massachusetts, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

By Mr. SYMINGTON, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Gen. John P. McConnell (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force, for appointment as Chief of Staff, U.S. Air Force.

By Mr. CANNON, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Gen. Curtis E. LeMay (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force, to be placed on the retired list in the grade of general;

Lt. Gen. Walter King Wilson, Jr., Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army), to be placed on the retired list in the grade of lieutenant general;

Maj. Gen. William Frederick Cassidy, U.S. Army, for appointment as Chief of Engineers, U.S. Army;

Maj. Gen. William Frederick Cassidy, U.S. Army, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President, in the grade of lieutenant general; and

Maj. Gen. Berton Everett Spivy, Jr., U.S. Army, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President, in the grade of lieutenant general.

By Mr. THURMOND, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Gen. Hugh Pate Harris, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army), to be placed on the retired list in the grade of general.

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Manuel L. Real, of California, to be U.S. attorney for the southern district of California; and

Edwin Langley, of Oklahoma, to be U.S. district judge for the eastern district of Oklahoma.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed Services, I report favorably the nominations of 2,863 captains, for promotion to the grade of major in the Air Force, and 1,770 second lieutenants, for promotion to the grade of first lieutenant in the Air Force. Since these names have already been printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in order to save the expense of printing on the Executive Calendar, I ask unanimous consent that they be ordered to lie on the Secretary's desk, for the information of any Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations are as follows:

Leroy P. Ache, and sundry other officers, for promotion to first lieutenant in the Air Force; and

Doyce L. Aaron, and sundry other officers, for promotion to major in the Air Force.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 628. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 so as to increase the maximum amount for which an employee may be insured under such act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. COTTON:

S. 629. A bill for the relief of Danuta Kurowska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COTTON (for himself and Mr. MCINTYRE):

S. 630. A bill for the relief of Donald Schultze; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AIKEN:

S. 631. A bill to amend section 371 of title 28, United States Code, so as to permit United States judges who resign after attaining age 65 and after serving for at least 15 years to continue to receive the salary which they were receiving at the time of resignation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FANNIN:

S. 632. A bill for the relief of Flora Romano Torre; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOWER:

S. 633. A bill for the relief of Edwin A. and Mattie Lee Barnes;

S. 634. A bill for the relief of Margarite Steigel De Pravda; and

S. 635. A bill for the relief of Allen Roger Bradford; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT:

S. 636. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture jointly with the Secretary of Commerce to make a preliminary survey of the proposed Skyline Drive Recreation Way in the Manti-LaSal and Fishlake National Forests in the State of Utah; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. BENNETT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota:

S. 637. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey certain lands in the State of North Dakota to the Mountrail County Park Commission, Mountrail County, N. Dak.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 638. A bill for the relief of Maximo Tang-Sie; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT:

S. 639. A bill to amend section 379d(b) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, in order to exempt from the requirements of such section wheat which is produced or processed solely for donation to needy persons; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. BENNETT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BIBLE:

S. 640. A bill for the relief of Zenon Zubieta;

S. 641. A bill for the relief of Jesus Torrado-Espana;

S. 642. A bill for the relief of Chung K. Won; and

S. 643. A bill for the relief of Siua Vakauta (Siosiua Vaka'uta); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 644. A bill to authorize the chartering of organizations to insure conventional mortgage loans, to authorize the creation of secondary market organizations for conventional and other mortgage loans, to authorize the issuance of debentures upon the security of insured or guaranteed mortgages and to create a joint supervisory board to charter and examine such organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. Sparkman when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JACKSON (by request):

S. 645. A bill to provide for the restriction of certain areas in the Outer Continental Shelf, known as the Corpus Christi offshore warning area, for defense purposes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Jackson when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ERVIN (for himself, Mr. Johnston, Mr. Williams of New Jersey, Mr. Kennedy of Massachusetts, Mr. Bayh, Mr. Douglas, Mr. Hart, Mr. Mondale, Mr. Long of Missouri, Mr. Kennedy of New York, Mr. Hruska, and Mr. Fong):

S. 646. A bill to implement further the constitutional right to bail by authorizing in appropriate cases the release on a personal recognizance of persons otherwise eligible for bail;

S. 647. A bill to assure that convicted persons will receive credit toward service of their sentences for time spent in custody for lack of bail; and

S. 648. A bill to further implement the constitutional right to bail by permitting persons admitted to bail to make a cash deposit with the court in lieu of providing securities or other collateral security; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Ervin when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MOSS:

S. 649. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase to $2,400 the annual amount individuals are permitted to earn without suffering deductions from the insurance benefits payable to them under such title; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 650. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct, in cooperation with the States and interested Federal agencies, a development survey of the recreational resources of the Golden Circle of National Parks and Monuments and associated science, recreation, and Indian areas in the States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico and Utah, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 651. A bill for the relief of Leonard J. O'Keefe; and

S. 652. A bill for the relief of Marvin R. Waldo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Moss when he introduced the first two above-mentioned bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. BYRD of West Virginia:

S. 653. A bill for the relief of George Paluras (Georgios Palouras);

S. 654. A bill for the relief of Dr. Vedii Ayyildiz;

S. 655. A bill for the relief of Dr. Arsenio M. Orteza;

S. 656. A bill for the relief of Dr. Josefina Quintos Marcelo;

S. 657. A bill for the relief of Dr. Bernardino D. Marcelo;

S. 658. A bill for the relief of Dr. Constancio D. Katigbak and his wife, Imelda Katigbak;

S. 659. A bill for the relief of Dr. Restituto M. Cabaltica; and

S. 660. A bill for the relief of Dr. Eun Sook Hahn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGOVERN:

S. 661. A bill for the relief of Reverend Ke Joon Lee, and his wife, Young Nan Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGOVERN (for himself, Mr. Metcalf, Mr. Burdick, and Mr. McGee):

S. 662. A bill to encourage and accelerate the economic development of the upper Great Plains region, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. McGovern when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mrs. NEUBERGER:

S. 663. A bill to extend Federal meat inspection and to permit cooperation with State meat inspection services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mrs. Neuberger when she introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mrs. NEUBERGER (for herself and Mr. Morse):

S. 664. A bill to provide for the disposition of judgment funds of the Klamath and Modoc Tribes and Yahooskin Band of Snake Indians, and for other purposes; and

S. 665. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Merlin division, Rogue River basin project, Oregon, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

S. 666. A bill to give the consent of Congress to the construction of certain international bridges; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. GRUENING (for himself, Mr. Bartlett, and Mr. Moss):

S. 667. A bill to prohibit private contests against certain public land entries; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Gruening when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McCARTHY:

S. 668. A bill to make funds available to the Commodity Credit Corporation to carry out the feed grain program in the remainder of the fiscal year 1965, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

S. 669. A bill for the relief of Katherine Robbins; and

S. 670. A bill for the relief of Capt. Stanley Wing Handford, U.S. Navy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANSFIELD (for himself, Mr. Dirksen, and Mr. Dominick):

S. 671. A bill to authorize the U.S. Secret Service to protect the persons of the nominees of the major political parties for President and Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT (by request):

S. 672. A bill to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act, as amended, in order to increase the authorization for appropriations; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. Fulbright when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

S. 673. A bill to amend section 315 of the Communications Act of 1934 so as to eliminate the statutory requirement of affording equal time for use of broadcasting stations by candidates for public office; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Robertson when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HARTKE:

S 674. A bill for the relief of Vlassios Benatses (Bonatsos); and

S. 675. A bill for the relief of Sakelarious Pilatos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIRKSEN (by request):

S.J. Res. 31. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the week of November 18–24, 1965, as National Youth for Christ Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT (for himself and Mr. Inouye) (by request):

S.J. Res. 32. Joint resolution to authorize a contribution to certain inhabitants of the Ryukyu Islands for death and injury of persons, and for use of and damage to private property, arising from acts and omissions of the U.S. Armed Forces, or members thereof, after August 15, 1945, and before April 28, 1952; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. Fulbright when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

THE 47TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE PROCLAMATION OF INDEPENDENCE OF UKRAINE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, January 22, 1965, is the 47th anniversary of the Proclamation of Independence of Ukraine from the yoke of Russian domination, which regrettably was short lived because the Soviet Communists were able, by superior number of forces and military might, to subjugate these 45 million people of Ukraine, making her the largest subjugated nation in Europe. History records the valiant fight for over 3 years to preserve the independence of Ukraine.

I know of no better way to commemorate Ukrainian Independence Day than by asking Congress to pass a concurrent resolution urging the United Nations to take effective action so that the Soviet Union will withdraw its troops from Ukraine and other captive nations referred to therein, to return such captive people to their homeland if they are now in exile and thirdly to require free elections under the supervision of the United Nations.

Deeds and not words are the order of the day to help the people of Ukraine and other captive nations that soon will also commemorate their short-lived independence day in weeks and months to come.

To all Ukrainians and peoples of captive nations, I salute you and encourage you to keep the hope of freedom constantly before you. History records that many nations and peoples did not wait and hope in vain.

Mr. President, I submit a concurrent resolution, intended to be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, to the effect that the President be requested to take such action as he deems necessary to bring before the United Nations for its consideration the question of the forcible incorporation into the Soviet Union of the captive nations enumerated.

I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution in its entirety be printed in the Record as a part of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 10) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Whereas the Communist regime of the Soviet Union did not come to power in the Eastern European countries by legal or democratic processes, but has flouted even the solemn assurances and agreements entered into at the Yalta Conference of February 1945; and

Whereas the Soviet Union has denied self-determination by free election in those countries, resorting not only to heavily manned occupational forces, but also to genocidal activities in the cases of the many countries known as captive nations; and

Whereas the sovereignty and independence of the former free governments of those captive nations under the yoke of Soviet communism were duly recognized and continue to be given recognition and moral support; and

Whereas the suppression of human freedoms and the denial of free trade and communications with other sovereign countries present a threat to peace, intolerable either to the United States, other free nations, or the international law agencies; and

Whereas the governments and peoples of said captive nations now under the yoke of Soviet communism have always been in close relation with the United States and constantly continue to prove their belief in democracy through the work and blood of their peoples: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the President is hereby requested to take such action as may be necessary to bring before the United Nations for its consideration the question of the forceful incorporation into the Soviet Union of the following captive nations and peoples now behind the so-called Iron Curtain: Ukrainians, Turkestanians, Byelorussians, Azerbaijanians, Armenians, Albanians, Georgians, Bulgarians, Yugoslavs, Czechoslovaks, Rumanians, Lithuanians, Latvians, Estonians, North Epirotians, Hungarians, Poles, and East Germans; and a resolution declaring that—

(a) the Soviet Union shall withdraw all Soviet troops, agents, colonists, and controls from said captive nations;

(b) the Soviet Union shall return all citizens of said captive nations to their homelands from places of exile in Siberia, and dispersion in prisons and slave labor camps throughout the Soviet Union; and

(c) the United Nations should conduct free elections in said captive nations under the direct supervision of the United Nations and sit in judgment on the Communist counterparts of the Nazi war criminals convicted at the Nuremberg trials.

RESOLUTIONS

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. STENNIS, from the Committee on Armed Services, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 37) to provide additional funds for the Committee on Armed Services, which, under the rule, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. STENNIS, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

CLOSING OF VETERANS' FACILITIES

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I send to the desk for appropriate reference a resolution.

Mr. President, we urge the President of the United States to cancel all action with respect to the possible closing of regional offices, hospitals, and domiciliaries operated by the Veterans' Administration until the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare reaches a determination, expressed in a written report, as to whether the proposed closings will decrease or improve service to honorably discharged veterans of the Armed Forces of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 38) was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, as follows:

Resolved, Whereas, on January 13, 1965, the Acting Administrator of Veterans' Affairs announced the proposed closing of seventeen regional offices, eleven hospitals, and four domiciliaries, operated by the Veterans' Administration; and

Whereas the closing of these installations could have a harmful effect on the health and welfare of millions of veterans who served this country with distinction in time of war; and

Whereas the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is to conduct hearings to ascertain by whom the determination to close the Veterans' Administration facilities was made, and to investigate and evaluate the reasons therefor: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the President of the United States is urged to cancel all action with respect to the possible closing of regional offices, hospitals, and domiciliaries operated by the Veterans' Administration until the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare reaches a determination, expressed in a written report, as to whether the proposed closings will decrease or improve service to honorably discharged veterans of the Armed Forces of the United States.

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported the following original resolutions, which, under the rule were referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. Res. 39. Resolution to study administrative practice and procedure;

S. Res. 40. Resolution to investigate antitrust and monopoly laws of the United States;

S. Res. 41. Resolution to consider matters pertaining to Government charters, holidays, and celebrations;

S. Res. 42. Resolution authorizing a study of matters pertaining to constitutional amendments;

S. Res. 43. Resolution to investigate matters pertaining to constitutional rights;

S. Res. 44. Resolution to study matters pertaining to immigration and naturalization;

S. Res. 45. Resolution to study and examine the Federal judicial system;

S. Res. 46. Resolution to investigate the administration, operation, and enforcement of the Internal Security Act;

S. Res. 47. Resolution to investigate national penitentiaries;

S. Res. 48. Resolution to examine and review the administration of the Patent Office;

S. Res. 49. Resolution to investigate problems created by the flow of refugees and escapees from communistic tyranny;

S. Res. 50. Resolution to study revision and codification of the statutes of the United States;

S. Res. 51. Resolution to investigate the administration of the Trading With the Enemy Act; and

S. Res. 52. Resolution to investigate juvenile delinquency.

(See the above resolutions printed in full when reported by Mr. EASTLAND, where they appear under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

SKYLINE DRIVE RECREATION WAY, UTAH

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I sent to the desk, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for a preliminary survey of a route to be known as the Skyline Drive recreation way in the Manti-LaSal and Fishlake National Forests in Utah. The survey will be undertaken jointly by the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. President, the proposed Skyline Drive Recreation Way would extend from Thistle, Utah, south through central Utah's Manti-LaSal National Forest generally along the route of what is now known as the Skyline Drive and connecting with and following generally the course of Forest Highway No. 31 in the Fishlake National Forest.

EXISTING ROADS INADEQUATE

As noted, low standard roads already traverse the lengths of adjoining Manti-LaSal and Fishlake National Forests. The Fishlake road at the present time is paved for approximately 6 miles up from the southern border of the forest, and traverses the northern shore of Fish Lake to Bowery Haven. From there on to the point where a connecting link would be made with the present Skyline Drive route in the Manti-LaSal National Forest, it is a very low standard road, little more than a trail. The present Skyline Drive route, for almost its entire length is likewise a very low standard road, which in order to be maintained to a degree to meet the needs of a scenic recreation way, would have to be resurveyed and relocated. At present, both roads are passable only during the summer months and then in many areas are dangerously steep and rough.

GREAT SCENIC AND RECREATION POTENTIAL

The recreation way which I envision would result from the survey my bill proposes will be comparable to the great Blue Ridge National Scenic Parkway, for the terrain it would traverse is some of the most scenic in the world. Linking together two national forests, the recreation way would extend along approximately 175 miles of some of Utah's most beautiful and primitive high country. Much of the area is high alpine mountain country of singular beauty, with elevations rising to 11,000 feet, which affords a panoramic view of hundreds of miles on clear days.

Its recreation potential is tremendous, for this mountain area with its spectacular scenery, streams, lakes, and reservoirs provides opportunities for fishing, hunting, camping, boating, and water skiing. The area's splendid ski slopes present an unusually attractive potential for development as a year-round recreation center.

The proposed Skyline Drive Recreation Way would be a stimulus to the economy of central Utah for it would attract to the area increasing numbers of tourists who would be interested in viewing the natural scenic beauties to be found along the road and in participating in the recreational pursuits to be enjoyed there.

GOVERNMENT AGENCIES SUPPORT DEVELOPMENT

The Bureau of Reclamation, in response to a resolution of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, has prepared a report on the Price and San Pitch River basins, Utah, which was transmitted to the Congress on December 31, 1964. Among other interested agencies of the Federal Government and the State of Utah who collaborated closely in the studies are the Soil Conservation Service and Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture, the Corps of Engineers of the Department of the Army, Utah Water and Power Board, Utah Department of Fish and Game, Utah State Engineer, Utah Tourist and Publicity Council, and the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife and Bureau of Outdoor Recreation of the Department of the Interior. The report dealt mainly with water supplies in the two basins, but among its conclusions is one of great significance in the consideration of the proposed survey of the Skyline Drive Recreation Way. The report states, on page vii:

> It is concluded * * * that both the Price and San Pitch Rivers in the heartland of scenic Utah have enormous potentials now only partially used for fish, wildlife, and recreation purposes varying from rugged and colorful canyons to alpine forests, and that the Gooseberry Creek Basin, in combination with the Skyline Drive, as an example, could be further developed into one of the finest winter ski areas anywhere in the world as well as providing unsurpassed pleasurable mountain scenery by foot or by road.

The report then recommends, on page IX:

> That the recreation development of both basins, and particularly of the Gooseberry basin in combination with the Skyline Drive, be further developed by appropriate local, State, and Federal agencies to enhance the economy, thus affording many more people the enjoyment of an unsurpassed resource.

Moreover, I am informed by the director of the intermountain region of the Forest Service, headquartered in Ogden, Utah, that the Forest Service listed the Skyline Drive road as its highest priority for Utah in a project list prepared for the President's Recreation Advisory Council for use in its current study of a national program of scenic roads and parkways.

I believe the survey authorized in my bill will further bear out these conclusions and recommendations concerning the great scenic and recreational potential of the area traversed by the present Skyline Drive road, and will point up the desirability of constructing a recreation way there and of extending it south to include the area traversed by Forest Highway No. 31 as well. The survey will determine an estimate of the construction costs of the proposed Skyline Drive recreation way, together with such spur roads as will be needed to serve the recreation areas along its course.

The proposed recreation way is feasible from an engineering standpoint and is highly desirable to open up this beautiful scenic area to public use and enjoyment.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of my bill be printed in the RECORD at this point. Further, I ask unanimous consent that the bill lie on the table until the close of the legislative day next Tuesday for cosponsors.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD and will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Utah.

The bill (S. 636) to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture jointly with the Secretary of Commerce to make a preliminary survey of the proposed Skyline Drive Recreation Way in the Manti-LaSal and Fishlake National Forests in the State of Utah, introduced by Mr. BENNETT, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Commerce are authorized and directed to make a preliminary survey of a possible route for a scenic recreation way to be known as the Skyline Drive Recreation Way extending from Thistle, Utah, through the Manti-LaSal National Forest generally along the route of what is now known as the Skyline Drive and connecting with and following generally the course of the Forest Highway Numbered 31 in the Fishlake National Forest. Such survey shall include consideration of the manner in which public access will promote travel within and enjoyment of the scenic and recreational features of the area and the stimulating effect thereof upon the economic development of the region through increased tourism and recreational activities. An estimate of the cost of construction of an appropriate scenic recreation way over the indicated route, together with such spur roads as may be needed to serve appropriate recreation developments, together with all other pertinent data shall be obtained through such preliminary survey for the purpose of determining the feasibility and desirability of constructing the proposed scenic recreation way. A final report of such survey accompanied by full information and data, with recommendations, shall at the earliest possible date be made and submitted to Congress for its consideration. For the purpose of carrying out such survey there is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $50,000.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 379d(b) OF AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to exempt from the wheat processing certificate purchase requirements wheat which is purchased or processed solely for donation to needy persons.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill lie at the desk until Tuesday of next week.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Utah.

The bill (S. 639) to amend section 379d(b) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, in order to exempt from the requirements of such section wheat which is produced or processed solely for donation to needy persons introduced by Mr. BENNETT, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

MORTGAGE MARKET FACILITIES ACT OF 1965

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill relating to the creation of new secondary market facilities for home mortgages. Recently, the President presented to the Congress the broad outlines of an antipoverty program which constitutes an integral part of his plans for the Great Society. An obvious prerequisite for the high level of prosperity and economic development envisioned by such a program is the creation of machinery which will facilitate the flow of capital from areas of abundance to areas which experience serious capital shortages. In the past, the secondary market for conventional mortgages has at times been inadequate. It seems, therefore, particularly appropriate at this time to introduce a bill that will help stimulate an even flow of mortgage financing at all times.

The objective of the Mortgage Market Facilities Act of 1965 is to enable all private lenders to originate mortgage loans without fear that such loans will subsequently prove unmarketable. There is admittedly little apparent urgency about eliminating the serious deficiencies of the mortgage market mechanism, but to delay positive corrective legislation because there is no present crisis surely seems to say "wait until the horse is stolen before the barn door is locked."

The postwar baby boom is now upon us and there is every indication that an increasing demand for housing will occur before the decade closes. Now is the time to plan for the demands that will be made upon the supply of mortgage funds. If we do not take the necessary steps to insure that private enterprise will be able to handle the housing needs of the future, it will result in a repetition of the unfortunate experience of the latter 1950's when there was such a shortage of mortgage funds.

The Mortgage Market Facilities Act contains many other provisions which recommend its passage. Of particular significance is the fact that it would provide an effective tool by which the small and the isolated lenders could fully participate in the socially and economically important home financing program. The deficiencies of the present mortgage market most seriously affect such lenders and it is in the public interest to provide them with sufficient tools to assure their continuing existence and prosperity.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have a section-by-section summary of the Mortgage Market Facilities Act of 1965 inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the section-by-section summary will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 644) to authorize the chartering of organizations to insure conventional mortgage loans, to authorize the creation of secondary market organizations for conventional and other mortgage loans, to authorize the issuance of debentures upon the security of insured or guaranteed mortgages and to create a joint supervisory board to charter and examine such organizations, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. SPARKMAN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The section-by-section summary presented by Mr. SPARKMAN is as follows:

S. 644—SUMMARY OF MORTGAGE MARKET FACILITIES ACT OF 1965

TITLE I—SHORT TITLE, STATEMENT OF PURPOSE, AND DEFINITIONS

Section 101. Short title: Contains a table of contents and provides that the act may be cited as the "Mortgage Market Facilities Act of 1965."

Section 102. Statement of policy: Provides that "the Congress desires to make additional facilities available to increase the market for conventional and insured mortgages as a means of improving the housing conditions of the American people."

Section 103. Definitions: Provides definitions of the following terms used throughout the act: "Joint Board," "Chairman," "mortgage," "first mortgage," "mortgage insurance corporation," "mortgage marketing corporation," and "United States."

TITLE II—JOINT SUPERVISORY BOARD FOR MORTGAGE INSURANCE AND MARKETING CORPORATIONS

Section 201. Establishment: Provides for the creation of a Joint Supervisory Board for Mortgage Insurance and Marketing Corporations (Joint Board) to consist of five members, with its principal office in the District of Columbia.

Section 202. Chairman and Directors: Subsection (a) provides for the appointment of the Chairman of the Joint Board by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Chairman is to serve a 6-year term at a salary of $____ per annum. Subsection (b) provides that in addition to the Chairman, the Directors of the Joint Board shall be the Comptroller of the Currency, the Chairman of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, and the Chairman of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, all ex officio: and a person appointed by the President from among persons recommended by the supervisors of banking in the various States who shall serve for a term of 6 years at a stated salary. All decisions of the Board to be effective shall require the affirmative vote of at least three Directors, at least one of whom shall be other than an ex officio Director. Each ex officio Director may delegate his duties and responsibilities under the act to an assistant.

Section 203. General powers: Subsection (a) provides the Joint Board with power to charter, audit, inspect, and examine corporations organized under the act, to require such corporations to prepare and file reports, to subpena witnesses, to hold hearings, and to issue rules and regulations. The Joint Board is to send an annual report to Congress. Subsection (b) pertains to employees of the Joint Board. Subsection (c) allows the Joint Board to avail itself of the use of information, services, etc., of other Government agencies on a reimbursable basis.

Section 204. Taxation provisions: Provides that corporations organized under this act shall be subject to taxation to the same extent as State-chartered corporations.

Section 205. Expenses: Authorizes appropriations as may be necessary for salaries and other necessary expenses of the Joint Board. Beginning with the third full year after enactment of the act, the Joint Board will assess corporations organized under this act in amounts sufficient to cover expenses of the Joint Board. Amounts thus assessed will be paid into the Treasury.

Section 206. Forfeiture of charter: Establishes a procedure for involuntary forfeiture of the charter of a corporation established under this act and liquidation of the corporation.

Section 207. Injunction: Provides that the Joint Board may bring an action to enjoin a violation of the act and to enforce compliance with the act.

Section 208. Removal of director, officer, etc.: Provides for a procedure whereby the Joint Board may remove a director, officer, attorney, employee, or agent of a corporation organized under the act for cause.

Section 209. Review of order, rehearing: Provides for judicial review and rehearing of an order of the Joint Board removing an individual from office.

TITLE III—MORTGAGE INSURANCE CORPORATIONS

Section 301. Establishment: Provides for the chartering by the Joint Board of mortgage insurance corporations upon the approval of an application submitted by not less than five natural persons of good repute.

Section 302. Insurance authorization: Subsection (a) authorizes a mortgage insurance corporation organized under this act to (1) insure up to 100 percent of the unpaid principal and interest on loans in the form of obligations secured by mortgages; and (2) establish, through action by the Board of Directors, an adequate insurance premium for such insurance which shall be set, and the initial capital be allocated, so that there shall be maintained at all times unimpaired capital, surplus, and undivided profits in an aggregate amount, upon the basis of market value, of not less than 5 percent of the unpaid principal amounts of all outstanding contracts of mortgage insurance. At least 50 percent of the capital shall be invested in obligations of or guaranteed by the United States and the remainder in other obligations or securities approved by the Joint Board. All other funds shall be safely invested with due regard to the purpose of the corporation. Subsection (b) provides that a loan insured by a mortgage insurance corporation shall have a maximum term not exceeding 30 years; shall be secured by an amortized mortgage, deed of trust, or other such instrument under the terms of which payments shall be made in equal amounts from month to month and are sufficient to: (1) amortize the entire principal of the loan within the period ending on the date of its maturity; (2) cover interest applicable to each payment period; and (3) cover the premium applicable to each payment period; shall have a loan-to-value ratio not exceeding 90 percent of appraised value as approved by the corporation or sales price, whichever is less; shall be in an amount not exceeding $30,000; shall be on a one- to four-family residential property or condominium which is or will be occupied in whole or in part by the mortgagor; and shall be originated and serviced by an organization approved by the mortgage insurance corporation.

Section 303. Payment: Provides that a mortgage insurance corporation organized under this title shall pay in cash without delay the insurance claims of any applicant submitting appropriate evidence of ownership of a defaulted loan insured under authority conferred by this act, but such payment shall not be made until (1) there is a default in any payment of principal or interest on the loan or the insurance premium and such default is not cured by subsequent payment in not less than 91 days; (2) the mortgagee conveys to the mortgage insurance corporation clear title to the property; and (3) the mortgagee assigns to the mortgage insurance corporation all claims of the mortgagee against the mortgagor or others, arising out of the mortgage transaction, except such claims as may have been released with the consent of the Joint Board. Such payment shall include interest and allowances (including foreclosure costs) from time of default as approved under regulations of the Joint Board in effect at the time the mortgage was insured.

Section 304. Succession: Provides that "each mortgage insurance corporation organized under this title shall have succession from the date of its organization unless it is dissolved by act of its shareholders or its franchise becomes forfeited by order of the Joint Board."

Section 305. General powers: Empowers mortgage insurance corporations to adopt and use a corporate seal, to adopt bylaws, to make contracts, etc.

Section 306. Citizenship: Provides that a mortgage insurance corporation shall be deemed a citizen of the State in which its principal office is located.

Section 307. Capital requirements: Provides that the minimum subscribed initial capital shall be $25 million and shall be represented by shares of stock each with a par value of $100. No authorization to commence business shall be granted by the Joint Board to any mortgage insurance corporation until the Joint Board is satisfied that initial capital in the amount of not less than $10 million par value has been subscribed for at not less than par and paid in full in cash.

Section 308. Directors and officers: Provides for a board of directors of at least 9 but no more than 15 to be elected by the shareholders. The board of directors is to elect the officers. Also authorizes board to issue regulations which would govern the standards under which this corporation is to operate.

TITLE IV—MORTGAGE MARKETING CORPORATIONS

Section 401. Establishment: Provides for establishment of mortgage marketing corporation in the same manner as is provided for mortgage insurance corporations in section 301 above.

Section 402. Trading and debenture-insuring authorization: Authorizes mortgage marketing corporation to: (1) purchase, sell, and service mortgages on one- to four-family residential property and which are insured by a mortgage insurance corporation or insured or guaranteed by an agency of the United States; (2) publish data with respect to mortgages; (3) issue, with the approval of the Joint Board, and to have outstanding bonds, notes, or other obligations up to a maximum of 20 times the sum of its capital, surplus reserves, and undistributed earnings; (4) set underwriting fees, maturities, interest rates, etc., within the limits of standards prescribed by Joint Board regulations; and (5) purchase its outstanding obligations in the open market.

Section 403. Succession. Section 404. General powers. Section 405. Citizenship: Provisions identical to those pertaining to mortgage insurance corporations in sections 304, 305, and 306 above.

Section 404. General powers: Empowers mortgage marketing corporations to adopt and use a corporate seal, to adopt bylaws, to make contracts, etc.

Section 405. Citizenship: Provides that a mortgage marketing corporation shall be deemed a citizen of the State in which its principal office is located.

Section 406. Capital requirements: Provides that no authorization to commence business shall be granted by the Joint Board to any mortgage marketing corporation until the Joint Board is satisfied that initial capital in the amount of not less than $5 million par value has been subscribed for at not less than par and paid in full in cash. Such capital shall be represented by shares of stock each with a par value of $100.

Section 407. Directors and officers: This provision is identical with section 308 above, which pertains to mortgage insurance corporations. Also authorizes board to issue regulations which would govern the standards under which this corporation is to operate.

TITLE V—CHANGES IN RELATED STATUTES

Section 501. National Bank Act: Subsection (a) amends paragraph 7 of section 5136, U.S. Revised Statutes (12 U.S.C. 24) so as to permit a national bank to purchase for its own account shares in mortgage insurance corporations and/or mortgage marketing corporations in an amount not exceeding 5 percent of the capital and surplus of the bank in either type of corporation.

Subsection (b) amends the same statute so as to permit a national bank to deal in, underwrite, and purchase for its own account, obligations of mortgage marketing corporations.

Section 502. Federal Reserve Act: Amends section 24 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 371) so as to exempt corporations organized under the act from the maturity and loan-value percentage limitations of that section.

Section 503. Federal Home Loan Bank Act: Amends section 11 of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act (12 U.S.C. 1464(c)) so as to permit a Federal home loan bank to invest assets in obligations of mortgage marketing corporations to the same extent as it may invest in obligations of the United States, in obligations of the FNMA, and in other securities under present law.

Section 504. Home Owners Loan Act: Amends section 5(c) of the Home Owners Loan Act so as to permit a Federal savings and loan association, within certain limits, to invest in stock of mortgage insurance corporations and mortgage marketing corporations, and in obligations of the latter.

Section 505. Securities Act of 1933: Exempts securities issued by mortgage insurance corporations and by mortgage marketing corporations from the requirements of the Securities Act of 1933.

Section 506. Investment Company Act of 1940: Exempts mortgage insurance corporations and mortgage marketing corporations from the Investment Company Act of 1940.

RESTRICTION OF CERTAIN AREAS IN OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I introduce a bill, for appropriate reference, at the request of the Secretary of the Navy to restrict a specifically described area of the Outer Continental Shelf off the coast of Texas known as the Corpus Christi offshore warning area. The proposed restriction would be for defense purposes, including use by the Navy for air-to-air firing and from subsonic to supersonic flight. Involved are some 3,800,000 acres of the Outer Continental Shelf area.

In order that all interested persons may be informed of this proposal to withdraw this rather large area of the Outer Continental Shelf from mineral development, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill and Navy Secretary Nitze's letter of explanation be printed at this point in the Record.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and letter will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 645) to provide for the restriction of certain areas in the Outer Continental Shelf, known as the Corpus Christi offshore warning area, for defense purposes, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Jackson, by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) so much of the Outer Continental Shelf as is within the area described in section 2 of this Act is hereby restricted from the operation of the mineral leasing provisions of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (67 Stat. 462), at the request of the Department of the Navy, for the use of the Department of Defense for a period of six years with an option to renew the restriction for an additional period of four years upon notice to the Secretary of the Interior. The restriction made by this subsection may be terminated at any time by the Secretary of Defense upon notice to the Secretary of the Interior, or it may be terminated by the Secretary of the Interior as provided in section 3 of this Act. The Secretary of the Interior may, with the concurrence of the Secretary of Defense, grant mineral leases pursuant to the provisions of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (67 Stat. 462) and subject to such other terms and conditions as they shall agree upon within any of the areas restricted by this Act.

(b) This Act does not prohibit applications under laws and regulations then existing, for further restrictions at the time of termination or expiration of the restriction made by this Act.

(c) The right to enter the areas described in section 2 of this Act to use them for the defense purposes set forth in the application for restriction becomes effective upon the date of enactment of this Act.

Sec. 2. The area restricted by this Act is so much of the Outer Continental Shelf as is embraced in an area described as follows: Beginning at a point three (3) leagues off Matagorda Island, being 28 degrees 04 minutes 58 seconds north, 96 degrees 35 minutes 15 seconds west; thence southeast along a true bearing of 115 degrees to 27 degrees 42 minutes 15 seconds north, 95 degrees 42 minutes 00 seconds west; thence following the 100-fathom curve of the Outer Continental Shelf westerly and southerly to 26 degrees 00 minutes 00 seconds north, 96 degrees 19 minutes 10 seconds west; thence west along 26 degrees 00 minutes 00 seconds north, to a point three (3) leagues from the coast of Texas, being 96 degrees 59 minutes 00 seconds west; thence parallel to and three (3) leagues off Padre Island and Matagorda Island to the point of beginning, being 28 degrees 04 minutes 58 seconds north, 96 degrees 35 minutes 15 seconds west, containing 3,807,808 acres, more or less.

Sec. 3. At any time after six years from the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior may, upon written notification to the Secretary of Defense, terminate the restriction made by this Act with respect to all or any part of the following described area, being a portion of the area described in section 2 of this Act, provided however, that the restriction shall not terminate until six months after the date the Secretary of Defense receives written notice of termination from the Secretary of the Interior: Beginning at a point three (3) leagues off Matagorda Island, being 28 degrees 04 minutes 58 seconds north, 96 degrees 35 minutes 15 seconds west; thence along a true bearing of 115 degrees to 27 degrees 42 minutes 15 seconds north, 95 degrees 42 minutes 00 seconds west; thence following the 100-fathom curve of the Outer Continental Shelf westerly and southerly to 27 degrees 30 minutes 30 seconds north, 95 degrees 43 minutes 20 seconds west; thence northwesterly along a true bearing of 295 degrees to a point three (3) leagues off Matagorda Island, being 28 degrees 00 minutes 00 seconds north, 96 degrees 41 minutes 00 seconds west; thence parallel to and three (3) leagues from Matagorda Island to the point of beginning being 28 degrees 04 minutes 58 seconds north, 96 degrees 35 minutes 15 seconds west, containing 351,200 acres, more or less.

The letter presented by Mr. Jackson is as follows:

Department of the Navy,
Washington, D.C., January 7, 1965.

Hon. Carl Hayden,
President pro tempore,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

My Dear Mr. President: There is enclosed a draft of proposed legislation "To provide for the restriction of certain areas in the Outer Continental Shelf, known as the Corpus Christi offshore warning area, for defense purposes and for other purposes."

This proposal is pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 85–337 and is part of the Department of Defense legislative program for the 89th Congress. The Bureau of the Budget advises that, from the standpoint of the administration's program, there would be no objection to the presentation of this proposal for the consideration of the Congress. The Department of the Navy has been designated as the representative of the Department of Defense for this legislation. It is recommended that this proposed legislation be enacted by the Congress.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

The purpose of this proposed legislation is to restrict the utilization of certain lands and waters, described in the attached draft, of the Outer Continental Shelf adjacent to the State of Texas, and to restrict the operation of mineral leasing laws therein. This area has been used by the Department of the Navy for years as Navy Warning Areas Nos. 228 and 493.

The installation involved is the Corpus Christi offshore warning area involving a land and water area of approximately 3,807,808 acres which is used by the Navy for air-to-air weapons firing and for transition from subsonic to supersonic flight. The utilization of areas by the Naval Air Advanced Training Command at Corpus Christi will be approximately 80 percent of the available daylight hours for the foreseeable future and will prohibit exploitation of mineral resources, except under certain circumstances to be agreed upon by the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Defense.

COSTS AND BUDGET DATA

The area involved is currently in use by the Department of the Navy and there will be no change in Department of Defense appropriations.

Sincerely yours,

Paul H. Nitze,
Secretary of the Navy.

PROPOSED MODIFICATION OF FEDERAL PROCEDURES

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, for myself, Senators Johnston, Williams of New Jersey, Kennedy of Massachusetts, Bayh, Douglas, Hart, Mondale, Long of Missouri, Kennedy of New York, Hruska, and Fong, I send to the desk, for appropriate reference, three bills designed to modify and improve Federal procedures.

In conjunction with its extensive overall study of the administration of criminal justice, the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, of which I am chairman, has for some time focused its attention on Federal bail procedures. These procedures were found to be repugnant to the spirit of the Constitution, and in direct conflict with two or our most cherished principles of justice—that the accused is presumed innocent until proved guilty by a court of law, and that justice should be equal and accessible to all. Further, Federal bail procedures are a vivid example of how our judicial machinery has failed to attain a satisfactory level of efficiency.

These defects stem, in large part, from the fact that bail decisions rely primarily upon financial inducements to insure the presence of the accused at trial, rather than his character or his community ties.

The measures I am introducing today are similar to three bills—S. 2838, S. 2839, and S. 2840—which were the subject of joint hearings held by the Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights and the Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery on August 4, 5, and 6, 1964. These bills received strong support from the Department of Justice, Federal and State law enforcement officials, law professors, and other persons and groups concerned with the administration of criminal justice.

Based upon the reasonable and expert testimony provided on these bills—S. 2838, S. 2839, and S. 2840—during the joint hearings, the subcommittees have prepared a report entitled "Constitutional Rights and Federal Bail Procedures," which has not yet been printed.

This report, which was unanimously approved by all of the members of the subcommittees, "recommended the enactment of S. 2838, S. 2839, and S. 2840," and contained the following conclusions regarding the function of bail and the many inequities in Federal bail practices:

Thousands of citizens are confined each year not because they are guilty of the commission of a crime, but because they cannot afford to post bond.

Because Federal bail procedures rely primarily upon financial considerations rather than the accused's character or community ties, such procedures inevitably disadvantage persons of limited means.

The Federal bail system, as it operates today, is repugnant to the spirit of the Constitution and in direct conflict with the basic tenets that a person is presumed innocent until proven guilty by a court of law, and that justice should be equal and accessible to all.

The inability to meet bail requirements severely handicaps the accused in the preparation of his defense.

Persons unable to afford bail are often confined and subject to the influence of persons already convicted of crimes and serving their jail sentences.

Being confined before being proven guilty by a court of law subjects the accused and his family to needless public derision.

Federal bail procedures represent a vivid example of where our judicial machinery has not attained its desired degree of efficiency.

When Government maintains peace and order, it must exclude irrelevant factors—such as the financial status of the accused—in determining his guilt or innocence.

Proper respect for law and order is jeopardized when the disposition of justice turns upon the financial status of the accused.

Federal bail procedures impose a severe financial burden upon the taxpaying public.

The high cost of pretrial detention depletes public funds which could otherwise be used to provide counsel for indigent defendants or other public purposes.

Our adversary system of justice is undermined because the Federal bail system handicaps the accused in preparing his defense.

Our Federal bail laws demonstrate that an important phase of the administration of criminal justice has become the responsibility of professional bondsmen.

Mr. President, the litany of abuses and inequities in Federal bail procedures is long, and is discussed more fully in the report which is to be issued by the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights and the Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery.

Before outlining briefly the basic purpose and scope of the bills being introduced today, I wish to mention that efforts are being made to develop an omnibus bail reform measure. Consultations are underway between the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights and the Department of Justice, and I anticipate that the measure will be ready for introduction shortly. Meantime, because of the serious need to begin action on modifying existing Federal bail procedures, I am introducing three separate proposals which incorporate many of the suggestions made during the joint hearings of the last Congress.

RELEASE ON RECOGNIZANCE

The first bill provides that any person charged with an offense against the United States shall be admitted to bail on his personal recognizance if he is otherwise qualified, and except for good cause shown to the contrary. Any court of the United States or the District of Columbia admitting persons to release on their personal recognizance may set reasonable conditions deemed necessary to assure the accused's appearance at time of trial. This measure also provides appropriate penalties in cases where the accused fails to honor the terms of his release.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be included at this point in my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 646) to implement further the constitutional right to bail by authorizing in appropriate cases the release on a personal recognizance of persons otherwise eligible for bail, introduced by Mr. ERVIN (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) chapter 207 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"§ 3147. Release on personal recognizance

"(a) Any person otherwise eligible to be admitted to bail for appearance before any court of the United States, United States commissioner, or other officer empowered to commit persons charged with offenses against the United States shall, unless good cause be shown to the contrary, be released on his personal recognizance subject to such reasonable conditions as the court, commissioner, or other officer may prescribe. Any person so released shall be fully informed by the court, commissioner, or other officer of the penalties provided for failure to comply with the terms of his recognizance (the furnishing of such information being made a matter of record), and, upon a failure of compliance, a warrant for the arrest of such person shall be issued forthwith.

"(b) As used in this section the term 'personal recognizance' means an obligation of record, not conditioned upon the posting of financial security, which is entered into by an individual before a court of the United States, United States commissioner, or other officer empowered to commit persons charged with offenses against the United States, and under which such individual obligates himself to appear at such time and place as may be required by such court, commissioner, or officer."

(b) The analysis of chapter 207 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following:

"§3147. Release on personal recognizance."

SEC. 2. The first paragraph of section 3146 of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"Whoever (1) having been admitted to bail for appearance before any court of the United States, United States commissioner, or other officer empowered to commit persons charged with offenses against the United States, incurs a forfeiture of the bail and willfully fails to surrender himself within thirty days following the date of such forfeiture, or (2) having been released as provided in section 3147, willfully fails to comply with the terms of his personal recognizance and such failure continues for a period of thirty days, shall (A) if the bail was given or the release was obtained in connection with a charge of felony or pending appeal or certiorari after conviction of any offense, be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both; or (B) if the bail was given or the release was obtained in connection with a charge of committing a misdemeanor, be fined not more than the maximum fine provided for such misdemeanor, or imprisoned for not more than the maximum period provided for such misdemeanor, or both; or (C) if the bail was given or the release was obtained for appearance as a witness, be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both."

SEC. 3. (a) Section 704 of title 16 of the District of Columbia Code (D.C. Code sec. 16–704) is amended by—

(1) inserting "; release on personal recognizance" after "collateral security" in the heading thereof;

(2) redesignating subsection (b) as subsection (c); and

(3) inserting after subsection (a) a new subsection as follows:

"(b) (1) Any person otherwise eligible to be admitted to bail for appearance before the criminal division of the Court of General Sessions shall, upon a showing satisfactory to the court that he can reasonably be expected to appear when required, unless good cause be shown to the contrary, be released on his personal recognizance subject to such reasonable conditions as the court may prescribe. Any person so released shall be fully informed by the court of the penalties provided for failure to comply with the terms of his recognizance (the furnishing of such information being made a matter of record), and, upon a failure of compliance, a warrant for the arrest of such person shall be issued forthwith.

"(2) As used in this subsection, the term 'personal recognizance' means an obligation of record, not conditioned upon the posting of financial security, which is entered into by an individual before the Court of General Sessions, and under which such individual obligates himself to appear at such time and place as may be required by such court."

(b) The analysis of chapter 7 of title 16 of the District of Columbia Code is amended by inserting "; release on personal recognizance" after "collateral security" in the fourth item.

Sec. 4. Whoever (1) having been admitted to bail for appearance before the criminal division of the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions, incurs a forfeiture of the bail and willfully fails to surrender himself within thirty days following the date of such forfeiture, or (2) having been released as provided in section 704(b) of title 16 of the District of Columbia Code, willfully fails to comply with the terms of his personal recognizance (as defined in such section) and such failure continues for a period of thirty days, shall (A) if the bail was given or the release was obtained in connection with a charge of felony or pending appeal after conviction of any offense, be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both; or (B) if the bail was given or the release was obtained in connection with a charge of committing a misdemeanor, be fined not more than the maximum fine provided for such misdemeanor, or imprisoned for not more than the maximum period provided for such misdemeanor, or both; or (C) if the bail was given or the release was obtained for appearance as a witness, be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

CREDIT FOR PRETRIAL CONFINEMENT

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, the second bill provides that persons convicted of offenses against the United States receive credit toward their sentence term for time they spent in custody prior to the imposition of sentence by the sentencing court.

Under existing law, credit for pretrial confinement is provided only in cases where the law requires a mandatory minimum sentence. Thus, where the minimum sentence is discretionary, there is no assurance that credit for pretrial confinement will be provided.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be included at this point in my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 647) to assure that convicted persons will receive credit toward service of their sentences for time spent in custody for lack of bail, introduced by Mr. Ervin (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first paragraph of section 3568 of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"The sentence of imprisonment of any person convicted of an offense in any court of the United States (including the District of Columbia court of general sessions and the juvenile court of the District of Columbia) shall commence to run from the date on which such person is received at the penitentiary, reformatory, or jail for service of such sentence: *Provided,* That such person shall be given credit toward service of his sentence for any days spent in custody in connection with the offense for which sentence was imposed."

REFUNDABLE CASH DEPOSIT

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, the third bill provides that the accused, if otherwise eligible for bail, and except for good cause shown to the contrary, may deposit with the court a cash deposit equal to 10 percent of the amount of the bail set by the court. When the accused appears for trial as ordered, 90 percent of his initial deposit would be refunded, less any amount required to meet court costs or any fine imposed. If the accused breaches a condition of his bond, however, the court shall declare a forfeiture of the full amount of bail set. Existing penalties for bail jumping would be applicable to any person released under the procedure in this bill.

This measure would be particularly helpful in cases where bondsmen refuse to write bail because they have too many bonds outstanding, because of the nature or unpopularity of the offense, because of the background of the accused, or because of local hostility against the accused.

The refundable deposit provision in this bill will ease the financial burden on the accused who properly conforms to the terms of his release. Moreover, since the deposit device can be denied persons likely to flee the jurisdiction of the court, misuse of the deposit system would be unlikely.

Finally, this bill would insure that decisions concerning pretrial release and custody remain with the Federal judiciary rather than professional bondsmen.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be included at this point in my remarks:

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 648) to further implement the constitutional right to bail by permitting persons admitted to bail to make a cash deposit with the court in lieu of providing securities or other collateral security, introduced by Mr. Ervin (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) chapter 207 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"§ 3147. Refundable cash deposit

"(a) Whenever the amount of bail has been fixed in the case of any person charged with an offense against the United States, such person shall execute a bond for his appearance, and may, except for good cause shown to the contrary, in lieu of providing such collateral security or sureties as might otherwise be required, deposit in the registry of the court a sum equal to 10 per centum of the amount of bail so fixed. Upon the deposit of such sum such person shall be released subject to the conditions of his bond.

"(b) If there is no breach of condition of a bond given by any person as provided in subsection (a), the court shall release such person from the obligation of the bond, but may retain 10 per centum of the sum deposited by such person to defray bail bond costs. The balance of such deposit shall, no judgment for court costs or fine being entered against such person, be returned to him. In the event a judgment for court costs or fine, or both, is entered against such person, the balance of such deposit shall be first applied to the payment of such judgment.

"(c) If there is a breach of condition of a bond given by any person as provided in subsection (a), the court shall declare a forfeiture of the full amount of the bail fixed in the case of such person. Notice of the forfeiture shall be mailed to such person at his last known address, and, if such person does not appear as required within thirty days after the mailing of such notice and the forfeiture is not set aside by the court, the court shall render judgment of default against such person in the full amount of the bail. The court may direct that any such forfeiture be set aside if, under all the circumstances, it appears that justice does not require the enforcement thereof. Any judgment of default against such person shall be enforced by all available processes of the court, and the amount deposited by such person in the registry of the court shall be applied to the payment of costs and the balance thereof shall be applied to the judgment.

"(d) Nothing in this section shall limit in any way the application of section 3146 of this title to any person."

(b) The analysis of chapter 207 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following:

"3147. Refundable cash deposit."

Mr. ERVIN. By way of conclusion, Mr. President, I should like to read a portion of the testimony of Mr. David McCarthy, director of the District of Columbia bail project, which aptly sums up the myriad problems in our Federal bail procedures:

> Indeed, the community pays dearly, not only in the monetary costs of detention, the attendant welfare and representation costs, and the loss of derivative revenue, but also—and more importantly—in the dilution of two fundamental principles of our society: equality before the law, and the presumption of innocence. The individual pays dearly in his inability to assist in his own defense, in the psychological result of entering the courtroom from jail, in his inability to gain or maintain employment, in family disruption, and of course, in the incarceration itself. How much more dear is the price when the accused is in fact innocent?

Given our laudable goals of developing a rational and effective system of criminal justice, as well as preserving our cherished constitutional precepts of equal justice for all and the presumption of innocence, it is incumbent upon us, Mr. President, to rectify the many unnecessary and serious problems fostered by our Federal bail system. I am hopeful, therefore, that the proposed legislation introduced will be enacted and thereby further our efforts to provide each citizen his full measure of constitutional justice and protection.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these bills lie on the desk for

10 days to provide other Senators an opportunity to cosponsor them.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I am today introducing a bill to liberalize and simplify the social security retirement test. My bill would double the basic earned income limitation from $1,200 a year to $2,400. In other words, under this measure, a senior citizen could, after retirement, earn up to $2,400 a year without losing any social security benefits.

The retirement test, which is also referred to as the earning test, has been a part of the social security law in one form or another since 1935. I think it is fair to say that it has never been entirely satisfactory and has always been a point of controversy.

Several years ago the House Ways and Means Committee asked the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to study the retirement test. In response to this request, the Department submitted a report to the committee in 1960. In this report the Department made the following candid statement which reflects the inexorable conflict of desires inherent in the retirement test:

> The fact must be faced that the retirement test is the center of an insoluble dilemma. There is, on the one hand, the need to conserve the funds of the program by not paying benefits to people who have substantial work income, and on the other hand, the need to avoid interfering with incentives to work. Both of these objectives cannot be fully accomplished. The best that can be done is to accommodate the two, so that while the funds of the system are in a large part directed to the most socially useful purposes, at the same time interference with incentives to work is kept at a reasonably low level.

Mr. President, it is my opinion that the present retirement test does not maintain a proper accommodation between the needs stated in the Department's report. It interferes unreasonably both with the individual's desire to work and his ability to find employment which will not result in financial disadvantage. Moreover, I think the vast majority of people affected by it—people in the early retirement years—share this opinion, and wish to have this bar to greater independence and self-sufficiency eliminated.

During 1961, the Special Committee on Aging, of which I am a member, held hearings in 34 cities and towns throughout the country. In each of these hearings there were what we called "Town Hall" sessions in which senior citizens were invited to speak from the floor on any problem that was of concern to them. The problem most frequently mentioned related to the cost of health care. However, aside from that, one of the most frequently mentioned problems was some kind of inequity or frustration arising out of the social security retirement test. These were not witnesses making prepared statements, but were ordinary citizens speaking extemporaneously in Town Hall fashion. The desire for useful employment and the desire to be self-sufficient were recurrent themes in these meetings in all parts of the country, and the barrier of the retirement test was one of the chief complaints in the minds of our older citizens.

Mr. President, I serve as a member of the Subcommittee on Employment and Retirement Incomes of the Elderly of the Special Committee on Aging. That subcommittee, under the chairmanship of the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], conducted hearings and supplementary studies last session on ways to increase the opportunities available to our older citizens for part-time employment. One of the major conclusions of the subcommittee was that the retirement test should be both liberalized and simplified to enable older people to capitalize on the opportunities for part-time employment that exist or may be created.

The basic exemption of $1,200 has remained unchanged since it was put into law in 1954. Living costs and wage rates have increased so much since that time that it is no longer a realistic base figure. I am convinced that this bill is needed to alleviate the discriminatory effect of the retirement test on those who are ready, willing, and able, and in many cases forced, to work.

We will be considering other amendments to the Social Security Act this session. We should consider amending the retirement test at the same time.

I send to the desk, for appropriate reference, my bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase to $2,400 the annual amount individuals are permitted to earn without suffering deductions from the insurance benefits payable to them under such title.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 649) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase to $2,400 the annual amount individuals are permitted to earn without suffering deductions from the insurance benefits payable to them under such title, introduced by Mr. Moss, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

GOLDEN CIRCLE DEVELOPMENT SURVEY

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make a development survey of the recreation resources of the magnificent Golden Circle area which surrounds the four corners area of Utah, Colorado, Arizona, and New Mexico. The survey would be made in cooperation with the Governors of the four States and the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Commerce, and appropriate State, local, and Indian agencies.

I first introduced this bill in the 88th Congress, and the Department of the Interior gave a favorable report on it. However, the press of other business kept the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee from giving it consideration. I shall ask for early hearings this year.

At present, separate Federal and State agencies are making isolated plans for the development of this area. A program should be devised for overall, related development of the area, so that both Federal and State agencies, as well as private enterprise and local tourist and recreation groups in the various communities, can work more closely together. We need to assess the present situation and future needs so that all can begin to move toward a common goal.

This area is famous as the only place in our country where four States touch. More important, it is without question the most spectacular area of erosional grandeur in America. Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall named it "the Golden Circle" after he and I traveled it on foot, by boat, and by helicopter in the summer of 1961. He observed at that time that it "included the greatest concentration of scenic wonders to be found in the country, if not in the world."

Over 80 percent of the land is in Federal or trusteeship ownership, and there are five separate Federal agencies which have land management responsibilities in the area—the National Park Service, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the U.S. Forest Service, the Bureau of Land Management, and the Bureau of Reclamation. At least four of these five have major programs for the construction of highways, roads, and trails within the region, in addition to the Bureau of Public Roads, and State and county road construction agencies of the four States. Eight of the 15 counties in the immediate Golden Circle area have been classified as low-income counties for purposes of the Area Redevelopment Act.

A major objective of the survey would be to study efforts now underway to establish easier public access to the national parks and monuments and to the associated scenic, recreation, and Indian areas of the four States. Recommendations would be made for additional roads or trails which must be built if the area is to be provided with the network of roads it must eventually have. Our aim should be to provide easy access not only to each of the scenic areas, but between them, so that a visitor to one of the golden circle attractions will be encouraged to go on and see others, and to stay in the area for several days.

Additionally, the study would be aimed at finding ways and means of stimulating economic development of the region through increased tourism and recreation activities. To do this we need an inventory of present resources and facilities, which, tied in with the inventory of present roads and the recommendations for future ones, will point the way for coordinated development by Government and private agencies, and by private capital. For example, the survey should serve as a guide for private investors who want to develop tourist accommodations, and other commercial enterprises to serve the greatly increased tourist trade expected in the area.

Within the circle are 17 national parks and monuments, and just outside within an easy drive are 8 others. My own State has Bryce and Zion and Canyonlands National Parks and Arches, Capitol Reef, Cedar Breaks, Natural Bridges, and Rainbow Bridge National Monuments. Part of Hovenweep National

Monument straddles the Utah-Colorado line.

In Colorado, Mesa Verde National Park lies within the circle, and the Black Canyon of the Gunnison National Monument is not far outside. Aztec Ruins, Chaco Canyon, and El Morro National Monuments are located in New Mexico. Arizona's portion of the circle contains the famed Grand Canyon National Park and Canyon de Chelly, Navajo, Wupatki, Pipe Spring, and Sunset Crater National Monuments.

In addition to the scenic wonders, a part of the appeal of the area comes from the Indian culture there—which ranges from the modern to the prehistoric. The presentday Navajo and Hopi Indian Reservations constitute a substantial portion of the land area of the circle itself. The culture of the early cliffdwellers is preserved at Mesa Verde, and in the pueblo country of New Mexico to the east. Still further back in time, some of the earliest Indian pictographs are visible in Canyonlands and elsewhere—relics of a culture and a way of life which flourished in this region more than 800 years ago.

As if all of this were not enough, the miracle of modern engineering is creating in the very center of the area the great Lake Powell Reservoir which is backing up behind the Glen Canyon Dam. Lake Powell will be 180 miles long. This heralds the beginning of boating and other year-round recreation on a great manmade lake which will eventually exceed 253 square miles in area.

I believe the evidence clearly indicates that optimum long-range economic benefits will accrue to the 15-county area only through the protection and orderly development of the golden circle's most valuable asset, the remarkable unique quality of the scenic resources. Since careful study is a prerequisite in any development plan, I am asking that $150,000 be appropriated to finance this first step.

I emphasize again that this would be a survey of and by an area, a survey in which the States and local agencies would cooperate and would have full opportunity to make recommendations. Likewise, its purpose is not only to help State and Federal agencies to direct their planning toward a common goal, but to point out opportunities for private capital in the area, and to promote the economic development of the cities and towns which lie within the circle and in its associated areas.

The success of any plans that may be recommended by the study will depend to a considerable degree on the cooperation and initiative of private interests.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 650) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct, in cooperation with the States and interested Federal agencies, a development survey of the recreational resources of the golden circle of national parks and monuments and associated science, recreation, and Indian areas in the States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, and Utah, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Moss, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PROPOSED UPPER GREAT PLAINS REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill on behalf of myself and Senators Lee Metcalf of Montana, Quentin Burdick of North Dakota, and Gale McGee of Wyoming, proposing an Upper Great Plains Regional Development Commission to promote economic development in their four-State area.

The bill authorizes the Commission to stimulate research, demonstrations, planning and development projects in relation to both natural and human resources in the area. It specifically authorizes study of an Upper Great Plains Scenic and Historic Parkway which would link such attractions as the Badlands, Black Hills, the Great Lakes of the Missouri and South Dakota caves and grasslands areas into a loop with similar attractions, such as the Theodore Roosevelt monuments, in the four-State area.

The measure would authorize a budget of $10 milion annually for the Commission. Projects developed by the Commission would be financed separately.

The statement of purpose in the measure explains that economic growth of the region has lagged behind that of the Nation as a whole because of drought, unwise requirement of cultivation of some lands in the early homestead laws, and necessary readjustments, lack of development of economic means for utilizing ligite and similar large but lower grade mineral resources, major dependency on farm income which is depressed, and need for development projects.

The proposed Commission would include a member from each State appointed by the Governors, a member from each State appointed by the President, and a chairman appointed by the President which would be the executive officer.

The nine-point statement of authority directs the Commission to plan developments in the region, conduct and sponsor studies and research, assist in local programs, encourage interstate compacts and cooperation, support local nonprofit development districts and encourage private investment, work with citizens groups, formulate and recommend Federal projects for the area, and to make grants and contracts with public educational institutions to conduct basic and applied research in weather modification, management of botanic, animal and marine life, and the extracting processing, transporting, and marketing of mineral and other products.

It authorizes $500,000 annually in grants and fellowships for graduate studies and research to train personnel for economic development work in the area.

I have been concerned by the recent report indicating that South Dakota has the 10th lowest per capita income in the Nation. Sister States in the Upper Great Plains have similar problems. This bill is intended as a constructive answer to the reality we face—a proposal to do something about economic development.

We are considering special measures for other areas of lagging economic growth. This proposal is in the national as well as the regional interest, for a strengthened regional economy will strengthen the national economy.

South Dakota and the Upper Great Plains have resources for a higher level of income and standard of living if we will go about developing them imaginatively.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 662) to encourage and accelerate the economic development of the Upper Great Plains region, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. McGovern for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I am very grateful for the opportunity to join with my distinguished colleagues from Montana, North and South Dakota in sponsorship of legislation which I believe will play a vital role in the development of one of our Nation's last remaining underdeveloped areas.

It seems quite evident that no program to promote the even and complete development of our national potential—both in terms of people and resources—can succeed unless it is applied nationally rather than to the most evident trouble spots which command attention by the severity of the problems they possess. While we in the upper Great Plains region are fortunate to have escaped in large measure the extremes of poverty and unemployment that have affected other sections, we still are faced with the very real problem that as a region we have not fully shared in the growth and development that has characterized this Nation since the end of the Second World War.

Mr. President, the State of Wyoming, for one, is possessed of a great potential for development but also has severe problems which have greatly hindered the development of that potential. Among these problems are inadequate rainfall, extremes of climate, great distances from large population centers, and, as Senator McGovern has mentioned, some instances of unwise agricultural development which have caused the wasting and misuse of our agricultural potential.

The Commission which would be authorized under the bill introduced today would focus the attention not only of the people of this area but of the entire Nation upon our problems and upon our potential to surmount them. For several years I have been suggesting the need for a more detailed study of our vast mineral resources so that when the demand comes—and it will come—we will be able to contribute our riches to the national economy.

The proposal also contained in this bill for a historic parkway to link together the many historic sites and natural wonders which have become a part of our Nation's heritage will also provide a welcome impetus to the development of what is certainly one of our greatest resources.

It also should be noted that this is no program imposed upon the States from Washington, but is rather a cooperative effort of all branches of government, of private economy, and the great educational and scientific institutions of our area. To me, this is the only sound approach to a problem of this magnitude.

Mr. President, I realize that to some people the word "planning" is synonymous with socialism and that any attempt to systematically provide for our future is heresy. But it is my firm belief that we cannot afford to sit back and accept what the future will bring, that we must begin now to utilize the spirit of our people and the resources of our area to make that future bright with success and prosperity. To fail to provide a plan for our future is to indulge in a reckless gamble with our very economic survival as the stakes. This we cannot, we must not, do. Again, let me say how pleased I am to join in sponsorship of this measure which I believe constitutes needed action for a better future for my State, my region, and my country.

PROTECTION FROM DISEASED MEAT SOUGHT

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, more than a half century of Federal meat inspection has brought health protection and pocketbook savings to consumers since Congress enacted the first Meat Inspection Act of 1906. But the public confidence in a wholesome meat supply today is undermined because a small minority of meatpackers supply 18 percent of our market with meats either inadequately inspected or not inspected at all.

I am introducing today a bill identical to H.R. 538 championed in the House of Representatives by the able Representative NEAL SMITH, of Iowa. This measure not only provides protection for the consumer, but protects all those whose livelihood depends on meat. Our livestock producers and feeders require a continuing market for their meat animals. Producers also need protection against livestock losses through inspection that permits early detection of obscure animal diseases.

Both the Kennedy and Johnson administrations have supported legislation that would broaden inspection—in cooperation with the State and industry—to cover all meat slaughtered in the United States. In a Presidential message of March 15, 1962, concerning consumer protection, President Kennedy said:

> A fifth of all the meat slaughtered in the United States is not now inspected by the Department of Agriculture because the coverage of the Meat Inspection Act is restricted to meat products moving across State lines.

President Johnson has requested legislation "to insure that all meat and poultry sold in the United States—intrastate as well as interstate—is inspected for safety and wholesomeness, either by the Department of Agriculture or in cooperation with State authorities." This request was applauded by the Agriculture Department, the United Packinghouse, Food and Allied Workers of America, the Amalgamated Meat Cutters, and Butcher Workingmen's Union.

The Neuberger proposal extends protection by permitting State and Federal cooperation in meat inspection services. The Secretary of Agriculture would be empowered to designate State agencies to work with Federal meat inspectors under standards regarded essential by the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Federal-State cooperation also would permit contracts for the use of the Federal seal so that customers would know when they are protected.

Finally, the Secretary of Agriculture would be permitted to exempt plants which are in interstate commerce but slaughter less than 50,000 pounds of cattle, sheep, swine, goats, or horses a week and process less than 20,000 pounds of meat or meat food products a week. The Secretary could end this exemption when he found such action necessary to protect the consuming public.

Although 80 percent of the meat is properly inspected, many consumers as a practical matter are unable to tell whether they are getting inspected or uninspected meat and too many assume that it is all adequately inspected. In a recent report, the United Packinghouse Workers Association stated:

> The members of this union have good reason to warn the American public that it faces a grave danger in the rapidly expanding volume of meat slaughtered and processed which escapes adequate inspection under Federal and State legislation.

Mr. President, a survey conducted by the U.S. Department of Agriculture 2 years ago found meat from diseased carcasses being prepared for human consumption in slaughtering and other processing establishments exempt from Federal meat inspection under the present law. This report revealed that some of the nonfederally inspected plants were contaminated and were using unsafe chemical additives. It also reported the use of improper cleaning techniques, false labels, and failure to detect or control dangerous parasites such as trichinosis.

The use of harmful or otherwise unacceptable additives can be successfully prevented only by actions of trained inspectors having at their disposal competent laboratory facilities, such as those provided by the bill I have introduced today.

Meat inspection varies significantly from State to State. Some allow meat products to contain hog blood, lungs, detergents, antibiotics, and excessive amounts of water. Lax inspection in other States results in contaminated meats, false labels, and improper cleaning techniques. Nineteen States do not bother with inspection of any kind. And only five States have adequate State meat inspection laws to protect their citizens against meat being sold to them from cancer-eyed cows, diseased pigs, and unwholesome parts of the carcass.

This bill would encourage more States to help close the gap in meat inspection standards now existing, and it would in no way conflict with the passage of State laws providing for meat inspection in those plants which are not now covered by Federal jurisdiction.

I believe the packers, as well as Congress, have the responsibility to urge reform for the small minority of uninspected packers and processors who remain exempt under the present enactment. The American consumer should have the assurance that all meat bought is guaranteed inspection by Federal standards. Hearings on meat inspection should not be delayed any longer. Expanding the coverage of Federal meat inspection standards is necessary now.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 663) to extend Federal meat inspection and to permit cooperation with State meat inspection services, and for other purposes, introduced by Mrs. NEUBERGER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

AMENDMENT OF U.S. PUBLIC LAND LAWS

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I send to the desk a bill, cosponsored by my colleagues, Senator BARTLETT and Senator MOSS, designed to eliminate one of the many anachronistic provisions of the U.S. public land laws which has been exceedingly troublesome for many years.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 667) to prohibit private contests against certain public land entries, introduced by Mr. GRUENING (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the legislation would repeal existing law which permits private citizens to claim homesteads on which the original entrymen have failed to comply with the residence and cultivation requirements of the homestead laws.

For nearly 100 years it has been possible for individuals, in effect, to "jump claims" of other settlers on the public domain. It has been all too frequent a practice. It has encouraged individuals seeking an easy way of acquiring land to watch for failures of their neighbors to comply with homestead law requirements and seize an opportunity to file a contest of the original entry in the local land office. When this happens, it is necessary for the first settler to undertake great expense and effort to defend his claim against that of the contestant. Although private contests do not often result in the invalidation of an original claim, this result is sometimes achieved and the contestant succeeds to rights to land on which his neighbor may have expended great effort and, often, considerable sums of money looking toward ownership of the land.

In addition to stirring up troublesome controversy between individual citizens, the result of the private contest procedure is that the individuals initiating contests assume the responsibility, properly that of the Department of the Interior, to determine whether or not homesteaders comply with requirements of the public land laws. It is my view that the question as to whether a homesteader is in compliance with the law or not should properly be determined only at the initiation of the Government agency concerned and not by the whim of a contesting claimant.

It is to be hoped that the Public Land Law Review Commission, which was established by Public Law 88-606, will design a reformation of Federal land laws of the United States to provide an effective system for management and disposition of the public lands. All concerned are aware that the existing legislation in this field is woefully inadequate and should be replaced by modern legislative provisions.

Meanwhile, pending the thorough review of the public land laws to be undertaken by the Commission, there are specific remedies which can be accomplished in specific instances without waiting for a full review of this field of legislation. Clearly, the private contest statutes are in this category.

I urge early and favorable action on this bill.

TO AMEND THE ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT ACT, AS AMENDED, IN ORDER TO INCREASE THE AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act, as amended, in order to increase the authorization for appropriations.

The proposed legislation has been requested by the President and the Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, and I am introducing it in order that there may be a specific bill to which Members of the Senate and the public may direct their attention and comments.

I reserve my right to support or oppose this bill, as well as any suggested amendments to it, when the matter is considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed in the RECORD at this point, together with the letter from the Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency to the President dated January 13, 1965, with regard to it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 672) to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act, as amended, in order to increase the authorization for appropriations, introduced by Mr. FULBRIGHT, by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 672

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the second sentence of section 49(a) of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act, as amended (22 U.S.C. 2589(a)), is amended by inserting immediately after "$20,000,000", the following: "and for the four fiscal years 1966 through 1969, the sum of $55,000,000,".

The letter presented by Mr. FULBRIGHT is, as follows:

U.S. ARMS CONTROL
AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY,
Washington, January 13, 1965.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I submit herewith, for your approval and transmittal to the Congress, proposed legislation to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act in order to extend the authorization for appropriations for this Agency. This proposed amendment has one purpose: to authorize appropriations of $55 million for the 4-year period of fiscal years 1966 through 1969. Since the current authorization is inadequate to permit operations much beyond June 30, 1965, this legislation will be required to keep the Agency operating. Early enactment is necessary to permit timely congressional consideration of the Agency's fiscal 1966 budget estimates.

As you have repeatedly pointed out, enhancing our national security through the verified control and reduction of worldwide armaments and through other measures to lessen the risk of war is a U.S. foreign policy goal of the greatest importance. The United States has already achieved three significant measures toward this end: the nuclear test ban treaty, the communications link between Washington and Moscow, and the U.N. resolution against weapons in space. In addition, we are cutting back our planned production of nuclear materials, and the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union have announced that they intend to make cutbacks in theirs. The Agency has played a key role in the development of the current U.S. proposals before the 18-Nation Disarmament Conference; namely to freeze the production of strategic nuclear delivery vehicles, to halt production of fissionable materials for weapons use, to create observation posts to reduce the danger of war by miscalculation and surprise attack, and to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons into the national control of countries currently not possessing them.

Attempts directed toward arms control and other measures to lessen the threat of war are no longer utopian dreams. The work of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency has become an integral part of our overall national security policy. Indeed, the need for arms-control measures is becoming even more acute as more nations develop a nuclear capability and as the arms race remains with us. Armaments alone can no longer increase security; the unchecked increase of these weapons of mass destruction can only diminish our safety and the hope for peace.

Research in arms control and disarmament is imperative if realistic international agreements are to be reached. The complexity of arms-control negotiations requires systematic and comprehensive study in the development of policy proposals. The chief value of this endeavor is to allow the United States to make concrete proposals for arms-control measures which will not jeopardize our security interests vis-a-vis the relative balance of power in the world, and which will assure that such agreements permit proper inspection and verification to prevent possible subterfuges by other nations. It also has an ancillary value in demonstrating to our allies, adversaries, as well as neutrals, the importance we attach to arms control.

To fulfill the Agency's responsibility as a repository of knowledge on the technical, economic, military, and political aspects of arms control, made especially difficult by the rapidly changing world scene, to back up proposals currently before the 18-Nation Disarmament Conference, and to prepare new proposals in support of your continuing quest for peace, the Agency must have authorization to carry on its efforts during the years ahead. Specifically, the Agency must have resources to pursue vital studies aimed at preventing the spread of nuclear weapons, controlling and reducing arms, and developing other measures to reduce the risk of war. Although the United States has already achieved significant progress in making the world safer from the ever-present nuclear threat, the quest must continue and even intensify during the coming years.

The road to peace and arms control is slow and arduous, but it is one which we must travel. Therefore, I believe our authorization for appropriations should be for a period adequate to allow for long-range research planning and to emphasize our determination in making this effort. I believe a 4-year authorization for fiscal years 1966 through 1969 would accomplish these purposes.

Faithfully yours,

WILLIAM C. FOSTER.

REPEAL OF EQUAL-TIME PROVISION OF COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to repeal permanently the so-called equal-time provision of the Communications Act of 1934.

This is the provision which says that if a radio or television station gives any free time to one candidate for public office, it must accord equal time to all other aspirants, no matter how small their followings may be.

In presidential campaigns this law has prevented the networks from offering their facilities to the nominees of the major political parties, because if they did so they would be required to allocate similar time periods to any number of fringe candidates.

In 1960 Congress suspended the equal-time provision for that one campaign, and it enabled the networks to make their facilities available for the Kennedy-Nixon debates, which served to point up the issues of that campaign as no other device could have done.

Congress considered another suspension of the law in 1964, but failed to pass the necessary legislation.

In a recent editorial the Wall Street Journal refers to an offer of free time for major party candidates in 1964, provided the equal time law was suspended and added:

> The offer died when congressional Democrats, who had favored legislation providing suspension, reversed themselves and killed it, apparently to prevent presidential debates.

Then the editorial proceeds to call attention to a letter from Frank Stanton, President of the Columbia Broadcasting System, Inc.

In view of the fact that I always have favored the repeal of the equal-time law, I am now introducing a repeal bill and hope this Congress will act promptly on it. I ask unanimous consent to have published at this point in the Record the Stanton letter referred to in the Wall Street Journal.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 673) to amend section 315 of the Communications Act of 1934 so as to eliminate the statutory requirement of affording equal time for use of broadcasting stations by candidates for public office, introduced by Mr. Robertson, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. Robertson is, as follows:

TV and the Candidates

Editor, The Wall Street Journal:

I read with great interest your editorial entitled "Time To Remove a Speech Impediment" (January 6) in which you forcefully charge the ridiculous so-called equal-time provision of the Communications Act (sec. 315) with at least part of the responsibility for the recent campaign, which you called one of the most uninformative in memory.

You rightly urge repeal of this antiquated provision which, for all practical purposes, prevents television during election campaigns from performing the enlightening role of which it is demonstrably capable.

I would like to point out that for over a decade we have been fighting to get this law changed. We have petitioned Congress countless times and been joined by many important institutions throughout the country in presenting incontrovertible evidence that repeal of section 315 was clearly in the public interest.

We have made many proposals. I would like to quote from a letter we delivered to the chairmen of the Republican and Democratic National Committees [prior to the 1964 campaign and assuming suspension of the equal-time provision].

"The Columbia Broadcasting System offers, over the CBS Television and Radio Networks, prime time for an extended series of joint appearances of the major parties' presidential candidates and of their vice-presidential candidates, during the 8-week period from Labor Day to Election Day. These joint appearances—whatever the number and length agreed upon by the opposing candidates—will not be available for sponsorship. * * *

"We hope very much that the candidates will see their way clear to appear in 1964 in direct dialogs, where there can be an exchange of views and questions between them."

As a practical matter, section 315 not only prevents face-to-face discussions of the type described above, but many individual appearances by the candidate.

To illustrate, last October Senator Goldwater requested time to respond to the President's broadcast report to the Nation on the explosion of the Chinese atom bomb and the replacement of Chairman Khrushchev. CBS would have granted Senator Goldwater's request were it not for the fact that if we had done so, we would have been subject to claims not only, theoretically, on behalf of the President for a second appearance, but also by up to 10 minor party candidates. As it was, we had already received demands from five of the minor candidates. Our position was upheld both by the Federal Communications Commission and by the courts.

Congress has a clear mandate to correct what is in effect a deplorable short-changing of the American people. To this end I hope your editorial voice will continue to be heard.

Frank Stanton,
President,
Columbia Broadcasting System, Inc.
New York City.

CONTRIBUTION TO CERTAIN INHABITANTS OF THE RYUKYU ISLANDS FOR DEATH AND INJURY OF PERSONS, AND FOR USE OF AND DAMAGE TO PRIVATE PROPERTY

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, by request, for myself and the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Inouye], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution to authorize a contribution to certain inhabitants of the Ryukyu Islands for death and injury of persons, and for use of and damage to private property, arising from acts and omissions of the U.S. Armed Forces, or members thereof, after August 15, 1945, and before April 28, 1952.

The proposed legislation has been requested by the Secretary of the Army and I am introducing it in order that there may be a specific resolution to which Members of the Senate and the public may direct their attention and comments.

I reserve my right to support or oppose this resolution, as well as any suggested amendments to it, when the matter is considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution may be printed in the Record at this point, together with the letter from the Secretary of the Army dated January 8, 1955, to the President pro tempore of the Senate in regard to it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution and letter will be printed in the Record.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 32) to authorize a contribution to certain inhabitants of the Ryukyu Islands for death and injury of persons, and for use of and damage to private property, arising from acts and omissions of the U.S. Armed Forces, or members thereof, after August 15, 1945, and before April 28, 1952, introduced by Mr. Fulbright (for himself and Mr. Inouye), by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S.J. Res. 32

Whereas certain persons of the Ryukyu Islands suffered damages incident to the activities of the Armed Forces of the United States, or members thereof, after the surrender of Japanese forces in the Ryukyus on August 15, 1945, and before the effective date of the Treaty of Peace with Japan on April 28, 1952;

Whereas article 19 of the Treaty of Peace with Japan extinguished the legal liability of the United States for any claims of Japanese nationals, including Ryukyuans, with the result that the United States has made no compensation for the abovementioned damages (except for use of land damage to land during the period from July 1, 1950, to April 28, 1952);

Whereas it is particularly consonant with the concern of the United States, as the sole administering authority in the Ryukyu Islands, for the welfare of the Ryukyuan people, that those Ryukyuans who suffered damages incident to the activities of the United States Armed Forces, or members thereof, should be compensated therefor;

Whereas payment of ex gratia compensation, by advancing the welfare of the Ryukyuan people, will promote the security interest, foreign policy, and foreign relations of the United States; and

Whereas the High Commissioner of the Ryukyu Islands has considered the evidence regarding these claims, and has determined, in an equitable manner, those claims which are meritorious, and the amounts thereof; therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives in Congress assembled, That the United States should make an ex gratia contribution to the persons determined by the High Commissioner of the Ryukyu Islands to be meritorious claimants, in the amounts determined by him, and that the Secretary of the Army or his designee should, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, pay such amounts to the claimants or their legal heirs, as a civil function of the Department of the Army; and be it further

Resolved, That no funds appropriated under this joint resolution shall be disbursed to satisfy claims, or portions thereof, which have been satisfied by contributions made by the Government of Japan.

Sec. 2. There is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $22,000,000 to carry out the provisions of this joint resolution, which funds are authorized to remain available for two years from the effective date of their appropriation. Any funds unobligated by the end of that period shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States.

Sec. 3. No remuneration on account of services rendered on behalf of any claimant in connection with any claim shall exceed 5 per centum of the total amount paid, pursuant to the provisions of this joint resolution, on such claim. Fees already paid for such services shall be deducted from the amounts authorized under this joint resolution. Any agreement to the contrary shall be unlawful and void. Whoever, in the United States or elsewhere, demands or receives, on account of services so rendered, any remuneration in excess of the maximum permitted by this section, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and, upon conviction thereof, shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than twelve months, or both.

The letter presented by Mr. Fulbright is as follows:

January 8, 1965.

Hon. Carl Hayden,
President pro tempore of the Senate.

Dear Senator Hayden: A draft of legislation to authorize a contribution to certain inhabitants of the Ryukyu Islands for death and injury of persons, and for use of and damage to private property, arising from acts and omissions of the U.S. Armed Forces, or members thereof, after August 15, 1945, and before April 28, 1952, is enclosed.

This proposal is part of the Department of Defense legislative program for the 89th Congress, and the Bureau of the Budget advises that, from the standpoint of the administration's program, there is no objection to the presentation of this proposal for the consideration of the Congress. The Department of the Army has been designated the executive agency of the Department of Defense for the civil administration of the Ryukyu Islands, and is therefore the representative of the Department of Defense for this legislation. The Department of State concurs in this proposal, from the viewpoint of foreign policy. It is recommended that the proposal be enacted by the Congress.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

The purpose of the proposed legislation is stated in the title. The following background information will be useful in considering this bill.

A. Historical background

The Ryukyu Islands became an integral part of Japan in 1879. This area was regarded as enemy territory by the U.S. Armed

Forces during World War II, and was invaded by them on March 26, 1945. Hostilities ended in the Ryukyus on June 21, 1945, and Japanese forces there formally surrendered on August 15, 1945. Full military government was established in the islands on September 21, 1945. For purposes of control and administration, the Ryukyus were severed from Japan, and Japanese postwar legislation was not, of itself, extended to this area.

The Treaty of Peace with Japan, which was signed by the United States and other nations at San Francisco on September 8, 1951, entered into force on April 28, 1952. By article 3 thereof, Japan agreed to concur in any proposal of the United States to place the Ryukyu Islands under the United Nations trusteeship system, with the United States as the sole administering authority. Pending the making of such a proposal, Japan gave to the United States the right to exercise all and any powers of administration, legislation, and jurisdiction over the territory and inhabitants of the Ryuku Islands. The northernmost group of these islands, known as the Amami Oshima group, was returned to Japanese jurisdiction on December 25, 1953, and is no longer considered a part of the Ryukyu Islands, as they are known today.

The President has asserted, in the budget of the U.S. Government for fiscal year 1965, that "to protect the security of the United States and of the free world, the United States will continue responsibility for the administration of the Ryukyu Islands as long as conditions of threat and tension in the Far East require the maintenance of military bases in these islands."

B. Governmental arrangements

Under the provisions of Executive Order No. 10713, dated June 5, 1957, as amended by Executive Order No. 11010, dated March 19, 1962, the President delegated to the Secretary of Defense the responsibility of exercising the above-mentioned powers of administration, legislation, and jurisdiction over the Ryukyus, subject to the direction and control of the President. The basic order established a civil administration of the Ryukyu Islands (USCAR), headed by a High Commissioner appointed from among the active-duty members of the U.S. Armed Forces. The 1962 amendment to the basic order also provided for a civilian official, under the High Commissioner, called the Civil Administrator; his powers and duties are such as may be assigned to him by the High Commissioner. The basic order charged the Secretary of State with the responsibility for conducting Ryukyuan relations with foreign countries and international organizations. It also established the Government of the Ryukyu Islands (GRI), which, under the High Commissioner, had extensive powers in the legislative, executive, and judicial fields.

C. Nature of claims

The presence of U.S. Armed Forces in the Ryukyu Islands constituted a military occupation from June 21, 1945, until April 28, 1952. Certain damages were caused during this period to residents of the Ryukyu Islands by various acts and omissions of the U.S. Armed Forces or of their members. These damages ranged from the uncompensated use of real and personal property, taken over for the legitimate requirements of the occupying forces, to tortious acts by members of the forces.

It is a generally recognized principle of international law, particularly as reflected in the provisions of the Hague Convention No. IV of 1907 (which has been ratified by both the United States and Japan), that individuals whose personal or real property is used or taken by occupation forces are entitled to fair compensation for such use. In other occupations of enemy territory by U.S. Armed Forces during and after World War II, such compensation was normally provided, on behalf of the United States, by the existing local governments. This principle applied also to claims arising from death or personal injury suffered by residents of the occupied territory due to acts or omissions of the Armed Forces or of their members.

However, the absence of any financially responsible local government in the Ryukyus in the immediate postwar years unfortunately resulted in the nonpayment of any compensation to individual Ryukyuans for the use of or damage to their property by the U.S. occupation forces during the pretreaty period (with one exception, as will be explained below), or for any pretreaty tort claims for death or personal injury caused by such forces or members thereof.

In any event, U.S. liability for Ryukyuan claims arising during that period was formally extinguished by the Treaty of Peace with Japan, which entered into force on April 28, 1952. In article 19a of this treaty, Japan waived all its claims, and those of its nationals (including Ryukyuans), against the Allied Powers and their nationals, arising from the war and occupation of Japanese territory prior to the coming into force of the treaty. (Unlike other agreements with former enemy states, this treaty did not require Japan to settle and pay the claims of its nationals against the other contracting parties.) Accordingly, the United States, on the basis that it has thus been absolved from legal responsibility for payment of these claims, denies legal liability for such claims and therefore has not paid them—except for certain claims relating to rental of land and damages thereto during the last 2 years of the occupation period, as will be explained herewith.

Beginning with the effective date of July 1, 1950, the principle of uncompensated requisitioning of Ryukyuan private property was abandoned in favor of leasehold arrangements, with rentals paid by the U.S. Government; payments have also been made to cover the cost of restoring lands damaged during that period. These arrangements were undertaken on the basis of implied leases, executed by virtue of the retroactive provisions of Civil Administration Proclamation No. 26, dated December 5, 1953. These particular pretreaty claims may thus be regarded as covered by article 19b of the treaty, which specifically exempts from the waiver provision of article 19a those claims which are "specifically recognized in the laws of any Allied Power enacted since September 2, 1945." These already satisfied pretreaty claims, of course, are not included among the claims covered by the attached draft legislation.

As a matter of related interest, the Government of Japan denies legal liability for pretreaty claims in the home islands of Japan, but has provided some compensation to such Japanese claimants. Although the Government of Japan similarly denies legal liability for pretreaty claims in the Ryukyu Islands, in 1957 it made solatia payments to Ryukyuan pretreaty claimants in the amount of 1 billion yen (approximately $2.8 million). The amount of these solatia has been deducted from the amount of the claims covered by the proposed legislation, and a specific stipulation has been included therein, precluding disbursement of funds appropriated thereunder for claims already satisfied by the Government of Japan. Although the Government of Japan, when paying these solatia, stipulated that the amount thereof would be repaid to it, should the Ryukyuan claimants succeed in obtaining compensation from the U.S. Government for these claims, this stipulation was a unilateral action on the part of the Government of Japan, and has never been agreed to by the U.S. Government.

D. U.S. policy regarding these claims

The claims to be compensated by this bill have been presented by Ryukyuans to the high commissioner and to his predecessors during the years since the treaty entered into effect. Numerous petitions in this matter have also been submitted to him and to other officials of the U.S. Government. Most recently, in 1960, the Ryukyuan members of the High Commissioner's Land Advisory Committee submitted to him a comprehensive petition, requesting compensation for these claims. Although recognizing that the United States had no legal liability for such claims, the High Commissioner forwarded this petition to the Department of the Army, recommending that the United States review this entire problem with a view toward modifying its past policy of relying solely on the legal merits of the case, and that it now give due emphasis to related considerations of equity and moral responsibility.

The High Commissioner's recommendation for a review of this problem was favorably received by the Department of the Army, and, with the approval of the Department of Defense and the concurrence of both the Department of State and the Bureau of the Budget, the high commissioner was directed to undertake a review of the entire subject of Ryukyuan pretreaty claims, to include discussions with the Ryukyuan claimants, their representatives, and the Government of the Ryukyu Islands. An announcement to this effect was released by the High Commissioner on April 6, 1961. In his announcement, the High Commissioner noted that he thereby assumed no legal responsibility or commitment to settle these claims, and stated that they were being reviewed because of the concern of the United States, as the administering authority in the Ryukyus, for the well-being of the Ryukyuan people. Advance copies of this announcement had previously been distributed to the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House, the members of the concerned committees of both the Senate and House, and to selected Senators and Congressmen.

The High Commissioner subsequently established a joint Ryukyuan-American group to conduct the review, the American members of which were appointed by himself and the Ryukyuan members by the Chief Executive of the Government of the Ryukyu Islands. The committee examined all of the evidence in this matter and reviewed it in accordance with equitable standards that had previously been developed, and applied with considerable success, in reviewing claims submitted to the U.S. Government by residents of other areas in the Far East. The committee completed its study and submitted a unanimous report to the High Commissioner on March 23, 1962. After reviewing the committee's report, the High Commissioner transmitted it to the Department of the Army on October 16, 1962. The High Commissioner supported the committee's conclusions and recommended that appropriate action be taken to seek approval by the Congress for authorization of the proposed payments. This legislative proposal is a direct result of the committee's study and of the High Commissioner's recommendation thereon.

Bills seeking the same objective as this proposal were introduced in the 86th, 87th, and 88th Congresses, but were not enacted.

The proposed payments are considered warranted because of the concern of the United States, as the administering authority in the Ryukyus, for the well-being of the Ryukyuan people. Payment of these claims will also provide effective redress for an acknowledged inequity, which has caused these claimants to throw themselves on the mercy of the U.S. Government, which has full jurisdiction over them. It would also promote the security interests of the United States, by fostering an atmosphere of respect on the part of the Ryukyuan people for the spirit of fairplay and equity evidenced by the U.S. Government, in keeping with the image and record of American practices throughout the world.

While the legal position of the U.S. Government is quite clear, in view of the abovementioned extinguishment of our liability for these claims by article 19 of the treaty, the fact that the individual claimants were, through no fault of their own, left uncompensated during the 7 years of the occupation, contrary to the practice followed in other occupied areas, does constitute a situation calling for equitable adjustment at this time. In referring this matter to the Congress, the executive branch believes that the problem should be regarded in this light. This question is basically keyed to the moral imperative of living up to the demands of equity, even where no legal liability exists. It is respectfully suggested that this be the framework for legislative consideration of the attached proposal.

E. Cost and budget data

The total of all claims which have been submitted in this matter was originally $43 million, as tabulated in the above-mentioned petition submitted by the claimants to the High Commissioner. However, in the course of the review conducted by the Joint Committee, as approved by the High Commissioner, the total of the meritorious claims has been reduced to approximately $22 million, broken down as follows:

Personal injury and death	$800,000
Land rentals (1945–50)	15,000,000
Restoration of released lands	2,500,000
Water rights	50,000
Property damage, growing crops, etc	3,650,000

If this legislative proposal is enacted, it is estimated that the bulk of this sum would be expended within 1 years. This amount has not been included in any estimate of appropriations submitted through budget channels by either the Department of Defense or the Department of the Army.

It is proposed that distribution of the requested payments would be made by the Government of the Ryukyu Islands, under controls established by the High Commissioner, and would not require additional civilian employment or expenditures for personnel services. The anticipated negligible increase in general administrative expenses in the office of the High Commissioner will be absorbed within other appropriations for the Department of Defense.

In connection with the operative clause of the attached joint resolution, it is proposed that a tabulation of the claims determined by the High Commissioner to be meritorious will be submitted to the respective committees of the Congress in the course of their consideration of this proposal.

Sincerely,

STEPHEN AILES,
Secretary of the Army.

DEVELOPMENT OF APPALACHIAN REGION—AMENDMENTS (AMENDMENT NO. 3)

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I sent to the desk an amendment, intended to be proposed to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] to S. 3, a bill to provide public works and economic development programs and the planning and coordination needed to assist in the development of the Appalachian region. I ask that it be printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred.

The amendment (No. 3) was referred to the Committee on Public Works.

PRINTING OF SENATE BILL 576

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, on Tuesday, January 19, I introduced a bill (S. 576), to encourage physicians to practice in areas having a shortage of doctors. The Senate gave its consent to hold the bill at the desk until January 26. It now appears that the committee is prepared to give this bill its immediate consideration, and therefore there is no need to hold the bill at the desk for that length of time. I ask unanimous consent that the bill (S. 576) be taken from the desk and be sent for printing today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] be listed as a cosponsor of S. 363 and that his name appear on subsequent printings of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ECONOMIC CONVERSION AND DIVERSIFICATION COMMISSION—ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, 30 Senators from both parties have joined in cosponsoring Senate bill 30, to create an Economic Conversion and Diversification Commission, Senators BARTLETT, BAYH, BREWSTER, BURDICK, CHURCH, CLARK, GORE, GRUENING, HARTKE, INOUYE, KENNEDY of New York, LONG of Missouri, McINTYRE, McGEE, METCALF, MONDALE, MONTOYA, MORSE, MOSS, MUSKIE, NELSON, NEUBERGER, RANDOLPH, RIBICOFF, SCOTT, TYDINGS, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, YARBOROUGH, and YOUNG of Ohio.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the 30 cosponsors of this bill be added thereto.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, this represents nearly twice as many Senators as sponsored the bill last year. I have received indications from many more Senators that they would support the bill should it come up on the floor of the Senate for consideration.

In the House of Representatives, 15 Members have introduced similar legislation, Representatives BROWN of California, FARBSTEIN, JOELSON, ROSENTHAL, RYAN, SICKLES, MINISH, RODINO, EDWARDS of California, CORMAN, GRABOWSKI, CONTE, LONG of Maryland, and MILLER.

Mr. President, cutbacks in defense spending are taking place and will continue. Over the last year and a half, the Secretary of Defense has announced the closing of some 125 military installations with a total reduction of nearly 80,000 jobs. The military budget declined by $500 million last year and another $300 million this year.

A recent study by the Arthur D. Little Co. warned that the aerospace industry faced a 15-percent drop in contract revenue over the next 5 years. The report stated:

> The production portion of the defense budget available to the aerospace industry will decline about 30 percent and defense research, development, testing, and evaluation will decline about 15 percent.

It is increasingly clear that to put these resources no longer needed for defense to constructive use in the civilian economy will require more than just wishful thinking. It will require thoughtful study and planning on Federal, regional, and local levels. The purpose of this bill is to create a high-level Federal commission to work on the problem now with business and labor, before the full impact of this kind of technological unemployment hits.

How can the Federal Government help to put the facilities of the Black Hills Ordnance Depot in Igloo, S. Dak., to productive use? What can be done to help the 10,000 employees of the Brooklyn Navy Yard to find jobs in the area and put some of the finest industrial property in New York City to proper use? What should happen to the Springfield Armory in Massachusetts that is no longer needed for ordnance requirements? How can the Federal Government work with the citizens of Lincoln, Nebr., to replace jobs and opportunities being reduced at Federal installations there? Where can the city of Seattle turn for guidance and help in meeting cutbacks in the production of nuclear materials?

Mr. President, this is precisely the type of question that the Federal Government should be able to answer—and help defense firms and federally impacted communities to answer. In my view, this Commission will fill a vital gap and enable the whole country to benefit from defense cutbacks by intelligent and constructive planning.

The bill has been revised to meet objections that were raised during Commerce Committee hearings last year and according to Business Week magazine, these changes have won White House support for the bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article published in the New York Times discussing the plight of the aerospace industry, as well as a brief article from Business Week.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Jan. 17, 1965]

FUTURE FOUND UNCERTAIN FOR AEROSPACE INDUSTRY

(By Richard Rutter)

"When there is no wind—row."

That is reputedly an old Chinese proverb. "Well, this is the time for companies in the aerospace industry to row," says Dan A. Kimball, chairman of the Aerojet-General Corp.

This remark from one of the leaders in the field points up a growing concern within this largest of all industries. The concern is not so much over the immediate future—which might be described as leveling off but far from depressed—as over the rapidly intensifying competition in which some companies may well suffer and others simply fail.

EFFECT OF CUTBACK

The "wind" in the aerospace field has been provided by the sharp buildup in defense and space programs in recent years. Now, there are reduced Government expenditures, stretchouts, the fulfillment of many military hardware requirements, and a cutback in the start of new programs. This has already resulted in a sales dip for some companies.

Aerojet, for instance, last year had its second best year, down from 1963 after a 10-year stretch of growth in sales.

Aerojet says it is tightening up operating costs to make the company more competitive and is also diversifying its technical base to pursue a wider range of programs. It is involved in such major existing programs as the Polaris, Minuteman, and Titan missiles, and has a role in the next generation programs such as the Nerva nuclear rocket, the Snap–8 nuclear power system, the M–1 liquid hydrogen engine, the large solid rocket space booster program, oceanics, and tactical warfare.

Just last week Arthur D. Little, Inc., the industrial research and management consultant concern, issued a massive study called "Strategies for Survival in the Aerospace Industry." It was, on the whole, a very sobering report.

Little, for instance, forecast that the production part of the Nation's defense budget available to the aerospace industry would decline about 30 percent in the next 5 years. A decline of 15 percent over the same period was seen in defense research and development spending. The study also pointed out that the number of major aircraft and missile programs annually placed in development or production is decreasing because of these factors:

The increased cost of major weapons systems has limited the number that can be procured.

Greater effectiveness has limited the number required:

Adequate strategic weapons force levels have been achieved.

Not all leaders in the aerospace industry are agreed on the outlook. Some insist no major decline is in sight. Others question whether missile production actually has reached or neared a peak.

DIVERSIFICATION PLANS

Meanwhile, there are the first signs of a planned diversification move into entirely new fields—notably, the conversion of salt water into fresh and underwater studies. Air freight is seen by some companies as a major impetus to business in coming years.

Aerospace thus gives the appearance of an industry entering a state of flux, with its future outlines not yet clearly discernible. Since it had sales last year of some $20 billion and employs more than 1.1 million, the potential effect on the national economy is far reaching and certainly bears close watching.

The Lockheed Aircraft Corp. is one of the giants that sounds an optimistic note. Daniel J. Houghton, president, comments:

"As for the outlook for 1965 * * * so much depends on the timing of new programs in the immediate offing and our success in winning one or more of the competitions on which we are now bidding. These programs have a total value of something like $4 billion.

"Our best estimate is that this year looks very much like 1964 from a standpoint of both sales and earnings."

Of great significance for 1965 and beyond is that Lockheed and other major aerospace producers are engaged in seven major contract competitions with a total value of more than $10 billion. These include the projected commercial supersonic transport; the C–5A, huge military transport for the Air Force; an armed helicopter for the Army; a vertical and short takeoff transport for the Air Force; the manned orbital laboratory, a military research station in space, and a followup to the current 156-inch solid rocket motor program for the Air Force.

VAST POTENTIAL SEEN

Lockheed says that it foresees a vast potential for the new frontier under the seas and has developed capabilities in a half dozen areas, such as studies of undersea life support systems. The company has organized a Bioastronautics Division, charged with studying man both in space and underwater.

Among Lockheed's current programs are the C–141 Starlifter transport, the C–130 Hercules transport, the P–3 Orion antisubmarine patrol plane, the F–104 Starfighter, the Polaris missile and the Agena orbital vehicle.

William M. Allen, president of the Boeing Co., says that his company achieved record commercial jet airliner sales in 1964. But, he adds, Boeing now faces several major new business challenges and these "can have a tremendous bearing on our future."

Here, again, the challenges lie in intense competition for major contracts involving the supersonic commercial transport, the manned orbital laboratory and a military heavy logistics system.

Mr. Allen points out that the available military and space market in the next several years has been estimated as nearly eight times the size of the available commercial market. He believes the impression that times are tough as far as new business opportunities are concerned is not warranted. "Times are tough only in terms of the competition we face, and this is the subject to which we must devote ourselves," he says.

Last year Boeing had record deliveries and sales of its 707, 720, and 727 jet commercial airliners, although this was partly offset by the completion of production of KC–135 jet aerial tankers for the military. The Aerospace Division delivered 300 more Minutemen missiles to the Strategic Air Command. In September, the advanced Minuteman II made a successful first flight. Work continued on the company's Saturn V first-stage booster, helicopter, and gas turbine programs.

PROGRESS PREDICTED

"The aerospace industry should continue to maintain its position of prominence in the overall economic picture in 1965 with the growth of commercial aviation and the expected progress of the Nation's space program," says Donald W. Douglas, Jr., president of the Douglas Aircraft Co. He adds:

"Although there will be a flattening out of defense spending, it should be noted that a $50 billion market (somewhat less this year) is substantial. It will, however, be more difficult for firms to obtain defense business if they are not prepared to invest profits in facilities and research and development, which create the capabilities required to discharge the responsibilities of the complex projects assigned to the aerospace industry."

Douglas Aircraft puts considerable stress on the commercial aspects of the industry. Last week, for instance, the company rolled out the world's newest jet transport, the DC–9. Orders and options for the DC–9, a short- to medium-range twin-jet, have already passed the 100 mark even though the first flight has yet to take place. So far, 244 of the older DC–8 jet airliners have been sold, with the order backlog at 30.

In the space area, the company is involved in the Saturn IV–B booster and it is competing for contracts on the manned orbital laboratory plus a large orbiting research laboratory and an orbiting space station.

W. B. Bergen, president of the Martin Co., a division of the Martin Marietta Corp., sees some other developments of importance in the coming years. One is in the area of manned military space operation, as distinguished from the civilian-oriented space flights for the gathering of scientific information. Mr. Bergen forecasts:

"The military manned space operation will commence in near-earth orbit and, I expect, will be concentrated there for several years. In the long view, however, I feel that what we are seeing now is comparable to what happened when an aviator who just happened to be a military man piloted an airplane for the first time. As it turned out, this was a revolutionary event, but no one could truly foresee then how the airplane would shape and reshape security considerations. I feel the same about space flight by man."

Mr. Bergen also does not share the opinion that there will not be another generation of intercontinental ballistic missiles. There will be another generation of ICBM's, he is convinced, but not until the Nation's missile defense has caught up to, or passed, the offensive power. He expects strides in this direction in 1965.

SALES SET RECORD

North American Aviation, Inc., had record sales last year and confidently expects the same in 1965. J. L. Atwood, president, attributes this success in great part to diversification of space and military projects.

He explains: "At one extreme we have developed a whole new generation of microminiaturized electronic equipment—so small that much of the circuitry cannot be defined with the naked eye. * * * At the other extreme, we have developed, built, and flown the first large aircraft designed to cruise for intercontinental distances at three times the speed of sound." The latter is the XB–70A.

Going beyond space, North American has devoted much attention recently to the development of a sodium graphite reactor that would produce not only electrical power but also fresh water from salt water. The aim, of course, is prices competitive with conventional power and water sources.

In the space field, the company continues in its major Apollo (the moon landing) and Saturn booster programs. It is putting the XB–70A plane through initial tests, has delivered a more powerful model of the X–15 to the Air Force and the National Space and Aeronautics Administration, and is currently engaged in early steps toward production of a light armed reconnaissance aircraft for counterinsurgency use.

William P. Gwinn, president of the United Aircraft Corp., is enthusiastic about the future of air freight. He notes that last year the free world's carriers flew almost 2.5 billion ton-miles of air freight, an increase of 1.3 billion over the 1958 level. Air freight, according to Mr. Gwinn, is growing twice as fast as air passenger travel and by 1970 will amount to 7 billion ton-miles. This, of course, is all part of the aerospace industry's activity.

United's basic business is building jet engines and aircraft equipment. Through its various divisions, it is also involved in hydrogen-oxygen space engines, fuel cells for onboard power of space vehicles, the moon space suit and its life support equipment, and many other projects.

Sylvania Electric Products, Inc., is the space component of the General Telephone & Electronics Corp. The company says its market studies indicate the phenomenal growth of pure space spending by the Government in recent years will slow to an increase of only 5 percent a year each year for at least the next 5 years. This applies to the budgets of both NASA and the Department of Defense. Future spending, according to Sylvania projections, will concentrate on manned space flight, space communications, and both unmanned and manned experiments.

TESTS ARE SEEN

Other predictions: The administration will continue to extend management control over space programs. All new programs will have to pass "cost effectiveness" tests. The top 15 NASA prime contractors are receiving 75 percent of that agency's total space awards and "the rich will get richer."

This is just a sampling of the thinking and planning going on in the aerospace industry as it faces an increasingly uncertain future.

The Arthur D. Little study points out an important trend within the industry. Business with the Government is becoming more and more a matter of research and development as opposed to production. In fact, the level of research and development work has already exceeded that of production.

The report suggests that aerospace companies accordingly devote increased time and effort to research and development and specialize in relatively few lines rather than try to compete simultaneously in many areas of the defense and space markets.

And, finally, even though the overall aerospace market is no longer growing, Little says, it can still be profitable. Those skies are not completely dark.

[From Business Week magazine]

Study of Defense Cutback Effect Backed by L.B.J.

President Johnson is ready to back a bill to help communities hit by defense cutbacks—a switch from last year when he was cool to the idea.

Senator George McGovern, Democrat of South Dakota, held hearings last summer on the bill, which calls chiefly for establishment of a national commission to study defense adjustment problems. McGovern is reintroducing the bill this year with the commission idea intact. But he is dropping a recommendation that would have required each defense contractor to establish a company readjustment committee, a provision opposed by industry and by Ackley. By dropping it, McGovern won White House support for the bill.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS, JOINT RESOLUTION, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION, AND RESOLUTION

Under authority of the orders of the Senate, as indicated below, the following names have been added as additional cosponsors for the following bills, joint resolution, concurrent resolution, and resolution:

Authority of January 6, 1965:

S. 2. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States: Senators Allott, Anderson, Bartlett, Bennett, Byrd of Virginia, Cannon, Case, Dodd, Dominick, Eastland, Fulbright, Harris, Hartke, Holland, Hruska, Johnston, Jordan of North Carolina, Jordan of Idaho, Kennedy of New York, Kuchel, Magnuson, McGovern, Mondale, Morse, Morton, Murphy, Nelson, Neuberger, Pastore, Prouty, Saltonstall, Scott, Simpson, Smathers, Sparkman, Symington, Talmadge, Thurmond, Tower, Tydings, Williams of Delaware, and Young of North Dakota.

S. 49. A bill to conserve the offshore fishery resources of the United States and its territories, and for other purposes: Mr. Morse, Mr. Ribicoff, and Mrs. Smith.

S. 111. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress, research, and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes: Senators Bayh, Brewster, Case, Clark, Dodd, Gore, Harris, Hartke, Kuchel, McGovern, Morse, Mundt, Nelson, and Pell.

S. 290. A bill to protect the integrity of the court and jury functions in criminal cases: Senators Burdick, Dodd, Fong, Inouye, Johnston, Long of Missouri, McGee, Moss, Prouty, Scott, Yarborough, Young of North Dakota, and Young of Ohio.

S. 291. A bill to effectuate the provision of the sixth amendment of the United States Constitution requiring that defendants in criminal cases be given the right to a speedy trial: Senators Burdick, Fong, Gruening, Inouye, Johnston, Long of Missouri, McGee, Prouty, Scott, Talmadge, Yarborough, Young of North Dakota, and Young of Ohio.

S.J. Res. 2. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to preserve to the people of each State power to determine the composition of its legislature and the apportionment of the membership thereof in accordance with law and the provisions of the Constitution of the United States: Senators Hill, Lausche, McClellan, Robertson, Sparkman, and Stennis.

S. Con. Res. 4. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the people of the United States should not be denied an opportunity to view the film prepared by the United States Information Agency entitled "John F. Kennedy—Years of Lightning, Day of Drums": Senators Bible, Clark, Inouye, Jackson, and Neuberger.

Authority of January 7, 1965:

S. 309. A bill creating a Commission to be known as the Commission on Noxious and Obscene Matters and Materials: Senators Dirksen, Eastland, Fannin, Gruening, Hickenlooper, Jordan of Idaho, and Lausche.

S. 315. A bill to establish a National Arts Foundation: Senators McCarthy, McGovern, Mondale, and Yarborough.

Authority of January 12, 1965:

S. 400. A bill to authorize assistance under the Area Redevelopment Act for certain additional areas which have sustained, or are about to sustain, sudden and severe economic hardship: Senators Bartlett, Clark, Cotton, Douglas, Kennedy of Massachusetts, Kuchel, Long of Missouri, Magnuson, McGovern, Mondale, Muskie, Pastore, Pell, Randolph, Ribicoff, Scott, and Yarborough.

S. 408. A bill to authorize a study of methods of helping to provide financial assistance to victims of future flood disasters: Senators Boggs, Case, Church, Clark, Douglas, Gruening, Hartke, Jackson, Long of Missouri, McGovern, Mondale, Neuberger, Pell, Ribicoff, Scott, and Tydings.

S. 458. A bill to provide educational assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces in the southeast Asia theater of operations: Senators Allott, Bartlett, Curtis, Fannin, Mundt, Murphy, Randolph, and Simpson.

S. 459. A bill to designate Vietnam as a combat zone for Federal tax purposes: Senators Allott, Bennett, Clark, Fannin, Jordan of Idaho, Murphy, Randolph, and Simpson.

S. Res. 25. Resolution expressing the sense of the Senate as to the arming of American servicemen fighting in Vietnam: Senators Allott, Bennett, Curtis, Fannin, Jordan of Idaho, Murphy, Randolph, and Simpson.

Authority of January 15, 1965:

S. 563. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Army to convey certain lands to the State of Utah: Mr. Bennett.

SOUTH AFRICA

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, last year Mr. Clayton Willis, WAVA White House correspondent, made a trip to South Africa. On August 21 of last year he made a statement over station WAVA. He is in accord with many of the conclusions I reached during my trip to Africa.

I should like to read one paragraph from his statement:

> Moreover, the South African Negro has the best hospital attention and employment in all Africa. Thousands of Negroes from other African nations are migrating to South Africa simply because there are jobs and a better life in that relatively economically healthy republic.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

South Africa

(WAVA commentary by WAVA White House Correspondent Clayton Willis, August 21, 1964)

While more publicized African problems are developing in the Congo today, one of the most botched up news reporting jobs of recent times centers on South Africa.

I am just back from there and can report, that contrary to anticolonial ballyhoo, there is plenty being done to help the progress of the black people of that racially divided country.

It's a two-way street in South Africa. The Negro does not yet have much individual liberty. Anyone who says he does is either dishonest or blind, and maybe both. He has no social equality and no vote. The South African Government feels it cannot extend franchise to the Africans since they outnumber the white population by four to one. But, a key matter found being overlooked is that the South African Government now provides the best living conditions for Africans on the entire continent. Housing, in particular, stands in splendid contrast to the hovels scattered through the rest of dark Africa. Moreover, the South African Negro has the best hospital attention and employment in all Africa. Thousands of Negroes from other African nations are migrating to South Africa simply because there are jobs and a better life in that relatively economically healthy republic.

And, there are other signs of progress. The Government in Pretoria has begun permitting Negro athletes to participate in major competition with whites. This, of course, is where the United States itself made its relatively recent breakthrough in race relations when Jackie Robinson became the first Negro to play big league baseball.

How small and sad it is at the same time to view a stand taken by the International Olympics Committee. This muddle-headed outfit headed by America's Avery Brundage, has demanded that the South African Olympics Committee disassociate itself from the South African Government apartheid (or separate racial development) policy. Thus, while rejecting South Africa, the world sports body accepts athletes from the Soviet Union and other Communist dictatorships. If politics is to become involved at all, and it should not, then let Mr. Brundage's group also throw the Russian athletes out of the games.

Communist practices are, after all, by all standards more brutal than apartheid. This is not to accept the social discriminations practiced by the South African Government, but to insist on a single set of rules in the sports arena, and to put into perspective these facts of progress in South Africa.

CHANGE IN LEADERSHIP OF REPUBLICAN NATIONAL COMMITTEE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, today the Republican National Committee will formalize, I believe, action to install a new "skipper," who will take office on the 1st of April. On this occasion there will be some lamentations, I suppose. But hope springs eternal.

In that connection I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial published in the Chicago Sun entitled "Old GOP Habit: Oust Chairman," by Milburn P. Akers, onetime head of the Associated Press Bureau in Washington, press aid to Gov. Henry Horner, and a longtime editor and managing editor of the Chicago Sun Times, in which Mr. Akers sets forth the history of the party and the vitality that always gives us hope.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OLD GOP HABIT: OUST CHAIRMAN

(By Milburn P. Akers)

The GOP National Committee having lost seven of the last nine presidential elections, again assembles to pick up the pieces and restore life to the party corpse. For hope springs eternal, even among those party stalwarts who concede that the 1952 and 1956 victories were largely attributable to Dwight D. Eisenhower's personal popularity based on his World War II role.

The committee, meeting in Chicago this weekend, has avoided a repetition of its bitter Omaha 1949 meeting, held in the aftermath of Thomas E. Dewey's spectacular feat of "snatching defeat out of the jaws of victory." It has already cut the political throat of its chairman, Dean Burch, who recognized his own impending defeat for reelection sooner than he did Barry Goldwater's catastrophic rout. His forthcoming resignation makes unnecessary a rerun of the Omaha scenario when HUGH SCOTT, now a U.S. Senator from Pennsylvania, was publicly excoriated by committee members who, unable to vent their ire in a meaningful manner upon Dewey, the defeated nominee, chose their chairman as the sacrificial offering.

Unlike Burch, who has announced his resignation effective April 1, SCOTT fought back. He won a narrow rollcall victory, 54 to 50.

It was a largely meaningless one, however. For SCOTT's opposition continued its harassment and brought about the chairman's resignation the following August Burch would have found the chairmanship similarly uncomfortable had he somehow managed reelection. As it is, Ray Bliss, Ohio State chairman scheduled to replace Burch, has a chance to be a somewhat unifying force in a somewhat fragmented minority party.

SCOTT and Burch are not the only one-time chairmen of the GOP's national committee who became targets following party defeat. Herbert Brownell, put into that post by Dewey when the two-time nominee made his first unsuccessful presidential race in 1944, was bombarded following party defeat. So was John Hamilton after the party's 1936 debacle. So have been most losing national chairmen of the GOP.

Republicans seem to operate on the theory that the political gods can, after a GOP defeat, be appeased only by offering up the party chairman as a burnt sacrifice. Democrats occasionally perform similar tribal rites.

The role of chairman, usually one of limited influence, is important, but far from being all important, in the return to power by a political party. Bliss, Burch's scheduled successor, has been a very effective State chairman. He'll probably be an effective national chairman. More important, however, is the image projected by Republican Representatives and Senators between now and the 1968 election and the kind of jobs accomplished by Republican Governors and, of course, the ultimate nominee.

Democrats have occupied the White House only 40 of the 108 years since 1856, when the GOP ran its first presidential nominee. They had no White House occupant for 24 years until Grover Cleveland's first election; none for 16 years until Woodrow Wilson and none for 12 years until Franklin D. Roosevelt.

The longest GOP drought was 20 years, the administrations of Roosevelt and Harry S. Truman. Of the 28 presidential contests since that of 1856 the Democrats have won 11: Grover Cleveland, 2; Woodrow Wilson, 2; Franklin D. Roosevelt, 4; Harry S. Truman, 1; John F. Kennedy, 1, and Lyndon B. Johnson, 1.

Over the years, the Republicans have had more electoral successes than the Democrats. But not in recent years.

Many segments of the public have come to look upon the GOP as a back number, as a party out of tune with the times, and as a party which accents reactionary, extremist, and racist ideology. Changing that image, if it can be changed, will be Chairman Bliss' toughest job. For it can't be changed unless he brings about some fundamental changes in the GOP itself.

PRAYER IN SCHOOLS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the Acacia Mutual Life Insurance Co., with headquarters in Washington, D.C., inserted a full page advertisement in the Washington Star, dated January 12, 1965, dealing with the question of prayer in schools.

This article is at once so timely, so sensible, and so appealing that it merits consideration in every part of the country. To that end, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the advertisement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IT'S TIME TO STAND UP AND BE COUNTED

"Come Lord God and be our guest,
Let these, Thy gifts to us be blessed,
For health and strength and daily food,
We praise Thy name, Oh Lord, Amen."

This is the simple "blessing" which four times a day, at each lunch shift, is said aloud by students and teachers standing in the cafeteria of the W. T. Woodson High School in Fairfax County, Va. No one is required either to stand or to recite this grace. It is entirely voluntary. It is interdenominational and favors no specific form of religion.

Despite these facts, the National Capital American Civil Liberties Union is going to appear before the Fairfax County School Board on Thursday, January 14, and contend that this practice violates the first amendment to our Constitution. As the editor of the paper in which this message appears said on November 14, 1964, "How can anyone possibly believe that the recital of grace by school children impinges upon, or even remotely approaches, the first amendment's pronouncement that 'Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof'?"

We are not attempting to interpret the law. But to force the discontinuance of any voluntary act of homage to God is, in our judgment, a step backward that will have an adverse effect in maintaining our beloved United States as "One Nation, under God, indivisible" and we take this occasion to make our position publicly known.

We hope that an overwhelming majority of those parents whose children attend the W. T. Woodson High School will appear at the school board meeting next Thursday evening and raise their voices in favor of the continuance of a wholesome American practice. We also salute and congratulate Woodson's principal, Mr. Emory Chesley, for permitting his students to acknowledge voluntarily the power and glory of God.

It's time, we believe, to stand up and be counted.

ACACIA MUTUAL LIFE
INSURANCE CO.,
HOWARD W. KACY,
President.

BANDSMEN VISIT EUROPE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, for the information of my colleagues in Congress I bring to their attention an article written by Emily Jane Canning of Homewood, Ill., entitled "We Bandsmen Saw Europe Together." The article was published in the November issue of last year of the School Musician magazine of Joliet, Ill. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE BANDSMEN SAW EUROPE TOGETHER

(By Emily Jane Canning, Flutist, School Band of America, Homewood, Ill.)

(About the author: Emily Jane Canning, of Homewood, Ill., played flute and piccolo in the School Band of America. Since she speaks French, she was used as an interpreter and was interviewed on TV in Strasbourg. Winner of four superior medals in State music competition, she is a student of Emil Eck, of Chicago. She is a senior at Homewood-Flossmoor High School, where she is in the National Honor Society, band, orchestra, and sings alto in the ensemble and viking choir. Emily was a justice on the student supreme court last year. She has twice attended the Illinois Summer Youth Music Camp at Urbana. Sunday mornings she is a pianist in the First Presbyterian Church school. She has passed senior Red Cross and "Y" lifesaving, emblems which have taken the place of her curved bar of Girl Scouts. Emily is now concentrating on making application for college admission.)

As a music student, I had never really realized before my trip with the School Band of America the variance of American student musicians. They are different, but they can have fun living and traveling together for a month, and at the same time see Europe and learn to know about the people.

The European tour this past summer by the School Band of America and the School Chorus of America covered during this short month the Netherlands, Belgium, Germany, Austria, Italy, Switzerland, France, and England, followed by an exciting day at the New York World's Fair.

Concerts were given in The Hague, Rotterdam, Blankenberge, Brussels, Spa, Heilbronn, Nuremberg, Munich, Innsbruck, Venice, Piacenza, Genoa, Nice, Lausanne, Strasbourg, Paris, Horsham, Dorking, and New York.

Transatlantic crossings were by charter jetplane. Comparative strangers left from New York Kennedy International Airport on June 11; but they were well acquainted on the return flight which departed from London, July 9. European land travel was by four blue charter buses with drivers and couriers from the Netherlands.

Band and chorus members were from Alabama, Arizona, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Georgia, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Maryland, Minnesota, Missouri, New Jersey, North Carolina, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Texas, Utah, West Virginia, and Wisconsin. We have made new friends not only in Europe but throughout the United States.

The band, with 98 members, and the chorus, with 34 members, continued the tradition of presenting concerts to large enthusiastic audiences, the largest being 5,000 in the very famous St. Mark's Square in Venice. In each instance, 22 concerts in all, SBA–SCA was invited to return next year.

SBA–SCA since its beginning has covered 45,000 miles to play 71 concerts to a total audience of 150,000 persons, and has participated in 24 official receptions, 4 TV appearances, 18 radio broadcasts, and 9 youth gatherings.

Since its founding as a nonprofit, noncommercial organization on July 1, 1959, the School Band of America-School Chorus of America has established itself as an integral part of the American music education scene. The organization was founded primarily for the purpose of giving outstanding American school musicians an opportunity to use their talents in the area of international understanding, and at the same time acquire a first-hand knowledge of the cultural centers of Europe.

SBA–SCA has developed into a cooperative venture involving music educators, music teachers, music publishers, and music instrument manufacturers throughout the United States.

The European audiences were eager to hear the music of SBA–SCA. They clapped, whistled, and gave standing ovations for the tunes they particularly enjoyed, especially the "Stars and Stripes Forever" and "Battle Hymn of the Republic." It can be said the SBA–SCA has more than fulfilled its original purpose and has developed into a strong positive influence in the field of international relations. American Government officials in Europe and European government authorities have repeatedly stated that SBA–SCA concerts and related activities are the major events in their year's calendar. A dignified image of American youth is projected to the Europeans who draw many of their conclusions only from movies.

SBA–SCA has been accepted as an official project of the music committee of the people-to-people program, has been sanctioned by the Bureau of Cultural and Educational Affairs, Office of Cultural Exchange, U.S. State Department, and is assisted by the U.S. Information Agency. Files contain letters of commendation from Dr. Norman Vincent Peale, Leonard Bernstein, and Edward R. Murrow. The band and chorus have been personally commended by former Vice President Richard M. Nixon.

The reputation of SBA–SCA has grown considerably in the 4 years since the European tours were established. The band and chorus have become a tradition in many areas with a loyal following. An SBA–SCA fan club has been organized by students in Nuremberg, Germany where a large youth gathering was held this year.

At Nuremberg an important concert was presented in Europe's newest and most beautiful concert hall, the Meistersingerhalle, which was filled to capacity of 2,200. A local orchestra director led us in "El Capitan" before an audience made up mostly of young people.

At Dorking, England, the SBA–SCA opened the annual music festival in grand style. Guests of honor were Prince and Princess Tomislav, of Yugoslavia, and Max Grossman, cultural attaché of the American Embassy, and Mrs. Grossman. The director of the British Broadcasting Corp. (BBC) television orchestra, Eric Robinson, was guest conductor. The chairman of the music festival committee publicly stated that he had never seen an audience in Horsham react so enthusiastically to any presentation.

Near the end of the tour at Strasbourg, the groups taped two albums of high-fidelity records.

At the final concert at the New York World's Fair, July 10, SBA–SCA drew the largest crowd of the year at the Tiparillo Band Pavilion.

The repertoire of the School Band of America and School Chorus of America is representative of school instrumental and vocal groups throughout the United States. It is designed to please all audiences with a varied program including serious, contemporary, traditional, vocal, and band music; marches, musical comedy selections, and novelties.

Any school instrumental or vocal student in the United States between the ages of 15 and 21 may apply for membership. Final selections for the touring groups is made on the basis of musicianship, character, and personality. Musicianship is determined by audition, tape recording, or in person; character by letters of recommendation from a school official, music teacher, and pastor; personality by personal interview where practical. SBA–SCA has 16 representatives in 10 States and 2 foreign countries. They all volunteer their services.

The individual cost of the European concert tours was $878. This amount was determined on a prorated basis covering the expenses involved in developing and carrying out the concert tour. This relatively modest amount, which included all necessary expenses for the month-long tour from New York and return, was a result of the nonprofit feature of SBA–SCA and the fact that SBA–SCA is authorized by the Civil Aeronautics Board to charter transatlantic flights.

SBA–SCA functions within the philosophy that the free enterprise system is the central core of the American way. Therefore, Government financial assistance is neither sought nor desired. However, financial assistance in varying amounts to individual students on a local basis is recommended.

Considering the fact that the appearance, conduct, and quality of SBA–SCA reflect an image of all Americans, many students receive financial assistance from local civic and service clubs, church groups, school organizations, individuals, etc. A sponsor is defined as an organization or an individual who contributes $25 or more to a student's expenses. The 1964 program listed approximately 600 friends and official sponsors.

Founder and director is Edward T. Harn, of Bloomington, Ill. In addition to his directing duties with SBA–SCA, he is principal conductor of the All-Star High School Band which annually presents the grand finale concert at the Mid-East Instrumental Conference sponsored by Duquesne University School of Music in Pittsburgh.

European music critics have highly acclaimed his work with young American musicians. He received two medals this summer at Nervi and Venice, making eight he has received from European governments for his contribution to a better understanding between America and Europe.

Assisting with directing duties are Wayne M. Reger, authority on brass instruments, author of "The Talking Trumpets," and instructor in the public schools at Massillon, Ohio; Don McCathren, clarinet clinician, affiliated with H. & A. Selmer, and chairman of instrumental music at Duquesne University; and Cederic Cooke, director of music in the Greenview, Ill., public schools.

SBA–SCA concert tours are chaperoned by a select group of adults, mostly teachers, who pay their own expenses as do the students. Each chaperone is assigned 10 students. There are also two nurses. Following the tour, chaperones' reports are sent to parents of each member and to school officials.

Four concert tours are planned for 1965. The regular SBA–SCA European section tour of central Europe, June 12–July 11, will feature a command performance for Her Majesty, Queen Elizabeth, in Royal Festival Hall of London.

A new SBA Near East section tour of Israel and central Europe, July 21-August 19, will participate in the Israel Festival of Music, the first time a band has been honored with an invitation. Al Reed and Mr. McCathren will be conductors.

A new SBA Far East section tour of Japan, July 25–August 15, will be sponsored by the All-Japan Band League. SBA alumni will be given preference for this trip. School Band of America will be the featured band at the Japanese Music Federation Convention in Tokyo.

A new School Orchestra of America tour of central Europe, June 21–July 20, has been developed to provide additional incentive, quality, and prestige to the fast-growing string education program in the United States. SOA is to be directed by Don Miller, director of the string program at Lyons Township High School in La Grange, Ill. He is well known in the field of music education and is in demand as a festival director and adjudicator.

Headquarters for the groups is 28 Harbord Drive, Bloomington, Ill., where information about the bands, chorus, and orchestra is available. Deadline for making application for 1965 concert tours is December 1, 1964.

THE 47TH ANNIVERSARY OF PROCLAMATION OF UKRAINIAN NATIONAL REPUBLIC

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, today marks the 47th anniversary of the Proclamation of Independence of the Ukraine and this day has special significance for thousands of Ukrainian descendants living in North Dakota. We cannot help but admire all the Ukrainian descendants and many others for the militant fight they continue to put up in defense of liberty and freedom which are so important to the Ukrainians behind the Iron Curtain and to people everywhere. Dr. Anthony Zukowsky, president of the North Dakota branch of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc., expressed the feeling of these people in a recent letter and news release.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Zukowsky's letter, news release, and attached document entitled "Ukraine" be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter, news release, and document were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Ukrainian Congress Committee
of America, Inc., State Branch
of North Dakota,
Bismarck, N. Dak., January 10, 1965.

Hon. Milton R. Young,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Young: Our sincere thanks for your kind cooperation in the past. We assure you of our support in your work for the progress of America in the role of leader of the Western World in your endeavors for the common good of the peoples enslaved by the Communist tyranny.

January 22, 1965 will mark the 47th anniversary of the Proclamation of the Ukrainian National Republic. Ukrainians all over the world will celebrate this day as a memorial to the once-free Ukraine, while Ukrainians in America will set aside this date to reassert their belief in freedom for all people and to reaffirm their conviction that tyranny and despotism cannot long prevail where men so believe.

The Ukrainian democratic republic was recognized by the Soviet Union but not for long, for it was thrown into turmoil and chaos by Communist Russia which invaded the Ukrainian State despite its previous pledges to respect and honor the Ukrainian independence. By the end of 1920, this gallant struggle of the Ukrainian people came to a tragic end, when the Communists subjected it to the rule of the Bolshevik government. Despite the Communist yoke imposed by Moscow on Ukraine, the Ukrainian people never accepted the foreign domination but continued to struggle for their freedom.

The U.S. Congress and the President of the United States of America have recognized the legitimate right and aspiration of the Ukrainian people to freedom and national independence by enacting and signing respectively the Captive Nations Week resolution in July 1959, which enumerated Ukraine as one of the captive nations enslaved and dominated by Communist Russia, and entitled to recognition and moral support on the part of the American people and the free world at large.

Americans of Ukrainian descent in North Dakota are planning to observe the forthcoming 47th anniversary as Ukrainian Day in a fitting and solemn manner. (Additional information on observance is enclosed.) We firmly believe that you, Senator YOUNG, are fully aware of the importance of Ukraine as our ally in the common struggle against Russian totalitarian tyranny and in the defense of freedom.

The entire world, including the enslaved Ukrainian people, is looking toward the United States of America as the true citadel of freedom and hope for the oppressed people everywhere.

To observe this day provides an appropriate occasion for the American people and the U.S. Government to demonstrate their sympathy with understanding of the aspiration of the Ukrainian people, and to call on all our citizens, regardless of their national background to observe this day in recognition of the gallant struggle of the Ukrainian people for the most precious goal cherished by our own Nation and liberty-loving people everywhere: freedom.

We are sure that you understand the significance of this day of Ukrainian independence anniversary and will read your message into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in commemoration of this event and thus contribute to the successful recognition of the anniversary.

Respectfully yours,
Dr. ANTHONY ZUKOWSKY,
President.

[Press release]

ANNIVERSARY OF UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE, JANUARY 22, 1965

On January 22, 1965, Americans of Ukrainian descent in our State will observe the 47th anniversary of the proclamation of independence of Ukraine, which occurred on January 22, 1918, in Kiev, the capitol of Ukraine. This was the culmination of the centuries long aspiration of the Ukrainian people. After 2½ centuries of foreign oppression and domination, Ukraine regained its freedom and national independence. The sovereignty and independence of Ukraine was recognized by a number of states, including the Government of Soviet Russia. However, the Russian Government, led by Lenin and Trotzky at that time, launched a military aggression against the free Ukrainian state, despite previous pledges to honor and respect Ukrainian independence. After almost 3½ years of heroic and unequal struggle, the Ukrainian people deprived of all military, economic, and diplomatic assistance on the part of the Western Powers, succumbed to the numerically superior forces of Soviet Russia.

Since 1920, Ukraine has remained under the Communist and totalitarian yoke of Moscow, but it never has surrendered the spirit of freedom, nor has it given up the hope for regaining its full freedom and national independence. In the past 46 years the Ukrainians have amply demonstrated their love for freedom by the unceasing uprisings and large-scale resistance movements, such as the underground resistance warfare waged by the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA) against both the Nazis and the Bolsheviks. The Ukrainians paid a high price in the defense of freedom and independence, as they were ruthlessly persecuted by Moscow through a series of inhuman measures undertaken by the Kremlin, such as mass trials of Ukrainian patriots, mass deportations of Ukrainians to Siberia, and the systematic genocide of the Ukrainian people. Khrushchev, the deposed Communist dictator, stated himself at the 20th Congress of the Communist Party in 1956 that Stalin planned the total annihilation of the Ukrainian people for their resistance to Russian communism.

Today, in January 1965, the Ukrainian people in enslaved Ukraine are continuing to fight for their freedom and national independence. They wage a stubborn and ceaseless struggle by passive resistance, economic sabotage, and unrelentless opposition to the Russian alien rule imposed on Ukraine.

The U.S. Congress and the President of the United States of America have recognized the plight of the Ukrainian people by enacting and signing respectively the Captive Nations Week resolution, which listed Ukraine as one of the captive nations enslaved by Communist Russia and entitled to full freedom and national independence.

Americans of Ukrainian descent in our State are planning to observe this memorable event—the 47th anniversary of Ukraine's independence—with appropriate ceremonies and observances. Last June, Americans of Ukrainian descent performed an outstanding feat by erecting a statue of Taras Shevchenko in Washington, D.C., in honor of the 150th anniversary of the birth of Ukraine's national poet and Europe's freedom fighter; 100,000 Ukrainians participated in this event. A number of our Congressmen and Senators are now seeking to issue a commemorative postage stamp in honor of Taras Shevchenko and to establish a section in the Congressional Library in recognition of this great man and freedom fighter.

On this day of Ukraine's independence anniversary we should rededicate our efforts and our thoughts to the principle of freedom not only of the people of these countries, but for the freedom of all people in the world.

The struggle of the Ukrainian people is a gallant example of human courage and dedication. Lenin, Stalin, and Khrushchev had been the most despotic oppressors of the Ukrainian people, and the new masters, Brezhnev and Kosygin, are the same oppressors and enemies of freedom as were their predecessors.

In honoring the 47th anniversay of Ukrainian independence we are upholding the right of all people to the God-given right to freedom and national self-determination. These are the basic tenets and principles on which our own great Republic has been erected.

The principle of freedom is indivisible. Therefore, we honor the anniversary of Ukrainian independence because we believe that the Ukrainian people, and all other people enslaved by Communist Russia, are entitled to the same fundamental rights as we so blessfully enjoy—freedom and independence.

FACTS ABOUT UKRAINE

Ukraine, in regard to population, is the largest of the many countries under Russian domination. The Ukrainians want to be free, and they are persistently struggling for complete independence from Russia. On the other hand, the Russians have energetically opposed all efforts of Ukrainians for independence, because Ukraine's natural resources and geopolitical location have been of utmost importance to the political ambitions of Russia, both Czarist and Communist.

THE LAND

Ukraine, or the Ukrainian ethnic territory, is the area in which Ukrainians are in the absolute majority. This area, which is slightly larger than Texas, covers around 270,000 square miles. About 40 million Ukrainians live on this territory; 232,000 square miles of this territory comprise the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic. West of the Ukrainians live the Rumanians, Hungarians, Slovaks, and Poles; to the northwest are the Byelorussians; to the north and to the east are the Russians; to the south lies the Black Sea.

About three-quarters of Ukraine is flat land; mountains and hills make up the remaining area. Part of the Carpathian Mountain range runs through the southwestern area of Ukraine. There are also the Crimean Mountains in the southern part of the Crimean Peninsula.

The climate of Ukraine is a healthy one. The seasons are distinct. The average yearly temperature is 47° F. Adequate rainfall and many sunny days favor the growth and ripening of various kinds of crops. The salubrious climate of the resorts on the coast of the Black Sea is renowned throughout the world.

NATURAL AND INDUSTRIAL RESOURCES

Ukraine is a rich and industrially developed country. Its industrial potential can be seen from the following figures of 1958 for the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic:

	Million tons [1]	Percent of U.S.S.R. output
Iron ore	50	56
Pig iron	28	51
Steel	20	40
Coal	165	33

[1] Metric ton; 1 metric ton equals 2,205 pounds (approximately).

The primary industrial region is that of the Donets River basin, one of the biggest coal and metallurgical production centers in the U.S.S.R. Of equally great importance are Ukraine's machine building, heavy and light industries, and its giant hydroelectric powerplant, Dnieprelstan, on the Dnieper River. The railroads of Ukraine are the most developed in the whole U.S.S.R. Ukraine, still known as "the granary of Europe," has become the breadbasket and sugar bowl of the U.S.S.R. Its agricultural production, not fully developed because of the erratic methods used in Soviet agriculture, is still one of the highest in the world; in sugarbeets alone it amounts to 67 percent, in grains to 22 percent, and in meat to 27 percent of the total output of the U.S.S.R.

The figures given above have more meaning when one realizes that Ukraine comprises only 3 percent of the total area of the U.S.S.R.

HISTORY

The history of Ukraine goes back more than a thousand years. From the 9th to the 13th century, there existed a powerful state created by the ancestors of the present Ukrainian people. The capital of this state was Kiev. At that time, Ukrainian economic and cultural development was in full bloom. Ukraine was in close contact with the Byzantine Empire. On the basis of Byzantine culture the Ukrainians developed their own. The Ukrainian ruler, Volodymyr the Great, converted his nation to Christianity in 988. His son, Yaroslav the Wise, compiled a code of laws, founded schools, and built many churches. Yaroslav the Wise enlarged and beautified his capital city of Kiev. Travelers from Western Europe were astounded by Kiev's splendor.

The rich Ukrainian land was coveted by many neighbors, who made efforts to occupy Ukraine; the Tartars, Turks, and Poles invaded Ukraine several times. The Ukrainians bravely defended their country but were not always able to drive away their enemies; they had to live under alien rule for periods of time. For several centuries, Ukraine acted as a bulwark protecting Western Europe from the Tartars and Turks. During these years of continuous fighting, there arose and gained importance a military class—the Kozaks (also spelled Cossacks). The Kozaks are renowned in Ukrainian history as noble defenders of Ukrainian freedom. From the Kozaks came many capable leaders of the Ukrainian Nation; the most famous was Bohdan Khmelnytsky (1595–1657).

In 1709, Ukraine was deprived of its independence by the Russian Czar Peter I. Peter I ruthlessly crushed the Ukrainian leading class which stood for Ukrainian independence; he turned Ukraine into a province of Russia. From then on, Ukrainian history centers upon the valiant struggle of the Ukrainians for their independence, and the efforts of the Russian Government to keep Ukraine under Russian control.

In 1917, when the Russian revolution broke out, the Ukrainian people took advantage of this event. They cast off Russian control of Ukrainian territory and proclaimed the independent Ukrainian National Republic on January 22, 1918. The ancient city of Kiev again became the capital of the Ukrainian nation. Immediately, the young Ukrainian National Republic was attacked by the forces of Communist Russia, and despite a drawn-out struggle, it succumbed to the numerically superior forces of Moscow after 3 years of fighting.

PRESENT POLITICAL STATUS

The Russian Communist rulers realized the intensity of Ukrainian nationalism and gave the Ukrainians a separate republic in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, but this Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic is not the independent country the Ukrainians desire. The present Communist government in Kiev is not truly representative of the Ukrainian people; it is a government imposed upon the Ukrainian people by the Russian Communist rulers in Moscow. The Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic is a member of the United Nations, but its representative in the United Nations has his every decision made for him in Moscow.

The people of Ukraine have not accepted the status of enslavement, and are continuing to the present day a struggle to regain their national independence. The government of the Ukrainian National Republic, which had been democratically elected in 1918, moved abroad and became a government-in-exile. This government continues its activities up to the present time; it consists of a president, administration and parliament. Its current president is Dr. Stephan Vytvytsky.

During the last World War, the Ukrainians organized the underground Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA), which fought first the Nazis and then the returning Red Army, in order to regain freedom for Ukraine. Even now (1962) news of underground activities in Ukraine leaks through the Iron Curtain from time to time.

CULTURE

The Ukrainians have their own culture and speak a language which is distinctly different from that of all their neighbors. The Ukrainian language belongs to the family of Slavic languages.

With the spread of Christianity, the rapid development of Ukrainian literature began. The stirring epic poem, "The Tale of Ihor's Campaign," was written at the end of the 12th century; it can be compared to the French "Chanson de Roland" or the German "Nibelungenlied". In more recent times, the most outstanding figure in Ukrainian literature has been the poet Taras Shevchenko (1814–61). His poems have had a tremendous influence on the Ukrainian masses, strengthening the desire of Ukrainians for freedom. In commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the death of Taras Shevchenko, a law was passed by the Congress of the United States authorizing the erection of a statue of Taras Shevchenko on public grounds in Washington, D.C. Another great Ukrainian poet and novelist was Ivan Franko (1856–1916). The greatest Ukrainian poetess was Lesya Ukrainka (1872–1913). The most famous Ukrainian historian was Michael Hrushevsky (1866–1934), who wrote an excellent 10-volume history of Ukraine.

Present Ukrainian literature suffers in quality because of restrictions imposed by the Russian Communist Government: Ukrainian writers are expected to glorify communism; they cannot write anything that would strengthen Ukrainian patriotic feeling, and they are not allowed to show certain phases of Ukrainian history in a true light, especially Ukrainian-Russian relationships. Over 200 Ukrainian poets, playwrights and novelists paid with their lives for their insubordination to these wishes of the Russian Communist Government.

The greatest Ukrainian composer was Mykola Lysenko (1842–1912). The favorite Ukrainian opera is the very melodious "The Dnieper Kozak Beyond the Danube," by S. Hulak-Artemovsky (1813–73). The most popular national musical instrument is the bandura, and there are many professional and amateur ensembles of bandura players in Ukraine today. Ukrainian folk music and art, as well as Ukrainian dances, are well known throughout the world.

RELIGION

The Russia Communist regime, through government channels, conducts a very active antireligious program. As the Russian Communists occupied Ukraine, they found two major churches, the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church and the Ukrainian Catholic Church. The Communists destroyed these churches; the hierarchies and thousands of priests and laymen were murdered, or imprisoned for long terms, solely for their religious beliefs. Ukrainian Protestant groups have been similarly persecuted.

The Russian Communist rulers make temporary concessions to the Russian Orthodox Church in Ukraine because it aids in the Russification of the Ukrainians.

UKRAINIANS ABROAD

For economic, political and religious reasons, about 2 million Ukrainians emigrated to other lands. The emigration to the Western Hemisphere started in the second half of the 19th century. Since the establishment of the Communist regime on Ukrainian territory, Ukrainians were not able to leave Ukraine legally. At the present time, it is estimated that 1,200,000 people of Ukrainian ancestry live in the United States, and 600,000 in Canada. Those in the United States live mainly in industrial cities such as New York, Jersey City, Philadelphia, Chicago, Detroit, Pittsburgh, and Cleveland; a substantial number of Ukrainian farmers have settled in North Dakota.

The Ukrainians in the United States founded many fraternal, political, scientific and professional organizations, which are all united under the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc. The mailing address of the main office of this organization is Post Office Box 721, Church Street Annex, New York, N.Y.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, today is the 47th anniversary of the proclamation of Ukrainian independence in January 1918.

No people in history has fought harder or more courageously for freedom than have the people of the Ukraine. Through centuries of oppression, under both the Russians czars and the Bolsheviks, they have persevered in the struggle for national freedom.

The Communist tyrants have sought to break their will to resist by mass deportations and forced starvation and unlimited terror. But in a thousand different ways, the Ukrainian people have demonstrated even in recent years that the spirit of Taras Shevchenko still lives in the Ukraine.

In observing this anniversary of the brief establishment of an independent Ukraine, it is only a minor part of our purpose to mourn the lost freedom of four decades ago.

I and other colleagues observe this occasion in the Senate to renew our commitment to the ultimate establishment of a free and independent Ukraine, living at peace with the nations of the world.

This is an objective which can be endorsed by all men of good will.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, today it is my privilege to commemorate the anniversary of the Ukrainian Republic which was proclaimed on January 22, 1918, and which endured a brief and stormy 2 years. This republic was the incarnation of an idea cherished for centuries. From their first association with the empire of Moscow by the treaty of Pereyaslav in 1654, Moscow has striven in vain to deny the cultural integrity of the Ukrainian nation which constantly and courageously resurges.

The country was christianized from Constantinople; Kiev, its capital, developed into one of the most prominent outposts of Byzantine civilization. In the 13th century the Mongol Tartar invasion destroyed the Kievan state. Gradually it became divided among surrounding countries, but the culture and traditions were more tenacious than the shifting borders and the Ukrainians remained a distinctive national group.

From Catherine II's late 18th century suppression of self-government, Ukrainian nationalism was severed by continuous czarist persecution. For a short period in the 1920's, prohibition against the cultivation of Ukrainian culture and language were relaxed. The dictatorial regime of Stalinist Russia did not suffer this long. Oppression and purges have continued to this day. Freedom of expression and cultural renaissance have been destroyed.

Although recognized as an independent state by Lenin in 1917, he simultaneously presented it with an unacceptable ultimatum whose rejection precipitated the Soviet declaration of war upon the Ukrainian National Republic. The Republic proclaimed its complete independence on January 22, 1918, and began a valiant and stubborn fight to preserve it. Despite its heroic struggle, the last remnants of the Government of the Ukrainian National Republic were forced into exile in November 1920, marking the close of another chapter in the Ukraine's pursuit of national independence.

Ukrainians have proved that the spirit of freedom is almost indestructible. Centuries of oppression have not dampened the hopes and aspiration of Ukrainians throughout the world. It is this spirit we pay respect to today. Its essence was most aptly expressed by the great Ukrainian poet, Taras Shevchenko, in the following poem:

I Care Not

I care not, shall I see my dear
Own land before I die, or no,
Nor who forgets me, buried here
In desert wastes of alien snow;
Though all forget me—better so.

A slave from my first bitter years,
Most surely I shall die a slave
Ungraced of any kinsmen's tears;
And carry with me to my grave
Everything; and leave no trace,
No little mark to keep my place
In the dear lost Ukraina
Which is not ours, though our land.
And none shall ever understand;
No father to his son shall say:
Kneel down, and fold your hands, and pray;
He died for our Ukraina.
I care no longer if the child
Shall pray for me, or pass me by.
One only thing I cannot bear:
To know my land, that was beguiled
Into a death-trap with a lie,
Trampled and ruined and defiled—
Ah, but I care, dear God; I care.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, today, January 22, commemorates the anniversary of the founding of the Ukrainian Republic, established in 1918.

On this occasion, free people everywhere join in paying tribute to the Ukrainian people, for whom the struggle for freedom and independence has been long and bitter. We all hope that the time will not be far off when a Republic may again be established in the Ukraine, free from Communist domination and oppression.

I ask unanimous consent to insert, as part of my remarks, a proclamation by His Excellency, Gov. John A. Volpe, the Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, marking today as Ukrainian Independence Day.

There being no objection, the proclamation was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Proclamation by Gov. John A. Volpe, of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts

Whereas during the past 47 years, the people of the Ukraine have demonstrated their devotion to freedom by waging relentless opposition to Communist Russian tyranny in their country; and

Whereas the aspirations of the Ukrainian people for freedom and independence were recognized and supported by the United States of America in the Captive Nations Week law; and

Whereas Americans of Ukrainian descent endeavor to obtain the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations which will be directly concerned with the captive nations under Communist rule; and

Whereas this year on January 22, thousands of Americans of Ukrainian descent in this Commonwealth will observe the 47th anniversary of the proclamation of the independence of the Ukrainian National Republic, paying tribute through special commemorations to the heroic struggle of the enslaved in Ukraine, thus enhancing their aspirations for freedom and justice: Now, therefore, I, John A. Volpe, Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, do hereby proclaim January 22, 1965, as Ukrainian Independence Day, and urge all citizens of the Commonwealth to take cognizance of this observance.

Given at the executive chamber in Boston, this 12th day of January, in the year of our Lord, 1965, and of the independence of the United States of America, the 189th.

John A. Volpe.

By His Excellency the Governor:

Kevin H. White,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

THE GOLD RESERVE REQUIREMENT: SHOULD IT BE ELIMINATED?—ADDRESS BY DR. CHARLES E. WALKER, EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT, AMERICAN BANKERS ASSOCIATION

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an address entitled "The Gold Reserve Requirement: Should It Be Eliminated?" delivered by Dr. Charles E. Walker, executive vice president of the American Bankers Association, before the bank management appreciation dinner of the Houston chapter of the American Institute of Banking, at Houston, Tex., on January 20, 1965.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Gold Reserve Requirement: Should It Be Eliminated?

(Address by Dr. Charles E. Walker, executive vice president, the American Bankers Association, before the bank management appreciation dinner of the Houston chapter of the American Institute of Banking, State Ballroom, Hotel America, Houston, Tex., January 20, 1965)

Should the 25-percent gold reserve requirement against Federal Reserve notes and deposits be eliminated? In recent years monetary growth and reductions in our gold stock have combined to pull the actual ratio below 28 percent. According to newspaper reports, President Johnson plans to ask the Congress to reduce or eliminate the requirement.

Advocates of removal or reduction of the requirement argue that it threatens the sustainability of the economic advance in this country and undermines the strength of the dollar abroad. Those who favor such a requirement maintain that it serves a highly useful purpose as an ultimate check against the excessive monetary expansion which could destroy domestic prosperity and undermine the dollar abroad.

It may surprise you to learn that I agree with both of these viewpoints: the requirement, at its present level, does threaten the sustainability of the economic advance and may hurt the dollar internationally. But it is equally true that such a requirement has in the past and can in the future serve a useful purpose.

In short, the gold reserve requirement should and must be changed. But it should be relaxed, not removed. And such a reduction should be effected only if the American people are assured that the discipline enforced by the requirement will be maintained.

BACKGROUND OF THE PROBLEM

At the present time, Federal Reserve banks are required to maintain a gold-certificate reserve equal to at least 25 percent of their note and deposit liabilities.[1] Legislative requirements that the banks maintain a minimum gold reserve equal to a specified proportion of these liabilities dates from the Federal Reserve Act of 1913. Originally, Reserve banks were required to hold a gold reserve of 40 percent against notes and a reserve of gold and/or other lawful money of 35 percent against deposits. Despite the intervening suspension of domestic convertibility, these requirements remained in effect until 1945. By that time the actual gold coverage of Federal Reserve notes and deposits, which had been as high as 91 percent in 1941, had declined to slightly less than 50 percent. Uncertainties concerning the postwar requirements for monetary expansion, as well as the direction and magnitude of gold flows, led to congressional reappraisal of the gold reserve requirement in that year. As a result, the requirement was reduced to 25 percent and made uniformly applicable to both note and deposit liabilities of the Reserve banks. This requirement remains in effect today.

The gold reserve requirement is not absolutely rigid. The Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System is empowered to suspend it for as long as 30 days, and to renew such suspensions for up to 15 days. There is no stated limit as to the number of times that a suspension may be renewed. However, in the event of the requirement's suspension, the Board of Governors is required to establish a graduated tax upon the amounts by which the gold-certificate reserve may be permitted to fall below the 25-percent level.[2]

The present urgency of the problem posed by the gold reserve requirement reflects an accumulation of developments. First, postwar monetary expansion in this country has produced a gradual increase in the amount of gold required as a legal reserve. Second, and parallel to this growth in the amount of gold required to meet the legal requirement, U.S. gold holdings have declined steadily as a result of the persistent deficit in our international accounts. These divergent trends have produced a sharp decline in the Nation's stock of free gold, or gold in excess of the amount necessary to meet the reserve requirement, and at the present time the amount of free gold held is only $2 billion.

In view of the absence of prospects for near-term elimination of our balance-of-payments deficits, it is clear that our stock of free gold can be expected to decline further, and perhaps disappear altogether, in the months and years ahead. As it declines, this key question becomes more urgent: Is the U.S. commitment to continuing convertibility of the dollar backed only by its $2 billion of free gold, or is it backed by the entire gold stock of $15 billion? The answer to that question can have a profound impact on international confidence in the dollar.

---

[1] Gold certificates, which are owned by the Reserve banks, must be backed dollar for dollar by gold owned by the Treasury. Therefore, the term "gold reserve requirement" is synonymous with "gold-certificate reserve requirement."

[2] Section 11(c) of the Federal Reserve Act provides that "when the reserve held against Federal Reserve notes falls below 25 per centum, the Board of Governors shall establish a graduated tax of not less than 1 per centum per annum upon such deficiency until the reserves fall to 20 per centum, and when said reserve falls below 20 per centum, a tax at the rate increasingly of not less than 1½ per centum per annum upon each 2½ per centum or fraction thereof that such reserve falls below 20 per centum. The tax shall be paid by the Reserve bank, but the Reserve bank shall add an amount equal to said tax to the rates of interest and discount fixed by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System."

This tax is applicable to deficiencies in the reserve requirement against Federal Reserve notes, but not against deficiencies in the reserves held against Federal Reserve deposits. Presumably, therefore, the tax could be avoided, or at least reduced, by "assigning" all gold certificates to the reserve against notes, allowing the deficiency to be registered in the reserve against deposits. This, in turn, would mean that automatic increases in discount rates could be reduced, or perhaps eliminated altogether.

THE IMPORTANCE OF CONFIDENCE IN THE DOLLAR

Maintenance of confidence in the dollar—in its continued convertibility into gold at the rate of $35 per ounce—is the key to the stability and viability of the international monetary system. This is because the international payments mechanism which has evolved in the postwar period has been built around the dollar as a supplement to gold in the monetary reserves of free world nations. Suspension of dollar convertibility into gold at the $35-per-ounce price could well lead to collapse of the international payments system. Moreover, the reduction in international liquidity which would result from the suspension of dollar convertibility also could generate worldwide deflationary tendencies. Much of the postwar progress in restoring a system of multilateral trade and payments might be sacrificed, and the strength and unity of the free world could be strained severely.

It is in this context that the existing gold reserve requirement must be viewed, for Government action or inaction with respect to the requirement is certain to be scrutinized by foreign observers for implications concerning future dollar convertibility.

THE GOLD RESERVE REQUIREMENT: THE CASE FOR ITS RETENTION

In some circles, there is a tendency to regard the Nation's gold stock as "backing" for the domestic money supply, and there frequently is the implication that the value of money is in some way derived from the gold collateral which is pledged to secure it. Many of those who hold this view advocate a strengthening of the ties between currency and gold—i.e., the restoration of domestic gold convertibility—as the most effective means of assuring a sound monetary system. They oppose, consequently, steps which would sever or weaken the remaining domestic relationship between gold and currency.

While this view often reflects a mystical confidence in the merits of gold as a currency base, sound reasons underlie it. Principal among them is the fact that the existence of a close relationship between currency and gold serves as an ultimate check against excessive monetary expansion. Under conditions of domestic currency convertibility, the capacity of the monetary authorities to expand the money supply is limited by the supply of gold, for excessive monetary expansion can shake public confidence and lead to internal gold drains. In the absence of domestic currency convertibility, internal gold drains cannot lead to a check against excessive monetary expansion. As a substitute, therefore, principal reliance is placed upon statutory requirements which limit monetary expansion to a given multiple of the value of the gold supply on hand.

Most observers agree that the United States should not hesitate—as, in fact, it has not hesitated—in pledging its entire gold stock to the defense of the dollar. This does not answer the question, however, as to whether the gold reserve requirement should be retained with the understanding that it may be suspended if necessary, whether it should be retained in relaxed and modified form, or whether it should be eliminated altogether.

The advocates of a gold reserve requirement do not necessarily suggest that the gold required for currency "backing" be made unavailable for settling international claims. They recognize that although the absence of domestic convertibility prevents internal gold drains from arresting excessive monetary expansion, such expansion nevertheless will give rise to an external gold drain arising from unfavorable balance-of-payments developments.

Implicit in this argument is the belief that a nation should not exhaust its entire "free gold" stock before initiating the required action with domestic economic policies, particularly monetary policy. Rather, it is felt, changes should be made gradually and with due regard to trends in gold holdings. Thus, the gold reserve requirement may be viewed as an intrument for ultimately enforcing a harsh adjustment only if earlier indications of the need for adjustment have been ignored.

There can be little quarrel with the crux of the argument advanced by advocates of a gold reserve requirement: that a nation which provides international convertibility of its currency—especially a key-currency nation—must sooner or later submit to the discipline of the balance of payments. In effect, a gold reserve requirement is an arbitrary device for insuring that these adjustments take place sooner than otherwise. As such it has the merits as well as the shortcomings of other arbitrary control devices, such as the public debt ceiling.

Advocates of a gold reserve requirement would also argue that the declining margin of free gold in recent years has provided a very strong inducement to actions which would relieve our balance-of-payments deficit. Abandonment of this requirement, they believe, would tend to relieve the sense of urgency with which the international payments problem has been viewed, thereby resulting in the postponement of remedial action already overdue.

Viewed in this context, the gold reserve requirement plays an important role in our economy. Proposals to remove or change the requirement should, in this view, be assessed with the utmost care.

THE GOLD RESERVE REQUIREMENT: THE CASE FOR ITS REMOVAL

Arguments for elimination of the gold reserve requirement proceed from the fact that the principal role of gold is to serve as a source of international liquidity. As such, a nation's gold reserve provides maneuvering room—or time during which to adjust internal policies to international requirements—when its currency comes under international pressure.

Critics of the gold reserve requirement argue that it serves to prevent the functioning of gold as a source of international liquidity. By pledging gold as collateral to secure domestic claims which legally cannot be exercised, the requirement leaves only a small margin of gold to satisfy claims which, in fact, can be exercised freely. As a result, uncertainty exists concerning both the availability of U.S. gold to satisfy foreign claims and the extent of the U.S. commitment to dollar convertibility. In view of the fact that free gold holdings have declined to less than $2 billion and indications point to continued international payments deficits, such uncertainty could have disturbing consequences.

Elimination of the gold reserve requirement, by pledging the entire gold stock behind the commitment to dollar convertibility, would remove uncertainty concerning the availability of U.S. gold to satisfy foreign claims and, it is believed in many quarters, thereby relieve a source of the gold drain. Moreover, such a step would give the United States greater maneuverability in working toward long-range solutions to its international payments problem.

Removal of the gold reserve requirement can, in the current situation, be supported on domestic grounds. The normal growth in the Nation's monetary needs in the months and years ahead will require expansion in Federal Reserve note and deposit liabilities, thereby requiring additional gold backing. Maintenance of the gold reserve requirement at the present level could hinder such growth and thus impede domestic economic expansion.

As a substitute for the requirement, advocates of its removal point to the judgment and integrity of the monetary authorities—those officials of the Federal Reserve System who formulate and carry out the policies which influence the rate of monetary growth. These officials, it is argued, can be depended upon to prevent monetary expansion from becoming excessive. In effect, therefore, the administrative decisions of the monetary authorities would be trusted to substitute adequately for the type of statutory discipline afforded by the gold reserve requirement.

A SUGGESTED COURSE OF ACTION

As I noted at the outset, both of these sets of arguments have considerable merit. The gold reserve requirement does serve as a check on excessive monetary expansion and, as the volume of free gold declines, spurs actions to correct a balance-of-payments deficit. On the other hand, the requirement ties up gold that could, and at times should, be used to support the dollar internationally, and it can contribute to an artificial shortage of reserves that may deter domestic expansion by hampering normal and desirable growth in the money supply. Now below 28 percent, the actual ratio is approaching the danger point. And it should be noted that the recent sharp drop in the ratio has not resulted primarily from gold outflows, which have diminished in the past few years, but from growth in the currency and deposits required by a rapidly growing economy.

How solve the dilemma? The best course of action seems to me to be to relax, but not to remove, the requirement. Retention of the discipline, even if at a lower level, would preserve many of its advantages. But any easing of the limit should be effected only if we can be certain that the monetary discipline which the requirement helps maintain continues to be assured.[3]

It is in this respect that we must rely on the integrity and good sense of the Federal Reserve authorities. The financial community, both domestic and foreign, has great faith in that integrity and good sense, and would be willing to rely on the Federal Reserve to carry out a sound and flexible monetary policy even if the gold reserve requirement were relaxed. This confidence reposes, however, in a Federal Reserve System operating independently within Government, unhampered by political considerations. Anything that restricted that independence could undermine the confidence of the financial community in the ability of the Federal Reserve System to carry out a monetary policy flexibly adjusted to the needs of the economy. Unfortunately, there is legislation pending before the Congress which would restrict this traditional independence and the sponsors of these measures intend to push them strongly.

It is highly regrettable that this challenge to Federal Reserve independence should occur at the same time the administration is seeking a change in the gold reserve requirement. As the financial community appraises the desirability of such a change, it cannot but be impressed with this fact: One set of legislative proposals would, if enacted, sharply increase our national reliance on sound and discretionary monetary policy as a means of protecting the public interest in national and international economic stability. The second set of legislative proposals, if enacted, would expose the monetary authorities to political pressures which, if history is a guide, would impair their ability to adjust monetary policy flexibly to the needs of the economy.

---

[3] There are various ways in which the requirement could be relaxed while still preserving its basic discipline. The approach believed to be favored by the administration—removal of the requirement against Federal Reserve deposits but retaining it against notes—has much to commend it. This action would raise the volume of free gold to more than $6 billion but would retain the traditional linkage between the public's paper money and the Nation's gold reserve.

With heavy Democratic majorities in the House and Senate, the attitude of the administration toward the legislative proposals to restrict the independence of the Federal Reserve System will be of great importance. In this respect, recent statements by administration officials are encouraging. In March 1964, Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon represented the administration in testifying on similar bills and, although he did endorse coterminous terms of office for the President and the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board (as has, in fact, Federal Reserve Chairman William McChesney Martin), he strongly supported independence within Government of the Federal Reserve as conducive to sound monetary policy.

During the past year President Johnson has at least twice referred to the independence of the Federal Reserve System. In a speech to business leaders last April, the President expressed his confidence in "the independent Federal Reserve" as a line of defense against either inflation or adverse balance-of-payments developments. In October, the President stated that the Kennedy-Johnson administrations had maintained the Federal Reserve's traditional independence within the Government. He went on to say that our monetary system must remain flexible. He added if inflation develops, or if excessive outflows of funds occur, the Federal Reserve System is in a position to do what is necesary.

These statements seem to me to imply that the administration recognizes the importance of an independent Federal Reserve System and intends to protect that independence. It would be conducive to strong support in the financial community, however, if the President's request for a change in the gold reserve requirement were accompanied by reaffirmation of the statements of last year. Such a statement would serve to remove any lingering doubts that relaxation of the discipline of the gold reserve requirement would be followed by elimination of still another safeguard against excessive monetary expansion—the independence within Government of the Federal Reserve System.

Inasmuch as any action to reduce the gold reserve requirement also relaxes a statutory pressure toward balance-of-payments correction, support for relaxation of the requirement could also be broadened and strengthened if the administration would at the same time make it clear that efforts to bring our international accounts back into balance will be intensified. Although some progress in reducing the deficit has been made, it is believed to have risen sharply in the last quarter of 1964, and the prospects for further substantial progress are not encouraging. It is to be hoped that this necessary intensification of balance-of-payments policies will reflect a fundamental understanding of the need to minimize the dollar outflows on Government account and, rather than to rely on arbitrary selective controls, to use policies that work through market processes and encourage, rather than obstruct, the free flow of goods, services and capital among nations.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

Statutory limitations can cause trouble, but they can also provide an important discipline to bolster and support administrative decisions that are vital to the interests of the American people. The test of leadership is to know when such limitations, because of their blunt and nondiscriminating nature, should be relaxed. It seems clear to me that now is the time to relax, but not to remove, the 25 percent gold reserve requirement.

Opinions within the financial community differ with respect to the desirability of changing the requirement. However, if the administration moves only to relax and not to eliminate the restriction, and if the financial community becomes convinced that the independence within Government of the Federal Reserve System will be continued, and that balance-of-payments policies will be intensified, the proposal to increase the volume of free gold available to protect the dollar should gain a broad base of support.

USE OF CREDIT BY CONSUMERS

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, there has been much attention given to the problems that can arise if consumers do not use credit properly. Many incidents have been related over the past few years inferring that grantors of credit have no interest in the welfare of their customers.

One need only realize that any grantor of consumer credit builds his business on his reputation to know that such inferences do not actually apply to legitimate lenders and merchants. As credit restrictions have become less strict and down payments have been reduced, problems of credit management have become more difficult for those who are uneducated in monetary affairs.

In order to assist such persons, last spring, businessmen of Utah organized the Consumers Credit Counseling Service of Utah, a nonprofit organization which offers free counseling help, and, if desired, will also provide a prorating service for those who need or desire additional assistance. I hope other communities are planning to supply similar services.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of an article published in the Deseret News may be printed in the RECORD to illustrate the service that has been rendered to date. This service has received the endorsement of virtually all segments of the credit industry in Salt Lake City.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Salt Lake City (Utah) Deseret News, Oct. 30, 1964]

COUNSELING FOR CREDIT

(By Don C. Woodward)

"Is there any way out at all? Can anyone help me?"

These pleas for help come every day from Utahans buried under a mountain of debt, but up until last spring there was no organized community effort to help them.

At that time the Consumer Credit Counseling Service of Utah was organized by businessmen to be a self-help service for people who wanted to bail themselves out of financial trouble.

A nonprofit organization which offers free counseling help, it has so far helped 126 families with their problems, said Lorenzo M. Richards, president.

CONSIDER BANKRUPTCY

Their total indebtedness was a staggering $607,000—and most of them had considered taking out bankruptcy. "All of them were overburdened with debt," said Mr. Richards.

Instead of accepting the stigma of bankruptcy, however, the families entered into plans which have returned up to $50,000 to their creditors—money that would have been lost to the community if they had not been concerned with the obligation to pay their debts.

And, says Mr. Richards, "most of these families will develop into good sound credit risks. This is evidenced by their voluntary request to live on a strict budget while discharging their debts in an honest and honorable manner."

OFFERS TWO SERVICES

The organization actually offers two services. One is free credit counseling for families who need advice on budgeting, and the second is a prorating service for which a nominal charge is made ($2 to $3 a month, which barely covers postage and stationery).

Here's the way it works:

1. A client comes into the office after being referred by creditors, an attorney, a social service agency, or by some individual.

2. The clients—both man and wife—fill out a form showing their financial situation, which they submit to the agency along with payment books and other supporting data.

WORK OUT PLAN

3. The counseling manager then works out a plan of payment to each creditor, and if necessary, will notify the creditor that the couple is receiving counseling help. This usually brings cooperation from the creditor. "In most cases, no further action or contact is required," says Mr. Richards.

4. However, if the case becomes involved, creditors are informed that the couple will be prorated by the agency. A schedule of payments is sent to all creditors, who also receive information on the client's income and other bills so they can get the whole picture.

SEPARATE CHECKING ACCOUNT

5. The client then sends funds every month to the counseling office—either through a payroll deduction (at his request) or he brings it in personally. This is deposited in a separate checking account which requires both his and the counseling service's signature.

6. On the agreed disbursement date, the client comes to the office, makes out the checks to each creditor, mails them immediately, and records the payment. (This also helps teach self-reliancce.)

7. As months pass and problems are solved, he is encouraged to take over his own affairs under the program.

The service has received endorsement from the Better Business Bureau, Salt Lake Credit Bureau, Retail Merchants Association, Family Service Society, the Chamber of Commerce, Legal Aid Society, Utah Credit Union League, Utah Consumer Finance Association, Salt Lake Clearing House, National Foundation of Consumer Credit, Salt Lake City Lenders Exchange and Utah Furniture Association, S.L. County Medical Society, Utah Savings & Loan League.

Revised to Dec. 31, 1964

Total involvements	$1, 188, 759
Total disbursements	80, 228
December disbursements	17, 672
Number of checks (December)	1, 311
Families in prorate	223

PROBLEMS OF SPACE PROGRAM—ADDRESS BY DR. WERNHER VON BRAUN

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on December 8, 1964, at the annual meeting of the chamber of commerce of my hometown, Huntsville, Dr. Wernher von Braun, Director of the Marshall Space Flight Center, was the principal speaker. He delivered a fine address, in which he discussed many problems concerning our space program, as well as problems as between the local community and the Marshall Space Flight Center, and other aspects. I should like to call attention to one thing he said:

> Huntsville is my home. I like it here.
>
> Together I believe we can project a truthful image of Huntsville as an advanced scientific, educational, and cultural center, an image that will help persuade every top-level scientist, engineer, or industrial executive that we feel we need, not only to come to Alabama, but to come willingly.

The speech is quite thought provoking. I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the Record as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Huntsville in the Space Age

I was honored by your invitation to speak at this annual chamber of commerce banquet, and delighted to accept, for it gives me an opportunity to talk with you about the future roles of Huntsville and the Marshall Space Flight Center in the Nation's space effort.

First, I would like to salute Huntsville and Madison County for the tremendous effort you have made since 1950 to match the growth and absorb the impact of the Federal agencies at Redstone Arsenal. Probably no other community in the United States during this period met such a barrage of opportunities for growth and problems of adjustment. Certainly none responded with more vigor and enthusiasm. Huntsville has been my home for 14 years, so I speak firsthand of the outstanding community spirit in our town.

You native Huntsville folks have welcomed into your midst with true Southern hospitality the influx of military, civil service, and contractor personnel connected with the Nation's missile and space programs. You have seized the opportunity to build a metropolitan area that will long be outstanding as a scientific, educational, religious, and cultural center. And you have tackled with boldness and vision the difficult problems that accompany such rapid expansion.

You have grown accustomed to the rumble of static tests on the arsenal, and they no longer attract much attention in Huntsville. But you have maintained a sensitive ear to any mention of problems or needs of your neighboring Federal agencies, and have always shown your willingness to work with Government officials to meet those needs.

So I can understand why you antennaes went up quickly last month when Mr. Webb, NASA's Administrator, spoke to chamber of commerce groups in four other Alabama cities. It came as a suprise—even a shock, I gather—to hear of the difficulties Mr. Webb has experienced in persuading top-level executives from industry to come to Alabama and accept civil service positions at the Marshall Center. And his statement that it may be necessary to transfer more contract supervisory personnel to New Orleans and the plants of industrial firms triggered a reaction that mushroomed quickly out of proportion. Before the weekend was over, rumor had it that the entire Marshall Center—including my office—was moving to New Orleans.

I think Mr. Webb scotched this rumor pretty effectively during his visit to Huntsville at the invitation of Leroy Simms. Since I have not had an opportunity to meet with all of you recently, let's do some Monday morning quarterbacking on events of the past few weeks.

First, you will all agree that Mr. Webb has a problem—in fact, he has a lot of problems, and Alabama would not even make his top 10 listing of them. You can appreciate the magnitude of his job, I'm sure, for the national space program which he directs is a multibillion dollar business. It is truly a major national program. And you can appreciate his frankness in discussing the needs of this program as he views them, just as he appreciated your straightforward defense of Huntsville's progressiveness and your offer to work with him in strengthening the space program.

Second, let's take a realistic and discerning look at what Mr. Webb said. I quote: "For you who are concerned with the future of Huntsville, it is most important to keep in mind that the Marshall Space Flight Center is both the research and development and the management center for the Apollo vehicles.

"We have given the Marshall Center the job," Mr. Webb said, "and we want it to continue to have the job here in Huntsville, of research and development on the giant vehicles required for the Apollo manned space flight missions.

"We have also given the Marshall Center the job of managing the contractors who will assemble, test, and launch giant vehicles, and much of this work is handled here in Huntsville."

Before examining some of Mr. Webb's other remarks, let's take a closer look at these two jobs of the Marshall Center, and the two arms we have for accomplishing them. Let me review the history, size, and scope of each function, and their interrelationships with each other, with the community, and with the Nation.

Research and development has always been our primary function in the past. Our in-house competence in this area has been well recognized. Our management responsibilities have not been as well known. This is strange, in a way, because the industrial firms and universities have always participated in our programs, even during the earliest phases of the research and development cycle. In fact, most of our funds for research, development, and production have always gone to contractors, who have performed major roles in our programs.

When the Marshall Center was established in 1960, the budget for its first year of operation was about $400 million. The inhouse proportion of this budget totaled 19 percent. Today our total budget is about $1.8 billion—more than four times that of 1960. Our inhouse effort today is about 7 percent of this total, leaving 93 percent of the Saturn programs in the hands of contractors.

Now, the research and development work done at the Marshall Center has not decreased. On the contrary, it has almost doubled during the last 4 years. Seven percent of $1.8 billion is a lot more money for the Huntsville area than 19 percent of $400 million.

By far the greater part of the new facilities added to the Marshall Center since it was formed are used by research and development laboratories and supporting offices. Since the Center was formed in 1960, we have been allotted about $150 million for construction. Marshall Center facilities at Huntsville are now valued at a quarter of a billion dollars. We expect in 1965 that our budget for new facilities will drop below $10 million and that actual construction underway will drop to $30 million. This will be $15 million less than construction currently in progress. This decline in our construction will undoubtedly have some adverse effect on the local area construction business.

Now let us examine the size of the two arms of the Marshall Center, according to personnel strength. The total strength of civil service personnel at Marshall is about 7,600. Of this number, about 1,600 are in staff and support offices that assist both research and development operations and industrial operations.

Almost 5,000 of our Marshall Center civil service employees are assigned to research and development operations. This is almost two-thirds of our total strength. In addition, research and development has more than 5,000 support contractor personnel in the Huntsville area.

Our research and development laboratories are not oriented toward specific launch vehicle projects, such as Saturn I, Saturn I–B, or Saturn V. They are alined along the lines of professional disciplines such as mechanical engineering, electronics, flight mechanics, vehicle dynamics, and the like. Research and development applies these disciplines to the Saturn projects, to supporting research and advanced technologies, and to studies of space transportation systems of the future. Technical competence in each scientific discipline exists in such depth at no other point in our organization. Consequently, research and development operations has the additional responsibility of supporting the industrial operations side of the house with this technical competence.

We maintain a high level of technical competence by undertaking theoretical studies, by following work being done by other agencies, and in industry. But more importantly, we dirty our hands at the workbench on in-house projects selected specifically for the purpose of updating our knowledge and increasing our competence. Again, this maintenance of current competence works constantly in an important interrelationship with our industrial operations, which is responsible for careful and wise disbursement of our funds to our many contractors.

In order to use the best judgment possible in spending the taxpayers' money intelligently, we must do a certain amount of research and development work ourselves. If we are to command the professional respect of the contractors working for us, we must retain our technical competence. The best way to keep up to date is to continue our longstanding practice of performing a certain amount of work with our in-house laboratory personnel.

Mr. Webb emphasized that the Marshall Center will continue its research and development here in Huntsville on the giant Saturns required for the Apollo manned space flight missions. Our research and development operations is capably directed by Hermann K. Weidner.

Now let us turn to the industrial operations side of the house.

While the Marshall Center's in-house research and development budget almost doubled during the past 4 years, its contracts with industry quadrupled. This called for an increase in our managerial capability. To meet this need, our industrial operations arm was created more than 1 year ago for the concentration of managerial talent and centralized direction of the vastly increased contractor projects. Bob Young, who returned to private industry the first of November, was its first director. He agreed to serve in this capacity for 1 year when he accepted the job, and returned to Sacramento upon completion of his contract. Industrial operations is now headed by Air Force Col. Edmund F. O'Connor, who was assigned here through a special personnel exchange arrangement that NASA has with the Department of Defense.

The contractor effort in the Saturn programs is spread across the Nation—from California and Washington to Massachusetts and Florida. Our industrial operations arm in general directs and manages the Marshall Center's industrial program. It plans, budgets, schedules, reviews, and controls contractor participation in our efforts. It defines, directs, reviews, and evaluates the performance of industrial firms. These contractors have been given the job of design engineering, development, manufacturing, test, and checkout of launch vehicle stages, components, engines and propulsion systems, supporting ground equipment, and facilities. Industrial operations directs the operations of contractors in the Government-owned facilities at Michoud and Mississippi test operations, and in their own plants and other Government facilities across the Nation.

The key to the success of industrial operation's farflung activities is coordination through close communication by competent people.

Since industrial operations is basically a technical project management operation, it is staffed largely with technical personnel. The entire staff now totals about 1,000 people, mostly professional management and engineering talent.

To attain the necessary sure, clear lines of communication, and to insure daily personal contacts, industrial operations locates resident managers in the plants of prime contractors for stages and engines. Through daily personal contacts at the contractor's plants, the resident managers can provide rapid direction to resolve problems, and may even spot and settle potential problems before they become stumbling blocks.

Resident managers are supported by onsite staffs of technical, administrative, contractual, and research and development operations personnel. The size of the staff varies from a handful of specialists in some offices, to 277 now at Michoud operations.

This principle of operation has been used by the Marshall Center for some time, although this fact was forgotten in the consternation following Mr. Webb's first November visit to Alabama. In fact, of a total strength of 975 people in industrial operations, approximately 450 are located outside the Huntsville area. This leaves about 525 people from this side of our bipartite house at Huntsville.

Now we come to the crux of Mr. Webb's stated problem. He summarized it himself on his visit to Huntsville, using these words:

"We have placed this management job with the Marshall Center because the management of industrial development contracts involving hundreds of millions of dollars per year requires the daily support by scientists and engineers intimately familiar with the many-faceted development problems. And we want to keep this arrangement. As this very large program progresses, it will be good business, and in the interests of efficiency and lowered costs, to move part of the contract management functions near our Michoud assembly facility at New Orleans or our industrial stage assembly plants in California.

"We have done this in the past," Mr. Webb said, "and we will undoubtedly do more of it in the future. The extent to which we may have to move more of these management functions out of the Huntsville area will directly depend on our ability to improve our record of attracting senior executives from industry to the Huntsville installation."

Mr. Webb was right, you know. It has been difficult to get top level people to come to Alabama and to Huntsville—not to the Huntsville we know—but to a place whose image has suffered by what has been said about it and what has been written about it nationally.

Now I believe there are two ways to look at this situation as it affects the future of Huntsville and the Marshall Center. First, there is the short-term outlook, the outcome of which is governed by the progress on the Saturn vehicles, now well along in development. From the very beginning our plans called for the influx of more civil service and contractor personnel in the Huntsville area, and the transfer of many of them to Michoud and Mississippi as work increases there. Construction of our Mississippi test facility is proceeding rapidly, and should be completed by the end of 1965. Right now we have only 40 Marshall Center civil service personnel there. This number is expected to increase when the test site becomes operational. The contractor people there now are construction personnel. When their job is done, they will make way for about 2,500 permanent contractor persons who will operate the test site. The level of civil service personnel at MTO will remain quite low.

The rocking of the boat which some of you undoubtedly think we have undergone in recent weeks will be far more meaningful to us if we will consider it from a long-range viewpoint.

Mr. Webb clearly showed that he has confidence in our competence at the Marshall Center and in the quality and reliability of the Saturns now under development. He clearly stated that he would like to see the Marshall Center remain the principal Center of all NASA space launch vehicle development. And he repeated here in Huntsville the statements that he made in Mobile, Montgomery, Birmingham, and Florence—that he would work with Alabamians not just for 5 days or 5 weeks or 5 months, but for 5 years if necessary, to help create the kind of conditions he feels are vital for the success of the space programs here and for the future economic growth of this State. I know he is sincere in this offer.

So, let's concentrate our efforts on the long-range contributions we can make to the national space program, and consider their long-range impact on the Marshall Center, on Huntsville, and Alabama. Important decisions concerning the use of launch vehicles will be made in the not very distant future. The launch vehicles we are developing will unquestionably be in competition with other vehicles on the drawing board and in development for a big share of future space launch assignments.

For instance, a determination will be made someday as to whether the Saturn IB or the Titan will be used for interplanetary missions.

This question already has been batted around openly in technical journals and scientific trade magazines. It may be looked into during the next session of Congress. These upcoming decisions will have far more bearing on the role of the Marshall Space Flight Center than the transfer of a few hundred people to the plants of contractors on current projects.

In order to put a man on the Moon in this decade, we must be able to fly unmanned Saturn V vehicles as early as 1967. This means that the peak of our effort in design, procurement of hardware, manufacturing, and testing, will probably occur in 1966. From that point onward our total effort in the Apollo program as it is currently outlined is expected to decrease.

Since it normally takes from 2 to 3 years to build up a capability for new programs, NASA is now trying to determine what projects should follow Apollo.

Three major possibilities are being considered. The first is to put more emphasis on Earth orbital operations. The brilliant successes of communications and weather satellites show that these programs will yield many very handsome payoffs. Earth orbital operations could be extended to include large manned space stations, shuttle vehicles from Earth to orbit, and possibly launching platforms from Earth orbit to outer space.

The second field being studied is further lunar exploration. Methods for living, working, and moving about the Moon's surface would be developed if this area is pursued.

The third field under consideration is planetary exploration. First attempts would probably be made at exploring Mars and Venus with unmanned devices, to be followed later with manned exploration.

The selection of any one of these three fields for major emphasis would not eliminate all of the work on the other two. Regardless of the field to be selected, the hardware developed in the $20 billion Apollo program would be used to the maximum.

And all three fields require large launch vehicles. I feel that the Saturn vehicles will be used for a long time to come. We expect to be involved in many modifications and adaptations of the Saturns to new uses.

Right now we are in an enviable position to share in NASA's space projects of the 1970's and 1980's, whatever they may be. Our record of reliability and performance is good.

We must realize, however, that the public, which sponsors the space program, is becoming more cost conscious, and that launch vehicle development is becoming more competitive.

This is no new problem. You businessmen face it every day. The world has not changed. We are challenged to rise above the ordinary by opportunity—not security. We have been given tough assignments in the past, and we have always managed to come out all right. I feel that the development of any new large launch vehicle beyond Saturn that NASA needs for the peaceful exploration of space will be directed by the Marshall Center.

To merit continued confidence in our ability, we are dedicating ourselves anew to the task of superior launch vehicle development. And to beat the competition, we're not going to substitute an inferior product. We cannot sacrifice reliability or dependable performance, for they are absolute musts in manned space flight. While maintaining our technical standards of excellence, we shall devote ourselves anew to attaining the performance we seek at minimum costs, and on schedule. It's going to take the best brains and talents we have and the best we can attract to do the job right. If we attain noteworthy success in all three of these areas, I feel certain that our competence in rocket development will not be seriously challenged. Cultivating and expanding this competence is our task in the days ahead at the Marshall Center.

It would be rash, presumptuous, and unpardonable for me to attempt to tell you what your task is for the continued growth and prosperity of Huntsville and Madison County.

But perhaps you would permit me, not as the Director of the George C. Marshall Space Flight Center, but as a citizen of Huntsville for well over a decade, to suggest a list of questions which we may want to examine for ourselves to determine if Huntsville is going to match the very keen competition of other cities of the country for the future space dollars.

I wrote this list of questions several days ago, and I am delighted to see that the events of the last few days made several of them obsolete, and I had to drop them from my speech.

I understand that Mayor Hearn met with the bar association this afternoon, and made several important announcements of steps that will be taken to continue the growth of Huntsville as the "space capital of the universe."

Mayor Hearn said that he has set up a complaint department through which civic-minded citizens may call attention to imbalances and make constructive suggestions for improvements.

The mayor is also establishing a biracial committee, with full authority to act on its own, to strive for fair employment and improvement of racial relations in our city.

I think we should all admit this fact: Alabama's image is marred by civil rights incidents and statements.

I know that Huntsville and Madison County have set the pace for the remainder of the State in the employment of qualified persons regardless of race, creed, or national origin. I am especially grateful for the splendid example that the Association of Huntsville Area Contractors has set for the entire State of Alabama in participating in the Marshall Center's equal opportunity program. I know that it took more than a little courage for this association to undertake such leadership.

This is an area that needs your continued leadership in the future.

Title VII, the equal employment opportunity section of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, will become effective July 1, 1965. This is an important law, with far-reaching significance. It imposes upon employers, labor unions, and employment agencies a new set of obligations. It behooves all of us to study the equal employment opportunity section of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. We should become thoroughly familiar with the rights afforded and the obligations imposed by its provisions.

A Better Business Bureau is now being formed, and should prove extremely valuable in monitoring and stimulating the business and performance standards of the multitude of enterprises springing up in our midst.

Adequate hospital facilities are an important must for a fast-growing city presently at the 120,000 population mark. Just yesterday the Madison Baptist Association announced plans for building a $3 million 125-bed Baptist hospital in Huntsville. This unit and the proposed Crestview Hospital will help alleviate a critical shortage of hospital facilities.

And the traffic situation is being given serious study. One of the suggestions to relieve this situation is an old one—take all cars that are not paid for off the streets.

Here are the questions I have that survived the swift pace of progress during the past week:

Are we doing enough for those less fortunate families who are bypassed by the big space and missile boom and who should pose a great challenge to our civic leadership, both from the practical and humanitarian point of view?

Are we doing everything possible to attract more diversified industry to the community?

Are we doing everything we can to beautify our city? Just think of Mobile's azalea trails to realize what a city can do in this respect. Is a drive down our Memorial Parkway a thing of enjoyment?

Are we adequately supporting the development of recreational facilities in beautiful areas in the vicinity of Huntsville, such as Guntersville Lake?

Do we have an adequate long-range planning program for our educational needs, all the way from grade school to university level?

Do we have an adequate master plan for the long-term growth of Huntsville, lest we deprive ourselves of opportunities to beautify the city? Do we have an adequate plan for city parks?

Are all of our State laws, as well as county and city ordinances, in accord with the requirements of a metropolitan complex of distinctly cosmopolitan flair which has much potential to attract, and which could benefit greatly from, national conventions and international meetings. Are we planning facilities to this end? Could Huntsville sponsor a national convention of 2,500 people? Would the 2,500 delegates enjoy their accommodations?

Hundreds of people from this area attend such conventions in other cities every year.

The list of questions that I have mentioned may not even be complete. But you are the experts in community development. And the success which you and the other people of this area have achieved in the past 14 years leads me to believe that you will find all the answers to the questions I have raised, and other questions, too.

I would be remiss if I let this occasion pass without paying tribute to two groups of citizens who have helped us greatly in the formative years of the Marshall Space Flight Center and the Saturn program. One is your Chamber of Commerce Committee for Marshall Space Flight Center, under the able guidance of Dr. Bill McKissack. The other is the MSFC Advisory Committee, headed for over 3 years by Mr. Harry Rhett. To these people we turned with questions and problems that affected our early operations since 1960. Our life here has been smoother and our work easier because of their unselfish cooperations and wise counsel. Since our growing pains have now largely abated, I have asked some of my people to look into the possibility of modifying the advisory committee to a very small, compact, and workable group that can be readily available to us on short notice for advice and recommendations on any future problem areas that may develop. Fortunately, we can do this, I believe, without losing contact with the other members and without sacrificing their valuable contributions, because all are members of Dr. McKissack's committee. We expect in the future to have even more frequent contact with these groups than we have had in the past. I want to thank them and you for the exemplary cooperative attitude and the close working relationship you have developed and maintained with the Marshall Space Flight Center.

Although I will not attempt to tell you what we should do to bolster the image of Huntsville as a highly desirable place to live and work, I will promise to help as a citizen of Huntsville in every way I can. I promise to help both as the Director of the George C. Marshall Space Flight Center and as a citizen of the community. Huntsville is my home. I like it here.

Together I believe we can project a truthful image of Huntsville as an advanced scientific, educational, and cultural center, an image that will help persuade every top-level scientist, engineer, or industrial executive that we feel we need, not only to come to Alabama, but to come willingly.

And I can assure you that Mr. Webb will hear of our progress.

I think we would be wise to follow the advice of the couplet:

> "Late to bed, early to rise;
> Work like hell and advertise."

PROBLEMS OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, this Congress must deal realistically with problems confronting agriculture. While I did not express my feelings about the elevation to the Vice Presidency of the distinguished former Senator from Minnesota, I do so now. At the same time, I have mixed feelings and emotions, because agriculture, when the present Vice President served as a Member of this body, had one of its great champions in him. We shall miss his guidance and leadership in that field. As the senior Senator from Kansas and as one coming from the Midwest, I express the hope that the distinguished Vice President will add as an extracurricular activity his aid to see that those engaged in agriculture receive a reasonable income.

At the present time the farmer is not receiving his fair share of the national income with parity at 74 percent, the lowest since the depression years of the 1930's, and more than 10 points below the 84.5 average of the 8 Eisenhower years.

The parity ratio is the ratio which measures prices received by farmers against those they pay for goods and services.

Many farmers write me and ask why they are not entitled to 100 percent of parity for produce they raise and sell on the market, based on farm operating costs versus the share that industry and labor receive in our economy.

Those of us who have served many years in Congress well remember the battles we have had in support of a 90-percent parity. In fact, if one did not support a figure of at least 90 percent parity, he was not considered a friend of the farmer.

This administration must reevaluate its responsibility to the farmer and its need for a prosperous farm population.

The January 19 issue of the High Plains Journal, northeast Colorado edition, carried an editorial entitled, "Dear Mr. President." This editorial stresses the importance of agriculture to the economy and the well-being of our Nation and urges that farmers be kept on a par with the rest of the economy of the United States.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be made a part of these remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT

We don't believe there is a farmer or rancher in the high plains or a supplier of goods or services connected with agriculture in the towns of the high plains who is not basically in sympathy with your humanitarian programs such as the "war on poverty." All these people also are businessmen, however, and they know that if some of their finances are diverted to new uses, they either have to make more money or economize somewhere along the line. And we know that this is a pressing problem for your administration.

As citizens, we see the end results of the activities of our Government—the Bureau of the Budget, the Department of Agriculture, the State Department, the Senate, and the House of Representatives. Occasionally we have the opportunity to see our Government at work, and we find it very complicated.

We feel, however, that in light of recent developments, you must have been receiving information and advice from groups or individuals who find it convenient to forget about the importance of agriculture to our Nation. It appears to us that those who are planning the use of public funds need to stay in their own field, and are out of place in formation of agricultural policy.

It has long been axiomatic that severe depression in agriculture is followed by depression in industry and labor, sweeping the country with disaster we would not like to see again. When farmers and ranchers stop buying because of low income, industry suffers and labor employed by industry suffers. To ignore this situation would be a serious mistake.

American agriculture probably has come to the point where it can feed the Nation too well. The United States probably has the only farmers and ranchers in the world who have solved the problem of famine for their people. We believe the decision is whether it is in the public interest to have a shortage of food and fiber from agriculture rather than the abundance we now enjoy.

Many farm programs are set for extension, revision, improvement, or abandonment during this session of Congress. An idea has appeared in some circles that farm income should be allowed to drop—that falling farm income will result from calculated arrangements. If this idea is allowed to prevail, poverty will be created artificially in some parts of the most valuable (if not the most profitable, moneywise) parts of the Nation—the farm and ranch country—and the wheatlands of the United States.

We believe there is wide misunderstanding, if not outright misrepresentation, about such plans as the current certificate program for wheat, in which the value of the certificate comes from the marketplace, and not from the Federal Treasury. This program is a means of helping wheat farmers to help themselves, and certainly is no less humanitarian than the "war on poverty." The program value to farm income has been estimated at about $450 million, and the cost about $250 million less than the 1959–63 wheat program. This is the kind of cooperation we like to see between Government and wheat producers * * * and the public that benefits from such an arrangement.

We respectfully recommend that the importance of agriculture to the economy and well-being of the Nation, and income for farmers on a par with the rest of the economy of the United States be kept in the forefront of your policy decisions, so that agriculture can continue to be an ally in the war against poverty, rather than a victim to be rescued from this adversary.

The Editor.

SHALL WE THE PEOPLE RULE?

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, it is my pleasure to be a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 2 which was introduced by my distinguished colleague the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen]. If this joint resolution should be passed—and I fervently hope that it will be—the people of this country will once again have the right to determine the form of their own State governments.

On four or five separate occasions in the past year, I took the floor to point out the inequities in the Supreme Court's ruling on legislative apportionment, particularly as it affects the State of Colorado. I mentioned our right of initiative and referendum, and the fact that the people of the State had adopted our Federal plan by a 2-to-1 vote in the 1962 election, following a heated campaign in which this plan and the one-person, one-vote proposal were side by side on the ballot.

One of my good friends, a distinguished former Senator, Hon. Edwin C. Johnson, who served in the Senate for 18 years, and who is a member of the Democratic Party, three times Governor of our great State of Colorado, and one of the leaders in the fight for the Federal plan, has recently written an article published in the January 1965 edition of Western Farm Life. The article is entitled "Shall We the People Rule?"

He was kind enough to send me a copy. This article is timely, forceful, and bluntly stated. It is of great importance to the debate on this most important issue.

I recommend reading this article to all Senators and ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Shall We the People Rule?

(By Edwin C. Johnson)

Are the 50 States of the Union about to lose the right to govern their own affairs without interference from the Federal courts?

When the Founding Fathers of this Nation created the United States, were they tricked into believing that each of the States was to remain free, sovereign, and independent, and to have its own legislature and its own constitution, or was it to be dominated by the overlordship of the Federal courts?

Undoubtedly this is the most vital question before the United States today.

The Supreme Court of the United States—whom the American people would like to look up to with pride and confidence, as the protector of simple justice and the trusted friend of the States—has demonstrated by majority decision to be the spoiler of the traditional self-government existing among the States of the Union which said States have enjoyed for 177 years.

On November 22, 1963, our revered and beloved President was assassinated, in cold blood without warning by a madman, and on June 15, 1964, government by the people in the State of Colorado was assassinated by six Justices of the U.S. Supreme Court. On that evil day the Supreme Court ordered the court below to reverse its judgment and decision with respect to honoring the legal ballots of the electorate of the State of Colorado. This opinion by the High Court was the result of a narrow, tortured, and revolutionary interpretation by it, of a provision that had been a part of the Constitution of the United States for 98 years.

In a brisk dissenting opinion Justice Clark said, "The Court strikes down Colorado's apportionment which was adopted by the majority vote of every political subdivision in the State. I would refuse to interfere with this apportionment for several reasons. First, Colorado enjoys the initiative and referendum system which it often utilizes and which indeed produced the present apportionment. As a result, the State assembly has been reapportioned eight times since 1881. This indicates the complete awareness of the people of Colorado to apportionment problems and their continuing efforts to solve them. The courts should not interfere in such a situation."

Justice Clark continues, "I cannot agree to the arbitrary application of the one-man, one-vote principle for both houses of a State legislature. In my view, if one house is fairly apportioned by population (as is admitted here), then the people should have some latitude in providing, on a rational basis, for representation in the other house.

"The Court seems to approve the Federal arrangement of two Senators from each State on the ground that it was a compromise reached by the framers of our Constitution, and a part of the fabric of our national character. But what the Court overlooks is that Colorado, by an overwhelming vote, has likewise written the organization of its legislative body into its constitution and our dual federalism requires that we give it recognition.

"In striking down Colorado's plan of apportionment, the Court, I believe, is exceeding its power under the equal protection clause; it is invading the valid functioning of the procedures of the States, and thereby commits a grievous error which will do irreparable damage to our Federal-State relationship. I dissent."

In his dissenting opinion Justice Stewart said: "I am convinced this decision marks a long step backward into that unhappy era when a majority of the members of this Court were thought by many to have convinced themselves, and each other, that the demands of the Constitution were to be measured not by what it says, but by their own notion of wise political theory. What the Court has done is to convert a particular political philosophy into a constitutional rule, binding upon each of the 50 States."

In his dissenting opinion Justice Harlan said this: "In these cases the Court holds that seats in the legislatures of six States are apportioned in ways that violate the Federal Constitution. Under the Court's ruling it is bound to follow that the legislatures in all but a few of the other 44 States will meet the same fate. These decisions have the effect of placing basic aspects of State political systems under the pervasive overlordship of the Federal judiciary. I must register my protest."

Colorado today is about where it was in the spring of 1962, insofar as the apportionment of its general assembly is concerned, but with many unanswered imponderables added. The Federal courts have certainly foulded up the general assembly of Colorado (and other States), and how to straighten the matter out is a mystery.

In the spring of 1962 the legislature had failed to reapportion the Colorado General Assembly following the Federal census of 1960. This is required by the Colorado constitution. Many farm and civic organizations in Colorado were determined to bring the apportionment provisions of the constitution up to date. This constitution had many quaint apportionment provisions. Neither the U.S. Supreme Court nor anyone outside the State at that time was paying the slightest attention to Colorado's apportionment problems.

But the league of women voters, organized labor, State chamber of commerce, the Colorado educational block, the State grange, the farm bureau, the cattlemen's association, the woolgrowers and numerous civic and political leaders were actively holding meetings in a most congenial atmosphere. They were striving to place an amendment on the ballot by petition that would reapportion the general assembly in a satisfactory manner.

The parties could not agree, however, on districting the house and the senate and this resulted in placing two amendments on the ballot by petition. Each amendment obtained more than 60,000 signatures and were known as amendment No. 7, the Federal plan, and amendment No. 8, the voter plan. In the general election in 1962, following a long, hard-fought and contested campaign, amendment No. 7 won in every county in the State by almost 2 to 1. Amendment No. 8 lost in every county by a vote of over 2 to 1.

Then a group of attorneys filed a suit in the Federal court charging that amendment No. 7 was not in accord with the provisions of the Federal Constitution. Three Federal judges heard the case and decided 2 to 1 that amendment No. 7 was constitutional. This outside group of attorneys then appealed the lower court decision to the U.S. Supreme Court. The Supreme Court reversed the Federal court below and ordered it to reconsider the case and straighten out the legal tangles. The Federal court below then declared amendment No. 7 unconstitutional and voided it.

But the Federal district court below also held that it is legal to district the house and the senate in all large counties. The State supreme court, to the contrary, said that in all counties entitled to more than one senator or representative, candidates for the general assembly must run at large. Thus, the parliamentary situation is still tangled, since districting in the large counties is controversial in Colorado.

Thereupon the attorneys for amendment No. 7 appealed to the Supreme Court to separate all the provisions of the amendment having nothing to do with the apportionment of the State senate from the other provisions and declare them constitutional. To date the Supreme Court has not spoken in reply to this petition.

Thus the people of the State of Colorado are engaged in a hectic struggle with the U.S. Supreme Court. As citizens of a free, sovereign, and independent State, they demand the right to govern themselves, in accord with the provisions of the Constitution of the United States. They deemed it necessary to their safety and happiness to alter their constitution. Their constitution, ratified by Congress, gave them that right, limited solely by the requirement that such alteration be not repugnant to the Constitution of the United States.

Specifically, the qualified electors of the State of Colorado, in the general election of 1962, by an affirmative vote of 305,700 for and 172,725 against, altered their own constitution by adopting 7 separate and distinct constitutional provisions. The purpose of each provision was to remove the obsolescence of the State constitution with respect to legislative apportionment. Each of them was spelled out in great detail in amendment No. 7 to the Colorado constitution.

Six of these seven provisons are in complete harmony with, and are not in any degree repugnant to, the Constitution of the United States. Furthermore, no citizen of Colorado has charged them with being repugnant to the U.S. Constitution before the U.S. Supreme Court. The Court itself found no fault with them. For the record they are:

PROVISION 1

Amendment No. 7 repealed the ridiculous requirement that Colorado conduct a State census in the fifth year of each decade. The cost of each such census is estimated to be something less than $1 million. Of course, it should be stricken from the Colorado constitution.

PROVISION 2

Amendment No. 7 repealed the provision that the senate shall consist of not more than 35 members and instead shall consist of 39 members. The membership should be definitely stated and not leave this number to be juggled by the Colorado General Assembly.

PROVISION 3

Amendment No. 7 requires the Colorado House of Representatives to have exactly 65 members instead of not more than 65 members as provided by the present constitution. The purpose is to prevent juggling the membership for ulterior purposes.

PROVISION 4

Amendment No. 7 imposed a penalty on the members of the Colorado General Assembly should they fail to apportion the legislature following each Federal census as required by the Colorado constitution. No work, no pay. Each legislator takes a solemn oath to support the constitution of the State of Colorado and to perform the duties of his office as outlined by this constitution.

PROVISION 5

Amendment No. 7 requires that the 65 Colorado house members be apportioned on a strict population basis in accord with the Supreme Court's theory of one-man, one-vote. It is shocking that the Supreme Court did not uphold this democratic provision but instead threw it out with the trash. It compelled the citizens of Colorado to return to the old constitution they tried to improve with these badly needed alterations.

PROVISION 6

Amendment No. 7 requires that members of the Colorado house and senate shall be elected from single house and senate districts. This is a tremendously vital issue to the people of Colorado, and yet the Supreme Court gave it no consideration whatsoever. The court below threw this provision out on the basis that it was not severable. Such arbitrary action by the court below is an insult to the electorate of the State of Colorado.

PROVISION 7

Among the seven provisions heretofore mentioned, the sole provision to which the Supreme Court took exception was the apportionment of the State senate on something less than a strict population basis. Amendment No. 7 to a very limited degree used factors other than population in creating State senatorial districts. It took into consideration such matters as the vocations and pursuits of people, the potential growth of areas, the distribution and use of natural resources, and the quantity of legislative problems prevalent within various Colorado areas.

The Supreme Court took the position this solitary provision was in error and to get rid of this rat they burned down the barn.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, in the same letter written to me by former Senator Johnson, he also enclosed a speech made by a very distinguished general lawyer, Frazer Arnold, commenting freely on the problems which the people of the respective States have encountered because of the recent decision of the Supreme Court.

It strikes me that Mr. Arnold's speech makes the situation painfully clear. The speech would be useful to all Senators and to many citizens now engaged in the process of studying the need for Senate Joint Resolution 2, introduced by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen] and cosponsored by me and many other Senators; and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The American Bills of Rights, State and Federal

(Address at a meeting of the Colorado Society, Sons of the American Revolution, at Denver, December 15, 1964, Bill of Rights Day)

I cannot but feel honored, Mr. President, on being asked to speak to the Colorado Society and its guests, at this traditional observance of an important anniversary.

An absent-minded professor was on a railroad train and, when the conductor came around, was distressed when he couldn't find his ticket. The conductor said, "Oh, that's all right, Professor, we all know you. We know you wouldn't try to cheat the railroad. Just forget it." The professor said, "That's good of you. But I need the darn ticket to remember where I'm supposed to get off."

So, it's been said that, while we can't know exactly where the country is going, at least if we keep our Bill of Rights, we will know we are on the right track.

When Americans speak of "Our Bill of Rights," they are usually thinking of the first 10 amendments to the national Constitution.

But the rights of Americans did not originate with, nor are they granted by, those 10 Federal amendments. The rights of individuals in our law are very ancient, and the so-called Federal Bill of Rights did not even pretend to bestow them upon the people. In fact, the 10 amendments were not meant to create rights at all, but were simply to protect them by limiting the action of national authorities, and specifically of the Congress; or, more accurately, were meant to underline the complete absence of any power in the Federal Government to transgress the rights of the people or the powers of the several States.

Important, however, were the first 10 amendments, and none of them has been rewritten since. They were formally proposed by James Madison, in a single package, at the first meeting of the newly established Congress in 1789. They were drawn up to fulfill a promise made to the States by the Founding Fathers, who had previously submitted the Constitution for ratification without expressly including a Bill of Rights at all.

General Washington, after consulting with the other delegates, had suggested that a Bill of Rights be added, to disarm strong opposition in the States to the entire Constitution; and it was apparent that, without those initial amendments, the Constitution as a whole would be rejected by the peoples' conventions in the several independent States, whose ratification was necessary.

Alexander Hamilton, Washington himself, and others whose labors has produced the Constitution, had earlier pointed out that a Federal Bill of Rights was logically unnecessary, since the proposed national government was one of delegated powers, without any license at all to impair the rights of the people or the local authority of the States, no such power having been granted to it. But it was recognized by all, including the gifted Hamilton, that it was not wise to insist on a merely logical position, and General Washington's proposal was unanimously agreed to by the delegates.

The first 10 amendments, then, did not purport to restrict the powers of the States. They merely made clear that the National Government could not do anything therein forbidden. They expressly limited Federal action, not action by the free and independent States whose people were being asked to ratify the basic charter of a national union.

How is it, then, that a State is not, and never has been, at liberty to ride roughshod over the rights and privileges of the individual?

The answer is that those rights and privileges had their roots in age-old liberties of Englishmen, freedoms which began clearly to evolve with Magna Carta wrung from King John by the barons at Runnymede in 1215, and later strengthened and confirmed by various instruments of sovereignty during later reigns.

Not only so—and I believe this point is important to remember—but those rights of person and property had been vigorously laid down in certain charters of the American Colonies and in all the constitutions of the 13 States, adopted soon after the Declaration of Independence and during the progress of the Revolutionary War. Many of the men in the Convention of 1787 had helped to draft those State constitutions 5 or 10 years before; and all delegates to the Convention were thoroughly familiar with them. In many ways, the State constitutions were the models on which the new Federal Constitution was built. The national framework was deliberately set up on a similar plan. For example, the State constitutions had all provided for a chief executive, usually called a Governor; there were two legislative bodies in the States, often called a senate and a house of representatives; and there was a judicial branch composed of the State courts. Sometimes the nomenclature was different, but the essential pattern was the same as was later written into the National Constitution, with its President, its bicameral Legislature, and a Supreme Court, whose appellate authority was to be regulated by Congress, and with inferior courts to be established from time to time by the Congress.

And, as mentioned, the State constitutions all listed the inalienable rights of their people.

The same pattern of organization has been followed ever since in the admission of new States, as is familiar to all of us.

Colorado, for example, has a bill of rights consisting of 28 sections in article 2. California has 26, and the other State constitutions vary in number and language, but are all in essence alike, affirming the ancient privileges of our ancestors and the natural rights of all Americans.

It has been correctly pointed out, therefore, that the first 10 amendments to the U.S. Constitution should not strictly be thought of as a bill of rights, but as specific denials of authority to the National Government. And the climax to the whole series is in the words of the 9th and 10th amendments, which say:

"The enumeration in the Constitution of certain rights shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.

"The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

It is a basic tenet of the Communists and their blood brothers the Fabian Socialists that a person has no natural rights at all. He has no God-given privileges, and any rights he has are those conceded to him by "society," that is to say, by those in control of a government. Indeed, this is implied by the very name of their movement, socialism.

In short, they say, a natural right is a myth, an inherent right is a myth, and all so-called individual rights are socially created and may be socially withheld or dispensed with.

This is why the Communists insist upon atheism as the cornerstone of their doctrine. This is why they beat the drums for materialism. This is why they say society reflects only an economic struggle between classes. If there is no divine law, they say, there can be no divine right vested in the individual. Or, putting aside religious conceptions, they say that unless you can point your finger to an element in nature that clearly endows each person with a natural right, then natural rights are an illusion; all of man's privileges, if any (and they deny there are any), must be socially derived, that is, must come from the abstraction called the state, which is merely the working apparatus of society.

At first glance, their argument may seem hard to answer, until we look at the other side of the coin.

"The state" is just a term to denote an organization of persons. A combination of particular persons, at a given time, run the government, operate the machine called the state.

Let us ask, then, Who has given them any authority to lord it over their fellow men, without let or hindrance? Even assuming there is no divine law, and no natural right, what superior thing has given them the privilege to do as they please with other people? Where, in either heaven or earth, did their unlimited power to govern originate?

The answer, of course, is: Nowhere. They are impudent usurpers, and their authority, when they deny to others any basic rights, rests on naked power, naked force, and on nothing else.

There was consistent logic, at least, in the old doctrine of the divine right of kings. The old monarchies admitted that they must look somewhere, other than to their own naked physical power, to justify an authority to rule. They claimed that their right to hold sway was vested in them by divine providence.

Now, many of our ancestors who first came here were quitting Europe because they aspired to religious freedom, a thing they firmly believed they had a God-given privilege to enjoy, without the interposition of a royal government. Those also whose thinking was not essentially religious believed they had an inherent privilege to live their own lives and to make their way without rendering fealty to an hereditary aristocracy or an official clergy, and without much if any interference even from the king and his officers. They felt these rights inhered in them from the mere fact that they were human beings working out their own destiny in life.

The dogma of the divine right of kings was first and finally upset by the American Revolution. It was first effectively answered in the Declaration of Independence. The Declaration of Independence proclaimed a philosophy, on which the American State—and Federal Constitutions alike are based. The American doctrine is that a reservoir of inalienable rights reposes in all the people, in the vast complex made up of every individual in a country, by virtue of his existence as a human creature.

This philosophy was later adopted, at least in theory, by all civilized nations on this side of the Iron Curtain.

But it requires more than a mere statement of rights to insure their enforcement. The Soviet Union has a "bill of rights" that reads almost as well as ours. Yet it is a mere shadow, accomplishing, and intending to accomplish, nothing. The reason is that their structure of tyrannical power makes the Russian bill of rights a cynical mockery.

A free and workable government, in America as in England, could exist without a written bill of rights at all.

But no free government would endure for a day if its constitution contained only a bill of rights.

What is it, then, that allows American freedom to function? It is the structure created by its constitutions—the republican structure which puts teeth in a declaration of rights. It is the division of powers. It is the checks and balances within a government, and between the National and State Governments.

Let me read you article III of the Colorado constitution, which follows immediately after Colorado's bill of rights:

"Distribution of Powers: The powers of the government of this State are divided into three distinct departments—the legislative, executive and judicial; and no person charged with the exercise of powers properly belonging to one of these departments shall exercise any power properly belonging to either of the others, except as in this constitution expressly directed or permitted."

This same separation of powers was rigidly set up, although implicitly, in the structure of the Federal Constitution.

Practically every internal evil that disturbs us in our time stems from a violation of that principle. It is that principle which has been denied or whittled away in the last 30 years by a majority of the U.S. Supreme Court and by the overreaching Federal bureaucracy, an engine of executive usurpation, with judicial approval; that principle, plus the principle of separate authority between the Federal Government and the States.

There is time to mention only one or two among the most flagrant examples.

One of the powers delegated to Congress is the power to regulate commerce among the several States—the famous interstate commerce clause that has been so terribly abused in recent years to enhance the burgeoning Federal bureaucracy.

The majority of the Supreme Court recently decided that the Federal Wage and Hour Act applies to a janitor or elevator-pilot in a large office building, because the building had corporation tenants who shipped goods in interstate commerce. The janitor himself never left town, and there were other tenants who had nothing to do with interstate commerce, but the janitor swept the floors in the building and therefore, they said, his work affected interstate commerce. Unless the Court held that he affected interstate commerce, the wage and hour bureaucracy would have no right to supervise his wages and hours; and so the settled decisions over a period of many earlier years were overruled, and the scope of a national bureau was further expanded.

By such farfetched reasoning, the majority of the Court could, and probably would, hold that a vendor roasting chestnuts on a street corner affects interstate commerce, because the chestnuts he sells are shipped in from another State.

For many years the judicial rule was that merely selling or processing merchandise inside a State was not engaging in interstate commerce. Which, of course, is the commonsense view. However, those who would destroy the separate authority of the States, and sweep everything into the maelstrom of federalized control, are not deterred by prior decisions. They overrule them.

Another instance where the spread of Federal bureaucracy has been speeded up by the Supreme Court is in its holdings that a national bureau may regulate any business within a State, although admittedly engaged in purely intrastate commerce, if it is in any way subsidized or given aid from the National Treasury. In other words, Federal control follows Federal cash. And no method exists whereby a State or a taxpayer can object, by suit or other proceeding, if Congress sees fit to subsidize a business inside the State; hence all that either Congress or an agency has to do is to vote or supply money, and Federal jurisdiction takes over.

The net result of these and a myriad of other decisions is that the plan of the Constitution and its Bill of Rights is being wrecked with the active assistance of the radical majority on the Supreme Court. This is often done over the vehement protest of a minority of about three Justices—Justices Harlan, Stewart, and Clark. In the radical majority are usually found Warren, Black, Douglas, Brennan, White, and Goldberg. Occasionally one or two of them will unexpectedly dissent, and more rarely one of the other three will concur in some questionable decision; but the pattern is more or less as indicated.

This brings me finally to mention the recent decision where the majority of the Court upset Colorado's right to decide for itself how to reapportion the voting for our State senators. I refer to the Colorado constitutional amendment—No. 7 on the ballot—which was overwhelmingly adopted by our people 2 years ago, with large majorities in every one of the 63 counties in the State. The framers of the U.S. Constitution had carefully kept hands off of the discretion in the States to say how their legislators are chosen, and the Supreme Court had earlier held that the matter was political, a matter for each State to decide, and that a State's policy does not present a judicial question. The sole condition stipulated in the Constitution is that every State must have a republican form of government (art. IV, sec. 4). An American State cannot set up a monarchy, or a dictatorship, or a so-called "pure democracy" where the majority can do as it likes with the minority.

A State was always supposed to be free to decide upon the territorial apportionment in choosing its legislative branch; and accordingly, the prevailing practice of the States was to elect a lower house from districts more or less equal in population, but to fix district representation in its senate by considering geographical features, mountains, rivers, or great lakes (as in Michigan) which separate the voters. The States also took into account their unique agricultural, mining, and great-city divisions, to insure that all elements of the State would be assured of proper hearing and representation in its legislative branch. The foolish slogan of "one man, one vote," whereby large urban areas can dominate the whole, was never dreamed of as the criterion. The traditional plan had been held valid in numerous decisions and, as I say, was the virtually universal practice in the States.

But we all know, more or less, what happened. On June 15 of this year, in *Lucas* v. *Colorado General Assembly* and companion cases, the Supreme Court struck down the right of the people of Colorado, New York, Maryland, and Alabama to say how their State senators are to be elected, and held that "one man, one vote" must be the only test. In doing so, the Court reversed the decisions of lower Federal courts in those same cases, which had allowed the States to act for themselves. The result has been endless confusion and absurdities in State affairs. The Supreme Court even retained jurisdiction and ordered the judges in the lower courts to take over the details of reapportionment if a State legislature fails to satisfy the Supreme Court; a political usurpation by which the judicial branch steps in and assumes a legislative role in particulars about which no court is appropriately equipped or constitutionally empowered to investigate and decide.

Justices Harlan, Stewart, and Clark dissented, and in protesting, among many other pointed and vigorous objections to the majority's usurpation of the political power of a State, Justice Harlan said:

"The Court's elaboration of its new 'constitutional' doctrine indicates how far—and how unwisely—it has strayed from the appropriate bounds of its authority. The consequence of today's decision is that in all but the handful of States which may already satisfy the new requirements the local district court or, it may be, the State courts, are given blanket authority and the constitutional duty to supervise apportionment of the State legislatures. It is difficult to imagine a more intolerable and inappropriate interference by the judiciary with the independent legislatures of the States."

In his separate dissent, Justice Stewart points out that Colorado is not a homogeneous unit in either its economy or geography. He describes how Colorado is split up and many parts of it isolated by mountain ranges; how the water supply affects different sections differently; how the large cities form a line along the eastern slope of the high mountains; how vast grazing, farming, and mining regions, with peculiar interests of their own, contain only a sparse population and small towns; and how justice and commonsense require that each peculiar region in the State should have its views and its interests heard and strongly represented in the State senate.

And, referring to both Colorado and New York, and after reviewing the immense differences between regions and sections in both States, Justice Stewart ends his dissent by saying:

"The Court today holds unconstitutional the considered governmental choices of these two sovereign States. By contrast, I believe that what each State has achieved (in its reapportionment) fully comports with the letter and the spirit of our constitutional traditions."

I imagine that this sketch, which I have briefly attempted, is enough to show that the Supreme Court is wrecking the great scheme of government set up in our beloved country's Constitution and Bill of Rights.

Other lethal dangers to our constitutional freedoms exist, like the treaty power vis-a-vis the United Nations, which I have not even mentioned.

And there appear, I believe, to be only three lines open to protect the people from the U.S. Supreme Court on the subjects I have brought up:

1. In the slow process of life and death, succeeding Presidents who understand and respect the Constitution could appoint sound lawyers to the Court, who will reestablish its earlier doctrines and overrule the worst that have been handed down in the last 30 years. Even with the best of luck, improvement by that method would move at a snail's pace, over perhaps two or more generations, with all the attendant mischief in the meantime.

2. Another course that could be quite promptly effective in pulling the teeth of the innovators on the Court is definitely within the power of Congress, if Congress is willing to follow it. As I mentioned before, article III of the Constitution grants appellate jurisdiction to the Supreme Court, but with such exceptions and regulations as the Congress shall make. If Congress becomes sufficiently alarmed and disgusted at the antics of the majority on the Court, it can abolish that Court's appellate jurisdiction in cases arising under the Constitution. That would leave the final say on constitutional questions to the U.S. court of appeals in each of the 10 Federal circuits, at least some of which would probably follow the sound precedents established before the present majority in the Supreme Court took over; and their decisions would be final in the particular circuit. This would be an heroic measure for Congress to adopt, but it would be strictly in accord with its constitutional power under article III.

3. And this is no doubt the course most likely to be followed: Congress can initiate one or more constitutional amendments to reassert and redefine the powers of the States in apportioning their legislative branches; also to define clearly what is meant by interstate commerce, and thus removing some of the worst encroachments by the Federal bureaucracy; and to eliminate other perils that threaten the structure of the great Nation we love.

SUPPORT PRESIDENT'S EFFORT TO PROMOTE COMBAT READINESS OF OUR ARMED FORCES

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President—and I am very delighted to see the Vice President presiding with the dignity that I knew he would exhibit on his first day presiding over the Senate—Mr. President, the American people have been rightly described as an affluent society. Certainly, we can afford to spend whatever money is necessary to maintain our national security. However, money spent for this purpose should not be wasted. Under the present system of maintaining the unit structure of the Army Reserve and National Guard, at least $200 million is unnecessarily squandered each year through waste and duplication.

As a retired Army Reserve officer, I know that in recent years the Reserves have not been geared to an effective combat plan. There are thousands of Reserve officers and enlisted men who would be of very little, if any, use in the event of an outbreak of hostilities, escalating into a major war between this Nation and the Soviet Union and its Communist allies even in a limited crisis, such as the Berlin crisis of 1961. There are only a comparatively few of our Reserve Forces which are combat ready and which can be of service.

I support President Johnson and Secretary of Defense McNamara in their efforts to streamline and unify our armed services and provide combat readiness and capability to respond immediately if we are attacked. In this fast-moving space age, it is necessary to meet challenges with changes. We cannot cling to outmoded concepts of defense.

I have received a great deal of correspondence from many of my constituents expressing their concern over the recent announcement of the Secretary of Defense regarding the military Reserve structure. Although I realize that this is an unpopular move insofar as thousands of officers in our Reserves are concerned, and an unpopular move for me to support it, it is an essential one from a military viewpoint and from the standpoint of economy. The public interest and welfare will be served by our support of the President on this issue. If we are to maintain our defense preparedness and enact legislation to help create the Great Society envisioned by our President and by our Vice President, now presiding over the Senate, we must practice economy in Government. The most likely place to begin is in the Military Establishment which now consumes over half our annual Federal expenditures. The deadwood, the inefficient, the frills, and the wasteful must be eliminated.

Let us support the leadership of our President and Secretary of Defense who propose real and steady improvements in our defense preparedness to meet all conceivable emergencies likely to confront us in this grim cold war period.

AIDS TO PRESIDENT JOHNSON

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I invite attention to the many talented and dedicated public servants who have served with distinction under Presidents Kennedy and Johnson and who are leaving or have recently left the White House. Joining Ted Sorenson, Pierre Salinger and Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., who resigned some time ago are Kenneth O'Donnell, David Powers, Myer Feldman, and Brooks Hays. These men have been outstanding and dedicated public servants. They have given great assistance to two Presidents in roles of profound trust and confidence. Brought to the White House by the late President John Fitzgerald Kennedy, they gave vital and devoted service to President Johnson during the crucial months following the assassination. As they leave the White House the gratitude of President Johnson goes with them for the exceptional contribution which they have made. It is also fitting that, as they take on other Government responsibilities or return to private life, they know that Senators are also aware of and appreciative of their efforts on behalf of two Presidents.

I should also like to note that President Johnson has brought into the White House a group of highly talented and able men. Press Secretary George Reedy, aids and counselors Bill Moyers, Jack Valenti, Doug Cater, and Horace Busby have taken up their heavy responsibilities with vigor, dispatch, and dedication. They have the good wishes and appreciation of the Senate and the Nation.

STATEMENT BY MAJORITY LEADER TO THE FIRST DEMOCRATIC CONFERENCE OF THIS SESSION OF CONGRESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the statement I made to the first Democratic conference of the session, although addressed only to Democratic Members of the Senate, was also made available to the members of the press following the conference; in view of this later release, I can see no reason why the contents should not be made generally available to the Senate as a whole. What the majority sees as its responsibilities, how it surveys the work ahead may be of some interest to the minority as well. Accordingly, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks referred to be inserted at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement Before the Democratic Conference

(By Senator Mike Mansfield)

I should like to welcome you to the largest Senate Democratic conference in a quarter of a century.

May I introduce, first, the new Senators-elect who are a part of this great majority: Ross Bass, of Tennessee; Fred Harris, of Oklahoma; Robert Kennedy of New York; Walter F. Mondale, of Minnesota; Joseph Montoya, of New Mexico; Joseph Tydings, of Maryland.

I have had the privilege of meeting them all. They are an outstanding addition to our ranks. In the years ahead there is every reason to expect that they will contribute greatly to the achievements of the party in the Senate.

I should like to offer, now, in block, the congratulations of the conference to these reelected Democratic Members: Senators Burdick, Byrd of Virginia, Byrd of West Virginia, Cannon, Dodd, Gore, Hart, Hartke, Holland, Jackson, Ted Kennedy, McCarthy, McGee, Moss, Muskie, Pastore, Proxmire, Stennis, Symington, Williams of New Jersey, Yarborough, Young, and if I may be permitted, Mansfield of Montana.

For many reasons, and none of these reasons is more important than his own courage and determination, I should like to underscore particularly the return of Steve Young.

At the same time, I should also like to note with regret the absence from the 89th Congress of these colleagues of the 88th:

Senators Salinger, Walters, Edmondson, and Humphrey.

With respect to Senator Humphrey, I want to say that the Senate has given to the President and to all of the people, one of the most brilliant and effective Members ever to be graduated or demoted—depending on your point of view—from its ranks. I have known Hubert for many years and, for the past 4 years, we have worked together intimately in the leadership. He has been a tower of strength to the party and a great Senator. I know he will serve the Nation, as Vice President, with the same dedication, intelligence, and diligence which he displayed as a Senator and as Democratic whip. We will miss him on the floor. But I expect to see him in the chair, from time to time, as President of the Senate. He will be welcomed in this discharge of his constitutional responsibility. And his advice and counsel will not only be welcomed but sought on a great variety of matters.

For all of us who ran in November, I should like to express thanks to those who did not but who helped us in countless ways. We are especially grateful to the Senate Democratic campaign committee, and its great chairman, one of the rocks of the Senate Democrats, Warren Magnuson. His committee and its staff worked with equity and impartiality and with professional understanding and astuteness for all Democratic senatorial candidates who sought their help.

And, finally, I should like to note the strenuous efforts of the President and the Vice-President-elect, during the campaign. They traveled from one end of the country to the other. They worked without rest for days on end and were of great help to many Democratic senatorial candidates. May I note that they did not stop, first, to ask whether these candidates were cataloged as liberal, conservative, moderate, or middling before going into any State. The President and the Vice President gave everything they had to the main theme: To the election of Democrats, spelled with a small or capital "d," everywhere in the Nation.

As we enter the 89th Congress, I would hope that all the members of this conference would bear that main theme in mind. It is true that each of us may have our own philosophical interpretation of the Democratic Party's principles. It is true, too, that each of us confront unique State or regional situations. One fact, however, is clear from the last election. The national results reflect the well-placed faith of the United States in the Democratic Party as a whole.

The people of our States elected us as individuals but they also elected us, too, in a great many cases, because the Nation has been well led for 4 years by two outstanding Democratic Presidents. They elected us, in a great many cases because in two successive Congresses, the Senate has worked creatively and effectively in its own right and in excellent harmony with these Presidents in facing up to the needs of the Nation at home and abroad.

The past 4 years have been good years, for the Nation and for the party. They have been years which have carried us to a high pinnacle of political acceptance in the Nation. They have been years of cautious national progress, progress toward a more stable peace in the world. They have been years of material progress at home and of progress in the development of a greater equity for all the people of the Nation.

The election is a clear call from a preponderant majority of the American people to continue on the track of both a stable responsibility and an alert responsiveness to national needs. For us, it is a call to continue to work with the President, ever mindful of our separate and distinct responsibilities under the Constitution. It is a call to continue to work, not with a hysterical or ruthless anxiety, but with a dedicated and consistent diligence on the Nation's domestic and foreign problems.

Above all, it is a call to continue to work within the framework of national unity and continuity, to work without the kind of reckless and irresponsible divisiveness which was so decisively rejected in November.

Let me underscore the words "national unity." I want to say, in particular, to the new members of the conference that, on occasion, there arise in the Senate issues which lend themselves neither to Democratic nor Republican solutions. There are issues of foreign policy and sometimes of domestic policy of such transcendent importance to the Nation that the only acceptable answers can never be either Republican or Democratic but only American.

Politics are partisan, as our election experiences have taught us. But as majority leader for the past 4 years, I have not allowed the partisan wedge to drive so deeply in the Senate as to alienate the minority Members, so deeply as to force them out of the House of the Nation. And I have every intention of continuing to work, as in the past, with the minority leadership, with the restraint and respect and the mutual understanding and with that high degree of comity and civility which are the foundations of the House.

What applies in relation with the minority in the Senate applies even more forcibly among the members of this conference. We are still a nation of great diversity. Even as members of the same party, we view the Nation's needs now and for the future in different ways. Many shades of this diversity are represented in this conference. Yet we are brought together as Americans and as Democrats in the quest of the common good of the United States.

As far as I am concerned, I regard it as a paramount aspect of the trust which you have placed in me, to do everything I can to keep us together as a party in the Senate. I ask your help in this effort. I ask you all to bear in mind at all times the differences in the Nation itself which, as individual Senators, we tend to personify and to reflect. I ask you to bear in mind the higher need of the United States as a whole for an essential unity, without which no part of the Nation, no group of inhabitants, can expect anything but a short-lived advantage. And I ask you for the restraint, the understanding, and the tolerance in our individual differences which alone will enable us to work together for the Nation as a whole.

And while I am on this subject of unity, let me say in great frankness, that there is another aspect of it of which we will all need to be especially aware in the months ahead. There are enough natural pressures for division in the real issues which confront us. But it is also in the nature of life in this city that we be subject to all sorts of efforts to promote a contrived disunity among us. With a majority as large as ours, we may anticipate a great intensification of these efforts.

Some years ago, President Johnson, in a conversation with me, referred to this process which may be characterized as the intellectual and journalistic equivalent of "let's you and him fight." He noted that efforts would be made to alienate him as Vice President from President Kennedy and from me as majority leader. As he predicted, the efforts were made by a variety of columnists and by all sorts of rumors, innuendoes, and gossip. These efforts failed. The answer to them was written in the record of close collaboration between Lyndon Johnson and the late John Fitzgerald Kennedy which continued up until the very hour of his tragic death. And as for me, I do not know that I ever missed a Tuesday morning leadership breakfast at the White House, whether tendered by the late President Kennedy or President Johnson. May I say that I have every intention of continuing to attend these breakfasts in the future, so long as the coffee is hot.

The process of contriving disputes and divisions, however, will go on. It is likely to be directed at Mr. Johnson and Mr. Humphrey. It is likely to be directed at Mr. Humphrey and Mr. Kennedy and at Mr. Kennedy and Mr. Johnson. It will be directed at Democratic Senators, of the North and South, the East and the West. It will be directed at Senators, junior and senior.

I have every confidence that we shall, as Democrats, be just as successful as in the past in turning aside these attempts to divide us. We shall continue to act with the maturity and the good sense and the good humor which have enabled us, for many years, to devote our preponderant energies, not to petty personal feuding but to the real and pressing problems of the Nation. Certainly, to the extent that I can do anything about it, there will be no Cow Palaces in the Democratic pasture.

The leadership will operate, as in the past, on the basis of the equal treatment of every Member, whether the most junior or the most senior. It will seek in the same fashion the exercise of an equal voice on the part of all Democratic Members in the party's affairs in the Senate.

In this connection, I would note that I have been criticized to some degree in the press for failing to impose upon the conference a choice for majority whip. Most recently, I believe I have been accused of acting as though I were the president of a high school sorority. I do not think I regard the

Democratic conference as a sorority. Nor do I regard it, may I say, as a Boy Scout troop to be led by a scoutmaster. The leadership, as I view it, is an instrument of the conference and the Senate as a whole, not the other way around. And so long as I remain as leader I shall not be blustered, badgered, or bluffed into reversing the order. The party in the Senate is not the leadership. The party is all of us.

As contrasted with the situation involving the whip, I want to make clear that I have already made clear my own personal preference for secretary of the conference. I do support the incumbent as I support all incumbents. I do so, because I do not believe in change for the sake of change and because the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] has worked most effectively in the leadership. But when a vacancy occurs from natural causes, so to speak, as in the case of the position of the whip, it seems to me eminently desirable that it be filled by the sober and careful judgment of the entire Democratic membership, without any suggestion of coercion or imposition from the leadership. Insofar as I am concerned, there is not a member of this conference with whom I cannot work in the Senate or in the leadership; and after this selection is made by the conference, I fully expect the same situation to prevail.

So much for the manner in which the leadership hopes to conduct the party's affairs in the 89th Congress. I have dealt with this matter at some length because it is of relevance to our capacity to function effectively as individual Senators and as a party in the Senate. It is also of relevance to our capacity to support the President as fully as our separate constitutional responsibilities permit. Insofar as I, personally, am concerned, may I say, I was able, at some expense to my personal political fortune, to give almost 100 percent support to the programs of the late President Kennedy and to those of President Johnson during his year in office. And I know that every member of this conference will join with me in doing whatever we can do to help the President and his programs in the session ahead.

I will not anticipate, at this time, the specifics of the President's state of the Union message. He shall address us in person tonight. I would expect, however, in general terms, that he will call upon us to work with him in completing those parts of his program which were pending before the last Congress at its close. Indeed, I believe, insofar as possible, the prompt reconsideration of measures already passed by the Senate in the last session would be most desirable. I would expect, further, that the President will seek perfecting and new legislation designed to fill in the outlines of the design for progress which we have drawn during the past 4 years.

And I would anticipate that during the years ahead, the Nation will reach decisive crossroads at several points in foreign policy. The preponderant responsibility in these matters rests with the President. He will be confronted with grave questions not only in Vietnam but elsewhere in Asia, not only in NATO but in Europe as a whole, not only in the Congo but throughout Africa, not only with regard to fiscal difficulties but with a general organizational disarray in the United Nations.

I would hope that Democratic Members, indeed, all Senators would bear in mind at all times the great burdens which the President carries for all of us in these decisions of foreign policy. I would hope and expect that we will give him every support, by word and vote which can, in good conscience, be given. And I would hope that Members qualified in questions of foreign policy would not hesitate, after careful study, to speak out on them. Contributions have been made, from time to time, by Members of the Senate, to the more effective formulation and conduct of our foreign relations. While such contributions usually come from members of the Foreign Relations Committee, others with experience and knowledge of these matters have frequently been most helpful. And clearly, we are at a stage, now, in world developments when prudent contributions of thought and idea can be very useful.

This, then, is the framework within which I intend to exercise the trust of leadership which you have reposed in me. I thank you for your confidence. I pledge to you every effort to insure the unity of our party and the effective functioning of the Senate. I pledge to you that I shall work closely with the President without losing sight of the independent constitutional functions of the Senate. I ask for your help and cooperation now and in the days ahead, that we may work together and with the President. That unity is essential if we are to achieve new dimensions in the fullness of American society for all our people and improve the security and the lot of human existence on this planet.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TUESDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business this afternoon, it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock on Tuesday next.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EARLY CONSIDERATION OF LEGISLATIVE MEASURES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I express the ardent hope that in the meantime the committees will organize themselves and start considering legislation and, if at all possible, bring such measures as the Appalachia bill and the water pollution bill to the floor of the Senate next week. As soon thereafter as possible, measures having to do with the coffee agreement and the Presidential succession should be considered.

TRIBUTE TO T. S. ELIOT

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, for more than 40 years T. S. Eliot has been a major force in contemporary literature. He has had a great influence on poetry and literary criticism and, in fact, on the whole modern culture. He not only contributed new ideas and new forms in literature, but at the same time sustained traditional principles and institutions which he thought sound.

There is today great interest in the advancement of the arts and in the support of the arts by Government. There is no certainty that a Government program will develop great artists like T. S. Eliot. Certainly it should develop some lesser talents as well as a greater appreciation and response to the work of the artist.

T. S. Eliot was a poet recognized in his own time, one who had great influence not just on literature, but on the whole life of the two generations during which he has been a living force. He shall continue to be a force and an influence in the future.

It is proper that at the beginning of this new Congress we should stop to recall the fact of his death and the extent of his influence on our times.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an article entitled "Famed Poet and Playwright T. S. Eliot Dies in London at 76," published in the Washington Post on January 5; an editorial entitled "Mood of an Age," published in the New York Times on January 6; and a statement by Reed Whittemore, poetry consultant at the Library of Congress, published in the New Republic, dealing with his life's work.

There being no objection, the articles and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post,
Jan. 5, 1965]

FAMED POET AND PLAYWRIGHT T. S. ELIOT DIES IN LONDON AT 76

LONDON, January 4.—T. S. Eliot, American-born Nobel Prize poet and playwright, died tonight in London. He was 76. Other details of his death were not immediately available.

Mr. Eliot had suffered a heart attack aboard the liner *Queen Mary* in June 1956, but recovered and married his secretary the following January when he was 68.

His bride, 30-year-old Valerie Fletcher, was his second wife.

Mr. Eliot was once described by an acquaintance as "an American who is more English than the English."

That word portrait was sharply drawn, for Thomas Stearns Eliot might have posed as a model for the Compleat Englishman.

The St. Louis-born poet-playwright had a clipped, precise manner of speech and he dressed with Saville Row conservatism, down to the tightly rolled umbrella which he invariably carried.

Mr. Eliot applied the finishing touches to the picture by relinquishing his U.S. citizenship in 1927—he had made his home in England since 1914—and becoming a British subject. In the same year he was confirmed in the Church of England.

His sincere Christian beliefs were reflected in his writings from that time onward. Previously he had dipped his pen in cynicism.

He caught the imagination of the so-called "lost generation" of writers and artists of the 1920's with "The Waste Land," a strange mixture of anthropology, learning, cynicism, and song.

This appeared in the first issue of the Criterion, a literary magazine which Mr. Eliot edited, in 1922. The Criterian failed of wide appeal—its circulation never exceeded 900—but "The Waste Land" brought Eliot fame.

SAW HOPE IN FAITH

The poem mirrored an age of uncertainty, despair, squalor, and decay—a parched desert through which a wanderer straggled in the hope of finding an abiding faith but met only disillusionment.

His lines "This is the way the world ends. Not with a bang but a whimper" were memorized by legions of college students.

Mr. Eliot later came to believe there was a way out of the wasteland—but not the middle way. He preached that the Western nations must choose between a pagan society and a truly Christian one, that is, a way of life guided by Christian principles.

He pounded home this faith in his two most successful plays, "Murder in the Cathedral" (1935), a dramatization of the murder of Archbishop Thomas Becket in Canterbury Cathedral, and "The Cocktail Party" (1950), the story of a psychiatrist who helped people find the peace of mind their souls were groping for.

"Cocktail Party," a religious yet witty play in verse, won the New York drama critics award for the best foreign play of the year.

In 1948, Mr. Eliot received the Nobel Prize for literature. This was "for his remarkable pioneering work in modern poetry." He also was awarded the Order of Merit, one of the highest honors conferred in the British Empire. That was the only honor Winston Churchill accepted at the end of his wartime service as Prime Minister.

SIXTIETH BIRTHDAY HONORS

Mr. Eliot's 60th birthday in 1948 was the occasion for worldwide tributes such as a living artist seldom received. These included a symposium of 48 contributions testifying to his place and influence in modern literature. The symposium contained essays and poems from famous literary figures in many countries.

There had been little in Mr. Eliot's work to remind readers of his Middle West background until his poem, "The Dry Salvages," appeared in 1941. To most Americans he was a highbrow poet who chose, for some inexplicable reason, to live abroad.

Mr. Eliot was born in St. Louis, September 26, 1888. His father was head of a brick manufacturing company. His mother wrote dramatic poetry. He attended Smith Academy in St. Louis and later Milton Academy, near Boston. The step to Harvard was a short one and there, at 18, he began his studies of philosophy, classic literature, and logic. He aspired to become a professor of philosophy.

Harvardian Eliot contributed romantic poetry to the undergraduate Advocate.

STAYS IN ENGLAND

After graduation he went to Paris for a year of study at the Sorbonne. Mr. Eliot wrote his first significant poem, "The Love Song of J. Alfred Prufrock," while living in a left-bank pension in the French capital. It portrayed an aging man reliving a life dissipated between timid hopes and lost opportunities.

There followed three years of graduate study at Harvard, after which he returned to Europe on a fellowship in 1914. It turned out to be a long stay. Although he revisited America 18 years later, he went back to the serenity of his beloved London.

Mr. Eliot tried teaching at English boys' schools, then went to work for Lloyd's Bank of London. Neither satisfied him. He subsequently joined the publishing firm of Faber & Gwyer, now Faber & Faber, of which he became a director.

Explaining why he legalized his British status, Mr. Eliot said:

"I decided I didn't want to be a professor of philosophy after all. There seemed no point in going back. I found I had really settled down here and that I might as well recognize the fact. I didn't want to be a permanent visitor here. I wanted to accept the responsibilities that go with permanent residence in any country and so I became a British subject."

He married Vivienne Haigh, daughter of a British artist, in 1915. She died in 1947. There were no children.

Mr. Eliot was a church warden in St. Stephen's Anglican church in the Kensington section of London.

HIS SELF-PORTRAIT

The tall, slightly stooped poet had a shy, kindly smile. His slightly blurred spectacles were always sliding down his roman nose, beneath which was stuck an inevitable cigarette.

He was quite unlike the picture he once drew of himself in a bit of doggerel:

"How unpleasant to meet Mr. Eliot!
With his features of clerical cut,
And his brow so grim
And his mouth so prim
And his conversation so nicely
Restricted to What Precisely
And If and Perhaps and But * * *
How unpleasant to meet Mr. Eliot!
(Whether his mouth be open or shut.)"

Mr. Eliot wasn't concerned about the possibility his writings might be difficult to understand.

"I think understanding what the author is trying to say is not the necessary part," he said. "If they think about it afterwards, that's the main thing.

"A poem, if it's any good, ought to be enjoyed before it is understood. So with a play."

He explained his creative talent as almost beyond his control.

"People used to say my poem, 'The Waste Land,' was important because it expressed the mood of a generation. I didn't have that feeling when I wrote it.

"Writing, to me, has always been like relieving myself of the burden of an unborn infant. I didn't know what the infant would look like, or what it would say to people when it grew up."

At the time he won the Nobel Prize, he said:

"What I want to see is good minor poets. The major poets are rare enough and never to be expected. But the minor poet, content to be minor, who can make the most of his small talent until it shines; that is what we can ask for."

[From the New York Times, Jan. 6, 1965]

The Mood of an Age

T. S. Eliot was a poet who could not be placed into an easily marked cubbyhole. His youthful work, so harshly and bitingly critical of society, frightened off the reader accustomed to the romantic poetry of the time. When he moved to more orthodox positions, he lost even his earlier support.

There was a gulf between Eliot the poet and Eliot the critic. The man who was a self-proclaimed classicist, who wrote that "the whole of literature has a simultaneous existence and composes a simultaneous order," appeared determined to smash that order and introduce anarchy into English verse. "The Waste Land" ran roughshod over everything that had preceded it in English poetry.

Yet, in spite of the difficulties, there was in his work a sureness of accent, a depth of tone, an accuracy of image. Those who read him responded to the hard precision of his lines without always defining their contents. They sensed that the references were not essentially private. Eliot summed up a mood of an age, and in forms that mirrored a world marked by loss of faith, weariness, deadened feelings.

His critical essays, which are not only about literature but are part of it, provided new attitudes and tools to a generation of critics, and for two decades at his height no literary journal was free from its Eliot quotation, either in support or rebuttal.

Today his work is less difficult than when it first appeared. It will be less so in the future, until it is absorbed into that tradition in which the temporal and timeless are one.

T. S. Eliot, 1888–1965

In a better world than this one I might have been able to write these words before reading T. S. Eliot's obituary in the Times. But the Times in its orderly way has been lying in wait for the man for years; so too have a great many teachers and scholars who have sensed dimly for more than a decade that they had on their hands perhaps a major poet, perhaps a minor poet, but certainly a dead poet, and therefore fair game. Even Mr. Eliot himself seemed to have this sense of himself a few years back when he delivered a lecture about "The Waste Land" with the detachment of a Martian. All our literary morticians have had their say. Perhaps he has earned a few years of simple silence.

Yet (always the "yet," followed by pages and pages), for anyone who grew up between the big wars thinking of "Prufrock" and the rest as somehow of the essence of poetry, it is difficult even to meditate in silence about this poet's death without as it were employing some of the poet's own "terms." I am saying that in a sense he now lives on, for his admirers, in the quotation-ridden thoughts they entertain about his death, they having learned a good deal of what they know and feel about death from him, learned of growing old with their trousers rolled, of dying with a little patience, of shoring fragments against their ruin, of dancers gone under the sea, houses gone under the sea, of captains, bankers, and eminent men of letters fading off into the dark. It is not just the words and phrases that contain the death preachment; the preachment is also lodged in the tone and manner, in the basic intellectual and emotional stance that the poems project, a stance that the admirers, having picked up, now live with.

Meanwhile it is this stance that Eliot's detractors have also picked up, but only to mock him. In the word "stance"—an unfortunate one—lies their complaint: the man consciously and with insufferable deliberation and detachment adopted, cultivated, rigged up a way of poetry which produced poetry which was not merely not good poetry on the subject of death but nearly managed to be the death of poetry.

These lines have been long drawn, but now the man is dead. As a reluctant longtime admirer I can only see a great and abiding consistency in his controversial stance, a stance which seems to me now to have been surely no stance at all in the bad sense, but just a way of looking at things, a considerate way. Partly of course the way was bred into him by all the immediate social and cultural circumstances the positivists have always been eager to cite; but of course it was also more than that, it was a way that has always been bred into all considerate poetry. A poetry of death like his is no more a stance in the bad sense than the surge of the sea may be said to be a stance, the sea to which, to paraphrase the man, there is no end, no beginning—and certainly at the heart of it no contriving. To his admirers Eliot was a great poet of that sea.

But how unsealike and unseaworthy is this poem, this stance: "Twit twit twit * * * so rudely forced."

REED WHITTEMORE.

JANUARY 5, 1965.

GOLD RESERVES

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, it is widely accepted that the legal reserve gold requirements of our American money supply may be modified.

Since under existing law, 25 percent gold reserve is required on notes and deposits, and since with an expanding economy the deposits have risen to a point where there is pressure upon the gold reserve, some action must be taken soon.

On January 20, Mr. Charles E. Walker, executive vice president of the American Bankers Association, speaking in Houston, Tex., supported the proposal to relax requirements but went on to say they should not be removed altogether. This seems to be the proposal which is gaining strength and may have Treasury backing.

I think it unsound and inadequate for a number of reasons:

First, because it perpetuates the myth that our monetary system is dependent upon gold reserves. The fact is that it depends upon the productivity of the United States and the strength and stability of our Government. The American people know that we are not on the gold standard. Rumors of reducing reserves behind Federal Reserve deposits have not created any sign of fear or panic.

Second, it fails to recognize or use the full power of our gold holdings. Gold has become a prime asset today. International bankers know that we are not on the gold standard. The action which I recommend could only serve notice on them that we were prepared to use our full economic power, which would be reassuring to those who are concerned with the continuing economic growth of the free world. And it would serve as a warning to those bankers and countries that have benefited from our shortsighted or fearful policy, or who might continue to benefit from it.

We should take out of cold storage not just the $5 billion now being held against deposits in the Federal Reserve System, but the additional gold being held as reserves behind Federal Reserve notes. Such action would release approximately $13 billion in gold which would be used to serve three purposes:

First, to strengthen the dollar.

Second, to provide greater liquidity in that great trading area which depends primarily upon the dollar.

Third, to strengthen our hand in the economic cold war.

It is my hope that those who are required to make recommendations with reference to this matter follow the recommendations of economists and monetary experts rather than the proposed halfway measures.

LEADERSHIP OF UNITED STATES IN PURPOSEFUL PURSUIT OF PEACE

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, on January 15, President Johnson sent to the President pro tempore of the Senate a letter and a draft bill to assure the continuing leadership of the United States in the purposeful pursuit of peace. In effect, the President requested that the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency should be given a 4-year authorization, totaling $55 million, for the pursuit of its activities; in other words, that this splendid agency, created under the auspices of President Kennedy in the summer of 1961, with the strong support of the President and Vice President, without whom, I am confident, the bill would not have passed, has placed us in a position of having an agency devoted solely to the pursuit of peace through arms control and disarmament. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the President's letter be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
January 15, 1965.

HON. CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I have the honor to forward today to the Congress—with my strongest urging that it be enacted promptly—a draft of a bill to assure the continuing leadership of the United States in the purposeful pursuit of peace.

Four years ago, the United States became the first nation in the world to establish an Agency for Arms Control and Disarmament. The record of achievement since has refuted the doubts of those who questioned whether there was effective work for such agency to perform. While the journey toward peace remains long, we have begun to take the first steps—and we have found others of the family of nations willing to walk with us.

In the last year and a half, we have concluded the nuclear test ban treaty now joined by over 100 other nations. We have established a direct communications link between Washington and Moscow, joined in a United Nations resolution agains weapons in space, and initiated cutbacks in the planned production of fissionable material—a step which the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union have announced that they intend to take also.

We have, in addition, placed before the 18-nation Disarmament Conference in Geneva a number of important, concrete proposals for the control and reduction of armaments on which agreement has not yet been achieved.

In our times, as always, vigilance remains the price of liberty and we stand today as a strong, ready and vigilant nation, prepared and determined to defend our freedom and the freedom of those who stand with us. But as a nation vigilant to danger, we must also be vigilant for opportunities for improving the hopes for peace. The Arms Control and Disarmament Agency helps us keep this most vital vigil.

Since existing authorization expires on June 30, 1965, I am asking the Congress to extend that authority for 4 years. I do so because it is my purpose to intensify our efforts in this critical area. I am determined to work in every way that I can for safeguarded agreements that will halt the spread of nuclear weapons, lessen the risk of war and reduce the dangers and costly burdens of armaments. This effort—as much as our continuing preparedness efforts militarily—is essential to our security for a continued increase and spread of modern weapons can actually decrease our security.

The first legislation creating the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency is a proud and honored memorial to the initiative and vision of President John F. Kennedy. It is also a living tribute to the responsibility of the Members of Congress, and, in particular, to the dedicated leadership offered through the years by the Vice-President-elect. Such legislation so clearly reflects the spirit and the will of the American people that I hope the Congress will act with all dispatch to give approval to this extension of the Agency's valuable role.

The background and justification for my recommendation are amplified in the accompanying letter to me from the Director of the Agency, William C. Foster. I share Mr. Foster's conclusions fully and confidently trust that the action of the Congress will impressively reaffirm to the world the dedication of this generation of Americans to the untiring quest for peace for ourselves and all mankind.

Sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I should like to comment on the President's letter. He points out that we have placed before the 18-nation Disarmament Conference in Geneva a number of important, concrete proposals for the control and reduction of armaments, on which agreement has not yet been achieved. The most important of these proposals has been pending at the Geneva Disarmament Conference since April 1962.

At that time, in compliance with the great speech that President Kennedy made before the United Nations on September 21, 1961, at which time he committed our country to complete general disarmament under the force of world law, our delegation at the Geneva Disarmament Conference tabled an outline treaty to achieve that high goal.

At the same time, the Soviet Union tabled its own version of a treaty of general and complete disarmament, a principle to which that nation had been committed for many years.

Those treaties, unfortunately, have languished since they were tabled in 1962, although there has been substantial discussion of their terms, both at Geneva, and generally across the world. I do hope that the request of the President for a continuation of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency on a more permanent basis will resuscitate the interest of the executive branch, Congress, the United States of America, and the world in general, in this great goal of general and complete disarmament under enforceable world law, without which in my opinion there is grave danger that Western civilization will be destroyed within the lifetime of all of us.

There are, of course, many other measures of arms control which are very much under discussion. It is of great importance that these measures, some of which may necessarily be preliminary to the achievement of general and complete disarmament, should be under constant negotiation, and that we should have an agency secure in its tenure of life for at least a 4-year period. This agency would be empowered to adequately represent the United States of America in the very delicate and, indeed, tough negotiations which are an inevitable part of coming to an agreement of any sort with the very difficult, and sometimes truculent, individuals who represent the Government of the Soviet Union.

I note with particular pleasure the following comments of the President in his letter:

> I am determined to work in every way that I can for safeguarding agreements that will halt the spread of nuclear weapons, lessen the risk of war and reduce the dangers and costly burdens of armaments.

This indeed should be the prime objective, in my opinion, of our foreign policy. I am happy to see the President espouse it as part of his program.

As the President pointed out in his letter:

> The first legislation creating the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency is a proud and honored memorial to the initiative and vision of President John F. Kennedy. It is also a living tribute to the responsibility of the Members of Congress, and, in particular, to the dedicated leadership offered through the years by the Vice-President-elect.

The Vice-President-elect has now been, happily, inducted into office as the Vice President for the next 4 years.

The letter continues:

> Such legislation so clearly reflects the spirit and the will of the American people that I hope the Congress will act with all

dispatch to give approval to this extension of the Agency's valuable role.

The Agency referred to is, of course, the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. Two days before the President wrote to Congress, a letter was addressed to him on January 13 by Mr. William C. Foster, the Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of this letter may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFICER (Mr. BASS in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY,
Washington, January 13, 1965.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I submit herewith, for your approval and transmittal to the Congress, proposed legislation to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act in order to extend the authorization for appropriations for this Agency. This proposed amendment has one purpose: to authorize appropriations of $55 million for the 4-year period of fiscal years 1966 through 1969. Since the current authorization is inadequate to permit operations much beyond June 30, 1965, this legislation will be required to keep the Agency operating. Early enactment is necessary to permit timely congressional consideration of the Agency's fiscal 1966 budget estimates.

As you have repeatedly pointed out, enhancing our national security through the verified control and reduction of worldwide armaments and through other measures to lessen the risk of war is a United States foreign policy goal of the greatest importance. The United States has already achieved three significant measures toward this end: the nuclear test ban treaty, the communications link between Washington and Moscow, and the United Nations resolution against weapons in space. In addition, we are cutting back our planned production of nuclear materials, and the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union have announced that they intend to make cutbacks in theirs. The Agency has played a key role in the development of the current U.S. proposals before the 18-nation Disarmament Conference; namely, to freeze the production of strategic nuclear delivery vehicles, to halt production of fissionable materials for weapons use, to create observation posts to reduce the danger of war by miscalculation and surprise attack, and to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons into the national control of countries currently not possessing them.

Attempts directed toward arms control and other measures to lessen the threat of war are no longer utopian dreams. The work of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency has become an integral part of our overall national security policy. Indeed, the need for arms-control measures is becoming even more acute as more nations develop a nuclear capability and as the arms race remains with us. Armaments alone can no longer increase security; the unchecked increase of these weapons of mass destruction can only diminish our safety and the hope for peace.

Research in arms control and disarmament is imperative if realistic international agreements are to be reached. The complexity of arms-control negotiations requires systematic and comprehensive study in the development of policy proposals. The chief value of this endeavor is to allow the United States to make concrete proposals for arms-control measures which will not jeopardize our security interests vis-a-vis the relative balance of power in the world, and which will assure that such agreements permit proper inspection and verification to prevent possible subterfuges by other nations. It also has an ancillary value in demonstrating to our allies, adversaries, as well as neutrals, the importance we attach to arms control.

To fulfill the Agency's responsibility as a repository of knowledge on the technical, economic, military, and political aspects of arms control, made especially difficult by the rapidly changing world scene, to back up proposals currently before the 18-nation Disarmament Conference, and to prepare new proposals in support of your continuing quest for peace, the Agency must have authorization to carry on its efforts during the years ahead. Specifically, the Agency must have resources to pursue vital studies aimed at preventing the spread of nuclear weapons, controlling and reducing arms, and developing other measures to reduce the risk of war. Although the United States has already achieved significant progress in making the world safer from the ever present nuclear threat, the quest must continue and even intensify during the coming years.

The road to peace and arms control is slow and arduous, but it is one which we must travel. Therefore, I believe our authorization for appropriations should be for a period adequate to allow for long-range research planning and to emphasize our determination in making this effort. I believe a 4-year authorization for fiscal years 1966 through 1969 would accomplish these purposes.

Faithfully yours,
WILLIAM C. FOSTER.

Enclosure: Proposed legislation to amend Arms Control and Disarmament Act.

S. —

A bill to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act, as amended, in order to increase the authorization for appropriations

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the second sentence of section 49(a) of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act, as amended, (22 U.S.C. 2589(a)), is amended by inserting immediately after "$20,000,000", the following: "and for the four fiscal years 1966 through 1969, the sum of $55,000,000,".

Mr. **CLARK**. Mr. President, Mr. Foster points out the need for appropriations totaling $55 million for the 4-year period, the fiscal years 1966 through 1969.

He points to the success achieved largely, although not entirely, under his jurisdiction, due to the efforts of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, in the nuclear test ban treaty, the communications link between Washington and Moscow, and the United Nations resolution against weapons in space.

Mr. President, we have indeed made some progress since 1961 in the relaxation of tensions and the adoption of specific and useful, although limited, measures which I hope will lead toward an eventual agreement, first, for arms control, and, later for disarmament under enforcible law.

As Mr. Foster points out:

> Attempts directed toward arms control and other measures to lessen the threat of war are no longer utopian dreams.

I suggest that those of us who are dedicated to the cause of disarmament and arms control are the true realists in international politics. The utopian pipe dreamers are those who believe that despite a constant proliferation of weapons of ever-increasing force and despite constant resort to threats of force, we will be able to preserve an uneasy truce based on a balance of terror in this age of nuclear, chemical, and biological warfare.

So I suggest that the realistic plan would be to do away with armaments, step by step, under adequate safeguards and controls, as President Kennedy stated, in an effort to arrive at the magnificent goal which he set forth, first in the speech in September 1961, again in the spring of 1963 at American University, and a third time in the fall of 1963 shortly before his assassination.

I return to Mr. Foster's letter:

> The work of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency has become an integral part of our overall national security policy. Indeed, the need for arms control measures is becoming more acute as more nations develop a nuclear capability and as the arms race remains with us. Armaments alone can no longer increase security; the unchecked increase of these weapons of mass destruction can only diminish our safety and the hope for peace.

I hope very much that the request of the President, joined in by Mr. Foster, will be given prompt and favorable consideration by the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House, and the membership of both Houses.

I think it quite significant that the President should have sent to Congress this modest proposal to work for this goal before he sent to Congress the proposal dealing with the military budget. In my opinion, the priority was correct. We must, of course, keep up our guard. We dare not let it down. We must continue to negotiate from strength. There is no other way of dealing with the Russians and, eventually, with the Chinese.

But, as the President stated in his state of the Union address and in his inaugural address, the great objective is to abolish war and poverty. These are objectives that not only the American people, but also the overwhelming majority of the people of the world desire, and that are certainly the goal of all people of good will, regardless of their race, color, creed, or national origin.

I hope this modest proposal to increase hopes for bringing about a solution of the problems which plague the nations of the world will receive favorable consideration from the Senate and from the House.

TIME FOR ACTION IN THE FIELD OF POPULATION CONTROL

Mr. **GRUENING**. Mr. President, we have the knowledge and the means to solve the population-poverty problem if we mobilize the resources available, keeping ever in mind that we do not have to ask anyone to do anything which is opposed to his own particular beliefs. Individual choice must prevail and the opportunity to make that choice must be offered here and in other nations.

I have discussed the population problem in this Chamber and elsewhere. On August 15, 1963, I joined with my able colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] and cosponsored Senate Concurrent Resolution 56 which proposed that the President create a Presidential Commission on Population to get the real population facts and to report what they mean. The resolution proposed that the President substantially increase our research in the field of human reproduction and make our findings freely available to countries requesting assistance.

On October 10, 1963, when I spoke at length on the population problem, I said:

> There is an urgency involved in the need to discuss population control * * *. It does us little, if any, good to provide economic or technical assistance to nations which show no concern for their population explosion.

I reviewed the work underway here and elsewhere to help solve the problems created by the population explosion abroad and at home. I suggested that a nation such as ours which can spend better than $31 million of the taxpayers money to end foot-and-mouth disease, for example, can find the funds to do something positive in the field of population research and control. It does us little good to spend $100 billion yearly if we bankrupt ourselves to feed and help an ever-increasing world population.

We are making some progress.

President Johnson assured us in his January 4, 1965, state of the Union address:

> I will seek new ways to use our knowledge to help deal with the explosion in world population and the growing scarcity in world resources.

The President has pinpointed a bitter truth. I am heartened and encouraged by his statement of support, for we must know the extent of our resources and we must make certain that we do not waste them or ourselves, thereby depriving future generations of the gifts of this Great Society.

The Congress of the United States can help the President resolve the problem of burgeoning population and diminishing resources. Reason can prevail. Of this I am confident.

Those of us who have been concerned about population, and I have been concerned about it for more than 40 years, know the value of the pioneer work in this field such as that made recently by the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK].

But the time for pioneering has passed. The time for action looms before us now. Within a short time I shall propose a modest action program. I shall shortly invite the attention of my colleagues to the bill.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alaska yield?

Mr. GRUENING. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. First let me commend the Senator, not only for the fine and brief statement he has just made on the critical subject of population control, but also for his outstanding courage in earlier years, going back 40 years, I believe, in speaking out on the subject which so many people in those days would like to have swept under the rug. The Senator has performed a valuable service in this connection, both before and since he came to the Senate.

I should also like to thank the Senator for his kind words about me and to join in his commendation of the President of the United States for the courageous statements which the President made in his state of the Union message, which were quoted by the Senator from Alaska.

Next, I should like to ask the Senator from Alaska whether he is not vastly heartened by what appears to me to be a real breakthrough on the question of population control which has recently been made, not only in terms of the attitude of our very good and dear friends, the hierarchy of the Roman Catholic Church, whose general change of position I endorse and commend. I am happy that they realize that this is a critical problem for everyone in the world, regardless of his religion. I further ask the Senator from Alaska whether he is not heartened by the news that in the Office of Economic Opportunity—which is sometimes known as the poverty program—we are now finding grants being made to localities to establish birth control clinics in areas where it is felt by the local people—with the approval of the administration of the Office of Economic Opportunity—birth control information is vitally important in the war on poverty.

Second, I ask whether the Senator from Alaska is not further heartened by the splendid position taken by the administrators of AID with the total support—so far as Latin America is concerned—of Assistant Secretary of State Thomas Mann, toward making available to the nations of Latin America not only research and development material, technical assistance and information, but also, in the course of our aid programs, encouragement of their efforts to control their own populations, without which efforts, it seems to me, the possibility of increasing the standard of living of our friends to the south of us would be very much less than it otherwise would be.

Mr. GRUENING. Let me say to the Senator from Pennsylvania that I am greatly heartened by the various changes in ideology—in thinking, and in action—to which he has alluded. He himself will always be remembered as the man who made the breakthrough in the Congress. That was an important breakthrough. I believe that all these changes can be summed up in that one word. We have had a major breakthrough on the whole question of population growth and the need to control it.

I am reminded of the saying attributed to Victor Hugo to the effect that there is nothing that equals the irresistible force of an idea whose time has arrived.

That is true of the idea that we need to establish population control. We must realize that the time has come when we have to do something to stop the burgeoning of the population and instead to leave the control of this precious function of the human race to the wisdom of the individual family.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alaska yield further?

Mr. GRUENING. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I have no doubt that the Senator has in mind, in due course of time, making a much more elaborate presentation of his view than he has been able to do today. I have the same purpose in mind.

I hope that when we come to state the case for population control, and the specific administrative and perhaps legislative measures which would be helpful in achieving the goal of an adequately balanced population, a situation in which every married couple would be able to have as many children as they want, and not one more, we shall find, as a result of the breakthrough, to which the Senator from Alaska has referred, that Congress will take the position that the days of silence are over, and that this subject deserves the best brains and attention and the most intense debate that Members of Congress can give to it.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, this is another revolution in the freedom of thought. We have talked a great deal about the various current revolutions. We should be enabled—and are now enabled—to discuss freely important questions which for so long have been taboo. This is one of the heartening revolutions of our time.

When such legislation as I am considering is drafted, I shall certainly consult with the Senator from Pennsylvania and other colleagues, to see if we cannot draft appropriate measures, and introduce them, in the hope of having them enacted.

THE "THRESHER" SUBMARINE DISASTER—CLOSING OF PORTSMOUTH—KITTERY—NAVAL SHIPYARD

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, Frank P. Bennett, executive editor of America's Textile Reporter magazine, has written a very penetrating and revealing editorial condemning the ordered closing of the naval shipyard at Kittery, Maine, and what he characterizes as "bureaucratic blackmail" against that shipyard on the *Thresher* disaster.

I stress the fact that this expression of opinion does not come from a partisan State advocate for this shipyard and consequently it carries greater credence of objectivity. I stress the fact that this opinion emanates out of Boston, Mass., whose own shipyard was spared from being closed in spite of its very high operating costs.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be placed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUREAUCRATIC BLACKMAIL

We think no one will argue that this publication is 100 percent for private enterprise. We have always been against the inclusion of Federal-prison-made articles in our interstate commerce. We never could understand why the Boston Navy Yard had a ropewalk in competition with private cordage manufacturers. Probably the best illustration of our philosophy in this area is our continuing free enterprise interest and one example has been our early and continuing support of the liberty amendment. So when, last year, Secretary of Defense McNamara announced his intent to close numerous military establishments around the country, we hoped that this was an indication, on his part, of a sincere purpose. But, unfortunately, more recent events have indicated less sincerity and more pigheadedness and even insincerity to a greater degree than seems believable. Among those establishments slated for the pronounced phaseout is, to the New Hampshire people, the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard, but to State of Mainers, it's Kittery, because it is the latter State in which it is located.

The stated reason for its closing by the Department of Defense was because of inefficiencies including high costs and substandard workmanship.

Before we get to our point, it should be well to remember that our U.S. Government has been building combat vessels on the presently connected islands forming Kittery's Naval Shipyard or on adjacent islands since John Paul Jones supervised the construction and commissioning of our first regular American warship, the U.S.S. *Ranger*, and it was under Commodore Jones' command on the ship that the American Navy received its first formal salute as she entered Tiberon Bay in France in 1778. And it was there in Kittery that Capt. Paul Jones constructed and commissioned the *America*, the first American ship of the line and which we presented to the French Nation as a token of our gratitude for their assistance during our Revolutionary War.

And many other famous vessels have been constructed there during almost 200 years, including that famous steam sloop, the U.S.S. *Kearsarge*, mostly famous for its defeat of Confederate States of America, *Alabama*, off the coast of Cherbourg during the War Between the States. So much for sentiment.

The Kittery Naval Shipyard, until recently a commissioned Navy base, is located on the 75-foot-deep Piscataqua River and is the most northeasterly located naval installation (excepting Brunswick Naval Air Station) on our Atlantic coast. But that is not the only plus factor. This naval shipyard has the only covered construction ways on the coast; since World War I, it has built hundreds of submarines and, in more recent years, many nuclear-powered boats including our most advanced Polaris missile-firing types. It was here that the deep-diving, high-speed nuclear-powered, U.S.S. *Thresher*, was constructed under the supervision of the U.S. Navy and its Bureau of Ships.

The *Thresher* was unique in more than a passing way. As has been the custom for the last several years, she was under the complete surveillance of Vice Adm. Hiram Rickover, so-called father of our nuclear underwater fleet, and as we pursue further into this story, we should remember that she was first constructed and later overhauled under the supervision and surveillance of the U.S. Navy.

The U.S.S. *Thresher*, 2 years ago this coming April and after her overhaul, set out for deep-diving trials and never returned. She had made deep, high-speed dives before her overhaul and we have yet to read of any serious faults in her individual performance although Admiral Rickover had said that during more than one deep-diving operation among other boats, "several minor failures had occurred."

After months of exhausting search, the sunken hull of the boat was found and pieces of twisted steel and ruptured piping were brought to the surface and presented as part of the evidence to the Navy court of inquiry which formally investigated this tragedy. After months of study, it was reported to the public that the *Thresher* failed due to some undetermined combination of reasons. Following the construction and commissioning of the *Thresher*, the Kittery Naval Shipyard was ordered to construct a sister ship, the *Tinosa*, and the latter, in theory, was ready for operation when the *Thresher* went down.

Immediately the U.S. Navy Bureau of Ships commanded a complete reexamination of the *Tinosa's* equipment and fittings, and enlargement of its water ballast expelling capacities and other changes suggestive that the Bureau had at least learned something from the loss of the *Thresher*.

And then came the announcement by the Department of Defense that the Kittery installation would be phased out which may or may not have had any connection with that submarine disaster.

Of course, this proposal has every political facet. First, the yard employs a hard core of approximately 6,000, who not only reside in the States of Maine and New Hampshire but come from as far away as the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. The shipyard is the only employer of any consequence in that geographic area. (As an aside, that area has always voted Republican until the most recent national election.)

Recently we read of a congressional committee report commenting on the conditions at the naval shipyard. The papers emphasized Admiral Rickover's statement that "A spot check of pipe joints in the nonnuclear part of the *Thresher* was made before she left for her last voyage after overhaul, and if the quality of the joints so inspected was representative of all the *Thresher's* silver-brazed joints, this means that the ship had several hundred substandard joints when she last went to sea." But was it not the U.S. Navy and its Bureau of Ships which passed the inspections?

Senator JOHN O. PASTORE, of Rhode Island, chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy which made the most recent findings, said, "For example, the design and limited blowing capability for the deballasting system (to give a submarine buoyancy) which might have been adequate for the World War II and postwar conventional submarines were inadequate for the larger, deep-diving, higher performance nuclear submarines." And who but the Bureau of Ships was responsible for this final OK?

All of us have a lot to learn about the performance and behavior of high-speed deep-diving vessels, and not enough is yet known about what happens to pipes and valves and other appurtenances when they are under tremendous pressures.

Is there a possibility that under these tremendous pressures and water velocities that there might not be produced an icing condition such as is experienced by high-flying internal-combustion-engine aircraft? Senator PASTORE has pointed out that the Navy failed to understand that these heavy displaced submarines required greater capacity for deballasting than was inherent in the *Thresher*, and the reconstruction, the strengthening, of the *Tinosa* would indicate that the Bureau had recognized this area fault.

There is a further and much more complicated area, subterranean wave actions and activities at great depths of the ocean, of which we have still an elementary knowledge.

Recently oceanic scientists reported that at depths at which *Thresher*-type boats might operate, they had observed that there occur great hydraulic upheavals measuring up to 600 feet in vertical dimension, waterwise, something like the up-and-down drafts which aviators have observed, sometimes fatally.

Without exonerating any human inefficiencies in the yard, even though all of the work is passed as satisfactory by the Bureau, we should not leave out human frailties which can occur after the submarine had left its mooring. We well remember the fate of an S-type submarine operating as a tame target during World War II. This boat was proceeding on the surface, close to American shores and with its standard complement on deck when it suddenly plunged to the bottom and its only survivors were the command OD, a quartermaster, and a seaman. Later investigation showed that some young man opened something which should have been left closed.

We would like to think that the Secretary of Defense is sincere and we do not for the moment question his motives. We want to save the taxpayers' money, but we don't see how we can accomplish this by throwing 6,000 people out of work, ruining a basic area economy, abandoning a strategically located military establishment when his reasons why are still not satisfactorily answered.

The Accounting Office, it would seem, has indicated high costs in Kittery. And all of this reminds us of stories coming out of the new congressional office building. Mr. McCloskey was the low bidder on the original specifications but thanks to the connivance of the Congress itself, so many additions, changes and alterations have been made since the original contract that the structure's final cost has been stated to be the highest of any Federal building ever constructed. We think the same thing might apply as one compared costs between Kittery and some other private yard, such as the one in Groton. Has any serious investigation been made into what happens after those original competitive bids are in?

As one example, has the accounting department taken into consideration the fact that the Kittery Yard has built many components to be incorporated into boats built elsewhere which explains why we, personally, have seen a huge tractor-trailer hauling a prefabricated sail from the State of Maine to the South? The whole thing is still mysterious and we wonder if we have been told all of the facts.

Bethlehem Steel could not operate Fore River Shipyard economically because of labor problems, so they sold it to General Dynamics. Now we see the latter is having trouble with the same problem. Of course, the trouble is with labor and its unions. Will that mean that as the Defense Department phases out in Kittery, the taxpayers will be asked to subsidize private yards to make up the productive capacity volumes?

Whatever is Mr. McNamara's "end," are the means justified?

TRIBUTE TO CHARLES L. WATKINS, PARLIAMENTARIAN EMERITUS

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I wish to be among those who are recording their appreciation for the great service of Charles L. Watkins, who retired at the first of the year as Parliamentarian of the U.S. Senate.

The Nation is indebted to him for some 60 years of dedicated effort. I am indebted to him for his friendship and courtesies over the past 32 years.

I think it can be said without exaggeration that the Senate of the United States is a better body because of the service given it by Charlie Watkins.

His position as Parliamentarian frequently placed him between conflicting views, but he is a man with the capacity to maintain the confidence, friendship, and esteem of Senators in the midst of conflict.

I have always liked the calmness of wisdom that seems to be around Charlie Watkins. He was a captive of his position, but he was the master of his work.

He understood what he was doing from long experience and deep study. He combined this experience and study with a sense of proportioning and distinguishing.

With all of this he was instinctively fair, and just, and gentle, and friendly.

He is retiring by nature. His eminence is based on the ability and quality of his work.

Charlie Watkins is a dedicated public servant in the very best sense of the word. He has my very best wishes in highly deserved retirement.

We are indebted to Charlie Watkins also for having Dr. Floyd M. Riddick ready and available to assume the position from which he retired.

Dr. Riddick has been an able assistant to Mr. Watkins for many years. He has demonstrated his ability. He has earned our confidence, and we have learned to rely upon him.

If Dr. Riddick is not a native of Virginia, I think he has close ties to the Old Dominion. For this reason, and others, I welcome his promotion and look forward to his service as Parliamentarian of the Senate.

UNITED STATES-CANADIAN TRADE IN AUTOMOTIVE PRODUCTS

Mr. HART. Mr. President, on January 16, President Johnson and Prime Minister Pearson, of Canada, signed, in the President's words, "a historic agreement" covering United States-Canadian trade in automotive products.

On August 17 of last year, I expressed the hope that it would be possible "for our two countries to sit down across the table and work out a practical solution to what, after all, is a joint problem." I said at that time, "Surely both parties recognize that their mutual interests will be served ultimately by a pattern of freer trade and increased economic interdependence."

We appear to have in this new agreement, bearing the signatures of the President and the Prime Minister, a constructive response to a situation that could have led to serious commercial conflict and to grave damage to American-Canadian trade and to employment in both countries. As I understand, the Government of Canada now has withdrawn its export rebate plan which led the United States to consider the application of countervailing tariff duties. Acting together, Canada and the United States have embarked on a wide measure of tariff-free treatment for automobiles and original parts. Instead of a trade war, we have moved to forward-looking understanding.

The agreement between the President and the Prime Minister has implications which go beyond the resolution of a current controversy. We have found a North American solution, under which the United States and Canada agree that there is to be a single, integrated continental automobile industry. This major sector of industry, from now on, will develop as though there were no national border between us.

We have every right to expect that the results of the agreement will be to increase efficiency, to expand the total North American automobile market, and to bring higher levels of trade and employment to both the United States and Canada. For the longer run, moreover, we can look to a widening area of freer trade between the two sovereign nations that live in friendly and mutually profitable association on this great continent.

It is on this assumption, of course, that I voice this early assent. It is to be hoped that the legislation which will be drafted to implement this agreement insofar as the United States is concerned, will provide adequate adjustment assistance for those companies and workers who may be adversely affected.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the agreement signed by President Johnson and Prime Minister Pearson together with a statement describing in some detail its background. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the statements made about the agreement by Mr. Frederick Donner, president of General Motors Corp.; Mr. Henry Ford, chairman of the board of Ford Motor Corp.; Mr. Lynn A. Townsend, president of Chrysler Corp.; Mr. Robert Abernathy, president of American Motors Corp.; and Mr. Walter Reuther, president of the United Auto Workers. Finally, Mr. President, I request unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD editorial comments which are almost uniformly highly favorable.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCHANGE OF REMARKS BETWEEN PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON AND PRIME MINISTER LESTER PEARSON ON THE UNITED STATES-CANADIAN TRADE AGREEMENT ON AUTOMOTIVE PRODUCTS, AT THE L.B.J. RANCH, JOHNSON CITY, TEX., 10:16 A.M.

President JOHNSON. The Prime Minister and I, with Secretary Martin and Secretary Rusk, are about to sign a historic agreement, an agreement for free trade on automotive products between Canada and the United States.

Two years ago it appeared that our two countries might have grave differences in this great field of trade. We faced a choice between the road of stroke and counterstroke and the road of understanding and cooperation. We have taken the road of understanding.

This agreement is the result of hard work on both sides all along that road. I am sure that the Prime Minister joins me in expressing our hearty thanks to the negotiators on both sides and to their chiefs, Mr. Rusk and Mr. Martin.

Mr. Prime Minister, would you like to say a word before we sign?

Prime Minister PEARSON. Mr. President, I share completely your satisfaction as we are able today to sign this automotive agreement, and our expression of thanks to those, including the Secretary of State and the Secretary of State for External Affairs, who conducted the negotiations.

This is one of the most important accords ever signed between our two countries in the trade field. As you say, we faced a very difficult situation in this particular area of industry, and through hard work and patient negotiation we have concluded an agreement which is of benefit to both countries. In effect, we have agreed to rationalize the production of our respective industries and to expand our production and trade through a dismantling of tariff and other barriers in the automotive field. This wasn't accomplished easily, and it could not have been accomplished at all if there had not been that mutual understanding, good will, and confidence which has grown up between our two countries over the years.

A measure of the significance of this agreement is basically this: Canada and the United States trade more with each other than any other two countries. Indeed, about one-fifth of your exports go to Canada, and automobiles and parts constitute the largest single category in that trade.

I am confident that this agreement will result in an even greater flow of two-way trade, and eventually the consumers on both sides of the border will share in its benefits.

Mr. President, I have said to you many times and you have said to me many times, that there are no problems between our two countries which can't be solved if we work at them hard enough and in the right spirit. This is what we have done in this agreement which we are about to sign.

The PRESIDENT. Mr. Prime Minister, would you like to make some observations and answer questions before you leave?

The PRIME MINISTER. If there are any questions about the agreement or anything related to the agreement that you would like to ask, I would be glad to deal with them.

We are leaving here immediately after the signing, Mr. Martin and I, for Washington, and then later going home.

We have had a wonderful visit to the ranch. It was very considerate on the part of the President to provide the kind of climate this morning we are accustomed to. I notice some of you people seem to be taking it very hard. This has been a short but very, very happy visit. We had some interesting discussions last night in a homey and friendly atmosphere.

I had the pleasure and privilege of being taken around the country by the President immediately on arrival. I wasn't able to take my hat into the house before I was put on a jeep. It was wonderful. I saw a lot of deer. They were very small deer. They were very friendly. Up in Canada they are bigger and wilder.

Question. Mr. Prime Minister, why could not this agreement be used as a basis for other agreements in other industries?

The PRIME MINISTER. Well as far as we are concerned we would like to explore that possibility. This agreement may be important not only in itself but it could be important from that point of view. But the automotive industry, the organization of it on this continent, lends itself to this kind of agreement more easily than other industries. But we will certainly be anxious to have a look at the other situations to see if we can apply this. Anyway, we made a start.

Question. Could you run over briefly the other subjects you discussed?

The PRIME MINISTER. Well, we had a chance to look at some of the other problems—bilateral problems—between our two countries that we are working on, economic and financial problems, the problem of air traffic between our two countries. I hope we will reach an agreement before long.

Then we have been looking at the U.N. problem. There is some difficulty there, as you know, facing the U.N. on financing and the proposed withdrawal of Indonesia. And the President has been discussing with me some of the problems of southeast Asia and difficulties there. International problems—we have of course in Canada a great responsibility, as the United States has, which is important for us to know about and see what we can do to help cooperate in it.

Question. Mr. Prime Minister, was the question of trade with Communist China discussed?

The PRIME MINISTER. No, except in a casual way. We have been selling wheat and grains to China now for some time, and there was no particular discussion about that. Of course, we don't send anything to China on an agreed prohibitive list.

Question. Mr. Prime Minister, were there any other bilateral matters under discussion?

The PRIME MINISTER. No. We mentioned the air negotiations as one that is most active at the moment and hope there will be an agreement before long.

Question. What does that involve?

The PRIME MINISTER. We have had a problem between the two countries and we tried to bring that up to date in the light of new conditions, new developments in air traffic.

Question. (Garbled.)

The PRIME MINISTER. We have an interest in these matters, but then under our aid agreement to countries in southeast Asia we are trying to be as helpful as we can in that part of the world.

AGREEMENT CONCERNING AUTOMOTIVE PRODUCTS BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE GOVERNMENT OF CANADA

The Government of the United States of America and the Government of Canada,

Determined to strengthen the economic relations between their two countries;

Recognizing that this can best be achieved through the stimulation of economic growth and through the expansion of markets available to producers in both countries within the framework of the established policy of both countries of promoting multilateral trade;

Recognizing that an expansion of trade can best be achieved through the reduction or elimination of tariff and all other barriers to trade operating to impede or distort the full and efficient development of each country's trade and industrial potential;

Recognizing the important place that the automotive industry occupies in the industrial economy of the two countries and the interests of industry, labor and consumers in sustaining high levels of efficient production and continued growth in the automotive industry;

Agree as follows:

ARTICLE I

The Governments of the United States and Canada, pursuant to the above principles, shall seek the early achievement of the following objectives:

(a) The creation of a broader market for automotive products within which the full benefits of specialization and large-scale production can be achieved;

(b) The liberalization of United States and Canadian automotive trade in respect of tariff barriers and other factors tending to impede it, with a view to enabling the industries of both countries to participate on a fair and equitable basis in the expanding total market of the two countries;

(c) The development of conditions in which market forces may operate effectively to attain the most economic pattern of investment, production and trade.

It shall be the policy of each Government to avoid actions which would frustrate the achievement of these objectives.

ARTICLE II

(a) The Government of Canada, not later than the entry into force of the legislation contemplated in paragraph (b) of this Article, shall accord duty-free treatment to imports of the products of the United States described in Annex A.

(b) The Government of the United States, during the session of the United States Congress commencing on January 4, 1965, shall seek enactment of legislation authorizing duty-free treatment of imports of the products of Canada described in Annex B. In seeking such legislation, the Government of the United States shall also seek authority permitting the implementation of such duty-free treatment retroactively to the earliest date administratively possible following the date upon which the Government of Canada has accorded duty-free tratment. Promptly after the entry into force of such legislation, the Government of the United States shall accord duty-free treatment to the products of Canada described in Annex B.

ARTICLE III

The commitments made by the two Governments in this Agreement shall not preclude action by either Government consistent with its obligations under Part II of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

ARTICLE IV

(a) At any time, at the request of either Government, the two Governments shall consult with respect to any matter relating to this Agreement.

(b) Without limiting the foregoing, the two Governments shall, at the request of either Government, consult with respect to any problems which may arise concerning automotive producers in the United States which do not at present have facilities in Canada for the manufacture of motor vehicles, and with respect to the implications for the operation of this Agreement of new automotive producers becoming established in Canada.

(c) No later than January 1, 1968, the two Governments shall jointly undertake a comprehensive review of the progress made towards achieving the objectives set forth in Article I. During this review the Governments shall consider such further steps as may be necessary or desirable for the full achievement of these objectives.

ARTICLE V

Access to the United States and Canadian markets provided for under this Agreement may by agreement be accorded on similar terms to other countries.

ARTICLE VI

This Agreement shall enter into force provisionally on the date of signature and definitively on the date upon which notes are exchanged between the two Governments giving notice that appropriate action in their respective legislatures has been completed.

ARTICLE VII

This Agreement shall be of unlimited duration. Each Government shall however have the right to terminate this Agreement twelve months from the date on which that Government gives written notice to the other Government of its intention to terminate the Agreement.

In witness whereof the representatives of the two Governments have signed this Agreement.

Done in duplicate at Johnson City, Texas, this 16th day of January 1965, in English and French, the two texts being equally authentic.

For the Government of the United States of America:

——— ———.

For the Government of Canada:

——— ———.

ANNEX A

1. (1) Automobiles, when imported by a manufacturer of automobiles.

(2) All parts, and accessories and parts thereof, except tires and tubes, when imported for use as original equipment in automobiles to be produced in Canada by a manufacturer of automobiles.

(3) Buses, when imported by a manufacturer of buses.

(4) All parts, and accessories and parts thereof, except tires and tubes, when imported for use as original equipment in buses to be produced in Canada by a manufacturer of buses.

(5) Specified commercial vehicles, when imported by a manufacturer of specified commercial vehicles.

(6) All parts, and accessories and parts thereof, except tires, tubes and any machines or other articles required under Canadian tariff item 438a to be valued separately under the tariff items regularly applicable thereto, when imported for use as original equipment in specified commercial vehicles to be produced in Canada by a manufacturer of specified commercial vehicles.

2. (1) "Automobile" means a four-wheeled passenger automobile having a seating capacity for not more than ten persons;

(2) "Base year" means the period of twelve months commencing on the 1st day of August, 1963 and ending on the 31st day of July, 1964;

(3) "Bus" means a passenger motor vehicle having a seating capacity for more than 10 persons, or a chassis therefor, but does not include any following vehicle or chassis therefor, namely an electric trackless trolley bus, amphibious vehicle, tracked or half-tracked vehicle or motor vehicle designed primarily for off-highway use;

(4) "Canadian value added" has the meaning assigned by regulations made under section 273 of the Canadian Customs Act;

(5) "Manufacturer" of vehicles of any following class, namely automobiles, buses or specified commercial vehicles, means, in relation to any importation of goods in respect of which the description is relevant, a manufacturer that

(i) produced vehicles of that class in Canada in each of the four consecutive three months' periods in the base year, and

(ii) produced vehicles of that class in Canada in the period of twelve months ending on the 31st day of July in which the importation is made,

(A) the ratio of the net sales value of which to the net sales value of all vehicles of that class sold for consumption in Canada by the manufacturer in that period is equal to or higher than the ratio of the net sales value of all vehicles of that class produced in Canada by the manufacturer in the base year to the net sales value of all vehicles of that class sold for consumption in Canada by the manufacturer in the base year, and is not in any case lower than seventy-five to one hundred; and

(B) the Canadian value added of which is equal to or greater than the Canadian value added of all vehicles of that class produced in Canada by the manufacturer in the base year;

(6) "Net sales value" has the meaning assigned by regulations made under section 273 of the Canadian Customs Act; and

(7) "Specified commercial vehicle" means a motor truck, motor truck chassis, ambulance or chassis therefor, or hearse or chassis therefor, but does not include:

(a) any following vehicle or a chassis designed primarily therefor, namely a bus, electric trackless trolley bus, amphibious vehicle, tracked or half-tracked vehicle, golf or invalid cart, straddle carrier, motor vehicle designed primarily for off-highway use, or motor vehicle specially constructed and equipped to perform special services or functions, such as, but not limited to, a fire engine, mobile crane, wrecker, concrete mixer or mobile clinic; or

(b) any machine or other article required under Canadian tariff item 438a to be valued separately under the tariff item regularly applicable thereto.

3. The Government of Canada may designate a manufacturer not falling within the categories set out above as being entitled to the benefit of duty-free treatment in respect of the goods described in this Annex.

ANNEX B

(1) Motor vehicles for the transport of persons or articles as provided for in items 692.05 and 692.10 of the Tariff Schedules of the United States and chassis therefor, but not including electric trolley buses, three-wheeled vehicles, or trailers accompanying truck tractors, or chassis therefor.

(2) Fabricated components, not including trailers, tires, or tubes for tires, for use as

original equipment in the manufacture of motor vehicles of the kinds described in paragraph (1) above.

(3) Articles of the kinds described in paragraphs (1) and (2) above include such articles whether finished or unfinished but do not include any article produced with the use of materials imported into Canada which are products of any foreign country (except materials produced within the customs territory of the United States), if the aggregate value of such imported materials when landed at the Canadian port of entry, exclusive of any landing cost and Canadian duty, was—

(a) with regard to articles of the kinds described in paragraph (1), not including chassis, more than 60 percent until January 1, 1968, and thereafter more than 50 percent of the appraised customs value of the article imported into the customs territory of the United States; and

(b) with regard to chassis of the kinds described in paragraph (1), and articles of the kinds described in paragraph (2), more than 50 percent of the appraised customs value of the article imported into the customs territory of the United States.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION ON THE UNITED STATES-CANADIAN TRADE AGREEMENT ON AUTOMOTIVE PRODUCTS

The United States and Canada have arrived at an agreement which provides for the elimination of customs duties by both countries on motor vehicles (passenger cars, trucks, and buses) and original parts for production of new vehicles. This paper presents background on the structure of the automotive industry in the two countries, and a description of the benefits to the two countries which are foreseen from the agreement.

I

The Canadian market for automobiles is a natural extension of the U.S. market, the two parts forming what is in most respects a single North American market. Canadian consumers overwhelmingly choose automobiles of American design and make (91 percent of all cars purchased in Canada in 1963 were American models). They prefer and they get a range of body types and models almost as wide as is available to American consumers.

Production in Canada is almost wholly in the hands of subsidiaries of the U.S. motor vehicle manufacturers: General Motors, Ford, Chrysler, American Motors, Studebaker, International Harvester, Kaiser, Jeep, and others. The value of Canadian automotive output in 1963 was $1.4 billion, the bulk of which was accounted for by U.S. subsidiaries.

Canada is now the world's sixth largest consumer of automobiles and other motor vehicles. Sales in 1963 amounted to about 600,000 units. In 1964, total sales probably exceeded 700,000 units. The Canadian market is growing rapidly, more rapidly than in the United States, and is likely to continue to do so since the number of automobiles in Canada per capita is relatively smaller than in the United States, and since Canadian incomes are growing at a faster rate than American incomes.

Canada is our major export market for automotive products. In 1963 the United States sold to Canada cars, trucks, and, most important, automobile parts valued at $560 million. In the first 8 months of 1964 our exports were about $455 million, an increase of almost $90 million over the same period of 1963.

We are importing from Canada a smaller but growing volume of automotive equipment. Imports in 1963 were $33 million. In the first 8 months of 1964, imports were $46 million, as compared with $16 million in 1963.

II

Although Canada produces and consumes the same automobiles under much the same conditions as does the United States, costs and prices are significantly higher than in the United States. This is so even in the face of lower Canadian wages and certain other Canadian cost advantages.

A principal reason is the lower volume of Canadian output. In an industry in which economies of scale are very important—that is, high costs of capital plant and equipment need to be spread over large numbers of units of output—Canadian manufacturers typically operate at levels too low to permit them to get the full advantage of such economies. For example, the Ford Motor Co. now makes some 60 different models of 5 distinct passengers car lines at its assembly plant in Canada. Just across the river on the U.S. side, Ford's great River Rouge assembly plant produces only three models of the Mustang line. Similar disparities exist for the other producers; in only a few auto parts and in none of the vehicles is the volume of Canadian output large enough to bring costs down to American levels.

This relatively high-cost industry—and the word "relatively" should be emphasized because Canadian plants are for the most part modern and well equipped—is protected by customs tariffs and by the so-called Commonwealth content requirement. Tariffs on finished vehicles are 17½ percent and range from duty-free up to 25 percent on component parts. The content requirement calls for up to 60 percent of Canadian parts and labor and other costs in the finished automobile. These restrictive devices have helped to screen producers located in Canada from U.S. competition. They have served to maintain a Canadian automotive industry in being but they also have worked to perpetuate uneconomic production runs, higher costs in Canada, higher priced cars for Canadian consumers, and a smaller total North American market.

III

So long as there are tariff and other barriers to the automotive trade between Canade and the United States, there is no possibility of achieving the full potential of a North American automotive industry and automotive market. Our tariff duties are considerably lower than Canadian duties, at 6½ percent on vehicles and 8½ percent on most parts, but they of course also have been a burden on the flow of trade in the automotive sector. Together with the higher Canadian tariffs they have helped to shape a pattern of trade and production that falls far short of the efficient pattern that could otherwise be developed.

With tariffs and other restrictive devices eliminated, an American motor company having a Canadian subsidiary will be able gradually to concentrate in Canada on a limited number of models—and on those component parts which could be most efficiently produced in Canada—while supplying the Canadian customer with a full range of other models from American plants. Canadian management naturally will work toward getting high volume production of specific components and models in Canada. The result, over time, will be to create a rationalized and integrated North American industry. With lower costs and prices, the Canadian market for automobiles will grow faster than before. The total of North American production and the total of United States-Canada trade similarly can be expected to expand.

IV

Canadian and American officials have worked together over several months to see whether the abstract concept of a North American market and industry, unimpeded by tariffs and other barriers, could be given substance and reality. Their talks took place against the background of serious differences between the two countries over a Canadian program, initiated in November 1962 and extended a year later, under which the automobile companies operating in Canada were allowed to have the benefit of tariff-free treatment on certain automobile parts, through the technique of tariff rebates, in return for increased exports of automobiles or parts. This Canadian program was challenged by interested parties in the United States as being contrary to a section of our basic Tariff Act concerned with foreign bounties or grants on exports to the United States. If the Canadian plan were judged to fit the statutory definition of a bounty or grant, then the Secretary of the Treasury would be required to assess countervailing import duties on Canadian automotive equipment entering the United States so as to compensate for the export incentive being offered by Canada.

The applicability of countervailing duties was, of course, a legal question. Nevertheless, this issue and the Canadian program from which it derived has overhung the future of United States-Canadian automobile trade. If the differences between the United States and Canada were to have ended in trade retaliation and counter-retaliation, the consequences for North American commerce and commercial relations could have been harmful for both countries and, in particular, for the North American automobile industry.

This situation gave urgency, therefore, to the exploration of possibilities for the constructive alternative of a mutual attack on Canadian and United States barriers to trade in the automotive sector. The technical and economic problems involved were given extensive and searching examination by the two Governments. Various alternatives were considered and these were discussed with representatives of industry and labor.

V

The negotiators on both sides found that the mutual advantage of both countries lay in taking a long step toward freeing United States-Canadian trade in motor vehicles and original parts for the production of new vehicles. Terms for achieving this end were agreed on and the overall agreement to this end has now been concluded.

The two Governments agree to seek the early achievement of a broader market for automotive products within which the full benefits of specialization and large-scale production can be achieved. They agree also to the early liberalization of automotive trade in respect of tariff barriers and other factors tending to impede it, so that the industries of both countries may participate on a fair and equal basis in the expanding total market in North America. And they agree to develop conditions in which market forces may operate effectively to attain the most economic volume of investment, production, and trade. Each Government will avoid actions which would frustrate the achievement of these objectives.

Canada, on its part agrees to award duty-free treatment to automobiles and parts for original construction imported by Canadian vehicle manufacturers. Canada is bringing its measures into effect immediately by an order in council.

The U.S. Government will ask the Congress during its current session to enact legislation authorizing duty-free import into the United States of Canadian automobiles and parts for original construction, to be retroactive to the earliest date administratively possible following the date when Canada removes its duties.

At the request of either government, the parties will consult concerning the application of the agreement to new automotive producers in Canada and for other purposes. A comprehensive review will be made of progress toward the objectives of the agreement no later than January 1, 1968.

The parties may agree to give other countries similar access to their markets. The agreement will continue indefinitely but may be ended by either party on 12 months' written notice. The agreement will come into provisional effect on the date of signature and into definitive effect after action is completed in the legislatures of both countries.

VI

The new agreement not only provides a solution for a difficult existing problem. It is also a positive development for the North American automobile industry and for United States-Canadian automobile trade. It has been warmly welcomed by the automobile companies on both sides of the border.

Under the agreement, tariffs will be removed. The effects of the old Canadian content requirement will disappear as the industry grows. As a result, North American production will become substantially more efficient. Both the United States and Canada will benefit from increased consumption of automobiles and from expanded trade, as efficiency increases. Employment in both countries can be expected to increase and the earnings of the Canadian and American automobile companies can be expected to grow.

The Canadian sector of the industry at present is relatively much weaker than the American and special arrangements have been made to cover the transitional period of interindustry rationalization. Under Canadian tariff procedures duty-free treatment will be accorded to manufacturers maintaining their assembly operations at existing rates, subject to market developments. Customs duties on replacement, or service, parts will not be reduced under the agreement.

It is anticipated that the removal of duties and other barriers will result in a substantially increased market above the increase which would otherwise have developed. In the light of this widening opportunity, Canadian companies have made plans for an expansion of their production and have assured the Canadian Government that Canadian production will fill a substantial part of the increased demand.

VII

Apart from the specific benefits expected to accrue to automobile production and trade, the U.S. Government considers this step toward freer trade to be in a highly desirable direction so far as the broad United States-Canadian commercial relationship is concerned. The United States and Canada are one another's largest markets, by a wide margin over all others. The economic ties between the two countries are very close. Both countries have an interest in practical measures to make these ties as mutually beneficial as possible. The present agreement will contribute to this end and to the good relations that have historically marked the association between two great and friendly nations.

NEWS RELEASE BY GENERAL MOTORS CORP.

DETROIT.—In commenting on the new trade agreement announced today by the Governments of the United States and Canada, Frederic G. Donner, chairman of General Motors, stated that "General Motors agrees with the objectives of the agreement. We will cooperate fully to implement the program and will make every effort to assure its success.

"An important objective of this agreement is to encourage the long-term growth of production and employment in both the United States and Canada by facilitating the free flow of automotive vehicles and components between the two countries. General Motors subscribes to this objective and agrees with the approach of removing tariff barriers and moving in the direction of free trade.

"General Motors has long favored measures which reduce the barriers to free and open competition throughout the free world. I feel this agreement is an important step toward the free flow of trade between these two countries."

TEXT OF STATEMENT FOR THE PRESS BY MR. HENRY FORD II, CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD, FORD MOTOR CO.

The agreement announced today between the United States and Canadian Governments on the establishment of essentially free trade in motor vehicles and motor vehicle components is a historic event.

I have long believed that the elimination of artificial obstacles to international trade is one of the best ways to promote economic development and to strengthen the ties of friendship and understanding between nations.

We at Ford Motor Co. are pleased that this important development has taken place in our industry. We believe that it will help the motor vehicle industries of both countries to give their customers still greater value in automobiles and trucks.

There will of course be some difficulties as the necessary readjustments are made. But we are confident that the ultimate benefits will far outweigh the temporary problems. We pledge our conscientious effort to help make sure that the potential benefits of this progressive step are realized as fully and as quickly as possible in both nations.

STATEMENT BY LYNN A. TOWNSEND, PRESIDENT, CHRYSLER CORP.

The agreement between Canada and the United States—aimed at the eventual removal of tariffs and other restrictions on trade between the two countries in motor vehicles and in automotive parts for use as original equipment—is an encouraging step toward the full realization of the kind of economic partnership between Canada and the United States that we all know is possible.

No other two nations have a better chance to provide the world with an example of what can be done for peace and prosperity through the reduction of barriers to trade. Already we enjoy by far the greatest exchange of goods and services taking place between any two countries on earth. And we have common access to the Great Lakes—the world's greatest reservoir of fresh water and a magnificent means of low-cost transportation into the industrial heart of the continent.

In the automobile industry we have long been conscious of the inefficiency of preserving duplicate facilities in Canada for the production of motor vehicles that differ only in the most superficial ways from their U.S. counterparts. I believe it is in the national self-interest of the United States and in the interest of everyone associated directly or indirectly with the automobile industry to do what is necessary to make possible a more logical interrelationship of the United States and Canadian automobile industries.

This agreement between our two countries is only a start toward that objective. What is needed now is action on both sides of the border—administrative action in Canada and legislative action in our Congress. Let us hope this action will be taken without delay.

STATEMENT BY ROY ABERNATHY, PRESIDENT OF AMERICAN MOTORS CORP.

American Motors supports steps on the part of the Governments of the United States and Canada to achieve termination of tariffs on automotive parts produced and sold in the two countries.

For a number of years American Motors has strongly advocated international trade bridges that would bring an end to artificial barriers to free trade in all parts of the world.

The consumers and the economies of both the United States and Canada should ultimately benefit from the long-range effects of programs to eliminate trade barriers between the two countries.

As such a program would be implemented it would accelerate the anticipated growth of both the United States and Canadian automobile industries.

FOR WISCONSIN PAPERS

We can see increasing potential benefits for Wisconsin. When we had no Canadian plant in 1958, we sold roughly 5,000 Ramblers in Canada. In 1964, with a plant in Brampton, Ont., we sold 35,000 Ramblers. Since these cars contain 40 percent American content, it is evident this has been beneficial to Wisconsin.

UNITED AUTO WORKERS HAIL UNITED STATES-CANADIAN MOVE TO END AUTO TARIFFS BUT INSISTS ON PROTECTION FOR WORKERS ADVERSELY AFFECTED

The following statement was issued today by UAW President Walter P. Reuther:

"We in the United Auto Workers are pleased that an agreement has been worked out by the United States and Canadian Governments to provide for a common market in automobiles and parts.

"We have long favored trade liberalization and expansion and we have advocated for many years the creation of such a common market.

"We are confident that a rational division of labor in the production of autos and parts as between the United States and Canada will prove to be in the best interests of the economies, the consumers and the workers of both countries.

"The efficiencies resulting from such a division of labor will reduce production costs—particularly in Canada where low volume has prevented full and effective use of mass production techniques. The industry is morally obligated to pass those cost savings on to consumers in lower prices and thus expand sales and production. Lower prices would mean increased employment in both countries for autoworkers as well as workers in other industries which supply materials, parts and components used in auto factories.

"Moreover, at the point these efficiencies are achieved, autoworkers and their families will be entitled to their full equity which means the eventual elimination of wage and fringe benefit differentials that exist between the two countries.

"In order to achieve the more rational division of labor made possible by the agreement, there will inevitably be some readjustment of production within and between both countries. This could result in hardship and dislocations for some groups of auto workers and their families unless effective steps are taken to tide them over the transition period.

"We call upon both Governments to assure that adequate protection will be provided for those who would otherwise be adversely affected by the agreement. It would be wholly improper for the auto corporations and car consumers to enjoy the benefits of the agreement while auto workers and their families bear the burden and sacrifices resulting from it.

"In the United States, the agreement will have to be implemented by legislation permitting the elimination of tariffs on Canadian-produced cars and parts. While we favor the principle underlying the agreement, our position on the implementing legislation will depend both upon the adequacy of the protection it provides for affected workers and their families and whether it provides definite assurance that they will actually be afforded such protection.

"We are compelled to reserve our position on the implementing legislation because of experience under the adjustment assistance provisions of the U.S. Trade Expansion Act. That act recognizes in theory the obligation of the Nation to protect those adversely affected by trade agreements, but, to date, not a single worker has been held eligible to receive adjustment assistance. Moreover, the assistance provided under that act can hardly be described as adequate fulfillment of the Nation's obligations to those injured by agreements negotiated in the national interest.

"In comparable situations the European Coal and Steel Community provides 'tide-over' allowances for workers that run as high as 100 percent of wages plus other forms of assistance including supplementation of reduced wages received on new jobs. Workers may continue to receive assistance from the Community for up to 2 years.

"Much as we would like to see the new agreement come into effect, we will, nevertheless, have no alternative but to oppose any implementing legislation that fails to provide definitive assurance of genuinely adequate protection for the affected workers and their families.

"We have discussed and will continue to discuss with both Governments the nature of the protections and assurances which we consider imperative.

"In particular, we have made clear to the authorities in the United States that we shall be compelled regretfully to oppose implementing legislation unless it provides objective criteria for the determination of eligibility for assistance. No legislation will have our support which allows room for administrative discretion of the kind that has, in effect, nullified the adjustment assistance provisions of the Trade Expansion Act.

"We are hopeful that the administration will draft and Congress will enact sound and equitable implementing legislation which we can support. Given such legislation in the United States, and comparable action in Canada, we look forward to the very substantial benefits that the new agreement will bring to the peoples of both countries."

[From the New York Times, Jan. 17, 1965

COMMON MARKET AHEAD?

An important step toward an American-Canadian Common Market has been taken in the treaty eliminating automobile tariffs signed by President Johnson and Prime Minister Pearson.

At the very least, their agreement does away with the distorted and wasteful practices dictated by the force of economic nationalism. High tariffs and other barriers obliged Canadian auto plants—most of which are subsidiaries of American companies—to undertake small and costly production runs and to manufacture parts that could have been bought more cheaply in the United States. Now, they will be able to follow more rational procedures, with benefits in greater stability for the industry and lower prices for Canadian consumers.

In reaching an agreement renouncing nationalism, the President and Mr. Pearson are demonstrating a willingness to work for a much broader liberalization of trade between their own countries and with the rest of the world. The auto treaty is, in fact, a trial run for the Kennedy round trade negotiations and for a closer economic partnership with Canada.

It will involve adjustment problems as production is realined so that each country handles what it can do best. The task is made easier by the common management of many companies, but retraining programs supported by public funds will have to be established for displaced workers on both sides of the border.

Clearly, continued cooperation will be needed to forge closer economic links between this country and Canada. Both have much to gain from further measures to liberalize trade and rationalize production, but the United States, with its vast preponderance of economic power, must take care to avoid exerting that power in ways that rekindle the flames of Canadian nationalism. The path to the Common Market must be wide enough for both countries to travel at the same pace.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Jan. 17, 1965]

CARS ACROSS THE BORDER

The agreement on the elimination (under certain specified conditions) of tariffs on automobiles and parts which Prime Minister Lester Pearson and President Johnson signed yesterday is an excellent example of how to approach Canadian-American differences. It will serve both nations, and damage neither; wiping out some odd economic anomalies, it will restore commonsense to a major North American industry.

Canada has maintained a stiff tariff on automobile imports from the United States. This was justified by the argument that Canada wanted to foster its own automobile production—which was done. But the plants were almost exclusively subsidiaries of American firms. Canada paid considerably more for the same kind of car that sold south of the border—and most of the difference went to the Canadian Government.

Eliminating tariffs at this point will not eliminate Canadian production, or affect Canadian or American employment—except possibly for some temporary adjustments. The manufacturers will be able to employ plant and labor on both sides of the line more efficiently, instead of duplicating their efforts over an arbitrary tariff wall.

This agreement, which (on the American side) must still await congressional action, does not go to the roots of Canadian objections to the preponderant influence of American capital and management in Canada. But it does recognize the facts in one important industry, and ends an exchange of tariff and rebate reprisals that had been embittering trade relations and increasing costs.

The spirit of the agreement is one which both Americans and Canadians must trust will prevail in discussions between the two neighbors. It offers present practical benefits—and future hopes.

[From the Baltimore Sun, Jan. 18, 1965]

CAR AGREEMENT

The United States-Canadian agreement on practically free trade in automobiles is a model of the way good neighbors ought to behave. There will be Canadians who regret anything likely to increase highway and midtown traffic congestion in the big Canadian cities, but the economic upbeat in both countries will be considerable. Canadians are at the peak of an affluence comparing favorably with that of the United States. Yet their domestic motor industry has been held down by high parts and material prices and restricted production volume while the Canadian tariff has made American cars dear.

Now the 17.5-percent tariff on American imports will come off. So will the lower American tariff on Canadian cars. Various other Canadian devices to protect the domestic industry will lose their rationale and disappear. Up to 60,000 new jobs could open up in the Canadian industry, much of which consists of American-owned subsidiaries. Some observers even see the car agreement—in effect as of now in Canada, but still to be ratified by the American Congress—as a long step toward a United States-Canada customs union.

Some points of discussion remain, however, and may well have been touched on in the Johnson-Pearson conversations this weekend. The interest equalization tax exempts Canadian borrowers and heavy bond sales from north of the border are one of the elements that boosted the American payments deficit in the last quarter of 1964. American producers of zinc and lead, of oil, natural gas and timber never stop pushing for restrictions on Canadian imports of the same. And it is by no means certain that Canadian and American bargainers in the forthcoming GATT sessions will invariably concur. Still, autos are almost the symbolic North American industry and neighbors which can agree on cars are better prepared to tackle other differences.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 17, 1965]

FREE TRADE FOR WHOM?

President Johnson and Prime Minister Lester B. Pearson have reached an agreement to eliminate most of the tariffs in the automobile trade between Canada and the United States. A free trade compact, aimed at establishing a single and more efficient North American automotive market, has an instant appeal for proponents of a more liberal international order. But rhetoric can be treacherously misleading. The document to which signatures were affixed in Johnson City contains a number of unpleasant surprises. What is more, its success is contingent upon the fulfillment of a parallel agreement between the major U.S. automotive manufacturers and the Canadian Government, an agreement that is shrouded in secrecy.

In an effort to improve her balance of trade, Canada in 1963 instituted a plan under which Canadian-based auto manufacturers earn duty remissions on the parts which they import by increasing exports to the United States. This export subsidy scheme worked to the advantage of the major American automakers, the Big Three that operate on both sides of the border. But the consequent shift of production to Canada inflicted injury upon those independent parts manufacturers who produce only in this country. Legal action was brought to compel the Treasury to levy countervailing duties against the Canadians, and an effort to avert a tariff war led to the proposed agreement.

The 3-year compact provides for a duty-free trade in automobiles and original parts that is limited to producers. Chrysler, Ford, and General Motors can trade freely with their Canadian subsidiaries, but the same privilege is not extended to the Canadian citizen who would take advantage of lower prices in the United States. Genuinely free trade in automobiles would confer solid benefits on consumers through lower prices. But the outcome is in doubt when the freedom is limited to producers.

There is no doubt at all that the compact is discriminatory. The Canadian Government is empowered to designate the manufacturers who would be eligible to engage in the duty-free trade with this country, thereby closing the "free market" to European and Japanese producers. These provisions clearly violate the spirit if not the letter of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, a fact that will be underscored by strong protests from the excluded countries.

Free trade would tend to concentrate auto production in this country, and to avert that development the Canadian Government has obtained assurances from the American producers that the output of their Canadian subsidiaries will be increased. The details are a secret, but it is understood that Canadian output will be boosted by $250 million over and above the current growth trend. And to seal the political bargain, the United Auto Workers have been assured of adjustment assistance for displaced workers on terms which are sensibly denied under the Trade Expansion Act.

Good intentions have hatched a scheme, tailored to the needs of the major manufacturers, that bears an ominous resemblance to the bilateral trade restrictions of the 1930's. Unless Congress approaches it in a spirit of unflinching criticism, free trade will again fall victim to the deadly embrace of its "friends."

[From the Detroit Free Press, Jan. 17, 1966]

WHAT HISTORIC AUTO PACT WITH CANADA MEANS TO YOU

(By James Robinson)

WASHINGTON.—The United States-Canadian agreement on auto trade has been hailed as a boon to the economies of both countries.

What does it mean for workers, consumers, and businessmen on each side of the border?

U.S. officials have answered specific questions. Their views are set forth here:

Question. How will Canada benefit?

Answer. By expansion of its auto industry, particularly in making parts for the U.S. market. For Canada it will mean more jobs, lower car prices, and bigger U.S. investment in Canada.

Some estimates are that Canada will gain 60,000 jobs in the next 3 years.

Canadian-made autos will become more competitive in the world market and eventually in the North American market.

The greater benefits will result from specialization by Canadian subsidiaries of U.S. manufacturers. They will try to reduce the number of models made in Canada, while increasing total production.

Question. How will the United States benefit?

Answer. Through freer access to the Canadian auto market, which is expanding even faster than the U.S. domestic market. Sales should grow as a result of lower prices in Canada for models of U.S. cars that are not produced in Canada.

Question. Will a Canadian be able to come to the United States, buy a car, and take it home duty free?

Answer. No. Free trade in the Canadian direction is available only to auto manufacturers. Individuals still will have to pay import duties.

Question. Can an American go to Canada to buy a car and bring it back duty free?

Answer. Yes, so long as the car is made with at least 50 percent Canadian or United States parts. But the price of cars in Canada will remain high enough to discourage such purchases.

Question. Can Canadian auto dealers import U.S. cars duty free?

Answer. No. Free imports can be made only by manufacturers who will resell through their Canadian subsidiaries.

Question. What will the effect be on car prices in Canada and in the United States?

Answer. Canadian car prices will tend to go down as specialization occurs. U.S. parts used in Canadian assembly plants will be cheaper.

There will be no appreciable effect on auto prices in the United States. They are lower than Canadian prices.

Question. When does the agreement take effect?

Answer. Immediately. Canadian Government will issue an order-in-council with duties being removed next Monday.

Removal of U.S. duties will require legislation but will be made retroactive to January 16.

Question. Are tariff cuts to be in stages or all at once?

Answer. All at once, if Congress approves. The agreement is scheduled for review no later than January 1, 1968, and can be ended by either Government on 12 months' notice.

Question. Are there further details to be worked out? Any obstacles ahead?

Answer. Yes. Congressional approval may be difficult to get due to opposition from U.S. replacement parts makers and workers in their plants.

Question. Are some auto parts not included?

Answer. Tariffs will remain on tires and tubes and for all replacement auto parts.

Question. What happens to Canada's controversial duty remission that some U.S. firms say is an illegal export subsidy?

Answer. It will be dropped.

Question. Will this stop complaints by U.S. parts companies?

Answer. No. They have been left out of this agreement and still say they will lose sales later in the Canadian market.

Question. Do the United Auto Workers Union and the U.S. auto companies approve?

Answer. The UAW has given its general approval. U.S. companies were involved in the negotiations through their Canadian subsidiaries.

Question. What happens to U.S. companies and workers who are displaced?

Answer. The Government has promised to include economic adjustment benefits in the legislation. This would give financial aid to firms and workers through loans, relocation expenses, and job training.

Question. Will the United States lose jobs to Canada?

Answer. This could happen in particular cases though officials say the total result will be a gain in jobs on both sides of the border.

Canadian auto production probably will expand faster than U.S. production, though both industries will continue to grow.

Question. Is this the first step toward complete free trade with Canada? Will it spread to other products?

Answer. Probably not. This agreement involves limited free trade for auto manufacturers, not consumers.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Jan. 18, 1965]

UNITED STATES AND CANADA AGREE TO DROP TARIFFS ON VEHICLES AT MANUFACTURER'S LEVEL—ORIGINAL EQUIPMENT PARTS ARE INCLUDED; CONGRESS MUST APPROVE; UAW IS OPPOSED

The United States and Canada agreed to eliminate tariffs on vehicles and original equipment parts moving across the border from manufacturer to manufacturer. One ultimate effect of the move is expected to be increased employment and output in the Canadian auto industry.

The agreement, signed Saturday at the LBJ Ranch in Texas by President Johnson and Canadian Prime Minister Pearson, is subject to congressional approval. Such approval which the administration hopes would be retroactive to mid-January could be delayed by action of the United Auto Workers.

The auto union has said it will oppose the pact, unless it contains guarantees for any autoworkers laid off as a result of the agreement. And U.S. parts makers are likely to oppose the plan, too.

The accord would remove tariffs on an estimated $700 million of trade, nearly 10 percent of the annual $8 billion of commerce between the United States and Canada. And officials of both countries indicated the pact could be a forerunner of similar agreements for other industries, although none was specified.

UNITED STATES TO SEEK GATT WAIVER

The United States also will seek a waiver from the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade of its requirement that all other member nations receive as big a break on tariff concessions as any one nation is given.

Canada, by what is in effect an executive order, removed its automotive tariffs over the weekend. It extended the duty-free treatment to all countries and thus it needn't seek the waiver from GATT.

Major U.S. automakers have given the Canadian Government "assurances in writing that their Canadian output will be increased, a government spokesman said in Ottawa. Another Canadian spokesman said, that as a result of the agreement Canada hopes to increase its share of North American auto output to 6 percent from 4 percent. He added that the pact should provide at least 6,000 new jobs in Canada.

The agreement is expected to result eventually in a cut in Canadian car prices, which currently average about 18 percent higher than U.S. prices. But such price cuts won't be possible "for some time," according to Earl K. Brownridge, president of American Motors (Canada), Ltd., and head of the Canadian Motor Vehicle Manufacturers Association.

Mr. Brownridge added: "Attaining the objectives of the agreement will require long-term plans for new and heavy capital investment by motor-vehicle and parts manufacturers. New plants and machines and renovation of production facilities must be started as present operations help generate the needed capital."

U.S. AUTO FIRMS BACK ACCORD

The big U.S. automakers, which control most of the Canadian auto industry through subsidiaries, support the new agreement. Henry Ford II, chairman of Ford Motor Co., said it "will help the motor vehicle industries of both countries to give their customers still greater value." Frederic G. Donner, chairman of General Motors Corp., called it "an important step toward the free flow of trade."

But Walter Reuther, head of the big United Auto Workers, had reservations. He warned: "Much as we would like to see the new agreement come into effect, we will, nevertheless, have no alternative but to oppose any implementing legislation that fails to provide definite assurance of genuinely adequate protection for the affected workers and their families."

He also said that because of lower production costs in Canada that would result from the agreement, "the industry is morally obligated to pass those cost savings on to consumers in lower prices."

Until last weekend, the ordinary Canadian import duty on vehicles and parts generally ranged from 17½ to 25 percent. But, under a policy effective in November 1963, an automaker in Canada was allowed to bring in duty free a dollar's worth of autos or parts for every dollar's worth of increase in that maker's exports over a base period. The U.S. import duties on vehicles and parts have been 6½ to 8½ percent.

Canada had instituted the November arrangement to stimulate exports, both to ease balance-of-payments problems and to encourage Canadian auto production.

U.S. makers of auto parts had objected to the November 1963 arrangement because it encouraged increased Canadian manufacture of auto parts for the U.S. market. And industry observers say the parts makers probably will object to the new pact, too, as it would encourage the trend.

The parts makers had contended the 1963 policy provided for illegal rebates, and they had asked the U.S. Government to impose retaliatory tariffs against Canada. The Government had the request under consideration, and the possible retaliation against Canada was one reason for that nation's desire for the agreement that was signed over the weekend.

SIGNING IS ON LAWN OF RANCH

The signing of the pact, which averted what officials feared could have been a widening trade war with Canada, took place under informal and adverse conditions that might have accompanied the hasty signing of a truce ending hostilities. Even though a 25-mile-an-hour wind sharpened the effects of near-freezing temperatures, the President and the Prime Minister sat without topcoats at two weathered redwood picnic tables on the front lawn of the LBJ Ranch.

Recalling that the two nations had faced grave difficulties over autos, Mr. Johnson described the pact as a historic step down the road of understanding. While stressing that the auto industry is particularly suited for free trade, Mr. Pearson added that he is "certainly anxious to look at other industries" for which trade barriers may be eased.

It is hoped, he added, that agreement will come soon on proposals to let Canadian airlines serve more U.S. points, but he didn't go into detail. Canadian and many other foreign airlines have for a long time wanted rights to serve more U.S. cities.

Duties will still apply on auto repair and replacement parts moving between the two countries, chiefly because it's feared that small, high-cost Canadian makers of repair parts couldn't face tariff-free competition.

The agreement broadly covers trucks and buses, and their new parts, as well as passenger cars and new parts for them. But it excludes tires and tubes destined for new Canadian autos, and it excludes certain specialized vehicles such as fire engines and concrete mixers.

ADVANTAGES FOR UNITED STATES LISTED

The agreement's major advantages for the United States, officials said, are that it provides a constructive, forward-looking solution to a nettlesome trade problem, that it promises to expand total North American auto and parts activity, and that it should contribute to the overall commercial relationship and friendly association with Canada.

The agreement is to "continue indefinitely" but may be ended by either party on 12 months' written notice. A comprehensive review of resulting developments is to be made by January 1, 1968.

The Canadians agreed only to remove the tariff on new vehicles and parts imported by an auto manufacturer. Thus, the old tariff will continue to discourage a Canadian citizen from undercutting home production by personally bringing in a new U.S. car, which typically would be substantially cheaper than a comparable model produced in Canada.

The agreement would cost the United States $6 million a year in customs duties, Government officials estimate. The revenue loss to Canada could be as much as $50 million a year, they said, but they noted that the rebate plan was costing Canada some of that anyway.

The United States sold about $600 million of automotive goods to Canada last year and bought products valued at $72 million.

The agreement also provides for duty-free import to the United States of European-make cars manufactured in Canada. At present, Volvo autos are assembled in Nova Scotia, and French Renault and Peugeot cars are scheduled to be produced in Quebec by next fall.

[From the Milwaukee Journal, Jan. 18, 1965]

Auto Industry Hails Tariff Eliminations

Detroit, Mich.—The automotive industry—both management and labor—Friday night hailed as good news the announcement of a United States-Canadian treaty eliminating tariffs on autos and parts.

Top executives from General Motors, Ford, Chrysler, American Motors, and United Auto Workers Union President Walter P. Reuther all issued statements praising the treaty and promising their cooperation.

GM Board Chairman Frederic G. Donner said his firm agreed with the objectives of the treaty and will cooperate fully to implement the program and make every effort to assure its success.

Ford Board Chairman Henry Ford II called the agreement "an historic event." He said "I have long believed that the elimination of artificial obstacles to international trade is one of the best ways to promote economic development and to strengthen the ties of friendship and understanding between nations."

AN ENCOURAGING STEP

Chrysler President Lynn A. Townsend, who long has been an advocate of a North American common market, called the treaty an encouraging step toward the full realization of the kind of economic partnership between Canada and the United States that we all know is possible.

AM President Roy Abernethy said the consumers and the economies of both the United States and Canada should ultimately benefit from the long range effects of programs to eliminate trade barriers between the two countries.

(Abernethy added: "We can see increasing potential benefits for Wisconsin. When we had no Canadian plant, in 1958, we sold roughly 5,000 Ramblers in Canada. In 1964, with a plant in Brampton, Ont., we sold 35,000 Ramblers. Since these cars contain 40 percent American content, it is evident that this has been beneficial to Wisconsin.")

Reuther said the union was pleased an agreement has been worked out by the United States and Canadian Governments to provide for a common market in automobiles and parts.

NOT FOR SOME TIME

Earl K. Brownridge, president of American Motors of Canada, Ltd., and president of the Motor Vehicle Manufacturers Association, voiced, the support of the Canadian manufacturers' group for the objectives of the treaty.

"While, as a result of the agreement," Brownridge said, "there could be a narrowing of the cost differential between vehicles produced in Canada and the United States over a period of years, no such narrowing will be possible for some time.

"The inflationary forces in current labor contracts in several industries could be felt before the economics of the agreement come into effect."

However, he conceded, "there is no doubt that the trade agreement should lead to additional economic production in Canada of vehicles and parts."

Officials said that while the Canadian restrictions had helped to shield the smaller Canadian auto industry from U.S. competition, they also had perpetuated uneconomic production runs, higher costs in Canada, higher priced cars for Canadian consumers, and a smaller total North American market.

Officials also said total auto production on both sides of the border and trade between the two countries could be expected to expand.

[From the Detroit News, Jan. 13, 1965]

United States-Canadian Auto Pact—A Free Trade Signpost

The American-Canadian agreement for free trade in autos and auto parts is historic.

It does not follow, however, that because this is a first foot in the free trade door that both nations are going to zip merrily along into a customs union or a common market in the style of the Six in Europe. That has long been a dream of forward-looking people in both nations. But when attempts have been made previously to bring the dream to reality the deal was botched and national differences were exacerbated rather than composed.

It doesn't need a crystal ball to forecast that in some quarters there will be screams over the agreement signed by President Johnson and Prime Minister Pearson on the banks of the Pedernales, a pact still subject to congressional approval.

Some sections of the auto industry will be hurt and some workers are going to protest. But the real competitors in the business will welcome the pact and it's the noncompetitive who will be miffed that their tariff cushion has been whisked away.

Among the consequences that will flow from the agreement is that the auto industry in both nations will be able to rationalize itself, encouraging production in response to market, labor and other factors.

Today some American-made autos include Canadian-made parts. Some Canadian-assembled cars use American-made parts. The intricacies of coping with the tariff situation has given producers a headache. And what has made it more pointless has been that 90 percent of Canadian car production comes from concerns that are American subsidiaries.

Without tariffs, the price for Canadians of cars made in Canada will drop to meet the price of tariff-free imported cars from the United States. This will open up a market, both in Canada and here, for Canadian makers. Production will be boosted and this will have a beneficial effect on Canadian industry generally.

The deal will be of material help to Canada in its chronic trade deficit with this country. A major part of that deficit has been in the intertrading and supply of cars and parts.

American auto parts makers will benefit, also. They were selling more to Canada than Canada could sell to us, so 2 years ago Canada granted its auto makers a duty remission—or subsidy—to promote export of parts to the United States. Those exports rose quickly from $8 million annually to $60 million last year. This year they may have headed for the $200 million mark.

American auto parts makers were angry—"Canadians stealing jobs from American workers" was the least of their complaints. That Canadian duty remission will be wiped out by the new pact.

Auto Tariff Pact Historic—Johnson

(By Tom Joyce)

Johnson City, Tex., January 16.—At a wide-ranging press conference in the living room of his LBJ ranch, President Johnson today hailed the new auto tariff agreement between the United States and Canada as one of the most significant developments in history between the two nations.

Mr. Johnson, in an especially relaxed and expansive mood, talked with newsmen for nearly 45 minutes before taking them on a long inspection tour of the ranch.

The auto tariff agreement was signed at the ranch this morning by Mr. Johnson and Canadian Prime Minister Lester Pearson.

SIGN AT PICNIC TABLE

The signing ceremonies took place at a rustic picnic table on the lawn in front of the two-story ranchhouse.

Mr. Johnson was accompanied by Secretary of State Dean Rusk. With the Canadian Prime Minister was his Secretary of External Affairs, Paul Martin.

Mr. Johnson described the unusual ceremonies as probably the first time such an important document was signed at a picnic table in Texas.

PRESIDENT IN BOOTS

Although the temperature was a biting 36 degrees, the President was bareheaded and wore only a sport coat over a cowboy shirt. He also wore cowboy boots.

The Canadian Prime Minister was clad in typical conservative business attire as were the other signers.

Pearson described the agreement as "one of the most important accords ever signed by the two countries."

He said he was confident it would "increase the auto markets in both countries." Mr. Johnson agreed.

COVER MANY TOPICS

Mr. Pearson arrived at the ranch yesterday primarily to deal with the auto tariff arrangement. But many other matters were discussed.

Among them, according to Mr. Pearson, were problems concerning the Unted Nations, the war in southeast Asia, Canada's expanded trade with Red China and Canada's hope of getting improved air routes into the United States.

The United States has been attempting to persuade Canada to become actively involved in the war in South Vietnam. Pearson acknowledged that this was discussed today. He emphasized that there "was no commitment," but that Canada will "try to be helpful to the extent of our limited resources."

COME ON LESTER

Minutes after the signing President Johnson jumped into the driver's seat of one of his electric golf carts and said:

"Come on, Lester."

The Canadian Prime Minister, his wife, and other members of the party also climbed aboard and the President drove them off to a waiting helicopter at the airstrip behind the ranchhouse.

Mr. Johnson walked arm in arm with the Prime Minister up to the door of the helicopter.

After the Pearsons had left, Mr. Johnson invited about 60 newsmen into the living room to get warm.

Once inside he picked up the white telephone on his desk and said to the other end of the line:

"Bring coffee for 30, 40, or 50 people."

Mr. Johnson relaxed in his padded rocking chair and began fielding questions about issues ranging from the war in Vietnam to the illness of Winston Churchill.

He was asked about the recent loss of American jet planes in southeast Asia and whether he would go into detail about military operations there. The President replied:

"I do not think it is wise public policy to go into detail on military operations."

On the questions of the budget the President will submit to Congress later this month, he was asked if the administration still feels that it can keep it below $100 million figure. Mr. Johnson answered:

"We finished work on about one-third of the budget last night. I don't want to get into a numbers game—I always lose.

"What is sacred about a $100 million budget, a $99 million budget or a $102 million budget? I hope to put in everything I believe is necessary."

The President also talked about the Nation's economy and said the gross national product (total goods and services) is now more than $35 billion higher than a year ago.

SEES HEALTHY GROWTH

At the same time, the President said civilian employment has been running 1.5 million above a year ago and described it as the largest gain in the current business expansion.

In wrapping up the economic outlook, the President predicted, "with the cooperation of business and labor a healthy and continued expansion."

The President also was asked about the NATO alliance and the proposal for a multilateral force of Polaris-carrying surface ships manned by mixed allied crews.

This proposal, a U.S. plan to permit nonnuclear members of NATO to participate in nuclear defense while avoiding proliferation of nuclear weapons, has drawn lukewarm enthusiasm outside of America.

SEEK NEW ACCORDS

Mr. Johnson said, however, that the force is still a sincere goal of the United States and that we will continue to press for it.

The idea has generated bitterness within the alliance, especially on the part of France, and has the backing only of West Germany.

Talking about the alliance generally, the President said he disagrees that it is in a state of disarray and added the United States is working to develop new agreements within the alliance.

Returning to the new automobile trade agreement between the United States and Canada, the President said: "Both the producers and workers will be pleased with the results of the agreement."

He added:

"Two years ago it appeared that our two countries might have grave differences in this great field of trade. We faced a choice between the road of stroke and counterstroke (conterveiling tariffs) and the road of understanding and cooperation.

"We have taken the road of understanding. The agreement is the results of hard work on both sides along that road."

[From the Detroit News, Jan. 15, 1965]

UNITED STATES, CANADA SIGN BAN ON AUTO TARIFF

(By Tom Joyce)

JOHNSON CITY, TEX., January 16.—In a major move toward expanding United States-Canadian trade relations, President Johnson and Prime Minister Lester B. Pearson signed an agreement today abolishing automobile tariffs between the two countries.

The agreement, which requires the approval of Congress, also applies to original automobile parts, trucks, and buses.

It is regarded as one of the most significant developments in trading history with Canada.

The Canadian Prime Minister and Mr. Johnson are meeting at the LBJ Ranch near here for a weekend of talks on a variety of subjects. But the signing of the trade agreement is clearly the most important phase of the meeting, attended also by Secretary of State Dean Rusk and Paul Martin, Canadian Minister of External Affairs.

TO STRENGTHEN TIES

The purpose of the agreement, according to the official document, is to "strengthen economic relations between the two countries."

"This can best be achieved," the agreement continues, "through stimulation of economic growth and through expansion of markets available to producers in both countries within the framework of the established policy of both countries of promoting multilateral trade."

Canada, which can make the move at the cabinet level without approval of Parliament, is expected to wipe out tariffs immediately.

In the United States, congressional approval is required because under the 1962 trade expansion law the President has only the authority to work out 50-percent reciprocal tariff cuts.

MORE CANADIAN SALES

More cars are expected to be sold in Canada as a result of the agreement. But they will contain more Canadian-built parts.

Even though wages are lower in Canada, the price of automobiles manufactured in that country is about 18 percent higher than for comparable models made in the United States.

The chief reason is the lower volume of output.

It is hoped as a result of the agreement that Canadian production will concentrate on a limited number of finished automobiles while building up an efficient original parts supply operation to feed American assembly lines.

TARIFFS COMPARED

The Canadian duty on American-made new cars and trucks going into the country has been 17.5 percent and up to 25 percent on parts. The U.S. duty has been much lower, 6.5 percent for new cars and trucks and 8.5 percent on parts and accessories.

Production of automobiles in Canada is almost entirely in the hands of U.S. firms of subsidiaries—General Motors, Ford, Chrysler, American Motors, Studebaker, International Harvester, Kaiser, and others.

Canada, which has been running an adverse trade balance with the United States at the rate of about $700 millon a year for some time, has been seeking a bigger share of the North American automobile and auto parts market.

NATIONS NEGOTIATE

Last year Canada exported about $50 million in parts to the United States at the same time she imported about $600 million in U.S. automotive products, contributing heavily to her trade deficit.

Canadian and American officials have been working on the move to abolish the tariffs for many months.

The negotiations took place against a background of discord over Canada's adoption of an involved system of bonuses designed to increase export of Canadian-made parts to the United States.

This was aimed at making it profitable for American producers to buy more made-in-Canada components for U.S. models, at the expense of U.S. supplier firms, such as manufacturers of radiators.

Under the plan, which is now academic, Canada rebated duties to companies that exported Canadian-made components to the United States.

Because the same companies bought parts in the United States, it was easy for them to buy from Canada and win the rebate.

BONUS PLAN'S WORKING

It worked like this: Companies importing a component and paying a 25 percent duty could get a rebate if they bought other goods in Canada and shipped to an American plant for use. The bonus plan went into effect in November 1963.

It ran into bitter opposition in the United States, where partsmakers filed a suit to force the Treasury Department to enact countervailing duties on auto parts imported from Canada.

White House sources said that replacement parts were excluded from the tariff-killing agreement because it was felt inclusion would have dealt too harsh a blow to Canada's burgeoning parts industry.

LABOR AFFECTED

Some displacement of labor in the United States as a result of the move is felt to be inevitable. But the impact is expected to be lessened as more cars are sold in Canada.

In the meantime, White House sources said the President will ask Congress to provide help for affected workers under the 1962 Trade Expansion Act.

This provides for aid to workers in import-stricken industries. But conditions for getting help under the act are rigid and so far all applications have been rejected.

Under consideration is a proposal for easing the assistance eligibility requirements, especially for any workers injured under the new agreement.

In addition to congressional approval, the United States also must get permission from the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT).

EXPECT APPROVAL

But Government spokesmen said they anticipate little if any trouble in getting a waiver from the 62-nation trade group because the United States-Canadian auto industries are particularly interrelated.

Nevertheless, some West European countries and Japan, exporters of cars and parts to the United States, are not expected to be joyous. The majority of countries in GATT, however, have little or no interest in auto tariffs.

Moreover, the United States can argue that in the round of so-called Kennedy negotiations, where 50-percent duty cuts are expected, all auto tariffs will drop sharply.

INDUSTRY SHELTERED

Another aspect of the agreement is that it automatically relieves carmakers of conforming with the 60-percent content requirement imposed by Canada—requiring up to 60 percent of Canadian parts and labor in the finished automobile.

This, like the high tariff wall, has helped shelter producers in Canada from U.S. competition.

But the measures also worked to create costly production operations in the country.

The whole idea behind the new move, according to both United States and Canadian sources, is to stimulate the North American auto industry so both countries will benefit.

White House aids said it should result in substantially increased markets above the increases which otherwise would develop.

STEP IS COMMENDED

And beyond the auto industry, the United States "considers this step toward freer trade to be a highly desirable direction so far as the broad United States-Canadian commercial relationships are concerned."

Canada is now the world's sixth largest consumer of autos and other motor vehicles. When all the figures are in, 1964 sales are expected to exceed 700,000 units. The Canadian market is growing more rapidly than the U.S. market.

The United States, according to informed sources, was motivated also by other considerations.

One is that it feels considerations that invoke countervailing duties would damage relations between the two countries, not only in trade but in other areas as well.

In addition to this, President Johnson is seeking a more unified front with Canada in foreign affairs. Among other things, he would like to see Canada committed in Vietnam.

WINDSOR-DETROIT TIES BOLSTERED

(By Michael Parks)

Economic links between Detroit and Windsor will be considerably tightened when the proposed automotive free trade arrangement between the United States and Canada goes into effect.

The interdependence could mean, for instance, that a strike at a Windsor parts plant would soon disable the Detroit assembly it serves.

A second expected effect is increased business for independent Michigan and Ontario part suppliers and more jobs in the two metropolitan areas especially Windsor.

It could also lead, observers feel, to free trade in other products, and perhaps ultimately result in a Canadian-American common market.

AIM OF AGREEMENT

The automotive free trade arrangement, signed today, was worked out by United States and Canadian Governments and the three major auto makers in an effort to integrate North American production facilities by dropping tariffs or import taxes on cars or auto parts.

It will affect all Cadanian production, one-quarter of which is in Windsor, and eventually about a fourth of U.S. production, auto company spokesmen said.

The agreement removes U.S. tariffs of 6.5 percent on assembled cars and trucks and 8.5 percent on parts and Canadian duties of 17.5 percent on vehicles and 25 percent on parts.

The arrangement still must be approved by Congress. Opposition is expected there in behalf of parts suppliers who stand to lose business to Canadian firms and those U.S. plants nearer Canadian automotive centers. The major auto firms, however, have approved and praised the plan.

PREDICTIONS MADE

Specific results of the new program are not known, but Government and auto company officials predicted these general developments:

An increase of about $369 million in the annual factor value of vehicles and parts made in Canada over the current $300 million.

Transfer of parts manufacturing to plants nearer Canadian-American production complexes, like Detroit-Windsor, from those further away. A Detroit assembly line might then use parts from a closer Ontario firm that it had been buying in Indiana or Ohio.

Substantially lower—$250 to $400—prices for Canadian car buyers over the next 5 years and slightly lower car prices for U.S. consumers in 3 or 4 years. Inflation could reduce these amounts, however.

Greatly stimulated new car sales in Canada resulting from the lower prices. Sales could rise according to one Canadian Government estimate, by as much as 30 percent by 1970 even if the country's economy does not grow proportionately.

An estimated 60,000 additional jobs in the Canadian auto industry by 1970 as production and purchases increase and prices drop. About 10,000 jobs are expected to be transferred to U.S. border cities, too, as a result of the program.

TWO CITIES AFFECTED

Detroit and Windsor, because of their existing links and their status as automotive capitals of their respective countries, are expected to be among the first and most greatly affected areas.

A U.S. Department of Commerce trade official in Ottawa said both countries would gain by what he called rationalization of the industry—the prospect of carrying out production of various parts in whichever locale offers the greatest efficiency without artificial barriers or incentives.

A Canadian counterpart in Detroit said his country has been running a consistent trade deficit with the United States on automobiles and parts, now about $600 million a year.

To rectify this, he explained, Canada established an "export incentive" program in November 1963, which gave auto firms a $1 import exemption for each $1 of goods exported over a certain base.

PARTS MAKERS CRITICAL

This program was attacked by American parts makers who asserted it hurt domestic business by giving a subsidy in effect for the manufacture of parts in Canada and is therefore illegal under current trade agreements. The free trade arrangements was designed to replace it.

The independent parts suppliers, members of the Automotive Service Industry Association, have also criticized the new plan which they say "would deny us free access to the Canadian market" since it requires auto firms to channel as much production as economically feasible to Canada.

Added incentives for manufacturing in Canada are lower labor costs and the low exchange rate of the Canadian dollar.

PLAN SPECIALIZATION

The interlocking of regional plants, already begun in the Detroit-Windsor area in a limited fashion by Chrysler Corp. and the Ford Motor Co., would generally have Canadian plants concentrate on certain parts for both United States and Canadian production.

Thus a Windsor plant now makes all the engines for a certain Plymouth Valiant model made in both countries.

Through such specialization and division of labor, Canadian trade officials here said, Canadian auto producers, most of whom are U.S. subsidiaries, will cut their net trade deficit with the United States and become **effectively integrated.**

SUPPORTED BY TOWNSEND

Chrysler Corp. President Lynn T. Townsend hailed the agreement as an encouraging step toward the full realization of the kind of economic partnership between Canada and the United States.

[From the Detroit Free Press]

UNITED STATES AND CANADA AGREE TO END MOST TARIFFS ON CARS, PARTS

(By Robert Boyd)

The United States and Canada agreed Friday to form a limited "common market" on new automobiles and auto parts.

The agreement, to be signed by President Johnson and Canadian Prime Minister Lester Pearson at 11 a.m. Saturday at the LBJ Ranch in Texas, will wipe out most tariffs on automotive products between the two countries.

It takes effect as soon as enabling legislation is passed by Congress and the Canadian Parliament. It also applies to trucks, buses, and parts for those vehicles.

The main effect of the agreement will be to permit Canadian auto plants to import American-made cars and parts without paying the present 17½ to 25 percent duties imposed by Canada.

Canadian auto dealers and private citizens will still have to pay duty on American-built cars and parts. The tariff will be erased only for auto manufacturers.

Almost all Canadian car makers are subsidiaries of American firms.

The tariff will be lifted only so long as the Canadian auto plants continue to produce at existing rates or higher.

In turn, American duties of from 6½ to 8½ percent on Canadian-made cars and parts will be abolished.

American auto dealers or manufacturers and private citizens will be able to buy cars and parts duty-free from Canada.

The agreement would mean that Detroiters, for example, could go to Windsor and buy a Canadian-built car, or auto parts, and not have to pay duty to bring the car or parts across the Detroit River.

But Windsor residents who bought a car or parts in Detroit would have to pay the regular duty to bring them back to Windsor.

The purpose of the agreement as stated in a text issued simultaneously at the Texas ranch and in Washington, are:

"To create a broader market for automotive products within which the full benefits of specialization and large-scale production can be achieved.

"To liberalize United States and Canadian automotive trade * * * to enable the industries of both countries to participate on a fair and equitable basis in the expanding total market of the two countries.

"To develop conditions in which market forces may operate effectively to attain the most economic pattern of investment, production, and trade."

U.S. officials said both countries would benefit from the tariff cuts.

The officials said no estimate of jobs that might be added to the Canadian auto industry was available, but there were reports that as many as 60,000 additional workers could be employed.

And it was reported that Canadian subsidiaries of U.S. auto firms had assured the Canadian Government that they would increase annual production by $250 million over the next 3 years.

Further details of the assurances were described as "commercial secrets."

Congress is expected to demand a full disclosure of the "secrets."

Canada obviously looks upon the agreement as a spur to its auto industry, but some U.S. officials claimed industry employment in the United States should also rise as the total market expands.

Such thinking is based on the theory that a large common market trading area should permit more economical car production and hence increase sales in both countries.

The agreement is also expected to end, or at least soothe, the United States-Canadian controversy over a "duty-remission scheme" which has irritated U.S. auto parts makers.

This scheme involves rebates of Canadian tariffs to Canadian auto makers who increase their exports to the United States. It has been termed illegal and unfair by independent U.S. parts makers who do not have manufacturing outlets in Canada.

Complaints by these parts makers in Ohio, Wisconsin, and Missouri may cause difficulty in Congress when the agreement comes up for passage.

TARIFF CUT CHEERS AUTO FIRMS, UAW

The automotive industry—both management and labor—Friday hailed the announcement of a United States-Canadian treaty eliminating most tariffs on autos and parts.

GM Board Chairman Frederic G. Donner said his firm "will cooperate fully to implement the program and make every effort to assure its success."

Ford Board Chairman Henry Ford II called the agreement "an historic event. I have long believed that the elimination of artificial obstacles to international trade is one of the best ways to promote economic development and to strengthen the ties of friendship and understanding between nations," he said.

Chrysler President Lynn A. Townsend called the treaty "an encouraging step toward the full realization of the kind of economic partnership between Canada and the United States that we all know is possible."

AMC President Roy Abernethy said the consumers and the economies of both the United States and Canada "should ultimately benefit from the long-range effects of programs to eliminate trade barriers between the two countries."

Reuther said the union was "pleased an agreement has been worked out by the United States and Canadian Governments to provide for a common market in automobiles and parts."

Windsor's two biggest auto dealers—each claims to be No. 1—reacted differently to the tariff-cutting announcement.

Burt James, owner of James Chevrolet-Oldsmobile, Ltd., was elated.

"I think it's a terrific thing," he said in his showroom at 917 Goyeau. "It will bring additional people into the car market because of reduced prices. It will make more two-, three-, and four-car families."

Al Sternberg, new car sales manager at Webster Motors, a Ford dealership, saw no such a bonanza.

"Eventually I think you'll get more for your money on cars," he said in his office at 485 Windsor. "But I don't think prices on most cars will come down."

Both said they are convinced Canadians will continue buying their cars in Canada, and Americans will continue buying theirs in the United States.

Sternberg said the new agreement would remove tariffs only for manufacturers and business—an individual couldn't hop a bus in Canada, buy a car in the United States and drive it back home duty-free.

Canadians pay more for their cars.

Dealers said that a Chevrolet selling for about $2,950 in Detroit costs about $3,300 in Canada.

[From the Kansas City Times, Jan. 16, 1965]

TARIFF ACCORD AFTER LONG FIGHT BY MISSOURIANS

(By John R. Cauley)

WASHINGTON.—The United States-Canadian agreement which will eliminate custom duties on motor vehicles and original parts by both countries climaxes a long and successful fight on discrimination against American manufacturers in which two of the leading participants were Senator STUART SYMINGTON, Democrat, of Missouri, and Jack F. Whitaker, president of the Whitaker Cable Corp., of Kansas City.

The agreement is expected to be signed today at Johnson City, Tex.

"Naturally I am very grateful to the President for carrying this matter through to a conclusion," SYMINGTON said last night. "The proposed agreement should result in holding many thousands of jobs in Missouri."

Senator SYMINGTON expressed some concern that replacement parts were not included in the agreement, but said he had assurances the matter would be considered.

GROWTH OF FLOW

Last year Whitaker, as chairman of an industrywide committee, wrote President Johnson that due to the Canadian tariff rebating plan the Canadians were shipping motor car parts into this country at the rate of $50 million a year—six times what they were shipping 2 years ago.

Whitaker said the Canadian intent, which they openly expressed, was to obtain 60,000 jobs for Canada at the expense of American labor.

The Kansas Citian asked the President to order the Treasury Secretary to place countervailing duties on the importation of Canadian parts.

SYMINGTON said Whitaker brought the Canadian manipulation to his attention about 2 years ago and predicted what would happen unless something was done.

"His prediction turned out to be only too right," SYMINGTON said.

STUDEBAKER IS CITED

The Missouri Senator added that "when the Studebaker Corp., a prominent customer of Whitaker, saw the handwriting on the wall, it decided to move its entire assembly operation to Canada."

SYMINGTON said he immediately took the issue to the proper Government agencies and later as a member of the Canadian affairs subcommittee obtained a hearing to investigate the tariff question.

American officials said last night that the trouble began in 1962 when Canada initiated a program under which automobile companies operating in Canada were allowed to have the benefit of tariff-free treatment on certain car parts through the technique of tariff rebates, in return for increased exports of cars or parts.

This Canadian program was challenged by Whitaker and others in the industry as being contrary to a section of our basic tariff act concerned with foreign bounties or grants on exports to the United States.

TRADE WAR SEEN

Their request for countervailing duties by the United States as a counteraction was not granted because, as officials explained, it was believed this would have set in motion a chain reaction of retaliatory protective measures and a trade war would have developed.

Instead, the United States and Canada began discussions in an effort to bring peace. The result was the agreement announced yesterday.

Officials said the tariff rebate scheme which was at the root of most of the complaints will be dropped by Canada, probably on Monday. They said the replacement-parts issue was not included because a study is needed to determine its impact on many small firms.

Officials said the principal concern of the Canadians was whether their car industry could exist in the face of the concentration of absentee American ownership. Officials said because Americans and Canadians live side by side and are big customers of each other an agreement to end a potentially disastrous trade war was imperative.

They said that some dislocations would occur in the parts industry with perhaps some American parts factories moving to Canada and some Canadian factories to the United States.

In Kansas City, Jack F. Whitaker said last night, "I think this is a major step in United States-Canadian relationships, and if we are capable of taking care of ourselves competitively, it should work out to the best for both countries.

Whitaker's company, which is at 13th and Burlington Streets in North Kansas City, supplies electrical wiring to all U.S. motorcar makers except General Motors Corp., and employs about 1,000 persons here.

The trade pact is especially beneficial to Missouri, Whitaker said, because it is the second largest assembler of motor-cars in the United States.

"Without the agreement we would have had to put a plant in Canada to increase services and cut costs," Whitaker said. "It is still possible we may have to move part of our operation to Canada, but not nearly as probable as before."

HOW AND WHY WE GOT INTO VIETNAM

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, even to those of us who lived for a long time with the problems of our involvement in southeast Asia, the complex history of the past 11 or 12 years there is not in our minds in a clear and orderly fashion.

But that story has been told, clearly and succinctly and with the history compiled for the understanding of every reader, in an excellent article which appeared in the December issue of the American Legion magazine. The article is entitled "The Long Struggle in Vietnam" and it was written by Gerald L. Steibel.

Mr. Steibel's review of the history makes clear how and why we got there. He relates the manner in which our policy there is connected with what happened in the Korean war, and how our involvement began as early as 1953 before the French were entirely out of what was then Indochina. He discusses the world situation as it existed, and the elements of our own foreign policy which dictated the measures we have taken.

Because this seems to me, Mr. President, perhaps the most enlightening single summary I have seen, and the most comprehensive, setting forth this background of history and policy, I ask unanimous consent that it may appear following these introductory remarks, as a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LONG STRUGGLE IN VIETNAM

(By Gerald L. Steibel)

(In Korea we fought a huge war to contain communism on Red China's north. It was barely over when the French left a vacuum for the Reds to fill, if we'd let them, in Indochina to the south. Here, in all its strange detail, is the complex history of our first 11 years of meeting in Indochina the challenge we accepted in Korea—the how and why of our involvement in Vietnam and Laos.)

In 1964, the United States had spent about 10 years and $3 billion defending Laos and South Vietnam from Communist aggression; and by ones, twos and threes, Americans in uniform had died and were still dying there. Yet 6 out of 10 people here at home told the Gallup poll that they didn't know what was going on there. Of the four who said they did, only one had any opinion on what ought to be done, and he was half for getting out altogether, half for getting in further.

It is not surprising that so many people are unsure about their grasp of the Vietnam situation. The Indochinese Peninsula is strange country to most Americans. Until recent years, Indochinese world problems were French, not American, worries. Before the present dilemma evolved, we had no background or tradition there.

Even the few familiar place names have changed. The entire region has no well-known, traditional name. It's just southeast Asia, a land mass hanging down from the southeast corner of China. It has a fat upper peninsula—Indochina—where Vietnam and the other areas of acute present concern are located; and a long, slim lower part known as the Malay Peninsula. Our maps show the divisions, and trace the name changes. Siam is still on the map, but now it's Thailand. The maps show how Laos, Cambodia and Vietnam came into being out of French Indochina. Then, in the Geneva agreement of 1954, Vietnam had a line drawn straight across it—the "cease-fire line of July 1954"—dividing it into North Vietnam (Communist, with the seat at Hanoi) and South Vietnam (non-Communist, with the capital at Saigon). The hottest problem today arises from guerrilla and political activity in South Vietnam, chiefly flowing from North Vietnam, now a political arm of Red China. Broad U.S. policy is aimed at keeping communism north of the line in Vietnam, and preventing Laos and Cambodia (as well as Thailand, Burma, and Malaya) from falling lock, stock, and barrel into the Communist orbit.

All the events in the area are actually all of one piece, with respect to both free world and Communist policy, but they are complex and confusing to the man in the street in the United States because several different countries with different leaders, and different Communist and other opposition factions are involved. On top of that, within each country old local antagonisms, interests, and factions are jockeying for position in the big battle between East and West.

Before World War II, Laos, Vietnam, and Cambodia had been one French colonial area—French Indochina—for nearly a century. In World War II the Japanese moved in. When they left, after loss of the war in the Pacific, France returned, but her old ascendancy was shaken. The Japanese had proved that France, now weakened by the war in Europe, need not be all powerful there. V-J Day had hardly dawned in 1945 when the Annamese, one of the dominant people of Indochina, were in revolt. Other natives throughout the provinces of Laos, Cambodia, and Vietnam joined the agitation, organizing and fighting for independence. Different groups had different long-term aims, especially the local nationalists and Communist-organized groups. The nationalist groups sought permanent independence as an end; the Communists sought independence as the first step toward delivering the whole peninsula into the world Communist camp. But they were united on getting rid of France.

The Indochinese war for independence from France was successful, culminating in the terrible defeat of the French at Dienbienphu in 1954. In the settlement with France after her defeat, the three territories became the new independent nations of Laos, Cambodia, and Vietnam. Meanwhile, also as a result of the post-World War II power vacuum and the failure of U.S. policy to maintain Chiang Kai-shek in China, all of mainland China went Communist in 1949. It became the seat of Communist power in Asia, bent on making all Asia Communist. U.S. policy stiffened against this. By the time the French were out of Indochina, the United States had wound up the bloodbath of the Korean war in conjunction with the U.N. in a major expression of its determination to block further Communist expansion in Asia.

Very broadly, our present involvement in the whole Indochinese area is our Korea policy all over again, applied to the area south of Red China as Korea applied it to the northeast. The events in Indochina can be compared with those in Korea as an effort to achieve the same containment of communism that we achieved in Korea while avoiding, if possible, a major war on the Korean scale of 1950–53, or greater.

The beginning of U.S. involvement in Indochina came in 1953, even before France was entirely out. The well-organized Communists, aided by Red China, were hell-bent to turn the coming independence into Communist captivity. They were strongest in Northern Vietnam, closest to Red China, and in Laos where a second Communist force, the Pathet Lao, controlled an island of territory in the northern part of the country. It seemed that the militant and better organized Communists, with powerful outside aid, would carry the day.

While France still held out, China and Russia had been warned by the United States, in September 1953, not to try to overrun the French colonies. This, the United States said, would have "grave consequencies which might not be confined to Indochina." That was a part of the late Secretary of State John Foster Dulles' "brink of war" policy. In 1954, President Eisenhower considered U.S. military intervention to save the French at Dienbienphu. On April 8, he said the rest of Asia "would fall like dominoes" if Indochina went Communist. But in the fight against the French, the Indochinese were together. The United States would be attacking the freedom-seeking forces as well as the Communists, so intervention to save the French was out of the question.

The French defeat led to an international conference in Geneva, Switzerland, called by Britain and the U.S.S.R. Geneva agreements signed June 21, 1954, drew the cease-fire line across Vietnam. This line gave half of Vietnam's 126,000 square miles to the new Communist "Democratic Republic of Vietnam"—built around the powerful Vietminh armies. The Geneva agreements were supposed to prevent civil war and they scheduled a "permanent settlement" to be arrived at by "all-Vietnam" elections in July 1956. The agreements were to be policed by an international commission, but they had little more effect than to consolidate the Communist control of North Vietnam, making it an internationally recognized haven out of which they could later operate south of the line with political agitation and guerrilla warfare. Though the United States did not sign the agreements, its representative, Gen. Bedell Smith, issued a statement saying it would not interfere with them.

Washington now faced its first big decision: to back out quietly and by degrees permit the Communists to complete their conquests by political means, or to commit itself to trying to maintain the freedom of the new nations.

Most foreign diplomats in the summer of 1954 gave Laos and South Vietnam no more than 6 months to a year before the Communists would take over, and Washington was very much inclined to concur. In the proposed all-Vietnam elections of 1956, Communist North Vietnam would come in with over 17 million people to South Vietnam's less than 14 million. It also had most of the industry, and the whole region was in the middle of Red China's own front yard.

Some quarters in the Eisenhower administration, particularly in the French section of the State Department, urged withdrawal. They were influenced by the French Government's view that Indochina could not be saved from the Communists, and that the best deal obtainable would be a Red promise to respect the neutrality established by the Geneva accords. This was the French Government's position more than 4 years before Gen. Charles de Gaulle returned to power and adopted the neutralization policy as his own policy.

Other U.S. voices argued differently, among them Senators Mike Mansfield and John F. Kennedy, Gen. William J. Donovan, and Francis Cardinal Spellman. Together with officials of private refugee-aid organizations, they urged that help be given to the new Premier of South Vietnam, Ngo Dinh Diem, appointed 2 weeks before the Geneva agreement. They insisted that Diem, a stanch anti-Communist who had spent many years in the United States, could save his beleaguered country if he were helped.

The administration sent some economic aid in August 1954, but wrestled with the larger question of permanent policy until late in the fall. Even as Gen. J. Lawton Collins prepared to go to Saigon as President Eisenhower's special representative, Washington was still leaning toward a pullout. But the pro-Diem advocates finally prevailed and Collins was ordered to make a definite U.S. commitment.

The first commitment was small and limited primarily to economic assistance. The United States was then setting up the next fallback position in Asia, pinned to the Pakistan-Thailand-Malaya-Philippines arc, and embodied in the then new Southeast Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO) established at Manila in September 1954. Dulles induced SEATO to give Laos, Cambodia, and South Vietnam one-way guarantees against Communist invasion from North Vietnam. (The Geneva treaties forbade offering them membership in the alliance itself.)

Though there was little appreciation of what really lay ahead, this hesitant commitment was a historic decision for the United States. From there on, no withdrawal would be possible without great loss of "face." With that, the first stage of U.S. involvement was over.

The second stage lasted for 3 years, until the beginning of 1958, and it was deceptively quiet. Convinced they could not overrun Laos or South Vietnam, the Communists now reverted to the slower tactics of infiltration and buildup, concentrating on Laos. With the breathing spell thus offered him in South Vietnam, and with substantial U.S. economic and military aid, Ngo Dinh Diem began to vindicate the faith of his American supporters.

To begin with, Diem received a big psychological lift when almost 900,000 Vietnamese "voted with their feet" and left the Communist North to come South in a 300-day period provided by the Geneva accords. (Only a trickle elected to go North.) This jolted Red "popularity" claims throughout Asia, although 900,000 new citizens added to Diem's economic problems.

Second, he moved immediately and vigorously to assert his control over the army. That secured, he cracked down hard on religious sects which had their own private armies, like the Cao Dai and the Hoa Hao. These had long defied all efforts by the French to curb their power. Diem also broke the power of the Binh Xuyen, a "syndicate" that ran the country's commercialized vices such as narcotics and prostitution, and which terrorized businessmen and peasants into submission to it.

Then, on October 23, 1955, Diem called a referendum which ousted the playboy king of South Vietnam, Bao Dai, and made Diem chief of state. A Republic of South Vietnam was proclaimed on October 26, with Diem as its president. Next year, a constitution was adopted and a measure of political stability was finally achieved in the country. (The "all-Vietnam" elections, slated for 1956, were simply never held.) "All-Vietnam" was by then really two countries, one Red, one free.

To the further satisfaction of his American allies, Diem turned his attention to his shattered economy. In the next 5 years, 140,000 landless peasants received their own farms in a program a former U.S. Agriculture Department specialist, Wolf Ladejinsky, helped design and oversee. Diem rebuilt the transportation system; rice and rubber production climbed above prewar levels; and a base for national industrial growth was erected. School enrollments and teaching staffs were tripled and almost 3,000 medical aid stations and maternity clinics were opened.

The contrast with Ho Chi Minh's Communist North Vietnam was painfully clear. Though the Reds had inherited a much larger industrial plant when Vietnam was split, their estimated gross national product was only $70 per person by 1961, as against $110 in the free south. And, while per capita food production dropped 10 percent in the north after 1956, it went up 20 percent in the south.

Finally, the United States continued to help train and equip the South Vietnam armed forces to meet the invasion from the north which was still believed to constitute the main danger.

American gratification with events in South Vietnam was tempered by the gloomier picture in Laos. From the start, the Communist Pathet Lao military forces violated the Geneva neutrality stipulations. Men and arms were brought in from North Vietnam, and the Pathet Lao maintained a virtual state-within-a-state in Laos' northeastern Provinces of Samneua and Phongsaly. Repeated appeals for help by the Royal Lao Government to the International Control Commission proved fruitless. The Commission, set up at Geneva to police the agreements, was made up of a Communist Pole, an Indian, and a Canadian member. Neither the Pathet Lao nor the Polish member would permit it to function.

Despite the Laotian troubles, there were no major crises or decisions in the years 1955–58. Indochina disappeared from the headlines, which were taken over by the East-West good will summit meeting at Geneva in 1955, the Polish and Hungarian uprisings in 1956, and the first Soviet sputnik space vehicle launching in 1957.

In 1958, the Indochinese calm began to disintegrate and the second stage gave way to a third, filled with alarms and crises and culminating in two further major U.S. decisions 3 years later, in 1961.

The first alarm went off in Laos. In November 1957, the refurbished Pathet Lao set itself up as a party and pushed its way into the neutralist government of Prince Souvanna Phouma. The United States, which had been giving Laos about $50 million a year, declared it was "seriously concerned" by this event. It said that letting Communists into the government was a "perilous course" for Laos. By 1958, Washington had become very worried over what the Communists might accomplish in organizing other leftwing elements for the assembly elections set for 1959 in Laos.

To counter the Communist weight, the United States now threw its support to an army-based group there headed by Gen. Phoumi Nosavan. A rapid buildup of his forces followed, and by December 1958 they were in open skirmishes with the Pathet Lao in the northeast. In February 1959, the Laotian Government denounced the Geneva agreements as having been robbed of meaning by the Communists. The United States approved the denunciation and prepared to send a military mission to Laos—a move the Chinese and Vietnamese Communists attacked as an American plot to restore imperialism to all Indochina.

At first, General Phoumi seemed to be the answer Washington was looking for in Laos, perhaps a leader as good as South Vietnam's Ngo Dinh Diem. In December 1959, Phoumi drove the Communists out of the Laotian Government. But his 50,000 U.S.-trained and U.S.-backed troops proved unable to defeat the 18,000 Pathet Lao and their instructors operating out of the North Vietnam sanctuary. A new crisis in Laos rapidly approached.

In August 1960, Phoumi himself was ousted by a rebel officer named Capt. Kong Le, who declared his loyalty to the neutralist premier, Prince Souvanna Phouma. Immediately, the Pathet Lao military threat erupted into what looked like the start of a complete takeover. In September 1960, the United States repeated the warning of 1953 against a military conquest of Laos. But this time it sent a carrier force into the South China Sea, including 1,000 combat-ready Marines.

This assertion of U.S. willingness to use its military held the Communists in check, but the settlement for Laos of 1954 was hopelessly shattered. In December, Phoumi cnce more came back into power, but the neutralists now set up their own government in the south, and Laos was in effect split in three parts, with Phoumi's pro-Western official government sandwiched between Communists and neutralists.

Meanwhile, South Vietnam, too, had come under the Communist gun, in spite of the 1954 cease fire. In 1958, Ho Chi Minh's radio in North Vietnam announced that the Communists would mount a major campaign against the Diem regime. A virulent propaganda offensive tore at Diem's American "imperialist" sponsors, and Red guerrilla fighters known as Vietcong appeared in South Vietnam. They were led by tough cadres trained in North Vietnam and supplied with weapons and material originating in Moscow and Peiping, and transported through North Vietnam and northeastern Laos over what came to be called the Ho Chi Minh trail through the jungles.

The Vietcong offensive hit the Diem government at one of its most sensitive points: the increasingly personal rule of Diem and his brothers, particularly Ngo Dinh Nhu. (Note that what we call the first name is the last.) By 1958, the Ngo Dinh family had replaced or stripped of power most of the old leaders. Nhu was head of a strong security police, which had learned many lessons from the Communists. His wife, Madame Nhu, wielded great influence behind the scenes, particularly in propaganda and cultural affairs. Diem's two brothers, Catholic Archbishop Ngo Dinh Thuc and Ngo Dinh Can, controlled political power levers in the north. Diem, a cautious and suspicious man, trusted no one except his own family. Under him they built a formidable ruling machine that brought cries of outrage from the better educated South Vietnamese—and from many quarters in the United States. As the Vietcong stepped up their attacks, the stern measures of the Diem government increased.

By June 1960, assassinations by Reds were taking place at the rate of 2 to 10 a day. In 1 year alone, 3,000 South Vietnamese civilians were killed and 2,500 kidnaped. Red insurgent organizers, many of whom had come in with the 900,000 refugees 6 years earlier, were persuading and forcing South Vietnamese peasants to give them havens. Many had family ties in the countryside and the cities, and they exploited them to the full. A front for the liberation of the south, inspired and backed by Hanoi, the capital of Communist North Vietnam, added to Diem's burdens by calling for the departure of the Americans and their puppet Diem.

In the South Vietnam countryside, the Vietcong grew bolder, too. Its guerrillas attacked in force, sometimes with as many as 500 men. When pursued by government troops, they often fled into Laos or Cambodia as well as North Vietnam. Prince Norodom Sihanouk, Cambodia's leader, denied that his country was a privileged sanctuary for them, but Sihanouk was a declared believer in the ultimate victory of the Communists and in the necessity to come to terms with them before that happened. He neither defended nor impounded the rebels, so to all practical intents Cambodia was a sanctuary.

The year 1961 opened with both Laos and South Vietnam showing signs of impending collapse. For the United States it was to be the year of decision in southeast Asia—and the year when it finally recognized what its decisions really meant.

On January 6, Khrushchev made what Secretary of Rusk later called "one of the most important speeches on Communist strategy of recent decades." In it, Khrushchev said world nuclear wars and large-scale "conventional" wars were too dangerous for the big powers to risk. But "wars of national liberation" were different. Naming Vietnam specifically, he said, "It is a sacred war. We recognize such wars."

The incoming Kennedy administration read this speech with the deepest interest, deriving these three major clues from it: (1) Khrushchev's split with Communist China had now widened to the point where he was ready to put a virtual ban on big war, in defiance of Peiping's insistence on more risk taking; (2) the price the West would have to pay was more sublimited wars of insurgency; (3) the Laos-Vietnam insurgency would get much more intense, with both Moscow and Peiping behind it, though disagreeing over the degree of intensity.

Khrushchev later spelled all this out in detail for Kennedy when they met at Vienna in June. He and the U.S. President did agree that Laos could drag both of them into a world war neither wanted, and that some kind of limitation had to be placed on it. Kennedy came home calling this a "somber" meeting.

With the Laos situation in turmoil and the Communists convinced the United States would probably come in to stop a final victory, it was time for them to revert to their classic 1954 maneuver—a new, 14-nation Geneva conference. The Peiping, Vietnamese and Laotian Reds went to it to get at the bargaining table some of what they could not claim in the field. The United States went also—to stave off the old, nasty choice of (1) a major land war in Asia or (2) a Communist sweep.

The new conference met in Geneva on May 16, 1961, and wrangled for the next 15 months, while the three Laotian factions battled in the field for positions of advantage in the ultimate settlement. Before it could forge new agreements, the United States was faced with far more serious problems in South Vietnam.

Throughout 1961, the Diem forces strove to meet the Vietcong challenge, but by the fall it was obvious they were failing badly. Diem called on the United States for additional help, and President Kennedy sent Gen. Maxwell Taylor to Indochina to review the entire situation there.

Taylor's findings were a landmark. He reported the lack of everything from proper equipment and weapons to understanding the nature of the war itself. In effect, Taylor said the South Vietnamese were trying to meet a skillful and effective Communist insurgency with arms, organization, and doctrine designed for an altogether different kind of conventional war. Though his criticisms necessarily fell most heavily on the South Vietnamese, they implied an indictment of U.S. past involvement for the failure to see the changed nature of the war. He recommended an immediate and vast stepup in U.S. help, especially in the categories of men and materiel needed for counterinsurgency operations.

Taylor's recommendations were adopted with little hesitation, and a flood of American men, money, and equipment began to flow into Saigon, South Vietnam's capital, in 1961. In the next 2 years, U.S. personnel increased from a few hundred to over 12,000. Our spending there rapidly shot up to almost half a million dollars a day.

The United States has now passed over the most important watershed since the Korean war: its acceptance of the Communist challenge of liberation war. The Communist challenge of conventional war had been met in Korea; the Communist challenge of nuclear war would be met in Cuba a year later. In Indochina we accepted engagement on the third level of Communist revolutionary war, the sublimited. This was the last chance for the United States to get out without total disaster to its international prestige. It was not taken.

Sending 12,000 Americans to Saigon meant that the United States would accept the conflict even if it stepped up to general war, and communicated to the Reds in advance that they could run into overwhelming force.

But the United States emphasized that it was not taking over the war. President Kennedy said, later, "It is their war [South Vietnam's]. They are the ones who have to win or lose it."

The State Department took pains to tell the Communists that "the U.S. measures are not a threat to North Vietnam but are merely a response to the Communist assault on South Vietnam." The measures were, in other words, not a rollback of Communist power, or liberation of North Vietnam from Red rule, but a move to stop Red expansion.

Thus began our full commitment in Indochina. The first effects were felt in Laos in the early spring of 1962. While the 14 nations still sat in Geneva dueling verbally, the Pathet Lao once more attacked the stability of Laos with arms, driving the government forces westward toward the Mekong River boundary with Thailand. At the same time, Red guerrillas brought Thailand under threat with attacks in northeastern Thailand, backed by arms slipped across the Mekong from Laos, while a free Thai radio propaganda campaign spewed out of Hanoi.

On May 15, 1962, the United States moved 5,000 troops into Thailand and made clear they would respond if the Pathet Lao tried to reach the Mekong. This plain threat by the United States to make it "our war" worked, and the Communists switched back to the bargaining table. The long-deadlocked Geneva Conference came to a quick new agreement on June 12, 1962. It set up a Lao Government which included all three of the warring factions—Communist, free and neutral—and, in theory, reaffirmed Lao neutralization. In July, U.S. troops began leaving Thailand, and Laos went back to an uneasy truce punctuated frequently by new clashes between the Communists and government neutralist troops.

Criticism of the new U.S. commitment grew from two directions at home. Senator WAYNE MORSE decried our stepped-up participation and said it would lead to a head-on clash with China. He called Diem a "tyrant" and said that his kind of rule made victory against the Reds impossible and that the United States was making "a great mistake in South Vietnam." Columnist Walter Lippmann went further, describing the original commitment in 1954 as an error and saying the United States should admit it and withdraw.

From the other direction, Senator THOMAS DODD said the commitment was not enough, that coalition governments in any country between free and Communist factions were open invitations to eventual Red takeover. Others pointed out that as long as Red power was intact in Laos, in the form of the Pathet Lao, it would feed the revolt in South Vietnam and that therefore U.S. withdrawal from Laos would be inconsistent with its growing involvement in South Vietnam.

Administration spokesmen admitted that the Laos agreements are fragile at best, but defended them as the best obtainable under the circumstances. President Kennedy said, "We've got a very simple policy in Vietnam * * * we want the war to be won, the Communists to be contained, and the Americans to go home." The point, as he further emphasized, was that "we are not there to see a war lost."

The dispute went to crisis point in 1963. In May, Diem's police fired on demonstrating Buddhists in the northern South Vietnam city of Hue, and riots spread throughout the country as students protested and monks burned themselves in public. The Kennedy administration fought off demands that the United States abandon southeast Asia, while bringing strong pressure on Diem to reform his methods of rule. The dissension over whether to back Diem or try to oust him reached all the way into the U.S. mission in Saigon.

Before a showdown could be reached, Diem was overthrown and assassinated by a junta of 16 South Vietnamese generals, on November 1, 1963. This got Washington off the worst part of the hook, but the disappearance of the Ngo Dinh family from power did not solve the prime question: How could any South Vietnamese Government long survive in a war which had no apparent end? This was a point Maj. Gen. Nguyen Khanh, who took over the junta rule of South Vietnam on January 30, 1964, pressed on his U.S. allies. Throughout the spring of 1964, while the Communists in both Laos and South Vietnam stepped up the pace of their attacks, Khanh urged on the United States the need for carrying the fight to the enemy.

In March 1964, under President Johnson, another 1,500 U.S. military men were sent to Vietnam, raising the total to 16,500. Though it was carefully explained that these were advisers, the move unleashed speculation that the war was about to be widened. On April 26, Secretary of State Rusk made a deliberately vague reference to military actions against North Vietnam and said, "This course of action—its implications and ways of carrying it out—has been carefully studied."

Further well-advertised American hints that some kind of initiative against North Vietnam was under consideration followed. In June, top-level U.S. military and civilian leaders met at Honolulu and new stories of impending strikes against North Vietnam were leaked. Next, U.S. reconnaissance planes appeared over Red-held territory in Laos, and the U.S.-trained Royal Laotian Air Force also went into action. On June 11, six U.S.-built jets bombed the Pathet Lao base at Khang Kay, in Laos, while the United States denied they had U.S. pilots.

In July, the movement of 5,000 more American troops into South Vietnam was announced, and U.S. spending increases were projected over the $700 million level for fiscal year 1965. Maximum publicity was given these facts, too.

It was now the Communists' turn to worry, especially the North Vietnamese. From China and Russia came the demand for a new conference of the 14 nations that signed the 1962 Geneva agreements. France, as well as many neutrals, backed this demand, while in the United States 5,000 college professors called for a neutralized Vietnam and pacifist groups circulated an open letter from North Vietnam leader, Ho Chi Minh, asking the American people to force their Government to negotiate with him.

The United States refused to entertain the conference idea, saying that it would only serve to "ratify the violations" of the existing treaties the Communists had committed. The buildup went on, with South Vietnam's General Khanh adding new tension when he declared in July that his government felt free to carry the war into North Vietnam on its own.

Amid a welter of speculation about just what action would be taken, a clash between United States and North Vietnamese warships took place in early August. Part of the new posture of the United States now became clear.

U.S. planes struck at North Vietnam bases, destroyed PT boats, bases and oil facilities. This was the first organized military blow by the United States against Communist territory since the Korean war. It was followed by an immediate augmentation of U.S. forces in southeast Asia in readiness for any counter blow of any size.

President Johnson went on the air as the strike was beginning to assure the Communists that this "response will be limited and fitting." He emphasized pointedly, "We still seek no wider war." Publicity was given to Ambassador Taylor's notification of General Khanh that his call for an extension of the war was against present U.S. policy.

For the first time in the long Indochinese struggle, too, the two sides had exchanged roles. It was now the Communists who had to decide what response to make—or whether to respond at all—and the United States which had the initiative. Nor would this be the last such time, said President Johnson on August 8. The air and naval action in the Gulf of Tonkin, he announced, applied more broadly to "aggression in southeast Asia as a whole." This threatened the "privileged sanctuary" in North Vietnam and the Red-held areas of Laos, where Red forces could rest and plan new forays between strikes.

To sum up where the United States stood in the fall of 1964:

The range of our responses to the Communist "war of liberation" had been widened.

New risks considered to be "manageable" were taken. They could lead to more general war, but the belief was they would stay within the confines of limited war, and would help produce that effect.

Though the scale of combat had risen appreciably, what had escalated enormously was the U.S. commitment in the intangibles: will, prestige, determination. The United States was now fully immersed in the kind of political-psychological-military war the Reds had made their own specialty, in which the intangibles were often the most important stakes.

Late this fall, General Khanh stepped out in favor of a civilian government under Tran Van Huong, former Saigon mayor. Then, after the Vietcong attacked a U.S. bomber base, rumors were rife of sterner U.S. action.

As these words go to press the last chapter is not written, but the struggle in Indochina is seen as an extension of our Korea policy to hold Red colonialism where it is in Asia while, unlike Korea, avoiding any bigger military commitment than is necessary. It is a neat trick to win any struggle with the minimum possible involvement. The Communists have done it many times. In Vietnam today we are witnessing our own first big attempt to walk that tightrope.

SAMUEL L. HAMMERMAN

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I rise today to call the attention of the Senate to the passing of an outstanding Marylander and a fine American.

Samuel L. Hammerman gave the highest kind of service to the welfare of the

general public. As a successful businessman, he could have rested on his many laurels in the field of real-estate development. But this was not the way of Sam Hammerman. At age 70, he accepted the responsibility of chairman of the State Commission of Forests and Parks in Maryland. On the day of his death, he presided over a meeting of that group.

Under his compassionate and creative direction, Maryland parks have grown in their utility to people, while remaining true to the highest standards of conservation. Sam Hammerman was a man who bought a piece of property, spending more than $1,000 to save a tree doomed to destruction, a tree which is still growing.

The bill to establish a national park on Assateague Island, of which I am a cosponsor with my colleague, Senator BREWSTER, is, at least in some part, a monument to his foresight and courage as a creative conservationist. I am sure that no finer tribute could be paid to this wonderful man than the establishment of a national park on Assateague Island.

Maryland and the Nation are truly poorer for his passing.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD appropriate editorial comment from the Baltimore Evening Sun and the Baltimore News American of January 20, 1965.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Baltimore (Md.) News American, Jan. 20, 1965]

SAMUEL L. HAMMERMAN

The community mourns Samuel L. Hammerman, who gave so much of himself to its betterment.

Mr. Hammerman, who was a successful realtor in his business life, made contributions in so many different fields of civic endeavor that it is difficult to single out his most outstanding.

High among his accomplishments, certainly, rank his leadership in the affairs of the Advertising Club, of which he was the founder and a former president; his years of service on the city park board, during which he was at the forefront of the successful drives for the erection of Memorial Stadium and the upgrading of the city zoo; and his successful chairmanship of the State commission on forests and parks, which he headed at the time of his sudden death.

This friendly, outgoing man made his presence felt in everything he undertook. The Advertising Club in its present form is largely his creation—and the plush, glittery style which has made the Ad Club Award Banquet a sellout every year, attracting the top names in the city's political, commercial, and civic life, is due to his verve and enthusiasm.

"In many ways Sam Hammerman was Mr. Baltimore himself," Mayor McKeldin recalls. "For he understood deeply and was an integral part of our city's aspiration, personality, growth, and municipal pride."

In paying homage to this outstanding citizen, we can do no better than to repeat a tribute paid to him a dozen years ago by the Jesuit priest, the Very Rev. Edward B. Bunn, at a testimonial dinner. It was brief and to the point: "The fulcrum of Sam's successful life has been his unabashed love of mankind."

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Evening Sun, Jan. 20, 1965]

S. L. HAMMERMAN

For a leading businessman to enter public life as a member of one or more advisory or regulatory bodies is far from difficult; the job often seeks out the appointee. What can come hard is for the businessman to reorient his outlook, putting the public interest ahead of the private or commercial considerations. An example, indeed a model, of the successful changeover will long be available to Baltimoreans and Marylanders in the career of the late S. L. Hammerman. A man whose profession was the development of residential real estate, Mr. Hammerman went to work, when named head successively of the city's park board and the State's commission for forests and parks, to advance the public's cause.

Outstanding instances of such action on the part of Hammerman-led boards included the defense of Druid Hill Park against an attempt to locate the civic center there, ardent support of the effort to bring about Federal acquisition of the full Maryland length of Assateague Island and, within recent days, the rebuff of an executive attempt to allow destructive strip mining on a stretch of State parkland in western Maryland. A gregarious man and a driving force whose death will be mourned also at Advertising Club banquets and in interfaith programs, Sam Hammerman could count many achievements, and not least among them a role as a distinct part of the flavor or color of the city's collective personality.

WYOMING'S UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION LAW

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, the Reader's Digest, in its January 1965 issue, presented its readers with what it termed "a case study of unemployment-compensation abuse—and its cure."

The article about the State of Wyoming and its unemployment compensation law was a broadly embroidered one, based on only bare threads of truth. The Wyoming Employment Outlook, a publication of the Employment Security Commission of Wyoming, gives a different outlook on the situation. It sets the record straight.

I ask unanimous consent that the Employment Security Commission editorial in reply to the Reader's Digest article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

READER'S DIGEST STRIKES AGAIN

The Reader's Digest has once more zeroed in on its favorite target, the Bureau of Employment Security. In its latest issue, the magazine has chosen Wyoming's unemployment compensation law for its attack. The story swarms with villains (the bureaucrats) and white knights (three special-interest group technicians), and the fight ensues.

The technicians, according to the story, became unemployment insurance experts practically overnight. They snatch a "hoop and holler" victory from the bureaucrats by virtue of an early morning breakfast with two members of the State legislature. The hoop and holler victory even with the two members voting for the proposals, would have meant a margin of one vote for the proposals.

The Reader's Digest intentions become quite obvious when one reads the advertisement displayed in local Wyoming papers. Its ads are even more sensational than the story itself. Quoting from one such ad: "Wyoming tightens up on 'happy time' money. Freeloaders were coming from as far away as California. Anybody who refused to work could sign up for unemployment compensation—even convicted criminals. Then the public woke up."

The inference of the ads and the story is that any out-of-State worker who comes to fill available jobs in Wyoming, does so for the sole purpose of becoming qualified to draw unemployment compensation from the Wyoming fund and thus, have a "happy time."

During the construction time of the year, Wyoming never has enough workers within its borders to fill all the jobs available. The contractors know this and offer the enticement of good wages and working conditions to encourage the migration of the right kind of worker. This is what brings these workers into Wyoming, not the promise of a good time at the "trough" of public funds, as the magazine suggests.

The article emphasizes the fact that some workers can earn as little as $375 and become eligible for "happy time" money. The article does not mention that on this bare minimum of wage earnings, the benefits would have been $10 a week for 12 weeks. Nor does it mention that the average weekly benefit for all claimants is only $35.

Most of these workers who come into Wyoming to work on construction and other outside type jobs can, while they are working, earn at least four to five times this amount and would find it difficult to have a "happy time" on such a reduced rate of earning.

The ad said that anybody who refused to work could sign up for unemployment compensation. This, as with many of the statements made by the magazine, has a thread of truth. The law states that the commission cannot refuse to accept an application for compensation from anyone. However, they must qualify for entitlement and meet eligibility tests. A refusal to work would result in a denial of payments of benefits.

In the past, many experts have taken the magazine to task and have exposed their blasts at the Bureau of Employment Security for what they are: illogical assumptions based only on threads of truth.

The experts' answers were printed in publications with a circulation of thousands. The Reader's Digest claims a circulation of over 25 million. By the time a rebuttal comes out, the Lilliputian magazine is once more trying to pin down another Bureau of Employment Security Gulliver with thin, weak threads of truth.

AN ACTION PLAN FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE NATION'S DEPRESSED REGIONS—AMENDMENT (AMENDMENT NO. 2)

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment intended to be proposed by me to the bill (S. 3) to provide public works and economic development programs and the planning and coordination needed to assist in the development of the Appalachian region. I ask that the amendment be referred to the Committee on Public Works and be printed. I also ask unanimous consent that the amendment be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

This amendment is designed to authorize immediate planning for up to six other regions in the country with problems similar to those of Appalachia.

The legislation would establish a Federal Action Plan Administrator with authority to designate regions for immediate development planning.

Up to $2.5 million for any one region could be used for the development of an action plan, to be completed within 18 months by Federal and State representatives.

No more than $10 million could be spent on the total program.

Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., who prepared the Appalachian legislation, told the House Public Works Committee last year that plans for other regions could be completed within 6 months if they were authorized.

Only regions which meet the general criteria established by the Senate in passage of last year's Appalachian legislation would be eligible for action plan money. To receive such planning funds, the region must: Lag substantially behind the rest of the Nation in economic growth; have an uneven past development which has not permitted self-sustaining growth; have demonstrated that local people and governments are prepared for immediate planning and development; and have common problems which offer hope of a regional solution.

In addition to the upper Great Lakes area, the standards in this bill might be met by the Ozarks; the northwestern mountain regions; the upper New England area; the desert high plateau corner of Utah, Colorado, New Mexico, and Arizona, and parts of the Deep South.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD, and will lie on the desk, as requested.

The amendment was referred to the Committee on Public Works, as follows:

On page 1, strike out lines 3 and 4 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"CHAPTER 1—APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT

"Short Title

"SECTION 1. This chapter may be cited as the 'Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965', and all references in this chapter to this Act shall be held to refer to this chapter."

At the end of the bill add the following new chapter:

"CHAPTER 2—REGIONAL ACTION PLANNING

"Title V—Regional Action Planning Act of 1965

"Short Title

"SEC. 501. This chapter may be cited as the 'Regional Action Planning Act of 1965'.

"Statement of Purpose

"SEC. 502. The Congress recognizes that many regions of the country, while abundant in natural resources and rich in potential, lag behind the Nation in economic growth so that the people of such regions have not shared properly in the Nation's prosperity. Often a region's uneven past development, with historical reliance on a few basic industries and marginal agriculture, have failed to provide the economic base vital as a prerequisite for vigorous self-sustaining growth. In some cases the uneven distribution of productive Federal expenditures has left regions at a comparative disadvantage. Nonetheless, in many areas of the country the State and local governments and the people of the region understand their problems and have been and are prepared to work purposefully toward their solution. It is the purpose of this chapter to assist such regions in meeting their special problems and promoting their economic development by helping to develop policies and programs for Federal, State, and local efforts essential to an attack upon common problems through a coordinated and concerted regional approach.

"Regional Action Plan Administrator

"SEC. 503. (a) The provisions of this chapter shall be administered by a Regional Action Plan Administrator (hereinafter referred to as the 'Administrator') in the Executive Office of the President. The Administrator shall be appointed by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and shall be compensated at the rate provided for level IV of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule.

"(b) The Administrator may, subject to the civil service and classification laws, appoint and fix the compensation of such officers and employees as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this chapter.

"Determination of Regions

"SEC. 504. (a) The Administrator shall designate areas representing two or more contiguous States as a region for Federal-regional action planning pursuant to this chapter upon determining that—

"(1) such region lags substantially behind the rest of the Nation in its economic growth, and its people have not shared properly in the Nation's prosperity;

"(2) such region's uneven past development has failed to provide the economic base that is a vital prerequisite for vigorous self-sustaining growth;

"(3) State and local governments and the people of the region understand their problems and have been and are prepared to work purposely toward their solution; and

"(4) region-wide development is feasible, desirable, and urgently needed.

"(b) The Administrator may designate not to exceed six regions pursuant to subsection (a).

"(c) The Administrator shall assign an appropriate department or agency of the Federal Government the responsibility for developing a Federal-regional action plan pursuant to this chapter for each region established pursuant to subsection (a). Such plan shall be developed with the participation of other Federal departments and agencies which in the Administrator's opinion can make a substantial contribution, and with representatives from each State involved.

"(d) The Administrator shall review economic information relating to the various regions of the Nation so as to determine the relative position of such regions, as compared with the rest of the Nation, in terms of unemployment, underemployment, out-migration, rate of economic growth, percentage of the population receiving welfare payments, family income, and such other economic indices he deems relevant to the purpose of this chapter.

"Planning Assistance

"SEC. 505. (a) The Administrator may make grants to any department or agency assigned pursuant to section 504(c) for the development of a Federal-regional action plan which is consistent with the purpose of this chapter and will—

"(1) be completed prior to the date which is one and one-half years after the date of enactment of this Act;

"(2) provide for the development, on a continuing basis, of comprehensive and coordinated plans and programs for the region, including plans for land and other natural resource use and public works, and establish priorities thereunder, with due consideration to other Federal, State, and local planning in the region;

"(3) provide for investigations, research, and studies, including where necessary inventory and analysis of the resources of the region, and in cooperation with Federal, State, and local agencies provide for demonstration projects designed to foster regional productivity and growth;

"(4) provide for the review and study, in cooperation with the agency involved of Federal, State, and local public and private programs and, where appropriate, the recommendation of modifications or additions which will increase the effectiveness of such programs and assist in their financing;

"(5) provide assistance in the formulation of necessary and helpful State and local laws and, where appropriate, interstate compacts, and make recommendations for other forms of interstate cooperation;

"(6) provide for the support of existing local development districts and encourage the formation of such districts where needed by providing technical assistance and assistance in the financing of a professional staff and administration;

"(7) provide for the encouragement of private investment in industrial, commercial, and recreational projects;

"(8) provide a forum for consideration of problems of the region and proposed solutions and provide for the establishment and utilization, as appropriate, of citizens and other special advisory councils and public conferences;

"(9) provide for the formulation and recommendation to the Congress of a program of development projects with proposals for Federal participation in their funding; and

"(10) provide that all such activities will be carried out by or through a single agency which will serve as a focal point and coordinating unit for Federal, State, and local programs in the region.

"(b) As a condition to making any grant pursuant to this chapter, the Administrator may require the making of such reports, in such form and containing such information, as he determines necessary to carry out his functions under this chapter. He may also require the keeping of such records and the affording of such access thereto as is necessary to verify such reports.

"(c) No grants pursuant to this chapter shall be made for the development of a plan for any one region in excess of a total of $2,500,000.

"General Authority

"SEC. 506. Any department or agency assigned the development of a Federal-regional action plan pursuant to this chapter may for the purpose of such development—

"(1) arrange for the services of personnel from any State or local government or any subdivision or agency thereof, or any intergovernmental agency, and pay for the same; and

"(2) enter into and perform such contracts, leases, cooperative agreements, or other transactions as may be necessary in carrying out its functions and on such terms as it may deem appropriate, with any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States or with any State, or any political subdivision, agency, or instrumentality thereof, or with any person, firm, association, or corporation.

"Federal Personnel Assistance

"SEC. 507. At the request of any department or agency developing a plan pursuant to this chapter, the head of any other department or agency may detail to temporary duty, on a reimbursable basis, with such agency such personnel within his administrative jurisdiction as such agency may need in developing such plan. Such temporary duty shall be without loss of seniority, pay, or other employee status.

"Report

"SEC. 508. Not later than six months after the completion of any Federal-Regional Action Plan pursuant to section 505, the department or agency developing such plan shall prepare and submit to the Governor of each State in such region and to the President, for transmittal to the Congress, a report on such plan.

"Consent of States

"SEC. 509. Nothing contained in this chapter shall be interpreted as requiring any State to engage in or accept any program under this chapter without its consent.

"Appropriations Authorized

"SEC. 510. There is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $10,000,000 to carry out the provisions of this chapter."

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD the remarks I made on the floor of the Senate on May 20, 1964, relating to the management, use, and public benefits from the Appalachian Trail.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Appalachian trail is a 2,000-mile-long continuous trail, for foot use, extending from Mount Katahdin, Maine, to Springer Mountain, Ga., passing through some 13 States—Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Virginia, Tennessee, North Carolina, and Georgia.

Mr. President, the Appalachian trail has been developed, maintained, and protected by a good many thousands of very conscientious citizens, some of whom live near the trail; others live many miles away from it. Certainly they are to be commended for the great contributions they have made to the development and preservation of this magnificent outdoor asset.

But today this beautiful trail is being threatened by encroachments, due to population pressures; and unless protection such as that provided by this bill, is given, the day will soon come when large parts of the Appalachian Trail, except those passing through national parks, will be destroyed.

The two most distinguishing features of this trail are: First, the primitive, wild, natural or "primeval" nature of its immediate surroundings; and second, its remoteness from the signs and influences of civilization. In the national parks and forests, where some measure of control can be exercised, these characteristic features of the trail are given definition by preserving the area within 200 feet of the trail in an essentially natural condition and prohibiting incompatible developments within 1 mile of the trail. This protection has now been afforded the trail on Federal lands for the past 25 years.

However, to protect the lands traversed by the trail, I believe new legislation will be required in order to maintain this continuous 2,000-mile foot trail through a primitive environment over the years to come.

The Appalachian Trail is unique. It is the longest, continuous marked foot trail in the world. Its reputation is international.

This bill is in effect an extension of the Appalachian Trailway Agreement, which has governed the policy of the National Park Service and the national forests with regard to the Appalachian Trail lands since 1938, and similar agreements signed by 13 of the States through which the trail passes. The bill would provide congressional recognition of the Appalachian Trail as an outdoor recreational facility and provide means to protect the remaining trail lands not covered by the existing agreements.

The need for the trail is obvious. Its value to the Nation can be measured in terms of: First, its historical development; second, its present use; and third, the future well-being of our population.

The trail itself was conceived in 1921 as a continuous footpath connecting the remaining wilderness areas of the eastern seaboard—a footpath which for all practical purposes would be endless. It was to be the backbone of a primeval environment, a retreat from a civilization considered even then to be too mechanized. From this beginning followed a remarkable story of the establishment—the actual laying out, clearing, and marking—of a 2,000-mile trail entirely through volunteer efforts. It was an amateur recreation experiment of unprecedented magnitude.

Following completion of its basic route in 1938, the trail has been maintained and improved to provide the best possible route, scenery, and environment. About one-third of the trail is now on Federal lands. Here the Federal agencies provide substantial assistance to maintain the trail and its shelters, funds permitting. The remainder of the trail is maintained by the volunteer efforts of trail and hiking clubs and individuals. This work and the publication and distribution of information and guidebooks are coordinated by the Appalachian Trail Conference, Inc., a nonprofit organization with headquarters in the District of Columbia. This conference has no salaried employees. The fact that the entire project was originated and developed and has matured without Government sponsorship or profit motive attests to the strong public support of the trail.

The trail is used as a recreational facility by many persons in many walks of life. It is used for recreation and training by Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, and other youth groups from most of the States east of the Mississippi River. It is enjoyed by lovers of wildlife, flowers, the outdoors, and nature in general. It is used by hunters and fishermen. It provides opportunity for hiking and physical exercise ranging from leisurely half-hour walks to rigorous trips of up to the full 2,000 miles of the trail—and incidentally there are some hardy souls who have walked the entire length of the trail in one hike. It provides the means whereby man can experience an intimate relationship with his natural environment.

There are 50,000 to 100,000 annual visitations to the trail at the present time. Of more significance is the fact that use of the Appalachian Trail is an exceedingly high-quality experience, in fact one rarely forgotten. Its very nature, that of providing a natural and remote recreational area, precludes its simultaneous use by very large numbers of persons.

In my opinion, the future well-being of the American people rests, among other things, on physical fitness, and understanding of their environment, mental health, and spiritual awareness. Opportunities for outdoor physical exercise in an environment resembling that enjoyed by our forefathers are on the decline in the Eastern United States. Increasingly, suitable lands are taken up by private dwellings and a variety of enterprises. The mental nad spiritual well-being of the people may depend upon sufficient places to retreat for contemplation, to commune with nature. The Appalachian Trail is an already established facility which satisfies these various needs, and it is for that reason that we seek to preclude the existing and possible future threats to the permanence of the trail.

First, there is the gradual biting away of the lands along the trail for other uses. This is a problem mainly, but not exclusively, on private lands, where the Appalachian Trail Conference or its member clubs have merely received permission, usually verbal, from the owner for the trail to cross these lands. Such competitive uses include real estate developments for summer or year-round homes, commercial recreational developments, lumbering and bulldozer operations, roads, ski lifts, radar and TV installations, and powerline crossings.

The other major type of threat consists of the construction of scenic parkways on the same ridgecrest as occupied by the Appalachian Trail, either forcing relocation of large segments of the trail or resulting in inferior portions in the sense that its most important characteristic of naturalness and remoteness can no longer be maintained.

Limited protection for the trail and its surroundings was effected in 1938 by the so-called Appalachian Trailway Agreement entered into by the National Park Service, the U.S. Forest Service, 13 States and 2 interstate park commissions, and the Appalachian Trail Conference. These agreements have served to protect certain portions of the trail and its adjoining lands fairly satisfactorily. However, only lands in Federal and State ownership are covered and any such agreements may be superseded at any time by Federal projects.

Any projection of recent trends through the next 40 years leads to the conclusion that there is no hope of maintaining the present 2,000-mile continuous foot trail through a primitive environment close to our eastern cities without public protection of the route and adjoining lands. Since 14 States, 2 national parks and 5 national forests are involved, the only practical type of public protection would appear to result from congressional action.

If the trail is a valuable asset to the American people, present and future—and I certainly do believe that it is a valuable asset—action is needed to recognize the unique qualities of the trail as a primitive-type recreation facility and afford it Federal recognition and protection.

This bill would provide for coordination and cooperation between the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Defense, and any other Federal officials who now or hereafter administer Federal properties traversed by the Appalachian Trial. They, in turn, will give encouragement to and cooperate with the States, local communities, and private organizations, such as the Appalachian Trail Conference, and other persons in promoting the purposes of my bill.

The trail needs protection.

This bill will help provide protection for it. Just one example will emphasize what I mean: According to a recent report of the Citizens Committee for the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, by the year 2000 our population will nearly double; the overall demand for outdoor recreation will triple. Not only will there be more people, but they will have more free time, more money, and more mobility. Already, the increase in demand for outdoor recreation is surging ahead of population growth. Whatever measuring rod is used, it is clear that Americans are seeking the outdoors as never before. And this is only a hint of what is to come.

Two out of three Americans now live in metropolitan areas and by the turn of the century three out of four will. It is here that demand for most types of outdoor recreation is concentrated. It is here that people have the greatest need for outdoor recreation. And it is here that needs will be most difficult to satisfy; the great bulk of demand must be met during after work and weekend hours and the larger cities and their suburbs have the fewer recreation facilities per capita and highest land costs.

As mobility continues to increase, more people will travel farther to enjoy outstanding scenic, wildlife and wilderness areas.

These places are where you find them and they provide outdoor experiences of memorable quality which cannot be duplicated elsewhere. Continuing transportation improvements, higher incomes and longer vacations will result in increased pressures on high-quality recreation resources that now seem remote from population centers. Already, more than 40 percent of vacationers traveling by car travel more than 500 miles and more than 25 percent travel more than 1,000 miles. The number of passenger cars is expected to increase 80 percent by 1976 and another 80 percent by 2000.

The CORC report has already recommended that Congress should establish and preserve outstanding primitive areas as "wilderness areas," to be managed for the sole and unequivocal purpose of maintaining their primitive characteristics. There is a wilderness bill now before the Congress for substantially that purpose.

Parks and other recreation areas are only part of the answer. The most important recreation of all is the kind people find in their everyday life. What this means is an environment—an outdoor environment—an Appalachian Trail.

It is something of a tribute to Americans that they do as much cycling and walking as they do, for very little has been done to encourage these activities, and a good bit to discourage them.

The Appalachian Trail Conference is doing its bit to encourage them. The conference consists of some 55 maintaining clubs, 15 contributing clubs or a total of 70 different clubs along the route of the trail. The New York-New Jersey Trail Conference, as a body, is a member of the conference, and this consists of 21 more clubs, or a grand total of 91 clubs in the conference. The membership in any one of these clubs may range from 50 individuals to 9,000. The total membership is around 30,000. However, users of the trail are not just members of the clubs or the conference—there is no real count of them, and it is almost impossible to calculate just how many nonmembers do use the trail. However, each of these clubs and the conference itself consists of purely voluntary labor. They receive upward of 300 letters a day in regard to the trail. Guidebooks are written and published through voluntary help. The trail is kept cleared by voluntary labor. If this great asset is to be preserved for posterity, legislative action is needed now.

Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Williams], who could not be present at this time, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record a very fine history of the Appalachian Trail, as prepared and printed by the Appalachian Trail Conference.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

"The Appalachian Trail is a continuous marked path—for travel on foot—extending through the mountain wilderness of the Eastern Atlantic States. It is, in its ideal, a skyline route along the crest of the ranges generally referred to as Appalachian—hence the name of this trail. It extends from Katahdin, a massive granite monolith in the central Maine wilderness, over 2,000 miles south to Springer Mountain in northern Georgia. This master trail has been opened throughout its length, marked and measured.

"The trail traverses 14 States. Its greatest elevation is 6,641 feet at Clingmans Dome in the Great Smokies. It is only slightly above sea level where it crosses the Hudson River at Bear Mountain.

"A project of real magnitude, the Appalachian trail might seem to have been the result of many suggestions. It can, however, be traced directly to one man—Benton MacKaye, of Shirley Center, Mass. Forester, philosopher, and dreamer, Mr. MacKaye conceived the plan of a trail which, for all practical purposes, should be endless. To MacKaye's mind this trail should be the backbone of a primeval environment, a sort of retreat or refuge from a civilization which was becoming too mechanized. MacKaye first presented his plan through an article, 'The Appalachian Trail—An Experiment in Regional Planning,' in the October 1921, issue of the Journal of American Institute of Architects. Others had previously advanced suggestions of extensive trails in the New England States but the conception of this supertrail was solely MacKaye's. His proposal aroused interest among leaders of the outdoor clubs in the Northeast. Clubs in New York City were the first to undertake actual work on this new trail. Under the leadership of the late Raymond H. Torrey, the first section of the trail was opened and marked during 1922 in the Palisades Interstate Park. For it, Maj. William A. Welch, then general manager of the park, designed the distinctive Appalachian trail marker and monogram. The New York-New Jersey Trail Conference was organized and the trail was carried west toward the Delaware River. Pennsylvania was also the scene of early activity.

"To gage better the extent of this undertaking, it is of interest to turn back four decades to survey the then existing trail system and the organized groups which could be enlisted to further the project. First, and most striking, is the fact that all outdoor organizations in the East were confined to New England and New York. The Hudson River was then the frontier to the south and west.

"The existing trail systems, which in 1921 could be incorporated into this supertrail, numbered four. First, there were the splendidly maintained Appalachian Mountain Club trails in New Hampshire. In Vermont the lower 100 miles of the rapidly developing 'Long Trail,' begun in 1910, could be utilized. Between the White and Green Mountains was the Dartmouth College Outing Club's trail system. In New York there were the comparatively narrow Bear Mountain and Harriman sections of the Palisades Interstate Park. This was all—perhaps 350 miles out of a then necessary 2,050. Originally, however, the trail was estimated to be only 1,200 miles in length; its actual development has demonstrated the distance to be almost twice as long. In addition to these four sections were the national forests in the South, where connected skyline trails were subsequently developed to a degree unanticipated by those who early formulated the Appalachian Trail route.

"The first enthusiasm aroused by Mr. MacKaye's proposal in 1921 flared, waned and by 1926, had practically died out. The project was moribund; it had degenerated into a fireside philosophy. It was then that Arthur Perkins, a retired lawyer of Hartford, Conn., resurrected the project and made it once again a vital, living thing.

"He interested in it Myron H. Avery, of Lubec, Maine, and later Washington, D.C., who as chairman of the Appalachian Trail Conference from 1931 to 1952 enlisted the aid of hundreds of persons up and down the coast. To the enthusiasm and efforts thus aroused is due the practical completion of the trail project.

"The trail was initially completed in 1937 when the last 2 miles were opened on Mount Sugarloaf in Maine. The southern terminus was then Mount Oglethorpe, Ga. Major changes since then in Maine, Virginia, Tennessee, North Carolina, and Georgia have resulted in a stabilized trail route through scenic and more isolated regions.

"It is very interesting to note that the trail has been the pioneer. Interested individuals have carried the route forward; then, after them, have come the clubs to utilize and maintain the trail. One might have expected the reverse; that is, that the formation of clubs would precede the trail. But, with the exception of the 3-year-old isolated Smoky Mountains Hiking Club at Knoxville, Tenn., there were no organizations below Harrisburg, Pa. The penetration of the southern Appalachians began with the formation at Washington, D.C., in late 1927 of the Potomac Appalachian Trail Club. Numerous other Appalachian trail clubs followed, so that, with insignificant exceptions, the entire trail route is now apportioned among these energetic organizations. These clubs, aiding the trail project, and individuals comprise the Appalachian Trail Conference.

"The Appalachian Trail Conference functions through a board of 18 managers, 3 being elected from each of the 6 districts into which the trail route is divided. The chairman is the conference's executive officer.

"The conference is a volunteer amateur recreational group. It is an experiment in amateurism on a very extensive scale. All the activities of the conference and the labor of maintaining trails are contributed by those interested in the project. The conference has no salaried employees. The expenses incurred in its activities are contributions to the cause. Its budget is decidedly limited. By reason of this situation, it will be appreciated that the conference's financial resources restrict a desire to furnish, gratis, maps, guidebooks, and further information as to the trail. However, with a view of indicating the availability of the extensive literature which is obtainable, there is printed on the reserve side a list of publications, in which various topics of interest to trail users are set forth under appropriate headings.[1]

"The Appalachian Trail Conference now meets each third year. Its membership consists of four classes: Class A, clubs which maintains specific portions of the Appalachian Trail; class B, clubs which support, by other means, the Appalachian trail project; class C, public officials (Federal and State) who have charge of areas through which the trail passes and who maintain the trail therein, and persons maintaining in an individual capacity certain designated portions of the trail; and class D, individual members. A class D member receives the publications (other than guidebooks) of the Appalachian Trail Conference which are issued during the membership period, including Appalachian Trailway News; this membership (dues $5 annually) offers a distinct opportunity to individuals actively to support the Appalachian Trail. The conference urges the enlistment, in this form, of persons interested in the trail. Applications for this membership, with a brief biographical statement, should be addressed to the Appalachian Trail Conference, Washington, D.C.

"A word as to the manner of marking this trail. There have been many experiments in the development of a standard marker for the trail. The museum collection is extensive. The earliest marker was an embossed, copper square with the trail insignia. Its softness rendered it an easy prey to souvenir hunters, so the then ATC Chairman Perkins designed a diamond-shaped galvanized iron marker, with the trail monogram printed on it. However, the main reliance in marking the Appalachian trail is a rectangular paint blaze, 6 by 2 inches. These blazes are placed fore and aft—like highway markers—in the direction of travel. White is the prevailing color, and blue for side trails. There is only one approved variation from this uniform blaze. This is the so-called double blaze—two superimposed blazes or markers—which constitute a warning of an obscure turn or change in direction, which might be otherwise overlooked.

---

[1] Full information as to current developments on the Appalachian trail is available through its publication, Appalachian Trailway News. This journal, issued three times a year (subscription $1.50 per year) not only affords an opportunity to be fully informed as to happenings on the Appalachian Trail route but offers an opportunity to lend support, in some measure, to the trail project. Subscriptions are urged.

"With the view of standardizing trail practices and thereby contributing to improved maintenance, the Appalachia Trail Conference has issued a manual on trail construction. This manual details the procedure to be followed in constructing, maintaining and marking the Appalachia trail.

"Originally, the Appalachian trail was a foot trail, the distinguishing feature of which was its practically endless character. Subsequently, by virtue of the so-called Appalachian trailway agreement, this area has attained a distinctive status. In the eight national forests and two national parks which the route traverses—federally owned land—a narrow zone, 1 mile in width, has been set apart on each side of the trail. In this area there are to be no new paralleling roads or other incompatible developments. In fact it is the creation of a new recreational area, reserved for the benefit of those who walk and camp. In 13 of the 14 States through which the route passes, similar agreements, for a lesser width, have been effected. Thus, the Appalachian trail passes into its second stage, the Appalachian trailway, a narrow, isolated zone set apart for those who find their recreation by virtue of their own unaided efforts.

"In addition to the development of an actual trail, the Appalachian Trail Conference has issued very extensive literature on trail technique and attendant phases of trail construction. For a person who has had no prior experience in travel along the Appalachian trail or on other trails, the conference particularly commends its publication No. 15, 'Suggestions for Appalachian Trail Users.' This publication has been prepared to answer many types of inquiry addressed to the conference. A perusal of the booklet will be of value even to the experienced trail traveler.

"Of primary importance is the issuing of guidebooks to the trail. The measuring of the trail and the obtaining of trail data kept progress with the actual construction of the trail. A number of local guides have crystallized into a series of guidebooks for the entire Appalachian Trail. The conference has also issued a comprehensive pamphlet, detailing the history, route, guidebook data, and literature on the trail project.

"The guidebooks for the Appalachia trail furnish necessary information preliminary to the trip. Accommodations are specifically set forth. The accommodations along the trail route are of two types: public, such as farmhouses, inns or camps on or adjacent to the trail; the second class is the shelter of the open type, known as a lean-to.

"Shelters, closed and open, are absolutely essential to a finished through trail. The ideal is a continuous chain of such structures at intervals of a moderate day's journey, say 7¼ miles, so that an active hiker may utilize every other one, yet a family party or one exploring side trails, photographing or observing the flora or geology, may have time for such activities and still find shelter each night.

"Since 1937 the plan of providing a continuous chain of open shelters along the Appalachian trail has been vigorously pressed by the conference. As of 1963, there are 221 of these structures along the trail. (Some do not have bunks.) In addition, there are two authorized campsites. In some sections there are long continuous units. From the northern terminus at Katahdin to the Vermont-Massachusetts line there is an unbroken chain of structures, with the exception of one still to be built at Rattle River in the White Mountain National Forest. In the central Appalachians in southern Pennsylvania, Maryland, and northern Virginia, there is a chain of 39 lean-tos, extending over 285 miles. After a gap of 27 miles there is through the Pedlar District of the George Washington and Glenwood Districts of the Jefferson National Forest a chain of lean-tos for 110 miles. Beyond this, in the Jefferson and Cherokee National Forests there is a chain of 15 lean-tos in 142 miles, with 3 to the south, and 6 to the north at varying intervals and the gaps are being rapidly filled. In the far southern Appalachians, in the contiguous Pisgah National Forest and Great Smoky Mountains National Park, there is a chain of 19 structures, extending over a distance of 130 miles. The chain is continuous for the southernmost 130 miles in the Nantahala and Georgia National Forests. The trail through publicly owned lands will eventually be 'complete,' as far as this chain of lean-tos is concerned.

"And now a brief word as to the route or geography of the trail. From Katahdin the trail leads in Maine, for 279 miles through an utter wilderness, past lake and stream over a disconnected series of peaks. It meets its first pronounced mountain group in the White Mountains of central New Hampshire, which it crosses from east to west. Near Rutland, Vt., the trail turns south for 100 miles along the Green Mountains. In western Massachusetts and northwest Connecticut, the route traverses the Berkshire and Taconic groups, the worndown remnant of a once much loftier range. The Hudson River is crossed at Bear Mountain Bridge. Then the trail leads close to the New York-New Jersey line, over a seemingly endless series of ridges, on its course to the Kittatinny Mountains at High Point Park. Here, for the first time, a narrow ridge crest indicates the route. Beyond the Delaware River, this front range of the Alleghenies becomes Blue Mountain. It and the ridges to the north are followed until, 8 miles beyond the Susquehanna River, the first major change of route is made. The Alleghenies are left and the trail crosses the Cumberland Valley, by secondary roads, to the northern base of the Blue Ridge. Here commences the range which is followed to the southern terminus of the trail. Through southern Pennsylvania and Maryland, where it bears the name of South Mountain, the Blue Ridge continues as a narrow crest line where trail location offers few problems. Three hundred miles south in Virginia, where the Roanoke River breaks through the range, the Blue Ridge forks. These forks, sometimes 100 miles apart, form an immense oval, coming together again at Springer Mountain in northern Georgia, the southern terminus of the trail. Lofty, transverse ranges, enclosing beautiful elevated valleys, connect the two forks. The eastern rim keeps the name Blue Ridge; the western rim is divided by rivers.

"The major route problems of the trail came here. There was one fixed point—the trail must pass through the Great Smokies on the western rim. The route originally utilized the eastern rim to New River in southern Virginia, then crossed the plateau between the rims to the western fork at Iron Mountain and continued south. In 1954 the trail was relocated to follow the western rim. At the southern end of the Great Smokies, a cross-range, the Nantahala Mountains, leads back to the eastern rim, which is followed to Springer Mountain, the southern terminus of the trail.

"The brief résumé merely serves to indicate the character of the Appalachian trail. Its successive changing zones of birds, animal, and plant life fascinate the traveler. It is indeed a guide to the study of nature. Of it has been written by one who served it well during an all too short life: 'Remote for detachment, narrow for chosen company, winding for leisure, lonely for contemplation, the trail leads not merely north and south but upward to the body, mind, and soul of man.'

"The length of the trail is now approximately 2,000 miles.

"The length in the several States is now:

	Miles
"Maine	279.23
New Hampshire	153.42
Vermont	133.76
Massachusetts	82.69
Connecticut	55.75
New York-New Jersey	158.75
Pennsylvania	215.87
Maryland	37.14
Virginia	462.28
Tennessee	112.60
North Carolina-Tennessee	147.79
North Carolina	79.67
Georgia	76.44"

DEMOCRACY REACHES FARTHER WESTWARD ACROSS PACIFIC

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, an event of real significance in the history of man's progress on earth occurred 3 days ago and was completely overlooked by the press. I think this is not hard to understand in view of the remote area in which it occurred.

On January 19, the first free elections ever held in that part of the world were conducted in Micronesia when the people of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands elected legislators. Thus did self-government come to yet another part of the globe.

The United States administers Micronesia under a trusteeship for the United Nations. Most of these islands had been overrun and seized by the Japanese during World War II. Our forces, as they worked their way through the western Pacific Ocean, liberated them one by one. The names of island groups in Micronesia will be well remembered by many GI's and their loved ones. They include the Marshall, Caroline, and Mariana Islands, where many important battles were fought and many American young men gave their lives.

Since the war the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands has offered a window to the world on what can be accomplished in promoting real democracy. I am proud of the fact that a man who was born in Skagway, Alaska, is the very able High Commissioner of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. He is M. Wilfred Goding. One of his principal assistants until recently was also an Alaskan—Joseph T. Flakne, who has now retired.

In Micronesia there are great opportunities for the United States to promote and develop ideals that will counter and defeat Communist ideas and subversion. The people of Micronesia are making great economic, cultural, and political progress. The eyes of the world are on this progress.

Recently a United Nations mission in reporting to the U.N. on its inspection trip to the islands, recognized the good work that is being accomplished. The mission's members were from Liberia, New

Zealand, Great Britain, and China. They applauded the evidence of political development in the islands since their last visit in 1961. They spoke of the political freedom that prevails and especially of the amicable relations between the American administration and the islanders. They stressed that besides political progress there have been great cultural and economic advances accomplished.

Such reports are not common in the United Nations where debates about trust or colonial territories evoke the familiar charges of exploitation. The strongest impression carried away by the mission was a new sense of unity among the island people. The mission's report emphasized that this was no small achievement in a trust territory consisting of 2,000 islands scattered across 3 million square miles of ocean.

The political development of the islands has been so successful as to make possible elections and the establishment of a Micronesian parliamentary government. This is being accomplished by this week's free election of members of both houses of the legislature.

Mr. President, a few years ago our Government was experimenting on one of the islands of Micronesia, Eniwetok, with a great force unleashed in very recent times. This was the atomic bomb. I suggest that the new force being unleashed in Micronesia in the form of political self-government will in the long run prove to be even more important and revolutionary. I am pleased to be able to bring to the people of the United States this good news of another great forward step in man's progress.

And it is heartening that that great step forward has taken place under U.S. guidance, U.S. sponsorship, U.S. leadership. Thus, westward not the course of empire but of democracy takes its way.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TUESDAY

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, under the order previously entered, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until Tuesday next, at noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 27 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the previous order, until Tuesday, January 26, 1965, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 22, 1965:

Adm. James S. Russell, U.S. Navy, for appointment to the grade of admiral, when retired, pursuant to the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5233.

Having designated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, Vice Adm. John S. Thach, U.S. Navy, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, I nominate him for appointment to the grade of admiral while so serving.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JANUARY 25, 1965

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. William Diakiw, St. Joseph's Ukrainian Orthodox Church, Sharon, Pa., offered the following prayer:

O God, beneath whose guiding hand our forefathers crossed the sea, we, their beneficiaries, this day bow our heads before Thy Majesty: gratefully, humbly, and reverently.

Father, we ask Thee to bless our President, Lyndon B. Johnson, the members of his Cabinet, the Senate, and this deliberative body, the House of Representatives of the United States of America.

Remember in Thy kingdom, O Lord, the great humanitarian and statesman, Sir Winston Churchill, one of the creators of the Atlantic Charter, which extended the four freedoms to all peoples and nations. May his soul repose among the just and his memory be eternal.

We thank Thee for favoring this grand land of ours with great men who loved Thee. They understood Thy truth that men are endowed "with certain unalienable rights, and that among these are life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness."

We, who believe these rights are for all men, in commemorating the 47th anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the Ukrainian National Republic, raise our prayer in behalf of this long-suffering nation, which is denied freedom by godless imperialism. Hear the plea of the many other peoples who continue to aspire to freedom, despite the brutal and ruthless suppression of this most despotic ideology and regime the world has ever known.

Ukrainian independence, proclaimed in a mute, self-centered world, became the first sacrifice to the satanic powers of communism. Continuous destruction of millions; the suffering of men, women, and children, constantly testify to the fact that Ukraine is still enslaved but not defeated. Merciful Lord, we humbly entreat Thee, do not permit this persistent struggle for liberty of the Ukrainian nation to go by the wayside unnoticed. Please awaken all freemen to their duty to suppress this growing evil over other innocent souls in the world.

Permit us, O gracious Lord, to bow our heads in solemn tribute to the countless defenders of freedom throughout the world. Many of these heroes have made the supreme sacrifice so that the torch of liberty may constantly proclaim the message of hope to all who are held in bondage.

Father, grant that the Ukrainian, and all other captive nations, may soon receive a new birth of freedom; that they may take their rightful place among the free nations of the world; we pray and beseech Thee through Jesus Christ, our Lord, Thy Son, who liveth and reigneth with Thee in the unity of the Holy Spirit, now and forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 21, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

SIR WINSTON CHURCHILL

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the close of business and all special orders heretofore entered into for today, I may address the House for 1 hour, in order that I may yield to Members on the subject of the life and service of Sir Winston Churchill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

ANNUAL PANEL MEETING OF COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND ASTRONAUTICS ON JANUARY 26 AND 27

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Science and Astronautics be allowed to sit on January 26 and 27 for its annual panel meeting of scientists while the House is in session.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

ANNUAL PANEL MEETING OF COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND ASTRONAUTICS ON JANUARY 26 AND 27

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Committee on Science and Astronautics and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, I am pleased to extend an invitation to attend a briefing by the Administrator, Mr. James E. Webb, and other senior NASA headquarters officials on the agency's space program.

Other NASA officials participating will include Dr. Wernher von Braun, Director, Marshall Space Flight Center; Dr. William H. Pickering, Director, Jet Propulsion Laboratory; and Astronaut L. Gordon Cooper.

The briefing will take place in the caucus room No. 362, Cannon House Office Building, at 10 a.m. on Thursday, January 28.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Science and Astronautics has taken this means of trying to give Members of the House an opportunity to meet the men and women who administer this great institution and to talk to them and so see for themselves the work they are doing. I urge those of you who can to attend the meetings.

TRIBUTE TO ED LARSON

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, all of Florida was shocked and saddened yesterday when it was learned that one of this Nation's truly great leaders had come to the end of his journey. I speak of our beloved State treasurer, J. Edwin Larson, one of the titans in Florida's history.

Death came suddenly and unexpectedly to this outstanding Floridian on Sunday, and with his passing, a chapter was closed which will forever serve as an inspiration for all men everywhere.

Florida has a unique cabinet system of government, the Governor serving as chairman of the cabinet and each of the six members of the cabinet having virtually an equal share in the affairs of our State.

We have had many fine men to serve in Florida's cabinet, but I can say without reservation that none have made any greater contribution than my friend, Ed Larson.

He was Florida's 16th treasurer, having taken office in January of 1941, and had just been sworn into his 7th consecutive term at the time of his passing. Born on June 27, 1900 at Brookston, Pa., he was educated at Allegheny College—A.B., and the University of Florida—LL. B. He served as principal of Keystone Heights High School and as mayor of Keystone Heights. Later he served as a county commissioner of Clay County, and was a member of the Florida House of Representatives from that county in 1929 and 1931. He served as a member of the Florida Senate in 1933 and served as collector of internal revenue for Florida 1933–39.

In his distinguished career he served as president of the National Association of Insurance Commissioners; National Association of State Auditors, Comptrollers and Treasurers; and National Association of Securities Administrators.

His record of service to the Masons in Florida is without parallel, serving as grand master of Masons in Florida and as grand patron of the Order of the Eastern Star. He was the recipient of the highest honor which the Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite of Free Masonry can confer, that of the 33d degree. He was a member of the Red Cross of Constantine and the Shrine.

Married to the former Clara Bussard of Keystone Heights, they have three lovely daughters. He was a member of the Methodist Church.

The devotion with which he served the people of Florida in a period when Florida became the fastest growing in the Southeast, is a record of service which can never be forgotten. His interests were wide and farflung, he always looked to the future.

Because of his vision and devotion, our State met the challenges which unprecedented growth brought. Great times call for great men, and surely J. Edwin Larson was a great man in a great time. He leaves a sorrowing State, a host of grieving friends, who were richly rewarded in having known him.

At the close of his journey, it can truly be said, here was a man among men, who left the world as a much better place in which to live, because of his efforts.

AN APPEAL TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and to include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on last Thursday, I called attention to an Associated Press story, announcing action of the Labor Department in setting up a $1.25 an hour minimum wage for youths who are to be employed in the Neighborhood Youth Corps projects under President Johnson's program to combat poverty.

Since then, I have heard from Art Wallhausen, Jr., president of the Mississippi County, Mo., Economic Opportunity Corp., protesting this action, and providing me with a copy of a letter he has written to President Johnson, setting forth the need for a modification of this order. I know, Mr. Speaker that there are many communities throughout this Nation, particularly in the rural areas, where the decision to require payment of the $1.25 minimum wage to nonskilled trainees, will have the effect of curtailing and in some instances actually preventing the programs to be put into effect.

Because the letter addressed to the President, written by Mr. Wallhausen, editor of one of the leading weekly newspapers in Missouri, who has been giving so generously of his time and talents, sets forth so clearly and succinctly how the Labor Department ruling does not follow the spirit and letter of Public Law 88–452, I have requested permission to make this letter a part of my remarks, in the hope that other Members of this House who are similarly affected, will be encouraged to join with me in attempting to have the law administered as Congress intended that it should be. I think the letter which follows points out another good example where bureaucratic agencies of Government show their contempt for Congress by refusing to follow directives in the law.

JANUARY 21, 1965.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: Judging by what we read in the newspapers concerning a top-level fight in the Department of Labor over whether or not to apply the $1.25 minimum wage to work-trainees in the Neighborhood Youth Corps programs, I believe you are the only court of appeal in the matter, and I respectfully ask your assistance.

I am writing as president of the Mississippi County not-for-profit corporation which is developing a community action program under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

The problem is this:

The school systems in this county have been preparing work-training programs under title 1–B of the act, and yesterday, when the $1.25 ruling was announced, had their paperwork ready to submit to the Labor Department. I understand no action has been taken in Washington on dozens of similar proposals, pending the Department ruling on wages.

Now, it appears, all these projects must be reworked, in most instances reducing the number of young people to be aided in order to raise the wage to $1.25. In some instances the added cost to the school systems, many of which would have to raise the salaries of supervisors in order to give them at least as high a wage as the trainees, would be so prohibitive that they are being forced to cancel plans for the work-training program.

Mr. President, the program is desperately needed here, where the dropout rate is the highest in the State of Missouri—36.7 percent of our 16- and 17-year-olds. However, as a former resident of the South, you must be familiar with the problems involved in trying to uplift a fourth of the population all at once. The problems are discouraging enough, without adding Government harassment to the list.

Recognizing that declared Government policy is a $1.25 minimum wage, I believe it is also Government policy to fight poverty, and to admit that the fight will take a different shape in each geographical region of the Nation.

The arbitrary ruling that $1.25 must be paid to work-trainees, when the going wage in the surrounding community is 75 cents an hour or less, is a violation of "appropriateness" as spelled out in the Economic Opportunity Act. It is also the ideal way to insure that your war on poverty is not put into effect in those very communities, like my own, which need it the most.

I realize, Mr. President, that the ruling has been thoroughly discussed, and that there is very likely no face saving way to reverse the decision. But perhaps a modification is in order.

It is bitterly disappointing to learn that the act, which wisely provides for the economic differences between the various regions and subregions of our Nation, is to be violated, apparently to appease the wrath of the president of the AFL–CIO and the Under Secretary of Labor, at the expense of the poor.

In urban areas, where the going wage rate is $1.25 or higher for apprentice-type labor I am certain there will be no objection to the Department's ruling.

However, I urgently request that you take note of the enclosed excerpt from the act, and order the Department of Labor to reconsider its ruling as it is to apply to the rural South.

Respectfully,
ART L. WALLHAUSEN, JR.,
President, Mississippi County Economic Opportunity Corp.

EXCERPT FROM PUBLIC LAW 88–452, THE ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT OF 1964

TITLE 1–B—WORK TRAINING PROGRAMS

SEC. 113. FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

(a) The Director is authorized to enter into agreements providing for the payment by him of part or all of the cost of a State or local program submitted hereunder if he determines, in accordance with such regulations as he may prescribe, that—

* * * * *

(5) the rates of pay and other conditions of employment will be appropriate and reasonable in the light of such factors as the type of work performed, geographical region, and proficiency of the employee;

THE CUTBACK OF VETERANS' FACILITIES

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the closing of 17 Veterans' Administration regional offices, 11 Veterans' Administration hospitals, and 4 domiciliaries as announced by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs on January 13, 1965. There are many places to eliminate waste, improve efficiency, and to save money, but this is not one of them. The best information I can gather convinces me these facilities are not surplus and therefore to me it boils down to a matter of keeping faith with our veterans.

Our World War I veterans are now old men. World War II veterans are middle aged or close to it. They, along with the young men who fought the Korean war for us and who fight the relatively minor, yet deadly, brush fire battles, are growing older. As they age, the injuries and infirmities of their military service are aggravated and more medical care as well as supporting administrative attention are required. If we are lucky enough and smart enough to prevent war the number of veterans needing the services offered by VA facilities will naturally decline. Then, of course, fewer facilities will be needed and cutbacks will be in order. But that time is still in the future.

I am impressed by the administration's efforts to eliminate waste and save taxpayers' money. I would be more impressed, however, if it were not apparent that more new programs and projects will be instituted rather than old ones eliminated. Our national debt is around the $325 billion mark. Our annual budget is straining at the $100 billion barrier. Our gold reserve is down to $15.6 billion. If there was ever a time for economy and efficiency, that time is now. I have always supported such efforts and, in fact, initiated a few, myself. But veterans' facilities and services cannot be measured by the usual dollar and efficiency yardsticks. We owe it to our veterans to have whatever is necessary and to have it conveniently located. An aged and sick old soldier ought not to have to travel far to see a doctor. He ought not be made to go a long distance to see a counselor at a regional office. If he is hospitalized, he ought to be close enough to home for his friends and relatives to visit conveniently.

The Veterans' Administration says it will save about $23 million per year as a result of closing these facilities, and that is a lot of money. But think of it in comparison with the war on poverty, for example, which is a $1 billion program the first year and projected to $2 billion the second and on up the escalator to $5 billion.

And think of foreign aid which, at best, even in the knowledge of its stanchest supporters, serves many dubious causes. This has consumed in the neighborhood of $120 billion over the years—enough to carry a $23 million veterans' program for more than 5,000 years. The $3.4 billion asked this year would carry the veterans' facilities they want to close for 165 years.

Today the Federal Government is concerned more than ever with the personal problems of some segments of our population. The President in his state of the Union message mentioned programs for the elderly, education, the poor, research to conquer disease, and other humanitarian and social problems. These are not in the least incompatible with care and facilities for our Nation's honored veterans.

I ask that more study be given the decision to close veterans' facilities. It seems to me that the care of veterans might well be coordinated with the goals of the Great Society. Certainly if it were not for these veterans there would be no American society, great or otherwise.

AIR FORCE ACADEMY CHEATING SCANDAL, LIKE WEST POINT CHEATING SCANDAL BEFORE IT, SHOWS FOLLY OF PERMITTING SERVICE ACADEMIES TO PURSUE POLICIES OF ATHLETIC PROFESSIONALISM

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Armed Services I have been distressed, as I know other Members have, by reports of the uncovering of a new service academy cheating scandal at the Air Force Academy at Colorado Springs. The facts that have already been announced with regard to the Air Force Academy scandal show that it bears many striking resemblances to the cheating scandal uncovered at the U.S. Military Academy at West Point in 1951. In both cases a major portion of the varsity football squad was involved.

Mr. Speaker, it is time we faced up to the plain truth which both these unfortunate events have now made clear. The fact that three-quarters of the Air Force Academy football squad were involved in this latest scandal and that of 100 cadets involved some 30 were football players makes it perfectly apparent that there is more than a purely coincidental connection between athletics as they are practiced at the service academies and cheating on examinations. The latest cheating scandal at the Air Force Academy is obviously the result of the athletic professionalism which is still rampant in all three of our service academies.

In their desperate efforts to recruit top athletes to build teams capable of competing with private colleges that follow similar standards of athletic professionalism, our service academies have admitted students with marginal academic records and with little if any real motivation for a service career. Inevitably under the pressures of the academy schedule, many of these individuals find that cheating is the only possible way they can continue their athletic careers at taxpayers' expense.

Whatever may be said for it in private colleges and universities, athletic professionalism, has no proper place in our service academies where college educations are provided at taxpayers' expense. The mission of these academies is solely to train career military leaders for the future, not to develop championship football teams or championship football players. Already criticism has been heard about whether the curriculums in our service academies are really adequate to the development of the kind of leaders we need in today's increasingly complex and technical military world. Developing championship football teams is certainly no requirement for building successful service careers. The lesson the so-called ivy league colleges learned many years ago is one our service academies ought to start learning now.

Mr. Speaker, I have called on Secretary McNamara to take steps without delay to put an end to athletic professionalism in these academies. I hope we may look for the same kind of prompt and vigorous action from the Secretary in this regard that we have seen demonstrated in connection with other matters. Some 3 years ago I brought to the attention of Members of the House, as well as to the attention of the Secretary of Defense, a documented case of improper, illegal, and dishonest methods followed in the recruiting of athletes for West Point. And I commented at the time on the effect which such procedures would be bound to have on cadets who are later required to subscribe to an honor system. Members who desire to examine the details of this case will find the facts set forth in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 108, part 10, pages 13169–13171. So far as I have been able to determine no one was ever disciplined as a result of these disclosures, and frankly I have seen little change in the recruiting procedures followed by the athletic staffs of our service academies as a result of this information which I brought to the attention of the Secretary of Defense.

Mr. Speaker, it is time now I believe for the Secretary of Defense to address himself to this aspect of military education, and to get rid, once and for all, of these procedures which not only have no proper place in the mission of our service academies and which seriously impair their effectiveness, as the latest developments at Colorado Springs are now demonstrating. Let me add, Mr. Speaker, we need a thorough housecleaning to do this job, not just some new kind of TV spectacular put on by public relations experts to cover it up.

THE INCREASING NUMBER OF CASES OF CHILD ABUSE OR NEGLECT

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, the increasing number of cases of child abuse or neglect is a serious problem in the District of Columbia. It has been estimated eight District children die each year because of abusive treatment or neglect on the part of their parents or persons responsible for their care. Many others are seriously injured.

To provide these children more protection my bill introduced today would require District of Columbia physicians to report suspected cases of child beating immediately to the Metropolitan Police Department. The bill gives these physicians immunity from lawsuits which might result from these reports.

Maryland already has such a law, but in Washington, too many children are treated for injuries inflicted upon them by irresponsible parents or guardians and then returned to homes where they are again mistreated and sometimes even beaten to death with no community efforts made to correct the situation. We have a responsibility to give these helpless children more protection.

THE UNITED NATIONS IS NEEDED IN SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, in a speech on South Vietnam in Washington, Mo., over the weekend, Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs William P. Bundy observed that "there may emerge possibilities for a U.N. role."

As one who has long urged a U.N. presence in South Vietnam, I am encouraged by this expression from an able and authoritative spokesman for the State Department. The options generally said to be available to us are the three unattractive ones of enlarging the war, precipitate withdrawal, and muddling along as we have been. Involving the United Nations is a constructive fourth alternative that we should do our best to bring about.

The jurisdiction of the U.N. in South Vietnam seems clear. What is happening there is a threat to world peace because the Vietnamese civil war is complicated by the involvement of outside powers. A U.N. presence could be invoked by the Governments of South Vietnam and the United States, as well as by others. If the U.N. Security Council failed to act, jurisdiction would devolve on the General Assembly under the uniting for peace procedure.

A U.N. presence in South Vietnam could help to stabilize the area. Action by South Vietnamese troops would rest on a firmer psychological foundation if their sponsor were the United Nations, rather than a fragile local government or a far-off United States. With peace restored, there would be an opportunity for negotiating the independence and neutrality of South Vietnam under circumstances which would guard against this being a cover for a Communist takeover.

Mr. Bundy cites two difficulties in the way of a U.N. presence in South Vietnam. First, as he points out, the U.N. involvement in the Congo was less than wholly effective. But from 1961 to their departure in 1964, United Nations troops did damp down a threat to world peace in the Congo. A U.N. operation in South Vietnam would be expensive, but it would be a tiny fraction of the more than $2 million a day which the United States alone is now spending in South Vietnam.

A second difficulty pointed out by Mr. Bundy is the doubt concerning a U.N. role expressed by the United Nations Secretary General U Thant. It is true that Mr. Thant has blown hot and cold on the idea of invoking the U.N. in the South Vietnam situation. Last July 8 he called for a U.N. peacekeeping mission to supervise a neutralization plan for South Vietnam. On August 6 Mr. Thant doubted that the U.N. could "be usefully involved in any settlement of the crisis in southeast Asia." If we and other leading members of the U.N. are willing to work hard for a U.N. presence in South Vietnam, I am confident the Secretary General would go along.

Most important of all, I am sure that the American people would go along. At dozens of meetings and on hundreds of doorsteps in my Wisconsin district in the last few months, I have received the warmest support for the idea that we invoke the moral authority of the U.N. to internationalize the position in South Vietnam.

REMOVING THE GOLD COVER IS NEEDED TO CONSERVE OUR WORLD ECONOMIC POSITION

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, it has long since become apparent that the statutory gold cover requirements not only serves no practical purpose but hamstrings the U.S. performance of its world economic role. There follows my recent statement on the subject, a Washington Post article of January 25 giving the views of the Committee for Economic Development, an editorial from the Washington Post of January 11, and an editorial from the New York Times of January 25.

REUSS STATEMENT FOR REPEAL OF GOLD COVER ON FEDERAL RESERVE DEPOSITS AND NOTES, JANUARY 7, 1965

The bill which I am submitting today, H.R. 2084, would repeal the 25 percent gold reserve requirement for Federal Reserve notes and deposits.

The gold cover is as useless to the body politic as the vermiform appendix is to the body physical of men. The domestic value of the dollar is completely unrelated to the amount of gold held by the Government. The strength of the dollar depends on maintaining a sound and strong economy. Today, money is created by the Federal Reserve to supply the needs of the economy—enough to keep it growing but not so much that inflation occurs. Money is not created simply because gold is owned by the Government. The present requirement for a 25 percent gold cover is, therefore, an anachronism—left over from days when people had not grown up to the realities of the modern money and banking system.

Useless as the gold cover requirement is in assuring the domestic value of the dollar, its existence is harmful in a number of ways.

First, while money is created by the Fed according to standards which have nothing to do with the gold supply, the arbitrary requirement that there must be a 25 percent gold cover will sooner or later make it impossible for the Fed to keep on adding to the money supply as the economy grows.

The gold supply today comes to $15.5 billion. Since the Fed's notes and deposit liabilities come to around $55 billion, $13.7 billion of the gold is the amount of cover needed today. This leaves only $1.8 billion as the 25 percent base against which new money can be created. When the Fed bumps up against this ceiling—and, at present rates of expansion in the money supply, this could be within 2 years—it would have to stop creating money. The economy would grind to a halt, and we would have a manmade depression on our hands.

Second, the existence of the gold cover for our domestic money leads uninformed foreigners to think that our entire gold supply is not available as backing for our dollar obligations abroad. This is not true. All of the $15.5 billion is, in fact, available to foreign official holders of dollars—central banks and governments—as backing for those dollars. A special provision of the Federal Reserve Act makes this possible. These facts are well known to official holders of claims, which now total around $13.5 billion. And the likelihood that these claims would all be presented against our gold is very slight.

However, the fact that our domestic gold cover requirements now apparently leaves only $1.8 billion as "free gold" can be used to arouse fears among those less informed. These fears can in turn be mobilized to exert undesirable pressures on the United States. The fearmongers and blackmailers are not scrupulous even with their figures. They frequently make it appear that against $1.8 billion in "free gold," international claims against our gold come to over $29 billion. This huge figure includes about $15.6 billion held by foreign private individuals, banks, nonofficial institutions—none of whom can directly purchase gold from the United States and nearly all of whom hold these dollars to pay for current transactions in this country.

There is no reason to expose ourselves to this kind of misunderstanding and threat of blackmail. We should, by repealing the useless 25 percent domestic gold cover, make it crystal clear that the whole of our $15.5 billion gold supply is available against official international claims.

Third, with all doubts removed on the availability of our gold for settling our international accounts, we could do what we should have been doing.

We could tell France that we prefer to get back all the $1 billion in dollars now in French monetary reserves in exchange for gold. Having given up its $1 billion in claims, it would lose its present ability to place pressures on this country or to cash in the claim at a time when it would be most embarrassing for the United States.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Jan. 25, 1965]

Gold Cover Removal Is Backed: Economists Favor U.S. Plan To Meet Claims on Dollar

(By Frank C. Porter)

Administration plans to remove the 25 percent gold cover on commercial bank deposits with the Federal Reserve System won strong backing yesterday from the influential Committee for Economic Development.

But the CED would go even further. It would also free the gold backing for Federal Reserve currency.

The committee is a nonprofit economic research organization that generally reflects the views of the more liberal wing of American big business. Two years ago its active support of President Kennedy's plan to slash income taxes helped crystallize corporate opinion in favor of the program.

ARGUMENT OF 1961 RECALLED

Yesterday's statement was issued by Frazar B. Wilde, CED chairman and board chairman of Connecticut General Life Insurance Co. He recalled that the CED called for abolition of the gold cover requirement 4 years ago and said its 1961 argument is even more valid today than it was then.

"There should be no doubt as to the availability of the total U.S. gold stock to meet international claims," he said.

The requirement was enacted as part of the Federal Reserve Act in 1913 at a time when Americans could exchange currency for gold. In its present form, it directs the Federal Reserve banks to maintain a supply of gold equal to 25 percent of their notes and deposit liabilities.

This required gold backing for notes and deposits now amounts to $13.5 billion.

GOLD SUPPLY DWINDLES

But the Nation's total gold supply has dwindled from a 1949 peak of $25 billion to just a bit over $15 billion.

This leaves a bare $1.5 billion in free gold with which to meet some $28 billion in international claims against the dollar.

There is little likelihood that foreign central banks would simultaneously rush to convert all these claims into U.S. gold. Until recently, in fact, confidence in the dollar had been so strong that the gold outflow was stemmed throughout most of 1964.

In the past few months, however, the crisis in the British pound and a steep rise in the U.S. deficit of international payments to an estimated annual rate of $5 billion in the fourth quarter has put the dollar under new pressure. France, which has been converting its dollar surpluses into American gold at a $400 million annual clip, announced earlier this month that it will step up its rate of conversion. And just last week the U.S. gold supply reached its lowest level since 1939.

The United States has pledged its entire gold supply, not just the $1.5 billion in free gold, to meet international claims. The law permits it to suspend the 25-percent domestic gold cover in an emergency.

But this fact is dimly understood in European capitals. To remove any lingering foreign doubts about the dollar's soundness and to permit the domestic money supply to grow with the economy, the Treasury announced recently it would seek legislation to remove the gold cover on Federal Reserve deposits. This would free nearly $5 billion more in gold.

The Treasury would keep the cover on currency, however, presumably to satisfy critics who contend the cover is necessary for monetary discipline and to avoid inflation. These critics caused Treasury Secretary C. Douglas Dillon to rescind a proposal to abolish the cover 3 years ago.

But opponents of the cover, such as the CED, insist it has been an anachronism ever since the rights of Americans to convert currency to gold was eliminated 30 years ago. The gold exchange standard inaugurated then limited the use of gold to the settlement of international accounts, they argue, and it is to this purpose that the whole gold supply should be dedicated.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Jan. 11, 1965]

Auri Sacra Fames

It would be too much to hope that the gold reserve requirement against the domestic liabilities of the Federal Reserve banks can be lifted without a rash of frightening rumors from the lips of those who are ignorant about monetary matters and the informed few who have a direct interest in perpetuating a hag-ridden myth. But the facts of the matter are available for all who are willing to ponder them with an open mind.

Under the present law the 12 Federal Reserve banks are required to maintain a 25 percent gold cover against their bank-note and deposit liabilities. The bank notes—paper currency of all denominations—now amount to about $34.5 billion. Deposit liabilities consist of the reserves of the private member banks, amounting to $18.5 billion, and the deposits of the U.S. Treasury and official foreign institutions, altogether a total of $19.5 billion.

Why is there a gold cover? The briefest answer is that it is a quaint relic of a bygone era. Before 1934, when the holders of Federal Reserve notes could freely exchange them for gold coins, a gold cover requirement was a necessity. But with inconvertible paper currencies the gold requirement, as Representative Henry S. Reuss remarked, "is as useless to the body politic as the vermiform appendix is to the body physical of men."

A failure to alter the gold-cover provisions of the law could lead to insufferable consequences. With the gold ratio at 27.6 percent, misinformed foreign holders of dollar claims may believe that the U.S. gold supply is not available to meet international obligations. And with only $1.5 billion in gold over and above the statutory requirement, the Federal Reserve System has little room to create the money required to keep a $630 billion economy growing. The only alternative would be a lowering of the reserve balances that the private banks must maintain at the Federal Reserve banks, but that solution might make monetary control far more difficult.

Auri sacra fames—the accursed craving for gold—has been a harbinger of misery since the dawn of civilization. But it needn't be if men will only act sensibly. The United States is one of three countries—the other two are very small—that still maintain a gold reserve against the domestic liabilities of their central banks. In dealing with the gold-cover appendix, as in surgery, there is greater safety in complete excision that in a partial operation. Representative Reuss' bill for total repeal of the gold cover deserves the wholehearted support of the administration.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 25, 1965]

Proposals on Gold

The proposal to eliminate the domestic gold cover so that the Nation's gold stock will be freely available to meet the demands of foreign creditors has met the objection that the gold cover is essential as a check against excessive monetary expansion.

But if the domestic gold cover remains at the present legal minimum of 25 percent the monetary authorities will be made to increase the money supply to meet the legitimate demands of a growing economy. If the gold lobby prevails, there is little doubt that foreign demand will increase, lowering the gold stock to the minimal 25-percent level.

A compromise solution suggested by C. E. Walker, of the American Bankers Association, calls for reducing rather than eliminating the gold cover. Mr. Walker admits that a change must be made to permit a necessary increase in the domestic money supply and to reassure foreign creditors. But he fears that removing the cover entirely would lead to a relaxation in the administration's efforts to defend the dollar.

Mr. Walker's proposal for keeping a small link to gold is more likely to induce complacency than do away with it. The gold cover has been reduced in the past without instilling a need for discipline; if it is reduced again, the natural tendency will be to sit back and relax until the gold stock erodes to whatever new minimum is set. But with no cover at all, the administration will be forced to step up its disciplinary measures to safeguard currency strength.

The idea that nothing should be done about removing the cover until new steps are taken to reduce the deficit also is a mistake. For it would create fresh doubts in Europe and, at the same time, provoke concern about the adequacy of the domestic monetary supply. The administration can best allay fears by combining a request to eliminate the gold cover with a series of other measures designed to reduce the dollar drain and the pressure on the gold stock.

I wish I could say, Mr. Speaker, that the reaction to the proposal to remove the gold cover has been uniformly favorable. In the interest of fairness, I wish to include some negative comments I have recently received:

Anna Maria, Fla.,
January 25, 1965.

Congressman Henry Reuss,
Washington, D.C.:

Your administration fronting for retirement dollar devaluation outrageous act of calumny, stupidity, stealthy inflation.

Edward and Emma Chandler.

Springfield, Mo.,
January 19, 1965.

Congressman Henry S. Reuss,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman: While I'm away from my beloved State of Wisconsin I hear you are playing the fool's part in fronting for the White House by introducing a bill to repeal the 25-percent support behind our dollar.

Have you lost your brains? What kind of American are you? This is insanity of the first order. Do you have a sound explanation?

Please let me hear from you.

E. R. Bell.

New York, N.Y.,
January 14, 1965.

Representative Henry S. Reuss.

Sir: If what Henry J. Taylor of the New York World-Telegram and Sun says about you in the enclosed article is true, how dare you, sir, to introduce such legislation as the outright repeal of our dollar's gold support?

Yours truly,

Mrs. Marie L. Greer.

Bluffton, S.C.,
January 18, 1965.

My Dear Mr. Reuss: I did not think any man intelligent enough to be elected to Congress would ever introduce legislation to sabotage American money.

My husband and I spent 3 years in Europe in the early thirties. Had you heard the stories we got from Germans about their iniquitous inflation and from Frenchmen who were robbed by their government of practically everything for which they had worked for lifetimes to accumulate.

To destroy the value of your money is sheer, brazen, criminal theft on the part of any government. Of course a government lessens its debt by the amount of the inflation. But it does it at the expense of the people from whom its money comes.

A German woman in Taormina told me her husband was on the street when German inflation reached its peak trying to buy something for what remained of his capital. The mark was catapulting so rapidly he went into a shop and bought a saddle in the window. She said he had never owned a saddle. He had never even owned a horse.

Lyndon Johnson is not God. Neither was Mr. Kennedy to whom money was something that appeared out of the blue when he wanted it. No one can prevent what happened to Germans and Frenchmen at the hands of their criminally dishonest governments if this country makes money just some scraps of paper run off of a press and that you carry in a wheelbarrow when you go shopping.

What, in the name of God, induced you to introduce such destructive legislation? This administration had better awake to the cold, hard truth that governments and people are alike. Both must live within their honest budgets * * * not incur debts they cannot pay * * * not live beyond their means.

It's merely a point of honor and integrity and the highest principles. Not to mention morals.

It is just as simple as that.

Sincerely,

EDITH DICKEY MOSES.

LA MESA, CALIF.,
January 22, 1965.

DEAR MR. REUSS: It is with much regret that I see you are advocating that the gold backing of our dollar be discontinued. It is a long, long step backwards.

Devaluation of currency has been tried in many countries in the past, always with disastrous results. We are in our present unhappy state, regarding money, because of complete fiscal irresponsibility.

The piece of paper money in your hand—no matter the number on it—is worth nothing, of course, without its gold backing. This is what you are asking for.

You may speak of our great country with its natural resources, manpower, and know-how. Who will work without good money in their hands with which to buy food, rent, etc.? Just plain, hard cash, gold-backed, is essential to our good standard of living.

Now we do not have sufficient gold reserves to pay for calls for our gold, or even stability for our own dollars. How appalling that you should suggest that we no longer keep the 25-percent gold backing for our own currency.

Sincerely,

MRS. ELIZABETH D. LOWE.

INDIANA RESERVOIR PROJECTS ARE CAPITAL ASSETS

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, the introduction today of the proposed Federal budget for 1966 marks the annual opening of the Pandora's box of criticism. Some of it is constructive, some of it destructive, a great deal of it fails to take into consideration all of the facts behind the individual requests.

We are certain to hear throughout the debate ahead that the Government fails to apply business principles in the implementation of the various budget requests. Invariably those who express this specific type of criticism tend to overlook one particular business principle which is always considered in many of the programs and projects advanced for consideration each year.

I am referring to those expenditures which add materially to the wealth and growth of our Nation. Funds expended by an industry to add a new production facility or to expand present facilities are regarded as an investment in the future. They result in an increase in the company's capital assets.

But when the Government spends money for the construction of reservoirs the critics overlook or fail to recognize the returns to be gained through this investment in the future.

The proposed budget for 1966 contains appropriation requests to continue construction of three major reservoir projects in my section of Indiana. Two of these projects will be virtually completed within the next fiscal year. The third will be completed in another 2 years. Upon completion these will represent a total expenditure of more than $60 million.

What is going to be the return on this investment? Basically these funds have been spent for flood control purposes. Going back through the years we find the average annual damage resulting from floods in the area below these projects running into several million dollars. When these projects are completed they will reduce this by $3 million each year. Thus within 20 years' time the reduction of flood damage will amount to the entire cost of these projects.

At the same time the impounded waters will create a new recreation industry which will add substantially to the area's economy.

These projects and many more like them are truly capital assets.

AN ADMINISTRATION OF EXCELLENCE FOR WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, last Monday, January 18, on the steps of West Virginia's State Capitol, the 27th Governor of the State of West Virginia, Hulett C. Smith, delivered a brilliant inaugural address. He set the tone of his new administration by pledging for West Virginia a new era of excellence in all fields.

With a firm mandate from the people of West Virginia based on the largest electoral majority won by any Governor since 1948, Governor Smith showed his determination to provide the spark of leadership necessary to ignite the State to a vast new cooperative effort. The snow-covered crowd in front of the capitol cheered when Governor Smith stated:

> First, I am determined that excellence in education will be our No. 1 goal. A great educational system is a prerequisite to a great State.

On the following day, Tuesday, January 19, immediately prior to flying to Washington for President Johnson's inauguration, Governor Smith delivered his first legislative message to a joint session of the West Virginia Senate and House of Delegates. Taken together, these two noble pronouncements set the future goals for West Virginia and spelled out in clear-cut fashion the pathway toward those goals.

Mr. Speaker, Gov. Hulett Smith is no stranger to government. He has been instilled with the instincts of sound public service. His father, the late Honorable Joe L. Smith, served in this body for eight consecutive terms from 1929 through 1944. He himself has been State chairman of the Democratic executive committee, and has more recently served as the West Virginia commissioner of commerce during a period when he helped engineer an unprecedented expansion of industry and rise in employment in the State.

With great pride, I ask my colleagues to review these great State papers of West Virginia's Governor Smith:

[From the Charleston Gazette, Jan. 19, 1965]

A PLEDGE TO EXCELLENCE—TEXT OF SMITH'S INAUGURAL ADDRESS

My fellow West Virginians, I step forward today to accept this opportunity to serve West Virginia and all its people—with confidence, and with determination—knowing that today, we begin an era of a new spirit in West Virginia.

Though humbled by the honor you have given me, I am at the same time eager to meet the challenges which face West Virginia.

Indebted to all my friends, I have a keen awareness that more than my efforts alone brought me to this day.

I am grateful to my teachers, whose counsel guided me; thankful to my parents, whose example, sacrifices, and training in a Christian home inspired me, and will strengthen me in the times ahead; and for my wife and children, whose patience, encouragement, and love sustain me.

My fellow citizens, we meet today to set the goals of a new administration—to build on the proud achievements of the past and to plan anew for the future.

It is a time to reaffirm those qualities which unite us, and to purge those elements which divide us.

We must set standards for our government's conduct, and search for a new spirit to unite us all, as true sons and daughters of this proud State.

I have pledged that I would give this State an administration of excellence, an administration which will demand the highest standards of ethics, integrity, and honesty from dedicated and qualified public servants and never tolerate incompetence or mediocrity.

Today, as your Governor, I am proud to reaffirm that pledge of excellence.

With excellence as our standard, let us determine our goals not just for 1 year, nor just for 4 years, but for all the years that lie ahead.

These plans must be both objective and visionary; both prudent and imaginative.

First, I am determined that excellence in education will be our No. 1 goal. A great educational system is a prerequisite to a great State.

We must improve our schools, so that every child will have the best possible teacher, and every teacher the best possible salary and classroom.

Educational excellence must extend from our grade schools through our colleges and universities.

We must expand our adult education program. In this manner, every citizen will have the opportunity for a continuing education.

It has been said, "there is a time for quality and a time for quantity." Today, education in West Virginia is in need of both.

The pursuit of excellence must also be extended to the road programs of West Virginia.

Through careful use of highway funds, and through systematic planning, we can accelerate the building of the road system which West Virginia has long needed, and which is now within our reach.

We must give high priority to roads which provide service to our more inaccessible communities, our industries and our farms, so they can have full and general access to marketplaces of the State and the Nation.

We must continue to expand our interstate and primary system, so that we can truly unite all sections of our State, and our State with the Nation.

The pursuit of excellence will carry into industry and commerce. We today are citizens of an opportunity State. We must explore all means to attract new industry and to encourage our existing industries to expand. This will mean more jobs for thousands of West Virginians.

This new spirit of excellence demands that we develop our tourist potential into a major industry for this State.

Nature has blessed West Virginia with great beauty. Now we must develop our scenic grandeur so that it will become a haven for the vacationer and the industrialist alike. And we must tell the world what we have to offer in West Virginia—and this, too, shall be done.

This new spirit of excellence will thrive only if there is an open-door policy between the State government and the people. I believe that the surest guarantee of responsible government is an informed public.

And this new spirit must be compassionate, compassionate for those who are in need in this State.

Together, then, we can build a State where self-reliant and intelligent citizens, united in progressive communities and rising above the petty prejudices of color, religion, and race, will create a society where decency and dignity will prevail.

To achieve these goals, I need your assistance and dedication.

The call to greatness is sounding for us today.

You and I—public servant and private citizen alike—have a responsibility to pursue the course of excellence, to work together, and to develop our State to its full potential.

Instilled with this unity of purpose, and steadfast in our desire to improve all areas of community life; vitally concerned with the welfare of all citizens of today and tomorrow; we can travel on that high road of excellence.

My fellow citizens, let us resolve today to instill this new spirit of excellence in our hearts and minds and lives, so that future generations might proudly boast of this great hour in our State's history.

Inspired by such resolution, and aware of our responsibilities to the future, we shall leave a heritage that will be a challenge to succeeding generations.

Let no West Virginian be mistaken. These goals of excellence will not easily be achieved.

But you and I must constantly strive to make West Virginia first in the constellation of the 50 States.

We have a solid foundation upon which to build, a foundation left to us by Governor Barron.

We are fortunate that he has been a forward-looking chief executive, who possessed the vision to create programs of progress, and the courage to seek unconventional answers to unprecedented problems.

It is our responsibility, therefore, to carry forward these programs with action, and to propose new legislation to meet the needs of the future.

Tomorrow, I will go before the legislature.

I will ask members of that distinguished body to join with me in creating new programs for better schools, more and better highways, for a more efficient and streamlined State government and such other legislative programs which are necessary steps toward achieving our goal of excellence in government.

There are many fields of promise waiting to be harvested in West Virginia.

Let us reap that bountiful harvest.

We stand today at that blessed moment of beginning again, when no achievement of the past appears quite good enough, and no prospect of the future seems impossible.

We recognize that in the Mountain State, we have mountains to climb and obstacles to overcome, as we move toward our goals.

But we have pinnacles to reach and we shall reach them.

And so, my fellow West Virginians, let us pursue the goal of excellence. Let us seek the new spirit in West Virginia. Let us seek new ways to advance the common good. And let us prayerfully and humbly ask guidance from a benevolent God who has so richly endowed our State.

For my part, I do not ask that the burdens of this great office be lightened, but that my back may be strengthened to bear them.

In such a spirit, and with such goals, we can achieve a greatness worthy of this State and of its people.

I pray to Almighty God that I be given the light to perform my duties with courage, wisdom, and compassion.

With this prayer, I welcome the challenges and burdens; the tasks and the responsibilities of this office.

[From the Charleston Gazette, Jan. 20, 1965]

TEXT OF GOVERNOR SMITH'S ADDRESS TO LEGISLATURE

Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, Members of the Legislature:

We gather today in one of West Virginia's most important hours.

We are fortunate to be given the opportunity to serve our State in such an exciting time.

It is a truly gratifying experience, and a challenge.

Our determination to accomplish a State government of excellence is supported by a groundswell of favorable public opinion.

The work we do here—our every effort—must have the active support of all of our citizens.

Every man, woman, and child who becomes an active worker for the cause of a government of excellence, and wages an individual campaign persuading others to be the same, is a key asset in our pursuit of excellence.

Self-interest groups shape public opinion only when most of us fail to speak and act.

This new administration—this administration of the new spirit—is convinced that our people are now eager to speak and act for the better West Virginia.

We still have problems to solve.

But public initiative has come to the front in West Virginia.

The tide is running with us.

For each generation, progress is an individual, do-it-yourself project.

It is only on this basis—each citizen contributing his time and talents for the good of all—that we can reach our great goals.

In government, as in life, we get out of it what we put into it—no more, no less.

We must march to meet the future.

But we must march together—West Virginians all.

We must win acceptance of the West Virginia image for what it really is.

We can do this.

We can do it by working for excellence.

What other people think of us depends entirely on what we do.

With three consecutive all-time high economic records to the State's credit, we have much of which to be proud.

But we cannot afford to relax our efforts—not even for a minute—for the job of progress never ends.

I am extremely confident about West Virginia's future—a future which can be as bright as we want it to be, for the call to greatness has sounded for West Virginia.

And, this call is echoed in our new spirit.

Let it be our resolve here today that no longer are we going to treat symptoms of problems, but causes of problems—that we are going to show the Nation and the world what cooperative action can do.

We declare in favor of excellence.

But our actions will speak louder than our words.

So, let our actions be an unmistakable expression of the will of our people.

EDUCATION

Last March, I presented my policy statement on education for West Virginia. Throughout the primary and general campaigns, I continued to stress that policy, expressing the belief that the most important citizen living today is the 6-year-old child who will enter school next fall. That child—and those children in school today—as well as those to follow, are the future of our State and of this Nation.

I will not take your time to review the needs of our schools. Our low ranking in most educational categories is well known to a large majority of West Virginians. I do want to reiterate my determination to give education highest priority.

Proposed legislation includes bills to increase teacher salaries, establish programs for school building construction, educational television, and remedial reading.

The West Virginia Education Association, our school boards association, and our State department of education have offered a comprehensive school improvement program called Decision 65.

I have studied this program carefully. It has been revised where revision was felt necessary and I shall submit it for your consideration, because I believe it to be realistic. It meets some of our most pressing needs, and its cost is spread over a 3-year period.

An administration bill embraces these principles and it will be introduced today.

In its first year, the program calls for more than $12 million in new money, including funds for the comprehensive plan, and totals approximately $33 million for a 3-year period.

This will mean an average salary increase of more than $1,300 during that period. These increases will materially help boards of education to keep qualified teachers in the classrooms—the teachers who are the very heart of any school system.

ROADS

Along with education, another problem of great urgency is roads.

My special task force on roads has suggested establishment of county committees to recommend criteria of need and priorities for secondary road construction, maintenance and long-range planning.

The task force recommended that standards of design be developed for each functional classification of roads, and that classifications be made statutory. It is further recommended that an immediate study be made to provide adequate financing of our secondary road system.

It is proposed that proceeds from bonds issued under the better roads amendment of 1964 be placed in a separate account, and audited by a separate firm.

I ask approval of legislation for these road programs during the present session.

HIGHWAY SAFETY

The needless loss of lives on our highways, and the increasing number of accidents which cause serious injury to our people, points out the need for expansion and improvement of our State's traffic safety program.

We must take steps to protect the careful driver from the reckless driver. Expansion of the department of public safety, as provided in the budget bill, will be a big move in this direction.

To protect our young drivers, and others who travel our roads, we must establish a drivers' education program in every one of our secondary schools.

I also urge a probationary license for drivers between the ages of 16 and 18. Under such a plan, violations of any of the State's traffic vehicle control and movement laws would mean suspension of such a probationary license.

HEALTH

A matter of serious concern to health and law-enforcement authorities is the increased use of so-called "pep" pills by drivers of motor vehicles.

I propose legislation providing for control of both the sale and possession of such drugs, which, when used improperly, can result in the loss of lives.

The need for a good Samaritan law also exists in West Virginia.

Many automobile accident victims are reportedly denied first aid and emergency care because the threat of lawsuits looms over those persons who might render such care and services.

These situations arise from alleged malpractice, omissions, lack of continuity in care, and the like—despite the fact that these persons may have given emergency care only because they were at or near the scene of an accident, and despite the fact that they performed their services under the most adverse circumstances, and with the best of intentions.

Adequate protection should be given those who voluntarily render such help, solely on the basis of being a good Samaritan.

VITAL STATISTICS

West Virginia's present law on the registration of vital statistics is outmoded. The law is vague and sketchy. Certain provisions essential to a sound vital statistics act are either lacking or inadequate.

Improvements in this law should be made during the present session.

EXECUTIVE REORGANIZATION

The challenges we face today demand that we have a modern and efficient government. Therefore, I strongly recommend that we begin today the task of reorganizing the executive branch of State government, in order that we may serve the people of this State in the best and most efficient manner.

Specifically, initial steps should be taken to modernize our fiscal structure by streamlining operations in budgeting, accounting, auditing, and treasury management.

In addition, action should be taken to consolidate responsibilities in penal and corrective fields by establishing a division of corrections within the department of public institutions.

CONSTITUTIONAL REVISION

The operation of our State government today is severely limited and often made more costly by provisions of a State constitution written 93 years ago.

Since 1872, when our constitution was fashioned, our people have seen fit to make a number of changes. A great many more are needed today; and still more undoubtedly would be necessary in the future.

In an effort to strengthen our governmental structure, I am recommending a constitutional convention, and I urge you to take appropriate legislative action to accomplish this purpose.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

We in State government have the responsibility of protecting the rights of the public, as well as the rights of those who serve the public.

I consider appropriate conflict-of-interest legislation an integral part of this administration, which has excellence as its goal. Such legislation, of course, must contain proper enforcement and penalty provisions.

A special task force has been appointed by your Governor to make recommendations on this matter. This task force has requested that you appoint a legislative committee to join in an investigation of this subject, and to give it further study before taking whatever action you deem appropriate.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT

With an eye to the future and with a constant awareness of the need to alleviate all forms of poverty in this State, West Virginia has joined ambitiously with the Federal Government in order to benefit from the many programs available under the Economic Opportunity Act.

Many of our communities, as well as agencies in State government, have been very active in their participation under this program and, in the future, it will mean many more inroads in the war against poverty in West Virginia.

Legislation will be presented for your consideration to assure that we utilize all the advantages available to us under this act.

CONSUMER PROTECTION

Protection of the West Virginia consumer against fraud has become a serious matter and deserves immediate attention. Far too often, the public is exploited through misrepresentations.

Some agencies of the State have regulatory powers in this particular field. However, the housewives and the shoppers of West Virginia often are victimized in areas not specifically covered by existing laws.

I hereby propose establishment of a division of consumer protection within the office of the attorney general. Legislation to accomplish this will soon be introduced.

This will authorize the attorney general to take whatever action is necessary—criminal or otherwise—against such fraudulent practices.

INVESTMENT OF FUNDS

Liberalization of laws relating to investment of State funds, with appropriate safeguards, would bring a substantial increase in income for West Virginia.

Under the present system, restrictions result in an interest yield to this State, which is considerably less than that of most other States.

West Virginia investments are earning approximately 1 percent less than those of neighboring States. This 1 percent on our investments of which I speak would have meant an additional $2,750,000 income for this State in the last fiscal year.

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

In the last 4 years, significant improvements have been made in our unemployment compensation laws. Both the fund level and the benefit schedule have been strengthened.

You will receive proposals soon for further improvements in this vital area of activity.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION

A more realistic benefit schedule is needed in workmen's compensation.

In addition, other suggested changes would remove the limitation on the amount of medical expenses, and would make total temporary benefits no longer deductible from statutory permanent partial awards.

WAGES

The record economic progress West Virginia has experienced in the past 4 years has resulted in alltime high personal incomes for most West Virginians.

Yet many of our citizens have not shared in this prosperity for the simple reason that their wage rates are too low.

To help relieve this situation, there should be a maximum workweek, and a minimum wage of $1 an hour.

In this same general field, fringe benefits should be included as wage costs in computing wages under the prevailing wage rate act.

You will also be asked to consider legislation which will guarantee equal pay for women who do the same work as men.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Action is needed to strengthen the authority and scope of service performed by the State commissioner of labor.

The commissioner should be authorized by statute to mediate disagreements between labor and management in areas currently exempt from Federal jurisdiction, and, when requested by both sides.

HOUSING

You will soon receive legislation designed to give the department of commerce authority to help resolve the problem of inadequate housing in West Virginia.

Under such legislation, the department's duty would be to cooperate with private builders, building craft unions, municipal and county governments, and Federal and State agencies. This would constitute a joint effort toward eliminating inadequate housing in this State.

CLEANUP AND BEAUTIFICATION

West Virginia's nationally recognized cleanup and beautification program certainly will be continued by the new administration.

The cleanup has been a grassroots movement from its beginning 4 years ago. Volunteers in all parts of the State have made the program an outstanding success.

I am sure that this effective interest and support by volunteers will be continued and increased.

This volunteer effort will be given further support by the department of commerce.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

With further regard to the department of commerce, you will be asked to approve certain minor changes of a technical nature in the 1961 act that created the department.

It is suggested that you study the possibility of setting up a science and space unit within the department.

Such a unit would pool this State's efforts to meet the challenge of developing our scientific capabilities. It would also seek to obtain more space business for West Virginia industries. Above all, such an organization would formulate a policy aimed at strengthening development of all sciences in this State.

WOOD UTILIZATION

You may want to consider new action in the field of wood utilization.

Wood production has been increased substantially in recent years, and its use in manufacturing has grown rapidly since creation of the Governor's committee on wood utilization in 1961.

The wood utilization conference must be continued; research programs dealing with new wood products, plant management and related needs should be strengthened.

Each year, our West Virginia forests are plagued by forest fires, which result in a loss of much valuable timber.

This points up the need for a more vigorous plan of action in forest fire suppression, together with the need for necessary financing to carry out its objectives.

AGRICULTURE

The West Virginia poultry farmer deserves attention in your consideration of legislation to help agriculture.

There is a need for a new egg inspection law which would aid our farmers in competing on an equal basis with farmers of surrounding States. This will contribute to better poultry products for the State.

We also seek a uniform poultry feed law which would encourage expansion of the poultry industry.

The administration urges your approval of these bills.

WATER DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

I urge the repeal of the 1963 bill authorizing and setting forth the functions of the West Virginia Water Development Commission.

LAW OF CRIMINAL PROCEDURE

You will have before you proposals to update our law of criminal procedure, to bring it into compliance with recent decisions of Federal courts and the supreme court of West Virginia.

These proposals embrace revision of the law which deals with preliminary procedure, search and seizure, discovery, bail, guilty pleas, transcripts for indigents, and the right to counsel.

The bills represent a year's study and work by a special committee of the West Virginia State bar.

COUNTY AND MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENTS

Your attention is directed toward the financial problems of our counties and municipalities.

Our entire State will benefit from any action you take which would enable our counties and municipalities to provide the inprovements which are now essential to our continued economic growth.

BUDGET

Our continued economic growth has made possible increases in the education program, as well as improvements in other services without any increase in taxes to meet the budget recommendations.

These improvements include: an appropriation which will permit us to hire additional State policemen, and which will give a much needed salary increase in the present personnel;

Salary increases for lower-paid personnel in State institutions and mental hospitals;

Increased salaries and additional enforcement officers within the Department of Labor;

And the hiring of additional guards in our penal institutions.

Other legislation is still being considered which may be necessary or appropriate to recommend for your consideration later in this session.

CONCLUSION

Members of the legislature, I leave you now as one who seeks your help in meeting the challenges that lie ahead. We meet together in our present roles for the first time, yet I know that this initial meeting here today can only be the beginning of what will be an era of cooperation—an era of progress—an era of new ideas—and an era of decisive action for West Virginia.

This is the advent of a new administration whose chief measure of success will be determined by what all of us, together, can accomplish. We each have responsibilities to the people of this great State. To each one of you I pledge that this administration will never fail to recognize its responsibility to you. I have asked the people of West Virginia to come with me on a journey, a journey in pursuit of excellence. Alone, I can accomplish but little. Together, you and I, as elected representatives of those we serve, can do much.

Our friendship with one another and our devotion to West Virginia can lead us to that exciting day when the proudest boast a man can make is this: "I am a West Virginian."

SIR WINSTON CHURCHILL

Mrs. **BOLTON**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. **BOLTON**. Mr. Speaker, last evening with millions of other people here in this great country of ours, I listened to the CBS hour "Sir Winston Churchill—Man of the Century." Today I take this opportunity to thank the network for giving us these reminders of this great man's contribution to Britain, to the free world, and to his other country.

What a life was his. What a channel he was for the forces of good. How privileged we have been to have lived during the long years when he challenged all free people to match his courage to meet the full measure of his faith in his country.

"We will win." How often those words rang out loud and clear in those terrible years—in the voice that carried them across the world.

Undaunted he never accepted defeat. Unfaltering he led his people to victory.

In deepest gratitude for the "Churchill Hour" I would say to you who share with me the privileges and responsibilities of this U.S. Congress that there never was a time in our history when we so needed that same courage and vision and determination.

I challenge each one of you to renew your faith in these United States—to say to yourselves, to our country, and to the world "We can and we will win this battle for decency and honor which is being waged within our borders and in all corners of the globe."

Is there no one who will come forth and give us a clarion call to the battle we must wage against the false gods of discouragement and despair? Is there no one who will challenge us to fill our Government positions with men whose blood is the blood of heroes that we may hear on all sides the call that Sir Winston gave the free world in its darkest days "We will win"?

Mr. **HALL**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. **HALL**. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentlewoman from Ohio, the Honorable FRANCES P. BOLTON, has made an inspiring statement and I commend her, and would like to associate myself with her thoughts.

With the death of Sir Winston Churchill, England has lost a great leader, statesman, and soldier, maker and recorder of history. And the free world has lost the greatest fighter for freedom of this century. When England stood alone against the onslaught of Nazi tyranny, it was Churchill who summoned the English language to battle and in so doing prepared his people for the dark days that followed. Surely, hindsight must tell us that his leadership, his perseverance, and his courage not only changed the course of history, but may indeed have saved it from entering a new dark age in the midst of the 20th century.

As an author, Churchill has left us with a valuable insight for our own future course of action. In his book "The Gathering Storm" he perceived:

> If you will not fight for the right when you can easily win without bloodshed; if you will not fight when your victory will be sure and not too costly; you may come to the moment when you will have to fight when all the odds are against you and only a precarious chance of survival. There may even be a worse case. You may have to fight when there is no hope of victory, because it is better to perish than to live as slaves.

In evaluating Sir Winston's place in history, his own comments during the Battle of Britain could well be paraphrased: never have so many owed so much to one man.

U.S. GROUP OF THE INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION

Mr. **PIRNIE**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. **PIRNIE**. Mr. Speaker, on January 18, 1965, there was held the annual meeting of the U.S. group of the Interparliamentary Union.

At that time, officers were elected and the report of the executive secretary received. For the information of my colleagues, I will place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the slate of officers elected and the text of the report.

However, I would like to make special mention of the election of our former colleague, Katharine St. George, as an honorary member of the group and also as its secretary. This is fitting recognition of her exceptional talents which have been so effectively employed in this activity for many years.

We recall her skill as a parliamentarian, her linguistic ability, her forthrightness in debate, as well as her charm and understanding in personal relations. Likewise, we remember her splendid leadership of the U.S. group during the last Congress. She has done much to gain respect and friendship for our country through her fine work in the Union, and it is good news for us all that she has been cast in an appropriate role to permit future participation.

The full slate of officers and the report are as follows:

U.S. Group of the Interparliamentary Union

President: Herman E. Talmadge, Senator from Georgia.

Vice Presidents: Gordon Allott, Senator from Colorado; Alexander Pirnie, Representative from New York; John Sparkman, Senator from Alabama.

Treasurer: Paul C. Jones, Representative from Missouri.

Secretary: Katharine St. George.

Executive committee: Herman E. Talmadge, Senator from Georgia; Gordon Allott, Senator from Colorado; Alexander Pirnie, Representative from New York; John Sparkman, Senator from Alabama; Paul C. Jones, Representative from Missouri; Katharine St. George; W. Robert Poage, Representative from Texas; E. Ross Adair, Representative from Indiana; Thomas H. Kuchel, Senator from California.

Honorary members: Homer Ferguson, judge, Military Court of Appeals; Katharine St. George.

Permanent executive secretary: Dr. George B. Galloway.

Report of the Executive Secretary U.S. Group Interparliamentary Union, 1964

During the calendar year 1964 members of the U.S. group participated in three interparliamentary conferences. The first was the Third Pan-American Interparliamentary Conference, held at the Pan American Union, February 5–7, 1964, at the invitation of the U.S. group which planned, organized, and conducted the meeting. Mrs. St. George was elected permanent chairman of the Conference which was attended by delegations from the National Parliaments of Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Costa Rica, Mexico, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, and Venezuela. The Canadian and Spanish groups were represented by observers. The president of the Interparliamentary Council, Mr. Ranieri Mazzilli, and the secretary general of the Union, Mr. Andre de Blonay, also attended. Lively and interesting debates were held on the operation of the Alliance for Progress and on strengthening parliamentary institutions in the Americas. The Conference also amended the statutes of the Inter-American Regional Group, elected new officers, and agreed to hold the Fourth Regional Conference in Argentina in 1965.

The Third American Interparliamentary Conference heard addresses by Dean Rusk, Secretary of State; Andre de Blonay, Secretary General of the Interparliamentary Union; and Dr. Jose Mora, Secretary General of the Organization of American States. Official receptions were given to the delegates at the State Department and in the OAS headquarters, as well as a luncheon at the Cosmos Club. At the conclusion of the sessions, the delegates were taken on a visit to Cape Kennedy where they were shown some of the latest American space missiles.

The second meeting in which members of the U.S. group participated during 1964 was the spring meeting of the IPU Council and standing committees held in Lucerne, Switzerland, March 30 to April 5, 1964.

Two hundred and twenty-six Members of Parliament from 44 different countries in all regions of the world participated. The delegation from the United States consisted of Representative Katharine St. George, chairman; Representatives W. R. Poage, Alexander Pirnie, Emilio Q. Daddario, F. Bradford Morse, and Robert McClory; and Senators Gordon Allott and Mike Monroney. Dr. George B. Galloway, executive secretary; Darrell St. Claire, fiscal officer; and Dr. Charles J. Zinn, law revision counsel of the House of Representatives, accompanied the delegation.

The conference opened with a general session at which the delegates were welcomed by Swiss officials of Lucerne. Four days of the conference were devoted to a series of meetings by the five standing study committees of the Union. The political and disarmament committee, on which the United States was represented by Representatives Pirnie and Morse, debated four topics: (1) possible steps toward general disarmament, (2) relations between political and military alliances, (3) active coexistence and future international law, and (4) adaptation of the United Nations Charter and working methods to the requirements of an enlarged international society.

The Parliamentary and Juridical Committee, on which Representative Daddario represented the United States, discussed the report of its Subcommittee on Space Law, and considered the international protection of human rights and the role of members of parliament as intermediaries between the citizens and governments.

The Economic and Social Committee, where Senator Monroney and Representative Poage represented the United States, debated the fight against disparities in world economy, including (1) the role of international organizations in technical cooperation and development assistance, (2) means of insuring more extensive exchanges between countries with different political regimes and economic levels, and (3) the demographic problem: the present situation and proposed solutions.

The Cultural Committee, on which Representative McClory represented the United States, discussed democratic access to educational facilities and the fight against illiteracy in the developing countries. And the Committee on Non-Self-Governing Territories, where Senator Allott represented the United States, considered the implementation of the United Nations Declaration on Colonialism. On all these topics the U.S. delegation was equipped with position papers prepared in the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress.

During the Conference the Executive Committee of the Union held its 131st session and the Interparliamentary Council held its 94th session. Representative Katharine St. George and Senator Allott represented the United States at the session of the Inter-Parliamentary Council.

The five permanent study committees submitted an account of their work to the Interparliamentary Council which, at a meeting held on April 4, drew up the agenda for the 53d Interparliamentary Conference to be held in Copenhagen from August 20 to 28, 1964.

During the session of the Council on April 4 it was agreed to postpone until the Copenhagen Conference action on the application of the Republic of South Korea for reinstatement in the Union and not to admit observers from South Vietnam to the floor of the 53d Conference. Proposals formulated by the Executive Committee regarding the status and rights of honorary members of national groups at interparliamentary conferences were accepted by the Council. Secretary General Andre de Blonay was elected to that office for the period from July 1, 1965, to June 30, 1969. The Council elected the Honorable M. Senanayeke, member of the Parliament of Ceylon, to fill the vacancy on the Executive Committee caused by the dissolution of the South Vietnam Parliament and the withdrawal of Mr. Thiep. A proposal by Mr. Hermann Kopf, of the Federal Republic of Germany to change the name of the Committee on Non-Self-Governing Territories was debated in the Council, but a decision on a new name was postponed until the Copenhagen meeting.

During the Lucerne meetings Representative Alexander Pirnie was elected Vice Chairman of the Committee on Political Questions, International Security and Disarmament; and Representative Robert McClory was elected rapporteur of the Committee on Cultural Questions.

At the invitation of the Spanish group of the Interparliamentary Union, the U.S. delegation to the Lucerne meetings spent a few days in Spain as guests of the Spanish group, some of whose members had previously been entertained by the U.S. group in Washington. While in Madrid the congressional delegation was received at a reception in their honor given by the American Ambassador, Mr. Woodward, at his residence.

The delegation was also taken on a tour of the Cortes, the National Parliament of Spain, by the vice president of that body. Several members of the U.S. delegation also visited the Rota Naval Station. The generous hospitality of the Spanish group was deeply appreciated and greatly enjoyed.

The third meeting in which members of the U.S. group took part during 1964 was the 53d Conference of the Interparliamentary Union, held in Copenhagen, Denmark, August 20–28, 1964. Five hundred and twenty-five delegates from sixty-six of the seventy-five-member countries attending the meeting. The U.S. Congress was represented at the Conference by a delegation of 11 Senators and 13 Representatives.

Representatives St. George and Pirnie represented the United States at the meetings of the Interparliamentary Council on August 19; and Senator Sparkman and Mrs. St. George at the Council meeting on August 26. The agenda of the Council meetings included receipt of the Secretary General's report and the administrative report of the Geneva bureau for 1963–64; proposals for the election of officers of the 53d Conference; a report by the Executive Committee on the creation of new groups since the previous session of the Council; the organization of the 54th Conference to be held in Ottawa in September 1965; consideration of the place of meeting of the 55th Conference (Moscow, 1966); proposals of the names of Mr. Vilfan of Yugoslavia, Mr. Mbu of Nigeria, and Mr. Hacohen of Israel to fill three vacant seats on the Executive Committee; and of Mr. Senanayeke of Ceylon to replace Mr. Thiep of the Republic of Vietnam who had lost his parliamentary mandate. The above-mentioned delegates were subsequently elected to the Executive Committee. The Council also decided to hold the spring sessions of 1965, 1966, and 1967 at Dublin, Ireland, Canberra, Australia, and Mallorca, Spain, respectively.

During the Copenhagen Conference the five standing study committees of the Union met, considered amendments to their draft resolutions, exchanged views on their 1965 work programs, and adopted recommendations for submission to the Executive Committee. The United States was represented on these study committees by the following delegates:

1. Committee on political questions, international security, and disarmament: Senators Sparkman and Stennis and Representatives Pirnie, Daddario, and Smith.
2. Parliamentary and Judicial Committee: Representatives Daddario and Tollefson.
3. Economic and Social Committee: Senator Bennett and Representative Poage.
4. Committee on non-self-governing territories and ethnic questions: Senator Kuchel and Representative Derwinski.
5. Cultural committee: Representative McClory, who was the rapporteur of the committee, and Representatives Whalley and Morse.

Five days of the Conference were devoted to general debate on the Secretary General's report and on the following subjects:

1. The fight against disparities in world economy.
2. Adaptation of the United Nations Charter and working methods to the requirements of an enlarged international society.

3. The problem of education and the fight against illiteracy.

4. The role of members of parliament as intermediaries between the citizens and their government.

Delegates of the United States participated actively in all these debates which took place in plenary sessions. Mrs. Katherine St. George, chairman of the delegation, spoke in the general debate on "The Role of Parliament in a Changing World." In the debate on the fight against disparities in world economy Representatives ADAIR and JONES were the American spokesmen. Senator SPARKMAN and Representative PIRNIE presented the American viewpoint in the debate on the adaptation of the U.N. Charter. Representative MCCLORY submitted the report of the Cultural Committee on the problem of education and fight against illiteracy. And Senator TALMADGE spoke on the meaning of literacy in our times. Senator ALLOTT and Representative MORSE spoke for the United States on the role of Members of Parliament as intermediaries between citizens and governments.

While en route to Copenhagen, the U.S. delegation paid brief visits to Oslo, capital of Norway, and to Stockholm, capital of Sweden. In Oslo the delegation received a briefing on economic, social, and political conditions in Norway at the American Embassy from Ambassador Wharton and his staff. The delegation also visited the Storting, Norway's Parliament, where the Ambassador and Representative Tollefson presented to Storting President Langhelle engrossed copies of the congressional resolution congratulating the Storting on the 150th anniversary of the Norwegian Constitution. In an eloquent and moving televised speech, spoken in Norwegian, Representative Tollefson referred to his Norwegian ancestry and stressed the close ties that bind Norway and the United States together.

After a tour of the Storting, the U.S. group was entertained by the Norwegian Interparliamentary Group at a luncheon at the Shipping Club. Finn Moe, chairman of the foreign affairs committee, was the host. Senator HICKENLOOPER responded in a fine speech of warm appreciation. While in Oslo, Embassy visits were also arranged to Frogner Park with its famous Vigeland collection of sculptures, to Oslo's unique city hall, and to the Viking ships, *Kon-Tiki*, and Munch Museums.

At Stockholm the delegation received an instructive briefing by Ambassador James Graham Parsons at the American Embassy chancery. Later, Ambassador and Mrs. Parsons gave a reception in honor of the congressional delegation at their residence to which leading members of the Swedish Government, Parliament, banking, business, labor, science, and the press were invited. The delegation was also entertained at a reception at the Royal Ministry for Foreign Affairs. Conducted tours were arranged by the Embassy to the principal sights of the city, including a visit to *Vasa*, a 17th century warship, sunk in 1628, and recently raised from Stockholm harbor; Skansen, open-air museum and amusement park; Millesgarden; town hall; and Drottningholm Palace.

Upon arrival at Copenhagen, the U.S. delegation were met at the airport by Ambassador Katharine E. White and members of her staff. Later, the delegation received an informative briefing at the American chancery by our Ambassador and her leading aids on the government, economy, and foreign relations of Denmark. Ambassador White also gave a reception at her residence for the IPU delegation to which Danish officials, the Danish delegation, and American businessmen were invited.

While in Copenhagen the international committee of the students' club of the city organized an informal discussion between a panel of parliamentarians from the IPU Conference and a panel of leading Danish commentators on foreign politics. Senator HICKENLOOPER represented the U.S. Congress in this panel discussion on foreign affairs and ably upheld the American position in a lively and stimulating exchange with three leading Danish newspaper editors.

On the last day of the IPU Conference 10 members of the congressional delegation flew to Berlin where they were entertained at lunch at Harnack House by the U.S. commander and received situation and political briefings by General Polk and Minister Calhoun. In a 7-hour visit the party also took a tour of West Berlin and inspected the wall.

After the Copenhagen Conference several members of the U.S. delegation returned to the United States by way of Dublin, Ireland, where they were entertained at an airport luncheon by Hon. Frank Aiken, Irish Minister for External Affairs, and were given an official dinner by the Irish group of the IPU at the Gresham Hotel. There was also a reception at the U.S. Ambassador's residence in Phoenix Park.

In addition to participating in the three international Conferences described above, members of the U.S. group also met twice in the Capitol. They held their annual meeting at a luncheon in the Speaker's dining room on January 21, 1964, at which plans for the Third Pan-American Regional Conference were discussed. And they held a meeting on July 22 in the Senate conference room at which plans for the Copenhagen Conference were considered. These meetings were attended by Members of both Houses of Congress who had been appointed as delegates to these Conferences, and by staff aides.

During 1964 the executive secretary engaged in the following activities on behalf of the U.S. group:

1. Coordinated the preparation of background reports, position papers, and speech materials for the use of the congressional delegations to the spring meetings of the IPU at Lucerne, March 30–April 5, and to the 53d Conference of the Union at Copenhagen, August 20–28.

2. Prepared and sent to the Geneva bureau the annual report of the U.S. group for 1964, in accordance with article 3 of the IPU statutes.

3. Prepared a report on the Lucerne meeting of the IPU Council and standing study committees and distributed it to the officers of the U.S. group. Mrs. St. George inserted this report in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 110, part 6, pages 8120–8121.

4. Accompanied the congressional delegations to the Lucerne and Copenhagen Conferences and attended to their needs.

5. Carried on an extensive correspondence with the Geneva bureau of the Union and with other national groups.

6. Distributed among the officers of the U.S. group various official publications and documents of the Union received from Geneva.

7. Escorted numerous visiting parliamentarians from abroad around the Capitol and entertained them at lunch and dinner at the Cosmos Club.

Planned and organized the third American regional meeting of the Union which was held in Washington, D.C., at the Pan American Union, February 5–7.

In closing this report I wish to make special acknowledgement to Mr. Darrell St. Claire, chief clerk of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, for his many and invaluable services to the U.S. group as its fiscal officer. Mr. St. Claire was responsible for the arrangements for the Cape Kennedy trip in February, and for the hotel accommodations and the multifarious administrative arrangements for the U.S. delegations to the Lucerne and Copenhagen Conferences. His efficient, resourceful, and skillful competence was indispensable to the successful completion of these missions.

Respectfully submitted.

GEORGE B. GALLOWAY,
Executive Secretary.

HORTON BILL TO REPEAL MANUFACTURERS' EXCISE TAX ON PHOTOGRAPHIC EQUIPMENT

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to call to the attention of my colleagues a bill I am introducing today to repeal the manufacturers' excise tax on photographic equipment.

This wartime-imposed 10-percent tax was instituted in 1941, increased in 1942 to 15 percent on some items and 25 percent on others, leveled at 20 percent in 1951, and returned to 10 percent under the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, with the addition of a 5-percent tax on home projectors. My bill would amend the 1954 law by abolishing the present 10-percent manufacturers' excise tax, levied on cameras, lenses, and film and the 5-percent tax on home projectors.

I believe that as my fellow Members become more aware of the benefits this legislation will bring to all camera-carrying Americans as well as the photographic industry, they will join me in working for the elimination of this superfluous, discriminatory, and restrictive tax. For the following reasons, I urge prompt enactment of my proposal.

First, the Federal manufacturers' excise tax levied on photographic equipment is highly repressive—that is, it is levied contrary to our generally accepted philosophy of taxation according to ability to pay. Since these taxes are passed along and included in the purchase price of the commodity, they exert an especially punitive effect upon individuals in the lower income levels who can least afford to pay them.

Second, since the American consumer has just so much money available to spend on cameras, film and other photographic supplies, the excise tax only adds to the purchase price which must be charged for these products and makes it prohibitive for some persons to buy them. Decreased demand for photographic equipment discourages production and reduces employment in those firms engaged in manufacturing and retailing these items. The Federal Government also stands to lose as income tax revenues from business firms and individuals decline as a result of lower incomes and profits. Thus the restrictive effect of these taxes reacts adversely upon the entire American economy.

Past experience has demonstrated that reduction or elimination of excise taxes tends to spur consumption and provides our economy with the stimulus it needs.

For example, in April 1954, when the excise tax rate on photographic apparatus was reduced from 20 to 10 percent, it was immediately accompanied by a strong upsurge in sales of these products. During the past 5 years, however—from 1959 to 1963—sales of these taxed items have leveled off, while in contrast, sales of untaxed photographic supplies have continued to rise steadily year by year.

Third, I believe that the initial loss in Federal revenues which would accompany repeal the photographic excise taxes would soon be offset by rising income tax collections made possible by a more productive economy. Even the loss which would be felt at first would not be a significant one, since taxes on photographic supplies yielded only $30 million in revenues during the fiscal year 1964.

Fourth, this tax is especially harsh in that it proliferates, or is encountered time and again. For example in buying a camera one is subject not only to the excise tax levied on this item, but the purchaser must also pay the 10-percent tax on the film he buys to use in the camera and on the projector he purchases to show the film. In testimony which was presented in 1955, it was demonstrated that the photographic excise tax was encountered at least 34 times in preparing a photographic illustration for inclusion in a book or magazine. Thus, the regressive effects of such a tax is intensified by this proliferation.

Fifth, suppliers and retailers of photographic supplies are compelled to tie up a considerable amount of their capital in taxes which must be paid on goods held in inventory. Generally, dealers in photographic supplies keep at least $20,000 worth of merchandise on hand. A large portion of this will consist of taxable cameras, film, and projectors. Thus, these taxes work a real hardship on the small retailer, restricting the amount of supplies which he can afford to keep on hand and reducing his sales potential.

Finally, everything possible should be done to encourage such a highly creative and instructive hobby. Photographing highlights of travels and family and other social activities contributes greatly to the enjoyment of millions of Americans. Continuation of such a restrictive tax will only discourage many from pursuing a delightful and rewarding avocation.

Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to represent in Congress a portion of the city of Rochester, N.Y., birthplace and capital of much of the world's photographic industry. I have pointed out the competitive disadvantage of the photographic industry in our national economy—a fact that is especially distressing to my constituents whose livelihoods are so directly tied to this area. The remedy offered in my bill will have significant impact in Rochester. Similarly, it will be felt in homes, shops, and factories across the country.

In view of these considerations, we as legislators, consumers, and camera users can lift this heavy and unfair burden on the maker, seller, and buyer of photographic equipment by enacting this legislation.

CONGRESSMAN HORTON SALUTES KIWANIS INTERNATIONAL ON ITS 50TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, an enterprising organization as well as a fellowship club whose membership numbers more than a quarter of a million men in over 5,000 clubs, Kiwanis International, celebrated the 50th anniversary of its founding on January 21, 1915.

This golden anniversary of Kiwanis International—a name synonymous with community service—offers an occasion for Kiwanians everywhere both to reflect on a half century of significant service and to rededicate themselves to the objectives of promoting comradeship and civic service.

In saluting Kiwanis International on this proud occasion, I also want to point with special pride to the illustrious role which my home community of Rochester, N.Y., has played in Kiwanian history.

From its founding, Kiwanis International has had many ties to Rochester. In fact, the first president of Kiwanis International, George F. Hixson, was a Rochesterian and served the organization from 1916 to 1918.

Reference to the local Kiwanis clubs also is important in our recognition of Kiwanis since the very essence of Kiwanis wherever it exists—the United States, Canada, Mexico, the Caribbean, Europe, or the Far East—is the local club.

A service organization for men, Kiwanis inspires in its members a sense of community leadership. They learn to share the burdens of their fellow citizens, by doing human helpful things that less fortunate people cannot do for themselves, that individuals cannot accomplish except by collective action, that governments are not geared nor intended to do, and that just need doing for the good of all involved.

Kiwanis has been called "a phenomenon of the 20th century." This is so since its existence is evidence of social maturity: Members motivated by a common desire to serve and a desire for fellowship.

The activities—or, more appropriately, the good works—of Kiwanis can be seen all across our Nation and around the world. Just a skeleton listing of Kiwanian accomplishments would fill volumes. Even to recount the contributions of the Kiwanis clubs which serve the congressional district I represent would take many hours.

Kiwanis members render service to society at every level, among every group. Kiwanians work with boys and girls, with senior citizens, with the poor, the mentally retarded and the sick. They sponsor programs to increase church attendance, recruit teachers, improve safety standards, set up soil erosion projects, get out the vote, and point the way to career possibilities for high school and college students.

In all of these areas, we find close and careful concern for the objects of Kiwanis first set forth and adopted at the Denver convention in June 1924. Because they have such obvious meaning and motivation today, I take pleasure in repeating them as part of my remarks:

> To give primacy to the human and spiritual rather than to the material values of life.
>
> To encourage the daily living of the Golden Rule in all human relationships.
>
> To promote the adoption and the application of higher social, business, and professional standards.
>
> To develop, by precept and example, a more intelligent, aggressive, and serviceable citizenship.
>
> To provide, through Kiwanis clubs, a practical means to form enduring friendships, to render altruistic service, and to build better communities.
>
> To cooperate in creating and maintaining that sound public opinion and high idealism, which make possible the increase of righteousness, justice, patriotism, and good will.

And, Mr. Speaker, I also believe it is fitting on this occasion to repeat the 10 Kiwanis objectives for 1965.

> First. Build, defend, and preserve our heritage of freedom, our belief in God, and the dignity of man in his human and spiritual relationships.
>
> Second. Build international understanding by demonstrating the basic principle of the Golden Rule, using as an example Canada-United States good will.
>
> Third. Build an understanding of an appreciation for the private ownership of property by educating ourselves and our youth in the principles of a free capitalistic system.
>
> Fourth. Build responsible government by insisting upon worthy and competent men in all positions.
>
> Fifth. Build the highest standards of morality and integrity by encouraging organizations, businesses, professions, labor, and news media to adhere to self-regulated codes of ethics.
>
> Sixth. Build youth for leadership through Circle K and Key clubs and other worthy youth organizations, and create a desire to achieve excellence.
>
> Seventh. Build a more abundant existence by effective programs to preserve natural resources.
>
> Eighth. Build safer communities and preserve life.
>
> Ninth. Build opportunities for retiring and retired persons by developing programs which will enable them to make use of their skills and abilities.
>
> Tenth. Build pride of Kiwanis membership by dramatizing the golden anniversary and telling the Kiwanis story.

Mr. Speaker, on this golden anniversary of Kiwanis International it not only is my privilege to speak here in the House in tribute to Kiwanians the world over, but it also is my honor to act in behalf of the Genesee division of Kiwanis which serves the Rochester area with 23 Kiwanis clubs. I take pleasure in announcing that at the request of the division's lieutenant governor, Leonard N. Pilaroscia, who is my constituent, that I am today presenting a golden anniversary Kiwanis pen to our distinguished Speaker of the House of Representatives, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCormack] and to the President of the United States, the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson.

I salute Kiwanis and Kiwanians as they enter upon their second half century of fulfilling their motto: "We Build."

THE 1965 REAL ESTATE BOARD OF ROCHESTER, PRESIDENT FRED B. KRAVETZ, SPEAKS OF REALTOR ACCOMPLISHMENT

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, this past Thursday, January 21, it was my pleasure to be present for the Installation Dinner of the Real Estate Board of Rochester, N.Y., Inc. I was there because the realtors of my home community mean a great deal to me and because my good friend and constituent, Fred B. Kravetz, was installed for his second term in the board's presidency.

Realtors have a special place in the communities of our Nation. They are businessmen, but they also are zealous protectors of sacred rights secured to all of us by the U.S. Constitution.

In Rochester, realtors have an outstanding record of civic service and accomplishment. These men and women are partners in the progress we are achieving and, in many cases, the inspiration or impetus for it.

So that my colleagues in the House of Representatives can read and review the elements which make up this past year's contributions to the community from the realtors of Rochester, I take pleasure in sharing the speech which President Kravetz delivered on the occasion of his installation:

Ladies and gentlemen, welcome once again to the annual installation dinner of the Real Estate Board of Rochester.

On behalf of the officers and directors of the board, may I thank you for honoring us tonight with your presence. It is gratifying and flattering to us that your interest in the board and its activities takes such tangible form as the fine turnout in evidence here. It seems that all the important people of the Nation are here tonight attending this great event. I hope that Lyndon Baines isn't too lonely at his inauguration in Washington.

This occasion also gives me the opportunity to express a personal note of thanks to each of you for your confidence in reelecting me president of the Real Estate Board for 1965. This, as you know, is my second term in the presidency, and someone has remarked that, if I am given a third leg on it, it may mean permanent possession. However, I want to assure you tonight I have no such Rooseveltian aspirations. Two years in office are enough for any man who must also conduct the daily affairs of his own business. Being an officer can cut deeply into the time normally accorded the day-to-day task of deriving a living.

The situation is somewhat analogous to a priest who liked to play golf, and he asked his bishop what he considered a fair amount of time for this recreation. "Well," said the bishop wisely, "if you play in the hundreds, you're neglecting your golf; and if you play in the seventies, you're neglecting your parish."

The position of the presidency is constantly one of blood, sweat, and tears. It is impossible to foretell the precise nature of the problems that will confront you. You have to expect the pleasure of office sit-ins, badgering, abuse, and ridicule, but the prospect of ultimate accomplishment impels you to continue.

I have learned to know and understand the pulse and nerve center of this board. I stand ready to serve it with whatever vitality I possess.

Tonight I should like to review some of the accomplishments of the board during the past year and then to project some goals for the future.

When we speak of achievements, one of the most notable has been the improved image of the realtor in the Greater Rochester area. Somehow or other in the past, we have appeared to be against things without always having an acceptable counterproposal of our own.

During 1964 we attempted to create a more positive program. On controversial civic questions we went on record with policy statements of our position and recommendations, and it undoubtedly helped our cause to publicize ourselves as businessmen trying, like others, to rear families in this fine community of ours.

Representatives of the real estate board have appeared on their own time to present statements to such governing bodies as city council and the board of supervisors; to participate in interfaith meetings throughout this community; to address neighborhood improvement associations and, in cooperation with the Rochester Safety Council, to pay tribute to the winner of the annual clean-up, fix-up, paint-up campaign won last year by the Southside Neighborhood Association.

Further, some of our members have appeared on such radio shows as Eddie Meath's and Dorothy Cotton's to explain our activities during National Realtor Week, and we have participated in television discussions on redevelopment and rehabilitation of our inner city.

The Real Estate Board of Rochester saluted Bill Kane at a luncheon as realtor of the year, and we were most proud when recently one of our number, Realtor Robert Pierce, was honored twice in the same day for his heroism in breaking into a burning home and snatching back from the jaws of death a 1-year-old infant who, because of the heavy smoke, seemed certain to perish.

All these incidents and activities, plus continued and vigorous publicity, tended to enhance our image as realtors among the Rochester community. In the line of paid advertising we continued to keep the name, seal, and services of the realtor before the vast audience on radio and TV and in the newspapers.

What does an average observer see when he envisages a realtor?

He sees an individual happily building homes and cities—interested in his community and family—prosperous—contributing to the general welfare. He sees a realtor on the city council, zoning board, the civic planning commission, interested in politics and growth, a homeowner, a tenant, a stable, solid citizen, and member of the Real Estate Board of Rochester.

Now that is quite a bit to say of any man.

A year ago, when I attended the inauguration of NAREB President Ed Mendenhall in Washington, D.C., he said:

"There is no more appropriate and direct manner in which a realtor can discharge his civic responsibility than in giving his wholehearted support to municipal officials in shaking the dust from the housing codes, bringing them up to date, and giving them meaningful and impressive reinforcement.

"We should give our special attention * * * to the cold fact that enactment of a housing code does not improve housing. It takes enforcement to do that. This is an urgent field of action in which the municipality has a power that the Federal Government lacks."

How did we react to this appeal?

You know the answer as well as I. Rochester realtors were in large part responsible for the passage by the city council in August 1964, of an improved housing code. This code is designed to prevent overcrowding, and it also prescribes minimum standards of heating, plumbing, ventilation, and electricity.

At the time this desirable legislation was passed, however, the real estate board, while praising city council, sounded a warning that the new housing code would be only as good as its means of enforcement. The board stressed the point that through the intelligent administration of the property rehabilitation code we can preserve the housing we already have in the city.

There are so many things a realtor can do. Midtown is a brilliant example in which private capital—risk capital—cooperated with realtors and city government to bring about a successful enterprise that won the admiration of the Nation.

As realtors we believe in the concept that under all is the land. We further believe that upon its wise utilization and widely allocated ownership depend the survival and growth of free institutions and of our civilization. Realtors in Rochester have pioneered in urban renewal. They have played an important part in fostering and encouraging adoption by the city of the property rehabilitation and conservation code without which urban renewal programs are literally impossible.

Realtors have played an important part in urban renewal programs, from redevelopment of the Culver-Norton-Fernwood-Goodman area, which was one of the earliest and most successful urban renewal projects in the entire country to Midtown Plaza and Genesee Crossroads. We have been in a position to observe the success of these projects.

Realtors have been among the earliest proponents of urban renewal programs and have published blueprints for neighborhood conservation; the original edition was published in 1953 and it has been revised and updated to meet changing conditions. As realtors we are well aware that cities are built not by planners, but by decisions made in the marketplace, by the willingness of people to buy, sell, and invest, lease, and operate in the expectation of making profits. A city is concerned with improving its tax base and operating more efficiently and attracting new business, new industries, new investments enhancing the convenience, safety, health, and welfare of its citizens.

There is no other valid reason for encouraging urban renewal projects. Urban renewal efforts that fail to understand and take into account the needs and abilities of people are bound to fail. Worse, any such program will compound the bad effects and will damage, perhaps irreparably, the fabric that comprises the whole complex of our urban community.

Above all, we must realize that we could not solve the basic problems by simple relocating people from one area to another or by herding them into subsidized housing. Any urban renewal program inevitably requires sacrifices on the part of owners and tenants directly affected. Urban renewal is essential to the life of the community. It is costly to the taxpayers in terms of revenues lost to redevelopment. It is of the utmost importance that these sacrifices and expenses ultimately achieve the goals intended. Many of the problems leading to the need for urban renewal programs have arisen from our failure to understand and meet the needs and abilities of marginal families and marginal businesses, which comprise a significant portion of our urban renewal complex.

Our goal in the year ahead should be the continued improvement of the realtor's image: every realtor electing responsible legislators, and participating in worthy civic ventures where he has the ability to serve others. This outstanding community has a right to expect that our realtors are highly qualified, specialized people; more is expected of us. Our image must continue to be one of respect and responsibility. In one important respect the Real Estate Board of Rochester is the envy of the Nation. Through it are channeled better than 80 percent of the real estate transactions in this community.

Realtors in Rochester are a professionally minded, harmonious group. Through our cooperative efforts, especially in the efficiency of realtor photo multiple listings, we can sell a home in most instances within 45 days.

Our local board is in healthy condition. It furnishes an important spur to the general economy. No other business group can better evaluate every neighborhood as to the danger of deterioration into slums, for no other group is so closely associated with all factions of the economic scale.

We are striving in 1965 to make ourselves more competent realtors than ever before so that we may better serve our clients and the community. As a real estate board with a civic conscience, we have supported programs in the general interest to improve Rochester, and we shall continue to support them. However, we shall also oppose programs we deem not in the best interest of this community's proper future growth.

Our participation with the Rochester Safety Council is one good example. We have worked with it for better protection of neighborhoods, and we have joined with the Citizens' Tax League to watch constantly over the community's tax base. We have sponsored the annual "Civic Pride" luncheon to emphasize to the public some of the finest attributes of our outstanding community.

The real estate board is 55 years old in 1965—55 in 65. Born in 1910, it has matured into an important entity in this great community.

The Real Estate Board of Rochester has just completed another most successful year. We hope now not only to maintain the momentum we have generated, but to achieve even greater success for you in 1965.

Thank you.

THE LATE HONORABLE SIR WINSTON CHURCHILL

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, Great Britain and the United States have lost a son without peer. Sir Winston Churchill bestrode the free world like a mighty colossus. He was—as President de Gaulle has said of his role in the great drama of World War II—"the greatest."

Our century may not see his like again. His courage was indomitable. His sense of the course of history was clear and ofttimes prophetic. His eloquence was unmatched. His flashing wit could uplift a nation or devastate a mean thrust. His leadership in the House of Commons, in power and out, was formidable and farseeing.

Few men in high public life have written of history—and of history they made—with such authority and with such sweep.

For the future, Churchill will in some measure be part of all of us. His voice and his words will always beat the call to courage and to principle—whenever freedom and human dignity stand in danger; wherever tyranny raises up its head and whenever the time comes for freemen to stand together undaunted and unafraid.

I am sure all in this House deeply mourn his passing and extend all sympathy to his family, to his Queen and to Great Britain and the Commonwealth.

Mr. Speaker, I submit the following editorials for the Record:

[From the New York Times, Jan. 25, 1965]

Sir Winston Churchill

The power and the glory are gone, the soaring oratory, the eloquent pen, the cherubic face, the impish twinkle in his eyes, the jaunty cigar, the vitality that sparked a world.

One measure of Churchill's greatness is that no one today, now that the blaze of his genius has subsided into dust and ashes, need explain or describe or grope for words. He is one of those rare figures in history who stand like skyscrapers above the merely great. Usually history waits to recognize its supreme leaders, but there is no need to wait in Churchill's case.

He was Britain's glory in a special way, for he somehow managed to personify what is magnificent in the English race, and what is most appealing—John Bull with imperfections and eccentricities, but with the courage, the doggedness, the loyalty, the strength. Many who sought to isolate the essential quality of his greatness fastened upon his astonishing vitality. Never was there a man so durable, so indefatigable, so indomitable. It is almost incredible that there was a man among us yesterday who rode in the charge of the 21st Lancers at Omdurman and was a Member of Parliament under Queen Victoria, but who served as his nation's Prime Minister as late as 1955.

Yet durability and vitality are not in themselves a guarantee of greatness. They only assured him life and dominance at a moment of history when all his gifts and those of his people could combine to produce the miracle of Britain in the Second World War.

There was some quality of anticlimax about the rest. When the Great War was won, Winston Churchill was rejected as his nation's leader. A few of his military commanders were critical in their memoirs of some of his wartime decisions—as an earlier generation had been critical of his Gallipoli campaign in 1915–16.

A decade ago his work was done, in the sense that he no longer had the strength to carry on in his beloved House of Commons, although he remained an M.P. almost to the end. In some ways the whole of his life was devoted to the House of Commons. He did go on writing and, in fact, the fourth and last volume of his monumental "History of the English-Speaking Peoples" was only published in 1958. Writing for him was always an avocation although for years he had to make a living out of it and he wrote superbly.

He was, too, an orator whose speeches were never dull and sometimes reached the most inspiring heights of which our language is capable. Like Shakespeare, he will be full of quotations so long as the English language lives. But no one in later generations will ever recapture the thrill that came to us, listening over the radio in moments of glory and agony, as we heard Winston Churchill speak of blood, toil, tears and sweat, of their finest hour, of fighting on the beaches, in the fields, in the streets, of so much being owed by so many to so few.

In the sweet, sad process of looking back we have the consolation of these memories. A man like Winston Churchill makes everyone a part of his life, as if a little of that greatness were shared by each of us. That he should have been half American as well as all English was a special source of pleasure to Americans. Nowhere beyond his native land will he be more sincerely mourned than throughout the length and breadth of these United States.

Winston Churchill was the glory of a tremendous era in history encompassed by the two World Wars. He leaves one feeling that an age has gone into history with him. Years ago he wrote that he gave sincere thanks to the high gods for the gift of existence. We, too, have reason to be thankful for that gift.

One would like to think of his passing in terms jotted down in a notebook by another supremely great human being, Leonardo da Vinci: "Just as a day well spent brings happy sleep, so a life well spent brings happy death."

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Jan. 25, 1965]

John Crosby in London: The Greatest Man

London.—I love the story about the little boy whose mother took him to Chartwell and promised to introduce him to the greatest man in the world. Unfortunately, Winston Churchill was ill that day and the visit was called off. But the little boy slipped off down a corridor and followed a waiter into the sickroom. There he marched up and asked: "Are you the greatest man in the world?"

"Yes, I am," snarled Sir Winston. "Now push off."

He was, too, but I've always felt his greatest moments were, not during the war, but before it. England stood alone in 1940 and the great speeches—"blood, toil, tears, and sweat," "we shall fight in the fields and in the streets, we shall fight in the hills, we shall never surrender," "this was their finest hour" and the rest—thundered throughout the free world.

This was England's great ordeal but Winston Churchill's great ordeal came earlier, when with his monumental vision, he thundered unheard, unheeded, virtually unread, and unprinted his great warnings about the growing military power and intentions of Germany. Then, Churchill stood alone, against virtually all of England, to say nothing of its allies.

In 1936, when Hitler reoccupied the Rhineland, the shock waves rocked the chancelleries of the world but it was Churchill alone who specifically spelled out in precise terms, in a speech before the House of Commons, the military significance of this action.

"The creation of a line of forts opposite to the French front will enable German troops to be economized on that line and will enable the main forces to swing through Belgium and Holland," he said. This was in 1936, mind you, 2½ years before World War II started. Four years later, the German forces did exactly that.

"The whole aspect," Churchill said in his speech, "of the Baltic States, Poland, and Czechoslovakia, with which must be associated Yugoslavia, Rumania, Austria, and some other countries are all affected very decisively the moment this great work of reconstruction is completed." All these prophecies were appallingly accurate.

It was not a popular speech. England was in a mood of business as usual. Stanley Baldwin was Prime Minister and a very popular one. Some of Churchill's greatest speeches were blasts of withering scorn against the flaccidities of Baldwin's government:

"The Government cannot make up their minds, or they cannot get the Prime Minister to make up his mind. So they go on in strange paradox, decided only to be undecided, resolved to be irresolute, adamant for drift, solid for fluidity, all powerful to be impotent. So we go on preparing more months and years—precious, perhaps vital, for the greatness of Britain—for the locusts to eat."

Six months later Baldwin resigned and Churchill later wrote: "[Baldwin] laid down his wide authority he had carefully gathered and maintained but used as little as possible. He departed in a public glow of gratitude and esteem." Churchill was in anything but a public glow of gratitude or esteem.

In July 1936, 4 years before England was to be saved by a handful of Spitfire pilots, Churchill told a select committee of great public figures in the Prime Minister's room at the House of Commons: "We are facing the greatest danger and emergency in our history. At all costs, we must draw the flower of our youth into piloting airplanes. We must accelerate and simplify our aircraft production and push it to the largest scale. We are in danger as we have never been in danger before—no, not even at the height of the submarine campaign (of 1917)."

This prophetic utterance was totally discounted. The Government told Churchill his views were too gloomy, that nothing in the international situation justified upsetting the industrial life of the country or alarming the populace.

These were Churchill's finest hours when he was making prophecies of such stunning accuracy they could be put unchanged into the history books.

Churchill's darkest hours came well before World War II. One was Neville Chamberlain's rebuff of President Roosevelt's offer to mediate which Churchill considered "the last frail chance to save the world from tyranny otherwise than by war." The darkest hour was when Anthony Eden resigned as Foreign Secretary in protest against Chamberlain's appeasement policies on February 20, 1938.

"In a long life," he wrote, "I have had many ups and down. During all the war soon to come and in its darkest times, I never had any trouble sleeping. In the crisis of 1940, when so much responsibility lay upon me, and also at many other very anxious, awkward moments in the following 5 years, I could always flop into bed and go to sleep after the day's work was done. I slept sound and awoke refreshed and had no feelings except appetite to grapple with whatever the morning's boxes might bring. But on this night of February 20, 1938, and on this occasion alone, sleep deserted me. From midnight till dawn I lay on my bed consumed by emotions of sorrow and fear. I watched the daylight slowly creep in through the windows and saw before me in mental gaze the vision of death."

That was Churchill's darkest hour. England's came 2 years later in the Battle of Britain—September 15, 1940—when Churchill asked a subordinate: "How many Spitfires have we in reserve?"

"None, sir," was the reply.

"Then we must press forward the attack," said Churchill lightheartedly. That was the night the German air armadas finally desisted and the Battle of Britain was over just when Germany might have won it.

By then, Churchill was the beloved, indomitable hero of the whole free world. But I like him best when he was unloved—and still indomitable. That's the true best.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE—COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, last Friday I read in the papers that the supplemental appropriation for the Department of Agriculture in excess of $1 billion will be up for consideration on Tuesday, that is, tomorrow.

I made an effort to get a copy of the hearings and a copy of the report so that I could study up on this matter. None was available. So, this morning I called the Committee on Appropriations, and I also called the Subcommittee on Agriculture of the Committee on Appropriations and at both places asked for a copy of the hearings. None was available. I was told that the hearings and the report will not be available until about 10 o'clock tomorrow morning, which is about 2 hours ahead of the time set for consideration of this very important and very large appropriation bill.

I would like to have the opportunity to read this material ahead of the consideration of the matter on the House floor and no doubt some other Members would also like the opportunity.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. MAHON. A hearing was held on this matter. I have a copy of the page proof of the transcript. I would be very glad to make that available to the gentleman and I will do so. We have been pressed for time on the request to repair the capital structure of the Commodity Credit Corporation, as the gentleman knows. Time is of the essence in the matter. We had some notice of the probabilities of this supplemental request during the debate on the regular appropriation bill here on the floor last year.

When I make some remarks on the new budget in a few minutes, I will arrange to include in them some additional information about the CCC supplemental item. I quite agree that the gentleman, and all other Members who are interested, should have as much advance information as we reasonably can supply, we want to cooperate and we will cooperate. Time has been short, as the gentleman knows.

Mr. FINDLEY. Would it not be helpful if we could set over the consideration of this bill at least a day in order to give all Members an opportunity to read the hearings and study up on this very important bill?

Mr. MAHON. We were advised that the Commodity Credit Corporation needed this money last week. They are almost out of money and unable to meet commitments. It is imperative that we take action at the earliest possible moment. However, the hearings are short and the problem is easy to understand, so I think we can and should manage to dispose of the matter tomorrow.

Mr. FINDLEY. Would 1 day's delay be that important, I will ask the gentleman?

Mr. MAHON. We ought to move forward as we had planned I would say.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

BUDGET OF THE UNITED STATES, FISCAL YEAR 1966—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 15)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am presenting to you today the budget of the United States for the fiscal year 1966.

A budget is a plan of action. It defines our goals, charts our courses, and outlines our expectations. It reflects hard decisions and difficult choices. This budget is no exception.

It is a budget of priorities. It provides for what we must do, but not for all we would like to do.

It is a budget of both opportunity and sacrifice. It begins to grasp the opportunities of the Great Society. It is restrained by the sacrifices we must continue to make in order to keep our defenses strong and flexible.

This budget provides reasonably for our needs. It is not extravagant. Neither is it miserly.

It stands on five basic principles:

Government fiscal policies must promote national strength, economic progress, and individual opportunity.

Our tax system must continue to be made less burdensome, more equitable, and more conducive to continued economic expansion.

The Great Society must be a bold society. It must not fear to meet new challenges. It must not fail to seize new opportunities.

The Great Society must be a compassionate society. It must always be responsive to human needs.

The Great Society must be an efficient society. Less urgent programs must give way to make room for higher priority needs. And each program, old and new, must be conducted with maximum efficiency, economy, and productivity.

The major features of the 1966 budget translate these principles into action.

First, excise taxes are substantially reduced. Social security benefits, including hospital insurance, are increased. These are combined with other expenditure increases to yield an overall fiscal policy designed to maintain our steady economic expansion.

Second, the budget supports a massive defense establishment of steadily growing power, within reduced outlays.

Third, our international and space programs are being advanced at a satisfactory rate, but with smaller increases than in earlier years.

Fourth, expanded programs and higher expenditures are proposed to:

Provide better and more education for our children.

Extend the war against poverty.

Promote advances in the Nation's health.

Improve conditions in the urban areas where most of us live.

Help the Appalachian region lift itself out of its present depressed condition.

Strengthen our social security protection.

Increase economic opportunities in rural communities.

Encourage sound use of our natural resources.

Conserve natural beauty in our land.

Fifth, a large part of the funds for needed program expansion has come from savings, reductions, and economies in other parts of the budget.

FISCAL POLICY

This budget recognizes that a growing economy is needed to promote national strength and progress. It is also needed to move us toward a balanced budget. When the economy slows down, Federal revenues fall and spending tends to increase. The result is larger, not smaller, budget deficits.

Nearly 4 years ago, this Nation began its fourth postwar economic expansion. With the help of last year's income tax reduction—the largest and most comprehensive ever enacted—this expansion has already outlasted each of the previous three postwar recoveries.

During the past 4 years, the Nation's real output of goods and services—the gross national product—has grown at an average rate of about 5 percent per year.

New highs have been achieved in employment, income, and profits. Unemployment has been reduced. Price stability has been maintained.

This is a creditable record of achievement. And we look forward to continued growth in the year ahead. The Nation's output in calendar year 1965 is expected to reach $660 billion, plus or minus $5 billion.

Nevertheless, we must keep in mind that our economy is still producing at a level well below its potential. Nearly 4 million people are out of work. The unemployment rate is still nearly 5 percent. Plants and machines are standing idle while human wants and needs go unmet. An estimated 35 million people continue to live in poverty.

We cannot substitute last year's achievements for next year's goals; nor can we meet next year's challenge with last year's budget.

The revenue and expenditure proposals presented in the 1966 budget are carefully designed to promote continued economic expansion and improved economic opportunities.

This budget takes into account the need to reduce the Nation's balance-of-payments deficit. During the last calendar year, the deficit showed a significant decline. To help insure continued improvement, I will intensify efforts to carry out Federal activities with the least possible burden on our balance of payments.

BUDGET SUMMARY

Administrative budget: In preparing this budget, I have applied exacting tests of efficiency and necessity to all proposed expenditures. As a result, total administrative budget expenditures are being held to $99.7 billion in 1966. Although expenditures will rise by a relatively small amount, they will decline as a percent of the gross national product—to less than 15 percent, the lowest ratio achieved in 15 years.

Administrative budget receipts are expected to increase in 1966 to $94.4 billion. This is $3.2 billion over the estimated level for 1965. This increase reflects the economic growth anticipated in calendar year 1965. It also takes into account the revenue losses from proposed excise tax changes and from the second stage of income tax cuts enacted last year.

The resulting 1966 administrative budget deficit of $5.3 billion is $1 billion lower than the 1965 deficit, marking continued progress toward a balanced budget.

As our population increases, as science and technology change our methods of doing things, as our wants multiply with the growth in our incomes, and as urbanization creates new problems, there is growing need for more public and private services. It is evident that unless defense needs should decline substantially, Government expenditures will continue to rise over the long run.

At the same time, we have good reason to expect that Government expenditures in the years ahead will grow more slowly than the gross national product, so that the ratio of Federal spending to our total output will continue to decline.

The expenditures proposed in this budget reflect a careful balancing of national goals against budgetary costs. The budget I now present will, in my judgment, carry out the responsibilities of the Federal Government efficiently and wisely. It was constructed on that basis alone.

My budgets for both 1965 and 1966 have provided for major increases in areas of high national priority—particularly education, health, aid to the needy, housing, and the war on poverty. Also, for these 2 consecutive years, careful pruning of less urgent programs and vigorous cost reduction efforts have, on balance, resulted in lower expenditures in other major sectors of the budget. The application of these strict policies of priority and frugality is evident in the modest growth in administrative budget expenditures.

The changing Federal budget

[Fiscal years. In billions]

Description	Administrative budget expenditures				
	1964 actual	Change, 1964 to 1965	1965 estimate	Change, 1965 to 1966	1966 estimate
National defense and space	$58.4	−$1.3	$57.1	−$0.4	$56.7
Interest	10.8	+.5	11.3	+.3	11.6
Health, labor, education, housing and community development, economic opportunity program, and aid to the needy	6.7	+.7	7.4	+3.6	11.0
All other	21.8	−.1	21.7	−1.3	20.4
Total, administrative budget	97.7	−.2	97.5	+2.2	99.7

Consolidated cash statement: The administrative budget is based on a definition of Federal spending which excludes such important Federal activities as social security and highway construction that are financed through trust funds. A more comprehensive measure of the Government's finances is the consolidated cash budget which covers all of the Government's programs.

On the consolidated cash basis, total payments to the public are estimated at $127.4 billion in 1966. Total receipts from the public are estimated at $123.5 billion, resulting in a net excess of payments of $3.9 billion. The estimated increase of $6 billion in cash payments in 1966 over 1965 is mostly in trust funds which are financed by special taxes.

About $9.5 billion of the nondefense payments recommended in this budget—almost 2½ times the size of the entire cash deficit—represent an investment in physical and financial assets which will provide benefits to the Nation for many years to come. These payments are made for Federal civil public works, equipment, and loans as well as for highways, hospitals, and other State, local, and private assets.

Federal sector, national income accounts: Another measure of Federal finance which includes trust funds emphasizes the direct impact of Government fiscal activities on the economy. This measure is based on the national income accounts. Under this concept, Federal fiscal data are estimated on an accrual rather than a cash basis. Purely financial transactions—such as loans—which do not directly affect production or income are excluded. On this basis, the deficit for 1966 is estimated at $6 billion.

Federal expenditures as measured by the national income accounts are estimated to rise by $6.0 billion in 1966. This increase—covering both purchases of goods and services and other types of payments—will provide a strong stimulus for continued economic growth.

FEDERAL REVENUES

The Revenue Act of 1964 has played a major role in widening and strengthening our prosperity. At the beginning of this month, the second stage of the rate reductions provided under the act became effective. In total, last year's tax law will decrease consumer and business tax liabilities by about $14 billion in the current calendar year.

Summary of Federal receipts and payments

[Fiscal years. In billions]

Description	1964 actual	1965 estimate	1966 estimate
FEDERAL RECEIPTS			
Administrative budget receipts	$89.5	$91.2	$94.4
Trust fund receipts	30.3	30.5	33.6
Deduct: Intragovernmental transactions	4.3	4.3	4.5
Total cash receipts from the public	115.5	117.4	123.5
Add: Adjustment from cash to accrual basis	−.7	−.9	−1.8
Deduct: Receipts from loans, property sales, and other adjustments	.2	.5	.7
National income account receipts, Federal sector	114.7	116.0	121.0
FEDERAL PAYMENTS			
Administrative budget expenditures	97.7	97.5	99.7
Trust fund expenditures (including Government-sponsored enterprises)	28.9	29.0	32.9
Deduct: Intragovernmental transactions and other adjustments	6.2	5.1	5.2
Total cash payments to the public	120.3	121.4	127.4
Add: Adjustment from cash to accrual basis	1.8	1.7	1.1
Deduct: Disbursements for loans, land purchases, and other adjustments	3.6	2.1	1.5
National income account expenditures, Federal sector	118.5	121.0	127.0
EXCESS OF RECEIPTS (+) OR PAYMENTS (−)			
Administrative budget	−8.2	−6.3	−5.3
Receipts from and payments to the public	−4.8	−4.0	−3.9
National income accounts, Federal sector	−3.9	−5.0	−6.0

With this substantial change in income taxes completed, it is now appropriate to revise and adjust excise taxes as well. Some of the present excises are costly and inefficient to administer. Some impose onerous recordkeeping burdens on small business. Some distort consumer choices as among different kinds of goods.

Within the revenue requirements for continued progress toward a balanced budget, I believe it is vital that we correct the most pressing of these deficiencies this year. I plan to transmit to the Congress recommendations to repeal some excise taxes and reduce others. In addition to improving the tax system, the recommended changes will increase purchasing power and stimulate further growth in the economy.

These changes should become effective July 1, 1965. They will reduce tax liabilities on a full-year basis by $1.75 billion. Revenues collected by the Treasury in 1966 will be reduced by $1.5 billion.

My other major revenue proposals this year involve important activities financed through trust funds.

I am recommending prompt enactment of a hospital insurance program for elderly persons, who are finding hospital and medical costs far greater than their ability to pay. This program should be self-financing, with a combined employer-employee payroll contribution of 0.6 percent on the first $5,600 of income to start in calendar year 1966.

Receipts from the public

[Fiscal years. In billions]

Source	1964 actual	1965 estimate	1966 estimate
Administrative budget receipts:			
Individual income taxes	$48.7	$47.0	$48.2
Corporation income taxes	23.5	25.6	27.6
Excise taxes	10.2	10.7	9.8
Other	7.1	7.9	8.8
Total administrative budget receipts	89.5	91.2	94.4
Trust fund receipts:			
Employment taxes	16.8	16.7	18.7
Deposits by States, unemployment insurance	3.0	3.0	2.9
Excise taxes	3.5	3.6	4.0
Federal employee and agency payments for retirement	2.0	2.2	2.2
Interest on trust fund investments	1.6	1.7	1.9
Veterans life insurance premiums	.5	.5	.5
Other	2.8	2.8	3.5
Total trust fund receipts	30.3	30.5	33.6
Intragovernmental transactions (deduct)	4.3	4.3	4.5
Total receipts from the public	115.5	117.4	123.5

I am also recommending an increase from $4,800 to $5,600 in the wage base on which social security taxes are paid. This would take effect on January 1, 1966, and would be coupled with a smaller increase in the payroll tax than is scheduled at that date under existing law. These changes will provide the funds for the needed increases being proposed in old-age, survivors, and disability insurance benefits.

While I am recommending reductions in certain excise taxes, I am also proposing increases in certain other excise taxes which are in the nature of user charges. The excise taxes for which I am recommending reduction or repeal are not associated with the provision of particular Government services. However, certain existing excises on transportation are in effect a charge for the use of facilities and services provided by the Government. In these cases, I am proposing changes in user charges for transportation so that different modes of transportation can compete on more equitable and efficient terms and users of special Government services will pay a greater share of the costs.

The estimated cost of completing the Interstate Highway System—which is financed by highway user taxes—has recently been increased by $5.8 billion. To avoid serious delay in completing the system, while remaining on a pay-as-you-go basis, I will include in my excise tax proposals specific recommendations for increasing certain highway user charges.

In contrast to the users of the highways, the users of the airways and inland waterways bear considerably less than the full cost of the Government investments and services provided them. Accordingly, I am recommending increased or new taxes on aviation gasoline and jet fuels and a new tax on air freight for commercial aviation. Receipts from the existing 2-cent tax on aviation gasoline should be kept in the general fund rather than transferred to the highway trust fund, and the 5-percent ticket tax on air passengers should be made permanent. A fuel tax for inland waterway users is also being proposed.

I will continue to press for other user charges in Government programs where benefits are provided to specific, identifiable individuals and businesses. Fairness to all taxpayers demands that those who enjoy special benefits should bear a greater share of the costs. Legislation is needed for some of the charges, such as patent and meat inspection fees. In other instances, equitable user charges will be instituted through administrative action.

I will also present recommendations to correct certain abuses in the tax-exempt privileges enjoyed by private foundations.

NEW OBLIGATIONAL AUTHORITY

This budget includes new obligational authority for 1966 of $106.4 billion in the administrative budget.

Ninety-three billion five hundred million dollars of this requires congressional action this year.

Twelve billion nine hundred million dollars represents permanent authorizations that do not require further congressional action, mainly the appropriation for interest on the public debt.

Most of the $34.5 billion in new obligational authority recommended for 1966 for trust funds represents revenues from special taxes which are automatically appropriated.

New obligational authority

[Fiscal years. In billions]

Description	1964 actual	1965 estimate	1966 estimate
Total authorizations requiring current action by Congress:			
Administrative budget funds	$87.9	$94.5	$93.5
Trust funds	.4	1.4	.5
Total authorizations not requiring current action by Congress:			
Administrative budget funds	13.2	12.8	12.9
Trust funds	31.2	30.3	34.0
Total new obligational authority:			
Administrative budget funds	101.1	107.3	106.4
Trust funds	31.5	31.8	34.5

The 1965 estimate in the administrative budget includes $6.0 billion of recommended supplemental authorizations. These authorizations will provide funds for several programs for which I am requesting immediate consideration and enactment—for example, housing activities and aid to Appalachia. The new obligational authority and related expenditures under these supplemental proposals are reflected fully in the estimates presented in this budget.

FEDERAL PROGRAMS AND EXPENDITURES

The soundness of a budget can only be judged by the merits of the programs it proposes and the levels of expenditure it recommends. For both old and new programs, merit turns on a weighing of benefits against costs. In constructing this budget, I have tried to apply this approach to the entire range of Government operations.

Payments to the public

[Fiscal years. In billions]

Function	1964 actual	1965 estimate	1966 estimate
Administrative budget expenditures:			
National defense	$54.2	$52.2	$51.6
International affairs and finance	3.7	4.0	4.0
Of which food for peace	(1.7)	(1.7)	(1.7)
Space research and technology	4.2	4.9	5.1
Agriculture and agricultural resources (not including food for peace)	5.6	4.5	3.9
Natural resources	2.5	2.7	2.7
Commerce and transportation	3.0	3.4	2.8
Housing and community development	—.1	—.3	(1)
Health, labor, and welfare	5.5	6.2	8.3
Education	1.3	1.5	2.7
Veterans benefits and services	5.5	5.4	4.6
Interest	10.8	11.3	11.6
General government	2.3	2.4	2.5
Allowance for Appalachia	--------	(1)	.1
Allowance for contingencies	--------	.1	.4
Interfund transactions (deduct)	.7	.8	.6
Total administrative budget expenditures	97.7	97.5	99.7
Trust fund expenditures:			
Health, labor, and welfare	22.7	23.4	26.5
Commerce and transportation	3.5	3.9	3.7
National defense	.5	.8	1.0
Housing and community development	1.9	.2	.8
Veterans benefits and services	.7	.6	.5
All other	.1	.6	1.0
Interfund transactions (deduct)	.5	.6	.6
Total trust fund expenditures	28.9	29.0	32.9
Intragovernmental transactions and other adjustments (deduct)	6.2	5.1	5.2
Total payments to the public	120.3	121.4	127.4

(1) Less than $50,000,000.

As the year unfolds, developments may occur which call for prompt action by the Government. This is particularly true in international affairs, in the civil supersonic aircraft program, and in moving ahead with the recommendations resulting from various studies and analyses I am requesting, such as that related to military and civilian pay.

Specific legislation and appropriations to meet such contingencies will be proposed as needed, but the amounts which may be required cannot now be estimated with any confidence. The budget therefore includes an allowance for contingencies of $650 million in new obligational authority and $400 million in expenditures. These amounts are larger than is customary. Their inclusion makes it clear that the budget totals are intended to provide adequately for meeting new needs that may arise or seizing new opportunities that may be presented.

Here are the highlights of my expenditure recommendations:

National defense: We cannot afford second-best defense forces. Neither can we afford to be wasteful.

Our defense forces have reached new levels of strength. With the rapid strides made in the past 4 years and the future gains already scheduled, our powerful modern forces will be adequate to their tasks for years to come. In cooperation with our allies, we have now provided for:

Forces able to deter nuclear attack.

Forces able to counter conventional aggression and prevent the piecemeal erosion of the free world.

Forces, in short, able to promote peace.

We still have improvements to make. We must maintain a strong research and development program to insure that our forces are always the most modern in the world.

The 1966 budget fully provides for these needs.

However, we are able to reduce our defense expenditures in 1966 because:

The buildup of our forces, which started in 1961, is nearly complete.

The vigorous cost reduction program of the Department of Defense is producing large savings.

Less effective and less economical forces are being retired or reduced as promptly as possible.

International affairs and finance: We cannot achieve lasting world peace with armaments alone. Nor can greater worldwide prosperity be bought with money alone. These goals will be achieved only through the hard work, patience, understanding, and strength of men of good will everywhere.

Yet it is essential that we continue to put our best energies and some of our vast economic resources to work in solving the problems the world faces today. Prudent and careful expenditures for our international programs can help to keep men free, to promote understanding, and to substitute cooperation and negotiation for force in world affairs.

The 1966 budget calls for only a very modest increase in foreign economic assistance expenditures. With these funds, we will continue to concentrate our aid efforts in those less developed countries that are demonstrating the will and determination required to achieve political stability and economic growth.

We shall maintain our firm commitment to the Alliance for Progress—the focus of our efforts to achieve unity and understanding in this hemisphere. As an important part of this commitment, I recommend prompt action to permit our participation in the expansion of the Inter-American Development Bank.

This budget also enables us to:

Continue our participation in and support for the United Nations.

Maintain an adequate and alert network of diplomatic posts around the world.

Improve our oversea information activities, so that others may know us not just as a rich nation, but as a free and responsible nation as well.

Expand the Peace Corps, by now a proven experiment in international cooperation.

In an important step to strengthen the free world's financial system, the members of the International Monetary Fund are considering an increase in quotas. Upon completion of these discussions, expected shortly, I shall recommend that the Congress authorize promptly the funds needed to provide the U.S. share of this increase.

Space research and technology: This Nation has embarked on a bold program of space exploration and research which holds promise of rich rewards in many fields of American life. Our boldness is clearly indicated by the broad scope of our program and by our intent to send men to the moon within this decade.

The costs are high—as we knew they would be when we launched this effort. We have seen a rise in annual expenditures for the space program from less than one-half billion dollars in 1960 to over $4 billion in 1964.

Expenditures are continuing to increase. However, we have built up momentum and are concentrating on our highest priority goals. Therefore, we will no longer need to increase space outlays by huge sums each year in order to meet our present objectives.

This budget proposes that expenditures increase by $200 million in 1966 over 1965. This is the smallest annual increase since 1959. The new obligational authority requested is about the same as enacted for 1965.

Agriculture and agricultural resources: The increased production efficiency of our farms has contributed greatly to growth of the national economy. This efficiency, in turn, has contributed, along with our high per capita income, to making us the best-fed Nation in the world, while men are leaving farms and entering other occupations.

However, because of lack of adequate employment opportunities, the rapidly declining need for people to operate our farms has also meant low incomes for all too many of our rural families. We must therefore find ways to help provide a greater share of our national prosperity for those rural families that do not farm or who can no longer look to farming as a sole source of income.

Progress toward this goal will be made both through broader programs to fight poverty and through programs specially aimed at increasing economic opportunities and improving living conditions for rural people. The latter include a proposal for an insured loan program which will help provide more and better housing in rural areas.

I shall shortly transmit to the Congress my recommendations to continue and improve our farm commodity programs.

For the longer run, we need to explore new approaches to the problems with which the farm commodity programs are designed to deal.

I have directed the Secretary of Agriculture to make a comprehensive review of the kinds of programs needed for the changing farm economy. I strongly believe that programs can be designed that will continue the national benefit from our present highly efficient commercial agriculture, bolster farm income, put less burden on the Federal budget, and direct more of our effort to the problems of low-income farmers.

Natural resources: During its last session, the Congress passed a number of far-reaching laws that will advance significantly the development, conservation, and use of our natural resources. They include the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act, the Wilderness Act, and the Water Resources Research Act. The 1966 budget will implement these measures.

The budget also recommends the start of 37 new projects by the Corps of Engineers, 9 new projects by the Bureau of Reclamation, and 5 new projects by the Tennessee Valley Authority.

About two-thirds of the total expenditures for natural resources will be used to continue construction and operation of projects to provide water, control floods, improve navigation, and generate power.

Increased attention has been focused in recent years on the importance of the wise use and conservation of our water resources. Federal investment in water and related resources development has grown sharply—and is expected to grow further in the period ahead.

Urban, industrial, and recreational requirements for water have increased greatly in recent years and will continue to increase as our economy grows. The relative priorities of many historic water uses, including cropland, are changing. The implications of the changing needs for water resources programs and the most effective means of achieving our objectives are under intensified review to meet changing priorities.

The budget provides for a major expansion in research to develop improved technology for desalting water, including the use of nuclear energy. This program holds important promise in a world where water is a key to economic development and well-being.

I am also again recommending legislation to authorize river basin planning commissions and grants to States for planning the best use of water resources.

Nuclear energy will become increasingly important in meeting the rapidly growing demand for electric power. Power reactors must be improved, however, to make better use of nuclear fuel resources than they do today, as well as to provide economical electricity. In 1966, the Atomic Energy Commission plans to join with non-Federal groups in the construction of two different advanced power reactors which incorporate substantial improvements over those now in use.

The Commission is also working toward the long-range objective of high-gain breeder reactors which produce significantly more fuel than they consume. These breeders would insure a tremendous energy source for centuries to come.

Commerce and transportation: The vitality of the millions of privately owned businesses is essential to our continued economic development. The Federal Government will continue to provide extensive encouragement toward this end.

In the depressed areas of our Nation, we must create a constructive partnership between industry and Government which will improve opportunities for new investment and new jobs.

I urge prompt congressional action to:

Extend the program begun by the Area Redevelopment Act of 1961, now scheduled to expire on June 30, 1965.

Amend the act so that Federal aids can be concentrated in areas of greatest need and can emphasize the most effective types of assistance.

If the Nation is to have a truly efficient system of transportation, we must revise the traditional Government programs of regulation and operating subsidies to place greater reliance upon the forces of free competition. My proposals for charging users of Government transportation services a greater share of the costs incurred on their behalf are consistent with this objective. In addition, my proposals for transportation will provide for greater emphasis on the recreational and scenic aspects of our road system.

To encourage long-overdue improvements in surface transportation in our densely populated regions, I will propose legislation to authorize a comprehensive program of technical research and development on high-speed, intercity surface transport. As a first step, we will begin demonstrations of possible improvements in existing rail passenger services in the northeast corridor of the Nation.

By increasing efficiency and productivity, the Post Office Department has been able to avoid a general increase in postal rates since calendar year 1962. Despite these efforts, however, significant postal deficits are now estimated in the current and future years. At my request, a panel of distinguished citizens will consider whether certain postal rates should be increased to bring them into line with postal costs.

Housing and community development: The Federal Government's role in the Nation's huge annual investment in housing and community development is largely indirect. The Government insures savings and loan accounts and mortgages, encouraging private investment and making large direct Federal investments unnecessary. Today these insurance programs are involved in about half of the homes purchased or being built.

Yet, some direct Federal aid is, and will remain, necessary. This type of aid gives incentives to forward-looking communities, lenders and builders, and private citizens, who share the national concern over the unsatisfactory state of American cities.

In a message on housing and urban development, I will present my proposals for further extension of the Federal-local-private partnership in meeting city problems. Revitalized Federal leadership through a new Department of Housing and Urban Development will be coupled with increased emphasis on comprehensive local planning.

Federal financial assistance will be offered to:

Support the neighborhood facilities needed to serve the city's people.

Increase the supply of low- and moderate-income housing.

Continue the attack on urban blight.

Encourage better standards of development and more adequate public facilities at the growing urban fringe.

No recent step in improving the prospects for future urban development has been more significant than the enactment of the Urban Mass Transporation Act of 1964. To extend similar opportunities to the local communities of the National Capital region, I urge authorization of the special Federal assistance required to provide the nucleus of an adequate system of high-speed urban transportation for this area.

Health, labor, and welfare: The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 rededicated the Nation to a vigorous attack on the causes of the poverty which grips one-fifth of our population—including 15 million children. Our objective is to mobilize local, State, and Federal resources in a coordinated effort to assist the poor—especially children and youth—to achieve a better life.

The 1966 budget provides for almost doubling the new obligational authority and quadrupling the expenditures for this effort. These funds will—

Support 300 urban and rural community action programs.

Provide work opportunities, remedial education, and vocational training for 330,000 youths in the Job Corps and the Neighborhood Youth Corps.

Provide work-study opportunities for 100,000 needy college students and work experience for 110,000 unemployed adults.

Support the Volunteers in Service to America (VISTA); finance literacy training for adults; and assist migrant workers, farmers, and other low-income rural families.

To improve health care and facilities for the American people, the 1966 budget includes new proposals for:

Hospital insurance for the aged under social security.

Multipurpose regional medical centers to provide the most advanced diagnosis and treatment for heart disease, cancer, stroke, and other major diseases.

Grants for operating expenses of medical and dental schools.

Initial staffing of community mental health centers.

Improved medical diagnostic and treatment services for preschool and school-age children and youth.

Grants for projects to reduce water pollution caused by combined storm and sanitary sewers.

Increased aid to State and local air and water pollution control agencies for research and for more vigorous enforcement.

Our social security system provides needed day-in and day-out support to the millions who have contributed to it during their working years. This system needs strengthening.

In addition to hospital insurance for the aged, I am proposing legislation to provide an average 7-percent increase in social security benefits, retroactive to January 1, 1965. The increase in benefit payments will amount to about $2 billion in 1966.

I am proposing legislation to authorize long overdue improvements in the unemployment insurance system.

Improvements are also needed in our public assistance and manpower training programs.

Legislation will be recommended to increase the Federal share of public assistance payments, establish a program of medical care for children in families unable to afford such care, and authorize payments for needy aged persons in mental and tuberculosis hospitals.

Recommendations will also be made to broaden the Manpower Development and Training Act and increase the Federal share of project costs to 90 percent from the 66 percent which would go into effect under present law in 1966.

Education: Among the unfinished tasks of our Nation, the improvement of education deserves first priority.

It is our primary weapon in the war on poverty and the principal tool for building a Great Society.

This budget recognizes the increasing Federal responsibility to expand educational opportunity for all people and at all levels. It provides an increase in 1966 of over 60 percent in new obligational authority and over 75 percent in outlays. The programs of the Office of Education alone are more than doubled in 1966.

Education programs in the 1966 budget

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Agency or program	New obligational authority			Expenditures		
	1964 actual	1965 estimate	1966 estimate	1964 actual	1965 estimate	1966 estimate
Office of Education:						
Elementary/secondary	$407	$488	$1,765	$404	$408	$971
Higher	164	668	1,167	150	182	496
Vocational and other	130	345	449	106	186	326
Subtotal, Office of Education	702	1,500	3,381	660	776	1,792
National Science Foundation	353	420	530	310	325	405
Other education programs	475	599	192	369	408	466
Total, education	1,530	2,519	4,103	1,339	1,509	2,663
Present programs	(1,530)	(2,519)	(2,588)	(1,339)	(1,509)	(2,063)
Proposed legislation			(1,515)			(600)

The 88th Congress enacted more education legislation than any previous Congress. About 30 percent of the estimated increase in expenditures for education in 1966 is to carry out the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, the Vocational Education Act of 1963, the Library Services and Construction Act of 1964, and the National Defense Education Act Amendments of 1964.

But much remains to be done. Federal aid to meet critical needs in elementary and secondary education has not been enacted. Such aid is vital if we are to end the situation in which children are handicapped for life because they happen to live in communities which cannot support good schools.

The program I am proposing emphasizes assistance to improve elementary and secondary education, particularly for children who live in poverty. It will step up research in education and help schools and communities to provide wider educational opportunities for all. It will also strengthen higher education by expanding assistance to colleges and to college students. My proposals were presented more fully in a special message on education.

I also propose to expand present programs of support for academic research and science education. In 1966, expenditures by the National Science Foundation will increase by 25 percent, primarily to help provide an adequate rate of growth in Federal support for basic research in universities. Consistent with these objectives, I recommend that the Congress remove its restrictions on payments to universities for indirect costs of research grants.

Veterans benefits and services: Veterans benefits and services under the basic, continuing compensation, pension, and medical care programs will be at record levels in 1966.

Nearly 4½ million veterans or their survivors will receive compensation and pension payments.

Six hundred and ninety thousand veterans will be admitted to hospitals, domiciliary homes, or nursing homes.

Legislation enacted in 1964 by the 88th Congress to increase pension rates and to establish new nursing home programs will entail expenditures in 1966 of more than $100 million.

In line with the trend of recent years, an increasing part of the expenditures for veterans will be for non-service-connected benefits and services. As we continue to improve our social security and health protection programs, we should place greater reliance on these programs for meeting veterans needs not connected with their military service. Our major emphasis in veterans programs should be concentrated on meeting fully our obligation to those who were disabled in the defense of the country and to their dependents and survivors.

The Appalachian region: The Appalachian region of the United States has not shared fully in the great growth and prosperity enjoyed by the Nation as a whole. The 16 million people of this 165,000-square-mile area deserve a better opportunity to improve their region.

Many of the education, health, housing, and economic opportunity programs already outlined in the budget will help to overcome the problems brought on by chronic poverty. We need to make the most effective use of these programs. But a special effort is required to help this region. This means that Federal, State, local, and private institutions must combine to—

Improve access to the region.

Develop its natural resources.

Promote better employment opportunities for its people.

I urge the enactment of legislation to make this possible.

Employee pay: In preparing this budget, I have given close attention to the matter of Government pay.

Federal pay raises in the past 3 years have moved us much nearer to realizing the principle that civilian pay rates should be comparable to those in private enterprise for the same levels of work and that changes in pay and allowances of members of the uniformed forces should keep pace with advances in the general economy. These policies have been firmly established after careful congressional review. Taken together, they assure that civilian and military pay are effectively interrelated and maintained at rates which are fair to taxpayers and to Federal employees.

I believe, however, that it is equally essential to assure that any proposals for further pay adjustments during this calendar year accurately reflect pay developments in the private economy and be compatible with our national wage and price objectives.

For these reasons, I am appointing a special panel to make a prompt review of the present situation. This panel will be composed equally of distinguished public members and officers of the executive branch. It will report to me on April 1, 1965, after which I will make a recommendation to the Congress. Provision has been made in the allowance for contingencies for a possible military and civilian pay increase.

PUBLIC DEBT

Changes in the amount of public debt from year to year reflect primarily the amount of the budget surplus or deficit. Based on the estimates presented in this budget, the debt on June 30, 1965, will be $316.9 billion and on June 30, 1966, $322.5 billion.

Public debt at end of year

[Fiscal years. In billions]

Description	1963 actual	1964 actual	1965 estimate	1966 estimate
Owned by Federal agencies and trust funds	$57.9	$60.7	$62.5	$64.4
Owned privately and by Federal Reserve banks	248.6	251.8	254.4	258.1
Total	306.5	312.5	316.9	322.5

NOTE.—For further details see table 11 in pt. 2 of this document.

Under present law, the temporary debt limit of $324 billion will continue in effect through June 30, 1965. Then—if no action is taken—the permanent legislative ceiling of $285 billion will again become effective. It will be necessary, therefore, to raise the legal debt ceiling before that date.

The size of the debt limit needed is strongly affected by the seasonal pattern of Federal recipts and expenditures. Since receipts are always larger in the last half of the fiscal year, the public debt during 1966 will, from time to time, exceed the level presently estimated for June 30, 1966.

These seasonal fluctuations will require a higher debt limit than would be necessary if we had only to consider the amount of debt at the end of the fiscal year.

The need for flexibility in managing the debt must also be considered in fixing the debt limit. The Treasury generally borrows relatively large amounts of cash at periodic intervals during the year. These sizable financing operations are—and should be—carefully timed to take full advantage of favorable market conditions when they exist.

REDUCING GOVERNMENT COSTS

As we focus attention on improving the quality of American life, we must also see to the quality of American Government.

The tasks we face are formidable. They require new dedication, new vision, and new skills. We have neither the resources nor the right to saddle our people with unproductive and inefficient Government organization, services, or practices.

This must be a year of renewal—a year that will be long remembered for what we accomplish in bringing the public service to its highest state of readiness.

To realize this renewal, action will be necessary on a wide front. I pledge that this administration will strive to conduct the work of the Government by the same exacting standards that would apply in the most expertly managed private business.

Government organization: We must reorganize and modernize the structure of the executive branch in order to focus responsibilities and increase efficiency. I will shortly propose certain reorganizations which will constitute the initial and most urgent steps that I deem necessary to consolidate functions and strengthen coordination of related activities.

I will ask that permanent reorganization authority be granted to the President to initiate improvements in Government organization, subject to the disapproval of the Congress.

Controlling employment: In this budget, as in the budget for 1965, I have insisted upon stringent criteria to control the growth of Federal civilian employment. It is important that we have enough people to carry on the Government's business efficiently, but we must also see that we have no more employees than we need.

Realistic guidelines and goals have been established to aid administrators in the effective management of the Government's large and diverse work force. Controls on employment have been established for each agency. To remove the guesswork from determination of employment needs, agencies are installing improved work measurement systems, and the Bureau of the Budget is providing advice and assistance in introducing measures of productivity into agency management systems. The result of such efforts has been and will continue to be a reduction in the size of the Federal work force relative to the work being accomplished. The effectiveness of these controls may be seen in the fact that had Federal civilian employment kept its 1955 relationship to total population, Federal employees would have totaled 2,747,000 on June 30, 1964, more than 275,000 above the actual number as of that date.

Modest and highly selective increases in employment are proposed in the budget for 1966, mainly to carry out new and expanded programs recommended in this budget and to reduce excessive overtime in the Post Office Department. At the same time, we will take full advantage of every opportunity to keep the work force at minimum levels by eliminating functions, consolidating operations, closing unnecessary offices and installations, and abolishing vacancies. Total civilian employment proposed for 1966 is about 1 percent above the totals for the current year, and I am confident that we will be able to keep actual employment somewhat below these estimates.

Management improvement and cost reduction: The past year has been a successful one from the standpoint of improved management and cost reduction. Next year will be still better.

Led by the outstanding performance of the Department of Defense, Government agencies last year undertook cost reductions that saved almost $3.5 billion. These economies were not easy to come by. They have resulted from the concentrated work of Government officials and employees in all agencies, large and small. They reflect a wide variety of actions ranging from the abolition of reports and other publications to the introduction of computers, the application of modern business equipment, the adoption of new purchasing methods, and decisions to close major installations.

I am counting heavily on the continuation and acceleration of cost reduction and management improvement efforts. Every dollar saved in this way can be put to better use in carrying on more urgent business. And today every dollar is important. Among other things, we must:

Continue our war on excessive paperwork.

Increase our capacity to find and correct management weaknesses throughout the Government.

Reexamine our career services, making certain that they are all they should be with respect to selection, training, placement, promotion, rotation, retirement, and removal.

Seek legislation that will remove legal barriers to efficient operation.

I have instructed the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to give direction to a comprehensive, Government-wide cost reduction program to be put into effect in every department and agency. In general, this program will require the head of each agency to:

Take personal charge of cost reduction efforts.

Set specific goals for reductions in cost.

Reassess priorities for all programs and operations.

Identify and remove roadblocks to economy.

Verify reported savings.

I believe the Congress and the American people approve my goals of economy and efficiency. I believe they are as opposed to waste as I am. We can and will eliminate it.

CONCLUSION

Since I sent you my first budget a year ago—

Four million Americans have been born.

Three million two hundred thousand young people have reached college age.

One million seven hundred thousand new families have been formed.

One million three hundred thousand persons have entered the labor force.

One million five hundred thousand persons have reached retirement age.

Thus, our Nation faces growing responsibilities. But we also possess growing resources to meet them.

One result of our expanding economy is a larger revenue potential. This means a potential for—

Necessary increases in Federal expenditures.

Reductions in taxes.

Reductions in the public debt.

No one of these goals is paramount at all times. Each must be balanced against the others to assure our continued progress toward a Great Society.

This progress does not rest on economic growth alone. It is aimed at improving the quality of our way of life. And it is aimed at insuring that all Americans share in this way of life.

The Federal Government must do its part.

This does not mean simply spending more.

It does mean spending more on some new and vital activities. But it also means cutting back or eliminating activities which are less urgent or no longer necessary.

Where there is waste, to end it; where there are needs, to meet them; where there are just hopes, to move toward their fulfillment—that is the object of the budget which I now submit to your consideration.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

JANUARY 25, 1965.

THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET MESSAGE

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include tabular material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand the President's budget for fiscal year 1966. It is very voluminous. A great portion of our time in the coming weeks and months will be devoted to the study of this budget and to the consideration in the House of the appropriation bills for various Government operations for the fiscal year 1966.

Last year, the Committee on Appropriations improved its image, to employ a much used word, considerably, in the Congress and in the country, by expeditiously considering and passing all appropriation bills in the House by July 1.

We begin our hearings on the fiscal year 1966 budget on Thursday of this week before the full Committee on Appropriations. The Secretary of the Treasury and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget will be the first witnesses. We expect to very soon develop a schedule for the consideration of the appropriation bills that will be acceptable to the Speaker, the majority leader, and to the minority leader.

I should like to make a brief statement and in connection with the revision of my remarks insert considerably more material which I think pertinent to the budget situation.

It is, of course, impossible to evaluate fully the President's budget without a thorough study, but my overall reaction to today's budget is largely favorable. In my judgment, there is much about this budget that the country and both sides of the political aisle can and will accept. Unquestionably there will be unanimity about the great bulk of it. Undoubtedly there will be controversy over certain specific items.

I am immediately struck with the fact that this is a performance budget in the sense that it manifests a determination by the President to deliver what he has promised the country.

I personally know that the President and his associates have labored mightily to hold spending at the lowest acceptable level in many areas of government. This has been a herculean task. No more sincere and dedicated job in this respect, has ever been done by the executive branch in my memory. I want to commend the President and the members of his Cabinet and the heads of the agencies for their efforts. Some priorities have been reset and some nonessential and low-priority items have been weeded out.

There is no doubt but that many hard decisions have been made. Some of the decisions are unpopular and painful, but they demonstrate a determined effort to activate the President's objectives. Certain of these decisions have been painful, in some cases to you and in some cases to me, but we all want to see this Government managed in the best possible way.

From the standpoint of good management, the President's budget is more outstanding than any of those with which I have had to deal in my service here.

The budget inevitably grows as a growing population makes automatic demands for more public services, but I note approvingly the restraint manifested by the fact that today's budget, as a percentage of the gross national product, is the smallest in 15 years. This, I think, is further evidence of the indefatigable labors of the President and those who have worked with him in this tremendous task.

I am sure that I will not find myself in agreement with every recommendation and I would not expect the Congress to be in full agreement with all the items in the budget. My colleagues, we have our independent legislative responsibilities and I propose that we must discharge them. We need a strong President and we need a strong Congress, but we also need a degree of cooperation between them which will enable this country to move forward.

A thorough evaluation of all budget proposals by the Congress is imperative and in keeping with our responsibility to the taxpayers back home.

As the President indicated in his inaugural address, we can have progress and still have some differences of opinion. Generally speaking, I believe it is best that we be in a perpetual state of some dissatisfaction about Government spending but with our perspectives in good focus.

We will give full and complete consideration to all phases of the appropriations budget in the 50-member Committee on Appropriations. If we are to have a reasonably early adjournment, we must move along expeditiously and we propose to do that.

Pursuant to leave granted, Mr. Speaker, I shall now supplement my preliminary remarks on the new budget with some additional material which I hope may be useful in the consideration of the budget. Manifestly, we cannot digest immediately the fullness of anything so encompassing, so vast, and complex as the budget for the far-flung operations of the U.S. Government.

SOME PERSPECTIVES ABOUT DIMENSIONS OF FEDERAL SPENDING

As I mentioned earlier, a distinguishing feature of today's budget is that it proposes spending a smaller proportion of the GNP—gross national product—than is the case this year or last year—in fact, the smallest in 15 years. In all administrations, budgets rest on a mix of philosophy and fact. It is inevitable that we face big national budgets as long as we face the totalitarian challenge to freedom. There can be no limits to the necessities because there is no second place in the contest. But beyond defense spending, growth of the country and the economy and growth of the budget are to an extent inseparably bound up together. Increased governmental spending virtually adds a third dimension to the law of inevitability. It is of interest to note that through both Republican and Democratic administrations in the last 10 or 12 years the spending budget, while climbing, has ranged around 16 percent of the gross national product—GNP, a widely accepted overall measure. Growth of the population means growth of demand for public services. I recall what President Eisenhower had to say on this general point in his 1960 budget to Congress:

> Inescapable demands resulting from new technology and the growth of the Nation, and new requirements resulting from the changing nature of our society, will generate Federal expenditures in future years. We must not forget that a rapidly growing population creates virtually automatic increases in many Federal responsibilities.

This is such a fundamental point of consideration to a good perspective about big budgets that I should take the time to quote one of our predecessors who was once chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations and later President—James A. Garfield, from the great State of my friend, the ranking minority member of our committee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow]. Writing about national appropriations and expenses way back in 1879, Mr. Garfield put the question this way:

> What, then, is the test by which the proper scale of national expenditures shall be determined? In time of peace, perhaps the most important test is that of population. Doubtless the annual increase of national expenditures should bear some relation to the increase of population; but it would be unphilosophical, in the highest degree, to insist that expenditures shall increase in the same ratio as the population increases. * * * Judged by the test of population alone, the total ordinary expenditures of a growing nation ought to increase year by year; but the amount expended per capita ought not to increase but should rather diminish.
>
> From these elements, the just scale of increase could be readily ascertained, if all our calculations could rest upon the basis of perpetual peace; but war—

And today I think he would add "cold war"—

> but war * * * overturns all ordinary calculations. * * * For more than half of all expenditures of civilized nations have been devoted to war and the support of armies and navies.

I was especially struck by Mr. Garfield's depth of perspective and by the applicability of his statement to the current budget situation.

National defense alone—the "cold war," if one pleases—now takes about 52 cents of each administrative budget dollar.

Interest on the debt, very largely accumulated during hot wars, takes about 12 cents of each budget dollar. There are other war- or defense-related expenses but these two categories alone make big budgets an inescapable fact of life.

To bring these big and increasing budgets in a bit sharper focus, I would mention right here just one other fact that I noted some time ago. It is rather arresting. About three-quarters—75 percent—of Federal budget spending today goes for things considered proper functions of the Federal Government from the early days of the Republic—national defense, internal revenue, the postal service, administration of justice, aid to veterans, conduct of foreign affairs, and interest on the national debt.

Perspective is not always easy to come by. All of us more or less have our philosophies, our interests, our ideas. We are always more enlightened by an intelligent conflict of opinions than we are by too much agreement, because out of divergence and contention comes the distilled view, the majority rule which is the distinguishing feature of our form of government.

Mr. Speaker, I would also recall something which Abraham Lincoln said while serving here in the House:

> There are few things wholly evil or wholly good. Almost everything, especially of governmental policy, is an inseparable compound of the two; so that our best judgment

of the preponderance between them is continually demanded.

It seems to me therefore that as we process the many segments of this budget—both sides, all sides of it—all of us here in Congress might well "continually demand" what seems to us best for our free democratic way of life. Congress has its responsibilities to the people to thoroughly ventilate, debate, and decide the issues. Thorough consideration and vigorous debate are conducive to better legislation and better government. Democracy, like people, gains strength from exercise. And as a general proposition of principle I would say that we shall be in deep trouble if that day ever comes when all of us are satisfied with a given level of public spending, at whatever level.

Mr. Speaker, a source of some misunderstanding and confusion in the House, in the press, and therefore in the country is the matter of just which budget we act upon. Contrary to widespread impression, the House will not act directly on the more generally familiar $99.7 billion spending budget for fiscal 1966. The House acts on the new obligational authority budget of $106.4 billion for 1966, the fiscal year which begins on July 1, 1965, and extends through June 30, 1966. That is the amount for fiscal 1966, not the $99.7 billion spending budget. There will be in addition, in this session, about $6 billion of new obligational supplementals for the current fiscal year 1965. The grant of authority to obligate is the significant point of decision in the process. The actual expenditure in payment of the obligation necessarily follows in due time. If no obligation is created, then no expenditure—disbursement—is made. The $99.7 billion spending budget for 1966 is the checking account budget—it represents the checks to be drawn to pay the bills. The $106.4 billion is the authority to create the obligation and that is the key figure to keep in mind because that is the basis on which the bills to be voted on will be stated. An increasingly higher obligational authority budget signifies, inevitably as night follows day, a higher future spending.

It should be noted that the House at this session will have opportunity to vote on only approximately $59.1 billion of the $99.7 billion spending budget figure for fiscal 1966. The point is that much of the $99.7 billion has been approved by previous Congresses. And about $12.9 billion of the $106.4 new obligational authority budget represents permanent appropriations recurring automatically under prior law and therefore not required to be voted on in the current session. I will insert a table that elucidates the situation:

The 1966 spending and new obligational budgets—Portions subject to action in this session

	Administrative budget estimate of expenditures, 1966 (disbursements)	Administrative budget requests for new obligational authority, 1966
1. Totals proposed, President's budget, Jan. 25, 1965	$99,687,000,000	$106,417,000,000
2. Deduct estimate of expenditures in fiscal 1966 against obligational authority made available in prior sessions (and therefore not before the present session for action)	−27,640,000,000	
Subtotal	72,047,000,000	106,417,000,000
3. Deduct amounts applicable to permanent appropriations recurring automatically without necessity for action in this session (several items; interest is by far the largest. Expenditure figure here may negligibly duplicate some small part of item 2, but not enough to distort)	−12,909,000,000	−12,909,000,000
Amount involved in proposals for direct consideration and action in this session	59,138,000,000	93,508,000,000
4. Foregoing divided as to—		
(a) Amounts relating to proposed new legislation, first to be considered by various legislative committees prior to any appropriation action	416,960,000	2,548,654,000
(b) All other amounts (going programs, but this includes major military procurement and R. & D.; military construction; NASA; AEC; Peace Corps; foreign assistance; and the Coast Guard; all of which, aggregating some $28,974,000,000, must be processed twice, first in annual authorization bills from the legislative committees and therefore subject to some budgetary impact before appropriation action)	58,721,040,000	90,959,346,000

NOTES

Item 2, in the "expenditure" figure, would include some amounts applicable to activities subject to annual scrutiny under the Corporation Control Act which would largely result, however, from new obligational authority granted in previous sessions.

Item 3, the "expenditure" figure is a bit arbitrary because a few relatively small items cannot be separately identified.

In addition, 1966 budget indicates proposed supplementals this session for fiscal 1965—tentatively, $5,978,000,000 in new obligational authority (of which, again tentatively, $1,460,000,000 is estimated to be expended in fiscal 1965, the balance in later years).

NEW LEGISLATIVE PROPOSITIONS WITH BUDGET AMOUNTS

Mr. Speaker, the first-year costs of the President's new legislative propositions are included in the budget in terms of both new obligational authority and expenditures. These are in the class of items which must twice run the gantlet, so to speak, if they are to be undertaken. First, in sundry bills from the various legislative committees, prior to appropriation consideration, the proposals will either be enacted or, if such be the decision, be cut from the budget by failure of enactment.

New legislation, of course, is a principal source of seed for higher future budgets. The first-year cost is often comparatively small.

For general information and reference, I include a table summarizing the official budget totals on this point:

Propositions of new legislation included in the budget for 1966 (for both fiscal years 1965 and 1966)

[In thousands of dollars]

	1965 budget		1966 budget	
	New obligational authority requested	Expenditures (estimated)	New obligational authority requested	Expenditures (estimated)
Funds appropriated to the President:				
Inter-American Development Bank	250,000		250,000	25,000
International Monetary Fund	1,031,250	257,812		
Agriculture:				
REA: Revolving fund		−168,000	−345,000	−177,000
FHA: Insured rural housing program, increase in insured rural housing loans			100,000	40,000
ARS: Meat inspection, user fees			−27,305	−31,945
AMS: Poultry, grain, cotton, tobacco, etc., user fees			−20,936	−24,646
SCS: Fees for technical services			−20,000	−20,000
Total, Agriculture		(−168,000)	(−313,241)	(−213,591)

Propositions of new legislation included in the budget for 1966 (for both fiscal years 1965 and 1966)—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	1965 budget		1966 budget	
	New obligational authority requested	Expenditures (estimated)	New obligational authority requested	Expenditures (estimated)
Commerce:				
ARA			400,000	40,000
Transportation research, Northeast corridor, tests and evaluation			20,000	10,000
Total, Commerce			(420,000)	(50,000)
Defense—Civil: Ryukyu Islands, Ryukyuan pretreaty claims			22,000	15,000
Health, Education, and Welfare:				
Medical care for children under public assistance			100,000	100,000
Grants for maternal and child welfare			25,000	25,000
Vocational rehabilitation, amendments for services to mentally retarded and severely disabled			10,000	7,000
Community health facilities, services and education			106,000	58,000
Mental retardation development grants			(2,200)	(2,200)
Multipurpose medical centers			(50,000)	(10,000)
Community mental health centers, initial staffing			(19,500)	(19,500)
Operating support grants to medical and dental schools			(20,000)	(20,000)
Group practice facilities (loans and guaranteed loans)			(7,500)	(3,100)
University research and training, HEW-wide authority for grants for specialized facilities			(7,000)	(3,000)
Elementary and secondary education			1,255,000	500,000
Higher education, including student assistance and other			260,000	100,000
Environmental health			60,000	12,000
Construction and research grants to solve storm and sanitary sewer problem			(50,000)	(5,000)
Increase various grant ceilings, etc., for enforcement, control, and construction in air- and water-pollution programs			(10,000)	(7,000)
Social security, military service credits			60,000	60,000
Public assistance, increase public assistance payments			114,000	114,000
Total, Health, Education, and Welfare			(1,990,000)	(976,000)
Interior:				
Bonneville power revolving fund			−80,030	−80,030
Southeastern power revolving fund			−1,000	−25,200
Southwestern power revolving fund			−10,300	−18,369
Total, Interior			(−91,330)	(−123,599)
Labor: Manpower Development and Training Act, to reduce matching requirements for States and other amendments			140,500	40,000
Post Office: Authorize Federal construction of postal facilities			92,154	18,000
Housing and Home Finance Agency:				
Federal National Mortgage Association: Special assistance functions (authorization to spend debt receipts)	150,000			5,000
Urban service facilities and basic community facility grants			150,000	15,000
College housing loans (authorization to spend debt receipts)	110,000			
Urban renewal fund (contract authorization)	675,000			
Total, Housing and Home Finance Agency	(935,000)		(150,000)	(20,000)
Veterans' Administration: Compensation and pensions, check cycling				−150,000
Farm Credit Administration: Short-term credit investment fund				−7,500
National Capital Transportation Agency: Federal grant for construction of District of Columbia subway			10,171	1,550
Small Business Administration: Sale of participations in pool of business loans			−137,000	−350,000
District of Columbia:				
Federal payment increase			7,000	7,000
Increase highway fund loan authorization			2,700	2,100
Increase loan for District of Columbia subway			5,700	
Total, District of Columbia			(15,400)	(9,100)
Appalachia: (Several agencies)	365,000	3,000		107,000
Total, proposed legislation, for 1965 and 1966 in the 1966 Budget	2,581,250	92,812	2,548,654	416,960

1966 budget, trust funds, proposed legislation

[In thousands of dollars]

	1966	
	New obligational authority requested	Trust expenditures estimated
Agriculture: For voluntary inspection of tobacco and grain and classing of cotton	7,546	7,229
Proposed improvements in the social security system increasing benefits (expenditures) to be financed by increases in the covered wage base and tax rate (receipts and NOA):		
Old-age and survivors insurance trust fund	−332,000	1,858,000
Federal disability insurance trust fund	194,000	155,000
Railroad retirement account	3,600	42,000
Hospital insurance for the aged—provides hospital care under the social security system	600,000	20,000
Military service credits:		
Old-age and survivors insurance trust fund	56,000	
Disability insurance trust fund	4,000	
District of Columbia: Construction of mass transportation system	5,700	
Total, trust funds	538,846	2,082,229

VARIATIONS IN BUDGET PROJECTIONS

Mr. Speaker, it is always prudent to keep in mind as we consider segments of the budget during the session, that original budget totals are tentative at best. They never turn out to be exact. The final results are always at variance—and for a variety of reasons. It is not unnatural; it is understandable; and it is traditional that a budget, which defines sets of goals, charts courses of actions, and outlines expectations, should be somewhat optimistic in outlook and tone. It embodies anticipations. This is true in all national budgets and in all administrations. But it is unfortunately nonetheless true that the realizations often do not measure to the initial expectations. More often than not there has been a shortfall. I will insert a rather illuminating tabulation for the 10 years, 1955–64, which cuts across administrations of both political parties:

Variations in administrative budgets—The original versus the final (using the last 10 budgets, 1955–64)

[Rounded amounts used]

Receipts:	
Original January budget projections	$760,300,000,000
Final results (when the years were over)	747,900,000,000
Revenues fell short by	−12,400,000,000
NOTE.—In 6 of the 10 years, revenues were less than the original budget; 4 were more.	
Expenditures:	
Original January budget projections	768,600,000,000
Final results	787,400,000,000
Expenditures went higher by	+18,800,000,000
NOTE.—In 6 of the 10 years, actual spending exceeded the original budget. In 4 years, it was less.	
So, in total, there was a deviation of	31,200,000,000

Surplus (+) or deficit (−):	
Original January budget projections	−$8,300,000,000
Final results	−39,500,000,000
So, in total, instead of a deficit of $8,300,000,000 over the 10 years as originally projected, there was a deficit of $39,500,000,000, a change for the worse of	31,200,000,000
New obligational authority:	
Original January budget proposals from the President (which he not infrequently amends from time to time)	771,300,000,000
Final amounts enacted	810,800,000,000
Final amounts enacted exceeded the original budget proposals by	39,500,000,000
NOTE.—In 9 of the 10 years the final amount enacted exceeded the original January budget proposal for the year.	

Source: Budget documents.

DEFENSE AND NONDEFENSE NEW OBLIGATIONAL AUTHORITY

Mr. Speaker, further in connection with the fact that the House will act on the new obligational authority budget rather than the expenditure budget and that a higher obligational budget foreordains a higher spending budget, I include a table of obligational authority for each year since the end of the Korean war. It shows the trends of what Congress has been enacting—for both national defense and nondefense functions:

New obligational authority—Defense and nondefense

[Administrative budget basis. Rounded amounts used]

Fiscal year	National defense functions	Other than national defense	Total new obligational authority
1953 enacted (Korean war year)	$57,298,000,000	$23,010,000,000	$80,308,000,000
1954 enacted (1st post-Korean year)	39,471,000,000	23,294,000,000	62,765,000,000
1955 enacted	33,656,000,000	23,420,000,000	57,076,000,000
1956 enacted	35,903,000,000	27,295,000,000	63,198,000,000
1957 enacted	41,344,000,000	28,835,000,000	70,179,000,000
1958 enacted	40,448,000,000	35,897,000,000	76,345,000,000
1959 enacted	45,517,000,000	35,848,000,000	81,365,000,000
1960 enacted	44,761,000,000	34,813,000,000	79,574,000,000
1961 enacted	45,994,000,000	40,681,000,000	86,675,000,000
Increase in level in 8 years, 1961 over 1954	+6,523,000,000	+17,387,000,000	+23,910,000,000
1962 enacted	52,414,000,000	40,448,000,000	92,862,000,000
1963 enacted	54,323,000,000	47,960,000,000	102,283,000,000
1964 enacted	53,762,000,000	47,341,000,000	101,103,000,000
1965 enacted plus supplementals to come (as shown in 1966 budget)	52,424,000,000	54,838,000,000	[1] 107,262,000,000
1966 total proposed (as shown in 1966 budget)	51,129,000,000	55,288,000,000	[2] 106,417,000,000
Comparisons:			
1966 total proposed compared to 1965 including proposed 1965 supplementals	−1,295,000,000	+450,000,000	−845,000,000
1966 compared to 1964 enacted	−2,633,000,000	+7,947,000,000	+5,314,000,000

[1] Includes $5,978,000,000 proposed as supplementals for 1965 in 1966 budget.

[2] Includes $3,205,000,000 for tramsmission later in session, mostly all entailing propositions of new legislation.

Source: Budget increments, including the budget for 1966.

DEFENSE AND NONDEFENSE SPENDING AND THE BUDGET RESULTS

Debate on the direction and growth of the Federal budget in recent years has centered to some extent on the relative proportions allocated between national defense and nondefense functions. The impression has been fairly widespread that defense spending has principally accounted for the rather rapid rise in Federal spending. But this is not the case. By far the greater increase, in both absolute dollars and percentagewise, has been in the nondefense areas rather than national defense although—and this is worthy of note—in the last 4 or 5 years the proportion between the two has been somewhat more nearly even. I think we might usefully bring the picture on that down to date.

It would, I think, be fair to start with fiscal 1954. The Korean war had just concluded. During the following years through fiscal 1961, which ended June 30, 1961, the level of national defense spending stood virtually still. Nondefense spending rose rather steadily. The official budget expenditure figures—I am using expenditures rather than appropriations—show that national defense spending rose only 1 percent from fiscal 1954 through fiscal 1961, whereas nondefense spending increased 65 percent in that period.

The buildup following the Berlin crisis in 1961, the subsequent emphasis on conventional and limited war capability, and the acceleration of the buildup of our intercontinental ballistic missile force, resulted in larger appropriations for defense in the years 1961–65 and brought about a more nearly balanced proportion of increased spending as between defense and nondefense functions. The substantial completion of these buildups, and a renewed emphasis on domestic programs, indicates some alteration in these ratios as indicated in the following table:

Net budget receipts and net budget expenditures (the traditional administrative budget), fiscal years 1954–66

[In millions of dollars]

Fiscal year	Net budget receipts	Net budget expenditures: National defense	Net budget expenditures: Other than national defense	Net budget expenditures: Total	Budget surplus (+) or deficit (−)
Fiscal 1953 (Korean war year)	$64,671	$50,442	$23,678	$74,120	−$9,449
Fiscal 1954 (1st post-Korea year)	64,420	46,986	20,551	67,537	−3,117
Fiscal 1955	60,209	40,695	23,694	64,389	−4,180
Fiscal 1956	67,850	40,723	25,501	66,224	+1,626
Fiscal 1957	70,562	43,360	25,606	68,966	+1,596
Fiscal 1958	68,550	44,234	27,135	71,369	−2,819
Fiscal 1959	67,915	46,491	33,851	80,342	−12,427
Fiscal 1960	77,763	45,691	30,848	76,539	+1,224
Fiscal 1961	77,659	47,494	34,021	81,515	−3,856
8 years, 1954–61	554,928	355,674	221,207	576,881	−21,953
Fiscal 1962	81,409	51,103	36,684	87,787	−6,378
Fiscal 1963	86,376	52,755	39,887	92,642	−6,266
Fiscal 1964	89,459	54,182	43,502	97,684	−8,226
Fiscal 1965 (as reestimated in 1966 budget)	91,200	52,160	45,321	97,481	−6,281
4 years, 1962–1965, with 1965 still an estimate	348,444	210,200	165,394	375,594	−27,151
Fiscal 1966 (the budget estimate, January 1965)	[1] 94,400	51,578	48,109	[2] 99,687	−5,287
Comparisons:					
Fiscal 1966 compared to 1964 actual	+4,941	−2,604	+4,607	+2,003	−2,939
Fiscal 1966 compared to current reestimate for 1965	+3,200	−582	+2,788	+2,206	−994

[1] As with all budgets, rests on many assumptions and contingencies. Principal assumptions underlying the revenue figure; calendar 1965 GNP of $660,000,000,000 (up from $622,300,000,000 in 1964): personal income of $520,000,000,000 (up from $491,400,000,000 in 1964); corporate profits before taxes, $61,000,000,000 (up from $57,200,000,000 in 1964). Also assumes various legislation for cutting excises effective July 1, 1965, and enacting various user charges—see pp. 52–55 of budget.

[2] As with all budgets, rests to some extent on various proposed new legislation, having the effect of either some expenditure reductions or some increases.

Source: Budget documents, including the 1966 budget of Jan. 25, 1965.

THE PUBLIC DEBT

A word about the matter of the debt. The bulk of our steadily rising public debt was incurred in World War II, but not all of it. The debt necessarily increases as money is borrowed from the future to pay for some of our current costs. The record of national self-discipline and restraint in this respect over the last 35 years is something less than ideal in the minds of many people. It will be necessary in this session to again make another upward adjustment in the $324 billion debt ceiling.

I include a recent Treasury statistical table on the Federal debt:

Summary of direct and guaranteed debt on significant dates

[Based upon statement of the public debt published monthly; consequently all figures are stated as of the end of a month]

Date	Classification	Total debt (including interest-bearing debt, matured debt on which interest has ceased, and debt bearing no interest): Direct debt (gross)	Guaranteed debt [1, 2]	Total direct and guaranteed debt	Per capita [3]
	WORLD WAR I				
Mar. 31, 1917	Prewar debt	$1,282,044,346.28		$1,282,044,346.28	$12.36
Aug. 31, 1919	Highest war debt	26,596,701,648.01		26,596,701,648.01	250.18
Dec. 31, 1930	Lowest postwar debt	16,026,087,087.07		16,026,087,087.07	129.66
	WORLD WAR II				
June 30, 1940	Debt preceding defense program	42,967,531,037.68	[4] $5,529,070,655.28	[4] 48,496,601,692.96	367.08
Nov. 30, 1941	Pre-Pearl Harbor debt	55,039,819,926.98	6,324,048,005.28	61,363,867,932.26	458.47
Feb. 28, 1946	Highest war debt	279,213,558,897.10	550,810,451.19	279,764,369,348.29	1,989.75
June 30, 1946	Debt at end of year in which hostilities ceased	269,422,099,173.26	476,384,859.30	269,898,484,032.56	1,908.79
Apr. 30, 1949	Lowest postwar debt [5]	251,530,468,254.82	22,851,485.16	251,553,319,739.98	1,690.29
	SINCE KOREA				
June 30, 1950	Debt at time of opening of hostilities in Korea (hostilities began June 24, 1950)	257,357,352,351.04	19,503,033.97	257,376,855,385.01	1,696.74
Dec. 31, 1952		267,391,155,979.65	53,969,565.31	267,445,125,544.96	1,687.90
Nov. 30, 1964	Highest debt [6]	318,486,290,312.18	833,751,225.00	319,320,041,537.18	[7] 1,654.18
Dec. 31, 1963	Debt a year ago	309,346,845,059.17	741,796,725.00	310,088,641,784.17	[4] 1,625.13
Nov. 30, 1964	Debt last month	318,486,290,312.18	833,751,225.00	319,320,041,537.18	[7] 1,654.18
Dec. 31, 1964	Debt this month	317,940,472,718.38	809,241,900.00	318,749,714,618.38	[7] 1,647.70

[1] Does not include securities owned by the Treasury.

[2] Includes outstanding matured principal of guaranteed debt of U.S. Government agencies for which cash to make payment is held by the Treasury of the United States in the general fund balance.

[3] Based upon estimates of the Bureau of the Census.

[4] Revised.

[5] Represents the lowest point of the debt at the end of any month following World War II. The lowest point of the debt on any day following that war was on June 27, 1949, when the debt was as follows:

Direct debt (gross)	$251,245,889,059.02
Guaranteed debt of U.S. Government agencies	23,876,001.12
Total direct and guaranteed debt	251,269,765,060.14

[6] Represents the highest point of the debt at the end of any month. The highest point of the debt on any day was on Dec. 30, 1964, when the debt was as follows:

Direct debt (gross)	$318,979,836,156.27
Guaranteed debt of U.S. Government agencies	809,949,100.00
Total direct and guaranteed debt (includes $285,900,769.30 not subject to statutory limitation)	319,789,785,256.27

[7] Subject to revision.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Speaker, we heartily commend the President and his associates for their efforts in the direction of economy. They have labored long and mightily and with considerable profit. In all my experiences here I do not recall a budget so classically put together. Good budgeting involves the hard necessities of choice.

It involves doing some painful and unpopular things. You can save some money by hacking at the branches but a good deal more by hacking at the roots. I cannot recall a year in which such a broadly based, vigorous "selection out" screening was applied by the President to the budget.

And he unequivocally promises to keep at the business of weeding out the less essential items and getting a dollar's value for a dollar spent.

The Committee on Appropriations does not, of course, process all of the budget but so far as it is our province we intend wholehearted cooperation with the President and the leadership to the end that his budget recommendations are fully considered and disposed of fairly and expeditiously.

We welcome any constructive suggestions from any Member of the House or anyone else. In the spirit of the President's announced determination to dispense with every nonessential, we especially invite specific suggestions. We do not know all the answers. We shall be diligent but likely less than perfect.

We begin hearings on the general budget on Thursday and will shortly develop a schedule of hearings and reporting dates for the various appropriation bills.

CCC SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE

While I am on my feet, Mr. Speaker, I wish to digress for a moment to make reference to an earlier colloquy today with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY]. He raised a question as to a one-billion-and-six-hundred or seven-hundred-million-dollar appropriation bill which is scheduled to be on the floor tomorrow involving restoring the impairment of the capital stock of the Commodity Credit Corporation. Most Members of the House are somewhat familiar with this matter, but at a later point in the RECORD I shall insert a further statement in regard to the item so that all Members will know more precisely what will be before us tomorrow when we take up the bill. The RECORD, of course, will be available at about 7 o'clock in the morning.

I shall be glad to cooperate with my colleagues and other members of the committee will want to cooperate in giving essential information to Members who are interested.

On Thursday last, the House made it in order to consider a supplemental appropriation bill for the Commodity Credit Corporation of the Department of Agriculture tomorrow, Tuesday, January 26. This request, in the total amount of $1,742,209,000, was received by the House on January 19, 1965, and printed as House Document No. 59.

In view of the urgency of this matter and the speed with which it must be handled, it has not been possible to give members the usual 3 days to review the bill and report in advance of floor action. The record of the hearings will not be ready for final printing until tonight.

In order that Members may have as much advance information as possible, and in line with my colloquy earlier today with the gentleman from Illinois, I take this opportunity to discuss the pending request briefly.

The Commodity Credit Corporation was created by Congress in 1933 to assist in maintaining farm income at a level comparable to labor and industry and thereby stabilize the purchasing power of this basic segment of our national economy upon which all others are dependent. The Corporation is charged with the mandatory responsibility of supporting prices for the six basics—wheat, corn, cotton, peanuts, rice, and tobacco—as well as wool, mohair, certain feed grains, milk, butterfat, honey, and tung nuts. For certain other commodities price supports are permissive, such as cottonseed, flaxseed, soybeans, dry edible beans, and crude pine gum.

In recent years, the Corporation has also been charged with the responsibility of financing many other programs not directly related to its price support activities and not originally contemplated when the Corporation was created. The larger and more expensive programs are the International Wheat Agreement, Public Law 480, and bartered materials for the supplemental stockpile.

To finance these numerous activities, the Corporation has a borrowing authority of $14.5 billion. As of January 20, 1965, all but $54 million of this was committed and the Corporation is virtually unable to continue operations.

The Corporation has three possible methods of obtaining additional funds for operating purposes: First, by selling commodities to which it has title; second, through congressional approval to increase its borrowing authority; or third, by an appropriation to restore capital impairment.

For the Corporation to attempt to obtain operating funds by suddenly placing its commodities on domestic and world markets would be disastrous. Also, it does not seem practicable to undertake to pass legislation to increase its borrowing authority this early in the session. The only feasible means to meet this need expeditiously, therefore, is to approve a supplemental appropriation at this time.

Failure to provide additional funds to the Corporation would result in a complete breakdown in our price support mechanism, with serious consequences to the economy of our entire Nation. It is imperative, therefore, that immediate action be taken to restore funds to the Corporation to continue its operations during the balance of the current fiscal year.

THE BUDGET

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time in order to proceed with the further discussion of the budget.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with my distinguished chairman that it is necessary for the committee to expedite this work to get the budgets passed as rapidly as possible. But in doing so, we must give careful consideration to each and every item. I think it should always be remembered, Mr. Speaker, that the Constitution places upon the Congress the responsibility of appropriations and budgets and that the Budget Bureau can recommend to the President what we shall consider. But we are not bound by those recommendations. They can and should make recommendations but it is our responsibility under the Constitution to handle the appropriations and that starts here in the House of Representatives.

First, Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a question and then to try to answer it.

Is the budget below $100 billion?

On the face of the matter alone, but especially because of all the advance press buildup of the struggle to keep this budget below $100 billion, let me try to dispel the persistent myth that the budget has been held below $100 billion. It has not been, and all one has to do is turn to page 15 of the message where the President says:

> This budget includes new obligational authority for 1966 of $106.4 billion in the administrative budget.

Anyone knows that if the Government makes obligations it must honor them—which in simple language means spend money to pay for them.

This is the third, or perhaps fourth year the obligational budget requested has been above $100 billion. What difference does it make to the taxpayer in the long run as to just when actual spending crosses the $100 billion mark—or how many bookkeeping gimmicks are used to delude by keeping the expenditure figure from going over $100 billion. The end result is unavoidable.

Furthermore, this budget says that in this session the President expects to ask for $6 billion in supplemental appropriations for the current year 1965 in addition to the $106.4 billion for fiscal 1966—in other words, a total of $112.4 billion authority, in this session alone, to make expenditure commitments. Page 38 of today's budget says that so far, $101.3 billion of new obligational authority has actually been enacted by Congress for this year. So, the President is really asking, in this session, to enact obligational authority of $11.1 billion above what was done for the current fiscal year. I cannot recall such a large increase in any peacetime budget.

As to any bookkeeping gimmicks, if there are any in the budget we ought to root them out and examine them for what they are.

When are we going to redeem the pledge?

In the tax cut bill last year, Congress gave a pledge to the American people—it was the Democratic majority that wrote the pledge and voted it in the bill—that the increased revenues expected to come into the Treasury would first—I emphasize the word "first"—would first be used to eliminate the budget deficit and then to reduce the public debt. And the President agreed when he signed the bill.

It takes only a minute to find the figures in this budget to prove that the President evidently wants to break with the promise or at least rearrange it. Look at page 30 of the budget where he says the larger revenues now coming into the Treasury have a potential for, in this order—

Necessary increase in Federal expenditures;

Reduction in taxes; and

Reductions in the public debt.

But, he adds that "no one of these goals is paramount at all times."

In today's budget larger revenues are anticipated but, contrary to the explicit promise, spending increases and tax reductions get priority. This budget hardly pays lipservice to the promise. The deficit gets only minor relief and the national debt goes up by $5.6 billion.

UNBROKEN RECORD OF DEFICITS

This budget, with a deficit projection of $5.3 billion, is the fifth straight deficit—we have had one every year since President Eisenhower left office—a total of $32.4 billion in the fiscal years 1962–66. Yet the President likes to characterize his administration as prudent.

Do they really ever expect or intend to restore fiscal responsibility when they advocate going deeper into debt in times of record national prosperity?

The President says this budget marks continued progress on the path toward a balanced budget. Mr. Speaker, it is a mighty slow pace along a mighty long path.

MORE FEDERAL EMPLOYEES—26,680 MORE

A much publicized feature of the President's program—one the President himself seemed to be quite interested in—was to trim the number of Federal employees. I expect the average American has the impression the agencies are dropping them from the rolls right and left.

Page 376 of today's budget shows that while they plan to drop some from the defense agencies, they want to add some 45,000 more in civilian agencies.

It would represent about 154,000 more than were on the roll when President Eisenhower left office.

I am certain the committees will want to take a good hard look at these requests.

CONGRESS MUST MEET ITS RESPONSIBILITIES

I hope we do not yield to all the blandishments of bureaucracy. The appetite to expand cannot be satisfied.

I hope the majority does not dust off the rubber stamps of the 1930's.

I hope the majority refuses to take all these requests at face value and gives every one of them a thorough examination.

I hope we can find solid ways to further economize—at least of the magnitude we were able to in the last two sessions when we cut about $10.5 billion from the appropriations actually requested.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS. I am very interested in the point you make on the deficiency requests that will total $5.978 billion, which makes the total new obligational authority for 1965 $107.3 billion. On page 15 of the report the President shows that that is the figure and then the report has his $106.4 billion for 1966, which makes it look like his requests for 1966 are a little bit lower.

I remember last year when the budget was presented that the gentleman from Ohio and some others pointed out that we felt there were bound to be deficiencies and that the budget was presented in such a way as to disguise this fact. Now, sure enough, this has turned out to be correct. It is a $6 billion deficiency. Could we look at this budget and can your committee do so to ferret out the hidden deficiencies? I hope you will look at this budget of $106.4 billion of requests to see what you think the real deficiencies will come to next year. I ask that because I suspect not only is this a request for $112.4 billion, $106.4 plus the $6 billion deficiency, but it also has inherent in it probably another $6 or $7 billion of deficiencies that are going to occur by the end of the year.

Mr. BOW. I think the gentleman is quite right. Of course, we shall look for these areas where we may be called upon for deficiencies. It is rather interesting that before the Committee on Appropriations is actually organized in this session of Congress we have a deficiency or a supplemental request here for $1.4 billion. A part of that is to come up tomorrow for a program which we understood was going to save money, but now we find that program which was going to save money costs considerably more money. I am talking about the cotton program which will be discussed tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the impact of the Federal budget in the national and world economies no longer permits it to be judged in simple or isolated terms. By every realistic test the 1966 budget is fiscally responsible beyond any doubt.

This budget meets the Nation's basic needs—for defense, for space research, for international representation, and for economic assistance.

This budget awakens us to the fact that our national strength lies in our people—and that investment in them promises high dividends in economic growth which is the source of fiscal strength.

This budget shows concern with the continued improvement in the equity, efficiency, and flexibility of the tax system—both as an end in itself and for the effect which it has for encouraging sound economic growth.

This budget shows sensitivity to the current state of the economy by offering continued economic stimulus on an adequate but not excessive scale.

This budget offers continued improvement in the vital balance-of-payments position with nearly a $400 million reduction in payments abroad by Federal agencies carrying out vital responsibilities overseas.

This budget continues the progress toward fiscal balance with a $1 billion reduction in the deficit—the third consecutive year of reduction and the lowest deficit in 5 years, despite the effect of tax cuts totaling over $4½ billion.

This budget demonstrates continued control over the growth in Federal expenditures with an increase of only $2 billion over the 2-year period 1964–66—the second lowest 2-year increase in the past decade.

Thus, from every angle, the 1966 budget shows evidence of a solid understanding of the sources of fiscal strength, of the uses and purposes of fiscal power, and the true spirit of fiscal responsibility.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, once again the President has demonstrated that it is possible for the Federal Government to be both responsive and responsible—responsive to the Nation's needs and responsible to the taxpayer.

The budget we have just received provides greatly needed increases for programs of education, health, manpower, and training, economic opportunity, and urban development that are aimed at stimulating improvements in the life of all our people.

But, the budget also proposes to make these increases in a selective and responsible manner—and at a pace consistent with growth in our ability to pay. In this way, progress toward a balanced budget goes hand in hand with social and economic progress.

It is also gratifying to see from the budget that the President understands that encouragement of private and State and local activities deserves emphasis along with improvements in Federal activities and functions. The excise tax cut will leave an additional $1½ billion in the hands of individuals and business firms to be spent as they see fit. At the same time, aids to State and local governments will rise by over $2 billion to record levels.

These facts amply demonstrate the President's concern with the Nation's needs wherever they exist and his desire that they be solved by means that are appropriate.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, a balanced budget has come a step closer under President Johnson's 1966 budget. The President is to be congratulated for being fiscally responsible as well as compassionate for the aged, the needy, and the underprivileged.

The expected deficit of $5.3 billion for 1966 will be the smallest deficit in the past 5 years. At the same time, this is a stimulative budget for the Nation's economy. The combination of tax and expenditure proposals can only result in continued economic growth, higher personal incomes, and increased employment. The Secretary of the Treasury tells us that a balanced budget may be possible 2 or 3 years from now—without starving our public needs, and even with a cut in excise taxes.

Every Member of Congress should welcome this budget as a sign of solid economic strength and good fiscal policy. It is good news for the American people and for every nation whose security and future is linked to our own.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, our Government today is asked to serve our country on a scale without precedent.

Our people have urgent needs—for more and better public services, better economic and cultural opportunities, and a better environment.

Our State and local governments need assistance in meeting their traditional responsibilities.

Our Nation needs the strongest national defense that we can provide.

Our society needs to be sure that growth produces not just quantity of abundance, but quality as well.

These are the tests by which we should judge the President's budget for fiscal year 1966. President Johnson himself has told us that it is a budget of priorities. That is what a budget should be. It cannot do everything at once, but it can show us what needs to be done first and foremost, within our means.

This is a reasonable, constructive budget. We owe it to the President to consider it on a reasonable and constructive basis.

We will not agree with every detail, and the President does not expect us to. But if we do our part as well as the President has done his part, this budget can be the basis for the most constructive Congress of this generation.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, the President's budget gives us a program for continued national prosperity and growth.

During the past 4 years, we have enjoyed an average rate of economic growth of over 5 percent. Unemployment has dropped from 7 percent of the labor force in early 1961 to about 5 percent today. We must continue this unprecedented economic advance.

Only a few years ago, our economy was moving erratically along a path of retarded growth, accompanied by the monetary and social costs of widespread unemployment. Many had to forgo opportunities because of reduced incomes, while others felt the heavy hand of unemployment. I need not chronicle the hardship and loss of self-esteem which result from inability to provide adequately for one's own family.

The 1966 budget contains many measures to avert the dire consequences of inadequate growth. All of them follow the pattern—so evident under President Johnson—of reliance on a dynamic private sector of the economy. One important example is the proposed \$1¾ billion cut in excise taxes, which will transfer additional buying power to consumers and businesses.

In sum, it is essential that we continue to promote national prosperity and economic growth. This budget will do that.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the 1966 budget which President Johnson has submitted to us today presents a forward-looking program which provides generously for many of the needs of our people. In addition to many existing activities, it proposes several new programs which represent a noble beginning toward the realization of the Great Society which will benefit all Americans.

In reviewing the 1966 budget, it is apparent that the President has applied a critical hand in weeding out many less urgent but costly Government activities. These cost reductions, led by the outstanding performance of the Department of Defense, have saved the taxpayers of this country several billion dollars in the past year—including \$3½ billion last year—and have made it possible to carry out many urgent activities that otherwise might have had to be postponed. This budget is a vivid example of what can be done to eliminate waste and inefficiency in Government.

The 1966 budget also reflects the President's promise to maintain strict control over the level of civilian employment in the executive branch of the Government. It is apparent from this budget that President Johnson feels as strongly as we in Congress—and, I am sure, most of the American people—feel that there should be enough Government workers to carry out the essential activities required of our Government, but that there should be no more than are needed. In spite of the growth in certain existing programs and in spite of additional programs proposed for the first time, President Johnson has pointed out in his budget that Federal civilian employment will grow at only about 1 percent—far less than the population, State and local government employment, or total civilian employment. This is not only a credit to the President and his department and agency heads for maintaining strict employment controls but it is also a credit to the Government employees whose increased productivity contributes heavily to the results.

There is ample evidence throughout the 1966 budget that cost consciousness was given heavy weight in the President's forward-looking program.

Mr. Speaker, I like the direction of this budget. Foreign aid and foreign expenditures have been deemphasized and higher priorities are given to projects of importance in the United States. I am pleased that the Appalachia program has been pinpointed in the President's budget.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the administration is to be commended for the quality of its proposals in the budget for fiscal year 1966.

They guarantee the continued superiority of our Armed Forces while demonstrating our commitment to world peace and prosperity. As the richest nation in the world, we must both see to our responsibilities abroad and heed the pleas of our less fortunate people here at home.

The most striking feature of the President's budget is its accent on human needs. Health, labor, welfare, and education programs alone will increase by \$6½ billion over 1965. Including housing and community development, these programs amounted to about 15 percent of total Federal outlays only 10 years ago; today, they account for nearly 30 percent of all Federal payments.

This budget recognizes that no nation can achieve greatness except by building its human resources, and building them well.

Our objective is to stop the appalling costs resulting from poverty and unemployment. Last year alone, the Nation lost more than \$25 billion in potential output due to our failure to provide productive employment for more of our workers. We want to guarantee that all Americans have the opportunity to share in national prosperity and well-being. Prosperity and individual fulfillment ought to become more than mere words to the one-fifth of the Nation living in poverty.

This budget sets us on the right course. The Nation will be watching to see how we respond.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, the 1966 budget which President Johnson has submitted to us today is a prudent budget, one that is not extravagant nor wasteful of the Nation's resources. There is no doubt, however, that this budget was prepared with more than merely efficiency and economy in mind. Throughout the entire budget, it is evident that the President has given careful consideration to the need for the economic stimulus necessary to help promote economic strength and progress. It is also evident that President Johnson, in preparing his 1966 budget, has kept in mind the need to move toward a balanced budget.

The financial pages of our daily newspapers and trade journals are ample evidence of the overwhelming success of the recent tax cut which was enacted last year. Our gross national product continues to move up rapidly, personal incomes have grown substantially, and private consumption and investment have responded favorably to the stimulus provided.

The 1966 budget now proposes to reinforce the Revenue Act of 1964 by revising and adjusting excise taxes. As President Johnson well recognizes, in addition to improving the tax system, these recommended changes will further greatly increase private purchasing power and stimulate growth in the economy.

The stimulus to economic growth provided by the 1966 budget is not limited to the revenue side, however. Government expenditures, on an administrative and cash budget basis as well as on a national income basis, will increase in 1966 over 1965. Many of the expenditure programs are designed to reinforce private consumption and investment. For example such programs as old-age and survivors insurance benefits, unemployment compensation, veterans benefits, public assistance grants, and grants to State and local governments all help to reinforce the purchasing power of other sectors of the economy.

Another example of how the 1966 budget will help stimulate the economic growth and progress is the billions of dollars of Federal expenditures of an investment nature. These expenditures for investment in physical and human resources are an important factor in the continued economic growth of our economy and are essential for achieving a higher rate of economic growth in the future, as well. As pointed out in the 1966 budget:

> Of the total Federal cash payments to the public estimated for 1966, about $14.9 billion or 11.7 percent are for activities (outside of defense and space) which—directly or indirectly—will increase physical assets and otherwise promote productivity and economic growth.

In spite of increased budget expenditures and the estimated excess of Federal payments over receipts, the President's 1966 budget is mindful of the necessity to maintain price stability along with economic growth. As with the past several budgets, it is apparent that the 1966 budget can and will provide an economic stimulus without leading to price instability.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, the 1966 budget represents a high water mark in the history of responsible government.

It meets head on the important challenges which confront our Nation. For example, through the programs proposed in the budget we will: greatly increase our attack on poverty in the United States; increase education assistance by 75 percent; provide more and better health care for our citizens, particularly our children and the elderly; and make our cities better places in which to live.

Responsible government also requires that we meet our needs at costs which we, as a nation, can afford. The 1966 budget meets this criterion by holding administrative budget expenditures below $100 billion for the second year in succession—although increases in fixed commitments would indicate that this was impossible; and providing for a reduction in the deficit for the second straight year as our economy continues to grow and move us toward a balanced budget.

The 1966 budget is the essence of responsible government. It meets the needs of our people well. It meets them without overburdening our resources.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, the budget for 1966 which President Johnson has submitted to us today recognizes fully the accelerating pace of growth and change which in recent years has led to increasing demands for services from the Federal Government. However, in spite of all the criticism about the size of the Federal Government and the growth of the Federal budget it is necessary to bear in mind some of the relative comparisons involved.

In 1966, Federal administrative budget expenditures are estimated to be $99.7 billion. In the decade ending with fiscal 1966, Federal expenditures will have increased by an estimated 50 percent. Over the same period, however, the gross national product will have risen over 60 percent. While Federal expenditures rose as a proportion of the GNP during the first part of this 10-year period, they are now falling for the third year in a row and in 1966 will drop to less than 15 percent, the lowest ratio in 15 years.

On a national income basis, the same trend is also evident. As seen from the 1966 budget document, Federal purchases of goods and services were 11.1 percent of the GNP in 1956. In 1966 they are estimated to be about 10 percent, also the lowest proportion of the past 15 years. In other words, despite a growing economy, a growing population, and a growing budget, the Federal Government's direct share of the Nation's total output of goods and services is declining. Moreover, while Federal purchases of goods and services will increase by less than $1 billion in 1966 over 1965, State and local governments will probably increase its direct purchases of goods and services by a considerably greater amount in 1966. With a continuing pressure at the local level for increased public services, present indications are that State and local governments will continue to increase their direct purchases of goods and services by at least and possibly more than the $3 to $5 billion by which they have been increasing in recent years.

We have here in the budget submitted to us today a financial plan which provides for many of the needs of our people. It has been prepared with careful forethought and consideration of economy and efficiency. While it provides for some increase in total expenditures, these increases have been carefully weighed against the costs involved.

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, this is a budget neither extravagant nor parsimonious, neither wasteful nor pinchpenny. From behind all the complex figures, this document emerges clearly as a people's budget. It is a plan keyed to the needs of all our people.

It is a budget that recognizes that a dollar well spent will bring far more than a dollar value in return, to the Nation, the State, the local community.

The President's emphasis on health and education and aid to the needy is not only heartwarming and reassuring for its humanism, but it is also a reminder to us that this is an investment for all of us, every one of us, in the future greatness of America. This is an investment that makes hardrock economic sense.

Our human resources are our most valuable asset, and no segment of it should remain fallow. These 35 million people, who represent a vast untapped vein of economic wealth, should not remain unproductive because of lack of opportunity to develop their skills and capabilities. And this budget reaches out far to embrace many of the Nation's 35 million poverty-ridden people with an offer to help them get on their feet, to get the country rolling with gathering speed toward a full, no-unemployment economy.

The people of the West, in particular my own district, will be gratified at the proper recognition of the need for investments in multipurpose river structures. The calamity, which was the December 1964 flood, teaches us again the wisdom of investing our resources in preventative flood control structures rather than squandering them in repairing the frequently avoidable damage both to property and, even more important, preventing the loss of life and the destruction of human values in the flood-threatened areas.

The magic figure in this budget is not $100 billion—the magic is in each of the pieces that make up the $100 billion that will help this Nation achieve greater heights by opening wider the doors of opportunity to these neglected people who are capable of contributing to our growing economy, but who need a helping hand.

THE BILL TO PAY FOR LAST YEAR'S COTTON FOLLY

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Findley] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the House will consider a supplemental appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture. The time has now come to pay the piper for last year's cotton folly.

In April of 1964 Congress passed and the President approved H.R. 6196, the so-called cotton-wheat bill. Those of us who were here at the time and who opposed this legislation pointed out that H.R. 6196 would cost the taxpayers of this Nation millions of more dollars per year, that it would result in multimillion-dollar Government payments to U.S. textile companies, that the plight of small cotton farmers would not be eased, and that consumers were not assured of any benefits.

What has the record been since the enactment of this legislation?

Let us take a look at it.

During the House debate the ranking Republican on the Committee on Agriculture, the Honorable Charles B. Hoeven, of Iowa, stated that additional costs of the cotton program would rise to $635.9 million.

During that debate the gentleman from California [Mr. Leggett], then a member of the Committee on Agriculture wrote to each of us in the House, explaining that the bulk of the new expense would be used in a domestic mill subsidy and said, and I quote:

> The Democrats have long stood for priming the pump at the bottom. The theory of the pending bill, I believe, is alien to our philosophy. Should the mill subsidy provision be included in the final version of the bill, I would ask you to consider seriously defeating this legislation.

Yes, Republicans and Democrats opposed this bill, but it passed.

On November 9, 1964, the Department of Agriculture published the list of payments made to individual textile mills and others in the cotton processing industry. And I want to remind you that these are just the interim payments. The payments for the 1964 marketing year will be much greater.

The interim payments reached a total of $86.1 million, of which $57 million was in cash and $29.1 million in kind—surplus cotton. You may recall assurances during debate on the cotton bill that the program would be financed by using surplus cotton, not by cash. Up to this point, at least, it certainly has not worked out that way.

You will note that several firms have already received multimillion payments under the interim program, and this is but a fraction of their entitlement during the 1964 and 1965 marketing years.

To illustrate the magnitude, I have combined the interim payments for four firms. The totals may not be complete, but they at least illustrate why the cotton program is so costly, and why the capital of the Commodity Credit Corporation needs replenishment. The cost of the cotton program, as with most commodity programs, is financed largely by drawing money out of CCC. When the CCC account gets low—and it certainly is low now—the administration asks for more.

Here are grand total figures for the four mills, as disclosed by the November 9, 1954, report of the Department of Agriculture. And once more, I repeat that these figures are for the interim period only, and are much lower than entitlement for an entire marketing year.

J. P. Stevens & Co., Greenville, S.C.:	
Georgia plant	$343,980.44
North Carolina plant	889,835.52
South Carolina plant	2,650,133.52
Tennessee plant	322.407.33
Total	4,206,356.81

Cannon Mills Co., Kannapolis, N.C.:	
North Carolina plant	$3,224,433.32
South Carolina plant	182,299.77
Total	3,406,733.09

Cone Mills Corp., Greensboro, N.C.:	
North Carolina plant	2,980,212.07
South Carolina plant	106,249.32
Total	3,086,461.39
The Springs Cotton Mills, Lancaster, S.C.: South Carolina plant	3,780,297.40

Here are the detailed payments during the interim. They can be verified by direct reference to USDA release of November 9, 1964, serial USDA 3725–64.

Individual interim payments during the period Apr. 11–July 31, 1964

Name and address	Sight draft payments	Payment-in-kind certificates	Total
ALABAMA			
Adelaide Mills, Inc., Anniston, Ala	$49,837.32	$65,460.65	$115,297.97
Alabama Board of Corrections, Kilby Cotton Mill, Montgomery, Ala	8,069.29	0	8,069.29
Aliceville Cotton Mill, Aliceville, Ala	20,862.14	81,675.75	102,537.89
American Cyanamid Co., Santa Rosa plant, Post Office Box 1826, Pensacola, Fla	204.29	0	204.29
Anniston Manufacturing Co., Anniston, Ala	270,087.81	0	270,087.81
Avondale Mills, Sylacauga, Ala	365,070.01	1,455,918.18	1,820,988.19
Bama Cotton Mills, Inc., Geneva, Ala	22,651.91	94,790.99	117,442.90
Bemis Bros. Bag Co., Talladega, Ala	331,777.16	0	331,777.16
Botany Cotton, Inc., Gastonia, N.C	42,640.58	0	42,640.58
Carlton-McLendon Furniture Co., Montgomery, Ala.	163.86	0	163.86
Cowikee, Mills, Eufaula, Ala	72,940.78	288,422.72	361,363.50
Danville Yarn Mills, Bon Air, Ala	171,049.24	0	171,049.24
Dan River Mills, Inc., Post Office Box 261, Danville, Va		318,134.20	318,134.20
Fayette Cotton Mills, Inc., Fayette, Ala	31,341.18	143,501.92	174,843.10
Geneva Cotton Mills, Inc., Geneva, Ala	22,669.40	89,644.10	112,313.50
Standard-Coosa-Thatcher Co., Box 791, Chattanooga, Tenn	120,682.11	136,271.78	256,953.89
Union Yarn Mills, Jacksonville, Ala	47,416.98	167,764.22	215,181.20
Victorian Furniture Corp., Montgomery, Ala	588.76	0	588.76
Wehadkee Yarn Mills, Box 150, West Point, Ga	117,880.03	140,518.42	258,398.45
West Boylston Manufacturing Co., Montgomery, Ala	82,638.01	98,060.36	180,698.37
West Point Manufacturing Co., Post Office Box 71, West Point, Ga	347,948.37	1,385,388.53	1,733,336.90
Winfield Cotton Mill, Inc., Winfield, Ala	15,687.55	56,430.59	72,118.14
Total	4,301,997.90	5,427,776.88	9,729,774.78
ARKANSAS			
Crompton-Arkansas Mills, Inc., Morrilton, Ark	240,545.18	0	240,545.18
Earl of Arkansas Division, Earle, Ark	36.08	0	36.08
Pinecrest Cotton Mills, Inc., Pine Bluff, Ark	41,898.73	0	41,898.73
Total	282,479.99	0	282,479.99
CALIFORNIA			
L. A. Sani-Felt Co., Los Angeles, Calif	1,168.43	0	1,168.43
California State Prison, San Quentin, Calif	5,129.28	0	5,129.28
Total	6,297.71	0	6,297.71
CONNECTICUT			
American Thread Co., Inc., 260 West Broadway, New York, N.Y	45,531.51	0	45,531.51
Acme Cotton Products Co., Inc., East Killingly, Conn	5,654.41	0	5,654.41
Baltic Mills Co., Baltic, Conn	6,549.19	0	6,549.19
Gould Products Corp	4,717.88	0	4,717.88
Total	62,452.99	0	62,452.99
GEORGIA			
Aragon Mill, Aragon, Ga	360.03	0	360.03
Applied Fiber Co., Grantville, Ga	1,142.89	0	1,142.89
Atlantic Cotton Mills, Macon, Ga	68,361.86	0	68,361.86
Avondale Mills, Sylacauga, Ala	48,549.03	80,822.99	129,372.02
Bibb Manufacturing Co., Macon, Ga	1,102,611.38	599,491.28	1,702,102.66
Buck Creek Cotton Mills, Columbiana, Ala	26,159.24	0	26,159.24
Callaway Mills, LaGrange, Ga	660,275.17	0	660,275.17
Canton Cotton Mills, Canton, Ga	466,082.30	0	466,082.30
GEORGIA—continued			
Chicopee Manufacturing Co., New Brunswick, N.J	$360,065.98	0	$360,065.98
Coats & Clark, Inc., Albany, Ga	6,573.88	0	6,573.88
Coats & Clark, Inc., Clarkdale, Ga	67,545.72	0	67,545.72
Crompton Highland Mills, Griffin, Ga	91,826.39	0	91,826.39
Crown Cotton Mills, Dalton, Ga	344,623.09	0	344,623.09
Crystal Springs Bleachery, Chickamauga, Ga	338,280.52	0	338,280.52
Dundee Mills, Griffin, Ga	466,636.40	0	466,636.40
Eastman Cotton Mills, Eastman, Ga	185,650.07	0	185,650.07
Echota Cotton Mills, Calhoun, Ga	75,479.55	0	75,479.55
Erwin Mills, Durham, N.C	10,083.44	0	10,083.44
Federal Prison Industries, Atlanta, Ga	144,306.68	0	144,306.68
Fieldcrest Mills, Inc., Spray, N.C	160,756.44	$178,958.45	339,714.89
Fitzgerald Mills Corp., Fitzgerald, Ga	41,477.27	0	41,477.27
Flagg-Utica Corp., Grantville, Ga	94,515.19	0	94,515.19
Flint River Cotton Mills, Albany, Ga	140,636.40	51,787.38	192,423.78
Franklin Novelty Yarn Co., Lavonia, Ga	357.04	0	357.04
Fulton Cotton Mills, Atlanta, Ga	216,388.50	0	216,388.50
Gainesville Mills, Gainesville, Ga	102,582.02	139,362.40	241,944.42
Georgia Duck & Cordage Mill, Scottdale, Ga	50,072.35	0	50,072.35
B. F. Goodrich Textile Products, Thomaston, Ga	553,579.70	210,813.78	764,393.48
Graniteville Co., Graniteville, S.C	111,438.79	475,156.42	586,595.21
Habersham Mills, Habersham, Ga	126,397.89	0	126,397.89
Harmony Grove Mill, Commerce, Ga	237,272.16	0	237,272.16
Harriet & Henderson Cotton Mills, Berryton, Ga	169,172.95	0	169,172.95
Hartwell Mills, Hartwell, Ga	100,598.15	0	10,598.15
Imperial Cotton Mills, Eatonton, Ga	57,722.01	20,662.72	78,384.73
The Jefferson Mills, Jefferson, Ga	172,360.09	0	172,360.09
Juliette Milling Co., Macon, Ga	27,923.86	0	27,923.86
The John P. King Manufacturing Co., Augusta, Ga	301,558.00	100,314.43	401,872.43
Klopman Mills, Inc., Greensboro, N.C	149,848.45	0	149,848.45
Lavonia Manufacturing Co., Hickory, N.C	8,726.63	0	8,726.63
Mary-Leila Cotton Mills, Inc., Greensboro, Ga	97,858.72	0	97,858.72
Monroe Mills, Monroe, Ga	142,287.07	0	142,287.07
Moultrie Cotton Mills, Moultrie, Ga	79,416.93	0	79,416.93
New Holland Mills, New Holland, Ga	215,143.11	261,326.19	476,469.30
Opelika Manufacturing Co., Hawkinsville, Ga	67,770.09	0	67,770.09
Pepperell Manufacturing Co., Boston, Mass	372,793.97	835,261.11	1,208,055.08
Piedmont Cotton Mills, East Point, Ga	2,450.56	0	2,450.56
Puritan Cordage Mill, Athens, Ga	3,285.35	0	3,285.35
Reeves Bros., Inc., Spartanburg, S.C	192,656.68	0	192,656.68
Reigel Textile Corp., Trion, Ga	959,150.20	0	959,150.20
Rushton Cotton Mills, Griffin, Ga	93,678.26	0	93,678.26
Scottdale Mills, Scottdale, Ga	153,574.65	0	153,574.65
Social Circle Cotton Mills, Social Circle, Ga	72,325.69	23,095.93	95,421.62
Southern Mills, Atlanta, Ga	33,222.53	0	33,222.53
J. P. Stevens & Co., Greenville, S.C	0	343,980.44	343,980.44
Strickland Cotton Mills, Valdosta, Ga	157,163.43	51,404.79	208,568.22
Summerville Manufacturing Co., Summerville, Ga	117,631.20	0	117,631.20
Swift Manufacturing Co., Columbus, Ga	287,591.33	111,773.22	399,364.55
Swift Spinning Mills, Columbus, Ga	228,139.72	80,968.29	309,108.01
The American Thread Co., Inc., New York, N.Y	237,771.42	0	237,771.42
The Blanche Cotton Mills, Augusta, Ga	39,237.63	0	39,237.63
Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., Cedartown, Ga	103,765.39	0	103,765.39
Jordan Co., Columbus, Ga	14,990.81	0	14,990.81
Thomaston Cotton Mills, Thomaston, Ga	675,907.29	0	675,907.29
Tifton Cotton Mills, Tifton, Ga	88,754.37	0	88,754.37
Trio Manufacturing Co., Forsyth, Ga	25,801.80	0	25,801.80
Union Manufacturing Co., Union Point, Ga	19,216.65	0	19,216.65

Individual interim payments during the period Apr. 11–July 31, 1964—Continued

Name and address	Sight draft payments	Payment-in-kind certificates	Total
GEORGIA—continued			
United States Rubber Co., Hogansville, Ga	$165,763.81	0	$165,763.81
Walton Cotton Mills, Monroe, Ga	233,191.91	0	233,191.91
Washington Manufacturing Co., Tennille, Ga	66,739.98	0	66,739.98
West Georgia Mills, Inc., Whitesburg, Ga	7,778.47	0	7,778.47
West Point Manufacturing Co., West Point, Ga	105,879.47	$470,602.51	576,481.98
Whitfield Spinning Co., Dallas, Ga	53,672.06	0	53,672.06
Whittier Mills Co., Atlanta, Ga	108,052.80	0	108,052.80
Willingham Cotton Mills, Macon, Ga	98,969.64	0	98,969.64
Total	12,609,630.50	4,035,782.33	16,645,412.83
ILLINOIS			
Bear Brand Hosiery Co., Chicago, Ill	49,976.82	0	49,976.82
Johnson & Johnson, Chicago, Ill	63,095.50	0	63,095.50
Total	113,072.32	0	113,072.32
IOWA			
Iowa State Industries, Textile Division, Fort Madison, Iowa	4,474.72	0	4,474.72
Total	4,474.72	0	4,474.72
KANSAS			
American Felt Mfg. Co., Inc., Kansas City, Kans	62.20	0	62.20
Total	62.20	0	62.20
KENTUCKY			
Jamuary & Wood Co., Inc., Maysville, Ky	43,959.56	0	43,959.56
Louisville Textiles, Inc., Louisville, Ky	7,503.33	0	7,503.33
Total	51,462.89	0	51,462.89
MAINE			
Pepperell Manufacturing Co., Boston, Mass	83,300.30	318,670.55	401,970.85
Bates Manufacturing Co., Post Office Box 591, Lewiston, Maine	643,125.63	0	643,125.63
Total	726,425.93	318,670.55	1,045,096.48
MASSACHUSETTS			
Berkshire-Hathaway, Inc., New Bedford, Mass	100,360.83	0	100,360.83
The Kendall Co., Walpole, Mass	7,458.47	0	7,458.47
Maplewood Yarn Mills, Inc., Fall River, Mass	35.56	0	35.56
Sagamore Manufacturing Co., Fall River, Mass	34,133.12	0	34,133.12
United Cotton Products Co., Fall River, Mass	1,767.73	0	1,767.73
Total	143,755.71	0	143,755.71
MICHIGAN			
Michigan State Industries, Jackson, Mich	4,893.27	0	4,893.27
Total	4,893.27	0	4,893.27
MISSISSIPPI			
Erwin Mills, Inc., Durham, N.C	327,645.69	102,419.13	430,064.82
Mississippi Industries for the Blind, Jackson, Miss	289.25	0	289.25
Total	327,934.94	102,419.13	430,354.07
MISSOURI			
American White Cross Labs of Missouri, Cape Girardeau, Mo	2,357.82	0	2,357.82
Absorbent Cotton Co., Valley Park, Mo	456.69	0	456.69
Total	2,814.51	0	2,814.51
PUERTO RICO			
Ponce Mills, Inc., Ponce, P.R	8,417.96	0	8,417.96
Total	8,417.96	0	8,417.96
NEW HAMPSHIRE			
Chicopee Manufacturing Co., 501 George Street, New Brunswick, N.J	$285,788.82	0	$285,788.82
Total	285,788.82	0	285,788.82
NEW YORK			
Clinton Prison Industries, Dannemora, N.Y	9,131.07	0	9,131.07
Greenhaven Prison Industries, Stormville, N.Y	4,598.69	0	4,598.69
Lockport Mill, Inc., Lockport, N.Y	131.75	0	131.75
Total	13,861.51	0	13,861.51
NORTH CAROLINA			
Acme Spinning Co., Belmont, N.C	190,035.55	0	190,035.55
Alexander Mills, Forest City, N.C	147,055.86	$54,838.29	201,894.15
Amazon Cotton Mills Co., Thomasville, N.C	73,864.56	25,443.01	99,307.57
American & Efird Mills, Inc., Mount Holly, N.C	598.776.71	0	598.776.71
Arista Mills Co., Winston-Salem, N.C	109,391.81	0	109,391.81
Balston Yarn Mills, Inc., Lincolnton, N.C	14,535.75	0	14,535.75
Barnhardt Manufacturing Co., Charlotte, N.C	2,523.43	0	2,523.43
Bartex Spinning Co., Clayton, N.C	60,391.10	0	60,391.10
Beaunit Corp., 450 Seventh Avenue, New York, N.Y	30,518.01	0	30,518.01
B. I. Cotton Mills, Asheville, N.C	239,294.43	0	239,294.43
B. I. Cotton Mills, Caroleen, N.C	195,543.78	0	195,543.78
B. I. Cotton Mills, Marion, N.C	143,379.59	0	143,379.59
B. I. Cotton Mills, Henrietta, N.C	125,877.36	0	125,877.36
Bladenboro Cotton Mills, Inc., Bladenboro, N.C	253,960.19	0	253,960.19
Bonnie Cotton Mills, Kings Mountain, N.C	16,093.14	0	16,093.14
Borden Manufacturing Co., Goldsboro, N.C	91,315.39	79,348.67	170,664.06
Botany Cottons, Inc., Gastonia, N.C	270,292.11	0	270,292.11
Caldwell Cotton Mill Co., Lenoir, N.C	66,117.01	0	66,117.01
Cannon Mills Co., Kannapolis, N.C	2,426,755.67	797,677.65	3,224,433.32
Carlton Yarn Mills, Inc., Cherryville, N.C	14,340.16	0	14,340.16
Carlton Yarn Mills, Inc., Salisbury, N.C	3,779.55	0	3,779.55
Carolina Mills, Inc., Maiden, N.C	454,170.44	0	454,170.44
Carolinian Mills No. 167, High Shoals, N.C	210,823.00	0	210,823.00
China Grove Cotton Mills Co., Inc., China Grove, N.C	114,199.85	0	114,199.85
The Chronicle Mills, Belmont, N.C	126,418.88	0	126,418.88
Clayton Spinning Co., Gastonia, N.C	67,215.25	0	67,215.25
Cleveland Mills Co., Lawndale, N.C	80,945.85	0	80,945.85
Climax Spinning Co., Belmont, N.C	126,568.26	0	126,568.26
Clyde Fabrics, Inc., Newton, N.C	174,357.10	0	174,357.10
Cone Mills Corp., Greensboro, N.C	646,619.74	2,333,592.33	2,980,212.07
Corriher Mills Co., Landis, N.C	144,134.43	0	144,134.43
Craftspun Yarns, Inc., Kings Mountain, N.C	149,624.15	0	149,624.15
Cramerton Mills, Cramerton, N.C	202,651.07	0	202,651.07
Crescent Spinning Co., Belmont, N.C	68,245.64	0	68,245.64
Cross Cotton Mills Co., Marion, N.C	147,762.99	0	147,762.99
Dacotah Cotton Mills, Inc., Lexington, N.C	158,290.91	0	158,290.91
Dora Yarn Mill Co., Cherryville, N.C	13,910.76	0	13,910.76
Dover Mill Co., Shelby, N.C	5,623.72	0	5,623.72
Dover Yarn Mill, Inc., Shelby, N.C	5,272.46	0	5,272.46
Durham Hosiery Mills, Durham, N.C	2,863.36	0	2,863.36
Eagle Yarn Mills, Inc., Belmont, N.C	71,825.12	0	71,825.12
Eastern Manufacturing. Co., Selma, N.C	72,602.98	0	72,602.98
Edenton Cotton Mills, Edenton, N.C	69,264.45	0	69,264.45
Elizabeth City Cotton Mills, Elizabeth City, N.C	38,376.38	0	38,376.38
The Elk Cotton Mills, Inc., Fayetteville, Tenn	24,087.69	0	24,087.69
Erlanger Mills, Inc., Lexington, N.C	73,803.79	0	73,803.79
Erwin Mills, Inc., Durham, N.C	1,371,229.44	0	1,371,229.44
Esther Mill Corp., Shelby, N.C	2,288.32	0	2,288.32
Falls Manufacturing Co., Granite Falls, N.C	86,974.94	0	86,974.94
Fieldcrest Mills, Inc., Spray, N.C	197,406.34	204,475.75	401,882.09
Filterite Corp., Timonium, Md	780.84	0	780.84
Firestone Textiles, Gastonia, N.C	43,136.26	0	43,136.26
Flint Plant, Gastonia, N.C	196,958.12	0	196,958.12
Gambrill Melvin, Inc., Bessemer City, N.C	55,293.74	0	55,293.74
Gibson & Cushman, Inc., Lincolnton, N.C	30,473.10	0	30,473.10
Glen Raven Cotton Mills, Inc., Kinston, N.C	4,659.00	0	4,659.00
Globe Mill, Mount Holly, N.C	22,504.62	0	22,504.62
Golden Belt Manufacturing Co., Durham, N.C	52,659.35	0	52,659.35
Groves Thread Co., Inc., Gastonia, N.C	83,160.27	0	83,160.27

Individual interim payments during the period Apr. 11–July 31, 1964—Continued

Name and address	Sight draft payments	Payment-in-kind certificates	Total
NORTH CAROLINA—continued			
Hadley-Peoples Manufacturing Co., Siler City, N.C	$97,033.94	0	$97,033.94
P. H. Hanes Knitting Co., Winston-Salem, N.C	165,693.32	$192,443.22	358,136.54
Harriet Cotton Mills, Henderson, N.C	131,302.65	158,724.27	290,026.92
Hart Cotton Mills, Tarboro, N.C	150,844.38	0	150,844.39
Hayes Cotton Mill Co., Lenoir, N.C	28,154.88	0	28,154.88
Henderson Cotton Mills, Henderson, N.C	150,566.26	188,541.27	339,107.53
Henry River Mills Co., Henry River, N.C	5,978.24	0	5,978.24
Hickory Spinners, Inc., Hickory, N.C	449,721.22	0	49,721.22
Highland Cotton Mills, Inc., High Point, N.C	200,563.00	71,129.64	271,692.64
Highland Park Manufacturing Co., Charlotte, N.C	169,727.61	0	169,727.61
Holt-Williamson Manufacturing Co., Fayetteville, N.C	50,380.84	0	50,380.84
Howell Manufacturing Co., Cherryville, N.C	32,204.18	0	32,204.18
Hudson Cotton Manufacturing Co., Inc., Lenoir, N.C	29,537.23	0	29,537.23
Imperial Yarn Mills, Inc., McAdenville, N.C	69,740.24	0	69,740.24
Ivey Weavers Plant No. 174, Hickory, N.C	43,397.17	0	43,397.17
J. D. Mills, Inc., Henderson, N.C	51,211.67	64,013.56	115,225.23
Johnston Manufacturing Co., Charlotte, N.C	173,741.15	0	173,741.15
Johnston Spinning Co., Monroe, N.C	101,409.54	0	101,409.54
Jordan Spinning Co., Saxapahaw, N.C	52,457.73	0	52,457.73
Kasar Mills, Inc., Casar, N.C	1,944.60	0	1,944.60
Kindley Cotton Mill, Inc., Mt. Pleasant, N.C	18,073.70	0	18,073.70
Kings Mountain Manufacturing Co., Kings Mountain, N.C	21,784.28	0	21,784.28
Klopman Mills, Inc., Greensboro, N.C	200,422.26	0	200,422.26
Lily Mills Co., Shelby, N.C	12,888.84	0	12,888.84
Linford Mills, Inc., Belmont, N.C	74,276.01	0	74,276.01
Linn Mills Co., Inc., Landis, N.C	142,112.93	0	142,112.93
Lions Club Industries for the Blind, Durham, N.C	1,248.63	0	1,248.63
Little Cotton Manufacturing Co., Wadesboro, N.C	136,223.67	14,224.86	150,448.53
Long Shoals Cotton Mills, Inc., Lincolnton, N.C	56,743.95	0	56,743.95
R. C. G. Love Plant, Gastonia, N.C	15,444.77	0	15,444.77
Lowenstein Cotton & Storage Corp., Anderson, S.C	44,187.26	168,909.83	213,097.09
Macanal Mills, Salisbury, N.C	76,807.89	0	76,807.89
Majestic Manufacturing Co., Belmont, N.C	14,788.78	0	14,788.78
Manetta Mills, Monroe, N.C	39,323.76	0	39,323.76
Marion Manufacturing Co., Marion, NC	61,538.67	0	61,538.67
Marshall Mill No. 2, Charlotte, N.C	40,332.36	0	40,332.36
Mauney Mills, Inc., Kings Mountain, N.C	37,220.23	0	37,220.23
Moore Cotton Mill Co., Lenoir, N.C	11,913.97	0	11,913.97
Mooresville Mills, Mooresville, N.C	308,954.75	0	308,954.75
Morehead Mills, Inc., Spray, N.C	38,043.45	0	38,043.45
National Yarn Mills, Belmont, N.C	123,743.61	0	123,743.61
Oakboro Cotton Mills Co., Mount Pleasant, N.C	12,738.70	0	12,738.70
Oakdale Cotton Mills, Jamestown, N.C	70,943.07	0	70,943.07
J. M. Odell Manufacturing Co., Pittsboro, N.C	58,506.10	0	58,506.10
Paola Cotton Mills, Inc., Statesville, N.C	31,745.79	0	31,745.79
Parkdale Mills, Inc., Gastonia, N.C	198,540.41	70,927.61	269,468.02
Park Yarn Mills Co., Kings Mountain, N.C	45,737.31	0	45,737.31
Peck Manufacturing Co., Gastonia, N.C	73,287.62	0	73,287.62
Peerless Spinning Corp., Lowell, N.C	13,117.05	0	13,117.05
Perfection Spinning Co., Belmont, N.C	55,865.28	0	55,865.28
Phoenix No. 1 Plant, Kings Mountain, N.C	200,402.53	0	200,402.53
Phoenix No. 2 Plant, Lincolnton, N.C	151,638.81	0	151,638.81
Pickett Cotton Mills, Inc., High Point, N.C	107,212.03	0	107,212.03
Piedmont Processing Co., Belmont, N.C	86,010.72	0	86,010.72
Pilot Mills Co., Raleigh, N.C	53,843.13	0	53,843.13
H. K. Porter, Co., Inc., Charlotte, N.C	2,060.42	0	2,060.42
Quaker Meadows Mills, Inc. Hickory, N.C	37,398.58	0	37,398.58
Randolph Mills, Inc., Concord, N.C	79,922.04	0	79,922.04
Randolph Mills, Inc., Franklinville, N.C	118,988.40	0	118,988.40
Rhodes-Whitener Mills, Inc., Taylorsville, N.C	39,782.98	0	39,782.98
D. E. Rhyne Mills, Inc., Lincolnton, N.C	5,843.48	0	5,843.48
Roberta Manufacturing Co., Concord, N.C	55,477.24	18,147.61	73,624.85
Robinson Mills, Inc., Gastonia, N.C	105,489.27	0	105,489.27
Rockfish-Mebane Yarn Mills, Inc., Chattanooga, Tenn	181,086.92	0	181,086.92
Rocky Mount Cord Co., Rocky Mount, N.C	655.38	0	655.38
Rocky Mount Mills, Rocky Mount, N.C	362,591.31	0	362,591.31
Rowan Cotton Mills Co., Salisbury, N.C	123,631.48	0	123,631.48
Roxboro Cotton Mills, Roxboro, N.C	275,092.71	0	275,092.71
Royal Cotton Mill Co., Saxapahaw, N.C	81,422.63	0	81,422.63
Rudisill Spinning Mills, Inc., Hickory, N.C	$12,633.26	0	$12,633.26
Sadie Cotton Mills Co., Inc., Kings Mountain, N.C	30,604.46	0	30,604.46
Schneider Mills, Inc., Taylorsville, N.C	15,040.47	0	15,040.47
Scotland Mills, Inc., Lancaster, S.C	330,030.71	0	330,030.71
Sellers Manufacturing Co., Saxapahaw, N.C	42,604.38	0	42,604.38
Shelby Mills, Inc., Shelby, N.C	4,317.48	0	4,317.48
Sherrill Yarn Mills, Inc., Taylorsville, N.C	2,378.09	0	2,378.09
Shuford Mills, Inc., Hickory, N.C	122,065.02	0	122,065.02
Smitherman Cotton Mills, Troy, N.C	73,746.58	0	73,746.58
Smithfield Spinning Co., Smithfield, N.C	135,818.15	0	135,818.15
A. M. Smyre Manufacturing Co., Gastonia, N.C	164,837.85	$71,010.42	235,848.27
South Fork Manufacturing Co., Belmont, N.C	81,455.72	0	81,455.72
Spindale Mills, Inc., Spindale, N.C	131,749.99	0	131,749.99
Spray Cotton Mills, Spray, N.C	123,652.22	0	123,652.22
Sterling Cotton Mills, Inc., Franklinton, N.C	127,528.76	0	127,528.76
Sterling Spinning Co., Belmont, N.C	11,989.17	0	11,989.17
J. P. Stevens & Co., Inc., Greenville, S.C	0	889,835.52	889,835.52
Stowe Spinning Co., Belmont, N.C	122,229.11	0	122,229.11
Stowe Thread Co., Belmont, N.C	34,961.73	0	34,961.73
Superior Yarn Mills, Inc., Mount Holly, N.C	113,129.10	0	113,129.10
Textiles, Inc., Gastonia, N.C	144,418.68	591,030.39	735,449.07
Tolar, Hart & Holt Mill, Inc., Gastonia, N.C	103,801.15	0	103,801.15
Travora Textiles, Inc., Graham, N.C	62,434.96	21,600.66	84,035.62
Tuscarora Cotton Mill, Mount Pleasant, N.C	33,995.31	0	33,995.31
United Spinners Corp., Lowell, N.C	1,213.03	0	1,213.03
United States Rubber Co., Gastonia, N.C	82,389.83	0	82,389.83
Valdese Manufacturing Co., Valdese, N.C	94,501.47	0	94,501.47
Virginia Mills, Inc., Swepsonville, N.C	31,800.85	0	31,800.85
Wade Manufacturing Co., Wadesboro, N.C	139,952.60	0	139,952.60
Washington Mills Co., Winston-Salem, N.C	181,258.85	0	181,258.85
Waverly Mills, Inc., Laurinburg, N.C	3,278.14	0	3,278.14
Wennonah Cotton Mills Co., Lexington, N.C	53,251.56	0	53,251.56
Wiscassett Mills Co., Albemarle, N.C	490,973.59	156,765.44	647,739.03
Worth Spinning Co., Stony Point, N.C	13,953.28	0	13,953.28
Total	19,449,734.34	6,172,680.00	25,622,414.34
OKLAHOMA			
Oklahoma City, Mattress & Felt Co., Oklahoma City, Okla	78.71	0	78.71
Oklahoma Bed Springs Co., Oklahoma City, Okla	100.88	0	100.88
Total	179.59	0	179.59
PENNSYLVANIA			
Raybestos-Manhattan, Inc., Manheim, Pa	5,532.67	0	5,532.67
Total	5,532.67	0	5,532.67
RHODE ISLAND			
Coats & Clark, Inc., Pawtucket, R.I	26,008.25	0	26,008.25
Berkshire-Hathaway, Inc., New Bedford, Mass	79,981.90	0	79,981.90
Total	105,990.15	0	105,990.15
SOUTH CAROLINA			
Abney Mills, Greenwood, S.C	235,644.87	929,597.55	1,165,242.42
Alice Manufacturing Co., Easley, S.C	548,229.97	0	548,229.97
American Thread Co., 260 West Broadway, New York, N.Y	185,618.93	0	185,618.93
Arkwright Mills, Spartanburg, S.C	171,728.18	171,327.58	343,055.76
B. I. Cotton Mills, Calhoun Falls, S.C	254,870.65	0	254,870.65
B. I. Cotton Mills, Cherokee Falls, S.C	101,454.72	0	101,454.72
B. I. Cotton Mills, Valley Falls, S.C	85,411.16	0	85,411.16
Bamberg Textile Mills, Bamberg, S.C	64,480.96	0	64,480.96
Beacon Manufacturing Co., Swannanoa, N.C	60,767.85	0	60,767.85
Blair Mills, Inc., Belton, S.C	75,925.51	0	75,925.51
Blanche Cotton Mills, Augusta, Ga	20,988.69	0	20,988.69
Bowling Green Spinning Co., Gastonia, N.C	61,203.53	0	61,203.53
Cannon Mills Co., Kannapolis, N.C	137,853.16	44,446.61	182,299.77
Catlin Farish Co., Batesburg, S.C	152,791.21	0	152,791.21
Cheraw Cotton Mills, Inc., Cheraw, S.C	129,878.96	0	129,878.96
Chicopee Manufacturing Co., 501 George Street, New Brunswick, N.J	149,425.05	0	149,425.05
Clifton Manufacturing Co., Clifton, S.C	551,797.26	0	551,797.26

Individual interim payments during the period Apr. 11–July 31, 1964—Continued

Name and address	Sight draft payments	Payment-in-kind certificates	Total
SOUTH CAROLINA—continued			
Clinton Cotton Mills, Clinton, S.C	$267,123.99	$93,930.65	$361,054.64
Cone Mills Corp., Greensboro, N.C	106,249.32	0	106,249.32
Drayton Mill, Spartanburg, S.C	34,548.47	42,181.35	76,729.82
Firestone Textiles, Bennettsville, S.C	49,010.25	0	49,010.25
Franklin Process Co., Greenville, S.C	51,632.54	0	51,632.54
Gaffney Manufacturing Co., Gaffney, S.C	49,018.84	235,018.80	284,037.64
Graniteville Co., Graniteville, S.C	279,395.27	1,102,216.40	1,381,611.67
Greenwood Mills, Greenwood, S.C	1,045,156.89	0	1,045,156.89
Greer Manufacturing Co., Easley, S.C	51,161.88	0	51,161.88
Hamer Spinning Mills, Hamer, S.C	60,168.93	0	60,168.93
Hamrick Mills, Gaffney, S.C	19,896.56	78,064.08	97,960.64
Hartsville Mill, Hartsville, S.C	13,700.18	65,146.44	78,846.62
Hermitage Cotton Mills, Camden, S.C	101,072.13	0	101,072.13
Highland Park Manufacturing Co., Rock Hill, S.C	82,618.05	0	82,618.05
Inman Mills, Inman, S.C	123,634.80	491,786.53	615,421.33
Jackson Mills, Wellford, S.C	398,455.12	0	398,455.12
Joanna Cotton Mills Co., Joanna, S.C	272,347.20	0	272,347.20
Joint Research Prototype Mill, Spartanburg, S.C	39,504.14	61,590.62	101,094.76
Judson Mills, Greenville, S.C	16,581.69	65,693.67	82,275.36
Kendall Co., Box 1828, Charlotte, N.C	195,392.40	784,501.59	979,893.99
Kenneth Cotton Mills, Walhalla, S.C	37,805.75	0	37,805.75
Lockhart Mill, Lockhart, S.C	126,351.87	162,280.68	288,632.55
Lowenstein Cotton & Storage Corp., Anderson, S.C	364,124.91	1,354,305.32	1,718,430.23
Lydia Cotton Mills, Clinton, S.C	179,435.36	63,665.16	243,100.52
Mackintosh Spinning Mill, Inc., Clover, S.C	33,187.55	0	33,187.55
Manetta Mills, Inc., Lando, S.C	2,034.82	0	2,034.82
Mass. Mohair Plush Co., Inc., Kings Mountain, N.C	23,785.96	0	23,785.96
Mayfair Mills, Arcadia, S.C	609,777.84	0	609,777.84
Monarch Mill, Union, S.C	230,045.65	273,496.14	503,541.79
Mount Vernon Mills, Inc., 201 East Baltimore Street, Baltimore, Md	475,825.58	0	475,825.58
Musgrove Mills, Gaffney, S.C	14,978.60	58,608.67	73,587.27
Newberry Mills, Inc., Newberry, S.C	142,372.03	0	142,372.03
Orange Cotton Mills, Orangeburg, S.C	38,133.73	0	38,133.73
Pacolet Mill, Pacolet Mills, S.C	162,221.08	189,224.75	351,445.83
Pacolet Yarns, Greenville, S.C	58,485.37	65,303.67	123,789.04
Parke, Davis & Co., Greenwood, S.C	7,586.14	0	7,586.14
F. W. Poe Manufacturing Co., Greenville, S.C	147,653.79	0	147,653.79
Raybestos-Manhattan, Inc., North Charleston, S.C	5,460.84	0	5,460.84
Reeves Bros. Inc., Spartanburg, S.C	342,216.13	0	342,216.13
Riegel Textile Corp., Ware Shoals, S.C	549,299.77	0	549,299.77
S. C. Cotton Mills, Orangeburg, S.C	86,001.42	0	86,001.42
Scotland Mills, Inc., Lancaster, S.C	136,204.56	0	136,204.56
Spartan Mills, Spartanburg, S.C	1,122,060.26	0	1,122,060.26
The Springs Cotton Mills, Lancaster, S.C	3,780,297.40	0	3,780,297.40
J. P. Stevens & Co., Inc., Box 1209, Greenville, S.C	0	2,650,133.52	2,650,133.52
Townsend Cotton Mill, Anderson, S.C	10,171.19	0	10,171.19
Division of United Merchants & Manufacturers, Bath, S.C	32,723.34	121,507.03	154,230.37
Division of United Merchants & Manufacturers, Buffalo, S.C	58,586.19	308,762.08	367,348.27
Division of United Merchants & Manufacturers, Union, S.C	6,122.67	40,752.92	46,875.59
U.S. Rubber Co., Winnsboro, S.C	148,881.19	0	148,881.19
West Point Manufacturing Co., Box 71, West Point, Ga	34,720.07	185,617.30	220,337.37
Woodside Mills, Greenville, S.C	0	1,126,922.73	1,126,922.73
Total	15,211,290.37	10,766,081.84	25,977,372.21
TENNESSEE			
Bemis Bro. Bag Co., Bemis, Tenn	285,699.89	0	285,699.89
J. P. Stevens & Co., Inc.-Borden Plant, Greenville, S.C	0	322,407.33	322,407.33
Cherokee Textile Mills, Sevierville, Tenn	109,991.70	0	109,991.70
TENNESSEE—continued			
Dixie Mercerizing Co., Chattanooga, Tenn	$205,831.92	0	$205,831.92
Dyersburg Cotton Products, Inc., Dyersburg, Tenn	125,163.47	0	125,163.47
Elk Cotton Mills, Fayetteville, Tenn	88,028.06	0	88,028.06
Rockford Manufacturing Co., Rockford, Tenn	57,302.62	0	57,302.62
Standard-Coosa-Thatcher Co., Chattanooga, Tenn	72,942.03	$73,691.47	146,633.50
Standard Knitting Mills, Inc., Knoxville, Tenn	194,685.12	0	194,685.12
Tennessee Line & Twine Co., Elizabethton, Tenn	6,651.83	0	6,651.83
Trenton Mills, Inc., Trenton, Tenn	29,767.45	0	29,767.45
Werthan Bag Corp., Nashville, Tenn	185,876.20	0	185,876.20
Total	1,361,940.29	396,098.80	1,758,039.09
TEXAS			
Brenham Cotton Mill, Inc., Brenham, Tex	127,199.47	57,878.86	185,078.33
B. I. Cotton Mills, West, Tex	41,902.49	0	41,902.49
Corsicana Cotton Mills, Corsicana, Tex	45,235.57	0	45,235.57
Central Texas Development Co., Inc., West, Tex	7,911.73	0	7,911.73
Coastal Pickery, Inc., Galveston, Tex	287.75	0	287.75
Denison Cotton Mill Co., Denison, Tex	146,212.82	0	146,212.82
Houston Cotton Mills Co., Houston, Tex	31,925.58	0	31,925.58
Houston Textile Co., Houston, Tex	0	52,984.80	52,984.80
Walter Hogg Cotton Industries, Inc., Dallas, Tex	808.07	0	808.07
Hillsboro Cotton Mills, Hillsboro, Tex	26,931.69	0	26,931.69
Ralph Leggett Cotton Co., Houston, Tex	165.68	0	165.68
Lone Star Textiles, Inc., Hallettsville, Tex	78,292.94	0	78,292.94
Lone Star Textiles, Inc., Mexia, Tex	126,466.53	0	126,466.53
Mission Valley Mills, Inc., New Braunfels, Tex	131,662.43	47,678.08	179,340.51
Postex Cotton Mills, Post, Tex	110,209.70	0	110,209.70
Plains Cotton Growers, Inc., Lubbock, Tex	190.97	0	190.97
Plainview Mattress Factory, Plainview, Tex	468.96	0	468.96
Red River Cotton Mills, Inc., Bonham, Tex	88,206.49	0	88,206.49
Sherman Manufacturing Co., Sherman, Tex	219,517.08	0	219,517.08
Standco Brake Lining Co., Houston, Tex	1,144.32	0	1,144.32
Sinclair Bedding Co., Waco, Tex	118.95	0	118.95
Texas Department of Corrections Textile Mill, Huntsville, Tex	18,322.84	0	18,322.84
Texas Textile Mills, Inc., McKinney, Tex	241,016.29	0	241,016.29
Waco Mattress Co., Waco, Tex	36.40	0	36.40
Total	1,444,234.75	158,541.74	1,602,776.49
VIRGINIA			
Dan River Mills, Inc., Danville, Va	0	1,593,303.78	1,593,303.78
Fieldcrest Mills, Inc., Spray, N.C	96,890.95	100,762.41	197,653.36
Halifax Cotton Mills, Inc., South Boston, Va	32,999.47	0	32,999.47
Industrial Department, the Penitentiary, Richmond, Va	5,361.08	0	5,361.08
Washington Mills Co., Fries, Va	349,931.53	0	349,931.53
Total	485,183.03	1,694,066.19	2,179,249.22

HOW DID THE CONSUMERS FARE?

The latest cotton situation report, official bulletin of the U.S. Department of Agriculture—CS-215, page 9—reports:

> Cloth prices are slightly higher. The average wholesale value of fabric (20 constructions) made from a pound of cotton in October was 61.25 cents per pound compared with 61.02 cents in September and 61.34 a year earlier.

Here is today's Wall Street Journal commodity price quotations. They show the comparison with a year ago, before the multimillion-dollar payments to textile mills were begun:

CASH PRICES: FRIDAY, JANUARY 22, 1965

(Quotations as of 4 p.m., eastern time)

Textiles and fibers

	Friday	Thursday	Year ago
Cotton, 1-inch middling, Memphis ……pound	0.3025	0.3025	0.3325
Print cloth:			
64 by 60, 38½-inch, New York ……yard	.16	.16	.14½
80 by 80, 39-inch, New York ……do	.20¼	.20¼	.19
Sheetings, 56 by 60, 40-inch, New York ……do	.19¾	.19¾	.19½
Burlap, 10-ounce, 40-inch, New York ……do	.1320a	.1320	.1195
Wool, fine staple territory, Boston ……pound	1.30	1.30	1.41
Wool tops, New York ……do	1.655n	1.655	1.845
Rayon, satin acetate, New York ……yard	.28n	.28	.27

Textile unions which a year ago supported the cotton bill now call it a bonanza for the mills.

The administration assurances that the mill subsidies would yield rich returns for the consumers have not been fulfilled.

Yes, this is why the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLEN-

der], who are the ranking member and chairman of the other body's Agriculture and Forestry Committee, have expressed such deep doubt about the cotton program.

In the Congressional Record, volume 110, part 17, page 22000, the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. Aiken] says:

> This subsidy will amount to some $300–$400 million this first year.
>
> In other words, it would have paid us better to have bought all these imports coming in from foreign countries and given them to the people of the underdeveloped countries of the world and we would still have saved some money.

At page 20001 of the Record of the same date, the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Ellender] said:

> My study of the cost figures revealed that actual expenditures under the new cotton law would amount to $753 million. * * * And, as a matter of fact, it is considerably more than the cost of the program under the 1958 law.

I would also draw to the attention of the House the fact that Secretary Freeman has reduced by 1 penny a pound the CCC loan level on the 1965 crop, an action which will affect the income of every cottongrower in the Nation.

I commend the Secretary for this action, but regret that he did not take a similar action each year he has headed the Department. Had he done so—and he had ample authority—cotton would have today been on a sound road and taxpayers would have millions more in their pockets.

It is noteworthy that the Internal Revenue Service has ruled that the new subsidies going to textile mills must be treated as income for tax purposes.

An item in the Wall Street Journal of January 15, 1965, reported as follows:

> Payments voted by Congress in the 1964 farm law must be counted promptly by U.S. mills as taxable income, the IRS ruled. The payments of 6½ cents a pound to cotton handlers are aimed at keeping the fiber from being more costly to domestic than to export mills. Some cotton users wanted the payments, which can be either in cotton or in cash, to be treated as reducing their cotton inventory values, in which case the amounts involved usually wouldn't be subject to tax until the goods were sold. But the IRS held the recipients generally must treat the payments as "other income" in the year in which the Agriculture Department approves their applications for the subsidies.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think the House should understand very clearly today why it is going to be asked tomorrow to put up millions of extra dollars to pay for the cotton program. Millions of dollars more, I might add, than was originally budgeted for fiscal year 1965.

After I complained earlier today in a speech on the House floor that copies of the Appropriations Committee hearings on the supplemental bill would not be ready for examination until 2 hours before the House convenes tomorrow, the distinguished chairman of the Committee, the Honorable George Mahon of Texas, saw to it that I was provided with an advance proof the hearings.

For that, I am grateful, as it enables me to refer you directly from official sources as to why we are now called upon to pay the piper for last year's cotton folly. I invite your attention to the hearings, which will doubtless be available during consideration of the bill tomorrow. See statements on these pages: 7, 12, 15, 24, 28, 29, 33, 38–39, and 41.

KERMIT GORDON STIRS UP A STORM

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Findley] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, it will be surprising if Budget Director Kermit Gordon ever again ventures from statistical seclusion to discuss Federal farm programs.

In the January 9 issue of Saturday Review magazine, Mr. Gordon made some mild observations about the cost and results of farm programs, noted they originated back in the 1930's as welfare measures and suggested they be reviewed in the light of today's circumstances. It stirred up a storm of critical comment, most of it from Mr. Gordon's side of the political aisle.

Most of what he wrote about farms and farming was mild, factual, and restrained—information readily available to every student of the subject. He noted, for example, that most of the money spent for farm programs does not trickle down to the low-income farmers but goes to relatively successful commercial farmers.

Those who have been reading my rather steady commentary on the wheat certificate program will recognize this as a familiar theme. I have pointed out, for example, that the big boys, 1,300 giant wheatgrowers, qualify for average annual payments of $15,000 a year, while the small wheatgrowers—those in the 12- to 15-acre category, and there are more than a million of them—qualify for average annual payments of only $58.

But back to Mr. Gordon's predicament About all Mr. Gordon did was to air some long-known truths. He said farm programs "are no longer a means of distributing income to the neediest groups in our population; they are not welfare programs. From a welfare standpoint, the chief claimants to assistance are the 2,500,000 farmers who do not now and cannot in the future be expected to operate successful commercial farms."

In this comment, Mr. Gordon was, in my opinion, unduly pessimistic. If freed from the shackles of bureaucratic regulation, U.S. agriculture can win such expanding markets that many of these farmers who are now marginal will find solid opportunity on the farm. Whether that happens depends in great measure on whether Congress acts promptly to give the farmer the freedom he needs and deserves. Under present governmental handicaps, these 2½ million farmers probably do face the bleak future painted by Mr. Gordon.

In any event, Mr. Gordon does not deserve to be blasted for wanting to drive 2½ million farmers off the land.

Mr. Gordon made the valid and important point that much of American agriculture is relatively healthy and the Federal Government should stop using welfare gimmicks on that part of it.

He also took note of the influence of compensatory payments that have, as he puts it, "crept" into our system.

I commend particularly his statement on this point:

> Now if there is any one principle of economics that economists of every persuasion would accept, it is that the price system is an exceptionally useful mechanism both for conserving a scarce resource and for allocating it to uses with the greatest value.

I hope the people drafting farm legislation proposals soon to come to Capitol Hill will keep this excellent time-tested principle in mind.

This is probably too much to hope for, as Mr. Gordon has been verbally whipped from pillar to post for making observations such as that in the Saturday Review piece.

The inconsistencies of agricultural legislation must drive good economists crazy.

Take a look at the first farm bill launched by President Johnson, the wheat-cotton bill of 1964. In the very same legislative package he put a multimillion-dollar payment bonanza benefiting textile mills and a multimillion-dollar processing tax handicapping flour mills; on one hand, a scheme to reduce raw material costs to cotton processors, and on the other, one to increase raw material costs to wheat processors; one of these—cotton—financed by general tax revenues, and the other—wheat—financed by what may be the most regressive excise fee in history, fittingly described as a tax on poor people.

Other inconsistencies have been with us for years.

As Mr. Gordon pointed out, taxpayers spend millions of dollars to take land out of production, hoping this will balance supply and demand, and spend other millions to put new land into production. The cost of some of the land reclamation and irrigation projects, heavily subsidized by taxpayers, ranges as high as $1,500 an acre.

If responsible officials like Mr. Gordon are to be bloodied up every time they attempt to discuss farm programs, can we reasonably expect ever to pull the American taxpayer—farmers are taxpayers too—out of the costly muck and mire churned up in the Capitol Hill legislative mill during the last 30 years?

A responsible dialog on farm programs should be encouraged, not discouraged. Some of the programs have become so complex they seem to defy understanding.

It is high time for a thorough discussion, debate, and delineation of their nature and effect. Such would be helpful to farmers and all other Americans.

Mr. Gordon's article is a hopeful beginning.

PRESIDENT'S BUDGET CAN BE CUT

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. Pelly] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's 1966 budget request asks new obligational authority of $103 billion. In addition, the President says later he will ask for an additional $3 billion. The total is estimated as $106 billion, so no one should be misled into believing this is a $99.7 billion budget.

That $99.7 billion figure is for the consumption of those who urged Mr. Johnson to hold his budget under $100 billion.

As for the statement of the President in his message, that public debt is not a drain on national resources because it is mostly owed to ourselves, that is more of the same old brainwash we have been hearing for years. The $11 billion interest alone of our national debt averages $222 per household and that is a drain on every family in America.

The President may have cut out funds to purchase a few new filing cabinets and maybe a few light bulbs, but I am confident that Congress can make substantial cuts on his budget without hurting anyone.

THE CONTINUING BALANCE-OF-PAYMENTS PROBLEM

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, in spite of numerous actions which have been taken to eliminate the chronic balance-of-payments problem, the United States continues to run a heavy deficit and no solution to the problem is in sight under current policies.

The deficit on regular transactions in 1964 is now estimated at $2.5 million. This is some improvement over the previous years but far from satisfactory. Even more disturbing is the fact that experts on the balance of payments expect little or no improvement this year. When one recalls that Secretary Dillon told the Joint Economic Committee several years ago that deficits of this magnitude could not be permitted to continue much longer, there appears to be cause for real concern.

The continuing deficit as well as the sharp increase in our money supply in recent years have all combined to put renewed pressure on our gold stock. While the gold drain in 1964 was small by the standards of the past several years, opinion is widespread that the gold outflow will accelerate sharply this year. It has been said in the press that some administration officials believe the gold outflow may run from $500 million to $1 billion. If this occurs, combined with the expected increase in Federal Reserve note and deposit liabilities, the so-called free gold available to meet potential foreign claims will shrink near the vanishing point.

In spite of such regressive measures as the interest equalization tax and numerous other palliatives and gimmicks which the administration has devised to buy time we have not used this time to attack the basic causes of the problem. We are still in the position where our continuing balance of payments and gold problems could result in the collapse of the international monetary system unless basic and effective remedial action is taken in the near future. In fact the cost of buying the time we have squandered has put us in a worse position. This may involve some hard and unpleasant choices, such as a reexamination of U.S. foreign and military outlays overseas. But we must remember that the health of the world financial system is at stake and that any collapse of that system would create new and serious problems of unemployment and deflation here at home.

Last July Senators Jacob K. Javits and Jack Miller and myself, as members of the Joint Economic Committee, in a resolution introduced in the House and Senate, recommended that the United States initiate discussions within the International Monetary Fund designed to strengthen the international monetary system. While such discussion, particularly involving the adequacy of both present and future supplies of international liquidity, were conducted by both the IMF and the so-called group of 10 major industrial powers, the practical results of those studies have been inadequate in the face of the problems before us.

For this reason my colleagues and I in the Senate, as well as Representative William B. Widnall, ranking minority member of the House Banking and Currency Committee and member of the Joint Economic Committee, are again introducing a resolution dealing with our balance-of-payments deficit.

The resolution declares the intent of Congress that the elimination of the payments deficit should receive top priority by the administration, that the maintenance of the balance-of-payments equilibrium should be a continuing and major goal of our economic policy, that the world monetary and credit mechanism should be strengthened and that the United States should press for an international economic conference to discuss urgent economic world problems.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the resolution be included in the Record at this point.

H. Con. Res. 127

Whereas the United States has had a deficit in its international balance of payments every year, except one, since 1950; and

Whereas, largely as a result of these deficits, United States short-term dollar liabilities to foreigners totaled an estimated $27,976,000,000 at the end of October 1964; and

Whereas these liabilities constitute a potential claim against the United States gold stock of $15,200,000,000, of which less than $1,400,000,000 is "free gold" not required to serve as backing for our currency; and

Whereas the health of our domestic economy and strength of the dollar and its ability to serve as a key international reserve currency depends upon the early elimination of the balance-of-payments deficit and the creation of improved arrangements to serve the liquidity needs for an expanding international trade and payments system: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress of the United States that achievement of balance-of-payments equilibrium in a manner consistent with the dollar's role as a key international reserve currency should receive the highest priority in the formation of national economic policy, and be it further

Resolved, That the maintenance of equilibrium in its international accounts should be a continuing and major goal of United States international economic policy; and be it further

Resolved, That the United States take the initiative to devise new and improved methods of permanently strengthening the international monetary and credit mechanism in order to provide (a) improved means of financing balance-of-payments deficits until basic corrective forces restore equilibrium, and (b) sufficient liquidity to finance future increases in world trade and payments; and be it further

Resolved, That the President be required to call for an International Economic Conference to review the long-term adequacy of international credit; to recommend needed changes in existing financial institutions; to consider increased sharing of economic aid for development and military assistance; and to consider other pressing international economic problems placed before it by a preparatory committee for such Conference.

WHO IS INTERESTED IN INTEREST?

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, much discussion of monetary policy, and the concern of public policy with respect to interest rates, seems to emphasize the cost or payment aspect of interest and interest rates. This concern tends to neglect the fact that for every interest payment or interest cost there is elsewhere in the economy an interest-received item or interest-income aspect.

This one-sided concern probably results from the fact that most homeowners and businessmen are more aware and reminded of the monthly payments coming due on mortgages and notes payable than they are of their share in the interest income which accrues to them on life insurance policies, pension incomes, savings bonds and accounts, or other interest-bearing holdings. The interposition of these financial intermediaries between the individual as a debtor who must pay interest, and the same individual as a creditor who benefits indirectly from interest received, may be the reason why the cost aspect tends to be emphasized and the income aspect overlooked. We tend to think primarily about higher interest costs and forget, for example, that the recent high rates on savings accounts mean increased income to savers—often the same persons who pay interest—and help to generate savings which in turn become available to finance home mortgages and businesses. This same situation involving intermediaries and differences between credit obligations and equity positions makes it difficult for us to balance the two quantities of first, who pays interest on the one hand; and second, who receives this interest on the other hand.

A table in the Federal Reserve Bulletin of October 1964 giving the sector statement of "financial" assets and liabilities throws some light on this subject. It is not argued on the basis of the table that interest payments or interest income are precisely proportionate to these "financial" liabilities or assets since interest rates may differ from contract to contract and, indeed, some assets or liabilities carry no interest charges at all.

It is noteworthy from the table, however, that "households" own more than twice as many financial assets as those which they owe. Interest earnings credited to or received by households are presumably of a magnitude nearly double the interest paid. It is significant, too, but not surprising, that the interest-earning assets and the deposits of commercial banks, not all of which bear interest of course, are substantially the same amount. Principal debtors, on balance, are governments and nonfinancial businesses.

Sector statement of selected financial assets and liabilities,[1] Dec. 31, 1963

[In billions of dollars]

	Assets (interest earning) [1]	Liabilities (interest cost) [1]
Households	$694.1	$269.2
Farms	7.1	29.7
Business (nonfinancial)	254.5	362.6
Commercial banks	262.4	258.8
Savings and loan associations	107.4	100.2
Mutual savings banks	49.7	44.6
Life insurance companies	133.8	116.9
Other insurance companies	25.8	----------
Pension funds (noninsured)	23.1	----------
Finance companies	36.2	27.0
Brokers and open-end investment companies	13.0	8.0
U.S. Government	77.4	295.0
State and local governments	69.0	121.4
Rest of world	34.8	29.5

[1] Estimated amounts involving interest payments or receipts (in the case of demand deposits for service and availability costs). Corporate stocks, direct investments of foreigners in U.S. gold stocks, etc., although "financial assets" have been excluded.

Source: Federal Reserve Bulletin, October 1964, pp. 1343–1348.

DEFINING POVERTY: THE IMPORTANCE OF CONSIDERING POTENTIAL INCOME FROM ASSETS

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, in attempting to identify those who are living in poverty the administration has set an annual money income of $3,000 as the poverty line. Critics of this definition have pointed out that a family's assets, the number of children and their ages, the area of the country in which they live and many other nonincome factors should be considered before a family can be said to be poverty-stricken.

A recent Government study conducted by the Social Security Administration and discussed in the December 1964 issue of the Social Security Bulletin dramatically illustrates the effect on income of persons and families aged 65 and over, if the assets of such persons were converted to income prorated over the expected life of the holder.

Under this system, the median income of aged couples rises from $2,875 to $3,795 annually with assets, including home equity, prorated over the expected life of the couple. Excluding home equity, the median would rise to $3,130. Prorating all assets, the percentage of aged couples with income levels under $3,000 falls from 54 percent of the total of such couples to 35 percent of the total.

The type of analysis contained in this study is vital if the poverty program is going to achieve its objectives. In the case of the aged population, supplementary sources of income not considered under the administration's definition are especially important and may significantly enhance the well-being of an aged couple or individual.

I ask unanimous consent that the article referred to, entitled "Potential Income From Assets: Findings of the 1963 Survey of the Aged," and prepared by Janet Murray be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

POTENTIAL INCOME FROM ASSETS: FINDINGS OF THE 1963 SURVEY OF THE AGED

(By Janet Murray [1])

If the assets of all persons in the United States aged 65 and over could be converted to income prorated over the expected life of the holder, the median income for aged couples in 1962, with equity in the home excluded, would be raised from $2,875 to $3,130. The median would be raised from $1,365 to $1,560 for nonmarried men and from $1,015 to $1,130 for nonmarried women.

Such an addition of distributed assets to income would increase the inequality of the income distribution. It would still leave more than a third of the couples and about two-thirds of the nonmarried with insufficient income to live independently at the modest but adequate budget of standards developed by the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

It has long been recognized that, although current money income is the customary and certainly the best single measure of the economic situation of any population group, supplementary resources may be especially important for the aged. Assets, inheritances, and other occasional money receipts not classified as income, the informal transfers to income that occur when the elderly share living arrangements with relatives, food that is homegrown or received as a gift or in lieu of wages—all these resources may significantly enhance the well-being of an aged couple or individual.

Detailed information from the 1963 Survey of the Aged, conducted by the Social Security Administration, on the size and sources of the income of the aged and on the size and composition of their asset holdings has been published in previous articles.[2]

The objective of this article is to focus on a measurement that combines data on the income and assets of the survey units, as well as their age and sex. This measurement has been called potential income. It involves an arbitrary proration of assets, plus earned interest, over the expected life of the survey units. Although this is a statistical construct, it serves as a convenient device for grouping together units having approximately the same economic position when both income and assets are considered and thus for showing how the size distribution of current money income would be altered with assets taken into account in this way.

Lump-sum life insurance and other payments—inheritances, gifts, tax refunds, back pay, awards for injury or damage—that are classified as current income may be large indeed for a few individuals (the inheritance of a "wealthy widow," for example), but they cannot be considered as a resource for the great majority. In 1962 only about 5 percent of the units aged 65 and over had any receipts of this kind. Food received without direct expense is a supplementary resource for a larger number of units and may be of special importance to those with very low incomes, but in general the value of such food is small. Living with relatives may improve the economic situation of the aged in some cases; in others, it is of mutual advantage or may benefit the younger members. The limited information on the financial aspects of such living arrangements that can be derived from a cross-tabulation of the money income of the older units by income of all members in the family group is currently being analyzed.

POTENTIAL INCOME—CONCEPT AND MEASUREMENT

In order to express the economic position of units with any combination of income and asset holdings and to group the units with broadly equivalent positions, "income with prorated assets"—in other words, potential income—was computed for each unit. The following procedure was used:

Assets were assumed to be capable of earning a 4-percent annual rate of return. The principal and the appropriate interest amounts were divided over the expected remaining years of the unit's life in equal annual sums so that the assets would be exhausted at the end of that period. The annual amount computed in this way was added to the current money income less income actually received from assets.[3] For couples, proration was based on a joint probability: the number of years of life remaining for husband and wife together and the number either spouse might survive alone to draw two-thirds of the annual portion of asset holdings previously available to the couple.[4] In a few cases—usually those in the lower end of the age range, or couples who had assets other than equity in a home—the actual return was greater than the 4 percent used in the computation, and the prorated amount of assets added was less than the amount subtracted.

---

[1] Division of Research and Statistics. John Labovitz assisted in the analysis.

[2] The income of the aged was reported in the Bulletin for March 1964, work experience and earnings in the June 1964 issue, and assets in the November 1964 issue.

[3] The amounts that were subtracted were interest on deposits in banks, credit unions, etc.; interest or dividends on stocks and bonds; and 4 percent of any amounts reported as invested in a business or farm.

[4] The factors needed in the computation were developed by the Division of the Actuary. The U.S. Life Tables for 1959 were used in determining life expectancies by age and sex. For simplicity in calculation for married couples, the wife was arbitrarily assumed to be 5 years younger than the husband and the joint life expectancies were computed on that basis.

The adoption of these procedures, although in effect assuming the conversion of assets into life annuities, does not in any way bear upon the question of the feasibility or the desirability of this form of asset management for individuals. The advisability of such conversion would, indeed, be subject to many conditions and considerations important for the individuals involved. The conversion of the owned farm or other business holdings into prorated assets, for example, is recognized as particularly unrealistic. However, in order to achieve the objective of measuring equivalence of economic status within broad population groups, such assets have been included.

As an illustration of the concept and measurement of potential income, some questions may be raised, and answered, about groups of individuals with different combinations of income and assets. It would be generally agreed that persons with incomes of, say, $1,500 and asset holdings of $10,000 are better off than those with the same income and no assets. But would they be better off than others with an income of $2,000 and with $1,000 in assets? If these persons were all nonmarried women aged 65 and were currently receiving a 4-percent return from their assets, all would have about the same potential income—actual income minus the income from assets plus prorated assets—of slightly more than $2,000. For those with $10,000 in assets, $900 of this amount would be income from prorated assets. If the latter group were aged 85 instead of 65, the potential income would be appreciably greater—about $3,600, with more than $2,500 from prorated assets.

An owned home, unlike other assets, is not normally acquired as a source of future money income or as a reserve for contingencies but rather for the services and satisfaction it yields as a place of family living. Accordingly, potential income has been calculated both including and excluding home equity among the assets prorated. For many purposes it may be more reasonable and realistic to exclude the owned home from prorated assets, especially since sale of the home would increase the need for income to cover rental costs. Such costs tend to run higher than the expense of ownership, particularly for the large group of the elderly who own their homes clear of mortgage.

The distributions of couples and of nonmarried men and women aged 65 and over by level of potential income and the median amount of such income are compared with the distributions of the same groups by level of actual income. Comparisons are presented for beneficiaries under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance (OASDI) program and for nonbeneficiaries, for three age groups. A cross-tabulation of units by actual income and by income with prorated assets other than owned homes provides information on the proportions of units whose potential income is considerably higher than or about the same as their actual income. Finally, the income with prorated assets other than the owned home of units with no income from earnings is reviewed. Those units who are receiving income from earnings may still be increasing their asset holdings. Those who no longer have such income are more likely to be drawing upon assets previously acquired. An understanding of the potential income of this group seems of special interest.

COMPARISON OF POTENTIAL AND ACTUAL INCOME

When the distributions of survey units by actual and potential income shown in table 1 are compared, they appear to be remarkably similar. When the comparison is based upon income with prorated assets other than the home, the differences that do exist usually amount to only 1 or 2 percentage points at any income interval. Differences are definitely larger when the owned home is included in the prorated assets. An indication of the shifts in the distributions may be obtained through a comparison of the medians for units aged 65 and over, shown below.

Type of unit	Actual income	Income with prorated assets	
		Excluding home equity	Including home equity
Married couples	$2,875	$3,130	$3,795
Nonmarried men	1,365	1,560	1,845
Nonmarried women	1,015	1,130	1,395

Although the median potential income is about 10 percent greater than actual income when home equity is excluded and a little more than 30 percent greater when home equity is included, these shifts in the medians do not indicate the amounts that prorated assets would add in the aggregate to current income. The distributions of potential income are even more skewed to the right than are the distributions of current income, and the inequalities in the distributions are increased.

The greater shift in the distribution when equity in the home is included among the assets reflects the importance of such equity, and the extent of homeownership, as a major form of assets among aged persons with relatively low incomes.

Another way of relating potential to actual income is to compare the percentages of units at less than a given level. It has been estimated that $2,500 in 1962 would have permitted a retired couple to live independently at the BLS "modest but adequate" budget standard. About 42 percent of the couples had actual income of less than $2,500. Thirty-six percent had less than $2,500 if prorated assets excluding the owned home were added to income. It is not appropriate to relate to this benchmark the proportion of couples with less than $2,500 in potential income when the equity in the owned home is prorated because the $2,500 cost estimate assumes that a majority of units own their homes. If all units are assumed to rent their homes the cost of the "modest but adequate" budget would be higher.

TABLE 1.—*Size of income, actual* [1] *and with prorated assets (excluding and including equity in nonfarm home),*[2] *for units aged 65 and over—Percentage distribution, by income level, 1962*

Income level	Married couples			Nonmarried men			Nonmarried women		
	Actual income	Income with prorated assets		Actual income	Income with prorated assets		Actual income	Income with prorated assets	
		Excluding equity in home	Including equity in home		Excluding equity in home	Including equity in home		Excluding equity in home	Including equity in home
Number (in thousands):									
Total	5,445	5,445	5,445	2,402	2,402	2,402	6,329	6,329	6,329
Reporting on specified income [3]	4,719	4,337	4,337	2,173	2,063	2,063	5,536	5,086	5,085
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Less than $1,000	5	4	3	32	28	25	49	45	36
$1,000 to $1,499	10	9	6	25	20	18	21	21	18
$1,500 to $1,999	14	12	8	12	12	11	13	13	13
$2,000 to $2,499	13	11	9	11	12	11	7	6	8
$2,500 to $2,999	12	12	9	5	6	7	3	4	6
$3,000 to $3,999	16	18	18	6	6	8	3	4	7
$4,000 to $4,999	11	10	11	3	5	6	1	2	4
$5,000 to $9,999	15	18	26	6	8	11	3	3	5
$10,000 and over	5	7	9	1	3	5	(4)	2	2
Median: [5]									
All units	$2,875	$3,130	$3,795	$1,365	$1,560	$1,845	$1,015	$1,130	$1,395
OASDI beneficiaries	2,800	3,020	3,685	1,405	1,640	1,960	1,225	1,330	1,630
Nonbeneficiaries	3,580	3,835	4,585	1,145	1,325	1,560	755	815	960

---

[1] Total money income in 1962.

[2] Actual income less income from assets plus the portion of asset holdings that would have been available for spending annually if all assets were prorated over the average remaining years of life of the unit, with a 4-percent annual return. Sex differentials in longevity included in computation. For couples, proration based on joint probability of the number of years remaining for husband and wife together and the number either spouse might survive alone to draw ⅔ of asset holdings available to couple annually.

[3] Data on actual income based on information for those survey units reporting amount of money income received in 1962. Data on income with prorated assets based on information for those survey units reporting both amount of money income in 1962 and amount of assets at the end of 1962. Median actual income of those reporting on both income and assets would probably be about the same for married couples, slightly higher for nonmarried men, and slightly lower for nonmarried women.

[4] Less than 0.5 percent.

[5] Computed from $500 income groupings.

For an individual living alone, the estimated amount required to provide the modest but adequate standard was $1,800. Those nonmarried men and women having income of less than $2,000 and those with less than $1,500 as measured by the concepts—actual money income and income with prorated assets excluding the owned home—are shown in percentage terms in the following tabulation:

Income	Nonmarried men		Nonmarried women	
	Income less than—		Income less than—	
	$2,000	$1,500	$2,000	$1,500
Actual income	69	57	83	70
Income with prorated assets (excluding equity in owned home)	60	48	79	66

The percentages of the survey units with income (actual and potential, including and excluding the owned home) of less than $3,000 and less than $2,000 for couples and, for nonmarried men and women, of less than $2,000 and less than $1,000 are shown in chart 1. These levels cover, in general, the critical ranges of concern in much of the current discussion of the identification of the "poor."

(Chart omitted from printing.)

The role of assets may also be judged by examining the proportion of those at each income level who shift into a higher level when the classification is by potential income. A cross-tabulation of the units by actual income and by income with prorated assets excluding the owned home permits the measurement of such shifts. Those units with no assets, or with assets so small that their potential income falls in the same $1,000 intervals as their actual income, are classified as having "no improvement." The few units whose potential income falls in a lower interval than their actual income are also classified in this way. The units who shift into the next higher income class with the addition of prorated assets are grouped as having "moderate improvement," and those who shift two or more classes as having "appreciable improvement."

The results, as shown in table 2 and chart 2, reflect the fact that most of the units with low incomes have little in the way of assets, especially when equity in the home is excluded. Most of the units—more than four-fifths of the nonmarried men and women and three-fourths of the couples—with actual incomes of less than $3,000 remain in the same income interval when classified by potential income. The proportion remaining in the same class is greater at the income levels below $3,000 than in the $3,000 to $5,000 classes. Conversely, the proportion with "appreciable" improvement increased with income, particularly among the nonmarried. Four percent of the couples with actual income of less than $2,000 showed an appreciable improvement when classified by potential income; of those with actual income of $3,000 to $3,999, the improvement was substantial for 9 percent. For nonmarried men, on the other hand, 6 percent of those with actual income of less than $2,000 but 27 percent of those with $3,000 to $3,999 showed an appreciable improvement. The pattern for nonmarried women was similar to that for the men.

TABLE 2.—*Shifts in income level with addition to actual income of prorated assets (excluding equity in nonfarm home)* [1] *for units aged 65 and over—Percentage distribution at specified income level, by extent of improvement, 1962*

Actual income level and marital status	Number reporting [2] (thousands)	Total percent	Percent with—		
			No improvement [3]	Moderate improvement [4]	Appreciable improvement [5]
Married couples:					
Less than $1,000	224	100	76	19	4
$1,000 to $1,999	1,007	100	81	14	4
$2,000 to $2,999	1,097	100	77	16	6
$3,000 to $3,999	713	100	76	15	9
$4,000 to $4,999	453	100	68	(6)	(6)
Nonmarried men:					
Less than $1,000	677	100	86	9	6
$1,000 to $1,999	767	100	80	14	6
$2,000 to $2,999	339	100	72	11	17
$3,000 to $3,999	101	100	57	16	27
$4,000 to $4,999	67	100	52	(6)	(6)
Nonmarried women:					
Less than $1,000	2,572	100	87	11	2
$1,000 to $1,999	1,698	100	85	9	6
$2,000 to $2,999	487	100	75	11	13
$3,000 to $3,999	141	100	55	18	26
$4,000 to $4,999	61	100	11	(6)	(6)

[1] Actual income less income from assets plus the portion of asset holdings that would have been available for spending annually if all assets were prorated over the average remaining years of life of the unit, with a 4-percent annual return. Sex differentials in longevity included in computation. For couples, proration based on joint probability of the number of years remaining for husband and wife together and the number either spouse might survive alone to draw 3/5 of asset holdings available to couple annually.

[2] Based on information for survey units reporting both amount of money income in 1962 and amount of assets at the end of 1962; distribution among income classes therefore not strictly comparable with that shown for actual income in table 1.

[3] Income with prorated assets in same class or class below actual income.

[4] Income with prorated assets one class above actual income.

[5] Income with prorated assets two or more classes above actual income.

[6] Distribution between "moderate improvement" and "appreciable improvement" not available.

BENEFICIARY STATUS

The next question to be explored concerns the pattern of change found for OASDI beneficiaries [5] and for nonbeneficiaries. Do the results found for all those aged 65 and over hold for both these groups when their actual income is compared with their potential income?

Differences between actual income and potential income for beneficiaries and nonbeneficiaries are fairly similar as shown by the following medians; the differences tend to be a few percentage points greater for the beneficiaries.

Type of unit	Actual income	Income with prorated assets	
		Excluding home equity	Including home equity
Married couples:			
Beneficiaries	$2,800	$3,020	$3,685
Nonbeneficiaries	3,580	3,835	4,585
Nonmarried men:			
Beneficiaries	1,405	1,640	1,960
Nonbeneficiaries	1,145	1,325	1,560
Nonmarried women:			
Beneficiaries	1,225	1,330	1,630
Nonbeneficiaries	755	815	960

Changes in beneficiary-nonbeneficiary relationships when measured by potential rather than actual income are the net result of an intricate pattern of differences in the level of assets, their distribution by income class, and the average ages of the individuals in the beneficiary-nonbeneficiary groups being compared. Thus, the beneficiary couples had less in assets than the nonbeneficiaries, but they were somewhat older; the nonmarried men and women beneficiaries had somewhat greater assets than the nonbeneficiaries, but they were somewhat younger. Asset holdings increased rather more steeply with income for nonmarried beneficiary men than for the other groups.

Comparison of the actual and potential income of beneficiaries and nonbeneficiaries has also been made on the basis of the percentage of the units with income less than a specified amount. The proportion of couples aged 65 and over with less than $2,500 is shown below.

Income less than $2,500	Beneficiaries	Nonbeneficiaries
Actual income	42	38
Income with prorated assets (excluding equity in owned home)	37	35

---

[5] Income data previously presented (in the March Bulletin) for beneficiaries related to those who had been on the rolls for a full year, because income in the year of retirement is not meaningful in comparing the income of beneficiaries with those of nonbeneficiaries. Assets, however, were presented (in the November Bulletin) for all beneficiaries, which in effect showed them in a more favorable asset position than if only full-year beneficiaries had been shown. Data for all beneficiaries have also been used here since the major purpose has been to focus on the comparisons of actual and potential income for the important groups of the aged.

These data suggest greater improvement in position for the beneficiaries than for the nonbeneficiaries. Similar relationships hold for nonmarried men and women at two income levels—less than $2,000 and less than $1,500—as shown by the following percentages:

Income	Nonmarried men		Nonmarried women	
	Beneficiaries	Nonbeneficiaries	Beneficiaries	Nonbeneficiaries
Less than $2,000:				
Actual income	69	69	80	86
Income with prorated assets (excluding equity in owned home)	59	64	75	84
Less than $1,500:				
Actual income	55	59	64	79
Income with prorated assets (excluding equity in owned home)	46	54	58	76

Perhaps the most striking finding emerging from this analysis is that more than half the nonmarried nonbeneficiary men and three-fourths of the nonbeneficiary women have potential income of less than $1,500 (excluding home equity).

Table 3 gives, for beneficiaries and nonbeneficiaries, data on the proportion of units at each actual income level that shift with the addition of prorated assets. These data support the findings for all units aged 65 and over grouped by marital status. In general, the proportion with moderate or appreciable improvement increases as income increases, and conversely the proportion whose potential income is at the same level as their actual income or at a lower one declines as income increases.

AGE

There is a tendency for asset holdings to decrease with age, especially if no member of the unit is working. On the other hand, of course, the life expectancy decreases, and the prorated amount to be added to actual income increases with age. Data shown in table 4 suggest that, when the groups aged 65 to 72 and aged 73 and over are compared, the decrease in life expectancy is the stronger influence. Differences between actual and potential income are generally greater for the group aged 73 and over than for the younger group.

The decrease in income with age is thus less striking when potential income rather than actual income is compared. The median actual income of married couples aged 73 and over was, for example, 30 percent less than that of those aged 65 to 72; the median income with prorated assets was 24 percent lower when home equity was excluded. Only for the relatively small group of nonbeneficiary nonmarried men is the percentage difference between potential and actual income less for the older than for the younger group. The level of asset holdings of the older men was very much lower—so low that the age advantage was not sufficient to overcome the difference. Although there is some tendency for the ratio of potential to actual income to be higher for the group aged 65 to 72 than for those aged 62 to 64, this tendency was neither very striking nor consistent for the various marital-beneficiary comparisons. The difference according to age is not so great as in the previous comparison, and assets may be greater or less, depending in large part upon the employment and earnings situation.

TABLE 3.—*Shifts in income level with addition to actual income of prorated assets (excluding equity in nonfarm home),*[1] *by OASDI beneficiary status, for units aged 65 and over—Percentage distribution at specified income level, by extent of improvement, (1962)*

Actual income level and marital status	OASDI beneficiaries					Nonbeneficiaries				
	Number reporting [2] (in thousands)	Total percent	Percent with—			Number reporting [2] (in thousands)	Total percent	Percent with—		
			No improvement [3]	Moderate improvement [4]	Appreciable improvement [5]			No improvement [3]	Moderate improvement [4]	Appreciable improvement [5]
Married couples:										
Less than $1,000	138	100	80	17	3	87	100	70	23	7
$1,000 to $1,999	816	100	79	17	4	193	100	88	5	7
$2,000 to $2,999	1,001	100	78	16	6	96	100	74	16	10
$3,000 to $3,999	606	100	76	14	10	109	100	75	19	6
$4,000 to $4,999	367	100	68	(6)	(6)	85	100	67	(6)	(6)
Nonmarried men:										
Less than $1,000	367	100	81	12	7	311	100	92	4	4
$1,000 to $1,999	623	100	80	15	5	147	100	78	14	8
$2,000 to $2,999	278	100	75	10	15	61	100	57	13	30
$3,000 to $3,999	72	100	49	19	32	29	(7)	(7)	(7)	(7)
Nonmarried women:										
Less than $1,000	1,213	100	83	15	2	1,359	100	92	6	2
$1,000 to $1,999	1,272	100	85	10	5	427	100	85	5	10
$2,000 to $2,999	354	100	79	12	10	134	100	66	10	24
$3,000 to $3,999	93	100	62	14	24	48	(7)	(7)	(7)	(7)

[1] Total money income, less income from assets plus the portion of asset holdings that would have been available for spending annually if all assets were prorated over the average remaining years of life of the unit, with a 4-percent annual return. Sex differentials in longevity included in computation. For couples, proration based on joint probability of the number of years remaining for husband and wife together and the number either spouse might survive alone to draw ⅔ of asset holdings available to couple annually.

[2] Based on information for survey units reporting both amount of money income in 1962 and amount of assets at end of 1962. Distribution among income classes therefore not strictly comparable with that shown for actual income in table 1.

[3] Income with prorated assets in same class or class below actual income.

[4] Income with prorated assets 1 class above actual income.

[5] Income with prorated assets 2 or more classes above actual income.

[6] Distribution between "moderate improvement" and "appreciable improvement" not available.

[7] Percentage not computed when number is less than 50,000.

EARNINGS

Earlier reports from the 1963 survey of the aged have shown earnings to be one of the important components of income, even for the population group aged 65 and over. Incomes are appreciably lower for those who have retired or are unemployed than for those who still have income from their work. Resources other than income are of particular importance to this low-income group, and evidence from the survey has been used to determine the extent to which the proration of assets, excluding the home, affects their relative financial position.

The data shown in table 5 indicate that differences in median income between earners and nonearners are greater for potential than for actual income. Those with no income from earnings have lower assets, and even though they are an older group their median position is not improved by more than about 10 percent, in general, by the proration of assets. The differences between the median income of those with and those without earnings are especially great for the nonbeneficiaries in both dollar and percentage terms, whether measured by actual or potential income.

A more significant comparison may be that of the earners who are not beneficiaries with nonearners who are beneficiaries. The data in table 5 suggest, at least for the group of persons presently approaching retirement, that the assets they own cannot be expected to cushion the drop in income that inevitably accompanies withdrawal from the labor force. If the nonbeneficiary earners represent the preretirement group and the beneficiaries without earnings the retired, the median income of the former (with a deduction of, say, 5 percent for savings) may be compared with the potential income of the latter as estimates of consumption levels. (The use of potential income assumes dissavings of the amount of prorated assets.) For couples, these estimates are $4,745 as the preretirement level and $2,550 as the postretirement level. The comparable estimates for nonmarried men are $3,755 and $1,580. An allowance for taxes would narrow the gap; nevertheless, assets would not appear sufficient to prevent a considerable reduction in the level of living following retirement.

TABLE 4.—*Income, actual*[1] *and with prorated assets (excluding and including equity in nonfarm homes)*,[2] *for units aged 62 and over—Medians, by age, 1962*

Age	Married couples			Nonmarried men			Nonmarried women		
	Total	OASDI beneficiaries	Nonbeneficiaries	Total	OASDI beneficiaries	Nonbeneficiaries	Total	OASDI beneficiaries	Nonbeneficiaries
Median:[3]									
Actual income:									
62 to 64	$5,200	$2,950	$5,900	$1,775	$1,375	$2,685	$1,610	$1,395	$2,205
65 to 72	3,340	3,050	4,750	1,765	1,720	1,980	1,280	1,400	855
73 and over	2,325	2,425	1,680	1,165	1,260	860	885	1,035	720
Income with prorated assets, excluding equity in owned home:									
62 to 64	5,395	2,920	6,155	1,900	1,410	2,925	1,645	1,385	2,330
65 to 72	3,480	3,260	4,890	1,925	1,855	2,250	1,335	1,475	890
73 and over	2,640	2,745	1,850	1,335	1,450	920	975	1,200	795
Income with prorated assets, including equity in owned home:									
62 to 64	5,930	3,310	6,705	2,000	1,510	2,940	2,080	1,755	2,805
65 to 72	4,105	3,865	5,785	2,120	2,035	2,420	1,575	1,750	1,055
73 and over	3,300	3,380	2,355	1,550	1,855	960	1,250	1,485	930

[1] Total money income in 1962.

[2] Actual income less income from assets plus the portion of asset holdings that would have been available for spending annually if all assets were prorated over the average remaining years of life of the unit, with a 4-percent annual return. Sex differentials in longevity included in computation. For couples, proration based on joint probability of the number of years remaining for husband and wife together and the number either spouse might survive alone to draw ⅔ of asset holdings available to couple annually.

[3] For actual income, based on information for those survey units reporting amount of money income received in 1962. For income with prorated assets, based on information for those survey units reporting both amount of money income in 1962 and amount of their assets at the end of 1962. Median actual income of those reporting on both money income and asset holdings would probably vary slightly from the amount estimated from the larger base, particularly for units aged 62 to 64.

SUMMARY

The economic status of the aged has been described through a constructive, potential income. This measure combines information on the money income, the asset holdings, and the age and sex of each unit. The addition of prorated assets to money income provides a summary figure for grouping units who are equally well off in terms of their combined income and asset position and then studying the distributions of the units by this new measure in comparison with their distributions by money income.

Median incomes were increased 10 percent when prorated assets excluded the owned home and more than 30 percent when equity in the owned home was included. The increases in the medians were appreciably greater for those aged 73 and over than for those aged 62 to 64 or 65 to 72, because of the shorter remaining lifespan over which assets were prorated.

The differences in the medians tended to be a few percentage points higher for beneficiaries than for nonbeneficiaries, and they were higher both in dollar amounts and relatively for those units including an earner than for those with no earned income.

More than three-fourths of those with income of less than $3,000 did not have asset holdings great enough to place their potential income in a higher $1,000 interval than that in which their actual income fell.

The findings reflect, and are simply another way of pointing out, the established fact that asset holdings are larger at the higher income levels than at the lower. The inequalities in the distributions of income are greater for potential than for actual income.

TABLE 5.—*Size of income, actual*[1] *and with prorated assets (excluding equity in nonfarm home)*,[2] *for units aged 65 and over with and without earnings—Percentage distribution, by income interval, 1962*

Total income	Married couples				Nonmarried men				Nonmarried women			
	Without earnings		With earnings		Without earnings		With earnings		Without earnings		With earnings	
	Actual income	Income with prorated assets	Actual income	Income with prorated assets	Actual income	Income with prorated assets	Actual income	Income with prorated assets	Actual income	Income with prorated assets	Actual income	Income with prorated assets
Number (in thousands):												
Total	2,449	2,449	2,998	2,998	1,738	1,738	666	666	4,907	4,907	1,422	1,422
Reporting on income[3]	2,030	2,030	2,309	2,309	1,530	1,530	536	536	4,025	4,025	1,061	1,061
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Less than $1,000	8	6	3	2	39	35	14	7	59	52	20	13
$1,000 to $1,999	33	30	14	12	40	35	29	26	32	34	37	34
$2,000 to $2,999	31	29	21	17	15	18	19	18	5	6	26	25
$3,000 to $3,999	14	16	18	19	3	4	11	11	2	3	7	10
$4,000 to $4,999	7	9	14	12	1	3	10	12	1	1	3	6
$5,000 and over	7	10	31	38	2	5	17	27	2	4	6	11
Median[4]												
All units	$2,285	$2,475	$3,680	$3,985	$1,265	$1,430	$2,380	$2,935	$855	$955	$1,810	$2,095
OASDI beneficiaries	2,365	2,550	3,420	3,740	1,410	1,580	2,130	2,570	1,040	1,205	1,840	2,105
Nonbeneficiaries	1,775	1,875	4,995	5,550	845	890	3,950	4,320	695	745	1,680	2,060

[1] Total money income in 1962.

[2] Actual income less income from assets plus the portion of asset holdings that would have been available for spending annually if all assets were prorated over the average remaining years of life of the unit, with a 4-percent annual return. Sex differentials in longevity included in computation. For couples, proration based on joint probability of the number of years remaining for husband and wife together and the number either spouse might survive alone to draw ⅔ of asset holdings available to couple annually.

[3] Data based on information for survey units reporting both amount of money income received in 1962 and amount of assets held at end of 1962. Data on actual income therefore not strictly comparable with those shown in table 1.

[4] Medians based on $1,000 income groupings and therefore not strictly comparable with those shown in table 1, based on $500 groupings.

SOCIAL SECURITY SHOULD COVER MENTAL ILLNESS AND TUBERCULOSIS

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, an unfortunate remnant of the days when illness was viewed as an invasion of the human body by evil spirits remains in our public assistance laws. This is the provision in the Social Security Act which calls for different treatment under the law for those suffering from tuberculosis and mental illness than is given those afflicted by other ills. I have today again introduced legislation which would help bring this aspect of our public assistance programs up to date and provide for equality of treatment for all of those who are ill and eligible for public welfare aid.

I was very disappointed, in this connection, with President Kennedy's message of February 5, 1963, on mental illness and retardation. The problem which I have noted was ignored and nothing was mentioned to achieve the goals toward which my proposal is guided. The final bill which became law also ignored this problem. The bill I again propose would be a constructive step forward in helping the mentally ill and those with tuberculosis.

As our understanding of disease has progressed, we have gone further toward realizing certain basic similarities in illness. The specific exception of tuberculosis and mental illness from the general provisions of our Social Security Act is a reflection of bygone days.

During the last session, a provision such as the one here was in the Social Security Amendments of 1964—the bill which died in conference. It is my hope that that bill will be enacted in the near future.

OPTIONAL SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation which would make it possible for Americans to choose, in planning their retirement future, whether they shall be covered by social security or a qualified private benefit plan. This bill is offered in no sense to undermine social security, but rather to improve the opportunities for our people to get the best plan for their money in preparing for their retirement.

At present, the social security system is a young one. Maturity for it will not be reached until we have had three generations of workers covered during their entire productive lives by social security and until it has had the opportunity of meeting all of the challenges of our economic cycles. The amendment which I have offered will help social security meet these challenges and grow into a sound program upon which the retirement future of our people can be based.

Several years ago I placed in the Congressional Record, volume 107, part 3, pages 3292–3294, a speech which I made, "Politics Can Destroy Social Security," in which I outlined the threats to our social security system from a failure to recognize its inherent characteristics and limitations. This bill is designed to prevent the system's very possible destruction by preserving its integrity for those who are counting upon it and by creating a better awareness of its true nature. Quite often social security is spoken of as insurance—indeed, the most important part of the system is entitled old age, survivors, and disability insurance—but it is not insurance in the common or legal meaning of the word. It is a share-the-wealth plan. My purpose today is not to discuss the concept of sharing the wealth, that debate can wait another day. What I hope to accomplish through the introduction of this bill and discussion of it is a better understanding of social security so that it may achieve the purposes for which it was designed and meet the needs which exist for it in our society.

As to the details of the bill itself, social security would remain mandatory for those who had not entered a qualified private benefit program. Thus we would not permit one to ignore his future, but we would permit each individual to weigh which path toward retirement security is best for him in the range of qualified plans.

I believe serious consideration of this proposal would be profitable both in saving our social security system and in permitting a sound basis for the retirement life of all of our citizens.

PANEL DISCUSSION ON THE INTERNATIONAL SITUATION IN THE FAR EAST

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Younger] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, on January 8, the Commonwealth Club of California had a panel discussion by ABC worldwide commentators in regard to the international situation in the Far East. The comments of these worldwide observers are most interesting and furnish us a background of on-the-spot observation. The published flashes in the Commonwealth of this meeting follow:

Must Red China Be Stopped in Vietnam? Arnot-Scali Clash Highlights ABC Eight-Commentator Panel

Charles P. Arnot (southeast Asia):

"Not long ago I commented that the real question was not whether—but when—we would have to go to war with Red China. I withdraw that statement. On reflection, it was not strong enough.

"I feel that we are already at war with Red Chinese imperialism, with Communist North Vietnam, and with their agents in South Vietnam, the Vietcongs.

"South Vietnam is Red China's 'Spain.' It is high time we faced up to this fact.

"Not long ago, I was present when our pilot, in a scramble, went into the air with orders to shoot down Red Chinese planes if they went below a certain place on the map. For 23,000 uniformed Americans, we are at war. Certainly it was war for the 250 Americans killed (as even Washington admits) by enemy action.

"ASHAMED AT QUESTION: SHOULD WE WITHDRAW?

"For the past 18 months, I have been in south Asia. Returning to this country, I'm ashamed and amazed to hear the question: Should we withdraw? Should we negotiate?

"We did go into South Vietnam. We said it was the place where we would stop the march of the Communists across southeast Asia.

"Before there is any more defeatism and talk about 'escalation,' we should ask, are we prepared to allow all Asia to go to Red China? Are we prepared to be the paper tiger Red China says we are? Are we prepared to allow Latin America and Africa to go to the Communists as well?

"Is our word any more sacred in West Berlin than it is in South Vietnam? If it is, as I hope, we have to get tough in South Vietnam. Red China is today posing the greatest threat to world peace and she must be stopped in South Vietnam."

Johns Scali (Washington, D.C.):

"With all due respect to my colleague, his view is a prescription for bloody disaster in the Far East.

"The vital security interests of the United States and the free world do not stand on who possesses this particular real estate half the world away.

"Total victory in Vietnam, while desirable, is not worth the price. We can win, but only after a Korea-type war, with a quarter million American casualties. And after the war, we will have solved virtually nothing. There will be the same frustrating problems, the same quarrelsome politicians, the same ambitious generals, the same discontented Buddhists. Intervention in such a situation would be the height of folly.

"SHOULD NOT MAKE EMOTIONAL DECISION

"While defeat in South Vietnam would make the situation in southeast Asia more difficult, it would not open all Asia to Communist domination. We should not make an emotional decision to intervene simply because we can't save people who don't want to be saved.

"A tolerable compromise is still possible. A master persuader, Lyndon Johnson, is about to test his ability in this regard."

Russ Jones (Berlin):

"In his inaugural remarks, the President had two things to say about satellite Europe and I agree with one, disagree with the other.

"He said the Communist empire is crumbling. I do not agree. It may be loosening up, but militarily the Warsaw Pact (Communist counterpart to NATO) is as solid as ever. There is no likelihood that Eastern Europe will spin away from the Kremlin militarily.

"BERLIN PUT ON ICE

"President Johnson also advocated increased trade with these countries. I agree.

"We are even now doing this with the rubber plant in Rumania and Conrad Hilton's talks with the Hungarians about possibility of a hotel in Budapest—it's already being called the 'Comrade Hilton.'

"Berlin a year ago was a very hot spot but it has been put on ice as a result of the colloquy between Washington and Moscow. Both sides have agreed to leave Berlin alone. This is good for America. I hope and believe that Berlin will remain on ice for the next year or more."

Will It Be Great Britain, or Little England?—Sheehan; Lazard Congo Report; Cioffi Destroys De Gaulle Myths

Bill Sheehan (London):

"Britain is faced with two basic questions: Will she be forced to devalue the pound? Can she modernize her industry? She is plagued by restrictive labor practices, the failure of business and industry to modernize, and resulting low productivity. She buys more than she sells abroad. If tough emergency measures don't work, devaluation will be the only alternative.

"GREAT BRITAIN, OR LITTLE ENGLAND?

"The question is, what kind of a country is Britain going to be—the Britain of the great tradition, an influence in the world—Great Britain, or little England?

"British history might be different had not General de Gaulle rejuvenated France at the expense of his allies."

Lou Cioffi (Paris):

"Few people really understand De Gaulle, and he doesn't make it easy: he even talks in archaic French.

"When I first went on this assignment I thought my French was pretty good. But after hearing De Gaulle I asked a French colleague to tell me what he had said in English. My colleague replied, 'Tell me what he said in French.'

"It is a myth that De Gaulle is a dictator. Nothing can be further from the truth. He has been freely elected. All his policies have been approved by the French people. If he ran again, he would surely be reelected.

"NOT ANTI-AMERICAN

"It is a myth that he is anti-American. His presence at the Kennedy funeral was, really, a tribute to the American people. In the Cuba incident he was the first of our allies to stand with us.

"It is a myth that you never know what he is going to do. If you read his speeches, even back to 1945, you'll find they say exactly what he is doing now.

"It is a myth that he wants to destroy the Atlantic Alliance. He knows he is dependent on U.S. power. But he is a realist who wants to get rid of the NATO state. What is really important is that his aims are the same as ours.

"Finally, it is a myth that he is not fond of reporters. It is not true. He dislikes us intensely."

Sidney Lazard (Rome):

"You can't imagine the horror of the Congo. I couldn't until I got there and saw the victims.

"A refugee Catholic priest broke down and cried as he told how his altar boys—representing the leading families in Stanleyville—cheered as the rebels committed atrocity after atrocity. Civilization there is that thin.

"There is a very serious cold war overlay, involving the United States, Red China, and the Soviet Union. United States position is difficult: We back Tshombe, probably Africa's most unpopular man. Our stock with other African nations has suffered greatly, but if we drop him, the pro-Western Congolese Government will fall and pro-Communist element take over; that country, with its mineral riches and strategic location, will be lost.

"NEUTRALIST BODY?

"The only alternative to an increase in the cold war (and I foresee that increase this year, with a far greater American involvement) would be to have the cold warriors replaced by the U.N. or the Organization of African Unity, or perhaps some neutralist body acceptable to African leaders.

"In the last 4 years we have learned the Congolese are incapable of governing themselves. Until the cold warriors are replaced, they'll stay there—and the greater will be chance of escalation to an African Vietnam."

New Russ Leaders Will Stay in 1965, Says Jaffe; ABC Panel Answers Written Questions From Floor at Luncheon

Sam Jaffe (Moscow):

"President Johnson's remarks on steps to improve Soviet relations I'm sure will please the new Kremlin leaders. Today Russia wants better relations with the United States.

"I'm sure Brezhnev and Kosygin will accept the President's invitation to appear on TV and to visit the United States, but not soon. They have agricultural and economical messes to clean up that Khrushchev left behind, and that's why he was ousted.

"The Sino-Soviet split has forced the Soviet Union closer to us. The Soviet Union is still an enemy, but friendlier.

"NO CHANGES SOON

"Don't look for changes in leadership soon. Brezhnev and Kosygin are not power-mad men who blasted their way in, but solid organization men who rely on their advisers. We'll see no shoe-pounding, no off-the-cuff statements in the near future.

"I was impressed by Kosygin, he'll be the front man. Both of these men are a new breed of Communists, born without a firsthand knowledge of Lenin or the fire of the Russian revolution.

"Not only will the new leaders stay in 1965, but we may see the day—and this is being considered—when the Presidium elects a Premier and a head of the Communist Party for a specified term."

Answers in written questions from floor

Question. Why not U.N. in Vietnam instead of solely U.S. action?

Answer (Scali): A favorite theme of Senator Morse; 10 Senators now agree. It has been opposed because outlook would be time-consuming debate while Communists still gained.

Answer (Arnot): Red China not a member of U.N. nor is North Vietnam. I saw U.N. operation in the Congo; idea is unrealistic. I don't think U.N. could do anything in Vietnam—it couldn't even solve border dispute between Cambodia and South Vietnam.

Question (W. George L. Hughes). Assuming English pound is devalued, effect on U.S. dollar? Gold price?

Answer (Sheehan). If pound is devalued, British living standard will drop. Dollar will be affected, therefore price of gold.

Question. Will France retain stability if De Gaulle dies? Attitude re United States and Europe?

Answer (Cioffi). French rather enjoy political stability—I don't think they'll ever go back to old Fourth Republic and its political musical chairs. De Gaulle has prepared for his own replacement. Transition will be smooth.

Answer (Jones). Adenauer-De Gaulle romance is about over. Germany is veering toward us, and I think will stay that way.

Answer (Sheehan). After De Gaulle, Britain would again apply for EEC and, with five countries ready to sign an agreement, I think will get in, which will be good for Atlantic Community.

Answer (Cioffi). Facts are wrong. I was in Brussels when negotiations were broken off. Negotiations were getting nowhere. Britain wanted in on her own terms. De Gaulle said "No—either you're a member of Europe, or not." Britain had refused to join when Common Market was formed and later sponsored Outer Seven to scuttle Common Market. Britain can come in tomorrow by accepting what six other nations have accepted.

Question (Edgar M. Kahn). Do you foresee Communists taking Hong Kong and Singapore?

Answer (Arnot). More important right now is complete Communist takeover of Cambodia and Indonesia. I don't foresee attacks against Hong Kong but Red China through Sukarno has opened new front against us. Singapore is definitely in danger.

Question (Clyde Walthall): Will our Cuba policy be changed in 1965?

Answer (Jones). No—no more evidence that Johnson administration will compromise with Castro than that Kennedy would soften in later years.

Answer (Morgan). Cuba's policy is changing; she's suffered two major setbacks in Chile and Venezuela.

Answer (Scali). Castro continues to put out feelers toward the United States, based on idea that Castro can be Caribbean Tito. This is totally unacceptable—he has to go before relations can be normalized.

Question. Will Italian Communists gain power?

Answer (Lazard). Not likely in next 20 years. You read that Communists gained votes; fact is, Communist Party is losing strength; cells smaller; control of labor and university youth groups dwindling. Italian Communist Party is traditional party of protest—increased vote for Communists means Italy is unhappy, not that Communists will take over.

Question (Hilary H. Crawford). Why don't we stop trying to set up democratic government in Vietnam, but back strongest group and go all out to win?

Answer (Scali). We now have no illusion about desirability of supporting a stable government, democratic based or not. But there's no way of achieving that at present.

Answer (Arnot). Problem is twofold, (1) leadership and (2) convincing the people we're there to stay. We must use the only virile element, the military, and go in to win. We can only do it with deeds.

Question (Turkish Consul General Myron B. Goldsmith). Future of Cyprus?

Answer (Lazard). Trouble next March when U.N. peace force leaves.

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, as the greatest democratic republic in the world, the United States has a direct, vital interest in the cause of freedom and individual liberty everywhere in the world.

Today, we mark the 47th anniversary of the independence of the Ukraine, which is the largest non-Russian nation in Europe subjugated to Communist tyranny. There are other occasions to come during the year when this House will pay formal tribute to the struggle for liberty in other captive nations. The catalog is long and grim. Our hearts go out to those held captive and our admiration for their unflagging spirit is unbounded.

So long as they remain captive and oppressed, our freedom here in America is threatened. But, so long as they keep the struggle for freedom alive, there is hope in ultimate victory.

It is well for us here to take this time to give official recognition to the continuing efforts of the people of the Ukraine to become masters of their own destiny once more. Their struggle is ours and of mutual concern to all who believe in the cause of individual liberty and freedom.

SIR WINSTON CHURCHILL

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, Sir Winston Churchill's name is forever associated with the cause of freedom and its finest hours. A politician in the highest sense of the word, he set standards of courage, vision, and leadership on which public servants and all freedom-loving men of every nation may model themselves without reservation.

Born an aristocrat, Churchill touched the hearts and stirred the finest feelings in men of every walk of life. Throughout his long, extraordinary career, he did nothing cheap or mean and no breath of scandal touched him.

He was also born half-American and died in the enjoyment of full citizenship bestowed on him by Congress in the name of a grateful people allied with him in the common cause of freedom.

Every American laments his passing.

Free men everywhere will long walk in the titanic shadow of this great and good man.

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McDADE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, today is a day of reflection in the heart of every man who loves freedom. It is a day of remembrance, but it is a day of sad remembrance, because it was on this day, just 47 years ago, on January 22, 1918, that one of the great nations of Europe, after centuries of slavery, achieved its freedom. It was on that day that the Ukraine became, once more, an independent nation.

Now that freedom is once more dead.

These are a great people. For centuries they had been a great nation, a great religious nation, a nation whose agriculture and culture were the solid heartland of Eastern Europe. But they became pawns in the tide of European power politics.

They tried in vain to placate the czars of the 17th century. In the treaty of Pereyaslav, on January 18, 1654, they hoped that their freedom would be protected while giving the czar certain military rights. Their hopes were in vain. The czar used the treaty to interfere in the internal affairs of Ukraine, and in 1667 Ukraine was divided between Poland and Russia.

But if freedom was taken away, the hearts of the people still lived. They revolted in 1708. But the revolt failed, and the punishment wrought upon Ukraine was terrible. Czar Peter I massacred thousands upon thousands of Ukrainians. We all remember Hitler's vengeance upon the city of Lidice in World War II. How few of us remember that Czar Peter tortured and massacred the entire city of Baturyn as punishment for that revolt in 1708.

But even then the hope of freedom did not die. Even the songs of freedom did not die. The great Ukrainian Poet Taras Shevchenko raised his voice for this freedom, and paid for his bravery by years of servitude. Year after countless year the people dreamed of freedom, and in the tumult at the close of the First World War they finally achieved it.

It was a short lived independence. The Soviet Union recognized that independence, but immediately began a program of subversion and conquest, and in 1920 the Ukraine was swallowed in the vastness of the Soviet Union, under the crushing heel of communism.

They have labored under that heel ever since. The Soviet Union, with cynical disregard for truth proclaims that Ukraine is free. It is not. But it dreams of freedom.

Perhaps our words here will have little effect. But if they have one effect, they will not be wasted. Let our words here in the Congress of the United States, the very fortress of freedom, cry across the thousands of the children of the Ukraine in the United States to the Ukrainians in the mother country that their freedom has not been forgotten, and that we, too, await the day when they will speak their own tongue when they worship their own God under their own free flag.

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, history tells us that the people of the Ukraine announced their national independence as Russian troops advanced on Kiev, seat of the government. Within a month, the Kiev defense of 750 soldiers, including 250 high school boys, had been cruelly slaughtered by 6,000 Russian marines. And within a period of months, the independent Ukrainian Government had been destroyed, thousands of Ukrainian patriots shot.

However short the lifetime of a free Ukraine, we are reminded on this January 22, 47th anniversary of Ukrainian independence, of the invincibility of a noble idea and of the enuring power of freedom, even as a memory.

We are pleased to join with all Ukrainians and their descendants in our country in marking this anniversary. We take heart in the profound belief that the cause of liberty will not forever remain unserved.

SIR WINSTON CHURCHILL

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRAY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, we all mourn the passing of Sir Winston Churchill, probably the greatest man of this century.

He possessed so many great attributes and so many attributes of greatness that we hardly know which are the most important to remember.

He had indomitable courage and perserverance, proven both in his personal life and in his leadership of Great Britain and the free world.

He had a capacity for being absolutely honest, even when his candid assessments of things as they actually were were not appreciated and were not popular.

We should remember especially that he was always skeptical about Russian intentions. At Teheran, it was Churchill who tried in vain to safeguard the interests of the Western democracies, rightly guessing that after World War II we would find our peace and security endangered by international communism.

The Russians, even during his final illness, have castigated Churchill as the man who started the cold war. Of course, that is preposterous. It is one thing to start something; it is something else to be able to see clearly what is happening in the world.

Churchill early perceived the course of international communism and the treachery of the Russians. Had we in the United States heeded his advice sooner, many of communism's advances would never have been achieved.

The greatest need of the world today is for more men of the caliber of Winston Churchill.

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the 22d of January 1965, marks the 47th anniversary of the proclamation of a free Ukraine and the 46th anniversary of the union of all Ukrainian lands into one sovereign republic. On this occasion, I would like to have the privilege of asking our distinguished colleagues of the House of Representatives to pause for a moment to pay tribute to the undying struggle of Ukrainians for freedom.

For the past 250 years the Ukrainian history has been one of blood and tears. This nation with 1,000-year-old history and culture of its own has fought a losing battle for freedom. After struggles for centuries against repeated invaders, chiefly against Russian autocracy, the Ukrainians overthrew their oppressors in 1918. Hard-fought freedom finally came to them when, on January 22 that year, the Rada, the popularly elected Ukrainian Parliament, proclaimed the independence of Ukrainian National Republic and promised to be the foundation of a democratic government. On January 22, 1919, it also proclaimed the act of union, whereby all the Ukrainian territories united into one sovereign and independent state.

But in the very next year, November 1920, even before the joy and jubilation had ceased, Bolshevik Russia conquered and made the young republic one of its satellites, ending her newly won independence all too soon. For half of this century, the stouthearted and freedom-loving Ukrainian people, through the forcible incorporation into the Soviet Union in 1933, have been ruled by brutal and ruthless suppression. And the Kremlin daily digs a trench of everlasting resentment wider and wider as this policy of subjugation continues.

The Ukrainians were the first victim of Communist imperiocolonialism brought about against the absolute will of the people—a victim with every loss of the right to live, every restriction of freedom of thought, every damage done to the dignity of life, every opportunity lost for a share in the intelligent advance of the age in which we live.

A sage said that a man is free from the time of his very birth, and life and liberty are something inseparable. As long as he lives, he is endowed with the right to be free. This is the clear leading of God, the moving principle of the current age and through all eternity, the just claim of the whole human race. It is something that cannot be stamped out, or stifled or gagged, or suppressed.

Now, a great new age wakes before us, the old one of force being over. And the new age of righteousness and truth is here. All creation now stifled by the ice and snow, will soon be awakened by the breezes of early spring and life will spring forth from the dark earth to the light of freedom.

On this solemn and memorable occasion, we the people of the United States and all the peaceloving friendly nations enjoying our God-given freedom and dignity of life, wholeheartedly join the 45 million Ukrainians and other enslaved peoples the world over in the firm determination that their cherished desire of restoring sovereign independence, individual liberty, and dignity of man will soon return again.

THE UNITED STATES SHALL REIMBURSE THE STATES AND THEIR POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS FOR REAL PROPERTY TAXES NOT COLLECTED ON REAL ESTATE PROPERTY OWNED BY A FOREIGN GOVERNMENT AND THEREFORE EXEMPT FROM TAXATION

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. OTTINGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to reimburse the States and their political subdivisions for real property taxes not collected on real property owned by a foreign government and therefore exempt from taxation.

This measure was first introduced by my distinguished colleague from the 12th Congressional District of New York, the Honorable EDNA F. KELLY, and I am pleased to lend my support to what I believe is a most necessary piece of legislation.

Communities in Westchester County, N.Y., have been particularly plagued by tax exemptions on properties owned by foreign governments. Because of their proximity to United Nations headquarters in New York City, where virtually every country has a major consulate, Westchester's cities, towns, and villages have been losing thousands of dollars every year because they cannot collect taxes on land and houses owned by foreign governments.

Mr. Speaker, in some communities, a number of ambassadors live tax free, thus making the taxes of other residents unbearably high. The U.S. attorney's office has held that communities must recover such lost tax revenues either through diplomatic channels or by having the taxes remain as a lien on the properties, to be recovered when and if the foreign governments sell them.

At a time when our local governments are hard pressed for revenues to such vital services as education, police and fire protection, and the like, the Federal Government should not add to the burden by permitting tax exemptions on properties not directly benefiting the communities in which they lie.

This situation was dramatized not too long ago in a law suit brought by the city of New Rochelle. An account appeared in the New York Times of December 17, 1964, and I introduce it for the RECORD.

[From the New York Times, Dec. 17, 1964]

NEW ROCHELLE SUIT ON ENVOYS' HOMES IS KILLED BY JUDGE

WHITE PLAINS, December 16.—A Westchester County judge dismissed most reluctantly today a suit by New Rochelle to foreclose tax liens of $24,000 each for 1958 and 1959 on the residences of the Ambassadors of Ghana, Indonesia, and Liberia.

In his opinion, Judge Robert J. Trainor sharply criticized the widespread tax exemptions provided by State law for residences of foreign diplomats representing their countries in the United Nations.

The case decided today involved homes on Croft Terrace in New Rochelle.

"It might not be amiss," the judge wrote, "to wonder if the State Department realizes that our guests at the United Nations could virtually ruin some of our finest villages which are so conveniently located to the United Nations headquarters.

"If the ambassadors from 50 or more nations should decide to squat tax-free in the highest assessables—and they take nothing but the best—in the same village, the taxes of the remainder of the inhabitants would be so high that they would not be able to afford the honor of having them."

The State Department had intervened to urge dismissal of the suit. Judge Trainor wrote that a court should not embarrass the Government in the conduct of it foreign affairs.

"The tongue of the U.S. attorney must have been jamming his cheek," he continued, "when he wrote * * * that New Rochelle must recover its taxes through diplomatic channels or, alternatively, these taxes could remain as a lien on the properties to be recovered when and if the foreign governments sell the properties."

CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I followed with considerable interest the remarks of some of our colleagues from the other side of the aisle during the debate over seating of the gentleman from New York [Mr. OTTINGER]. While one aspect of this matter has now been settled by the vote on Tuesday of last week, I should like to make a number of comments prompted by this debate.

Mr. OTTINGER was criticized because, first, he spent about $200,000 in his successful campaign in the 25th District of New York, and, second, because members of his family had contributed the great bulk of this money to a series of campaign committees established in his behalf. The questions are: Was it wrong for him to spend that much money, and was it wrong for him to receive that much money from his relatives? Unless we want to pretend that our Federal election laws really have any relevancy to today's election campaigns the answer must be "No" on both counts.

I think it is important to recall that there would have been no basis for criticism if the gentleman from New York [Mr. OTTINGER] had not been forthright and honest in reporting his contributions and expenditures. He used no subterfuges. He concealed nothing. He filed a full report for all to see. In this connection I should like to recall the words of Senator Thomas Hennings, who during his years in the Senate fought long and hard for reform of our antiquated election laws. He said:

> It is not money itself which is potentially a corruptive force in political campaigns, but money handled in secret.

A number of magazines and newspapers have come to Mr. OTTINGER's defense since he filed his campaign report and was criticized for it. One of them is the Reporter, which makes this excellent point:

> Because he filed an honest report on his $200,000 in campaign expenditures, the newly elected Congressman from New York's 25th

District is now being criticized by those persons who refuse to face the realities of financing a campaign for Congress.

The Reporter goes on to analyze the particular problem faced by a Democratic challenger in that congressional district located in a large urban area. And it observes that, in raising the large sums needed for this effort by tapping family funds, he avoided having to depend on special-interest groups which might compromise his stand on future issues.

The Louisville Courier-Journal, editorializing on the Ottinger controversy, said it was at a loss to understand the furor in view of the high costs of campaigning in this era of television and other costly mass media. The Courier-Journal concluded:

> Perhaps the New York Times has a point in scolding the Congressman-elect for not disclosing the "nature and scope" of his financing during the race, but try as we could, we couldn't think of one congressional candidate who has followed such a course.

Mr. Speaker, I think the time has come for the Congress to recognize that our Federal election laws are archaic. They are so unrealistic that they are ignored in all but the most superficial way. They set no limit on spending, in truth, because there are no requirements for reporting the receipts or expenditures of campaign committees working in the candidate's behalf. And if the limits found in the law could be enforced, they would be pitifully inadequate for today's campaign costs.

This is particularly true with respect to a challenger like the gentleman from New York [Mr. Ottinger]. An incumbent has enormous advantages as we all know. He has the franking privilege with which to acquaint his constituents with his views throughout his term of office. He has a staff capable of rendering him invaluable assistance in the course of a campaign. He has telephone and telegraph allowances, typewriters, mimeograph machines, addressing machines, a stationery allowance, and many other appurtenances of office. The value of these many advantages cannot be expressed precisely in dollars, but it is considerable.

When a challenger sets out to campaign against an incumbent having all these advantages, he necessarily must spend more than the incumbent if he is going to achieve the same impact on the public. In Mr. Ottinger's case this task was made more difficult because the registration in his district happens to be about 2 to 1 in favor of the other party.

If one were to ask a cross-section of voters how much money could reasonably be spent in such a campaign, I dare say that most would agree that an expenditure of $1 per voter would not be unreasonable. With such a budget one might contemplate making two or three mailings to all voters, buying some billboards, and running some advertising on radio, on television, and in the press. However, within the dollar-per-voter limit one can see there would be some pretty hard decisions to be made as to what could be bought and what would have to be neglected.

Well, believe it or not, Mr. Ottinger's budget was just such a budget. In fact, he spent less than $1 for each registered voter, and he spent just a penny or two over $1 for each vote cast. In his particular race, in an area where everyone reads the metropolitan newspapers which devote little free space to a contest like this, such a budget is not unreasonable. It is, to be sure, a lot of money for many of us to raise; it is a lot more money than I have ever spent in the Second District of Arizona; but it is not an unreasonable budget for this race under these circumstances.

Mr. Speaker, I do not for a minute think that Members of Congress should be required to spend money like this, nor do I think that Congress should be restricted to people who have this kind of money. Rather, I believe we should recognize the need for legislation that will provide new sources of campaign funds, that will limit campaigns to reasonable lengths, that will provide perhaps more public-service time for debates and discussions on radio and television, and that will take into account the changes that have taken place in the art of campaigning in the last quarter century.

Until such new legislation is enacted I think we should at least acknowledge the reality that is about us and, rather than castigate candidates who make large investments in their own campaigns, thank them for showing this much interest in our Government and its political processes. This Nation is the better for the personal investment made in the many campaigns of John F. Kennedy; it can benefit, as well, from the willingness of Dick Ottinger to invest some of his resources, and his family's resources, in the improvement of our Government. It is a rare Member who can take his seat without some obligation—express or implied—to those groups of individuals who supplied the money for a successful campaign.

Mr. Speaker, without objection, I insert at this point in my remarks a number of magazine articles, editorials and letters which bear on Mr. Ottinger's now celebrated campaign.

[From the Reporter magazine, Jan. 14, 1965.]

THE DISADVANTAGE OF BEING EARNEST

Because he filed an honest report on his $200,000 in campaign expenditures, the newly elected Congressman from New York's 25th District is now being criticized by those persons who refuse to face the realities of financing a campaign for Congress.

Richard L. Ottinger, son of the founder of the U.S. Plywood Corp., is a wealthy young man who worked for 3 years as a regional director in the Peace Corps and last March returned to his hometown of Pleasantville in Westchester County to run for the House of Representatives. He was an unknown Democrat in an overwhelmingly Republican district, and his opponent was a three-term incumbent Congressman. Most people in his area read the New York City newspapers, which had little free time or space to devote to 1 of the more than 70 congressional candidates within the New York metropolitan area. To get his name and views known, he had to spend lots of money.

Luckily for him, Ottinger had family money he could use. He did not have to depend for financial support on special-interest groups who might compromise his stand on future issues. He even turned down one large contribution of this kind. He did try to raise funds from small contributors—with some success. But the American public, dominated by the unsavory image of politicians in general, isn't willing to contribute in the amounts needed today.

Ottinger's prime mistake, apparently, was to comply with antique Federal and State campaign-fund reporting and tax laws that in effect limit individual contributions to $3,000 if the recipient is to avoid paying a gift tax—a totally unreasonable figure. To circumscribe this limitation, Ottinger employed a well-established technique of setting up as many different committees as he needed $3,000 contributions. In the recent presidential campaign, dozens of wealthy men contributed $3,000 for themselves and individual members of their families to similarly constructed "paper" committees. Henry Ford II's $3,000 checks to the Johnson campaign turned up in more than a half-dozen Democratic committees. Five members of the conservative Pew family of Pennsylvania contributed more than $60,000 in tandem to the 1964 Republican presidential campaign, a contributing habit of the Rockefellers before the nomination of Senator Barry Goldwater. In Robert F. Kennedy's recent Senate campaign, Kennedy's brother-in-law Stephen Smith, family friend K. Lemoyne Billings, and others also exceeded the legal limit of $5,000 by giving to more than one such committee. Most of the time in the House and Senate races, the embarrassment that has befallen Ottinger is avoided by the simple technique of failing to file accurate and complete campaign fund reports. One of Ottinger's New York colleagues in his 1962 race avoided the individual contribution limitation for a candidate—$8,000—by reporting after the 1962 campaign that he had "loaned" his own campaign committee $80,000. The law put him under no obligation to report when or even if his "loan" was repaid.

The New York Times and the Herald Tribune, who "exposed" Ottinger's campaign funds after reading the public records, have since dropped the issue of political financing as quickly as they picked it up—but not before writing pious editorials about the need for reform. If the papers had directed a portion of their reforming zeal at getting Ottinger's delinquent political contemporaries to own up to what they had actually spent, the young Westchesterite's $200,000 might not stand out as much as it does—and some real progress at reform might be achieved. Without facing the real facts of ballooning campaign costs, reforms will not reach the basic problem—the need for new sources of funds—and therefore will be bypassed by Congress. The legislators are not about to make things actually worse, through legislation that cuts down on existing fund sources, just to satisfy reformers who want things to look better.

[From the Louisville Courier-Journal, Jan. 6, 1965]

OTTINGER'S CASE IS NOT CAUSE FOR OUTRAGE

We are at a loss to understand the furor which has developed in New York over the campaign expenses of Democratic Representative-elect Richard L. Ottinger, who apparently spent close to $200,000 of his family's money getting elected last November.

In the first place, $200,000 is hardly an astounding sum in this age of television campaigns. In the second place, Ottinger appears to have broken no laws, unless it has suddenly become illegal to have a rich and indulgent family. If anything, his error seems to have come in being too scrupulous about reporting his campaign expenses.

One thing is certain: If Ottinger is guilty of moral turpitude, he has lots of company. By setting up numerous campaign committees, and thus evading the legal limitation on campaign contributions, Ottinger was merely following a time-worn practice which has helped to make Federal election laws a meaningless farce. The practice is not unique to New York. It is also prevalent in Kentucky.

THE LIMIT IS UNREALISTIC

Every member of the Kentucky congressional delegation questioned on the subject in 1962 had tried to avoid the necessity of reporting campaign contributions by having others handle the money. If it is really worked to perfection, the campaign committee gimmick can enable a Senator or House Member to both comply with the Corrupt Practices Act and conceal the amount, source, and date of all his campaign contributions.

Strict compliance with the act would have meant that Ottinger could have spent no more than $5,000 in his race, a stipulation precious few candidates live up to. This unrealistic limitation, plus the campaign committee loophole, force virtually every candidate to break the spirit, if not the letter, of the law.

Senator William Proxmire, Wisconsin Democrat, last year warned that unless Congress acts promptly to put teeth in Federal election laws, the rising cost of buying essential advertising in the mass media is "going to make the dollar-and-cents purchase of elections even more scandalous in the future than in the past." To this, we say amen.

Come to think of it, when it comes to buying an election, we could suggest far more ominous purchasers than the candidate's mother and sister, sole contributors to 22 of 34 Ottinger campaign committees. Perhaps the New York Times has a point in scolding the Congressman-elect for not disclosing the "nature and scope" of his financing during the race, but try as we could, we couldn't think of one congressional candidate who has followed such a course.

[From the Nation, Jan. 4, 1965]

Money and Politics

Robert R. Barry, who represented the western part of Westchester County, adjoining New York City, and all of adjacent Putnam County, was on the Nation's list of Congressmen most eligible for retirement. However, the area is solidly Republican; Barry had served three terms and it looked as though he could stay in Washington as long as he chose. Since he is a comparatively young man, the prospect was gloomy. Thus, when Richard L. Ottinger came out of the Peace Corps and defeated Barry, the Nation was both surprised and elated.

Without doubt Ottinger will be a shining addition to a New York congressional delegation that can stand some luster, but his election raises a troublesome issue. Barry claims to have spent only $25,000 on his campaign. Ottinger's campaign cost some $193,000, of which $174,000 was contributed by his mother and sister through an assembly line of committees with names like "Citizens for Effective Government in Westchester," "Democratic Committee for Better Representation," "Ottinger for Congress Committee," etc. The New York Herald Tribune has listed 27 such committees; each received $3,000 or $6,000, depending on whether one or both relatives of the candidate contributed.

Joseph W. Shannon, writing in a Westchester newspaper, the Daily Times of Mamaroneck, comments: "Money—and lots of it—is more and more the essential ingredient of political success. A poor man hardly has a chance these days." Shannon cites a "rumor" that Representative Ogden R. Reid, a Republican who successfully defended his seat in another part of Westchester, spent $150,000. Mr. Ottinger himself comments: "In this day and age, campaigning is very expensive. A person who wants to run, particularly in a district held by the opposition, simply has to advertise—newspapers, billboards, radio—and this all costs money. A man has two choices. He can finance it himself, or he can go through organizations to which he is then beholden." He adds that the money was used not only on his behalf but to support other Democratic candidates in the district.

Mr. Ottinger's case is certainly not unusual. Many of the more attractive public figures of our time are rich men—some self-made like Governor Romney, but most of them possessors of inherited wealth: Governor Scranton, Governor Rockefeller, Senator Pell, Senator Clark, the Kennedys, and others. And when other State and National campaign costs are examined, Ottinger's spending falls in perspective. Robert Kennedy spent $2 million to win his Senate seat from New York, a large portion of which came from his own fortune and from the fortunes of other Kennedys. The so-called President's Club of Lyndon B. Johnson is said to have secured 4,000 contributions of $1,000 each. In the California senatorial primary, it cost Alan Cranston no less than $800,000 to lose to Pierre Salinger.

There is no patent cure for this problem, but some proposals may have merit. Perhaps the Government should pick up the tab for certain kinds of campaign expenses, TV appearances in particular; perhaps the laws governing expenditures should be tightened, and it would be a good thing to broaden the base of political financing. Senator Goldwater demonstrated that large campaign funds can be raised in small amounts from thousands of donors through daily mail and television appeals. The fat cat is not indispensable. Certainly the problem should be kept under continuous study and investigation, for as the process of political inflation goes on, all sorts of talent, particularly young talent, is in effect barred from political office. Especially pertinent is the question of what happened to the report of the Commission on Campaign Expenditures, initiated by President Kennedy in 1962. Its specific proposals were mild enough: individual tax deductions for campaign contributions to a total of $1,000 or, as an alternative, since only 40 percent of the taxpayers itemize deductions, a tax credit of one-half of campaign contributions to a total of $10. Neither proposal was adopted, but a simple deduction of $50 passed the Senate and was then voted down in the House. While President Johnson has espoused as his own most of the legislative programs and proposals of his predecessor, he has yet to say anything about campaign expenditures.

[From the Yonkers (N.Y.) Record, Jan. 3, 1965]

The Square Peg

(By Peggy Williams)

The fuss over the dollars spent by Ottinger's own family to set him up in the legislative business brought calls and letters from many readers. And we wonder if Frankenberry may not have stirred up a hornet's nest for which his GOP colleagues will not thank him. Personally, we wish our family had $200,000 worth of confidence and interest in us. We think there is no compliment as sincere as financial backing by one's own family.

The comments by press confreres and some members of the voting public on the high cost of Ottinger's run all ignored the very special factors involved: (1) the fact that the 25th Congressional District has been a traditionally GOP seat so long as we know of; (2) a GOP incumbent who had captured the run initially by primary held it; and (3) the majority of communications outlets in the 25th District in this kind of a situation costs money. **But is it not fair to the** voter that he be reached? At any cost? And that he be informed on his alternatives? So at least his vote is his own and not the tool of a possible indoctrinated and interpretive press?

For the record—when Ogden Reid challenged Congressman Ed Dooley in the 26th District—in the primary (which he won)—Reid spent, we are told, $287,000 as against Dooley's $21,000. If it's not OK to spend $200,000 and up, let's go back and undo that one.

[Letter addressed to the New York Times]

The Editors,
The New York Times,
New York, N.Y.

Gentlemen: Your recent editorial on reported expenditures attributed to my election fails to appreciate the costs of modern-day campaigning. The real need for reform is to find a way to finance these high costs so that a challenger for high office need not be independently wealthy or indebted to special interest groups.

Candidates must and should make their records and positions known to the public. This is a substantial and expensive endeavor in a district of nearly 500,000 persons.

During the 8 months in which I campaigned, I was out meeting people 16 hours a day, 7 days a week. I met more than 100,000 people and talked to more than 400 groups. In order to do this, a candidate must have a staff to make appointments, write press releases, answer correspondence, do publicity, and work with the party organization on registration and getting out the vote.

The only way to be sure of getting into every house in the district is direct mail. I made three mailings to each of the 168,000 families in my district. Each mailing cost about $20,000 or 12 cents per family. This includes 4 cents for postage, 3 cents for printing, one-half cent for the envelope, one-half cent for the letterhead, 2 cents for addressing, and 2 cents for folding, stuffing, collating, handling, and trucking. Thus, the cost of my mailings was $60,000, about one-third the cost of the campaign. Furthermore, the costs of producing advertising for, and procuring space in newspapers and on billboards and radio are very high, often running to thousands of dollars per insertion.

A breakdown of the major campaign expenditures shows that $37,633 went for staff, $14,562 for office expenses, $21,838 for billboards, $59,682 for mailings, $20,079 for newspaper advertising, $14,807 for radio ads, and $20,000 for miscellaneous (postage, travel, registration, etc.). As you can see, $193,582 went for communication with the constituency and for permitting candidates to spend their time meeting and talking with the public. No expenditure was improper and the total is not unusual for a hotly contested election in such a district.

While this comes to a lot of money, it must be remembered that any challenger must confront an incumbent who has office space, office equipment, stationery and supplies, a staff of nine people paid a total of about $50,000, and the franking privilege to send mail free, all of which is used to put forth the incumbent's name, record, and activities, if not directly for "campaigning."

In my district, even more formidable obstacles were present. No Democrat had ever won in the district and the incumbent's last plurality was 62 percent and 41,000 votes. I had to go from a virtual unknown in this district to become a person whose record and positions could persuade many to bolt their party and support my candidacy.

It should be pointed out, too, that the money raised in this campaign was not used solely in my behalf. It was used to support the entire ticket, national and local. All candidates distributed literature through the offices and had their names displayed there.

The local candidates used the staff and offices and shared in the scheduling and all other activities. Registration efforts and work in bringing out the vote was for everyone's benefit. All participated.

I wish that "all this spending" had proved to be "unnecessary" as your editorial maintained. The fact is that the voters supported President Johnson, then returned to their normal Republican voting pattern to give Senator Keating a 10,000 vote plurality in my district. Were it not for the ability of me and my running mates to communicate our records and issues and to tie the incumbents with Senator Goldwater, it is at best doubtful that the voters would have returned to row B to give me a 27,000 vote plurality and elect a Democratic State senator and two assemblymen in the district.

You express concern over the fact that the great majority of the campaign funds were contributed by my family and me. Where is a candidate to go for the money necessary for the expense of communication? There is no prospect of the public contributing this kind of money, although we made every effort to obtain wide support and did, in fact, raise publicly more than $20,000.

There should be some means of encouraging wide public involvement in financing campaigns. The Government should participate. The late President Kennedy proposed a $15 tax credit and maximum $1,000 deductibility for political contributions. I heartily endorse such a reform and will give it top priority in my legislative program.

Very truly yours,

Richard L. Ottinger,
Congressman-Elect.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Dec. 28, 1964]

Ottinger and the Issues

To the Herald Tribune:

Fortunately for the citizens of Westchester and Putnam Counties, the attempt to unseat our new Congressman, Richard L. Ottinger, will prove only what Mr. Ottinger already knows so well: it costs a lot of money to run for office these days.

Dick Ottinger left the Peace Corps to accept the Democratic nomination for Congress in the 25th District before the Republicans lost their minds and nominated Goldwater. The Democrats, while welcoming Ottinger as a candidate, were not about to invest cash in trying to elect a newcomer over Representative Robert Barry, who was habitually returned to office.

But Ottinger's campaign was like a freshening breeze. He made an issue of the Hudson River and its pollution; he tried to stop Consolidated Edison from gouging up the Hudson Highlands with a powerplant; growing blight of decaying towns and commuter transportation were other issues.

In my life as a Westchester Republican, I never heard such talk from a candidate—modern, civilized sense. And the voters were given an opportunity to vote for somebody while uniting to stamp out Goldwater.

Regardless of the money Ottinger's family spent on his campaign, it was issues that put him in office—and the good luck to have a Goldwater sycophant running against him.

The laws governing election campaign expenditures are, like many of our tax, divorce and birth control laws, so stupid, inequitable and inapplicable that they frequently do not deserve, nor do they get, the respect or attention of rational people. There are unsavory things about an election campaign. But there were two good things about the last election: Goldwater didn't get in, and Ottinger did.

William Rodgers.

Briarcliff Manor, N.Y.

[From the Yonkers (N.Y.) Herald-Statesman, Jan. 2, 1965]

Brands Attacks on Ottinger's Election Outlay Vicious

To the Herald-Statesman:

I am shocked at the intemperate and vicious attacks leveled against our newly elected Congressman Richard Ottinger before he has even taken his seat in the House.

Wouldn't it be fairer for our Republican friends to hold their partisan blasts against the first Democrat elected in this district in decades until his record in the Congress is clear?

This business about election spending is pure nonsense, and no one knows it better than the Republican leaders. Congressional candidates of all political stripes must and do spend far in excess of $8,000 on their own and related campaigns. There is no rule against this if it is properly done. Rest assured if there was, a healthy percentage of the Congress including members from all parties would be seated in violation of law.

The entire matter of campaign spending is an apparent smokescreen. What the Republican leaders are upset about is that a traditionally "safe" congressional seat has gone to an attractive young Democrat.

Michael F. Mayer.

[Letter addressed to the Ossining (N.Y.) Citizens Register, Jan. 5, 1965]

To the Citizens Register:

The critics of Richard L. Ottinger's congressional campaign expenditures brush quickly past the problem of communication in a suburban district of 250,000 voters. They ignore altogether how severely the problem is compounded for the candidate whose party's registration averages 30 percent.

Leaving aside the legal questions, about which we have insufficient information, some of the conditions of suburban campaigning which the critics overlook, are these:

Prior to Ottinger, no Democrat came even close to winning the 25th District. Most professional politicians in both parties would agree, I believe, that personality has not played a decisive role in the hitherto endless string of Republican victories. The Democratic candidates in recent years have been at least as able as the GOP incumbent, and not remarkably different in program or personality, from Mr. Ottinger.

The biggest Democratic problem in the 25th District is reaching 250,000 voters, particularly with the registration 3-to-1 Republican. (I say "Democratic problem" because the incumbent with his franking privilege, reaches all of his constituents regularly.) These quarter of a million people are spread out over 50 miles, at least half of them scattered in one-family homes. The bulk of the working population travels many miles away from home every day. The radio they hear, the TV they see, the newspapers they read on the way to work, hardly cover at all the life of the 25th Congressional District.

Thus, the minority candidate starts off with 7 out of 10 against him. There is no single, effective way (even an expensive one), to reach large numbers of voters. He has to go to the people—250,000 of them—personally, more than half of them, 1 house at a time.

How many can afford to quit work in February, as Mr. Ottinger did, and spend 18 hours a day from March to November, every day, visiting every village, town, and city? Is it any wonder that before 1964 not even a Democratic presidential landslide could beat such odds? Yet anything else has meant certain defeat.

As to the argument that with President Johnson heading the ticket, Mr. Ottinger didn't need to spend so much, there is considerable contrary evidence. An able Democrat who did not have Mr. Ottinger's resources, lost decisively in the adjoining 26th District, despite President Johnson. Excellent Democrats running for the State senate and assembly on spartan budgets, lost in the same villages and towns where Dick Ottinger won. With $200,000 to spend, and able to take the time off to use himself as well, Ottinger could get to these places personally many times, not to mention the dozens of times he came there by billboards, newspaper ads, and mailings. Why then is it that the one thing Ottinger and his runningmates had in common—President Johnson—was enough for him, but not for them?

It seems to me that the answer is that Mr. Ottinger did what every candidate, particularly from a minority party, must do to stand even an outside chance of winning. It is obviously a disgrace that he had to spend $200,000 to do it. But I submit that the disgrace is not his, but our system's.

It is tough enough to get good Democratic candidates to run in Westchester County. If the rare one with money is now to be criticized for using it, we will really have a one-party system.

Mr. Ottinger's story is neither a Westchester nor a Democratic problem. It surely applies in many parts of the country where good Republicans stand little chance against a 70-percent Democratic registration. The solution does not lie in penalizing the rare rich candidate, nor in unrealistic spending ceilings. The answer can only come from Federal-State financed campaigns, patterned after the English system.

Until then, let us elect good candidates, without money if we can, with it if we must. But good candidates.

Very truly yours,

William Klein II.

Briarcliff Manor, N.Y.

[Letter addressed to the New York Times, Dec. 23, 1964]

To the Editor:

In your editorial, "The Ottinger Campaign," in referring to Mr. Ottinger, you state: "An otherwise attractive young man starts his political career under a cloud." This statement is unduly harsh and unfair to Mr. Ottinger, not only because, as you point out, "his case is by no means unique"—but if Mr. Ottinger is to be beholden to anyone for campaign contributions, it is far better—from the standpoint of the public interest—that he be beholden to his family rather than to groups who might make demands upon him to serve their special interests.

Considering the huge sums spent in the recent election and raised from sources other than candidates' families, apparently lack of family or personal financial background has not restricted access to office (about which you were concerned) by many candidates. The crux of this matter is: Whose money helped elect the candidates; and, what will donors expect in the way of service and "favors" from successful candidates? In the past, some candidates have paid off their election obligations at the taxpayers' expense in the form of legislation, jobs, contracts, etc.

I am sure that neither Mr. Ottinger's mother nor sister will receive any political favors or payoffs, or anything that will cost the taxpayer a single penny. Just because he did not pass around the hat among contributors who might, in the normal course, want favors or special privileges, Mr. Ottinger should start off his congressional career with a minimum of obligations to specific groups. I hope that it might be said that he wears no man's collar. This should permit him to serve his district and his country more effectively and objectively.

Rather than condemn contributions made by Mr. Ottinger's family, everything possible should be done to encourage the election of such intelligent, honest and dedicated young men, as Mr. Ottinger, particularly if they can be elected with a minimum or, possibly, no financial obligations to the "bosses" or "special interest groups."

Sincerely,

Leon Cole.

New York City.

THE 47TH ANNIVERSARY OF UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. Grabowski] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, today we are commemorating the 47th anniversary of Ukrainian Independence Day.

For three centuries the tragic story of these people has been written into the history books. During most of that time misery and misfortune have been their lot, and they have been allowed no voice in their destiny.

This is no less true today than it has been in the past.

Since the middle of the 17th century, except for a brief period between 1918 and 1920, this nation of over 40 million industrious, gifted, and gallant souls, has not been allowed to enjoy freedom and independence. For centuries Ukrainians have been held down by the unrelenting hands of alien despots. They have endured hardships and privations; they have been ruthlessly oppressed and persecuted for clinging to their national ideals, for dreaming of, and cherishing their freedom.

Yet, no oppressive measure, no amount of severe persecution has forced them to abandon their yearning for freedom. These oppressions and persecutions succeeded in uniting the Ukrainians against their foes, and, toward the end of the First World War, when the czarist Russian regime was overthrown, these brave people proclaimed their independence. On January 22, 1918, the Ukrainian Republic was founded.

Unfortunately, this Republic was surrounded by powerful and greedy foes, all eager to take over. Early in 1920 it was attacked by Russian Communist forces and soon overrun. The Ukraine's independence was brought quickly to an end and it was incorporated into the Soviet Union.

Since then, for more than 44 years, the Ukraine has been submerged in the vast Soviet empire and the Ukrainian people have suffered under Soviet totalitarianism. They have borne the heavy yoke of the Kremlin longer than other minority group in the U.S.S.R. The Communist regime, hard on all nationality groups there, has been particularly harsh on the individualistic and independent spirited Ukrainian population.

Fortunately, not even the Communist dictatorship has been able to break the spirit of freedom that still exists within these people. They have struggled against their oppressors and have fought with all the means at their disposal.

On this 47th anniversary celebration of their independence day we must wish them continued fortitude and power in their fight for freedom and liberty.

HOUSING FOR THE ELDERLY ACT OF 1965

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Hanna] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, my bill, H.R. 2981, entitled, "Housing for the Elderly Act of 1965," is in the form of much needed amendments to present laws recommended by persons and organizations with years of experience in planning, financing, building, and management of large and successful nonprofit housing for the elderly.

The Nation's housing for the elderly is no longer in the experimental stage. Many millions of dollars have been spent in the 8 years of the program, yet the surface has hardly been scratched in providing decent, safe, and sanitary housing at rentals the majority of the elderly can afford.

Public housing for the elderly, it has been found, is not the answer. It is resented by the community and considered a modern version of "over the hill to the poorhouse," by the elderly themselves. Government-owned and managed housing becomes institutionalized and lacks the love and understanding that only private, nonprofit interest, efficiently operated, can furnish, if properly financed and encouraged.

A number of sincere groups had the courage to sponsor nonprofit housing for the elderly seeking to bring about quality, low-rent housing. Some of these projects are in financial difficulties because of the rental charge set by the Government in order to make the project a financial success. The rents charged are too high for the great majority of the elderly on low, fixed incomes, therefore the projects suffer from lack of occupancy.

It would be much cheaper for the Government to forestall their failure by offering a modest monthly subsidy to enable such projects to meet their obligations and, at the same time, permit low-income elderly to live in these developments.

First. Therefore, my bill, H.R. 2981, provides that the Administrator may enter into a contractual agreement with the owner, after construction, for payments not to exceed $10 a month or $120 a year per living unit.

Second. My bill places the two housing programs for the elderly together, under the skilled and experienced FHA personnel in this field, thereby saving costly duplications of administration, and so forth.

Third. It establishes a much needed Board of Appeals to give sponsors, and so forth, the opportunity for a fair hearing if their applications are not acted upon within a reasonable time or if they are dissatisfied with the action accorded by local offices of the FHA and CFA.

Fourth. Much of the success of this type of project depends upon timely completion when the owner can move in renters to create an income to meet debt service obligations. Under my bill the contractor is required to post a completion bond with additional sureties providing penalties in the event of failure to complete the project on time.

Fifth. Furnishings, fixtures, and equipment needed to operate a housing for the elderly project is included in the loan provisions under my bill. Most nonprofit corporations, because of the nature of being nonprofit, should not be compelled to assume unreasonable obligations along with the responsibilities they are required to meet by the Government agencies.

Sixth. The age for occupants are lowered from 62 years of age, and over, to 60 years of age, and over. The average age of occupants living in elderly housing is 74 years. The lowering of the age by 2 years will encourage younger part-time employed persons to live in such housing.

Seventh. Owners are reluctant to rent to those on public assistance because of the undependency of their income. My bill provides, upon permission from the recipient, payments may be made directly to the owner by local welfare agencies, where permitted by law.

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include copy of a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have permission to extend their remarks following my own on this subject.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, Friday, January 22, 1965, marked the 47th anniversary of the independence of Ukraine. Because of the inaugural festivities, it was thought best to hold our annual observance in the House today, January 25. As in prior years, in both the House and the Senate, the elected representatives of the American people take this memorable occasion to express the deep feeling of affinity and common purpose we hold for the captive nation of some 45 million Ukrainians.

We share with them the ideals of real democracy, national self-determination, and individual liberty and in many ways truly support their undying aspirations for freedom and national independence.

OCCASION FOR HOUSE RESOLUTION 14

On this significant occasion of the 47th anniversary of Ukraine's independence, I deem it necessary to go beyond the realm of sincere expressions of thought and feelings by advancing a concrete proposal that would aid immensely in the eventual liberation of Ukraine—indeed, all other captive nations—from the imperio-colonialist heel of Moscow. I know that by offering the adoption of House Resolution 14, a measure to establish a desperately needed Special House Committee on the Captive Nations, my proposal for specific and concrete action bespeaks also the desires of numerous Members of this body, who in the 87th Congress, in the 88th Congress, and in the present 89th Congress have joined in submitting similar resolutions. This congressional observance of Ukrainian independence affords us the excellent opportunity in this Congress to urge the necessary creation of this special committee.

Mr. Speaker, in a move which I believe touches the heart of every Ukrainian patriot—in fact, the hearts of all our captive allies in the Red totalitarian empire—I take this important occasion to urge the immediate adoption of House Resolution 14, a copy of which will be found at the end of my remarks.

THIS 47TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. Speaker, the national histories of east European peoples are full of miseries and misfortunes, and the history of the Ukrainian people is no exception. Since the signing of a compact between the Russian czar and the Ukrainian leaders in 1654, stouthearted and liberty-loving Ukrainians have not been allowed, except for periods in the 18th century and the brief 2-year period of 1918–20, to enjoy the benefits of free and independent life in their historic homeland.

Through the turns and twists of fateful international events, some 45 million Ukrainians have not been permitted to be masters of their fate. For too long a period they have been held down under the oppressing yoke of alien despots. They have endured hardships, privations, and indescribable miseries. They have been ruthlessly persecuted for clinging to their national ideals, for dreaming and cherishing their independence and freedom.

Yet, no oppressive measure, no amount of severe persecution could compel them to abandon their yearning for freedom. Instead, oppressions and persecutions have united the Ukrainians against their foes, held them together. Then toward the end of the First World War, when the decrepit czarist regime was overthrown, and Austria's hold over the western Ukraine was broken, the Ukrainians proclaimed their independence and established the Ukrainian National Republic.

This historic event took place on the memorable 22d of January 1918—47 years ago. That day has become a landmark in the history of Ukraine, and remains the brightest spot in their struggle for freedom and independence. Unfortunately, the newborn republic was suffering under severe handicaps. It was surrounded by powerful foes, ready to pounce upon it and put an end to its existence. And that is what happened even before the joy and jubilation had ceased.

Before the Ukrainian people had any time to recoup their losses, they were attacked by their inveterate foes, Moscow and its Red army. Early in 1920 enemy forces entered and occupied the eastern part of the country; soon the whole country was overrun and all Ukrainian opposition was ruthlessly crushed. Then in the fall of that year Ukraine became a satellite of Soviet Russia, and by 1933 it was forcibly incorporated into the Soviet Union.

Since those fateful days, for nearly five decades, Ukraine has been submerged in the Soviet Russian Empire, and the Ukrainian people have suffered grievously under Moscow's totalitarianism. For all practical purposes the country is sealed off from the free world. Neither the people of Ukraine are allowed in large numbers to travel abroad, nor are the people of the free world, except under carefully guided Communist supervision, able to go to Ukraine.

Thus, the country has become a large prison house for its people. Their most cherished possession is their spirit of freedom. Inhuman Kremlin agents have resorted to every device to deprive the Ukrainian people of this possession, but fortunately they have not succeeded in their task. Today, even under the most relentless of Soviet Russian totalitarian tyrannies, the sturdy and stouthearted Ukrainian clings steadfastly to his national ideals and still preserves his fervent love for freedom and independence.

The Ukrainian people, in and out of their homeland, have been a boon to the communities in which they lived. In this country they have been noted for their industry, ingenuity, and tenacity for hard work in whatever vocation. They have never shunned heavy labor in preference to something less arduous. In this respect their tough and resilient physiques, and their tenacious nature have served them well.

Hundreds of thousands of loyal, patriotic, and hardworking Americans of Ukrainian origin have always given excellent accounts of themselves in this country. I can say this because I have known many of them in my Congressional District, and have seen them at work. These people of stolid character have contributed their full measure to the free and democratic way of life in this great Republic. They have been a positive force in the building of our democratic institutions, and they have always been ready to fight and die for the preservation of these institutions.

Today, on this solemn occasion, I am happy to join them in the celebration of the 47th anniversary of Ukrainian Independence Day.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit at this point a copy of the aforementioned House Resolution 14, 89th Congress:

H. RES. 14

Whereas on the issue of colonialism the blatant hypocrisy of imperialist Moscow has not been adequately exposed by us in the United Nations and elsewhere; and

Whereas Presidential proclamations designating Captive Nations Week summon the American people "to study the plight of the Soviet-dominated nations and to recommit themselves to the support of the just aspirations of the people of those captive nations"; and

Whereas the nationwide observances in the first anniversary of Captive Nations Week clearly demonstrated the enthusiastic response of major sections of our society to this Presidential call; and

Whereas following the passage of the Captive Nations Week resolution in 1959 by the Congress of the United States and again during the annual observances of Captive Nations Week, Moscow has consistently displayed to the world its profound fear of growing free world knowledge of and interest in all of the captive nations, and particularly the occupied non-Russian colonies within the Soviet Union; and

Whereas the indispensable advancement of such basic knowledge and interest alone can serve to explode current myths on Soviet unity, Soviet economy and monolithic military prowess and openly to expose the depths of imperialist totalitarianism and economic colonialism throughout the Red Russian Empire, especially inside the so-called Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; and

Whereas, for example, it was not generally recognized, and thus not advantageously made use of, that in point of geography, history, and demography, the now famous U–2 plane flew mostly over captive non-Russian territories in the Soviet Union; and

Whereas in the fundamental conviction that the central issue of our times is imperialist totalitarian slavery versus democratic national freedom, we commence to win the psychopolitical cold war by assembling and forthrightly utilizing all the truths and facts pertaining to the enslaved condition of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba, and other subjugated nations; and

Whereas the enlightening forces generated by such knowledge and understanding of the fate of these occupied and captive non-Russian nations would also give encouragement to latent liberal elements in the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic—which contains Russia itself—and would help bring to the oppressed Russian people their overdue independence from centuries-long authoritarian rule and tyranny; and

Whereas these weapons of truth, fact, and ideas would counter effectively and overwhelm and defeat Moscow's worldwide propaganda campaign in Asia, Africa, the Middle East, Latin America, and specifically among the newly independent and underdeveloped nations and states; and

Whereas it is incumbent upon us as free citizens to appreciatively recognize that the captive nations in the aggregate constitute not only a primary deterrent against a hot global war and further overt aggression by Moscow's totalitarian imperialism, but also a prime positive means for the advance of world freedom in a struggle which in totalistic form is psychopolitical; and

Whereas in pursuit of a diplomacy of truth we cannot for long avoid bringing into question Moscow's legalistic pretensions of "noninterference in the internal affairs of states" and other contrivances which are acutely subject to examination under the light of morally founded legal principles and political, economic, and historical evidence; and

Whereas in the implementing spirit of our own congressional Captive Nations Week resolution and the four Presidential proclamations it is in our own strategic interest and that of the nontotalitarian free world to undertake a continuous and unremitting study of all the captive nations for the purpose of developing new approaches and fresh ideas for victory in the psychopolitical cold war: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That there is hereby established a committee which shall be known as the Special Committee on the Captive Nations. The committee shall be composed of ten Members of the House, of whom not more than six shall be members of the same political party, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 2. (a) Vacancies in the membership of the committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original selection.

(b) The committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members. In the absence of the chairman, the vice chairman shall act as chairman.

(c) A majority of the committee shall constitute a quorum except that a lesser number, to be fixed by the committee, shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of administering oaths and taking sworn testimony.

SEC. 3. (a) The committee shall conduct an inquiry into and a study of all the captive non-Russian nations, which includes those in the Soviet Union and Asia, and also of the Russian people, with particular reference to the moral and legal status of Red totalitarian control over them, facts concerning conditions existing in these nations, and means by which the United States can assist them by peaceful processes in their present plight and in their aspiration to regain their national and individual freedoms.

(b) The committee shall make such interim reports to the House of Representatives as it deems proper, and shall make its first comprehensive report of the results of its inquiry and study, together with its recommendations, not later than January 31, 1966.

SEC. 4. The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times within or outside the United States to hold such hearings, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, and to take such testimony as it deems advisable.

SEC. 5. The committee may employ and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, and other employees as it deems necessary in the performance of its duties.

Mr. VIGORITO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VIGORITO. Mr. Speaker, January 22, 1965, marked the 47th anniversary of the proclamation establishing a free and independent Ukrainian National Republic. Because freedom is stifled today in the Ukraine, it is just and appropriate for us to observe this anniversary and to speak up for those who are silenced by Russo-Communist tyranny. Today, we pay tribute to the 45 million people of the Ukraine and those Ukrainian sons and daughters who have come to our shores and made such a worthy contribution to our culture and national heritage.

The independence and freedom of the Ukrainian National Republic were of short duration, but its commemoration remains as a steadfast reminder that that freedom burns brightly as it did in 1918 despite long years of tyranny and oppression. No despot, however cruel, can extinguish the yearning for liberty that dwells in the hearts of men. The Ukraine has been forced to submit to manmade famine, religious suppression, cultural control, purges, and deportations. Yet, no one has broken the spirit of these people who have so long labored under the yoke of Soviet domination.

The Ukrainians have retained their strong national feelings and have lived and worked according to the traditions of their heritage. National resistance to Soviet domination has ever been uppermost in their minds and actions.

The crimes of the Soviet Russian leadership against the Ukrainians assumes an overwhelming significance in this modern day. Lest this plight be forgotten, let us take this opportunity to reaffirm our own dedication to freedom, and assure the Ukrainian people, along with all others held captive under the hand of Communist oppression, that we have not forgotten them, and that we do not accept their enslavement as final. We are confident the sun of freedom will again shine upon them and that they will take their place—as is their God-given right—in the community of free and sovereign nations.

On this solemn anniversary day of Ukrainian independence, I join my colleagues and millions of Americans in wishing the Ukrainian people everywhere, fortitude and power in their struggle against the forces of tyranny, and express hope that they attain their supreme goals of freedom and national independence with justice for all.

Mr. FLOOD. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania. If I am not mistaken, Mr. Speaker, this is the gentleman's maiden speech as a Member of the House of Representatives. We wish for him great success here and many years of tenure in which to continue these remarks.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include an article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, this occasion is an excellent one for us to remind ourselves of the imperiocolonialist bondage in which over 117 million non-Russians—Ukrainians, Lithuanians, Armenians, and many other nationalities in the U.S.S.R.—find themselves today. It has been most mystifying to all knowledgeable Americans as to why our representatives in the United Nations have remained silent on this fundamental issue while the United States has been excoriated for imperialism and colonialism in the Congo, Vietnam, and elsewhere. On this issue I commend to the reading of my colleagues the following article written by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, of Georgetown University, on "Dominant Russian and American Problems in the Cold War." I request that this article, which was recently published in the authoritative journal of East European and Asian affairs, the Ukrainian Quarterly, be printed at this point in the RECORD:

DOMINANT RUSSIAN AND AMERICAN PROBLEMS IN THE COLD WAR

(By Lev E. Dobriansky)

Now that President Johnson has been elected for a 4-year term, the eyes of all Americans who are deeply and intelligently concerned with the steady progress made by the Sino-Russian imperialist combination in the cold war are fixed more than ever on the dominant problems confronting both Moscow and Washington. The problems are numerous; they are economic, political, ideological and scientific, but despite their character, they will in great part be viewed against the background of conceptions revealed by the President himself. With an expected sharp turn of events, it wouldn't at all be surprising to witness his reverting back to a position taken in the last decade: "We should keep our strength ready, the strength we are now building. If anywhere in the world—by any means, open or concealed—communism trespasses upon the soil of the free world, we should unleash all the power at our command upon the vitals of the Soviet Union."[1]

Since these words were uttered, there has been a great deal of trespassing on the soil of the free world. Whole territories in Cuba, Tibet, and elsewhere have been taken over by both Moscow and Peiping. Regardless of the presence of nuclear weapons, which obviously doesn't deter their concealed aggressions against the free world, there is grave doubt that the President's current conceptions of the struggle can cope with the swiftly moving changes abroad. Take, for example, his notion about good Communists and bad ones: "It is true * * * that communism is a danger. But Russia is a different kind of danger from Yugoslavia. A small Communist Party in Africa is a different danger from the Government of Red China."[2] It would seem from this that no Communist conspiracy exists, that we needn't worry about any venomous tentacles, only the heart.

Another false conception is that of personality diplomacy. We oriented our policy toward the Soviet Union rather heavily on the whims and caprices of Khrushchev. Indeed, upon his downfall the President even praised him for joining in the nuclear test ban treaty, in the hot line, and in agreeing on a nuclear-free space. "In these actions," stated the President, "he demonstrated good sense and sober judgment."[3] Only the future will tell whether we exercised "good sense and sober judgment" in all this. Aside from the terrible real costs of any technologic breakthrough on Moscow's part that we may yet sustain, the costs of maintaining safeguards since the treaty went into effect keep soaring at close to a billion dollars a year.

In that same address, speaking of turmoil in the Communist world, the President declared "this great change will not stop the forces in Eastern Europe that are working for greater independence. Those forces will continue to have our sympathy. We will not give up our hope of building new bridges to these peoples." Are these bridges with the oppressive governments or with the captive nations, the peoples themselves? So far it has been with the former and as such has undermined the forces working for greater independence. With an anticipated consolidation of the Sino-Russian Empires, where will bridges be extended then?

---

[1] Senator Johnson, Lyndon B., CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 98, pt. 8, p. A127.

[2] President Johnson, text, Al Smith dinner, New York, Oct. 14, 1964.

[3] Address, the Washington Post, Monday, Oct. 19, 1964, p. A10.

An additional favorite Presidential conception that will be exploded in the not too distant future is that of random evolution. "All political systems change," states Johnson. "They are forced to by historic circumstances. It would be dangerously foolish to believe that Soviet Russia or Communist China will soon become open societies. But it would be equally foolish to think they will never change."[4] Change how?—essentially or accidentally. The United States has been in constant change, yet in the essence of its democracy it is changeless. So with the totalitarian systems of the Soviet Russian and Red Chinese Empires, they are changing by the day, but not away from their totalitarian essence. History is made; it just doesn't merely happen, with all of us changing accordingly.

To depend on such conceptions for the future would be defeating, indeed. The removal of Khrushchev from power signalizes both the collapse of the policy of accommodation, as pursued by Kennedy and Johnson, and the move for empire solidarity. Red Chinese and Soviet Russian cooperation will spearhead wars of liberation in the underdeveloped areas. Strengthened within, every attempt will be made by the solidified Sino-Russian Empire to intensify disintegrative forces in Western Europe, southeast Asia, Africa, and Latin America. It didn't take long for Poland's Gomulka and Hungary's Kadar to fall in line with the Brezhnev-Kosygin regime. Others will rapidly fall in line, too. Meantime, Moscow has received Peiping's stanch ally in Europe. Soon Moscow and Tirana will be exchanging ambassadors. The trend is on and the problems facing Moscow and Washington will be greater than ever.

THE NATURE OF PROBLEMS

Now, every body politic has problems. This has always been; it will always be. We in the United States are beset with a full spectrum of problems, ranging from a shot to the moon to the employment of every willing and able worker. The Soviet Union has even greater problems, not only those normally associated with day-to-day existence in a developing industrial society but also—indeed more so—those created by the totalitarian goals, drives, and energies of what is commonly called Russian communism.

In a valid sense, then, the problems of Russian communism, totalitarian in nature and scope, constitute an additional layer to the everyday problems engulfing those who are directly or indirectly under the influence of Moscow. Yes, there are problems of juvenile delinquency, skilled labor shortages, alcoholism, urban development and a host of other socio-economic phenomena as there are here and in numerous other countries. But to pose these as the distinctive, direct problems of Russian communism would mean to lose sight of the forest because of the trees. To be sure, in any totalitarian framework the impact of broader, overall problems is felt in the lower range of particular, day-to-day problems—creating some, sustaining others, and intensifying most. But to comprehend as best we could the total, integrated picture of the problems of Russian communism, and thus those facing us, it is necessary to distinguish between the truly totalistic problems and the particular derivative problems, with primary concentration on the former.

Methodically, then, for us to view the picture of the problems of Russian communism as an integrated whole, we shall survey six selective categories, each in turn predicating a variety of interrelated problems. More, to assess the meaning of these aggregate problems both for the achievement of Moscow's goals and the realization of capable responses on our part, we shall throughout stress their operational significance in the context of traditional Russian cold war activity.

THE IDEOLOGICOPROPAGANDA PROBLEM

The six problem areas for our analysis are: (1) the ideologicopropaganda, (2) the imperio-colonial, (3) the economic area, (4) the military-space field, (5) the party apparatus, and (6) Soviet Russian totalitarianism. Let us consider the first, the ideologicopropaganda. The strength of Moscow's ideologicopropaganda drive is admitted as being superior by mcst students of the subject. Moscow's tremendous feat in this all-encompassing area is the sustained impression and opinion generated in too many parts of the free world that a new way of life, a new philosophy, and new methods and operations of social order are represented by the Soviet Union and other sectors of Moscow's empire. The way of life is socialism in transition to communism; the philosophy is Marxism-Leninism with unspecified revisions now and then; and the new methods and operations are ostensibly the products of a planned economy. Our personalist way of life, our democratic philosophy, and our capitalist methods and operations stand in contradiction to these essentials of so-called Soviet society.

Moscow's strategists have enlarged this ideologicopropaganda achievement by convincing many unsuspecting Americans and others that the momentous contest is between two social systems—socialism versus capitalism—in the atmosphere of "peaceful coexistence" which, by definition, means cold war and Soviet Russian takeover right down the line. We are supposed to be in an economic and technologic race, the outcome of which is predestined by Moscow's interpretation of history. As in the case of Hitler and his 1,000 years of the new order, the Russian totalitarians see themselves riding the wave of the future.

To prevent this, we spend considerable time, capital and energy in the simple belief that we are fighting international communism or, at best, Communist imperialism. Clouding up the situation further is the notion that our adversary is the Soviets—mind you, councils of workers and peasants. No one will deny here that to confuse, deceive, and distract your chosen opponent is a basic accomplishment in and of itself. As concerns the nature of the struggle and its manifold ramifications, the Russian totalitarians have succeeded in this with us. In the past Russian tyrants cloaked their totalitarian rule and imperialist conquests with equally spurious ideologies of super-religious orthodoxy and racist pan-Slavism. Today it is millenarian communism, interspersed at times with these old ideologies in what suits the occasion.

We have uncritically accepted this and inadvertently impute philosophic respectability and dignity to what is essentially not the ideology but the mythology of communism. The pendulumic swings of attitude in the United States, viewing the Russians as 4-footers at one time and then 11-footers at another, indicate both our uncertainty of knowledge and susceptibility to Moscow's manipulation of half or isolated truths. On the one hand, we deprecate Moscow's activities in Asia, Africa, and Latin America as mere propaganda, while, on the other hand, we complain that our story is not reaching the university students and the peoples of these areas. We have still to appreciate the central importance and significance of propaganda in the cold war. The heirs of Pushkin, Tolstoy, Dostoyevsky, and other practical psychologists have remarkably developed this basic art to make a relatively backward state appear as a prime contender to the American giant, to make the worst empire of its kind appear as the great proponent of national liberation and independence, and to move the minds of millions throughout the world in the belief that all this is so.

However, the problems of Moscow's ideologicopropaganda are deep and fundamental. These have been time and time disclosed by experience and events, not theory or speculation. How often have you heard about Communist indoctrination of the youth and a captive population? Well, after 20 years of so-called indoctrination millions of Ukrainians, Georgians, Armenians, and others deserted colonial Moscow in World War II; after 10 years of heavy propaganda Hungarian students and workers staged the 1956 revolution, shouting "Russky, go home"; after years of enslavement in the Vorkuta, Karaganda, and other labor correction camps, inmates of all different nations struck for freedom.

Month after month, Pravda and Izvestia hammer away at the need for heavy indoctrination in the schools, in the armed services, and in the republics to overcome what is in effect hollow babbitry. On Lenin's birthday in 1963, B. N. Ponomaryov, the party historian and secretary of the Central Committee, delivered an address designed to justify Soviet Russian policy under Khrushchev. The basic principles of revolutionary theory, he said, are loyalty toward Marxism-Leninism—determined struggle against the dogmatic strangulation of the theory; indissoluble union between theory and practice, their organic unity within the scope of all party activities. In other words, like Lenin with Marx, Moscow's colonialists can interpret Lenin as conditions warrant it.

These are only a few of the hundreds of examples proving the utter bankruptcy of what we uncritically call Communist ideology. Without Iron, Bamboo, and Sugar Curtains, walls, and the oppressive apparatus of totalitarian rule this existential bankruptcy would come into full bloom, the Hitlerian totalitarian and imperialist nature of so-called communism would be clear to all, this Trojan Horse of thought and weapon of deception with no basic relevancy to 19th-century Marxism would become transparent even to the newly independent nations and peoples who know little about Soviet Russian imperiocolonialism.

Nevertheless, Moscow continues to capitalize on this massive deception chiefly because of our failure to recognize its own problems in waging this ideologico-propaganda offensive. Such development requires a realization of the central importance of propaganda—a forceful, well-planned propaganda of truth and fact—and also a grasp of the real nature of the threat stemming from Eastern Europe. Our Voice of America is but a pygmy compared to Moscow's media. Worse still, the policies of USIA run counter to the task of recognizing and aggravating these problems in the U.S.S.R. For example, 6 years ago, by virtue of congressional hearings, the USIA was stopped in its attempt to curtail and eliminate Lithuanian, Ukrainian, Georgian, and other non-Russian broadcasts to the U.S.S.R.[5] It sought to have the captive non-Russian peoples under the heel of Soviet Russian imperiocolonialism listen in the language of their Moscow captor.

---

[4] President Johnson, Lyndon B., address, the Morman Tabernacle, Salt Lake City, Oct. 28, 1964.

[5] "Review of U.S. Information Agency," Committee on Foreign Affairs, October 1958, Washington, D.C., pp. 102–122.

The opportunities for projecting the ideologico-propaganda problems of Moscow are many. For one, we could easily show the theoretic Russian perversion of Marxism and the vanity of so-called Communist ideology. Points on economic determinism, the technocratic elite in the U.S.S.R., the appeal to underdeveloped areas in the name of socialism, surplus value, economic and colonial exploitation in the Soviet Union, state versus society, are only a few to establish the Russian mythology of communism. As one writer puts it, "Bolshevism evidently stems from the traditional messianic and universalist outlook of the Russian revolutionary intelligentsia which fastened upon Marxism as an instrument of its own will to change the world." [6] The fact is that Soviet Russian mythology is a Comtean impulse to reorganize wholesale the societies of other nations in the image of barbarian Russian institutions.[7] The combination of oppressive institutions and modern technology, the latter largely the creation of the West, has produced a mythology which in every fundamental respect is Hitlerian totalitarianism.

If we are to win the cold war, we must recognize and repeatedly stress the real threat which Soviet Russian mythology conceals. And this is the Soviet Russian imperiocolonial system of totalitarian rule. Our most powerful weapon against this last remaining empire in the world is the ideology, the system of ideas and truths, embodied in our own Declaration of Independence. About 10 years ago we called for a universalization of the declaration, aimed particularly at the captive non-Russian nations in the Soviet Union.[8] The evidence of this past decade proves the soundness of this position. However, when we find Secretary of State Rusk declaring in a letter to the House Rules Committee in 1961 that Ukraine, Armenia and Georgia are traditional parts of the Soviet Union, meaning, in effect, that we should not disturb Moscow's eminent domain over these captive areas, we cannot but wonder about the understanding and vision of some of our leaders, many of whom are today seeking a nonaggression pact with Moscow and a virtual sellout of the captive nations.[9] Three months later Ambassador Stevenson in a U.N. declaration talks about an "independent Ukrainian Republic," about an Armenia that "declared its independence" in 1918, about "the independent state of Georgia." [10]

Clearly, it is such confusion of thought that inhibits us from recognizing the problem Moscow has in shielding its backward imperio-colonialism with Marxist ideology. It is such cross-purpose operation that causes men like Madariaga to say, "This is a war of ideas, brains and heart. The West's foreign policy is passive and flaccid. It will never get an understanding with Russia. How about Russian imperialism? It's the worst imperialism the world has ever known." [11] Now with Red China, another imperio-colonialist power, Moscow will advance in the free world behind the cloak of Marxism-Leninism.

THE IMPERIOCOLONIAL PROBLEMS

Well, how about Soviet Russian imperialism? The second general area of Moscow's foremost problems is its tremendous empire. Contrary to much current wishful thinking about Red China, Albania, and Rumania, about the slow fragmentation of the Communist bloc, the Soviet Russian Empire has continued to consolidate itself in substantial terms of economic coordination, military accretion, and an expedient exploitation of nationalist forces. One of Moscow's paramount goals in the past 5 years has been to gain Western acquiescence to the permanence of its present empire, and our increasing indifference toward the captive nations has helped in this. Today we can look forward to even greater Soviet Russian consolidation.

Since its accidental inception in 1917, Soviet Russia has reduced to captivity one non-Russian nation after another. The history of Soviet Russian conquest began with most of the nations now held in bondage within the Soviet Union itself—White Ruthenia, Ukraine, Georgia, Armenia, Turkestan, and others—and this process, either directly or indirectly, continues in Cuba, South Vietnam, Laos, Iran, and elsewhere.[12] The most significant development in all areas of the empire is the emphasis placed on the old formula "national in form, Socialist in content." To attract the instinctive nationalist forces in Poland, Ukraine, Hungary, Azerbaijan, Turkestan, and elsewhere to the global ambitions of Moscow, the Russian totalitarians are accommodating themselves to the stress of national heroes and events of the past. In this they hope to prove that the future of these captive nations rests with them rather than the imperialist powers of the West. Moscow exploits past and present national grievances to its own advantage, constantly telling Poles and Ukrainians, for example, about the German atrocities of the past and constantly reminding Azerbaijani and Armenians about their claims against Iran and Turkey, respectively.

Moscow plays every angle to strengthen its hold on the empire, on both the internal captives within the Soviet Union and the outer captives outside it. Feelings of pan-Slavism, religious orthodoxy, national pride, past hatreds and national uncertainty toward the future are exploited. Past disagreements with Red China, Rumania, or Albania were more of a proof of this overall tendency of expedient accommodation than of any basic distintegrative tendency.

Those who today preach that the Soviet Russian Empire is showing signs of disintegration, that the future is with us that all that is required is a military build-up and trade with this empire are gravely misleading the citizens of this country. There is no substantial evidence of this. In fact all the important and basic evidence of increasing empire strength points the other way. Of course Moscow has its problems. Who doesn't? It had even graver problems at Stalin's death during the Hungarian Revolution but it nonetheless continued to build up its composite power.

Yet ingrained in this imperial power and strength lies the most profound problem of the Soviet Russian imperiocolonialists. This fundamental problem revolves about the immense latent power of genuine patriotic nationalism both within and outside the Soviet Union. This problem is so deep that despite his public disclaimers of Stalinist terrorism Khrushchev deemed it necessary to have two Ukrainian nationalist leaders in exile murdered.[13] It is this power of patriotic nationalism which is our most formidable weapon against Soviet Russian imperiocolonialism; not the superficial disagreements between puppet junior partners and the prime power. Despite the unmistakable clues given by former Russian Premier Khrushchev himself we have yet to translate this basic problem for general American understanding.

Turning now to the economic area it should be readily recognized that for cold war objectives the empire economy of the Soviet Union is strong secure and increasingly threatening. The usual comparisons about their surpassing us in this or that are of barren meaning a source of much economic illusion. The U.S.S.R. economy is and always has been a war economy in essence. With a gross imperial product of only about 40 percent of our GNP with an industrial output of about 55 percent of ours and requiring over 20 percent more labor, with an agricultural output below ours by one-third and requiring 40 percent of their labor force as against 10 percent of ours, with available goods and services only 33 percent of ours and on a per capita basis only 25 percent of ours, and with the inevitable problems of growth being experienced by them, Moscow has a long way to go to match our economy. However, being a totalitarian and essentially a cold war economy, the U.S.S.R. poses an increasing threat as $12 to $20 billion of additional output becomes annually available to it for cold and hot liberation war purposes.

Problems in this unbalanced economy are many, but most fundamental are the disparities of real income and status between the new class of the ruling elite and party functionaries and the underlying population, and also the rampant economic colonialism to which the captive non-Russian peoples are subjected. What the average factory worker in the United States receives in 1 week—a little over $100—exceeds the average monthly wage in the U.S.S.R., about $80.

Although living standards have improved in the last 6 years, they are far below those of any modern industrial economy. The shortage of adequate housing space, not to mention facilities, remains acute; and if the present 7-year plan succeeds, the average family in a large city would have about the same living space in 1965 that its forebears had in 1917. In 1961, upon announcing the 20-year draft plan, Khrushchev promised that by 1980 every newly married couple could expect a private apartment of its own.

Such basic maladjustments exist throughout this cold war-oriented economy—in industrial and agricultural production, transportation, communications, distribution, and economic organization. No doubt there are units in each that compare efficiently and brilliantly with the best plants we have. But unless we are wont to be deceived by Russian economic Potemkinism, every sphere lacks depth and proportionality in what for years has been a capital overstrained economy. This strain showed itself in 1961 with a marked decrease in the growth rate, that in 1962 is estimated to have been less than 4 percent.

In combination with these problems, the pressures exerted by the captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. for a greater take in the economic pie represent nationalist resistance to Soviet Russian economic colonialism within the U.S.S.R. Moscow is now decrying localism and has launched another economic reorganization that has all the marks of Russification for the Baltic, Caucasian, and Turkestan areas.

These basic problems deserve our concentrated cold war attention. One of our main objectives should be the study and full disclosure of the scope and depth of Moscow's economic colonialism in the Soviet Union.[14] But so far the administration has resisted such a step, this despite all the evidence of Moscow's troubled concern over such studied interest.[15]

---

[6] Lichtheim, George, "Marxian: An Historical and Critical Study," New York, 1961, p. 398.

[7] Dobriansky, Lev E., "Veblenism, a New Critique," Public Affairs Press, Washington, D.C., 1957, pp. 85–86.

[8] "Universalized Declaration of Independence: America's New World Revolution," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Feb. 18, 1953.

[9] "State Proves the Necessity of a Special Committee on the Captive Nations," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 108, pt. 3, p. 3583.

[10] "Spotlight on Moscow's Imperio-Colonialism," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 108, pt. 3, p. 3569.

[11] Salvador de Madariaga, Washington Post, May 26, 1961.

[12] Dobriansky, Lev E., "History of Communist Aggression," report, Fort Leavenworth, Kans., 1961, pp. 14–22.

[13] George Vine, "I Killed for Russia," the Daily Mail, London, Nov. 18, 1961.

MILITARY-SPACE PROBLEMS

Contributing to the capital overstrain in the U.S.S.R. economy are the military-space problems facing Moscow. The general and specific strength of the U.S.S.R. in this area are the consummate result of top priority allocation in this war economy. Matching in dollar volume our total military expenditures over 20 percent of the gross produce in the U.S.S.R. goes to military pursuits. Every weapon, every means from ICBM's to pistols, receives high qualitative and quantitative development. In space exploration, tremendously expensive in itself, Moscow has, as we know, made an early start under the rule of inordinate concentration. In all these areas the technologic achievements are basically and almost entirely Western. They have little or nothing to do with so-called Socialist economy or Communist pretensions. Their further development poses, nevertheless, certain dangers, particularly in significant breakthroughs capable of magnifying the military power of the imperio-colonial tyrant.

But the innovation of present military-space technology in no way alters the persistent problems in the armed services of the U.S.S.R. Complete and striking military power is not just a conglomeration of new weapons. The ultimate weapon is still man and his morale, loyalties, and will. No one is more aware than Moscow of the overriding fact that, despite changing military technology, in all three major wars in this century the motley and multinational forces of the Russian Empire, whether Czarist or Soviet, disintegrated early. In the Russo-Japanese and the two World Wars, political factors associated with the freedom of the Russian people and the independence of the non-Russian nations, accounted for this record. About 43 percent of the U.S.S.R's armed forces is non-Russian and despite the fact that the constitution of the U.S.S.R. calls for separate Republic war ministries, troops are carefully intermixed and dispersed.

Our capitalization of this deep-seated problem rests obviously on a broader program directed at the captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. Along with this is the necessity for a full and superior development of all our arms, nuclear and conventional. Disarmament in the realistic context of the cold war is a political myth. The only sure and safe way to preserve the gray peace and to move forward toward cold war victory is by attaining to unquestioned superiority along the entire spectrum of military technology and weaponry. Our economy can flexibly accommodate this; the empire economy of the U.S.S.R. cannot. In space, we already enjoy an overall superiority. As in so many other respects, the Russians potemkinize their firsts and demonstrate in time their lack of depth. There is no common sense reason why we or the free world should cooperate and share our space discoveries with the Russian totalitarians. Whether we like it or not, even space is not excludable from the Russian cold war matrix.

THE PARTY APPARATUS

Another major problem area is the party apparatus. Not unlike the Nazi Party under Hitler, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union is the cohesive agent of totalitarian Soviet Russian strength. There are some 9 million in the party today, but this figure is misleading. Predominantly Russian, the party consists of members with families, relatives and associates who, though not members, share both material and spiritual interests in the strength and power of the party. And these number well over 25 million. The party, thus, is the strong vehicle for totalitarian rule in the empire and for subversive conspiracy beyond it.

However, it is not without problems that, along with others, could not be worked on. The perennial problem of succession is uppermost today. Two heads in this empire won't last for long. There are, too, intraparty feuding, the pressures of national parties in Ukraine, Georgia, and elsewhere, and infiltration of party councils and machinery that lend themselves to our use in the cold war. Here, as elsewhere, our offensive in the cold war would necessarily have to be organic, composite, and totalistic. Pursuing one problem as against others would be foolish and wasteful. But it will be noted that involved in each of these major problems is the basic cross-sectional problem of the captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R.

SOVIET RUSSIAN TOTALITARIANISM

The final and perhaps cardinal problem of Russian communism is the maintenance of its nexus between Soviet Russian expansionism and internal totalitarianism. The former continues unabated by push and accomplishment, as in the case of Cuba. And, contrary to the false notion of progressive mellowism in the U.S.S.R., the latter is kept intact. Aside from terrorism, the totalitarian reins in the U.S.S.R. are as strong as ever. There has been no evidence of any democratization under Khrushchev, and allowable criticism is more administrative than institutional. As Khrushchev said in 1957, "I * * * wish to goodness every Communist could fight as Stalin fought." Logically, to allow any institutional democratization, Moscow would be consigning its whole imperial structure, including the U.S.S.R., to limbo. But this logic is no reason for us to hesitate in the enlargement of this problem by actively generating pressures within the U.S.S.R. toward the civil and political freedoms of the Russian people and the national freedoms of the non-Russian nations.

In short, the permanence of the cold war and the basic fixity of Soviet Russian totalitarianism are indispensable requisites to the preservation of Moscow's imperial domain, within and beyond the U.S.S.R. A limited nuclear test ban treaty is not even a shaft of light pointing to any cessation of the cold war. In fact, as Moscow proceeds to put its house in order by solving the major problems described here and resolving the Sino-Russian imperialist rift, we can look forward to more intense cold war efforts in the free world—this, of course, under the banner of a qualified peaceful coexistence. The hard line is the line of the future.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the eloquent remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD].

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] for yielding, and I commend him for taking this time so that we might pause to pay tribute to the contribution of Americans of Ukrainian descent and to remind ourselves of the unfinished business before us in connection with an independent Ukraine. It was a short-lived independence that the Ukraine enjoyed, but our hopes continue that at some time in the not too distant future we may again see the Ukrainian people winning back that independence.

I want particularly to commend the gentleman for the action he has referred to in his resolution to create in this House a Committee on Captive Nations. As he knows, I have joined with him in the past in introducing this resolution, and have again joined with him this year. I am hopeful, Mr. Speaker, that in this 89th Congress we may perhaps be more successful than we have been in previous Congresses in creating this committee within this body.

It is easy for us to stand up year after year and pay tribute in words to this objective of an independent Ukraine, but we need action as well, and the creation of this kind of a committee is the kind of action that we as Members of the House of Representatives can take to underscore our firm belief that Ukrainian independence is not just a slogan, but continues to be an active goal and objective of American foreign policy. Some effort must be made in the development of those policies to keep in mind what needs to be done to reassure the independence of all captive peoples and to guide the State Department and the other branches of the executive end of the Government in their dealings with the Soviet Union and with other nations to bring this result about.

Those of us who share the belief of the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania ought to redouble our efforts in this new 89th Congress to establish this committee so that we can indeed in the not too distant future welcome the Ukraine back into the brotherhood of free and independent states.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to the gentleman from New York. During the years of this fight, I have always considered him one of the most forceful weapons in my arsenal.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, may I join those who have been associating themselves with and commending the distinguished and eloquent gentleman from Pennsylvania on his statement? The people of the Ukraine and other captive nations everywhere have as their champion in this House one of the most courageous, one of the most articulate spokesmen for human liberty in all the world.

Mr. FLOOD. The gentleman is more than kind.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for bringing this very important subject before us today.

Mr. Speaker, today is the day when all Americans join their fellow citizens of

---

[14] "Action on the Creation of a Special Committee on Captive Nations," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 107, pt. 11, pp. 15376–15383.

[15] See "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 107, pt. 3, pp. 3518–3544.

Ukrainian descent in marking the anniversary of the renewal of the independence of Ukraine which was solemnly proclaimed by the Ukrainian Parliament on January 22, 1918, in the capital of the Ukraine, Kiev.

It is well that Americans should recognize and honor Ukrainian independence, for the Ukrainian people have spent centuries battling for that independence and after it was gained 47 years ago, it was again quickly lost.

It should be recalled that the independence and sovereignty of Ukraine were recognized by a number of states, including Soviet Russia. But the latter attacked Ukraine both by direct military aggression and by subversion and infiltration from within. After almost 3½ years of bloody and heroic struggle, Ukraine, deprived of all military, economic, and diplomatic assistance by the Western World, succumbed to the numerically superior forces of Communist Russia.

For the past four and a half decades Ukraine has remained under the Communist yoke of Moscow, but it never has surrendered the spirit of freedom, nor has it given up the hope for regaining its full national independence.

During the period of enslavement the Ukrainian people have demonstrated their love of freedom and independence by a series of uprisings and large-scale resistance movements such as the underground warfare of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army in World War II and after it. The Ukraine has continued its internal battle for independence and by doing so has forced Moscow to resort to masquerading this captive nation as independent and free.

Such a masquerade must be apparent to all the countries of the free world. It is part of the master plan of Russia to illustrate to the world that it is indeed paternalistic in its attitude toward enslaved people. Today, the Ukraine is not free. It is held in the bondage of Soviet communism, along with others of its sister, captive nations.

Therefore, let us take a moment today to pay honor to the desire of Ukrainians for freedom; a desire which has been alive under the harshest of oppression, for half of this century.

Moreover, let us intensify our efforts by deed and word to bring some hopeful feeling to the distressed people behind the Iron Curtain who would once again like to savor the joys of freedom.

Mr. Speaker, while we pause to pay honor to one of our captive nations, let us also pay tribute to one who in perilous times fought for the freedom of the entire world. This was the late Sir Winston Churchill, a man among very few who saw his name chronicled in history during the course of his own lifetime.

Mr. Churchill was a giant among great men and grand events, his hallmark being supreme tenacity in the face of adversity. Over and above this, he had a facility for bringing forth the best in men during times when it was most needed.

During World War II, he proved a great light in long hours of darkness; and because he remembered the high purpose of freemen in their hour of trial, mankind will never forget Winston Churchill.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD].

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, January 22 marked the 47th anniversary of the proclamation of a free Ukraine, and the 46th anniversary of the union of all Ukrainian lands into a free and sovereign republic of Ukrainian people.

It is appropriate that Americans should honor the Ukrainians on this day, for the Ukrainians are a worthy and virtuous people who have long been held in subjection.

Through the twists and turns of international events, the Ukrainian people, now numbering some 45 million persons, have been an independent nation for only 2 short years in the past three centuries.

An independent Ukraine was created in 1918 at the conclusion of World War I, and it is this anniversary which we note this month. Independence proved to be short lived, however, for in 1920 the armies of Soviet Russia invaded the young nation. After a heroic and bloody resistance, the Ukrainians were forced to surrender and relinquish their cherished independence.

The succeeding 47 years have been a time of extreme deprivation, but they have brought out the quality of courage that marks the Ukrainian character. The Russians have tried hard to quench the nationalistic fire of these individualistic people. But among the Ukrainians, the love of their national heritage remains intense and the desire for freedom continues undiminished.

Ukrainians in the West, and others in the Ukraine, have kept alive the flame of freedom, and have sought to unite all Ukrainians in their common desire for independence. In the forefront of this valiant battle has been the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, whose work deserves the respect and admiration of free people everywhere.

In Washington, D.C., there stands a monument to Taras Shevchenko, the beloved Ukrainian national poet, whose works have inspired Ukrainians throughout the world and have stirred the hearts of freedom-loving patriots in all lands.

His monument is an enduring reminder to us that the spirit of the Ukrainian freedom fighters lives on even though their land is enslaved. On this day of remembrance, Mr. Speaker, we Americans should express our concern and hope for the aspirations of the Ukrainians and all others who suffer under alien tyranny.

Mr. Speaker, I call upon all my countrymen to join me in a salute to those Ukrainian patriots, both here and in their fatherland, who remain dedicated to freedom and liberty.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, it is very important to have the assistance of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD] and our majority leader.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, may I first speak for my constitutents in paying tribute to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] for his thoughtfulness in reserving this time and for giving his colleagues the opportunity to join with him in commemorating the 47th anniversary of the independence of the Ukraine. The gentleman enjoys international respect as a fearless foe of communism, and his activity here today in the House is in pursuit of that purpose.

I also want to report to my colleagues that this past weekend afforded me the opportunity to meet with a large number of my constitutents who had gathered in Rochester, N.Y., to observe this national day of the Ukrainian people. It was an impressive ceremony, held under the auspices of the Rochester branch of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc. My good friend, William Andrushin, president of the Rochester branch, conducted the ceremony.

As a part of the celebration, seven Ukrainians who fought in the 1918 revolution against Communist Russia received medals for their valor from the Ukrainian Veterans Association. For that heroic exploit and for their continuing contribution to the welfare of their fellow Ukrainians, I am honored indeed to bring their names to the attention of my colleagues in the House. The seven men are: Rev. Stephen Hordecki, Dr. Lev Rubenger, Mr. Wasyl Kalichensky, Mr. Dymytro Masymiw, Mr. Dmytro Wysocky, Mr. Peter Jarysh, and Mr. Wasyl Pylyshenko.

In my remarks today, I would like to reemphasize the remarks it was my privilege to deliver before this gathering in my home community last night.

Our heritage of democracy and freedom makes it deserved and fitting that we salute the bravery of the Ukrainian people. Because Soviet oppression obstructs any observance of this Independence Day in the Ukraine, our voices on this occasion must be particularly loud and lusty so that these liberty-loving patriots may know our concern for their cause.

Despite hundreds of years of despairing domination under Russian imperialist rule, the Ukrainian desire for liberty is as strong as that of our own colonists in 1776. Though robbed of all freedoms except that of secret spirit, the Ukrainians continue undaunted in their struggle for national self-government.

Our unwavering principle, found at the heart of the Declaration of Independence, is that every nation has the undeniable right to determine its destiny. Thus, the American ambition always must be to help the Ukraine throw off the shackles of subjection and restore the liberty for which your people long.

Because it is my belief that we must reassert this principle, I reaffirm my pledge to work for the creation in Congress of a Special Captive Nations Committee. On the opening day of the 89th Congress, I introduced a bill for this purpose, and today in the House of Representatives on our official observance of Ukrainian Independence Day, I again call on my colleagues for careful consideration of this important resolution.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LINDSAY. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I compliment him for taking this time to speak on a subject very important to every American and the free people the world over.

The pressures and demands of the 20th century forbid us to indulge in idle ceremony. Our times demand that the merits of men and ideals, habits and deeds be judged anew. So it is right and proper to ask, what significance does Ukrainian Independence Day have for us in 1965?

The answer is as old as the Declaration of Independence and as young as the emerging nations of Africa. We are proud carriers of what Jefferson called "the disease of liberty." We hold today as in the past that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed, that men are endowed with a right to pursue happiness. And yet, like fish in water, there is a danger that we may take for granted that very thing which is most vital to us.

This Nation has not since its founding felt the weight of foreign oppression, and it is all too easy to forget that others have not been as fortunate. This Nation grew by the slow accretion of liberty-loving people who were one by one drawn to our shores. It is too easy to forget that Russia grew by the calculated enslavement of her peaceful neighbors. Moscow tries to foist on the world the illusion that the U.S.S.R. is a union of shared sentiment and culture. We hear glib references to the Soviet Union and the Soviet people, and it is easy to forget that these facile words conceal the fact that the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is an empire of captive nations and different peoples. What incredible irony that we are denounced as imperialists for rescuing people in the Congo—while 45 million Ukrainians suffer under Russian tyranny.

Here then is the significance of this day of commemoration: it shows the world that we have not forgotten our heritage or the captive peoples' plight. It affirms that there are values common and valid for men everywhere; that the urgent desire for self-determination pervades the Ukraine as surely as it does Africa or Asia or the Americas, and that therefore neither weapons nor troops can long keep enslaved the brave Ukrainian people. Freedom shall come to them—not because it is written in any stars, but because it is written in the hearts of men.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, the struggle against oppression rages in many parts of the world tolling a bitter cost in blood and misery. The forced deprival of freedom of expression, freedom of belief, and freedom of association continues to witness the stanch indestructible spirit of human dignity.

On this day in Congress commemorating the 47th anniversary of the independence of Ukraine, let us reaffirm our responsibility to those people whose courage stands a reminder to all freemen. On behalf of 43 million Ukrainian people, let us renew our dedication to the principles of self-determination and liberty.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, toward the end of the First World War when the oppressive regimes of Russia and Austria were overthrown, the Ukrainians realized their opportunity for freedom, and proclaimed their national independence on January 22, 1918. That event marked the achievement of a centuries-old dream. Soon the Ukrainian Republic was set up, and the Ukrainian people were doing their utmost to rebuild their war-ravaged country and to create a safe haven for themselves. But they were not allowed to carry on their task. In 1920 the country was attacked and soon overrun by the Red army; then it was made part of the Soviet Union, thus putting an end to the Ukrainian Republic.

But even though the Republic ceased to exist many years ago, it lives on in the souls of tens of millions of Ukrainians, and they are as one in celebrating their independence day. I gladly join them on the 47th anniversary of celebration of Ukrainian Independence Day.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, on January 22, 1918, to the sound of Russian guns across the Dneiper, the Central Rada proclaimed the Fourth Universal and declared the complete independence of the Ukrainian State. This act was the culmination of a long struggle against the Moscow regime which had resorted to all possible measures to deny to the Ukrainian populace their national existence as a people with their own distinct culture.

This freedom was, however, shortlived for in 1920 the Red army again overran the country, and the Ukraine was brought under the control of the U.S.S.R.

In the years that followed, and up to the present time these courageous people have had to bear the burden of Communist tyranny, but the spirit and desire for freedom has not been eradicated from their minds and hearts. Their fight is our fight, and we must continue to support the Ukraine, and the other captive nations in their heroic effort so the principle of self-determination, rather than the sword of the Communist dictatorship, will again control their destiny.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join with my colleagues in this observance of the 47th anniversary of the independence of the Ukrainian National Republic. It provides us, as Members of the Legislature of one of the great democratic nations of the world, an opportunity to commemorate the courageous efforts of other freedom-loving peoples to throw off the yoke of Communist despotism.

Anyone familiar with the history of the Ukrainian people must be inspired by their relentless struggle to gain their freedom. For over 250 years they have been oppressed by the czars and more recently by the Communists, but they still cling to the hope that freedom and independence will someday prevail in their beloved land.

In our time the brutal tide of Communist conquest has engulfed many free nations. But, despite the brutal oppression of godless communism, it has not been able to wipe out the liberty-loving spirit of those who live behind the Iron Curtain. Nowhere is this more evident than among the 40 million people of the Ukraine. Over the long years of subjugation, which saw their patriots liquidated, their citizens sent into slave labor camps, and their religious beliefs trampled upon, the Ukrainian people have courageously and stubbornly rebelled against their Communist masters.

The people of the Ukraine hold a special place in our hearts and in our prayers. Over a million Americans of Ukrainian descent have enriched our country with their culture, their spiritual values, their love of freedom, and their devotion. I have witnessed the importance of these contributions in our city of Buffalo where many Ukrainian-Americans live. I am acquainted, too, with the splendid efforts being made by the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America to help and encourage those in their homeland.

The Ukrainian people have suffered much. They know hunger and poverty. They have seen their fertile lands ravaged. Yet the light of freedom that burns in the heart of every Ukrainian nationalist has not been extinguished. These people we have not forgotten. We shall not forget them, nor accept their present unhappy fate as permanent.

This anniversary is an appropriate occasion for us in America to make known to these brave people that we are wholeheartedly dedicated to the cause of human freedom, and we once again express our determination never to rest until freedom is restored to all the captive nations.

Let us continue our prayers and efforts for the liberation of the Ukraine as we look forward to the day when it will join us in the family of free nations.

Mr. Speaker, this 47th anniversary of Ukraine's independence is a most propitious occasion for me to submit two important joint resolutions pertaining to the struggle of the Ukranian nation for freedom and independence. The first is a resolution calling for the establishment of a section to be known as the Shevchenko Freedom Library in the Library of Congress; the second is a joint resolution for the creation of a captive nations freedom series of postage stamps in honor of national heroes of freedom, commencing with a Taras Shevchenko freedom stamp. I request the inclusion of the texts of these resolutions as part of my remarks:

H.J. Res. —

Establishing a section to be known as the Shevchenko Freedom Library in the Library of Congress

Whereas, in October 1964, our President declared: "Shevchenko well deserves the honors paid him. He was more than a Ukrainian—he was a statesman and citizen of the world. He was more than a poet—he was a valiant crusader for the rights and freedom of men"; and

Whereas, in March 1961, President John F. Kennedy stated: "I am pleased to add my voice to those honoring the great Ukrainian poet, Taras Shevchenko. We honor him for his rich contribution to the culture not only of Ukraine, which he loved so well and described so eloquently, but of the world. His work is a noble part of our historical heritage"; and

Whereas, in March 1963, President Kennedy also paid tribute to the world-renowned Shevchenko Scientific Society in these words: "My congratulations on the ninetieth anniversary of the Shevchenko Scientific Society and on your sustained program for support for distinguished scholarship. Among your members have been some of the great names in learning to whom the world owes an incalculable debt. May you continue to extend the frontiers of human knowledge in the years ahead"; and

Whereas, in September 1960, President Eisenhower approved and signed a resolution of Congress providing for the establishment of a lasting memorial to Shevchenko's works in behalf of world freedom and justice; and

Whereas, with understanding and vision, the Eighty-sixth Congress of the United States honored this outstanding freedom light by authorizing the erection of a Shevchenko statue on public grounds in the District of Columbia; and

Whereas the initiative of Congress successfully nullified the exploitation of Shevchenko as a historic symbol by both Moscow and its colonial puppets and the vehement attacks of the latter against these farseeing acts have clearly proven the wisdom of the United States Government in properly claiming Shevchenko as a towering beacon in the march of freedom; and

Whereas for our times and struggles the universal significance of this revered poet and national hero was permanently established in a galaxy punctuated by other luminaries of freedom, such as his contemporaries Abraham Lincoln, the Italian Mazzini, the Pole Mickiewicz, the Hungarian Petofi, and others from different nations and soils; and

Whereas for our time and beyond, the supreme importance of Shevchenko's works rests in his early and heroic opposition to traditional Russian imperio-colonialism and in his courageous advocacy of the freedom of all captive nations in the Russian Empire, including the freedom of Jews and all peoples in bondage of suppression and slavery; and

Whereas our expanding American interest in the classic contributions of Shevchenko and their universal import can only receive full educational satisfaction by an accessible concentration of his voluminous works and all related studies at a facility of national convenience: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That a section in the Library of Congress shall be established and designated as the Shevchenko Freedom Library. This library section shall contain all the works written by Taras Shevchenko, both in the original and translations, and all volumes related to his immortal contributions and contents therein. This library section shall be established with the expert cooperation of the Shevchenko Scientific Society.

SEC. 2. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this joint resolution.

H.J. Res. —

To provide for the creation of a Captive Nations Freedom Series of postage stamps in honor of national heroes of freedom, commencing with a Taras Shevchenko Freedom Stamp

Whereas in his 1964 Captive Nations Week Proclamation the President declared: "It is appropriate and proper to manifest to the people of the captive nations the support of the Government and the people of the United States of America for their just aspirations" and urged all Americans "to give renewed devotion to the just aspirations of all people for national independence and human liberty"; and

Whereas since 1959 both President Dwight D. Eisenhower and President John F. Kennedy expressed similar thoughts and sentiments in their successive annual proclamations; and

Whereas the Eighty-sixth Congress of the United States honored Taras Shevchenko, Ukraine's poet laureate, by authorizing the erection of a monument to him on public grounds in Washington, District of Columbia; and

Whereas the same Congress provided for a documentary biography of Shevchenko in tribute to the everlasting spirit and works of this freedom fighter of Europe; and

Whereas the unremitting condemnations and attacks by imperialist Moscow and its colonial puppets against these farseeing data clearly prove the wisdom of the United States Government in properly claiming this contemporary of Lincoln as one of freedom's outstanding lights; and

Whereas in 1961 the President of the United States paid respects to the ideals and immortal teachings of this former serf, whose poetry, art, and philosophy have deeply inspired the forty-five million Ukrainian nation in its aspirations to freedom and independence; and

Whereas the profound humanism of this champion of liberty was courageously directed against the colonial subjugation of all the non-Russian nations in Eastern Europe and Central Asia, as well as against the suppression of the Jews and the slavery of Negroes; and

Whereas in consonance with the policy of the United States it is both proper and fitting to advance the aspirations for freedom and independence of all nations by honoring their historic advocates of human liberty, and thus forging indissoluble spiritual ties with the respective peoples; and

Whereas by all evidence a Freedom stamp series can become an important and essential vehicle of expression in the formation and strengthening of such ties: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Postmaster General is requested and authorized to create and initiate a Captive Nations Freedom Series of postage stamps in honor of national heroes of freedom. The first of this series shall be designated as the Taras Shevchenko Freedom Stamp, symbolizing the determined struggle of his Ukraine, the largest captive non-Russian nation in Eastern Europe, for national freedom and independence. Within the selected format of the series, such stamps shall be of such denomination and design and shall be issued for such period commencing in 1965 as the Postmaster General shall determine.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, January 22 marked the 47th anniversary of the independence of Ukraine.

Ever since the Mongol conquest of the Kiev State in the 13th century, the Ukraine has always lived under alien rule. It has also been the battleground of east Europe. Its natural riches attract all neighbors and its sparsely wooded steppes provide easy routes for invasions.

In March 1917, the czarist Government of Russia was overthrown and succeeded by the weak interregnal government of Prince Lvov. In April of that year, a Rada—assembly—convened in the old Ukrainian capital of Kiev and established a Ukrainian Government.

On November 7, 1917, the assumption of power in Petrograd by the Bolsheviks, led by Nikolai Lenin, completely changed the situation. In accordance with the Bolshevik declaration that any part of the former Russian Empire could secede, the Rada declared the Ukraine to be an independent republic on January 22, 1918.

Unfortunately, the Ukrainian Republic was shortlived. By 1921 the country was overrun by the Russian Communists and the Ukraine again became a subjugated nation. It was one of the first and earliest victims of Soviet imperialism and has paid a tremendous toll in suffering and destruction. The Ukraine's national churches were destroyed, the country suffered terrible famines, mass murders, purges, and deportations. Nevertheless, the spiritual and moral resources of the Ukrainian people have not been exterminated, nor has its indomitable desire for national freedom been extinguished after all these years of enslavement and suffering.

The Ukrainian nation numbers some 44 million people and constitutes the largest non-Russian group behind the Iron Curtain in Europe. In the struggle of the free world against communism, the Ukrainians are a most important and potential ally of the Western democracies. They have survived through five centuries of Tartar barbarism. Never have they stopped their struggle for the liberation of their country from the Communist yoke.

Their cause is a righteous one. They merit our support and encouragement.

On the occasion of the 47th anniversary of their independence, we share in the aspirations of Ukraines everywhere for the early liberation of their country. We extend our greetings and renew our wishes to all Americans of Ukraine descent that their country of origin, the Ukraine, will soon regain its independence from the forces of evil and tyranny which are in control today.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, 47 years ago a band of brave and patriotic Ukrainians unfurled the banner of freedom and proclaimed Ukraine's political independence. That event marked the realization of a long-cherished national dream. Then, on January 22, 1918, the Ukrainian Republic was born. But soon after its birth the newborn Republic was faced with innumerable difficult problems, and the most pressing of these was the crucial problem of national security. Even before the Ukrainian Republic had any chance to cope effectively with any of its problems, the country was under attack first by the Poles from the north, and 2 years later by the powerful Red army of Communist Russia. As the Ukrainians by themselves alone could not have coped with the deadly onslaught of the Soviet Union's might, their independence was doomed. Their forced surrender in the fall of 1920 brought to a close a short but brilliant chapter in their recent history.

Today Ukraine is the second largest Socialist Republic in the Soviet Union, second only in size and in population to the Russian Socialist Republic itself. And some 44-million-odd Ukrainians constitute about a fifth of the Soviet

Union's total population. Bearing these impressive facts in mind, it is truly tragic to think that so many millions of Ukrainians, constituting such an important segment of the European community, and possessing distinct national traits, do not enjoy today any of the elemental privileges and amenities of life which are considered natural birthrights of all human beings. If these Ukrainians were allowed some freedom, and if they were in a position to realize part of their national aspirations, they would have established a democratic government based upon those freedoms necessary for their full cultural, intellectual, and spiritual development. Unfortunately such has not been their unhappy lot. For more than four decades conditions have been far from normal in the Ukraine, and the people there have been fated to suffer under the detested Communist totalitarian tyranny.

For long periods in their modern history Ukrainians have lived under conditions not at all conducive to the wholesome development of their political, intellectual, social, cultural, and economic life. For a long time they have been denied the attainment of their supreme national goal: that of determining the form of their national political life. The geography of their country, and modern international politics have largely determined the course of their history. Though older than modern Russia, more than three centuries ago they fell under the unrelenting domination of Russian czars. Until the rise of the Communist Russian regime they had no choice but make the best of a bad situation. Since the advent of communism in Russia, and the forcible incorporation of their country into the Soviet Union, tragedy has been their lot.

For more than four decades the Kremlin's agents have ruled the Ukraine with an iron hand. They have practically sealed off the country from the free world, and there has been no trace of freedom there. The minions of the Kremlin have seen to it that there be no Western "trappings," such as freedom and independent action in the country. In such total darkness and depression, in total misery and endless suffering, there is one indestructible element of encouragement. That is the Ukrainian's innate and inborn desire for freedom and independence, his unquenchable yearning for liberty. Fortunately neither the tyrants of Moscow, nor their servants in the Ukraine, can extinguish this spirit which all Ukrainians claim as their birthright. As long as that noble spirit is kept alive, as long as the ideal of national freedom is cherished by them, no dictatorship or Communist tyranny can rob them of their real independence: the independence of their soul and hearts. On the 47th anniversary of Ukrainian Independence Day I wish them fortitude and forebearance.

Mr. REDLIN. Mr. Speaker, last Friday, January 22, Americans of Ukrainian descent in my State of North Dakota, as well as Ukrainians the world over, observed the 47th anniversary of the proclamation of independence for the Ukrainian National Republic.

Freedom and independence, following centuries of foreign domination, were cherished by the Ukrainian people, but were short lived. Soviet Russia launched an attack against the new nation, which struggled valiantly against numerically superior forces for 3½ years.

While Ukrainians have been under Communist domination since 1920, they have never surrendered the spirit of freedom. As stated by Dr. Anthony Zukowsky, of Steele, N. Dak., president of the North Dakota State branch of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc.:

> Ukrainians all over the world will celebrate this day as a memorial to the once-free Ukraine, while Ukrainians in America will set aside this date to reassert their belief in freedom for all people and to reaffirm their conviction that tyranny and despotism cannot long prevail where men so believe.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to pay my tribute to the Ukrainian people for their steadfast courage and dedication to the principle that human beings can best reach their highest potential under conditions of freedom.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, 47 years ago, on January 22, 1918, a manifesto was issued by the Ukrainian Central Rada—Parliament—declaring the Ukraine to be an independent, free, and sovereign state of Ukrainian people. On this anniversary of their struggle for independence from all forms of foreign oppression, we want to once again express our hope that this desire for freedom and justice will be fulfilled.

After centuries of struggle against the autocracy of the Russian czars, the unquenchable thirst of the Ukrainian people to govern themselves in a spirit of freedom and independence seemed to have been satisfied. Tragically, after 2 short years, a new form of Russian despotism—godless communism—crushed their independence with overwhelming military power.

Since that time, over 40 million Ukrainians, both behind the Iron Curtain and in our own country, have dreamed of the day when the independence for which they have strived so earnestly will once again be restored. It has been shown that the desire of a people to be free from tyranny cannot forever be stilled. By observing Ukrainian Independence Day, we demonstrate our recognition and approval of this historical fact.

At the same time that we reaffirm our belief in the principle of national self-determination, we remind the Soviet leaders that we have not and cannot forget their suppression of the rights and freedoms of other peoples. For ourselves, we recall that freedom has always been a precious and fragile possession, and those gallant Ukrainians who fought to retain theirs provide us with a moving example of its value, and a poignant lesson for our own future.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, January 22 marked the 47th anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the Ukrainian nation. It is fitting that Congress recognize that historic date in the annals of an ancient nation now submerged by the new imperialism of Russian communism. This occasion provides us with an opportunity to pay tribute to all those who have sacrificed and struggled over a span of many decades to keep alive the spirit of Ukrainian national independence. By these means we reaffirm our dedication to the political ideals and aspirations which are the foundation of our own national independence and our hope for all the nations of the world.

No people in modern history have fought harder or longer for their national independence. The Ukrainian proclamation of January 22, 1918, which we recall today, culminated a long struggle to break free of the Russian empire. We are reminded again today that Ukrainian national independence fell before the armed aggression of Russian communism after 3 years of war and great human sacrifice by the Ukrainian people. But the Russian occupation of Ukraine did not end the determination of her people to win freedom and independence. That determination is as strong today and in some ways stronger than it was 47 years ago.

It is a tribute to the spirit and character of the people of Ukraine that today, after more than 40 years of ruthless oppression and exploitation by the new imperialism of Moscow, their aspirations for freedom and self-government are unbroken and undimmed. The strength and depth of that spirit can be measured best against the record of efforts made by Moscow to break it. Those efforts include a manmade famine which took the lives of millions of Ukrainians, mass deportations, persecution of the intellectual and educated classes, cultural and spiritual genocide. Such storms of Communist tyranny have been broken on the Gibraltar of courage which has characterized life in modern day Ukraine.

There are encouraging signs that the Communist empire over which Moscow presides is faced with political and economic problems for which tyranny and despotism have no answers. The tide of change is flowing throughout the last remaining empire on earth. Promises of a better life made by the new ruling group are not being supported by genuine changes in the instruments of state control which are responsible for the crisis. Invoking the reactionary theories of Marxism-Leninism has become nothing more than a temporary escape mechanism for the new rulers of the empire, who are themselves enslaved by chains of the past. Time will tell whether the new Russian rulers have set themselves on a collision course with progress and the demands of their colonies for a full share in the political and economic life of modern civilization.

President Johnson in his state of the Union address made reference to the "restless nations" of central-east Europe. These are, of course, the captive nations under imperial control of Moscow. There can be little doubt about the restless character of all the captive nations or that their restlessness arises from a rejection of colonial status in this era of anticolonialism. How should we respond to this opportunity? That question has posed a great national issue for many years. There is no single or simple answer to that question and the issue it poses is as complex as the quest for peace with freedom.

As we face this issue in the months and years ahead, it would be well to reflect upon the guidelines laid down by President Johnson in his inaugural address. In stating our national purposes in world affairs he said:

> We aspire to nothing that belongs to others. We seek no dominion over our fellow man, but man's dominion over tyranny and misery.

Man's dominion over tyranny is a goal toward which all of us must work in a world where the tyranny of man over his fellow men has for too long thwarted peace and threatened war. It is in the highest American tradition that we should turn our full national energies to this task. President Johnson also reminds us in this connection:

> The American covenant called on us to help show the way for the liberation of man. That is still our goal. Thus, if as a nation there is much outside our control, as a people no stranger is outside our hope.

As we observe this anniversary of Ukrainian national independence, we embrace the hopes of that submerged nation as our own. We view the restless yearnings of the people of Ukraine as evidence there is much to be done before we achieve man's dominion over tyranny. We are comforted in the knowledge that bridges of the spirit which bind us together in common cause shall serve to help us show the way for the liberation of man.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, 47 years ago, after centuries of domination and harassment by foreign rulers, the people of the Ukraine at last overcame their alien oppressors and acclaimed their independence. The hopes that sprang up in the hearts of those brave people when at last they were free can be fully appreciated only by those who also have been the victims of subjection. We, to whom freedom has long been an unquestioned way of life, can but faintly understand what the achievement of independence meant to them after centuries of yearning and striving for it.

A new life was opening for them to live in the fulfillment of their aspirations. But in 2 years, tragedy, in the form of the ruthless Red revolution, struck again and snatched from them their briefly tasted freedom. The oppressive Soviet domination has continued over those freedom-loving people of the Ukraine ever since that time, without any promise of restoring them to their rightful place in the community of nations.

More than 40 million Ukrainians are the victims of Soviet domination. These people are afforded no opportunity to commemorate the anniversary of the winning of their long-sought freedom. Only we, who live in freedom and independence, can mark that day for them. We can express our concern over their present plight. We can express our hope that once again they and all the oppressed people throughout the world will soon be the masters of their own destiny.

The captive people of the Ukraine—numbering one-fourth the entire population of the United States—must know that they are not forgotten. The aspirations they had in 1918 must be kept alive in their hearts by the knowledge that millions of Americans are conscious of their tragic plight and earnestly pray that it will soon be relieved. The efficacy of prayer may be completely unknown to the atheistic rulers, but the religious people of the Ukraine will be sustained by their own prayers and those of Americans until their freedom is once more attained.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, 44 million Ukrainians constitute the second largest Slavic group in the huge landmass of the Slavic world extending from Eastern Europe to the Pacific Ocean. But these valiant and dauntless fighters for their freedom have not been successful in staving off fundamental threats to their national existence by the Russians. That is why, since the middle of the 17th century, they have been compelled to endure the oppressive yoke of czarist Russia and then the almost unbearable yoke of Communist Russia. But there was a short and happy interlude of about 2 years, in 1918–20, when they seemed masters of their fate and captains of their national soul.

As the result of the Russian revolution and the defeat of imperial Austria in the First World War, the autocratic forces which had been holding down the Ukrainians were overthrown, and so the Ukraine had the golden opportunity of asserting its freedom. On January 22, 1918, they proclaimed their independence. The democratic government constituted in the new Ukrainian Republic did its utmost to cope with the new state's difficult problems, but it had neither the manpower nor the resources to cope with these effectively. In the meantime, the Ukraine's inveterate and deadly foe, now in Communist garb, was preparing for the kill. Before the Ukrainian Republic could muster sufficient forces with which to stave off impending threats to its existence, it was attacked by the Red army in 1920. The country was overrun, and by the fall of that year became part of the Soviet Union. Thus ended the brief 2-year period of independent existence for the Ukrainian people.

Since those fateful days the whole world has been radically transformed in many respects, but unfortunately the Communist yoke imposed upon the Ukrainian people by the men in the Kremlin has not changed. The Communist Russians are as much masters of Ukraine today, and more firmly entrenched there, than they were in the 1920's. On the 47th anniversary of Ukrainian Independence Day we pray for the relaxation of Communist tyranny in Ukraine and for the eventual freedom of the Ukrainian people.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, hardworking, liberty-loving, and supremely devout Ukrainians have struggled for their freedom against terrible odds for centuries. In 1918, when the forces that held them in chains were shattered, they proclaimed their independence and established the Ukrainian Republic. From its birth on January 22 until its agonizing death at the hands of the Russians 2 years later, the newborn state was faced with insurmountable difficulties and implacable enemies. The Communists were the deadliest and the most ferocious among these. Early in 1920 the country was attacked and eventually overrun by the Red army. Soon it was incorporated into the Soviet Union, and the independent Ukraine had ceased to exist.

Since those fateful days more than 44 million Ukrainians have borne the heavy yoke of the Kremlin and have suffered in ways beyond description. They have been robbed of their worldly possessions, and they have been put to death by the millions. They were driven from their homes to the forbidding vastnesses of Siberian wasteland and in slave-labor camps they were forced to work for their heartless taskmasters in the Kremlin under most abominable conditions.

The Ukrainians are still imprisoned in their homeland and still suffering under the relentless Communist totalitarian tyranny. On the 47th anniversary celebration of their independence day I fervently hope and pray for their delivery from tyranny.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to participate in this commemoration of Ukrainian Independence Day.

In addition to my personal devotion to the cause of freedom, I speak out, also, today, in behalf of all of the people of the 12th Congressional District of Illinois and particularly those fine citizens of Ukrainian birth and descent who have contributed so much to the economic, spiritual, and cultural life of my district and of the Nation.

No aspect of the growth and spread of communism is more disheartening than that experienced by the Ukrainian nation and others in the Communist orbit who are held in the grasp of this atheistic society.

There are signs in the air indicating that the cause of human freedom is on the march in the Soviet Union and elsewhere. It is the fervent hope of all Americans, I am sure, that the Ukrainian nation may soon regain its independence and freedom, and that the great laughter, song, music, dancing, and literature of this historic nation may rebound with new vigor and energy to the benefit of all mankind.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join with my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania, the Honorable DANIEL J. FLOOD, and Americans of Ukrainian descent in celebrating the 47th anniversary of Ukrainian Independence Day and in paying tribute to the freedom-loving people of the largest captive non-Russian nation in Europe.

The dedication of the Ukrainian people to the principles of freedom and dignity of the individual has been a shining example to the world. Congress is today commemorating the 47th anniversary of the declaration of the Ukrainian National Republic. Although free Ukraine survived for only 2 years until it lost its hard-won independence to Communist tyranny, the spirit and determination of the Ukrainian people has survived intact.

To those of us who are free, the flame of Ukrainian liberty should renew our desire to maintain and strengthen the cause of freedom everywhere.

It is a pleasure to join my colleagues in commemorating the 47th anniversary of Ukrainian Independence Day and to assure the captive people of that country that we in America join in their prayers and hopes that freedom will again grace their land and they will be given the opportunity for a free and just form of government.

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to join with my colleagues in an observance of the 47th anniversary of Ukrainian Independence Day.

We, in the U.S. Congress, welcome this opportunity to pay tribute to a great people and to express hope that they will achieve once more a life of freedom. Year after year we have passed a resolution commemorating Captive Nations Week. In so doing, Congress and the American people have demonstrated their support of the eternal principle of self-determination.

Many Americans are unaware of the fact that the U.S.S.R. is a multinational state consisting of ethnic groups variously estimated from 177 to more than 200. One hundred and twenty-five languages and dialects are spoken, and 40 different religions practiced in this nation which includes Ukrainians, Byelorussians, Armenians, Jews, Latvians, Lithuanians, Estonians, Tatars, Uzbeks, and many others—all individual ethnic groups with separate historical, cultural, political, religious, and social traditions and institutions. Indeed, there are more Turks in the Soviet Union than in Turkey; and more Moslems than in the United Arab Republic.

To achieve proper recognition of these groups, the Soviet Union should strive to become a melting pot of nationalities instead of a forced union of peoples who resist casting in the Soviet mold. Accordingly, we are constrained to point out to the world the profound contradiction that exists in the Soviet Union; namely, that while the Soviets attack the West on charges of colonialism and imperialism, their own country, the U.S.S.R., has in reality, through satellite control, the greatest of all colonial and imperial systems presently existing.

Few occasions during the year are more appropriate for pinpointing this contradiction than the one today, the commemoration of Ukrainian independence. The Ukrainian people have been the victims of Bolshevik oppression. Decades ago they demonstrated their desire to be free, yet freedom is denied them. They have suffered severest hardships under Soviet rule; deportations, forced famines, and religious persecution.

On this anniversary of Ukrainian independence, therefore, I join with all other Members of this legislative body to hail a people noble in their aspirations but, above all, noble in themselves.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, today we are honoring all Ukrainians in America by celebrating the 47th anniversary of Ukrainian independence.

The Ukrainian people historically have set an example for all nations to never cease in the fight for freedom and self-government. For centuries their country has been the victim of overpowering neighbor nations with conquering armies but the heroic Ukrainian people have constantly resisted and fought for their liberty and independence.

In 1918 the Ukrainian people finally won the victory which they had sought over the centuries and they overthrew their oppressors. Their nation, unfortunately, was the victim of Communist invasion and they have been under the tyranny of Soviet colonization to this day. The thirst for freedom of the Ukrainian people has never wavered and the spirit of resistance today is as strong as in generations past.

In observing this 47th anniversary of the independence of Ukrainia, I am again filing a resolution setting out the support of our Government by authorizing a special congressional committee to investigate the continued enslavement of Ukrainia and all captive nations. I am asking that the Congress establish a special House committee to again remind the people of our Nation as well as the people of all nations, who love freedom, that the fight for human liberty must not cease until nations now under Communist tyranny be liberated.

In the 81st Congress I had the honor to be the chairman of the special Katyn Forest Congressional Investigating Committee which held hearings in this country and Europe exposing the Communist barbaric methods in their campaign of enslavement, when they massacred over 14,000 Polish leaders at the beginning of World War II. The publicity and exposure of Communist methods and tyranny was brought to the attention of the people of all the world during those hearings. The Soviet propaganda machine was placed on the defensive at that time and millions throughout the globe were reawakened to the threat of the Communist takeover.

The 42 million Ukrainians who are now virtually prisoners in their homeland are to be commended for continuing this fight for freedom by annually celebrating their own national holiday of independence.

If the nations of the free world continue their support, some day Ukrainia and other captive nations will enjoy freedom, liberty, and self-government.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon we commemorate the 47th anniversary of the independence of Ukraine, the largest non-Russian nation held captive behind the Iron Curtain. I am especially pleased to participate in this observance today under the leadership of the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD].

The people of the Ukraine fought valiantly but unsuccessfully against the Communist forces to retain their newly won freedom and their democratic government, but they were subjugated in 1920.

This was particularly tragic because the Ukrainian people had suffered through so many years of war and conquest before finally achieving their freedom, which was proclaimed on January 22, 1918. Their country had been divided under alien rulers for many years, but their short-lived unity and independence were cruelly taken from them by the Communist invaders.

Nevertheless, their desire for freedom remains strong and should be kept alive by every means possible until they are able to throw off the rule of their Communist oppressors. We who enjoy our freedom must never let the Ukrainian people think they have been forgotten by the free world.

The great longing of the Ukrainian people for freedom is manifested in the free world by the spirited activity of Ukrainian leaders, such as the great demonstration we witnessed in Washington last June when the Taras Shevchenko statue was dedicated.

One of the ways we in Congress could work for the best interests of the people of the Ukraine is by establishing a special House Committee on Captive Nations. On the opening day of this session I again introduced a resolution for this purpose and certainly hope that prompt and favorable consideration will be given to this proposal.

It is obvious, Mr. Speaker, that true peace and freedom for the entire world will never be achieved until the people of the Ukraine and the other captives behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains are permitted to develop under a government of their own choosing.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 47th anniversary of the independence of the Ukrainian people. For centuries these brave and dedicated patriots have suffered in the grip of Russian imperialism. They have endured the most tragic event in their history when forced to relinguish their freedom and political sovereignty only 2 short years after the founding of the Ukrainian Republic in 1918. This nation, encompassing 45 million people within its borders, is a captive of the Kremlin. The Ukrainian peoples died by the thousands in valiant efforts to preserve their independence and their unique national character. The Taras Shevchenko Monument stands as a daily reminder to us that this contemporary of Lincoln fought for the cause of freedom through his immortal works of art and literature. This patriot provided the inspiration for Ukrainian nationalism in his times and his words today intertwine the strands of patriotism that bind this freedom-repressed nation together.

Ukrainian history reveals an undying devotion to the ideals of freedom and independence. For a people who have known so few years of independence—from 1918–20—one might be prone to think that their love for freedom is slowly dying. On the contrary, the Ukrainian desire to be free permeates every daily act for constantly they are brought to grips with the crushing reality of living under a totalitarian system of government.

Here in the United States we are fortunate to have Americans of Ukrainian descent defending our democratic way of life. These stouthearted people have been a positive force in the building of our democratic institutions, and they have always been ready to fight and die for the preservation of freedom. In this country they are known for their industry, ingenuity, and tenacity for hard work in any vocation; this is the backbone of their national character and the reason why their long history of nationalism is unparalleled.

The 45 million Ukrainians existing with the Communist bloc must not be forgotten; we must ever bear in mind the plight of these people who have seen their freedom destroyed by brutal force. They, as indeed all enslaved peoples, must always have our sympathies.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, January 22, 1965, will mark the 47th anniversary of the proclamation of the Ukrainian National Republic. A great many Ukrainians have settled in North Dakota. Many of them are among our outstanding farmers, some have served in our State legislature, and others are professional men. We are very proud of the contributions they have made to our State. I wish to insert in the RECORD the letter I received from Dr. Anthony Zukowsky, president of the North Dakota State Branch of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc. I also wish to include a press release issued by the North Dakota committee on this occasion. It is our great hope the Ukrainian people will soon have their freedom and independence which we in America all cherish.

The letter and press release follow:

UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE OF AMERICA, INC., STATE BRANCH OF NORTH DAKOTA,
Bismarck, N. Dak., January 10, 1965.

Hon. MARK ANDREWS,
U.S. Congressman, New House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ANDREWS: Our sincere congratulations on your reelection to Congress. We assure you of our support in your work for the progress of America in the role of leader of the Western World in your endeavors for the common good of the peoples enslaved by the Communist tyranny.

January 22, 1965, will mark the 47th anniversary of the proclamation of the Ukrainian National Republic. Ukrainians all over the world will celebrate this day as a memorial to the once-free Ukraine, while Ukrainians in America will set aside this date to reassert their belief in freedom for all people and to reaffirm their conviction that tyranny and despotism cannot long prevail where men so believe.

The Ukrainian democratic Republic was recognized by the Soviet Union, but not for long. Turmoil and chaos came when Communist Russia invaded the Ukrainian state despite its previous pledges to respect and honor the Ukrainians independence. By the end of 1920, this gallant struggle of the Ukrainian people came to a tragic end, when the Communists subjected it to the rule of the Bolshevik government. Despite the Communist yoke imposed by Moscow on Ukraine, the Ukrainian people never accepted the foreign domination but continued to struggle for their freedom.

The U.S. Congress and the President have recognized the legitimate right and aspiration of the Ukrainian people to freedom and national independence by enacting and signing respectively the Captive Nations Week Resolution in July 1959, which enumerated Ukraine as one of the captive nations enslaved and dominated by Communist Russia, and entitled to recognition and moral support on the part of the American people and the free world at large.

Americans of Ukrainian descent in North Dakota are planning to observe the forthcoming 47th anniversary as "Ukrainian Day" in a fitting and solemn manner. We firmly believe that you, Congressman ANDREWS, are fully aware of the importance of Ukraine as our ally in the common struggle against Russian totalitarian tyranny and in the defense of freedom.

The entire world, including the enslaved Ukrainian people, is looking toward the United States of America as the true citadel of freedom and hope for the oppressed people everywhere.

To observe this day provides an appropriate occasion for the American people and the U.S. Government to demonstrate their sympathy with understanding of the aspirations of the Ukrainian people, and to call on all our citizens, regardless of their national background to observe this day in recognition of the gallant struggle of the Ukrainian people for the most precious goal cherished by our own Nation and liberty loving people everywhere: freedom.

We are sure that you understand the significance of this day of Ukrainian independence anniversary and will read your message into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in commemoration of this event and thus contribute to the successful recognition of the anniversary.

Respectfully yours,
Dr. ANTHONY ZUKOWSKY,
President, UCCA,
State Branch of North Dakota.

ANNIVERSARY OF UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE

On January 22, 1965, Americans of Ukrainian descent in our State will observe the 47th anniversary of the proclamation of independence of Ukraine, which occurred on January 22, 1918, in Kiev, the capital of Ukraine. This was the culmination of the centuries long aspiration of the Ukrainian people. After two and a half centuries of foreign oppression and domination, Ukraine regained its freedom and national independence. The sovereignty and independence of Ukraine was recognized by a number of states, including the Government of Soviet Russia. However, the Russian Government, led by Lenin and Trotsky at that time, launched a military aggression against the free Ukrainian state, despite previous pledges to honor and respect Ukrainian independence. After almost 3⅓ years of heroic and unequal struggle, the Ukrainian people deprived of all military, economic and diplomatic assistance on the part of the Western Powers, succumbed to the numerically superior forces of Soviet Russia.

Since 1920 Ukraine has remained under the Communist and totalitarian yoke of Moscow, but it never has surrendered the spirit of freedom, nor has it given up the hope for regaining its full freedom and national independence. In the past 46 years the Ukrainians have amply demonstrated their love for freedom by the unceasing uprisings and large-scale resistance movements, such as the underground resistance warfare waged by the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA) against both the Nazis and the Bolsheviks. The Ukrainians paid a high price in the defense of freedom and independence, as they were ruthlessly persecuted by Moscow through a series of inhuman measures undertaken by Kremlin, such as mass trials of Ukrainian patriots, mass deportations of Ukrainians to Siberia, and the systematic genocide of the Ukrainian people. Khrushchev, the deposed Communist dictator, stated himself at the 20th Congress of the Communist Party in 1956 that Stalin planned the total annihilation of the Ukrainian people for their resistance to Russian communism.

Today, in January 1965, the Ukrainian people in enslaved Ukraine are continuing to fight for their freedom and national independence. They wage a stubborn and ceaseless struggle by passive resistance, economic sabotage and unrelentless opposition to the Russian alien rule imposed on Ukraine.

The U.S. Congress and the President of the United States of America have recognized the plight of the Ukrainian people by enacting and signing respectively the Captive Nations Week Resolution, which listed Ukraine as one of the captive nations enslaved by Communist Russia and entitled to full freedom and national independence.

Americans of Ukrainian descent in our State are planning to observe this memorable event—the 47th anniversary of the Ukraine's independence—with appropriate ceremonies and observances. Last June Americans of Ukrainian descent performed an outstanding feat by erecting a statue of Taras Shevchenko in Washington, D.C., in honor of the 150th anniversary of the birth of the Ukraine's national poet and Europe's freedom fighter—100,000 Ukrainians participated in this event. A number of our Congressmen and Senators are now seeking to issue a commemorative postage stamp in honor of Taras Shevchenko and to establish a section in the Congressional Library in recognition of this great man and freedom fighter.

On this day of the Ukraine's independence anniversary we should rededicate our efforts and our thoughts to the principle of freedom not only of the people of these countries, but for the freedom of all people in the world.

The struggle of the Ukrainian people is a gallant example of human courage and dedication. Lenin, Stalin, and Khrushchev had been the most despotic oppressors of the Ukrainian people, and the new masters, Brezhnev and Kosygin, are the same oppressors and enemies of freedom as were their predecessors.

In honoring the 47th anniversary of Ukrainian independence we are upholding the right of all people to the God-given right to freedom and national self-determination. These are the basic tenets and principles on which our own great Republic has been erected.

The principle of freedom is indivisible. Therefore, we honor the anniversary of Ukrainian independence, because we believe that the Ukrainian people and all other people enslaved by Communist Russia are entitled to the same fundamental rights as we so blessedly enjoy: freedom and independence.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, the Ukrainians today live under the Soviet domination, unable to enjoy the basic and fundamental rights of liberty, sovereignty, and freedom of speech. On the 47th anniversary of their national independence day, they cannot celebrate their onetime political freedom. It is for us to do so.

The history of the Ukrainian people has indeed been one of struggle for freedom against overwhelming odds leaving misery and hardship for the majority of its patriots in its wake. Since the day the liberty-loving Ukrainians signed a compact between the Russian czar and their leaders in 1654, they have only known brief periods of political independence—their longest lasting only 2 years, from 1918 to 1920. Their fate has been largely due to curious twists of international events and the Russian desire for power. Yet despite the severe hardships, the Ukrainians have nourished their desire to be free; they did not submit docilely to the harsh rule of alien despots. Indeed the numerous persecutions against them only united them more closely together. Toward the end of the First World War, the Ukrainians finally proclaimed their independence on January 22, 1918, and established the Ukrainian National Republic.

That day marks one of the brightest yet tragic spots in the Ukrainian history for not only is it the day in which the years of struggle and deprivation of freedom came to an end, but it also serves as a vivid reminder of the freedom which was lost. For in early 1920, the Red army invaded and occupied the eastern part of the country, quickly crushing the Ukrainian opposition and forcing the native peoples to comply to Russian demands. At that fateful time, Ukraine again became a Russian colony. Yet, the flame of freedom flickers in the hearts of the Ukrainians, and for this very reason they endure the countless measures designed to subjugate them physically and in both mind and spirit. The Soviets cannot chalk up total victory so long as the Ukrainian peoples retain their national identity and their indomitable spirit for freedom.

The United States is fortunate to have many of the Ukrainians that were able to escape from the Soviet yoke; these Americans of Ukrainian descent have contributed to the free and democratic way of life; they have risked their lives to preserve the institutions which did not have a chance to flower in their homeland.

We Americans often overlook the fact that we enjoy our freedom every day in our lives; but freedom is not merely a hollow-sounding word. The Ukrainians, living under Soviet tyranny today, know what it means to lose their independence, yet their sturdy spirit and love for freedom is the only thing that sustains them.

We Americans salute the 47th anniversary of the Ukrainian Independence Day.

Mr. HELSTCSKI. Mr. Speaker, January 22 marked the 47th anniversary of the establishment of the free and independent Ukrainian National Republic. Today, we, in this U.S. House of Representatives, commemorate an occasion significant to the people of the Ukraine and equally significant to the millions throughout the world who are dedicated to the cause of freedom. It is fitting that we pay tribute not only to the anniversary but to the men and women of courage who on January 22, 1918, regained their liberty and national independence following over a century of subjugation.

The centuries-old struggle for freedom and independence on the part of the Ukrainian nation constitutes an impressive chapter in the annals of human history. This determined will for national freedom clearly crystallized itself in the old Ukrainian Kievan state from the 9th to the 14th century, in the Ukrainian Kozak state from 1648 to 1783, and more recently in the Ukrainian National Republic from 1917 to 1920. As one of the first victims of Soviet imperialism, Ukraine, since the very inception of alien Bolshevik tyranny, has proved to be the Achilles heel of the Soviet Union. The destruction of its national churches, the horrible manmade famine of 1932–33, the mass murder at Vinnitsia in 1937–39, and the vast purges and deportations decreed by Moscow have failed to exterminate the spiritual and moral resources for national freedom in Ukraine. The historic capital of Kiev, with centuries of rich tradition and culture conserved in its vaults, still symbolizes today the indestructible hope and passion of a nation destined to be sovereign, free, and independent.

During the Second World War millions of Ukrainian patriots seized the short-lived opportunity of the German invasion to realize once again this hope, only to be frustrated in their valiant efforts by the scourge of another imperialism. But this unbending will shall continue to be strong and powerful in the epic struggle of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army—UPA—against the evil forces of Soviet imperialism, and in the resistance of the Ukrainian people.

As a nation of over 43 million people—the largest non-Russian nation behind the European Iron Curtain—the Ukraine stands as one of the most important and natural allies in the eventual defeat of Soviet imperialism. Its historic claim to national freedom and independence cannot be ignored. Its place as a sovereign and equal partner in the mutual construction of the free Europe of tomorrow must be assured, if the foundation of permanent peace among freedom-loving nations is to be invincible.

We are all fully aware of the importance of the Ukraine as an ally in the common struggle against Russian Communist imperialism. On this 47th anniversary of the independence of the Ukraine, let us rededicate ourselves to the restoration of liberty and self-determination to all who now suffer behind the Iron Curtain of Red tyranny.

We must extend a hand of friendship to the Ukrainian people and our moral support to their aspirations. We must also join them in prayer that their just cause will soon be realized.

Admiration alone for freedom fighters in the Ukraine and elsewhere behind the Iron Curtain will not help these people to get rid of Russian domination. We must do more than that if we still believe in the principle that all nations, however great, however small, should be free and independent.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, it was 47 years ago when the stouthearted and brave people of Ukraine proclaimed to the world its independence and established the Ukrainian National Republic. Unfortunately, its freedom was only of a temporary nature, for in 1920 that land was overrun by the Red army and was forced to become a satellite of the Russians.

You may properly ask, why should we here in the United States and particularly here in the Congress mark this occasion? In reply I state that we do so for three very good reasons:

First. Because we Americans who treasure liberty and democracy are deeply touched by the plight of 42 million Ukrainians, the largest captive non-Russian nation in Eastern Europe and of enslaved peoples everywhere.

Second. For the reason that we personally know countless Ukrainians and people of Ukrainian ancestry who have become good loyal U.S. citizens and who have contributed so very much to America.

Third. By our taking official cognizance of a valiant beginning of a nation which shook off the sackles of its overlords much in the same manner as our Original Thirteen Colonies did in 1776, we give notice to all the world of our sympathy and encouragement to captive nations everywhere to persevere in their fight for independence.

Before I alluded to the fact that we all know those Ukrainians who not only make the United States their home and their new country and have thereby enriched our culture with their special aptitudes and became an important factor in making America the great Nation it is, but they are also now numbered among our valued American citizens of whom we are justly proud and happy to have among us.

The late John F. Kennedy in his book, "A Nation of Immigrants," which is a compelling story of America's origins and development, quotes Oscar Handlin as follows:

> Once I thought to write a history of immigrants in America. Then I discovered that immigrants were American history.

In that spirit our late President's great book is a history of America. It is the exciting story of the 42 million immigrants who have come to our shores since our beginnings as a nation.

Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, of Georgetown University, in his recent letter to me respecting the 47th anniversary of the independence of Ukraine mentions the President's state of the Union message, in which President Johnson declared:

> With the Soviet Union we seek peaceful understandings that can lessen the danger to freedom.

I should now like to quote another sentence in that message of the President to the effect that "In this period no new nation has become Communist, and the unity of the Communist empire has begun to crumble." This augurs well for the future of Ukraine and all the captive nations. By the work of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc., hope for the future freedom of that land will be kept alive in the hearts of all people. I trust that someday Ukraine will join the community of free and independent nations in the world.

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to join my colleagues today in marking the 47th anniversary of the Ukrainian proclamation of independence.

No people within the Soviet empire have suffered more, suffered longer, and resisted harder than the people of the Ukraine. There should be no illusion about the great difficulty faced by the forces of freedom in that area. Unlike the captive nations farther to the west, Ukrainians are more deeply involved in the Soviet way of life, and face greater obstacles in the assertion of nationalist spirit.

Our participation in this observance is not an empty gesture. By our action, the greatest deliberative body in the world reaffirms the principle of self-determination and alerts people everywhere to the colonial aspects of the Soviet Union. Let it not be forgotten that 45 percent of the Soviet Union is composed of non-Russians.

There are powerful social, economic, and political forces at work in Eastern Europe. All are infected by the germ of freedom from the West—a germ which appeals to the basic Western orientation of most of the captive nations. From year to year, the internal situation of these captive nations has changed: at times toward greater flexibility, as in Rumania and Hungary in 1964, and at times in the direction of reaction, as in the atrophied Poland of today. What seems impossible today, may become possible in the future. Somebody must keep the faith, both within and without that unhappy area.

The culture, language, and religion of the Ukraine have been maintained despite decades of difficulties. History teaches us that their maintenance will form the basis for national emergence.

In our observance today, we are doing what is morally right, as well as what is politically right. In doing so, we serve the cause of freedom everywhere.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, one of my earliest boyhood recollections is that of the magic which the mere mention of the Ukraine evoked. At no time could my wandering attention be more completely recaptured by my no doubt despairing teacher than at those times when the nature and climate, the principle products, and the day-to-day life of Ukrainians were under discussion.

The pictures which came before me then were of golden fields of wheat, of pastures and barnyards where poultry, sheep, hogs, and dairy cattle led placid existences, the bountiful vineyards of the Crimea. I could even see the stalwart Ukrainian people tending their crops and their livestock, gathering the fruits of their vineyards, and earning their daily bread from the rich deposits of coal, iron, and other metals of their land.

But even then the pictures which took me out of the classroom and into the beauty and bounty of the Ukraine could only suggest a fraction of the natural gifts bestowed on this land—a land which by today's cold light of reality can only conjure up the horrible picture of starvation and oppression of this, the second largest nation under Soviet domination. The Golgotha of Ukrainians has indeed been brought about by the attempts of the Kremlin to blot out the brave resistence of the Ukrainian people to Soviet enslavement.

Into the greedy, power-seeking hands of the Kremlin despots now pours the wealth of the Ukraine—the products of the vast forests of the lowlands, the crops of the fertile black earth of the land to the east, the vast production of the mining and metallurgical industries, the electric power, and the vast assortment of products which come from the extensive industrialization of the Ukraine which has been accomplished by the energy and ingenuity of the brave people of Ukraine.

As we observe here on January 25 the event of the independence of Ukrainia, we should stop and consider the lesson to be drawn from the fact that this 47th anniversary of the independence of Ukrainia did indeed take place on January 22 and that we are delayed in our tribute to the freedom-loving Ukrainian people because this great representative body paused in observance of the inauguration of our President—the great occasion when our Chief Executive raises his hand and commits himself to serve under our Constitution and in accordance with a Government established for the people, by the people, and of the people.

When we consider the vast wealth and power of our great country and the freedom which abounds for the people of America, how can we do less than to pledge ourselves anew to a leading role alongside the freedom-loving people of Ukrainia and the other captive nations in their determination to restore their right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. We should not forget that those Ukraine-Americans who left their oppressed homeland to live among us have contributed much from their own rich tradition and faith to our deeply rooted principal of universal freedom. It is of special importance that we join with them in our common heritage and common future in peace and liberty.

We cannot say that this observance of that day in 1918, 47 years ago, when the independence of Ukrainia was declared, is a joyous one—because now Ukrainian freedom is only a dream among those suffering human beings who live under the misery inflicted by Soviet domination. But we can make known to the world our determination as freedom-loving Americans of every ancestry to stand with the people of Ukrainia and the other captive nations until the day when they are again free from cruelty and oppression. To this purpose we are dedicated, and until that great day comes we must not diminish our support of the hopes and dreams and the fight and struggle of these Soviet-dominated nations to rid themselves of their oppressors.

We salute our friends, the Ukrainians, in our resolve to strengthen their aspirations for freedom and independence from foreign rule and pledge to them our help.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, January 22 was Ukrainian Independence Day. In 1917, tens of millions of Russians subjected to the czarist regime cast aside the heavy yoke of that autocratic government and proclaimed their independence. To those peoples, the Russian Revolution of 1917 seemed to usher in a new day; they hoped to find their freedom in the overthrow of the czarist order.

At first their optimism seemed justified. By the end of World War I nearly all ethnic groups in that sprawling empire had attained, or at least proclaimed, their national independence. The Ukrainians were the most numerous of these nationality groups.

The Ukraine had been part of the Russian Empire since mid-17th century, and during that time attempts had been made to eradicate Ukrainian nationalism and national ideals. But these cruel efforts were unsuccessful. The liberty-loving Ukrainians clung firmly to their traditional national ideals, and in 1918 they regained their independence.

On January 22, 1918, they proclaimed the birth of the Ukrainian National Republic and set up their own democratic form of government. Unfortunately, however, the independent state thus born did not last long. For only 2 years the Ukrainians enjoyed their freedom, then they lost it to their inveterate foe, the Russian Communists. Early in the 1920's the country was overrun, for the Ukrainians could not by themselves stave off the superior force of the Red army. Their independent existence came to an end, and their country was annexed to the Soviet Union.

For over 40 years, Mr. Speaker, the Ukrainians have been captives under the unrelenting rule of the Kremlin. On the 47th anniversary celebration of their independence, it is fitting to recall that memorable event. These gifted and gallant people, who refused to be submerged in Russia's empire for centuries, today with equal determination refuse to be absorbed and amalgamated into the Soviet Union. Even under most trying circumstances, they have not given up their hope for freedom.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, we have the right and duty once again to express our sympathy with the Eastern European peoples under domination of the Soviet Union. Not least of these are the people of the Ukraine, whose 47th anniversary of independence was observed on this January 22 just past.

In the savage wars that have drenched our century, the Ukrainians have suffered invasion and counterinvasion, burnings and destruction and death not surpassed in any place or in any generation.

In the breakup of the czarist state during World War I, they rose against eastern domination and helped hurl out the remnants of the collapsing czarist armies. Invaded almost instantly by troops of the German Empire, they suffered the imposition of a puppet king—but not for long, for they rose to hurl out the puppet. Invaded yet once more by the Red armies of Lenin's new state, they lost the sovereignty and nationhood they had twice sought to establish in those bitter years.

The Ukraine, as always, was a battlefield for the contests of armies in World War II. The Nazi hordes swept in and then were driven back in years of incredible struggle.

There is no doubt in the minds of those who know the Ukrainian people, the Ukrainian culture, that tens of millions still living in their homeland maintain a strong and burning desire for sovereignty and independence. Americans of Ukrainian descent have labored for decades to keep open the lines of communication, and they know well the feelings of Ukrainians in the land of their birth.

Freedom is still an indivisible element in man's affairs. The suppression of national sovereignty anywhere on the earth must be a cause of concern to those who believe in liberty.

It is fitting, therefore, for this House to renew its expressions of concern for the future liberation of the Ukraine from an alien domination imposed by a monolithic political state and imposed equally, by troops and tanks and guns. A captive people is a captive people—no matter how long enduring the tyranny imposed from without. We must pay our tribute to the Ukrainians and salute them and express our acknowledgement of their yearnings for independence.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, January 22, 1965, marked the 47th anniversary of Ukrainian independence. We are free to commemorate this date in history, but, unfortunately, the people in the Ukraine do not have this privilege. The freedom gained by these brave people on January 22, 1918, was short-lived—only 2 years. The Red army invaded the Ukraine and took over.

These people who suffered so much to win their independence have been under Soviet domination for more than 40 years, but they have not given up the hope and will to be a free and independent nation. When we reflect upon the burning desire for freedom of these people, we cannot help but be reminded of our own desires and fight for independence. We were successful and pray that we will never fall under the heel of tyranny that has been the misfortune of the Ukraine.

The United States has never sought to subjugate a nation and we continue to espouse the firm belief that every nation has the right to determine for itself the form of government it wishes and to choose this government in free elections.

In joining in this commemoration of Ukrainian independence, I hope that we give encouragement to these enslaved freedom-loving people and that in the near future they may be free to celebrate this day in their nation's life as we are free to celebrate our own Fourth of July, our Independence Day.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, January 22, 1965, marks the 47th anniversary of the Ukrainian proclamation of independence. In 1918, the flame of independence and democracy flickered briefly in a Russia torn by the ravages of World War I. The Ukrainian People's Republic, centered in Kiev, proclaimed its independence from the Moscow revolutionary regime, already in the hands of the Bolsheviks. The new Republic was recognized by several nations, including Soviet Russia. However, the Soviet Union attacked the Ukraine and, after 3½ years of heroic struggle, the long-cherished freedom of the Ukrainians was drowned in blood.

The people of the Ukraine have throughout history been subjected to various forms of alien domination. Yet, Ukrainian nationalism has survived all forms of subjugation and today remains a potent threat to Moscow.

During the four decades of Russian Communist enslavement, the Ukrainian people never accepted the Communist yoke imposed by Moscow and have continued to wage an unequal struggle for their freedom and national independence. The Ukrainian people have demonstrated their love of freedom and their opposition to alien slavery and oppression through a series of bloody and heroic uprisings, active and passive resistance, and large-scale underground warfare against Communist Russia during World War II.

Under the circumstances, Ukrainians cannot hope to celebrate their national independence day in their own country, but the hope for freedom and independence remains in their hearts and souls.

I join with the thousands of Ukrainians who took refuge in our own country in expressing sympathy on this anniversary date. It is my fervent hope that the goals of freedom and independence for the Ukrainians will be achieved soon.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to join the gentleman from Pennsylvania and other colleagues in marking the 47th anniversary of Ukrainian independence. It is a privilege to pay tribute to the liberty-loving people of the Ukraine, and I hope Americans everywhere will join in observance of this significant anniversary and pledge their support to the enslaved people of the Ukraine.

January 22 not only marked the anniversary, but also provided us with a poignant reminder that the threat to freedom of all peoples and independence of nations is a constant one. The Ukrainian people were among the first to suffer the fate that has befallen millions of others. We must not forget the plight of the people under Communist rule or take our own freedom for granted.

Since the middle of the 17th century, except for a brief 2-year period in 1918–20, unhappy Ukrainians have not known freedom in their fair and fertile homeland. Until the overthrow of the czarist regime in Russia in 1917, they were oppressed by the Russian autocracy. Then on January 22, in 1918, they proclaimed their national independence, established their republic, and set to work for its preservation. Late in 1920 the Russians, appearing now as Communist tyrants, sent their Red army into Ukraine and the country was overrun and made a part of the Soviet Union.

Since then, for 47 years, Ukrainians have been suffering under the tyranny of Soviet dictatorship, but they have not given up their ideals and they still cherish their national goal—freedom and independence.

It is appropriate that many of us have reintroduced resolutions providing for the creation of a Special Committee on Captive Nations. A Captive Nations Committee would be invaluable in drawing attention to the plight of the people behind the Iron Curtain and renewing our efforts to free them from Soviet imperialism.

I would like to quote from a letter I received from the president of the Omaha, Nebr., branch of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America:

> As you are well aware, the freedom of the Ukrainian nation was a short-lived one, as it fell under the heels of Communist Russian imperialism and subjugation. Nonetheless, the Ukrainian people have never lost their aspirations for freedom and have been waging both active and passive campaigns against Communist oppression.

It is in this spirit that we salute the Ukrainian people and all other captive peoples, reiterating our solidarity with the cause of freedom everywhere.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, on the 47th anniversary of the founding of the Ukrainian Republic, we take this opportunity to pledge our support to these freedom-repressed people who have fought so hard for their independence yet saw it vanish before their eyes under the force of Soviet totalitarianism.

In the 300 some years of their modern history, more than 40 million Ukrainians have known only 2 years of blessed freedom in which they enjoyed the undeniable right of national political independence. Though their homeland has been ravaged by alien despots, the Ukrainians have kept alive their unquenchable love for freedom. The Taras Shevchenko monument erected last June here in Washington symbolizes the determination and courage of the entire Ukrainian people; his works and art deem him worthy of the title, "Champion of Liberty."

The Ukrainians have suffered misery and hardship. They have been forced to endure the most humiliating thrusts of tyranny. Their history has been one of futile struggle against the devouring Russian drive for power. Their land, with one of the world's richest areas of grain, cannot be used to the best advantage owing to the notorious failures of the Soviet agricultural system. For these failures, Ukrainians have suffered considerably.

We Americans enjoy the rights that these people have been forced to relinquish; we are able to exercise our freedoms without undue restraint. However, we must bear in mind that the Ukrainians desire freedom just as we did when we too were dominated by an imperial power. We sympathize with their cause and extend to them our hopes for a better national life.

Captive Nations Week, which is observed in this country in the second week of July, indicates the degree of our concern for those freedom-starved nations now forced to live under Soviet dictatorship. Commemoration of this week serves a vital function to nations such as the Ukraine, for it shows the solidarity and the determination of the American people in the cause of world freedom. We do not forget the relentless struggle of these millions of patriots for liberty and independence.

Today the Ukrainians cannot celebrate their national holiday for they are prisoners in their own homeland. But for those Ukrainians living in the free world, and particularly for those Americans of Ukrainian descent, we observe this day solemnly as our way of paying homage to a great people. With heartfelt wishes, I join the rest of Americans in the celebration of the national independence day of the Ukrainian people and may their deep love of freedom someday become a living reality.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, today throughout the United States Americans and Ukrainians are celebrating the 47th anniversary of the independence of the Ukrainian National Republic. However, regrettably those Ukrainians living in their homeland have no holiday in which to commemorate the only bright spot in their history.

In the past 300 years of their history the Ukrainians have known only 2 years of independence, that between 1918 and 1920. Surrounded by powerful neighbors greedy for their fertile lands of wheat, the Ukrainians have known what it is to struggle, despite misery and hardship, for freedom. Their indomitable spirit has withstood tortures inconceivable for us to comprehend, yet that spirit burns more brightly now than ever before. Up to the middle of the 17th century the Ukrainians were able to survive the onslaught of the invading Asiatic hordes, but then in 1654 their leaders signed a treaty with the Russian czar designed to unite the two countries. However, the standard of treachery began to enter into the relations between the isolated, small Ukraine and the powerfully large Russia; this treaty in effect ended the independence the Ukrainians had enjoyed up to that time. From this date the Ukrainians were forced to abandon their national ideals of freedom and traditional beliefs. Ukraine became a colony of imperialist Russia. However, the Russians were unable to stamp out their growing nationalism, which has become a powerful living force especially among the Ukrainians today.

Only in 1918 did Ukrainian patriots succeed in realizing their centuries-old dream of independence. Yet fate was to deal them a crushing blow in 1920. The country was invaded and overrun by the Red army, and its new independence was shattered. Although that freedom was shortlived, the proclamation of Ukrainian independence and the establishment of their Republic came to symbolize the realization of the deepest and heartfelt Ukrainian ideal—freedom.

The Ukrainian people have suffered more under the Soviet tyranny than their forebears under Russia's autocratic czars. They have no freedom of expression or of movement, thus their leaders resort to underground tactics to show their defiance. Although information of their activities and victories is scanty, these leaders have kept the Ukrainian desire for independence burning brightly. Hostile acts of the Soviet dictators have been countered with rebellion and counterattack. For example, the Ukrainian political leaders, deported in vast numbers to the forced labor camps in Siberia, staged bloody rebellions that shook the Kremlin with its force in 1953, 1954, 1955, and again in 1956. When the Hungarian uprising took place, some Ukrainian freedom fighters came to their aid. Many gave their lives for the cause of freedom no matter how little chance they had to succeed against Soviet totalitarianism.

The spirit of these courageous freedom fighters is symbolized in the Taras Shevchenko monument erected here in Washington last June. This man in his poems and songs has done more to unify the Ukrainians together in their common aspiration for independence than any other national hero. The awe-inspiring statue stands as daily witness to those who have put patriotism and freedom above life and material happiness.

As a nation of over 40 million people—the largest non-Russian nation behind the European Iron Curtain—Ukraine stands as a bulwark of strength and courage against Soviet imperialism. Its historic claim to national freedom and independence cannot be ignored. Our sympathies go out to these heroic people and on the 47th anniversary of the Ukrainian independence we join with freedom-loving people throughout the globe in the celebration of their independence day in the fervent hope that someday they will enjoy the right of self-determination.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, the voice of this House is being heard throughout the world in its commemoration of the 47th anniversary of the proclamation of independence of Ukraine from the bonds of Russian domination.

The days and hours of the closing months of World War I that saw the terror and anarchy of the decline and dissolution of empire also witnessed the brightness of the hopes of many small groups of peoples. They saw in their own hands the possibilities of self-government, of the end of dynasties in which they had not found a future.

The Ukrainian people, living in one of the finest territories of the world, were among these who worked hopefully to attain such government. Today, their proclamation of independence stands for the aspirations of some 45 million Ukrainian people—but they live in subjugation to an empire more rigorous than any the world has ever known.

These words express the feeling and earnest hope of the American people that the Ukrainians, once more, will find their way to freedom and to independence.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, once again it is my privilege to take part in commemorating the anniversary of the independence of the Ukrainian National Republic.

Forty-seven years have passed since the people of the Ukraine proclaimed freedom and joined the community of sovereign nations. But communism never respects the sovereignty of others, and within 2 short years the legitimate aspirations of this nation were suppressed. The fact that Soviet tyranny has not destroyed the will of the Ukrainians to be free is a testimonial to the indomitable spirit of human beings for liberty.

Nevertheless, these proud people remain captives of international communism. As long as the regime remains Communist, the people of the Ukraine remain prisoners, for the survival of the Communist Party depends upon the Red army.

It is very important that the United States take every opportunity to expose Communist colonialism in every corner of the globe. As leaders of the free world we cannot afford to do less and still keep faith with our heritage. So on this occasion let us rededicate ourselves to the restoration of liberty and self-determination for all who remain imprisoned behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, last Friday marked the 47th anniversary of the independence of the Ukraine and I am pleased to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the great people of the Ukraine. The brave people of the Ukraine need this demonstration of our faith in those behind the Iron Curtain who wish to be free.

On January 22, 1918, when these people proclaimed their independence, it was the culmination of a centuries-old struggle by the Ukrainian people to achieve their freedom from Moscow, but their victory was short lived. The country was quickly taken over by the Bolshevik armies, and once more Ukraine became a captive nation.

Mr. Speaker, even in spite of deportations, imprisonment, religious persecution, labor camps, ruthless executions, and other Soviet repressive measures, the spirit of the people has not been broken and the hope of regaining their independence continues to burn brightly in their hearts.

I salute both the Ukrainian people and those Americans of Ukrainian descent whose deep love of freedom and deep commitment to American ideals has added so greatly to the progress of our great country. Therefore, it is not only my hope but also my conviction that the people of the Ukraine, like the people of the other nations who are now slaves to Communist imperialism, the nations we refer to as captive nations, will soon be free again.

Mr. Speaker, unfortunately this proclamation of independence lasted less than 3 years and since 1920 40 million Ukrainians have not been able to enjoy the benefits of a free and independent life in their historic homeland. Once again they are persecuted for clinging to their national ideals, for dreaming of independence and freedom. But oppression and persecution has united the Ukrainians against their foes and held them together.

Therefore, on this 47th anniversary of the independence of the Ukraine, let us solemnly commemorate the continuing struggle for freedom of a brave and noble people.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, today we, Americans, are beset by a serious crisis in Vietnam. With each passing day the crisis deepens. American lives have been lost. Americans have been seriously wounded. And yet, the Communist North Vietnamese continue to press on toward their asserted military and political goal of conquering all of Vietnam.

This type of confrontation of power is not a new phenomenon in the history of world communism. Indeed, the nation whose independence we commemorate today, the Ukraine, had such a battle for survival on its hands 45 years ago. Then, as now, the enemy was communism. Regrettably, the Ukrainians were not able to sustain the independence they had declared, and like many other former non-Russian peoples of the Russian

Empire who had declared their independence with the collapse of the Empire, the Ukrainians were conquered by the Bolsheviks and reincorporated into a new Russian empire, the Soviet empire.

In the years that followed, the Ukrainians had suffered much under the tyranny of communism. They had known the full weight of the harsh collectivization program that had brought catastrophe to their land and people. Political, economic, and cultural oppression had become a part of everyday Ukrainian life, but by the force of interior strength they were able to sustain their sense of national identity and resist whenever possible the Moscovite autocracy.

Will the Ukrainians, along with other Soviet peoples, ever have the right of self-determination?

This only history can tell, and for those of us in the free world we can only hope and pray that this right shall one day be theirs to exercise.

On this anniversary of Ukrainian independence, therefore, we take this opportunity to reassert our own faith in democratic principles, especially in this all-inclusive democratic principle of self-determination. On this occasion we should also take stock of our commitment to resist Communist aggression throughout the world.

Americans of Ukrainian extraction, the Ukrainian community of Hudson County, N.J., met this past Sunday, January 24, 1965, to celebrate the 47th anniversary of Ukrainian Independence Day. I was the guest speaker of honor, and I was happy to join these courageous people in their wish and will to further Ukrainians' right of self-determination. All freedom-loving peoples throughout the world, on this occasion, join in this wish.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, last June 27, 1964, Washington witnessed a dramatic series of events, revolving about the unveiling of the statue of Taras Shevchenko, the great Ukrainian poet, whose immortal words inspired lovers of freedom 150 years ago and still keep alive in the hearts and minds of his countrymen the determination to continue with singleness of purpose on the road to freedom until the Ukraine is free.

On the occasion of the unveiling in Washington, the capital of the free world, 36,000 Ukrainians marched in parade and 100,000 witnessed the unveiling. A significant and inspiring symbol of the determination of the Ukrainian American people that their homeland shall be free.

Too often have we reminded ourselves of the glorious past of the Ukraine: its culture, centered around the University of Kiev; the richness of its soil which provided a mammoth sugar bowl and breadbasket for the commerce of Europe and Asia. Too often have we recounted regretfully its conquest first by Genghis Khan, and later by Peter the Great; its invasion and division by Poland and Austria. We have rejoiced with the Ukrainians over their brief period of freedom following World War I, a period during which the Ukraine was a democratic Republic.

Again today we have told the story of 4 years of bloody struggles with the Bolsheviks which terminated in Communist rule. We have recounted the purges, deportations, and genocide by which the Russians decimated the Ukrainian intelligensia and leadership. But ahead we see the breaking of a new day of freedom.

Last June in the capital of the free world, people of Ukrainian blood proved to the world that their determination to be free is indomitable.

Today the Congress of the United States and the United Nations pay tribute to a nation whose determination to be an independent, democratic republic must be realized.

I am proud, Mr. Speaker, that in the district I have the honor to represent are many fine men and women of Ukrainian blood. Expectantly, confidently with them, all Americans of all lines of descent await the happy day when the Ukraine has broken the cruel chains of its bondage.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, first let me commend the distinguished and able gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] for reserving this special hour in the House. Naturally, I am pleased to join with my colleagues in these appropriate exercises to mark the 47th anniversary of the independence of the Ukraine.

Members of this House are well aware of the very significant history of this great nation and the long bitter struggle of its loyal, faithful people against oppression. It is most appropriate for us in the House to intensify our efforts for the cause of freedom for the millions of honest, God-fearing, religious-minded, democratically oriented peoples who are enslaved behind the Iron Curtain.

There can be no lasting peace so long as Red imperialism continues to hold men in bondage in denial of their God-given rights. If we and the rest of the free world continue our efforts for peace and freedom, the day will come when the Ukraine and all other subject nations may rejoice in the blessings of freedom and governments of their own choice.

I am proud to congratulate the Ukrainian people and their loyal descendants and relatives in this country upon the 47th birthday of their great nation.

The Ukrainians, though under the yoke of tyranny and oppression, have demonstrated in the past that they will never give up their aspirations and struggles to be free men and women.

It is also fitting that the House today be reminded of Congressman FLOOD'S resolution to establish a Special Committee on the Captive Nations, with which I am proud to be associated as cosponsor.

There is no question that a committee of this kind could render great service, particularly to those oppressed peoples behind the Iron Curtain. I hope that the House will authorize such a committee so that the cause of personal liberty, democracy, and freedom can make itself heard more effectively.

These are troubled times in the disordered affairs of mankind and it is well that we pause today to commemorate the great contributions and sacrifices of the Ukrainian people on the 47th anniversary of the independence of the Ukraine.

Let us also make it known on this day of Ukrainian independence that the American Congress, reflecting the wishes and sentiments of the American people, reaffirms principles of liberty, justice, freedom, human honor, and decency.

Long live free Ukraine and may that great land and inspired people soon regain in fullest measure the great liberties they cherish.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, the history of the Ukrainian people in modern times is the story of a gifted, gallant, and industrious people ceaselessly struggling for their freedom and independence. These hard working and tenacious folk of the fertile steppe land tilled their bountiful soil for centuries for the well-being of all peoples in the whole of Eastern Europe. Irrespective of the regimes under which they suffered for centuries, they continued to perform their productive work and always hoped for better days. For more than three centuries, since the mid-17th century, they lived under the oppressive regime of Russia's czars. Since 1654, the Ukrainians have not been allowed, except for the brief 2-year period of 1918–20, to enjoy even the semblance of a free and independent life in their homeland. There they have endured hardships, privations, imprisonments, and death. They have been persecuted and oppressed relentlessly for clinging to their national ideals, for cherishing their independence and freedom.

But these oppressions and persecutions have at least had the salutary effect of uniting the Ukrainian people against their foes. Toward the end of the First World War, when the czarist regime in Russia was overthrown, the Ukrainians proclaimed their independence on January 22, 1918, and established the Ukrainian Republic.

Unfortunately, the Ukrainian Republic at the time of its birth was surrounded by powerful and ruthless foes, all eager and anxious to pounce upon the newborn state and destroy it. Early in 1920, this Republic was attacked by Communist forces of Bolshevik Russia. Soon the country was overrun by the Red Army. All effective opposition was crushed under the hammerblows of Russian might, and the Ukrainian independence came to an end. By the fall of that year the country was annexed to the Soviet Union, and since then it has been submerged in the sprawling Soviet empire. Thus for more than 44 years Ukrainians have been suffering under Soviet totalitarian dictatorship. These 44 million, constituting the second largest ethnic group in the Soviet Union, have suffered more and have sacrificed more, both in the number of victims and in material wealth, than any other minority group in the Soviet Union. They have borne the heavy yoke of the Kremlin longer than all other groups, and have suffered longer under it.

Today the once prosperous and productive Ukraine is a land of unfortunate and unhappy millions where they all are held down and ruthlessly oppressed by the agents of the Kremlin. The whole country is practically sealed off from free societies; thus they have very little contact with peoples of the non-Communist world. They have been robbed of all their worldly possessions under the Communist collective system. And their only inherited and cherished possession is their spirit of freedom, their hope for eventual national independence. Heartless minions of the Kremlin have even tried to deprive the Ukrainians of their spirit of freedom, but fortunately they have not succeeded in this task. Today even under the most relentless of totalitarian tyrannies liberty-loving Ukrainians cling ever tenaciously to their national ideals, still preserving their fervent love of freedom.

Both at home and abroad the Ukrainian people have been noted for their industry and ingenuity. They have never shunned hard, menial work. In this respect their tough and rugged physique and tenacious nature have served them well. Hundreds of thousands of loyal, patriotic, and hardworking Americans of Ukrainian origin have given their very best for the good of their adopted country. In many industrial areas they constitute the core of sturdy and hardworking laborers who perform difficult and onerous tasks with determination and distinction. We are indeed proud to have them as worthy citizens of this great Republic, and today I joyfully join them in the observance of the 47th anniversary of Ukrainian Independence Day.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the fair and fertile Ukraine, with its 230,000 square miles, is the largest country in Eastern Europe, and some 44 million Ukrainians constitute the most numerous ethnic group in the area. Throughout their long and turbulent history they had to struggle hard for the maintenance of their freedom and independence. They had been more or less successful in doing this until early modern times, but they have not been able to withstand the onrushing tide of Russian aggression since the mid-17th century.

Beginning in 1654, the Ukraine was submerged in the continental empire of the Russian czars. From then until 1918, for more than 250 years, the Russians did their worst to suppress and eradicate Ukrainian national feeling and all its attendant traits, such as their desire for freedom, their boundless love for their homeland, their undying yearning for political independence, and their readiness to sacrifice all for the attainment of their national goal. All the efforts of callous Russian authorities were of no avail, and the Ukrainians clung firmly to their ideals. Toward the end of the First World War, Ukrainian leaders seized upon the occasion of the overthrow of the czarist autocracy and proclaimed their national independence. This was done on January 22, 1918, and thus was born the Ukrainian Republic.

Unfortunately the new-born Republic, frail and fragile, was under several handicaps. Her friends could not help her. The war-torn country was in ruins, and most of its inhabitants were uprooted from their homes. These were serious problems with which the Government was confronted, but even more serious was Communist Russia's threat. Before the Ukrainian Government had the chance to bring some order out of the existing chaos, the country was attacked by the Red army, and overrun by early 1920. Thus ended the independent Ukrainian Republic, and soon the country was incorporated into the Soviet Union.

Since then Ukrainians have not known freedom in their homeland. They have suffered more under the Soviet tyranny than did their forefathers under the autocratic czars. We know that under the Communist dictatorship the Ukrainians are not allowed to celebrate their independence day at home. That privilege is denied them by their overlords. But Ukrainians of the free world, as well as hundreds of thousands of Ukrainian-Americans in this great Republic, celebrate the anniversary of that event as the symbol of the Ukrainian free and independent spirit. I am indeed glad to join them in the celebration of the 47th anniversary of Ukrainian Independence Day.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, the 47th anniversary celebration of Ukrainian Independence Day is a most fitting occasion for the reaffirmation of our dedication to the eventual liberation and freedom of all the enslaved nations under Communist totalitarian tyranny. Today the leaders and peoples of the free world have many onerous responsibilities. But all conscientious, thinking, and well-meaning human beings who are privileged to enjoy freedom as their birthright feel that they have a moral obligation to work for the freedom of many millions still held in chains. Nor are the governments of free peoples less conscious of this moral obligation, this solemn duty, toward human suffering, than the peoples they represent. All these governments, and especially the Government of this great Republic, are painfully aware of this obligation. And they are seriously concerned with the fate of the Ukrainian people.

The Ukrainian Republic was born on January 22, 1918, when there was a fair chance for its survival. Oppressive forces which had held the Ukrainians down for centuries were shattered, and thus they felt that their inveterate foes were no more. But in this they were sadly misled, for soon in place of old foes appeared new ones. Among these the deadliest was the then-rising Communists. It was the Red army of Communist Russia which finally put an end to the independent Ukrainian Republic and made the country part of the Soviet Union in 1920.

Since then millions of Ukrainians have been suffering under the unrelenting rule of the Kremlin. They have been robbed of their wordly possessions and they are deprived of all forms of freedom. They have been practically and quite effectively sealed off from the non-Communist world, and are driven by their Communist taskmasters. But in the midst of misfortune and misery these courageous patriots have not given up their hope for freedom, have not abandoned their national goal: the attainment of their national independence. On the 47th anniversary of their independence day, I wish all of them fortitude and power in their struggle against Communist totalitarian tyranny in their homeland.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join in this observation of the Independence Day of the Ukraine, and to express the hope that the brave people of the Ukrainian nation will once again enjoy liberty and freedom before many more years have passed.

It has long been my belief that we could find no better way to express our sympathy with the people of the captive nations than to have an official observance of each of the independence days so dear to the hearts of the patriots who now labor under the heavy yoke of Communist imperialism. To this end I have sponsored in each of the last three Congresses a resolution to establish such a practice, and I ask leave to include with my remarks the text of that resolution, as follows:

> Whereas the United States of America is dedicated to the restoration of liberty and self-determination for eight hundred million people enslaved by Communist imperialism; and
>
> Whereas there exists in the hearts and minds of Americans a deep sympathy and understanding for the hopes and aspirations of the captive peoples; and
>
> Whereas it is appropriate for Americans to keep alive the traditions of liberty symbolized by the historic national holidays of the captive nations: Now, therefore, be it
>
> *Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)*, That it is the sense of the Congress of the United States that the President of the United States proclaim the following historic dates as days of observance by the people of the United States in their spiritual union with the victims of Communist imperialism and colonialism: January 22 as Ukrainian Day; February 16 as Lithuanian Day; February 24 as Estonian Day; March 3 as Bulgarian Day; March 14 as Slovakian Day; March 15 as Hungarian Day; March 25 as White Ruthenian Day; May 3 as Polish Day; May 10 as Rumanian Day; May 26 as Georgian Day; May 28 as Armenian and Azerbaijan Day; June 17 as East German Day; August 15 as Korean Day; October 10 as Chinese Day; October 26 as Vietnamese Day; October 28 as Czech Day; November 18 as Latvian Day; November 28 as Albanian Day; December 13 as Turkestan Day.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to join my colleagues in the House of Representatives today in paying tribute to the brave people of the Ukraine. It saddens me that this 47th anniversary of the independence of the Ukraine finds its 43 million people still enslaved behind the Iron Curtain. I hope that all Americans everywhere will join in the observance of this significant anniversary and pledge support to the aspirations of these enslaved people.

The modern history of many east European countries presents a long series of miseries and misfortunes, with occasional happy, but all too brief, interludes. This is the general pattern of their history, and it is particularly true of the Ukrainian people. Since the middle of the 16th century, except for a very brief period of 1918–20, the Ukrainians have known no freedom in their homeland. But during that 2-year period, fate seemed kind to them. On January 22, 1918, they proclaimed their national independence, established their own democratic Republic, and worked feverishly for the preservation of their richly deserved and newly won freedom. But this dreamlike existence was not to last long; before the end of 1920 the Red army cruelly robbed them of their freedom. Their country became part of the Soviet Union and once more they were enslaved by Russians, this time by Communist Russia.

The history of the domination of the Ukraine by the U.S.S.R. has merely been a repetition of the exploitation of the Ukraine by the czarist regime. It has been one of economic exploitation of resources and the labor of the Ukraine for the benefit of Russia. Many thousands of Ukrainians were deported to the desolate wastelands of Siberia.

For more than 44 years some 43 million sturdy and stouthearted Ukrainians have been suffering under the heavy yoke of Communist tyranny. Their homeland is the mere western extension of the Soviet empire, where they are restive prisoners. As such they are helpless in the shaping and making of their own destiny, but fortunately they will feel they are the masters of their souls. We in the West must give them encouragement and intensify our efforts by deed and word to bring some hopeful feeling to the distressed people of the Ukraine who look forward to the joys of freedom so long denied them. Many Ukrainians migrated to the United States. They have made great contributions to our country's strength, our intelligence, our culture, and progress.

Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to urge the Congress to approve the resolution to establish a Special Committee on the Captive Nations. I am one of the sponsors of this resolution, and its approval would reinforce and strengthen the will and aspirations of over 43 million Ukrainians. It would reassure them of our determination not to forget them in their desire to once again become independent.

On this 47th anniversary of their independence day, I wish the people of the Ukraine forbearance and fortitude in their struggle for freedom.

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, the anniversary of Ukrainian independence is observed each year on January 22. It was on that day in 1918 when the Ukrainian constituent assembly met and issued a proclamation reestablishing the Ukraine as an independent Republic after several centuries of Russian domination.

That Republic lasted only 3 years and by 1921 the Ukraine was again overrun by the Russian Communists. After a brief period of freedom the Ukrainian people again became a subjugated nation. The 45 million people of the Ukraine thus were among the first victims of Communist imperialism.

Throughout all these long years the indomitable desire of this brave but suffering people for freedom has not been extinguished. Their cause is a righteous one. The American people have always looked with a great deal of sympathy upon the plight of the Ukrainian people and their struggle for freedom, and we have given them our support and encouragement to the fullest extent possible.

On this occasion of the anniversary of their independence, I join with many other Americans in saluting the Ukrainian people and expressing our hope that their cherished dream to see their country free will be fulfilled in the near future. There are numerous examples in history where enslaved and subjugated nations became free after many years of seemingly hopeless waiting. I trust the Ukrainian people will some day soon taste the joy of such victory.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that in marking the 47th anniversary of Ukrainian independence we mark also the passing of another year of Soviet enslavement of the Ukrainian people.

An easing of tensions between East and West has not produced a meaningful easing of the oppression and tyranny of their Communist masters.

It is well to mark this occasion and remind ourselves that the battles for freedom in Eastern Europe are far from won. The Ukrainian people fight on. We must never let them think that they fight alone.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, as we commemorate here today the 47th anniversary of Ukrainian Independence Day, we do so in the conviction that free men have an important stake in the freedom of peoples everywhere.

Observances such as the one in which we are participating today are evidence that Members of the House take this responsibility seriously. Our words and actions in the greatest representative assembly in the free world can bring renewed hope, stronger faith, and a deeper sense of what unites freedom-loving peoples to those who suffer oppression and deprivation in nations ruled by the enemies of freedom.

The people of Ukraine have a special claim to our understanding and support. Well over a million Americans of Ukrainian descent have brought to this country their love of freedom, their individual self-reliance, their deep spiritual values, and the riches of a distinctive culture. Since I am fortunate in representing a congressional district with a sizable population of people from Ukraine, I have known at first hand the extent and importance of their contributions and especially of their unfailing dedication to the goals of personal liberty and national independence for those who remain in the homeland.

The history of the struggle for freedom in Ukraine is a long and honorable one. The brutality of the Russian czars could not kill the people's determination to be free. Nor has the tyranny of Soviet commissars stifled the yearning for the rights of self-government. No people has suffered more for freedom. And despite the generations of persecution and oppression, the spirit of freedom burns as intensively as ever in the hearts of these brave people.

Just a few months ago, Mr. Speaker, in June of last year, a statue was unveiled in a small park in northwest Washington representing Taras Shevchenko, the great poet and patriot of Ukraine and the eloquent voice of Ukrainian freedom, past and future. The park is a small one, but it is significant both for what Shevchenko has come to mean throughout the world as a symbol of resistance to those who oppress mankind and—since the Congress of the United States authorized the use of the land for this purpose—as testimony of our own determination to speak up for freedom, to oppose dictatorship, to share the burden of those who suffer for liberty.

We are expressing this same determination and sense of kinship today, Mr. Speaker. And, in the same spirit, I urge our colleagues to renew and broaden their support of the pending resolution to establish a Special Committee on the Captive Nations. Here would be an especially meaningful way in which to translate the ideals we uphold into action that can bring those ideals closer to reality.

We owe at least this much, not only to the Ukrainian people themselves, not only to their families in the United States, but also to ourselves and to our belief in man's right to live freely.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, 47 years ago peoples subjected to Russian autocracy cast off the heavy yoke of that oppressive regime and proclaimed their independence. To tens of millions the Russian revolution of 1917 seemed to usher in a new day; they all then sought and hoped to find their freedom in the overthrow of the czarist regime. At first their most sanguine expectations seemed justified, and by the end of the First World War nearly all ethnic groups in the continental empire had attained, or were about to attain, their national independence. The Ukrainians, as the most numerous and also as the most important of these nationality groups, had done this.

Since mid-17th century Ukraine had been part of the Russian Empire, and during all that time the Russians had tried to Russianize them by eradicating Ukrainian nationalism and national ideals, but their attempts were not successful. Liberty-loving and stouthearted Ukrainians clung firmly to their traditional national ideals, and in 1918 they had their reward in freedom and independence. On January 22 of that year they proclaimed the Ukrainian Republic, set up their own democratic government and began to rebuild their war-ravaged country. Unfortunately, the independent state thus created did not last long. Ukrainians enjoyed their hard-earned independence for only 2 years; they then lost it to their inveterate foe, the Russian Communists. Early in the 1920's the country was attacked by the Red army; Ukrainians could not by themselves stave off this deadly threat. Soon the country was overrun, and their independent existence came to an end. Before long Ukraine was annexed to the Soviet Union. Since then, for more than 44 years, some 44 million Ukrainians have been captives of the Kremlin's Communist totalitarianism.

On the 47th anniversary of their independence day it is appropriate that we join them in its observance. We do this gladly in the fond hope of seeing them regain their freedom and independence once more and live in peace in their historic homeland, in their fair and fertile Ukraine.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, all peoples struggle to attain their national goals, their freedom and independence, and after attaining these goals, they do their utmost to retain them. In this task some have succeeded well, while others have not been so fortunate, and through some freakish turn and twist in international affairs over which they had no control, have witnessed their own tragic failure in this supreme task. The Ukrainians have been among these unfortunate people. By the inexorable forces of nature their fair land has been surrounded by powerful and aggressive neighbors, and these have shown no mercy in their dealings with the Ukrainians. Among the cruelest of these neighbors have been, and still are, the Russians. In the past, before World War I, they had held the Ukrainian people in bondage under their czarist autocracy. When that autocracy was shattered in 1917, Ukrainians asserted their freedom and proclaimed their independence on January 22, 1918.

That historic event seemed for a time to have turned a new page in Ukrainian history, but within 2 years, before the Ukrainian people barely had time to taste the sweetness and joy of their freedom, they were robbed of their richly deserved prize by the Red army of Communist Russia. That was in 1920, and during the last 44 years these ceaseless fighters for their freedom have known no freedom in their historic homeland. They have been held down under the unrelenting rule imposed upon them by the Kremlin. During all these years they have struggled hard to free themselves from the Kremlin's tyranny, but they have not been successful. On the 47th anniversay of their independence day we wish them success in future years.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, for many, this past Friday, January 22 had no special significance, yet for Ukrainians and people of Ukrainian descent throughout the world this day was one of solemnity and reverence. Forty-seven years ago the Ukraine proclaimed independence and established the Ukrainian National Republic, amidst greedy powerful neighbors. This day marked the end of almost 300 years of foreign domination and oppression. However, the realization of their long-nourished dream for freedom was doomed to perish before 2 years were finished.

Soviet imperialists eagerly eyed this rich and fertile land and the skilled and vigorous people of its soil. Hardly had the Ukrainians had a chance to enjoy their independence than the Red army attacked the country and crushed all Ukrainian opposition. The Ukraine thus became a mere satellite of Soviet Russia, and within a few years was forcibly incorporated into the U.S.S.R.

Now the Kremlin boasts that the Ukraine is free and independent in the attempt of the new Russian ruling class to discredit the growing charges in the free world that the Ukrainian nation is a captive people of Soviet imperialism. But we in the West are acutely aware of the Communist calculated transformation of the words "freedom" and "national independence." For them, the definition of Ukrainian independence is "national in form and Socialist in substance," which simply means that the Ukraine is allegedly "free" to develop within the structure of Ukrainian national values but only according to the "substance" or ideology of communism. Here is a serious contradiction of terms, for in reality freedom for the Ukrainians means that they are free only to obey Moscow's dictates, not to assert their own will. Nevertheless, it is clear that the Soviet Union has failed to destroy the Ukrainian spirit of freedom and self-determination.

We, as the leader of the free world, must never discourage the aspirations of captive nations. We must never allow the cause of freedom to suffer from any failure on our part. Indeed, we act in the highest American tradition when we raise our voices in behalf of those who aspire to be free and who wish to live a life of dignity and peace.

Americans of Ukrainian descent have made great and lasting contributions to the success of our political and economic system. They have defended our democratic institutions in time of war against totalitarian and imperialist foes. To these Ukrainian-Americans our Nation is ever grateful.

On this solemn occasion I, therefore, join hands with all freedom-loving peoples in commemoration of Ukrainian independence day. Let us all rededicate ourselves to the principle that has made our Nation great, the principle of self-determination, and let us pray that this principle will one day bring freedom to those who desire it.

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, the 22d of January is a significant day for every man who loves freedom. It was on this day, 47 years ago, that the Ukrainians, one of the great peoples of Eastern Europe, achieved their freedom. After centuries of being overrun by invaders, the Ukrainian people on this day in 1918 proclaimed their independence.

It was a freedom they fought hard for, and yet it was short lived. For in 1920 the budding union of all the Ukrainian lands was no more. It was swallowed up in the vast orbit of the Soviet Union. It was a bitter pill for the Ukrainians, who for centuries have been trying to repel invaders from their lands.

Though their liberty has been snuffed out, we here in the United States, whether of Ukrainian descent or just ordinary freedom-loving Americans, will never forget the 45 million Ukrainians now under Communist domination. We have memorialized in statuary, here in our Nation's Capital, Taras Shevchenko, that legendary Ukrainian poet who spoke loudly for freedom, and paid heavily with years of exile.

It is only fitting on this occasion that we pledge that their cause will not be forgotten as long as they are not free—free to worship their own God, free to speak their own tongue, free to enjoy their own culture, and free to live their own lives in dignity.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, Friday, January 22, 1965, marked the 47th anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the Ukraine from domination by Soviet Russia.

In commemorating that occasion, free people all over the world once again raise their voices in encouragement and sympathy to the valiant Ukrainian people.

Despite years of domination by the Kremlin, the spirit of a free Ukraine still is enshrined in the hearts of her sons and daughters, both within the homeland and outside.

Despite the fact that the Ukraine has been suppressed by totalitarian powers, incorporated forcibly into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, deprived of their individual political, economic, and religious freedoms, the people of that land look forward to the day when the Ukraine will once again resume its rightful place in the family of free nations.

It is my earnest hope that the people of the Ukraine will draw encouragement from the warm regard of the people of the United States for them. On this auspicious date, we extend our best wishes to the Ukrainian people and Americans of Ukrainian ancestry, and we pray that the oppression of their native land may soon be ended.

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to add my thoughts to those of my colleagues in paying tribute to one of the most valiant people ever to grace this earth. We are gathered today to commemorate the 47th anniversary of the Ukrainian Republic. Our meeting this afternoon, however, is not a completely festive occasion, for while we honor the men and women who struggled to make the Ukraine a free republic we are also mindful of the terrible burden borne by those who today live in the Ukraine.

Recently, we have heard many overtures from the Soviet leaders that they desire cordial relations with the Western world. Might I suggest that these leaders, who for so long have unjustly considered the Ukrainians as Russians, release these valiant people from the shackles of Communist imperialism. Might I also suggest that the U.S. Government go on record recognizing the rights of the people of the Ukraine to be free and self-governing.

I have the honor of representing a number of loyal Americans of Ukrainian descent. Nothing could please me more than to see these wonderful people reunited with their loved ones. It would indeed be a joyous day in Syracuse and Onondaga County if the Republic of the Ukraine were released forever from the yoke of Communist slavery.

IS THE WAR ON POVERTY GETTING OFF ON THE RIGHT FOOT?

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. GUBSER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, since the poverty program has been authorized and it is obvious that funds will be made available for its operation, it is my hope that they will be used in places where poverty does in fact exist and will not be spread over the entire country like icing on a political cake. I also hope the program will not be out of tune with economic reality.

My purpose today is not to prejudge the poverty program. It is my purpose to raise thoughtful and honest questions in the hope that the administration will analyze them in the same constructive spirit in which they are raised.

On January 18 a grant for the State of California from the Office of Economic Opportunity was announced: $3,811,265 was granted to the counties of Contra Costa, Los Angeles, San Francisco, Shasta, Ventura, and Santa Clara in California; $795,900 was granted to Santa Clara County to retrain 2,075 men and women with 6,200 dependents. The object of the retraining program will be to "lessen the impact of seasonal unemployment by removing deficiencies in skills that have limited public assistance recipients to seasonal jobs."

The trainees, the Poverty Office announced, will be given instruction as homemakers, and home health center and day care center aids.

I am privileged to represent about two-thirds of the county of Santa Clara. For 10 years before the recent reapportionment I represented all of Santa Clara County. For a moment, let us look at Santa Clara County and at what it has been doing for itself to assist those who are less fortunate and who are in need.

Santa Clara is a county of about 857,000 persons. It is recognized as the fastest-growing county, economically speaking and populationwise, in the United States. We have recently completed a beautiful new welfare building. Our county welfare department employs about 700 people. About 300 of these are qualified social workers, and there are 70 supervisors. The board of supervisors has recently authorized additional social worker positions.

Last year Santa Clara County disbursed almost $33 million in welfare funds. Including administration, the cost of programs administered last year by the Santa Clara County Welfare Department was in excess of $38 million. A little more than $16 million of this came from the Federal Government, $13 million from the State of California and Santa Clara County contributed approximately $9 million from local resources.

Santa Clara County is considered to be one of the most progressive counties in the Nation in welfare programs. Its district attorney has instituted a vigorous program to apprehend "weekend fathers" of children who are under the aid to needy children program. The Santa Clara County officials have recommended legislation that would allow children in the program to earn small amounts on the outside without penalty. This was recommended on the theory that earning some money might provide an incentive to earn more, and eventually take families off the aid to needy children program.

Santa Clara County officials have advocated legislation to make aid to needy children payments payable in the form of grocery orders in instances where a mother has a record of irresponsibility and has been known to spend her aid-to-needy-children payment in some local bar or tavern.

The Santa Clara County Welfare Department in the State of California has pioneered in retraining and reemployment programs. It has an active program today of placing welfare recipients in gainful employment.

I am proud to say that Santa Clara County is known and conceded to be the most progressive county in the State. This makes the county I represent one of the most progressive in the field of welfare in the entire Nation.

Under the new poverty program, it is mandatory that every welfare recipient be processed and considered for retraining under the Federal poverty program. Because of other legislation passed in the last Congress, local welfare agencies are now required as a practical matter to reduce the case loads per social worker from an average of 90 to 60 cases. One of the few shortages of available skills that we have in the State of California today is that of social workers. We cannot hire enough social workers. Now with this new requirement imposed upon our county by the poverty program, the shortage will become even more acute.

I heartily agree with the objective of the poverty program that welfare recipients should be taught new skills so that they are not solely dependent upon seasonal jobs, but present indications are that this new program will not be training Santa Clara County people for jobs that are available. In fact, it may well be training them for nonexistent jobs.

The State department of employment conducts a continuing labor market analysis for the Santa Clara County area. This analysis as of last week showed that the only jobs available in Santa Clara County, and which are unfilled, are for specialists in electronics, specialized engineers, for social workers, for pharmacists, for registered nurses, licensed vocational nurses, machinists with production experience, competent stenographers and secretaries, mechanics and domestics who will "live in."

Since 35 percent of the $795,900 grant given to Santa Clara County last week for the California work-experience program will be spent to transport and to feed trainees lunches and dinners and to provide other supplemental assistance, this means that there will only be an average of $249 spent on retraining each of the 2,075 trainees who have been designated under the program.

Obviously this will not be enough to produce the professional skills which are needed, such as specialists in electronics, social workers, pharmacists, registered nurses, licensed vocational nurses, machinists, competent stenographers, and competent secretaries. Yet these are the skills which are needed today in Santa Clara County. So, this program may only train more persons to compete for unskilled jobs which are in short supply.

As an example of what I believe may well be unrealistic planning which is out of tune with local economic reality, I point to my own hometown of Gilroy, Calif., in Santa Clara County. My home city was recently designated as a "pocket of poverty" by a Columbia Broadcasting System film and by poverty program officials. Such a designation is unfair to the city of Gilroy. An unrealistic retraining program based upon the assumptions which naturally follow that designation will have little chance of success.

By all the economic indicators, the city of Gilroy is enjoying a wave of prosperity, along with the rest of the Nation. We have had a steady increase in bank and savings and loan deposits, which set an alltime record in 1964. When the 1964 figures are known, postal receipts for Gilroy may be nearly double the figure for 1959, only 5 years ago. School population in Gilroy has increased by almost 30 percent since 1959. The dollar value of building permits has continued to climb to new records, and three times the number of new homes were started in 1963 than were started in 1960. Per capita wages and personal income increases in Gilroy compare favorably with any other area in the Nation.

Statistics show that Gilroy is hardly a pocket of poverty. Any broadcasting network or any Government agency which calls it such is guilty of overgeneralization and is hurting the chances for the future growth of a thriving, progressive community.

Though it is changing rapidly, Gilroy is still primarily an agricultural community, and much of its employment is seasonal. Many migrant families who work all over the State return to Gilroy for the winter in anticipation of occasional winter jobs and the "thinning" and "hoeing" which comes in early spring. They have made Gilroy their permanent home, because they like it there and because its agricultural employment season is longer and more stable. So a portion of each winter's welfare caseload is due to the fact that Gilroy is a better agricultural community in which to live.

The seasonal labor requirements of communities like Gilroy will not disappear so long as God's world is geared to the seasons of the year. Crops and food will continue to grow in the summer and will require seasonal labor. If the retraining program is successful in making year-round homemakers, or health and day care center aids out of Gilroy's seasonal workers, then it is obvious that new seasonal employees will have to take their places. They, too, will probably remain in Gilroy because it is a better place to live.

The bracero program has ended despite a continuing farm labor shortage, and now it appears that an effort will be made to remove domestic workers from seasonal employment, including agriculture. This is an inexcusable disregard of economic reality.

A poverty program should start with the recognition of the economic need of local areas and should preserve, rather than eliminate, the type of work force which the area needs. After this is done, then an effort should be made to find additional employment in the same area during the slack season.

There are countless possibilities for expanding employment opportunities during the off season which can be tailored to the economic realities of individual areas. In Gilroy, for example, it might be possible to extend the canning season to include nonperishable foods like dried beans, soups, meat products, and specialty foods. Workers could be trained to wire electronic subassemblies in their own homes on a piecework basis. And small baking and confectionery plants could be organized to utilize locally produced dried fruits during the winter season. To accomplish this, it is obvious that financial and tax incentives must be offered to companies to allow them to overcome the competitive disadvantage of operating on a seasonal basis. Labor unions would have to cooperate and relax some of their work and apprenticeship rules in order to open up year-round employment for the worker who is seasonally unemployed. Doing these things will not be easy, but they are the only ways in which an agricultural community can stabilize its pattern of employment.

Reducing seasonal unemployment is a desirable objective but it must start on the right foot instead of the approach being used in Gilroy and similar communities. It must complement existing employment opportunities instead of removing them.

When we come to the point where we are spending $795,900 in localized work-training programs as in the Santa Clara County, the programs must be adjusted to fit local problems.

I definitely fear this is not the case in Santa Clara County.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

A VOTE OF CONFIDENCE FOR THE DEMOCRATIC PROCESS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Utah [Mr. KING] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, the most recent Republican candidate for President has made a statement which, among other things, casts a serious reflection upon the Members of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Goldwater is quoted by the national press as having said, at the recent meeting of the Republican National Committee in Chicago, held on January 22:

> I wasn't dishonest enough in the last campaign to win. In order to win campaigns one must be dishonest or a little bit dishonest.

If this statement means what it purports to mean, then Mr. Goldwater is accusing every duly elected official in the United States of dishonesty. Mr. Goldwater is in effect attacking, not a political party, but a political system: the very system of which he is so ardent a supporter. In effect he is saying that in a democratically structured society it is impossible for a man to be elected by the people without resorting to dishonesty.

If this is his meaning, then I find myself impelled to ask the question: Is this doctrine of the inevitability of dishonesty uniquely applicable to democracy? Are we to infer that there is something about our free society that brings out the worst, rather than the best?

Let me remind those who resort to such fallacious generalities that this was the argument of one Adolph Hitler, in his takeover of the German Reich. During his rise to power he found his most vicious and most effective weapon to be the systematic disparagement of democratic processes, in the eyes of the German people. He, too, argued that democratically conducted elections were dishonest. Once that idea became firmly emplanted, the death knell of freedom quickly followed.

Perhaps Mr. Goldwater was inferring, not so much that democracy, as an abstract concept of government, bred dishonesty, but that it did so only in the case of America. This position, in my opinion, is even less tenable than the first. Let me remind the gentleman that America today stands as the chief exponent and the supreme example of democratic government throughout the world. If this supreme example turns out to be supremely bad, how can it be argued that the system which produced it is supremely good? How can America argue to the underdeveloped nations of the world that they should move in the direction of democracy, if one of their chief exponents takes such a dim view of the way in which it functions?

I hope that this tempest in a teapot will turn out to be nothing more than an unfortunate slip of the tongue on the part of the gentleman from Arizona. Or, perhaps the gentleman was misquoted. If so, I strongly urge him to set the record straight.

If there is one proposition on which Democrats and Republicans alike can agree it is that in America we have the noblest example of self-government in all the history of mankind. This is my own affirmation, and I would urge all who so feel to make themselves heard.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, if the statement attributed to Mr. Goldwater is true as it has been reported it is certainly one of the most amazing statements that I have ever read coming from a man who has not only run and lost an election but who has run for office and won elections.

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his contribution, with which I agree.

THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I had intended to talk primarily about certain aspects of the budget, but in light of the remarks just made by the gentleman from Utah [Mr. KING], I would like to observe that I think from what he quoted Senator Goldwater, he has misconstrued the meaning; not that Senator Goldwater himself would conduct such a campaign, but that such a campaign had been conducted. I regret to say—and I think there is constant concern in our society about demagoguery and how campaigns should be conducted with adherence to the truth—I regret to say that there is a school of political scientists, and I think I can describe it as a school, who actually teach what I call neo-Machiavellism; that the way to get things done in the Congress, for example, is through pressures and not through deliberation and consideration of the merits.

Mr. Speaker, I must say that in witnessing some of the things that have happened in the 14 years that I have been in the Congress, that seems to be the technique that is deliberately employed by certain people in government, to propagandize the people in respect to labels on issues, instead of discussing the very serious differences of opinion that do exist between those who have studied the measure, both Republicans and Democrats, and permit the Congress to deliberate upon these matters.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would share with the gentleman from Utah [Mr. KING] the thought that our Government is one of the best examples in history, if not the best example, of how government by the people can operate. However, the disease which he points out so well is something that forces us to be constantly on our guard against it.

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I will yield to the gentleman in just a minute.

Mr. Speaker, as I interpret Senator Goldwater's words, he is telling the people what he thinks did exist. I am not entirely sure but what he was right.

Mr. KING of Utah. Now, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. KING of Utah. Would the gentleman not agree, however, that my statement to the effect that no person in this country can be elected to public office without indulging in dishonest practices is a most deplorable statement and a reflection upon our great democracy?

Mr. CURTIS. If it is untrue, it is deplorable. But if it is true, it is something we had better pay a great deal of attention to. I must say that I am beginning to wonder whether in any sizable campaign, based upon the way the news media reports or fails to report, whether indeed this might be the case.

So I would answer the gentleman from Utah by saying that indeed I share with him his concern about the seriousness of the charge. I then say let us get to an examination of what the situation is with reference to campaigning in America today, as to whether or not the issues as they pertain, or the development of the issues as they pertain to social problems, are intelligently discussed, or whether or not it does not represent a battle of labels and an exchange of ignorance which goes on in much of our campaigning.

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield further to the gentleman.

Mr. KING of Utah. Would the gentleman not agree that it is most important that we establish the fact, once and for all, that under this democratic process, the overwhelming majority of the elected officials both in this body, and in the other body, as well as in the executive branch of our Government, are elected through honest rather than dishonest practices?

Mr. CURTIS. That is the issue. That is what our people should consider. That is what everyone here in this room should really be concerned about. I am wondering about it. I am not going, just through oratory, to pose the things I would like to believe, for example, that we have lived up to these fine traditions and that thereby we have them.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is time that we begin to take stock of ourselves here in the House as well as the manner in which our political campaigns have been conducted. A great personality cult is growing up in this country where we are not discussing political issues in political campaigns at all, but human beings and human frailties instead of great issues. I think the gentleman has put his finger on something that is very serious and I do not believe he is remiss in referring to what can happen, if it did happen in the recent political campaign, where demagoguery becomes rampant. But I say let us not dismiss this with fine oratory about how we wish it were not so. I say we had better pay direct attention to it, to correct it if it is even partially so.

THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

Now, Mr. Speaker, with reference to the discussion which I wanted to have in regard to the budget. It has some bearing on this very point of reporting honestly to the people. The budget presented to the Congress actually is a request for new obligational authority. The President has asked for $106.4 billion of new obligational authority for fiscal year 1966. In the budget also—but one has to dig for it—is a request for $6 billion of new obligational authority for fiscal 1965. This serves two purposes. I refer to the chart on page 15 which contains the President's request for new obligational authority. The chart relates to the previous year and it makes it look like his new request for authority of $106.4 billion is actually less than the obligational authority of 1965, which was $107.3 billion. But the $107.3 billion figure would be $101.3 billion—$6 billion less but for the request in this 1966 budget message for $5.978 billion supplemental new obligational authority for 1965. One purpose served, then, is to make the request for new obligational authority in 1966 seem less than the request in 1965 when actually it is $11 billion more.

The second point. This $106.4 billion is subject to the same criticism that the $101 billion request in the 1965 budget which was presented to the Congress last year now reveals it is subject to. That is, it has deficiencies inherent in it. Probably there will be a deficiency bill of around $6 or $7 billion presented at the next session of the Congress to make up for this new understatement of NOA requests. So that the real request for new obligational authority is going to show up to be $112 billion or $113 billion for fiscal year 1966. This, however, is not the main tenor of what I wish to discuss.

NOA is what the Congress is concerned with; namely, the requests for $106.4 and $5.978 billion new obligational authority. The public attention through the press releases of the executive department has been directed toward the expenditure level of 1966, which is stated in the budget to be $99.7 billion and Congress has little to do with this. On page 43 of the budget one gets a clearer understanding of the distinction between the request for new obligational authority, which we call our appropriation bills, and the expenditures in a given fiscal year. Incidentally, this is only revealed in a table, table 8, page 43. But there is no text accompanying this table to explain it, but the main thrust is there for anyone to see.

There is the new authority recommended to the Congress of $106.4 billion. Below it in the table is the unspent authorizations enacted in prior years, $96.7 billion carried over. So if the Congress votes new authority to spend $106.4 billion that will be added to the $96.7 billion, which would give the President $203.1 billion in authority to spend in fiscal 1966 if he were to choose, or to let any portion of it go into the fiscal years 1967 and 1968 if he chooses.

But, then, the President has said he will only spend this $99.7 billion. He will not spend the $106.4.

Again, at the bottom of the table is the carryover in unspent authorizations for expenditure in future years beyond 1966. It accumulates to where there are $101.5 billion carryover for July 1, 1966, not the $96.7 that will be available as a carryover beginning on July 1, 1965. It will be increased by another $5 billion.

The Congress has no control over the expenditure level in any given fiscal year. This has been the unresolved problem in this legislative body. That is the fait accompli that comes to this Congress and the Ways and Means Committee when we have to consider the problems in the field of debt management. There is no way in which Congress can actually produce a balanced budget in a given year. The request for new obligational authority is not related directly to the expenditure in a particular fiscal year. It is these new obligational authorities, plus those we have not used and have accumulated that gives the President his total authority to spend. The Congress has no way of exercising judgment over the rate of expenditure in any fiscal year save by one cumbersome means and that is by the debt ceiling.

That is why I take the floor at this time to point out that the President in his budget, page 26, has stated that he is going to have to ask for an increase in the debt ceiling this year under the assumptions of this budget. The debt at the end of fiscal 1964 is $312.5 billion. The debt at the end of fiscal 1965 is estimated to be $316.9 billion, and the debt at the end of 1966 is estimated to be $322.5 billion. See page 26 of the budget.

The present debt ceiling is $324 billion. We have to have $5 or $6 billion, which is a low figure, in working cash. So it is very clear that the $324 billion debt ceiling will not be adequate to handle this kind of expenditure even if the President limited himself to the $99.7.

If the Congress wanted to cut that $99.7 billion expenditure level down for fiscal 1966 it could hold the debt ceiling at $324 billion and might even lower it and reduce the expenditure level to say $95 billion. Certainly Congress could hold it to $324 billion, and say to the President: We think that because of problems in the field of debt management we should not increase the debt further, that we already have problems as far as managing the Federal debt is concerned which are contributing to our gold outflow, which underlies the imbalances in our international payments, which are bringing about increased prices of goods and services which makes it more difficult for us to compete in the international marketplace, and so creates unemployment.

The inflationary forces that we have already set loose will be furthered through this process.

The point is that the Congress will have only one way in which it can exercise its judgment over the actual budget for fiscal 1966 as far as it relates to total expenditures in relation to our revenue. We are going to collect only about $94.4 billion, according to the President's Budget, leaving us shy under his estimate of expenditures by about $5.3 billion.

It is when it comes time for the Committee on Ways and Means to consider the question of whether or not we should increase the debt ceiling that Congress will have this one very inadequate, I might say, method of exercising its judgment over the basic fiscal policies of this country which relate to a balanced budget.

I have long argued that the Ways and Means Committee should develop the technique of using the debt-ceiling legislation as a method whereby Congress exercise an independent judgment over what Congress felt the actual balance in the budget for the fiscal year should be. We have not developed these techniques, I must admit. I must also say that even if properly developed it is a cumbersome way of handling this problem.

In the Reorganization Act of 1946 the Congress did attempt to set up a process for developing a legislative budget. This too proved cumbersome, and the technique has never been used, although it is still the law. The members of the Ways and Means Committee, of the Appropriations Committee, of the Senate Finance Committee, and of the Senate Appropriations Committee, are supposed to meet each year and prepare a legislative budget that relates expenditure to our income so Congress can consider the difficult problems that are involved, the economic problems that are involved in our debt-management policy.

So I urge the Congress and the people to keep their eyes on the fate of the bill which will be introduced at the request of the President to increase the debt ceiling.

ASSISTANCE FOR SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFICIARIES WITH DEPENDENT PARENTS

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, under our Social Security Act special provision is made to allow for extra benefits to those beneficiaries who have other persons dependent upon them. These special provisions have been applied to the case of the beneficiary's spouse and his dependent children, but at the present time no added benefit is given for the beneficiary who also has dependent parents to support.

Cases have been called to my attention in which social security beneficiaries, even those receiving their benefits under the normal retirement provisions of the OASDI, support dependent parents and I see no reason why we should not treat parents as we do any other person dependent upon the beneficiary in establishing the amount of benefits to be given. For this reason, I have today introduced legislation which would provide monthly benefits for dependent parents of individuals entitled to old-age or disability social security benefits.

This proposal does not increase the overall top benefit which may be paid on a single account. However, where the top benefit level has not been reached, this would be effective to increase the monthly payments and help defray the beneficiaries in supporting their dependent parents.

A BILL TO AMEND THE ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT ACT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRASER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a companion to the bill introduced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN], chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act.

This proposed legislation will provide a 4-year authorization of $55 million for the fiscal years 1966 through 1969.

The authorization under which the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency is currently operating will expire on June 30, 1965. The need for arms-control measures was never so obvious as now when more countries are acquiring a nuclear capability.

Since the Agency was created in 1961, we have taken three significant steps in the field of arms control: The nuclear test ban treaty, the establishment of the "hot line" between Washington and Moscow, and the United Nations resolution calling upon all nations to refrain from placing nuclear weapons in outer space.

The presence of an increasing number of nuclear nations makes an already insecure world even more shaky. Developments in recent years have shown us that military superiority can no longer guarantee stability and security. The day has passed when the strongest nation is the most safe and secure nation.

President Kennedy put it eloquently when he said "as our power has grown, so has our peril." Weapons and their accumulation alone can no longer guarantee security.

William Foster, the Director of ACDA, said recently that "the road to peace and arms control is slow and arduous, but it is one which we must travel." The approval of this bill by the Congress will take us another important step along that road.

THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS: IMPLEMENTING THE INTERNATIONAL COFFEE AGREEMENT REMAINS A SIGNIFICANT PROBLEM

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, last week I addressed the House on the subject of the Alliance for Progress and the significant advances that have been made in the past year. The Alliance's third annual review meeting at Lima, Peru, last month highlighted a year's activity in which through U.S. assistance alone 300,000 homes and 26,000 classrooms will have been built; 11 million textbooks will have been printed; 280,000 agricultural credit loans will have been extended; 850 health centers, hospitals, or mobile health units will have been built; 1,500 wells and water systems will have been drilled or installed; and food will have been provided for 22 million people, by the middle of this year. These are some of the tangible results of inter-American cooperation and efforts under the Alliance for Progress.

But despite the significant advances of the Alliance, significant problems remain. Not the least of these was the failure of the 88th Congress to pass the implementing legislation to the International Coffee Agreement. Fears and criticism of protectionist actions on the part of the United States, largely as a result of our inaction on the coffee agreement, were expressed to Assistant Secretary of State Thomas Mann at the December meeting in Peru.

The background of the International Coffee Agreement is well known. But it is important enough to be repeated, for widespread understanding on the part of the Members of Congress is essential if we are to act wisely with respect to our policy with the nations of Latin America.

In 1957 the coffee-producing countries of Latin America and Africa attempted but failed to establish a worldwide system of export regulation of coffee. Because of the great fluctuations of coffee prices on the world market such an agreement was considered necessary as a stabilizing influence. Why is stabilization needed in this industry? Because in several of the Latin American countries, principally Brazil, coffee exports exercise a dominating influence on the national economies, and if the coffee industry in those countries is not stable, then their economies will not be stable.

In 1958 the United States took the lead role in seeking a long-term solution to the coffee price problem. Through the then Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, Thomas Mann, a coffee study group made up of the major coffee-producing countries and the major coffee-consuming countries, was created to study the entire matter and to recommend a solution.

In 1962, with the United States again in the lead, the coffee study group proposed the establishment of the International Coffee Agreement as a long-term solution to the problem. That summer a meeting was held in New York City with representatives of the countries involved, under the auspices of the United Nations, and the International Coffee Agreement was negotiated. The U.S. Senate ratified the agreement in May 1963. To carry out its responsibilities under it, enabling or implementing legislation was required. It is this implementing legislation which Congress failed to pass last year.

It is a fact that several Latin American countries are built on a one-commodity or a one-crop economy. The dangers inherent in such economies are obvious. It is therefore important not only to the well-being of those countries but to the well-being of the entire Western Hemisphere that those one-crop economies be diversified. Diversification is one of the major aims, if not the major aim, of the Alliance for Progress. For a nation to prosper and progress it must be stable. In order for it to be stable its economy must be stable, and a diversified economy tends to be more stable than a one-crop economy.

So diversification has been an important goal of our policy in Latin America. It is for this reason that the U.S. Government helped promote the International Coffee Agreement. We want the one-crop countries based on coffee to diversify. But they cannot diversify if they cannot sell even their one crop.

And if they do not sell their one crop they will not be stable.

In July of 1964 Senator Wayne Morse, warned that "a rejection of the agreement would be costly to us as far as the development of misunderstanding in Latin America is concerned." This was a prophetic warning which we in Congress would now do well to heed. Misunderstanding has developed in Latin America over our failure to carry through with our end of the International Coffee Agreement. This misunderstanding was clearly and amply demonstrated last month at the meeting in Peru. Our representative to the meeting, Thomas Mann, stated at that time in response to Latin American criticisms of the United States:

> I share your disappointment that our Congress did not pass in its 1964 session, the implementing legislation to the coffee agreement.

It is imperative that the 89th Congress act favorably on the implementing legislation at the earliest possible time if we are to support our end of the bargain entered into when we signed the International Coffee Agreement and when it was ratified by the Senate, and if the Alliance for Progress is to go forward.

With unanimous consent, I am inserting at this point in the Record, two articles from the New York Times by Juan de Onis concerning the problems I have touched upon. The first, dated December 7, 1964, is entitled "U.S. Trade Bars Feared by Latins"; the second, dated December 9, 1964, is a report of the December meeting in Lima, Peru, and is entitled "Mann Asks Latins To Avoid Attacks":

[From the New York Times, Dec. 7, 1964]

U.S. Trade Bars Feared by Latins—Alliance for Progress Urged To Fight Restrictions

(By Juan de Onis)

Lima, Peru, December 6.—Latin American fears of U.S. trade protectionism have generated the most discordant issue of an Alliance for Progress conference here.

The United States cast the lone vote against a report by a committee on foreign trade that would give the Alliance's coordinator, Carlos Sanz de Santamaria, precise instructions to fight trade restrictions.

The report was prepared at the technical level of the Alliance and is subject to study by a ministerial-level meeting that began yesterday. Dr. Sanz Santamaria indicated that he would seek a compromise solution during negotiations this week.

Meanwhile, Chile's new Christian Democratic Government opened what promised to be a prolonged fight against the present structure of the Organization of American States and Gen. Jose Antonio Mora.

FUND'S TRANSFER URGED

The Chilean delegation proposed that a "special assistance for development fund," now under Dr. Mora's control, pass to the Inter-American Committee for the Alliance for Progress, a steering group that is headed by Dr. Santamaria.

Behind the move to shift the $8 million fund, the Chileans said, was a policy to strengthen the steering group, a "new dynamic body," and to reduce the influence of the OAS on the hemisphere's economic and social development programs. The Chileans described the OAS as "archaic" and "discredited."

The Alliance for Progress is a 10-year program established in 1961 by the American Republics, with the promise of $20 billion in U.S. aid and investment, to further economic development of Latin America and to encourage social reforms.

ACCESS IS AN ISSUE

The two new issues facing the review conference reflected the growth in the prestige of the steering committee, a body set up at the Alliance's review meeting in São Paulo, Brazil last year.

The Latin American preoccupation with U.S. trade policies centers on real or feared restrictions on access to the U.S. market for Latin America's basic exports and on possible declines in commodity prices.

U.S. delegates told the Latin American representatives that President Johnson would renew in the next Congress the administration's fight to obtain final ratification of a stabilizing agreement for the world's coffee prices.

[From the New York Times, Dec. 9, 1964]

Mann Asks Latins To Avoid Attacks—Seeks Reasonable Attitude Toward U.S. Trade Curbs

(By Juan de Onis)

Lima, Peru, December 8.—The United States asked its Latin American partners in the Alliance for Progress today to be reasonable and avoid "unnecessary divisions."

Thomas C. Mann, Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, gave his response at the Alliance's third annual review meeting to a succession of objections by Latin American delegates to U.S. actions on international trade.

These criticisms included the failure of the U.S. Congress to approve legislation to implement the world coffee price stabilization agreement, a lapse in U.S. sugar import legislation and Congressional endorsement of meat import quotas.

"Much has been said here about protectionism in the United States," Mr. Mann said. "I share your disappointment that our Congress did not pass, in its 1964 session, the implementing legislation to the coffee agreement."

He went on to observe that "President Johnson has publicly stated that the enabling legislation will be resubmitted to the next Congress."

RESTRAINT ON SURPLUSES PLEDGED

Stressing that the United States buys 40 percent of Latin America's exports and pays in convertible currency, Mr. Mann said that the United States would "continue to exercise restraint in the export of our surplus commodities." Some of the exports, such as wheat, cotton, and meat, compete with basic Latin American exports.

The Alliance for Progress is a 10-year program in which the United States has joined 19 Latin American republics, with the exception of Cuba, to accelerate their economic and social development. The United States has pledged $20 billion in public and private capital to help reach goals of economic growth, housing, education, health, and rural reform.

Mr. Mann said that there had been "solid achievements" this year in the development of a steering organization for the Alliance's work, the Inter-American Committee for the Alliance for Progress. Carlos Sanz de Santamaria, a former Minister of Finance in Colombia, is the chairman.

"It has completed the first cycle of country-by-country studies ever made in our hemisphere," Mr. Mann said. "It has recommended specific and concrete courses of action to countries and international organizations on how to accelerate progress."

URGES BETTER EXECUTION

He went on: "What is needed now is better execution, better performance by all of us in the Alliance * * *. If we can continue to work honestly and sincerely for human progress, rather than for short-term personal or political advantages of individuals or groups, we shall see an ever-growing number of countries join those who have already achieved viable and relatively self-sustaining economies."

Delegates from Chile, Mexico, and Ecuador gave major emphasis to the desirability of direct international financing for the economic integration of Latin America.

The weakness of Latin America as a bloc in negotiating trade relations with the United States, the European Common Market, and the Socialist bloc led by the Soviet Union was mentioned repeatedly.

Mr. Mann said that to increase export earnings the Latin Americans should diversify exports and try to sell in greater volume, as well as "get on with the job of making the Latin American regional trading arrangements more effective."

He also laid heavy stress on private investment as a stimulant to economic growth.

PERPETUAL EDUCATION

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. Staggers] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, an article in the January 1965 issue of Harper's magazine considers one of the many devices presently being developed for the purpose of raising the level of competence in a world where vocational requirements grow increasingly more sophisticated. Speaking in general terms of the whole problem of education, the author makes some quite startling, but obviously correct, statements:

> Neither white-collar nor blue-collar workers can expect to make a lifetime career out of what they have been instructed to do for their present jobs.
>
> Nobody will be safe from instruction.
>
> Some of the subject matter (required for those who can get and hold jobs) will have been taught to generations of learners. Some won't exist until next year. Some will be taught once only, after which the surge of new information will erase the subject.
>
> We have in the United States 25 million adult men with less than eighth-grade education and at the other end of the educational scale we have upward of 3 million males enrolled in college-level courses. Add to these the men in the armed services and Government services, and all of the men learning jobs in industry, and you have a considerable segment of adult males who are, or ought to be, under formal instruction.

What the author said about men would presumably apply with equal force to women.

The old idea of finishing your education must be thrown into the discard. Training for future needs has become the major concern of the young. Their elders must accept the thesis that they too can learn—in fact, that they must learn—as long as they draw the breath of life.

It is fitting, then, that all of us should adopt education, both general education and specialized education, as the No. 1 problem of this period of national life. A casual survey of current discussion of the problem reveals the present existence of at least four major attacks already marshaling their forces. It may be desirable to look at each briefly.

First, there are the regular State and local public school systems. These have been spurred to action by criticisms of the quality and quantity of their instructional programs. Interest has been focused on three separate groups of potential students: First, the college-material type who do not go on with their education due to lack of financial resources or to a degree of indifference; second, the dropouts who are insufficiently motivated to complete the training easily available to them; third, the older unemployed who need retraining for jobs presently available. A variety of proposals are under consideration by public school systems to take care of each of these groups. In a few cases, an ambitious program to take care of all these groups in one institution has been projected; one such for Greenbrier County, W. Va.

The second major attack comes from recently established Federal programs designed primarily to furnish retraining for unemployed youth and adults in underdeveloped areas, such as those contemplated in the poverty bill passed in the 88th Congress and the Appalachian bill which is proposed for the consideration of the 89th Congress.

Third on the list is the well-established training programs conducted first, by the armed services of the United States and, second, by most of our big private industries. The armed services offer as an inducement for enlisting a thorough training in skills which are useful to the services, and which are equally in demand in private life after the enlistee completes his military service. Private industry has also found it expedient to set up training programs for all employees from the lowest ranks up to potential supervisory and executive material. Programs intended to teach the various skills required for workmen are customarily carried on in the industry's plants. It is a type, or an extension, of the old and well-known system of apprenticeship. Supervisory and executive possibilities may be sent to universities and technical schools at company expense.

The fourth attack on the educational front is one that is just getting underway, but it may have important results. Press reports indicate that a number of leaders of the various Negro groups which have been fighting for civil rights assert that they intend to shift their emphasis to a positive program for better job training and retraining. Several organizations are sponsoring vocational training, some of them aided by Federal grants and some by private grants. Said one of the leaders:

> We have to move into the much more difficult area of trying to upgrade the whole Negro community so that we can achieve the educational, economic, and political equality which are necessary if we're to make full use of the freedoms which we are fighting for and winning.

The movement is important because it furnishes a necessary stimulus toward action which must be implemented by other agencies. That is, it must be absorbed in one or more of the other movements.

All these attacks on the educational problem may be regarded as experimental. They are forced on the agencies and institutions involved by necessity. Doubtless the armed services and industrial organizations would prefer to select most of their recruits from individuals already possessing the basic training for the services they are chosen to perform. The fact that they do not possess such training forces them to act in their own interests. The cost is considerable, and the time spent in training is lost for productive uses. Nevertheless both the armed services and industry have been highly successful in developing the skills they need. They have two advantages working for them. First, they do not have to deal with the population as a whole. They can and do select individuals who give promise, in their judgment, of being able to learn what they wish to teach. The armed services, for instance, do not offer specialized technical training to all their recruits; only to those who can pass appropriate tests. Second, and probably more important, the incentives to learn are very strong. The learner can see clearly the way to position, to prestige, and to higher pay.

It must be admitted that Federal projects to retrain displaced workers have not been significantly successful. In the case of a number of apparently well-planned projects, newspaper reports indicate that only a minor fraction of those eligible for the training take advantage of it. Various reasons may be assigned for this lack of interest. But the underlying reason must be that the training prepares for only possible jobs, not real and certain jobs. There can be no guarantee that the learner is going immediately out of training into a satisfactory and paying job.

A recent TV documentary program dealt with efforts to transplant unemployed coal miners from West Virginia to copper mines in Montana. The workers were said to prefer mining to other occupations. The copper mines needed workmen. Working conditions were not importantly different. The pay was good, in fact, better than pay in the coal mines because the copper mines operated continuously rather than intermittently. One miner indicated that the average workman could make $40 per day. Several hundred workmen were brought to Montana. But many of them returned to West Virginia after only a short stay. Various reasons were given: separation from families; a strange and unfamiliar social environment; protection of seniority and pension rights in the coal mining industry. Emotionally, they were not prepared to make the change.

The author of the Harper's magazine article referred to above puts the situation in a nutshell: "It is amazingly difficult to instruct adults." All teenagers will agree with this.

Now consider the case of the public schools. They have been playing with the idea of vocational instruction for generations. Federal support for training in agriculture and in home economics began early in the century. A general estimate might be that such training has been only moderately useful. Few of those enrolled in the courses took their work seriously. More recently the schools have added instruction in various manual arts. These have suffered a similar mediocrity of success.

The controlling fact is that the public schools are oriented toward the promotion of literacy. They have been so oriented from the beginning of our national history. They have been continuously admonished that a successful democracy is composed of a literate citizenry. Their programs of instruction and their techniques of instruction have been developed and refined with the object of producing literacy. This laudable aim must be, so far as we can see, their continuing dominative interest.

Several things have happened in modern times to make the drive toward universal literacy insufficient for our needs. Something must be added.

The public schools have acquired an enormous prestige. Their work has been accepted as the key to success in life. In their prepossession with literacy they have unintentionally conferred prestige upon literacy, with a corresponding lack of prestige on practical arts.

This is a wide departure from ancient ideas of the educated man. In all ages, the educated man was the man whose practical skill matched his mental preeminence. The great men of history were doers as well as thinkers, whether it was in the field of the arts, or science, or the professions, or government. An educated mind apart from an educated body was unthinkable, as it should be.

The public schools, taking as their prime function the development of the mind, have unfortunately created the impression that skill of mind is ennobling, while skill of muscle is not necessarily so, and may even be degrading. Those whose inherited or acquired aptitudes drive them toward manipulation of things rather than toward manipulation of ideas get the feeling that they are the rejects of society. They resent it, and so come to resent the public schools which foster the idea, however unintentionally.

A second development of modern times is the almost complete separation of the modern working world of the adult from the learning world of the child. A few generations ago it was possible for the school to confine itself to literacy because the child was in daily contact with the various operations necessary to feed and clothe the world, to provide shelter, or to make and operate the mechanical contraptions which facilitate production. He learned about doing outside of school, not only how to do, but why it was necessary to do. Today there is no segregation so absolute as the segregation of the working world from the learning world. The school is an artificial society. Anyone who has had experience in trying to teach Johnnie to read is aware of the difficulty of finding words which appeal to his experience. He has no acquaintance with the things or acts which express meaning in the working world. Things come to him from some benevolent source without his knowledge of how or why they come.

The child is confined in this artificial society until, hopefully, he has grown adult in body. Then he is thrown out into a working world, and is expected to conform to its requirements. He has not been prepared for his responsibility. But he has finished his education. He wants to make a lot of money, and quick. He has no notion of fooling around playing with the children any longer.

In a truly comprehensive and totally sufficient school system, all these elements must somehow be brought together and synthesized. The whole educative process must be accepted as a unity, beginning in infancy and continuing through life. It is important to do and it is important to learn so that we may do better. Experience and training must be synonymous. Some of us will work mainly with things and others will work mainly with ideas. They are equally and mutually status occupations. Our society needs machinists and typists and lawyers. It would be foolish to abolish segregation based on race and set up an even more rigid segregation based on membership in a labor union or in the American Bar Association.

It seems logical and inevitable that most of the details of total education will come under the management and direction of the public school system. To scatter them around among diverse agencies would destroy the unity which education is supposed to produce. The school system has the organization around which direction could be effected most economically. It has the technical know-how of the teaching job. It is accustomed to the job of selecting and grading material for the various stages of learning.

What it lacks, of course, is money. Money is needed both to provide equipment and to train and pay the personnel that would be required to operate a comprehensive system. The total cost would be enormous, measured by modern standards.

Some 50 years ago macadamized roads began to be built in quantity. The cost of macadam roads at that time, if memory is correct, was something like $8,000 per mile. It was considered an extravagant outlay, but probably worth it. A few days ago a modern highway through open country was put in use. It cost, said the newspaper report, $1 million per mile. And that would be cheap if built through thickly settled areas. Thus do people's notions about cost versus value change in a short time. So far no education speech or publication has even dreamed of such escalation applied to the schools.

Both the administrative and the legislative branches of the Federal Government have expressed interest in providing increasingly larger sums for what is called general education. The problem is how and where to apply the money so that it will do the most good. There are problems of public education versus private education, State and local control versus Federal control, distribution of funds according to need versus per capita distribution, and so on. In lieu of finding some common ground for agreement on these issues, it may be tempting to set up more and more projects designed for specific situations and needs. A more promising procedure might seem to be to boldly grasp the principles which would govern an effective modern educational program, and to disregard the political considerations involved in the controversial issues. Otherwise the goal of a training system that will prepare every individual for effective participation in modern life will be moved still further into the future.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. Moore (at the request of Mr. Gerald R. Ford), indefinitely, on account of death in his family.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. King of Utah, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. Lindsay (at the request of Mr. Del Clawson), for 1 hour, on January 27.

Mr. Curtis (at the request of Mr. Del Clawson), for 15 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

All Members (at the request of Mr. Mahon) in the body of the Record on the President's budget message.

Mr. Dorn and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Holland.

Mr. Lindsay and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Del Clawson) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Stanton.

Mr. Anderson of Illinois.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Evins of Tennessee) and to include extraneous matter):

Mr. Teague of Texas.

Mr. Celler.

Mr. Gallagher.

SIR WINSTON CHURCHILL

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Albert] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, and further ask unanimous consent that all Members speaking on this subject today may revise and extend their remarks, and I also ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the whole world shares the sorrow of the family and friends of Sir Winston Churchill, a world citizen of extraordinary dimensions, who on yesterday departed this life in the city of London.

Of all men who have lived in the 20th century, Sir Winston may well have lived the fullest life. For more than 90 years he walked among us as one of God's noblest and most remarkable creatures.

Sir Winston, the articulate spokesman for the cause of free men in World War II, was unquestionably the one man behind whom all the forces of freedom rallied in the fight against Nazi and Facist tyranny.

He was the first outstanding public figure in the world to warn against the threat that Hitler posed.

He was the first to raise the warning flag, as disciples of appeasement began to raise their heads among the free nations of Western Europe. There are many, he said, who would feed the crocodile only to be devoured by him in the end.

Among all public men whose lives and careers were identified with World War II, Churchill's name stands preeminent.

But, Mr. Speaker, Winston Churchill's leadership in this era is not his only claim to historic recognition. Had he passed on even before Hitler's armies began to march, he would have had a prominent place in the annals of his country. He was acclaimed as the best debater in Parliament and was the unchallenged prince of British orators for more than half a century. He was a fighting man of great courage and talent—an author of rare distinction. Of all those who spoke the English language in this century, Winston Churchill spoke it best. In his speeches and in his writings, he demonstrated again the strength and the beauty of Shakespeare's language. Rugged, determined, articulate, witty, courageous, he was every inch a man. Historian, philosopher, and statesman, he as much as any other human being understood and raised his voice against the dangers of tyranny from both the right and the left.

This generation and the world in which it lives—future generations and the world of tomorrow—all who will ever cherish freedom will owe a lasting debt of gratitude to Sir Winston Churchill.

Today in sorrow, respect, and affection, we salute this great man. This man whose life was wholly affirmative. This man who in battle would accept only victory. This man whose courage never faltered. This champion of liberty who was unbending in his determination to preserve Christian civilization against the onslaughts of evil despots.

Mr. Speaker, we in America proudly and rightfully share in the glory of Churchill's fame and rejoice in the scope of his accomplishments. The son of an American mother, the first and only honorary American citizen in the history of this country, an ally and friend in every major battle, we can say that Winston Churchill was in a very real sense one of our own.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as the flags fly at half-mast—as prince and pauper offer their last farewells—all good men rejoice that Winston Churchill passed our way in our day and generation. He hung his star high. Among history's most distinguished statesmen, he has set new patterns of human achievement which aspiring youth may seek to emulate for years and centuries to come.

As his countrymen mourn him and lay his remains to rest, decent men and women everywhere will surely proclaim: Well done, thou good and faithful servant, in whom we are well pleased.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, from time to time in the history of nations there emerges a man, as human as the rest of us, but one able to capture for himself and his country the respect and imagination of all of us. By native intelligence, force of personality, diligent effort, determined leadership, and a sense of the historical, Sir Winston Churchill became that kind of man.

He belongs first of all to Great Britain but every nation in the free world is richer because he lived. The entire world has felt the impact of his work and the fullness of his spirit.

England has lost a leading public figure. Mankind is bereft of a symbol which has stood for the finest qualities in our humanity: courage, tenacity, ability, dedication—all used in the eternal struggle for freedom and justice.

We in the United States join our fellowmen everywhere in mourning the passing of one of the great men of our time. He is gone but his work remains as an inspiration to us and all who follow.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, England, the United States of America, and all of the world have lost a vigorous, effective, and most successful champion of freedom, democracy, and decency, the Right Honorable Sir Winston Spencer Churchill.

During World Wars I and II, Sir Winston was the cannon, the ammunition, the ramrod, the warhead, and the marksman which literally blew Britain's enemies and those of world peace out of the water with a direct hit. Of course, our great Nation came to Britain's aid—but Sir Winston had called the war shots with the phenomenal accuracy endowed with a clairvoyant mind.

His famous "blood, toil, sweat, and tears" speech in the House of Commons on May 13, 1940, mobilized the talents, the ingenuity, and the challenge, stirred the hearts, and provided the inspiration that turned the tide against Hitler. It came at a time when Britain stood all alone.

My colleagues, on March 12, 1963, I made a speech here in the House urging the passage of legislation that would confer honorary citizenship upon this truly great statesman of the world. This legislation had been introduced by all of us who were members of the Immigration and Nationality Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, no matter how hard I tried here today, I sincerely do not believe that I could pay Sir Winston a better tribute than was contained in my March 1963 Churchill speech. So, my colleagues, if you will please be so kind as to forgive me and bear with me, I will quote a few excerpts from my previous remarks about this resolute, valiant, unconquerable Englishman. I quote:

> To find words adequate to describe properly this distinguished man is comparable to gilding the lily, bringing cotton to Alabama, the derby to England, and good bourbon to my native Kentucky.
>
> His bravery, his fortitude, his tenacity of purpose, and his unyielding desire to win shall never be forgotten.
>
> In my opinion, his achievements shall stand out forever like the Washington Monument, Big Ben, the Eiffel Tower, and the pyramids. By his unselfish service to mankind, he has emblazoned his name with honor and everlasting distinction in huge letters of gold on the silver pages of world history. Why? Because during war, travail, "blood and tears and sweat," fear, want, privation, devastation, chaos, and despair—at a time when it seemed all was lost—this incomparable leader was the epitome of hope, the very embodiment of courage, the preserver of time, the protector of faith, the guardian of destiny, the inspiration for victory, and the successful negotiator of the peace.

Quoting further:

> To paraphrase one of his own famous statements: "Never in the field of human conflict was so much owed by so many to one man."
>
> May he have a full fruition of his dreams and a happy realization of all of his endeavors. May his leaf never wither and whatsoever he doeth, may it prosper. May God in His infinite wisdom spare and protect our beloved friend, Sir Winston, for many years to come and may He who reigns as the King of Kings, the Master of all lodges, nations, and men, smile graciously, abundantly, beautifully, and everlasting from His wide blue canopy of heaven upon this, our worthy candidate for the position of the world's most honored peacemaker since that lowly Man walked the shores of Galilee many centuries ago. * * *
>
> Thank the Lord, he did not place his light under a bushel, but on a candlestick and it giveth light unto all in the house.
>
> I trust that Sir Winston will forgive my inadequate words of praise—and I say this from a humble heart—because, unfortunately, not in America nor in England nor any place else on the face of the globe, is there another Churchill with the command of the King's English which he alone possesses.

My colleagues, this great but humble man, when he had heard that I had made this speech, wrote me the following letter which I prize so dearly and so highly that the original is now framed along with a picture of President Kennedy signing the legislation into law, and one of the pens with which he signed it:

> MY DEAR CHELF: I am indeed obliged to you for the very agreeable things you say about me and for the graceful way you expressed them. Pray accept my good wishes.
>
> Yours very sincerely,
>
> WINSTON CHURCHILL.

May the Good Lord bless Lady Churchill and all of their wonderful family in this great void which has come to them.

The Good Lord, in his infinite wisdom, as I see it, literally lent us Sir Winston and allowed us the benefits and fruits of his labors for lo these past 90 years. Obviously, He could not allow us to retain forever this magnificent leader of men and so the Master has called Sir Winston back to that mansion of rest on high. The free world thanks you dear Lord for the loan of Sir Winston.

Again, I repeat from my 1963 speech: "Hail, noble Englishman. Hail, great American."

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman for his very eloquent tribute.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON].

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with the distinguished majority leader in paying my own small tribute to a great statesman, a great man and a great Englishman, Sir Winston Churchill. We are all in his debt, as the majority leader has already indicated, whether we be Americans or citizens of some other country.

The quality that has always stood out above all others, in my judgment, in the career of Sir Winston Churchill, is courage. He displayed physical courage as a war correspondent and when he was a young subaltern on the fields of India and of Africa. He displayed great courage and indomitability as the leader of the free world and of his own country in the dark days of World War II.

But, Mr. Speaker, I think there is another aspect of courage that perhaps has been overlooked in the career of Sir Winston Churchill, and that is the courage he displayed, the moral courage, in his unwillingness to alter or compromise or ignore his own beliefs and convictions simply because they were not at the time very popular. We know Sir Winston as the great leader of his country. But let us not forget that only a few months before he was called, on May 10, 1940, to take over the war leadership of his country, he had been, at age 65 already tabbed as a has-been, a back-bencher, a dissenter who was unable to agree with members of his own party and sometimes members of other parties, too, simply because he had refused to back down from his deep conviction which he held throughout the 1930's of the urgency of rearming England to deal with the growing menace of Hitler's Nazi tyranny.

The fact that Sir Winston was right after all was brought out only because of his courage and determination in sticking by those views even though they were for too long a time unpopular with the majority of Englishmen.

Mr. Speaker, last November 30, on the occasion of the 90th birthday of Sir Winston Churchill, I happened to be in London as a member of the Naval Reserve on training duty. Although I realized that it would be difficult if not impossible to see Sir Winston at that time, and though I had never seen him personally at all, I could not resist the temptation to walk around to Hyde Park Gate, and to walk down that little cul-de-sac and stand there for a few minutes in front of his home at No. 28.

As we pause here today in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, to pay tribute to Sir Winston Churchill, I cannot help feeling grateful that I had this opportunity last month to stand there for a minute or two to pay a small and silent tribute to one who has done so much for the free world; who so brilliantly demonstrated that the institutions of democratic, parliamentary government can indeed deal effectively and efficiently with the forces of totalitarianism in time of crisis; and who has been and will surely always continue to be an inspiration to every one fortunate enough to serve in elected public office.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman and at this time I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Moorhead].

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, never have so many people of so many nations owed so much to the courage of just one man.

A friend described the courage of Sir Winston Churchill as "a fixed resolve to see the thing through to its end."

The glory of the courage of Sir Winston Churchill was that he had courage in sufficient quantity to share it with and bestow it upon 50 million people of the British Isles.

When the Battle of Britain was on, when invasion of England seemed imminent, Winston Churchill, as the late President Kennedy said, "Mobilized the English language and sent it into battle." He marshaled words the way generals marshal their troops.

Who knows what caused Hitler to postpone and later to cancel his invasion plans, but when he did so, he must have had ringing in his ears those Churchillian words:

> We shall fight on the landing grounds, we shall fight in the fields and in the streets, we shall fight in the hills; we shall never surrender.

On a later occasion, Sir Winston said:

> It was the British that had the lion's heart, I had the luck to be called upon to give the roar.

The roar of that brave man will echo throughout all eternity.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Pucinski].

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I should like to congratulate our distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Albert], for taking this time today. I would like to join in the stirring remarks delivered here today in tribute to one of the great giants in history, Sir Winston Churchill.

Mr. Speaker, it would be my hope that the epitaph on Winston Churchill's tomb would read, "He dared to be different."

Throughout his entire life of public service, the world saw this man time and time again rise above the clamor of popular opinion. Time and time again he spoke out in defense of positions he felt to be just. He was not concerned with popularity, but with principle. His soaring individuality kept him from marching in a single cadence with men too blinded by tradition and prejudice to see the stars above them. He was able to capture and lead the spirit of the world in its darkest moments and its moments of ultimate victory. He was "Winnie"—and unconquerable.

It would seem to me that a study of Sir Winston's illustrious career in public service, and his great contribution to literature and to the arts should be an inspiration to all of us. "Each of us," in the lines of an old poem, "passes this way but once." Winston Churchill trod that path with three generations of men. Yet, in his record of achievements in that single lifetime we can find solace, confidence, and courage. He did, indeed, dare to be different and the results will illuminate the history of the world. May he rest in peace.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Speaker, the world will remember Sir Winston Churchill in many different ways—the politician, the statesman, the world leader. But the people of the Third District of Georgia will particularly remember those dark years during which our boys left their training bases at Fort Benning and Warner Robins to fight beside Sir Winston's gallant British forces.

Winston Churchill's memory will long live in the hearts of Georgians—and freedom-loving men everywhere. Perhaps, at this moment in our history, it is fitting to consider the words of this great man:

> If you will not fight for the right when you can easily win without bloodshed; if you will not fight when your victory will be sure and not too costly; you may come to the moment when you will have to fight when all the odds are against you with only a precarious chance of survival. There may even be a worse case. You may have to fight when there is no hope of victory, because it is better to perish than to live as slaves.

May America, Mr. Speaker, be ever mindful of his words, as we carry on his work in search of freedom for all men.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to personally thank our outstanding majority leader for his not only reserving this time today but being so generous and so magnificent in giving those of us who really idolize this great man, Sir Winston Churchill, an opportunity to say a word about him.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Missouri delegation I should like to recall one of the great contributions made to the world by Sir Winston Churchill in an appearance at Fulton, Mo., the home of Westminster College.

It was back in March of 1946, as the personal guest of my fellow townsman President Truman, that Sir Winston Churchill first coined the expression, "the Iron Curtain," which now has become a symbol of the barriers separating the free from the enslaved world. In prophetic words he warned us that unless the free world banded together in common defense against Stalin, Europe would undergo the same order of tragedy she had experienced under Hitler.

> I do not believe that Soviet Russia desires war—

He said—

> What they desire is the fruits of war and the indefinite expansion of their power and doctrines.

Then the indominable Englishman defined the Communist character in a way that was to be echoed over the next few years by President Truman, by our Secretaries of State, and by the other leaders of the free world:

> From what I have seen of our Russian friends and allies during the war—

He said—

> I am convinced that there is nothing they admire so much as strength, and there is nothing for which they have less respect than for weakness, especially military weakness.

These remarks, Mr. Speaker, set the tone for the alliance policy of the next decade and a half.

The man who uttered these words is no longer with us. But his spirit and his forceful ideas will continue to live on, both in the written history of the postwar epoch and in the policies of the Western Alliance.

We own an incalculable debt to him. We have already recognized that indebtedness once by bestowing honorary American citizenship upon him, the same honor given once before to the French General Lafayette after the Revolutionary War. We must now acknowledge that indebtedness in another, more lasting manner. Our greatest tribute to him would be to remember his message and his example.

Mr. Speaker, I know that I speak for all of Missouri and particularly for the city of Fulton and for Westminster College, when I say that today we are all filled with grief and are all mindful of the lasting contributions of this heroic public figure. We all share the grief of his loved ones. May his good soul rest in peace.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it is one of the great truths of this hour that the only individual in more than a hundred years, who is not an American, and yet could evoke the profound sense of bereavement Americans feel so emotionally today, is Sir Winston Spencer Churchill. What he did in our time established for him and for the people of Great Britain an immortality on the noblest levels of human achievement. The depth of our pride, as Americans, in this man, is the more astonishing for its intensity because this hero of our century was so distinctively and so absolutely an embodiment of the greatest qualities of his people. His voice, even, as we heard it on the floor of this very Chamber, his stance, his language, made him the incarnate hero of the hour during one of the world's most agonizing periods of travail. Yet this Englishman, born of an American mother, became more than ever one of our own, by the principles he espoused and the cause he fought for.

It is to the enormous credit of this greatest European statesman of the last several hundred years that at no time during the grand alliance or after, did the slightest stigma arise between the two greatest English-speaking nations on basic questions of mutual integrity, mutual good will, mutual respect. The great man on this side of the Atlantic, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, and the great man of 10 Downing Street—Winston Churchill—represented within themselves the lofty idealism and the decency of character of their respective peoples. It is not so much that the oratory of this brilliant Englishmen was touched with flame and the quality of endurance so long as English will be spoken, but that he used this mighty tool on behalf of freedom. It was a weapon that in its time will be equated by historians with the majesty of moving armies and the power of the most intrepid battalions in the chronicle of warfare.

It is not enough to say that we so intensely admired Winston Churchill because, of course, he intensely admired the American people, and the American tradition of liberty. We have been, as two nations in two World Wars ideologically on the same track, fighting against what became in world history an affliction of afflictions when the unspeakable Nazis took over in Germany. What Winston Churchill did not only for his people, but for all the free world, was to sharpen the confrontation so that no one could fail to understand the monumental meaning of the cause of freedom against the ferocity and the ruthlessness of this barbaric threat. By the same token he has since—and mostly in a speech on American soil—revealed with identical sharpness to the whole of mankind, the meaning of the newly expanded threat he defined under the term "Iron Curtain."

Most of all to the average man Winston Churchill presented the human personality in its finest manifestation of courage, conviction, and solidity. In this, we like to think, he was most like us, and essentially one of our own. Indeed, in our own way and with the highest regard for the English people, we sought to claim him as one of our own when we here in the Congress voted him an honorary citizen of our country. He was the very personification of valor when he led his people and the free world to victory under the guns and the overwhelming might of the German onslaught, finally with the fullest support and cooperation of President Roosevelt and the American people, fighting shoulder to shoulder. We join with the British people and the free people everywhere in the expression of the grief we feel and the pride we take in having lived in the same period of world history with this great man, this American citizen, this outstanding hero in the crisis of crises that finally brought an ugly despotism of our time to book.

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a few moments to join with those millions of persons around the world in paying tribute to Sir Winston Churchill.

He is gone. Yet his words, deeds, and spirit will live as long as freemen walk this earth. History will record few men who answered the call and met the challenge of public service with the wisdom, intelligence, statesmanship, and determination of Sir Winston. His achievements were remarkable in view of the formidable tasks which he faced.

Americans have admired, respected, and held Sir Winston in warm personal regard for decades.

The people of Tennessee were among the first in the Nation to show their esteem for this great leader. In 1963, the Tennessee General Assembly adopted a resolution making Sir Winston an honorary Tennessean.

Two years ago, as a member of this body, I was honored to join in sponsorship of the resolution granting him honorary U.S. citizenship.

A great man has passed our way and the world is a better place for his service to the cause of freedom and liberty.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, the world mourns the passing of Sir Winston Churchill, whose words and deeds, whose courage and dedication to the cause of freedom and peace will be long remembered. But particularly must his own people feel a deep sense of loss, for in their darkest and most perilous hours they called upon him to lead them against their most bitter and destructive enemy. He gave all of his talent, all of his strength, and all of his wisdom to this struggle and called forth from his people the determination and valor which brought victory.

And we in this country feel a close kinship with this man of our age, whose friendship and warmth for our people have given us a sense of pride that we were privileged to know him. He has gone from the scene, but the substance of his greatness will live in the pages of history and be a source of inspiration to future generations.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, this day we stand in tribute to the great statesman of our time, Sir Winston Churchill. In such a moment the deep sense of loss felt by all can only be second to our continuing gratitude that the world was given his example to follow, an example of integrity, courage, and faith.

His mark has been dramatically recorded not only on the character of his beloved England, but on the other nations for which he fought so gallantly.

Sir Winston was time and again tested; without fail the challenges were met. He was an honorable winner who knew the responsibilities of victory. He was a noble loser, gracious yet proud in defeat. This tremendous fighter for good, this statesman and soldier, has always been close to the heart of America.

As Churchill made history he also recorded it, leaving a wealth of documentation on our times and guideposts for the future. Though the man is gone, his spirit lives on. His strength of character and record of service to humanity will continue to inspire men to ever nobler achievements in generations yet unborn.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I desire to join with my colleagues in an expression of deepest sorrow at the passing of Sir Winston Churchill, and in paying a brief but sincere tribute to the memory of this distinguished world statesman.

In common with American citizens throughout our country, and with freemen everywhere, the people of the district I have the honor to represent regarded Winston Churchill as one of the greatest men our our century.

He was indomitable in time of war and a great champion of freedom and liberty in days of peace and always.

We mourn his passing as we would the loss of a cherished member of our own family circle.

He spoke our deepest thoughts in times of stress and great difficulty.

He taught us anew the meaning of courage.

He asserted the greatness of the human spirit in words and deeds that gave inspiration to multitudes of freemen everywhere.

As he was fond of recalling, Winston Churchill was half American and he made us feel that we were bound together by something even greater than ties of blood, shared traditions and our common language.

Many of us recall when he came to America as Prime Minister and spoke to a joint session of the Congress. He commented on his relationship to our country and the fact that his mother was born in America. He told the Congress that if his father had been an American and his mother British instead of the other way around, that he "might have made it here," on his own.

The fact is that he did "make it here" on his own.

His permanent constituency does include all of America.

In voting last year to confer honorary American citizenship on him, the Congress acted to formalize the universal recognition of Citizen Winston Spencer Churchill as one of our own.

In America, we have no titles of nobility. The designation of "citizen" is the highest honor that can be bestowed on an individual in our land.

We loved this gallant Englishman as a warmhearted friend and ally, at the same time that we acclaimed him as a peerless leader. We can never forget Citizen Winston Churchill. We can never forget his command to fight, to preserve and never to surrender, in the struggle for liberty, justice, freedom, and peace.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, my constituents in the Second District of Illinois would wish me to express their grief at the passing of Sir Winston Churchill and to join in this tribute to his memory.

In a very large sense he was one of us. Perhaps no man more completely blended the spirit of the peoples of two great nations, that of the United States of his mother's birth and the England of his father and his father's family.

He was truly beloved by the people of the United States as he was beloved by the people of his native land. He gave a new depth of meaning, of eloquence, and of force to our common language.

It was not long ago that the Congress voted to confer honorary American citizenship upon Sir Winston Churchill, and now that he is gone I am sure we all feel more than ever a quiet sense of satisfaction that during the lifetime of this good and remarkable man this recognition was given.

Mr. Speaker, while the youth and the prime of Winston Churchill were active and colorful, it was not until he had reached the age of 65 that the mantle of greatness began to envelop him. If there had been a rule or a law in England such as obtains in some businesses, and some of little vision would fasten upon all public as well as private employment, that anyone on reaching 65 must be eliminated by compulsory retirement, Sir Winston Churchill in the dazzling brilliance of his genius would have been lost to the world.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, when one feels compelled to speak out on the passing of a great man, the limitation of one's own vocabulary becomes sharply defined. When the great man is Winston Churchill this deficiency of expression becomes even more acute.

It has been said that for Englishmen, of all the races on earth, any task undertaken in an adventurous spirit acquires the merit of romance.

Winston Churchill personified the spirit of adventure. For him life was one long romance. It was a relationship in which the past was only a prelude to be thoroughly understood so that he could better appreciate today in preparing for the challenges he anticipated tomorrow.

For Winston Churchill, history was a subject to be studied, a record to be set down, events to be directed. All of these he did in what has become known as the Churchillian manner.

He himself commented it is foolish to waste lamentations upon the closing phases of life.

We shall follow his counsel. These few words are not voiced to lament his passing but to express our appreciation he was here.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join in the tribute we pay today to an honorary citizen of this country, the son of an American beauty, who accomplished so much in his lifetime to maintain the freedom of the West.

His deeds are many and they are worth study and emulation. He was a giant among men. Though he once said that it was the British people who had the lion's heart and he only had the luck to give the roar, it was his voice of defiance, his spirit of determination which was more than a frail reed, more than an uncertain trumpet in the West's hour of need.

Because he took positive stands in so many trying moments, there are those who find it difficult to forgive. Yet the world has benefited from his pugnacious and resolute being, from his imaginative and fighting spirit, and from his leadership.

This leadership transcends all petty worries and leads us to sorrow with the British at the passing of such a great figure. We saw him, in the world's moment of crisis, working closely with our own great leader, Franklin D. Roosevelt, in bringing victory to the West. We have seen him, in his waning years, giving counsel to the West, contributing history of first water in quality to the traditions of our youth.

Let me add my condolences today, then, to those which are being expressed by the House to his family, to his nation, and to the world.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, it is entirely fitting that the American flag should be flown at half staff in memory of Sir Winston Churchill.

It is appropriate, also, that we pause today in this House of Representatives to pay tribute to a great Member of the British House of Commons.

Winston Churchill's great talents developed and flourished in the British House. His skill in debate, his wise and ominous warnings to the British nation and to the world, and his long, difficult experiences in behalf of unpopular causes prepared him for the hours of greatness which came to him. This greatness, associated as it was with courage and fortitude, enabled Great Britain to survive amidst the most devastating attacks upon the British Isles.

The strength and courage of this man provided hope and inspiration to Britain's Western allies, as the long, hard road to victory began—and Winston Churchill challenged one and all with fingers raised in a symbolic "V" for victory.

It was a personal privilege to be part of the 88th Congress and to support H.R. 4374 which made Winston Churchill the first and only honorary citizen of the United States.

The people of the 12th District of Illinois, as well as citizens of the entire world, join in tribute to Winston Churchill's life of service and leadership.

It was a glorious hour when Winston Churchill rose to encourage faith and strength in his British countrymen and the free world. Today, it is a dark hour as the world mourns his passing.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, today the world mourns a great statesman.

In the passing of Sir Winston Churchill, all mankind has lost a friend and leader. Today, as we mourn his passing, we are consoled with the realization that we have been privileged to have had such a man among us.

A lifetime of training, of bitter disappointment, was suddenly shunted aside at a time when many men have retired from life's labor, as he was called to lead his nation, and even the world, in one of its most trying hours.

The freedom of dignity of every man was at stake as the Fascist hordes enslaved vast areas of the earth's surface. And it was Winston Churchill's lot to fall heir to the most trying position that a man has ever tried to fill.

With his cheery countenance, his bulldog determination, his unflinching patriotism and devotion to the cause of freedom for every man everywhere, he became the man of the hour. Never in history has so much been demanded of a man.

And in response, he gave.

We cannot know the agonizing suffering which must have been his. We cannot know the full impact that these responsibilities must have had, as he realized that what he did might well determine the course of freedom. And it did.

His flashing "V" for victory sign gave hope to a beleaguered people. Where there was no hope, he gave hope—where there was misery he gave comfort—where it was darkest, he gave light. Truly, it was one of the finest hours for all men everywhere.

Today we are blessed because he gave. As his mortal remains are deposited with all the honor that his beloved land can give him, he has the love and appreciation of all freemen everywhere.

History has just begun to judge his contributions. They are legend. To paraphrase his own immortal words, "Never have so many owed so much to just one."

The world is richer because of his life. From him we should draw inspiration. Never can a statesman study the past, for the key to the future, without drawing on the life and works of Winston Churchill.

He is gone from us, and we mourn his passing.

But we are richer for his having been with us. Nations and men from this day forth will humbly thank the Creator for having allowed such a leader to emerge when one was so needed.

From his determined spirit, we willingly accept the torch and the responsibilities which he passes to us. A new generation now must lead, and they will lead better because of his example, his courage, wit, and determination.

The pages of history will record his deeds. As has been so aptly stated, surely this was the man of our century. From his passing, let us resolve that we will have learned from his life, that we may strive for a world where hunger, disease, ignorance, and enslavement may be abolished. His dream was our dream. And it shall come to pass if we have faith, and we give of ourselves as unselfishly as did this man we honor today.

He is gone, but he can never be forgotten.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, with countless others I mourn the death of Sir Winston Leonard Spencer Churchill, but even more—much more—I am grateful for his life and the contributions which he made during that life of four score years and ten.

Unquestionably he was the outstanding Briton of this century. It is possible that he was the outstanding leader of the English-speaking people. More than that of any single person, his courage, his faith and his indomitable will provided the leadership which led the United States, Great Britain, and our Allies to victory in World War II.

His prescience was a marvel of both warfare and international politics. He foresaw events before they occurred; and when they did occur, he already had the answers to questions and the solutions to problems. Fortunately for us those answers and solutions were accurate ones—this was fortunate not only for his country, but for ours as well.

We shall gratefully remember him as long as there lives an American or Englishman who remembers 1939–45. We who have heard or seen or met him will never forget him. History will honor him and accord him a high place on any list of great men of all time.

As head of the Government of Great Britain and as British leader in war and peace, he is without a peer.

As both a speaker and a writer he was a master of the English language. On June 4, 1940, I vividly remember listening to a radio rebroadcast of his speech on Dunkirk to the House of Commons; and I especially remember these words:

> We shall not flag or fail. We shall fight in France, we shall fight on the seas and oceans, we shall fight with growing confidence and growing strength in the air, we shall defend our island, whatever the cost may be, we shall fight on the beaches, we shall fight on the landing grounds, we shall fight in the fields and in the streets, we shall fight in the hills; we shall never surrender.

Winston Churchill did not surrender and he never had any intention of doing so.

A fortnight later, on June 18, 1940, he said:

> Let us therefore brace ourselves to our duties, and so bear ourselves that, if the British Empire and its commonwealth last for a thousand years, men will still say: "This was their finest hour."

And men will also say with accuracy that in "their finest hour," Winston Churchill was their finest man.

In a radio broadcast on July 14, 1940, he said:

> We shall defend every village, every town, and every city. The vast mass of London itself, fought street by street, could easily devour an entire hostile army; and we would rather see London laid in ruins and ashes than that it should be tamely and abjectly enslaved.

Winston Churchill loved his country, his people, and his island. Even more, he loved freedom and he meant to maintain freedom for his people and his island. This he did.

He has earned an enviable place in English literature. He was a prolific writer and with his pen he mastered our language as he did with his speech.

As President Kennedy said when he proclaimed Sir Winston an honorary citizen of the United States:

> He mobilized the English language and sent it into battle.

The contributions of few writers can compare with his three-volume biography of the Duke of Marlborough; his multivolume history of World War I, "The World Crisis"; the six volumes comprising his "The Second World War"; "The Gathering Storm," "Their Finest Hour," "The Grand Alliance," "The Hinge of Fate," "Closing the Ring," "Triumph and Tragedy." Following that, he published "The History of the English Speaking People" and "Island Race."

In war he demonstrated resolution. In victory he was magnanimous. In peace he provided good will. Now in death, he leaves behind a grateful people in England, in this United States, and throughout the world.

In the minds and hearts of freemen he will be their patron saint—the patron saint of freedom.

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, a titan has left our midst. Those legendary and historical inhabitants of Mount Olympus and Valhalla have willingly moved over to make room on the front bench for one of our age who need acknowledge no peer.

No human throughout our history has faced more Herculean challenges successfully than he. No one has been vested both with the prescience and the courage, ability, and opportunity to both combat evil and advance the cause, not just of his own people, but of humanity everywhere.

His life spanned generations; his talents knew no bounds. Greatness never marred his humility; reverses never dampened his integrity or his resolve.

Those of us who shared, even briefly, Sir Winston Churchill's time on earth know that the age of heroes is not over.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, with profound sorrow I join my colleagues and countrymen in expressing grief over the loss our world suffered yesterday with the passing of Sir Winston Churchill.

We have lost a stalwart statesman whose four score and 10 years of vigor and vitality occupy a prominent part of the history of our times.

Let it not be forgotten that the United States has lost not only a fond friend and able ally but also an honorary citizen. I shall always remember the honor which I felt as a freshman Congressman in voting for the legislation which became Public Law 88–6 bestowing honorary U.S. citizenship on Sir Winston. I said at that time and I repeat now: It was a great privilege in behalf of a great man.

Mr. Speaker, Sir Winston's passing was the subject of an editorial eulogy published this morning by the Democrat and Chronicle of Rochester, N.Y. I take pleasure in sharing this eloquent expression with my colleagues:

A Giant Passes

So the old gentleman died, and the very fact of his death, even as the achievements of his life, had the quality of perfect timing.

For Sir Winston Churchill's death reminds us—at a time when the free world needs reminding—that nations can rise above bickering and name calling and apathy; that there is a nobility and a willingness to sacrifice in mankind, when the right figure steps forth to lead.

His death reminds us of the days and months and years that his shattered stubborn little island stood against the might of organized barbarism—we called it the Axis then—and held it at bay until the rest of the free world could mobilize to join the fight. So we are reminded that while one oasis of freedom remains, there is always hope for man.

His death reminds us that the price of war always is too great, for victor as well as vanquished. This practical thought should cause the free world to look up from its mourning and renew its dedication to peace. For in ultimate victory, the British nation overspent its strength in the cause of honor and freedom in that last great war. After the war it entered upon the twilight of greatness, but it did this without a whimper, knowing it had done what had to be done.

His death reminds us always to seek for giants, of whom we have so pitifully few today. We need giants who can see—as did Sir Winston—danger massing against the free world when others cannot see it; who can describe the danger with icy or fiery words; and who can thus arouse free men to action.

We need to think of all those things now, we who live in this bickering threatening world. And the death of the old gentleman reminds us to think hard, even while we mourn.

Mr. Speaker, in this same edition, the editors of the Democrat and Chronicle carried an article by Reporter George Murphy which traced the little-known ancestry aspects of Sir Winston that so directly relate to Rochester, N.Y. All who are interested in this history, I am sure will find Mr. Murphy's article a fascinating story:

Coowner of Democrat and Chronicle Progenitor—Churchill's Grandfather Was Rochesterian

(By George Murphy)

Winston Leonard Spencer Churchill, who typified England and the English people, had Yankee blood in his veins.

His maternal grandfather, Leonard Jerome, once lived only a stone's throw from where this story is written—74 Fitzhugh Street South, now the site of the Civic Center Garage.

As a matter of fact, the connection between Britain's great leader and this newspaper is more than geographic, for Leonard Jerome and his brother Lawrence owned the Rochester Daily American from 1846 to 1850, and that newspaper eventually was combined with the Democrat and in 1870 became an integral part of the Democrat and Chronicle.

It was prophetic that Churchill's grandfather once dealt with the printed word, for it was Winston who rallied Britain when she stood alone in World War II with these historic words:

"We shall fight on the beaches, we shall fight in the fields and in the streets; we shall fight in the hills; we shall never surrender."

One wonders also if Winston Churchill did not inherit his audacity, his gusto, and his gift for the stirring phrase from ancestors who were pioneers in upstate New York.

His grandfather was born on a farm at Pompey, south of Syracuse. Young Leonard was sent as a lad in his teens to live with his uncle, Hiram K. Jerome, a lawyer in Palmyra. There he prepared for college, leaving for Princeton in 1836, but a desire to economize prompted him to transfer 2 years later to Union College in Schenectady, where he was graduated in 1839.

Returning to Palmyra, he studied law in the office of his uncle, recently named judge of Wayne County. And when Judge Jerome decided in 1842 to move to Rochester, Leonard and his younger brother, Lawrence likewise moved to the Flour City.

The Jeromes located in the fashionable third ward where the judge rented a house at No. 72 (later renumbered 83) Fitzhugh Street South, while his two nephews boarded across the street at No. 63 (later 74). Neither Leonard nor his brother developed a strong attachment to law, and in 1845, after Lawrence married Catherine Hall, a wealthy heiress of Palmyra, the brothers bought an interest in the Daily American.

Shortly after their marriage in August 1844, Lawrence and his wife rented the Pond House at No. 65 South Sophia (No. 219 Plymouth) Street, taking Leonard in as a boarder, but they moved back to 63 South Fitzhugh the next year, renting the entire house.

Leonard settled there with his wife, too, when in April 1849 he married Clarissa Hall, younger sister of Lawrence's Catherine. It must have been a lively household, but the spacious house afforded ample room for the two Jerome-Hall couples.

The first two sons of Lawrence and Catherine Jerome, Roswell W. and Lovell Hall, were born in the house at 63 South Fitzhugh Street S. but Jennie Jerome (Churchill's mother) and one of Leonard and Clarissa's four daughters was not.

But local myths have waxed with the Churchill fame until finally some Rochesterians were insisting that this city was the birthplace of the statesman's mother.

Lady Churchill, who should know, wrote in her autobiography, "I was born in Brooklyn." But her son, ever the politician, at times seemed to concur in the Rochester claim while not denying Brooklyn's.

In 1941 when Winston received—via radio—an honorary degree from the University of Rochester, he replied to the honor in these diplomatic words:

"As you tell me, my mother was born in Rochester."

In 1952 City Historian Blake McKelvey's passion for historical accuracy swept away the cobwebs spun by local wishful thinking. His careful research showed that Jennie Jerome was born in Brooklyn 4 years after her parents moved away from Rochester and the Fitzhugh Street house.

A bronze tablet which once stood on that house told the true story in its inscription:

"Leonard Jerome, publisher and grandfather of Britain's Winston Churchill resided on this site, 1844–50. He married Clarissa Hall of Palmyra, April 5, 1849."

Winston Churchill visited Rochester on two occasions. He came the first time as a young Boer War correspondent to address a sparse audience in the Lyceum Theater on January 28, 1901. Winston Churchill was not a celebrated name then.

He was better known on his second visit, February 10, 1932, when he spoke on "The World Economic Crisis" at the Eastman Theater. But the Labor Party was in power in Britain and Winston was on the sidelines, picking up a few dollars on a lecture tour.

On neither visit is there any record he visited the houses where his forebears had dwelt.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to share with the Members of the House a historical account of the Churchill ancestry which was printed a few days ago in the Palmyra Courier-Journal which serves a large part of my Wayne County constituency. Editor Carol Clark and her staff have provided us with details of the special relationship which the community of Palmyra had in the life of Leonard Jerome, Sir Winston's maternal grandfather:

WINSTON CHURCHILL—WE CLAIM ONE "FINEST HOUR"

Winston Churchill, citizen of the world, the United States only honorary citizen, of early Palmyra stock—Palmyra can claim him as a son, a part of our vital heritage.

Churchill never formally recognized Palmyra's claim to his birthright through his maternal grandparents here. We are among the many who entered his bloodline—Marion, Rochester, New York City, Philadelphia, New England.

A blood-right Churchill did claim. Of his address to our Congress in December, 1941 he wrote, "To me, who could trace unbroken male descent on my mother's side through five generations from a lieutenant who served in George Washington's army, it was possible to feel a blood-right to speak to the representatives of the great Republic in our common cause."

That Christmas Eve Churchill had told the American people, "I cannot truthfully say that I feel far from home. Whether it be the ties of blood on my mother's side, or the friendships I have developed here over the many years of active life, or the commanding sentiment of comradeship in the common cause of great peoples, I have a right to sit at your fireside."

Palmyra was 2 years in the making when in 1791 Rhode Islander David Wilcox joined the settlement. A daughter, Clarissa, in the early 1820's, wed Ambrose Hall, newly come from Massachusetts, and raised a family of six daughters in their home where the village park bandstand now stands.

Their daughter, also Clarissa, married Leonard Jerome, a prosperous Marion farmer formerly of Pompey in Onondaga County.

The Jeromes moved to Rochester, then to New York, where Leonard became a publisher, arts' patron, racetrack owner, diplomat, world traveler, a man of wealth.

A daughter, one of four, Jenny Jerome, married Englishman Lord Randolph Churchill.

Ninety years ago a son was born to the granddaughter of Ambrose Hall and the son of the Duke of Marlborough.

He was named Winston Leonard Spencer Churchill.

The Jerome farm still stands on the Boss Road in Marion, now the home of the Leo Allen family.

Still standing on west Canal Street is the home of newlywed Leonard and Clarissa Hall Jerome.

And, still remembered is the Market Street site of the law office where Leonard Jerome studied law with an uncle, Judge Hiram Jerome.

Whatever strain of pioneer spirit that typified the industry of the early Palmyra coursed through the generations to Winston Churchill, however small the part a Palmyra ancestry played in his formation, of the preponderance of greatness that has marked Churchill's 90 years, Palmyra can rightly claim at least one of his finest hours.

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Speaker, my good constituents from the Fifth District of Texas will think me remiss in my duty if I do not express in their behalf that we of Dallas County join with those in this august body and those of the world who have expressed their deepest sorrow at the passing of one of the century's ablest leaders and statesmen, Sir Winston Churchill. Particularly, representing Dallas, do I feel motivated to speak out in praise of this man's life and in sorrow at this man's death, for we in Dallas owe him a debt. Three years ago, while I was the mayor of the fine city of Dallas, Sir Winston was made an honorary citizen of Dallas. In responding to this city's tribute to him, Sir Winston paid Dallas one of its most revered compliments. We will never forget this great man or his warm remarks about our city.

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Speaker, most of us, in this body of Members truly representative of our Nation, are of that generation which President Kennedy in his inaugural address referred to as "tempered by war." We had, from the tragic years from 1938 to the triumphant year of 1945, our own great leader in the person of Franklin D. Roosevelt, but we and all people who fought tyranny during that dark convulsion which shook the earth had another leader in the person of Sir Winston Churchill.

England has the honor to call him her own, but we have the honor to call him ours, too, by adoption and by affection. From the beginning of that conflict there was tragedy, and there was fear, and a new language was imposed upon the minds and hearts of the American people. As the German armies overran Poland, the first nation proud enough to fight rather than surrender, the words "blitzkreig," "panzer," "stuka," and "gestapo" became household words, and brought a foreboding of a terrible and irresistible force which could menace us even across the Atlantic, and as those armies overran France this fear increased.

And then that doughty, cocky, magnificent voice was raised, and a more familiar language went to work, and phrase after eloquent phrase rolled across England, and across America, and put heart in her people and our own.

"Give us the tools," he said, and America produced the tools.

"Look west, the land is also bright," he quoted, and the conscience and honor of America were awakened.

"We shall fight on the landing grounds, we shall fight in the fields and in the streets, we shall fight in the hills; we shall never surrender," he said, and courage and resolve flowed from this one man into all who enlisted in the cause of freedom.

For that generation which was tempered by war, he provided both the fire and the steel; he articulated courage and honor; he brought out the best in all of us, and made that generation greater than it had been.

For all those, in all lands, who have ever engaged in public service, he did something more. He demonstrated the value of standing hard by one's beliefs. Sir Winston Churchill did not always leap mightily from triumph to triumph. He had his political defeats, his public repudiations, and must at times have despaired for the future of all those principles in which he most deeply believed, but he held to those principles and in the fullness of time they were recognized, needed, and used to save his nation and our own.

Not many men live to be recognized as great in their own time. None will be recognized as greater in our own. Warrior, statesman, author, artist—this was a man. This was the titan of our time. From his life each of us has gained greatly; with his death we join gratefully to do him honor.

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in expressing my deepest sorrow on the passing of a great statesman and great citizen, Winston Churchill. When Congress made this noble Englishman an honorary citizen of the United States, it was showing this country's deep affection for him, its abiding admiration. In effect, Congress said, "We are presenting you with the finest gift in our power to give, because of your outstanding foresight, your invincible courage, your inspired leadership to the free world in some of its darkest hours."

We are today honoring him in death, but fortunately he did not have to wait for the many honors and the respect his colleagues in Great Britain, and Americans everywhere accorded him during his life. Respected and long recognized for his distinguished leadership and for upholding the highest standards of public office, he was equally esteemed for his personal graces and his exceptional concern for all mankind.

Winston Churchill has left a distinguished imprint upon the decisions and policies of our time. We shall all miss his greatness, his wisdom, his counsel and the courage with which he held steadfastly to his convictions.

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, all too often it seems that the true worth of a man is recognized only after his death. This was not true of our beloved Winston Churchill.

This man became a legend in his own time. He became the symbol of a proud people and a proud nation and an enduring, prideful relationship between our great Nation and his own. The extent of his personal contribution to the world is simply awe inspiring—virtually impossible to measure in any mortal terms. His passing takes Winston Churchill into the realm of the immortal, but to so many of us he has seemed immortal while he was among us.

Winston Churchill has always seemed to me to be a man who defies description in any reasonably human terms. His contributions have been so extensive, so valuable, so fulfilling that he demands description in language that is too poetic because despite the immortal character of the man, he was a warm, sincere, and genuine human. He enjoyed his life and he obviously enjoyed life's pleasures, even though he had dedicated his life to service to his fellow man. And, there is no man in public life in any time who has so richly deserved the deference he received during his lifetime and now. His greatness found its origins in his own character and he was one of the few men on this earth who has been able, by the great force of his magnetic ability, to influence people and nations and the world.

He has seemed, in recent years, to gain in stature and in the admiration of his colleagues, friends, and admirers and in human warmth. It has become evident to every citizen of every nation that Winston Churchill had given his every thought, his every action, and his life to the best interests of Britain and the world. The affection that has been showered on him in recent years seemed to please him and I am very deeply grateful that this man who gave so much was able to know—as one of our great leaders was never able to know—that the people loved him.

It has become commonplace in recent times for men in public life to talk about their place in history. Winston Churchill who himself has gained a hallmark reputation as an historian will be recorded in history as the man who perhaps best represents the Western World's image of leadership in modern times. The symbol of leadership that he is leaving behind may never again be matched on this earth. His mastery of men and events and issues was not only uncommon—it was gigantic. His own people have recognized him as a superb author, orator, patriot. Here in the United States we have known him for all these things and as a friend.

I am personally very deeply sorry that he is no longer with us, and yet I know that he will live forever in the hearts of his own people, on the pages of history, and in our hearts.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, freedom-loving people the world over today mourn the death of Sir Winston Churchill. The great warrior is stilled. The final battle is over.

But the tears in our eyes and the grief in our hearts are not so much for Sir Winston, himself, who lived a rich, full life and tasted the fruits of honor and glory and the respect and admiration of his fellow man.

No, I think we mourn for ourselves, for we have lost a valiant and farsighted man. We have lost a statesman and a patriot who rallied an entire country to the cause of liberty, giving it the fortitude and courage to withstand the forces of oppression and tyranny which besieged it. We have witnessed the passing of a leader who helped inspire an alliance of nations to turn back the enemy so that freedom might prevail. We have lost a great orator and writer who gave the English language new eloquence. Indeed, we mourn for ourselves because we have lost one of the great men of our time.

Yet, we cannot really mourn for our children who will never know him as we did. We cannot grieve for them because they are the richer because Sir Winston lived. They are the heirs of the liberty into which he breathed new life and the heirs of the freedom he fought so steadfastly to perpetuate.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, we have received the tragic though not unexpected news of the passing of the truly remarkable Sir Winston. His great works will live forever in the history of our planet as shining guideposts for those who follow.

Mere words fail as we seek to eulogize Winston Spencer Churchill. The greatest of the great falls far short of the mark in describing the impact of this man upon our century. It is clear to all that he was the greatest of our era—and one of only a few of the truly outstanding mortals in all of recorded history.

Mr. Speaker, we are aware that Sir Winston was a man of many rare qualities. He leaves a rich personal heritage which we may study to our very great benefit.

His statesmanship is legendary. By the force of his own personality and will, Prime Minister Churchill crystallized the determination of his own nation and of the entire free world during times of extreme danger to repel and overcome the most serious threat to civilized society in the history of the world to that point. It seems probable that this "uncommon commoner" affected the course of human affairs more profoundly than has any other single individual since Jesus of Nazareth.

Mr. Churchill was an early and implacable foe of communism, recognizing it as a most dangerous form of tyranny.

As a member of the House of Commons for 62 of his 90 years, Mr. Churchill was a parliamentarian without equal—a politician in the most honorable sense of the word.

Mr. Churchill was perhaps the foremost craftsman of the English language of all time—written and oral, formal and extemporaneous—a towering figure in the area of human expression.

Mr. Churchill was a renowned painter throughout most of his life—one of the outstanding artists of his time. His place in history would have been secure with his contributions in this field alone.

As the son of an American mother, and an honorary citizen of the United States—a distinction of which he was enormously proud—we cherish Mr. Churchill as one of our own.

It would seem, Mr. Speaker, that we might honor the great Sir Winston best—and simultaneously benefit all of mankind—by studying his life, emulating his works as best we can, heeding his admonitions, pursuing his dreams, and keeping alive his ideas.

May God grant us a small portion of his indomitable courage, his profound foresight, his selfless, sustained dedication to the preservation of freedom for all men.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, belief in evil equals fear. Belief in good equals courage. Sir Winston Churchill's death reminds us of these truths. He was in fact the world's greatest living person and his passing over to the realm of spirit makes us look again at his predominant tool for leadership and victory—namely, courage. Even the most humble are important in the eyes of God; and we Christians believe that all become great with the acquisition and practice of courage for right things. Churchill's life will always be a symbol of the value of courage for proper objectives. I am glad I lived in his age, met him, and have his memory to strengthen me. As to his life we all respond "Well done."

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, Sir Winston Churchill is dead. And it is right and proper for all who love freedom and admire man to do him honor.

But is must be done in the correct way. It is not enough merely to recite lists of deeds done, or name battles won, or chant a string of adjectives with his name. Nor should it be maudlin or idolatrous.

He would not have liked it.

More important, it would have missed the point. For Churchill was a man, and a very human one. He made mistakes, sometimes enormous. He was hard to get along with, and sometimes pettish. He was always stubborn, and he could be tyrannical.

But it was precisely that humanity—set in a grand scale and raised to a high power—that made him what he was: One of the giants of our times. Churchill, the man, was bigger than lifesize, and it was partly through this that he led men as he did. But he led men from a position in their midst, rather than trying to lead from above. He went out into the streets during the agony of London, to be with his people. As a man, then, we must see him and do praise to his measure.

Merely to have lived in the same century with Sir Winston was an honor and an inspiration and, unquestionably, fun. For Churchill had that lashing sense of humor and quick flash of wit which importantly complemented his iron will and fierce resolve. He was big enough and strong enough to direct it against himself, as well as others.

His wit, coupled with his impatience, helped him lead. "Pray submit to me, by 4 p.m. today, on one-half sheet of paper, the preparations undertaken by His Majesty's Navy to pursue the coming war," he supposedly wrote the First Sea Lord after becoming the First Lord of the Admiralty.

He led with words, written sometimes but more effectively spoken. To an extraordinary degree, his language had always expressed his unusual character. It came, in time, to express not only what Great Britain must be, but what the Western World must do. It was good, tough language and it had a majesty that made the important things seem vitally alive and immediate. He could never say, as had his predecessor, Neville Chamberlain, that England would not fight "for a small, faraway country, between people of whom we know nothing."

Instead, Churchill rallied his people and the world to the struggle at hand and to the problems to come. He did so by combining to a degree unmatched since President Lincoln, the qualities of a great man and a towering writer in a setting of dark peril. The result was the true criterion of leadership; he made people feel directly, personally, and passionately involved in the great events of their time. Not only people in Great Britain, but also in France, America, and around the world.

Winston Churchill did this himself, through the force of his personality and the power of his words. The setting did not make the man, though it called him forth. Once emerged, he changed it entirely. His life was one of the rarest of all historical events; in living, he did not make a difference. He made the difference.

His death was right and proper. It was expected and dignified, quiet and fitting, after such a life. His going leaves us all the poorer, as his living left us all the richer.

Winston Churchill will always be with us, for in large measure he molded our world. He will particularly be in our hearts during moments of crisis and fear, his words and his example giving fiery thrust to our hopes:

> In war, resolution.
> In defeat, defiance.
> In victory, magnanimity.
> In peace, good will.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, one of the highlights of my service in the Congress was a visit with Sir Winston Churchill at 10 Downing Street in London in the fall of 1951. Mr. Churchill was again Prime Minister following Prime Minister Attlee and his labor government. I was with a group of my colleagues headed by the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER].

As our congressional group was leaving Mr. Churchill's office, the Prime Minister called me back to inquire of his good friend, Jimmy Byrnes. The Prime Minister was very familiar with the history of our country and he knew of my States rights philosophy and devotion to the private enterprise system. Mr. Churchill with tears in his eyes said that England could no longer lead the free world and this responsibility now belonged to the United States. He said that England could become a second-rate power due largely to one party in England being wholly conservative and the other extremely liberal. Mr. Churchill said that after 6 years of the labor government under Mr. Attlee, he could do nothing to undo socialistic measures which had been instituted by the labor government. Churchill said it was impossible to induce businessmen to return and take over certain utilities that had been nationalized by the Government because these businessmen knew that someday the liberal government would come back to power and that business would be again nationalized.

Mr. Churchill, in referring to socialized medicine, said that it would be impossible for him to take a pair of pliers and pull the teeth from the mouths of the people given to them by the Government. He said they would howl to high heaven. He used this as an example to illustrate that there is no turning back from socialism and the erosion of initiative, private enterprise, and individual effort.

Mr. Churchill suggested that if the United States were to remain the heart and core of the free world, our two great political parties must continue to embody in each conservatives, liberals, and moderates. He warned that the United States would deteriorate and lose its prestige and position as a world power if one of our great political parties became completely conservative and the other totally liberal. Sooner or later, Mr. Churchill warned, the liberal party would come to power and the United States and its great institutions would be treated to socialistic schemes from which there is no return. Mr. Churchill said in order for the United States to continue its world leadership it would be necessary to keep a balance in both political parties so that the Nation could move forward in the middle of the road. I was amazed at Mr. Churchill's keen insight into American political philosophy and was amazed with his foresight. I will always believe that Mr. Churchill called me aside for this word of warning because at that time I was a young man in my early thirties, and he knew that I was associated with the philosophy of States rights and devoted to the private enterprise system and was a member of the Democratic Party which has traditionally encompassed all elements and classes of our American society.

Mr. Speaker, I have wished many times that the world had listened to Winston Churchill, a man of unsurpassed wisdom, culture, education, training, and experience in world leadership in the most critical time in our modern history. No one was more aware than Winston Churchill that the Polish corridor created after World War I was the immediate cause of World War II. Churchill was well aware that a Berlin corridor would set the stage for World War III. It will always remain a mystery to me how the incredible tragedy of the Berlin corridor was fostered on the world. War lords and agitators in their wildest imagination could have never dreamed up a more perfect way to insure another war. Winston Churchill knew, which many of us seem to forget, that Communist Russia was equally as guilty as Adolph Hitler in launching World War II. He kept constantly in mind that Communist Russia violated the integrity of Poland and invaded that nation and in its deal with Hitler received the largest slice of Polish territory.

Churchill was one of the greatest men in the history of the world but he did not have to be great to see the folly and stark tragedy of turning Central Europe over to Communist Russia. Churchill knew in the end that we won no victory in Europe. We only made it possible for Communist Russia to win the ultimate victory. It was with such sadness that Churchill saw Poland, the very nation that the free nations went to war to preserve, gobbled up by the ruthless Communist aggressor, thus depriving the Western World of a victory over the forces of oppression, dictatorship, and aggression.

Mr. Speaker, Winston Churchill typified all that was great, all that was grand, gallant, and magnificent about the British Empire. Winston Churchill is an example of British statesmanship at its best. Churchill was incomparable as a patriot, soldier, historian, and statesman. We are all indebted to him today for standing like a stone wall guarding the ramparts of freedom when the chips were down.

SIR WINSTON CHURCHILL

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 136

Resolved, That the House of Representatives has learned with profound sorrow of the death of Sir Winston Churchill, former Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, honorary citizen of the United States, beloved elder statesman of the world.

Resolved, That the House of Representatives tenders its deep sympathy to the members of the family of the late Sir Winston Churchill, and to his countrymen, and expresses the hope that the burden of their personal loss will be diminished by the knowledge that it is shared by his fellow citizens on this side of the Atlantic who were sustained by his eloquent words and courageous deeds when lesser men despaired and by all those throughout the world who are the beneficiaries of his dauntless defense of freemen.

Resolved, That the Secretary of State be requested to communicate these expressions of sentiment to the family of the deceased and to the Parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the late Sir Winston Churchill the House do now adjourn.

The resolution was unanimously agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, January 26, 1965, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

407. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Administration, Agency for International Development, Department of State, transmitting a copy of the Agency's reply to report (B-146754) on deficiencies in administration of the earthquake reconstruction and rehabilitation program for Chile; to the Committee on Government Operations.

408. A letter from the adjutant general, United Spanish War Veterans, transmitting proceedings of the 66th National Encampment of the United Spanish War Veterans, pursuant to Public Law 249, 77th Congress (H. Doc. No. 61); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and printed with illustrations.

409. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting report of the Rural Electrification Administration for fiscal year 1964; to the Committee on Agriculture.

410. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting an annual report of the orderly liquidation of stocks of agricultural commodities held by the Commodity Credit Corporation and the expansion of markets for surplus agricultural commodities, by the Secretary, dated December 1964, pursuant to section 201(b), Public Law 84–540; to the Committee on Agriculture.

411. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1966 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels, and research, development, test, and evaluation, for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

412. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting the July–November 1964 report on Department of Defense procurement from small and other business firms, pursuant to section 10(d) of the Small Business Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

413. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Export-Import Bank of Washington, transmitting a report on insured shipments to Yugoslavia for the month of December 1964, pursuant to title III, Foreign Aid and Related Agencies Appropriation Act of 1965, and to the Presidential determination of February 4, 1964; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

414. A letter from the General Manager, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting a report on disposition of foreign excess property during fiscal year 1964, pursuant to provisions of title IV, Foreign Excess Property, Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (sec. 404, 63 Stat. 398; 40 U.S.C. 514); to the Committee on Government Operations.

415. A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, to make title III thereof directly applicable to procurement of property and nonpersonal services by executive agencies, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Government Operations.

416. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the deficient financial analysis which resulted in approval of unneeded grant, Area Redevelopment Administration, Department of Commerce; to the Committee on Government Operations.

417. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States; transmitting a report on unreasonably high prices paid by Government prime contractors and subcontractors for GG-49 gyroscopes purchased from the only qualified and approved source, Honeywell, Inc., Aeronautical Division, Minneapolis, Minn., Department of Defense and National Aeronautics and Space Administration; to the Committee on Government Operations.

418. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on excessive Federal matching of administrative expenses for public assistance programs in the State of Massachusetts, Welfare Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; to the Committee on Government Operations.

419. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on potential savings by consolidating additional personnel offices of field stations, Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Government Operations.

420. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting a copy of "All Electric Homes in the United States, 1964"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

421. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 753(b) of title 28, United States Code, to provide for the recording of proceedings in the U.S. district courts by means of electronic sound recording as well as by shorthand or mechanical means"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

422. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to withdraw from the district courts jurisdiction of suits brought by fiduciaries who have been appointed for the purpose of creating diversity of citizenship between the parties"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

423. A letter from the Clerk, U.S. Court of Claims, transmitting a report of court's opinion *In re Josephine C. Rumley, Administratrix of the Estate of George S. Rumley* v. *The United States*, Congressional No. 4–61; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

424. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General for Administration, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting information relative to the total number of positions in grades GS–17 and GS–18 required to be reported pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 1105a; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H.R. 3347. A bill to repeal the Civil Rights Act of 1964; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS:

H.R. 3348. A bill to authorize a 3-year program of grants for construction of veterinary medical education facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ASHMORE:

H.R. 3349. A bill for the relief of certain retired officers of the Army, Navy, and Air Force; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASPINALL (by request):

H.R. 3350. A bill to amend the act of July 29, 1954, as amended, to permit transfer of title to movable property to agencies which assume operation and maintenance responsibility for project works serving municipal and industrial functions; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BONNER:

H.R. 3351. A bill to provide for the measurement of the gross and net tonnages for certain vessels having two or more decks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 3352. A bill to provide for a comprehensive, long-range, and coordinated national program in oceanography, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 3353. A bill to correct and improve the Canal Zone Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 3354. A bill to provide benefits for members and survivors of members of the Philippine Scouts on the same basis as such benefits are provided for other members of the Armed Forces and their survivors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 3355. A bill to provide that nonprofit hospitals shall be subject to the National Labor Relations Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 3356. A bill to provide for the erection of a monument on Alcatraz Island to commemorate the founding of the United Nations in San Francisco, Calif., in 1945, and to serve as a symbol of peace; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BURTON of Utah:

H.R. 3357. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H.R. 3358. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide monthly insurance benefits for certain dependent parents of individuals entitled to old-age or disability insurance benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3359. A bill to encourage the use of private benefit plans in lieu of social security by providing that individuals who are eligible for certain benefits under such plans shall not be entitled to social security benefits or subject to social security taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3360. A bill to amend titles I, X, and XIV of the Social Security Act to make individuals suffering from tuberculosis or mental illness eligible thereunder for public assistance payments (and medical assistance) on the same basis as individuals suffering from other types of illness; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DINGELL (by request):

H.R. 3361. A bill to provide for payment for hospital and related health services for persons 65 years of age and older, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOLE:

H.R. 3362. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to abolish the renewal requirement for licenses in the safety and special radio services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 3363. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide uniforms for mail handlers in the postal field service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee:

H.R. 3364. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I and their widows and dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H.R. 3365. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, to provide annuities for surviving spouses without deduction from original annuities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FLYNT:

H.R. 3366. A bill to encourage the creation of original ornamental designs of useful articles by protecting the authors of such designs for a limited time against unauthorized copying; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 3367. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 3368. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an additional $2,400 exemption from income tax for certain amounts received as retirement annuities or pensions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FISHER:

H.R. 3369. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H.R. 3370. A bill to amend the act of July 15, 1955, relating to the conservation of anthracite coal resources, to remove certain restrictions; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FRASER:

H.R. 3371. A bill to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act, as amended, in order to increase the authorization for appropriations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 3372. A bill to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act, as amended, in order to increase the authorization for appropriations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 3373. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 3374. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the State of Florida; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 3375. A bill to strengthen and improve educational quality and educational opportunities in the Nation's elementary and secondary schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 3376. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3377. A bill to increase, in the case of children who are attending school, from 18 to 21 years of age until which child's insurance benefits may be received under title II of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HANLEY:

H.R. 3378. A bill to extend to volunteer fires companies and their auxiliaries the rates of postage on second-class and third-class bulk mailings applicable to certain nonprofit organizations; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. HANSEN of Washington:

H.R. 3379. A bill to provide assistance to the States of Oregon, Washington, California, and Idaho for the reconstruction of areas damaged by recent floods and high waters; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HARVEY of Michigan:

H.R. 3380. A bill to amend the Flood Control Act of 1958 to authorize reimbursement to Frankenmuth, Mich., for certain work on the flood control project on the Saginaw River, Mich.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.R. 3381. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to individuals for certain expenses incurred in providing higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 3382. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the manufacturers excise tax on photographic equipment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUTCHINSON:

H.R. 3383. A bill to adjust wheat and feed grain production, to establish a cropland retirement program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 3384. A bill to establish a new program of grants for public works projects undertaken by local governments in the United States; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KARTH:

H.R. 3385. A bill to provide a uniform period for daylight saving time; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 3386. A bill to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and section 705(b), of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 and to amend the first proviso of section 8(a)(3) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 3387. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code, so as to provide for the appointment of one additional district judge for the district of Minnesota; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 3388. A bill relating to the interest rates on loans made by the Treasury to the Department of Agriculture to carry out the programs authorized by the Rural Electrification Act of 1936; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KING of Utah:

H.R. 3389. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to assist in compensating for the hazardous and arduous nature of employment in certain occupations, and for the decreased life expectancy of persons engaged in such occupations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LENNON:

H.R. 3390. A bill to appropriate funds for advanced engineering, design, and initiation of construction of the New Hope Reservoir project, North Carolina; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.R. 3391. A bill to appropriate funds for construction of the navigation porject at Wilmington Harbor, N.C.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.R. 3392. A bill to appropriate funds for construction of the North Masonboro Inlet jetty, North Carolina; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. MILLER:

H.R. 3393. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Auburn-Folsom South unit, American River division, Central Valley project, California, under Federal reclamation laws; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 3394. A bill to provide for the mandatory reporting by physicians and institutions in the District of Columbia of certain physical abuse of children; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 3395. A bill to amend the Federal Firearms Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NATCHER:

H.R. 3396. A bill to extend veteran benefits to persons serving in the Armed Forces between November 12, 1918 and July 2, 1921; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.R. 3397. A bill to amend section 1(14)(a) of the Interstate Commerce Act to insure the adequacy of the national railroad freight car supply, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 3398. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the excise tax on communications; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3399. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to limit or repeal certain retailers excise taxes and to repeal the manufacturers excise tax on musical instruments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 3400. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the tax treatment of payments under retirement plans of certain exempt organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.R. 3401. A bill to provide that the United States shall reimburse the States and their political subdivisions for real property taxes not collected on real property owned by a foreign government and therefore exempt from taxation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 3402. A bill to provide for the return of obscene mail matter; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H.R. 3403. A bill to amend the act of May 29, 1944, providing annuities for persons who participated in the construction of the Panama Canal, by extending the class to whom annuities may be paid; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. REIFEL:

H.R. 3404. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 3405. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the manufacturer's excise tax on household-type electric, gas, and oil appliances; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H.R. 3406. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROUDEBUSH:

H.R. 3407. A bill to amend chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions of $100 per month to World War I veterans, subject to a $2,400 and $3,600 annual income limitation; to provide that retirement income such as social security shall not be counted as income; to provide that such pension shall be increased by 10 percent where the veteran served overseas during World War I, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 3408. A bill to amend section 312 of title 38, United States Code, to provide a 6-year presumption of service connection of tuberculous disease in the case of former prisoners of war; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H.R. 3409. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHRIVER:

H.R. 3410. A bill to repeal retailers excise taxes on jewelry, furs, toilet preparations, and luggage and handbags; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SICKLES:

H.R. 3411. A bill to provide for the mandatory reporting by physicians and institutions in the District of Columbia of certain physical abuse of children; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. STALBAUM:

H.R. 3412. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies", approved July 2, 1890; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 3413. A bill to amend section 106 of title 38 of the United States Code to provide that individuals who incur a disability in line of duty during certain service shall be entitled to certain veteran's benefits; to the Committee on Veterans Affairs.

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 3414. A bill to provide that hereafter the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation in the Department of Justice shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, from among career officers or employees of such Bureau; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BONNER:

H.R. 3415. A bill to equalize certain penalties in the Intercoastal Shipping Act, 1933; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mrs. DWYER:

H.R. 3416. A bill to protect the public health and safety by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to establish special controls for depressant and stimulant drugs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 3417. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to individuals for certain expenses incurred in providing higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.R. 3418. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code (relating to highways) in order to authorize appropriations to assist the States in the purchase of lands and easements for scenic purposes along Federal-aid highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 3419. A bill to exempt oceanographic research vessels from the application of certain vessel inspection laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 3420. A bill to promote economic growth by supporting State and regional centers to place the findings of science usefully in the hands of American enterprise; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 3421. A bill to provide for equitable acquisition practices, fair compensation, and effective relocation assistance in real property acquisitions for Federal and federally assisted programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 3422. A bill to provide that until the national debt is retired, not less than 10 percent of the net budget receipts of the United States for each fiscal year shall be utilized solely for reduction of the national debt; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 3423. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to permit charitable contributions, bequests, transfers, and gifts to the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) to be deductible for income tax, estate tax, and gift tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3424. A bill to provide a deduction for income tax purposes, in the case of a disabled individual, for expenses for transportation to and from work; and to provide an additional exemption for income tax purposes for a taxpayer or spouse who is physically or mentally incapable of caring for himself; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3425. A bill to provide that tips received by an employee in the course of his employment shall be included as part of his wages for old-age, survivors, and disability insurance purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3426. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act and chapter 2 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to place social security coverage on an individual option basis for U.S. citizens performing service in the United States as employees of international organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3427. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide monthly insurance benefits for dependent or surviving sisters of certain insured individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3428. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3429. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the tax on admissions shall not apply to admissions to any live dramatic (including musical) performance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3430. A bill relating to the tax treatment of transfers of rights to copyrights and literary, musical, and artistic compositions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3431. A bill to amend the Federal Firearms Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H.R. 3432. A bill to equalize certain penalties in the Intercoastal Shipping Act, 1933; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. POLANCO-ABREU:

H.R. 3433. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Interior shall convey certain real property to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER:

H.R. 3434. A bill to provide for research into and development of practical means for the utilization of solar energy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. BURTON of Utah:

H.R. 3435. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture jointly with the Secretary of Commerce to make a preliminary survey of the proposed Skyline Drive Recreation Way in the Manti-LaSal and Fishlake National Forests in the State of Utah; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WHITENER:

H.R. 3438. A bill to amend the Bankruptcy Act with respect to limiting the priority and nondischargeability of taxes in bankruptcy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAMERON:

H.R. 3439. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 3440. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:

H.R. 3441. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 3442. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CALLAN:

H.R. 3443. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 3444. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.R. 3445. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award postumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H.R. 3446. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 3447. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DENTON:

H.R. 3448. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H.R. 3449. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DYAL:

H.R. 3450. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California:

H.R. 3451. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 3452. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARNSLEY:

H.R. 3453. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARNUM:

H.R. 3454. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON of Tennessee:

H.R. 3455. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 3456. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILLIGAN:

H.R. 3457. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 3458. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAMILTON:

H.R. 3459. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 3460. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANSEN of Iowa:

H.R. 3461. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. HANSEN of Washington:

H.R. 3462. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 3463. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUNGATE:

H.R. 3464. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUOT:

H.R. 3465. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACOBS:

H.R. 3466. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H.R. 3467. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 3468. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma:

H.R. 3469. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEE:

H.R. 3470. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 3471. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KREBS:

H.R. 3472. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGRATH:

H.R. 3473. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.R. 3474. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 3475. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 3476. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 3477. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RACE:

H.R. 3478. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RESNICK:

H.R. 3479. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 3480. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H.R. 3481. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 3482. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 3483. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H.R. 3484. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHISLER:

H.R. 3485. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER:

H.R. 3486. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STALBAUM:

H.R. 3487. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SWEENEY:

H.R. 3488. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TODD:

H.R. 3489. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TUNNEY:

H.R. 3490. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VIGORITO:

H.R. 3491. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALKER of New Mexico:

H.R. 3492. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON:

H.R. 3493. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOLFF:

H.R. 3494. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POLANCO-ABREU:

H.R. 3495. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.J. Res. 222. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the balancing of the budget; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.J. Res. 223. Joint resolution providing that an environmental health center that may hereafter be established in the Public Health Service shall be known as "Rachel Carson Memorial Research Center for Environmental Health"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DENT:

H.J. Res. 224. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to succession to the Presidency and Vice-Presidency and to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.J. Res. 225. Joint resolution establishing a section to be known as the Shevchenko Freedom Library in the Library of Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.J. Res. 226. Joint resolution to provide for the creation of a captive nations freedom series of postage stamps in honor of national heroes of freedom, commencing with a Taras Shevchenko freedom stamp; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HARVEY of Michigan:

H.J. Res. 227. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORHEAD:

H.J. Res. 228. Joint resolution to designate Columbus Day, the 12th day of October in each year, a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.J. Res. 229. Joint resolution requesting the President to proclaim the week of November 16 to 22 as National Student Council Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REIFEL:

H.J. Res. 230. Joint resolution designating the bridge constructed over the Washington Channel of the Potomac River in the District of Columbia, as the "Francis Case Memorial Bridge"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H.J. Res. 231. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue a proclamation commemorating the centennial anniversary, on April 9, 1965, of the surrender of General Lee to General Grant at Appomattox, Va.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROUDEBUSH:

H.J. Res. 232. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H.J. Res. 233. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BELL:

H. Con. Res. 126. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the United Arab Republic be denied aid under the terms of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H. Con. Res. 127. Concurrent resolution to establish an international economic conference to consider balance of payments; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H. Con. Res. 128. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union, and calling upon the Soviet Union to guarantee human rights; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Con. Res. 129. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the rectification of the relief rolls of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McEWEN:

H. Con. Res. 130. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the proposal to close the Sunmount Veterans' Administration Hospital, Tupper Lake, N.Y.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H. Con. Res. 131. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the enforcement of the provisions of article 19 of the United Nations Charter; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TODD:

H. Con. Res. 132. Concurrent resolution providing for a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H. Res. 137. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigations authorized by House Resolution 80; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H. Res. 138. Resolution establishing a Special Committee on the Captive Nations; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. Res. 139. Resolution providing for the expenses incurred pursuant to House Resolution 94; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 3436. A bill to provide additional time to certain homestead entrymen in the State of Arizona to establish actual permanent residence; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BRAY:

H.R. 3437. A bill to provide for the advancement of Hospitalman Chief Gerald Henry White, U.S. Navy (retired), to the grade of chief warrant pharmacist; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H.R. 3496. A bill for the relief of Dr. Yoshio Watanabe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BELL:

H.R. 3497. A bill for the relief of Anne Marie Kee Tham Rosenberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAMERON:

H.R. 3498. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marguerite Kedemos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3499. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mala Swe Bridges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H.R. 3500. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Emilie Boulay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3501. A bill for the relief of Charles F. Leahy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONABLE:

H.R. 3502. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Josephina C. Aquino Heindel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3503. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marianna Fiannaca Vella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 3504. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Juan Antonio Rivas Lopez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3505. A bill for the relief of Beverly Helen (Smith) Bowers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3506. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Joan Bramwell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FALLON:

H.R. 3507. A bill for the relief of Dr. Selim Samaan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 3508. A bill for the relief of Florinda Cascarano and Lucia Pacucci; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3509. A bill for the relief of Santa Pisciotta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3510. A bill for the relief of Nicola Congiliaro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3511. A bill for the relief of Newton Dowden and Shirley Agnes Dowden; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3512. A bill for the relief of Angelo Barone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3513. A bill for the relief of Angelo Lopane; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3514. A bill for the relief of Zakharia Dorani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 3515. A bill for the relief of Mary Ann Hartmann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 3516. A bill for the relief of John (Ioannis) Antonopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3517. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Pito; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3518. A bill for the relief of Efthemios Chryssikos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3519. A bill for the relief of Vincenzo Amato; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3520. A bill for the relief of Dr. Themistocles J. Chryssochoos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3521. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Iccari; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GERALD R. FORD:

H.R. 3522. A bill for the relief of Ng Thiat Hor and Ng Thiat Keung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H.R. 3523. A bill for the relief of Carmela Macaro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3524. A bill for the relief of Dr. Aman Farajiani and his wife, Letitia Atienza Farajiani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 3525. A bill for the relief of Leon Levy, Mira Levy, and Moses Levy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3526. A bill for the relief of Dr. Eric J. Lazaro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.R. 3527. A bill for the relief of Manuel Lee Sanchez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3528. A bill for the relief of Guiseppe Esposito and Eduardo Amodio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.R. 3529. A bill for the relief of Claire A. Zarur; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3530. A bill for the relief of Dr. Miguel Angel Martinez y Corpas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3531. A bill for the relief of Dr. Julio Cesar Muniz y Sotolongo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 3532. A bill for the relief of Vlada Cizerlin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 3533. A bill for the relief of Todor Dimovski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KARTH:

H.R. 3534. A bill for the relief of Dr. Rafael F. Fernandez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 3535. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Viola Louise Bradley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGEN:

H.R. 3536. A bill for the relief of George R. Lore; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3537. A bill for the relief of Albert Carter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 3538. A bill for the relief of Soultana Tselidou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3539. A bill for the relief of Dr. Sadashiv V. Phansalkar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3540. A bill for the relief of Enni Rosa-Tezza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H.R. 3541. A bill for the relief of Leena Johanna Jaskari Taylor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Alabama:

H.R. 3542. A bill for the relief of Eiko Udaka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of Illinois:

H.R. 3543. A bill for the relief of Kyriakos G. Kyriakoulis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 3544. A bill for the relief of Janina Janus; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 3545. A bill for the relief of Lauren F. Teutsch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 3546. A bill for the relief of Owen C. Boyle; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3547. A bill for the relief of Dusan Dobnik, Anna Dobnik, and Verena Dobnik; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 3548. A bill for the relief of Carmen Elsena and Clarence Rudolph Chase; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3549. A bill for the relief of Spyros Katsihtis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3550. A bill for the relief of Biagio Polizzi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3551. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Janet Franklin (nee Reid); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 3552. A bill for the relief of Colombo Melone, his wife, Vivalda Melone, and his minor child, Maria Teresa Melone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 3553. A bill for the relief of Andrija Horwath, his wife, Anka Horwath, his son, Adolfo Horwath, his mother, Elisabeta Horwath, and his sister-in-law, Elisabeta Horwath; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY of New York:

H.R. 3554. A bill for the relief of Eva Cuaycong deCastro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 3555. A bill for the relief of Njdeh Megerdichian and his wife, Mary Megerdichian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3556. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Chieko Takagi McKinstry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUMSFELD:

H.R. 3557. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the U.S. Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Solomon S. Levadi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 3558. A bill for the relief of Jean Croitorou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3559. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Angel Virjin Papas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3560. A bill for the relief of Michael Tsimenoglou and his wife, Arety Tsimenoglou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3561. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Soon Man Rhim (nee Hai Won Chang); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3562. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Yolando Asuncion Chia de Fernandez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H.R. 3563. A bill for the relief of Aristotelis G. Papaevangelou and Constantina Papaevangelou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.R. 3564. A bill for the relief of Anita Roberta Facey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3565. A bill for the relief of Viviane Rubin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHWEIKER:

H.R. 3566. A bill for the relief of Crystal Julia Fuller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT:

H.R. 3567. A bill for the relief of Ziya Idris Tabak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3568. A bill for the relief of Jivan R. Tabibian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHRIVER:

H.R. 3569. A bill for the relief of Odette M. Hudspeth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 3570. A bill for the relief of Dr. Surender Kumar Nanda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STALBAUM:

H.R. 3571. A bill for the relief of Dimitrios Ioannis Tsakiris (husband), Thomae Dimitrios Tsakiris (wife); and two children, Ioannis and Athina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 3572. A bill for the relief of Paja Radojevic and his wife Zlata Radojevic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3573. A bill for the relief of Miloye M. Sokitch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TODD:

H.R. 3574. A bill for the relief of Hack Kyun Woo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YATES:

H.R. 3575. A bill for the relief of Dr. Kaloo Chandiram Thadhani and his wife, Rekha Thadhani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

79. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the executive director, National Affairs Committee, Youth Council on Civic Affairs, Inc. Jacksonville, Fla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to requesting consideration of legislation to charter the Youth Councils on Civic Affairs, a national organization composed of local community youth councils; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

80. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to passage of the Federal Reserve reform bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Ukrainian Independence Day, 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1965

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, I take this occasion to join my colleagues in rising today to salute and remember January 22, 1918—the date the Ukrainian peoples proclaimed the now-destroyed Ukrainian National Republic. That was 47 years ago. A lot has happened to the world order in this period of time, but we are concerned here today with just two events that have touched the lives of the Ukrainian people. Just 3 years after independence was proclaimed the country was occupied by Soviet troops, and 12 years after that, in 1933, the once-free peoples of the Ukraine were incorporated into the Soviet Union.

Now, Mr. Speaker, being a political pragmatist and not a historical fatalist, I realize, as do many of my colleagues in both Houses, that all the speeches, all the salutes, and all the remembrances will not change the policies of the Soviet leaders, or undo this tragedy of modern history. There are, however, valid reasons for our words today:

First of all, it permits us the opportunity to search our own souls and political consciences, by taking just a few moments each year to recall the history of these noble peoples. In what better forum can this be done than in the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress? Secondly, it affords the American people the opportunity to collectively recall there still exists in the world national and religious persecution. Thirdly, it gives us the chance to tell the world that we Americans do not take our freedoms lightly or for granted. Despite impressions to the contrary, the American people are not complacent, are not preoccupied with themselves. Instead, our hearts and our minds and our spirit will always be with those less fortunate than ourselves—especially with those whose freedom has been forcibly taken from them.

Let us tell Ukrainians all over the world today that we heartily agree with President Johnson who said in his inaugural address:

> How incredible it is that in this fragile existence we should hate and destroy one another. There are possibilities enough for all who will abandon mastery over others to pursue mastery over nature. There is world enough for all to seek their happiness in their own way.

Sir Winston Churchill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1965

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, one of the acts of the 88th Congress was to confer honorary citizenship on Sir Winston S. Churchill. We did so in recognition of the vast and heroic part that he played in the prosecution of the allied war effort which gave us victory over our common foes, the Axis Powers. We did it also because he exemplified more than any other living mortal of foreign nationality those essential traits of devotion to liberty on which the whole American experiment was initially founded. The fact that this experiment, begun 189 years ago, has not only endured but flourished and prospered beyond measure is due in large part to the fact that these ideals of liberty, respect for truth, and love of justice, have been fought for by courageous men of purpose and vision.

Sir Winston Churchill will surely live forever in the annals of history. We mourn today his passing; yet, we rejoice in the imperishable heritage which he has not only helped to preserve but which his shining deeds and magnificent words of courageous counsel in times of adversity have helped to strengthen. For in the course of human events there will surely come other times of decision; yes, even times when once again our whole democratic system will come under the siege guns of those who would overcome us. Yet, we can remain confident that in times like these the inspiration of Sir Winston Churchill's life and writings will continue to strengthen other men in the purpose and resolve to resist tyranny and remain free. The world has truly lost a great man, but as freedom's champion he lives on in the immortal garb of historic greatness. He will forever remain joined in the affections of the American people with the great patriots of our Republic.

Polish Insurrection of 1863

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1965

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, the unhappy Poles have suffered under numerous alien regimes, but they suffered longer and more cruelly under the oppressive and decrepit regime of Russian czars than any of the others. Since the third partition of Poland late in the 18th century, most of Poland became part of imperial Russia and the majority of the Polish nation restive subjects of the czars. More than once, the Polish people tried to free themselves through uprisings and open revolts. Such an event took place in 1863.

This uprising was proclaimed on January 22 of that year, but actually it had been in the making since mid-1861. A secret conspiracy was planned, with adherents in all parts of Poland, in August of 1861. On October 15, there was a demonstration protest. Demonstrators took possession of the churches, and the clergy was forced to close them down. This was followed by reconciliation overtures by Russian authorities, and for a while things seemed quiet. Then in the summer of 1862 more uprisings took place; there was an attempt to assassinate the Russian Grand Duke. This was followed by severe repressive measures, which in their turn brought a revolutionary group into the open, proclaiming itself the "true government of Poland." Then Polish leaders made categorical demands on Russian authorities adding that they would accept nothing short of the establishment of a Polish national government. Unfortunately, these demands left the Poles to their own meager resources, for though they could and did expect moral support of their friends abroad, these friends were in no position to aid them in any effective way. Nevertheless, they meant to carry on their resolve.

On January 16, they called the nation to arms, and many Poles serving in the Russian Army responded to this call. Then on the fateful January 22 they announced the emancipation and "complete enfranchisement of every person in the Polish realm without regard to race, religion, or previous condition of bondage."

The response to this announcement was heartening; simultaneous uprisings occurred in many parts of the country, even though the Poles could organize no more than 10,000 men against Russia's 100,000. Therein lay the tragedy of the Polish uprising of 1863. As long as brute force was the arbiter of a righteous and sacred cause, the uprising was doomed to failure. In mid-1864 when the stouthearted and youthful Polish leader Traugett was hanged by Russian authorities in Warsaw, the daring Polish uprising against Russia was officially brought to an end. Today, noting the 102d anniversary of the uprising against czarist tyranny, we pay tribute to the memory of those gallant Poles.

Ukrainian Independence: Nationalism at Its Best

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM STANTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1965

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, the last decade has witnessed the emergence of many new nations, some of them barely meeting any valid criteria of nationhood. In fact, many people would argue that these new countries are meddlesome and unstable, and that the world would be a lot better off if the nationalism which spawned them, and which animates their policy, could be forgotten.

Whatever the merits of this contention, there is no doubt that nationalism has played, and can play, a constructive role on the world stage. When genuine national feeling, and a genuine basis for nationhood exists, its suppression is a measureless tragedy. Such has been the unhappy, and yet inspiring fate of the Ukraine, whose brief taste of independence and freedom was crushed by the Soviet Union 47 years ago.

Unhappy—because with all the requisites of nationhood the Ukraine was destroyed. The country possessed a broad and fertile territory, a hardy and intelligent population, and a tradition of independence and democracy going back to medieval times. Its leaders set up a humane and democratic state, with the support of the great majority of their people. Yet the Red Army snuffed out the life of the Ukrainian Republic, and the Soviets, professing to support self-determination, set up their own regime in the Ukraine.

Inspiring—because Ukrainians have never lost hope. They cannot celebrate January 22 as their national day. Only their brethren living abroad can do so. But oppressed as they are, the people of the Ukraine know, with a sure faith, that a day of freedom will eventually come.

The fate of the Ukraine should also serve as an object lesson to those new countries tempted to play ball with communism, whether of Soviet or Chinese stripe. For communism cannot accept truly valid national aspirations. It can only give them lip service. For the Communists the only nationalism they can support is one which serves their interests. They have proved this in the Ukraine.

The destruction of the Ukrainian Republic can serve as an object lesson for this country as well. It demonstrates that we can never relax our vigilance, never take Soviet professions of cultural or national freedom at face value. But more than this, the example of the Ukrainian people should inspire us all. For if we can only show the same steadfastness, freedom—true freedom—is bound to triumph in the end.

Statue to "Mr. Sam" Unveiled

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1965

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN, our distinguished and able colleague, delivered a timely, brief, but masterful and eloquent address when the statue to our late beloved Speaker was unveiled in the Rayburn Building on January 10. I commend this superb address to the attention of the Congress and to the Nation:

REMARKS OF WRIGHT PATMAN, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, AS MASTER OF CEREMONIES AT UNVEILING OF SAM RAYBURN STATUE AT RAYBURN BUILDING, CAPITOL HILL, WASHINGTON, D.C.

President Hutchinson, Mrs. Johnson, Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen, we are gathered here today to accept reverently and with gratitude a superbly sculptured image in bronze of Sam Rayburn from the Texas State Society of Washington to the American people and their Government. This is the statue of the greatest legislative personality in the history of our country. It is to adorn this massive and distinguished new congressional office building, which is to bear Sam Rayburn's name. The building itself, as you see, in size and scope and capacity to serve, in accommodation, and in its structural soundness and architectural eminence, is a high monument made for the centuries. It is ideally suited to help preserve the name of the great Texan who, by his leadership in the Congress of the United States, has done so much to change for the better the face of our country and the posture of the world.

I knew Sam Rayburn for a half century or more, and I say this building is the ideal monument to his memory, and this statue is a remarkable rendering of the dynamic, the patriotic, the humanely concerned American whom we are here to honor. A building with this immense space and footage is, of course, not a minor undertaking. Much has been said about its cost that, I find, conflicts with the simple truths of arithmetic. In terms of cost—$86,400,000 in relation to its 33,600,000 cubic feet—this new Rayburn House Office Building may be said to be, not an extravagance, but a sound buy and a solid success from every aspect of fiduciary commonsense.

In truth and in fact, it may be described as a bargain of the first magnitude, except by those who think in the dismal financial language of the 1930's and in the depressed labor market of the same period, the economic evils Sam Rayburn did so much to redress. For example, the Supreme Court at current prices would cost $4.46 a cubic foot. The Old Senate Office Building would come to $3.50 at today's prices. Yet this magnificently imposing, ably engineered, brilliantly architectured monument in stone and marble cost $2.46. On the square foot basis, the Supreme Court would cost $90.94, the Old Senate Office Building $59.00, and this new Rayburn Building $36.56. This is arithmetic, not rhetoric. It is the sort of Government deal that would have pleased the heart of "Mr. Sam."

The new Rayburn House Office Building, like the grand old man after whom it is named, looks not only to the present but even more notably to the future. In an age of quick absolescence, this edifice is made, like Rayburn's toughly achieved reputation, to last for the next thousand years and more. I hope you will forgive my emotion, but Sam Rayburn was my friend, and I revered and loved him as one respects and admires a legendary figure in his lifetime and after.

This statue moves my heart because the Texas State Society of Washington has done a noble thing. For this statue is the ideal tribute in perfect taste and I salute you for it. I know it does all of us good—those who worked so closely and so loyally with the master legislator who has been Speaker of the House longer than any Speaker in history and those who were for years his intimate friends: Speaker John W. McCormack, of Massachusetts; the Reverend Bernard Braskamp, Chaplain of the House; the sculptor, Felix de Weldon, who so perfectly caught the essence of Mr. Sam's personality; President Everett Hutchinson; and the judges and representatives of the Texas State Society Committee who were commissioned to decide on a fitting memorial. There is, of course, a special and a very particular place in all this for Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson. For it must be said it was nothing less than a stroke of genius that named her to make the dedication. And now it must be said that, more than ever before, from here on out with the unveiling of this statue, Speaker Sam Rayburn belongs not only to Texas, but to all our people, indeed, to mankind and to history.

Senator Mansfield Unfairly Criticized

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1965

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I was distressed by a recent editorial criticizing the distinguished majority leader of the U.S. Senate for expressing his opposition to the closing of veterans hospitals throughout the country. The editorial stated that the current practice of caring for veterans with non-service-connected disabilities is a "fantastic distortion" of the main purpose of caring for sick and disabled veterans of this Nation. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the editorial writer is in error. The system of caring for non-service-connected veterans in Veterans' Administration hospitals on a bed-available basis is one which was authorized approximately 40 years ago. It should be borne in mind, Mr. Speaker, that these individuals suffering from non-service-connected illnesses are in many instances veterans having chronic disabilities, many suffering from neuropsychiatric disorders, others with tuberculosis, and by far the greatest percentage of admissions of this type of patient are receiving a pension and that in itself indicates that they cannot afford to pay for medical care.

These sick individuals must be cared for, and I am not aware that any city, county, or State has come forth with any offer to assume the responsibility for caring for these individuals. I for one feel that they deserve to be treated better than as charity cases.

The editorial writers too conveniently overlooked the contribution which the Veterans' Administration medical system has made to the training of physicians. I cite the recent statement of Dr. John L. Parks, dean of the School of Medicine of George Washington University, and a member of the Executive Council of the Association of American Medical Colleges, when he stated:

> A total of 3,885 out of 7,321 registered senior medical students have a part of their fourth year clinical training in VA hospitals. Approximately 10 percent of all residencies are in VA hospitals. Many of America's best specialty training programs have developed through combined university and affiliated VA hospital programs; 15 percent of all practicing physicians have received part or all of their specialty training in Veterans' Administration hospitals.

Anyone who takes the trouble to ascertain the facts will learn that excellent medical care is being given in small communities throughout the United States. If this is not the case, why are medical associations, public health groups, and hospital association encouraging the use of Hill-Burton funds to construct, man and maintain hospitals in small communities? This fact in no way detracts from the outstanding research or the quality of medical care which is being performed in hospitals affiliated with medical schools or in medical facilities devoted to research.

Rather than criticize Senator MANSFIELD, the editorial writers should be appreciative of his efforts to bring out one of the facts involved in this complicated situation, and particularly for coming to the defense of a medical system which has made a unique and distinct contribution to medical care in the United States.

I am of the opinion that the editorial criticizing Senator MANSFIELD, which appeared in a local Washington newspaper yesterday, was particularly unfair and, in fact, missed the entire point of Senator MANSFIELD's position. The editorial accepted the Veterans' Administration hospital closing as a justified economy move and inferred that Senator MANSFIELD's opposition is based on his own local interests. I think this is most unfair. Senator MANSFIELD's question of the Veterans' Administration hospital curtailment has not been on the narrow issue of a hospital in his own State, but rather he has questioned the policies of the Veterans' Administration in closing hospitals in smaller towns and concentrating its medical facilities in the big cities, in many instances hundreds of miles away from the veteran beneficiary.

This editorial characterized the facilities being closed as "old, expensive to maintain, and not needed." This characterization is in direct conflict with the Veterans' Administration's own description of the facility at Miles City, Mont., which is as follows:

> The reservation consists of approximately 14 acres and the hospital includes nine brick buildings. It is equipped with the most modern facilities and services for the treatment of medical and surgical patients. There is a new, modern medical library. The staff includes consultants who are outstanding in their specialties. There are approximately 130 full-time employees, comprising a complete team of physicians, dentists, nurses, and a full range of auxiliary staff.

It is a fact that the Miles City Hospital is operated more economically than the local Washington, D.C., Veterans' Administration hospital. In December 1964, the per diem cost per patient at Miles City was $37.62 as compared with a per diem cost per patient at the Washington hospital of $49.65.

Economy is not the essential issue involved in these closings. Actually, this decision will save only about $20 million and in fiscal year 1966 the Veterans' Administration will spend for veterans' medical care $60 million more than it did in the previous year. Their recently announced budget includes $50 million for new medical facilities. These are mainly located in large population centers. We heard no criticism or cries of economy several years ago when Congress appropriated funds to expand the Washington VA hospital from 335 beds to 760 beds at a cost of $18,500,000. As I recall, this move was applauded by the local newspapers. The New York City newspaper which has chosen to criticize Senator MANSFIELD's position has failed to note that this year's Federal budget provides $15,109,000 to build a new hospital at Northport, N.Y., and another million dollars to obtain the site for a hospital to be located on Long Island with a total cost of approximately $20 million. In other words, the new construction designated for the New York City area will require considerably more funds than will be saved by closing facilities in other parts of the country. I do not criticize the plans of the Veterans' Administration to expand facilities in the New York City area and, in fact, I think they are needed but, again, I must question the excessive emphasis on facilities in large metropolitan areas at the expense of other sections of the country.

At a time when we are being told that the Nation is woefully short of hospital beds and is doing an inadequate job of caring for our older citizens, we are also closing 6,000 VA hospital and domiciliary beds which would cost in excess of $125 million to replace. This is being done on the basis of economy. At the same time, VA facilities are being expanded in the larger cities, apparently at the expense of veterans located in small towns and rural areas. This is the policy being questioned by Senator MANSFIELD.

It is most unfortunate that newspapers should level criticism at Senator MANSFIELD when he calls for further inquiry into this complicated situation. There are many of us who share his concern about the overemphasis on facilities in large cities at the expense of rural areas. Along with others, I worked hard to secure the authorization of the new Washington VA hospital. I did this because I believed it was needed and justified. But I regret to see the local Washington press criticizing Senator MANSFIELD because he seeks to preserve medical facilities which exist in some less populated areas in order that the veterans in those areas may participate to some degree in the programs our Nation maintains for their benefit.

One-hundredth Anniversary of the Salvation Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1965

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, many times throughout the years we have gone on record with our recognition of the Salvation Army's humanitarian work in various disasters, situations of depression, in wartime and in peacetime, at the Christmas season and other seasons, all months and all hours. Today I propose that we place on record a happy acknowledgement of the fact that this year the Salvation Army is 100 years old—that we express our appreciation for this century of service to God and man.

The history of the program aptly described as "heart-to-God, hand-to-man" is reflected directly and indirectly in the lives of people throughout our 50 States—to say nothing of the rest of the world. The dedication of the men and women who fight on all fronts of human need has earned for the Salvation Army not only our respect but our affection.

This centennial makes us think how long the Salvation Army has been feeding the hungry, sheltering the homeless, caring for the sick, helping all manner of the unfortunate, spreading its message of good will, and planting seeds of hope. Even more important, the worldwide observance of the centennial makes us stop to think how much the Salvation Army has grown. All the lines of its service are now woven like strong threads into the patterns of our social service. And seeing all the Salvation Army hospitals, maternity homes, shelters, schools, missions, camps, institutes for the blind, residences for the elderly—a fantastic number of institutions as well as of services beyond measure—we marvel at the century of progress, the century of service, since it started in England in 1865.

A dedicated minister, William Booth, a nonconformist in that Victorian era of conformity, courageously went to preach the Gospel among the poverty-stricken in the East London slum. He preached on the corners of the streets because the people were in the streets, for this was one of the worst sections of the city during one of its worst periods of economic depression. Full of drunkenness, prostitution, degradation, it was beset by the general evil and specific crime that are born of poverty wed to hopelessness.

Booth had not meant to found a separate church. But his converts, destitute and shabby, were not at home in the regular churches to which he tried to send them. So he banded them together.

Seeing the tragedy, the suffering of the men and women who were out of work, out of health, out of homes, out of hope itself, he was filled with compassion. He and his little group of followers strove to find shelters for the homeless, including children who had nowhere to go, to feed the hungry, care for the sick, and to help the alcoholics.

And this program of spiritual and material help was to be symbolized in the S on the Salvation Army uniforms today. On the collar there are two S's. One S stands for salvation, which is what William Booth was preaching. The other stands for service, which is what he was practicing.

Word of his work spread. The Salvation Army spread. To other parts of England. To Sweden. To the European mainland. It invaded the United States in 1880—from which time until this the history of the services it implemented, year after year, has paralleled much of the history of social progress in this country.

Today in 71 countries and geographical areas the Salvation Army's flag flies over everything from schools to leprosaria, from maternity homes to camps for the elderly. Its spiritual and social welfare ministry attracts people from all walks of life, all income groups, and the diversification of its program is matched only by the multiple needs of troubled humanity. We are familiar with the heartwarming sight of its mobile units, of the men and women who rush in with supplies in times of disaster. We know how they serve snacks or hot beverages to victims and workers in train wrecks, hurricanes, floods, earthquakes.

It would not be Christmas without their red kettles. But even the Army's most loyal supporters are not fully aware of the vast scope of the year-around activities whereby it helps people in need, at their point of need—whatever the need may be.

The Salvation Army, for example, operates 31 general hospitals throughout the world. It cares for frightened unwed or deserted mothers in 37 maternity homes and hospitals in the United States. It maintains 125 social service centers in this country where homeless men can reclaim their lives.

Each year the missing persons bureau of the Salvation Army acts as a worldwide network of hope for an average of 12,000 people seeking lost relatives or friends, while its League of Mercy takes comfort and cheer to 3 million lonely, sick, and unfortunate men and women in prisons, hospitals, and other institutions away from the mainstream of life. The Army maintains Evangeline residences where young women can have pleasant, low-cost accommodations. It operates Red Shield Clubs and USO Clubs where men and women of the Armed Forces can find a welcome, attend classes, enjoy athletic and other events. And travelers and immigrants are helped by the Salvation Army's Transportation and Immigration Bureaus.

Foster homes for children of broken homes—day care for children—clubs for boys and girls—camps for senior citizens—and many other allied services are among those provided by the Salvation Army. And—around the world—one of the world's greatest contributions to literacy. The Salvation Army has an amazing number of schools, 857 in fact. It staffs and operates some of them in undeveloped areas where villages are so far apart pupils could not travel to and from class, so they are also given room and board.

In parts of the world so remote that no other aid would be available to the afflicted from the time of their birth to that of their death, the Salvation Army has 10 institutes for the blind. It accommodates 1,301 sufferers from leprosy in well-equipped leprosaria in Malaya, India, Rhodesia, and Sumatra.

The unique army that was begun by William Booth in that London slum section is now one of the nongovernmental organizations of the United Nations. The ministry that he began is now conducted in 147 languages.

The Salvation Army, then, has much for which to be congratulated on this, its 100th anniversary. To its 25,000 officers and cadets, its million members, its 30,000 employees, and the countless citizens who support and serve with them in communities everywhere, let us say "happy birthday." And, humbly, let us all say it with gratitude. It is a remarkable century of service to God and man.

Taxes on Antitrust Treble Damage Payments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1965

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my statement submitted

to the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, January 21, 1965, in opposition to the tax ruling allowing deduction of treble damage antitrust penalties. The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. EMANUEL CELLER

I welcome the decision of the distinguished chairman and vice chairman of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation to consider the recent ruling of the Internal Revenue Service, announced in TIR–615, permitting Federal income tax deductions, as "ordinary and necessary" business expenses, of payments made in satisfaction of, and for unsuccessful defense against, private treble damage claims under the antitrust laws. I am grateful for this opportunity to express my concern at the impact of this ruling upon effective antitrust enforcement.

The antitrust laws embody policies essential to our political and economic strength, and their enforcement is a matter of primary importance. The Sherman Act of 1890, 15 U.S.C. §§ 1–17, is the keystone, so to speak, of the antitrust arch. As the Supreme Court recently stated in *Northern Pacific Ry.* v. *United States,* 356 U.S. 1, 4:

"The Sherman Act was designed to be a comprehensive charter of economic liberty aimed at preserving free and unfettered competition as the rule of trade. It rests on the premise that the unrestrained interaction of competitive forces will yield the best allocation of our economic resources, the lowest prices, the highest quality and the greatest material progress, while at the same time providing an environment conducive to the preservation of our democratic political and social institutions."

In sweeping language "comparable to that found to be desirable in constitutional provisions" (*Appalachian Coals, Inc.* v. *United States,* 288 U.S. 344, 359), the Sherman Act condemns contracts, conspiracies and trusts in restraint of trade, and monopolies or conspiracies to monopolize. Violations may be punished both by criminal prosecution and by private actions for treble damages, and either the Government or private parties may sue to restrain violations.

The Clayton Act of 1914, 15 U.S.C. 12–27, supplements the broad provisions of the Sherman Act by prohibiting specified transactions or conduct such as tie-in sales, exclusive dealing, interlocking directorates, mergers and the like where their effect "may be substantially to lessen competition or to tend to create a monopoly." Violations may be restrained by injunction at the suit of the Government or a private party, the Government can recover its actual damages incurred as a result of antitrust violations, and private parties are again accorded a right of action for treble damages.

The Internal Revenue Service ruling in TIR–615 must be measured against the public policy embodied in these statutes. I believe that TIR–615 is bad law, bad public policy, and bad public administration. It permits an antitrust offender, already convicted of a criminal antitrust violation, to deduct treble damages paid to its victims after guilt has been established, and consequent damage to the victims proved in a private action.

The legal question before this committee, in my view, is whether conduct which constitutes a criminal antitrust violation is conduct that is "ordinary and necessary * * * in carrying on any trade or business" within the meaning of the statute, 26 U.S.C. 162, so that the treble damages which Congress has prescribed to punish violators and deter others from violating the antitrust laws, would give rise to an income tax deduction.

From this standpoint of public policy, the question before this committee, as I see it, is whether the "sting" of treble damages which Congress has prescribed to penalize antitrust violators should be lessened by shifting from the shoulders of criminal antitrust offenders to the taxpayers generally approximately one-half of treble damage awards.

From the standpoint of public administration, the question is whether the Internal Revenue Service by an administrative ruling, not subject to judicial review, should, in effect, amend the antitrust laws by mitigating the treble damages which Congress has expressly prescribed as a "penalty."

To me, the answer to each of these questions is clear from repeated decisions of the Supreme Court and the lower Federal courts and from the legislative history of the treble damage provisions of the antitrust laws.

I. THE EXPENSE OF ILLEGAL BUSINESS ACTIVITY IS NOT DEDUCTIBLE AS AN "ORDINARY AND NECESSARY" BUSINESS EXPENSE

When it was first suggested that a Federal income tax deduction should be allowed for the expense of carrying on illegal business activities, Mr. Justice Holmes rejoined, "it will be time enough to consider the question when a taxpayer has the temerity to raise it," *United States* v. *Sullivan,* 274 U.S. 259, 264.

Accordingly, it is now well settled that fines or penalties paid for violations of State or Federal laws are not deductible under section 162 of the Internal Revenue Code. In *Tank Truck Rentals* v. *Commissioner,* 356 U.S. 30, and *Hoover Motor Express Co.* v. *U.S.,* 356 U.S. 38, the Supreme Court held that fines paid for violations of State laws, whether willful or inadvertent, were not deductible as "ordinary and necessary expenses paid or incurred * * * in carrying on any trade or business." By contrast, TIR–615 confers a Federal income tax deduction on penal damages flowing out of a hard core criminal price-fixing conspiracy in flagrant violation of the Federal antitrust laws.

In Tank Truck Rentals, the Supreme Court said (356 U.S. 33–34), 35, 35–6:

"A finding of 'necessity' cannot be made, however, if allowance of the deduction would frustrate sharply defined national or State policies proscribing particular types of conduct, evidenced by some governmental declaration thereof.

* * * * *

"We will not presume that the Congress, in allowing deductions for income tax purposes, intended to encourage a business enterprise to violate the declared policy of a State. To allow the deduction sought here would be to encourage continued violations of State law by increasing the odds in favor of noncompliance. * * *

"Although each case must turn on its own facts, *Jerry Rossman Corp.* v. *Commissioner,* 175 F. 2d 711, 713, the test of nondeductibility always is the severity and immediacy of the frustration resulting from allowance of the deduction. The flexibility of such a standard is necessary if we are to accommodate both the congressional intent to tax only net income, and the presumption against congressional intent to encourage violation of declared public policy.

"Deduction of fines and penalties uniformly has been held to frustrate State policy in severe and direct fashion by reducing the 'sting' of the penalty prescribed by the State legislature."

Here, as in *Tank Truck Rentals,* supra, this Committee faces the necessity "to accommodate both the congressional intent to tax only net income, and the presumption against congressional intent to encourage violation of declared public policy." Here, as there, "allowance of the deduction would frustrate sharply defined national * * * policies proscribing particular types of conduct." Here, as there, it would be inappropriate in the absence of a scintilla of evidence to "presume that the Congress, in allowing deductions for income tax purposes intended to encourage a business enterprise to violate the declared policy" embodied in the Federal antitrust laws.

Earlier, in *Textile Mills Corp.* v. *Commissioner*, 314 U.S. 3266, the Supreme Court upheld a Treasury Regulation denying a deduction for lobbying and propaganda expenses. The Court pointed out that "Contracts to spread such insidious influences through legislative halls have long been condemned" and concluded, "There is no reason why, in the absence of clear congressional action to the contrary, the rulemaking authority cannot employ that general policy in drawing a line between legitimate business expenses and those arising from that family of contracts to which the law has given no sanction."

By contrast here, it is difficult to see why the same "rulemaking authority" failed to "employ that general policy [of fostering effective antitrust enforcement] in drawing a line between legitimate business expenses and those arising from that family of contracts to which the law has given no sanction" and indeed roundly condemns.

II. THE LEGISLATIVE HISTORY CLEARLY SHOWS THAT CONGRESS REGARDED TREBLE DAMAGES AS PENAL

The legislative history of the treble damage provisions of the antitrust laws clearly shows that the Congress regarded them as penal in nature.[1] *Haskell* v. *Perkins,* 28 F. 2d 222 (D.N.J., 1928) squarely so holds.

The treble damage provision of the antitrust laws was originally embodied in section 7 of the Sherman Act of July 2, 1890 (26 Stat. 210) which provided: "Any person who shall be injured in his business or property by any other person or corporation by reason of anything forbidden or declared to be unlawful by this act, may sue therefor in any circuit court of the United States in the district in which the defendant resides or is found, without respect to the amount in controversy, and shall recover threefold the damages by him sustained, and the costs of suit, including a reasonable attorney's fee."

In the Clayton Act of October 15, 1914, Congress enacted section 4 in its present form (38 Stat. 731), providing for treble damage recoveries for injuries sustained "by reason of anything forbidden in the antitrust laws."

In 1955, Public Law 137 repealed section 7 of the Sherman Act because, as stated in Senate Report No. 619, 84th Congress, 1st session: "Section 7 is almost identical with section 4 of the Clayton Act, but relates only to violations of the Sherman Act. * * * Since the Clayton Act's section 4 is more comprehensive, section 7 of the Sherman Act is considered to be no longer necessary."

---

[1] Congress has rarely authorized private treble damage actions. Section 4 of the Clayton Act, 15 U.S.C. 15, is one of but three statutes which provide for mandatory treble damages. The others are the Antidumping Act, 15 U.S.C. 72, and the statute relating to Government-aided railroads which renders the Union Pacific Railroad liable for treble damages to victims of discrimination practiced by the railroad, 45 U.S.C. 83.

The patent and copyright laws permit, but do not require, recoveries up to three times actual damages in cases of infringement, 35 U.S.C. 284, 17 U.S.C. 1, 101, while under 38 U.S.C. 1822, a veteran can recover three times the excess of the purchase price over the reasonable value of property sold under a loan guaranteed by the Veterans' Administration, underscores the importance attached by the the Veterans Administration.

The rarity of mandatory treble damages underscores the importance attached by the Congress to effective antitrust enforcement.

Accordingly, in determining the congressional intent in prescribing treble damages for antitrust violations, the legislative history of original section 7 of the Sherman Act is crucial.

In *Haskell* v. *Perkins, supra,* 28 F. 2d 222, the Court squarely held that the legislative history of section 7 shows that treble damages are penal in nature. There, after the plaintiff had recovered a verdict under the Sherman Act, the defendant died. Accordingly, on the plaintiff's motion to treble the damages and for a counsel fee, the Court confronted the question whether the statutory right to treble damages and counsel fees survived the defendant's death. With eminent counsel on both sides, the Court noted (28 F. 2d 222–3) that "there was, apparently, virtual agreement between counsel in the proposition that, if the matters in dispute were in truth of a punitory nature they could not be considered as having survived [the defendant's] lifetime." In language so apposite that I quote it here at length, the Court concluded (28 F. 2d 223):

"The trebling of the damages and the addition of an attorney's fee can be regarded in no other way than as a burden laid upon an alleged wrongdoer by way of penalty or punishment.

"The records of the introduction and passage of this act have been made available, and it is interesting, in connection with this dispute, to pursue the account of proceedings in the Senate and House at the time the Sherman Act, so called, was made law. Apparently an argument was precipitated through an effort made by a Senator from Texas, who offered an amendment to provide that under this section suit might be brought, not only in the Federal courts, but alternatively in any State court, and during the course of the debate which ensued Senator Hoar, of Massachusetts, who was in charge of the bill, and who probably was in large measure the author of the same in its final form, spoke as follows, regarding this very section 7:

"'What I wish to point out to the Senate and to the Senator from Texas is this: This section, which is proposed to be amended, is a section establishing a penalty, threefold damages. Now, you cannot clothe a State court with the authority to enforce a penalty. If we create a legal right like a debt by a U.S. statute, then undoubtedly a State court of general jurisdiction, which has authority to enforce and aid in the collection of debts, without express enactment by the Congress of the United States, would sustain an action to recover that debt.

"'But, when you come to penalties, no court enforces penalties except those created by the authority which creates the court, and no statute of any foreign or other authority but that can clothe the court with that power. * * * We might perhaps say that a person who owed to another a sum of money under an obligation solely the creature of a statute of the United States might recover in any State court; and if the obligation were created he could recover it equally, whether he said so or not; but we cannot say that a State court shall be clothed with jurisdiction to enforce a claim for threefold damages suffered, which is purely penal and punitive.'

"And at that point Mr. Morgan, Senator from Alabama, asked the following question: 'And the attorney's fee?' To which Mr. Hoar replied: 'Yes; and the attorney's fee. So I submit to my honorable friend from Texas that his amendment, though intended in the same direction as the bill is intended, will not bear examination.'

"There is much of the same nature in the further consideration of this law as set forth in the congressional proceedings, and from it there is no other conclusion to be drawn than that Senator Hoar, of Massachusetts, Senator Morgan, of Alabama, and Senator Edmunds, of Vermont, all of them eminent lawyers, regarded the trebling of damages and the attorney's fee as constituting a penalty."

Accordingly, the legislative history seems crystal clear that the Congress conceived of treble damages for violation of the antitrust laws as penal in nature.

The final judgment in *Haskell* v. *Perkins* was later reversed on other grounds, id., 2d Cir., 31 F. 2d 53, cert. den. 279 U.S. 827, but the holding that treble damages are penal in nature has been widely cited and followed.

Thus in *Sun Theatre Corp.* v. *RKO Radio Pictures* (7th Cir., 213 F. 2d 284), the court referred to the legislative history I have just canvassed and concluded (p. 287): "the only permissible interpretation is that the remedy afforded is treble damages, penal in nature."

Again, in *Rogers* v. *Douglas Tobacco Board of Trade,* 5th Cir., 244 F. 2d 471, the court cited *Haskell* v. *Perkins,* supra, and held (p. 483): "Trebling of the damages seems to us to be in the nature of a penalty for the public wrong."

Finally, in *Leh* v. *General Petroleum Corp.,* 9th Cir., 330 F. 2d 288, the court in a recent exhaustive opinion written by Judges Barnes, formerly the Assistant Attorney General in Charge of the Antitrust Division, referred to the holding in *Haskell* v. *Perkins* as "correct."

III. TREBLE DAMAGES UNDER THE ANTITRUST LAWS ARE PENALTIES TO PUNISH THE OFFENDER AND TO DETER OTHERS

In the cases where the proper tax treatment of treble damages under the antitrust laws was directly at issue, the Supreme Court and the lower Federal courts consistently have characterized them as "payments * * * extracted from the wrongdoers as punishment for unlawful conduct," *Commissioner* v. *Glenshaw Glass Co.,* 348 U.S. 426 at p. 431.

Similarly, in *Commissioner of Internal Revenue* v. *Obear-Nester Glass Co.,* 7th Cir., 217 F. 2d, the court distinguished sharply between compensatory and "punitive" damages stating (at pp. 61–62): "The principal purpose of treble damages seems to be punishment which will deter the violator and others from future illegal acts."

Indeed, the courts have generally stressed the public purpose in prescribing treble damages under the antitrust laws to punish offenders and to deter others from violating the antitrust laws.

Thus, in *Karseal Corp.* v. *Richfield Oil Corp.,* 9th Cir., 221 F. 2d 358, the court noted (p. 365): "The treble damage action was intended not merely to redress injury to an individual through the prohibited practices, but to aid in achieving the broad social object of the statute."

Again, in *Kinnear-Weed Corp.* v. *Humble Oil & Refining Co.,* 5th Cir., 214 F. 2d 891, the court held (p. 893): "The main purpose of those laws was to protect the public from monopolies and restraint of trade, and the private right of action for treble damages was incidental and subordinate to the main purpose. *Glenn Coal Co.* v. *Dickinson Fuel Co.,* 4th Cir., 72 F. 2d 885, 889. The grant of a claim for treble damages to persons injured was for the purpose of multiplying the agencies which would help enforce the antitrust laws and therefore make them more effective. *Maltz* v. *Sax,* 7th Cir., 134 F. 2d 2, 4. The very foundation of the right of a private suitor to recover 'threefold the damages by him sustained, and the cost of suit, including a reasonable attorney's fee' is the violation of public rights prohibited by the act, and, indeed, made criminal offenses. 15 U.S.C.A. secs. 1, 2."

Finally, in *Lyons* v. *Westinghouse Electric Corp.,* 2d Cir., 222 F. 2d 184, cert. den. 350 U.S. 825, Judge Learned Hand described a private treble damage action under the antitrust laws thus: "The remedy provided is not solely civil; two-thirds of the recovery is not remedial and inevitably presupposes a punitive purpose. It is like a qui tam action except that the plaintiff keeps all the penalty, instead of sharing it with the sovereign."

IV. PAYMENT OF FINES AND PENALTIES AND FOR THE UNSUCCESSFUL DEFENSE OF CASES UNDER THE ANTITRUST LAWS ARE NOT DEDUCTIBLE

Accordingly, the courts have generally denied Federal income tax deductions for payments of statutory penalties to the State and Federal Governments and for counsel fees incurred in the unsuccessful defense of antitrust proceedings brought by the State and Federal Governments.

In *Commissioner of Internal Revenue* v. *Longhorn Portland Cement Co.,* 5 Cir., 148 F. 2d 276, the Court denied a deduction for payments made to the State of Texas in compromise of a suit under the State antitrust laws to recover statutory penalties. In so doing, the Court reversed the tax court which had found that the defendants "didn't admit their guilt and were not proven guilty, and that the compromise settlement was made by them because they believed a defense of the suit would be more expensive than the settlement even if the verdict was favorable." (148 F. 2d 277). Overturning the tax court's decision that such compromise payments were not penal in nature and hence were deductible, the court said (148 F. 2d 277–278):

"The sense of the rule that statutory penalties are not deductible from gross income is that the penalty is a punishment inflicted by the State upon those who commit acts violative of the fixed public policy of the sovereign, wherefore to permit the violator to gain a tax advantage through deducting the amount of the penalty as a business expense, and thus to mitigate the degree of his punishment, would frustrate the purpose and effectiveness of that public policy.

"The test universally employed to determine the applicability of the doctrine to any such claimed deduction is whether the sums claimed were paid as penalties * * * if deduction for such expense is to be denied, it must be because allowance would frustrate sharply defined public policies.

"Though the solution of such issues usually turns upon the taxpayer's guilt or innocence of a crime, the ultimate determinative inquiry upon this appeal is whether the deduction claimed was paid as a penalty. This is illustrated by cases where due to a compromise settlement, the question of guilt or innocence was not established, yet the deduction claimed was disallowed to the extent that it represented a payment made to extinguish a cause of action to impose a penalty."

Such also was the holding in *Burroughs Building Material Co.* v. *Commissioner of Internal Revenue,* 2 Cir., 47 F. 2d 178, where the court disallowed a deduction for fines, costs and counsel fees incurred in an unsuccessful defense of a suit against a corporation and its president under the New York State antitrust law. Again, in *Gould Paper Co.* v. *Commissioner of Internal Revenue,* 2 Cir., 72 F. 2d 698, 699, 702, the Court denied an income tax deduction for counsel fees paid in connection with the unsuccessful defense of a criminal action and a suit in equity under the antitrust laws. Moreover, in ***National Outdoor Advertising Bureau*** v. ***Helvering***, 2 Cir., 89 F. 2d 878, the Court held that the taxpayer could not deduct his legal expenses incident to the defense of an antitrust action brought by the Federal Government which was settled in the course of trial by a consent decree declaring unlawful a contract to which the taxpayer was a party although the decree did not find that the taxpayer had committed the offense forbidden by the consent decree. The Court concluded (89 F. 2d at p. 881):

"If it is never necessary to violate the law in managing a business, it cannot be necessary to resist a decree in equity forbidding violations, except in cases where an injunction is unjustified. There is indeed less to be said for spending money in that way than in defending a criminal prosecution, for the decree by hypothesis will do no more than forbid what the taxpayer ought not to do anyway."

V. CONGRESS HAS RECENTLY AGAIN MANIFESTED ITS INTENT TO PUNISH ANTITRUST VIOLATORS BY INCREASING THE MAXIMUM FINES FOR CRIMINAL VIOLATION OF THE SHERMAN ACT

Congress has recently again manifested its intent to deal severely with criminal antitrust offenders, particularly giant business corporations which engage in restraints of trade.

As enacted in 1890 the Sherman Act provided criminal penalties not to exceed $5,000 or 1 year in prison or both. Since corporations could not be sentenced to imprisonment and prison sentences for corporate officers were rare, criminal sanctions for huge nationwide corporations amounted to a mere slap on the wrist.

The inadequacy of the financial sanctions against large corporations, such as those involved in the notorious electrical equipment conspiracies, was a matter of continuing congressional and legislative concern. Accordingly, in 1955, the Congress amend the Sherman Act to increase the penalties for each violation from $5,000 to $50,000 (Public Law 135, 84th Cong., 1st sess., 69 Stat. 282).

As the Senate report on that bill noted, "As early as 1900 a House committee reported that the penalty provisions were deemed insufficient,"[2] and a similar position was taken in the minority views of Representatives Nelson and Volstead in connection with the House bill which ultimately became the Clayton Act.[3]

In *U.S.* v. *South-Eastern Underwriters Ass'n.*, 322 U.S. 533, 591 at note 11, Mr. Justice Jackson observed:

"The antitrust law sanctions are little better than absurd when applied to huge corporations engaged in great enterprise. In the two related Madison Oil cases (see *United States* v. *Socony-Vacuum Oil Co.*, 310 U.S. 150) 15 of the 17 corporations convicted had combined capital and surplus reported to be $2,833,516,247. The total corporate fines on them were $255,000 making a ratio of fines to corporate capital and surplus of less than one-hundredth of 1 percent. In addition, fines of $180,000 were assessed against individuals. In the automobile financing case (see *United States* v. *General Motors Corp.*, 121 F. 2d 376, cert. denied, 314 U.S. 618) General Motors Corp., three wholly owned subsidiaries and no individuals were convicted. The fines were $20,000. Capital and surplus were then reported at $1,047,840,321, the fine being somewhat less than one five-hundredths of 1 percent thereof."

The very reason which moved the Congress to increase the penalties for each violation of the Sherman Act from $5,000 to $50,000 was stated in the Senate report to be: "so small a fine may indicate that the offense for which it was levied is not very serious, with the result that some businessmen may consider the possibility of violation a good business risk."

This attitude—that a violation of our antitrust laws, even a flagrant criminal price fixing conspiracy, is no worse than a traffic ticket—is the major premise of TIR-615. Such an attitude is indefensible. It conflicts with the intent of Congress expressed in the antitrust laws. It is also at war with the more recent recognition of Congress that increased criminal penalties were needed if the sanctions of the antitrust laws are to be truly effective.

VI. TIR-615 MISTAKENLY RESTS ON A MINORITY VIEW IN CONTENDING THAT TREBLE DAMAGES ARE "REMEDIAL" RATHER THAN PENAL

I understand that the Internal Revenue Service relies on a line of cases following *City of Atlanta* v. *Chattanooga Foundry and Pipe Works*, 203 U.S. 390, for the proposition that private treble damage actions under the antitrust laws are "remedial" rather than "penal" in nature. The Chattanooga case and those which have followed it involve the question of the appropriate State statute of limitations governing such actions.

To the extent that those cases, which arose before the amendment of the Clayton Act in 1955 to provide a uniform statute of limitations for actions arising under the antitrust laws, 15 U.S.C. 15b, applied a State statute of limitations other than the statute applicable to actions to recover on a penalty, they recognize the public policy embodied in section 4 of the Clayton Act which favors private enforcement of the antitrust laws.

Moreover, even if the statute of limitations cases were relevant here, they are inconclusive. As the court noted in *Englander Motors, Inc.* v. *Ford Motor Co.*, 6 Cir., 293 F. 2d 802, 804, the Federal courts have been divided on the question whether private treble damage actions under the antitrust laws are "penal" or "remedial" for purposes of the statute of limitations.

However, the most recent decision on this issue holds that a private treble damage action is penal in nature. *Leh* v. *General Petroleum Corp., supra*, 330 F. 2d 288. The comprehensive opinion in the Leh case, as I have already noted, was written by Judge Barnes, a former Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Antitrust Division.

Citing the report of the Attorney General's Committee to Study the Antitrust Laws (p. 379) to the effect that the treble damage provision penalizes antitrust violators by "imposing the harsh penalty of mutiple damages," Judge Barnes concluded (330 F. 2d 298-299): "What is recovered under section 7 of the Sherman Act (15 U.S.C. 15 note) is no less a penalty on the wrongdoer than is the fine or imprisonment with which the sovereign can threaten the violator under sections 1 and 2, or the forfeiture of articles transported in commerce, as provided for in section 6 (15 U.S.C. 6)."

The same "policy of the Federal statute," namely, to encourage effective private antitrust enforcement, applies with equal force to cases such as *Rogers* v. *Douglas Tobacco Board of Trade, supra*, 244 F. 2d 471, 483, which deal with the nature of the treble damage remedy in connection with questions of abatement and survival. *Cinnamon* v. *Abner A. Wolf, Inc.*, 215 F. Supp. 833 (D. Mich., 1963).

In view of this paramount public policy, the answer to the proper tax treatment of treble damages, it seems to me, is suggested by these words of Judge Cardozo in *Cox* v. *Lykes Bros.*, 237 N.Y. 376; 143 N.E. 226 at pp. 227-228: "We are to remember that the same provision may be penal as to the offender and remedial as to the sufferer. * * * The nature of the problem will determine whether we are to take one viewpoint or the other."

Applying this test to the proper tax treatment of treble damages, treble damages are properly taxable as income to a successful antitrust plaintiff. So the courts have held in *Commissioner* v. *Glenshaw Glass Co.* (348 U.S. 426), and *Commissioner of Internal Revenue* v. *Obear-Nester Glass Co.* (7 Cir., 217 F. 2d 56). By the same reasoning a deduction should be denied to the unsuccessful defendant in a private treble damage action under the antitrust laws.

VII. THE ERROR OF TIR-615 IS DEMONSTRATED BY THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE FLAGRANT CRIMINAL ANTITRUST CONSPIRACY WHICH IT PREDICATES AND THE LEADING CASES ALLOWING "BUSINESS EXPENSE" DEDUCTIONS

(1) In support of TIR-615, the Internal Revenue Service may also be expected to cite *Commissioner* v. *Heininger* (320 U.S. 462), where the Supreme Court upheld deduction of legal expenses incurred in connection with an unsuccessful attack upon a mail fraud order. The decisive difference is to be found in the fact, as the Supreme Court noted, that it is not the policy of the statutes which authorize the Postmaster General to issue fraud orders "to impose personal punishment upon violators," 320 U.S. 474. By contrast, as we have seen, it is the purpose of the treble damage provision of the antitrust laws to impose a penalty upon offenders.

In *Jerry Rossman Corporation* v. *Commissioner, supra* (195 F. 2d 711, 713), Judge Learned Hand had this to say of the Heininger case: "It is possible to read it as distinguishing between the legal expenses of an unsuccessful defense and the payment of fines or forfeitures. On the other hand, it is also possible to read it as meaning that, whether the claimed deduction be of legal expenses or of fines or forfeitures, its allowance depends upon the place of sanctions in the scheme of enforcement of the underlying act. We think that the second is the right reading."

I fully concur in this view, and I submit that the difference between the statute authorizing a prophylactic administrative stop order designed to prevent fraudulent advertising through the mails in the Heininger case, and the criminal and penal treble damage sanctions in the antitrust laws demonstrates that by no stretch of imagination does the Heininger case support deduction of penal treble damage payments.

(2) Again, the Internal Revenue Service may be expected to cite *Commissioner* v. *Sullivan* (356 U.S. 87), where the Supreme Court held deductible payments for rent and salaries in the conduct of illegal gambling enterprises. In sustaining the deduction, the Supreme Court stressed that Congress had recognized the existence of the gambling business by imposing a Federal excise tax on wages and that the regulations of the Internal Revenue Service made this tax deductible as an ordinary and necessary business expense. The Court stated (356 U.S. 28-29): "This seems to us to be recognition of a gambling enterprise as a business for Federal tax purposes. The policy that allows as a deduction the tax paid to conduct the business seems sufficiently hospitable to allow the normal deductions of the rent and wages necessary to operate it."

---

[2] Senate Report No. 618, 84th Cong., 1st sess.

[3] Minority views of Representatives John M. Nelson and A. J. Volstead, House Report 627, 63d Cong., 2d sess., pt. 3, p. 7: "Attention must be directed, also, to the fact that the maximum fine which is provided * * * is $5,000. To fine a great trust a maximum of $5,000 when the loot it gained may have been many hundred times that sum, is most ridiculous. The maximum should be much greater in amount."

By contrast here, the Congress has never countenanced illegal conspiracies in violation of the antitrust laws.

(3) TIR–615 cites *Jerry Rossman* v. *Commissioner, supra,* 175 F. 2d 711. That case is wholly inapplicable here. There, the defendant voluntarily paid to the Office of Price Administration inadvertent overcharges to his customers; in that case, (a) there was no criminal conviction, (b) the offense was inadvertent, and not deliberate, and (c) the defendant had voluntarily disclosed the offense and done his best to make restitution. This is toto coelo different from the criminal conspiracies concealed by the defendants, and punished by conviction when uncovered, which TIR–615 predicates.

(4) Finally, the Internal Revenue Service may cite *Foss* v. *Commissioner of Internal Revenue,* 1 Cir., 75 F. 2d, 326, where the Court sustained the deduction of payments for counsel fees incurred by the president of a corporation in the unsuccessful defense of a stockholder's derivative suit to enjoin violations of the Sherman Act. The contention may be that the Foss case sustains a deduction in private actions under the antitrust laws, whereas payments of fines and penalties on account of antitrust violations to the sovereign are not deductible. This contention was rejected by Judge Learned Hand in *National Outdoor Advertising Bureau* v. *Helvering, supra,* where he acknowledged the conflict of that decision with the Foss case, stating "we cannot see any distinction between the unsuccessful defense of a suit by a minority shareholder to enjoin the unlawful conduct of the taxpayer and a suit brought by the sovereign."

Similarly, in *International Shoe Co.,* 38 BTA 81, 95–97, the Board of Tax Appeals sustained a deduction for attorney's fees and the amounts paid in settlement of a private action under the antitrust laws. The Board reasoned that "There is no evidence that the petitioner and its officers had entered into any conspiracy or committed any illegal act. The petitioner was, however, receiving unfavorable publicity from the suit and its officers considered that it might be advisable to pay a reasonable amount to settle the controversy." However, whatever authority the International Shoe case may once have possessed, its rationale was later flatly rejected in *Commissioner of Internal Revenue* v. *Longhorn Portland Cement Co., supra,* 148 F. 2d 276–277.

VIII. ANALOGOUS DECISIONS UNDER OTHER STATUTES LIKEWISE HIGHLIGHT THE ERROR EMBODIED IN TIR–615

Since treble damages under the antitrust laws are penal in nature, the decisions of the courts and of the Internal Revenue Service itself under the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 (50 U.S.C.A. app. 925 (e)) afford no support for TIR–615. Instead, they serve to highlight the error of this ruling, and the same is true of the Tax Court rulings under section 16(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, 15 U.S.C. 78p(b), and cases the Walsh-Healey Act, 41 U.S.C. 35 et seq.

(1) As to the OPA cases, as Judge Learned Hand noted in *Jerry Rossman Corporation* v. *Commissioner, supra,* 175 F. 2d at p. 714, Congress amended the statute to mitigate the treble damage penalty in the case of innocent violations.

Accordingly, it became the rule that a taxpayer could deduct payments to the Office of Price Administration in settlement of charges of price ceiling violations if the taxpayer could establish that the overcharge had been innocently and unintentionally made and not through an unreasonable lack of care, *National Brass Works* v. *Commissioner of Internal Revenue,* 9 Cir., 182 F. 2d 526. If, on the other hand, the taxpayer acted purposely, deliberately and knowingly, payments to the Administrator in settlement of such charges were not deductible, *National Brass Works* v. *Commissioner of Internal Revenue,* 16 T.C. 1051, affirmed 9 Cir., 205 F. 2d 104; *American Brewery* v. *U.S.,* 126 F. 2d 477 (D.Md. 1954); *Nemrow Bros., Inc.* v. *U.S.* 125 F. 2d 604.

By the same token here, since TIR–615 predicates a criminal conspiracy in restraint of trade, these OPA rulings would suggest denial of any deductions.

In support of TIR–615, the Internal Revenue Service cites its own ruling in 1943 C.B. 111, 112–3 to the effect that amounts paid pursuant to judgments in favor of consumers or tenants (other than the United States) in consumer actions under section 205 of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, and amounts paid in compromise of pending or contemplated litigation in such cases, were deductible as ordinary and necessary business expenses. This attempted distinction between actions brought by the sovereign and by private parties is at odds with the holding of Judge Learned Hand in *National Outdoor Advertising Bureau* v. *Helvering, supra,* 89 F. 2d at p. 881, that there is no such distinction.

In any event the Internal Revenue Service ruling permitting a deduction of payments in satisfaction of private suits under the OPA statutes is inapplicable here, for Congress has never relaxed the treble damage penalties—indeed, it has increased the criminal sanctions—for violations of the antitrust laws, whereas, at the behest of the Administrator, Congress mitigated the penalties for violation of the Emergency Price Control Act, *Jerry Rossman Corp.* v. *Commissioner, supra,* 175 F. 2d at p. 714.

(2) In sharp contrast with TIR–615 are the decisions of the Tax Court and the ruling of the Internal Revenue Service denying deduction for payments by corporate insiders, made by way of restitution for short-swing profits gained in violation of section 16(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934.

Unlike the antitrust laws, violations of section 16(b) are not punishable either criminally or by a private treble damage action. Instead, section 16(b) merely requires the corporate insider to restore profits gained from short-swing trading in his corporation's stock. Nevertheless, the Tax Court and the Internal Revenue Service have consistently ruled that such payments by way of restitution are "in the nature of a penalty" and deduction of such payments have been disallowed because a deduction "would mitigate the deterrent effect of the statute and subvert a sharply defined public policy." *William F. Davis, Jr.,* 17 T.C. 549; *Robert Lehman,* T.C. 629, 635; 1952 C.B. 28.[4]

(3) A further relevant analogy is furnished by *McGraw-Edison Co.* v. *U.S.,* 300 F. 2d 453 (ct. cls., 1962), a decision written by Mr. Justice Reed, now retired from the Supreme Court. There the Court held that a taxpayer could not deduct as a business expense sums paid in compromise of amounts claimed by the United States under provisions of a Government contract prohibiting the use of child labor in its performance. In language directly applicable here, Mr. Justice Reed said (p. 455): "Deduction of amounts assessed as penalties pursuant to specific legislation virtually always must be treated as frustrating 'sharply defined National or State policies' unless those charged with the administration or interpretation of the statute have indicated that deductibility will not undercut the governmental punitive purpose."

By the same token here, I submit, deduction of treble damages should not be allowed unless "those charged with the administration and interpretation of the statute"—to wit, the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice—"have indicated that deductibility will not undercut the governmental punitive purpose." TIR–615 cites no such indication from the Department of Justice. Indeed, I am informed that the Antitrust Division has taken a contrary position.

IX. TIR–615 IS INTERNALLY INCONSISTENT AND IT IS INCONSISTENT WITH EFFECTIVE ANTITRUST ENFORCEMENT

TIR–615 is internally inconsistent, as previous rulings of the Internal Revenue Service have been inconsistent, with respect to the deductibility of fines, damages and counsel fees incurred in the unsuccessful defense of antitrust actions.

In 1944 C.B. 93, in the wake of the Heininger case, supra, the ruling was that legal expenses incurred by a corporation in defending itself and its officers and directors for violation of the Sherman Act were deductible.

However, in 1962—2 C.B. 50, that broad ruling was modified to render nondeductible attorneys' fees and related legal expenses paid or incurred in unsuccessfully defending a prosecution for criminal violation of the Sherman Act.

Now, TIR–615 would deny a deduction for payment of compensatory damages to the Federal Government on account of antitrust violations but would permit a deduction for treble damages which, as we have seen, are penal in nature. This ruling is flatly inconsistent with the announced principle on which it purports to proceed, namely, that if the statutory right is "remedial" a deduction should be allowed, whereas if the statutory remedy is "penal," no deduction should be allowed.

The obvious unstated reason for denying a deduction for damages paid to the Federal Government in an action to recover "actual" damages under section 4A of the Clayton Act, 15 U.S.C. 15a, is that the Government would never be fully compensated if the defendant were allowed to deduct from its income tax roughly one-half of the amount of the payment.

However, there is not a scintilla of evidence to suggest that Congress intended by allowing the deduction of "ordinary and necessary business expenses" to reduce the "sting" of the treble damage penalties previously prescribed in the antitrust laws. On the contrary, as we have seen, Congress has recently evidenced its concern that the penalties for antitrust violations may be inadequate rather than the reverse.

Accordingly, and in flat violation of the "cardinal principle" that repeals by implication of the antitrust laws are not favored (*U.S.* v. *Borden Co.,* 308 U.S. 188, 198; *Georgia* v. *Pennsylvania R. Co.,* 324 U.S. 439, 456–7; *California* v. *Federal Power Commission,* 369 U.S. 482, 485; *Silver* v. *New York Stock Exchange,* 373 U.S. 341, 357), TIR–615 would in effect amend the treble damage provision in section 4 of the Clayton Act, 15 U.S.C. 15, by reducing the penalties which Congress has prescribed to approximately double damages. I respectfully submit that to work such a de facto amendment of the antitrust laws by an administrative ruling, not subject to judicial review, in the teeth of the clearly expressed intent of Congress, and in the face of a long line of judicial decisions to the contrary, is bad law, bad public policy, and bad public administration.

I trust and believe that this distinguished committee will take whatever action may be necessary to correct this serious mistake.

---

[4] In Lawrence M. Marks, 27 T.C. 464, the decision permitted such a deduction only where it was doubtful whether there was any violation at all.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JANUARY 26, 1965

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D. used this verse which Sir Winston Churchill quoted when he addressed a joint session of the Congress: Psalm 112: 7: *He shall not be afraid of evil tidings: his heart is fixed, trusting in the Lord.*

O Thou who art the companion of our hearts and the counselor of our minds may we feel that Thy eternal truth is our guiding light and Thy love the bond of unity among men and nations.

Fill us with generous impulses and sympathetic attitudes toward all mankind and may each day bear witness to new adventures and advances in faith and in friendship.

Hear us as we daily pray for our beloved President, beseeching Thee to share Thy healing ministry with the doctors and nurses at the Naval Hospital, enabling them to know just what to do for his complete and speedy recovery.

We mourn the passing of our greatly esteemed and beloved Sir Winston Churchill but we rejoice that Thou hast opened for him the gateway to the larger life and received him into Thy nearer presence, leaving us to dream and imagine how wondrous fair that life must be since he is there.

In Christ's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

SIR WINSTON CHURCHILL

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, we are all much the poorer today for the passing of one of the truly outstanding men of our century, Sir Winston Churchill.

His wisdom, his courage, his wit, his proficiency as a writer and speaker, his artistic ability, his foresight, and his indomitable will have all been remarked upon time and again in the days which have elapsed since his death last Sunday.

As one privileged to be a Member of this body, however, I like to recall Sir Winston as a man of politics. It was in this very Chamber, Mr. Speaker, that this towering figure of our times said, "I am a child of the House of Commons."

He meant that, I believe, as a compliment to those of us who serve in this House of Representatives. He knew the rigors of practical politics, of legislative compromise, of parliamentary strategy. He knew as well that service as a representative of the people is an opportunity for measureless good and accomplishment.

The course of his political career was far from smooth. He never feared to speak his mind in the face of countervailing public opinion and it often cost him dearly. Today we know that what he spoke was very often the truth.

It was he who first saw the dangers inherent in the rise of Hitlerism and tried to warn his complacent people against the coming tyranny. It was he who first crystallized for us the postwar threat in the advance of the Soviet Union across Europe.

As Winston Churchill is taken from us, let our prayer be that the Almighty, seeing the needs of humanity, will favor the world with other leaders of his kind to show the way should the sky again darken and the hour once again seem late.

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky.

There was no objection.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, the hearings on the administration's recommendations in the field of elementary and secondary education, H.R. 2361 and H.R. 2362, were initiated on January 22. Since that time we have held 4 full days of hearings and I have been greatly impressed with both the quality and the depth of the presentations.

The President's legislation is attracting the strong support of education leaders and organizations throughout the Nation.

While we plan to hold thorough hearings, we do not propose to drag them on for the simple sake of gathering cumulative testimony.

I would welcome the appearance and comments of any of my colleagues who have for many years been interested in seeing positive action taken in this field.

CLOSING OF CERTAIN VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITALS

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, I am appalled, shocked, and disgusted at the callous and inhumane treatment that the veterans of our country are being subjected to by the Veterans' Administration because they are in such a hurry to close many of our badly needed VA hospitals.

I speak today to let this House and the American public know to what lengths the VA is proceeding to carry out their heartless, coldblooded policy of refusing to operate hospitals in rural and semiurban areas.

A veteran in my district residing 15 minutes away from Castle Point Veterans' Administration Hospital was stricken with meningitis. Although the Veterans' Administration has stated that it would admit emergency patients to the hospital it was in the process of closing down, this veteran was refused admittance. He was taken by ambulance over roads covered with snow and ice to Albany, N.Y., a trip of over 2½ hours.

The Veterans' Administration in its haste to close these needed facilities is neglecting the welfare of the very people it is supposed to serve.

The administrator of the Castle Point Veterans' Administration Hospital stated this morning that under normal circumstances this patient would have been admitted to that hospital. However, now he is being sent to Albany.

The additional burden on the family of this veteran is obvious. The additional cost of transporting him via a Veterans' Administration ambulance to Albany is also obvious.

I protest this callous and inhumane policy of the Veterans' Administration under this closedown order.

In most cases we do not treat sick animals as badly as we are now treating our sick veterans.

CLOSING OF FORT BAYARD VETERANS HOSPITAL

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, but for the services which our veterans gave to this country, our form of government could well have been washed down the drain. Now comes a proposal from the Veterans' Administration to close down 17 regional offices, 11 hospitals, and 4 domiciliaries. Among the reasons given for the closing are advanced medical techniques and treatments, centralized operations, and a saving of some $23 million. When the President sends us a budget asking for appropriations in the staggering amount of $99.7 billion, can we in good conscience even consider the idea of closing down any facility which serves the very men and women who have fought and preserved our Government for us. If the entire amount to be saved by this closing would be necessary for the care and treatment of one man or woman who served this country it would not be an overexpenditure of funds.

I intend to introduce a resolution which will do away with the imposed limitation which the executive branch of the Government has seen fit to impose upon the veterans of this country by way of a 125,000-bed limitation. My resolution would raise the limit from 125,000 to 130,000. I hope that the great chairman of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, my able colleague, the gentleman from Texas, the Honorable Olin E. Teague, will conduct hearings as soon as possible on this resolution.

The House Appropriations Committee this morning passed a joint resolution making a supplemental appropriation of $1,600 million to the Commodity Credit Corporation. I believe this resolution will be passed by this House this afternoon. It seems to me if we can make a deficit appropriation of $1,600 million surely there must be somewhere in this great and prosperous Nation of ours that we can find $23 million to operate these veterans facilities.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

LINCOLN'S DAY OBSERVANCE

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time for the purpose of inquiring of the majority leader as to the adjournment schedule for the observance of Abraham Lincoln's birthday.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ALBERT. In response to the inquiry of the gentleman from Michigan, and for the benefit of Members and particularly Republican Members of the House, I am happy to announce that there will be no legislative business after Wednesday evening, February 10, until Tuesday noon, February 16.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. In other words, we will adjourn on Wednesday at the conclusion of business on February 10.

Mr. ALBERT. That is correct.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. And we will reconvene for business on Tuesday, February 16?

Mr. ALBERT. That is correct.

The SPEAKER. Might the Chair state that there will, of course, be pro forma meetings of the House during that period.

Mr. ALBERT. Yes, since this will not be an adjournment by resolution, but under 3-day unanimous consent agreements.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. In other words, it is the expectation of the leadership that the House will meet on Monday, February 8; on Tuesday, February 9; and Wednesday, February 10, but as of now there is no business scheduled for those days?

Mr. ALBERT. I know of none at this time. Of course, our agreement begins Wednesday afternoon and ends Tuesday morning. However, the legislative program at the time will enable Members to govern themselves accordingly with respect to the other days.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I thank the distinguished majority leader.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means be permitted to sit during sessions of the House for the remainder of the 89th Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

REPORT OF PROJECTS AND PROGRESS OF THE NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 63)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, and together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Science and Astronautics and ordered to be printed, with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, as amended, I transmit herewith a report of the projects and progress of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for the period of January 1, 1964, through June 30, 1964.

This report covers in enlightening detail 6 months of accomplishment. Problems of technological complexity as well as those of managerial difficulty have been met with a sense of awareness of the contributions the national space program is making toward human welfare and world peace.

Lyndon B. Johnson.

The White House, *January 26, 1965.*

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR CERTAIN ACTIVITIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the unanimous-consent order of last Thursday, I call up for consideration House Joint Resolution 234 and I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 234) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, for certain activities of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to not exceeding 1½ hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 234), with Mr. Harris in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the joint resolution was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Mahon] will be recognized for 45 minutes and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] will be recognized for 45 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Whitten] has been the chairman of the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations for many years. When the Committee on Appropriations is fully organized this year, he will again resume that position. He is quite familiar with the issues involved in the pending resolution.

I therefore now yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Whitten].

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, at the outset may I say that this request to restore capital impairment of the Commodity Credit Corporation comes as no surprise. In handling last year's agricultural appropriation bill on this floor, I advised the Congress that the Commodity Credit Corporation, with the funds which were to be provided in that bill, would doubtless find it necessary to come before Congress prior to the first of February to request additional funds. Members will find that in the Congressional Record in two or three different places.

I do not believe there is any controversy, or that there could be any, about the necessity for providing these funds. There may be some discussion concerning various and sundry aspects of the overall farm situation, and perhaps some other items.

At the outset, the agricultural programs were set up by the Congress on the basis that the purchasing power of American agriculture had to be protected and maintained in the interest of the overall national economy. Those laws provided price supports which in turn were geared to maintaining a parity of purchasing power for American agriculture. Under the procedures for carrying that out, we set up the Commodity Credit Corporation in 1933. Originally that Corporation was set up, I believe, under the laws of Delaware. Later it became a Government corporation. It is a corporation because it has a need to buy and sell, to make loans, and to deal as any other business institution would.

Since the time when this Corporation was organized, it has been directed by the Congress to support the prices of wheat, corn, cotton, peanuts, rice, and tobacco, as well as wool, mohair, certain feed grains, milk, butterfat, honey, and tung nuts. Price supports also are provided by that Corporation on cottonseed, flaxseed, soybeans, dry edible beans, and crude pine gum.

In recent years, the Corporation has also been charged by Congress with the responsibility of financing certain other programs not directly related to its price support activities and not originally contemplated when the Corporation was created. These include three major programs: The International Wheat Agreement, Public Law 480, and the transfer of bartered materials acquired in exchange for agricultural commodities to the supplemental stockpile. In addition, a number of other programs have been assigned to the Corporation through the years, such as food and feed donations for emergency or disaster relief, donations to Federal and State penal institutions, furnishing of grain for migratory and game birds, loans for conservation purposes, emergency conservation assistance, and research to reduce surpluses.

The Corporation has a borrowing authority of $14.5 billion. As of today the Corporation is holding up some of its outstanding obligations because its borrowing authority is virtually exhausted. Yet under the law we find that the Corporation is directed to support the prices by loans on these storable commodities and by purchases with regard to the nonbasics and perishable commodities.

On the one hand, the law says that the officials of the Corporation must do these things. On the other hand, the law says that if they do support these commodities without adequate financing in hand, that is against the law, too.

Now, the description given in the hearings and the report indicates where the Corporation's borrowing authority has been used. The need for these funds is to enable the Corporation to continue to carry on its responsibility in the price support field.

May I say to you that if by any happenstance the Congress should fail to provide these funds and these loans were not available, it would bring about a disastrous situation in our country. Two or three things to keep in mind are that this borrowing authority will not be used except as required by law and that a cushion is needed in the operating funds of the Corporation. In the years I have served as chairman of this subcommittee there have been numerous instances where, for the perishables, because the Corporation had sufficient funds to support prices and announced that certain commodities would be supported—and in that connection I recall eggs and several other commodities—it in effect and in actuality had to buy very, very little, because it was known that if prices dropped below a certain level, the Government would step in.

So I say to you here is a necessity to restore the capital impairment to a corporation essential to the operation of our price support system and, I say, to our entire economy.

There are two other ways in which this Corporation could meet this problem. One of them would be to go before the legislative committee and increase the borrowing authority, which is something that would require a much longer time to do. In my own judgment, a $14.5 billion corporation is big enough. The Corporation has something over $7 billion in assets. About $2.5 billion of those assets are in loans on commodities which they cannot call because the loans have not yet matured. They also own about $4.7 billion of commodities.

If those were sold, the funds received would be available to carry out the obligations which they have to meet as directed by law. But we all know if the Corporation tried to raise its money by selling this $4.7 billion worth of commodities, it would break commodity markets all over the world and we would really be in for the beginning of an all-out depression.

May I repeat again, in the last Congress we recognized the likelihood that the funds which were then provided for the Corporation would be involved in loans and purchases to the point where by February of this year we would be in here for additional funds, just as we are. You may say, "Why do you do that?" The pressures each year to hold appropriations as low as possible are such that we have been faced with this problem of meeting the need. That is the only answer to it.

You may raise the question, "Are you sure that the Corporation will, from now to July 1, the beginning of the new fiscal year, obligate all the funds you have in this bill?" I certainly hope not. The Corporation feels that it will be able to convert enough of its commodities into cash in the normal way, which will be available to meet its needs, and that other things will occur so that they may not use over about $900 million of the funds that are here. But who knows definitely about that?

Second, with a big bank, such as this, they need lending authority to move in, in some cases, to show that they have the financial ability to support prices, in an effort to keep from having actually to take over these commodities.

Mr. Chairman, may I repeat that involved in this is the overall national economy. We have laws which require this Corporation to support the major basic commodities and many producers have not yet come into the Corporation for those loans. We cannot afford to fail to give the Corporation the right to meet these legal obligations.

The other point that I would like to make, as to whether they expect actually to use all this money in this period, is that we are granting here money to restore capital impairment. But the basic source of funds for the Corporation is to borrow from the Treasury. The Corporation, with these funds, will not actually draw upon this authority until funds are actually required for the price supports as directed by law. The dollars that are withdrawn from the Treasury are limited to those that are actually required by law.

Further may I say that under the law the Corporation is charged with interest on funds withdrawn from the Treasury, as they are withdrawn, which in itself tends further to impair the capital stock of the Corporation.

There may be a great deal of discussion as to whether this set of figures or that set, or this farm program or that program, or this commodity or that other commodity, is affected. We are dealing here with a bank whose assets are all tied up in commodities that we cannot afford to have them sell. We have a bank that has these commitments which are essential to maintain the economy of this country. We, ourselves, have an obligation not to run any risk that this problem will not be met by providing these funds which, as I say, will be used only as they are required under laws that the Congress has passed.

Mr. Chairman, I do not see that there is any question or any controversy about the necessity to act in this instance. May I say that I had a call this morning from the vice president of one of the major banks in the country asking what the Congress would do in this case. I said that there is nothing we can do except to carry out the obligations of the law. And I meant just that. We do not have any choice in this case.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman, one of the complaints that constantly comes to my office is that Commodity Credit Corporation has been selling its commodities at a very low figure and driving the price down in the free marketplace. Would it not make some sense if the Commodity Credit Corporation instead of dumping cheap grain on the market and realizing a very limited income from that—would it not be much better if they would hold back and sell it at a higher price and permit the farmers' price to rise? It seems to me this is the major complaint that comes in. I hope the committee has taken that into account.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, in the first place, as the gentleman will recall, this was the argument made in connection with legislation that was passed by the Congress in an effort to keep production in line with that which was desired. The Corporation by legislation—not by this committee—was called on to have its commodities available so as to keep prices at a level which would not lead to increased production.

May I say also that, where the Corporation has sold these commodities, the funds from those sales become available to carry out its commitments.

And if this were not an appropriation which restores their borrowing authority, and if we were considering a legislative bill when this subject comes up, I think there we might have some discussion as to whether that is sound or not sound. But in this bill we are trying to enable them to carry on their obligations under the law, and therefore this is not the place to get into this argumentative field as to what the legislation ought to be.

Mr. NELSEN. I thank the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. QUIE. One of the alternatives you say is to sell commodities to which the Commodity Credit Corporation has title. Does the gentleman have figures on the amount of wheat which they have sold thus far in the fiscal year?

Mr. WHITTEN. That information is readily available, but I do not have it before me at this time. It is in the hearings.

But our immediate problem is to give the bank enough capital with which to carry on its business. That is the problem to which I have been directing my attention and which I feel must be considered. However, the figures are readily available.

Mr. QUIE. If the gentleman will yield further, if the Commodity Credit Corporation had not sold this huge volume of wheat, then you would have been required to come in here and ask for a greater amount than the $1.7 billion which is now being requested? I understand the total sales in the last half of calendar year 1964 were just under $1 billion for all commodities.

Mr. WHITTEN. Through the years we have insisted that this Corporation stay in world markets in order to keep its commodities moving. If they do not, they will require that much more money. Further, unless we continue to sell abroad, we will have to reduce the acreage and production at home, which in itself would constitute a serious problem.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. I believe the figure which the gentleman from Minnesota has requested appears on page 35 of the hearings which shows the receipts from the sale of wheat.

Mr. WHITTEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Could the gentleman from Mississippi clarify for the Members what this action does in relationship to the appropriation bill for fiscal year 1965 which the House passed in calendar year 1964? There were certain actions which were taken at the time of the consideration of the appropriation bill for fiscal year 1965 but I am not clear as to how this relates to what we did last year.

Mr. WHITTEN. I handled the bill last year, as the gentleman from Michigan knows, and I have handled it for the past 12 or 14 years. Last year, based upon my own experience of prior years, I pointed out that the funds contained in that bill to restore capital impairment to the Corporation in my opinion were at a level where we would have to be back in here by the first of February 1965, requesting over $1 billion for the operation of the Corporation. The gentleman from Michigan will find that in the hearings. I believe my exact words were—I said, "This Corporation was broke, b-r-o-k-e." We laid it right out on the table. However, with all of the problems which we have today in dealing with agriculture, it was rather difficult for us to come in here with a bill over the budget by that amount. But we did lay it on the table and pointed out what was involved.

May I make one observation which is a little apart from that particular problem?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has again expired.

Mr. MAHON. I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. WHITTEN. This is digressing a little from the point which the gentleman from Michigan has raised here, but it is very vital to the welfare of the country. The Washington Post, the local newspaper, on yesterday had an editorial pointing out that, of the $35 billion which is received by American agriculture, 78 percent is spent with industry and labor.

May I say to the members of the committee that American agriculture is by far the biggest customer or buyer from industry and labor. May I say that while we have only 8 percent of our people on the farm, every time we have lost a farmer we have lost a potential buyer of machinery, chemicals and everything else which, in turn, comes from industry.

I say to the members of the committee—and this again is digressing from the immediate problem—that agriculture today is just as much one of the "big three" insofar as the well-being of this country is concerned as ever before in our history. This means that the people who are engaged in agriculture invest more and more in machinery and other items which are involved in production. Thus they are important consumers of American business.

But, Mr. Chairman, involved here is the bank itself which under the law has to perform all of these duties on which this country depends.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I ask these questions because I think the gentleman's long experience and intimate knowledge of the financing of the Department of Agriculture, particularly the Commodity Credit Corporation, is most valuable to all of us. I understand that in the hearings last year on the budget for the Department of Agriculture, the gentleman raised questions concerning whether they had enough capital for the proper operation of the Commodity Credit Corporation during fiscal year 1965.

Mr. WHITTEN. I want to be completely candid with the gentleman. I do not know whether I asked those questions or not, but I was convinced in my own mind that they were not. But whether I asked them or told them, I do not recall.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. In other words, at least the belief you had a year ago in this regard is now true. They did not ask for enough based on what knowledgeable people would ask for as they looked down the road in the field of agriculture.

Mr. WHITTEN. Certainly that would be my view. There is a certain amount of difficulty in estimating the needs of the Corporation; however, due to many unpredictable factors such as production trends, market demand, weather, insects, individual decisions, and similar things.

Also, there is the problem of having sufficient operating margin to announce supports for surpluses, particularly for perishables. It is extremely difficult to determine in advance how much margin may be needed to meet such factors.

Frequently you do not have to move in to support such surpluses, but once you let the bottom break out and allow the price to fall there is a real need to have a sufficient latitude for them to operate their business as any other corporation would do. This is a corporation for the very reasons I have discussed here.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. May I ask one other question? Does the gentleman from Mississippi recall what was asked for in the budget message a year ago in this category? Does he have that figure at hand?

Mr. WHITTEN. As the gentleman knows, being a ranking member of the Appropriations Committee, those figures are readily available, but I do not happen to have them here.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I am told the budget request was $5.8 billion. Did the Congress make funds available last year to that extent?

Mr. WHITTEN. No. With all the problems that we had in trying to get these things through under pressure, Congress did make some reductions.

Four years ago, our subcommittee provided additional funds to put these programs on a pay-as-you-go-basis. Since that time, however, under the pressures of budget deficits and trying to stay within the overall budget amounts, we have not provided them with all the funds needed to actually get by.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. As I understand it, the President's budget for fiscal year 1965 requested $5.8 billion. We are now asked to make available $1.6 billion. How much was that above what President Johnson and Secretary of Agriculture Freeman asked for a year ago? Does the gentleman recall that figure?

Mr. WHITTEN. I do not recall exactly, but in my opinion it was a little over a billion dollars. But as I say again, we all have been around here long enough to know how these things work. This will show as an appropriation by Congress for the operation for the fiscal year 1965.

I do say again, however, that whether this will all be spent I do not know, and I hope not. I repeat, funds will not be withdrawn from the Treasury until actually needed to carry out an obligation. So theoretically the money might not come out of the Treasury at all. In actuality, I am convinced that one-half to two-thirds of it will, so that they will not needlessly upset the commodity markets.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. LATTA. I want to compliment the gentleman for a very fine review of how the Commodity Credit Corporation works. Would the gentleman enlighten us further, on page 2, as to what this $1,100 million means in commodities? How is this broken down?

Mr. WHITTEN. The gentleman means the restoration of capital impairment item?

Mr. LATTA. Yes, the $1,100 million.

Mr. WHITTEN. The funds in this bill are provided under three paragraphs. Those are descriptive to indicate the purposes involved. Actually the money is authorized to allow the corporation to restore the impairment of capital. Once this is passed, it can be used for any purpose for which the corporation is authorized to act. The restoration is requested in connection with the program which incurs the cost.

Mr. LATTA. I understand that, but calling particular attention to the $1,100 million, my question referred to what commodities, how much in tobacco, corn, wheat, and so forth.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. I would say to my friend that this information is shown on page 35 of the hearings, which are immediately available to all of us. These funds which are being requested will be used to make loans and purchases of corn, feed grains, and other commodities in the program. These funds are commingled. They are used to support all types of commodity support programs.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL].

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, our situation today brings back recollections from yesteryear. Public Law 1 of the 88th Congress was a resolution similar to that which we are considering today. At that time it was to restore the capital impairment of CCC for $508 million. Today, the first measure of consequence to come before the 89th Congress is a similar request but with a far bigger figure. I think it is significant that the day after receiving the budget message for the coming fiscal year we are here to consider a supplemental request for the current fiscal year of $1,742 million.

Bear in mind that yesterday the budget figure did not bridge that psychological barrier of $100 billion. In my opinion, it is a phony figure, and what we are doing today points up the phoniness of last year's budget. What was presented to us a year ago has turned into something a lot different today. Looking down the road we will see them one after another when we expose these phony figures to the pure light of day.

Last May I said in debate on this bill we would probably have to come up with $975 million more to really balance up the books of the Commodity Credit Corporation. In August when the conference report was considered I said again it would have to be in the neighborhood of $1 billion, as the chairman pointed out. Now, several months later, it is up to an even greater figure of $1,700 million.

You know this item is the easiest one in this agricultural budget to cut because it is the kind of thing that does not reflect itself in the current year when we are appropriating for the Department of Agriculture. In this item today, for example, there is an item for $100 million for net realized losses sustained in the year 1962. The balance of the net realized losses, amount of $1.081 billion is for 1963. We are always running a couple of years behind time in balancing the books of CCC for the sales of surplus agricultural commodities to these underdeveloped countries. Since there are a number of new Members of the House on the floor it might be well for you to get firmly in mind what happens in these transactions under Public Law 480 to underdeveloped countries.

The sales, so called, are in the main for local currencies rather than dollars. To balance the books of CCC we need dollars and this is where the taxpayer gets it in the neck for we have to appropriate dollars to make up the difference. To be quite frank these local currencies are of very little value to us unless they are used in the country itself. In other words there is no possible way for them to be used in the foreseeable future to help balance the books of CCC. To give you a better idea of what we are talking about these net realized losses for the year 1962 total $2,800 million. In the year 1963 they totaled $2,650 million. The best estimates for these net realized losses in 1964 will be $3,220 million.

Now the bigger part of this, in effect, has got to be charged to foreign aid because it is for sales of agricultural surpluses abroad for local currencies that we cannot use. So when they talk about this foreign aid program later on in the year in the neighborhood of $3 billion or $4 billion you just add a couple of more billion dollars made up of the sale of agricultural commodities for local currencies and you have the picture in better perspective.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FINDLEY. The gentleman was speaking of the effect of the supplemental appropriation and the budget just presented by the President. The President's budget, I understand, came to $99.7 billion, just shy of $100 billion. Am I not correct in saying that if the supplemental appropriation for U.S. aid this year had been handled with the same goal as the one presented last year, namely, to wind up the fiscal year with about $400 million in the Commodity Credit Corporation bank instead of almost a billion dollars as provided this time, the President would have had to present a budget in excess of $100 billion earlier; would he not?

Mr. MICHEL. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Now there are three ways out of this dilemma in which we find ourselves today. First, the Commodity Credit Corporation could sell the commodities to which it has title, but if it did that in any significant amount, you know what would happen to all the grain markets and the economy around the country. The moment you would have any wholesale dumping on the market of these surplus commodities there would be complete chaos.

Second, we could increase the borrowing authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation above the $14½ billion limit, however we do not want to do that. We say it is already too large.

The only avenue open to us today is to appropriate in dollars to make up for this deficiency in net realized losses.

Now the request that originally came up from the Department was for $1,742 million and your subcommittee—not an officially constituted subcommittee, but those of us who sat in as a subcommittee came up with the figure of $1,600 million. Is this the right and proper figure for this supplemental appropriation? There is a question and an area of doubt.

If we appropriate the full $1,600 million it means by the end of this fiscal year, June 30, the Commodity Credit Corporation will have something in the neighborhood of $800 million or $900 million to play with for the coming fiscal year. Last year they started out the fiscal year with only $400 million to play with in these transactions.

There could conceivably be an argument that they do not need this full amount and that maybe they can get by with somewhat less.

I believe personally we would probably only be kidding ourselves again, and it would be necessary to come back several months hence to ante up for what we would not be doing today, if we followed that procedure. Personally, I would prefer to be honest and direct with the Members of this House and the American people, and tell them the losses we have sustained forthrightly. We should say, "This is what it costs for these programs, and we are here now to do the job which has to be done."

I believe it is significant to read the requests and the hearings, which show some of the figures that go into making up the request of $1.7 billion. If Members will look at some of the testimony, they will find that the Department said, in the words of their witnesses, that the cotton portion of the so-called wheat-cotton bill, if enacted into law would result in saving $200 million.

What are the facts? The facts are that there will not be a saving of $200 million at all, but there will be a cost of more than $300 million in addition to what was conceived to be the cost of the program. There is a total item here of $543 million in this program alone.

Then we get into the feed grains program. They say that most of the increase is for advance payments due to an increased estimated acreage to be diverted, from 25 to 35 million acres. This item is $240 million more than what they thought the program would cost.

This was that great program whipped through the House. You may remember that it went to the Senate and came back with the cotton bill attached. It was jammed down our throats, with no debate, as a "take it or leave it" proposition.

It was said, at the time, "It will save the taxpayers beaucoup money."

What happened? Today we are here to ante up the difference between what they said it would save and what it actually is costing the American taxpayer.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONTE. I compliment the gentleman for his fine presentation.

Speaking with regard to the cotton bill, I notice, as shown on page 33 of the committee hearings, that Mr. Beach, in answer to a question, said:

> The estimate made last year was based on the assumptions Mr. Godfrey outlined to you, that the cotton legislation would result in savings in expenditures of $200 million below the estimated expenditures based on a continuation of the 1963 type program and the other piece of legislation was the $140 million saving in interest cost which would have resulted from the language stricken from the floor last year on a point of order. That is $340 million. Instead of having a saving on cotton of $200 million as was expected, the cost increased $343 million which made a difference of $543 million. When you add those two items together——

Mr. MICHEL. I appreciate the gentleman's giving the official citation.

Mr. CONTE. In other words, this cotton program is now costing the taxpayers a half-billion dollars.

Mr. MICHEL. That is exactly correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BOW. I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FINDLEY. I would hate to have the record stand as indicating that the total cost of the cotton program will be only a half-billion dollars for the current crop year. The fact is it will be more than a billion dollars, or more than one-half the market value of the entire cotton crop.

Mr. MICHEL. The point the gentleman makes is a very good one, and I am grateful for his alertness. Of course all of us have been aware of his valuable contributions in these matters since becoming a Member of the House.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONTE. Would the gentleman sum this up by saying that the taxpayers have lost their cotton shirts right off their backs?

Mr. MICHEL. That could be said. Yes.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman yields back 1 minute.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS].

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, if I may have the attention of the gentleman from Michigan, the minority leader [Mr. GERALD R. FORD], I believe I have the answer to the question he propounded with respect to the appropriation request for this item last year.

I have the hearings on the bill for 1965, the current fiscal year, and on page 369 thereof I find this caption: "Reimbursement for net realized losses of the Commodity Credit Corporation." That is what we are talking about today.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. What was that figure again?

Mr. JONAS. That is just the caption. Under the caption it states—and this is quoted from the justification of the Department of Agriculture's witnesses last year before the Subcommittee on Agriculture—and I quote: "For reimbursement for net realized losses of the CCC we request $1,724 million, a reduction of $975.4 million."

What they did last year was to reduce this budget item by nearly $1 billion and claim credit for it. That was a great reduction—nearly a billion dollars. They were great economizers then. Yet the claimed credit of nearly $1 billion reduction did not stand up. We knew last year that it would not stand up because the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] stated on the floor then that the Congress would be requested early this year to restore it. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] gave the same warning on the floor of the House.

The trouble we are in today is because the Department last year underestimated by $1 billion the amount that they would need.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I will be glad to yield to the minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Was this gross error in the estimate something that has happened just one year, or is there a history of such inaccurate estimating?

Mr. JONAS. As the gentleman knows, I am not a regular member of the Subcommittee on Agriculture. I was assigned to this particular hearing by the chairman of our committee. He created a sort of deficiencies subcommittee because the full committee is not yet organized, as the gentleman knows. Therefore, I do not have the history or the record of this in mind. I am not an expert in this field. However, I will say that I have studied this enough to know that the term "restoration of capital" is a $50 word which simply means that we are making up the losses sustained by the Commodity Credit Corporation, and the losses we are asked to make up in this bill today are losses it incurred in 1962 and 1963. We have not even gotten to the losses incurred in 1964. If we undertook today to make up the losses incurred in 1964, we would have another $1 billion bill in here.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. JONAS. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I have looked over the appropriations or, rather, the actual expenditures for the Department of Agriculture for the last several years, and I note they are substantially higher than they have been in the prior few years.

Mr. JONAS. And my understanding is that they are higher than ever in the new budget just received yesterday.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Which prompts me to make the observation that Secretary of Agriculture Freeman has been the most expensive commodity ever produced by the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. JONAS. Well, I will simply say this: Based on the estimates given the committee last year, as reflected in the hearings and as reflected in statements made by committee members on the floor, somebody down in the Department of Agriculture is not doing a good job of estimating expenditures. I will admit that it is difficult to estimate exactly how much cotton you will have to buy and how much wheat you will have to buy and how many other products you will have to buy, but it does seem a little strange to me that, having had all of the experience they have had, they would make a $1 billion mistake a year ago in underestimating the amount of money they would need. Of course this enabled the administration to claim great credit for reducing the budget. It made the administration look good. But when, in less than 7 months, the first act Congress is requested by the administration to take is to repair that mistake, the economy image becomes somewhat tarnished. This deficiency bill amounting to $1.6 billion would not be here as the first order of business of this Congress if the administration had not arbitrarily reduced the previous year's appropriation last year by nearly a billion dollars.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Could the gentleman from North Carolina tell me what percentage error officials of the Department of Agriculture made? The gentleman has indicated that they made a gross error of $1 billion in estimating their future cost of the CCC. Percentagewise how far off were they in their estimate?

Mr. JONAS. They reported a reduction of $975 million below the previous year's request, and last year requested $1,724 million. Someone who is good in mathematics can divide that out and get the percentage. I have not done that.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. It is not quite a 100-percent error but it is rather substantially.

Mr. JONAS. It is a $975 million reduction, and they requested $1,724 million; that is above 50 percent.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I yield.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished minority leader raised a question here with respect to the most expensive commodity in the Department of Agriculture, meaning Mr. Freeman himself. It might be well to note that in 1960 it cost $5.4 billion to run the Department of Agriculture. By 1961 it was $5.9 billion. By 1962 it was $6.6 billion. By 1963 it was $7.7 billion. In 1964 it was $6.9 billion. It will be about $6.8 billion for the current fiscal year.

Mr. JONAS. The gentleman will recall this. I believe last year in Committee of the Whole we had an amendment offered on the floor which provided that at no time in the future could the Department of Agriculture have more employees than there are farmers in the United States. That amendment carried in Committee of the Whole but was eliminated when we went back into the House.

Mr. Chairman, may I make one other comment in concluding my remarks? The record will show that according to the best estimates of the Department, if this money is provided, the Commodity Credit Corporation will have on hand in new borrowing authority at the end of the current fiscal year, June 30, 1965, between $800 and $900 million. While it has been stated here on the floor that it is a $14 billion Corporation, of course it does have borrowing authority of $14 billion, but it owns commodities worth $5 billion and it has, I understand, loans of about $2.5 billion and also has other operations. So it is not exactly a $14 billion Corporation if you take off the losses that it has sustained over the years. Nevertheless, it is a substantial Corporation. Maybe they need to carry over into the new year $800 or $900 million. They carried over last year only about half that amount. So that is a question of judgment.

The subcommittee in its wisdom decided that they had made out a good case for this additional leeway or margin or cushion or additional capital, whatever you wish to call it. But I think the Members of the Committee today ought to know that if this bill is approved the Corporation will carry over into the new fiscal year between $500 million and $1 billion of additional borrowing authority; and it is a question of judgment whether they actually need that much or not.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. Roncalio].

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Chairman, it ill behooves a freshman in this group whose State receives benefits from support of wool as well as wheat payments under this program, to be critical of this overall program. Also, under consideration is a supplemental appropriation, and it may not be the appropriate time to comment. But there are nevertheless many of us in America who would like to know what programs, if any, are being considered in the Department of Agriculture designed to reduce tobacco acreage, to reduce tobacco use, and to reduce commodity payments for crops that are detrimental to the health of the people of the Nation.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding me this time, and for allowing me this observation on this bill.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, all of us recognize that we are confronted today with the problem of providing funds which are required by law. We are not here to determine the course of agricultural legislative policy. That is another matter. Of course, there are many views and opinions as to how we should undertake to solve our farm problems. In this resolution today we are simply up against the proposition of having a law on the books which provides for a course of conduct by the Government and we have to provide the money in order to carry out the law which we ourselves passed. It is really that simple.

Mr. Chairman, in 1932 the country was in a state of agricultural prostration.

In 1933 the Commodity Credit Corporation was established. It gave stability to agriculture and as a result of the stability which has been given to agriculture, a fantastically successful record has been made. The American people are able to secure food and fiber at a lower relative cost than people in any other country of the world.

Mr. Chairman, the success of the program has been dramatic. The number of people required to produce in agriculture has been drastically reduced. This has freed the American people for tremendous progress in other areas. We really have no reason to apologize for the overall progress which we have made, sometimes under laws which have not been adequate and which many times have been cumbersome.

We are faced with the bill before us today because of two or three problems.

Last year the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Whitten], the chairman of the subcommittee, stated here on the floor during debate on the appropriation bill that the capital stock of the Commodity Credit Corporation would have to be repaired early this year. In hindsight, we can see that the budget was too low, in the first place; and in the second place, Congress cut the request by about a half-billion dollars. If we had not cut the budget last year in the House as we did—and I supported the cut—we would not be in quite such an immediately urgent position, though we would still have to take action very shortly in the present fiscal year.

So, Mr. Chairman, there was a miscalculation on the part of the executive branch as to the exact amount of money required, and then we reduced the funds requested for the entire program by about a half a billion dollars.

Mr. Chairman, what I think we need to do here is simply to provide the additional funds for this $14.5 billion Corporation which will give it an operating leeway of about 5 percent, which certainly does not seem like too much for a banking-type operation.

Mr. Chairman, I hope we will not undertake to fight the battle of foreign policy or general farm program policy here, but simply implement the law which we ourselves have passed. If we want to change the law, we can change it later in the session in the regular legislative way after proper hearings.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. I think the record ought to show that the Congress last year reduced this particular item, the restoration of capital, by only $150 million.

Mr. MAHON. That is right, but these funds are all commingled and they are interchangeable, so this is not significant.

Mr. JONAS. If the gentleman will yield further, I understand that, but the $975 million reduction below the previous year, claimed in the 1965 budget, applied to this particular item and Congress cut that reduced request by only $150 million.

Mr. MAHON. Yes. So, let us admit that there was a miscalculation and that the additional funds are required under the law.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that we have no other alternative here if we are to implement the laws which we ourselves have approved.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Langen].

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, it has been very effectively and very convincingly stated by both the chairman of the full committee and the chairman of the subcommittee that there is a real need and a real urgency for this legislation. Certainly, knowledgeable as they are of the whole background of the agricultural scene they have stated their case well and I should try as convincingly to agree with them that there is both a need and an urgency.

But the fact that these two conditions prevail causes me to be reminded that there are a couple of reasons why we in this Congress and the entire Nation ought to be alarmed by the situation which prevails. Why do I say that? I say it because we are now only 6½ months into this fiscal year, and find ourselves in a position where the entire agricultural program, the whole price support system, is threatened with collapse unless action is taken by this Congress within a matter of days.

In addition to that, it has also been pointed out that not only is the farm need urgent in this matter, but the entire national economy is threatened in exactly the same way. We should realize how serious the question is.

I refer you to the hearing that was held by the subcommittee the other day. In response to questions on the subject, Mr. Godfrey said:

> We now have in our four commodity offices outstanding bills of $62.5 million which we are holding and not making payments, because we needed the $54 million, we felt, to make loans to farmers in county offices.

All they had left as of last Thursday was $54 million, with $62.5 million in unpaid bills pending. They are literally bankrupt. I have heard mention around this Chamber a good many times some reference to brinkmanship. This is brinkmanship at its very worst because these threats do prevail with regard to the future of agriculture as well as our entire economy.

If we were faced with this kind of proposition and it had served the purpose it was designed to serve; namely, that the agricultural opportunity of this Nation was what it should be, that would be one thing. But instead we find an agricultural economy that is back to where it was in the depression days of the 1930's. With the prices available to farmers on a parity basis having dropped to the level of the mid-1930's—of 45 percent—I cannot help but recall the number of times I have heard programs that have been proposed, designed to accomplish two purposes: First, to improve our economy and, second, to cost the taxpayers less money. But we have the reverse of that today. The income is down and the cost is up. As was pointed out very well by my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Michel] a few minutes ago, this is an indication that all of these programs have failed to function as they were designed to function. Many of us have pointed out these flaws from time to time. It is time that we begin requesting that the Department of Agriculture furnish us with a reliable estimation of what the needs of the Commodity Credit Corporation are going to be so the Congress and the committees can give due consideration to the needs at the time when they ought to be made; namely, in the regular appropriation bill.

This is the second time we have had this experience, and we have been placed in the position where we have to act instantaneously in order to take care of their needs. What a threat it is to those concerned with both the income of the farm people as well as the national economy.

I should take notice of the extent to which the programs have been improperly administered, thereby aggravating the entire problem, by the Commodity Credit Corporation. My colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Nelsen] recently pointed out the inequity of the sales by the Corporation at prices that were too low and that reduced the prices further. There is also another factor that is equally important. The price support program has been reduced for wheat and feed grains recently. Whenever that is done, what happens? The market moves down along with it. Then the value of the CCC stocks automatically goes down along with it. When Commodity Credit Corporation is then forced to move some of it on the market, of course, this is a loss. It is rather simple arithmetic that you are going to lose money operating on that basis. These are problems that we are going to have to continue to face in the future, and we are going to need a system and a program that deals more realistically with those particular phases of it, with better administration, and more reliable estimates of needs and costs.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANGEN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I want to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Minnesota. We have been hearing a great deal about how the administration is economy minded and we have been getting press releases about how they were going to save $23 million by closing down veterans hospitals around the country, and this has been front-page news. I am just wondering how the press will handle this so-called billion-dollar error in this appropriation. They claim to save $23 million closing veterans hospitals. Yet they ask $1.6 billion more in this appropriation.

If you will check the figure you will find we lost $43 million on our sale of wheat to Russia. We sold wheat to Russia. It cost the taxpayers $43 million. But it is a great economy move when we save $23 million closing down veterans hospitals at the expense of veterans care.

Mr. LANGEN. May I thank my colleague for making that excellent point. I think it is well to remind the House at this point that it was only 6 months ago when this same money we are talking about today was pictured to the people of the United States as being an economy move, and represented a saving of a billion dollars.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANGEN. I yield to the distinguished chairman of the committee.

Mr. MAHON. With respect to the sale of wheat to Russia, which has just been mentioned, I believe the gentleman is aware that the Government collected from Russia in cash $154 million for the sale of wheat at the world price. It is true this wheat was brought from the farmers at a higher price, but the sale to Russia was for $154 million.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I do not think there is any difference of opinion in the way the sale was made, but the fact still remains that the American taxpayer sold it at a lower price, at the world market, and had to make up the difference.

Mr. MAHON. The sale had to be made at the world price, but if it had not been sold at all, the taxpayer would have been less well off. If we had not made the sale to Russia we would be out the $154 million and would be paying storage charges on that much additional wheat.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Except that it could have been used to better advantage in some other area of the free world.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANGEN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FINDLEY. As a matter of fact, had this wheat that was sold to Russia been sold to American millers, the taxpayers would not have suffered this $40 million loss at all.

Mr. MAHON. The American mills are being supplied what they need and there is an abundant supply on hand if they want it. I think this was a rather substantial saving to the taxpayer.

Mr. FINDLEY. The Secretary of Agriculture has hinted that there may be a shortage of wheat one of these days.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANGEN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. LATTA. I would just like to clear up one point with reference to the purchase of wheat under this certificate plan by our domestic millers. They have to pay 70 cents per bushel on each bushel they purchase. So it is not on a par with sales to Russia as the gentleman from Texas indicates.

Mr. LANGEN. The gentleman has made a very good point. The fact still remains that we do have before us today a request for $1,700 million to make up for the losses that have been sustained by the Commodity Credit Corporation. As I recall, when the question of the sale of wheat to Russia was before us, it was emphasized with "all the money we are going to save."

But regardless of what the experience has been, we are still faced with the need for making this appropriation at this time. I want to conclude then, Mr. Chairman, with this observation: What an injustice this need before us today is to the agricultural industry of this Nation. Requiring them to be placed in this kind of a position where literally they have to beg at the last moment for consideration by this House of Representatives in order to get funds with which to finance inadequate programs. All because of miscalculations and juggling of figures by Department personnel. This is the history we have experienced and I am hoping our experience today may serve as a lesson to the Department in any actions that they take in the future regarding appropriations for the coming fiscal year.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, in view of the reference to the sale of wheat to Russia, I think it should be pointed out that this wheat was sold to Russia for cash. It was sold to Russia on the same basis that it would have been sold to England, or to France, or to any friendly country. It was sold at the world market price. Of course, wheat sold to our own domestic mills is sold at a different price level, so it clouds the issue to undertake to say that Russia was given any special privilege. We got $154 million in cash from Russia, which was helpful to us and which, of course, was a drain on the gold supply of the Soviet Union, but they needed the wheat and they paid for it.

Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time in general debate on this side.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Findley].

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, continuing the discussion of wheat sales to Russia, it is not correct to state that the wheat was sold to the Russians on the same terms and conditions as wheat was being sold before to free countries. As a matter of fact, the Soviet Union got a super-duper discount on the Durum wheat involved in the transaction, a discount worth somewhere around $3 million. So there was definitely a price advantage given to the agents of the Soviet Union on that transaction.

Getting back to the supplemental appropriation bill before us now, the main part, of course, is the $1.1 billion to recover some of the losses caused by farm programs and to restore this to the Commodity Credit Corporation. We ought to take just a minute and think about the Commodity Credit Corporation and what it is. It is a Government-owned bank, the largest bank in all the world. It has an authorized capital structure of $14.5 billion.

A question arose in the discussion earlier today as to why there should be a supplemental appropriation bill so soon after the regular Department appropriation bill was passed. There are two obvious advantages. First, using the supplemental appropriation route does help to make last year's budget look better than it otherwise would. Second, by being bunched in with some other items, hopefully, it will hide some of the cost of farm programs of the past year. In a way, it is an exercise in concealment.

Will this restore the Commodity Credit Corporation to the full $14.5 billion? It certainly will not. We should keep that fact in mind and ask ourselves: "Why?"

If Members will check the Commodity Credit Corporation reports they will find that full restoration of losses has not occurred for 4 years. On page 10 of the Commodity Credit Corporation report of financial conditions and operations as of November 30, 1964, there are listed for fiscal years 1961, 1962, 1963, 1964, and 1965 the amounts of unrestored losses, losses caused by farm programs of these years. These unrestored losses of the past 4 years amount to the astronomical figure of $8.1 billion. What we could be considering today, if we were really seeking to restore the capital resources of the Commodity Credit Corporation, would be a supplemental appropriation bill in the amount of $8.1 billion instead of $1.1 billion.

The reason why we are not is also obvious. To do so would point the finger clearly at the extraordinary costs of these farm programs over the past 4 years. It is a $8 billion cost item which otherwise would not show up and thus not be apparent to the public. So, in a sense, we are engaged in a sort of conspiracy against public understanding, in hiding the truth from the American people about the financial operations of the Department of Agriculture.

According to the hearings, the 1965 budget assumed that the cost of the cotton program would go down $200 million. Instead, according to the hearings, it went up $343 million. Testimony reported in the hearings indicates that this costly failure could not have been anticipated. I would question that.

The blame was placed on bad weather, which caused high yields. The "bad weather" in this case was good weather, because it resulted in high yields of cotton.

Had those people read the minority views, prepared last year by the Committee on Agriculture, and available to the public as well as to members of the Appropriations Committee, they would have been braced for what happened. The minority views of last year documented exactly why the cotton bill would boost the cost of the cotton program by $221 million at the very least. We used the phrase in those views, "at the very least."

If the expense of the program is due to good yields of cotton, are we foredoomed to another costly "fizzle" of the cotton program this year, if yields continue to be good. Is the cotton program so shaky it will work only in the event of a crop failure?

What about the cost of the cotton program? The estimate presented by the Committee on Agriculture last year, assuming that no cotton bill was passed, was $772 million. Now the increased cost, as a result of this new bill and as evidenced by the hearing of the appropriations subcommittee, is an addition of $343 million, bringing the grand total cost of the cotton program, by this estimate, to $1,115 million. This is more than one-half of the market value of the 15 million-bale cotton crop of 1964. At 30 cents a pound the cotton crop would have a worth of $2¼ billion. At 24 cents a pound, which is the market value of cotton in world circles, the crop would be worth only $1.8 billion.

Under this new cotton bill the mills were to get direct payments, and payments they certainly have received. If you who are interested in this bill will refer to the Record of January 25 and turn to page 1108, you will find listed there the direct interim payments to textile mills since this bill was placed into effect last summer. These payments come to a total of $86.1 million. They represent just the payments for the interim or transition period. It did not involve the crop year of 1964–65. The additional payments for the crop year, believe it or not, are estimated to come to $445 million in addition to the payments of $86.1 million.

Well, the crop year is about half gone, which means roughly $227.5 million in addition to the $86 million interim payments have already been disbursed to the textile mills, and with a half year yet to go that means they will be on the receiving end of $227.5 million additional, with a grand total payment already made to the textile mills of $313.6 million.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. FINDLEY. Now, have the textile mills lived up to their end of the deal? Have the textile mills lived up to their end of the bargain? They have not. Under the bargain they were to receive direct payments from the taxpayers in return for which they were to reduce the price to consumers of cotton products. Every indication I have received from the pages of the Wall Street Journal and from the Cotton Situation Report of November as well as of September, issued by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, indicates that consumer prices for cotton textiles, the gray cloth, too, is up and not down as compared to a year ago. I quote from the Cotton Situation Report of last September. These are words which are worth listening to:

> Cloth prices about the same. The average wholesale value of fabric (20 constructions) made from a pound of cotton in August was 61 cents per pound, up slightly from the 60.95 cents in July and 60.60 cents in August 1963. The average price for the 1963–64 season was 61.65 cents compared with 60.52 cents for the previous year. * * *
>
> Prices paid by mills for cotton used in these 20 constructions, which reflect the 6.5-cent equalization payments, were at the lowest level since May 1946. At the same time, mill margins in August were at the highest level since February 1953. For 1963–64 crop year mill margins, the difference between the price of a pound of cotton and its approximate cloth equivalent averaged 26.19 cents, up from 24.91 cents for the previous year.

The mills have not lived up to their end of the bargain but they have been on the receiving end of multimillion-dollar payments.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute to supplement what the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Findley] said in his opening remarks in respect to the machinations that went into the subsidized sale of wheat to the Soviet Union. To make it very clear of the total amount of that sale, $18 million, was reflected in the sale being lower than the acquisition cost of the wheat. The balance between the $18 million and the $42 million or $43 million went into storage charges, carrying charges, and the freight. So it is like most of these export sales, that is, heavily subsidized and a direct cost to the taxpayers.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. MICHEL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WHITTEN. I am not defending the sale of wheat to Russia. I recall that I opposed an amendment which would have prohibited it on the basis that to tie your hands where you could not do it under any circumstances was unwise. However, it is my understanding under this sale, as in all others, the sales were made on a competitive basis to American business. We then granted the exporters permits so that they could sell to Russia in line with world prices, which is the price level for all sales abroad. It cost us no more than a similar sale of wheat to any other nation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, before yielding to my good friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Laird], I would like to say that the price of the Durum wheat was not sold at a competitive price and I think the record will bear this out.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of the time on this side to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Laird].

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. Chairman, this supplemental appropriation for the Commodity Credit Corporation in the amount of $1.6 billion is especially disturbing, coming as it does just 24 hours after the President submitted his so-called economy budget to the Congress.

It appears just a little bit hypocritical to take bows for an expenditure budget that is barely under a hundred billion dollars when on the very next day a supplemental of more than a billion and a half dollars is submitted. Can anyone doubt that this supplemental which will be charged to the fiscal 1965 budget contains hundreds of millions of dollars that should more properly be contained in the 1966 budget?

The timing of this request is an amazing example of the President's excellent public relations abilities. This supplemental is languishing in limbo, coming when it did, the day after the budget was submitted. The full amount does not appear in the estimated expenditures for fiscal 1965 although new obligational authority will be charged to fiscal 1965, nor will it appear entirely in the fiscal 1966 expenditure estimates, although a large portion of it will certainly be used in fiscal 1966.

Mr. Chairman, the minority does not like to criticize. But neither does it like to have its sensibilities abused time after time after time. We realize that the budget is a vastly complicated document. We would like to support the President in the conduct of necessary public business. But it is not incumbent upon us to sit by while figures are manipulated and maneuvered to show superficially that the fiscal 1966 budget is an economy budget.

The President, we are told, labored mightily to keep the 1966 expenditure budget under $100 billion. He submitted a budget in which he estimates expenditures of $99.7 billion, $300 million less than the so-called magic figure of $100 billion but at the same time asks for new spending authority in 1966 totaling $106 billion.

Can anyone in this Chamber doubt that at least half of these funds requested today will be expended in 1966? If anyone can, I would call his attention to the hearings before the Agricultural Appropriations Committee last week. In those hearings it was stated that there would be a working balance of $947 million available to the CCC if the full supplemental of $1.7 billion were appropriated.

With the expectation of almost a billion dollars left over, can anyone really believe that the CCC will go bankrupt or out of business if the full supplemental is not appropriated?

Mr. Chairman, it certainly seems that the administration fixed an overall budget ceiling of less than $100 billion. Then, as in last year's budget, certain figures were manipulated. Apparently, when all else failed, it became apparent that the CCC all of a sudden would need a supplemental large enough to leave a working balance of $947 million for operations in fiscal 1966.

Mr. Chairman, that $947 million was just about the same amount by which the Department of Agriculture underestimated its needs for fiscal 1965 and, we will all recall, the fiscal 1965 budget miraculously was below President Kennedy's request for fiscal 1964.

Is it not time, Mr. Chairman, for the Congress to reassert its prerogatives and insist that the executive call a halt to its transparent toying with our patience and our sensibilities?

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Chairman, the proposed motion to recommit this bill with instructions to exclude Egypt as a beneficiary of our Public Law 480 program poses a difficult problem.

The official attitude of Egypt toward the United States has been little short of insulting. The public statements of Nasser have deliberately sought to deride the United States and to belittle the friendship and assistance which we have offered. It is entirely understandable and natural for Americans to be frustrated and angered by these gratuitous attacks and to resent a further outpouring of U.S. aid in the face of these insults.

We must ask ourselves under these circumstances whether continued Public Law 480 assistance to Egypt is justified but this decision, I submit, Mr. Chairman, is essentially one for the President to make. Not only is he charged under the Constitution with the responsibility for the conduct of foreign affairs but he has available to him, through the State Department, the Central Intelligence Agency and other sources, vastly greater and more accurate information upon which to base a decision than does this body which now seeks to supply an answer without benefit of hearings of any kind.

It may well be that the aid policy of our country should reflect the hostile attitude of Egypt and other nations which have been recipients of American largess but I think it is a great mistake for the Congress to destroy the very flexibility which the President must have at his command if he is to be effective in conducting our Nation's foreign affairs. This is a dangerous area in which we trespass, Mr. Chairman, because we are taking it upon ourselves, without so much as even consulting the one man who is charged under the Constitution with the conduct of American foreign policy, to take away prerogatives which properly should be exercised by others. Unless we act wisely now, the result will almost certainly be widely construed as a lack of faith in President Johnson and his ability to represent the best interests of the United States in our relations with other countries. Such failure to act rationally and responsibly could be unfortunate and even tragic in its consequences. For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I will oppose the motion to recommit.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, the size of this deficit in the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation is shocking, but not altogether surprising to many of us who have voted against farm programs we knew could not work—and indeed have not worked.

We have voted more than $1¾ billion here today to make up deficits in Agriculture Department operations that we know are unwise. I hope this vote today may serve as a major warning to my colleagues, when, inevitably, other farm bills will come before this Chamber.

I can think of much better uses for this vast amount of money than paying it out for unworkable farm programs that do not solve anything.

If we really are concerned about some of the problems outlined by the President of the United States, we will consider more carefully than ever before we again vote for farm programs that roll up a deficit of $1¾ billion in 1 year.

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Chairman, I shall vote against a motion to recommit House Joint Resolution 234 to the Committee on Appropriations. I hold no brief for Colonel Nasser; I do not believe that the United Arab Republic is entitled to agricultural assistance from the United States at this time. But my conviction is even stronger that Congress should take no action to embarrass the President of the United States or to tie his hands in the conduct of foreign policy. The grave responsibility for charting our foreign policy is entrusted to the President by the Constitution. I, for one, will not tinker with the Constitution or gratuitously make the President's task more difficult than it already is in this delicate field. Let me say to our Republican friends that I never supported any effort to hobble President Eisenhower in his conduct of foreign affairs, and in my judgment, President Johnson deserves equal consideration.

The **CHAIRMAN.** All time has expired. The Clerk will read the joint resolution for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, namely:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Commodity Credit Corporation

Reimbursement for Net Realized Losses

For an additional amount to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for unreimbursed net realized losses sustained during the fiscal year 1963, pursuant to the Act of August 17, 1961 (15 U.S.C. 713a–11, 713a–12), $1,100,000,000.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FINDLEY

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FINDLEY: On page 2, line 3, strike the period at the end of the sentence and insert the following: ": *Provided,* That no part of this appropriation shall be used to formulate or carry out any price support program providing further payments during the fiscal year 1965 to any person, partnership, firm, joint stock company, corporation, association, trust, estate, individual, or other legal entity, pursuant to the provisions of section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order.

The **CHAIRMAN.** The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] reserves the point of order.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] for 5 minutes.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, the effect of this amendment will be to reach up and turn off the faucet through which flow the millions of dollars to the textile mills under this direct-payment program.

As I pointed out a few minutes ago these textile firms received $86 million in direct payments under the transitional, interim program last summer. Since then they have received an estimated $227 million in additional money, making a grand total already received in excess of $313 million. Presumably they are entitled to an additional $227 million for the balance of the crop year, assuming they have lived up to their responsibilities of this program, which they have not.

Their responsibility was to reduce the price of their products so that a greater demand and greater usage of cotton would result. The increased usage of cotton since this program went into effect has been simply the normal increase which would have occurred anyway. Where is the 1.5-million-bale increase which the industry freely predicted would result if they got these payments which, in turn, would enable them to reduce prices?

My amendment would shut off this golden flow to the textile mills.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, could I be heard at this time on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair shall be glad to hear the gentleman from Mississippi on the point of order.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to say at the outset that I have sent for the Corporation Control Act. I am sorry I do not have it at my fingertips.

Mr. Chairman, the Commodity Credit Corporation is a corporation, as I said earlier, and as a corporation it is given certain authorities in its charter. As a corporation it has all the acts, rights, and duties of a corporation, with certain exceptions.

Under the Corporation Control Act of some years ago—and I am speaking from recollection, and as I explained to the Chair I will have the act before me in a minute—we provided that the Congress could supervise the operations of these corporations, but that Congress could not prevent the Corporation from discharging the functions as provided in that charter except by amending the Charter Act, which of course would require legislation—and such would be subject to a point of order here.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if perchance this amendment were to be held in order—and I trust that it will not—it would provide that this particular fund should not be, but this Corporation in turn can use the payments that it receives from the sale of commodities and those funds would be available for this purpose. There is no separation within the Corporation of its funds.

While in the Appropriation Act that we have before you we have described three different activities of the Corporation as indications of where losses occurred and we have provided that those funds are justified because of these losses. But as a corporation, once these funds are made available to the Corporation by restoration of its borrowing authority, they are then pooled and they are pooled in the Corporation's borrowing authority for all the purposes of that Corporation.

Mr. Chairman, I respectfully insist that, first, the only authority remaining to the Congress is to supervise this Corporation in its operation as provided by law. It says specifically that it shall not be used to prevent the Corporation from discharging its responsibilities with all the authority that a corporation enjoys.

Second, that the funds or the borrowing authority of that Corporation, once it is received, is there for all purposes.

Mr. Chairman, if this amendment were permitted it would require a division of those funds within the Corporation and would require additional duties on its officers. Let me explain why this would be so. These funds will go there, but in addition to these funds the Corporation will have funds from the sale of commodities. It would require additional work on the part of the officers to separate the funds received from the sale of commodities from funds that might be made available here.

Mr. Chairman, I respectfully submit that in the long line of decisions that where what purports to be a limitation, if it imposes additional duties upon the officers or the agents of the Government dealing with it it has been held not to be a limitation and, therefore, subject to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. FINDLEY. I do, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, first of all the gentleman from Mississippi knows very well that the Commodity Credit Corporation is a creature of the Congress, a child of the Congress; therefore the parent can control the rules which govern the child. I further direct the attention of the gentleman to the bottom of page 5 of the hearings in which the gentleman from Mississippi said, "Some of the laws require the Department of Agriculture to support the price of certain commodities and it is a violation of the law not to support them. We have other laws that say if they do support them and the Corporation does not have the money they are in violation of the law."

He pointed out the conflict here in the present law, and it is up to us today as the parents of the Commodity Credit Corporation to resolve the conflict.

The effect of my amendment is a retrenchment, and it is within the Holman rule. It is a limitation and I believe it is in proper order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Harris). The Chair is ready to rule.

The joint resolution before the Committee at this time is a joint resolution making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Findley] has offered an amendment which provides that no part of the appropriation shall be used to formulate or carry out any price support program, provide for further payments, and so forth.

The Chair has considered the arguments of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Whitten] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Findley]. Apparently there is no question raised as to the germaneness of the amendment.

The amendment being germane to the bill before the Committee, the question is whether or not it is a limitation.

The Chair feels that the proposed amendment is a limitation in that it applies only to the appropriation before the Committee at this time. The Chair therefore overrules the point of order.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from Illinois should make his argument when the bill is on the floor to renew the cotton program instead of advancing it as a limitation on this supplemental appropriation bill. He has some figures which have been quoted here, and they can be contradicted. The entire premise upon which his argument is based can be contradicted in that the mills that have received this money never asked for a subsidy. They do not want it now, and they did not want it originally. All they asked was to have equality in the marketplaces of the United States with foreign competitors who were permitted to buy American-grown cotton at $42.50 a bale cheaper than they had to pay for it themselves.

We went through that argument last year when the bill was enacted. The law comes up for renewal this year.

With all due respect to my friend from Illinois, that will be the time and the place for him to make his argument against the renewal of this act.

The Commodity Credit Corporation is, as he has said, a creature of the Congress, and I suppose we can hamstring its operations and could change the rules in the middle of the game, but I do not think that is quite fair. I think the rules ought to be announced at the beginning of the game instead of between innings. So long as the bill is on the books which requires the Department of Agriculture to take certain actions which the gentleman would now limit I think it would be a mistake for us to tell the Department that it shall not enforce the law which Congress passed after full and complete debate.

Mr. FINDLEY. I will certainly advance it at a later date if the opportunity arises, but $200 million of the taxpayers' money is involved here. Further, if the gentleman is correct, in that the textile mills really do not want the subsidy, here is an opportunity to accommodate them by adopting this amendment.

Mr. JONAS. The answer to that is that there is no way for them to get away from the two-price cotton system except the way the Congress made available to them. If the gentleman can come up with any other vehicle which can be used to eliminate the unfairness in the two-price cotton system, I am confident, while I do not speak for any mill or the textile industry as a whole, that the industry would welcome such a solution. The textile industry does not desire nor has it ever sought a subsidy.

Mr. FINDLEY. Is the gentleman suggesting that the textile mills have actually reduced the price of cotton to the consumer?

Mr. JONAS. As the gentleman knows, I do not own any stock in any cotton mill and am not connected with the management of any mill. I do not know whether or not they have. But I will say this: I have heard it on sound authority that they have had to pass on all of the funds they have received under this program to their converters, processors, and the people who make the goods up for the ultimate consumer. So I ask that this amendment be rejected.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to aline myself with the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Jonas]. I trust, the Members of this body will vote down this amendment.

In addition to the point that has been made, whether or not the act is sound, the best interest of this country is served by not reneging on the law. The effect would be to deny a commitment of the United States. It would set aside an obligation which the Government has undertaken, against the wishes of the gentleman who proposed the amendment. I am sure the Members of this body would not want to be a party to reneging on a law which has been passed by this Congress. When this basic act comes back before the Congress, the gentleman may offer his amendment. He may win or lose, as he lost last time. No one wants to be a party at this late stage to saying that the law should not be carried out.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman from Illinois, of course, opposed the cotton bill. He did not vote for it in the first place. This is an effort to kill it by negating the law, as the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Jonas] said, in the middle of the game. Congress will have to take action later on, because the law expires the middle of this year. But the action brought about by the adoption of this amendment which changes the cotton law basically would have a very damaging effect, and I do not think it should be adopted.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I was not going to get into this argument today, but since there has been talk about the fairness of the cotton subsidy, I say that we ought to point out how unfair some of our agricultural laws are. In order that there will not be two prices on cotton, the Federal Government pays a subsidy to the mills so that they can buy cotton for their domestic use; raw cotton, at the same price that the exporter pays for cotton which is sent to foreign mills. Now let us take another commodity that was in the same bill, wheat. With wheat the loan level is now down to the world market price, but we are charging the wheat millers this coming year 75 cents a bushel to make sure that they do have a two-price program. Where flour mills have foreign competition as they do especially along our Canadian border, the flour millers in this country have to pay 75 cents a bushel more than the export price of wheat.

So we see unfairness all through our agricultural laws. I rise today to point out that we have three commodities in which we use direct payments—feed grains, wheat, and cotton—and we use a different kind of direct payment under each one. With cotton the mills receive a subsidy from the U.S. Treasury to bring their cost of raw cotton down to world level. With wheat the mills pay a tax to the U.S. Treasury to bring their cost way above the world level. With feed grains the farmers receive a subsidy from the U.S. Treasury the way a program ought to operate if direct payments are to be used.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FINDLEY. There have been several references to breaking contractual obligations on the part of the Federal Government. This, of course, would be unthinkable unless a balancing breach of agreement was involved. The textile industry gave us clear assurances during the consideration of this proposal that this program would result in lower prices of cotton products—and this has not occurred.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Findley].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Findley), there were—ayes 45, noes 105.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

PUBLIC LAW 480

For an additional amount for expenses during the fiscal year 1965, not otherwise recoverable, and unrecovered prior years' costs, including interest thereon, under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1701–1709, 1731–1736), to remain available until expended, as follows: (1) Sale of surplus agricultural commodities for foreign currencies pursuant to title I of said Act, $250,000,000; and (2) long-term supply contracts pursuant to title IV of said Act, $200,000,000.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MICHEL

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Michel: On page 2, line 13, strike the period at the end of the sentence and insert the following:

": *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used during the fiscal year 1965 to finance the export of any agricultural commodity to the United Arab Republic under the provisions of title I of such Act."

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, last Thursday I introduced a joint resolution which would, in effect, do what I seek to do by way of this amendment as a limitation on this appropriation request.

The disclosures on Tuesday, January 12, by an Egyptian secret police official who asked for asylum in Iran provided us with proof that Colonel Nasser has been diverting American aid funds in order to pay for his interference in the affairs of other independent states.

This new evidence, as well as the events of the past 3 months, should be enough to convince everyone that some changes must be made in the distribution of our agricultural surpluses, as well as our foreign economic aid.

Nasser's record of interference in the affairs of other countries in the past has been extensively documented many times. Under a variety of pretexts, our aid has nevertheless continued. The events of the past 3 months, however, provide us with an almost uninterrupted array of provocations, insults, and illegal actions.

To enumerate them:

On November 26, 1964, the John F. Kennedy Memorial Library in Cairo was sacked and burned by mobs the Government of the United Arab Republic was unwilling or unable to control.

On December 19, 1964, the Russian-built planes of Colonel Nasser's air force shot down an unarmed commercial plane belonging to the John Mecom Oil Co. of Texas.

On December 23, 1964, in a long speech at Port Said, Colonel Nasser not only insulted the United States by telling us to "jump in the lake" in Egyptian dialect, but also admitted that he was supplying arms to the Congolese rebels.

We suspected before, and know now, how he is able to do this by diverting resources from important agricultural development projects to the purchase of military equipment and supplies. Nasser is able to accomplish a diversion because we supply him with $140 million worth of surplus wheat, beef, and poultry every year under the Public Law 480 food-for-peace program. The proceeds from the sale of these surplus foodstuffs is then loaned or granted to the government, which in this case uses them for its own interventionist foreign policy.

Until 18 months ago we had also granted or loaned Nasser nearly $900 million in economic and other aid programs.

Under the terms of the 1963 Foreign Assistance Act, the President was directed by Congress to withhold all foreign economic aid, as well as food-for-peace aid, from any nation committing aggressive acts against any other country receiving our aid. I believe we have here a clear-cut violation of that act. Nasser has admitted publicly that he is supplying arms to the Congolese rebels, whose avowed intent is to overthrow the central government. Our Government both recognizes and supports that central government. I believe it is time for Congress to act.

If we do not wish to see the dignity of the laws of the United States flouted by every petty national leader who wishes to enhance his position, we must act. We can do so today by adopting the pending amendment.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. STAFFORD. I wish to compliment the gentleman from Illinois for his amendment and for the statement he has made.

Recently I had occasion to be in the U.A.R. for a short time. The trip was not extensive, but it was off the beaten track. It was my very strong impression that the citizens of that country, except for those in the seaport where some of our aid comes in, have no idea that the wheat being distributed there comes from the United States. They believe Mr. Nasser raises it himself.

Mr. MICHEL. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

I wish to point out also that the total amount of agricultural commodities in the public law 480 agreement signed October 1962 was $431.8 million of export value. Apropos of what we are doing today in reimbursing the Commodity Credit Corporation for net realized losses on the books of the Commodity Credit Corporation, this so-called $431.8 million is in reality a $583.8 million sale so far as the Commodity Credit Corporation is concerned. We still have left to be shipped to the United Arab Republic before the end of the fiscal year, roughly $37 million worth of agricultural surplus commodities.

Adopting this amendment would foreclose the further shipment of the balance on that agreement. I think it is very clear what our task is and what we ought to be doing here. We can do it very easily by adopting this amendment here this afternoon.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I suppose that my position is fairly clear in this situation. On several occasions I have spoken in favor of a similar amendment. I do not think that the situation has changed any. Unfortunately I did not hear the words of the author of the amendment, but let me say that there is every reason in the world to deny any further assistance to Mr. Nasser. He uses our assistance for the purpose of building up the arms industry in the Soviet Union. He has done everything within his power to flaunt the wishes of this Nation. Of course, you all know some of the heinous things he has done only recently, and this despite the fact that only a short time ago a similar resolution was defeated by 3 votes. You would think he would give pause to some of his acts as a result of the closeness of the last vote, but he disregarded that vote altogether. He seems to feel that our wishes and interests are of no concern to him; that he has the right willy-nilly to do as he pleases, that is, to tell us to jump into the sea, to destroy civilian airplanes owned by American concerns, to burn our libraries, and to make trouble throughout the entire continent of Asia and also the entire continent of Africa. Incidentally, it was he, together with Algeria, who is presently sending war materiel and men to the Congo against the interests of this Nation.

I do not think there is any question at all but what additional aid should be denied to Mr. Nasser. I think it is high time that he was brought to book and was made to understand that we are not to be trifled with, which is what he is doing. He tells us to jump into the lake when we suggest to him that he should discontinue these acts with which he has been charged and of which we know he is guilty.

So, gentlemen, I implore you for the purpose of holding up the flag of this Nation, and ask that we stand not alone on our rights but on our dignity by passing this amendment.

I personally feel that the Nation generally, as a result of reading the various editorials and news items which have been published throughout the entire Nation—I feel that the people of this Nation are behind cutting off any further aid to Mr. Nasser. I firmly believe that we will be doing a disservice to the interests of this Nation if we permit ourselves to continue assisting this man.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, the thought may come to some Members that this is an unreasonable and unwise restriction on the freedom of action of the President of the United States in conducting our foreign policy. Before you reach any conclusions on it I would like to have you clearly understand the limitations of this restriction. I might add it is limited strictly to the balance of the current fiscal year. It does not restrict the use of any dollars which might even be held over at the end of the fiscal year to the next fiscal year. It does restrict the use of money presently in CCC. It ties his hands in a limited way only for this 5-month period, and I am sure most of us would agree that Mr. Nasser deserves some public reprimand and rebuke from this side of the ocean for the acts he has committed and the remarks he is making.

A recitation was made just a few minutes ago of the events under which an American plane was shot down, resulting in two deaths, and the disclosure by Nasser that he had been aiding the Congolese rebels.

Within 7 days after these events became public, believe it or not, the U.S. Department of Agriculture announced plans to ship $19 million worth of wheat to Nasser, the very same man who had, in Egyptian slang, told us to take our foreign aid and go to hell. The shipment of wheat was deplorable and the timing was even more deplorable.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support of this amendment.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, as I read this amendment it says that the limitation shall be applicable only to the financing of exports to the United Arab Republic under provisions of title I of such act for the remainder of the fiscal year 1965.

Mr. FINDLEY. That is correct.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. If there is any other capital available in the Commodity Credit Corporation that is free may that capital be used for this purpose?

Mr. FINDLEY. This could not possibly restrict the use of other capital, in my opinion.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. The limitation is only applicable to the $1.6 billion that we are making available here.

Mr. FINDLEY. Yes, to the $200 million portion of it; as a matter of fact, that portion set aside for use under titles I and IV of Public Law 480.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. It is limited to $200 million of the $1.6 billion and only for the remainder of the fiscal year 1965?

Mr. FINDLEY. That is correct.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment now pending before the Committee is similar in nature to an amendment which I had sent to the desk, which would have the purpose of preventing the use of funds appropriated under the resolution before the Committee for the sale of agricultural commodities to the United Arab Republic.

The history of the activity on the part of the United Arab Republic, particularly since the House considered this matter last summer, makes it imperative that we move at this time to express the clear sense of the House and of the Congress that Public Law 480 shipments shall cease to this nation which deliberately pursues a policy of aggression in the Near East and in Africa.

It is perfectly clear that even after the warning which the House gave last summer Nasser has continued to foment strife and agitation in the Middle East. He has continued to make clear his determination to destroy the democracy of Israel. He has established the United Arab Command for the purpose of military encirclement of Israel. He has worked with other Arab countries toward the diversion of the headwaters of the Jordan River. He has imported German scientists to build rockets aimed at the heartland of Israel. In addition, he has been meddling in the affairs of the Congo.

Mr. Chairman, Nasser has made perfectly clear his contempt for the foreign policy objectives of the United States and his contempt of the United States itself. Witness the burning of the USIA library in Cairo. Witness other acts of aggression and terror. His speeches have reflected his contempt for the United States. Recently he accused the U.S. Ambassador of using economic pressure and told the Egyptian people that anyone disagreeing with his anti-U.S. attitude "can drink from the sea."

Mr. Chairman, I have repeatedly on the floor of the House and in communications to the Secretary of State and to the President pointed out that Nasser is preparing for aggression against the democracy of Israel and that the economic assistance he receives under our foreign aid programs permits him to allocate his resources to the ever-spiraling arms race in which he is engaged.

The United Arab Republic is still in violation of the aggressor nation clause which Congress wrote into the Foreign Assistance Act of 1963. It provides that foreign aid be terminated to any nation which "is engaging in or preparing for aggressive military efforts directed against any country receiving assistance under this act or any other act." The intent then was to deny aid to Egypt as long as her aggressive policy continued. The clause has never been implemented.

The United Arab Republic is also in violation of Public Law 480 as it was finally amended in the conference report last September. At that time Congress provided that no sales shall be made with any country if the President finds such country is "an aggressor in a military sense against any country having diplomatic relations with the United States." The legislative history clearly shows that this provision was directed at the United Arab Republic.

Today we have the opportunity to implement the express policy of the Foreign Aid Act and the policy of the Congress as enunciated last September when we adopted the extension of Public Law 480. Let us make it clear here and now that any funds appropriated under this supplemental, which is all we have jurisdiction over today, shall not be used to continue the sale of agricultural commodities to the United Arab Republic. The United States must not underwrite Egypt's arms buildup.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I think most of us recognize that the United Arab Republic has been carrying on practices with which we cannot agree and which we feel should be stopped. Mr. Nasser has been inexcusably arrogant and insulting.

Mr. Chairman, many Members feel that we should stop all aid to the United Arab Republic. I have to confess that I find myself in general agreement with those views. I think it is a mistake to feed the mouth that bites us. But for us to adopt a policy of trying to pass upon the most fundamental type of foreign assistance issues without any committee hearings, without any previous notice—simply legislating as it were by hysteria—seems to me would be engaging in the very worst sort of legislative practices, the very kind of practices of which Mr. Nasser is so often guilty.

Mr. Chairman, I would hate for this country to put itself on the same level as the arrogant gentleman on the Nile. However, this proposed amendment is but one of a series of amendments—you just voted down the first—which the minority is attempting to pass this afternoon by hysteria. I cannot believe that it is at all sound to pass on fundamental issues whether foreign or domestic as amendments to an appropriations bill. Here you are really trying to amend existing law without holding any hearings or listening to any argument. Maybe the objective is good—I am inclined to think that it is good, but I do not believe that it is good practice to condemn without evidence.

Mr. Chairman, the Members of this Committee just voted down the proposal to repeal the cotton law, because that is exactly what the last amendment proposed. Now we have another amendment seeking to change existing law through a so-called "limitation" upon the appropriation bill. This pending amendment will not only change existing law, but it will also change our foreign policy as well. I am inclined to think our foreign policy should be changed. I would like to clip the wings of this hawk of the Middle East, but I know that that kind of thing ought to go through the regular processes.

Years ago we had a great Governor of my State, called "the Old Alcalde" who said "If Texas is going to go to hell, I am going to see that she does it according to law." If we are going to show our displeasure at Mr. Nasser—and I am ready to do so—let us do it according to the spirit of the rules of legislative procedure.

Mr. Chairman, the House Committee on Agriculture is not unmindful of the problems here involved. The Subcommittee on Foreign Agriculture has already made arrangements, some 10 days ago, to hear the Secretary of State tomorrow morning. This was done long before we knew that this bill was coming up today and long before anyone else knew it was coming up today. We did it because we felt that it was desirable to stop aid where we felt it was probably being misused, but we felt that common decency require that we give the State Department a chance to be heard before we condemned them.

Mr. Chairman, I point this out in an effort to show the Members of the Committee that there has been no delay on the part of the House Committee on Agriculture. We have scheduled a meeting with the Secretary of State for tomorrow morning to discuss this very issue, because we feel as many of you feel that there is a serious question of giving aid to those who do not show any respect for the United States. We do feel that there is a serious question as to the continued grant of aid to the United Arab Republic, but we believe that it is also a right serious question as to how we should handle these things. I think that they should be handled through legislative committee, with hearings and conferences with the executive officials, rather than by simply amending an appropriation bill without any possible understanding of the factors involved except as we have heard them from what we have read in the papers. I am not defending Mr. Nasser. I am not suggesting that we should continue to aid him, but I am pleading with you to cherish and protect our own legislative processes. The intelligent processes of democratic legislation are far more vital to the United States than the opportunity to express our identification with a popular cause.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know what the witnesses are going to say and I do not know if they are going to change our attitude in regard to this matter. We may come back here asking for legislation asking for exactly the same results desired by the advocates of this amendment, but if we do we will come back here with a preannounced time for a discussion of the problem, for a consideration of both sides, for a real look at what can be done.

If after hearings the legislative asks you to stop aid to the United Arab Republic we will try and deal with the problem—not simply put it off 5½ months as this amendment does. The author of the amendment says himself that it will be effective only through June. Actually, it will not be effective that long. The existing Public Law 480 agreement runs until next June. This amendment touches nothing but the existing agreement. It does not stop entering into a new agreement, it does not prevent the Commodity Credit Corporation from selling corn or wheat or cotton and using those proceeds to finance the exportation of these commodities between now and June. It relates only to moneys appropriated today. The wheat we are shipping was bought with other money. This amendment does not actually do the things that its authors allege they want done and that many of us want done. It does not prohibit the fulfillment of these agreements.

It simply says you cannot use this new money that is being appropriated. We are not using this new money to buy this wheat which is being shipped. We already have it bought. It can still be delivered. But if you will handle this thing in the regular, legitimate way, then the whole question of whether we should provide wheat to those who insult the United States can be considered. But you cannot consider it under circumstances such as these, and I hope you will turn down the amendment.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I trust this amendment will be rejected, and I hope it will be rejected by a sizable vote.

I say that for a variety of reasons. The first is, as the gentleman from Texas pointed out a moment ago, the legislation before us today is basically an additional authorization for the Commodity Credit Corporation. For us to use this as a vehicle for attempting to write the foreign policy of the United States would, in my judgment, be a very serious mistake.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, has announced that he will begin hearings next week on the foreign aid authorization bill. The President of the United States sent up a foreign aid message over a week ago which I believe is the earliest this message has come up in recent times. So we are prepared to go to work on these problems in an orderly fashion.

There is no doubt about the fact that our people, and with great justification, have feelings of anger against Nasser and against other people on this earth.

But the great late President, John Kennedy, told me something I try to remember on occasions. That was, and the quote is almost verbatim, "Never do something simply because you are angry."

We are angry against Nasser.

But let us take a look at what we are really doing here if we adopt this amendment. The gentleman from Illinois, author of the amendment, was quite frank here a moment ago when he said that the point might be made that this amendment would tie the hands of the President of the United States in a question involving the foreign affairs of the United States. He said, however, that after all, it will only tie his hands for 5 months, not for 5 years or 10 years—just 5 months.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that without hearings, without consideration of the issues involved, and in a spirit mainly motivated by frustration and anger, for us to tie the hands of the President of the United States, who is charged with the foreign policy of the United States, for 5 months or 5 minutes is a mistake.

Let us look at the record. Back in 1956, I think it was—I could be wrong—some of my foreign policy experts here will correct me if I am—there was a crisis in the Middle East. Nasser had virtually seized the Suez Canal. He was continuing his aggressive activities against his neighbor, Israel, a country which I have visited and which I greatly admire. At that time Anthony Eden, Prime Minister of Great Britain, ordered an invasion of Egypt. General Eisenhower was the President of the United States. He demanded the withdrawal of the British and other forces. This was done. The Democratic Members of this body said, and rightly so, that President Eisenhower was the Commander in Chief and was charged with conducting the foreign policy of the United States. We did not try to dictate a contrary policy, although some of us may have disagreed.

I am not prepared to say that the President is right or wrong on this issue, but I am prepared to say that he as the President is the President of all the people, and he is entitled to at least the same consideration which was accorded by a majority of Congress back in those years, a Democratic Congress, to President Eisenhower.

For us to do what the gentleman from Illinois by his own admission says it will do, tie the hands of the President of the United States for 5 months, at a time such as this, would be, in my judgment, a very serious mistake. So I hope, Mr. Chairman, that this amendment will be rejected.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the amendment needs some clarification. Based on the debate so far, one might get the impression that by taking this action we were withdrawing from the President the right and the authority to make any grant or loan or give any assistance through the Commodity Credit Corporation. The facts are that this amendment is applicable only to title I, which relates to sales to a country for its local currency. This amendment does not limit, it does not restrict any action taken by the President under titles II and III of Public Law 480. In other words, if by any chance there was any reason whatsoever on the part of the President and in the foreign policy interest of the Government, he would have authority under this amendment for the remainder of fiscal year 1965 to make grants under titles II and III. So, in conclusion, I simply say that this amendment, as limited as it is, in my opinion is a proper step to give to the United Arab Republic and to Mr. Nasser a kind of warning which should be heeded if they are to be the beneficiaries of our help and assistance in the future.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am disappointed that on the first important matter to come before the House in this session the distinguished minority leader has seen fit to take a course which is at variance, as I see it, with the historic bipartisan foreign policy of the United States, initiated by one of the great men in the history of his State, the late Senator Vandenberg.

Mr. Speaker, the issue here is not whether this amendment would limit the use of funds under one title or another of Public Law 480 and appropriations implementing that law. The issue here is not whether you like or do not like Nasser, and I agree with those who have said that Nasser has done things that are certainly not to our liking. The issue here is whether a matter of major foreign policy should be determined by legislative action on an appropriation bill without the advice, the information, and the help of the President of the United States and his Secretary of State, who are charged under the Constitution of the United States with the responsibility of speaking for this country in matters of foreign policy.

This is a major policy matter. This bill could have major repercussions.

This is a dangerous amendment. What a victory it would be for Communist diplomacy for the House of Representatives to take this kind of action and undo our patient—and I emphasize the word "patient"—diplomacy in these critical areas of the world.

No one and no country likes to be treated with disrespect. This is aimed not just at Nasser, but it is aimed at anybody who might succeed Nasser in the United Arab Republic.

But Americans know that patience is the price of greatness. The gentleman from Louisiana, the distinguished Democratic whip, referred to the Suez Canal incident of a few years ago where we learned a lesson, a lesson which should be particularly close to our friends on the other side of the aisle. That lesson is that returning insult for insult is not the way to get ahead diplomatically. It took us 10 years to recover from the Suez crisis. It would take us years to recover from the crisis which could result from this kind of action.

The Secretary of State spoke to me just a few minutes ago and said that tomorrow he was appearing before a subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture with reference to this very subject. In due time and after due consideration, this problem will be treated by responsible committees of the House with the advice and the help of the spokesmen for the President, who is the spokesman for this country in matters of foreign policy.

This is the intelligent way to handle this matter. This is the way matters of this kind were handled by the Democratic leadership of the House during the administration of President Eisenhower. Should we not give to President Johnson the same cooperation we gave President Eisenhower only a few years ago? As for me, I place my confidence in President Johnson. He is the President of all the people, and his hands should not be tied as he undertakes to fulfill his enormous responsibilities in this difficult age.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to get into this debate on this amendment. But I should like to repeat some of the things I said yesterday and to try to clarify one thing that we hear so often on this floor and that the distinguished majority leader has just repeated; namely, that under the Constitution the President of the United States has the sole power—the sole power in our foreign affairs.

I challenge you to find anything in the Constitution of the United States that says the President of the United States has sole power in foreign affairs.

The only reference made in the Constitution to the question of foreign affairs is that he may make treaties with the advice and consent of the Senate, which, of course, is a branch of the Congress.

Now let us get away from this. Let us get down to the facts on this question that we hear so many times on this floor—whether it is President Eisenhower, President Kennedy, or President Johnson. It is not a fact and the Constitution does not grant any such power to the President that he shall have the sole power.

But what other power is mentioned in the Constitution?

The Constitution says that no funds shall be spent unless appropriated by the Congress of the United States. If Members will read the constitutional debates and the Federalist Papers, to see what the Founding Fathers had to say with regard to foreign affairs, they will find reference to the fact that one of the checks on the President in regard to foreign affairs was placing this responsibility in the Congress.

My purpose in rising, Mr. Chairman, is not particularly to debate this question on this amendment, but to try to make it crystal clear that the Constitution specifically gives us the power of the limitation on the use of funds, how funds shall be appropriated and how they shall be spent. We are acting constitutionally on this amendment in making the determination whether it shall be done or not. There is no constitutional language which says that the sole power of foreign affairs is vested in the President of the United States. I say it is a joint responsibility, and we have as much responsibility under the power given to us in the Constitution with regard to expenditure of funds, even though those funds are spent across the seas.

I am not speaking partisanly. This is bipartisan, for the Congress. We have as much right, and even more, under the Constitution, as does the President of the United States, on the question of how the American taxpayers' dollars are to be spent in this country or abroad, or whatever it may be. We are acting responsibly when we act upon an amendment of this kind.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. The gentleman would agree that the Constitution of the United States specifically vests in the Congress the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations.

Mr. BOW. That is correct.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, it is with great reluctance that I rise to speak, but it does seem to me that support of a bipartisan foreign policy does not necessarily mean support of an unwise foreign policy. Nor does it mean that following the lead of a Democratic administration, a Democrat must follow it blindly. Nor does it mean that I do not have a heavy heart when the first thing I do in my new assignment as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs is to take a position opposite that of the distinguished and lovable chairman of that committee. Nor does it mean the fact that an amendment is sponsored by a member of the opposite party means it has no merit, per se.

Mr. Chairman, it is unfortunate that we are dealing with one nation, but we cannot escape from the fact that this one nation has told the United States of America through its "duly elected" head of state that this Nation should jump in the ocean. They have indicated, in words or in substance, time and time again, that they could not care less what we do.

We are presumably giving them food-for-peace. The argument can be made, and can be made well, that we are feeding hungry children. Surely there is no one in this Chamber who does not support that position. But, when those funds which they themselves would be using to feed their own children are used to buy guns, equipment, and materiel from the Soviet Union, this results in a situation in which they are taking the funds we are giving them, and then we are a part of a conspiracy to destroy other democracies in the Middle East and to destroy the balance of power.

I do not worry about what might happen if Nasser should be removed and another man should take over in 6 months or a year from today. We can meet that situation when we come to it.

When a country has enunciated time and time again that the principles it stands for are repugnant to the principles of the United States of America and what we stand for, I have no hesitation in voting for an amendment to cut off aid at any time or at any place to such a country.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am in full accord with the purpose of my colleague from Illinois. However, I differ with his approach. If this matter were left to me, and I acted on what I believe, I would certainly stop all grants to Nasser's Egypt tomorrow. If I relied on what I now know and feel, I would stop sales of commodities to Nasser and Egypt. However, if the responsibility rested with me, I would first get the entire story and then act. Personally, I might say the same thing with regard to continuing our war in Vietnam as I have pointed out many times. I have the same feeling with respect to many other things. However, I do not feel I know all there is to know about them.

Let me point out several things here which I do know. This amendment would prohibit sales to Egypt but would fix no limit on gifts or grants of the same commodities to Egypt. This amendment would prohibit the use of the funds in this bill to sell commodities to Egypt but would leave intact the use of money which the Corporation now has on its books to the credit of Public Law 480, which perhaps it has used temporarily for other purposes. Further, this restriction on sales, while leaving the right for grants and gifts to Egypt of the same commodities, would be limited in time.

I truly believe this amendment will not do the job but will needlessly restrict the activities of a Government corporation on which we must depend for financing price supports and which has authority of a corporation to carry on the many operations which we have assigned to it.

While I am in accord with the desire and the attitude of my colleague, and my feelings are in accord with his, still the procedure here of starting to write restrictions on certain funds of a corporation which is so vital to so many activities is proceeding in the wrong way and, in my opinion, would not get the job done. To act here without hearings on press reports is not the way we have handled the other items and problems.

I wish this matter had been brought up in our committee hearings so that we could have fully developed the facts and given real attention as to how to handle the problem effectively, either by action if it could be reached in this bill or by recommendation to the appropriate committee or agency.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I had hoped that the policy issue proposed by the pending amendment would not be raised on this bill today. Most Members of the House hold no brief for Abdel Gamal Nasser. Certainly I do not. He has conducted himself in such a way as to rightfully incur the displeasure and contempt of the American people. The problem of what must be our policy in north Africa is of importance but this is not the proper time and place to make that decision. We do not have all the facts before us and the appropriate witnesses have not been heard.

I am not exactly sure as to how the members of this Committee will vote on the issue before us now. I am sure as to how I feel we should vote on this issue.

The continent of Africa is a major field of battle in the cold war. I do not want to abdicate the continent of Africa to the Soviet Union or to Red China. The adoption of this amendment would in my judgment be a move in that direction.

I know that there is conflict between the Arab countries and the country of Israel and I am convinced that the adoption of this amendment would be hurtful to Israel in the long run, indeed to all concerned.

My colleagues, just because Nasser said to the United States that we should go jump in the ocean is no reason why we should go jump in the ocean.

A paramount reason why there are so many men on our side of the aisle and so few on the other today is that this administration has provided broadgaged leadership and the leadership of the minority has too often seemed to seek short time gains which would result in longtime losses. That is the issue here today, to grasp this thing which seems to be popular and to welsh on an agreement which we made in 1962. This is an agreement to provide certain commodities, for which we have no apparent need and which are costing us money to store, to the United Arab Republic.

I am not advocating the sale or gift of agricultural commodities to Egypt. My position is that we should not restrict the President in his handling of this delicate international matter. Moreover, I doubt that there could be any long-range gain to this country in welshing on a solemn international agreement.

The United States has deep rooted and well founded interests in the Middle East. That area is one of the major oil producing areas of the world. The Suez Canal is a vital link in the world trade routes upon which so much of our agriculture and industry depend.

The rulers in Moscow and Peiping would welcome further difficulties between this country and Egypt. They are deeply involved in exploiting the turmoil and confusion in Africa. Let us beware of taking any action that might help them achieve their ends.

We are about through with the Public Law 480 program in Egypt under the present agreement. It is about 90 percent or more over. It expires on June 30.

To emphasize the inadequacy of the pending amendment, I point out that although it prohibits sales to the United Arab Republic under title I of Public Law 480, it would not prohibit gifts or grants under titles II and III of that act. I am certainly not in favor of telling the President that he can give commodities to Nasser, but he cannot sell any.

Yes, we talked about the sale of wheat to Russia last year. Most of us voted to let that decision be made by the President. We voted not to restrict him. He sold some wheat for cash. And what did the farm States do? They contributed along with the rest of the Nation to the overwhelming avalanche of votes in behalf of this administration. Broadgaged leadership seems to be what the people want.

In just a few weeks, we will have before us the foreign aid authorization bill from the committee headed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN]. That is the time and place to fight the issue on what should be done in this matter.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BOGGS. I appreciate the gentleman's yielding.

I might say to the gentleman that the President has been so anxious to inform all Members of this body of the problems that confront the Nation—not the Democratic Party but the Nation—that on the day after the inaugural ceremonies which were tiring, to say the least, on the President, he called at the White House a meeting of the leadership of both political parties where, with the help of Mr. McNamara and Mr. Rusk, he sought to brief all these gentlemen on these problems. I think the President is entitled to some confidence, certainly at the beginning of this administration.

Mr. MAHON. Unwise action on our part at this time would tend to force the United Arab Republic closer to the Soviet Union and Red China. It does seem to me that we should not appear to be abandoning a continent, as we tend to do in this amendment.

So I for one would prefer to let the House decide this issue during the debate on the foreign aid bill. I am not going to vote, and I know there are many Members who are not going to vote for something which may seem attractive on the surface but which is not in the best long-range interests of the United States. We have got to stand hitched. This is the time to stand up and vote for the long-range best interests of our country and that means, in my judgment, voting against the ill-conceived amendment that has been proposed to this bill.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have repeatedly stood on the floor of this House and have cited indictment after indictment of violations of international law, morality, and human decency on the part of the Castro of the Nile, Colonel Nasser.

Mr. Chairman, it is not just his attitude toward Israel, as has been mentioned by the distinguished chairman of the committee, as the basic reason for this amendment here on this floor today. This is reprehensible enough. But of utmost significance is his flagrant and repugnant abuse of power which seriously threatens the peace of the world. We cannot appease this tyrant any longer. He taunts, insults, and defies the United States; he consistently supports Soviet policies; he acclaims the leadership of Red China; he avows the annihilation of Israel; he subverts his fellow Arab States; he instigated barbarous warfare in the Yemen; he boasts about his arming of the Congo rebels—made possible, indirectly but ironically, by U.S. economic support. I could go on and on. But it should not be necessary to say anything more.

Mr. Chairman, this man has made a mockery of our aid program. It is high time that we stood up for principle, Mr. Chairman, and said once and for all that we will not stand for his double-crossing, for his mischief, for his gangsterlike tactics.

Mr. Chairman, Nasser has had more than his chance to prove honorable intentions and he has failed miserably and decisively at every turn.

Mr. Chairman, I trust that we will have the guts here today to adopt this amendment.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALPERN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a comment concerning a statement made by the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS]. It is true that the President at a meeting with myself and others on our side, the day after the inauguration, outlined some of the problems that he had in the area of foreign policy, including the pros and cons of our relations with Mr. Nasser. I concede that it is a very difficult position to be in, to know which course of action is the better one from the standpoint of our country's national interest. But I think the President would also agree that there is good, sound argument for taking a position such as the one that is being taken here today, although upon weighing it on the scales, in his judgment he might feel differently.

So, Mr. Chairman, although we on our side said to him that we would cooperate to the degree that we could, it was our feeling then, and I think now, that we ought to reserve for ourselves some independence of judgment when an issue such as this comes to the floor of the House.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALPERN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I want to say in summary of my argument in support of my amendment, reading word for word from President Johnson's state of the Union message:

> We are prepared to live as good neighbors with all, but we cannot be indifferent to acts designed to injure our interests, or our citizens, or our establishments abroad.

Mr. Chairman, I remind the Members of the Committee of those instances that I cited in my remarks.

The President further stated:

> The community of nations requires mutual respect. We shall extend it—

Then, remember, how we all applauded him when he said—

> and we shall expect it.

Mr. Chairman, today is the time for reckoning. You can do the right thing by supporting the amendment.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise most reluctantly to speak in favor of this amendment, for in the 6 years that I have been in the Congress, I have always supported the President at all times on all foreign policy issues that have come up before the House.

However, Mr. Chairman, I feel so strongly about this amendment that I must support it and explain my reasons.

Mr. Chairman, it has been stated here this afternoon that this will be coming up before the Committee on Foreign Affairs. Mr. Chairman, this is Public Law 480. It will not come before the Committee on Foreign Affairs, but rather the Agriculture Committee.

I feel that Nasser has been thumbing his nose at the United States long enough. For instance, the association between Russia and Nasser that is as spine-chilling as it was to the English and French over the buildup of Mussolini and Hitler over a short generation ago, a time we would like to forget but its festering forces will not allow.

As a matter of fact, I am so disturbed over this alliance of Russia and Egypt that I question seriously whether this country should continue to lend economic aid to Egypt and other aggressive countries that are playing one country off against another. And if there is ever a tipoff as to the real sentiment of Egypt as regards the United States, we had it in the burning of the Kennedy Library in Cairo recently, while the police obviously looked on with amusement. I say that it is high time we called their bluff. Egypt depends on us for upwards of 40 percent of their food. I say we are now in a position to tell these aggressors that if they want food, let them stop threatening the peace of the world, or let them go to Russia which is presently having a hard enough time feeding their own people, the Chinese and the Cubans, to mention just a few hungry Iron Curtain countries.

But by the same token, there are other people and other countries who are not so bent on destroying their neighbors, not so flaunting and biting the hand that feeds them who could use our aid and help us promote love and peace in the world.

Mr. Chairman, as long as we provide 40 percent of the food consumed in Egypt under Public Law 480, we will allow this country to take the money which it would use for this food to buy armaments and allow the United Arab Republic to enter the atomic and rocket fields. Mr. Chairman, I will insert in the RECORD an article by Omer Anderson entitled, "Nasser's Rocket Program Well Advanced, Presents Real Threat to Israel by 1967."

My good chairman, for whom I have the highest regard and respect, says that Africa is the heart of the cold war between the East and West and that we cannot throw northern Africa to the Communist side. This is true. But by the same token, the United States is expending considerable effort and money in the Congo in an attempt to settle the problem and the unrest that exists there. And on the other hand, we find that Colonel Nasser continues to meddle in the Congo against the best interests of the United States.

It is my strong belief that the only way that we can control this man is to tie his hands by stopping our aid through Public Law 480. Certainly, someone will argue that the Soviet Union will step in and pick up where the United States left off. We all know the economic difficulties that the Soviet Union is having at the present time. In fact, she is buying wheat from the United States, Canada, and France and she cannot assume this added burden of supplying 40 percent of the food for Egypt.

If we maintain this firm policy, it will be only a matter of time before Nasser can be contained, which is our only hope for peace in the Middle East. Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment is adopted.

NASSER'S ROCKET PROGRAM WELL ADVANCED; PRESENTS REAL THREAT TO ISRAEL BY 1967

(The following interview is based on interviews with German scientists, just back from Egypt (they asked that their names be withheld), and with West German defense ministry officials who debriefed them after their return.)

(By Omer Anderson)

BONN.—President Gamal Abdel Nasser said in a speech on Christmas Eve that the United Arab Republic must enter the atomic and rocket fields to deal with imperialism and Zionism.

"To deal with imperialism and Zionism," Nasser said at Ismailia, "Egyptians must rely on themselves and develop their industrial, rocket, and atomic fields."

Nasser spoke a few days after a high officer on his general staff had told a correspondent of Die Welt, the West German newspaper published in Hamburg:

"The military situation of Israel will weaken from year to year. But the real danger of war in the Middle East will not exist for another 3 years—when Egypt has completed its rocket armament."

Addressing the 26th Zionist World Congress in Jerusalem, Israel Premier Levi Eshkol said Nasser intended picking the time to start a war with Israel and would try to avoid an uncontrolled conflict until he was ready.

German rocket scientists hired by Nasser say that his growing bellicosity and candor reflect the fact that Egypt's missile program is considerably further advanced than is generally realized in the West.

HIT ISRAEL BY 1967

Some of these scientists who have returned to West Germany say that Nasser will have the missiles to devastate wide areas of Israel by late 1967 and that he will have rockets with a 1-ton payload by the end of 1965.

West German defense ministry experts who have questioned the returning rocket scientists regard their assessment of Nasser's rocket potential as entirely realistic and possibly too conservative.

The scientists say Nasser has accelerated greatly his rocket program since the first test firing of four missiles on July 22, 1962, from a launching site in the western desert 50 miles from Cairo.

Two types of rockets were fired: The 40-foot Al Kahir (Conqueror), with a range given as 360 miles; and the Al Zafir (Victor), with a range of 250 miles. Range of 360 miles easily would carry the Al Kahir from within Egypt's borders to towns in Israel.

Nasser observed the firings marking the start of celebrations of his regime's 10th anniversary. He said the military significance of the rockets was in their range. He claimed the missiles were in large-scale production and that Egypt also could build two-stage rockets.

UNDERSTATES POTENTIAL

The returned rocketeers dispute Nasser's claim to have had rockets in large-scale production in 1962. But they say he has understated, if anything, Egypt's potential for missile mischief making.

The rockets launched in 1962 were basic copies of the German V-2 of World War II. Their guidance system was too erratic to give them military value for use against Israel. But that was 2½ years ago.

About 500 Europeans were working in the United Arab Republic in 1963 at the peak of Nasser's recruiting campaign which began in 1958 with an advertisement in a German newspaper: "Aviation works in north Africa offers employment to specialists of all types."

In fact, the presence of German military experts and technicians traces back to 1951. The Cairo government turned to German military experts and four naval experts. Dr. Wilhelm Voss, Nazi occupation manager of the Czechoslovakia Skoda Works and military production expert was hired to build an Egyptian armaments industry. In 1953, Rudolph Engel, a German engineer, was hired to build an Arab rocket, but this project was dissolved in 1957.

JET AIRCRAFT FIELD

All but about 50 of the 500 Europeans (of whom 450 were German) worked on the development of jet aircraft for Nasser in factories No. 35 and No. 136 in Heluan, 15 miles south of Cairo. The 50 scientists and engineers are employed on Nasser's rocket program, and these were led by Hans Goercke, Hans Kleinwachter, and Wolfgang Pilz, chief of Nasser's rocket project. This top trio worked at Peenemuende helping develop the V-2's that bombed London at the end of World War II, and after the war in the Normandy town of Vernon helping the French build the Veronique rocket. Dr. Eugen Saenger, who died last year, was hired as a consultant while he continued to head the Bonn government-supported institute for propulsion and space research at Stuttgart.

Dr. Saenger, it was revealed when he was forced to resign his position at Stuttgart, had received about $35,000 in little more than a year from Nasser. Goercke Kleinwachter and Pilz were paid even more generously.

Top engineers receive $2,500 a month and technicians $1,000 and up. In contrast to the austerity imposed on Egyptians by Nasser, the Germans were provided with lavish living—air-conditioned penthouses, Nile-side villas with swimming pools, privileged status in the Heliopolis Sporting Club. At carnival time they took over the Nile Hilton for Mardi Gras parties.

FANTASTIC LIFE

One of the returnees related, "It was a fantastic life. We had everything we wanted, but we were kept under constant guard to protect us from Israel terrorists and—I suspect—from a lot of Nasser's own people who must have been furious over the way we were coddled."

Pilz, Goercke, and Kleinwachter were protected by an Egyptian bodyguard in charge of a former Nazi SS officer. All of the Germans worked behind barbed wire, and their afterhours life of luxury was tinged with fear.

Pilz's secretary was blinded in one eye and her hearing damaged by the explosion of a package sent to Pilz from West Germany; Kleinwachter was ambushed on his way home from his laboratory in the town of Loerrach, on the German-Swiss border; and Goercke's daughter, Heidi, 25, was threatened in Basel, Switzerland, by two men later arrested by Swiss authorities as Israel agents.

In recent months, Israel has been exerting intense pressure on West Germany to force the repatriation of the Germans in Cairo. Chancellor Ludwig Erhard has demurred at asking for legislation to force their repatriation, but Erhard has encouraged their return by indirect measures, such as encouraging their employment by private German companies with Government aerospace contracts.

Goercke has returned and Pilz and Kleinwachter say they are ready to return if Erhard will guarantee their protection (presumably in this instance from Arab terrorists) and will indemnify Pilz' German secretary for the loss of her eye and impaired hearing from the package blast. But the Bonn government refuses to assume any special responsibility for their safety.

GERMANS RETURNED

Meanwhile about 150 Germans have returned, including at least half a dozen key associates of Pilz, Goercke, and Kleinwachter on the rocket program. Nearly all of the Germans were recruited by two Zurich concerns (which placed the "North Africa" advertisement in 1958)—Mecco (mechanical corporation) and MTB (motors, turbines, and pumps). These concerns are owned by an Egyptian-born Swiss industrialist named Hassen Sayed Kamel. They are handling the procurement of components and other equipment for the missile program, and presumably the proximity of these concerns are not unconnected with the fears of Pilz and the rest for their safety if they break their contracts with Nasser.

Some of the repatriated Germans believe that Israel, short-term, may have more to fear from the jet aircraft the Germans are building for Nasser than the still-to-be-proved missiles, particularly since planes can be used against the Jewish state with fewer international complications than rockets.

Chief of the aeronautical section of Nasser's aerospace venture is Dr. Ferdinand Brandner, an Austrian-born jet aircraft pioneer. He developed engines for the Junkers bombers, and headed a team of 800 German engineers and technicians which developed the first postwar jet engines for the Soviets. The Germans were released from Russia in 1958, and a number of them, including Brandner, signed on with Nasser.

Mecco is the aircraft contractor, and MTB is providing the powerplants. Two planes are being built at Heluan, the HA200, a jet trainer, and the HA300, a supersonic jet fighter similar to the Mirage which France has sold to Israel.

MESSERSCHMITT SUBSIDIARY

The aircraft were designed by the Spanish subsidiary of Willy Messerschmitt, Hitler's aeronautical genius who developed the world's first jet fighter. Messerschmitt, now a major West German plane builder, established himself in Spain after the war when Germany was under Allied occupation and forbidden to have an aircraft industry.

While Nasser, technically, is being assisted by Messerschmitt's Spanish subsidiary, Messerschmitt himself is reported to be directly involved, regarding Nasser's program as a useful laboratory for creative endeavor outside the scope of his work for the West German defense ministry.

Messerschmitt has a design for a four-engined jet airliner which has been rejected for financing in West Germany. Nasser is understood to be interested in converting the airliner design into a light bomber. The HA300 ("HA" originally signified Messerschmitt's Spanish firm, Hispano Aviation, and now Nasser's Heluan Aircraft) is being upgraded into a tactical fighter bomber and the HA200 into an interceptor.

One of the Bonn government officials who has been debriefing the Cairo returnees summed up, "What Nasser will do is still problematical. He could be just running a gigantic bluff. It could be that he is too strapped for money to carry this thing much further. But it is obvious that the potentialities for trouble that he has created at Heluan are great and sinister."

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, we had an election last November, and the American people clearly manifested their confidence in the leadership of Lyndon B. Johnson by giving him the largest majority ever given in the history of our country.

We now have the first bill before the Congress, and we find an amendment coming from our Republican friends that will tie the hands of the President of the United States in the performance of his duty under the Constitution in connection with foreign affairs.

The people of America had confidence in Lyndon B. Johnson last November, they have confidence in Lyndon B. Johnson today. I think it would be dangerous to adopt an amendment that will limit and tie the hands of the President of the United States in the field of foreign affairs. For 8 years under President Eisenhower, we Democrats supported him in the field of foreign affairs. We never offered an amendment to tie his hands. We never offered an amendment, no matter what our personal views might be, that would limit his powers as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of the United States, the one person under the Constitution who is charged with the conduct of foreign affairs.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment ties the hands of the President. As I say, we did not do it when President Eisenhower was in the White House for 8 years. The President of the United States is administering foreign affairs in the national interest of our country.

We can have confidence in President Johnson just as the people had confidence in him in November of last year.

I have always voted against any amendment that would limit the powers and the jurisdiction of the President of the United States in the field of foreign affairs. We took that position when a Republican was in the White House, and we should take the same fundamental position today.

I am opposed to any amendment in the field of foreign affairs that would tie the hands or limit the powers of the President of the United States, and I urge the Committee to reject the amendment because it is of vital importance, first in the national interest of our country and, second, I have confidence in the leadership of Lyndon B. Johnson.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I have been intrigued by the statements made this afternoon by administration spokesmen that there was "miscalculation" and "error" last year in financing operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

It was repeatedly pointed out last year that the funds then made available would be insufficient for the current fiscal year. It is not "miscalculation" and "error" that now makes necessary this legislation. It was phony budget cutting for which the Johnson administration must take the responsibility.

And let me make it plain that I support the amendment which has been offered to halt any additional agricultural products from being made available to Dictator Nasser of Egypt. When Nasser recently told the U.S. Government, in effect, to go to hell, President Johnson should have taken immediate action to cut off assistance of every description.

It is senseless to supply Nasser with any kind of aid while he buys arms from the Communists and supplies them to the rebels in the Congo, thus helping to make possible the butchery of thousands of whites and blacks.

Nasser should be put on notice now, not 6 months or a year hence that the taxpayers of this country will no longer tolerate such misuse of their money.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MICHEL) there were—ayes 122, noes 128.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the joint resolution.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the joint resolution back to the House, with the recommendation that the joint resolution do pass.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HARRIS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 234) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, for certain activities of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the joint resolution back to the House, with the recommendation that the joint resolution do pass.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the joint resolution to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the joint resolution?

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, in its present form I am.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MICHEL moves to recommit House Joint Resolution 234 to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment: On page 2, line 13, strike the period at the end of the sentence and insert the following: ": *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used during the fiscal year 1965 to finance the export of any agricultural commodity to the United Arab Republic under the provisions of title I of such Act."

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 204, nays 177, not voting 53, as follows:

[Roll No. 7]

YEAS—204

Abernethy
Adair
Addabbo
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, George W.
Andrews, Glenn
Andrews, N. Dak.
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Ayres
Baldwin
Baring
Battin
Belcher
Bell
Bennett
Berry
Betts
Bingham
Bolton
Bow
Bray
Brock
Broomfield
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke
Burleson
Burton, Utah
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Callaway
Carey
Carter
Casey
Cederberg
Celler
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Collier
Conable
Conte
Corbett
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis
Dague
Davis, Wis.
Delaney
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Dole
Dorn
Dowdy
Dulski
Duncan, Tenn.
Dwyer
Edwards, Ala.
Ellsworth
Erlenborn
Farbstein
Findley
Fino
Fisher
Fogarty
Ford, Gerald R.
Fountain
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fuqua
Gettys
Gibbons
Gilbert
Goodell
Grabowski
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffin
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Hagan, Ga.
Haley
Hall
Halpern
Hansen, Idaho
Harvey, Mich.
Helstoski
Herlong
Horton
Howard
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jarman
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Keith
Kelly
Keogh
King, N.Y.
Krebs
Kunkel
Laird
Langen
Latta
Lennon
Lindsay
Long, La.
Long, Md.
McCarthy
McClory
McDade
McEwen
McMillan
Macdonald
MacGregor
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Nebr.
Mathias
May
Michel
Minish
Minshall
Mize
Morse
Morton
Mosher
Multer
Nelsen
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Konski
O'Neal, Ga.
Passman
Pelly
Philbin
Pike
Pirnie
Poff
Pool
Pucinski
Quie
Quillen
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reinecke
Reuss
Robison
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rooney, N.Y.
Rosenthal
Roudebush
Ryan
Satterfield
St Germain
St. Onge
Saylor
Scheuer
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Secrest
Shriver
Sikes
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Va.
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Stalbaum
Stanton
Stratton
Talcott
Teague, Calif.
Tenzer
Tuck
Utt
Walker, Miss.
Watkins
Watson
Weltner
Whalley
Whitener
Widnall
Wilson, Bob
Wolff
Wyatt
Wydler
Yates
Younger

NAYS—177

Adams
Albert
Anderson, Tenn.
Annunzio
Ashley
Aspinall
Bandstra
Barrett
Beckworth
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bonner
Brademas
Brooks
Brown, Calif.
Burton, Calif.
Byrne, Pa.
Cabell
Callan
Chelf
Clark
Clevenger
Cohelan
Conyers
Cooley
Corman
Craley
Culver
Daddario
Davis, Ga.
Dawson
de la Garza
Dent
Denton
Diggs
Dow
Duncan, Oreg.
Dyal
Edwards, Calif.
Evans, Colo.
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farnsley
Farnum
Feighan
Flood
Foley
Ford, William D.
Fraser
Fulton, Tenn.
Gathings
Giaimo
Gilligan
Gonzalez
Gray
Greigg
Grider
Griffiths
Hagen, Calif.
Hamilton
Hanley
Hansen, Iowa
Hansen, Wash.
Hardy
Harris
Hathaway
Hechler
Henderson
Hicks
Holifield
Hull
Hungate
Huot
Irwin
Jacobs
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Okla.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
King, Utah
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Landrum
Love
McDowell
McFall
McGrath
McVicker
Machen
Mackay
Madden
Mahon
Matsunaga
Matthews
Meeds
Miller
Mills
Mink
Moeller
Monagan
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Murphy, Ill.
Murray
Natcher
Nedzi
Nix
O'Brien
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
Ottinger
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Pickle
Poage
Price
Purcell
Race
Randall
Redlin
Resnick
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Roberts
Rodino
Rogers, Tex.
Ronan
Roncalio
Rooney, Pa.
Roush
Roybal
Schisler
Schmidhauser
Scott
Selden
Sickles
Sisk

Slack
Smith, Iowa
Steed
Stephens
Stubblefield
Sweeney
Taylor
Teague, Tex.
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Todd
Trimble
Tunney
Tuten
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vigorito
Vivian
Watts
White, Idaho
White, Tex.
Whitten
Wilson, Charles H.
Wright
Young
Zablocki

NOT VOTING—53

Abbitt
Bates
Cameron
Colmer
Daniels
Dingell
Donohue
Downing
Edmondson
Fascell
Flynt
Gallagher
Garmatz
Halleck
Hanna
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Hawkins
Hays
Hébert
Holland
Hosmer
King, Calif.
Leggett
Lipscomb
McCulloch
Mackie
Martin, Mass.
Moore
Moss
Murphy, N.Y.
O'Neill, Mass.
Patman
Powell
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rivers, S.C.
Roosevelt
Rostenkowski
Rumsfeld
Senner
Shipley
Sullivan
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Toll
Tupper
Udall
Vanik
Waggonner
Walker, N. Mex.
Williams
Willis

So the motion to recommit was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Toll for, with Mr. King of California against.

Mr. Donohue for, with Mr. Holland against.

Mr. Murphy of New York for, with Mr. Daniels against.

Mr. Halleck for, with Mr. Gallagher against.

Mr. Rhodes of Arizona for, with Mr. Willis against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Lipscomb.

Mr. Hays with Mr. Harsha.

Mr. Hébert with Mr. McCulloch.

Mr. Colmer with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.

Mr. Moss with Mr. Hosmer.

Mr. Powell with Mr. Bates.

Mr. Rivers of South Carolina with Mr. Moore.

Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Rumsfeld.

Mr. Dingell with Mr. Harvey of Indiana.

Mr. Flynt with Mr. Thomson of Wisconsin.

Mr. Shipley with Mr. Tupper.

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Williams.

Mr. Vanik with Mrs. Sullivan.

Mr. Waggonner with Mr. Downing.

Mr. Fascell with Mr. Senner.

Mr. Cameron with Mr Thompson of Texas.

Mr. Edmondson with Mr. Udall.

Mr. Leggett with Mr. Abbitt.

Mr. Hanna with Mr. Patman.

Messrs. KEOGH and GREEN of Pennsylvania changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the instructions of the House, I report back to the House, House Joint Resolution 234, with an amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 2, line 13, strike the period at the end of the sentence and insert the following: ": *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used during the fiscal year 1965 to finance the export of any agricultural commodity to the United Arab Republic under the provisions of Title I of such Act."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks made in Committee of the Whole and to insert certain tables and figures.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

GENERAL PERMISSION TO REVISE AND EXTEND REMARKS MADE IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE TODAY

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members speaking in the Committee of the Whole be permitted to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

A PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION AMENDMENT

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to say, again, that Congress must face up to the responsibility of providing for the effective determination of Presidential and Vice-Presidential inability and succession. For this reason I have again filed a bill—House Joint Resolution 158—a copy of which I attach herewith, and which I believe will eliminate in the future uncertainties that have been with us on too many occasions.

Weaknesses in the present provisions for Executive succession were once more brought into sharp focus following the assassination of President Kennedy. The absence of provision for filling the vacated office of Vice President caused a period of international uncertainty which remained with us from November 22, 1963, to January 20, 1965. While these questions are not new to us—witness the Wilson inability—our most recent experience highlights the need for positive action during this session of Congress. We cannot afford the hazard of further delay.

All of us are aware, I am sure, that no less than eight Vice Presidents have taken over the office of President upon the death of incumbent Presidents since 1841. This means that for nearly one-fifth of the history of the country, the Nation has been without a Vice President.

The joint resolution which I have filed for action by the 89th Congress is similar to legislation which I proposed in the 88th. It provides that in the event of the removal of the President from office or of his death or resignation, the Vice President shall become President for the unexpired term. Within 30 days after such succession, the new President would nominate a Vice President who would take office upon confirmation by the House and Senate. A majority of those Members present and voting would be required for the confirmation. Similar action would be taken in the event of removal, death, or resignation of the Vice President. Should the President declare his inability to serve in writing, he would be succeeded by the Vice President, and this succession would be automatic. In the absence of such declaration in writing, the Vice President could assume the duties and powers of Acting President with the written approval of the majority of the heads of the executive departments in office. Should there be controversy, it would be resolved by a majority vote of the Congress.

In the absence of a President and Vice President, the order of succession to the Presidency would be from the members of the Cabinet, as follows: Secretary of State, Secretary of Treasury, Secretary of Defense, Attorney General, Postmaster General, Secretary of Interior, Secretary of Agriculture, Secretary of Commerce, Secretary of Labor, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. Speaker, the issue of Presidential and Vice-Presidential inability and succession is one of the most challenging before the Nation. It was of sufficient import to merit recommendation by President Johnson in his state of the Union message for action in this session.

In further support of my proposal, I include an editorial from the Meriden, Conn., Journal of April 27, 1964. I also include an editorial from the Hartford, Conn., Times of January 15, 1965, on the same subject.

[From the Meriden Journal, Apr. 27, 1964]

PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION

A nation without a Presidential backstop in the form of a Vice President is a nation in danger of confusion and dismay in the event its Chief Executive is removed by death or incapacitated by illness or accident.

The United States today is in this position, lacking a Vice President and encumbered with a system of Presidential succession which would be bound to place an aged, possibly an infirm man at the helm.

To change the system, even if Congress can agree upon a plan, will be bound to take a great deal of time. Congress, giving its attention to other pressing matters, does not seem disposed to consider a matter which is possibly the most pressing of all.

Representative JOHN S. MONAGAN, Democrat, of Connecticut, has introduced a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution which, he argues, would "fit current conditions as well as future uncertainties."

The Monagan bill provides, as at present, that in the event of the removal of the President from office, or of his death or resignation, the Vice President shall become President for the unexpired term. Within 30 days thereafter, the new President would be required to nominate a Vice President who would take office upon confirmation by the House and Senate. A majority of those present and voting would be required for confirmation. Similar action would be taken in the event of removal, death, or resignation of the Vice President. The bill also would establish procedure for the Vice President to succeed the President as Acting President if the President were unable to serve. Should the President declare his inability to serve in writing, the succession would be automatic; in the absence of such a declaration, the Vice President could assume the duties and powers of Acting President with the written approval of a majority of the heads of the executive departments in office.

Should there be a controversy, it would be resolved by a majority vote of the Congress. In the absence of a President or Vice President, the order of succession to the Presidency would be from the members of the Cabinet in this order: Secretary of State, Secretary of Treasury, Secretary of Defense, Attorney General, Postmaster General, Secretary of the Interior, Secretary of Agriculture, Secretary of Commerce, Secretary of Labor, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The plan is simple; it seems to foresee every possible contingency. We like it better than any of the other plans offered to date.

The long process of amending the Constitution requires the approval of two-thirds of both Houses and ratification by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States. There is no feasible shortcut.

In the more than 6 months between now and the next election, anything could happen. President Johnson is not a cautious man, and in spite of the precautions erected around him, he often exposes himself in an unsafe manner, while mingling with crowds. He drives his car at high speeds when he visits his Texas ranch. Some years ago, he suffered a serious heart attack. He works long hours and gets a minimum amount of sleep. His life, it is apparent, is full of more than normal risks.

Next November, a new Vice President will be elected, and the country will breathe more easily. But the faults of the present system of Presidential succession will remain.

Congress should approve a better plan of succession during the present session, and should start it on its way toward becoming a part of the Constitution.

Representative Monagan's bill should receive the attention which it deserves. He has done a real service to the country in proposing it.

[From the Hartford Times, Jan. 15, 1965]

Presidential Succession

Congressman John S. Monagan, of Connecticut's Fifth Congressional District, proposes an amendment to the Constitution that would guarantee the Presidential succession in the President's inability to serve.

Mr. Monagan's proposal provides that the succession proceed through the Vice President to the members of the Cabinet in the order of seniority of their departments. A President could declare himself in writing to be unable to serve, or in the absence of such a declaration the Vice President could assume the duties of Acting President with the written approval of a majority of the heads of executive departments. Controversies, the resolution provides, would be resolved by a majority vote of the Congress.

It's a good idea and has the advantage of being simple. It will probably be criticized for proposing a change from the present line of succession—Vice President to Speaker of the House—which keeps the office in the hands of an elected official, not an appointed one.

But Mr. Monagan says that there have been times (the Eisenhower administration, for example, when Sam Rayburn was Speaker) when the President and the Speaker were not members of the same party. A change of party in time of national crisis might be too upsetting for the country to endure. There's another objection to the Speaker as heir, too—the Speaker is usually an old man, for it takes many years for him to attain that office.

As for the Speaker being an elected official, there is the point that he is not elected President but only a Member of Congress. His fellow Congressmen, not his constituents, elect him Speaker.

This and other proposals to safeguard the succession should be explored thoroughly—now, while there is no hurry.

H.J. Res. 158

Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to succession to the Presidency and Vice-Presidency and to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"Article —

"Section 1. In case of the removal of the President from office, or of his death or resignation, the Vice President shall become President for the unexpired portion of the then current term. Within a period of thirty days thereafter, the new President shall nominate a Vice President who shall take office upon confirmation by both Houses of Congress by a majority of those present and voting.

"Sec. 2. In case of the removal of the Vice President from office, or of his death or resignation, the President, within a period of thirty days thereafter, shall nominate a Vice President who shall take office upon confirmation by both Houses of Congress by a majority vote of those present and voting.

"Sec. 3. If the President shall declare in writing that he is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, such powers and duties shall be discharged by the Vice President as Acting President.

"Sec. 4. If the President does not so declare, the Vice President, if satisfied that such inability exists, shall, upon the written approval of a majority of the heads of the executive departments in office, assume the discharge of the powers and duties of the office as Acting President.

"Sec. 5. Whenever the President makes public announcement in writing that his inability has terminated, he shall resume the discharge of the powers and duties of his office on the seventh day after making such announcement, or at such earlier time after such announcement as he and the Vice President may determine. But if the Vice President, with the written approval of a majority of the heads of executive departments in office at the time of such announcement, transmits to the Congress his written declaration that in his opinion the President's inability has not terminated, the Congress shall thereupon consider the issue. If the Congress is not then in session, it shall assemble in special session on the call of the Vice President. If the Congress determines by concurrent resolution, adopted with the approval of two-thirds of the Members present in each House, that the inability of the President has not terminated, thereupon, notwithstanding any further announcement by the President, the Vice President shall discharge such powers and duties as Acting President until the occurrence of the earliest of the following events: (1) the Acting President proclaims that the President's inability has ended, (2) the Congress determines by concurrent resolution, adopted with the approval of a majority of the Members present in each House, that the President's inability has ended, or (3) the President's term ends.

"Sec. 6. (a) (1) If, by reason of death, resignation, removal from office, inability, or failure to qualify, there is neither a President nor Vice President to discharge the powers and duties of the office of President, then the officer of the United States who is highest on the following list, and who is not under disability to discharge the powers and duties of the office of President, shall act as President: Secretary of State, Secretary of Treasury, Secretary of Defense, Attorney General, Postmaster General, Secretary of Interior, Secretary of Agriculture, Secretary of Commerce, Secretary of Labor, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and such other heads of executive departments as may be established hereafter and in order of their establishment.

"(2) The same rule shall apply in the case of the death, resignation, removal from office, or inability of an individual acting as President under this section.

"(3) To qualify under this section, an individual must have been appointed, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, prior to the time of the death, resignation, removal from office, or inability of the President and Vice President, and must not be under impeachment by the House of Representatives at the time the powers and duties of the office of President devolve upon him.

"(b) In case of the death, resignation, or removal of both the President and Vice President, his successor shall be President until the expiration of the then current presidential term. In case of the inability of the President and Vice President to discharge the powers and duties of the office of President, his successor, as designated in this section, shall be subject to the provisions of sections 3, 4, and 5 of this article as if he were a Vice President acting in case of disability of the President.

"(c) The taking of the oath of office by an individual specified in the list of paragraph (1) of subsection (a) shall be held to constitute his resignation from the office by virtue of the holding of which he qualifies to act as President.

"(d) During the period that any individual acts as President under this section, his compensation shall be at the rate then provided by law in the case of the President.

"Sec. 7. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission."

THE SUPEREXPRESS OF DREAMS

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the unsolved problems which faces our country today is the proper management and operation of our public transportation systems. President Johnson forcefully pointed this out in his state of the Union address.

One of the needs of the country is an adequate rail passenger transportation system from Boston to Washington. That this system need not remain a dream has been demonstrated in other countries throughout the world. The most recent demonstration was begun October 1, 1964, in Japan where the Japanese National Railways initiated regular service for the 320-mile distance between Tokyo and Osaka. The bullet train which operates for this distance makes the run in 4 hours, with stops at Kyoto and Nagoya. Although the present run is made at an average speed of 80 miles an hour, it is planned eventually to cover the run in 3 hours at an average pace of 107 miles per hour.

Some of the features of this record-making train trip were set forth by E. J. Kahn, Jr., in an article which appeared in the New Yorker of November 21, 1964. For the information of those who seek to improve our transportation system, I include Mr. Kahn's article at this point:

THE SUPEREXPRESS OF DREAMS

(By E. J. Kahn, Jr.)

KYOTO, JAPAN.—It is rare these days for a full-fledged airline to be glum about the speed of a railroad train, but that has been the situation lately in Japan. Since October 1, when the National Railways Japanese started regular service betwen the nation's two largest cities, Tokyo and Osaka, with what the National Railway Japanese formally calls the bullet train and newspapers here have informally called the superexpress of dreams, the airlines operating on the same run have canceled several flights and, instead of increasing their fares, as they had planned to, have been muttering about decreasing them. As the bullet train flies, Tokyo and Osaka are 320 miles apart. Counting driving time between downtown areas and airports, travel by air between the two metropolises takes, in the best of circumstances, 2½ hours. The bullet train, even with stops at Kyoto and Nagoya, covers the distance in 4. That's just for now, though. The train has a potential top speed of a hundred and fifty-nine miles per hour, but until the road-bed over which it zooms has settled, it is being held down to a maximum of a hundred and thirty-one. There hasn't been much attention paid to the superexpress of dreams, even in Japan. The start of scheduled service occurred only 9 days before the start of the Olympics, from which it was hard to divert local attention, but most Japanese are by now proudly aware that, come next year, this latest product of their ingenuity is slated to cover the run in a flat 3 hours, at an average pace, the two stops notwithstanding, of a hundred and seven miles an hour. Some Japanese who were disappointed at their country's not having won any gold medals for speed in the games are now cheerfully reflecting that, in the year of the XVIII Olympiad, at least they have shown their heels to the rest of the world when it comes to rail transit.

An English-language magazine in Tokyo noted the other day, "The progress of railway in Japan is most amazingly rapidity." Japan didn't have any trains at all until 1872. Today, it has many, and they tend to be extremely crowded. Forty percent of the country's population and 70 percent of its industry are in the area served by the Tokyo-Oska line, but until last month the only railroad connecting the two cities was a narrow-gage double-tracked line. The old trains were rapid enough by Western standards—they rattled along, and still rattle along, at speeds as high as 80 miles per hour—but the need for a new, faster through route had been foreseen for a good while. In 1959, the National Railways began construction of a standard-gage double-track line, with very gentle curves to accommodate really swift trains. The engineers used rail that was welded into 5,000-foot sections and attached by means of metal mountings, called chairs, to ties of pre-stressed concrete. To hug these rails suitably, new electric trains with a very low center of gravity and a special pneumatic suspension system were built, and painted in dashing horizontal bands of blue and white. Each of the 30 bullet trains consist of 12 cars—2 buffet, 2 first class, and 8 second class, with an engineer's cab in the car at either end. Each train is an extra-fare proposition, and all seats are reserved—a comparatively startling idea in Japan, where standees sometimes fight for enough shoe space. Each train runs on a split-second schedule—its speed being subject to automatic control from signals along the line. An emergency stop can gum things up wildly. A couple of weeks ago, a superexpress halted unexpectedly at a station along its route to let off a child suffering from what a doctor aboard had diagnosed as a ruptured appendix, and this humanitarian pause so upset the train's schedule that it was delayed for an hour and a half. (At last report, however, the sick child was doing nicely.)

After the Olympics ended, I decided to leave the furor of Tokyo for the relative tranquillity of Kyoto, and I booked a seat on a 10 a.m. southbound train on the new line. There are 28 bullet train runs a day in each direction, departing on the hour and on the half hour between 6 a.m. and 8 p.m. The fastest trains are those that leave on the hour, making only the stops at Nagoya and Kyoto, and that are classified as "hikari," which means "light." (At home, I most frequently ride on commuter trains, which can ordinarily be classified as murky and disagreeable at best.) The trains that leave on the half hour are called Kodama, or Echo, and take an extra hour for the tri but since they make eight additional stops, they can hardly be accused of pokiness.

My seat was in a first-class car, which was tastefully decorated in the new line's dominant blue and white. There were wide double-pane windows, trimmed with light-blue glass curtains and draperies of a slightly darker blue, both of them elegantly veined with gold. A strip of rich blue carpeting ran down the middle of the car under overhead fluorescent lights, which were flanked by gleaming apparatus for heating and air conditioning. The seats, which could be tilted back and swiveled, were upholstered in gold, with crisp white antimacassars, and equipped with adjustable footrests and with little tables that popped out of the arms. I had an aisle seat. The seat next to mine was occupied by a Japanese who had placed a pint bottle of whisky and a glass jigger on the window sill. The sill, I calculated, was slightly less than 4 inches wide. While we were waiting to get underway, my seatmate uncapped the bottle, threw away the cap, filled the jigger, and set bottle and jigger back on the sill. The only suit I had with me was the one I was wearing, and I began wondering what might happen to it after we hit a hundred miles an hour and the bottle and the jigger began to jiggle. I also began wondering how sedate old Kyoto might react to an American in a whisky-soaked suit.

We set forth at precisely 10 o'clock. A few minutes later, as we cruised at a calm enough clip through the outskirts of Tokyo, there was a musical flourish over a public-address system. Then a pleasant feminine voice came on to tell us, first in Japanese and afterward in English, that we would reach Nagoya at 12:29, Kyoto at 13:36, and Osaka at 14:00. Her voice brimmed with confidence; there were no qualifications or doubts, explicit or implicit, in her prophecy. My seatmate gulped down the contents of his jigger, refilled it, and put it back on the narrow sill. I just gulped. A conductor and his assistant, both clad in trim blue-gray uniforms and immaculate white gloves, came into the car to check our tickets. First they favored us with smart salutes—an occurrence that would no doubt jolt a New York Central or New Haven commuter into dropping his whisky glass.

After handing over my ticket and being rewarded with grateful smiles, I pulled from my pocket a strip map that the railroad distributes to patrons. It was entitled "Train Window Panorama," and, fully extended, it was 5 feet long. In pictures and text, it described points of interest along our route. Like all tourists here, I was most interested in Mount Fuji, which a thick cloud cover had blotted out when I flew into Tokyo a month earlier. It was cloudy this morning, too, but the clouds were scattered and drifting. At 10:59—we hadn't seemed to be going especially fast out of Tokyo and through Yokohama, but even so we'd racked up over 80 miles that first hour—the mesmeric tip of that legendary mountain became momentarily visible to our west, above the clouds. I grabbed my camera and clicked away. An Englishwoman across the aisle remarked sourly that the best view of Fuji is from its west. (There is a spoilsport in every crowd.) Two minutes later, the public-address girl said that we would shortly be revving up to a hundred and ninety kilometers—about a hundred and eighteen miles—per hour, and that if we gazed to the west at that instant we would obtain our best view of Fuji. The Englishwoman grabbed her camera, but the mountain, I was gratified to notice, had ducked behind another cloud. Soon afterward, I tried to get a picture of some of the shrubbery in the district of Shizuoka, which my "Train Window Panorama" advised me was Japan's principal producer of green tea, but we were now moving faster than my shutter seemed likely to. The window, however, was a steady as a teetotaler's hand.

By 11:30, my companion, his bottle half empty, had tilted his chair back, removed his shoes, and stretched out to use his footrest. I was beginning to feel thirsty myself, so I walked into the next car, which housed one of the buffets. Along one side ran a sitdown counter for eating, and along the other ran a standup counter for cooking and serving and eating and drinking. Above the door at the far end was a roster of the principal cities on our route; a thermometerlike red line—for all I know, electronically controlled—moved slowly from one to the next to indicate where we were at any given moment. (We were now approaching Hamamatsu, whence, said the "Train Window Panorama," comes much of Japan's edible seaweed.) At the opposite end of the car was a speedometer. We were traveling at 200 kilometers an hour—more than 2 miles a minute. Behind the standup counter was a refrigeratorlike appliance bearing a sign reading "Do not drink water when lamp is out." Next to this warning was an unlit light bulb, so I ordered a beer from a girl behind the counter. The buffet car was prettied up with lots of fresh flowers. It was chrysanthemum time in Japan, and in Tokyo I had seen eye-popping displays of that imperial blossom at the Olympic Village, at the National Stadium, and almost everywhere else I turned, but the bullet train, as if to emphasize its uniqueness, had this morning gone in for carnations. The speedometer inched up to 210 kilometers per hour. There was a bit of swaying, but not much more than you get on a New York Central commuter car when it has come so close to a full stop that the passengers are already jumping off. According to a large electric clock that the Japanese had also thoughtfully provided for our enlightenment, it was now 11:46 and as the red line revealed that we were closing in on Hamamatsu the public address girl announced, with evident relish, that when we got to that city we would overtake an ordinary express train that had left Tokyo half an hour before us. A minute or two later, we shot past it, and not long afterward there was another sound like a shot as we passed a bullet train going in the opposite direction. The other bullet train's 12 cars were fused into a single blue-and white blur.

A Japanese standing next to me at the counter asked, in English, if I was an American, and when I said I was he wanted to know if I was an observer. I asked what he meant, and he explained that he'd read in a newspaper just that morning that the United States was thinking of going into the bullet train business on the run between Washington and Boston and also in the San Francisco area, and that American railroad men were supposed to be sniffing around to find out how the Japanese had turned the trick. Washington to Boston in 4 hours was the American dream, he told me, and he added that as far as he was concerned he hoped his nation would share its technological know-how with mine. I told him I was not really an observer and thanked him, and we exchanged bows. Then he asked me how it felt to be a marmot. I looked puzzled again. He must have taken me for a real dope, but he explained patiently that Japanese doctors use marmots to try out delicate surgical procedures on before they use them on human beings, and that we passengers were akin to marmots (if he had said guinea pigs, I'd have caught on more quickly) in that the railroad wouldn't introduce the 3-hour Tokyo to Osaka run until it had determined experimentally how we stood up to the 4-hour run. The conductor came into the buffet car and stopped beside us to ask the counter girl if there had been much breakage. No breakage at all, she told him. The conductor beamed. My companion offered him a cup of coffee, but he said he didn't drink while on duty. I asked the conductor how everything was going. In 22 years of working on the railroad, he said, he'd never had a better time, and the members of his crew—20 or so all told, including the kitchen help—were also thoroughly enjoying themselves. You meet a higher class of people on the bullet train, he added. (This, I reflected, might have some connection with the higher class of fare.) Without even inquiring whether I was an observer, he volunteered the information that each bullet train has a capacity of 987 passengers—132 in first class and 855 in second. On this run, his Hikari was 80 percent full.

Gamagori, a summer resort noted, according to my map, for its picturesque seascape, was coming up next, but when it came we tore through it so swiftly that its picturesqueness eluded me. The conductor said matter-of-factly that the train would probably be fuller than it was but for a good many Japanese who were reluctant to ride on it because they were not yet entirely convinced that it was safe. I blinked. He added hastily that, of course, it was safe. In a month's operation, there had been only one, minor misadventure: somebody had fired an air-rifle bullet at a bullet train and nicked a window in the last car. The marksman, I suggested, had probably aimed at the first car. Nevertheless, the conductor went on, quite a few Japanese appeared to be hanging back, waiting for some sort of all-inclusive guarantee. As far as the government and the railway administration were concerned, he said, the bullet trains had already been proved as safe as any trains could be.

Feeling not only secure but euphoric, I ate some fried prawns and returned to my seat to prepare to disembark, which I ultimately did on the dot of 13:36, as promised. By that time, my seatmate, who was evidently going on to Osaka, resembled an anesthetized marmot. His bottle was nearly empty, but his jigger, brimful, stood defiantly on the window sill. As well as I could make out, not a drop had spilled during the entire trip.

PROVIDING A COLLEGE EDUCATION FOR CHILDREN

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a companion bill to H.R. 2098, as introduced by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT] on January 7.

This bill takes cognizance of the burden placed upon parents attempting to provide a college education for their children at today's high costs, by granting a small amount of tax relief to such parents. I bespeak your favorable consideration of this measure.

The text of the bill follows:

H.R. —

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a credit against income tax for a taxpayer with one or more children in college

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to credits against tax) is amended by redesignating section 38 as section 39 and by adding after section 37 the following new section:

"SEC. 38. CREDIT FOR TAXPAYER WITH CHILDREN IN COLLEGE.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—There shall be allowed to an individual, as a credit against the tax imposed by this subtitle for the taxable year, an amount equal to $300 for each child of such individual (within the meaning of section 151(e)(3)) who in such year is a student at the undergraduate level (within the meaning of section 151(e)(4)) at a duly accredited college or university.

"(b) CREDIT NOT TO CAUSE REFUND OF TAX.—The credit allowed by subsection (a) shall not exceed the amount of the tax imposed by this chapter for the taxable year, reduced by the sum of the credits allowable under the provisions of this part other than this section and sections 31 and 32.

"(c) CREDIT IN ADDITION TO DEDUCTIONS.—The credit allowed by subsection (a) shall be in addition to, and shall not reduce or otherwise affect, any deduction which may be allowable under this chapter."

(b) The table of sections for such part IV is amended by striking out

"Sec. 38. Overpayments of tax."

and inserting in lieu thereof

"Sec. 38. Credit for taxpayer with children in college.

"Sec. 39. Overpayments of tax."

SEC. 2. (a) Section 36 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to disallowance of credits to individuals paying optional tax or taking standard deduction) is amended by striking out "and 35" and inserting in lieu thereof "35, and 38".

(b) Section 37(a) of such Code (relating to retirement income credit) is amended by striking out "and section 35 (relating to partially tax-exempt interest)" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 35 (relating to partially tax-exempt interest) and section 38 (relating to credit for taxpayers with children in college)".

SEC. 3. The amendments made by this Act shall apply only with respect to taxable years ending after the date of the enactment of this Act.

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, as a nation of 44 million of sturdy, stout-hearted and industrious souls the Ukrainian people have deserved much more than what has been allotted to them. Fate was kind to them in planting them in the most fertile and rich land in Eastern Europe, but it denied them the requisite power with which to defend their land against its more powerful and greedy neighbors. In this sense fate was cruel to them, and cruel has been their lot especially since the middle of the 17th century.

Since then, except for a brief span of 2 years in 1918–20, the Ukrainians have been suffering under alien regimes. In 1918 the chains holding them in bondage were shattered, and they proclaimed their independence on January 22 of that year, only to be enslaved once more by Communist Russians 2 years later. Today these Ukrainians are suffering more under Communist Russians than did their forefathers under Czarist Russians, but fortunately these oppressive regimes have not killed their spirit of freedom, their love of independence. I gladly join all liberty-loving Ukrainians in the 47th anniversary celebration of Ukrainian Independence Day.

NASSER AND U.S. AID

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MINSHALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, biting the hand that literally is feeding them is becoming popular sport among some nations. As a member of the Foreign Operations Appropriations Subcommittee I continue to be appalled at the administration's insistence on rewarding nations for their ingratitude and contempt.

Continued aid to Nasser and others of his ilk comes under the heading of "How Silly Can You Get?" It is time to call a halt.

I am pleased that the House at last will express itself on aid to the United Arab Republic, one of the more notorious of the ingrate nations. In exchange for heavy U.S. aid over the years, we have had our library in Cairo burned, an unarmed plane shot down, and our Nation made the object of ridicule and derision by Nasser.

Less than a week after he denounced the United States and told us to "go drink sea water," the Department of Agriculture issued an authorization for shipment of almost $17 million worth of wheat to the United Arab Republic under the food-for-peace program. Since 1954 we have sent Nasser $720 million in goods. Adding transportation costs, it means our taxpayers have footed a $1.1 billion bill.

I shall vote to withdraw our assistance, and I look forward to the day when the House will take similar action regarding Indonesia and other nations who commit acts of insolence.

THE FEDERAL BUDGET

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MINSHALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, we are considering the first in a $6 billion series of postscripts to the 1965 Federal budget.

Today's postscript asks taxpayers for $1.7 billion for price-support payments. This represents a budgetary mistake on the President's part last year when his experts estimated the cost of these payments.

One wonders how many such errors were committed in drawing up the 1966 fiscal budget, the famous "under 100 billion" budget submitted to Congress yesterday.

The ranking minority member of the Appropriations Committee on which I serve, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow], has scored many of the obvious bookkeeping deceptions in the 1966 budget presentation, pointing them out as embarrassingly awkward attempts to prove that an economy-minded administration is struggling to run the country for less than $100 billion a year. Actually, as the gentleman pointed out in his remarks, the budget contains new obligational authority of more than $106 billion.

If this is compounded by "underestimates" which only will be discovered later on, we can count on supplementals to the 1966 budget pushing spending far past the $110 billion mark.

It is my responsibility as a member of the Appropriations Committee to examine every budget request. I approach this duty in behalf of the average taxpayer who has neither the time nor the detailed information nor the benefit of committee hearings to do a budgetary analysis, but who wants his country run efficiently with a fair return in defense and public services for the dollars Washington takes from him. He is due an honest statement of facts by both White House and Congress where his hard-earned money is involved.

Sham economies and shaded figures cannot fool him long if the public debt climbs and the value of his dollar declines. We already have been alerted to a request from the White House to raise the debt limit another $5 billion later this year.

If it is essential to spend $106 billion, or $110 billion, to run the Nation at peak efficiency and national security, let the administration say so forthrightly. Not one of us begrudges money wisely spent. But there are many of us, on both sides of the aisle, who think that it can be run very well indeed for far less than the amount actually asked by the White House.

Those of us who served in the 85th Congress remember the battle of the budget which raged in 1957 when President Eisenhower submitted his $78 billion request. The size and purpose of the proposed budget was given wide publicity, the public had the facts. A storm of protests reached Capital Hill and you could scarcely get into a congressional office for all the mailbags in the doorway. By the end of the session, Congress had found that $5 billion could be spared from the budget without the loss of a single service or the sacrifice of national defense.

I feel confident that if the white light of publicity were given to the new budget so that the public realized its enormity, Congress might well be encouraged to weigh each money request with reasoned care.

ISOLATIONISM FOR THE UNITED STATES

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. BOB WILSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I am increasingly concerned over reports in the press which indicate that some Members of Congress, who have acted as bellwethers for foreign policy changes that have been made in the past, have advocated a new isolationism for the United States.

The press has carried statements that we are "overextended" in our commitments around the globe, that the vital interests of the United States are not in Asia and Africa. It has been suggested that we came in only because there was a power vacuum.

Some of these statements pointedly refer to Vietnam and suggest that we should affect some sort of more or less honorable withdrawal from military engagement in that strife-torn country. The argument is used that factors are out of our control and that we cannot be the determining factor there, or in some of the other sectors of the world.

It is to a degree puzzling that those who at one time talked of full commitment of U.S. resources and personnel to almost every struggling nation of the world, now talk of withdrawing—in effect preaching the isolationism they so vigorously condemned just a few years ago.

I suggest that withdrawal of U.S. forces would not leave South Vietnam for the Vietnamese. Nor would it leave Asia for the Asians. It would leave Asia at the mercy of the Chinese Communists. With 700 million restless people, the Chinese Reds might welcome the diversion an all-out Communistic crusade in Asia would offer. No greater stimulus to such a drive could be offered than U.S. withdrawal from Vietnam.

Our sticking to the job in Vietnam is necessary to preserve our world respect. A few years ago, it was announced that we would begin withdrawing troops from Vietnam as the situation there was supposed to have improved. Just last week, we hit the 20,000 level in U.S. personnel—considerably more than the 2,000 men we had when the announcement of the drawback was made in 1961. We further have urged that the South Vietnamese Government add 100,000 men to its commitment, bringing their total to 660,000.

We are now heavily engaged in Vietnam. A withdrawal would indicate to the world that the United States has neither the weaponry nor the stamina to meet the Communist threat of aggression head-on. A withdrawal would jeopardize our respect all over the world. Who could believe that we really mean it when we pledge full support, if we abandon the Vietnamese to the Reds?

I feel it is important that we Members of the Congress who have a deep and abiding concern for our Nation's future, point out that the new isolationist thinking is not that of the majority of Congress, and I am certain not that of the American people.

President Johnson in his state of the Union message said that the United States will continue to honor its commitment to freedom in Vietnam. I want to assure the President that I fully support this principle, and believe that my fellow Republicans also are behind any program to make a decisive effort to defeat the Vietcong and assure the future freedom and sovereignty of South Vietnam.

ANOTHER VICIOUS ATTACK AGAINST U.S. PROPERTY

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCHWEIKER] may etxend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Speaker, once again Americans are swallowing hard as they receive news of yet another vicious attack directed against U.S. property in a country into which our Nation has poured countless millions in aid. This time it was a rioting mob burning books at a U.S. Information Agency Library in South Vietnam. Not long ago, similar vicious attacks occurred against U.S. diplomatic missions and libraries in a number of other countries which we have assisted, including Egypt and Indonesia.

As a concerned Member of Congress, I believe it is time the Government of our country speak out in a firm voice regarding these actions, but even more important that we offer to the world, through the United Nations, constructive suggestions which might help avoid such incidents in the future.

A few weeks ago, I wrote the President expressing my grave concern and alarm with recent unjustified attacks and outlining a course of action. It is still my hope that the President will personally take more effective action in this field than we have witnessed to date. For the information of my colleagues, I am today inserting in the RECORD a copy of my proposals to the President:

DECEMBER 9, 1964.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The citizens of my district, as all American citizens, note with grave concern and alarm the recent unwarranted attacks upon U.S. embassies and legations abroad.

This unlawful practice of reckless destruction, which seems to have increased during the past few years, has not received the attention and strong response which it clearly deserves. By appearing to condone these actions in the past, we have allowed them to increase without justification. Such actions are an affront and an injury to the pride of all Americans.

These practices are not consistent with our traditions of accepting the presence of foreign embassies and legations in our own Nation regardless of our attitude toward the foreign policies and programs which these nations may choose. Nor are such acts of violence consistent with the inviolate protection to be accorded foreign embassies under existing international treaties and international law.

As the friendly hosts to the United Nations, and as good neighbors to all peoples of the world, Americans view with dismay the action taken in those countries where the United States has become the target of uncontrolled demonstrations and riots. These attacks have caused extensive damage to our embassies and have resulted in the harassment of embassy staff members abroad, as well as related destruction of personal property belonging to American citizens.

To all Americans and to people of good will throughout the world this injury is more than physical.

Many incidents have occurred, but I need draw your attention to but one of these to emphasize my feelings.

The new John F. Kennedy Library in Cairo, Egypt, with 27,000 books, was one of the finest libraries in that city. It was appreciated, needed, and used beneficially by many Egyptian students. The mob-fired blaze which destroyed most of the volumes and buildings of this library destroyed also a symbol of the good will and willingness of the American people to help people in the developing nations abroad. Its destruction injures directly the memory of a great man, our late President, who believed deeply in the importance of learning as a way to find the wisdom needed by all nations and their leaders in a difficult and too often unknowledgeable age.

Peaceful public demonstrations certainly have a justifiable place in all democratic societies. They draw our attention to existing injustices and hasten the day when these injustices may be corrected. But wanton destruction of diplomatic buildings and centers of learning cannot be justified as an appropriate form of peaceful demonstrations.

I believe some of these outbreaks to be part of a coordinated effort by Communist groups and other extremist groups in foreign nations to fan a "hate the United States" attitude among people who look to our country as a leader of the free world and as a source of assistance.

As a foreign policy matter, we cannot and should not condone such activities.

As a first step in response to these actions, I believe it would be advisable and opportune for you, as President, to articulate now on behalf of the American people our Nation's extreme disgust and displeasure with such practices, and also our view that each nation is responsible for controlling and curbing such outbursts which result in violence and destruction against the property of foreign embassies.

As a second step, I would respectfully suggest you formally request the United Nations General Assembly, presently convened in the city of New York, to place on its agenda for consideration and review the existing international treaties and consular conventions which deal with these questions. The General Assembly through its appropriate committees could then determine what steps might be taken under United Nations law to assure protection of foreign embassies and consulates so that these properties remain inviolate against citizen attack. The appropriate United Nations committee might consider drafting a new convention, or amending existing agreements so that the responsibility of host nations in protecting the inviolate character of embassy property might be clarified.

I believe that the international relations between all nations would be substantially improved by creating a definite standard of responsibility to be adopted by all nations for securing such protection. These standards could best be adopted by placing this task with the United Nations which through its deliberations and recommendations could establish standards of behavior and responsibility to which all nations would be expected to adhere.

I offer this recommendation as a concerned Member of Congress, believing it is time the Government of our country speak out in a firm voice regarding these actions, but even more important that we offer to the world, through the United Nations, constructive suggestions which might help to avoid such incidents in the future.

Sincerely,

RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER,
Member of Congress.

PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, whenever one of our Presidents becomes ill or dies there is invariably a flurry of concern about clarifying our laws so that we may be able to deal more effectively with such situations than we have in the past. Thus far such flurries have not resulted in action.

President Garfield lay unconscious for most of 80 days after he had been struck by an assassin's bullet. During that time the country was without a President even though the Constitution provides that when the President is unable to carry out his duties the Vice President is to take over. It does not, however, say whether he is to become President or merely act as President. It does not say whether he is to take over until the end of the term or only until the President again becomes able. It does not say who will decide when such a disability begins and ends.

Because there is so much doubt about the law, Garfield's Vice President, Chester Arthur, did nothing. The doubt also dissuaded Vice President Marshall from acting during President Wilson's 18-month illness. The voluntary agreement between President Eisenhower and Vice President Nixon was not worked out until after the President had recovered from his last illness, too late for it to be useful. In any case, there is general agreement that a Vice President acting on the basis of a voluntary agreement cannot have the full confidence of the people. Only an amendment to the Constitution can provide the necessary air of legitimacy.

After each of these incidents, the problems of Presidential inability and succession were explored but not until last year was there any semblance of agreement on a way to solve them. In January of 1964, at the call of the American Bar Association, a dozen of the Nation's leading legal scholars met in Washington, discussed the possible solutions and after 2 days emerged with a consensus subsequently endorsed by the American Bar Association house of delegates. If there be no objection, Mr. Speaker, I shall include the text of that consensus and a description of the circumstances under which it was reached at the end of my remarks.

Later in January the Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments began hearings on Presidential inability which continued in February and March. From those hearings and the many executive sessions which followed them, there emerged Senate Joint Resolution 139 of the 88th Congress which the Senate passed by a vote of 65 to 0 shortly before adjournment last year. It is that measure which I introduce today. Though it is essentially the same as House Joint Resolution 1103 which I introduced in the 88th Congress, there are some differences.

This proposed constitutional amendment would solve two problems. It would solve the problem of vacancies in the office of Vice President, which has existed on 16 different occasions for periods totaling more than 37 years, by directing the President to nominate a Vice President who shall take office upon confirmation by a majority of both Houses of Congress. With the inauguration of Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY on January 20, 1965, we have a Vice President of the United States for the first time in 14 months.

It would solve the problem of Presidential inability by directing the Vice President to discharge the powers and duties of the Presidential office whenever the President declares in writing that he is unable to carry them out or, if the President does not so declare, whenever the Vice President, with a written concurrence of a majority of the heads of the executive department or such other body as Congress may by law provide, transmits to Congress his written declaration that the President is unable to discharge his duties. In either case, the President shall resume his office whenever he transmits to Congress his written declaration that no inability exists, unless the Vice President, with a written concurrence of a majority of the heads of the executive departments, transmits to Congress, within 2 days, his written declaration that the President is unable to carry out his duties. In such a case, Congress is to decide the issue immediately and unless two-thirds of both Houses decide that the President is unable, the President shall resume the powers and duties of his office.

Although this measure differs slightly from the American Bar Association consensus, the consensus was not framed in terms of approval of specific constitutional language. I have been informed that the American Bar Association is supporting the measure even though its house of delegates has not had an opportunity to take an official position on it.

More recently the committee for economic development has issued a national policy statement on Presidential succession and inability. The principal difference between their recommendations and this measure is that they would permit disagreements between the President and Vice President on disability to be resolved by the Cabinet. The Cabinet decision would stand unless upset by the Congress through the impeachment process.

On one thing there is complete agreement. There is urgent need for immediate action. In these perilous times there can never be a moment's doubt about whose hand is responsible for running this country. The resolution I introduce today is the best solution I have yet seen. Even if it might be improved with a change here and there, I think this is the measure about which the deliberations of our Committee on the Judiciary should center and I urge that those deliberations begin quickly.

Appendix

(Prior to the national forum sponsored by the American Bar Association a conference was held on Presidential inability and succession in Washington, D.C. The following consensus and analysis resulted from that meeting.)

Consensus

The conference on Presidential inability and succession was convened by the American Bar Association at the Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C., on January 20 and 21, 1964. The conferees were Walter E. Craig, president, American Bar Association; Herbert Brownell, president, Association of the Bar of the City of New York, and a former Attorney General of the United States; John D. Feerick, attorney, New York; Paul A. Freund, professor of law, Harvard University; Jonathan C. Gibson, chairman, standing committee on jurisprudence and law reform, American Bar Association; Richard H. Hansen, attorney, Lincoln, Nebr.; James C. Kirby, Jr., associate professor of law, Vanderbilt University, and a former chief counsel to the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments, Senate Judiciary Committee; Ross L. Malone, past president of the American Bar Association, and a former Deputy Attorney General of the United States; Charles B. Nutting, dean of the National Law Center; Lewis F. Powell, Jr., president-elect, American Bar Association; Sylvester C. Smith, Jr., past president, American Bar Association; Martin Taylor, chairman, committee on Federal Constitution, New York State Bar Association; and Edward L. Wright, chairman, house of delegates, American Bar Association.

The members of the conference reviewed as a group the following statement at the close of their discussions. Although there was general agreement on the statement, the members of the conference were not asked to affix their signatures; and it should not be assumed that every member necessarily subscribes to every recommendation included in the statement.

The conference considered the question of action to be taken in the event of inability of the President to perform the duties of his office. It was the consensus of the conference that—

Agreements between the President and Vice President or person next in line of succession provide a partial solution, but not an acceptable permanent solution of the problem.

An amendment to the Constitution of the United States should be adopted to resolve the problems which would arise in the event of the inability of the President to discharge the powers and duties of his office.

The amendment should provide that in the event of the inability of the President the powers and duties, but not the office, shall provide upon the Vice President or person next in line of succession for the duration of the inability of the President or until expiration of his term of office.

The amendment should provide that the inability of the President may be established by declaration in writing of the President. In the event that the President does not make known his inability, it may be established by action of the Vice President or person next in line of succession with the concurrence of a majority of the Cabinet or by action of such other body as the Congress may by law provide.

The amendment should provide that the ability of the President to resume the powers and duties of his office shall be established by his declaration in writing. In the event that the Vice President and a majority of the Cabinet or such other body as Congress may by law provide shall not concur in the declaration of the President, the continuing inability of the President may then be determined by the vote of two-thirds of the elected Members of each House of the Congress.

The conference also considered the related question of Presidential succession. It was the consensus that—

The Constitution should be amended to provide that in the event of the death, resignation, or removal of the President, the Vice President or the person next in line of succession shall succeed to the office for the unexpired term.

It is highly desirable that the office of Vice President be filled at all times. An amendment to the Constitution should be adopted providing that when a vacancy occurs in the office of Vice President, the President shall nominate a person who, upon approval by a majority of the elected Members of Congress meeting in joint session, shall then become Vice President for the unexpired term.

REPEAL OF EXCISE TAX ON MUSICAL INSTRUMENTS

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson, in his state of the Union message, underscored the urgent need to revise our outmoded system of excise taxes. The President, in calling for a substantial cut in excise taxes as an essential step toward keeping the economy growing and the Nation prosperous, has pointed the way toward a thorough reevaluation and overhaul of the entire excise tax structure.

I am particularly pleased therefore to introduce today a bill to repeal the Federal excise tax on musical instruments and thus remedy a serious injustice in our present tax laws.

The primary reason that this tax must be repealed is that it is a tax on education. Music is an important element in the curriculum of our schools, and musical instruments, like textbooks, have become an essential tool of education.

The scope of the problem is indicated by the fact that an estimated 11 million school-age children are now playing musical instruments or receiving instruction from public, parochial, and private teachers. Many of these children participate in the Nation's 71,000 school bands and orchestras while countless others belong to smaller musical groups they have organized themselves. In 1963 the American Music Conference estimated that 85 percent of all band and orchestra instruments were purchased for the use of school-age children.

Music, in one form or another, is required as a course of study in all of the elementary grades and is an elective in high schools and colleges throughout the country. Although musical instruments purchased by public and nonprofit schools are tax free, those purchased by the parents of individual students are subject to a 10-percent tax markup. In the case of smaller instruments—such as clarinets, flutes, and trumpets—it is usual for each student to own his instrument and, therefore, for his parents to be forced to pay the higher price or not buy the instrument. The Federal Government is thus in the curious situation of helping to erect a barrier to the musical education of our children.

The excise tax is, furthermore, a regressive tax. Lower income families pay a greater proportion of their smaller incomes for the excise tax on musical instruments than do higher income families. Since most instruments are purchased by the young parents of school-age children—that is, for the most part parents with relatively limited incomes—the musical excise tax places a particular burden upon those with comparatively limited ability to pay.

The tax also strikes hard at the musical instrument industry, an industry which is already suffering under the severe pressures of increased foreign competition. The price advantage enjoyed by foreign manufacturers, chiefly as a result of their lower labor costs, is made still greater by the tax. For instance, the 10-percent tax on a $200 instrument made in the United States results in a price increase of $20 whereas the tax on a competitive imported instrument costing $150 would result in only a $15 markup. By increasing the price differential between American and foreign instruments, the excise tax works against the interest of our own manufacturers and the workers they employ.

Finally, experience has shown that lowering the price of musical instruments appreciably increases sales. For example, an average reduction in the wholesale cost of pianos of 10 percent from 1959 to 1963 resulted in a 20-percent increase in sales; a 10-percent decrease in the cost of organs during the same period resulted in an 11.5-percent increase in sales.

Since the amount of revenue raised by the excise tax is comparatively small—in 1963 it was approximately $20 million, or about one-fiftieth of 1 percent of the total Federal tax revenue—and the potential for sales growth in the industry is high, it does not seem unrealistic to assume that the loss of revenue incurred by repeal of the 10-percent excise tax could be compensated for by increased corporate profits and new jobs in the musical instrument industry.

For all these reasons I strongly urge the adpotion of this long overdue reform of our excise tax program. A tax which inhibits the natural development of musical knowledge and appreciation is one which is difficult to defend. It is a contradiction of our growing emphasis as a people on the importance of education and cultural values that we should allow the continuation of a tax which works against both.

THIS THY PEOPLE, THAT IS SO GREAT

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, the year was 1014 B.C., if the ancient chroniclers do not err. That was long before Socrates and Aristotle and the others haggled around the brow of the Acropolis, or the eagles pointed out the hill which served as the citadel for the Eternal City by the Tiber. An oriental potentate was mounting the throne of his father. He was anxious to be a good king. His two immediate predecessors had each wielded power for 40 long years. He looked at his heritage and found it very, very good. The record reads:

> Judah and Israel were many, as the sand which is by the sea in multitude. And Judah and Israel dwelt safely, every man under his vine and fig tree. And the king made silver and gold at Jerusalem as plenteous as stones. And he had a thousand and four hundred chariots, and twelve thousand horsemen. And his revenues were royal.

In humility of heart, Solomon bowed himself to the earth before the shrine of his fathers and asked for guidance:

> Give me now wisdom and knowledge, that I may go out and come in before this people: for who can judge this thy people, that is so great?

Things had not been always thus. Slightly more than 4 centuries earlier, the Hebrews had been slaves in an alien land. They were poor and unskilled in the arts of government—only a little more advanced than savages. Under wise and determined leadership they had burst the bonds of slavery, crossed a trackless desert, and seized possession of a land which their ancestors had considered home.

The land was sterile and arid and devoid of resources. Only by incessant and arduous toil could they convert it to a land flowing with milk and honey, and at the same time protect it from the inroads of fiercely hostile neighbors.

The force which held them firmly to their course was a flaming ideal nourished in the minds of their leaders. The spark of that ideal had been kindled in the traditions of their remote ancestors. It had been fed on the lore of their masters while they sojourned in Egypt, and then burst into flame while they were traversing the desert and hewing out a home for themselves in an inhospitable wilderness.

The ideal never became clear to all the Hebrews. They tried, and advanced a little; they stumbled and fell; they got up, and tried again, always a little farther on. Only the relentless insistence of their leaders held them to their purpose. A full thousand years of mingled joy and tragedy was needed to bring an unclouded vision of that ideal in the life of the Prince of Peace.

But because they kept on and did not give up the struggle, that ideal has come to be accepted as the norm for civilized society. Translated into modern terminology, it is the ideal of liberty, of justice, and of mercy. Experience teaches us that it is the necessary formula for an enduring social organization.

To those who find fascination in musing on the recurrent phases of history, it is not strange that the discerning leader of a modern mighty republic, on the occasion of his inductance into office, should invoke the image of 1014 B.C.

Time is condensed in these centuries. Only 300 years ago our forebears were scattered in little settlements along the Atlantic coast. Many of them were refugees from oppression in the Old World, oppression of body or mind or spirit. Trying to establish a foothold in a new world, they were subject to death by starvation, by disease and loneliness, by the tomahawks of the natives. But they persisted, and in a few short centuries they set up an empire beside which the kingdom of Solomon was a puny affair.

On his Inauguration Day, President Johnson might have viewed his heritage with prideful satisfaction. He, too, has many chariots of fire ready to course at his bidding over land and sea and through the circumambient. Under their shelter, the inhabitants of America and many lands may dwell in a security which Solomon could not offer. Mr. Johnson presides over a vast productive machine which pours out material goods and personal services in incredible abundance. He has at his command, and the command of the Nation, superbly skilled workmen who prove the innermost secrets of nature and bend them to human purposes.

Instead, the President chose to speak of the ancient dream, a dream that in this age is at last capable of incarnation in breathing flesh.

It is easier to understand Mr. Johnson's words if we consider them in the setting from which they were spoken.

Modern technology brings every component of the scene instantly before the eyes and ears of millions. The unbiased eye of the camera makes the smallest details visible afar off. The faithful tongue of audio transmission makes every sound audible. What do we see and hear on January 20, 1965?

The camera's eye moves fitfully through the scene. Now it pauses on the stately majesty of the Capitol. Supported on many white columns of marble, the huge dome rises far above the street. A flag stirs idly in the breeze. No cannons peer menacingly through the colonnaded apertures. Instead, the Statue of Freedom surmounts the highest arch of the dome, looking toward a rising sun. Now the camera shifts, and we look down the long stretches of the Mall, splotched here and there with patches of snow. In the distance, the obelisklike monument pierces the sky, and beyond it, the Memorial. Still farther beyond, a noble hill is visible, dotted with innumerable markers of the resting places of our heroes in peace and war. Among these are two reminders of profound tragedies, one of them occurring a century ago and the other so recent that it catches our breath.

The camera shifts to the interior of the Capitol. Here are the huge bronze doors which guard the entrance to the rotunda. Within the curved walls of the rotunda have rested in solemn state the mortal remains of illustrious citizens, while thousands filed by in respect and in homage. The great arch of the dome ornamented by the genius of painters and sculptors, comes into view. Again, we see the halls of legislature, where world-important decisions are made almost daily.

All these are symbols of the greatness which is America. No wonder the voice of the soloist trembled with emotion, and her eyes filled with tears.

These scenes are not empty. They are filled with people, moving about with the freedom characteristic of this land of the free. Some of them are dignitaries of church or state; some are citizens come to view a spectacle; others are workmen arranging articles to be used. But it is difficult to distinguish one from the other by his garb. A handful of uniformed guards keep open a pathway for the necessary movements of the procession.

Occasionally the camera pauses on a single face. Some of these faces are familiar to many—members of the administrative or legislative branches of Government. Others are unknown to the general public, just men and women, boys and girls, gathered here from who knows where for a reason equally untold. There were, for instance, later down on the avenue, the two boys who had come all the way from Hawaii and had stood all night in the cold waiting to see a parade. In the crowd, all recognize the benign countenance of the Chief Justice. Finally, the strong profile of the President as he intones the phrases of consecration to his office laid down by the Founding Fathers nearly two centuries ago.

Later, the camera picks up the details of the parade as it moves down the historic avenue. Band and marching groups and floats depicting the history of the Nation and its achievements in peace and industry and progress. The scene was dominated by young people, boys and girls from our high schools and colleges who had traveled hundreds and thousands of miles just to take part in a brief ceremony marking an important period in our national life. And, for a final touch, the little dog which the President led into his reviewing box in front of the White House.

The thing most conspicuous in the whole scene, from beginning to end, was what was not in it: no pomp, marked by gorgeous regalia and obsequious ceremony; no display of military might; no engines of war, on the ground or in the air above; no exhibitions of wealth and prestige. Just people, pursuing their ordinary rounds of business or pleasure: the Senator, the department official, the merchant, the doctor, the housewife, the schoolboy—just you and me.

It is impossible to believe that this pattern of events and scenes happened by accident. It was deliberately contrived to accent the meaning of the President's words. And what did he say? "This thy people, that is so great." Great, yes, but also so weak. Age-old weaknesses still hinder our progress toward the goal of freedom, justice, and mercy. There is the brazen instinct toward power which would dominate business and government and society, power solely for the sake of power. There is the greedy avarice which would grasp and hold material goods which it could not possibly use. There is the callous inhumanity which looks upon the woes of others merely as proof of its own superiority.

The President said that he wished to "go out and come in before this people." He can lead, he can set an example, but he cannot judge them. Unless our weaknesses are overcome, unless we seize the opportunities to move toward the ancient dream, there will be no progress. It is the essence of democracy that mass movements determine the destiny of a nation.

The President's address needs to be read and reread. Beneath the unimpassioned and carefully chosen words in which it was uttered lies the bold hortatory of the old visionaries:

> See, I have set before thee this day life and good, and death and evil. Choose you this day whom ye will serve.

The ideal conceived by Abraham in Ur and nurtured and developed through the ages by sages and seers is now in the hands of a pragmatist. Mr. Johnson understands the meaning of the words he uses, and he means what he says. May each of us commit to heart his own role in the drama that is being staged.

THE LATE HUMPHREY DOULENS

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. IRWIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, December 30 marked the first anniversary of the premature and unexpected death of Humphrey Doulens, one of the true giants of the entertainment world. It was my good fortune to have known him well as he was a resident of my hometown and also a constituent from the Fourth Congressional District of Connecticut.

Likewise, his brother, Roger Doulens, a native of my hometown, is an officer of Pan American World Airways and has been on assignment in Washington for his company for the past 18 years.

Humphrey Doulens had all the qualities which most of us would like to have. He had an Irish wit, an unlimited vocabulary, a fantastic memory, and a passionate dedication to the world of entertainment.

Mr. Speaker, Humphrey Doulens began his career as a reporter for the Norwalk Hour when he was still in high school. His talents were so self-evident that at the age of 19 he was hired by the South Norwalk Sentinel as city editor. From there he went to the Bridgeport Post as Sunday editor, later to Newsweek, under the late, great Rex Smith as editor of the theatrical section and then on to his really true love, show business.

There are many more things I could say at this time about Humphrey—his war experiences, his contributions to Connecticut community life. But I think they are best summed up by the recent remarks of his boss, the man who recruited him from newspaper work to the field of entertainment.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Frederick C. Schang, formerly chairman of the board and president of Columbia Artists Management, has put his sentiments about Humphrey Doulens most poignantly. Under unanimous consent, I include Mr. Schang's remarks as a part of the RECORD:

REMARKS BY MR. SCHANG

We have set aside these moments to honor the memory of two valued employees who became directors and officers and were taken by death this past year.

One of them, Humphrey Doulens, was brought into the company by me, was a loyal lieutenant by my side for many years, grew to be a trusted partner and longtime friend.

It is therefore proper that I be the one to voice words of appreciation for his life of service, the sunny good nature he brought to his work, and to recall the affection and esteem in which he was held by many people from the most humble to those of highest importance.

Although Humphrey seemed to favor musical folks and particularly sopranos—called by him "Great Ladies of Song"—his truly enormous acquaintanceship encompassed the theater, the literary world, the newspaper world, the circus and the air forces.

And don't fancy that was all. Two of his best friends were Ed Sullivan (TV) and Gene Tunney (fight champ).

This versatile man about town has also been seen on occasion in white tie and tails hobnobbing with boxholders at the opera and horse show.

While Humphrey's disposition was not that of a warrior, his success in the Army was indeed sensational. Drafted as a common private he spent his first day in the service unloading a freight car in Miami Beach. Scarcely 2 years later he was a captain assigned to the 20th Air Force Headquarters in the Pentagon Building. This was a very special outfit under the direct command of Gen. Hap Arnold.

When you consider how many GI's never so much as laid eyes on a one-star general, it is remarkable to me that two five-star generals, Arnold and Marshall, referred to Captain Doulens more often than not by his first name.

Humphrey ended his Army stint as an aide to Gen. Laurence S. Kuter, one of the top generals in the Air Force. Humphrey went around the world with him to various commands and on many important missions.

When the time came for Captain Doulens to return to civil life, this General Kuter told me: "I envy your Humphrey. He is indispensable. I do not know what I am going to do without him."

I can echo this tribute. The kind of personal service rendered this company by Humphrey as liaison to Lily Pons, Grace Moore, Dorothy Kirsten, and dozens of others is irreplaceable because it involved his peculiar endearing personality.

Now, friends of Humphrey, led by his pal, Bill Raisor, started a fund to buy a seat in Philharmonic Hall of Lincoln Center as a suitable memorial to him. It requires contributions totaling $1,000 to procure such a seat. In a few weeks money poured in from all over the land, so that $3,000 was on hand, which assured seats not only for Philharmonic Hall, but also the new Metropolitan Opera and the New York State Theater.

Right now this fund is past $5,000, actually $5,346 due to contributions just received from England. Mrs. Misch, the lady in charge of the project, states that the multiple seats in honor of Doulens involve more individual contributors than any other person on her books.

What a tribute to the memory of Humphrey, and how pleased his shade will be when some future critic slides into a pair of aisle seats bearing the name of E. Humphrey Doulens.

Humphrey was born and raised in Connecticut and now he lies buried there. He worked on newspapers in Norwalk and Bridgeport and loved Fairfield County. He was proud of its celebrity citizens past and present and spiced his speech with anecdotes of P. T. Barnum and Mark Twain, two former residents.

So to conclude these remarks I will quote a Connecticut bard, Fitz-Greene Halleck:

"Green be the turf above thee
Friend of our better days.
None knew thee but to love thee
Nor named thee save in praise."

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. DANIELS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, January 24, 1965, I was privileged to be guest speaker at the Ukrainian Community Center in Jersey City, where Ukrainian-Americans gathered to observe the 47th anniversary of their homeland's Declaration of Independence. The Honorable Thomas J. Whelan, mayor of Jersey City, N.J., was present to issue a proclamation commemorating January 22 as Ukrainian Independence Day in Jersey City. Presiding was Mr. Walter Bilyk, president of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America's Jersey City branch. Also present was Mr. Joseph Lysawyer, president of the Ukrainian National Congress.

I include my comments on this auspicious occasion in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY MR. DANIELS

At the outset I desire to congratulate the Ukrainian-American community upon the progress it has made in Jersey City over the past 75 years, and also for its contributions to our civic, cultural, religious and educational life. The erection of a $700,000 parochial school and this community center where dances, choral singing, sport events, dramatics, etc., take place, indeed merit the praise of the community.

Ukrainians are a hard working, honest and religious people, who have strong home ties and who cherish their freedom. They are a great asset to this country.

And, although Ukrainians have strong feelings for their homeland, like other minority groups, and desire their kinfolks to enjoy self-government and freedom, yet are loyal, patriotic Americans.

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE AND SOVIET COLONIALISM

I am delighted to be here today and join with my many Ukrainian friends of New Jersey to commemorate the 47th anniversary of the proclamation establishing Ukraine a free and independent national republic.

Meetings such as this one today are in a long-established and deeply revered tradition of American history; for we Americans, conscious of the pains of colonialism and the joys of freedom, since this has been our heritage, have always given a friendly hearing to all oppressed peoples who have come to our shores, assumed the duties and obligations of American citizenship, and have pleaded the case of the oppressed homeland.

This is, indeed, an auspicious occasion for which we are gathered today. To commemorate the independence of a people is to commemorate perhaps the most solemn moment in a nation's history.

Our task today is, however, both solemn and sad, because Ukrainian independence was only fleeting, as those few moments of joyful freedom were dissolved by the force of Soviet tyranny.

I need not recall to you the seemingly endless tragic details of Soviet oppression in Ukraine. The catalog of crimes—enforced famines, deportations, slave labor camps, religious and cultural suppression, and so forth—all are distressingly familiar to us.

What I would like to do, however, is to comment briefly on the character of Soviet colonialism in an effort to throw at least a little light on what I propose to call the greatest historical anachronism of our time.

Let me say at the outset that many Americans and perhaps many other peoples of the free world do not realize that the Soviet Union is not a nation inhabited only by Russians. Few Americans know that there are more Turks in the Soviet Union than in Turkey and more Moslems than in the United Arab Republic. It would come as a surprise to many, I am sure, to learn that Russians constitute a little more than 50 percent of the total Soviet population. The remainder of the population, as you well know, is made up of Ukrainians, Byelorussians, Armenians, Georgians, people of Turkic and Iranian origin, and other non-Russian peoples.

The Soviet Union is in fact a multinational state of peoples whose ethnic origins, religious traditions, social customs, and cultural heritages differ widely.

Thus, the Soviet Union, or Imperial Russia as it was once called, is not a nation of Russians, but is an enslaved state of many peoples, many cultures, many religions. And although the Soviets categorically deny the fact, the Soviet Union is a classic example of a traditional colonial empire.

Again, let me say, to most Americans it comes as a surprise to learn that the Soviet Union is indeed a colonial empire. What creates this confusion is the mistaken belief that the term colonialism refers only to oversea empires. This error is quite understandable because of our association of colonialism with our own particular colonial experience and those of the other American states whose territories had been conquered by the British, French, and Spanish. It seems never to have occurred to us that colonial empires could be built by a process of contiguous expansion. This is, of course, the manner in which the Russian Empire and its successor Soviet empire was built. From the small principality of Moscovy, the Russians added conquest upon conquest until their empire stretched from the borders of Germany to the sea of Japan, and from the arctic to the borders of southern Asia and the Middle East. And the Soviet Union today is the legatee of this great imperial and colonial system.

Perhaps one of the greatest myths among the many that have been generated in the Communist world is the dogmatic assertion that the United States and its Western allies are imperialistic and colonial powers that seek world domination, while the Soviet Union and its Communist allies are in reality the great liberating force for all mankind.

The truth is, of course, directly opposed to this assertion and it can be supported by the following evidence.

Since World War II, two great historical movements have been occurring on the world scene: One of these movements has been the dissolution of the old colonial systems of the Western Powers; the other movement has been the development of a new colonial system, that of the Communists. For, while the West was dissolving its colonial empires and bending to the necessity of granting national independence to subject peoples, the the Soviet Union was expanding its colonial empire into Europe and seeking conquests elsewhere through subversion, insurrection, and political warfare.

What are the specific facts to support our charge against the Soviets?

Let me cite them for you.

During the period 1939–60 the people who have won full independence from the West numbered 769,120,000 and embraced an area of 9,206,108 square miles. Adding to this figure the self-governing territories and those nations nearing independent status, the total figures rise to 846,935,000 in population and 11,557,707 square miles.

This massive movement toward national independence was countered by another trend, that of expanding Russo-Communist colonialism. At the time of World War II, the Soviet Communist world consisted of the Soviet Union with its population of about 190 million living in an area of approximately 8,600,000 square miles. By mid-1963, the Communist world expanded from this fairly constricted area to embrace a total of 1,109,500,000 persons in an area of 13,761,000 square miles. In other words, the Communist world now constitutes 34.99 percent of the world population and 26.25 percent of the total area of the world.

Another aspect of Soviet colonialism can be seen in the fact that the U.S.S.R. is constructed on the ruins of conquered independent national states. Ukraine, and other subject peoples, declared their independence after the Bolshevik Revolution, but only the Baltic States and Finland succeeded in maintaining their freedom. Subsequently, the other nations were conquered and incorporated into the Soviet Union. In 1940 and 1944, the Kremlin completed its unfinished task by conquering the Baltic states. In addition, they extended their empire into the states of Eastern Europe.

Thus, my friends, we are faced with a basic contradiction when we juxtapose Soviet charges against the West for colonialism and imperialism next to the realities of Soviet international life. We are presented here, I submit, with an historical anachronism of enormous proportions; for the Soviet Union which claims that the future belongs to communism has refused to acknowledge the internal relevance of the most powerful trend in modern history, the movement of peoples toward national independence. Indeed, the Soviet Union and its Communist allies stand as a reaction against the main current of world history.

We must remind ourselves of these historical facts as we commemorate the occasion of Ukrainian independence. Modern Ukrainian history proves beyond doubt that the Soviet claim of self-determination as a basic principle in Soviet constitutionalism is an outright fraud. The truth is that Moscow could not permit genuine self-determination for this would mean the dissolution of the Soviet empire.

Ukraine, therefore, as indeed, all the other Soviet colonial states, stand as living proof of the charge that the Soviet Union constitutes the greatest colonial empire of our modern day.

On this day of national dedication of all Ukrainians let me assure you that the sympathies of all free people go out to these heroic people, and we join with all others in fervent prayer and hope that someday Ukrainians will enjoy the full and unencumbered right of self-determination.

AUSTRALIAN DAY

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, today, January 26, is Australian Day, the occasion on which the Commonwealth of Australia marks the anniversary of its accession to the control of its own destinies. As a Californian who looks across the wide Pacific to a friendly neighbor and as a recent visitor to that great and beautiful country, it is a pleasure to congratulate Australia on its National Day.

We in the United States have been closely associated with Australia throughout this century. American miners helped to develop the great Australian gold fields near Kalgoorlie in western Australia. Americans fought alongside Australians in France in World War I and were again comrades in arms during World War II in the Solomon Islands, in New Guinea, and in Borneo. Since the war we have been closely associated with Australia in the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization—SEATO—and in the Anzus Treaty in which we have jointly pledged our efforts to maintain peace and security in southeast Asia.

Australia is a credit to the Pacific area and a credit to the free world. Here is a country almost as large as the United States with a population of 11 million people. It is growing rapidly, it is receiving tens of thousands of immigrants each year, its economy is shouldering a growing burden in providing a high standard of living for its people. Above all, it is a functioning democracy in the great tradition of Western man.

I am sure that all the Members of the House will join with me in the expression of the best of good wishes to a loyal and valued friend and associate in the Pacific.

THE HIGHWAY SCENIC EASEMENT BILL

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Gibbons] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced a bill (H.R. 3418) for the purpose of implementing the purpose of President Johnson, expressed in his state of the Union message and elsewhere, to protect and preserve our natural scenic beauty. One of the most important means of attaining this goal is to assure that the areas adjacent to our highways do not become a vast wilderness of billboards, junkyards, shabby commercial buildings and shacks where there was once a panorama of natural beauty.

For years conservationists, garden clubs and other groups have been struggling to prevent further destruction of our natural scenic heritage and to repair some of the damage already done. Legislation has been on the books since 1940 providing for use by a State of up to 3 percent of its Federal-aid highway funds for the purchase of scenic easements, waysides and rest areas. However, most States are hard pressed to find needed funds for current highway construction needs, and diverting 3 percent of the Federal-aid away from construction would retard the highway programs which are so urgently needed. The proposed legislation would provide additional funds, outside the highway funds, for the purpose of preserving scenic views, or historical sites, and wiping out eyesores which have sprung up along highways which otherwise would provide beautiful scenic vistas.

Despite the provision in existing highway legislation which provides additional funds amounting to one-half of 1 percent of the total cost of projects, for the purpose of removing or preventing installation of billboards along the Interstate System, only 20 States have so far qualified for the additional funds.

The amounts available are in addition to the Federal-aid highway funds and are to be paid from the general funds of the Treasury. A great difficulty in preventing billboard blight is that the dollar value of the locations along highways for advertising purposes is easily measured whereas the value of beautiful scenery is less suspectible of measurement in monetary terms.

Amendment of section 319 of the Federal-aid highway laws to provide additional funds for assistance to the States in the purchase of lands and easements for scenic purposes along Federal-aid highways is urgent. This will not provide all the answers but will supplement the work now being done in landscaping rights-of-ways along new highways and enforcement of laws against dumping of trash along highways.

The proposed legislation will not be the final answer to the problems of protecting one of our greatest resources—our natural scenery. Federal studies and proposals now in process will help point the way to solutions of many of the difficulties. The President has indicated that he intends to use every resource at his command to make the view from our highways as attractive as possible. This bill will assist the States toward that goal by making it possible for them to purchase scenic easements, leaving the land in the hands of the owners, and not depriving them of its use for purposes which would not destroy the natural beauty. One of the principal industries of my own State is tourism, and one of the greatest attractions to tourists is natural beautiful scenery.

Most of the States are desirous of preserving the natural beauty along their highways but most are woefully short of highway funds of all kinds. We must act before any more of our natural heritage has been destroyed and lost forever to us. Time is of the essence if we are to preserve "America the Beautiful."

FOREIGN AID AND AGRICULTURE

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Fraser] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to hear the President emphasize in his foreign aid message the need for greater efforts in agriculture and rural development in the less-developed countries in Latin America, Asia, and Africa. This is a crucial matter which demands priority attention. Many of the less developed countries are losing ground in the battle against hunger and poverty and others are just barely able to hold their own. We know that we cannot have peace and security in the world when hundreds of millions of people are at or near starvation. And as the President has said, we have many assets to put into the battle against hunger and poverty around the world. The food-for-peace programs, our agricultural technology and the skills and resources of our industries can all be mobilized to make a more effective contribution. The U.S. Department of Agriculture and the land-grant universities have a large reservoir of technical competencies which could be drawn upon in greater measure than heretofore.

In the less developed countries where 60 to 80 percent of the population live or work on the land, the whole economy of the country depends on the strength of the rural sector. Industrial development is closely linked with agricultural development. We cannot expect sustained economic growth in these countries without agricultural development. This is of great significance to our own economy as we look for expanded markets for our increasing agricultural production. As we help countries achieve economic growth we help them become better markets for our own agricultural products.

REFORM OF BAIL PROCEDURES

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Ashley] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced three bills to reform bail practices in the Federal courts. The Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights has for some time focused its attention on Federal bail procedures and has found them to be repugnant to the spirit of the Constitution and in direct conflict with two of our most cherished principles of justice—that the accused is presumed innocent until proved guilty by a court of law, and that justice should be equal and accessible to all. These bills which I have introduced, Mr. Speaker, have the strong support of the Department of Justice, Federal and State law enforcement officials, law professors, and other persons and groups concerned with the administration of criminal justice.

The bail system in the United States determines whether an accused person in a criminal proceeding will be released or jailed in the period between his arrest and trial. In the typical case, the accused is brought by the police before a committing magistrate or judge who will set bail in a monetary amount. The legal theory underlying this procedure is that the bail will be sufficient to insure the appearance of the defendant at trial. If he is able to post bond in the bail amount, or to pay a bondsman to post it for him, he is released. If he is financially unable to make bail, he is detained in jail.

Each year, the freedom of thousands of persons charged with crime hinges upon their ability to raise the money necessary for bail. Those who go free on bail are released not because they are innocent but because they can buy their liberty. Those who remain in jail are detained not because they are guilty but because they are poor. In short, Federal bail procedures rely primarily on financial considerations and inevitably disadvantage persons of limited means.

A brief summary of these three bail bills follows, Mr. Speaker, and I earnestly recommend that these measures which guarantee equal justice to rich and poor alike be considered by the House at the earliest possible time:

SUMMARY OF THE BILLS

RELEASE ON RECOGNIZANCE

The first bill provides that any person charged with an offense against the United States shall be admitted to bail on his personal recognizance if he is otherwise qualified, and except for good cause shown to the contrary. Any court of the United States or the District of Columbia admitting persons to release on their personal recognizance may set reasonable conditions deemed necessary to assure the accused's appearance at time of trial. This measure also provides appropriate penalties in cases where the accused fails to honor the terms of his release.

CREDIT FOR PRETRIAL CONFINEMENT

The second bill provides that persons convicted of offenses against the United States receive credit toward their sentence term for time they spent in custody prior to the imposition of sentence by the sentencing court.

Under existing law, credit for pretrial confinement is provided only in cases where the law requires a mandatory minimum sentence. Thus, where the minimum sentence is discretionary, there is no assurance that credit for pretrial confinement will be provided.

REFUNDABLE CASH DEPOSIT

The third bill provides that the accused, if otherwise eligible for bail, and except for good cause shown to the contrary, may deposit with the court a cash deposit equal to 10 percent of the amount of the bail set by the court. When the accused appears for trial as ordered, 90 percent of his initial deposit would be refunded, less any amount required to meet court costs or any fine imposed. If the accused breaches a condition of his bond, however, the court shall declare a forfeiture of the full amount of bail set. Existing penalties for bail jumping would be applicable to any person released under the procedure in this bill.

This measure would be particularly helpful in cases where bondsmen refuse to write bail because they have too many bonds outstanding, because of the nature or unpopularity of the offense, because of the background of the accused, or because of local hostility against the accused.

The refundable deposit provision in this bill will ease the financial burdens on the accused who properly conforms to the terms of his release. Moreover, since the deposit device can be denied persons likely to flee the jurisdiction of the court, misuse of the deposit system would be unlikely.

Finally, this bill would insure that decisions concerning pretrial release and custody remain with the Federal judiciary rather than professional bondsmen.

THE 47TH ANNIVERSARY OF UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to join in honoring the brief period of Ukrainian independence again this year, on the 47th anniversary of its establishment in 1918.

For a time, all too fleeting, it appeared that the centuries-old aspirations of Ukrainians to achieve enduring freedom from foreign oppression might be realized. When czarist Russia was plunged into revolution and defeat in World War I, a National Ukrainian Congress met in Kiev in April 1917 and elected a central council, or rada. After the earlier proclamation of an autonomous Ukrainian Republic, the rada on January 22, 1918, proclaimed a "free and sovereign" Ukrainian Republic.

Less than a month later, the Communists captured Kiev, and the rada was forced to flee. Briefly independent again in the changing fortunes of war, the Ukrainians were again subjected by the Red army, and their brief realization of independence quickly vanished.

The flame of independence still burns brightly in Ukrainian hearts. Along with more than 200 million other people of Eastern Europe, whose hopes for freedom are being repressed, the 44 million Ukrainians and those of Ukrainian ancestry in other countries long for the day when true independence can be celebrated again on native soil.

Each year, Members of the House and Senate join in commemorating this anniversary of freedom in the Ukraine, to help draw the attention of free peoples to the continuing plight of the Ukraine and to help strengthen the resolve of Ukrainians to be free, letting them know that they do not stand alone. And here in the capital of the world's mightiest nation, the attention of hundreds of thousands of visitors is captured by the statue of Taras Shevchenko, distinguished Ukrainian poet and freedom fighter, one of the patriots who founded a secret society in Kiev in 1846 in opposition to czarist rule.

What we have witnessed in the Ukraine, despite starvation, persecution, and mass deportations by the Stalin government in Moscow, has been an inspiring proof of the power of love of country, which the sternest measures of dictatorship have not been able to overcome. And so I am proud indeed to join in honoring this brave people and to express my own fervent hope that the freedom they have so long and valiantly struggled for will at last be permanently achieved.

AID TO UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILBERT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, our generosity with aid to the United Arab Republic has helped Nassar further his aggressive policies in the Middle East. President Nasser is using our American aid to finance rebel uprisings in the Congo and Yemen. The United States has received only hatred and insults for our $1.5 billion in aid to Nasser in the last 10 years. He attacked us time and time again in speeches, and a recent example of his vilification was the burning of the Kennedy Memorial Library in Cairo.

Nasser has repeated his threats to destroy Israel, our democratic ally in the Middle East. Last week in a 4-day conference in Cairo, the Arab Premiers reaffirmed intentions to push toward the cutting off of Israel's water with the building of a pumping station on the Wazzani River, which flows through Lebanon and Syria into Israel. By a series of locks, tunnels, and canals, the water is to be fed around Israel and into Jordan. The Arab's second main goal is to force reduction of West German aid to Israel. The Arab Premiers warned Bonn they might retaliate by recognizing East Germany.

The United States has been very generous to the people of Egypt for many years. In our food-for-peace program we have had the well-being of the people of Egypt in mind. Nasser has used our generosity to channel his country's resources toward a modern offensive arms buildup.

Mr. Speaker, the time has come when we must face the fact that in our foreign aid to Nasser we have an example of a dictator who has used the plight of his hungry people to further his ambitions to conquer and subjugate smaller, weaker nations who seek peace—a dictator who has used our generosity to build up animosity and hatred against us.

Nasser has received and continues to receive American aid despite the almost constant turmoil he has created and nourishes in the Middle East. Egypt has refused to cooperate with the U.N. in the Congo; it has persisted in a campaign to incite the Congolese people against Europeans and Americans and it arms the rebels in the Congo. Nasser employs German scientists to build military machines and he receives large-scale military aid from Soviet Russia. He demands the removal of the U.S. base in Libya and harasses the British in Aden. In violation of its promise to withdraw troops from Yemen, Egypt keeps more than 40,000 soldiers there. It threatens the destruction of Israel, shoots down a U.S. civilian plane, killing the two crewmen, and its street mobs destroy our USIS library.

When Congress adopted the "aggressor nation clause" the intent was that aid be denied to Egypt as long as her aggressive policy continued. So far, that clause has not been implemented. Recent events prove not only that Nasser has not changed his policies, but that he is becoming more belligerent in his attitude and actions, and the situation in the Middle East is rapidly deteriorating.

Mr. Speaker, I support the amendment offered. It is time that we discontinue aid to Egypt. Let us give Nasser the opportunity to convince us that he and his nation deserve our generosity. The time has come to place upon him the burden of proving to our satisfaction that he is worthy of our aid.

LUTHER HARTWELL HODGES

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to pay a brief tribute to a true and trusted friend, a distinguished statesman and a great American, Luther Hartwell Hodges.

Shakespeare once said, "be not afraid of greatness. Some are born great, some achieve greatness, and some have greatness thrust upon them."

Luther Hodges was not born great nor was greatness thrust upon him, but he achieved greatness. By his unswerving fidelity to truth, his great integrity, and by the honest and courageous manner in which he performed all of the vital functions of public office and high service and especially by his intelligent devotion to duty he has distinguished himself and endeared himself to the people of our State of North Carolina and to the people of the Nation. He was born in poverty, the son of a tenant farmer, but he waged war against poverty when he was but a child and he made his way in the business world of a busy Nation. He pulled himself up by his own bootstraps with determination and a smile. He obtained an education and he won the hearts of thousands of friends and went on to other and great achievements. He was a success in the business world and he has never been intimidated nor retarded by any sort of a complex. He knew that in this great land of ours no man is born great and no man has greatness thrust upon him, but every man has a chance to achieve greatness.

After a successful career in the business world of America and after he had decided to retire, another great opportunity was presented to him in the political life of our State. He became Lieutenant Governor and after that he became Governor and served with great ability and distinction for 6 years. Upon the death of Gov. William B. Umstead, Luther Hodges, then Lieutenant Governor, became Governor and thereafter was elected for a full 4-year term. Certainly he could have succeeded himself but for the organic law of our great State. Upon retiring from the Governor's office he was again called back into public service and appointed by our late beloved President John Kennedy as Secretary of Commerce. While Governor of North Carolina Luther Hodges traveled in the States of the Union. After he became Secretary of Commerce he traveled in the nations of the world. Wherever he went he made broad thoroughfares for friendship. In many far distant places on this earth he spoke out as a champion of justice and of freedom. He served our Nation in times of war and in times of peace. No man has ever questioned his sincerity nor impugned his motives. He has always been prompted by the purest of motives. Never has he betrayed a friendship nor has he ever violated a trust. His work has always far surpassed his wages and he has earned the right to live the rest of his life as he pleases. Luther Hodges has achieved greatness because of the exalted purpose of his life and the nobility of his soul. I shall not attempt to beautify his character nor to dignify his life. I come only to commend him and to wish him Godspeed as he leaves his high office as Secretary of Commerce of the greatest Nation on earth.

Luther Hodges has, by the beauty and simplicity of his life, endeared himself to his countrymen. He has never suffered because of poverty, fatigue or loneliness. He always realized that he was a child of the universe and he believes that the world with all of its sham, drudgery, and broken dreams is still a beautiful world and he has always been prepared to meet the strange and mysterious vicissitudes of life and misfortune with courage, vision, and fortitude and he has above all been a champion of world peace. By his great life he has made the world a better place in which to live. His character is a tower of strength and his heart is the core of greatness.

When he leaves Washington he will retire to Chapel Hill, the little university town where I first met him, but I am certain that he will never fail or refuse to make further contributions to the welfare and happiness of the people of his State and Nation. Actually, he is too young to retire from active duty. So those of us who have known and loved this magnificent man will watch with interest his activities in the years ahead.

To his lovely wife, Martha, and to the other members of his family, Mrs. Cooley joins with me in extending to them our cordial good wishes as they leave the Capital of our great Nation and return home to the lofty peaks and lovely lakes of the State they love best of all—the State of North Carolina.

Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD a brief biography of the life of a beloved statesman, Luther Hartwell Hodges:

BIOGRAPHY OF LUTHER H. HODGES

Luther Hartwell Hodges, retiring U.S. Secretary of Commerce, was born in Pittsylvania County, Va., March 9, 1898, son of John James and Lovicia (Gammon) Hodges. His father was a farmer.

Young Hodges received his preliminary education at public schools in Spray and Leaksville, N.C., and was graduated B.A. at the University of North Carolina in 1919. While at the university he joined the Student Army Training Corps in 1918 and, after receiving a commission as 2d lieutenant in the U.S. Army, served at Camp Grant, Ill.

In 1919 he became secretary to the general manager of Marshall Field & Co.'s eight textile mills in the Leaksville-Spray area. He was made manager of the Marshall Field & Co. blanket mill in Spray in 1927 and production manager of the Marshall Field mills in the Leaksville area in 1934. He assumed the position of general manager of the mills of the company in 1939, was named general manager of all 29 of the company's mills in the United States and abroad in 1940, and was elected vice president in charge of mills and sales in 1943.

Mr. Hodges retired from the Marshall Field organization in 1950 and since then has devoted his entire time to public service. Meanwhile, during the Second World War he had entered the service of the Federal Government in 1944 to direct a $4 billion textile pricing program for the Office of Price Administration, and in the following year he was made a special consultant to the U.S. Secretary of Agriculture.

In 1950 he went to the Federal Republic of Germany (West Germany) as head of the industry division of the Economic Cooperation Administration, and late in 1951 he became a consultant to the U.S. Department of State on International Management Conference. During this period also he was active in North Carolina affairs, serving for 6 years on the vocational education board and the State highway commission. In November 1952, he was elected on the Democratic ticket to the post of Lieutenant Governor of North Carolina.

On the death of Gov. William B. Umstead in November 1954, Mr. Hodges assumed the governorship to serve for the remaining 26 months of the unexpired 4-year term and in 1956 he was elected Governor of North Carolina for a 4-year term expiring in January 1961. Two proposals made by him in 1955 were passed by the North Carolina General Assembly: the first provided for an $18 million increase in appropriations for public schools and the second established small business development corporations to stimulate new local industrial enterprises. Also enacted were revisions in the public school law that transferred authority over enrollment and assignment of pupils from the State board to local boards, transferred ownership and operation of school buses from State to local administrative units, and provided for yearly contracts for teachers in place of continuing contracts.

During his tenure Governor Hodges traveled approximately 300,000 miles studying problems within the State and pleading for more participation in governmental affairs by all of the people. He successfully recommended a major reorganization of the State highway commission and its separation from the prison department. Upon his urging, the 1957 North Carolina General Assembly established a new department of administration to serve as a coordinating center for all State services. He strongly supported redistricting of the judiciary as a means of relieving congested court dockets and originated a study of the North Carolina court system designed to improve its effectiveness. To accomplish improvement in the per capita income of the people of North Carolina he exerted tremendous influence in such fields as industrial development, agricultural diversification, and forestry, and during his administration the State passed all previous records in the investment of new capital for manufacturing plants, payrolls, and jobs. Governor Hodges also emphasized the need for better education and research as a means of developing a sound economy and to provide greater opportunities for the State's population. One of his most dramatic achievements was the development, under the research triangle project, of a large, modern research park in the center of the geographical area bounded by the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, North Carolina State College at Raleigh, and Duke University at Durham.

In his many speeches across the State he advocated better utilization of water resources and navigable streams, development of recreational facilities, a new study of school curriculums and a new State board of higher education to coordinate various State-supported institutions of higher learning, a vigorous program of highway safety, and a forceful program of hurricane rehabilitation to offset the devastating effect of four hurricanes within the period of 1 year.

Called upon by President Kennedy to serve as U.S. Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Hodges took the oath of office on January 21, 1961. In administering the U.S. Department of Commerce, he has directed his major effort toward revitalizing the Nation's economy, with respect both to encouraging domestic industrial expansion and to extending American markets abroad.

In addition to directing the affairs of the U.S. Department of Commerce, Secretary Hodges served as Cochairman of the President's Advisory Committee on Labor-Management Policy, Chairman of the Foreign Trade Zones Board and of the Interdepartmental Highway Safety Board, and as a member of the Foreign Service Buildings Commission, the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission, the National Advisory Council of International Monetary and Financial Problems of the U.S. Department of the Treasury, and the President's Council on Youth Fitness.

A member of Rotary International, he was chairman of its convention in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, in 1948, served as chairman of its postwar committee during 1943–45, attended the United Nations Conference on International Organization in San Francisco in 1945 as a Rotary consultant, and served in a similar capacity at the United Nations Security Council for 2 years.

At various times he was chairman of the Southern Governors' Conference and of the Southern Regional Education Board, and in 1959 he was one of nine American Governors who made an extensive tour of the Soviet Union and was in charge of a North Carolina State trade and industry mission to Europe.

He also has been active in such organizations as the YMCA, and Boy Scouts of America.

Honorary LL.D. degrees were conferred upon him by the University of North Carolina in 1946 and by North Carolina State College in 1955 and by several other colleges since.

He is a member of the Masonic order, American Legion, and the University Club of New York City. His religious affiliation is with the Leaksville Methodist Church, which he has served as a lay leader and steward. His recreational interests are hunting, fishing, and book collecting.

Secretary Hodges was married in Monroe, N.C., June 24, 1922, to Martha Elizabeth, daughter of Rochel Edward Blakeney of that place, a farmer, and has three children: Betsy, who married Don M. Bernard, Jr.; Nancy, who married John C. Finlay; and Luther Hartwell.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues today in paying tribute to one of North Carolina's most remarkable men. I have known him for a long time, both before and since he came upon the political scene in North Carolina.

Luther Hartwell Hodges grew up in my congressional district and there began his education and his business and political careers. Many people who have known and observed him all of his life have described to me the years of his childhood and youth so that I have come to regard him as a lifelong acquaintance. As a student in grammar school, in high school, as a textile mill employee, as a self-help college student, and as a nationally known textile executive, he worked hard and he succeeded. He came up the "hard way," so to speak, and his phenomenal success has not been accidental. Honesty, frugality, and hard work are now often referred to as the "old-fashioned American virtues." There may be those who regard these virtues as old fashioned, but in my opinion they have constituted the solid ground and the "plain path" on and in which Luther Hodges always trod as from time to time he was required to make difficult choices and decisions involving the differences between failure and success.

After reaching the top in the field of business as an executive in one of the country's largest textile manufacturing concerns, he retired. Though not old in years, he was so situated and at an age when many people of less mettle than he might have begun thinking of sheltered ease in retirement. But this would have been contrary to his character and nature. Looking about for new fields of endeavor, he chose a difficult one—statewide politics in North Carolina—and ran for Lieutenant Governor at a time when only a very few of the political leaders of that day conceded him more than a poor, outside chance of winning election. Win he did and, upon the death of Gov. William B. Umstead, became Governor of North Carolina. In 1956, he ran for a full term and was elected by an overwhelming majority. In all, he served North Carolina as Governor for approximately 6 years, and he served with brilliant distinction.

In the course of his business career and his service as Governor of North Carolina, his superior abilities and qualities of leadership drew nationwide attention. Having been a tried and proved business executive and a seasoned chief executive of one of the country's most progressive States, it was not by mere chance that President John F. Kennedy selected him for one of the most complex and difficult positions in the National Government, that of Secretary of Commerce. His industry and well-directed energy, his training and experience in both private business and government, and an inherent desire to do a good job at whatever he undertook, were combined to make Luther Hodges stand out prominently among the great Secretaries of Commerce.

During his service as Secretary of Commerce he traveled into practically every part of the world in his efforts to promote sales of American products abroad, to attract tourists to our country, and to encourage the investment of foreign capital in the United States.

Prior to his election as Governor of North Carolina he had served as head of the textile division of the Office of Price Administration and as a consultant to the Secretary of Agriculture. He spent over a year in West Germany as head of the Industry Division of the Economic Cooperation Administration, and was consultant to the State Department in the latter months of 1951 on the International Management Conference. While Governor of North Carolina, he served as chairman of the Southern Governors' Conference and of the Southern Regional Education Board. These are only a few of the honors he has received and which bear witness to the high regard in which he is held by his fellow Americans and the trust they have reposed in him from time to time.

It was with deep regret that I learned of Secretary Hodges' decision to leave his post in President Johnson's Cabinet. He has given much of himself to his difficult job in the Federal Government, and his experience, seasoned judgment, and wise counsel will be sorely missed.

Here, today, we say farewell and thanks for a job well done, but at the same time we North Carolinians welcome him back home. Judging from the past, it is reasonably safe to predict that Secretary Hodges' retirement from the President's Cabinet does not mean that he is leaving the field of public service. The future will doubtless find him in the thick of some forming battle for the advancement of the welfare of his beloved State and country.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to my colleague from North Carolina [Mr. KORNEGAY].

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to my colleague from North Carolina for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, the retirement of the Honorable Luther H. Hodges, Secretary of Commerce for 4 years, takes from the Washington scene one of the most shining ornaments in North Carolina's galaxy of distinguished public servants.

Prior to his appointment as Secretary of Commerce, Luther Hodges had served the State of North Carolina for 3 years by filling out, as Lieutenant Governor, the unexpired term of the late Governor William B. Umstead, formerly a Member of the House; and then in his own right Mr. Hodges was elected to another 4-year term by one of the most overwhelming votes in the history of our State. He served a total of almost 7 years as Governor of North Carolina—the longest term any Governor has served in this century, because in our State the Governor cannot immediately succeed himself in a second elective term.

Governor Hodges' term of office in North Carolina was distinguished by his wholehearted and effective efforts to attract industry to our State and to put North Carolina on the map as an inviting industrial site with splendid labor potential, water resources, and excellent climate. He traveled abroad in the interest of North Carolina and its many attractions to industry and to tourists, and in many ways he put our State squarely on the national and international scene. In addition, Governor Hodges recommended and piloted through our State general assembly many far-reaching and desirable improvements in our State government and demonstrated as a "businessman Governor" that a rich business background enhanced his abilities as Chief of State.

Before he was elected Lieutenant Governor of North Carolina, Luther Hodges had enjoyed a brilliant career in the textile world in the large textile complex of Marshall Field & Co. He had literally carved out his career by his own hand and had risen to the highest positions of honor and responsibility in the company. He retired from the world of business at the age of 54. After his retirement he then entered the field of politics and government, when most men would have taken their ease and enjoyed the fruits of their labors. How well and how brilliantly he succeeded in this second career is attested to in the tributes which have been paid to him on his recent retirement.

It was particularly fitting that Governor Hodges be chosen as Secretary of Commerce by the late President Kennedy, for while he was certainly blessed with a versatility of experience and of mind and thought, and could have admirably filled many posts of responsibility and trust, the Commerce Cabinet post was custom tailored to fit him. He has been responsible for many innovations in the Department and has brought to this multibureaued and immense agency the same know-how and large thinking which have characterized his other endeavors.

His statesmanlike and objective attitude under all circumstances and conditions, his dignity, and his fairmindedness inspired respect and confidence in all with whom he came in contact. I am moved to quote some lines of Shakespeare and in doing so will substitute the present for the past tense, for Luther Hodges is in all respects very much in the present tense:

> His life is gentle, and the elements
> So mix'd in him that Nature might stand up
> And say to all the world "This is a man!"

Secretary Hodges has indeed earned and well deserves his voluntary retirement, for few men have piled up such an impressive record of public service. In returning to North Carolina he has chosen to make his home in the town of Chapel Hill, the site of the University of North Carolina. This is the institution so deeply loved by Luther Hodges, where he received the training disciplines which so admirably equipped one of the university's most illustrious sons. I am proud that he will reside in my congressional district and that I may call him my constituent.

I keep referring to Governor Hodges' retirement, but this is actually a misnomer. For his retirement ended after 6 days when, on January 21, he was named chairman of the Research Triangle Foundation. To paraphrase a statement in one of my district papers—it was just like throwing Br'er Rabbit into the briar patch where he belonged, for while serving as Governor of North Carolina Luther Hodges played a large part in the creation of the research triangle. He will be completely at home in guiding the affairs of the foundation.

Governor Hodges and his charming wife Martha have left the Washington scene, but we North Carolinians proudly feel that Washington's loss is truly North Carolina's gain. We know the life of our State will be enriched by their presence. Governor Hodges leaves for his successor Secretary of Commerce a challenging record and a well-organized Department, which I predict will bear the imprint of his personality and achievements for many years to come.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to my friend from Louisiana [Mr. Boggs].

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to commend the gentleman for taking this time to permit us to say a word or two about Luther Hodges, our great Secretary of Commerce and a former great Governor of the gentleman's State of North Carolina.

I have known Secretary Hodges, his wife, and his family for a great many years. They are fine people.

Secretary Hodges above all is a distinguished and patriotic American as are the members of his family. But in addition to that he is a dedicated public official. Under his administration as Secretary of Commerce this country has experienced the longest period of sustained prosperity in its entire history. He leaves that office at a time when there are more people gainfully employed at good wages than at any other time in our history.

Secretary Hodges was untiring when he served as Secretary of Commerce. He was never too busy to go to the most remote part of our country, the smallest town, make a talk and meet with the business leaders and community leaders wherever they were.

I think our country owes your fellow North Carolinian a great debt of gratitude. I personally have the greatest respect and esteem for him and for Mrs. Hodges, and I shall miss them here. Mrs. Boggs joins me in wishing them many years of happiness.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Louisiana. At this time I yield to my colleague from North Carolina [Mr. Taylor].

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleagues in paying respect to Luther Hodges who retired last week as Secretary of Commerce. Someone said that he was a bit surprised 4 years ago when a Catholic President picked a man named Luther as a member of his Cabinet, but I believe that he has been one of the great Secretaries of Commerce of all time. I believe that he deserves much of the credit for the business expansion and phenomenal increase in the gross national product during the last 4 years. He did an extraordinary job in improving America's balance-of-payments posture by creating a campaign to encourage export sales.

Luther Hodges is a big man, with big thoughts and plans. He is a hard, determined worker, a sound thinker, an interesting personality, yet he is humble, warm, human, and considerate. A few nights ago some of you heard him say at an occasion given in his honor that any of us who can make even a tiny contribution to our country with the help of friends and coworkers gets a tremendous satisfaction. I hated to see Luther Hodges retire as Secretary of Commerce for many reasons, some of which were personal because I have felt very close to him and his lovely wife for many years.

This man worked his way through the University of North Carolina and worked his way up in industry to a position as general manager and vice president of Marshall Field & Co. He retired from this position in 1950 and spent over a year in West Germany as head of the Industry Division of the Economic Cooperation Administration.

In 1952 Luther Hodges was elected Lieutenant Governor of North Carolina, his first venture in politics. His main argument for election had been that businessmen should devote a portion of their time to politics and government and he was volunteering for service. Upon the death of Gov. William Umstead in November 1954, Luther Hodges became Governor of our State and was reelected in 1956. He was a great Governor. It was during his administration, and under his leadership that North Carolina made phenomenal gains in industrial development and in establishing industrial training centers across the State to train tenants who were being pushed off the farms, and other citizens in becoming skilled and useful as industrial employees.

Luther Hodges loves the out of doors. He has climbed many of the mountains and has waded most of the trout streams in my congressional district. He and I happened to live in the same apartment building here in Washington and frequently at night he took a quick hike along Connecticut Avenue and sometimes I walked with him. He has not limited his travels to hikes in Washington. As Secretary of Commerce, he has visited over 25 countries and traveled over 300,000 miles in the interests of increasing American export trading. It was my privilege to travel with Secretary Hodges to the South Pole some 26 months ago. He seemed to be having a fine time in temperature 45° below zero.

In years Luther Hodges was the oldest Member of the Cabinet. Yet in outlook and actions, he is one of the youngest. This is his third retirement, as he retired from industry in 1950 and from the governorship and from politics in North Carolina in January 1961. He retires from a job well done in a Nation well served. Now he will take a rest but not for long. He will soon be active and productive again. Luther Hodges at age 66 still has a great future.

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my distinguished colleague, the former great Governor of the State of Virginia and now a distinguished Member of the House of Representatives.

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Cooley] for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with him and with others in paying this tribute to the character and the public service of our friend the Honorable Luther H. Hodges upon his retirement from the Cabinet of the President of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I have known Governor Hodges for many years. I knew him long before he went into public life. I became better acquainted with him when he became Lieutenant Governor and Governor of the State of North Carolina.

Mr. Speaker, Luther Hodges was born and reared in the congressional district from whence I come and which I have the honor to represent on the floor of the House of Representatives. As a man whose heart is attuned to the highest public good and who has made a mark upon the public life of his great State and this great country, upon his retirement I am glad to know that he has decided to return to North Carolina where he has so many friends and where his work is so widely known and has received such high public acclaim.

Mr. Speaker, Governor Hodges during his term as Governor came over into the congressional district which it is my honor to represent and spoke at a districtwide meeting in behalf of my candidacy for reelection to the House of Representatives. Thus, I am doubly appreciative of his friendship which he bestowed upon me at a time of greatest need.

Mr. Speaker, I wish Governor Hodges, and the members of his family every happiness in his retirement. I am confident that his contributions to the welfare of his great State and the Nation have not ended and that in his present position he will continue to do all he can to enhance the best interests of the great section of the country from whence he comes.

Mr. COOLEY. I thank the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I happily join with my colleagues in taking note of the splendid services rendered by our fellow North Carolinian, the Honorable Luther Hartwell Hodges, during his tenure as Secretary of Commerce. It has been the source of much pride to all of us who have known Secretary Hodges through the years to see the quality of his performance during his 4 years of service here in Washington.

No man in America could have given any more brilliant performance as Secretary of Commerce than Luther Hodges. His background at all stages of business activity provided the intuition requisite for fulfilling the many responsibilities which he has met so well. As a young college graduate he returned to his home community for employment with one of the great textile companies. Within a few years he was directing the entire operation of this large textile concern.

After a brilliant business career he decided that he should serve the State which he loved so well. As a candidate for Lieutenant Governor he surprised many political veterans with his ability to change from the business world to political life. He was elected by a large majority to serve as Lieutenant Governor and shortly thereafter succeeded to the governorship.

At the next election he became a candidate for Governor and was again given an overwhelming majority by the people of our State. This indicated that the full impact of the personality and ability of this outstanding North Carolinian had been felt by the public in a manner which they liked.

As Governor, Luther Hodges gave to our State a well-rounded program of activity. He gave particuar emphasis, however, to industrial development. The results of his energy and ability in the area of industrial development has already been a great blessing to many people in North Carolina and will continue to be enjoyed for generations to come.

When the late President Kennedy selected Luther Hodges as his Secretary of Commerce all of us who knew him felt that a wise choice had been made. His performance during the 4 years he served in that position fully justifies the confidence that we had at the time of his appointment.

I am sorry that Governor Hodges decided that he should retire from the Washington scene. The Nation sustained a great loss when he elected to leave his post at the Commerce Department. We are pleased that he has returned to North Carolina and that he has already volunteered for further service to the Tar Heel State.

Governor Hodges has accepted the position of chairman of the board of the Research Triangle at the request of Gov. Dan K. Moore and will give his leadership to a splendid program of research and development of which all North Carolinians are so proud. In characteristic fashion Luther Hodges is serving without financial compensation in this new position. This is the sort of thing that one has come to expect Luther Hodges to do because of his unselfish devotion to the people of his home State.

I join with our other colleagues in wishing all of those good things of life for Governor Hodges and Mrs. Hodges as they continue on their useful course in life at home in North Carolina.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, it is a very real pleasure for me to join with my colleagues here today to pay tribute to our former Secretary of Commerce, Luther H. Hodges. As a North Carolinian, I am proud that such an illustrious son of the Old North State has given such outstanding service to the people of this Nation.

Following a career in which North Carolina honored Mr. Hodges, entrusting to him the highest office it could bestow, he came to the Nation's Capital from a most successful term as Governor. His talents, his dedication, and his fairness have brought great credit on his State. In his service as Secretary of Commerce, he has demonstrated his special knowledge of industry and the economic affairs of this country. He retires from the Cabinet post with the universal respect of that segment of America which he was appointed to serve. This he has accomplished without sacrificing the respect of any element of American society.

In departing the Washington scene, we North Carolinians are happy that he will return to his home State to accept fresh and new challenges. His future work with the Research Triangle operation opens new vistas for Luther Hodges. Out of this vast project will come research that will contribute to the economic development of the American people and to general human betterment. This is not a valedictory for Luther Hodges. It is rather a new phase of a fine career in which he has consistently sought to improve his own generation and to open new horizons for the future of America.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to add my voice to the many who speak in honor of a great North Carolinian, the Honorable Luther H. Hodges, who has served with distinction as the Secretary of Commerce for the past 4 years.

Though very definitely a man of the 20th century, the story of Luther Hodges parallels those of other great men, of earlier years who guided an infant nation to international preeminence. At a very tender age young Luther and his family moved across the line into North Carolina from the log cabin in which he was born in Pittsylvania County, Va.

His early life was characterized by hard work, hardship, and ambition. Helping his tenant farmer parents and working as a candy butcher on passenger trains typify his efforts to help his family and his own poor economic status.

Despite adverse circumstances he insisted upon gaining a college education. Waiting on tables, tending furnaces, and performing other similar services, Luther Hodges worked his way through the University of North Carolina, receiving his B.A. degree there in 1919.

His business career began at the very bottom of the promising textile industry in his State, and ended at the very top as vice president of Marshall Field & Co.

This remarkable man with abundant energy and vitality has served through several careers. Taking time off from his important post with Marshall Field during World War II, he became head of the Textile Division of OPA in 1944 and consultant to the Secretary of Agriculture in 1945. He retired from business in 1950 when he again placed his great abilities in the service of his Government as head of the Industrial Division of the Economic Cooperation Administration in West Germany.

Retiring again, he entered into politics in North Carolina, becoming Lieutenant Governor in 1952 and succeeding to the Governorship in 1954. He was then elected Governor to succeed himself in 1956 for a term ending January 1961.

Again Luther Hodges retired, but only to begin another distinguished career as Secretary of Commerce, where he proved to be one of the most outstanding in our history. In this post he brought new vitality to the American business community, characterized by his unyielding efforts to bring about the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. And during these years new emphasis was placed on advancing American technological progress.

This restless man, who fully earned each of his several retirements, refuses to be retired. Since his retirement as Secretary of Commerce on January 15 of this year he has been named chairman of the Research Triangle in North Carolina, made up of the great educational institutions of Duke, University of North Carolina, and North Carolina State University. The Research Triangle, which was started while he was Governor, will be one of the outstanding environmental health centers of the Nation. It will be a great source of satisfaction to him, I am sure, to be actively participating in its further development.

Over many years I have enjoyed a warm and close friendship with Luther Hodges. Our families have been equally close.

I supported him for Lieutenant Governor and for Governor, and I admire him greatly, as my previous remarks reveal. He has made an outstanding contribution to the State of North Carolina and the Federal Government, both politically and economically.

I and all of us who have had the privilege of knowing him will greatly miss him as he leaves the Washington scene to begin his new career. His works here as Secretary of Commerce will remain as a monument to his distinguished service to our Federal Government and our Nation.

May God's richest blessings go with him and his lovely wife.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, I did not have any advance notice that some of my colleagues would comment this afternoon about the voluntary retirement from Government service of the Honorable Luther H. Hodges, former Secretary of Commerce. But I could not let the occasion pass without joining them in paying tribute to Mr. Hodges as he leaves his most recent post in public service.

Mr. Hodges has had a distinguished record in public affairs, not only as a member of the Cabinet of the late President Kennedy and President Johnson before the latter assumed the office of the Presidency in his own right, but as a very distinguished Governor of the great State of North Carolina.

Mr. Hodges is held in high regard by the people of our State. Many worthwhile accomplishments stand to his credit while he was Governor of North Carolina, but my guess is that he will be best remembered as the Governor who went beyond the call of duty in his efforts to attract industry to our State in order to raise the level of the per capita income of our people.

His service on the national scene has been in the capacity as Secretary of Commerce, and in that high position he rendered outstanding service to the Nation as he did for our State when he served as Governor.

After a long and arduous tour of public service, Mr. Hodges has now elected to retire to the quiet and peaceful scenes in the beautiful village of Chapel Hill. He well deserves the rewards that will come from retirement, but many of us who know him intimately feel that his restless spirit will not permit him to retire to a life of idleness and ease. My prediction is that he will merely be transferring once again the scene of his activities and that his voice and influence will continue to be heard and felt in the promotion of causes which have such strong appeal to him.

Mrs. Jonas joins me in extending to Luther, and to his charming and devoted wife Martha, our deep and sincere good wishes for long life, good health, and happiness at Chapel Hill.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, throughout history political theorists have attempted to set up a model for the ideal public servant who would provide his people with good ethic, vast experience, and insurmountable knowledge. We find Plato confronted with this problem some 23 centuries ago, and even today there are those skeptics who say that the ideal public servant does not exist. Apparently, such people know nothing of the career of one of the most remarkable men of our time, Luther H. Hodges. In less than 13 years Governor Hodges has rendered outstanding public service to his native State of North Carolina, to the United States, and to the free world.

Like Winston Churchill, Secretary Hodges became an internationally known figure comparatively late in life, and yet like Churchill this man has made an indelible impression that will never be forgotten. Mr. Hodges was elected Lieutenant Governor of North Carolina, his first political office, at the age of 52 and subsequently served as Governor of the great Tar Heel State for more than 6 years before becoming Secretary of Commerce during a critical period of world history.

Luther Hodges became one of the greatest Governors of any State in the history of our country. He served longer as Governor of North Carolina than any man in the modern history of the State. He was a tireless, energetic, and forthright Chief Executive. His administration in North Carolina was marked by phenomenal industrial and economic growth. In an age and a time of salesmanship and public relations Governor Hodges excelled in selling his philosophy and ideals. He was one of the greatest ambassadors his State and the South has ever known.

Governor Hodges personally went after new industry and worked tirelessly for industrial expansion for his people. He made frequent trips throughout the Nation and the world to talk with industrialists, encouraging them to locate a plant or subdivision in North Carolina. His methods and tactics became a model for other Governors and planning boards throughout the Nation.

During the administration of Governor Hodges, education and research made great strides in North Carolina. Roads were vastly improved and the advantages of tourism in North Carolina as a vacationland were well advertised under his leadership. He pointed the way for other Southern States and laid the groundwork for a new-found economy that has projected the Southland as a recognized leader in numerous industrial endeavors.

The South and the Nation can be proud of Governor Hodges' record in easing racial tensions, in pointing the way for the South and the country during a time of turmoil and social upheaval. Governor Hodges realized that the answer to racial problems was to provide more jobs and opportunities.

President John Fitzgerald Kennedy in recognizing Governor Hodges' intense loyalty and patriotism asked that the Governor become Secretary of Commerce in his administration. As Secretary of Commerce, Governor Hodges participated in some of the most momentous decisions in the history of our country and in the history of freedom. As the senior member of the administration's first team, Luther Hodges' advice and counsel was constantly sought and heeded by the young President.

Luther Hodges realized more than any other contemporary American that if the United States was to continue to be the heart and core of the free world and the arsenal of democracy, we must get our economy moving. We must find jobs and opportunity for our youth.

During the administration of Luther Hodges the American economy moved forward as never before. The enemies of America were counting heavily on depression, unemployment, and downward business trends in the United States. Today the United States is on a much firmer foundation than in 1961, and we face the future with confidence. Mr. Hodges was largely instrumental in inaugurating trade policies which have benefited this country and our allies throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, Luther Hodges became Secretary of Commerce at a time when the great textile industry of this country and its employees had their backs to the wall. Unemployment was rampant. Mills were operating on curtailment and closing was the order of the day. The textile industry had been promised relief from unfair imports. The Democratic National Conventions of 1956 and 1960 called for consideration to be given this great industry so vital to the defense of the Nation. President Kennedy appointed Secretary Hodges chairman of a five-man Cabinet committee to remedy the desperate and critical situation in the textile industry and among its more than 2 million employees. It was a near impossible task, but Secretary Hodges, by tact, diplomacy, leadership, and constant efforts was able to reach a voluntary agreement with the leading textile manufacturing nations of the world.

Step by step Secretary Hodges implemented the seven-point program of President Kennedy. Under President Lyndon Johnson's administration, Luther Hodges saw his objective fulfilled with the elimination of the two-priced cotton system. The textile industry now with the other great industries of this country is moving forward.

During this period I had the opportunity to work with Secretary Hodges and observed him closely in meetings with President Johnson, President Kennedy, the members of the Cabinet, and great industrial leaders throughout the Nation. It was the Secretary's ability to deal with diverse elements and with people that enabled us to be finally successful.

Secretary Hodges is distinguished in appearance, mild in manner, always gracious, thoughtful, and courteous. He is a man of great courage and determination, one who fights for a successful but honorable conclusion. These are the traits of a man of vision, and it is to such men that this Nation will always turn.

As a political campaigner, Secretary Hodges is unsurpassed. I have campaigned with him on the stump and I have seen firsthand how he could even win hostile audiences. This unique attribute is the gift of very few politicians. He loved to campaign, because he wanted to meet people. He is undoubtedly one of the greatest men of our time. He is a man of accomplishment and achievement in both public and private life. After 13 years of devoted service to his State, Nation, and free world he is going to take a well-deserved rest. I cannot talk about Luther Hodges without making mention of his wonderful, charming, and gracious wife who has helped this great man so much during his outstanding career. Mrs. Dorn, a native North Carolinian and a fellow alumna of the University of North Carolina, joins me in the hope that for Secretary Hodges it will only be a short rest, as our country is still in need of men of his character, integrity, and superb leadership.

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, I consider it a great privilege that the gentleman from North Carolina has yielded to me in order that I might make a statement in behalf of the former Secretary of Commerce, the Honorable Luther Hodges.

Mr. Speaker, I first had the privilege of becoming acquainted with Luther Hodges when he was the Governor of his great State. As Governor, and later on many occasions as a member of the President's Cabinet, he came to our State to share with us his sagacity and great store of commonsense in meeting the problems not only of Michigan but of the Nation. His dedication to purpose, his honesty, and his gentlemanly graciousness impressed all who came in contact with him. Mr. Speaker, I consider it a privilege here today to be allowed to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Cooley] and to commend him for his remarks which he has made today in regard to this great man. It is my privilege to participate in this well-deserved tribute to former Secretary of Commerce Hodges and may God bless him and his family in his future years.

Mr. COOLEY. I thank the gentleman from Michigan.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the Record on Mr. Hodges.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

THE LATE SIR WINSTON CHURCHILL

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Halpern] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, the world has lost a great champion of liberty, a man who in character and deed embodied the grandeur of an upsetting time.

We mourn the quiet passing of Sir Winston Churchill; may our remembrance of him stir within us the will and faith which distinguished his life.

To his family and the British people, we extend profound sympathy on their loss, which is also ours.

There is no end to the honor and respect owing to this giant among men. In an age of growing specialization and polarization, he epitomized skill and wisdom in all fields. Statesman, politician, warrior, author, painter, and bricklayer, the life of Winston Churchill is of heroic dimension.

We can never forget that Winston Churchill, more than any other person, rallied the forces of civilization against Hitlerite tyranny. At that hour when Europe quivered, helpless, before the onslaught of evil incarnate, the island kingdom found a man who would not surrender. He stirred the conscience of his nation, of the free world, returning to the democracies that vital respectability which had been lost in weakness, pettiness, and defeat.

Sir Winston Churchill, his character and his achievements, will endure as long as freemen have the strength to protect the liberties which he cherished.

BIG LIES

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. Berry] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, the House is indebted to the distinguished gentleman from Utah, the Honorable David King, for bringing to the attention of the House yesterday another of the "big lies" that the leftwing radical press is still in the process of telling about Senator Barry Goldwater.

Let me point out, Mr. Speaker, that a deliberate misquote is worse than a deliberate lie. For several years and particularly throughout the past year this leftwing radical press has heaped upon the head of Barry Goldwater a crown of thorns woven from deliberate lies, deliberate misquotes, deliberate misstatements of his position, and the deliberate taking of quotes out of context.

In reporting the speech of Senator Goldwater at the Chicago meeting of the Republican National Committee on January 22, the Washington Post carried in quotations their version of the statement Mr. Goldwater made and it was exactly as the gentlemen from Utah read on the House floor yesterday. In other words the Post quoted him as saying:

> I wasn't dishonest enough in the last campaign to win. In order to win campaigns one must be dishonest, or a little dishonest.

In their report of the meeting of the national committee the Newsweek magazine which is associated with the Washington Post Co. and is almost as far to the left as the Post could not, apparently, go quite as far in misquoting the Senator as did the Post—they said this:

> What it boils down to is that I wasn't dishonest enough to win this campaign.

The Newsweek article could not even stomach the whole lie and the so-called quote even had been tamed down a little from the Post article.

Now what did Mr. Goldwater say in his speech in Chicago. I have the paragraph taken from the transcript of his speech. I shall quote this part of the speech today and I ask, Mr. Speaker, that I may have unanimous consent to insert in the Congressional Record on tomorrow, the entire speech in order that everyone may read what the man actually said and not what the Washington Post said he said or what the Newsweek magazine even quoted him as saying. That part of his speech dealing with dishonesty is as follows:

> Of course, this always happens after a campaign. People begin to write books about the campaign and I have had a real interesting and amusing time reading them. In fact, what they boil down to mostly is that I wasn't dishonest enough in this last campaign to win. [Applause.] It is a little distracting to find writers feeling that in order to win an election one must be dishonest or, at least, a little dishonest. In fact, it has gotten so bad I may write a book myself about this campaign just to get the truth across. If I were going to do that I would include in it something like this.

Mr. Speaker, it is not difficult to see what the warped and wicked mind of a writer can contrive. What Mr. Goldwater was saying was that the people who have been writing these books about the election have been saying that he was not dishonest enough in this last campaign to win. And then by simply leaving out the words "it is a little distracting to find writers feeling that," the reporter was able to put the forked tail and the horns, they pictured Goldwater as having during the campaign, back on the Senator in Chicago by having him say—not the writers of books on the election, but Goldwater himself—"in order to win campaigns one must be dishonest, or a little dishonest."

Of course, those who would continue to shoot their poisoned arrows through the former Senator, in hopes of poisoning the minds of all Americans against anyone who may be inclined to be conservative can easily skip the important words that Goldwater used, when he said, "it is a little distracting" and so forth. This gives an entirely different impression of the speaker from the one the reporters would like to present. As Newsweek said in reporting this speech in their February 1, 1965, issue on page 21:

> But Barry wasn't about to eat humble pie for long. Defiantly, he unleashed a verbal attack on the President as bitter as any he made last year. "What it boils down to," he said, "is that I wasn't dishonest enough to win this campaign."

Does this statement depict the truth of Goldwater's speech?

Is it any wonder, Mr. Speaker, that a very prominent Republican—who was on the floor yesterday and heard the gentleman from Utah [Mr. King] and the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Albert]—made the statement to me, "If Goldwater said that, I am done with him too."

Until tomorrow, when I will have the entire text of the Goldwater speech to insert in the Record, I simply want to express my appreciation to the gentleman from Utah for calling the "big lie," this character assassination, to the attention of the Members of the House, in order that the truth may be properly ventilated.

THE LATE SIR WINSTON CHURCHILL

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Derwinski] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I join Members of the House in paying tribute to a great world statesman, the late Sir Winston Churchill. Americans certainly appreciate and recognize his unique role in history. The Nation mourns his passing as a true friend of freedom whose memory will always be held in special reverence by all Americans. Typical of the press commentary across the country on Churchill's career were the editorials which appeared in Chicago's American and the Chicago Daily News on January 25:

[From Chicago's American, Jan. 25, 1965]

CHURCHILL

(*The life we are today honoring is unique. The oldest amongst us can recall nothing to compare with it. The younger ones among you, however long you live, will never see the like again.*—Harold Macmillan, before House of Commons, July 1964.)

With Sir Winston Churchill, an age of heroes has passed. There are living reminders of it still; there are even still heroes, but they have survived their time. The world does not stir to their voices as it stirred to Churchill's.

We should not really grieve for Churchill. His death was not a tragedy. His life had to end and it ended, in peace and honor, after one last, gallant fight; and we could have wished no better for the old warrior.

What a life it was. Churchill was famous, a leader and shaper of events, in an age so different that it is hard for most of us to imagine. He saw and fought in battles that rang as far off and strange as the wars of the Old Testament. Malakand and Tirah, the world's last great cavalry charge at Omdurman against the dervishes, the siege of Ladysmith in the Boer War.

And not once but twice, before the two Great Wars, he fought the most crucial and heartbreaking battle of all with his own countrymen; he had to plead and argue and flog them into arming themselves against deadly danger.

More than any one man, Churchill could claim a proud title: He was the enemy of Adolph Hitler. He stood against the monstrous indecency of Nazi Germany, rumbling anger and defiance and indomitable will. And his stern, splendid language led the Western World like a banner.

We feel grief at Churchill's passing, of course; we cannot help it. But there is no real cause for grief, unless it is for this world that has grown smaller now.

[From the Chicago Daily News, Jan. 25, 1965]

SIR WINSTON CHURCHILL

Death finally bested the indomitable little man whose mark lies more boldly than any other on our time. But Sir Winston Churchill had given so much of himself to history that the victory, when it came at last, had lost much of its meaning. The imprint had already hardened when Churchill, battered by two successive strokes, gave over the reins of government to Anthony Eden in 1955. It was, and will remain, a mighty imprint.

A man who rises by his own force to tower above his peers may often be a single-minded man, but he will never fall into an easily defined mold.

In the complex interworkings between the man and his times, certain salient characteristics will show through—the resiliency, the humor, the daring, the eloquence, and with Churchill above all, the stubbornness so deeply ingrained that it shaped the very contour of his jaw. But the whole somehow emerges greater than the sum of the parts.

It could not be said in this case that history largely made the man, because history did its persistent worst to destroy him. The great military academy of Sandhurst rebuffed young Churchill twice, and on the third desperate try he crashed the academic gate. The Boers captured him and when he escaped, put a price on his head, but he hid out for days in an old mine and finally made his way to freedom.

His own people rejected him time and again—the Gallipoli disaster was laid to his mishandling as First Lord of the Admiralty, and he was banished to a niche so obscure that he took to painting as a relief from the boredom.

It was such first-rate painting that one of his works was later hung in the Royal Gallery.

His incessant oratory against the rising menace of nazism was scorned ("We have sustained a total and unmitigated defeat," he roared after Munich) until Hitler sent his panzers into Poland in September of 1939. Then he won his old Admiralty post back, and when the war was nearing its lowest ebb, and there was no one else to turn to, the King summoned him to be Prime Minister on May 10, 1940.

No one could have known how apt was the choice, until 3 days later Parliament heard words that shaped history in their very saying:

"I have nothing to offer but blood, toil, sweat and tears. You ask what is our policy? I will say it is to wage war—by sea, land and air, with all our might and with all the strength that God can give us; to wage war against a monstrous tyranny never surpassed in the dark lamentable catalog of human crimes. That is our policy."

Stubbornness, a zestful, almost insolent daring—and humor; these, more than any genius, were what Britain needed, and what Churchill provided. When Dunkirk fell he delivered his solemn, stirring address: "We shall go on to the end; we shall fight in France, we shall fight on the beaches, we shall fight in the fields, in the streets, in the hills." And at the end put his hand over the microphone and muttered: "And we shall hit them over the heads with beer bottles, which is all we really have got."

His memorable tribute to the Royal Air Force after the Battle of Britain was well deserved—but seldom, too, had so many owed so much to a single man.

Cast aside once again when the war was won, the old campaigner returned with undiminished zeal to his writing, to emerge, for his final triumph, to public life in 1951 when, at 76, he regained the premiership in his own right. When he stepped down 4 years later, it was by his own wish.

Churchill lived, wrote, and guided history—but so have many great men. What is unique with Churchill, Lincoln and their kind is that in gaining a world's respect they also won its love. As long as there is a Britain, that love will endure for the square-jawed little man with the bowler hat, the cigar and the twinkling eye who lifted a great people to their finest hour.

Winston Churchill's greatness was in large part seen in his personal courage and the inspiration he gave to his countrymen and people throughout the free world. His heroic leadership of the British people during World War II, coupled with his statesmanlike qualities in recognizing the postwar designs of international communism, were outstanding high points of his career.

The free world has lost a great leader, but he has left a rich and inspiring history that will continue to be a source of strength and inspiration to us.

SUPPLEMENTAL AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Ottinger] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I voted today against an amendment which would hamstring the President in his conduct of foreign policy with respect to the United Arab Republic.

The amendment provides that no funds for surplus food distribution under the supplemental agricultural appropriation bill shall go to the United Arab Republic.

This was not a vote by any means favoring the United Arab Republic or Mr. Nasser, but a vote for giving the President and Secretary of State the flexibility they need for the conduct of our foreign policy. The Constitution places this responsibility with the Executive and this is the only way foreign policy operations can be intelligently exercised.

Broad policy guidelines can be properly established by Congress, setting forth the basic principles upon which our foreign relations should be conducted, but Congress is not the body to decide that we should adopt this or that tactic here or there, stop assistance as a snub to such-and-such a leader, and so forth. Congress, in addition to lacking the constitutional authority for such conduct of foreign affairs, lacks the detailed knowledge of the complex situations in the many countries with which we deal, and lacks the diplomatic expertise to exercise the function of policy conduct intelligently. Once again, the framers of the Constitution demonstrate their farsighted wisdom.

Now, if I were the State Department and were charged with this decision, based on my present knowledge, I certainly would not be giving aid of any kind to Mr. Nasser. I deplore his entry into the Congo to aid the disruptive and savage rebels there. I deplore his expressed contempt for the United States and its assistance. I deplore his permitting wanton destruction of U.S. property without lifting a finger to protect our legitimate rights. I deplore his bellicose actions and attitudes toward Israel and the Jews, including our own Jewish people, of whom I am one.

Nasser's contemptible actions and attitudes, his destructive leadership of the Arab world, more than justify our refusing to give him any kind of aid or comfort. Indeed, we subject ourselves to criticism as being soft and softheaded for continuing aid to Nasser under these conditions, though this harsh assessment is far beyond that enunciated by the Government of Israel. The Israeli Ambassador to the United

States stated his country's position as being for aid to the Arab people in a recent speech, stating:

> We in Israel are not an anti-Arab country, and we never will be. We recognize not just the existence of the Arab States, but the legitimacy of their existence. We are not against the development of the Arab States. We think it is right that they should seek to develop the status and the level of their peoples, just as we in Israel seek to develop and expand the horizons of opportunity for our own people. Thus, we never objected to their getting help for economic development. The real issue, however, lies elsewhere.

Still, I would not have Congress void the President's constitutional power and tie the President's hands under the ruse of its power over appropriations. Let the President decide and take the consequences if his decision is incorrect. The people of the United States have just elected him with an unparalleled vote of confidence. I have confidence that his decision would be right and just.

There may be factors in the administration's decision on such a matter as this that we as Congressmen or the public do not know and cannot be told. How do we know that this assistance is not vital in some arrangement the administration is negotiating with Nasser to get him to mend some of his horrendous actions and attitudes? How do we know that if this assistance is denied, Nasser does not have a commitment to receive it from the Communists or that denial would not drive Nasser more irrevocably into the Communist camp? How do we know that this assistance may not be playing a key role in preventing Nasser from taking some action still more detrimental to our interests than those he has already taken? These are the kinds of questions the Congress is not competent to answer—the kind of action with which our 435 nonexperts are simply not qualified to deal.

The action taken today by the House is just one more instance of destructive congressional interference in foreign policy conduct, depriving the President unconstitutionally of the power delegated to him, and which he must have to intelligently and ably conduct our foreign affairs.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. Edwards of Alabama (at the request of Mr. Gerald R. Ford), beginning tomorrow, January 27, for a period of 10 days on account of official business with Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. Harsha (at the request of Mr. Arends), for today, on account of illness.

Mr. Murphy of New York (at the request of Mr. Farbstein), for January 26 through February 10, 1965, on account of official business.

Mr. Hanna (at the request of Mr. Boggs), for balance of week, on account of official business.

Mr. Flynt (at the request of Mr. Hagan of Georgia), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. Downing (at the request of Mr. Fountain), for today, on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Lindsay (at the request of Mr. Del Clawson), for 1 hour, on January 27, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Halpern (at the request of Mr. Del Clawson), for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. Saylor (at the request of Mr. Del Clawson), for 15 minutes, on Thursday, January 28.

Mr. Berry (at the request of Mr. Del Clawson), for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. Ottinger (at the request of Mr. Evans of Colorado), for 30 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. Del Clawson) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Widnall in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Evans of Colorado) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mrs. Sullivan.
Mr. Farbstein.
Mr. Schmidhauser.
Mr. Patman.
Mr. Pepper.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 16 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, January 27, 1965, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

425. A letter from the Chief Justice, Supreme Court of the United States, transmitting a copy of the report of the proceedings of a special meeting of the Judicial Conference of the United States, held at Washington, D.C., January 13, 1965, pursuant to title 28, United States Code, section 331 (H. Doc. No. 62); to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

426. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report on soil survey and land classification of the lands in the Oroville-Tonasket unit, Chief Joseph Dam, Wash., pursuant to Public Law 83-172; to the Committee on Appropriations.

427. A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a report of the Secretary on the progress of the ROTC flight training program for the period August 1, 1963, to November 30, 1964, pursuant to Public Law 84-879 and section 2110(b) of title 10, United States Code; to the Committee on Armed Services.

428. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on unnecessary costs resulting from leasing rather than purchasing electronic data processing equipment at Mare Island Naval Shipyard, Vallejo, Calif., Department of the Navy; to the Committee on Government Operations.

429. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on wage rates for federally financed building construction improperly determined in excess of the prevailing rates for similar work in New England areas, Department of Labor; to the Committee on Government Operations.

430. A letter from the Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting a copy of the 78th annual report on the activities of the Commission for fiscal year ended June 30, 1964; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

431. A letter from the secretary-treasurer, Congressional Medal of Honor Society, United States of America, transmitting the annual audit report of the society for the calendar year 1964, pursuant to Public Law 88-504; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

432. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, transmitting a report on the disposition of four GS-17 positions allocated to the agency, pursuant to section 1105a of title 5 of the United States Code; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

433. A letter from the Deputy Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MAHON: Committee on Appropriations. House Joint Resolution 234. Joint resolution making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, for certain activities of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H.R. 3576. A bill to implement further the constitutional right to bail by authorizing in appropriate cases the release on a personal recognizance of persons otherwise eligible for bail; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3577. A bill to assure that convicted persons will receive credit toward service of their sentences for time spent in custody for lack of bail; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3578. A bill to further implement the constitutional right to bail by permitting persons admitted to bail to make a cash deposit with the court in lieu of providing securities or other collateral security; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATES:

H.R. 3579. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that an individual may deduct amounts paid for his higher education, or for the higher education of any of his dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H.R. 3580. A bill to remove the excise tax on musical instruments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURKE:

H.R. 3581. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to provide for the greater protection of the President and the Vice President of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 3582. A bill to provide for the addition of certain property in Philadelphia, Pa., to Independence National Historical Park; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 3583. A bill to provide a hospital insurance program for the aged under social security, to amend the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system to increase benefits, improve the actuarial status of the disability insurance trust fund, and extend coverage, to amend the Social Security Act to provide additional Federal financial participation in the Federal-State public assistance programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 3584. A bill to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide further for the prevention of accidents in coal mines; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 3585. A bill to establish a system of loan insurance to assist students to attend institutions of higher education and post-secondary vocational schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California:

H.R. 3586. A bill to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and section 705(b) of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 and to amend the first proviso of section 8(a)(3) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 3587. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the San Felipe division, Central Valley project, California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 3588. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3589. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, to establish the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, to provide grants for research and development, to increase grants for construction of municipal sewage treatment works, to authorize the establishment of standards of water quality to aid in preventing, controlling, and abating pollution of interstate waters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 3590. A bill to provide a hospital insurance program for the aged under social security, to amend the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system to increase benefits, improve the actuarial status of the disability insurance trust fund, and extend coverage, to amend the Social Security Act to provide additional Federal financial participation in the Federal-State public assistance programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 3591. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to reduce from 65 to 62 the age at which the additional exemption on account of age becomes allowable; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H.R. 3592. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H.R. 3593. A bill to require the expenditure of 35 percent of the funds expended for the conversion, alteration, and repair of naval vessels to be expended with private ship repair yards; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.R. 3594. A bill to fix certain fees payable to the Commissioner of Patents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 3595. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide for the adjustment of inequities and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. HANSEN of Washington:

H.R. 3596. A bill to provide for the disposition of judgment funds on deposit to the credit of the Skokomish Tribe of Indians; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD (by request):

H.R. 3597. A bill to authorize appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. IRWIN:

H.R. 3598. A bill to authorize the sale, without regard to the 6-month waiting period prescribed, of zinc proposed to be disposed of pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 3599. A bill to authorize the temporary release of 100,000 short tons of copper from the national stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McCLORY:

H.R. 3600. A bill to adjust wheat and feed grain production, to establish a cropland retirement program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MACGREGOR:

H.R. 3601. A bill to require the establishment, on the basis of the 19th and subsequent decennial censuses, of congressional districts composed of contiguous and compact territory for the election of Representatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOELLER:

H.R. 3602. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase to $2,400 the annual amount individuals are permitted to earn without suffering deduction from the monthly insurance benefits payable to them under such title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H.R. 3603. A bill to increase to 15 percent the night duty differential of postal field service employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 3604. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act in order to exclude from the definition of interstate commerce for the purposes of such act commerce directly between any point in a State and any point on the Outer Continental Shelf and commerce between points in the same State through such Continental Shelf; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 3605. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, to establish the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, to provide grants for research and development, to increase grants for construction of municipal sewage treatment works, to authorize the establishment of standards of water quality to aid in preventing, controlling, and abating pollution of interstate waters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. O'BRIEN:

H.R. 3606. A bill to promote a more adequate national program of water research; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. O'HARA of Michigan:

H.R. 3607. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act to extend its protection to employees of certain hospitals and nursing homes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PICKLE:

H.R. 3608. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act, as amended, in respect of the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission over nonprofit cooperatives; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. POAGE:

H.R. 3609. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. QUIE:

H.R. 3610. A bill to make bedding subject to the provisions of the Flammable Fabrics Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 3611. A bill to amend the act of June 29, 1906, to apply to the transportation of animals in interstate commerce by motor vehicle; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H.R. 3612. A bill to provide for the rehabilitation of the Eklutna project, Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Br. Mr. SHRIVER:

H.R. 3613. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to abolish the renewal requirement for licenses in the safety and special radio services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SICKLES:

H.R. 3614. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3615. A bill to designate the Veterans' Administration hospital being constructed in the District of Columbia as the Melvin J. Maas Memorial Hospital; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H.R. 3616. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to extend the period of entitlement to education and training benefits for certain veterans of the Korean conflict; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 3617. A bill to establish a National Arts Foundation; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H.R. 3618. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.R. 3619. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to provide for the greater protection of the President and the Vice President of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3620. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3621. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide for the adjustment of inequities and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 3622. A bill to provide a hospital insurance program for the aged under social security, to amend the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system to increase benefits, improve the actuarial status of the disability insurance trust fund, and extend coverage, to amend the Social Security Act to provide additional Federal financial participation in the Federal-State public assistance programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MAHON:

H.J. Res. 234. Joint resolution making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, for certain activities of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.J. Res. 235. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to succession to the Presidency and Vice-Presidency and to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LOVE:

H.J. Res. 236. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to succession to the Presidency and Vice-Presidency and to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. QUIE:

H.J. Res. 237. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of the President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 238. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHWEIKER:

H.J. Res. 239. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to succession to the Presidency and Vice Presidency and to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLL:

H.J. Res. 240. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to succession to the Presidency and Vice Presidency and to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H.J. Res. 241. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOWDY:

H.J. Res. 242. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DENT (by request):

H.J. Res. 243. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the third Sunday in October of each year as Free Enterprise Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONTE:

H. Con. Res. 133. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the people of the United States should not be denied an opportunity to view the film prepared by the U.S. Information Agency entitled "John F. Kennedy—Years of Lightning, Day of Drums"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H. Con. Res. 134. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the United Nations conduct free elections in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia under its supervision and punish all Soviet Communists who are guilty of crimes against the people of the Baltic States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McCLORY:

H. Con. Res. 135. Concurrent resolution requesting the President of the United States to urge certain actions with respect to Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CONTE:

H. Res. 140. Resolution establishing a Special Committee on the Captive Nations; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FALLON:

H. Res. 141. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Public Works to conduct studies and investigations within the jurisdiction of such committee; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 142. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the studies, investigations, and inquiries authorized by House Resolution 141; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. McCLORY:

H. Res. 143. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that Soviet religious persecution be condemned; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WOLFF:

H. Res. 144. Resolution establishing a Special Committee on the Captive Nations; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to expressing opposition of the Oklahoma State Legislature to the proposed elimination of the U.S. Army Reserve and reorganization of the National Guard; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting Congress to call a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States regarding reapportionment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting Congress to call a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States regarding apportionment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred to as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 3623. A bill for the relief of Demijohn D. Downer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3624. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Albert Benaksas, and minor child, Joseph Benaksas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BETTS:

H.R. 3625. A bill for the relief of Mr. Alfred Estrada; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia (by request):

H.R. 3626. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Araxie K. Anbardjian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3627. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Forgione; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3628. A bill for the relief of Ozen Ayse Gercin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3629. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Luitgard R. Oswald; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3630. A bill for the relief of Charlie Jacob Danfora and his sons, Romel Charlie Danfora, Naji Charlie Danfora, and Nicola Charlie Danfora; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 3631. A bill for the relief of John Sinclair; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H.R. 3632. A bill for the relief of Sau Hung Wong and Wai Kin Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.R. 3633. A bill for the relief of Donald Loo, also known as Loo Hong Mun; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3634. A bill for the relief of C.W.O. Edward E. Kreiss; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3635. A bill for the relief of Romana Costa Edwards; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3636. A bill for the relief of Kenneth Wu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 3637. A bill for the relief of Mieczyslaw Miskowiec; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEVINE:

H.R. 3638. A bill for the relief of Robert O. Overton, Marjorie C. Overton, and Sally Eitel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DULSKI (by request):

H.R. 3639. A bill for the relief of Dr. Juliet Hananian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee:

H.R. 3640. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ava Howard Taylor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. DWYER:

H.R. 3641. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Kerstin Margareta Codrington; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California:

H.R. 3642. A bill for the relief of Enrique Aurelio Baca-Patlan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 3643. A bill for the relief of Patricia Tung Ling Wai; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3644. A bill for the relief of Benjamin Alexander Shafran; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARNSLEY:

H.R. 3645. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Venus Ballesteros Tanamachi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 3646. A bill for the relief of Fitz Neptune (also known as Fitz Mims); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 3647. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the U.S. Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Colvern D. Henry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GROVER:

H.R. 3648. A bill for the relief of Kim Sa Suk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3649. A bill for the relief of Vito Di Lisi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IRWIN:

H.R. 3650. A bill for the relief of Peter Carson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEITH:

H.R. 3651. A bill for the relief of Joseph Ferreira Benevides; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of California:

H.R. 3652. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Antica Dominis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 3653. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Styliani Papathanasiou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGRATH:

H.R. 3654. A bill for the relief of David Bagg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts:

H.R. 3655. A bill for the relief of Maria de Conceicao Botelho; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3656. A bill for the relief of Carlos Vita; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H.R. 3657. A bill for the relief of Antonio Ingraffia, his wife, Alfonsa Monteleone Ingraffia, and their minor son, Salvatore Ingraffia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3658. A bill for the relief of Ovadia Sutton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3659. A bill for the relief of Kauders-Steuber Co., and Max N. Tobias and Max N. Tobias Bag Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN:

H.R. 3660. A bill for the relief of Nicholas Viaggino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3661. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Aristide Isolino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3662. A bill for the relief of Sister Lourdes Buesa Oliver and Sister Rufina Matilde Gonzalez-Garcia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3663. A bill for the relief of Yu Bing Chuck, Yu Lai Jing, Yu Lai Chun, and Yu Bing Cheong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.R. 3664. A bill for the relief of Magdalene Lolakas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H.R. 3665. A bill for the relief of Inger J. Ladegaard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3666. A bill for the relief of Wilfredo C. Causing; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3667. A bill for the relief of Dr. Nathaniel Y. Cualoping and his wife, Dr. Lourdes Cualoping; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3668. A bill for the relief of Khurshed Bhumgara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3669. A bill for the relief of Emilia Majka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3670. A bill for the relief of Isaac Fuad Roubein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3671. A bill for the relief of Giuseppina Restivo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 3672. A bill for the relief of Mr. Elemer Gagor Kaloczy-Farkas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 3673. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Adriana Alexandria Lyle; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3674. A bill for the relief of Natalie Ann Doloris Mary Sergenti (also known as Lee Carry, Ligeia Caravias, and Lygia Panagiotis Karavias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RESNICK:

H.R. 3675. A bill for the relief of Rocco Agostino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3676. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Masaka O'Hara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3677. A bill for the relief of Alberico Nardone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3678. A bill for the relief of Miss Ulla Lofgren; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY of New York:

H.R. 3679. A bill for the relief of Franca Fausto Stellino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 3680. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Han Pill Glassman (nee Yoo); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3681. A bill for the relief of Abraham Segal and his wife, Elana Zipora Segal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H.R. 3682. A bill for the relief of Zenaida Legaspi Mayuga; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3683. A bill for the relief of Paciencia Mallari; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHWEIKER:

H.R. 3684. A bill for the relief of Maj. Alexander F. Berol, U.S. Army, retired; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLL:

H.R. 3685. A bill for the relief of Russell D. Harris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAN DEERLIN:

H.R. 3686. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Carole Ann Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3687. A bill for the relief of Rene Sportes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3688. A bill for the relief of Emilio Akitoshi Iguchi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3689. A bill for the relief of Juanita Cereguine de Burgh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.R. 3690. A bill for the relief of George Mattar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H.R. 3691. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Joanna Ryten Zund; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3692. A bill for the relief of William F. Kuhlman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3693. A bill for the relief of Murray Moritz Jacobson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3694. A bill to confer authority upon the Secretary of the Army to pay certain claims of Ottinger Bros.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3695. A bill for the relief of Francesco Rizzuto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3696. A bill for the relief of Dr. Cenon Q. Baltazar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WYATT:

H.R. 3697. A bill for the relief of Oh Wha Ja (Penny Korleen Doughty); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YATES (by request):

H.R. 3698. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Inge Hemmersbach Hilton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

81. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Francisco Cepero, Santurce, P.R., with reference to a redress of grievances relative to the application of the 14th amendment; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

82. Also, petition of C. A. Castle, Washington, D.C., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to requesting that the United States tabulate imports c.i.f. as most countries do; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

83. Also, petition of Clarence E. Caldwell, Columbus, Ohio, with reference to a redress of grievance relative to article 1 of the U.S. Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

Tuesday, January 26, 1965

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Most Reverend Jaroslav Gabro, Ukrainian Catholic bishop of Chicago, Ill., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, giver of wisdom and source of all knowledge, in Your infinite solicitude for mankind, You have willed that we should attain to measures of well-being and happiness on earth that are in accord with Your immutable and universal laws. One gift of inestimable value that rejoices the hearts of free men throughout the world is the choice of self-government through judicial bodies that are dedicated to the principles of moral government for the welfare of their fellow men.

We pause at this moment to express our reverent gratitude for the favorable circumstances that divine providence has granted us toward the preservation of a free government, wherein our industry and labor, our science, technology, and all humanities are blended in such admirable combination for the advancement of our American society.

In equally humble fashion, O Lord, we ask Your assistance, that a constant spirit of wisdom and perseverance will direct our esteemed President of the United States, and that Your blessing of counsel and equanimity will remain in abundant measure with this august body, the honorable Senate of the United States. May all their deliberations be entered into with justice, formulated in charity, and promulgated in harmony.

These benefits are in excess of our exclusive human ability to achieve, and therefore we pronounce this propitiatory admission, for the perpetuation of all these qualities in our Government through Your divine guidance.

The bestowal of these blessings, we realize, is never limited to any single people in the family of nations; and we pray that the ideals integrated into our civil and religious heritage may serve as a God-given inspiration to such comparable attainments as are suited to the particular needs of all mankind, whose souls are imbued with similar aspirations to be the free and proper stewards of their land under the benevolence of divine providence.

In particular, we pray for the Ukrainian nation, whose proclamation of national independence 47 years ago has yet to be realized. As fortunate citizens of a free society, we are keenly aware of the plight of a nation whose struggle for self-determination is not over. The heroic striving for this victory, nevertheless, remains undiminished; and in recent months this hope has been emphasized in America and throughout the world. The dedication of the statue of Taras Shevchenko, the national poet of Ukraine, whose name is synonymous with the "bard of freedom," is an enduring reminder that the spirit and culture of Ukraine, of which Shevchenko is so integral a factor, today are vital forces that preserve a nation in its hour of oppression. Our fervent prayer is that the blessings achieved in a democracy of freedom such as ours may soon be the expectation of the Ukrainian nation, as well as of all nations that remain forcibly deprived of these benefits.

We pray that our United States of America will ever remain a bulwark of moral government and conscientious leadership for the entire world, and that our distinguished Senate of the United States, today entering into its 89th session, will continue to enrich its prestige with the competent resolution of the tasks it has dedicated itself to resolve for the welfare of our country.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, January 23, 1965, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

THE BUDGET—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 15)

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the budget message from the President of the United States. Inasmuch as the message was read in the House of Representatives, the message will be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Appropriations, without being read.

The message from the President was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am presenting to you today the budget of the United States for the fiscal year 1966.

A budget is a plan of action. It defines our goals, charts our courses, and outlines our expectations. It reflects hard decisions and difficult choices. This budget is no exception.

It is a budget of priorities. It provides for what we must do, but not for all we would like to do.

It is a budget of both opportunity and sacrifice. It begins to grasp the opportunities of the Great Society. It is restrained by the sacrifices we must continue to make in order to keep our defenses strong and flexible.

This budget provides reasonably for our needs. It is not extravagant. Neither is it miserly.

It stands on five basic principles:

Government fiscal policies must promote national strength, economic progress, and individual opportunity.

Our tax system must continue to be made less burdensome, more equitable, and more conducive to continued economic expansion.

The Great Society must be a bold society. It must not fear to meet new challenges. It must not fail to seize new opportunities.

The Great Society must be a compassionate society. It must always be responsive to human needs.

The Great Society must be an efficient society. Less urgent programs must give way to make room for higher priority needs. And each program, old and new, must be conducted with maximum efficiency, economy, and productivity.

The major features of the 1966 budget translate these principles into action.

First, excise taxes are substantially reduced. Social security benefits, including hospital insurance, are increased. These are combined with other expenditure increases to yield an overall fiscal policy designed to maintain our steady economic expansion.

Second, the budget supports a massive Defense Establishment of steadily growing power, within reduced outlays.

Third, our international and space programs are being advanced at a satisfactory rate, but with smaller increases than in earlier years.

Fourth, expanded programs and higher expenditures are proposd to—

Provide better and more education for our children.

Extend the war against poverty.

Promote advances in the Nation's health.

Improve conditions in the urban areas where most of us live.

Help the Appalachian region lift itself out of its present depressed condition.

Strengthen our social security protection.

Increase economic opportunities in rural communities.

Encourage sound use of our natural resources.

Conserve natural beauty in our land.

Fifth, a large part of the funds for needed program expansion has come from savings, reductions, and economies in other parts of the budget.

FISCAL POLICY

This budget recognizes that a growing economy is needed to promote national strength and progress. It is also needed to move us toward a balanced budget. When the economy slows down, Federal revenues fall and spending tends to increase. The result is larger, not smaller, budget deficits.

Nearly 4 years ago, this Nation began its fourth postwar economic expansion. With the help of last year's income tax reduction—the largest and most comprehensive ever enacted—this expansion has already outlasted each of the previous three postwar recoveries.

During the past 4 years, the Nation's real output of goods and services—the gross national product—has grown at an average rate of about 5 percent per year.

New highs have been achieved in employment, income, and profits. Unemployment has been reduced. Price stability has been maintained.

This is a creditable record of achievement. And we look forward to continued growth in the year ahead. The Nation's output in calendar year 1965 is expected to reach $660 billion, plus or minus $5 billion.

Nevertheless, we must keep in mind that our economy is still producing at a level well below its potential. Nearly 4 million people are out of work. The unemployment rate is still nearly 5 percent. Plants and machines are standing idle while human wants and needs go unmet. An estimated 35 million people continue to live in poverty.

We cannot substitute last year's achievements for next year's goals; nor can we meet next year's challenge with last year's budget.

The revenue and expenditure proposals presented in the 1966 budget are carefully designed to promote continued economic expansion and improved economic opportunities.

This budget takes into account the need to reduce the Nation's balance-of-payments deficit. During the last calendar year, the deficit showed a significant decline. To help insure continued improvement, I will intensify efforts to carry out Federal activities with the least possible burden on our balance of payments.

BUDGET SUMMARY

Administrative budget: In preparing this budget, I have applied exacting tests of efficiency and necessity to all proposed expenditures. As a result, total administrative budget expenditures are being held to $99.7 billion in 1966. Although expenditures will rise by a relatively small amount, they will decline as a percent of the gross national product—to less than 15 percent, the lowest ratio achieved in 15 years.

Administrative budget receipts are expected to increase in 1966 to $94.4 billion. This is $3.2 billion over the estimated level for 1965. This increase reflects the economic growth anticipated in calendar year 1965. It also takes into account the revenue losses from proposed excise tax changes and from the second stage of income tax cuts enacted last year.

The resulting 1966 administrative budget deficit of $5.3 billion is $1 billion lower than the 1965 deficit, marking continued progress toward a balanced budget.

As our population increases, as science and technology change our methods of doing things, as our wants multiply with the growth in our incomes, and as urbanization creates new problems, there is growing need for more public and private services. It is evident that unless defense needs should decline substantially, Government expenditures will continue to rise over the long run.

At the same time, we have good reason to expect that Government expenditures in the years ahead will grow more slowly than the gross national product, so that the ratio of Federal spending to our total output will continue to decline.

The expenditures proposed in this budget reflect a careful balancing of national goals against budgetary costs. The budget I now present will, in my judgment, carry out the responsibilities of the Federal Government efficiently and wisely. It was constructed on that basis alone.

My budgets for both 1965 and 1966 have provided for major increases in areas of high national priority—particularly education, health, aid to the needy, housing, and the war on poverty. Also, for these 2 consecutive years, careful pruning of less urgent programs and vigorous cost reduction efforts have, on balance, resulted in lower expenditures in other major sectors of the budget. The application of these strict policies of priority and frugality is evident in the modest growth in administrative budget expenditures.

The changing Federal budget

[Fiscal years. In billions]

Description	Administrative budget expenditures				
	1964 actual	Change, 1964 to 1965	1965 estimate	Change, 1965 to 1966	1966 estimate
National defense and space	$58.4	−$1.3	$57.1	−$0.4	$56.7
Interest	10.8	+.5	11.3	+.3	11.6
Health, labor, education, housing and community development, economic opportunity program, and aid to the needy	6.7	+.7	7.4	+3.6	11.0
All other	21.8	−.1	21.7	−1.3	20.4
Total, administrative budget	97.7	−.2	97.5	+2.2	99.7

Consolidated cash statement: The administrative budget is based on a definition of Federal spending which excludes such important Federal activities as social security and highway construction that are financed through trust funds. A more comprehensive measure of the Government's finances is the consolidated cash budget which covers all of the Government's programs.

On the consolidated cash basis, total payments to the public are estimated at $127.4 billion in 1966. Total receipts from the public are estimated at $123.5 billion, resulting in a net excess of payments of $3.9 billion. The estimated increase of $6 billion in cash payments in 1966 over 1965 is mostly in trust funds which are financed by special taxes.

About $9.5 billion of the nondefense payments recommended in this budget—almost 2½ times the size of the entire cash deficit—represent an investment in physical and financial assets which will provide benefits to the Nation for many years to come. These payments are made for Federal civil public works, equipment, and loans as well as for highways, hospitals, and other State, local, and private assets.

Federal sector, national income accounts: Another measure of Federal finance which includes trust funds emphasizes the direct impact of Government fiscal activities on the economy. This measure is based on the national income accounts. Under this concept, Federal fiscal data are estimated on an accrual rather than a cash basis. Purely financial transactions—such as loan—which do not directly affect production or income are excluded. On this basis, the deficit for 1966 is estimated at $6 billion.

Summary of Federal receipts and payments

[Fiscal years. In billions]

Description	1964 actual	1965 estimate	1966 estimate
FEDERAL RECEIPTS			
Administrative budget receipts	$89.5	$91.2	$94.4
Trust fund receipts	30.3	30.5	33.6
Deduct: Intragovernmental transactions	4.3	4.3	4.5
Total cash receipts from the public	115.5	117.4	123.5
Add: Adjustment from cash to accrual basis	−.7	−.9	−1.8

Summary of Federal receipts and payments—Continued

[Fiscal years. In billions]

Description	1964 actual	1965 estimate	1966 estimate
FEDERAL RECEIPTS—con.			
Deduct: Receipts from loans, property sales, and other adjustments	0.2	0.5	0.7
National income account receipts, Federal sector	114.7	116.0	121.0
FEDERAL PAYMENTS			
Administrative budget expenditures	97.7	97.5	99.7
Trust fund expenditures (including Government-sponsored enterprises	28.9	29.0	32.9
Deduct: Intragovernmental transactions and other adjustments	6.2	5.1	5.2
Total cash payments to the public	120.3	121.4	127.4
Add: Adjustment from cash to accrual basis	1.8	1.7	1.1
Deduct: Disbursements for loans, land purchases, and other adjustments	3.6	2.1	1.5
National income account expenditures, Federal sector	118.5	121.0	127.0
EXCESS OF RECEIPTS (+) OR PAYMENTS (−)			
Administrative budget	−8.2	−6.3	−5.3
Receipts from and payments to the public	−4.8	−4.0	−3.9
National income accounts, Federal sector	−3.9	−5.0	−6.0

Federal expenditures as measured by the national income accounts are estimated to rise by $6 billion in 1966. This increase—covering both purchases of goods and services and other types of payments—will provide a strong stimulus for continued economic growth.

FEDERAL REVENUES

The Revenue Act of 1964 has played a major role in widening and strengthening our prosperity. At the beginning of this month, the second stage of the rate reductions provided under the act became effective. In total, last year's tax law will decrease consumer and business tax liabilities by about $14 billion in the current calendar year.

With this substantial change in income taxes completed, it is now appropriate to revise and adjust excise taxes as well. Some of the present excises are costly and inefficient to administer. Some impose onerous recordkeeping burdens on small business. Some distort consumer choices as among different kinds of goods.

Receipts from the public

[Fiscal years. In billions]

Source	1964 actual	1965 estimate	1966 estimate
Administrative budget receipts:			
Individual income taxes	$48.7	$47.0	$48.2
Corporation income taxes	23.5	25.6	27.6
Excise taxes	10.2	10.7	9.8
Other	7.1	7.9	8.8
Total administrative budget receipts	89.5	91.2	94.4
Trust fund receipts:			
Employment taxes	16.8	16.7	18.7
Deposits by States, unemployment insurance	3.0	3.0	2.9
Excise taxes	3.5	3.6	4.0
Federal employee and agency payments for retirement	2.0	2.2	2.2
Interest on trust fund investments	1.6	1.7	1.9
Veterans life insurance premiums	.5	.5	.5
Other	2.8	2.8	3.5
Total trust fund receipts	30.3	30.5	33.6
Intragovernmental transactions (deduct)	4.3	4.3	4.5
Total receipts from the public	115.5	117.4	123.5

Within the revenue requirements for continued progress toward a balanced budget, I believe it is vital that we correct the most pressing of these deficiencies this year. I plan to transmit to the Congress recommendations to repeal some excise taxes and reduce others. In addition to improving the tax system, the recommended changes will increase purchasing power and stimulate further growth in the economy.

These changes should become effective July 1, 1965. They will reduce tax liabilities on a full-year basis by $1.75 billion. Revenues collected by the Treasury in 1966 will be reduced by $1.5 billion.

My other major revenue proposals this year involve important activities financed through trust funds.

I am recommending prompt enactment of a hospital insurance program for elderly persons, who are finding hospital and medical costs far greater than their ability to pay. This program should be self-financing, with a combined employer-employee payroll contribution of 0.6 percent on the first $5,600 of income to start in calendar year 1966.

I am also recommending an increase from $4,800 to $5,600 in the wage base on which social security taxes are paid. This would take effect on January 1, 1966, and would be coupled with a smaller increase in the payroll tax than is scheduled at that date under existing law. These changes will provide the funds for the needed increases being proposed in old-age, survivors, and disability insurance benefits.

While I am recommending reductions in certain excise taxes, I am also proposing increases in certain other excise taxes which are in the nature of user charges. The excise taxes for which I am recommending reduction or repeal are not associated with the provision of particular Government services. However, certain existing excises on transportation are in effect a charge for the use of facilities and services provided by the Government. In these cases, I am proposing changes in user charges for transportation so that different modes of transportation can compete on more equitable and efficient terms and users of special Government services will pay a greater share of the costs.

The estimated cost of completing the Interstate Highway System—which is financed by highway user taxes—has recently been increased by $5.8 billion. To avoid serious delay in completing the system, while remaining on a pay-as-you-go basis, I will include in my excise tax proposals specific recommendations for increasing certain highway user charges.

In contrast to the users of the highways, the users of the airways and inland waterways bear considerably less than the full cost of the Government investments and services provided them. Accordingly, I am recommending increased or new taxes on aviation gasoline and jet fuels and a new tax on air freight for commercial aviation. Receipts from the existing 2-cent tax on aviation gasoline should be kept in the general fund rather than transferred to the highway trust fund, and the 5-percent ticket tax on air passengers should be made permanent. A fuel tax for inland waterway users is also being proposed.

I will continue to press for other user charges in Government programs where benefits are provided to specific, identifiable individuals and businesses. Fairness to all taxpayers demands that those who enjoy special benefits should bear a greater share of the costs. Legislation is needed for some of the charges, such as patent and meat inspection fees. In other instances, equitable user charges will be instituted through administrative action.

I will also present recommendations to correct certain abuses in the tax-exempt privileges enjoyed by private foundations.

NEW OBLIGATIONAL AUTHORITY

This budget includes new obligational authority for 1966 of $106.4 billion in the administrative budget.

Ninety-three billion five hundred million dollars of this requires congressional action this year.

Twelve billion nine hundred million dollars represents permanent authorizations that do not require further congressional action, mainly the appropriation for interest on the public debt.

Most of the $34.5 billion in new obligational authority recommended for 1966 for trust funds represents revenues from special taxes which are automatically appropriated.

New obligational authority

[Fiscal years. In billions]

Description	1964 actual	1965 estimate	1966 estimate
Total authorization requiring current action by Congress:			
Administrative budget funds	$87.9	$94.5	$93.5
Trust funds	.4	1.4	.5
Total authorizations not requiring current action by Congress:			
Administrative budget funds	$13.2	$12.8	$12.9
Trust funds	31.2	30.3	34.0
Total new obligational authority:			
Administrative budget funds	101.1	107.3	106.4
Trust funds	31.5	31.8	34.5

The 1965 estimate in the administrative budget includes $6 billion of recommended supplemental authorizations. These authorizations will provide funds for several programs for which I am requesting immediate consideration and enactment—for example, housing activities and aid to Appalachia. The new obligational authority and related expenditures under these supplemental proposals are reflected fully in the estimates presented in this budget.

FEDERAL PROGRAMS AND EXPENDITURES

The soundness of a budget can only be judged by the merits of the programs it proposes and the levels of expenditure it recommends. For both old and new programs, merit turns on a weighing of benefits against costs. In constructing this budget, I have tried to apply this approach to the entire range of Government operations.

Payments to the public

[Fiscal years. In billions]

Function	1964 actual	1965 estimate	1966 estimate
Administrative budget expenditures:			
National defense	$54.2	$52.2	$51.6
International affairs and finance	3.7	4.0	4.0
Of which food for peace	(1.7)	(1.7)	(1.7)
Space research and technology	4.2	4.9	5.1
Agriculture and agricultural resources (not including food for peace)	5.6	4.5	3.9
Natural resources	2.5	2.7	2.7
Commerce and transportation	3.0	3.4	2.8
Housing and community development	−.1	−.3	[1]
Health, labor, and welfare	5.5	6.2	8.3
Education	1.3	1.5	2.7
Veterans benefits and services	5.5	5.4	4.6
Interest	10.8	11.3	11.6
General government	2.3	2.4	2.5
Allowance for Appalachia	--------	[1]	.1
Allowance for contingencies	--------	.1	.4
Interfund transactions (deduct)	.7	.8	.6
Total administrative budget expenditures	97.7	97.5	99.7
Trust fund expenditures:			
Health, labor, and welfare	22.7	23.4	26.5
Commerce and transportation	3.5	3.9	3.7
National defense	.5	.8	1.0
Housing and community development	1.9	.2	.8
Veterans' benefits and services	.7	.6	.5
All other	.1	.6	1.0
Interfund transactions (deduct)	.5	.6	.6
Total trust fund expenditures	28.9	29.0	32.9
Intragovernmental transactions and other adjustments (deduct)	6.2	5.1	5.2
Total payments to the public	120.3	121.4	127.4

[1] Less than $50,000,000.

As the year unfolds, developments may occur which call for prompt action by the Government. This is particularly true in international affairs, in the civil supersonic aircraft program, and in moving ahead with the recommendations resulting from various studies and analyses I am requesting such as that related to military and civilian pay.

Specific legislation and appropriations to meet such contingencies will be proposed as needed, but the amounts which may be required cannot now be estimated with any confidence. The budget therefore includes an allowance for contingencies of $650 million in new obligational authority and $400 million in expenditures. These amounts are larger than is customary. Their inclusion makes it clear that the budget totals are intended to provide adequately for meeting new needs that may arise or seizing new opportunities that may be presented.

Here are the highlights of my expenditure recommendations:

National defense: We cannot afford second-best defense forces. Neither can we afford to be wasteful.

Our defense forces have reached new levels of strength. With the rapid strides made in the past 4 years and the future gains already scheduled, our powerful modern forces will be adequate to their tasks for years to come. In cooperation with our allies, we have now provided for:

Forces able to deter nuclear attack.

Forces able to counter conventional aggression and prevent the piecemeal erosion of the free world.

Forces, in short, able to promote peace.

We still have improvements to make. We must maintain a strong research and development program to insure that our forces are always the most modern in the world.

The 1966 budget fully provides for these needs.

However, we are able to reduce our defense expenditures in 1966 because:

The buildup of our forces, which started in 1961, is nearly complete.

The vigorous cost reduction program of the Department of Defense is producing large savings.

Less effective and less economical forces are being retired or reduced as promptly as possible.

International affairs and finance: We cannot achieve lasting world peace with armaments alone. Nor can greater worldwide prosperity be bought with money alone. These goals will be achieved only through the hard work, patience, understanding, and strength of men of good will everywhere.

Yet it is essential that we continue to put our best energies and some of our vast economic resources to work in solving the problems the world faces today. Prudent and careful expenditures for our international programs can help to keep men free, to promote understanding, and to substitute cooperation and negotiation for force in world affairs.

The 1966 budget calls for only a very modest increase in foreign economic assistance expenditures. With these funds, we will continue to concentrate our aid efforts in those less developed countries that are demonstrating the will and determination required to achieve political stability and economic growth.

We shall maintain our firm commitment to the Alliance for Progress—the focus of our efforts to achieve unity and understanding in this hemisphere. As an important part of this commitment, I recommend prompt action to permit our participation in the expansion of the Inter-American Development Bank.

This budget also enables us to:

Continue our participation in and support for the United Nations.

Maintain an adequate and alert network of diplomatic posts around the world.

Improve our oversea information activities, so that others may know us not just as a rich nation, but as a free and responsible nation as well.

Expand the Peace Corps, by now a proven experiment in international cooperation.

In an important step to strengthen the free world's financial system, the members of the International Monetary Fund are considering an increase in quotas. Upon completion of these discussions, expected shortly, I shall recommend that the Congress authorize promptly the funds needed to provide the U.S. share of this increase.

Space research and technology: This Nation has embarked on a bold program of space exploration and research which holds promise of rich rewards in many fields of American life. Our boldness is clearly indicated by the broad scope of our program and by our intent to send men to the moon within this decade.

The costs are high—as we knew they would be when we launched this effort. We have seen a rise in annual expenditures for the space program from less than one-half billion dollars in 1960 to over $4 billion in 1964.

Expenditures are continuing to increase. However, we have built up momentum and are concentrating on our highest priority goals. Therefore, we will no longer need to increase space outlays by huge sums each year in order to meet our present objectives.

This budget proposes that expenditures increase by $200 million in 1966 over 1965. This is the smallest annual increase since 1959. The new obligational authority requested is about the same as enacted for 1965.

Agriculture and agricultural resources: The increased production efficiency of our farms has contributed greatly to growth of the national economy. This efficiency, in turn, has contributed, along with our high per capita income, to making us the best-fed nation in the world, while men are leaving farms and entering other occupations.

However, because of lack of adequate employment opportunities, the rapidly declining need for people to operate our farms has also meant low incomes for all too many of our rural families. We must therefore find ways to help provide a greater share of our national prosperity for those rural families that do not farm or who can no longer look to farming as a sole source of income.

Progress toward this goal will be made both through broader programs to fight poverty and through programs specially aimed at increasing economic opportunities and improving living conditions for rural people. The latter include a proposal for an insured loan program which will help provide more and better housing in rural areas.

I shall shortly transmit to the Congress my recommendations to continue and improve our farm commodity programs.

For the longer run, we need to explore new approaches to the problems with which the farm commodity programs are designed to deal.

I have directed the Secretary of Agriculture to make a comprehensive review of the kinds of programs needed for the changing farm economy. I strongly believe that programs can be designed that will continue the national benefit from our present highly efficient commercial agriculture, bolster farm income, put less burden on the Federal budget, and direct more of our effort to the problems of low-income farmers.

Natural resources: During its last session, the Congress passed a number of far-reaching laws that will advance significantly the development, conservation, and use of our natural resources. They include the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act, the Wilderness Act, and the Water Resources Research Act. The 1966 budget will implement these measures.

The budget also recommends the start of 37 new projects by the Corps of Engineers, 9 new projects by the Bureau of Reclamation, and 5 new projects by the Tennessee Valley Authority.

About two-thirds of the total expenditures for natural resources will be used to continue construction and operation of projects to provide water, control floods, improve navigation, and generate power.

Increased attention has been focused in recent years on the importance of the wise use and conservation of our water resources. Federal investment in water and related resources development has grown sharply—and is expected to grow further in the period ahead.

Urban, industrial, and recreational requirements for water have increased greatly in recent years and will continue to increase as our economy grows. The relative priorities of many historic water uses, including cropland, are changing. The implications of the changing needs for water resources programs and the most effective means of achieving our objectives are under intensified review to meet changing priorities.

The budget provides for a major expansion in research to develop improved technology for desalting water, including the use of nuclear energy. This program holds important promise in a world where water is a key to economic development and well-being.

I am also again recommending legislation to authorize river basin planning commissions and grants to States for planning the best use of water resources.

Nuclear energy will become increasingly important in meeting the rapidly growing demand for electric power. Power reactors must be improved, however, to make better use of nuclear fuel resources than they do today, as well as to provide economical electricity. In 1966, the Atomic Energy Commission plans to join with non-Federal groups in the construction of two different advanced power reactors which incorporate substantial improvements over those now in use.

The Commission is also working toward the long-range objective of high-gain breeder reactors which produce significantly more fuel than they consume. These breeders would insure a tremendous energy source for centuries to come.

Commerce and transportation: The vitality of the millions of privately owned businesses is essential to our continued economic development. The Federal Government will continue to provide extensive encouragement toward this end.

In the depressed areas of our Nation, we must create a constructive partnership between industry and Government which will improve opportunities for new investment and new jobs.

I urge prompt congressional action to:

Extend the program begun by the Area Redevelopment Act of 1961, now scheduled to expire on June 30, 1965.

Amend the act so that Federal aids can be concentrated in areas of greatest need and can emphasize the most effective types of assistance.

If the Nation is to have a truly efficient system of transportation, we must revise the traditional Government programs of regulation and operating subsidies to place greater reliance upon the forces of free competition. My proposals for charging users of Government transportation services a greater share of the costs incurred on their behalf are consistent with this objective. In addition, my proposals for transportation will provide for greater emphasis on the recreational and scenic aspects of our road system.

To encourage long-overdue improvements in surface transportation in our densely populated regions, I will propose legislation to authorize a comprehensive program of technical research and development on high-speed, intercity surface transport. As a first step, we will begin demonstrations of possible improvements in existing rail passenger services in the northeast corridor of the Nation.

By increasing efficiency and productivity, the Post Office Department has been able to avoid a general increase in postal rates since calendar year 1962. Despite these efforts, however, significant postal deficits are now estimated in the current and future years. At my request, a panel of distinguished citizens will consider whether certain postal rates should be increased to bring them into line with postal costs.

Housing and community development: The Federal Government's role in the Nation's huge annual investment in housing and community development is largely indirect. The Government insures savings and loan accounts and mortgages, encouraging private investment and making large direct Federal investments unnecessary. Today these insurance programs are involved in about half of the homes purchased or being built.

Yet, some direct Federal aid is, and will remain, necessary. This type of aid gives incentives to forward-looking communities, lenders and builders, and private citizens, who share the national concern over the unsatisfactory state of American cities.

In a message on housing and urban development, I will present my proposals for further extension of the Federal-local-private partnership in meeting city problems. Revitalized Federal leadership through a new Department of Housing and Urban Development will be coupled with increased emphasis on comprehensive local planning.

Federal financial assistance will be offered to:

Support the neighborhood facilities needed to serve the city's people.

Increase the supply of low- and moderate-income housing.

Continue the attack on urban blight.

Encourage better standards of development and more adequate public facilities at the growing urban fringe.

No recent step in improving the prospects for future urban development has been more significant than the enactment of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964. To extend similar opportunities to the local communities of the National Capital region, I urge authorization of the special Federal assistance required to provide the nucleus of an adequate system of high-speed urban transportation for this area.

Health, labor, and welfare: The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 rededicated the Nation to a vigorous attack on the causes of the poverty which grips one-fifth of our population—including 15 million children. Our objective is to mobilize local, State, and Federal resources in a coordinated effort to assist the poor—especially children and youth—to achieve a better life.

The 1966 budget provides for almost doubling the new obligational authority and quadrupling the expenditures for this effort. These funds will—

Support 300 urban and rural community action programs.

Provide work opportunities, remedial education, and vocational training for 330,000 youths in the Job Corps and the Neighborhood Youth Corps.

Provide work-study opportunities for 100,000 needy college students and work experience for 110,000 unemployed adults.

Support the Volunteers in Service to America (VISTA); finance literacy training for adults; and assist migrant workers, farmers, and other low-income rural families.

To improve health care and facilities for the American people, the 1966 budget includes new proposals for:

Hospital insurance for the aged under social security.

Multipurpose regional medical centers to provide the most advanced diagnosis and treatment for heart disease, cancer, stroke, and other major diseases.

Grants for operating expenses of medical and dental schools.

Initial staffing of community mental health centers.

Improved medical diagnostic and treatment services for preschool and school-age children and youth.

Grants for projects to reduce water pollution caused by combined storm and sanitary sewers.

Increased aid to State and local air and water pollution control agencies for research and for more vigorous enforcement.

Our social security system provides needed day-in and day-out support to the millions who have contributed to it during their working years. This system needs strengthening.

In addition to hospital insurance for the aged, I am proposing legislation to provide an average 7-percent increase in social security benefits, retroactive to January 1, 1965. The increase in benefit payments will amount to about $2 billion in 1966.

I am proposing legislation to authorize long overdue improvements in the unemployment insurance system.

Improvements are also needed in our public assistance and manpower training programs.

Legislation will be recommended to increase the Federal share of public assistance payments, establish a program of medical care for children in families unable to afford such care, and authorize payments for needy aged persons in mental and tuberculosis hospitals.

Recommendations will also be made to broaden the Manpower Development and Training Act and increase the Federal share of project costs to 90 percent from the 66 percent which would go into effect under present law in 1966.

Education: Among the unfinished tasks of our Nation, the improvement of education deserves first priority.

It is our primary weapon in the war on poverty and the principal tool for building a Great Society.

This budget recognizes the increasing Federal responsibility to expand educational opportunity for all people and at all levels. It provides an increase in 1966 of over 60 percent in new obligational authority and over 75 percent in outlays. The programs of the Office of Education alone are more than doubled in 1966.

Education programs in the 1966 budget

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Agency or program	New obligational authority			Expenditures		
	1964 actual	1965 estimate	1966 estimate	1964 actual	1965 estimate	1966 estimate
Office of Education:						
Elementary/secondary	$407	$488	$1, 765	$404	$408	$971
Higher	164	668	1, 167	150	182	496
Vocational and other	130	345	449	106	186	326
Subtotal, Office of Education	702	1, 500	3, 381	660	776	1, 792
National Science Foundation	353	420	530	310	325	405
Other education programs	475	509	192	369	408	466
Total, education	1, 530	2, 519	4, 103	1, 339	1, 509	2, 663
Present programs	(1, 530)	(2, 519)	(2, 588)	(1, 339)	(1, 509)	(2, 063)
Proposed legislation			(1, 515)			(600)

The 88th Congress enacted more education legislation than any previous Congress. About 30 percent of the estimated increase in expenditures for education in 1966 is to carry out the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, the Vocational Education Act of 1963, the Library Services and Construction Act of 1964, and the National Defense Education Act Amendments of 1964.

But much remains to be done. Federal aid to meet critical needs in elementary and secondary education has not been enacted. Such aid is vital if we are to end the situation in which children are handicapped for life because they happen to live in communities which cannot support good schools.

The program I am proposing emphasizes assistance to improve elementary and secondary education, particularly for children who live in poverty. It will step up research in education and help schools and communities to provide wider educational opportunities for all. It will also strengthen higher education by expanding assistance to colleges and to college students. My proposals were presented more fully in a special message on education.

I also propose to expand present programs of support for academic research and science education. In 1966, expenditures by the National Science Foundation will increase by 25 percent, primarily to help provide an adequate rate of growth in Federal support for basic research in universities. Consistent with these objectives, I recommend that the Congress remove its restrictions on payments to universities for indirect costs of research grants.

Veterans benefits and services: Veterans benefits and services under the basic, continuing compensation, pension, and medical care programs will be at record levels in 1966.

Nearly 4½ million veterans or their survivors will receive compensation and pension payments.

Six hundred and ninety thousand veterans will be admitted to hospitals, domiciliary homes, or nursing homes.

Legislation enacted in 1964 by the 88th Congress to increase pension rates and to establish new nursing home programs will entail expenditures in 1966 of more than $100 million.

In line with the trend of recent years, an increasing part of the expenditures for veterans will be for non-service-connected benefits and services. As we continue to improve our social security and health protection programs, we should place greater reliance on these programs for meeting veterans needs not connected with their military service. Our major emphasis in veterans programs should be concentrated on meeting fully our obligation to those who were disabled in the defense of the country and to their dependents and survivors.

The Appalachian region: The Appalachian region of the United States has not shared fully in the great growth and prosperity enjoyed by the Nation as a whole. The 16 million people of this 165,000-square-mile area deserve a better opportunity to improve their region.

Many of the education, health, housing, and economic opportunity programs already outlined in the budget will help to overcome the problems brought on by chronic poverty. We need to make the most effective use of these programs. But a special effort is required to help this region. This means that Federal, State, local, and private institutions must combine to—

Improve access to the region.

Develop its natural resources.

Promote better employment opportunities for its people.

I urge the enactment of legislation to make this possible.

Employee pay: In preparing this budget, I have given close attention to the matter of Government pay.

Federal pay raises in the past 3 years have moved us much nearer to realizing the principle that civilian pay rates should be comparable to those in private enterprise for the same levels of work and that changes in pay and allowances of members of the uniformed forces should keep pace with advances in the general economy. These policies have been firmly established after careful congressional review. Taken together, they assure that civilian and military pay are effectively interrelated and maintained at rates which are fair to taxpayers and to Federal employees.

I believe, however, that it is equally essential to assure that any proposals for further pay adjustments during this calendar year accurately reflect pay developments in the private economy and be compatible with our national wage and price objectives.

For these reasons, I am appointing a special panel to make a prompt review of the present situation. This panel will be composed equally of distinguished public members and officers of the executive branch. It will report to me on April 1, 1965, after which I will make a recommendation to the Congress. Provision has been made in the allowance for contingencies for a possible military and civilian pay increase.

PUBLIC DEBT

Changes in the amount of public debt from year to year reflect primarily the amount of the budget surplus or deficit. Based on the estimates presented in this budget, the debt on June 30, 1965, will be $316.9 billion and on June 30, 1966, $322.5 billion.

Public debt at end of year

[Fiscal years. In billions]

Description	1963 actual	1964 actual	1965 estimate	1966 estimate
Owned by Federal agencies and trust funds	$57.9	$60.7	$62.5	$64.4
Owned privately and by Federal Reserve banks	248.6	251.8	254.4	258.1
Total	306.5	312.5	316.9	322.5

NOTE.—For further details see table 11 in pt. 2 of this document.

Under present law, the temporary debt limit of $324 billon will continue in effect through June 30, 1965. Then—if no action is taken—the permanent legislative ceiling of $285 billion will again become effective. It will be necessary, therefore, to raise the legal debt ceiling before that date.

The size of the debt limit needed is strongly affected by the seasonal pattern of Federal receipts and expenditures. Since receipts are always larger in the last half of the fiscal year, the public debt during 1966 will, from time to time, exceed the level presently estimated for June 30, 1966.

These seasonal fluctuations will require a higher debt limit than would be necessary if we had only to consider the amount of debt at the end of the fiscal year.

The need for flexibility in managing the debt must also be considered in fixing the debt limit. The Treasury generally borrows relatively large amounts of cash at periodic intervals during the year. These sizable financing operations are—and should be—carefully timed to take full advantage of favorable market conditions when they exist.

REDUCING GOVERNMENT COSTS

As we focus attention on improving the quality of American life, we must also see to the quality of American Government.

The tasks we face are formidable. They require new dedication, new vision, and new skills. We have neither the resources nor the right to saddle our people with unproductive and inefficient Government organization, services, or practices.

This must be a year of renewal—a year that will be long remembered for what we accomplish in bringing the public service to its highest state of readiness.

To realize this renewal, action will be necessary on a wide front. I pledge that this administration will strive to conduct the work of the Government by the same exacting standards that would apply in the most expertly managed private business.

Government organization: We must reorganize and modernize the structure of the executive branch in order to focus responsibilities and increase efficiency. I will shortly propose certain reorganizations which will constitute the initial and most urgent steps that I deem necessary to consolidate functions and strengthen coordination of related activities.

I will ask that permanent reorganization authority be granted to the President to initiate improvements in Government organization, subject to the disapproval of the Congress.

Controlling employment: In this budget, as in the budget for 1965, I have insisted upon stringent criteria to control the growth of Federal civilian employment. It is important that we have enough people to carry on the Government's business efficiently, but we must also see that we have no more employees than we need.

Realistic guidelines and goals have been established to aid administrators in the effective management of the Government's large and diverse work force. Controls on employment have been established for each agency. To remove the guesswork from determination of employment needs, agencies are installing improved work measurement systems, and the Bureau of the Budget is providing advice and assistance in introducing measures of productivity into agency management systems. The result of such efforts has been and will continue to be a reduction in the size of the Federal work force relative to the work being accomplished. The effectiveness of these controls may be seen in the fact that had Federal civilian employment kept its 1955 relationship to total population, Federal employees would have totaled 2,747,000 on June 30, 1964, more than 275,000 above the actual number as of that date.

Modest and highly selective increases in employment are proposed in the budget for 1966, mainly to carry out new and expanded programs recommended in this budget and to reduce excessive overtime in the Post Office Department. At the same time, we will take full advantage of every opportunity to keep the work force at minimum levels by eliminating functions, consolidating operations, closing unnecessary offices and installations, and abolishing vacancies. Total civilian employment proposed for 1966 is about 1 percent above the totals for the current year, and I am confident that we will be able to keep actual employment somewhat below these estimates.

Management improvement and cost reduction: The past year has been a successful one from the standpoint of improved management and cost reduction. Next year will be still better.

Led by the outstanding performance of the Department of Defense, Government agencies last year undertook cost reductions that saved almost $3.5 billion. These economies were not easy to come by. They have resulted from the concentrated work of Government officials and employees in all agencies, large and small. They reflect a wide variety of actions ranging from the abolition of reports and other publications to the introduction of computers, the application of modern business equipment, the adoption of new purchasing methods, and decisions to close major installations.

I am counting heavily on the continuation and acceleration of cost reduction and management improvement efforts. Every dollar saved in this way can be put to better use in carrying on more urgent business. And today every dollar is important. Among other things, we must:

Continue our war on excessive paperwork.

Increase our capacity to find and correct management weaknesses throughout the Government.

Reexamine our career services, making certain that they are all they should be with respect to selection, training, placement, promotion, rotation, retirement, and removal.

Seek legislation that will remove legal barriers to efficient operation.

I have instructed the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to give direction to a comprehensive, Government-wide cost reduction program to be put into effect in every department and agency. In general, this program will require the head of each agency to:

Take personal charge of cost reduction efforts.

Set specific goals for reductions in cost.

Reassess priorities for all programs and operations.

Identify and remove roadblocks to economy.

Verify reported savings.

I believe the Congress and the American people approve my goals of economy and efficiency. I believe they are as opposed to waste as I am. We can and will eliminate it.

CONCLUSION

Since I sent you my first budget a year ago—

Four million Americans have been born.

Three million two hundred thousand young people have reached college age.

One million seven hundred thousand new families have been formed.

One million three hundred thousand persons have entered the labor force.

One million five hundred thousand persons have reached retirement age.

Thus, our Nation faces growing responsibilities. But we also possess growing resources to meet them.

One result of our expanding economy is a larger revenue potential. This means a potential for—

Necessary increases in Federal expenditures.

Reductions in taxes.

Reductions in the public debt.

No one of these goals is paramount at all times. Each must be balanced against the others to assure our continued progress toward a Great Society.

This progress does not rest on economic growth alone. It is aimed at improving the quality of our way of life. And it is aimed at insuring that all Americans share in this way of life.

The Federal Government must do its part.

This does not mean simply spending more.

It does mean spending more on some new and vital activities. But it also means cutting back or eliminating activities which are less urgent or no longer necessary.

Where there is waste, to end it, where there are needs, to meet them; where there are just hopes, to move toward their fulfillment—that is the object of the budget which I now submit to your consideration.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

JANUARY 25, 1965.

REPORT OF NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 63)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, as amended, I transmit herewith a report of the projects and progress of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for the period of January 1, 1964 through June 30, 1964.

This report covers in enlightening detail 6 months of accomplishment. Problems of technological complexity as well as those of managerial difficulty have been met with a sense of awareness of the contributions the national space program is making toward human welfare and world peace.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 26, 1965.*

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements during the morning hour be limited to 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the request is granted.

DEATH OF THE RIGHT HONORABLE SIR WINSTON SPENCER CHURCHILL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the world has received a shock in the passing of one of the great statesmen of our time. I refer, of course, to Sir Winston Churchill, funeral services for whom will be held on Saturday next.

While his death had been anticipated, nevertheless the news aroused a feeling of shock on the part of all people because of the many contributions which this man made to the welfare of Great Britain, Western Europe, this country, and to the world as a whole.

No man was able to do so much with so little for so many people in an hour of great emergency. His monument will be his words and his deeds. His passing will, in effect, mark the end of an era.

We shall miss this eminent statesman, this honorary citizen of the United States, the only one, I believe, besides the Marquis de Lafayette.

Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN] and myself, I submit a resolution and ask that it be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

> *Resolved,* That the Senate of the United States has learned with profound sorrow of the death of Sir Winston Leonard Spencer Churchill, former Prime Minister of Great Britain, a great and revered friend and honorary citizen of the United States of America.
>
> *Resolved,* That the Senate expresses its deepest sympathy to the family and the people of Great Britain in their great loss.
>
> *Resolved,* That the President of the United States be requested to communicate this expression of sentiment to the widow and members of his family assuring them of the condolence of the people of our Nation in their irreparable bereavement; and be it further
>
> *Resolved,* That when the Senate adjourns today, it does so as a further mark of respect for the former Prime Minister.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I can recall no individual, certainly in the past 100 years, who has been so honored by the entire world as Winston Churchill—and rightly so. In a dark hour, his words went into every corner of the world and restored confidence, restored strength in the cause of freedom, and somehow brought the entire world together in that hour, as the struggle for freedom was pursued to victory.

He was indeed a distinguished statesman in every sense of the word. I am sure that in all the corners of the world this week, and particularly on Saturday, there will be mourning in places high and humble to mark the passing of a truly great man.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and unanimously agreed to.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, those of us who love freedom and have an understanding of what war means have lost our hero and idol. No one individual ever represented more completely the qualities of leadership in times of great crises than did Sir Winston Churchill—courage, resourcefulness, energy, and the ability to stimulate an entire nation and others throughout the free world.

I shall always remember the day I spent with him at Harvard University, when that institution honored itself by offering him an honorary degree. He spoke to the many boys in training, he lunched with the officials of the college, and he stimulated the alumni in the afternoon. Then he returned to Washington.

But he left us all wiser about our duties and enthusiastic about our part in winning a war that would keep our country and his nation secure for the advancement of freedom and opportunity.

We owe him a debt of gratitude which we can never repay.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield to the senior Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the life and labor of the late Winston Churchill are completely unparalleled in all recorded history. This good, noble, and complex man demonstrated, in a long lifetime of service in the legislative branch of his government, an unmatched leadership, a bulldog devotion to the independence of the United Kingdom, and to the cause of man's freedom, as well as a capacity for constructive labor in many fields. He rallied his people in their very dark day in their night of peril when another Dark Age hovered over them. Finally, when Pearl Harbor came, the New World stood by his side in vanquishing oppression and dictatorship bent on enslavement of the human race.

I have no doubt that every Senator has read and reread, as I have, that superb history of the Second World War which was one of the gifts of his pen to the ages.

I recall many times these days the last volume of that history, which is entitled "Triumph and Tragedy." I recall vividly the theme of that volume which he set down:

> How the great democracies finally emerged triumphant and so were able to resume the follies which had so nearly cost them their life.

Once again, does it not appear that the follies of the great democracies which have been, and are being resumed, undermine the Grand Alliance which ought steadfastly to continue as a deterrent to new aggression?

The prescient wisdom this great human being demonstrated in all his long, productive life represents a remarkable gift to the strength of freedom-loving peoples on both sides of the Atlantic and in every sphere, in which human kind strives today for freedom against the new kind of tyranny.

Surely the lesson is clear for the people of the United States. We have a duty of leadership in the world today to continue those cherished goals which Churchill represented with his voice and his deeds as the indomitable figure of human dignity and leadership.

I rise as an American citizen to express the profound sense of loss to all mankind at the passing of this giant. I join my senior colleagues in expressing condolences to his family and to stand in solemn salute to the majestic, illustrious life he led. Americans recognize in their hearts that it was Churchill who rallied freedom against tyranny at a time when our mother country stood alone. That kind of dark day must never occur again. If America respects the Churchill legacy, the darkness will not return.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I share the sorrow of the millions of friends and admirers throughout the world of Sir Winston Churchill, whose death occurred last Sunday. He was the greatest man that I have ever known. He was the greatest statesman of the 20th century. I believe history will record him as one of the truly great statesmen of all recorded time.

It was my happy privilege to know Sir Winston Churchill over a long period of time, and I regard him as having been the greatest statesman of our century.

I believe history will rate him with the great statesmen of all time.

I not only had the privilege of meeting Sir Winston on all of his official visits to Washington, but on two occasions away from the Capital, which stand out in my memory.

The first time was in 1929, when Sir Winston, then 54, visited Richmond, Va., to study the surrounding battlefields with Dr. Douglas Southall Freeman. The distinguished British visitor was entertained at the Governor's mansion by the then Governor, now Senator HARRY F. BYRD. I was a member of the Governor's staff, having served in World War I and retired as a major. Senator BYRD invited me to come to Richmond and assist him in entertaining the visitor.

Seventeen years later, after World War II, I met Sir Winston again and had my longest personal conversation with him, at Palm Beach, Fla. I was there with Raymond Guest, visiting his mother, Mrs. Frederick Guest, whose late husband was a cousin of Sir Winston. Sir Winston and Mrs. Churchill had come over from Miami Beach to spend the day at the Guest home.

This occurred early in 1946, while I was still a Member of the House. Realizing that the House would soon be debating the bill to make a postwar loan of about $3.7 billion to Great Britain, and being fearful that the Labor Government would pour that money down the rathole of socialistic schemes, I discussed the matter for about an hour with Sir Winston and followed his advice to support the loan.

Although I was on the Ways and Means Committee at the time, and the British loan bill had been reported fron the Banking and Currency Committee, I took a leading part in the debate in support of the bill, because of the information I had received from Mr. Churchill, and my great respect for his opinions. The great wartime British leader felt that the money was absolutely necessary for Great Britain's survival.

None of us will ever forget the courage he displayed following the fall of France in World War II. I am glad that Congress acted a few years ago to confer honorary U.S. citizenship on this champion of democracy. I shall always cherish the memory of my contacts with him.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the passing of Sir Winston Churchill has stilled the most eloquent orator the English-speaking peoples have ever produced.

He was the modern Prince Valiant of mankind, rising like the answer to prayer from the rubble of wartorn England to lift up a torch of hope for freedom that spread its glow to the outer limits of the free world.

He exemplified the courage and steadfastness and the will to win that saved England and all Europe from a tyranny worse than the Dark Ages. No man has done more for freedom.

His genius for inspired leadership, his understanding of the human ideals combined to produce a legend that will live as long as men work and hope for a finer civilization.

It was my privilege to cosponsor the resolution conferring honorary American citizenship on Sir Winston Churchill.

On Monday morning, January 25, I recommended to Postmaster General John A. Gronouski that a stamp in tribute to Sir Winston be issued as soon as possible by the U.S. Post Office Department, and am pleased to learn that this is being done. It is my hope also that other memorials will be forthcoming, suitable to commemorate the memory of this great man, whose record now belongs to the ages.

It will be particularly beneficial to young Americans to know as much as possible of the magnificent record of the man who became a symbol of courage in the most trying hours for his country and ours, and of freedom itself.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I rise to express my sorrow at the passing of Sir Winston Churchill.

During the war, I was mayor of Cleveland for part of the time and Governor of Ohio for the remainder. Those hours were critical. The citizenry of our Nation and its public officials were looking for signs of hope that might give them courage to withstand the agony and the portents of disaster which appeared on the European battlefield.

It was in 1940, the darkest hours of the war, when the retreat from Dunkirk was made. Nothing but darkness seemed to hover over the nations struggling to repel the assaults of the tyrants. Each day their hopes grew fainter.

Then there came a voice from England calling upon the citizens devoted to freedom to stand up, not to surrender hope, but to fight to the end.

As mayor of Cleveland, I knew the state of thought among the citizens of that community. Although we might have been divided prior to that time, we were consolidated in action at the time when the portents grew darkest.

In my judgment, one man stood out in rallying the forces of freedom, and that was this distinguished, brave, intrepid statesman of England—Winston Churchill.

When I learned of his passing, though it was anticipated because of the illness which beset him, I felt as though I had lost my closest friend.

The world has suffered a great loss in his passing. Winston Churchill will go down in history as the greatest man of the 20th century.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, free men and women everywhere and people who yearn for freedom the world over are saddened by the death of Winston Churchill. Very few individuals in history have made as many notable contributions to their time as Winston Churchill has to the 20th century. The entire world in indebted to him for his leadership in the struggle of free men against nazism, fascism, and communism.

He is one of the honored few whose names themselves speak for their achievements. As a writer, historian, and orator—indeed, one of the great masters of all time in the art of the English language—he has earned himself a place among the literary giants of the English-speaking world.

Throughout the years he has been one of our Nation's stanchest friends. All Americans are grateful to him for his contributions to freedom and democracy. A thousand years from now people in faraway places will give thanks that in a dark and grave period in history this man grasped leadership of free men and free women and threw back in bitter defeat the powerful forces of tyranny. His enthusiasm, power, and leadership helped crush the terror of nazism, and men and women the world over were restored to their simple dignity as creatures of God.

Mr. President, on August 9, 1962, I introduced in the Senate the first resolution introduced in the Congress authorizing the President of the United States to declare Winston Churchill an honorary citizen of the United States. Two weeks later Representative Frances Bolton introduced the same joint resolution in the other body and other Representatives in that body later introduced the same joint resolution. Early in 1963 this joint resolution was passed by both Houses of Congress and a short time thereafter the late great President John F. Kennedy declared him an honorary citizen at a ceremony at the White House at which Miss Kay Halle and I were guests along with many others, including Randolph Churchill and young Winston Churchill, grandson of this great leader of the world.

The person most responsible for this was Miss Kay Halle, radio and television commentator, journalist, author, world traveler of note, and one of our country's outstanding women. During World War II, Miss Halle served in an executive capacity in the Office of Strategic Services and most recently has been a member of the President's Advisory Committee on the Arts.

She first met Winston Churchill in 1931 when she was writing a column from London for the Cleveland News. During her stay in England, she spent many weekends at Chartwell with the Churchill family.

For many years Miss Halle has been urging that this great man be honored with American citizenship as a token of the esteem in which all Americans hold him. It was an article written by Miss Halle entitled "Hero of Two Nations" that appeared in the Plain Dealer, a great newspaper in Ohio and in our Nation, on July 23, 1962, that prompted me to introduce the joint resolution which would confer honorary citizenship on Winston Churchill. I spoke on this subject in the Senate and inserted her column in the Congressional Record. The Nation is indebted to Miss Kay Halle for her tireless efforts in urging the Congress to take this action.

Mr. President, I join with my colleagues and with free men and women everywhere in expressing deep sorrow at the passing of Great Britain's great war leader, one of the great men of all time.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, among the many who will try, few will succeed in writing eulogies that do justice to the greatness of Winston Churchill. One such tribute, written with brilliance and singular perception, appeared in this morning's edition of the Washington Post. Captioned, "He Was Us as We Would Like the World To See Us," Patrick O'Donovan has contributed an article worthy of the extraordinary man we mourn.

I ask unanimous consent that the O'Donovan tribute be published at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

HE WAS US AS WE WOULD LIKE THE WORLD TO SEE US

(By Patrick O'Donovan)

London.—His death had been long expected. And when it came, it was gentle and discrete. He was prodigiously old. We had not seen or heard him in many months. He had lived a great roaring life and somehow shared it with the Nation.

He had written great books and had relished adventures that others knew only in fantasy. He had wielded unimaginable power. He was a man who could weep at a school song or bow before his sovereign with the awe of a courtier or walk in procession to the Garter Chapel muffled in a great cloak, buried under a preposterous Tudor hat, looking like a giant blue mushroom.

He could express his displeasure at a modern portrait presented by Parliament and be applauded for unbending prejudice. He could be tyrannical or petulant, he could be patently wrong, he could be monstrously unfair to an opponent, he could sail through life with more sails out than any ship was made to carry, and we relished it all.

He will not be mourned in the usual way. He was no father figure. He was us as we would like the world to see us. We enjoyed him vastly. We are glad to have lived to see him. We shall not forget him.

Those who are middle aged or more will remember him, almost as if they knew him. That is the strange thing about him. The innumerable barroom bores putting on their imitations of his voice to tell some apocryphal story are only adding their incoherent praise to one of those rare legends that are also fact.

Above all, he will be remembered as he was in war, and when the war is recalled with him at its center it is somehow less horrible and more of an adventure. This is essential, because in the war he did something remarkable to Britain and, for once, Britain has recognized and remembered the achievement.

UNREALITY OF WAR

He was not really a great national figure before the war. He was already an elder statesman. He had an aura of failure, of incomplete fulfillment, about him—though it must be said that he did not recognize this himself. He was a little suspect, because he was forever issuing terrible warnings that seemed unnecessary and wrongheaded. He was admittedly brilliant and amusing. But we left our government to more solid men, to Baldwins and Chamberlains. They were the responsible 20th century figures.

And when war did come, the solid men were at a loss. The madness and the vulgarity of Hitler seemed unreal rather than menacing. There were expeditions and defeats and men died or became prisoners, but Britain did not really feel like a nation at war.

We were amateurs at a distasteful game. We were dutiful rather than wholehearted. And then the real though undeclared prospect of defeat toppled the solid men and we had this old and slightly suspect adventurer to lead us. And we were reassured and confident from the start.

The new Premier came at the worst possible moment and he made no bones about what lay ahead. He seemed positively to relish the prospect. He, and we, perked up at the possibility of disaster.

He brought a relish for old wars to new. He made what we were doing seem natural and inevitable. He convinced us that we could do it and do it greatly. He called up the old Adam in us and gave us back the power to be aggressive.

AN ACTOR'S TIMING

It was partly his eloquence, though he was not truly an eloquent man but an unsurpassed reader of speeches. You could see the joke or the epigram coming; he would rootle and fumble for it, and suddenly brandish it aloft as if he had dug it out of a deep packing of cotton wool. And he did it with an actor's timing.

The language he used was inflated and Augustan, and it served to dignify the messy things we were doing. He snarled and ranted, and the whole country crowded in to listen to what he said, because this was how we were beginning to feel—exasperated, defiant and prickly proud.

He boasted for us, but not outrageously. He talked like a great captain whose only trade was war and found it a good one. He would "strangle the U-boats" and "wage great battles." And somehow he brought the past in as an ally. It could be said that somehow he brought out the best in war.

Or he would come down to look at his troops, and stump, scowling, along the ranks. He would wear a preposterous billycock hat and hold a cigar and brandish a stick and suddenly relax and grin wickedly and make a gesture toward victory with his fingers that meant something else to a soldier. The whole act was so confident and natural and superb that the troops grinned back from the ranks and cheered and forgot for a little to complain. They went back to their tents or billets with the vague feeling that they came of great stock.

Or, after a bad night of bombing in London, he would pick his way down a ruined street, crunching the glass underfoot, looking now angry, now almost indecently cheerful. And exhausted men and women, picking over the ruins of their homes, would straighten up with a broken toy or a soiled curtain in their filthy hands and shout out, not a demand for protection or aid, but a reassurement to him.

SCHOOLBOY HEROICS

Or he would sneak off to watch the war, with an air of conscious delinquency, and be seen with his exasperated generals by the side of the road munching a sandwich with a flask in his hand. Or he would order a gun to be fired toward the enemy or insist on seeing the Rhine. It was all very reprehensible and it is not a fashionable attitude today. But, at the time, it served marvelously to increase the sum of national courage.

He made war seem more noble and less squalid.

He was not, of course, a one-man band and he did not win the war singlehanded. Others did the dying and the crawling with fear. He was surrounded by men who had to work impossibly hard and none of them who survived were sycophants. And yet he utterly commanded the stage. For a few years he summed up Britain and gave life to Britain and gave her confidence and was himself the more than life-sized image of Britain. That was his achievement.

THE CLOSING YEARS

The retirement and old age of the great and the powerful can be a pathetic spectacle. Lloyd George frittered away his long years in bitterness and crankiness. But this man, as he came closer to the inevitable end, still seemed to enjoy the last drops at the bottom of the glass that others have found so bitter. He possessed a curious quality of inner freedom about him.

In large part, this was due to his origins. He was born, quite simply, into a highly privileged aristocracy. Such people are accorded a special liberty. So are those at the bottom of the pyramid. For both classes pretense is not necessary. They are the truly liberated. And between this aristocrat and the least privileged of the British there was an instinctive understanding, even when they chose not to vote for him.

UNCONVENTIONAL TO END

He relished the solid, rather vulgar luxury of unfashionable watering places in the sun. He never courted the press. He kept a few racehorses for a time and did well with them. He maintained an ironclad privacy. He was sentimental. He loved great occasions. He expected to dominate a conversation. He was unconventional. He was untouched by scandal.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, nowhere will it be possible to fully record for historians the total sense of loss felt by peoples the world over at the death of Sir Winston Churchill. His death has cast a shadow on the hearts of people everywhere. From his youth, and for almost a century, his motto was: "Trust the people." He did, and was repaid in kind. There is no finer tribute.

He died as he lived, a symbol of what man can do in the face of adversity. And to the end, without flinching, he fought the certainty of death with the same audacity he confronted the trials of life. He was the epitome of the civilized man, revered by those whom he led to victory and respected by the vanquished.

I feel a personal loss at his death. As was said of Abraham Lincoln, "He truly belongs to the ages."

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, all people throughout the world who love and cherish freedom have been saddened by the loss of Winston Churchill.

If one were to name the greatest man of the 20th century, it would have to be the one whose loss we mourn this week.

His life history reads like a historical novel. His accomplishments and experiences are so many and so far reaching as to stagger the imagination.

For all that he will be remembered, however, it is likely that he will be most remembered for his strength of character and the magnificence of his leadership in transferring that strength not only to the people whom he officially led, but also to the people in other lands whom he inspired.

We may pray that this inspiration will continue, even though he is gone, because it is through such inspiration that freedom for all people will come.

The lead editorial in yesterday's Washington Evening Star is but one of many which are appearing to eulogize this great statesman and humanitarian. But the writer of this editorial has uniquely expressed Winston Churchill's imprint on history, and he appropriately ends with the prayer, in which all of us join—"May angels attend him." I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

WINSTON CHURCHILL

Churchill is dead, gone from the world he saved. And the world he saved, distracted still by the flow and eddy of the aftermath, has not yet reckoned its debt to him.

Perhaps that sum cannot be reckoned up, so great it is. Our very troubles of this time derive from that more nearly mortal evil that Churchill fought and ended.

Are the emerging nations irritated and frustrated at what they take to be survivals of the British Raj? Had it not been for Churchill, they would have been spared their hurt feelings, for they would never have emerged at all.

Does Charles de Gaulle grow restive at the failure of the nations to see his glory? The question would not have arisen without Churchill to fight for a France that had been captured.

Are we ourselves troubled with the problems of the alliance? We'd have been spared our troubles had not Churchill stood when all else fell. Is it hard and endless to achieve the unity of Europe? There was a European unity of slavery and depravity designed to last a thousand years. Because of Churchill it is no more.

The Russians themselves may count their debt to that great man. Had England made its peace with evil, the Soviet state would have dropped into the dark of history or have become, in the extension of the Stalin-Hitler pact, the complete political expression of the worst shadows in Stalin's mind.

But Churchill did not fail. He lived and spoke and fought, and so all of us live as we do.

In an age of progressive thought, he seemed an odd man to become a hero. He liked cigars and brandy and high cuisine. He believed deeply in the virtue of royalty. He believed in the British Empire, in gallantry, in chivalry. He believed in language and in the golden deeds of the English past. In an age that wrote history in terms of social movements and philosophical evolution, Churchill read history as a glorious record of brave men and the things they did for their country.

He was old fashioned and out of date. But when the hour struck it was his alone. For the evil that rose in Germany was a timeless evil. To meet it required a cast of mind that Churchill had, a dedicated innocence, a belief in battles and in courage. The monstrous German war-gods came up from under mountains and brandished again their hammers and axes. Their shadow of death spread through the heart of Europe, north to the polar ice, south to the Sahara, over all of France and paused for a moment at the little strip of water before England.

In that moment Churchill spoke and his voice was like Roland's horn at Roncesvalles. He broke the spell of the evil magician and roused the world to fight for its freedom. Against the Wehrmacht's mechanical might, he had, for a while, only the gallantry, the courage, the spirit, of his people. These old-fashioned virtues held the battle.

He saved the world and his world at home replied by turning him out of office, for a new time had come. He said that he would not preside over the dissolution of the British Empire, but it is dissolved and it had to be dissolved. Yet whatever hope of freedom and dignity all men have today, they owe in part to the last glorious fight of that Empire and to the ability of the Empire to bring forth, as its last gift, the man, Winston Churchill.

May angels attend him.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to pay my respects to the memory of the great British statesman, Mr. Winston Churchill, in the following one-sentence eulogy:

Freedom continues to live in the world because Winston Churchill lived and defended it.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, few persons in this century, indeed, in this age have left their mark on mankind as has the late Sir Winston Churchill. Few persons, indeed, have contributed so much and, at the same time, have so endeared themselves to men of all walks of life.

The passing of Sir Winston to yet another glory, is not a fact that we should mourn. For, he shall certainly receive in full measure as he gave.

Our hearts should, rather, swell with a sense of pride to have lived as contemporaries of this great man.

We are enabled to attain greater ends for mankind, though we may have to endure hardship, because his example has shown us how to do both.

Sir Winston Churchill will most probable not be memorialized in great marble monuments to his memory in this country. He will be among the greatest American citizens for whom this will not be done.

He did, however, give his consent to become one of us. In doing so, he honored us as highly as he possibly could. In doing so, also, he permitted us to honor him.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, all who respect courage, faith, truth, and wisdom today deeply mourn the death of Sir Winston Churchill. He was a giant of our times in all these attributes. We will always remember the resonance of his voice, its inspiration, and the way he marshaled our thoughts and energies in the cause of justice. In the dark and tragic days of World War II he offered to all who fought opression that unforgettable challenge of blood and tears. Now the world responds with tears at the loss of this great man.

His remarkable career spanned some of the most difficult times mankind ever faced. He met these difficulties with that soaring quality of spirit which transcended national boundaries and instilled itself into our own hearts and minds. He was the young cavalier, the superlative leader of his people in periods of crisis, the elder statesman who imparted both wisdom and strength. Among those who especially admired him, I feel privileged to have shared in the same century in which we lived.

Mankind stands in respect. Freemen everywhere mourn his passing.

APPOINTMENTS TO THE FIFTH MEETING OF THE MEXICO-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair announces that the following Senators are appointed to attend the fifth meeting of the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group to be convened in Mexico on February 11–18, 1965: Senators J. W. Fulbright, John Sparkman,

Wayne Morse, Mike Mansfield, Albert Gore, Joseph M. Montoya, Daniel K. Inouye, Ernest Gruening, Bourke B. Hickenlooper, George D. Aiken, Thomas H. Kuchel, and **Wallace F. Bennett.**

Alternates: Senators **Milward L. Simpson,** and **Paul J. Fannin.**

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

Appropriations to National Aeronautics and Space Administration

A letter from the Deputy Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

Report on Liquidation of Stocks of Agricultural Commodities Held by Commodity Credit Corporation

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the orderly liquidation of stocks of agricultural commodities held by the Commodity Credit Corporation and the expansion of markets for surplus agricultural commodities, dated December 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Report of Rural Electrification Administration

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Rural Electrification Administration, for the fiscal year 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Reports on Overobligations of Appropriations

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, 23 reports covering 25 overobligations of appropriations within that Department (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations.

Report of Export-Import Bank of Washington on Short-Term Export Credit Insurance Program

A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Export-Import Bank of Washington, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, that shipments to Yugoslavia insured by that Bank under the short-term export credit insurance program, totaled $294.35, during the month of December 1964; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Report on Federal Contributions Program, Equipment, and Facilities

A letter from the Director of Civil Defense, Office of the Secretary of the Army, reporting, pursuant to law, on the Federal contributions program, equipment, and facilities, for the quarter ended September 30, 1964 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Removal of Limitation on Settlement of Certain Claims

A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to remove the present $5,000 limitation which prevents the Secretary of the Air Force from settling and paying certain claims arising out of the crash of a U.S. aircraft at Wichita, Kans. (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report on Procurement From Small and Other Firms

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on Department of Defense procurement from small and other firms, for the period July–November 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Amendment of Section 902 of Federal Aviation Act of 1958

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 902 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 relating to penalties for falsification of records, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Commerce.

Publication Entitled "All Electric Homes in the United States, 1964"

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a publication entitled "All Electric Homes in the United States, 1964" (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on Commerce.

Amendment of Inter-American Development Bank Act

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Inter-American Development Bank Act to authorize the United States to participate in an increase in the resources of the Fund for Special Operations of the Inter-American Development Bank (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Adjustment of Legislative Jurisdiction Exercised Over Certain Land

A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the adjustment of the legislative jurisdiction exercised by the United States over land in the several States used for Federal purposes, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Reply to Comptroller General on a Certain Report

A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Administration, Agency for International Development, Department of State, transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a copy of that Agency's confidential reply to the Comptroller General relating to his report on deficiencies in administration of the earthquake reconstruction and rehabilitation program for Chile (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Reports of Comptroller General

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on excessive rental costs for postal facilities at Washington, D.C., and Alexandria, Va., Post Office Department dated January 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on potential savings by consolidating additional personnel offices or field stations, Veterans' Administration, dated January 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on unnecessary costs to the Government in the leasing of electronic data processing systems by McDonnell Aircraft Corp., St. Louis, Mo., Department of Defense, dated January 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on unreasonably high prices paid by Government prime contractors and subcontractors for GG49 gyroscopes purchased from the only qualified and approved source, Honeywell, Inc., aeronautical division, Minneapolis, Minn., Department of Defense and National Aeronautics and Space Administration, dated January 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on excessive Federal matching of administrative expenses for public assistance programs in the State of Massachusetts, welfare administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, dated January 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Disposal of Foreign Excess Property

A letter from the General Manager, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on the disposal of foreign excess property, during the fiscal year 1964; to the Committee on Government Operations.

Court Opinion in Case of Rocky River Company, Inc., and Macy Land Corp., Against the United States

A letter from the clerk, U.S. Court of Claims, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of the court's opinion and findings in the case of Rocky River Company, Inc., and Macy Land Corp., against the United States, Cong. No. 7–60 (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Report of Proceedings of a Special Meeting of the Judicial Conference of the United States

A letter from the Chief Justice, Supreme Court of the United States, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the proceedings of a special meeting of the Judicial Conference of the United States, held at Washington, D.C., on January 13, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Proposed Legislation of Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 753(f) of title 28, United States Code, relating to transcripts furnished by court reports for the district courts (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend to 30 days the time for filing petitions for removal of civil actions from State to Federal courts (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 144 of title 28 of the United States Code (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation relating to the retirement of judges of the territorial district courts (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 376 of title 28, United States Code (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 753(b) of title 28, United States Code, to provide for the recording of proceedings in the U.S. district courts by means of electronic sound recording as well as by shorthand or mechanical means (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to increase the fees of jury commissioners in the U.S. district courts (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide the same life tenure and retirement rights for judges hereafter appointed to the U.S. District Court for the District of Puerto Rico as the judges of all other U.S. district courts now have (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to withdraw from the district courts jurisdiction of suits brought by fiduciaries who have been appointed for the purpose of creating diversity of citizenship between the parties (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 1871 of title 28, United States Code, to increase the per diem and subsistence, and limit mileage allowances of grand and petit jurors (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON ADMINISTRATION OF PUBLIC LAWS 874 AND 815

A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the administration of Public Laws 874 and 815, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 1 OF THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

"To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the members of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, assembled in the 38th session thereof, do respectfully represent that:

"Whereas the Constitution of the United States should not prohibit any State which has a bicameral legislature from apportioning the members of one house of such legislature on factors other than population, provided that the plan of such apportionment shall have been submitted to and approved by a vote of the electorate of that State; and

"Whereas the Constitution of the United States should not restrict or limit a State in its determination of how membership of governing bodies of its subordinate units should be apportioned; and

"Whereas in proposing an article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States implementing the above freedom from prohibition, restriction or limitation of apportionment, the article, as proposed, should be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission to the States by Congress: Now, therefore

"We, your memorialists, respectfully make application to the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing an article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, to read as follows:

" 'ARTICLE —

" 'SECTION 1. Nothing in this Constitution shall prohibit any State which has a bicameral legislature from apportioning the numbers of one house of such legislature on factors other than population, provided that the plan of such apportionment shall have been submitted to and approved by a vote of the electorate of that State.

" 'SEC. 2. Nothing in this Constitution shall restrict or limit a State in its determination of how membership of governing bodies of its subordinate units shall be apportioned.

" 'SEC. 3. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an Amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission to the States by Congress.': Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That if Congress shall have proposed an amendment to the Constitution identical with that contained in this memorial prior to June 1, 1965, this application for a convention shall no longer be of any force or effect; be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to forward certified copies of this memorial to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States and to each Member of the U.S. Congress from this State, as being an application of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, pursuant to article 5 of the Constitution of the United States."

A resolution of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES AND THE SECRETARY OF STATE TO PREVAIL UPON THE WEST GERMAN GOVERNMENT TO RECALL CERTAIN SCIENTISTS DEVELOPING MISSILES FOR THE UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC, AND TO EXTEND ITS STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS RELATIVE TO WAR CRIMES

"Whereas the West German Government has consistently refused to recall German scientists now working in Egypt on the development of missiles for the United Arab Republic, thereby bearing a great responsibility for the creation of a serious threat to the peace of the Middle East; and

"Whereas West Germany's failure to extend the statute of limitations against Nazi war criminals after May 8, 1965, will literally open its doors for the return of thousands of fugitive Nazis who will be immune to prosecution: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Massachusetts Senate respectfully urges the President of the United States and the Secretary of State to prevail upon the West German Government to take appropriate action to prevent the application on May 8, 1965, of its statute of limitations relative to war crimes, and also to recall West German scientists who are participating in the development of missiles for the United Arab Republic; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the clerk of the senate to the President of the United States and the Secretary of State.

"Senate, adopted, January 14, 1965.

"THOMAS A. CHADWICK,
"Clerk.

"Attest:

"KEVIN H. WHITE,
"Secretary of the Commonwealth."

A concurrent resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Iowa; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 4 OF THE STATE OF IOWA

"Whereas there is an immediate and continuing need for caring for veterans; and

"Whereas there is an existing facility known as the Veterans' Administration Domiciliary, located at Clinton, Iowa; and

"Whereas this existing facility has been maintained properly and is at present housing more than 600 veterans; and

"Whereas said facility could be continued and even expanded at minimum costs to meet the needs for veteran care; and

"Whereas the Veterans' Administration has announced plans to close the said domiciliary at Clinton, Iowa: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the house (the senate concurring): That the Veterans' Administration is respectfully requested to continue the operation of the domiciliary at Clinton, Iowa, with its suitable facilities and desirable location for the permanent care of veterans; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the President of the U.S. Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of Congress, the Iowa Members of the U.S. Senate, the Iowa Members of the House of Representatives of Congress, and the Veterans' Administration.

"VINCENT B. STEFFEN,
"Speaker of the House.

"Attest:

"WILLIAM R. KENDRICK,
"Chief Clerk of the House."

The petition of Joe Harris, of New York, N.Y., relating to alleged malfunction of the military code of justice; to the Committee on Armed Services.

The petition of Clarence E. Caldwell, of Columbus, Ohio, praying for a redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Government Operations, without amendment:

S. 2. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States (Rept. No. 6).

By Mr. ROBERTSON, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, without amendment:

S. Res. 10. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to make certain investigations (Rept. No. 8); referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. SPARKMAN, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, without amendment:

S. 507. A bill to authorize the Veterans' Administration to extend aid on account of defects in properties purchased with financing assistance under chapter 37, title 38, United States Code (Rept. No. 7).

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, without amendment:

S. Res. 24. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to examine, investigate, and study matters relating to migratory labor; referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. SPARKMAN, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, without amendment:

S. Res. 15. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to investigate matters relating to public and private housing (Rept. No. 9); referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

PRINTING OF COMPILATION OF HEARINGS, STAFF REPORTS, AND STUDIES OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY, STAFFING AND OPERATIONS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Government Operations, reported an original concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 11); which, under the rule, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Senate Committee on Government Operations four thousand copies each of volumes 1 and 2 of a compilation of the hearings, staff reports, and studies of its Subcommittee on National Security Staffing and Operations issued during the Eighty-seventh and Eighty-eighth Congresses.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS TO MAKE CERTAIN STUDIES—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Government Operations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 54) authorizing the Committee on Government Operations to make certain studies as to the efficiency and economy of the operations of the Government, which, under the rule, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by section 134 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 and in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Government Operations or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized from February 1, 1965, through January 31, 1966, to make investigations into the efficiency and economy of operations of all branches of the Government, including the possible existence of fraud, misfeasance, malfeasance, collusion, mismanagement, incompetence, corrupt or unethical practices, waste, extravagance, conflicts of interest, and the improper expenditure of Government funds in transactions, contracts, and activities of the Government or of Government officials and employees and any and all such improper practices between Government personnel and corporations, individuals, companies, or persons affiliated therewith, doing business with the Government; and the compliance or noncompliance of such corporations, companies, or individuals or other entities with the rules, regulations, and laws governing the various governmental agencies and its relationships with the public: *Provided,* That, in carrying out the duties herein set forth, the inquiries of this committee or any subcommittee thereof shall not be deemed limited to the records, functions, and operations of the particular branch of the Government under inquiry, and may extend to the records and activities of persons, corporations, or other entities dealing with or affecting that particular branch of the Government.

SEC. 2. The Committee on Government Operations or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof is further authorized from February 1, 1965, to January 31, 1966, inclusive, to conduct an investigation and study of the extent to which criminal or other improper practices or activities are, or have been engaged in in the field of labor-management relations or in groups or organizations of employees or employers, to the detriment of interests of the public, employers, or employees, and to determine whether any changes are required in the laws of the United States in order to protect such interests against the occurrence of such practices or activities. Nothing contained in this resolution shall affect or impair the exercise by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of any power, or the discharge by such committee of any duty, conferred or imposed upon it by the Standing Rules of the Senate or by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

SEC. 3. The Committee on Government Operations or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof is further authorized and directed from February 1, 1965, to January 31, 1966, inclusive, to make a full and complete study and investigation of syndicated or organized crime which may operate in or otherwise utilize the facilities of interstate or international commerce in furtherance of any transactions which are in violation of the law of the United States or of the State in which the transactions occur, and, if so, the manner and extent to which, and the identity of the persons, firms, or corporations, or other entities by whom such utilization is being made, what facilities, devices, methods, techniques, and technicalities are being used or employed, and whether or not organized crime utilizes such interstate facilities or otherwise operates in interstate commerce for the development of corrupting influences in violation of the law of the United States or the laws of any State, and, further, to study and investigate the manner in which and the extent to which persons engaged in organized criminal activities have infiltrated into lawful business enterprise; and to study the adequacy of Federal laws to prevent the operations of organized crime in interstate or international commerce; and to determine whether any changes are required in the laws of the United States in order to protect the public against the occurrences of such practices or activities. Nothing contained in this resolution shall affect or impair the exercise by the Committee on the Judiciary or by the Committee on Commerce of any power, or the discharge by such committee of any duty, conferred or imposed upon it by the Standing Rules of the Senate or by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

SEC. 4. The Committee on Government Operations or any of its duly authorized subcommittees shall report to the Senate by January 31, 1966, and shall, if deemed appropriate, include in its report specific legislative recommendations.

SEC. 5. (a) For the purposes of this resolution, the Committee on Government Operations or any of its duly authorized subcommittees, from February 1, 1965, to January 31, 1966, inclusive, is authorized, as it deems necessary and appropriate, to (1) make such expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate; (2) hold such hearings; (3) sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjournment periods of the Senate; (4) administer such oaths; (5) take such testimony, either orally or by sworn statement; (6) employ on a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (7) with the prior consent of the executive department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, employ on a reimbursable basis such executive branch personnel as it deems advisable; and, further, with the consent of other committees or subcommittees to work in conjunction with and utilize their staffs, as it shall be deemed necessary and appropriate in the judgment of the chairman of the committee or subcommittee: *Provided further,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment and the person selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,100 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee.

(b) For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, or its chairman, or any other member of the committee or subcommittee designated by the chairman, from February 1, 1965, to January 31, 1966, inclusive, is authorized, in its or his or their discretion, as may be deemed advisable, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents.

SEC. 6. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $435,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

STUDY OF CERTAIN ASPECTS OF NATIONAL SECURITY AND INTERNATIONAL OPERATIONS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Government Operations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 57) to study certain aspects of national security and international operations, which, under the rule, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by section 134 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Government Operations, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized, from February 1, 1965, through January 31, 1966, to make studies as to the efficiency and economy of operations of all branches and functions of the Government with particular reference to:

(1) the effectiveness of present national security methods, staffing, and processes as tested against the requirements imposed by the rapidly mounting complexity of national security problems;

(2) the capacity of present national security staffing, methods, and processes to make full use of the Nation's resources of knowledge, talents, and skills;

(3) the adequacy of present intergovernmental relationships between the United States and international organizations of which the United States is a member; and

(4) legislative and other proposals or means to improve these methods, processes, and relationships.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, from February 1, 1965, to January 31, 1966, inclusive, is authorized—

(1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable;

(2) to employ upon a temporary basis and fix the compensation of technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Pro-*

vided, That the minority of the committee is authorized at its discretion to select one employee for appointment; and

(3) with the prior consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize on a reimbursable basis the services, information, facilities, and personnel of any department or agency of the Government.

SEC. 3. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $90,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

FUNDS FOR STUDY OF MATTERS PERTAINING TO ECONOMY AND EFFICIENCY OF FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACTIVITIES—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] I report a resolution (S. Res. 58) to provide funds for the Subcommittee on Foreign Aid Expenditures of the Senate Committee on Government Operations. The resolution was unanimously approved this morning by the full committee and the Senator from Alaska has been designated chairman of the subcommittee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and printed; and, under the rule, the resolution will be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The resolution (S. Res. 58) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Government Operations, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to the operation of foreign assistance activities by the Federal Government, with a view to determining the economy and efficiency of such activities.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1965, through January 31, 1966, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized at its discretion to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,100 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings upon the study and investigation authorized by this resolution, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1966.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $57,500, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

STUDY OF INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THE STATES AND MUNICIPALITIES—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. MUSKIE, from the Committee on Government Operations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 59) authorizing a study of intergovernmental relationships between the United States and the States and municipalities, which, under the rule, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Government Operations, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by subsection 1(g)(2)(D) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of intergovernmental relationships between the United States and the States and municipalities, including an evaluation of studies, reports, and recommendations made thereon and submitted to the Congress by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 86-380, approved by the President on September 24, 1959.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1965, to January 31, 1966, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,100 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1966.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $141,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

ADDITIONAL STAFF FOR COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 60) to authorize additional staff for the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, which, under the rule, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is authorized from February 1, 1965, through January 31, 1966, to employ one additional assistant chief clerk, seven additional professional staff members, and nine additional clerical assistants to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman in accordance with section 202(e), as amended, of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and the provisions of Public Law 4, Eightieth Congress, approved February 19, 1947, as amended.

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR COMMITTEE ON AERONAUTICAL AND SPACE SCIENCES—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. ANDERSON, from the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 61) to provide additional funds for the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, which, under the rule, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

S. RES. 61

Resolved, That the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to the aeronautical and space activities of departments and agencies of the United States, including such activities peculiar to or primarily associated with the development of weapons systems or military operations.

SEC. 2. (a) For the purposes of this resolution the committee is authorized, from February 1, 1965, through January 31, 1966, inclusive, to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable, (2) employ upon a temporary basis and fix the compensation of technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants, and (3) with the prior consent of the head of the department or agency of the Government concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any department or agency of the Government.

(b) The minority is authorized to select one person for appointment as an assistant or consultant, and the person so selected shall be appointed. No assistant or consultant may receive compensation at an annual gross rate which exceeds by more than $2,100 the annual gross rate of compensation of any person so selected by the minority.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1966.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $95,000 shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—FEDERAL STOCKPILE INVENTORIES

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, I submit a report on Federal stockpile inventories as of November 1964. I ask unanimous consent to have the report printed in the RECORD, together with a statement by me.

There being no objection, the report and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL STOCKPILE INVENTORIES, NOVEMBER 1964

INTRODUCTION

This is the 60th in a series of monthly reports on Federal stockpile inventories. It is for the month of November 1964.

The report is compiled from official data on quantities and cost value of commodities in these stockpiles submitted to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures by the Departments of Agriculture, Defense, Health, Education, and Welfare, and Interior, and the General Services Administration.

The cost value of materials in inventories covered in this report, as of November 1, 1964, totaled $13,746,416,569 and as of November 30, 1964, they totaled $13,555,771,885, a net decrease of $190,644,684 during the month.

Different units of measure make it impossible to summarize the quantites of commodities and materials which are shown in tables 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5, but the cost value figures are summarized by major category, as follows:

Summary of cost value of stockpile inventories by major category

Major category	Beginning of month, Nov. 1, 1964	End of month, Nov. 30, 1964	Net change during month
Strategic and critical materials:			
National stockpile [1]	$5,594,391,500	$5,577,026,200	−$17,365,300
Defense Production Act	1,440,197,800	1,431,479,600	−8,718,200
Supplemental—barter	1,389,084,274	1,392,829,269	+3,744,995
Total, strategic and critical materials [1]	8,423,673,574	8,401,335,069	−22,338,505
Agricultural commodities:			
Price support inventory	4,912,819,890	4,740,981,789	−171,838,101
Inventory transferred from national stockpile [1]	57,974,259	57,735,859	−238,400
Total, agricultural commodities [1]	4,970,794,149	4,798,717,648	−172,076,501
Civil defense supplies and equipment:			
Civil defense stockpile, Department of Defense	11,882,027	11,878,612	−3,415
Civil defense medical stockpile, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare	200,878,138	201,085,079	+206,941
Total, civil defense supplies and equipment	212,760,165	212,963,691	+203,526
Machine tools:			
Defense Production Act	45,300	45,300	
National Industrial Reserve Act	88,379,300	88,499,800	+120,500
Total, machine tools	88,424,600	88,545,100	+120,500
Helium	50,764,081	54,210,377	+3,446,296
Total, all inventories	13,746,416,569	13,555,771,885	−190,644,684

[1] Cotton inventory valued at $128,409,100 withdrawn from the national stockpile and transferred to Commodity Credit Corporation for disposal, pursuant to Public Law 87-548, during August 1962.

Detailed tables in this report show each commodity, by the major categories summarized above, in terms of quantity and cost value as of the beginning and end of the month. Net change figures reflect acquisitions, disposals, and accounting and other adjustments during the month.

The cost value figures represent generally the original acquisition cost of the commodities delivered to permanent storage locations, together with certain packaging, processing, upgrading, et cetera, costs as carried in agency inventory accounts. Quantities are stated in the designated stockpile unit of measure.

Appendix A to this report, beginning on page 19, includes program descriptions and statutory citations pertinent to each stockpile inventory within the major categories.

The stockpile inventories covered by the report are tabulated in detail as follows:

Table 1: Strategic and critical materials inventories (all grades), November 1964 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity, and excesses over stockpile objectives in terms of quantity as of the end of the month).

Table 2: Agricultural commodities inventories, November 1964 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity).

Table 3: Civil defense supplies and equipment inventories, November 1964 (showing by item net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity).

Table 4: Machine tools inventories, November 1964 (showing by item net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity).

Table 5: Helium inventories, November 1964 (showing by item net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity).

NEW STOCKPILE OBJECTIVES

The Office of Emergency Planning is in the process of establishing new stockpile objectives for strategic and critical materials.

Table 1 of this report reflects the new objectives established between May 1963 and April 1964, based on essential needs in the event of a "conventional war emergency."

Appendix B contains excerpts from Office of Emergency Planning statements setting forth the new policy and current studies with respect to objectives for strategic and critical materials required for "conventional war emergency" and "nuclear war emergency."

TABLE 1.—*Strategic and critical materials inventories (all grades), November 1964 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity, and excesses over stockpile objectives in terms of quantity as of the end of the month)*

Commodity	Cost value			Quantity					
	Beginning of month, Nov. 1, 1964	End of month, Nov. 30, 1964	Net change during month	Unit of measure	Beginning of month, Nov. 1, 1964	End of month, Nov. 30, 1964	Net change during month	Stockpile objective [1]	Excess over stockpile objective
Aluminum, metal:									
National stockpile	$487,680,600	$487,680,600		Short ton	1,128,988	1,128,988			
Defense Production Act	405,539,700	404,015,000	−$1,524,700	do	804,586	801,314	−3,272		
Total	893,220,300	891,695,600	−1,524,700	do	1,933,574	1,930,302	−3,272	450,000	1,480,302
Aluminum oxide, abrasive grain:									
Supplemental—barter	15,717,600	15,717,600		Short dry ton	50,905	50,905		(2)	50,905
Aluminum oxide, fused, crude:									
National stockpile	21,735,100	21,735,100		Short ton	200,093	200,093			
Supplemental—barter	22,747,400	22,747,400		do	178,266	178,266			
Total	44,482,500	44,482,500		do	378,359	378,359		160,000	218,359
Antimony:									
National stockpile	20,487,900	20,487,900		do	30,275	30,275			
Supplemental—barter	13,550,900	13,550,900		do	22,704	22,704			
Total	34,038,800	34,038,800		do	52,979	52,979		25,500	27,479
Asbestos, amosite:									
National stockpile	2,637,600	2,637,600		do	11,705	11,705			
Supplemental—barter	9,867,562	9,867,562		do	39,420	39,420			
Total	12,505,162	12,505,162		do	51,125	51,125		40,000	11,125
Asbestos, chrysotile:									
National stockpile	3,356,200	3,356,200		do	6,224	6,224			
Defense Production Act	2,102,600	2,102,600		do	2,348	2,348			
Supplemental—barter	4,983,954	4,983,954		do	7,576	7,576			
Total	10,442,754	10,442,754		do	16,148	16,148		13,700	2,448
Asbestos, crocidolite:									
National stockpile	702,100	702,100		do	1,567	1,567			
Supplemental—barter	10,268,600	10,456,575	+187,975	do	39,591	40,342	+751		
Total	10,970,700	11,158,675	+187,975	do	41,158	41,909	+751	(2)	41,909

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 1.—*Strategic and critical materials inventories (all grades), November 1964 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity, and excesses over stockpile objectives in terms of quantity as of the end of the month)*—Continued

Commodity	Cost value			Quantity					
	Beginning of month, Nov. 1, 1964	End of month, Nov. 30, 1964	Net change during month	Unit of measure	Beginning of month, Nov. 1, 1964	End of month, Nov. 30, 1964	Net change during month	Stockpile objective [1] [2]	Excess over stockpile objective
Bauxite, metal grade, Jamaica type:									
National stockpile	$13,925,000	$13,925,000		Long dry ton	879,740	879,740			
Defense Production Act	18,168,000	18,168,000		do	1,370,077	1,370,077			
Supplemental—barter	92,995,436	93,857,968	+$862,532	do	6,038,721	6,107,954	+69,233		
Total	125,088,436	125,950,968	+862,532	do	8,288,538	8,357,771	+69,233	5,000,000	3,357,771
Bauxite, metal grade, Surinam type:									
National stockpile	78,552,500	78,552,500		do	4,962,706	4,962,706			
Supplemental—barter	45,280,400	45,280,400		do	2,927,260	2,927,260			
Total	123,832,900	123,832,900		do	7,889,966	7,889,966		5,300,000	2,589,966
Bauxite, refractory grade:									
National stockpile	11,347,800	11,347,800		Long calcined ton.	299,279	299,279		173,000	126,279
Beryl:									
National stockpile	9,768,400	9,768,400		Short ton	23,230	23,230			
Defense Production Act	1,425,800	1,425,600	−200	do	2,543	2,542	−1		
Supplemental—barter	23,049,952	23,049,952		do	12,277	12,277			
Total	34,244,152	34,243,952	−200	do	38,050	38,049	−1	28,000	10,049
Beryllium metal:									
Supplemental—barter	18,703,500	18,703,500		do	153	153		(2)	153
Bismuth:									
National stockpile	2,674,300	2,674,300		Pound	1,342,402	1,342,402			
Defense Production Act	52,400	52,400		do	22,901	22,901			
Supplemental—barter	5,536,700	5,536,700		do	2,506,493	2,506,493			
Total	8,263,400	8,263,400		do	3,871,796	3,871,796		3,600,000	271,796
Cadmium:									
National stockpile	15,163,000	15,155,000	−8,000	do	7,724,563	7,702,957	−21,606		
Supplemental—barter	12,326,600	12,326,600		do	7,448,389	7,448,389			
Total	27,489,600	27,481,600	−8,000	do	15,172,952	15,151,346	−21,606	5,100,000	10,051,346
Castor oil:									
National stockpile	45,809,600	45,511,600	−298,000	do	180,187,374	178,996,404	−1,190,970	22,000,000	156,996,404
Celestite:									
National stockpile	1,412,300	1,412,300		Short ton	28,816	28,816			
Supplemental—barter	812,693	812,693		do	19,201	19,201			
Total	2,224,993	2,224,993		do	48,017	48,017		10,300	37,717
Chromite, chemical grade:									
National stockpile	12,288,000	12,288,000		Short dry ton	559,452	559,452			
Supplemental—barter	21,930,200	21,930,200		do	699,644	699,644			
Total	34,218,200	34,218,200		do	1,259,096	1,259,096		600,000	659,096
Chromite, metallurgical grade:									
National stockpile	264,565,500	264,565,500		do	3,795,292	3,795,292			
Defense Production Act	35,879,900	35,879,900		do	985,646	985,646			
Supplemental—barter	227,024,400	227,024,400		do	1,558,054	1,558,054			
Total	527,469,800	527,469,800		do	6,338,992	6,338,992		2,970,000	3,368,992
Chromite, refractory grade:									
National stockpile	25,149,300	25,149,300		do	1,047,159	1,047,159			
Supplemental—barter	5,039,000	5,039,000		do	179,775	179,775			
Total	30,188,300	30,188,300		do	1,226,934	1,226,934		1,425,000	(3)
Cobalt:									
National stockpile	169,225,700	169,225,700		Pound	76,066,657	76,067,015	+358		
Defense Production Act	52,075,300	52,075,300		do	25,066,651	25,066,651			
Supplemental—barter	2,169,000	2,169,000		do	1,065,398	1,065,398			
Total	223,470,000	223,470,000		do	102,198,706	102,199,064	+358	42,000,000	60,199,064
Coconut oil:									
National stockpile	2,058,800	1,484,000	−574,800	do	13,582,369	9,790,029	−3,792,340	(2)	9,790,029
Colemanite:									
Supplemental—barter	2,636,400	2,636,400		Long dry ton	67,636	67,636		(2)	67,636
Columbium:									
National stockpile	24,777,200	24,777,200		Pound	7,360,707	7,360,707			
Defense Production Act	50,238,900	50,238,900		do	7,966,341	7,966,341			
Supplemental—barter	799,100	799,100		do	371,426	371,426			
Total	75,815,200	75,815,200		do	15,698,474	15,698,474		1,176,000	14,522,474
Copper:									
National stockpile	524,012,800	524,204,600	+191,800	Short ton	1,008,039	1,008,042	+3		
Defense Production Act	45,924,000	43,447,500	−2,476,500	do	81,918	77,472	−4,446		
Supplemental—barter	8,252,100	8,252,100		do	12,382	12,382			
Total	578,188,900	575,904,200	−2,284,700	do	1,102,339	1,097,896	−4,443	775,000	322,896
Cordage fibers, abaca:									
National stockpile	37,034,400	37,034,400		Pound	146,934,136	146,934,136		100,000,000	46,934,136
Cordage fibers, sisal:									
National stockpile	41,868,300	41,867,900	−400	do	309,571,655	309,567,177	−4,478	300,000,000	9,567,177

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 1.—*Strategic and critical materials inventories (all grades), November 1964 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity, and excesses over stockpile objectives in terms of quantity as of the end of the month)*—Continued

Commodity	Cost value: Beginning of month, Nov. 1, 1964	Cost value: End of month, Nov. 30, 1964	Cost value: Net change during month	Quantity: Unit of measure	Quantity: Beginning of month, Nov. 1, 1964	Quantity: End of month, Nov. 30, 1964	Quantity: Net change during month	Quantity: Stockpile objective [1]	Quantity: Excess over stockpile objective
Corundum:									
National stockpile	$393,100	$393,100		Short ton	2,008	2,008		2,500	(3)
Cryolite:									
Defense Production Act	5,651,300	5,564,000	−$87,300	do	20,466	20,149	−317	(2)	20,149
Diamond dies:									
National stockpile	577,800	584,100	+6,300	Piece	18,667	18,836	+169	25,000	(3)
Diamond, industrial, crushing bort:									
National stockpile	61,601,800	61,601,800		Carat	31,109,411	31,109,411			
Supplemental—barter	15,800,500	15,800,500		do	5,550,579	5,550,579			
Total	77,402,300	77,402,300		do	36,659,990	36,659,990		24,700,000	11,959,990
Diamond, industrial, stones:									
National stockpile	100,509,400	100,509,400		do	9,319,183	9,319,183			
Supplemental—barter	186,341,500	186,341,500		do	15,425,827	15,425,827			
Total	286,850,900	286,850,900		do	24,745,010	24,745,010		16,500,000	8,245,010
Diamond tools:									
National stockpile	1,015,400	1,015,400		Piece	64,178	64,178		(2)	64,178
Feathers and down:									
National stockpile	32,838,100	32,316,500	−521,600	Pound	7,925,702	7,799,784	−125,918	3,000,000	4,799,784
Fluorspar, acid grade:									
National stockpile	26,167,500	26,167,500		Short dry ton	463,049	463,049			
Defense Production Act	1,394,400	1,394,400		do	19,700	19,700			
Supplemental—barter	33,531,100	33,531,100		do	673,232	673,232			
Total	61,093,000	61,093,000		do	1,155,981	1,155,981		540,000	615,981
Fluorspar, metallurgical grade:									
National stockpile	17,332,400	17,332,400		do	369,443	369,443			
Supplemental—barter	1,508,100	1,508,100		do	42,800	42,800			
Total	18,840,500	18,840,500		do	412,243	412,243		850,000	(3)
Graphite, natural, Ceylon, amorphous lump:									
National stockpile	937,900	937,900		do	4,455	4,455			
Supplemental—barter	341,200	341,200		do	1,428	1,428			
Total	1,279,100	1,279,100		do	5,883	5,883		5,500	383
Graphite, natural, Malagasy, crystalline:									
National stockpile	6,765,500	6,744,800	−20,700	do	32,836	32,736	−100		
Supplemental—barter	232,500	232,500		do	1,908	1,908			
Total	6,998,000	6,977,300	−20,700	do	34,744	34,644	−100	18,000	16,644
Graphite, natural, other, crystalline:									
National stockpile	1,894,400	1,894,400		do	5,481	5,481		2,800	2,681
Hyoscine:									
National stockpile	30,600	30,600		Ounce	2,100	2,100		(2)	2,100
Iodine:									
National stockpile	4,082,000	4,082,000		Pound	2,956,713	2,956,713			
Supplemental—barter	1,401,300	1,406,700	+5,400	do	1,333,563	1,333,563			
Total	5,483,300	5,488,700	+5,400	do	4,290,276	4,290,276		8,000,000	(3)
Iridium:									
National stockpile	2,525,800	2,525,800		Troy ounce	13,937	13,937		17,000	(3)
Jewel bearings:									
National stockpile	4,564,600	4,564,600		Piece	52,435,065	52,435,065		57,500,000	(3)
Kyanite-mullite:									
National stockpile	734,300	734,300		Short dry ton	8,493	8,493		4,800	3,693
Lead:									
National stockpile	309,761,300	307,487,000	−2,274,300	Short ton	1,019,008	1,011,528	−7,480		
Supplemental—barter	78,398,500	78,398,500		do	327,998	327,998			
Total	388,159,800	385,885,500	−2,274,300	do	1,347,006	1,339,526	−7,480	0	1,339,526
Magnesium:									
National stockpile	125,242,200	125,016,200	−226,000	do	172,516	172,182	−334	145,000	27,182
Manganese, battery grade, natural ore:									
National stockpile	21,025,500	21,025,500		Short dry ton	144,485	144,485			
Supplemental—barter	14,064,600	14,064,600		do	142,245	142,245			
Total	35,090,100	35,090,100		do	286,730	286,730		80,000	206,730
Manganese, battery grade, synthetic dioxide:									
National stockpile	3,095,500	3,095,500		do	21,272	21,272			
Defense Production Act	2,524,700	2,524,700		do	3,779	3,779			
Total	5,620,200	5,629,200		do	25,051	25,051		6,700	18,351
Manganese, chemical grade, type A:									
National stockpile	2,133,300	2,133,300		do	29,307	29,307			
Supplemental—barter	7,922,100	7,922,100		do	117,607	117,607			
Total	10,055,400	10,055,400		do	146,914	146,914		68,500	78,414

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 1.—*Strategic and critical materials inventories (all grades), November 1964 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity, and excesses over stockpile objectives in terms of quantity as of the end of the month)*—Continued

Commodity	Cost value			Quantity					
	Beginning of month, Nov. 1, 1964	End of month, Nov. 30, 1964	Net change during month	Unit of measure	Beginning of month, Nov. 1, 1964	End of month, Nov. 30, 1964	Net change during month	Stockpile objective [1]	Excess over stockpile objective
Manganese, chemical grade, type B:									
National stockpile	$132,600	$132,600		Short dry ton	1,822	1,822			
Supplemental—barter	6,669,800	6,669,800		do	99,016	99,016			
Total	6,802,400	6,802,400		do	100,838	100,838		64,000	36,838
Manganese, metallurgical grade:									
National stockpile	248,240,900	248,240,900		do	5,852,192	5,852,192			
Defense Production Act	173,911,300	172,681,800	−$1,229,500	do	3,011,674	2,990,084	−21,590		
Supplemental—barter	259,307,917	261,804,075	+2,496,158	do	3,900,011	3,932,316	+32,305		
Total	681,460,117	682,726,775	+1,266,658	do	12,763,877	12,774,592	+10,715	7,900,000	4,874,592
Mercury:									
National stockpile	33,069,600	33,075,900	+6,300	Flask	184,456	184,456			
Supplemental—barter	3,446,200	3,446,200		do	16,000	16,000			
Total	36,515,800	36,522,100	+6,300	do	200,456	200,456		200,000	456
Mica, muscovite block:									
National stockpile	27,627,600	27,627,600		Pound	11,622,775	11,622,775			
Defense Production Act	40,689,700	40,689,700		do	6,432,569	6,432,569			
Supplemental—barter	6,392,241	6,493,896	+101,655	do	1,896,681	1,923,982	+27,301		
Total	74,709,541	74,811,196	+101,655	do	19,952,025	19,979,326	+27,301	6,000,000	13,979,326
Mica, muscovite film:									
National stockpile	9,058,100	9,058,100		do	1,719,308	1,719,308			
Defense Production Act	633,300	633,300		do	102,681	102,681			
Supplemental—barter	1,142,300	1,142,300		do	116,558	116,558			
Total	10,833,700	10,833,700		do	1,938,547	1,938,547		2,000,000	(2)
Mica, muscovite splittings:									
National stockpile	40,598,300	40,598,300		do	40,040,169	40,040,169			
Supplemental—barter	6,225,800	6,225,800		do	4,826,257	4,826,257			
Total	46,824,100	46,824,100		do	44,866,426	44,866,426		22,200,000	22,666,426
Mica, phlogopite block:									
National tockpile	303,600	303,600		do	223,239	223,239		17,000	206,239
Mica, phlogopite splittings:									
National stockpile	2,580,500	2,580,500		do	3,079,062	3,079,062			
Supplemental—barter	2,501,800	2,501,800		do	1,986,902	1,986,902			
Total	5,082,300	5,082,300		do	5,065,964	5,065,964		1,300,000	3,765,964
Molybdenum:									
National stockpile	78,293,200	77,102,600	−1,190,600	do	75,173,469	74,087,632	−1,085,837	68,000,000	6,087,632
Nickel:									
National stockpile	181,773,000	181,737,000	−36,000	Short ton	166,816	166,761	−55		
Defense Production Act	98,049,800	95,227,100	−2,822,700	do	51,413	50,341	−1,072		
Total	279,822,800	276,964,100	−2,858,700	do	218,229	217,102	−1,127	50,000	167,102
Opium:									
National stockpile	13,661,700	13,661,700		Pound	196,355	196,364	+9	141,280	55,084
Palladium:									
National stockpile	2,079,000	2,079,000		Troy ounce	89,811	89,811			
Supplemental—barter	12,170,200	12,170,200		do	648,124	648,124			
Total	14,249,200	14,249,200		do	737,935	737,935		1,300,000	(2)
Palm oil:									
National stockpile	1,988,900	1,852,100	−136,800	Pound	11,050,613	10,290,233	−760,380	(3)	10,290,233
Platinum:									
National stockpile	56,879,900	56,879,900		Troy ounce	716,343	716,343			
Supplemental—barter	4,024,500	4,024,500		do	49,999	49,999			
Total	60,904,400	60,904,400		do	766,342	766,342		450,000	316,342
Pyrethrum:									
National stockpile	415,100	415,100		Pound	67,065	67,065		25,000	42,065
Quartz crystals:									
National stockpile	67,473,900	67,473,900		do	5,470,013	5,470,013			
Supplemental—barter	3,519,200	3,519,200		do	232,352	232,352			
Total	70,993,100	70,993,100		do	5,702,365	5,702,365		650,000	5,052,365
Quinidine:									
National stockpile	1,846,000	1,846,000		Ounce	1,600,428	1,600,428		2,000,000	(2)
Quinine:									
National stockpile	2,617,000	2,617,000		do	4,137,733	4,137,733		4,130,000	7,733
Rare earths:									
National stockpile	7,134,900	7,134,900		Short dry ton	9,969	9,969			
Supplemental—barter	5,830,900	5,830,900		do	5,810	5,810			
Total	12,965,800	12,965,800		do	15,779	15,779		3,000	12,779
Rare earths residue:									
Defense Production Act	657,200	657,200		Pound	6,079,983	6,079,983		(3)	6,079,983
Rhodium:									
National stockpile	78,200	78,200		Troy ounce	618	618		(3)	618

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 1.—*Strategic and critical materials inventories (all grades), November 1964 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity, and excesses over stockpile objectives in terms of quantity as of the end of the month)*—Continued

Commodity	Cost value			Quantity					
	Beginning of month, Nov. 1, 1964	End of month, Nov. 30, 1964	Net change during month	Unit of measure	Beginning of month, Nov. 1, 1964	End of month, Nov. 30, 1964	Net change during month	Stockpile objective [1]	Excess over stockpile objective
Rubber:									
National stockpile	$677,451,900	$672,049,800	−$5,402,100	Long ton	876,264	869,141	−7,123	130,000	739,141
Ruthenium:									
Supplemental—barter	559,500	559,500		Troy ounce	15,001	15,001		(2)	15,001
Rutile:									
National stockpile	2,070,100	2,070,100		Short dry ton	18,599	18,599			
Defense Production Act	2,725,100	2,725,100		do	17,385	17,385			
Supplemental—barter	1,061,300	1,061,300		do	11,632	11,632			
Total	5,856,500	5,856,500		do	47,616	47,616		51,000	(3)
Sapphire and ruby:									
National stockpile	190,000	190,000		Carat	16,187,500	16,187,500		18,000,000	(3)
Selenium:									
National stockpile	757,100	757,100		Pound	97,100	97,100			
Supplemental—barter	1,441,819	1,533,094	+91,275	do	249,982	273,876	+23,894		
Total	2,198,919	2,290,194	+91,275	do	347,082	370,976	+23,894	475,000	(3)
Shellac:									
National stockpile	8,339,800	8,274,500	−65,300	do	16,635,181	16,504,799	−130,382	8,300,000	8,204,799
Silicon carbide, crude:									
National stockpile	11,394,500	11,394,500		Short ton	64,697	64,697			
Supplemental—barter	26,803,600	26,803,600		do	131,805	131,805			
Total	38,198,100	38,198,100		do	196,502	196,502		30,000	166,502
Silk noils and waste:									
National stockpile	1,232,100	1,232,100		Pound	979,924	979,924		(2)	979,924
Silk, raw:									
National stockpile	486,600	486,600		do	113,515	113,515		(2)	113,515
Sperm oil:									
National stockpile	4,775,400	4,775,400		do	23,442,158	23,442,158		23,400,000	42,158
Talc, steatite block and lump:									
National stockpile	494,800	494,800		Short ton	1,269	1,269		200	1,069
Talc, steatite ground:									
National stockpile	231,200	231,200		do	3,901	3,901		(2)	3,901
Tantalum:									
National stockpile	11,964,700	11,964,700		Pound	3,142,473	3,142,473			
Defense Production Act	9,734,400	9,734,400		do	1,536,023	1,536,023			
Supplemental—barter	21,100	21,100		do	8,036	8,036			
Total	21,720,200	21,720,200		do	4,686,532	4,686,532		3,400,000	1,286,532
Thorium:				do					
Supplemental—barter	17,991,700	17,991,700		do	3,965,428	3,965,428		500,000	3,465,428
Thorium residue:				do					
Defense Production Act	42,000	42,000		do	848,534	848,354		(2)	848,354
Tin:									
National stockpile	743,055,800	739,245,500	−3,810,300	Long ton	305,950	304,008	−1,582		
Supplemental—barter	16,404,000	16,404,000		do	7,505	7,505			
Total	759,459,800	755,649,500	−3,810,300	do	313,095	311,513	−1,582	200,000	111,513
Titanium sponge:									
Defense Production Act	175,884,400	175,879,000	−5,400	Short ton	22,341	22,340	−1		
Supplemental—barter	32,097,700	32,097,700		do	9,021	9,021			
Total	207,982,100	207,976,700	−5,400	do	31,362	31,361	−1	20,500	10,861
Tungsten:									
National stockpile	369,128,200	369,128,100	−100	Pound	120,069,151	120,014,168	−54,983		
Defense Production Act	316,893,600	316,321,700	−571,900	do	77,700,912	77,559,581	−141,331		
Supplemental—barter	18,651,400	18,651,400		do	5,774,827	5,774,827			
Total	704,673,200	704,101,200	−572,000	do	203,544,890	203,348,576	−196,314	44,000,000	159,348,576
Vanadium:									
National stockpile	31,567,900	31,567,900		Short ton	7,685	7,685		1,400	6,465
Vegetable tannin extract, chestnut:									
National stockpile	10,296,900	10,209,400	−87,500	Long ton	36,906	36,591	−315	15,000	21,591
Vegetable tannin extract, quebracho:									
National stockpile	48,855,000	48,858,500	+3,500	do	197,456	197,472	+16	86,000	111,472
Vegetable tannin extract, wattle:									
National stockpile	9,826,900	9,826,900		do	38,962	38,962		15,000	23,962
Zinc:									
National stockpile	346,132,900	343,215,200	−2,917,700	Short ton	1,193,513	1,183,365	−10,148		
Supplemental—barter	79,588,400	79,588,400		do	323,896	323,896			
Total	425,721,300	422,803,600	−2,917,700	do	1,517,409	1,507,261	−10,148	0	1,507,261

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 1.—*Strategic and critical materials inventories (all grades), November 1964 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity, and excesses over stockpile objectives in terms of quantity as of the end of the month)*—Continued

Commodity	Cost value			Quantity					
	Beginning of month, Nov. 1, 1964	End of month, Nov. 30, 1964	Net change during month	Unit of measure	Beginning of month, Nov. 1, 1964	End of month, Nov. 30, 1964	Net change during month	Stockpile objective [1] [2]	Excess over stockpile objective
Zirconium ore, baddeleyite:									
National stockpile	$710,600	$710,600		Short dry ton	16,533	16,533		(2)	16,533
Zirconium ore, zircon:									
National stockpile	116,300	113,300	−$3,000	do	1,970	1,920	−50	(3)	1,920
Total:									
National stockpile	5,594,391,500	5,577,026,200	−17,365,300						
Defense Production Act	1,440,197,800	1,431,479,600	−8,718,200						
Supplemental—barter	1,389,084,274	1,392,829,269	+3,744,995						
Total, strategic and critical materials.	8,423,673,574	8,401,335,069	−22,338,505						

[1] Stockpile objectives for strategic and critical materials are determined pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98–98h). The Office of Emergency Planning is currently in the process of revising stockpile objectives. (See app. B, p. 1239.)

[2] No present objective.

[3] Not in excess of stockpile objective.

Source: Compiled from reports submitted by the General Services Administration and the Department of Agriculture.

TABLE 2.—*Agricultural commodities inventories, November 1964 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity)*

Commodity	Cost value			Quantity			
	Beginning of month, Nov. 1, 1964	End of month, Nov. 30, 1964	Net change during month	Unit of measure	Beginning of month, Nov. 1, 1964	End of month, Nov. 30, 1964	Net change during month
Price-support inventory:							
Basic commodities:							
Corn	$1,025,414,403	$1,023,459,014	−$1,955,389	Bushel	841,397,409	839,566,038	−1,831,371
Corn products		34,181	+34,181	Pound		997,100	+997,100
Cotton, extra-long staple	34,799,098	34,807,878	+8,780	Bale	131,803	131,837	+34
Cotton, upland	1,375,966,938	1,309,733,817	−66,233,121	do	8,332,975	7,925,111	−407,864
Peanuts, shelled	5,709,862	4,585,753	−1,124,109	Pound	33,332,644	26,094,715	−7,237,929
Rice, milled	30,331	90	−30,241	Hundredweight	3,405	8	−3,397
Rice, rough	6,385,987	5,972,556	−413,431	do	1,218,923	1,140,504	−78,419
Wheat	1,547,268,932	1,498,330,257	−48,938,675	Bushel	758,123,772	732,645,481	−25,478,291
Wheat, rolled	2,363	2,324	−39	Pound	53,790	52,910	−880
Wheat flour	270,747	380,868	+110,121	do	4,827,000	6,818,300	+1,991,300
Bulgur	100,450	10,287	−90,163	do	2,328,657	250,073	−2,078,584
Total, basic commodities	3,995,949,111	3,877,317,025	−118,632,086				
Designated nonbasic commodities:							
Barley	22,775,997	21,846,389	−929,608	Bushel	26,087,625	25,129,923	−957,702
Grain sorghum	677,941,801	670,343,497	−7,598,304	do	605,005,505	596,936,964	−8,068,541
Milk and butterfat:							
Butter	85,943,468	58,637,460	−27,306,008	Pound	147,418,978	100,697,086	−46,721,892
Butter oil	10,617,855	8,415,460	−2,202,395	do	13,739,810	10,889,582	−2,850,228
Cheese	16,464,951	14,121,520	−2,343,431	do	43,159,287	36,976,328	−6,182,959
Milk, dried	34,788,191	25,659,254	−9,128,937	do	230,262,627	168,118,166	−62,144,461
Oats	20,372,776	19,982,822	−389,954	Bushel	33,804,983	33,142,026	−662,957
Rye	762,423	699,024	−63,399	do	704,382	642,690	−61,692
Tung oil		3,556,314	+3,556,314	Pound		14,818,194	+14,818,194
Total, designated nonbasic commodities	869,667,462	823,261,740	−46,405,722				
Other nonbasic commodities:							
Beans, dry, edible	6,826,619	6,052,408	−774,211	Hundredweight	961,278	858,689	−102,589
Cottonseed oil, refined, other	10,062,627	9,683,663	−378,964	Pound	89,623,441	86,238,245	−3,385,196
Cottonseed oil, refined, salad oil [1]	965,293	1,583,189	+617,896	do	5,217,904	8,489,215	+3,271,311
Flaxseed	14,796,970	9,890,137	−4,906,833	Bushel	4,984,695	3,332,035	−1,652,660
Linseed oil	8,399,062	8,693,240	+294,178	Pound	71,052,660	73,435,680	+2,383,020
Soybeans	6,152,746	4,500,387	−1,652,359	Bushel	2,629,249	1,923,824	−705,425
Total, other nonbasic commodities	47,203,317	40,403,024	−6,800,293				
Total, price support inventory	4,912,819,890	4,740,981,789	−171,838,101				
Inventory transferred from national stockpile: [2]							
Cotton, Egyptian	35,049,892	35,007,651	−42,241	Bale	41,488	41,438	−50
Cotton, American-Egyptian	22,924,367	22,728,208	−196,159	do	45,578	45,188	−390
Total, inventory transferred from national stockpile.	57,974,259	57,735,859	−238,400	do	87,066	86,626	−440
Total, agricultural commodities	4,970,794,149	4,798,717,648	−172,076,501				

[1] Reported as "Cottonseed oil, refined," prior to February 1964.

[2] Transferred from General Services Administration pursuant to Public Law 85–96 and Public Law 87–548. (See app. A, p. 1238.)

Source: Compiled from reports submitted by the Department of Agriculture.

TABLE 3.—*Civil defense supplies and equipment inventories, November 1964 (showing by item net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity)*

Item	Cost value			Quantity			
	Beginning of month, Nov. 1, 1964	End of month, Nov. 30, 1964	Net change during month	Unit of measure	Beginning of month, Nov. 1, 1964	End of month, Nov. 30, 1964	Net change during month
Civil defense stockpile, Department of Defense:							
Engineering equipment (engine generators, pumps, chlorinators, purifiers, pipe, and fittings).	$10,082,438	$10,080,668	−$1,770	10 mile units	45	45	
Chemical and biological equipment	1,799,589	1,797,944	−1,645	(1)			
Total	11,882,027	11,878,612	−3,415				
Civil defense medical stockpile, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare:							
Medical bulk stocks, and associated items at civil defense mobilization warehouses.	135,870,496	136,001,799	+131,303	(1)			
Medical bulk stock at manufacturer locations	5,724,614	5,536,639	−187,975	(1)			
Civil defense emergency hospitals	53,306,755	53,610,830	+304,075	Each	2,012	2,016	+4
Supply additions (for packaged disaster hospitals)	5,976,273	5,935,811	−40,462	(1)			
Total	200,878,138	201,085,079	+206,941				
Total, civil defense supplies and equipment	212,760,165	212,963,691	+203,526				

[1] Composite group of many different items.

Source: Compiled from reports submitted by the Department of Defense and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

TABLE 4.—*Machine tools inventories, November 1964 (showing by item net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity)*

Item	Cost value			Quantity			
	Beginning of month, Nov. 1, 1964	End of month, Nov. 30, 1964	Net change during month	Unit of measure	Beginning of month, Nov. 1, 1964	End of month, Nov. 30, 1964	Net change during month
Defense Production Act:							
On loan	$45,300	$45,300		Tool	7	7	
National Industrial Reserve Act:							
In storage	76,076,900	75,843,700	−$233,200	do	6,607	6,584	−23
On lease	27,500	27,500		do	1	1	
On loan to other agencies	10,900	14,900	+4,000	do	2	3	+1
On loan to school programs	12,264,000	12,613,700	+349,700	do	2,923	3,002	+79
Total	88,379,300	88,499,800	+120,500	do	9,533	9,590	+57
Total, machine tools	88,424,600	88,545,100	+120,500	do	9,540	9,597	+57

Source: Compiled from reports submitted by the General Services Administration.

TABLE 5.—*Helium inventories, November 1964 (showing by item net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity)*

Item	Cost value			Quantity			
	Beginning of month, Nov. 1, 1964	End of month, Nov. 30, 1964	Net change during month	Unit of measure	Beginning of month, Nov. 1, 1964	End of month, Nov. 30, 1964	Net change during month
Helium:							
Stored above ground	$229,345	$270,026	+$40,681	Cubic foot	20,300,000	24,100,000	+3,800,000
Stored underground	50,534,736	53,940,351	+3,405,615	do	4,787,000,000	5,090,900,000	+303,900,000
Total, helium	50,764,081	54,210,377	+3,446,296	do	4,807,300,000	5,115,000,000	+307,700,000

Source: Compiled from reports submitted by the Department of the Interior.

APPENDIX A

PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS AND STATUTORY CITATIONS

STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS

National stockpile

The Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98–98h) provides for the establishment and maintenance of a national stockpile of strategic and critical materials. The General Services Administration is responsible for making purchases of strategic and critical materials and providing for their storage, security, and maintenance. These functions are performed in accordance with directives issued by the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning. The act also provides for the transfer from other Government agencies of strategic and critical materials which are excess to the needs of such other agencies and are required to meet the stockpile objectives established by OEP. In addition, the General Services Administration is responsible for disposing of those strategic and critical materials which OEP determines to be no longer needed for stockpile purposes.

General policies for strategic and critical materials stockpiling are contained in DMO V–7, issued by the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning and published in the Federal Register of December 19, 1959 (24 F.R. 10309). Portions of this order relate also to Defense Production Act inventories.

Defense Production Act

Under section 303 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2093) and Executive Order 10480, as amended, the General Services Administration is authorized to make purchases of or commitments to purchase metals, minerals, and other materials, for Government use or resale, in order to expand productive capacity and supply, and also to store the materials acquired as a result of such purchases or commitments. Such functions are carried out in accordance with programs certified by the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning.

Supplemental—barter

As a result of a delegation of authority from OEP (32A CFR, ch. 1, DMO V–4) the General Services Administration is responsible for the maintenance and storage of materials placed in the supplemental stockpile. Section 206 of the Agricultural Act of 1956 (7 U.S.C. 1856) provides that strategic and other materials acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation as a result of barter or exchange of agricultural products, unless acquired for the national stockpile or for other purposes, shall be transferred to the supplemental stockpile established by section 104(b) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1704(b)). In addition to the materials which have been or may be so acquired, the materials obtained under the programs established pursuant to the Domestic Tungsten, Asbestos, Fluorspar, and Columbium-Tantalum Production and Purchase Act of 1956 (50 U.S.C. App. 2191–2195), which terminated December 31, 1958, have been transferred to the supplemental stockpile, as authorized by the provisions of said Production and Purchase Act.

AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

The price-support program

Price-support operations are carried out under the charter powers (15 U.S.C. 714) of the Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture, in conformity with the Agricultural Act of 1949 (7 U.S.C. 1421), the Agricultural Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1741), which includes the National Wool Act of 1954, the Agricultural Act of 1956 (7 U.S.C. 1442), the Agricultural Act of 1958 and with respect to certain types of tobacco, in conformity with the act of July 28, 1945, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1312). Under the Agricultural Act of 1949, price support is mandatory for the basic commodities—corn, cotton, wheat, rice, peanuts, and tobacco—and specific nonbasic commodities; namely, tung nuts, honey, milk, butterfat, and the products of milk and butterfat. Under the Agricultural Act of 1958, as producers of corn voted in favor of the new price-support program for corn authorized by that act, price support is mandatory for barley, oats, rye, and grain sorghums. Price support for wool and mohair is mandatory under the National Wool Act of 1954, through the marketing year ending March 31, 1966. Price support for other nonbasic agricultural commodities is discretionary except that, whenever the price of either cottonseed or soybeans is supported, the price of the other must be supported at such level as the Secretary determines will cause them to compete on equal terms on the market. This program may also include operations to remove and dispose of or aid in the removal or disposition of surplus agricultural commodities for the purpose of stabilizing prices at levels not in excess of permissible price-support levels.

Price support is made available through loans, purchase agreements, purchases, and other operations, and, in the case of wool and mohair, through incentive payments based on marketings. The producers' commodities serve as collateral for price-support loans. With limited exceptions, price-support loans are nonrecourse and the Corporation looks only to the pledged or mortgaged collateral for satisfaction of the loan. Purchase agreements generally are available during the same period that loans are available. By signing a purchase agreement, a producer receives an option to sell to the Corporation any quantity of the commodity which he may elect within the maximum specified in the agreement.

The major effect on budgetary expenditures is represented by the disbursements for price-support loans. The largest part of the commodity acquisitions under the program result from the forfeiting of commodities pledged as loan collateral for which the expenditures occurred at the time of making the loan, rather than at the time of acquiring the commodities.

Dispositions of commodities acquired by the Corporation in its price-support operations are made in compliance with sections 202, 407, and 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, and other applicable legislation, particularly the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1691), title I of the Agricultural Act of 1954, title II of the Agricultural Act of 1956, the Agricultural Act of 1958, the act of August 19, 1958, in the case of cornmeal and wheat flour, and the act of September 21, 1959, with regard to sales of livestock feed in emergency areas.

Inventory transferred from national stockpile

This inventory, all cotton, was transferred to Commodity Credit Corporation at no cost from the national stockpile pursuant to Public Law 85–96 and Public Law 87–548. The proceeds from sales, less costs incurred by CCC, are covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts; therefore, such proceeds and costs are not recorded in the operating accounts. The cost value as shown for this cotton has been computed on the basis of average per bale cost of each type of cotton when purchased by CCC for the national stockpile.

CIVIL DEFENSE SUPPLIES AND EQUIPMENT

Civil defense stockpile

The Department of Defense conducts this stockpiling program pursuant to section 201(h) of Public Law 920, 81st Congress, as amended. The program is designed to provide some of the most essential materials to minimize the effects upon the civilian population which would be caused by an attack upon the United States. Supplies and equipment normally unavailable, or lacking in quantity needed to cope with such conditions, are stockpiled at strategic locations in a nationwide warehouse system consisting of general storage facilities.

Civil defense medical stockpile

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare conducts the stockpiling program for medical supplies and equipment pursuant to section 201(h) of Public Law 920, 81st Congress, as delegated by the President following the intent of Reorganization Plan No. 1, of 1958. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare plans and directs the procurement, storage, maintenance, inspection, survey, distribution, and utilization of essential supplies and equipment for emergency health services. The medical stockpile includes a program designed to preposition assembled emergency hospitals and other medical supplies and equipment into communities throughout the Nation.

MACHINE TOOLS

Defense Production Act

Under section 303 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2093) and Executive Order 10480, as amended, the General Services Administration has acquired machine tools in furtherance of expansion of productive capacity, in accordance with programs certified by the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning.

National industrial equipment reserve

Under general policies established and directives issued by the Secretary of Defense, the General Services Administration is responsible for care, maintenance, utilization, transfer, leasing, lending to nonprofit schools, disposal, transportation, repair, restoration, and renovation of national industrial reserve equipment transferred to GSA under the National Industrial Reserve Act of 1948 (50 U.S.C. 451–462).

HELIUM

The helium conservation program is conducted by the Department of the Interior pursuant to the Helium Act, approved September 13, 1960 (Public Law 86–777; 74 Stat. 918; 50 U.S.C. 167) and subsequent appropriations acts which have established fiscal limitations and provided borrowing authority for the program. Among other things, the Helium Act authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to produce helium in Government plants, to acquire helium from private plants, to sell helium to meet current demands, and to store for future use helium that is so produced or acquired in excess of that required to meet current demands. Sales of helium by the Secretary of the Interior shall be at prices established by him which shall be adequate to liquidate the costs of the program within 25 years, except that this period may be extended by the Secretary for not more than 10 years for funds borrowed for purposes other than the acquisition and construction of helium plants and facilities.

This report covers helium that is produced in Government plants and acquired from private plants. Helium in excess of current demands is stored in the Cliffside gasfield near Amarillo, Tex. The unit of measure is cubic foot at 14.7 pounds per square inch absolute pressure and 70° F.

Appendix B

New Stockpile Objectives

The Office of Emergency Planning is in the process of establishing new objectives for strategic and critical materials. Table 1 of this report reflects the new objectives established between May 1963 and April 1964 for 79 materials (including 3 removed from stockpile list), based on essential needs in the event of a "conventional war emergency." The new objective for each material has been noted in the reports, beginning with June 1963, for the months in which the respective objectives were established.

The following excerpts from OEP statements dated July 11 and 19, 1963, February 28, 1964, March 6, 13, 20, and 27, 1964, and April 3 and 10, 1964, set forth the new policy with respect to objectives for strategic and critical materials:

"The Office of Emergency Planning is now conducting supply-requirements studies for all stockpile materials which will reflect current military, industrial, and other essential needs in the event of a conventional war emergency. On the basis of recently completed supply-requirements studies for the foregoing materials, the new stockpile objectives were established with the advice and assistance of the Interdepartmental Materials Advisory Committee, a group chaired by the Office of Emergency Planning and composed of representatives of the Departments of State, Defense, the Interior, Agriculture, Commerce, and Labor, and the General Services Administration, the Agency for International Development, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Representatives of the Bureau of the Budget, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the Small Business Administration participate as observers.

"These new objectives reflect a new policy to establish a single objective for each stockpile material. They have been determined on the basis of criteria heretofore used in establishing maximum objectives, and reflect the approximate calculated emergency deficits for the materials for conventional war and do not have any arbitrary adjustments for possible increased requirements for other types of emergency.

"Heretofore, there was a 'basic objective' and a 'maximum objective' for each material. The basic objectives assumed some continued reliance on foreign sources of supply in an emergency. The former maximum objectives completely discounted foreign sources of supply beyond North America and comparable accessible areas.

"Previously, maximum objectives could not be less than 6 months' normal usage of the material by industry in the United States in periods of active demand. The 6-month rule has been eliminated in establishing the new calculated conventional war objectives.

"The Office of Emergency Planning also announced that the present Defense Mobilization Order V–7, dealing with general policies for strategic and critical materials stockpiling, was now being revised to reflect these new policies. When finally prepared and approved, the new order will be published in the Federal Register.

"New conventional war objectives for the remaining stockpile materials are being developed as rapidly as new supply-requirements data become available. They will be released as they are approved.

"The Office of Emergency Planning is also making studies to determine stockpile needs to meet the requirements of general nuclear war and reconstruction. Stockpile objectives for nuclear war have not previously been developed. Some commodity objectives may be higher and others may be lower than the objectives established for conventional war.

"After the nuclear war supply-requirements studies are completed, stockpile objectives will be based upon calculated deficits for either conventional war or nuclear war, whichever need is larger.

"The Office of Emergency Planning stressed that any long-range disposal programs undertaken prior to the development of objectives based on nuclear war assumptions would provide against disposing of quantities which might be needed to meet essential requirements in the event of nuclear attack. While the disposal of surplus materials can produce many problems which have not heretofore arisen, every effort will be made to see that the interest of producers, processors, and consumers, and the international interests of the United States are carefully considered, both in the development and carrying out of disposal programs. Before decisions are made regarding the adoption of a long-range disposal program for a particular item in the stockpile, there will be appropriate consultations with industry in order to obtain the advice of interested parties."

The OEP statement of April 17, 1964, contained the following excerpts:

"Today's action completes supply-requirements studies for all stockpile materials based on current military, industrial, and other essential needs in the event of a conventional war emergency. Objectives for 79 materials in the stockpile were established with the advice and assistance of the Interdepartmental Materials Advisory Committee, a group chaired by OEP and composed of representatives of the Departments of State, Defense, the Interior, Agriculture, Commerce, and Labor, and the General Services Administration, the Agency for International Development, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Representatives of the Bureau of the Budget, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the Small Business Administration participate as observers.

"These new objectives reflect a new policy which accords with the recommendation of the Executive Stockpile Committee to establish a single objective for each material in the national stockpile. These new objectives will be reviewed and revised as necessary each year. Because military requirements and estimated emergency supplies of stockpile materials are constantly shifting, the supply-requirements balance for any material that is now or may become important to defense must be kept under continuing surveillance. Supply-requirements studies of the conventional war needs of approximately 20 other strategic and critical materials, which do not have stockpile objectives, are underway and are expected to be completed in the next few weeks. At the same time, studies on supply requirements for nuclear war are going forward. No definite date for completion of these studies has been established as yet.

"OEP stressed that long-range programs for disposal of identified surpluses would take into account the interests of producers, processors, and consumers, as well as the international interests of the United States. Appropriate consultation with industry will precede all decisions for the adoption of every disposal program and the advice of interested parties will be sought."

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD OF VIRGINIA

The cost value of Federal stockpile inventories as of November 30, 1964, totaled $13,555,771,885. This was a net decrease of $190,644,684, as compared with the November 1 total of $13,746,416,569. Net changes during the month are summarized by major category as follows:

Major category	Cost value, November 1964	
	Net change during month	Total, end of month
Strategic and critical materials	−$22,338,505	$8,401,335,069
Agricultural commodities	−172,076,501	4,798,717,648
Civil defense supplies and equipment	+203,526	212,963,691
Machine tools	+120,500	88,545,100
Helium	+3,446,296	54,210,377
Total	−190,644,684	13,555,771,885

These figures are from the November 1964 report on Federal stockpile inventories compiled from official agency data by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, showing detail with respect to quantity and cost value of each commodity in the inventories covered.

STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS

So-called strategic and critical materials are stored by the Government in (1) the national stockpile; (2) the Defense Production Act inventory; and (3) the supplemental-barter stockpile.

Overall, there are now 94 materials stockpiled in the strategic and critical inventories. Stockpile objectives—in terms of volume—are presently fixed for 76 of these 94 materials. Of the 76 materials having stockpile objectives, 63 were stockpiled in excess of their objectives as of November 30, 1964.

Increases in cost value were reported in 9 of the materials stockpiled in all strategic and critical inventories, decreases were reported in 23 materials, and 62 materials remained unchanged during November.

National stockpile

The cost value of materials in the national stockpile as of November 30, 1964, totaled $5,577,026,200. This was a net decrease of $17,365,300 during the month. The largest decreases were $5,402,100 in rubber, $3,810,300 in tin, $2,917,700 in zinc, $2,274,300 in lead and $1,190,600 in molybdenum.

Defense Production Act inventory

The cost value of materials in the Defense Production Act inventory as of November 30, 1964, totaled $1,431,479,600. This was a net decrease of $8,718,200. The largest decreases were in nickel, copper, and aluminum.

Supplemental-barter

The cost value of materials in the supplemental-barter stockpile as of November 30, 1964, totaled $1,392,829,269. This was a net increase of $3,744,995. The largest increase was in manganese.

OTHER STOCKPILE INVENTORIES

Among the other categories of stockpiled materials covered by the report the largest is $4.8 billion in agricultural commodities. Major decreases in agricultural commodities during November were reported for cotton, wheat, and milk and butterfat.

Inventories of civil defense supplies and equipment showed a net increase; the machine tools inventories showed a net increase, and the helium inventories showed a net increase during November.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. ROBERTSON, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Arthur M. Okun, of Connecticut, to be a member of the Council of Economic Advisers.

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Benjamin Aaron, of California; Joseph A. Beirne, of Maryland; Daniel Bell, of New York; Howard R. Bowen, of Iowa; Patrick E. Haggerty, of Texas; Albert J. Hayes, of Maryland; Anna Rosenberg Hoffman, of New York; Edwin H. Land, of Massachusetts; Walter P. Reuther, of Michigan; Robert H. Ryan, of Pennsylvania; John I. Snyder, Jr., of New York; Robert M. Solow, of Massachusetts; Philip Sporn, of New York, and Whitney M. Young, Jr., of New York; to be members of the National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CLARK:

S. 676. A bill for the relief of Dr. Woo Yoon Chey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BREWSTER:

S. 677. A bill for the relief of John Snure, Jr.;

S. 678. A bill for the relief of Lee Hi Sook;

S. 679. A bill for the relief of Sotirios John Pappathasiou;

S. 680. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Tropea;

S. 681. A bill for the relief of Mario Simoes da Fonseca;

S. 682. A bill for the relief of Dr. Manuel Tayko;

S. 683. A bill for the relief of Mrs. A. E. Houseley;

S. 684. A bill for the relief of Iluminada Bilgua Cabading;

S. 685. A bill for the relief of John Acerbi;

S. 686. A bill for the relief of Pietrina Del Frate; and

S. 687. A bill for the relief of Wadika Raffoul; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 688. A bill to amend title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, to provide for additional means and measures for land conservation and land utilization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. MUNDT (for himself, Mr. Muskie, Mr. Allott, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Curtis, Mr. Fong, Mr. Miller, Mr. Pearson, and Mr. Simpson):

S. 689. A bill to provide for periodic congressional review of Federal grants-in-aid to States and to local units of government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. Mundt, when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. TALMADGE:

S. 690. A bill for the relief of Norman J. Pitman; and

S. 691. A bill for the relief of Charles E. Tarver, Charles L. Garwood, James S. Rivers, John P. Hines, and R. F. Hudgins, owners of the Cordele Hotel of Cordele, Ga.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COTTON:

S. 692. A bill for the relief of Mesrop Berberian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT (for himself and Mr. Hickenlooper):

S. 693. A bill to amend the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. Fulbright, when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CURTIS:

S. 694. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Anna Soos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS (for himself and Mr. Carlson):

S. 695. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction from the gross estate for the value of property passing to children; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. PASTORE:

S. 696. A bill for the relief of Sheung Wan Ng;

S. 697. A bill for the relief of Maurice Jean Marcel Belanger, Jr.; and

S. 698. A bill for the relief of Bernard M. dos Remedios, and his son, Titus dos Remedios; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 699. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act so as to provide for inclusion of certain periods of reemployment of annuitants for the purpose of computing annuities of their surviving spouses; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PASTORE (by request):

S. 700. A bill to authorize appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. MANSFIELD (by request):

S. 701. A bill to carry out the obligations of the United States under the International Coffee Agreement, 1962, signed at New York on September 28, 1962, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Mansfield when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JACKSON:

S. 702. A bill to provide for the disposition of judgment funds on deposit to the credit of the Quinaielt Tribe of Indians; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 703. A bill for the relief of Kimie Okamoto Addington; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BREWSTER:

S. 704. A bill for the relief of John L. Dean; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 705. A bill to extend the application of the Classification Act of 1949 to certain positions in, and employees of, the executive branch of the Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BURDICK (for himself and Mr. Young of North Dakota):

S. 706. A bill to provide for a highway bridge across the Missouri River between Bismarck, N. Dak., and Mobridge, S. Dak.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BURDICK (for himself, Mr. Anderson, Mr. Bartlett, Mr. Bible, Mr. Church, Mr. Clark, Mr. Fulbright, Mr. Inouye, Mr. Javits, Mr. Long of Missouri, Mr. Magnuson, Mr. McGee, Mr. McGovern, Mr. Moss, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Ribicoff, Mr. Yarborough, and Mr. Young of North Dakota):

S. 707. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, with respect to the purposes for which surplus personal property may be donated; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. BURDICK:

S. 708. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that only those clubs whose annual dues exceed $25 a year will be subject to the tax on club dues; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BURDICK (for himself, Mr. Young of North Dakota, Mr. Hartke, Mr. Nelson, and Mr. Mundt):

S. 709. A bill to amend the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 in order to increase the limitation on the amount of loans which may be insured under subtitle A, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. SCOTT:

S. 710. A bill for the relief of Wing Kai Mak; and

S. 711. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hertha L. Wohlmuth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT (for himself, Mr. Allott, Mr. Mundt, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Simpson, Mr. Tower, and Mr. Murphy):

S. 712. A bill to prohibit the use of products originating in any country or area dominated or controlled by communism in any housing construction which is assisted under programs administered by the Housing and Home Finance Agency, its constituent agencies, or the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SCOTT (for himself and Mr. Dodd):

S. 713. A bill to amend the Wool Products Labeling Act of 1939 in order to exempt headwear from the provisions of such Act; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Scott when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SCOTT (for himself, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Simpson, Mr. Tower, and Mr. Murphy):

S. 714. A bill to prevent the importation of flat glass which is the product of any country or area dominated or controlled by communism; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Scott when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SCOTT:

S. 715. A bill to prevent the use of stopwatches, work measurement programs, or other performance standards operations as measuring devices in the postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. Scott when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SCOTT (for himself, Mr. Allott, Mr. Mundt, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Simpson, Mr. Tower, and Mr. Murphy):

S. 716. A bill to prohibit the use of products originating in any country or area dominated or controlled by communism in Federal or federally assisted projects for the construction, alteration, or repair of any building, public work, or facility; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LAUSCHE:

S. 717. A bill providing for the loss of nationality in the case of an individual entering a Communist country with the intent to transfer his allegiance from the United States to that counry;

S. 718. A bill to prohibit profiteering in coins of the United States;

S. 719. A bill for the relief of Ivanka Pekar; and

S. 720. A bill for the relief of Ivan Radic, his wife, Ester Radic, and their daughter, Olivera Radic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Lausche when he introduced the first two above-mentioned bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. YARBOROUGH (for himself and Mr. Tower):

S. 721. A bill to authorize the establishment of the Alibates Flint Quarries and Texas Panhandle Pueblo Culture National Monument; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Yarborough when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. INOUYE:

S. 722. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property situated in the State of Hawaii to the State of Hawaii; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 723. A bill to provide for the inclusion of years of service as judge of the Circuit Court for the Territory of Hawaii in the computation of Federal judicial service of the Honorable Martin Pence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRIS (for Mr. Monroney):

S. 724. A bill for the relief of Insook (Kim) Cho; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARTKE:

S. 725. A bill to repeal the retailers excise taxes on jewelry, furs, toilet preparations, and luggage and handbags; and to repeal the manufacturers excise tax on musical instruments; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Hartke when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware:

S. 726. A bill for the relief of Peter Drossos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 727. A bill for the relief of certain individuals; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 728. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act so as to provide for retirement on full annuity upon voluntary separation after 30 years of service or upon involuntary separation after 20 years of service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. Sparkman when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DODD:

S. 729. A bill to fix certain fees payable to the Commissioner of Patents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Dodd when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McCLELLAN (by request):

S. 730. A bill to fix the fees payable to the Patent Office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. McClellan when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 731. A bill to amend the bonding provisions of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 and the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Morse when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MILLER:

S.732. A bill to require the registration with the Postmaster General of the names of mailing list suppliers and buyers, and of transactions involving the sale or other exchange of mailing lists, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. Miller when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. TOWER:

S. 733. A bill to allow an additional time for payment of 1964 income tax to the extent of underwithholding on wages paid to individuals; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Tower when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. INOUYE:

S. 734. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make a loan and grant to the State of Hawaii for the construction of the Kokee water project, Hawaii, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER:

S. 735. A bill creating a commission to be known as the Commission for Elimination of Pornographic Materials; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. Miller when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

S. 736. A bill for the relief of Rene Saturnino Pulido; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONDALE:

S. 737. A bill for the relief of Prof. Arturo Serrano-Plaja;

S. 738. A bill for the relief of Kiren Lall;

S. 739. A bill for the relief of Dr. Rafael Fernandez;

S. 740. A bill for the relief of Vasiliki Niloloudis;

S. 741. A bill for the relief of Pham Thu; and

S. 742. A bill for the relief of Dr. Luis Mario Tredici; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 743. A bill to eliminate the requirement that the Federal Reserve banks maintain certain reserves in gold certificates against deposit and note liabilities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. Douglas when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. Montoya, and Mr. Magnuson):

S. 744. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Compensation Act so as to permit injured employees entitled to receive medical services under such act to utilize the services of chiropractors; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Williams of New Jersey when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ERVIN (for himself and Mr. Hruska):

S. 745. A bill to further insure to military personnel certain due process protection by providing for military judges to be detailed to all general courts-martial, and for other purposes;

S. 746. A bill to further insure due process in the administration of military justice in the Department of the Navy by establishing a Judge Advocate General's Corps in such Department;

S. 747. A bill to protect the constitutional rights of military personnel by providing an independent forum to review and correct the military records of members and former members of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes;

S. 748. A bill to provide additional constitutional protection for members of the Armed Forces by establishing Courts of Military Review, and for other purposes;

S. 749. A bill to insure to military personnel certain basic constitutional rights by prohibiting command influence in courts-martial cases and in certain nonjudicial proceedings, and for other purposes;

S. 750. A bill to protect the constitutional rights of military personnel by insuring their right to be represented by qualified counsel in certain cases, and for other purposes;

S. 751. A bill to protect the constitutional rights of military personnel by increasing the period within which such personnel may petition for a new trial by court-martial, and for other purposes;

S. 752. A bill to amend chapter 47 (Uniform Code of Military Justice) of title 10, United States Code, so as to provide additional constitutional protection in trials by courts-martial;

S. 753. A bill to implement the constitutional rights of military personnel by providing appellate review of certain administrative board decisions, and for other purposes;

S. 754. A bill to insure due process in the case of certain administrative actions involving military personnel;

S. 755. A bill to further insure the fair and independent review of court-martial cases by prohibiting any members of a board of review from rating the effectiveness of another member of a board of review, and for other purposes;

S. 756. A bill to broaden the constitutional protection against double jeopardy in the case of military personnel;

S. 757. A bill to more effectively protect certain constitutional rights accorded military personnel;

S. 758. A bill to provide additional constitutional protection in certain cases to members of the armed forces, and for other purposes; and

S. 759. A bill to afford military personnel due process in court-martial cases involving minor offenses, to insure the right of counsel in such cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. Ervin when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ERVIN:

S. 760. A bill to amend chapter 47 (Uniform Code of Military Justice) so as to assure the constitutional rights of confrontation and compulsory process by providing for the mandatory appearance of witnesses and the production of evidence before certain boards and officers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 761. A bill to provide for compliance with constitutional requirements in the trials of persons who are charged with having committed certain offenses while subject to trial by court-martial, who have not been tried for such offenses, and who are no longer subject to trial by court-martial; and

S. 762. A bill to provide for compliance with constitutional requirements in the trials of persons who, while accompanying the armed forces outside the United States, commit certain offenses against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Ervin when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS

PRINTING OF COMPILATION OF HEARINGS, STAFF REPORTS, AND STUDIES OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY STAFFING AND OPERATIONS

Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Government Operations, reported an original concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 11) to print 4,000 copies of a compilation of the hearings, staff reports, and studies of the Subcommittee on National Security Staffing and Operations, which, under the rule, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above concurrent resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. Jackson, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

PROVISION FOR ONE GENERAL EXPENDITURE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR EACH FISCAL YEAR

Mr. BYRD of Virginia (for himself and Mr. Williams of Delaware) submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 12); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved by the Senate (*the House of Representatives concurring*), That, effective on the first day of the regular session of the Eighty-   Congress, the joint rule of the Senate and of the House of Representatives contained in section 138 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(c) (1) All new expenditure authorizations for each fiscal year shall be contained in one general expenditure authorization bill to be known as the General Expenditure Authorization Act of   (the blank to be filled in with the appropriate fiscal year). The general expenditure authorization bill may be divided into separate titles, each title corresponding so far as practicable to the respective regular general appropriation bills heretofore enacted. As used in this paragraph, the term 'expenditure authorizations' shall not include deficiency or supplemental expenditure authorizations, expenditure authorizations under private Acts of Congress, or rescissions of expenditure authorizations.

"(2) The general expenditure authorization bill for each fiscal year, and each deficiency and supplemental general expenditure authorization bill containing expenditure authorizations available for such fiscal year, shall contain provisions limiting the total net expenditures during such fiscal year against each expenditure authorization made therein; and the general expenditure authorization bill for each fiscal year shall contain provisions limiting the total net expenditures during such fiscal year against each expenditure authorization available from prior years. In each case in which an expenditure authorization for any fiscal year for any purpose is provided in any such bill and any other expenditure authorization or authorizations for the same general purpose are available during such fiscal year, the limitation shall be against total expenditures from all expenditure authorizations available for the same general purpose during such fiscal year. The foregoing provisions of this paragraph shall not be applicable to expenditure authorizations made soley for the payment of claims certified by the Comptroller General of the United States or of judgments, to appropriations for the payment of interest on the public debt, or to expenditures from intragovernmental revolving and management funds. Nothing in this subsection shall be deemed to preclude the inclusion in any general expenditure authorization bill or in any deficiency or supplemental expenditure authorization bill of such provisions as may be deemed appropriate with respect to transfer of expenditure authorizations or expenditure limitations.

"(3) The committee reports accompanying each general expenditure authorization bill, and the statement of managers accompanying any conference report thereon, shall show in tabular form for information purposes, by items and totals—

"(A) the amount of each new expenditure authorization available for expenditure in the fiscal year;

"(B) estimates of the balances of expenditure authorizations as of the beginning of the fiscal year;

"(C) estimates of the net expenditures in the fiscal year from each expenditure authorization referred to in clause (A), except expenditures from intragovernmental revolving and management funds;

"(D) estimates of the net expenditures in the fiscal year from the balances of expenditure authorizations, referred to in clause (B), except expenditures from intragovernmental revolving and management funds;

"(E) estimates of the net expenditures in the fiscal year from intragovernmental revolving and management funds;

"(F) the totals of the amounts referred to in clauses (C), (D), and (E); and

"(G) estimates of the total amount which will be available for expenditure subsequent to the close of the fiscal year from the expenditure authorizations referred to in clauses (A) and (B).

The committee reports accompanying each deficiency and supplemental expenditure authorization bill containing expenditure authorizations available for obligation or expenditure during the fiscal year, and each expenditure authorization rescission bill, and the statement of managers accompanying any conference report on any such bill, shall include appropriate cumulative revisions of such tabulations.

"(4) The information reported under paragraph (3) shall be accompanied by (i) data on intragovernmental revolving and management funds and public enterprise funds (including the funds of wholly owned Government corporations) which shall show the gross amounts from which the net amounts estimated to be expended are derived, and information on estimated investments, repayment of capital, payment of dividends, and other cash transactions which do not affect net expenditures; and (ii) such supplemental data as may be considered desirable by the committee making the report.

"(5) No general expenditure authorization bill shall be received or considered in either House unless the bill and the report accompanying it conform with this rule.

"(6) For the purposes of this subsection, the amount of expenditures shall be determined upon a checks-issued basis.

"(7) As used in this subsection (c), the term 'expenditure authorization' shall apply to all current appropriations, permanent appropriations, contract authorizations, authorizations to expend from public or corporate debt receipts, cancellation of obligations of Government agencies to the Treasury, reappropriations, reauthorizations, and any other authorizations to withdraw moneys from the Treasury of the United States. The term 'expenditure authorization' shall not apply to appropriations of trust funds, deposit funds, transactions involving public debt retirement, or appropriations made solely for payment of refunds and drawbacks.

"(8) The Appropriations Committees of the two Houses may hold hearings simultaneously on each general expenditure authorization bill or may hold joint hearings thereon.

"(d) The general expenditure authorization bill for each fiscal year, and each deficiency and supplemental general expenditure authorization bill containing expenditure authorizations available for expenditure during such fiscal year, shall at the time the bill is reported to the House of Representatives and to the Senate contain in the body of the bill or in the preamble thereto, as the respective committees may deem appropriate, a current estimate by the Secretary of the Treasury of the overall Federal receipts for such fiscal year."

Sec. 2. (a) The Senate, recognizing the necessity for an amendment to its Standing Rules in order to make effective the amendment to the joint rule made by the first section of this resolution, hereby adopts the provisions of subsection (b) of this section as an exercise of its rulemaking power.

(b) Effective on the first day of the regular session of the Eighty- Congress, but only if prior thereto this resolution is adopted by both Houses of Congress, subsection (b) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Committee on Appropriations, to consist of twenty-seven Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:

"1. Expenditure authorizations. As used in this paragraph, the term 'expenditure authorizations' means current appropriations, permanent appropriations, contract authorizations, authorizations to expend from public or corporate debt receipts, cancellation of obligations of Government agencies to the Treasury, reappropriations, reauthorizations, and any other authorizations to withdraw moneys from the Treasury of the United States except authorizations to withdraw moneys from the Treasury of the United States for the payment of private claims."

EXPRESSION OF SENSE OF CONGRESS ON INCREASING THE BED CAPACITY FOR ALL VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITALS

Mr. ANDERSON (for himself, Mr. Mansfield, Mr. Montoya, and Mr. Metcalf) submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 13) expressing the sense of Congress on increasing the authorized bed capacity for all Veterans' Administration hospitals, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the above concurrent resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. Anderson, which appears under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTIONS

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS TO MAKE CERTAIN STUDIES

Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Government Operations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 54) authorizing the Committee on Government Operations to make certain studies as to the efficiency and economy of the operations of the Government, which, under the rule, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. McClellan, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

AMENDMENT OF RULE XXV, TO CREATE A COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. RANDOLPH (for himself and Senators Mundt, Talmadge, Fong, Montoya, Harris, Holland, Moss, Boggs, Bible, Jackson, McCarthy, Long of Missouri, Inouye, Byrd of West Virginia, Metcalf, Cannon, Pearson, Neuberger, Williams of New Jersey, McIntyre, Ribicoff, Gruening, Hart, Douglas, and Bayh) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 55), which, under the rule, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. Randolph, which appears under a separate heading.)

FUNDS TO STUDY AND EVALUATE EFFECTS OF LAWS PERTAINING TO PROPOSED REORGANIZATIONS IN EXECUTIVE BRANCH

Mr. RIBICOFF, from the Committee on Government Operations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 56) to provide funds to study and evaluate the effects of laws pertaining to proposed reorganizations in the executive branch of the Government, which, under the rule, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. Ribicoff, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

STUDY OF CERTAIN ASPECTS OF NATIONAL SECURITY AND INTERNATIONAL OPERATIONS

Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Government Operations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 57) to study certain aspects of national security and international operations, which, under the rule, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. Jackson, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

FUNDS FOR STUDY OF MATTERS PERTAINING TO ECONOMY AND EFFICIENCY OF FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACTIVITIES

Mr. RIBICOFF (for Mr. Gruening), from the Committee on Government Operations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 58) to provide funds for the study of matters pertaining to economy and efficiency of foreign assistance activities by the Federal Government, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. Ribicoff (for Mr. Gruening), which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

STUDY OF INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THE STATES AND MUNICIPALITIES

Mr. MUSKIE, from the Committee on Government Operations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 59) authorizing a study of intergovernmental relationships between the United States and the States and municipalities, which, under the rule, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. Muskie, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

ADDITIONAL STAFF FOR COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 60) to authorize additional staff for the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, which, under the rule, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. Hill, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR COMMITTEE ON AERONAUTICAL AND SPACE SCIENCES

Mr. ANDERSON, from the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 61) to provide additional funds for the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, which, under the rule, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. ANDERSON, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

TO PRINT AS A SENATE DOCUMENT A COMPILATION OF MATERIALS FROM SPEECHES IN THE UNITED STATES BY MR. CHURCHILL

Mr. TOWER (for himself and Mr. JAVITS) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 62); which, under the rule, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. TOWER, which appears under a separate heading.)

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. PELL submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 63); which, under the rule was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 63

Resolved, That the Committee on Rules and Administration, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to:

(1) the election of the President, Vice President, or Members of Congress;

(2) corrupt practices;

(3) contested elections;

(4) credentials and qualifications;

(5) Federal elections generally, and

(6) Presidential succession.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of this resolution, the committee, from February 1, 1965, to January 31, 1966, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ, upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,100 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1966.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $ shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

USE OF RADIO OR TELEVISION IN REPORTING PROCEEDINGS OF THE SENATE

Mr. JAVITS (for himself, Mr. CLARK, and Mr. MORSE) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 64) relative to the use of radio or television in reporting proceedings of the Senate and in the Press Gallery, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. JAVITS, which appears under a separate heading.)

ELECTRICAL PUBLIC ADDRESS SYSTEM IN SENATE CHAMBER

Mr. JAVITS (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BOGGS, Mr. CLARK, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MOSS, Mrs. NEUBERGER, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mrs. SMITH, and Mr. SYMINGTON) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 65) to provide a suitable electrical public address system in the Senate Chamber, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. JAVITS, which appears under a separate heading.)

TO PRINT AS A SENATE DOCUMENT CERTAIN STATEMENTS AND SPEECHES ON POLISH INDEPENDENCE

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 66); which, under the rule, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 66

Resolved, That there shall be printed as a Senate document a selected compilation, to be prepared by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, of the principal statements and speeches made by Members of Congress since the founding of the Government of the United States which constitute expressions of concern or support for the freedom and independence of the people of Poland; *Provided*, That such selected compilation shall not exceed two hundred and fifty pages in length and shall specifically include the following statements: From the History of Congress, December 1797—article on General Kosciusko; from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 6, 1918—statement by Mr. Sabath; from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 4, 1964—articles on Progress on the Children's Hospital Project in Poland, Children's Hospital Receives AID Grant, and the University of Krakow.

SEC. 2. There shall be printed and bound as directed by the Joint Committee on Printing, four thousand copies of such document.

PROPOSED PERIODIC CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW OF FEDERAL GRANTS IN AID TO THE STATES AND TO LOCAL UNITS OF GOVERNMENT

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I introduce a bill along with the chairman of the Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee of the Senate and other colleagues to provide for periodic congressional review of Federal grants-in-aid to the States and to local units of government. This bill is identical to S. 2114 of the 88th Congress which was reported by the Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee following hearings and which passed the Senate in the last session.

We expect to press for early action on this bill, or to have it added as an amendment to an omnibus bill which will also come before the Subcommittee on Intergovernment Relations.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill may lie on the table until a week from today in case other cosponsors may wish to sponsor the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie at the table as requested.

The bill (S. 689) to provide for periodic congressional review of Federal grants-in-aid to States and to local units of government, introduced by Mr. MUNDT (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the grant-in-aid program has been a very useful instrument in furthering Federal-State-local cooperation. To anyone undertaking a serious study of the subject of intergovernmental relationships, the dominant role of the Federal grants-in-aid became immediately apparent since the greatest portion of the Federal role in State activity takes the form of grants-in-aid. Hearings before the Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee last year revealed the dramatically rapid growth of such programs during this century and the vastly significant role of grant-in-aid programs in our Federal system today.

The problem we face in achieving effective and systematic review of Federal grant-in-aid programs typifies the problems faced in other areas where the Congress is so crowded with its legislative agenda that it is unable effectively to fulfill all its responsibilities. Depending on the basis used to select them, there are between 60 and 105 Federal grant-in-aid programs. They have grown like "Topsy," and there is strong likelihood of more forthcoming to make the problem even more acute. There is a lack of uniformity of program operations; at no single point is there an overall review or effort to harmonize. Once on the books, they are not effectively reviewed for possible termination or redirection; some are out of harmony with others, creating dissension within the States. Needed is an overall view of grant-in-aid legislation on a continuing basis with the objective of harmonizing, streamlining, and standardizing such legislation to simplify State administration and to promote overall government efficiency.

This bill is designed to correct the foregoing problems. Its objective, then, is to achieve the full measure of efficiency and uniformity in the operation of all Federal grant-in-aid programs and to eliminate unnecessary programs or portions of programs.

This bill would establish a systematic procedure for continuing congressional review of all Federal grant-in-aid programs, but the procedures established to provide review of future programs differ somewhat from those applying to existing programs.

The bill would subject future grant-in-aid programs to an automatic termination provision and would require that prior to program termination appropriate congressional committees undertake comprehensive review of affected programs and report their findings and recommendations to the Congress. Those programs enacted in the 89th or subsequent Congresses, would automatically expire at the end of 5 years unless first, an earlier date was specifically provided for; or, second, application of this termination provision had been specifically waived. Between 12 and 24 months before program termination, both House and Senate committees having jurisdiction over the legislation shall, separately or jointly, undertake a comprehensive review of the program. To assist the committees in their review, the General Accounting Office and, upon request, the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations are given a directive to undertake independent studies of grant-in-aid programs and to report their findings and recommendations to the respective committees and the Congress. These reports will be timed to coincide with congressional reassessment. The committees would undertake their review to ascertain, among other matters of concern: First, the extent to which the purposes for which the grants-in-aid are authorized have been met; second, the extent to which such programs can be carried on without further Federal financial assistance; and, third, whether any changes in the original program should be made in the light of reports and recommendations of the General Accounting Office or of those submitted on request by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. Each committee shall report the results of its review to its respective House not later than 120 days before the program authority is due to expire.

Existing grant-in-aid programs would not be subject to an automatic expiration provision, but they would be subject to continuing review by the General Accounting Office. Many existing grant-in-aid programs contain provisions for termination, and, while the bill does not require congressional committees to review existing programs, it sets forth guidelines for those committees that decide to undertake a review and provides them with assistance by the General Accounting Office. The General Accounting Office is directed to make continuing studies of all grant-in-aid programs with a view to determining first, the extent to which program conflict and duplication can be eliminated and more effective, efficient, and economical administration of such programs could be achieved by changing certain requirements and procedures applicable thereto; and second, the extent to which the administration of such programs could be improved by making certain requirements and procedures uniformly applicable to such programs. The General Accounting Office would submit an annual activities report to the Congress on the extent of its study of Federal grant-in-aid programs and interim reports on its findings and recommendations concerning specific grants. When feasible, individual reports on expiring programs would be submitted in the year prior to the program expiration date. In general, these provisions give greater direction to the activities of the General Accounting Office under existing statutory authority.

AMENDMENT OF FOREIGN AGENTS REGISTRATION ACT

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] and myself, I reintroduce a bill to amend the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938. This is the same bill that passed the Senate last session. I am pleased to report that Congressman CELLER, chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, which has jurisdiction over this subject on that side, has introduced an identical bill.

The basic purpose of this bill is to update the Foreign Agents Registration Act to reflect the changes in the nature of the U.S. role in world affairs today. As our interests throughout the world have multiplied, the efforts of foreign interests to influence American foreign policy have become correspondingly greater and more subtle.

In order to determine the extent of the use of nondiplomatic means to influence American policy, in 1961 the Committee on Foreign Relations ordered a preliminary staff investigation to look into incidents which had come to its attention. The staff investigation uncovered evidence of extensive activities which were not subject to the public scrutiny they deserved and, at the committee's request, the Senate agreed to a resolution authorizing a full investigation into the subject. The committee's investigation began in 1962 and continued through most of 1963. On September 10 of that year, a bill was introduced to amend the Foreign Agents Registration Act substantially in accord with the provisions of the bill being introduced today. Full public hearings were held on the bill and it was reported to the Senate with amendments on February 21 of last year.

The committee has studied at great length both the conditions which prompted the bill and the provisions of the bill itself. The bill was debated thoroughly in the Senate and objection was raised to only one aspect of it. I believe that this objection was settled satisfactorily by adoption of an amendment offered by the senior Senator from New York, Senator JAVITS, even though I did not believe that the amendment was necessary. The major provisions of the bill as it passed the Senate and as it is being reintroduced today are:

First. Revised definitions for the terms "foreign principal," "agent of a foreign principal," and "political activities" plus a new term "political consultant"—all of which are aimed at better focusing the act on those individuals performing political or semipolitical activities.

Second. An injunctive remedy is authorized for the Attorney General where compliance with either the act itself or the regulations issued under the act is considered inadequate.

Third. Stricter requirements for disclosing political activities and expenditures as part of regular reports to the Department of Justice.

Fourth. Prohibition of campaign contributions for or in behalf of a foreign principal in connection with any primary or general election for public office.

Fifth. Prohibition of contingent fee contracts between agents and foreign principals based upon success in political activities to be undertaken by the agent.

Sixth. Provision that a foreign agent appearing for or in the interest of his foreign principal before a congressional committee be required to identify himself fully as to his principals and file his latest registration statement as part of the committee hearing record.

Seventh. Officers and employees of the U.S. Government are prohibited from acting as agents of foreign principals. Contract or part-time employees of the Federal Government may act as agents of foreign principals if the head of the employing agency certifies such employment is in the national interest and a copy of the certification is placed in the public file of the agent maintained by the Department of Justice.

Since the bill did not pass the Senate until July 6, the House Judiciary Committee did not have sufficient time to consider the bill in detail last session. It should not be necessary for the Senate committee to spend a great deal of time on the bill this session, since we will not be covering any new ground. However, the committee would, of course, be pleased to receive the views of individuals and organizations on aspects of interest to them which they believe warrant additional attention. I do hope that the Senate can pass the bill without unnecessary delay so that the House will have ample opportunity to give it careful study this session.

The Committee on Foreign Relations has in its files much material that justifies additional hearings on the activities of foreign lobbyists, but it does not believe that exposure for exposure's sake is a proper activity for a congressional investigation. The committee takes the view that legislation, not headlines, is the end objective of legislative activity. And this committee has adhered to that principle in considering this difficult subject in the past. This approach has, we believe, produced a fair and reasonable bill. However, if the Senate feels that further investigations are needed, I will be glad to cooperate in bringing additional information bearing on the problem to public attention.

I ask unanimous consent to have the text of the bill printed at this point in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 693) to amend the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended, introduced by Mr. FULBRIGHT (for himself and Mr. HICKENLOOPER), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 693

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of

America in Congress assembled, That section 1 of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended, is amended as follows:

(1) Subsection (b) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) The term 'foreign principal' includes—

"(1) a government of a foreign country and a foreign political party;

"(2) a person outside of the United States, unless it is established that such person is an individual and a citizen of and domiciled within the United States, or that such person is not an individual and is organized under or created by the laws of the United States or of any State or other place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States and has its principal place of business within the United States; and

"(3) a partnership, association, corporation, organization, or other combination of persons organized under the laws of or having its principal place of business in a foreign country."

(2) Subsection (c) is amended to read as follows:

"(c) Except as provided in subsection (d) hereof, the term 'agent of a foreign principal' means—

"(1) any person who acts as an agent, representative, employee, servant or in any other capacity at the order, request, or under the direction or control of a foreign principal or of a person any of whose activities are directly or indirectly supervised, directed, controlled, financed or subsidized in whole or in major part by a foreign principal, and who directly or through any other person—

"(i) engages within the United States in political activities for or in the interests of such foreign principal;

"(ii) acts within the United States as a public relations counsel, publicity agent, information-service employee or political consultant for or in the interests of such foreign principal;

"(iii) within the United States solicits, collects, disburses, or dispenses contributions, loans, money, or other things of value for or in the interest of such foreign principal; or

"(iv) within the United States represents the interests of such foreign principal before any agency or official of the Government of the United States; and

"(2) any person who agrees, consents, assumes or purports to act as, or who is or holds himself out to be, whether or not pursuant to contractual relationship, an agent of a foreign principal as defined in clause (1) of this subsection."

(3) Subsection (d) is amended by striking out "clause (1), (2), or (4) of".

(4) Subsection (g) is amended by inserting before the words, "matter pertaining to", the words "public relations" and before the semicolon at the end thereof the words "of such principal".

(5) Such section is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(o) The term 'political activities' includes the dissemination of political propaganda and any other activity which the person engaging therein believes will, or which he intends to, prevail upon, indoctrinate, convert, induce, persuade, or in any other way influence any other person or any section of the public within the United States with reference to the political or public interests, policies, or relations of a government of a foreign country, or a foreign political party or with reference to the domestic or foreign policies of the United States.

"(p) The term 'political consultant' means any person, including, without limitation, any economic, legal or other consultant, who engages in informing or advising any person with reference to the political or public interests, policies or relations of a foreign country or of a foreign political party or with reference to the domestic or foreign policies of the United States."

Sec. 2. Section 2 of such Act is amended as follows:

(1) Subsection (a) is amended by striking out the second, third, and fourth sentences and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Except as hereinafter provided, every person who becomes an agent of a foreign principal shall, within ten days thereafter, file with the Attorney General, in duplicate, a registration statement, under oath on a form prescribed by the Attorney General. The obligation of an agent of a foreign principal to file a registration statement shall, after the tenth day of his becoming such agent, continue from day to day, and termination of such status shall not relieve such agent from his obligation to file a registration statement for the period during which he was an agent of a foreign principal."

(2) Subsection (a) (3) is amended by inserting before the semicolon at the end thereof a comma and the following: "or by any other foreign principal".

(3) Subsection (a) (4) is amended by inserting before the semicolon at the end thereof a comma and the following: "including a detailed statement of any such activity which is a political activity".

(4) Subsection (a) (6) is amended by inserting before the semicolon at the end thereof a comma and the following: "including a detailed statement of any such activity which is a political activity."

(5) Subsection (a) (7) is amended to read as follows:

"(7) The name, business, and residence addresses, and if an individual, the nationality, of any person other than a foreign principal for whom the registrant is acting, assuming or purporting to act or has agreed to act under such circumstances as require his registration hereunder; the extent to which each such person is supervised, directed, owned, controlled, financed, or subsidized, in whole or in part, by any government of a foreign country or foreign political party or by any other foreign principal; and the nature and amount of contributions, income, money, or thing of value, if any, that the registrant has received during the preceding sixty days from each such person in connection with any of the activities referred to in clause (6) of this subsection, either as compensation or for disbursement or otherwise, and the form and time of each such payment and from whom received;".

(6) Subsection (a)(8) is amended to read as follows:

"(8) A detailed statement of the money and other things of value spent or disposed of by the registrant during the preceding sixty days in furtherance of or in connection with activities which require his registration hereunder and which have been undertaken by him either as an agent of a foreign principal or for himself or any other person or in connection with any activities relating to his becoming an agent of such principal, and a detailed statement of any contributions of money or other things of value made by him during the preceding sixty days (other than contributions the making of which is prohibited under the terms of section 613 of title 18, United States Code) in connection with an election to any political office or in connection with any primary election, convention, or caucus held to select candidates for any political office;".

(7) Such section is further amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(f) The Attorney General may, by regulation, provide for the exemption from registration, or from the requirement of furnishing any of the information required by this section, of any person who is listed as a partner, officer, director, or employee in the registration statement filed by an agent of a foreign principal under this Act, where by reason of the nature of the functions or activities of such person the Attorney General having due regard for the national security and the public interest determines that such registration, or the furnishing of such information, is not necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act."

Sec. 3. Section 3(d) of such Act is amended by striking out the words "financial or mercantile" and by inserting after the words "foreign principal" the words "or other activities not serving predominantly a foreign interest".

Sec. 4. Section 4 of such Act is amended as follows:

(1) Subsection (a) is amended by inserting after the words "political propaganda" the words "for or in the interests of such foreign principal"; and by striking out the words "send to the Librarian of Congress two copies thereof and file with the Attorney General one copy thereof" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "file with the Attorney General two copies thereof".

(2) Subsection (b) is amended by inserting after the words "political propaganda" where they first appear the words "for or in the interests of such foreign principal"; by inserting after the words "setting forth" the words "the relationship or connection between the person transmitting the political propaganda or causing it to be transmitted and such propaganda;"; and by striking out the words "each of his foreign principals" and inserting in lieu thereof "such foreign principal".

(3) Subsection (c) is amended by striking out the words "sent to the Librarian of Congress" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "filed with the Attorney General".

(4) Such section is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(e) It shall be unlawful for any person within the United States who is an agent of a foreign principal required to register under the provisions of this Act to transmit, convey, or otherwise furnish to any agency or official of the Government (including a Member or committee of either House of Congress) for or in the interests of such foreign principal any political propaganda or to request from any such agency or official for or in the interests of such foreign principal any information or advice with respect to any matter pertaining to the political or public interests, policies or relations of a foreign country or of a political party or pertaining to the foreign or domestic policies of the United States unless the propaganda or the request is prefaced or accompanied by a true and accurate statement to the effect that such person is registered as an agent of such foreign principal under this Act.

"(f) Whenever any agent of a foreign principal required to register under this Act appears before any committee of Congress to testify for or in the interests of such foreign principal, he shall, at the time of such appearance, furnish the committee with a copy of his most recent registration statement filed with the Department of Justice as an agent of such foreign principal for inclusion in the records of the committee as part of his testimony."

Sec. 5. Section 5 of such Act is amended by inserting after "the provisions of this Act," where they first appear the words "in accordance with such business and accounting practices,".

Sec. 6. Section 6 of such Act is amended by inserting the letter "(a)" after the section number and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(b) The Attorney General shall, promptly upon receipt, transmit one copy of every registration statement filed hereunder and one copy of every amendment or supplement thereto, and one copy of every item of political propaganda filed hereunder, to the

Secretary of State for such comment and use as the Secretary of State may determine to be appropriate from the point of view of the foreign relations of the United States. Failure of the Attorney General so to transmit such copy shall not be a bar to prosecution under this Act.

"(c) The Attorney General is authorized to furnish to departments and agencies in the executive branch and committees of the Congress such information obtained by him in the administration of this Act, including the names of registrants under this Act, copies of registration statements, or parts thereof, copies of political propaganda, or other documents or information filed under this Act, as may be appropriate in the light of the purposes of this Act."

SEC. 7. Section 8 of such Act is amended as follows:

(1) Subsection (a) is amended by adding before the period at the end of paragraph (2) a comma and the following: "except that in the case of a violation of subsection (b), (e), or (f) of section 4 or of subsection (g) or (h) of this section the punishment shall be a fine of not more than $5,000 or imprisonment for not more than six months, or both".

(2) Such section is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(f) Whenever in the judgment of the Attorney General any person is engaged in or about to engage in any acts which constitute or will constitute a violation of any provision of this Act, or regulations issued thereunder, or whenever any agent of a foreign principal fails to comply with any of the provisions of this Act or the regulations issued thereunder, or otherwise is in violation of the Act, the Attorney General may make application to the appropriate United States district court for an order enjoining such acts or enjoining such person from continuing to act as an agent of such foreign principal, or for an order requiring compliance with any appropriate provision of the Act or regulation thereunder. The district court shall have jurisdiction and authority to issue a temporary or permanent injunction, restraining order or such other order which it may deem proper. The proceedings shall be made a preferred cause and shall be expedited in every way.

"(g) If the Attorney General determines that a registration statement does not comply with the requirements of this Act or the regulations issued thereunder, he shall so notify the registrant in writing, specifying in what respects the statement is deficient. It shall be unlawful for any person to act as an agent of a foreign principal at any time ten days or more after receipt of such notification without filing an amended registration statement in full compliance with the requirements of this Act and the regulations issued thereunder.

"(h) It shall be unlawful for any agent of a foreign principal required to register under this Act to be a party to any contract, agreement, or understanding, either express or implied, with such foreign principal pursuant to which the amount or payment of the compensation, fee, or other remuneration of such agent is contingent in whole or in part upon the success of any political activities carried on by such agent."

SEC. 8. (a) Chapter 29 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"§ 613. Contributions by agents of foreign principals

"Whoever, being an agent of a foreign principal, directly or through any other person, either for or on behalf of such foreign principal or otherwise in his capacity as agent of such foreign principal, knowingly makes any contribution of money or other thing of value, or promises expressly or impliedly to make any such contribution, in connection with an election to any political office or in connection with any primary election, convention, or caucus held to select candidates for any political office; or

"Whoever knowingly solicits, accepts, or receives any such contribution from any such agent of a foreign principal or from such foreign principal—

"Shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisonment not more than five years or both.

"As used in this section—

"(1) The term 'foreign principal' has the same meaning as when used in the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended, except that such term does not include any person who is a citizen of the United States.

"(2) The term 'agent of a foreign principal' means any person who acts as an agent, representative, employee, servant, or in any other capacity at the order, request, or under the direction or control of a foreign principal or of a person any substantial portion of whose activities are directly or indirectly supervised, directed, or controlled by a foreign principal."

(b) Chapter 11 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"§ 219. Officers and employees acting as agents of foreign principals

"Whoever, being an officer or employee of the United States in the executive, legislative, or judicial branch of the Government or in any agency of the United States, including the District of Columbia, is or acts as an agent of a foreign principal required to register under the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended, shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned for not more than two years, or both.

"Nothing in this section shall apply to the employment of any agent of a foreign principal as a special Government employee in any case in which the head of the employing agency certifies that such employment is required in the national interest. A copy of any certification under this paragraph shall be forwarded by the head of such agency to the Attorney General who shall cause the same to be filed with the registration statement and other documents filed by such agent, and made available for public inspection in accordance with section 6 of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended."

(c)(1) The sectional analysis at the beginning of chapter 29 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"613. Contributions by agents of foreign principals."

(2) The sectional analysis at the beginning of chapter 11 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"219. Officers and employees acting as agents of foreign principals."

SEC. 9. This Act shall take effect ninety days after the date of its enactment.

INTERNATIONAL COFFEE AGREEMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the administration, I introduce today a bill to implement the International Coffee Agreement. The purpose of introducing the bill at this time is to enable the Senate Finance Committee to hold hearings tomorrow.

This bill is necessary to enable the United States to carry out its obligations under the coffee agreement which the President ratified in December 1963 pursuant to advice and consent of this body. Last summer the Senate did pass an implementing bill, but the Congress adjourned before the House completed action.

This bill will help the coffee agreement bring some stability to the world coffee market. Coffee prices fluctuate widely, bringing inflation when prices are too high, deflation and widespread distress when prices are too low. This instability is to no one's advantage. It dislocates the economies of the producing countries; it dislocates the trade; and it brings no lasting benefits to the ultimate consumer.

Coffee is important to more than 30 low-income countries. It is especially important to Latin America. It is the largest export earner for all the developing countries after petroleum, a major source of tax revenue for essential Government operations and of foreign exchange for the purchase of development goods. The dollars the low-income countries earn from coffee sales they use to buy from us the industrial materials and capital equipment for growth.

The developing countries want and need stable earnings so their economic and social development can proceed at a steady pace. They want and need stable earnings that grow as consumption grows so they can earn their way in trade and not depend so heavily on aid.

There are ample safeguards in the agreement to protect the American consumer, and there is no interference with our trade. We can import coffee freely without let or hindrance. There are no import quotas. The few obligations we have as importing members are those spelled out in this implementing bill, that is, to require certificates of origin on coffee from members and to limit imports from nonmembers if this should be necessary.

This bill will help the United States do its full part in making the coffee agreement an effective instrument for stabilization. It will strengthen and revitalize the Alliance for Progress.

I send the bill to the desk, which I introduce by request, and I assume it will be referred to the Committee on Finance.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 701) to carry out the obligations of the United States under the International Coffee Agreement, 1962, signed at New York on September 28, 1962, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MANSFIELD, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

USE OF IMPORTS FROM COMMUNIST COUNTRIES

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference three bills which deal with the sale and use of Communist products in the United States.

The first of these bills, introduced in behalf of myself and Senators RANDOLPH, SIMPSON, TOWER, and MURPHY, would prohibit the importation of flat glass which is the product of any country or area dominated or controlled by communism.

My second bill, introduced in behalf of myself and Senators ALLOTT, MUNDT, Randolph, Simpson, Tower, and Murphy, prohibits the use of products originating in any country or area dominated or controlled by communism in Federal or federally assisted projects for the construction, alteration, or repair of any building, public work, or facility.

The third, introduced in behalf of myself and Senators Allott, Mundt, Randolph, Simpson, Tower, and Murphy, prohibits the use of such products in any housing construction which is assisted under programs administered by the House and Home Finance Agency, its constituent agencies, or the Veterans' Administration.

At a time when we are trying to expand the markets for our domestic products and get thousands of our workers back to work, it just does not make sense for us to allow imports from Communist countries to provide unfair competition for hard-pressed domestic industries. Yet, this is exactly what we are doing.

As one example, our domestic glass industry has been particularly hard hit. In the first 9 months of 1964 alone, $1,322,921 worth of flat glass came into the United States from Communist countries—$244,393 from the Soviet Union itself. Not only was this glass priced 50 percent or more below prices quoted in our highly competitive domestic industry, but was frequently 50 percent or more below other free world suppliers such as the United Kingdom, West Germany, and Japan.

These Communist prices do not reflect costs of production. Nor are Communist export policies aimed primarily at raising the standard of living of their own peoples. Rather, they are designed often to damage the economies of the free nations. The Red bloc is still bent on our destruction through an allout economic and ideological struggle, and their state-owned industries and export policies are weapons in that struggle.

These bills conform with a pledge I made to the people of Pennsylvania last fall, and I am urging their early consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bills will be received and appropriately referred.

The bills, introduced by Mr. Scott (for himself and other Senators), were received, read twice by their titles, and referred, as indicated:

By Mr. SCOTT (for himself, Mr. Allott, Mr. Mundt, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Simpson, Mr. Tower, and Mr. Murphy):

S. 712. A bill to prohibit the use of products originating in any country or area dominated or controlled by communism in any housing construction which is assisted under programs administered by the Housing and Home Finance Agency, its constituent agencies, or the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SCOTT (for himself, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Simpson, Mr. Tower, and Mr. Murphy):

S. 714. A bill to prevent the importation of flat glass which is the product of any country or area dominated or controlled by communism; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SCOTT (for himself, Mr. Allott, Mr. Mundt, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Simpson, Mr. Tower, and Mr. Murphy):

S. 716. A bill to prohibit the use of products originating in any country or area dominated or controlled by communism in Federal or federally assisted projects for the construction, alteration, or repair of any building, public work, or facility; to the Committee on Public Works.

EXCLUSION OF WOOL FELT HAT PRODUCERS FROM PROVISIONS OF WOOL PRODUCTS LABELING ACT

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senator Dodd, I am introducing today a bill to exclude headwear from the provisions of the Wool Products Labeling Act and exempt wool felt hat producers from the necessity of disclosing the wool fiber content of their products.

The wool felt hat industry has been having serious difficulties in recent years. For one reason, it must compete with headwear made from other materials, such as fur felt and cloth, which are exempt from the labeling requirements now required of wool felt. Yet, the wool content of headwear has little bearing on the fabric's performance, and is not of major importance in consumer acceptance.

Three of the four wool felt hat factories in America are located in Lancaster County, Pa. Over 50 percent of the work force of two Lancaster communities—Adamstown and Denver, Pa.—are employed in that industry.

My proposal would give these producers an opportunity to compete fairly and equitably in the open market. A similar bill, which I introduced in the last session of Congress passed the Senate on my motion, but no action was taken in the House. I am urging prompt consideration this year.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 713) to amend the Wool Products Labeling Act of 1939 in order to exempt headwear from the provisions of such act, introduced by Mr. Scott (for himself and Mr. Dodd), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

PROHIBITION OF USE OF STOPWATCHES AND MEASURING DEVICES IN POSTAL SERVICE

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I am introducing today a bill to prevent the use of stopwatches, work measurement programs or other performance-standards operations as measuring devices in the postal service. The Post Office Department refers to these measurement programs as "guidelines."

I have been proposing an end to these inequitable guidelines for many years and I am delighted to learn that this year six bills similar to mine have been introduced in the House of Representatives.

Proponents of the guidelines system maintain that it is conducive to speed and efficiency. But testimony before congressional committees and my own conversations with postal workers convince me that just the opposite is true. The guidelines system not only subjects members of an old and honored Federal service to the indignity of constant surveillance, but results in unnecessary job tensions, dissension among postal workers and poor management-employee relations.

The postal worker is a devoted public servant and part of a great tradition. He is entitled more to commendation than surveillance.

My bill would eliminate completely the guidelines system both because it has failed in its objectives and because it is detrimental to the postal service. It conforms with a pledge I made to the people of Pennsylvania last fall, and I am urging its early consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 715) to prevent the use of stopwatches, work measurement programs, or other performance-standards operations as measuring devices in the postal service, introduced by Mr. Scott, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REGULATIONS GOVERNING RENUNCIATION OF U.S. CITIZENSHIP

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I send to the desk a bill which would tighten the right of defectors from the United States who renounce their citizenship while in a foreign country to reenter the country.

The bill grows specifically out of Lee Oswald's return to the United States. Lee Oswald renounced his citizenship and proclaimed his fidelity and belief in the Communist Government of Red Russia.

However, under the law, his citizenship was not forfeited, because he did not make his renunciation in the form prescribed by the present statute. The present statute provides that a citizen of the United States while in a foreign country who declares his purpose to renounce his citizenship does not lose his citizenship unless he goes to the American Embassy or to a consular office and there under oath declares his abandonment of his citizenship in the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I ask that I may be permitted to proceed for an additional minute.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator may proceed.

Mr. LAUSCHE. My bill would allow the renunciation of citizenship not made under oath to become effective and to deny such individual the right to reenter the United States.

I desire to have placed in the Record the statement I made on this subject on January 24 of last year, when I introduced a similar bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOSS OF NATIONALITY IN CERTAIN CASES

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I have been in contact with the Department of State, seeking to inquire under what authority Mr. Oswald was allowed to reenter the United States after he had taken out papers indicating a purpose to abandon his citizenship. I have received from the Department an answer to my inquiry.

In the letter answering my inquiry, it is stated:

"Under existing law, a person who is a U.S. citizen may lose his nationality in a number of ways.

* * * * *

"The question whether an individual has lost his U.S. citizenship must be determined in accordance with this act. For example, persons desiring to renounce their U.S. nationality under section 349(a)(6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act are required to appear before a diplomatic or consular officer of the United States abroad and take an oath of renunciation of nationality of the United States in the form prescribed by the Secretary of State. Lee Harvey Oswald did not renounce in accordance with the provisions of the statutory requirements and therefore did not lose his U.S. citizenship."

In my inquiry, I also asked on what theory the loan was made to enable Lee Oswald to come back to the United States. The answer states as follows:

"The Department of State grants loans to U.S. citizens abroad who are destitute and without relatives, friends, or others able and willing to finance their return to the United States. Each such case is carefully investigated to insure that the loan applicant is a destitute U.S. citizen. Each applicant to whom a loan is granted is required to sign a promissory note covering his loan and to repay it as soon as possible after his return to the United States.

"A repatriation loan was granted to Lee Harvey Oswald to cover the cost of transportation for him, his wife, and his child from the U.S.S.R. to the United States. He repaid the loan in installments after he returned to this country."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the 3-minute limitation in the morning hour, the time available to the Senator from Ohio has expired.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, there have been other persons who have gone to Communist countries, indicating an intention of abandoning their citizenship in the United States, who have been permitted to come back.

Under the present law, even though one goes abroad, intending to give up his citizenship in the United States, unless he takes an oath in the consul's office, that intention to abandon citizenship does not effect a forfeiture.

I think the law is weak in that respect. While we should make it difficult for legitimate citizens who are not defaulting our cause, to lose their rights when going to a foreign country, we should not make it hard for a person who wants to give up his U.S. citizenship and become a Communist, to do so.

On that theory, I am introducing a bill which I ask to have printed, which will contain such an amendment to the existing law, as follows:

"Any person, a citizen of the United States, entering any country which is Communist, Communist dominated, or Communist occupied, with the intent to transfer his allegiance from the United States to such country, or formulating an intent while in such country to transfer his allegiance from the United States to such country, and thereafter taking any action with a view to carrying out that intent, shall not be permitted to reenter the United States."

Mr. President, if this proposed language were in the law when Oswald asked to come back to the United States, he could not have done so; and I cannot understand why we should be gentle and sympathetic and easy with those Americans who go to Communist countries and announce their purpose to abandon allegiance to the flag of the United States and their citizenship. I cannot understand why they should subsequently be permitted to reenter.

I ask that my bill be printed, and be printed in the RECORD, and that it be permitted to lie on the desk for 1 week so that those who want to join in it will have the opportunity to do so.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD, and lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Ohio.

The bill (S. 2459) providing for the loss of nationality in the case of an individual entering a Communist country with the intent to transfer his allegiance from the United States to that country, introduced by Mr. LAUSCHE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon, and by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"'(32) Any person who has lost his nationality pursuant to the provisions of paragraph (11) of subsection (a) of section 349 of this Act.'

"SEC. 2. Section 349(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act is amended (1) by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and the word 'or', and (2) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"'(11)(A) entering any country which is Communist, Communist dominated, or Communist occupied with the intent to transfer his allegiance from the United States to such country, or (B) formulating an intent, while in any such country, to transfer his allegiance from the United States to such country and thereafter taking any action with a view to carrying out that intent',"

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 717) providing for the loss of nationality in the case of an individual entering a Communist country with the intent to transfer his allegiance from the United States to that country, introduced by Mr. LAUSCHE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SILVER COINS

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I have received a communication from an Ohio banker—if the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] will listen—and to this banker came this notice:

Who has all the coins? Even "Pep" the coin man doesn't know. But he can alleviate your banks' coin shortage with all denominations of coins at a small handling charge which includes delivery of wrapped and boxed coin. What's the handling charge? Call me now at (609) 662-6644 (Camden, N.J.), (215) 925-8981 (Phila., Pa.).

This person was offering to provide silver coins at a premium. In other words, he is in the black market, in my opinion, in the sale of silver coins, which are vitally needed at this time in our commerce.

I have an intuitive feeling that this is the beginning of an operation in which the paper dollar will be selling for metal at a price below its supposed one dollar value.

I send to the desk a bill which would make it a crime for anyone to buy or sell or offer to buy or sell any silver or minor coins of the United States for monetary use at a price in excess of the face value.

In my opinion, this operation ought to be nipped in the bud. It ought not to be allowed to grow.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, because the distinguished Senator from Ohio asked me to listen to his introduction of a bill which would make it a crime to sell small silver coins at a premium for use as coins, I call attention to the fact that his bill will probably be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, because it is a criminal measure.

Second, we are doubling our production of small coins. It is only a question of weeks until we shall have more small coins than the country can use. But the possible evil will be in the melting down of silver dollars if the price of silver goes any higher. We have issued $600 million in silver dollars; only $3 million of silver dollars are now in the Treasury. There are virtually none in circulation. The coins have been bought up not only by coin collectors, but also by speculators, who are planning to melt them down.

If the Senator from Ohio wishes to do something that would protect our Government from the speculators, let him add to his bill a prohibition against melting down any silver coins.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate is now in the morning hour. The Chair must ask Senators to abide by the order.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Virginia. The Senator has made a suggestion that is worthy of favorable consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 718) to prohibit profiteering in coins of the United States, introduced by Mr. LAUSCHE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ALIBATES NATIONAL MONUMENT BILL

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I introduce for myself and my colleague from Texas [Mr. TOWER] a bill to establish the Alibates Flint Quarries National Monument near Amarillo, Tex.

This bill, seeking to assure recognition and preservation of these flint quarries used by American Indians for 10,000 years, is identical to my bill S. 1348 of the 88th Congress and to legislation sponsored by Congressman Walter Rogers. This effort to secure adequate protection for this important historical site is bearing fruit in an increasing likelihood that preservation will be assured. Through this or other appropriate legislation I shall continue my work on behalf of conservation of the Alibates Flint Quarries.

A recent article in the Monday, December 21, 1964, Dallas Morning News by Frank X. Tolbert well describes the interest and importance of this site. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the Record.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the article will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 721) to authorize the establishment of the Alibates Flint Quarries and Texas Panhandle Pueblo Culture National Monument, introduced by Mr. Yarborough (for himself and Mr. Tower), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The article presented by Mr. Yarborough is as follows:

Mines Rich in History

(By Frank X. Tolbert)

Amarillo, Tex.—There it lies, glittering like a three-quarter-mile-long jewel, on a mesa over the Canadian River in the canyon country 30 miles north of Amarillo: the Alibates flint mine, the greatest quarries west of the Mississippi River.

It has been worked by men for at least 15,000 years. It is said to produce the finest flint in the world, with the most variegated colors of any flints or cherts.

There are more than 550 quarries in an outcrop of flint beds, in a vein of rainbow colors and not in the nodules as flint is usually found. Here were quarried and painfully manufactured the most beautiful and most prized weapon and tool points in this part of the ancient world. Even before the patina is polished and fluted, the flint sparkles with all the colors of the rainbow.

For some reason, the Alibates points most wanted by Indians for the last 450 years and by prehistory men were the red and gray banded ones.

Sign-talking traders came in the olden days from all over the western reaches of the continent and purchased them from the Alibates miners. Now they are found all over, even sometimes in New England, in Indian burials and in the middens of pueblos and old camps.

The antiquity of the mine has been firmly established by scientists, who found the Alibates weapon points in the remains of extinct animals whose approximate ages are known.

Amarillo Archaeologist Floyd V. Studer, who has been studying the quarries since 1926, was the one who pinned the "Alibates" title on the flint. The name honors an old cowboy, Allen or Alie Bates, who squatted in this pasture of the Lee Bivins Ranch back in the 19th century. The cowboys, with their tendency to shorten place names, called a tributary of the Canadian Alibates Creek and this part of the ranch was Alibates Pasture. (Poor old Allen Bates certainly never dreamed that his name would appear in the works of some of the world's leading archaeologists, geologists, and historians, who have come to inspect the venerable quarries.)

Because, to the stone age Indian, flint was the equivalent of steel, and valued far higher than modern men do precious jewels, Mr. Studer has dubbed the Alibates site "The Pittsburgh of the Ancient West."

The mesa and the roadways around the quarries are littered with fragments of gorgeous flint, apparently thrown away because they were defective or were not of the prized red and gray bands variety. The wonderful blues, a kind of "Maxfield Parrish" blue, streaked with pink and red and ocher, appeal just as much to the contemporary eye.

In the flint debris on the mesa are scrapers with sharp convex edges, awls, diamond shaped knives, notched hammerstones, double-bladed knives, and all manner of weapon points.

Some of the points were indented to permit the lifeblood of a wounded animal to flow out quicker. When you were driving your lances into a mastodon, as did the "Clovis man," 11,000 years ago in New Mexico with an Alibates point, you wanted the blood to flow swiftly and get the fight over. Fifteen thousand years ago, the "Sandia man," the oldest known man in North America, used these same points to hunt the ice age mammoth and other giant creatures.

These quarries were found by Floyd Studer in 1926 when he was surveying sites for the easternmost known pueblos, those in the Panhandle along the Canadian.

There was a big "housing development" in connection with this Pittsburgh of prehistoric man. These are also called the Alibates Ruins (Old Man Allen Bates, the squatter, continues to be honored), and one of the "apartments" which has been excavated had 66 rooms. There are many more to be dug into: Floyd Studer and Henry Hertner of Amarillo, and the Potter County Historical Survey Committe showed me one complex, not yet excavated, which had 100 rooms, much larger rooms than in a New Mexico contemporary pueblo, plus a kiva.

The foundations were of horizontally placed stones, and the walls were made of vertical stones in double rows, the innerspace filled with rubble and adobe. Atop these were placed horizontal layers of rock with adobe binding to make a building that was warmer in winter and cooler in summer than some 1964 construction.

There are big living rooms, semicircular sleeping rooms, storage rooms, and tunnels connecting them. In the storage rooms, Studer found carbonized corn ears and corn grains, and the fossilized remains of other foods. The tunnels were used as ventilators, with loose slabs at the mouths of them as deflectors.

Shells, possibly from the gulf coast, obsidian flakes, and some of the decorative pottery (although these pueblos made utilitarian ceramics), and bone tools not native to the panhandle indicate that these industrious people imported many articles in exchange for their matchless flint.

Studer, Hertner, Ernest R. Archambeau, Clayton Heare, S. B. Whittenburg, J. Robin Allen, Charles Woodburn, Ray S. Daniel, Charles Gunn, and W. M. Adams, are some of the panhandle citizens who have been working to get the mines made a national monument.

On April 24, 1963, U.S. Senator Ralph W. Yarborough introduced a bill to create a national monument, preserving the Alibates Mine and the Alibates pueblo ruins near Amarrillo, Tex. A similar bill was introduced by Congressman Walter Rogers. Both bills are in committee now, but are expected to pass.

This part of the South Canadian is now being dammed to form 25,000-acre Lake Meredith. And the quarries and the pueblos are in the recreation area over this canyon country lake which will be 175 feet deep when it fills.

When all this is done, the Alibates quarries and pueblos will form a magnificent outdoor museum of prehistoric times. And the flint will glitter even more than it does now. For the soil around the flint beds will be hydraulically removed, leaving only the lovely rainbow colors of the flint to sparkle under the sun.

REPEAL OF RETAIL AND MUSICAL INSTRUMENT EXCISES

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, today I send to the desk for appropriate reference a bill to repeal the retail excise taxes on jewelry, furs, toilet preparations, luggage and handbags; and to repeal the manufacturer's excise tax on musical instruments. The bill is similar to S. 2644 which I introduced in the last session of Congress, except that it does not contain the $100 limit on tax exemption proposed there for furs and jewelry. It also contains a new provision, specifying in the case of musical instruments the method for handling application of tax repeal to musical instrument stocks in the hands of dealers on which the manufacturers' excise has already been paid.

Like many Members of the Senate, I have for quite some time favored repeal of the retail excise taxes. They were imposed in wartime more than 20 years ago, and their enactment was supposed to be a temporary measure. We have far too long ignored the promise made then to remove them after the emergency which brought them into being. I have testified in favor of doing so before the Ways and Means Committee last August, and urged an excise repeal plank before the Democratic platform committee. During the campaign I promised to continue my efforts for this cause, and distributed widely a leaflet captioned, "Let's Stop Taxing the Ladies." In that leaflet I said:

> On January 1, I expect to start the battle against these onerous and unfair luxury taxes. It is not a good tax, it is not necessary, and it is not fair.

I confidently expect that these taxes will be removed in this session of the Congress.

Mr. President, the second portion of my bill singles out another item in the excise structure for whose removal I have fought over several years past. This is the third Congress in which I have presented a bill to alter or remove the tax placed upon musical instruments, which are essentially tools for education and culture. We have expended great sums of late to advance culture in this Nation, by appropriations for the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, by support of the cultural exchange program of the State Department, and in other ways. No musical instrument should be taxed as is now done, and my bill would repeal that tax. In addition to repeal, the bill I am offering includes a method for providing refunds of the tax on instruments for which it has already been paid at the time the change is effective.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 725) to repeal the retailers excise taxes on jewelry, furs, toilet prepartions, and luggage and handbags; and to repeal the manufacturers excise tax on musical instruments, introduced by Mr.

HARTKE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

ECONOMIC IMPACT OF BASE CLOSINGS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act so as to provide for retirement on full annuity upon voluntary separation after 30 years of service or upon involuntary separation after 20 years of service. This is the first of a series of bills I expect to introduce in the near future to assist localities which have been severely affected by base closings and defense contract terminations in making orderly economic adjustment.

During the first 4 years of the Kennedy-Johnson administrations, Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara has taken actions which have effected or will effect the closing or partial closing of 669 bases around the world—most of them within the United States. These actions, when completed, will result in the elimination of 149,000 job positions and annual budget reductions of over $1 billion. The impact of these reductions is not evenly distributed throughout the economy but falls with particular severity on certain localities.

In the city and county of Mobile, in my State of Alabama, we have an outstanding example. There, 12,000 dedicated workers face the possibility of unemployment upon completion of the announced closing of Brookley Air Force Base. For my own part, I have already protested vigorously the closing of this base. I will continue to do so because I believe neither the Nation's security nor the economy justify this proposed action.

I am deeply concerned with the impact of this action upon the Nation, the community and the workers involved. Their personal and individual misfortune is also that of the community, since they represent nearly 13 percent of its total labor force. The consequences of such a large reduction in disposable income in the area as would be represented by the layoff of that many persons will reach far beyond the employees themselves.

Mr. President, across the country, thousands of loyal dedicated American civil servants, such as those at Brookley, face the future with grave uncertainty.

Over the years they and their families have become deeply rooted in their communities. They have reached an age where other job opportunities in the community are extremely limited. Through no fault of their own, they are confronted with an unfortunate choice that will change their lives and the lives of their families: They may retire at a greatly reduced annuity, or accept a transfer to even further uncertainty. Many are less fortunate. They must wait for years before being eligible to receive any annuity even though greatly reduced. This is the plight of those civil servants who unfortunately are working at a base or installation scheduled to be closed.

It is the purpose of the bill I introduce today to ameliorate this situation by liberalizing civil service retirement benefits.

Under present law, a civil service employee, including a civilian employee of the Department of Defense, may retire voluntarily on full earned annuity at age 62, with 30 years of service. If retirement is involuntary and not for misconduct or delinquency, full annuity is payable at age 60 after 20 years of service.

Under ordinary circumstances, these provisions are reasonable, even generous, when compared with many retirement programs found in private industry. However, the Nation's defense workers and the communities in which they are concentrated are not now faced with ordinary circumstances.

My bill would, quite simply, eliminate the age qualification for full retirement benefits, retaining the length-of-service qualification. That is, a civil servant voluntarily or involuntarily separated would become eligible for full earned retirement annuity, regardless of his age, after 30 years of service. He would be eligible for full earned annuity, regardless of age, after 20 years of service if his separation was involuntary—occasioned, for example, by a base closing—and not for cause, misconduct, or delinquency.

The distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], who so ably chairs the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, has, I know, himself worked long and hard for liberalized civil service retirement. I should like him to know that the civil servants in Alabama, and I personally, appreciate his efforts and his concern. I expect to consult and confer closely with the Senator to secure enactment of this or comparable legislation in this session.

The impact of base closing and contract terminations falls painfully on at least two other important groups of persons: First, local governmental units which have incurred indebtedness for capital improvements such as schools; and, second, businessmen—especially small businessmen—in various circumstances. Other bills which I shall introduce in the near future will be intended to help solve the problems of these other affected classes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 728) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act so as to provide for retirement on full annuity upon voluntary separation after 30 years of service or upon involuntary separation after 20 years of service, introduced by Mr. SPARKMAN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REVISION OF FEES PAYABLE TO THE COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to revise the schedule of fees payable to the Commissioner of Patents, to apply on applications for original patents, the reissue of patents, and in other steps connected with the routine processing of patents.

The objective of this bill is to increase the revenue of the Patent Office so as to make it substantially self-supporting.

This bill is identical to a bill which I introduced last year in order to provide an alternative to an administration patent fees bill, H.R. 8190. The administration has revised somewhat last year's bill, but I still feel that an alternative approach must be offered.

And I will explain why. Both my bill and the administration bill would seek to increase revenue, but the latter would do this by making minor raises in the fees that are already being charged, and by including an entirely new kind of fee. This is a maintenance fee of $75, which the holder of a patent would have to pay in order to retain rights to his patent.

This fee could either be paid in one lump sum at the time a patent is issued or in three installments over a prescribed period of time.

I feel that the charging of a maintenance fee, which is a totally new concept, would make an unnecessary substantive change in our patent procedures. I do not think that such an important step should be undertaken as a part of a bill of which the primary purpose is to revise the Patent Office's fee schedule.

Instead, I feel that additional revenue should be obtained by raising only the existing fees. For example, I propose that the charge for filing of an original patent be raised from $30 to $70, and the charge for the filing of an application for a trademark be raised from $25 to $60.

These changes are intended as a substitute for the loss of revenue caused by my deletion of the maintenance fee section in the administration bill.

Both bills would raise just about the same total of revenue, an estimated $22 million a year, but my bill would accomplish this without having to rely on a new and controversial technique, the use of the maintenance fee.

Last year my bill received the endorsement of the Connecticut Bar Association. And many patent attorneys and private businessmen wrote to me during the year and expressed support for my bill in preference to the administration's.

This year, I understand that the Connecticut Bar Association has approved of the basic formula which I am submitting for the raising of revenues.

I hope that the Senate will agree that the approach to raising Patent Office fees that I have introduced today is far preferable to the one proposed by the administration.

It is high time that patent fees be raised, for they have not been increased since the early 1930's. Let us raise the fees to reflect more closely the economics of the 1960's, but let us do this by using the tried and traditional way rather than by going into a completely new and controversial area of patent procedures in order to obtain these needed revenues

A bill identical to mine will be introduced in the House today by one of my colleagues from Connecticut, Congressman ROBERT GIAIMO.

Both Congressman GIAIMO and I have been counseled and helped a great deal in our efforts by a prominent New Haven patent attorney, Mr. Anthony De Lio.

Mr. De Lio has spent a lot of time and put much effort into helping with the preparation of this legislation, and he deserves commendation and credit for his constructive and thoughtful work in this important, complex field.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 729) to fix certain fees payable to the Commissioner of Patents, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. DODD, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

FEES PAYABLE TO PATENT OFFICE

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights of the Committee on the Judiciary, and by request of the Secretary of Commerce, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to fix the fees payable to the Patent Office, and for other purposes.

No significant change in patent fees has occurred since 1932. At that time the fees collected made the Patent Office a substantially self-supporting activity. Costs have since risen so that in fiscal 1964 only 30 percent of costs were recovered by fees. The legislation proposed would, when fully effective, achieve a recovery of approximately 75 percent of costs.

The Subcommittee on Patents conducted hearings on patent fee legislation during the 87th and 88th Congresses. The bill drafted by the administration incorporates some of the suggestions made at these hearings. I anticipate that the previous hearings of the subcommittee can and will be adopted as part of the record of this revised bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 730) to fix the fees payable to the Patent Office, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. McCLELLAN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO BONDING PROVISIONS OF LABOR-MANAGEMENT REPORTING AND DISCLOSURE ACT OF 1959 AND THE WELFARE AND PENSION PLANS DISCLOSURE ACT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I send to the desk a bill for appropriate reference to amend the bonding provisions of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 and the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed at this point in my remarks and appropriately referred.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 731) to amend the bonding provisions of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 and the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act, introduced by Mr. MORSE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 731

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first sentence of section 502(a) of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 is amended by striking out "for the faithful discharge of his duties" and substituting therefor the following: "to provide protection against loss by reason of acts of fraud or dishonesty on his part directly or through connivance with others", and by inserting before the period at the end of such subsection the following: ": *Provided,* That when in the opinion of the Secretary a labor organization has made other bonding arrangements which would provide the protection required by this section at comparable cost or less, he may exempt such labor organization from placing a bond through a surety company holding such grant of authority".

SEC. 2. (a) Subsection (a) of section 205 of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act is amended by striking out "and 203" and inserting in lieu thereof "203, and 211".

(b) Subsection (b) of such section is amended by striking out "or 203" and inserting in lieu thereof "203, or 211".

(c) Subsection (c) of such section is amended by striking out "or 203" and inserting in lieu thereof "203, or 211".

(d) Subsection (b) of section 207 of such Act is amended by striking out "or the second sentence of section 203(b)" both times it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "the second sentence of section 203(b), or section 211".

SEC. 3. Title II of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SURETY COMPANY REPORTS

"SEC. 211. Each surety company which issues any bond required by this Act or the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act shall file annually with the Secretary, with respect to each fiscal year during which any such bond was in force, a report, in such form and detail as he may prescribe by regulation, filed by the president and treasurer or corresponding principal officers of the surety company, describing its bond experience under each such Act, including information as to the premiums received, total claims paid, amounts recovered by way of subrogation, administrative and legal expenses and such related data and information as the Secretary shall determine to be necessary in the public interest and to carry out the policy of the Act. Notwithstanding the foregoing, if the Secretary finds that any such specific information cannot be practicably ascertained or would be uninformative, the Secretary may modify or waive the requirement for such information."

REGISTRATION WITH POSTMASTER GENERAL OF MAILING LIST SUPPLIERS

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I send to the desk a bill to require the registration with the Postmaster General of the names of mailing list suppliers and buyers, and of transactions involving the sale or other exchange of mailing lists. This is a companion bill to that introduced by Representative ZABLOCKI, of Wisconsin, on January 18.

This bill is aimed at what may be called mail-order pornography, a traffic which, according to estimates by post office officials, pollutes the mails with 100 million pieces a year, with gross receipts estimated at $500 million annually.

Numerous complaints have been received over unsolicited mailings to children of advertisements for obscene booklets and pictures. The Post Office Department estimates that over 1 million schoolchildren will receive unsolicited obscene materials through the mail this year. These mailings are often traceable to mailing lists used by dealers in pornographic materials.

Congressman ZABLOCKI made an excellent statement on this subject, beginning on page 818 of the January 18 issue of the House of Representatives section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I commend it to my colleagues for reading.

I ask unanimous consent that this bill be printed in the RECORD, that it be printed and appropriately referred, and that it remain at the desk through Friday of this week for such other Members as wish to join in cosponsoring it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, will be printed in the RECORD and lie at the desk as requested.

The bill (S. 732) to require the registration with the Postmaster General of the names of mailing list suppliers and buyers, and of transactions involving the sale or other exchange of mailing lists, and for other purposes; introduced by Mr. MILLER, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 732

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) chapter 53 of title 39, United States Code, relating to the several classes of mail, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 4061. Registration of mailing list suppliers, buyers, and transactions

"(a) Each individual and each corporation, partnership, or other business organization or association buying, selling, leasing, renting, exchanging, or otherwise making available to others for profit, in the course of business, any list of addresses or similar mailing list shall furnish to the Postmaster General information in such form and detail, and at such time (but at least once a year), as the Postmaster General shall require, including, as the Postmaster General shall determine, the name of the individual, corporation, partnership, or other business association or organization, the identity of individuals having a financial interest in any such organization or association (except holders of common stock), the responsible officers and employees thereof, the particulars of the transactions pertaining to such list of addresses or similar mailing list; and shall allow postal officials to see a copy of such list upon request.

"(b) The Postmaster General shall make appropriate rules and regulations to carry out the purposes of this section.".

(b) The table of contents of such chapter 53 is amended by inserting

"4061. Registration of mailing list suppliers, buyers, and transactions."

immediately below

"4060. Foreign publications free from customs duty.".

SEC. 2. (a) Chapter 83 of title 18, United States Code, relating to offenses against the postal service, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 1735. Mailing list suppliers, buyers, and transactions

"Whoever, being required by section 4061 of title 39 to furnish information to the Postmaster General, fails or refuses to furnish such information as the Postmaster General shall require under such section, shall be fined not more than $3,000.".

(b) The table of contents of such chapter 83 is amended by inserting

"1735. Mailing list suppliers, buyers, and transactions."

immediately below

"1734. Editorials and other matter as 'advertisements'.".

SEC. 3. The foregoing provisions of this Act shall become effective on the ninetieth day following the date of enactment of this Act.

RELIEF FOR TAXPAYERS SUFFERING FROM UNDERWITHHOLDING TAX RATE

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, it is now apparent that a large number of taxpayers have had an underwitholding rate applied to their 1964 wages. These taxpayers, of course, presently owe this deficit to the Federal Government, and must pay this deficit, generally by April 15 of this year.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point a more detailed explanation of this situation, and the facts surrounding it, along with certain IRS explanations.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR TOWER RELATIVE TO UNDERWITHHOLDING

The withholding rate under the Revenue Act of 1964 is 14 percent, as opposed to the old rate of 18 percent. The Revenue Act provided for a two-stage reduction in individual rates, the first to take effect in January 1964, and the second in January 1965. In the House passed version (1963) of the bill, there was provided a like two-stage reduction in withholding, 15 percent the first year, and 14 percent the following year.

Since the Revenue Act did not pass in 1963, the 18-percent withholding rate continued in effect until March of 1964 and the final version of the bill provided for an immediate transition to the 14-percent withholding rate. The effect of an 18-percent withholding rate for 2 months of 1964 and a 14-percent rate for 10 months, although making for an average rate of 14.7 percent for the year, has resulted for many in a withholding in excess of tax reduction given by the bill. This underwithholding for many in all but 2 months of 1964 resulted in the expenditure by the taxpayer of many millions of dollars, thus giving the economy its so-called boost.

I am not critical in general of the Internal Revenue's efforts to make these many taxpayers aware of the plight they will be in once April 15 of this year rolls around. However, I do wish that IRS had done more, and I am sure many more will share this wish when the extent of underwithholding becomes known.

I am quite sure every taxpayer heard about the tax cut. I am equally sure very few taxpayers heard anything about the underwithholding certainty. The taxpayers' pay envelope was fatter, or so he thought. Solely as a result of the tax cut he had heard so much about, most of the money was spent, as was expected. What wasn't known by the taxpayer was the fact he was spending money he would have to repay later.

I frankly don't feel we can blame the taxpayer for this plight. True, I've always though it would be a good idea if more taxpayers were more aware of their Federal Government's expenditures, more aware of wages withheld for taxes. I still think this is a good idea, but I would never propose to do it in such a way that would be unfair to the taxpayer, and I think this is what we have done in the Revenue Act of 1964.

IRS WITHHOLDING EXPLANATIONS

The Revenue Act of 1964 effected major changes in both tax liabilities and the withholding rate. Therefore, it is desirable for wage earners in the middle and upper wage brackets to review their pay-as-you-go status for 1964.

Under our pay-as-you-go system the vast majority of taxpayers—typically two out of three—are entitled to refunds at the end of the year because the taxes withheld from their wages and quarterly payments on declarations of estimated tax exceed their liability. A third of all taxpayers owe additional taxes at the end of the year. Attempting to provide withholding tailor made to the needs of each individual taxpayer so he would come out "even" at the end of the year would, of course, be almost impossible and would impose a substantial hardship on both employees and employers.

The withholding rate dropped from 18 percent to 14 percent in March under the Revenue Act of 1964. This act provides for a two-step reduction in individual income tax liability rates: The first to be effective for the calendar year 1964, the second for calendar year 1965. In the initial version of the bill passed by the House of Representatives there was also a two-step reduction in the withholding rate; the rate to be put into effect as of January 1964 was 15 percent, followed by a 14-percent rate as of January 1965.

However, since the Revenue Act was not adopted until late February 1964, the 18-percent rate was necessarily continued during this interim. The overwithholding at the beginning of 1964 permitted immediate transition to the 14 percent rate which was originally prescribed for 1965. This action relieved employers of having to make two successive changes, one for the balance of 1964 and the other to take effect in 1965 and also avoided the additional overwithholding that would otherwise have occurred in 1964.

The combination of the 18-percent withholding rate in effect through March 4, 1964, and the 14-percent withholding rate in effect after that date (an average rate of 14.7 percent for the year) will in some cases result in a reduction in withholding in excess of the reduction in total tax liability for 1964. Although most taxpayers will continue to receive refunds, some who previously received small refunds will shift to a moderate balance due and others will owe larger balances than before. A similar situation would have occurred had the 15-percent withholding rate in the House bill been effective for 1964.

Those who, after reviewing their expected 1964 tax status, face probable balances due have alternative opportunities for adjustment available. Adjustments may be made either by amending the quarterly declaration at one of the filing dates and increasing payments, or by arranging for additional withholding by employers.

Because of variations in each individual tax situation, it is difficult to generalize about the type of taxpayer who may have a significantly larger balance due. However, a rough rule of thumb: A single person using the standard deduction and receiving all wage income who is above $5,000 could have a balance due that he may want to avoid. By the same token, married couples using the standard deduction and with more than $10,000 of combined salary could also have balances due they may want to avoid. Generally, taxpayers with income above these levels are required to file declarations of estimated tax.

It is emphasized that all taxpayers received a substantial tax cut under the law. Unless adjustments are made, however, underwithholding will result in some instances in 1964. It should be noted that in 1965 the tax rate will drop further but the 14-percent withholding rate will remain the same.

U.S. TREASURY DEPARTMENT NOTICE TO EMPLOYERS REGARDING ADJUSTMENTS IN INCOME TAX WITHHOLDING UNDER THE REVENUE ACT OF 1964

Since the Revenue Act of 1964 did not go into effect until March this year, it was possible to relieve employers of having to make two successive withholding rate changes (one for 1964 and the other for 1965) by making a one-step reduction from the former 18-percent rate to the 14-percent rate, which will continue into 1965 and thereafter.

The combination of the 18-percent withholding rate in effect through March 4, 1964, and the 14-percent withholding rate in effect after that date may result in some instances in less withholding than needed to satisfy the tax liability for the year. Although most taxpayers will continue to receive refunds, some taxpayers may shift from the refund category to balance due, and others may owe larger balances than before.

Because of variations in each individual tax situation it is difficult to generalize about the type of taxpayer who may have a significantly larger balance due. However, a rough rule of thumb is: A single person, using the standard deduction and receiving all wage income, who is above $5,000 could have a balance due that he may want to avoid. By the same token, married couples using the standard deduction and with more than $10,000 of combined salary could also have balances due they may want to avoid. Generally, taxpayers with income above these levels are required to file a declaration of estimated tax.

You can help your employees in these circumstances avoid a balance due situation if you will advise them to review their tax status for this year.

Employees can estimate their tax for 1964 by using tax returns for 1963 and substituting the new tax provisions and rates. The enclosed form 1040-ES (supplement) summarizes the principal changes under the Revenue Act of 1964 and provides the new rate schedules. Taxpayers with incomes under $5,000, who elect the standard deduction, should obtain the "1964 Tax Tables" for incomes under $5,000 from an Internal Revenue office (Publication No. 465, Rev. 2-64).

Employees can estimate the amount of tax that will be withheld from their wages this year by multiplying the amount formerly withheld by the number of paychecks under the old 18-percent rate; then by multiplying the amount, now withheld under the new 14-percent rate, by the number of such paychecks in 1964; and adding the two together. This will give them the estimated amount to be withheld to compare with the estimated tax liability for the year. Employers generally applied the new withholding rate around March 5.

If the withholding estimate is less than the tax liability estimate, the employee may find it helpful to make an adjustment either through quarterly payments on a declaration of estimated tax or through arranging for an increase in withholding.

If employees prefer to satisfy their current tax payment through withholding, they can take their own particular circumstances into account.

By reducing the number of withholding exemptions—each exemption dropped will increase the amount of tax withheld by approximately $1.80 per week—the taxpayer can minimize or eliminate a prospective balance due. The reduction of withholding exemptions, of course, has no effect on the number of exemptions that should be claimed on the yearend return. Instead of reducing withholding exemptions, your employees may arrange for you to withhold additional fixed amounts from their paychecks.

It is emphasized that all taxpayers received a substantial tax cut under the law. Unless adjustments are made, however, underwithholding will result in some instances in 1964. It should be noted that in 1965 the tax rate will drop further but the 14-percent withholding rate will remain the same.

For further information, please contact your local District Director of Internal Revenue.

Your cooperation will be appreciated by the Internal Revenue Service and your employees.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, the situation is simply as follows: Many taxpayers, largely through the fault of the Congress, are going to be hard pressed to pay their tax bill this year. The economy will probably suffer as a result.

The legislation I propose, though I realize it must be formally initiated in the other body, will provide for payment of the deficit by the taxpayer himself, as follows:

First. For those owing up to $100, an additional 3 months.

Second. For those owing up to $500, an additional 6 months.

Third. For those owing an amount in excess of $500, an additional 12 months.

Mr. President, I believe my approach to not only be appropriate, but most realistic. It calls for payment by the taxpayer in quarterly installments, of the liability involved. This approach does not burden further the already "form burdened" employer, and the quarterly payment provision, as opposed to a monthly payment requirement, lessens the paper burden to the Internal Revenue Service.

Mr. President, I send my bill to the desk and ask that it be appropriately referred.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 733) to allow an additional time for payment of 1964 income tax to the extent of underwithholding on wages paid to individuals, introduced by Mr. Tower, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware subsequently said:

Earlier today the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower] pointed out the serious results of too low a reduction in the withholding rate of last year's taxes. He pointed out the sad plight in which many taxpayers this year find themselves, particularly those in the lower brackets, as a result of not having had an adequate amount withheld from their salaries.

I wish to join the Senator from Texas in expressing concern over that situation. The Senator suggested that it was an oversight on the part of Congress. The record should be kept straight on that point. When the first tax bill was sent to the Congress by the then President, John F. Kennedy, he recommended a 15-percent withholding tax rate. The Treasury Department and the accountants thought that that rate would be adequate. The tax bill passed the House of Representatives with the recommended 15-percent rate, and had it been left at this figure we would not be in trouble today.

However, after the bill came to the Senate Finance Committee, in the early part of January 1964, orders came down from the White House apparently to change the 15-percent rate and reduce it to 14 percent. That was done. I think it was a most unfortunate action. No one at the time felt that the 14-percent rate was adequate. The Department itself agreed that it was inadequate.

At that time the action was described by some as merely a political gimmick to give the taxpayers the impression that they were getting a larger tax reduction prior to election than that which they actually were getting. Now, as they get their tax bills, this April, they will call for additional payments. The election is now over. I understand that the committee may even be asked to increase the withholding rate to a figure which would be a proper rate to take care of the tax.

I regret very much that such action was taken, because unquestionably it will cause a great deal of hardship and disappointment to many taxpayers.

ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMISSION FOR ELIMINATION OF PORNOGRAPHIC MATERIALS

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I send to the desk a bill to create a commission to be known as the Commission for Elimination of Pornographic Materials, and ask that it be printed in the Record, that it be printed and appropriately referred, and that it lie over through Friday of this week for such other Members as wish to join in cosponsoring it.

This Commission would be composed of 25 members, to be appointed by the President from various walks of life as specified in the bill. The Commission would investigate the traffic in pornographic materials, analyze the laws and regulations relating to this traffic, and make recommendations for improved laws and other methods of control and elimination of such materials, and provide information needed to promote a coordinated national effort to eliminate pornographic materials from our society.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, will be printed in the Record and lie on the table as requested.

The bill (S. 735) creating a commission to be known as the Commission for Elimination of Pornographic Materials, introduced by Mr. Miller, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Government Operations, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

FINDINGS OF FACT AND DECLARATION OF POLICY

Section 1. The Congress finds that the publication and dissemination of pornographic materials is a menace to the moral fiber of the American people. All levels of government—Federal, State, and local—bear a responsibility in eliminating this menace, although it is recognized that this responsibility can be effectively carried out only through the cooperative efforts of all citizens. It is the purpose of this Act to establish a national commission to investigate the traffic in pornographic materials, analyze the laws and regulations relating to this traffic, and make recommendations for improved laws and other methods of control and elimination of such materials, and provide information needed to promote a coordinated national effort to eliminate pornographic materials from our society.

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE COMMISSION FOR ELIMINATION OF PORNOGRAPHIC MATERIALS

Sec. 2. (a) For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act, there is hereby created a Commission to be known as the Commission for Elimination of Pornographic Materials (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission").

(b) Service of an individual as a member of the Commission or employment of an individual by the Commission as an attorney or expert in any business or professional field, on a part-time or full-time basis, with or without compensation, shall not be considered as service or empolyment bringing such individual within the provisions of section 281, 283, 284, 434, or 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code, or section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U.S.C. 99).

MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMISSION

Sec. 3. (a) Number and Appointment—The Commission shall be composed of twenty-five members, appointed by the President, as follows:

(1) Two from the Senate (one from each major political party);

(2) Two from the House of Representatives (one from each major political party);

(3) One from the Post Office Department;

(4) One from the Department of Justice;

(5) One from the Department of Defense;

(6) Three from the clergy;

(7) One medical doctor who shall be prominent in the field of psychiatry;

(8) One who shall be a prominent representative of the book publishing industry;

(9) One who shall be a prominent representative of the magazine and periodical publishing industry;

(10) One who shall be a prominent representative of the newspaper publishing industry;

(11) One who shall be a prominent representative of the motion picture industry;

(12) One who shall be a prominent representative of the radio and television industry;

(13) One attorney who shall be a chief prosecutor of a city or county government;

(14) One attorney who shall be prominent in the practice of law;

(15) Three educators (one who shall be prominent in the field of primary education, one who shall be prominent in the field of secondary education, and one who shall be prominent in the field of higher education);

(16) Two parents serving actively in a parent-teacher association; and

(17) Two judges from the State or local benches.

(b) Vacancies—Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(c) Continuation of Membership Upon Change of Status—A change in the status or employment of any person appointed to the Commission pursuant to subsection (a) of this section shall not affect his membership upon the Commission.

ORGANIZATION OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 4. The Commission shall elect a Chairman and a Vice Chairman from among its members.

QUORUM

SEC. 5. Thirteen members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 6. (a) MEMBERS OF CONGRESS—Members of Congress who are members of the Commission shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as Members of Congress; but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(b) MEMBERS FROM THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH—The members of the Commission who are in the executive branch of the Government shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services in the executive branch, but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(c) MEMBERS FROM PRIVATE LIFE.—The members from private life shall each receive $100 per diem when engaged in the actual performance of duties vested in the Commission, plus reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties.

STAFF OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 7. The Commission shall have power to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable, without regard to the provisions of the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

EXPENSES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 8. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, so much as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 9. (a) INVESTIGATION, ANALYSIS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS.—It shall be the duty of the Commission—

(1) to explore methods of combating the traffic in pornographic materials at the various levels of governmental responsibility;

(2) to provide for the development of a plan for improved coordination between Federal, State, and local officials in the suppression of such traffic;

(3) to determine ways and means of informing the public as to the origin, scope, and effects of such traffic, and of obtaining public support in its suppression;

(4) to secure the active cooperation of leaders in the field of mass media for the accomplishment of the objectives and purposes of this Act;

(5) to formulate recommendations for such legislative, administrative, or other forms of action as may be deemed necessary to combat such traffic; and

(6) to analyze the laws pertaining to traffic in pornographic matters and materials, and to make such recommendations to the Congress for appropriate revisions of Federal laws as the Commission may deem necessary in order to effectively regulate the flow of such traffic.

(b) REPORT.—The Commission shall report to the President and the Congress its findings and recommendations as soon as practicable and in no event later than January 31, 1967. The Commission shall cease to exist sixty days following the submission of its final report.

POWERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 10. (a) HEARINGS AND SESSIONS.—The Commission or, on the authorization of the Commission, any subcommittee or member thereof, may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act, hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places, administer such oaths, and require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents as the Commission or such subcommittee or member may deem advisable. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the Chairman of the Commission, or such subcommittee, or any duly designated member, and may be served by any person designated by such Chairman or member. The provisions of sections 102 through 104 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (2 U.S.C. 192–194) shall apply in the case of any failure of any witness to comply with any subpena or to testify when summoned under authority of this section.

(b) ADVISORY COMMITTEES.—In carrying out its duties under this Act, the Commission (1) may constitute such advisory committees within States composed of citizens of that State, and (2) may consult with Governors, attorneys general, and other representatives of State and local government and private organizations, as it deems advisable. Any advisory committee constituted pursuant to this subsection shall carry out its duties without expense to the United States.

(c) OBTAINING OFFICIAL DATA.—The Commission is authorized to secure directly from any executive department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality, information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics for the purpose of this Act, and each such department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, establishment, or instrumentality is authorized and directed to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the Commission, upon request made by the Chairman or Vice Chairman.

MEDICAL SERVICES OF CHIROPRACTORS

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the purpose of the legislation I am now introducing is expressly to permit Federal employees who are injured in the performance of their duties and are entitled to receive medical service at Government expense, under the Employees' Compensation Act, to utilize the service of chiropractors.

This long overdue legislation will provide our Federal employees their freedom of choice in the healing arts, a choice now taken for granted by all other Americans.

This particular bill is designed to give the fullest protection to the Federal employee and to the Federal Government against inappropriate pseudomedical diagnosis or improper claims by inclusion of language effectively limiting payment for chiropractic services by stating:

> Chiropractic services shall be reimbursed only for spinal adjustment by hands and spinal X-rays.

This descriptive language has been endorsed by the U.S. Civil Service Commission when offered by the International Chiropractors Insurance Service Department and is presently used in Federal worker plans under the Federal Health Benefits Act.

I urge your favorable consideration and study of this legislation which will prove so beneficial to our Federal employees.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 744) to amend the Federal Employees' Compensation Act so as to permit injured employees entitled to receive medical services under such act to utilize the services of chiropractors, introduced by Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS OF MILITARY PERSONNEL

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I send to the desk, for appropriate reference, a legislative program designed to further safeguard the constitutional rights of our Nation's service men and women who for so long have sacrificed so much to protect our American way of life. Senator HRUSKA has joined me in sponsoring some of these measures as will be indicated on the bills when they are printed.

President Johnson recently stated that we must make every effort to improve the status of our military personnel and to make them "first class citizens in every respect." Improved pay and retirement policies, better housing and equitable promotion systems are indeed important steps for improving working and living conditions for our Armed Forces. However, basic to the goal of making military personnel "first class citizens in every respect," is to insure that they are accorded the rights, privileges and protections guaranteed to every American citizen under the Constitution.

At one time in our history, our fighting forces were said to be without rights; it was said they were not entitled to due process of law, and that the sole test of the legality of a court-martial was whether the tribunal had jurisdiction over the offender and the offense. This view has been discredited by the Supreme Court, which has held that court-martial proceedings must conform to our fundamental concept of due process. Further, military administrative discharge procedures are now subject to judicial review.

Congress, too, has responded to the challenge of extending the constitutional safeguards, so cherished in civilian life, to the countless thousands of men and women who enter the armed services. Mr. President, the Uniform Code of Military Justice was enacted in 1950. And equally important, we have established an independent civilian tribunal—the Court of Military Appeals—empowered to review court-martial convictions. This tribunal has carried out its duties with utmost judiciousness in protecting the rights of our military personnel and in preserving our Nation's constitutional safeguards. Indeed, our Nation has made great progress in safeguarding the constitutional rights of our servicemen since the days of Blackstone, when military personnel were considered indentured citizens in a society of freemen.

Despite this progress, however, considerable room for improvement in the quality of military justice remains. Complaints received by the Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, and the results of its extensive 4-year study, have revealed numerous inadequacies both in the Uniform Code of Military Justice, administrative discharge proceedings, and other important phases of military justice.

Extensive hearings were held by the subcommittee in 1962 to determine the need for legislation to insure a more satisfactory method of safeguarding the constitutional rights of military personnel. In addition to the information received during these hearings from the Defense Department, Court of Military Appeals, bar associations, veterans groups, and experts in military law, the subcommittee also conducted an extensive field investigation at numerous military establishments in Europe to obtain firsthand views as to the adequacy of our present system of military justice. Almost without exception, the subcommittee work has pointed up a very serious need for legislation to modify our system of military justice so that it adequately protects the constitutional rights of our military personnel.

Protecting the rights of the individual by providing procedures in which disputes about rights and duties can be fairly and equitably decided is basic to our Nation's system of constitutional due process. This system has long been a part of the rights of every citizen. Certainly, Mr. President, it is time that the men and women of the armed services, whose sacrifices almost defy enumeration, should also be provided the protections of our Constitution which are consistent with the duty of the military to protect our Nation.

These measures were introduced early in the last Congress, and I am hopeful that early hearings will be scheduled on these measures in this Congress.

It may be necessary to revise the wording of some of these measures; I am wedded to no particular language. However, the substance of each is, I feel, important if we are to grant the full measure of justice and security to those to whom this Nation has entrusted its defense. For this reason, I hope that hearings on these bills will be held at an early date.

The first of these bills seeks to guarantee to military personnel the basic right that any judicial or quasi-judicial proceeding affecting them be conducted by a fair and impartial tribunal. Over the years there have been numerous complaints of command influence in trials by court-martial and in certain administrative proceedings involving military personnel. The interpretation by the courts of article 37 of the Uniform Code, which purports to prohibit command influence with respect to trials by court-martial, is not, in my opinion, sufficient to provide the requisite protection against subtle influences affecting the impartiality of the members of a court-martial. For example, a commanding officer can, under some circumstances, give pretrial instructions to court-martial members without violating this article. Furthermore, there is no prohibition at the present time against command influence with respect to administrative proceedings involving military personnel, even though those proceedings can have tremendous impact on the future of a serviceman and may result in a discharge under other than honorable conditions.

The right to counsel is a fundamental right which applies to all Federal district courts and which the Supreme Court in Gideon against Wainwright has fully extended to State courts. Although an accused, in a general court-martial, must be furnished with a qualified lawyer to represent him, he may be convicted in a special court-martial and sentenced to a bad conduct discharge, a discharge under other than honorable conditions, without having the assistance of legally trained counsel. Similarly, an enlisted man may be discharged as undesirable—or under other than honorable conditions—without having qualified counsel to represent him. Because of the effects of such discharges and the stigma which they create, I consider that. except in an emergency situation created by war, any serviceman should have the assistance of a qualified attorney to assist him in connection with a proceeding which may result in a discharge under other than honorable conditions; and the second bill which I am introducing would so provide.

In the Federal district courts a period of 2 years is provided for the submission of a petition for new trial. Under the Uniform Code of Military Justice, an accused has only 1 year to petition for a new trial even if the petition is based on a fraud which has been committed on the court-martial which might involve a deprivation of due process. Moreover, many convictions by court-martial are not subject at all to the remedy of a petition for new trial, even if that petition is based on an alleged deprivation of constitutional rights. The third bill which I am introducing would extend the time period for the submission of a petition for new trial and would expand the scope of this remedy to include any conviction by court-martial.

The subcommittee has received many complaints concerning summary courts-martial, where a single officer acts as judge, jury, prosecuting attorney, and defense counsel. I find it hard to conceive that the criteria of due process are observed in such a court. Furthermore, any need for the summary court was removed when article 15 of the Uniform Code was expanded to allow a commanding officer to impose greater punishment nonjudicially. Therefore, to better protect the constitutional rights of the enlisted man, the fourth bill proposes the abolition of the summary court-martial.

The Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights has received complaints that a member of the Armed Forces, who was alleged to have been guilty of misconduct, was separated administratively under other than honorable conditions by reason of this misconduct, even though he had requested trial by court-martial. The Uniform Code of Military Justice provides recognition and protection of many of the constitutional rights of military personnel; and yet this protection is circumvented by the procedure that I have described. In short, in some cases a member of the Armed Forces has been separated under other than honorable conditions and thereby stigmatized without receiving safeguards which both the Constitution and the Congress intended for him to have. The fifth measure proposed today would prohibit any such procedure, although, of course, it would retain the right of the Armed Forces to discharge under honorable conditions a member of the Armed Forces who could no longer serve effectively.

Although article 44 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice provides considerable protection against double jeopardy, I still perceive substantial omissions in its coverage. For example, there is no express prohibition of the administrative discharge of a serviceman under other than honorable conditions for the same alleged misconduct for which he has already been tried and acquitted by court-martial. The sixth bill would be designed to further implement the constitutional right of military personnel to protection against double jeopardy.

The seventh bill recognizes that in some instances cumbersome procedures militate against a fair trial. In this connection, I found that a major impediment to the fair and speedy trial by general court-martial is the absence of any procedure for a pretrial conference between the law officer—who serves as the judge in a general court-martial—and the trial and defense counsel. Interlocutory matters such as the admissibility of evidence alleged to have been obtained by unreasonable search and seizure must be decided at the trial after the court-martial members have assembled. Therefore, lengthy continuances may be necessary after the court has been convened in order to dispose of matters which in Federal courts would have been disposed of long before a jury was impaneled. The result often militates against the fairness of the trial, both from the standpoint of the accused and that of the Government. Under the eighth bill substantial improvement would be effected in this regard.

In Federal district courts or in State courts, the criminal trial is presided over by an independent judge who rules on all matters of law. The Uniform Code of Military Justice requires that a law officer preside over general courts-martial. However, there is no provision for a law officer to preside over special courts-martial, even though these courts can impose a sentence which includes a bad conduct discharge. As a result, there have been cases where a special court-martial sentenced a member of the Armed Forces to a bad conduct discharge without the legal guidance that would be required in a civilian trial to insure adequate protection of the constitutional rights of the accused. The stigma of such a discharge, of course, persists throughout the entire life of the person who receives it. The eighth bill which is being introduced would authorize the appointment of a law officer to any special court-martial and require that, except in time of war, a law officer be appointed in order for the special court to have the authority to adjudge a bad conduct discharge. Also, on the analogy of the waiver of trial by jury permitted in the Federal courts, the accused would be allowed to waive trial by the members of the court-martial and be tried before the law officer alone.

Administrative proceedings in the Armed Forces and especially the proceedings of boards of officers appointed to make findings and recommendations concerning discharge of military personnel, can have very serious consequences for members of the Armed Forces. In light of those consequences, it is not surprising that these administrative board proceedings raise important questions involving constitutional rights of military personnel. Although the Federal courts, since the Supreme Court's decision in Harmon against Brucker, have increased the scope of judicial review of administrative action taken by military authorities, the procedure for obtaining such review is often cumbersome.

Moreover, the Federal courts generally do not have occasion for extensive contact with problems of military law. On the other hand, the Court of Military Appeals is a specialized court, well-acquainted with military law and with the constitutional rights of military personnel. The ninth bill would establish a procedure for appellate review by the Court of Military Appeals with respect to certain administrative actions taken by the Armed Forces.

I have already mentioned the necessity for providing legal guidance for the accused from a trained lawyer as a prerequisite in cases which would result in his receiving a bad conduct discharge by a special court-martial. A similar need exists with respect to administrative board proceedings that can result in an undesirable discharge, also a discharge under other than honorable conditions. Accordingly, the 10th measure would require that, except in time of war, a board hearing be held prior to an administrative separation under other than honorable conditions and that such a board have a legal adviser with the same qualifications and functions of those possessed by the law officer of a general court-martial under the Uniform Code of Military Justice. In this way, I feel sure that the guarantee of due process will be much better implemented for military personnel being proposed for undesirable discharges.

At the hearings of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights it was pointed out that there is no authority for compelling witnesses to appear before military boards concerned with administrative discharges or before an officer who is conducting a pretrial investigation under the provisions of article 32 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice. As a result, vital constitutional rights of confrontation and compulsory process are affected; and it is quite possible that in many cases the boards and investigating officers do not reach the same conclusions that they would reach if they were able to obtain the personal testimony of witnesses, instead of relying on written statements. The 11th bill would authorize administrative discharge boards, discharge review boards, and correction boards, and investigating officers appointed under article 32 of the Uniform Code to compel the attendance of witnesses and the production of evidence where, in their discretion, this seems desirable.

During the hearings of the subcommittee we were informed that in Army and Air Force boards of review, the chairman of the board rated the efficiency of the members of the board and that these ratings helped determine future promotions and assignments of these members. Naturally, this practice does not promote the independence of the board members in cases where they disagree with the chairman. Shortly after the hearings, the Army discontinued this practice; but the Air Force has apparently retained its rating system. Because any such rating system threatens the fairness of the appellate review of courts-martial, including the review of issues involving constitutional rights, it should be prohibited. The 12th bill contains such a prohibition.

Article 3(a) of the Uniform Code of Military Justice purports to authorize trial by court-martial of former members of the Armed Forces who, while in a military status, committed serious crimes for which they cannot be tried by any State or Federal court. In Toth against Quarles the Supreme Court held that this provision was unconstitutional and that court-martial jurisdiction cannot be extended to former members of the Armed Forces. The 13th of these bills would comply with the constitutional requirements set out by the Supreme Court and at the same time would fill a jurisdictional gap by authorizing trial in Federal district courts of serious violations of the Uniform Code which otherwise would not be subject to trial in any American tribunal.

Article 2 of the Uniform Code purports to subject to military jurisdiction civilian dependents and employees accompanying the Armed Forces overseas; but the Supreme Court has held this provision unconstitutional. To fill the jurisdictional gap created by the Supreme Court decisions, it has even been proposed that civilian dependents and employees overseas be given a quasi-military status and be organized into a Support Corps. I doubt the constitutionality of such a proposal and I am even less convinced of its desirability. The appropriate method for handling the problem seems to be the one contained in the 14th bill, which would authorize the trial in Federal district courts of persons who commit serious offenses while accompanying the Armed Forces outside of the United States. I realize that there may be differences of viewpoint as to whether the jurisdiction of American courts should be limited only to persons in a special relation to the military or should instead be extended to include other categories; as to what should be the statute of limitations and the authorized punishments; and as to which categories of offenses should be punishable. I believe, however, that the proposal dealing with the trial of certain persons accompanying the Armed Forces outside of the United States will provide the starting point for the solution of the problem.

The value of the constitutional right to counsel depends greatly on the ability and independence of the attorney who is defending the accused. It is my belief that both the independence and the ability of lawyers in the Navy might be enhanced by the creation of a Navy Judge Advocate General's Corps, like that of the Army. The 15th bill would establish this corps.

Congress has established boards for the correction of military records and these boards often provide a remedy for servicemen who have been deprived of their constitutional rights by reason of actions taken by military authorities. I feel, however, that 10 United States Code, section 1552, which establishes these boards, should be modified in order to provide a more effective and independent forum to review applications for correction of military records. The 16th bill I have introduced is designed to achieve that objective.

Among the most significant developments in military law is the field judiciary system. It was developed by the Army and later was adopted by the Navy. The members of the field judiciary preside as law officers of general courts-martial and apparently have implemented effectively the right of accused military personnel to be tried by court-martial in accordance with the concepts of due process. During the subcommittee's hearings, with the exception of the representatives of the one service which has not adopted a field judiciary system, the witnesses, who discussed the system, praised it. In light of the proven virtues of this system for insuring due process, I am proposing the statutory recognition and adoption of the field judiciary system. The 17th measure implements this proposal.

Under article 66 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice, boards of review examine the records of trial by court-martial in serious cases. In addition to reviewing the legality of the conviction, these boards have a power, which the Court of Military Appeals does not have, to weigh the evidence and to evaluate the sentence imposed. In many instances, claims of deprivation of constitutional rights must stand or fall on the basis of factual determinations made by these boards. I am convinced that the role of these boards in protecting the constitutional rights of servicemen and in insuring a fair and impartial appellate review of court-martial convictions can be better fulfilled by some changes in the structure and designation of the boards. The last of the 18 bills is designed to accomplish certain changes to improve the boards of review.

Each of the bills is the outgrowth of extensive study and detailed research. Each of them benefits from the testimony received during the hearings conducted in February and March 1962, by the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, from an intensive 17-day field investigation and from the comments and suggestions of hundreds of former judge advocates who have written to the subcommittee. Each of them is designed to better insure the constitutional rights of members and former members of the Armed Forces and of persons accompanying the Armed Forces overseas. No objective could be more important at the present time than to protect the constitutional rights of the men and women in uniform who stand ready to protect the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted at this point in the RECORD the text of each of the aforementioned bills with an accompanying memorandum on each bill. A number of my colleagues have indicated that they would care to join in sponsoring one or more of these measures. Accordingly, I ask unanimous consent that these bills lie on the table for 10 days so that other Senators who so desire may add their names as cosponsors.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bills and memoranda will be printed in the RECORD, and the bills will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from North Carolina.

The bills were received, read twice by their titles, and referred, as indicated:

By Mr. ERVIN (for himself and Mr. HRUSKA):

S. 745. A bill to further insure to military personnel certain due process protection by providing for military judges to be detailed to all general courts-martial, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 801(10) (article 1(10)) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking out "'Law officer'" and inserting in lieu thereof "'Military judge'".

(b) Section 806(c) (article 6(c)) of such title is amended by striking out "law officer" and inserting in lieu thereof "military judge".

SEC. 2. Section 816 (article 16) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking out in clause (1) "law officer" and inserting in lieu thereof "military judge".

SEC. 3. Section 826 (article 26) of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 826. Art. 26. Military judge of a general court-martial.

"(a) The Judge Advocate General of the military department concerned shall detail a military judge to every general court-martial convened within the military department of which the Judge Advocate General is a member.

"(b) A military judge shall be a commissioned officer of the Armed Forces, or a civilian, who is a member of a Federal court or a member of the highest court of a State and who is certified to be qualified for duty as a military judge of a general court-martial by the Judge Advocate General of the armed force of which such military judge is a member or employee, as the case may be.

"(c) Except in the case of a general court-martial convened by the President or the Secretary of a military department, an officer detailed as military judge of a general court-martial shall not be a member of the same command as the convening authority of such court-martial; and in no case, except in the case of a general court-martial convened by the President or the Secretary of a military department, shall the convening authority of a general court-martial (or any member of the staff of such convening authority) be responsible for the preparation or review of any report concerning the effectiveness, fitness, or efficiency of any officer detailed as a military judge of a general court-martial convened by such authority.

"(d) Any person certified to serve as military judge shall be assigned and directly responsible to the Judge Advocate General of the armed force of which he is a member or of which he is an employee, as the case may be. A military judge shall perform such duties of a judicial nature other than those relating to his primary duty of military judge of a general court-martial whenever such duties are assigned to him by or with the approval of the appropriate Judge Advocate General. Duties of a nonjudicial nature may not be assigned to a military judge except in time of war, and then only with the approval of the appropriate Judge Advocate General.

"(e) Any military judge of one armed force may be detailed to serve as military judge of a general court-martial of a different armed force with the consent of the Judge Advocate General of the armed force of which such military judge is a member or employee, as the case may be.

"(f) No person is eligible to act as military judge in a case if he is the accuser or a witness for the prosecution or has acted as investigating officer or a counsel in the same case.

"(g) The military judge of a general court-martial may not consult with the members of the court, other than on the form of the findings as provided in section 839 of this title (article 39), except in the presence of the accused, trial counsel, and defense counsel, nor may he vote with the members of the court."

SEC. 4. Section 866 (article 66) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(g) No member of a board of review shall be eligible to review the record of any trial if such member served as investigating officer in the case or served as a member of the court-martial before which such trial was conducted, or served as military judge, trial or defense counsel, or reviewing officer of such trial."

SEC. 5. Sections 827(a) (article 27(a)), 829(b) (article 29(b)), 837 (article 37), 839 (article 39), 841 (a) and (b) (article 41 (a) and (b)), 842(a) (article 42(a)), 851 (b) and (c) (article 51 (b) and (c)), 854(a) (article 54(a)), and 936(b) (article 136(b)) of title 10, United States Code, are amended by striking out "law officer" wherever it appears in such sections and inserting in lieu thereof "military judge".

SEC. 6. The amendments made by this Act shall become effective with respect to general courts-martial convened on or after the first day of the third calendar month following the date of enactment of this Act.

The memorandum accompanying Senate bill 745 is as follows:

PROPOSED BILL TO IMPLEMENT THE CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT OF SERVICE PERSONNEL TO RECEIVE DUE PROCESS AND FAIR AND IMPARTIAL TREATMENT IN TRIALS BY GENERAL COURTS-MARTIAL

Background memorandum: At the present time there are three kinds of court-martial—general, special, and summary courts-martial. The general court, which must consist of at least five members, is not subject to the same limitations of its jurisdiction that apply to other courts-martial. (See articles 18–20 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice, 10 U.S.C. 818–820.) Therefore, it is used for trial of the more serious offenses, where the sentence and punishment may be quite severe. Because of the consequences of a conviction by general court-martial, Congress required for the first time in the Uniform Code of Military Justice that each general court-martial have a law officer, who must be a qualified attorney and, like a judge, sits apart from the members of the court, rules on interlocutory questions, and instructs the members concerning the law applicable to the cases before them. Unlike a Federal judge, the law officer, under present law, is not authorized to impose sentence; nor may he rule finally on challenges to the court-martial members.

Since the Uniform Code first took effect in 1951, the Court of Military Appeals has tended more and more to equate the status and responsibility of the law officer to that of a judge and has inferred that Congress intended for him to have certain powers—like that of declaring a mistrial—which a trial judge would usually possess. Also, the Army and more recently the Navy have initiated a program—the field judiciary (or trial judiciary) program—designed to enhance the independency, impartiality, and efficiency of their law officers. This field judiciary program, which was described in detail during the course of the hearings held in 1962 by the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights (see pp. 838–839 of the hearings), has received widespread acclaim and has produced signal results in reducing errors at the trial and in assuring that the accused serviceman received due process. Moreover, the law officers appointed pursuant to the field judiciary program have apparently been especially immune from command influence and so have been better able to assure the fairness and impartiality of the trial.

Because the advantages of the field judiciary program have proved so great, several witnesses at the hearings urged that it be given specific recognition by the Congress and applied to each armed service. In this way the airman could be better assured of receiving the same type of trial by general court-martial that the soldier and sailor have obtained under the field judiciary program. Moreover, until the field judiciary system is required by statute, there will always be the risk that even the Army or Navy might abandon it.

Under the field judiciary program, the performance of duty as law officer is a full-time matter—rather than something to be sandwiched in among a host of nonjudicial duties. Furthermore, the law officer is not assigned to the staff of a field command, where he may be trying a case and may be subject to subtle or overt command influence, but instead falls under the supervision of the Office of the Judge Advocate General of his armed service. Efficiency reports concerning a member of the field judiciary, which will help determine his future promotions and assignments, are prepared by a senior member of the field judiciary, rather than by some commanding officer in the field.

Since the time of the subcommittee's hearings last year, the Army has introduced various refinements of the field judiciary program. However, the basic ingredients of the system remain the same; namely, mature full-time law officers, who are not subject to any sort of influence by the commander who has convened the general court-martial to which the law officer has been appointed.

If the field judiciary is to be given statutory sanction, the members of the judiciary could properly be redesignated as "military judges" a term which could give a clearer picture of their function. Also, with a view to obtaining the best utilization of personnel and in accord with the premise that justice should be of the same quality in all the services, interservice exchange of the members of the field judiciary should be facilitated, so that an Army law officer could be readily available for an Air Force general court-martial, or vice versa. At the present time, under pargraph 4g(3) of the 1951 Manual for Courts-Martial, such interservice appointments are possible—with the consent of the Secretary of each Department involved; but, probably because of the cumbersomeness of obtaining the consent of both Secretaries, this authority is used quite infrequently. An easier procedure for interservice use of qualified law officers seems desirable.

Although the members of the field judiciary should be full-time military judges, it would not be inconsistent with this concept for them to perform duties of a judicial nature other than in a general court-martial. For instance, there have been proposals to reconstitute the special court-martial with a law officer or to provide a law officer for administrative discharge boards considering proposed discharges under other than honorable conditions. Therefore, it does not seem amiss to provide that, although the primary duty of the military judge shall be to serve on general court-martial, he shall not be disqualified to perform other duties of a judicial nature. Also, because of possible manpower problems during wartime, it seems desirable to provide that the requirement of full-time judicial duty for the military judge shall not apply in time of war; and the Judge Advocate General shall be free to assign to the military judge nonjudicial duties to the extent that this may become necessary.

There is much to be said in favor of requiring a minimum tour of duty for the military judge, so that he could not be reassigned at once to some other type of activity if his decisions proved favorable to the accused. On the other hand, this requirement might introduce excessive rigidity in the system and might preclude the Judge Advocate General from removing from duty as military judge an officer who had not displayed suitable competence and impartiality. On balance, the best solution at this time seems to be to rely on the fairness of the Judge Advocate General not to reassign a military judge to other duty merely because he has ruled frequently in favor of accused persons.

During the hearings no loud voices were heard in favor of having civilian lawyers preside over general court-martial, as is currently done under the British Articles of War. However, no objection is apparent to amending the Uniform Code to enable a civilian attorney to serve as military judge or law officer if the Judge Advocate General chooses to assign him to such duty. Although such an authorization would probably never be used by the Armed Forces, it seems desirable to give them this option.

To implement the foregoing proposals, it seems necessary to:

(a) Amend article 26 of the Uniform Code, 10 U.S.C. 826, to require that every general court-martial have a military judge, who shall have the same qualifications and disqualifications now stated in article 26(a) except that he may be either an officer or a civilian employee. Then, after setting forth the qualifications of the military judge and prohibiting the convening of a general court-martial without such a judge, article 26 should provide that this military judge shall not be a person assigned to the command of the officer who convenes the court-martial, unless the court-martial is convened by the President or the Secretary of the Department (art. 22(a)). Furthermore, this military judge shall be assigned to the office of the Judge Advocate General of his armed service, although he may be attached for administrative or recordkeeping purposes to some other organization or activity. No efficiency or fitness report shall be prepared on the military judge by any convening authority, other than the President or the Secretary of the Department, nor be prepared by any person who is assigned to the staff of any such convening authority. Furthermore, article 26 should provide that, the military judge's primary and full-time duty shall be as judge for general courts-martial, except that this shall not preclude his performance, with the consent of his Judge Advocate General, of other duties of a judicial nature to the extent they do not interfere with his duties in general courts-martial and except that in time of war the Judge Advocate General may assign him additional duties of a nonjudicial nature.

(b) Enact a new subsection of article 26 which will allow a military judge to serve in a trial by court-martial or other judicial proceeding which involves a member of a different armed force, so long as this is done with the consent of the Judge Advocate General of his own armed force.

(c) In every article of the code which refers to the law officer of a general court-martial, substitute "military judge" (e.g., arts. 16, 26, 27, 29, 39, 41, 42, 51, 54).

S. 746. A bill to further insure due process in the administration of military justice in the Department of the Navy by establishing a Judge Advocate General's Corps in such Department.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 5148 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by redesignating subsections (a), (b), and (c) as subsections (b), (c), and (d), respectively, and by adding at the beginning of such section a new subsection as follows:

"(a) The Judge Advocate General's Corps is established as a Staff Corps of the Navy, and shall be organized in accordance with regulations promulgated by the Secretary of the Navy. Members of the Judge Advocate General's Corps in addition to their other duties shall perform the duties of law specialists under the Uniform Code of Military Justice."

(b) The catchline of such section is amended to read as follows: "Judge Advocate General's Corps: Judge Advocate General; appointment, term, emoluments, duties".

Sec. 2. Section 5149 of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 5149. Office of the Judge Advocate General: Deputy Judge Advocate General; Assistant Judge Advocate General

"(a) An officer of the Judge Advocate General's Corps shall be detailed as Deputy Judge Advocate General of the Navy. While so serving he is entitled to the rank of rear admiral (upper half) unless entitled to a higher rank under another provision of law. The Deputy Judge Advocate General is entitled to the same privileges of retirement as provided for chiefs of bureaus in section 5133 of this title.

"(b) An officer of the Judge Advocate General's Corps shall be detailed as Assistant Judge Advocate General of the Navy. While so serving he is entitled to the rank of rear admiral (lower half), unless entitled to a higher rank under another provision of law. An officer who is retired while serving as Assistant Judge Advocate General of the Navy, or who, after serving at least six months as Assistant Judge Advocate General of the Navy, is retired after completion of that service while serving in a lower rank or grade, may, in the discretion of the President, be retired with the grade of rear admiral. He is entitled to the retired pay of a rear admiral in the lower half of that grade, if he is retired as a rear admiral.

"(c) When there is a vacancy in the office of Judge Advocate General or during the absence or disability of the Judge Advocate General, the Deputy Judge Advocate General shall perform the duties of the Judge Advocate General until a successor is appointed or the absence or disability ceases."

Sec. 3. (a) Chapter 539 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding after section 5578 a new section as follows:

"§ 5578a. Regular Navy: Judge Advocate General's Corps

"Original appointments to the active list of the Navy in the Judge Advocate General's Corps may be made from persons who—

"(1) are at least 21 and under 35 years of age; and

"(2) have physical, mental, moral, and professional qualifications satisfactory to the Secretary of the Navy.

For the purposes of determining lineal position, permanent grade, seniority in permanent grade, and eligibility for promotion, an officer appointed in the Judge Advocate General's Corps shall be credited with the amount of service prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy, but not less than three years."

(b) Such chapter is further amended by inserting in the table of sections at the beginning of such chapter immediately after

"5578. Regular Navy: Dental Corps."

the following:

"5578a. Regular Navy: Judge Advocate General's Corps."

Sec. 4. Section 5587(c) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking "law,".

Sec. 5. (a) Section 5600(b) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end of paragraph (1) a new clause as follows:

"(D) Judge Advocate General's Corps—at least three years;".

(b) Such section is further amended by striking out paragraph (2) and redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (2).

Sec. 6. (a) Subsection (h) of section 202 of title 37, United States Code, is amended by—

(1) striking out "or" at the end of clause (6);

(2) redesignating clause (7) as clause (8); and

(3) adding immediately after clause (6) a new clause as follows:

"(7) Deputy Judge Advocate General of the Navy; or".

(b) Subsection (i) of such section is amended by striking out clause (3) thereof and by redesignating clauses (4) and (5) as clauses (3) and (4), respectively.

(c) Such section is further amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(k) An officer serving as Assistant Judge Advocate General of the Navy is entitled to the basic pay of a rear admiral lower half."

Sec. 7. All law specialists in the Navy shall be redesignated as judge advocates in the Judge Advocate General's Corps. All provisions of title 10, United States Code, not inconsistent with this Act, relating to officers of the Medical Corps of the Navy shall apply to officers of the Judge Advocate General's Corps of the Navy.

The memorandum accompanying Senate bill 746 is, as follows:

Proposed Bill To Implement the Constitutional Rights of Naval Personnel to Due Process and Assistance of Counsel by Establishing a Judge Advocate General's Corps in the Navy

Background memorandum: The importance and necessity of the assistance of counsel in preparing a defense to criminal charges has long been recognized as basic to Anglo-American law, and was guaranteed to an individual by the sixth amendment to the Constitution ("to have the Assistance of Counsel for his defense.") Constitutionally, this right to counsel is more often seen as part and parcel of the requirement of due process set forth in the fifth amendment. Thus, the denial of the right to counsel is considered a deprivation of the due process. In a recent opinion by the Supreme Court, this requirement was even further extended to State courts under the 14th amendment.

Although the necessity for legally trained counsel has long been spelled out by decisions as regards civilian courts, the existing provisions of the Uniform Code of Military Justice set forth mandatory requirements for qualified counsel which have had significant effects upon the administration of military (and naval) justice. For example, the code requires the presence of at least three uniformed attorneys at every general court-martial and of at least one attorney in connection with the review of every court-martial—general, special, or summary. In addition, the code requires that the accused must be represented by an attorney during the pretrial investigation prerequisite to a general court-martial, if he requests such representation, and no deposition will be admissible in evidence in a general court-martial unless the accused was represented by a lawyer.

In light of this increased demand for lawyers for the proper administration of military justice, it is evident that the uniformed legally trained officer must spearhead the protection of the rights of the accused set forth under the code and, more broadly, under the constitutional mandate for "due process." Such protection can only be accomplished where the attorney can be assured of complete independence in the performance of his military duties.

There seemed to be agreement at the hearings of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights on the necessity for the creation of a separate Judge Advocate General's Corps in the Navy and that the result would be to enhance the independence of naval counsel, as well as their efficiency (see subcommittee hearings, p. 401).

Under the existing system the Office of the Judge Advocate General of the Navy is a restricted line special duty category to which legally trained individuals are appointed. As such it carries out the functions required under the code in the administration of military justice. Often the legal officer must be both line officer as well as legal officer; in fact, in past years he was used for alternate sea and legal duty to maintain his "line" experience. With the advent of the specialization required by the code, law has become a full-time job for these officers. Often also the paths of regular Navy thought and Navy legal thought appear to be on collision course, and under the existing system substantial pressure can be brought against legal officers to accomplish certain results which other officers consider to be in the best interests of the Navy, irrespective of the legal issues involved and the rights of the accused individual. Perhaps this conflict can best be summed up by the following which appeared in the Military Law Review, April 1959 (p. 111):

"The Judge Advocate General's Corps of the Army bears the heavy responsibility of seeing that the large body of statutes, regulations, and customs governing the military service, both internally and in its relations with the civilian world, is enforced correctly and fairly. It must persuade impetuous officers of the line, impatient of legal restrictions, of the virtues of orderly procedure according to the law."

There seems to be little disagreement that there should be a separate Judge Advocate General's Corps created within the Navy; the only point of issue is how such a step can be brought about and implemented into actual practice.

The attached draft is a revision of H.R. 6889, which was introduced in the House by Representative Vinson during the last Congress, and seems to be quite acceptable to most of the individuals concerned. This effort has received the support of Admiral Mott, Judge Advocate General of the Navy who, as he stated in the subcommittee hearings (p. 401), feels that creation of a separate Judge Advocate General's Corps for the Navy "would be better for the Navy. I think a Judge Advocate General's Corps will make it easier to recruit lawyers, it will be easier to retain them, and we will be able to give our client, the Navy, better service."

S. 747. A bill to protect the constitutional rights of military personnel by providing an independent forum to review and correct the military records of members and former members of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsections (a) and (b) of section 1552 of title 10, United States Code, are amended to read as follows:

"(a)(1) There is hereby established in the Department of Defense a board to be known as the 'Board for the Correction of Military Records' (hereinafter in this section referred to as the 'Board'). The Board shall be composed of nine members appointed from civilian life by the Secretary of Defense. No retired member of an armed force of the United States or of the United States Coast Guard shall be eligible for appointment to the Board.

"(2) Each member of the Board shall be appointed for a period of three years, except that (A) any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term, and (B) the terms of office of the members first appointed to the Board shall expire, as designated by the Secretary of Defense at the time of appointment, three at the end of one year, three at the end of two years, and three at the end of three years. The Secretary of Defense shall designate from time to time one of the members of the Board to serve as Chairman.

"(3) Each member of the Board shall receive the same salary which shall be fixed by the Secretary of Defense. No duties other than those directly concerned with the administration of this section may be assigned to members of the Board if such duties in any manner interfere with or adversely affect the proper administration of this section.

"(4) The Board shall determine the number of members required to constitute a quorum, and shall prescribe its own rules of procedure for the conduct of its affairs. A vacancy in the Board shall not impair the right of the remaining members to exercise the powers of the Board. The Secretary of Defense may remove any member of the Board, after notice and hearing, for neglect of duty or malfeasance in office, or for mental or physical disability, but for no other cause.

"(5) Upon his certificate, each member of the Board is entitled to be paid out of appropriations for such purpose (A) all necessary traveling expenses, and (B) reasonable maintenance expenses, incurred while attending Board meetings or transacting official business outside the District of Columbia.

"(b) It shall be the function of the Board to review the service record of any member or former member of an armed force and to correct such record when it considers such action necessary to correct an error or to remove an injustice. The power of the Board shall include authority to modify, set aside, or expunge the findings or sentence, or both, of a court-martial case not reviewed by a board of review pursuant to section 866 of this title (article 66) when it considers such action necessary to correct an error or to remove an injustice; and in any case in which the Board determines that an error has been committed or an injustice suffered as the result of a court-martial trial which has been reviewed pursuant to section 866 (article 66) it may recommend to the Secretary concerned that the Secretary exercise his power under section 874 or 875 of this title (article 74 and 75). Except when procured by fraud, a correction under this section is final and conclusive on all officers of the United States."

Sec. 2. Section 1552 of title 10, United States Code, is further amended by—

(1) redesignating subsections (c), (d), and (e) as subsections (d), (e), and (f) respectively;

(2) adding after subsection (b), as amended by this section, a new subsection (c) as follows:

"(c) No correction may be made under this section unless the claimant or his heir or legal representative files a request therefor within three years after he discovers the error or injustice. However, the Board may excuse a failure to file within three years after discovery if it finds it to be in the interest of justice.";

(3) striking out "department concerned may pay" in subsection (d), as redesignated by this Act, and inserting in lieu thereof "department concerned shall pay";

(4) striking out "who was paid under subsection (c)" in subsection (e), as redesignated by this Act, and inserting in lieu thereof "who was paid under subsection (d)"; and

(5) adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(g)(1) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to establish in the Treasury Department a Board to review and correct military records of members and former members of the United States Coast Guard. Such Board, if established, shall be composed of three civilian members, appointed by the Secretary of the Treasury, none of whom shall be members of or retired from the United States Coast Guard or the armed forces.

The members of such Board, if established, shall be appointed for a term of three years, except that (A) any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term, and (B) the terms of office of the members first appointed to the Board shall expire, as designated by the Secretary of the Treasury at the time of appointment, one at the end of one year, one at the end of two years, and one at the end of three years. The Secretary of the Treasury shall designate from time to time one of the members of the Board to serve as Chairman. The Board shall have the same powers and functions regarding the correction of military records of members and former members of the Coast Guard as the Board established under subsection (a) of this section has with regard to the correction of military records of members and former members of the armed forces.

"(2) In the event the Secretary of the Treasury does not elect within one year after the date of enactment of this paragraph to establish a Board pursuant to paragraph (1) hereof, the Board established under subsection (a) of this section to correct military records of members and former members of the armed forces shall have authority to review and correct military records of members and former members of the Coast Guard in the same manner and to the same extent as it may review and correct military records of members and former members of the armed forces."

Sec. 3. Any case pending before any Board established under section 1552 of title 10, United States Code, on the effective date of this Act shall be transferred for review and disposition to the appropriate board authorized to be established pursuant to the amendments made by this Act.

Sec. 4. The amendments made by this Act shall become effective on the first day of the third calendar month following the month in which this Act is enacted.

The memorandum accompanying Senate bill 747 is as follows:

Proposed Bill To Protect the Constitutional Rights of Service Personnel by Establishing an Independent and Impartial Forum To Review Possible Errors or Injustices Affecting the Records of Service Personnel

Background memorandum: The Congress has provided for Discharge Review Boards and Boards for the Correction of Military Records (see 10 U.S.C. 1552–1553). The former boards are composed of military personnel and review the type and nature of any discharge or dismissal from the Armed Forces, unless the discharge or dismissal resulted from the sentence of a general court-martial. The correction boards, which are composed of civilians, have the authority to recommend to the Secretary of their Department that he "correct any military record of that Department * * * to correct an error or to remove an injustice." The correction boards are established by each military Department and by the Secretary of the Treasury; their members are usually performing other duties in addition to the duty as member of the correction board. Although the correction boards can recommend corrective action with respect to the findings and sentence of a court-martial, the effect of such recommendations is unclear in light of the direction in article 76 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice that the proceedings, findings and sentence of courts-martial, after undergoing the appellate review prescribed by the code, "shall be final and conclusive." Of course, for summary court-martial cases or special court-martial cases that have not resulted in a punitive discharge, the appellate review of the case is somewhat limited; and under the present wording of article 73 a petition for a new trial cannot be submitted. Absent the possibility of relief from the correction board, the serviceman has little chance to rectify an injustice at the hands of the court-martial, even though his constitutional rights may have been violated.

Since the correction boards today do not usually have full-time members, the members of the board may be compelled to subordinate their duties on the board to other pressing matters. Furthermore, even though many of the statutes and directives applicable to requests for correction of records may apply to all the Armed Forces, there is always the possibility that the different correction boards will vary quite markedly in their application of those statutes—with a resulting lack of uniformity. Accordingly, it seems desirable to have a single correction board for the military departments with the members of this board to have no other duties. The Secretary of the Treasury should have the authority to establish his own correction board for Coast Guard cases or to have applications for correction of records considered by the Defense Department board. The unified correction board, which, for administrative purposes should be located in the Office of the Secretary of Defense, should have the authority either to make binding determinations that records should be corrected to correct an error or injustice or to recommend action to the Secretary of the appropriate military department. With respect to cases that have not received the full appellate review by a board of review authorized under article 66 of the Uniform Code, the correction boards should have full authority to modify, set aside, or expunge either the findings or the sentence of the court-martial; and article 76 of the code should be amended to this effect. Even with respect to cases that have been reviewed under article 66, there seems nothing amiss in giving the boards authority to recommend to the Secretary of the appropriate military department that he take action under articles 74 and 75.

The implement this proposal it seems desirable to:

(a) Amend 10 U.S.C. 1552 to provide that the Secretary of Defense shall appoint a board of civilians which may order the correction of any military or naval record when the board deems this necessary to correct an error or remove an injustice.

(b) Require in 10 U.S.C. 1552 that the members of the correction board devote substantially all of their working time to their duties as board members.

(c) Modify article 76 of the Code (10 U.S.C. 876) and 10 U.S.C. 1552 to authorize the correction board to modify, expunge, and set aside for any purpose a court-martial conviction that has not been reviewed by a board of review under article 66 of the Uniform Code; and to authorize the correction board, even in cases which have been reviewed under article 66, to make recommendations to the Secretary of the appropriate military department, which recommendations shall however be purely advisory, concerning the exercise of his discretion under articles 74 and 75 of the Uniform Code.

(d) Authorize the Secretary of the Treasury either to establish his own correction board, which need not be composed of employees who have no other duty, or to submit applications for relief received by him to the Defense Department Correction Board under regulations to be promulgated jointly by him and the Secretary of Defense; but the correction board which considers Coast Guard cases shall have the same authority in these cases as the Defense Department Correction Board has in cases concerning requests for correction of military records.

S. 748. A bill to provide additional constitutional protection for members of the armed forces by establishing Courts of Military Review, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 866 (article 66) of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 866. Art. 66. Courts of Military Review

"(a) There is established for each military department an appellate court which shall have authority to review, as provided in this section, courts-martial cases tried by that military department for which such court is established. Each such court is a court of record and shall be known as the Court of Military Review for the military department for which it is established. The Court of Military Review for any military department shall, for administrative purposes only, be located in such department.

"(b) The Secretary of each military department shall appoint persons to serve as judges of the Court of Military Review for that military department. The Court of Military Review for each military department shall consist of as many three-judge panels as the Secretary of the department concerned shall deem necessary. The Secretary of the military department concerned shall from time to time designate one of the judges of the Court of Military Review for such military department as chief judge of such court. Only civilian judges of each court shall be eligible to act as chief judge. Any civilian and any commissioned officer of the armed forces shall be eligible for appointment to a Court of Military Review if such civilian or officer is a member of the bar of a Federal court or the highest court of a State, has had not less than six years' experience in the practice of military justice, and meets such other qualifications as may be prescribed by the Secretary concerned.

"(c) The Court of Military Review for each military department shall sit in panels of three judges each for the purpose of reviewing courts-martial cases. The composition of such panels shall be determined by the chief judge of the court concerned; but the chief judge on his own motion, or on the request of at least one-half of the judges of the court concerned, may require the court to sit en banc for the purpose of reviewing any particular court-martial case. A judge of the Court of Military Review of one military department may sit as a judge of the Court of Military Review for another military department when authorized to do so by the Secretaries of the military departments concerned.

"(d) At least one judge of each three-judge panel of any Court of Military Review shall be a civilian who is not a retired member of any armed forces.

"(e)(1) Any commissioned officer appointed to a Court of Military Review shall be appointed for a term of three years, and shall be eligible for reappointment.

"(2) Any person appointed to a Court of Military Review from civilian life shall be appointed in accordance with the civil service laws. Any persons appointed to such court from civilian life shall serve during good behavior, and may be removed from office only for physical or mental disability or other cause shown, upon notice and hearing, by the Secretary concerned.

"(f) Any person appointed to a Court of Military Review shall be known as military judge, and any commissioned officer appointed to serve on a Court of Military Review shall, in all matters relating to the work of such court, be addressed and referred to as a military judge without reference to his military grade.

"(g) The Judge Advocate General shall refer to the Court of Military Review the record in every case of trial by court-martial in which the sentence as adjudged by the court-martial affects a general or flag officer or extends to death, dismissal of an officer, cadet, or midshipman, dishonorable or bad-conduct discharge, or confinement for one year or more.

"(h) In any case referred to it, a Court of Military Review shall act only with respect to the findings and sentence as approved by an officer exercising general court-martial jurisdiction. It shall affirm only such findings of guilty, and the sentence or such part or amount of the sentence, as it finds correct in law and fact and determines on the basis of the entire record, should be approved. It may, also, suspend all or any part of the sentence. In considering the record it shall have the authority to weigh the evidence, judge the credibility of witnesses, and determine controverted questions of fact.

"(i) If a Court of Military Review sets aside the findings and sentence it may, except where the setting aside is based on lack of sufficient evidence in the record to support the findings, order a rehearing. If it sets aside the findings and sentence and does not order a rehearing it shall order that the charges be dismissed.

"(j) The Judge Advocate General shall, unless there is to be further action by the President, or the Secretary of the Department, or the Court of Military Appeals, instruct the convening authority to carry out the mandate of the Court of Military Review. If the Court of Military Review has ordered a rehearing and the convening authority finds a rehearing impracticable, he may dismiss the charges.

"(k) The Chief Judges of the Courts of Military Review shall prescribe uniform rules of procedure for proceedings in and before such courts subject to the approval of the Chief Judge of the Court of Military Appeals."

Sec. 2. (a) Section 865(b) (article 65(b)), section 867(b), pargraphs (2) and (3) (article 67(b) (2) and (3)), section 867 (c) and (f) (article 67 (c) and (f)), section 870 (b), (c), and (d) (article 70 (b), (c), and (d)), and section 871(c) (article 71) of title 10, United States Code, are each amended by striking out "board of review" wherever it appears in such sections and inserting in lieu thereof "Court of Military Review".

(b) The first sentence of section 868 of such title (article 68) is amended by striking out ", and to establish in such branch office one or more boards of review".

(c) The last sentence of section 868 of such title (article 68) is amended to read as follows:

"That Assistant Judge Advocate General may perform for that command, under the general supervision of the Judge Advocate General, the duties which the Judge Advocate General would otherwise be required to perform in respect to all cases involving sentences not requiring approval by the President."

(d) Section 869 of such title (article 69) is amended by striking out "reviewed by a board of review" and inserting in lieu thereof "transmitted for review to the Court of Military Review".

(e) Section 873 of such title (article 73) is amended to read as follows: "If the accused's case is pending before a Court of Military Review or before the Court of Military Appeals, the Judge Advocate General shall refer the petition to the appropriate court for action."

SEC. 3. The provisions of this section shall become effective on the first day of the third calendar month following the calendar month in which it is enacted. Any case pending before a board of review on the effective date of this Act shall be transmitted to the appropriate Court of Military Review for review and disposition.

The memorandum accompanying Senate bill 748 is as follows:

PROPOSED BILL TO PROVIDE ADDITIONAL CONSTITUTIONAL PROTECTION FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES BY ESTABLISHING COURTS OF MILITARY REVIEW, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

The Uniform Code of Military Justice makes provision in article 66 for boards of review to review the record of trial by court-martial in every case where the sentence, as approved, affects a general or flag officer, or extends to death, dismissal of a commissioned officer, cadet, or midshipman, dishonorable or bad conduct discharge, or confinement for 1 year or more. Certain other cases tried by general court-martial may also be referred to the boards of review pursuant to article 69 of the code. While the Court of Military Appeals acts only with respect to findings and sentence which are incorrect in law, the boards of review also review issues of fact and such matters as the appropriateness of sentence. Thus, in cases raising constitutional issues, such as the voluntariness of a confession, the boards of review may reexamine factual, as well as legal, issues in deciding the case on appeal.

During the hearings of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights concerning the "Constitutional Rights of Military Personnel," it was explained that the Navy boards of review have as members both naval officers and civilian employees of the Navy Department. On the other hand, the boards of review of the Army and Air Force use only military officers. In order to assure that the board members will have an opportunity to develop some degree of expertise in their work, it would seem advisable to provide a minimum tour of duty for these military members of the respective boards. The practice of the Navy in having civilian members on the boards provides some continuity and probably facilitates understanding and application by the board of the legal principles enunciated by the all-civilian Court of Military Appeals. To enhance the stature of the boards of review and emphasize their judicial role as guardian of the rights of military personnel, it also seems desirable to redesignate them as "Courts of Review." Because of the relatively small number of cases processed by the Coast Guard Board of Review, it may not be feasible to reconstitute the boards in that particular service.

S. 749. A bill to insure to military personnel certain basic constitutional rights by prohibiting command influence in courts-martial cases and in certain nonjudicial proceedings, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 837 (article 37) of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

§ 837. Art. 37. Unlawfully influencing the action of any court-martial or the action of certain military boards; effectiveness reports

"(a) No authority convening a general, special, or summary court-martial, nor any other person subject to this chapter may lecture, censure, reprimand, or admonish the court or any member, law officer, or counsel thereof with respect to the findings or sentence adjudged by the court, or with respect to the exercise of its functions and duties in the conduct of any past, pending, or future proceedings before the court.

"(b) No person subject to this chapter may lecture, censure, reprimand, or admonish any board, or any member, legal adviser, recorder, or counsel thereof, with respect to the finding and recommendations made by the board, or with respect to the exercise of its functions and duties in the conduct of any past, pending, or future proceedings before the board, if the proceedings with which such board is concerned relate to the administrative discharge or separation from service of any member of the armed forces, or to the nature and character of the type of discharge to be issued to any member of the armed forces, or to the demotion or reduction in grade of any member of the armed forces, or to any matter materially affecting the status or rights of any member of the armed forces.

"(c) The provisions of subsections (a) and (b) of this section shall not apply with respect (1) to general instructional or informational courses in military justice if such courses are designed solely for the purpose of instructing members of a command in the substantive and procedural aspects of courts-martial, or (2) to statements and instructions given in open court by the law officer of a general court-martial.

"(d) In the preparation of an effectiveness, fitness, or efficiency report, or any other report or document used in whole or in part for the purpose of determining whether a member of the armed forces is qualified to be advanced in grade, or in determining the assignment or transfer of a member of the armed forces, or in determining whether a member of the armed forces should be retained on active duty, no person subject to this chapter may, in preparing any such report (1) consider or evaluate the performance of duty of any such member as a member of a court-martial, or as a member of any board described in subsection (b) of this section, or (2) give a less favorable rating or evaluation of any member of the armed forces because of the zeal with which such member, as defense counsel, represented any accused before a court-martial, or any respondent before a board described in subsection (b) of this section.

"(e) No person subject to this chapter may attempt to coerce or, by any unauthorized means, influence directly or indirectly the action of any court-martial, or any other military tribunal, or of any board described in subsection (b) of this section, or of any member of such court-martial, tribunal, or board, in reaching the findings, sentence, or recommendations in any case, or the action of any convening, appointing, approving, or reviewing authority with respect to his judicial acts in the case of a court-martial or other military tribunal case, or his acts of approval or disapproval of the findings or recommendations made by a board described in subsection (b) of this section."

SEC. 2. Section 898 (article 98) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking out the semicolon at the end of item (2) and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the following: "or with any provision of section 837 of this title (article 37) relating to the proceeding before certain military boards described in such section."

SEC. 3. The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter VII of chapter 47 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking out

"837.37. Unlawfully influencing actions of court."

and inserting in lieu thereof

"837.37. Unlawfully influencing the action of any court-martial or the action of certain military boards; effectiveness reports."

The memorandum accompanying Senate bill 749 is as follows:

PROPOSED BILL TO PROTECT THE CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS OF SERVICE PERSONNEL TO RECEIVE A FAIR AND IMPARTIAL TRIAL BY COURT-MARTIAL, TO HAVE THE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL, AND TO HAVE CASES CONSIDERED IN ACCORDANCE WITH REQUIREMENTS OF DUE PROCESS

Background memorandum: Article 37 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice, 10 U.S.C., section 837, prohibits unlawful influence on the members of a court-martial. This prohibition reflects an effort to assure the impartial trial which is guaranteed in the sixth amendment. Unfortunately, despite the existence of article 37, complaints of command influence have not been absent with respect to trials by court-martial. Moreover, the Court of Military Appeals, by a 2-to-1 vote, has permitted the continuing use of pretrial instructions to court members. Testimony given to the subcommittee at its hearings on the constitutional rights of military personnel took the position that, in order to guarantee more adequately the impartiality of the court-martial members, the scope of article 37 should be broadened. Not only a convening authority or commanding officer but also the members of their staff should be prohibited from censoring or reprimanding any court personnel, including the counsel of the court. Any sort of pretrial instruction to members of courts-martial, now purportedly authorized by paragraph 38 of the Manual for Courts-Martial, should be expressly prohibited. Evaluation of a person's performance as a court member should not be a basis for the rating he receives on an effectiveness or fitness report used for purposes of determining his promotions and assignments. Similarly, a defense counsel should not be subject to the threat of a low rating on his own fitness report in retaliation for his vigorous defense of an accused person; otherwise the accused may, as a practical matter, be deprived of his constitutional right to the full assistance of counsel.

Article 37 contains no prohibition of command influence exerted upon discharge boards or other administrative boards which are considering important rights of service personnel—rights affecting their "liberty" and "property." For many of the same reasons applicable to courts-martial, the concept of due process would seem to demand that the participants in such board actions be protected from sanctions or retaliation, enabling them to perform their duties as their conscience guides them, instead of being forced to rely on a superior military authority for direction.

To implement these proposals for protecting the constitutional right of military personnel to a fair and impartial trial or hearing which will accord with the requirements of due process, it seems necessary to:

1. Rewrite article 37 of the Uniform Code, 10 U.S.C. 837, to provide that, not only a convening authority or other commanding officer, but also any member of their staff, or other person subject to this code, shall not censure, reprimand, or admonish a court-martial, or any member, law officer, or counsel thereof.

2. To avoid indirect efforts to control the behavior of court members, add to article 37 a provision that, in the preparation of any effectiveness report, fitness report, efficiency report or other document used for determining promotions, transfers, or assignments of service personnel, no person subject to the Uniform Code shall be free to consider or evaluate any performance of duty as a court-martial member.

3. To avoid indirect efforts to inhibit defense counsel, add to article 37 a provision that, in the preparation of any effectiveness report, fitness report, efficiency report or other document used for determining promotions, transfers, or assignments of service personnel, and with respect to a person who has served as a defense counsel, no person subject to the Uniform Code shall be free to prepare a less favorable report than would otherwise be the case because of the vigor and zeal with which the person being reported on has performed his duties as defense counsel.

4. Prohibit expressly the giving of instructions before trial by any convening authority, other commanding officer, or member of their staff, with the exception of general courses in military justice designed to instruct the members of a command concerning the provisions of military law and the procedures of courts-martial and with the proviso that instructions given in open court by the law officer of a general court-martial to the members of the court, at the outset of the trial or otherwise, shall not be prohibited.

5. Either broaden article 37 or put in an additional article at the end of the Uniform Code (or an additional section elsewhere in title 10) so that the prohibition of article 37 shall be equally applicable to board proceedings concerning administrative discharges or separations and administrative reductions. Thus, no authority convening a board to make findings or recommendations, or both (with respect to an administrative discharge or separation, or with respect to the nature and character of such discharge or separation, or with respect to any demotion or reduction of any service personnel, or with respect to any matter affecting materially the status or rights of any officer or serviceman) or any commanding officer or member of his staff, or other person subject to the Uniform Code, shall censure, reprimand or admonish such board, or any member, legal adviser, recorder, or counsel thereof with respect to the findings or recommendations made by the board, or with respect to any other exercise of its or his functions in the conduct of its proceedings. The same provisions concerning effectiveness or fitness reports should apply here that would apply to courts-martial under the preceding suggestions to amend article 37. Also, there would be a catchall prohibition applicable like that in article 37 which would apply to anyone subject to the Uniform Code of Military Justice who attempts to coerce, or by any unauthorized means influence, the action of any board of officers or other board considering findings or recommendations pertinent to an administrative discharge or separation, or an administrative demotion or reduction of any service personnel, or with respect to any other matter affecting materially the status or rights of any officer or serviceman, or any member of such board, in making findings or recommendations or in the performance of their duties in any case or proceeding, or the action of any convening, approving, or reviewing authority with respect to his acts in connection with such case or proceeding. Depending on the manner in which the prohibition against unlawful influence is applied to administrative proceedings in the armed services, it will also be necessary to rewrite article 98 of the Uniform Code, 10 U.S.C. 898, so that the penalty it authorizes will expressly apply to such behavior.

S. 750. A bill to protect the constitutional rights of military personnel by insuring their right to be represented by qualified counsel in certain cases, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the last sentence of section 819 (article 19) of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows: "A bad-conduct discharge may not be adjudged unless a complete record of the proceedings and testimony before the court has been made and, except in time of war, unless the accused was represented at the trial, or afforded the opportunity to be represented at the trial, by a defense counsel with qualifications not less than those prescribed under section 827(b) of this title (article 27(b))."

SEC. 2. (a) Chapter 47 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"§ 941. Art. 141. Procedural requirements and right to counsel in certain nonjudicial proceedings.

"(a) Except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, no member of the armed forces shall be administratively discharged or separated from service under conditions other than honorable unless such member has been afforded an opportunity to appear and present evidence in his own behalf before a board convened by appropriate authority for the specific purpose of determining whether such member shall be discharged or separated from service under conditions other than honorable. Any member of the armed forces with respect to whom such a board is convened shall have the right, unless waived by him, to be represented before such board by counsel whose qualifications are not less than those prescribed under section 827(b) of this title (article 27(b)).

"(b) The provisions of subsection (a) shall not apply in the case of any member of the armed forces discharged or dismissed from service pursuant to the sentence of a general or special court-martial, or in time of war if the Secretary concerned suspends the operation of such subsection. Any member of the armed forces may waive his right to appear and be represented by counsel before a board convened for the purpose described in subsection (a) if such member is given notice in writing of his right to appear and present evidence in his own behalf before such board and of his right to be represented by counsel before such board, and such member is afforded an opportunity to consult with counsel, whose qualifications are not less than those prescribed under section 827(b) of this title (article 27(b)), regarding the waiver of such member's right to appear before such board."

(b) The table of sections at the beginning of subchapter XI of chapter 47 of such title is amended by adding at the end thereof a new item as follows:

"941.141. Procedural requirements and right to counsel in certain nonjudicial proceedings."

The memorandum accompanying Senate bill 750 is as follows:

PROPOSED BILL TO PROTECT THE CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS OF SERVICE PERSONNEL TO HAVE THE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL AND NOT TO BE DEPRIVED OF LIFE, LIBERTY, OR PROPERTY WITHOUT DUE PROCESS OF LAW

Background memorandum: A general court-martial has the jurisdiction to impose on a serviceman a punishment which may include a dishonorable discharge or a bad conduct discharge. In a trial before such a court-martial the accused will be offered the services of defense counsel, whose qualifications, as defined by article 27(b) of the Uniform Code, 10 U.S.C. 827(b), include graduation from an accredited law school or membership in a bar and certification of his competence by the Judge Advocate General of the armed force of which the defense counsel is a member.

A special court-martial is entitled to impose a punishment which may include a bad conduct discharge, if a verbatim record is made of the proceedings. In the special court-martial a "defense counsel" must be appointed for the accused. However, there is no statutory specification of the qualifications required of such a counsel, except in terms of the trial counsel's qualifications, and so the defense counsel may be a person with absolutely no formal legal training or experience. In the event the accused is sentenced to a bad conduct discharge by a special court-martial, there will be extensive appellate review of the findings and sentence pursuant to articles 66 and 67 of the Uniform Code, 10 U.S.C. 866, 867 (see also art. 70, 10 U.S.C. 870); but this is a review "on the basis of the entire record." If evidence or information favorable to the accused has not been placed in the record by his counsel who, by reason of his lack of legal training, may not recognize what evidence would probably benefit the accused—then the appellate defense counsel are unable to take advantage thereof in the accused's behalf. A sentence to bad conduct discharge which survives the appellate review is treated as final, in the absence of a petition for new trial submitted within a 1-year period of time. See articles 73 and 76, 10 U.S.C. 873, 876.

Each armed service makes provision in its directives for administrative discharges, which may be honorable, general, or undesirable. The undesirable discharge is a discharge under other than honorable conditions and, for purposes of veterans' benefits and certain other rights, is treated like the bad conduct discharge imposed by a special court-martial. Sometimes, in fact, it may be issued for misconduct that would be cognizable by a court-martial. Usually the serviceman being considered for an undesirable discharge is provided the opportunity for a hearing before some sort of board of officers which can make findings or recommendations pertinent to the proposed hearing. While the respondent serviceman may be provided with counsel to represent him at this board hearing, the counsel may not be legally trained or experienced. Quite often the hearing before a board is waived by the serviceman after consulting with counsel; and in this instance, too, the counsel is sometimes not legally trained.

According to all available evidence the recipient of a discharge under other than honorable conditions—whether it be a bad conduct discharge of an undesirable discharge—encounters considerable difficulty in obtaining employment, is restricted from engaging in many types of activities, and is stigmatized. Thus, such a discharge has great effect on his liberty to engage in many activities and the property that he has in being allowed to enter activities which are open to other members of the community.

Therefore, the fifth amendment guarantee that no person shall "be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law" is quite relevant to the circumstances under which a serviceman may be discharged from the armed forces. Furthermore, since a court-martial is a form of criminal prosecution and since a sentence to a bad conduct discharge involves such severe consequences to the recipient, the sixth amendment guarantee of the "assistance of counsel" is especially significant in determining whether a special court-martial should be empowered to sentence a serviceman to a bad conduct discharge when he has not been provided with the assistance of legally trained counsel—assistance that would be mandatory if he were being prosecuted in a Federal district court. Indeed, whether the serviceman is confronting a court-martial that may sentence him to a bad conduct discharge or a board of officers that may recommend that he be issued an undesirable discharge, the availability of a legally trained counsel to advise and assist him is one of the best guarantees that he will receive due process in the proceeding.

In light of these considerations, witnesses in the hearings of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights recommended that legally trained counsel should be provided for an accused serviceman as a prerequisite for a special court-martial's having the power to adjudge a bad conduct discharge (report, p. 52). The same position is taken concerning the power of a discharge board to recommend an undesirable discharge (report, draft, p. 5). Moreover, so that a serviceman will not be misadvised by a nonlegally trained counsel to waive a board hearing and the attendant procedural rights, a waiver of rights to a hearing should not be accepted or be binding unless the respondent serviceman has been given reasonable opportunity to consult with legally trained counsel (draft of report, p. 5). The requirement of counsel should be limited to time of peace (draft of report, p. 5) in line with the general position that procedures which might be infeasible in wartime should not be discarded solely on this ground if they are otherwise suitable for peacetime (draft of report, pp. 57–59). Indeed, the Uniform Code has several articles which make special provision for time of war. (See arts. 35, 43, 71, 85, 90, 99, 105, 106, 113.)

To implement the purpose of guaranteeing legally trained counsel as a prerequisite for a discharge under other than honorable conditions, it would seem desirable to:

1. Amend article 19 of the Uniform Code, 10 U.S.C. 819, to add as a prerequisite for a bad conduct discharge that it not be adjudged unless a complete record has been made and "except in time of war unless accused has been provided with or been offered the services of a defense counsel who is legally qualified to serve as trial counsel or defense counsel of a general court-martial in accordance with the requirements of article 27(b) of the Uniform Code (10 U.S.C. 827(b))."

2. Add a separate article at the end of the Uniform Code or elsewhere in title 10 to provide that, "except in time of war no board of officers shall be empowered to recommend that a serviceman or officer be issued an undesirable discharge or other discharge under other than honorable conditions, or be separated under other than honorable conditions, or to make any finding which shall be used by that board or otherwise as the basis for any such recommendation or for any such discharge or separation; unless in any hearing before such board of officers that serviceman or officer has been provided with or been offered the services of a counsel who is legally qualified to serve as trial counsel or defense counsel of a general court-martial in accordance with the requirements of article 27(b) of the Uniform Code of Military Justice, 10 U.S.C. 827(b)."

3. Either as an addition to the article or section discussed immediately hereinabove, or as a separate article of the Uniform Code or a separate section of title 10, provide that "except in time of war no waiver of any statutory or other right to a hearing before a board of officers shall have, or be given, any effect whatsoever unless, prior to the execution of such a waiver, the officer, serviceman, or other person subject to the Uniform Code of Military Justice who executes the waiver has been provided or offered the opportunity to consult concerning the proposed execution of the waiver with a counsel who is legally qualified to serve as trial counsel or defense counsel of a general court-martial in accordance with the requirements of article 27(b) of the Uniform Code of Military Justice, 10 U.S.C. 827(b)."

S. 751. A bill to protect the constitutional rights of military personnel by increasing the period within which such personnel may petition for a new trial by court-martial, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first sentence of section 873 (article 73) of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows: "At any time within two years after approval by the convening authority of any court-martial sentence, the accused may petition the Judge Advocate General for a new trial on the ground of newly discovered evidence or fraud on the court."

Sec. 2. The amendment made by the first section of this Act shall be effective with respect to any court-martial sentence approved by the convening authority on and after the date of enactment of this Act and with respect to any court-martial sentence approved by the convening authority not more than one year prior to the date of the enactment of this Act.

The memorandum accompanying Senate bill 751 is, as follows:

Proposed Bill To Protect the Constitutional Rights of Service Personnel to Trials by Court-Martial in Accordance With Requirements of Due Process

Background memorandum: Article 73 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice, 10 U.S.C. 873, provides that, at any time within 1 year after approval by the convening authority of a court-martial sentence which extends to death, dismissal, dishonorable or bad conduct discharge, or confinement for 1 year or more, the accused may petition the Judge Advocate General for a new trial on gound of newly discovered evidence or fraud on the court. Subject to a successful petition for new trial under article 73 and the authority of the Secretary of the Department, under article 74, to substitute an administrative discharge for an executed discharge or dismissal pursuant to court-martial sentence, the Uniform Code provides that court-martial judgments shall be final (art. 76). Thus, if a serviceman has been convicted in a trial wherein, because of some material fraud on the court-martial or otherwise, he has been deprived of due process, he will have no remedy unless the sentence involved a discharge or confinement for 1 year or more; and even if the sentence were sufficiently severe to authorize relief, he must petition for a new trial within 1 year. On the other hand, Federal Rule 33 of Criminal Procedure authorizes a petition for new trial by reason of newly discovered evidence at any time within 2 years from judgment.

Since in some instances a fraud on the court martial may constitute a deprivation of due process or the newly discovered evidence may reveal that a conviction was obtained by means which deprived the accused of due process, and since—aside from the dubious remedy of judicial action predicated on the theory that the absence of due process deprived the court-martial of jurisdiction and made its action void—the accused is so limited in his means to remove the stigma and the other consequences of the unjust conviction, better protection of the accused's constitutional rights demands that the remedy of the petition for a new trial be expanded. In the first place, the time limit on the petition for new trial should be expanded to 2 years to conform to the requirements of Federal Rule 33 of Criminal Procedure. There is no reason that it will be easier for the serviceman than for the civilian to obtain new evidence after a trial is completed; and therefore the time limit for the serviceman should be no less liberal than for the civilian. Secondly, the petition for new trial should be made available with respect to any conviction by court-martial, irrespective of the sentence imposed.

To implement this broadening of the remedy of the petition for new trial, it would be necessary to:

1. Substitute in article 73, 10 U.S.C. 873, the words "2 years" for "1 year."

2. Rewrite article 73 to make the petition for new trial available after "approval by the convening authority of any court-martial sentence."

3. Probably this remedy should be made available retroactively to apply to any conviction by any kind of court-martial that had occurred within 2 years of the date of the proposed amendment to article 73. Certainly it would be desirable to specify in the amending legislation the extent to which it would apply to any court-martial sentences previously imposed.

S. 752. A bill to amend chapter 47 (Uniform Code of Military Justice) of title 10, United States Code, so as to provide additional constitutional protection in trials by courts-martial.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 801(10) (article 1(10)) of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(10) 'Law officer' means an official of a general or special court-martial detailed in accordance with section 826 of this title (article 26)".

Sec. 2. Section 816 (article 16) of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The three kinds of courts-martial in each of the armed forces are—

"(1) general courts-martial;

"(2) special courts-martial; and

"(3) summary courts-martial.

"(b) A general court-martial consists of a law officer and not less than five members, except in any case in which the accused waives trial by court members under section 855 of this title (article 55), in which case the court consists of a law officer only.

"(c) A special court-martial consists of not less than three members, or a law officer and not less than three members, or, in any case in which a law officer has been detailed to the case and the accused waives trial by court members under section 855 of this title (article 55), the court consists of a law officer only.

"(d) A summary court-martial consists of one commissioned officer."

Sec. 3. The last sentence of section 819 (article 19) of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows: "A bad conduct discharge may not be adjudged in any case tried by special court-martial unless (1) a complete record of the proceedings and testimony before the court has been made, and (2) except in time of war, a law officer was detailed to such case and was present during all trial proceedings."

SEC. 4. (a) Subsection (a) of section 826 (article 26) of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The authority convening a general court-martial shall, and the authority convening a special court-martial may, detail as law officer thereof a commissioned officer who is a member of the bar of a Federal court or of the highest court of a State and who its certified to be qualified for such duty by the Judge Advocate General of the armed force of which he is a member. Any officer certified as qualified to serve as law officer of a general court-martial shall be certified as qualified to serve as law officer of a special court-martial. No person is eligible to act as law officer in a case if he is the accuser or a witness for the prosecution or has acted as investigative officer or as counsel in the same case."

(b) The catch line of section 826 (article 26) of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 826. Art. 26. Law officers of general and special courts-martial."

(c) The table of sections at the beginning of subchapter V of chapter 47 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking out

"826. 26. Law officer of a general court-martial."

and inserting in lieu thereof

"826. 26. Law officers of general and special courts-martial."

SEC. 5. (a) Subsection (a) of section 829 (article 29) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking out "No" at the beginning of such subsection and inserting in lieu thereof "Except in any case tried by a law officer without court members, pursuant to section 855 of this title (article 55), no".

(b) The first sentence of subsection (b) of such section is amended to read as follows: "Except in any case tried by a law officer without court members pursuant to section 855 of this title (article 55), a general court-martial trial may not proceed if the court is reduced below five members unless the convening authority details new members sufficient in number to provide not less than five members."

(c) Subsection (c) of such section is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Except in any case tried by a law officer without court members pursuant to section 855 of this title (article 55), a special court-martial trial may not proceed if the court is reduced below three members unless the convening authority details new members sufficient in number to provide not less than three members. When the new members have been sworn, the trial shall proceed as if no evidence had previously been introduced, unless a verbatim record of the testimony of previously examined witnesses or a stipulation thereof is read to the court in the presence of the law officer, if any, the accused, and counsel."

(d) Such section is further amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(d) In any case being tried by a law officer only pursuant to section 855 of this title (article 55), and the law officer is unable to proceed with the trial because of physical disability, as the result of challenge, or for other good cause, the trial shall proceed, subject to the provisions of section 55(d) of this title (article 55(d)), after the detail of a new law officer as if no evidence had previously been introduced, unless a verbatim record of the testimony of previously examined witnesses or a stipulation thereof is read in court in the presence of the new law officer, the accused, and counsel."

SEC. 6. The last sentence of section 838(b) (article 38 (b)) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking out "president of the court" and inserting in lieu thereof "Law officer or by the president of a court-martial without a law officer".

SEC. 7. Section 839 (article 39) of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 839. Art. 39. Sessions

"When the members of a court-martial deliberate or vote, only the members may be present. After the members of a court-martial which includes a law officer and members have finally voted on the findings, the president of the court may request the law officer and the reporter, if any, to appear before the members to put the findings in proper form, and these proceedings shall be on the record. All other proceedings, including any other consultation of the members of the court with counsel or the law officer, shall be made a part of the record and shall be in the presence of the accused, the defense counsel, the trial counsel, and in cases in which law officers have been detailed to the court, the law officer."

SEC. 8. Section 841(a) (article 41(a)) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking out the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "The law officer and members of a general or special court-martial may be challenged by the accused or the trial counsel for cause stated to the court."; and

(2) by striking out "court" in the second sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "law officer or, if none, the court".

SEC. 9. (a) The first sentence of subsection (a) of section 851 (article 51(a)) of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows: "Voting by members of a general or special court-martial on the findings and on the sentence, and by members of a court-martial without a law officer upon questions of challenge, shall be by secret written ballot."

(b) The first and second sentences of subsection (b) of such section are amended to read as follows: "The law officer and, except for questions of challenge, the president of a court-martial without a law officer shall rule upon all questions of law and all interlocutory questions arising during the proceedings. Any such ruling made by the law officer upon any question of law or any interlocutory question other than the mental responsibility of the accused, or by the president of a court-martial without a law officer upon any question of law other than a motion for a finding of not guilty, is final and constitutes the ruling of the court."

(c) Subsection (c) of such section is amended by striking out "the law officer of a general court-martial and the president of a special court-martial" and inserting in lieu thereof "the law officer of a court-martial, or the president of a special court-martial without a law officer,".

(d) Such section is further amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(d) Subsections (a), (b), and (c) of this section do not apply with respect to any court-martial case tried by a law officer only pursuant to section 855 of this title (article 55)."

SEC. 10. Section 852 (article 52) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(d) The foregoing provisions of this section, insofar as they relate to the number of votes required by members of a court-martial, shall not apply with respect to the trial of an accused who has waived trial by members of the court pursuant to section 855 of this title (article 55) and is tried by a law officer."

SEC. 11. Section 854(a) (article 54(a)) of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Each general court-martial shall keep a separate record of the proceedings in each case brought before it, and the record shall be authenticated by the signature of the law officer. If the record cannot be authenticated by the law officer by reason of his death, disability, or absence, it shall be authenticated by the signature of the trial counsel or a member."

SEC. 12. (a) Chapter 47 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding after section 854 (article 54) a new section as follows:

"§ 855. Art. 55. Waiver by accused of trial by court members.

"(a) In accordance with such rules and regulations as the President shall prescribe, any accused who is to be tried by a general court-martial, or by a special court-martial to which a law officer has been detailed, shall be given the opportunity to waive his right to a trial by the members of the court and elect instead to be tried by the law officer of such court. The accused may exercise such waiver by notifying the law officer of the court either before or after the convening of the court. If the waiver is made prior to the convening of the court, the members of the court shall not be present at any time during the trial; if the accused wishes to exercise such waiver after the court has been convened he may do so only with the consent of the trial counsel. If the trial counsel consents to the waiver the law officer shall forthwith excuse the members of the court from further participation in the trial.

"(b) In any court-martial case tried before a law officer pursuant to a waiver authorized under subsection (a) of this section, the law officer shall have authority to entertain and accept a plea of guilty from the accused, subject to the provisions of section 845 of this title (article 45). In any court-martial case tried by a law officer pursuant to a waiver under subsection (a) of this section, the law officer shall decide all questions of fact and law, make final rulings on all interlocutory questions and motions, make all findings with respect to guilt, and impose any sentence not prohibited by this chapter.

"(c) No waiver authorized by subsection (a) of this section shall be permitted by the law officer unless the accused prior to exercising his right to waiver, has been advised by counsel with qualifications not less than those prescribed in section 827(b) of this title (article 827(b)) regarding such waiver.

"(d) A waiver by an accused of trial by court members may be withdrawn by him if, subsequent to exercising such waiver, a law officer different from the one to whom the waiver was submitted is detailed to act as law officer at the trial of the accused."

(b) The table of sections at the beginning of subchapter VII is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"855. 55. Waiver by accused of trial by court members."

SEC. 13. The amendments made by this Act shall become effective on the first day of the tenth month following the month in which enacted.

The memorandum accompanying Senate bill 752 is as follows:

PROPOSED BILL TO IMPLEMENT THE CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT OF SERVICEMEN TO DUE PROCESS IN TRIALS BY COURT-MARTIAL

Background memorandum: Article III of the Constitution envisages that Federal crimes shall be prosecuted in district courts presided over by an independent judge who rules on all matters of law. Courts-martial, on the other hand, as Justice Black emphasized in *Toth* v. *Quarles*, 350 U.S. 11, are not presided over by a Federal judge. Although Congress has required in article 26 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice that each general court-martial have a law officer, who must be a qualified attorney, who sits apart from the court-martial members, and who does not participate with them in ruling on issues of fact, there is no provision for any lawyer to preside over special courts-martial. Yet a special court-martial is authorized by article 19 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice, 10 U.S.C. 819, to impose a sentence to a bad conduct discharge—a sentence which, according to qualified observers, creates considerable stigma for the recipient. Although the Army does not allow its special courts to impose bad conduct discharges, this is currently authorized by the Air Force and the Navy. Some records of trial indicate that the proceedings in which these discharges are imposed occasionally are replete with legal error and that the constitutional rights of the serviceman may be violated due to the absence of an experienced attorney to preside over the proceedings. In the Navy legally trained counsel seldom are provided to represent the parties, and so the special court-martial may impose a bad conduct discharge in a proceeding where no experienced attorney is present to assure that the accused's rights are protected. In Air Force special courts-martial legally trained counsel are generally provided for the Government and the accused; however, there is no impartial law officer present to advise the court members as to what is the correct rule of law and to assist them in choosing between the sometimes drastically divergent arguments of counsel for the parties.

In light of the severe consequences of a sentence to bad conduct discharge, it seems appropriate to require that a law officer be provided for a special court-martial proceeding in order for the court-martial to have the authority to adjudge a bad conduct discharge. While it may not be practicable to insist that the law officer of this special court-martial have the same professional qualifications that are now customary for the law officers of general courts-martial, the proposed law officer of the special court should have the qualifications required of counsel under article 27(b)(1) and should also be certified as qualified for such duty by the Judge Advocate General of the armed force of which he is a member. At present, the Uniform Code does not envisage a special court-martial with a law officer or "military judge." Therefore, it will be necessary to amend the code to provide for this alternative. While it may not be practicable to require that all special courts-martial have a law officer, it does seem desirable to authorize a special court-martial with a law officer to adjudicate any case that might be referred to it and whether or not a bad conduct discharge would be authorized for the offenses charged. Moreover, since waiver of jury is well recognized in the Federal district courts and has been held constitutional, there is no reason to forbid a similar waiver by the accused of trial by the members of the special court-martial (who correspond to a civilian jury). Of course, even in a general court-martial, where a law officer is presently required by statute, the sentencing is done by the court members, rather than by the law officer; and in this respect the military practice differs from that in the Federal district courts, where the judge does the sentencing. Even so, no objection can be seen to allowing the accused to consent to the law officer's finding the facts, imposing the sentence, or both, so long as this consent is given in open court. Certainly the armed services could not object since—if the law officer has been properly certified by the Judge Advocate General as competent to perform his duties—he should be able to make correct findings and impose an appropriate sentence—or, at the very least, he should be as able to do so as would be the members of the court-martial.

To implement these proposals it would appear desirable to:

(a) Amend articles 16(b), 19, 39, 41, and 51 to provide that a special court-martial may be appointed which—in addition to the members required under article 16—shall have a law officer and that this law officer shall have all the authority to conduct the proceedings of a special court-martial to which he has been appointed as the law officer of a general court-martial would have under the provisions of article 51(b) (which prohibits him from consulting with the court members or voting with them) and, in addition to the qualifications required by article 27(b)(1), shall have been certified as competent to perform the duties of a special court-martial law officer by the Judge Advocate General of the armed force of which he is a member. Certification as the law officer of a general court-martial would include certification as law officer of a special court-martial.

(b) Amend article 19 of the Uniform Code, 10 U.S.C. 819, to provide that, except in time of war, a bad conduct discharge shall not be adjudged by a special court-martial unless that special court-martial shall have been provided with a law officer.

(c) Amend articles 39, 51, and 52 to authorize the accused, after having been provided with counsel who is qualified under the provisions of article 27(b), to consent that any findings shall be made, or any sentence imposed, or both, by the law officer of the special court-martial, without any necessity for either the concurrence or the presence of the court-martial members. At any time prior to the convening of the court, the accused shall have an absolute right to waive trial by the court members as to findings, or sentence, or both. However, after the court-martial has convened, such waiver shall only be effective with the consent of the trial counsel (who represents the Government). No waiver of trial by the court members shall be binding in the event there is a change with respect to the law officer who has been identified to the accused and his counsel as the one who will conduct the case. (This last provision is designed to avoid any switching of law officers after the accused has committed himself in reliance on the information as to who will be the law officer.)

S. 753. A bill to implement the constitutional rights of military personnel by providing appellate review of certain administrative board decisions, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) subsection (b) of section 867 (article 67) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by—

(1) striking out "all cases" at the beginning of clauses (1), (2), and (3), and inserting in lieu thereof "all court-martial cases";

(2) striking out "and" at the end of clause (2);

(3) striking out the period at the end of clause (3), and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and the word "and"; and

(4) adding after clause (3) a new clause as follows:

"(4) all cases reviewed by a board established under section 1552 of this title (correction of military records) or under section 1553 of this title (review of discharges and dismissals) which the Judge Advocate General orders sent to the Court of Military Appeals for review, or in which, upon petition of the applicant and on good cause shown, the Court of Military Appeals has granted a review."

(b) Subsection (c) of such section is amended (1) by inserting "in a court-martial case" immediately after "The accused", and (2) by adding at the end thereof the following:

"The applicant in any case reviewed by a board referred to in subsection (c)(4) of this section has thirty days from the time he is notified by the board of the decision in his case to petition the Court of Military Appeals for review. The court shall act upon such a petition within sixty days of the receipt thereof."

(c) Subsection (d) of such section is amended by (1) striking out the word "case" in the first, second, and third sentences and inserting in lieu thereof "court-martial case", and (2) inserting after the third sentence thereof the following new sentences: "In any case referred to in subsection (b)(4) of this section which Judge Advocate General orders sent to the Court of Military Appeals review, the court shall take action only with respect to the issues raised by the Judge Advocate General, and in any such case reviewed upon petition of the applicant, the court shall take action only with respect to the issues specified in the grant of review."

(d) The first sentence of subsection (e) of such section is amended by striking out "sentence," and inserting in lieu thereof "sentence of a court-martial case,".

(e) The first sentence of subsection (f) of such section is amended by striking out "case," and inserting in lieu thereof "court-martial case,".

(f) Such section is further amended by redesignating subsection (g) as subsection (h) and adding after subsection (f) the following new subsection:

"(g) After it has acted on any case referred to in subsection (a)(4) of this section, the Court of Military Appeals may, in cases sent to it by the Judge Advocate General, direct the Judge Advocate General to return the record to the appropriate board for further consideration or action in accordance with the decision of the court, or may, in cases appealed by an applicant, return the record directly to the appropriate board for further consideration or action in accordance with the decision of the court. The Court of Military Appeals shall have exclusive jurisdiction with respect to the review of cases brought before any board referred to in subsection (b)(4) of this section."

SEC. 2. (a) Subsection (c) of section 870 (article 70) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting "in a court-martial case" immediately after "shall represent the accused".

(b) Subsection (d) of such section is amended by inserting "in a court-martial case" immediately after "The accused".

(c) Such section is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(f) Appellate defense counsel shall also represent before the Court of Military Appeals on applicant whose case is before the court pursuant to the provisions of section 867(b)(4) of this title (article 67(b)(4))—

"(1) when he is requested to do so by the applicant;

"(2) when the civilian or military board concerned is represented by counsel; or

"(3) when the Judge Advocate General has sent such a case to the Court of Military Appeals.

An applicant has the right to be represented before the Court of Military Appeals by civilian counsel if provided by him.

"(g) In the case of a board established pursuant to section 1552 or 1553, the Judge Advocate General shall detail appellate counsel to represent the board before the Court of Military Appeals whenever the board so requests. In the case of a civilian board established pursuant to section 1552 of this title, such board may be represented before the Court of Military Appeals by its own counsel if it so elects."

The memorandum accompanying Senate bill 753 is as follows:

PROPOSED BILL TO IMPLEMENT THE CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT OF SERVICE PERSONNEL TO DUE PROCESS

Background memorandum: Congress has established for each armed service a discharge review board, composed solely of service personnel and authorized to review certain discharges from the armed services, and a board for the correction of records, composed of civilian personnel and authorized to review discharges and other matters. In some instances applications for relief submitted to either of these boards may present complex legal issues and involve the constitutional rights of the applicant. Apparently, in some cases a legal issue will be referred by a board for consideration to the Office of the Judge Advocate General of the appropriate armed service. In the event of denial of the requested relief, the applicant may sue for back pay and allowances in the Court of Claims or may seek relief in an appropriate district court. However, the initiation of such court action may be a troublesome and cumbersome process.

At the present time, the jurisdiction of the Court of Military Appeals, as defined in article 67 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice, 10 U.S.C. 867, extends only to cases tried by court-martial. However, this court would seem qualified in terms of experience and personnel to review legal issues that might arise in connection with administrative discharges or other administrative proceedings affecting the rights or status of members of the armed forces. Indeed, in some instances the administrative action may be predicated on alleged misconduct, which would be cognizable under the Uniform Code of Military Justice. In order to provide a single convenient forum to review legal issues arising in connection with applications to the discharge review boards and the correction boards and in that connection to protect the constitutional rights of the serviceman, it would seem desirable to amend article 67 of the Uniform Code and extend the jurisdiction of the Court of Military Appeals to legal issues involved in matters pending before the discharge review boards or the correction boards. The review by the court would be solely on matters of law and would not embrace review of factual issues. Just as the Court of Military Appeals can obtain jurisdiction of a court-martial case under article 67 of the Uniform Code by an accused's petition for review or by a certification from the Judge Advocate General of the appropriate armed service, the Court of Military Appeals could be petitioned by an applicant to the discharge review board or the correction board to grant review of any constitutional or other legal issue present in his case, or the Judge Advocate General of the respective service or general counsel of the appropriate department, could certify any legal issues to the court for adjudication. The court would specify rules of procedure to govern such petitions for review or certified issues; and it would be provided by statute that the Court of Military Appeals would be the exclusive forum for the consideration thereof. There would be no mandatory jurisdiction, and accordingly the court would grant review only "on good cause shown"—the same criterion applied by article 67(b) (3) to petitions for review in court-martial cases. In the event a petition for review was granted or a certificate for review was submitted, appellate counsel would be provided both for the Government and the accused, just as is authorized under article 70 of the Uniform Code for courts-martial. Moreover, the court would be authorized to direct that appellate defense counsel be assigned to assist in supplementing a petition for review where it considered that in the interests of justice such aid should be provided the applicant.

Possibly some amendment should be considered in the Judicial Code, title 28, with a view to making it clear that the Court of Military Appeals would have exclusive jurisdiction of all legal issues arising in connection with administrative action proposed or taken by the armed services and involving members of the armed forces. In this way, the authority of district courts to enjoin a contemplated administrative discharge or other administrative action would be negated, and the member of the armed services would be remanded to the discharge review board, the correction board, and the Court of Military Appeals for his relief. The relief available there, of course, would be retroactive in nature, with a view to repairing any harm that might have resulted to the serviceman from the action taken.

To implement this proposal, it would seem necessary to:

(a) Expand article 67 of the Uniform Code to expand the jurisdiction of the Court of Military Appeals and to provide a procedure for bringing legal issues to that court from either the discharge review boards and the boards for the correction of military (or naval) records.

(b) Amend article 70 to provide for appellate counsel to represent the parties with respect to legal issues brought before the Court of Military Appeals pursuant to the provisions of article 67 as expanded.

(c) Amend the statutory provisions establishing discharge review boards (10 U.S.C. 1553); and correction boards (10 U.S.C. 1552) to correspond with article 67 as amended.

(d) Amend title 28, of the Judicial Code, to any extent necessary to authorize the Court of Military Appeals to be the exclusive forum for considering the legality of any administrative action proposed or taken by the armed services affecting members of the armed forces. (Perhaps the wording of article 67 could adequately handle this matter without the necessity to amend the Judicial Code.)

S. 754. A bill to insure due process in the case of certain administrative actions involving military personnel.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That chapter 47 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"941. Art. 141. Administrative separation or discharge; board proceedings

"(a) No person, except in time of war, shall be separated or discharged from the armed forces under conditions other than honorable unless (1) such person has been accorded a hearing in accordance with the provisions of this section before a board of officers convened for the specific purpose of determining whether such person should be separated or discharged under such conditions, and (2) the board, on the basis of the testimony and evidence presented at such hearing has recommended that such person be so separated or discharged. The Secretary concerned shall have authority to promulgate rules and regulations establishing such boards and prescribing the procedures to be followed.

"(b) Any board convened for the purpose of determining whether any person should be separated or discharged from the armed forces under conditions other than honorable shall have detailed to it by the convening authority of such board a commissioned officer who shall serve as law officer of the board. The law officer of any such board shall have been certified pursuant to section 826 of this title (article 26), by the Judge Advocate General of the armed force of which such officer is a member, as competent to act as law officer of a general court-martial. The function of the law officer shall be to preside over the proceeding of the board, rule on all legal questions and on all motions made before the board, and to insure that the board proceedings are conducted in a fair and impartial manner. The law officer shall not be a member of the board. When the board deliberates or votes only the members of the board may be present.

"(c) Any person directed to appear as respondent before a board described in subsection (a) of this section shall be informed, prior to appearing before the board, of the nature and purpose of the hearing to be conducted by the board, and shall be notified of his right to be represented by counsel appointed by the convening authority, or by civilian counsel at his own expense. Counsel appointed by the convening authority shall have qualifications not less than those prescribed in section 27(b) of this section (article 27 (b)).

"(d) The right to a hearing as provided in subsection (a) of this section may be waived by any person if, prior to exercising such waiver, he has consulted with appointed counsel or civilian counsel regarding the advisability of such waiver."

Sec. 2. The table of sections at the beginning of subchapter XI of chapter 47 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"941.141. Administrative separation or discharge; board proceedings."

The memorandum accompanying Senate bill 754 is as follows:

PROPOSED BILL TO IMPLEMENT THE CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS OF SERVICE PERSONNEL TO CONFRONTATION AND COMPULSORY PROCESS

Background memorandum: The sixth amendment requires that in all criminal prosecutions the accused shall "be confronted with the witnesses against him" and "have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor." The issuance of subpenas is, of course, the means by which prospective witnesses are compelled to come to court and testify either for the Government or for the defense; and without the subpena power it would be difficult in many instances to obtain necessary testimony.

Article 47 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice, which is implemented in paragraph 115 of the 1951 Manual for Courts-Martial, provides for the subpenaing of witnesses to appear before "any court-martial, military commission, court of inquiry, or any other military court or board, or before any military or civil officer designated to take a deposition to be read in evidence before such court, commission, or board." However, there is no authority for the subpenaing of witnesses to testify before an investigating officer during the pretrial investigation of serious offenses required by article 32 of the Uniform Code. Therefore, if it is necessary to obtain testimony from civilian witnesses prior to trial in order to determine whether the Government has a case against the accused and if the civilians will not appear voluntarily, then the needed testimony can only be obtained through the rather cumbersome procedure of convening a court of inquiry. Also, during the 1962 hearings of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, it was testified that the phrase "any other military court or board," as used in article 47, had not been interpreted to include administrative discharge or separation boards, even in cases where such boards might be considering specific allegations of misconduct.

Consequently, even though the discharge board may be making a decision which will affect the entire future of the respondent serviceman and even though the correctness of this decision may hinge on the testimony of civilians who are reluctant to testify and undergo cross-examination, the board has no process available to compel their appearance. Similarly, such a board has no authority to order civilian witnesses to appear for the taking of depositions. Furthermore, neither the Discharge Review Boards (38 U.S.C. 693h) nor the Boards for the Correction of Military (or Naval) Records (5 U.S.C. 191a) have authority to compel civilian witnesses to appear and testify. Accordingly, in some instances a member of the armed forces may be discharged or separated under other than honorable conditions for alleged misconduct without having the opportunity to confront and cross-examine his accuser or to obtain the testimony of certain witnesses whose presence he may desire.

If the subpena power is to be expanded, two issues are immediately encountered: (1) How much of an expansion is feasible? and (2) What procedural mechanism should be used for such an expansion? With respect to the first issue, it should be noted that making subpenas available without any limitation whatsoever in administrative discharge proceedings might make it possible for the respondent to block prompt action by unreasonable requests for the presence of witnesses. To avoid this possibility, the subpena power should not be made available simply upon request of the respondent without some showing of necessity for the witness' presence; and the board should have the discretion to utilize depositions of witnesses if they reside a considerable distance from the place where the board will convene. In fact, the circumstances under which subpenas might be issued by military boards or by investigating officers acting under article 32 of the Uniform Code should be left for treatment by Executive order promulgated as an amendment to paragraph 115 of the present Manual for Courts-Martial.

With respect to the mechanics to be used in extending the subpena power to military boards and to officers conducting investigations under article 32, there exists some uncertainty in Federal administrative law concerning the extent to which administrative agencies and similar bodies can issue valid and enforcible subpenas without enlisting the aid of a Federal district court. On the other hand, no question has ever been raised concerning the power of courts-martial and military courts of inquiry to issue valid subpenas, disobedience of which may be punished by prosecution in a Federal district court. Thus, instead of requiring that the military board or the article 32 investigating officer go into Federal court to request the issuance of a subpena by that court, it would probably be permissible simply to amend articles 46 and 47 of the Uniform Code to authorize the issuance of subpenas by the board or investigator. Any legislation should be simply of an enabling nature.

To implement these proposals it would seem appropriate to:

1. Amend article 46 to authorize an investigating officer duly appointed under article 32 to issue subpenas for the attendance of witnesses before him incident to his investigation in the performance of his duties under article 32, or for the attendance of witnesses before any military or civil officer who has been designated to take a deposition to be used in the investigation performed pursuant to article 32, and under regulations to be prescribed by the President.

2. Amend article 46 to authorize a military discharge or separation board, or any military or naval board which is determining whether and under what circumstances to discharge or separate a member of the armed forces, as well as the Discharge Review Board of each Department and the Boards for the Correction of Military (and Naval) Records, to issue subpenas requiring the attendance of witnesses before the boards incident to the performance of their duties, or requiring the attendance of witnesses before any military or civil officer designated to take a deposition to be read in evidence before such board.

3. Amend article 47, which provides for punishment of the witness who fails to appear, to include failure to appear before the investigating officer, the discharge board, the Discharge Review Board, the Correction Board, or before any military or civil officer designated to take a deposition to be used or read by such officer or board.

4. Amend article 49 to allow the taking and use of depositions in connection with proceedings of military discharge and separation boards, Discharge Review Boards, Correction Boards, or any other military or naval boards, subject to regulations to be prescribed by the President (this is to be merely permissive legislation to authorize clearly the use of depositions in connection with military administrative proceedings, but not to require the use of depositions).

5. In connection with all the previous amendments, clarify that the President shall prescribe the circumstances under which subpenas shall be issued for witnesses to appear and testify including the persons who may request issuance of the subpena.

6. Clarify the procedure for the taking of depositions during a trial by amending article 49 as proposed at page 31 of the Court of Military Appeals annual report for 1962.

S. 755. A bill to further insure the fair and independent review of court-martial cases by prohibiting any members of a board of review from rating the effectiveness of another member of a board of review, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 866 (article 66) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(g) No member of a board of review shall be required, or on his own initiative be permitted, to prepare, approve, disapprove, review, or submit, with respect to any other member of the same or another board of review, an effectiveness, fitness, or efficiency report, or any other report or document used in whole or in part for the purpose of determining whether a member of the armed forces is qualified to be advanced in grade, or in determining the assignment or transfer of a member of the armed forces, or in determining whether a member of the armed forces should be retained on active duty."

The memorandum accompanying Senate bill 755 is as follows:

PROPOSED BILL TO PROTECT THE CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS OF SERVICE PERSONNEL TO RECEIVE DUE PROCESS AND FAIR AND IMPARTIAL REVIEW OF THEIR CONVICTIONS BY COURT-MARTIAL

Background memorandum: During the hearings it was testified that in Army and Air Force Boards of Review, established under article 66 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice, the chairman of the three-member boards would prepare the efficiency or fitness reports on the two junior members of the board. These reports, in turn, help determine future promotions and assignments for the member reported on. According to several witnesses, this practice would tend to inhibit the junior members in making an independent and impartial evaluation of the cases on which they are acting. In the absence of such an evaluation, the serviceman whose case is being reviewed does not receive the full measure of due process contemplated by the Constitution and by the Uniform Code. The Army has already changed its practices to eliminate this possibility; but the Air Force apparently has not yet done so. In any event it seems desirable to prohibit any such practice in the future.

Accordingly, article 66 of the Uniform Code should be amended to: (a) Prohibit specifically any practice whereby the chairman of any board of review established under that article prepares any efficiency or fitness report or rating with respect to any other member of that board or submits any document that is made a part of, or is contained in, any promotion or selection file with respect to that member, or in any way admonishes, reprimands, or otherwise seeks to control or direct the other members of the board in the performance of their judicial duties.

S. 756. A bill to broaden the constitutional protection against double jeopardy in the case of military personnel.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 844 (article 44) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(d) No person shall be administratively discharged or separated from military service under conditions other than honorable if the grounds for such administrative action are based in whole or in part upon misconduct for which such person has been previously tried by court-martial and acquitted; or for which such person has not been acquitted or convicted but for which he cannot again be tried by reason of subsection (c) of this section.

"(e) No military board shall be authorized, in the case of any person, to make any findings or recommendations or to take any actions that are less favorable to such person than the findings or recommendations made, or the actions taken, in the case of such person by any previous military board, if (1) the matter considered by both boards (or the same board in two separate proceedings) relates to whether such member should be discharged or separated from military service under conditions other than honorable, or whether such member should be reduced in grade, and (2) the evidence before the second (or subsequent) board is substantially the same as the evidence that was before a previous board."

The memorandum accompanying Senate bill 756 is as follows:

BILL TO IMPLEMENT FURTHER THE CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT TO DUE PROCESS AND TO PROTECTION AGAINST FORMER JEOPARDY

Background memorandum: The fifth amendment contains a prohibition against twice putting anyone in jeopardy of life or limb; and article 44 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice, 10 U.S.C. 844, implements this same prohibition. However, this article does not purport to apply in any way to administrative proceedings, even though these proceedings may be based principally or exclusively on alleged misconduct which would be subject to prosecution before a court-martial. Thus, it would be conceivable for an accused to be acquitted in a trial by a court-martial and then administratively discharged under other than honorable conditions for the same misconduct. Similarly, there appears to be no affirmative statutory prohibition against repeated administrative discharge hearings concerning basically the same allegations of misconduct or unfitness.

Although there is no desire to preclude the armed services from administratively discharging a member of the armed forces under honorable conditions for the convenience of the Government or from having more than one hearing with respect to fitness of a serviceman to remain in the armed forces if he is involved in additional incidents which demonstrate his unfitness, the armed services should not be free to harass a member of the armed services by repeated trials or hearings of the same issue. Indeed, such harassment does not conform to due process concepts or to the spirit of the double jeopardy prohibition.

To implement these proposals, it would seem desirable to:

(a) Add to article 44 a prohibition against administratively discharging a member of the armed forces under other than honorable conditions by reason of alleged misconduct for which he has been tried and acquitted by court-martial.

(b) Either add to article 44 of the Uniform Code, or add as a separate section, a prohibition against allowing an administrative board to make any findings or recommendations that shall be less favorable to the respondent member of the armed forces than any findings or recommendations that have already been made concerning the same matter by some other board which had jurisdiction thereof in a proceeding wherein he was a party.

S. 757. A bill to more effectively protect certain constitutional rights accorded military personnel.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) chapter 47 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding after section 835 a new section as follows:

"§ 836. Art. 36. Pre-trial conference

"(a) The law officer of any general court-martial case shall have authority, in accordance with such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the President, to conduct a pre-trial conference with respect to such case. The law officer shall have authority at any such pre-trial conference to entertain and make final disposition of any motion or interlocutory question with respect to which he would have authority to make final disposition of during trial. The law officer shall also have authority to entertain and accept a plea of guilty from an accused, and any such plea accepted by the law officer shall, subject to the other provisions of this title, be accepted by the court as if such plea had been made in open court. The provisions of section 845 (article 45) shall apply with respect to a plea of guilty made by an accused at a pre-trial conference to the same extent such provisions apply to a plea of guilty made in open court. Pre-trial conferences may also be utilized for the purpose of—

"(1) simplifying the issues;

"(2) receiving stipulations; and

"(3) considering such other matters as may aid in the fair and speedy disposition of the case.

There shall be present at any pre-trial conference the law officer, the trial counsel, the defense counsel, the accused, and a reporter; members of the court shall not be present at pre-trial conferences. A record of all proceedings at a pre-trial conference shall be taken by the reporter. Any ruling made by the law officer at a pre-trial conference may be changed by him at any time during the trial.

"(b) Any motion to suppress evidence shall be made at a pre-trial conference (if one is held) unless opportunity therefor did not exist or the accused was not aware of the grounds for the motion, but the law officer in his discretion may entertain the motion at the trial."

(b) The table of sections at the beginning of subchapter VI of chapter 47 of such title is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"836. 36. Pre-trial conference."

SEC. 2. Section 854(a) (article 54 (a)) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "The record of any pre-trial conference conducted in connection with any general court-martial shall be made a part of the record of such court-martial and shall be authenticated by the signature of the law officer. If the record of the pre-trial conference cannot be authenticated by the law officer, by reason of his death, disability, or absence, it shall be signed by the trial counsel."

The memorandum accompanying Senate bill 757 is as follows:

PROPOSED BILL TO BETTER PRESERVE THE CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT OF SERVICE PERSONNEL TO A SPEEDY AND FAIR TRIAL

Background memorandum: In a civil case in a Federal district court extensive resort is had to pretrial hearings whereby the attention of the parties and of the court is focused on the real issues of the case and irrelevancies are eliminated. There have been proposals to introduce somewhat similar procedures for criminal cases in the Federal district courts, although any such proposals must be carefully prepared to avoid interfering with the defendant's right to remain silent and not provide any evidence which might be used by the Government to convict him. Even so, extensive hearings may take place in a Federal district court before a jury is selected and impaneled. For instance, motions to suppress evidence obtained by an unreasonable search and seizure or by wiretapping usually are made before the trial. Furthermore, a plea of guilty may be received without impaneling a jury.

On the other hand, in a general court-martial the law officer, who corresponds to the Federal trial judge, has no authority to conduct any pretrial proceedings. Thus, all the members of the court-martial must be assembled at the beginning of the trial before any proceedings can be conducted. Then these members may be required to remain idly at hand for hours while the law officer disposes of various motions and other matters of law. Instead of hearing motions to suppress evidence before the trial begins, the law officer must interrupt the trial to rule on objections to admissibility. Even if the accused intends to plead guilty, the law officer cannot receive this plea until all the formalities of assembling the court members have been complied with.

The necessity for assembling a number of officers to serve as court members will sometimes delay the commencement of the trial; and this, in turn, will tend to impair the accused's right to a speedy trial. On the other hand, once the court-martial members are convened, the law officer may be very reluctant to grant a motion for a continuance—however justifiable the grounds—because of the necessity in that event to reassemble the court members at some later time. Accordingly, the accused may be forced to trial at a time when his defense counsel is not completely prepared to proceed—with the resulting ill effects on the fairness of the trial.

With this in mind, it seems desirable from the standpoint of accused service personnel, as well as from the standpoint of the armed services themselves, to authorize a procedure for pretrial hearings in a case. Indeed, the Department of Defense has previously drafted proposed legislation along these very lines, which might be consulted in drafting a bill.

To implement this proposal it would seem appropriate to:

(a) Amend article 39, 10 U.S.C. 839, to authorize the law officer of a court-martial to hold proceedings outside the presence of the members of a court-martial, and either before or after the members of the court-martial have been convened or assembled, during which proceedings the law officer shall have the authority to rule on any interlocutory questions (see art. 51(b)) which he would otherwise be empowered to decide, including any motions to dismiss the charges, motions, or requests for continuances, motions to require further investigation under article 32, objections to the competency of the accused to stand trial, motions to suppress any evidence, and other motions for appropriate relief. At these same sessions the law officer of the court-martial should also have the authority to receive any appropriate stipulations. (This is phrased here in terms of the law officer of "a court-martial." At the present time only a general court-martial has a law officer; but a bill may later be introduced either to authorize or to require a law officer for special courts-martial.)

(b) Amend article 39 and perhaps article 54 to make specific the requirement that a record be made of the proceedings conducted outside of the presence of the court-martial members, including pretrial proceedings, just as a record would be made of the proceedings at the trial.

(c) Amend articles 39, 45, 51, and 52 to authorize a law officer of a court-martial (law officer of a general court-martial as the Uniform Code now stands concerning the structure of a special court-martial) to receive a plea of guilty, after suitable determination that it has not been made improvidently or through lack of understanding of the plea's meaning and effect, and to make and enter a finding of guilty thereon without any necessity or requirement that the members of the court-martial be convened or assembled.

(d) Authorize the President to promulgate reasonable regulations concerning any proceedings outside of the presence of the members of the court-martial. (In this connection it might be desirable specifically to empower the President to promulgate regulations requiring that generally motions to suppress evidence should be made prior to trial if a pretrial hearing is held to consider any motions to suppress and if the defense counsel had available at that time and knew of the facts on which he subsequently bases his motion to suppress. This might conform military procedure concerning admissibility of illegally seized evidence to the practice governing in the Federal district courts.)

S. 758. A bill to provide additional constitutional protection in certain cases to members of the armed forces, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That chapter 47 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"941. Art. 141. Right to trial by court-martial

"(a) In any case in which a military department proposes action to administratively discharge or separate any member of the armed forces under conditions other than honorable on the grounds of alleged misconduct, such member shall, upon his written request and in lieu of such proposed action, be granted a trial by general or special court-martial on such alleged misconduct. Except in any case in which a member has had no reasonable opportunity to consult with qualified counsel (counsel with qualifications not less than those prescribed in section 827(b) of this title), a member shall be deemed to have waived his right to trial by court-martial under this section unless he makes written application for trial by court-martial within ten days after receipt of written notice of the proposed administrative action. Any notice to a member of the proposed administrative action to be taken against him shall include notice of the alleged misconduct constituting the basis for such action and such member's right to trial by court-martial on such alleged misconduct in lieu of the proposed administrative action. Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions, a member may be discharged or separated from the military service under conditions other than honorable on the grounds of misconduct if the misconduct alleged was, to a substantial degree, the basis for the conviction of a criminal offense in a State or Federal court of competent jurisdiction.

"(b) Any member of the armed forces granted a trial by court-martial pursuant to subsection (a) of this section shall be deemed to have waived the right to plead any statute of limitations applicable to any alleged misconduct with which he is charged and which constitutes the basis for the proposed administrative action described in subsection (a) of this section. Such member shall also be deemed to have waived any right to a plea of immunity or prohibition against trial by court-martial to which he might otherwise be entitled under the terms of any statute, treaty, or executive agreement; and such member shall be deemed to have waived any plea to which he might otherwise be entitled on account of any foreign country having jurisdiction over the alleged misconduct or on account of any acquittal, conviction, or other ruling with respect to such alleged misconduct made by any court of any foreign country.

"(c) The provisions of this section may be suspended in time of war with respect to any military department by the Secretary concerned.

"(d) As used in this section the term 'misconduct' means any act or failure to act which, at the time of its commission or omission, would have constituted a violation of subchapter X of this chapter."

Sec. 2. The amendments made by this section shall be in addition to and not a substitute for the provisions of section 804 of this title (article 4).

Sec. 3. The table of sections at the beginning of subchapter XI of chapter 47 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"941. 141. Right to trial by court-martial."

The memorandum accompanying Senate bill 758 is as follows:

PROPOSED BILL TO PROTECT CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS TO DUE PROCESS, CONFRONTATION, COMPULSORY PROCESS, AND ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL

Background memorandum: In 1951 Congress enacted the Uniform Code of Military Justice, which provides a number of safeguards corresponding to some of the constitutional rights protected in the Bill of Rights. Moreover, the Court of Military Appeals has enforced a requirement of military due process.

The armed services have established procedures for administrative separation or discharge of officers and servicemen; and in some instances the discharge or separation will be based on alleged misconduct and will be under conditions other than honorable. Such a discharge creates a considerable stigma, affects eligibility for veterans' benefits, and usually severely restricts the employment and other opportunities available to the ex-serviceman; thus, it pertains to his liberty and, in the broad sense, to his property. However, the administrative discharge proceedings, even when the discharge is to be predicated on alleged misconduct, are not subject to the same safeguards of due process that would apply to courts-martial. In instances where the serviceman or officer does not deny the alleged misconduct and request trial by court-martial, he is not prejudiced by the nonavailability in administrative discharge proceedings of protections that would be available in a court-martial—such as the opportunity for confrontation and cross-examination or to have compulsory process issued to secure the attendance of witnesses. On the other hand, when the misconduct is vigorously denied and trial by court-martial is specifically requested, it seems unfair for the armed services to presume guilt rather than innocence, and to discharge or separate the serviceman under other than honorable conditions by reason of the alleged misconduct, even though it has not been proved in a proceeding where the constitutional rights of the serviceman have been protected. This reasoning does not imply that the accused serviceman or officer who is not brought to trial must be retained in the armed services; instead he may still be discharged under honorable conditions for the convenience of the Government.

To avoid the bypassing of safeguards for constitutional rights provided by the Uniform Code, it would appear necessary:

1. Either by an additional article at the end of the Uniform Code of Military Justice or by addition of a new section to title 10, to require that in the event action is proposed or commenced with a view to discharge or separate a serviceman or officer under other than honorable conditions by reason of alleged misconduct and a written request is made by the serviceman or officer to be tried by court-martial for such misconduct in accordance with the Uniform Code of Military Justice and if no conviction in any State or Federal court shall have resulted from or been based in substantial part upon the alleged misconduct, or some act or omission which comprises a part or aspect of the alleged misconduct, and if the request for trial by court-martial is denied and no court-martial takes place, then no administrative discharge or separation under other than honorable conditions based solely or in part upon the same misconduct shall be recommended or issued, provided, however, that this article (section) shall in no way restrict the power and authority of the armed forces to separate or discharge an officer or serviceman under honorable conditions for the convenience of the Government and under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Department, even though the discharge or separation under honorable conditions may result from or be based solely or partly upon alleged misconduct for which the serviceman or officer shall never have been tried or convicted by court-martial or other military tribunal or by any State or Federal court or the court of any foreign country. If a serviceman or officer makes written request to be tried by court-martial for misconduct of which any foreign court has taken or may take cognizance or over which it may have or exercise jurisdiction, and if under treaty, statute or otherwise, the armed services might otherwise be precluded and barred from prosecuting such misconduct, then the request for trial by court-martial shall constitute a binding waiver of any immunity or prohibition against trial by court-martial which might otherwise exist under the terms of any such treaty, statute or otherwise, and, after having made such written request, no serviceman or officer shall be allowed to enter any plea in bar of trial by reason of any acquittal, conviction, or other proceedings in the courts of any foreign country. (The last proviso is to take account of the situation that might othewise exist if a serviceman asked to be court-martialed for misconduct which had been the basis of proceedings in a foreign tribunal. Under the provisions of the NATO Status of Forces Agreement and certain other treaties or agreements, an aquittal or conviction in the foreign court might preclude trial by court-martial and, therefore, constitute grounds for a plea in bar. It seems appropriate under such circumstances to prevent the serviceman from taking advantage of such a plea.)

S. 759. A bill to afford military personnel due process in court-martial cases involving minor offenses, to insure the right of counsel in such cases, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 810 (article 10) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking out "with an offense normally tried by a summary court-martial," and inserting in lieu thereof "with an offense normally disposed of under section 815 of this title (article 15),".

Sec. 2. Section 816 (article 16) of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 816. Art. 16. Courts-martial classified

"The two kinds of courts-martial in each of the armed forces are—

"(1) general courts-martial, consisting of a law officer and not less than five members; and

"(2) special courts-martial, consisting of not less than three members."

Sec. 3. Section 820 (article 20) and section 824 (article 24) of title 10, United States Code, are hereby repealed.

Sec. 4. The first sentence of section 837 (article 37) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking out "general, special, or summary court-martial," and inserting in lieu thereof "general or special court-martial,".

Sec. 5. Section 843 (article 43) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking out in subsections (b) and (c) "summary court-martial" wherever it appears in such subsections and inserting in lieu thereof "special court-martial".

Sec. 6. Subsection (b) of section 854 (article 54(b)) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking out "special and summary court-martial" and inserting in lieu thereof "special court-martial".

Sec. 7. Subsection (c) of section 865 (article 65(c)) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking out "special and summary court-martial" and inserting in lieu thereof "special court-martial".

Sec. 8. (a) Section 934 (article 134) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking out "general, special, or summary court-martial," and inserting in lieu thereof "general or special court-martial,".

(b) Such section is further amended by substituting a comma for the period at the end thereof and adding the following: "or shall be disposed of under authority of section 815 of this title (article 15)."

Sec. 9. Subsection (a) of section 936 (article 136(a)) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking out paragraph (3), and by renumbering paragraphs (4) through (7) as paragraphs (3) through (6), respectively.

Sec. 10. (a) Subsection (a) of section 4711 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking out "shall direct a summary court-martial" and inserting in lieu thereof "shall appoint a special investigating officer".

(b) Subsections (b) and (c) of such section are amended by striking out "summary court-martial" wherever it appears in such subsections, and inserting in lieu thereof "special investigating officer".

Sec. 11. (a) Subsection (b) of section 4712 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking out "shall direct a summary court-martial" and inserting in lieu thereof "shall appoint a special investigating officer".

(b) Subsection (c) of such section is amended (1) by striking out "summary court-martial" and inserting in lieu thereof "special investigating officer"; (2) by striking out "in the court's possession" and inserting in lieu thereof "in the investigating officer's possession"; and (3) by striking out "the court's final report" and inserting in lieu thereof "the investigating officer's final report".

(c) Subsections (d), (e), (f), and (g) of such section are amended by striking out "summary court-martial" wherever it appears in such subsections, and inserting in lieu thereof "special investigating officer".

(d) Subsection (f) of such section is further amended by striking out "in the court's possession" and inserting in lieu thereof "in the investigating officer's possession".

Sec. 12. (a) Subsection (a) of section 9711 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking out "shall direct a summary court-martial" and inserting in lieu thereof "shall appoint a special court-martial officer".

(b) Subsections (b) and (c) of such section are amended by striking out "summary court-martial" wherever it appears in such subsections, and inserting in lieu thereof "special investigating officer".

Sec. 13. (a) Subsection (b) of section 9712 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking out "shall direct a summary court-martial" and inserting in lieu thereof "shall appoint a special investigating officer".

(b) Subsection (c) of such section is amended (1) by striking out "summary court-martial" and inserting in lieu thereof "special investigating officer"; (2) by striking out "in the court's possession" and inserting in lieu thereof "in the investigating officer's possession"; and (3) by striking out "the court's final report" and inserting in lieu thereof "the investigating officer's final report".

(c) Subsections (d), (e), (f), and (g) of such section are amended by striking out "summary court-martial" wherever it appears in such subsections, and inserting in lieu thereof "special investigating officer".

(d) Subsection (f) of such section is further amended by striking out "in the court's possession" and inserting in lieu thereof "in the investigating officer's possession".

The memorandum accompanying Senate bill 759 is as follows:

Proposed Bill To Protect the Constitutional Rights of Service Personnel To Receive Due Process in the Trial of Minor Offenses and To Be Tried in a Fair and Impartial Tribunal Where They Shall Have the Right to the Assistance of Counsel

Background memorandum: Articles 20 and 24 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice (10 U.S.C. 820 and 824) authorize summary courts-martial and direct who may convene such courts. These military tribunals cannot try officers or warrant officers and may not adjudge a punishment of more than 1 month's confinement at hard labor (or 45 days hard labor without confinement or 60 days restriction) and a forfeiture of 1 month's pay. Therefore, as a practical matter the summary court-martial is used primarily for the trial of minor offenses—and thus corresponds to a police court or recorder's court. (Because of the fact that the summary court generally is used only for minor offenses, the Uniform Code in art. 10, 10 U.S.C. 810, expressly provides that one charged only with an offense normally tried by a summary court-martial shall not ordinarily be placed in pretrial confinement.) Because the summary court-martial is used for the minor offense which has not been disposed of under article 15 by nonjudicial punishment, the number of trials by summary court-martial have usually been much greater than the trials by special or general courts-martial, which are usually reserved for more serious offense. Thus, in practice the serviceman has been much more likely to experience trial by summary court-martial. Unfortunately, if he does have such an experience, he may be very unimpressed by the quality of justice meted out, and he may be outraged by lack of adherence to concepts of due process in such a court-martial.

The summary court-martial consists of a single officer, who acts as judge, jury, prosecuting attorney, and defense counsel. Occasionally he does not shine in this last role, and the combination of duties imposed on the summary court-martial raises, in itself, some question of due process. By reason of the accused's "right to be represented in his defense before a general or special court-martial by civilian counsel if provided by him" (art. 38), it might appear by negative implication, that an accused lacks any statutory right to retain a civilian attorney to represent him before a summary court-martial. Under this construction of the Uniform Code there is a serious question of deprivation of the right to counsel guaranteed by the sixth amendment.

As a practical matter the review of a summary court-martial is rather limited in scope, since there is no requirement that the record of trial contain any summary of the testimony given. In the event relief is requested from a discharge review board or correction board, there is some question as to the scope of the action either board may take because of the finality provisions in article 76 of the Uniform Code.

The testimony received by the subcommittee makes it clear that in light of the recent expansion of the authority to punish nonjudicially under article 15 of the Uniform Code, see Public Law 87–648, there is currently no need to retain the summary court-martial and its continued existence presents a substantial risk of defeating some of the objectives that Congress intended to achieve through Public Law 87–648[1] (see pp. 32–44 of the draft report). Accordingly, it appears necessary to revise the Uniform Code forthwith to eliminate entirely the summary court-martial.

To effectuate the purpose of eliminating the summary court-martial, the following amendments would appear necessary:

1. Amend article 10, 10 U.S.C. 810, to provide that a person charged with an offense normally disposed of by nonjudicial punishment under article 15, ordinarily shall not be placed in confinement; and delete all reference in article 10 to the summary court-martial.
2. Rewrite article 16, 10 U.S.C. 816, to refer to two, rather than three, kinds of court-martial—namely, the general and the special court-martial; delete article 16(3) entirely.
3. Delete article 20 entirely.
4. Delete article 24 entirely.
5. In article 37, refer only to the convening authority of a general or special court-martial and eliminate any reference to the summary court-martial.
6. In articles 43 (b) and (c), substitute the word "special" for "summary" in determining what is the critical date for the operation of the 3- or 2-year statute of limitations, as provided respectively by those two subsections.
7. In article 54(b) delete all reference to the summary court-martial.
8. In article 65(c), which deals with appellate review, eliminate all reference to review of "summary court-martial records," so that the only review provided by that subsection will concern special court-martial records.
9. In article 134, 10 U.S.C. 934, delete all reference to summary courts-martial. Article 134 contains no specific reference to, or authority for, imposing nonjudicial punishment for the offenses embraced within article 134. Accordingly, it might be desirable to insert at the end of article 134 some such phrase as: "or shall be nonjudicially punished in accordance with article 134 of this code."
10. Delete article 136(a)(3). In certain instances not related directly to military justice, statutory reference is made to the summary court-martial.

See 10 U.S.C. 4711, 4712, 9711, 9712. Those sections should be rewritten to provide that, instead of a "summary court-martial," an officer shall be detailed specifically to perform the functions envisaged in those sections.

* * *

By Mr. ERVIN:

S. 760. A bill to amend chapter 47 (Uniform Code of Military Justice) so as to assure the constitutional rights of confrontation and compulsory process by providing for the mandatory appearance of witnesses and the production of evidence before certain boards and officers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 846 (article 46) of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"Under such rules and regulations as the President may prescribe, the following shall have authority to compel witnesses to appear and testify and to compel the production of other evidence—

"(1) courts-martial;

"(2) military commissions;

"(3) courts of inquiry;

"(4) investigating officers conducting investigations pursuant to section 832 of this title (article 32);

"(5) military boards appointed for the purpose of making findings or recommendation concerning the type or kind of administrative separation or discharge any member of the armed forces should receive;

"(6) boards established pursuant to section 1552 (correction of military records) and section 1553 (review of discharges and dismissals) of this title; and

"(7) any other military courts or boards when authorized to exercise subpena power by the President.

Process issued under authority of this section shall be similar to that which courts of the United States having criminal jurisdiction may lawfully issue and shall run to any part of the United States, or the territories, Commonwealths, and possessions. In court-martial cases the trial counsel, the defense counsel, and the court-martial shall have equal opportunity to obtain witnesses and other evidence in accordance with such regulations as the President may prescribe."

Sec. 2. Subsection (a)(1) of section 847 (article 47) of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(1) has been duly subpenaed to appear as a witness before any body or officer described in section 846 of this title (article 46), or before any military or civil officer designated to take a deposition to be read in evidence before any such body or officer;".

Sec. 3. Subsection (a) of section 849 (article 49(a)) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting immediately after "unless" the following: "the law officer or court-martial without a law officer hearing the case, or if the case is not being heard,".

The memorandum accompanying Senate bill 760 is as follows:

Proposed Bill To Protect the Constitutional Rights of Service Personnel To Receive Due Process Before Being Discharged or Separated Under Other Than Honorable Conditions

Background memorandum: The Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights hearings conducted in 1962 established that an administrative discharge under other than honorable conditions issued pursuant to the recommendations of a military board has almost the same effect on the recipient as the punitive discharge imposed by sentence of a court-martial. In either instance he may lose his veterans' benefits; in either instance he is stigmatized in the eyes of the community. Some of the most immutable effects of a punitive discharge are reserved for cases which have been heard by a general court-martial (see 38 U.S.C. 693g) which is presided over by a qualified law officer.

---

[1] Indeed, the subcommittee has recently been informed by the Air Force that the expanded article 15 has virtually eliminated the summary court in many commands.

Nonetheless, the consequences of any discharge under other than honorable conditions are clearly serious enough with respect to the recipient's life, liberty, or property to entitle him to due process.

Unfortunately, the military boards which recommend administrative discharges under other than honorable conditions—like special courts-martial, which can adjudge a sentence to a bad conduct discharge—often find it difficult to adhere to standards of "due process" because of the absence of competent, independent, and impartial legal advice. While some of these boards may have legal advisers, their status and function is often ill defined, as the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights learned from an examination of current military regulations in this field. Certainly, this legal adviser has not been accorded the status and responsibility of a judge; and, without his having such status, it is doubtful that he can adequately insure adherence to the due process to which the serviceman is entitled under the U.S. Constitution.

Accordingly, it seems highly desirable to require that a board empowered to recommend a discharge or separation under other than honorable conditions, or to make findings on which such a discharge or separation might be based, must have a law officer with the qualifications required of the law officer of a general court-martial under article 26 of the Uniform Code. Just as in a general court-martial, the law officer would not retire to deliberate or vote with the board members (arts. 26(b), 39); he would rule upon interlocutory matters (art. 51(b)); and he would instruct the board members concerning any questions of law reasonably raised by the evidence before them (art. 51(c)). This law officer would also preside over the proceedings of the board.

To implement these recommendations, it would be necessary; (a) to enact a separate article of the Uniform Code which would provide that, except in time of war, no member of the armed forces shall be discharged or separated under other than honorable conditions unless he has either received a hearing before a board of officers presided over by a qualified law officer, certified as qualified for such duty (art. 26(a)) and such a board had made suitable findings and recommendations, or unless he had waived the right to such a hearing after having had the opportunity to consult with an attorney having the legal qualifications required for counsel of a general court-martial under article 27(b).

(b) As part of the same article or section provide that the law officer presiding over the board proceedings should not consult with board members, except in the presence of the respondent and his counsel nor vote with the board members and should rule on interlocutory questions and instruct the board members on any legal issues or matters of law (art. 51).

S. 761. A bill to provide for compliance with constitutional requirements in the trials of persons who are charged with having committed certain offenses while subject to trial by court-martial, who have not been tried for such offenses, and who are no longer subject to trial by court-martial; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (a) of section 803 (article 3) of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Subject to section 843 of this title (article 43), any person not subject to trial by court-martial who is charged with having committed, while in a status in which he was subject to trial by court-martial, an offense against this chapter punishable by confinement for five years or more, and who, while in such status, was not tried for such offense may be tried upon indictment for such offense—

"(1) in the United States district court for any judicial district in which any act or omission constituting an element of such offense was committed, if such offense was committed in the United States, or

"(2) in the United States district court for the judicial district in which such person is found or into which he is first brought, if such offense was committed outside the United States or on the high seas.

No person may be tried in any district court for any such offense if (1) the offense is one for which such person could not be tried by court-martial without his consent if he were in a status subject to trial by court-martial, or (2) such person has been previously tried in a State court for substantially the same offense. For the purpose of all proceedings for or ancillary to the trial of any person for any such offense in any district court of the United States, such offense shall be considered to be an offense prohibited by and punishable under the provisions of title 18, United States Code."

Sec. 2. The amendments made by the first section of this Act shall be effective with respect to any offense committed on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

The memorandum accompanying Senate bill 761 is as follows:

PROPOSED BILL TO PROVIDE AN AMERICAN FORUM, SUBJECT TO THE U.S. CONSTITUTION, FOR TRIAL OF SERIOUS OFFENSES BY PERSONS WHO HAVE BEEN SEPARATED FROM THE ARMED SERVICES

Background memorandum: Under the articles of war no American forum existed to prosecute offenses against those articles by a serviceman who was discharged before charges had been preferred against him. As a result, World War II produced several incidents where persons who allegedly had committed serious crimes were immune from trial because they had been discharged and were no longer subject to trial by court-martial and also were not subject to trial in any American civil court. Congress attempted to close this jurisdictional loophole by enacting article 3 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice; but the Supreme Court, in the famous case of *Toth* v. *Quarles,* 350 U.S. 11, held this provision unconstitutional. In light of the Toth case, courts-martial lack jurisdiction to try a serviceman for predischarge violations of the Uniform Code, however serious they may be (unless the ex-serviceman later reenlists); and so frequently there is no American court which can try the accused for his crime. Of course, if the crime was committed overseas in a foreign country and if the accused either has remained there or can be extradited to that country, prosecution may still be possible; but in that event the ex-serviceman is brought to trial in a foreign court, which is not subject to the U.S. Constitution and may not furnish some of the procedural safeguards with which we are familiar.

In light of these circumstances and of the fact that the Supreme Court did not say in the Toth case that jurisdiction could not be granted to prosecute persons like Toth in a Federal civil court, the best solution would appear to be through amendment of article 3 to authorize trial in Federal district courts of ex-servicemen whose crimes were committed while they were in the Armed Forces and who would not otherwise be subject to trial for the offense in a State or Federal court. In this manner the jurisdictional hole can be plugged; but trial can take place in an American tribunal, where every constitutional safeguard will be present. Furthermore, in instances where the alleged crime occurred overseas, there will be considerably less occasion to deliver or extradite the ex-serviceman to a foreign court for trial, since an American court would also have the power to try for the same misconduct. On the other hand, under present laws trial by an American court is impossible; and therefore foreign prosecution is the only alternative to condoning the crime.

The armed services have been interested in the problem and legislation was studied after the Toth decision to help meet the problem created there. (See subcommittee hearings at 852, 910, 946.) However, somewhere along the line action apparently has bogged down.

To implement this proposal, it would seem desirable to:

(a) Amend article 3(a) of the Uniform Code to provide that, subject to the provisions of article 43 (which is the statute of limitations), any person charged with having committed, while in a status in which he was subject to the code, an offense against the Uniform Code, which, under the code and the regulations prescribed by the President and in effect at the time of the alleged offense, would be punishable by confinement of 5 years or more and for which that person cannot otherwise be tried in the courts of the United States or any State or territory thereof or the District of Columbia, shall be subject to trial for that offense in a Federal district court. If the offense occurred within the United States, then venue to try the offense shall be in any district where there occurred any of the acts or omissions complained of. If the acts or omissions all occurred on the high seas or outside the United States, then venue shall lie in the district where the defendant first comes or is brought back to the United States (the intent here being to conform the venue requirements under this article to the general venue requirements of the United States Code). Trial by a State court for substantially the same act or omission which it is proposed to try under this article shall preclude trial under this article by a Federal district court. (This is designed to clarify that a person who already has been tried by a State court cannot be tried under this article in a Federal district court; this may be especially important because of the wide scope of art. 134.)

S. 762. A bill to provide for compliance with constitutional requirements in the trials of persons who, while accompanying the armed forces outside the United States, commit certain offenses against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding after chapter 47 a new chapter as follows:

"CHAPTER 48. TRIAL OF CERTAIN PERSONS WHO ACCOMPANY THE ARMED FORCES OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

"Sec.
"951. Persons subject to trial; jurisdiction of United States district courts; offenses for which persons may be tried.
"952. Statute of limitations; maximum punishment; general provisions.

"§ 951. Persons subject to trial; jurisdiction of United States district courts; offenses for which persons may be tried

"(a) Any citizen, national, or other person owing allegiance to the United States who commits any offense referred to in subsection (b) of this section while serving with, employed by, or accompanying the armed forces outside the United States shall be guilty of an offense against the United States and shall be tried for such offense in the United States district court for the judicial district in which such person is found or into which he is first brought.

"(b) The offenses for which any person described in subsection (a) of this section may be tried in a United States district court are those offenses specified in—

"(1) section 877 through 881 of this title (articles 77–81) insofar as such sections relate to offenses referred to in clauses (2) through (5) of this subsection;

"(2) section 882 of this title (article 82);

"(3) sections 907 through 911 of this title (articles 107–111);

"(4) sections 913, 914, and 916 of this title (articles 113, 114, and 116); and

"(5) section 934 of this title (article 134) to the extent of crimes and offenses not capital.

"§ 952. Statute of limitations; maximum punishment; general provisions

"(a) An indictment may be found at any time without limitation with respect to any offense referred to in section 951(b) of this title for which the death penalty may be imposed. Except as provided in section 843(f) of this title (article 43 (f)), no person shall be prosecuted, tried, or punished under this chapter for any offense, not capital, unless the indictment is found or the information is instituted within three years next after such offense shall have been committed. No person may be tried under this chapter for any offense if such person has been tried for substantially the same offense in a foreign country pursuant to a treaty or agreement to which the United States is a party.

"(b) The maximum punishment which may be imposed in the case of any person tried for an offense pursuant to this chapter shall be the same as that applicable to persons subject to trial by courts-martial for the same offense, but the provisions of chapter 47 of this title relating to the forfeiture of pay and allowances shall not be applicable in the case of any person tried under authority of this chapter.

"(c) Any offense for which a person is indicted and tried under authority of this chapter shall, for the purpose of all proceedings for or ancillary to the trial of such person, be considered to be an offense prohibited by and punishable under the provisions of title 18, United States Code.

"(d) Nothing in this chapter shall be construed as depriving courts-martial, military commissions, provost courts, or other military tribunals of concurrent jurisdiction with respect to offenders of offenses that by statute or law of war may be tried by courts-martial, military commissions, provost courts, or military tribunals.

"(e) As used in this chapter, the term 'outside the United States' means outside the several States, Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands, Canal Zone, and the special maritime and territorial jurisdiction of the United States."

SEC. 2. (a) The table of chapters at the beginning of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting immediately below

"47. Uniform Code of Military Justice__ 801"

the following:

"48. Trial of Certain Persons Who Accompany the Armed Forces Outside the United States__________________ 951"

(b) The table of chapters preceding chapter 31 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting immediately below

"47. Uniform Code of Military Justice__ 801"

the following:

"48. Trial of Certain Persons Who Accompany the Armed Forces Outside the United States__________________ 951"

The memorandum accompanying Senate bill 762 is as follows:

PROPOSED BILL TO PROVIDE AN AMERICAN FORUM, WITH FULL CONSTITUTIONAL SAFEGUARDS, TO TRY PERSONS ACCOMPANYING THE ARMED FORCES OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

Background memorandum: Until the present century, the United States had no large forces operating overseas, and so, with a few exceptions, American civil courts were available to try any crimes that might be committed by civilians who were employed by, serving with, or otherwise accompanying the armed forces. On the other hand, the United States now maintains large military contingents overseas, where no American civil courts are available to try American civilian dependents or employees who may commit serious crimes. In a few instances, provisions of the Federal Criminal Code could be invoked as a basis for prosecuting the conduct of Americans outside the country; but, generally speaking, Federal criminal statutes were not intended to apply extraterritorially.

In order to provide an American forum for trial of civilian employees and dependents with our armed forces overseas, Congress enacted article 2(11) of the Uniform Code of Military Justice, which subjected to the code "all persons serving with, employed by, or accompanying the armed forces without the continental limits of the United States and without certain territories." Thus, civilian employees and dependents of the armed forces overseas were made subject to trial by court-martial. Ultimately, article 2(11) was invalidated by the Supreme Court, with the result that, in most instances, there is now no American court, either military or civil, that has jurisdiction to try serious crimes committed by American civilian employees or dependents overseas. Therefore, the only courts which can prosecute those offenses are foreign courts, which are not subject to the U.S. Constitution and may not provide the safeguards available in American courts. There is no indication that the foreign courts are anxious in most instances to try crimes committed by American civilian employees or dependents overseas, but the only alternative is to let the crime go completely unpunished.

The relationship of the conduct of civilian employees and dependents to the maintenance of discipline and morale in the armed services is great enough to give considerable support to the argument made by several dissenters in the Supreme Court that article 2(11) was constitutional under Congress power to "make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces." Because of this relationship it seems important to provide a forum for trial of crimes committed by civilian employees and dependents overseas. If this forum is a foreign court, the civilian accused loses the benefit of the safeguards provided by the U.S. Constitution. The Supreme Court has held that this forum cannot be a court-martial. *Kinsella* v. *Singleton*, 361 U.S. 234; *Grisham* v. *Hagan*, 361 U.S. 278; *McElroy* v. *Guagliardo*, 361 U.S. 281. Therefore, virtually by a process of elimination, the Federal district courts seem to be the proper forum for the trial of such misconduct.

Prior to its hearings in 1962, the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights was informed that the Department of Defense had prepared draft legislation to deal with this problem (hearings 848–51, 910, 946). However, this draft legislation has apparently bogged down somewhere between the Pentagon and the Department of Justice.

If jurisdiction is to be given the Federal district courts with respect to serious crimes committed overseas by civilian dependents and employees, it would seem desirable to apply the usual venue provisions governing Federal trials of offenses committed outside the United States or on the high seas. Also, since a serviceman cannot be prosecuted in a court-martial after trial by a foreign court in a country which is a party to the NATO Status of Forces Agreement, the civilian employee or dependent should receive the same protection and not be subject to trial in a Federal civil court after trial in a foreign court. Articles 107–132 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice prohibit certain acts which might be committed by a civilian employee or dependent and perhaps with disastrous consequences; in article 134 of the code there is a prohibition of "crimes and offenses not capital" which serves to incorporate by reference the Federal Criminal Code. Accordingly, it would seem to suffice to make a civilian employee or dependent punishable in an American district court if he committed an act or is guilty of an omission for which a member of the armed forces, who did the same thing could be punished under articles 107–132 of the Uniform Code or under the "crimes and offenses" provision of article 134.

To implement this proposal it seems necessary to:

(a) Amend article 2(11)—or enact a separate article—to provide that "all persons serving with, employed by, or accompanying the armed forces without the United States, the Canal Zone, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands" shall be subject to trial by a Federal district court for all acts or omissions which, on the part of a member of the armed forces would constitute a violation of articles 107 through 132 or "crimes and offenses not capital" within the meaning of article 134.

(b) Provide that the statute of limitations which would apply to the prosecution of a member of the armed forces under article 43 shall apply to misconduct by a civilian prosecuted in a Federal district court under this article and the maximum punishment authorized shall be that which would be authorized for the same act or omission if committed at the same time by a member of the armed forces.

(c) Provide that venue shall be the same as for offenses committed outside the United States under the venue provisions of the Criminal Code (18 U.S.C. 3231–3243 and especially 18 U.S.C. 3238).

(d) Provide that it shall be a defense to prosecution if the defendant has been tried for the same act or omission by the courts of a foreign country and with respect to acts or omissions which allegedly took place within the boundaries of that foreign country.

INCREASE IN BED CAPACITY FOR VETERANS' HOSPITALS

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], and the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], and me, I send to the desk a Senate concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the bed capacity for veteran hospitals be increased from 125,000 to 130,000 beds. I ask unanimous consent that it lie on the table for 2 days for additional cosponsors.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, it will lie at the table for 2 days for additional cosponsors, as requested by the Senator.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 13) was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is hereby declared to be the sense of the Congress that the authorized bed capacity limitation of 125,000 for all Veterans' Administration hospitals which was established by the President in a letter to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, dated February 26, 1959, should, in view of the present need for additional bed capacity in such hospitals, be increased by the President to the limitation of 130,000, and the President is hereby respectfully requested by the Congress to take such action as soon as practicable.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I am greatly concerned about the announcement that 11 Veterans' Administration hospitals are to be closed, and I was especially disturbed that this news was given to Members of Congress in whose States these hospitals are located, only on short notice before the announcement to the press. No doubt the Veterans' Administration has given this matter considerable thought and study, but the failure to consult with the veterans organizations concerned and the congressional delegations so that we could consider the hospital problems together, was a serious mistake.

I cannot speak regarding each individual hospital involved but I do know something about the situation in New Mexico. The plan to close Fort Bayard Hospital in Grant County, N. Mex., is subject to question because in recent years considerable capital improvements have been made there, including installation of a new medical and surgical department in 1959. The only excuse given for closing this hospital is that the cost per patient is slightly above the national average and that in order to build more hospital rooms someplace else, this hospital—and similarly situated ones—must be closed. This is a pretty coldblooded approach where veterans and their families are involved. Such items as caring for a 1,500 to 2,000 grave cemetery is included as part of the daily per patient cost at Fort Bayard.

I realize that the Veterans' Administration must have their facilities and the operation of them under constant study and analysis in order to see that they operate efficiently and as economically as possible. I know that changes are necessary from time to time as advances are made in medical science that alter the nature of treatment of the sick. I am glad to see these advances and to know that the Veterans' Administration is doing what it can to cut costs and improve the care of veterans. However, Mr. President, I do not believe that these changes and advances justify the automatic determination by a computer that certain hospitals are less efficient than others and therefore should be closed, without giving any consideration to the human element involved.

During the years since World War I the older veterans, especially those with respiratory problems, have gradually moved into the Fort Bayard area. They have bought homes and established small family businesses, in order to be near the hospital. I know many of these veterans and I know that many of them are hospitalized once or twice or more times during each year. The fact that their families and homes are nearby and that they can be visited by relatives during hospitalization contributes much to the veterans comfort and peace of mind. It is not hard to imagine what will happen if this hospital is closed. These veterans will have to be transported hundreds of miles away from their homes for hospitalization, thus disrupting their family life or business, and costing the Government thousands of dollars in transportation expenses. It has been estimated that this hospital serves approximately 75,000 veterans in west Texas, the southeast corner of Arizona, and in southwest New Mexico. Any of these can reach the hospital within 2 to 3 hours by auto. The southwestern part of the United States is growing by leaps and bounds and the demand for hospitalization for veterans at Fort Bayard will increase tremendously as the years go by.

In dealing with the sick or disabled veterans we are not dealing with commodities; we are dealing with human beings. They cannot be treated as mere numbers on a punch card.

Mr. President, in 1866 Fort Bayard in New Mexico was established as an Army post to protect the miners, settlers, and travelers in that part of the Southwest. It was the troops from Fort Bayard that subdued the Apache band led by the famous Indian leader Mangas Colorado.

Our famous expeditionary commander in World War I, the distinguished General John J. Pershing did his first soldiering at Fort Bayard, coming there directly from West Point in 1886.

In 1899 Fort Bayard was deactivated and because of the recognized beneficial climate of that area and its value in treating tuberculosis victims, it was converted into an Army hospital. During World War I it had as many as 1,700 patients at one time. The hospital was operated as a tuberculosis hospital until 1959 when it was certified as a general medical and surgical hospital. The buildings and facilities at Fort Bayard are modern and well kept.

Mr. President, I could go on and on citing the advantages of Fort Bayard, and giving reasons why it could be continued in operation. I have received hundreds of letters and telegrams from veterans in which they express their feelings and give strong evidence to support the existence of Fort Bayard. I do not intend to put all of these letters into the Record but I do submit a letter from Dr. R. E. Watts, of Watts Clinic and Hospital at Silver City, N. Mex., a World War I veteran who regained his health at Fort Bayard. I also submit for the Record a letter from the Honorable Carl P. Dunifon, former district judge at Silver City and who was cured of tuberculosis at Fort Bayard, and finally a letter from Mr. Thomas P. Foy, chairman of a Tri-State Committee for Retention of Fort Bayard. These letters give additional reasons to support the existence of the hospital and I request unanimous consent that they be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Watts Clinic and Hospital,
Silver City, N. Mex., January 19, 1965.

Hon. Clinton P. Anderson,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Anderson: I am sure that within the next few days you will be receiving hundreds of letters of protest regarding the removal of the U.S. Veterans' Administration hospital from Fort Bayard, N. Mex. I have also been told that our protests will be of no avail. Regardless, I feel that I must write this letter of protest because it may be my last gesture toward the preservation of an institution that has meant so much to thousands of veterans such as I, as well as an economic value to the community.

I came here as a veteran during World War I being transferred from Camp Beauregard, La., in the early part of 1918. I was suffering from tuberculosis following an attack of meningitis complicated by pneumonia. I was told that my condition was hopeless. Within a year, I had recovered to the extent that I was able to go on duty, take my turn as a regular ward physician in the so-called K wards. In the early spring of 1919, I was made clinical director of the institution. By 1923, I was declared completely quiescent and with one exception I have been so since that time. All this was accomplished without the modern methods of treatment of tuberculosis and the argument now is that tuberculosis can be successfully treated anywhere regardless of the climate but those who make these statements have never lived in this area of the Southwest. The climate may have no effect on the tuberculosis condition itself, but the change in the patient's attitude through living in a climate where the sun shines 335 days out of the year, where there are neither extremes of heat nor cold and where there is ample diversion of many kinds, a person's physical condition improves or has an untold value in the ultimate recovery of the patient. I, being a physician, know whereof I speak.

We are in total sympathy with the economic moves made by the Johnson administration and I know each individual area affected will naturally protest. I think we are in a peculiar position here. Fort Bayard veterans facility is more than a hospital. It is a symbol. It is a symbol of hope and health and security. Since my locating here in 1918, I have known hundreds of people to locate in this area for no purpose other than to enjoy this wonderful climate and to be close to the Veterans' Administration hospital where they could partake of the excellent treatment which has always been administered by this institution. We are isolated from metropolitan areas for lack of adequate railroad or bus transportation. It is taking too much of a chance to remove an extremely or desperately ill patient several hundred miles to receive care which, when reached, may be too late to be of any benefit.

Last, but not least, the effects of the removal of this facility will be economic. Since Fort Bayard is our third largest source of income in the county, its removal will reduce this area to a partial state of dependency upon Federal agencies.

Politically speaking, Grant County has always been a Democratic stronghold since I have been a resident in New Mexico. If Fort Bayard facility is removed from this area, you may as well wipe Grant County from your Democratic listing.

My last statement will not be a discussion of the economic situation but from a humanitarian and health standpoint. I think the designation of Fort Bayard as a general hospital was a mistake. I believe that it should have remained a hospital for the treatment of tuberculosis and upper respiratory infections and if it is so redesignated, I cannot see where there will be any unfavorable reaction from other regional areas. I have been on the consulting staff from 1918 to 1963 and I have always been opposed to changing the hospital from a tuberculosis hospital to a general hospital which entailed many additions to the staff plus new, expensive equipment and space. This has been the chief cause of the increase in the cost of the facility. It is my opinion that four or five physicians should be ample to supervise a tuberculosis hospital of this size.

As before stated, this climate is of definite benefit to people suffering from any type of respiratory disease and I am sure that there are enough people in the veterans hospitals to more than fill Fort Bayard and they will benefit far beyond the expectations of drug therapy alone. In my opinion the closing of this hospital would be a tragedy and an injustice to the people in this area who have invested their life savings in their homes in order to receive maximum benefit of the climate and veterans hospital care.

Sincerely yours,

R. E. WATTS, M.D.

JANUARY 23, 1965.

Re Fort Bayard.
Senator MANSFIELD.
Senator DIRKSEN.
Senator ANDERSON.
Senator MONTOYA.
Congressman MORRIS.
Congressman WALKER.

GENTLEMEN: We are not asking a subsidy for a worked-out or otherwise unprofitable mine, an unneeded shipyard, or the like.

I came from Ohio to Silver City just 40 years ago. I thought I was coming to die, but thanks to an allwise providence and a wonderful climate, I am still alive and working every day.

The Fort Bayard climate is not out of date—notwithstanding the allegedly smart young doctors who say that climate means nothing in the treatment and care of a tubercular.

If Fort Bayard is abandoned, many of my contemporaries in the area (I am 2 months younger than Senator ANDERSON) will stay at home and die rather than be hauled hither and thither among strangers.

For years the operation of Fort Bayard has been uneconomic—it is no more so today than it was 10, 20, 30, or 40 years ago. The closing of Fort Bayard and its counterpart in our sister States is unthinkable, cruel, and heartless.

Since when does the United States of America put a dollar-and-cents price on human life?

President Johnson has been sold a bill of goods by the "sharp pencil computer boys."

Disillusion our President before it is too late.

CARL DUNIFON.

FOY & VESLEY,
SILVER CITY, N. MEX., *January 18, 1965.*

Hon. CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR ANDERSON: After our telephone conversation of this date, I received the enclosed petition from the remaining veterans at the Fort Bayard Veterans' Hospital 5055, Fort Bayard, N. Mex. In checking over the list, I find many patients from El Paso, Tex., southern New Mexico and eastern Arizona. I also have been informed that a great number of these men are World War II patients and we all know that the 5 million veterans of World War I are fast passing away and that we, as veterans of World War II are going to be in need of hospitalization and hospital facilities in the very near future.

The Fort Bayard Veterans' Hospital serves a vital area of approximately 75,000 veterans and takes most of the overload from the veterans hospital at Albuquerque, N. Mex.

An item that I forgot to mention today is that the veterans hospital is designated as a Civil Defense Area and that all of the food and medicine for the Albuquerque, El Paso and Tucson, Phoenix centers is installed at Fort Bayard, N. Mex.

The one local hospital that we have in Silver City to take care of the civilian population has a bed capacity of 63 patients and is almost filled to capacity at all times without any veterans. If this hospital is filled to capacity and a veteran is in need of emergency care in Silver City, Bayard, Central, Santa Rita, or Hurley, he would have to be taken to William Beaumont in El Paso which is 160 miles from Silver City and where they have 20 emergency beds for veterans. Air service can only be provided by private plane. If the veteran had a coronary, it would be almost impossible for him to survive if we lose Fort Bayard.

I have talked to the Tri-State Committee for the Retention of Fort Bayard and they are desirous of going to Washington for a conference with the President. I informed them that after talking to you, you have assured me that you would make every effort to see President Johnson as you saw President Truman and that you will do all in your power, together with the congressional delegation, to have Fort Bayard retained as a veteran's hospital.

Thanking you for your kind cooperation and help in this fight, I am,

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS P. FOY,
Chairman, Tri-State Committee for Retention of Fort Bayard.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the limit on the number of veterans hospital beds is 125,000, but this is not fixed by law. It came about as a result of a letter from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, Mr. Sumner G. Whittier, to President Eisenhower on February 2, 1959, recommending that the number of beds be limited to that figure. On February 26, 1959, the President wrote to the Administrator approving this number. I submit copies of these letters for the record and request unanimous consent that they be printed immediately following my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the resolution I have introduced would add 5,000 beds to the Veterans' Administration hospital system. This resolution could be the vehicle for detailed congressional examination of the present and long-term needs for Government hospital beds for veterans.

Mr. President, the Veterans' Administration argues that the purpose in closing the 11 hospitals is to save money and to provide a higher quality of service to the veterans and their beneficiaries. I do not believe that closing a hospital and requiring veterans to travel hundreds of miles to another hospital means providing better service to the veteran and his family. I have been advised that many of the hospitals have waiting lists and that due to the fact that improved medicine and treatment methods have extended the life of thousands of veterans, there will be an ever increasing need for more hospital room as these veterans grow older. I, therefore, question the limit of 125,000 beds as being sufficient to provide the better service and better quality of treatment that the Veterans' Administration claims will come about by closing these hospitals. Therefore, my resolution expresses the sense of Congress that 125,000 beds are insufficient and suggests that this limit be raised to 130,000.

EXHIBIT 1

FEBRUARY 2, 1959.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In order to bring up to date the authorized bed capacities of the Veterans' Administration hospitals, it is requested that you approve the attached revised authorization for each of our hospitals. The revised authorizations, which total 125,000 beds for the Veterans' Administration hospital system, are based on the present structural capacity of each of the existing hospitals as modified by previously approved hospital replacement and modernization projects. Also shown are interim authorizations for hospitals affected by approved replacement or modernization projects, to remain in effect until the completion of each project. These revised authorizations, if approved by you, will provide a base for requests for Presidential approval of construction or other acquisition as the need arises.

The need for approval of a revised authorization for each hospital is occasioned by many factors. It will bring together for the first time in one document authorizations which have been scattered in many documents since the establishment of the Veterans' Administration. In many cases the number of beds approved when the hospitals were constructed or acquired by the Veterans' Administration are no longer current. As the practice of hospital administration has changed so has the number of beds which can be provided within the hospital's physical plant at accepted bed spacing criteria. Many of the physical facilities acquired from the military services after World War II have been unused for many years and have been demolished or transferred to other organizations or have deteriorated to the point that they could not be used today without the unwise expenditure of thousands of dollars for their rehabilitation. In addition, many of the modernization projects have resulted in the readjustment of beds so that a hospital's bed capacity is no longer as originally approved.

In the revised authorizations I am including the use of the 114 additional beds at the Veterans' Administration hospital at Lake City, Fla. These beds can be provided by the modernization of building No. 38 which we had originally intended to convert for nurses' quarters. The need for this purpose no longer exists and for a small cost these beds can be used for patients to compensate further for the shift of the veteran population to Florida.

The proposed revised authorization also includes the Veterans' Administration hospitals at Martinsburg, W. Va., and Vancouver, Wash., both of which were authorized to be acquired from the Army for temporary use pending the development of permanent hospital programs for those areas. The physical condition of these two hospitals is such that they can be continued in operation for the time being without the need for replacement and I, therefore, propose their continued use.

It is also requested that you approve the utilization of unused buildings at the Veterans' Administration hospital, Dublin, Ga., to provide 500 domiciliary beds and a revised authorization of 1,638 domiciliary beds for the Veterans' Administration Center, Dayton, Ohio. The 500 domiciliary beds, when added to the 500 hospital beds authorized for Dublin, Ga., will make full utilization of the hospital's existing structural capacity. It will permit a reduction of 500 domiciliary beds in the 2,138 such beds at the Dayton, Ohio, Center and the demolition of five obsolete, non-fire-resistant buildings there.

I believe that an up-to-date authorized bed capacity for all Veterans' Administration hospitals and the shift in domiciliary beds from Dayton, Ohio, to Dublin, Ga., are urgently required and I recommend your approval.

Respectfully,

Sumner G. Whittier,
Administrator.

Authorization bed capacities of Veterans' Administration hospitals

	Authorized bed capacity
Albany, N.Y	1,005
Albuquerque, N. Mex	500
Alexandria, La	842
Altoona, Pa	200
Amarillo, Tex	156
American Lake, Wash	904
Ann Arbor, Mich	486
Atlanta, Ga	300
Augusta, Ga	1,744
Baltimore, Md	291
Batavia, N.Y	257
Bath, N.Y	273
Battle Creek, Mich	2,055
Bay Pines, Fla	866
Beckley, W. Va	196
Bedford, Mass. (1,636 beds authorized until completion of current modernization project)	1,500
Big Spring, Tex	250
Biloxi, Miss	189
Birmingham, Ala	479
Boise, Idaho	207
Bonham, Tex	56
Boston, Mass	923
Brecksville, Ohio	324
Brockton, Mass	988
Bronx, N.Y	1,442
Brooklyn, N.Y	1,000
Buffalo, N.Y	951
Butler, Pa	500
Canandaigua, N.Y	1,700
Castle Point, N.Y	512
Cheyenne, Wyo. (151 beds authorized until completion of current modernization project)	133
Chicago, Ill. (research)	516
Chicago, Ill. (West Side)	495
Chillicothe, Ohio	2,116
Cincinnati, Ohio	813
Clarksburg, W. Va	200
Cleveland, Ohio	1,000
Cleveland, Ohio (827 beds authorized until completion of construction of new hospital at this location)	800
Coatesville, Pa	1,602
Columbia, S.C	593
Coral Gables, Fla	800
Dallas, Tex	798
Danville, Ill	1,729
Dayton, Ohio	823
Dearborn, Mich	914
Denver, Colo	504
Des Moines, Iowa	386
Downey, Ill. (2,487 beds authorized until completion of current modernization project)	2,300
Dublin, Ga	500
Durham, N.C	489
Dwight, Ill	215
East Orange, N.J	950
Erie, Pa	204
Excelsoir Spring, Mo	209
Fargo, N. Dak	228
Fayetteville, Ark	254
Fayetteville, N.C	416
Fort Bayard, N. Mex	222
Fort Harrison, Mont	262
Fort Howard, Md	377
Fort Lyon, Colo	681
Fort Meade, S. Dak	720
Fort Wayne, Ind	200
Fresno, Calif	250
Grand Island, Nebr	201
Grand Junction, Colo	152
Gulfport, Miss	915
Hines, Ill	2,489
Hot Springs, S. Dak	255
Houston, Tex	1,368
Huntington, W. Va	180
Indianapolis, Ind	727
Iowa City, Iowa	484
Iron Mountain, Mich	269
Jackson, Miss. (554 beds authorized until completion of construction of new hospital at this location)	500
Jefferson Barracks, Mo	815
Kansas City, Mo	500
Kecoughtan, Va	604
Kerrville, Tex	449
Knoxville, Iowa	1,540
Lake City, Fla	468
Lebanon, Pa	1,065
Lexington, Ky	1,171
Lincoln, Nebr	280
Little Rock, Ark	471
Livermore, Calif	550
Long Beach, Calif	1,600
Los Angeles, Calif	3,621
Louisville, Ky	494
Lyons, N.J	2,009
Madison, Wis	481
Manchester, N.H	150
Marion, Ill	176
Marion, Ind	1,650
Marlin, Tex	201
Martinsburg, W. Va. (840 beds authorized until completion of construction of the new 500-bed hospital at Washington, D.C.)	765
McKinney, Tex	312
Memphis, Tenn. (1,378 beds authorized until completion of construction of new hospital at this location)	1,000
Miles City, Mont	96
Minneapolis, Minn	1,014
Minot, N. Dak	162
Montgomery, Ala	285
Montrose, N.Y	1,940
Mountain Home, Tenn. (575 beds authorized until completion of current modernization project)	555
Murfreesboro, Tenn	1,307
Muskogee, Okla	390
Nashville, Tenn. (520 beds authorized until completion of construction of new hospital at this location)	500
Newington, Conn	300
New Orleans, La	492
New York, N.Y	1,238
Northampton, Mass	1,105
North Little Rock, Ark	2,062
Northport, Long Island, N.Y	2,488
Oakland, Calif. (712 beds authorized until completion of construction of new hospital at this location)	500
Oklahoma City, Okla	488
Omaha, Nebr	486
Oteen, N.C. (1,063 beds authorized until completion of new clinic building at this location)	944
Outwood, Ky	189
Palo Alto, Calif	2,400
Perry Point, Md	1,779
Philadelphia, Pa	488
Phoenix, Ariz	192
Pittsburgh, Pa	1,197
Pittsburgh, Pa	951
Poplar Bluff, Mo	201
Portland, Oreg	565
Providence, R.I	393
Reno, Nev	166
Richmond, Va	1,100
Roanoke, Va	2,000
Roseburg, Oreg	670
Rutland Heights, Mass	540
Saginaw, Mich	217
Salisbury, N.C	973
Salt Lake City, Utah	710
San Fernando, Calif	519
San Francisco, Calif	440
San Juan, P.R	200
Seattle, Wash	320
Sepulveda, Calif	956
Sheridan, Wyo	707
Shreveport, La	449
Sioux Falls, S. Dak	270
Spokane, Wash	200
St. Cloud, Minn	1,379
St. Louis, Mo	495
Sunmount, N.Y	511
Syracuse, N.Y	488
Temple, Tex. (800 beds authorized until completion of construction of new hospital at this location)	500
Togus, Maine	869
Tomah, Wis	1,176
Topeka, Kans	1,011
Tucson, Ariz	402
Tuscaloosa, Ala	964
Tuskegee, Ala. (1,978 beds authorized until completion of current modernization project)	1,851
Vancouver, Wash	575
Waco, Tex	2,040
Wadsworth, Kans	944
Walla Walla, Wash	407
Washington, D.C	500
West Haven, Conn	861
West Roxbury, Mass	304
Whipple, Ariz	382
White River Junction, Vt	188
Wichita, Kans	252
Wilkes-Barre, Pa	500
Wilmington, Del	300
Wood, Wis	1,250
Total	125,000

Change in authorized bed capacities of Veterans' Administration domiciliary homes

	New authorized bed capacity
Dayton, Ohio	1,638
Dublin, Ga	500

Approved:

Dwight D. Eisenhower.

February 12, 1959.

The White House,
Washington, February 26, 1959.

Hon. Sumner G. Whittier,
Administrator of Veterans' Affairs,
Veterans' Administration,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Whittier: You have recommended my approval of a revised authorized bed capacity for each of the Veterans' Administration hospitals because in recent years there has developed a considerable amount of uncertainty as to the total capacity of the hospitals. Since World War I numerous Presidential approvals have been granted for construction and acquisition of hospitals by the Veterans' Administration, and these usually have been related to the operation of a specific number of beds. However, these approvals—in terms of number of beds, nature of care, and location of facilities—have been rendered obsolete or have been modified through necessity by deterioration or abandonment of facilities, changes in methods of medical treatment and hospital care, and other similar factors.

For these reasons I agree with your recommendation and am returning as of this date with my approval your proposed revision of the authorized bed capacity of each of the Veterans' Administration hospitals. These revised authorizations total 125,000 beds for the Veterans' Administration hospital system. They are based on your determination of the present structural capacity of each of the hospitals with adjustments for approved hospital replacement and modernization projects.

While this revision of the authorized bed capacity of Veterans' Administration hospitals is a constructive step it does not solve the basic questions and uncertainties which exist concerning provision of hospital care to the Nation's veterans. Each Administrator of Veterans' Affairs has emphasized the need for a clear policy in this regard, with particular reference to the Federal Government's responsibility for the care of wartime veterans with non-service-connected disabilities. In 1956 when the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs recommended the establishment of a policy for the care of such patients, I requested that a study be made to show both where veterans are now receiving such care and an estimate of the magnitude of the non-service-connected war veteran patient loads for the next 30 years.

That study was completed last year and has been made public. Its findings, when considered in relation to the hospital care responsibilities of other governmental jurisdictions and the responsibilities of the Federal Government to assist in the improvement of hospital facilities throughout the Nation, clearly indicates the urgent need for correcting existing uncertainties in the policies governing our veterans hospital care programs. Manifestly, the existing lack of clarity in the definition of Federal responsibility for the care of war veterans with non-service-connected disabilities makes difficult precise long-range planning by the Federal Government and denies other governmental jurisdictions a reliable foundation on which they may plan their hospital requirements for all their citizens.

By statute, Congress has authorized the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, within the limits of Veterans' Administration facilties, to furnish hospital care which he determines is needed for: (1) Veterans with service-connected disabilities; and (2) war veterans with non-service-connected disabilities who are unable to defray expenses of necessary hospital care.

Laws enacted by Congress clearly establish the responsibility of the Federal Government to provide all the care required by veterans for disabilities resulting from their military service. The Veterans' Administration provides effective care to veterans with such disabilities without delay by giving them priority in Veterans' Administration hospitals, by contracting for their care in other Federal and community hospitals, and by providing them with outpatient treatment in Federal and non-Federal facilities.

At best, however, the statutes furnish only broad guidelines as to the responsibility of the Federal Government with respect to the hospital care of war veterans for non-service-connected disabilities and there is the need for a clear policy governing the role of the Federal Government in providing facilities for their care. For many years, the number of beds in Veterans' Administration hospitals has been greatly in excess of the number needed to provide hospital care for veterans with service-connected disabilities. At present only one-third of the beds are occupied by veterans receiving care for disabilities resulting from their military service. The number of such veterans is now declining and the need for beds for their care in the future will decrease.

Further, the recent study has disclosed that the Federal Government is now providing approximately one-half of all hospital beds occupied by veterans with non-service-connected neuropsychiatric, tubercular, and medical and surgical illnesses. The remaining 50 percent of the hospital beds occupied by veterans with non-service-connected illnesses are provided in non-Federal hospitals. A continuing increase in the number of such non-Federal facilities has been encouraged by extensive Federal grants for hospital construction. Such grants, together with other Federal programs of public assistance and vocational rehabilitation, have enlarged the capacity of other governmental jurisdictions to discharge their responsibilities for providing medical assistance to all their citizens including veterans.

In light of these facts and recognizing that Congress, except in a few specific instances, has traditionally and properly left it within the discretion of the President to determine and recommend to the Congress the extent to which facilities shall be constructed or otherwise provided for the care of veterans, I have adopted and approved the following four policies, which will govern my future approvals for construction or acquisition of Veterans' Administration hospital beds:

1. Continuance of complete, high-quality hospital care for all veterans in need of such care for service-connected disabilities. Such care will be provided in hospitals of the Veterans' Administration, other Federal hospitals, and State and local community hospitals in the discretion of the Administrator.

2. Continuance, within the capacity of the 125,000 authorized beds in Veterans' Administration hospitals, of the care of war veterans with non-service-connected disabilities, recognizing that basic responsibility lies with other governmental jurisdictions for providing hospital care for all citizens who are unable to defray the expense of hospitalization.

3. Shifting of beds or hospitals from one type of use to another by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs as may be permitted by law and advances in medical treatment.

4. With the approval of the President and subject to the availability of funds, construction to provide beds or hospitals for replacement and modernization or to compensate for major geographic shifts in veteran population, all within the overall total of 125,000 authorized beds.

Sincerely,

——— ———.

STANDING COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I am today submitting a resolution to amend the Standing Rules of the Senate to provide for a standing Committee on Veterans' Affairs. Some 25 Senators have joined as cosponsors of this measure, including: Senators Bayh, Bible, Boggs, Byrd of West Virginia, Cannon, Douglas, Fong, Gruening, Harris, Hart, Holland, Inouye, Jackson, Long of Missouri, Metcalf, McCarthy, McIntyre, Montoya, Moss, Mundt, Neuberger, Pearson, Ribicoff, Talmadge, and Williams of New Jersey.

Since the enactment of the La Follette-Monroney Reorganization Act of 1946, the question of a specialized Committee on Veterans' Affairs has been a matter of recurrent concern to the Senate. And in every session of Congress since 1950 resolutions to establish such a committee have been introduced with widespread bipartisan support and the support of veterans' organizations.

It is not to impugn the able work of the Finance Committee and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare—the committees which have heretofore handled veterans' affairs—to suggest that we might achieve a more efficient means of organization in this matter.

We acknowledge the value of the years of experience developed by members of the Finance Committee in handling veterans' problems. But that does not gainsay the fact that with the growing population of our country, with the growing complexity of Government, the workload of all standing committees is being increased and necessitates greater specialization. At the same time, there are approximately 23 million veterans, and their dependents, whose problems do not have the attention of a specialized committee in the Senate.

The present Senate organization with respect to veterans' affairs is an outgrowth of the period between the two World Wars, when we had only a few million veterans. I suggest that the present organization is not the most efficient one possible for handling the legislation of 23 million veterans and annual Federal expenditures amounting to billions. I further suggest that a grateful Nation should not deny to its veterans the merits of the most serious and specialized attention of which we are capable. Surely, we owe the veteran no less than the farmer or the worker or the small businessman.

It might be observed also that such a specialized committee, with sole responsibility and authority over veterans' legislation might effect greater savings in Federal expenditures by repealing or minimizing questionable expenditures and concentrating on those which are valid and justified.

Therefore, in the interests of more efficient Senate organization and in justice to the veterans who served and sacrificed in our Nation's cause, I urge the expeditious and affirmative consideration of this resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 55) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate (relating to standing committees) is amended by—

(1) striking out subparagraphs 10 through 13 in paragraph (h) of section (1);

(2) striking out subparagraphs 16 through 19 in paragraph (1) of section (1); and

(3) inserting in section (1) after paragraph (p) the following new paragraph:

"(q) Committee on Veterans' Affairs, to consist of nine Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:

"1. Veterans' measures, generally.

"2. Pensions of all the wars of the United States, general and special.

"3. Life insurance issued by the Government on account of service in the Armed Forces.

"4. Compensation of veterans.

"5. Vocational rehabilitation and education of veterans.

"6. Veterans' hospitals, medical care and treatment of veterans.

"7. Soldiers' and sailors' civil relief.

"8. Readjustment of servicemen to civil life."

Sec. 2. Section 4 of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by striking out "and Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences" and inserting in lieu thereof "Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences; and Committee on Veterans' Affairs".

Sec. 3. Section 6(a) of rule XVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate (relating to the designation of ex officio members of the Committee on Appropriations), is amended by adding at the end of the tabulation contained therein the following new item:

"Committee on Veterans' Affairs—For the Veterans' Administration."

SEC. 4. The Committee on Veterans' Affairs shall as promptly as feasible after its appointment and organization confer with the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare for the purpose of determining what disposition should be made of proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters theretofore referred to the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare during the Eighty-eighth Congress which are within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

ESTABLISHMENT OF SUBCOMMITTEE ON EXECUTIVE REORGANIZATION

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I report a resolution to provide funds for the newly established Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization of the Senate Committee on Government Operations. The resolution was unanimously approved this morning by the Committee on Government Operations. I have been designated chairman of the new subcommittee.

Mr. President, the Committee on Government Operations is charged under rule XXV of the Senate to consider proposed reorganizations in the executive branch of the Government and to evaluate the effects of laws enacted to reorganize the legislative and executive branches of the Government. There is every indication that new interest and activity in executive branch reorganization will be generated by President Johnson. In his recent state of the Union message he said:

> For government to serve these goals it must be modern in structure, efficient in action, and ready for any emergency. I am currently reviewing the structure of the executive branch. I hope to reshape and reorganize it to meet more effectively the tasks of today.

And yesterday in his budget message the President told us:

> We must reorganize and modernize the structure of the executive branch in order to focus responsibilities and increase efficiency.

To carry out his reorganization plans the President has already indicated his intention to—

First. Propose certain reorganizations which will constitute the initial and most urgent steps that he deems necessary to consolidate functions and strengthen coordination of related activities;

Second. Seek permanent reorganization authority to initiate improvements in Government organization, subject to the disapproval of the Congress; and

Third. Submit legislation to establish a new Department of Housing and Urban Development.

The legislative branch should be ready to cooperate with and assist the President in his reorganization efforts. As chairman of the new Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization I intend to rely heavily on the breadth of experience and know-how of the able and experienced full committee staff. At the same time I will invite the Nation's leading political scientists and public administration experts to work and consult with us in our work.

Mr. President, this new assignment represents both opportunity and challenge. From the time I served in the House and throughout my tenure as Governor of Connecticut this problem of governmental organization and reorganization has been of great interest and deep concern to me. While serving as Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare I became even more convinced that those of us involved in government must pay more attention to the problems of proper organization of governmental functions. The people's business deserves to be conducted at the peak of efficiency and economy.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and printed; and, under the rule, the resolution will be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The resolution (S. Res. 56) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Government Operations, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to make a full and complete study for the purpose of evaluating the effects of laws enacted to reorganize the executive branch of the Government, and to consider reorganizations proposed therein.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1965, through January 31, 1966, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized at its discretion to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,100 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings upon the study and investigation authorized by this resolution, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1966.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $57,500, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

TO PRINT AS A SENATE DOCUMENT A COMPILATION OF SPEECHES BY SIR WINSTON CHURCHILL

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 5 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution providing for the printing of certain representative and selected speeches of Sir Winston Churchill, as a Senate document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 62) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be printed as a Senate document a compilation, to be prepared by the Library of Congress, of representative published speeches made in the United States, or selections therefrom, of Sir Winston Churchill; it is further

Resolved, That, in addition to normal distribution, a copy of the compilation shall be furnished to each Member of the Parliament of Great Britain.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my resolution may lie on the table until Friday, for additional cosponsors.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, our hearts are full and no mean words that we might muster could appropriately eulogize the most heroic figure of the century whose death the free world mourns.

As a chronicler of our English speaking civilization, he articulated an appreciation for the inherent greatness of our race of which he was a living manifestation. He was, too, a manifestation of the notion he so lucidly advanced that the sweep and course of history has been influenced by a succession of great men. He was possessed of an infinite and unequaled capacity for leadership. He distinguished himself in so many ways that it staggers the imagination. His deeds and achievements are so vast and so well known to us all that it would be superfluous to recite them here. His eloquence not only inspired us but brought to our ears the soaring majesty of the English language.

If from some eternal domicile the immortals of the past—Richard the Lionhearted, Edward III, Elizabeth I, Wellington, Nelson, Disraeli—could look upon the earthly procession of this era, they would concede that this leader of epic proportion was the greatest Englishman of them all.

His passing marks an epoch in human history. Those of us who have Anglo-Saxon blood coursing through our veins can think better of ourselves because we belong to a race that produced Winston Churchill.

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, a resolution authorizing the Committee on Rules and Administration to make expenditures and to employ temporary personnel during the year beginning February 1, 1965, and ending January 31, 1966.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received, printed, and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The resolution (S. Res. 63) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Rules and Administration, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to:

(1) the election of the President, Vice President, or Members of Congress;

(2) corrupt practices;

(3) contested elections;

(4) credentials and qualifications;

(5) Federal elections generally, and

(6) Presidential succession.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of this resolution, the committee, from February 1, 1965, to January 31, 1966, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ, upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,100 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1966.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $ shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

PUBLIC ADDRESS SYSTEM AND TELEVISING OF GREAT DEBATES IN SENATE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, two resolutions designed to enhance the interest of the public in Senate proceedings.

The first resolution, introduced on behalf of myself, Mr. CLARK and Mr. MORSE, would permit television and radio coverage of selected Senate sessions during major debates on the most important national issues. The other would allow the installation of a public address system within the Senate Chamber.

The latter resolution, introduced on behalf of myself, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BOGGS, Mr. CLARK, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. MORSE, Mr. Moss, Mrs. NEUBERGER, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mrs. SMITH, and Mr. SYMINGTON, and which was introduced in 1957 and in the last Congress, would locate a microphone at the desks of the Presiding Officer and each Senator.

The problem this resolution is designed to solve was dramatically underscored on two recent occasions. Late last year a Senator claimed to have been misquoted by the press because he was not heard in remarks on the Senate floor. And just 3 weeks ago, a number of Senators complained that they had not heard an important parliamentary ruling of the Presiding Officer during the opening round of this Congress' antifilibuster debate. Both incidents, and the ensuing debates they occasioned, could have been avoided if a public address system had been in use at the time.

The House of Representatives has had a public address system in its Chamber for many years, but in the Senate often interesting and vigorous debate on the Senate floor is completely missed by the many visitors in the gallery and heard often only partially, sometimes hardly at all, by the members of the working press in the press gallery. In this age of electronics, it is anomalous that the Senate should labor under such a disadvantage.

There is certainly room for a small microphone at each Senator's desk, and the controls are easily applied. One place that readily comes to mind is the little-used inkwell which recalls the days when quill pens were still used on the Senate floor.

When I first came to the Senate in 1957, as a member of the Rules Committee, I made an effort to bring about the institution of a suitable public address system in the Senate Chamber. The committee asked the Architect of the Capitol to look into the feasibility of the plan. The staff of the committee made a survey of the then 96 Members and found a considerable number who were interested in the change. However, a considerable number were opposed to any change at all, but principally because of technical difficulties, for example, the presence of a large number of unsightly microphones, which the greatly improved state of the art of electronics can now entirely eliminate. It has been suggested that they be placed in the inkwells which are installed on the desks of all Senators.

The measure would be a helpful step forward to bring Senate procedures into modern times and I hope the Rules Committee will give it early consideration.

The resolution on TV coverage would give the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration authority to determine the times and conditions under which television and radio broadcasters would be permitted to cover the Senate proceedings.

While there are approximately 300 seats for the public in the Senate Gallery, the right to witness public business should not be confined only to those whom the Senate Chamber will hold.

This resolution is intended to take account of the views of those who fear television's effect on the legislative process. It is a reasonable and modest approach and essentially experimental. It would permit the Senate Rules Committee, now composed of nine Senators of both parties, to determine if a particular debate was of sufficient public interest to warrant television coverage, much as congressional committees now determine if they will open hearings to television coverage.

I believe if we try this on a limited scale at first, we will be convinced that television coverage will have a beneficial effect on the legislative function. I believe, for example, that it would speed the often agonizing deliberative process because there would be less need to dramatize issues by extended debate. I believe also it will result in less time-consuming and more action-producing Senate procedures. In short, it would result in a more informed citizenry and a more responsive Senate.

This is not an idea without precedent. Senate committees for several years have permitted the televising of selected committee investigating sessions, and these have been generally successful. In some cases, they have aroused widespread national interest leading to reform and other desirable objectives. The impact of television coverage of major United Nations debates is well known. In the past few years selected legislative proceedings were opened successfully to television in many States, among them Arizona, Kansas, Idaho, Oklahoma, and Massachusetts. In others, legislative committee hearings were televised successfully.

This year a major debate will certainly be waged on the President's education and medicare package programs that will directly affect nearly every American family. The American people should have a front seat in such crucial debates. I can see only positive results from bringing the Senate closer to the people in this way.

We tried many ways to stimulate the interest of our people in government. Television has proved it can awaken this interest effectively. I believe that the time has come for the Senate to make a start toward using the great modern medium of communications to advance the public interest.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions may be received and appropriately referred, and that the text of the resolutions be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolutions will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the resolutions will be printed in the RECORD.

The resolutions were received, appropriately referred, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself, Mr. CLARK, and Mr. MORSE):

S. Res. 64. Relative to the use of radio or television in reporting proceedings of the Senate and in the Press Gallery; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Resolved, That (a) the second paragraph of rule XXXIV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by inserting therein, immediately after the first sentence thereof, the following new sentence: "Such regulations shall make appropriate provision for the reporting of proceedings of the Senate by radio or television at such times and under such conditions as may be specified in such regulations or by resolution of the committee from time to time."

(b) The second sentence of the second paragraph of rule XXXIV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by inserting therein, immediately after the words "radio, wire, wireless", the term "television,".

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BOGGS, Mr. CLARK, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MOSS, Mrs. NEUBERGER, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mrs. SMITH, and Mr. SYMINGTON):

S. Res. 65. Resolution to provide a suitable electrical public address system in the Senate Chamber:

Resolved, That (a) to insure that debates of the Senate may be heard in all parts of the Senate Chamber and in the galleries thereof, the Committee on Rules and Administration is authorized and directed to take such action as may be required for the installation and operation within the Senate Chamber of a suitable electrical public address system, including a microphone placed at the desk of the Presiding Officer and at the desk of each Senator.

(b) To the extent authorized by law, the expenses incurred for the installation and operation of such public address system may be defrayed from the contingent fund of the Senate.

POLISH INDEPENDENCE

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, in 1964, Polish people throughout the world celebrated the anniversary of 1,000 years of their existence as a state and as a Christian nation. Many nations are participating in various ways in recognition of the birthday of the Polish nation.

I would like to take this opportunity, as an expression of American respect and affection for the people of Poland and of Polish extraction, to introduce, for appropriate reference, a Senate resolution authorizing the printing as a Senate document, of a selected compilation, to be prepared by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, of the principal statements and speeches made by Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives since the founding of the Government of the United States, which constitute expressions of concern or support for the freedom and independence of the people of Poland.

Because of the particular merit of certain such statements which have come to my attention, I have specifically enumerated them in the resolution.

I feel that publication of this document, reflecting congressional concern for Polish independence during our entire history, will demonstrate to all nations the intensity and continuity of our friendship, sympathy, and respect for the Polish people.

Such publication will evidence the durable and reliable interest of the U.S. Congress in the Polish people.

Second. The Communist regime in Warsaw will realize that we are aware of their actions and judge them accordingly.

Third. The people of Poland who have often felt abandoned to their fate, will be profoundly reassured by this act of the U.S. Congress that they have not been forgotten.

Fourth. Americans of Polish parentage will be grateful to the Congress for taking this initiative.

Last. This will constitute a most fitting and moving tribute to the Polish people to commemorate their 1,000th-year birthday of freedom.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the resolution printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 66) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be printed as a Senate document a selected compilation, to be prepared by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, of the principal statements and speeches made by Members of Congress since the founding of the Government of the United States which constitute expressions of concern or support for the freedom and independence of the people of Poland: *Provided*, That such selected compilation shall not exceed 250 pages in length and shall specifically include the following statements: From the History of Congress, December 1797—article on General Kosciusko; from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 6, 1918—statement by Mr. Sabath; from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 4, 1964—articles on Progress on the Children's Hospital Project in Poland, Children's Hospital Receives AID Grant, and the University of Krakow.

SEC. 2. There shall be printed and bound as directed by the Joint Committee on Printing, four thousand copies of such document.

WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT CHANGE NEEDED (AMENDMENT NO. 4)

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, an amendment to S. 4, a bill introduced on January 6, 1965, by the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. My amendment would:

First. Eliminate the existing limitation of $600,000 for a single project or $2.4 million for a joint project involving several communities on grants for construction of waste treatment facilities. It would also authorize an across-the-board Federal contribution of 30 percent of the cost of constructing these facilities.

Second. Eliminate the existing requirement that half of all construction grant funds be used for municipalities of 125,00 people or less.

Third. Establish a more meaningful standard for the allocation of funds for construction of sewage treatment facilities in urban areas of need. The amendment would set up a standard based on the ratio of the urban population in one State to the urban population in all States, replacing the existing criterion based on per capita income. Such a standard would bring about a more equitable distribution of funds to highly populated areas where major water pollution problems exist.

Fourth. Authorize the Federal Government to subsequently reimburse States and municipalities that have spent their own funds for treatment facilities when a Federal construction grant, which has been approved, cannot be immediately allocated because of inadequate Federal funds.

The problem of water pollution and the waste of our country's water resources—lakes, streams, rivers, and reservoirs—because of inadequately treated sewage has created a major national economic and social problem. The need for improved sewage facilities has been dramatized in both rural and urban areas throughout the country. Most regrettably, the water pollution problems of the larger urban areas have not received sufficient attention, and it is charged that under the existing formulas they have been discriminated against in the construction grants section of the existing Federal Water Pollution Control Act.

This act authorizes the Federal Government to pay up to 30 percent of the cost of local sewage treatment facilities but places a limitation of $600,000 on the amount which may be paid to a municipality for a single project and $2.4 million on the amount which may be paid to municipalities cooperating in a joint project. Although these project allocation limitations would be raised to $1 and $4 million, respectively, under S. 4, which has been the subject of hearings by the Special Subcommittee on Water Pollution, the Governor of New York as well as the New York State Conference of Mayors and others contend that this proposed limitation still does not go far enough. In effect, these limitations discriminated against the Nation's large cities and urban areas. For example, a single pollution control project in New York City cost $87.6 million. In view of the existing statutory $250,000 limitation on a single project, at the time this project was approved, the Federal Government could only contribute that amount instead of paying 30 percent of the cost, which would have amounted to $26.2 million.

The present Water Pollution Control Act discriminates also against highly populated urban areas through its requirement that at least 50 percent of funds appropriated for each fiscal year must be used for construction of treatment works servicing municipalities of 125,000 population or under.

Further, the present act discriminates against States with large cities, despite the fact water pollution remains a major urban problem—through an allocation formula which results in an annual allocation to New York of barely more than $5 million from a total appropriation of $100 million.

The State of New York is embarking on a new $1.7 billion water pollution program with $513 million to be expended through 1970 for construction of needed sewage treatment facilities. To permit States making substantial efforts in this field to accelerate their work, the Federal Government should assume a full 30-percent share, and the other provisions of the present law which discriminate against heavily populated urban areas should be altered.

I believe that the Congress must enact legislation to increase funds for the construction of treatment facilities and to remove existing discriminatory features of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. This means authorizing the Federal Government to share fully in an unrestricted one-third contribution to the cost of needed sewage treatment facilities.

I have been advised that the Special Subcommittee on Water Pollution of the Senate Public Works Committee expects to examine in the very near future in detail the existing problems surrounding the construction grant section of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. During the hearings on January 18 on S. 4, the chairman of the Special Subcommittee on Water Pollution stated that the subcommittee recognized that hearings on S. 4 did not cover the entire scope of water pollution control concerns, and that further hearings on the adequacy of the present sewage treatment grants program were anticipated. I very much appreciate the chairman's interest in this matter which has also been of great interest to the State of New York and other similarly situated States, and I hope that the problems with which this amendment deals will be given serious consideration by the subcommittee.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record the text of my amendment and the text of a letter from the New York State Conference of Mayors to the President of the United States describing the need for modification in the existing water pollution legislation.

There being no objection, the amendment and letter were referred to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Amendment No. 4

On page 5, beginning with line 11, strike out all through line 17, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 4. (a) Subsections (b) and (c) of the section of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act herein redesignated as section 8 are amended to read as follows:

"'(b) Federal grants under this section shall be subject to the following limitations: (1) No grant shall be made for any project pursuant to this section unless such project shall have been approved by the appropriate State water pollution control agency or agencies and by the Secretary and unless such project is included in a comprehensive program developed pursuant to this Act; (2) no grant shall be made for any project in an amount exceeding 30 per centum of the estimated reasonable cost thereof as determined by the Secretary: *Provided,* That the grantee agrees to pay the remaining cost: *Provided further,* That, in the case of a project which will serve more than one municipality the Secretary shall, on such basis as he determines to be reasonable and equitable, allocate to each municipality to be served by such project its share of the estimated reasonable cost of such project, and shall then apply the limitation provided in this clause (2) to each such share as if it were a separate project to determine the maximum amount of any grant which could be made under this section with respect to each such share; (3) no grant shall be made for any project under this section until the applicant has made provision satisfactory to the Secretary for assuring proper and efficient operation and maintenance of the treatment works after completion of the construction thereof; and (4) no grant shall be made for any project under this section unless such project is in conformity with the State water pollution control plan submitted pursuant to the provisions of section 7 and has been certified by the State water pollution control agency (A) as entitled to priority over other eligible projects on the basis of financial as well as water pollution control needs, or (B) for reimbursement pursuant to subsection (c).

"'(c) In determining the desirability of projects for treatment works and of approving Federal financial aid in connection therewith, consideration shall be given by the Secretary to the public benefits to be derived by the construction and the propriety of Federal aid in such construction, the relation of the ultimate cost of constructing and maintaining the works to the public interest and to the public necessity for the works, and the adequacy of the provisions made or proposed by the applicant for such Federal financial aid for assuring proper and efficient operation and maintenance of the treatment works after completion of the construction thereof. The sums appropriated pursuant to subsection (d) for any fiscal year shall be allotted by the Secretary from time to time, in accordance with regulations, as follows: (1) 50 per centum of such sums in the ratio that the population of each State bears to the population of all the States, and (2) 50 per centum of such sums in the ratio that the urban population of each State bears to the urban population of all the States. Sums allotted to a State under the preceding sentence which are not obligated within six months following the end of the fiscal year for which they were allotted because of a lack of projects which have been approved by the State water pollution control agency under subsection (b)(1) of this section and certified under subsection (b)(4) of this section, shall be reallotted by the Secretary, on such basis as he determines to be reasonable and equitable and in accordance with regulations promulgated by him, to States having projects approved under this section for which grants have not been made because of lack of funds: *Provided, however,* That whenever a State has funds subject to reallocation and the Secretary finds that the need for a project in a community in such State is due in part to any Federal institution or Federal construction activity, he may, prior to such reallocation, make an additional grant with respect to such project which will in his judgment reflect an equitable contribution for the need caused by such Federal institution or activity. Any sum made available to a State by reallotment under the preceding sentence shall be in addition to any funds otherwise allotted to such State under this Act. The allotments of a State under the second and third sentences of this subsection shall be available, in accordance with the provisions of this section, for payments with respect to projects in such State which have been approved under this section, except that in the case of any project constructed in such State after the date of enactment of the Water Quality Act of 1964 which meets the requirements for assistance under this section but was constructed without such assistance, such allotments shall also be available for payments in reimbursement of State or local funds used for such project to the extent that assistance could have been provided under this section if such project had been approved pursuant to this section and funds available. For purposes of this section, population, including urban population, shall be determined on the basis of the latest decennial census for which figures are available, as certified by the Secretary of Commerce.'"

(b) Subsection (d) of such section 8 is amended by striking out the colon preceding the word *"Provided"* and all after such colon to the period at the end of such subsection.

New York State Conference of
Mayors and Other Municipal
Officials,
Albany, N.Y., January 11, 1965.

The Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson,
President of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: On the 30th of December last, Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller, of our State, wrote to you urging that you exercise your leadership and influence to make the sewage disposal assistance program of the Federal Government, under Public Law 660, a more realistic and effective tool in the vital fight for water pollution abatement.

As representatives of the 12.5 million persons who live in the cities and villages of New York State, and on behalf of all 16.8 million of our citizens in the State, we, too, urge you most vigorously to take such action.

The money heretofore allocated to projects in our State has helped us to make significant progress in the water pollution abatement fight. Unfortunately, however, most of the progress to date has come about through the solution of the less complex and less expensive problems.

As reported by the temporary State commission on water resources planning, we now face the hard core of the more complex, more difficult, and more expensive pollution problems. These are our biggest and our worst problems. These are the ones thrusting the burden of financial hardship most severely upon our communities.

The relatively small amount of money allocated to the State of New York, and the strict dollar limitation placed upon each project combine to make the Federal program completely inadequate to help us meet our present situation.

We feel a particular concern because in almost every, if not every, Federal assistance program the taxpayers of our State pay so much more into the program in taxes than we receive back in assistance. In the particular matter of water pollution abatement we feel that the magnitude of our problems, like the needs of New York City where a single project cost $87.6 million, and with the allocation of Federal funds falling far short of meeting the requirements for the projects submitted for approval each year, merits our receiving a full share of Federal assistance for this vital activity.

We therefore urge upon you, most respectfully, yet most emphatically, the necessity and the equity of a program in which the Federal Government will assume financial responsibility for a full 30 percent of the cost of all approved sewage disposal facility construction, without any dollar restriction upon any project. We concurrently urge our State to assume a similar share of the cost, a program to which our Governor already has committed himself.

The citizens of the State of New York, and particularly its 12.5 million urban residents, urgently need and will deeply appreciate your utmost assistance in this matter.

Respectfully yours,
Raymond J. Cothran,
Executive Director.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT, AS AMENDED (AMENDMENT NO. 5)

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to S. 4, a bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended.

Last year, although I was in sympathy with the objectives of the bill introduced by Senator Muskie, and passed by the Senate, I opposed the bill because I believed it vested absolute power in the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, or in his Assistant Secretary, to fix standards of water quality applicable to interstate water.

The amendment which I send to the desk, and which I ask to have printed in the body of the Record, would establish procedures that would, at minimum, give to the States and to interstate agencies acting under compacts, municipalities, and industries which are directly concerned the right to be heard concerning water quality standards, promulgated by the Secretary, to present their views in a public hearing after the standard had been published and to propose revisions of such water quality standards; and finally the right of appeal to the circuit courts of appeals.

The procedures which I propose would assure justice to the States and other interested parties. They would not obstruct the essential purpose of the bill—to establish water quality standards. They would assure the standards which the Secretary promulgates are in accord with the criteria under which he is required to act.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be received, printed, and referred to the Committee on Public Works; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment (No. 5) is as follows:

Beginning with line 13, page 7, strike out all to and including line 14, page 8, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(c) (1) In order to carry out the purpose of this Act, the Secretary may, after consultation with the Secretary of the Interior and with other Federal agencies, with State and interstate water pollution control agencies, and with municipalities and industries involved, to obtain the views of such officer and such agencies, municipalities, and industries, and after such public hearings as he may deem advisable, prepare proposed regulations setting forth standards of water quality to be applicable to interstate waters or portions thereof.

"(2) Standards of quality prescribed by regulations adopted under paragraph (1) shall be such as to protect the public health and welfare and carry into effect the purposes of this Act. In establishing such standards with respect to any waters, there shall be taken into consideration (A) the use and value of such waters for public water supplies, agricultural, industrial and commercial use, the propagation of fish and wildlife resources.

"(3) Such proposed regulations shall be published in the Federal Register, and copies thereof shall be transmitted to all Federal, State, and interstate water pollution control agencies, municipalities, and industrial organizations involved. Upon request made within ninety days after publication of such proposed regulations by one or more of the States, interstate agencies, municipalities, and industrial organizations (referred to hereinafter as 'interested parties') affected, the Secretary shall conduct public hearings upon such proposed regulations at a place convenient to the interested parties. In any such hearing, interested parties shall be accorded adequate opportunity to obtain and present necessary evidence in support of their contentions, and shall be entitled to propose revisions and modifications of the proposed regulations. Upon the basis of all evidence received in any such hearing, the Secretary shall prepare and transmit to each party to the hearing his report thereon, which shall contain a full and complete statement of his findings of fact and his conclusions with respect to issues presented at the hearing. The Secretary may, thereupon, affirm, rescind, or modify in whole or in part such proposed regulation.

"(4) If any interested party is dissatisfied with the Secretary's action with respect to it under this subsection, it may appeal to the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which such State (or any of the member States, in the case of an interstate agency) is located. The summons and notice of appeal may be served at any place in the United States. The findings of fact by the Secretary, unless contrary to the weight of the evidence, shall be conclusive; but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Secretary to take further evidence, and the Secretary may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive unless contrary to the weight of the evidence. The court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Secretary or to set it aside, in whole or in part. The judgment of the court shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in title 28, United States Code, section 1254.

"(5) Such regulations shall become effective only if, within a reasonable time after being requested by the Secretary to do so, the appropriate States and interstate agencies have not developed standards found by the Secretary to be consistent with paragraph (2) of this subsection and applicable to such interstate waters or portions thereof."

AMENDMENT OF IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT (AMENDMENT NO. 6)

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, an amendment to S. 436, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes, which I introduced on January 12. My amendment is technical and corrective in nature, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred.

The amendment (No. 6) was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

On page 2, line 11, after "assigned" insert "annually thereafter".

On page 16, between lines 5 and 6, insert the following new subsection:

"(c) Section 272(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1322) is amended (1) by deleting '(3) an epileptic,' and (2) by redesignating clauses '(4)', '(5)', '(6)', '(7)', and '(8)', as clauses '(3)', '(4)', '(5)', '(6)', and '(7)', respectively."

BANKING AND CURRENCY SUBCOMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the Banking and Currency Committee had its organization meeting this morning. I ask unanimous consent that the assignments of the members of the committee to subcommittees be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the assignments were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY SUBCOMMITTEES

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Robertson, chairman; Sparkman, Douglas, Proxmire, Williams, Muskie, Long of Missouri, Bennett, Tower, and Thurmond.

HOUSING

Sparkman, chairman; Douglas, Proxmire, Williams, Muskie, Long of Missouri, McIntyre, Tower, Bennett, and Hickenlooper.

INTERNATIONAL FINANCE

Muskie, chairman; Sparkman, Proxmire, Williams, Neuberger, McIntyre, Mondale, Hickenlooper, Bennett, and Tower.

PRODUCTION AND STABILIZATION

Douglas, chairman; Robertson, Proxmire, Muskie, Long of Missouri, Neuberger, Mondale, Bennett, Tower, and Thurmond.

SECURITIES

Williams, chairman; Robertson, Muskie, Long of Missouri, Neuberger, McIntyre, Mondale, Thurmond, Bennett, and Hickenlooper.

SMALL BUSINESS

Proxmire, chairman; Robertson, Sparkman, Douglas, Neuberger, McIntyre, Mondale, Tower, Thurmond, and Hickenlooper.

AUTHORITY TO FILE REPORT TOMORROW ON S. 3, APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT BILL

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may file a report tomorrow, Wednesday, January 27, irrespective of whether the Senate be in session, on S. 3, the Appalachian regional development bill, this report to come from me through the Committee on Public Works.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF INDIANA DUNES NATIONAL LAKESHORE BILL

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing the names of the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], and the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] be added as additional cosponsors of S. 360, to establish the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore.

This makes a total of 33 Senators, which is an imposing number.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] be added to S. 507 at the next printing of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at its next printing the name of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] be added as a cosponsor of S. 100, a bill to establish a Department of Education.

I also ask unanimous consent that at its next printing the names of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE] be added as cosponsors of S. 488, a bill to amend title V of the Social Security Act to assist States and communities to establish programs for the identification, care, and treatment of children who are or are in danger of becoming emotionally disturbed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

WEST COAST DISASTER RELIEF—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of the bill, S. 327, the names of the Senators from Alaska [Mr. Bartlett and Mr. Gruening] be added as cosponsors.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RIVER BASIN PLANNING—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hartke] be added as a cosponsor to S. 21, the river basin planning bill which I recently introduced, and that his name be shown on the next printing of this measure.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR TO S. 618—A BILL FOR THE RELIEF OF NORA ISABELLA SAMUELLI

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, due to a clerical error, the name of the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pell] was inadvertently omitted from S. 618, a bill for the relief of Nora Isabella Samuelli.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that the name of the junior Senator from Rhode Island be added as a cosponsor at the next printing of S. 618.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Under authority of the orders of the Senate, as indicated below, the following names have been added as additional cosponsors for the following bills:

Authority of January 6, 1965:

S. 30. A bill to establish a National Economic Conversion and Diversification Commission, and for other purposes: Senators Bartlett, Burdick, Church, Gore, Inouye, Kennedy of New York, McGee, Metcalf, Mondale, Moss, Muskie, Neuberger, Scott, and Yarborough.

Authority of January 7, 1965:

S. 316. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes: Senators Bass, Bayh, Burdick, Clark, Dodd, Douglas, Fong, Gruening, Hart, Hartke, Inouye, McGee, McGovern, McIntyre, Mondale, Montoya, Morse, Moss, Muskie, Nelson, Neuberger, Ribicoff, Tydings, Williams of New Jersey, Yarborough, and Young of Ohio.

Authority of January 8, 1965:

S. 362. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code (relating to highways) in order to authorize appropriations to assist the States in the purchase of lands and easements for scenic purposes along Federal-aid highways: Senators Church, Fong, Gruening, Hart, Inouye, Neuberger, Randolph, and Williams of New Jersey.

Authority of January 12, 1965:

S. 438. A bill to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to regulate the manufacture, compounding, processing, distribution, delivery, and possession of habit-forming barbiturate drugs, amphetamine, and other habit-forming central nervous system stimulant drugs, and other drugs that have a potential for abuse resulting in psychotoxic effects or antisocial behavior: Senators Burdick, Fong, Hart, Hartke, Kennedy of New York, Montoya, Ribicoff, and Yarborough.

Authority of January 15, 1965:

S. 558. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to carry out certain programs to develop and expand foreign markets for U.S. products, and to provide more effectively for assistance in the financing of certain foreign sales which are affected with the national interest: Senators Bartlett, Long of Missouri, and Pell.

S. 559. A bill to regulate the labeling of cigarettes, and for other purposes: Mr. Bennett.

Authority of January 19, 1965:

S. 576. A bill to encourage physicians and dentists who have received student loans under programs established pursuant to title VII of the Public Health Service Act to practice their professions in areas having a shortage of physicians or dentists: Mr. Allott and Mr. Long of Missouri.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON GOLD RESERVE REQUIREMENTS

Mr. ROBERTSON. In accordance with the President's request that top priority be given by the Banking and Currency Committee to the administration's proposals for amendments to the Nation's gold reserve requirements, I have agreed to introduce the administration's bill on the subject. I understand this will be transmitted to the Congress on January 28, at the same time as the President's economic message.

Also, in accordance with the President's request for prompt action on the administration bill, I have scheduled hearings on that bill before the full Banking and Currency Committee, beginning February 2, 1964, following my policy to give immediate attention to proposals on which the President has requested prompt action, regardless of my personal views on such proposals.

In addition to the administration bill, which I expect to introduce Thursday when it is received from the Secretary of the Treasury, Senator Douglas has today introduced a bill on this subject, which would repeal the gold reserve requirements entirely. The hearings beginning February 2, 1965, will also include the consideration of this bill.

Any persons who wish to appear and testify before the committee on these bills are requested to notify Matthew Hale, chief of staff, Senate Banking and Currency Committee, room 5300, New Senate Office Building, telephone 225-3921.

I ask unanimous consent that a statement I made on January 23 be inserted in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement by Senator A. Willis Robertson, Democrat, of Virginia, Chairman, Senate Committee on Banking and Currency

At a conference of Senate leaders at the White House last night, the President expressed interest in prompt action on the administration bill to amend the Nation's gold reserve requirements. This bill is to be sent to the Congress January 28, along with the President's economic message.

In view of the President's interest in prompt action on the bill, and in view of the heavy legislative program which the Senate will face later in the session, I will introduce, at the President's request, the administration bill on January 28. I have scheduled hearings before the full Banking and Currency Committee, beginning February 2, 1964.

The proposed legislation is of great importance to our domestic monetary system, and to our financial relations with foreign nations. It is, therefore, just as important that our hearings should be thorough and careful as it is that action should be prompt.

We plan to hear testimony from witnesses in support of the bill, starting with the Secretary of the Treasury and the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, on February 2, 3, and 4. The next week, February 9, 10, and 11, we expect to hear witnesses opposing the bill or proposing changes in it.

We shall, of course, be glad to receive statements and briefs from the public on the matter. However, in view of the desire of the President to give this matter top priority, we plan to limit the witnesses who appear to representatives of interested groups or to persons with some special knowledge or experience whose testimony would be of benefit to the committee and to the Senate.

During the consideration of the bill, and the important monetary questions which will be involved, I trust that the President will renew his statement in support of "the Federal Reserve's traditional independence within the Government," which he made on October 26.

I trust the President will also express his determination to take any action necessary to correct the unfavorable balance of payments, which has been such an important factor in reducing our gold reserves, including careful review of the tremendous flow of dollars through the foreign aid programs and military expenditures around the world.

PRESIDENTIAL INABILITY—NOTICE OF HEARING

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments of the Committee on the Judiciary, I wish to announce forthcoming hearings on Senate Joint Resolution 1, an amendment dealing with presidential inability and the filling of vacancies in the office of Vice President.

Because extensive hearings held in the 2d session of the 88th Congress resulted in the passage of an identical measure, we hope to limit our hearings to 1 day. The hearing is scheduled to begin at 10 o'clock a.m. on January 29, 1965, in room 2228 of the New Senate Office Building.

Due to the almost complete unanimity of agreement in the Senate on Senate Joint Resolution 1, which is a proposal identical with the one which was passed in the last session by a vote of 65 to 0, we hope to confine the hearings to 1 day.

I ask unanimous consent to have the names of Senator Allott, Senator Kennedy of Massachusetts, Senator Kennedy of New York, and the majority whip, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long] added to the list of cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 1, at its next printing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARRIS in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

An address by Senator A. S. MIKE MONRONEY to the Aero Club of Washington on January 26, 1965.

PRESENTATION OF GAVELS TO PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I have been given a pleasant duty today by a good citizen of my State, Mr. Tom Martin, of Atlanta, a woodworker, whose hobby is making gavels. He has made gavels and presented them to recent Presidents and Vice Presidents of the United States and to the Speakers of the House, including the present Speaker.

It is my privilege to present, if the Presiding Officer will accept them, these gavels from Mr. Tom Martin, of Atlanta, Tex., a citizen of good character.

The first gavel is made of wood from a pecan tree and bears on it the six flags that have flown over Texas—those of France, Spain, Mexico, the Republic of Texas, the Confederacy, and the 50-star present U.S. flag.

The other gavel is made from wood of trees from three States.

This is the executive gavel made from woods from the States of Texas, Minnesota, and Massachusetts, and bears upon each kind of wood the likenesses of the President of the United States, Lyndon Baines Johnson, Vice President HUBERT HORATIO HUMPHREY, and the Speaker of the House, JOHN W. MCCORMACK. Each of the woods of the respective States has the name of the State placed upon it.

If the Vice President will receive them, on behalf of the citizens of the State I represent, I should like to present them to him, with the request that some time during this session the Vice President will use these gavels in presiding over the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair gratefully accepts these gavels.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I hold in my hand the letter which describes the woods of the respective States, which I send to the Vice President along with the gavels.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The letter will be also gratefully received.

NOMINATION OF CURTIS E. LEMAY TO BE A FULL GENERAL IN RETIREMENT

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the Executive Calendar of the Senate again reflects the name of Gen. Curtis E. LeMay in connection with the confirmation of his appointment in retirement as a full general. As General LeMay is slated for early retirement, perhaps this is the last time his name will appear on our Executive Calendar.

General LeMay leaves big tracks on the pages of history. He has been one of the truly great leaders of our military forces for more than three decades. His outstanding leadership began in his youthful days as a fighting pilot and a unit commander in World War II, when his achievements were of the highest possible order as a fighter, as a leader, and as a strategist.

Following World War II, General LeMay was far in the forefront in planning and developing our present Air Force. Further, he has often been properly called the chief architect of the Strategic Air Command of the Air Force, and he has been its foremost authority and commander for many years. More recently he has served with great distinction as Chief of Staff of the Air Force.

General LeMay is no ordinary man. He has great courage, foresight, and skill. He is a doer of many things. While he has always striven for the utmost in attainment, he has never been an extremist. He is a man of rare judgment and discretion. His judgment can always be relied upon and has been relied upon and often followed by Congress, over which, of course, he had no control, but an abundance of persuasion and respect.

Further, he inspires confidence, and has never betrayed it. He made us a strong nation in air power and has been a tremendous influence for good in his great profession.

Senators who have dealt with General LeMay and who are familiar with his record appreciate his great services and fine patriotism, his upright character, and the honorable course he has always followed and inspired others to follow with him.

General LeMay has richly earned, and I hope that he will enjoy, many more years of satisfaction and the blessings and thanks of our Nation and the gratitude of humanity.

PRIVATE HOSPITAL INSURANCE FOR THE AGED THROUGH SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the sharply rising cost of hospital care is one of the principal reasons behind the proposal to provide private hospital insurance to the aged through social security.

The hospitals of this country have been faced with a serious problem resulting from public assistance programs which pay for only a portion of the cost of charity patients; in effect, a payments gap. The hospitals, of course, must find some way to continue to operate and so regular patients must pay higher costs in order to make up, at least partially, for the welfare patients. Additionally these patients, many of whom have modest incomes themselves, also pay taxes in order to provide public assistance. Thus, they are carrying a double burden.

The King-Anderson bill would help the hospitals tremendously by paying the reasonable costs of care for the aged. The King-Anderson bill also provides alternative care when medically advisable to the more expensive hospital care.

The American Hospital Association is deeply concerned about the fiscal difficulties which confront hospitals under existing public assistance programs. The American Hospital Association has made significant contributions to improvements in hospital care and in planning designed to modernize our hospital system.

An article by Eve Edstrom in the Washington Post of January 17 deals with the problems I have just mentioned. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEDICARE IS SEEN AS COST STABILIZER

(By Eve Edstrom)

The administration's medicare plan for the aged could well have a stabilizing effect on hospital costs.

This is because hospitals take care of many charity patients. Sometimes the hospitals receive partial reimbursement, sometimes they do not.

Thus, the cost of caring for these patients is reflected in the bills paid by patients who can afford care. And this is one reason why hospital bills have gone up and up.

But the administration's medicare proposal would reimburse the hospitals for all reasonable costs of caring for the aged. This would represent a stable source of income to hospitals and, according to supporters of the plan, should act as a brake on spiraling hospital costs.

UNKNOWNS PLAY ROLE

However, critics of medicare point out there are many unknown factors that could continue hospital costs on their sky-high path.

For example, the nonprofit hospitals are exempt from Federal minimum wage, unemployment compensation and collective bargaining laws. If legislative attempts to remove these exemptions are successful, the American Hospital Association predicts that hospital costs could go up at least one-third.

Critics also insist that once financial barriers to hospital care for the aged are removed, there will be such excessive demands on the hospitals that an ever-increasing number of new hospital beds will be needed.

This expressed fear does not square with the often voiced contention of the medical profession that all of the aged who need care are getting it and, therefore, medicare is not necessary.

CONTROL HOSPITALIZATION

The argument that medicare will bring the aged to hospitals in droves also overlooks the fact that the very doctors who now admit patients to hospitals will be responsible for admitting the aged under medicare.

It will not be the Federal Government but the physician of the patient's own choice who will make the arrangements for hospitalization. Thus, the proposed legislation relies on the ethical judgment of doctors to see that patients get care only when they need it.

Furthermore, the legislation would require the establishment of local review panels of doctors to keep a continuing check on hospital admissions for the purpose of making certain that the services offered were medically necessary.

However, there is no question that passage of medicare would result in more of the aged being admitted to hospitals. Experience under such health insurance plans as Blue Cross has shown that as greater numbers of people are protected against the high cost of health care, there is greater use of health facilities.

MORE BEDS NEEDED

The estimates on which the administration's medicare plan is based indicate that there will be about a 4-percent increase in the overall need for hospital beds. The chief of the American Hospital Association's Washington office, Kenneth Williamson, thinks the increase will be greater.

But Williamson points out that many smaller communities already have more hospital beds than they can use. And in metropolitan centers, where shortages of hospital beds usually exist, there also are a number of old, big hospital plants that could accommodate more beds if space was used more efficiently.

Thus, medicare could act as a spur to redirecting more of the Hill-Burton funds for hospital construction to modernizing hospital plants instead of constructing new hospitals. This has been an objective of the American Hospital Association.

The American Hospital Association is not opposed to financing a health care plan for the aged through social security, as the American Medical Association is. And the American Hospital Association believes that the administration's medicare bill, as now drafted, meets most of the objections it registered against previous bills. It does object, however, to making benefits available to all persons over 65 regardless of their income.

But supporters of medicare say that any plan geared to income levels will result in a means test to qualify persons for care. Health care for the aged, they emphasize, should be available as a matter of right. And they insist that they have enough favorable votes in Congress this year to make that right a reality.

UTILIZATION OF ELECTRONIC DATA-PROCESSING SYSTEMS IN SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks excerpts from an article entitled "Data Center Is Planned," published in the January 15, 1965, issue of the New York Times.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, this article reports another instance of what I believe to be a most important development in small business utilization of electronic data-processing systems. The National Retail Merchants Association has announced plans to establish a data-processing service center for use by smaller and medium-sized retail stores.

It should also interest Senators to know that those attending the convention, where this announcement was made, heard what I am sure was a very stimulating address by our distinguished minority leader, Senator DIRKSEN.

Mr. President, smaller merchants will be able to obtain the services of the data-processing center at a group rate, reported to be at least 50 percent lower than the cost would be without group participation. Spokesmen for the association stated that these stores will now be able to obtain, more quickly, data on weekly sales in dollars and units, weekly or monthly inventory and purchase information and cumulative totals, better merchandising control, more detailed and revealing budgeting information, and more useful accounting reports.

With more adequate and more current information about their operations, these smaller merchants will be able to compete more vigorously with larger retailers who already utilize electronic data-processing systems as a beneficial management tool.

Mr. President, I had occasion to comment a few days ago that better management and better tools for management are among the greatest needs of small businesses. It pleases me to note the great good sense demonstrated by these smaller merchants who have recognized a common need for improved management, and have acted cooperatively to meet that need in a way which minimizes costs.

I am aware of other instances where groups of businessmen have joined together to procure electronic data-processing services, which would have been too costly for any one of them acting individually. It occurs to me, however, that this opportunity may not be widely known or appreciated.

As chairman of the Select Committee on Small Business, I have directed the staff of the committee to conduct a study of the extent to which small businessmen may be using electronic data-processing systems, arrangements for minimizing the cost of such services, how this subject might be included in the management assistance program of the Small Business Administration, and the extent to which electronic equipment of Government agencies may be used during idle hours by small businesses on a reimbursable basis.

EXHIBIT 1

DATA CENTER IS PLANNED

(By Leonard Sloane)

A plan to provide small retailers with the same advantages of electronic data processing as enjoyed by big department stores was outlined here yesterday by the National Retail Merchants Association.

The program was announced on the final day of the association's 4-day convention at the New York Hilton Hotel.

It calls for the use of a data-processing service center by smaller merchants at a group rate said to be at least 50 percent lower than what it would cost them individually.

The group data-processing project of the association will be run by its smaller stores division, whose members have a total of some 1,700 department and specialty stores.

It was explained at a news conference by Harold S. Garber, general manager of Garber's in Staten Island and chairman of the division's electronic data-processing committee.

COSTS ARE BIG FACTOR

Mr. Garber termed the idea, under consideration for 2½ years, a way to obtain "minimum processing costs for smaller and medium-sized stores that would enable them to benefit from the many advantages of electronic data-processing systems without having to invest large amounts of capital in computers or other expensive electronic equipment."

Among the information that stores could quickly obtain through this program is weekly sales data in dollars and units, weekly or monthly inventory and purchase information and accumulative totals.

Mr. Garber noted that the association had made an arrangement with the firm of Lennox & Lennox of New York, which operates a data-processing service bureau.

Stores will work with the service bureau on their own, he said, but would obtain the financial benefits of group participation.

BENEFITS ARE LISTED

Seymour Helfant, manager of the smaller stores division, said merchants would get "better merchandizing control, more detailed and revealing budgeting information and more useful accounting reports" with electronic data processing.

"Lack of adequate and up-to-date merchandise controls have contributed materially in forcing the smaller retailer to lag far behind his king-sized competition during the most widespread prosperity any nation has ever enjoyed," he added.

GOVERNMENT FARM PROGRAMS

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, the farmers of the United States, of almost every commodity, are in severe difficulty. Government programs over the past 30 years have maintained a floor under prices, but for many years this floor has been at a minimum, far below parity. The cumulative effect, therefore, after 10 years of operation at below normal prices, of steadily rising costs of operation, of the increased tendency of borrowing against crops not yet harvested, and against capital, has brought American agriculture very close to a crisis.

I am not talking about marginal farmers, or those who are engaged in part-time farming while working regularly at jobs in towns and cities. Rather, they are the farm families who have traditionally made their living from farming and who have kept up with the latest technological and scientific methods.

In view of the difficulties of these farmers I was very disappointed to read the statement in the budget message yesterday, as follows:

> With the help of the Federal Government's farm commodity programs, some of the larger and more efficient farmers are now receiving rates of return for their labor, capital, and management nearly comparable with the rates received in other parts of the economy.

I question whether that is an accurate statement.

To continue with the quotation:

> But in view of the market outlook for farm commodities at home and abroad, farming alone cannot be expected to provide a decent living in the future for more than about 1 million farm families, even with continued Government assistance, page 89.

It may be that some of the larger farmers are receiving these comparable returns, but it is certainly misleading to conclude that this is typical of efficient farmers generally or that it is characteristic of the traditional farm family operations in the Midwest.

The full-time farmers of Minnesota are efficient producers. They have adopted the best methods of technology and production. Their problem is not one of their efficiency but of low prices. From the production and efficiency standpoint they and other Midwest farmers are well equipped to make a decent living from farming—if they receive fair prices for their dairy, feed grain, and livestock production.

One of the major tasks of the 89th Congress should be to extend and improve farm programs so as to raise farm income and to keep efficient farm families in agriculture.

Mr. President, it is undoubtedly true that 1 million farms could produce all the food and fiber we need. It is just as true to say that 500,000 or even 100,000 farms could do so—if it is the decision that we want to adopt a corporation farm system in which farmers would no longer be individual owner-operators but hired men.

It would also be a mistake to conclude that some larger and more efficient farmers are receiving an adequate return because they are larger or because they are efficient. The present price support programs are an important factor in net farm income.

Last year Senator McGovern, Senator Young of North Dakota, and I asked the Legislative Reference Service to make a study of the effects of farm programs on net farm income. Dr. Walter Wilcox undertook this study. In his preliminary report last fall Dr. Wilcox found that realized net farm income, instead of averaging $12.6 billion a year as it actually did the past 3 years, would have averaged 50 percent less, or about $6 billion annually, in the absence of price support and acreage diversion programs. His further studies have sustained this conclusion.

It is difficult for me to believe that these larger units—certainly the 1 million referred to in the message—are really enjoying a return comparable to returns in industry, but to the extent they are, the farm programs make a substantial contribution. The truth is that the farm programs have been effective in several ways. Under the farm programs of the past 4 years the per capita income of our farm population rose from 58 percent of the national average in 1960 to 63 percent of the national average.

At the same time, and with these same commodity programs, we reduced our wheat carryover stocks from 1.4 billion bushels in 1960 to 900 million bushels in 1964. Feed grain stocks were cut from 85 million tons to about 58 million tons by the end of 1964.

These reductions in wheat and feed grain surpluses will save the taxpayers $640 million a year in carrying charges.

We have also increased our farm exports during the past 4 years to a record $6.1 billion worth in 1964—$4.5 billion worth of such exports were for U.S. dollars, and the remainder for foreign currency, credit sales, and donations under the food-for-peace program.

Our cotton exports are up 36 percent; animals and animal products up 28 percent; and grain exports up 23 percent.

It is difficult to conclude that these larger units referred to in the budget message are really enjoying a return comparable to returns in industry. We have already had hearings in the Senate Committee on Agriculture this year regarding the effects of moderate standards which Secretary Wirtz set down for citrus and other speciality crop growers before they could be certified to import foreign farmworkers. The Secretary set hourly rates at $1.15 to $1.25 which must be offered domestic workers before applications for foreign workers could be approved. We were told by representatives of these large growers that this places too heavy a burden on them and that qualified U.S. workers could not be obtained to do the work. We need to make some careful studies before we draw any conclusions about the efficiency of these large operations using hired workers as compared to the family farm family operations.

There are many farmers listed in the census figures who are part-time farmers. They have need for special programs. But there are several hundred thousand full-time farmers more than the million counted in the budget message who are efficient producers and who wish and reserve the opportunity to remain in farming. Their problem is one of low prices, of prices that fall far short of parity. Their welfare and their opportunity to make a decent living should be our concern also.

RETURN OF SENATOR KENNEDY OF MASSACHUSETTS TO THE SENATE

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I should like to say a word concerning one of our colleagues, the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy].

On the opening day of this session, I had hoped that the Members of this body en masse could pay tribute to him on his return to the Senate. However, because of the many other duties of that day, such an opportunity did not present itself. I feel certain that he, more than anyone else, would say that such an expression from this body was the last thing that he desired.

The first time I met the junior Senator from Massachusetts was shortly before we entered this Chamber for the first time. Since that time, as the days have rolled by all too rapidly, he has become my fond and fast friend.

I remember working with him on the floor of the Senate where he battled to do his utmost for those he represented in Massachusetts. I have seen him work in committee where, as most of us know, the real work of the Senate is done. I have visited with him in his home, and have become well acquainted with the members of his family; and I know of the warmth and spirit that exists there in the finest American tradition.

I have also seen him in pain and suffering. I know a bit about the long fight that was required to make it possible for him to join us in the Chamber today.

True, he comes from a great family, with a great tradition, but I, for one, prefer to think of him as an individual in his own right.

Today, I believe that it is fitting, as we pay tribute to a great human being who is no longer alive, to recall that history has been good to us in America—indeed, it has been good to the whole world, because history has provided great men when greatness was required.

Mr. President, I believe that the name of the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy] will be written in history as one of the great men. I personally say to him, my colleague and my friend Ted Kennedy, welcome back, and God bless you.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield for a brief comment?

Mr. BAYH. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to add my endorsement to what the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Bayh] has just stated.

We in Massachusetts were horribly shocked when we learned of the airplane accident in which the Senator from Indiana and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy] were involved.

I can say most sincerely that I have admired the courage, the morale, and the patience that my colleague showed during his stay in the hospital. Not only did he have good surgery, but the surgery would have meant little if he had not had the qualities that made him live up to what the necessities demanded at the time.

As I walked with him down the aisle in January, he walked straight and true.

In the days to come, I look forward to working with him for the best interests of our country and the State we represent.

As we walked down the aisle—and this is the second Kennedy I have escorted down the aisle—I asked him, "How many more Kennedys shall I be escorting?"

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, in June 1964, millions of men and women here and abroad joined in prayer for the speedy recovery of our junior colleague and Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy].

The Senator's presence now in the Chamber shows that our prayers were answered.

I join all Senators in rejoicing in the successful recovery and return of the Senator from Massachusetts.

A few years ago, a great and distinguished American wrote a book entitled "Profiles In Courage." I believe it is appropriate that a new chapter be added to that great book, a chapter relating to the courage and perseverance of our beloved and distinguished colleague, the Senator from Massachusetts, Ted Kennedy.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I join with other Senators in welcoming back today the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy], and in expressing admiration for his great fight after his unfortunate airplane crash. It is a tribute to his courage and tenacity that he has triumphed over his misfortune, and that he is here in full health.

During the presidential campaign of 1960, when the junior Senator from Massachusetts was on a campaign tour of Texas college campuses, I had the privilege of first seeing the Senator in action. On college campuses the polls had shown that the students were adverse to the party of which the Senator's brother was the nominee. I was with the junior Senator from Massachusetts on several campuses.

I welcomed him to Texas at Dallas.

At that time I observed his outstanding personality and how, on his first appearance, he captivated people who had previously been hostile to his cause. Having seen such a person with his dynamic appeal, having worked with him during the 88th Congress on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and having seen his diligent attendance at hearings and his hard and faithful work, I join other Senators in welcoming back the junior Senator from Massachusetts. We welcome him not only because of his personality and intelligence, but also for his devotion to duty. We congratulate him on his return.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I, too, wish to join my colleagues in expressing pleasure at the return of the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy], who, during the past several months, has been through a very trying experience, suffering in a hospital with a badly broken back.

Courage has always been a characteristic of the Kennedy family. I can remember when, 10 years ago, our late beloved President John F. Kennedy was seriously ill with a mysterious back ailment which kept him from the floor of the Senate for many months, and which probably threatened his life. Many of us wondered whether he would ever return, and we were delighted when he came back. We found that during those months he had written the book entitled "Profiles in Courage," which established his reputation as an author and which won him the Pulitzer Prize for American history.

Senator Edward Kennedy is not only a chip off the old block; he is a part of the old block himself. After being in an airplane crash and breaking his back, an accident which would have killed lesser men, and spending many months in the hospital, he has returned with the same undaunted spirit which his elder brother showed.

I do not wish to tell stories on the junior Senator from Massachusetts, but the first story I heard about him was in the campaign of 1960, when he went out to Wisconsin and the Northwest to win over delegates to the Democratic National Convention for his brother. He came to a place where there was a ski jumping contest. The final jump was, I believe, one of 65 or 75 feet. I am informed that Senator Edward Kennedy had never put on skis before that time, but that he then put on skis, went down the slope swiftly, made the 65- or 75-foot jump, landed on his skis, not on his neck, and came through that experience without breaking either his neck or his back. That seemed to me to be the most extraordinary act of courage performed in behalf of a relative that I had ever heard of. So I was perfectly prepared, knowing of the activities of his brother and his own past record, to understand the courage which the junior Senator from Massachusetts has displayed. We are very happy to have him back.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I wish to join other Senators in welcoming back to the Senate our distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy]. Also, I wish to express my personal admiration for the courage, determination, and patience which characterized his recovery, and particularly the pleasant and unselfish demeanor which he displayed throughout his ordeal. I look forward to serving with him in the days and years ahead with a great deal of pleasure.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I wish to join other Senators in extending a cordial welcome to our colleague from Massachusetts and to say how delighted I am that he is able to join us again. We wish for him a most speedy recovery.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I join my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in expressing my personal satisfaction that our distinguished colleague the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy], is back in the Chamber.

I hope that he will take care of himself to the end that he can represent his State in the Senate for many years to come. He has made a reputation which stands him in good stead. He has been an outstanding Senator. His contributions to the welfare of this body, his State, and the Nation, have been many.

I assure the Senator that, as the majority leader, so far as I am concerned, I should like him to spend a little more time in the sunshine in Florida, so that he can recover more rapidly. I assure him further that if he is needed at any time, I shall not be adverse to picking up the telephone or sending him a telegram.

The important thing is that the start which he has made, both in this legislative body and in recovering his old physical state of being should be continued. We value his services as well as his friendship. We wish for him the best of everything in the years ahead.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I know that the Senator from Massachusetts knows how I feel. Nevertheless I rise and join other Senators in telling Teddy Kennedy that everyone in this Chamber is delighted that he has returned to the Senate.

Every Senator has in his heart a prayer for the complete recovery of the Senator from Massachusetts from the tragedy which, several months ago, overtook him and my friend who is also sitting on the Democratic side of the aisle, the distinguished junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. Bayh]. We were deeply grieved at the accident in their plane trip into New England. To see the junior Senator from Massachusetts come into this Chamber, as we have seen him today, makes us all happy, indeed.

I wish to say what really needs no saying: All of us are happy and glad to see our friend return here to resume his labors for his country and for his State.

"POLITICAL ADVISERS"; "POLITICAL COMMISSARS"

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, during a recent visit to the Air Force Strike Command at MacDill Air Base in Florida, I was startled to see among the roster of ranking officers, a high official of our State Department termed "political adviser." I learned all I could regarding his duties. I learned also that this political adviser attached to the U.S. Strike Command in Florida and those attached to seven other major military commands throughout the world hold the rank of minister.

Mr. President, it is unfortunate that some bureaucrat in the State Department chose the term "political adviser" for these men whose duties in no way meet that description. It is an obnoxious title which immediately brings to mind the name or title "political commissar" of the Soviet Union who are assigned to units of the Soviet Armed Forces. They in reality are political advisers to keep the Soviet Armed Forces in line in support of the Communist dictators of the Soviet Union. Our State Department officials assigned to various installations of our Armed Forces have duties entirely unlike the duties of the Soviet political advisers. If the assignment of such officials to our major commands is necessary, it would be more advisable and certainly less obnoxious to Americans to term them "diplomatic consultants" or "foreign policy consultants" or "diplomatic advisers" or some appropriate and more suitable title other than "political adviser." This latter appelation is too much like "political commissar."

Also, Mr. President, I seriously question the need for State Department political advisers at command installations located within the continental United States. Certainly, the commander of the Strategic Air Command at Omaha, Nebr., can obtain all the foreign policy advice he needs merely by picking up a telephone with a direct line to the State Department or to State Department personnel assigned to the Pentagon or to the White House. I see no need whatever that a State Department bureaucrat on the staff be assigned to Air Force or strike command installations in any of our 50 States.

It would seem to me it would be a simple matter for State Department officials responsible for this policy to immediately discard the misleading and obnoxious term "political adviser" and to reconsider the need for them at all installations to which they are presently assigned. These State Department officials bear the rank and receive the salaries of Ministers in our Foreign Service approximating $24,000 per annum, and I am wondering if all of them are presently earning their salaries in their posts as political advisers. I do not believe they are rendering real and needful public service to our country commensurate with their high State Department ratings and salaries.

FREEDOM AND THE FARMER

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, one of the foremost observers of Americana is the editor of the Chronicle in Toledo, Iowa.

Editor David Ash has the wisdom and foresight so common to editors of rural weeklies. He and others of his kind are close enough to the soil to be aware of what America is and what has made America great.

A Jeffersonian, Mr. Ash is also aware that we are living in a world so swiftly changing that we are in danger of losing the principles for which America and its people have stood for so long.

His thinking was never so clearly set out as in an editorial in his newspaper on January 7. And in putting his thoughts down on paper, he also managed to set out guidelines for the Great Society. He asserts:

> Freedom and the farmer—these cannot be separated.
>
> Without freedom, the farmer is a peasant, a serf, or someone sucked into the proletarian city; without the farmer and his proud independence, his fierce integrity, we are doomed to industrialize and centralize ourselves into something too terrible to contemplate.

I commend the editorial to my colleagues.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, entitled "Freedom and the Farmer," be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FREEDOM AND THE FARMER

Recently much has been made of a great, all-embracing idea called the "Great Society"—and rightly so, since our people, our Nation must become great or go under. But exactly what are we to be, what are we to have, what are we to do, in order to be great?

It is not enough to be rich, even to share the riches more fairly; not enough to think big, talk big, even act big about our material abundance, our industrial capacity, our high standard of living, our broad acres, and our great accomplishment in producing and sharing food, clothing, shelter, and schoolbooks. Bigger and better things, more and more novelty and speed and luxury—these may seem to be the means to the Great Society, but our society will not be great, and our hopes will die a bitter death unless we ourselves can be great—not great in money and the things money will buy, but great, truly great, in mind and heart and soul. If our thoughts and acts are meanly confined to material things, our hopes will die, and with them the hope of the world.

The Great Society has been hoped for, dreamed of, wistfully desired from the very beginning. It is what many have called "the American dream." Over and over again that phrase occurs in one of the finest one-volume histories ever composed for the furthering of that dream—"The Epic of America," by James Truslow Adams. From the very beginning the dream has always existed—vaguely for the many, more clearly for the few. We in our time, we and our children, must make it come true. Otherwise we shall not have the Great Society.

The term Great Society may seem to us a new name for a new thing. Not so. James Truslow Adams was familiar with it in 1931, more than a generation ago—and it was not new with him. We have always known—that is, always a few among us have known—that here in America, and especially here in the rich farming section of the Midwest, the Great Society could and must begin.

We have always known—that is the few among us have always known—that the Great Society must be a free society made up of free men and women using their freedom actively, creatively, responsibly, to make the American dream at long last a reality.

We have always known—the few among us—that with all the freedom possible there must be all the equality possible, all the brotherhood possible. Each according to his ability and his opportunity must not merely wish and hope, but actively, generously work to keep that dream alive and make it come true: "Those on top, financially, intellectually, or otherwise," Truslow Adams asserted, "have got to devote themselves to the Great Society, and those who are below the scale have got to strive to rise, not merely economically, but culturally."

The present discussion seeks in Jeffersonian terms, by Jeffersonian means, to help us all remember that dream and work for that Great Society—to help us all remember that socially it must be democratic, politically it must be republican, economically it must be based on the proud independence of the freehold farmer. We cannot all be farmers, those of us who are cannot all own land; there must be professional and businessmen of many sorts, factories and banks, newspapers and schools and libraries, towns and cities—but unless we have among us freehold farmers and many of them, the Great Society has no chance. This was essential to the American dream—the healthy agrarian base for American life.

Hamilton thought otherwise. Hamilton believed that wealth was important—wealth and great cities. Hamilton sought first the welfare of rich men, of industry and banking. As Adams puts it, "Hamilton stood for strength, wealth, and power; Jefferson for the American dream." Essentially that dream was agrarian. Today, when cities grow and the propertyless many seek to vote themselves rich, we know that salvation lies now, as it did then, with not merely keeping but increasing the number of men who work with their own land and implements, their own tools and skills, their own stocks of goods, their own talents—not within some vast pyramid of industrial, mercantile, or financial power but independently, proudly.

We shall probably have always a few men who are rich, a few more who are poor, and we cannot, dare not, equalize the way the ranting Red and the whining salmon pink would have us do—but we can struggle to avoid the clotting of power and rotting of people in the big industrial cities. We can strengthen our small towns, our reasonably sized cities, and our healthy freehold agriculture as Jefferson would have had us do.

Only by such means, only through such men, can we build the Great Society—not a Hamiltonian society of spreading cities and roaring factories, but a Jeffersonian society with as few rich and as few poor as possible, as many freehold farmers as possible, as many independent merchants and mechanics as possible. If "alabaster cities" are to rise, "undimmed by human tears," they must be of reasonable size, the abode of free men and women dealing fairly with each other and serving the small towns and the rural regions around them fairly.

Primacy of the person. Many landowners. Many small farmers. Many small trades. These are the Jeffersonian republican essentials to the Great Society—not the city masses, the labor unions, the pyramids of governmental and industrial power, the fierce venalistic struggle between capital and labor.

Freedom and the farmer—these cannot be separated. Without freedom, the farmer is a peasant, a serf, or someone sucked into the proleterian city; without the farmer and his proud independence, his fierce integrity, we are doomed to industrialize and centralize ourselves into something too terrible to contemplate.

CLOSING OF VA HOSPITALS

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, many Senators are protesting the proposed closing of Veterans' Administration facilities throughout the country.

I believe any such action should be postponed until a thorough investigation is made of the various factors involved.

It is my feeling that the first consideration should be the well-being of those of our citizens who have served our Nation in its hour of need. Once this consideration has been completely met, then the cost to the taxpayers is an appropriate consideration.

But that cost must be accurately measured, and it certainly is in order to include in that measurement the peace of mind to veterans and their families which any cost saving might affect.

I am pleased that the American Legion is mustering its full power to have this decision reversed.

As Don Johnson, the American Legion national commander, who comes from West Branch in my State of Iowa, said:

> The VA closing of installations is completely inconsistent with the announced objectives of the administration. It is shocking to learn that these men who made our Great Society possible cannot participate in the program to improve our society.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement by Commander Johnson and an article from the Cedar Rapids, Iowa, Gazette, of January 13, underscoring the impact of such a closing would have on the city of Clinton, Iowa, be placed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL COMMANDER DON JOHNSON'S STATEMENT ON VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION'S CLOSING OF VA HOSPITALS, JANUARY 14, 1965, WASHINGTON, D.C.

I wish to protest with all the emphasis at my command the decision by the Veterans' Administration to close 11 hospitals, 4 domiciliary homes, and 16 regional offices. These actions by the Veterans' Administration, and the manner in which they were executed, reflect a gross disregard of the needs of our sick and disabled and are in direct conflict with the announced aims of the administration to improve the lot of needy citizens.

In closing regional offices the Veterans' Administration has substantially decreased its ability to render service to veterans and their survivors. These persons will find it increasingly difficult to learn about and to obtain benefits authorized by Congress. The consolidation of regional offices is part of a trend toward centralization and automation which produces small savings at the expense of a great sacrifice to our veterans. VA's closing of regional offices is directly opposite to the expansion by the Social Security Administration of its field offices. The latter agency seems convinced that the best way to serve is to open, not close, its facilities for the public.

It is difficult to understand how the Veterans' Administration can participate in any war against poverty or in the establishment of an improved society when it closes hospitals and domiciliaries. The agency says that there is a decreased demand for the 11 hospitals to be closed, yet these hospitals will exceed in the current fiscal year the patient load planned for them by VA central office. VA says that these hospitals are obsolete, yet it concedes that for many years it has refused to expend money to modernize the facilities. VA says that it has had difficulty in attracting capable staff to the hospitals in question. VA will have a greater difficulty in explaining to the 6,000 patients involved that no care at all will improve their condition.

Veterans' Administration regional offices, hospitals and domiciliaries serve either the service connected or those who are in deep financial need. Repeated surveys have demonstrated the appalling financial condition of most VA beneficiaries. One conducted recently by the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, for example, established that of 19,000 hospital patients screened, the overall average annual income was $1,800 (far below the poverty level), and that almost 15,000 of the patients surveyed had no ready assets.

The plight of the domiciliary member is particularly pathetic. According to a study published by the Veterans' Administration in 1961, the typical domiciliary member is 68 years old, is disabled principally by heart disease, had no family, and has an income of $66 a month from VA pension. Where these men go and who will help them are questions the VA will have to answer.

The VA closing of installations is completely inconsistent with the announced objectives of the administration. It is shocking to learn that these men who made our Great Society possible cannot participate in the program to improve our society. Even if the estimated savings are fully realized—and this is highly questionable, because some governmental agency will be called upon to care for these people—there is no justification for the hardships and sacrifices to be imposed. This action by the Veterans' Administration, accomplished through the internal budget process does not reflect the will of the people nor the attitude of Congress. I call upon the Veterans' Administration to reconsider.

I doubt if it is the will of the American people that this society be built at the expense of those who have risked their lives that this Nation, under God, might endure, and who now find themselves in need of the services which their Government in Washington is best equipped to render.

I now call for a total mobilization of the efforts and resources of the American Legion to prevent this disastrous proposal from becoming reality.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION CLOSING BIG IMPACT ON CLINTON, MAYOR SAYS

CLINTON.—Clinton Mayor Harold Domsalla said the closing of the Veterans' Administration domicilary here will have quite some impact on the city's economy.

Officials in Washington Tuesday announced 14 VA hospitals and 17 regional offices around the Nation will be closed. The VA said the move will save $25 million a year.

Domsalla said the VA domiciliary at Clinton has one of the largest payrolls in the city.

"I'm not sure exactly how large, but the closing will have quite some impact here," the mayor said.

The target date for the closing is June 30, the end of the current fiscal year for VA facilities. VA Domiciliary Director Harold Jaffrey said the facility currently has 611 residents.

"I hadn't heard a thing until this announcement," Jaffrey said. "We had no idea it was coming."

The purpose of the domiciliary is to rehabilitate veterans so they can overcome disabilities and support themselves. In cases where rehabilitation is unsuccessful, he said it becomes "more or less an old soldiers' home."

Jaffrey said he didn't know the reason his facility was chosen to be closed, but surmised it might be because of the age of the buildings. The center was constructed in the early 1940's as Schick General Hospital, named for the first medical officer killed in World War II. It was closed as a hospital after the war and became a VA facility.

It currently has 174 employees and a payroll of about $1 million a year. Its current budget is $1,713,325 for the fiscal period ending June 30.

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the prevailing wind of human progress since the 18th century has been toward individual liberty. The political history of the modern world shows a gradual increase in man's freedom of choice. Nationalism is a symptom of this trend.

Colonialism was a respectable foreign policy until the national fervor of the subject peoples wore it out. The image of a generous mother country raising backward colonies to maturity could not stand up against a basic longing for independence. Colonial empires of the West have been blown apart by the insistence of the colonial peoples on their own national integrity. There is some irony in the thought that this independent spirit was stimulated by the political philosophy of the West. Nonetheless, self-determination is now accepted as the legitimate hope of emerging nations.

But in one large segment of the world dedication to a national identity is stifled. Colonial exploitation still thrives within the confines of the Communist world. Today we mark the anniversary of the short-lived independent state of the Ukraine. The strong sentiment this anniversary arouses proves the enduring force of liberty. To recall occasions such as this helps stem a very human tendency to take our own freedom for granted. People who have defended their national independence—whether they have won or lost the fight—have perpetuated and sanctified the principles for which they fought.

The personal freedoms of choice, expression, and association die hard. They live in the hearts of Ukrainians as they live for East Germans, Lithuanians, Poles, and Americans. Here in the United States they are protected by the Constitution and the rule of law. In Communist countries dictators are finding that the idea of freedom can infiltrate even a closed society.

Our thoughts today are with our friends in the Ukraine, who cherish a memory of independence and a great pride in that legacy.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, it seems a paradox to celebrate the independence day of a nation that is not free. But when the spirit of freedom remains unquenched in a people, after centuries of captivity, repression, and oppression, it is fitting that we salute the inspiration they give to all the world. Theirs is a resolution that is a reproach to the free world that merely looks on.

I speak of Ukrainian independence. Its anniversary is January 22; and we go back 47 years to that glorious day of power in 1918.

Though held in the bondage of Soviet communism, the desire and the determination of the Ukrainians for freedom are stronger than ever.

Our American neighbors of Ukrainian descent are such a great credit to our communities that we feel that their plight is our problem, and their vital cares have our prayers and our concern.

For over 40 years, over 40 million people have found a wall between them and the Western World of freedom. But theirs is a love of the land—a faith and a courage which have helped these fine people to endure through the centuries and to keep in their hearts their existence as a nation whole and apart from their conquerors.

Three centuries ago the Ukrainians fought the czar, who began the encroachment on their rich and fertile country.

In January 1918 they boldly proclaimed their release from the slavery imposed upon them in the 17th century. Three years of bloody struggle found this little nation unequal to stem the endless hordes from Russia.

Suppression—not surrender—was the order of the day, for the Ukrainians will never surrender.

History is on their side; and one day the millions of Ukrainian people will take their place among the truly free nations of the earth.

Today we salute them for their courage, and we share their dream of inevitable liberty.

Let us do all in our power to make that dream come true.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, once again I am pleased to pay tribute to the Ukrainian people on the anniversary of their brave proclamation of independence from outside rule. In 1918 the Ukrainian peoples declared themselves independent from the newly formed Bolshevik regime in Moscow. Two years later it capitulated to the Communist forces after more than a year of resistance against overwhelming military odds. There followed what has now become the well-known pattern of oppression. Under the Communist militant regime the Ukrainian heritage and culture were forcefully suppressed. The product of the land and its people was confiscated. Collectivization was enforced, Ukrainian nationalist leaders were persecuted, and the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church was dissolved.

This stands as a tragedy not only for the nearly 40 million Ukrainian people but a loss for the whole world. For the incorporation of the Ukraine has strengthened the Soviet regime, the enemy of freedom everywhere. And the loss has denied the free world of the dynamism, the talents, and the creativity of a great people. If the Ukrainians were truly represented, I am sure they would stand on the side of freedom. As a deeply religious people they are torn by the antichurch campaign relentlessly pursued by the Kremlin.

The Ukrainians were among the first to feel the heavy heel of Communist tyranny. But the spark of liberty has never been extinguished, and never can be, even by the most effective totalitarian system in the history of mankind.

The conflict between communism and freedom which started in European Russia has gradually spread throughout the whole world. In Asia the Chinese Communists are trying to convince backward peoples that their brand of ruthlessness is the best way to become a modern nation. In Africa the Communists will use any method to thwart orderly progress in freedom. In our own hemisphere they have set up a launching pad not only for missiles, but for terror and subversion to be aimed at every country struggling toward freedom and order.

But we have on our side the most potent defense of all—the instinct of man to be free. It is up to us to mobilize our economic and moral resources to demonstrate that a nation can make the transition from backwardness to stability and progress without sacrificing freedom and opportunity.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, once again, we observe an anniversary that should be a happy occasion but instead has tragic overtones.

I refer to the 47th anniversary of Ukrainian Independence Day, which fell on January 22, and is being commemorated today in the Senate.

It is important, I believe, to the aspirations for freedom of captive peoples wherever they live under tyranny that we make formal recognition of Ukrainian Independence Day even though the Ukrainian Republic existed as a free and independent nation for a brief span and has been under Russian Communist domination since 1920.

For 250 years, the Ukrainian people suffered under czarist tyranny, never once giving up their aspirations for independence. Tragically, their brief period as a free nation was followed by a Soviet dictatorship—even more brutally efficient than the tyranny of the czar.

But despite the oppressive machinery of the modern police state, the flame of freedom still burns in the Ukraine.

In 1957, I remarked that the observance of the anniversary of Ukrainian freedom had a hollow ring. Perhaps it still does today, because even the most optimistic find it difficult to visualize the early liberation of the Ukrainian peoples.

But nevertheless, it is both important and necessary that we publicly salute the brave and continuing struggle of the Ukrainian people for freedom and independence.

It is important to renew our protests against tyranny and suppression. It is necessary to remind the Ukrainians—the other captive nations—and their oppressors—that we have not forgotten them—that we maintain our allegiance to the principle of self-determination, and continue in our belief that it will ultimately prevail.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, on Friday last, the Ukrainians of North Dakota joined Ukrainians throughout the world in observing the 47th anniversary of the declaration of a free Ukrainian state on January 22, 1918.

Mr. President, I have here a press release prepared by the North Dakota chapter of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, and Gov. William L. Guy's proclamation on behalf of the citizens of North Dakota. Each tells a tragic story. But it is a story worthy of being noted by the people of America. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the press release and proclamation were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On January 22, 1965, Americans of Ukrainian descent in our State will observe the 47th anniversary of the proclamation of Independence of Ukraine, which occurred on January 22, 1918, in Kiev, the capital of Ukraine. This was the culmination of the centuries-long aspiration of the Ukrainian people. After two and a half centuries of foreign oppression and domination, Ukraine regained its freedom and national independence. The sovereignty and independence of Ukraine was recognized by a number of states, including the government of Soviet Russia. However, the Russian Government, led by Lenin and Trotsky at that time, launched a military aggression against the free Ukrainian state, despite previous pledges to honor and respect Ukrainian independence. After almost three and a half years of heroic and unequal struggle, the Ukrainian people, deprived of all military, economic and diplomatic assistance on the part of the Western Powers, succumbed to the numerically superior forces of Soviet Russia.

Since 1920 Ukraine has remained under the Communist and totalitarian yoke of Moscow, but it never has surrendered the spirit of freedom, nor has it given up the hope for regaining its full freedom and national independence. In the past 46 years the Ukrainians have amply demonstrated their love for freedom by the unceasing uprisings and large-scale resistance movements, such as the underground resistance warfare waged by the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA) against both the Nazis and the Bolsheviks. The Ukrainians paid a high price in the defense of freedom and independence, as they were ruthlessly persecuted by Moscow through a series of inhuman measures undertaken by the Kremlin, such as mass trials of Ukrainian patriots, mass deportations of Ukrainians to Siberia, and the systematic genocide of the Ukrainian people. Khrushchev, the deposed Communist dictator, stated himself at the 20th Congress of the Communist Party in 1956 that Stalin planned the total annihilation of the Ukrainian people for their resistance to Russian communism.

Today, in January 1965, the Ukrainian people in enslaved Ukraine are continuing to fight for their freedom and national independence. They wage a stubborn and ceaseless struggle by passive resistance, economic sabotage, and unrelentless opposition to the Russian alien rule imposed on Ukraine.

The U.S. Congress and the President of the United States of America have recognized the plight of the Ukrainian people by enacting and signing respectively the "Captive Nations Week resolution," which listed Ukraine as one of the captive nations enslaved by Communist Russia and entitled to full freedom and national independence.

Americans of Ukrainian descent in our State are planning to observe this memorable date—the 47th anniversary of Ukraine's independence—with appropriate ceremonies and observances. Last June Americans of Ukrainian descent performed an outstanding feat by erecting a statue of Taras Shevchenko in Washington, D.C., in honor of the 150th anniversary of the birth of Ukraine's national poet and Europe's freedom fighter. One hundred thousand Ukrainians participated in this event. A number of our Congressmen and Senators are now seeking to issue a commemorative postage stamp in honor of Taras Shevchenko and to establish a section in the Congressional Library in recognition of this great man and freedom fighter.

On this day of Ukraine's independence anniversary we should rededicate our efforts and our thoughts to the principle of freedom not only of the people of these countries, but for the freedom of all people in the world.

The struggle of the Urkainian people is a gallant example of human courage and dedication. Lenin, Stalin, and Khrushchev had been the most despotic oppressors of the Ukrainian people, and the new masters, Brezhnev and Kosygin, are the same oppressors and enemies of freedom as were their predecessors.

In honoring the 47th anniversary of Ukrainian independence we are upholding the right of all people to the God-given right to freedom and national self-determination. These are the basic tenets and principles on which our own great Republic has been erected.

The principle of freedom is indivisible. Therefore, we honor the anniversary of Ukrainian independence because we believe that the Ukrainian people, and all other people enslaved by Communist Russia, are entitled to the same fundamental rights as we so blessfully enjoy, freedom and independence.

PROCLAMATION

Whereas on January 22, 1965, Ukrainians in North Dakota and throughout the free world will solemnly observe the 47th anniversary of the proclamation of a free Ukrainian state; and

Whereas after a defensive war lasting 4 years, the free Ukrainian state was destroyed in 1920 and a puppet regime of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic was installed, later becoming a member state of the Soviet Union; and

Whereas the once free Ukraine is now no more than a colony of Communist Russia and its vast human and economic resources are being exploited for the purpose of spreading communism; and

Whereas the U.S. Congress and the President of the United States of America have recognized the legitimate right of the Ukrainian people to freedom and national independence by respectively enacting and signing the Captive Nations Week resolution in July 1959, which enumerated Ukraine as one of the captive nations enslaved and dominated by Communist Russia; and

Whereas some 25,000 Americans of Ukrainian descent now living in North Dakota have made significant contributions to both State and Nation,

Now therefore, I, William L. Guy, Governor of the State of North Dakota, do hereby proclaim Friday, January 22, 1965, as "Ukrainian Independence Day in North Dakota" and urge all citizens to demonstrate their sympathy with an understanding of the aspirations of the Ukrainian nation to again achieve its rightful inheritance of freedom and independence.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the great State of North Dakota to be affixed this 14th day of January 1965.

Attest:

WILLIAM L. GUY,
Governor.
BEN MEIER,
Secretary of State.
JAY W. BRYANT,
Deputy.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, today we commemorate the 47th anniversary of the declaration of Ukrainian independence. For 45 million citizens of that nation, the more than 2 million Americans of Ukrainian descent or origin, and freedom-loving men everywhere, this occasion can only be one dedicated to the future emancipation of an enslaved nation.

At the time of the Ukrainian National Republic's declaration of sovereignty on January 22, 1919, it appeared that the nationalistic aspiration of a people held in captivity since medieval times had been achieved. Tragically, this state of affairs was short lived. Within 2 years, this nation which had thrown off the czarist autocracy was overwhelmed by invading Soviet armies. Thus did these people, which had aspired for freedom through centuries of repression, see their dreams destroyed as they became the first victims of communist imperialism.

The first independence day was one of joy for the Ukrainian people; its 47th commemoration is one of sadness. However, it is a day on which we can look with hope to the future. No student of history can ever believe that Ukrainians will forget their dignity as a freedom loving people and as a nation. Communism has failed time and time again to destroy the aspirations of its subject peoples. We must continue to expose the hypocritical position of the Soviet colonialists and lend encouragement to the spirit of resistance of the Ukrainians and other peoples of the captive nations.

SENATOR SCOTT HOPES FOR EVENTUAL FREEDOM FOR CAPTIVE PEOPLES

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, January 22 marked the 47th anniversary of the proclamation issued at Kiev declaring the Ukraine to be a free and independent republic. All across our Nation, Americans of Ukrainian descent celebrate this day as Ukrainian Independence Day.

The Ukrainian people proclaimed their independence on January 22, 1918, after a struggle which had begun in the mid-17th century when they were brought under Russian rule. But their freedom was short lived. By 1920 Red army troops, in a pattern that was to be repeated time and again throughout much of Europe and Asia, crushed and enslaved the new republic. For more than 4½ decades they have suffered the grim tyranny of Soviet colonial rule.

Each year people in the free world have called attention to this oppression and have expressed their sympathy for the people of the Ukraine. In recent years these expressions have brought more and more violent replies from the Russians. Indeed, I have been attacked both in Pravda and in the Soviet-Ukrainian magazine Literaturna-Ukraine for advocating a free and independent Ukraine.

These reactions show that the Soviet leaders are very nervous about their vast colonial empire and do not want the world to be reminded of their crimes.

It is up to us to repeat once again that we in the United States do not recognize the oppression of the captive peoples, and to declare with renewed vigor our belief that they will one day regain control of their own destinies and live in freedom.

CLOSURE OF VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITALS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, when I discussed the action taken by the Veterans' Administration in announcing the liquidation of the Miles City Veterans' Hospital by June 30 of this year, I inadvertently accused the Veterans' Administration of being responsible for the delivery of approximately 86 hand computers to Senators. These computers indicated, if one turned the arrow the right way, just what type of hospitals were in the various States, and where they were located.

I apologize for that statement. Since that time, I have found that this hand computer, if that is what it should be called, was issued by the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and not by the Veterans' Administration.

SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION TODAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I do not find any clearance on the majority side. I ask the able Senator if that request has been cleared with the leadership on this side?

Mr. MANSFIELD. It has been cleared.

Mr. KUCHEL. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I now move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no reports of committees, the first nomination on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Frederick Lewis Deming, of Minnesota, to be Under Secretary of the Treasury for Monetary Affairs.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I rise to commend the President of the United States for the appointment of Mr. Frederick Lewis Deming to be Under Secretary of the Treasury for Monetary Affairs.

It is hard to imagine how he could have found a better appointee. Mr. Deming is a resident of the State of Minnesota and has for some years been engaged with the Federal Reserve bank located in the city of Minneapolis.

He is well trained by way of academic background, having earned his doctorate in economics from Washington University. He has been actively engaged professionally in virtually every aspect of the Federal Reserve System from 1941 to the present; but there is another aspect to the career of Mr. Deming that may not be as fully known, but which I think is very important with respect to the important and fundamental duties he will assume—that is, that he has been completely and wholeheartedly a participant in the community in which he lives.

He has been active in several voluntary organizations. He has been an active and guiding person in the field of economic growth and economic development throughout the Federal Reserve district which he served. He served on the board of directors of my alma mater, Macalester College. He was chairman of the World Affairs Center. He just completed distinguished service as president of the Minnesota State Junior College Board, a board and a program created through action of the last session of the Minnesota Legislature.

This is one of the most exciting and yet difficult new programs in the history of education in the State of Minnesota. Mr. Deming has, as its first chairman, provided magnificent and creative guidance for this junior college board during its first 2 years of activity. That program is now well underway. He was appointed by our great Gov. Karl Rolvaag.

The Governor personally asked me to advise the Senate of his magnificent and effective services on that board.

I take great pleasure and pride, and I know I speak for every Minnesotan, in endorsing and supporting the nomination of Mr. Frederick Lewis Deming.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of W. J. Driver, of Virginia, to be Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. KUCHEL. Over.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I personally am not opposed to confirmation of Mr. Driver as Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. I do not blame him personally for what has happened in the closing down and liquidation of various veterans' facilities, regional headquarters, nursing homes, and the like.

I want the RECORD to show that two Senators have asked that this nomination go over, but I think I ought to notify the Senate that there will be a certain grace period allowed in taking up the nomination, but at the appropriate time the nomination will be brought up for Senate approval.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. Let the RECORD also show that objection has been lodged with the minority against taking up this nomination at the moment. It was on that basis that I asked that the nomination go over.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I understand that the Senator is only carrying out his obligation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Without objection, the nomination will be passed over.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Paul R. Ignatius, of Massachusetts, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

U.S. AIR FORCE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Gen. Curtis E. LeMay to be a general.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to express my respect and high regard for Gen. Curtis LeMay who represents, in my opinion, the last of an era in the Air Force which came into prominence during World War II.

He has been an outstanding member of that branch of the service. He has represented the Air Force with great vigor and determination. He has been frank in his views and his statements and he has been so whether they were in agreement with any particular administration.

It is with regret that I note this outstanding general is to retire from the Air Force, but it is with respect and approbation that I make these remarks at this time.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. I join the majority leader in his commendation of Gen. Curtis LeMay. The Americal people owe this great American a never-ending debt of gratitude. In the midst of the Second World War, and thereafter, he has always typified the intrepid, courageous American airman ready to defend his country anywhere, anytime.

Gen. Curtis LeMay represented for the free world great military strength and great military vigor as well as great devotion to the cause of freedom. His leadership of our Air Force has been gallant and inspiring.

It is to the credit of this Chief of Staff of the Air Force that no one could dissuade him from speaking his piece, frankly and boldly, on the questions of defense of our country.

I happen to be an American who does not consider himself to be a military expert but who respects the kind of knowledge, the kind of wisdom, and the kind of realistic advice which the Chief of the U.S. Air Force has made to his Commander in Chief, and to the Congress. We are a stronger country because of him.

I wish for him many years of constructive service to his Government, as well as many years of happiness and success as he retires. We shall not forget his long years of service to his country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, major general, Regular Air Force, to be a general?

The nomination was confirmed.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the U.S. Air Force.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

U.S. ATTORNEY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Manuel L. Real, of California, to be U.S. attorney for the southern district of California.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I shall detain the Senate for but a moment. I am quite honored, as a Californian, to pay tribute to a dedicated and highly able California lawyer, Manuel Real.

Mr. President, Mr. Real belongs to your political party, not mine; but that fact is not relevant to the unanimous confirmation of his name for U.S. attorney for the southern district of California which the Senate is about to render.

We have many problems of law enforcement in California. This fast-growing State requires law enforcement of vigilance and of justice. That will be just the sort of public service which I have no doubt the U.S. Attorney Manuel Real will render to the American people during his tenure of office.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Manuel L. Real to be U.S. attorney for the southern district of California for the term of 4 years?

The nomination was confirmed.

U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Edwin Langley, of Oklahoma, to be U.S. district judge for the eastern district of Oklahoma.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Air Force, which had been placed on the Secretary's desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, these nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of all these nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On motion by Mr. MANSFIELD, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE WEEK

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the benefit of all Senators, the schedule for the remainder of this week will be as follows:

Tomorrow, the Senate will consider the veterans housing bill (S. 507) which was reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency today.

In addition, tomorrow the Senate will take up S. 576, a bill concerning physicians and dentists and their areas of practice, which we passed in the last Congress and which we hope will be reported to the Senate by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

On Thursday, the agricultural supplemental appropriation bill, to be reported tomorrow by the Appropriations Committee, will be taken up.

Also ready for floor action on Thursday will be the water pollution bill and the aid to Appalachia bill, which we anticipate will be reported from the Public Works Committee tomorrow.

If both bills are reported tomorrow, as hoped, the water pollution bill will be taken up on Thursday, as well as the supplemental appropriations bill.

On Friday the Senate will consider the aid to Appalachia bill.

There is a good possibility that discussion of this bill may delay a vote on final passage until Monday.

However, I would add, depending on the circumstances, that I would not rule out the possibility that the Appalachia bill may be considered on Thursday, but I wish the Senate would allow a little flexibility in this respect until we see how things develop in the committee itself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business?

FEDERAL CONTROL OF EDUCATION

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I ask that there be printed at this point in the RECORD a January 14 editorial of the Wall Street Journal on the question of Federal control of education.

I quote one sentence and commend the entire editorial to the attention of the Senate:

> Freedom is fragile if citizens are complacent about Federal domination of their children's education.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SCHOOLED IN COMPLACENCY

We would think parents and educators would be the ones most disturbed by President Johnson's education program, for it points more plainly than ever toward Federal domination. But Federal intrusions in this and other areas have become so customary that no great outcry is heard. Those who are troubled can make little headway against the clamor for Federal school money coupled with the general willingness to accept Federal leadership.

The uncomfortable fact, nonetheless, is that the education proposals the President made to Congress this week are sweeping; a "tots through teens" program it has been dubbed. The Government would provide aid not only from preschool through college, but also for a host of related activities from buying schoolbooks to supporting university extension projects. Mr. Johnson bills it at more than $1.5 billion for the next fiscal year, which he says would bring the Federal education total in his 1966 budget to over $4 billion.

Even that is only the immediately visible part of the iceberg. When all the school-connected expenditures of all the Government agencies—Defense and the Atomic Energy Commission, for example—are added, some estimates put the total at over $8.5 billion in fiscal 1966.

The recent health message, it should not be overlooked, calls for aid to medical and dental schools. The Government is already the major sponsor of the Nation's research and development, much of which involves universities. And all of this promises to grow in the years ahead.

The Federal Government is rapidly becoming the dominant voice in education, up and down the line, all across the land. That should be a startling development, no matter how much anyone may applaud the broad goal of improving education and no matter how much anyone may concede that education is largely a governmental function.

Governmental, yes, but the traditional emphasis has been primarily on the States and localities, these being far more responsive than Federal officialdom to particular needs and parental opinion. The arrangement has worked remarkably well, and yet the American people are apparently prepared to let a lot of it be swept away without even asking the fundamental questions: Is the Federal Government the best manager of the Nation's educational affairs, and is it wise to put it in that position?

To take the first question, the President stresses improved schooling, including preschool, for children in slums. Yet that work is in progress in a number of places, and more could be done if the Federal Government were not so busily preempting the tax base of everything and everybody.

In fact, there is hardly an idea or a project in the whole Johnson omnibus that is not already being undertaken by States, localities or private institutions. It is hard to escape the suspicion that the Washington officials want not so much to speed progress as to assert their authority in every conceivable aspect of education.

One trouble with this trend toward dominance is that no one can know what policies the governmental superintendents might decide upon. The policies might be terribly wrong, and they would then be wrong not for just a school district but for the entire country.

Certainly some of the best recent ideas—the Conant proposals for reform of teacher training, the new technological techniques, the broader phenomenon of a return to basic education—have not been the gift of Government but have come from a great many educators, interested groups and parental pressures. It is not at all clear they would have found favor in a system of federalized education.

Such, we think, is part of the answer to the question whether it is wise to allow the Federal Government the prominent roll it seeks. A further answer is that when the Government subsidizes so much so heavily it is going to exercise a considerable amount of control over its scholastic dependent, despite all protestations to the contrary.

If it is going to establish projects, build schools, buy books, grant scholarships and all the rest, it has to make judgments and exert pressure. In time those judgments and that pressure may be of a political nature that won't be to the liking of the American people, including the presently apathetic educators and parents.

At one point in his message President Johnson observed that "Freedom is fragile if citizens are ignorant." Passing over the fact that our traditional educational system has made Americans about the least ignorant of all peoples, we would suggest a paraphrase: "Freedom is fragile if citizens are complacent about Federal domination of their children's education.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works may be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the able majority leader whether his request has been cleared with the minority.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It has.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. McNAMARA. I wish to inform the acting minority leader that the request has been cleared.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the majority leader and the able committee chairman.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO GOVERNOR JOHN DEMPSEY OF CONNECTICUT

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I wish to speak in the Senate for a few minutes, not about a matter which will come before us today or even this week, but about the really tremendous job that the Governor of my State is doing.

John Dempsey has been Governor for 4 years. He was Lieutenant Governor and became Governor when ABRAHAM RIBICOFF, now my distinguished colleague in the Senate, resigned early in 1961.

In recognition of the fine administration of John Dempsey during his first 2 years, the people of Connecticut returned him to the Governor's office for a full, 4-year term, in the 1962 elections. And they did so with a resounding majority.

Governor Dempsey has done an excellent job in all areas, but I want to particularly commend him for the energy, thought, time and hard work that he has put into the solution of the problems caused by the deterioration of the finances of and services performed by the New Haven Railroad.

Until now it is only the State of Connecticut, under the able leadership of John Dempsey, that has taken positive, constructive steps to try to help keep the New Haven's commuter and passenger services going.

There were page 1 headlines last week when John Dempsey and Governor Rockefeller met with the press in New York and announced a plan they had worked out, for Connecticut and New York to contribute $5 million apiece, with the Federal Government matching this total with another $10 million, for the rehabilitation of old cars and the purchase of 80 new multiple-unit commuter cars.

And it should have been page 1 news, because I think this agreement between the two Governors is a major breakthrough.

I believe it will be the forerunner of important assistance to the New Haven Railroad, both from the two States and the individual communities dependent on the continued operation of commuter services and from the Federal Government.

Because this Dempsey-Rockefeller agreement is such a significant step forward, I will urge the court to which the trustees have applied for permission to discontinue the commuter services either to turn down the request or at least hold it up for a while.

Now that we have the hope of substantial assistance for the New Haven from more than one State, this is certainly not the time to allow any large-scale reduction in services.

And since this proposed joint Connecticut-New York effort is so important to many thousands of people, I think that credit for this achievement should be given to whom it is chiefly due, namely, John Dempsey.

For it is he who undertook the initiative last week. He sought out Governor Rockefeller at the Governor's reception and other occasions during the inauguration festivities.

The result of this, as we all know now, was agreement for the meeting between Governors Dempsey and Rockefeller on Thursday, January 21, and the program they announced at a subsequent press conference.

This is not the first, nor the last time that John Dempsey and the State of Connecticut will be in the forefront of the fight to preserve and improve the New Haven's commuter services.

Connecticut has already made provision to assist the New Haven, by authorizing in 1963 a total of $3 million to help defray some of the operating expenses and capital expenditures of the railroad.

And right along Connecticut has been contributing up to $500,000 a year for improvements made on railroad crossings by the New Haven Railroad.

Gov. John Dempsey has always had my respect and enthusiastic support and he has once again demonstrated his great qualities of mind and heart in his latest effort to help save the New Haven Railroad commuter service.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I want to join with my colleague, the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] in commending and praising Gov. John Dempsey, of Connecticut, for his determined leadership in the struggle to preserve passenger and commuter service on the New Haven Railroad. All of us from Connecticut are proud of the leadership our Governor shows in this and other fields.

If the other States do their similar share to save essential service on the New Haven, it will continue running for the benfit of the people of Connecticut. For my part I shall continue working with the Senators from Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and New York to assure Federal assistance to the hard-pressed railroad.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point a letter I have received from Chairman Charles A. Webb of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., January 22, 1965.

Hon. ABRAHAM RIBICOFF,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR RIBICOFF: Thank you for the letter of January 15, 1965, signed by the Senators from Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, and New York, advising me of the steps being taken to alleviate and resolve the financial crisis facing the New Haven Railroad.

As you know, the Commission will be required in the relatively near future to make some difficult decisions respecting the future of the New Haven Railroad and particularly its passenger service. I want to assure you that in reaching those decisions, the Commission will give the fullest possible consideration to your efforts and to the efforts of Federal, State, and local officials to solve the immediate crisis and to develop a permanent solution. To the extent that these efforts promise to be successful, the Commission's ability to protect all aspects of the public interest will be enhanced.

An identical letter is being sent to the other cosigners of the January 15 letter.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES A. WEBB,
Chairman.

SUGGESTED IMPROVEMENTS IN ADOPTION AGENCY PROCEDURES

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, last week I introduced a bill to help eliminate the interstate black market in babies and to encourage reliance on authorized agencies by prospective mothers and by peoples desiring to adopt a baby.

Yesterday's Wall Street Journal had an article outlining certain improvements in adoption agency procedures.

This should help relieve any anxieties on the part of the public regarding overly strict requirements and other unreasonable obstacles to parenthood allegedly maintained by the official agencies, and I therefore ask unanimous consent to have this informative article inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Jan. 25, 1965]

BOUNTIFUL BABIES: ADOPTION GROWS EASIER AS INFANT SUPPLY RISES, AGENCIES RELAX RULES—INCREASED ILLEGITIMACY SPURS TREND—REDTAPE, BARRIERS OF AGE AND INCOME DECLINE—THE PLIGHT OF THE NEGRO CHILD

(By Thomas J. Bray)

AUSTIN, TEX.—Five years ago John and Martha Kashan applied to the Home of Holy Infancy here to adopt a baby. They were age 35 at the time, had been happily married since their teens, were faithful churchgoers and Mr. Kashan held a steady job as a diesel truck driver.

After several interviews the adoption agency informed the Kashans that, while they met all other requirements, they were considered past the "desirable age" to adopt a child. In following months the couple applied at several other agencies and were met with similar refusals. "It was always the same—younger couples were given the limited number of babies that were available," says Mrs. Kashan.

Last March, however, the Kashans decided to reapply to the Home of Holy Infancy. Three months later they were given a 6-day-old boy. "You can't imagine how happy this has made us," says Mrs. Kashan. "We're thinking about going back and getting our son a baby brother."

MORE INFANTS AVAILABLE

Chances are they won't have much difficulty. Throughout the Nation adoption is becoming easier as the supply of available infants grows in relation to the number of couples seeking children. The Childrens Home Society of California, the States biggest private adoption agency, currently is receiving about four inquires for every child it has available; in the late 1950's, the ratio was 10 inquiries per child. This trend is causing agencies to sharply alter standards and techniques used in placing children.

Agencies increasingly are approving applications from couples such as the Kashans who formerly were considered beyond the ideal age for adoptive parents. Also, less emphasis is being placed on such things as family income and physical matching of child and parents. Miss Ursula Gallagher, specialist on adoptions in the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, notes that a few years ago the primary requisite for adopting children was the assurance the child would be "well cared for." But now, she says, "we emphasize that the child be well loved as a first consideration."

Easier requirements for adoption result from several factors. For one, the supply of parentless children is increasing fast due to the sharp rise in illegitimacy. Up to 90 percent of adoptions involve illegitimate children. An estimated 268,000 infants were born out of wedlock in 1964, up 24 percent from 1960 and nearly double the 1950 total. The rate of illegitimacy among unmarried women has more than doubled since World War II. Almost 1 in 40 births among white mothers is illegitimate and the rate is 10 times higher among nonwhites.

FEWER POTENTIAL ADOPTIVE PARENTS

At the same time, the percentage of married couples who are in the adoptive age group has declined because of the low birth rate during the depression. The supply of potential adoptive parents is cut further by important medical gains in treating infertility. "Five years ago we accepted as fact that there was 1 barren marriage in every 10," says Dr. Herman Kanton, a Dallas gynecologist and obstetrician. "This has been reduced to 7 or 8 percent."

The Negro child has a far smaller chance of being adopted than has a white child. Some 90 percent of the estimated 67,300 adoptions in the United States last year were of white children, experts say, despite the fact that 60 percent of illegitimacies—and thus a high proportion of adoptable infants—are nonwhite. Total adoptions last year were up from 48,000 in 1954. These exclude so-called relative adoptions, the adoption of a child by a stepparent or relative.

The plight of the Negro child without parents is serious because fewer Negro couples have the income or other qualifications that agencies insist upon in placing a child. Offsetting this somewhat is the fact that a higher proportion of unwed Negro mothers than white mothers decide to keep their illegitimate offspring. Nevertheless, many agencies have more Negro children available for adoption than they can place.

"If we decided to handle 50 white children and 50 Negro children, we might be able to place all the white children in a year's time," says the director of a large Eastern agency. "But we couldn't hope to find adoptive homes for more than 25 of the Negro children." The result is that Negro children more often wind up in orphanages or are shifted from foster home to foster home with little hope of enjoying normal family life.

Some agencies, however, are experimenting with special programs designed exclusively for Negroes. Last November the Children's Aid Society of Pennsylvania launched a "quasi-adoption" program for Negroes. Prospective adoptive couples are provided with financial support for the child and professional counseling while experiencing a trial period as parents. Even if the couple decides against adoption, usually after a 6-month period, the Pennsylvania agency hopes the couple will keep the child in a foster family arrangement with continued financial support. "What we're trying to do is insure the child a sense of permanency and belonging," says Miss Roberta Andrews, executive director of the agency.

In adoptions of both white and nonwhite children, a major effort is being made to impress upon couples that the procedure isn't as rigorous or prolonged as it once was. Hope Cottage in Dallas, for example, has trimmed the waiting period for adoption approvals to a minimum of 4 months from 2 years in 1961.

Adoption agencies also are abandoning the inquisitorial approach that often frightened prospective parents. In the past a favorite method of many social workers was to drop in unannounced to inspect the homelife of a couple. Now a couple usually is interviewed by a caseworker six or seven times both at home and at the agency on a regular schedule. Then a supervisory group evaluates the caseworker's study to determine whether it has been fairly conducted and decides whether the couple should be accepted or rejected.

"We take a much more positive approach toward the applicant these days," says Miss Helen Montgomery, executive director of New York's Spence-Chapin Adoption Service. A frequent complaint of applicants in the past, she says, was that they never knew how they stood until all the investigations were complete and they were either accepted or rejected. "By telling a couple early in the game what their chances are, we overcome their resentment and they are willing to talk more freely and honestly with us. This makes it easier on everyone and actually improves the couple's chances," she says.

EVALUATING THE PARENTS

Adequate housing, steady employment, and good health are among the basic criteria for an adoptive couple. But a caseworker also probes the emotional stability of the husband and wife and any other people in the immediate family. Adoption workers are especially on the lookout for marriages in which one spouse blames the other for their inability to produce natural offspring. This can be carried over by husband or wife into hostility toward an adopted child as a symbol of failure.

"We often have couples come in here because they think an adopted child will be the answer to a shaky marriage," says Miss Montgomery of Spence-Chapin. "We have to be careful we aren't placing a child with a couple who will break up anyway, after discovering their problem lies in another area."

At the same time, however, adoption agencies maintain they are putting less emphasis on finding ideal parents. "There is no justification for our seeking ideal homes," says Miss Rita Dukette, adoption director of the Illinois Children's Home and Aid Society in Chicago. "They don't exist, and to seek them results only in postponing placements and subjecting families to unnecessary investigation and delay."

Other techniques also help streamline the adoption process. The Children's Home Society of California uses a chartered plane to carry caseworkers and representatives into hard-to-reach communities in northern California, thus speeding the screening of applicants. The agency is also a firm believer in the value of public relations to attract couples interested in adoption. Since 1962 it has persuaded California radio and television stations to donate $100,000 worth of air time to publicize the agency and its services.

PUBLICITY HELPS

Such promotion can pay off. The Children's Home Society of Washington in 1962 began sending social workers into remote communities instead of expecting couples to drive long distances to Seattle for preliminary interviews; it also began publicizing the fact that it had an ample number of babies available. As a result, adoption applications showed a gain in 1963 for the first time since 1959.

To increase the number of potential parents, many agencies are encouraging couples with natural offspring to adopt children. Usually this is done in cases where couples are unable to have more children of their own for medical reasons. As with all adoptions, the adopted child acquires the same legal status, including inheritance rights, as a natural child. A southwestern agency estimates that couples with natural children now account for 20 percent of the agency's applications, "up from zero only 2 years ago." More agencies, too, are urging couples who adopt one child to agree to adopt another later, thus creating a followup market for future adoption.

In dealing with minority groups and low-income applicants, agencies are overturning traditionally cautious adoption policies. A young Negro Army officer and his wife who were visiting Seattle recently stopped by the Children's Home Society there. The couple had been approved by an agency in their midwestern hometown but that agency had no suitable babies available. Mrs. Ann Jamieson, director of the Seattle agency, decided to dispense with her own case study; instead, she promptly phoned the midwestern agency for a summary of the couple's background and then spent several hours personally interviewing them.

"Satisfied that we had a good, responsible family, we introduced them to a child that evening," she says. "They had another play period with the child the next morning and, by the afternoon of the second day, the three were en route to their home."

SUBSIDIES FOR ADOPTIVE PARENTS

The Diocesan Bureau in Hartford, Conn., a Catholic agency, occasionally subsidizes families in lower income groups when it feels they would be acceptable parents. Ed Power, agency director, tells of a Negro couple who had been approved to adopt a child. Before they received the infant, the husband's union went on strike. Financially pressed, the couple informed the agency they would have to withdraw their application. But the Diocesan Bureau gave them $1,000 to pay bills and, soon after, the couple received a child.

The Hartford agency sometimes provides money for a family to build an extra room onto its house to accommodate an adopted child or pays hospital bills to have a child's physical defect corrected. "We feel that an expenditure of $1,000 to $1,500 in these situations is a small investment," reasons Mr. Power, "when one considers that the alternative is to place the child in a foster home at a cost of about $2,000 a year." He adds: "We social workers have too long been penny-wise and pound foolish."

Mr. Power is quick to point out, however, that most adoption agencies exist financially on a hand-to-mouth basis. The Nation's more than 300 agencies generally are dependent on small amounts of State support or on community and individual contributions.

Agencies under State law generally are not allowed to make a profit on their services. But most ask the adopting couple to reimburse the agency for medical, legal, and other tangible expenses. Usually a sliding scale based on income is used. New York's Spence-Chapin, for example, charges $1,250 if the family's annual income exceeds $16,000. On the other hand, the agency often waives the fee completely, particularly in cases involving young couples.

THE GRAY MARKET

Childless couples can arrange an adoption without using an agency, of course, and a great many do. This constitutes what agency workers scornfully call the gray market. In such cases, a lawyer usually acts as an intermediary in the transfer of infants from unwed mothers to adoptive couples. "Doctors call me and say they are treating an unwed mother who needs help, and I find a couple who are interested in adopting the child," says a Dallas attorney who arranges several such adoptions a year. The attorney says he collects $250 for such a service, of which he says only $100 is profit. Adoption agency officials claim that, in many cases, fees are higher.

Agency workers also complain that attorneys who handle such adoptions often know very little about the prospective parents or the unwed mother. Thus, it is reasoned, the parents may not provide a good home or the infant may turn out to be unsuitable or defective. The Dallas attorney is inclined to agree. "Anybody with any sense knows adoption agencies can do a better job than a lawyer in placing a baby," he says. "But if the unwed mother, or the adoptive parents, refuse for some reason to go to an agency, what can I do about it? I'd rather have the girl come to me than have her dispose of her child on a doorstep somewhere."

Senator THOMAS DODD, Democrat, of Connecticut, a few days ago introduced a bill that would impose stiff fines and jail terms on any individual profiting from placing a child for adoption. Licensed agencies would be exempt. A similar bill passed the Senate last year but failed to clear the House. Senator DODD said his Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency had been told of "crooks whose charges for illegal adoptions have gone up to $7,000" and of "a ring of doctors, lawyers, and housewives that sold babies for prices ranging from $1,100 to $4,000."

There is evidence that the changing concepts of adoption agencies are cutting into the percentage of adoptions handled by individuals such as doctors and lawyers. Licensed adoption agencies handled 66 percent of all nonrelative adoptions last year, up from 59 percent in 1960, according to Federal figures.

COINAGE SYSTEM AND SILVER SHORTAGES

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, on December 4, 1964, my good friend and colleague, Senator WALLACE F. BENNETT, delivered to the Northwest Mining Association a most important and significant speech which deserves the attention of the Congress and the administration.

This outstanding speech, which sets forth a constructive and positive program for dealing with our silver crisis, takes on special significance when we consider the fact that Senator BENNETT, who is the ranking Republican on the Senate Banking and Currency Committee and third ranking member of the Senate Finance Committee, 2 years ago accurately warned the Treasury Department of the crisis that we are now experiencing. Unfortunately, few people in Government realized the scholarly insight that Senator BENNETT had in regard to our coinage system and silver shortages.

After his extensive study of the silver problem, the senior Senator from Utah has come to the conclusion that—

First. We should mint no more silver dollars.

Second. We must have a change in our coinage system.

Third. The sooner the change begins the better.

Fourth. The change should disrupt our present system as little as possible.

Fifth. The transition will be a difficult period.

Sixth. The Treasury must hold the price of silver below $1.38 until the transition is completed.

Seventh. The new coinage system must be one that will not need to be changed in the foreseeable future.

Eighth. Reduction rather than elimination of silver in our coins is most desirable, measured by the foregoing criteria.

Ninth. The price of silver, regardless of what is done must be released from the artificially low ceiling if we ever expect supply to equal demand.

Tenth. Congress must act on this matter early in the next session.

I recommend this excellent and thought-provoking speech to Members of Congress and to all the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the speech delivered by the senior Senator from Utah. WALLACE F. BENNETT, entitled, "Silver—1964 and 1965."

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SILVER—1964 AND 1965

(By Senator WALLACE F. BENNETT before the Northwest Mining Association, Spokane, Wash., December 4, 1964)

During the past year, the U.S. Treasury stock of silver has been depleted by about 250 million ounces. The depletion during the last few months has been at a much higher rate. In fact, if today were an average day, our stockpile of silver would have dropped between 1 and 2 million ounces. This is literally a raid, legal though it may be, on Treasury silver. Yet the Treasury is unable under present conditions to stop it. It is a raid, because the price being paid for silver is significantly below what it would be if the free market forces of supply and demand were allowed to determine prices. The Treasury is unable to put a stop to the raid because to do so in the absence of prior action to protect our coinage would leave us stranded without coins with which to transact business.

It is this dilemma that I have been asked to discuss with you today. Undoubtedly, our silver and coinage problems are going to be among the most urgent to face the next session of Congress which will convene just a month from now. Because of the tie between silver and our coinage system, this problem is not one concerning only the silver producers and users, but every citizen of this country as well.

PRESENT COINAGE SYSTEM BEGAN IN 1792

The coinage system which we now have dates back to the beginning of our country, and the first coinage act of the new Government in 1792. It has served well with minor changes since that time except during relatively short periods when inflation caused the silver value of the coins to surpass their monetary value and they were withdrawn from circulation.

We reached that same point again in 1963 when the first large-scale redemption of silver certificates took place at a price of $1.293 an ounce.

You are well aware of what has happened to the silver dollar that we used to see circulating as a medium of exchange in the Western States. At the $1.293 an ounce ceiling price held by the Treasury, they each contain $1 worth of silver and have therefore all been withdrawn from circulation. If the Treasury had not continued to redeem silver certificates (which in effect amounts simply to selling silver to all who desire it whether they present silver certificates or not) the price would have continued to rise and our coins would have been withdrawn also as they became worth more as silver than they are as money. Thus the Treasury has had no alternative to selling silver to all who request it.

ARTIFICIAL LOW PRICE INCREASES CONSUMPTION AND DISCOURAGES PRODUCTION

Holding the price at an artificially low level has been costly in terms of outflow of silver from the Treasury because it has made it necessary for the Treasury to supply the large difference in the supply and demand of silver throughout the world.

Holding the price low has also aggravated the problem by increasing consumption and discouraging production.

A few figures on production and consumption will show what has happened. We must go back to 1940 to reach the last year when production and consumption of silver in the United States were approximately equal. In that year, industry, art, and coinage needs in the country were about 68 million ounces and our domestic mining industry was able to produce an equal amount. Last year, domestic production was 37 million ounces while domestic demand or consumption totaled 221 million. This left a deficit of 184 million ounces, as the United States produced only about one-sixth of its needs.

The same problem, though not to the same extreme, carried over into the world scene. Free world production last year was 210 million ounces while consumption was almost twice that amount at a figure of 419 million. Most of the difference was made up by the U.S. Treasury as 185 million ounces were withdrawn from the stockpile. It is estimated that the outflow this year will be about 265 million ounces and that it will be somewhere in the neighborhood of 350 million ounces in 1965.

WARNING ISSUED MORE THAN 1 YEAR AGO

Quite obviously, at this rate of withdrawal, the Treasury stock, of 1.3 billion ounces of silver will not last very long.

More than a year ago, I warned that the Treasury and Congress must take action within a year or two based on my estimates of demand on Treasury silver. At that time, others were estimating that we had between 10 and 20 years in which to take action. Most of those concerned with the problem have now changed their time schedule to coincide more nearly with mine, but I am disturbed by the statement of one Treasury official as late as the end of June that we still have an 8-year supply on hand.

Looking at the Treasury's own estimates for use of silver, we discover that by July of 1966, there would be a balance of only 774 million ounces of the present 1.3 billion unless we make a change in our coinage system. At that rate of usage, the balance would last less than an additional 2 years and that would leave us with no stockpile of silver, no way tc hold the price, and thus no ability to protect our coinage system from withdrawal and collapse.

COINAGE CHANGE IS URGENT

Before our approximately 4-year supply of silver is used, we must have completed the changeover to a new coinage system or we will lose all of our coins, for their silver content. During the changeover, to prevent hoarding of present coins, the price of silver must be held below $1.38 an ounce and with the present demands on the mint, the changeover which will include a replacement of all present dimes, quarters, and half dollars cannot be effected "overnight."

It is difficult to estimate just how long it will take to replace these silver-bearing coins because the mint is working at capacity, around the clock, right now just to meet present demands.

It is possible that by flooding the market with 8 to 9 billion coins during the next year, the present shortage will be alleviated and the demand for additional coinage may go back to normal.

Normal, according to an Arthur D. Little study made for the Treasury, would be something like 4 to 4½ billion pieces a year. Actually, the needs may run more in the area of 6 billion pieces a year, but even at the lower figure, it would require 2 to 3 years at least to replace the present stock of 12 billion outstanding dimes, quarters, and half dollars while keeping up with the additional demand for all coins.

If it is going to require 2 or 3 years to make the transition to a new coinage system and the Treasury has only enough silver on hand (if every ounce of it were to be used leaving none for a defense stockpile) to last for 4 years, and the only way to hold the price and thus avoid hoarding of present coins is to sell this silver as demanded; the urgency of beginning the changeover in our coinage system as soon as possible should be clear.

URGENCY DOES NOT WARRANT STAMPEDE INTO UNWISE ACTION

Despite the urgency, this is no time to be stampeded into unwise action and unfounded proposals. I have been appalled at the many unsatisfactory legislative proposals which have received support from various groups. Unfortunately, none of the proposals made to date, nor for that matter, all of them combined, would provide a satisfactory solution or even assist in arriving at a satisfactory solution to this serious problem which we must meet and solve.

Several bills were drafted which would immediately double the price of silver. This may seem desirable from a producer's standpoint; but in the absence of prior action to protect our coinage, this would immediately drive all of our silver-bearing money into hoarding or the melting pot. It would also create chaos in the silver market and user industries.

A bill was introduced to prohibit redemption of silver certificates with bullion. The Treasury, as we have seen, must sell silver to hold the price and if it couldn't do it with bullion, it would have to mint dollars at an additional cost of $1 million a year just to have them melted down for use by industry and the arts.

A bill was introduced and passed authorizing the minting of 45 million new silver dollars. Even though I am from a silver producing State and like silver dollars as well as any other westerner, I think that this was unwise legislation.

I don't expect to ever see any of these circulating as a medium of exchange. I have heard that the offering price for them is above $2 each even before they are minted. I would like to get a few for the coin collections of my grandchildren. You, too, may get a few as souvenirs of the first dollars minted since 1935 and likely the last containing full silver content ever to be minted.

Minting new dollars with 90-percent fine silver is indefensible. They will not add to our circulating coin or money supply. They will immediately be hoarded either as rare coins or for their silver content, and there is no justification for such action depleting our silver stocks by millions of ounces.

Minting full 90-percent silver dollars is also based on the assumption that the silver content in our coins will remain what it is now and that puts the Treasury in an indefensible situation of holding the price of silver at $1.29 an ounce until every ounce of it is gone.

Another bill was introduced to reduce the silver content in the dollar from 90 percent to 80 percent. This would have made the silver value in our present coins greater compared to their monetary value than the silver content in the new dollars and could have resulted in withdrawal of all of our present subsidiary coins.

It has also been suggested (though I haven't seen a bill on this yet) to double the value of our subsidiary coins. In other words, the dime would be worth $0.20, the quarter worth $0.50, and the half dollar worth $1. In spite of its seeming simplicity, I have not been able to see how it could reasonably be accomplished. I tried to determine how it would affect our monetary system and finally decided that it wasn't practical, or desirable. To be sure that I hadn't overlooked something, I asked the monetary authorities of the Treasury if they were seriously considering such a possibility. I was informed that they had heard of the idea, had considered it, and had rejected it. It is not being considered now.

As you know, the whole problem of silver and coinage is being studied by the Treasury. They have asked for the assistance of producers and consumers of silver as well as Government experts. The study should be completed and legislative suggestions given to the Congress about the first of April.

GUIDELINES FOR ACTION ARE CLEAR

I will not try to second-guess what the results of the intensive study will be but I would like to suggest a few points which I feel are very important.

First, we should not mint any more standard silver dollars. In addition to the 45 million already authorized, Treasury estimates of silver demand include 100 million to be minted in fiscal 1966. The estimate suggests that a total of 425,700,000 ounces of silver will be used to mint new silver dollars with a full 90-percent silver content. Using one-third of our present stock of silver to mint dollars which have no value other than a sentimental one is unwise, undesirable, and indefensible.

Second, there must be a change in the silver content of our coinage system. We cannot continue to mint coins with a full silver content for more than a few years. If we don't make the change before our supply is used, then our whole coin system will collapse.

Third, the sooner the change takes place, the better it will be in the long run for all concerned.

Fourth, it is desirable that the change be such that it disrupt our present system as little as possible.

Fifth, the transitional period is going to be the most difficult part of the change.

Sixth, during the transition, the Treasury must hold the price of silver below the $1.38 level at which present coins would be worth as much for their silver content as they would be as money.

Seventh, the new coinage system must be such that it will not need to be changed in the forseeable future.

EVIDENCE POINTS TO SILVER REDUCTION RATHER THAN ELIMINATION

Within this framework of guidelines, I have come to the conclusion after studying the many facets of our problem and considering the alternatives, that the most desirable solution is a reduction of the silver content rather than an elimination of all silver and replacement with a base metal. As would be expected, the decision is not a clear-cut one. There are certain advantages and disadvantages in various proposals for change, but all things considered, I feel that it is desirable to keep some of the silver content in the coins.

Let me briefly mention some factors leading to this conclusion. An adverse psychological reaction to complete abandonment of precious metal in our coinage system is highly possible. We have always had silver in our coinage since the beginning of our monetary system. Even our paper money Federal Reserve notes have 25 percent gold backing. Certainly a reduction in silver would be far less disrupting than complete abandonment. Although the value of our coins has seldom been dependent on their silver content, silver has had a stabilizing effect and whether based on sound monetary theory or not, has given confidence in our money. This has been particularly true since the withdrawal of gold in 1933. The fact that our coins have had intrinsic value and that it has been possible to redeem paper money for silver has allayed justifiable fears of a system which had nothing but printing press money.

Another item which has caused little concern in the recent past is counterfeiting of coins. A base coinage could make such operations profitable, if the spread between costs of producing coins and the monetary value of the coins were greatly increased.

A third factor of great importance is that the new coins should have electrical conductivity properties needed to make them acceptable in pay telephones, coin-operated dispensers, laundries, dry cleaning machines, etc. At the present time, some silver in the coins is necessary to meet this requirement. If the new coins do not meet this requirement, they would be rejected by the coin machines. They would then be inferior to present silver-bearing coins, a premium would be paid for present coins and the elements that cause Gresham's law to function would interact. This would cause the silver bearing coins to be withdrawn.

SILVER REDUCTION NEED NOT RESULT IN WITHDRAWAL

A Treasury official said in a hearing on the coin shortage last June that "if you cut the silved content of the coin, you would have to make a law against hoarding or melting existing silver coins. Otherwise everybody would take existing coins off the market because of the old economic law that cheap money drives out good money."

The law is Gresham's law to which I just referred. The law is a valid one, but we must remember that our choice is not between leaving the full silver content as now exists and reducing it to some lower percentage. The content must be reduced. The choice is between reduction and elimination.

Certainly, if the new coins were to have no silver content and were unacceptable in coin machines, we could expect existing coins to disappear but if the new coins do contain silver and are completely interchangeable with present ones in all of their uses, holding the price of silver below the price at which it would prove advantageous to hoard or melt them should discourage any withdrawal of present coins. The present coins would not be forth more either in terms of purchasing power or in terms of the new coins. Thus, it would not be strictly correct to call one good money and the other bad money.

ABANDONMENT OF SILVER IS NOT INEVITABLE

It has been claimed that anything less than complete abandonment of silver in our coinage is just postponing an inevitable abandonment which would result from a reoccurrence of a situation similar to that which we now face. I cannot agree with such a claim. While I will admit that such an event is possible decades from now, I think that it is by no means inevitable nor do I consider it to be probable.

I am not a metallurgist, but I understand that the silver content could be reduced to about one-third and combined with other metals could result in an attractive coin with electrical conductivity properties similar to our present coins.

FREE MARKET CAN ADJUST SUPPLY, PRICE, AND DEMAND

If the silver content of our coins were reduced to one-third, this would allow the price of silver to reach over $4 an ounce before we would face a similar situation in which the silver content of our new coins equaled their monetary value. It is an economic law that as the price of a goods or service increases in the absence of offsetting increases in similar competing items, the relative demand for the one which increased in price declines. Long before the price of silver approached the $4 an ounce mark, substitutes would replace and satisfy some of the market that is now being met by silver. Not only would the demand decrease, but the increase in price would bring additional supplies of silver to the market, silver deposits which are not sufficiently high grade at today's prices would become profitable, exploration for new deposits would be stimulated, and mines that are now producing could well increase their production.

There is an indication that this is now starting to take place. U.S. production averaged 3 million ounces a month in 1962. In 1963, after the increase in silver price, the average monthly production rose to 3.8 million ounces and thus far this year it has approached an average of nearly 4 million ounces a month. Part of the increase may be as a result of firm lead and zinc prices, but we should not discount the power of increased silver prices to bring additional production. Recent estimates indicate a significant increase in silver production in the next few years.

I have pointed out that market forces will take care of the industrial and art needs for silver through price adjustments. What about our needs for coinage?

COINAGE COULD TRIPLE WITHOUT TREASURY SILVER

With a reduction to 30-percent silver, we could almost triple our stock of silver-bearing coins without using any of our present Treasury stockpile of silver.

We don't know exactly how many coins we will need each year in the future. The most reliable projections of needs are that as soon as the present shortage is overcome, demands will drop back to a steady increase as has been the case for decades. If the silver content is reduced so that individuals are not tempted to keep coins for their silver content, I agree with this position. Otherwise, I cannot.

In the Arthur D. Little study previously cited, it was estimated that we would need about 15 to 16 billion additional silver-bearing coins between now and 1980. That would give us a total of about 26 to 27 billion dimes, quarters, and half dollars at that time. Our present circulating coins have sufficient silver content to provide silver for about 36 billion coins at one-third their present silver content. This would give us silver enough to meet our coinage needs until almost 1990 without drawing any from the Treasury stockpile after the changeover begins.

It is very possible, even probable, that in the years between now and 1990, automation of transactions will have reduced substantially the number of coins needed. I envision the day in the not too distant future when business firms will be equipped to automatically transfer the amount of a purchase from the purchaser's bank or savings account to the business firm's account with no exchange of cash.

SILVER AND COINAGE PROBLEM CONCLUSIONS REITERATED

In conclusion, let me reiterate the conclusions I have come to through my study of our silver problem.

1. We should mint no more silver dollars.
2. We must have a change in our coinage system.
3. The sooner the change begins the better.
4. The change should disrupt our present system as little as possible.
5. The transition will be a difficult period.
6. The Treasury must hold the price of silver below $1.38 until the transition is completed.
7. The new coinage system must be one that will not need to be changed in the forseeable future.
8. Reduction rather than elimination of silver in our coins is most desirable, measured by the foregoing criteria.
9. The price of silver, regardless of what is done must be released from the artificially low ceiling if we ever expect supply to equal demand.
10. Congress must act on this matter early in the next session.

NATIONAL FOREST RESOURCES

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, we in the public lands States of the West have for many years not been fully aware of the need to keep all of the people of the United States aware of our great resources such as exist in the national forest. In recent years we have been amazed at the great interest which others from the far corners of the United States have taken in our public lands particularly as sites for outdoor recreation. What we have taken for granted is indeed a new wonder for those who do not live near these forests.

This new development has made us more cognizant of the real meaning of the multiple-use concept. We see clearly that it cannot mean just multiple-use for the people of the West but must mean multiple-use for all of the people of the United States. This has been further clarified in the enactment of multiple-use legislation for our Federal agencies managing public lands. It has also brought about through several years of often times intense debate the realization that these lands could be used and managed in such a way as to fulfill all of the demands upon it including the recreationist as well as the logger, the miner, the rancher, and the irrigator.

All of this requires greater education of those who have not been previously considered as users of the national forests of the West. I am pleased today to report that the growing awareness of this need to learn to use our public lands in harmony is moving forward remarkably well. Users, public land managers, and the general public, have all joined together in this education program which points out that with public land use goes responsibility for land management and protection.

Mr. President, today I would like to ask unanimous consent to have included in the RECORD following my remarks the presentation and acceptance speeches made on the occasion of the awarding to the U.S. Forest Service of a commendation by the American Association for State and Local History for their outstanding work in the initiation of a program to help interpret to the public the ecology, ethnology, and history of our national forests. The presentation was made by Mr. H. J. Swinney, director of the Idaho State Historical Society, who is also State and regional records chairman for this group. Acceptance was by Regional Forester Floyd Iverson. I commend the remarks of these two outstanding gentlemen to you.

We in Idaho are indeed proud that the Forest Service selected the Red Fish Lake area in Idaho for the first of its visitor centers under this program. I am certain that the people of Idaho will be further motivated by this to their responsibility to continue this promotion of national forest benefits and responsibilities to all across the Nation.

In closing I would like to extend an invitation to one and all on behalf of the people of Idaho to visit this very fine Redfish Lake visitor center in the majestic Sawtooth National Forest in Idaho.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESENTATION BY MR. H. J. SWINNEY

For more than 20 years, there has existed a professional organization with the mouth-filling title of the American Association for State and Local History. Today we have roughly 3,000 members, a substantial annual budget, and an extremely able professional director who supervises a considerable staff at our headquarters in Nashville, Tenn. As an organization, we seek in many ways to enhance appreciation of the importance of the history of American communities and regions. One of these various ways is the annual recognition of good jobs well done in our field. These jobs may be as various as the history itself. They may be books, either scholarly or popular; exhibitions; pieces of research, radio or television shows; any sort of successful effort, no matter by whom or where, to search out the story of American local history or to tell it to the American people. Some of these awards are issued to great and powerful institutions for jobs of great significance, and others to individuals or organizations who work on a small scale in small places. But these annual awards share one common denominator: they are neither lightly awarded nor easily won. This is no rubberstamp program.

In practically every State in the Union we have a State chairman, who every year nominates the best jobs he knows of to a regional chairman. The regional chairman screens these nominations, and those which he approves he sends on with a formal citation to a national committee composed of all 12 regional chairmen. For 2 days before our annual convocation, this national committee subjects each nomination to a searching scrutiny. Out of more than 500 nominations ordinarily made in a year, perhaps 125 are referred up to the national committee, and fewer than 75—and sometimes fewer than 50—of these survive to receive awards. It is one of these awards which I am to present this morning, and I have gone through these details in order to show you that this is no empty honor or routine pat on the back.

In 1963, the intermountain region of the U.S. Forest Service opened a handsome new visitor center at Redfish Lake in the Sawtooth National Forest in central Idaho. For this modest but effective building Albert H. Culverwell, the regional chief of interpretation, designed and installed a series of broadly conceived displays which interpret to the general public the natural history, the history, and the ecology of the whole Sawtooth Forest area—the story of nature which is here laid upon the land for man to read, together with the story of Indian Idahoans who have lived upon that land for probably a thousand generations, and white Idahoans who have been there for a century. In this visitor center, which looks out on one of the most beautiful views in this country, Idahoans and their guests can learn what that spot and its surrounding forests mean to them not merely in terms of timber and conservation, but of the whole wide complex of scientific, economic, and recreational uses.

This building and its displays are a living proof that the Forest Service means what it says when it talks about its new multiple-use program. Redfish Lake is the first Forest Service visitor center planned as such from the beginning, and is only one of a series to be built in this country, each to do a roughly similar job in its own area. Our association believes that the Redfish Lake visitor center and others to follow will add greatly to the historical appreciation of the thousands of Americans who will pass through their doors each year.

Now, the idea of such visitor centers is not new, nor is the technique of designing and constructing them. In fact, once a powerful and professional organization like the Forest Service decides to begin such a program, it would be surprising if they did not do a good job of it. Furthermore, it is not the practice of the Association for State and Local History to commend fellow professionals for doing a professional job. We are not commending here just the construction of a successful visitor center. What we are commending is the initiation of a big program which will interpret not only the traditions of conservation but a whole broad spectrum of knowledge, history included, about some of the most magnificent areas in this country. As State awards chairman for Idaho and regional awards chairman for the Intermountain West, I am particularly proud that it has fallen to my lot to extend the professional congratulations of the American Association for State and Local History to the U.S. Forest Service for the initiation program, and I know you will all be proud that our region of that Service is leading in this program, and that its first center is in Idaho. I am delighted that Mr. Floyd Iverson, regional forester (which means "boss") of the intermountain region, has come all the way up from Ogden to receive this certificate this morning. He is the man whose leadership is responsible for the success his region—our region—has achieved at Redfish Lake, and I am going to ask him to stand now while I read aloud the citation and present the actual certificate to him. The citation approved by the national committee reads: "For the success of the Redfish Lake visitor center in this Sawtooth National Forest in Idaho, which is the succesful initiation of a laudable national program intended to help interpret to the public the ecology, ethnology, and history of our national forests."

Mr. Iverson, it is my privilege to present this certificate of commendation to your region with my best congratulations on a good job well done.

REMARKS BY REGIONAL FORESTER FLOYD IVERSON

The Forest Service is most appreciative of this honor. I accept it in the name of the organization I represent and in behalf of the people who actually planned and contracted this facility—some of whom are here today—and especially Al Culverwell who directs interpretive work for the region.

We know the American Association for State and Local History does not normally recognize a Government agency for doing its job. For this reason we are doubly proud of this award for our work at the Redfish Lake visitor center.

The conservation movement in America today is seeking a philosophy of land management that will meet modern needs in a nuclear age. The Forest Service believes that the multiple use concept of land management is the best answer to these needs now and in the years to come.

One of the principal needs under this kind of land management is for greater recreation opportunities for the public. For example, during calendar year 1963 four and a half million recreation visits were made in the national forests of Idaho. As businessmen and legislators you are all aware of the importance of the tourist industry in this State. The Forest Service is also well aware of the importance of tourism in Idaho. At the same time, we hope that the visitors to the national forests will come away with a better understanding of the resources of these public properties and how they are managed for the public good.

One of our jobs, therefore, is to create an environment where people can become better acquainted with the significant features of the forests—historic, scientific, and scenic. The Redfish Lake visitor center is the first facility dedicated wholly to this purpose in the intermountain region. It is a facility which is essentially educational in function, aimed not only to show the activities of the Forest Service but also to portray the entire complex of history, economics, wildlife, and human values which the national forests of Idaho foster and conserve.

My sincere thanks for this fine award and for the opportunity to be with you here today.

THE NATION'S DEBT

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, while every Member of Congress would like to see the day when no one in this country is ill housed, ill clothed, or ill fed, we should frankly face the fact that the so-called war on poverty is of the same nature as the war described by King Solomon in the eighth verse of the eighth chapter of Ecclesiastes, in which he said: "and there is no discharge in that war."

Years ago, the chief editorial writer of the Hearst papers, Arthur Brisbane, correctly summarized the fact that we shall have the poor with us always, when he said:

> As long as there are men with poor minds, there will be poor people.

In the opinion of one financial paper, published in the city of New York, the best picture of what the current program will cost is presented by the cash bookkeeping budget, which will show that spending in the next fiscal year will amount to $127.4 billion, a rise of $6 billion over that in the present fiscal year. That paper then states:

> In other words, the Government now accounts for close to a quarter of the Nation's entire product, and at the rate it is going it must be asked how soon it will reach half or more.

In my opinion, a more easily understood gage of the current increase in public spending is the increase in the interest on the public debt. As Members of Congress well know, we do not annually budget that interest; but each year we merely appropriate enough to pay it.

Of course, I consider what has happened in recent years in terms of Government spending. In 1932, when I was elected to the House, the total expenditures of the Government were less than one-third of the present interest on the public debt. In 1932, the interest on the public debt was $599,277,000. The biggest jump came during World War II; but it has been steadily rising ever since. Economists are agreed that the current boom is the longest sustained period of prosperity in this century; and it has carried both the gross national product and the national produced income to alltime highs. Yet, during that period, the interest on the national debt has steadily increased, simply because Congress has been spending more than the total revenue and has been passing on to generations yet unborn the remainder in the form of a national debt that will soon reach $325 billion. Figures on the interest on the national debt from 1961–66—estimated—are as follows:

Interest on the public debt

Year	Amount	Increase over 1961 (percent)
1961	[1] $8,957,000,000	
1962	[1] 9,120,000,000	2
1963	[2] 9,895,000,000	10
1964	[3] 10,666,000,000	19
1965 (estimated)	[3] 11,200,000,000	25
1966 (estimated)	[3] 11,500,000,000	28

[1] P. 515, Annual Report of the Secretary of the Treasury for fiscal 1962.

[2] U.S. Budget for fiscal 1965.

[3] U.S. Budget for fiscal 1966.

EQUAL TIME

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, in a speech on January 15, Chairman Henry, of the Federal Communications Commission, criticized the views of the leaders of two of our major television networks—Robert Sarnoff, of NBC; and Frank Stanton, of CBS, both of whom have spoken out, in recent months, to urge repeal of the portion of the Communications Act which requires a broadcaster to give every political candidate equal time with every other political candidate.

When I introduced my bill to repeal the equal-time provision in section 315, I inserted in the Record a letter from the president of the Columbia Broadcasting System. In order that Members of the Senate may know how the chairman of the board of the National Broadcasting Co. feels on this issue, I now quote significant paragraphs from an address Mr. Sarnoff delivered to the Economic Club of Detroit on December 7, 1964. He said:

> Television is now a basic part of the American press. With its reach, immediacy, and directness it has unique capabilities for informing the public and engaging them in the affairs of their society. As a consequence, it, too, has taken on the classic responsibility of the press to serve as the public's watchdog in relation to the activities of politics and government.
>
> The principle of a free press was established as the cornerstone of our democratic society by a generation of men who still bore the scars of a tyrant's lash. Its purpose was to protect the public's right to unfettered dissemination of views and information so the public itself could forever determine the direction of that society.
>
> Our Founding Fathers insisted that their institutions be fully visible, and this visibility so struck the visiting French aristocrat Alexis de Tocqueville that he wrote in his historic treatise "Democracy in America": "The American learns to know the laws by participating in the act of legislation; and he takes a lesson in the forms of government from governing. The great work of society is going on before his eyes, and, as it were, under his hands."
>
> The American society has grown considerably more intricate since De Tocqueville wrote those words. Few Americans can know their candidates for public office personally, and the town meeting has bowed to the voting machine. The operation and scope of Federal Government have removed much of the workings of his nation from the individual. The intimate relationship between our people and their institutions has been altered by the inexorable force of technological, social, and political change.
>
> The pace of change has had a profound effect, too. Events succeed events with overwhelming speed, and time for decision, action, and reaction has been compressed into history's microseconds.
>
> In the fanciful world of mythology, the more difficult problems were solved by gods and giants. In our own time we have been aided by the fortuitous arrival of a communications giant—television—that cannot solve our problems for us but can assist an entire population in understanding them.
>
> For all these reasons, the public's stake in freedom of the press applies with particular forcefulness to television journalism. Yet it is in television's most essential area of information service that its capacities are seriously restricted—in political coverage, in dealing with controversy, in reporting on the public business.
>
> Paradoxically, these shackles—which do not apply to any other medium—have been forged by government itself in the name of the public interest. Two arguments are generally offered to justify them, and both are invalid.
>
> One is based on fear of television's power and unique capabilities. A medium so influential, it is argued, should be regulated to assure its responsibility.
>
> This is precisely the theory used to argue for repression of the printed press when its force was first felt. We have come to recognize, however, that danger does not lie in a free news medium, but in a regulated one. A regulated press is vulnerable to official pressures, to timidity, to accommodation. A free medium of journalism is independent of these forces which can threaten its integrity. In an open society, the greater the freedom of the press, the less the danger. And in such a society, television's power as a communicator is a public asset to be developed, not a public danger to be restrained by laws and regulations.
>
> The other argument for restriction rests on the circumstance that television uses a public resource, the frequency spectrum; that it therefore has been licensed by the Government to operate in the public interest; and that consequently the Government should represent the people by judging what is in their interest.
>
> The fallacy here lies in the assumption that in the field of journalism the Government can better judge what is in the public interest than the press or public itself—an assumption directly contrary to the constitutional guarantee that "Congress shall make no law * * * abridging the freedom of the press."
>
> The Supreme Court has ruled that broadcasting is included in the press whose freedom is guaranteed and the Federal Communications Commission has explicitly acknowledged this. Actually, the Communications Act expressly forbids the Commission from censoring radio and television broadcasts.
>
> Restrictions on television's news function cannot be justified by invoking the precept that "the airwaves belong to the people." On the contrary, that precept demands that the people's resource be used in their service to provide a free flow of information and ideas unfettered by Government restraint. The Government's licensing authority over television, designed to promote efficient use of broadcast frequencies in the public interest, is not a license to the Government to control or influence the function of a free press.
>
> Although the arguments for regulation do not stand the test of principle or logic, there are in the law, in the stated policy of the Federal Communications Commission and in the practices of legislative and judiciary bodies the elements of an effective control over television's journalistic expression.
>
> Perhaps the best known is the so-called equal-time requirement, imposed on political coverage by section 315 of the Communications Act. With stated exceptions, it requires that a broadcaster who makes his facilities available to a candidate for political office must provide the same opportunity to all candidates for the same office—a requirement that would shock public conscience if it were applied to the printed press.
>
> Its effect has been to restrain broadcasters from presenting serious and major candidates who command the public interest, by requiring the same amount of air time to be devoted to candidates of splinter and frivolous parties in whom the public has little or no interest; and the byproduct of this mechanistic rule has been less, rather than more, exposure of candidates and discussion of issues.
>
> The shackles were eased, on an experimental basis, during the 1960 presidential campaign when the equal-time rule was suspended for appearances by the presidential and vice-presidential candidates. The result was the historic television encounters between John F. Kennedy and Richard M. Nixon. Equally important was the great variety of special programs in which the major candidates were enabled to appear. These, together with the debates, were generally credited with making an unprecedented contribution to the definition of the issues and a stimulation of interest in the campaign and the elections.
>
> First, the Congress should revise section 315 of the Communications Act to eliminate the equal-time requirement completely and permanently. This provision of the law has in fact served a purpose contrary to the one anticipated and it discriminates against the medium of information best equipped to inform the public on candidates and issues.
>
> Only then will we be true to the precepts of Thomas Jefferson, who displayed an insight that was to prove applicable over the ages when he wrote: "I know of no safe repository of the ultimate powers of society but the people themselves. and if we think them not enlightened enough to exercise their control with a wholesome discretion, the remedy is not to take it from them but to inform their discretion by education."

TWENTY-FOUR ORGANIZATIONS JOIN IN PLEA FOR FAMILY FARMS

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, recently the representatives of 24 national farm, commodity, and rural church organizations met in Washington. They agreed to a statement which, on their behalf, was presented by the master of the National Grange, Mr. Herschel Newsom, to President Lyndon Johnson. The statement called for increased farm income and policies that will assure "that the family farm be preserved and strengthened."

I ask unanimous consent that the statement and the names of the groups signing it be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement and the names were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement From Conference of Farm, Commodity, and Rural Church Leaders Presented to the President

> Mr. President, rural America—the millions of people on our family farms and in the Main Street towns—are alarmed at reports now current that the budget message,

soon to be transmitted to the Congress, will propose severe restrictions and restraints upon farm price stabilization programs; with the result that many family-type farms may be wiped out, the rural economy damaged and our national economic growth severely impaired.

Taking note of these reports, representatives of farm, commodity, and rural church organizations met at the National Grange headquarters on January 19, to discuss a course of action that they might respectfully counsel you on the best judgment from rural America.

More than 50 million of our citizens live in rural America, on farms and in the Main Street towns. The towns depend upon the farms around them.

Agriculture still is the biggest business in this Nation.

Free enterprise began with the family farm on this continent. The family farm and the towns in the countryside, scattered over the breadth of this land, first established the economic foundation for our liberties. The contribution of rural America to the Nation's spiritual, social, and political vitality—down through the year—is immeasurable.

From the reports we hear, the family farm and Main Street America face a future of uncertainty, perhaps of peril.

We have faith in your wisdom, and we appeal to you to see that agriculture has more, not less, income in the policy recommendations and determinations you are about to send to the Congress, and that you state it as the policy of our Government that agriculture must have more income and that the family farm, which has blessed this Nation and the free world with food abundance, be preserved and strengthened.

SIGNATORIES

The statement was signed at the meeting and subsequently endorsed by farm, commodity, and rural church organizations with a membership totaling over 3 million, excluding church organizations. Included are:

The National Grange, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.: Herschel D. Newsom, master; A. Lars Nelson, master, Washington State Grange; Harry Graham, legislative representative; Joseph O. Parker, legislative counsel; L. Alton Denslow, associate legislative counsel.

The National Farmers Union, 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.: James Patton, president; Reuben Johnson, director, legislative services; Alvah Troyer, president, Indiana Farmers Union; Douglas Simpson, president, Utah Farmers Union.

National Association of Wheat Growers, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.: Anson Horning, president; Ken Kendrick, executive vice president.

National Farmers Organization, Corning, Iowa: Harvey Sickels, secretary.

National Corn Growers Association, Route 4, Pana, Ill.: John Butterfield, vice president; Walter Goeppinger, president (not in attendance, but in agreement with the statement).

Farmers Grain Dealers Association, Laurens, Iowa: Fred J. Ludwig, director.

Missouri Farmers Association, Inc., Columbia, Mo.: Fred V. Heinkel, president.

Uplands Cotton Growers, Inc., Post Office Box 5112, Raleigh, N.C.: F. H. Heidelberg.

Flue-Cured Tobacco Cooperative Stabilization Corp., Box 2718, Raleigh, N.C.: L. T. Weeks, general manager.

American Rice Growers Cooperative Association, 211 Pioneer Building, Lake Charles, La.: H. G. Chalkley; R. W. Johnson.

Plains Co-op Oil Mill, Lubbock, Tex.: Wilmer Smith, president.

Virginia Association of Peanut and Hog Growers: W. Rollins.

Soybean Growers of America, Inc., Mount Zion, Ill.: Hubert W. Baker, president.

Delta Cotton Council, Greenwood, Miss.: Charles R. Sayre.

Pure Milk Association, 343 S. Dearborn, Chicago, Ill.: Jim Mogan.

Vegetable Growers of America, 3510 Runnymede Place N.W., Washington, D.C.: A. E. Mercker.

De Kalb County Farm Bureau (Illinois): Howard W. Mullins, president.

The National Catholic Rural Life Conference, 1312 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.: Rev. James L. Vizzard, S.J.

National Council of Churches (Church in Town and Country), 110 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.: Lewis I. Maddocks (United Church of Christ).

Organizations agreeing with the statement but unable to send a representative:

National Milk Producers Federation, 24270 West 7-Mile Road, Detroit, Mich.: Glenn Lake, president.

Grain Sorghum Producers, 322 Petroleum Building, Amarillo, Tex.: Bill Nelson, executive secretary.

National Beet Producers Federation, Greeley, Colo.: R. W. Blake, president.

North Carolina Peanut Growers Association, Inc., Box 409, Rocky Mount, N.C.: Joe S. Sugg, executive secretary.

Georgia Cotton Producers Association, Post Office Box 2210, Atlanta, Ga.: D. W. Brooks.

PROTECTING AGRICULTURE—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON POST

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, I call to the attention of my colleagues an editorial which was published in the Washington Post of January 25, 1965. I was particularly impressed with the editorial because of its suggestion that at a time when much attention to building our Great Society is being focused on our urban areas, it would benefit all of us to remember the problems of rural America and the significance which that part of America plays in our entire national effort.

This story is not new to those of us who come from rural America; but it may be an enlightening bit of information for many of our urban citizens, especially those who have been led to believe that price-support farm programs are costing them tax dollars, and should be terminated. The editors of the Washington Post are to be commended for lifting their eyes beyond the many pressing problems of our National Capital and for lending their talents for a moment to the farmers of this country.

I ask unanimous consent that the Washington Post editorial be printed in the RECORD, and I urge my colleagues to give the editorial their sincere consideration.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Jan. 25, 1965]

PROTECTING AGRICULTURE

With the growth of Federal expenditures politically constrained many a cold eye in the executive branch is cast on the older programs. And since the expenditures of the Agriculture Department rank second only to Defense in size, they are attracting their share of attention. There are few Federal programs that cannot be trenched upon without courting disaster, but before subjecting the agricultural programs to indiscriminate cutting, an effort should be made to weigh their costs and benefits.

By the end of the current fiscal year about $3.5 billion will be spent in supporting agricultural commodity prices. The price support programs have been criticized on the grounds that they neglect the welfare of the small "dirt farmer" and result in higher prices to consumers. It is, indeed, tempting to add to the direct Federal outlays a much larger figure representing the difference between current prices for food and what it would cost consumers in an absolutely free market.

But calculations of that type tacitly assume that farm prices can somehow be permitted to find their natural levels without serious economic dislocations. In a highly interrelated economy, such an assumption is highly dubious. According to the new input-output study recently completed by the Office of Business Economics, every dollar of agricultural products that is delivered for final demand requires about 78 cents in the products and services of nonagricultural industries. So any disruption in the agricultural sector would be transmitted immediately to all other sectors of the economy and would be magnified.

If the United States faced the predicament of France where farms absorb 25 percent of the labor force. the protection of agriculture would have the untoward effect of retarding the growth of the industrial labor force, raising wages, and boosting costs. But with only 7 percent of the labor force on farms and an uncomfortably high level of unemployment in urban areas, the social costs of protecting agriculture are considerably reduced. In fact a good case can be made for retarding the migration of poorly educated young people from farms to cities.

None of the foregoing considerations vitiate the need to re-examine the agricultural programs and to broaden them in such a way as to improve all aspects of rural life. Government programs are increasingly geared to the 75 percent of the population that lives in urban areas. But a Great Society cannot ignore the welfare of the other 25 percent.

HOW THE SUPREME COURT IS CHANGING THE UNITED STATES—ARTICLE FROM U.S. NEWS & WORLD REPORT

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, in the January 18 issue of U.S. News & World Report there appeared an excellent discussion of how the U.S. Supreme Court is changing the United States and vitally affecting the lives of all the American people.

It has long been my view that the Supreme Court has departed from its assigned role in our Government; and not content with fulfilling its responsibility of interpreting the Constitution, this Court time and time again attempts to amend the Constitution—and in fact succeeds in this endeavor—by judicial decree.

As pointed out in this interesting article, the Supreme Court repeatedly hands down decisions intended to remake the United States according to the way the Court's liberal majority thinks it should be remade. Perhaps the greatest concern—and I confess that I share this concern—is that the Court's action will ultimately lead to the destruction of all rights of the States and will make them mere administrative units of a great centralized government in Washington.

Mr. President, I call this U.S. News & World Report discussion to the attention of the Senate, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From U.S. News & World Report, Jan. 18, 1965]

How Supreme Court Is Changing United States

(Note.—Controversy is growing over the Supreme Court and its decisions that reach more and more deeply into American life.

(What kind of United States does the Court's "liberal" majority seem to be working toward?

(Are States to become mere "provinces" under a centralized government of vast powers?

(Does the Court seek an America in which individuals—even criminals—are to have rights over those of the community?

(Heart of this growing controversy is presented here—along with the views of two authorities on the Supreme Court, interviewed by members of the staff of U.S. News & World Report.)

The Supreme Court now is being accused of trying to remake the United States in an image existing in the minds of the Court's "liberal" majority.

In that process, it is held, the Court, in effect, is amending the Constitution by judicial edict.

Jewish, Protestant, and Roman Catholic clergymen in New York recently joined in accusing the Court of trying to "recast moral law" in overthrowing State and local bans on material held to be pornographic.

This, the clergymen warned, points to a nation which will be subjected to "vile depiction of violence, perversion, illicit sex and, in consequence, to their performance."

Police and judges are complaining that the Supreme Court is creating a situation in which criminals are to be free to prey on society at will.

This situation is attributed to Supreme Court decisions broadening rights of criminals in arrest, interrogation and trial procedures. A leading judge of Baltimore's criminal court said:

"Effective law enforcement and proper verdicts have been increasingly hampered by a number of 5-to-4 decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court, a majority of whose members seem dedicated to a complete federalization of all State criminal law."

Prayer in public schools, even on a voluntary basis, has been outlawed. This has led some critics, including Dean Erwin N. Griswold of Harvard Law School, to ask if the Court will now turn its attention to other religious observances, such as Christmas and Thanksgiving, and perhaps to Sunday as a day of rest.

What many fear is emerging from the Supreme Court's philosophy is a nation in which the States are to become mere administrative units of centralized government.

Already States are under Court orders to redistrict legislatures strictly according to population—a dramatic extension of the Court's authority. This intervention is seen removing checks and balances within States so as to give metropolitan masses undisputed sway over State governments.

Since 1954, it has been the Supreme Court, more than any other agency, that has pushed the drive for total integration of the races in America.

Successively it has struck down race barriers in schools, public facilities and neighborhoods—even when Congress and the White House seemed reluctant to go along. Recently it overthrew State bans on sex relations between races, and is expected to act similarly on laws against interracial marriage.

One of the Nation's top jurists, who prefers not to be identified, said:

"I don't think you can name any of the three principal concerns of States—civil criminal or social—that has remained in their custody as originally intended in the Constitution."

As this authority and others see it, the Court now headed by Chief Justice Earl Warren is carrying forward a judicial revolution that began in the mid-1930's.

Then, the Court was under fire for being too "conservative," as it struck down one New Deal law after another that would have extended the powers of Government.

That philosophy changed in 1937, almost overnight, under pressure of the "courtpacking" crisis. There began a new era, still going on, in which the Court has generally upheld centralization of power not only on economic issues, but in social and political fields.

In the currents of change being loosed on the country by the Court, the Constitution itself is not being amended as originally provided for.

Instead, the Court is claiming broad authority to interpret that document in the light of modern conditions. Also arising is the doctrine that the Court has the duty, as the "Nation's conscience," to step in and correct national ills whenever politicians elected by the people do not act.

President Johnson is said to have expressed privately his disquiet over some aspects of Court philosophy. The next vacancy on the Court, when it occurs, will give him a chance to change the Court's balance—now generally considered to be a 5-to-4 majority for liberals on key issues—by appointing a conservative.

In that connection, it is pointed out that two of the Court's foremost liberals are Chief Justice Warren, 73, and Justice Hugo L. Black, 78. Neither, however, shows an inclination to retire.

In Congress, a bill that would have deprived the Court of authority to order legislative reapportionment passed the House but died last year in the Senate. Another attempt is being made to pass it this year. Meantime, Congress gave the Court a warning by cutting down on salary raises for the Justices—while approving raises for other members of the Federal judiciary.

These and other signs point to a growing conflict over a Supreme Court that, many say, is trying to shape a nation to conform to its own ideals.

In the following interviews, a political scientist and a professor of law—both top-ranking authorities on the Supreme Court—tell you how it is bringing change to the United States.

This Court Now Sees Itself as Above the Constitution

Question. Professor Hyneman, why is so much controversy developing over Supreme Court decisions? Is this something new in American history?

Answer. It is not new to have controversy centered upon the Court, but the particular point of concern is new. The great controversies in the past—for instance, in 1937, when President Roosevelt tried to alter the personnel on the Court—arose because the Court was resisting change in our political system. At the present time, the controversy arises largely because the Court's decisions have been forcing change in our general governmental system.

Question. Is it basic change that the Court wants to make in America?

Answer. I think it already has brought basic changes, and done so purposely. I think we have to say that the 1954 segregation decision was the start of very basic social and political changes that the Court is fostering.

Question. Was the 1954 decision a more fundamental one than, say the Dred Scott case a century ago?

Answer. Well, it's different in kind. Maybe I ought to say different in style.

You see, Congress had attempted by law in the Missouri Compromise legislation to regulate the extension of slavery. The Supreme Court nullified that legislation. The Court, in effect, said: "Try a different solution—this one won't be allowed." Now, that seems to me to be greatly different from what occurred in 1954, when the Supreme Court said, in effect: "Admit these Negro children to school with whites, all over this Nation." And later it added: "With all deliberate speed."

Question. Broadly, what is the trend of Supreme Court decisions since 1954?

Answer. First, I would say on racial matters it has been to extend into various areas of life in addition to education the doctrine that "separate but equal" has no place in our laws. Therefore, governmentally enforced separation of the races is not to be allowed in any situation.

Second, we come to the field of "expression"—speech, press, and so on. Now, here the significant thing is the pronouncement by Justice Hugo L. Black—and the tendency of the Court to go along with him—that the first amendment which says that Congress may make no law abridging the freedom of speech or press means absolutely no law in any way interfering with or in any way restraining expression. And the Court has extended this prohibition to the States through the "due process of law" clause in the 14th amendment.

Now, this notion of absolute prohibition, applied to religion as well as all means of expression, may prove to be the most important innovation in our constitutional law since World War II.

HOW SUPREME COURT IS CHANGING UNITED STATES

Question. Is it going to eliminate censorship of literature?

Answer. Presumably it will, and, beyond that, Justice Black said in an address at New York University Law School that "I think it may be that we will have to say that slander and libelous statements cannot be forbidden by law."

Question. How about pornographic printing and pictures?

Answer. The evident effect of Justice Black's position would be to say that they cannot be forbidden by National, State, or local government.

Now, does this mean that there is no way to provide that such material will not fall into the hands of little children, or be televised into the home? Conceivably Justice Black, when he faced it, would not go that far. But his declaration of "absoluteness" suggests that there can be no governmental interference whatever in the field of communication.

Question. Aren't libel and slander laws restraint rather than a prohibition?

Answer. Now, that is very interesting. The first amendment says, "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof," nor any law "abridging the freedom of speech or of the press."

Why did the authors say "abridging the freedom of speech"? Why didn't they forbid Congress to make laws which impose restrictions or restraints on speech or press? My belief is that the men who wrote the first amendment meant to say that Congress shall never impede or destroy the system of free and easy-flowing combination. They did not mean at all that Congress may not regulate it—e.g., remove pornographic literature and stop scandalous and libelous statements, and so on.

ON FREEDOM OF RELIGION

Question. How about the prayer ruling?

Answer. This seems to me to be another instance of Justice Black's proposition that the prohibition is absolute. Here's one, I think, he could never live up to. At some point he will have to give up his absolute prohibition against laws interfering with freedom of religion. Otherwise, what is he going to do about people who wrap poisonous snakes around their necks as a religious ceremony—even put snakes around a little child who isn't yet able to make his own judgment?

Question. Would the Court go so far as to stop the chaplain's invocation at a public meeting—in Congress, for instance?

Answer. Now, let us suppose that a Black Muslin who is a properly elected member of Congress or a State legislature says: "I object to having to listen to this and I am handicapped if I absent myself, and therefore I ask this Court to order the termination of that prayer." I would not bet my money that the Court wouldn't say: "Yes, prayer is out in a legislative assembly."

Question. Was the Court, in dealing with the prayer issue, trying to interpret what it thought the writers of the first amendment meant? Or were the Justices trying to reinterpret the Constitution in light of problems that have arisen in our own day?

Answer. I think that the Court, generally, is not guided by what it understands either from "the plain meaning of plain words" or by intention of the framers or by the course of history.

Rather, it is indeed doing what many writers have urged it to do—namely, to find in the Constitution an ideal, and then, when it thinks the country is ready to live up to that ideal, say: "From now on, this Court stands back of that ideal and you must comply with it."

Question. Is it a new attitude on the part of the Court?

Answer. In the past you did have reference to the spirit of the Constitution. I think all that meant was this: Every part of this document has some significance for understanding another part. And when you put them all together, you see clear intention of the whole thing.

I think that this business of finding an ideal goes much, much beyond deciding what's the spirit of the Constitution. It is really to say: "Here is a grander purpose its authors must have had in mind." The reasoning goes like this: "If it were meeting today, would the Constitutional Convention say something additional? Yes, we think it would. Then, let's put that 'additional' in ourselves."

Question. Is that a revolutionary approach in jurisprudence?

Answer. Well, I find it a startling change of attitude, and do not object to hearing it called "revolutionary."

I would that this Court now sees itself as above the Constitution. It is using the Constitution to bring the Nation to political practices which the Court thinks to be the ideal—and it can find in the Constitution words to justify its definition of the ideal.

Question. Is there an increasing use of "equal protection" as a basis of Court rulings, and less of "due process"?

Answer. Yes, and I think it was Justice Holmes who said that the "equal protection" clause is what the attorney brings in as a last resort when he's afraid he has lost on every legitimate claim.

Question. What's the broad effect of that going to be on the country?

Answer. I think it will at least alter the distribution of inequities. The fact that the Court has pointed such forceful attention to loose criminal-law processes, to restrictions on speech and press, and to race relations is going to have a very important effect on inequities in our society.

But will this society then be able to say that 1954 put us on a new plateau of morality? I haven't got that much confidence in something called progress. My supposition is that new inequities will develop and, someday, another Court is going to have to do it all over again.

Question. How far can the Court carry the "equalizing" idea? Between rich and poor, for instance——

Answer. Oh, I think this prospect is limitless. Take capital punishment. My son living in California says: "I am against capital punishment because no rich man has ever seen the gas chamber in California." Why shouldn't a Court which is committed to the advancement of ideals respond to that kind of argument and outlaw capital punishment? And, if it is going to do that, why should it not say: "Now, let us look at some other inequities in the distribution of advantage between rich and poor"?

COURT AS A "CONSCIENCE"

Question. Is the Supreme Court now becoming more or less the conscience of the Nation?

Answer. Certainly many people writing about it have said that the Court does express the conscience of the Nation, and I imagine that half of the Judges on this Court today secretly do feel that way about it.

But I think the Nation has many consciences under many different circumstances, and the most I would be willing to acknowledge is that the Court is indeed trying to cause the Nation in its law and governmental processes to live up to a very high standard of what all of us would agree to be humanity, justice, fair dealing. But that raises questions:

First, were the Judges charged to do this, and have they disturbed the historic separation of powers by doing it?

Second, are they simply too idealistic for everyday living?

Third, can you mix that function with the historic function of the judge to settle lawsuits between individuals?

Question. What about the argument that the whole idea of checks and balances is outmoded and unnecessary?

Answer. Checks and balances are a modification of the doctrine of separation of powers. Separation of powers is to be understood in the American experience on two grounds:

First, the authors of the Constitution did have some uncertainties about the success of the electoral process, and, therefore, they thought that separated branches, and checks and balances, would be a safeguard against tyrannical powers.

But I think they thought separation of powers achieved something else also—and this is just as important today—namely, that there is a better chance of wisdom in decisions if there are "parallel considerations" of problems. It is good for the Senate to have to debate the same question that the House debates, and that these be separate debates, because, in this way, considerations come to attention that otherwise wouldn't.

Question. What about the argument that the Court should move in when the other branches of Government or the States fail to act?

Answer. The late Chief Justice Harlan F. Stone suggested that, where the democratic process is not working, the Supreme Court should be especially attentive to complaints against legislation.

Now, that seems to me as sound a doctrine as could be. When the other branches are in some way clogged up so that they cannot represent popular will, the Supreme Court is invited to take a dim view of legislation that excites complaint.

But how do you tell whether the legislative channels are clogged up? In my opinion, there never was a time the northern Congressmen couldn't have put over a civil-rights bill if they had wanted to put it over.

The Court says, in effect: "Congress can act, but it doesn't. The President can urge, but he doesn't. Therefore we will move in and do the job they ought to have done."

If the Court has a right to do that, the President has a right to assume authority to do what he thinks Congress ought to have done.

I don't find anything in the Constitution that says the Supreme Court has any more right to undo the inadequacies of the other branches than Congress has to say: "This Supreme Court is blind in antitrust cases, so we will review the antitrust cases."

Now, who would want to be around when we start to run the country that way?

REFLECTING POPULAR WILL

Question. Is the Court itself responsive to democratic processes?

Answer. We get a learned article on that subject every once in a while in one of the law reviews. Usually the author concludes that the Supreme Court either catches up with the country or the country catches up with the Supreme Court, before the Supreme Court and the people get too far apart. But the author's judgment, of course, is always affected by what he considers to be "too far apart." I have no doubt that the Supreme Court judges have their ears to the ground, but I have never heard any evidence that they follow a "one man, one vote" rule in deciding what to do after listening to the voice of the people.

Question. Could the Court, in deciding it knows what is best for the Nation, eventually become a sort of judicial dictatorship?

Answer. If unrestrained, it could be extended to that. I would say that the Court is going in that direction, but I also expect the Court either to pull back or be pulled back before it gets to anything I would call "dictatorship."

Question. How could it be pulled back?

Answer. One of the steps tried in the past was to restrict the Court's jurisdiction. But now we have law-review articles claiming that the Court itself must hold such restraints on its power invalid if they would hinder the Court fulfilling what it sees as its obligations under the Constitution.

Second, by adopting constitutional amendments, you can change the language of the Constitution's prohibitions and requirements. But I see little to be gained from that, because the Court still sits in a position to read the new language as it thinks it should be read.

Now, a third possibility is to effect some restraint on the personnel of the Court. This seem to me to be the more hopeful recourse.

I guess if I were going to get into this controversy actively I would try to work out a limitation on tenure of the judges by constitutional amendment.

For instance, 12 years would seem to be a good period since that's three presidential terms. Always the President who appointed him would be out of office when the Justice's term came to an end and a new President could send his name back to the Senate for reconfirmation if he wished to do so.

Question. Would this result in choosing men on a purely political basis?

Answer. I surely wouldn't want some "conservative" Senators saying: "We are going to alter the decisions in some antitrust cases on their way up to the Court by dropping off the 'liberal' judges now on the Court." It would be a terrible thing if the Supreme Court gets into politics in that sense.

But if this Court is going to announce to the Nation that it is in the business of revising the Constitution to achieve its ideals—to be the Nation's conscience—then I guess I would say we are going to have to take risks at the other extreme.

Question. Are you saying if the Court is going to insert itself into the field of lawmaking, its personnel should be subject to review?

Answer. I do indeed mean to say that. There must be more accountability to the population than I believe we now have.

Question. Could Congress and the President cut the Court's budget?

Answer. I'd rule that out as not a legitimate way to run a country.

Question. Is amendment to the Constitution the best way to solve the question of Court powers?

Answer. No doubt the Court would acknowledge that the Nation has spoken if its authority is redefined by a constitutional amendment. They might not yield so gracefully to a statute that sought to limit their authority or regulate their procedures. But I am not confident that either statute or constitutional amendment will solve the questions of judicial power which excite so many people in this country today.

I think the best remedy—and perhaps the most likely remedy—for a too-aggressive judicial review lies in a persistent display of humbleness on the part of judges. Chief Justice Stone recommended a sense of self-restraint. Justice Frankfurter cited the virtues of humility on the part of judges. Justice Holmes is best remembered because his votes consistently manifested a doubt about his own wisdom, and his opinions repeatedly urged his colleagues to recognize that justice may be achieved through political action.

My own preference as solution for present discontent with the Supreme Court is to induce the judges to read Justice Holmes carefully and try to find it in their hearts to make his philosophy and behavior a model for their own thought and conduct.

COURT FEELS FREE TO DECIDE WHAT IS BEST FOR THE NATION

Question. Professor Kurland, what kind of United States does the Supreme Court seem to be working toward in its decisions?

Answer. I can speak only in generalities, of course, on the direction in which the Court has been moving. Whether the country will go along is a matter that only the future can reveal. Mainly, I would say, the Court's new emphasis is on uniformity rather than diversity. There is less emphasis on the protection of individual liberties and more on making every American like other Americans.

Question. What lies behind this viewpoint of the Court?

Answer. The reason, I think, is to be found in a shift in the Court's constitutional guidelines. Once it was due process. Now it is equal protection. In fact, Mr. Justice Arthur Goldberg not so long ago lectured on the theme that the Constitution's essential thesis is equality. He disposed of the original Constitution's sanction of slavery as a mere aberration—"a bow to political expediency," I think he said.

What the Court seems to want, in other words, is a situation where everybody is considered equal, at least equal before the law. And you're not going to arrive at that state without eliminating many of the differences that may produce inequalities.

Question. How is the Court carrying out this idea, in practice?

Answer. You have the prime example in the apportionment cases, in which the Court has acted to put voting on a basis of exact equality. And, of course, it all started, I think—the Court's new emphasis, that is—in 1954 with *Brown* v. *Board of Education*, which upheld the right of equal access to public education regardless of race.

Question. In that situation, how much power will be left to the States?

Answer. Very little. One effect of the Supreme Court's philosophy has been to hasten the subordination, if not the actual destruction, of the Federal system—though I hasten to add that the movement toward centralized Government has been going on since the Civil War, and other factors have played a large part—as large a part as the Court—in the process.

What has happened is that the emphasis on equality may put the final touches to the abolition of State power. You see, if you have many governments making many different rules, it means that different people are going to be treated differently. To attain equality, you must eliminate authority not subject to centralized power.

Question. Does this mean that it will be the Supreme Court that actually rules the Nation?

Answer. I don't think it will come to that. After all, the Court's powers are very limited ones. But certainly the judicial branch has made inroads on the power of the executive and legislative branches. Furthermore, the trend of thinking among those who speak on behalf of the Court is to see it as "the conscience of the Nation." This would seem to mean that even when the people themselves are willing to ignore their moral duty as interpreted by the Court, it will see to it that the people do not take erroneous steps. A large group—however you label them—seems to believe that the Court knows what is best for the Nation.

Question. Is this what the makers of the Constitution actually had in mind for the role of the Supreme Court?

Answer. Oh, the majority opinions of the Supreme Court attempt to rationalize their conclusions in terms of what the Founding Fathers wanted, and, in doing so, they distort history in many instances. Mr. Justice Hugo Black, for example, in the apportionment cases, finds in Madison's "Federalist No. 57" support for the idea that "one person, one vote" is a constitutional requirement.

Mr. Justice Goldberg, in Bell against Maryland, one of the sit-in cases, certainly concocted a good deal of history.

Quite often the majority of the Court feels perfectly free to decide what is best for the Nation, and then to say that this is historically a constitutional mandate that has just come to light.

JUSTICE BLACK'S LEADERSHIP

Question. Is it Chief Justice Earl Warren, primarily, who has this view of "reforming" the Nation?

Answer. No, I don't think he is the intellectual leader of the Court. Rather, it would be Mr. Justice Black. In effect, his approach is to attempt to read into the Constitution what he thinks belongs there.

Question. Is there to be any place at all for individual liberties in times ahead?

Answer. I certainly would not want to suggest that the Court has abandoned its protection of individual liberties. It certainly continues to perform this vital function. But, where it has done so in recent years, it has often been to "equalize," to curb the power of the majority—whether it be on race questions, or criminal law, or on religion.

Question. Is the doctrine of equality going to be extended to make it a crime to keep anyone out of a private club because of race?

Answer. Whatever personal inclinations the Justices may have, I don't think they are prepared to carry the doctrine of equality to the point of saying that it is a constitutional mandate to admit persons of all races or religions.

You see, the accepted interpretation of the 14th amendment is that it limits only State action that supports inequality. I don't see how it can be applied to private clubs.

Question. Will present State barriers to interracial marriage be lowered by the Court?

Answer. I haven't any doubt that such laws will be held unconstitutional once they get to the Supreme Court.

Question. What about criminals? Are they now to have special protection?

Answer. There you have this emphasis on protection of the rights of the minority and a curb on the majority. And, again, it's a question of how far the Court is going to go. For example, it started off by saying that an accused has a right to counsel, and I don't think many people would disagree with that—at least at the trial stage—but then it went on to require this so early in the process of police investigation that it may make it difficult for a local government to control crime effectively. And of course, there have been other rulings to impose on State and local courts the same procedures enforced in Federal courts, which also are going to raise big problems for local law enforcement. In this field, as in others, what the Court seems to want is to eliminate State or local differences in the way that crime is handled. All must conform with standards set for Federal authority.

Question. Will criminals often be allowed to go free to ply their trade?

Answer. To the extent that the prosecutor is becoming limited in the use of the evidence that he can introduce, yes. In large part, the prosecutor is handicapped by the lack of fixed doctrine in the Court's decisions. He knows that, although certain evidence was acceptable under constitutional doctrines of last year, they may not be acceptable this year—at least he is not sure, because he has no precise guidelines in many instances. The Court's opinions often leave an area of doubt as to what is admissible and what is not.

Question. Then the prosecutor may have to throw out valuable evidence——

Answer. He has the very hard choice of trying his case without evidence which may be important, or of introducing evidence which he knows might result in the reversal of the conviction if it reaches the Supreme Court.

Furthermore, as the Court lays down each new notion of proper procedure for State courts and puts a constitutional imprimatur on it, people who have been convicted in the past under the old rules now have a basis for seeking habeas corpus. As a result, the Federal courts are being flooded with habeas corpus petitions. In effect, it amounts to reviewing large numbers of convictions that were obtained in State courts.

Some State judges, of course, are throwing up their hands. They want to know why they should go through the entire process of trying a case with the foreknowledge that it is then going to be subjected to what amounts to a retrial in Federal courts.

Question. Might all justice, then, eventually come to be administered by a centralized government?

Answer. Well, one State judge—a chief justice—has suggested to me that the States ought to abolish criminal trials and just turn them over to the Federal Government, because the duplication of the trial process is expensive and time consuming. It aggravates what is the grossest defect in our criminal jurisprudence, namely, the extensive length of time that elapses between arrest and carrying out of sentence.

HOW POLICE MAY REACT

Question. Will "police brutality" be eliminated in the arrest and trial procedures now being laid down by the Court?

Answer. Actually, I wonder about that. There is the possibility—it has occurred in some States because of their failure to permit Negroes to serve on juries—that the police will decide that the way to punish or deter criminal conduct is not to try for conviction in the courts, but to act on their own.

In short, I'm not so sure that the extension of the limits on confessions will lead to less brutality. It could lead to more. The police might very well say, "All right, we'll beat the hell out of this guy—that's the punishment he is going to get."

Question. Is there validity to the idea that the Supreme Court is carrying out the will of the people when States or Congress fail to act?

Answer. That raises an interesting point, if you look at the reapportionment cases, as to what the Court is really trying to do. First, you may remember, the Court handed down what it termed a limited judgment in *Baker* v. *Carr*, when it accepted Federal jurisdiction in such cases, and held plaintiffs fighting against the existing apportionment were entitled to relief. And the Court went on in later cases to command the reapportionment of congressional districts and to state that not only lower houses of State legislatures but upper ones as well must be based on population.

In all of this the Court was saying, in effect, that the majority should be allowed to exercise its will through the principle of "one man, one vote." Yet now the Court apparently is denying the right of the majority to express its will. That, certainly, was the effect when the Supreme Court last year vetoed the outcome of an initiative in Colorado in which the majority of voters in every county approved an upper house not based strictly on population.

Now, when the Court is able to specify the form that the State government shall take—not merely to guarantee the republican form of government, but to specify that both houses of the State legislature must be elected according to population, no matter what the people want—then you've gone pretty far toward making the States no more than the equivalent, say, of local government in England.

Question. Are States and local governments going to have to look to the Supreme Court for direction?

Answer. I don't think so. The problem now is that, even if the States and localities want to get direction from the Supreme Court, they can't always be sure of what principle the Court is going to follow. For instance, in four cases involving the loss of citizenship, the Court decided each case on a totally different principle, with no attempt to reconcile their reasoning.

Because of the Court's readiness to move into so many fields, what we're getting are decisions that are of poor quality—unprincipled jurisprudence, you might call it. As a result, the lower courts lack guidance for deciding the hard cases, and these cases have to go up to the Supreme Court.

Question. Is the Supreme Court—rather than the executive branch or Congress—to be the most powerful voice in Government?

Answer. As I already indicated, the answer to that question is "No." But I don't think there is any doubt that it is taking unto itself the power to act in more and more areas, and to formulate policy, such as the form that State legislatures must take.

Question. Has this ever been true of the Court in the past?

Answer. To some extent, yes. Certainly Chief Justice John Marshall was an "activist," and so was his Court, and in the New Deal era you had the "nine old men" who rapidly struck down almost all State and Federal social legislation. They were attempting to make policy, too.

I think, perhaps, it is the rate at which it formulates policy that is so peculiar to this Court. There is no stopping point. Once it takes something in hand, it just goes on to the very end—as it did in the reapportionment cases when it started out by acting on the lower house of a State legislature, moved on to congressional districts, then extended its ruling to the upper house of State legislatures, and wound up by denying the people a right to decide what they wanted for themselves. And as it did in the "right to counsel" cases.

Question. Is this going to mean, eventually, that Congress and State legislatures are going to have to get prior approval—or an indication of approval—from the Court before enacting a law?

Answer. Oh, I think we still are a long way from that. There will come a time when the Court is going to be brought up short. There are inklings of that, even now. It seems to me that the number of proposed constitutional amendments in response to specific decisions of the Court indicate an unwillingness of Congressmen simply to accept the Court's statement of what the Constitution means. The pinprick that Congress stuck into the Court only in the last session, when it raised all Federal judicial salaries more than it did those of the Supreme Court, indicates their dissatisfaction.

You see, Congress controls the Supreme Court's budget and jurisdiction, and the executive controls appointments to the bench. When these two branches combine to act, they can ultimately correct any overreaching by the Court.

My own feeling is that, within the next 10 years, either the Court is going to have to impose some restraints on itself, or it is going to have restraints imposed on it, which probably would be worse, because critics might go too far in curbing the Court's legitimate role: to guard us against clearly defined breaches of the Constitution.

JOURNALISM AND THE COLD WAR

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, Eugene Methvin, of the Reader's Digest, is a young writer who in recent years has contributed a number of commendable essays, often critical of established governmental or institutional methods, both of doing and of looking at things. Now he has authored another which, it is hoped, administrators of every institution training journalists will study.

It appears in the Quill, the magazine of the national journalistic fraternity Sigma Delta Chi.

Mr. Methvin perceives a threatening disparity between the crucial role assigned to psychopolitical warfare in the foreign relations of Communist aggressors, both those of Peiping and those of Moscow origin, and the nearly universal ignoring of psychopolitical warfare as a subject for study by Americans aspiring to be journalists. Only two of our universities offering full journalistic preparation include course work in psychological warfare. Yet these institutions prepare professionally the group of men and women in our country upon whom the great bulk of us depend for insight into, as well as recognition of, what is going on.

This is critical, Mr. President. Fully functioning journalism is crucial to the welfare of this country. Without it, we cannot expect to achieve a national consensus fully responsive to certain challenges confronting us in foreign relations.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the Record, after these remarks, the full text of Eugene Methvin's article entitled "Journalism and the Cold War," taken from the Quill for January 1965.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a study prepared for me last year by the Library of Congress, which identifies the courses dealing with propaganda or with psychological warfare that are offered by the various journalism schools.

One further point: A discrepancy arises between what the Library found in certain institutional catalogs for the Washington area and what is actually taught. Fewer courses dealing with propaganda are actually taught here than those listed in the catalogs, due primarily, I suppose, to certain professors' resignations, or to other reasons of that sort. In any case, an independent survey of Washington area institutions indicated that only 2 courses are actually available, despite the listing of 10 courses in the catalogs.

There being no objection, the article and the study were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Journalism and the Cold War

(By Eugene H. Methvin)

When the newly independent Sultan of Zanzibar was overthrown last January New York Times Correspondent Robert Conley put himself in the running for a Pulitzer Prize with his stories revealing that the power seizure was engineered by 30 or 40 Communists trained in Cuba, the Soviet Union and Communist China. This was brilliant cold-war coverage that alerted the American people to brewing trouble in yet another sector of what Adlai Stevenson calls the "world civil war."

But the American people could be even better served if journalists were prepared to "background" such news with a knowledge of the Communist revolutionary training schools and what they teach. For example, last January 20 Conley reported: "The real power is concentrated in the hands of the vice president, Kassim Hanga, a bitter opponent of the West. He studied international law in Moscow and has a Russian wife."

And what do Africans study in Moscow's "international law" course? We know what one Nigerian student, Anthony G. Okotcha, got. He found himself among 200 other students from Africa, Central America and Asia in a class in "self defense," rigorous paramilitary training in the guerrilla arts. "One army officer told me, 'Remember, today you are a student, but tomorrow you will be a leader of a revolutionary front,' " Okotcha reports.

His next study was "occult science," a witch-doctor class arranged exclusively for African students. An African affairs expert in perfect Swahili lectured surrounded by plastic human skulls and skeletons, plastic serpents of various sizes. One witch doctor carrying on among primitive people can do more than a dozen political lecturers." He said. "He can move the masses in any way he chooses. Well, then, suppossing he is a Communist?"

The professor placed a skull on the table and using radio microphones caused it to issue commands such as: "I am your ancestor speaking. I command you to go tonight, kill the British Governor, and bring his head and hands to me. If you fail I will cast evil spells on you and your family."

With this background, it is not hard to add two plus two—and the obvious answer is more trouble of the Mau-Mau type in all of East Africa in coming years as the Communists turn Zanzibar into an unsinkable Cuba-style little red schoolhouse. (It is already happening, under Red Chinese tutelage, in the eastern Congo. A special school near Peiping is training witch doctors in guerrilla warfare and upon their return they are organizing tribal insurgency.)

(Editor's Note.—This article was written prior to the November outbreak of conflict in the Congo.)

Certainly this is an indispensable part of "depth" reporting on this cold-war round. And any news commentator or deskman in America who had bothered to get himself on the mailing list for Senate Internal Security Subcommittee reports could have produced sparkling "interp" pieces backgrounding the Zanzibar development—for that is where Okotcha's account is to be found.

This Zanzibar example illuminates a major problem many thoughtful journalists see confronting America's free press today. Simply put, the problem is this: The professional practitioners in our communications media are not generally equipped to recognize Communist-inspired violence, deception and psychopolitical manipulation and to adequately "background the news" on thousands of complex cold-war skirmishes being fought daily around the globe. This problem can mean "opportunity" for the professional—cash, recognition and satisfaction for those with reportorial initiative to dig out and write the "depth" stories nobody else is tackling.

Let me cite a minor personal experience. After the June 1960 riots in Tokyo forced cancellation of President Eisenhower's visit, a Reader's Digest editor asked the obvious question nobody else seemed to have thought of: "All the newspapers say these riots are Red-inspired. How do we know? If you're a Communist, how do you start a riot?"

Assigned to get the answer, I asked my State Department contact to set up an interview with the Department experts on such things. "Sure," he said, "Call you back in a day or so." Two weeks passed. My friend finally called, quite crestfallen. "I hate to tell you this, and frankly I'm a little shocked myself. I've checked everywhere. Nobody in the entire U.S. Government really keeps up with these things."

Realizing we had stumbled onto a major gap in our cold war defenses the Digest Washington bureau initiated what became a series of stories on national policy machinery, and Communist tactics. Meanwhile, fascinated by a whole new world I never knew existed, I spent 6 months digging into mob psychology and crowd management and researching case studies. The result was an article which was published in a relatively obscure scholarly journal. The U.S. Army Command and General Staff School picked it up for its Military Review, and the State Department sent a briefed version to all 375 U.S. diplomatic posts overseas. The article has been adopted in our own Armed Forces training texts, translated into Spanish and circulated among Latin American services, and to my utter dismay the Army has even invited me as an expert to lecture on Communist mob techniques.

This experience shows how widespread is the information gap on what has been called "the new frontier of war." Other examples:

PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S ASSASSINATION

American journalists were poorly equipped to background the Dallas tragedy because assassination as a political weapon is so utterly foreign to us. Americans find it hard to connect the act of handing a 15-year-old boy a hate-filled pamphlet on the Rosenbergs, condemned nuclear spies, and that youth's act 9 years later of shooting the President of the United States. Yet there is a connection. Although psychiatrists recognized Oswald was potentially dangerous when he was 13 still he is a case study of how inflammatory Communist propaganda can attract, activate, and motivate a confused, frustrated individual and give direction and focus to his aggressive behavior. The lesson Oswald so eloquently teaches is that inflammatory Communist propaganda can kill. Yet reporting on the sociology and psychology of Communist organizational and psychological warfare is generally distinguished chiefly by its shallowness.

Beyond Oswald the whole history of Communist assassination as a political weapon was relevant background the press missed. Nobody pointed out that the Soviets were caught using it in Western Europe as late as 1959, for example. A few commentators pointed out that Lenin condemned assassination—but they only demonstrated that a little knowledge can be dangerous.

For Lenin only condemned the approach of the Narodnaya Volya terrorists, on of whom was his older brother Alexander, hanged for plotting to kill the czar. Lenin said that assassination used indiscriminately would be counter productive, especially if it took the place of careful organizational work. But he not only never ruled out assassination. He always considered it an integral part of the revolutionary's arsenal and insisted that Communists be willing and able to use all weapons, including murder. He required all Communist parties formed under the Communist International to set up secret apparatuses. The German Party, for example, organized cover M (military), N (intelligence), Z (infiltration), and T (terror) groups. We have some well-authenticated and corroborated accounts of the early beginnings of the Communist T-groups in Germany. Their function was to punish traitors and to murder anti-Communist political and military leaders. Most interesting was the emergence of a willingness to use the T-groups to solve intraparty differences. With the Khrushchev-Mao feud heating up the history of this intramural use of the Communist T-squads it may one day prove to be a vital part of one of the biggest news stories of our century.

ANTI-CIA CAMPAIGN

Any psychological warfare technician knows that in his adversary's society there are always groups and individuals who will share his objectives and do his work for him, for their own independent moral or political reasons. In his jargon these are called "targets of opportunity." In Western society, for example, the Communist warrior knows there inevitably are people who will oppose almost any policy of their governments that he wants to attack always for their own independent reasons. The Red strategist's problem then becomes: How to activate the opposition? The answer is the simple stratagem of throwing the spotlight of publicity on the issue and draw the target group's attention to it. Such has been the nature of the Soviet campaign to discredit the CIA and undermine public confidence in it. Enough Americans fear any secret agency and abhor the idea of a "department of dirty tricks" so that to draw their attention to its existence guarantees a substantial public opposition and steady drumfire of criticism, controversy, and suspicion. (Of course the agency earns some of its criticism quite honestly.)

Nikita Khrushchev's seemingly casual remarks on his 1959 tour of the United States about the CIA set this strategy of exposure rolling. The most famous incident was carefully staged at the White House within easy earshot of reporters when Khrushchev met CIA Director Allen Dulles and joked about paying the same spies and reading the same reports. Throughout his tour Khrushchev's remarks were repeated too often and too prominently to have been genuinely casual. Since that time we have learned the Soviet KGB has set up a special section assigned to think up and execute deception operations to discredit the CIA. It's called—shades of "1984"—the "Disinformation Bureau."

Among its favored weapons are the forgery, the fake news story, the planted rumor. On April 23, 1961, when the Bay of Pigs and the Algerian generals' revolt were top news, a crypto-Communist newspaper in Rome, Il Paese, carried a story declaring that "some people in Paris are accusing the American secret service headed by Allen Dulles of having participated in the plot of the four 'ultra' generals."

This paper, testified Assistant CIA Director Richard Helms later, is frequently "used as an outlet for disguised Soviet propaganda." Tass promptly relayed the story, and the London Daily Worker and the Paris Communist daily L'Humanite headlined: "U.S. Spy Agency Encouraged Revolt." Simultaneously the Polish press attaché spread it in Paris bars where newsmen hang out. Soon the free world press services—not one of them aware of the story's origins—splashed it onto front pages everywhere. This Moscow-manufactured "fable," as such inteligence gambits are called, was taken up by Paris officialdom anxious to redeem French honor by proving their rebellious officer corps had been inspired from abroad. They drew hot words from the U.S. Ambassador and White House Press Secretary Pierre Salinger, in Paris preparing for a Presidential visit. Salinger accused Pierre Baraduc, French Foreign Office press chief, of putting out the story to put President Kennedy at a disadvantage with General de Gaulle. "I'm not putting it out," Barraduc replied. "It seems to have sprung from nowhere. But you have to admit the story sounds logical." The Western press continued to play it for a week without any idea where it originated.

FAIR PLAY FOR CUBA COMMITTEE

On April 6, 1960, the New York Times carried a full-page ad branding as false the rising tide of news reports indicating Castro's Communist ties. "Not a shred of evidence has been produced," the ad proclaimed, praising the "great work of revolutionary reform now in progress in Cuba." Thirty citizens calling themselves the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, signed it. The FBI very quickly flagged the Fair Play Committee as a typical front operation initiated by individuals with known public record Communist links, and reporters who bothered to inquire were so informed as early as the summer of 1960. Yet so few bothered that the Fair Play Committee was able to organize 30 committees in major American cities, 40 college chapters, and enlist 10,000 students, adults, and subscribers who contributed at an annual rate of $45,000 for this propaganda effort. On October 20, 1960, 1,500 people attended a New York rally urging "hands off Cuba" at a time when growing Communist influence in that unhappy isle was a presidential campaign issue.

Not once, so far as diligent inquiry reveals, did any newspaper or wire service reporter do a story revealing the known facts of Communist involvement, organizational talent, and publicity support going into the "Fair Play" operation or suggest that this was a Communist-inspired maneuver.

Indeed, when the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee initiated hearings it was hotly denounced by a leading magazine and a score or more newspapers for "McCarthyism." Yet the subcommittee got nothing like equal notice when a young Cuban physician testified that he had gone with the Fair Play Committee's organizer to U.N. headquarters to pick up $3,500 from Raul Roa, Jr., a member of the Cuban delegation and son of Castro's Foreign Minister, for the Times ad that kicked off the whole operation.

"The whole sad episode reveals a deep double standard," says Senator Thomas J. Dodd. "Show too many people a nutty rightwing outfit like the Birch Society and they are off like chargers, eager to do battle. Editors send reporters to their meetings, probe their organizational structure, and hound them with steady criticism. But they are not interested in a Fair Play for Cuba Committee, organized with secret Communist financial support by an ex-convict who is actively misleading thousands of innocent students and using them to advance

Moscow's grand strategy. Yet that organization proved itself capable of inciting and channeling the hatred of the sick soul who killed the President of the United States."

THE GAP IN JOURNALISM EDUCATION

Recent scholarship in the history of revolutionary movements forces us to realize that the "cold war" between democratic due process and revolutionary totalitarianism has been with us, on a minor scale, since the Frence Revolution, and that the totalitarians have developed a thorough technology of planned violence and social demolition. The persistent recurrence of domestic extremist groups ranging from the Ku Klux Klan, the Black Muslims, and the pro-Chinese Communist splinter factors indicates these phenomena are likely to be with us indefinitely. Since they borrow liberally from each other their methods are generally uniform, and covering them adequately requires specialized background knowledge.

One cause of the inadequacy of cold war coverage so far is that journalism schools have paid so little attention to it. Of course, thus far the profession has not asked them to supply journalists trained in what has up to now not been recognized as a specialty. When the demand exists, they will supply it. They give courses in science writing, political affairs reporting, even book reviewing—but not propaganda, psychological warfare, and the sociology of political conflict.

But more and more is this gap being recognized as editors turn to "depth" reporting to meet growing readership sophistication and compete with electronic media on "spot" news. It is not too optimistic to predict that in a few years every newspaper large enough to have a business editor, garden writer, or editorial page editor will also have some staffer who has made some special study of the sociology and psychology of extremist groups and hate ideologies, and who devotes at least part time to keeping track of Communist strategy and tactics—for example, by reading the Worker twice weekly (subscriptions cost $7 yearly), or the Moscow-published monthly of the international Communist movement, International Affairs (available in English for $3.50 a year).

Even so, the current vacuum in journalism education concerning psychopolitical warfare, which tremendously affects the mass communications media, is a little surprising. The Library of Congress at the request of Senator Karl Mundt, Republican, of South Dakota, surveyed 46 journalism departments accredited in 1962 by the American Council on Education for Journalism and found that 22 offered no courses even brushing psychological warfare and propaganda, insofar as course descriptions indicated. In the rest, 51 courses bore amorphous titles ranging from "Attitudes and Media Research Methods" to "The Press and World Affairs." Only 8 schools out of the entire 46 had courses bold enough to mention the word "propaganda" in their title and the course descriptions showed that most were irrelevant. Out of the hundreds surveyed in the entire United States, only two courses seemed to zero directly in:

1. Seminar in Propaganda and Psychological Warfare, at Boston University—primarily concerned with the study of propaganda and psychological warfare developments in the 20th century. Major emphasis on case-study approach to important private and governmental efforts at home and abroad. Special attention to social and political implications of such activities. Evaluations of worth of different methods of persuasion and of utilization of the mass media of communication. Direct importance of these subjects to the free societies, the garrison states, and the underdeveloped areas in the world. A 3-semester-hour course.

2. Psychological Warfare and Propaganda, at Washington and Lee University—"Functions, tactics, and media of psychological and political warfare, with special reference to World War II and contemporary world conflict. Organization and strategy of information programs; cultural propaganda; military procedures." A 3-hour course.

Prof. O. W. Riegel, who teaches the Washington and Lee class, says his course deals directly with psychological manipulation and the cold war. "We try to cover the policymaking apparatus of the United States and Soviet Union, the propaganda directives of the two countries, and how their propaganda works out in practice. We spend quite a bit of time on Soviet and Communist operations. But we make no case studies or post mortems on Communist manipulations of the Western press."

Washington and Lee graduates only eight or nine journalism majors annually. If the Library of Congress survey is indicative, pitifully few of the annual crop of American journalism graduates get even a whiff of this vital subject matter.

There is a silver lining however. Professor Riegel's course has proved so popular it attracts 30 to 50 students every year from history and political science majors. And he says it excites a lot of student interest, indicating there will be a good campus "market" for such courses if journalism departments introduce them.

Recognizing that courses outside the journalism schools would be available to journalism students, the Library of Congress checked the full curriculums of the five metropolitan universities of Washington, D.C. Since these have many students studying for military, diplomatic, and other Government careers, they offer highly nontypical concentrations on international affairs and conflict. But even they offered only two courses whose descriptions might attract a journalism student shopping the university catalog for a good survey of psychopolitical warfare and propaganda. Catholic University offers "Strategy and Tactics of Organized Communism," and Georgetown University, even though its international relations school is renowned as a "prep" school for the Foreign Service, offers only one, "Propaganda, Political Warfare, and Revolutionary Techniques in the 20th Century." Teaching this 6-hour course is Dr. James D. Atkinson, a recognized authority who was consultant to President Truman's Psychological Strategy Board, a veteran intelligence officer, and National War College lecturer.

But there's still a hitch.

"The last time I taught the course I had nine students—and no journalists," Dr. Atkinson reports.

The simple fact is that a journalist who has not studied the history of Communist operational techniques is hardly more equipped to report or comment on today's world or handle copy on the cold war than a doctor who has never studied the measles syndrome is competent to practice medicine.

He needs a solid factual course on the sociology, psychology and history of insurgency, guerrilla warfare, urban terrorism, and the organizational warfare techniques of the Communists. This doesn't mean turning journalists into witch hunters, but they should know more about such operations historically, write and talk more about them so that the American people will be better informed, all in a cool, calm, factual and sophisticated fashion. The history of Soviet psychological warfare and policy sabotage through such operations as the Institute of Pacific Relations and the Harry Dexter White-Alger Hiss interlocking subversion rings should be as much a part of the equipment of every journalist as the John Peter Zenger trial and the Hearst role in the Spanish-American War.

Recently, Allen W. Dulles, former CIA director addressing the American Association of School Administrators, made an appeal that could be addressed to the Nation's journalism educators as well:

"I am convinced that unless we increase our understanding of the real nature of the Communist threat and improve upon our techniques to meet it, the past may well prove to be the prolog to further advances of communism. The nature of the Communist apparatus must be exposed to the world as best we can, through the press, through publications, in public addresses and in the schoolrooms. The fact that it has at times been able to work in secret until the moment of actual takeover has been a major contributing cause of the success they have had. I earnestly ask you to find a place for teaching the hard facts about the Communist program to undermine our free way of life."

Ten years ago to suggest "teaching communism in the schools" was to risk being smeared by McCarthyists as "pinko." Today it means risking being labeled a "neo-McCarthyist" or "rightwinger." Fortunately there is an admirable precedent that could serve as a model for professional action by a society like Sigma Delta Chi.

Today, the American Bar Association conducts a three-prong program: (1) internal self-education; (2) a continuing analysis of Communist tactics, strategy and objectives; and (3) the promotion of teacher training institutes so that public schoolteachers may get both sound scholarly knowledge and professional guidance in presenting it. The committee taps graduate centers such as the Georgetown University Center for Strategic studies, the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution and Peace at Stanford University; the University of Pennsylvania Foreign Policy Research Institute, and the University of South Carolina Institute of International Studies.

Currently the ABA is issuing two timely studies: (1) "Peaceful Coexistence—A Communist Blueprint for Victory," a sifting of the evidence of internal Communist communications which indicates that "peaceful coexistence" in the Red lexicon means more cold war by subversion, insurgency and social demolition techniques; (2) "Communist Propaganda on the Campus," summarizing propaganda themes now being promoted by top U.S. Communists in their speaking forays on American campuses. The ABA has given both respectability and coherence to a national movement that might otherwise have turned into a McCarthyistic-Birchite brouhaha.

Isn't it time SDX, the one professional society representing all news media, joined the ABA pioneering in this field? Of course so broad or elaborate an effort is neither practical nor desirable now, but the society might begin by establishing a committee to encourage professional development through chapter workshops, journalism courses and research. Such a committee could offer a centralized collecting point for experience, guidance, and general information to interested chapters and professors. Any such undertaking is of course fraught with hazards. Opportunities for lunacy and ineptitude are legion. But the job must be done by responsible leaders or it will be botched by cranks and witch hunters. The hazards can be avoided by one commonsense rule and one corollary.

RULE

An SDX committee on education about communism must stick to its mission—education. Not indoctrination. Not censorship. Not name-calling. Not witch hunting.

COROLLARY

The committee and the teachers, courses, and workshops it would inspire must stick to facts. Not conjecture, not speculation, not propounding dogma, not prescribing remedies or telling journalists how to practice their profession.

Let us teach the facts about Communist operational methods and propaganda themes in their orchestration of psychopolitical warfare, insofar as diligent, objective scholarship can reveal them through case studies. This knowledge should be a part of the professional equipment of every journalist in this century of conflict. SDX, as a society devoted to truth, has a duty to help supply that equipment by encouraging the teaching and research in our journalism schools needed for a deeper, more systematic knowledge of the facts. In the spirit of the Scripps-Howard motto, the profession will then be better able to "give light and the people will find their own way."

SCHOOLS OF JOURNALISM AND PROPAGANDA COURSES: A SURVEY

Simply stated the purpose of this paper is to survey a select group of American colleges and universities which offer courses in journalism, and to determine from the survey how many schools offer courses "which familiarize the students with the principles and techniques of propagandizing and with the character and the methods of psychological warfare."[1]

Colleges and universities: An aimless sample survey taken from the country's 2,000 colleges and universities might possibly be less informative than no survey at all. It would also appear to place into unwilling comparison schools which have no desire to teach courses in journalism with those which have an excellent reputation for courses in journalism. In an effort to be fair and somewhat scientific, this study includes those 48 colleges and universities which are accredited by the American Council on Education for Journalism,[2] and 5 additional schools which are geographical brothers, but are not accredited in journalism.

Administrative unit: Inasmuch as the list of accredited schools was accepted in toto, there was no effort to distinguish between "schools of journalism," "departments of journalism," "colleges of journalism," or any other term. Although these administrative designations are listed in column 2 of the accompanying survey it is felt that they are not comparable in many cases, and certainly give no indication to the quality of education or the number of courses taught. The appearance on the list of these schools, departments and colleges indicates only that the courses and the administrative units have met the minimum qualifications for professional education in journalism as defined by the American Council on Education for Journalism.

Curriculum: It is extremely difficult to determine which courses in a school of journalism are applicable to this study. The broad view of courses dealing with the character and methods of propaganda have been discarded in favor of a more limited group of courses. For example, every school of journalism teaches any number of courses dealing with propaganda from elementary newspaper reporting to advanced public relations and advertising. The courses listed in this paper as dealing with propaganda and/or psychological warfare are more limited and precise in scope. For example, the author sought only those courses which in some way deal with: (1) the utilization of psychological and communications concepts in persuasion, rumor, and propaganda, or (2) the political and/or journalistic implications of propaganda and psychological warfare, or (3) attitudes, perceptions and opinions as they apply to psychology, social-psychology, sociology, world politics, or (4) mass communications and interpersonal and group relationships on an international scale. Finally, it should be pointed out that the author sought those courses which were not restricted only to a study of the United States. For example, almost every school of journalism teaches some course dealing with public opinion or propaganda in the United States.

Qualifications: Undoubtedly so restricted a view as that explained above does not give a true picture of propaganda courses being taught in American colleges and universities. In addition to those kinds of courses just mentioned as being rejected for the purposes of this study, the restricted view also rules out courses in psychological warfare and propaganda which never appear in the college catalog or are taught in other departments such as psychology or sociology, and are available to journalism students. A very important qualification is that every school of journalism offers its graduate students and upperclass undergraduates the opportunity to pursue independent study in such unnamed or ambiguous courses as "Research in Journalism," or "Readings in Journalism," or "Honors in Journalism," or some such title. Furthermore, most schools do not give their seminar courses titles, but permit the students to determine the direction of the seminar on a semester-to-semester basis. In addition, almost every school of journalism offers courses in "interpreting current events," or "world events," or some similar title. In a word, then, it became quite impossible to pin down a course as dealing or not dealing with propaganda in the restricted sense. Given the catalog description of the courses, the author has attempted to apply the precise definitions mentioned above.

Additional survey: In an effort to extend the survey to a few schools not approved or accredited by the American Council on Education for Journalism, the author studied the courses offered by the five metropolitan universities of Washington, D.C.; namely, American, Catholic, Howard, Georgetown, and George Washington. Only one of the five (American University) has a department of journalism, and only one other (George Washington University) offers courses in journalism. However, all the universities except Howard University offer at least one course in propaganda or psychological warfare within the definition outlined above.

1. Although American University's Department of Journalism offers no such course as this paper is concerned with, the school of international service teaches (57.530–1) "Social and Psychological Aspects of International Relations," and the school of government offers (75.550) "International Political Communications," and (65.592) "Social Aspects of Mass Communications."

2. Catholic University offers a sociology course (666), "The Strategy and Tactics of Organized Communism" which touches on the use of propaganda.

3. George Washington University's Graduate School offers (156) "Psychology of Propaganda and Public Opinion," and (144) "Sociology and Mass Communications."

4. Georgetown University offers to the undergraduates of its college, (136) "Propaganda, Psychological Operations and Opinion and Political Warfare," and in the graduate school the following courses are taught: (Government 309) "The Media of Public Opinion and Propaganda," (Government 262) "Techniques of Conflict," and (Government 366) "The Evolution of Warfare: Political Factors."

---

[1] From the member's letter requesting the survey.

[2] The list has been approved as of the end of 1962 by the National Commission on Accrediting, Washington, D.C., with the author of this paper.

Name and address of institution [1]	Administrative unit	Number of course	Title of course
University of Alabama, University, Ala., 1962-63	Department of journalism		None.
Boston University, Boston, Mass., 1962-63	School of public relations and communications.	CO421 CO435 CO711 CO712 CO726 CO827 CO831 CO835 CM705 PR410	Attitude and media research methods. Semantics: Language, truth and reality. Theory and process of communication. Communications and society. Communication and perception. Seminar in propaganda and psychological warfare. Seminar in international communications. Seminar in ideologies of the 20th century. Psychology of communication. Public opinion and propaganda.
University of Colorado, Boulder, Colo., 1963-64	College of journalism		None.
Columbia University, New York, N.Y., 1962-63	Graduate school of journalism		Do.
University of Florida, Gainesville, Fla., 1962-63	School of journalism and communications.	JM605 JM606	Seminar in mass communications and society. Seminar in mass communications theory.
Fresno State College, Fresno, Calif., 1963-64	Department of journalism	149	Public opinion and propaganda.
University of Georgia, Athens, Ga., 1963-64	Henry W. Grady School of Journalism.		None.
University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill., 1957-58	College of journalism and communication.	218 474	Press and public opinion (international propaganda). Government and mass communications.
Indiana University, Bloomington, Ind., 1962-63	Department of journalism		None.
Iowa State University of Agriculture & Mechanic Arts, Ames, Iowa, 1961-63.	Department of technical journalism.		Do.
State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa, 1963	School of journalism	19:265	Mass communications in modern society.
Kansas State University of Agriculture & Applied Science, Manhattan, Kans., 1962-64.	Department of technical journalism.	626	Formation of public opinion.
University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kans., 1961-62	William Allen White School of Journalism & Public Information.		None.
University of Kentucky, Lexington, Ky., 1962-63	School of journalism		Do.
Louisiana State University & Agricultural & Mechanical College, Baton Rouge, La., 1963-65.	do	215	Mass communications and society.
Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wis., 1961-63	College of journalism	192	Public opinion.
University of Maryland, Baltimore, Md., 1962-64	Department of journalism		None.
Michigan State University of Agriculture & Applied Science, East Lansing, Mich., 1961-62.	School of journalism		Do.
University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich., 1963-64	Department of journalism		Do.

See footnote at end of table.

Name and address of institution [1]	Administrative unit	Number of course	Title of course
University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn., 1962-64	School of journalism	125w	Communication systems of the free world.
		126s	Communication in authoritarian society.
		130f-131w	Public opinion and propaganda.
		224f-225s	Seminar in international news communications and comparative journalism.
		230s	Seminar in public opinion and propaganda.
		277f-278w-279s	Government and mass communication.
University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo., 1962-63	do		None.
Montana State University, Missoula, Mont., 1963-64	do	598	Theories of communications.
University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebr., 1962-63	do	195	The world press.
University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, N. Mex., 1962-63	Department of journalism		None.
University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N.C., 1963-64	School of journalism	165	Communications and opinion.
		146	International communication and comparative journalism.
		346	Seminar in international communications.
Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill., 1957-58	Medill School of Journalism	325-E15	Press and world affairs.
Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, 1963-64	School of Journalism		None.
Ohio University, Athens, Ohio, 1960-62	do		Do.
Oklahoma State University of Agriculture & Applied Science, Stillwater, Okla., 1957-58.	Department of technical journalism.		Do.
University of Oklahoma, Norman, Okla., 1961	School of journalism		Do.
University of Oregon, Eugene, Oreg., 1963-64	do	J494	Journalism and public opinion.
Rutgers University, New Brunswick, N.J., 1962-63	do	570: 406	The mass media and public opinion.
San Jose State College, San Jose, Calif., 1962-63	Department of journalism and advertising.	191B	The press and world affairs.
University of South Carolina. Columbia. S.C	School of journalism	142	Public opinion and propaganda.
Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, Ill., 1962-63	Department of journalism		None.
South Dakota State College of Agricultural & Mechanic Arts, Brookings, S. Dak., 1963-64.	Department of printing and journalism.		Do.
Stanford University, Palo Alto, Calif., 1963-64	Department of communications and journalism.	255	International communication.
Syracuse University, Syracuse, N.Y., 1957-59	School of journalism	208	Government publicity and information.
		215	Seminar on propaganda and public opinion.
University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tenn., 1962-64	do		None.
Texas Agricultural & Mechanical College, College Station, Tex	Department of journalism		Information not in the Library of Congress.
University of Texas, Austin, Tex., 1955-57	School of journalism	264	The world press, communications, and international relations.
Texas Women's University, Denton, Tex	Department of journalism		Information not in the Library of Congress.
Tulane University of Louisiana, New Orleans, La., 1962-63	do		None.
University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah	do	152	Public opinion and propaganda.
		210	International communications and comparative journalism.
University of Washington, Seattle, Wash., 1961-62	School of communications	416	Press and world affairs.
		480	Propaganda.
		502	Government and mass communications seminar.
		580	Seminar in propaganda.
Washington & Lee University, Lexington, Va., 1962-63	Department of journalism and communications.	J221 (3) H	Psychological warfare and propaganda.
West Virginia University, Morgantown, W. Va., 1963-64	School of journalism	343	Seminar in the foreign press.
University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis., 1957-59	School of journalism	114	Communications and public opinion.
	Department of agricultural journalism.		None.

---

[1] The year(s) indicates the date of the catalog used in this study.

THE RESPONSIBILITY OF FREEDOM—ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, an address by President Diosdado Macapagal, of the Republic of the Philippines, before the National Press Club little more than 3 months ago, recently came to my attention. The text of this speech has never been published.

Because of present threats to peace and freedom in southeast Asia, I hope my colleagues will find the views expressed by one of the great political leaders of free Asia both interesting and timely.

I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE RESPONSIBILITY OF FREEDOM

(By President Diosdado Macapagal)

I am not exactly a stranger at the National Press Club of Washington, D.C. When I was in the Philippine diplomatic service as second secretary of our Embassy in Washington in 1948, I had a card of admission to the National Press Club, through the good offices of Al Valencia, then our Embassy's press attaché, who is known to a good number of you. So I used to come here in the company of Al Valencia and Jim Cunningham of the United Press, whom I met in Honolulu on my way here on this trip. I enjoyed coming here because when I was a student I tried to become a newspaperman as a reporter in Manila's largest paper, the Tribune, which is now the Manila Times, but I did not make good as a newspaperman, so I quit. In politics I achieved some success. This makes me draw the conclusion that it is harder to be a newspaperman than to be a politician.

The editor under whom I failed as a reporter was a man by the name of Mauro Mendez. Recently I named him as my Secretary of Foreign Affairs. I hope he will do better as my subordinate than I did when I was his subordinate.

Although I failed as a reporter, I still have the heart of a newspaperman. That is why my press secretary complains because I write his press releases. Because I have the heart of a newspaperman, freedom of the press in our country is secure under my administration. In fact, some observers say that freedom of the press in the Philippines tends to be licentious. I personally like it that way because in modern times, democracy and freedom not being indigenous to the soil of Asia and Africa, we in the Philippines prefer to have more freedom of the press than less. I have stated it to be my position that as between licentious freedom of the press and a regulated press, I prefer a licentious press to a regulated press because freedom has an inherent responsibility of self-discipline that can curb its excesses while regulation of the press may lead to regimentation which might finally lead to tyranny.

As proof of my faith in the freedom of the press, I am one of the most criticized presidents in our country because I have dared to introduce postindependence basic changes and reforms in our national life but I have never done any act of resentment or reprisal against my bitterest critics and have assumed the attitude that they are only doing their duty in their profession as they see it and I regard them as my friends who are trying to help me by pointing out my possible mistakes.

This brings me to the subject which I wish to dwell on, which is the responsibility of freedom.

When our people waged a revolution under Gen. Emilio Aguinaldo and Andres Bonifacio in 1896 after 375 years of Spanish rule, the Filipino revolutionists drew up a constitution which set up a Republic with the authority emanating from the people. Thus, from the very first time that our people decided to become an independent nation, they expressed preference for the democratic way of life.

After the American-Spanish War which broke out simultaneously with the Filipino revolution against Spain, although having lost physical control over the country, Spain nonetheless ceded the Philippines to the United States. Filipino resistance to American rule began in 1898 and ended completely in 1904, and the Philippines came under the democratic tutelage of the United States.

American rule and tutelage over the Philippines bolstered our commitment to freedom by giving us the benefit of American experience in the processes of democracy. What was even more fortunate is that the United States spread mass education in the Philippines, with American teachers going to, and living in, farflung hills and barrios to provide education for the Filipinos. As a result, the Philippines today has the second highest level of literacy throughout Asia and the desire for education has become a passion among the people. The value of mass education for our people lies in the truism that the chances of success of a democracy increases in proportion to the level of literacy and learning of the people.

The result of all these is that the Philippines is today regarded with justification as one of the most stable democracies in the regions of Asia, Africa, and South America.

Following their association for a period of 48 years until the separation of their political ties in 1946, the United States and the Philippines have come to share common ideals such as freedom, love for peace, and the rule of law. This sharing of common ideals are ties that bind the two peoples together in a manner stronger than their legal ties before independence. It was this belief in common ideals that made the Philippine Republic enter into a military alliance with the United States in the United States-Philippine Island Mutual Defense Treaty of 1951 and in the SEATO Treaty of 1954.

The result of all these is that United States-Philippine Island relations today are as close and strong as they were during the period of American rule and will remain as strong as ever in the future.

Because we Filipinos have come to cherish freedom as a way of life, we recognize that its enjoyment carries the responsibility of helping uphold, defend, and preserve it. This is why our soldiers fought side by side with Americans in Bataan and Corregidor. This is why we resisted Japanese occupation for 3 dark years until General MacArthur returned. This is why we sent Filipino soldiers upon call of the United Nations to South Korea and to the Congo.

We not only believe in freedom; we believe that freedom is a gift of God to all men; and to paraphrase a great American, we believe that the world cannot endure half free and half slave; that therefore under our treaty commitments and as a member of the United Nations we Filipinos are ready to join the United States and other allies in defending and preserving freedom whenever and wherever freedom is threatened by tyranny.

It is this same acceptance of the responsibility of freedom that goes with the Philippines to play an active role in Afro-Asian affairs as exemplified in our effort to bring about a peaceful settlement of the dangerous dispute between Malaysia and Indonesia.

Despite our deferment of the formal recognition of Malaysia, relations between our two countries are of the friendliest kind. This is basically because both Malaysia and the Philippines are virtual allies committed to the cause of the freedom. We deferred recognition to enable us to mediate the dispute between Malaysia and Indonesia. Consular relations have been reestablished between Malaysia and the Philippines. The Philippines will formally recognize Malaysia upon agreement on the sending of the Philippine claim to Sabah to the World Court, which was previously agreed upon in principle.

The question of Indonesia is more difficult and far-reaching from the standpoint of the Philippines and of the whole free world as well. Although it has a large Communist party, Indonesia is still a neutralist country. Indonesia's neutralism may be compared to India's neutralism before the Red Chinese transgressed upon India's northern borders. At the time of the Tokyo summit meeting last June, it was our belief that Indonesia was in a state of indecision as to which side, the free world or the Communists, it would increase its dealings with. We felt that there was an identical effort on both sides—between the free world and the Communists—to keep Indonesia from moving towards the other side. In this struggle, the attraction of the Communists was the sustenance of Indonesian nationalism which denounces colonialism and neocolonialism upon which President Sukarno's leadership is based, while the attraction of the free world was economic aid, particularly from the United States, to enable Indonesia to improve its economy and thereby do something about the poverty of the Indonesian masses.

We felt that the stakes were so high in this struggle over the future course of Indonesia that it was worthwhile exerting every effort to make Indonesia accept Malaysia, thus widening Indonesian dealings with neighbors who are allied with the free world. We are apprehensive that failure of such effort would result in Indonesia moving further toward the Communists and finally turning Communist, an eventuality which could be frightfully costly to the free world. If it costs about $2 million a day and the use of 16,000 Americans to save with great difficulty a small country like South Vietnam, it staggers the mind to contemplate the cost, the effort and above all, the manpower needed to retrieve Indonesia with 100 million people, should it become Communist.

After the Philippine attempt to mediate the Malaysian-Indonesia dispute in Tokyo, the dispute went to the Security Council of the United Nations. The Security Council has not found a solution. In Tokyo, I proposed as a solution a four-nation Afro-Asian Commission of Conciliation. This Commission was unqualifiedly acceptable to Indonesia who accepted in advance its recommended solution, including on the agenda the matter of the partial or total withdrawal of Indonesian guerrillas in Sabah and Sarawak. The Commission was acceptable to Malaysia in principle subject to the qualification that there be total withdrawal of Indonesian guerrillas in Sabah and Sarawak prior to the formation of the Afro-Asia Commission.

The situation has since deteriorated when Indonesia landed guerrillas on the Malaya mainland. After the failure of the Security Council to settle the dispute, Indonesia informed the Philippines that it is still ready to resume the Tokyo talks provided the agenda will be the Philippine proposal for the formation of an Afro-Asian Commission. In my estimate, such talks are not possible except under the minimum condition that the Indonesians who landed on the Malaya mainland are withdrawn.

It is likewise our recognition of the responsibility of freedom that the Philippines has sent doctors, technicians, and other civic action units in South Vietnam who are now working side by side with Americans and other allies to help the Vietnamese preserve their freedom.

South Vietnam has become essential to the security of the whole of southeast Asia. We believe that should South Vietnam fall to communism, other southeast Asian countries in the mainland, including Malaysia, will in no time follow. This is the reason why retaliatory action taken by the United States in the Tonkin incident heartened all free southeast Asian nations.

Approval of the effort to help South Vietnam is such that it is my belief that some free Asian nations would be disposed to join in assisting the Vietnamese to defend and preserve their freedom.

Among the nations of Asia, our share of the responsibility in upholding the cause of freedom is unique because we are the only Asian country which was a former colony of the United States. Should democracy fail in the Philippines, American leadership in sustaining democracy and freedom all over the world will be less convincing and become weakened. However, should democracy succeed in the Philippines and be able to elevate the level of living of the impoverished masses, the leadership of the United States would be strengthened and the Philippine experience will speak loudly and eloquently for the cause of freedom.

When I assumed the Presidency of the Philippines in 1962, our basic concern and endeavor was to advance the cause of democracy in Asia. First, we tackled squarely the problem of graft and corruption, which in the 16 years since the end of the last world war, had spread from the lowest to the highest levels of government.

Twenty-one days after assuming office, we removed exchange control which was a principal source of the graft thereby arresting corruption. This was observed by George E. Taylor in his book, "The Philippines and the United States": wherein he wrote that the Macapagal administration "devaluated the peso, thus eliminating a great deal of corruption."

We also eliminated kickbacks in connection with deposits of Government funds in commercial banks by the same expedient of removing the cause to eliminate the effect, that is, prohibiting the deposit of Government funds and substituting them with central bank loans. We have effectively combated the graft of percenting in Government contracts. We are presently engaged in a drive against petty graft in the lower levels of the Government and against criminality and smuggling. The results of our efforts have been most encouraging.

I have said that 21 days after assuming office, we removed exchange control which had been in operation for the past 12 years. In addition to removing the main cause of corruption, we did this in order to return the country to the system of free enterprise. Simultaneously, in order to fight poverty, we launched a 5-year socioeconomic development program based on free and private enterprise to increase production in agriculture, industry and mining, and to increase employment. This program has met with encouraging success during the last 2½ years.

However, the achievement which we are most proud of has been the successful effort to have a land reform law passed that abolishes the centuries old tenancy system which enslaved our farmers in poverty and prevented our agro-industrial progress. To push this bold measure through an unprecedented opposition-controlled lawmaking body with whom we have to effect post-independence reforms, I had to extend seven times the special session of Congress which I convoked for the enactment of the land reform law. This land reform measure is a realistic effort to liberate the Filipino masses from the chains of poverty and misery and open to them the way to a better life, thereby after centuries of a sense of hopelessness in their life of poverty enable them to participate in the building of a progressive nation.

Our fight for the land reform program that abolishes a tenancy system, has resulted in a dramatic development in our successful struggle against communism in the Philippines. Land reform removed from the Communists their main argument to win adherents, which was the exploitation of the peasants by the landlords. Weakened in their propaganda and in their will to continue resistance against the Government, Jesus Lava, the highest leader and brains of the Communist Hukbalahap movement, was captured this year under my administration after successfully evading capture for the last 18 years. Upon his capture, he acknowledged that the administration's land reform and socioeconomic program have given "fresh hopes to the common man" for a better life.

These, in the main, have been our efforts and progress in discharging the responsibility of freedom by making democracy work as a demonstration to the new nations of

Asia and Africa that it is not through communism but through democracy that the impoverished masses can attain a better life.

Finally, I thank you for this opportunity given to me to enjoy your distinguished company and to express the views of the spokesman of 30 million people who have adopted freedom as a way of life and are determined to defend and uphold the cause of freedom even at the cost of their lives.

THE MARCH OF DIMES CAMPAIGN

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, it gives me pleasure to remind Senators that the annual March of Dimes campaign, begun by our late, beloved President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, is now underway. Through this fine organization, we have conquered polio, once the most feared crippling disease in the country. Now the March of Dimes is attacking another great crippler, birth defects; and I urge Senators and all other Americans to lend this campaign their generous support during the month of January.

In connection with the March of Dimes drive, I wish to include in the RECORD a statement by Basil O'Connor, who has been the devoted president of the March of Dimes since its inception in 1938:

> No health organization anywhere has a brighter chapter in its history than does the National Foundation in its victory over polio.
>
> But too many of us are content to rest on the laurels of that history; and history, as a fundraising appeal, has never bought a test tube for a laboratory or medical care for a crippled child.
>
> Since the National Foundation entered the field of birth defects in 1958, clinicians in March of Dimes centers have taken giant steps in pioneering research and teaching to improve medical care for birth defects victims. Scientists supported by the March of Dimes have rapidly advanced toward solutions of problems far greater than polio ever was.
>
> But in one vital respect—understanding by the public of the menace and tragic results of birth defects—we have not come far enough.
>
> We have not brought home to all Americans the harsh reality of a quarter of a million babies killed or maimed by birth defects each year. We have not made them angry at the death and human devastation of birth defects.
>
> We have not kindled the wonderful compassion which Americans have always felt for their neighbors in trouble—the feeling that the suffering of innocent victims is undeserved, unfair, and that something must be done about it.
>
> We have been told that people who are "normal" have no fear of birth defects—that, unlike polio, birth defects create no emergency.
>
> Is the reality of more than a million persons in the United States with orthopedic abnormalities due to birth defects not an emergency?
>
> Is the relegation of thousands of human beings to mental institutions for life because their brains have been irreparably damaged by birth defects not an emergency?
>
> The shattering blow to half a million parents every year, the disruption of homelife that follows, the years of physical and mental anguish that lie ahead for at least 1 out of every 16 babies born in this Nation—is this vast tragedy not an emergency?
>
> Is there nothing in this tragic situation to concern other parents? Parents of healthy children, who hope to see them grow up and marry healthy persons? Who look forward to the thrill of having grandchildren and who think they are safe from the shock and tragedy of a desperately ill child in the family?
>
> How many more of our children have to die? How many more must be crippled in body or retarded in mind? How many more millions of parents have to go through their ordeal before the people of America begin to look on birth defects as a national emergency?

PROPOSED REPEAL OF SECTION 14(b) OF NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I am happy that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] has introduced a bill to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act. Last year, I introduced similar proposed legislation, and I want to express my heartfelt and vigorous support of Senator McNAMARA's efforts this year. I have joined him in sponsoring this year's bill.

Section 14(b) allows the States to prohibit certain forms of union security—such as the agency shop and the union shop—which are legal and permissible under all other sections of the Taft-Hartley Act. The union shop, as we well know, requires that all employees in a bargaining unit pay union dues as a condition of employment. The agency shop requires that nonunion employees, sharing in the benefits accorded all other members of the bargaining unit, pay their fair portion of the costs of collective bargaining.

State legislation to ban these legitimate forms of union security has masqueraded under the highly deceptive term of "right-to-work" law. This so-called right-to-work principle is not only the worst misnomer of recent decades; it is also a powerful weapon aimed at destruction of the institutions we have established for peaceful, constructive labor-management relations.

Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz once characterized the term "right to work" as a "corruption of the English language which prejudices the consideration of the real problem involved."

Let us take a long and searching look at the different considerations actually involved.

The first, and the worst of the distortions spread by the "right-to-workers" is the claim that there is some abstract, unconditional right to work. In a democratic society which is dedicated to the interest of everyone, there can be no absolute and unlimited rights. Even the right of free speech—which is as zealously protected as any freedom we have—is circumscribed by the laws of slander and the "clear and present danger" doctrine.

Similarly, the so-called right to work is a fiction of the propagandists. Most obviously, a job opening and a willing employer must exist, and no right-to-work law on the books can create those. The worker must be qualified. Various Federal and State laws will regulate his minimum wage, will compel him to participate in health and welfare plans, and will provide for his old age and retirement.

In short, employment, like every other activity in a highly complex society, is subject to rules and regulations which, from an overall perspective, operate to create more opportunities and freedom for everyone.

Second, the right-to-work laws would destroy the very system which has been devised—and which has been operating with a commendable amount of efficiency—to give the greatest protection to the workingman. That is the system of free, collective bargaining.

The existence of strong and vigorous unions founded on majority representation is of vital importance to meaningful collective bargaining. For this reason, Federal law not only recognizes and encourages the process of collective bargaining, but also provides machinery for the democratic selection of the union which is to speak for every member of the bargaining unit.

Under section 9 of the National Labor Relations Act, detailed procedures are outlined for each step involved in the choice of a labor union. Even to secure an election from the National Labor Relations Board, a union must demonstrate that it has substantial support from the members of the work unit. After that, a secret ballot election is conducted by the NLRB, at which the union must win a majority of votes before it is legally authorized to be the employees' collective-bargaining representative.

It is only at this juncture—after a fair and free election—that an employer need even sit down with a union to bargain and to negotiate for a contract which will establish the job benefits for all employees.

Thus, it is clear that the "voluntary unionism" slogan bandied about by the right to workers is another example of their habitual use of catch phrases to conceal reality. No employer is ever required, under Federal law, to sit across from a union at a bargaining table, until that union has been selected as the majority representative of the employees.

Once chosen, that union then has a continuing and enforceable duty to represent fairly all the employees in the particular bargaining unit, regardless of whether they are members of the union. Moreover, every member of that unit must share equally in the benefits negotiated for all.

Is it any wonder that unions require that those who reap the benefits must either join the union after a 30-day waiting period or else pay the reasonable costs incurred in securing them the advantages of a union contract? No one likes free riders; and every union needs money with which to carry out its functions as bargaining agent. Thus, the right to work people, under the guise of voluntary unionism, are in reality trying to get something for nothing. While virtuously proclaiming their opposition to unionism of any brand, this heedless minority of workers happily accepts the higher wages, job seniority, and health and welfare benefits negotiated for them by the majority union.

A union needs the security and the stability accruing from regular dues payments, in order to function in a responsible manner. We now reach the heart of the whole right to work issue: the real purpose of those who support section 14(b) is to slowly erode the power and responsibility of our major unions. By sapping their financial strength, the right to workers would undercut the ability of unions to participate vigorously in the process of collective bargaining and to fully represent the rights of the working man at the negotiating table.

I emphasize the point that progressive businessmen are as much opposed as is any labor official to legislation that would operate to diminish the power of legitimate unions. Businessmen all over the country have come to realize that efficient cooperation between management and labor is absolutely essential to the continued growth and vitality of the free enterprise system.

By weakening unions and fragmenting their power, such right-to-work laws would merely increase the difficulties involved in conducting day-to-day, peaceful, and harmonious labor relations. Employers have learned that it is far easier to deal with a properly functioning union which has the support of its members, rather than with various, complaining splinter groups of employees whose grumblings and constant haggling over individual wages merely impede production.

As a last-ditch final argument, the advocates of section 14(b) attempt to prove that right-to-work legislation is, above all, economically beneficial to local communities, attracts new industries to the States enacting such laws, and creates more jobs for workers. These assertions are categorically false, and these "phony" claims should be exposed once and for all.

Let us look for a moment at the statistics. In 1950, hourly manufacturing earnings in the 19 right-to-work States averaged $1.26, 21 cents less than the U.S. average of $1.47. By 1961, hourly wages in the right-to-work States stood 23 cents below the national average of $2.32.

The per capita income story is the same. In the 19 right-to-work States, per capita income fell from $281 below the national average in 1950 to $379 below by 1961; and the number of States trailing the U.S. average increased from 15 in 1947 to 18 in 1962.

Milton J. Nadworny, professor of commerce and economics at the University of Vermont, has carefully analyzed the income and wage picture in right-to-work States. His conclusions bear out the foregoing arguments:

> Right to work legislation aims to weaken the bargaining and organizing strength of unions and reduce pressures for wage increases. We must conclude that such statutes have widened the wage and income gap between right-to-work States and the Nation as a whole.

In short, the claims of industrial expansion, attraction of new industry, economic growth, and raising of wages and personal income have absolutely no basis in fact.

On the contrary, the facts establish that right-to-work legislation lowers wages of workers, cuts consumer buying power, slashes business and industry profits, and increases unemployment, by creating job instability and resulting in fewer business opportunities.

The fallacy of the right-to-work arguments has been amply documented and demonstrated in the past. It is time that that we stopped the evils of State right to work legislation. I am confident that under the vigorous and dedicated leadership of Senator McNamara, we shall win the repeal of section 14(b), and shall finally put an end to these laws, which operate to the detriment of our national economy, as well as to the detriment of the interests of labor and management.

MEDICARE

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, for several years many Members of this body have argued forcefully for a program that would free our senior citizens of the persistent fear of financial disaster due to recurring illnesses. The arguments presented in this Chamber have not gone unheard. The people across this land have listened; they have thought; and now they have spoken out. They have spoken decisively; and we must act with determination to meet their needs.

There can be no doubt about the need for a program of hospital insurance for our senior citizens. Many of us in this Chamber have felt the heavy burden of medical care for our aging citizens—in many cases, for our own parents. We are familiar with the vicious cycle of events that can leave our senior citizens in a state of complete destitution and privation.

The tragedy of the plight facing the elderly lies in the fact that there is little—indeed, nothing—that they can do to avoid an illness that will wipe out their hard-earned savings. As age increases, so does the susceptibility to chronic illnesses. The facts behind this statement are staggering. Eighty percent of all citizens over age 65 suffer from some sort of chronic ailment. Sixteen percent need hospital care every year, and 9 out of 10 are hospitalized at least once during their retirement. Two out of every three retired persons, according to a U.S. national health survey, will be hospitalized at least twice; and one of every three will need hospitalization at least three times during the so-called happy years of retirement.

These persistent problems of health alone should give us grounds for concern; but the present plight of the elderly involves not only health, but also finances, for they go hand in hand. Of the more than 18 million elderly citizens, only half have any kind of health insurance; and the policies held by those who do are all too often insufficient to meet the need. It has been estimated that only 10 to 15 percent of the health expenses incurred by our elderly are covered by insurance. The need for insurance coverage would be somewhat lessened if our elderly had an adequate income to rely on; but recent statistics indicate that the average income of more than half of our senior citizens is $1,000 a year, or less—hardly sufficient, when one considers the cost of medical care.

Upon leaving the hospital, the average elderly citizen can expect to face a bill of more than $700. The more than 300,000 less fortunate citizens who have to stay in hospitals for in excess of 30 days will find that the bill they must pay for better health is more than $1,000.

The financial disaster brought on by these costs is usually far reaching. Like an iceberg, the problem of paying these overwhelming bills goes far below the surface. The elderly, unable to pay these bills themselves, must rely on their families or welfare for help. All too often, however, the family called upon is itself unable to pay the medical bills without digging into hard-earned savings that have been set aside for education of the children or some other equally important expense. Therefore, a man and his wife who come to the aid of their parents jeopardize the future of their children, and perhaps even that of their own grandchildren. On the other hand, if the hardhit senior citizen has to turn to what is usually inadequate welfare for relief, he has to declare himself indigent—a cruel and unnecessary humiliation.

The Kerr-Mills program, frequently advocated by opponents of an aged health benefits program as the answer to the problem, operates in only 41 States; and even where it is available, the benefits are, in most cases, nominal and inadequate. The program also requires a means test; and in many States this includes "family responsibility" provisions or recovery provisions giving the State a lien, to be foreclosed after death, on homes owned by beneficiaries. Apart from these degrading qualities of the Kerr-Mills program, people fail to realize that this is a very expensive program. The administrative costs are high. States often transfer persons listed as recipients of other welfare programs to the Kerr-Mills program, in order to take advantage of its higher matching grant provisions. This saves millions of dollars for the States, but defeats the program's purpose to aid those who become "medically indigent" when illness or disease suddenly strikes.

The problem today might not be so acute if our private insurance companies were able to develop adequate policies. Unfortunately, however, the nature of the situation prevents such an accommodation. No private company can be expected to insure a chronically ill person, and still keep the premiums low enough so that our citizens with low incomes could purchase the protection. When, as so often occurs, group health policies which were purchased through employment, end with retirement, and new policies are available only at prohibitively high prices, the senior citizen is left to hope and, indeed, to pray that he will not be struck with an ailment which in a matter of weeks would sap his life savings.

Mr. President, we are fortunate to have before us two outstanding bills that will deal with the problem. Both proposals, introduced respectively by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Anderson] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNamara], while they differ in some important details, are quite similar in nature. Both would establish a pay-before-need insurance program to cover some of the health needs of our older citizens. In both cases, persons age 65 and over would be entitled to the following benefits: Hospital inpatient services, posthospital extended care in nursing homes, home health services, and outpatient hospital diagnostic services.

Under both bills, a payroll tax would be levied, to finance a hospital insurance trust fund. The fund would be administered by an agency of the Federal Government.

In the area of financing and administration, the two proposals have some significant differences. The Anderson bill calls for the establishment in the Treasury of a hospital insurance trust fund, financed with moneys earmarked for allocation to the fund, from social security contributions. The tax supporting the insurance fund would be part of the social security tax.

Under the McNamara bill, the moneys for the trust fund would be derived from a separate payroll tax. If the moneys collected through the tax proved to be greater than anticipated, an advisory council to the program could recommend an extension of the benefits period, or could add a new provision to provide partial payments for the cost of prescription drugs.

The Anderson bill calls for the administration of the program by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, through the social security program.

Senate bill 65 provides for administration of the program jointly through the Social Security Administration and the Public Health Service, with the latter assuming chief responsibility for liaison with hospitals, nursing homes, and so forth.

Both these bills, Mr. President, would go a long way in helping to meet the desperate needs of our elderly citizens. As you know, I have cosponsored Senate bill 1, introduced by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Anderson]. In addition, I am a cosponsor of Senator McNamara's worthwhile proposal.

I believe that the Senator from Michigan has incorporated in his bill several features that are definitely worthy of a thorough study by the Members of this body. While I have not pointed out all the differences between the two bills, for I believe the distinguished Senator from Michigan is far more qualified to do so, I wish to make special note of one of the most significant variations I have mentioned.

I refer to the provision calling for partial administration of the program by the Public Health Service. The most important factor that will determine the extent of the success of this program will be the extent to which the public and private health facilities and organizations establish a sense of rapport with the Federal Government. No branch of the Government better understands the problems of health than does the Public Health Service. There can be no doubt that the medical experts on the staff of the Public Health Service would well understand the problems arising at the local level.

I have no intention of slighting the Social Security Administration, for it has shown time and time again its capabilities in the administration of the old-age and survivors insurance trust fund and the disability insurance trust fund. I have no doubt of its ability likewise to manage the hospital insurance trust fund with utmost efficiency and skill. I do have doubts, however, of the ability of the Administration to deal with the medical problems that will surely be a major part of the administration of this program. This is a function that rightly should be left to the doctors and health experts in our Government.

After all these years of neglect, we owe it to our seniors to present to the President, for his signature, a bill that is the best this Nation is capable of. I am sure this great deliberative body will pass such a bill in the near future.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

SWEET WATER DEVELOPMENT CO., DALLAS, TEX.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, today I wish to discuss the background of two contracts. The Sweet Water Development Corp. is the principal company, and is controlled by the Texas Construction Corp., commonly known as Tecon, with the same address, 1000 Fidelity Union Tower, Dallas, Tex. Mr. Clinton Murchison, Jr., and the Murchison family own the controlling interest in this company.

Mr. Robert F. Thompson, an official of Tecon, appears as president of Sweet Water Development Co., along with other Murchison associates as partners or officers.

The first contract under discussion was contract No. 14–01–0001–259.

Sweet Water Development Co. was recognized and chartered under the corporation laws of Texas on March 16, 1961, with authorized common stock of 100,000 shares having a stated par value of $1 a share. The outstanding capital stock, as of January 31, 1963, was 15,000 shares. Shares were issued at par value to the following stockholders:

Tecon Corp., or Texas Construction Corp., 4,725 shares; Bedford S. Wynne, 4,725 shares; Ralph Pittman, 2,700 shares; Thomas D. Webb, 675 shares; Francis Law, 675 shares; and Virgil C. Williams, 1,500 shares; a total of 15,000 shares.

The record is not clear whether this stock was all paid for at $1 a share or to what extent capital invested was paid in to the company.

One of the contracts first negotiated with this company was contract No. 14–01–0001–259. This contract was negotiated on May 1, 1962, in the amount of $75,000. The contract was negotiated by the Director of the Office of Saline Water, of the Department of the Interior.

On February 13, 1963, this negotiated cost-plus-fixed-fee contract was amended, increasing the authorization by $14,000.

On November 1, 1963, it was further amended so as to add another $30,000, bringing the total amount involved under this contract to $119,000.

The purpose of the first contract was to cover processing and development of salt water conversion, with the performance location designated as St. Louis, Mo.

Prior to the expiration of contract No. 1, and under date of April 27, 1963, a second contract was negotiated, contract No. 14–01–0001–341. More properly, I should say that the second contract was negotiated and agreed upon on September 2, 1963, but was made retroactive to April 27, 1963; that is, the contract was officially signed on September 2, 1963, but was made effective on the preceding April 27, 1963.

Apparently the reason for this was that there may have been, although I was unable to locate it, a letter of intent. Anyway, the final negotiation of the contract itself was a foregone conclusion as to its signature. By September 2, 1963, over $90,000 of the $150,000 had already been paid out and spent. The record shows that while the second contract was not signed until September 2, 1963, on March 18, 1963, $15,300 was paid out under this second contract. On April 30, it was $25,819.76. On May 31, there was an additional $14,712.04. On June 30, there was paid another $10,937.24. And, on July 31, there was a payment of $11,302.59. In August, there was a payment of $10,882.14.

These payments were made, yet the contract itself was not officially agreed upon until September 2, 1963. Thus we had a situation that, at the time the contract itself was finally negotiated, it would have been practically paid off.

This second contract was likewise a negotiated, cost-plus-fixed-fee contract, and it involved an extension of the same type of work as provided under the first contract.

The purpose of the second contract was described again as a process for the further development of a desalinization of water process. The performance location of the second contract was listed as Wrightsville Beach, N.C.

The second contract was negotiated for an amount of $151,000. However, as I pointed out before, at the time the contract was finally agreed upon, approximately $90,000 had already been paid out. On February 1, 1964, this second contract was amended to add an additional $499,000. On November 17, 1964, it was amended to add another $375,000. This brought the total authorization under this second negotiated contract to $1,025,000.

As of January 1964 $108,152.35 had been paid out under the first contract and approximately $800,000 had been paid out under the second contract.

These payments were being made notwithstanding the fact that an audit report seriously questioning the propriety of expenditures under the first contract was available.

These two contracts were interrelated and, in effect, dealt with the same project, the same company, and on the same cost-plus, fixed-fee contract basis. All of these payments developed out of the contract which originally was negotiated as only a $75,000 contract.

This first contract was audited by the Dallas district of the U.S. Army Audit Agency in Dallas, Tex., and is dated August 12, 1963. It is highly critical, particularly of the payment of expenditures that had been made under the first contract.

The second contract, I believe, is still in the process of being negotiated.

As I understand it, one of the reasons these expenditures are made so far in advance of the contract actually being signed is that there seems to be a rather critical shortage of competent auditors in the department handling the negotiations.

The department claims that they are handicapped because they do not have adequate staff to deal with the auditing of these reports. Far too often, they find themselves in the situation of auditing these expenditures after they have all been made.

In other words, this is a case of locking the barn after the horse has been stolen.

This audit report shows that under the first contract the expenditures claimed by the contractor were $120,322.71. These expenditures were claimed under the amended contract which called for expenditures totaling $119,000.

After auditing the expenditures under the first contract the auditors questioned payment of $49,472.48 of the $120,322.71 claimed.

In other words, they recommended that the Government pay on this first contract only in the amount of $70,850.23, although it is interesting to note that by the time it was audited the expenditure had all been made.

Later I shall incorporate this complete audit report in the RECORD along with other documents. I now ask unanimous consent that exhibit A of the audit reports, pages 1, 2, 3, and 4, in which there is outlined the recommendation that $49,472.48 be questioned and disallowed, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the exhibit was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

2. Results of audit: Our audit results are summarized in the following tabulation. Additional details are shown on the exhibits and schedules of this report. Our determination of the eligibility of costs for reimbursement were made in conformance with subpart 1-15-2, Federal procurement regulation, contract provisions and administrative determinations by the contracting officer.

(a) Amount of original claims for reimbursement of costs to Jan. 31, 1963	$120,322.71
(b) Amounts questioned:	
(1) Disallowances and deductions by contracting officer	6,609.72
(2) Amounts we recommend for disallowance	42,862.76
Total	49,472.48
(3) Net amount considered eligible for reimbursement subject to negotiation of final overhead rates	70,850.23

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I quote further from the exhibit:

The salary and wages questioned are those pertaining to Mr. Robert F. Thompson, president, $8,000; Mr. Bedford S. Wynne, executive vice president, $8,000; and Mr. Virgil C. Williams, vice president, operations, $13,500. The salaries of officers of the company, except when engaged in direct cost objectives, are not properly direct salaries. Accordingly, the entire salary of the Messrs. Thompson and Wynne are considered to be nonreimbursable. Mr. Virgil Williams stated to us that only approximately 40 percent of his time was expended in direct effort under the contract, and the remaining 60 percent was spent on company administrative matters.

Certain traveling and entertainment expenses were questioned. These were not deductible as expenses on the contract.

The auditors properly questioned these. There was no reason why this company should be allowed large entertaining expenses in order to proceed on a contract to perfect the desalination of water.

What did expenses in a barroom have to do with desalinization of water?

I ask unanimous consent that the entire auditor's report dated August 12, 1963, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SWEET WATER DEVELOPMENT CO., DALLAS, TEX., INTERIM REPORT OF COST CLAIMED—FROM INCEPTION OF THE CONTRACT MAY 1, 1962, TO JANUARY 31, 1963—CONTRACT NO. 14-01-0001-259

1. Introduction: In accordance with an April 5, 1963, letter request by the Director, Office of Saline Water, U.S. Department of Interior (contracting officer), we performed an audit of the costs and reimbursement claims of the Sweet Water Development Co., Dallas, Tex., under cost reimbursement contract No. 14-01-0001-259. Our audit period for reimbursement claims was May 1, 1962 (date of contract), to January 31, 1963. We are providing a statement of overhead costs for the proposal May 1, 1962, to March 31, 1963. The contract was dated May 1, 1962, and originally included a cost limitation of $75,000. The amended cost limitation was $119,000. The period of contract performance was originally established to terminate on September 1, 1962 (4 months), and was extended by contract amendments to February 1, 1963 (8 months). The work under the contract consisted of an engineering study and operational evaluation of the various components of an existing (700 gallons per day) model plant to give a reliable, continuous, and trouble-free operation. Also, included was the provision of certain operational data including the preliminary design of a larger capacity pilot plant for the hydrate forming saline water conversion process patented by Mr. V. C. Williams on March 7, 1961. The contract was later amended to provide design and engineering of a 20,000-gallon-per-day pilot plant.

2. Results of audit: Our audit results are summarized in the following tabulation. Additional details are shown on the exhibits and schedules of this report. Our determination of the eligibility of costs for reimbursement were made in conformance with subpart 1-15-2, Federal procurement regulation, contract provisions and administrative determinations by the contracting officer.

(a) Amount of original claims for reimbursement of costs to Jan. 31, 1963	$120,322.71
(b) Amounts questioned:	
(1) Disallowances and deductions by contracting officer	$6,609.72
(2) Amounts we recommend for disallowance	42,862.76
Total	49,472.48
(3) Net amount considered eligible for reimbursement subject to negotiation of final overhead rates	70,850.23

3. Contractor's organization and operations:

(a) The Sweet Water Development Co., was organized and chartered under the corporate laws of the State of Texas on March 16, 1961, with authorized common stock of 100,000 shares with a stated par value of $1 per share.

(b) The outstanding capital stock as of January 31, 1963, was 15,000 shares issued at par value to the following stockholders.

Stockholder:	*Number of shares*
Texas Construction Corp. (Tecon)	4,725
Bedford S. Wynne	4,725
Ralph Pittman	2,700
Thomas D. Webb	675
Francis Law	675
Virgil C. Williams	1,500
Total	15,000

(c) The company was organized to conduct and engage in a scientific business in the fields of engineering, physics, chemistry, geology and economics as related to the production, storage, transportation and distribution of fresh or potable water. Also, to engage in research and development in the field of converting salt water or saline solutions into fresh or potable water and all economic aspects deriving these forms; including dealing in and development of real estate for resort and other purposes and generating, distributing and selling power from such conversions.

(d) The company uses the facilities and personnel of the Texas Construction Corp. (Tecon) 1000 Fidelity Union Tower, Dallas, Tex., for administrative and accounting purposes. A corporate office is also maintained in the offices of Webb and Law, 1005 Riddell Building, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C., for administrative and Government liaison purposes. The 700-gallon-per-day pilot plant was located on the premises of Killebrew Engineering Corp., 8640 Pardee Lane, St. Louis, Mo., until such time as it was abandoned.

(e) The accounting records of the corporation show that the only revenue-producing work performed was the work under contract No. 14-01-0001-259. However, the nature of the business organization is indicative of a great amount of promotional work being conducted.

3. Scope of audit: Our audit was performed in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards as deemed appropriate in the circumstances. The conditions of the contractor's records regarding time distribution and travel expenses were limiting factors in making audit determinations.

4. Contractor's accounting system: The accounting system maintained by Tecon Corp. for the company did not adequately segregate costs of a direct and indirect nature or identify such costs with cost objectives. Time distribution records were not maintained. The company has no published travel expense policies and procedures limiting travel expense or identifying travel with cost objectives. No records were maintained of equipment purchases for the account of the Government and for which reimbursement was claimed. Accordingly, the accounting system and internal controls are

not considered adequate for performance of Government cost reimbursement contracts.

5. Discussion with contractor's personnel:

(a) The results of this audit were discussed with Mr. C. J. Spangler, assistant secretary and assistant treasurer of the company. Mr. Spangler objected to the auditor's reclassification of 60 percent of V. C. Williams' salary as indirect cost. He stated that it was his opinion that 40 percent charged to overhead and 60 percent as direct would be more reasonable notwithstanding the proration by Mr. V. C. Williams. However, Mr. Spangler stated that it was his understanding that all of Mr. Williams' salary would be allowable as a direct charge by the contracting officer.

(b) Other costs included in the overhead pool; i.e., salaries of the president and executive vice president and the reasonableness of the monthly charge from the law office of Webb and Law for use of the facility located in Washington, D.C., were also discussed as questionable items for future consideration. Mr. Spangler considered the items of cost to be appropriate charges to the contract, but stated the use charge for the Washington facility may be excessive since it is based on one-half the amount billed monthly to the Tecon Corp.

6. Other comments:

(a) Although the assistant secretary and assistant treasurer for the company stated that the final claim voucher had been submitted under the contract, we noted other direct costs which might be claimed. The most significant amount was a $6,000 charge by the Lummas Co. for estimated costs incurred for the period February 1, to March 31, 1963, concerning the design and engineering of the 20,000-gallon-per-day pilot plant. Such costs may be claimed on any follow-on contract.

(b) Representatives of this office are available for additional audit and advisory services in connection with this report or the audit of additional claims by the contractor as may be requested.

DALLAS DISTRICT,
U.S. ARMY AUDIT AGENCY.

Date of issue: August 12, 1963.

EXHIBIT A

SWEET WATER DEVELOPMENT CO., DALLAS, TEX.

Summary of cost claims, May 1, 1962, to Jan. 31, 1963

Description	Claims for reimbursement	Questioned	Reference
Salaries and wages	$58,966.63	$29,500.00	Note 1.
Material, parts, and supplies	525.66		
Equipment	2,503.63		
Subcontracts	22,021.28		
Printing	638.28		
Travel	7,015.10	3,068.40	Schedule A–1.
Other	348.16	344.08	Note 2.
Indirect costs, provisional rate 48 percent of indirect salaries and wages	28,303.97	16,560.00	Note 3.
Total	120,322.71	49,472.48	Note 4.

U.S. ARMY AUDIT AGENCY EXPLANATORY NOTES

1. The salary and wages questioned are those pertaining to Mr. Robert F. Thompson, president, $8,000; Mr. Bedford S. Wynne, executive vice president, $8,000; and Mr. Virgil C. Williams, vice president, operations, $13,500. The salaries of officers of the company, except when engaged in direct cost objectives, are not properly direct salaries. Accordingly, the entire salary of the Messrs. Thompson and Wynne are considered to be nonreimbursable. Mr. Virgil Williams stated to us that only approximately 40 percent of his time was expended in direct effort under the contract, and the remaining 60 percent was spent on company administrative matters. The total salary of Mr. Williams for the period May 1, 1962, to January 31, 1963, was $22,500. In consequence of his statement we reclassified $13,500 as indirect expense. Exhibit B shows the reclassification and its treatment. With respect to the reasonableness of the $2,500 per month salary for Mr. Williams, we were informed that a portion of the salary was to be used in purchasing materials consumed in the operations of the model plant. We did not find evidence of any billings to the company by Mr. Williams for materials or utility services which might have been used in operations. Also, the costs claimed by the contractor do not include such charges. We noted that the 700-gallon-per-day model plant was abandoned. Consequently, any allowance in Mr. Williams' salary for operational costs after abandonment is considered unreasonable.

2. The amount questioned is composed of:

Telephone and telegraph expenses of Mr. V. C. Williams, transferred to indirect expense (exhibit B)	$131.34
Service charge for repair of recorder transferred to indirect expense (exhibit B)	151.33
Comprehensive liability insurance, transferred to indirect expense (exhibit B)	44.80
Petty cash expenditures by Mr. V. C. Williams for entertainment (unallowable in accordance with Federal procurement regulation 15.205.11)	16.61
Total	344.08

3. The $16,560 is questioned since it represents the indicated reduction in the contractor's claims based upon the 48 percent provisional overhead rate specified in the contract (direct salaries and wages exclusive of $5,000 consultant fees or $24,466.63 times 48 percent equals $11,743.97 adjusted indirect expense).

4. The contractor informed us that the total claims submitted through January 1963 ($120,322.71) was the final claim under the contract because they had been working under a letter of intent for a new contract subsequent to that date. Provided the overhead rate of 97.24 percent is allowed the contractor on $24,466.63 of direct labor the overhead allowance will become $23,791.35. Paragraph 6a of this narrative report includes other information concerning the settlement of costs under this contract and the effect upon the letter of intent mentioned herein.

SCHEDULE A–1

Schedule of travel claims, May 1, 1962, to Jan. 31, 1963

Name and position of traveler, itinerary and dates of travel	Total claim	Questioned	Adjusted balance	Reference	Memorandum per diem allowance
R. F. Thompson, president:					
Itinerary and dates of travel unknown	$103.51	$103.51		Note 1	
Dallas to Washington to Dallas, July 16–18, 1962	585.42	585.42		Note 1	
B. S. Wynne, executive vice president: Itinerary and dates of travel unknown	940.09	940.09		Note 1	
C. J. Spangler, assistant secretary and assistant treasurer:					
Dallas to Washington to Dallas, July 29–30, 1962	248.32	2.30	$246.02	Note 2	$24
Dallas to Washington to Dallas, Jan. 14–17, 1962	265.63	37.06	228.57	Note 2	40
Harold Gilbert: Washington to Wilmington to Atlanta to Dallas, Jan. 13–17, 1963	368.89	368.89		Note 3	
V. C. Williams, vice president:					
St. Louis to Dallas to St. Louis, May 9–12, 1962	198.16	40.98	157.18	Note 2	40
St. Louis to Dallas to St. Louis, July 25–27, 1962	299.50	137.49	162.01	Notes 2 and 4	48
St. Louis to Chicago to New York to Pittsburgh to Chicago to St. Louis, Nov. 8–11, 1962	239.83	35.55	204.28	Notes 2 and 5	52
St. Louis to Dallas to Kansas City to St. Louis, Dec. 2–7, 1962	325.33	107.92	217.41	Note 2	88
St. Louis to New York to St. Louis, Dec. 9–11, 1962	166.40	(13.00)	179.40	Note 2	48
St. Louis to Washington to New York to St. Louis, Dec. 16–20, 1962	372.40	122.18	250.22	Notes 2 and 5	64
St. Louis to New York to St. Louis, Jan. 2–5, 1963	220.82	23.50	197.32	Note 2	80
St. Louis to New York to St. Louis, Jan. 6–12, 1963	440.81	83.05	357.76	Note 2	112
St. Louis to New York to Washington to St. Louis, Jan. 13–17, 1963	234.98	47.74	187.24	Note 2	80
A. Williams, operations manager:					
St. Louis to Dallas to Marshall to Dallas tc St. Louis, July 25–27, 1962	158.76	(5.31)	164.07	Note 2	48
St. Louis to Kansas City to St. Louis, Dec. 6–7, 1962	131.23	131.23		Notes 2 and 6	28
St. Louis to Washington to New York to St. Louis, Dec. 16–21, 1962	441.64	76.70	364.94	Notes 2 and 5	84
St. Louis to Washington to Wrightsville Beach	350.26	42.42	307.84	Note 2	112
C. L. Roy, assistant engineer:					
Longview to St. Louis to Longview, July 20–22, 1962	118.42	(11.32)	129.74	Note 2	24
Longview to St. Louis, Aug. 13–14, 1962	61.78	(1.75)	63.53	Note 2	8
St. Louis to Kansas City to St. Louis, Dec. 6–7, 1962	107.26	107.26		Notes 2 and 7	28
St. Louis to Washington to New York to St. Louis, Dec. 16–21, 1962	292.94	41.85	251.09	Notes 2 and 5	84
St. Louis to Washington to New York to St. Louis, Jan. 11–18, 1963	342.72	64.64	278.08	Note 2	128
Total	7,015.10	3,068.40	3,946.70		

U.S. ARMY AUDIT AGENCY EXPLANATORY NOTES

1. All expenses of the company president and executive vice president are questioned since they were considered unnecessary for contract performance. The wide interest of the company in prospective business as shown by the nature of the business (paragraph 3c and e of narrative report) was considered in making the decision to question the items. In two instances the purpose, itinerary and dates of travel are unknown to us. In the third instance the meals,

lodging, laundry, or valet costs claimed was $221.81 compared to $48 per diem or a difference of $173.81. Using the principles outlined in note 2 we would question $178.81, had we not questioned the entire amount. The claim for the president on the trip July 16–18, 1962, includes $37.48 entertainment expense (note 5).

2. In calculating questioned items we followed the administrative determination of policy by the contracting officer that meals, lodging, laundry or valet costs should not exceed an average of $16 per day. We show a memorandum per diem allowance in multiples or fractions of $16 for each trip. The amount questioned represents the excess of meals, lodging, laundry or valet costs over the per diem allowance, except as affected by other items questioned and explained in other notes on this schedule.

3. The entire expenses of Mr. Harold Gilbert were questioned. Mr. Gilbert is not an employee of the company and it was not shown how the expenses were incurred in contract operations. (The per diem allowance and the meals, lodging, laundry or valet costs for Mr. Gilbert were $80 and $100.36, respectively.)

4. In addition to $32.28 excess of per diem allowance (note 2) we questioned $105.21 of transportation expense pertaining to Mr. W. Michael who accompanied Mr. Williams on the trip. Mr. Michael is not associated with the company and it was not shown that his travel benefited contract operations.

5. All identifiable items of entertainment expense were questioned as being ineligible for reimbursement in accordance with Federal procurement regulations 15–205.11. The amounts questioned were $10; $60.39; $17.15; and $15.25 in the order which this note 5 reference appears on the above listing. Other memorandum items of entertainment expenses are shown in the notes of this schedule.

6. The purpose of the visit to Kansas City was "discussion with Prichard Co." It was not shown that the discussion was of benefit to the performance of the Government contract. The entire amount of $131.23, including $14.92 entertainment expense and $42.24 of meals, lodging, laundry, or valet costs was questioned.

7. The purpose of Mr. Roy's visit was the same as shown in note 6. Accordingly, the entire amount of $107.26, including $42.47 of meals, lodging, laundry, or valet costs was questioned.

EXHIBIT B

Statement of indirect expenses, May 1, 1962, to Mar. 31, 1963

Expense classification	Amount	Questioned	Reference
Per contractor's records:			
Allocations by TECON of monthly billings by Webb & Law	$21,770.79	$21,770.79	Note 1.
Accounting, tax and administrative services by TECON	11,567.62		Note 2.
Expenses billed by Wynne, McKinney, Stroud, Jaffe, & Tinsley, attorneys	792.03	588.90	Note 3.
Insurance	11,066.00	11,066.00	Note 4.
Office supplies and printing	531.46		
Other	663.38	629.42	Note 5.
Legal expenses	10,366.00	10,241.70	Note 6.
Taxes	866.95	395.07	Note 7.
Executive salaries	4,000.00	4,000.00	Note 8.
Total indirect classifications per contractor's records	61,624.23	48,691.88	
Audit reclassifications from direct expenses:			
Executive salaries (exhibit A, note 1)	34,500.00	18,000.00	Note 8.
Insurance (exhibit A, note 2)	109.62		
Telephone and telegraph (exhibit A, note 2)	131.34		
Repair and maintenance of equipment (exhibit A, note 2)	151.33		
Total audit unclassifications	34,892.29	18,000.00	
Total indirect expenses	96,516.52	66,691.88	
Computation of overhead rate:			
Total adjusted indirect expenses		29,824.64	
Direct salaries and wages		30,666.63	Note 9.
Ratio of indirect expenses to salaries and wages (percent)		97.24	

EXPLANATORY NOTES

1. The allocations by Tecon of billings from the law firm of Webb & Law were arbitrarily determined as half of the billings to Tecon. The composition of the charges is: office expenses (12 months at $1,250) $15,000 and office salaries (13 months at $520.83) $6,770.79. The total questioned includes $2,291.66 applicable to periods prior to award of the Government contract. The remainder of $19,479.13 is questioned as being unreasonable and not allocable to performance of a contract for the purpose of research and development where the estimate to perform was only $75,000 originally. The service purportedly rendered was liaison with Government representatives and the charges were authorized by the board of directory for Sweet Water Development Co. on March 5, 1962. We did not obtain an explanation of the services rendered Tecon by the law firm.

2. The charges by Tecon at $1,000 per month plus long-distance telephone calls were accepted as reasonable costs for allocations as indirect expenses.

3. The questioned amount is described as follows:

Costs prior to contract period	$212.74
Printing	59.62
Clerical overtime	10.50
Entertainment	98.40
Hotel expenses	203.99
Other	3.65

The $212.74 is questioned as a part of the indirect expense pool during the contract period. All other items were not supported as being allocable to contract operations. Entertainment is not allowable in accordance with the Federal procurement regulation 15–205.11.

4. The annual premium on two life insurance policies with a face value of $100,000 insuring the life of Virgil C. Williams and designating Sweet Water Development Co. as beneficiary is questioned since it does not represent additional compensation to Mr. Williams, vice president, operations (Federal procurement regulation 15.205–16(a)(2)(V)). Additionally, the contractor does not carry similar insurance on the lives of other officers and the face value of the policies equals the amount the company agreed upon on January 1, 1962, to pay the insured and his spouse for the patent rights on the patent held by Mr. Williams. The officer whose life is insured may, at a later date, be made the owner or beneficiary of the policies.

5. Commentary on the separate items totaling $629.42 follows:

(a) Entertainment expenses in the amount of $33.54 incurred by Messrs. C. J. Spangler and V. C. Williams not allowable (Federal procurement regulation 15.205–11).

(b) Bank charges for account overdraft ($2) not allowable (Federal procurement regulation 15.205–17).

(c) Travel costs of Mr. Ralph Pittman, vice president, on a round trip from Washington, D. C., to Dallas, Tex., during the period May 15–17, 1962—not supported as benefiting the work under the contract ($429).

(d) Surety policy premium ($136.41) for a 3-year period beginning May 3, 1962, required by or payable to C. W. Murchison, Jr., et al. (president of Tecon Corp.) is questioned as being allocable to contract work. At least $114.72 is properly classified as prepaid expense.

(e) The remaining $28.47 consists of $4.44 unsupported and unidentified expense; $15.03 documentary stamp expense; $4 Mexican consul fee; and $5 notary public fee. All the charges were in connection with filing for foreign patents and were not in connection with contract performance.

6. The legal expense of $10,241.70 questioned included the following items:

(a) Payment of $287.70 to Grand, Peper & Martin by Projex Engineering Corp. check No. 117 dated June 22, 1962, for filing fee, articles of dissolution, and recording fee. Reclassified by auditor to organization expense which is not allowable.

(b) Payment of $1,350 to Kingsland, Rogers & Ezell by check No. 31, dated February 15, 1962, for filing patent applications and assignment of patents on dockets Nos. 9418 and 9419. Not allocable to contract.

(c) Payment of $1,000 to T. D. Webb by check No. 184, dated October 5 was not supported, nor other indication why payment was made or that expense was allocable to the contract.

(d) Expense of $54 incurred for patents not supported as being allowable for reimbursement.

(e) Expense of $4,050 incurred and paid to below-named individuals in manner shown for legal services, but such services were not defined or supported as being allocable to contract.

T. D. Webb, 675 shares stock at $1	$675
J. E. Law, 675 shares stock at $1	675
Ralph Pittman, 2,700 shares stock at $1	2,700
Total	4,050

7. The taxes questioned are the charges from Tecon Corp. for payroll taxes applicable to R. F. Thompson's salary questioned and explained in note 8 ($282.24) and payroll taxes on office salaries, of the law firm

of Webb & Law, questioned and explained in note 1 ($174.98).

8. The $22,000 represents the salaries of Messrs. R. F. Thompson and B. S. Wynne, president and vice president, respectively. The audit reclassification of the $18,000 was made to conform with the contractor's classification subsequent to January 1963 when the charges were questioned by the contracting officer as direct salaries. Although the board of directors for Sweet Water Development Co. authorized the $1,000 per month salary, they are considered unreasonable charges to the research contract. There was no evidence to support the individual's participation in the work under the contract. Further, there was no evidence that the amounts were paid the individuals; the salary charges were recorded as accounts payable since authorization beginning April 1, 1962.

9. The composition of the direct salaries and wages during the 11 months ended March 31, 1962, is as follows:

Name and position of employee:	*Amount*
V. C. Williams, vice president, operations	$11,000.00
R. A. Williams, operations manager	13,750.00
C. L. Roy, assistant engineer	5,916.63
Total	30,666.63

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, on page 7 of this report there will be found an item showing various trips of officers and entertainment expenses which are recommended to be disallowed on the basis that they do not contribute at all to the performance of the contract.

Altogether there are items involving $3,068.40 in traveling expenses, largely between Dallas and Washington, which the auditor said rendered no contribution at all to the performance of the contract.

On page 8 of the report will be found listed the expenses of the company president and the executive vice president, which the auditor said should not be considered necessary for the contract performance.

Now in addition to this report—and I will not review all of it, but I will merely have it printed in the RECORD—in addition to this report, it is interesting to note that there is certain correspondence also in the file which indicates that excessive attorneys' fees have been paid out under this contract. Those too are questioned in this report. Also, it is found that one of the items questioned in this report is the apparent effort to charge to the Government the cost of the stock which was used to start the corporation.

There is a question which appears on page 12 which should be further examined. Here we find certain individuals who are owners of some of the initial stock, but apparently the company tried to pay them back for the original investment and charged it up to the contract. That is not clear, but it should be checked further. This claim was rejected by the auditors. I believe that the auditors have done an excellent job in analyzing this contract. Certainly, their report deserves and perhaps will be getting further study.

There is also another item. As I pointed out earlier, the amount of the legal fees which have been paid in this connection were questioned by the auditors.

In connection with these legal fees I read an excerpt from a letter which appears in the files. This letter, dated December 15, 1964, from the law offices of Weisman, Celler, Allan, Spett & Sheinberg, 1501 Broadway, New York 36, N.Y.—Lackawanna 4-9700—addressed to the U.S. Treasury Department, Internal Revenue Service, Post Office Box 4100, Church Street Station, reads as follows:

> We were retained by Sweet Water Development Co., of 2808 Southland Center, Dallas, Tex., to render it legal services. This client was referred to us by Tucker & Baker. Upon receipt of payment from the client for the legal services rendered, we sent our check in the sum of $2,500, representing 25 percent of our fee, to Tucker & Baker, the forwarding attorneys.
>
> We made no other payment of any kind at the time to Robert Baker or Tucker & Baker.

This letter is signed by Mr. Smith and appears in the records. Further if they check the records, they will find following this that a check was deposited to the account of the Tucker & Baker law firm and subsequent to that, checks were issued which appear to be for the benefit of Mr. Robert Baker.

I am sure that all of these payments will be fully explored, but inasmuch as there has been some speculation as to what is going on in connection with these contracts, I thought I would try to be of a little assistance and release the audit reports.

At this point I ask unanimous consent to have a three-page, short synopsis of these two contracts in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMARY DATA ON CONTRACT NO. 14-01-0001-257

With: Sweet Water Development Co., 1000 Union Tower Building, Dallas, Tex.

Contact: Clarence E. Spangler.

Type of contract: Cost reimbursable.

Division and purpose (research, processes, or demo.): Processes—development hydrate process of salt water conversion.

Project engineer: Walter L. Rinne.

Performance location: St. Louis.

Provisional overhead basis: 48 percent.

Contractor's fiscal year: March 31.

	Effective date	Amount	Duration	
			Start	Expiration date
Original contract	May 1, 1962	$75,000	May 1, 1962	Sept. 1, 1962
Amendment No. 1	Aug. 20, 1962		Sept. 1, 1962	Oct. 1, 1962
Amendment No. 2	Feb. 13, 1963	14,000	Oct. 1, 1962	Feb. 1, 1963
Amendment No. 3	Nov. 1, 1963	30,000	do	Do.
Total		119,000		

Obligations: Total paid including final settlement January 1964: $108,152.35; returned to available funds, $10,847.65; cost underrun, total contract value, $119,000.00.

Audit agency: Army Audit Agency.

Address: 912 Commerce Street, Dallas, Tex.

Audit requests, date and period: Audits completed and considered in negotiating final settlement.

SWEET WATER DEVELOPMENT CO., 1000 UNION TOWER BUILDING, DALLAS, TEX.

LIST OF STOCKHOLDERS

	Shares
Texas Construction Corp. (Tecon)	4,725
Bedford S. Wynne	4,725
Ralph Pittman	2,700
Thomas D. Webb	675
Francis Law	675
Virgil C. Williams	1,500
Total	15,000

SUMMARY DATA ON CONTRACT 14-01-0001-341

With: Sweet Water Development Co., 1000 Fidelity Union Tower, Dallas, Tex.

Contact: Clarence Spangler, assistant secretary-treasurer, same address.

Type of contract: cost plus fixed fee.

Division and purpose (research, processes, or demo.): Processes, further development of the hydrate forming saline water conversion process.

Project engineer: Stephen C. Verikios.

Performance location: Wrightsville Beach, N.C.

Provisional overhead basis: 100 percent of salaries through December 1963—75 percent to present.

Contractor's fiscal year: March 31, 1965. Audit data information from Sweetwater per M. V. Barry.

	Effective date	Amount	Duration	
			Start	Expiration date
Original contract, Sept. 2, 1963	Apr. 27, 1963	$151,000	Apr. 27, 1963	Feb. 1, 1964
Amendment No. 1	Feb. 1, 1964	499,000	Feb. 1, 1964	July 31, 1964
Amendment No. 2				
Amendment No. 3			July 31, 1964	Sept. 30, 1964
Amendment No. 4	Nov. 17, 1964	375,000	Sept. 30, 1964	May 31, 1965
Total		1,025,000		

	Amount	Symbol	Activity	Fiscal year
Obligations:				
Aug. 14, 1963	$150,000	14X0113	423	
Feb. 18, 1964	499,000	14X0113	423	
Nov. 18, 1964	375,000	14X0113	423	

Audit agency: U.S. Army Audit Agency.

Address: Dallas District, 912 Commerce Street, Dallas Tex., 75202.

Audit requests—date and period: December 1964 (inception through March 31, 1965).

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I shall not incorporate the contracts themselves in the RECORD, although they are available. They are rather voluminous. It is interesting to note that in the negotiation of these contracts—and these are negotiated contracts—far too often on only a letter of intent substantial payments have been made. In fact, when the negotiators sat down for the final round of negotiations, they did not have much to negotiate, because the payments had mostly been made.

As I pointed out earlier, more than $90,000 of the $150,000 had been paid out.

On another matter, Mr. President——

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield before he turns to another matter?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I shall yield in a moment.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION LOSSES AND THE BUDGET

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, yesterday the President of the United States submitted the budget, in which he pointed out that $99.7 billion would be next year's expenditures.

It is interesting to note that in this budget, although the Commodity Credit Corporation's losses are listed as $3.2 billion, an appropriation of only $2.3 billion is asked for in this connection. That means that $900 million will not be reimbursed. This money, having been lost, whether it is reimbursed this year or next year, actually is an expenditure.

Therefore, it could be said that this is not exactly a $99.7 billion budget, but rather a $100.6 billion budget. Certainly these losses of the Commodity Credit Corporation must eventually be restored.

I regret that this has developed into a rather common practice in order to hold down what appears to be the real deficit that is being generated.

For example, the Comptroller General, under date of January 13, 1965, submitted to Congress an audited report of the Commodity Credit Corporation. In this report he points out that the losses actually sustained by the Commodity Credit Corporation are not being fully restored, as they should be. In schedule 4, page 4, of the Comptroller General's audited report there appear these items. They are listed as unrestored, realized losses. For fiscal year 1961 these losses were $1,057,047,169.73.

For fiscal year 1962 the losses were $100,000,162.73. For fiscal year 1963, they were $2,654,853,208.90. For fiscal year 1964, they were $3,226,769,976.27. The total is $7,038,670,517.63.

In the 1965–66 budget the administration is asking for an appropriation of $2,300 million, which will reduce that much of the 1964 $3.2 billion deficit. But even after that has been appropriated there will still remain an accumulated deficit of $4.7 billion over the past 4 years. This amount has been actually sustained as losses but which has not been written off.

Mr. President, I think that what I have stated shows an unfortunate policy that we have adopted. I hope that the administration will correct it. We dislike to see our deficits mount, but if we spend, let us face the facts. If those are deficits, and if we are to spend that amount of money, let us put it before the people above board so that the American taxpayers can see it.

Much has been said in the Congress and before committees about the necessity of a truth-in-lending bill. There may be merit to some of those proposals. But I wonder if we also do not need a truth-in-Government-reporting bill, so that the Government will tell the American taxpayers and the American citizens exactly what is happening.

INVESTIGATION OF ROBERT G. BAKER BY COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. Somewhat earlier in his remarks the Senator from Delaware made some rather comprehensive statements about a contract let by the Army to the Sweet Water Development Co., as I got the name. During the course of his comments, the Senator pointed out that a $2,500 check for attorney's fees had been issued to the law firm of Tucker & Baker. I wonder if my friend is aware of the fact that the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration has for some weeks been investigating that subject.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Oh, yes. I understood that the committee had, because on one particular day members of the committee were waiting in the other Chamber as I was examining the records.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I was not present during a good part of the morning hour. Did I correctly understand the Senator from Delaware to state that he had spoken on this general subject during the morning hour?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. No. I said I had incorporated some material into the RECORD. I have just made the speech. I believe the Senator from Pennsylvania was present when I made my speech, or at least most of it. I hope he was.

Mr. CLARK. As I said, I was not present during the morning hour. My purpose in asking the Senator to yield is to ask him whether during his talk in the morning hour he made any reference to Robert G. Baker other than the one he made in his speech just now.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. As I told the Senator from Pennsylvania earlier, I would strongly suggest that anytime he is interested in what I say, he should always be present, because I am conceited enough to think that what I say is important and should necessitate his presence.

Mr. CLARK. I am delighted to have the advice of my good friend from Delaware, which is always good. If the Senator is finished, I should like to seek the floor in my own right.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator from Pennsylvania has pointed out that the Committee on Rules and Administration is working on this case. That is good. I know of two or three other instances in which the committee examined a subject after I had examined the record. I am glad to assist whoever might be interested in following the subject. I even marked some of the pages. I hope very much that they did pay attention to it.

I thought the question might be asked as to why I was not turning this information over to the Committee on Rules and Administration. But they have stated in very clear language that they were not interested in anything I develop. I presented this material today because I thought that even though the committee might not be interested, someone else might be. So I thought I would make that information available for whatever assistance it may be, and I shall continue to do this in the future.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, before the Senator from Delaware leaves the Chamber, I should like to have it stated for the RECORD that he is quite wrong in his view that the Committee on Rules and Administration is not interested in anything else he might drag up about the Baker case. We are always fascinated with the information which the able Senator from Delaware drags out for us. From time to time we ask him if he knows anything else. He always tells us that he does not know anything else. Then something else turns up. I hope that he will feel free at all times to communicate through the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration or, if he prefers, through the ranking Republican member of that committee, any other information he may turn up. The doors of the committee are always open to him; and we hope that he will not feel it necessary to go to the floor of the Senate with material which the Committee on Rules and Administration already has under investigation in connection with the Baker case.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I am delighted that the Senator from Pennsylvania is fascinated with what I have to say. I hope that in the months to come his fascination will continue.

THE BUDGET

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I congratulate President Johnson on the budget which he sent to Congress yesterday—a budget which calls for a $5.3 billion deficit. In view of the prevailing attitude in Congress toward Federal expenditures, I recognize the political necessity which required him to hold his budget below $100 billion; but I deplore it. Let me attempt to justify this somewhat provocative assertion.

In an editorial this morning, the Washington Post expressed some concern that the deficit in this budget may not be big enough to maintain the rate of expansion we have enjoyed during the last 49 months. The editorial said, in part:

> While the 1965 budget, with the big tax cut, provided a stimulus of about $10 billion in reduced tax liabilities, this budget will at best provide an offset for rising Federal revenues.

In others words, this budget's deficit may not be big enough to boost aggregate demand high enough to employ the unemployed and use the idle plant capacity which still exists.

In my capacity as chairman of the Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, where we have been greatly concerned with the fact that our increasing gross national product and our increasing prosperity have not brought a comparable reduction in unemployment or in the utilization of presently unused plant, it has been our view in the subcommittee—at least, on the part of the majority of the members—that in order to reduce unemployment, the fiscal tool of an unbalanced budget should be utilized, unless and until it becomes apparent that the use of that tool will engender some inflation, which it has not done in any significant degree up until this time.

On Sunday, in the New York Times magazine, Edwin L. Dale, one of our most able economic reporters, wrote one of the finest popular expositions of why a deficit is sometimes necessary that I have ever read. Under the title of "When Will It Be Safe To Balance the Budget?" Mr. Dale points out that in recent years a growing number of businessmen, bankers, and labor leaders have come around to the conviction that deficits can often be good and not bad for America; and that sometimes deficits may be necessary even when the economy as a whole is on the rise.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. I find the thesis of the able senior Senator from Pennsylvania interesting. The role of Government in our national economy has undergone and is still undergoing considerable change. The attitude of the people toward the use of fiscal policy, tax policy, and monetary policy has undergone change and is still undergoing change.

In view of the comments of the able Senator from Pennsylvania, I hope he will not mind it if I recall to him that had Congress not passed the tax reduction bill last year, we would now have a surplus instead of a deficit. I know the Senator may very well take a view that this would be bad. If that be true, then let me suggest to the Senator that a year ago the senior Senator from Tennessee was suggesting that the pressing needs of our society were not bigger profits—profits then being at an all-time high; not for big tax cuts for those who needed them the least; but for an adequacy of education, for better health facilities, full employment and improvement of community facilities. Nevertheless, there was a hue and cry for tax reduction. This, we were told, was the "consensus."

Now that we have closed our eyes to the real needs of our people and reduced Government revenue by more than $11 billion, we discover that we have something called poverty, against which we must wage war. We discover that our health facilities are inadequate; that education is woefully inadequate; that our streams are polluted; our trains too slow; and that America is badly in need of beautification. Indeed, we discover that our society has many pressing needs. But now we do not have the money to meet those problems because we gave away the revenue in an unwise, unjustified, political tax cut, without which, let me again point out, we would now have the money to solve the problems which are most pressing to our society. And the "consensus" is nowhere to be found.

Mr. CLARK. I agree in part with my good friend from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. That is a great victory.

Mr. CLARK. No; I think the Senator from Tennessee and I have always been in accord in connection with the economy. I have felt for a long time that the public sector of our economy has been starved. There are needs for vast expenditures for education, the rebuilding of cities, health needs, the purification of streams, conservation, and the like. Expenditures in those areas are vitally needed and should be made. That part of our economy has been starved to some extent.

However, my view is that there is also a need for a continuous stimulation of the private sector of our economy, in order that revenues may be obtained, largely to make it possible, in due course, to make expenditures in the public sector which are deserving, and with respect to which I am in complete accord with the Senator from Tennessee.

The Senator from Tennessee is a pragmatic man. He knows there are limits to which the Federal bureaucracy can gear itself up to spend wisely the money which Congress might appropriate.

In my view, while I would prefer to see, as I said at the beginning of my remarks, a budget well in excess of $99.7 billion, I still think there are limits to our public expenditures in the areas which the Senator points out.

I also reiterate what I said before: That there is an economic benefit in running a deficit large enough to stimulate employment. This is my particular interest—employment; to reduce the all-too-high unemployment rate. A deficit does stimulate employment.

Also, it is necessary to be certain that we do not run so large a deficit that we create inflationary pressures, as we would do if we were to create dificits which required more Government borrowing than there were savings to go into Government securities.

So the only difference between the Senator from Tennessee and me is largely one of timing.

I again say that I wish the budget were larger. I did not go along with the Senator from Tennessee in voting against the tax bill, a bill which I think has probably pragmatically done more than any other single measure I can recall to keep our economy moving in the way John Kennedy got it moving in the early days of 1961.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONDALE in the chair). The senior Senator from Tennessee is recognized.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I am grateful for the comments of the distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania. Unquestionably, some stimulation has been realized, however temporary. I think the amount has been grossly exaggerated and its effect greatly overplayed. When millions of our fellow citizens find in April that an inadequate amount to meet their tax liability has been withheld from their paychecks, they will suffer some disillusionment themselves.

It seems to me that what the able Senator has said is that he favors deficit financing, but, as he points out, there are two kinds of deficits. One is a deficit resulting from inadequate revenue, which may or may not serve the right purposes, and the other involves the expenditure of more funds than are taken in.

Mr. CLARK. Or both.

Mr. GORE. That is correct. In the latter instance, however, the expenditure of funds can be directed and, indeed, by law must be directed, for specific purposes, while an arbitrary across-the-board tax reduction that permits a taxpayer with an annual income of more than a million dollars a year to pay a tax in the 15-percent bracket, contrary to the public understanding, is not the type of program that will serve well the social objectives of the country, but, which, instead, piles favoritism on top of existing favoritism.

We come back to the fundamental question, that instead of an across-the-board tax reduction, which gave most relief to those who needed it the least, we should have had a tax reform plus a stimulation of the public sector to meet and solve the pressing problems which are now constantly placed before Congress and the country.

I am still ready to do that. I know that the distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania would welcome a rigorous tax reform today.

It is somewhat unrewarding, however, to speak about tax reform after we have so unfairly and unwisely reduced taxes without making the needed tax reforms.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I have no serious quarrel with the senior Senator from Tennesee. I agree with him that we missed the boat when we did not require tax reform as the price for tax reduction. As the Senator stated, it may be too late now.

Mr. President, I return to my earlier comments on Mr. Edward L. Dale's splendid article, "When Will It Be Safe To Balance the Budget?" which appeared in last Sunday's New York Times magazine.

Mr. Dale paid particular tribute to Walter Heller, certainly the most successful Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers we have had, for advising a deficit even if busines is rising. Walter Heller—and I suspect the vast majority of professional economists as well as increasing numbers of businessmen and bankers—several years ago saw the very real dangers of a budget surplus—or even a budget in balance—when the country was still failing to employ its idle manpower and unused productive capacity.

The Federal budget represents one-sixth of our gross national product. It is the one segment of the national economy which can be controlled purposefully. It can be expanded when the level of aggregate demand must be increased by expanding Federal purchases of goods and services and contracted when there is too much demand and the risk of inflation.

The Heller policy works. The extra aggregate demand pumped into the economy by the 1963 tax cut helped put 1.5 million men and women to work and our industrial plants moved closer to their potential output.

The critical nature of this problem can well be envisaged if we remember that each year for the foreseeable future, 1 million more individuals will join the labor force than joined the year before, and the further fact that the pressure of automation and cybernation in job-serving devices is aggravating joblessness at a very time when the size of the labor force is increasing rapidly.

Therefore, we must be very alert indeed to assure that the Federal Government, through fiscal and monetary measures and an active expenditure policy, is helping to create jobs. We must be keenly aware of the fact that at a time when we have the greatest prosperity of any country in the history of the world, we are still plagued with an unemployment rate that is far too high, particularly among younger people moving into the labor force either as graduates from schools, or, more often, as dropouts from school, and particularly with respect to the very high rate of unemployment among members of minority groups, particularly Negroes. The Heller policy, as I say, has worked.

Yet, as the President pointed out yesterday, there is a $30 billion gap between our present output and what is needed to provide full employment. The Federal budget is one tool we have for helping to close that gap.

We have reached the day when the Federal budget must no longer be viewed by Congress as a simple fiscal document, a tally of revenues and expenditures compiled by bookkeepers. It is the single best fiscal tool we have for keeping the national economy on an even keel and ever on the rise.

As the President said yesterday:

> When budgetary restraint leads the Government to turn its back on new needs and new problems, economy becomes but another word for stagnation.

And he went on:

> The budget is * * * a powerful force which can help or hamper our efforts to achieve stable prosperity and steady growth.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I agree with a number of the arguments made by the distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania.

However, when we look at the so-called deficit in the budget, there are a number of items included in expenditures, which may not refer at all to the fact that there are assets on the other side of the ledger. For example, in this year's budget there is an item involving an additional contribution by the United States to the International Monetary Fund. If only the gold contributions should be counted, under the present plan, as a practical matter that is an asset. The United States can draw it out any time it wants it back. It is not a proper part of any deficit. There will be loans under the Export-Import Bank, which, so long as they are held by the Government, are regarded as being part of the deficit.

The Senator knows that they are sound loans. They pay off with interest. And while they reflect an increase in the deficit, because there is an asset that offsets them, there are certain public power projects, with regard to which funds will be devoted, which pay themselves off with interest. At least in part, those are assets that will pay themselves out in cash.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I think the senior Senator from Louisiana will agree with me; and I am sure, from private conversations that I have had with him, the senior Senator from Louisiana would agree, too, that the method of presenting the Federal budget is an accounting monstrosity which tends more to confuse than to explain.

For years many Senators have urged that the Federal budget be presented in a different way, or at least, in a more orderly way so that we may take a look not only at the cash inflow and the cash outflow, which has a real bearing on the fiscal impact on the Government, but also that we may distinguish between capital expenses and orderly operating expenses, in the manner that some of our well-operated cities and States in the country have done for years.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. As the Senator so well knows, if any bank or any building and loan association, or a major corporation set up their books as required to be set up on the part of the Federal Government; namely, that if an expenditure is made it goes down as a liability, without its being an asset of the bank—the bookkeeping of this particular bank or building and loan association would be of such a nature as to make it appear to be hopelessly bankrupt, without hope of retrieving anything.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct; but if a corporation kept its books in that way, it would be in trouble with the Securities and Exchange Commission, because it would be accused of fraudulent accounting.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. As the Senator knows, the banks would be in the position of rendering statements that would make it appear that they were bankrupt to the stockholders, while, according to SEC regulations, they would be required to declare dividends.

Mr. CLARK. I return to my text. The President said:

> When budgetary restraint leads the Government to turn its back on new needs and new problems, economy becomes but another word for stagnation.

He continued:

> The budget is a powerful force which can help or hamper our efforts to achieve stable prosperity and steady growth.

It appears that the President, as well as most of the country's economists, many business and labor leaders and bankers, are well aware of the role which the budget must play in bringing about a full employment economy in the United States. But, as the Washington Post observes this morning, so long as the conventional economic wisdom continues to prevail in Congress, the President "is in the predicament of the pugilist who was compelled to enter the ring with sandbags on both legs."

I would hope that what I have referred to as economic illiteracy by many of my beloved colleagues will be dissipated, that the congressional lag in terms of economic thinking will disappear, and that the executive branch will be able to put into effect doctrines of modern economics with respect to the proper utilization of fiscal weapons in order to promote the orderly growth of our economy.

Let me say a word about the national debt, because to my way of thinking there is more talk about the national debt than any other matter connected with the Federal budget. Obviously, when there is a national budgetary deficit, an excess of cash outflow over cash income, Government must cover those deficits by borrowing money. Like other borrowers, it taps the huge amount of savings that the economy generates each year. The national debt now totals $315 billion, but again I point out—and it should be pointed out again and again and again—that most of it was piled up during World War II, when budgetary deficits were huge, and we had to resort to printing money to keep the Government operating, because there were not enough savings to finance the huge debt without demoralizing the monetary structure.

But today the Government covers its budget deficits by borrowing money. Like other borrowers—corporations, State and local governments, and individuals—it taps the huge flow of savings that the economy generates each year. The Government has rigorously refrained from financing its debt by printing money since the war. The borrowing creates the national debt, which is now $315 billion.

The first thing to be said about the national debt is that it is made up of a host of individual securities, ranging in maturity from 3 months to 25 years, that are always paid off or replaced by new securities, as they come due. The public debt now constitutes an essential part of the Nation's financial mechanism, forming a medium for investment of a part of the funds of individual savers, of institutions such as insurance companies and pension funds.

The National Government's securities are today, always have been, and I am confident always will, have the overriding quality of being safe. One will get his money back as long as there is no great inflation. The debt puts our savings to work, creating jobs.

Indeed, if the national debt were to disappear, something would have to be invented to replace it, because if there were nothing to take its place we would have a national disaster.

These are paraphrases of what Mr. Dale had to say last Sunday, but I would like to ask and answer two key questions about the national debt which constantly occur:

> Is it not inflationary? And are we not burdening our grandchildren as the debt constantly grows?

The answer:

> Contrary to widespread popular belief, there is nothing inherently and inevitably inflationary about the Government's borrowing operations, any more than there is in the borrowing operations of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. or General Motors. The danger in Government debt arises from the fact that the Government, and only the Government, has the power to create money.

It is when we go to the printing press for money that we are in trouble. As I said, this Government has not done that. That is why we have had little trouble with inflation in recent years.

Our Government now finances its much smaller deficits essentially by tapping private savings. As long as it can do this, and as long as it can prevent an excessive concentration of the debt in very short-term securities, there is nothing inflationary about its borrowings. This is not just theory. It is fact. There has been no inflation during a period when we have been having these deficits for the last several years.

Let us now talk about the burden on our grandchildren.

The fallacy behind the assumption that we are playing a dirty trick on our grandchildren lies in the incorrect assumption that the debt will have to be paid off. If it were, then, of course, there would be a large extra tax burden on future generations. But the fact is that the debt will never be paid off, and today the deficits are running at a decreasing percentage of our gross national product.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield to the ablest economist in the Senate.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that in 1946 the total debt of the Government was approximately $260 billion, and that the gross national product was slightly more than $200 billion?

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. So the ratio of the national debt to the gross national product was approximately 130 to 100?

Mr. CLARK. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not a fact that the national debt now is approximately $315 or $316 billion, and that the gross national product is $630 billion?

Mr. CLARK. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Therefore, the ratio of the national debt to the gross national product, instead of being approximately 133 to 100 is only about 50 to 100.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. So the ratio of the national debt to the gross national product has diminished markedly.

Mr. CLARK. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not also true that the physical assets of the U.S. Government, on the basis of original cost, $316 billion as of last June, would have to be taken into consideration? This figure has been computed by the House Committee on Government Operations. The amount is now slightly greater than the amount of last June.

Mr. CLARK. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is on the basis of original cost. I believe the Louisiana Purchase was made at a cost of about $25 million, whereas the public lands have greatly increased in value during the 160 years since then. Thus the physical assets of the Federal Government are approximately equal in value to the debt.

Mr. CLARK. Louisiana is only a small part of the original Louisiana Purchase, but I suspect that the value of Louisiana today is substantially in excess of what Thomas Jefferson paid when he bought the original land which extended to the Pacific Coast.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, the Kisatchie National Forest which was bought by the Federal Government is worth more than what Thomas Jefferson paid for the Louisiana Purchase.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Without wishing to disrupt the harmony of this discussion, despite the fight which we had with our colleague over the tidelands, which now have been placed in the possession of the United States, such territories have brought in about $300 million a year in rents and royalties to the Federal Government and will be a continuing source of revenue.

Mr. CLARK. I, too, would dislike to dispel the happy harmony which now exists, but if we were able to persuade the Senator from Louisiana and others of our colleagues to reduce the oil depletion allowance, there would be still more revenue coming into the Treasury.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In addition, there is a contribution made to the Federal Government by the Federal Reserve Board amounting to about $1 billion.

Mr. CLARK. And the Federal Reserve banks are the only central banks in the civilized world which are not owned by the Government.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes, but they would like to retain the earnings without question, but they dare not do so. After the operating expenses are paid, they give these amounts to the Government as a voluntary gift, but they know that if they did not make voluntary presentations of this money, we would make it a compulsory obligation.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator from Illinois for his helpful intervention.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. CLARK. The Senator from Louisiana wishes me to yield, and I am glad to do so.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. While I agree with much of what the Senator from Pennsylvania is saying, and with much of what the Senator from Illinois has said, although the national debt at the present time is a much smaller percentage of our gross national product than it was at the close of World War II, the fact is that the carrying charges are as heavy as they were at that time. The national debt, while it is a percentage of the gross national product, is about half of what it was, and the interest charges have been permitted to double.

Mr. CLARK. I know the Senator from Louisiana is not happy about this.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I am not happy about it at all. I know that there has been "buckpassing" in the field. There has been talk about a sound dollar, honest money, and printing press money; and all sorts of phrases have been heard in the Senate Chamber, but basically it seems to me that it is a matter of the Federal Reserve Board doing what bankers wish done, instead of what the people would like to have done, if the people of this country really understood the situation.

Much as I dislike to make the point of responsibility, it is really in the Congress rather than in the President.

Mr. CLARK. As the Senator from Louisiana will notice, he and I, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], and other Senators, have been able to prevent Congress from repealing the interest ceiling on the Government debt. If we had not done that, in my opinion, the interest course would be far higher than it is today.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator so well knows that the rate at which the Federal Government borrows tends to fit the facts on all interest rates. When the interest rates go up by 2 points, that tends to push them up across the entire length and breadth of the debt structure of the Nation.

The last time I examined into the situation, there was about a trillion dollars of public and private debt in this country. The increase of two points on the debt, generally speaking, meant approximately a $20 billion tax on borrowers who, generally speaking, are much less fortunate in my eyes than lenders, for the benefit of lenders. It would seem to me that if we could tend to reverse that tendency, it would be even more of a contribution to the war on poverty than the few billion dollars that are in the budget to try to do something about that war.

Mr. CLARK. I feel that if the Senator from Louisiana were to take this matter up with our beloved colleague and his superior, the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, he might find agreement which would bring us out of this situation better off.

Mr. President, I return to my text and my final word on the suggestion that by increasing the national debt to a modest extent we are being very unfair to our grandchildren.

As Mr. Dale states, the Government does not borrow these days because it is profligate, but for good economic reasons. It can do so if it is desirable or necessary without any real necessity of ever paying off the national debt and therefore to maintain its credit.

Our grandchildren are not going to have to pay for our sins. I hope that we shall hear less in Congress in the future than we have in the past about how we are being unfair to our grandchildren when we support a sustainable deficit in the budget, and hence an increase in the national debt.

As Mr. Dale has pointed out in the article to which I have been referring:

> The national debt will rise again as the Government borrows to cover the deficit. But all indications are that the flow of savings will once again exceed the private demand for borrowed funds this year, and thus the Government will once again activate "idle" savings.

Generally speaking, this will put a large proportion of those funds into that public sector of the economy which has been starved hitherto, and where expenditures will generate new markets; hence a larger gross national product, and hence in turn larger Federal revenues and therefore a wholly salutary process.

Mr. Dale continues:

> The deficit will be financed in noninflationary fashion, as it was last year. Some Americans will again murmur "inflation," and burden on our grandchildren and unsound fiscal policy. Probably more Americans than ever before will say, "Good for the President, he is following the right policy."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article to which I have been referring, "When Will It Be Safe To Balance the Budget," written by Edwin L. Dale, Jr., and published in the Sunday New York Times of January 24, 1965, be printed in the RECORD; as well as an article entitled "Economic Front—GNP's Rise Impressive," written by Harvey H. Segal and published in the Washington Post of January 18, and an editorial published in the Washington Post today, entitled "Budget for Fiscal Year 1966."

There being no objection, the articles and the editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Jan. 24, 1965]

WHEN WILL IT BE SAFE TO BALANCE THE BUDGET?

(By Edwin L. Dale, Jr.)

WASHINGTON.—Tomorrow President Johnson will submit to Congress a fat and complicated document called the budget, covering the Government's income and outgo for the year beginning July 1. At this writing its spending total—whether $100 billion or more, or perhaps less—is unknown, as are the details of the President's coming recommendations to reduce excise taxes. But one thing is as certain as can be. Once again—for the 6th consecutive year—the budget will show a deficit, with more spending than receipts.

It is not only the economically unsophisticated who ask themselves whether there is something worrisome about these continued deficits. One does not have to resort to the homely—and misleading—analogy of the ordinary family to wonder if the Government can or should constantly spend more than it takes in.

Yet it is safe to say that the big majority of economists, and a growing number of businessmen, bankers and labor leaders, believe that the recent deficits in the Federal budget have been good, not bad, for America. So sharply has opinion swung that Walter W. Heller, the recently resigned Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, tells of a leading businessman who asked him last year, "Dr. Heller, when will it be safe to balance the budget?"

This will be an attempt to explain the reasoning behind what is clearly becoming the dominant viewpoint among economic thinkers in modern America: Budget deficits in our present circumstances (though not necessarily always) are sound policy. It is a line of reasoning, backed by some hard facts, that may reassure those citizens who have a nagging fear that something dangerous is going on.

There are a number of places where one can begin, but perhaps the best is our old friend, the national debt. Obviously, the Government covers its budget deficits by borrowing money. Like other borrowers—corporations, State and local governments, and individuals—it taps the huge flow of savings that the economy generates each year. The borrowing creates the national debt, which is now $315 billion, most of it piled up during World War II when budget deficits were hugh.

The first thing to be said about the national debt is that it is made up of a host of individual securities, ranging in maturity from 3 months to 25 years, that are always paid off, or replaced by new securities, as they come due. The public debt now constitutes an essential part of the Nation's financial mechanism, forming a medium for investment of part of the funds of individual savers, of institutions such as insurance companies and pension funds, and supplying a flexible volume of short-term securities in which corporations and others can place their temporarily idle cash. These securities have the overriding quality of being safe.

Indeed, if the national debt were to disappear, something would have to be invented to replace it.

It is astonishing how smoothly the Nation's financial markets handle the huge financing operations of the Government. Every week $2.2 billion worth of 3-month and 6-month Treasury bills are sold without strain in replacement of expiring issues. The Treasury from time to time borrows new cash in amounts of $2 billion and more without causing the slightest ripple, and the operation is worth no more than a few paragraphs in the newspapers.

"Managing" the national debt is not, of course, simple. The Government must make certain that the debt is properly distributed among long-, medium-, and short-term securities. Because an excess of very short term issues can be inflationary (technically, by adding to the "liquidity" of the economy, because these short-term issues amount to near-money) the Treasury must from time to time sell bonds and notes ranging up to 25 years in maturity; it must judge the right time for such sales, and the rate of interest to pay, on the basis of the current market in Government securities. But our officials have become more and more expert in this intricate task, and it is almost universally agreed that debt management in recent years has been handled brilliantly. Certainly it has been smooth, for few of us have ever known it was going on, multibillion-dollar operation though it was.

There remain two key questions about the national debt. Is it not inflationary? And are we not burdening our grandchildren as the debt constantly grows?

The debt—or more precisely the deficits that give rise to it—can be inflationary or not depending upon how it is financed. Contrary to widespread popular belief, there is nothing inherently and inevitably inflationary about the Government's borrowing operations, any more than there is in the borrowing operations of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. or General Motors.

The danger in Government debt arises from the fact that the Government, and only the Government, has the power to create money. If it finances its budget deficits by resort to the printing presses—as Brazil, for example, has been doing—the result is inflation of the most classic and devastating kind.

This happened in the United States during World War II, when it could not be avoided. Deficits—huge deficits—were financed largely by the printing press. The result was the postwar inflation of 1945–48. But our Government now finances its much smaller deficits essentially by tapping private savings rather than printing new money. As long as it can do this, and as long as it can prevent an excessive concentration of the debt in very short term securities, there is nothing inflationary about its borrowings. This is not just theory: Prices have been remarkably stable for the last 7 years, in all but one of which there were Government deficits.

What about the burden on our grandchildren?

The fallacy behind this question is its implicit assumption that the debt will have to be paid off. If it were, then of course there would be a large extra tax burden on future generations. But the fact is that the debt will never be paid off. The individual securities are paid off as they mature, and will continue to be, but they are replaced by new ones. The debt will not be repaid because there is no reason to do so, and because repayment could be downright dangerous for the economy.

It is true that many individual families strive to be "out of debt." It is a comfortable feeling. But this does not apply to the Government or, for that matter, to many corporations. No expanding electric utility, for example, would dream of paying off all its debt. The important point is that both the Government and the utility pay off each obligation as it becomes due.

They can keep borrowing afresh because their credit remains good. They have regular annual income that assures the buyers of their securities that the interest will be paid, and the principal as well when the security matures. A Government security is just as safe an investment today, with the debt at $315 billion, as it was before World War II when the debt was less than $50 billion. As long as the Government's credit remains good—which it will continue to be—there is no reason to pay off the debt.

This is one great distinction between the Government and the ordinary family. Many families use "deficit financing," of course: This occurs in any year in which the family borrows—for a mortgage, to buy a car—more than it repays on past debt. They can borrow because their credit is good and their credit is good because their earnings prospects are good.

But they cannot, like the Government, add repeatedly and indefinitely to their debt. Because they do not have the power to tax, their credit is not virtually unlimited, as the Government's is. There is an effective ceiling on how much they can borrow.

The Government, as we shall see, does not borrow in most years because it is profligate, but usually for good economic reasons. The point here, however, is that it can do so if desirable or necessary and that it need not reduce or pay off its debt to maintain its credit. Our grandchildren will not have to pay for our sins.

The "burden," then, comes down essentially to the question of interest payments. And it is quite true that the gradual increase in the national debt has added to the interest burden not only of future generations but of the present generation as well. Interest payments now amount to one-tenth of the national budget, at about $10 billion a year.

These interest payments go to private Americans—institutions and individuals—who have invested their money in Government securities. To them, the interest is income, not a burden. But for the taxpayers at large, there is no question that interest payments on the national debt are a burden.

But it is a burden that should be kept in perspective. The best way to measure it is to compare the growth in the interest burden with the growth of the national economy, or of total incomes. By this test both the debt itself and the interest payments on it have been a declining burden in recent years. As our incomes grow, the amount of tax that each of us pays to cover interest on the national debt declines relative to our incomes, or at worst remains stable. And the same will be true for our grandchildren, who will probably be actually less burdened than we.

So much then, for the national debt itself. It is now a necessary part of our financial structure, it is not inflationary unless it is financed in the wrong way, and the only "burden" it imposes is the interest burden. But that leaves the more important question of why deficits in the budget can be considered a positive benefit for the economy.

The analysis starts with what economists call "aggregate demand." This is the term for total spending in the economy for goods and services—by consumers, by business for investment in new plant and equipment, by foreigners for exports, and by governments at all levels for defense, education and the host of other government functions.

At times, in our kind of economy, aggregate demand is less than the capacity of our plants and workers to produce. When this occurs, we have unemployment of both plant and labor. The obvious remedy is to expand aggregate demand. But how?

One, perhaps the best, answer is through the Government's budget, by a deficit. A deficit obviously means that the Government is spending more than it takes in. Aggregate demand in the economy can be increased either by higher Government spending with no change in taxes, or by a tax reduction with no change in spending.

In 1964 the Government used the latter method. A huge tax cut poured about $12 billion into the economy by way of private spending, while Government spending remained stable. The $12 billion turned over and multiplied, and the result was a $40 billion growth in total spending in the economy. A million and a half new jobs were created and the economy had one of the best years in history. Government revenue rose, despite the tax cut, because of the rapid economic growth, and the deficit will turn out much less than the $12 billion tax cut.

There are several refinements to this general description of the purpose and function of deficits.

The first is the question of how the Government borrows the money to cover the deficit. Clearly if there were a huge demand for borrowed funds from private corporations and individuals—a demand equaling or exceeding the flow of savings—the Government's borrowing would deprive someone else of funds. And this would reduce aggregate demand for goods and services, thus canceling the effects of the deficit.

But the fact is that almost always when there is slack in the general economy, the flow of savings exceeds the demand for borrowed funds. What can be called "idle" savings are in a sense, the counterpart of insufficient aggregate demand. The two normally go together.

Thus the Government, in effect, activates the idle savings by borrowing them and pushing them into the Nation's spending stream. Because the flow of savings is greater than the private demand for credit, the Government's borrowing does not push up the price of borrowed money—that is, interest rates. During the past year, for example, long-term interest rates remained stable despite mammoth Government borrowing operations.

But let us take an opposite case, say that of 1956. Then the economy was operating with a full head of steam. Unemployment was about as low as it can get, and factories were working near capacity. Aggregate demand was adequate, or more than adequate; and when it is more than adequate—when demand is greater than supply—there is only one result: inflation. And we had some inflation in 1956.

In these circumstances the proper course for the Govrnment is clear; it should avoid a deficit like the plague. If it runs a surplus in the budget, it pays off a small part of the national debt, thus in effect adding to the savings flow and providing more funds for private borrowers. Typically, in times of boom like 1956 the private demand for credit exceeds the savings flow, and thus Government debt repayment—which, in effect, supplements private savings—is just the right medicine. And that is what the Government did in 1956: it ran a budget surplus.

Up to this point I believe there is broad agreement among economists on the national debt itself and on the function of deficits and surpluses in the budget. This reflects general acceptance of the theories first propounded by the great British economist John Maynard Keynes in the 1930's. The debate, to the extent it exists, is not over these principles. Rather, it is over degree and timing, reflecting subjective judgments of the adequacy or inadequacy of aggregate demand and of the savings flow at a given point in time.

The debate centers on a daring innovation of the Kennedy-Johnson administration, under the economic leadership of Walter Heller. Until this administration, the prevailing view was that the Government should surely run a deficit in recessions, when the economy is slack and unemployment mounts, but that it should run a surplus in the budget whenever business was good and the general economy rising.

Mr. Heller's innovation was to deem the economy slack, and a deficit called for, even if business was rising, so long as unemployment was excessive and some idle plant capacity existed. In brief, he and his associates believed and believe that a surplus in the budget was not called for until the economy achieved full employment—a time in which, almost by definition, there would be inflationary pressure from booming demand.

Thus the administration adopted what seemed the almost radical policy of purposeful, planned budget deficits at a time of good business. It felt this could be done safely—that is, without inflation—as long as there were idle resources of plant and manpower. And thus far, at least, the results have borne out the theory.

Extra aggregate demand was pumped into the economy last year in massive amounts through the tax cut, but prices maintained the general stability they had shown for 6 years. Additional men and women were put to work—1.5 million of them—and business profits rose as plants began to work somewhat closer to capacity. The economy grew faster than it otherwise would have, but not too fast.

The policy worked so well that President Johnson is going to try it again this year. The big rise in the number of persons at work still left sizable unemployment because of the rapid growth in our labor force from the teen-age explosion. Plant capacity is still not fully utilized. And so the President will plan another deficit, and create it both by a rise in Government spending and by a cut in excise taxes.

The national debt will rise again as the Government borrows to cover the deficit. But all indications are that the flow of savings will once again exceed the private demand for borrowed funds this year, and thus the Government will once again activate "idle" savings. The deficit will be financed in noninflationary fashion, as it was last year.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Jan. 18, 1965]

GNP's 1964 Rise Impressive

(By Harvey H. Segal)

With the latest releases of information on employment and production, the statistical history of 1964 is all but written. The important question is whether the lesson that it holds for economic policy has been properly understood and assimilated.

In the fourth quarter, the gross national product—estimated at a seasonally adjusted annual rate—reached the level of $633.5 billion. For the year as a whole the GNP was $622.3 billion. The increase over 1963 amounts to nearly 6.6 percent in current prices.

The Office of Business Economics has not yet released an estimate of the 1964 GNP in constant prices. But if it is assumed that the GNP price deflator rose by 1.7 percent in 1964—a figure in which the increase in Federal salaries has a heavy weight—the GNP, measured in 1963 prices, would be nearly $612 billion. And the increase in real rate of growth would be slightly more than 4.8 percent.

By Japanese or even Western European standards, a 4.8 percent of real GNP growth is not very impressive. But bear in mind the recent American experience. For the postwar period as a whole, from 1947 through 1963, the real GNP grew at an average annual rate of a little more than 3.6 percent. And between 1957 and 1962, when the economic policies of the Federal Government wavered between passivity and measures that inhibited growth, the rate was about 3 percent.

A 4.8 percent of real GNP growth was exceeded in only 6 years since 1947, but there were abnormal circumstances in every year except 1964. In the recovery from the 1948–49 recession, the GNP increased by 8.7 percent in 1950. And in the following year the outbreak of the Korean conflict boosted the rate to over 7.4 percent. The gains of 8.2 percent in 1955, 6.8 percent in 1959, and 5.4 percent in 1962 all were made when the economy rebounded from the troughs of recessions.

If one excludes recession years, initial years of cyclical recovery and 1951 as a war year, 8 of the 16 years from 1947 through 1963 remain. And the average rate of real gross national product growth in those "normal" years was less than 2.8 percent. By this standard the 4.8 percent growth rate achieved in 1964 represents a striking improvement, a tribute to the expansionist policies of the Federal Government.

What was accomplished by the higher growth rate? The answer lies in the summary figures on employment and unemployment for 1964.

The overall rate of unemployment, measured as a percentage of the civilian labor force, fell from 5.7 percent in 1963 to 5.2 percent in 1964. When these barebone rates are clothed with arithmetic flesh, the following picture emerges. The labor force increased by 1,258,000 in 1964, but because of the stimulus of the tax cut and moderately expansive monetary policy, the number of jobs increased by 1,598,000. As a result, unemployment declined from 4,166,000 to 3,876,000, a gain of 290,000.

These summary figures, it should be noted, understate the improvement. In December the overall unemployment rate was down to 4.9 percent, the third time since 1957 that the monthly rate fell below 5 percent. And two of those months were in 1964. The 3.5 percent December unemployment rate for men over 20 is the lowest since 1957. And even teenage unemployment was reduced under the impact of higher economic growth.

This record makes a shambles of the gloomy "structural unemployment" hypothesis. The structuralists, a rather diverse group that share only a common pessimism about the effectiveness of fiscal and monetary policies, argued that unemployment could not be reduced because of the obsolescence of vocational skills and the disparity between actual levels of educational attainment and those required for employment in industries that utilize advanced technology.

Can the momentum of 1964 be sustained? The answer is yes, but not unless there are actively expansionist Government policies.

President Johnson will probably ask the House of Representatives to devise speedier procedures in responding to Executive requests for temporary reductions of income tax withholding rates. If the President can extract an agreement on that point, the economy will gain a new and very powerful instrument of fiscal policy.

But a willingness on the part of Congress to change tax rates quickly is not enough. Federal economic policies should be coordinated to achieve predetermined rates of economic growth, rates that are calculated to reduce unemployment to desired levels. If explicit growth and employment goals were formulated by the White House in the same manner that it now formulates the grotesquely outmoded administrative budget, it would be possible to assign specific fiscal and monetary policy tasks.

The great danger ahead lies in underestimating the potential of the American economy. Underestimation is inherent in the wish-fulfilling prophecy of the "standard" business forecast, predicated on the assumption that the rate of economic growth must decline in the latter part of this year. Forecasters project current trends, but it is the business of Government to change them.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Jan. 26, 1965]

BUDGET FOR FISCAL 1966

President Johnson supplied a most apposite characterization of his budget when he remarked that: "It reflected hard decisions and difficult choices." Constrained by the taboo against budgeting expenditures in excess of $100 billion and the difficulty of shifting funds from defense to other pressing needs, the administration was in the predicament of the pugilist who was compelled to enter the ring with sandbags on both legs. Under the circumstances it performed well.

It is significant and comforting that the first topic to which the President turned in his excellent budget message was fiscal policy. "The budget," he said "recognizes that a growing economy is needed to promote national strength and progress. It is also needed to move us toward a balanced budget. When the economy slows down, Federal revenues fall and spending tends to increase. The result is larger, not smaller budget deficits." That statement provides the clearest rationale for submitting a deficit budget for the fiscal year 1966, one that assumes deficits of between $3.9 and $6.0 billion depending on which accounting concept is employed.

But the crucial question is whether this budget will provide a sufficient stimulus to hold the economy on its present tangent of rapid growth. If, as the administration assumes, the gross national product reaches $660 billion in 1965, Federal revenues from all sources will increase by $6 billion. What offsets does this budget provide in order to avert a "fiscal drag," the diversion of large sums from the stream of expenditures through rising tax revenues as economic activity expands?

Under current budgetary procedures, the sales of mortgages and other financial assets of the Federal Government are deducted from total expenditures. Since $3.1 billion in assets are slated for sale in 1966, the gross expenditures will be $102.8 billion, or $3.2 billion higher than in fiscal 1965, a year in which asset sales are estimated at $2.2 billion. A second offset is the proposed reduction in excise taxes which would cut receipts by about $0.7 billion if enacted by midyear. The third offsetting factor is an increase in social security benefits that would be retroactive to January of this year and add a net sum of $2.1 billion to the expenditure stream.

If the administration succeeds in achieving its legislative goals, there will be a nominal offset for the increase in revenues. But bear in mind that the stimulus of excise tax cuts, on a dollar-for-dollar basis, may be smaller than for income tax cuts. And while the 1965 budget, with the big tax cut, provided a stimulus of about $10 billion in reduced tax liabilities, this budget will at best provide an offset for rising Federal receipts.

The fears implicit in the foregoing discussion may well be rendered groundless by an even more vigorous upsurge in capital spending. But that development—if indeed in the cards—lies beyond the horizon of economic prescience. And one closes this budget with some apprehension that it may fail to provide the necessary stimulus to sustain rapid economic growth.

WHY WE SHOULD REPEAL THE GOLD COVER REQUIREMENT

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, we are confronted with the paradoxical situation that while our economy is the strongest in the world, with a gross national product of approximately $630 billion, or an average of about $3,300 per capita, we may nevertheless be facing a monetary crisis. This is true despite the fact that we have no less than $15 billion of gold or over a third of the world's supply. This is about four times the gold reserve of Germany, nearly four times that of France, and almost seven times that of Italy. Furthermore, alone among the great powers of the world, our wholesale price level has remained absolutely stable since 1957–59 as have the commodity components of our cost-of-living index—although services have increased. There is absolutely no need, therefore, either for us or for other nations to take alarm, if we but act rationally and sensibly.

We can easily overcome our monetary difficulties which are partially manmade and which largely result from a tendency to retain outworn traditions which were useful in their time but which today are dangerous impediments. I refer to the present legal requirement that we maintain a gold reserve of 25 percent against both the total of Federal Reserve notes in circulation and the deposit liabilities of the Federal Reserve banks, mostly to member banks.

Since the former—that is, the Federal Reserve notes—now amount to $35.4 billion and the latter—that is, deposits in Federal Reserve banks—to 19 billion, these require at present gold reserve covers of $8.85 and $4.75 billion, respectively, or a total of $13.6 billion. Since our total gold certificate reserve at the end of 1964 came to $15.1 billion, this leaves us with a free margin of only $1.5 billion.

These were the figures for the end of December. No one knows what the loss of gold has been during the month of January. The Treasury Department very properly refuses to give out advance figures. It has announced that it will make a statement early in February. But there has been, as we all know, a run on the British pound, and probably a decrease of appreciable size in the gold reserves of England.

A few days ago, it was reported in the press that gold amounting to at least $132 million had been taken from the underground vaults of Fort Knox and was moving eastward under armed guard.

What the purpose of this is, we do not know; but it is at least possible that it is designed to meet the demands of the French that we redeem some of their dollar claims against us in gold.

Even our present free gold reserves will be reduced very shortly. For in the first place the normal growth of production and trade will cause the supply of bank credit, of deposits in the Federal Reserve, and of Federal Reserve notes all to increase. This will in turn require an increase in the amount of gold required as cover.

In 1964, this increase amounted to no less than $790 million and the prospects for 1965 are that at least a further $750 million will be absorbed in this fashion. Therefore even without other developments, growing domestic needs would decrease the available gold reserves to only about three-quarters of a billion dollars.

But there are other threatening forces as well. We have been running an unfavorable balance of payments in most of the postwar years which since 1957 has amounted to a total of about $21 billion. Our gold reserve has declined by nearly $7.4 billion in the past 7 years. Last year despite all the optimism of the first 6 months, when we were being told that the situation was getting much better, we ran a deficit of around $3 billion. There is every prospect that we will again experience a deficit in this year, 1965.

Even without a run on the dollar our scanty supply of free gold will probably be exhausted by the end of the year. Yet the answer is plain before us. If we fail to act we will then be like the ship in a current of fresh water whose crew was perishing from thirst but who did not dare to let down their buckets because they believed that would bring up only salt water.

But all this does not fully outline the dangers to which we may be exposed. Foreign governments and central banks have $12 billion either deposited in our banks or invested in short-term obligations. Under the International Monetary Agreement of 1944, they can at any time demand that this be converted into gold. France, under instructions from General de Gaulle, has already converted 150 million of her dollar holdings into gold and served notice that she will likewise convert most or all future dollar earnings. This might well result in a drain in our gold reserves of $500 million in 1965.

Moreover, foreign nationals have another $11 billion invested in short-time American obligations. In their present form these cannot be converted into gold, because only the holdings of foreign central banks or governments can be converted into gold. But they could be sold to foreign central banks and these banks could then ask that they be redeemed in gold. The United States has one of the two key currencies of the world—the other is the pound—and bears the heavy burden of being pledged to redeem in gold the foreign exchange claims against it.

In addition to these $21 billion, international institutions, foreign monetary authorities, and foreign businesses hold about another $8 billion. We face, therefore, potential claims of around $29 billion with only a few hundred million as an effective free reserve.

Our burden is made even greater by the fact that Britain, with its far more depleted gold reserves, which certainly do not exceed $2 billion, is now meeting sales of the pound not primarily by giving gold but instead by offering dollars. These are drawn mainly from the $3 billion of credit recently extended to her. We are thus bearing part of the strain of the run on the pound not only by helping Britain directly, but also by substituting large quantities of our own currency for pounds in carrying the burdens of the gold exchange standard. In effect, the gold exchange standard burden is being borne not by the pound and the dollar, but almost entirely by the dollar alone. The dollars placed at Britain's disposal in turn largely become potential claims against our gold.

It is idle to say in response to all this that we have $90 billion invested abroad with which we can retaliate or which can readily be brought to the defense of the dollar. These claims are in longtime debts which cannot be quickly realized upon. Moreover, they are mainly the property of private businesses and persons and not within the reach of our monetary authorities, except through unprecedented, or extraordinary legislation.

Nor is it safe to place our sole trust in the cooperative policies of the European Central Banks, or rest secure in the belief that they could never play the part of Samson by pulling down the pillars of the financial temple upon themselves as well as upon us.

The foreign central banks are valuable institutions, but it is well known that years ago the head of the Central Bank of Germany, Mr. Blessing, implied that our financial policies were unsound because we were operating under a deficit, although that deficit was largely caused by the expenses which the American Government was bearing in protecting Germany and other countries from possible Russian attack.

Mr. Blessing now is unreasonably blaming us for the increase in prices in Germany, indicating in a recent statement, that the rise in prices in Germany is imported inflation, and, although not directly stating so, clearly implying that it was some disease which we had somehow or other caused them to experience. But you cannot freeze prices and take part in the international trade and monetary mechanism.

So we cannot rest secure, relying on central bank cooperation to avert any possible crisis. The foreign central banks are in fact largely the creatures of their governments although their psychology is primarily that of the private international bankers. Many of them have been smarting under the financial primacy of the United States and have made very caustic references about us. It is not impossible that they can be used to embarrass us. They might tighten the noose so that, in order to prevent a massive run on the dollar, we would be forced to agree to their financial demands that we raise the long-term interest rate or bow to the political program of Gen. Charles de Gaulle.

These are background influences, but in the foreground are the international freebooters of finance. Many of these operate out of Zurich, where, under the Swiss system of numbered accounts, they can conceal their identity and buy and sell currencies behind a mask of anonymity. Like the dwarfs in the Wagnerian cycle of the Nibelungenlied they try at times to hoard their gold in the hope that if they can force a country to devaluate, then they will make a profit on the transaction. Not without reason, these gentlemen have been referred to, in operatic terms, as the "gnomes of Zurich."

For too long have the members of the Federal Reserve Board been excessively fearful of these gentry and have sought to offset their influence by trying to keep our short-time interest rates high in order to head off withdrawals by them.

I believe I should say, in justice to the Treasury and, in some degree, to the Federal Reserve, that during the past few years, particularly in the years of the Kennedy and Johnson administrations, they have been successful in keeping the long-term rate from rising, as it otherwise would. However, as the Senators from Pennsylvania and Louisiana have implied, under the preceding administration there was without question a terrific drive to raise the long-term interest rate.

If our memories are sharp, we will remember the so-called "fabulous fives," which the then Under Secretary of the Treasury from Minneapolis issued. It was part of a drive to raise the long-term interest rate to 5 percent, and an effort was underway to repeal the 4¼-percent statutory limit.

One should always be conservative in self-praise. But I am very proud of the fact that some of us stood almost alone against pressure from the Treasury and from the financial community, and that we insisted that the legal limit should not be breached. We turned back the drive to make 5 percent the basic interest rate, and instead of that, we have found that the Federal Government has been able to borrow on a longtime basis at less than 4¼ percent. When I looked at the figures a few days ago, the current rate seemed to be somewhere around 4⅛ percent. So we still have a margin of safety.

I submit that the experience has shown that we were right on this point years ago; that the Eisenhower administration was wrong, that the international banking fraternity was wrong, and that, in the aggregate, those of us who stood firm—a small few—have probably saved the taxpayers and business groups of this country many billions of dollars.

Some have estimated that the amount of money which is under the control of this international money ring probably does not exceed a billion dollars at the outside and may be only half this amount, or $500 million. This may be an understatement and in a future crisis it might well be more. In any event in the past the Federal Reserve, with certain honorable exceptions, has allowed a very short tail to wag a very big dog. For the total amount which has been shifted in the past was probably less than one-fifth of 1 percent of the gross national product, and may have been as low as one-tenth of 1 percent of the gross national product. As long as this fear overhangs our money managers and disturbs both their waking and sleeping hours, there is always the danger that they will attempt to deal with it by raising our interest rates.

This would put a damper upon our internal economic expansion and would increase unemployment, which, with sodden poverty, is our most acute economic evil.

While only a minority of malevolent anti-Americans would desire such a result, the inherent bias of the international bankers in favor of high interest rates would make them welcome such an increase here. For it would also enable them not only to maintain their present exceptionally high rates but might also permit them to be increased.

The monetary situation is therefore potentially serious and we should not drift any longer.

II

It is basically both ridiculous as well as tragic that we are allowing ourselves to be put in great danger because of an obsolete requirement which meets no present need or purpose. For the gold reserve requirement—now 25 percent—was imposed when one could demand and receive gold for paper currency and for bank deposits.

But since 1933 this is no longer possible. No one can get gold in return for Federal Reserve notes.

From a somewhat depleted pocketbook, I pull out a number of Federal Reserve notes, which I hope will last me for the next week. I hold in my hand a $20 Federal Reserve note. It states:

> This note is legal tender for all debts, public and private, and is redeemable in lawful money at the U.S. Treasury or at any Federal Reserve bank.

I have frequently presented Federal Reserve notes either to members of the Treasury or to members of the Federal Reserve Board and have asked to have the money redeemed in gold. They have always refused and have said that the law of 1933 prevents them from doing so.

When the money has been redeemed, how has it been redeemed? By giving me another $20 Federal Reserve note.

I now turn to the very able Assistant Parliamentarian, who is a neutral person in relation to this subject, and I give him a $20 note, not as a gift, but I ask him to serve as my agent and see if he can have it redeemed in gold at the nearest Federal Reserve bank or at the Treasury.

I also have on my desk bills of smaller denominations, which I ask him to have redeemed for me. First, I give him a $10 Federal Reserve note, which contains an identical statement:

> This note is legal tender for all debts, public and private, and is redeemable in lawful money at the U.S. Treasury or at any Federal Reserve bank.

I shall ask our good friend the Assistant Parliamentarian that, at the conclusion of today's session he go over to the Treasury and ask that this note be redeemed in gold and see what his experience is when he does so. I think at most he will be given another Federal Reserve note for $10.

Coming down to more democratic currency, I have a $5 bill in my hand, which is also a Federal Reserve note. It bears the identical statement:

> This note is legal tender for all debts, public and private, and is redeemable in lawful money at the U.S. Treasury or at any Federal Reserve bank.

Would you, sir, take this $5 note and ask for gold? I say that if you have any expectation that you will get gold, you will be grievously disappointed. All you will get back, sir, will be another $5 Federal Reserve note.

The $1 bill contains a somewhat shorter statement:

> This note is legal tender for all debts public and private.

I ask the Assistant Parliamentarian to go to the Treasury and present that $1 bill, which is a Federal Reserve note, or go to Mr. William McChesney Martin downtown in that handsome palace in which he dwells, and ask that he give you $1 in gold. I caution you, however, that if you expect to receive a dollar in gold, you will be grievously disappointed.

Now, sir, I have entrusted $36 to you. I do not have a $50 Federal Reserve note. Perhaps I could borrow one and ask you to take care of it. You would have the same experience with a $50 bill; you would have the same experience with a $100 bill, a $500 bill or a $1,000 bill.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I hand the Senator a Federal Reserve note.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Here is a $100 bill. I am glad to have such an affluent friend.

I now hand a $100 Federal Reserve note to the Assistant Parliamentarian. That note contains the same statement:

> This note is legal tender for all debts, public and private, and is redeemable in lawful money at the U.S. Treasury or any Federal Reserve bank.

The "lawful money" which the Treasury will give you, sir, will not be gold. It will not be silver. They will not say, "I know that my Redeemer liveth." No; they will reply by giving you another $100 in Federal Reserve notes.

I am very glad that my good friend the majority whip is able to supply that $100 note. If there are any affluent Democrats who can supply a $500 note, or if there is anyone in the gallery who can lend us a $500 or a $1,000 note, I should like to tell them that the money will be safe in the hands of the Parliamentarians, who are men of probity.

I ask the Assistant Parliamentarian if he will, unofficially, at least—because I understand that he is not supposed to report officially to the Senate—report tomorrow on his experiences at the Treasury and the Federal Reserve, and tell us whether they will redeem this money in metallic currency.

He will find that they will not.

Now I shall come down to my own level. I will wager 24 cents that they will not give coin; they will give only other Federal Reserve notes. In other words, the gold reserve requirement against Federal Reserve notes and deposits is pure hocus-pocus. The gold will never be used and cannot be used to redeem the $34 billion of Federal Reserve notes outstanding. Nor can any bank obtain gold by drawing down its deposits at the Federal Reserve. It cannot do so legally; it will not do so economically; because for every dollar which it has on deposit, it can create approximately $6 of credit, upon which it makes its earnings. So the banks do not want to draw down their deposits; they want to keep their deposits up, because that is what gives them earning assets.

Furthermore, they do not need to get gold to protect themselves against possible bank runs lest depositors try to convert credit into metallic currency, for the safety of bank deposits is guaranteed by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, under an act passed by the Democratic Congress in the Roosevelt administration in 1933, an act which has removed the danger of bank runs.

We hear much about vestigial remains. This is what the veriform appendix is which once performed a biological function, but is now useless.

The reserve gold cover is, therefore, purely a monetary vestigial remain which serves no practical purpose but which is a serious impediment in the performance of the one remaining monetary function of gold; namely, that it is the ultimate method of settling international balances of payments.

That is the real essence of our transition and that of nearly all the rest of the world from an internal gold standard to an international gold exchange standard.

It is high time that we used our gold reserve for what it is presently designed for instead of hoarding it for purposes which disappeared over three decades ago. We should seek to free gold so that it can perform its present duties instead of hoarding it for nonexistent and long since vanished functions.

III

I submit that we should make the entire U.S. gold stock available to maintain the international value of the dollar and the stability of our international monetary system.

This very proposal was made in the report of the Joint Economic Committee on the U.S. balance of payments, of which I was then chairman, which was released in March 1964. Unfortunately, the Joint Economic Committee's recommendation did not receive the support it merited within the administration and no action resulted.

The Joint Economic Committee examined the question of the gold reserve requirement in 1963, when the need for action was not as urgent as it has now become. It held hearings in November 1963 on the functioning and possible reform of the international monetary system. A number of its expert witnesses were questioned on the reserve requirement, and numerous distinguished bankers provided written statements in response to my request. These statements are contained on pages 429 through 438 of the printed record of our hearings, and the views of the witnesses on this point can be found on pages 361, 362, 402, 413, 506, and 507. In addition, Senator JAVITS provided for the record a compilation of statements relating to the removal of the 25-percent gold reserve requirement printed on pages 439 through 450 of the hearings volume. See also the report prepared by Dr. Gerald A. Pollack of the committee's staff, "The U.S. Balance of Payments Perspectives and Policies, 1963," pages 10–13.

I was then chairman of that committee; and when the distinguished Representative from Texas, Mr. PATMAN, was chairman, we went into the question of the gold reserves over a period of years and took a great deal of evidence. We owe a great debt to Dr. Pollack, of our staff, for preparing material on this subject. Many of us have advocated this action for years, but we have been voices crying in the wilderness. People have said, "This is not the time."

The need for action is far more urgent today than when the committee's report was released.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am pleased to yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator from Illinois is much more familiar with these figures than is the Senator from Louisiana. I should like to ask the Senator, who has served for years on the Joint Economic Committee and has studied this subject in great detail, both while a member of the committee and before he became a Senator, if he recalls about how much gold is needed in this country for industrial purposes and for purposes of the economy, such as for gold fillings, gold watches, and items of that sort. Does the Senator have any figures on that subject?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have not; I could obtain the information and place it in the RECORD.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Would it be correct to say that the requirements for those purposes, in addition to what is held for those purposes, are relatively small?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think that is true. During the last decade about 47 percent of new gold went into the arts, industrial purposes, and private holdings.

I am happy to note that my colleague on the Joint Economic Committee, Representative HENRY S. REUSS, has introduced in the House a bill to eliminate the gold reserve requirement. His bill, H.R. 2084, contains the same substantive provisions as the bills introduced in the 87th Congress by Representative MULTER, and Representative WIDNALL, a distinguished Democrat and a distinguished Republican, respectively. I regard it as a great misfortune that hearings on the latter two bills were canceled after having first been scheduled, and that the public did not then have an opportunity to learn of the merits and importance of the proposed legislation. I hope that events will follow a different course this year and in order that this issue may come before this body as speedily as possible, I will introduce, at the conclusion of my remarks, a bill identical to that of Congressman REUSS and propose that it be immediately referred to the appropriate committee.

IV

Now, what are the alternatives to such an action? I suppose that theoretically we could stand by and do nothing, relying on emergency action under the Federal Reserve Act to buy us more time. For under that act, the Board of Governors is authorized to suspend gold reserve requirements, "for a period not exceeding 30 days, and from time to time to renew such suspension for periods not exceeding 15 days." There is no stated limit on the number of such renewals which may be permitted. Upon suspending the requirements, however, the Board must establish a tax graduated upward with the amount of the deficiencies.

Chairman Martin, of the Board of Governors, has summarized provisions for this penalty tax, as follows:

> The tax could be very small for as long as the reserve deficiencies were confined to the reserves against deposits and the first 5 percentage points of any deficiencies against Federal Reserve notes. If the reserve deficiencies should penetrate below 20 percent of Federal Reserve notes outstanding, the tax would undergo a fairly steep graduation in accordance with statutory specifications.
>
> The Federal Reserve Act further specifies that, should the reserve deficiencies fall below the 25-percent requirement against notes, the amount of the tax must be added to Reserve bank discount rates. But if the reserve deficiencies were confined to reserves against Reserve bank deposits, the required penalty tax could be nominal, and no addition to Reserve bank discount rates would be necessary.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. While the Senator's argument makes much sense, I should like to ask him if it is not true that sooner or later we shall have to adjust our way of doing business so that our balance of payments will come into line. In other words, assuming that we remove the gold cover and use the $15 billion in gold for international payments, when that is gone, will we not eventually be required to take steps either to restrict imports or to increase exports, or to bring home some of the troops that are abroad, reduce the foreign aid program, place a tax on passports of Americans going overseas, or reduce the amount of goods that Americans can bring back duty-free; to subsidize further the merchant marine; restrict the importation of foreign oil; and use one of the many devices available to us to protect our balance of payments?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do not deny the importance of obtaining an ultimate balance of payments, but this proposal would buy a considerable amount of time during which we could make the necessary adjustments instead of being compelled to move very quickly.

It may become necessary to take some of the steps which the Senator from Louisiana has indicated, although I should dislike to see us take all of them. At the conclusion of my remarks, I propose to suggest some of the ways in which I think we can meet the difficulties.

I should like to point out that there are certain automatic influences which may help us. For instance, there is the so-called unfavorable balance of payments. It has led to a movement of gold abroad, and to an increase in the amount of dollar exchange held by the central banks and private individuals, of course.

This has led to an increase in the amount of bank credit issued by the credit and currency institutions of Europe which has been greater than the increase in output. This has caused an increase in the price level. We have held our own commodity price level constant, in spite of everything. Therefore, since our prices have been constant and their prices have been increasing this has led to an increase in our exports without a corresponding increase in our imports, and therefore an improvement in the so-called balance of trade.

Furthermore, as we export capital abroad, our returns on foreign investment will grow. Moreover, new investments will be used for progressively less profitable purposes and on a diminished margin of productivity. This will mean a long-time fall in profit rates, which will in turn discourage further investment. So that while we do not have the immediate adjustments which we had under the old automatic gold standards, we have an approach to them.

It may be that in a few years the present unfavorable balance will be corrected through these natural forces. There are certain things which we can and should do, and which our allies, in all good conscience, should help us do. They should assume a larger share of the military cost which we bear in defending Europe from possible attack by the Communists. They should assume a larger share of foreign aid at a lower rate of interest. Their rates of interest are much higher than the rates of interest which we charge. They should remove some of the restrictions which they have placed upon our exports to them.

I shall suggest in the case of France, from which the immediate threat may come at any moment, that we press our existing countervailing claims so that they will not be in a position to demand gold for dollars.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, did it ever occur to the senior Senator from Illinois that the leverage which this nation has in world affairs through helping less economically developed countries, engaging in foreign aid, stationing troops abroad, and doing a great number of things, is to a great extent limited by the amount we are able to earn in foreign trade, plus the amount of gold which we have on hand?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is largely true, although I should dislike to see our foreign military policy determined entirely, or predominantly, by balance-of-payments problems.

I believe that the monetary system is something that should serve us in attaining our major policy objectives, and it should not be allowed to dictate what those policies should be.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask the senior Senator from Illinois if he will agree with the statement that the U.S. dollar is good currency, whether we have the gold or not.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. As a practical matter, people throughout the world look upon these dollars with the view in mind of what they will buy, not in terms of gold, but in terms of commodities generally.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. In the last analysis, it is not gold that they are looking for, but food, clothing, shelter, and material that can be used for manufacture—both raw materials and finished products.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, those who spread distrust in the dollar and those who organize international raids on the dollar are betraying the cause of the free world and are acting in a fashion contrary to the welfare of free institutions.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I cannot guarantee this statement, but I should like to ask the senior Senator from Illinois if he would not agree that in all probability we could buy about anything in the world that we wanted to with the American dollar, even if we did not have the gold at Fort Knox as a so-called backup for the dollar.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Very much so. While I do not propose to eliminate the gold exchange standard, because I think it is valuable, I can well conceive of even the gold exchange standard being superseded by a new standard based on an international currency, in which event, international balances would be adjusted by the transfer of deposits denominated in the new unit.

V

But under present circumstances, by far the better course is to reduce or eliminate the reserve requirement. This has several compelling advantages. First, I believe that this method of change, through normal legislative channels, would not create the serious and dangerous shocks to domestic and monetary confidence which the other alternative would cause. I can picture now the headlines in our financial press, or in the press abroad, if we merely relied upon the Board of Governors to suspend the reserve requirement. Such an emergency action would create such widespread alarm that it could easily bring about a run on the dollar which is the very situation which we wish to prevent. It would permit the "gnomes of Zurich" to have a field day. And they could reenact the first opera of Wagner's "The Nibelungenlied," of taking the gold from the Rhine and putting it in underground caves to keep it from being used by mankind. We need a new Siegfried who will prevent these gnomes from exerting their financial power over the monetary system and thus threaten the prosperity of this country and of the world.

Second, international confidence in the dollar would, on the other hand, be greatly strengthened if our total gold stock were unequivocally freed of restrictions on its international uses, rather than to have its use for these purposes made solely dependent upon administrative discretion. And third, it is not seemly for a great country such as ours to see events inexorably unfolding before it without taking timely, positive, and appropriate action.

Some of us have urged the Government, the Treasury, and the Federal Reserve Board for years to deal with this matter. They have withheld their action until the very last minute.

It is a simple matter to deal with this problem through legislation. If we fail to do so, we could bring on a crowning humiliation for the strongest nation of the world.

The truth is that the gold reserve requirement has lost the significance it once had. There is no need to protect the currency. There is not any need to protect the banks against runs. It now remains only as the vestigial remain of a monetary system which no longer exists. It is the smile of the Cheshire cat when the Cheshire cat itself has disappeared.

Let me repeat once again the single but ignored fact that the requirement of a gold cover was imposed at a time when gold circulated as domestic currency, and when it was intended to assure the public that paper currency could always be redeemed into gold on demand. Let the Assistant Parliamentarian find out this afternoon whether that still holds. An ounce of demonstration is worth a pound of exposition.

Since 1933, however, gold has been no longer a part of our circulating medium, either directly or indirectly, and American citizens are not allowed to buy or hold gold except for use in industry or the arts. Thus, clearly, the value of the domestic U.S. currency is no longer dependent in any way upon its possible conversion into gold, but rather, as the able junior Senator from Louisiana has stressed, upon the faith and credit of the U.S. Government and the growth and soundness of the supporting U.S. economy. Monetary gold serves today solely as a reserve for the settlement of international balances and as a means for defending the international value of the dollar. For we operate not under the old gold standard but the gold exchange standard. Let that be known once and for all.

The financial authorities of this country, and, to some degree, the financial writers have failed in their duty in not making these simple facts known to the public, or in not making them sufficiently known.

There are, of course, those who while agreeing with these observations, nevertheless believe that the reserve requirement serves a useful purpose in restraining any expansionary policies by the Federal Government and disciplining the Government to follow policies to restore and maintain an equilibrium in the balance of payments.

I believe, of course, that excessive expansion in Federal spending should be avoided and that improvement in our balance-of-payments position is necessary. But I feel that we have many policy methods which can achieve these ends better than the gold reserve requirement. I would like to cite a letter I received from Mr. Jesse W. Tapp, chairman of the board of directors of the Bank of America. In his communication of December 26, 1963, Mr. Tapp stated that:

> The international movement of gold is not the proper determinant of the money supply of a nation. That money supply, of course, should be held in check if inflation threatens, but gold movements constitute neither a faithful mirror of inflation nor the most effective bulwark against it. What is important is that the monetary authorities under all circumstances be permitted ample scope for flexible administration of the money supply, and not be bound by a rigid limiting formula which would potentially subject our internal economy to stresses and strains engendered by sporadic flights of gold.

Many others, including Mr. Mariner S. Eccles, former Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, have also advocated the repeal of the gold reserve requirement as did some years ago, Mr. Henry S. Alexander, chairman of the board of the Morgan Guaranty Trust Co.—the financial institution which is largely continuing the work of J. P. Morgan—hardly a member of the dark forces of disorder.

The United States has in fact maintained a gold reserve requirement long after most nations have abandoned theirs. According to the First National City Bank of New York, less than half of the world's central banks now have any legal reserve requirement against their note and deposit liabilities. And only three other countries besides the United States have reserve requirements expressed solely in gold—namely, Belgium, South Africa, and Switzerland. We can certainly find reassurance in the "economic miracle" of postwar Europe that a gold reserve requirement is not an essential bulwark against government excesses and inflation. As a matter of fact we are in a sound financial position with an absolutely steady wholesale price level.

Finally, I believe that international considerations support the elimination of the gold reserve requirement. Our gold must be available to meet international claims on us if we are to maintain the international value of the dollar. For if it were not available to meet such claims which may shortly be upon us, the dollar would then be devalued—and this is precisely what we are determined to prevent.

For as I have pointed out, our domestic gold reserve requirement makes the reserve of $13½ billion of gold unavailable for its real functions; namely, to meet international monetary claims.

Again, I quote from Mr. Jesse W. Tapp's communication:

> The 25-percent gold-reserve requirement poses problems for the full execution of U.S. policy at home and abroad. Speculation against the dollar is fed by the illusion that the United States is running out of gold. This false view is engendered by the legal requirement apparently impounding some $12 billion of our gold reserve at the present time (December 1963). Such speculation leads directly to losses of gold from the Treasury's stock, and also tends to worsen our balance-of-payments position.

VI

Some students such as Dr. Walker of the American Bankers Association have advocated doing away with the reserve requirement on Federal Reserve deposits but maintaining the requirement on Federal Reserve notes.

I understand this may be the recommendation which the administration will send to Congress, possibly next week.

This would free $4.75 billion of gold from the domestic requirement on the basis of December 1964 data. An increase in "free" reserves of this magnitude would, of course, postpone the time before we would again have to face up to the issue, but that time would surely come again. For even if our balance-of-payments deficit were to be eliminated and gold ceased to flow out to foreigners—it is not at all certain this will happen soon—increases in the domestic money supply would, within a few years, increase the amount of gold which would be required as reserves to the amount on hand.

Others believe that we should keep our reserve against notes but eliminate it against deposits in the Federal Reserve. This makes just as much sense and possibly more as eliminating the reserve against notes. But there is every reason to make a clean sweep.

I believe that we should eliminate the requirement, rather than tinker with it.

We have delayed too long. The Treasury has pussyfooted too long. The Federal Reserve has pussyfooted too long. The American public has consequently been inert to the dangers which have been lurking in both foreground and background. We are one of the most advanced nations in the world, and we should not hesitate to face our problems. Why should we buy only a few years' time, when the arguments for a partial measure, when carried to their logical conclusions, would have us go all the way? I believe that the time has now come to eliminate the gold reserve requirement against both the deposit and note liabilities of the Federal Reserve banks—on the full $54 billion, and not merely on the $19 billion. Should we not recognize at last that gold is not a national currency now but an international one and that unless we maintain an adequate reserve for this purpose, we, the strongest nation in the world, may be driven to devalue the dollar, an act which is absolutely unnecessary.

Should we not grow up intellectually to the requirements of the world in which we live? Let us not fix our gaze upon a past which has long since disappeared, but, instead, face the realities of the present and the dangers of the future.

I agree with my friend from Louisiana that we shall still have to canvass steps which will bring our international accounts more nearly into balance. Unless we have more cooperation from our allies, this may require an agonizing reappraisal of our foreign military and economic policies.

Now, with a little timidity, I should like to throw out a suggestion which I think may have some merit. I address it especially to those who are managing our foreign military programs. For example, there are at present claims against the dollar which have been primarily built up out of American purchases made by us in France, which we have made at least indirectly in dollars, and not in francs, at the rate of $300 million a year recently, for the purpose of providing troops to defend our friends against possibly being overrun by the Communists. These have become our liabilities to the French central bank and form a part of the danger of a run on our gold conducted by the French Government and the French central bank. This danger could be averted in several ways. First, we could avert some of these charges by negotiating long-term low-interest loans with France by which they would give us local currencies which we would use for the purchase of supplies for our military.

Second, we could ask France to accept counterpart funds which we own in other countries in payment for our purchases.

I can hardly believe that if France faced the fact that she has been and is being protected in part by American arms, she will insist that we pay in gold for the privilege of protecting her. I may be naive but I cannot believe that she will use these claims, incurred in her defense, to try to wreck the American dollar.

Finally, if we do not obtain French cooperation on either one of these first two methods, we have a little-known trump card in reserve, which has been largely forgotten.

We have not finally or completely canceled the obligations of some $20 billion which the European countries owe us for the loans which we made to them in World War I. We suspended asking them for these loans, but we have not canceled them. We suspended asking them for repayment, I believe, in 1931, at the time of the European financial crisis. But they are still legal claims. I would not think of reinstating these claims against Great Britain, our loyal ally, one of the two key currencies of the world, which is loyally striving to maintain the gold exchange standard with us; but I do say that if France refuses to cooperate and uses our very assistance to try to wreck us, we then should reinstate our World War I claims against France, which now amount to some $6 billion.

This would indeed be rough medicine for us to adopt, but if underneath the suave language of international diplomacy, France weakens our position so that we threaten to be carried off the gold exchange standard, then in my judgment this would be a proper form of self-protection—though I hope very much that we would not be compelled to use this weapon.

VII

I do not, of course, maintain that the repeal of the gold cover requirement will solve all our balance-of-payment problems. We will still have to canvass methods which will bring our international accounts more nearly into balance. Unless we get more cooperation from our allies, this may require an agonizing reappraisal of our foreign policy.

Let me say to my good friend, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], that I do not pretend that our present gold exchange standard is necessarily ideal. I believe that it is a valuable transition from the pure gold standard because it husbands a scanty supply of gold and uses it for international and not domestic purposes. But we may, in the future, decide to devise either a more flexible international currency or try to get other European countries to assume the burden of joining the key currency club.

Finally, we should consider the question of flexible rather than fixed exchange rates. But the repeal of the gold cover requirements will give us ample time with which we can deal with these problems. We could then proceed without fear of a panic situation which, as in the thirties might touch off a series of compensatory and competing devaluations which would disorganize international trade in the non-Communist world and wreak great damage upon the prosperity and stability of nations.

The time to act is now. Accordingly, I ask for the consideration by the Senate through appropriate channels of the proposal which Representative REUSS has already introduced in the House and which I now send to the desk and ask that it be referred to an appropriate committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 743) to eliminate the requirement that the Federal Reserve banks maintain certain reserves in gold certificates against deposit and note liabilities, introduced by Mr. DOUGLAS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SENATOR NELSON'S PLEA THAT THE ST. CROIX AND THE NAMEKAGON BE RESERVED FOR RECREATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, Senators know the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON] to be one of the most eloquent conservationists in the Congress today. We know also that his forceful and persuasive defense of our natural resources is founded on an outstanding record of leadership in conservation of the successful and respected Governor of Wisconsin. When the Senator from Wisconsin pleads for the preservation of our wild areas, our shorelines, and our clean waterways, he speaks from a record of accomplishment and a deep personal understanding of the problems and the opportunities which we have in this field.

A few days ago the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON] appeared before a joint hearing of the Minnesota Conservation Commissioner and the Minnesota Water Pollution Control Commission in Stillwater, Minn., to urge that the beautiful St. Croix River be reserved for recreation development. His efforts to save the waters of the St. Croix and the air above them from pollution have received nationwide attention. His recent speech before the joint hearing is as moving and as compelling a case for the preservation of our clean and wild streams as one can find. He makes a positive case. While industry is the immediate threat to the St. Croix and its Wisconsin tributary, the Namekagon, he does not berate the industrial promoters; he asks if we cannot plan more wisely and more cooperatively.

I know that many Senators will be interested in and persuaded by the Senator's statement before the hearing. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD, along with an editorial entitled "The Dying Rivers," and published in the Washington Post of January 19, an article written by Austin Wehrwein and published in the New York Times of December 27, 1964, and an article published in the Economist of January 16, 1965, entitled "Saving the St. Croix."

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR GAYLORD NELSON BEFORE A JOINT HEARING BY THE MINNESOTA CONSERVATION COMMISSIONER, WAYNE OLSON, AND THE MINNESOTA WATER POLLUTION CONTROL COMMISSION IN STILLWATER, MINN., JANUARY 14, 1965

I appreciate the opportunity to appear here today before this joint hearing of the Minnesota Conservation Commissioner and the Minnesota Water Pollution Control Commission. I want it to be clear at the outset that I am appearing here today on my own time and expense as a private citizen. I represent and speak only for myself. Though I grew up in a fine little village not far from the banks of the St. Croix, my prime concern over this river is neither parochial nor nostalgic. It is the same broad concern that all conservationists have about these matters whether it be the wilderness of the West, the redwoods of California, the Indiana dunes, or the Appalachian Trail of the East.

This morning I want to speak briefly about conservation as an issue in American life, and about why it has been for so long an uphill fight and why, I believe, the tide must turn now or the cause be irretrievably lost.

I hope to outline the compelling reasons why the St. Croix River ought to be reserved for recreation development, and why this will be in the best interests not only of the Nation and this whole metropolitan area, but even of Washington County, Minn.

The agencies holding this joint hearing appear to be the only public agencies that have any power under present legal arrangements to consider the broad issues involved in this dispute. I hope that you take these broad issues into consideration and that you examine the information now being gathered by the Federal-State task force on the St. Croix before you reach your decision.

With President Johnson's commitment to protecting our natural heritage and to preventive action on water pollution, the nationwide conservation movement has taken on a new political luster.

Let me quote for a moment from the state of the Union message: "For over three centuries," the President said, "the beauty of America has sustained our spirit and enlarged our vision. We must act now to protect this heritage."

This statement reflects both wisdom and hard political sense. The wisdom is familiar to all of us from our schoolday acquaintances with John Muir, Henry Thoreau, and the other greats of the long, but losing 19th century battle to preserve some of our natural wilderness.

Wisdom has often seemed a kind of euphemism for the attractive but impractical position in that battle.

But times are changing. President Johnson is as much a reflection of that change as he is its leader.

The day when short-term-economic gain could easily win over long-range public conservation interests is about at an end. The vital need to preserve what is left is widely recognized.

To put it bluntly: there is a rapidly growing public interest in conservation that just was not there before. Perhaps some people care now who did not before because they have the money and the leisure to enjoy the out of doors; or perhaps it is because increasing tens of thousands of people in our vast metropolitan wastelands finally sense a growing isolation from nature; or because of the dawning awareness that the children have no place to play, the adults no place to relax in peace, and the environment no place to accommodate the beauty and wonders of nature. Whatever the reasons, there most certainly is a developing sense of dismay over the wanton destruction of our resources.

I think one little noted element in this change is a new recognition of the vital economic importance of outdoor recreation.

According to the highly regarded report to the President of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission (ORRC report), outdoor recreation is a $20 billion a year business—and it is growing by leaps and bounds.

The report, by the way, makes at least two statements directly relating to the decision before this hearing:

First, it states that the recreation resource in greatest demand and shortest supply is water-oriented recreational areas handy to metropolitan areas.

Second, it says, the area of the Nation that by 1980 will have the largest demand for outdoor recreation facilities is the north-central census region. As you know, the Twin Cities are the great population center for the western part of that region.

It may be hard to realize for those who have lived their lives in the St. Croix Valley, but Minnesota and this entire region have a priceless recreation resource in this river—a clean, large, spectacularly beautiful river within a half hour's drive of a major population center.

I am appearing here today to express the hope that you preserve this river in its present state for yourselves and as a heritage for those who come after you.

The President said: "For 300 years the beauty of America has sustained our spirit."

Under industrious cultivation our rich and beautiful land not only sustained our spirit but has made us rich beyond our greatest dreams.

We have always been grateful, but I fear that we have too often forgotten the need to conserve as much as possible of this rich inheritance we have received. Everyone, or nearly everyone, is in favor of conservation—in principle. But in fight after fight, the general public interest in conservation has lost out to the specific local interest in commercial development.

Perhaps the conflict goes back to the day when the white man first faced the original American.

The white man brought from Europe ideas of land management very different from the Indian's.

The Indian had great reverence for the land. He knew he depended upon it for life itself. The fruit of the earth confirmed the generosity of the gods. The land belonged not to the individual, but to all his people.

The white man, of course, thought in terms of individual exploitation—too often for private gain at public expense.

It is only gradually that we are coming to see that there is much truth for us in the original American's idea.

Thoreau and Muir, and our other early conservationists, had a good deal of the Indian about them. But the fight they waged was little more successful than the Indian's.

In most conservation contests—whether over the use of the Indiana Dunes, of the Redwoods of California, or the St. Croix—there is usually a sizable group of local people willing to grant the validity of the conservationist's arguments, but bowing in this specific instance to the strong local economic interest in the development of a specific forest, river, or bit of lakeshore.

The fight has been unequal—eloquent spokesmen preaching lofty conservation generalities on the one hand pitted against a sincere, well organized group on the other speaking the magic words of "economic growth."

The country has always seemed so vast, its resources so endless, and economic progress so American, that the conservation interests, except in areas of marginal economic utility, have almost always lost the contest. No single one of these lost contests loomed large in the total picture. But down through the decades these thousands of lost contests have spelled the destruction of a major portion of America's resources.

In this way, most of the great rivers of America have been systematically destroyed, in the name of "progress."

George Washington dreamed of the Nation's Capital on the beautiful Potomac, the river praised by early travelers for its exceptionally sweet water.

But since Washington left us with his dream tons of silt from exhausted tobacco plantations, acids leeching into the river from abandoned mines, industrial wastes and half treated sewage have fouled this once sweet river and turned it into a national disgrace. Stand on the lawn in front of George Washington's Mount Vernon home today, gaze across the broad expanses of the Potomac, and your view will be scarred by a sign proclaiming: "Danger, polluted water." The U.S. Corps of Engineers has proposed to spend $500 million to build a system of dams to flush out this scenic sewer. And now the President is thinking in terms of a multimillion dollar program to restore some measure of the river's great reputation.

Call the roll of the great American rivers of the past, and you will have a list of the pollution problems of today—the Androscoggin in Maine; the Connecticut, that boundary water between the Green Mountain and the Granite States; the mighty Hudson; the thermally polluted Delaware; the Ohio; the Mississippi; the Missouri, and even Minnesota, covered from time to time by your flotillas of sugarbeet chips.

The story in each case is the same: they died for their country. They died in the name of economic development.

And now we must spend vast amounts of money if we wish to restore part of this heritage.

The story of America's commercial development, which is in large part the story of her rivers, is a glorious one. We all benefit. But we are only beginning to reckon the price we must pay for the foolish squandering of our limited supply of clean water.

The story of America's rivers warns us against that American spirit of optimism that presumes there is always more to be had and more to be carelessly wasted.

The vision of the frontier, with its promise of untapped land and fresh opportunity has always been part of our dream. It has not, however, been part of our reality for some 70 years. We are only now coming to realize this fact.

We must act now to plan, and to husband this heritage of land and water carefully. Our long tradition of private land ownership and management makes these things very difficult for us, but we are learning.

It seems logical to me that some rivers ought to be working rivers, kept as clean as possible, but recognized and designated as industrial and commercial arteries.

Others ought to be classified as wild rivers, and still others as recreation rivers. Your favorite trout stream most certainly ought to be protected in a wild state. Rivers like the lower St. Croix, that offer unusual potential for recreational development, ought to be set aside for wise recreational development.

The St. Croix is the last large clean river near a major metropolitan area in all of the midwest. If we dont halt commercial exploitation here, where shall be stop?

The upper St. Croix is a river that got a second chance. By 1903 the stripping of the valley's forests had left it nearly bare—and made the river towns rich. But 60 years of quiet have reclothed its banks with trees and stabilized its soil with grass. Now it has been studied as a wild river, part of a new Federal program for the preservation of our dwindling supply of undeveloped streams. It looks like the upper St. Croix is going to be preserved. We can all be grateful.

The towns of the lower St. Croix thrived on timber fortunes and related industrial development while the upper valley was being stripped.

The magnificent period architecture in Stillwater is a tribute to those prosperous, high-handed old days.

But since World War I, the lower St. Croix valley has been industrially becalmed. Local citizens have kept up their hopes for a rebirth of industry, but without any luck. In 1938, as Mr. Chester Wilson so eloquently explained at our Senate subcommittee hearings in December, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers completed a 9-foot barge channel 23 miles up the river to Stillwater in hopes of attracting industry.

For many years this lack of industry has concerned local leaders. With proper planning, however, it will turn out to be a blessing. For the lower St. Croix, neglected by industry for half a century, is now in an excellent position to develop a real growth industry—outdoor recreation.

Washington County is already part of the Twin Cities metropolitan area. Even in 1960, according to the census, 50 percent of the county's wage earners worked outside its borders—in the Twin Cities, of course. The pressure on the schools of Free School District 834 comes from the children of Twin Cities workers who are making their homes in this beautiful county.

By the year 2000—only 35 years away (those of you who remember 1930 will realize what a short time 35 years is)—the Twin Cities area population will hit the 2 million mark, according to a report by your metropolitan planning commission, and Stillwater will be practically downtown.

"In our urban areas," President Johnson said in his state of the Union message, "the central problem today is to protect and restore man's satisfaction in belonging to a community. * * *

"The first step is to break old patterns—to begin to think, work and plan for the development of entire metropolitan areas."

Now, but even more in the years immediately ahead, this great and growing metropolitan area will need the St. Croix as a recreational resource, not as an industrial site.

Despite its sparkling array of lakes and woods the Twin Cities area, again according to the MPC report, is even today short of outdoor recreational facilities. In fact it has only 30 percent of what is considered desirable (10 acres for every 1,000 residents).

The Upper Midwest Research and Development Council reports that in the next 15 years the Twin Cities area will bear the brunt of the continuing migration from the small towns and farms of the north-central region.

Wtih incomes going steadily up (the gross national product is predicted to jump 95 percent in the next 15 years) and more and more leisure time available, the need for and demand for outdoor recreation in the beautiful lower St. Croix Valley will be enormous.

Conservationists usually find themselves in the position of arguing for abstract values against men holding gilt edged balance sheets.

We are beginning, however, to develop some facts that help explain the dollar value of green space and recreational areas.

For instance, it was discovered in New York City that, over a 15-year period, property located on Central Park increased 18 times in value while similar property away from the park only doubled in value.

In Washington, D.C., it has been demonstrated that the total investment in lovely Rock Creek Park has been more than paid for by the increased tax income on the properties near the park.

Those who fear that without heavy industry Stillwater is doomed to be just another dying river town are looking to the past, not to the future. Recreational development offers more in the long run than the development of industry on the St. Croix.

The Northern States Power Co. proposes to begin construction this year on the first of two coal-operated steam-electric generating units at Oak Park Heights, Minn., just south of Stillwater. The first unit would have a capacity of 550,000 kilowatts. It would have a 785-foot smokestack, a half-mile coal pile, and require 660 cubic feet of river water per second for cooling and condensing steam. The second unit, a 750,000-kilowatt unit, would of course require even more cooling water.

Valley residents and thoughtful conservationists everywhere fear the heat pollution of the river, pollution of the air by the sulfur gases from the burning of low-grade fuel, and the fiftyfold increase in barge traffic on the river that the first unit of the plant would require. In essence, this plant will simply and unnecessarily reduce the value of the river for recreation at a stage in history when the trend should be sharply reversed.

On the narrow question of water pollution danger, I have no new information to add. The Minnesota Water Pollution Control Commission is, I am confident, able to sift all the available evidence on that problem. If the evidence shows that the operation of the plan will have any adverse effect on the water quality or the ecology of the river, I am confident that the commission will either turn down the company's application for a permit to return heated water to the river, or at least require the construction of the proper cooling towers to insure the river against damage.

I would like to raise one question, however.

The National Power Survey just released by the Federal Power Commission indicates that it is generally considered sound practice to limit stream diversion for stream condensation to one-half the streamflow.

The first unit of the proposed Allen S. King plant would require, I understand, 660 cubic feet per second, well over half the 1,000 cubic feet per second which is the 10-year minimum flow of the St. Croix at Oak Park Heights. Since the second unit of the plant is even larger than the first, I am anxious to see evidence behind the company's assurances that no harm will be done to the river by such massive withdrawal of its waters.

I would like to make one other comment. NSP representatives, in answer to questions at our Senate subcommittee hearing, said that the additional cost to the company of constructing this plant on the Mississippi—say at the Prairie Island site, north of Red Wing, Minn.—would not be great enough to affect the electricity rates.

Still the company argues the wisdom of developing the St. Croix site now on the grounds that the power requirements of the Twin Cities area in the years ahead will be so great that all available sites must be developed at one time or another, and the best time to develop the St. Croix site is now.

Given the fantastic pace in powerplant design and development—it was only in 1961 that the first 500,000 kilowatt steam-electric generating plant went into operation—would it not be wise to hold off on using the St. Croix site for the time being in the expectation that new developments in plant capacity might make using the site unnecessary?

The pollution questions may be relatively easy to pass on. (I emphasize "relatively" because the issue is not simple.) The larger questions, more crucial really, raise perplexing problems.

Which is to come first on the St. Croix—power development or recreation and conservation?

Who is vested with the authority to protect the public welfare in these cases?

This case raises the age old question of land use and resource use, a question that must daily be decided in situation after situation across the country.

Whose responsibility is it?

Are we to ask Northern States Power Co. officials to make their decision on the basis of the area's present and future recreational needs?

The Washington County officials? For the taxpayer that $68 million plant is a well nigh irresistible tax windfall, although I believe there are some who see the long-range dangers.

In the absence of any regional, or metropolitan planning authority, the appeal must be made to this joint hearing to take the larger considerations into account.

I am aware there are differences of opinion over the scope of authority vested in the conservation commissioner by the words "health and welfare" in the pertinent section of the statutes. These are matters over which competent counsel are expected to differ. But since they do differ and the issue is so important, it surely is a matter that ought to be settled by the appropriate court before authorization is granted the company to proceed.

That there is a vested public interest in public waters as such is clear; that any reasonably liberal interpretation of the word "welfare" raises the question of the stake of the general public in this matter; that since this is a private utility with a monopoly in a service area set by the Government, the company can hardly argue that a few months of delay will cause irreparable damage—while whatever damage is done by the plant to the river will be irreparable.

Furthermore, I am advised that the company plans to proceed with construction on other sites including the Mississippi in the years immediately ahead.

I ask again, would it not be reasonable to develop another site now, saving the lovely St. Croix for exploitation at some future time and only if absolutely necessary?

I know you all realize this is a case of national significance. It has attracted attention of the press and magazines through the Midwest and from coast to coast. The New York Times, the Washington Post, the Nation, and New Republic have written stories and editorialized about it.

During the past 100 years we have wrought more wanton destruction of our landscape than any previous civilization accomplished in 1,000 years. We now say, what a pity our ancestors didn't have the foresight to husband our bountiful resources more sensibly. How much richer we would be in both esthetic and material wealth had they had more vision and more courage. Before this case is decided I think we all should ask ourselves this question: What are our great-great-grandchildren going to say about us a half century from now?

I might add that beginning attempts at the industrialization of the St. Croix make it clear that Federal action is needed to protect the national interest.

Therefore, I am now drafting a bill to make the entire length of the St. Croix and its Wisconsin tributary, the Namekagon, into a national scenic waterway.

North of Taylors Falls the St. Croix would be designated a "wild river" as envisioned in the Federal study. A national recreation area would be laid out along the lower St. Croix.

I want to thank you for the chance to appear and urge you to hold your hearings open until the evidence gathered by the task force is available, and then to make your decision on the broadest possible grounds.

President Johnson's state of the Union message showed that the tide in conservation decisions has turned.

If you will examine all of the relevant factors, I am sure that you will decide that the best interests—the welfare of the people of Minnesota—is in denying the application of the Northern States Power Co., and preserving the St. Croix for its rightful role as a recreational resource, a part of what President Johnson has called a green legacy for tomorrow.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 19, 1965]

The Dying Rivers

The St. Croix River is, as Senator Nelson, of Wisconsin, rightly points out, the last large clean river near a major metropolitan area in all of the Midwest. It won't be for long, if the Northern States Power Co. has its way. The company wants to build a coal-burning electric generating plant at Stillwater, Minn. Besides inflicting a huge coal-pile on the river, the plant would also pour warm chlorinated water into the stream, changing the natural habitat for the worse.

Senator Nelson appeared on Thursday before a hearing in Minnesota to appeal to State authorities to reconsider consequences of approving the project. There is no doubt, as the Senator acknowledged, that there would be some local economic benefits for the area if the plant were built. But that is precisely the problem, because, he added, "the fight has been unequal—eloquent spokesmen preaching lofty conservation generalities on the one hand, determined people seeking their bread and butter on the other."

As the Senator pungently put it:

"Call the roll of the great American rivers of the past, and you will have a list of the pollution problems of today—the Androscoggin in Maine; the Connecticut, that boundary water between the Green Mountain and the Granite States; the mighty Hudson; the thermally polluted Delaware; the Ohio; the Mississippi; and even your Minnesota, covered from time to time by flotillas of sugar beet chips.

The story in each case is the same: they died for their country. They died in the name of economic development."

By disapproving or at least delaying the Stillwater generating plant, Minnesota authorities could spare one river from the same fate until Congress has time to consider Mr. NELSON's proposal for a St. Croix National Scenic Waterway. We urge them to do so.

[From the New York Times, Dec. 27, 1964]

PROPOSED POWERPLANT ON ST. CROIX STIRS OPPOSITION—POLLUTION OF WATER AND AIR FORESEEN BY PROJECT FOES

(By Austin C. Wehrwein)

STILLWATER, MINN., Dec. 26.—A State hearing will be held January 13 and 14 on a proposed coal-fired electrical powerplant on the St. Croix River near here.

The project has aroused national concern among conservationists.

The Northern States Power Co. is planning a $68 million expandable facility of 550,000 kilowatts with an exhaust stack 800 feet tall and a coal pile half a mile long.

The joint hearing by Wayne H. Olson, conservation commissioner, and the Minnesota Water Pollution Control Commission, headed by Dr. M. N. Hargraves of the Mayo Clinic, will confront these agencies with problems of high emotional content.

Few of the opponents live in Stillwater, where the plant is welcomed as a tax bonanza.

But they contend that the St. Croix is one of the last clean rivers serving the recreation needs of a large metropolitan area. And they say that the plant would send fumes into the air that would be trapped in the valley by air inversion like that in Los Angeles.

POLLUTION FEARED

They also say the hot water draining into the stream would ruin fishing and swimming by polluting the water. They contend that there would be a big increase in coal barge traffic that would ruin boating.

This pollution, water experts contend, results from the raising of the water temperature—in this case they say by as much as 17°—which stimulates the growth of algae and bacteria.

In an interview, Barl Ewald, president of Northern State Power, made a blanket denial of the allegations about pollution, promising a full technical explanation at the January hearing. He said any consequences of the plant's operation would be of no importance to people or nature.

The 165-mile long St. Croix originates in northern Wisconsin and flows into the Mississippi border.

A part of the upper river is a candidate for Federal designation as a "wild river" and the power company, a big landowner on the upper river, is cooperating fully with the Interior Department.

But the section here is a broad reach that forms a lake. It is, nevertheless, a spring-fed playground for the entire Twin Cities region of Minneapolis and St. Paul and it is said to be the most used boating area between the Great Lakes and the west coast.

The plant site is in Oak Park Heights, a village of 332 immediately south of Stillwater, which has a population of 8,000. It once was a sawmill town, but today is part of the suburban complex of the Twin Cities, which lie about 20 miles to the west.

Local leaders have banded together to fight in favor of the plant, contending chiefly that the population explosion, which made the valley important to recreation, has caused demands for schools and other services that require more taxes. Signs around town say, "Welcome N.S.P."

John T. McDonough, the probate-juvenile court judge, said, "They're raising black dragons. The real issue is not pollution—it is whether the entire St. Croix Valley is going to be zoned for recreation. For whom?"

Ray Humphries, a member of the school board, said, "The St. Croix River is a great natural resource in which the people of Wisconsin and Minnesota have residual rights."

Mr. Humphries is a chemical engineer who commutes to St. Paul.

Those who feel as he does have formed "Save the St. Croix, Inc.," whose membership spreads from the Woman's Club of Hudson, Wis., across the river to the Minnesota Society of Architects. These opponents claim at least 10,000 followers, including many commuters from the area.

They range from implacable foes who see the plant as a blow to spiritual values to those who would accept it if the company would use natural gas instead of coal and cool the exhaust waters.

To Judge McDonough, however, the valley can be used for both industry—of which he wants more—and recreation. He and his friends are determined to show the "outsiders" that the valley residents are masters of their fate.

Sigurd F. Olson, of Ely, in northern Minnesota, a conservation writer and ecologist, summed up the opposite point of view.

"The St. Croix does not belong to those who live along its banks," he said. "It belongs to everybody. It is a heritage all America owns. We happen to hold it in trust. It is up to us to preserve it. The time for decision is now."

He said that no industry, no matter how valid its expansion, had the right to destroy beauty if there were an alternative site, and he said that in this case there was one.

Mr. Ewald, asked why his company did not use an alternate site, such as one near Red Wing on the already polluted Mississippi, replied: "Why should we?"

He said the alternative would cost more to build and to operate and that the objections to the plant near Stillwater were "rather fringy."

He said the plant would be built in an area that already had some industry; that the 800-foot-high stack would emit noticeable particles only once or twice a year, that the warm water would be of no major consequence and that the barge traffic would be confined to three trips a week at night and never on weekends.

The power company, which has been reducing rates, would not have to raise them if a more costly alternative site were used. It would mean, however, that the company would prabably have to skip the next rate reduction.

Gov. John Reynolds, of Wisconsin, set up a study group to look into the effect of the plant on the Wisconsin side of the river. Feeling runs strongly in Wisconsin against the plant.

Earlier this month, Senator GAYLORD NELSON, Democrat, of Wisconsin, and a former Governor, conducted a hearing in Stillwater for a Senate Air and Water Pollution Subcommittee.

He is a strong opponent of the project.

The hearing is expected to add impetus to a drive for Federal legislation designed to prevent water pollution.

A bill designed to achieve that purpose passed the Senate in the last session but died in the House.

[From the Economist, Jan. 16, 1965]

SAVING THE ST. CROIX

(From a correspondent in Minneapolis)

The battle to preserve natural areas for their scenic values, and old buildings for their architectural or historic importance, is all too often lost simply through the failure of conservation-minded people to appreciate early enough what is fundamental to success. A classic example of this failure is now on display in the valley of the St. Croix River—a clear, pleasant stream which rises near Lake Superior and flows south, forming the Minnesota-Wisconsin boundary for 100 of its 165 miles to its junction with the turbid Mississippi. It is said to be the most popular boating water between Lake Michigan and the west coast. Virtually all traces of the lumbering industry, which flourished in the river in the late 19th century, have disappeared; the valley has remained a quiet wooded area—the last such unspoiled valley so near a major metropolitan area.

On the lower river just below Stillwater, however, the Northern States Power Co., which provides the growing region with electricity (the same company, ironically, which has preserved from development some 70 miles of the upper St. Croix) has now proposed to construct a major electric powerplant. The first 550,000-kilowatt coal-burning unit is to be in operation in 1968; a second 650,000-kilowatt unit is to be added after 1970. The company, eager to proceed, has the enthusiastic backing of local interests hungry for the tax relief which its $140-million plant will ultimately bring to a growing community.

The company's proposal has, however, been vigorously opposed by an organization known as "Save the St. Croix"—a curious alliance of planners thinking primarily of the valley as a major recreational site for the 2 million or so people in the Minneapolis-St. Paul metropolitan area, and of local householders. Many of these are commuters into the cities, whose enjoyment of the river and its vistas will suffer from the plant, with its tall smokestack; long coal pile and attendant barge tows. The opponents have drawn eloquent support from conservationists all across the Nation. Their problem is simply that no agency exists which is specifically empowered to consider the broad questions which they are raising about the future use of the valley.

In spite of Minnesota's liberal tradition, it is one of the four States without direct State regulation of electricity companies. Northern States Power needs only four formal approvals: a local zoning permit from the village of Oak Park Heights (1960 population: 322); a permit from the Army Corps of Engineers, certifying that the 9-foot river channel is adequate; permission from the Minnesota Conservation Department, which opened hearings this week, to withdraw water for cooling; and an agreement from the State's water pollution control commission that the return of this water will not raise the temperature of the river unduly and, by doing so, make swimming unpleasant and skating impossible.

Formal review of potential pollution of the air is not even required, though this hazard will be considered. Nor has Wisconsin's approval been asked on any of these questions. The company can point out that no public decision has been made to save the valley for recreation and that it has done more than is legally required to protect public health; it can also ask legitimately, "Why is it up to a private firm to save the St. Croix"?

Indeed, the conservationists ought to have understood long ago the threat which the electric power industry, doubling its generating capacity every 10 years, posed to the rivers of the region. An almost identical controversy has been underway on the Hudson River above New York City. Local planners have long been pointing out that the fragmentation of the metropolitan area into a multitude of small, sovereign governments makes it especially difficult to preserve major areas from development.

Under the existing arrangements for financing public services these municipalities and school districts can share in the tax revenue from the region's commercial and industrial development only by getting the shopping centers, factories, and electric generating plants built within their boundaries. No public body exists to enforce a regional plan for development.

The St. Croix may yet be saved, however. Minnesota's authorities may find technical grounds for rejecting the plant, or the company may move voluntarily to another, already industrialized site (perhaps at Redwing on the Mississippi) either out of concern about future regulatory legislation or simply because its construction schedules make extended delay intolerable. As an interstate river, moreover, the St Croix is likely soon to be covered by new Federal legislation, which President Johnson has promised to support designed to forestall air and water pollution.

The issue, however, goes beyond the St. Croix. There are other cases to which this Federal legislation will not apply. If the people interested in preserving the historic, scenic, and esthetic values of urban areas are not to be disappointed repeatedly in the future, they will need to insist much more skillfully than they have in the past that the planning of major plants and roads be integrated at an early stage with a far more effective program of public planning.

ILLINOIS PARTNERS OF THE ALLIANCE

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, in his foreign aid message which the President sent to Congress on January 14, I was pleased to note the President's special mention of a new program developing under the Alliance for Progress. When he spoke of the achievements that are being realized in support of the Alliance, he said:

> Twenty-five of our States have joined the Partners for the Alliance program—they bring to bear a vital people-to-people effort on our relationships with Latin America.

I invite the attention of Senators to my own State's participation in the Partners for the Alliance. As a result of organizational meetings held last month in Illinois, and negotiations in Brazil conducted by partners officials, Illinois has entered into a partnership arrangement with the State of São Paulo in Brazil.

The first steps in creating closer community-level relationships between the State of Illinois and Latin America were taken on December 17 and 18 with the formation of two Illinois Partners of the Alliance planning committees. This followed organizational meetings in Illinois at which Mr. James H. Boren, director of the Partners of the Alliance programs, and Mr. Robert C. Ruben, special assistand in the partners program, discussed this new approach with Illinois leaders. The two planning committees were formed in Carbondale, in southern Illinois, and in Chicago and their activities will be coordinated through a central organization made up of members of both committees. These groups are now working to enlist the support of business, labor, education, and civic groups throughout the State. Governor Kerner and the Illinois Board of Economic Development are offering the fullest support to initiate a meaningful program that will offer new opportunities to participate in the development of social services, economic growth, community development, and trade.

With the organization of Illinois' participation underway, Mr. Boren left for Brazil. There he scheduled a number of meetings, in southern and northeast Brazil, as well as in Rio, with private sector leaders, governors of states, and other officials to discuss partners program activities. When first in Rio, he met with AID and American Embassy personnel to lay the groundwork for a number of partnerships developing for Brazil.

In São Paulo on January 8, Mr. Boren met with business and community leaders to propose an active partnership between the state of Sao Paulo and Illinois. On January 15, the São Paulo partners planning group advised U.S. officials that they had accepted the offer of Illinois for a partnership arrangement and had begun to organize their program.

I am proud to join with the many citizens of my State who have been working to effect a partnership with an area of Latin America. I commend this program to all those who would encourage lasting friendships with the great peoples of Latin America.

The speech delivered to the São Paulo leaders by Mr. Boren provides valuable background material on the aims of the partners program, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY MR. JAMES BOREN, SÃO PAULO, BRAZIL, JANUARY 8, 1965, ON THE OCCASION OF THE ORGANIZATION OF THE SÃO PAULO/ILLINOIS PARTNERS OF THE ALLIANCE COMMITTEE

It is a pleasure for me to be here in the dynamic city of São Paulo, and it's particularly a pleasure to have the privilege of meeting with you for the purpose of discussing a new dimension of the Alliance for Progress involving the private sector. I have not come to speak in generalities about the Alliance, but rather, in the spirit of the Alliance, I have come to seek your help and to explore with you the possibility of developing a working partnership involving two great areas of the hemisphere, the State of São Paulo and the State of Illinois. The proposal which I shall make is at the request of an active group of leaders in the State of Illinois which has organized itself into the Illinois Partners of the Alliance.

The American nations have been linked from their beginnings by a desire for freedom and greater human dignity. Inter-American conferences through the years have resulted is close cooperation in commercial, cultural, political, and economic fields. This cooperation was made more formal with the creation of the Organization of American States, whose charter was signed at the Conference of Bogotá in 1948. The signing of the Charter of Punta del Este on August 17, 1961, has given a new dimension to the concept of hemispheric partnership. While many areas of close cooperation continue to flourish between governments, and between private and institutional organizations, direct individual or community activity has only just begun.

The partners of the Alliance is basically a private sector program through which direct relationships can be established or strengthened among such community groups as business, professional, educational, labor, service organizations, state, county or city institutions, and even private individuals.

At the present time there are in existence 22 organized partnerships involving areas of Latin America and areas of the United States; other States and regions will soon become organized. These partnerships are action oriented. The partners of the Alliance is not based on material assistance as such, but rather it is based on a concept—a concept of working together in simple but meaningful activities through which economic, cultural, and social development can be promoted through private initiative. The partnerships become a channel through which the citizens of the Americas can translate personal interest in hemispheric friendship into reality.

Permit me to describe some of the types of activities which are being undertaken by some of the partnership programs already established. This month 10 educators from Costa Rica will be traveling to the State of Oregon where they will serve as special resource professionals for 2 months. Each of the educators will work with a different school district. They will upgrade the teaching of Spanish and history, and will provide much enrichment to the educational program in Oregon. While in Oregon, they will participate in professional training programs involving teaching techniques and the development of low-cost teaching materials. Thus, Costa Rica will make a significant contribution to the life of Oregon.

Oakland County in Michigan is working in a partnership with the Valle del Cauca in Colombia. A permanent representative of the Oakland Partners of the Alliance is living in Cali and is helping to develop direct relationships. Students from Michigan are presently studying at the University del Valle under a scholarship established by that university. Students from Colombia are studying at Oakland University in Michigan under similar arrangements. A union leader in Michigan accepted an invitation from a union in Valle del Cauca to participate in a regional labor seminar. Commercial contacts are being established, and other activities planned. Florida is now implementing an educational partnership with Colombia and the Massachusetts Partners of the Alliance is moving forward in a program with the State of Antioquia in Colombia.

The Texas Partners of the Alliance are working with Peru in a number of activities. Various private groups, including high school students, have assisted villages in rural Peru in the completion of many small self-help projects. The Texas AFL–CIO provided wheelbarrows, picks, and shovels to a village which was working on a farm-to-market road. Several villages had built schools but lacked the materials for the roofs, doors, and windows. The Texas Partners provided some of these materials. Villages have been assisted with sets of new books (in Spanish) and generators have been provided for use with night literacy classes. These and other similar small projects were developed in conjunction with the Peru Partners of the Alliance Committee. Plans are now being made for an investments conference through which business leaders of Peru and Texas can meet to discuss not general investment climate but specific joint venture opportunities and other marketing or commercial relationships.

The 4–H Club and other rural youth activities are being developed as one phase of a Bolivia-Utah partnership. Years ago, incidentally, the tomato industry in Utah was saved by the introduction of new varieties of tomatoes from Bolivia; the people of Utah remember this. The Idaho Partners of the Alliance are working with the Ecuadorian town of Pelileo in the completion of seven projects which are an essential part of their town development plan. The private sector part of a Chile-California relationship is moving forward.

A partnership is now beginning to develop between the State of Minas Gerais and the State of Colorado. At this minute the Junior Chambers of Commerce of Denver and Boulder are working on community health center projects. A shipment of medical journals and related materials is now on its way to Minas Gerais. In keeping with the partnership concept, the Minas Gerais partners group is in the process of collecting various mineral samples which will be sent to schools in Colorado to be of help in the teaching of the sciences. Other activities are being planned in this partnership which is just beginning to develop.

The State of Rio de Janeiro has an effective Partners of the Alliance Committee and is developing its program with the State of Maryland. Ambassador Juraci Magalhães participated, as did Governor Tawes, in the banquet during which the Maryland team reported on its program development visit to the State of Rio de Janeiro.

Other partnerships exist which involve a broad range of activities. Some of the Latin American committees are now developing special collections of art, historical material, and handicraft items which will travel on a special schedule throughout the partner State in the United States. Arrangements are being made to exchange educational materials in order that the citizens may learn more about their partners. Partner committees can assist in developing constructive tourism—constructive in the sense of serving as a channel to visitors in partner areas to become acquainted with business and professional counterparts. The range of activities is limited only by the imagination of the partners committees.

The Partners of the Alliance is not a charity or "old clothes" program but it is an action program which is developed along more substantive lines by the representatives of the two partners committees. For example, a group of business, educational, and professional leaders from Colorado and Maryland visited in Minas Gerais and Rio de Janeiro. They met with their counterparts and developed the plans for their initial partnership activities. At this moment a four-man team representing the Ohio Partners of the Alliance is visiting in the State of Paraná for the purpose of discussing making initial plans for the direct alliance. Next week a team representing the New Jersey Partners of the Alliance will be arriving in Alagoas to develop a program. Very soon a program development team representing the Indiana Partners of the Alliance will arrive in the State of Rio Grande do Sul where an effective committee has been established. The Connecticut Partners team will arrive in Paraiba during the early days of February.

We in the United States have learned much from your country, but we have only begun to learn. When the late President Kennedy spoke before the diplomats of Latin America and the Members of the U.S. Congress on March 13, 1961, he said: "We invite our friends in Latin America to contribute to the enrichment of life and culture in the United States. We need teachers of your literature and history and tradition, opportunities for our young people to study in your universities, access to your music, your art, and the thought of your great philosophers. For we know we have much to learn."

And more recently, President Johnson, in speaking of the Alliance for Progress, said, "The foundations have been laid. The time calls for more action not more words." It is in this spirit that I today seek your help in São Paulo.

I have been asked by the Illinois Partners of the Alliance Planning Committee to explore with you a possible partnership—a direct alliance of citizens—between the States of São Paulo and Illinois. The Illinois committee is composed of representatives of business, labor, professional, civic, educational, and State and local officials; it is a committee of leaders, men and women of action. In their first official action, the committee asked that I extend "best wishes to our counterparts in São Paulo, and express the hope for a mutually beneficial partnership. We are anxious that the 'Chicago of South America' be informed of our committee's eagerness to develop an exchange of social, cultural, and economic ideas and projects." Gov. Otto Kerner, of Illinois, has officially asked that I convey to Gov. Adhemar de Barros and to you his sincere interest in the proposed partnership, and he has assured his strong support to this citizens effort. I might add also that present at the Chicago meeting at which the partners committee was formed were representatives of Senators DOUGLAS and DIRKSEN.

Therefore, I now formally put before you the request from the Illinois Partners of the Alliance Planning Committee. They seek a partnership with the citizens of the State of São Paulo, and express the hope that a São Paulo Partners of the Alliance Planning Committee may be organized in order that the program may begin. If you wish to consider this requset and act favorably upon it, I can assist in making the arrangements for a representative team from Illinois to visit the State of São Paulo at some date in the near future. This team would meet with your committee for the purpose of developing the initial partnership programs.

In conclusion, may I explain that my role and the role of my office is to respond to interest and to serve as the catalyst in bringing together the partnership groups. I then withdraw to the side of the stage, but I am available to serve the various committees upon request. Similarly, Jim Grazier of the AID mission in Brazil has an office in the Canavara Building in Rio de Janeiro, and he can be of service to the committees in Brazil in whatever liaison capacity may be desired.

I wish to again thank you for the privilege of meeting you, and I wish also to express the hope that the States of São Paulo and Illinois may become active partners of the Alliance.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate adjourns, it do so in accordance with the resolution previously adopted, as a further mark of respect to the deceased Sir Winston Churchill and his bereaved family.

I now move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Wednesday, January 27, 1965, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 26, 1965:

IN THE COAST GUARD

The following-named person to be a member of the permanent commissioned teaching staff of the Coast Guard Academy as an assistant professor with the grade of lieutenant commander:

John D. Crowley

The following officer to be permanent commissioned officer in the Coast Guard in the grade of lieutenant commander:

Thomas R. Rutledge

The following officers to be permanent commissioned officers in the Coast Guard in the grade of lieutenant:

Roger V. Millett
Timothy J. Howard
Paul Resnick
Robert W. Davis
Fred M. Lane
Walter N. Warschum

The following officers to be permanent commissioned officers in the Coast Guard in the grade of lieutenant (junior grade):

Marcus J. Wallace
William H. Tydings
James F. Hunt
Branson E. Eplar
Stephen L. Richmond

The following officer of the Permanent Commissioned Teaching Staff of the Coast Guard Academy for promotion to the grade of captain:

Otto E. Graham, Jr.

The following officers of the Permanent Commissioned Teaching Staff of the Coast Guard Academy for promotion to the grade of commander:

John D. Crowley
Carl W. Selin

The following officer of the Permanent Commissioned Teaching Staff of the Coast Guard Academy for promotion to the grade of lieutenant commander:

Ronald A. Wells

The following retired officer recalled to active duty for promotion to the grade of lieutenant commander:

Ellis P. Ward

The following-named officers to be permanent commissioned officers in the Coast Guard in the grade of lieutenant commander:

Walter R. Goldhammer
Eugene L. Davis
Dewey F. Barfield
Frank J. Diersen
Howard Janke
Harry W. Perdue
Bill M. Aldridge
Alfred E. Sporl
Aubrey R. Patten
Edgar S. Hutchinson

The following-named officers to be permanent commissioned officers in the Coast Guard in the grade of lieutenant:

David A. Corey
John B. Thwing, Jr.
Kenneth E. White
Richard G. Nelson
Peter D. Corson
William R. Lipham
John F. Curry
Charles W. Mason
Axel J. Hagstrom
David L. Abbott
John H. Hancock, Jr.
Francis M. Coonrod, Jr.
Donald L. Alsup
John B. Friel
Cyril D. Maxwell
Julian W. Howell
John F. Sutton
Dale R. Foster
Walter Hamilton
Billy C. Read
Emmerson E. Chambers
Thomas L. Wedgewood
William T. White
Kenneth G. Robertson
James G. Wilcox, Jr.
Robert J. Descoteaux
William W. Thurmond
Roland D. Moriarty
John J. Smith, Jr.
Neal G. Nelson
Arthur N. Lee
Earle K. Hand
Gordon H. Dickman
Albert L. Olsen, Jr.
James H. Scott
George P. Asche
Paul L. Lamb
James W. Brawley, Jr.
William Senn
Milton J. Stewart
George F. Garvy
Harold E. Geck
John J. Clayton
Robert E. Nielsen
Daniel E. Baumbaugh
Leon D. Lawson
Charles F. Gailey, Jr.
Charles L. Fraizer
Bruce S. Little
John O. Leatherwood, Jr.
Bobby G. Burns
Hodges S. Gallop, Jr.
Dalton J. Beasley
David W. Irons
Mathew Woods
Eugene D. Gray
Leo J. Kelley
Everett G. Walters
Howard C. Beeler, Jr.
Harold U. Wilson, Jr.
John F. Dunn
George L. Gordon

Earl E. Martin
Louis R. McDowell, Jr
Roy E. Clayton
Leo J. DeGraw
Howard W. Barkell
Robert E. Bagley
Joseph H. Martin
James F. Eckman
James A. Blake
Joseph M. Tanguay
Ronald H. Youngman
Dean L. Webster
Hubert T. Blomquist
John D. Drewer
Robert L. Barr
Jackie R. Gore
James E. Mitts
Peter D. Van Horsen
Robert V. Bouck
John T. Watson
Franklin H. Doughten
Kenneth W. Bates
William F. Hunter
Harvey R. Little
Francis J. Honke
Robert M. Terkelsen
Peter F. Sterbling, Jr.
Richard H. Hill
Cecil L. McManus
Raymond H. Spoltman
Richard C. Tims
Thomas F. Tutwiler
Elbert W. McKinney
Kenneth F. Wadman
Martin J. Nilson
Charles E. Siegman
Edward L. Stubbs
Berl R. Williams
Robert E. Phelps
Thomas C. Schafer
Earl E. Edenfield, Jr.
Normand A. Brunelle
Leon Clarizio
Donald S. Krug
David M. McCann
Gary D. Palmer
Edward F. Boulanger
Steve W. Geletka
Phillip W. Harwood
Billie A. Campbell
Richard J. Clements
Robert F. Stoeltje
Byron T. McCullough
Jackie L. Ward
Robert C. Gussman

The following-named officers to be permanent commissioned officers in the Coast Guard in the grade of lieutenant (junior grade):

Eugene L. Blowers
Robert A. Burjoice
John M. Deaver
Louis C. Snell
Alfred G. Howe
Cecil M. Morris
Frederick H. Muesse
Robert W. Talley
Andrew L. Holeman
Herman J. Jacobs, Jr.
John I. Yagerline
George E. Jackman
Leonard G. Stone, Jr.
Thomas J. Vento
Loren D. Gordon
Richard E. Somers
Allen R. Turner
Richard A. Lenassi
Ralph W. Lawrence
Robert L. Phelps
Kenneth R. Ball
Kenneth R. Gard
Leon N. Velenchenko
Bradley L. Wood
George J. Seney
William H. Wilson, Jr.
Robert P. Jamerson
Karl E. Stansell, Sr.
Robert E. Peterson
Dale R. Schmidt
Joseph A. Underwood
George M. Simpson
Anthony J. Nigro, Jr.
John H. Gould, Jr.
James F. Ronan
Richard N. Howard
Harry J. Cougan
Richard H. Graham
Richard E. Ahrens
David W. Reineke
Donald A. Spear
Arthur E. Sharkey
Charles B. Pitcock
Glenn B. Littlefield
Glen M. Larsen
John L. Linnon, Jr.
Osler R. Tipton
Donald J. Aites
Karl W. Lehrman
Nolan C. Sowell
Albert E. Kaufmann, Jr.

The following officers of the Coast Guard for promotion to the grade of captain:

Douglas D. Vosler
Frank C. Schmitz
James F. Phair
Clinton J. Maguire
Harry A. Solberg
John W. Hume
Jack E. Forrester
John H. Hawley
Charles E. MacDowell
Elmer P. Mathison
Warren C. Mitchell
Henry A. Campbell, Jr.
Armand J. Bush
Lester A. Levine
John J. O'Meara
David Oliver
Glenn O. Thompson
Eugene F. Walsh
Samuel E. Taylor
Emerson Hayes, Jr.
Joseph R. Steele
Garth H. Read
William E. Dennis
Robert J. LoForte
Owen W. Siler
Arthur Hancock
Richard A. Pasciuti
William S. Allen, Jr.
Wallace C. Dahlgren
Bernard E. Kolkhorst
Donald M. Reed
Frederick J. Hancox
Robert A. Adams
William M. Benkert
Robert A. Schulz
Warren E. Rast
Curtis J. Kelly
Austin F. Hubbard
William J. Zinck
Richard E. Hoover
William N. Banks
Daniel J. Scalabrini
Wilfrid N. Derby, Jr.
Alden E. Lewis
Robert T. Norris
Frank M. Fisher, Jr.
John J. Doherty
Lloyd M. Logan
Albert S. Frevola
Andrew J. Grogard
Jason S. Kobler
Robert E. Foley
Harry G. Kosky
Neale O. Westfall
Burton V. Weston, Jr.
Harold J. McCormack
Earl B. Cooper
Joseph E. Gould
Dono W. Moore
Eric G. Grundy
Jay P. Dayton
Richard H. Hagadorn

The following officers of the Coast Guard for promotion to the grade of commander:

Frank E. Parker
Robert C. Krulish
Dudley C. Goodwin, Jr.
John F. O'Connell
Ross L. Moore
Harry A. Davenport III
Virgil W. Rinehart
Robert E. Dolliver
Robert S. Hall
Robert W. Durfey
Robert J. Bosnak
William P. Butler, Jr.
Luigi Coluccielo
Robert F. Goebel
Robert A. Duin
Alfred Prunski
William H. Fitzgerald, Jr.
Herbert E. Lindemann
Philippe C. Gaucher
George Schmidt
Stuart S. Beckwith
Carl S. Mathews
Wayne E. Caldwell
Samuel M. Moore III
Bernie E. Thompson
Howard W. Pagel
Robert E. Walsh
Clarence R. Hallberg
Darrel W. Starr, Jr.
Joseph C. Dorsky
Thomas T. Wetmore III
Norman P. Ensrud
James T. Clune
Charles B. Hathaway
Donald M. Chapman
LeRoy Reinburg, Jr.
Walter C. Ochman
Maxwell S. Charleston
Paul W. Tifft, Jr.
William R. Weadon
Roger F. Erdmann
Harry N. Hansen
John Atherton
Donald F. Hall
John S. Lipuscek
Alfred E. Hampton
Ralph R. Pruett
Christy R. Mathewson
Warren H. Wilmot
"A" "J" Beard
Alvin L. Kooi
Orval K. Beall
Philip S. Lincoln
Walter Folger
Marin M. Cornell
Lyle W. Lemos
Frederick W. Folger
Charles B. Williams
John V. Caffrey
John E. Wesler
William R. Fearn
Laurence J. Hoch
James S. Gracey
Richard T. Penn, Jr.
Charles L. Blaha
Thomas E. Hawkins
Sydney M. Shuman
Richard Q. Lowry
Ernest R. Tindle
Neal E. Williams, Jr.
Frank L. Shelley
William T. Adams II
Arne J. Soreng
David F. Lauth
William H. Stewart
Charles E. Larkin, Jr.
Henry A. Cretella
Donald B. Russell
William S. Schwob
Anthony F. Fugaro
Norman B. Binns
Harold A. Paulsen, Jr.
Richard S. Dolliver
Sidney A. Wallace
Jules B. DuPeza
Joseph W. E. Ward
Herbert M. Hartlove
Herbert H. Mulvany
Harry H. Keller, Jr.
Wilfred H. Shaw
Paul W. Meyer
Forrest E. Stewart
William K. Vogeler
Donald H. Reaume
Harold R. Brock
George N. Wood
Albertus N. Schroeder, Jr.
George H. Drinkwater
Oscar J. Jahnsen, Jr.
Richard G. Donaldson
William D. Derr
Arthur G. Morrison
John T. Rouse
David E. Metz
James R. Meeker
Frederick J. Lessing
Sherman G. Sawyer
William E. West, Jr.
Richard R. Hoover
Joseph A. Macri
Richard J. MacGarva
Edgar S. Castle
William T. Sode
Donald J. Riley
Thomas F. McKenna, Jr.
Richard D. Hodges
John C. Dowling
Walter B. Alvey
William L. Webster
John M. O'Connell, Jr.

The following officers of the Coast Guard for promotion to the grade of lieutenant commander:

Walter E. Mason, Jr.
Louis Moats
Stephen J. Dasovich
Donald L. Gordon
Daniel B. Charter, Jr.
Robert L. Johanson
Alan D. Breed
Daniel C. Olson, Jr.
Kenneth R. Depperman
Ira E. Thompson
Ralph W. Eustis
Edward F. Lewis
Edmund J. Spillane, Jr.
John B. Jones-Bateman, Jr.
Robert H. Overton III
Kenneth D. Albritton
John M. Duke, Jr.
John R. Butler
Edward R. Baumgartner
David A. Corey
John B. Thawing, Jr.
Howard E. Mickelson
Kenneth D. Urfer
Kenneth E. White
Richard G. Nelson
Richard L. Burns
Peter D. Corson
William R. Lipham
Francis J. Flynn
John H. Guest
James A. Atkinson
Harold B. Summey
Robert N. Finnie, Jr.
Joseph L. E. Hamilton
William H. Simpson
Edward J. Sullivan, Jr.
William Drew
James N. Schenck
John F. Curry
Donald C. Cunningham
Robert A. Biller
Robert J. Ketchel
Thomas W. Kirkpatrick
Walter W. White
William N. Devlin
Michael Abarbanell
William F. Roland
Stanley J. Walden
John J. Cadigan
John W. Duenzl
Donald L. Prince
Donald L. Frantz
Ronald C. Kollmeyer
Basil D. Harrington
Floyd D. Hunter
Richard E. Sardeson
Charles W. Mason
George F. Viveiros, Jr.
Kennard M. Palfrey, Jr.
William G. Hicks
John N. MacDonald
Clifton R. Smith
Norman B. Lynch
Norman E. Cutts
Barry C. Roberts
Robert G. McMahan
Paul F. Bade
David P. Bosomworth
George H. Garbe
Bruce L. Solomon
Thomas P. Schaefer
Robert Gillespie
James Weiskittel
Donald M. Taub
Richard D. Olsen
Bruce J. Kichline
Don S. Bellis
Charles W. Faircloth
Lynn N. Hein
Arthur H. Wagner
James E. Rivard, Jr.
LeRoy C. Melberg, Jr.
William M. Flanders
John G. Stanley
William B. Mohin
James A. Granger
Earl L. Sullivan, Jr.
Kirk R. Kellogg
George L. Rettie
Richard I. Rybacki
Laurence C. Kindbom
Joseph H. Wubbold III
William J. Brogdon, Jr.
David A. Sumi
Charles E. Moorhead, Jr.
James I. McLeaish
Lawrence J. O'Pezio
James J. Rooney III
Brinton R. Shannon
Roger P. Hartgen
George R. Oberholtzer
Joseph F. Smith
Vernon C. Jones
Alan C. Dempsey
John E. DeCarteret
Gilbert E. Brown, Jr.
Gilbert L. Aumon
Ernest C. Allen
Robert E. McKew
Richard A. Blackford
Paul D. Henneberry
John R. Ehrmann
Benjamin K. Schaeffer
Axel J. Hagstrom
David L. Abbott
John H. Hancock, Jr.
Francis M. Coonrod, Jr.
Donald L. Alsup
John B. Friel
Cyril D. Maxwell
Julian W. Howell
John F. Sutton
William T. Rockwell, Jr.
Dale R. Foster
Walter Hamilton
Billy C. Read
Emmerson E. Chambers
Thomas L. Wedgewood
William T. White
Kenneth G. Robertson
James G. Wilcox, Jr.
Robert J. Descoteaux
William W. Thurmond
Roland D. Moriarty
John J. Smith, Jr.
Neal G. Nelson
Arthur N. Lee
Earle K. Hand
Thomas C. Volkle
Edwin L. Rahn
Hugh M. McCreery
James Napier, Jr.
John B. Mahon
Ronald D. Stenzel
Bobby C. Wilks
Donald E. Hand
Robert Burke
Gordon H. Dickman
Albert L. Olsen, Jr.
Carl L. Lane
James H. Scott
George P. Asche
Paul L. Lamb
James W. Brawley, Jr.
William Senn
Milton J. Stewart
Delmar F. Smith
George F. Garvy
Harold E. Geck
John J. Clayton
Robert E. Nielsen
Daniel E. Baumbaugh
Leon D. Lawson
Charles F. Gailey, Jr.
Charles L. Fraizer
Bruce S. Little
John O. Leatherwood, Jr.
Bobby G. Burns
Hodges S. Gallop, Jr.
Dalton J. Beasley
David W. Irons
Mathew Woods
Eugene D. Gray
Leo J. Kelley
Everett G. Walters
Howard C. Beeler, Jr.
Gerald C. Hinson
Calvin P. Langford
Harold U. Wilson, Jr.
John F. Dunn
George L. Gordon
Earl E. Martin
Royce R. Garrett
Benjamin R. Sheaffer

The following officers of the Coast Guard for promotion to the grade of lieutenant:

Eugene L. Blowers
Donald C. Greenman
Gerald F. Hotchkiss
Bailey M. Geeslin
William E. Neal
Charles H. King, Jr.
John N. Faigle
John H. Hill
Richard W. Long
Jan D. Long
Douglas A. Hlousek
Richard O. Buttrick
James E. Margeson, Jr.
Donald R. Casey
John F. Otranto, Jr.
George F. Ireland
Gary F. Crosby
Walter T. Leland

George H. Moritz III
William C. Park III
Ronald C. Pickup
Randolph DeKroney
David L. Parr
Thomas B. Irish, Jr.
Kyle A. Shaw
David E. Ciancaglini
Thomas Y. Lawrence, Jr.
William J. Campbell
William J. Ecker
Wayne E. Rentfro
Frederick A. Hill
Angus McKinnon
Gregory A. Penington
Gary J. Boyle
Keith P. Pensom
Leo N. Schowengerdt, Jr.
Arthur C. Foster
Robert A. Burjoice
John M. Deaver
Louis C. Snell
Alfred G. Howe
Cecil M. Morris
Frederick H. Muesse
Robert W. Talley
Andrew L. Holeman
Herman J. Jacobs, Jr.
John I. Yagerline
George E. Jackman
Leonard G. Stone, Jr.
Thomas J. Vento
Loren D. Gordon
Richard E. Somers
Allen R. Turner
Richard A. Lenassi
Ralph W. Lawrence
Robert L. Phelps
Kenneth R. Ball
Kenneth R. Gard
Leon N. Velenchenko
Bradley L. Wood
George J. Seney
Lafayette J. Harbison
William H. Wilson, Jr.
Robert P. Jamerson
Karl E. Stansell, Sr.
Robert E. Peterson
Dale R. Schmidt
Joseph A. Underwood
George M. Simpson
Robert G. Rugur
Anthony J. Nigro, Jr.
John H. Gould, Jr.
James F. Ronan
Richard N. Howard
Harry J. Cougan
Richard H. Graham
Richard E. Ahrens
David W. Reineke
Donald A. Spear
Arthur E. Sharkey
Glenn B. Littlefield
Charles B. Pitcock
John A. MacDonald
Glen M. Larsen
Donald A. Feldman
Ronald S. Dugan
David A. Sandell
Keith C. Edgecomb
Aylmer R. Trivers
James F. Meade
Robert H. Wehr
John D. Vitkauskas
Jerome J. Savel
Robert E. Ettle
Byron H. Romine
David J. Duquette
Charles R. Robinson
Richard A. McBride
Richard A. Appelbaum
David A. Hough
David L. Folsom
John R. Wallace
Guy P. Clark
Stephen P. Leane
Richard J. Hinkle
Dennis C. Hilliard
Robert C. Eddy
James L. Shanower
Donald G. Langrock
William A. Day
Joseph C. Amaral
Robert H. Cassis, Jr.
Brent C. Mills
William A. Jansen
Peter N. Thurman
James M. Lightner
Carl A. Strand, Jr.
John F. Roeber, Jr.
William Protzman, Jr.
James D. Prout
Robert T. Willoughby
John A. Randell
Richard J. Flynn
Robert L. Ashworth
John T. Ward
John L. Patterson
William A. Anderson
Kenneth E. Wagner
Joseph D. Porricelli
Joseph F. Carilli
Robert E. Kramek
Brian P. Richards
James A. Hallock, Jr.
Thomas E. Blank
Dale L. Bennett
Samuel J. Cavallaro
Norman H. Harrold
James L. Krish
Thomas F. Frischmann
Ronald J. Caudle
Robert A. White
David W. Hiller
Nils Linfors, Jr.
Edward J. Dimmock
Adam J. Shirvinski
William G. Zintl
James M. Seabrooke
Thomas E. Braithwaite
John A. Setter
Donald D. Hanson
Matthew J. Barbour, Jr.
Joseph S. Anderson, Jr.
Robert J. Swain
Francis M. Blackburn
Peter A. Bornstein
John P. Brennan
Craig R. Schroll
Robert R. Caron
James S. Billingham
George P. Wisneskey
John C. Trainor
Harold G. Fletcher, Jr.
Bruce G. Twambly
George E. Gaul
Lawrence F. Merlino
David A. Worth
Joseph C. Beima
Russell C. Warren
Joseph T. Ponti
Robert L. Pearson
Leon Z. Katcharian
George A. Wildes
Robert C. McFarland
William F. Barry
Kenneth H. Cary, Jr.
Jon D. King
Frank D. Ritchie
Leonard V. Dorrian
Paul E. Versaw
Edward B. Peel
Francis A. Nicolai
Peter A. Joseph
Cecil W. Gray, Jr.
Fred S. Golove
Jonathan C. Ide
Stanley F. Powers
Robert F. Muchow
John S. Davis
Robert A. Ferguson
Douglas C. O'Donovan
William B. Steinbach II
Anthony B. Ford
Peter L. Collom
Vincent G. Dipasqua
Macon T. Jordan
Thomas R. Brougham
John C. Midgett, Jr.
John L. Linnon, Jr.
Osler R. Tipton
Donald J. Aites
Karl W. Lehrman
Nolan C. Sowell
Albert E. Kaufmann, Jr.

The following officers of the Coast Guard for promotion to the grade of lieutenant (junior grade):

Thomas P. McGann
Gerald F. Woolever
David R. Zwick
Nelson H. Keeler, Jr.
James L. Webster
Harry T. Suzuki
Kevin T. Clancy
Robert A. Major
Carl R. Mockler
Warren D. Snider
Robert L. Vence, Jr.
Gill R. Goodman
Howard B. Gehring
Richard L. DeVries
Thomas D. Fisher
James W. Fry, Jr.
Nelson W. Koscheski, Jr.
George J. Buffleben, Jr.
Robert P. Dickenson
Billy W. Richardson
Robert E. Leggett
David J. Connolly
Robert L. Kuhnle
Virgil F. Keith, Jr.
Harry D. Nelson
Karl L. Reichelt
Richard A. Walsh
William B. Waff
John E. Lindak
Robert W. Burchell
Arthur E. Katz
Harvey F. Orr
John R. Yetke, Jr.
Andrew F. Durkee, Jr.
Wayne K. Hodsen
Stephen T. Ulmer
David A. Young
James J. Lantry
Dan A. Nauman
Kent M. Ballantyne
Philip R. North
Raymond H. Canada, Jr.
Charles B. Mosher
George H. Brown III
John W. Greason
Dennis J. Brady
Kurt L. Elste
Ray A. Heller
Robert G. Bates
Rudy K. Peschel
James F. Dewey
Robert E. Fenton
Michael J. Jacobs
William M. Baxley
Jerome P. Mullins
William A. Caster
Arthur B. Shepard
Peter C. Busick
Ronald O. MacFee
William D. Bechtel
David T. Machamer
Daniel K. Shorey
Jeffrey D. Hartman
Ernst M. Cummings
James A. Murray, Jr.
Denis J. Bluett
Robert M. Pochman
Edward E. DeMuzzio
John D. Adams
Jan F. Smith
Michael Burdian
Michael P. Studley
Michael E. Greene
David C. Brostrom
Charles E. Haas
Stephen J. Ratey, Jr.
James D. Boyce
Dana W. Starkweather
Roger W. Hassard
David L. Andrews
James F. McCahill, Jr.
Barham F. Thomson III
Murray J. Towle
Nicholas H. Allen
Richard J. Heym
Anthony R. Adams
William A. Monson
Roger L. Beving
James C. Haldeman
Karl W. Mirmak
Forrest F. Furaus, Jr.
Norman J. Cross
James L. Hapel
Gerald "D" Mills
Lyman B. Norton
Lynn M. Brown
Phillip J. Kies
Monette B. J. Ratcliff
Virgil J. O'Grady
Erwin F. Chase, Jr.
Dale W. Johnson
Charles L. Gomez
Jacob P. Aucoin, Sr.
John McDonald
Howard H. Lindsay
Thomas E. Brown

In the Naval Reserve

The following-named officer of the line of the Naval Reserve for temporary promotion to the grade of rear admiral subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Charles N. Paxton.

In the National Guard

I nominate the Army National Guard of the U.S. officer named herein for promotion as a Reserve commissioned officer of the Army, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 593(a) and 3385:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Francis Stevens Greenlief, O1291268.

In the Army

The following-named officer for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3305:

To be colonel

Delnore, Victor E., O32398.

The following-named officer for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3299:

To be major, Medical Service Corps

Smith, Donald E., O79675.

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3298:

To be first lieutenants

Casey, Thomas J., Jr., O99802.
Henderson, William D., O99864.
Hersey, Donald L., O91802.
Jackson, Jerry E., O99884.
Labovich, Walter, O99898.
Langley, Larry L., O97774.
Laski, Paul E., OF101837.
McPherson, William R., OF100316.
Payne, Gilbert M., Jr., O99946.
Stryker, John F., O99401.
Woodbury, Paul W., OF100047.
Zetterberg, Robert W., OF101148.

To be first lieutenant, Women's Army Corps

Tate, Alice M., L627.

To be first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps

Huff, Fred V., O99878.

The following-named person for reappointment to the active list of the Regular Army of the United States, from the temporary disability retired list, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 1211:

To be colonel

Mauz, Henry H., O29799.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army by transfer in the grades specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, 3288, 3290, and 3292:

To be major, Medical Service Corps

Runnels, Johnnie L. (CMLC), O69551.

To be first lieutenant, Judge Advocate Corps

Wagner, Keith A. (Arty), O85276.

To be captain, Judge Advocate General's General's Corps

Smith, Harold R. (AGC), O82976.

To be second lieutenant, Medical Service Corps

Amos, William H., Jr. (CMLC), O96305.

To be captains

Crenshaw, William A. (MSC), O79568.
Yeats, Christopher S. (MSC), O76774.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades specified under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, and 3288:

To be majors

Allspaw, James W., O2014637.
Armstrong, George A., O1686706.
Berge, Einar, O1699963.
Davis, Clarence A., Jr., O2209840.
Dixon, Frank W., O980713.
Feduska, Paul G., O1339527.
Hayes, John T., O2203412.
Kanemoto, George K., O2262428.
Parker, Herbert G., O2021162.
Talsma, Martin L., O1332433.
Tierney, Daniel W., O974488.
Umpierre-Vazquez, Wilfredo, O955815.

To be captains

Baker, William L., O4017901.
Barnes, John L., O4074650.
Bassham, Archie F., O4010205.
Benedit, Edward B., O1935984.
Berry, Bobbie G., O4030643.
Billington, Norton L., O1886143.
Brayton, Neal C., O1926235.
Capps, Walton H., O4018290.
Churchill, Morris L., O4032168.
Crawford, Roscoe D., O5201555.
Crosland, William E., O1887790.
Davies, Arthur, Jr., O4074677.
Doherty, James J., O4014653.
Donatucci, Gerard A., O4035733.
Goetcheus, James R., O4031464.

Grandone, Frank F., O4037247.
Gray, Jack, O1888556.
Griffin, Leslie A., O4036527.
Haack, John K., O4010650.
Hackley, Frank W., O1942379.
Hannum, Alden G., O4034662.
Hendricksen, Earl E., O2288719.
Heon, Normand P., O1925511.
Hewitt, William A., O4074603.
Hogan, Wayne C., O4006792.
Hughes, Roy, O1889825.
Hunt, James W., O4031073.
Johnson, Edward K., O4006492.
Jordan, Aldy C., O1879922.
Kaufman, Gerald G., O2314951.
Kolb, John A., Jr., O4036472.
Kracht, Peter M., O1935467.
Lammers, Marvin E., O2266731.
Lee, William R., O4031725.
Lesher, Harry E., Jr., O1889916.
Little, Carl, O5200008.
Luck, Harold E., O5300047.
Lundquist, Richard V., O1931832.
Mansfield, Tommy M., O4025019.
McFadden, Willie J., O4058995.
Rose, James E., O1936358.
Rutherford, Billy E., O1925670.
Sallee, John W., O4035223.
Shanahan, John A., O2271977.
Shuttleworth, Charles W., O5202172.
Simkus, Anthony P., O1894088.
Slesinger, Burton E., O1885568.
Smith, Albert L., O1932316.
Spearing, James M., O1925565.
Stallman, Arnold S., O1882630.
Stover, Charles W., Jr., O4070761.
Toye, John E., O5201463.
Travis, Robert L., O4005634.
Tremblay, Kenneth R., O4010098.
Waller, Carol D., O1690995.
Welch, William J., O1926709.
Wilson, Charles E., O4025350.
Wilson, James K., III, O5405049.
Wohlman, Melvin, O4026582.

To be first lieutenants

Allison James K., O2291683.
Alvarez, Alfred P., O4084753.
Arata, Thomas C., O5410610.
Blakely, Clyde H., O5403485.
Boerschel, August P., O2311424.
Boyle, David J., O5509250.
Brashear, Hollis N., O4049274.
Burch, Charles G., III, O5512061.
Burns, James E., O5514924.
Carmichael, Rex, Jr., O5304185.
Craft, Morris H., O5213148.
Craig, William H., Jr., O5307449.
Curran, Joseph S., Jr., O5001492.
Davies, Michael D., O5007060.
Deasy, William T., O5702311.
Dutcher, James A., Jr., O5412384.
Earp, Curtis D., Jr., O2313634.
Erbacher, Richard P., O5008883.
Ferrick, John F., O5207096.
Fichtl, Theodore C., O5312128.
Fitzgerald, Robert E., O5204327.
French, Luther L., O5411977.
Gaddy, William D., O2298320.
Girard, Ronald E., O5410945.
Green, George O., Jr., O4017786.
Hall, Donald G., O5312284.
Heffner, Albert R., Jr., O5513103.
Heiden, Elden W., O5510779.
Herr, Wayne L., O5209384.
Hilton, Kenneth R., O5401984.
Hofmann, Ronald A., O5310613.
Hollingsworth, Malcolm L., O5410747.
Jackson, Gordon R., O4059441.
James, Kenneth G., O2309083.
Jones, Jack L., O5405602.
Jones, Louis R., Jr., O5306370.
Kern, Jack R., O5505773.
Koneval, Robert W., O5206304.
Kuppich, Joseph W., Jr., O5513966.
Lally, Patrick G., O5405078.
Lim, George K., O5705912.
Lorimier, Joseph M., III, O4045067.
Majhan, Thomas, O5209758.
Manning, James R., O5705572.
Marlow, John B., O5703419.
McCain, William T., O2313608.
McDaniel, Joseph H., O5405760.
McMath, Laney M., Jr., O5410278.
McMillien, David, O5409704.
McMillion, Clifford C., O5304025.
Mehigan, Denis M., O5215993.
Metress, Patrick A., O5212486.
Morris, Edward D., O5509762.
Mulvaney, Merle L., O5507675.
Murray, Matthew P., Jr., O5310798.
Nelson, Edward E., O5311494.
Nettles, John S., Jr., O5308362.
Nicotra, Andrew P., O4045315.
Paris, William L., O4075969.
Patten, Rodney L., O5313742.
Patterson, Harvey G., O4024250.
Patty, J. W., III, O5307963.
Peterson, Fredrick D., O5705932.
Piech, Arthur S., O5000534.
Pike, Verner N., O5304735.
Quintarelli, Nicholas F., O5212385.
Rader, Allan L., O5509019.
Redden, Thomas W., 01933347.
Riley, William H., Jr., O5007871.
Scheel, Clarence A., O5404188.
Schnell, Hudson A., O5405675.
Sellentin, Jerry L., O5509650.
Sharpton, Aubrey J., Jr., O5875129.
Sheldon, Charles M., O5206129.
Sims, John R., O5703818.
Smarsh, James D., O5514529.
Spinner, Charles R., Jr., O5203905.
Suhosky, Robert J., O5210411.
Thomas, William S., III, O5306057.
Toner, Richard M., O4068822.
Toomey, Samuel K., III, O5405679.
Unger, Curtis G., O5305153.
Vaughters, Kenneth R., O5215098.
Walker, Frederick A., O5005708.
Walker, Robert T., O5311233.
Walton, Joseph A., O5204687.
Warren, James A., O5308337.
Weitzel, Werner G., O5513374.
Welch, Elliot J., O5205893.
Wickliffe, Paul T., O5512418.
Wimsatt, Philip D., O2307757.
Wollard, Clifford L., O5206147.
Young, Leon A., O5703798.
Zaremba, Walter C., O5405839.

To be second lieutenants

Barrera, Fabricio, Jr., O5413309.
Barry, David A., Jr., O5319078.
Becker, Edward G., O5218707.
Broadwater, Terry W., O5220695.
Brown, James H., O5513002.
Causer, Wilburn R., Jr., O5405909.
Clements, Lawrence J., O5314039.
Edge, Liston L., O5317233.
Edwards, William J., O5205377.
Elliott, Don A., O5413630.
Evans, Richard F., O2311200.
Everly, Julian R., O5216621.
Ferrell, James E., O5530038.
Fincher, Hubert T., Jr., O5314781.
Fredrick, Gilbert H., Jr., O5412988.
Fulcher, Stan L. T., O5515640.
Ginsburg, Norman I., O5010658.
Guenzburger, Albert, O5014717.
Hadley, Miles B., O5317237.
Hailey, John F., O5219599.
Harriman, Charles T., O5314930.
Harvey, Joe B., O5413528.
Henson, William R., Jr., O5215074.
Hinkle, Donald E., O5317631.
Howey, Raymond A., O2308470.
Humphrey, Vernon W., Jr., O5406385.
King, Earle E., Jr., O5316107.
Landis, Harry L., O5405856.
Lawson, Edward J., Jr., O5406181.
Mathis, Foy M., O5507530.
McGuinness, John W., Jr., O5318381.
McKeon, Charles A., O5218098.
McLemore, Oran F., O5412929.
Moss, Pat L., O5315533.
Mullis, Harry E., O5314636.
Myatt, John E., O5875214.
Nicolai, Larry D., O5514043.
Novembre, Peter J., O5515137.
Olson, Robert J.
Parker, Charles M., O5313908.
Pedigo, William E., O5219562.
Poff, Gary L., O5219221.
Salter, Edward A., O5217778.
Seldomridge, John A. A., O5215233.
Smith, Charles F., O5515190.
Spencer, Wilbur P., Jr., O5010622.
Swain, Oren, Jr.
Thrasher, Carl D., O5314631.
Wagner, Ronald E., O5216637.
Wasielewski, Joseph S., O5517559.
Westbrook, James P., O5410150.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade and branches specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, 3288, 3289, 3290, 3291, 3292, and 3294:

To be majors, Medical Corps

Aultman, Mims C., O4043417.
Deubler, Keith F., O4030392.
Kernan, Philip M., Jr., O2318126.
Rapmund, Garrison, O5003235.

To be captain, Army Medical Specialist Corps

Gierhart, Jane E., M3077.

To be captains, Army Nurse Corps

Jackson, Helen, N2289948.
Pollock, Valeria G., N2293537.
Russell, Mary V., N805736.
Sater, Corinne M., N902392.
Thompson, Agnes J., N901312.

To be captains, Dental Corps

Bass, Kenneth D., O5201340.
Bauman, Richard, O5013267.
Belenky, Michael M., O4036100.
Cherry, Norman L., O2295918.
Cox, Frederick L., O5210009.
Daniels, Jon L., O2284655.
Derfelt, Paul W., O5501226.
Engelhardt, Herbert R.
Hammond, Harry I., O5301108.
Latin, Ronald J., O5500214.
Levin, Marvin P., O5206615.
Lyon, Thayer C., Jr., O2289648.
McNeill, Thomas J., O5206297.
Mueninghoff, Leonard A., O5501087.
Schoultz, Edward R., O5501255.

To be captains, Judge Advocate General's Corps

Kenny, Peter J., O2298819.
McNealy, Richard K., O2298051.
Stone, Frank R., Jr., O4071938.

To be captains, Medical Corps

Anthony, Lewis G., O5217711.
Conrad, William C., O5708379.
Deak, Andrew, O4009331.
Fahrni, John H., O2295838.
Foster, Robert E., O5214973.
Ghigleri, Richard E., O5703665.
Graff, Charles K., O5013227.
Hagler, Louis, O2305216.
Hawkins, Lawrence R., O2305184.
Khoury, Nicholas F., O5012701.
Lane, Robert K., O5501279.
Mindrum, Gerald G., O5012976.
Noble, Jay A., O5012987.
Power, Robert C., O2298155.
Rowden, Robert M., O5518710.
Schofield, Elliott C., O2003385.
Twohey, Robert J., O4057243.
Virtue, Clarence M., Jr., O2282663.
Watson, Jerry F., O5312823.

To be captains, Medical Service Corps

Jenkins, Irvin E., O4069124.
Johnson, Douglas L., O4075319.
Lowe, John W., O4065560.
Maes, Paul B., O4059843.
Powell, Donald N., O4069132.
Reiter, Robert J., O1893904.
Saylor, William L., O1882624.

Stein, Dale R., O2263840.
Williams, Glenn M., O1893713.
Wolf, Philip G., O4069458.

To be captain, Veterinary Corps

Dunton, Robert K., O4073707.

To be first lieutenants, Army Nurse Corp

Kidon, Shirley A., N5407038.
Leach, Clara M., N5312584.
Nakama, Shizuko, N2296640.

To be first lieutenants, Dental Corps

Bent, Jerry P., O5408251.
Fagouri, Edward L., O5208066.
Kirchoff, Rodney M., O2312669.
Matich, Joseph A., O5708841.

To be first lieutenants, Judge Advocate General's Corps

Cooley, Robert H., III, O2315255.
Cumming, Richard E., O5207614.
Cunningham, Louis M., Jr., O2313597.
Hamel, Robert D., O2307713.
Lasner, Edwin J., O2299881.
Moody, Brent F., O5706040.
Osteen, James N., O5309646.
Watson, Kermith G., O5308095.
Yawn, Malcolm T., O1887062.
Yost, Harold S., O5216657.

To be first lieutenants, Medical Corps

Allison, Howard H., O2313131.
Brown, Frank M., O2309353.
Cavanagh, Richard C., O2309341.
Fravel, William J., O5208396.
Gerlock, Amil J., Jr., O2312997.
Kaplan, Jerrold M., O2313094.
McDonald, Herbert B., O5708474.
McKee, Willis P., Jr., O5213676.
McManis, James C., O2309631.
Robinson, Norman J., O5209330.
Smith, Donald R., O2313082.
Spicer, Melvin J., O5005671.
Sullivan, Robert G., O2309357.

To be first lieutenants, Medical Service Corps

Bell, John H., O4031806.
Black, Robert G., O2289956.
Boyd, William M., Jr., O5301394.
Dominguez, Roberto D., O5404367.
Ebner, Donald G., O4040525.
Good, Roger S., O5000503.
Hyde, Gary P., O5312293.
Intermill, Ronald W., O2305928.
Munley, Thomas C., Jr., O5215323.
Whitehouse, Roy L., O5412087.

To be first lieutenants, Veterinary Corps

Armstrong, Tommy S., O2312595.
Howarth, Robert A., O2312573.
Huxsoll, David L., O2305589.
Hysell, David K., O2312684.
Ottenberg, John C., O2305595.
Shroyer, Emerson L., O2309131.
Strahler, Eugene G., O2312474.

To be second lieutenants, Medical Service Corps

Bolte, Gordon L., O5404418.
Colbert, Bill N., O5314146.
Covington, William R., O5316120.
Davis, Richard O., Jr., O5509512.
Heimendinger, Richard B., O5514778.
Heisig, David W., O5517746.
Kitchin, David J., III, O5317495.
Mumma, Patrick J., O5516595.
Rians, Charles W., III, O5316597.
Sack, Gerald E., O4042496.
Yoder, William G., O2312614.

The following-named distinguished military student for appointment in the Judge Advocate General's Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of first lieutenant, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, 3288, and 3292:

Gisi, Lyle D., O2317679.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the Medical Service Corps, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, 3288, and 3290:

Bedford, William S., Jr.
Klein, Albert W.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, and 3288:

Banta, Donald J.
Beebe, Verl D., O5323431.
Biviano, James W.
Burtnett, John W., Jr.
Burton, Emmette Y., III, O5226101.
Cobb, William T.
Collins, Bernhard B., Jr., O5533797.
Cook, Glyn M., O5417078.
Corradini, Richard A.
Counts, Clyde G.
Cox, Howard E., Jr.
Crosby, Rees G., O5226724.
Cummings, Timothy A.
Curtin, Thomas P., Jr.
Dabrowski, Peter F., Jr.
Dickson, John R.
Dougherty, John A.
Dunkelberger, James W.
Edmonds, Harvey L.
Elzey, John T.
Eriksson, William A., Jr., O5710177.
Fagan, William G.
Fair, Lyle M., O5533461.
Fairfull, Thomas M.
Fowler, James A., O5323669.
Fuller, Cornell.
Fultz, Richard H.
Gabbert, John H.
Gebott, Warren B., O5710722.
Gerhart, George M., Jr.
Greene, Allan R., Jr., O5227069.
Harrison, Robert B., III.
Heimerdinger, William A., O5533229.
Heisterman, Robert J., O5323933.
Hemovich, Michael, O5710389.
Hemphill, Robert L., O5324055.
Henkel, James R.
Hoebeke, Gary L., O5534536.
Holland, Francis B., O5226662.
Izquierdo, Osvaldo A.
Jenks, James E., Jr.
Jones, Larry W.
Kowalczyk, Walter J., Jr., O5226668.
Kritscher, Andrew M.
Lecklitner, Myron L.
Lewin, John V.
Lewis, Edward R., O5416964.
Lewman, Thomas J., Jr.
Marrone, Ronald J.
McCauley, John K., Jr.
Molkup, Kenneth M.
Moss, Melvyn.
Mutal, Morris F., O5710610.
Myers, Ted S., O5710660.
Payne, David P., O5417713.
Pochert, Lynn C., O5710713.
Reams, Larry W.
Salceda, Daniel A., O5710186.
Scott, Edward A., Jr., O5710641.
Severson, Daniel J., O5020232.
Simmons, Bobby J., O5323420.
Skaggs, Gary C., O5534502.
Steele, Walter W., O5710639.
Sterling, Douglas F., O5710637.
Stevens, Robert S., O5710618.
Stewart, Jerry D.
Suchan, Robert L.
Travis, Stuart B.
Verdier, Bernard L. J.
West, Johnny F.
Whitlock, Dennis A.
Wyatt, William D.
York, Ray E.
Ziegler, Alfred J.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 26, 1965:

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Frederick Lewis Deming, of Minnesota, to be Under Secretary of the Treasury for Monetary Affairs.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Paul R. Ignatius, of Massachusetts, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

U.S. AIR FORCE

Gen. Curtis E. LeMay 26A (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force, to be placed on the retired list in the grade indicated, effective Feb. 1, 1965, under the provisions of sec. 8962, title 10, of the United States Code, to be general.

Gen. John P. McConnell 611A (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force, to be Chief of Staff, U.S. Air Force, for a period of 2 years beginning Feb. 1, 1965, under the provisions of section 8034, title 10, of the United States Code.

U.S. ARMY

The following-named officers, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in grade as follows:

Maj. Gen. Berton Everett Spivy, Jr., O19479, U.S. Army, to be lieutenant general.

The following-named officer to be placed on the retired list, in the grade indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3962:

Lt. Gen. Walter King Wilson, Jr., O17512, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army), to be lieutenant general.

Maj. Gen. William Frederick Cassidy, O18354, U.S. Army, to be Chief of Engineers, U.S. Army, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3036.

The following-named officer, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in grade as follows:

Maj. Gen. William Frederick Cassidy, O18354, U.S. Army, to be lieutenant general.

The following-named officer to be placed on the retired list in the grade indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3962:

Gen. Hugh Pate Harris, O18518, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army), to be general.

U.S. ATTORNEY

Manuel L. Real, of California, to be U.S. attorney for the southern district of California for the term of 4 years.

U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE

Edwin Langley, of Oklahoma, to be U.S. district judge for the eastern district of Oklahoma.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The nominations beginning Doyce L. Aaron, to be major, and ending Charles H. Wilkens to be major, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on January 6, 1965; and

The nominations beginning Leroy P. Ache, to be first lieutenant, and ending William M. Wilder, to be first lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on January 6, 1965.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Ukrainian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1965

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, on January 22, all true Ukrainian patriots marked the anniversary of the independence of their country, 47 years ago. Although the Ukrainian Republic lasted but a few short years from its inception in 1918, the memory of freedom from over 300 years of Russian rule is still fresh today.

The Ukraine is the largest constituent republic of the Soviet Union, with over 40 million inhabitants and a rich, fruitful land it is. Yet its people were cruelly subjected to the tyranny of communism through the force of arms, not by choice. Economic exploitation, and an attempt to crush Ukrainian national spirit and traditions by their Red rulers has failed to diminish the burning hope of the Ukrainian people for freedom.

Mr. Speaker, earlier in this century the United States restated its belief in the principle of self-determination. The hope that this principle would be honored in Eastern Europe and on the steppes of Asia has been dimmed by the actions of the Communist empire. This does not mean, however, that we should blandly sit back and accept the status quo. It is our moral duty to speak out against injustice wherever it may be found. And the recognition of the right of the Ukrainian nation to self-determination can be a symbol of hope to all people behind the Iron Curtain.

Nor is this the only reason for remembering the bitter struggle for freedom by the Ukraine. There is a pragmatic reason as well. Until the day comes that all men may taste again of freedom, we should work in every way possible for the relaxation of their bonds. The very encouragement of a nationalistic yearning for freedom and independence forces the Russian bear to accommodate to the pressures in order to keep up its influence among non-Russian peoples. Within the Soviet eastern European empire, this spirit of national independence has already made itself felt and it may eventually be true within Russia itself.

It is not my purpose to raise false hopes of easy, quick victories in the cause of freedom. The struggle for that priceless commodity has been going on for centuries within the Ukraine. Surrounded by hostile nations, subjected by foreign rulers, the Ukrainian nation knows full well that the struggle will be long and costly. It is a tribute to the indomitable spirit of the Ukraine that the heritage of its people has not been lost, and their faith has not been diminished.

I join with Americans of Ukrainian descent, and with all those who cherish freedom in saluting the Ukrainian nation, and adding my hopes that the day will come when that nation will again be free to celebrate a new independence day.

Tribute to Mr. J. Edwin Larson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1965

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday Florida was shocked by the passing of one of the State's most distinguished and dedicated leaders, J. Edwin Larson.

He held the post of State treasurer, a post second only to that of Governor of the State of Florida. He worked his way up to this merited prominence, being a dedicated public servant of Florida for over 40 years.

He came to Florida from Pennsylvania to study law at the University of Florida in 1923. Soon active in Florida affairs, he was principal of the Keystone Heights High School, and later mayor of Keystone Heights. After becoming a commissioner of Clay County, he was a State representative and later a State senator.

A stanch Democrat, he was an early supporter of Franklin Roosevelt. Appointed collector of internal revenue in 1933, he held that post until he ran for treasurer in 1940. He became the 16th treasurer of Florida, a post he held until his death.

An honorable man, he received many honors. An exemplary Mason, he served as grand master of the Masons in Florida, and grand patron of the Order of the Eastern Star. The Masons honored him by conferring upon him the 33d degree, the highest Masonic tribute.

Besides being a Mason and a Shriner, he was also active in the Methodist Church, Kiwanis, Odd Fellows, Moose, and Elk.

The newly arrived Floridian married Clara Bussard in 1927 in Keystone Heights. Today they have three lovely daughters, all raising families of their own.

Always active in his life, it was appropriate that he was active until the moment of his death. Indeed, the stroke came as he was delivering a speech opening a clinic for which he had raised funds.

Ed Larson had been my devoted friend ever since we served in the House of of Representatives of Florida Legislature in 1929. My wife and I have cherished his friendship and that of his lovely wife and we shall ever hold that friendship with him warm in our memories.

Mrs. Pepper and I spent some happy times with Mr. and Mrs. Larson when they were here during inauguration.

In the passing of Ed Larson America has lost a dedicated patriot; Florida has lost a devoted and distinguished public servant; good causes have lost a notable and faithful champion; and a host of friends have lost a friend they shall never forget.

Mrs. Pepper and I join all Floridians and his fellow Americans in mourning the passing of this dedicated man who gave inspiration to all in the public service of Florida and who contributed so much to making Florida the threshold of space.

Congressman Schmidhauser Urges Strengthening of Agricultural Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. SCHMIDHAUSER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1965

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, after spending the weekend carefully analyzing the budget, I made the following strong recommendations:

It is fortunate to me that the American system of government provides for final congressional modification of effective budget recommendations. After a careful analysis of the general statements which Budget Director Kermit Gordon has made concerning the position of agriculture in our economic system, I can only conclude that he does not understand the nature of our efficient agriculture economy. I should like to strongly urge the President and the Secretary of Agriculture in their current preparation of agriculture recommendations that they include the following proposals:

First. That our total agriculture program shall strive to encourage the family farm as a measure of recognition of the great contributions that this way of life has made to our society as a whole.

Second. That our agricultural program strengthen and improve our successful feed grains program. It is worthy to note that our feed grains program has now indicated the greatest promise of success in eliminating surpluses and their attendant costs. I would also recommend that improvement of the feed grains program include a program of sufficient duration to enable agriculture producers stability in long-range planning in the use of their land. Specifically, a program of 4 years' duration will be exceedingly helpful.

Third. I strongly recommend the adoption of a sound national defense food reserve program.

Fourth. I recommend that we strengthen rather than weaken our agricultural conservation program and our rural electric cooperative movement.

Fifth. In designing a program for agriculture, let us recognize clearly that many budgetary items charged to agriculture actually should be categorized under some other appropriate heading.

And finally, let us recognize that any ill-conceived cutback in our agricultural economy will not only have a serious direct effect upon agricultural producers but will set the stage for a weakening of our total national economy similar to the setback suffered during the 1920's.

It is noteworthy that an editorial of January 25, 1965, in a fine urban newspaper, the Washington Post, pointed out that "according to the new input-output study recently completed by the Office of Business Economics, every dollar of agricultural products that is delivered for final demand requires about 78 cents in the products and services of nonagricultural industries. So any disruption in the agricultural sector would be transmitted immediately to all other sectors of the economy and would be magnified."

Surely our economy is diverse enough to continue recognition that our family-farm economy must be preserved in continuing its vital productive role in American world leadership in the production of the food essential to promoting well-being domestically and peace in our time abroad.

Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1965

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, it affords me great pleasure to advise this body that a number of Democratic organizations in my district have adopted the town of Starksville, Miss., and are seeking to raise funds, food, and clothing for this Negro community. In this connection I issued a statement lauding these organizations for their efforts as an "inspiring demonstration of that unity of Negro and white which will insure full civil rights for all Americans, regardless of race, creed, or color."

Following is my full statement:

I was very pleased to learn of the action of a number of Democratic clubs in the upper end of my district in adopting the town of Starksville, Miss., and their current campaign to raise funds, food, and clothing for this community. It is an inspiring demonstration of that unity of Negro and white which will insure full civil rights for all Americans regardless of race, color, or creed.

The complete support of full civil rights for all, by the National Convention of the Democratic Party and the total and unequivocal campaign of President Lyndon B. Johnson and Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey for civil rights, made this issue the overriding one of the 1964 campaign.

The overwhelming victory of President Johnson and Vice President Humphrey was in every real sense a true consensus of the desire and the determination of the American people to wipe out and end discrimination now and in this day.

Now all Americans must, as good citizens, work together and on every level to implement and assist in carrying out the clear mandate of the Nation.

I hope that this striking example of cooperation will stimulate other communities to similar action. I do not think it is too much to ask the remaining pockets of resistance to the will of the Nation to accept the inevitable. I trust that from here on all our people will move forward to a better and a stronger America.

Excise Tax Repeal Bill Introduced First Day of Congress, January 4, 1965—The Number Is H.R. 7—Vigorous Efforts Will Be Made for Its Passage as Disclosed in the Speech Made in San Francisco Last Fall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1965

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting herewith a report of the speech made by me before the National Association of Retail Druggists in October of 1964. The subject discussed has been delayed so long that I have personally promised to do everything that can be done under parliamentary rules to get the bill enacted into law .

The statement made at San Francisco is as follows:

EXCISE TAXES MUST GO—CONGRESSMAN TO INTRODUCE EXCISE TAX REPEAL BILL WHEN CONGRESS CONVENES

(By WRIGHT PATMAN, Representative in Congress from Texas)

The time has come for repeal of the retailers excise taxes on a number of items widely used by consumers. There has been talk about it for a long time, but the present opportunity and occasion calls for action. There is no reason for further delay.

With that in mind, I am introducing a bill to repeal these retailers excise taxes. Specifically, the bill will exempt toilet preparations, jewelry and related items, ladies' handbags, luggage and furs and fur trimmed coats.

The present ad valorem tax rate on these items is 10 percent; they have been subjected to this "luxury" tax for over 20 years. It was first imposed in 1943 as an emergency wartime measure. After the war, the tax was retained as a restraint against inflationary pressures warranted by the tremendous buildup of consumer purchasing power during the war. During this time, and in fact up until 1954, all of these items included in my bill were taxed at a 20-percent rate. Finally, in 1954, the Congress reduced the rate on these items to 10 percent.

There was no justification, in my opinion, for continuing these taxes after 1949. The fact is that a wartime emergency tax measure gained enough momentum to stay on and on long after its reason for being had ceased. And the result has been an unequitable burden for consumers—particularly the ladies. I don't see how anyone can argue that ladies' handbags are a luxury, or for that matter cosmetics, in this day and age. My bill would abolish the Federal excise tax on these items entirely and it would do it effective January 1. There is no reason for deferring the effective date. As a matter of fact, to do so would merely result in postponement of purchases, with resulting problems for retailers.

But it must be stressed that prompt action is needed not only by the Congress but by the voters throughout the country who are so much in favor of this tax repeal. Since the measure is long overdue, there is no reason, as I see it, why it cannot be put through in the first 90 days of the Congress. That is why I have prepared this bill for introduction at the very beginning of the Congress.

But the bill will not breeze through without support from the people who favor it, and that is why retail druggists who are so vitally concerned, as well as the other retailers, and the consumer groups, too, of course, who are affected, must make their views known early and see how important it is that this legislation is brought to the attention of the public.

Removing these Federal taxes will save consumers about $550 million a year. This will, of course, stimulate consumer purchasing power and will contribute to higher business activity and employment.

At this point, a word is in order about the general economic situation. We hear a lot of talk these days about inflation, and in some banking circles it has been suggested that a general increase in interest rates will be needed. To my mind, this would be a terrible mistake. Raising interest rates slows down the entire economy and could bring on a recession. That is what happened three times during the last Republican administration. To raise interest rates because of the fear that some prices may rise (I might add a fear that hasn't really shown itself to be warranted by the evidence) is like trying to kill a mosquito with a sledge hammer.

Our present high level of economic activity, which we all want to continue, will require some additional stimulus in 1965, according to many competent economic analysts. The reduction occasioned by this excise removal will help to provide some stimulus. By itself, it will not produce a major spurt in consumption, but it will definitely provide a lift in demand for these items that will be removed from the tax, and it will reverberate down through the retailer, the wholesaler, and the producer, with a healthy effect on the economy.

ADMINISTRATION STUDYING REPEAL

It well may be that removal of other excises is warranted, and I am happy that the administration is studying the question at the moment. But there is absolutely no doubt that the excises removed by my bill are long overdue. They have been 15 years overdue, and the time for action is January and February of 1965. To delay would be to run the risk of getting caught up in the whole range of legislative activity and lose momentum.

Taxes are necessary for national defense, for the maintenance of law and order, for provision of the many services to business, agricultural, labor, and consumer groups required by this complex society in which we live. But taxes in a democracy should be fair and based on the ability to pay. Taxes on consumers, particularly when they fall heavily on one group such as the American women and where they are levied on items that are widely necessary for comfort and convenience, are in violation of both of these principles. This fact makes the case for immediate action a very strong one.

A humorist once defined the retail drugstore as the "poor man's country club." Like most jokes this is somewhat exaggerated but there is no doubt that the retail druggist is as close to the American consumer as anyone is. You provide him with some of his fundamental needs and you see him often. It is your members who understand thoroughly the stagnating effect of excise taxes. You are in a position to bring home these facts to the consumer and to enlist his sympathy and enthusiasm in what is really a common objective. As a sponsor of the excise tax removal I look to your organization for the kind of support that you have always given me.

(In his address to National Association of Retail Druggist members attending the October annual convention in San Francisco, Mr. Patman reviewed the efforts that had been made in various sessions of Congress to effect repeal of the excise taxes which were assessed during World War II, and continued in effect after the war emergencies were ended.

(He suggested that a maximum effort by consumers and retailers would be helpful in repealing such taxes. Contacting Representatives in Congress before the opening of Congress in January 1965 is needed to assure passage of repeal measures, he said. Also, in his convention address, Representative Patman warned that other tax measures were being considered in top level business quarters. He cited several of these proposals.)

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce is on record for a general sales tax at either the retail or manufacturing level. The members, of course, are split on it, but in the Washington office they are working for it.

The National Association of Manufacturers are for it. They prefer to call it a broad-based excise tax instead of a sales tax, which, of course, is the same thing.

Then the American Retail Federation is interested, debating it internally trying to decide whether to change from a previous policy of allout opposition. They seem to be on the fence about it, and very likely will come over on the side of the sales tax. I hope they don't, but it looks like they are trying to get them, and they are considering it.

The National Retail Merchants Association is sounding out department store members about whether or not they should have a general sales tax and whether it should be at the retail or manufacturers' level, and many other trade groups are doing the same thing.

The No. 1 objective of the National Association of Retail Druggists for 1965, as stated by the NARD executive committee was, "To renew our vigorous efforts to successfully eliminate the retail excise tax on toiletries, cosmetics, leather goods, and jewelry." The repeal of these Federal taxes on toilet preparations, jewelry and related items, ladies' handbags, luggage, and furs and fur trimmed coats will save consumers about $550 million a year.

Any Members who would like to join this effort will be privileged to do so.

Senator Pell Outlines the Need for an Eight-State Transportation Compact

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1965

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, the plight of our rail commuter transportation was at last recognized by Congress in passing the Mass Transportation Act of 1964, which I cosponsored. While this problem is by no means solved, the need to provide for high-speed passenger rail transportation between cities is also being noted. A pioneer in this approach has been the junior Senator from Rhode Island, Claiborne Pell, who has proposed an eight-State compact to create a new authority to provide for new and improved passenger transportation between Boston and Washington, D.C. For the past two Congresses, I have joined in cosponsoring this approach.

In the Washington, D.C., Sunday Star of January 17, 1965, Senator Pell provides an excellent analysis of the need for this new transportation authority. His position as an observer of the present problems in this area has been uniquely shaped by the fact that his own travels between his home State of Rhode Island and the Nation's Capital have provided him with personal experience.

The use of the interstate compact device, specifically provided for in the Constitution, has too often been overlooked. It provides a means, other than the creation of a new Federal program, for the development of a governmental authority large enough to handle the problem, yet still responsible to the States themselves. And as Senator Pell points out, in the case of an interstate transportation authority, its costs could be financed without Federal subsidy, short of a Federal guarantee of a portion of the authority's bonded indebtedness. I believe the problem and the proposal merit the serious attention of Congress.

The article follows:

PELL SAYS OWN EXPERIENCES LED TO DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA-BOSTON RAIL PLAN

(By Claiborne Pell)

A brief 38-word passage in President Johnson's state of the Union message may presage new developments in public transportation as significant as the flight of the Wright brothers or the invention of the automobile.

The President's statement, succinct and to the point, said:

"I will ask for funds to study high-speed rail transportation between urban centers. We will begin with test projects between Boston and Washington. On high-speed trains, passengers could travel this distance in less than 4 hours."

PROPOSED IN 1962

Behind those deceptively terse words lies a bright vision of innovation in transportation that ultimately could involve the construction of new intercity ground transit systems operating at speeds of 200 miles per hour or more, perhaps in the form of rocket-shaped trains operating in enclosed rights-of-way.

Until these futuristic concepts can be perfected, the administration's program hopefully will involve maximum improvement and utilization of our existing conventional rail equipment.

For myself, the President's statement meant the coming to fruition of 2½ years of persistent and often discouraging argument of the idea that Americans should have more adequate and dependable public transportation facilities for medium-range intercity travel.

I first spelled out my proposal in June of 1962, when I introduced a bill in the Senate to create an eight-State public authority to operate high-speed rail passenger service between Boston and Washington.

LIKE A SUPERCITY

I did not specify the Boston-Washington corridor out of idle sectional political interest. The fact is that this coastal strip, comprising the oldest and most crowded section of our Nation, is in many respects the prototype of our complex urban society of the future, and the manner in which we solve the problems of the area thus is important to the whole Nation.

The corridor already has the aspects of a supercity, and scholars have dubbed it the megalopolis. It already has over 20 percent of the Nation's population and nearly 30 percent of the Nation's business crowded on only 1.4 percent of the Nation's land.

There is no other comparable area in our country at present where so many people are in competition for channels of communication, although demographers have identified 21 other urban clusters which soon will be megalopolitan in their own right. Together they will contain almost 100 million people on less than 6 percent of the Nation's land. Some of the centers of these urbanized belts are Chicago-Green Bay-South Bend; Los Angeles-San Francisco; Pittsburgh-Cleveland; Portland-Seattle; St. Louis-Kansas City (Mo.) and Dallas-Fort Worth-San Antonio, to name a few.

In our northeast megalopolis we are already being faced with some hard decisions about the future. By 1980 we are told that intercity travel will increase by about 170 percent and that public facilities will have to be expanded to meet the increased traffic. For example, up to $1 billion will have to be spent on expanding our airport facilities in the corridor unless other alternatives are presented.

It was against this background that I put forward my proposal in 1962 for development of high-speed intercity rail service in the Northeast.

KNOWS THE PROBLEMS

A number of factors have convinced me that such a development was badly needed. As a former Foreign Service officer who has lived and worked in Europe, I have often marveled at the speed and efficiency of European railroad systems. To my mind, there is no reason why we should not do as well.

Moreover, as a U.S. Senator from Rhode Island, I so often have occasion to travel the 400-mile trip between Washington and Providence that I know painfully, at first hand, the problems confronting the intercity traveler today.

TOO FAR FOR AUTOS

The Washington-Boston trip is too long for automobile travel when one has a tight schedule—and yet it is too short, by modern 20th century standards, for the maximum utilization of our splendid developments in air transportation. So often, the weather or air traffic congestion renders flight plans uncertain, and so often planes are missed because of mammoth traffic jams on the way to the airports. Yet the railroads in their present state of decline offer only marginal relief. The overnight rail service between Boston and Washington is so rough that I refer to the cars as "wakers" rather than "sleepers."

But it is the railroads, with their splendid exclusive rights-of-way, and with their inherent efficiency—one estimate is that one set of tracks can do the job of up to 18 highway lanes—which I believe hold the greatest hope for the future over the intermediate distances separating our megalopolitan centers.

HIGH SPEED PLANNED

The type of development I envision would involve purchase of new rail cars and improvement of right-of-way to allow service at a minimum average speed of 100 miles per hour—or up to 200 miles per hour as we develop new types of equipment. The service should be very frequent—at 15 to 30 minute intervals at the busy times of the day—and it should be directly integrated with local urban transit systems. It should also be clean, comfortable, and reliable.

This type of service would assure a Washington businessman, for example, that in any kind of weather, he could travel in one integrated system from downtown Washington to downtown New York City or Boston and back in a timespan virtually equal to if not less than the lapsed door-to-door time by air carrier. And, with fully modernized equipment he could use his time en route to get a haircut in the train's barbershop, or to dictate correspondence or hold a conference in a special business compartment, or to place phone calls on the train's long-distance telephone system.

To do the job right, even with conventional rail equipment and with no technological breakthroughs, would require an investment of about $1 billion for the entire Boston-Washington line. But I am convinced that the development would be so promising that it might be accomplished without Government subsidy, short of a Federal guarantee of a portion of the bonded indebtedness.

Where direct Federal assistance is needed is in the preliminary planning stage because no railroad today is in a position to risk money on new techniques and equipment capable of greatly improved, high-speed service. It is for this reason that President Johnson has proposed a federally financed research and development program designed to stimulate technological breakthroughs that could revolutionize ground transportation and stimulate the entire economy. In addition, he proposes demonstration programs to show how existing service can be improved in the meantime.

Let's Have More, Not Less "Politics in the Pantry"—and All Through the House—by Closing Gaps in Consumer Protection Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1965

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I was greatly honored in the last Congress by the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas, when he named me to the chairmanship of a newly created standing subcommittee known as the Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs, a field to which I have devoted so much of my efforts in the Congress during the past 12 years. And you, Mr. Speaker, further honored me for my work on consumer issues by appointing me as 1 of 5 Members of the House of Representatives serving on the 15-member bipartisan National Commission on Food Marketing, created by Public Law 88-354.

I am therefore always interested in the views of responsible leaders of our food industry and in any discussion of legislation affecting the consumer and the businesses which serve consumers. Consequently, I read with great interest an article in the current issue of Look magazine—the one dated today, January 26—written by the chairman of the board of one of our greatest food processing corporations about the fine job the American food industry is performing in making this the best-fed Nation in the world, and at the most reasonable cost.

POLITICS AND THE PANTRY

The article is entitled "Let's Keep Politics Out of the Pantry." In it, Mr. Charles G. Mortimer of General Foods points out that whereas only 19 cents of the American family's take-home dollar goes for food, the average family in Great Britain spends 29 cents, in France 31 cents, in Japan 47 cents, and in the Soviet Union, 50 cents. Furthermore, he tells us, there is a much greater variety of foods here, more convenience foods, and—thanks to Government safeguards and the competitive pressures of America's free enterprise system—Mr. Mortimer says the American housewife is fully protected not only against dangerous and unwholesome foods but also against trickery and deceit in the marketplace.

Nevertheless, this food executive warns, there is an ominous cloud on the horizon, threatening our best-of-all-possible food worlds. Mr. Mortimer declares:

> The machinery of free competition which has made ours the best-fed Nation on earth is in danger of being tampered with. It is being attacked by certain people in Government who have the perverse notion that the Mary Joneses of America need more Government protection than the ample safeguards they already have.

The fears of the General Foods Corp. board chairman grow out of the activities of what he describes as "vote-conscious politicians" who are, as he puts it, "playing politics in the pantry" by "pitching emotion-charged appeals" to consumers. He says that the politicians are indulging in "headlinemaking innuendos" implying that America's food marketing system "needs to be watched and regulated even more closely than it is."

The General Foods executive was directing his fire primarily at Senator HART's so-called truth in packaging bill, which is aimed at the jungle of confusing sizes making intelligent price comparisons so extremely difficult for the average shopper in the supermarket; at Mrs. Esther Peterson, the President's dynamic and effective Special Assistant for Consumer Affairs; and at the possible recommendations of the National Commission on Food Marketing.

IF THE SHOE FITS—

But although he does not mention me by name, I cannot help but feel that I, too, must be one of his targets in that article. The evils Senator HART seeks to eliminate in his bill proposing readily comparable sizes of bottles and cans and boxes in easily computed multiples or fractions of pints, quarts, pounds, and so on, are also attacked in the labeling provisions of one of my bills, although from a much different approach, and in a less controversial manner. But essentially, Senator HART and I seek similar goals of better information to the consumer in making price and quantity computations in the stores.

For a second thing, I think Esther Peterson is doing a wonderful job, and I am all for what she is trying to accomplish. I have worked very closely with her through my subcommittee, and I hope to continue to do so. And, for a third thing, I am, as I said, a member of the National Commission on Food Marketing, which Mr. Mortimer of General Foods hopes may do a good job in explaining the necessary roles played by the different levels of our food distribution system, but he fears we may, instead, do a very bad job by merely trying to expose the so-called middlemen as profiteers.

Personally, I have no idea in the world what we will end up doing in that Commission, for we have only just begun our work, and the first job has been to pick capable and unbiased staff experts to do the basic research which will eventually guide us in making our recommendations to Congress.

WE NEED MORE CONSUMER POLITICS, NOT LESS

But beyond all that, I am certainly the food executive's target because I must admit that I am a politician—and undoubtedly a vote-conscious one, too. Members of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States must win reelection every 2 years in order to retain and enhance their seniority and thus accomplish their objectives. To win elections, you have to get more votes than your opponents, and I have taken my chances in the ballot boxes of my district seven times, so I am certainly aware of the importance of consumers as voters.

Thus, I suppose I must plead guilty to at least some of the counts in the General Foods Corp. board chairman's indictment in today's Look magazine against "vote-conscious politicians" promoting what he calls the "perverse notion" that the supermarket customers of this country need more Government protections than the ample safeguards Mr. Mortimer believes we already possess.

If I didn't have such notions—perverse or not, depending upon one's viewpoint—I would undoubtedly feel a bit silly about putting so many bills into the congressional hopper to tighten the safeguards which already exist, or to create new safeguards where none exist.

It is not my purpose here to debate with the General Foods chairman the quality and wholesomeness and comparatively reasonable costs of American food. However, I certainly challenge his theory that there is something ominous or reprehensible about "playing politics" on these issues, or that we should, as he puts it "Keep Politics Out of the Pantry." Instead, I would say: "Let's Have More Politics in the Pantry, and All Through the House."

POLITICS IS SCIENCE OF GOVERNMENT

Perhaps the whole argument rests on what we mean by the word "politics." As used in the Look article urging us to "Keep Politics Out of the Pantry," it is a somewhat mild and gentle word, implying—in a not too angry fashion—hints of self-seeking, of personal aggrandizement, demagoguery, voter deception, and perhaps a tiny touch of corruption. In this connotation, "politicians" are not necessarily evil, not bad all through, but rather forced by their professions to "play politics" by deceiving the public into wanting things that are not good for them, so that the politicians can stir up enough turmoil in giving these undesirable things to the public to make a lot of headlines and thus get the politicians' names in the paper, the better to gain attention and win votes.

To me, politics is a good many cuts above that level. To me, politics is the science and art of government in which every citizen has not only the right but the solemn obligation to participate to the utmost of his abilities and opportunities. Without politics American-style, the free enterprise system which has made this country great in so many ways could not possibly have grown and developed, for our economy is an outgrowth, and a corollary, of our form of government and of the politics which make democracy function.

POLITICS AND WHOLESOME FOOD

Even the acknowledged greatness of the American food industry is a direct reflection of American politics at work. For the very safeguards the General Foods chairman referred to in his article as now adequately protecting the American consumer against unwholesome foods and deceptive sales devices were the hard-won—but never completely won—fruits of political effort and political achievement—by Teddy Roosevelt as well as by Franklin D. Roosevelt, and by other Presidents and Cabinet officers and bureaucrats and Congressmen and Senators doing what the General Foods executive calls "playing politics"—putting politics in the pantry, as it were.

There is a long history of legal enactments—which were all bitterly contested, highly controversial, touch-and-go political issues—when first introduced in the form of proposed legislation in the Congress—but which resulted in todays' high food quality and wholesomeness. Each was proclaimed in its time as the forerunner of doom for the American free enterprise system. Opponents charged in each instance that the "vote-conscious politicians" were "playing politics" with free enterprise.

MEAT AND POULTRY INSPECTION

We have had compulsory Federal inspection of meat for wholesomeness in interstate commerce for 59 years. Upton Sinclair and other writers known in their day as "muckrakers" presented such a sickening picture of the conditions in our packing plants that the people demanded that Government take action, and it did. But it was not until 1957—41 years later—that we had the same protections written into law for interstate shipments of poultry. When I first introduced the poultry inspection bill, the poultry industry was alarmed. Today, federally inspected poultry is accepted within the industry as one of its best sales tools, and American poultry has won tremendous export markets around the world, based on the reliability and acceptability of the little seal or tag which says "U.S. Inspected for Wholesomeness." Nevertheless, much meat in intrastate commerce is still not inspected for wholesomeness.

PURE FOOD AND DRUG LAW OF 1906

The Food and Drug Act of 1906 was our first foray into protecting the American consumer against adulterated or unsafe American products in the two fields of foods and drugs. It took a scandal involving the sale to the Army of meat treated with formaldehyde, and revelations about tonics and medicines (supposedly for women but consisting mostly of alcohol or opium or other ingredients no lady would have knowingly used), to spur the public into demanding remedial legislation and Congress to pass it.

COSMETICS REGULATION BEGAN ONLY 27 YEARS AGO

But cosmetics did not come under Federal supervision until only 27 years ago, in the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of 1938, after numerous women had been blinded by unsafe eye preparations. If you read the old congressional debates on that bill—a milestone piece of legislation then, but terribly outmoded today—you will come across speeches predicting that the measure would bankrupt every business in the field, discourage research in medicines, and make every woman get permission from some bureaucrat in Washington before she could powder her nose or use lipstick.

LOOPHOLES IN THE FOOD, DRUG, AND COSMETIC ACT OF 1938

The 1938 act, as I said, was a good law for its time, but time quickly eroded holes in it, through court decisions and changes in technology. Not all of those holes have been repaired. Other loopholes still in the act were deliberately put there when it was originally passed, in order to assure neutrality on the bill on the part of some business interests, like the soap manufacturers, for instance, who otherwise would have joined in the bitter battle to defeat the controversial legislation in 1938. I will mention later a few of those special exemptions dating back to 1938.

But what about the loopholes Congress did not anticipate, and had no intention of creating? One of the first bills I introduced in my first term in the Congress was directed at closing such a gap created by court decisions. The courts had ruled that the Government's food and drug inspectors could not inspect the operations of a plant if the owner or manager did not want to admit them. Well, this was not the intent of Congress at all, so we had to amend the law to make it explicit.

In 1954 we first took notice of the great danger to our food supply which was developing from unregulated use of pesticides on raw agricultural commodities—that was only 11 years ago.

UNTESTED CHEMICALS IN FOOD

It was only 15 years ago that the Delaney committee in the House, a special committee headed by Congressman JAMES J. DELANEY of New York, first spotlighted the dangers to consumers from a proliferation of new chemical additives being used in food processing without prior testing and certification as to their safety. It took Congress 8 years thereafter to act on the Delaney committee revelations in the Food Additives Act of 1958, which I cosponsored. By then, responsible leaders of the food industry were acknowledging the need for corrective legislation, but the battle over the details of the bill were often bitter ones. The 1958 act was a great forward step. Under it, the manufacturer now has to prove an additive is safe before he can use it in foods. Previously, the burden of proof had been on the Government; if the Government could not provide legal proof that the additive was harmful, the manufacturer could continue to use it, even if the weight of scientific evidence indicated the safety of the product was seriously in doubt.

BURDEN OF PROOF ON COSMETICS SAFETY IS ON GOVERNMENT

The burden of proof, however, is still on the Government in the law's sections on cosmetics. There is no requirement that cosmetic manufacturers must pretest their products for safety. The consumer thus can easily be a guinea pig on a new cosmetic item. If enough consumers get hurt—burned or scalped or disfigured or scarred or infected from a new and untested cosmetic—the Government eventually hears about it and moves against the product and takes it off the market. But, oh, the agony in the meantime. Remember the false fingernails which caused such anguish several years ago, when it was discovered that removing them could also remove the nails? Or the hair dyes which made women bald? These things can happen under our present law on cosmetics.

So I say to women in this country: "This is an area in which every woman—every woman—had better begin to play politics in every way she knows how, because your skin and your hair and your nails and your eyebrows and your lips and even your lives may be at stake some day."

COSMETIC COLORS MUST BE SAFE—BUT NOT IN HAIR DYES

The only significant improvement made in the cosmetic sections of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act in the last 27 years had to do with the coloring matter used in cosmetics. How it came about is a long story, and a somewhat ironic one, but color additives must now be proved safe in the manner used before incorporation in a food, drug or cosmetic. Even if considered safe in the manner used, a color additive can still not be approved if it could cause cancer in man or animal. That is the so-called Delaney clause, which we also wrote into the law on food additives in 1958.

But outside of the coloring matter, no other ingredients of cosmetics have to be pretested for safety or subjected to any preclearance by the Government before use. Only when the Government can produce legal proof that a cosmetic is unsafe or contains unsafe ingredients can it act against it. Legal proof, as you can guess, must go far beyond reasonable doubt as to safety—it must be proof of harm. And often that is impossible to ascertain without years of laboratory research.

In the case of hair dyes, it does not matter how dangerous they are—they can be sold anyway, as long as the label clearly warns the purchaser that the product may be dangerous to use. That is all the law requires. In a beauty shop, how many women ever get to see the labels on the bottles or drums in which hair dyes are shipped?

GAPS IN OUR FOOD LAWS

So to go back to the thesis in the food executive's article in today's issue of Look magazine—that the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act already fully protects the consumer of foodstuffs, and that those who would further tighten consumer protections are cynical politicians "playing politics in the pantry," I would say that legislative history of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act in the 12 years in which I have served, and for long before that, shows that is overoptimistic, and usually premature, to make sweeping defenses of the status quo in consumer protection legislation. Even if we concede the accuracy of Mr. Mortimer's claim that the provisions of the act dealing with foodstuffs are generally adequate—and on the whole they are very good—it is clear that other sections of the law are terribly inadequate—dangerously so—and that some of the food sections need modernization, too.

For instance, the law we passed in 1960 on cautionary labeling of hazardous household products such as bleaches, paints, insecticides and so on, does not apply to foods, drugs, and cosmetics; including those packaged in pressurized containers, which can be dangerous when carelessly handled. Furthermore, the section of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act dealing with informative labeling of foods—giving the consumer information she is legally entitled to have—has been held by the courts to be too vague to prevent some processors from hiding the information in tiny type in a cluttered panel, or in pastel inks on noncontrasting backgrounds, defying the housewife's efforts to find the information on weights, ingredients, and so on.

I am not a lawyer, so I cannot argue with the judges on whether the present language on labeling is too vague. It sounds clear enough to me. It says the required information on a food label must be "prominently placed thereon with such conspicuousness—as compared with other words, statements, designs, or devices, in the labeling—and in such terms as to render it likely to be read and understood by the ordinary individual under customary conditions of purchase and use."

READ THE LABEL—IF YOU CAN

As I said, that sounds pretty clear and straightforward to me. But the courts have nevertheless blocked Food and Drug Administration efforts to crack down on some flagrant violators. The law therefore needs a simple amendment authorizing the Government to issue regulations specifying—as is done now in the prescription drug sections of the law—how the required label information must be presented on the label—the location of the data on weights and on ingredients, the comparative type sizes to be used, and so on.

Otherwise, the housewife will continue to find it difficult, if not impossible, to find the net weight on some bags or boxes, or cans or bottles, if only to try to figure out the better buy between different sizes of the same brand. And she will continue to find it a real challenge to find the listing of ingredients to make sure the contents do not include anything to which some member of the family is allergic.

There is not widespread enough violation of the spirit of the labeling law to an extent that it is a serious national crisis, but violations are common enough to constitute an unpardonable nuisance to the careful, label-reading shopper—who must take extra hours to do her marketing. These violations also victimize the casual shopper who is quickly discouraged from making the complex price computations to determine the more economical among competing products or among different size packages of the same product. So she buys the "large economy size" on faith that it is the better buy—and often it is not as good a buy as a smaller size—believe it or not.

LOOPHOLES ENDANGERING HEALTH

Much more serious, however, are the gaps in the food, drug, and cosmetic law which affect not your pocketbook and disposition so much as your life and safety. I have described the free and easy manner in which cosmetics can be manufactured and put on sale without pretesting or clearance for safety and the fact that coal tar hair dyes are subject to no regulation, no matter how dangerous, as long as the label warns you of the possible consequences of using them. The cosmetic and hair dye manufacturers won these special exemptions for their products during the battle over passage of the original act in 1938.

They have been successful ever since in fighting off attempts to make them prove the safety of their products before marketing. They apparently want us vote-conscious politicians to keep politics out of the beauty parlor. I hope you agree with me that more politics, not less, is needed in coping with this problem.

THERAPEUTIC DEVICES

Let us look at another loophole in the law. Therapeutic devices—medical devices of all kinds—can also be marketed, as cosmetics are, without safety clearance, and can be removed from the market only if proved dangerous or fraudulent. In this case, we should require not only proof of safety but also proof of effectiveness, too—particularly when someone with a serious illness or disability delays seeking medical attention in the hope some useless machine or device can cure him. But the problem is serious also in the devices and materials used in good faith by physicians and dentists. What a tragedy it has been for some patients who underwent surgery involving the use of artificial bone material only to have the material deteriorate in the body; then they have had to go through the ordeal all over again—merely because the material used had not been sufficiently tested for safety and effectiveness before being put on the market.

H.R. 1235, AN OMNIBUS BILL TO REWRITE THE FOOD, DRUG, AND COSMETIC ACT OF 1938

Rather than catalog all of the possible dangers of living in today's fast-changing world with its amazing new technology, I would like to list what my omnibus bill to rewrite the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of 1938 would actually do. Its number is H.R. 1235. I introduced it originally on the opening day of the 87th Congress, in January 1961, 4 years ago. Brief hearings were held in June 1962 on the whole range of issues covered in the omnibus bill, after President Kennedy's consumer message that year endorsed most of its provisions. As originally introduced, the bill provided the procedures later adopted by Congress to safeguard prescription drugs, in the historic Drug Control Act of 1962 which was enacted after the thalidomide tragedy came to public attention.

IT HAS EVERYTHING IN IT, INCLUDING THE KITCHEN SINK

I revised and reintroduced the bill in the 88th Congress, 2 years ago, but no action occurred in the House on any of its features. I have now reintroduced it in this Congress, bringing it up to date once again. It is 45 pages long and covers everything you eat, all the medicines you use, anything rubbed, poured, sprinkled, or sprayed on, introduced into, or otherwise applied to the human body for the purpose of cleansing, beautifying, promoting attractiveness, or altering the appearance, to give you the official definition of a cosmetic; it applies also to therapeutic devices, fake cancer cures, worthless ingredients in special dietary foods; over-the-counter drugs, animal feeds, sleeping pills, pep pills, and other habit-forming stimulant drugs.

In other words, it has everything in it, including the kitchen sink, along with the refrigerator, the bathroom medicine cabinet, the dressing table, and the nursery. I am going to spell out some of the provisions, Mr. Speaker, so that the Members can decide whether the loopholes which this bill would close are serious enough to warrant action. I also hope that through publication of this material in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, many citizens, particularly women, are able—through newspapers, radio, and television programs, magazine articles, and through their churches and clubs and organizations—to learn more about the need for this legislation, for I am convinced that they then will insist and demand that Congress act.

As I told the women attending the convention of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, along those lines, if enough women are made aware of the deficiencies in our basic consumer law and are encouraged to write to their congressional delegation about these deficiencies and the need for corrective legislation, such legislation will be enacted promptly. As I explained, "Congress is like the accelerator of your car—that is, very sensitive to pressure. You make it go."

SECTION-BY-SECTION EXPLANATION OF H.R. 1235

Now here, in the order in which they are covered by H.R. 1235, are some of the things on which all of us, and particularly the women of this country, must put their foot down hard.

Section 1 is the title of the bill.

MAKING THE LABEL SERVE ITS FULL PURPOSE

Section 2 deals with amendments to the required labeling provisions of the present law—to make sure the consumer can readily find the net weight and ingredients and other information she is entitled to have on food, drug, and cosmetic labels; also to require cautionary labeling on pressurized food or cosmetic containers so as to prevent accidents, and on medicines and drugs to prevent unsafe use by children or by adults with pathological conditions. Labels would have to carry instructions for first aid treatment, when necessary.

For instance, in the case of cosmetics which are frequently swallowed by children, the doctors just have to guess as to what is in the products. This section would also apply to hair sprays, which are usually dangerously flammable—but you see women using them while smoking, and in the beauty shops you see clouds of the spray with no one apparently aware of the fact that they can be dangerous to inhale.

Section 2 also removes a 27-year-old loophole put in by the dairy industry, exempting butter, cheese, and ice cream from having to reveal on the package or label the presence of artificial color. Every other food label must show the presence of artificial color; why not butter, cheese, and ice cream? Of all of the provisions of my bill, I guess this one on artificial color in dairy products is probably the least urgent from the standpoint of health and safety, but I included it because this exemption is typical of how every industry wants to hide from the consumer facts which are perhaps a little embarrassing—such as the fact that the beautiful yellow color which butter claims as its own is often put there with a chemical.

Some consumers, for reasons of their own—and sometimes they are good reasons—want to avoid artificial coloring matter in food whenever possible. The color additives in use in food are proven to be safe in the manner in which they are used, but it should be remembered that the law had to be changed several years ago to repeal a previous requirement that these colors must be absolutely and completely harmless under any and all circumstances. The Government discovered that many of the coal tar colors were no longer able to pass this requirement of the 1938 act because the testing devices, like those used to find pesticide residues in milk, were so much improved and so extremely sensitive.

SPECIAL DIETARY FOODS

Section 3 of my bill deals with worthless ingredients in special dietary foods. This is a very controversial issue among health food manufacturers. It prohibits the use in a product represented as a special dietary food of exotic-sounding ingredients which have never been shown to have the least nutritive value, or any dietary usefulness whatsoever. Sale of the ingredients themselves would not be touched; the bill would apply only when the products are represented as having special dietary value.

PRETESTING OF MEDICAL DEVICES FOR SAFETY AND EFFICACY

Section 4 applies to the pretesting of therapeutic devices for safety and proof of effectiveness before they can be sold. I covered that earlier.

CERTIFICATION OF ALL ANTIBIOTICS

Section 5 requires the certification by the Food and Drug Administration of the purity and potency of veterinary antibiotics, similar to the requirement we wrote into the law in 1962 applying to antibiotics intended for use by man. When these powerful, and often unstable, drugs are used on meat animals, we should be certain they are from certified batches, tested and approved by Uncle Sam.

THE MIND-AFFECTING DANGEROUS DRUGS

Section 6 deals with the barbiturates, amphetamines, and other habit-forming central nervous system stimulants—the sleeping pills, and the pep pills, the "goof balls" and "bennies," and other drugs now so widely bootlegged as to constitute a national menace. How many deaths on the highways that can be attributed to the use of these pills we can never know. They are dangerous, and docors who prescribe them treat them with respect.

H.R. 1235 would not interfere in any way with proper medical dispensing of any of these drugs; the targets of the bill are the fly-by-night outfits which obtain and distribute them in the same way that narcotics are sold and whisky used to be sold during prohibition. My bill uses weapons similar to those we use in fighting narcotics; possession itself would be a crime for any except those having a legitimate reason for having the drugs on hand.

We are dealing here with a vast illicit traffic in death-dealing drugs which are major instruments of suicide, and major causes of highway deaths, and major causes of mental injury to youth. A Presidential Advisory Committee called them psychotoxic, or mind-affecting drugs. There is now such widespread awareness of the dangers from these drugs that the Senate last year passed a bill containing most of the features of this section of my bill.

I oppose the piecemeal approach, however; there are so many deficiencies in the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, of which this is only a part, that I decided in 1961 to seek a single overall solution to all of them at one time, in one bill. That is how my omnibus bill was developed. I got tired of the snail's pace at which we were correcting faults in the old act, like putting blowout patches on an old automobile tube long after it needed replacement for safety. I am sure we could quickly pass a bill dealing with the bootlegging of these so-called psychotoxic drugs, but I am afraid it might be at the expense of early action on other necessary reforms in the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, such as on cosmetics safety and so on. Of course it all depends on the Congress and on the public. If enough Americans insist upon a complete overhaul of the entire act, it can be done. But if Members of Congress are not made more aware of the problems, then the piecemeal approach will undoubtedly continue to be followed.

FAKE CANCER REMEDIES

Section 7 of H.R. 1235 deals with fake cancer remedies, and drugs or devices intended for the prevention or cure of cancer. This is an area of widespread trickery and fraud, and it is tragic. On the other hand, we do not want to discourage the search for any really effective treatment for this disease, on which so much research money and time and effort are now being spent.

This is a section of my original bill of 1961 which I have retained in succeeding versions of the measure, even after the passage of the 1962 Drug Control Act which covered the testing of new prescription drugs in comprehensive fashion. I left this section in, however, because I think that in evaluating drugs or devices intended to prevent or cure cancer, the Government must have every possible assistance—the complete facts—everything about the treatment—without any holdback of information, so a determination can be made of the circumstances under which it can be tested and used. This section, by the way, would apply primarily to racketeers in health, not legitimate researchers.

PRETESTING COSMETICS INCLUDING A DELANEY ANTI-CANCER CLAUSE

Section 8 is the basic foundation on which the rest of the omnibus bill was originally built 4 years ago: the pretesting of cosmetics for safety. It contains an anticancer clause such as we have in the food additives and color additives acts—under it no ingredient could be used in a cosmetic if it could cause cancer in man or animal. The law on cosmetics does not now say that. Under the present law, the Government, as I noted, must prove a cosmetic harmful in order to block its sale; under H.R. 1235, the manufacturer would have to prove the product is safe to use, and, in addition, that it does not contain any carcinogens, whether used in a safe fashion or not.

THE SOAP AND HAIR DYE EXEMPTIONS

This section would also repeal the old special interest exemption for soap, which, since 1938, has been held by the law not to be a cosmetic. Soap manufacturers are therefore subject to nothing more than their own consciences and the risk of possible damage suits for what they might include among ingredients of a soap, and they do not even have to tell you the net weight of a bar of soap.

More importantly, this section of H.R. 1235 also repeals the hair dye exemption now in the law. Hair dyes, too, would have to be proved safe for use before being placed on sale.

FULL DISCLOSURE OF COSMETIC INGREDIENTS

All of the significant ingredients of a cosmetic item would have to be revealed on the label under H.R. 1235. Actually, there are few secrets in the cosmetic industry; most competing products use similar basic ingredients. But for the woman who is allergic, there is no way but painful trial and error—and sometimes it is very painful—in finding suitable cosmetics. When a formula is suddenly changed in a product she has been using, she is back in the dark, and perhaps also back in the doctor's office. Even the Food and Drug Administration sometimes has to guess what is in a particular cosmetic. The Government should be informed about ingredients, and so should the buyer.

ADMINISTRATIVE SUBPENAS

Section 9 provides for administrative subpena powers, particularly in developing information for the establishment of food standards. Food standards issued by the Government, in cooperation with the processors, spell out exactly what ingredients must be included in a processed food once it is covered by a particular standard. Subpena power may be needed, too, in pesticides hearings.

CARRIER'S EXEMPTION IS TOO BROAD

Section 10 repeals an exemption enjoyed for many years by the railroads, trucking firms, and other common carriers, which are now relieved of responsibility under the act for transporting adulterated foods, drugs, or cosmetics even when the adulteration occurred as a result of their own actions or omissions. Under my bill, the carriers would continue to be exempt only in those cases where they did not cause the adulteration.

A TOUGH FACTORY INSPECTION PROVISION

Section 11 is a tough factory inspection amendment, giving to the Food and Drug Administration stronger powers in inspecting facilities used and methods used in the manufacture, processing, warehousing, packaging, and distribution of foods, cosmetics, and nonprescription drugs. The Food and Drug Administration already has these stronger factory inspection powers in checking on prescription drugs, under the 1962 act. These powers include the right to see all relevant files, including complaint files, and to check on the professional qualifications of personnel responsible for performing certain technical functions in the plant. Factory inspection is a vital area of consumer protection, even though food and drug inspectors can still touch only a tiny fraction of the existing plants in the country each year. But when they do go in to inspect, the inspectors must have sufficient powers to determine whether the products are made in a sanitary, wholesome or safe manner and if the production controls are adequate to maintain the necessary standards.

CANCER-CAUSING COLORING MATTER IN MEAT ANIMAL FEEDS

Section 12 repeals a special interest exemption in the law for cancer-causing coloring matter used in animal feeds. I have never been able to get an understandable story from anyone on why this exemption was written into the law or what purpose it is to serve. If the Government finds any residue of a cancer-causing feed ingredient in the carcass of meat animals he can order a halt to the use of the animal feed responsible; and it is on this basis that the growth stimulant hormone stilbestrol is now widely permitted to be used in animal feeds. But why should we permit the use of cancer-inducing coloring of animal feeds? The coloring matter serves no nutritive purpose, and no economic purpose. It is certainly not intended to make the feed more appetizing to the steer. It merely helps the farmer to identify different feeds by color. But permitting the use of carcinogenic coloring matter for this purpose is a completely unnecessary and unjustifiable additional hazard. H.R. 1235 repeals this glaring exemption.

U.S. INSPECTION OF FOREIGN FACTORIES

Section 13 would require foreign manufacturers of foods, drugs, or cosmetics who export substantial quantities of their products to the United States to permit on-the-scene inspection by U.S. officials of their plants overseas. At present, only a small percentage of the food, drug, and cosmetic imports into this country are inspected on arrival—on a sampling basis, but not necessarily a random one—to make sure they are safe, wholesome, uncontaminated, and otherwise eligible for admission under our laws. This spot-check at the docks is often concentrated on the exports of firms whose products have frequently reflected a high percentage of violations. Under H.R. 1235, the United States could send inspectors to inspect the plants of foreign firms it has reason to believe are not observing proper sanitary or production control practices on foods, drugs, or cosmetics sold here. We would inspect on the same basis as we now inspect American plants. If the foreign plant cannot pass our domestic inspection requirements, or if it refuses to permit our inspectors to enter on request, its products would be denied admission to this country. I think this is a useful reform.

A BAN ON FLAVORED ASPIRIN FOR CHILDREN

Section 14 of H.R. 1235 prohibits the sale in interstate commerce of flavored or sweetened aspirin. This is a new provision, just put into the bill this year for the first time. It grew out of a letter from a St. Louis resident on a completely different matter, but in checking into some facts on household accidents in connection with inquiries made in that letter, I discovered to my amazement and horror that candy aspirin, the special baby aspirin, is far and away the leading cause of accidental poisoning of children under 5.

Aspirin poisoning is the most frequent cause of death among young children from accidental ingestions. The children learn to regard flavored aspirin as candy, and thousands of them each year risk death by eating an entire bottle of flavored aspirin in the belief it is candy. If the mother or the babysitter discovers the empty bottle in time, the child's life is saved, but in 125 to 150 instances a year, the child dies.

There is no reason in the world why a parent cannot crush half of a regular aspirin tablet on a spoon, using the bottom of the bowl of another spoon to do the crushing, and then add sugar and water, or jelly or some other sweetner to the crushed aspirin to help push the medicine down, if the child needs aspirin. The child would at least know this was medicine, not candy.

Since adding this aspirin provision to H.R. 1235, I have heard from mothers from different parts of the country telling me of hair-raising experiences in their homes when children or grandchildren found the flavored aspirin bottle, pried off the so-called safety cap, and ate the contents.

If there were no chance whatsoever of the product being misused by preschoolers—who after all, cannot read warnings on labels—my bill would permit certain exemptions and waivers under this provision, but otherwise flavored aspirin could not be sold in interstate commerce, except for stocks manufactured prior to 1965.

CONSUMERS MUST MAKE THEIR VOICES HEARD

I do not think the aspirinmakers will like section 14 of H.R. 1235, just as the cosmetic manufacturers do not like section 2 or section 8 and other affected interests do not like other sections of H.R. 1235. The big question to me, however, is whether the people of this country like this bill—enough to join me in fighting for it.

Consumer battles can be won in the Congress only when consumers make it clear they want them won, and will work at it, and, yes, "play politics" at it. That is why I say—in contrast to the General Foods executive I quoted—let us have more politics in the pantry, and also in the bathroom medicine cabinet, and all through the house, as H.R. 1235 would require—more politics in the sense of more active citizen interest in more effective safety laws affecting consumers and consumer products.

There are other consumer issues in Congress besides those involving the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, of course, and I hope the people of this country will "play politics" on those, too.

TIRE SAFETY

In addition to more politics in the pantry, and all through the house, as exemplified by H.R. 1235, we need more politics on the highways, too. Passage of the provisions of H.R. 1235 applying to the mind-affecting drugs which are such frequent causes of highway accidents will certainly save lives, but so also will another bill of mine on highway safety—H.R. 688, to provide for Federal standards for automobile tires, to and the mass murder on the highways from shoddy tires which the consumer purchases in a jungle of price and performance claims, but with no way of knowing for sure what the quality of that tire really is. H.R. 688 was originally drafted and introduced in the last Congress by former Congressman Kenneth Roberts, of Alabama, who, as we all know, Mr. Speaker, was our leading expert in Congress on automobile safety legislation. Unfortunately, he was defeated in the Goldwater sweep of Alabama last November. I cosponsored his bill on tires last session, and since he cannot reintroduce it this year, I introduced it on my own and will work for its adoption. The Federal Trade Commission hearings on tire advertising earlier this month certainly proved the need for reliable grades and standards for tires.

SAFE HANDLING OF INDUSTRIAL MATERIALS

In still another area of consumer safety, let's have more politics in job safety, too. One of my bills this year, H.R. 1179, never before introduced, provides for the establishment by the Secretary of Labor of Federal regulations for the safe handling of hazardous materials in industry and commerce. At present, the Secretary of Labor issues guides and suggestions for worker protection, but he has no powers to enforce safety standards. State laws vary widely in this respect, and few, if any States have the resources to keep abreast of all of the new solvents and chemicals and bleaches and dyes and other dangerous materials coming into use each year, sometimes with very limited application. The Federal Government can do this job, and should be given it to do.

FULL DISCLOSURE OF CREDIT TERMS

What about more politics at the loan company, or department store credit window, or the automobile agency's finance department? As chairman of the Subcommittee on Committee Affairs of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, I introduced on our side of the Capitol in the 88th Congress the truth-in-lending bill drafted by Senator Douglas to require disclosure of actual interest rates and the full costs of credit, and I have reintroduced it in the 89th Congress as H.R. 155.

UNINSPECTED MEAT GOING INTO OUR CITIES

Citizens of urban areas must become more aware of the danger to their health from meat coming into their city from uninspected slaughtering houses located within the same State. If this meat does not cross State lines, it is not subject to Federal inspection. Since President Kennedy first suggested in his 1962 consumer message an expansion of Federal inspection to cover much of this 20 percent of our meat supply which is not now subject to such controls, I have sponsored bills to accomplish this purpose. In this Congress, my bill on Federal inspection of intrastate shipments of meat in certain designated "major consuming areas" is H.R. 149. It follows the same principle in the designation of major consuming areas as we established originally in the Poultry Products Inspection Act of 1957 for poultry moving only in intrastate commerce but burdening or affecting interstate commerce in wholesome poultry.

PRICE GYRATIONS IN SUGAR AND COFFEE FUTURES

In 1954 an investigation by the Federal Trade Commission revealed the part played by unregulated speculation, and abuses in trading in coffee futures contracts in bringing about and accelerating the tremendous leap in retail prices of coffee that year. Since then I have consistently proposed placing trading in coffee futures under the Commodity Exchange Act, as the FTC recommended 11 years ago. Investigation in the last Congress into sugar price gyrations convinced me that sugar futures trading should also be regulated under that act. Consequently, I have amended my previous bill on coffee futures trading to include sugar also, and have introduced it in this Congress as H.R. 8. Excessive speculation in futures contracts, usually at very low margin—thus, largely on borrowed money—can send prices of any commodity skyrocketing, if the futures trading is not properly regulated.

THE NEED FOR POLITICAL ACTION TO ACHIEVE CONSUMER GOALS

Mr. Speaker, I have outlined many of the great glaring gaps in our consumer legislation, and the kind of legislation which is necessary to close those gaps. This legislation can be passed only if a great many more citizens actively "play politics," as the chairman of General Foods calls it, on these important issues. But this is no game. Politics is a serious business, because the stakes of political action—or inaction—are high.

The battles are not won overnight. Sometimes it takes years. But often results are won even before the legislation is passed. For instance, the food processors do not like Senator Hart's bill on packaging—not one bit; but his introduction of the bill and the hearings he conducted in support of it, did a great deal to bring about voluntary reforms in food packaging by the processors themselves.

Many consumers have now begun to do the same thing I do: that is, try to favor those grocery store products which are packaged in pounds or half pounds or quarts or similar standard sizes in preference to competing products which come in sizes such as $7\frac{5}{16}$ ounces, or $19\frac{31}{32}$ ounces. I just think it gives the consumer a better basis for judging comparative values, particularly on the two-for-so-much deals, and I show my appreciation to the manufacturer accordingly. So far as this one consumer is concerned, and I think there are now many like me, it is good business for a firm to package its wares in containers using easily understood net weights.

Senator Hart's hearings have made many consumers aware of this method of fighting back, and increasing numbers of manufacturers are therefore paying heed—getting the message—changing their packaging practices accordingly.

But in many of the situations I have described today—involving the safety of the consumer rather than pennies or nickels on a grocery item—we cannot depend merely upon the manufacturer's sense of intelligent self-interest to provide us with the protections we should have. We have had consumer protection laws for many years, but the laws always need updating, because the products they regulate are constantly changing in composition and in manufacturing technology.

As consumers we are far from helpless in solving these problems if—if, that is—we put more, not less, politics into the pantry and into our strategy for achieving consumer protection.

Senator A. S. Mike Monroney Presents Important Address "The SST—A Bird for All Nations," to Aero Club Members and Guests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 26, 1965

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, a friend and colleague, Senator A. S. Mike Monroney, has been hospitalized at Walter Reed Hospital with a virus infection and a bad case of laryngitis. He was to have delivered a speech today at the Aero Club of Washington. The address was given in excellent fashion by Mr. John Burzio, staff attorney on the Aviation Subcommittee of the Senate Commerce Committee.

I was privileged to be present as a guest of the officers of Lake Central Airlines, one of the local service carriers providing scheduled flights to several West Virginia cities. It is of interest to the constituency I represent to note that Lloyd Hartman, president of Lake Central, has just been elected chairman of the Association of Local Transport Airlines. ALTA is composed of 21 local airlines operating throughout the United States and our territories.

Mr. President, Senator Monroney has been involved in so much legislation affecting aviation he is known as "Mr. Aviation." He serves as chairman of the Commerce Aviation Subcommittee and in 1958 was author of the Federal Aviation Act, which established the FAA and provided unified and independent control of air traffic and airspace for both civil and military aviation. In 1961 Senator Monroney received the Wright Brothers Memorial Trophy given by the Aero Club and in 1964 his contribution to the scheduled airline industry earned him the Tony Jannus Award.

Mr. President, I request unanimous consent that Senator Monroney's remarks "The SST—A Bird for all Nations" be placed in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The SST—A Bird for All Nations

I have always been an advocate of building airplanes—the more the better. And the aircraft manufacturers in the United States have always built the finest aircraft in the skies. Whenever the military or the airlines said we needed a new type of plane, American ingenuity and technology provided it.

But I must confess that at the conclusion of hearings before the Senate Aviation Subcommittee on the development of a U.S. SST in October of 1963, I thought perhaps we were expecting too much too soon from our manufacturers. After 6 months of sonic boom testing in my hometown during 1964, I was even more pessimistic. The booms bombarded my constituents and my constituents sonic boomed me.

I am happy to report, however, that after an extensive review of developments and improvements in the state of the art during the last year, my gloom has been dispelled. I am now more enthusiastic and optimistic about the SST than ever before.

I talked to the engineers and scientists who designed and built supersonic aircraft now being tested and flown. Ten days ago, I talked to the test pilots who have been flying these planes. I saw the colored movies on sound film of takeoffs and landings. And I talked to the executives of the companies who make the decision whether to risk many millions of dollars of their stockholders' funds in the development of a commercial SST.

These highly competent teams of engineers, scientists and management have solved virtually every technical difficulty which concerned me only a year and half ago. Working with titanium is no longer a black art. Recent announcements by scientists give us every reason to hope there may be an alleviation to the sonic boom problem within reach.

I am convinced that it is now time to get our SST off paper and off the drawing board. We now have available our own supersonic test bed—the XB–70. We will probably see it fly at mach 3 no later than April 1. The XB–70 will be able to give us invaluable information on the characteristics and effects of mach 3 flight.

The pilots who have flown the XB–70 so far are enthusiastic. Of course, this is not the SST and it was never designed as a transport. The XB–70's old nickname, "Savior,"—and I am sure you have heard the irreverent story behind that nickname—is no longer cogent. This bird now is more like John the Baptist; it can lead the way into a new era of flight.

I am convinced that the use of the XB–70 for a test bed can result in savings on both development and construction costs for the commercial SST. One model of the XB–70 is already flying and a second is nearly completed. We perhaps will need a third to complete the research that is required. What the XB–70 can tell us about titanium already has added a great deal and can add much more to our fund of aeronatical knowledge.

Based on economic studies recently made, the SST's being designed in this country will not only break the sound barrier, but will also break alltime earnings records for the airlines. I am convinced we can build an aircraft that will land and lift off as easily as our present subsonic transports and with sound levels as low as our present 707's, DC–8's, etc. We can produce a bird that will land as gently as a dove—both on the balance sheets and on the runways.

We cannot ignore the race that exists between our aeronautical industry and the combined forces of Britain and France now working on the Concorde, but we can be confident that if we proceed in good order, the race will be comparable to matching a plowhorse against Kelso. With the XB–70 as a test bed, we can have at least 2 years' experience flying mach 3 before the British and French begin flight testing the Concorde, an airplane that may be obsolete before it is born.

There is only one obstacle remaining—the lack of a firm commitment by the U.S. Government. The decision last year to make more studies, do more research and improve designs was right. The progress made during the last year is the best evidence of that. It would have been a grave error to have gone ahead at that time on the course that had been charted.

Those in Government participating in this project have not been inactive. The Commerce Department has been making intensive studies on the economics of this plane and studying financing plans which would be workable and acceptable to Government and industry. The McNamara Committee, composed of the able Secretary of Defense, other Cabinet members and other very competent Government officials, is giving its concentrated attention to the SST. Those of us in Congress interested in aviation have been constantly seeking new approaches and ways to resolve the impasse between Government and industry on financing arrangements.

I have spent a lot of time worrying and thinking about this plane. I have known all along that it should and must be built. The United States must maintain its leadership in aviation. We must continue to build the best, the safest, and the fastest aircraft in the world—and it must have growth capability. It is important to us as a nation—important to our domestic economy and important to our position in foreign affairs as the mightiest nation on the earth.

We in Government have been slow to recognize the full significance of this. We did recognize it in the field of communications when we launched the Communications Satellite Corp. We recognized it in the field of space when we launched our vast space program and devoted it to peaceful purposes. But we have partially defaulted in the field of transportation. In our changing world of rapidly advancing technology and soaring costs we are just coming to realize that some tasks are of such enormity that the Nation through its Government must share the responsibilities in advancing the state of the art. It is the cost of progress. In the long run the cost of abdicating such responsibilities greatly outweighs the costs of meeting them. The overall impact on our economy, our balance of trade, our employment and our prestige with other nations because of these defaults, is beyond estimation.

The most modern ocean-going fleets do not fly the U.S. flag. The best commercial fishing vessels are not built in this country. The fastest, smoothest trains in the world do not run on U.S. roadbeds.

Other technological contests exist. You can get into an argument almost any time, anywhere, in this country over the relative merits of U.S. versus foreign-built small automobiles. The arguments are almost always started by the owners of Volkswagons, Fiats, or Renaults. Small automobile enthusiasm seems to be the mania of the Americans who own the foreign-made models. We can't afford to be smug or complacent in any field of endeavor.

I have traveled some 35,000 miles since Thanksgiving, mostly abroad. I have flown on many airlines of the world. It has given me the greatest sense of pride and security to fly into Saigon on a 707, Tokyo to Honolulu on a DC–8, to see DC–3's flying into the deepest parts of Latin America, to see 727's running shuttle service in Japan.

These shining, silver-winger machines are often our best ambassadors and the most graphic symbols of our might, our wealth, and above all our record of always advancing the frontiers of aeronautical science.

The latest available estimates show that if the United States does not build an SST, our balance of trade would be adversely affected to the tune of almost $10 billion. A default by the United States at this stage would fit in perfectly with General De Gaulle's dream of transferring our gold hoard at Fort Knox wholesale to the Paris mint. The number of jobs available in the U.S. aircraft industry would be reduced by at least 25,000, and employment in related areas of the U.S. economy would compound this problem. Considering the indirect effects on related industries, failure to go ahead with an SST would probably chokeoff 375,000 job opportunities a year over a period of years, and our airline profits would suffer, probably to the tune of a billion dollars a year less by the year 1980.

In broader terms we could lose our technological superiority and invaluable skills. If history repeats itself, we would lose the spill-out which past advances in science have given to the U.S. economy. We would have a second-class air transportation system, just as we now have a second-class merchant marine and second-class railroads. And we would be well on our way, in the opinion of other countries, to being a second-class nation as the other countries of the world surpassed us in industrial technology, scientific and productive capabilities.

What we must do now—you in industry and we in Government—is decide on a mutually acceptable approach and get on with the business of building our SST. We must talk with each other and discuss frankly our ideas to discover those which are alike and those which are divergent. I have concluded in my own mind that we must build an SST—the best one the state of the art will permit. I want to tell you my own personal ideas on what I think the proper approach should be. I reiterate, I speak only for myself, one Senator. And there are some 99 other prima donnas—I said other—in the U.S. Senate.

The development of an SST is a national program. When I speak of development, I mean the design, engineering, construction and testing of experimental prototypes—soft tooled and hand-knit. For until we fly and test our paper theories in the air, we will not have the knowledge upon which to make an intelligent decision with respect to production—neither the Government, which will be investing taxpayers' dollars, nor the manufacturers or the airlines, who will risk stockholders' equities.

We must proceed without delay—prudently, but deliberately—to test our ideas, to refine them, to improve them so that we will arrive at a safe and economical aircraft. We no longer face the spur of earlier deliveries by foreign competition, which added a sense of urgency to the program in 1963. I believe the best way to do this is to build both of the competing prototypes and two copies of each. We have two existing concepts to be tested. One airframe prototype would be complex, but offers the advantages of flexibility. This is the variable sweep-wing design proposed by the Boeing Co. The other prototype would perhaps not be as flexible, but would offer the advantages of simplicity and time-tested design. This is the swept back fixed-wing on double Delta design proposed by the Lockheed Co.

Seldom in the development of new aircraft have such diverse designs been proposed. Both designs offer great promise. But until they are built and flown, we cannot know whether the promises will come true. In a project as complicated as the SST where the tinest refinement can mean the difference in economic success or failure—where the addition of 1,000 pounds of payload or an extra 300 miles spells profit or loss—we cannot afford now to make a 1 billion dollar decision on insufficient information. Although the development costs are enormous and competing prototypes would add to the cost, this is one situation where the old adage "penny wise and pound foolish" applies.

Speaking of decisions based on insufficient information, we have already noted regretfully one or two goofs during the process of getting ready for the big decision to go ahead. For instance, sonic boom tests were scheduled last year over a metropolitan area in Oklahoma to obtain the reaction of citizens to these noises. Then the cart was placed squarely before the horse by scheduling sonic boom studies in the desert of New Mexico to obtain more precise data on what happened structurally to the homes of Oklahoma citizens. It may be that the human eardrum will tolerate more boom than ordinary window glass. The FAA should have had better data on sonic boom structural effects before it launched its Oklahoma experiment to obtain data on human effects.

Actually, the competing prototype approach could result in only minor added program costs, plus a much more economical aircraft, which in the long run would be more profitable to the airlines and which would assure a quicker and surer recoupment of Government investment.

A computer analysis of added cost for competing airframe prototypes shows that added cost through 100 hours of testing would be about 98 percent greater. But through certification, this would raise costs only 49 percent. The added cost for production of 200 units would be not quite 10 percent greater. The increase in airplane total operating costs over a 15-year period would only be 1.4 percent greater. When you stack the possibilities of obtaining a much safer and a more profitable plane against only 1.4 percent added cost spread over 15 years, I believe we would save money in the long run by spending a little extra now and letting competition do the rest.

The figures I have seen lead me to believe we can build and test four airframe prototypes—two of each design, including engines—for about $1.2 billion. The engine, if one estimate prevails, costs $400 million of this amount. The outlay on appropriations would be spread over a 5-year period, so that we would not need to fund the total cost in any one year. Thus, the funding requirements would be about $250 million a year. The willingness and ability of the manufacturers to share this cost with the Government should be a consideration. I think it would be in their interest to do so. But prudent management could not allow, and the Government should not expect, them to bear the proportion envisaged a year and a half ago. If need be, the Government should pay for all development costs through the stage at which an intelligent decision can be made with the help of the airlines (the final buyer) on production.

The idea of Government funding for developing of technological improvement with commercial benefits for private companies should not frighten anyone or even come as a surprise. There are many past precedents. Back in 1844, the Treasury Department subsidized the building of trial lines for the Morse telegraph. The State Department funded the building of a transoceanic cable between Newfoundland and Ireland in 1857. We gave millions of acres of public land to the transcontinental railroads after the Civil War. In more recent times the Maritime Administration has funded the development and operation of the nuclear ship *Savannah*. Since the early days of aviation, the Government has funded the airlines through mail payments and direct subsidy.

Only yesterday the President, in his budget message, asked for funds to study the development of a high-speed express train from Boston to New York. This could be a $2 billion project in itself. The Congress has appropriated funds for mass transit systems. All these projects provide commercial benefits to private companies, but are also in the national interest and for the benefit of the public.

Some provision must be made for the recoupment of the Government's investment. I do not think it is necessary at this time to work out a detailed plan, because again we do not have sufficient knowledge about what the end product will be.

But the economics of the plane must be designed so that there will be eventual recoupment over a period of years. Of course, if the decision is made not to go into production, the question is moot anyway. I am confident this will not happen.

Therefore, discussion should continue during the development period as to the most practical way to repay the Government.

I believe that some means can be devised where the Government—the taxpayers at large—would bear the loss if production fell short and where the taxpayers would share in profits or revenues if sales exceed a yet undetermined break-even factor. In any event, taxpayers would benefit in the long run. The program should not flounder now, though, simply because a proper formula has not been agreed upon.

Since the Government will bear virtually all the development cost and be responsible for the procurement of the prototypes, it must have a voice in the crucial decisions to be made. Because this is a national program of immense proportion, these decisions must be made by the highest officials of the Government.

And since the program cuts across many segments of our national interest, the decisions must be made by a representative group of Government leaders. The President's appointment of the Cabinet level committee, headed up by Secretary McNamara, was a wise move. Much of the progress made in the past year is directly attributable to the fine efforts of this committee. With a cross section of our top leaders working on the program, the proper decisions are assured. A committee of this type is necessary to make the broad decisions inherent in a national program. Such a committee serves essentially the same functions as a board of directors for a corporation.

There must, of course, be other Government officials to execute the broad decisions and supervise the details of the program. I personally (again) feel that some way must be worked out to insure the fullest active participation of the other aircraft manufacturers and the airlines, who will be the purchasers. The most tragic mistake we could make would be to establish a Government procurement officer as czar of the program and come up with a plane he likes, but one the airlines will not buy, or long distance travelers will not use.

It is at this stage—the detail design of the plane—that Government should fade into the shadows and private enterprise assume responsibility. Adequate provision must necessarily be made to insure against waste and exorbitant cost. But with competing prototypes, we need have no fear about inefficiency or poor effort on the part of manufacturers or airlines.

I understand that the Commerce Department is working on a plan which would permit the full engagement of private management working in cooperation with Government project supervisors. This is a vital essential to the success of this program. The manufacturers and the airlines must design the plane—not Government officials. The Government agency which certifies the plane cannot become deeply involved in its detailed design or designate the selection.

As we must avoid arbitrary decisions by a Government czar, we must also avoid detailed decisions by a committee of too many cooks. This is an area where Government and industry must sit down together and find a workable approach—and I might add one with sufficient flexibility to permit change as the program progresses. This may require full- or part-time assignment of airline officials to work directly with Government officials responsible for the execution of the program. I am sure the details of delegation of authority and responsibility can be agreed upon once the funding impasse is resolved.

In addition to being a national program, the development of SST prototypes must be an all-industry project. Just as the financing is beyond the capacity of any one company, so are the solutions of technological problems. The best research and design teams from all the major aircraft manufacturers interested in the program must be used. This could be achieved through prime contracts awarded to developers of the two competing designs with substantial subcontracts being let by them to other major manufacturers. I have talked with representatives of the companies involved and feel they would welcome this type of approach. Not only would we be assured of the best knowledge and skill available, but we would also temper opposition to the program by those who oppose what they call monopolies at Federal expense.

In this connection the most recent studies on market potential are much more optimistic than in 1963. Then, we talked about a market for 200 of our SST's. One of the manufacturers now conservatively estimates the market at 400. Other studies being made indicate the market through 1980 to be as large as 600, with an additional 400 needed by 1985 and another 500 by 1990. This is a total market through 1990 of 1,500 airplanes. This bird, if it is as good as I think it will be, will rival the venerable DC–3.

With a market potential this large, we don't need to worry about monopolies. There would be plenty of room for production of two or even three competing U.S. SST designs. The projections on revenue passenger-miles by 1980 and 1990 are fantastic.

I believe the airline managements, who plan ahead for only 2 to 5 years, must take a longer look at the future and get some of the optimism and enthusiasm which we senior citizens, I mean senior Senators, on Capitol Hill have. Often we spend so much time looking backward we don't realize we have made progress until it knocks us down.

Aviation progress has been remarkable. Sixty-one years ago the Wright brothers made the first powered flight. This momentous flight covered 120 feet. The fuselage on the domestic version of the Lockheed SST is over twice that distance. I think we are just now beginning to build airplanes. There will be a continual need for short-haul, intercity aircraft.

The SST will satisfy for 20 years to come our long-haul and intercontinental flights needs. We are just now building the stable of different types of airplanes we need—designed for specific missions.

Some of our military people are beginning to take off their blinders and recognize the urgent need for a new manned supersonic bomber. When they see what the new engine for the SST is capable of, they will be crying for a new bomber. We must, I repeat must, build a supersonic bomber. As a cornfield engineer, I believe the new bomber and our commercial SST can utilize a common engine, even though the boys in blue shout their opposition to any such mundane thing as a powerplant designed for civilian use. But when the engine for the SST is ready for production, I will wager that the idea of building it into an Air Force supersonic bomber will suddenly become an example of Air Force wisdom—as was the Lockheed C–141.

These comments I have made today and the approach I have suggested are necessarily broad and unspecific. Many of the specifics must be filled in later on.

I would welcome your comments on it and any potshots you care to take. Now is the time for us to get together across the table, maybe pound on it a bit, and discuss our problems and our dreams.

As in the song from "Damn Yankee," "You gotta have heart," and let's make the start.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 27, 1965

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, God, in the noise and confusion of these baffling days, when world peace with justice and righteousness still hang in the balance, we would this day lift our Te Deum for one who in the darkest night, with indomitable courage, was the embodiment of freedom and human dignity in its finest hour—Thy servant, Winston Churchill, to whom, as he lies now in peace, all the world is indebted.

We are grateful that to him came the summons of the words to the prophet of long ago: "I sought a man among them who should build up the wall and stand in the breech before me for the land, that it should not be destroyed."

To that ringing challenge, he cried, "Here am I; send me." And Thou didst send:

> The greatest captain of our times—
> Great in saving commonsense,
> And as the greatest only are
> In his simplicity sublime.

Thanks be to Thee that such have been, though they are here no more.

We bring our prayer in the name of the Master of all good workmen. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, January 26, 1965, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

REPORT OF HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 64)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the acompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of section 802(a) of the Housing Act of 1954, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the 17th Annual Report of the Housing and Home Finance Agency covering housing activities for the calendar year 1963.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 27, 1965.*

REPORT ON U.S. AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ACTIVITIES, 1964—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 65)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am proud to transmit—as I know the Congress will be proud to receive—this review of the significant successes of our Nation's aeronautic and space efforts in the calendar year of 1964.

The advances of 1964 were gratifying and heartening omens of the gains and good to come from our determined national undertaking in exploring the frontiers of space. While this great enterprise is still young, we began during the year past to realize its potential in our life on earth. As this report notes, practical uses of the benefits of space technology were almost commonplace around the globe—warning us of gathering storms, guiding our ships at sea, assisting our mapmakers and serving, most valuably of all, to bring the peoples of many nations closer together in joint peaceful endeavors.

Substantial strides have been made in a very brief span of time—and more are to come. We expect to explore the moon, not just visit it or photograph it. We plan to explore and chart planets as well. We shall expand our earth laboratories into space laboratories and extend our national strength into the space dimension.

The purpose of the American people—expressed in the earliest days of the space age—remains unchanged and unwavering. We are determined that space shall be an avenue toward peace and we both invite and welcome all men to join with us in this great opportunity.

In summary form, the accompanying report depicts the contributions of the various departments and agencies of the Government to the Nation's aeronautic and space accomplishments during 1964.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 27, 1965.*

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H.J. Res. 234) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, for certain activities of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 234) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, for certain activities of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection with the morning hour be limited to 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate go into executive session to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar beginning with those that appear after "New Reports."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations of the Executive Calendar, beginning with "New Reports."

COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Arthur M. Okun, of Connecticut, to be a member of the Council of Economic Advisers.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

NATIONAL COMMISSION ON TECHNOLOGY, AUTOMATION, AND ECONOMIC PROGRESS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

APPOINTMENT BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT. Pursuant to Public Law 88-271, the Chair appoints the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], in lieu of the former Senator from New York, Mr. Keating, to the U.S. Puerto Rican Commission.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

Report on Progress of ROTC Flight Training Program

A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the progress of the ROTC flight training program, for the period August 1, 1963, to November 30, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Reports of Comptroller General

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on unnecessary costs resulting from leasing rather than purchasing electronic data processing equipment at Mare Island Naval Shipyard, Vallejo, Calif., Department of the Navy, dated January 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on wage rates for federally financed building construction improperly determined in excess of the prevailing rates for similar work in New England areas, Department of Labor, dated January 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Certification of Soil Survey and Land Classification of Lands in Oroville-Tonasket Unit, Chief Joseph Dam Project, Washington

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, that an adequate soil survey and land classification had been made of the lands in the Oroville-Tonasket unit, Chief Joseph Dam project, Washington, and that the lands to be irrigated are susceptible to the production of agricultural crops by means of irrigation (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF IOWA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I send to the desk House Concurrent Resolution 4 of the General Assembly of the State of Iowa, urging the retention of the domiciliary veterans' facility at Clinton, Iowa.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, as follows:

House Concurrent Resolution 4 of the State of Iowa

Whereas there is an immediate and continuing need for caring for veterans; and

Whereas there is an existing facility known as the Veterans' Administration domiciliary, located at Clinton, Iowa; and

Whereas this existing facility has been maintained properly and is at present housing more than 600 veterans; and

Whereas said facility could be continued and even expanded at minimum costs to meet the needs for veteran care; and

Whereas the Veterans' Administration has announced plans to close the said domiciliary at Clinton, Iowa: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the house (the senate concurring) That the Veterans' Administration is respectfully requested to continue the operation of the domiciliary at Clinton, Iowa, with its suitable facilities and desirable location for the permanent care of veterans; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the President of the U.S. Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of Congress, the Iowa Members of the U.S. Senate, the Iowa Members of the House of Representatives of Congress, and the Veterans' Administration.

VINCENT B. STEFFEN,
Speaker of the House.

Attest:

WILLIAM R. KENDRICK,
Chief Clerk of the House.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, with amendments:

S. 408. A bill to authorize a study of methods of helping to provide financial assistance to victims of future flood disasters (Rept. No. 11).

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, without amendment:

S. 576. A bill to encourage physicians and dentists who have received student loans under programs established pursuant to title VII of the Public Health Service Act to practice their professions in areas having a shortage of physicians or dentists (Rept. No. 12).

WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT—MINORITY VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 10)

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE] from the Committee on Public Works, I report favorably, with amendments, the bill (S. 4) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, to establish the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, to provide grants for research and development, to increase grants for construction of municipal sewage treatment works, to authorize the establishment of standards of water quality to aid in preventing, controlling, and abating pollution of interstate waters, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and printed, and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask unanimous consent that the minority be permitted to file its views on S. 4.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. KUCHEL:

S. 763. A bill to extend the minimum wage provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to employees performing work in or related to agriculture; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks on Mr. KUCHEL when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. FONG:

S. 764. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to provide monthly insurance benefits thereunder at age 72 for certain individuals not otherwise eligible for such benefits; and

S. 765. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase to $2,400 the annual amount individuals are permitted to earn without suffering deductions from the insurance benefits payable to them under such title; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SYMINGTON:

S. 766. A bill for the relief of Lt. Samuel R. Rondberg, U.S. Army Reserve; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONG of Missouri:

S. 767. A bill for the relief of Gerhard Hofacker;

S. 768. A bill for the relief of Dr. Anson E. De Vera;

S. 769. A bill for the relief of Dr. Marshall Ku;

S. 770. A bill for the relief of Zoe P. (Bithos) Gavrilis; and

S. 771. A bill for the relief of Dr. Amin A. Faris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LAUSCHE:

S. 772. A bill for the relief of Jovan Janos Bunyik; and

S. 773. A bill for the relief of Dr. John Viljoen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELL:

S. 774. A bill to provide that the Department of Commerce shall conduct a program of investigation, research, and survey to determine the practicability of the adoption by the United States of the metric system of weights and measures; to the Committee on Commerce.

S. 775. A bill for the relief of Rosarinha Cardosa;

S. 776. A bill for the relief of Eileen Iris Punnett; and

S. 777. A bill for the relief of Juliano Barboza Amado and Manuel Socorro Barboza Amado; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. PELL when he introduced the first above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HART:

S. 778. A bill for the relief of Nicola Moric;

S. 779. A bill for the relief of Henryka Lyska;

S. 780. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Inge Maarsso Fischer;

S. 781. A bill for the relief of Gabor Siska and family;

S. 782. A bill for the relief of Anna Ungvari;

S. 783. A bill for the relief of Benedetta Vitale;

S. 784. A bill for the relief of Americo Mauti; and

S. 785. A bill for the relief of Enzo Lanni; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPARKMAN (by request):

S. 786. A bill to amend the National Housing Act by providing assistance to families of low income in obtaining decent, safe, and sanitary housing; and

S. 787. A bill to empower the Federal National Mortgage Association to deal in conventional mortgages and to provide otherwise for its further development as a secondary market facility; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. SPARKMAN when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HILL:

S. 788. A bill to designate the Veterans' Administration hospital being constructed in the District of Columbia as the Melvin J. Maas Memorial Hospital; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 789. A bill to prescribe a national policy with respect to the determination and disposition of property rights to inventions made in the course of experimental, developmental, and research work conducted under contracts or arrangements with the U.S. Government; to promote the public interest through widespread use and benefit from such inventions; to provide incentives to invention by rewarding inventors; and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. SALTONSTALL when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SCOTT:

S. 790. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Area Redevelopment Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. SCOTT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. INOUYE:

S. 791. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to continue to promote a program for the conservation, restoration, and management of the rare Hawaiian Nene goose; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. ELLENDER:

S. 792. A bill to amend section 8(e) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. ELLENDER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SIMPSON:

S. 793. A bill for the relief of Kee Hyung Lee, his wife, Young Shik Chung Lee, and his son, Choong Mu Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON (for himself and Mr. MAGNUSON):

S. 794. A bill to amend the act of June 12, 1948 (62 Stat. 382), in order to provide for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Kennewick division extension, Yakima project, Washington, and for other purposes; and

S. 795. A bill to provide for the assessing of Indian trust and restricted lands within the Lummi Indian diking project on the Lummi Indian Reservation in the State of Washington, through a drainage and diking district formed under the laws of the State; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. NELSON (for himself and Mr. MONDALE):

S. 796. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 so as to authorize the carrying out, in furtherance of the foreign policy of the United States, of certain programs of assistance to needy persons and social welfare and nonprofit school lunch programs; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. SIMPSON:

S.J. Res. 33. Joint resolution to cancel any unpaid reimbursable construction costs of the Wind River Indian irrigation project, Wyoming, chargeable against certain non-Indian lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT OF 1938, AS AMENDED, TO ESTABLISH A NATIONAL MINIMUM WAGE FOR AGRICULTURAL WORKERS

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I send to the desk a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to establish a national minimum wage for agricultural workers. This proposal would extend the wage provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act to those workers employed on large units of agricultural production. I have long been convinced of the necessity for such legislation.

Under the proposed bill, there would be a 3-year escalation in the rate of minimum hourly payment. The rate would be $1 for the first year, $1.15 for the second, and thereafter, it would be whatever the rate of the national minimum wage was. Employees on farms using more than 300 man-days of labor during any one of the preceding four quarters of a year would be protected by these minimum wage provisions. In 1962, 2 percent of the farms in the United States, employing 42 percent of those employed in agriculture, reached at least the 300 man-day standard. Obviously, this minimum standard would directly affect roughly one-half of those employed in agricultural work. However, the actual effect would be far wider than 50 percent of the workers. The 300 man-days figure was established to enable reasonable administration of the law. Immediate family members are excluded from coverage and a formula for acceptable piecework payment is set forth.

In addition, Mr. President, this bill seeks to establish a very important rule. Before foreign temporary supplemental labor is certified for use in this country, the executive branch possesses the discretionary power, under Public Law 414, to determine whether the entry of such labor into a given area will adversely affect wages and working conditions of domestic labor similarly employed. Recently Secretary of Labor Wirtz, pursuant to the power delegated to him by the Attorney General under Public Law 414, has issued an administrative regulation which states that after April 1, 1965, in order to receive certification to use foreign labor, employment must first have been offered to domestic workers at rates no less than between $1.15 and $1.40 an hour, depending on the State concerned. I do not deny that the Secretary has the power and, indeed, the duty to see that qualified domestic workers are employed before admission of any foreign workers to our country. But, I do not believe that the Secretary should discriminate between States in the minimum he sets. I believe that if the Congress chooses to establish a minimum wage for agricultural workers, no representative of the executive, whether he be the Attorney General, the Secretary of Labor, or any other official, should prescribe a wage which differs from the statutory national minimum. The wage that the Congress sets as a standard, should be applied impartially throughout the United States.

The economic and social reasons for this legislation are compelling ones. In 1938, a national policy of minimum wage security for industrial workers was established. Since that time, the policy has been reinforced and extended. Agricultural workers, however, were excluded. Is it reasonable or fair to exclude agricultural workers from minimum wage protection? Clearly not.

A minimum wage would not benefit farmworkers alone. Two years before the Fair Labor Standards Act was enacted, a Supreme Court Justice sensitively and succinctly outlined several economic conditions that many still prefer to ignore. He wrote as follows:

> We have had opportunity to learn that a wage is not always the resultant of free bargaining between employers and employees; that it may be one forced upon employees by their economic necessities and upon employers by the most ruthless of their competitors. We have had opportunity to perceive more clearly that a wage insufficient to support the worker does not visit its consequences upon him alone; that it may affect profoundly the entire economic structure of society and, in any case, that it casts on every taxpayer, and on government itself, the burden of solving the problems of poverty, subsistence, health and morals of large numbers in the community. Because of their nature and extent these are public problems. A generation ago they were for the individual to solve; today they are the burden of the Nation.

That is contained in Justice Stone's dissent from *Morehead* v. *New York ex rel. Tipaldo*, 298 U.S. 587.

In the American mixed economy of the 1960's, Justice Stone's dictum has become increasingly applicable. The entire Nation suffers when one group within the economy is damaged. Let us look for a moment at that damage. According to a special survey conducted by the U.S. Department of Agriculture for the Department of Labor in May 1963, the average hourly wage paid in the United States to contract construction workers was $3.34, for mineworkers $2.74, for manufacturing workers $2.45, for wholesale trade workers $2.45, and for retail trade workers $1.81. Yet, Mr. President, and this is almost unbelievable, agricultural workers were paid an average of 89 cents an hour. Although no comparative figures are available, the average composite wage for agricultural workers in 1964 was 90 cents. I am proud to note that in my State the hourly average wage for farmworkers was $1.33. As you can see, 89 cents or 90 cents an hour for agricultural workers amounts to less than half the wage paid to retail trade workers, and a little more than one-quarter of what contract construction workers receive on the average. The disparity is a glaring one and the gap is needless.

Economic, social, and humanitarian considerations demand that the wage provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act be extended to our farmworkers. I hope that the 89th Congress will face up to this longstanding inequity, and provide a decent minimum wage for those who labor in our fields. In doing so, we can remove, in some small way, the blight that should be on the conscience of most Americans.

In a word, agriculture in America is at a critical crossroad. The other day, the Secretary of Labor on his own ipse dixit set wage levels for agricultural workers as a prerequisite to importation of farm labor. He set one wage rate in California. He set a lower one in the neighboring State of Arizona. All across the country there is a disparity in the minimum wage rates established by the Secretary.

Mr. President, this is one country, and I do not want the farmers of California or of any other State to be discriminated against by any kind of rule which provides that they will be paid one rate and that workers in another State will be paid another rate.

This problem cannot be swept under the rug. We need to help American migratory farmworkers to the maximum extent possible. That is the reason why the Senate Agriculture Committee last year, with my enthusiastic support, provided additional moneys to assist the plight of American migratory workers.

Mr. President, I want it clearly understood that what is needed is sound American policy; that after we have exhausted to completion the availability of American farmworkers and have no more who are available to do the job, the American farmer needs the temporary help of nationals from beyond our shores.

I ask that the bill lie at the desk, hopefully for additional cosponsors, until the close of business on February 5.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and will lie at the desk as requested.

The bill (S. 763) to extend the minimum wage provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to employees performing work in or related to agriculture, introduced by Mr. Kuchel, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

STUDY OF PRACTICABILITY OF ADOPTING THE METRIC SYSTEM OF WEIGHTS AND MEASURES

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I again introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill providing that the Department of Commerce conduct a full-scale study to determine the practicability of adopting the metric system of weights and measures by this country.

For several years, the Honorable George P. Miller, chairman of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, and I have been pressing for such a study. The reasons are self-evident—the metric system is used by almost every country in the world with the exception of the English-speaking nations; it is an integrated and uniform system; and the ease by which it can be learned and its simplicity of use denotes higher efficiency and great savings of time.

I have attempted in drafting this bill to accommodate all interested parties. The bill specifically calls for comparative studies of the standards of weights and measures used in many broad areas, and the relative advantages and disadvantages of each in its respective field.

I recognize that some industries are concerned with the prospective cost of converting to the metric system. The formula used by some may not be good for others. For instance, the Eli Lilly Co., converted on its own initiative over a period of 4 years, economically and easily. The machine tool industry might need 30 to 40 years, to take advantage of the natural obsolescence of machine tools and the turnover in the labor force. The important thing to keep in mind, however, is the importance of gathering the true facts and devising the most economical plan.

Evidence is being constantly presented regarding the great losses in manpower, time, and money in trying to maintain an antiquated system which is difficult and cumbersome to use. In the field of international commerce, it has been estimated that America loses from $10 to $25 billion yearly in orders to countries that are on the metric system. If this estimate is accurate, we are sustaining losses that have a direct and disastrous impact on our economic wellbeing. If the estimate is not accurate, an extensive study of the pros and cons of adopting the metric system in this country will give us the true picture.

While favorable reports and statements were received on my bill during the last Congress from the Department of Defense, the Department of Commerce, and several individuals and groups, I am hopeful that in hearings this session many other interested parties will avail themselves of the opportunity to testify. Full and complete hearings will, I am certain, point up the need for a complete study of the advantages and disadvantages of converting to the metric system. I believe this is a reasonable suggestion, and one which will accommodate all points of view.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of my bill be printed in full in the Record at this point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 774) to provide that the Department of Commerce shall conduct a program of investigation, research, and survey to determine the practicability of the adoption by the United States of the metric system of weights and measures, introduced by Mr. Pell, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of Commerce is hereby authorized and directed to conduct a program of investigation, research, and survey to appraise the desirability, practicability, and cost of a general conversion to use of the metric system of weights and measures in the United States.

Sec. 2. In the conduct of the program described in the first section of this Act, the Secretary among other things shall—

(1) conduct extensive comparative studies of the standards of weights and measures used in engineering, manufacturing, commercial and scientific areas and in educational institutions, and the relative advantages and disadvantages of each in its respective field;

(2) cooperate with other governmental agencies and private organizations in determining the advantages and disadvantages of a general conversion to the metric system in the United States or of a conversion to such system in specific fields and the impact of such conversion upon those affected;

(3) cooperate with foreign governments in determining the advantages to the United States in international trade and commerce, and in military and other areas of international relations, to be derived from an internationally standardized system of weights and measures; and

(4) investigate the attitudes of the departments and agencies of the Federal Government and of the several States with respect to possible practical difficulties which might be encountered in accomplishing a conversion to the metric system of weights and measures generally or in specific fields or areas in the United States.

Sec. 3. The Secretary shall submit to the Congress such interim reports as he deems desirable, and within three years after the date of the enactment of this Act, a full and complete report of the findings made in the conduct of the program described in the first section of this Act, together with such recommendations as he considers to be appropriate and in the best interests of the United States.

Sec. 4. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums, not to exceed $2,500,000, as may be necessary to carry out this Act.

AUTHORITY FOR FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION TO DEAL IN MORTGAGES

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to empower the Federal National Mortgage Association to deal in conventional mortgages and to provide otherwise for its further development as a secondary market facility. I ask unanimous consent that an analysis of the bill be printed in the Record.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the analysis will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 787) to empower the Federal National Mortgage Association to deal in conventional mortgages and to provide otherwise for its further development as a secondary market facility, introduced by Mr. Sparkman, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The analysis presented by Mr. Sparkman is as follows:

Analysis of S. 787

The purpose of this bill is to empower the Federal National Mortgage Association to deal in conventional mortgages and to provide otherwise for its further development as a secondary market facility.

The first section of the bill revises section 302(b) of the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act so as to enlarge the scope of the Association's operations. Under its regular secondary market operations, which are in the main privately financed, the Association would be authorized to purchase, lend on the security of, and otherwise deal in conventional (uninsured) mortgages which do not exceed 80 percent of the appraised value of the security, and also in similar mortgages when the loan-value ratio exceeds 80 percent if the excess is covered by suitable mortgage insurance of an acceptable private insurer. Also as to the secondary market operations, certain existing operating restrictions are dropped as not being appropriately applicable to a privately financed activity intended to serve the broad general secondary market for mortgages:

These consist of the prohibition against purchasing mortgages at a price exceeding par (100); the prohibition against purchasing mortgages offered by, or covering property held by, Federal, State, territorial, or municipal instrumentalities; and a mortgage amount ceiling of $20,000 for each family residence or dwelling unit (as to which existing law now provides several exceptions). All present restrictions are retained, however, with one exception (see next paragraph) as to corporation's special assistance functions, which are wholly government financed.

As to the Treasury-financed special assistance functions, and also the management and liquidating functions, section 1 would accomplish the elimination of the existing prohibition against the corporation's acquisition of mortgages from Federal instrumentalities, in order to provide for possible future centralization of Government mortgage ownership and management. Present law provides an exception to the foregoing, in that mortgages can now be acquired from the Housing and Home Finance Agency and its constituents; the bill would expand this to include other Federal instrumentalities. All other restrictive provisions in existing law, including the general prohibition against acquisitions of mortgages from States and their instrumentalities, are retained.

Section 2 would expand the scope of the corporate activities under the privately financed secondary market operations, also. It would repeal section 304(d) of the FNMA Charter Act, which now states: "The Association may not purchase participations in its operations under this section." The purpose, of course, is to empower FNMA to buy, sell, etc., participations in mortgages, a type of transaction which has become markedly significant recently in the field of secondary market activity in mortgages.

UNIFORM PATENT POLICY

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to prescribe a uniform patent policy with respect to proprietary rights in and to inventions, discoveries, and improvements realized through Government research and development contracts. Included in this bill is provision for Government inventive contributions awards.

I introduced a similar bill during the first session of the last Congress in the belief that there is a definite and continuing need for congressional action to establish a defined, statutory policy concerning disposition of patent rights arising out of Government research and development contracts with private parties. That this need is apparent is evident in the statement of Government patent policy promulgated by the late President Kennedy in October 1963. This memorandum was a positive step toward a solution of this problem; however, I believe it imperative to express Government policy toward disposition of patent rights under research and development contracts by specific statutory enactment.

There has been a dramatic increase during the past 20 years in Government research and development contracts with private parties. This is shown by the fact that during the current fiscal year, the Government will obligate approximately $15 billion for research and development. This alone illustrates the importance of these contracts to the national economy.

The absence of a uniform Government patent policy has resulted too often in confusion and uncertainty both within the Government and among private segments of our society This condition should not be permitted to continue. I believe it is essential that specific legislation be enacted which will provide express standards for all departments and agencies of the Government to employ for determining the rights of parties under its research and development contracts. Reason, logic and equity require that this be done.

I recognize that this entire subject is extremely complex and solutions for the various problems which arise under it are often difficult to find. Certainly there is no rigid formula which can be applied to resolve all cases dealing with the proper disposition of patent rights under Government research and development contracts. I believe, however, that this bill can serve as a basis for establishing reasonable standards for the negotiation of these contracts.

My bill provides, with certain specific exceptions, that the patent rights of the parties shall be determined at the time Government research and development contracts are negotiated. It establishes criteria for determining disposition of these rights and provides that the Government will always receive an irrevocable, nonexclusive, nontransferable, royalty-free license to any invention developed under these contracts.

In my opinion, this bill insures protection of the rights of all parties to research and development contracts and gives due recognition to their contribution and effort in a manner consistent with our system of free enterprise. I believe that this bill offers a reasonable basis for the establishment of a Government patent policy toward research and development contracts.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 789) to prescribe a national policy with respect to the determination and disposition of property rights to inventions made in the course of experimental, developmental, and research work conducted under contracts or arrangements with the U.S. Government; to promote the public interest through widespread use and benefit from such inventions; to provide incentives to invention by rewarding inventors; and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. SALTONSTALL, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSION OF THE AREA REDEVELOPMENT ACT

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend certain provisions of the Area Redevelopment Act.

I have supported area redevelopment legislation since 1957. It was a much-needed program then and it still is now. But our quest for really effective and equitable area redevelopment legislation has not been easy.

Twice bills were passed by Congress and then vetoed, in part because the legislation was faulty. Then when legislation passed for a third time and was signed into law in 1961, it was so loaded with extraneous features that the best of national administrations would have had difficulty in properly implementing it.

Indeed, at times this whole idea of providing help for communities to help themselves has been degraded into a "pork barrel" program.

Shocking evidence of inequities, waste, and unfair treatment of States like Pennsylvania in the administration of the area redevelopment program was brought to light just last October when the General Accounting Office reported that $26 million in funds administered under the area redevelopment program had been spent in areas which no longer needed them.

While those funds were fattening up areas which had already achieved economic recovery, areas which were still in need such as Scranton and Uniontown-Connellsville, Pa., had not received grants because of insufficient funds.

I have always thought of area redevelopment legislation as a rifle that should pinpoint areas of greatest need and provide help where needed the most. That was the objective of the first bill I sponsored many years ago and that is the objective of a bill that I am introducing today. It would extend the area redevelopment program for 4 years, but would limit its benefits to areas of real need, rather than firing hard-earned tax dollars around like buckshot.

My bill would largely limit area redevelopment funds to areas of chronic and persistent unemployment having a labor force of 15,000 or more. But it would not foreclose assistance to areas having smaller labor forces which meet tightened eligibility requirements, or areas which have suffered disasters or are faced with an abrupt rise in unemployment, such as that which will be caused if the Olmsted Air Force Base is closed.

This legislation will mean a fairer distribution of funds to areas of real need in Pennsylvania and other States with pockets of chronic and persistent unemployment. Moreover, I have been assured by Pennsylvania Secretary of Commerce John K. Tabor, that the tightened eligibility requirements will not eliminate one Pennsylvania county or community.

The introduction of this bill conforms with a pledge I made to the people of Pennsylvania last fall, and I am urging its prompt consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 790) to amend certain provisions of the Area Redevelopment Act, introduced by Mr. SCOTT, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 8(e) OF SOIL CONSERVATION AND DOMESTIC ALLOTMENT ACT

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 8(e) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, relating to the bill, be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 792) to amend section 8(e) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, introduced by Mr. Ellender, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The letter presented by Mr. Ellender is as follows:

Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C., January 8, 1965.

Hon. Carl Hayden,
President pro tempore,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Hayden: The Department of Agriculture recommends that section 8(e) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, be further amended to substitute language for the "small cost-share increase" provision, which would direct the Secretary to give particular consideration to the conservation requirements of small family farms in the approval of agricultural conservation program (ACP) cost-sharing assistance for the application of needed conservation measures.

There is enclosed a draft of a bill to accomplish this proposal. This is identical with a bill, S. 2734, introduced in the 88th Congress but not enacted.

The present provision requires that each payment of less than $200 shall be increased by a specific dollars and cents amount ranging essentially from 40 percent of the earned cost-shares for the smallest payments to a $14 increase on cost-shares from $60 to $186. This provision has for many years substantially failed to accomplish the purpose for which it was originally designed. It was added to the act beginning with the 1938 program when the major use of program funds was for production adjustment or control purposes. At that time the size of payment was closely related to the size of farm and by giving additional assistance in the low-payment brackets (which the present rigid formula requires) the objective of providing more assistance to small farms was substantially achieved.

This situation does not exist in present programs since the amount of ACP payment is no longer closely related to the size of farm. Under present programs devoted entirely to assisting farmers to apply needed soil, water, woodland, and wildlife conserving measures, small payments are in numerous cases made to large farms. The effect of the present provision is to reward the farmers who do the least amount of conservation work regardless of the conservation needs of their lands, the financial assistance needed by the farmer, or the size of the farm.

An objective of giving increased attention to the conservation problems of small family farms can be much more nearly met if the Secretary were not required to apply the arbitrary, mechanical formula presently required. Flexibility is needed so that the objective can be carried out in a manner most appropriate to each area, taking into account the variation in the physical size of family farms in different areas, the relative needs of farmers for assistance, and other relevant factors.

The enactment of this proposal would not alter the legislative requirement of section 15 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act that funds be allotted among the States in accordance with the relative need of their lands for conservation measures. Its enactment would eliminate the necessity for the Secretary temporarily to withhold a part of the authorized funds to be added later for these ineffective "small cost-share increases," and permit those needed funds to be used to get increased conservation work.

A great majority of the farmer committees who administer the agricultural conservation program have been recommending for many years that such a change be made. They have repeatedly proposed using the funds otherwise required for those complicated and unproductive arbitrary increases, to share the cost of additional conservation work on farms on which the funds are most needed to accomplish the original purposes of this legislation.

Enactment of this proposal would not require additional appropriations, but would permit more effective use of all of the funds authorized.

A similar letter and a copy of this draft of a bill is being sent to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the presentation of this proposed legislation from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely yours,

Orville L. Freeman,
Secretary.

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965—MINORITY VIEWS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the minority be permitted to file its views on S. 3, the Appalachia bill, which I believe has already been reported by the Committee on Public Works.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR TO S. 296

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of S. 296 the name of the distinguished junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. Fannin] be added as a cosponsor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. Lausche] be added as a cosponsor to S. 296, the bill to make available to private industry 100,000 tons of copper from Government stockpiles.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF SENATE RESOLUTION 38 DEALING WITH VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION FACILITIES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Anderson], and the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. McIntyre] may be added as cosponsors to Senate Resolution 38 which seeks to withhold action on the closing of various Veterans' Administration facilities until the matter can be examined by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILLS

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be added as a cosponsor of S. 712, S. 714, and S. 716, introduced by the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott], at future printings of these bills.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 30

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, earlier in the session I introduced Senate Joint Resolution 30, to amend the Constitution.

Through an unavoidable oversight the name of my senior colleague from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska] was not added as a cosponsor during the time the resolution was on the desk.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that the name of my senior colleague be added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 30.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 10

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished minority leader, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. Lausche] be added as a cosponsor of Senate Concurrent Resolution 10 and that his name be added at the next printing of the concurrent resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KUCHEL. I ask unanimous consent that the name of the senior Senator from California [Mr. Kuchel] also be added as a cosponsor of Senate Concurrent Resolution 10 at its next printing.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished minority leader, I wish to express his delight that the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. Lausche] has asked to become a cosponsor of Senate Concurrent Resolution 10. Again, on behalf of the minority leader, I urge Senators of both parties to consider becoming cosponsors themselves.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of Senate Concurrent Resolution 10 be printed in full at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, Senate Concurrent Resolution 10 was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. Con. Res. 10

Whereas the Communist regime of the Soviet Union did not come to power in the Eastern European countries by legal or democratic processes, but has flouted even the solemn assurances and agreements entered into at the Yalta Conference of February 1945; and

Whereas the Soviet Union has denied self-determination by free election in those countries, resorting not only to heavily manned occupational forces, but also to genocidal activities in the cases of the many countries known as captive nations; and

Whereas the sovereignty and independence of the former free governments of those captive nations under the yoke of Soviet communism were duly recognized and continue to be given recognition and moral support; and

Whereas the suppression of human freedoms and the denial of free trade and communications with other sovereign countries present a threat to peace, intolerable either to the United States, other free nations, or the international law agencies; and

Whereas the governments and peoples of said captive nations now under the yoke of Soviet communism have always been in close relation with the United States and constantly continue to prove their belief in democracy through the work and blood of their peoples: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the President is hereby requested to take such action as may be necessary to bring before the United Nations for its consideration the question of the forceful incorporation into the Soviet Union of the following captive nations and peoples now behind the so-called Iron Curtain: Ukrainians, Turkestanians, Byelorussians, Azerbaijanians, Armenians, Albanians, Georgians, Bulgarians, Yugoslavians, Czechoslovakians, Rumanians, Lithuanians, Latvians, Estonians, North Epirotians, Hungarians, Polish, and East Germans; and a resolution declaring that—

(a) the Soviet Union shall withdraw all Soviet troops, agents, colonists, and controls from said captive nations;

(b) the Soviet Union shall return all citizens of said captive nations to their homelands from places of exile in Siberia, and dispersion in prisons and slave labor camps throughout the Soviet Union; and

(c) the United Nations should conduct free elections in said captive nations under the direct supervision of the United Nations and sit in judgment on the Communist counterparts of the Nazi war criminals convicted at the Nuremberg trials.

REMOVAL OF SENATOR MONDALE AS COSPONSOR OF SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 6

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, through inadvertence, the name of the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 6. I ask unanimous consent that his name be omitted from that measure at its next printing.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under authority of the orders of the Senate, as indicated below, the following names have been added as additional cosponsors for the following bills and resolutions:

Authority of January 15, 1965:

S. 500. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes: Senators BARTLETT, BREWSTER, MCGEE, MCNAMARA, MONDALE, and TYDINGS.

S. 561. A bill to achieve the fullest cooperation and coordination of activities between the levels of government in order to improve the operation of our Federal system in an increasingly complex society, to improve the administration of grants-in-aid to the States, to provide for periodic congressional review of Federal grants-in-aid, to permit provision of reimbursable technical services to State and local governments, to establish coordinated intergovernmental policy and administration of grants and loans for urban development, to provide for the acquisition, use, and disposition of land within urban areas by Federal agencies in conformity with local government programs, and for other purposes: Senators ALLOTT, ANDERSON, BAYH, BENNETT, BIBLE, BOGGS, BREWSTER, CASE, CLARK, COOPER, DOUGLAS, ERVIN, FONG, GRUENING, HART, INOUYE, JACKSON, LONG of Missouri, MCCARTHY, MCGEE, MCINTYRE, MONDALE, MORSE, MOSS, MUNDT, NEUBERGER, PASTORE, PELL, PROUTY, PROXMIRE, RANDOLPH, and RIBICOFF.

S. Res. 30. Resolution to amend the Standing Rules of the Senate relative to the Select Committee on Small Business: Senators ALLOTT, BARTLETT, BOGGS, BURDICK, BYRD of West Virginia, CASE, CHURCH, FONG, GRUENING, INOUYE, JAVITS, KUCHEL, MAGNUSON, MCCARTHY, MCGEE, MCGOVERN, MILLER, MOSS, MUNDT, RANDOLPH, RIBICOFF, SCOTT, and YOUNG of North Dakota.

S. Res. 35. Resolution to amend rule VII to permit morning business statements or comments for 3 minutes: Senators HART, LONG of Missouri, SCOTT, and SYMINGTON.

Authority of January 19, 1965:

S. 624. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to make unlawful certain practices in connection with the placing of minor children for permanent free care or for adoption: Senators BAYH, BOGGS, BURDICK, FONG, HART, and LONG of Missouri.

BETTER THAN MEDICARE

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, an editorial appearing in the Manchester Union Leader on January 13, 1965, written by its publisher, William Loeb, outlines an approach to the problem of medicare which, in my opinion, merits the attention of every Member of Congress. Of course, it sets forth only a general approach, and many facets and details would need to be considered. It appears to me, however, that it utilizes our free enterprise system, affords the most needed protection of our people of limited means, including the elderly, and offers the medical profession the opportunity to get behind a constructive proposal which does not open the way to socialized medicine.

In view of the brevity of the editorial, I ask unanimous consent that it appear in the body of the RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BETTER THAN MEDICARE

What worries most American families, young or old, is a medical disaster in the form of one of the members of their family being struck down by cancer, a severe heart attack, or some other disease, the cure of which is slow and terribly expensive. Very few families have enough money in the bank to handle a real medical disaster.

It is against such a disaster that there should be an insurance provision not merely for the folks more than 65 but for all people, from birth on until their death. On the one hand, medicare is an expensive fraud. It will not take care of the real medical disasters and it will be misused, just as socialized medicine is misused in England. On the other hand, it is no solution to the problem of medical disaster to have the doctors cry "socialized medicine" and fight every attempt to solve the very legitimate medical problems of the average citizen.

If you give people free medical and hospital care, the expense in the form of taxation will be absolutely fantastic because, unfortunately, when something is free, people abuse it. Free medical care would result in everybody making a big production out of each small ailment that came along. There would be unnecessary doctoring and unnecessary occupation of hospital beds. The cost of it would be unbelievable in the form of the amount of extra taxes we would all have to pay.

The problem to which the Government and the doctors of the United States should devote themselves is how do they take care of medical disasters. This is something, the cost of which not only must be borne but could be borne by all of us at a reasonable figure.

Surely the great insurance companies of this Nation and the doctors could get together and come up with a form of insurance against medical disaster that would cover everything connected with that disaster—hospital, surgical, medical, drug, and convalescent costs.

When the cost of the premiums of this type of all-inclusive insurance has been determined, then there can be consideration as to whether the Government should not pay the premiums for those who are dependent on welfare or old-age assistance, or who are below a certain level of income and are on such a subsistence level of living that they could not possibly pay the insurance premiums.

In this way, you reduce the cost of the taxpayer to the minimum and you protect everyone, whether 10 years old or 100, from the continuing fear of some day having their budget and their normal pattern of living completely destroyed by a sudden medical catastrophe which could otherwise cost them thousands on thousands of dollars.

If the doctors and if the insurance companies want to avoid the straitjacket of socialized medicine and subsequent loss of freedom on the part of both the doctor and the patient, they had better sit down immediately and figure out a workable plan of insurance against medical disaster.

TRIBUTES TO SIR WINSTON CHURCHILL

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, the people of the free world were saddened to learn on Sunday that their champion and longtime leader had left them.

As I stand here today, I am reminded that North Carolina's great educator and Governor, Charles B. Aycock, said on one occasion, if a man requires an eulogy, he does not deserve one, and if he deserves one, he does not require it. Certainly, no one in this century has been more deserving of an eulogy and, certainly, no one requires one less, for Winston Spencer Churchill was known well and loved well by freemen everywhere. Surely, history will honor him well, and when the finest hours of the free world are recorded, those during his leadership will be at the pinnacle.

Each of us is saddened by the death of this great man, and we recall the gallant leadership that he gave to us during our most desperate hours and the direction that he gave in preserving the peace. It would be virtually impossible for one to enumerate the accomplishments of our honorary American citizen, and I shall not attempt to do so. His accomplishments and eloquence were such that they could not be embellished by anything that I might say. Even so, I should like to reflect a few minutes upon what he has meant to me through the years.

I have long been an admirer of Sir Winston Churchill. To me, he has been a source of inspiration because he always had tenacity of purpose however great was the opposition at the time. He persevered against tremendous odds, and even in the face of inevitable defeat, he never hesitated to say and do what he felt was right.

I go back to his childhood and the difficulty that this genius had in adjusting to a set curriculum, and although he may have been one who never mastered the classical languages, he certainly mastered the English language. Our language is the richer for that. As First Lord of the Admiralty, the Gallipolian fiasco would have shattered a lesser man, but not Winston Churchill. As Chancellor of the Exchequer, he faced the great depression and worked for fiscal stability against tremendous odds that would have discouraged most men; and finally, at 65 years of age, having lived longer than most men of his generation, and, certainly well beyond the age when men think of their greatest and most effective productivity, he took the mantle of leadership for the entire free world, and his steadfastness and determination played a major part in saving it. Of course, his service to mankind did not end there.

Seemingly rejected by the electorate at the war's end, he continued to speak out for principles he held dear. And again he emerged to lead his people. He served long and well, ever true to those democratic concepts that made England great and which form the bulwark of our political system.

Winston Churchill's example in fighting to preserve freedom and justice for all, in providing a body politic under law rather than men, is exemplary for those who would govern.

I recall that I was presiding as a superior court judge in Lincolnton, N.C., at the time of the Dunkirk evacuation. I went to my hotel room after the court had adjourned and heard a broadcast by Adolph Hitler, translated by an interpreter, in which he told the British people that the might of the Third Reich was against them and that the only sensible thing for them to do was to surrender. I remember Churchill's defiant reply, which not only aroused the pride of the peoples of the free world but strengthened the determination of the British people to fight on, to the death, if necessary, in the preservation of liberty.

He may no longer be among us, but Winston Churchill lives on in the hearts of free men everywhere, and his great spirit will forever permeate the history of our times.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the attached editorials on Sir Winston Churchill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Winston-Salem (N.C.) Journal, Jan. 25, 1965]

SIR WINSTON CHURCHILL

When history beckoned, Winston Churchill was ready.

For most of his 65 years he had stood in the shadows of mistrust. His countrymen found him brilliant—yes, attractive. But he was too impulsive, too erratic, people said. England would never trust him with what he wanted most, the supreme power; he was a dangerous man.

Yet when the field-gray hordes of Hitler rolled like an opaque fog over Flanders, when the freedom of the sceptered isle lay in the balance, England turned to Winston Churchill.

And from that moment in 1940 greatness enveloped him.

It was a token of that greatness that he never looked back in anger. He never reproached the Tories who had mocked him in the House of Commons when he warned them time and again of the coming peril. He never reminded the Laborites that they had made him their whipping boy during those bitter years with taunts of "warmonger" and "imperialist." Instead, he gathered them round him and made them see the glory of their place in history. He called on them to make this—the moment of England's greatest danger—their finest hour. And they made it their finest hour.

And always, together with the courage, the eloquence, there was the blessed humor.

"We shall fight on the beaches, we shall fight on the landing grounds, we shall fight in the streets * * * we shall never surrender," he said when the German blow seemed ready to fall. And then, according to the legend in the pubs, he put his hand over the microphone and added, "We shall hit them with beer bottles, because God knows that's all we've got."

To Americans he was such an ally as we may never see again. Tenacious in argument, stubborn in advocacy, he still was always loyal. His faults, our leaders found, were of the kind that make us love a man; his qualities were those that enrich and inspire the human spirit. There is no record that, even in the most trying days of the alliance, he ever uttered an ignoble word against us.

So now he leaves us—head forward, jaw thust out, shoulders hunched—for that lofty shrine where the English-speaking peoples guard the memory of their noblest heroes.

And in all truth we Americans have reason to cherish him. For he was generous to our mother tongue, and we may pray that schoolboys for centuries to come will recite his words. He was prodigal with his foresight and his wisdom, and we may hope that our leaders in these uncertain years will profit by the legacy he leaves us.

And as a guide to national conduct we can find nothing better than the moral he drew from the great crisis that he helped to master:

In war: Resolution.
In defeat: Defiance.
In victory: Magnanimity.
In peace: Good will.

[From the Greensboro (N.C.) Daily News, Jan. 25, 1965]

THE SPLENDOR OF SIR WINSTON CHURCHILL

The Lion of Chartwell is dead.

Sir Winston Leonard Spencer Churchill, among the handful of great men of the 20th century, has quietly passed away in London after the final valiant fight of his illustrious career.

It was Bismarck who said that political genius consists of the ability to hear the distant hoofbeat of the horse of history—and then by superhuman effort to leap and catch the horseman by the coattails.

Sir Winston Churchill did that in 1940. Later he wrote of that time: "It is impossible to quell the inward excitement which comes from a prolonged balancing of terrible things." When Churchill came to the fore in the crumbling dreamworld of Baldwin and Chamberlain, he again inspired the Island Race—his name for the British people—to magnificence.

Sir Winston was born at Blenheim Palace during a dance attended by his American-born mother. Visitors marvel that the event took place in a small anteroom when there were many vast apartments upstairs. His good friend Virginia Cowles noted: "Winston Churchill was 2 months ahead of his time. In subsequent years he continued on that schedule."

The Lion of Chartwell began life as a misfit. In school as a "fat and loutish boy" he refused to learn Greek or Latin. This assured him of the lowest place in his class at Harrow. But while his fellows concentrated on Greek and Latin, Winston concentrated on English; it repaid him handsomely. Once he reminisced about his early days: "I am surprised in my later life I should have become so experienced in taking degrees when as a schoolboy I was so bad at passing examinations. In fact, one might almost say that no one ever passed so few examinations and received so many degrees."

His ineptness in school led directly to his military career. Lord Randolph Churchill sent his wayward son to Sandhurst where, after two failures, he managed to pass the entrance examination. His military career led him to India seeking a post of danger. Then he resigned from the army to become a newspaper correspondent; he achieved world fame at the age of 25 when he was captured by the Boers in South Africa and managed to escape.

When Churchill returned to Britain to enter politics, he did what Franklin Roosevelt emulated later—he deserted his "class." He infuriated the Tories by becoming a Liberal. After a tumultuous career in the World War I government, which ended in the Dardanelles fiasco, he joined Lloyd George's government. At its downfall, Churchill was a broken man—politically despised by his former Tory associates and discredited among the Liberals.

At that dark moment Winston Churchill returned to the party of his fathers—the Tories. When he heard the "distant hoofbeat" in the late thirties, he was ready to catch the horseman's coattails.

During all of his years in the political wilderness, Winston Churchill wrote strong splendid nouns and verbs in 27 books, including a biography of his famous ancestor, the first Duke of Marlborough, and a beautiful history of the English people. But the events of World War II gave him the material for his finest literary work, which led to the Nobel Prize. Once, addressing the House of Commons, Sir Winston warned it to "leave the past to history, particularly since I intend to write the history myself."

And he did.

It was the doing, however—the imposition of his imagination and his will upon his countrymen during their dire crisis—that made Winston Churchill most memorable. Isaiah Berlin, in an analysis of "a great man at a great moment," notes that "Churchill was successful precisely because he appeared to them (his people) larger and nobler than life and lifted them to an abnormal height in a moment of crisis."

This has happened many times in history with dangerous results; dictators and demagogs have transformed "peaceful populations into marching armies." It was Winston Churchill's unforgettable achievement, Mr. Berlin reminds us, "that he created this necessary illusion within the framework of a free system without destroying or even twisting it; that he called forth spirits which did not stay to oppress and enslave the population after the hour of need had passed; that he saved the future by interpreting the present in terms of a vision of the past which did not distort or inhibit the historical development of the British people. * * *"

Here was a man, then, who reminds us of Pitt, Marlborough, Nelson, Wellington, Leonardo da Vinci, Washington, Julius Caesar, and even Lincoln. Here was a man who possessed great and versatile talents and used them effectively in the service of a besieged civilization. Sir Winston was soldier, scholar, historian, "naval person," correspondent, statesman, orator, artist, and wit. This splendid renaissance man made history and then wrote about it in words of magnificence.

Two quotations from his own pen may befit this hour of his passing—one which he delivered on the occasion of the death of his old adversary, Sir Neville Chamberlain:

"The only guide to a man is his conscience; the only shield to his memory is the rectitude and sincerity of his action. It is very imprudent to walk through life without this shield, because we are so often mocked by the failure of our hopes; but with this shield, however the fates may play, we march always in the ranks of honor."

And finally his own words at Harrow in 1941:

"Never give in. Never give in. Never, never, never, never—in nothing great or small, large or petty—never give in except to convictions of honor and good sense."

[From the Charlotte (N.C.) Observer, Jan. 25, 1965]

Churchill and History Met To Create Our Finest Hour

The times of Sir Winston Leonard Spencer Churchill were the best of times and the worst of times for all who lived through them with him. He has been bone of our bone and flesh of our flesh.

Americans have more cause than any other people in the world save the British to say of Sir Winston, "Ah, there was a man." For there was a man of such splendid proportions that we would search in vain for his peer among us.

Churchill was the essence of the history we have had a part in making. When Hitlerism threatened the freedom of the English-speaking peoples in World War II and our nations formed the grand alliance, Churchill was its omnipresent symbol.

He rallied his nation and the cause of freedom with the literary brilliance of his words. He exuded a self-assurance that without his boyish charm would have bordered on arrogance. He was brave, he was stubborn, he smoked and he drank, he made political and military mistakes that detracted but little from the brilliance of his life.

We were drawn to him because to be remote from him was to turn our backs on the meaning of our lives and the significance of our years.

HISTORY

The week was simultaneously mournful, majestic, and momentous.

Sir Winston Churchill died at the age of 90, one of the greatest and best loved statesmen in the history of statesmanship. He had served Britain under three kings and two queens, beginning with Queen Elizabeth II's great great-grandmother Victoria.

Britain's Parliament was 700 years old last week. Historians generally consider 1295 to be the beginning of Parliament as it is known today, but in 1265 Simon de Montfort summoned Britain's first known national legislative gathering of peers and commoners together, establishing the precedent on which today's Parliament is based.

Lyndon Johnson's inauguration as President last week was the 44th since George Washington took the oath on April 30, 1789.

Surely it does neither Sir Winston nor President Johnson a disfavor to point out that without Parliament (and possibly all 700 years of its life) and the nation that produced it, the death of a man named Churchill might have gone unnoticed by all but a handful of relatives, and the inauguration of the 36th U.S. President might never have occurred at all.

The Old World and the New met and blended in Sir Winston. His 90 years were practically a span between the muzzle loader and the hydrogen bomb, with two world wars in between. He was in the thick of all of it.

Soldier and journalist par excellence. Chronicler of military engagements in all parts of the world. Successful politician. Social reformer. Historian and prophet. World leader. All these and more.

We loved Winnie for many things. We revered his words for what they did to keep the world from being plunged into a new dark age.

There was that moment in May 1940 when in his first appearance as Prime Minister before the House of Commons, with Hitler's panzer divisions sweeping through the Low Countries, he said:

"I have nothing to offer but blood, toil, tears, and sweat."

At that moment it became clear what the lifelong preparation of Sir Winston Churchill had been about. A point in history came to be matched with a point in the life of a man, as if they had been proceeding toward each other by radar for more than half a century.

And the debacle at Dunkirk, that dark hour for Great Britain when Churchillian prose broke through the gloom:

"We shall fight on the beaches, we shall fight on the landing grounds, we shall fight in the fields; we shall never surrender, and even if, which I do not for a moment believe, this island or a large part of it were subjugated and starving, then our Empire beyond the seas, armed and guarded by the British fleet, would carry on the struggle, until, in God's good time, the New World, with all its power and might, steps forth to the rescue and the liberation of the Old."

A voice to bring the power of justice and truth surging through the veins of men. A conscious purpose of demanding that man be true to the majestic purposes for which he was created. And, later:

"Let us therefore brace ourselves to our duties, and so bear ourselves that, if the British Empire and its Commonwealth last for a thousand years, men will say, 'This was their finest hour.' "

And so we bury Winnie, that utterly individualistic, rotund figure of a man who nevertheless managed to be the personification of his people and the power supply of the free world.

His death is swallowed up in victory.

[From the Twin City (N.C.) Sentinel, Jan. 25, 1965]

Winston Churchill: Our Tallest Giant

Until yesterday, Winston Churchill belonged to us. Now he belongs to the ages.

He was an aristocrat in the truest sense—a master among men who knew and honored his responsibilities and had the power to inspire others to rise to superhuman effort in hours of peril and crisis.

In the darkest hours of World War II, when England was under a cloud of terror from the skies, the appearance of Winston Churchill the "former naval person" as he often called himself, on a bomb-threatened London street, in an obscure English town, or at a military installation, instantly evoked wild enthusiasm and cheers. A man among men, he caused all freemen to lift their heads a little higher and grow a few inches taller.

When Winston Churchill spoke, men listened and their hearts beat faster. For this man spoke with a tongue of fire, and his words had a curious power over the heart and mind. No matter how desperate seemed the free world cause, no matter how invincible appeared the hordes of Hitlerian tyranny, when Churchill spoke, all men who believed in human freedom and dignity breathed new hope and went forward with the feeling that theirs was the ultimate victory.

He had human faults and weaknesses, of course. But there was something about Winston Churchill that always spoke of greatness. Greatness of courage. Greatness of will, of resolution, of loyalty to the great traditions of an Anglo-Saxon civilization. So to millions he became a father image, a constant inspiration, an assurance that helped men still find sense in an upended, confused and broken world.

So, in his own lifetime he became a legend, a symbol of all that is finest in the traditions of the West. Yesterday he belonged to us all, our tallest towering giant of the 20th century. Today indeed, he belongs to the ages.

[From the Smithfield (N.C.) Herald, Jan. 27, 1965]

Sir Winston Churchill and the West's Darkest Hour

Sir Winston Churchill deserves the title "savior of Western civilization."

In the summer of 1940, following the fall of France, there was no military might capable of preventing a Nazi conquest of Britain. There was only a man with an indomitable will to preserve Western traditions. And that man, Sir Winston, making the most of his opportunity as leader of Britain, rallied the human spirit in his own land and in all lands where love of democratic freedom prevailed. The courageous leadership of Prime Minister Churchill discouraged Hitler from carrying out his threat to invade England.

The words Mr. Churchill spoke in the House of Commons on June 18, 1940, not only gave heart to the people of Britain and the Americans who sympathized with them; those words rang clearly in the ears of Hitler, giving him reason to pause lest he commit a foolish act in his determination to extend the Nazi system to the great island citadel of freedom. This is what Mr. Churchill said on that fateful day, just 4 days after the Germans had occupied Paris:

"Hitler knows that he will have to break us or lose the war. If we stand up to him all Europe may be free, and the life of the world may move forward into broad sunlit uplands; but if we fail, then the whole world, including the United States, and all that we have known and cared for will sink into the abyss of a new dark age, made more sinister, and perhaps more prolonged by the lights of a perverted science. Let us therefore address ourselves to our duty and so bear ourselves that if the British Commonwealth of Nations and Empire last for a thousand years, men will still say: 'This was their finest hour.' "

Britain responded nobly to Mr. Churchill's appeal. It, indeed, "stood up" to Hitler, not only with a will to resist, but also with all the military strength it could muster through skillful use of its limited number of Spitfire planes. The Battle of Britain raged as the summer of 1940 wore on.

It was a trying time for civilians as well as for military personnel. In the words of one British writer (H. E. Bates), for the first time in British history "a housewife carrying her shopping bag could pause, look up into the sky and watch armed men engage in the bloody business of exterminating each other; a farm laborer at harvest could for the first time also look and see the victims of battle dropping into his barley." The German bombs fell on the aged, the young, the weak, the strong.

It is difficult for us in the United States, who have been spared the horrors of modern warfare on our own soil, to imagine the ordeal which the British survived in the months before Britain and her allies could mobilize full strength for the counterattack that ultimately crushed the Nazi menace. It was an ordeal that no people could have experienced successfully without a strong leader. Sir inston was the "man of Britain's finest hour." And all that he did for Britain, he did for the United States and all the world that stood in danger of conquest by the Nazi maniacs.

With the British, we mourn Sir Winston's passing. With the British, we share the pride that rises in the human breast as Sir Winston's uncommon achievements for the benefit of mankind are contemplated.

[From the Asheville (N.C.) Citizen, Jan. 26, 1965]

SMALLER MEN COWERED, SO FATE SENT A GIANT

It took Winston Churchill a long time to become a legend, but he worked hard at it and he wore the aura comfortably, even a little smugly, as one who had earned it.

His claim was undoubtedly valid.

Here was a brave man, with a special genius for inspiring bravery in others.

Regarded as the symbol of British courage during the dark days of World War II, he was more the catalyst of a spirit that carried the English people through the rubble of certain defeat and staved off an invasion by Hitler's triumphant armies.

You know his classic warning to the Nazi Fuhrer ("We shall fight on the beaches, we shall fight on the landing grounds, we shall fight in the fields and in the streets, we shall never surrender"). A few years later, after American and Russian entry promised an Allied victory, Churchill called his speech a bluff. "We had not, at that time, 50 tanks," he said. "We had a couple of hundred field guns, some of them brought out of museums."

Bluff or not, it worked—and Winston Churchill, a master of the written and spoken word, became the hero-father figure for millions of Britons as he scrambled through the bomb-scarred sections of London, chewing his cigar, raising his fingers aloft in his "V for victory" sign.

Since that time, and despite temporary setbacks, the Churchill legend has grown and mellowed, nourished by the affection of Britons, Americans, and the free world masses.

Winston Churchill was not, as Anthony Eden once said in a public address, "the greatest man that ever lived." He had many faults, including a stubborn resistance to social-political change and a longing for return to the age of empire when "the sun never set on British soil." He was not a military superman and he may have been, indeed, a military romanticist. But he learned, through words, to light a glow in men's hearts and he walked with majestic poise through the shambles of a time that needed his confidence. That was his test of greatness and he met it heroically.

Winston Churchill is dead at 90, but the legend still lives and will continue to grow as long as men gather to honor their memories. And somebody, somewhere, will always turn down a glass.

DEATH OF A GREAT STATESMAN

The world shares England's saddest hour in mourning the death of Sir Winston Churchill. The man who rallied England in her darkest hour in World War II, and thus set the stage for the forces of freedom to prevail against tyranny and oppression, has left monumental works for all mankind. Death at 90 from the onset of illness, injury, and advancing years, was not unexpected. Yet, even during the last, lingering days, when the world stood a hopeless vigil, Sir Winston's fight for survival demonstrated his indomitable spirit and resoluteness which characterized his 90 years of living.

It was his destiny, not only to make history, but also to shape the course of human events for generations to come. This was done through the combination of firm and steadfast leadership combined with compassion and feeling for his fellow man. No figure in modern history is perhaps so indelibly etched into the minds and hearts of men everywhere as the Churchillian posture of courage and bravery.

Those who remember the war years of the forties will never forget the giant of a man who emerged as the British Prime Minister and rallied his people and his allies in one of freedom's darkest periods of history.

But his great works will be remembered even beyond his gigantic contribution to victory. As a statesman, a soldier, an author, a painter, a man of dignity and humbleness, he has left a legacy worthy of his place in history.

And today's children will know of his greatness, for their lives, too, have been influenced by this man who strode magnificently across the world's stage and became the symbol for brave men everywhere.

There is no more fitting monument to this world statesman than that he will be remembered by the ages.

DEATH OF JUDGE F. DICKINSON LETTS

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, about a week ago, Hon. F. Dickinson Letts, a very famous and able judge of the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, who served long and ably, died.

He made an enviable record on the Federal bench in the District of Columbia and gained the respect of litigants, lawyers, and all those who knew him.

He died at the age of 89, after a brief retirement.

In the New York Times of January 20 there is a news story which covers his career quite succinctly but adequately. He was a great jurist, a native of the State of Iowa. Prior to his initial appointment, he was a Member of the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress, and he was a distinguished American.

I ask unanimous consent that the article in the New York Times be placed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

DICKINSON LETTS, EX-JUDGE, 89, DIES: HELD U.S. POST 30 YEARS—RULED IN 1961 HOFFA CASE

Washington, January 19.—F. Dickinson Letts, who until his retirement 4 years ago was the dean of the Federal bench in the District of Columbia, died today in Doctors Hospital. He was 89 years old.

The jurist, who made national headlines in the late 1950's and 1960 when he presided over disputes involving James R. Hoffa, president of the Teamsters Union, had been in the hospital for about 3 weeks because of complications from old age.

A lifelong Republican and a judge for more than half a century, Mr. Letts retired in 1961.

Surviving are his widow, the former Josephine Nell Haney, whom he married in 1916, and a sister, Mrs. Richard D. Hughes, of Washington.

A funeral service will be held at 11 a.m., Thursday, at Chevy Chase Presbyterian Church. Burial will be in Ainsworth, Iowa.

HOFFA CASE BROUGHT FAME

Judge Letts' career on the bench in Iowa and the District of Columbia and in Congress had brought him little notice. But for the 4 years he had before him the motion by a dissident group of the Teamsters Union to block takeover of the union by Hoffa, his name was in the newspapers nearly every week. The dissidents charged fraud in the election.

The case was assigned him in 1957 and the next year he appointed three monitors—one from the union loyalists, one from the dissidents and one neutral—to conduct union affairs. He finally dismissed the monitors and let the Teamsters hold a convention in 1961 and Hoffa was overwhelmingly elected president. Shortly thereafter, Judge Letts resigned from the bench to devote himself, he said to reading and watching television.

Interviewed by telephone at his home in Washington the day he resigned, April 22, 1961, he said he had been "watching the new Senators pan the old Senators." The Congress elected the previous November was just warming up to action.

Judge Letts had no illusions that the monitor system he established over the Teamsters Union would work any essential reforms. But he said, it had "accomplished some very worthwhile things," even if the monitors and he "were not able to do all that we wanted."

The other major case over which Judge Letts presided during his 30 years on the Federal bench was that of George Sylvester Viereck, the Nazi propagandist, in 1942. He found Viereck guilty of withholding information when he registered as a foreign agent and sentenced him to 2 to 10 years in jail.

"I am a victim of Pearl Harbor," Viereck said, in denouncing the verdict.

Judge Letts was born in Ainsworth, Iowa, April 26, 1875. He took an A.B. degree from Parsons College in Iowa in 1897 and spent a year studying law at Columbia University. He returned, however, to the State University of Iowa to take his law degrees in 1899.

He practiced law in Davenport for several years and then accepted appointment to the State court of the Seventh Iowa District in 1911. He served there until 1925 when he was elected as Representative from the Second Iowa District to the 69th Congress. He was reelected to the 70th and 71st Congresses. When he was defeated in 1930, President Herbert Hoover named him to the Federal district court in the District of Columbia.

"I never had any hobbies," he said on his retirement. "I never thought they did anybody much good."

TRIBUTE TO GEN. CURTIS E. LeMAY

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on February 1 Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, Chief of Staff of the Air Force, retires from active duty after more than 35 years of distinguished service to the Nation.

During this period, the U.S. Air Force has developed into the strongest deterrent to war the world has ever known. The accomplishment of this is due in large measure to the outstanding leadership and dedicated professionalism of General LeMay.

Fresh from Ohio State University, the general entered pilot training in 1928. After winning his wings, General LeMay spent several years flying fighters before transferring into bomber aircraft in 1937. Shortly thereater, he participated in the first mass flight of B–17 flying fortresses to South America, an outstanding aerial achievement which won for this unit the Mackay trophy. In the period prior to World War II, General LeMay pioneered air routes over the South Atlantic to Africa and over the North Atlantic to England. During the war he served with distinction in both

Europe and the Pacific. While in Europe he developed formation procedures and bombing techniques which were adopted throughout that theater of operations. He also led the famed Regensberg shuttle raid. Later, he directed B-29 attacks on Japan and became chief of staff of the Strategic Air Forces in the Pacific.

During the postwar period, General LeMay held many important assignments. He was commander of U.S. Air Forces in Europe at the time of the Russian blockade of Berlin and he organized air operations for the famous Berlin airlift. Upon his return to this country, he took command of the Strategic Air Command and during the next 9 years built it into a nuclear striking force second to none. He also laid plans for the development and integration of the intercontinental ballistic missile into the weapons inventory.

Since 1957, General LeMay has served in Washington, first as vice chief and later as chief of staff of the Air Force. During that time, he became a familiar figure here on the Hill in his appearances before many different committees. On these occasions, we have highly valued General LeMay's forthrightness and professional advice. He has fought hard to give this Nation the aerospace capability it needed and to improve the lot of his airmen and their families. He has long advocated a mixed strategic force of missiles and manned aircraft with the highest degree of accuracy and flexibility.

On behalf of a grateful Nation, I wish General LeMay well in his retirement so richly deserved.

He will be missed on the official scene but we shall never forget his unselfish dedication to our security.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

AMENDMENT OF THE LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1946

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar Order No. 2, Senate bill 2.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2) to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Government Operations.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, this measure has been before the Senate for some time. It passed in the previous session, I believe unanimously. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement of the purpose and need for the legislation, as contained in the report of the Joint Committee on the Budget to accompany S. 2.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET, REPORT TO ACCOMPANY S. 2

The Committee on Government Operations, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2) to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States, having considered the same, report favorably thereon and recommend that the bill do pass.

PURPOSE

The purpose of this bill is to provide the Congress with the machinery necessary to enable it to meet its constitutional responsibilities in connection with the appropriation of funds required for the conduct of the Federal Government. The bill S. 2 if enacted, would accomplish this objective by establishing a Joint Committee on the Budget, composed of members of the Senate and House Appropriations Committees, which would assist the Congress in exercising adequate control over the expenditure of public funds by the executive branch of the Government.

S. 2 is designed to remedy serious deficiencies in congressional appropriation procedures by providing the same kind of expert staff facilities and detailed technical information for the Appropriations Committees of the Congress, on a 12-month basis, as the Bureau of the Budget provides for the executive branch. Precedent for this action is found in the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation which has provided joint expert staff facilities and technical information for the revenue committees of both Houses of the Congress for more than a quarter of a century.

This bill, sponsored by 77 Members of the Senate,[1] is identical to S. 537, approved by the Senate in the 88th Congress. The Senate also approved similar bills in the 82d and 83d Congresses, after extensive hearings, and again in the 84th, 85th, and 87th Congresses. The pending bill includes perfecting amendments adopted by the committee since it was first reported and approved by the Senate on April 8, 1952. A complete legislative history of the proposed legislation is included in Senate Document 11, 87th Congress. (See p. 195, ff.) The publication, entitled "Financial Management in the Federal Government," was filed in the Senate by the Committee on Government Operations on February 13, 1961.

NEED FOR LEGISLATION

For many years, the Congress has labored under a tremendous disadvantage in connection with budget requests and justifications. Requests for funds are made by the executive branch, and witnesses who appear before the Appropriations Committees in support of these requested appropriatons represent exclusively the point of view of that branch of the Government. Since it is their duty as officers of the Government to support all items contained in the President's budget, it becomes their function and responsibility to demonstrate that the specified amounts are necessary. For the most part, these requests are supported by elaborate justifications, based upon extensive agency research, and by the testimony of technical experts who have devoted many years to the fields in which they are working, and whose main objective is to continue or extend the programs and operations of their respective agencies. Testimony from the public, except from witnesses appearing in behalf of public works projects, is rarely received, and, in a vast majority of instances, the only manner in which the public interest can be considered and protected, with respect to the purpose for which the funds are sought or their need or adequacy, is through careful scrutiny of requests and justifications by members of the Appropriations Committees. Other Members of Congress must rely largely upon the recommendations of these committees when funds are appropriated by the House and the Senate.

The material contained in the Federal budget is developed and assembled by numerous employees and officials in the departments and agencies, reviewed and substantiated by each department and agency, and then reviewed, revised, and finalized by the Bureau of the Budget where approximately 500 persons are involved in the preparation and submission of the final document. In the Washington area alone, it is estimated that a total of 2,000 persons in executive branch departments and agencies are involved in the preparation of the budget each year. In addition to the Federal budget itself, a tremendous amount of detailed information is supplied in written form to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees, and presented orally at hearings which last for many months and cover thousands of typed and printed pages.

Finally, when the requests are reduced to the form of legislative proposals, there are usually between 12 and 15 appropriation bills running into hundreds of pages and containing thousands of separate items.

Unfortunately, committee members are so heavily burdened by other legislative duties and responsibilities that they are unable personally to give the necessary attention to each budget item. Equally important, however, is the fact that they do not have adequate facilities for obtaining the information necessary to enable them to pass accurate judgment on the necessity for the budget requests. Thus, for the most part, they are forced to rely upon the representations made by the respective initiating agencies of the executive branch whose representatives appear before these committees in an ex parte type of proceeding for the sole purpose of justifying their requests for funds. As a result, the Congress is often unable to obtain impartial information and facts to enable it to effect needed economies in the operations of the Government. Because the Congress is not adequately equipped to carry out its fiscal responsibilities, many millions of dollars have been appropriated in excess of the actual requirements of the Federal Government. These excesses have in turn, added to the large recurring deficits which must be passed on to already overburdened taxpayers.

---

[1] Mr. MCCLELLAN (for himself, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BAYH, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BOGGS, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. BYRD of Virginia, Mr. CANNON, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. CASE, Mr. COOPER, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. DODD, Mr. DOMINICK, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. FANNIN, Mr. FONG, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, Mr. JORDAN of Idaho, Mr. KENNEDY of New York, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. LAUSCHE, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MILLER, Mr. MONDALE, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. MONTOYA, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MORTON, Mr. MOSS, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. NELSON, Mrs. NEUBERGER, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. PEARSON, Mr. PELL, Mr. PROUTY, Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. RIBICOFF, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. TALMADGE, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. TOWER, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, and Mr. YOUNG of Ohio).

The duties and responsibilities of the Appropriations Committees, in connection with examining and passing upon budget requests for the operation of the Federal Government, have increased tremendously in recent years. These committees are staffed with competent professional personnel. It is virtually impossible, however, for their relatively small staffs to examine and evaluate the annual budget with its many thousands of items, running to approximately 1,600 pages within the very limited time available. This precludes the detailed analysis which is so essential to the performance of the congressional function of controlling Federal expenditures.

The action taken on March 12, 1957, by the House of Representatives in adopting a resolution requesting the President to indicate the places and amounts in his budget where he thinks substantial reductions may best be made, is a clear indication that the Congress does not have adequate information upon which to act in carrying out its constitutional responsibilities for maintaining adequate controls over Government expenditures.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 2) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 138 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET

"SEC. 138. (a) There is hereby created a joint service committee, to be known as the Joint Committee on the Budget (hereinafter in this section called the joint committee) to be composed of fourteen members as follows:

"(1) Seven Members who are members of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, four from the majority party and three from the minority party, to be chosen by such committee; and

"(2) Seven Members who are members of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, four from the majority party and three from the minority party, to be chosen by such committee.

"(b) No person shall continue to serve as a member of the joint committee after he has ceased to be a member of the committee from which he was chosen, except that the Members chosen by the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives who have been reelected to the House of Representatives may continue to serve as members of the joint committee notwithstanding the expiration of the Congress. A vacancy in the joint committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as the original selection, except that (1) in case of a vacancy during an adjournment or recess of Congress for a period of more than two weeks, the members of the joint committee who are members of the committee entitled to fill such vacancy may designate a member of such committee to serve until his successor is chosen by such committee, and (2) in the case of a vacancy after the expiration of a Congress which would be filled from the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, the members of such committee who are continuing to serve as members of the joint committee, may designate a person who, immediately prior to such expiration, was a member of such committee and who is reelected to the House of Representatives, to serve until his successor is chosen by such committee.

"(c) The joint committee shall elect a chairman and vice chairman from among its members at the first regular meeting of each session: *Provided, however,* That during even years the chairman shall be selected from among the members who are Members of the House of Representatives and the vice chairman shall be selected from among the members who are Members of the Senate, and during odd years the chairman shall be selected from among the members who are Members of the Senate and the vice chairman shall be selected from among the members who are Members of the House of Representatives.

"(d) The joint committee may make such rules respecting its organization and procedures as it deems necessary: *Provided, however,* That no measure or recommendation shall be reported from the joint committee unless a majority of the committee assent.

"(e) It shall be the duty of the joint committee—

"(1)(A) to inform itself on all matters relating to the annual budget of the agencies of the United States Government, including analytical, investigative, audit, and other reports on Federal operations prepared by the General Accounting Office pursuant to section 312 of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, the Government Corporation Control Act, and section 206 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and by other Federal agencies, and including the initiation or continuation of Federal programs by utilization of borrowing authority, contract obligational authority, or other means which do not require direct appropriations for the intiation or continuation of such programs; (B) to provide the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate with such information on items contained in such budget, and the justifications submitted in support thereof, as may be necessary to enable said committees to give adequate consideration thereto; (C) to consider the President's messages on the state of the Union and the Economic Report, to consider all information relating to estimated revenues, including revenue estimates of the Department of the Treasury and the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, to consider essential programs, and to consider changing economic conditions; and (D) to report to the Appropriations Committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate its findings with respect to budget estimates and revisions in appropriations required to hold expenditures to the minimum consistent with the requirements of Government operations and national security;

"(2) to recommend to the appropriate standing committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate such changes in existing laws as may effect greater efficiency and economy in government;

"(3) to make such reports and recommendations to any standing committee of either House of Congress or any subcommittee thereof on matters within the jurisdiction of such standing committee relating to deviations from basic legislative authorization, or to appropriations approved by Congress which are not consistent with such basic legislative authorization, or to cutbacks in previously authorized programs which require appropriations, as may be deemed necessary or advisable by the joint committee, or as may be requested by any standing committee of either House of Congress or by any subcommittee thereof;

"(4) to report to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate at the beginning of each regular session of the Congress the total estimated costs of all programs and projects authorized by the Congress, together with estimated costs of such programs and projects during the fiscal year underway, the ensuing fiscal year, and subsequent fiscal years, and to make such interim reports as may be deemed advisable.

"(f) The joint committee, or any subcommittee thereof, shall have power to hold hearings and to sit and act anywhere within or without the District of Columbia whether the Congress is in session or has adjourned or is in recess; to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents; to administer oaths; to take testimony; to have printing and binding done; and to make such expenditures as it deems necessary to carry out its functions within the amount appropriated therefor. Subpenas shall be issued under the signature of the chairman or vice chairman of the committee and shall be served by any person designated by them. The provisions of sections 102 to 104, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes (U.S.C., title 2, secs. 192–194) shall apply in the case of any failure of any witness to comply with any subpena or to testify when summoned under authority of this section.

"(g) The joint committee shall have a staff director, an associate staff director, and such other professional, technical, clerical, and other employees, temporary or permanent, as may be necessary to carry out the duties of the joint committee. Such employees shall be employed without regard to the civil service laws, and their compensation shall be fixed without regard to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended. The staff director shall be appointed by and responsible to the members of the party of which the chairman of the joint committee is a member, and the associate staff director shall be appointed by and responsible to the members of the opposition party. No person shall be employed by the joint committee unless the members appointing him have favorably considered the data with respect to him submitted by the Federal Bureau of Investigation after a thorough investigation of his loyalty and security.

"(h) The joint committee shall make available members of its staff to assist the staffs of the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and of the Senate and the several subcommittees thereof during the periods when appropriation bills are pending.

"(i) Professional and technical employees of the joint committee, upon the written authority of the chairman or vice chairman, shall have the right to examine the fiscal books, documents, papers, and reports of any agency of the United States Government within or without the District of Columbia, and data related to proposed appropriations incorporated in the annual budget transmitted by the President.

"(j) The annual budget of the United States shall henceforth include a special analysis of all active long-term construction and development programs and projects authorized by the Congress, showing for each the total estimated cost, and the actual or estimated expenditures during prior fiscal years, the current fiscal year, the ensuing fiscal year, and subsequent fiscal years. All grant-in-aid programs shall be included in this analysis, in a separate grouping, showing under the heading 'Subsequent Fiscal Years' for grants of indefinite duration the estimated annual cost for a ten-year period. Each agency carrying on any program by utilization of the borrowing authority shall, at such times as the committee shall specify, report to the committee upon the extent of its borrowings under such program, and upon its operations generally under such program.

Upon request of the joint committee, any agency shall submit to the Appropriations Committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate estimates for proposed appropriations on an annual accrued expenditure basis.

"(k) Qualified members of the staff of the Bureau of the Budget shall, at the request of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives or the Senate, or any subcommittee thereof, be assigned to attend executive sessions of the subcommittees of the Appropriations Committees and to explain the content and basis of proposed appropriations.

"(l) The Comptroller General of the United States shall, at the request of the chairman of the Joint Committee on the Budget, make such investigations and reports with respect to any agency as will enable such joint committee to give adequate consideration to items relating to such agency which are contained in the budget as submitted by the President, and the justifications submitted in support thereof; and, for this purpose, the Comptroller General is authorized to employ technical and professional personnel without regard to the civil service laws, rules, or regulations, and fix their compensation without regard to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

"(m) When used in this section, the term 'agency' means any executive department, commission, council, independent establishment, Government corporation, board, bureau, division, service, office, officer, authority, administration, or other establishment, in the executive branch of the Government. Such term includes the Comptroller General of the United States and the General Accounting Office, and includes any and all parts of the municipal government of the District of Columbia except the courts thereof.

"(n) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this section. Appropriations for the expenses of the joint committee shall be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate upon vouchers signed by the chairman or vice chairman."

Sec. 2. Section 133 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(g) (1) All bills and joint resolutions authorizing appropriations reported from committees of the Senate or the House of Representatives shall be accompanied by reports in writing, which shall be printed; and there shall be included in each such report or in an accompanying document an estimate from the department or other agency of the legislative, executive, or judicial branch of the Government primarily concerned of the probable cost of carrying out the legislation proposed in such bill or resolution over the first five-year period of its operation or over the period of its operation if such legislation will be effective for less than five years. If the chairman of the committee determines that no existing department or agency is primarily concerned with the legislation, the estimate shall be made by the Bureau of the Budget.

"(2) Estimates received from departments or agencies under this subsection may be submitted by the committees to the Bureau of the Budget for review, and such reviews, when practicable, shall be included in the reports or accompanying documents before said bills and joint resolutions are reported.

"(3) The Joint Committee on the Budget shall maintain compilations of all such estimates, and semiannually shall print those compilations (together with any comment of the Bureau of the Budget) for the information of the Congress."

Sec. 3. Section 139 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(e) The Joint Committee on the Budget is authorized to recommend that joint hearings be held by the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate, and of subcommittees thereof; but such joint hearings shall not affect the power of the respective committees, and of subcommittees thereof, to conduct separate additional committee hearings, and shall not affect the independence of committee deliberations and decision. The chairman of each such joint hearing shall be the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, or of the appropriate subcommittee thereof, of the House in which the bill is pending at the time of the hearing, and the vice chairman shall be the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the other House, or of the appropriate subcommittee thereof."

A CHRISTMAS CARD FROM IOWA

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, a friend of mine, a former newspaper man in Iowa, sent me a unique Christmas card this year. It consisted of four editorials written by columnists of smaller Iowa newspapers. It will be noted from the preliminary remarks of Mr. Henry's card—and I agree with his statement—that Iowa has more good columnists on our weekly and daily newspapers than any other State in the Union.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record the preliminary information with respect to these particular columnists, together with their columns on "The Four Seasons of Iowa," the one on "Winter" written by Irene Gogerty in the Alden Times; the one on "Spring" written by LaVerne Hull in the Waukon Democrat; the one on "Autumn" written by Duane E. Dewel, in the Kossuth County Advance, Algona, Iowa; and the one on "Summer," written by Mildred Turnbull, in the Diagonal Reporter.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

About Iowa

The pieces on the seasons are by 4 of the 250-some writers on the smaller newspapers of the State.

Mildred Turnbull is half of the husband-and-wife team who publish the Diagonal Reporter. Her "Bird Notes" is one of the best columns in any State on nature in your own yards, back and front. Irene Gogerty is not now writing a column regularly, but over the years anything she has done has gone on into text and other books. This paragraph from a column on "Winter" is from something she did for the late Alden Times a decade and a half ago. She now lives in Des Moines. LaVerne Hull writes for both the Waukon papers, Democrat and Republican-Standard, and has for all the years they were put out by the Hull family. Before that she wrote for the Waverly papers, then Hull properties. There's none better anywhere than she. Duane Dewel also is a two-column man. In his "Advance at Algona" each week his "Hodge Podge" has wit and warmth and sweetness and light, but on another page his "Old Goat," isn't that way at all; he gets mad in it. In addition to this Duane does one of the State's best editorial pages; always, he writes well, seriously or otherwise.

Iowa has more good columnists than any other State; the ladies, Turnbull, Gogerty and Hull, and the lad, Dewel, are a sampling.

John M. Henry.

THE FOUR SEASONS OF IOWA

Winter

(By Irene Gogerty in Alden Times)

I like winter here in Iowa. I like the way a gust of wind will catch a column of smoke and hurl it into the sky. I like the mysterious quiet of rivers locked by the icy key of winter, the furry crust of snow on the little hills, and the remote aloofness of white-frosted high hills. I like the firelight that winks in an old-fashioned kitchen range, and the heat it extends into the freezing kitchen. I like winding paths and the deep feeling in lone walks in winter. I like this time of the year.

Spring

(By La Verne Hull in Waukon Democrat)

One autumn long ago, I planted some little brown bulbs in a garden, and, circumstances being what they were, I wondered if I'd ever see them blossom * * * I did * * * And I was made captive of Iowa's springs forever after, fastening the hopes of my life's winter on the promise of bees buzzing in apple blossoms when the ice has vanished and the secret of a budding summer is unlocked again. I always give thanks when winter is over, and I have come 'round the corner of the year to the season of green pastures and tiny flowers blooming on the rubble of an old, forgotten year. To me, it's proof of heaven, for it is heaven brought gloriously to clothe the earth for awhile. Just look at a clear, bright crocus, or a blazing blue scilla on a spring morning, and you'll guess. Try to count the tender green leaves on a burgeoning twig against the blue, blue sky; sniff plum bloom and wild violet and lily-of-the-valley in old gardens, and you'll know. Watch a frond of fern uncoil from the winter-chilled earth, listen to first bird song, and dream long dreams in the newly warm sun. Help plant the corn in new-turned earth—plant something, anything, and bless the season. Spring in Iowa.

Autumn

(By Duane E. Dewel in Kossuth County Advance, Algona)

It's grand just to be alive in Iowa in autumn, when the trees turn to glory colors and the dry corn whispers in the wind.

Where the trees are content with their summer's work—and stretch branches high to meet the oncoming snows and the cold winter wind—where the brown and black earth turned by the plow waits peacefully for the work of the weather to prepare it again for fruitfulness.

Where the sky is a soft blue, hazefilled, as softlooking as a featherbed—and as deep as the ocean—pleading perhaps for man to look into its depths and dream a bit—to build air castles—to contemplate—to find again a sense of well-being.

Brown leaves covering the hillsides along the rivers and ponds, returning to earth to supply the roots with food with which new leaves will spring forth when the springtime comes again.

Sheltered trees here and there proudly bearing a riot of color in the midst of neighbors who have shed the summer's coat—shrubs, still green in the low spots, flamboyant against the dull browns and russets of those who went before—perhaps unnoticeable in summer, but now standing out brilliantly against drab surroundings.

Busy squirrels scampering among the leaves, planting walnuts against the winter's needs, their bushy tails waving as they race for a tree, there to scold whoever has halted their important tasks.

The blueness that spreads over the land from the burning of leaves and cornstalks, and the fall smells that gain tang and zest from the tinge of smoke in the air.

White chickens, startling in contrast against the dull grasses, spreading in ripples from the barnyards to the field—cattle and horses in the fields searching quietly and purposely for the last remaining food of the summer.

The placidly flowing river, bearing the leaves tenderly downstream, here and there racing them over the rapids, then settling down soberly to work again in the progress toward a greater river, there to lend its mite to the tide that ceaselessly flows to the sea.

The sun, warmer by contrast in the autumn, its rays feeling antiseptic as mankind turns as to bask in effortless comfort and to gaze, moodily into the beyond, as nature waits for a moment in contemplation of a summer well done, before plunging into winter, there to be born again.

Cottony silver fluff floating high in the air, thin strands of spider webs glistening in the sunlight, letting the wind bear them where it will, secure in the knowledge that in this happy land few seeds fall on barren soil.

Jackrabbits loping easily across the plowing, ears up and nose questing the breeze, occasionally bounding high from sheer happiness.

The noisy tractor, seemingly subdued, as it pulls the pickers through the cornfields, rustling the stalks into yielding wagonloads of golden grain to bulge the bins, and the harvesters roll through the rows of soybeans rattling the seed in rippling flow of yellow and brown.

Ducks anxiously and warily circling and circling a slough in distrust of hidden dangers, or streaming dark streaks in the brilliant sky in the mornings and evenings as they leave their shelter for food or take off again in their instinctive flight to the Southland.

Noisy sparrows and starlings taking nature's spotlight as their more dramatic cousins have departed, busily dry-bathing in the dust, chirping ceaselessly, flying races with each other, impudent in their contempt for feeble earthbound men.

Dogs sleeping relaxed in the sun or busily nose-down practicing for the ecstasy when they can mark the fall of a bird, to be borne back proudly, brown eyes shining, for a pat on the head.

The tans of the corn against the black plowed earth, the shocked corn in stately rows marching up and down the rolling fields, the green where the ungleaned seeds performed their duty and sprang to life, smoke rising straight up from the chimneys, white houses and red barns left naked and unashamed, glistening through the groves.

The ruddy moon turning to brilliant silvery white as it rises, dimming the stars around it, turning shadows into havens of friendly mystery.

It's grand to be alive in such a world, to be content, to let the troubles of mankind slip away for a short time, to give balm to the mind bothered with manmade worries.

In the autumn, nature, in Iowa, turns with reassurance of a coming spring, the ageless promise that "God's in His Heaven, all's right with the world."

Summer

(By Mildred Turnbull in Diagonal Reporter)

Summer in Iowa is not all pleasure, but there are times when that is hard to believe. You can believe it when you see horseweeds obscuring a creek bank, sour dock producing seed for future years, when humidity denies a proper breath, when heat taxes patience.

You can believe it when the sky darkens with clouds, when storms sweep the land with frightening power. When the rain falls days on end, or when drought continues until grass is crisped, leaves curl, and the earth opens wide with thirsty cracks.

But the pleasant outweighs the unpleasant.

Ask the child who has come into the full freedom of summer, the land of the suntanned, the relaxed, the carefree. Ask the youngish man whose brown legs pedal a bike to the river bridge and back, to the green apple tree and back, and repeats it several times a day.

Ask that child with mouth and hands stained raspberry purple, arms and legs briar scratched, whose coat of tan is past pain of sunburn.

Ask any Iowan who has watched prairie wind cross a field of grain, watched the way of a breeze in a favorite tree, lain back on the tufted comfort of orchard bluegrass to watch apples ripen, stars shine or the moon rise.

It brings rest as well as pleasure to let your eyes rest on the deep dark green of an oak timber, to find there dimensions of green not to be pictured in words.

There is relief in the stalwart hickories, the graceful bending maples, the strength and stature of spreading elms.

Joy lives in an apple tree, delight is a summer resident of plum thicket and elderberry bush.

Bird sound and bird song are constant. In summer our lives are parallel to theirs. Building lots are chosen, mates courted, homes built, and young raised to a familiar accompaniment of danger, of making a living, of honest joy in a day's work done. They, too, sing thanks at eventide, and greet a new day with joyful sounds.

Against the background of varied greens from horizon to horizon color moves in parade. From gold to dandelion, fanfare of tulip, to the variety of color which is iris and peony, we come from March to the end of May.

This is prelude to the roses, the lilies, and to the old fashioned garden favorites, zinnia, marigold, and petunia.

Add to this the staccato notes of geraniums brought from indoors, multiply it by gladiolus and chrysanthemums.

Without cultivated flowers we would still have blossoms, for the trees would bloom in spring. The wild rose, spiderwort, black-eyed-susans and butter-and-eggs would brighten their corners and ours.

There would still be sweet wild plum, and whole fields of red clover. The flat discs of blossom on the elderberry would reflect the moonlight with their green creaminess even as they gave off their own fragrance.

The pleasures which are Iowa at this season are not too numerous, but too numerous to mention. The row crops marching across the black earth, grain fields gone golden, hay drying under the sun which helped to grow it.

The quietness of a country creek, or a fence-corner community, the peace that dwells beneath tall trees. The occasional sight of a deer drinking in the cool dusk of evening.

The year is shorter, and summer barely time to count the blessings between spring and fall. We may not be able to pedal to the river bridge, or to "piece" on green apples, but we can retrieve such memories from past summers, and add others to be recalled at a later time.

NEBRASKA NEWSPAPERS CONCERNED BY PRESIDENT'S USE OF POWERS

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, a sampling of editorial reaction in Nebraska to the President's state of the Union message reveals a consistent theme of nagging concern felt by Americans everywhere that the great powers of the White House be used to change, perhaps irrevocably, the course this Nation will take.

These editorials represent a broad consensus in my State that there is a recognizable danger in the very breadth of the proposals advanced by the President and his preoccupation with Government solutions to virtually all the problems of mankind.

None of the editorials I have seen quarrels with Mr. Johnson's aims and aspirations. Indeed, most of them commend his statement on this score.

The concern expressed in the editorials is summed up by the Omaha World-Herald in this way:

> Thus, under the ground rules of the Great Society, the people are not to do; they are to be done for. They need not act. Big brother will act for them.

The Lincoln Journal said:

> Some of Mr. Johnson's proposals undoubtedly will prove to be of little or no merit, or of potential danger. Most glaring among these is the proposed hospital care for the elderly under social security and the outlawing of the State right-to-work laws.

The Norfolk Daily News observed:

> Perhaps the shopping list includes nothing new in the way of proposals—but rarely in the Nation's history has one man been granted such great power to see his programs through.

The Grand Island Independent said:

> What we are suggesting is that some of the specifics may not be as glistening as the packages in which they come—that they may be excessively costly or better handled by State and local governments—We prefer to take the proposals one at a time instead of bidding too high on the President's gaudily wrapped box lunch.

The Scottsbluff Star-Herald wrote:

> The commitment of this Nation, as interpreted by the White House to a Washington-based, federally oriented, all-encompassing Government blueprint for society as lived in the 50 States was never more plain. The death knell was tolled over conservative lines of thought and the door was opened to a brand of liberalism which will mark the course of this Nation for many decades, if not for all time.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorials from which these excerpts have been taken be printed in the RECORD in their entirety.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Lincoln (Nebr.) Journal, Jan. 5, 1965]

THE PRESIDENT AND HIS MANDATE

If there ever was serious doubt that President Lyndon Johnson would use the mandate of his overwhelming election in order to press forward with his plans for a "Great Society," it should have been dispelled by his state of the Union message.

Included in his evening chat with Congress and the people was virtually every program he suggested during the presidential campaign—from creation of a National Foundation on the Arts to Social Security-financed hospital care of the aged—plus a few that had scarcely been mentioned before, such as reforms in the electoral college.

A nation still accustomed to the display of vigor and the oratorical flourishes of the Kennedy administration might miss the full impact of what President Johnson was proposing. But in his quiet, matter-of-fact delivery Mr. Johnson outlined the most far-reaching and all-encompassing domestic program the country has witnessed since New Deal days.

Without a doubt, every inhabitant of this land, and many of those abroad, would be directly affected in a number of ways by the President's proposals, if they become law.

Whether the individual and overall effect of each program would be good or bad will be the question for the American people, through the Congress, to decide. As a practical matter, of course, the top-heavy majority of Democrats in both Houses of Congress makes it highly likely that the President will get just about what he wants.

While details of the Presidential proposals are still to come in special messages, many of the generalities discussed appear to be beneficial, if not essential, to the forward thrust of this Nation.

Increased Federal involvement in such areas as education, health, urban development, transportation and air and water pollution control apparently is demanded if the Nation is to continue making economic and social advances. It can be argued that these and other functions should be performed at the State and local level. But the fact of the matter is that they have not been handled adequately by State and local authorities and there is no assurance that they will be.

Some of Mr. Johnson's proposals undoubtedly will prove to be of little or no merit, or of potential danger. Most glaring among these is the proposed hospital care for the elderly under social security and the outlawing of State right-to-work laws.

For Republicans and independent-minded Democrats in Congress, a huge assignment is issued in scrutinizing the detailed proposals and sorting the good from the bad. For Republicans, as a gravely depleted opposition party, the task is especially challenging.

By attempting to oppose the Johnson program in its entirety, the Republicans almost surely will be condemned to defeat. More feasible, it seems, will be a concerted attack on those few measures which the party deems most objectionable, along with sincere efforts to improve and offer alternatives on ideas that are of general merit.

The most obvious criticism of the President's proposals is in their added expense at the same time "substantial" cuts in Federal excise taxes are being pushed.

This argument in itself might not be too persuasive, however. For a number of proposals involve little or no expenditure. Others, which could lead to huge outlays in the future, apparently would be started on a very modest scale, as the antipoverty program already has been launched.

At the same time, Federal revenues have been rising sharply even under lower Federal income tax rates—some contend that the increases are because of the reduced tax rates. The proposed cuts in excise taxes undoubtedly would be reflected in increased economic activity and still greater income tax returns.

Moreover, Mr. Johnson has proven both his sincerity and his skill as an economizer in Government.

At least part of the added expenditures in his domestic programs could be offset by savings in the military and other phases of the Federal budget. In his message, the President singled out agriculture as one area in which he expects to reduce Government costs.

In foreign affairs, the President also outlined an active and ambitious future.

A prospective exchange of visits with the new Soviet leaders, plus possible trips to Europe and South America, promises stepped-up activity in the pursuit of world peace and understanding. Mr. Johnson served notice that he does not intend to withdraw from South Vietnam, even though he offered no suggestions for improving the situation there.

In all, the President has given the United States, and the world, a great deal of food for thought on what the destiny of mankind should be and how it might be achieved. He has provided a good foundation from which serious deliberation of the future can begin.

[From the Norfolk (Nebr.) Daily News, Jan. 6, 1965]

LYNDON'S UNPRECEDENTED POWER

In the past quarter century, as in most of the Nation's history, each American President has had to temper his own thoughts about the direction of the Federal Government with the attitude of the Congress through which he gained the authority and the money for his programs.

In this recent period that extends back in the Nation's history to the end of the second Franklin Roosevelt administration, the President's goals have been achieved largely by his success in obtaining compromise with Congress.

There are no such restraints on Lyndon Johnson.

Aside from a Congress overwhelmingly in political sympathy with him, he has been favored with a significant rules change in the House. Presidential programs have been stopped in the past by a stubborn House Rules Committee, but this will no longer be as likely. The Congress itself is now geared to act for President Johnson—and there is certain to be much more consent and less advice. His successes with the past Congress were achieved because he had long years of service on Capitol Hill that gave him the skill to know what could be done.

Now, he has that same skill along with the political strength of a landslide vote, a Congress made up of people two-thirds of whom are in sympathy with him, acting under rules which give greater power to the majority.

In his state of the Union talk Monday night, the President indicated, as he had throughout the campaign, that he would make full use of every power to push through Federal programs involving aid to education, social security health measures, added poverty-fighting funds and authority, additional efforts against crime and delinquency, extension of minimum wage laws, worker retraining, establishment of regional medical centers. That is just a sampling of the breadth of his programs.

Perhaps the shopping list includes nothing new in the way of proposals—but rarely in the Nation's history has one man been granted such great power to see his programs through.

[From the Scottsbluff (Nebr.) Star-Herald, Jan. 6, 1965]

GREAT SOCIETY NEARS FRUITION

The polished, 50-minute address by President Lyndon B. Johnson, reporting Monday night to the Congress and the country on the state of the Nation, represented a rather clear preview of things to come in these United States.

With a so-called mandate at his back, as a consequence of a sweeping election victory last November, President Johnson outlined a grand plan which, as the pattern for the Great Society, as it is more aptly called, demanded of the Congress legislation implementing vastly enlarged instruments of Federal responsibility.

The real core of Johnsonian thought was not in the invitation for high Soviet officials to visit the United States so that "we may come to know each other better," but was to be found in the broad outline for social and cultural action revolving around both old and new agencies of central government.

The commitment of this Nation, as interpreted by the White House, to a Washington-based, federally oriented, all-encompassing Government blueprint for society as lived in the 50 States was never more plain.

The death knell was tolled over conservative lines of thought and the door was opened to a brand of liberalism which will mark the course of this Nation for many decades, if not for all time.

The clock is not likely to be turned back, however much some of us may cherish and seek for the reestablishment of principles and programs having an old-fashioned and now outmoded foundation.

The champions of States rights, of individual responsibility, of personal freedom—the last vestiges of rugged individualism—may find themselves in the backwaters and eddies of what 1964 politicians referred to as the "mainstream of American thought," an almost silent and surely ineffective force.

We thought President Johnson went all the way as the spokesman for bigger and more powerful central government. Those who expected a more moderate posture were disappointed, because it wasn't there.

With an overpowering majority supporting him, in both Houses of Congress, the man from Texas is likely to attain the bulk of his objectives, just as he outlined them the other night.

If we are alert to the tide of our times, we should study his remarks of this week, and the supplementary, detailed recommendations soon to follow, for they will point out the future course of this Nation.

The Great Society is about to take on flesh and form.

[From the Grand Island (Nebr.) Independent, Jan. 7, 1965]

OUR JUDGMENT IS RESERVED

Unmistakably, the goals which President Lyndon B. Johnson has outlined for his Great Society in his state of the Union message have broad appeal. Unmistakably, this speech was in the best Johnson tradition of something for everyone.

Who can quarrel with his objectives?

A program in education to insure every American child the fullest development of his mind and skills.

A massive attack on crippling and killing diseases.

A national effort to make the American city a better and more stimulating place to live.

An increase in the beauty of America and end to the poisoning of our rivers and the air we breathe.

A new program to develop regions of our country now suffering from distress and depression.

New efforts to control and prevent crime and delinquency.

Elimination of every remaining obstacle to the right and opportunity to vote.

Honor and support for the achievements of thought and the creations of art.

An allout campaign against waste and inefficiency.

Most admirable ideals, all of them.

But will the specifics be as palatable?

That remains to be seen.

The President has given some hints, and they raise some doubt. In his state of the Union message he reiterated his support for hospital care for the elderly under social security. By now, this program may have been detailed. But whatever the details, it is certain to be met with objections, and valid ones.

Some improvement in medical assistance is unquestionably needed. The recent report that only eight persons in Hall County are receiving assistance under the Kerr-Mills plan indicates definite shortcomings in that approach. But isn't it more logical to improve that program, or inaugurate a new one with other methods of financing rather than jeopardize the social security system with a program that promises to be little better?

Similarly, is it really necessary to add a Department of Housing and Urban Development to our already vast Federal bureaucracy, as the President proposes? Or could his programs be handled by the existing Health, Education, and Welfare Department?

What we are suggesting is that some of the specifics may not be as glistening as the package in which they come—that they may be excessively costly or better handled by State and local governments.

We are not suggesting that this will apply to all of the contents. Massive Federal expenditures in the fight against cancer and heart disease, for example, might well be a boon to the Nation. Similarily, Federal power to prevent pollution of air and water might well be in order. Both were suggested in the President's message.

But we do prefer to take the proposals one at a time instead of bidding too high on the President's gaudily wrapped box lunch.

[From the Omaha (Nebr.) Evening World-Herald, Jan. 6, 1965]

LEAVE IT TO LYNDON

President Johnson's low-keyed delivery of his state of the Union message was pretty much in keeping with its vaguely worded content.

While the President managed to ask for most of the items in his party's 1964 catchall platform, he did so in restrained, almost pedestrian language.

The same proposals offered in Mr. Johnson's high-pitched, pre-White House voice and accompanied by his former arm waving might have roused the tiger in opponents of his mostly Socialist Great Society.

But he soothed and smoothed, rather than exhorted. The fatherly tones prompted even Senator Dirksen, the Republican Senate leader, to reply in kind and mildly to point out that the President apparently hoped to achieve paradise at cut rates.

Much of Mr. Johnson's appraisal of the Nation's needs was reasonable.

America does need to make available to every child an education that will develop his mind and skills.

It does need to attack disease, the blight of cities, the pollution of air and rivers, crime and delinquency, waste and inefficiency.

America does need to make the cities better places in which to live.

America needs to preserve and increase the beauty of America, and to encourage the achievements of thought and the creations of art.

The better America and the better world which Mr. Johnson pictured are not only legitimate aspirations, but their achievement should occupy the thoughts of all who care about the kind of world in which their children will live.

But the disconcerting thing about Mr. Johnson's portrait of the Great Society is that the great improvements therein are to be brought about not by individual and local effort—the ingenuity of Americans working together voluntarily.

They are to be imposed by a supposedly wise, benevolent Federal Government which will determine the needs, make the plans to meet them, devise the programs, supervise their administration, and, of course, finance them, while at the same time cutting taxes.

The President said he will call a White House conference for this purpose, send a bill to Congress for that, exercise the powers he already has to achieve still another goal.

Thus, under the ground rules of the Great Society, the people are not to do; they are to be done for.

They need not act. Big brother will act for them.

Don't worry about how our country can finance the superwelfare state while "we continue along the path toward a balanced budget in a balanced economy."

Just leave it to Lyndon.

Phrased in the President's quiet tones, this sounded almost convincing—this soft sell for soft socialism.

The same kind of words wrapped around the desperately complex problems of Vietnam or applied to relations with the Communist world were almost as consoling.

Let the Moscow leaders talk on our television and our people on theirs—and somehow the great chasms between us will close.

In any event, leave these problems to Lyndon Johnson. He and his administration and the Congress will figure things out.

And as for those who may have nagging doubts that father knows best, well, even many of them were subdued by Mr. Johnson's performance.

They may not be heard from, however, until Mr. Johnson this weekend starts sending down his special messages spelling out precisely what he has in mind and how much it is likely to cost.

NATHAN GOLD—GOLD MEDAL CITIZEN

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, last Thursday, January 14, the National Retail Merchants Association granted its highest award, the Gold Medal, to one of Nebraska's most selfless and civic-minded citizens, Mr. Nathan Gold, of Lincoln.

To mark the occasion, the 998 employees of Gold's of Nebraska, a leading midwestern department store, took a full page advertisement in the Lincoln newspapers to salute their friend and coworker. Each employee's signature appears on the advertisement.

It is interesting to note that Nate Gold's employees call themselves "coworkers." This is because an enlightened employment policy many years ago established that the lowliest clerk and the president of the company were literally working together for the good of the company and the community.

As the Lincoln Journal observed editorially:

> In a larger sense, Nathan Gold has been a friend and coworker of all Lincolnites and all Nebraskans. He has given of his time and talent toward developing the State and its resources, including Nebraska's youth.

It would not be possible to list here Mr. Gold's long and illustrious roll of activities for the betterment of his city and his State and their resources including Nebraska's youth.

Perhaps it will suffice to say that although he operates one of Nebraska's largest businesses, he has never been too busy to accept a new and burdensome civic duty. These activities range from the chairmanship of the Nebraska Resources Foundation to work with 4–H Clubs, from heading famine and relief drives to directing the sale of war bonds, from service to the Jewish Welfare Foundation to establishing a better business bureau in Lincoln.

Mr. President, it is entirely fitting that the National Retail Merchants Association should present its most distinguished Gold Medal award to a most distinguished gold medal citizen—Nathan Gold.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record, excerpts from an article in Stores, the official magazine of the National Retail Merchants Association, which explains the award given to Mr. Gold.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

> Like every other recipient of the Gold Medal Award, Mr. Gold has made a special and distinctive contribution to retailing. In his case, this contribution has been primarily the improvement and enlargement of the public image of the retailer. When he was president of the National Retail Merchants Association, in 1959, Nathan Gold led in the development of a public relations program for the industry, and he talked and wrote to hundreds of retailers on this subject.
>
> It is true, as he said then, that many stores are deeply and generously involved in community affairs and need only to tell the public about these activities to be more fully appreciated. But there are few retailers who have been such active community leaders as Nathan Gold himself. When he entered the family business of Gold & Co. in 1911, Nebraska as a State was only 43 years old.
>
> For 12 years, from 1949 to 1961, he headed the Nebraska Resources Foundation, a group dedicated to the creation of an increasingly diversified economy for the State. He saw the foundation's work reach success as more manufacturers established operations in Nebraska towns. This was only one phase of a well-planned program to avoid the pitfalls of a one-sided economy. At the University of Nebraska, chemurgic research was—and is—continuously adapting agricultural byproducts to industrial uses. Mr. Gold has been a financial contributor to this research, but that is only one aspect of his support of the university's activities.
>
> He has been the donor of special scholarships to freshmen, which are called the William Gold Keys in honor of his father, who founded the department store in 1902. The University of Nebraska gave him a Distinguished Service Award in 1946, and Nebraska's Wesleyan University conferred on him the honorary degree of doctor of humane letters.
>
> Gold's work for young people has brought him honorary memberships in the 4–H Clubs, the Future Farmers of America, the Future Homemakers of America, and the international farm youth exchange program. He helped finance trips to Europe for 4–H boys and girls under the farm youth exchange program; made an annual tradition of a Labor Day banquet for 4–H Club members from all over the State.
>
> The city of Lincoln is the focus of Nebraska State pride and accomplishment. Nathan Gold was a cofounder of the Lincoln City Planning Commission and the Better Business Bureau of Lincoln; has been honorary president of the Urban League Center and an officer of the Lincoln Chamber of Commerce and the Nebraska State Historical Society; is chairman this year of the Lincoln Foundation Endowment Fund campaign.
>
> These are but samples of the many activities which Mr. Gold feels the independent merchant can and should carry on in his community. His own contributions to the development of Lincoln and of Nebraska have, along with a tradition of progressive merchandising and management, built a highly personal and distinctive reputation for the store. Its recent purchase by J. L. Brandeis & Sons leaves its operation and management unchanged, and combines the resources and buying power of the two largest independent retailers in Nebraska.
>
> On the same site it has occupied since 1924, Gold's has been several times enlarged and modernized, until it occupies the better part of a square block. Its most recent modernization, completed last year, cost $1.5 million.

Nathan Gold became chairman of the board of Gold's in 1955, his son, William Gold, succeeding him in the presidency. The senior Gold has put his time and energy more than ever into State and community service, following the lifetime principle best summed up in his own words: "Every change in the economy of a city, every population shift, every tax measure, every slum clearance project exerts a direct or indirect influence on each retailer's business. No longer is it possible to be just a storekeeper. Whether we like it or not, in order to be successful merchants, we must also be successful, active, interested citizens of our communities."

CREATION OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, as in previous years, I have joined in the cosponsorship of the bill to create a Joint Committee on the Budget, S. 2.

This measure is an essential first step toward bringing the gigantic Federal budget back under congressional control. We speak of congressional control of the purse strings, but real control can proceed only on the basis of adequate knowledge. In recent years the budget has grown so vast, so complicated that it becomes increasingly difficult for the Senate and House Appropriations Committees to follow all of its reaches. Congressional control becomes more and more a matter of faith, less and less a matter of fact. There is a real and present danger that effective control over the spending of the people's money will be lost by simple default.

Yet, the Federal tax burden has become the largest single expense for the average American family. The Federal budget has become the longest balance sheet in the Nation. Federal revenues have become more than three times as great as the total of all private corporation profits. Federal spending, which was at a level of $9 billion in 1940, reached a new record of $98 billion in 1964. Just during the last 4 years spending has increased $21 billion. We have reached the point where the national debt grows in peace as well as war, during prosperity as during depression.

The purpose of this bill is to give Congress the tools with which to more carefull scrutinize the spending process.

First. It proposes that a new joint committee establish overall goals and limits on the spending program, so as to tailor the individual departmental and agency programs down to fit within those goals.

Second. It would equip Congress with a staff of fiscal analysts and technical specialists—experts to match against the spokesmen for the departments of the executive branch.

The joint committee proposed to be created by this bill would be composed of members of the Senate and House Committees on Appropriations. The staff of analysts under their supervision would make continuing studies of the programs of the executive branch, existing and proposed, on a year-round basis. When the budget requests from the executive departments came before the Appropriations Committees of the Senate and House, we would be more adequately prepared to analyze the budget presentations of departmental spokesmen, to question their claims or criticize their operations, even to propose policy changes in the conduct of such programs where necessary to reflect the will of Congress.

As the Federal Government piles program on top of program and reaches out to find new fields of activity, we need such staff assistance to enable us to discharge our responsibilities. The establishment of this joint committee would bring to the appropriations process the same advantages as the taxing committees of the two Houses now recieve from the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation.

The Senate has passed this proposal on six different occasions. This year has already seen many changes suggested for the operation of the Congress, and many of us have joined in support of the proposal for a general study of the operations of Congress. It is my hope that we can move ahead with this legislation and secure the adoption of this needed congressional committee.

One area where this proposed committee is particularly needed is in the handling of the reports by the General Accounting Office on its inspections of the various executive departments. The General Accounting Office is an arm of the Congress. Again and again it has uncovered bad budgetary practices or wasteful spending policies, and reported them to Congress. All too often such bad practices are permitted to continue even after being exposed simply because Congress has not created effective machinery to force their correction. The proposed Joint Budget Committee would give us the means to follow through after receiving the GAO reports of investigation, and to make sure that changes are made.

Mr. President, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] deserves a special word of praise for the leadership he has shown in carrying on this fight, and in maintaining the Senate's interest and support for the proposal, in the face of repeated discouragements because of the refusal of the House to agree. He and I have served on the Appropriations Committee together. From our experience there we have come to realize how essential it is to take action along the lines of S. 2, and give ourselves the necessary instruments with which to discharge our responsibilities.

CLEARWATER AND NEBRASKA MOURN CHURCHILL, ITS HONORARY CITIZEN

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the peoples of the world today are mourning the loss of a great leader and an eloquent spokesman for freedom. It remains for each of us to be a little less because of the loss of Winston Churchill.

Sir Winston said on his 88th birthday, "I feel on both sides of the Atlantic." Today we feel this tragic loss on this side of the Atlantic for he was one of our own. But we cannot claim exclusive possession because in fact, everyone on every side of every ocean feels this loss to the cause of mankind. Out of our ranks has departed a noble warrior and prince of peace with a passion for humanity.

It was nearly 2 years ago that we in the United States out of respect and thankfulness fittingly conferred, by an act of Congress, citizenship upon this elder statesman. Prior to this the State of Nebraska had conferred its citizenship upon Sir Winston because of "his courage, tenacity, wisdom, and leadership both in war and in peace." One of our own has gone out from among us.

The loss is limited not to the nations of the world alone. The impact of this tragic loss has been keenly felt in the town of Clearwater, Nebr. A kinship had grown and was strengthened between this eminent world leader and the citizens of the town. They had early made Sir Winston an honorary citizen of their little town—the highest honor they could grant and the finest expression of his inspiration for them.

In a letter to Sir Winston they pointed out that the "climate ranges from unspeakably hot to unbearably cold, but our land and people are productive." Productive—here was an element in the kinship between this great man of history and the citizens of Clearwater. In addition, the letter went on:

> We offer you as your residence in the United States of America a fine little home here in Clearwater, which will be maintained for you.

Where else can one find such an expression of kinship between a rural community and this cosmopolitan world figure?

Each of the 420 citizens of Clearwater, just as the peoples of all Nebraska and in the far reaches of the earth, poignantly feels the loss of this great actor from the stage of life. Indeed, his life was a "triumph of life itself."

INTERNATIONAL SCIENCE YOUTH PROGRAM

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, Science Service, Inc., an organization that specializes in distributing popular scientific news and information, holds an international science fair for young people every year. This year their fair is to be held in St. Louis, this coming May. I am sure the people of my State will look forward to the event, and will join me in welcoming the International Science Fair-International to Missouri.

The director of Science Service, Dr. Watson Davis, recently made a most interesting and informative speech concerning the scientific education of American young people, and of the youth of other nations. I would like to ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that Dr. Davis' excellent remarks be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERNATIONAL SCIENCE YOUTH PROGRAM

(Paper by Dr. Watson Davis, director, Science Service, Inc., Washington, D.C., at the meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, Tuesday, December 29, 1964, Main Ball Room, Sheraton-Mount Royal Hotel, Montreal, Quebec, Canada)

In the intellectual ferment remaking the world, educationally as well as industrially and philosophically, the kindling of youthful interest and creativity is a most powerful and important ingredient.

Throughout the world, as in the United States, boys and girls are studying science in schools and pursuing it avidly as a hobby. In a few years they are catching up with the explosive progress of modern science. A few of them are recognizably of great talent and promise, even at teen age of the secondary school. They are viewing the world with fresh but enlightened minds that will give advanced knowledge of facts and theories when they join the research ranks.

In the United States alone there are approximately a million science-oriented boys and girls in high school. They are the rank and file of this great national science youth program. These are the science-motivated students who do science projects and show them in science fairs in some 15,000 schools. Their science teachers, some 20,000 of them, are sponsors of Science Clubs of America units in practically all localities of the Nation. They provide continuing inspiration to encourage the young scientists who undertake projects, often amazingly expert and predictive of what the student is likely to do in the future.

Science is fun. A "do-it-yourself" method of learning typifies the modern method. To do experiments is more effective than watching a teacher perform the experiments or being forced to read about them without understanding, from a textbook. The technique of science education involves the student getting his hands dirty and his mind disturbed. John Dewey, earlier than the present revolution, advocated learning by doing in the form of fun and games. This progressive education attitude has now become accepted and conventional. Boys and girls learn more earlier. Many teachers cannot hope to know as much as some eager student who, perhaps under her inspiration, drinks deeply of the technical literature which ordinary examinations do not and should not encompass.

The course content revisions revolution recognized the necessity for an infusion of the experimental method into education, particularly secondary education. The growth of these efforts to change science courses in the United States is an outcome of the success of what might be called the science project or the science fair method of interesting the young in playing science actively, instead of sitting on the sidelines while teachers pontificate in lectures, goodhearted and competent though they may be.

There are underdeveloped or developing areas in the United States from the standpoint of science education, although tremendous progress is being made. America has learned enough to embolden us to attempt to export to other parts of the world what we have learned in science education. The new and useful methods that can be transplanted consist of ideas rather than materials and formal courses. The new teaching and extracurricular application in other countries of the world, based upon the science youth techniques developed in the United States, gives great promise for a continued revolution in educational thought. Many millions of boys and girls, in addition to learning how to read and write, do arithmetic and understand rudiments of health, are being given the opportunity of being convinced by their own efforts of the reality and validity of scientific knowledge and method. Even in the most advanced parts of the world where education is fashioned upon the British and French methods of studying rigid texts in order to be able to pass qualifying examinations for college entrance, there is being infused the experimental method as a result of which the students have a chance to learn for themselves by doing scientific tasks and projects.

The experimental science revolution is having its effect in the intellectually advanced areas as well as in the so-called underdeveloped new nations where an educational structure must be newly created or widely extended. A great opportunity exists in every area where educational facilities are being created to introduce the new methods, which in the long run will be cheaper to apply and result in greater educational values. All of the boys and girls of any area should be given the opportunity to participate in this attempt of their schools to upgrade and vivify their studies, particularly in science. What is done must take into account the cultural and national conditions. Science education suitable to a country cannot be imported like an automobile ready to run. It must be assembled and in some cases manufactured to meet the particular conditions. There can be imported into an area scientific educational know-how and prototypes of experimental kits of great simplicity that can be adapted to the areas and manufactured locally out of native materials. There can be training of teachers as to how science education, particularly the extracurricular science youth activities, can be utilized. This perhaps can best be done by a combination of bringing teachers from other areas to the United States and conducting educational work training sessions in those other areas.

Simultaneously, with its continuing development of the national science youth program in the United States, Science Service has had the opportunity to undertake, by several methods, the introduction of science fairs and science clubs in other areas. Some of the developments of science fairs have resulted from the desire of the teachers and educational authorities to introduce the science fair method into their nations after they had seen its results in the United States. Within the last 3 years, thanks to the wise support of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, Science Service has had the opportunity to offer cooperation to ministries of education in a number of nations. This has resulted in the holding of science fairs in those nations. In a number of instances the science fair as a continuing institution in the nation has been firmly transplanted.

The countries in which science fairs have been held as a result of the support of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission to Science Service are Mexico, Chile, Colombia, Uruguay, and Spain with fairs to be held in Portugal, El Salvador, and Guatemala in 1965. Second annual national science fairs already have been held in Mexico and Chile. Spain and Uruguay will in all probability have their second fairs in 1965.

Brazil has had science fairs, a science talent search, and a teaching center for the manufacture of simple inexpensive science teaching apparatus for a period of more than 5 years and the U.S. example and experiences have been instrumental in this development.

The National Science Fair, which was first held in 1950 in Philadelphia, became international in 1958 through the desire of the newly established Japan Student Science Awards' Science Fair, based on the U.S. pattern, to make an entry on a regional basis in the U.S. fair. This has been followed by NSF–I entries for 1 or more years by fairs in Canada, Thailand, Sweden, and from U.S. dependents schools in Germany, France, and Italy.

The nationwide science fair in Israel will have representatives at the National Science Fair-International for the first time this year, even though it has been in operation for the past 3 years. The fair is sponsored by the Weizmann Institute of Science.

Ireland may be represented at the 1965 NSF–I.

Canada has science youth programs that take the form of science fairs as well as science clubs. The Canadian Science Fairs Council with headquarters at Ottawa has a science fair structure which involves 21 localities and it holds an annual Canadian National Science Fair. In addition, two regional fairs, the Fourth Hamilton Science Fair, Hamilton, Ontario, and the Second Niagara Regional Science Fair at St. Catharines, Ontario, entered the National Science Fair-International. In French-speaking Canada, the interests and enthusiasm of young scientists, predominately French speaking, are served by the l'Association Canadienne-Francaise pour l'Avancement des Sciences and Club des Jeunes Naturalistes.

For the last 3 years, selected U.S. students who have won awards at the National Science Fair-International have been sent to Japan where they were guests of the Japan Student Science Awards' Science Fair. These U.S. representatives have been sponsored and selected for the last 2 years by the Army, Navy, and Air Force.

It is expected that as finances are available this very fruitful exchange of students between various parts of the world will be instituted.

In addition, several Far Eastern areas with science fairs, which have stemmed largely from the U.S. pattern, sent representatives to the Japan Students Science Awards' Science Fair as follows: Korea, Okinawa, Taiwan, and Thailand.

The science youth programs of France have taken a different form because of the fact that it was not possible for students to work on their own individual projects in the official schools. Therefore, there was organized the Mouvement Jeunes-Science, which has established laboratories in centers at Marseilles, Bordeaux, Angers, Lille, and Tunis, in which youths can work on various projects out of school hours. With French Government support, a beautiful laboratory for science youth costing more than $100,000 was inaugurated in October to serve youth of Marseilles.

England has developed regional science fairs which now total four in various parts of the nation and these are in part modeled upon the science fairs as developed in other parts of the world including the United States. Science Service was partly instrumental in obtaining the financial cooperation of one of the large London newspapers, the Sunday Times, of which Roy H. Thomson is publisher. The British Association for the Advançement of Science has taken an active part in developing the structure of science fairs working through local and regional organizations of the BAAS.

Stockholm's Tekniska Museet (Museum), whose director, Sigvard Strandh, had been the scientific attaché of the Swedish Embassy in Washington, D.C., inaugurated the Swedish National Science Fair in 1963 and a representative has been sent to the National Science Fair-International that year and subsequently. The Swedish National Science Fair has entries from various parts of that country.

Science fairs also have been developed in India, Pakistan, the Philippines, Australia, New Zealand and perhaps other countries upon which we do not have full information. These nations have utilized the techniques and methods of the American experience in most cases.

Overtures have been made through several channels, particularly the exchange of atomic energy information, toward a cooperation with the science youth program of the U.S.S.R. which takes the form of science pioneers. The science youth program of Russia is still believed to be relatively undeveloped.

Science Service has cooperated with the Interim Coordinating Committee for the Presentation of Science and the Development of Out-of-School Scientific Activities, which had had support from UNESCO and resulting from a UNESCO conference. There are representatives on this Committee from Belgium, England, France, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Norway, the United States, and the Council of Europe. Some of the youth programs in some of these countries take forms different from science fairs. Summer camps are particularly favored by France, Belgium, and Norway.

In London for several years, an international science youth fortnight has been held under the auspices of the World Friends Organization in conjunction with the British Association for the Advancement of Science, with representatives from several European countries as well as the United States.

Science Service has responded to the requests of other countries for cooperation in science youth activities, furnishing minimum prototype materials and "know-how." This pays magnificent dividends in scientific and educational interchange.

The cooperation of the U.S. Agency for International Development has been sought in answering some of the requests and opportunities. A small grant from the Rockefeller Foundation to Science Service is making it possible to extend to other countries in Latin America, such as Peru and Argentina, facilities and information similar to that provided to other countries in that area with U.S. Atomic Energy Commission support.

It may be questioned whether some of the sophisticated course content revisions that through the expenditure of many millions of U.S. dollars have been bludgeoned into American schools should be imposed on the schools of other nations, at least until they are proved to be better than their simpler though older study plans that are, or could be, infused with the simple experimental educational approach of the science fair method.

World cooperation for science youth activities is developing rapidly with the prospect that the program will bring the international scientific and educational world closer together.

A powerful and numerous body of science youths are in our science fairs. These million American youths of high school age, their teachers and parents, and cooperating scientists and engineers and their professional, university, and industrial organizations have the obligation to foster the world movement. Many hundreds of thousands of students in other countries of the world must be given the opportunity of joining according to their abilities the expansion of the precious science-technology "brain force" that will continually remake our civilization.

LONG-RANGE FEED GRAIN PROGRAM

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, there is deep concern on the part of many farmers and farm leaders that farm programs may be in jeopardy.

These programs have not proved perfect, but they have made great contributions to the well-being of farmers, reduced surpluses, and helped strengthen farm income while keeping consumer prices stable.

A great farm leader, Fred Heinkel, of Missouri, has expressed his views on these programs. He has looked at their accomplishments and their support.

I believe his views deserve the study of my colleagues. Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article written by Mr. Heinkel and published in the Missouri Farmer be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Farm Vote and Farmer Participation Indicate a Desire for Long-Range Feed Grain Program

(By F. V. Heinkel)

Land used to produce feed grains accounts for more than all the acres planted to wheat, cotton and soybeans. This is one reason why production of corn, grain sorghums, oats and barley is important. There's another: This grain eventually is marketed through livestock or poultry or dairy products.

So programs which involve feed grains are doubly significant—first to the farmers who raise the grain, second to those who feed it.

Both are concerned about price. Growers are interested in a figure sufficient to pay for fertilizer, fuel and other production costs and leave a profit; feeders, in a feed cost at which they can make a net return.

How can both be satisfied?

The answer lies in price and supply stability—stability at a figure where there is profit for those who raise the grain and also where livestock, poultry and milk production are not stimulated to the point of overproduction for the supply of meat, eggs and dairy products is a greater factor in determining profits than is the cost of feed.

How can this stability be achieved? How can the income of those who raise it and those who feed it be improved and yet Government costs held in check?

These questions were uppermost in the minds of farmers and Government officials when the first National Feed Grain Committee was appointed by President Kennedy. I was asked to be chairman of that Committee at its first meeting in January 1961. The members were farmers from all over the country. They met in Washington and were briefed by USDA economists.

The statisticians' report was anything but optimistic.

Production had been climbing rapidly, building carryover stocks to an estimated 85 million tons, and prices the fall of 1960 had slipped to the lowest level in years.

But that Committee knew what it wanted and went to work. We talked over the problems and then, in just a little more than 1 day, hammered out a feed grain program that has increased farm income, reversed the buildup in stocks and held down program costs to the Government.

Now the Committee has met once more to advise with USDA on recommendations to the Congress for new legislation. The program we've been operating under has been extended year to year in much the same form as first initiated in 1961. It expires December 31, 1965.

We had several specific recommendations in the meeting last month. It is always of interest to me how a group of hardfisted farmers can sit down and get right to the heart of problems like this. They are used to making rapid decisions in planting, harvesting, buying and selling. And they've got corn waiting to be picked or cows to milk back home, so they don't waste time.

One of the first things they lit into was the level of prices. Some suggestion had been made that the price-support loan level on feed grains should be lowered. No, these fellows argued, leave it where it is and build in additional farm income by upping support payments—as much as a dime or 15 cents a bushel for corn. They were determined that any changes should increase income. This approach of increasing payments does that while at the same time it stabilizes grain costs to the feeder; and it rewards the growers who comply with the program objective of holding production in check.

The next point was this matter of every year having to go to Congress with hat in hand, asking for a program and then waiting right up to time to fill the planter before knowing what the particulars are going to be. Enough of that, the committee said; give us a 5-year program. This would let farmers plan ahead and make farm program development much less of a political football.

I don't know just what will come of these recommendations. I do feel these two main points will get special attention. I base my conviction on three reasons: One, the program is working; two, farmers—as proved by their participation in it—like it; three, President Johnson believes in workable farm programs.

It is apparent from the election results that farmers do not want to weaken farm programs. The fact that the Johnson-Humphrey ticket carried every rural area in the usually Republican Midwest meant substantial party-switching took place.

One study of 1,800 typical rural precincts (selected prior to the election) showed a heavy Democrat vote. Nearly all of these had gone Republican in 1956 and 1960.

For instance, here are the figures for these rural precincts in Missouri and four neighboring States: In Missouri in 1960, 50 percent of the vote went for Kennedy compared to 63 percent for Johnson in 1964; in Illinois it was 42 percent for Kennedy, 53 percent for Johnson; in Iowa it was 44 percent for Kennedy, 63 percent for Johnson; in Indiana, 46 percent for Kennedy, 61 percent for Johnson; in Kansas, 38 percent for Kennedy, 62 percent for Johnson.

In addition to that, about 35 rural Senators and Congressmen were unseated—in many instances the unfavorable stand they'd taken on farm and farm-related issues was behind their loss.

It isn't easy to analyze election returns. But those whose business it is to do so are saying that Johnson's make-farm-programs-more-workable approach was more acceptable to farmers than Goldwater's away-with-them attitude.

If this is so, and I believe it is, then this administration surely will follow through and make every possible effort to strengthen farm programs to meet farmers' need for higher farm income. We certainly hope this comes true.

THE QUEST FOR TRUTH

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, answering of mail from constituents probably absorbs more Congressional time and energy than any other single activity on Capitol Hill. Personally, I go to some lengths to make certain that my views on political issues are not kept secret from the public, but questions asked in the incoming daily mail indicate these efforts are not totally effective, even with the combined assistance of newspapers, radio, and television. One can only conclude that Americans have an insatiable quest for knowledge, and this is all to the good.

I recall that one Senator recently reported that his daily first-class mail averaged 300 pieces. If he spent only 5 minutes on each response, this would occupy 25 hours each day, slightly more than allowed by the earth's diurnal transit.

Most of the mail shows real concern about national problems, but some requests are subtly uncomplimentary, such as: "Send me all the information you have on Government, if you have any." Or the questions are perplexing, such as "Do you think a woman will ever become President of the United States? When?"

Senators and Representatives are not the only persons who enjoy being the recipients in these quests for truth. Mr. Art Buchwald, in his syndicated column, has related some of his own experiences with the mailbag, and has offered his own solution. His method might not be drastic for a newspaper columnist, but I fear it would lead to the early forced retirement of a politician. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD Mr. Buchwald's column entitled "A Ruthless Conspiracy," which was published in the Washington Post of January 26, 1965.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A RUTHLESS CONSPIRACY

(By Art Buchwald)

There is a ruthless conspiracy going on in the United States among our grade and high school teachers and someone must put a stop to it.

Apparently, one of the major homework assignments these days is to have pupils write to someone in a profession and ask him a few hundred questions, such as how he got started, why he chose his work, how much he makes, and what course of study he would recommend to someone wanting to pursue the same work.

I receive on the average, 10 letters a week from students who have been assigned to interview me by mail. I would probably ignore the letters altogether except that each student usually points out at the bottom of the letter that if I don't answer his letter he will flunk the course. Most students give me until Thursday to reply, but some are more pressed and need it on Wednesday.

One time an entire class (40 students) wrote to tell me it had been assigned to find out how I remain fair in my columns. I wrote back that I do not try to remain fair in my columns. The question was "Could you please let me know in about 500 words where you get the ideas for your columns?"

The political science teacher had his students ask, "Would you explain the difference between the Federal and State court systems?" And a civics teacher suggested that his class write to me and find out what I thought about recognition of Red China.

It takes an average of 15 minutes to answer one of those letters, and since I don't have time to do my own kid's homework, I don't see why I should do the homework of complete strangers.

Therefore, I'm announcing as of today that any teacher who assigns her pupils to write to me as a research project will receive a questionnaire in return.

These are the questions the teacher will be required to answer:

1. How did you decide to go into the teaching profession?
2. Do you like to teach boys or girls better? Why?
3. Could you send me some anecdotes about your favorite pupil?
4. Please tell me the titles and authors of the books that have influenced you as a teacher?
5. Do you try to be fair in your classes? How?
6. Does anyone get mad at anything you say? Please give an illustration.
7. How do you come up with new ideas for your homework assignments every day?
8. What do you think about the new phases of education?
9. What do you think of our position in Vietnam? The Congo? Cuba?
10. What subjects should someone take if he wants to become a teacher?
11. How much money do you make?
12. Please let me have this no later than next week.

I feel that the questionnaire is the only way to make teachers stop assigning their students this type of homework.

From now on, whenever I get one of those pleading letters from a student, out goes the questionnaire. If the teacher refuses to answer the questions or flunks the student, I'll list her in my column as a fink teacher, which, as every student knows, is the worst kind. I know these are harsh measures. After all, the teachers started it, and they have no one to blame but themselves.

LOG EXPORTS AND THE GORED OX

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the vigorous growth in export sales of uncut logs from the Pacific Northwest to Japan has brought a welcome expansion of jobs and profits for the loggers, truckers, stevedores, longshoremen, steamship companies, exporters, and ports of the Northwest. Recently an editorial appeared in the Oregon Statesman which effectively answered those who see nothing but economic disaster in such trade.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial entitled "'Save Our Logs' at Olympia," published in the Oregon Statesman, Salem, Oreg., of January 22, 1965, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SAVE OUR LOGS AT OLYMPIA

The Save Our Logs organization is moving in on the Washington legislature today to seek legislation to ban sale of logs from State-owned lands for export. Oregon enacted such a law some sessions ago but modified it some in 1963. The Eugene Register-Guard, taking note of the meeting in Olympia today, says the advocates of restriction will have to overcome the report of the Batelle Research organization which stated, on the basis of its study, that Washington's economy benefits from this export rather than holding the logs for local processing. The Register-Guard declares: "That's a preposterous conclusion, and it must not be allowed to stand."

What's preposterous about it? And on what evidence does the Register-Guard base its claim? This export business has been giving extensive employment to loggers, truckers, longshoremen, shippers, which offsets to a considerable degree the loss to millhands and others if the logs were locally milled. There is definite profit to the timberland owner. He gets a good price. (There is a natural tendency of small mill operators to hold down the cost of the logs they buy.) The Japanese take a great deal of low-grade stuff, a lot of hemlock and small logs. This cleans up the forest better. Finally, if the competition did reduce somewhat the output of local mills it might improve the prices for finished products of all the others. Millmen are always complaining about too much production. Some mills might suffer, while the majority gained.

Frankly we can't say whether the log export results in plus or minus dollars to the economy of the Northwest. We do know that we need to export, that Japan is a good customer for American goods, whose goodwill we want to cultivate. Fundamentally we are opposed to trade barriers and quotas and restrictions. The Statesman opposed the Oregon measure when it was pending and hopes that Washington will hold the ground for freedom of trade in logs.

AUTHORIZATION OF VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION TO EXTEND AID ON ACCOUNT OF DEFECTS IN PROPERTIES PURCHASED WITH FINANCING ASSISTANCE UNDER CHAPTER 37, TITLE 38, UNITED STATES CODE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 3, S. 507.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 507) to authorize the Veterans' Administration to extend aid on account of defects in properties purchased with financing assistance under chapter 37, title 38, United States Code.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I have some brief remarks to make concerning the measure which is now pending before the Senate.

The pending measure, that is, S. 507, would allow the Veterans' Administration to extend aid to distressed homeowners who, after relying upon VA or FHA standard construction inspections, find structural defects in their homes which were purchased with GI mortgage loans. The bill also would provide that the relief to such homeowners would extend for a 4-year period after occupancy of the home.

Under existing procedure, when a veteran finds, within 1 year after occupying his new home, structural or other major defects, he can request the builder to correct these deficiencies. If the builder refuses, the veteran can then turn to the VA and that agency will cooperate in attempting to have the builder do the necessary work. If the builder continues to refuse, the VA can then cease doing business with the builder.

This procedure has worked very well. In the majority of cases where veterans have found structural deficiencies in their new homes, builders have cooperated to the maximum extent with the veteran and the VA. However, it is that very small percentage of builders who refuse to cooperate that this bill is aimed toward; that is, those who make absolutely no attempt to correct the deficiencies.

Of course, in these circumstances, the builder will lose his privilege of dealing with the VA, but it is the veteran homeowner who will ultimately suffer. My bill will do justice to those particular homeowners.

The 1964 Housing Act gave the Federal Housing Commissioner the same authority that S. 507 seeks to give to the

Administrator of the Veterans' Administration. I believe it is only equitable that those who have VA-guaranteed mortgages should have the same protection as those who have FHA-insured mortgages.

Mr. President, in view of the cooperation that veteran homeowners have received from their builders in the past, I do not anticipate that the Administrator will be called upon to use the authority which this bill would grant to him to any great extent. In fact, I am informed that the FHA Commissioner has not, thus far, been called upon to use the authority which was granted to him by the Housing Act of 1964. I might add, however, that the pending bill as well as the Housing Act of 1964 provides the veteran homeowner or his civilian counterpart, as the case may be, an avenue of relief when all other reasonable avenues are closed to him.

This bill was reported favorably to the Senate in the previous Congress and was passed by the Senate. However, it did not pass the House in the closing days of the session.

So far as cost is concerned, it is doubtful that there will be any material cost involved, because we believe that giving the Veterans' Administration the right to use this authority will tighten up the situation to such an extent that no appreciable costs will be entailed.

The Commissioner of VA has not yet had to spend any money under the 1964 act.

The pending bill, S. 507, was reported by the Committee on Banking and Currency without objection, and I urge favorable consideration of it by the Senate.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I would like to lend my support to the bill, S. 507, which would authorize the Veterans' Administration to extend aid on account of defects in VA-financed properties. Last year this same provision was made available for home loans made under the FHA program, but the bill extending the same privilege to veterans, S. 2470, was not considered in the House, after its passage by the Senate.

One of the most successful laws in our history has been the loan program under both the World War II and the Korean GI bills. By virtue of these programs, one out of every five homes in our Nation has been built, and the Government has made a profit from the interest paid on these VA-guaranteed loans. This bill would be valuable in maintaining the solidity of this program, as it would allow the Veterans' Administration to correct structural defects in the veteran's home without first having to take over title to the home, as it is now required to do. It is a sound policy to extend this program to our veterans, just as it was extended to civilians under the FHA program last year.

In connection with the success of previous loan programs under the previous GI bills, I would also like to mention that S. 9, the cold war GI bill, will extend this same privilege to the veterans of the cold war. The significance of a loan program for our returning veterans cannot be overestimated in its value to the veteran himself, nor can we overlook the boost which it provides for the economy as a whole. When 20 percent of the homes in this country can be attributed to this single program, it is undeniable that a future loan program for the cold war veteran will be of considerable significance in the future of our country.

Although the educational benefits of the cold war GI bill are inestimable, when we combine them with the value produced by the loans to these veterans, this bill becomes a necessity for the economic welfare of our Nation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill (S. 507) is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (S. 507) was passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 1826. Expenditures to correct or compensate for substantial defects in mortgaged homes

"(a) The Administrator is authorized, with respect to any property improved by a one- to four-family dwelling inspected during construction by the Veterans' Administration or the Federal Housing Administration which he finds to have structural defects, to make expenditures for (1) correcting such defects, (2) paying the claims of the owner of the property arising from such defects, or (3) acquiring title to the property: *Provided,* That such authority of the Administrator shall exist only (A) if the owner has requested assistance under this section not later than four years (or such shorter time as the Administrator may prescribe) after the mortgage loan was made, guaranteed, or insured, and (B) if the property is encumbered by a mortgage which is made, guaranteed, or insured under this chapter after the date of enactment of this Act.

"(b) The Administrator shall by regulation prescribe the terms and conditions under which expenditures and payments may be made under the provisions of this section, and his decisions regarding such expenditures or payments, and the conditions under which the same are approved or disapproved, shall be final and conclusive, and shall not be subject to judicial review.

"(c) The Administrator is authorized to make expenditures for the purposes of this section from the funds established pursuant to sections 1823 and 1824 of this title, as applicable."

(b) The analysis of chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"1826. Expenditures to correct or compensate for substantial defects in mortgaged homes."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which both bills were passed be reconsidered.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I had hoped to obtain the opportunity to appear before the committee before consideration of the Appalachia bill. The hearings have been completed, as I understand it. The bill is likely to be reported today.

The bill, when adopted, will become a precedent for similar programs being asked for by other regions of the country. It is my opinion, therefore, that before final action is taken on this bill, it should be viewed not only from a short, but also from a long-range standpoint. If there are weaknesses in the bill, they should be removed now. Those weaknesses should not be a foundation and precedent for inclusion in similar bills which will be presented to deal with other areas of the Nation.

It is my understanding that there is already pending a request for an Ozark Mountain bill, and a Mesabi Range bill.

I also understand that the Senator from Wisconsin is sponsoring a bill which would establish a base for expansion in seven regions.

The particular subjects which I have in mind deal with the chapter which would allow the Government to give up to $500 each to farmers in Appalachia, to be used in improving pastureland. The $500 will not be a loan; it will be a gift. Presumably, the gift will be used to improve pastureland. A farmer in Appalachia will be allowed to use that money as reimbursement for his expenditures in obtaining fertilizer, tile, irrigation systems, and fences, to increase the population of cattle in the country.

What bothers me is the paradox. In one instance we are spending money to get farmers out of production. In the next instance, we are saying to a farmer, "We will give you $500 to improve your pastureland." One of the two programs is wrong. They cannot both be right.

It has been recommended that in order to bring farm production into some fair relationship with consumption, 1 million farmers ought to leave the land. I make no comment on whether that recommendation is sound.

However, if we wish to have 1 million farmers leave their land, on what theory of rationalization can we say to the taxpayer, "Let us give to each farmer in Appalachia $500 to increase cattle population"? It requires extraordinary gymnastics of the mind to be able to rationalize those two obviously inconsistent positions.

Many experts have an amazing gymnastic ability in trying to develop logical conclusions based upon premises which are completely inconsistent. Let us say that in the Appalachia region the program that I have stated would not mean much. What will be the situation when the program is applied to seven other regions in the country, in addition to the weakness I have pointed out?

There is now on the statute books a program which provides aid in rehabilitating the land of a farmer without cost. In the last 6 or 7 years amendments have been offered to farm bills designed to reduce the amount of money which would be provided for the supplying of fertilizer, drainage pipes, irrigation systems, and fences. We now have a proposal to build a new program upon an old program the propriety of which has been vigorously challenged.

Mr. President, I should like to refer to another paradox on which I can speak with considerable authority. As a result of strip coal mining operations on land in my own State, many areas of our State have been devastated and sterilized. They are areas that once consisted of beautiful, tree-covered, grass-covered, and shrub-covered rolling lands. In those areas there is now nothing but uninhabitable sterile ground filled with noxious liquids because of the exposure of some of the coal that has not been removed.

In Ohio I have tried to obtain the passage of adequate laws which would prevent the butchering of the land. I am sure that practically every Senator—and the Vice President—who lives in the northern region of our country, as he flies from Washington homeward, when looking down from an airplane, has witnessed that abominable evil and unpardonable treatment of the land.

The bill proposes that payments be made to owners of that butchered land to enable them to create recreational grounds, and provide land which will subsequently be made available for public use.

Last year I introduced a bill which would provide a study of the evil of strip mining for coal. After I introduced the bill the proponents of the Appalachia program wrote into the Appalachia bill a proposal for a study. To that proposal I have no objection. I have no pride in authorship. Into the Appalachia bill is now written a provision that a study be made of the evil of strip mining and ways and means by which such devastation might be remedied. According to my recollection the proposed study would be completed by July 1, 1967.

Wise men supporting the Appalachia program have now proposed the spending of money for the rehabilitation of private lands before that study has been completed.

I wish respectfully to say that to propose on the one hand a study which will produce recommendations to remove an evil, and, before that study is completed, to begin spending money for the rehabilitation of private land, requires a very versatile and flexible mind.

Perhaps when that study is completed, a recommendation will be made that no Federal moneys be sent into the various States to rehabilitate strip mined land unless such States adopt laws which are adequately stringent to require the strip miner to replace the land in a condition which would be reasonably related to the topography of the land before the strip mining began.

In my judgment, these two aspects of the Appalachia bill should be given serious consideration. Therefore, before the bill comes up for consideration and a vote, the aspects which I have discussed should be studied and considered by Senators so as to insure that the long-range program will not be burdened with something that I believe is completely unjustified.

RECESS SUBJECT TO THE CALL OF THE CHAIR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(At 12 o'clock and 39 minutes p.m. the Senate took a recess subject to the call of the Chair.)

(At 1 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m. the Senate reconvened, when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. Harris in the chair).)

WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 5, Senate bill 4, and that it be laid down and made the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (S. 4) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, there will be no debate or discussion on the bill this afternoon.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 11 a.m. tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE 47TH ANNIVERSARY OF PROCLAMATION OF UKRAINIAN NATIONAL REPUBLIC

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I join my colleagues in recognizing this month the 47th anniversary of the proclamation of the Ukrainian National Republic and the 46th anniversary of the Act of Union in Kiev which united the Western Ukraine and the Ukrainian National Republic into a single, sovereign and independent republic.

Although short lived as a free nation, the Ukrainian National Republic still lives in the hearts of its people who never have abandoned their fierce desire to be rid of Soviet subjugation.

We owe it to these gallant people, Mr. President, to renew our pledge in this anniversary month to keep the hand of friendship and allegiance outstretched, in the fervent hope that one day they may throw off the yoke of tyranny and join the ranks of freemen in every sense of the word.

During this anniversary period, Ukrainians throughout the world mark the occasion with appropriate observances, and it is fitting that we at this time again reassure them of our support in their resistance to Communist oppression.

Nowhere on the face of the earth is today's struggle for freedom and independence more clearly defined than in this region, and those Ukrainians now in the United States and elsewhere look to us for support and guidance. We cannot—we must not—fail them. As freemen ourselves, we can do no less.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, it is anticipated that not only will the pending business, the Water Pollution Control Act, S. 4, be considered tomorrow, but it is also hoped that S. 3, the Appalachia bill, will be considered as well; also S. 408, the flood control and earthquake insurance bill.

OMAHA SALUTES GENERAL LEMAY, "THE LIVING LEGEND"

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, last Monday evening more than 300 Omahans and their guests paid tribute to Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, who is retiring at the end of this month as Air Force Chief of Staff.

It was Omaha's and Nebraska's salute to the man they knew as a neighbor while he was headquartered at Offutt Air Force Base and building the Strategic Air Command into the most powerful military instrument the world has ever known.

Guests who came to join in this last appearance of General LeMay in uniform included Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker and Lt. Gen. Jimmy Doolittle; Gen. Carl Spaatz, Lt. Gen. Ira Eaker, and Gen. John D. Ryan, the present SAC commander in chief.

Representatives of the aircraft and space industry joined these eminent military commanders and the community's civic leaders.

It was my privilege to participate in this testimonal to Curtis LeMay, a dedicated American patriot. The salute was arranged by a committee chaired by Arthur C. Storz, Sr., A. F. Jacobson, James B. Moore, Peter Kiewit, V. J. Skutt, and Leo A. Daly, all men who had worked closely with General LeMay while he was commander in chief of SAC.

Mr. Storz, a longtime personal friend of General LeMay, a lifelong aviation enthusiast and winner of the Air Force Association's Man of the Year Award, introduced the general with the words:

> Just as we look back a century and today recall such men as Grant and Lee and Jackson and Sheridan, future Americans will, a hundred years from now, remember a roster of great names that will include LeMay.

Mr. Storz continued:

> General LeMay helped save a million lives by leading the force that gave us a decisive victory in the Pacific in World War II, and he may have helped save hundreds of millions of lives since then. What would the cost have been if the nuclear deterrent he

conceived and built had not been in existence in the decades of postwar crises and tension? Certainly another man could have built a strategic air command to deter aggression. But I seriously doubt if it would be SAC. That unique command bears and will always bear the stamp of Curt LeMay's leadership and personality. He is a living legend to the men of SAC and his early struggle to build the command is a source of SAC's greatest tradition. At one time while he was leading a flight of our heavy bombers over Germany in World War II and his outfit came back with heavy losses an Air Force doctor told him he had to slow down or he would have ulcers. His reply was, "Hell, I don't get ulcers; I give them." Many of his outfit took great pride in repeating this story. He personified the characteristics of our bomber commanders and crews and not one of our bomber missions was ever turned back because of enemy action.

While demanding the high standards of readiness and performance, he was always aware of the human toll exacted by the mental and emotional stresses of life in SAC. General LeMay secured greatly improved living conditions on SAC bases, both for married and unmarried personnel. He built the first modern airman's barracks where 2 men were assigned to a room instead of 40.

As a neighbor to us in Omaha, he was always ready to help and support our community in every way possible. He gave much of his own time and energy to make our city the dynamic, growing metropolis it is and he instilled this same spirit in SAC personnel. He fully understood the great responsibility inherent in being Omaha's best friend * * * and perhaps also our biggest problem. No task was too small for his attention or too big for his ability.

On the program for this memorable testimonial, there appeared a tribute to General LeMay's role as a leading figure in the keeping of the peace in the second half of the 20th century.

Coincident with the dinner, there appeared in the Omaha World-Herald's Magazine of the Midlands an absorbing profile of General LeMay written by John Jarrell, chief of the World-Herald's Washington bureau. It is called, "Curtis LeMay, a Legend in His Lifetime."

Because it captures the spirit of the remarkable career of this remarkable military leader, I ask unanimous consent to have the article, along with an editorial, printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Curtis LeMay, a Legend in His Lifetime

(By John Jarrell, chief, World-Herald, Washington bureau)

Washington.—A legend goes into retirement February 1. Not many men become legendary figures while they're still around, but Curtis Emerson LeMay did just about that.

He will retire after a 35-year military career that saw him develop into probably the world's greatest air soldier. And it is not unlikely that in various unfriendly chancellories around this troubled globe audible sighs of relief will be heard.

He leaves the service with his imprint on bombing procedures and air tactics generally, and assuredly on the Strategic Air Command, the most powerful military force ever assembled which, from his headquarters at Offutt Air Force Base, he commanded for almost a decade.

He has left his imprint on world history itself—in Europe in World War II by imposition of procedures he worked out, in the Pacific through the development of low-level nighttime bombing tactics that sped the outcome of the war, and in those bitter postwar months when he organized the Berlin Airlift that thwarted Russia's scheme to block off the Allied sector of that isolated Germany city.

General LeMay, who will be honored at a formal dinner Monday night at Omaha's Indian Hills Inn, retires after 3½ years as Air Force Chief of Staff that climaxed a long, colorful, honors-filled but sometimes stormy career.

Many adjectives—tough, tenacious, taciturn are only a few—have been applied to the heavy-set, beetle-browed general with the more or less chronic scowl who disliked small talk, expressed his honest convictions bluntly to his bosses and to congressional powers, and never ceased battling for what he believed to be the country's and the Air Force's good.

The grim visage of General LeMay, cigar or pipe gripped in his teeth, has for many anxious years reflected American determination to remain all powerful in the air.

The Strategic Air Command is to a great extent his handiwork, built to awesome power in his 9 years of leadership before he turned over the reins to Gen. Thomas S. Power, himself only recently retired.

General LeMay went to Omaha in 1948, immediately issued orders for SAC to prepare itself—right away—for global operations, "to be able to counterattack anywhere at any time."

He started gathering what he needed—men, bases, equipment. If that meant robbing another commander, even one outranking him, General LeMay was ready to do it, and did. He was fortunate in that the late Gen. Hoyt Vanderberg, then Air Force Chief of Staff, usually backed him up.

Along the way he picked up the widest assortment of nicknames a soldier ever had—none expressed to his face. "Pappy." "Old Ironpants." "The Cigar." "Old Stoneface." "The Diplomat," because he's not. "The Grommet" because he, unlike almost every World War II airman, left the grommet in his cap when other fliers were removing theirs to give them that coveted rake-hell appearance.

Along the line, too, he picked up just about all the accolades a man can accumulate.

To the Baltimore Sun's famed military writer, Mark Watson, General LeMay was "the most distinguished of American combat fliers of World War II."

"He's as tough as his job," said Parade magazine.

"Relentlessly efficient," is the way Life described him.

Said Senator Stuart Symington, Democrat of Missouri, former Secretary of the Air Force under whose administration SAC was located in Omaha, in a 1961 speech in the Senate:

"As head of the Strategic Air Command, more than any other man he is the one any possible aggressor has considered with apprehension during the last decade of the cold war."

The stories about him are legion. It is impossible to distinguish fact from apocrypha.

There is the one about the crew of an aircraft worried when the general approached it, cigar lit. A gunner suggested in a low voice that, with gasoline fumes around, the plane might explode.

"It wouldn't dare!" replied a sergeant, looking at the stony face of the general.

Once he found a sentry who had put down his carbine to eat a sandwich. After dressing down the soldier in never-to-be-forgotten LeMay fashion, the general returned to his office and wrote a memorandum to his command which said:

"This afternoon I found a man guarding a hangar with a ham sandwich. There will be no more of that."

And there was no more of that.

Once a group of colonels invited him to dine with them. He declined. "A man should have dinner with his friends," he said, "and the commanding general has no friends."

In England, he told his men he didn't want them fighting with the British. "But if you do," he declared, "you'd better not get whipped."

Those are the stories that fliers tell about General LeMay in their long bull sessions. No one knows for sure which are true, which have been embellished and which have sprung to life only out of his own personality traits.

But there is no fiction involved in what he has done. As an engineering student at Ohio State University he put in for flight training and was accepted as a flying cadet, winning his lieutenant's commission in October 1929.

A pocket biography of some of his better known feats and command activities would show these highlights:

He participated in the first mass flight of B–17 flying fortresses to South America in 1938.

Before U.S. entry into World War II, he pioneered air routes over the South Atlantic to Africa, and over the North Atlantic to England, routes that were to be used extensively in the war years that followed.

He organized, trained, and led into combat in Europe in 1942 the 305th Bombardment Group, developing formation procedures and bombing techniques used by B–17 units throughout the European theater of operations.

Commanding the 3d Bombardment Division in England, he led the famed raid on German aircraft installations at Regensburg, a shuttle mission originating in England and terminating, after blasting the target, in Africa.

He directed the B–29 heavy bombardment activities of the 20th Bomber Command in the China-Burma-India theater, then the 21st Bomber Command with headquarters on Guam, still later was Chief of Staff of the strategic air forces in the Pacific.

He developed the low-level, night-flying fire-bomb technique credited with leveling Japanese targets—Tokyo first—and shortening the course of the war in the Pacific.

He organized operations of the Berlin airlift in the 1948–49 Russian blockade.

In 1948 he assumed command of SAC, established its headquarters at Offutt and built it from its remnants-created post-World War II posture into the greatest striking force in world history.

General LeMay left Omaha in July 1957 to become Vice Chief of Staff of the Air Force, and in 1961 he was named by President Kennedy to be Chief of Staff, a post many thought he never would achieve because tact and soft-shoe diplomacy are not two of his outstanding traits.

His credentials as an air tactician are of the highest order.

In 1942, in England, he was concerned that bombing accuracy was not what it should be, and he decided there was too much use of evasive tactics to avoid antiaircraft fire.

So he led the next raid, over St. Nazaire, and held a straight course for 7 minutes to the target, through murderous ack-ack—but with telling effect on the installations he had set out to destroy.

He also led that attack on Regensburg, at a cost of 31 U.S. bombers—but destroyed the German capacity to construct countless Messerschmitts. It was after that raid that, in his daily letter to his wife, he told her:

"We had a rough trip today. It could have been the weather and it could have been me."

General LeMay, transferred to the Asian theater, made the decision that the most effective way to blast Japanese cities was by night—and at only 6,000 feet. He dispatched

339 B-29's from Pacific bases, and they laid Tokyo low with small losses.

That set a pattern for systematic destruction of other targets, bringing widespread agreement that it was this bomb-inflicted havoc that paved the way for speedy Japanese surrender when Hiroshima and Nagasaki were atom bombed.

General LeMay is a "big bomber man," though his early Air Force days were in fighters. Plenty of people believe that his last tour of duty, that now ending, was extended by Presidential order for only 7 months because of his concern over lack of specific plans for new bombers, and his bluntness in saying so, ran athwart prevailing policy that stresses ever greater reliance on the missile concept of defense.

Yet it is readily conceded, that, though he has strong views contrary to those of Secretary of Defense McNamara, he has "played according to the rules." He has battled for his beliefs in high Pentagon councils—but outside the Pentagon he has kept silent. Only when questioned while before congressional committees has he, in reply to specific queries, voiced those opinions he holds so strongly.

No new bombers have been built since 1962, plans for a follow-on manned aircraft are somewhat vague, and his worry over too heavy a reliance on unmanned missiles is a matter of record in his testimony on Capitol Hill, where he has said the right answer to the defense problem is "a mix of weapons systems," not dependence on one.

Shortly before his retirement, a World-Herald reporter, talking to the general in his big Pentagon office, asked if he thought there would be a new manned bomber available in the early 1970's, to replace the B-52.

True to his belief that he should not express his view outside the Pentagon and congressional committees, he declined to answer. But a study of his testimony to Congress is plain enough. Last February, he told the House Appropriations Committee: "The manned system alone has the inherent flexibility and specialized characteristics required for certain military tasks."

And he told that committee: "In looking into the future, I am extremely concerned over the lack of a follow-on manned strategic system to replace our aging bomber fleet."

He sees the need for both missiles and manned planes for a good many years to come. Complementing what he calls the versatile manned aircraft, he feels missiles increase the ability to strike at targets deep in enemy territory.

But General LeMay strongly believes there are many options a commander has with a manned system he does not have with a missile system.

He has made it plain he wants the missile, too—in fact, he told Congress, he actually has recommended more missiles than the Secretary of Defense "has been willing to buy."

But even if by, say, 1974, the perfect missile has been developed—one that never has a mechanical failure, one that destroys a target every time a button is pushed—that would not be enough, in General LeMay's view.

"I still say," he declared, "that you are in a musclebound position. You are endangering the defense of the country by depending on this weapon system alone because you have no flexibility. You only have two choices. You are either off the button and are at peace or you are on the button and you are at war."

In that vein, he continued:

"The war is on, there are certain tasks that can be done with manned systems much better than you can do them with the unmanned systems.

"For instance, there is no loyalty to a missile. It goes where you say it should go when you launch it. You cannot change your mind and bring it back. You cannot hit imprecisely defined targets with a missile. You have to send a missile to a certain longitude and a certain latitude. Manned systems can use judgment, can find targets you know are in the area but you do not know exactly where until you go and look."

In his talk with the World-Herald, he was asked what he visualized the future of SAC to be over the next 10 years. That was a question he was glad to answer.

"I think every one agrees," General LeMay asserted, "that for the last 10 years it has been the backbone of deterrent power.

"I think it will continue to remain so over the next 10 years."

The general's opinions have always had a respectful audience on Capitol Hill, with many powerful Members of both the House and the Senate, Democrats and Republicans alike, in wholehearted agreement with his views.

He is only 58 now, and it seems reasonable to suppose that his opinions still will be sought by congressional committees and others, in the years ahead.

He's going to be missed by the men under his command, for with all his toughness he's been a battler on behalf of comfortable housing and good living conditions for Air Force personnel. He's taken the fight for better pay to Congress on many occasions, too, in an effort to improve the reenlistment rate—which he did.

The general likes to relax—but not on the cocktail-party circuit. He has no gift of small talk, and chatty hostesses are his despair.

He loves to hunt and fish. He's known to be a tough customer in a poker game. He built his own stereo. He loves to tinker with sports cars, and he builds them, too. He's flown every sort of plane, and he'd rather be the pilot than a passenger.

He's a bad man to tangle with physically. He's a black-belt judo artist.

At retirement time, General LeMay looks back on his almost 9 years in Omaha with pleasure, perhaps a hint of nostalgia.

"I spent more time in Omaha than anyplace else in my military career," he said.

"I lived there almost longer than I lived anywhere in my life, because even as a boy in Ohio we moved about quite a bit. I guess I spent about the same length of time in Columbus. Omaha is almost home to me. Our only child, Jane, lived there from the time she was 9 until she was 18. She's still a Nebraskan, married (to Dr. James L. Lodge) and in Lincoln."

He remembers many happy hunting trips in Nebraska and the surrounding States.

The future?

He said he hadn't decided, and that he won't until sometime after he begins his retirement.

A dozen nations have awarded their highest decorations to General LeMay. It is significant that he returned to the United States a few weeks before retirement from a trip to the Far East—and Japan, against which he directed a pulverizing air offensive, presented him with the First Order of a Grand Cordon Rising Sun Medal.

In the war he'd fought the Japanese with all he had. Then after the war he helped the conquered nation establish a modern air force. It was that for which he was decorated by his onetime enemy.

His admirers agree that any country which had the advantage of General LeMay's advice in creating an air arm had about the best help possible.

HISTORIANS WILL REMEMBER GENERAL LEMAY, PEACEMAKER

In some future time when historians write the chapter on world peace in the second half of the 20th century they will list the men whose untiring efforts were most responsible. Near the top of that list will be the name Curtis E. LeMay.

Very few will dispute the role of this great general in preventing the catastrophe of nuclear war in our time. It may seem a paradox that a professional military man should be remembered as a peacemaker. But this is the case. If proof is needed, consider the act of a grateful government of a former wartime enemy nation in recently presenting its highest award to General LeMay, a commander whose forces helped defeat this same enemy.

It was, however, the deterrent to nuclear war built by General LeMay after World War II that kept the Communists at bay and maintained the world stability needed for the recovery of all nations. General LeMay's belief in the peace-keeping power of strategic nuclear forces carried him through controversy and criticism during the first days of his greatest achievement, the development of the Strategic Air Command. Today, SAC is a monument to General LeMay's vision and determination to keep the world at peace. General LeMay spent almost 9 years here in Omaha and we saw him build SAC from a small military post to the most powerful and alert command in all history. We, the citizens of Omaha, are proud of the things we were able to do to help him whenever we were called upon to make his task a little easier.

But it was General LeMay's genius as a leader and commander that inspired the men of SAC to accept personal sacrifice and join him in building this tremendous command. These same men of SAC know, too, that General LeMay is also a warmblooded, compassionate man who hates war as bitterly as any man on earth. He had a great love for his men and constantly worried about them and their welfare.

By the time the President moved him up to take command of all our air forces, General LeMay's hard discipline and brilliant efficiency had already become an Air Force legend. The management and operational concepts that were so advanced when he introduced them in SAC soon became the high standards of all Air Force commands.

As the respected spokesman for airmen and aerospace power he told the Congress time and again of the need to keep our deterrent strong—of the need to adequately compensate the dedicated men who made the deterrent work. The shape of the United States Air Force today, its dedication, its morale, its overwhelming military capability, and its devotion to peace, are largely the work of General LeMay.

Every freeman on earth is deeply in debt to Gen. Curtis E. LeMay. Every citizen in our country can thank God for him. We his close friends here in Omaha, look forward to hearing his voice ring in the land as he lays aside the uniform to speak as a citizen. We know he will be riding in the lead plane as long as he draws the breath of life.

FEDERAL FLOOD AND EARTHQUAKE INSURANCE PROGRAM: A PRESSING NEED

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, only 9 months after the catastrophic Alaska earthquake of last March 27, we have what may very well turn out to be an even more disastrous situation along the west coast. A few weeks ago, floods brought misery to thousands of people in California, Oregon, Washington, and Idaho.

With this latest crisis, it should be clear that the people of this country will continue to experience large-scale natural disasters until the bright day when man learns to control the elements. Here along the east coast, hurricanes menace us from late summer until late fall. They appear to strike the people of the gulf coast with an even greater frequency. Floods are experienced throughout the central plains, in the western mountains, and along the Pacific coast. Finally, geologists tell us that it is not unlikely that in the foreseeable future, major earthquakes will strike the populous cities of the west coast. The prohibitively high coast of commercial earthquake insurance in the faulted areas around the Pacific Basin supports this prediction.

EXISTING FEDERAL DISASTER PROGRAM

The Federal Government has long recognized a responsibility to assist disaster-stricken communities. Between 1803 and 1950, Congress passed over 100 separate acts granting disaster relief of one sort or another to States, local governments, territories, and possessions.

In an attempt to provide a more flexible solution to national disasters, Public Law 81–875, the Federal Disaster Act, was passed by the Congress in 1950. That act provides that, upon request by the Governor of any State, there shall be a Presidential determination that a "major disaster" has occurred. This finding permits the President to order any agency of the Federal Government to lend, donate, lease, or sell equipment, supplies, facilities, personnel, and other resources to the State and local governments of the disaster-stricken area. In addition, provision is made for assistance in the restoration of public facilities, the clearing of debris, and the provision of emergency housing.

Public Law 81–875 also provides for the immediate reconstruction or restoration of all Federal facilities damaged or destroyed in any major disaster. The cost of the work can be paid from "any available funds not otherwise immediately required." Provision is also made for the President to devote to disaster relief any funds which he has available. Broad authority is granted all Federal agencies to acquire, rent, or contract for equipment, services, supplies, travel, communication, and administrative assistance required in the emergency, without regard to the civil service laws.

All these activities are administered by the President, through the extraordinary efficiency of the Office of Emergency Planning, and are supplemented by the work of a multitude of Federal agencies. Of special note is the most helpful disaster-loan program of the Small Business Administration. The full range of Federal services available to a community in a natural disaster is outlined in a publication entitled "Federal Disaster Relief Manual," produced under the supervision of the Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations, of the Senate Committee on Government Operations.

In at least one instance, the catastrophic Alaska earthquake, the President has established a special commission to coordinate plans for Federal disaster-recovery programs, and to recommend short-range and long-range programs and projects to be carried out by Federal, State, or local agencies, including recommendations for such additional Federal or State legislation as the Commission might deem necessary and appropriate to meet reconstruction and development needs.

The efficiency and comprehensiveness of Federal disaster relief which existing legislation and administrative practice are capable of providing can easily be reviewed in the report "Response to Disaster," produced last September by the Federal Reconstruction and Development Planning Commission for Alaska, chaired by the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

SOME SPECIFIC REMEDIAL LEGISLATION ALWAYS WILL BE NEEDED

Of course, in almost any disaster there will be special needs for the particular stricken area which will have to be provided by some specific legislation. In the case of the Alaska earthquake, Congress passed a series of amendments to the original Alaska Omnibus Act.

These amendments, Public Law 88–451, approved less than 5 months after the cataclysmic event, authorized the Farmers Home Administration, the Rural Electrification Administration, and the Housing and Home Finance Agency to make appropriate downward adjustments in outstanding loan obligations when the circumstances indicated. It also authorized a substantial amount of money to the HHFA, for use in urban-renewal projects. The Small Business Administration was granted authority to extend the maturity date for home-repair loans from 20 to 30 years; the Army Corps of Engineers was appropriated large amounts of money for civil-works projects involving the repair of Federal facilities; the Federal-aid highways program was amended, to provide for 100 percent Federal contribution to repair and reconstruction work made necessary because of the earthquake; and because of the possibility that adverse conditions would affect the marketing of Alaska State bonds, provision was made for purchase by the HHFA of $7.2 million worth of these bonds at a favorable rate.

In reviewing proposed legislation introduced in the present session by Senators and Representatives from our sister States of California and Oregon, I notice that they have adapted much of the language of the Alaska Omnibus Act to their own use, in solving the problems created by the recent western floods and road washouts.

UNSOLVED PROBLEM: A FLOOD AND EARTHQUAKE INSURANCE PROGRAM

However, Mr. President, there is one aspect of nearly every major disaster for which no overall solution has, as yet, been found by either private or public agencies. That is the problem of the individual private homeowner whose home is totally destroyed by forces not of his own making. In the usual case, the homeowner is purchasing his home under a substantial mortgage, or is the owner in fee, with the equity in the home being, in a large majority of cases, the result of a lifetime of investing.

If the damage is caused by fire, windstorm, or tornado, it is, in most cases, covered by the commercial insurance purchased by most homeowners. However, if the destruction is caused by flood, hurricane-produced wave action, or earthquake, commercial coverage at reasonable rates is unavailable. Yet, the destruction done each year by floods, hurricane-wave action, and, occasionally, earthquakes, is substantial. American Red Cross statistics show that from the Ohio Valley floods of last March through the California, Oregon, Washington, and Idaho floods of last month and this, 1,386 homes have been totally destroyed by flood damage, 368 by hurricane, 494 by the Alaska earthquake, and 55 by the Alaska quake-induced Pacific coast tidal wave.

What is to be done by a man who has a $20,000 mortgage and $10,000 equity in a home which has floated out to sea or been splintered by an earthquake? Even if he buys another home and finances it and the old $20,000 debt through a 3-percent-interest Small Business Administration disaster loan, his monthly payments may very well be more than he can afford. And what of his $10,000 equity, which he may have spent 5 or 10 years in accumulating? And what of the senior citizen whose life's savings are represented by the home to which he has retired, and in which, except for the vagaries of nature, he would be living the rest of his days?

No adequate answers to these questions presently exist.

In a small percentage of cases—loans held by the Veterans' Administration, the Federal National Mortgage Association, or the Farmers Home Administration—legislation similar to that enacted last August, and similar to that recently introduced by the senior and junior Senators from Oregon [Mr. MORSE and Mrs. NEUBERGER], will permit the writing down or cancellation of the outstanding indebtedness.

The Alaska legislation of last August, provided for a 50–50 Federal-State matching fund, out of which repayment could be made of outstanding indebtedness owed non-Federal mortgage holders. This legislation requires the mortgagor to pay $1,000 upon the outstanding mortgage balance, in order to qualify for release of the balance due, and also sets a maximum of $30,000 on the size of the debt which can be repayed under this program. However, the State's bond counsel has raised serious doubts concerning the constitutionality of the use by the State of Alaska of public funds for the relief of a few hundred specifically designated citizens. The State, therefore, has been required to bring a time-consuming and expensive test case in order to determine the question. Whether the State of Alaska will be able to avail itself of the 50–50 matching program provided in the act of last August still remains in doubt. If the Alaska Supreme Court rules that participation by the State is unconstitutional, several hundred Alaskans will have the alternatives of repaying staggering sums of debt upon homes which no longer exist, or of going into bankruptcy.

Neither the Alaska Act nor the bill introduced the other day by the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and cosponsored by the junior Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], provides any compensation for lost equity. Yet, a homeowner's equity often represents his life's savings, his hedge against inflation, or his source of retirement income.

Mr. President, since 1956 there has been on the statute books a Federal Flood Insurance Act, 42 Stat. 2401–2421. No funds have been provided as yet to implement this legislation, because the Housing and Home Finance Agency has not had sufficient funds with which to conduct a study to determine the size of the appropriation that would be necessary for the funding of the Federal flood insurance program.

In the last two Congresses the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] has introduced proposed legislation (S. 408) to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Agency to make this most necessary study. In the 88th Congress, the identical bill, S. 2032, passed the Senate, but did not get out of committee in the House of Representatives. Last week the bill was once again introduced by Senator WILLIAMS, with Senators BIBLE, COOPER, MONTOYA, MORSE, MOSS, RANDOLPH, YARBOROUGH, and myself as cosponsors. In considering S. 408 yesterday, the Banking and Currency Committee broadened its scope, so as to include a study of all natural disasters. This was done pursuant to the urging of the junior Senator from the State of Washington [Mr. JACKSON] and myself. The Senate will remember the comprehensive hearing, conducted last spring by Senator JACKSON, on the subject of a national-disaster-insurance program.

We hope that when the bill gets to the House of Representatives, considerable support for it will be found among the Representatives of the flood-stricken West Coast States, as well as among the many other Members of the House who have previously expressed enthusiasm for funding the 1956 flood-insurance program.

ALTERNATIVES FOR HHFA TO STUDY

In any insurance program, care must, of course, be taken to preserve for the commercial insurance industry all areas in which it can provide, at reasonable rates, the required coverage. However, when it cannot do this, Congress should act—as it did in 1941, when it provided for the war-risk insurance program. I hope the Housing and Home Finance Agency, under the authority of S. 408, will study alternatives other than those of strict insurance. The possibility of funding a disaster-assistance program by a nationwide stamp tax imposed on all real estate transactions should be considered. Under section 4361 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, a tax of 55 cents per $500 of value is imposed on all real estate transactions in the United States. I am informed by the IRS that the sale of documentary stamps to satisfy this tax obligation, together with the obligation imposed by the taxes on the issuance and transfer of securities and the sale of foreign insurance, amounted in 1963 to $140,200,000, and in 1964 to $162,600,000. As the same stamps are used for satisfying all three tax obligations, it is not possible to tell what percentage of these sums relates solely to real estate transactions. However, surely the amount is substantial.

Last spring, at the time of the hearings on the proposed retroactive earthquake insurance bill (S. 2719), the executive secretary of the Alaska Association of Insurance Agents, Ross P. Duncan, suggested, as a long-range solution of the problem, encouragement of the insurance industry to include earthquake damage in its ordinary all-risk coverage insurance policy, the additional cost of which would be spread, on a nationwide basis, among all policyholders. Surely an opportunity ought to be given the industry to present its views on this suggestion. Given the voluntary abstention of Congress from the field of interstate insurance regulation, it is perhaps unlikely that a law requiring all comprehensive home insurance policies to cover all natural disasters, including floods and earthquakes, would find acceptance in Congress.

Another idea which was discussed at the hearings last spring on the Alaska Act was the possibility of permitting urban renewal administrations to purchase disaster-stricken homes at their predisaster value. This possibility is probably undesirable, as no funding is provided for, although the funds from a conveyance stamp tax program might be specially appropriated to the Housing and Home Finance Administrator, for use by him in purchasing destroyed homes.

President Johnson has said there is no reason why any person in this great Nation of ours should live in ignorance or poverty, through no fault of his own; nor, Mr. President, is there any reason why some means should not be found to alleviate the enormous burden which blind chance imposes each year on hundreds of Americans, when floods, hurricanes, and earthquakes destroy their homes and savings.

THE ROW OVER URBAN RENEWAL

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, many people have been critical of the urban renewal program during recent months.

Some of them have always been opposed to urban renewal because they want the Federal Government to have nothing, or at least very little, to do with help in the solution of State and local problems.

Others, regrettably, have been critical either because they expect too much of the program and are disappointed because it has not yet cured urban ills or because they have heard inaccurate or exaggerated reports about dislocated families, bureaucratic foibles, and so on.

Since there is this kind of misunderstanding about urban renewal, what it should do and what it can do, I was pleased to read a very thorough and balanced article in the February issue of Harper's.

It is entitled "The Row Over Urban Renewal" and the author Joseph Epstein, does a good job of setting the record straight.

He does not deny failures and difficult problems, but he also points out the positive, often beneficial effect that urban renewal projects have had in various cities throughout the United States.

Hartford and New Haven in my own State of Connecticut were among the cities singled out as having made "substantial achievements" in the urban renewal field.

I ask unanimous consent that "The Row Over Urban Renewal" be printed in the RECORD at this point, so that as many people as possible will have a chance to read this interesting and realistic appraisal of urban renewal activities.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ROW OVER URBAN RENEWAL

(By Joseph Epstein)

(Many people are mad at a program which is changing the face of American cities—sometimes too hastily, but usually for the better.)

For some time now, it's been open season on urban renewal. The St. Georges out to slay this dragon are an odd crew—Socialists and Birchers, civil rightists and segregationists, city planners and people who equate planning with mortal sin. They have all, at one time or another, heaved a spear into the monster's flanks.

Within the past year the heaviest attack has been coming from the right. Early in 1964 in Indianapolis, for example, Edwin P. Neilan, then president of the U. S. Chamber of Commerce, in a speech entitled "Supermarket for Subsidies" denounced Federal urban renewal as inequitable and corrupt. He has since replayed this diatribe around the country. In March, nine conservative Congressmen, speaking in Rockford, Ill., before 200 businessmen calling themselves the National Conference on Urban Renewal, charged the program with "taxing the needy to benefit the greedy." One of these orators was JOHN DOWDY, a relatively obscure Texas Democrat who appeared in the March issue of Reader's Digest as author of an article called "The Mounting Scandal of Urban Renewal." In October, another Digest piece, called "The Sad Little Story of Wink" told how the injection of Federal money through urban renewal laid low the town of Wink, Tex. The strident message of all these sallies from the right is essentially the same: "Let private enterprise do it."

The liberal executioners, in contrast, base their attack on less ideological grounds: chiefly, the human dislocations and the hardening of segregated housing patterns that urban-renewal programs have sometimes caused. Perhaps their doughtiest spokesman is Jane Jacobs, author of "The Death and Life of Great American Cities." A condensation of her widely read book, published in the indefatigable Reader's Digest, highlighted her preoccupation with crime in our cities and her horror of urban renewal. As readers of her book will recall, Mrs. Jacobs is a kind of Adam Smith among city planners. Like the Calvinist economist, she argues that if a city has sufficient dynamism, density, and diversity everything else will take care of itself. She sees no need to shift people around since she believes that a slum can unslum itself as its people advance economically and remain in the old neighborhood to help clean it up. Mrs. Jacobs recognizes but unfortunately does not enlarge upon the sad truth that not all slums have the same high powers of regeneration, especially Negro slums. Just how New York's Harlem can ever unslum itself without outside help remains a mystery.

Urban renewal, however, has unslummed a good many Negro slums. It has also produced much of the integrated housing to be found today in San Francisco, Chicago, Detroit, New York, and Philadelphia. In the Border South—if not the Deep South—it has brought some measure of integrated housing to Washington, Baltimore, and St. Louis as well as to Johnson City, Tenn., and Nashville. And in all these cities, integration has occurred in neighborhoods of new housing.

Nor do the actual statistics on human dislocation justify the hysteria of Mrs. Jacobs and her followers. As of the summer of 1964, reports were at hand on the great majority of the people displaced by renewal. Less than 8 percent of them were still living in what the Government calls "substandard" housing and the whereabouts of only 5 percent were unknown. In other words, roughly 87 percent of those dispaced have moved into standard—and hence substantially better—housing, and the record seems to be improving each year.

To be uprooted by urban renewal—or for that matter, by any other governmental action—cannot of course be altogether painless. But it is a mistake to assume, as many critics do, that renewers couldn't care less. Chicago maintains a 92-man relocation staff to aid those forced to move in finding good housing. Philadelphia's Centralized Relocation Bureau conducts training programs to help make the process as unabrasive as possible. New York City's Department of Relocation has set up a human relations advisory committee, whose job is to prepare the way for Negro and Puerto Rican families in neighborhoods where they have hitherto been unwelcome.

Now there is surely nothing wrong about moving slum dwellers into better homes and apartments. But all too often none exist. This does not, however, mean that the renewal effort is unnecessary or hopeless. On the contrary, the lesson is that our cities are far sicker than anyone had imagined. And urban renewal alone cannot cure the whole malady.

This was not foreseen by the early champions of renewal. Underestimating the scope of their task, they vastly oversold their program as an all-out panacea. So inevitably it fell short of its original goal. Yet this hardly proves that—as Edwin Neilan urges—American cities should now "look inward to a responsibe local solution of their own problems instead of outward for irresponsible and expensive Federal aid." Nor does anything in the record call for the strange current antirenewal alliance of leftist idealists and nihilists from the right—all bent on destroying what remains the best available tool for halting the blight and decay of our cities. For the fact is that urban renewal has already worked well in many areas and is destined to work still better, though often with quite different techniques, than those envisioned by its original sponsors.

WHY THE DREAM FADED

The concept now so heavily under fire was first introduced in title I of the 1949 Housing Act against a background now depressingly familiar. Slums were rapidly devouring the Nation's cities, sending into the suburbs everyone who could afford to move. As downtown stores joined their customers in suburbia, the shrinking urban tax base hastened the central city's physical and economic decay. Those who escaped were, of course, almost all white. The city was left with blighted industrial areas, and people with dark skins and low incomes locked up in its slums.

Urban renewal, it was thought, would change this bleak picture through a unique partnership of private enterprise and government. Local communities would buy up land in slum areas, clear it, and sell it to private developers. The Federal Government would pay as much as two-thirds of the net cost of this operation if a renewal plan provided for proper housing and building codes and was part of a long-range slum-prevention program. Displaced people were to be relocated in as humane a manner as possible, and citizens' advisory committees were to help in planning.

Though the method was new, the idea of urban renewal has a long and honorable history. Pope Sixtus V took on the refurbishment of Rome in 1585–90; Leonardo da Vinci for a time was planning to redo Milan; Baron Haussmann actually did redo Paris; and in England at the turn of this century an ingenious court stenographer named Ebenezer Howard not merely renewed but built anew when he created his now famous English New Towns. But what distinguished the American plan was the idea of attracting private developers into slum clearance and thus putting private enterprise to work for the public good. It all seemed simple and plausible. When the Housing Act was passed optimists foresaw a slumless nation within a decade.

Not 10 but 15 years have now passed and the slums, cancerous and stinking as ever, are still with us. There have, to be sure, been successes, but no spectacular metamorphosis of the urban scene. What went wrong?

For one thing, renewers discovered it was no great problem to take a bulldozer and of a sunny afternoon go out and demolish a slum. But finding better housing for the people who had lived there was quite another matter. It was easy, too, to build elegant, high-priced apartment buildings; the complication came in finding tenants able to pay the rents. Private developers, often at their own considerable expense, had to learn that successful renewal did not admit of their making a great killing every time out. In some early ventures—such as Boston's West End and St. Louis' Mill Creek[1]—private developers cleared a site, only to discover afterward that the market would not support rapid or extensive redevelopment. So the land stayed empty—a yawning, dusty symbol of renewal's failure.

Certainly in the great majority of cases every effort was made to help displaced people find decent housing. But good will and genuine concern could not create livable vacant apartments where none existed. Thus, as it did away with some slums, urban renewal sometimes added to the crowding in others. Chicago's much talked about Hyde Park-Kenwood project is an example. There a rundown, crime-ridden neighborhood—"apache territory" we used to call it when I was an undergraduate at the adjoining University of Chicago—was transformed into a handsome community of tidy town houses and comfortable apartment buildings. At the outset, the Hyde Park-Kenwood Community Conference, a model grassroots citizens' participation group, wanted the neighborhood not only sightly and safe but racially integrated as well. They also wanted it economically homogeneous. So they turned down a 200-unit public housing project, and all new housing was in the middle-income range—beyond the means of most Negroes who had been living in the area. Integrated the neighborhood was (and is), but along economic strata. Poor families—both Negro and white—had little choice but to crowd into other Chicago slums.

Elsewhere—as is said to have happened in Atlanta—Negro removal was the result of racist rather than class motives, a weapon to keep Negroes from encroaching on white neighborhoods. But, in general, urban renewal has displaced more Negroes than any other group for the simple reason that Negroes inhabit the very worst sections of our cities. The slums, our greatest technological failure, and racial discrimination, our greatest moral failure, are brutally enmeshed.

There were other problems. Slum landlords, particularly in large cities like New York, Chicago, and Boston, saw the renewers coming and practically salivated with greed. Urban renewal offered a way to get a respectable price for their wornout buildings along with a final chance to wring them dry—at the expense, as usual, of their tenants. With renewal in prospect, dreary tenements that were already cut up into minute warrens were often redivided again, and even minimal upkeep ceased. But sometimes 2 or 3 years elapsed before a project actually got underway, and in the interval a slum landlord made a handsome buck.

Yet despite the accusations of the Neilans and the Dowdys, the administration of the urban-renewal program itself has been free of scandal. Indeed, there has been an almost frantic effort to close any loopholes which might precipitate charges of graft and corruption. In a country where the idea of planned, federally financed urban change is far from popular, one scandal could well have toppled the works. So the Government men in charge set up an elaborate system of bureaucratic checks and records. Maddening delays have often resulted. But there has been no misuse of public funds. Attesting to this rather remarkable record, Texas Congressman ALBERT THOMAS, whose subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations has reviewed the operation of the program since its inception, not long ago said: "It has been fantastic to me, the amount of money and the amount of different pieces of property involved. Sixty to sixty-five thousand pieces of property have been bought. I have not heard of any public scandal."

NEIGHBORHOOD FACELIFTING

Apart from the virtue of honesty, renewers can point to substantial achievements in Philadelphia, Hartford, Baltimore, Chicago, Little Rock, Washington, Detroit, Pittsburgh, New Haven. Worthy of mention, too, is the Baylor area project in Waco, Tex., which has replaced 63 acres of miserable shacks and ramshackle buildings with neat open streets and over $4 million of new construction. Renewal-agency tabulations show that home ownership among the people there displaced has increased by 8 percent and that only 5 percent of them now live in substandard homes—compared to 35 percent before relocation.

Successes of this kind are often forgotten or disdained by diehard opponents of urban renewal, who, in the words of Federal Housing Administrator Robert Weaver, "like to picture it as a bureaucratic monster, armed with a bulldozer that ruthlessly uproots people and lays waste vital areas of the city to no good purpose. Their bill of indictment includes shoving poor people and small businesses out of their homes and established locations, making the hard life of nonwhites harder, leaving valuable areas to stagnate while planners plan, doling out benefits that the Federal Government can't afford to local governments which don't need them."

The trouble with this caricature is not only that it is totally untrue but that it ignores much that has changed in urban renewal's aims and methods. These changes have been brought about through successive amendments of the original 1949 Housing Act. Among the most significant has been the attempt, as of 1954, to complement the clearance and total redevelopment of slums by rehabilitating those gray areas soon destined to slither over into the slum category. The process generally costs far less than tearing down and redeveloping an entire neighborhood and it also helps check the dismal cycle whereby one slum is cleared only to have another quickly take its place. To date, Philadelphia perhaps has employed this new tool of renewal with more intelligence and success than any other city.[2]

---

[1] Both are now on the way toward development. For Mill Creek, see "St. Louis Takes the Cure" by A. M. Watkins (Harper's, August 1964.)

Rehabilitation, to be sure, brings frustrations of its own. For one thing, how is a poor man to pay the cost of fixing up his home to the standard of an urban-renewal plan? Such problems are not actually insurmountable though they are made to seem so in "The Federal Bulldozer," a new book-length attack on urban renewal by Martin Anderson, an assistant professor of finance at Columbia University (published by the MIT Press). He believes that our urban housing problems can be overcome through the efforts of private enterprise buttressed by more public housing. Robert Weaver disagrees. He points out that we simply cannot meet the country's housing needs unless we rehabilitate the buildings that are worth saving and replace the ones that are not. "Rehabilitation will work because it has to work," he says, "if we are to establish and maintain healthy cities."

In this premise, the 1964 housing bill authorized Federal below-market interest loans for rehabilitation to owners of homes and businesses in urban-renewal areas. Other assistance programs are planned. By taking full advantage of Federal assistance, a battery of large apartment buildings in Chicago has been rehabilitated successfully through low-interest loans with only nominal increase in rents. Renewers have come to place so high a value on rehabilitation that it is now standard practice before beginning a project to determine if the job cannot be done by rehabilitation alone. And, in fact, the majority of urban-renewal projects in recent years have been a combination of rehabilitation and clearance. Thus the old image of the renewer as the man behind the bulldozer has been rendered obsolete.

THE RICH, THE POOR, AND THE PECULIAR

The rehabilitation program is only one of several significant changes in urban-renewal activities. Perhaps more far reaching in its effect has been the decision to permit the use of Federal funds to improve commercial and industrial areas. The resulting program of downtown renewal has had some exciting successes—among them Baltimore's Charles Center, Constitution Plaza in Hartford, the new sports arena with the movable roof in Pittsburgh, Norfolk's gateway project, and Capitol Mall in Sacramento. The Federal Government aided in such projects in the hope that they would help lure some of the city's affluent residents back from the suburbs. This has indeed come to pass. When the central city was refurbished, many middle-class families returned to live alongside former residents in mixed neighborhoods that include what one observer has called "the rich, the poor, and the peculiar." This has happened with no disturbance and little accompanying fanfare. Although it cannot be statistically proved, it appears that downtown renewal has brought about more integrated housing than President Kennedy's 1962 Executive order on equal opportunity in housing. (That order brought down the color bar on almost 1 million additional housing units, but not that many Negroes have chosen to "bust" white neighborhoods and put up with the agonies such a move often involves for their families.)

Downtown renewal has also fulfilled a second hope—that it would improve the city's tax base. In Washington's southwest project, for instance, a former slum area that yielded only $443,409 a year in taxes will, when the renewal project is completed, bring in $4.8 million a year. The site of the Gratiot project in Detroit, which used to earn $71,700, now yields $375,000. Elsewhere, assessed values have been increased fivefold by redevelopment.

To be sure, the city's tax revenues from its downtown area shrink while a project is under construction. Martin Anderson, in "The Federal Bulldozer," makes much of this fact. But he fails to note that in Boston, for instance, 14,000 jobs in the downtown area disappeared between 1950 and 1960, before renewal, and $78 million of taxable assessments vanished.

Downtown renewal may seem a far cry from slum clearance. But in fact it can play an important part in creating better job opportunities and improving housing conditions. This has been demonstrated, for example, in Atchison, Kans., a city which had been sliding downhill, both financially and spiritually. As rail traffic dwindled, there seemed little reason (and less hope) for the city's survival. In 1960, almost as a last-ditch effort, downtown Atchison was scooped out and replaced with new buildings and a tree-lined shopping mall. The effect was dramatic. The new downtown inspired the people of Atchison to refurbish their own homes without any formal program. Many did the job themselves, obtaining free technical advice from the local urban renewal agency and local architects. Meanwhile, sales tax revenues in the downtown area have risen 30 percent—as have, obviously, sales—and a number of new jobs have opened up. The city is undergoing something like a renascence, from the center outward. This same pattern will doubtless be repeated elsewhere.

WAITING FOR UTOPIA

Downtown renewal projects, of course, generally do not involve moving people out of their homes. But any direct attempt to eradicate the slums, whether through urban renewal or any other means, runs head on into the stark fact that we are desperately short of decent low-rental housing throughout the Nation. In 1960, the National Housing Conference, the AFL-CIO, and the National Association of Home Builders estimated that to reduce overcrowding, replace substandard housing, and accommodate the exploding population, at least 2 million new housing units should be built by 1965. But in the past 15 years we have actually constructed just over 1 million annually, both privately and publicly. In short, something like a half million to 700,000 much-needed housing units are not going up each year. In New York, that city planner's nightmare, there is even a shortage of substandard housing.

Nor will public housing presently scheduled fill the gap. Although the figure may soon be increased, only 37,500 new units annually are now authorized. One melancholy effect of the antirenewal clamor has been to mute public—and congressional—enthusiasm for the vast public housing program we still need. To argue, as do some of the more fanatic antirenewal brigade, that private enterprise can do the job alone if left to its own resources is to ignore the plain historical evidence that our present urban mess is the result of that same private enterprise, untrammeled and unplanned.

A new approach to the low-cost housing problem has been made possible by amendment of section 221(d)(3) of the National Housing Act. Usually sponsored by colleges, churches, or unions, on a nonprofit or limited dividend basis, these developments are given extremely low-cost financing and can obtain mortgages of up to 100 percent. The National Association of Home Builders has endorsed the 221(d)(3) program—and little wonder, since it enables the private builder to put up low-rental housing with a virtually guaranteed profit. These developments, which are called 221(d)(3)'s, are manna to mayors and urban renewal directors seeking homes for displaced people.[3]

In North Little Rock, where I myself am involved in renewal, we hope that 300 of these apartments can be built. To qualify we must first establish that the apartments are needed and that prospective tenants can afford the rents. In the fall of 1964, out of 391 families queried in a sample survey, 361 were seriously interested in the new housing. But 170 of them, including 14 elderly couples, were not financially eligible because the FHA's rather middle-class standards hold that no more than 25 percent of a family's income should go for housing costs. These people are not considered good rental risks, although most of them are already paying more than the 221(d)(3) rentals. Thus we have the sad situation in which nearly half the group are demonstrably too poor to afford the best buy yet produced by the partnership of Government and private enterprise. In North Little Rock as elsewhere, the only answer for them is a vastly increased program of public housing.

"What the devil are we supposed to do in the meantime?" one urban-renewal director recently asked me. "Of course I'd like to have more first-rate housing to move our people into; it would make both their problems and my own job easier. I'd also like to provide the battery of social services so many of them need. But until we do have these things, we have to scratch and scramble to do what we can. The alternative is simple: do nothing."

MOMENT FOR MIRACLES

Within the next decade in Boston, which has embarked on a particularly bold renewal program, half the city's 2 million inhabitants may be affected. For them—and millions of other people who will be uprooted elsewhere as we rebuild our cities—some hardships are inevitable. This has also been true, however, for the far greater numbers who have been displaced by highway construction and other public works. On the other hand, uprooting need not inevitably be a disruptive experience. Indeed, when relocation experts have helped a family establish a new home, and have brought them into contact with the community's social agencies—this may be precisely the moment when miracles of human rehabilitation can be accomplished.

A promising effort to achieve such miracles is now underway in New York City's sprawling West Side project. When completed, this project will include high-, medium-, and low-income housing and will be racially as well as economically integrated. The aim is no less than the social as well as the physical rebirth of the community. To this end, as few people as possible will be forced to leave the neighborhood during construction. As relocation becomes necessary, it will proceed in three stages. First to be moved will be stable households able to relocate readily. The second group will include low- or middle-income families who want to remain in the neighborhood but face some sort of obstacle. Finally, plans will be made for households with severe or complex difficulties.

Almost every urban renewal project has its share of the last category. Here in North Little Rock, for example, I not long ago called on Samuel McG., an illiterate Negro with a wife and 10 childern. For all practical purposes, the McG.'s—like all too many other Americans—are a one-family underdeveloped nation. Sam McG. is at once a victim of automation, racial discrimination, and a gnawing inner rage which is able to express itself only in the self-defeating habit of producing more and more children. Somehow, over the years, he accumulated enough money to buy a small lot and a two-room shanty without plumbing in a Negro slum which is the site of the city's first major urban-renewal project. On my first visit, I was astonished by the children's good behavior. Ten kids were crowded into two dank rooms, yet there was no fighting, teasing, quarreling, or complaining. A Negro colleague of mine who knows the McG.'s well explained that this was not unusual—when the rest of the world seems to be lined up against it, a family learns to stick together and not make trouble for one another.

---

[2] Philadelphia's remarkable housing- and neighborhood-renewal program was described by Nathaniel Burt in "Race and Renaissance in Philadelphia" (Harper's, September 1964).

[3] These developments are also among the best rental bargains in the Nation—centrally heated, capacious, equipped with modern kitchens, sometimes even with central air conditioning. A one-bedroom unit usually rents in the $55 to $75 range, with all utilities paid. So far, 18,000 such apartments in 120 projects have been built, another 10,300 in an additional 78 projects are committed, and applications for 40,000 more are anticipated in 1965.

In the McG.'s case, urban renewal is asked to undo what long years of ignorance and indifference have done. It cannot. But it can make a start. We found them a roomy if inelegant house, structurally safe, on a spacious lot adjoining woodlands. The McG.'s bought it with the money received for the old place and they have a few dollars left over. The McG.'s oldest child Jenny is very taken with the new house. She is 14, very bright, and now learning secretarial skills in high school. Here, in the person of Jenny, is a starting point.

In a sense, urban renewal itself can be said to be at a starting point. Thousands of new homes and apartments have been built and the face of a number of American cities has been changed. And 1,500 projects are either completed or underway in nearly 750 cities across the Nation. These efforts have shown, above all, how much remains to be done. Originating as a simple real estate venture with a simple humanitarian thrust—to tear down slums because they are unfit for human beings—urban renewal has brought into public view multitudes of people who, through years of economic deprivation and psychological hopelessness, are in themselves walking slums.

It has found an entrenched pattern of city ghettos and cold indifference, if not outright hostility, to the idea of integrated housing. It may well be, indeed, that much of the animus directed against urban renewal is an angry reaction to the sordid realities of American society which the program has exposed. For it is now evident that curing these social ills is essential to the rebuilding of our cities. Thus, for example, we need better and more comprehensive welfare services to ease the task of relocation; genuine civil rights would, among other things, open up more housing to minority groups; and a serious frontal attack on poverty is the essential social counterpart of physical renewal.

It would seem only commonsense that those who approve these social goals should also endorse urban renewal. But, instead, too many avowed liberals have supplied carping criticism, mercurial enthusiasm, and inconstant political support. Much of this criticism has been accurate and useful. While Jane Jacobs' ideas on city planning seem to me altogether wrongheaded her writing has certainly spurred the efforts of renewers to minimize the difficulties of relocation. But the critics of the left have so far produced no plan of action. This is unfortunate, since the renewal programs need the support of liberal-minded Americans.

As it is, the renewers are blasted from the right and sniped at from the left. And since they are enormously sensitive to pressure and, for the most part, no braver than most, they have tended to grow cautious, to sell urban renewal not because it is morally imperative but because it is good, sound business.

It probably is good, sound business. But more importantly, renewal is necessary business. It can be slowed down but not stopped—not, that is, unless we intend to sit back and watch the weeds of congestion and decay quietly grow over our cities. With the support of those who genuinely want to save our cities and the people who live in them, urban renewal may one day help achieve the cities of order, spaciousness, and beauty envisioned by such sophisticated urbanists as Lewis Mumford. One day, who knows, urban renewal, so long made to seem a dragon in the public mind, may even come to be looked upon as a St. George.

THE FATE OF THE FAMILY FARMER

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I commend the Washington Post for its lead editorial of today, under the caption "Moving Misery Around." It should be stimulating to newspapers in the rural areas to find a great newspaper in a great city take the lead in fighting for the survival of the family farm as an independent economic unit, rather than follow the Budget Director's plan of making family farmers unemployed dole-drawers on the sidewalks of the urban centers.

Agriculture faces its greatest crisis since World War II. The two successive yearly reductions in the per pound price support for cotton have been disastrous to the cotton farmers. The plan of the Council of Economic Development to drive 2½ million farm families, numbering about 12½ million people, off the farms of America, and into the ranks of the unemployed, has apparently been adopted by the Director of the Budget.

The President's war on poverty, an effort to build the Great Society, will be thwarted if we create more poverty in the rural areas than we alleviate in the cities. To win the war on poverty, we must roll back the dark areas of poverty that exist, while maintaining the economic strength of the areas not yet poverty stricken.

We engage in a retrogressive movement if we permit the recommendations of the private Committee on Economic Development and the Bureau of the Budget to succeed in driving off the land the 2½ million farm families who have relatively low money incomes, but who spend their lives away from urban blight, raise food on their farms, live in the open air, and have good lives. Traditionally, the young men needed to feed an industrial machine and to fill the ranks of the Armed Forces come from the rural areas; and if we end that way of life, we shall change for the worse the whole economic machine. The presence on the streets of the cities of millions of unemployed ex-farmers would glut the labor market and would depress the wages of labor.

Now is the time to reorient and realine our farm programs, so as to protect, promote, and encourage the family-type pattern of agriculture. These programs have been inadequate for those in rural areas who need income protection the most. This is a manmade problem; and this situation can be corrected, and must be corrected.

The American family farmer has done a good job in producing an abundance of food and fiber. In 1964, the wage earner spent only 18 cents of each dollar, to feed himself and his family. In no other country in the world is the consumer fed so well, at such a low cost. We should reward the family farmer for the good job he has done and is doing.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the Washington Post editorial entitled "Moving Misery Around."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Jan. 27, 1965]

MOVING MISERY AROUND

Secretary of Agriculture Freeman, in his address to the American Institute of Planners which met here Monday, made some points that ought to figure in any planning of agricultural policy. It is to be hoped that his ideas will be reflected in the agricultural message soon to go to Congress.

The Secretary told the planners that half the poverty of the country is concentrated in rural areas where 30 percent of the people live—a proportion of poverty twice as high as is found in cities and suburbs; that there are more substandard, dilapidated and deteriorating homes in rural American than in all the cities of the Nation put together.

And yet the Federal budget message proposes a half billion dollar reduction in agricultural appropriations, most of it in price support funds. The budget message, moreover, declares that "in view of the market outlook for farm commodities at home and abroad, farming alone cannot be expected to provide a decent living in the future for more than 1 million farm families, even with continued Government assistance." The message asserts that "many low income farm families will have to find other means of earning a living, or other sources of income to supplement their modest farm earnings, if they are to share in our national prosperity."

This is an unexceptionable statement, so far as it implies increasing farm incomes where the farmers are, but it does not hold out much hope to low-income farm families if they have no future in rural communities. Most of them are not equipped by training or provided with resources necessary to make a socially acceptable readjustment to urban life. We now have some 3½ million farm families of which 1 million are large commercial operators with gross income of $10,000 a year or more; 1½ million low-income commercial farmers and 1 million part-time farmers. It is the 1½ million farmers who earn less than $10,000 whose fate seems to be mostly involved. Of this group, some 821,000 have incomes less than $5,000 and the rest average between $5,000 and $10,000. Given the fact that many of these farmers lack any preparation for urban employment, migration may not be the best solution either for them or for society as a whole. Little is to be gained by moving them out of agriculture, which at least provides a subsistence, and onto urban welfare rolls.

Farm population declined 4 percent a year in the sixties. In the 25-year period after 1929 more than 18 million farm people moved out of agriculture. This is a staggering rate of depletion. As Secretary Freeman told the planners, "rural poverty has been moved en masse to the cities to become urban poverty—and the inherent evils of poverty have been compounded by congestion and the family disorganization that takes place when people are uprooted."

The Secretary declared himself in favor of an orderly migration of the well prepared and opposed to a disorderly, forced migration of the ill prepared. He rightly said there has been too much of the latter. And he rightly supported, as an alternative, "the creation of economic opportunity in rural America that will enable people who want to stay in their home communities to make a decent living there."

Secretary Freeman is calling for a "rural renaissance" and that is exactly what is going to be required. That renaissance might give the 2½ million farmers outside the highest income commercial group a decent standard of living in the rural areas where they now live. If the means are provided in rural areas to produce educated, capable and self-dependent people, they will move into urban industry as rapidly as positions are available to them. No enlightened government could contemplate a policy of inducing the disadvantaged and ill-prepared, by the naked coercion of want and poverty, to move into great urban centers which cannot provide the jobs for employable people already there and which cannot cope with the social problems of the unemployables already on their welfare rolls.

Nothing is to be gained by just moving human misery around from one sink of degradation to another. And that is what we are going to be doing if we simply cut agricultural appropriations in the expectation that the market system will cut the farm population down to the number that can find profitable employment in high-income commercial agriculture.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 11 a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 29 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Thursday, January 28, 1965, at 11 o'clock a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 27, 1965:

IN THE NAVY

Vice Adm. William A. Schoech, U.S. Navy, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral, when retired, pursuant to the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5233.

Having designated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, Rear Adm. Ignatius J. Galantin, U.S. Navy, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, I nominate him for appointment to the grade of vice admiral while so serving.

Rear Adm. Robert B. Brown, Medical Corps, U.S. Navy, for appointment as Chief of the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery in the Department of the Navy for a term of 4 years.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officer under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in grade as follows:

Lt. Gen. Robert William Porter, Jr., O18048, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army), in the grade of general.

1. I nominate Lt. Gen. Thomas Weldon Dunn, O18517, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army), for appointment as Senior U.S. Army Member of the Military Staff Committee of the United Nations, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 711.

2. I nominate the following-named officer under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in grade as follows:

Maj. Gen. Edgar Collins Doleman, O19131, U.S. Army, in the grade of lieutenant general.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 27, 1965:

COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS

Arthur M. Okun, of Connecticut, to be a member of the Council of Economic Advisers.

NATIONAL COMMISSION ON TECHNOLOGY, AUTOMATION, AND ECONOMIC PROGRESS

Benjamin Aaron, of California, to be a member of the National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress.

Joseph A. Beirne, of Maryland, to be a member of the National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress.

Daniel Bell, of New York, to be a member of the National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress.

Howard R. Bowen, of Iowa, to be a member of the National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress.

Patrick E. Haggerty, of Texas, to be a member of the National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress.

Albert J. Hayes, of Maryland, to be a member of the National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress.

Anna Rosenberg Hoffman, of New York, to be a member of the National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress.

Edwin H. Land, of Massachusetts, to be a member of the National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress.

Walter P. Reuther, of Michigan, to be a member of the National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress.

Robert H. Ryan, of Pennsylvania, to be a member of the National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress.

John I. Snyder, Jr., of New York, to be a member of the National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress.

Robert M. Solow, of Massachusetts, to be a member of the National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress.

Philip Sporn, of New York, to be a member of the National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress.

Whitney M. Young, Jr., of New York, to be a member of the National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 27, 1965

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., used these words from the Book of Daniel: *He knelt in prayer three times a day and gave thanks and made supplication unto God as was his custom.*

Let us pray:

Almighty God, as the Speaker and the Members of the House of Representatives again assemble to conduct the legislative business of the Congress, may they be governed and guided by Thy divine spirit in all their deliberations and decisions.

May they daily make a sincere trial of the privilege of prayer, for experience teaches us that if we give ourselves to fervent prayer in the ordinary days of our life, then we will know how to pray with conquering power when days of emergency and crisis suddenly come upon us.

Grant that when our minds and hearts are disturbed and disquieted by the multitude and the magnitude of the tasks and trials which confront us, we may then have the grace to carry on unafraid and hold on with increasing tenacity of faith for Thou art our refuge and strength.

In Christ's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

SUNDRY MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the President of the Senate, pursuant to section 1, Public Law 86–420, had appointed Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. GORE, Mr. MONTOYA, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. KUCHEL, and Mr. BENNETT to be members; and Mr. SIMPSON and Mr. FANNIN as alternate members; of the U.S. group of the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group for the meeting to be held in Mexico on February 11–18, 1965.

REFUSAL OF PERSONS TO TESTIFY BEFORE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, on December 30, 1964, the Federal grand jury of the District of Columbia indicted three persons for contempt of Congress. These three individuals, after being subpenaed to testify before the Committee on Un-American Activities in executive session on December 7, refused to do so. The House then not being in session, the committee reported their refusal to the

Speaker, who as provided by statute, referred the matter to the U.S. attorney for the District of Columbia.

Because this matter is of interest to the House, I request unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter; namely, the reports, statements of fact, and appendixes made by the Committee on Un-American Activities to the Speaker of the House concerning the refusal of the persons in question to testify.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

REPORT AND STATEMENT OF FACT OF THE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, PURSUANT TO TITLE 2, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTIONS 192 AND 194, CONCERNING THE FAILURE OF DAGMAR WILSON

To the SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

The Committee on Un-American Activities, as created and authorized by the House of Representatives through the enactment of Public Law 601 of the 79th Congress, section 121, subsection (q)(2), and under House Resolution 5 of the 88th Congress, duly caused to be issued a subpena to Dagmar Wilson. The said subpena directed Dagmar Wilson to be and appear before the said Committee on Un-American Activities, of which the Honorable Edwin E. Willis is Chairman, or a duly appointed subcommittee thereof, on Monday, December 7, 1964, at the hour of 10 a.m., at their committee room, 226 Old House Office Building, Washington, D.C., then and there to testify touching matters of inquiry committed to said committee, and not to depart without leave of said committee. The subpena served upon Dagmar Wilson is set forth in words and figures as follows:

"UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
"CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES.

"TO DAGMAR WILSON, GREETING:

"Pursuant to lawful authority, you are hereby commanded to be and appear before the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives of the United States, or a duly appointed subcommittee thereof, on Monday, December 7, 1964, at 10 o'clock, a.m., at their committee room, 226 Old House Office Building, Washington, D.C., then and there to testify touching matters of inquiry committed to said committee, and not to depart without leave of said committee.

"Hereof fail not, as you will answer your default under the pains and penalties in such cases made and provided.

"To William Margetich, to serve and return.

"Given under my hand this 18th day of November, in the year of our Lord, 1964.

"JOE R. POOL,
"Chairman—Chairman of Subcommittee—Member Designate of the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives.

"If you desire a conference with a representative of the committee prior to the date of the hearing, please call or write to staff director, Committee on Un-American Activities, Washington, D.C., telephone Capitol 4-3121, extension 3051."

The said subpena was duly served as appears by the return thereof by the said William Margetich, also known as William A. Margetich, who was duly authorized to serve the said subpena. The return of the service by the said William A. Margetich being endorsed thereon, is set forth in words and figures as follows:

"I made service of the within subpena by personal service the within-named individual at her home: 1406 29th Street NW., Washington, D.C., at 12:45 p.m., on the 19th day of November 1964. Dated November 19, 1964.

"WILLIAM A. MARGETICH,
"Investigator."

A subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities, composed of Representatives Joe R. Pool, as chairman, Richard Ichord and August E. Johansen, met and convened in executive session at or about 10 a.m., on December 7, 1964, in room 219, Cannon House Office Building, Washington, D.C., the said subcommittee members all being present. Dagmar Wilson having been duly summoned as a witness as aforesaid, was called as a witness on that day. The said Dagmar Wilson appeared before the subcommittee and was administered an oath as a witness by the subcommittee chairman, Representative JOE R. POOL. When asked to state her name and residence for the record, and whether she was represented by counsel, she responded to those questions, but thereupon and thereafter willfully refused to testify or answer in response to any question pertinent to the question or subject under inquiry, and willfully refused to give any testimony touching matters of inquiry committed to said committee as required by the said subpena.

The record of the proceedings before the said subcommittee on Monday, December 7, 1964, so far as it affects the witness, Dagmar Wilson, is set forth in appendix I, which is attached hereto and made a part hereof.

Other pertinent committee proceedings are set forth in appendix II, attached hereto and made a part hereof.

The foregoing willful refusal by the said Dagmar Wilson to give such testimony as required, in compliance with the said subpena, deprived the committee of necessary and pertinent testimony regarding matters which the said committee was instructed by law and House resolution to investigate, and places the said witness, Dagmar Wilson, in contempt of the House of Representatives of the United States.

Pursuant to resolution of the Committee on Un-American Activities adopted at a meeting duly held on December 10, 1964, a copy of which is set forth in appendix II, this report and statement of fact constituting the failure of Dagmar Wilson is herewith transmitted to and filed with the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Speaker of the House of Representatives, the House of Representatives having adjourned sine die on October 3, 1964, and not being now in session, so that the Speaker may certify the same under the seal of the House to the U.S. attorney for the District of Columbia, pursuant to title 2, United States Code, sections 192 and 194, to the end that the said Dagmar Wilson may be proceeded against for contempt of the House of Representatives in the manner and form provided by law.

Respectfully submitted this 10th day of December 1964.

E. E. WILLIS,
Chairman, Committee on Un-American Activities.

APPENDIX I

EXECUTIVE SESSION, ENTRY OF ALIEN: INTO THE UNITED STATES, MONDAY, DECEMBER 7, 1964

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,
Washington, D.C.

A subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities met, pursuant to call, at 10 a.m., in room 219, Cannon Building, Washington, D.C., Hon. JOE POOL (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Joe Pool, of Texas; Richard H. Ichord, of Missouri; and August E. Johansen, of Michigan.

Staff members present: Francis J. McNamara, director; Alfred M. Nittle, counsel; and Donald T. Appell, investigator.

Mr. POOL. The committee will come to order.

Before we get started I have an opening statement I want to read and I would like to know if Donna Allen, Dagmar Wilson, and Russell Nixon are in the room? Will you identify yourselves.

Mrs. WILSON. My name is Dagmar Wilson.

Mrs. ALLEN. Donna Allen.

Mr. NIXON. Nixon.

Mr. POOL. The Internal Security Act of 1950, a bill reported by this committee, contained provisions which barred aliens of certain types from admission to the United States either as immigrants or as nonimmigrant visitors.

The Congress subsequently incorporated these provisions in Public Law 414 of the 82d Congress, generally known as the McCarran-Walter Act or the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952.

Section 212, subsection (a), paragraphs (27) and (29) of that act classify certain types of aliens as inadmissible to this country and not subject to admission under provisions found elsewhere in the act; namely, paragraph (28) of the same subsection and paragraph (3) of subsection (d).

Section 212, subsection (a), paragraph (28) of the act also classifies certain types of aliens as inadmissible. However, it contains a subparagraph (I) which grants to the Attorney General, on recommendation of the consular officer, the authority to issue them entry visas under certain conditions. This subparagraph provides, however, that their admission must always be "in the public interest." In addition, it applies only to aliens inadmissible under paragraph (28).

Section 212(d) (3) grants the Attorney General, on recommendation of the consular officer or the Secretary of State, discretionary power to waive the inadmissibility of certain aliens described in section 212(a) except for those barred under paragraphs (27) and (29) of that section. Such waiver, however, applies only to temporary or nonimmigrant visas.

Information which has been brought to the attention of the Committee on Un-American Activities indicates that the discretionary authority of the consular officer or the Secretary of State to recommend, and of the Attorney General to approve, the issuance of nonimmigrant visas are possibly abused.

Preliminary investigation by the committee, authorized by the chairmen several months ago, raises serious questions as to whether the intent of Congress is being followed in the admission to this country of aliens under the above-mentioned sections of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952.

The investigation has also raised the question of whether the available background information on certain aliens temporarily admitted to this country is being properly evaluated. This may be resulting in certain aliens being classified as ineligible under paragraph (28)—and therefore eligible for a waiver—when they properly come under paragraphs (27) or (29) and are therefore ineligible for admission under waiver.

This hearing was authorized by the committee at a meeting held on February 19, 1964. The minutes of that meeting read, in part, as follows:

"A motion was made by Hon. WILLIAM M. TUCK, seconded by Hon. Henry C. Schadeberg, and unanimously carried, authorizing the holding of hearings in Washington, D.C., or at such other place or places as the chairman may designate, on such date or dates as the chairman may determine, including the conduct of investigations deemed reasonably necessary by the staff in preparation therefore, related to the following:

"1. Strategy, tactics, and activities of members of the Communist Party and Communist organizations in aiding the entry into the United States of aliens inadmissible under the provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act;

"2. Security aspects of the temporary admission to the United States of aliens who are inadmissible under provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act, for the legislative purpose of determining whether the exigencies of the situation require a strengthening of the security provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act;

"3. The execution by the administrative agencies concerned of the security provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act, and all other laws, the subject matter of which is within the jurisdiction of the committee, the legislative purpose being to exercise continuous watchfulness of the execution of these laws to assist the Congress in appraising the administration of such laws, and in developing such amendments or related legislation as it may deem necessary; and

"4. Any other matter within the jurisdiction of the committee which it or any subcommittee thereof appointed to conduct these hearings may designate."

The order appointing the subcommittee to conduct these hearings is as follows:

"To: Mr. Francis J. McNamara, Director, Committee on Un-American Activities:

"Pursuant to the provisions of the law and the rules of this committee, I hereby appoint a subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities, consisting of Hon. Richard Ichord and Hon. Henry C. Schadeberg as associate members, and Hon. Joe R. Pool, as chairman, to conduct a hearing in Washington, D.C., on Thursday, March 12, 1964, at 3 p.m., as contemplated by the resolution adopted by the committee on the 19th day of February 1964, relating to the entry of aliens into the United States and other matters under investigation by the committee, and take such testimony on said day or succeeding days as it may deem necessary.

"Please make this action a matter of committee record.

"If any member indicates his inability to serve, please notify me.

"Given under my hand this 11th day of March 1964.

"Edwin E. Willis,
"Chairman, Committee on Un-American Activities."

I also have a memorandum to Mr. Francis J. McNamara, director, Committee on Un-American Activities.

"On March 11, 1964, I appointed Hon. Joe R. Pool, Hon. Richard Ichord, and Hon. Henry C. Schadeberg to serve as a subcommittee on Un-American Activities to conduct hearings as contemplated by the resolution adopted by the committee on the 19th day of February 1964, relating to the entry of aliens into the United States and other matters under investigation by the committee. Mr. Schadeberg has indicated that he may be unable to serve on said subcommittee at its contemplated December 7, 1964, hearing, and possibly on other days, before and after that date, during the remainder of the year when meetings and hearings of the subcommittee may be held.

"I hereby designate Hon. August E. Johansen to serve on the said subcommittee in the place of Hon. Henry C. Schadeberg for the remainder of the year at any meetings and hearings of the subcommittee which Mr. Schadeberg is unable to attend.

"Given under my hand this 25th day of November 1964.

"Edwin E. Willis,
"Chairman, Committee on Un-American Activities."

Mr. Speiser, the subcommittee has met and considered your letter which is dated December 1, 1964, and has denied your request for a public hearing due to the fact that rule XXVI is involved, which this committee has been very zealous in following due to the fact that derogatory information might be revealed during these hearings, so your request has been denied.

Do you have any other reason or any other request to make of the committee at this time?

Mr. Speiser. Yes, sir. Has the committee made a determination under rule IV of the committee's rules that a public hearing might endanger national security?

Mr. Pool. I did not get your statement.

Mr. Speiser. Has the committee made a determination under rule IV of the committee's rules of procedure that a public hearing might endanger national security?

Mr. Pool. You are asking me something here that might have taken place in executive session and I am not at liberty to answer your question unless the committee decides to make it public. That would be my answer to that.

Mr. Speiser. I would like to make a motion then that the committee cannot properly hold an executive session unless they make such a determination and if such a determination has not been made that a public hearing should be ordered.

Mr. Ichord. Mr. Chairman, may I ask is that the only request that he has prior to the committee taking up its business?

Do you have any further objections to the executive hearing?

Mr. Speiser. The objections I stated in my letter and this is an additional one. Those are the two objections I have to an executive session.

Mr. Ichord. I think we should take that under consideration, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Pool. If you have no further statement or objections to make, than we will ask you all to step outside and we will make a determination of what the committee wants to do. Those are all the objections you have to raise before the testimony begins?

Mr. Speiser. That is on the question of executive session as compared to a public session. There may be other objections with regard to particular witnesses' testimony.

Mr. Pool. What other objections do you have at this time?

Mr. Speiser. I do not know at this time, Mr. Chairman. I cannot say until the matter comes up before the committee. I can't make a statement there.

Mr. Pool. That is a good point. Who do you represent here now?

Mr. Speiser. I represent Mrs. Allen and Mrs. Wilson.

Mr. Pool. All right. Mr. Nixon, do you have counsel?

Mr. Nixon. No, sir.

Mr. Pool. Would you like to state any objections at the present time before this hearing begins?

Mr. Nixon. I certainly associate myself with the objections stated by Mr. Speiser. I am not a lawyer. I would add the point that it would be unfortunate to require this kind of testimony, with the opprobrium of this kind of subpena, in private without having a full public and press view of the proceedings. The hearing is in only one sense private, since the committee maintains to itself the privilege at a date of its own choosing, the privilege of releasing to the press either a summary, or a partial transcript, or a full transcript of the hearings, so it is in this sense also that I would add an objection to these proceedings going ahead in executive.

I think that the press and the public have a right to hear the proceedings.

Mr. Pool. That is all of the objections you have, plus the ones that you associated yourself with in Mr. Speiser's case?

Mr. Nixon. Yes, sir, I think so.

Mr. Ichord. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee go into executive session for consideration of the request.

Mr. Pool. All right. The witnesses and the attorney will be excused and we will call you back in when we get through with this deliberation. Make yourselves available outside in the hall if you will.

(At this point the witnesses and attorney left the hearing room and the subcommittee proceeded further in executive session, which proceedings were not reported, following which the witnesses and attorney returned to the hearing room.)

Mr. Pool. The committee will come to order.

Mr. Speiser, the subcommittee feels that you have misinterpreted rule IV. It requires that if the committee or a subcommittee believes interrogation of a witness in public might endanger national security it must then hear such witness in executive session.

It does not say that reasons of national security are the only ones that permit or justify executive session hearings. For your information we have considered all the applicable rules as the full committee did months ago and have determined this hearing will be held in executive session.

Mr. Nixon's request has also been considered in the light of all applicable rules and has been rejected.

Mr. Speiser. Mr. Pool, am I to understand that a determination has been made that a public hearing would not endanger national security?

Mr. Pool. I have just read to you the statement here that was the determination of the subcommittee and it speaks for itself.

Mr. Speiser. I will leave my question on the record as it is. I do not feel it was answered. I would like to raise a question as to the absence of a quorum at this time, Mr. Chairman.

(At this point Representative Bruce entered the hearing room.)

I withdraw it.

(At this point Representative Johansen entered the hearing room.)

Mr. Pool. I didn't get the last.

Mr. Speiser. I raised the question of the absence of a quorum because Mr. Bruce and Mr. Johansen were not present. I withdraw it.

Mr. Pool. For the record there was a quorum here. It is a subcommittee of three members and Mr. Ichord and myself constitute a quorum.

Mr. Nixon, if you will come forth and be sworn in the other witnesses may be excused temporarily until they are called.

Mr. Nixon. Mr. Pool, I am not going to testify in this executive session. I am willing to testify in public session with the press and the public present, but for the reasons which I have stated here I am unwilling to proceed in this executive session.

Mr. Pool. I will direct you to come forward and be sworn.

Mr. Nixon. I think my statement speaks for itself, Mr. Pool.

Mr. Pool. For the last time I direct you to come forth and be sworn.

Mr. Nixon. I decline, as I have told you.

Mr. Pool. Let the record show that the chairman requested Mr. Nixon to come forth and be sworn and that he has refused to do so.

Mr. Johansen. Mr. Chairman, let the record also show that all three members of the subcommittee were present.

Mr. Pool. Let the record so show. The other witnesses and the attorney will leave the room at the present time temporarily. Mr. Nixon, you remain.

(At this point Mrs. Wilson, Mrs. Allen, and Mr. Speiser left the room.)

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the other witnesses be called.

Mr. POOL. All right. Mr. Nixon, you will leave the room and the staff will call the other witness.

(At this point Mr. Nixon left the room.)

(All the witnesses and Mr. Speiser came back into the hearing room.)

Mr. POOL. I brought you witnesses and attorney in here to excuse you until 2 o'clock when we will meet back in this room.

Donna Allen, Dagmar Wilson, and Russell Nixon, let the record show, are excused until 2 o'clock.

Mr. SPEISER. Mr. Chairman, can you tell us at this time whether the hearing will be public at 2 o'clock?

Mr. POOL. You are excused until 2 o'clock. That's all I have to say to you at the present time.

(Whereupon, at 11:30 a.m., the hearing was recessed to reconvene at 2 p.m., the same day.)

[After recess]

(The subcommittee reconvened at 2:50 p.m., Mr. POOL, chairman of the subcommittee, presiding. Committee members present: Representatives Pool, Ichord, Johansen, and Bruce.)

Mr. POOL. The committee will come to order.

(At this point Mr. Johansen withdrew from the hearing room.)

Mr. SPEISER. May I have a moment, please, to talk to my client?

Mr. POOL. Surely.

Mr. SPEISER. Thank you.

Mr. POOL. Will you stand and be sworn?

Mrs. WILSON. I will.

Mr. POOL. Do you solemnly swear that the testimony you are about to give is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mrs. WILSON. I do.

Mr. POOL. Mr. Counsel.

TESTIMONY OF MRS. DAGMAR WILSON, 1406 29TH STREET NW., WASHINGTON, D.C., ACCOMPANIED BY LAWRENCE SPEISER, ATTORNEY AT LAW, WASHINGTON DIRECTOR OF AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION, 1101 VERMONT AVENUE NW., WASHINGTON, D.C.

Mr. NITTLE. Mrs. Wilson, would you please state your name and residence for the record?

Mrs. WILSON. My name is Dagmar Wilson. My address is 1406 29th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Mr. POOL. Ask her if she is represented by counsel.

Mr. NITTLE. Are you represented by counsel?

Mrs. WILSON. I am.

Mr. NITTLE. Will counsel identify himself for the record, stating his name and office address, please.

Mr. SPEISER. Lawrence Speiser, American Civil Liberties Union, 1101 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

Mr. POOL. You are appearing here and representing Mrs. Wilson?

Mr. SPEISER. I am.

Mr NITTLE. Mrs. Wilson, you appeared before the committee in December of 1962, at which time we obtained certain pertinent information relating to your educational background, and your age, and date and place of birth, and we will not pursue that at this time.

Mrs. WILSON. Thank you.

Mr. NITTLE. Mrs Wilson, this committee has received testimony to the effect that on Friday, November 8, 1963, you accompanied Mr. Russell Nixon on a visit to the Department of State on behalf of Dr. Kaouri Yasui. Did you accompany Mr. Nixon as I have stated?

Mrs. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, we have formally requested that these hearings be held in public. I do not wish to answer any of the questions pertinent to this case in a private session.

Mr. POOL. Mr Ichord, would you state the reasons again?

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman, her counsel has heard, since he represented the previous witness, the reasons why the committee has refused the request for a public session, but for Mrs. Wilson's benefit, I will summarize those reasons again.

It is the position of the committee that the witnesses and your counsel have definitely misconstrued rule No. IV. Rule No. IV of the House Committee on Un-American Activities rules requires an executive hearing, if a public hearing might endanger the national security.

Rule 26(m) of the House rules requires the hearing of a congressional committee to be in executive session if the committee determines that evidence or testimony at any investigative hearing may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any other person, but I pointed out to your counsel, and I point out to you, that both of these rules do not restrict the right of a committee of Congress to hold executive sessions.

I might say to you that there are some aspects of national security involved in this hearing, but it is not necessary to determine whether or not the national security would be endangered if you were heard in public session, and we have not determined that, and still deny your request for a public session.

We are here investigating the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, and in particular the admission of inadmissible aliens to the United States under the waiver provisions of section 212 of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

I would say to you that there are many reasons why this hearing should be executive. They were discussed by me in full before the committee in executive session.

The committee has determined that rule 26(m) is applicable, but the committee has also determined that even if 26(m) is not applicable, the request should still be denied for reasons in the national interest.

We consider that at issue here is the very right of a committee of Congress to function effectively, and, as I stated in the excutive session, we cannot permit a witness to determine when this committee's hearings shall be in executive session or in public session. That decision must be reserved for the committee itself, if it is to function in the public interest.

This case is clearly governed by rule 26(g) of the House, which reads as follows, and I will read it to you, and I might say that I requested the Assistant House Parliamentarian, Bill Cockrane, for his opinion as to the action of the committee in ordering an executive session and refusing a public session, rule 26(g) reads as follows:

"All hearings conducted by standing committee or their subcommittees shall be open to the public, except executive sessions for marking up bills or for voting or where the committee by a majority vote orders an executive session."

And at this hearing the committee by unanimous vote has ordered an executive session. The committee has considered your request for a public hearing, has considered all of the applicable rules of the House and of this committee, and has determined that it is in the public interest that your request for a public hearing be denied.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. POOL. Will you state your question again, now?

Mr. NITTLE. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the reporter to read it to the witness?

Mr. POOL. All right.

(The question referred to was read by the reporter.)

Mrs. Wilson, this committee has received testimony to the effect that on Friday, November 8, 1963, you accompanied Mr. Russell Nixon on a visit to the Department of State on behalf of Dr. Kaouri Yasui. Did you accompany Mr. Nixon as I have stated?

Mrs. WILSON. In spite of Mr. ICHORD's explanation, I cannot see that there is anything in this question that can possibly endanger the national security. I can't see that this is anything that cannot be heard by everybody.

I still feel that I should be permitted to be heard in public.

Mr. ICHORD. I think that I should advise you, Mrs. Wilson, as I am sure your counsel has advised you, that you might possibly be subjecting yourself to penalties of contempt for refusing to answer.

Mrs. WILSON. I understand that. I feel that my Constitution is protecting me, yes.

Mr. POOL. With that in mind, Mrs. Wilson, the Chair directs that you answer the question.

Mrs. WILSON. I can only repeat what I have already stated.

Mr. POOL. You refuse to answer the question?

Mrs. WILSON. Yes, under these circumstances.

Mr. POOL. I will ask you one more time. I will direct you to answer the question.

Mrs. WILSON. I would be glad to answer any questions with my friends, and the public, and the press present publicly to hear my answers.

Mr. POOL. You refuse to answer this question?

Mrs. WILSON. Under these conditions, I refuse.

Mr. NITTLE. Mrs. Wilson, do you clearly understand that the committee has made a determination that this hearing must be held in executive session to comply with House rule XI, 26(m)?

(The witness conferred with her counsel.)

Mr. NITTLE. Do you understand that, Mrs. Wilson?

Mr. SPEISER. May I respond to that?

I was not under the impression that there had been a determination on that. As I understand, you were relying on all the rules, including this, and you were not relying on this alone.

I want to make sure that question even possibly encompasses that you are relying on all the rules, and not this one rule alone.

Mr. NITTLE. The committee made clear to you, and I think I made clear to you in the course of your representation of the last witness that the committee has considered all of its rules, and has made certain specific determinations——

Mr. POOL. All the House rules, also.

Mr. NITTLE. Under which it has specifically determined that House rule XI, paragraph 26(m), is specifically applicable, and for the benefit of your client, I think that rule should be read to her, and it provides as follows:

"If the committee determines that evidence or testimony at an investigative hearing may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person it shall receive such evidence or testimony in executive session."

I want to state specifically to Mrs. Wilson that in accordance with the opening statement of the chairman, where the subjects of inquiry and legislative purposes were explained to you, you must understand that the committee is seeking to ascertain the facts relating to the strategy, tactics, and activities of members of the Communist Party and Communist organizations in aiding the entry into the United States of aliens inadmissible under the provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The interrogation which I propose to make in your case, the committee has determined, will evoke evidence or testimony which will involve the activities of persons in organizations designated or known as Communist or subversive, and that will adversely reflect upon such persons, and in a manner within the provisions of House rule XI, 26(m), which I just quoted to you.

The committee has therefore made a specific determination that by reason of the provisions of this rule, and for other reasons which they have explained to you, this hearing and your testimony shall be received in executive session.

Is that clear to you?

Mrs. WILSON. Well, I can't, I must admit, follow all these complicated details. This is very tricky for a layman. But here I am reading from No. XI, rule XI, the words "defame, degrade, or incriminate."

I have no information that could possibly defame, degrade, or incriminate anybody, and I just do not see why, therefore, I should be required to testify in private.

Mr. NITTLE. Mrs. Wilson, that is a judgment that must be made by the committee. We do not know upon what basis you make your judgment, nor are you aware of the entire areas of the interrogation.

We state to you that the fact is that your interrogation will involve persons about whom the testimony may have the tendency to defame, degrade, or incriminate.

(The witness conferred with her counsel.)

Mr. POOL. Mrs. Wilson, I will direct you again to answer the question.

Mrs. WILSON. I will do my best to explain my—I beg your pardon.

Mr. POOL. I said I direct you to answer the question that was previously asked you by counsel and was read back to you by the reporter.

Mrs. WILSON. Do you wish to reread it?

Mr. POOL. The reporter read it to you a while ago. Would you like it to be read again?

Mrs. WILSON. No, I think I can remember, and I know that I did not wish to answer the question under the conditions.

Mr. POOL. You refuse to answer the question?

Mrs. WILSON. Under these circumstances, I do, yes.

Mr. POOL. Any other questions of this witness?

Any other questions?

Mr. BRUCE. No.

Mr. POOL. I direct you to escort the witness outside.

Mr. Appell, advise the witnesses to remain outside until we dismiss them.

(At this point Mr. Johansen reentered the hearing room.)

Mr. POOL. Tell the witnesses they are excused.

(Whereupon, at 4:05 p.m., the subcommittee adjourned, subject to call of the Chair.)

APPENDIX II

1. The following is an extract from the minutes of a meeting of the Committee on Un-American Activities held on February 26, 1963:

"The Committee on Un-American Activities met in executive session on Tuesday, February 26, 1963, at 3 p.m. in room 225 of the Old House Office Building. The following members were present: Clyde Doyle, acting chairman; William M. Tuck, Joe R. Pool, August E. Johansen, Henry C. Schadeberg.

"Also present were the following staff members: Francis J. McNamara, director; Frank S. Tavenner, Jr., general counsel; Juliette P. Joray, recording clerk; and Rosella A. Purdy, secretary.

"The acting chairman opened the meeting at 3:20 p.m. and explained to the members present that the meeting was called to consider several resolutions necessary to the reorganization of the committee for the 88th Congress.

"On motion of Mr. Tuck and seconded by Mr. Johansen, the following resolution was unanimously adopted, with Mr. Doyle voting the proxy of Mr. Walter and Mr. Tuck voting the proxy of Mr. Willis:

" '*Resolved,* That the chairman be authorized and empowered from time to time to appoint subcommittees composed of three or more members of the Committee on Un-American Activities, at least one of whom shall be of the minority political party, and a majority of whom shall constitute a quorum, for the purpose of performing any and all acts which the committee as a whole is authorized to perform.'

"On motion of Mr. Tuck and seconded by Mr. Johansen, the following resolution was unanimously adopted, with Mr. Doyle voting the proxy of Mr. Walter and Mr. Tuck voting the proxy of Mr. Willis:

" '*Resolved,* That authority is hereby delegated to each subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities which hereinafter may be appointed to determine by a majority vote thereof whether the hearings conducted by it shall be open to the public or shall be in executive session, and all testimony taken and all documents introduced in evidence in such an executive session shall be received and given as full consideration for all purposes as though introduced in open session.'

"On motion made by Mr. Johansen, and seconded by Mr. Pool, the following resolution was unanimously adopted, with Mr. Doyle voting the proxy of Mr. Walter, and Mr. Tuck voting the proxy of Mr. Willis:

" '*Resolved,* That the rules of procedure revised by the Committee on Un-American Activities during the 1st session of the 87th Congress and printed under the title of "Rules of Procedure—Committee on Un-American Activities," together with all applicable provisions of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, be, and they are hereby, adopted as the Rules of the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives of the 88th Congress.'

"The committee adjourned at 3:30 p.m.

"E. E. WILLIS,[1]
"Acting Chairman."
"JULIETTE P. JORAY,
"Recording Clerk."

A copy of the aforesaid "Rules of Procedure—Committee on Un-American Activities," as revised in 1961, and as adopted in the foregoing resolution, is attached to this appendix and made a part hereof, marked as "exhibit A."

2. The following is an extract from the minutes of a meeting of the Committee on Un-American Activities held on February 19, 1964:

"COMMITTEE ON
"UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,
"February 19, 1964.

"The Committee on Un-American Activities met in executive session on Wednesday, February 19, 1964, in room 356 of the Cannon House Office Building at 4:20 p.m. The following members were present: Edwin E. Willis, chairman; William Tuck, Joe Pool, Richard Ichord, Henry Schadeberg.

"The following staff members were present: Francis J. McNamara, director; Frank S. Tavenner, Jr., general counsel; and Alfred W. Nittle, counsel.

"A motion was made by Mr. TUCK, seconded by Mr. Schadeberg, and unanimously carried authorizing the holding of hearings in Washington, D.C., or at such other place or places as the chairman may designate, on such date or dates as the chairman may determine, including the conduct of investigations deemed reasonably necessary by the staff in preparation therefor, relating to the following:

"1. Strategy, tactics, and activities of members of the Communist Party and Communist organizations in aiding the entry into the United States of aliens inadmissible under the provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act;

"2. Security aspects of the temporary admission to the United States of aliens who are inadmissible under provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act, for the legislative purpose of determining whether the exigencies of the situation require a strengthening of the security provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act;

"3. The execution by the administrative agencies concerned of the security provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act, and all other laws, the subject matter of which is within the jurisdiction of the committee, the legislative purpose being to exercise continuous watchfulness of the execution of these laws to assist the Congress in appraising the administration of such laws, and in developing such amendments or related legislation as it may deem necessary; and

"4. Any other matter within the jurisdiction of the committee which it or any subcommittee thereof appointed to conduct these hearings may designate.

"The meeting adjourned at 4:40 p.m.

"EDWIN E. WILLIS,
"Chairman.
FRANCIS J. MCNAMARA,
"Director."

3. The following is a copy of the order of the chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities, Representative EDWIN E. WILLIS, appointing a subcommittee to conduct a hearing as contemplated by the foregoing resolution of February 19, 1964.

MARCH 11, 1964.

To: Mr. Francis J. McNamara, Director, Committee on Un-American Activities.

Pursuant to the provisions of the law and the rules of this committee, I hereby appoint a subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities, consisting of Hon. Richard Ichord and Hon. Henry C. Schadeberg as associate members, and Hon. Joe R. Pool, as chairman, to conduct a hearing in Washington, D.C., on Thursday, March 12, 1964, at 3 p.m., as contemplated by the resolution adopted by the committee on the 19th day of February 1964, relating to the entry of aliens into the United States and other matters under investigation by the committee and take such testimony on said day or succeeding days as it may deem necessary.

Please make this action a matter of committee record.

If any member indicates his inability to serve, please notify me.

Given under my hand this 11th day of March, 1964.

E. E. WILLIS,
Chairman, Committee on Un-American Activities.

4. The following is a copy of the order of the chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities, Representative Edwin E. Willis, designating Representative August E. Johansen to serve on the aforesaid subcommittee until such time as Representative Henry C. Schadeberg can resume his service on said subcommittee:

SEPTEMBER 4, 1964.

To: Mr. Francis J. McNamara, Director, Committee on Un-American Activities.

On March 11, 1964, I appointed Hon. Joe R. Pool, Hon. Richard Ichord, and Hon. Henry C. Schadeberg to serve as a subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities to conduct hearings as contemplated by the resolution adopted by the committee on the 19th day of February 1964, relating to the entry of aliens into the United States and other matters under investigation by the committee. Mr. Schadeberg has notified me of his inability to serve on said subcommittee at its hearing scheduled for 10 a.m., Wednesday, September 9, 1964.

---

[1] Mr. WILLIS succeeded Mr. Doyle as acting chairman upon Mr. Doyle's decease.

I hereby designate Hon. August E. Johansen to serve on said subcommittee in the place of Mr. Schadeberg at the hearing scheduled for September 9, 1964, and until such time as Mr. Schadeberg can resume his service on said subcommittee.

E. E. Willis,
Chairman, Committee on Un-American Activities.

5. The following is an extract from the minutes of a meeting of the aforesaid subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities, held on November 18, 1964:

"A subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities met in executive session on Wednesday, November 18, 1964, in room 225 of the Cannon House Office Building, Washington, D.C., at 11 a.m. The following members were present: Mr. Pool, chairman; Mr. Ichord (entered at 11:30 a.m.); Mr. Schadeberg. Mr. Johansen was also present.

"The following members of the committee staff were present: Francis J. McNamara, director; William Hitz, general counsel; Donald Appell, chief investigator; Mrs. Mary Valente, acting recording clerk.

"The director stated to the subcommittee that it was necessary to the committee inquiry relating to the entry of aliens into the United States and other matters to hear testimony from Dagmar Wilson, Donna Allen, and Russell A. Nixon. He explained why the testimony of these three individuals was necessary to the inquiry. On motion of Mr. Ichord, seconded by Mr. Schadeberg, the following resolution was unanimously adopted by the subcommittee:

"'Whereas, the director of the committee explained the reasons why Dagmar Wilson, Donna Allen, and Russell A. Nixon should have knowledge of facts relevant and material to the investigations and hearings authorized by the committee resolution of February 19, 1964, relating to the entry of aliens into the United States, and other matters: Now, therefore, be it

"'*Resolved*, That the subcommittee is of the opinion that the within-named persons should be required to attend the said hearings and investigations as witnesses and to produce such books, papers, and documents, and to give such testimony as the subcommittee deems necessary; that the subcommittee deems such attendance to be necessary in furtherance of the committee's legislative purposes; and that the subcommittee authorizes subpenas to be issued therefor in accordance with the provisions of law.'

"The subcommittee agreed that Dagmar Wilson, Donna Allen, and Russell A. Nixon should be required to appear before the subcommittee on December 7, 1964, in executive session.

"The meeting adjourned at 12:25 p.m.

"Joe R. Pool,
"Chairman.

"Mrs. Mary Valente,
"Acting Recording Secretary."

6. The following is a copy of the order of the chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities, Representative Edwin E. Willis, appointing Representative August E. Johansen to serve on the said subcommittee in the place of Representative Henry C. Schadeberg:

"To: Mr. Francis J. McNamara, Director, Committee on Un-American Activities.

"On March 11, 1964, I appointed Hon. Joe R. Pool, Hon. Richard Ichord, and Hon. Henry C. Schadeberg to serve as a subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities to conduct hearings as contemplated by the resolution adopted by the committee on the 19th day of February, 1964, relating to the entry of aliens into the United States and other matters under investigation by the committee. Mr. Schadeberg has indicated that he may be unable to serve on said subcommittee at its contemplated December 7, 1964, hearing, and possibly on other days, before and after that date, during the remainder of the year when meetings and hearings of the subcommittee may be held.

"I hereby designate Hon. August E. Johansen to serve on the said subcommittee in the place of Hon. Henry C. Schadeberg for the remainder of the year at any meetings and hearings of the subcommittee which Mr. Schadeberg is unable to attend.

"Given under my hand this 25th day of November 1964.

"E. E. Willis,
"Chairman, Committee on Un-American Activities.

7. The following is an extract from the minutes of a meeting of the aforesaid subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities, held on December 7, 1964, at 10:08 a.m.

"A subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities designated by the chairman on November 25, 1964, to sit at hearings in the matter of entry of aliens in the United States under waiver of ineligibility, met in room 225, Cannon House Office Building, at 10:08 a.m. The following members were present: Joe R. Pool, chairman; Richard Ichord, August E. Johansen. Representative Donald C. Bruce was also present.

"The staff members present were Francis J. McNamara, director; Alfred M. Nittle, counsel; Donald T. Appell, chief investigator; and Juliette P. Joray, recording clerk.

"The director advised the members that a request had been received by the committee from Lawrence Speiser, director of the Washington office of the American Civil Liberties Union and attorney for Mrs. Dagmar Wilson and Mrs. Donna Allen, that the hearings scheduled for December 7 and 8 be canceled or held in public session rather than in executive session. Following a discussion during which the reasons for holding the hearings in executive session were fully explored, Mr. Ichord moved that Mr. Speiser's request be denied and that the hearings be held in executive session. Mr. Johansen seconded the motion and the chairman so ordered.

"The chief investigator briefed the members on Russell Nixon's background.

"The subcommittee agreed to have all three witnesses in the hearing room at the same time for the reading of the opening statement.

"The meeting adjourned at 10:15 a.m.

"Joe R. Pool,
"Chairman of Subcommittee.

"Juliette P. Jorey,
"Recording Clerk."

The following letter dated December 1, 1964, on the letterhead of the Washington office of the American Civil Liberties Union, and signed by Lawrence Speiser, director of the Washington office, is the request to which reference is made in the above minutes as having been received by the committee from Lawrence Speiser:

"Hon. Edwin E. Willis,
"Chairman, Committee on Un-American Activities, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

"Dear Chairman Willis: I am the attorney for Mrs. Dagmar Wilson and Mrs. Donna Allen who have been subpenaed to appear before a subcommittee of the House Committee on Un-American Activities in an executive session concerning their personal visit to the State Department in 1963 to urge it to issue a visitor's visa to Prof. Kaoru Yasui so that he could fulfill speaking engagements all over the country.

"I have a great deal of difficulty in believing that you have authorized the issuance of subpenas to Mrs. Wilson and Mrs. Allen for this reason. It would seem that the open and aboveboard personal visitation of American citizens to an executive agency to urge its authorization of the entry into this country of a speaker (whose entry was later approved) should not be the basis of any congressional investigation. On its face, such an investigation violates the first amendment's protection of the right of citizens to petition the government and the right to hear all points of view.

"Accordingly, I respectfully request that the hearings be canceled. In the event that this request is not granted, then I request on behalf of Mrs. Wilson and Mrs. Allen that the hearings be public, rather than in executive session.

"Sincerely yours,

"Lawrence Speiser,
"Director, Washington Office."

8. The following are the minutes of a meeting of the aforesaid subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities held on December 7, 1964, at 11 a.m.:

"A subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities designated by the chairman on November 25, 1964, to sit at hearings in the matter of entry of aliens in the United States under waiver of ineligibility, met on December 7, 1964. The following members were present: Joe R. Pool, chairman; Richard Ichord, August E. Johansen. Representative Donald C. Bruce was also present.

"The staff members present were Francis J. McNamara, director; Alfred M. Nittle, counsel; and Donald Appell, chief investigator.

"The subcommittee discussed and considered again the request previously received in a letter from Mr. Lawrence Speiser, attorney for Dagmar Wilson and Donna Allen, that the hearings be canceled or held in public. It also considered the additional requests Mr. Speiser made in the hearings prior to recess relative to a public hearing for his clients. In addition, the subcommittee considered the views and requests of Russell Nixon expressed prior to recess.

"The subcommittee, in its deliberations, viewed these requests in the light of all relevant committee resolutions and applicable rules of the House and the committee itself, including House rules 26(g) and 26(m), and committee rule IV. The subcommittee concluded that rule XI, 26(g), was applicable, and that an executive session was desirable, for reasons of national interest, because of the area of Government operation involved, but which could not be disclosed to the witnesses at this time in any detail without violating that interest. It was also determined that rule XI 26(m) precluded a public hearing at this stage of the investigation because the proposed area of interrogation would involve persons, other than the witnesses, in a defamatory or possibly incriminating manner forbidden by the rule.

"The subcommittee unanimously concluded that the hearing should be continued in executive session and the requests of the witnesses for a public hearing denied.

"It was agreed that Mr. Ichord would prepare a statement expressing the subcommittee's determination, which he would make for the record when the hearing was reconvened at 2 p.m.

"It was agreed that, in the interim, Mr. Ichord would check with the parliamentarian of the House to obtain his view of the issues confronting the subcommittee and determine whether or not he believed the position adopted by the subcommittee was a correct one.

"The meeting adjourned at approximately 11:35 a.m.

"Joe R. Pool,
"Chairman.

"Juliette P. Joray,
"Recording Secretary."

9. The following are the minutes of the aforesaid subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities held on December 7, 1964, at 2 p.m.:

"A subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities designated by the chairman on November 25, 1964, to sit at hearings in the matter of entry of aliens in the United States under waiver of ineligibility, met in executive session in room 225, Cannon House Office Building, at 2 p.m., on December 7, 1964.

"The following members were present: Joe R. Pool, chairman; Richard Ichord, August E. Johansen. Representative Donald C. Bruce was also present.

"The staff members present were Francis J. McNamara, director; Alfred M. Nittle, counsel; Donald T. Appell, chief investigator; and Juliette P. Joray, recording clerk.

"With further reference to the requests of Russell Nixon and Mr. Speiser on behalf of his clients, Mrs. Dagmar Wilson and Mrs. Donna Allen, discussed at the meetings held this day, Mr. Ichord reported to the subcommittee on his contacts with the Assistant Parliamentarian, William Cochrane, in the absence of the Parliamentarian, Mr. Deschler, Mr. Ichord stated that the Assistant Parliamentarian advised him that by virtue of the committee resolutions, committee rules and applicable House rules, the subcommittee was empowered to order an executive session.

"The committee deliberated and concluded that there were aspects of national interest involved which require the holding of these hearings in executive session and that rule XI, 26(m), was operative in that the area of interrogation of these three witnesses might tend to defame, degrade or incriminate persons other than the witnesses. It was suggested that Mr. Ichord prepare a statement on behalf of the subcommittee, the contents of which were unanimously approved by the subcommittee, and which Mr. Ichord was to deliver upon the reconvening of the subcommittee following the recess.

"On motion of Mr. Ichord, seconded by Mr. Johansen and unanimously adopted, it was agreed that the requests of Mr. Nixon, Mrs. Wilson, and Mrs. Allen, should again be denied.

"The meeting recessed at 2:45 p.m.

"Joe R. Pool,
"Chairman.
"Juliette P. Joray,
"Recording Secretary."

10. The following is an extract of the minutes of the aforesaid subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities held on December 7, 1964, at 4:05 p.m.:

"A subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities designated by the chairman on November 25, 1964, to sit at hearings in the matter of entry of aliens in the United States under waiver of ineligibility, met in executive session on December 7, 1964, in room 219 of the Cannon House Office Building at 4:05 p.m. The following members were present: Joe R. Pool, chairman; Richard Ichord, August E. Johansen. Representative Donald C. Bruce was also present.

"The staff members present were Francis J. McNamara, director; Alfred M. Nittle, counsel; Donald T. Appell, chief investigator; and Juliette P. Joray, recording clerk.

"The subcommittee was called to order by the chairman who stated that the purpose of the meeting was to consider what action the subcommittee should take regarding the refusal of Russell Nixon to be sworn or examined as a witness; and the failures of Dagmar Wilson and Donna Allen to testify at the hearing conducted by the said subcommittee on the 7th day of December, 1964, and what recommendation it would make to the full committee regarding their citation for contempt of the House of Representatives.

"After full discussion of the testimony of Dagmar Wilson, a motion was made by Mr. Ichord, seconded by Mr. Johansen, and unanimously carried, that a report of the facts relating to the refusal of Dagmar Wilson to testify to those matters required by her subpena, be referred and submitted to the Committee on Un-American Activities as a whole, with the recommendation that a report of the facts relating to the refusal of said witness to testify to those matters required by her subpena, together with all of the facts in connection therewith, be referred to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, with the recommendation that the said witness be cited for contempt of the House of Representatives, to the end that she may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

"The meeting adjourned at 4:15 p.m.

"Joe R. Pool,
"Chairman.
"Juliette P. Joray,
"Recording Clerk."

11. The following is an extract of the minutes of a meeting of the full Committee on Un-American Activities held on December 10, 1964, at 10 a.m.:

"The Committee on Un-American Activities met in executive session on Thursday morning, December 10, 1964, in Room 225, Cannon House Office Building, at 10 a.m. The following members were present: Edwin E. Willis, chairman; William Tuck, Joe R. Pool, Richard Ichord, Donald C. Bruce.

"Also present were the following staff members: Francis J. McNamara, director; William Hitz, general counsel; Alfred M. Nittle, counsel; Donald T. Appell, chief investigator; Philip Manuel, investigator; and Juliette P. Joray, recording clerk.

"Chairman Willis called the meeting to order at 10:18 a.m. and announced that this special meeting of the committee was called, after notice to all committee members, for the purpose of considering a recommendation of the subcommittee headed by Mr. Pool, looking into the entry of aliens into the United States under waiver of ineligibility, that Russell Nixon, Dagmar Wilson, and Donna Allen be cited for contempt because of their refusals to testify before the subcommittee in executive session on Monday of this week, December 7.

"The chairman then directed Mr. Pool, chairman of the subcommittee, to report on the matter being considered by the committee.

"Representative Pool reported to the committee that he was chairman of the subcommittee appointed by the chairman, composed of himself, Representatives Richard H. Ichord and August E. Johansen, to conduct hearings on December 7, 1964, at Washington, D.C., as contemplated under the resolution adopted by the committee on the 19th day of February 1964; that the subcommittee met in executive session on December 7, 1964, in the Cannon House Office Building, Washington, D.C., to receive the testimony of Russell Nixon, Donna Allen, and Dagmar Wilson who had been duly subpenaed to appear as witnesses before said subcommittee; the said meeting of the subcommittee was attended on December 7, 1964, by subcommittee chairman, Representative Joe R. Pool, and Represenatives Richard H. Ichord and August E. Johansen; that the witness, Russell Nixon, having appeared before the subcommittee, refused to be sworn or examined as a witness, willfully refused to answer any question pertinent to the question under inquiry, and willfully refused to give any testimony touching matters of inquiry committed before said subcommittee; that the said Donna Allen appeared before the subcommittee, was administered an affirmation as a witness by the subcommittee chairman but willfully refused to testify in response to any question pertinent to the question or subject under inquiry; that the said Dagmar Wilson appeared before the subcommittee, was duly sworn as a witness, and when asked to state her name and residence for the record and whether she was represented by counsel, she responded to those questions, but thereupon and thereafter willfully refused to answer any question pertinent to the question under inquiry and willfully refused to give any testimony touching matters of inquiry before said subcommittee as required by her subpena; that the subcommittee thereafter met in executive session, attended by the said subcommittee chairman, Representative Pool, and Representatives Ichord and Johansen, being all of the members of the said subcommittee; at which time, motions were made and unanimously adopted with respect to each of said persons, to wit, Russell Nixon, Donna Allen, and Dagmar Wilson, that a report of the facts relating to the refusal of each of them to testify before said subcommittee at said hearings after having been summoned to appear to testify before said subcommittee, be referred and submitted to the Committee on Un-American Activities as a whole, with a recommendation that a report and statement of fact with reference to the refusal of each of said witnesses to appear to testify as aforesaid, be made to and filed with the Speaker of the House, the House now being adjourned sine die, in order that the said Speaker may certify the same under the seal of the House, to the appropriate U.S. attorney to the end that each of said witnesses may be proceeded against for contempt of the House of Representatives in the manner and form provided by law.

"A motion was made by Mr. Pool, seconded by Mr. Ichord, that the subcommittee's report of the facts relating to the refusal of Dagmar Wilson to testify before the said subcommittee at the hearings conducted before it in Washington, D.C., on the 7th day of December 1964 be and the same is hereby approved and adopted, and that the Committee on Un-American Activities report the said failure of Dagmar Wilson to the Honorable John McCormack, Speaker of the House of Representatives, the House of Representatives now being adjourned sine die, in order that the said Speaker may certify the same to the U.S. attorney for the District of Columbia to the end that the said Dagmar Wilson may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law; and that the chairman of this committee is hereby authorized and directed to forward such report and statement of fact constituting such failure of Dagmar Wilson to the said Speaker of the House of Representatives. Following discussion, the motion was put to a vote and it was unanimously adopted. Mr. Pool asked for the yeas and nays to be recorded. The yeas and nays were taken. Mr. Willis voted yea, Mr. Tuck voted yea, Mr. Pool voted yea, Mr. Ichord voted yea, and Mr. Bruce voted yea. Mr. Bruce also stated that he was authorized to vote the proxy of Mr. Johansen and that if he were present he would vote yea. So the motion was agreed to.

"The meeting adjourned at 11:15 a.m.

"Edwin E. Willis,
"Chairman.
"Juliette P. Joray,
"Recording Clerk."

REPORT AND STATEMENT OF FACT OF THE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, PURSUANT TO TITLE 2, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTIONS 192 AND 194 CONCERNING THE FAILURE OF DONNA ALLEN

To the SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

The Committee on Un-American Activities, as created and authorized by the House of Representatives through the enactment of Public Law 601 of the 79th Congress, Section 121, subsection (c)(2), and under House Resolution 5 of the 88th Congress, duly caused to be issued a subpena to Donna Allen. The said subpean directed Donna Allen to be and appear before the said Committee on Un-American Activities, of which the Honorable Edwin E. Willis is chairman, or a duly appointed subcommittee thereof, on Monday, December 7, 1964, at the hour of 10 a.m., at their committee room, 226 Old House Office Building, Washington, D.C., then and there to testify touching matters of inquiry committed to said committee, and not to depart without leave of said committee. The subpena served upon Donna Allen is set forth in words and figures as follows:

"United States of America,
Congress of the United States.

"To Donna Allen, *greeting:*

"Pursuant to lawful authority, you are hereby commanded to be and appear before the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives of the United States, or a duly appointed subcommittee thereof, on Monday, December 7, 1964, at 10 a.m., at their committee room, 226 Old House Office Building, Washington, D.C., then and there to testify touching matters of inquiry committed to said committee, and not to depart without leave of said committee.

"Hereof fail not, as you will answer your default under the pains and penalties in such cases made and provided.

"To William Margetich, to serve and return.

"Given under my hand this 18th day of November, in the year of our Lord, 1964.

"Joe R. Pool,
"Chairman—Chairman of Subcommittee—Member Designate of the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives.

"If you desire a conference with a representative of the committee prior to the date of the hearing, please call or write to staff director, Committee on Un-American Activities, Washington, D.C., telephone: Capitol 4-3121, extension 3051."

The said subpena was duly served as appears by the return thereof by the said William Margetich, also known as William A. Margetich, who was duly authorized to serve the said subpena. The return of the service by the said William A. Margetich being endorsed thereon, is set forth in words and figures, as follows:

"I made service of the within subpena by personal service the within-named individual at her home: 3306 Rose Place N.W., Washington, D.C., at 1:15 o'clock, p.m., on the 19th day of November 1964. Dated November 19, 1964.

"William A. Margetich,
Investigator."

A subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities, composed of Representative Joe R. Pool, as chairman, Richard Ichord and August E. Johansen, met and convened in executive session at or about 10 a.m., on December 7, 1964, in room 219, Cannon House Office Building, Washington, D.C., the said subcommittee members all being present. Donna Allen having been duly summoned as a witness as aforesaid, was called as a witness on that day. The said Donna Allen appeared before subcommittee and and was administered on affirmation as a witness by the subcommittee chairman, Representative Joe R. Pool, but the said Donna Allen willfully refused to answer any question pertinent to the question or subject under inquiry, and willfully refused to give any testimony touching matters of inquiry committed to said committee as required by the said subpena.

The record of the proceedings before the said subcommittee on Monday, December 7, 1964, so far as it affects the witness Donna Allen, is set forth in appendix I, which is attached hereto and made a part hereof.

Other pertinent committee proceedings are set forth in appendix II, attached hereto and made a part hereof.

The foregoing willful refusal by the said Donna Allen to give such testimony as required, in compliance with the said subpena, deprived the committee of necessary and pertinent testimony regarding matters which the said committee was instructed by law and House resolution to investigate, and places the said witness, Donna Allen, in contempt of the House of Representatives of the United States.

Pursuant to resolution of the Committee on Un-American Activities adopted at a meeting duly held on December 10, 1964, a copy of which is set forth in appendix II, this report and statement of fact constituting the failure of Donna Allen is herewith transmitted to and filed with the Honorable John W. McCormack, Speaker of the House of Representatives, the House of Representatives having adjourned sine die on October 3, 1964, and not being now in session, so that the Speaker may certify the same under the seal of the House to the U.S. attorney for the District of Columbia, pursuant to title 2, United States Code, sections 192 and 194, to the end that the said Donna Allen may be proceeded against for contempt of the House of Representatives in the manner and form provided by law.

Respectfully submitted this 10th day of December 1964.

E. E. Willis,
Chairman, Committee on Un-American Activities.

Appendix I

Executive Session, Entry of Aliens Into the United States, Monday, December 7, 1964

U.S. House of Representatives,
Subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities,
Washington, D.C.

A subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities met, pursuant to call, at 10 a.m., in room 219, Cannon Building, Washington, D.C., Hon. Joe Pool (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Joe Pool, of Texas; Richard H. Ichord, of Missouri; and August E. Johansen, of Michigan.

Staff members present: Francis J. McNamara, director, Alfred M. Nittle, counsel, and Donald T. Appell, investigator.

Mr. Pool. The committee will come to order.

Before we get started I have an opening statement I want to read and I would like to know if Donna Allen, Dagmar Wilson, and Russell Nixon are in the room? Will you identify yourselves.

Mrs. Wilson. My name is Dagmar Wilson.

Mrs. Allen. Donna Allen.

Mr. Nixon. Nixon.

Mr. Pool. The Internal Security Act of 1950, a bill reported by this committee, contained provisions which barred aliens of certain types from admission to the United States either as immigrants or an nonimmigrant visitors.

The Congress subsequently incorporated these provisions in Public Law 414 of the 82d Congress, generally known as the McCarran-Walter Act or the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952.

Section 212, subsection (a), paragraphs (27) and (29) of that act classify certain types of aliens as inadmissible to this country and not subject to admission under provisions found elsewhere in the act; namely, paragraph (28) of the same subsection and paragraph (3) of subsection (d).

Section 212, subsection (a), paragraph (28) of the act also classifies certain types of aliens as inadmissible. However, it contains a subparagraph (I) which grants to the Attorney General, on recommendation of the consular officer, the authority to issue them entry visas under certain conditions. This subparagraph provides, however, that their admission must always be "in the public interest." In addition, it applies only to aliens inadmissible under paragraph (28).

Section 212(d)(3) grants the Attorney General, on recommendation of the consular officer or the Secretary of State, discretionary power to waive the inadmissibility of certain aliens described in section 212(a) except for those barred under paragraphs (27) and (29) of that section. Such waiver, however, applies only to temporary or nonimmigrant visas.

Information which has been brought to the attention of the Committee on Un-American Activities indicates that the discretionary authority of the consular officer or the Secretary of State to recommend, and of the Attorney General to approve, the issuance of nonimmigrant visas are possibly being abused.

Preliminary investigation by the committee, authorized by the chairman several months ago, raises serious questions as to whether the intent of Congress is being followed in the admission to this country of aliens under the above-mentioned sections of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952.

The investigation has also raised the question of whether the available background information on certain aliens temporarily admitted to this country is being properly evaluated. This may be resulting in certain aliens being classified as ineligible under paragraph (28)—and therefore eligible for a waiver—when they properly come under paragraphs (27) or (29) and are therefore ineligible for admission under waiver.

This hearing was authorized by the committee at a meeting held on February 19, 1964. The minutes of that meeting read, in part, as follows:

"A motion was made by Hon. William M. Tuck, seconded by Hon. Henry C. Schadeberg, and unanimously carried authorizing the holding of hearings in Washington, D.C., or at such other place or places as the chairman may designate, on such date or dates as the chairman may determine, including the conduct of investigations deemed reasonably necessary by the staff in preparation therefor, related to the following:

"1. Strategy, tactics, and activities of members of the Communist Party and Communist organizations in aiding the entry into the United States of aliens inadmissible under the provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act;

"2. Security aspects of the temporary admission to the United States of aliens who are inadmissible under provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act, for the legislative purpose of determining whether the exigencies of the situation require a strengthening of the security provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act;

"3. The execution by the administrative agencies concerned of the security provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act, and all other laws, the subject matter of which is within the jurisdiction of the committee, the legislative purpose being to exercise continuous watchfulness of the execution of those laws to assist the Congress in appraising the administration of such laws, and in developing such amendments or related legislation as it may deem necessary; and

"4. Any other matter within the jurisdiction of the committee which it or any subcommittee thereof appointed to conduct those hearings may designate."

The order appointing the subcommittee to conduct these hearings is as follows:

"To: Mr. Francis J. McNamara, Director,
Committee on Un-American Activities.

"Pursuant to the provisions of the law and the rules of this committee, I hereby appoint a subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities, consisting of Hon. Richard Ichord and Hon. Henry C. Schadeberg as associate members, and Hon. Joe R. Pool, as chairman, to conduct a hearing in Washington, D.C., on Thursday, March 12, 1964, at 3 p.m., as contemplated by the resolution adopted by the committee on the 19th day of February 1964, relating to the entry of aliens into the United States and other matters under investigation by the committee, and take such testimony on said day or succeeding days as it may deem necessary.

"Please make this action a matter of committee record.

"If any member indicates his inability to serve, please notify me.

"Given under my hand this 11th day of March 1964.

"EDWIN E. WILLIS,
"Chairman, Committee on Un-American Activities."

I also have a memorandum to Mr. Francis J. McNamara, Director, Committee on Un-American Activities.

"On March 11, 1964, I appointed Hon. Joe R. Pool, Hon. Richard Ichord, and Hon. Henry C. Schadeberg to serve as a Subcommittee on Un-American Activities to conduct hearings as contemplated by the resolution adopted by the committee on the 19th day of February 1964, relating to the entry of aliens into the United States and other matters under investigation by the committee. Mr. Schadeberg has indicated that he may be unable to serve on said subcommittee at its contemplated December 7, 1964, hearing, and possibly on other days, before and after that date, during the remainder of the year when meetings and hearings of the subcommittee may be held.

"I hereby designate Hon. August E. Johansen to serve on the said subcommittee in the place of Hon. Henry C. Schadeberg for the remainder of the year at any meetings and hearings of the subcommittee which Mr. Schadeberg is unable to attend.

"Given under my hand this 25th day of November 1964.

"EDWIN E. WILLIS,
"Chairman, Committee on Un-American Activities."

Mr. Speiser, the subcommittee has met and considered your letter which is dated December 1, 1964, and has denied your request for a public hearing due to the fact that rule 26 is involved, which this committee has been very zealous in following, due to the fact that derogatory information might be revealed during these hearings, so your request has been denied.

Do you have any other reason or any other requests to make of the committee at this time?

Mr. SPEISER. Yes, sir. Has the committee made a determination under rule IV of the committee's rules that a public hearing might endanger national security?

Mr. POOL. I did not get your statement.

Mr. SPEISER. Has the committee made a determination under rule IV of the committee's rules of procedure that a public hearing might endanger national security?

Mr. POOL. You are asking me something here that might have taken place in executive session and I am not at liberty to answer your question unless the committee decides to make it public. That would be my answer to that.

Mr. SPEISER. I would like to make a motion then that the committee cannot properly hold an executive session unless they make such a determination and if such a determination has not been made that a public hearing should be ordered.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman, may I ask is that the only request that he has prior to the committee taking up its business?

Do you have any further objections to the executive hearings?

Mr. SPEISER. The objections I stated in my letter and this is an additional one. Those are the two objections I have to an executive session.

Mr. ICHORD. I think we should take that under consideration, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. POOL. If you have no further statement or objections to make, then we will ask you all to step outside and we will make a determination of what the committee wants to do. Those are all the objections you have to raise before the testimony begins?

Mr. SPEISER. That is on the question of executive session as compared to a public session. There may be other objections with regard to particular witnesses' testimony.

Mr. POOL. What other objections do you have at this time?

Mr. SPEISER. I do not know at this time, Mr. Chairman. I cannot say until the matter comes up before the committee. I can't make a statement there.

Mr. POOL. That is a good point. Who do you represent here now?

Mr. SPEISER. I represent Mrs. Allen and Mrs. Wilson.

Mr. POOL. All right. Mr. Nixon, do you have counsel?

Mr. NIXON. No, sir.

Mr. POOL. Would you like to state any objections at the present time before this hearing begins?

Mr. NIXON. I certainly associate myself with the objections stated by Mr. Speiser. I am not a lawyer. I would add the point that it would be unfortunate to require this kind of testimony, with the opprobrium of this kind of subpena, in private without having a full public and press view of the proceedings. The hearing is in only one sense private, since the committee maintains to itself the privilege at a date of its own choosing, the privilege of releasing to the press either a summary, or a partial transcript, or a full transcript of the hearings, so it is in this sense also that I would add an objection to these proceedings going ahead in executive.

I think that the press and the public have a right to hear the proceedings.

Mr. POOL. That is all of the objections you have, plus the ones that you associated yourself with in Mr. Speiser's case?

Mr. NIXON. Yes, sir, I think so.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee go into executive session for consideration of the request.

Mr. POOL. All right. The witnesses and the attorney will be excused and we will call you back in when we get through with this deliberation. Make yourselves available outside in the hall if you will.

(At this point the witnesses and attorney left the hearing room and the subcommittee proceeded further in executive session, which proceedings were not reported, following which the witnesses and attorney returned to the hearing room.)

Mr. POOL. The committee will come to order.

Mr. Speiser, the subcommittee feels that you have misinterpreted rule IV. It requires that if the committee or a subcommittee believes interrogation of a witness in public might endanger national security it must then hear such witness in executive session.

It does not say that reasons of national security are the only ones that permit or justify executive session hearings. For your information we have considered all the applicable rules as the full committee did months ago and have determined this hearing will be held in executive session.

Mr. Nixon's request has also been considered in the light of all applicable rules and has been rejected.

Mr. SPEISER. Mr. Pool, am I to understand that a determination has been made that a public hearing would not endanger national security?

Mr. POOL. I have just read to you the statement here that was the determination of the subcommittee and it speaks for itself.

Mr. SPEISER. I will leave my question on the record as it is. I do not feel it was answered. I would like to raise a question as to the absence of a quorum at this time, Mr. Chairman.

(At this point Representative Bruce entered the hearing room.)

Mr. SPEISER. I withdraw it.

(At this point Representative Johansen entered the hearing room.)

Mr. POOL. I didn't get the last.

Mr. SPEISER. I raised the question of the absence of a quorum because Mr. Bruce and Mr. Johansen were not present. I withdraw it.

Mr. POOL. For the record there was a quorum here. It is a subcommittee of three members and Mr. ICHORD and myself constitute a quorum.

Mr. Nixon, if you will come forth and be sworn in, the other witnesses may be excused temporarily until they are called.

Mr. NIXON. Mr. Pool, I am not going to testify in this executive session. I am willing to testify in public session with the press and the public present, but for the reasons which I have stated here I am unwilling to proceed in this executive session.

Mr. POOL. I will direct you to come forward and be sworn.

Mr. NIXON. I think my statement speaks for itself, Mr. Pool.

Mr. POOL. For the last time I direct you to come forth and be sworn.

Mr. NIXON. I decline, as I have told you.

Mr. POOL. Let the record show that the chairman requested Mr. Nixon to come forth and be sworn and that he has refused to do do.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, let the record also show that all three members of the subcommittee were present.

Mr. POOL. Let the record so show. The other witnesses and the attorney will leave the room at the present time temporarily. Mr. Nixon, you remain.

(At this point Mrs. Wilson, Mrs. Allen, and Mr. Speiser left the room.)

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the other witnesses be called.

Mr. POOL. All right. Mr. Nixon, you will leave the room and the staff will call the other witness.

(At this point Mr. Nixon left the room.)

(All the witnesses and Mr. Speiser came back into the hearing room.)

Mr. POOL. I brought you witnesses and attorney in here to excuse you until 2 o'clock when we will meet back in this room.

Donna Allen, Dagmar Wilson, and Russell Nixon, let the record show, are excused until 2 o'clock.

Mr. SPEISER. Mr. Chairman, can you tell us at this time whether the hearing will be public at 2 o'clock?

Mr. POOL. You are excused until 2 o'clock. That's all I have to say to you at the present time.

(Whereupon, at 11.30 a.m., the hearing was recessed to reconvene at 2 p.m., the same day.)

[After recess]

(The subcommittee reconvened at 2:50 p.m., Mr. Pool, chairman of the subcommittee, presiding. Committee members present: Representatives Pool, Ichord, Johansen, and Bruce.)

Mr. POOL. The committee will come to order.

Mr. POOL. All right.

Will you escort Mr. Nixon on outside and call the next witness?

Call Donna Allen.

Donna Allen, will you rise and take the oath?

Mr. SPEISER. She would prefer to affirm.

Mr. POOL. All right.

Do you affirm that the testimony you are about to give is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. SPEISER. Mr. Chairman, you followed with "so help me God." You have made it an oath. You have changed the word "swear" to "affirm," and then added after it an affirmation.

Mr. POOL. You want to——

Mr. SPEISER. She wants to affirm, which is provided for in the committee rules and in title 1, section 1 of the United States Code. She may affirm.

Mr. ICHORD. Let the record show that the witness does affirm.

Mr. POOL. Do you affirm the oath as given?

TESTIMONY OF MRS. DONNA ALLEN, ACCOMPANIED BY LAWRENCE SPEISER, ATTORNEY AT LAW, WASHINGTON DIRECTOR OF AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION, 1101 VERMONT AVENUE NW., WASHINGTON, D.C.

Mrs. ALLEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. POOL. The Chair now recognizes Mr. Ichord.

Mr. ICHORD. I have nothing at this time, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. POOL. Counsel, will you proceed, then, with the questions?

Mr. NITTLE. Would you state your full name and residence for the record, please?

Mr. JOHANSEN. You do not need to stand up.

Mrs. ALLEN. Mr. Chairman, I don't feel that I can give any information to this committee unless the hearing is a public hearing and all the questions are asked in public and the answers that I have to give are given in public.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman, may I be recognized at this point, then?

Mr. POOL. Yes.

Mr. ICHORD. Won't you be seated, Mrs. Wilson?

Mrs. ALLEN. My name is Mrs. Allen.

Mr. ICHORD. Mrs. Allen, I am very sorry.

I would like to state to you, Mrs. Allen, and to your attorney, Mr. Speiser, that in the executive session I made a statement to the committee setting forth many reasons why I did not believe that your request for a public hearing should be accepted by the committee, and I also took this matter up with the Assistant Parliamentarian, Bill Cochrane, Mr. Lewis Deschler, the House Parliamentarian being out of town, and Mr. Cochrane agrees with me that the committee is definitely right in refusing a public session.

I would like to state to your attorney that I believe that you have definitely misconstrued rule No. IV. Rule No. IV of the committee rules requires an executive hearing if a public hearing might endanger national security.

Rule 26(m) of the House requires the hearing of a congressional committee to be in executive session if the committee determines that the evidence or testimony at any investigative hearing may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person.

But I would like to point out to you that both rules do not restrict the right of a committee to hold executive sessions. There are some aspects of national security involved in this hearing, but it is not necessary to determine whether or not the national security would be endangered if your client, Mrs. Allen, is heard in public session.

We are here investigating the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, and in particular the administration of inadmissible aliens to the United States under the waiver provisions of section 212 of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

I would like to point out to you that there are many reasons why this hearing should be executive. Many of them I stated in the executive session out of your presence, which I do not think would be proper for me to go over at this time.

However, rule 26 I believe, is operative, and it is a reason why this hearing should be in executive session, and the committee also agrees that the national interest requires that the meeting be held in executive session.

You have raised an issue here, I believe, which goes to the very right of a committee of Congress to function effectively. We cannot permit a witness to tell the committee whether its hearings shall be executive or whether they shall be public. That decision must be reserved by a committee of Congress if it is to function effectively.

And I would advise you that your case is clearly governed by rule 26(g), which I discussed with the Assistant House Parliamentarian, and he read this rule, which gives this committee in his opinion the definite right to hold these hearings in executive session. Rule 26 (g) reads as follows:

"All hearings conducted by standing committees or their subcommittees shall be open to the public, except executive sessions for marking up bills or for voting or where the committee by a majority vote orders an executive session."

The committee by majority vote in this case has ordered an executive session, and we considered all of the rules of the House and of the committee in the executive session, and the committee unanimously determined that we would have to deny your request for a public session.

Mr. SPEISER. May I respond, Mr. Ichord?

Mr. ICHORD. Yes, sir.

Mr. POOL. Identify yourself first, I believe.

Mr. SPEISER. I am Lawrence Speiser. I am the attorney for Mrs. Allen. I am the Washington Director of the American Civil Liberties Union.

Mr. POOL. You are not testifying, and you are not under oath.

Counsel, will you come here?

Mr. NITTLE. Mr. Speiser, do you appear here today as the attorney for the American Civil Liberties Union, or do you appear in an individual capacity as the attorney for Mrs. Allen?

Mr. SPEISER. I appear in both capacities. As an employee of the American Civil Liberties Union I have been available to represent witnesses who have been called before committees where we feel that the committee hearings affect the rights under the Bill of Rights, and for that reason I am in effect offering myself to Mrs. Allen, and I am representing her. There is no commercial fee going between us, but I am appearing as her attorney.

Mr. POOL. What was your original question?

Mr. NITTLE. The question was a question I intended to address to Mr. Speiser.

Mr. POOL. You did not finish the question?

Mr. NITTLE. No, but it was the question I just asked him, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ICHORD. Does Mr. Speiser have an objection going to the jurisdiction of the committee?

Mr. SPEISER. I would like to respond to your comments, if I may, Mr. ICHORD, on the question of executive session as compared to a public hearing.

Mr. ICHORD. Go right ahead.

Mr. SPEISER. As I read the rules of the House, I believe that that rule, 26(g), does not apply to the situation where you have subpenaed witnesses to appear before the committee, because of the specificity that you have in rule 26(m) of the Rules of the House and of the rules that you have for the committee.

In a situation where you subpena witnesses to appear before the committee, I think those kinds of rules apply. As far as rule 26(m), which you alluded to but did not specifically rely on, Mr. ICHORD, as I read it, and I must confess there is some ambiguity in looking at it, I feel that that is a situation where a witness is called before the committee, and where the committee feels that the testimony of that witness may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate some other person, and in that situation the committee first receives the testimony of that person in executive session to prevent the malicious, the false, the unnecessary defaming, degrading, or incriminating some other person.

There has been no indication at all, as far as I can see from my contacts with Mr. McNamara, that there is any impression that Mrs. Allen's testimony would fall within that category, that anything that she would give would defame, degrade, or incriminate some-one else, so I do not think that rule applies for having an executive session, and that is the reason I think that rule IV, which is the other rule, and which is a later rule, would apply as far as this hearing is concerned.

Now, I think that you seem to indicate, Mr. ICHORD, that there was a national security aspect of this, although I had posed the question before, and I did not get a direct response, and I thought that had been washed out.

Mr. ICHORD. I would state to you that the committee did not make any determination as to whether there was with these particular witnesses. This is a continuation of these hearings, and there have been aspects of the national security involved.

We have determined that it is within the national interest. We did not make any determination as to rule No. IV as concerns you now.

Mr. POOL. I would like to state to you at this time that all applicable rules of the House and of the committee were considered in our determination before the subcommittee.

Is that not right, Mr. ICHORD?

Mr. ICHORD. Yes, sir.

Mr. POOL. Is that not right, Mr. Johansen?

Mr. JOHANSEN. Yes.

Mr. ICHORD. Under rule No. IV we concluded that you were not entitled to a public session. That is a rule of the committee.

Mr. SPEISER. As I understand it, because you have used two terms, one "national interest," and then the other one, "national security," you have not made a determination as a committee that under rule IV this shall be held in executive session, because to hold a public hearing would endanger national security.

Mr. POOL. All rules of the House and of the committee were considered in making this determination.

Mr. SPEISER. I have responded as I think the record should indicate, and I believe——

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, it is my clear understanding that is the position of the subcommittee that while rule IV forbids an open hearing under certain circumstances, it does not for that reason forbid an executive hearing if it is the determination of the committee that such should be held.

Mr. ICHORD. That is true, Mr. Johansen, and I might say that I checked with the Parliamentarian, and he concurred in the committee's belief.

Mr. POOL. Anything further on your part?

Mr. SPEISER. No, I am finished, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. POOL. All right, counsel.

Mr. NITTLE. Mrs. Allen, would you now state your full name and address for the record, please?

Mrs. ALLEN. Mr. Chairman, I am unable to give any information in a secret hearing, because I believe that everything I have to say, as well as the questions that are asked of me, should be open to the public and the press.

Mr. POOL. Mrs. Allen, I direct you as chairman of this committee, to answer the question as proponded to you by counsel.

(The witness conferred with her counsel.)

Mrs. ALLEN. Mr. Chairman, I am unable to give information in executive session unless it is open to the public, where the questions and my answers are known to the public.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, on the face of it, the witness' statement is not accurate. It is not a question of her being unable to. She either will do it, or refuses to do it. It is that simple, and the phraseology, "I am unable to do it" is not adequate to the situation.

Mr. POOL. I direct you for the last time to answer the question as propounded to you by counsel.

Mrs. Allen. I will accept the gentleman's language, but I insist upon a public hearing.

Mr. Johansen. And you refuse to answer at this hearing?

Mrs. Allen. I insist on a public hearing.

Mr. Johansen. And you refuse to answer here and now?

(The witness conferred with her counsel.)

Mr. Johansen. Is that so?

Mrs. Allen. I refuse to answer in an executive session.

Mr. Pool. Next question, counsel.

Mr. Nittle. Mr. Speiser, I want to clarify for the record a statement you have made, and I want to do this in your presence and in the presence of your client.

Did I understand you to say that the committee has merely alluded to rule 26(m), and that you did not understand it to make a specific finding that that rule was applicable in this case?

Mr. Speiser. That was my impression. As I understand it, the committee was not relying alone on any single rule, and did not make a finding with respect to any single rule, but you in effect said the executive session is based on all applicable rules of the committee and in particular the only allusion that you made in which you made a specific finding was on rule 26(g).

Am I correct in that?

Mr. Ichord. As I understand the action of the committee, we did find under 26(m) specifically, and also under rule 26(g), and all of the other rules. We are ruling on your request for a public session under all of the House rules. That takes into consideration 26(m), and the committee rules, and the House rules.

We have ruled that you are not entitled to a public session, and I might—of course you are an attorney advising your client—advise you that the House Parliamentarian concurred in the statement that I have just made.

In other words, Mr. Speiser, a committee of Congress has the right to determine whether its meetings shall be executive or in public session.

There are many reasons why in the public interest, in the national interest, these hearings should be in executive session.

Mr. Nittle. Will the fact that the committee has made a specific finding that paragraph 26(m) of rule XI of the House is applicable, and that the testimony sought to be elicited from the witness, Mrs. Donna Allen, may and will tend to defame, and degrade, and incriminate other persons alter your advice to your client?

If so, we would ask you to retire and consider it. Before you do so, however, I want to ask you a further question.

Did I understand you to say that the staff director of this committee, Mr. Francis McNamara, advised you that rule 26(m) would not be applicable?

Mr. Speiser. No, I did not say that, and I do not think that Mr. McNamara intended that. My contact with Mr. McNamara was two phone calls, but primarily the information I received from him was that the committee was interested in the fact that Mrs. Allen had gone to the State Department to urge that either a visa or a waiver of a determination of nonentry be given to a Professor Yasui last year, and on the basis of that statement of Mr. McNamara's I cannot see how rule 26(m) applies, and I have two answers to the first part of your question, if I may give them, Mr. Nittle.

The first one is that if the committee is interpreting rule 26(m) in terms of defaming, degrading, or incriminating the witness who is subpenaed before the committee, I think that the committee is misinterpreting the House rule, and secondly, I think that the committee and other committees in the past then have been continuously misinterpreting the House rule by calling people before the committee who the committee has known would be defamed, or degraded, or incriminated by being called before the committee.

My feeling is, and my legal opinion is, that rule 26(m) was intended to protect the names of other people who would be named in the testimony of an indvidual called before the committee.

I have a second point, which is that if the committee is thinking in terms of relying on rule 26(m) in citing Mrs. Allen for contempt, then I would say that you cannot do it, because if this rule is as ambiguous as it appears to be, I think that the committee has failed to follow the rules that due process would dictate, and the House has failed in having a clear unambiguous rule, so that an individual would know his rights in a hearing before a congressional committee.

I think because of that ambiguity that rule 26(m), both as it has been interpreted in the past and in your suggestions to us today, is so vague and ambiguous you cannot rely on that in holding a person in contempt for violating it.

Mr. Ichord. Mr. Speiser, I would state to you that the witness is not called before this committee to be prosecuted. This is an investigative hearing. The witness is not a defendant. The committee has ruled that rule 26(m) is operative, and even if it is not operative, the committee has other reasons for holding this hearing in executive session, which I discussed in the executive committee meeting, and we are relying on all of the rules of the House in denying your request for a public hearing, and the rules of the committee, also, so I think you should advise your client accordingly, which I am sure you will.

Mr. Speiser. Thank you for the courtesy. We have discussed this, and I believe that Mrs. Allen has determined what her position would be in the light of our consultations before we reached here.

Mr. Nittle. I want to state further, Mr. Speiser, in the presence of your client, that I have just talked to Mr. McNamara, and he advises me that he at no time advised you that interrogation of Mrs. Allen would not involve other persons in a defamatory, degrading, or incriminatory manner.

Mr. Speiser. If the hearing is concerned, as I was under the impression in talking with Mr. McNamara, to this visit by Mrs. Allen to the State Department, and I have some difficulty in determining how there would be defamation, or degradation, or incrimination of some other person, then I feel that the committee is under an obligation to indicate in some fashion before the hearing starts, so that you could have an executive session as to——

Mr. Pool. I answered that. My opening statement covered that.

Mr. Ichord. Mr. Speiser, your contention would put the committee in a very difficult position. Oftentimes when we hold executive sessions, we have been accused of conducting star chamber proceedings. Then when we hold a public session, we are accused of subjecting the witness to public contempt.

Now, I might say that in this hearing the witness was subpenaed. It is my information from the staff, and I asked the staff specifically to give me a report on this, that there was no relief made of these subpenas being authorized by the committee, and certainly she would have been outside the glare of any adverse publicity which might have come her way if she contends that appearing before this committee subjected her to public contempt, but those are not the reasons. There are reasons in this case which are set out in the rules why we want the hearings in executive session.

I think perhaps we understand one another as far as the law is concerned.

Mr. Pool. Has she answered your last question?

Mr. Nittle. Yes.

Mr. Pool. She refused to answer, I believe, did she not?

Mr. Nittle. No, she has refused to testify on the basis that she demands a public session.

Mr. Pool. Ask another question, counsel.

Mr. Nittle. I want to make clear to Mr. Speiser he has raised a question as to whether this inquiry would involve other persons in a derogatory or incriminating manner. I want to state to him that the principal inquiry is as was outlined to you very briefly by the staff director, but an inquiry into those circumstances will involve other persons possibly in a degrading or incriminatory fashion, and the committee has made its determination under 26(m) that this hearing should be conducted in executive session for that reason.

Mr. Pool. Now ask your next question.

I think we should go back and ask her her name again.

(The witness conferred with her counsel.)

Mr. Nittle. Would you state your full name and residence for the record, please?

Mrs. Allen. Mr. Chairman, in no possible way would any testimony that I would give or information be derogatory or defamatory to any individual.

I refuse to give any information or testimony except in a public hearing.

Mr. Pool. I direct you to answer the question that counsel asked you.

Mrs. Allen. I refuse to give any information or testimony except in a public hearing.

Mr. Pool. I will direct you one more time to answer the question, and of course your counsel is sitting there, and he can advise you as to your rights and of any possible prosecution for contempt of this Congress.

(The witness conferred with her counsel.)

Mrs. Allen I refuse to give any information or testimony except in public hearing.

Mr. Pool. All right.

Mr. Nittle. Mr. Speiser, we want to further clarify your conversation with Mr. McNamara. Do you claim that Mr. McNamara stated that Mrs. Allen would be asked no questions except one concerning what actually transpired in the course of her visit to the State Department?

Mr. Speiser. I do not believe Mr. McNamara said that, but this was the implication that I received, that the reason that Mrs. Allen, and I might say Mrs. Wilson, were called was concerning their visit to the State Department to urge the issuance of a waiver or a visa to Professor Yasui.

Mr. Nittle. I think I should clarify one further thing. Mrs. Allen has indicated that she is not aware, and so far as she knows, none of her testimony would involve other persons, in the light set forth in rule XI, 26(m). I want to advise her that her interrogation proposes to go into certain matters which, in our judgment, would involve other persons in such a light.

You are aware that the committee is seeking to ascertain facts relating to the strategy, tactics, and activities of members of the Communist Party and Communist organizations in aiding the entry into the United States of aliens generally inadmissible under the provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

We are today particularly inquiring into the circumstances surrounding the entry into the United States of Prof. Kaouri Yasui, who has actively served the world Communist movement and its front organizations.

Mr. Pool. Mrs. Allen, you were here when I read my opening statement and covered the investigation, as to what we were attempting to do here, and with that in mind, do you still refuse to answer as to your name?

(The witness conferred with her counsel.)

Mrs. Allen. Yes, sir.

Mr. Pool. I direct you to answer the question that counsel put to you in regard to asking your name.

Mrs. Allen. Yes, sir.

I will not give any information or testimony except in public hearing.

Mr. Pool. You refuse to answer?

Mrs. Allen. Yes, sir, for that reason.

Mr. Johansen. If you were asked questions which involved derogatory information or information which tended to degrade and defame other persons, would you refuse to answer those?

Mrs. Allen. My dear sir, I have no derogatory or defamatory information to my knowledge about anyone.

Mr. Johansen. I did not ask you that. I asked you if you were asked questions which involved that sort of information, would you refuse to answer in executive session?

(The witness conferred with her counsel.)

Mrs. Allen. I don't know how to answer a hypothetical question, sir.

Mr. Johansen. It is very clear from the statement of the chairman and counsel that there are questions of that character that would be asked.

That is all I have.

Mr. Ichord. Let me ask the counsel a question.

It is your position that the witness does not come under 26(m), and that it is not a 26(m) hearing? Then if the witness demands a public hearing, the committee has to grant a public hearing?

Mr. Speiser. I am frank to say—

Mr. Ichord. And under rule No. IV?

Mr. Speiser. I don't quite know what 26(m) does mean, and I don't think anybody else does. I think 26(m) is vague and ambiguous, and I think that the House is hoisted by its own petard on 26(m) for that reason.

Mr. Ichord. I am not trying to tell you how to practice law or advise your witness, but I pointed out 26(g), which in the opinion of the committee and in the opinion of the House Parliamentarian gives the committee the discretion to hold an executive session. That is what the committee has held, and that is why we are demanding that your client testify.

Mr. Speiser. If 26(g) gives the committee the authority in its absolute discretion to determine when it will hold executive sessions, then 26(m) means nothing, and it should not be in there, but if 26(m) has some validity, then I think it does amend the power of the committee to operate in determining when executive sessions are held.

You do not pass rules for the mere sake of passing rules. There must be a reason for it. And I think that 26(m) is a rule which requires the committee to give some kind of indication that the testimony of a witness about a subject which has been announced by the committee may tend to defame, or degrade, or incriminate someone, and there is no indication of that at all, if I interpret correctly the kind of information which Mrs. Allen is ready to give the committee in an open, public hearing.

Mr. Ichord. Of course that is a determination for the committee to make, not you, and the committee has decided that it is in the national interest to hold these hearings in executive session.

Mr. Speiser. The committee, I might suggest, has to be concerned as to whether it has this information available to present to a court of law to justify holding the executive sessions, because I think the committee is going to be placed in that position.

Mr. Ichord. I believe I read in executive session some very compelling reasons, and I advised you why these hearings should be in executive session, and with that I would ask you again to advise your client accordingly, under possible penalty of contempt.

I want to be completely fair to you and to the witness.

Mr. Speiser. I appreciate your concern, Mr. Ichord.

Mr. Nittle. May I also state, Mr. Chairman, and to Mrs. Allen, that the questioning is expected to involve the activities of persons in organizations designated or known as Communist or subversive.

(The witness conferred with her counsel.)

Mr. Nittle. Mrs. Allen, did you hear the statement that I made, and did you understand it?

Mrs. Allen. I heard you, yes.

Mr. Ichord. I might add, Mr. Counsel, that I personally do not think that the witness testimony in public session would endanger the public security, but this is one of several hearings, and there are other compelling reasons why these should be in executive session.

Go ahead with your questioning, Mr. Counsel.

Mr. Pool. I am going to ask you for the last time, and I am going to direct you for the last time, to answer the question that counsel asked you.

Mrs. Allen. Mr. Chairman, I refuse to give any information or testimony in an executive hearing, but I will be willing to in public hearing.

Mr. Pool. You refuse to answer any questions asked to you by counsel or by the committee?

Mrs. Allen. Unless it is in a public hearing.

Mr. Pool. All right. With that you may take the witness outside, and call Dagmar Wilson.

Mr. Nittle. One more question of the witness.

Do you make that statement and come to that conclusion irrespective of the fact that the interrogation may tend to incriminate, degrade, or defame other persons?

(The witness conferred with her counsel.)

Mrs. Allen. I don't understand. I don't understand your question.

Mr. Nittle. The question was whether you take the position you do, that you will not testify in executive session, whether that position is taken irrespective of the fact that the interrogation that I propose to enter into with you will involve the activities of persons in organizations designated or known as Communist or subversive, and that may reflect upon such persons?

(The witness conferred with her counsel.)

Mrs. Allen. As I said before, I know of no information that would be either derogatory or defamatory about anyone. I couldn't possibly give any testimony that would degrade or defame anyone, and therefore I must refuse to testify or give any information at all except in a public hearing.

Mr. Nittle. It is not a question of whether you know any information that is derogatory, but whether the testimony and evidence to be elicited in the interrogation will reflect upon other persons, a fact known to the committee, and upon which basis it made its determination.

Mrs. Allen. I don't know what the committee knows, but I only know that I have no such information.

Mr. Ichord. Mr. Counsel, may I state this to her counsel?

Irrespective of whether there would be any information which would incriminate or disparage any other person, there are very pertinent reasons why these hearings should be in executive session. I have explained that to the counsel. She desires not to testify, and I ask that you call the next witness, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Pool. Tell the witnesses they are excused.

(Whereupon, at 4:05 p.m., the subcommittee adjourned, subject to call of the Chair.)

Appendix II

1. The following is an extract from the minutes of a meeting of the Committee on Un-American Activities held on February 26, 1963:

"The Committee on Un-American Activities met in executive session on Tuesday, February 26, 1963, at 3 p.m., in room 225 of the Old House Office Building. The following members were present: Clyde Doyle, acting chairman; William M. Tuck, Joe R. Pool, August E. Johansen, Henry C. Schadeberg.

"Also present were the following staff members: Francis J. McNamara, director; Frank S. Tavenner, Jr., general counsel; Juliette P. Joray, recording clerk; and Rosella A. Purdy, secretary.

"The acting chairman opened the meeting at 3:20 p.m. and explained to the members present that the meeting was called to consider several resolutions necessary to the reorganization of the committee for the 88th Congress.

"On motion of Mr. Tuck and seconded by Mr. Johansen, the following resolution was unanimously adopted, with Mr. Doyle voting the proxy of Mr. Walter and Mr. Tuck voting the proxy of Mr. Willis:

" '*Resolved*, That the chairman be authorized and empowered from time to time to appoint subcommittees composed of three or more members of the Committee on Un-American Activities, at least one of whom shall be of the minority political party, and a majority of whom shall constitute a quorum, for the purpose of performing any and all acts which the committee as a whole is authorized to perform.'

"On motion of Mr. Tuck and seconded by Mr. Johansen, the following resolution was unanimously adopted, with Mr. Doyle voting the proxy of Mr. Walter and Mr. Tuck voting the proxy of Mr. Willis:

" '*Resolved*, That authority is hereby delegated to each subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities which hereafter may be appointed to determine by a majority vote thereof whether the hearings conducted by it shall be open to the public or shall be in executive session, and all testimony taken and all documents introduced in evidence in such an executive session shall be received and given as full consideration for all purposes as though introduced in open session.'

"On motion made by Mr. Johansen, and seconded by Mr. Pool, the following resolution was unanimously adopted, with Mr. Doyle voting the proxy of Mr. Walter, and Mr. Tuck voting the proxy of Mr. Willis:

" '*Resolved*, That the rules of procedure revised by the Committee on Un-American Activities during the First Session of the 87th Congress and printed under the title of "Rules of Procedure—Committee on Un-American Activities," together with all applicable provisions of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, be, and they are hereby, adopted as the Rules of the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives of the 88th Congress.'

"The committee adjourned at 3:30 p.m.

"E. E. Willis,[1]
"Acting Chairman.
"Juliette P. Joray,
"Recording Clerk."

A copy of the aforesaid "Rules of Procedure—Committee on Un-American Activities," as revised in 1961, and as adopted in the foregoing resolution is attached to this Appendix and made a part hereof, marked as "Exhibit A."

2. The following is an extract from the minutes of a meeting of the Committee on Un-American Activities held on February 19, 1964:

"The Committee on Un-American Activities met in executive session on Wednesday, February 19, 1964, in room 356 of the Cannon

---

[1] Mr. Willis succeeded Mr. Doyle as acting chairman upon Mr. Doyle's decease.

House Office Building at 4:20 p.m. The following members were present: Edwin E. Willis, Chairman; William Tuck, Joe Pool, Richard Ichord, Henry Schadeberg.

"The following staff members were present: Francis J. McNamara, director; Frank S. Tavenner, Jr., general counsel; and Alfred M. Nittle, counsel.

"A motion was made by Mr. Tuck, seconded by Mr. Schadeberg, and unanimously carried authorizing the holding of hearings in Washington, D.C., or at such other place or places as the chairman may designate, on such date or dates as the chairman may determine, including the conduct of investigations deemed reasonably necessary by the staff in preparation therefor, relating to the following:

"1. Strategy, tactics and activities of members of the Communist Party and Communist organizations in aiding the entry into the United States of aliens inadmissible under the provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act;

"2. Security aspects of the temporary admission to the United States of aliens who are inadmissible under provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act, for the legislative purpose of determining whether the exigencies of the situation require a strengthening of the security provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act;

"3. The execution by the administrative agencies concerned of the security provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act, and all other laws, the subject matter of which is within the jurisdiction of the committee, the legislative purpose being to exercise continuous watchfulness of the execution of these laws to assist the Congress in appraising the administration of such laws, and in developing such amendments or related legislation as it may deem necessary; and

"4. Any other matter within the jurisdiction of the committee which it or any subcommittee thereof appointed to conduct these hearings may designate.

"The meeting adjourned at 4:40 p.m.

"Edwin E. Willis,
"*Chairman.*
"Francis J. McNamara,
"*Director.*"

3. The following is a copy of the order of the chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities, Representative Edwin E. Willis, appointing a subcommittee to conduct a hearing as contemplated by the foregoing resolution of February 19, 1964.

March 11, 1964.

To: Mr. Francis J. McNamara,
Director, Committee on Un-American Activities.

Pursuant to the provisions of the law and the rules of this committee, I hereby appoint a subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities, consisting of Hon. Richard Ichord and Hon. Henry C. Schadeberg as associate members, and Hon. Joe R. Pool, as chairman, to conduct a hearing in Washington, D.C., on Thursday, March 12, 1964, at 3 p.m., as contemplated by the resolution adopted by the committee on the 19th day of February 1964, relating to the entry of aliens into the United States and other matters under investigation by the committee and take such testimony on said day or succeeding days as it may deem necessary.

Please make this action a matter of committee record.

If any member indicates his inability to serve, please notify me.

Given under my hand this 11th day of March 1964.

E. E. Willis,
Chairman, Committee on Un-American Activities.

4. The following is a copy of the order of the chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities, Representative Edwin E. Willis, designating Representative August E. Johansen to serve on the aforesaid subcommittee until such time as Representative Henry C. Schadeberg can resume his service on said subcommittee:

September 4, 1964.

To: Mr. Francis J. McNamara,
Director, Committee on Un-American Activities.

On March 11, 1964, I appointed Hon. Joe R. Pool, Hon. Richard Ichord and Hon. Henry C. Schadeberg to serve as a subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities to conduct hearings as contemplated by the resolution adopted by the committee on the 19th day of February, 1964, relating to the entry of aliens into the United States and other matters under investigation by the committee. Mr. Schadeberg has notified me of his inability to serve on said subcommittee at its hearing scheduled for 10 a.m., Wednesday, September 9, 1964.

I hereby designate Hon. August E. Johansen to serve on said subcommittee in the place of Mr. Schadeberg at the hearing scheduled for September 9, 1964, and until such time as Mr. Schadeberg can resume his service on said subcommittee.

E. E. Willis,
Chairman, Committee on Un-American Activities.

The following is an extract from the minutes of a meeting of the aforesaid subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities, held on November 18, 1964:

"A subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities met in executive session on Wednesday, November 18, 1964, in room 225 of the Cannon House Office Building, Washington, D.C., at 11 a.m. The following members were present: Mr. Pool, chairman; Mr. Ichord (entered at 11:30 a.m.), Mr. Schadeberg. Mr. Johansen was also present.

"The following members of the committee staff were present: Francis J. McNamara, director; William Hitz, general counsel; Donald Appell, chief investigator; Mrs. Mary Valente, acting recording clerk.

"The director stated to the subcommittee that it was necessary to the committee inquiry relating to the entry of aliens into the United States and other matters to hear testimony from Dagmar Wilson, Donna Allen, and Russell A. Nixon. He explained why the testimony of these three individuals was necessary to the inquiry. On motion of Mr. Ichord, seconded by Mr. Schadeberg, the following resolution was unanimously adopted by the subcommittee:

"'Whereas the director of the committee explained the reasons why Dagmar Wilson, Donna Allen, and Russell A. Nixon should have knowledge of facts relevant and material to the investigations and hearings authorized by the committee resolution of February 19, 1964, relating to the entry of aliens into the United States, and other matters: Now, therefore, be it

"'*Resolved,* That the subcommittee is of the opinion that the within-named persons should be required to attend the said hearings and investigations as witnesses and to produce such books, papers, and documents, and to give such testimony as the subcommittee deems necessary; that the subcommittee deems such attendance to be necessary in furtherance of the committee's legislative purposes; and that the subcommittee authorizes subpenas to be issued therefor in accordance with the provisions of law.'

"The subcommittee agreed that Dagmar Wilson, Donna Allen, and Russell A. Nixon should be required to appear before the subcommittee on December 7, 1964, in executive session.

"The meeting adjourned at 12:25 p.m.

"Joe E. Pool,
"*Chairman.*
"Mrs. Mary Valente,
"*Acting Recording Secretary.*"

6. The following is a copy of the order of the chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities, Representative Edwin E. Willis, appointing Representative August E. Johansen to serve on the said subcommittee in the place of Representative Henry C. Schadeberg:

"To: Mr. Francis J. McNamara, director, Committee on Un-American Activities.

"On March 11, 1964, I appointed Hon. Joe R. Pool, Hon. Richard Ichord, and Hon. Henry C. Schadeberg to serve as a subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities to conduct hearings on contemplated by the resolution adopted by the committee on the 19th day of February 1964, relating to the entry of aliens into the United States and other matters under investigation by the committee. Mr. Schadeberg has indicated that he may be unable to serve on said subcommittee at its contemplated December 7, 1964, hearing, and possibly on other days, before and after that date, during the remainder of the year when meetings and hearings of the subcommittee may be held.

"I hereby designate Hon. August E. Johansen to serve on the said subcommittee in the place of Hon. Henry C. Schadeberg for the remainder of the year at any meetings and hearings of the subcommittee which Mr. Schadeberg is unable to attend.

"Given under my hand this 25th day of November 1964.

"E. E. Willis,
"*Chairman, Committee on Un-American Activities.*"

7. The following is an extract from the minutes of a meeting of the aforesaid subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities, held on December 7, 1964, at 10:08 a.m.

"A subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities designated by the chairman on November 25, 1964, to sit at hearings in the matter of entry of aliens in the United States under waiver of ineligibility, met in room 225, Cannon House Office Building at 10:08 o'clock a.m. The following members were present: Joe R. Pool, chairman; Richard Ichord, August E. Johansen. Representative Donald G. Bruce was also present.

"The staff members present were Francis J. McNamara, director; Alfred M. Nittle, counsel; Donald T. Appell, chief investigator; and Juliette P. Joray, recording clerk.

"The director advised the members that a request had been received by the committee from Lawrence Speiser, director of the Washington office of the American Civil Liberties Union and attorney for Mrs. Dagmar Wilson and Mrs. Donna Allen, that the hearings scheduled for December 7 and 8 be canceled or held in public session rather than in executive session. Following a discussion during which the reasons for holding the hearings in executive sessions were fully explored, Mr. Ichord moved that Mr. Speiser's request be denied and that the hearings be held in executive session. Mr. Johansen seconded the motion and the chairman so ordered.

"The chief investigator briefed the members of Russell Nixon's background.

"The subcommittee agreed to have all three witnesses in the hearing room at the same time for the reading of the opening statement.

"The meeting adjourned at 10:15 a.m.

"Joe R. Pool,
"*Chairman of Subcommittee.*
"Juliette P. Joray,
"*Recording Clerk.*"

The following letter dated December 1, 1964, on the letterhead of the Washington office of the American Civil Liberties Union, and signed by Lawrence Speiser, director of the Washington office, is the request to which reference is made in the above minutes as having been received by the committee from Lawrence Speiser:

"Hon. Edwin E. Willis,
"*Chairman, Committee on Un-American Activities, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.*

"Dear Chairman Willis: I am the attorney for Mrs. Dagmar Wilson and Mrs. Donna

Allen who have been subpenaed to appear before a subcommittee of the House Committee on Un-American Activities in an executive session concerning their personal visit to the State Department in 1963 to urge it to issue a visitor's visa to Prof. Kaoru Yasui so that he could fulfill speaking engagements all over the country.

"I have a great deal of difficulty in believing that you have authorized the issuance of subpenas to Mrs. Wilson and Mrs. Allen for this reason. It would seem that the open and aboveboard personal visitation of American citizens to an executive agency to urge its authorization of the entry into this country of a speaker (whose entry was later approved) should not be the basis of any congressional investigation. On its face, such an investigation violates the first amendment's protection of the right of citizens to petition the Government and the right to hear all points of view.

"Accordingly, I respectfully request that the hearings be canceled. In the event that this request is not granted, then I request on behalf of Mrs. Wilson and Mrs. Allen that the hearings be public, rather than in executive session.

"Sincerely yours,
"LAWRENCE SPEISER,
"*Director, Washington Office.*"

8. The following are the minutes of a meeting of the aforesaid subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities held on December 7, 1964, at 11 a.m.

"A subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities designated by the chairman on November 25, 1964, to sit at hearings in the matter of entry of aliens in the United States under waiver of ineligibility, met on December 7, 1964. The following members were present: Joe R. Pool, chairman; Richard Ichord, August E. Johansen. Representative Donald C. Bruce was also present.

"The staff members present were Francis J. McNamara, director; Alfred M. Nittle, counsel; and Donald Appell, chief investigator.

"The subcommittee discussed and considered again the request previously received in a letter from Mr. Lawrence Speiser, attorney for Dagmar Wilson and Donna Allen, that the hearings be canceled or held in public. It also considered the additional requests Mr. Speiser made in the hearings prior to recess relative to a public hearing for his clients. In addition, the subcommittee considered the views and requests of Russell Nixon expressed prior to recess.

"The subcommittee, in its deliberations, viewed these requests in the light of all relevant committee resolutions and applicable rules of the House and the committee itself, including House rules 26(g) and 26(m), and committee rule IV. The subcommittee concluded that rule XI 26(g) was applicable, and that an executive session was desirable, for reasons of national interest, because of the area of Government operations involved, but which could not be disclosed to the witnesses at this time in any detail without violating that interest. It was also determined that rule XI 26(m) precluded a public hearing at this stage of the investigation because the proposed area of interrogation would involve persons, other than the witnesses, in a defamatory or possibly incriminating manner forbidden by the rule.

"The subcommittee unanimously concluded that the hearing should be continued in executive session and the requests of the witnesses for a public hearing denied.

"It was agreed that Mr. Ichord would prepare a statement expressing the subcommittee's determination, which he would make for the record when the hearing was reconvened at 2 p.m.

"It was agreed that, in the interim, Mr. Ichord would check with the Parliamentarian of the House to obtain his view of the issues confronting the subcommittee and determine whether or not he believed the position adopted by the subcommittee was a correct one.

"The meeting adjourned at approximately 11:35 a.m.

"JOE R. POOL,
"*Chairman.*
"JULIETTE P. JORAY,
"*Recording Secretary.*"

The following are the minutes of the aforesaid subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities held on December 7, 1964, at 2 p.m.:

"A subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities designated by the chairman on November 25, 1964, to sit at hearings in the matter of entry of aliens in the United States under waiver of ineligibility, met in executive session in room 225, Cannon House Office Building, at 2 p.m. on December 7, 1964.

"The following members were present: Joe R. Pool, chairman; Richard Ichord, August E. Johansen. Representative Donald C. Bruce was also present.

"The staff members present were Francis J. McNamara, director; Alfred M. Nittle, counsel; Donald T. Appell, chief investigator, and Juliette P. Joray, recording clerk,

"With further reference to the requests of Russell Nixon and Mr. Speiser on behalf of his clients, Mrs. Dagmar Wilson and Mrs. Donna Allen, discussed at the meetings held this day, Mr. Ichord reported to the subcommittee on his contacts with the Assistant Parliamentarian, William Cochrane, in the absence of the Parliamentarian, Mr. Deschler. Mr. Ichord stated that the Assistant Parliamentarian advised him that by virtue of the committee resolutions, committee rules and applicable House rules, the subcommittee was empowered to order an executive session.

"The committee deliberated and concluded that there were aspects of national interest involved which require the holding of these hearings in executive session and that rule XI, 26(m), was operative in that the area of interrogation of these three witnesses might tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate persons other than the witnesses. It was suggested that Mr. Ichord prepare a statement on behalf of the subcommittee, the contents of which were unanimously approved by the subcommittee, and which Mr. Ichord was to deliver upon the reconvening of the subcommittee following the recess.

"On motion of Mr. Ichord, seconded by Mr. Johansen and unanimously adopted, it was agreed that the requests of Mr. Nixon, Mrs. Wilson and Mrs. Allen, should again be denied.

"The meeting recessed at 2:45 p.m.

"JOE R. POOL,
"*Chairman.*
"JULIETTE P. JORAY,
"*Recording Secretary.*"

10. The following is an extract of the minutes of the aforesaid subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities held on December 7, 1964, at 4:05 p.m.:

"A subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities designated by the chairman on November 25, 1964, to sit at hearings in the matter of entry of aliens in the United States under waiver of ineligibility, met in executive session on December 7, 1964, in room 219 of the Cannon House Office Building at 4:05 p.m. The following members were present: Joe R. Pool, chairman; Richard Ichord, August E. Johansen. Representative Donald C. Bruce was also present.

"The staff members present were Francis J. McNamara, director; Alfred M. Nittle, counsel; Donald T. Appell, chief investigator; and Juliette P. Joray, recording clerk.

"The subcommittee was called to order by the chairman who stated that the purpose of the meeting was to consider what action the subcommittee should take regarding the refusal of Russell Nixon to be sworn or examined as a witness; and the failures of Dagmar Wilson and Donna Allen to testify at the hearings conducted by the said subcommittee on the 7th day of December 1964, and what recommendation it would make to the full committee regarding their citation for contempt of the House of Representatives.

"After full discussion of the testimony of Donna Allen, a motion was made by Mr. ICHORD, seconded by Mr. JOHANSEN, and unanimously carried that a report of the facts relating to the refusal of Donna Allen to answer any question before the said subcommittee at the hearing aforesaid, be referred and submitted to the Committee on Un-American Activities as a whole, with the recommendation that a report of the facts relating to the refusal of said witness to answer any question, together with all of the facts in connection therewith, be referred to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, with the recommendation that the said witness be cited for contempt of the House of Representatives, to the end that she may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

"The meeting adjourned at 4:15 p.m.

"JOE R. POOL,
"*Chairman.*
"JULIETTE P. JORAY,
"*Recording Clerk.*"

11. The following is an extract of the minutes of a meeting of the full Committee on Un-American Activities held on December 10, 1964, at 10 a.m.:

"The Committee on Un-American Activities met in executive session on Thursday morning, December 10, 1964, in room 225, Cannon House Office Building, at 10 o'clock a.m. The following members were present: Edwin E. Willis, chairman; William Tuck, Joe R. Pool, Richard Ichord, Donald C. Bruce.

"Also present were the following staff members: Francis J. McNamara, director; William Hitz, general counsel; Alfred M. Nittle, counsel; Donald T. Appell, chief investigator; Philip Manuel, investigator; and Juliette P. Joray, recording clerk.

"Chairman WILLIS called the meeting to order at 10:18 a.m. and announced that this special meeting of the committee was called, after notice to all committee members, for the purpose of considering a recommendation of the subcommittee headed by Mr. Pool, looking into the entry of aliens into the United States under waiver of ineligibility, that Russell Nixon, Dagmar Wilson, and Donna Allen be cited for contempt because of their refusals to testify before the subcommittee in executive session on Monday of this week, December 7.

"The chairman then directed Mr. POOL, chairman of the subcommittee, to report on the matter being considered by the committee.

Representative POOL reported to the committee that he was chairman of the subcommittee appointed by the chairman, composed of himself, Representatives Richard H. Ichord and August E. Johansen, to conduct hearings on December 7, 1964, at Washington, D.C., as contemplated under the resolution adopted by the committee on the 19th day of February, 1964; that the subcommittee met in executive session on December 7, 1964, in the Cannon House Office Building, Washington, D.C., to receive the testimony of Russell Nixon, Donna Allen, and Dagmar Wilson who had been duly subpenaed to appear as witnesses before said subcommittee; the said meeting of the subcommittee was attended on December 7, 1964, by subcommittee chairman, Representative Joe R. Pool, and Representatives Richard H. Ichord, and August E. Johansen; that the witness, Russell Nixon, having appeared before the subcommittee, refused to be sworn or examined as a witness, willfully refused to answer any question pertinent to the question under inquiry, and willfully refused to give any testimony touching matters of inquiry committed before said subcommittee; and the said Donna Allen appeared before the subcommittee, was administered an affirmation as a witness by the subcommittee chairman but willfully refused to testify in response to any question pertinent to the question or subject under inquiry; that the said Dagmar Wilson appeared before the subcommittee, was duly sworn as a witness, and when asked to state her name and residence for the record and whether she was represented by counsel, she responded to those questions, but thereupon and thereafter willfully refused to answer any question pertinent to the question under inquiry and willfully refused to give any testimony touching matters of inquiry before said subcommittee as required by her subpena; that the subcommittee thereafter met in executive session, attended by the said subcommittee chairman, Representative Pool, and Representatives Ichord and Johansen, being all of the members of the said subcommittee; at which time, motions were made and unanimously adopted with respect to each of said persons, to wit, Russell Nixon, Donna Allen, and Dagmar Wilson, that a report of the facts relating to the refusal of each of them to testify before said subcommittee at said hearings after having been summoned to appear to testify before said subcommittee, be referred and submitted to the Committee on Un-American Activities as a whole, with a recommendation that a report and statement of fact with reference to the refusal of each of said witnesses to appear to testify as aforesaid, be made to and filed with the Speaker of the House, the House now being adjourned sine die, in order that the said Speaker may certify the same under the seal of the House, to the appropriate U.S. attorney to the end that each of said witnesses may be proceeded against for contempt of the House of Representatives in the manner and form provided by law.

"A motion was made by Mr. Pool, seconded by Mr. Tuck, that the subcommittee's report of the facts relating to the refusal of Donna Allen to testify before the said subcommittee at the hearings conducted before it in Washington, D.C., on the 7th day of December, 1964, be and the same is hereby appproved and adopted, and that the Committee on Un-American Activities report the said failure of Donna Allen to the Honorable John McCormack, Speaker of the House of Representatives, the House of Representatives now being adjourned sine die, in order that the said Speaker may certify the same to the U.S. attorney for the District of Columbia to the end that the said Donna Allen may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law; and that the chairman of this committee is hereby authorized and directed to forward such report and statement of fact constituting such failure of Donna Allen to the said Speaker of the House of Representatives. Following discussion, the motion was put to a vote and it was unanimously adopted. Mr. Pool asked for the yeas and nays to be recorded. The yeas and nays were taken. Mr. Willis voted 'yea,' Mr. Tuck voted 'yea,' Mr. Pool voted 'yea,' Mr. Ichord voted 'yea,' and Mr. Bruce voted 'yea.' Mr. Bruce also stated that he was authorized to vote the proxy of Mr. Johansen and that if he were present he would vote 'yea.' So the motion was agreed to.

"The meeting was adjourned at 11:15 a.m.

"Edwin E. Willis,
"Chairman.
"Juliette P. Joray,
"Recording Clerk."

Report and Statement of Fact of the Committee on Un-American Activities, House of Representatives, Pursuant to Title 2, United States Code, Sections 192 and 194, Concerning the Failure of Russell Nixon

To the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

The Committee on Un-American Activities, as created and authorized by the House of Representatives through the enactment of Public Law 601 of the 79th Congress, section 121, subsection (q) (2), and under House Resolution 5 of the 88th Congress, duly caused to be issued a subpena to Russell Nixon. The said subpena directed Russell Nixon to be and appear before the said Committee on Un-American Activities, of which the Honorable Edwin E. Willis is chairman, or a duly appointed subcommittee thereof, on Monday, December 7, 1964, at the hour of 10 a.m., at their committee room, 226 Old House Office Building, Washington, D.C., then and there to testify touching matters of inquiry committed to said committee, and not to depart without leave of said committee. The subpena served upon Russell Nixon is set forth in words and figures as follows:

"United States of America,
"Congress of the United States.

"To Russell Nixon, *Greeting:*

"Pursuant to lawful authority, you are hereby commanded to be and appear before the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives of the United States, or a duly appointed subcommittee thereof, on Monday, December 7, 1964, at 10 o'clock a.m., at their committee room, 226 Old House Office Building, Washington, D.C., then and there to testify touching matters of inquiry committed to said committee and not to depart without leave of said committee.

"Hereof fail not, as you will answer your default under the pains and penalties in such cases made and provided.

"To Louis J. Russell or U.S. marshal, to serve and return.

"Given under my hand this 18th day of November, in the year of our Lord, 1964.

"Joe R. Pool.
"Chairman—Chairman of Subcommittee—Member Designate of the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives.

"If you desire a conference with a representative of the committee prior to the date of the hearing, please call or write to Staff Director, Committee on Un-American Activities, Washington, D.C., telephone Capitol 4-3121, extension 3051."

The said subpena was duly served as appears by the return thereof by the U.S. marshal, who was duly authorized to serve the said subpena. The return of the service by the said U.S. marshal is set forth in words and figures, as follows:

"Received this writ at New York, N.Y., on November 23, 1964, and on November 23, 1964, at 197 East Fourth Street, New York, N.Y., I served it on the within-named Russell Nixon by leaving a copy thereof or a subpena ticket with Russell Nixon.

"Anthony R. Marasco,
"U.S. Marshal.
"By James E. O'Tool,
"Deputy U.S. Marshal."

A subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities, composed of Representatives Joe R. Pool, as chairman, Richard Ichord, and August E. Johansen, met and convened in executive session at or about 10 a.m., on December 7, 1964, in room 219, Cannon House Office Building, Washington, D.C., the said subcommittee members all being present. Russell Nixon having been duly summoned as a witness as aforesaid, was called as a witness on that day. He appeared before the subcommittee but willfully refused to be sworn or examined as a witness, willfully refused to answer any question pertinent to the question under inquiry, and willfully refused to give any testimony touching matters of inquiry committed to said committee as required by the said subpena.

The record of the proceedings before the said subcommittee on Monday, December 7, 1964, so far as it affects the witness Russell Nixon, is set forth in appendix I, which is attached hereto and made a part hereof.

Other pertinent committee proceedings are set forth in appendix II, attached hereto and made a part hereof.

The foregoing willful refusal by the said Russell Nixon to give such testimony as required, in compliance with the said subpena, deprived the committee of necessary and pertinent testimony regarding matters which the said committee was instructed by law and House resolution to investigate, and places the said witness, Russell Nixon, in contempt of the House of Representatives of the United States.

Pursuant to resolution of the Committee on Un-American Activities adopted at a meeting duly held on December 10, 1964, a copy of which is set forth in appendix II, on page 1395, this report and statement of fact constituting the failure of Russell Nixon is herewith transmitted to and filed with the Honorable John W. McCormack, Speaker of the House of Representatives, the House of Representatives having adjourned sine die on October 3, 1964, and not being now in session, so that the Speaker may certify the same under the Seal of the House to the U.S. Attorney for the District of Columbia, pursuant to title 2, United States Code, sections 192 and 194, to the end that the said Russell Nixon may be proceeded against for contempt of the House of Representatives in the manner and form provided by law.

Respectfully submitted this 10th day of December 1964.

E. E. Willis,
Chairman, Committee on Un-American Activities.

Appendix I

Executive Session, Entry of Aliens Into the United States, Monday, December 7, 1964

U.S. House of Representatives,
Subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities.
Washington, D.C.

A subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities met, pursuant to call, at 10 a.m., in room 219, Cannon Building, Washington, D.C., Hon. Joe Pool (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Joe Pool of Texas; Richard H. Ichord, of Missouri; and August E. Johansen of Michigan.

Staff members present: Francis J. McNamara, director, Alfred M. Nittle, counsel, and Donald T. Appell, investigator.

Mr. Pool. The committee will come to order.

Before we get started I have an opening statement I want to read and I would like to know if Donna Allen, Dagmar Wilson, and Russell Nixon are in the room? Will you identify yourselves.

Mrs. Wilson. My name is Dagmar Wilson.

Mrs. Allen. Donna Allen.

Mr. Nixon. Nixon.

Mr. Pool. The Internal Security Act of 1950, a bill reported by this committee, contained provisions which barred aliens of certain types from admission to the United States either as immigrants or as nonimmigrant visitors.

The Congress subsequently incorporated these provisions in Public Law 414 of the 82d Congress, generally known as the McCarran-Walter Act or the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952.

Section 212, subsection (a), paragraphs (27) and (29) of that act classify certain types of aliens as inadmissible to this country and not subject to admission under provisions found elsewhere in the act, namely paragraph (28) of the same subsection and paragraph (3) of subsection (d).

Section 212, subsection (a), paragraph (28) of the act also classifies certain types of aliens as inadmissible. However, it contains a subparagraph (I) which grants to the Attorney General, on recommendation of the consular officer, the authority to issue them entry visas under certain conditions. This subparagraph provides, however, that their admission must always be in the public interest. In addition, it applies only to aliens inadmissible under paragraph (28).

Section 212(d)(3) grants the Attorney General, on recommendation of the consular officer or the Secretary of State, discretionary power to waive the inadmissibility of certain aliens described in Section 212(a) except for those barred under paragraphs (27) and (29) of that section. Such waiver, however, applies only to temporary or nonimmigrant visas.

Information which has been brought to the attention of the Committee on Un-American Activities indicates that the discretionary authority of the consular officer or the Secretary of State to recommend, and of the Attorney General to approve, the issuance of nonimmigrant visas are possibly being abused.

Preliminary investigation by the committee, authorized by the chairman several months ago, raises serious questions as to whether the intent of Congress is being followed in the admission to this country of aliens under the above-mentioned sections of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952.

The investigation has also raised the question of whether the available background information on certain aliens temporarily admitted to this country is being properly evaluated. This may be resulting in certain aliens being classified as ineligible under paragraph (28)—and therefore eligible for a waiver—when they properly come under paragraphs (27) or (29) and are therefore ineligible for admission under waiver.

This hearing was authorized by the committee at a meeting held on February 19, 1964. The minutes of that meeting read, in part, as follows:

"A motion was made by Hon. William M. Tuck, seconded by Hon. Henry C. Schadeberg, and unanimously carried, authorizing the holding of hearings in Washington, D.C., or at such other place or places as the chairman may designate, on such date or dates as the chairman may determine, including the conduct of investigations deemed reasonably necessary by the staff in preparation therefor, related to the following:

"1. Strategy, tactics, and activities of members of the Communist Party and Communist organizations in aiding the entry into the United States of aliens inadmissible under the provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act;

"2. Security aspects of the temporary admission to the United States of aliens who are inadmissible under provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act, for the legislative purpose of determining whether the exigencies of the situation require a strengthening of the security provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act;

"3. The execution by the administrative agencies concerned of the security provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act, and all other laws, the subject matter of which is within the jurisdiction of the committee, the legislative purpose being to exercise continuous watchfulness of the execution of these laws to assist the Congress in appraising the administration of such laws, and in developing such amendments or related legislation as it may deem necessary; and

"4. Any other matter within the jurisdiction of the committee which it or any subcommittee thereof appointed to conduct these hearings may designate."

The order appointing the subcommittee to conduct these hearings is as follows:

"To: Mr. Francis J. McNamara, Director, Committee on Un-American Activities.

"Pursuant to the provisions of the law and the rules of this committee, I hereby appoint a subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities consisting of Hon. Richard Ichord and Hon. Henry C. Schadeberg as associate members, and Hon. Joe R. Pool, as chairman, to conduct a hearing in Washington, D.C., on Thursday, March 12, 1964, at 3 p.m., as contemplated by the resolution adopted by the committee on the 19th day of February 1964, relating to the entry of aliens into the United States and other matters under investigation by the committee, and take such testimony on said day or succeeding days as it may deem necessary.

"Please make this action a matter of committee record.

"If any member indicates his inability to serve, please notify me.

"Given under my hand this 11th day of March 1964.

"Edwin E. Willis,
"Chairman, Committee on
Un-American Activities."

I also have a memorandum to Mr. Francis J. McNamara, Director, Committee on Un-American Activities.

"On March 11, 1964, I appointed Hon. Joe R. Pool, Hon. Richard Ichord, and Hon. Henry C. Schadeberg to serve as a Subcommittee on Un-American Activities to conduct hearings as contemplated by the resolution adopted by the committee on the 19th day of February 1964, relating to the entry of aliens into the United States and other matters under investigation by the committee. Mr. Schadeberg has indicated that he may be unable to serve on said subcommittee at its contemplated December 7, 1964, hearing, and possibly on other days, before and after that date, during the remainder of the year when meetings and hearings of the subcommittee may be held.

"I hereby designate Hon. August E. Johansen to serve on the said subcommittee in the place of Hon. Henry C. Schadeberg for the remainder of the year at any meetings and hearings of the subcommittee which Mr. Schadeberg is unable to attend.

"Given under my hand this 25th day of November 1964.

"Edwin E. Willis,
"Chairman, Committee on
Un-American Activities."

Mr. Speiser, the subcommittee has met and considered your letter which is dated December 1, 1964, and has denied your request for a public hearing due to the fact that rule XXVI is involved, which this committee has been very zealous in following, due to the fact that derogatory information might be revealed during these hearings, so your request has been denied.

Do you have any other reason or any other request to make of the committee at this time?

Mr. Speiser. Yes, sir. Has the committee made a determination under rule IV of the committee's rules that a public hearing might endanger national security?

Mr. Pool. I didn't get your statement.

Mr. Speiser. Has the committee made a determination under rule IV of the committee's rules of procedure that a public hearing might endanger national security?

Mr. Pool. You are asking me something here that might have taken place in executive session and I am not at liberty to answer your question unless the committee decides to make it public. That would be my answer to that.

Mr. Speiser. I would like to make a motion then that the committee cannot properly hold an executive session unless they make such a determination and if such a determination has not been made that a public hearing should be ordered.

Mr. Ichord. Mr. Chairman, may I ask is that the only request that he has prior to the committee taking up its business?

Do you have any further objections to the executive hearing?

Mr. Speiser. The objections I stated in my letter and this is an additional one. Those are the two objections I have to an executive session.

Mr. Ichord. I think we should take that under consideration, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Pool. If you have no further statement or objections to make, then we will ask you all to step outside and we will make a determination of what the committee wants to do. Those are all the objections you have to raise before the testimony begins?

Mr. Speiser. That is on the question of executive session as compared to a public session. There may be other objections with regard to particular witnesses' testimony.

Mr. Pool. What other objections do you have at this time?

Mr. Speiser. I do not know at this time, Mr. Chairman. I cannot say until the matter comes up before the committee. I can't make a statement there.

Mr. Pool. That is a good point. Who do you represent here now?

Mr. Speiser. I represent Mrs. Allen and Mrs. Wilson.

Mr. Pool. All right. Mr. Nixon, do you have counsel?

Mr. Nixon. No, sir.

Mr. Pool. Would you like to state any objections at the present time before this hearing begins?

Mr. Nixon. I certainly associate myself with the objections stated by Mr. Speiser. I am not a lawyer. I would add the point that it would be unfortunate to require this kind of testimony, with the opprobrium of this kind of subpena, in private without having a full public and press view of the proceedings. The hearing is in only one sense private, since the committee maintains to itself the privilege at a date of its own choosing, the privilege of releasing to the press either a summary, or a partial transcript, or a full transcript of the hearings, so it is in this sense also that I would add an objection to these proceedings going ahead in executive.

I think that the press and the public have a right to hear the proceedings.

Mr. Pool. That is all of the objections you have, plus the ones that you associated yourself with in Mr. Speiser's case?

Mr. Nixon. Yes, sir, I think so.

Mr. Ichord. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee go into executive session for consideration of the request.

Mr. Pool. All right. The witnesses and the attorney will be excused and we will call you back in when we get through with this deliberation. Make yourselves available outside in the hall if you will.

(At this point the witnesses and attorney left the hearing room and the subcommittee proceeded further in executive session, which proceedings were not reported, following which the witnesses and attorney returned to the hearing room.)

Mr. Pool. The committee will come to order.

Mr. Speiser, the subcommittee feels that you have misinterpreted rule IV. It requires that if the committee or a subcommittee believes interrogation of a witness in public might endanger national security it must then hear such witness in executive session.

It does not say that reasons of national security are the only ones that permit or justify executive session hearings. For your information we have considered all the applicable rules as the full committee did months ago and have determined this hearing will be held in executive session.

Mr. Nixon's request has also been considered in the light of all applicable rules and has been rejected.

Mr. Speiser. Mr. Pool, am I to understand that a determination has been made that a public hearing would not endanger national security?

Mr. Pool. I have just read to you the statement here that was the determination of the subcommittee and it speaks for itself.

Mr. Speiser. I will leave my question on the record as it is. I do not feel it was answered. I would like to raise a question as to the absence of a quorum at this time, Mr. Chairman.

(At this point Representative Bruce entered the hearing room.)

I withdraw it.

(At this point Representative Johansen entered the hearing room.)

Mr. Pool. I didn't get the last.

Mr. Speiser. I raised the question of the absence of a quorum because Mr. Bruce and Mr. Johansen were not present. I withdraw it.

Mr. Pool. For the record there was a quorum here. It is a subcommittee of three members and Mr. Ichord and myself constitute a quorum.

Mr. Nixon, if you will come forth and be sworn in the other witnesses may be excused temporarily until they are called.

Mr. Nixon. Mr. Pool, I am not going to testify in this executive session. I am willing to testify in public session with the press and the public present, but for the reasons which I have stated here I am unwilling to proceed in this executive session.

Mr. Pool. I will direct you to come forward and be sworn.

Mr. Nixon. I think my statement speaks for itself, Mr. Pool.

Mr. Pool. For the last time I direct you to come forth and be sworn.

Mr. Nixon. I decline, as I have told you.

Mr. Pool. Let the record show that the chairman requested Mr. Nixon to come forth and be sworn and that he has refused to do so.

Mr. Johansen. Mr. Chairman, let the record also show that all three members of the subcommittee were present.

Mr. Pool. Let the record so show. The other witnesses and the attorney will leave the room at the present time temporarily. Mr. Nixon, you remain.

(At this point Mrs. Wilson, Mrs. Allen, and Mr. Speiser, left the room.)

Mr. Pool. Mr. Nixon, for the record we are now in executive session. The committee is called to order and for your information under rule 26 this committee is charged with the responsibility of having executive sessions when testimony might be given which might be derogatory to certain persons.

In view of this fact the subcommittee has decided this session shall be in executive session and I now therefore direct you to come forward and be sworn in.

Mr. Nixon. I guess we need to repeat what I have said before. You already have in the record certain objections to the executive character of this hearing and I have associated myself with all of the statements that have been made here. I associate myself with Mrs. Wilson and Mrs. Allen who will take the same position, and I repeat to you now that I am available to you for public hearing at which the public is present and the witness and at which the press is present and the witness.

I will not just speak further in this executive hearing.

Mr. Pool. Were you served with a subpena to appear before this committee?

Mr. Nixon. Yes, sir.

Mr. Pool. Do you have any objections to the service of that subpena?

Mr. Nixon. I accepted the subpena.

Mr. Pool. You accepted it, and you are here today in accordance with the subpena?

Mr. Nixon. Yes, sir.

Mr. Pool. But you are now refusing to appear and testify under oath?

Mr. Nixon. No. No, I am not. I am refusing to appear and testify under oath in executive, private hearing. I am available to testify under oath in a public hearing to which the press and the public is invited.

Mr. Pool. Mr. Nixon, the counsel for the committee would like to ask you a question.

Mr. Nittle. Mr. Nixon, have you been furnished with a copy of the rules of procedure of this committee and of the House?

Mr. Nixon. Yes, sir. Rules of the committee I have been furnished with, yes, sir.

Mr. Nittle. The copy with which you were furnished includes also a copy of the applicable rules of the House governing the procedures of all committees of Congress. I now hand you a copy of rule XI of the House and direct your attention particularly to paragraph 26(m) of the rules and I ask you to read paragraph 26(m) of the rules of the House.

Mr. Nixon. Twenty-six (m). If the committee determines that evidence or testimony at an investigative hearing may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person it shall—

(1) Receive such evidence or testimony in executive session;

(2) Afford such person an opportunity voluntarily to appear as a witness; and

(3) Receive and dispose of requests from such persons to subpoena additional witnesses.

Mr. Nittle. We advise you that the committee has met and considered the application of rule 26(m) to the testimony which it expects to receive from you and that by rule 26(m) we are precluded from receiving your testimony in public session.

Mr. Nixon. I understand from the proceedings that have gone on that there is no question of national security involved and I can assure you that I would not say anything that is derogatory to any person.

Mr. Pool. As chairman of the committee I would like the record to show that this subcommittee has made no such statement. We have considered all the rules of the committee in making our determination.

Mr. Nixon. The exchange with Mr. Speiser will speak for itself.

Mr. Ichord. Mr. Nixon, I think as a member of the committee, and since you are not represented here by counsel today, that I should advise you that the rules of the House under certain situations require that the committee hearings be held in executive session.

There is no restriction upon the right of the committee to determine an executive session as I interpret the rule, and you may, by refusal to be sworn and testify before the committee, be possibly subjecting yourself to penalties of contempt, and I would advise you of that since you aren't represented by an attorney and ask that you be sworn and testify before this committee.

This committee is a duly established committee of Congress, and Congress and its committees does have the right to meet in executive session, and this committee in these hearings has many reasons to hold an executive session.

That is the reason we are asking you to testify in executive hearing today.

Mr. Nittle. Mr. Nixon, may I point out to you that the rule to which Mr. Ichord has just referred is rule XI of the House, paragraph 26(g), which reads as follows:

"All hearings conducted by standing committees or their subcommittees shall be open to the public, except executive sessions for marking up bills or for voting or where the committee by a majority vote orders an executive session."

You are informed that the committee has by majority vote ordered an executive session in the case of your appearance here. You are aware of that fact, are you not?

Mr. Nixon. I don't know anything about the majority vote. I was not present obviously. I don't challenge that, Mr. Nittle. I just tell you I don't know.

Mr. Nittle. I ask the chairman to inform Mr. Nixon of the fact that by a majority vote the committee has ordered an executive session.

Mr. Pool. That is correct. The committee has by majority vote decided that this shall be an executive session.

Mr. Ichord. Mr. Nixon, would you like to consult with an attorney before you make this decision?

Mr. Nixon. Thank you very much, Mr. Ichord. I don't need to consult an attorney.

Mr. Bruce. Mr. Chairman, may I ask, Mr. Nixon, you did hear the statement by the chairman and understand that the committee by a majority vote did authorize an executive session? You now have heard that and you do understand it?

Mr. Nixon. Oh, yes, and I think you understand that I am ready to testify in public hearing, that my subpena made no reference to executive session, and that I am available to the committee to testify in public, that it is my understanding there is no question of national security involved, and certainly as far as anything I would have to say before the committee there would be absolutely nothing derogatory of any nature.

Mr. Johansen. Mr. Nixon, you are familiar of course with section VII of the rules of procedure of the committee? A VII: "At every hearing, public or executive, every witness shall be accorded the privilege of having counsel of his own choosing."

You are aware of that?

Mr. Nixon. Yes, I am aware of that.

Mr. Johansen. And by your own choice you appear without counsel.

Mr. Nixon. I do not have counsel.

Mr. Nittle. Do you wish to consult counsel prior to making a firm determination today that you will not testify?

Mr. Nixon. No, I don't need to. You will find we all three agree.

Mr. Nittle. Do you wish to consult an attorney so that your position may be considered?

Mr. Nixon. No, sir.

Mr. Nittle. You bear in mind that your refusal to testify and to be sworn as a witness may result in a prosecution for contempt?

Mr. Nixon. I am always aware of the dangers when I come before this committee.

Mr. Nittle. You have referred to rule IV of the committee relating to executive sessions where a public hearing might endanger national security. We previously discussed the rules of the House relating to executive sessions. You are aware that the committee is bound by the rules of the House, are you not?

Mr. Nixon. Yes, sir.

Mr. Nittle. And if there is any conflict between the rules of the committee and the House the House rules would govern, is that correct?

Mr. Nixon. That is not a decision for me to make, is it?

Mr. Nittle. We inform you of that fact.

Mr. Pool. Mr. Nixon, as chairman of the committee I ask you and direct you to stand and be sworn. This will be the last time I make this directive.

Mr. Nixon. I give you the same answer. I can repeat it if you wish. You can read it from the record.

Mr. Pool. Do you refuse to be sworn?

Mr. Nixon. No, I don't refuse to be sworn. I refuse to be sworn at an executive hearing; available to be sworn and to be heard in a public hearing with the press and the public present.

Mr. Pool. I am going to give you the oath and then you can do what you wish.

Do you solemnly swear that the testimony you are about to give is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. Ichord. Let the record show that the witness refused to be sworn and take the oath.

Mr. Pool. That is correct.

Mr. Johansen. Let the record show that all three members of the subcommittee were present throughout these proceedings.

Mr. Ichord. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the other witnesses be called.

Mr. Pool. All right. Mr. Nixon, you will leave the room and the staff will call the other witness.

(At this point Mr. Nixon left the room.)

(All the witnesses and Mr. Speiser came back into the hearing room.)

Mr. Pool. I brought you witnesses and attorney in here to excuse you until 2 o'clock when we will meet back in this room.

Donna Allen, Dagmar Wilson, and Russell Nixon, let the record show, are excused until 2 o'clock.

Mr. Speiser. Mr. Chairman, can you tell us at this time whether the hearing will be public at 2 o'clock?

Mr. Pool. You are excused until 2 o'clock. That's all I have to say to you at the present time.

(Whereupon, at 11:30 a.m., the hearing was recessed to reconvene at 2 p.m., the same day.)

[After recess]

(The subcommittee reconvened at 2:50 p.m., Mr. Pool, chairman of the subcommittee, presiding. Committee members present: Representatives Pool, Ichord, Johansen, and Bruce.)

Mr. Pool. The committe will come to order. Mr. Ichord?

Mr. Ichord. Mr. Chairman, I see that the witness Nixon is present in the hearing room at this time, and for the benefit of the committee and for Mr. Nixon, I would like to summarize a statement which I made in the executive session, Mr. Nixon, just a few minutes ago as to why this committee should have these hearings in executive session, and I might state to you, Mr. Nixon, that I made the motion after making the statement for the reasons why, and that motion was carried unanimously by the committee.

At the meeting this morning, you objected to testifying in executive session and requested the committee to hold the hearings in public session. That request was overruled by the chairman, and you were later called and you refused to be sworn.

I would say to you, Mr. Nixon, that you have definitely misconstrued rule IV of the committee rules. Rule IV requires an executive hearing if a public hearing might endanger national security.

Rule XXVI(m) of the House requires a hearing of a congressional committee to be in executive session if the committee determines that evidence or testimony at any investigative hearing may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person.

But I would like to point out to you, and you are not represented here by counsel today, that both rules do not restrict the right of a committee to hold executive sessions.

I might say to you that there are some aspects of national security involved in this hearing, but it is not necessary for the committee to determine whether or not the national security would be endangered if you were heard in public session.

We are here investigating the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, and in particular the administration of inadmissible aliens to the United States under the waiver provisions of section 212 of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

There are many reasons why this hearing should be executive, many which I discussed in executive hearing a few minutes ago, before the committee. I might say that I believe that rule 26(m) is operative here. The committee believes that rule 26(m) is operative and has so held.

The committee believes that it is in the national interest to hold these hearings in executive session, but I would say to you that at issue here is the very right of a committee of Congress to function effectively. We cannot permit a witness to tell the committee when its hearings shall be public and when its hearings shall be executive. That is a decision which has to be made by the committee if it is to function in the public interest.

Your refusal to testify is governed by rule 26(g) of the House, which reads as follows, and I might say to you, sir, that I have had several telephone conversations with the Assistant House Parliamentarian, Bill Cochrane, and he advises me that the committee is right in requiring you to testify in executive session.

Rule 26(g) reads as follows:

"All hearings conducted by standing committees or their subcommittees shall be open to the public, except executive sessions for marking up bills or for voting or where the committee by a majority vote orders an executive session."

We have taken this matter under consideration and have voted unanimously that you be heard, and we have done this in complete fairness to you, after checking with the House Assistant Parliamentarian, and I would advise you, sir, as an attorney myself, and which the Assistant House Parliamentarian concurs in, that you should be sworn.

If you want to consult a lawyer I think perhaps the chairman would give you that right.

Mr. Pool. I would like to further state that in the consideration by the subcommittee of your request that it not be an executive session, all the applicable rules of the House and of the committee were considered.

Is that your understanding, Mr. Ichord, that all these rules were considered?

Mr. Ichord. Oh, yes, all of them.

Mr. Pool. Mr. Johansen, that is your understanding on that, too?

Mr. Johansen. Yes.

I suggest, Mr. Chairman, in the light of this statement by Mr. Ichord, that the chairman now instruct the witness to take the oath.

Mr. Pool. All right, Mr. Nixon, if you will stand and be sworn.

Mr. Nixon. Mr. Pool, I have made my position very clear on this, and I haven't changed it.

Mr. Pool. I am going to give you the oath and give you this one other chance, and I am going to direct that you take the oath.

Do you solemnly swear that the testimony you are about to give is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

I direct that you take the oath and be sworn.

Mr. Nixon. I have already given you the grounds for my refusal to do so in an executive session.

Mr. Pool. And you do now refuse to take it?

Mr. Nixon. I repeat the reasons which I have already presented to this committee and I refuse to take this oath at this time in this executive session.

Mr. Pool. All right.

Will you escort Mr. Nixon on outside and call the next witness? Call Donna Allen.

Mr. Pool. Tell the witnesses they are excused.

(Whereupon, at 4:05 p.m., the subcommittee adjourned, subject to call of the Chair.)

Appendix II

1. The following is an extract from the minutes of a meeting of the Committee on Un-American Activities held on February 26, 1963:

"The Committee on Un-American Activities met in executive session on Tuesday, February 26, 1963, at 3 p.m. in room 225 of the Old House Office Building. The following members were present: Clyde Doyle, acting chairman; William M. Tuck, Joe R. Pool, August E. Johansen, Henry C. Schadeberg.

"Also present were the following staff members: Francis J. McNamara, director; Frank S. Tavenner, Jr., general counsel; Juliette P. Joray, recording clerk; and Rosella A. Purdy, secretary.

"The acting chairman opened the meeting at 3:20 p.m. and explained to the members present that the meeting was called to consider several resolutions necessary to the reorganization of the committee for the 88th Congress.

"On motion of Mr. Tuck and seconded by Mr. Johansen, the following resolution was unanimously adopted, with Mr. Doyle voting the proxy of Mr. Walter and Mr. Tuck voting the proxy of Mr. Willis:

" '*Resolved,* That the chairman be authorized and empowered from time to time to appoint subcommittees composed of three or more members of the Committee on Un-American Activities, at least one of whom shall be of the minority political party, and a majority of whom shall constitute a quorum, for the purpose of performing any and all acts which the committee as a whole is authorized to perform.'

"On motion of Mr. Tuck and seconded by Mr. Johansen, the following resolution was unanimously adopted, with Mr. Doyle voting the proxy of Mr. Walter and Mr. Tuck voting the proxy of Mr. Willis:

" '*Resolved,* That authority is hereby delegated to each subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities which hereafter may be appointed to determine by a majority vote thereof whether the hearings conducted by it shall be open to the public or shall be in executive session, and all testimony taken and all documents introduced in evidence in such an executive session shall be received and given as full consideration for all purposes as though introduced in open session.'

"On motion made by Mr. Johansen, and seconded by Mr. Pool, the following resolution was unanimously adopted, with Mr. Doyle voting the proxy of Mr. Walter, and Mr. Tuck voting the proxy of Mr. Willis:

" '*Resolved,* That the rules of procedure revised by the Committee on Un-American Activities during the 1st session of the 87th Congress and printed under the title of "Rules of Procedure—Committee on Un-American Activities," together with all applicable provisions of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, be, and they are hereby, adopted as the rules of the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives of the 88th Congress.'

"The committee adjourned at 3:30 p.m.

"E. E. Willis,[1]
"*Acting Chairman.*
"Juliette P. Joray,
"*Recording Clerk.*"

A copy of the aforesaid "Rules of Procedure—Committee on Un-American Activities," as revised in 1961, and as adopted in the foregoing resolution, is attached to this appendix and made a part hereof, marked as "Exhibit A."

2. The following is an extract from the minutes of a meeting of the Committee on Un-American Activities held on February 19, 1964:

"The Committee on Un-American Activities met in executive session on Wednesday, February 19, 1964, in room 356 of the Cannon House Office Building at 4:20 p.m. The following members were present: Edwin E. Willis, chairman; William Tuck, Joe Pool, Richard Ichord, Henry Schadeberg.

"The following staff members were present: Francis J. McNamara, director, Frank S. Tavenner, Jr., general counsel; and Alfred M. Nittle, counsel.

"A motion was made by Mr. Tuck, seconded by Mr. Schadeberg, and unanimously carried authorizing the holding of hearings in Washington, D.C., or at such other place or places as the chairman may designate, on such date or dates as the chairman may determine, including the conduct of investigations deemed reasonably necessary by the staff in preparation therefor, relating to the following:

---

[1] Mr. Willis succeeded Mr. Doyle as acting chairman, upon Mr. Doyle's decease.

"1. Strategy, tactics, and activities of members of the Communist Party and Communist organizations in aiding the entry into the United States of aliens inadmissible under the provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act;

"2. Security aspects of the temporary admission to the United States of aliens who are inadmissible under provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act, for the legislative purpose of determining whether the exigencies of the situation require a strengthening of the security provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act;

"3. The execution by the administrative agencies concerned of the security provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act, and all other laws, the subject matter of which is within the jurisdiction of the committee, the legislative purpose being to exercise continuous watchfulness of the execution of these laws to assist the Congress in appraising the administration of such laws, and in developing such amendments or related legislation as it may deem necessary; and

"4. Any other matter within the jurisdiction of the committee which it or any subcommittee thereof appointed to conduct these hearings may designate.

"The meeting adjourned at 4:40 p.m.

"Edwin E. Willis,
"*Chairman.*
"Francis J. McNamara,
"*Director.*"

3. The following is a copy of the order of the chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities, Representative Edwin E. Willis, appointing a subcommittee to conduct a hearing as contemplated by the foregoing resolution of February 19, 1964.

March 11, 1964.

To: Mr. Francis J. McNamara, Director, Committee on Un-American Activities.

Pursuant to the provisions of the law and the rules of this committee, I hereby appoint a subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities, consisting of Hon. Richard Ichord and Hon. Henry C. Schadeberg as associate members, and Hon. Joe R. Pool, as chairman, to conduct a hearing in Washington, D.C., on Thursday, March 12, 1964, at 3 p.m., as contemplated by the resolution adoption by the committee on the 19th day of February 1964, relating to the entry of aliens into the United States and other matters under investigation by the committee and take such testimony on said day or succeeding days as it may deem necessary.

Please make this action a matter of committee record.

If any member indicates his inability to serve, please notify me.

Given under my hand this 11th day of March 1964.

E. E. Willis,
Chairman, Committee on Un-American Activities

4. The following is a copy of the order of the chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities, Representative Edwin E. Willis, designating Representative August E. Johansen to serve on the aforesaid subcommittee until such time as Representative Henry C. Schadeberg can resume his service on said subcommittee:

"September 4, 1964.

"To: Mr. Francis J. McNamara, director, Committee on Un-American Activities.

"On March 11, 1964, I appointed Hon. Joe R. Pool, Hon. Richard Ichord, and Hon. Henry C. Schadeberg to serve as a subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities to conduct hearings as contemplated by the resolution adopted by the committee on the 19th day of February 1964, relating to the entry of aliens into the United States and other matters under investigation by the committee. Mr. Schadeberg has notified me of his inability to serve on said subcommittee at its hearing scheduled for 10 a.m., Wednesday, September 9, 1964.

"I hereby designate Hon. August E. Johansen to serve on said subcommittee in the place of Mr. Schadeberg at the hearing scheduled for September 9, 1964, and until such time as Mr. Schadeberg can resume his service on said subcommittee.

"E. E. Willis,
"*Chairman, Committee on Un-American Activities.*"

5. The following is an extract from the minutes of a meeting of the aforesaid subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities, held on November 18, 1964:

"A subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities met in executive session on Wednesday, November 18, 1964, in room 225 of the Cannon House Office Building, Washington, D.C., at 11 a.m. The following members were present: Mr. Pool, chairman; Mr. Ichord (entered at 11:30 a.m.), Mr. Schadeberg. Mr. Johansen was also present.

"The following members of the committee staff were present: Francis J. McNamara, director; William Hitz, general counsel; Donald Appell, chief investigator; Mrs. Mary Valente, acting recording clerk.

"The director stated to the subcommittee that it was necessary to the committee inquiry relating to the entry of aliens into the United States and other matters to hear testimony from Dagmar Wilson, Donna Allen, and Russell A. Nixon. He explained why the testimony of these three individuals was necessary to the inquiry. On motion of Mr. Ichord, seconded by Mr. Schadeberg, the following resolution was unanimously adopted by the subcommittee:

"'Whereas the director of the committee explained the reasons why Dagmar Wilson, Donna Allen, and Russell A. Nixon should have knowledge of facts relevant and material to the investigations and hearings authorized by the committee resolution of February 19, 1964, relating to the entry of aliens into the United States, and other matters: Now, therefore, be it

"'*Resolved*, That the subcommittee is of the opinion that the within-named persons should be required to attend the said hearings and investigations as witnesses and to produce such books, papers, and documents, and to give such testimony as the subcommittee deems necessary; that the subcommittee deems such attendance to be necessary in furtherance of the committee's legislative purposes; and that the subcommittee authorizes subpenas to be issued therefor in accordance with the provisions of law.'

"The subcommittee agreed that Dagmar Wilson, Donna Allen, and Russell A. Nixon should be required to appear before the subcommittee on December 7, 1964, in executive session.

"The meeting adjourned at 12:25 p.m.

"Joe R. Pool,
"*Chairman.*
"Mrs. Mary Valente,
"*Acting Recording Secretary.*"

6. The following is a copy of the order of the chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities, Representative Edwin E. Willis, appointing Representative August E. Johansen to serve on the said subcommittee in the place of Representative Henry C. Schadeberg:

"To: Mr. Francis J. McNamara, director, Committee on Un-American Activities.

"On March 11, 1964, I appointed Hon. Joe R. Pool, Hon. Richard Ichord and Hon. Henry C. Schadeberg to serve as a subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities to conduct hearings as contemplated by the resolution adopted by the committee on the 19th day of February 1964, relating to the entry of aliens into the United States and other matters under investigation by the committee. Mr. Schadeberg has indicated that he may be unable to serve on said subcommittee at its contemplated December 7, 1964 hearing, and possibly on other days, before and after that date, during the remainder of the year when meetings and hearings of the subcommittee may be held.

"I hereby designate Hon. August E. Johansen to serve on the said subcommittee in the place of Hon. Henry C. Schadeberg for the remainder of the year at any meetings and hearings of the subcommittee which Mr. Schadeberg is unable to attend.

"Given under my hand this 25th day of November 1964.

"E. E. Willis,
"*Chairman, Committee on Un-American Activities.*"

7. The following is an extract from the minutes of a meeting of the aforesaid subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities, held on December 7, 1964, at 10:08 a.m.:

"A subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities designated by the chairman on November 25, 1964, to sit at hearings in the matter of entry of aliens in the United States under waiver of ineligibility, met in room 225, Cannon House Office Building, at 10:08 a.m. The following members were present: Joe R. Pool, chairman; Richard Ichord, August E. Johansen. Representative Donald C. Bruce was also present.

"The staff members present were Francis J. McNamara, director; Alfred N. Nittle, counsel; Donald T. Appell, chief investigator; and Juliette P. Joray, recording clerk.

"The director advised the members that a request had been received by the committee from Lawrence Speiser, director of the Washington Civil Liberties Union and attorney for Mrs. Dagmar Wilson and Mrs. Donna Allen, that the hearings scheduled for December 7 and 8 be canceled or held in public session rather than in executive session. Following a discussion during which the reasons for holding the hearings in executive session were fully explored, Mr. Ichord moved that Mr. Speiser's request be denied and that the hearings be held in executive session. Mr. Johansen seconded the motion and the chairman so ordered.

"The chief investigator briefed the members on Russell Nixon's background.

"The subcommittee agreed to have all three witnesses in the hearing room at the same time for the reading of the opening statement.

"The meeting adjourned at 10:15 a.m.

"Joe R. Pool,
"*Chairman of Subcommittee.*
"Juliette P. Joray,
"*Recording Clerk.*"

8. The following are the minutes of a meeting of the aforesaid subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities held on December 7, 1964, at 11 a.m.

"A subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities designated by the chairman on November 25, 1964, to sit at hearings in the matter of entry of aliens in the United States under waiver of ineligibility, met on December 7, 1964. The following members were present: Joe R. Pool, chairman; Richard Ichord, August E. Johansen. Representative Donald C. Bruce was also present.

"The staff members present were Francis J. McNamara, director; Alfred M. Nittle, counsel; and Donald Appell, chief investigator.

"The subcommittee discussed and considered again the request previously received in a letter from Mr. Lawrence Speiser, attorney for Dagmar Wilson and Donna Allen, that the hearings be canceled or held in public. It also considered the additional requests Mr. Speiser made in the hearing prior to recess relative to a public hearing for his clients. In addition, the subcommittee considered the views and requests of Russell Nixon expressed prior to recess.

"The subcommittee, in its deliberations, viewed these requests in the light of all relevant committee resolutions and applicable rules of the House and the committee itself, including House rules 26(g) and 26 (m), and committee rule IV. The subcommittee concluded that rule XI 26(g) was applicable, and that an executive session was desirable, for reasons of national interest, because of the area of Government operations involved, but which could not be disclosed to the witnesses at this time in any detail without violating that interest. It was also determined that rule XI 26(m) precluded a public hearing at this stage of the investigation because the proposed area of interrogation would involve persons, other than the witnesses, in a defamatory or possibly incriminating manner forbidden by the rule.

"The subcommittee unanimously concluded that the hearing should be continued in executive session and the requests of the witnesses for a public hearing denied.

"It was agreed that Mr. Ichord would prepare a statement expressing the subcommittee's determination, which he would make for the record when the hearing was reconvened at 2 p.m.

"It was agreed that, in the interim, Mr. Ichord would check with the Parliamentarian of the House to obtain his view of the issues confronting the subcommittee and determine whether or not he believed the position adopted by the subcommittee was a correct one.

"The meeting adjourned at approximately 11:35 a.m.

"Joe R. Pool,
"Chairman.
"Juliette P. Joray,
"Recording Secretary."

9. The following are the minutes of the aforesaid subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities held on December 7, 1964, at 2 p.m.

"A subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities designated by the Chairman on November 25, 1964, to sit at hearings in the matter of entry of aliens in the United States under waiver of ineligibility, met in executive session in room 225, Cannon House Office Building, at 2 p.m. on December 7, 1964.

"The following members were present: Joe R. Pool, chairman; Richard Ichord, August E. Johansen. Representative Donald C. Bruce was also present.

"The staff members present were Francis J. McNamara, director; Alfred M. Nittle, counsel; Donald T. Appell, chief investigator and Juliette P. Joray, recording clerk.

"With further reference to the requests of Russell Nixon and Mr. Speiser on behalf of his clients, Mrs. Dagmar Wilson and Mrs. Donna Allen, discussed at the meetings held this day, Mr. Ichord reported to the subcommittee on his contracts with the Assistant Parliamentarian, William Cochrane in the absence of the Parliamentarian, Mr. Deschler. Mr. Ichord stated that the Assistant Parliamentarian advised him that by virtue of the committee resolutions, committee rules and applicable House rules, the subcommittee was empowered to order an executive session.

"The committee deliberated and concluded that there were aspects of national interest involved which require the holding of these hearings in executive session and that rule XI, 26(m), was operative in that the area of interrogation of these three witnesses might tend to defame, degrade or incriminate persons other than the witnesses. It was suggested that Mr. Ichord prepare a statement on behalf of the subcommittee, the contents of which were unanimously approved by the subcommittee, and which Mr. Ichord was to deliver upon the reconvening of the subcommittee following the recess.

"On motion of Mr. Ichord, seconded by Mr. Johansen and unanimously adopted, it was agreed that the requests of Mr. Nixon, Mrs. Wilson and Mrs. Allen, should again be denied.

"The meeting recessed at 2:45 p.m.

"Joe R. Pool,
"Chairman.
"Juliette P. Joray,
Recording Secretary."

10. The following is an extract of the minutes of the aforesaid subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities held on December 7, 1964, at 4:05 p.m.:

"A subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities designated by the chairman on November 25, 1964, to sit at hearings in the matter of entry of aliens in the United States under waiver of ineligibility, met in executive session on December 7, 1964, in room 219 of the Cannon House Office Building at 4:05 p.m. The following members were present: Joe R. Pool, chairman; Richard Ichord, August E. Johansen. Representative Donald C. Bruce was also present.

"The staff members present were Francis J. McNamara, director; Alfred M. Nittle, counsel; Donald T. Appell, chief investigator; and Juliette P. Joray, recording clerk.

"The subcommittee was called to order by the chairman who stated that the purpose of the meeting was to consider what action the subcommittee should take regarding the refusal of Russell Nixon to be sworn or examined as a witness; and the failures of Dagmar Wilson and Donna Allen to testify at the hearing conducted by the said subcommittee on the 7th day of December 1964, and what recommendation it would make to the full committee regarding their citation for contempt of the House of Representatives.

"After full discussion of the refusal of Russell Nixon to be sworn or examined as a witness, a motion was made by Mr. Ichord, seconded by Mr. Johansen, and unanimously carried that a report of the facts relating to the refusal of Russell Nixon to be sworn as a witness and to answer any question before the said subcommittee at the hearing aforesaid, be referred and submitted to the Committee on Un-American Activities as a whole, with the recommendation that a report of the facts relating to the refusal of said witness to be sworn and answer any questions, together with all of the facts in connection therewith, be referred to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, with the recommendation that the said witness be cited for contempt of the House of Representatives, to the end that he may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

"The meeting adjourned at 4:15 p.m.

"Joe R. Pool,
"Chairman.
"Juliette P. Joray,
"Recording Clerk."

11. The following is an extract of the minutes of a meeting of the full Committee on Un-American Activities held on December 10, 1964, at 10 a.m.:

"The Committee on Un-American Activities met in executive session on Thursday morning, December 10, 1964, in room 225, Cannon House Office Building, at 10 o'clock a.m. The following members were present: Edwin E. Willis, chairman; William Tuck, Joe R. Pool, Richard Ichord, Donald C. Bruce.

"Also present were the following staff members: Francis J. McNamara, director; William Hitz, general counsel; Alfred M. Nittle, counsel; Donald T. Appell, chief investigator; Philip Manuel, investigator; and Juliette P. Joray, recording clerk.

"Chairman Willis called the meeting to order at 10:18 a.m., and announced that this special meeting of the committee was called, after notice to all committee members, for the purpose of considering a recommendation of the subcommittee headed by Mr. Pool, looking into the entry of aliens into the United States under waiver of ineligibility, that Russell Nixon, Dagmar Wilson and Donna Allen be cited for contempt because of their refusals to testify before the subcommittee in executive session on Monday of this week, December 7.

"The chairman then directed Mr. Pool, chairman of the subcommittee, to report on the matter being considered by the committee.

"Representative Pool reported to the committee that he was chairman of the subcommittee appointed by the chairman, composed of himself, Representatives Richard H. Ichord and August E. Johansen, to conduct hearings on December 7, 1964, at Washington, D.C., as contemplated under the resolution adopted by the committee on the 19th day of February 1964; that the subcommittee met in executive session on December 7, 1964, in the Cannon House Office Building, Washington, D.C., to receive the testimony of Russell Nixon, Donna Allen, and Dagmar Wilson who had been duly subpenaed to appear as witnesses before said subcommittee; the said meeting of the subcommittee was attended on December 7, 1964, by subcommittee chairman, Representative Joe R. Pool, and Representatives Richard H. Ichord and August E. Johansen; that the witness, Russell Nixon, having appeared before the subcommittee, refused to be sworn or examined as a witness, willfully refused to answer any question pertinent to the question under inquiry, and willfully refused to give any testimony touching matters of inquiry committed before said subcommittee; that the said Donna Allen appeared before the subcommittee, was administered an affirmation as a witness by the subcommittee chairman, but willfully refused to testify in response to any question pertinent to the question or subject under inquiry; that the said Dagmar Wilson appeared before the subcommittee, was duly sworn as a witness, and when asked to state her name and residence for the record and whether she was represented by counsel, she responded to those questions, but thereupon and thereafter willfully refused to answer any question pertinent to the question under inquiry and willfully refused to give any testimony touching matters of inquiry before said subcommittee as required by her subpena; that the subcommittee thereafter met in executive session, attended by the said subcommittee chairman, Representative Pool, and Representatives Ichord and Johansen, being all of the members of the said subcommittee; at which time, motions were made and unanimously adopted with respect to each of said persons, to wit, Russell Nixon, Donna Allen, and Dagmar Wilson, that a report of the facts relating to the refusal of each of them to testify before said subcommittee at said hearings after having been summoned to appear to testify before said subcommittee, be referred and submitted to the Committee on Un-American Activities as a whole, with a recommendation that a report and statement of fact with reference to the refusal of each of said witnesses to appear to testify as aforesaid, be made to and filed with the Speaker of the House, the House now being adjourned sine die, in order that the said Speaker may certify the same under the seal of the House, to the appropriate U.S. attorney to the end that each of said witnesses may be proceeded against for contempt of the House of Representatives in the manner and form provided by law.

"A motion was made by Mr. Pool, seconded by Mr. Bruce, that the subcommittee's report of the facts relating to the refusal of Russell Nixon to be sworn as a witness and to testify before the said subcommittee at the hearings conducted before it in Washington, D.C., on the 7th day of December 1964, be and the same is hereby approved and adopted, and that the Committee on Un-American Activities report the said failures of Russell Nixon to the Honorable John McCormack, Speaker of the House of Representatives, the House of Representatives now being adjourned sine die, in order that the said Speaker may certify the same to the U.S. attorney for the District of Columbia to the end that the said Russell Nixon may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law; and that the chairman of this committee is hereby authorized and directed to forward such report and statement of fact constituting such failure of Russell Nixon to the said Speaker of the House of Representatives. Following discussion, the motion was put to a vote and it was unanimously adopted. Mr. Pool asked for the yeas and nays to be recorded. The yeas and nays were taken. Mr. Willis voted "yea," Mr. Tuck voted "yea," Mr. Pool voted "yea," Mr. Ichord voted "yea," and Mr. Bruce voted "yea." Mr. Bruce also stated that he was authorized to vote the proxy of Mr. Johansen and that if he were present he would vote yea. So the motion was agreed to.

"The meeting adjourned at 11:15 a.m.

"EDWIN E. WILLIS,
"Chairman.
"JULIETTE P. JORAY,
"Recording Clerk."

IMMIGRATION HEARINGS

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to announce that the Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality will commence hearings on immigration legislation on February 16 at 10 a.m. Arrangements are now being made to schedule witnesses to appear before the subcommittee.

Administration spokesmen will be called to testify on changes made in the administration proposal on which hearings were held by the subcommittee during the 88th Congress.

Opportunity will be provided interested organizations and individuals who wish to present their views on immigration legislation.

The schedule of hearings will be arranged so that prompt action can be taken to bring reform immigration legislation to the floor of the House early in this session.

THE ELDERCARE ACT OF 1965

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, along with Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS of Missouri I have today introduced legislation, the Eldercare Act of 1965, that would amend the Kerr-Mills law to authorize broad health insurance coverage for elderly persons.

The bipartisan Herlong-Curtis bill would authorize Federal grants to the States on a matching basis to help persons 65 years of age and older pay costs of the health insurance if they could not afford it otherwise. The bill would provide for utilization of Blue Shield and Blue Cross plans and private health insurance companies.

The cost of such coverage would be borne entirely by Government for those elderly individuals whose income falls below limits set by each State. For individuals with incomes between the minimum and a maximum, Government would pay a part of the cost on a sliding scale according to income. Individuals with income above the maximum would pay the entire cost, but they would have the benefits of an income tax deduction for such payments, as well as statewide bargaining for noncancellable health care policies.

Persons under 65 years of age also would be given an income tax deduction for the amount of premiums paid on noncancellable health insurance policies to become effective upon retirement.

States could administer the program under State health departments if they so chose. The Kerr-Mills program now is administered by State welfare departments.

It was expected that the Herlong-Curtis bill would be supported by the American Medical Association which recently announced such a plan—the doctors' eldercare program.

Both HERLONG and CURTIS are members of the House Ways and Means Committee which has made health-care-for-the-elderly legislation its first business of this session with deliberations on it in closed meetings starting today.

In a joint statement, HERLONG and CURTIS said:

> Our legislation is designed to provide elderly persons all the medical services they require, in contrast to the limited benefits in the King-Anderson social security tax bill. Under our bill, workers would not be taxed to pay for hospitalization of those who are financially able to pay for it themselves.
>
> This legislation would not endanger the solvency of the social security fund or permit control of local hospitals by a Federal bureaucracy, as the King-Anderson proposal could.
>
> This bill goes to the real problem: helping those who need help in financing their health care. That problem would still remain after these individuals had used up the limited benefits of the King-Anderson bill. Why levy a new tax and set up another Federal bureaucracy when it will not do the full job?

A summary of the Herlong-Curtis bill follows:

ELDERCARE ACT OF 1965

HEALTH INSURANCE COVERAGE UNDER MAA

This bill would amend title I (old age assistance and medical assistance for the aged) and title XVI (aid to the aged, blind, or disabled, or such aid and medical assistance for the aged) of the Social Security Act to add a new section under which a State with an MAA program would be authorized, in its discretion, to provide the MAA in the form of premium payments for health insurance coverage under voluntary private health insurance plans in addition to providing the assistance in the manner authorized under existing law. A State wishing to participate in the program would be required to enter into contracts or other arrangements with private insurance carriers as it deems appropriate.

The contracts would have to: (1) be guaranteed renewable; (2) provide benefits which, together with MAA benefits authorized in existing law, include both institutional and noninstitutional care; (3) establish enrollment periods not less often than once a year; and (4) contain such other provisions as the State agency determines are necessary to carry out the purposes of the program.

If a State provides an MAA program in the form of health insurance coverage, the same coverage would have to be available to all individuals who reside in the State and who are 65 or over. In the case of old age assistance recipients (or aged recipients of aid to the aged, blind, or disabled under title XVI), at the discretion of the State, the coverage may be in lieu of or in addition to aid provided in the form of medical or remedial care under existing law. The bill provides that premium payments for such coverage would constitute medical or remedial care for aged recipients under the two titles.

The bill provides that premiums for coverage of any individual under an insurance plan would be paid by the State agency with the following two exceptions. The State agency could establish a maximum income level at least equal to the highest level at which an individual may qualify under the MAA program in the State. If the individual's income is above this level, the premiums would be paid in part by the individual and in part by the State agency in proportions based on the individual's income as the State agency may determine up to a higher income level as the State agency determines to be appropriate. If the individual's income is above the higher level, he would be required to pay the premium in full. Income standards for eligibility would have to be "reasonable."

For the purposes of the bill, "income" would include gross income as defined under the Internal Revenue Code and all other income which is not includible in gross income for tax purposes.

Each individual covered under an insurance plan under the program would be required to certify his income to the State agency in a manner and at such times (but at least once a year) as the State agency may require. The State agency would be required to accept the certification as conclusive. The certification would be subject to the penalties for fraud under the Social Security Act (a fine of up to $1,000, or imprisonment for up to 1 year, or both).

The bill would provide that medical assistance for the aged would be provided in behalf of individuals who are not recipients of OAA but whose income (rather than income and resources) is insufficient to meet the cost of necessary medical services.

The bill provides that, notwithstanding the provisions of existing law, if a State plan under title I or XVI includes both MAA and old age assistance or aid to the aged, blind, or disabled, the State could designate one State agency to administer or supervise the portion of the plan that relates to old age assistance (or aid to the aged, blind, or disabled), and a separate State agency to administer the medical assistance for the aged plan.

The bill would modify the prohibition in existing law against enrollment fees by providing an exemption for a State plan which provides medical assistance for the aged in the form of health insurance coverage.

The bill would amend the provisions of titles I and XVI which describe the purposes of appropriations to include encouragement for "each State to provide medical assistance for all aged individuals through the utilization of insurance provided by private insurance carriers."

The bill provides that States which provide MAA through the use of health insurance plans would have their Federal contributions increased by 5 percent (to 52.5–84 percent rather than 50–80 percent) of sums expended for medical or remedial care. A State which provides medical care using the health insurance plan under the old-age assistance program or the combined program of aid to the aged, blind, or disabled, would also have its Federal contribution increased by 5 percent (to 52.5–68.25 percent rather than 50–65 percent).

Further, the Federal Government would contribute toward the cost of administration of the health insurance program on the same basis as it does under the OAA and MAA programs.

PUBLIC ASSISTANCE FOR MENTALLY ILL AND TUBERCULOUS

The bill would amend title I (old-age assistance and medical assistance for the aged) and title XVI (aid to the aged, blind, or disabled, and medical assistance for the aged) of the Social Security Act to authorize money payments to, or medical care in behalf of, needy individuals who are 65 years of age or over unless the individual is an inmate in a public institution other than a patient in a medical institution.

Thus, payments or care could be provided to any needy individual who is a patient in an institution for tuberculosis or mental disease. Payments could be made to an individual who has been diagnosed as having tuberculosis or psychosis and who is a patient in a medical institution as a result thereof, and care could be provided to an individual who is a patient in a medical institution as a result of a diagnosis of tuberculosis or psychosis without regard to the 42-day limitation contained in existing law. However, under the combined program of aid to the aged, blind, or disabled (title XVI), such payments or care could not be made or provided to or in behalf of any individual in an institution for tuberculosis or mental disease if he is under age 65.

INTERNAL REVENUE CODE AMENDMENTS

The bill would make the following amendments to the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code which relate to medical expense deductions:

1. If neither the taxpayer nor his spouse has attained the age of 65, they would be authorized a deduction equal to—

(a) The uncompensated amount spent for medical care for any dependent who has attained the age of 65;

(b) The amount paid for accident or health insurance for the taxpayer or his spouse which by its terms would become effective when either has attained the age of 65; and

(c) Uncompensated medical expenses incurred on behalf of the taxpayer, his spouse, and other dependents which exceed 3 percent of the taxpayer's adjusted gross income.

2. If the taxpayer or his spouse has attained the age of 65, there would be no limitation on the deduction for uncompensated medical expenses incurred in behalf of the taxpayer, his spouse, or dependents over age 65. However, the deduction in behalf of dependents under age 65 would continue to be subject to the 3-percent limitation.

For the purposes of the above amendments, a dependent over age 65 would mean any individual who is related to the taxpayer, or who is a member of the taxpayer's household (as defined by the Internal Revenue Code) regardless of the amount of support the individual receives from the taxpayer. (A dependent under existing law is one who receives over half his support from the taxpayer.)

The amendments relating to the health insurance program would become effective July 1, 1966, but a State could make them effective any time after the first day of any quarter after the date of the bill's enactment. The amendments relating to the income tax deductions would become effective for taxable years after the bill's enactment.

"MR. SPEAKER," A NEW BOOK ABOUT THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND SOME OF ITS LEADERS

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, there was recently published a book entitled "Mr. Speaker" with the subtitle "Four Men Who Shaped the U.S. House of Representatives," which should prove of interest to all Members of this body.

Written by Booth Mooney, formerly of Texas, now of Washington, "Mr. Speaker" presents profiles in depth of four political giants of the House of Representatives: Speakers Henry Clay, Thomas Reed, Joseph Cannon, and Sam Rayburn.

Joseph F. McCaffrey, the well-known Capitol Hill television reporter, has said:

> Mooney's book does more to explain the House and its importance in our system than some of the heavier, more definitive works by professors.

Under permission granted me, I insert in the RECORD a review of "Mr. Speaker" by Robert E. Baskin, chief of the Dallas News Washington bureau, and the text of Mr. McCaffrey's television review:

FOUR KEY SPEAKERS LEFT INDELIBLE STAMP ON HOUSE

(By Robert E. Baskin)

WASHINGTON.—"I never served under any President. I served with eight."—House Speaker Sam Rayburn of Texas.

"Everything is all right out West and around Danville. The country don't need any legislation."—House Speaker Joseph G. Cannon of Illinois.

"The right of the minority is to draw its salaries and its function is to make a quorum."—House Speaker Thomas B. Reed of Maine.

These are quotations from three men who have held what has been described as the second most powerful position in our Government—the speakership of the House of Representatives.

In each case the occupant of this lofty post was a man with great consciousness of the power of the office, his own stature in the government and, implicitly, the prestige of the House.

Booth Mooney, an old Washington hand and a former Dallas public relations man, has made a study of the speakership and produced a book (Mr. Speaker; Follet, Chicago; $6.95) in which he not only evaluates the office but also delineates the four men who in his judgment did the most to mold the office.

Mooney's work was encouraged by the late Sam Rayburn, who held the speakership longer than any other man. Mr. Sam undoubtedly would agree with most of the conclusions drawn by the author.

The four outstanding speakers, depicted by Mooney are Rayburn, Cannon, Reed, and back in the early days of the Republic, the brilliant and controversial Henry Clay of Kentucky.

"There have been other great speakers, but it is my opinion that these are the men who, more than any others, influenced the structure and direction of the House of Representatives," Mooney says in his preface.

It would be hard to fault his verdict on this. Nicholas Longworth of Ohio and Champ Clark of Missouri were memorable men, to say the least. And Texas' John Nance Garner was a speaker who knew the ways of the House as few men have.

But in the light of history, it was Clay, Reed, Cannon and Rayburn—in that chronological order—who made the office what it is today.

In the first 11 Congresses after independence the speakership was an office modeled after the British House of Commons pattern—a job calling principally for presiding over the body in a nonpartisan way.

Henry Clay changed that completely in the early years of the 19th century.

He took command of committee assignments and he decided that the House must conduct its business in an orderly fashion. In the early years, and at times in more recent history, the House was a noisy place where Members drank, talked as much as they pleased and shouted down others trying to speak.

But essentially, Clay viewed the job as a partisan one and it has remained such ever since. He took the lead on pressing legislation and as a leader of the "war hawks" helped bring about the War of 1812.

As "the great compromiser" he had tremendous effect on the development of the country in the critical years before the Civil War.

There is a gap of a good many years between Clay's reign and that of Reed of Maine, who became Speaker in 1889, and in the intervening period the House had fallen into some disreputable conditions.

The portly, tart-tongued Reed was just the man to correct this, and he did so unflinchingly, drawing up a new set of rules for the House which he enforced rigidly.

Democrats were outraged by the Republican Speaker's tactics. They particularly resented his moves to curb filibusters and his sternness in requiring Members to be present and be counted on quorum calls.

But he was strongly partisan, too, and could so stolidly refuse to recognize members of the opposition who addressed the chairman he was known as "Czar Reed."

On one occasion he so angered Congressman Constantine Buckley Kilgore of Texas that Kilgore kicked out the panels of a door leading into the lobby. He was called "Kicking Buck" ever afterward.

Summing up Reed, Mooney says, "He brought order to the House at a time when disorder threatened to stop the Government from functioning. He set down a pattern for the speakership that, even after subsequent modifications, changed the nature of that office for all time."

"Uncle Joe" Cannon was probably the most colorful Speaker of all, and partisan to the extent that he considered Democrats simply not qualified to run the Government.

Using the Reed rules, he amassed vast power, consolidating his hold on the Rules Committee and every other key committee in the House. His rulings from the chair were arbitrary and sometimes capricious.

"The ayes make the most noise, but the nays have it," he declared once after a voice vote.

It was Cannon who brought the office to its greatest peak of unbridled power, but the old man from Danville, Ill., simply went too far. He was stripped in 1910 of much of his power by insurgent Republicans led by Nebraska's George W. Norris and the intolerable Democrats. The office of Speaker and the chairmanship of the Rules Committee were divorced for good.

Mooney appraises Rayburn as the Speaker who was "closest to the people of the country." The squire of Bonham, although vested with great power, preferred to lead the House through persuasion and good relations with his fellow Members.

His great asset, in Mooney's view, was his ability to have "the feel of the House." He could advise Presidents precisely what they could expect of the body.

"Looky here, Mr. President," Rayburn once told Franklin D. Roosevelt, who did not appear to be listening to him. "By God, I'm talking to you. You'd better listen." Roosevelt listened and changed his mind about a piece of legislation.

Rayburn was ever conscious of the dignity of the House, and the days when Members could become unruly or ungentlemanly ended, it is to be hoped, forever. And he demonstrated that bipartisanship, particularly in foreign affairs, could work admirably.

Mooney's book, in addition to being interesting reading, reflects a large amount of research. It is a valuable and much-needed contribution to the study of the American system of government.

Telecast by Joseph F. McCaffrey Over Station WMAL–TV, Washington, D.C., November 13, 1964

Speaker of the House Henry Clay told a newly elected successor to that office the secret of being a good presiding officer, "Decide, decide promptly and never give your reasons for the decision. The House will sustain your decisions, but there will always be men to cavil and quarrel about your reasons."

This is just one of the many sidelights of the speakership in his new book, "Mr. Speaker," by Booth Mooney. To give an insight into one of this country's most important positions, Mooney has done a sketch of four of the most powerful Speakers in our history, Clay, Thomas Reed, Joseph Cannon, and Sam Rayburn.

No one knows better the problems that John McCormack will face beginning in January because of the topheavy Democratic majority in the House than John McCormack. Mooney recalls the top-heavy majority the Democrats had in 1937 and the problems which faced Majority Leader Rayburn. The Republicans were so few in number it created the tender problem that there was not much incentive for cohesiveness among the Democrats' large majority.

Later when he became Speaker, Mr. Rayburn kept his hold on his majorities by personal persuasion. As then Senate Leader Lyndon Johnson said, "Rayburn runs the House out of his hip pocket."

Each of the four profiles is well done, but the one that moves to tears and then laughter is the one on Sam Rayburn, a man Mooney knew well. He knew him so well that the pen portrait he passes along of him is one of the best ever written.

Not many men really knew Rayburn. He had to protect himself from the gladhanders and the phonies, but those who did know him knew one of the great men in our history.

Mooney's book does more to explain the House and its importance in our system than some of the heavier, more definitive works by professors.

The jacket says Mr. Mooney is now a public relations consultant here in Washington. He should give that up, lock himself in a room and turn out more books like "Mr. Speaker."

It is one of the few books which will appeal to those who know little about American policies as well as to those who make it their daily meat and potatoes.

WASHINGTON POST ACCUSED OF LYING

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, soon after I was first elected as chairman of the House Committee on the District of Columbia about 15 years ago I decided never to try to reply to any type of newspaper article concerning the House Committee on the District of Columbia, or me personally, which appeared in any of the Washington papers.

Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I have asked for this time for the purpose of correcting a statement appearing in the Washington Post newspaper headlines this morning concerning the House District Committee. I thought we had an excellent reorganization meeting of the committee yesterday, as we adopted the committee rules and regulations, and also adopted the list of subcommittees for the 89th Congress. We reported 11 noncontroversial bills on which hearings were held during the 88th Congress and unanimously passed the House; however, they were not considered by the other body before the adjournment of the 88th Congress. I am certain that the 20 Members present for the organization meeting yesterday will vouch for the fact that no one mentioned any proposed revenue legislation and no one mentioned the President's budget. The real purpose of the meeting was to reorganize the committee. The President's budget message of course was referred to the Appropriations Committee and not the District legislative committee. My committee has not received any proposed revenue legislation from the Commissioners or the White House. Our committee will give consideration to any revenue proposals that are referred to the House District Committee from the President or the District Commissioners.

The headlines of the Washington Post and the statement that the chairman of the committee had blocked the President's budget was an unadulterated lie and a sample of the type of backing the House District Committee gets from the Washington press and news media in general—from the Washington, D.C., Post, January 27, 1965, "McMillan Balks at District of Columbia Budget Plans; House Fight Stalls Johnson Program of Schools, Health."

TO ESTABLISH A FEDERAL WATER CONTROL COMMISSION

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege to serve as a member of the House Natural Resources and Power Subcommittee, and I have found the work of that subcommittee tremendously interesting. We have held exhaustive hearings in various parts of the United States on the all-important subject of water pollution and we have amassed one of the most definitive records on this subject that has ever been gathered together. The work of the subcommittee has not been completed, but we are in a position at this time to make recommendations on the basis of our studies, and the more we probe the problem of water pollution control, the more convinced I am that corrective measures must be taken at once.

Water pollution has become the Nation's single most critical natural resources problem.

For these reasons, I have today filed a bill similar to that which I proposed in the 88th Congress, to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, to establish a Federal Water Control Administration, to provide grants for research and development, to increase grants for construction of municipal sewage treatment works, and to authorize recommendations for studies of water quality.

Almost all of our major streams, rivers, and lakes are suffering increasing pollution and this condition is jeopardizing our water supplies, menacing the public health, destroying aquatic life and disgracing our environment. This pollution comes from contaminants which are being dumped into rivers and streams in many parts of the country. They include oils, garbage, chemicals, acid drainage from mines and new chemicals such as synthetic fibers and detergents, pesticides, and radioactive wastes. Our own Federal installations are not without blame.

The bill, which I have filed today, establishes a Federal Water Pollution Control Administration within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, to administer comprehensive programs, sponsor interstate cooperation, recommend establishment of water quality standards, and stimulate elimination of pollution by Federal installations.

I have recommended the authorization of an appropriation of $20 million annually for the next 4 years for research and development grants. In addition, I have proposed the authorization of appropriations of $150 million for fiscal year 1966 and $200 million for fiscal year 1967, for grants to the States for waste treatment works. This would provide grants of up to 50 percent of the estimated cost of demonstration projects for operating combined storm and sanitary sewers. I recommend that we increase the individual dollar ceiling limitations on Federal grants for construction of waste treatment works from $600,000 to $1,500,000 for a single project, and from $2,400,000 to $5 million for a joint project involving two or more communities. These have particular reference to large municipalities.

I propose that we authorize an additional 10 percent in the grant for construction of waste treatment works after the project is certified as conforming with comprehensive plans for a metropolitan area.

My bill would authorize the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, after public hearing and consultation with all interested parties, to prepare recommendations of standards of water quality for interstate waters.

It would also provide that waste water discharges by Federal installations be reviewed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

I want to point out that while I recognize the need for greater local enforcement procedures, I also feel that we must reestablish and reaffirm a pattern of local, State, and Federal cooperation.

Experience has shown that there is definite need for Federal participation in the financing of sewage treatment plants and in the encouragement of research and development so essential to the continuing operation of industrial plants currently contributing materially to the pollution problem. One cannot listen to the evidence that our subcommittee has heard from all segments of the community, and from all parts of the country, without coming to the conclusion that the national interest requires a stepping up, not only in research but also in construction of facilities and, above all, in enforcement activity, if the Nation's water resources are to remain equal to the tremendous demands which will be made upon them in the future.

For this reason, I believe that the grants for research and development provided in my bill are vitally important. I feel also that the broadening of the application of this legislation by raising the limitations on grants for single projects, and combined projects, will have productive results.

This is the problem which faces every community and every State in the Nation because the communities and the States cannot bear the cost of abating pollution. I feel that the Federal Government must step up its participation without further delay if we are to meet the crisis confronting us in the shortage of usable clean water.

TO AMEND TITLE 23 OF THE UNITED STATES CODE TO INCREASE THE TOTAL MILEAGE OF THE NATIONAL SYSTEM OF INTERSTATE AND DEFENSE HIGHWAYS

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, the very lifeblood of a densely populated and heavily industrialized State's growth is its highway facilities. If States such as New Jersey are to continue to prosper they must have additional and better highways. Therefore, I am introducing a bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code which would increase the total mileage of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways from 41,000 to 50,000 miles.

At present the Federal Bureau of Public Roads has an authorization of 41,000 miles but has requests from a number of States, including New Jersey, for an additional 20,000 miles. The Bureau cannot even consider these additional requests, regardless of the needs, because all of the mileage authorized under the Federal Highway Act of 1956 has been allocated.

Our population is booming and each day more and more vehicles are being used on our roads. In New Jersey many persons commute to work each day and good roads are a necessity rather than a luxury to them. Before an industry locates in a State it first takes a hard look at the highway facilities because the difference between good and bad highway facilities can mean the difference between success and failure.

In Monmouth and Ocean Counties, for instance, there are more than 500,000 residents and yet there is but one highway which links them with the State capital in Trenton. This artery is Route 33. It is totally inadequate to handle the number of persons who must travel on this road each day. Because it is inadequate it also is dangerous.

This need for a limited access throughway between the shore area and Trenton is of paramount importance now. This, of course, is just one example. There are many other areas of New Jersey, as well as other States, where new or improved highways are desperately needed now. Unfortunately, under the present authorization New Jersey is unable to receive additional 90–10 Federal funds because all of the mileage in the Interstate Highway System has been exhausted.

No additional tax assessment is required in order to increase the authorization from 41,000 to 50,000 miles. These funds are derived from the trust fund which was established by Congress and administered by the Federal Bureau of Public Roads. This fund is primarily financed through taxes on petroleum products used in motor vehicles and is self-sustaining. These revenues are derived solely from those making use of our roads.

I am hopeful that the Congress will give early consideration and approval to my bill. I ask unanimous consent that the text of my bill be printed in full at this point in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first sentence of subsection (d) of section 103 of title 23 of the United States Code is amended by striking out "forty-one thousand miles" and inserting in lieu thereof "fifty thousand miles."

A PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. WHITE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, by reason of a number of hostile and insulting acts by President Nasser of the United Arab Republic, the people of my district are generally opposed to aid to Nasser's government unless such aid benefits our country. Because of recent actions of Mr. Nasser, I agree with my constituents. Therefore, when the House met in the Committee of the Whole on January 26, 1965, to deliberate on the Commodity Credit Corporation Act, in a standup vote I voted for an amendment to curtail this aid to Nasser's government as a means of tangible warning to President Nasser. This amendment failed and the House convened in regular session, at which time a motion was made to recommit the bill back to committee with instructions to bar the use of any funds to finance any exportation of agricultural commodities to the United Arab Republic under provisions of title I, which was substantially the same amendment presented in the Committee of the Whole House.

Knowing our present responsibilities and commitments under the Commodity Credit Corporation Act, I did not feel that this appropriation should be delayed any longer or buried, which I felt recommittal to committee would do. Therefore, I voted against recommital, although I did favor curtailing aid to Nasser's government. The motion to recommit carried, and unanticipated by me and by a parliamentary maneuver under the rules, the bill was immediately submitted back to the House within a matter of minutes for a final vote, at which time I voted for the bill, as amended, to curtail aid to Nasser's government under the Commodity Credit Corporation Act.

AUTO SAFETY GETTING CLOSER LOOK

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the appalling rise in the auto death rate is causing increased concern in responsible corners of the Nation. Latest figures show that in 1964 an estimated 48,000 Americans died in traffic mishaps. This figure is almost one-third higher than the number of Americans who died in combat during the Korean war.

As a member of the House Subcommittee on Health and Safety which in the 88th Congress approved Public Laws 201 and 515 to encourage higher safety standards among auto manufacturers through more stringent requirements for U.S. Government-purchased vehicles and other methods, I was pleased to see the General Services Administration announcement establishing safety standards for Government-purchased automobiles. As these new specifications cover such equipment as windshields, brakes, seat belts, instrument panels, and other features, coupled with the fact that Government purchases of vehicles come to almost 60,000 annually, the effects of these steps should be widespread, particularly in view of an estimated production of 8 million cars this year.

Additional signs of concern may be seen in the Federal Trade Commission hearings held recently on automobile tire safety. Numerous States are becoming aware of the need for heightening auto safety standards.

And it is interesting to note that General Motors has become involved in about

45 lawsuits due to accidents concerning one of their automobiles which is allegedly termed "inherently dangerous" due to its design.

It is clear that unless faster progress is achieved the public will demand action to stem the slaughter on America's highways.

PRESIDENTIAL DISABILITY AND SUCCESSION

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation in the form of a House joint resolution providing for a constitutional amendment on the subject of Presidential disability and succession.

It seems to me there has been enough talk about the lack of provisions in our Constitution to provide this great country continuity of leadership in the event of Presidential death, resignation, or disability. It is time we acted to do something to fill this void.

I, along with other Americans, am thankful the recent hospitalization of our President was due to a common cold and not a more serious illness. But the events of recent times attest to the urgency of immediate action.

The resolution I have introduced guarantees that our Nation will not be without a Vice President. It sets up machinery to handle succession in the case of disability of the President. I do not say it is the only method which could be considered.

But this matter must be considered and I am happy to join with those now pressing for such consideration by this Congress.

HORTON BILL EXTENDING INDEMNITY PROGRAM FOR DAIRYMEN

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, the efficiency of American agriculture has made this Nation the best fed group of people in the history of civilization.

Yet, today's food producer, in some respects, works in a narrow range of safety limits. On the one hand, he cannot produce crops, milk, and livestock products economically without using modern pesticides. But, on the other hand, he runs the risk of having pesticide residues show up—even though accidentally—in the food products he markets. The incidence of pesticide residues in milk throughout the Nation last year served to dramatize this problem.

The odd thing about this situation is that dairy farmers were following USDA and land-grant college recommendations for insecticide use. The difficulty lay in the fact that the Food and Drug Administration had developed and adopted without sufficient advance notice a new method of analysis which can detect residues as small as 0.01 parts per million. The milk was the same as before with one important exception: before there was no question of its purity; afterward, substantial numbers of farmers had to dump their milk as unfit for human consumption.

Safeguarding the health interests of American consumers is, as it well should be, a primary consideration. But actions such as these milk-dumping episodes are economically injurious and deserve congressional concern.

Obviously, work is sorely needed in further defining and setting up standards for pesticide use as well as pesticide residues. Later in this session, I plan to introduce legislation to speed activities toward this end. However, this will take time and farmers need protection in the interim. In this interest, I, therefore, introduced legislation today to extend the present indemnity program for dairy farmers forced to dump milk because of pesticide residues.

My measure amends the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 through extension of the indemnity payments provision from its current expiration at the end of this month to June 30, 1967. An appropriation of $8.8 million made last year for this section of the antipoverty bill remains available until June 30 of this year should the extended authorization be passed by Congress.

LEGISLATIVE REAPPORTIONMENT IN IDAHO

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a memorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I have today received a joint memorial from the legislature of my State of Idaho calling for a constitutional convention to consider an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide that both houses of a bicameral State legislature need not be apportioned solely on the basis of population. The memorial contains an amendment proposed by the Idaho State Legislature. I have today introduced a House joint resolution with language identical to that contained in the memorial.

Mr. Speaker, on September 11, 1964, a circuit judge in Michigan ruled that a county board of supervisors must be reapportioned on the "one-man, one-vote" theory. And, on January 5, 1965, the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin ruled similarly.

This, I submit, is an unwarranted intrusion into State affairs by the judiciary. Section 2 of the resolution would deal with this problem, just as section 1 deals with the problem of apportionment of State legislatures.

I commend this joint resolution to my colleagues, and respectfully request that hearings on it be called promptly.

SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 1

To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

We your memorialists, the members of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, assembled in the 38th session thereof, do respectfully represent that:

Whereas the Constitution of the United States should not prohibit any State which has a bicameral legislature from apportioning the members of one house of such legislature on factors other than population, provided that the plan of such apportionment shall have been submitted to and approved by a vote of the electorate of that State; and

Whereas the Constitution of the United States should not restrict or limit a State in its determination of how membership of governing bodies of its subordinate units should be apportioned; and

Whereas in proposing an article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States implementing the above freedom from prohibition, restriction or limitation of apportionment, the article, as proposed, should be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission to the States by Congress.

Now therefore, we your memorialists respectfully make application to the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing an article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, to read as follows:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. Nothing in this Constitution shall prohibit any State which has a bicameral legislature from apportioning the numbers of one house of such legislature on factors other than population, provided that the plan of such apportionment shall have been submitted to and approved by a vote of the electorate of that State.

"SEC. 2. Nothing in this Constitution shall restrict or limit a State in its determination of how membership of governing bodies of its subordinate units shall be apportioned.

"SEC. 3. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission to the States by Congress."

Now, therefore, be it resolved, That if Congress shall have proposed an amendment to the Constitution identical with that contained in this memorial prior to June 1, 1965, this application for a convention shall no longer be of any force or effect; Be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to forward certified copies of this memorial to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States and to each Member of the U.S. Congress from this State, as being an application of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, pursuant to article V of the Constitution of the United States.

AERONAUTICS AND SPACE IN 1964—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 65)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Science and Astronautics and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am proud to transmit—as I know the Congress will be proud to receive—this review of the significant successes of our Nation's aeronautics and space efforts in the calendar year of 1964.

The advances of 1964 were gratifying and heartening omens of the gains and good to come from our determined national undertaking in exploring the frontiers of space. While this great enterprise is still young, we began during the year past to realize its potential in our life on earth. As this report notes, practical uses of the benefits of space technology were almost commonplace around the globe—warning us of gathering storms, guiding our ships at sea, assisting our mapmakers and serving, most valuably of all, to bring the peoples of many nations closer together in joint peaceful endeavors.

Substantial strides have been made in a very brief span of time—and more are to come. We expect to explore the moon, not just visit it or photograph it. We plan to explore and chart planets as well. We shall expand our earth laboratories into space laboratories and extend our national strength into the space dimension.

The purpose of the American people—expressed in the earliest days of the space age—remains unchanged and unwavering. We are determined that space shall be an avenue toward peace and we both invite and welcome all men to join with us in this great opportunity.

In summary form, the accompanying report depicts the contributions of the various departments and agencies of the Government to the Nation's aeronautics and space accomplishments during 1964.

Lyndon B. Johnson.

The White House, *January 27, 1965.*

THE 17TH ANNUAL REPORT OF THE HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of section 802(a) of the Housing Act of 1954, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the 17th annual report of the Housing and Home Finance Agency covering housing activities for the calendar year 1963.

Lyndon B. Johnson.

The White House, *January 27, 1965.*

CONTROL OF DANGEROUS DRUGS

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. Dwyer] may extend her remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, the fact that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce this morning opened hearings on legislation to control the distribution of dangerous drugs as its first matter of legislative business is, I believe, an occasion for real satisfaction.

As a cosponsor with the chairman of the committee, the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Harris], of the bill under consideration and as a sponsor of similar legislation in the 87th and 88th Congresses, I am especially grateful that early and determined action is underway. With the chairman's leadership and with increasing awareness of the devastating impact on the youth of our country of readily available, habit-forming drugs like the amphetamines and barbiturates, I am confident that this Congress can quickly enact a bill providing reasonable and effective controls.

This morning's Wall Street Journal carried a very comprehensive article summarizing the "goof ball" and "pep pill" situation as the committee begins its hearings. While I can appreciate the sense of uncertainty on the part of retail druggists faced with the prospect of certain regulations in this area, I do not share their fears that such regulations either can or will be unreasonable under the terms of the legislation.

And, certainly, the article makes clear the fact that we cannot wait any longer to take effective action against a threat to the health and welfare of young Americans of mammoth proportions.

Mr. Speaker, I include the article as a part of my remarks.

Congressional Hearing Begins on Plan To Curb "Goof Balls," "Pep Pills": Growing Use of Barbiturates, Amphetamines by Teenagers and Others Spurs Measure

(By Joseph W. Sullivan)

Washington.—A legislative assault on the "goof ball" and the "pep pill" may well become the new Congress' very first contribution to the Great Society.

Faced with mounting evidence that these habit-forming depressants and stimulants have supplanted heroin and marijuana as the country's most insidious drug threat, legislative leaders are pushing action to curb their illicit distribution ahead of all other Johnson administration health proposals.

At House Commerce Committee hearings beginning this morning, the Food and Drug Administration will make its pitch for close Federal scrutiny of all makers and dispensers of the pills. The object: To catch pill diversions from legitimate medical uses as they occur.

The committee chairman, Democratic Representative Harris of Arkansas, is already sponsoring a bill patterned on the FDA's past requests. He intends to move the legislation swiftly through the House. In the Senate, enthusiastic backers led by Connecticut's Democratic Senator Dodd assure a warm reception.

Within the drug industry, however, there are worries that the FDA's proposed cure may prove more painful than the malady. Retail druggist groups are prepared to fight the legislation outright unless they are exempted from its tedious recordkeeping and inspection requirements. Drug producers fear the FDA might some day try to extend its proposed power to any medicine, perhaps even aspirin, that could be harmful in overdoses.

FRETTING ABOUT "BUREAUCRATS"

"The way the legislation is worded and the way those officious bureaucrats at FDA work, they'll be inquiring into every sale of any drug that's subject to misuse, and that takes in nearly everything we sell," complains one industry spokesman.

"Goof ball" and "pep pill" are the common back-alley names for a pair of basic drug compounds: Barbiturates and amphetamines. Both compounds serve useful medical purposes; both ordinarily must be prescribed by doctors. Barbiturates fill the roles of painkiller, nerve calmer and just plain sleeping pill. Amphetamines can pep up the depressed and the lethargic; they also can suppress appetite for the overweight and can relieve nasal congestion.

Served up by peddlers at highway truck stops to long-haul truckdrivers and on street corners and college campuses to thrill-seeking youngsters, both types of pills can cause abundant trouble. Pep pills, says a harassed New Jersey police chief, "makes antisocial lions out of kids as timid as mice." When taken by truckdrivers, according to the Interstate Commerce Commission, they contribute to many truck collisions. Goof balls create a trance-like effect and remove social and sexual inhibitions. Both compounds are habit forming, though less so than true narcotics. Both can cause permanent damage to the brain and nervous system—and even death.

For one view of the pill problem, listen to Police Chief Joseph P. McDevitt of Seaside Heights, N.J. Since 1960, he says, disorderly conduct arrests in that resort town have grown almost fivefold. "At first we thought the kids had found an illegal beer tap, but when our cops approached them they'd start biting, kicking and shoving, things they wouldn't do on alcohol," the chief relates. "Then we started noticing other kids with glazed or vacant looks at the dance halls and on the beach front, and we realized we had a pill problem." The biggest troublemakers are highschoolers spending spring weekends at the beach. Police once broke up a sex party involving 35 noisy teenagers in a rented cabin. Amid the ripped furniture police found a big supply of pills.

THE PILL HABIT SPREADS

Elsewhere, there is ample evidence that the pill habit is spreading. Chicago police report a 65 percent increase last year over 1963 in "dangerous drug" cases, defined as arrests for illegal sale or misuse of drugs not technically classified as narcotics; Baltimore experienced a 60-percent rise in the same period. In Los Angeles, teenage arrests for amphetamine and barbiturate use soared from 50 in 1958 to 321 last year. Police in the New York City suburb of Yonkers last summer pinpointed 900 teenage pilltakers, mostly in upper-income neighborhoods.

"It's easy to sensationalize the fact that some kids get hopped up on pills and commit lurid crimes or go beserk. But the real tragedy is measured in terms that the average person can't see, in lives that sink into oblivion," declares Dr. John D. Griffith, Oklahoma's director of mental health planning. In a recent 6-month survey in the Oklahoma City area, Dr. Griffith identified more than 2,500 pilltakers compared to a "few dozen" narcotics addicts. Among those "hooked" on pills: A psychiatrist, the daughter of a prominent physician, and an Air Force captain.

In contrast to narcotics traffic, which concentrates in big-city slums, the illegal pill trade is ubiquitous. The truck stop and the roadside tavern have extended it into even the smallest communities, according to the

FDA. In 1962, the agency surveyed amphetamine and barbiturate compounders and estimated their annual output at 9 billion tablets; by means of more obscure computations, the FDA figures at least half of these are diverted into illegal channels. Though the wholesale price is only a tenth of a cent per tablet, the standard 10 cents a pill charged by illicit retail peddlers indicates an annual take of at least $450 million.

The FDA insists it can't cut this total without stronger enforcement tools. Local authorities say they are powerless to do much without Federal help to shut off the sources of illicit supply. Hence the push for legislation.

Late last year the Senate whisked through a bill directing the FDA to police the sales records of all firms distributing any drugs that may induce "psychotoxic effects or antisocial behavior" if taken in excessive quantities. The object was to clamp down on sales that start the pills down the wrong paths. The bill also would have strengthened the FDA's existing powers to seize such drugs and prosecute illicit sellers, making it a crime just to possess the pills without a prescription and killing a requirement that they must have crossed State lines before Federal action can be taken. "It can be awfully difficult to prove that a little pink pill has traveled interstate," complains one FDA official.

This measure was far too severe for many retail druggists and more than a few drug makers. Some foresaw extension of onerous recordkeeping requirements and nuisance inspections to a wide range of prescription products and, eventually, to such over-the-counter staples as cough syrups and nasal inhalers. (Indeed, looking beyond the pill problem, FDA officials are talking seriously about cracking down on the surreptitious use of cough medicine for its codeine content and nasal inhalers for their amphetamine fumes). In any case, the House took no action on the pill problem last session.

The bill now before the House Commerce Committee meets many of the industry objections. It would simplify recordkeeping requirements and confine them to drugs with "depressant or stimulant effect on the central nervous system." While striking out the interstate-movement requirement now limiting Federal action, it would soften the possession clause with several exemptions to cover certain medical needs. Also, it would give any drug producer or distributor affected a chance to challenge his inclusion before an ostensibly independent advisory committee.

But the retail druggists still aren't happy. "The average pharmacist is a little guy who takes a lot of pride in his professional standing," explains a lobbyist sympathetic to his problems, "and it burns this little guy up to see his tax money going to pay a lot of Federal snoops to come in and harass him."

A PLEA TO MODERNIZE CONGRESS

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCHWEIKER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Speaker, the House has taken important first steps to modernize its procedures, but I feel additional reforms are vital if Congress is to function effectively in the nuclear age.

H.R. 3172, which I have introduced, would establish a 16-member Commission on Congressional Reorganization to study the organization and performance of Congress and determine ways to improve its legislative processes in the public interest.

The volume and complexity of legislation before the Congress have been constantly increasing, but little has been done over the decades to streamline congressional rules and procedures.

On the opening day of the 89th Congress, the House adopted three important rules changes designed to improve its efficiency.

These changes passed the House 224 to 201 with my support. The narrow 23-vote margin by which the three reforms were adopted indicates the difficulty of persuading Congress to modernize itself.

The legislation which I have introduced, providing for a Commission on Congressional Reorganization, would pave the way for further reforms necessary if Congress is to be responsive to present-day needs.

Five members of the Commission would be appointed from the Senate and five from the House. The President, and former Presidents Eisenhower and Truman, would each appoint two members, since I believe congressional procedures are not exclusively the concern of Members of Congress; outside experts can be valuable in this role.

The Schweiker bill would require the Commission to study at least 12 problem areas:

Scheduling of legislation. The workload is too light early in a session resulting in a congressional logjam late in the session.

Structure, staffing and operation of congressional committees, including the role of seniority.

Workload of Congress, including examination of time devoted to governing District of Columbia and to handling thousands of private claim and immigration bills.

Congressional rules and procedures, including possible use of joint appropriations hearings by the Senate and House, revision of Senate cloture rule to curtail filibusters, and use of electronic voting.

Conflicts of interest of Members of Congress.

Term of office of Members of the House, now set at 2 years.

Communications, travel and other allowance of Congressmen and Senators.

Financing of election campaigns.

Duties of Senators and Congressmen regarding appointments to the service academies and postmaster appointments.

Strengthening congressional power of the purse.

Operation and effectiveness of existing lobbying laws.

Legislative oversight of the manner in which laws are administered.

H.R. 3172 provides that the Commission must complete its study and forward recommendations to Congress by January 31, 1967. I urge my colleagues to support this proposed legislation.

WHEN URBAN RENEWAL GOES WRONG—NEW YORK IN CRISIS

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, the New York Herald Tribune is to be highly commended for its willingness to take a hard look at urban renewal, and to report its real impact on the people of the great city of New York.

I include here an article from the New York Herald Tribune of January 26, 1965:

WHEN URBAN RENEWAL GOES WRONG

(By Barry Gottehrer and Marshall Peck)

Even at its best, when the planning process flows smoothly, untouched by political pressures and indecision, urban renewal still claims its victims. As unfortunate as this may be, the greater good of a city, the clearing away of slums and blighted areas, decrees it and someone—usually the small business man—frequently must suffer hardship out of necessity.

Unfortunately, in New York City, politics, indecision and haphazard planning have become disturbingly identifying symbols of more than a few urban-renewal projects. This is the story of one of them and the unnecessary hardships inflicted by a city government unable to make up its mind.

MOVE

Three years ago, when William Brady decided to move his retail tire business to larger quarters, he called his attorney. He had already found what appeared to be an ideal location—a spacious and reasonably priced garage-type building at 311 East 23d Street—but first, before he moved from 35th Street, he wanted to make sure the city had no urban-renewal plans for that block.

A longtime New Yorker, he had heard about what could happen to a businessman, particularly one without political connections, when the city's slum-clearance people went to work.

His lawyer, Louis Buck, reported back that there were indeed plans for an urban-renewal project in the Bellevue Hospital area. But, according to plans approved by both the board of estimate and the city planning commission, the Bellevue South project was to run from 24th to 28th Streets and from First to Second Avenues. The building that Mr. Brady wanted to buy at 311 East 23d Street was not to be included in the project. And, at the time, according to Mr. Buck, he was told that there were no definite plans to extend or alter the boundaries of the project.

When research by the Title Guarantee Trust Co confirmed the attorney's findings, Mr. Brady was delighted. It was even better than he had anticipated. Now not only was he going to move his Economy Tire Co. into a highly suitable building—with a business section in front and interior parking in the back—but he also was moving into an area that, because of the nearby urban-renewal project, would be totally redeveloped and bring additional potential customers into the neighborhood.

SOLD

With these facts before him, Bill Brady closed the deal early in December of 1962 and, with a $25,000 downpayment, took possession of the $250,000 property.

"It seemed ideal—the location, the building, the price—everything," he said. "I thought I had looked into everything."

He had, but, as he and thousands of other victims of urban renewal have learned, everything frequently isn't enough in New

York. Bill Brady had failed to consider the inconsistencies, the haphazard planning, and the irregularities that have marked the administration of the city's urban-renewal program since it was first set up.

Within months after he had bought the building, Mr. Brady learned that the board of estimate and the housing and redevelopment Board, established in 1960 to strengthen and consolidate the city's urban-renewal program, were giving serious thought to extending the boundaries of Bellevue South.

Under the new plan, the project would still run from First to Second Avenues, but it would also run from 23d to 30th Streets. Suddenly, Bill Brady found himself standing directly in the path of a Federal bulldozer officially named urban renewal but labeled human or Negro removal by its critics.

PLANNING

"Sure the boundaries for the Bellevue South project have changed many times, but that's the way planning works," says one city official connected with the program. "That's the way planning has to work. When people ask about the area, we tell them that 'Yes, as of this date, there is no plan for that block.' But we also are supposed to warn them that if they are on the outskirts of a proposed project the plans could always be changed. Hell, there are no guarantees about anything in this life. We can't guarantee that your building won't be burned down by an arsonist either."

This city official has a job to do—to clear out slums and bring in more low- and middle-income housing—but he is part of a system that is simply not geared to function for the benefit of the city's little people, those who need help most of all.

In the case of Bellevue South, residents and small businessmen have been treated to a baffling series of shifting boundaries to the north and to the south simply because city officials, after more than 10 years of planning and procrastination, have finally decided that the larger boundaries provide "a neater package."

The project itself officially dates back to April of 1954 when the mayor's committee on slum clearance, headed by Robert Moses, announced that low-rent, State-aided public housing might be coming between 26th and 30th Streets on the East Side.

Bellevue Hospital, the largest of the city's hospitals, had long been seeking low-cost housing in its neighborhood to accommodate some of its 6,600 employees, and when the city planning commission listed the area as "substandard and unsanitary" in December of 1954, wheels began to turn.

By June of 1956, when the slum clearance committee sought planning commission and board of estimate approval to proceed with planning for the project, the boundaries had been extended to cover from 23d to 30th Streets. The approval, however, came at a time when the slum clearance committee was under intensive fire for alleged irregularities in the city's urban renewal program—and, consequently, the project was temporarily shelved.

Yet on June 25, 1959, when the board of estimate authorized the slum clearance committee to apply for advanced planning funds, the project's boundaries now stretched from 24th to 28th Streets. In fact, as late as April of 1961, the housing and redevelopment board (HRB) publicly discussed the project with these same boundaries.

NO SLUM

Though there was occasional mention in the city's newspapers about enlarging the boundaries again and an HRB report dated December 30, 1962 (which listed the boundaries from 23d to 30th Street), it was not until July of 1963 that the planning commission approved the larger $60 million project and the HRB filed its formal report to Washington.

And what is even more incredible is that it was not until last September 10 that the board of estimate got around to approving the new Bellevue South project and adopted a resolution that the boundaries (24th to 28th Street) set on June 25, 1959, more than 5 years before, should finally be amended to read from 23d to 30th Street.

Today, a small sign is fixed to the front window at 311 East 23d Street. It reads, "No Blight, No Slum" and, inside, Bill Brady and a half-dozen employees go about their business of selling tires. He had been offered $150,000 by the city for his property after being told that it was assessed for only $130,000.

Later, city officials discovered that Mr. Brady's 1964 city tax bill listed the assessed valuation at $170,000, $40,000 more than the recent assessment and $20,000 more than they had offered him. Yet, despite this apparent discrepancy, he has been offered no adjustment.

So Bill Brady has decided to sue and has hired Samuel Goldstein, an attorney who specializes in condemnation cases. If this case runs true to form, it will drag out for more than a year and, though he will probably recover some percentage of the money he feels he is legally entitled to, he must now share it with an attorney.

Some condemnation attorneys receive a minimum of 25 percent, but most work on a sliding scale, charging approximately 5 percent if the amount is near the assessed value, considerably more if the owner seeks what he considers payment in full for his investment, tangible and intangible. Mr. Brady expects to pay his attorney $20,000.

"It's taken me a while but I've finally learned that in this city you've got to look out for yourself," says Bill Brady. "I've fought this all the way and I can't fight any more. I've got to pick up the pieces and start again. I've got to take second best. I paid out $250,000 and it seems right that I should get it back. You know, they claimed I hadn't made a down payment, came up here looking me over as if there was some funny business going on. Well I know what is right and what is wrong. But I've got to take what they say. They make it sound like it is the law."

RENTS

Until his suit is settled, he will continue to look for another location (he has had no luck so far) and continue to sell tires at 311 East 23d Street, a building he now rents from the city. The rent has been set at $1,360 a month but, because the city is using four offices above his garage as special quarters for the project administration and because he is still paying the gas and electric bill for the entire building, Mr. Brady has requested a reduction, which the city is now considering.

"The last decade has seen a complete shift from brick and mortar renewal to human renewal in this city," says Milton Mollen, the city's housing chief. "Despite its youth, great strides have been made in New York City under its renewal program. I think the people who criticize the program just don't know what they're talking about. Under our program, the people wind up in better housing and the businessmen are reimbursed."

These are noble sentiments, but, in the case of Bellevue South and other past projects, they are, at best, half-truths. To anyone who spends a week or even a few hours talking to the residents and businessmen of the area, it would seem that New York's human renewal, at times, painfully ignores the human element. Just look at a cross-section of the area's residents and businessmen:

Mario Sargenti, a crippled, 52-year-old importer of food delicacies, is a two-time victim of urban renewal. He had been forced out of the Chelsea area by a State-aided, low-income housing project in 1958 and had moved to East 24th Street in 1959.

He says he hired an attorney and an architect to check out urban-renewal plans for the area.

He also says—and his lawyer concurs—that they were told by the city planning commission that there were no plans for 333 East 24th Street.

IMPOSSIBLE

The planning commission—and the HRB—both say that this is impossible, that there were plans for 24th Street to be included in the Bellevue South project at that time. They also say that they can't understand how it could possibly have happened.

"It just doesn't make sense," says Lloyd Kaplan, of the planning commission. "He should have been told. But, if he was told, it just doesn't make sense that he would still have bought the property."

Mr. Sargenti did buy the property, for $63,000, and says he spent an additional $40,000 to remodel it. The city appraisal for his property was only $68,000 and now he, too, is being forced to sue the city for money that his lawyer tells him is rightfully his.

"I don't know where I stand any more," says Mr. Sargenti. "I can't move until I get the money from the city. I can't do anything. The city doesn't care about me or any of the people down here. I've worked hard in this city. The city has let me down. Where do I go from here? What can I do? Start all over again—from scratch?"

WRONG

The City Textile Printing Corp., which employs 80 people, mostly in unskilled jobs, has been on East 27th Street for 18 years. "We can't stop what they're doing," says Irving Moskowitz, a company executive. "The city says it's all for progress and we don't have a leg to stand on. But there's another side to this. If they force all of us out of business, where are they going to get tax money from? The city compains about losing businesses and unskilled jobs and then they do this. Since we've been forced to move, we're now going to look for the most favorable spot—taxwise and laborwise." And, according to the company, the list of possible new sites does not include a single one in New York City.

George Baderian, 74, has owned the candy store at the corner of 23d Street since 1911 and lives above it, on the third floor with his three sons.

"It is wrong what they are doing to this neighborhood," he says. "The city is out for itself. It's not looking out for me. I spent my life here. You know what happens when a fish comes out of water. It dies. When I leave here, I die."

Duncan Campbell is a sheetmetal worker who emigrated with his wife and two children from Scotland 8 years ago. Today, he lives at 328 East 28th Street. His problem: He earns too much to move into the low-income Nathan Straus development nearby and too little to move into one of the middle income buildings that are planned for the area.

"There have been five different men here looking and asking what we want to do," says Mrs. Campbell. "We've been doing fine until now. We've been working hard. It's almost as if we were going to be penalized for working hard. The city is killing initiative."

Irving Brender owns a drycleaning shop at the corner of 28th Street and Second Avenue. He and his mother bought the building in May of 1961. The city today has offered him $58,990 for his property. Outside the project area but only two blocks up the avenue, a building smaller than his own is on sale for $85,000. Mr. Brender cannot afford to buy this new building.

"I just happen to be in the way," he says. "I'm just going to get the least they want to give me."

Irving Feuer, part owner of the Peter Cooper Pharmacy on First Avenue near 24th Street, is hopeful that the Department of Relocation will move his store to a temporary location somewhere within the renewal area during the construction. For if the pharmacy is forced to close temporarily or move far out of the area temporarily, Mr. Feuer fears he may be out of business permanently.

COMPETITION

Another pharmacy has already rented quarters just up the block in New York Towers, a luxury apartment house just recently completed at 305 East 24th Street.

"We may be the old, established drugstore now," says Mr. Feuer, "but with a new drugstore up the street, how many customers are going to come back to us when we move back? That other store is hurting us already."

It is the new apartment house that really infuriates most of the area's longtime residents and businessmen. This house, where rents average between $70 and $75 a month per room, was put up in the last 3 years, even though its owners knew that the city already had urban renewal plans for the area and conceivably could decide at almost anytime that their project did not fit into the Bellevue South plans.

"Sure it was a risk," says Nelson Seitel, one of the six owners of the house, an attorney, and a former aid and commissioner of labor under Mayor Wagner. "We figured we could always move faster than the city."

By August of 1963, when the city planning commission held a hearing on a petition to utilize that site for a public housing project, the New York Towers people had already relocated all 122 tenants, cleared the land, and started excavation.

CONVINCER

Mr. Seitel, who represented his coowners at the hearing, says he never discussed the apartment house with the mayor, and doubts whether his political connections helped him in any way. He insists that it was a Federal Housing Administration commitment of $50 a foot (the price the city would have to pay to acquire the cleared land) and the support of Federal Housing Administrator Robert Weaver, who said the Federal agency would not finance a public-housing project at that price, that ultimately convinced the city administration that the apartment house should stay.

Bellevue South residents and businessmen, far less successful in their attempts to save their homes and their livelihoods, insist, without proof, that Mr. Seitel's political connections were the determining factor.

Whatever the reason or reasons, the fact remains that a long shot paid off for Mr. Seitel and his partners—their house is now listed as part of the approved overall plan for Bellevue South—while several sure things have run out of the money for some other people, who never worked for the mayor.

"We found a good deal of support, almost as much as opposition, for the Bellevue South project," claims Milton Mollen.

What he means is that the residents and owners of the new apartment house, the directors and staff of the church and civic organizations, which will become part of the project, and the people of Bellevue Hospital, who one day will benefit from it, are all strongly in favor of this plan.

What he does not say is that there has been virtually no support from the people Bellevue South affects most—those who presently live and own businesses there.

PROBLEM

Perhaps the biggest problem here—and in almost every other urban renewal area—is the determination of what is and what is not a slum. To people who live and work in these seven blocks (6,215 residents and 147 retail shops), this area is by no means a slum or seriously blighted. It needs rehabilitation, they agree, but it does not need a bulldozer.

But to the city and Bellevue Hospital, which remains the main force behind the project, the seven-block area is definitely a slum. Of the 2,224 dwelling units there, the HRB classifies 1,632 as "dilapidated," 289 as "deteriorating," and only 303 as "sound."

Under present plans (Mr. Mollen says it will be a minimum of 5 years until the project is completed), the city intends to rehabilitate only 233 apartment units. In the place of the others, the city plans to put up 17 buildings with 2,260 apartments. Of these, only 210 will be public housing, with 35 percent of the others averaging between $24 and $33 a room.

Yet the dislocation of residents in the Bellevue South project area has been a lot less painful than it has been in other renewal areas. Although there is not enough public and low-income housing in the project, 267 apartments have been reserved in the recently completed Nathan Straus Houses, a low-income public housing project just outside Bellevue South between 27th and 28th Streets and 2d and 3d Avenues.

PROPOSAL

One proposal—put forward by the Bellevue South Tenants Association—called for the city to build housing for the people of Bellevue Hospital on highway and air rights over the East River Drive and suggested that the HRB rehabilitate rather than tear up the seven-block area. This proposal was presented at a city hall hearing and, despite loud and enthusiastic support, was quickly forgotten.

It is precisely this conflict between rehabilitation and bulldozing that cuts to the heart of urban renewal. Everybody agrees slums and blight are bad. It is the method of getting rid of them that disturbs many people and the city's haphazard planning that disturbs many more.

There will always be a basic conflict where urban renewal is concerned. The city government will always insist a project is for the greater good and the area's residents and small businessmen will invariably insist that it isn't. This conflict is not difficult to understand.

In many instances, these people have paid a price for progress that is truly necessary for the city's greater good. Yet, in the case of Bellevue South and other projects where haphazard planning, indecision, and politics have caused further and greater hardship on the area's residents and businessmen, the price for progress is too high. Here, the people have ceased to be victims of urban renewal. They have become instead victims of the city administration.

TO MANY NEW YORKERS, URBAN RENEWAL HAS COME TO MEAN NEGRO REMOVAL, SAYS THE NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, the New York Herald Tribune reported on January 25, 1965, that the public housing program in New York City was set up to cure at least one of the problems of poverty, but, because of limited funds, unlimited redtape, and little direction from the top, "it seems to have created almost as many problems as it has solved."

"New York, Greatest City in the World—And Everything Is Wrong With It" reads a headline in the New York Herald Tribune, which goes on to say:

> It is a city in which a public-housing program has been set up to cure at least one of the problems of poverty, but, because of limited funds, unlimited redtape, and little direction from the top, it seems to have created almost as many problems as it has solved. There are currently 520,000 people living in public housing, but there are more than 660,000 others now waiting to get in. At the rate that public housing has been constructed over the last 2 years (12,000 units or apartments since 1962), it would take someone more than 10 years to gain admittance to a public-housing project if he applied today.
>
> It is a city in which more than $2.19 billion has been committed to urban-renewal projects since 1950 in an attempt to wipe out slums and provide decent low and middle income housing, but one in which the slums continue to spread, the ghettos remain, and there is still a critical shortage of low and middle income housing. To many New Yorkers, urban renewal has come to mean Negro or human removal, the shifting of a minority group from one slum to another.

In my hope that new housing legislation covering urban renewal will forthrightly move to cure the festering problems uncovered and reported by the New York Herald Tribune, I am enclosing the following article from that fine newspaper which was published in its January 26, 1965, issue:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Herald Tribune, Jan. 26, 1965]

AROUSED AND INDIGNANT—URBAN RENEWAL HOPE: PLAGUED BY INDECISION

(By Barry Gottehrer and Marshall Peck)

To New York and dozens of other cities, fighting a seemingly endless, sometimes futile war against spreading slums, urban renewal has become the chief—and essential—weapon for progress. But in New York—and elsewhere to varying degrees—it is frequently a peculiar sort of progress, one that destroys slums out of necessity but one that also often destroys small businesses and uproots lower income families out of ignorance, incompetence and indecision.

Despite the city's extravagant claims, the 15-year-old slum clearance program in New York has consistently failed to live up to its original purpose—"the realization as soon as feasible of a decent home and a suitable living environment for every American family."

The slum-clearance program officially came into being in 1949 with the passage of the title I section of the Federal Housing Act. Under the legislation, the Federal Government agreed to pay cities for slum clearance and redeveloping by putting up two-thirds (the other third to be paid in full by the city or split between the city and the State) of the cost of buying up and clearing slum areas. The cleared land was then to be turned over to builders and developers at a considerably lower price than they would have had to pay if they had cleared the land themselves.

WHEN IT BEGAN

The term "urban renewal" was brought into use in 1954 when the Federal Housing Act was extended to provide Federal assistance on a similar basis for conservation, rehabilitation and comprehensive planning and redevelopment.

Since 1949, the U.S. Government has approved more than $4 billion worth of urban renewal contributions nationally, with more than $263 million allocated for New York City. Out of this, after 15 years, the city now has 41 federally aided projects totaling 63,074 apartment units in varying stages of planning or construction.

Through last month, however, only 3 of these 41 projects and only 24,052 of these 63,074 apartments were listed as completed by the Housing and Redevelopment Board. In a city in which the slums and ghettos continue to spread and where there is a desperate need for more public and middle-income housing, 15 years of urban-renewal work and money have not made notably impressive headway.

The failure of the city's urban-renewal program—coupled with a severe shortage of public housing (New York voters rejected two amendments last November that would have provided 2,500 additional public-housing units—have made the housing problem one of the most critical facing the city.

Some 1.25 million New Yorkers live in substandard housing today and more than 600,000 need to and can't get into public housing.

The white middle class continues to desert the city (more than 800,000 have left since 1950) because the apartments in Manhattan are, for the most part, too small or too expensive.

And the city's Negroes and Puerto Ricans, the principal victims of urban renewal, continue to be pushed from one slum to another.

One of the most outspoken and articulate critics of haphazardly administered and poorly planned urban renewal is Representative JOHN V. LINDSAY, whose 17th Congressional District includes the Bellevue South area. To the Republican Congressman, urban renewal is necessary for progress. But he seems to feel that in New York City urban renewal has unfortunately been allowed to become a necessary evil instead of a necessary good in many instances.

"The purpose of the Housing Act of 1949 is not served when we indiscriminately erase whole communities from the map," says Mr. Lindsay. "We must stop destroying neighborhoods in the name of urban renewal. We must stop ruining businesses, scattering the families we should keep and creating greater pressure on deteriorating housing—all in the name of urban renewal. Past programs have been urban removal rather than urban renewal."

PAYING THE PRICE

To a great extent, New York City today is paying for the capricious manner in which the urban-renewal program was run through the years. Under the direction of master builder Robert Moses and his committee on slum clearance, the urban-renewal or title I program—as it was originally called—was the subject of criticism and the object of controversy almost from the beginning.

Unlike other cities, which would relocate the residents and then clear the land before turning the sites over to private developers, New York insisted upon turning over the sites with the buildings still standing and the tenants still paying rent. This was done because Mr. Moses said it was the only way he could get firm commitments from developers. And what Mr. Moses wanted, Mr. Moses got.

It was precisely this policy, which allowed developers to delay relocation and clearance almost indefinitely while collecting rents from their slum tenants, that led to the start of the program's troubles. By mid-1956, with 10 projects approved but all running far behind schedule, hints of scandal and criticism of the way many slum residents were being treated were commonplace. But the biggest explosion—centering around the Manhattantown project, a six-block area between Amsterdam Avenue and Central Park West and 97th and 100th Streets—was yet to come.

The plan, calling for the construction of 17 apartment houses with 2,720 units, was approved by the board of estimate in September of 1951 and scheduled for completion by August of 1956. Manhattantown, Inc.—a group of developers headed by a builder named Jack Ferman and Samuel Caspert, who previously had been appointed a city marshal by Mayor William O'Dwyer—obtained the six-block area, which the city had condemned for $16.3 million, for $3.1 million, putting up only $1 million in cash.

THE MANHATTANTOWN STORY

But it wasn't until the fall of 1954 when the U.S. Senate Banking and Currency Committee held a 1-day hearing in New York that the story began to leak out.

Mr. Caspert disclosed how he had set up a separate firm headed by his son-in-law which bought all the refrigerators and gas ranges in the Manhattantown tenements for $33,000.

The son-in-law then rented the exact same refrigerators and ranges back to Manhattantown which, in less than a year, paid him $115,326. Though the Senate committee reported that $649,215 had been siphoned out of the Manhattantown project by similar methods in its first 18 months of operation, no official action was taken by either Mayor Wagner or Mr. Moses.

When charges of irregularities continued and the project's scheduled completion day came in August of 1956 without a single building having even been started, Mr. Moses blamed the Federal officials for taking too much time in underwriting a loan for the developers. Yet even when the loans were approved the Manhattantown developers did not pick them up. The situation became so bad in the Manhattantown tenements that one tenant complained she had no hot water for 3 months and no water at all for 1 month.

By mid-1957, the dimensions of the problem no longer could be evaded or denied. Though developers were collecting millions of dollars in rent from slum tenements throughout the city, some of them had not even bothered to pay their taxes or interest to the city. Of the $1 million owed the city, Manhattantown owed more than $414,000.

THE MAYOR'S VIEW

Finally, on June 11, 1957, the slum clearance committee recommended that the city start foreclosure action to repossess the Manhattantown site. Nearly 6 years after the project had first been approved, Manhattantown had not paid its taxes (which now totaled $620,000), had not cleared its land, had not started construction of its first apartment, and had not even picked up its Federal commitments.

At a city hall press conference, Mayor Wagner, who had steadfastly supported the slum clearance committee and its chairman and would continue to do so, was asked why he had done nothing but deny all charges involving Manhattantown in the past.

"We were misled," said the mayor.

"You mean to say you were conned for 5 years?" asked one reporter, who had been a persistent critic of the Manhattantown setup.

"Well, if you want to put it that way—yes," he said. "I guess you could say we were conned for 5 years."

Ultimately, under a new sponsor (Webb & Knapp, later replaced by Alcoa Residences, Inc.) and under a new name (Park West Village), the Manhattantown project became a reality. Today, 2,525 units are occupied (at rents between $28 and $55 a room) and another 140 are underway.

Manhattantown, however, wasn't the only urban-renewal project tainted with scandal and dotted with irregularities. In others, it also became obvious that urban renewal might not always work for the benefit of the slum residents, but it certainly didn't harm the developers.

At one point, the program was being run so haphazardly that a Federal Housing Administrator in Washington reportedly decided to do something about it. According to this story, the Administrator sent word to the slum clearance committee in New York that further funds would be withheld until the city cleaned up its program, eliminated the scandal, and started providing better housing and relocation for the people pushed out.

Within a week, the Administrator reportedly received a call from a superior. The message was supposed to have been loud and clear: "Leave Bob Moses and New York alone."

The Administrator is said to have taken the advice and Mr. Moses, whose own honesty and integrity have never been questioned, continued to administer New York's urban-renewal program in the way he saw fit.

(The Tribune repeatedly has attempted to interview Mr. Moses about his role in the city's urban-renewal program and its history, but has been told that Mr. Moses would under no condition speak to anyone from this newspaper about anything.)

Finally in 1960, the housing and redevelopment board was established to take over the duties of the slum clearance committee and six other municipal programs. Unfortunately, in New York, unlike several other cities (Boston, for one), the urban-renewal program and the city's planning unit, both of which overlap in many areas, were not brought under a single administration.

A PLANNING DECISION

It is still up to the city planning commission, which has received $3.7 million from the Federal Government under a new urban-renewal arm called the community renewal program, to hold preliminary hearings and designate specific areas for urban renewal.

It is then up to the HRB to request additional funds from the Federal Government for further study of these designated areas and, perhaps someday, for ultimate condemnation and clearance. Theoretically the HRB cannot initiate an urban-renewal project and the planning commission cannot complete one.

Caught up in this massive bureaucracy and this needless duplication of time, money, and effort, hundreds of thousands of New Yorkers must wait—unable to move because there is no place to move to and unable to repair their homes or businesses because banks are extremely reluctant to extend credit to someone whose business or home might be torn down in the next few years.

What then is the difference between the city's urban renewal program 5 years ago and today? Essentially, the difference seems to be that the people running the program now have their hearts in the right place. There are still occasional whispers of scandal, but they are infrequent and unsubstantiated.

Under Chairman Milton Mollen, who last week was named to coordinate all of the city's housing programs, the HRB picked up the cry of other cities in following the leadership of New Haven Mayor Richard Lee and his emphasis on "human renewal." Mr. Mollen tactfully avoids criticizing the old slum clearance committee ("I'd rather not talk about the past," he says), but believes that the entire emphasis of the program has changed for the better—"from simply clearing slums to a concern for the problems they symptomize."

"I think urban renewal is the hope of many areas of the city," he says. "Without it, there's uncertainty. As it is, there's inaction on one hand. In certain areas, such as Bedford-Stuyvesant, private enterprise won't go in. On the other hand, in other areas, private real estate interests are moving in. They only disrupt the neighborhood and they provide no relocation for the people."

In New York now, the department of relocation, which was set up in November of 1962, has taken the job of urban renewal relocating away from the builders. And the city itself—and not the builders—remains in control of the apartments and stores, collecting the rents until everyone is relocated and the site is cleared. Then—and only then—is the land turned over to the developers.

These are decided improvements—steps in the right direction—but the administration of the program and its accomplishments remain far from impressive.

One need look no further than Lincoln Center for a vivid example of the city's urban-renewal program at its very best and, yet at the same time, still not satisfying everyone.

At its best, the Lincoln Center project cleared away a seriously blighted area and provided the city with a cultural core—including a new theater, a new philharmonic hall, and an opera house—that any city in the world would be proud to possess.

Yet even here—where the beauty and worth of the cultural center so clearly demonstrate a step forward from the slum it replaced—there has been criticism—and, to a degree, the criticism is valid.

CAUSE FOR CRITICISM

In the place of the low rent, admittedly slum housing, a string of expensive apartment houses have been built—far out of the price range of the people these buildings have dispossessed. This is the continuing failure of urban renewal—this aimless traffic and removal of lower income people from one slum to another—and it is one that New York officials have been unable to solve.

HRB officials are quick to point out that the Lincoln Center apartment houses are integrated, but they usually fail to mention that they are integrated by upper-middle-class Negroes and not by Negroes and Puerto Ricans who had been driven from the area by the bulldozers. These houses, where 90 percent of the 4,271 apartments rent for $61 a room, have at best token integration and the project, despite HRB denials, is a prime example of what civil rights leaders call "Negro removal."

"It's unfortunate that someone has to be hurt and suffer but you have got to think of the greater need and the greater good," says one city official. "And, for a city the size of New York, the greater need is the elimination of slums."

Few people—even those uprooted by urban renewal—would dispute this. Everybody knows slums are bad and everybody knows slums must go. But what troubles these people and the many, many others is the lack of leadership from city hall, the indecision and the bureaucracy of the planning and urban-renewal units, the corruption, the politics, the inhumanity, and the irrationality that have plagued this city's clearance program throughout the years of its existence.

DESPERATION OR DECISION?

It makes little sense to clear one slum merely to start another one somewhere else. New housing is desperately needed, but, unfortunately, those who are the most desperate have, for the most part, been the last to get it.

Anyone can tell you that Harlem and Bedford-Stuyvesant both need immediate and far-sweeping urban-renewal programs and low- and lower-middle-income housing, but because of the magnitude of the problem and the uncertainty of where to house the people while the areas are being rebuilt, the city chooses to look and rebuild elsewhere.

"I'm absolutely committed to making New York a slumless city, a city in which every family, regardless of race, color, or creed, will live in a decent home, at a price it can afford to pay, in a good neighborhood with soundly planned community facilities," wrote Mayor Wagner in a series of syndicated articles last summer.

The mayor obviously meant every word he wrote, but, to those people forced to move out of Bellevue South, Lincoln Center, and dozens of other renewal areas and those people unable to move out of Harlem, Bedford-Stuyvesant, and the city's other slums, the mayor's inaction speaks louder than his words. No matter what name you call it—be it human renewal or human removal—the city's housing problems are extreme and in desperate need of remedial action.

CLEVELAND PRAISES HOUSE FOR CUT IN AID TO NASSER

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, action by the House, by a 204 to 177 vote, to bar Nasser from receiving American food aid for the next 5 months was wise and I supported it wholeheartedly.

In recent months, Egyptian mobs, encouraged by Nasser, burned the official library and information office we set up to help them; an Egyptian jet fighter, built in Russia, shot down an unarmed cargo plane belonging to an American oil company; and Nasser has unleashed a steady stream of insult and invective against us, telling us in effect to jump in the ocean if we did not like it. All this in spite of the fact that the American taxpayer has poured more than $1 billion into Egypt, bailing Nasser out of financial troubles time and again.

Our aid, indeed, has helped to make possible Nasser's conspiratorial adventures throughout Africa and his direct contributions to the turmoil in the Congo. Because of it, he has been able to divert resources sorely needed by his poverty-stricken people to promote war in Yemen and stir up trouble throughout Africa and the Mideast. He intimately follows the Soviet line and is in close concord with the Kremlin, acting as if he were in fact, as well as deed, the agent of the Soviet Union.

It is perhaps too much to expect gratitude for the aid we have given and probably it would be unrealistic to do so. Nor ought we to expect that recipients of our aid fall into line with everything we want. Each nation has special problems and individual courses to pursue in meeting them. But we do have a right to expect decency in our relations and respect for our intentions. We ought not to stand for insults and violence against our citizens and our installations. Least of all should we underwrite nations that are in open, even boastful league with our opponents.

It is, therefore, incomprehensible to me that our State Department, only 7 days after the events enumerated above became public, should have blandly announced plans to go ahead with a $19-million further shipment of wheat to Nasser.

It is high time that the American people let the dictators of the world know that they cannot take our generosity for granted no matter how severely they revile and attack us. So long as the administration does not seem inclined to tell them, it is the duty of Congress to do so.

FINANCIAL CRISIS IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, January 26, 1965, was a historic day in the United Nations. Our permanent representative to that organization, Ambassador Adlai E. Stevenson, took the floor to outline the position of the United States on the financial crisis which has paralyzed the United Nations. I had the honor to be present on the floor with the U.S. delegation at that time when this major speech was delivered to a packed General Assembly hall. This privilege was accorded to me as chairman of the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Ambassador Stevenson presented the United States position candidly and forcefully. He said that the integrity and future operational effectiveness of the United Nations will be seriously damaged unless the United Nations Charter, the right of the General Assembly to assess for peacekeeping purposes, and the responsibility of each and every member to pay assessments regularly imposed upon them are upheld. Ambassador Stevenson's speech was not, nor was it intended to be, a "shoe banging" denunciation—but it was unmistakably clear, firm, and strong. Because of the historic significance of this speech, Mr. Speaker, I wish to place it in the RECORD and to commend it to the attention of all my colleagues in the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, as we all know, the 19th General Assembly of the United Nations, meeting in the 20th anniversary year of that organization, finds itself unable to proceed with its business in a normal manner. Pursuant to a tacit agreement, the General Assembly for the past 2 months has undertaken only those matters on which no formal vote is required. A formal vote on any issue would immediately raise the question of the right to vote of several nations who are 2 years or more in arrears on the payment of their financial obligations to the United Nations. Therefore, the United Nations finds itself in the double bind of not having sufficient operating funds and of not being able to function in the General Assembly as it should.

The issue is the interpretation and application of article 19 of the charter which provides:

> A member of the United Nations which is in arrears in the payment of its financial

contributions to the organization shall have no vote in the General Assembly if the amount of its arrears equals or exceeds the amount of the contributions due from it for the preceding 2 full years. The General Assembly may, nevertheless, permit such a member to vote if it is satisfied that the failure to pay is due to conditions beyond the control of the member.

The present situation has arisen because of the refusal of a number of nations to pay their assessments for certain peacekeeping operations. Notwithstanding an advisory opinion sought and obtained from the International Court of Justice and the acceptance of that opinion by resolution of the General Assembly, some nations still contest the validity as well as the desirability of mandatory assessments for peacekeeping purposes and the applicability of article 19 for their nonpayment.

The following nations for one reason or another have declined to pay their financial obligations and, in our view, are currently subject to the provisions of article 19:

Communist bloc: Albania, Byelorussian S.S.R., Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Rumania, Ukrainian S.S.R., and U.S.S.R.

Other countries: Belgium, France, South Africa, and Yemen.

At this juncture in the history of a long struggle to achieve international commonsense, there can be little or no question that the United Nations and each of its members have arrived at a very crucial intersection. The decision made and the course of action agreed upon not only could decide the fate of the United Nations, but also the future of the world. The issue appears to me to be greater and more far reaching than whether Russia or any other country is in or out of the United Nations; or is permitted to participate in the deliberations and voting of the General Assembly: the issue is whether the strength and ideals of the United Nations shall be maintained.

The United States, in my judgment, cannot directly or indirectly be party to any agreement, accord, or understanding which circumvents, for all practical purposes, the provisions of the United Nations Charter. Therefore, the United States must continue to reject, as it has already rejected, any proposal which would seek to resume normal procedures and voting in the General Assembly until the arrears are settled which are in the purview of article 19. Similarly rejected should be any proposal to consider modifying or amending article 19 or the peacekeeping procedure or any proposal which has the effect of doing so unless and until the delinquencies have been settled.

The United States is strongly committed to the United Nations in spirit and with funds amounting to about $2.5 billion over the past 20 years. We, along with almost all nations, have nurtured the concept of mankind living without war. If a few nations, by refusing to pay their bills, threaten to undermine the United Nations, I am not convinced that the United States should follow suit and inflict the death blow by refusing to participate financially. However, the Congress of the United States, which must authorize and appropriate the regular assessment and the voluntary contributions, will find it extremely difficult and perhaps impossible to continue its full and ready financial support.

The United States should continue to take every action for preservation of the peacekeeping function and the idea of common financial responsibility in the United Nations despite the possible repercussions both at home and abroad. I believe that the United States must urge that the issue of article 19 be met squarely now. Delay will only aggravate the problem.

Ambassador Stevenson's speech, which follows, urges that all nations face up to this issue:

STATEMENT BY AMBASSADOR ADLAI E. STEVENSON, U.S. REPRESENTATIVE TO THE UNITED NATIONS, IN PLENARY SESSION IN GENERAL DEBATE

Mr. President, I have asked to speak at this late date so I can share with all delegations, in a spirit of openness, my Government's views on the state of affairs at these United Nations as our annual general debate comes to its conclusion.

Certain things which I shall say here today have to do with law, with procedures, with technical and administrative matters. So I want to emphasize in advance that these are but manifestations of much deeper concerns about peace and world order, about the welfare of human society and the prospects of our peoples for rewarding lives.

II

Mr. President, there can be little doubt that we have reached one of those watersheds in human affairs. It is not the first, of course, and surely not the last. But this is clearly a critical point in the long, wearisome, erratic, quarrelscme, but relentless journey toward that wider and wider community which is the central thread of the human story.

Twenty years ago we took a giant stride on that historic journey. We negotiated and signed and ratified the Charter of the United Nations.

The first purpose of the United Nations was to create a new system of world order. Those who drafted the charter were acutely conscious of earlier efforts to find collective security against war and were determined to do better this time.

I speak to you as one who participated in the formulation of the charter of this organization, both in the Preparatory Commission in London and the Charter Conference in San Francisco.

I recall vividly the fears and hopes which filled and inspired us as the Second World War ended—fears and hopes which brought us together in an attempt to insure that such a world catastrophe would never again occur. At those conferences we labored long and diligently, we tried to take into account the interest of all states, we attempted to subordinate narrow national interest to the broad common good.

This time we would create something better than static conference machinery—something solid enough to withstand the winds of controversy blowing outside and inside its halls.

This time we would create workable machinery for keeping the peace and for settling disputes by nonviolent means—and endow it with a capacity to act.

This time we would create working organizations to stimulate economic growth and social welfare and human rights, and put resources back of them.

And this time we would create a constitutional framework flexible enough to adapt to an inevitably changing environment, and to allow for vigorous growth through invention, experiment, and improvisation within that framework.

Twenty years ago nobody could see, of course, what the postwar years would bring.

But there was a widespread feeling at that time that the United Nations was our last chance for a peaceful and secure system of world order—that we could not afford another failure. For the character of war had evolved from a clash of armies for strategic ground to the possibility of the destruction of populations and the indiscriminate destruction of wealth and culture; the weapons of war had evolved from field artillery to blockbusting bombs, and then to a single warhead that could wipe out a city; and recourse to war had evolved from what was cruel to what could be suicidal insanity.

Twenty years ago there was a widespread feeling, too, that it already was late in the day to begin loosening the straitjackets of unbridled sovereignty and unyielding secrecy—to begin systematically to build the institutions of a peaceful, prosperous international community in the vulnerable, fragile, interdependent neighborhood of our planet. For science and technology were making the nations interdependent willy-nilly—and interconnected whether they liked it or not. Science and technology were making international cooperation and organization a modern imperative, ideology and politics to the side—and were paving the way for a practical assault on world poverty, if the world was up to the challenge.

III

It may well be, Mr. President, that 20 years ago people expected too much too soon from the United Nations.

In the workaday world we quickly discover that social and scientific and institutional inventions—even important and dramatic ones—do not swing wide the doors to utopia, but only add new tools to work with in the solution of man's problems and the abatement of man's ills.

In the workaday world, we also discover, over and again, that man himself is a stubborn animal, and in no way more stubborn than in his reluctance to abandon the iron luggage of the past that encumbers his journey toward human community.

In the workaday world we discover, too, that to be effective an international organization must be relevant to contemporary world realities, and that there may be conflicting views as to just what those realities are.

So we have learned how real are the limitations upon a single enterprise so bold and so comprehensive in its goals as the United Nations.

We have learned how heavy are the chains of inherited tradition that inhibit man's journey toward wider community.

We have learned that the United Nations will be no less—and can be no better—than its membership makes it in the context of its times.

And yet, Mr. President, we have seen that the charter of this organization has made it possible to maintain a hopeful rate of dynamic growth to adapt to changing realities in world affairs; to begin to create workable international peacekeeping machinery; to begin to grapple with the complex problems of disarmament; to stimulate effective international cooperation and so to move, however erratically, down the road toward that international community which is both the goal of the charter and the lesson of history. I am proud to say that not only has the United States given of its heart and mind to this endeavor but that over the years we have contributed over $2 billion to the support of the United Nations and its activities.

The progress which this institution has fostered has been accomplished despite the unprecedented character of the organization, despite the intractable nature of many of the problems with which we have dealt, despite the so-called cold war which intruded too often in our deliberations and despite a series of debilitating external and internal crises, from which the organization has, in fact, emerged each time more mature, and better able to face the next one.

In the short space of two decades, the United Nations has responded time after time to breaches of the peace and to threats to the peace. A dozen times it has repaired or helped repair the rent fabric of peace. And who can say that this has not made the difference between a living earth and an uninhabitable wasteland on this planet?

During that time, the United Nations has sponsored or endorsed all the efforts to halt the armaments race and to press on toward general and complete disarmament in a peaceful world. Its efforts were not fruitless. Agreement was reached on a direct communications link between Washington and Moscow—a step lessening the risk of war through accident or miscalculation. A treaty was signed—long urged by the General Assembly—banning nuclear weapons tests in the atmosphere, outer space and under water. The two states presently capable of stationing nuclear weapons in outer space expressed in the United Nations their intent to refrain from doing so, and we adopted a resolution here calling on all other states to do likewise. In short, the efforts of the last 20 years have at last begun to arrest the vicious spiral of nuclear armament.

In the short span of 20 years the United Nations also has created a versatile range of international agencies which are surveying resources, distributing food, improving agriculture, purifying water, caring for children, controlling disease, training technicians—researching, planning, programing, investing, teaching, administering thousands of projects in hundreds of places, so that "we the peoples of the United Nations" may enjoy "social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom." These activities are now being financed at the impressive level of some $350 million a year.

In its brief life the United Nations also has taken major strides toward creating an open community of science—for the peaceful use of atomic energy, for the application of technology to industry and agriculture and transport and communications and health, for a worldwide weather reporting system, for shared research in many fields, and for cooperative regulation of the growing list of tasks—like frequency allocation and aerial navigation—which cannot even be discussed except on the assumption of international cooperation and organization.

We have proved in practice that these things can be done within the charter of the United Nations whenever enough of the members want them done and are willing to provide the means to get them done.

In the process we have left well behind us the outdated question of whether there should be a community of international institutions to serve our common interests. The question now is how extensive and effective these organizations should become—how versatile, how dynamic, how efficient—and on what assumptions about the sharing of support and responsibility.

IV

And yet Mr. President, we have reached a fork in the road ahead of this organization—and thus in our search for world order and our journey toward a wider community.

Is this to overdraw the picture—to overdramatize the situation in which we find ourselves? Not, I think, if we recollect the historic character of warfare.

I assume that we are all convinced that the revolutionary advance in destructive capability—and the danger that little wars anywhere can lead to bigger wars everywhere—has made war an obsolete means for the settlement of disputes among nations. Yet World War II occurred after it already was clear to intelligent men that war had become an irrational instrument of national policy—that another way must be found to settle international accounts and to effect needed change.

The reason is not hard to find: The level of destruction does not obliterate the inherently double character of warfare. In our minds we tend to associate war—and correctly so—with the ancient lust for conquest and dominion; we tend, rightly, to identify war as the instrument of conquerors and tyrants.

Yet in every war there is a defender who, however reluctantly, takes up arms in self-defense and calls upon others for aid. And this is the other face of war: War has been the instrument by which lawlessness and rebellion have been suppressed, by which nations have preserved their independence, by which freedom has been defended. War is an instrument of aggression, and also the means by which the aggressors have been turned back and the would-be masters have been struck down.

As long ago as 490 B.C., Miltiades and his spearmen saved Greek civilization on the Plain of Marathon from the superior invading forces from Darius. Nearly twenty-five hundred years later, the gallant flyers of the Royal Air Force fought in the skies over Britain until the invading air armadas were turned back, while the indomitable legions of the Soviet Army fought on and on at Stalingrad until at last they broke the back of the Nazi threat to the Russian homeland.

All through the years we have been taught again and again that most men value some things more than life itself. And no one has reminded us more eloquently and resolutely that it is better to die on your feet than to live on your knees than the noble spirit that left us yesterday in London—Sir Winston Churchill.

As long as there are patriots, aggression will be met with resistance, whatever the cost. And the cost rises even higher with the revolution in weaponry. At Marathon 200 Athenians lost their lives. At Stalingrad 300,000 invaders lost their lives.

There, precisely, is the difficulty we are in. Now the end result of aggression and defense is Armageddon, for man has stolen the Promethian fire. Yet resistance to aggression is no less inevitable in the second half of the 20th century than in ancient times.

The powers of the atom unleashed by science are too startling, too intoxicating and at the same time too useful as human tools for any of us to wish to abandon the astonishing new technology. But if we will not abandon it, we must master it. Unless the United Nations or some other organization develops reliable machinery for dealing with conflicts and violence by peaceful means, Armageddon will continue to haunt the human race; for the nations will—as they must—rely on national armaments until they can confidently rely on international institutions to keep the peace.

This, it seems to me, makes the present juncture in our affairs historic and critical. This, it seems to me, is why the Assembly should be able to perform its proper functions in the event of an emergency, and why this issue before us must be resolved.

V

What then is the issue before us, Mr. President? It is, in essence, whether or not we intend to preserve the effective capacity of this organization to keep the peace. It is whether to continue the difficult but practical and hopeful process of realizing in action the potential of the charter for growth through collective responsibility, or to turn toward a weaker concept and a different system.

This choice has not burst upon us without warning. Some 3½ years ago, the late Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold, in what turned out to be his last report to the General Assembly, foreshadowed this choice quite clearly.

"There were," said the Secretary General, "different concepts of the United Nations, the character of the Organization, its authority, and its structure.

"On the one side, it has in various ways become clear that certain members conceive of the Organization as a static conference machinery for resolving conflicts of interests and ideologies with a view to peaceful coexistence, within the charter, to be served by a secretariat which is to be regarded not as fully internationalized but as representing within its ranks those very interests and ideologies.

"Other members have made it clear that they conceive of the Organization primarily as a dynamic instrument of governments through which they, jointly and for the same purpose, should seek such reconciliation but through which they should also try to develop forms of executive action, undertaken on behalf of all members, and aiming at forestalling conflicts and resolving them, once they have arisen, by appropriate diplomatic or political means, in a spirit of objectivity and in implementation of the principles and purposes of the charter."

If that language seems mild and diplomatic, the warning was nevertheless clear. If it was relevant then it is no less relevant now. If we needed an organization with capacity for executive action then, how much more do we need it now.

VI

There have been many challenges to the United Nations to act, from the abuse of the right of the veto to the effort to impose a troika to replace the Secretary-General. Now we are faced with a challenge to the Assembly's right even to engage in peacekeeping functions or to determine how they are to be financed and to adopt assessments to support them.

The decision to invest this Assembly with the power over the U.N.'s finances, its power of assessment, was made in 1945 when the charter was adopted. Ever since then, an overwhelming proportion of the members have been paying their assessments on the assumption and understanding that this was, in fact, the law—and that the law would be applied impartially to one and all.

Almost from the outset these assessments have included peacekeeping activities. Starting in 1947 the United Nations Truce Supervisory Organization in the Middle East, the United Nations military observer in Kashmir, the United Nations observation mission in Lebanon, and other similar missions were financed by mandatory assessments under article 17. For 10 years no member of the U.N. thought to refuse—as some are now doing—to pay these assessments, or to condemn as illegal—as they now do—these unique contributions to world peace.

When the assessments for the United Nations emergency force in the Middle East and the Congo operation were passed year after year by large majorities in this Assembly, the members clearly understood them also as mandatory obligations.

This was the understanding of states when they made voluntary contributions above and beyond their regular scale assessments to reduce the burden on members less able to pay.

This was the understanding on which the members approved the U.N. bond issue, and it was the understanding on which the Secretary General sold—and over 60 members bought—some $170 million of these bonds.

As the Secretary General put it so aptly last Monday, the question is whether the United Nations will, in the days ahead, be in a position "to keep faith with those who have kept faith with it."

When the argument was pressed, in spite of the U.N.'s unfailing practice, that peacekeeping assessments were not mandatory because peacekeeping costs could not be expenses of the organization within the meaning of article 17, that question was taken to the International Court of Justice for an opinion. We all know that the Court confirmed the principle which the Assembly had always followed: Peacekeeping costs when assessed by the Assembly—and specifically those for the Congo and UNEF—are expenses of the organization within the meaning of article 17. We also know that the General Assembly by resolution accepted that opinion by an overwhelming vote, thus confirming that the law was the policy of this Assembly as well.

VII

The Assembly's most important prerogative in the course of history may well be its power of assessment.

It is the heart of collective financial responsibility and as the Secretary General said last week: "A policy of improvisation, of ad hoc solutions, of reliance on the generosity of a few rather than the collective responsibility of all cannot much longer endure if the United Nations itself is to endure as a dynamic and effective instrument of international action."

It is your power of assessment which is being challenged directly.

It is the power of each member of this Assembly, and particularly those smaller nations whose primary reliance for peace and security and welfare must be the United Nations.

And, make no mistake about it, it is your power to keep or to abandon.

Mr. President, we can live with certain dilemmas and paradoxes; we can paper over certain ambiguities and anomalies; we can ignore certain contradictions of policy and principle in the interests of pursuing the common interests of majorities in this Assembly. And we can, of course, change our procedures and devise new procedures, within the framework of the basic law, for handling our affairs in the future. Or we can change the law.

But we cannot have a double standard for applying the present law under which we have been operating in good faith for the past two decades.

We cannot have two rules for paying assessments for the expenses of the organization—one rule for most of the members and another rule for a few. If the Assembly should ignore the charter with respect to some of its members, it will be in no position to enforce the charter impartially as to others, with all the consequences which will follow with respect to the mandatory or voluntary character of assessments.

VIII

This is not to say that the procedures under which the Assembly exercises its authority must not conform to changed conditions and to political realities. Indeed, we hold that it is important that they do.

This is why my government has suggested that a Special Finance Committee, perhaps with a membership similar to the Committee of 21, be established by the Assembly and be entrusted with the responsibility to recommend to the General Assembly in the future the ways and means under which it should finance any major peacekeeping operations, and that this Committee should consider a number of alternative and flexible financing schemes whenever it is called upon for such recommendations.

We are not dogmatic about this proposal and we are prepared to examine patiently variations and alternatives with other members. Certainly it should not be beyond the ingenuity of such a committee, on a case-by-case basis, to devise ways of assuring financing arrangements for the future which are generally acceptable, particularly to the permanent members of the Security Council.

But in favoring procedural changes we do not challenge the basic law of the charter; we seek improved working procedures.

We do not seek to undo the past, but to smooth the future.

We support the primacy of the Security Council in the maintenance of peace and security and would support an increase in its role; but we seek to maintain the residual right of this Assembly to deal with such questions in the event the Security Council fails to do so.

We support the right, under the charter, of this Assembly to assess the membership for the expenses of this organization, so long as it enforces this power equitably and impartially; we will also support steps to assure that the views of all are taken fully into account.

We believe the Assembly should continue, within the scope of its powers, to be able to deal, free of a veto, with problems of peace and security if need be. We are prepared to seek ways of accommodating the principle of sovereign equality and the fact of an unequal distribution of responsibility.

The question here is whether the United Nations will demonstrate again, as it has in the past, a capacity for flexibility and adaptation, which has permitted it to grow and prosper in the past and whether we continue to adhere to the prevailing principle of collective financial responsibility for world peace.

IX

It will, of course, be up to the member governments to decide whether this organization is going to continue to work under the charter as it has been accepted by most of us, interpreted by the Court, and endorsed by this Assembly.

My Government is quite clear about its own choice. We want to continue to do our full share in designing and supporting—morally, politically, and materially—any sound expansion of the peacekeeping machinery of the United Nations. We feel there are possibilities for a more diversified family of weapons of peace in the U.N. arsenal—from conciliation procedures to small teams available for investigations of complaints or for border inspection, to logistical plans for peacekeeping missions.

My Government also intends to continue the search for meaningful and verifiable steps to limit and, hopefully, to halt the arms race, and for a peaceful world delivered of the burden of armaments. We intend to pursue with the urgency it merits the objective of stopping the spread of lethal weapons and of halting the multiplication of nuclear arms among those already possessing them. We firmly believe that this is a most urgent objective and that it is in the common interest of all mankind. For if we fail to achieve it soon all the progress attained thus far would be brought to naught and the goal of general and complete disarmament would become more distant than ever.

My Government is prepared to support a further enlargement of the capacity of the international agencies to wage the war against poverty.

We would, for example, like to see the combined special fund and technical assistance program raise its budgetary goal well beyond the present $150 million once the two programs have been merged satisfactorily.

We would like to see a further expansion of capital for the International Development Association.

We would like to see a further expansion in the use of food for development.

We would like to see some major experiments in bringing to focus the whole family of United Nations agencies.

We would like to see, among other things, the center for industrial development intensify its work on the basis of its early experience and become an effective laboratory for spreading the technology of the industrial revolution to the far corners of the planet.

We feel that there are good opportunities for building up the institutions and programs dealing with the transfer and adaptation of science and technology, and developing programs for wise use of the world's most precious resources.

And, too, we wish to see the final chapter written in the drama of decolonization, and written peacefully.

We, too, wish to explore the desirability of creating some new U.N. machinery in that most neglected area of the charter called human rights.

We, too, want to press on with projects in such fields as weather forecasting and nuclear energy, and resource conservation, and the conversion of sea water to fresh water.

Mr. President, my Government is as anxious as any delegation represented in this Assembly to get on with these priority tasks.

This is to say that we prefer to see this organization move ahead toward peaceful solution of international disputes, toward cooperative international development, toward building the law and institutions of a world community in which mankind can someday turn its full talents to the quality of society and to the dignity of the individual.

This is what we have believed in and worked for at the United Nations for two decades now. This is what most of the members have believed in and worked for as long as they have been members.

X

What, then, is the alternative? What if the Assembly should falter in the exercise of its own authority? What if the Assembly should repudiate its own past assessments, reject the opinion of the International Court, reverse its own decision with respect to that opinion, and shut its eyes to the plain meaning of the charter, and thereby the treaty which gives it being.

I have no prophetic vision to bring to the answer to this question, for this would be a step in the dark down an unfamiliar path.

I can only say with certainty that the United Nations would be a different institution than most of the members joined and a lesser institution than it could otherwise be.

I do not have to draw a picture of the uncertainties, the delays, the frustrations, and no doubt the failures that would ensue were members able to decide with impunity which activities they, unilaterally, considered to be legal or illegal and which, unilaterally, they chose to support or not to support financially from year to year.

And so our world would become not a safer but a more dangerous place for us all, and the hopes for a strengthened and expanded and more useful United Nations would have been dimmed.

I must say in all earnestness, Mr. President, that my delegation would be dismayed if at this stage in history the members of this Assembly should elect to diminish the authority of this organization and thereby subtract from the prospects for world order and world peace. If the General Assembly should detour now on the long journey toward an enforceable world order, I fear we will set back the growth of collective responsibility for the maintenance of peace.

Wise men drew a lesson from World War I and established the League of Nations. And President Woodrow Wilson took the lead in that great experiment, and my countrymen, in hindsight, deeply regret that the United States did not take up its share of the burden in that historic enterprise. But the lesson of World War II was not wasted on us as our active leadership in establishing the United Nations and its charter attests.

Mr. President, who can say whether we shall have another chance to draw a lesson from another global conflict and start again? But this we know full well; we, the human race, are fellow travelers on a tiny spaceship spinning through infinite space. We can wreck our ship. We can blow the human experiment into nothingness. And by every analogy of practical life, a quarrelsome ship's company and many hands on the steering gear is a good recipe for disaster.

In such a world there can be only one overriding aim—the creation of a decent human world order on which we can build a reasonable peace, not simply the precarious peace of balances and alliances, not surely the horrifying peace of mutual terror, but the peace that springs from agreed forms of authority, from accepted systems of justice and arbitration, from an impartial police.

That is why our commitment to an effective working, tenacious United Nations is so deep, and why, in the most literal sense, the United Nations carries with it so much of the hope and future of mankind.

XI

This is our position not because we, among the members, are uniquely dependent upon the United Nations for the security and safety of our citizens.

This is our position not because we, among the members, especially look to the United Nations for guidance and help for our economic development.

This is our position not because we found it advantageous to our narrow national interests to treat assessments as mandatory; we found it a price worth paying in recognition that others also shared the principle that all members bear some measure of responsibility for maintaining the peace.

This is our position, rather, because we believe that in the nuclear age the only true national security for all members lies in a reliable and workable system of dealing with international disputes by nonviolent means, because we believe that we shall continue to face crises and problems which, by definition, can only be dealt with internationally, because we believe that workable, effective international institutions are a plain necessity of our day and age, because we believe that in every secure community shared privileges demand shared responsibility, and because we believe it unwise and unsafe and unnecessary to take a side road at this stage of the journey on which we set out together two decades ago.

XII

Mr. President, beneath all the complexities of the issue that now threatens the future capacity of this organization, there are some very simple, very basic, very plain points to remember.

My Nation and most nations represented here have paid their assessments and have kept their accounts at the United Nations in good standing.

My Government and most governments represented here have accepted the principle of collective financial responsibility for the expenses of this organization and have striven to uphold the prerogative of this Assembly.

My Government and most of the governments represented here want to resolve this crisis without violence to the charter and to get on with our business.

That is why we have all stood available to discuss this issue at all times.

What we have sought, Mr. President, is not defeat for any member of this organization. What we have sought is the success of the United Nations as a living, growing, effective international organization.

But the Assembly is now nearing a fork of the road and I have put the issue frankly because the Assembly may soon have to decide which branch of the road it will take.

And the very least we can do is to be absolutely clear just what we are doing when we exercise that option.

I, for one, cannot escape the deep sense that the peoples of the world are looking over our shoulder—waiting to see whether we can overcome our present problem and take up with fresh vigor and renewed resolution the great unfinished business of peace—which President Johnson has called "the assignment of the century."

OLDER AMERICANS ACT

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, in the national climate that seeks to create a Great Society through the enrichment of the life of man, we shall be guilty of dereliction of duty unless we give more than lipservice to the needs of the 18 million older Americans in our present society.

The brochure writers, the social workers, and even legislators talk and write of the golden years and of senior citizens but these are euphemisms. The enormous strides in medicine and technology have added years to life, but for too many, we have merely given them meaningless years in which to exist.

We are on the threshold of enacting a program of health care for the aged and most of us will agree that action is long overdue. However, I am deeply concerned that some may be misguided into believing that health care is the total answer to the needs of the elderly.

If we are to make it possible for older persons to realize their full potential in the later years, we must establish a framework or an organizational structure that will stimulate, assist, and support positive, practical action programs. These should remove arbitrary age barriers, create opportunities based on experience and ability, and recognize the right of older persons to dignity and independence throughout the added years.

This is a plea I have made specifically to each session of Congress since 1958 but the urgency for prompt action in this session has reached the critical stage.

It is inexcusable that 15 years after the first committee on aging was established in the Federal Security Agency in 1950, that we have made so little progress in implementing the knowledge that we have derived from the hundreds—or even thousands of meetings and conferences that have been held on the subject of aging—including the White House Conference on Aging held 4 years ago.

Perhaps I am more deeply aware of this tragedy of inactivity because of my close association with the legislation that has been proposed to restore older Americans to their rightful places as first class citizens.

An objective appraisal of the program on aging pursued in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and by the ever-reorganized—still the same ineffective interdepartmental council on aging, is convincing evidence of the need for an independent organization in the field of aging; one that can deal forthrightly with the many phases of the subject without being submerged, dominated, or diluted with other programs primarily directed toward welfare.

One need only glance through the latest insult to aging, "On Growing Older" published by the council, to understand why I urge prompt consideration of the Older Americans Act which I am introducing today.

This bill is identical with the Older Americans Act which I introduced last year and which was enthusiastically supported by national authorities, State officials, and organizations of older persons on a bipartisan basis.

On June 11 of last year, the Committee on Education and Labor submitted the following report on H.R. 10088:

> The Committee on Education and Labor, to whom was referred the bill (H.R. 10088) to provide assistance in the development of new or improved programs to help older persons through grants to the States for community planning and services and for training, through research, development, or training project grants, and to establish within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare an operating agency to be designated as the "Administration on Aging," having considered the same, report favorably thereon with amendments and recommend that the bill as amended do pass.

The bill meets the major organizational recommendations of the White House Conference on Aging and overcomes the present welfare stigma on aging by establishing the "Administration on Aging" in HEW but removed from the welfare setting and supervision.

The Secretary of HEW is authorized to carry out during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and each of the four suceeding fiscal years, the following program of: $5 million for fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, $8 million for fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, $8 million for fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for each of the two succeeding fiscal years, such sums as Congress may authorize by law.

The Secretary shall carry out titles IV and V—the research development projects and training projects—and is authorized: $1,500,000 for fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, $3 million for fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, $3 million for fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and each of two succeeding fiscal years, such sums as may be appropriate as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law.

These grants and appropriations have been so authorized to give Congress the opportunity to review the results after 3 years to measure the accomplishments and continuation of the program.

The grants to the States would salvage the programs that were begun in preparation for and since the White House Conference on Aging that need a minimum of financial assistance to move forward.

For the first time, there will have been created at the Federal level, a practical operating program that works with the States, communities, and older individuals toward an action program that will help to achieve the maximum potential of the older American as a national asset.

I earnestly hope the Older Americans Act will be recognized for immediate consideration and that you will give it your full cooperation and support.

NEED FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A MODERN CONFLICT-OF-INTEREST CODE FOR THE CONGRESS

The **SPEAKER**. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. **LINDSAY**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. **LINDSAY**. Mr. Speaker, in 1962 Congress passed a law that established a modern conflict-of-interest code for the executive branch of our Government. It was a notable achievement and represented the first major overhaul of conflict-of-interest legislation in the 20th century. I was pleased at that time to have played a key role in that undertaking. It represented the culmination of many years effort on the part of some Members of Congress and interested persons in the executive branch, with a superlative assist from an organization known as the Association of the Bar of the City of New York. That association for almost 3 years worked with a special committee consisting of men of both parties who had served in Government in several administrations. The study was funded by a grant of money from the Ford Foundation and was well staffed. It produced a book and suggested legislation which was sensible, sound, and realistic and ultimately substantially adopted by the U.S. Congress. It represented a graphic example of how an outside group can work in partnership with Government on a complex subject and achieve a result.

Mr. Speaker, we did not in that legislation, except with very minor exceptions, enact any new conflict-of-interest legislation for Members of Congress and employees of the U.S. Congress. There was good reason for this. The Congress and the executive branch are two separate matters and what may apply to the executive branch, many not necessarily apply to the Congress.

It was thought too that it was enough of a job at the time, and it was, to cope with the problem with respect to the executive branch alone. There was enough of a problem to handle without making it even more complex by dealing with the even more complicated problem of the U.S. Congress.

Nevertheless, it was an omission which the country noted at the time, with good reason, because the Congress, like the executive branch, has been operating under an equally archaic group of statutes purporting to affect the behavior of Members of Congress and their relationship to the outside world.

I think that the country expects the Congress will take a look at its own house and revise the standards under which Members conduct themselves as Members and in their relationships with the outside world.

I am today, in conjunction with other Members of the Congress, introducing two proposals. The first one is in two parts. First, it would forthwith and without delay, set up an interim code of ethics for Members of Congress. Second, it would establish a Joint Congressional Committee on Ethics, charged with the responsibility of recommending a very comprehensive code of ethics for Members of Congress and all legislative employees.

Congress has been willing to bear down rather heavily on the executive branch on this question of conflicts. We should be equally willing to enact an exact standard for ourselves. The public is entitled to have such a guide and we are entitled to have such a guide. Many Members want to make certain that they are always correct, but are not sure what the guidelines are. We are entitled to have guidelines, and so is the public.

Knowing the complexities of this subject, I think we can only arrive at a proper set of rules which fully protect the public interest and which are sensible by a complete examination of the matter by a joint congressional committee. Such a committee should be immediately established, should be adequately funded and have a good staff, and the right to call on outside consultants. This is an area where an objective look at the Congress by outside people who have a knowledge of Congress will do a lot of good.

As I stated earlier, the resolution sets up immediately, however, a code of ethics which I call an interim code, because it may not be complete. It is broad in scope, it sets important standards, but there may be omissions I have not thought of. The more thorough and detailed ground rules would be the responsibility of the joint congressional committee.

This interim code, which goes into effect immediately, provides that no Member of Congress, nor officer or employee of the legislative branch of Government, may have any interest, financial or otherwise, direct or indirect, or engage in any business, transaction or professional activity, incur any obligation of any nature, financially or moral, which is in substantial conflict with the Member's discharge of his duties in the public interest; nor give substantial and reasonable cause to the public to believe that he is acting in breach of his public trust; nor accept other employment which will tend to impair his independence of judgment in the exercise of his official duties; nor accept employment or engage in any business or professional activity which will tend to involve his disclosure or use of confidential information which he has gained by reason of his official position or authority; nor disclose such information for other than official purposes; nor use or attempt to use his official position to secure unwarranted privileges or exemptions for himself or others; nor give reasonable cause for belief that any person can improperly influence him or unduly enjoy his favor in the performance of his official duties, or that he is affected by the kinship, rank, position, or influence of any person or political party; or give reasonable cause for belief that he is likely to violate his trust.

In addition, the interim code provides that any Member of Congress, or officer or employee of the legislative branch of the Government having a financial interest, direct or indirect, having a value of $1,000 or more, in any activity of any kind which is subject to the jurisdiction of a regulatory agency, should file with the Comptroller General a statement setting forth the nature of such interest in such reasonable detail, and in accordance with such regulations as shall be prescribed by the Comptroller General.

Enactment of this resolution, I believe, immediately, preceding the establishment of the joint committee to examine the basic question, I think is of great importance and should be done in this session of the 89th Congress. This I think in itself would do much to restore the Congress again to the proper position of respect that it should enjoy unanimously by the people of this country.

I have also introduced at the same time, and am joined by other Members, a companion resolution which would amend the Administrative Procedure Act to provide that any written or oral communication between a Member of Congress or his staff and a Government agency concerning matters under adjudication before the agency be made a part of the public record of the proceeding in question. Enactment of this measure, I believe, will make it impossible for any improper congressional influence to manifest itself in an improper fashion. Indeed, it would have the salutary effect of removing the appearance of impropriety in communications which may be entirely proper.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know how long it would take for a proper study by the Members themselves using such outside staff and consultants as would be required to do a complete job in this area. It should not take anywhere near as long as the New York Bar Association study of the executive branch. That group of panelists and staff members, from all over the country, devoted all day Friday, Friday night, and half of Saturday, at least once a month, for 2 years. It took them that long to satisfy themselves that they had been fair and complete in their study of this complicated problem.

I think the Congress ought to be able to work faster because we are full-time people—or at least we should be full-time people—and we can put together a full-time staff, and at the same time call upon universities and other institutions and persons that have knowledge of political science and the Congress to help us. We ought to be able to write a permanent code of ethics and a set of laws that would give Congress proper guidelines and fully protect the public interest. We owe this to the country, and we also owe it to ourselves as Members of the Congress.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to say that I have been joined in the introduction of these resolutions by the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. ANDREWS], the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ELLSWORTH], the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON], the gentleman from California [Mr. MAILLIARD], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McDADE], the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. REID].

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINDSAY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to join with the distinguished gentleman from New York in the introduction of this significant legislation today. I believe that there is very clear and pressing need for a Committee on Ethics, an interim code of ethics, and equally for amendments to the Administrative Procedure Act to make it abundantly plain that any contact between a congressional office and any Federal regulatory agency—whether it be written or oral—be made part of the public record.

Admittedly, the subject is complex, but I submit that the principle at stake is basic. In a word we cannot indefinitely continue with a double standard—one standard for the executive branch and virtually none for the Congress.

A comprehensive code of ethics for Members of Congress and all legislative employee is long overdue.

In my judgment, enactment of this resolution would be a significant step toward restoring to the Congress of the United States the respect to which it should be entitled. I wish to congratulate the Member from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] and to say I believe his initiative in this regard is important and that indeed the country expects the Congress to act and particularly to act with regard to setting its own house in order.

Mr. LINDSAY. I thank the gentleman from New York for his comments and for the contribution he continues to make in this field.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINDSAY. I yield to my colleague from North Dakota.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. I am very happy to join with my friend from New York in the introduction of this very important legislation.

Our country goes on through the consent of the governed like no other nation in this world. Our people have the right to know—in fact, they must know—exactly what interests each individual Member of our Congress has which may affect his vote on critical issues which come before the House and the Senate.

I am a farmer. I suppose one could say I have a vested interest in certain farm legislation as it comes along, but everyone knows I am a farmer because one cannot hide acres under a rug.

This public disclosure of an individual's interest I believe is necessary to the conduct of and confidence in this Congress.

We are dealing with the people's money. We are dealing with $100 billion every year of the people's money. It is important that we get a full return for each dollar spent.

But we are also dealing with the people's future. It is even more important that any decision made be made regardless of and free of any bias which might exist on the part of an individual Member of Congress.

Our Government will remain strong and effective only so long as it has the full confidence of the people of this country. For this reason I am very happy to join with my friend from New York in introducing this important landmark legislation.

Mr. LINDSAY. I thank the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINDSAY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Did I correctly understand the gentleman to say that there is a code of ethics for the executive branch of the Government?

Mr. LINDSAY. No. What I said was that 2 years ago the Congress enacted a revision of the conflict-of-interest statutes as they applied to the executive branch of Government. It was a comprehensive omnibus bill and it was signed into law by the President.

What it did was to collate, revise, and bring up to date a whole series of statutes which had come into the code in bits and pieces for almost a century. The modernization was a definite improvement. Executive branch employees know more clearly where they stand today than they knew before, and this public interest has been more carefully safeguarded.

Mr. GROSS. I wondered, if there were a meaningful code of ethics for the executive branch of the Government, why such "characters" as Walter Jenkins could be protected and kept from testifying before a committee of Congress; but evidently the gentleman is not talking about code of ethics, he is talking about a conflict-of-interest statute.

Mr. LINDSAY. Yes. I was talking about a conflict-of-interest statute.

Of course, the administration of a law of that kind is important; it must be properly administered.

THE OBLIGATION OF THE MINORITY IN THE CONGRESS IN RELATION TO FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. Speaker, while I have this time to speak, I wish for a few moments, before I release the floor, to discuss very briefly another subject, not related to the one I have just discussed, but of equal importance. That has to do with the obligation that the minority has in the Congress, the Republican minority, in respect of foreign policy. The reasons why this subject is timely are two in number. One, apparent to everyone, is the vote that was taken yesterday on a complicated subject having to do with a complicated and fuzzy area of foreign policy. The second reason is the reduced state of the minority in the House of Representatives in this Congress and the enlarged state of the majority.

I am one of those, as many others on my side of the aisle, who have been very careful to see to it that we supplied a high degree of bipartisanship in the area of foreign policy. This I have regarded as important and essential, and it has behind it a long heritage of Republican philosophy which was manifested, as clearly as at any other time in Republican history, in the days of Senator Arthur Vandenberg. I, and I know others on my side of the aisle, intend to continue to exercise a high degree of bipartisanship when it comes to foreign policy. Bipartisanship, however, does not mean that we can or should ignore our obligation to the country to discover what our policy is. Indeed, I believe the country is quite concerned lest, under this reduced minority, there be insufficient, if any, constructive "opposition," in the parliamentary sense. Will we live up to our obligation to the country and, as the minority party, see to it that policy is clearly stated?

Bipartisanship in foreign policy on the part of Members of Congress or of any parliament does not mean, I repeat, that we do not have an obligation to insist that the Government tell us what Government policy is, who is making it, where it is going, and what it is intended to achieve. The great service of honest debate in the competitive two-party system is the discovery of truth. Policy should always be tested and examined. Conditions are such at this moment with the reduced state of the minority in Congress that there is a higher obligation, I think, than ever before on that minority to be a proper opposition in the sense that we insist that the Government make clear to the people through their elected representatives what U.S. foreign policy is. This is something that we minority members are free to do. Our friends and colleagues on the majority side of the aisle are not so free to do it for very understandable reasons. They are in the majority and hence they are a part of the Government. I found that after the campaign was over and we saw what a reduced state the minority was in, a great many people, Democrats and independents alike, were concerned about the problem of opposition and wondered about how it would be handled. They are genuinely worried about it.

Yesterday it was stated on the floor of the House, by the Speaker no less, that the country had spoken and put President Johnson in with an overwhelming mandate, and so forth and so on, proving that the President has the people's full confidence in the area of foreign policy.

Well, now, I came in in my own district with 72 percent of the vote. President Johnson carried my district by somewhere between 70,000 and 75,000 votes and I carried it over my Democratic opponent by 91,000 votes.

I think, if I can believe what people say, that many people were concerned about what was going to happen to the loyal opposition, particularly in the area of foreign policy. This was true on the part of thoughtful people of both parties before the election, and even truer after the election.

This problem is compounded by the curious silence of the administration on matters affecting our most vital interests. I still have not discovered the reason why there is only the slightest tangential mention of foreign policy in the state of the Union address that was delivered to a joint session of the Congress, in spite of the fact that this is the number one subject facing this country today; and there was no mention of it in the inaugural address, again in spite of the fact that no area is of greater moment or importance to the country. And, before and after, Presidential press conferences have not helped.

I go back to what I said at the outset which is that there is an obligation on the part of Members of Congress to insist that the Government tell us what policy is and who is making it. The latter is important because in Vietnam policy has been made by the Department of Defense, not by the Department of State, as nearly as we can discover. At least, the chief spokesmen have been officers of the Pentagon, not of the White House or of the Department of State during the most critical periods of changing turmoil. As near as I could make out operations were making policy, and snowballing into policy, instead of policy governing operations. It seemed that there was no policy in Vietnam. And now we are frozen into a hopeless position into which we should not have fallen.

Wherever possible I think minority Members have an obligation to say what they would do alternatively, in the area of foreign policy, if that is possible. But it is not always possible. We are not parties to the daily intelligence that comes in from intelligence sources all over the world and through the intelligence community of our Government. And we are not told. We are not in a position to make detailed proposals on some of these very sensitive areas that involve quasi-military operations, as in Vietnam. We therefore discharge part of our obligation simply by asking questions and insisting upon clear answers.

Our trouble in some parts of the world is that we have had no clear policy. I think this includes the Middle East. When congressional action is taken which is critical of Mr. Nasser's boycott of us and our people and our interests, or which takes aggressive action against us and our allies it seems to me our State Department agrees with us. They say, privately, that they wish they were free to exercise greater leverage on Nasser, but because of this or that they are not. I, for the life of me, have not been able to discover exactly what we think we are doing in respect of this very dangerous and difficult problem of Middle East relationships, internal and external. It is admitted that, for example, Mr. Nasser is aiding and abetting unrest and disorder in the very area we are trying to stabilize in Africa. Nasser has outdone the Chinese Communists and the Soviets in subversion and inciting to riot in this area. Nasser has fought and subverted every Western and U. S. interest in this part of the world. Where we have sought to stop the spread of infection and bloodshed they have sought to spread it. Where we have sought to help Africa they have sought to hurt it. They import arms and teach murder. To the north aggressions are committed every day of the week, as was pointed out on the floor yesterday by our colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE], against the State of Israel, which is a bastion of strength for the West in this sensitive part of the world. The United Arab Republic has been irresponsible and anti-United States on matters such as the fair division of the waters of the River Jordan and Mr. Nasser rants daily against us and Israel. Our Government each time it is asked the question, "Why do we persist in giving him money?" says in answer, "Yes, you people who are troubled about our ambivalent position in the Middle East really have a point but we are not sure what we can do about it."

Mr. Speaker, I think we have an obligation to insist particularly under the circumstances of today—a government unclear and uncertain on foreign policy, an unwillingness to define it or to make hard decisions, and a huge and probably docile majority in its pocket—we minority members must be willing and ready to ask straight questions. If the Government wants bipartisan support, which we will give as far as we can, it must be honest with us, consult with us, and tell us its program. And it is not enough to receive a chunk of boiler plate marked "Special" and "Confidential," all of which has appeared in fuller form in the newspapers a month earlier, and which still says nothing.

Mr. Speaker, I am one of those who believe that we ought to have a question and answer period on the floor of the House and the Senate, with the Secretary of State permitted on the floor to submit to questions. This is the parliamentary technique. We have borrowed from the English Parliament before and we can do it again. In this way all Members can be advised as to what the Government's position is and we can satisfy our constituencies that we at least know what our Government's position is, whether we agree with it or not.

Mr. Speaker, for all of these reasons, I wish to serve notice that I am going to insist as just one Member of the Congress, if nothing else, on the floor of this House, that the Government define the future course of foreign policy in this country.

I believe we have an obligation as the minority to do this, and an obligation to the country, both in order to obtain the truth about policy and to force the administration to make decisions it probably would rather not make. If you have served in the executive, you know perfectly well that it is easy to avoid the tough ones. You fuzz it over and pray that Congress leaves town.

Sometimes it is very difficult to have to make up your mind as to what your position is on a given subject, but in a free system it is expected that you do.

I want to know what our policy will be in respect to the Far East in general and on China? What are we going to do about trade? About the U.N.? About Sino-Soviet shifts? Where are we going in the complicated question of the Atlantic alliance? What we are going to do about the pressures that come from General de Gaulle which involve not just General de Gaulle but a more basic nationalistic pressure that is sweeping Europe? What we are going to do in Africa and what new leadership here and in Latin America?

Mr. Speaker, we Members of the minority have an obligation to ask these questions, and unless we receive answers I think we have an obligation to put the Government to the test as we did in the vote yesterday on the floor of the House of Representatives.

Mr. GROSS. ,Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINDSAY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I certainly agree with the gentleman from New York that in practically all areas of this world we lack any definitive statement on the part of the State Department or anyone else in this administration as to our policy and it is because of the absence of this that a few of us at least in this Congress and past Congresses have refused to vote for foreign aid bills to spew out billions of dollars a year.

Mr. LINDSAY. I thank the gentleman.

I wish to say in that connection that I have never failed to support a foreign aid bill in the 6 years I have been a Member of Congress. From time to time I have felt it necessary to take positions on amendments that were offered which were difficult positions for me to take on my side of the aisle. I believe that on the whole, the whole foreign aid bill has resulted in a plus for the United States and the vital interests of the United States around the globe. Also, I continue to lend support to matters that are foreign policy areas, and the foreign aid program is a part of foreign policy. If it is not thought of as foreign policy it is not right. I expect to continue to do that. But I am going to do it only after I have satisfied myself that the Government has a policy that is supported by the facts and has the courage to face the hard ones in the future.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINDSAY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I would compliment the gentleman on his remarks because, indeed, I think the people of the United States do expect the minority to pursue a responsible course of action here in the Congress that will lead to a meaningful bipartisan foreign policy. It is plain that the position of the U.S. Government in certain areas of foreign policy is not clear. It is equally true, I believe, that there are certain tests in foreign policy that must be applied and that the American people must be fully apprised of.

One of the first of these is whether or not we indentify emerging problems and deal with them—through creative statesmanship before they become crises endangering the peace.

I think in the spirit of bipartisanship it is important not only in South Vietnam, not only in the Congo, but equally in the Near East, that policy be made clear whenever possible, because it is a matter of fact that the United Arab Republic has not honored its undertakings with regard to withdrawal under certain conditions from the Yemen. It is clear that the recent Arab summit conferences have taken a position that is belligerent—specifically defining "the national cause as that of liberating Palestine" and "adhering to a plan of joint Arab action."

It is true that the United States stands back of the unified Johnston plan of 1955 in the Near East for the equitable sharing of the Jordan River waters by all the riparian countries. Yet we have seen a conference of Arab chiefs of state take a position with regard to the diversion of some of these headwaters. If this policy is continued, it might lead to a casus belli.

In my judgment it is a responsibility of the Congress to ask the Secretary of State appropriate questions to see whether our policies are effective; to find out whether they are in fact truly building the peace. In the Near East the fundamental question is whether the armistice agreements can be translated into documents of peace; whether a third war in this area can be prevented. I believe hostilities can be prevented but only if our policy in concert with other nations in the area is firm and clear, only if it is unmistakably evident that we will not stand for belligerency, that we will not stand for aggression, and that we stand wholly back of the United Nations and will not condone repeated violations of the spirit and letter of the United Nations Charter.

So I hope that this kind of inquiry can go on from time to time, and I would join with the gentleman in urging the House to make it possible for the Secretary of State to answer forthrightly on the floor of the House pertinent questions in the national interest.

Mr. LINDSAY. I thank the gentleman from New York. I think the record should show that the gentleman knows whereof he speaks, as he was a distinguished Ambassador of the United States in the Middle Eastern area. He was, for a period of years, U.S. Ambassador to the State of Israel. So I am delighted to have his constructive comment on these remarks I have made this afternoon.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may revise and extend my remarks made under this special order today, and also that the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. ANDREWS], the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ELLSWORTH], the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON], the gentleman from California [Mr. MAILLIARD], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McDADE], the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. REID] be permitted to extend their remarks following these remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend my able and distinguished colleague from New York for proposing the legislative code of ethics, and I am pleased to join with him in the introduction of this concurrent resolution here in the House today.

Since the Congress felt it necessary to establish a conflict-of-interest code for the executive branch of Government in 1962, I feel it is only proper, particularly in view of events surrounding the resignation of the former secretary of the Senate majority, that we take the proper steps to put our own house in order.

I hope the Congress will act immediately to establish this Joint Committee on Ethics to recommend a comprehensive code of ethics for Members of Congress and all legislative employees, and thus return the greatest legislative body in the world to its proper position of high esteem.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] in introducing legislation to establish a Joint Committee on Ethics. This is not the first time that the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] has exercised leadership in this field. As a member of a special committee of the Bar Association of the City of New York, he played an important role in the preparation of comprehensive revision of our conflict-of-interest laws as they affect the executive branch. He pointed out in 1962 when that revision was adopted by the Congress that we must set our own house in order in that regard.

The gentleman from New York, Congressman REID, has also played a significant role in this field and I am pleased to join with him also in introducing this resolution.

The accomplishment of these reforms is vital to the integrity of the legislative branch of Government. The problem we deal with here is not a simple one. It is for this reason that the resolution calls for a joint committee which can give careful study to conflict-of-interest problems which are admittedly quite different in many respects from those of the executive branch.

This detailed study will enable us to avoid the pitfalls in drafting what will be a permanent code of ethics for the conduct of Members of Congress. A reasonable, precise code can be drafted that will not inhibit legislative judgment or discourage the most qualified citizens from seeking public office.

There are times when our interests as Members of Congress may conflict with our interests as homeowners, parents, stockholders, lawyers, or businessmen. It is impractical to require Members of Congress, who must deal with the whole range of governmental interests, to disqualify themselves or to divest themselves of all financial interests. Our problems are quite different, but the establishment of clear standards will eliminate the shadow area of doubt and show to the public at large our determination to conduct the public business according to the highest ethical standards.

It is my hope that this resolution will receive prompt consideration and that it will pass so that the study by the joint committee proposed can get underway as soon as possible.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINDSAY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PERKINS. I thank the distinguished gentleman from New York for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to extend and revise my remarks in the body of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE LOCAL PUBLIC WORKS ACT OF 1965

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, the Local Public Works Act of 1965, which I have introduced today, will provide funds to enable many local communities to establish and maintain adequate water and sewage facilities, along with sewage treatment plants, which are essential to our future water supply in this country.

The present provisions for these programs are entirely inadequate and create a real hardship on communities with declining business activities and employment. The current limitations on such grants, both as to maximum amount and percentage of Federal participation, make it impossible for them to meet the general health standards now in effect in most States. Other projects, such as public buildings, have reached a state of obsolescence, which requires their replacement at an early date.

In general, local tax bases are not adequate to meet these demands. Other public facilities, such as parks, playgrounds, hospitals, and community centers, have never been adequately financed and cannot be under our present National, State, and local tax setup.

This bill provides special consideration for the so-called depressed areas, but also provides for grants to all communities without population, unemployment, or other limitations.

We cannot be a prosperous nation until adequate provision is made to provide modern public facilities for every community in the country.

ATHLETIC PROFESSIONALISM IN OUR SERVICE ACADEMIES

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I commented on the fact that the unfortunate cheating scandal at the Air Force Academy, like a similar scandal at the Military Academy in West Point in 1951, obviously stemmed from the undue emphasis placed on varsity athletics, chiefly football, at our three service academies, an emphasis which can only be described by the term "athletic professionalism." I said that such emphasis on athletics, especially football, as a special kind of activity at the academies and a special be-all and end-all for a substantial part of the Academy staff is simply out of place in today's modern military world and has no proper role in the mission of these academies supported by the Nation's taxpayers.

I am pleased to bring to the attention of my colleagues today two items which bear on the point I was trying to make. One of them is an editorial broadcast yesterday and today on WTOP radio and television in Washington by WTOP Commentator Jack Jurey.

The other is an address which has been called to my attention, delivered by Vice Adm. Hyman G. Rickover, U.S. Navy, at the U.S. Naval Academy on April 16, 1963. In the course of his remarks Admiral Rickover said the following:

> Convinced as I am of the importance of intelligence and education to military leadership, I have in the past proposed certain changes at the Naval Academy. I have, for instance, recommended decreased emphasis in nonacademic areas like organized athletics and extracurricular activities. These too often tend to become ends in themselves and thereby detract from academic effort, which should receive foremost attention. The retort invariably is the old chestnut attributed to the Duke of Wellington: "The Battle of Waterloo was won on the playing fields of Eton." This implies that the qualities required for success in warfare are acquired on the playing field rather than in the classroom. If it ever was true of any wars, it is certainly not true of modern wars. There is no clear evidence that the duke ever made this statement. The headmaster at Eton incidentally believes the duke said something to the effect that he had learned the spirit of adventure by jumping over a ditch. The duke, you may be interested in knowing, liked to toboggan around the corridors on a tea tray drawn by a team of young women.
>
> Athletics are, of course, essential to the physical fitness of young men. But not overorganized athletics. They become a drain on time and energy which should be devoted to the more important aspects of education. The time one has during his life for uninterrupted devotion to intellectual development is too brief even under the best of circumstances. Long ago a Greek physician sighed, "The life so short, the art so long to learn." I commend this sentiment to all of you. It is unwise to devote too much of your time to nonessentials, athletic department and alumni pressures notwithstanding.
>
> It is not really the function of the Naval Academy to engage in large-scale competitive spectacles for the benefit of the public. Of course, it will be said that this sort of competition develops leadership.
>
> I doubt this. The American economic and industrial system is also based on competition, yet the better colleges from which business recruits its leaders are now deemphasizing organized athletics. Knowledge now doubles every 10 years, hence the demands on the intellectual qualities of leaders are therefore growing apace. Can we then afford to devote precious time—time that can never be regained—to anything that is not essential?
>
> You know that much of college athletics today is big business. Professional coaches are hired at considerable expense to win some sort of status for the college where they happen to be working that year. But do the methods used by most coaches really develop leadership in the student player? The coaches call the shots; they manipulate the players in accordance with schemes developed by professional staffs. If it is initiative, team spirit and the like which is intended to be stressed, then it would seem logical to let the students call their own shots. In this manner, individualism, originality of thought, pride in accomplishment would be inculcated in the player and not remain with the coldly calculating professional athletic organization.
>
> Take the case of intramural sports. It so happens they were started here when I was a midshipman. The idea was good. It was to get as many midshipmen as possible to learn to play various games—to extend such an opportunity to more than varsity squads. The organization and schedules were left up to the midshipmen themselves. While important to the individuals involved, the outcome did not count for the company competition. Today, however, it seems that intramural sports are in danger of becoming overorganized, like varsity athletics. The important role they now have in intercompany competition may induce midshipmen to give them too much emphasis. Is the excess emphasis worth it? Does it really contribute to developing good officers?

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the text of the WTOP editorial and also the full text of the address by Admiral Rickover:

WTOP Editorial

(Broadcast on January 25 and 26, 1965, over WTOP radio and television by Jack Jurey)

From what already is known about the Air Force Academy's cheating scandal, it appears that as much as 75 percent of the football team is involved, together with other members of the cadet corps. This has led New York Congressman Samuel Stratton to send a telegram to Defense Secretary McNamara complaining of athletic professionalism. Mr. Stratton, a member of the House Armed Services Committee, charges that in the effort to create a football team good enough to compete with major colleges, Air Force has accepted athletes with marginal academic standards and that some of these young men are forced to cheat in order to keep up their grades. The Congressman charges further that three of the service academies—Army, Navy, and Air Force—put entirely too much emphasis on football, emphasis which, he maintains, "has no proper place in any tax-supported institution."

Somebody ought to pay some attention to what Mr. Stratton says. The West Point cheating scandal of 1951 included a high percentage of football players. Now the Air Force seems to be in the same situation. And at Annapolis, where no cheating has been detected, there still is an overpreoccupation with football. The biggest recent news from the Naval Academy had to do with the firing of one football coach and the hiring of another, as if it makes a tinker's dam to national security whether Navy has a good football team or not.

The Army, Navy, and Air Force Academies were established to train officers in military technology and give them an understanding of the military's role in a free society. That is a full-time assignment for any school, without any effort to maintain a semiprofessional football squad on the side. The Air Force scandal is an extremely good reason to deemphasize service football and keep it deemphasized.

Education for Naval Leadership

(By H. G. Rickover)

Admiral Kirkpatrick was good enough to ask me to speak with you today. He thought you might be interested in my views on some aspects of the education of naval officers. I hope what I say will have pertinence to the problems you will face throughout your naval career.

First I will explain why education is indispensable to leadership. Then I will tell you what I consider to be weaknesses in the education of officers—weaknesses which are inimical to the development of the military leadership our Nation requires. Finally I will urge you as individuals to take specific steps which can assist you in developing your own potential for military leadership. I limit myself to the Navy because of my greater familiarity with the service in which I have been on active duty for 45 years.

Science and technology are rapidly and radically changing the world and forcing mankind to face up to two alternatives: Adopt new ways of thinking or risk extermination. I need not belabor this point; no thoughtful person can help but be aware of the grave problems confronting us and of the inadequacies of traditional ways of dealing with them. Some of the concepts that we have long been taught and accepted are no longer relevant; others are no longer adequate; still others have now become profoundly dangerous. As Magnus Pike has said: "There have been many well-run societies and there have been well-run armies, too. The danger arises when big changes take place. When this happens a system designed for a particular purpose needs to be changed to meet the changed circumstances. If the system has become rigid, however, and people are not willing to change it, then it begins to impose itself on them."

We cannot cope with this new world if our minds are like attics stored with abandoned and useless furniture. What this new world demands of us is that we learn and that we think. Only those who have been taught to think with their own minds can discover and remedy their own deficiencies.

Our leading colleges recognize this problem and are upgrading their curriculums so as to prepare their graduates more adequately for coping with the increasingly complex problems they will face. I have been privileged to work with the engineering schools of Princeton, Yale, and Cornell and to assist them in revising their programs. These colleges as well as many others have replaced descriptive and applied courses with subjects which develop understanding of basic principles. To quote Dean Elgin, of Princeton:

"Instructure in the engineering principles of heat and mass transfer, mechanics of solids and fluids, and of electromagnetic theory is replacing the teaching of the technologies of diesel engines, steam powerplants, the manufacture of gasoline or alcohol, and how to construct an alternating current motor."

The basic humanities have not been slighted to accomplish this. Leading engineering schools now require that a substantial portion of their courses be in the areas of history, languages, English, and the like. Here too the emphasis is on principles, not on descriptive or applied subjects. A serious intellectual attitude is fostered and it is not surprising that those who most successfully meet this intellectual challenge are also the ones who succeed in the tasks they undertake after graduation. Let me quote from a recent report (Apr. 5, 1962), by Frederick R. Kappel, chairman of the board of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co., on a study made of the records of 17,000 college graduates in his company:

"The figures show that the single most reliable predictive indicator of a college graduate's success in the Bell System is his rank in his graduating class."

Like other colleges, the Naval Academy has been attempting to improve its curriculum. Some improvements have been made; others are currently being considered. Independent of these attempts, however, each of you should acquire an awareness of the importance of grasping the basic fundamentals of mathematics, science, engineering and the humanities. There is evidence you are not doing this. I know some of you feel that because the Academy is a military institution it need not compete with other colleges on an intellectual level; that perhaps military leadership is not in any significant way dependent on intellectual development. Nothing could be further from the truth, as I hope to show you.

Let us examine closely and critically just what military leadership consists of in the changing world in which your naval careers will be spent. The significance of military leadership has reached unprecedented importance, not only because of the obvious military threat to our country but also because of the increasing role of the military in our foreign relations and in our national economy.

Certain attributes of military leadership have always been important to success in warfare; among these is knowledge. History warns us to recognize the importance of this attribute; it supplies us with many examples where failure to do so has led to defeat. One striking example of such a failure is the war of 1870 between France and Prussia. I quote from Michael Howard's book, "The Franco-Prussian War":

"In the summer of 1870 the kingdom of Prussia and her German allies totally destroyed the military power of imperial France. For nearly 80 years the defeated nation had given the law in military matters to Europe, whereas the victor, 10 years earlier, had been the least of the Continent's major military powers. Within a month Prussia establish a military preeminence and a political hegemony which made the unification of Germany under her leadership a matter of course, and which only an alliance embracing nearly every major power in the world was to wrest from her half a century later.

"The collapse at Sedan, like that of the Prussians at Jena, 64 years earlier, was the result not simply of faulty command but of a military system; and the military system of a nation is not an independent section of the social system but an aspect of it in its totality. The French had good reason to look on their disasters as a judgment. The social and economic developments of the past 50 years had brought about a military as well as an industrial revolution. The Prussians had kept abreast of it and France had not. Therein lay the basic cause of her defeat."

The consequences of error in today's world of nuclear warfare are far more ominous than they were in 1870. The destiny of our country and of all free people is now at stake. Today it is too dangerous to harbor illusions. An illusion may be defined as a belief that has lost contact with reality, Illusions are a form of excess baggage which prevent a man or a nation from facing squarely up to issues and solving problems properly. How we fare will be determined in large measure by the relative capabilities of enlightened leadership in all areas, including the military. By enlightened leadership I mean leadership that sets new standards for itself as dictated by the dynamic developments of the times; leadership that is not bound by tradition; that is not based on frozen concepts which may have been important yesterday, but are no longer very important today.

For example, during the 18th and 19th centuries armies marched shoulder to shoulder, three, four, or six ranks deep, and then slowly and mechanically fired volley after volley at each other at dueling distance until one side was demolished or broke, leaving the ground literally carpeted with countless dead. Our own Civil War had similar hand-to-hand combats where both sides stood their ground and many thousands died. That type of warfare, employing, as it did, simple tactics with simple weapons, demanded emphasis on sheer physical bravery. Leadership excelling in bravery could bring success in battles of this sort. Such leadership is no longer sufficient to meet the military challenges that face us today when you may never even see the enemy—he may be hundreds, even thousands of miles distant.

What then are the main characteristics of military leadership in today's world of guided and ballistic missiles, supersonic aircraft, high-power sonar and radar, deep-diving nuclear submarines and other complex weapons? In such a world military power depends upon technology, and technology depends on educated brainpower. Therefore, today the keystone of military leadership clearly is an educated mind. Indeed, the motto of the Naval Academy itself is truly prophetic. For it says: "From Knowledge, Sea Power."

The educated man has knowledge that makes the world around him intelligible; his mind has been sharpened so that he can use it effectively; he is receptive to ideas; he thinks about them; he imparts something of himself to them, and comes forth with something new. Because he has broad general knowledge, the educated man is able to see things in perspective, as well as in relation to other things.

The uneducated man, who knows little about the forces which shape the world around him, lacks this ability to see things in true perspective and in their relation to other things. He is like a mirror; he does not absorb ideas; he merely reflects them. Each thing stands alone for him.

He lacks the ability of the educated man to join different ideas and bring some sort of order into them. Ability to withdraw into himself and think things out independently is perhaps the educated man's most important attribute. This ability to withdraw into oneself and think things out is the most significant characteristic distinguishing man from animals. This characteristic is developed through education. The uneducated have it to a much less degree than the educated. It has been said that some people are a bit like a seal who sleeps for a minute and a half, wakes up, takes a quick look at his surroundings and goes back to sleep again. He either sleeps or he looks—he doesn't think about what he sees. He just reacts.

A good liberal education endows a man with the faculty of entering with comparative ease into any subject and of taking up with aptitude any science and profession. It enables him to draw his own conclusions from what he observes around him. It equips him with sufficient general knowledge to understand the world. It develops in him the ability to make rational decisions in difficult circumstances and to meet totally new and unexpected contingencies. Education has familiarized him with the ways in which other people at other times have solved problems similar to the ones he must deal with. Thus he is supported by the vast fund of wisdom collected in the past and throughout the whole world. This sort of education takes much time and effort. It isn't finished when formal schooling ends but goes on all through life.

Certainly these characteristics, acquired through education, are necessary qualities in a modern military leader. Not enough officers in the Navy, I feel, recognize the need for this type of education.

Many studies have sought to find a definition of "leader." To most people the answer is simple: a leader is an active, forceful, outgoing person, the kind others look up to; the type that gets elected class president or football captain—the "big man on campus."

But there is another point of view that holds that the true leader makes no effort to impress his personality on others; he has no obvious "following." But because of him—because of the quiet influence of his ideas or his example—other people change their thinking and act in new ways.

About all that can be said for sure about a leader is that his actions influence others. Qualities which contribute to this ability to exert such influence are: above-average intelligence; originality and constructive imagination; practical knowledge relative to the situation; speed and accuracy in thought and decision; intensity of application and industry.

One of England's great educators, Lord James, says more lucidly than I have seen anywhere else that no society needs the quality of leadership as much as a free democracy. Again and again he stresses that the single most important ability required of a leader in today's complex life is trained intelligence of a high caliber.

Yet James notes that this quality of high intelligence is "more commonly underrated than any other aspect of leadership." The popular conception of a naval leader emphasizes the more obvious and spectacular qualities of character—as bravery, stamina, dominance, and so forth; these may mask and even ridicule intelligence. Yet high intelligence in naval leadership does not militate against these other qualities of character. Rather, implicit in high intelligence are all of these character qualities, but placed in proper perspective as dictated by the needs of the time. In essence, the intellectual element is always basic to a society, The other leadership qualities are essential, integral, indispensable, but they are not enough. When you have only the more obvious leadership to guide your action, you may lose early in the fight. The very nature of man requires that in the last analysis he be moved to action by ideas, not by codes.

Convinced as I am of the importance of intelligence and education to military leadership, I have in the past proposed certain changes at the Naval Academy. I have for instance recommended decreased emphasis in nonacademic areas like organized athletics and extracurricular activities. These too often tend to become ends in themselves and thereby detract from academic effort, which should receive foremost attention. The retort invariably is the old chestnut attributed to the Duke of Wellington: "The Battle of Waterloo was won on the playing fields of Eton." This implies that the qualities required for success in warfare are acquired on the playing field rather than in the classroom. If it ever was true of any wars, it is certainly not true of modern wars. There is no clear evidence that the duke ever made this statement. The headmaster at Eton incidentally believes the duke said something to the effect that he had learned the spirit of adventure by jumping over a ditch. The duke, you may be interested in knowing, liked to toboggan around the corridors on a tea tray drawn by a team of young women.

Athletics are of course esential to the physical fitness of young men. But not overorganized athletics. They become a drain on time and energy which should be devoted to the more important aspects of education. The time one has during his life for uninterrupted devotion to intellectual development is too brief even under the best of circumstances. Long ago a Greek physician sighed "The life so short, the art so long to learn." I commend this sentiment to all of you. It is unwise to devote too much of your time to nonessentials, athletic department, and alumni pressures notwithstanding.

It is not really the function of the Naval Academy to engage in large-scale competitive spectacles for the benefit of the public. Of course, it will be said that this sort of competition develops leadership. But for many years the Naval Academy did not in fact engage in such activities. Was its leadership, then, deficient in the years prior to the advent of organized intercollegiate contests? I doubt this. The American economic and industrial system is also based on competition, yet the better colleges from which business recruits its leaders are now deemphasizing organized athletics. Knowledge now doubles every 10 years, hence the demands on the intellectual qualities of leaders are therefore growing apace. Can we then afford to devote precious time—time that can never be regained—to anything that is not essential?

You know that much of college athletics today is big business. Professional coaches are hired at considerable expense to win some sort of status for the college where they happen to be working that year. But do the methods used by most coaches really develop leadership in the student player? The coaches call the "shots"; they manipulate the players in accordance with schemes developed by professional staffs. If it is initiative, team spirit, and the like which is intended to be stressed, then it would seem logical to let the students call their own "shots." In this manner, individualism, originality of thought, pride in accomplishment would be inculcated in the player and not remain with the coldly calculating professional athletic organization.

Take the case of intramural sports. It so happens they were started here when I was a midshipman. The idea was good. It was to get as many midshipmen as possible to learn to play various games—to extend such an opportunity to more than varsity squads. The organization and schedules were left up to the midshipmen themselves. While important to the individuals involved, the outcome did not count for the company competition. Today, however, it seems that intramural sports are in danger of becoming overorganized, like varsity athletics. The important role they now have in intercompany competition may induce midshipmen to give them too much emphasis. Is the excess emphasis worth it? Does it really contribute to developing good officers?

Another problem in developing qualities of military leadership has to do with instilling a proper understanding of the relationship between authority and independent thought. This always has been a problem but it is particularly acute today.

To illustrate the danger of unquestioned acceptance of a rule by authority take the case of the formula used by the British Admiralty in the last war to determine the number of escort vessels for a convoy. A longstanding rule required 3 escort vessels plus 1 additional escort for each 10 ships in the convoy. Thus a convoy of 20 ships would have 5 escorts and a convoy of 60 ships, 9 escorts. The theory behind this rule, whose origin had been lost in the mists of time, was that this number of escort vessels would make convoys of different size equally safe; that is, the same average percentage losses could be expected.

Because it presumably had its origin in "higher authority," the formula was never questioned until a group of civilians attached to the Admiralty decided to examine the actual records of ships lost in convoys of different sizes. To their amazement they found the rule to be not valid—that in the previous 2 years large convoys had suffered much fewer losses in relation to their size than small convoys. They also found that the number of ships sunk depended on the number of convoying vessels, not on the number of ships in the convoy. As a result the size of convoys was increased from a maximum of 60 ships to as high as 187, and fewer escort vessels were required. Had the policy of large convoys been adopted in 1942 instead of 1943, the merchant ship tonnage lost during this period might have been reduced by at least 20 percent. This is a good example showing that you should not take things for granted. Any formula followed unthinkingly may lead to disaster.

Take the traditional concept of morale. I often ask young officers which destroyer they would prefer to take to sea in war; the dirtiest one in the force, the one that had low morale, yet stood first in gunnery; or the smartest one, with high morale, but which stood last in gunnery. The answer almost invariably was the smart ship with the high morale. Now I admit this is a loaded question, because it is unlikely the dirty ship would have stood highest in gunnery. Yet in terms of my question, wasn't it the better ship? Isn't the real purpose of a naval ship to hit the enemy? Is morale an end in itself, or is it only a means to an end? Should we judge the value of a ship by its morale, or by its ability to sink an enemy?

Several years ago one of our large insurance companies decided to find out whether its highly organized employee morale program which included picnics, games, and so on was worth the cost and effort. They found that the employees who liked picnics and games at company expense went to them and were quite happy—but they didn't do any better work. The point I am trying to make is that we must question critically, we must never unthinkingly accept traditional rules and routines. Perhaps some efforts to build morale are overdone. Often they take the form of engaging ceaselessly in activities, so that little or no time is left for contemplation. Many of us would like to be just plain let alone; we may be quite capable of deciding all by ourselves what to do with our own time.

You should cultivate the habit of questioning the validity of all formulas and established traditions. There is some value even in the stalest truisms we memorize and recite; and since they are a convenient substitute for painful thinking, uneducated minds accept them as dogma and close themselves to new ideas that are necessary to keep in step with the times.

The military are not alone in becoming prisoners of outworn ideas. This is a characteristic of all elements of society. It happens in science, too. Take the discovery of oxygen. Priestly the Englishman and Lavoisier the Frenchman were working on this problem at the same time. Priestly could not conceive there could possibly be any other gas but air. He saw the gas he was experimenting with as dephlogisticated air. But Lavoisier had long been convinced that something was wrong with the phlogistic theory. So he could see in Priestly's experiments a gas that Priestly himself had been unable to see. To the end of his life, some 30 years after the new gas had been discovered and used, Priestly was still unable to see it. Or take Einstein's theory. There were some who did not accept it until it was dramatically proved at Hiroshima.

Max Planck, whose quantum theory is a cornerstone of modern physics, sadly remarked that "a new * * * truth does not triumph by convincing its opponents and making them see the light, but rather because its opponents eventually die, and a new generation grows up that is familiar with it." So great is the power of self-deception, so difficult is it to leave the warm womb of effortless routine, that hardly anyone who listens to a statement like Planck's conceives that it could possibly apply to himself, though he can instantly visualize many others to whom it does apply.

I keep pointing out that education is fundamental to the development of leadership. I keep giving examples of practices which detract from this development. I have made recommendations for the improvement of education at the Academy. But I do not intend to discuss these today. Rather I will show you weaknesses that you yourselves can do something about. I believe I can best do this by telling you about my observations of a large number of midshipmen and naval officers.

Over the past 14 years, I have interviewed more than 3,300 naval officers and prospective naval officers. I have done this in order to be able to recommend those whom I considered had the requisite qualifications for duty involving operation of nuclear powered ships. Over 1,000 of these have been midshipmen fresh from the Naval Academy and from civilian colleges. These interviews confirm my conviction that the Naval Academy midshipmen are not acquiring as good an education as do the midshipmen from civilian colleges. This conviction is supported by my observations of the remaining 2,300 officers who had varying amounts of experience in the Navy; most of these officers reflect the same shortcoming in education I saw in the young midshipmen.

Whenever one attempts to compare graduates of the Naval Academy with those from civilian colleges he is told that the need to develop leadership at the Academy gives it a unique mission requiring special time-consuming efforts. It is said that the Academy is a military institution preparing men dedicated to a loyal career in the service and, hence, cannot be like other colleges. It is also said that midshipmen are assigned military and administrative duties so that they may learn, by doing, to be followers and leaders; that regimentation is essential to the development of a fighting man and therefore, a necessary part of the experience of a midshipman.

These statements are not in accord with evidence at hand. Take Marine Corps officers. Would any one say they are not as loyal, or do not have as high a sense of duty as the officers in any of our other services? But the majority come from civilian colleges, receiving 6 months' training when they are commissioned. Are they inferior officers because they have not experienced a Naval Academy type of life for 4 years?

Or take NROTC graduates. The Navy itself has testified to Congress that after 2 or 3 years there is no distinction; that the captain rarely knows whether his officer is Naval Academy or college NROTC. Evidently some of the time-consuming efforts devoted by midshipmen to nonacademic activities may not be necessary to the development of an effective officer.

The central deficiency in the education of Naval Academy midshipmen is that they do not learn principles, and therefore do not learn to reason from principles. The extent of this deficiency is perhaps best understood by those who have themselves been educated at the Academy and then at a civilian college of the first rank. The contrast is markedly in favor of the civilian college. That this weakness in Academy education exists is real enough. Where the difficulty lies is in conveying a comprehension of this weakness to those who need to know about it.

Suppose we consider a course in thermodynamics. The course description in the Naval Academy catalog compares favorably with that for a similar course in other colleges. We find the standard topics: the first law of thermodynamics, the second law, and so forth. But the evidence available to me is that midshipmen simply do not acquire a real understanding of the principles. It appears that they memorize the formulas, they learn how to do the standard problems, and they contrive to pass the course with more or less credit. But never having comprehended the fundamental principles involved, they take away precious little of enduring value. The appearance of education is there, but not the reality.

Midshipmen, of course, are seldom aware of this. When asked whether they are getting the education they need, the answer is generally in the affirmative. The reason, of course, is that most of them have no way of comparing their own education with education at one of our better colleges. Similarly, if you asked a Chinese collie whether he liked rice he'd probably say "yes." How could he answer otherwise; he doesn't know how well he likes rice until you give him a beefsteak.

Deficiencies in Naval Academy education show up clearly in our nuclear power schools. We find that the NROTC graduates, on the average, do better than Naval Academy graduates, the principal reason being that they have, as a group, a better educational foundation than have officers from the Academy. For example, in one nuclear power school group the top 11 students are all non-Academy graduates. These 11, again as a group, were B-minus students at college, yet they stand higher than 10 Academy graduates, 4 of whom stood in the top 100 of their class. These are unpleasant facts. But it is better that you know them now than that you keep on deluding yourselves about your educational development.

Let me read from a letter I received commenting on a young Naval Academy graduate enrolled at one of our nuclear power schools.

"This young officer was most enthusiastic about the rigorous nuclear power school curriculum. For the first time in his life he was enjoying a new-found revelation of his capabilities * * * he mentioned one mathematics exam (at the Naval Academy) that he outguessed to make an almost perfect mark—3.98. During a typical study period at night he would read a few pages of an assignment and then shine shoes, wash cap covers, or play cards. This officer is now studying approximately 6 hours each night and a major part of each weekend. He has discovered how much he can learn and understand by applying himself and this I think is the lasting value of the nuclear power school course. He will retain more or less of the detailed knowledge depending on his interests and continued application of the material; he will retain the principles and methods of approach a longer time. But most important, and fortunately for him, this young man has learned early in life what his academic capabilities are; this knowledge he will never lose."

This young man finally discovered how important education was to his professional development as a naval officer. This is not understood by most midshipmen. I am often told that in the past they had not applied themselves to academics because they had only recently considered duty in the nuclear power program—that they would be ready to start studying if accepted for this program. My message is addressed to all of you, not just to those who may desire duty in nuclear powered ships. An intellectual approach cannot be decided upon overnight; it cannot be turned on and off like a faucet. It must grow out of continued and determined effort from the very beginning. Prolonged inattention to study and failure to develop oneself intellectually is a difficult habit to overcome; very few overcome it.

Many Academy graduates also believe that the academic phase of their education ends with graduation and that thereafter they merely apply in a routine manner what they learned at the Academy of the trade of naval officer. I seldom find an officer who devotes a significant amount of free time to continuing his general and professional studies. Perhaps there is too little reward or encouragement offered for this type of self-development. Most officers devote their energy to routine and perfunctory tasks associated with their jobs. Few maintain intellectual interests in science, engineering, history, languages, or similar academics. Without them, officers are really no more than technicians. They are stagnating intellectually. The fact that they are judged by their practical skills tends to mask this intellectual stagnation. This only reveals itself when real leadership and keen insight are needed to guide their decisions in dealing with the unforeseen problems that our rapidly changing times throw at them.

What impresses me in my interviews is the greater maturity of the NROTC students compared to Academy students. I attribute this to the fact that the generally superior academic education and the open life at civilian colleges tend to foster maturity. Or perhaps some practices at the Academy, such as hazing, tend to foster continuance of an adolescent attitude through and beyond the age when one should reach maturity. I am reminded of what the author and journalist Alan Pryce-Jones said recently about Oxford: "We were treated as grownups at the age of 17. And there were superb libraries and memorable tutors in an ambience of learning."

Is it too much to expect that a youth of 17 be treated as an adult? In Biblical times a young man attained manhood at the age of 13. In medieval times when the child reached the age of about 7, he belonged to adult society. This may have been due to the fact that because of the very high child mortality little emotional investment was made in young children. The child was dressed like the grownup. When you look at medieval paintings you can see the similarity in clothes. For many centuries there was no dividing line between the games and pastimes of older children and adults. Girls often married at 13 and boys at 14. For a long time the child, the adolescent and the adult all sat at the feet of the same master and studied the same lessons.

Children were accorded adult treatment even in later times. Our own naval hero, Farragut, was made master of a prize at 10. Yet at the age of 22 I still had to get my company officer's signed approval to buy a pair of socks at the midshipmen's store.

Relative immaturity of midshipmen is often explained away by arguing that Anglo-Saxon youth ripen slowly in comparison with other people.

Do not delude yourself on this point. Comprehensive studies show that it has no basis in fact. Therefore, the lack of maturity to which I referred is your own personal responsibility, not that of your ancestors.

I mentioned hazing as possibly contributing to immaturity. You may be interested in the origin of the type of hazing in vogue here. It began in England in the early 19th century when the growing industrial and business class sought better education for their sons. As there was then no public education in England, the few private schools became crowded. There were simply not enough teachers to do the teaching and maintain order too. Because of this, and to save money, the maintenance of order was turned over to the older students who accomplished this by hazing. This is the origin of modern hazing which continues to this day, in symbolic form at our civilian colleges, in actual practice at the service academies.

The harm done by hazing is not its physical aspect. I am sure this is quite minor and hurts no one. The harm is done in a more subtle way and to both parties. The newly arrived midshipman is made to feel, not as an equal who has joined a goodly company whose older members assume the responsibility for his welfare, but as an inferior who must do things because they are ordered, whether there is any reason or not. The upperclassman acquires a false concept of the proper way to exercise authority.

Yet hazing is not something the authorities require or officially condone. For 40 years I have been hoping that some day there would be a Naval Academy class that upon becoming third classmen at the age of 18, would be mature enough to depart from boyish practices and adopt an adult manly attitude toward their juniors. As the Apostle Paul said in his first letter to the Corinthians: "When I was a child, I spake as a child, I understood as a child, I though as a child, but when I became a man I put away childish things."

A misconception I find prevalent among midshipmen and younger officers is the feeling that during their years at the Academy and as young officers they are so far down the ladder that nothing they do can have real importance. This is exactly the opposite of the truth. Generally, the first 10 to 15 years of a man's career are the truly creative ones. Therefore, you cannot ever postpone doing the very best you know how. On the contrary, you must use your years at the Academy and as a young officer to work and study your very hardest. It is in these years that the foundations of your career are laid. Otherwise, you will find to your sorrow later in life that you have lost an opportunity which cannot be recovered.

Too often, midshipmen place the blame for their educational deficiencies on others. I am frequently told that the atmosphere in a particular company at the Academy is not conducive to study; or that no one teaches them about practical engineering on summer cruises. Yet, when confronted with the obvious question as to what initiative they themselves took to improve their lot in the face of these situations, the answer invariably is "None." This lack of initiative is a personal weakness characteristic of individuals who are content to follow passively and to bemoan that they are victims of their surroundings. The circumstances in which you find yourselves may be beyond your power. But your conduct in these circumstances is within your own power to control.

Blaming others for deficient conditions is of course not unique to midshipmen. It applies equally to many officers I interview before they enter the nuclear program. Many of these officers do not understand the true meaning of the word "responsibility." When questioned, they readily admit that the combat efficiency of their ship needs to be improved. Yet when asked what they are doing to improve matters, it seldom occurs to them that they have a personal responsibility. The fault, as they have analyzed it, lies in the inexperienced men assigned to them, in old or poor equipment, in not being motivated by their seniors, etc., but never in themselves. Yet these same officers usually have little knowledge of the fundamental or detailed technical aspects of the equipment for which they are responsible. They rarely study technical manuals or instruction books to overcome this ignorance. These weaknesses in the educational development of our naval officers can and should be corrected. The Navy cannot otherwise contribute its proper share to the military stature of our country. The question for each of you is: What can I do personally? No one can answer it for you. If you have listened to what I have said, it should be clear that each of you must find his own answer. "You yourself must set flame to the faggots which you have brought"—a statement, incidentally, by a playwright who was a naval officer. But I can perhaps help by posing some pertinent questions. I suggest you ponder these and like questions which will occur to you and decide your own positive courses of action:

Is broad and continuing intellectual development my foremost objective here at the Naval Academy? Or am I content merely to get by?

Am I striving to acquire a real understanding of the fundamentals of science, engineering, and humanities? Or am I resorting to techniques whose purpose it is to get the best possible grade for the least effort?

Do I choose electives which are difficult and intellectually stimulating? Or do I choose easy ones which may improve my class standing, yet contribute little to further my educational development?

Am I taking advantage of every available opportunity to broaden my knowledge? Or am I devoting time to meaningless activities which have little relevance to my development as a human being and as a professional naval officer?

Am I developing the habit of independent thought and inquiry which requires me to question doctrinaire and traditional approaches to problems? Or do I blindly accept everything that is cloaked with the mantle of authority?

In attempting to answer these self-imposed questions you may discover that you are discontented with what you have accomplished. You may find that a strong effort on your part is needed to wrench your mind from intellectual stagnation. While positive corrective action in your environment may be difficult to acquire, remember it is your responsibility to do what you can to overcome such difficulties. Ignorance is a voluntary misfortune.

In conclusion I will quote a perceptive passage at the end of Darwin's "Origin of Species":

"Although I am fully convinced of the truth of the views given in this volume. * * * I by no means expect to convince experienced naturalists whose minds are stocked with a multitude of facts all viewed, during a long course of years, from a point of view directly opposite to mine. * * * But I look with confidence to the future—to young and rising naturalists who will be able to view both sides of the question with impartiality."

My hope is a similar one. While I do not expect that my views will gain wide acceptance in the Navy today, I am hopeful that you of the younger generation will eventually learn to understand them and perhaps benefit from them. If what I have said disturbs you, bear in mind I did not come here to please you but to make you think.

Speakers often tell you that the future lies in your hands. By these words they do not mean that you are superior in capacity or in intelligence. Many of you appear to believe this as you graciously accept this platitudinous homage. Not at all. What they are attempting to convey to you is the hope that perhaps as many as a handful in the audience will be inspired to ponder their purpose in life and set themselves difficult goals.

The Spanish philosopher Ortega y Gasset once wrote a book around the thesis—to quote him—that "there is no doubt the most radical division it is possible to make of humanity is that which splits it into two classes of creatures: those who make great demands on themselves, piling up difficulties and duties; and those who demand nothing special of themselves, but for whom to live is to be every moment what they already are." I read this as a young man and it impressed me deeply. And all my life I have unconsciously judged people and institutions by whether or not they set themselves a standard; whether they measure themselves against a criterion that requires effort because they deem it worthy of effort.

The Navy can offer unlimited opportunity to anyone who is willing to study and work hard—to anyone who is willing to exercise his brain and who is not afraid to question outworn shibboleths. The Navy is also a place where an officer can, for a while, coast; where he can get by with a minimum of effort and with perfunctory work.

Take your choice. When the time comes for you to contemplate your life and you ask yourself "What have I accomplished?", will you have something to show; will you have had an impact on your environment, or will you have become nothing but a statistic.

ADDRESS OF SENATOR BARRY GOLDWATER BEFORE THE REPUBLICAN NATIONAL COMMITTEE

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. BERRY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to place in the RECORD the entire text of the speech which Senator Barry Goldwater delivered before the Republican National Committee in Chicago January 22 to which I made reference in my statement on the House floor yesterday.

The Senator's statement should clarify any doubts that remain as to exactly what he said, and how his remarks were deliberately misquoted by the leftwing press.

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE BARRY GOLDWATER, BEFORE THE REPUBLICAN NATIONAL COMMITTEE, FRIDAY, JANUARY 22, 1965, CHICAGO, ILL.

I, too, want to take a few moments at the outset to make a few remarks to express my heartfelt thanks and gratitude to Dick Nixon who worked harder than any one person for the ticket this year. Dick, I will never forget it. I know that you did it in the interest of the Republican Party and the interest of our country and not for selfish reasons. But if there ever comes a time I can turn those into selfish reasons, I am going to do all I can to see that it comes about.

I want to thank Dean Burch for the outstanding job that he did. I have worked with him and with many national chairmen and I don't say this because he is a young man from my own State. I say it because I have learned to recognize what makes a good national chairman and Dean accomplished an almost impossible task under very trying conditions and Dean, I wish you well in the years ahead.

I want to thank, too, my running mate, Bill Miller, who you all know worked tirelessly in this campaign. He and his charming wife and his family went every place in this country they were asked to go and they did an outstanding job and I hope I am successful in talking Bill Miller to moving his law practice to Arizona. It's a better climate out there, I might say, politically and meteorologically.

I want to thank my old friend Ray Bliss who finally—and this is the third time I went to him on bended knee—finally he said "yes." The first time I asked Ray Bliss to be national chairman, 6 years ago, and I thought we had him. We answered his three if's and then we found he came up with a fourth one. We couldn't quite crack it. Ray, I pledge my continued support in any way you feel you can use me and I wish you the best of success in this job you have taken on.

Of course, this always happens after a campaign. People begin to write books about the campaign and I have had a real interesting and amusing time reading them. In fact, what they boil down to, mostly, is that I wasn't dishonest enough in this last campaign to win. It's a little distracting to find writers feeling that in order to win an election one must be dishonest or at least a little dishonest. In fact, it's gotten so bad I may write a book myself about this campaign just to get the truth across. If I were going to do that, I would include in it something like this:

No. 1: As Republicans, let's quit blaming everyone for the defeat that I suffered. This defeat was not the fault of Dean Burch. It wasn't the fault of my lifelong friend and manager, Denny Kitchel. It wasn't the fault of this State, this section or that section of our country. It wasn't the fault of this person or that person. In my mind elections are won when five things can be counted on your side: Circumstances, organization, money, work, a candidate. Now, let's look at those:

Under circumstances the circumstances were not right for 1964.

Organization: I think that we had the finest working organization that I have ever seen in the Republican Party out across the States. It was excellent. I hope we can retain these millions of dedicated workers who worked for the first time in politics. I think we can and I think this is a challenge to each and every one of you State chairmen and county chairmen who might be here.

Money: OK in the long run but it didn't come in early enough so we could really plan to use it in the most effective way, and again I want to thank the finance committee and all those of you who contributed so much in time and labor to the successful drive that was put on.

Work: I don't think I have even seen in my life in the Republican Party any greater or more dedicated work than I saw across the length and breadth of this land. Not completely, but I'll say by and large, the best work that I've ever witnessed.

Now, we get down to the last thing and that's the candidate and I guess I have come to the unhappy conclusion that you had the wrong one. Now, let's look at the reasoning on this because I would like to close this book once and for all and let us get on with the job of electing people in 1966 and putting this party together. I would like the people who write about the campaigns to understand these things.

I picked Dean Burch and I might say to you national committeemen and committeewomen I hope the day comes, that you don't feel it incumbent upon yourselves to ask the national candidate who he wants for national chairman. I hope you, yourselves will make up your mind about this person and not change him every 3 or 4 years. But I want to talk about that a little later on.

I picked my team. I picked my writers. In fact, Dean has been blamed for some decisions that I made. I decided and asked Dean to put it out—that my campaign, or our campaign, would be run through the State organizations and I would still make that recommendation today. But I made it through Dean Burch and it was my decision. It was my decision not to go into several States—a decision had I to make it again, I probably wouldn't have made it in the same way. But this wasn't Mr. Burch's fault. It was my fault.

Mistakes were made in this campaign and I hope some day to record all of them so we don't do them again and I might say here I want to thank all of you who have so carefully answered my inquiries about what, in your opinion, was wrong with the campaign. The response has been overwhelming and out of this response will come some kind of a paper for the national committee. Mistakes were made, and they were my fault. It wasn't the fault of any other individual because I was charged with the decision. If TV was no good, that's my fault. It's not the fault of the camera. We had the best directors you could get. In the long run we had money, but if the TV programs were bad you can blame me.

If the speeches were no good, that's my fault. I didn't have to make them but I liked them and I thought they put my point across, but I could be wrong and I guess I was. In fact, I don't say this in a way to duck any responsibility; but I just couldn't overcome the false liabilities that were hung around my neck on July 15.

For instance, some 78 percent of the people wouldn't agree with me on nuclear permission for NATO commanders. I never made that suggestion to begin with—never at any time.

Sixty-four percent of the people thought I would start a war with Cuba. I wouldn't but neither would I duck one if it came in the cause of freedom.

Sixty-one percent disagreed with me on Supreme Court powers. I don't recall I ever once made any suggestion about cutting the Supreme Court powers. I made some suggestions as to the improving the quality of it, but not cutting it.

And then we have the two worst ones: the fact that I oppose social security, which couldn't be borne out by my voting record, and dropping a bomb in Asia. I'm glad they got down to Asia because during the campaign it was anyplace. These were falsehoods but I was tagged with them. I couldn't for the life of me, as often and as hard as I tried, unload the Republican ticket from those false accusations. So, I accept the full responsibility for this and I just want to have people stop blaming the wrong people.

I am reminded of the importance of doing this by the Battle in the Valley of the Little Big Horn when Custer had such a bad time, pretty much like I had, but I got out of it with my hair. I didn't want to wait for history to have to write these conclusions. I make them today. I accept the full responsibility for it. I am sorry I couldn't produce better results. I am sorry so many good men, including Chuck Percy here, went down with me, but we are going to start coming up and we are going to come up a lot further than when we went down.

Now, if you permit me a few other observations, observations that you must keep in mind because for the first time in my memory we were not fighting the Democratic Party. In fact, I don't think the Democratic Party exists today, organizationwise. I doubt that they have a national committee. I haven't heard of it in years.

Last fall we were fighting the Federal Government.

Now, remember that. We were not fighting any limited funds of the Democratic Party. We were not fighting the limited funds of the labor movement. We were fighting the Federal Government. The question of equal time on TV which the President ducked—he refused to debate. He refused even to answer questions and when he did use TV for a purely political reason to explain his reasons in firing over in southeast Asia, we were refused equal time. Why? Because the FCC was told not to give us that time and we even went to court about it and the courts wouldn't change it.

The Cabinet for the first time in my memory, every member of the Cabinet, every submember of the Cabinet, was out across the length and breadth of this land campaigning for the opposition ticket. Bureau pamphlets which had never been used in such a direct way went out in political form. Not just the actual facts, but in many cases distortions. The Federal threat of power which you are going to feel more and more of in your business and in your very home and social life. The threat that if you do not go along with L.B.J., something might happen to you.

We ran into this all over the United States—the use of the Internal Revenue Service, the use of the threat of the loss of a license or the denial of a license if the vote was not coming or the support wasn't coming. Federal propaganda spread both domestically and throughout foreign lands. These are the things we are now confronted with. We are not confronted, ladies and gentlemen, with fighting merely another party. We are fighting the full muscle and power of the Federal Government.

I might say that that's history, but we learn a lot from this history. In fact, we conservatives believe in history. We believe in making our progress upon the proven values of the past and if that is true we have learned from the history of our party that we have to stop playing musical chairs with the chairmanship.

I don't know whether you realize it or not but Ray Bliss is the 19th chairman we have had in 28 years. I believe the eighth or ninth chairman in the last 11 years. You businessmen know that you cannot run a business if you change your manager every year and a half. It doesn't work out. I would like to see this job a continuous one. I don't think we should worry about what the presidential nominee wants in this particular case. If you have a good chairman, keep him and not just for 4 years but keep him as long as you can.

Our opponents never stop organizing. They never stop to have fights like we have. They may scrap among themselves. They may say he is an * * *, but he is a Democrat. They'll vote for him. They will work for him. We have to stop moving this national chairman around. I don't care if it is Thruston Morton, Bill Miller, Dean Burch, or whoever it it. We have to have continuity in this job.

We have to, either through the national committee or some outside organization—and I would think it best to be an outside organization—have national television available to our cause at least once a month and preferably twice a month. I am happy to tell you that I know of such an organization that is being formed, not to put just this Republican or that Republican on, but to put people on who can explain the Republican approach to the answers of the problems that we have today, to answer the asinine charges made from time to time by the President and by his controlled Congress.

I must reiterate what's been said earlier. We have to establish better relationship with the press. Now I know these fellows. They are good decent Americans. The trouble is that we haven't taken the trouble to teach them what we are talking about. I have had many of these men, some of them oldtimers, some of them heads of their bureaus, tell me they came to work under Franklin Roosevelt. They worked under a so-called liberal philosophy all their writing lives. They don't understand conservatism and they have been asking for an explanation. They are not out to get us. I think we can get quite a few of them to understand we are just normal human beings. We aren't devils with horns and tails who hate the press. We would just as soon be seen with them as seen with anybody else. I don't dispair of creating a better working relationship between the press and the Republican Party.

I think we have to beef up our public relations. We have to beef up our research which I found we were woefully short on and we have to get our money early. We cannot wait until after the next convention in 1968 or the nominating days in 1966 to put our team together. This is one of our great mistakes. This is historically one of our great mistakes in that we have had no continuity in the national chairmanship. So the fellow is a little scared about losing his job. He drops off doing work in this field or that field for fear of offending someone. We don't encourage him to go ahead and do the thorough job that should be done.

We don't have the money early. Our national chairmen have spent more time raising money and collecting money than organizing and that's to be understood because we have been in debt quite a bit. I think we have to have a little better merchandising—in fact, a lot of merchandising and I use that term because my background is as a merchant. Many times I would look at a piece of merchandise, a fine piece of merchandise, but not selling and ask myself, "What the devil is wrong with it. It is a perfect item. Why can't it sell?" It usually was to be found in its presentation or its wrapping.

Now the Harris poll, whether you agree with it or not, showed just before the election, 94 percent of the American people agreed with me about tightening security in the Federal Government; 88 percent felt prayer should be restored in schools; 61 percent believed Goldwater wants to curb extremist groups; 60 percent believe welfare and relief make people lazy; 60 percent agree with me on trimming Federal power; 50 percent believed I would do a better job dealing with corruption.

You couldn't ask for a better setup, but, by golly, when it came to voting, they didn't buy this package even if they liked it. We have to think of some way to wrap it up and have some better packaging so we can get the American people to realize the Republican Party is the responsible party, the party of progress. This is historically true. It is a party that has gained more respect for the United States of America than the Democratic Party has lost, even though they are trying their best. I would make another suggestion, and I know that this flies in the face of some others that have been made, that the national committee not try to make of itself a policymaking body.

You have to remember, whether you like it or not, that policy is and has to be made by the elected Republicans and the Congress of the United States. Ladies and gentlemen, they have to run on their record. They can't run on the record of the national committee. They have to run on what they are able to get done in Congress and a lot will depend, I think, in the coming years on what they are able to hold back from L.B.J. as he asks for the moon. So, don't try to graduate this group into a policymaking body. I think the council that's been set up by Mr. FORD and Mr. DIRKSEN is adequate to cover this. It gives you representation. It gives the Governors representation. It gives the ex-candidates representation. In fact, to me, this expanded group can do a lot more than any of us can by meddling in the prerogatives of the Congress.

Now, in closing, we are a minority party, and we are greatly in the minority. We have about 30 million Republicans in this country, and the Democrats 52 to 55 million. As you will see later this afternoon, our sales curve has gone down constantly since 1932, and we have to get back to work on that. However, as a minority party, I believe we have a very, very serious charge, an obligation, and that is for objective opposition, not just opposition for the sake of opposing, but thoughtful opposition, opposition accompanied with suggestions of a Republican nature as to how we would approach the problem.

Now, I noticed throughout the speech of the President the other day, or I detected the setting up of some language that will make it possible for anybody to be stamped "hatemonger" or a "divider" if he ever criticizes the L.B.J. administration. I want to remind him that honest criticism does not mean divide. Honest criticism is actually a halter in both senses of the word—a halter on the donkey's snoot and to slow him down, and a halter in that we can stop by honest criticism some of the things that are not good for this country, and it produces results.

If you doubt that, look at the President's extreme efforts now to appear conservative; turning out the lights in the White House and even telling us about $3½ billion that were saved last year, which is not true. Now conservatives are not dishonest, so that's one case wherein he does not compare honestly with us. Also look at his effort to cut spending, and finally his efforts—not his efforts but his action in South Vietnam—as he works to do what Dick Nixon and I have suggested for 3 long years—cut off the supplies coming into Vietnam. If he just listens to us long enough, I think we will make a good President out of him.

Now, my criticism is not born of hatred nor is it born of a desire to disunite our country. It is born of a concern for my country, yes, a deep love for my country. I am concerned today, for example, about the very dangerous situation of our gold and our dollar. I don't agree our dollar is sound. I don't agree the outflow of gold is stopped. I am frightened by what France has threatened to do. If France does it you can rest assured others will do it.

What would we do as Republicans? What we always have done—balance that budget. Put some financial responsibility into our Government. See to it that foreign countries finally realize that the American people understand the value of balanced budgets to strengthen their dollar. If we can keep the criticism on, keep the heat on, I am certain he is going to have to take recognition of this because the American people are beginning to realize you can't continously spend something that you don't have.

Another field that I am vitally worried about, and I know Dick and Bill and most of you are, is our rapidly deteriorating position around this globe. This doesn't seem to concern the present occupant of the White House. He is more concerned about what is going on in this State or that State than he is what's going on around this world in relation to the United States. We are being spat upon, belittled. We are at the point today where the Ambassador of the United Nations is afraid to say, "Russia, pay up or get out." We are being frightened into positions we have no reason to be frightened into.

This isn't belligerent talk. This isn't war talk. This is merely the suggestion of one American who never wants to see a tear in an American's eyes as I saw tears in Frenchmen's eyes when the enemy finally moved in after being told it couldn't happen here. I want to see our party a party of honest opposition, strong opposition. I want to see more Members of our Congress standing up on their feet today and day after day pointing out the mistakes and the errors and the dangerous moves of the opposition. In fact, I suggest that our Republican Congress can do its best job by going slowly.

I was ranking minority member of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. How many days and hours do you think we spent on the antipoverty bill? Anybody want to make a guess? Less than 4 hours on the formal discussion in the Committee of Labor and Public Welfare in the Senate. We are hearing talk now about this astronomical program and its good points. We aren't going to argue with that. It has its good objectives. But we hear about jamming this through by July 1. These programs have to be studied. They have to be explained to the American people. We have to recognize that the aims are great but we also have to find out what threats are in them against freedom.

We hear about the Great Society. I would remind you we have been a Great Society all of our lives. If we weren't my grandfather would never have gotten here from Poland or England because there would have been no reason. He wanted to be free. Yet we hear in this Great Society today, justice, liberty, and unity. I might remind you that we find justice in jails. We find liberty among Communist-controlled people, to some extent. Unity, there is unity amongst the Communists. There is unity amongst criminals, but freedom is the major ingredient of our society and without it these things mean nothing and once again as I did during the campaign I implore the President to talk about freedom as he talks about justice, liberty, and unity because liberty and freedom are not exactly the same things.

Now, in closing, I want to say what Dick has said. I am a Republican. I have always been a Republican. I will never feel at home any place else. I will resist any third party movement in this country, and I will never allow my name to be associated with any such movement.

This Republican Party lives under a great tent. We have room in it for all interpretations of our basic philosophy. I said, I say now, as I said in Chicago 5 years ago, let's not stand inside this tent and throw rocks at each other. You can stand outside and throw rocks, but not inside. If you have your arguing to do, whether you are liberal, moderate, or conservative, whatever those words mean today, let's argue them out between now and 1966. When we have decided our nominees for the House and Senate, for the gubernatorial posts in 1966, just because we don't agree, for the "love of Mike" don't stay home and throw rocks at the candidate.

I want to thank all of you for the great honor that you bestowed on me by having selected me as your candidate—20–20 hindsight might make some of you wish you hadn't done it—20–20 hindsight can show me a lot wrong with the decision but it was your decision and I never have been so honored in my life.

I will never be so honored again. I will carry this honor to my grave as the proudest thing I own. Thank you.

REVISION OF IMMIGRATION LAWS

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. Cleveland] may extend his remarks at this point and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, as one who supports reasonable revision of the immigration laws, I was struck by a thoughtful analysis of the problems involved which appeared as an editorial in the January 14 issue of the Christian Science Monitor. I welcome this opportunity to place it in the Record for the consideration of the House:

What Immigration Law?

As the next step in what promises to be one of the most tradition-shattering legislative programs ever asked by a President of the United States, Lyndon B. Johnson has demanded fargoing changes in American immigration laws.

There has been for many years a sharp division within public thought on this question. On one side have stood those who believe that all nations have the right to preserve their traditional racial, religious, and cultural make-up against inflows which might seriously alter it. This group, hitherto dominant, points out that the United States, despite heavy immigration from many areas of the world, remains essentially northern European and Protestant.

Against this point of view are ranged those who claim that America's immigrant laws are discriminatory, that the United States should not make nationality a test for immigration. These would have the famed "melting pot" melt still more furiously. They would consider would-be immigrants as individual human beings rather than members of nations or races.

Although by no means adopting all the demands of the most extreme within this latter group, President Johnson has clearly responded to their pleas. Although not substantially lifting the yearly immigration quota (which, incidentally, does not give a true picture as it is exceeded each year by almost its own number due to special visas), the President's wish is to end the present preferential treatment given northern Europeans, primarily British, German, Irish, and Scandinavian.

The White House lays particular stress on what it says is the need to import workers with needed skills. The new bill would also further serve the already operative and humanitarian principle of seeking to unite families.

A serious question, and one which the President did not even touch upon in his message, is the desirability—one might even term it the "humanity"—of seeking to open the gates to large numbers of persons with greater or lesser skills, while there are millions of unemployed in the United States, while automation has already thrown many skilled workers out of a job, while large numbers of Negroes and Puerto Ricans are either unemployed or underemployed. But even these facts are less significant than still another: the United States is now entering the period when the postwar baby boom begins to flood the labor market. In the next 10 years alone, this boom will add 15 million jobseekers over and above the figure of those normally expected. Where will they find jobs?

From a hardheaded point of view, the United States might be expected under such circumstances to cut down on immigration, rather than seek to increase it. Many other countries follow such a course. But would it be consistent with American ideals?

Thus difficult questions arise. If, in this matter, one shows a humanitarian face to the world, is one showing a heartless face to unfortunates at home? Is an improvement in America's worldwide "image" worth the price of possibly compounding already existent economic difficulties? Clearly, such choices require careful weighing.

WIDENED FOOD-FOR-PEACE PROGRAM

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Kastenmeier] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill today which would provide a new and useful method of expanding oversea markets for U.S.-produced foodstuffs, increasing our dollar trade, and aiding in the economic development of recipient countries.

The bill would add a new chapter, chapter 7 to part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, to authorize long-term supply contracts for school lunch and welfare programs abroad. This chapter would authorize the President to make firm commitments for any period of up to 5 years after the Secretary of Agriculture made a determination that the commodity in question is reasonably likely to continue in surplus for that period.

This authority for firm commitments on the strength of estimated future supply conditions is the most significant contribution of this proposal. The bill would permit the Secretary of Agriculture to make open-market purchases at above-price-support levels to fill the commitments should our surplus supply become depleted during the period of the commitment. Existing law requires a determination at the time of delivery that the commodity is then in surplus before it may be shipped. This results in great uncertainty for the recipient country.

Elimination of this uncertainty is highly desirable, not solely for the convenience of recipient countries, but very importantly, for the U.S. producers, processors, and shippers.

In the face of the existing uncertainty potential participating countries are discouraged from investing in the storage, packaging, and distribution facilities needed to receive both governmental shipments and commercial sales through private channels. Where the products might be used for such politically sensitive purposes as welfare and school lunch distributions, there is an even greater disinclination to embark on a program which might have to be terminated because of supply conditions in the United States.

In a recent article appearing in the Washington Post on January 21, 1965, Dan Kurzman cited the growing interest of the Johnson administration in utilizing food more fully in our foreign policy. We who view food and our ability to produce surplus stocks of food as very effective foreign policy tools are greatly encouraged by this indication of the administration's willingness to consider and support measures similar to the bill I am introducing today. In the belief that this article is of interest to my colleagues and relevant to the measure I am proposing, I include with my remarks the text of that article:

Widened Food-for-Peace Program Is Planned

(By Dan Kurzman)

A revolutionary food-for-peace program to help end hunger in the free world is being planned by the administration.

The program would require new legislation to permit basic changes in this country's farm policy.

Under the current food-for-peace program, only agricultural products in surplus can be shipped abroad as aid. Under the one now being drawn up, nonsurplus foods would also be sent abroad, mainly high-protein items such as soybeans and dairy products selected to fight malnutrition.

CHANGES IN SUBSIDIES

To assure an adequate supply of the most needed foods, important readjustments in the Government's farm subsidy program would be necessary.

Subsidies intended to cut production of items that would be required for the antihunger campaign could be reduced or eliminated while new incentives might be needed to encourage rather than discourage the cultivation of certain crops.

The projected program would implement a proposal by President Johnson last October "to use food and agricultural skills of the entire West in a joint effort to eliminate hunger and starvation." The program is now being worked out jointly by the Department of Agriculture, the Agency for International Development (AID), food for peace, and the Bureau of the Budget.

Although the total program might cost more than the present one, U.S. officials pointed out, an increase in the farm budget probably would not be required since a large part of the cost could be shifted from the Department of Agriculture to AID.

BUDGET PROPOSAL

Such a shift would depend on the willingness of Congress to give food a priority place within the AID program—an uncertainty at best, particularly since the President has asked for a sharply trimmed AID budget for fiscal 1966, starting in July.

However, since increased funds for food would not be required until fiscal 1967, a decision by the President to push the program could help make the funds available then or later.

Actually, pilot projects, which would not require any change in present farm or AID budgets, may be launched this year. From three to six underdeveloped countries will probably be selected to test the practicability of the program. Administration officials feel that for the first time in history the means exist for eliminating world starvation, and that the Great Society can prove itself on a global basis by so doing.

POLITICAL RESULTS SEEN

A successful worldwide antihunger campaign, officials believe, would, at minmum cost, not only eliminate one of mankind's most deadly plagues, but produce tremendous political results, particularly since the Communist world cannot produce enough food for itself.

Such a program is possible now, these officials say, because the scope of world hunger can be measured for the first time as a result of an intensive survey made about a year ago by the Department of Agriculture. This survey was made possible by the Freedom From Hunger campaign started in 1961 by the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization, which made governments more aware of the need for statistics to tie down food requirements.

The world food shortage is estimated in terms of yearly value, at $6.8 billion, of which $2.5 billion is attributed to non-Communist countries. These figures take into account the present annual food-for-peace offerings of $1.6 billion and the less than $500 million contributed yearly by other nations.

Built into the projected program would be efforts to reduce the $2.5 billion free world gap through self-help measures undertaken by the needy nations.

HUGE CROP LOSSES

These measures would be designed first to improve the storaging and distribution of available food. India today loses almost one-third of its crop through rats, insect infestation, and spoilage, while Chile loses up to half of its fruit and vegetables because of the lack of proper canning facilities.

Second, increased local food production would be encouraged through greater use of fertilizer, increased farm credits, and technical aid, and new marketing facilities. Such self-help measures constitute the main effort of the FAO's Freedom From Hunger campaign.

Food shortages remaining after such measures were undertaken—and after normal commercial trade with food exporting countries was taken into account—would then be met under the new program, assuring that such aid represented the assistance that the hungry people could not provide for themselves.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Feighan, for 5 minutes, tomorrow, and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. Gross, for 30 minutes, on Thursday, January 28.

Mr. Saylor (at the request of Mr. Del Clawson), for 15 minutes, on Thursday, January 28, 1965; to revise and extend and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Whitener (at the request of Mr. Clevenger), for 30 minutes, on Monday, February 1, 1965; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, January 28, 1965, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

434. A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A joint resolution to authorize the disposal of chromium metal, acid grade fluorspar, and silicon carbide from the supplemental stockpile"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

435. A letter from the Acting Deputy Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a report on the Veterans' Administration's activities in the disposal of foreign excess property for calendar year 1964, pursuant to title IV, section 404(d), Public Law 81–152; to the Committee on Government Operations.

436. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed concession contract for services, etc., for the public at the Oak Bottom site in the Whiskeytown Reservoir Area, Calif., pursuant to 67 Stat. 271, as amended; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 3699. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to expand and improve services under the maternal and child health and crippled children's programs, to provide special funds for training professional personnel for providing health services for crippled children, to provide for a program of medical assistance for children and other persons whose income and resources are insufficient to meet the cost of necessary medical care and services, to enable States to implement and follow up their planning and other activities leading to comprehensive action to combat mental retardation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois:

H.R. 3700. A bill declaring Columbus Day to be a legal public holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 3701. A bill to authorize a 2-year program of Federal financial assistance for all elementary and secondary schoolchildren in all of the States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CABELL:

H.R. 3702. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a credit against income tax for a taxpayer with one or more children in college; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 3703. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase from 18 to 22, in the case of a child attending school, the age until which child's insurance benefits may be paid thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 3704. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide a new system of overtime compensation for postal field service employees, to eliminate compensatory time in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 3705. A bill to amend the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 to provide that the entire cost of health benefits under such act shall be paid by the Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 3706. A bill to prevent the use of stopwatches or other measuring devices in the postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 3707. A bill to improve the annuity computation formula for certain employees under the Civil Service Retirement Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 3708. A bill to provide assistance in the development of new or improved programs to help older persons through grants to the States for community planning and services and for training, through research, development, or training project grants, and to establish within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare an operating agency to be designated as the "Administration on Aging"; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GROVER:

H.R. 3709. A bill to provide for the medical and hospital care of the aged through a system of voluntary health insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 3710. A bill to amend section 331 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 in order to continue the indemnity payment program for dairy farmers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HOWARD:

H.R. 3711. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code to increase the total mileage of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 3712. A bill relating to the application of the manufacturers excise tax on electric light bulbs in the case of sets or strings of such bulbs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 3713. A bill to establish a Commission on the Organization of the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

H.R. 3714. A bill to amend the Administrative Procedure Act to provide for the disclosure of certain communications received by Government agencies from Members of Congress with respect to adjudicatory matters; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MEEDS:

H.R. 3715. A bill to provide for the assessing of Indian trust and restricted lands within the Lummi Indian diking project on the Lummi Indian Reservation in the State of Washington, through a drainage and diking district formed under the laws of the State; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 3716. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, to establish the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, to provide grants for research and development, to increase grants for construction of municipal sewage treatment works, to authorize recommendations for standards of water quality, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MOORHEAD:

H.R. 3717. A bill to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide further for the prevention of accidents in coal mines; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 3718. A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to acquire, contract, operate, and regulate a public offstreet parking facility; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI:

H.R. 3719. A bill to establish a U.S. mint in Cook County, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 3720. A bill to adjust wheat and feed grain production, to establish a cropland retirement program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SCHWEIKER:

H.R. 3721. A bill to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act, as amended, in order to increase the authorization for appropriations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SHRIVER:

H.R. 3722. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted from $1,200 to $1,800 yearly without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SPRINGER:

H.R. 3723. A bill to protect the public health and safety by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to establish special controls for depressant and stimulant drugs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TENZER:

H.R. 3724. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UTT:

H.R. 3725. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction from the gross estate for the value of property passing to children; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 3726. A bill to authorize the retirement on full annuity after 30 years of service of employees subject to the Civil Service Retirement Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.R. 3727. A bill to amend titles I and XVI of the Social Security Act to liberalize the Federal-State programs of health care for the aged by authorizing any State to provide medical assistance for the aged to individuals eligible therefor (and assist in providing health care for other aged individuals) under voluntary private health insurance plans, and to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide tax incentives to encourage prepayment health insurance for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H.R. 3728. A bill to amend titles I and XVI of the Social Security Act to liberalize the Federal-State programs of health care for the aged by authorizing any State to provide medical assistance for the aged to individuals eligible therefor (and assist in providing health care for other aged individuals) under voluntary private health insurance plans, and to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide tax incentives to encourage prepayment health insurance for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER:

H.R. 3729. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 so as to authorize the carrying out, in furtherance of the foreign policy of the United States, of certain programs of assistance to needy persons and social welfare and nonprofit school lunch programs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER:

H.R. 3730. A bill to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 3731. A bill to establish a new program of grants for public works projects undertaken by local governments in the United States; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 3732. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase from 18 to 22, in the case of a child attending school, the age until which child's insurance benefits may be paid thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3733. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide monthly insurance benefits for certain dependent parents of individuals entitled to old-age or disability insurance benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3734. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide monthly insurance benefits for qualified dependent relatives of certain insured individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3735. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without any deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3736. A bill to provide coverage under the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system for all officers and employees of the United States and its instrumentalities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois:

H.J. Res. 244. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 245. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANSEN of Idaho:

H.J. Res. 246. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any

State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACHEN:

H.J. Res. 247. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STAFFORD:

H.J. Res. 248. Joint resolution to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the succession to the Presidency and Vice-Presidency and to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota:

H. Con. Res. 136. Concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Ethics in the legislative branch of Government; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H. Con. Res. 137. Concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Ethics in the legislative branch of Government; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H. Con. Res. 138. Concurrent resolution that the President of the United States be requested to bring up the Baltic States question before the United Nations and that the United Nations conduct free elections in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, under its supervision; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H. Con. Res. 139. Concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Ethics in the legislative branch of Government; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H. Con. Res. 140. Concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Ethics in the legislative branch of Government; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MORSE:

H. Con. Res. 141. Concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Ethics in the legislative branch of Government; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. REID of New York:

H. Con. Res. 142. Concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Ethics in the legislative branch of Government; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SCHWEIKER:

H. Con. Res. 143. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to efforts of the President to secure a universal condemnation of anti-Semitism; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Con. Res. 144. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the persecution by the Soviet Union of persons because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TENZER:

H. Con. Res. 145. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the public viewing of the film "Years of Lightning, Day of Drums," prepared by U.S. Information Agency on the late President Kennedy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H. Con. Res. 146. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to aggression in the Middle East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H. Con. Res. 147. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress on increasing the authorized bed capacity for all Veterans' Administration hospitals; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H. Res. 145. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the rate of cost increases under health benefits plans; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H. Res. 146. Resolution authorizing payment of compensation for certain committee employees; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Iowa, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, requesting the continuation of operations of the Veterans' Administration domiciliary at Clinton, Iowa, which was referred to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H.R. 3737. A bill for the relief of Rasalina Sousa Martins; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CALLAN:

H.R. 3738. A bill for the relief of Antonia Herandez-Rico; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 3739. A bill for the relief of Elias Dialektakos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 3740. A bill for the relief of Rosalita Pina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3741. A bill for the relief of Maria Esther Nacson De Garcia Moya; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3742. A bill for the relief of Yong Ok Espantoso; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FALLON:

H.R. 3743. A bill for the relief of M. R. Agarwal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 3744. A bill for the relief of Anna Noullet; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3745. A bill for the relief of David Wajsblat; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3746. A bill for the relief of Irma Hegedus; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3747. A bill for the relief of Anna and Simon Leiser; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 3748. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elda Martin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACOBS:

H.R. 3749. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Matild Gizella Kovacs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H.R. 3750. A bill for the relief of certain individuals; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3751. A bill for the relief of Tarek L. Radjef; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3752. A bill for the relief of Robert C. Gibson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 3753. A bill for the relief of Grazia Modafferi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 3754. A bill for the relief of the heirs of Dalva Calazans and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McEWEN:

H.R. 3755. A bill for the relief of Theodora Kaltsounis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H.R. 3756. A bill for the relief of James S. Kahriman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.R. 3757. A bill for the relief of Jan Onnik Bahadir; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3758. A bill for the relief of Mary F. Thomas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H.R. 3759. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Christina Protonentis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3760. A bill for the relief of Dr. Abbas Assar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3761. A bill for the relief of Luigi Seminara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 3762. A bill for the relief of Mr. Nicolas Roth Domonkos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 3763. A bill for the relief of Melbourne B. Sibblies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3764. A bill for the relief of Lydia Carolina Pesso; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY of New York.

H.R. 3765. A bill for the relief of Miss Rosa Basile DeSantis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3766. A bill for the relief of Guiseppe Ciancimino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI:

H.R. 3767. A bill for the relief of Irena Gordyczukowska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3768. A bill for the relief of Anna Polnik; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of California:

H.R. 3769. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Surpik Sulukciyan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.R. 3770. A bill for the relief of certain individuals employed by the Department of the Navy at the Pacific Missile Range, Point Mugu, Calif.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TUCK:

H.R. 3771. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of R. Gordon Finney, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 3772. A bill for the relief of Maria Restivo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3773. A bill for the relief of Joshua Felise Ziro Brevio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3774. A bill for the relief of Wanda Olszowa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3775. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Polyxeni Terzidon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3776. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Margaret M. Burke; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOLFF (by request):

H.R. 3777. A bill for the relief of Edward Pechdimaldji; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WYDLER:

H.R. 3778. A bill to provide tax relief for contributors to the Thomas M. Dugan Memorial Fund; to the Committee on Ways and Means.